Appendix

Overlooking the Needy at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appears in the Lakeland Ledger on Thursday, July 27, entitled "Overlooking the Needy at Home."

At this time when we are spending the American taxpayers' money to assist so many of the so-called backward nations, it seems to me that we should take a good look in our own front yard. Certainly we need to take care of some of the responsibilities that are justly ours—such as the needs of the American Indian. The editorial which follows refers specifically to our Indians:

OVERLOOKING THE NEEDY AT HOME

Today a greater proportion of American Indians vote, seek office, go to school, enjoy good health and attain certain marks of accomplishment and status than ever before in U.S. history.

Nevertheless the 300 reservations where live some 360,000 Indians still bear strong resemblances to those underdeveloped lands we commit ourselves to aid beyond our shores.

The Indian lifespan is just two-thirds that of other Americans, and infant mortality rates run three times as high.

Among Indians 25 years and older the median education level is half that of the general U.S. population. Tens of thousands are not trained to hold good jobs even if they could find them.

Throughout most Indian territory substandard, waterless huts abound, though often electric curent which could bring more modern facilities stands within easy reach.

Economic development—agricultural, commercial, industrial—lags badly nearly everywhere. On one reservation, 108,000 potentially productive acres produce not a cent of income for their countless Indian owners. Water rights, vital to Indian as to other lands in much of the West, are vaguely defined and loosely protected.

These are but samples, part measure of the task perceived by Interior Secretary Udall's task force on Indian Affairs in its newly completed survey.

What the group proposes is something like the kind of development program favored for foreign aid plans, with heavy stress on better schooling, vocational training and placement, and infusions of outside capital to develop areas and draw in industry.

The task force likewise would slow down and make easier and more careful the Indians' transition from dependency to independence. There exists widespread Indian fear and distrust of the Federal policy symbolized by the one long word, "termination."

That policy, fixed by a 1953 congressional resolution, called for all deliberate speed in freeing Indians from their Federal wardship. Congress and others have become aroused over an Indian program which cost $160 million this year, $1 billion in the last 10. The rising Indian population has been a further spur.

Yet time and somewhat dismal experience with "termination" at big reservations in Oregon and Wisconsin cast the policy into question. To the Indians it means homelessness, deeper poverty than before, yielding Federal protection and getting no other.

Though the recommended development program probably promises no more than a slow uphill pull, no wiser course is in sight. Surely the help we are urged to give to millions overseas we canot withold from hundreds of thousands of Americans—citizens all.

Berlin: Alternative to Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, July 20, 1961, on the Berlin question, by a number of distinguished Americans. While I do not necessarily agree with the proposed solution of the Berlin problems set forth in the advertisement, I think it raises questions which should be seriously considered and debated by the American people, and that it proposes a solution to the Berlin question which I hope the State Department and the President will seriously consider. As the debate on the Berlin question proceeds, it becomes more apparent to me that while we must all support the President in his proposal for rearmament—and I do categorically and completely—nonetheless we must search the continent for peaceful solutions to the problem which will leave the people of West Berlin in freedom and yet prevent the holocaust of nuclear war.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN: THERE IS AN ALTERNATIVE TO NUCLEAR WAR

Berlin could touch off a nuclear war.

Mr. Khrushchev has stated his terms. He knows these terms are unacceptable to the West. He has said he will not be dislodged or bluffed out of his position by force or the threat of force.

Mr. Kennedy has rejected Mr. Khrushchev's demands. He has said that the United States will accept no change in the status of East Germany that would jeopardize the independence of West Berlin. He, too, has declared that the United States cannot be intimidated by the threat of nuclear force or the fact of nuclear force.

Thus the unthinkables are no longer unthinkable. Only yesterday leading statesmen warned that force as a means of settling disputes in an atomic age was unthinkable. They made it emphatic that the moment nations turned to nuclear war in pursuit of their objectives they destroyed both the objectives and one another. A single nuclear-tipped missile could carry a special delivery death message for a million people or more. No defense, however ingenious, could be adequate. Hence the clear warning that recourse to war in today's world was in the nature of a suicide pact.

Now, however, a specific test arises and the unthinkables threaten to become the possibles.

The Soviet Union wishes to wait no longer in settling the questions about Germany that were deferred at the end of the Second World War. In the absence of agreement among the victorious powers, Germany was temporarily divided into occupation zones. Berlin, the capital, happened to be deep inside the Eastern zone. The temporary arrangement called for Berlin to be divided, with the Western Powers having access through East Germany to West Berlin.

The Soviet Union feels that an indefinite continuation of the temporary arrangement is intolerable. Its probable reasons:

First. East Germany has been hemorrhaging. Every week, thousands of scientists, doctors, engineers, teachers, farmers, and factory workers are fleeing to West Germany through the Berlin gateway. The economy of East Germany is under increasing strain because of the constant loss of vital manpower.

Second. West Berlin is a glittering showcase for the free world inside the world of the Soviet satellites. No comparison in the modern world is more striking than is to be found today between West and East Berlin.

Third. And most important, the Soviet Union has become severely apprehensive about the remilitarization of Western Germany and is seeking leverage on the Western powers to keep such militarization from going too far.

The United States, Great Britain, and France are eager to maintain the showcase. They have made binding commitments to West Germany and to the people of West Berlin. They regard German militarization inside NATO as a vital buffer and deterrent against attack from the East.

Faced with this challenge to their national interests, both sides have declared they will hold fast. This means that the nations involved are now on an atomic collision course. This fact is clearly understood by all. Yet neither side wishes the other to assume it is reluctant to risk force. And each has served notice it would not lose its nerve because of the horror of nuclear war.

Thus, far from being a deterrent to war, nuclear weapons have actually accelerated the danger of conflict, since the nations now feel compelled to demonstrate they will have no hesitation to use them wherever their vitaly interests are directly involved.

All these facts in the current crisis over Berlin are relevant, but one fact is dominant.

The United States and the Soviet Union may insist on the sovereign right to wage war against each other on the issue of Berlin, or any other, but neither has the right to wage war against the human race in the pursuit of its national goals.

The central meaning of atomic war today is that it is impossible to engage in a major nuclear exchange without killing millions of

people outside the warring powers. The radioactive poisons pumped into the air in a major nuclear war would condemn or imperil all living creatures throughout most of the northern latitudes.

This raises the most profound moral question to face the American people in their history. How far should they—or anyone else—go in carrying out their national aims? Is a policeman justified in firing into a crowd in an effort to kill a murderer? Is any nation justified in firing into the body of humanity in an effort to kill an enemy?

These are not abstract questions. They cannot be ignored.

No extermination without representation

If mankind is involved, then mankind has a right to be consulted. The issue of Berlin is not just whether the Soviet Union is right or the United States is right. The issue is whether there should be extermination without representation; whether the contending nations have the right to proceed without regard for the lives and opinion of others.

It will be said that such terrifying eventualities belong to war itself, and the United States has no alternative. But it is not true that no alternative exists. The alternative is action through the United Nations.

The United Nations was created for the purpose of maintaining peace. A threat to peace has now materialized. The Soviet Union has served notice that it intends to take the law into its own hands. The United States need not do the same. The United States can bring the issue of Berlin before the United Nations. It can argue its position in the context of world law. It can attempt to mobilize world public opinion behind a peaceful settlement of the Berlin question.

The only power in the world greater than the power of nuclear force is the power of world public opinion. Not until this power is tapped and put to work can we or anyone else say that there is no alternative but force to Soviet intransigence in Berlin.

Bringing a constructive proposal on Berlin before the United Nations can be part of a much larger effort seeking the fullest possible development of the United Nations itself—to the end that the U.N. can do the job it was created to do in the first place.

That job is to safeguard the peace and serve the cause of human destiny.

ONE SOLUTION THE U.N. SHOULD CONSIDER

A Berlin Authority in an arms-free Germany

In going before the U.N., or in direct discussions, the United States can make these specific and constructive proposals. These can provide the minimum assurances that both the West and the Soviet Union can reasonably demand. They point the way to ultimate reintegration of that divided land, without the risk of remilitarization which could once again endanger the West, the Soviet Union, and the world. This solution involves the international supervision of Berlin through a Berlin Authority and the evolution of an arms-free Germany.

A Berlin Authority

While Berlin may be only a part of the German problem, it could hold the key to a solution:

A new Berlin Authority would be formed by the U.N. (or another appropriate international body) with the continued supervision of the Big Four.

The Berlin Authority would supervise the gradual unification of the administration of West and East Berlin, with powers of taxation.

The Authority would maintain access routes to West Germany and would oversee the inspected withdrawal of armed forces of all nations from Berlin, and their replacement by U.N. garrisons.

The Authority would be empowered to secure deficit financing for Berlin from East and West Germany.

The Authority would operate under a guarantee of the city's neutral status by the U.N., NATO, and the Warsaw Pact.

An arms-free Germany

The larger problem of Germany can be approached in a similar way, with the creation by the U.N.—in cooperation with the Big Four—of a German Authority. This would have responsibility to carry out and inspect the following agreements:

The prohibition of nuclear weapons from both East and West Germany.

The withdrawal in stages of all foreign armed forces from all German territory, and their replacement by U.N. garrisons.

The reduction of German military forces to a level useful only to maintain internal order.

The permanent establishment of the German-Polish border at the Oder-Niesse line.

The process of disengagement should include Czechoslovakia and Poland, and perhaps Hungary, Denmark, and Norway. An arms-free central Europe could do much to ease tensions and should be urged as a step toward general, inspected disarmament agreements.

The Big Four need not expect that the Governments of either East of West Germany will be pleased with all aspects of the proposed solution.

Any settlement must be based, not upon wishful thinking, but upon realism regarding the existence of two distinct and different German states today. Thus there is no possibility of reunification of Germany through free elections and self-determination at the present time. Only under international supervision can East and West Germany begin to work out the means of cooperation, interchange, and eventual reintegration or federation. Nothing less will really solve the Berlin problem.

Honorary sponsors: Max Born, Germany; Lord Boyd-Orr, United Kingdom; Martin Buber, Israel; Pablo Casals, Puerto Rico; Brock Chisholm, Canada; Canon L. John Collins, United Kingdom; Francois Mauriac, France; Gunnar Myrdal, Sweden; Philip Noel-Baker, United Kingdom; C. Rajagopalachari, India; Lord Russell, United Kingdom; Albert Schweitzer, Gabon.

Sponsors: Prof. Gordon W. Allport, James Baldwin, Prof. Stringfellow Barr, Harry Belafonte, Ray Bradbury, Allan M. Butler, M.D.; Dr. Edward U. Condon, Edwin T. Dahlberg, Dr. William Davidon, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Clark M. Eichelberger, Jules Feiffer, Dr. Harold E. Fey, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Dr. Jerome D. Frank, Dr. Erich Fromm, Rabbi Roland Gittlesohn, Dr. Israel Goldstein, Patrick E. Gorman, Walter Gropius, Gen. Hugh B. Hester, Ira Hirschmann, Hallock Hoffman, Prof. H. Stuart Hughes, Walt Kelly, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Rabbi Edward E. Klein, O. A. Knight, Arnold H. Maremont, Prof. A. H. Maslow, Dr Seymour Melman, William H. Meyer, Dr. C. Wright Mills, Lewis Mumford, Dr. William F. Neuman, Richard Neutra, Earl D. Osborn, Josephine W. Pomerance, Dr. Charles C. Price, Walter Reuther, Dr. David Riesman, Frank Rosenblum, Robert Ryan, Francis B. Sayre, Dore Schary, Paul A. Schilpp, Dr. Jack Shubert, Dr. James T. Shotwell, Prof. J. David Singer, Lillian Smith, Dr. Ralph Sockman, Dr. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Dr. Edward J. Sparling, Dr. Harold Taylor, Dean Howard Thurman, Louis Untermeyer, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, Jerry Voorhis, Bruno Walter, Bishop Hazen G. Werner.

Board of directors: Norman Cousins, cochairman; Clarence Pickett, cochairman; M. Stanley Livingston, vice chairman; Steve Allen, vice chairman; Max Youngstein, treasurer; William J. Butler, counsel; Albert Bigelow, Rev. Phillips P. Elliott, Eugene Exman, James Farmer, Nathan Glazer, Rev. James Gordon Gilkey, Jr., Robert Gurney, Jr., Rev. Donald Harrington, Dr. David L. Hill, Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Stanley M. Isaacs, Walter Lear, M.D., Harding Lemay, Lenore G. Marshall, Mrs. Stephanie May, Lawrence S. Mayers, Jr., Orlie Pell, Victor Reuther, Norman Thomas, Dr. Hugh C. Wolfe, Jerry Wurf, Robert Bloom, New York; Peter Charlton, California; Mrs. John Coggeshall, New York; Dorothy Eldridge, New Jersey; L. Harold WeWolf, Massachusetts; Nolan Kerschner, Connecticut; Truman Kirkpatrick, Illinois; Warren Morse, District of Columbia; Paul Olynyk, Ohio; Gregory Stone, Missouri; Ethel Taylor, Pennsylvania; Alvin E. Winder, Massachusetts.

Staff: Dr. Homer A. Jacks, executive director; Edward H. Meyerding, associate director; Donald Keys, program director; Sanford Gottlieb, political action director,

Should a Little Child Lead?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in 1788 Edward Gibbon completed his book "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." In it he gave five reasons for the fall of that great empire. Points 4 and 5 seem significantly timely and provocative:

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy was within, the decadence of the people.

5. The decay of religion—faith fading into mere form—losing touch with life and becoming impotent to guide the people.

During this fiscal year the Congress will have appropriated $45 to $50 billion for defense. Every member voting for this, does so hoping not one item of armament will ever be used for the purpose for which it is designed. He also knows in this field what we build today is obsolete tomorrow and other than giving us a certain sense of security we receive no return on our investment.

Our greatest investment with the largest potential return lies in our young folks. Are we making it easier or more difficult to secure capital gains and satisfactory return on this most important investment?

I commend the following letter to each Member of the Congress and suggest here is a field of endeavor costing so little which could return so much:

DEAR SIR: You may pay no attention to this question—you may never ever read this letter. I am only a ninth grade high school student, but I would like to know why Congress doesn't pass a law forbidding obscene movies and literature.

Our society seems to be losing its morals. While we are worrying about reaching the moon, testing bombs, etc., I think we should be more interested in our moral and religious standards.

Most of the people in our society go to the movies. And what do they see at most of the movies? Nothing but obscene junk. The plots and scenes are immoral.

Another thing people do to pass their time is read. What do they read? Maga-

zines that are the same as the movies I mentioned above.

I recently heard a sermon called "The Moral Mess," on "The Lutheran Hour." No wonder we have a moral mess. Wouldn't it be better to allow young people, such as myself, to read and see clean, decent things?

Couldn't such a bill be introduced in Congress?

Declaration of War on Reds Could Help To Win Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Evening Tribune published the following editorial with the heading stated above. It refers to House Joint Resolution 447, introduced on June 12. Identical resolutions sponsored by Representatives HALEY, PASSMAN, and DULSKI are also pending in the House of Representatives:

The United States is in a war with the international Communist conspiracy.

Why not recognize that blunt fact with a congressional declaration of war, not against any government, but against the actual enemy—the league of 98 Communities Parties in the world?

Congress has been challenged to do that in a joint resolution introduced by Representative JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York. The resolution was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Will the committee and the Congress do anything about this?

And if not, why not?

These questions are not asked lightly. Nor is PILLION'S suggestion a silly one.

What good would a declaration of war on the alliance of Communist Parties do? PILLION lists several practical results.

It would identify the enemy. That would clear the issue and provide a basis for forming policies to prosecute the war.

It would be a guide for domestic policies which, the New York Representative says, "must be consistent with the demands of the life and death struggle in which we are engaged."

Elsewhere in the free world, in all lands similarly menaced by the Communist conspiracy, an American declaration of war against the evil alliance would be a banner to which people could rally.

It would assert our rightful place of leadership in this conflict.

"Finally," Pillion says, "we shall have a justifiable hope that by accepting the challenge which the enemy poses to civilization itself, we can someday usher in an era of genuine peace, and the fulfillment of the highest aspirations of mankind."

There are some things a declaration of war on the Communist parties wouldn't do, and they are just as important as the positive gains.

It won't create a new war. Nothing Congress does, or fails to do, will change the fact that the Communist are already waging total war against us.

It won't involve us in any more peril. This war has been going on since 1917 when the Communists seized power in Russia.

It is a relentless war, an incessant war, a war of infinite duration. It is being waged totally, with orthodox and unorthodox methods, with conventional and unconventional weapons.

In urging support for his resolution, Pillion said:

"We must fully recognize that the Communist alliance will never be either persuaded or dissuaded from using their arsenal of thermonuclear weapons against us, if and when they believe they can do so with impunity. The passage of this joint resolution will however, signal the beginning—at long last—of our offensive against the Communists

"It will be a war not of missiles and marching soldiers with bayonets. It will be largely a war of economic, political, diplomatic and psychological weapons. We will not, however, submit to the slavery of the Communist tyranny, whatever the cost may be. I do not offer this resolution as a panacea. This action does furnish the starting point for the defeat of our enemy."

That's something to think about. Will Congress act?

Desalinization of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Roscoe Fleming, published in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Desalting Water: Long Way To Go."

This is a well-informed article on the problem of desalinization of water and indicates that although substantial progress has been made—enough progress has been made that water can be desalted and made practicable for use for domestic purposes—as yet we have a long way to go before we think in terms of irrigation. The research program should be encouraged, and I think the article will be of interest to many people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESALTING WATER: LONG WAY TO GO
(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, long-experienced chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, gently suggests that we well may have landed a man on the moon before we shall have learned how to freshen salt water so cheaply and in such immense quantities as to "make the deserts bloom."

Americans by nature expect the impossible immediately. Their minds—sometimes aided by rosy predictions of the Sunday supplement variety—leap ahead from the news of a scientific breakthrough, to its utmost useful development which they expect by day after tomorrow.

This has happened before. A decade ago we were hearing forecasts that limitless and well-nigh costless energy would be remaking the face of the world.

Atomic energy has, however, so far turned out to be relatively costly, strictly limited to use in specialized situations. One informed guess is that by 1975 it will still account for no more than 4 percent of the world's energy production, if that.

But it is proving of immense value in many situations to which it is suited; and the long-range forecast is still good, that in time it will become mankind's chief source of energy.

In the same way, sea water and brackish water are now being converted to fresh in many specialized situations. But where fresh water can be made available in almost any way at all, sea-water conversion has got a long way to go before it can be made cheap enough to produce fresh water in such great quantities as to meet significant irrigation needs in an area such as the American West.

Desert redemption takes an awful lot of water. Nor is nature, as yet, giving something for nothing.

One major reason for public confusion and overoptimism as to the immediate potentialities of salt-water conversion is that the terms and quantities used are largely meaningless to most people.

Water at $1 per thousand gallons, which is being produced at some of the experimental installations, sounds fine; and water at 50 cents a thousand gallons, which is the immediate goal, sounds wonderful. And as for the 30-cent cost which is as of now the ultimate goal, that sounds like utopia.

But making the deserts bloom, or producing any really major supply, means water by the trillions of gallons let alone billions. The latter is, even so, a meaningless figure. So let us adopt as a standard quantity figure the acre-foot, which is that generally used in western irrigation where the largest quantities of water are handled. An acre-foot is enough to cover 1 acre 1 foot deep; a quantity of 325,851 gallons. In rough calculation, 3 acre-feet constitute a million gallons.

To make a real desert blossom like the rose, you'd need at least 4 acre-feet per acre yearly. In our semiarid West, an acre-foot is good for one-third to one-half an acre of crops yearly. But in the same environment, an acre-foot is a family supply for a year for domestic purposes, including lawn, garden, and maybe a modest swimming pool. A family will pay from $60 to $100 yearly for such a supply, while a farmer feels pinched and justly aggrieved if his irrigation supply costs more than $5 an acre-foot. Mostly he gets it for less.

The present lower cost of fresh water made from salt water seems to be about $1 per 1,000 gallons. This is the cost at the new Freeport, Tex., plant of the Department of Interior. (Because the Government is selling the water at 30 cents and 20 cents a thousand gallons, some impression has arisen that the latter figures encompass the cost.)

But $1 per 1,000 gallons is $326 an acre-foot. The estimated cost is the same for the brackish-water conversion plant now being built at Webster, S. Dak., and a pilot operation for the latter in Colorado is actually producing water for $1.50 a thousand gallons, or just less than $490 an acre-foot.

The immediate goal of 50 cents a thousand gallons figures out to $163 an acre-foot; and the long-range goal of 30 cents still comes to just under $100 an acre-foot.

The costs are bearable when the need is great enough, or when water freshened by nature is unavailable. The community of Coalinga, Calif., entirely underlain by brackish water, supplies its drinking water needs by one of the newer processes at $1.43 a thousand gallons for 28,000 gallons daily, or about $466 an acre-foot. But Coalinga had formerly to bring in its fresh water by tank car at a cost three or four times as great.

In like manner, many Great Plains families obtain drinking water for family and livestock by tank truck at $3 to $4 a thousand gallons; it costs one community on the order of $1,900 an acre-foot.

In another euphoric aspect, we are sometimes told that communities near the seas, when able to supply their own needs by

freshening sea water, will thereupon surrender their claim to fresh water coming down the rivers so that communities high up on those rivers may benefit.

This is to argue that coast dwellers will gladly assume a rather steep rise in their water bills—for even an auxiliary supply of freshened water would mean such a rise—to benefit people farther inland. Further, there are apparently no quarrels and jealousies quite like those over water supply, as witness the long feuds between riven basins.

Nature runs the most gigantic and still the cheapest sea-water conversion plant, the atmosphere, and drops its product upon the just and the unjust alike, though, it must be confessed, rather unequally. Every means of enhancing and saving this naturally fresh water—pollution control, evaporation and leakage control, cloud seeding, etc.—is still cheaper in terms of water saved or produced than any presently practicable means of freshening salt water.

To sum up, and as Representative ASPINALL was gently saying: Large-scale, low-cost sea-water conversion of such a nature as to make a really profound change and improvement in the world's water supply picture, even for the driest countries, is still a matter for the far future, for incessant work and improvisation, and for patience.

It is questionable whether to get people excited by implied promises of immediate large results will do this great and overall promising project any good.

Kansas Fourth Congressional District 1961 Opinion Poll Taken by Representative Garner E. Shriver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the closest links which a Representative has with his constituents back home is the daily mail. We all recognize that while many citizens do appraise their Congressman of their opinions—most people do not avail themselves of that opportunity.

Since early June of this year, I have been conducting an opinion poll in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas. Through this questionnaire I attempted to present a representative random sample of my constituents with the opportunity to inform their Congressman of their views on varied issues which face the Nation and the Congress.

It has been most gratifying and enlightening to read the comments, and note the opinions of Kansans regarding such matters as Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, fiscal policies, admission of Red China to the United Nations, agricultural policies, and the financing of the Federal highway program.

Many citizens also took the opportunity to comment regarding the most pressing problems which faced their respective local communities.

It is most reassuring to me to note the keen interest which citizens in my district demonstrate in public affairs. I am sure that there is growing interest in Government all over this great Nation of ours.

My first public opinion poll was mailed to a random sample of 22,000 Kansans throughout my district. The mailing list was compiled by using the telephone directories of towns and cities of the Fourth District. I am pleased to report that more than 2,900 questionnaires already have been returned to me, and others are arriving daily.

FAVOR PAY-AS-WE-GO FISCAL POLICIES

One of the major conclusions which may be drawn from tabulations of the opinion poll is that most Kansans in my district favor a pay-as-we-go fiscal program.

Nearly 85 percent of the participants said they favor a balanced budget. Over 58 percent voted for an increase in postage rates to meet a $900 million Post Office deficit.

Significantly, in the face of a growing Berlin crisis which will require greater defense spending, over 62 percent indicated they favor postponement of domestic programs now planned while over 50 percent approved of increasing taxes to meet greater defense expenditures.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Kansans are proud of the gains made by education at all levels as a result of continued local and State efforts. They recognize that much remains to be done to improve the quality of educational opportunities. However, those participating in the poll did not express enthusiasm for most of the Federal educational programs which have been proposed to the Congress.

Nearly 58 percent expressed opposition to Federal aid to education for school construction while over 73 percent were opposed to Federal assistance for teachers' salaries.

There was favorable sentiment expressed regarding a program of college loans and scholarships to students.

A SOLID "NO" TO RED CHINA BID

There was overwhelming opposition expressed toward the admission of Red China to the United Nations and many of the recent returns have expressed a similar attitude toward U.S. diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia.

VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Many of my constitutents derive their livelihood from agriculture. It is interesting to note that over 80 percent of all participants expressed opposition to more Federal regulation of agriculture, only 10 percent favored more controls, and 10 percent were uncertain.

I appreciate the time and effort which many of the citizens in my district demonstrated in replying to my questionnaire. This has been a most valuable project in the conduct of my responsibilities, and I plan to continue to invite my constituents to inform me of their views on other issues through similar questionnaires.

Following are the percentage tabulations of the first opinion poll of the Kansas Fourth District:

Do you favor—	Percent		
	Yes	No	Uncertain
Federal aid to education for—			
School contruction	37.3	57.9	4.8
Teachers' salaries	20.7	73.3	6.0
College loans and scholarships	46.8	43.7	9.5
Full local and State responsibility	73.6	20.9	5.5
Medical care to the aged financed through—			
Social security	30.5	64.5	5.0
Federal grants to States	38.5	49.9	11.6
No Federal program in this area	40.9	45.3	13.8
More Federal regulation of agriculture, higher price supports and production controls	10.2	80.2	9.6
Financing the Federal highway program through—			
Extension of 1-cent temporary gas tax	46.2	46.5	7.3
Combination of extended temporary gas tax and increased tax on trucks	53.4	37.3	9.3
Retaining present tax receipts on highway construction fund rather than diverting to general fund	82.7	5.4	11.9
Admission of Red China to the United Nations	10.0	76.4	13.6
Continuation of House Un-American Activities Committee	78.8	9.1	12.1
Increase in postage rates to meet a $900,000,000 Post Office deficit	58.2	34.2	7.6
A balanced budget	84.8	4.2	11.0
If greater Federal expenditures in defense and foreign policy support are concluded to be in the national interest, should the necessary revenue—			
Be raised by increased taxes	50.8	38.2	10.9
Be financed through deficit spending	18.1	67.3	14.6
Come through postponement of domestic programs now planned	62.4	21.9	15.7

House Progress on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter by Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut, which appeared in the July 25, 1961, edition of the New York Times. Mr. MONAGAN, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, quite properly took exception to editorial criticism in the Times that Congress has dawdled over the foreign aid bill. I subscribe to Mr. MONAGAN'S statement that in the circumstances these criticisms were not justified:

HOUSE PROGRESS ON FOREIGN AID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The charge in your editorial of July 9, that "Congress is still dawdling, weeks behind schedule, over one of the most vital measures of our foreign and defense policies—the foreign aid bill" is most unfair.

It is true that a foreign aid bill was sent to the White House last year by May 12,

but you disregard entirely the fact that a totally new situation prevails this year.

The foreign aid bill which the House Foreign Affairs Committee is presently considering is the product of one of President Kennedy's task forces. This bill was not received by the House committee until May 29. Obviously, there would be no point in having hearings or committee deliberations until the new bill which the committee was to consider was produced.

Since the filing of this bill, the House committee has scheduled and heard major administration witnesses, as well as witnesses on the part of the public. Members of the committee have sat morning, afternoon, and evening, on many occasions, and we have also met during the July 4 recess in order to cope with this very difficult situation.

The House committee is now engaged in going over the bill, paragraph by paragraph, to determine the final product.

Congress may justifiably be subjected to criticism for many things, but in this instance, your critical comments were not justified.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, *July 15, 1961.*

Crew of Nahant (Mass.) Coast Guard Station, Like Predecessors, Are Always Ready

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lynn (Mass.) Evening Item of July 26, 1961, which discloses that the Nahant Coast Guard Station has for 61 years personified the motto of their service, "Semper Paratus" or "Always Ready":

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Evening Item, July 26, 1961]

CREW OF NAHANT COAST GUARD STATION, LIKE PREDECESSORS, ARE ALWAYS READY—ON DUTY 80 TO 100 HOURS A WEEK MANNING LAND AND SEA EQUIPMENT

(By Carl Jaffee)

Although the daily routine and rescue techniques at the Nahant Coast Guard Station have changed since it was first manned 61 years ago, today's crew, like their predecessors, personify the motto of their service, "Semper Paratus" or "Always Ready."

The original crew of the Nahant station lacked the equipment which is so essential today, but nevertheless proved invaluable in aiding the victims of accidents at sea.

The station first went into service following the wreck of the coal barge *Charles Briggs* at Sandy Cove Beach with the loss of all hands on board. Public agitation, spearheaded by the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., resulted in the construction of the Nahant station which has been serving the public ever since.

Until the outbreak of World War I, the station operated on an 8-month basis every year, remaining closed from March until August. Beginning in 1917, however, the station's crew manned their posts on a year-round basis.

One of the greatest changes in the daily routine at the Nahant station involves the safety patrols. Modern radio equipment and other timesaving devices have reduced the number of actual patrols necessary to spot boats in distress. The old "east patrol," for instance, is gone, when a Coast Guardsman would walk along the shore to Bass Point with a lantern in one hand and a time clock in the other. He often faced 40- to 50-mile-per-hour winds in the 7-mile patrol, as he searched for ships in trouble. All that is left of the patrols, in fact, are "dusk patrols," launched 5 years ago, involving a search along the shore line from Lynn Harbor to Marblehead each Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and holiday evening.

Also gone from Nahant is the radio station which was in operation from 1926 to 1931. The Nahant station at that time served as a guide and relay service for commercial shipping as well as for Coast Guard craft. Despite the loss of the radio station, however, the Nahant post has remained a vital link in the Coast Guard system because of its search and rescue functions.

Men from the Nahant crew have been involved in a number of vital rescues throughout the years. The schooner *Lucia R. Porter* ran aground off Swampscott in May 1916, and the crew of five were saved from heavy surf under Coast Guard Captain Frank A. Gove. Three Nahant Coast Guardsmen went to Cairo, Ill., in 1927 to aid in rescuing flood victims as the Ohio River overflooded its banks. Another 27 people were rescued in 1957 when two boats collided off Nahant near Graves Light.

The speed and efficiency of the current Coast Guard equipment is one of the main reasons that minor accidents can be prevented from turning into near tragedy, according to Chief Boatswain's Mate Maurice G. Poulin of Nahant, the skipper of the station. A 16-foot rescue speedboat can be launched in less than 3 minutes. Other craft includes a 30-foot utility rescue boat; a 36-foot motorboat for heavy weather sea rescue, and the 10-ton amphibious duck which can travel at a speed of 45–50 miles per hour on land and from 6 to 8 knots at sea.

Just as important as the equipment is the alertness and the teamwork of the Coast Guardsmen who man the ships. An average of 10 men from the 15-man crew are on duty at all times. The 3-man crews which operate each of the boats remain constant so that each crew will develop maximum teamwork and efficiency. Each crew, moreover, consisting of a boatswain, an engineman, and a seaman, can operate any of the boats at the station.

Even when there is no emergency, the men find plenty to keep themselves busy. The crew takes pride in maintaining the reputation of the station as one of the most spotless in the service, says Seaman Jerome O. Evaul of Haddon Heights, N.J. Regular drills in swimming and lifesaving, communications, including semaphore and Morse code, position plotting, firearms, and seamanship also keep them active. Chief Poulin estimates that each man in his crew is on duty from 80 to 100 hours per week, including regular 4-hour stints in the watchtower which is occupied 24 hours a day.

Other crew members include: John E. Horner, of Danvers, boatswain's mate, first class; James E. Walsh, of Lynn, engineman, first class; Thomas P. Haywood, of Winthrop, engineman, second class; James B. Collins of Hull, boatswain's mate, third class; Edward F. Lombard, of Natick, engineman, third class; Eugene F. Flanagan of Winthrop, seaman; James C. Pickard, of Portland, Oreg., fireman; Leon T. Minta, of Jewett City, Conn., seaman apprentice; Louis R. DesForges, of Ware, seaman apprentice; James A. Murphy, of Gardner, fireman apprentice; William Hall, of Magnolia, commissaryman, third class; John E. Wilbur, of Beverly, seaman, and Michael Finn, of Springfield, seaman.

Operating under the U.S. Treasury Department, the Coast Guard would be under the command of the Navy in the event of war.

American Good Government Society Supports Electoral College Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a completely unprecedented interest in electoral college reform is sweeping America. Magazine articles, newspaper editorials, important speeches, committee reports, convention resolutions and radio-TV commentaries are appearing almost daily in some area of this great country or other in support of electoral college reform.

As one of the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 12, a slightly revised form of the old Mundt-Coudert amendment, I am highly gratified in this great upsurge of interest in this basic element of our presidental elections. I think reform of our presidential election machinery is the most significant single step needing to be taken in order to give equal rights to all Americans. Senate Joint Resolution 12 has eliminated the possibility of gerrymandering electoral college districts and would return this great Republic to the district plan for electing presidential electors which was followed during our first several presidential elections. It would correct the ensuing evils which have developed as the country adopted the general ticket, bloc-system, of electing presidential electors with its undemocratic and unfair winner-take-all formula for disenfranchising minority viewpoints. It would substitute no new evils of its own and it would accomplish this by a simple Constitutional amendment which maintains the respective vote impact of any State in the election of our Presidents.

I was highly gratified, therefore, by the news release issued by the American Good Government Society of 810 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C., announcing the formation of a nationwide Committee on Electoral College Reform headed by Dr. John S. Millis, president of Western Reserve University of Cleveland, Ohio. I ask that the full text of this news release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTORAL COLLEGE EDUCATION PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, July 31.—A nationwide public education program on electoral college reform is being undertaken by a special committee of the American Good Government Society, former Representative Ed Gossett of Dallas, Tex., president of the society announced today.

This special commtitee on electoral college reform is headed by Dr. John S. Millis, president of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. When completely organ-

ized it will have at least two members from each State.

"In recent years polls have shown repeatedly that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States favor a change in the way the President and Vice President are elected," said Mr. Gossett. "However, they have also shown great lack of knowledge and misunderstanding of how the electoral college system operates. For example, a recent survey showed that 34 percent of those questioned thought the electoral college is a school for the children of Members of Congress.

"It is our hope that this educational program will bring about a clear understanding of the present system and how and why it should be changed. Former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower all favor a constructive change in the electoral system by constitutional amendment."

The first step in the educational program, Mr. Gossett said, will be the early publication and wide distribution of a brochure entitled "How Should the President Be Elected?" This brochure will explain just how the President is actually elected, the constitutional provisions which apply, and the historical background. It will describe the shortcomings of the present system and will explain the various plans for reform which are now pending in the U.S. Senate.

Members of the committee to date are: Stanford M. Adelstein, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Prof. Bower Aly, Eugene, Oreg.; Hon. James H. Pou Bailey, Raleigh, N.C.; Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, Owosso, Mich.; Richard Chapin, Lincoln, Nebr.; J. D. Stetson Coleman, Delray Beach, Fla.; Hon. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York, N.Y.; Hon. Charles E. Daniel, Greenville, S.C.; Frank M. Dixon, Birmingham, Ala.; Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R.I.; Hon. Arthur Gardner, Washington, D.C.; Miss Louise Gore, Potomac, Md.; James H. Gray, Albany, Ga.; John Griffin, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, La Crosse, Wis.; Daniel C. Gainey, Owatanna, Minn.; Richard L. Herman, Omaha, Nebr.; Lewis R. Holding, Charlotte, N.C.; and Mrs. Edmund C. Lynch, Jr., New York, N.Y.

Also William G. McFadzean, Minneapolis, Minn.; Roger Milliken, Spartanburg, S.C.; Felix Morley, Gibson Island, Md.; William S. Morris III, Augusta, Ga.; Harold F. Ohlendorf, Osceola, Ark.; Leonard J. Pasek, Neenah, Wis.; Charles S. Payson, New York, N.Y.; Boswell Stevens, Macon, Miss.; Hon. Lewis L. Strauss, Brandy Station, Va.; Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Lancaster, N.H.; Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Princeton, N.J.

National Charity Lottery of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in this country, it is all too often true that gambling is a pillar of organized crime. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the example of Panama in order to show that gambling does not have to serve such evil ends. The national charity lottery of Panama functions, as its name would indicate, to provide funds for the support of hospitals, welfare institutions, and orphanages.

The national charity lottery plays quite an important role in the everyday life of Panama, and although that nation has a population of only 1 million, gross receipts from the national charity lottery were $28 million in 1960. In that year, the profit to the Government was $4.7 million.

In Panama, the gambling urge is centralized and channeled so as to achieve beneficial ends. Gambling dollars in Panama are not used to shore up racketeers as in the United States. Instead, they are used to promote the public welfare. When we realize the merits of a national lottery, we, too, will be able to siphon funds from the pockets of gangsters into the pockets of hard-pressed taxpayers.

National Music Workshop in Door County, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the week of August 6 to 12, a national music workshop will be held in Door County, Wis. The event will bring musicians from all over the Nation to live and learn together in the rustic, natural surroundings of Door Count Peninsula.

Even though these are troubled times, we cannot, and must not, overlook the significance of also promoting cultural progress. Presented jointly by the University of Wisconsin and the Peninsula Music Festival, the events will include workshops on many aspects of music, including conducting, singing, and so forth; and which reflects a creative effort to develop talents and appreciation in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent edition of the Green Bay Gazette.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONWIDE MUSIC WORKSHOPS SET FOR DOOR COUNTY AUGUST 6 TO 12

MADISON.—During 2 weeks of annual music workshops, musicians from all over the Nation will live and learn together in the rustic natural surroundings of the Door County Peninsula.

The first of the workshops is the National Harp Master Class for advanced harpists from August 6–12. It will be conducted at the Clearing (at the tip of the Peninsula) by Marcel Grandjany, internationally celebrated concert harpist from the Juilliard School of Music in New York, assisted by Margaret Rupp Cooper, Madison, one of the leading harp instructors in the Midwest.

Grandjany, born in Paris, studied as a child with Juliette Georges Grandjany and Henriette Renie. Awarded the Premier Prix in harp at the Conservatoire National in Paris, at the age of 13, he later received the Premier Prix in harmony. He made his concert debuts in Paris in 1909, in London in 1922, and in New York in 1924.

Grandjany's active concert career in recital and with orchestras throughout Europe, the United States, Canada, and Cuba has brought him wide acclaim as a composer and faculty member of music schools both here and abroad.

Thirty participants will be offered 7 full days of concerts and recitals, technique study, and close association with harp instructors and fellow students.

The University Clearing Singers Workshop from August 20–26 will be directed by Dr. Lara Hoggard from California. Dr. Hoggard did graduate work at Northwestern University and Union Theological Seminary and holds two advanced degrees from Columbia University.

CONDUCTORS' SYMPOSIUM SLATED ON AUGUST 20–25

Offered permanent positions at some of the country's top institutions, he prefers to be free lance so that he can work with various groups. He has established a brilliant reputation in church and school music education, teaching in workshops and festivals, as a composer and author, arranging and conducting for radio.

Enrollees in each session will be limited to 30 and will live in the Clearing dormitory. This area of lakes, rocks and forests offers an attractive setting for music study and appreciation.

Built by Jens Jensen (1860–1951) as a cultural garden to which he invited the world, the Clearing is operated by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation.

Concurrent with the University Clearing Singers Workshop, the fourth annual Peninsula Symposium for Conductors is scheduled from August 20–25 at Fish Creek.

CONVENTION PLANNED

The University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department, in cooperation with Dr. Thor Johnson, and Prof. Richard C. Church, director of the University of Wisconsin Symphony Orchestra, offers this symposium in connection with the Peninsula Arts Association.

During the same week the National School Orchestra Association will hold its third annual convention in Fish Creek.

The objective of the symposium for conductors is the opportunity to study conducting techniques with Dr. Johnson and the provision of a professional symphony orchestra for demonstrations and actual conducting experience.

Participants will be enrolled in two categories—fellows and associates. Membership in each classification will be limited to 20.

Fellows, selected on the basis of background and experience, will be assigned orchestral works to prepare prior to the symposium. During the 6-day period they will rehearse and direct the Peninsula Festival Orchestra for symposium members and receive individual instruction from Dr. Johnson and the staff.

Associates will attend classes in conducting and baton technique, have individual conferences with Professor Church, and participate in all group activities during a week of intensive practical and theoretical study.

The late summer Door County music workshops are presented by the University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department under the direction of Prof. Emmett R. Sarig, the University of Wisconsin Music Department, and the Peninsula Music Festival. Requests for complete information should be sent to: University of Wisconsin Extension Music Department, 548 State Street, Madison, Wis.

Friendship Cannot Be Bought With Foreign Aid Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it seems pertinent, with the current debate on foreign aid that is being waged in the Congress and elsewhere, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from a letter which a constituent of mine John S. Schell, of Edinboro, Pa., sent to the President recently.

Mr. and Mrs. Schell served as foster parents this past year for an American field service exchange student from Indonesia. Their impressions of our foreign aid program, particularly in Indonesia, are based upon comments of this boy and other exchange students who visited their home during the past year.

Mr. Schell whote President Kennedy:

Indonesians, for example, regard us as "Uncle Sugar," who will be delighted to provide much more money than the $660 million of our tax money to continue President Sukarno's ill-conceived and wasteful projects, as well as his personal indulgences. The main idea expressed by these students is that the United States will give them anything so the Communists won't—actually they're on both sides of the fence and our State Department blissfully and naively continue to recommend spending huge sums of money in foreign aid or "international giveaway" which we as a nation with many of our own domestic problems requiring money cannot afford * * * money has not bought friendship for us but rather contempt and we see in our student a deep desire to get all the material possession possible from the stupid Americans who have more than they need.

Money never bought friendship at home or abroad.

Included here as part of my remarks is the letter by Mr. Schell:

EDINBORO, PA., *April 30, 1961.*

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I do trust that the secretary who reads this will forward the main thoughts expressed in the next section.

My wife and I have served as foster parents this year for an A.F.S. exchange student from Indonesia and have come to know him rather well. In addition, several other exchange students have visited in our home and as a result, we have received a rather amazing picture of our country's impression upon young people in other nations.

Indonesians, for example, regard us as "Uncle Sugar" who will be delighted to provide much more money than the $660 million of our tax money to continue President Sukarno's ill conceived and wasteful projects as well as his personal indulgences. The main idea expressed by these students is that the United States will give them anything so the Communists won't—actually they're on both sides of the fence and our State Department blissfully and naively continues to recommend spending huge sums of money in foreign aid or international giveaway, which we as a nation with many of our own domestic problems requiring money cannot afford. It angers us to hear our exchange students speak of Sukarno doing this and that with our money while many Americans are out of work and hungry.

Thus, might we respectfully but urgently request your consideration of these suggestions:

1. Cease or greatly reduce foreign aid funds to Indonesia and other countries as well. Money has not bought friendship for us but rather contempt and we see in our student a deep desire to get all the material possessions possible from the stupid Americans who have more than they need. As a Nation, we are taking money from many citizens who can not afford the present high taxes and actually wasting it in the grandiose rathole of so-called foreign aid. Pipe dreams such as this, which lack clearheaded consideration, are pushing us closer to the status of a second rate nation and perhaps we deserve this if we are so stupid.

2. Review our State Department's snub of an old friend, the Netherlands, in refusing to send a delegate to the New Guinea Council Installation. It seems we are being swayed into some rather assinine actions in an attempt to win the "friendship" of Sukarno who to me appears both morally and intellectually bankrupt. Please do not be "taken in" by the oriental charm but lack of real character which seems so typical of Indonesians.

Please give these thoughts your serious consideration and do act with more intelligence than our Congress and administration has in foreign aid matters thus far. Best wishes to you from an active "member of the opposition" and may our country under your administration come closer to the sort of America we all want.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. SCHELL.

Dollar Instability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1961 issue of the Monthly Letter on Business and Economic Conditions, published by the First National City Bank of New York, there appeared a table showing the rates of depreciation during the last decade of the U.S. dollar—2.1 percent—and of the currencies of 42 other nations.

The alarming rate of depreciation experienced by the U.S. dollar manifests the urgent need for a balanced Federal budget and a strong gold reserve.

With the Kennedy administration recommending repeal of the gold reserve requirement applicable to Federal Reserve notes and proposing Federal assumption of welfare programs which will perforce involve deficit budgeting of a monumental scope, I think it important that Members of the Congress have an opportunity to peruse the table to which I refer. I insert, under unanimous consent, the table in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEPRECIATION OF MONEY

The following table presents our annual review of comparative rates of depreciation of money, in this instance covering 43 countries, 1950–60. The shrinkage of currencies is measured, inversely, by the rise in cost-of-living or consumer price indexes as reported by the various governments. Year-to-year indexes of living costs for 18 countries are shown in the chart.

The U.S. dollar has been shrinking at an annual rate of 2.1 percent. Belgium, Germany, and Canada are among the industrial nations experiencing about this same rate of depreciation, one that means a loss of half the value of the currency in 33 years. Upward price pressures were measurably greater in 1950–55, but since then have been retarded, in Italy, the Netherlands, Japan, the United Kingdom, and Sweden.

In eight cases, the shrinkage in the value of money, exceeded 10 percent per year compounded, with results of shaving anywhere from two-thirds to 99 percent of the buying power of the currency unit over the decade.

	Indexes of value of money			Annual rates of depreciation (compounded)		
	1950	1955	1960	1950–55	1955–60	1950–60
				Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
Philippines	100	104	94	−0.8	2.1	0.7
Ceylon	100	96	93	.8	.6	.7
Portugal	100	101	92	−.2	1.9	.9
Guatemala	100	91	91	1.8	0.	.9
Switzerland	100	92	87	1.6	1.1	1.4
Ecuador	100	83	84	3.7	−.2	1.8
Belgium	100	90	83	2.1	1.7	1.9
Germany	100	91	82	1.8	2.2	2.1
India	100	106	81	−1.1	5.1	2.1
Lebanon	100	103	81	−.6	4.7	2.1
United States	100	90	81	2.1	2.1	2.1
Canada	100	88	80	2.5	1.9	2.2
El Salvador	100	78	77	4.8	.2	2.5
Pakistan	100	90	75	2.0	3.6	2.8
Italy	100	82	75	3.9	1.8	2.9
Netherlands	100	85	74	3.2	2.6	2.9
Denmark	100	83	71	3.7	3.0	3.3
South Africa	100	79	71	4.6	2.1	3.4
Ireland	100	79	69	4.7	2.5	3.6
Japan	100	74	67	5.8	2.0	3.9
United Kingdom	100	76	67	5.2	2.6	3.9
New Zealand	100	75	65	5.6	2.7	4.2
Norway	100	74	64	5.8	2.8	4.3
Sweden	100	76	64	5.3	3.5	4.4
Spain	100	88	61	2.6	7.1	4.9
Austria	100	67	60	7.8	2.1	5.0
Finland	100	80	58	4.3	6.3	5.3
France	100	76	57	5.3	5.5	5.4
Greece	100	64	57	8.6	2.2	5.4
Australia	100	66	57	8.0	3.0	5.5
Colombia	100	81	52	4.0	8.6	6.3
Iran	100	68	51	7.4	5.7	6.6
Mexico	100	65	49	8.3	5.2	6.8
Peru	100	71	47	6.6	7.8	7.2
Turkey	100	78	41	4.8	12.2	8.6
Israel	100	39	32	16.7	3.9	10.8
China (Taiwan)	100	45	28	14.9	8.8	11.9
Uruguay	100	59	21	10.0	18.4	14.3
Brazil	100	45	15	14.6	20.3	17.5
Argentina	100	44	9	15.3	27.6	21.7
Paraguay	100	14	8	33.0	11.1	22.8
Chile	100	18	5	29.1	23.6	26.4
Bolivia	100	7	1	40.5	34.6	37.6

NOTE.—Depreciation computed from unrounded data and measured by reciprocals of official cost-of-living or consumer price indexes.

Some More Feed Grain Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some additional figures in connection with feed grains:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1961.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In our letter to you of June 1, 1961, we informed

you that we had written to the ASCS State offices for estimates of farmer participation in the 1958, 1959, and 1960 price-support programs for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat in any two, three, and four of these crops.

The enclosed tabulation shows the information received from the ASCS State offices in this connection.

We trust this information will be satisfactory for your use.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary.

Number of farmers participating in price support loan programs for barley, corn, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat in 1958, 1959, and 1960

State	Percent of farmers participating in any 2 of above crops			Percent of farmers participating in any 3 of above crops			Percent of farmers participating in any 4 of above crops		
	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960	1958	1959	1960
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	0	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	2	7—	4	0	1	2	0	0	0
Arkansas	9	8	6	10	9	7	11	10	8
California	5.8	3.9	2.7	5.5	3.8	3.9	4.8	3.2	2.3
Colorado	10	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	10	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Georgia	4	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	45	30	20	15	10	2	0	0	0
Illinois	13.8	4.8	2.4	1.5	0.9	0.6	0	0	0
Indiana	14	16	18	13	13	15	9	11	13
Iowa	77.9	22.6	12.0	7.7	1	1.2	7.1	1.1	1.1
Kansas	85	75	80	5	7	12	0.01	0.01	0.01
Kentucky	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maine	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	25	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	7	6	9	3	2	2	2	1	1
Minnesota	15	6	7	3	1	1	1	0.5	0.5
Mississippi	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0	0
Missouri	30	30	30	10	10	10	2	2	2
Montana	18	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	60	55	55	30	23	26	2	3	4
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	−1	−1	−1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	21	14	19	1	0	1	0	0	0
New York	8	9	8	3	2	2	0	0	0
North Carolina	50	60	40	20	25	15	1	1	0
North Dakota	52	40	39	55	41	40	56	41	40
Ohio	25	20	25	8	5	5	−1	−1	−1
Oklahoma	13	4	6	0.7	0.2	0.3	0	0	0
Oregon	27.9	8.8	40	2.4	0.1	0.3	0.05	0	0
Pennsylvania	20	20	20—	5	5	5	0	0	0
South Carolina	14.4	13.1	11.6	3.0	1.3	1.7	0.3	0.7	0.3
South Dakota	35	5	32	17	1	14	4	0	3
Tennessee	3	6.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	12	5	10	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0
Utah	−1	−1	−1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	5.3	1.1	0.9	1	0	2	0	0	0
Washington	31	28	24	14	12	5	−1	−1	−1
West Virginia [1]									
Wisconsin	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	6	3	6	1	1	1	0	0	0

[1] Very little price-support activity.

Delinquents: Who's To Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Evening Star of July 31, 1961, contained a column by Mr. William S. White which I feel merits the attention of every Member of the Senate, particularly those who favor appropriating vast sums of Federal aid money to solve our juvenile delinquency problems. I was impressed with this column, particularly the last paragraph which expresses exactly my sentiments on efforts to obtain Federal aid funds to solve our juvenile delinquency problems. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELINQUENTS: WHO'S TO BLAME?—PARENTS SHOULD DISCIPLINE CHILDREN, NOT PASS BUCK ON RESPONSIBILITY

(By William S. White)

In the matter of juvenile delinquency and widespread juvenile shiftlessness there are increasing signs of a healthy revolt against that old American custom of expecting George to do it—George in this case being the Government.

Many days of solemn congressional hearings here into such things as violence on television and into ways and means to make the youngsters pull up their socks in general have produced about what might have been expected. There have been endless headlines and endless speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and there has been much viewing with alarm.

At last, however, and partly due to certain unusually brave Government officials like Secretary Ribicoff of Health, Education, and Welfare, the plain facts are insisting upon raising their plain heads above all this hulabaloo. The plain facts are these:

There is not now, and there never will be so long as we retain constitutional free speech and the right to private management of private property, any lawful and effective means of preventing television from showing what the public either wants or is too lazy or too stupid to reject by turning off the dial.

And there is not now, and never will be, any lawful and effective way to saddle the public authorities entirely with the responsibility which belongs to parents, and which always has and always will.

This is the simply responsibility to direct, to guide, and to discipline—repeat discipline—their children.

There is no reason whatever why Federal action should be taken, even if it could be taken, to prevent children from seeing sordid or otherwise harmful TV programs.

There is a perfectly simple remedy, a homegrown, do-it-yourself one which does not even require a kit from the hardware store.

It does not require a vast lobbying effort under the slogan "There ought to be a law." It does not require a marching host of boycotters.

It does not require sending delegations to the Federal Communications Commission, to Congress or the White House—or even to city hall. It only requires grownup people to do one little thing.

Tell the children to shut off the blasted TV at those times when programs obviously unsuitable for them are going on. And make sure that it really is shut off.

The same goes for movies, and, actually, for juvenile delinquency itself. In 9 cases out of 10 any father or mother who cannot cope with this thing before it starts is simply not doing his or her job.

Nobody needs a degree in "child care," for illustration, to know that teenagers should not be careening around in automobiles past midnight. And the way to stop it is just to stop it; physically, if nothing else will do.

Some will object that there are cases where a mother has to work and a father is away a great deal. The answer is not at all complicated: Any adult capable of bringing a child into the world can find the time, if he really wants to, to give that child some responsible guidance.

Now, of course, it is a sad fact of life that some children—a very few—are never amenable to any kind of discipline. In such cases the parent can only do his best. But it is extremely improbable, at all events, that any number of Federal regulations, on television, movies or anything else, would accomplish much here.

So the vast majority of American parents have only one necessity: To do their plain duty by the children and quit expecting somebody or everybody else—the Government, the schools, some committee or other, some social worker or other—to do it for them.

It is a frustrating, almost a sickening, thing to see a Nation which grew great long ago on personal guts and personal responsibility run howling to Congress for protection against its own children.

Ohio American Legion Endorses House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise this Congress that the American Legion of Ohio approved and expressed its support for House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution would recognize the total war being waged by the international Communist conspiracy, consisting of 98 national Communist Parties, against the United States and the free world.

Mr. Arthur E. Smith, fourth district Americanism chairman, Department of Ohio, wrote me on July 24, as follows:

The enclosure appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on July 23, in relation to our support of House Joint Resolution 447.

The Americanism Committee, Department of Ohio, felt genuinely impressed with the meaningful contents of the resolution.

Chicago Sun-Times Cites Proposal To Aid Education Through Libraries and Museums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the July 28 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times support is given to the proposition, set forth in H.R. 7478 and H.R. 7481, to allow further income tax deductions for contributions to museums and libraries. Quite accurately the editorial points out that this proposal has a close relationship to the improvement of the quality of American education. In considering the subject of education, we must consider library and museum facilities as well as colleges and universities, vocation education and rehabilitation as well as primary and secondary schools, research and new educational ideas as well as buildings and equipment. The focus of these bills is educational improvement, a further tax incentive for the advancement of quality education in America.

I should like to place this editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times in the RECORD under permission heretofore granted:

TO HELP MUSEUMS AND LIBRARIES

As most persons who itemize their income tax returns know, they may list as tax deductions certain contributions to worthy enterprises. Up until 1954, the limit was 20 percent of adjusted gross income. In that year, Congress, wishing to encourage greater contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions, raised the percentage for them to 30 percent. For other categories it remained at 20 percent.

The Internal Revenue Service has interpreted Congress wording so as to exclude certain educational enterprises, such as the Art Institute of Chicago, from the benefits of the broadening bill. Certainly museums and libraries are educational institutions, particularly for the general public.

To clarify the congressional intent in specifying educational institutions as beneficiaries of higher tax exemption provisions, two bills have been introduced in Congress this year. One is by a Republican, THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Webster Groves, Mo., and the other by a Democrat, EUGENE J. KEOGH, of Brooklyn, N.Y. Both extend the 30-percent deduction to any "museum of history, art, or science or a library open to and operated for the benefit of the general public and which normally receives a substantial part of its support from the United States, or any State or political subdivision, thereof, or from direct or indirect contributions of the general public."

The Curtis-Keogh bills recognize that libraries and museums are important to our educational system and deserve the same encouragement from Government that schools and colleges receive. We urge Congressmen to support them. Whatever small loss to the Treasury they cause will be made up many times more for all citizens by strengthening and improving libraries and museums that serve them directly.

Tributes to Dicky Bryant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the July 14, 1961, edition of the Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer carried a story concerning Dicky Bryant, a 12-year-old boy, who had taken a 5-mile hike. As the article pointed out, there is nothing very unusual about 12-year olds taking hikes of this sort, in an effort to qualify for advancement in the Boy Scouts; but in this particular case it was most unusual, for the young man involved lost his legs in a tragic accident less than 2 years ago.

To me, this story was inspirational. It reflects, I feel, the stalwart and courageous independent nature of our country's early settlers and Founding Fathers. This story deeply touched me and made me feel proud of this young man—and especially proud that he is a North Carolinian. By his exemplary act, this young man has given courage and inspiration to others. I am certain that many who have afflictions have taken new hope after learning of this young man's accomplishment; and, by the same token, those of us who have known no impairment feel inspired to achieve even more. I was extremely pleased to note that the Washington Evening Star, in an editorial of July 18, also paid tribute to Dicky Bryant's victory over adversity.

This editorial was most appropriate, I feel, as recognition of the stamina and moral fiber of America's wholesome youth, as epitomized by Dicky Bryant.

In an era when so much attention is given juvenile delinquency, it was heartening to me to read this story, and I should like to share it with my colleagues.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C., July 14, 1961]

DICKY TAKES A HIKE WITH SCOUT PALS

CHARLOTTE.—Dicky Bryant, who wants to be a Boy Scout, second class, took a 5-mile hike with his pals Thursday.

Nothing unusual about that—lots of 12-year-old boys have done it.

But Dicky made it with two artificial legs.

He lost his legs above the knees under the grinding wheels of a freight train over 19 months ago.

Slowly, surely he has been fighting his way back to normal routine. He returns to seventh grade at Thomasboro school in the fall. He's been using artificial limbs for about 17 months.

The hike over secondary roads took 4 hours. "I did all right, although I fell to my knees a couple of times," Dicky related proudly.

"We got a ride back. I guess I might have made it back without a ride if I'd had to, but I would have been real, real tired," he added.

The hike was part of the requirements toward becoming a second-class Scout. An oral test will determine whether he makes the grade.

Dicky lives with his waitress mother, Mrs. Pauline Bryant, three sisters and a brother. Two older sisters have married.

Dicky recalled a more trying ordeal in his scout training.

"I sure made a mess of things camping out some weeks ago. I tried to fry the eggs without any grease in the pan. They were terrible."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 18, 1961]

DICKY'S EXAMPLE

Dicky Bryant, a 12-year-old North Carolinian, has just taken a 5-mile hike with some of his friends. He has done so because he wants to be a Boy Scout, second class. He certainly has qualified, and in a decidedly first-class manner. Of course, lots of youngsters his age have walked as far as he has, and farther, but the very special thing about his performance is that he has carried it out on artificial legs, only 19 months after having been run over by a freight train. The example he has set does more than serve merely as an inspiration to the handicapped; it serves also, or ought to, as a kind of reproach to those all-too-numerous teenagers who seem to have come to the conclusion that walking is for the birds and that the only way to move from here to there, even from one's home to the corner grocery store, is by automobile. Dicky Bryant knows better, and his contemporaries, who are fortunate enough to be blessed with nonartificial legs, would be well advised to follow his lead.

If We Want To Win We Have To Risk Losing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in a recent advertisement, there appeared a statement which I think is so excellent that I would like to include it herewith:

IF WE WANT TO WIN WE HAVE TO RISK LOSING

The curse of this age is compromise—too often with evil. So we support neutralist nations with billions for fear they might go Communist. We don't dare even whisper a suggestion that they proclaim a stand with the decent nations of the world. If we demanded such a stand, our billions might pay off.

And we let Russia get ahead in the space race, because we were afraid of racketeers who held up production by strikes and featherbedding. We didn't have the courage to risk being tough.

We can't afford full speed ahead on missiles because powerful pressure groups drain away selfish billions of tax money—groups we should have courage enough to tell go hang.

Once we did have the courage—America was determined with the man-in-space, and had the courage to chance it openly. And courage won. Every war to save America was won because our leaders and the people pledged our "lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"—everything to win. And then America won.

Nothing worth having is ever won by weakly pecking at it, by being afraid of it. We believe the American people will back our President and Government in risking everything to preserve freedom—the American brand of freedom, not some compromised, watered down foreign version of it. Even if such a stand meant the atom bomb, we earnestly believe all decent, all real Americans would say once more, "give me liberty, or give me death." Who with a shred of decency left in him wants to live under enemy-dictated "coexistence" which is a parlor word today for slavery tomorrow.

Sound Appointments to the New Haven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, with the appointment of three trustees under the Bankruptcy Act, the New Haven Railroad has entered a new and critical period. It is essential that it emerge from this period in health and equipped financially to meet the growing needs of an expanding area. Moreover, the problems of the New Haven, although grave, are not unique. They are symptomatic of many of the troubles besetting the entire transportation industry across the country. A new national transportation policy is required urgently. But, in order to design this, we must have a clear understanding of what our present policy is. As an initial step, I have introduced H.R. 8364, which would direct the Secretary of Commerce to survey and analyze all present Federal and State regulations governing transportation including a survey of the structure of all governmental programs of assistance programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD the news release accompanying the introduction of H.R. 8364 and an editorial from the Hartford Courant of July 28, relating to the New Haven Railroad and the need for a national transportation policy.

It is an excellent editorial and I commend it to the earnest attention of every Member:

[From the Hartford Courant, July 28, 1961]
SOUND APPOINTMENTS TO THE NEW HAVEN

It was right that Judge Robert P. Anderson should name three trustees to take over the New Haven Railroad in bankruptcy. The job is a big one. But even more important is the judicial independence and integrity Judge Anderson displayed in making his appointments. He was informed that the White House itself, via the Attorney General, favored the appointment of former Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of Rhode Island. And this pressure was backed by some political big guns from Rhode Island and Connecticut.

The origin of such support may be deduced from the fact that way back in 1956 Mr. Roberts was a backer of John F. Kennedy for Vice President. But Judge Anderson noted that Mr. Roberts' "great ability and skill" had been devoted exclusively to politics, and so turned to professionally qualified trustees instead. He is right. The last thing the troubled New Haven needs is political appointments at the top, which have a way of proliferating in further political appointments down the line.

The three men who were chosen are well qualified. One of them, Harry W. Dorigan, knows not only railroads but the New Haven itself. He was fired by the elder Dumaine during the early years of the railroad's second descent into bankruptcy. Not only did Mr. Dorigan have a long record in the financial side of the railroad's management, but he has bankruptcy experience as well. During the New Haven's previous receivership he was executive assistant to the road's president, Howard G. Palmer, who was one of the trustees at that time. The other present trustees are an authority on corporation law who also has previous connections with the New Haven, Richard J. Smith, and a fiscal expert and lawyer, William J. Kirk. There can hardly be any question about FCC endorsement of these men.

So begins the long road back. But even such prudent and informed management as the railroad may now look forward to, may not be enough to turn the tide. Judge Anderson said that if the measures now begun are not enough, if no way can be found to make income and cost meet, then "The New Haven Railroad will simply have to go out of business." Here one may disagree with the judge. New England, and indeed the country as a whole, simply cannot afford to let the New Haven go out of business.

This railroad may have been dogged by an unusually evil fortune in recent years. But it is only a forerunner of others. The chief trouble bedeviling all American railroads lies in the changes wrought by the automobile and the truck, plus an unplanned and uncoordinated national transportation pattern. What not only the New Haven but all railroads need most of all is a carefully thought out national transportation policy. Such a policy must treat railroads, trucks, and buses, passenger cars, airplanes, and waterways as integrated parts of a single system, no one of which will be discriminated against as the railways are now. To fashion such a policy is beyond the powers of the ablest judge, the most competent trustees. It must be done by the President and Congress of the United States. And the hour is late.

NEWS RELEASE OF HON. ABNER W. SIBAL, CONGRESSMAN FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Congressman ABNER W. SIBAL today called for a new national transportation policy and introduced legislation directing the Secretary of Commerce to initiate the first steps.

The Sibal bill would order the Secretary to survey and analyze all Federal and State laws and regulations affecting the transportation industry, including the structure of grant and loan authorizations.

The Connecticut Congressman, a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, said the bill would provide the information "which is essential as a basis for action to insure that each form of transportation can function efficiently." "This," he continued, "will affect not only the overall transportation problems of the country, which are very grave, but will have a particular impact on the solution of the commuter railroad problem."

SIBAL declared:

"The present governmental approach to transportation has grown up in patchwork fashion over a long period of years. As a result, we now lack a uniform and consistent policy and, because of built-in inconsistencies, conditions of unfair competition and many basic inefficiencies exist among the various forms of transportation. Not only because of the commuter problem, but also for the economic welfare of the country as well as for our defense requirements, it is essential that the Government reassess its policies and that it treat the Nation's transportation facilities as a sum of integrated parts. The separate parts must be related to each other in such a way that each can perform its particular function in the most efficient manner with maximum benefit to the public.

"In order to do this, we must have a clear and total picture of present regulations and existing programs of governmental grants and loans. This picture would be provided under terms of my bill."

The Sibal measure would direct the Commerce Secretary to submit the results of his survey and analysis by June 30, 1963.

John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this year John Carroll University, University Heights, Cleveland, Ohio, is observing its 75th anniversary, and many significant programs have been planned during the year in observance of this anniversary, one of the most significant being a graduate workshop on Soviet ideology which was conducted on the campus June 20–24. Mr. Roger Tubby, Assistant Secretary of State, writing of this program, said:

The success of American leadership in championing the cause of international peace and freedom against the Soviet challenge lies in large measure in an accurate understanding by our citizens of the true nature of Soviet aims, techniques and motivations. John Carroll University is to be congratulated on offering the people of its community an opportunity to inform themselves on this subject under the guidance of specialists.

The Ohio House of Representatives recently adopted a resolution of congratulations to the university on the occasion of this 75th anniversary, and I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, together with a brief background history of John Carroll University, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and history were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio, several of whom are alumni of John Carroll, take great pleasure

in honoring the 75th anniversary of the founding of John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio; and

Whereas founded in 1886 as St. Ignatius College, the name was changed to John Carroll University in 1923 in honor of John Carroll, America's first archbishop; and

Whereas operated as a private school by the Society of Jesus, John Carroll University has earned inestimable respect and esteem for its devotion to the task of providing the opportunity for enjoyment of its fine educational facilities and programs by young people of all faiths; and

Whereas John Carroll has gained national prominence not only for its excellent achievement in the field of education, but also for its acquisition of the finest Chesterton library and one of the leading seismological observatories in the country, among others, and

Whereas the brilliance and dedication of the faculty of John Carroll is evidenced by the many distinguished alumni who have attained noteworthy success in their various endeavors, and by the outstanding ROTC program which makes John Carroll one of the major sources of officers for the U.S. Army Transportation Corps: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio extend their sincerest congratulations to John Carroll University on the memorable occasion of its 75th anniversary and commend the faculty and administration for their superlative accomplishments and foresight in their educational programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to Father Hugh Dunn, S.J., president of John Carroll University, William D. Fissinger, vice president for development, and the Carroll News.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: ITS BACKGROUND

Since 1886, John Carroll University has served Greater Cleveland and the Nation by training young men and women of all faiths.

Now northern Ohio's largest liberal-arts college, it is operated by the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits). Its alumni list is notable, and as a private school it serves the public.

Founded under the name of St. Ignatius College in 1886, it was incorporated under Ohio law and empowered to confer all academic and professional degrees. The name Cleveland University was adopted early in 1923 but later that same year was changed to John Carroll University in honor of Archbishop John Carroll.

In September, 1935, the university was moved from its original site on the west side of Cleveland to its present campus on the eastern fringe of metropolitan Cleveland.

The 60-acre campus of John Carroll University is located in University Heights. The main approach is from the intersection of Fairmount Boulevard and Warrensville Center Road, but Grasselli Tower of the Administration Building is an identifying landmark visible from any direction.

Fourteen buildings, predominantly Gothic in architecture, make up the present physical plant of John Carroll University. Three student dormitories—Bernet Hall, Pacelli Hall and Dolan Hall—accommodate a total of 620 full-time campus residents.

Roadman Hall serves as the Jesuit faculty's residence and also houses the seismological observatory and several academic offices.

The administration building is occupied by administrative offices and by classrooms and laboratories. The library contains over 100,000 volumes for general use by students and faculty. Here also is the Robert Bayer collection of G. K. Chesterton first editions and manuscripts. This collection gives John Carroll University what many authorities consider the finest Chesterton Library in the world.

Other buildings include the headquarters of the school of business, the department of education, and the military science building. Two recently opened structures—the gymnasium (1957) and the student activities center (1959)—comprise the nerve center of extra-curricular campus activity. The library, (1961) is the newest building on the campus.

The university educates 2,000 young men in the college of arts and sciences and in the school of business. Sixteen hundred men and women are enrolled in the evening college. The graduate school has 400 students, the majority of whom are elementary and high-school teachers taking advanced professional training.

John Carroll has the largest ROTC transportation corps in the United States. Over 1,200 cadets are enrolled in this training program. John Carroll graduates comprise one-third of the second-lieutenants entering the U.S. Army Transportation Corps.

Alumni in ever increasing numbers are adding to the stature of Cleveland in its myriad of business, professional, and industrial activities. For example, over 400 Cleveland doctors received their premedical training at John Carroll. Similarly; 200 area dentists claim John Carroll as their undergraduate school, as do 450 lawyers, of whom 11 have distinguished themselves as court judges.

Degree programs are offered in 40 major fields of the arts, natural sciences, social sciences, and business. They include specific curriculums for preprofessional study leading to medicine, law, dentistry, engineering, teaching, etc. The full range of studies is available in day, evening, and summer sessions.

The Carroll Seismological Observatory was the fourth of its kind when founded in 1904. Today it ranks as one of the top completely equipped seismological stations in the country.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: ITS FACULTY

As a Jesuit university, John Carroll University draws upon the intellectual resources and education experience of the Society of Jesus, which has operated colleges and universities for more than four centuries.

Fifty Jesuits are assigned to John Carroll. Their work as teachers and administrators culminates 15 years of individual Jesuit training, supplemented in many cases by further preparation in specialized fields at the major universities of the world.

At least 125 full-time lay teachers, well-trained specialists, work with the Jesuits in the classrooms and laboratories of John Carroll.

More than 60 percent of the full-time faculty have earned their doctorates. Lay faculty members are on 12-month contract. They enjoy a full range of fringe benefits. Lay faculty salaries are above average for the entire north central region.

The faculty of the university serves in four major academic units:

1. The college of arts and sciences.
2. The evening college.
3. The school of business.
4. The graduate school.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY: NAMED AFTER A GREAT RELIGIOUS LEADER

Founder, John Carroll, born on January 25, 1735, as the fourth of the seven children of Daniel and Eleanor Carroll of Upper Marlboro, Md., had grown up and been educated in those early years when it was unlawful, even treasonable, for Catholic children to attend a Catholic college even on the Continent of Europe 3,000 miles away. After schooling at home under the excellent training of his mother, whose own school days had been spent in France, young John spent a brief time at Bohemia Manor Academy in 1747–48 and then left, with his cousin Charles, for the long voyage across the Atlantic to the College of St. Omer, founded on French soil by the English Jesuits and best loved by the boys of Maryland.

John Carroll entered the Jesuit Order in Europe. Because of the temporary suppression of the Jesuits, he returned to the United States in 1774 as a priest.

His cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the signer of the Declaration of Independence, was recognized as one of the foremost leaders of the Revolutionary period.

On June 9, 1784, Father John Carroll was appointed "head of the missions in the provinces of the new Republic of the United States of North America," and the jurisdiction of a Vicar-Apostolic in London over the Catholics in the former colonies was ended by this appointment of Father John Carroll as Prefect-Apostolic in the United States. In 1790 he was consecrated Bishop of Baltimore, and in 1811 he became America's first archbishop. Because of his episcopal position he did not rejoin the Jesuit Order when it was restored.

Full of years and grace, he died on Sunday, December 3, 1815, at the age of 81.

JOHN CARROLL: TOMORROW

The university is an arena in which the students meet their teachers in appropriate and adequate physical surroundings. It is the task of university administration to provide maximum facilities for both the student and the teacher. This idea, this administrative goal, is what is meant by university development.

Contributions by business, industry, and individuals have been invested in the enrichment of educational offerings and enlargement of educational faculties. Faculty salaries have been increased in order to attract and retain well-qualified lay teachers. Research has been sponsored to further the professional development of teachers.

John Carroll will become an even greater university through the further enrichment and enlargement of its educational work.

The university needs $10 million as an addition to its endowed support. Income from such funds is used to provide merit salary increases for the faculty, opportunities for research, funded scholarships for intellectually gifted but needy students and endowed professorships for outstanding teachers.

If the university is to accept more students, the arena of learning must be enlarged to accommodate them. Buildings and essential facilities are necessary for further growth. In the face of national predictions of increasing college enrollments, John Carroll University is prepared to carry its share of the load as capital resources become available.

John Carroll's library is another forward step in its program to serve the community. On the drawing board is a new dormitory, and then a science building—steps in the fulfillment of John Carroll University's major product—the educated man.

Berlin and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of Eastern Europe and all those concerned about the plight of the captive nations in central and eastern Europe are most eager that the foreign policy of the United States does not reflect a condonment of Soviet imperialism in that area.

Several statements in President Kennedy's address to the Nation on July 25 have aroused a fear that the principle and goal of self-determination for these nations will be abandoned. Critics refer to the particular paragraph which reads:

We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet those concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area.

These statements are the foundation for the following telegram, dated July 26, 1961, to the President from the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Under permission heretofore granted, I include the telegram:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT BY THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ON JULY 26, 1961.

One-hundred million freedom-seeking people in Eastern Europe who, through no fault of their own, were overrun at the end of World War II by Soviet troops and absorbed into slave empire, will be shocked, Mr. President, by one statement in your important address last night. They will note with profound misgivings that no word was uttered to affirm their right to self-determination which is as indisputable as is that of peoples in other parts of the world and pour cause, that of the German people. Instead they were told that the Soviet Union, the most rapacious imperialist power of our times, is entitled to security in central and eastern Europe. The revival of the wartime myth that Soviet Russia was entitled to special rights at the expense of other nations to safeguard her security because she had been repeatedly invaded, is all the more regrettable as it is at complete variance with historical truth. Both Czarist Russia and Soviet Russia have an unmatched three-century long record of aggression against and conquest of their smaller neighbors. Some of the countries represented by our Assembly have been 10 times the victims of such Russian or Soviet invasions. This being the truth, to place security considerations of the Sovet Union before the right of self-determination of its victims is tantamount to recognizing rights of imperial conquest to big nations at the expense of smaller nations. It is tantamount to protecting the wolf against the lamb. Against such concept we must voice before the conscience of the world the protest of the enslaved nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It is up to the Western Powers to honor or forget their obligations under the wartime and postwar agreements pledging them to help our nations in the recovery of their independence and in the establishment of freely elected governments. But, we respectfully submit, there can be no doubt that neither the United States nor any other nation has the right to bargain away the inalienable rights of our nations in return for gains, real or illusory, in Berlin or elsewhere. We are sure that the people of our homelands would appreciate assurances to the effect that their rights are not negotiable.

Assembly of Captive European Nations: Vaclovas Sidzikauskas (Lithuania) Chairman, Stefan Korkonski (Poland) Vice Chairman, Vasil Germenji (Albania), Dimitar K. Petkoff (Bulgaria), Petr Zenkl (Czechoslovakia), Ilmar Raamot (Estonia), Ferenc Nagy (Hungary), Vilis Masens (Latvia), Constantin Visoianu (Rumania), Brutus Coste, Secretary General.

Wisconsin: Ideal Location for New, Expanding Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic health of the Nation, both in terms of jobs and output of goods and services, depends to a large degree upon the development of new, and expansion of existing, businesses and industries.

We recognize, of course, that selection of the right location for such operations contributes to its prospects for success.

Today, I would like to review some of the advantageous factors which make my home State of Wisconsin an extremely desirable and profitable place to operate business and industry. They include a good, ample labor force; a fine road, water, rail, air transportation network—particularly the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which offers greater opportunities for waterborne traffic; the availability of public services; a good climate—not only for business, but also for employees; and many other factors which make a location site in Wisconsin a real land of opportunity.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a thought-provoking editorial entitled "How a Big Industry Chooses a Plant Location—Many Factors Are Involved." It reflects also the advantages of the fine community of La Crosse—exemplary of new opportunity for business and industrial expansion in Wisconsin—and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A BIG INDUSTRY CHOOSES A PLANT LOCATION—MANY FACTORS ARE INVOLVED

The Associated Press last week produced an editorial piece attempting to answer the questions of how a big industry chooses a plant site.

It is a revealing study of interest to La Crosse and similar communities which have the latchstring out these days, hoping to attract industry. We quote the AP:

"Industry looks for a new factory home with much of the care of a woman choosing a home.

"She wants good schools, churches, and neighbors; in general, a pleasant and secure environment in a well-run community. So does an industry and, like the housewife, it will pay a premium to get what it wants.

"Increasingly, plant location scouts for blue chip industries—and many others—are on the lookout for judiciously stocked libraries and attractive parks. They look askance at high juvenile delinquency rates, municipal corruption, voter disinterest, and vice districts.

"Of course, this isn't the whole story by a long shot.

"The paper companies must set up new mills in timbered areas, rather than on treeless plains, and distilleries will seek out bountiful water, not a desert site.

"Nearly all business decisionmakers, regardless of kaleidoscopic plant picking yardsticks, are after what some call a good 'business climate,' a term as hard to define as love.

"They don't like heavy taxes, but will swallow them if careful inquiry shows value received in topnotch municipal services.

"'In the last 3 or 4 years, these subtleties have been giving real concern to discerning companies,' said William A. Barrett, a plant location expert with Ebasco Services, Inc., counselor to enterprises across the country.

"'Nine or ten years ago many companies were greatly swayed by low local taxes. But they learned that 5 years or so after they moved in they might get clipped and clipped badly.'

"General Electric Co., General Motors Corp., and Procter & Gamble are three industrial giants that assign a big value to intangibles in a community surveyed as a plant site.

"'We're interested in becoming an industrial neighbor,' said a General Electric spokesman. He displayed an outline that detailed about 350 check points on factors ranging from toll bridges to an area's tornado history.

"With occasional exceptions, the large companies operate anonymously lest they raise false hopes. The analysts usually contact the political, civic, education, business, financial, real estate and employment agency leaders, along with railroad and utility men, to gather most of their data.

"They don't stop there.

"'Aside from the basic facts, you can find out a lot of what you need to know about a place from a taxi driver or bell hop on the one hand and a leading minister or priest on the other,' one analyst said.

"As to schools, they observe quality and adequacy of building and construction staff, pupil-teacher ratios, program content, school board makeup, and numerous other points.

"The first principle is still the need to operate at a profit. 'Each corporation or type of industry is a study in itself,' said Charles Ludlum, a plant location specialist of Austin Co.

"'For example, a need for exceptionally pure water may affect a chemical company but not a foundry. Also very important in many cases is availability of skilled personnel. If you need them, you have to go where they can be found.'

"Closeness to markets and the availability of raw materials, water, and other utilities also are important. Wage levels, labor-management history, construction costs, and expansion room are other considerations.

"An estimated 12,000 full and part-time agencies work at factory luring these days, counting State, regional, and local public bodies, railroads, utility companies, chambers of commerce, and banks.

"Some States spend $500,000 a year in tax money promoting and advertising."

Cooperatives and the Private Grain Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has proposed that soybean cooperatives be eligible for crop support loans. A decision on this proposal is expected soon for the 1961 crop.

In this connection I would include pertinent portions of a letter I received

from an official of the Omaha Grain Exchange. The letter follows:

The future of the proprietary grain trade appears to be in the balance right at this time, with the emphasis by certain members of President Kennedy's Cabinet doing their utmost to stifle the taxpaying section of the grain trade and to give advantage to the cooperative element of the grain business.

In this, a copy of letter of Farm Grain Dealers of Iowa is being mailed, and I particularly call to your attention the underlined section of the wire from Roy Hendrickson which reads: "This is a major future policy to all grain co-ops not only in soybeans."

This is exactly what the private grain trade has feared was to be the plan of the cooperatives; but never before have we seen it in print.

The Beeghly portion of the letter is along the same line * * *; it appears now that the battlelines are definitely established between the cooperative grain trade and proprietary grain trade.

Out this way, we still feel America is best run by independent action of men with pioneering spirit, and we hope to keep it that way.

The letter of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa—cooperative—mentioned above is, as follows:

FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS
ASSOCIATION OF IOWA,
Des Moines, Iowa, July 24, 1961.

To Presidents, Secretaries, and Managers of Member Cooperatives:

Producers can measure the importance of the issue and challenge to farmers and to their cooperatives by the urgency and the action Roy Hendrickson stresses in his wire received in FGDA's office late Friday, July 21:

"This wire is being sent to all directors of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Need your help badly in behalf of Arkansas Grain Cooperative. CCC Board June 14 acted to recognize coop soybean pool as eligible producers for support price purposes. This is a major future policy to all grain coops not only in soybeans. Its action has received vigorous protest from anti-coop forces including some who long posed as coop friends. Responding to complaint that CCC did not consult or listen to opposition, USDA today agreed to consider any views filed with it up to Friday, July 28. Consider it essential to register with Secretary Freeman support of soybean pool action and this is to request your vigorous participation in telegram and letter campaign to put starch in USDA backbone."

"ROY E. HENDRICKSON,
"Executive Secretary, National Federation Grain Cooperatives, Washington, D.C."

FGDA's justification of its support of the USDA decision to offer farmers the opportunity to improve and stabilize soybean prices through voluntary cooperatively organized and managed bean marketing pools had already been expressed in a telegram FGDA President Milford Beeghly addressed to all Iowa Congressmen on Thursday, July 20:

"After the most careful consideration, as president of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa (cooperative), I am convinced that a USDA regulation authorizing soybean producers to pool their interests and thus make more effective use of the free market and the soybean price support program, should be published and made effective immediately so that it will be available to the producers of the 1961 crop which will be the largest of record.

"I understand the soybean regulation is patterned after the regulation governing the very successful rice pool. It is my studied opinion that the pool principle involved will contribute to the bargaining power and economic welfare of farmers, promote orderly marketing and thus sustain and better utilize our free marketing system, stabilize prices, enhance the price support program and broaden its effectiveness, reduce administrative costs and burdens now borne by Government, and eventually assure processors a dependable, consistent, accessible supply of beans for processing at satisfactory stable margins and thus stabilize prices for soybean meal.

"I urge that you support USDA's position that this regulation will result in benefits to farmers, consumers, and all segments of the soybean industry. I deem its immediate publication essential to the development within agriculture of the countervailing economic and bargaining power essential to survival in today's economy. I would appreciate your conveying to Under Secretary Charles Murphy my support and I would hope your support, of this position."

"MILFORD M. BEEGHLY,
"President, Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa."

This is a vital issue—its long range significance can't be overemphasized.

The anti-co-op forces are going all out in their effort to force USDA to abandon its announced position. Do you need any better evidence that the pool idea will help farmers and their cooperatives? Apathy at this moment could foreclose an opportunity not likely to recur. Can you afford to put forth any less effort than your anti-co-op opposition?

Address your telegram or night letter supporting the soybean pool principle to: Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

If the cost of telegrams and night letters is of any concern—FGDA considers this to be a matter of such fundamental importance that it will gladly reimburse any co-op member who wires Secretary Freeman if the member or his co-op will furnish FGDA with copies of the wires sent, together with a request for reimbursement.

Telegrams in your own words would be much preferred, but in case you are too busy you might prefer to use one of these three sample wires:

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 1

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge no letdown in June 14 action by CCC Board recognizing co-op soybean pool. This is very important to producers and has been properly interpreted as a most helpful step for farmers. Please disregard selfish interest of opposition to your constructive action.

_____.
(Signature)

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 2

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

As a farmer I hope you will stand pat on your helpful action of June 14 recognizing co-op pool program. We need stronger farm cooperatives, and this is no time for retreat.

_____.
(Signature)

SAMPLE MESSAGE NO. 3

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

I consider your action in recognizing co-op pool plan in soybean support program a wise and helpful action. I trust that the long record of opposition to farm co-ops of some private dealers and processors will not unnerve you. You are to be commended for your spirit of helpfulness to farmers and their cooperatives. I feel this is important enough to justify your personal intervention.

_____.
(Signature)

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, Is free enterprise to be eliminated from the Nation's grain business? Would this not be the intent of certain groups as indicated above?

Co-ops serve a useful purpose, but many people feel there should be a place in our economy for both cooperatives and free enterprise. If the co-ops are bent upon destruction of the private grain trade, then it may be time for the Congress to give a close and careful look at their entire operations and at tax legislation as it applies to them.

Lt. Gen. William Hall Receives ROA Hall of Fame Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Reserve Officers Association names a recipient of the Minute Man Hall of Fame award. The honor goes to a person who has contributed not only to ROA, but to his Nation, as well. This year, Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, commander of the National Continental Air Command, received the award.

Bill Hall was born in McAlester, Okla., my hometown. We were boys together. We were in McAlester High School at the same time. I have watched this man grow as a leader and an officer dedicated to the service of his country. He has moved upward steadily, assuming positions of greater responsibility in his Air Force duties.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article from the July 1961 issue of the Officer, paying tribute to my good friend and a great American, Bill Hall:

LT. GEN. WILLIAM HALL RECEIVES ROA HALL OF FAME AWARD

When the ROA awards board met to name a person to be honored with the association's Minute Man Hall of Fame award for 1961, it wasn't a difficult job. Bill Hall, or to be more formal, Lt. Gen. William E. Hall, not only has been a friend of ROA for a long time but he has contributed outstandingly to his country for many years.

So the choice of the commander of the nationwide Continental Air Command to receive the top honor at ROA's 1961 convention in San Antonio was an easy one.

Past recipients have included Congressman MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina, a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and an expert on military affairs, and Gen. Herbert B. Powell, commander, Continental Army Command.

Bill Hall is one of those grand people who wears his rank well; he measures fully to his responsibilities, and is in every sense of the word a commander.

The Continental Air Command with headquarters now at Robins Air Force Base, Ga., is no small outfit. It commands the Air Force Reserve's 15 troop carrier wings, has

jurisdiction over headquarters of the 52-wing Civil Air Patrol, and trains a large number of Reserve units prepared to provide recovery and support at U.S. Air Force bases and civilian airports throughout the country in event of attack.

More than 75,000 reservists are in a ready status and an additional 500,000 could be called to active duty in the case of a national emergency or war.

General Hall has commanded CONAC since July 1, 1957. Earlier, he had served as Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces in Washington.

A command pilot, he has more than 27 years of flying experience.

Bill Hall's country calls upon him for more than one job: In addition to commanding CONAC, he serves as Air Force representative of the U.S. delegation to the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations.

Born at McAlester, Okla., October 22, 1907, General Hall is a West Point graduate—class of 1929. He is an enthusiastic sportsman; at West Point he captained the track team in his first class year and received All American honorable mention as a football center.

Following 4 years' service with the field artillery, the general entered primary flying school at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., in 1933 and graduated from the advanced flying school at Kelly AFB in that State a year later.

During his early Air Force career, General Hall filled a number of routine assignments—serving successively with the 78th Pursuit Squadron at Albrook Field in the Panama Canal Zone and, in 1937, as operations officer with the 14th Airbase Squadron at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

General Hall attended the Air Force Tactical School at Maxwell AFB, Ala., in the fall of 1939. Upon graduation he returned to Bolling AFB as post adjutant. He became assistant executive officer there in July 1941.

In September 1941, the general was transferred to Air Force Headquarters as assistant to the air inspector. He became Secretary of the Air Staff there a year later, and Deputy Chief of Air Staff in March 1943.

During the crucial period of World War II, General Hall was assigned to the 15th Air Force in the Mediterranean theater as Chief of the American mission to Bulgaria. Later he was appointed deputy commander of the 15th Air Force in Italy.

Following V–E Day, the general returned to the States as Deputy Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Personnel. He was appointed air member of General Eisenhower's Advisory Group in 1946.

The following year General Hall was assigned to Turkey as Chief of the U.S. air survey mission—which conducted a modernization study of the Turkish Air Force. His next assignment was to Berlin—as director of intelligence for the commander in chief of the European Command during the Berlin airlift.

Reassigned to Air Force Headquarters in November 1949, General Hall was named Deputy Director of Legislation and Liaison in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. He became Director the following May.

The general assumed command of the 4th Air Force at Hamilton AFB, Calif., in January 1951. During early fall of 1952, he was assigned vice commander of the Continental Air Command at Mitchell AFB, Long Island.

General Hall was appointed Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces at Air Force Headquarters in September 1953—serving in that capacity until his assignment as CONAC's commander at Mitchell on July 1, 1957.

His decorations include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Air Medal.

He is married to the former Marguerite Higgins, New York Herald Tribune journalist.

University of South Carolina's First All-American Walked Into Rex's Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach here an article about a constituent of mine, Mr. Louis Sossaman, of Gaffney, S.C., and in the article, which I attach, is a story of the greatness of this man as an athlete and the fine citizenship and example he has continued in his hometown of Gaffney. I think this article deserves the interest of all of us as an example that this young man is an example of the youth of today:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S FIRST ALL-AMERICAN WALKED INTO REX'S OFFICE

(By Bill Rone)

GAFFNEY. — America's college football coaches recruit players far and wide, sparing no expense to lure agile behemoths to their campuses.

It is significant, therefore, that the University of South Carolina's first all-American walked into the late Coach Rex Enright's office and asked for a chance to play.

Enright, though unimpressed with the youngster's size, was agreeable. Rex didn't know it at the time, but his OK erased all problems at the center position for the next 4 years.

The clean-cut youngster with rimless glasses was Louis C. Sossaman, of Gaffney. After the 1942 season, Soss was named second-string center on the Associated Press all-American team, a pinnacle reached by no gamecock before him. That in itself should be ample testimony.

But Sossaman, a murderous blocker and tackler, although he never weighed more than 200 pounds, went on to star in service and professional football and establish himself as one of the most outstanding football players ever produced by this State.

The Sossaman saga begins on June 2, 1921, when he was born in Gaffney, long one of South Carolina's hotbeds of prep football. His was a newspaper family. Grandfather was the redoubtable Ed DeCamp, one of the men who produced the first edition of the State on February 18, 1891.

Later he went to Gaffney and founded the Ledger and the Grit and Steel, the latter a game chicken magazine that is being still circulated nationally. Lou's father, F. W. Sossaman, assumed control of the Ledger in 1926 and, at 74, is still at the reins.

Lou was a young kid when he acquired a hero—the famed "Galloping Ghost of Gaffney," Earl Clary. He remembers that a football scoreboard was erected in a vacant lot on the main drag. When Clary-led Gaffney High played on the road, large crowds would gather in the lot and await scores via telegraph. Great roars would go up when Gaffney scored.

Just hooked, Sossaman went out for football as soon as he reached high school in 1936. He was a center from the beginning, but at first he was a tiny one—130 pounds.

His first game was not exactly indicative of the future. His dad likes to tell this story:

The Gaffney B team, with young Lou clad in an out-sized uniform, went to Boiling Springs for a game. The field there measured only 90 yards. When a team reached the end, the ball would be placed back 10 yards and they had to be negotiated before a TD was signaled.

Despite its odd field, Boiling Springs had a bunch of rough tough country boys. Gaffney was having trouble. Finally, in the huddle, the quarterback said, "Soss, open up a hole for us in the middle."

The reply was not brimming with confidence. "I can't open up anything. You'd better go around."

Gaffney didn't have to "go around" for long however. The 1937 and 1938 teams, with Sossaman in the forefront swept the boards.

The undefeated 1938 club accepted an invitation to play Fort Union Military Academy in the Little Tobacco Bowl in Richmond, Va. Gaffney lost 7 to 0 and the winning touchdown was scored on an extremely unusual but quite legal maneuver.

"In all of my 14 years of football and many others as an official, I have only seen the play once. It's the return kick. We punted to Fork Union. The receiver caught the ball, ran a little bit, and then—boom. He punted it back to us, over our heads and dead on the 2-yard line. We couldn't get out of the hole, lost the ball, and they scored."

Sossaman also played in the second annual Shrine Bowl at Charlotte that year. He broke his shoulder on the second half kickoff, but Enright and Ted Petoskey of the USC staff expressed some interest in him in a postgame chat.

He went back to Gaffney and was graduated in January. The only college recruiter to visit him was a coach at the University of Tennessee, who dismissed Lou as too small for college ball. (He weighed 180 then.)

Shortly thereafter, Sossaman accompanied his parents to Columbia for a press association meeting. While they were thus occupied, Lou walked down to the fieldhouse for his fateful meeting with Enright.

He entered Carolina at the semester break and was thus able to participate in the spring training of 1939. The next year saw him playing freshman ball for Petoskey.

When he joined the varsity for the 1940 season, there were some fine players around—Al Grygo, Stan Stascia, Cutch Elston, John Leitner and Bobo Carter, to name a few.

"If the war hadn't come along, we would have had a fine team before we were finished," Sossaman said recently.

Sossaman won a regular job immediately, aided, he admits, by the fact that one center hurt a knee and another went into the service. "We were mostly 60-minute men," he added with a note of pride.

The Gamecocks didn't do so well in the won-lost column however. Sossaman best remembers the game in which the 1942 club, which he captained, tied Tennessee's Sugar Bowl team.

Despite University of South Carolina's so-so record, Sossaman was not ignored. He made all-State and all-Southern Conference in each of his 3 years and was the Associated Press' No. 2 all-American center in 1942.

Then came the service years. He went to Bainbridge (Md.) Naval Training Station as an apprentice seaman but quickly rose to the rating of chief specialist A (for athletics) and wound up commanding a boot company.

But of more interest is the fact that he played for the famous Bainbridge Commodores, a powerful service team that went undefeated for two seasons.

This team launched Charlie Justice to national fame. I always like to say the man carrying the ball is his own blocker, and Charlie was the perfect example. He could really set up a block for you.

Also around were Furman's Dewey Proctor (one of the hardest running backs I ever hit), Bill DeCorrevant (the Northwestern All-American), Buster Ramsey (now coach of the pro Buffalo Bills) and Red Hickey (the current San Francisco 49'er coach). It was quite a club.

Sossaman was transferred to Pearl Harbor but the war ended shortly. To entertain themselves and the troops, Sossaman and a few other right fair athletes in Hawaii organized Army, Navy, and Marine baseball and football teams and played on alternate days.

Who were these right fair athletes? Well, to name a few in the close-knit group, there were Schoolboy Rowe, John Pesky, Ted Williams, and Stan Musial (the nicest all-round guy I have ever met).

On his return to San Francisco, Sossaman was immediately signed by Dan Topping, now owner of the baseball Yankees, then owner of the New York Yanks in the newly formed and ill-fated all-American pro football conference.

Sossaman did a 3-year tour with the Yanks and each year they met and lost to the Cleveland Browns in the championship playoff. He was a regular center.

Both the baseball and football Yanks played in the stadium.

Sossaman and family alternated in a nearby apartment with the Yogi Berras, the Sossamans moving in after baseball season.

They became friends. Yogi gave the bat he used in Don Larsen's perfect game to Lou's son Cody. Needless to say, the Sossamans are perhaps the most violent Yankee fans in Gaffney.

There are quite a few parallels in Lou's family life. He married a Carolina cheerleader, Kathryn Edgerton of Columbia and Orangeburg.

Kathryn's father was Dr. Bruce (Red) Edgerton, a star center at Davidson. It is said that he was the first center to drop back out of the line to the linebacker position.

While Dr. Edgerton was establishing his medical practice in Columbia, he served as head coach for 4 years at Carolina (1912–15), compiling a 19–13–3 record with such stars as Fritz von Kolnitz and Luke Hill.

And if there have been two centers in the family, it also has its share of cheerleaders. Following Mama in this activity are 15-year-old Kit and 13-year-old Polly, the pert Sossaman daughters.

In the office of the Gaffney Ledger (Lou is now the advertising manager and a columnist), hangs a large photo showing Lou dumping a runner upside down while playing with the Yanks. Made by Ernest Sisto of the New York Times and entitled "The Gentle Art," it was named the "sports picture of the year."

Attached to the photo is this printed legend: "If you say you can or you can't, you're right."

Lou Sossaman years ago said he could—and he did.

The Shrinking Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Washington Daily News of July 31, 1961, and the Christian Science Monitor of July 29, 1961.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 31, 1961]

THE SHRINKING DOLLAR

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The most important dollar ever inherited by John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the U.S. buck bequeathed to him by the Eisenhower administration.

That dollar was a beat up bit of paper which had been inherited by Dwight D. Eisenhower from Harry S. Truman. H. S. T. got it from F. D. R.

To understand the importance of this Presidential dollar, it is necessary to agree on the moment of time when this dollar was in good health and capable of buying 100 cents worth of goods and services. The Senate Finance Committee fixes this moment of time in the year 1939. This is an arbitrary choice but a good one.

It puts the dollar to the severest test of the past 22 years. So it is that F. D. R. in 1939 had in his wallet a U.S. dollar worth 100 cents. Harry S. Truman inherited that dollar along with the Presidency in 1945. It had shrunk by then in value to less than 79 cents.

Conservative-minded citizens became alarmed. Everybody's dollar had shrunk in pace with the dollar in F. D. R.'s pocket. The prudent family man with a savings account, bonds, or a life insurance policy had suffered in 6 years at least a 21-percent levy on his capital. This probably represented the grandest larceny of all time. There was more to come.

When Harry S. Truman handed the presidential dollar on to Dwight D. Eisenhower that U.S. buck was worth about 52 cents. F. D. R. and Mr. Truman were big spenders. Each had a war in his lap, however, and much of the dollar-busting deficit spending sponsored by those two Presidents was for survival defense.

General Eisenhower was a bigtime spender, too, and he did not stop the rotting of the U.S. dollar. General Eisenhower slowed the disease, however, and handed over to John F. Kennedy a dollar worth about 46 cents. That is the way it has been.

F. D. R.'s healthy 1939 dollar is gravely ill. The illness has developed in step with a long and almost uninterrupted series of deficit years in the operation of the U.S. Government. These deficits require enormous borrowing to pay Government bills. There has been a relentless growth of the national debt toward $300 billion, an incomprehensible figure.

This deficit spending seems to have been bad medicine for the ailing U.S. dollar. President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon evidently believe this is good medicine. They will dose the dollar with a $7 billion deficit this year. The President needs a great lot of new defense money and he plans to borrow that and to borrow more for other purposes.

He may ask for higher taxes next January. But he is not talking in terms of cutting Government costs and preventing deficit spending by economy in postponable nondefense areas. Those are politically sensitive areas, untouchable except at great political risk.

The facts of simple arithmetic suggest something which should jolt all deficit spenders, past and present. From 1939–61 inclusive the dollar lost purchasing power at the rate of 2.4 cents a year. At that rate, if Mr. Kennedy served two terms, he would pass on to the next President a dollar worth about 27 cents. Two-bit dollar, here we come.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1961]

TREND OF THE ECONOMY—THE POUND AND THE DOLLAR

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—President Kennedy was correct when he reported to the people of the United States that their economy was fully able to handle the increased cost of the Berlin buildup.

The economy contains excess capacity and excess manpower. It has enormous absorption content. It can take a lot.

The President is incorrect, however, if he reads the economic situation as shipshape. It is not. The Nation's international monetary position is in the most sensitive balance it has even been. Every ounce of the Nation's gold is pledged to international obligations. The defense buildup, plus the stress on pound sterling, can unbalance this sensitive situation. There is evidence this process is beginning.

President Kennedy's chief economic adviser, Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, said in Bonn July 27 that if the United States must establish large numbers of Armed Forces overseas "a very substantial balance-of-payments problem" would occur, and that the 40-percent hike in the British bank rate was "a very drastic measure."

The New York Times editorially noted July 27 that "clearly there are severe economic problems that may arise, even in the near future. The possible problem area that needs to be watched most closely for the present is the position of the dollar on world markets."

The American economy's recovery from the 1960 recession is first rate. President Kennedy reported that the bounce back was better than any in the past 20 years.

It is important to note, however, that the bounce back actually began before any of the antirecessionary measures of the Kennedy administration could have had any economic impact. It was a natural bounce back and confirms the attractive theory of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the leading specialist in business cycles, that the economy is in an expanding upward natural trend.

Dr. Burns assailed what he termed the "neostagnationist" theories of the Kennedy economists.

Looking back at the Kennedy team's descriptions of the economy early this year is interesting. The economy was described as containing "chronic slackness," that it was "sluggish and tired," that "the sad fact is our last recovery was an anemic one," that "we combat basic sluggishness" in "a disappointingly slack economy," that a "grave economic challenge confronts our economic system," that "stagnation in the American economy can prevent us from making those improvements in our industrial productivity," * * * "a sagging economy," and so on.

The language and the attitude were grim. Just 3 months later the Kennedy team was talking about a budget surplus of $10 billion in fiscal 1963. Early in June the team was about $2 billion under in its forecast of the budget deficit for the fiscal year just past.

With an economic team so out of focus it is not safe for the American people to assume that the economy is not in a state of risk. The risk is not domestic. The risk is international, and this risk is great.

In the international sphere the United States is running on current account. No one is currently starting a run on the bank, yet the possibility exists. International speculators are not usually motivated by patriotism. The potential for speculation at the expense of the United States was never greater. This threat, plus the current tourist spending abroad, plus the arms buildup can easily deplete the gold which must be sustained to meet international obligations.

The Treasury should be building up its gold not depleting it.

The facts of international economics seem lost on the American public.

But the fact is just this simple: The Nation is on current account. It must pay as it goes. It must increase its productivity. It must step up its competitiveness. And it should be alert to the inherent threat to the

United States from European central bankers, international speculators in gold, and the rapidly increasing competitiveness and gold strength of the European Common Market.

The times call for the pound and the dollar to stand together. They are now fighting each other. But the move is up to America. The administration has not taken the lead necessary to strengthen the pound, and the British Government has been compelled to take protective steps. The winds across the Atlantic can change overnight. And they have.

California VFW Endorses House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I previously called to the attention of this House the endorsement of House Joint Resolution 447 by the New York State convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am most pleased to place before this Congress a most effective endorsing resolution adopted by the California Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its 41st annual convention.

The text of the resolution follows:

FORTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES—A CALL TO ACTION

(Resolution 74, 1961, in support of the Pillion resolution, H.J. Res. 447, expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy)

Whereas on July 12, 1961, Representative JOHN R. PILLION, of New York, introduced in the U.S. Congress, House Joint Resolution 447 and the purpose of the resolution is to mobilize all of our Nation's resources to meet and defeat the 98 Communist Parties, allied with and dominated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which are waging a total war against the United States and all free peoples; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has historically been on record in total opposition to the Communist philosophy; and

Whereas the gentleman from New York appears to have projected a positive approach with which to combat a false ideology; and

Whereas the fate of his resolution is dependent upon registering support for his resolution with the leaders of our Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in convention assembled in the city of Sacramento, Calif., does hereby endorse House Joint Resolution 447, 87th Congress; does request that the news media of this State publicize this House Joint Resolution 447, which was introduced only a few weeks ago; does request that all civic and patriotic organizations in California adopt similar resolutions, calling upon their members to register their individual support of this House joint resolution; and does call upon all patriotic Americans to join with the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of California, by immediately advising the President of the United States at the White House in Washington, D.C., the U.S. Senators at the Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., and the Members of Congress at the House Office Building in Washington, D.C., of their support of House Joint Resolution 447.

Adopted on July 18, 1961, by the 41st annual convention, Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

ORVILLE LOFTON,
Department Commander.

Attest:

ROBERT J. MUTT,
Department Adjutant.

The Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention is being focused these days on the new draft program which Premier Khrushchev is planning to present to the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in October.

While this new policy program emphasizes economic goals for the Soviet Union, it is far more than an economic document; it is, as the Washington Post so clearly stated it this morning, "a political blueprint which makes it altogether clear that coexistence, as proclaimed from Moscow, is an instrument of world revolution."

The Post goes on to point out:

The principal lesson of the draft program is to emphasize again that the basic Soviet challenge will continue irrespective of what happens on Berlin. It is a challenge that we must inevitably meet, a challenge that pervades every facet of existence and a challenge that may very well be with us all our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely timely article, and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

COEXISTENCE AS A WEAPON

Mr. McCloy's report to the President on his talks with the mercurial Mr. Khrushchev has as a backdrop the new draft program of the Soviet Communist Party. There is nothing in that document to suggest that, even if the Berlin crisis can be allayed by diplomatic means, relations between the Soviet Union and the West are going to become any happier.

If the Communist chieftains in Moscow were content to concentrate upon the improvement of living standards among the people—a big point in the heady promises—most of the rest of the world would wish the experiment well. There would still be much dislike of the method, but that would be primarily the business of the Soviet people. The fact that the program aims explicitly at surpassing the United States in production would be of interest as a stimulus here, but not of vast security concern.

The Communist program is fare more than an economic testament, however; it is really a political blueprint. It redefines the Communist intention to take over the world, and the purpose is only slightly less sinister because the doctrine appears to reject world war as something that may not be necessary.

For the document makes it altogether clear that "coexistence" as proclaimed from Moscow is an instrument of world revolution. Non-Communist societies presumably are expected to submit meekly to the inevitable; there will be trouble only if they resist, as in Berlin. In almost one breath the draft talks of "equality, mutual understanding and trust between countries; consideration of mutual interests; noninterference in internal affairs," and then of peaceful coexistence which "serves as a basis for the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale and constitutes a specific form of class struggle between them."

Rarely has the tactic been stated so candidly. Nor are the fulminations directed entirely at capitalist imperialism, although it receives the major critique. The program also alludes to the dangers of revisionism, naming explicitly Yugoslavia, and the dangers of dogmatism and sectarianism, which presumably are to be found in China.

Experts may well debate the economic meaning of the draft. It is noteworthy that the promises to the Soviet people, while lavish—a classless society, no rent, no heavy labor, adequate housing for practically everyone, and so on—are conspicuously vague as to timing. The utopian society is not yet. Indeed, some analysts see the failure specifically to mention a shift from heavy industry to consumer goods some retrenchment from Mr. Khrushchev's earlier promises.

Despite the hostile tone of most of the document, on one point its analysis carries a useful warning. "Anticommunism," it says, "has brought social reformism to an ideological and political impasse. This is one of the main reasons for the crisis of social democracy"—which the doctrine equates with bourgeois decadence. Then charge is by no means universally true; indeed, there has been a reawakening of social reform, particularly in Latin America. But it is certainly true that the democratic answer to the obsessive fervor of the Communists must be something more positive than a sterile anticommunism.

All of this has been laid down as a preliminary to the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party which meets in Moscow on October 17. That meeting constitutes a deadline of sorts, for Mr. Khrushchev obviously is focusing his efforts upon it. If the West is to put forward its own ideas and mount counterpressures for diplomatic negotiation to settle the Berlin crisis, they ought to be well under way before then. The long-range Soviet strategy does not rule out the possibility of mutual-interest accommodation short of war.

But the principal lesson of the draft program is to emphasize again that the basic Soviet challenge will continue irrespective of what happens on Berlin. It is a challenge that we must inevitably meet, a challenge that pervades every facet of existence, and a challenge that may well be with us all our lifetime.

Businessmen's Responsibility in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a noted business leader, Mr. Charles R. Barr, of Standard Oil Co., of Indiana,

delivered a speech before the 74th annual convention of the Michigan Savings and Loan League on the subject of the political responsibilities and obligations of businessmen in public affairs.

Mr. Barr was born on a Kansas farm in 1916 and educated in its public schools. He later received his law degree from Washburn University in Topeka. Kansas is proud of the may businessmen who have gained national prominence and it is with pride I submit Mr. Barr's speech and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

BUSINESS'S RESPONSIBILITY IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

(By Charles R. Barr, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); executive president, Effective Citizens Organization; member, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Political Participation Committee; adviser, public affairs committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, presented before Michigan Savings and Loan League 74th annual convention, Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, July 18, 1961)

It is a privilege to have the opportunity to be with you this morning to discuss public affairs and the roll of businessmen in it.

Before we enter into any discussion of this topic, I think it would be well to pause a moment and review why we should be interested in the political affairs of our country. Much has been said about our national goals or lack thereof. Our national goals can be achieved only through a sound political system. Those who have said that we have no national goals have a woeful lack of knowledge of the development of our country. Our goals and purposes were clearly spelled out by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence. Who can forget the ringing words of this sacred document which declares in part:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

No one has defined a goal more clearly. These goals were subsequently further developed in the Constitution of the United States, in which our forefathers declared their goals, "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Those goals were further defined in the Bill of Rights providing for freedom of religion, of speech, of the press, of the right to assemble, the right to petition, the right to bear arms, protection of private property, the right of due process of law, the right of a speedy trial by jury and many other provisions. Our country has since extended our goals by the enactment of 12 other amendments to the Constitution. Other goals have been set out in such documents as President Monroe's Monroe Doctrine, and by Lincoln's unforgettable Gettysburg Address, and in the laws and treaties of our land made pursuant to the Constitution. Millions of Americans have shed their blood on many battlefields to reach and preserve our objectives. Millions more have made their sacrifices in other ways to reach the high plane of civilization which we have achieved. It is startling, in view of the clarity with which we have set forth our goals in documents and deeds, that anyone could wonder about our national purpose. In view of the great sacrifices made by millions of people to achieve and preserve our goals, it is difficult to believe that anyone could doubt for a moment his own individual obligation to work and sacrifice to further enhance the achievement of even higher goals and to preserve this political system which has given us the finest fruits of civilization ever enjoyed by mankind.

Today I want to talk about the political responsibilities and obligations of a particular group of our citizens. I want to talk about that group classified as businessmen and their participation in public affairs. Businessmen have a long tradition of participating in the field of public affairs of our country. Our founders for the most part, were business and professional men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and Hamilton, who risked and pledged their lives, their liberty, and their honor to achieve their goals. The men who subsequently led in the development of our great political system, were also by and large, men of similar background, dedicated to the development of our Nation. Tragically, some 25 or 30 years ago, there began to be some evidence that a large number of members of the business community were leaving political affairs "up to George." George often seemed to have ideas that were not compatible with the continued development and enhancement of the principles which made our country the envy and the model of the free world. Because of the forfeiture and neglect of accepting political responsibility on the part of more and more businessmen, our political system has more and more fallen into the hands of those who seem to worship principles and ideologies contrary to those which made this country's high standards possible. Too often high ideals and purposes have been neglected and political interest and activity has been aimed primarily for the selfish benefit of special groups with the goal of what they could take out of government. If this trend continues, then our free political system and all that it means in the way of freedom and of a sound economic system will soon perish. Anyone who has taken time to read a little history must be aware of the tragic roles of other democracies and republics long demised, where high principles gave way solely to the pursuit of selfish interests by myriads of solely self-seeking interests. Our forefathers were aware of this danger. Benjamin Franklin was acutely aware of it when, after the signing of the Declaration of Independence he said, "We have given you a republic, if you can keep it."

We have kept and developed that Republic amazingly well to date. But now we see more and more attempts to take liberty and rights from our people in return for a dole or a subsidy. We see more and more of the fruit of our efforts taken from us by the tax collector and all about us we see evidence of the degeneration of large segments of our population whose particular goal in life appears to be to live off the fruits of other people's efforts by using their vote solely to gain economic advantage for themselves. There is substantial evidence that certain groups are using their franchise as a method of confiscating property and rights from others via the route of taxation. The ones whose labors are being robbed increasingly year by year with the meeting of every Congress and legislature, are those who produce the goods and services of this Nation, all of whom I would classify as businessmen, whether they work at a lathe or whether they manage the plant. Why then the lack of resistance? I believe that there are several answers to this question:

1. Many of us have come to take our way of life for granted and have forgotten "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

2. Because of insidious propaganda emanating from many sources and because our system has not reached perfection, many members of the business community apparently have lost faith in themselves and their system.

3. In the race for competitive advantage among businessmen, they have tended to avoid anything controversial for fear that it may affect sales. Politics is controversial and no one can indulge in it to any extent for any period of time without getting a bloody nose.

Our forefathers risked everything they had to develop this country but today we find all too many people unwilling to risk criticism or the loss of a customer or client in order to stand up for principles which make their business possible in the first place. Many businessmen have developed a tendency to hide behind and to use specialists such as lawyers, public relations people, and lobbyists to do work which they ought to be doing themselves to a large extent. This is not to say that these specialists are not necessary and desirable in our complex society, but they need help and they need it badly. Too often we seem to think that because we belong to an association whose job it is to protect our particular industry, we don't have to do anything more, or that because we have created an advertising and public relations program which has developed a good image of our own particular group, that we have nothing to worry about.

Sound government is created at the grassroots. Grassroots are the precincts where you and I live. This is where votes are decided upon, where they are cast and where they are counted. There is probably not a precinct in America that is not populated by a substantial number of businessmen and their families. Until such time as these people are willing to sell the principles of sound government to their neighbors and friends, to take responsibility and leadership in their own communities, it is not going to be possible to have a sound political system. If our political system becomes unsound, our economic system is going to fail. We are going to lose our rights and liberties and as surely as night follows day, we will follow Rome and ancient Greece into the ashes of history.

Now, what specifically can we as businessmen do? I have some suggestions:

1. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals and principles of our forefathers. We must match the diligence and spirit which sustained them.

2. We must take our share of leadership in our own communities in the political party of our choice by giving of our time, our talent, and our substance. We must encourage others to follow our example.

Now, assuming that some of you gentlemen decide to do this, what are some of the problems that you may expect to find? First, I am sure that you will find a lot of apathy. Second, you will probably find in many instances that political participation is not the social "thing to do." This is one of the greatest hurdles to overcome and it is only through leadership of responsible people like yourself that this stigma can be overcome. If political participation ever becomes popular and the "thing to do," then our battle is at least half won. Third, you will be surprised at how many people fail to register and vote. Some of these people fail to vote because they are apathetic or lazy, or just do not know why they should vote. Many people in the business community are unable to vote because of their transitory nature, from one community to another. All people should be interested in modernization of the laws to reduce the number of those people who are disenfranchised because of the transitory nature of our society. Let me spell out in some detail what you can do to be politically effective as a leader in your community.

1. Join a party and become identified with it; find out who the local leaders are, such as precinct captains, judges of election, local officeholders, etc. They are all neighbors of yours and probably you know most of them.

2. Voluntarily ask them what you can do to help and, if they are doing a good job, encourage them and let them know you appreciate their efforts.

3. If an opportunity comes to serve in your capacity in their political organization, accept it—don't sluff it off on George. Encourage others to do the same thing.

4. Be willing to give some time, talent, and money to this effort.

Once you have done this, then you will have the right and probably an opportunity to be heard in higher coupcils and to become a real influence for good, sound government. Enter politics and work for sound, general principles, and not merely for narrow interests which may affect you personally, because then you only become another special interest working for self-gain.

I think it is important that anybody entering this area get a proper perspective and put first things first. Few will quarrel with me when I say that first, we should all serve our God and stand only for those principles and rules which have been developed through a long period of His teaching; second, I think you will agree, is our obligation to our country, and we should never knowingly stand for any principle contrary to its best interests, followed closely by our interest and loyalty to those principles which will preserve and develop our families. Then, perhaps, we can think about the special problems that concern our own method of livelihood. If we really work and achieve sound principles for God, country and family, we are seldom going to have to worry very much about good economic principles for our own business enterprises. I suppose what I am really advocating is for each of us to start our own do-it-yourself program in public affairs.

Finally, as businessmen, we can all do a job of selling our political and economic system to our employees, to our associates and our friends. There are millions of people that no one has ever taken the trouble to tell where they fit into the scheme of things and how they benefit from this great country of ours. Liberty is like water. Too often we don't miss it until the well goes dry.

Let us stand up and speak up for what we believe.

We should not be like the parrot whose story so well illustrates the points that I have been trying to make. A merchant had long desired to own a fine parrot. One day, as he was walking to work, he noticed a fine parrot in a pet shop window. He entered the store and asked the manager about the bird and was told that it was an extraordinary bird and could speak seven different languages—the finest bird that he had ever seen. The businessman asked the price and after some negotiation, bought the bird and a cage for $35 and had it delivered to his home. When he returned that evening and met his wife at the door, he asked if his parrot had arrived and she said that it had. He asked where it was and she advised him that it had been in the oven for about 30 minutes and would be ready to be served in another hour. The husband shouted, "My good woman. That was a very expensive and talented bird that could speak fluently in seven different languages. Why in the world are you baking it?" To which his wife replied, "Well, why didn't he speak up?"

Unlike the parrot, the businessmen of America had better speak up.

Don't leave the preservation of this country up to others, but as I said before, start a do-it-yourself program of your own for the benefit of yourself and the generations to come. I am sure that you will get a great deal of personal satisfaction from it and you will leave a heritage far greater than the wealth of the Andes.

We must act. We must speak out.

Imports Destroy Local Industry and Nurture Widespread Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to be able to associate myself with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on matters pertaining to international trade. His long record of support for American industry and labor against the crushing impact of imported goods produced by workers whose wages are shamefully low is recognized and admired in Pennsylvania as much as in his own State.

I am happy to find that the West Virginia State Legislature has taken an active interest in the U.S. Tariff Commission investigation initiated because of the losses sustained by America's glass industry to unfair foreign competition. Western Pennsylvania has also felt the effects of unrealistic tariff policies that permit imported glass and other consumer items to destroy local industry and nurture widespread unemployment and hardship. Other State legislatures should be encouraged to take similar action. Perhaps Congress, when the voice of the people at home becomes sufficiently loud and clear through such media as State legislatures, will finally make restitution for the surrender of its constitutionally delegated power over international commerce.

We who have been exposed to the impoverishments of our communities through irresponsible trade policies are quick to appreciate any decisions by the Tariff Commission that are beneficial to the economy of this country. Decisions of this nature are so few and far between, however, that there is seldom an occasion for jubilation. It is particularly distressing when a favorable Tariff Commission recommendation is rejected by the White House, although such procedure has come to be expected in recent years.

It would seem past time, Mr. Speaker, that Members of Congress accept the fact that present foreign trade policies are entirely inadequate, indefensible, and inane. Even under most satisfactory conditions, the Tariff Commission is without authority to provide the kind of protection American industry and labor must have for proper development and moderate prosperity.

We most assuredly welcome whatever consideration the Tariff Commission proffers. Nonetheless, Members of this legislative body who are dissatisfied with the executive department's arrogation of authority over trade policy, who object to the displacement of American workers through reckless importation of commodities from abroad, and who recognize the long-term damage involved in a program that gives precedence to foreign exporters over domestic considerations; those of us who consider America's economy and defense our first responsibility must join together in drawing up a set of rules not presently being observed. Congress can no longer stand by and watch national welfare be sacrificed in favor of so-called diplomacy. Opening markets without regard to the effect on employment in this country was a connivance of the disciples of internationalism which has not only failed to win us more friends, but in actuality has produced a healthier grade of enemies. Russia's current invasion of energy markets in Europe, Africa, South America, and the Far East is lending emphasis to the futility of this country's attempts to purchase friendship with either hard cash or soft import policies.

There is also danger of supply gaps in all industries whose capacity to meet mobilization requirements is being depleted by competition from abroad. Glass is a good example. When a growing ratio of domestic demand is met by foreign supplies, America's own glass production is stinted instead of moving forward with the growth in population and rise in living standards. The glass industry finds it impossible to continue at normal operational levels when its markets are overrun by products shipped in from overseas. Glassworkers must seek employment in other industries, sometimes far removed geographically. If an emergency comes and imports are cut off, the domestic glass industry could not be expected to meet the sharply accelerated requirements.

Here is where we must make the decision to be sure that there will be no supply gaps under mobilization conditions. Whatever the product—glass, oil, coal, machine tools, pottery—Congress must erect the necessary safeguards. You name it. There are few congressional districts where the impact of unfair foreign competition has not been felt. I invite my colleagues to join me and my distinguished colleague from West Virginia in our long battle for a logical foreign trade policy. With the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring a year hence, now is a most appropriate time to serve notice on the executive department that future trade pacts must be made in favor of America's industries and labor instead of assorted peoples whose only interest in us is what our Government can do for them.

U.S. Airways Deal With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while war clouds gather over the Berlin problem and the United States and Soviet Russia flex their muscles, there is a peaceful negotiation transpiring at the present between these two great nations which deserve our attention.

I refer to the bargaining which has begun for air routes between New York and Moscow.

It so happens that a constituent of mine—James M. Landis, of Harrison—will be chief negotiator for the United States. It is to be hoped by all that he will do a good job, in conjunction with our State Department, and make certain that we do not end up short changed, as has been the case in air bilateral discussions so often in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the Mount Vernon Argus, one of the leading newspapers in my district, recently carried an excellent editorial on this subject. Under unanimous consent, I make this editorial a part of the RECORD:

U.S. AIRWAYS DEAL WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

Representatives of Russia and the United States are scheduled to meet tomorrow to discuss a commercial air treaty between the two countries.

Two airlines are involved.

One is Pan American World Airways, a privately owned American corporation with some 40,000 stockholders. Pan American must earn its own way.

The other is Aeroflot, which is a department of the Soviet Government and an arm of the Red air force. Aeroflot has no stockholders, is not designed to be self-supporting, is fully subsidized by Moscow.

Yet, theoretically, these two lines will compete for patronage under whatever agreement may be reached between the two governments.

But, unless that agreement records a new high in American diplomatic negotiation, Pan American competiton with Aeroflot will follow the pattern of our "competition" with Russia in all other areas of international trade. We do business on a free enterprise basis, Russia uses government-financed trade as an instrument of economic warfare.

Incidentally, whether or not Pan American can be assured of a deal under which its service to and from Russia can survive will depend largely on a Westchester man—James M. Landis of Harrison, who, as special assistant to President Kennedy, heads the U.S. negotiating team.

Mr. Landis is equipped, by training and experience, to do a good job for us.

But he will be only a negotiator, presumably required to consult Washington as well as Pan American every step of the way.

The Soviets will be represented by Col. Gen. Y. F. Loginov, who is boss of Aeroflot, a top officer of the Red air force, and final spokesman for his government in this situation.

So it looks as if—if an equitable arrangement, to say nothing of an advantageous one—is to be worked out for the United States, Mr. Landis must be prepared to do some very forceful table pounding.

Auto Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, of July 21, 1961:

HOW MUCH A MONTH

Representative CELLER's hearings on legislation looking to forcing Ford and General Motors to shed their subsidiaries which extend credit to buyers of automobiles is putting many persons connected with this important industry into a slow burn.

Representative CELLER's record shows him to be one of the "bleeding heart" liberals who is against anything that is big and has anything to do with business. Merit often seems to be a matter of secondary concern.

And that seems to be true in the case of the hearings on the finance companies owned by the automobile makers.

Those who do understand the industry, including Representative GEORGE MEADER, are upset because they feel the whole story has not been brought to light.

The simple truth is that a great number of consumers, when they go to make a major purchase, are interested in just one question: "How much a month?"

That applies to the sale of many items, appliances, and such, as well as to automobiles. To sell the dealer has to have a ready answer. He must have a financing plan available so the buyer can sign his name, make his down payment, or leave the old junker for that purpose, and take home his new washing machine, television set or automobile.

The automobile manufacturers got into financing early as a matter of necessity. When they began to tap the mass markets, the Nation's financial system simply was not geared or accustomed to time payment buying.

Today the buyer with a respectable credit rating has his choice of sources for the money he needs for installment buying. He is not a captive of the financing companies owned by the auto makers. Commercial banks bid openly for his business, as do other financing companies. Credit unions take care of many others.

Thus no real issue of monopoly is involved. Rather, the existence of the financing companies owned by the automobile concerns is a sort of an insurance against monopoly.

In fact, it appears that the harassment of these systems is more or less a matter of penalizing enterprise.

Illinois Legislature Favors GI Education Benefits to All Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith House Joint Resolution 13 of the State of Illinois 72d General Assembly:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 72D GENERAL ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House Joint Resolution 13 (offered by Messrs. Choate, Dunne, Harris, Downes, Craig, Benefiel, Allen Lucas, Ropa, Romano, Pfeffer, Ratcliffe, Scott, Powell, Schaefer, Rink, Russell, R. J. Welsh, Morris, Wendt, Baker, Redmond, and Carrigan)

Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not have been possible otherwise; and

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the level of education of this country and has produced a major national asset in better and more skilled manpower and has done much to improve the economy of our country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order of January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational benefits that were granted to veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas the veteran education program has been an integral factor in strengthening the defense system of our country and the continuation of this program may be justified in terms of our educational ideas and needs; and

Whereas it has been established by reliable statistics that the investment in education for our own American youth will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes, resulting from higher incomes earned by such veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the General Assembly of the State of Illinois does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI education benefits to all veterans who have entered or who will enter military service on or after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended as long as the provision of the draft law shall exist; and that a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the House, April 12, 1961.
PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
Concurred in by the Senate, June 30, 1961.
SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

A New and Dramatic Concept of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Meadville (Pa.) Tribune published an editorial approving of the SS *Hope*, a medical missionary ship from the United States.

According to the Meadville Tribune:

It has been hailed in every port it has visited for the work of its staff among the sick and diseased and for the training given to native doctors and nurses.

The editorial points out that the privately financed hospital ship has been

acclaimed because it brought help from the American people to people of foreign nations with no government intervention either on the giving or receiving end.

One Indonesian newspaper described the ship's visit as "tops on the list of mankind's hopes."

As we move toward consideration of the President's foreign aid proposals it would be well to consider the possibilities inherent in the SS *Hope* type of people-to-people aid.

I include here, for the information of my colleauges, the Meadville Tribune editorial to which I have referred:

LET THE PEOPLE DO IT

Associated Press Staff Writer Relman Morin reports that the SS *Hope*, a medical missionary ship from the United States, is exporting a new and dramatic concept of foreign aid. It has been hailed in every port it has visited for the work of its staff among the sick and diseased and for the training given to native doctors and nurses.

The privately financed hospital ship has been acclaimed because it brought help from the American people to people of foreign nations with no Government intervention either on the giving or receiving end. One Indonesian newspaper described the ship's visit as "tops on the list of mankind's hopes."

The U.S. Senate recently went on record in favor of establishment of a white fleet to provide prompt worldwide emergency aid to disaster victims. The Government's part in this project should be limited to making available ships now in mothballs, as it did with the SS *Hope*. But let the fleet be privately financed and operated so as not to destroy the potential goodwill value of people-to-people aid.

Freedom's Torch: House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of House Joint Resolution 447 on June 12, my office has received approximately 7,000 letters from citizens and organizations throughout this Nation. These messages have consistently expressed a fervent support for this resolution.

They are proof that our American people are far more aware of the Communist-Soviet threat than our Government has been.

The following letter is an example of popular support for House Joint Resolution 447:

May I thank you for the wonderful work you are doing with your recent resolution. More power to you. Surely you speak for many millions of thinking Americans, and we are carrying on an extensive letter writing campaign here in support of your resolution. We printed a half-page ad in last Sunday's Post-Times (West Palm Beach) with mail-in coupons for quick action by citizens.

I enclose a poem of mine on this very subject. I give you full permission to use it in any way you may wish in the cause of our beloved Republic.

The poem is an appropriate and inspirational expression of the resolute courage of our people:

FREEDOM'S TORCH

The torch burns low in a darkening land,
Where the enemy's footsteps steal,
Where the enemy moves in a shadowy band,
Where the enemy moves with a hideous zeal.
While America's leaders fail to stand.

Now cry ye out with a rousing cry,
Replenish the torch with oil.
Replenish the torch that is flickering dry,
Replenish the harvest of patriot's toil,
With the fiery light of that first July.

God, gird our men with a holy sword,
Awaken our household now.
Awaken them now to this perilous horde,
Awaken their souls to a thundering vow.
To triumph in battle for freedom warred.

Perish the base and the craven here,
These traitors defiling our time.
These traitors abiding in cowardly fear,
These traitors so drenched in their murderous crime.
As they knowingly builded our liberty's bier.

Hold high the torch on the mountain's height,
Rekindled to blind our foe.
Rekindled to guard with a radiant light,
Rekindled to blaze on the shining tableau.
Of America's power and America's might.

—*Marjorie Niles Kime.*

The Plight of Our International Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] has been calling our collective attention for many months to the plight of our international airlines. He has repeatedly warned us that unless our Government agencies practice greater restraint in handing out lush air routes to our competitors from abroad, our international commercial airlines will go the way of the American merchant marine.

Even now, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board is considering, even proposing, additional certificated service at a time when our domestic industry is in trouble from too much competition from within, just as our oversea lines suffer from too much competition from without.

An interesting negotiation is proceeding at this very time, Mr. Speaker, involving air rights for flights between New York and Moscow. On one side is a privately owned, free-enterprise airline flying the U.S. flag—Pan American World Airways. On the other is the Government-owned and dominated Soviet carrier—Aeroflot.

Recently, our State Department people who negotiate these bilateral air agreements have displayed excellent judgment and impressive fortitude in dealing with foreign governments. We can be hopeful that they will be just as forceful in dealing with the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Memphis Commercial Appeal graphically covered these current route discussions. I ask unanimous consent to make that editorial a part of the RECORD:

[From the Commercial Appeal, July 17, 1961]

INTERNATIONAL AIR

Something extra special in the international air business begins tomorrow, with the first session on drawing up a treaty for a route between the United States and Russia.

The question is on what terms will a branch of the Russian Government compete against an investor-owned airline for this Nation's transatlantic air passengers.

The antagonists are Aeroflot, the Soviet airline, and Pan American World Airways.

The air fleet flying the American flag has been having a hard time against other fleets. Last year 64 percent of the international air passengers in and out of the United States were citizens of this country but our airlines, which used to carry 75 percent of them, now have barely half.

The treaties under which these foreign airlines come into the United States have been violated, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been told in formal petitions filed by our lines.

Now another treaty is in the making and the U.S. flag lines are trying to prevent both the specific troubles of previous air treaties and the general woes of the merchant freight ships flying our flag.

The Pan American attack, in advance of the hearing, puts special emphasis on the contrast between its own necessity of paying dividends to stockholders and the Aeroflot position. The Russian line is free from concern about how much a new plane costs, or how much is lost operating it.

Neither is the Aeroflot representative an observer at the treatymaking, as the Pan American man is. The head of the Russian delegation is at the same time the top man of Aeroflot, an officer of the air force and a part of his Government.

Much experience as Pan American has had in international competition and in the heavy hands of governments in other international air service, this is a new kind of contest.

And we expect a good many citizens of the United States, in addition to Pan American stockholders, are going to watch it with interest.

Omnibus Farm Bill: Fact or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the 1961 farm bill was passed in good faith, thinking it was all inclusive. It now develops passage should have been delayed 1 day in order that a new technological advance might have been studied and provisions made to regulate its use.

On the day this bill was passed a news release from England reported a new discovery which could have serious repercussions to our dairy industry. Surplus stocks of dried milk, cheese, and butter indicate milk is already in over supply. Think what might happen if this English discovery should become common practice among our U.S. dairymen without proper regulation. How many cows should be allowed to watch one set? In what position should the set be placed

in order to avoid undue eyestrain? Should we have color or black and white? It would be rather disconcerting to an animal to be shown a beautiful green pasture on a black and white set. At what hour should the sets be turned off in order that cows have sufficient rest?

Farm equipment is subject to yearly depreciation. Ways and Means might want to make a schedule of depreciation percentages which would be fair and equitable for an item not formerly considered farm equipment.

Sounds facetious, does it not—but is it any more so than the colossal flops many of our farm programs have been during the past 30 years? We take land out of production and the good farmer raises more bushels on what is left than he did originally on his entire acreage. We pay him not to grow crops from one pocket and from the other we pay him to reclaim land to grow more surpluses. Government pays farmers for applying lime to make the soil more productive, to grow more bushels—a practice good farmers have followed long before Government decided it knew more about farming than farmers themselves. We spend billions to build dams for other purposes and allow the water to be used for irrigation to reclaim arid land. We buy countless acres for dry dam flood control sites and lease the nontaxable land to grow supported crops in competition with the taxpaying farmer when that land should be used for recreational purposes until such time that it is needed for food production. We spend billions for production research and peanuts for marketing and distribution studies. We fill the pocket of the big operator and take pocket and all from the little fellow.

If having cows watch TV sounds silly, reflect on some farm programs, past and present, and draw your own conclusions on which makes more sense.

To understand what you have read, you must read what follows:

THE HOLSTEIN HOUR

There is a news story out of Axmouth, England, which may lead to some little confusion on Madison Avenue. The report involves a farmer who has installed television sets in his barn because he found that his cows gave more milk while watching television than they did while standing sullenly in barnish gloom. The complications possibly arising from this discovery become alarmingly evident.

If cows give more milk while watching TV, other farmers will take up the challenge and in turn install sets for their cows, and television may even become standard dairy equipment. Eventually society may be confronted in some areas with the rather bewildering possibility of a TV audience 60 percent cow and only 40 percent people.

Not only that. Upon further research it may be established that cows give more milk while watching "Father Knows Best," for instance, than they do watching "The Rifleman." What influence would this have on ratings?

The industry must face the future of television with stern resolve, and make what adjustments it can. There might even come a stage at which cows would have more to say about program ratings than vice presidents. If video should become a factor in serious overproduction of milk the departments of agriculture might step in. At that point the vice presidents might be willing to relinquish their positions.

An Unwarranted Misrepresentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, after an uncalled for period of suppression, the truth about migratory labor conditions in the State of New Jersey has finally seen the light of day. This misrepresentation has been exposed by evidence submitted to a conference in Glassboro, N.J., a conference attended by representatives of various Federal, State, and private agencies concerned with migratory labor.

It is no credit to this legislative body that a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee accepted and published inaccurate and damaging testimony regarding migratory labor conditions in New Jersey without ever affording the opportunity to reply to the operators of the labor-pool service involved.

Nor is it to the credit of those in the television industry for releasing a study of the subject which was an equally unfortunate distortion of conditions as they actually exist. Members of the New Jersey Farm Bureau vigorously protested against this. Not that the effects of this misrepresentation have been confined to this country alone. Abroad, both the television film and the committee hearings containing the biased testimony have injured the prestige of the United States without just cause.

There is no secret in the fact that there is room for improvement in migrant labor standards, in New Jersey as well as elsewhere. But it seems only elementary fairness to call attention to progress that has been made, and to allow the presentation of facts to rebut the damaging testimony of a single witness.

I call the attention of the House, and of those throughout the country and the world who have been exposed to this irresponsible misrepresentation, to the true facts as succinctly summarized in an editorial published in the northern New Jersey newspaper, the Record, of July 29, 1961.

WHEN TRUTH PULLS ON ITS RUNNING SHOES

It's downright depressing to hear a committee of the Congress accused of practicing yellow journalism. But this is the overwhelming evidence of witnesses whose competence and disinterestedness are clear: a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee accepted and published damaging testimony on conditions in New Jersey migrant labor camps and then not only made no effort to check it but refused to hear a legitimate reply to it.

A migrant laborer named Fermin Lopez Romano testified he was paid 11 cents an hour. He testified he was beaten by a camp guard. The story made page 1. The operators of the labor-pool service asked the chairman of the subcommittee for a chance to comment. They got no reply. At a conference in Glassboro the other day they managed to get their evidence into the record: Mr. Lopez was paid the going rate, 80 cents; he had run up debts and medical-insurance charges, however, which reduced his net earnings from $142.18 to $23.52; he was indeed struck by a guard, in self-defense during a fight. At the conference were the Commissioner of Labor and Industry, the State Secretary of Agriculture, officials of the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Consumers and Urban Leagues, representatives of Puerto Rican civic and social groups, and Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen assigned to migrant laborers. The consensus was that, although there's room for improvement (cf. that 80-cent hourly pay), New Jersey maintains the highest migrant-labor standards in the Nation and that the House committee's dissemination of the unsupported Lopez testimony was unfortunate. Now let's see whether that truth can overhaul the scandalous misrepresentation.

Jersey Led the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has called on every American and particularly our youth to stress physical fitness. I am pleased that a constituent of mine, Carlos Diaz, of Bayonne, won the physical fitness test sponsored by the U.S. Marine Corps. Carlos was the top scorer with a performance record of 554 points out of a possible 600. Carlos competed with over 100,000 students throughout the country.

Everyone is indeed proud of Carlos, his family, community, State, and country, and I joint in congratulating this fine young man. I would like to include as part of my remarks the excellent editorial from the Jersey Journal of July 26, 1961:

JERSEY LED THE WAY

As everyone who ever answered a 6 a.m. military muster will tell you, the U.S. Marine Corps' legendary obsession with physical fitness has paid off handsomely on battlefields from Montezuma to the Chosin Reservoir.

When President Kennedy recently voiced open dismay about the physical condition of America's youth, the traditionally prepared Corps was equal to the occasion. The Marine Comandant, Gen. David M. Shoup, has ordered nationwide use of the physical fitness test pioneered right here in the last 2 years.

The test, administered to more than 100,000 students each year, was the brain child of Maj. John J. Swords, who commanded the metropolitan recruiters until his transfer this month to the Naval War College.

A decorated combat veteran, Major Swords reflected the corps' concern with the flabby physiques of today's recruits. His solution is typical of the resourcefulness of marine junior officers.

The success of Swords' excellent program soon was reported to the commandant, General Shoup, a Medal of Honor winner who belongs to the "hard belly" school of thinking, ordered the program expanded to reach the rest of this Nation's youth.

Carlos Diaz of Bayonne has already provided his fellow teenagers with a performance record to shoot for. His 554 points out of 600 made him top scorer this year and earned him a trip to the White House. Diaz' hand-

shake must have partially restored the President's confidence in the coming generation's brawn. The Marine Corps expanded fitness test should broaden that confidence even further.

New Figures on Russian Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects foremost in the minds of the American people is that of the Soviet economy and its comparisons with that of the United States. Hearings on this matter were held during the last Congress by the Joint Economic Committee and prominent mention was made of the threat of the Soviet economic gains in the 1960 election campaign.

Further information on the Soviet economy, new figures on the present rate of growth and indications of falsified statistics in previous periods, was reported in the July 24 issue of the New York Times. I believe that this information is very important and that these new figures on Russian growth should have wide dissemination among the American people who have such a deep interest in the subject matter.

I should like to place the New York Times article in the RECORD under previous permission:

SOVIET TIGHTENS OUTPUT CONTROLS—BOARDS ESTABLISHED TO BAR FALSE ECONOMIC REPORTS—GROWTH RATE SLOWS

Moscow, July 23.—The Soviet Union established today control commissions with extraordinary powers to deal with false economic reporting by managers in agriculture and industry.

The Government ordered the commissions set up on the national level and in the 15 republics. Last year a series of scandals implicated officials who had falsely claimed the fulfillment of economic goals.

The reorganization of the control bodies was put into effect in conjunction with a tightening of Communist Party supervision on every facet of economic activity.

The decree, which was published in Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, creates commissions of state control.

The senior commission is under Premier Khrushchev and the subordinate commissions will function directly under the Councils of Ministers of the Republics.

The commissions will replace control departments that have operated with limited powers since August 1957, when their role in running the economy was deemphasized.

An official Soviet source said the commissions would have the right to inspect and to intervene in the activities of all economic organizations, including those on the ministerial level.

The drastic nature of the decree pointed up the fundamental difficulties of Soviet planners in obtaining honest data so correct economic projections can be made.

The decree said the commissions would be charged with rooting out and eliminating the padding and falsification of state accounts. They also are to deal with the tendency of officials to display favoritism toward their own localities or institutions.

The commissions will exercise control over the expenditure of state funds, the procurement of materials and the fulfillment of state production plans.

Writing in Pravda, the secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Ivan P. Kazanets, gave two examples in his own Republic of abuses that should be corrected by the control commissions.

EXAMPLES ARE CITED

He cited the case of one regional economic council that had purchased automobiles with money assigned to it for building a factory. Another economic council allocated metal supplies that permitted its own enterprises to fulfill its production quota by 114 percent while another region was given a short supply so it could produce only 91 percent of its quota.

The most serious examples of fraudulent reporting of economic data were disclosed last winter and spring in agriculture. A wave of dismissals of officials followed the investigation launched by Premier Khrushchev on serious crop failures.

The entire top leadership of the Republic of Tadzhikistan was discharged for having falsified figures on the extent of cotton production.

It was noted here by Western experts that the state reports on the fulfillment of the national economic plan for the first 6 months of this year claimed an increase in industrial production of only 8.4 percent. This figure compares with an average of 11 percent for the like period in recent years.

There was speculation that the smaller figure might have reflected in part more honest reporting by economic managers after the campaign earlier this year against false reporting.

The figure of 8.4 percent still represents about twice the rate of economic growth of the United States.

SOVIET GROWTH SLOWS

Soviet economic growth is slowing appreciably. This is shown in the official data for the first half of this year published in Moscow last week.

Nevertheless, the U.S. margin of superiority over the Soviet Union in industrial production was narrowed during the first 6 months of 1961. In this period Soviet industrial output grew 8.4 percent over the like period of 1960, while production in the United States declined because of the recession.

The trends in the two countries were shown clearly in steel production. Soviet steel output was less than 70 percent of that of the United States in the first half of 1960, but rose to about 85 percent of the American figure during the corresponding period this year. Soviet steel production continued to rise, while U.S. steel mills cut their output.

The rapid decline in the Soviet Union's economic growth rate in recent years throws a shadow over Premier Khrushchev's boast that the Soviet Union will overtake the United States in production by or before 1970.

Evidence that the Soviet Union is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain past high rates of production growth is abundant in the new official economic report.

A sharp decline was noted, for example, in the rate of growth of industrial labor's productivity. This year's figure is 3.5 percent, last year's was 6.4 percent, and 8 percent was claimed for 1959.

The Soviet report attributes this to the institution of a shorer workweek in factories and offices. However, about 20 million workers had been shifted to a shorter workweek a year ago.

Retail sales increased only 3.5 percent during the first half of this year. A 9-percent gain was claimed for 1960 and 1959.

Soviet foreign trade increased this year by only 2 percent. Last year a 6-percent gain was claimed and a 20-percent increase was announced in 1959.

Some Soviet economic indicators declined during the first half of this year compared with the like period last year. New housing financed by the Soviet Government and finished during the first 6 months of 1961 was less than the corresponding figure last year. The amount of meat available for consumers also was down.

Some signs of inflationary pressures in the Soviet economy are also indicated in the report. Wages are said to have increased by 4 percent.

Key production figures released in the report for the first half of this year include the following: Pig iron, 25 million metric tons; steel, 34,800,000 metric tons; oil, 79,800,000 metric tons; and gas, 28,900 million cubic meters.

In connection with yesterday's Soviet decree tightening control over the economy, it was recalled that Premier Khrushchev demanded last January that punishment must be meted out to all persons guilty of falsifying production reports to the state. He said then:

"Unless we put things in order, the plans will be met statistically, but there won't be enough produce. As everyone knows, you can't make pancakes out of statistics."

Private Enterprise Has Much To Contribute to Exploration of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on many issues I find myself in opposition to the policies advocated by the administration. This is not because I see a partisan issue in every action, but rather because I have very firm convictions concerning the role of the Federal Government in the lives of the people. Very often, I find administration proposals running contrary to those convictions and I do not hesitate to speak out in opposition to plans for further Federal control, bigger welfare and spending programs, and politics as usual in the face of the critical situation in which the world finds itself. I hope I can be equally as frank when the administration advocates a policy which is sound and in keeping with our traditional concept of the free competitive system upon which our present greatness is built. Therefore, I applaud the administration for giving to private industry the opportunity to develop a communications satellite in outer space and echo the sentiments expressed in the following editorial from today's Wall Street Journal:

ENTERPRISE IN THE SKY

At first glance it would seem that one new frontier with little attraction for private industry would be the outer reaches of space. The rewards for exploring it appear to be more military and scientific than economic.

Yet that is not quite the case. It is already clear enough that, in the area of communications, space has it's commercial uses; so much so that a good many private companies are willing to invest large sums of money in manufacturing satellites and installing them

in the sky. Several groups have made concrete proposals to the Government, and now President Kennedy has given them a favorable reception.

We find all this encouraging on two counts. First it speaks well of the enterprise of the companies involved; they show considerable imagination in seeing the practical possibilities of communications satellites and diligence in tackling, well in advance, the problems of technology and cost accounting.

Equally encouraging is the attitude of the administration toward the future of private industry in space. Mr. Kennedy has laid down some very sensible guides—the final plans, for example, must safeguard against a private monopoly in this field of communication and permit participation by foreign as well as American industry in the enterprise. But he has definitely rejected the arguments that space must be, altogether, a Government monopoly.

An immediate gain from this is that private risk capital, not the taxpayer's funds, will bear the cost of establishing a usable communications system through satellites. The interested companies—including such established firms as A.T. & T., General Electric and RCA—are confident they can raise the $200 million to $300 million necessary to launch a space relay system. As a by-product, of course, private capital will also be paying a part of the cost of advancing space technology.

But the long-range gain from the President's ruling will be more important. For it opens wide the doors to space, heretofore a Government domain. And no man can foresee what fertile fields may be found when men are free to make peaceful enterprise in the sky.

Answer to Washington Post's Hanford Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post commenting on that newspaper's editorial urging expenditure of $95 million of the people's money to add electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash.:

JULY 31, 1961.

EDITOR: Like Pavlov's reflex conditioned dogs, the Post compulsively refuses to permit facts to interfere with its editorial opinions when public power is at stake. Result: Monday's plug for $95 million from the public till to generate electricity at the AEC's new plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash.

True, as editorially stated, public power is at issue. But only because its opportunistic adherents are using spurious arguments of all kinds in their efforts to slip it in through the Hanford back door.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the reactor "will necessarily generate steam." It will produce heat as a byproduct. Issue: can this byproduct be turned into steam, then into kilowatts, then sold to recover the $95 million investment? Even a series of economic studies based on unrealistically hopeful assumptions produced no more than a classically "iffy" response to the question.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the proposed "biggest nuclear powerplant in the world" would constitute "an advertisement of this country's determination to use atoms for peace." Rather, to a world gaging technical achievement by quality rather than quantity, this plan incorporating steam temperature, pressure, and quality close to Fulton's steamboat than to modern technology would advertise something else: the extent to which the United States will suffer technological retrogression to give the public power lobby its way.

Untrue, as editorially inferred, that the project is the sole answer to an alleged "desperate need of additional power" to assure the Northwest's growth. In the midsixties a 1- or 2-year period is anticipated when power supplies will be tight, but the situation will be solved by the new treaty with Canada. Meanwhile, any day public power zealots relax their grip on the Northwest, private power groups stand ready, willing, and able to supply all needed power at fair, publicly regulated rates.

Untrue, as editorially misstated, that the proposal is "warmly endorsed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy." The fact is that only a simple majority of the committee's members support it, while a strong minority oppose it. This minority not only succeeded in convincing the House of the unwisdom of the Post's editorial position, but points to a truly beneficial public purpose for which the $95 million can be spent. Namely, to let the Nation's nuclear power industry get off dead center. In the process install several million kilowatts of technically advanced, taxpaying nuclear generating facilities, and thereby advertise something really creditable to the world.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

Spiritual National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Lions Club of Bamberg, S.C., has recently had printed a statement by Dr. James P. Carroll, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Bamberg, S.C., on the subject of "Spiritual National Defense." I have had an opportunity to read this splendid statement, which is directed principally against the menace of world communism. I feel that it definitely makes a contribution to our national security and that it merits reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Dr. Carroll's statement, together with the foreword by Mr. B. Monroe Hiers, president of the Bamberg Lions Club, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

Sir Edmund Burke, the great English statesman and orator, said: "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win is for enough good men to do nothing."

The Bamberg Lions Club is in hearty agreement with that statement and this little booklet is presented as a definite contribution against the forces of evil as represented by communism in our country today.

We are proud of the fact that the author of this pamphlet, Dr. James P. Carroll is a member of our club. As pastor of the First Baptist Church of Bamberg, S.C., he has contributed 18 years of loyal service to his church, our community and our Nation.

If you are not already numbered among those who are aggressively fighting the evil of communism we remind you that it is later than you think and we sincerely hope that this booklet will be the means of placing you among the number who are willing to stand up and be counted as dedicated foes of the Communist way of life.

B. MONROE HIERS,
President, Bamberg Lions Club.

SPIRITUAL NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By Lion James P. Carroll, D.D.)

When most of us think of national defense, we think in terms of guns, ships, submarines, missiles, armed men, and the other things which are necessary for military conflict. Of course, such military defenses are vital to the security of our country, and all of us fervently hope that ours are adequate. What we need to realize is that military defense is not the only kind needed, nor is it the most important. Because of the character of the enemy we face; because of the methods the enemy employs, and because of the alarming success the enemy is having, we need also what we are calling Spiritual National Defense. By spiritual defense, we do not mean simply religion, as such, though, of course, that is of tremendous importance. We mean rather a revitalizing of those ways of thought and life, those purposes, loyalties, and ideals which have made our country great, and which are now in jeopardy. In fact, we are prepared to say that unless there is this type of defense, all of our military defense will be of no avail, and our country, as we know and love it, will one day be no more.

THE ENEMY WE FACE

Let us consider first, the enemy we face. There is no doubt that the enemy is communism. Communism is an ideology, a philosophy, a way of life which is totally at variance with democracy, and Christianity, and civilization as we know them. It appears in many places and in many forms, but it is always basically the same in belief and purpose, whether it is in Soviet Russia, Red China, strife-torn Cuba, or the United States. Communism is many things. It is atheism, one of its basic tenets being that there is no God. It is materialism, setting up things as being the chief values of life and denying the spiritual. It is collectivism, abolishing the right of private ownership. It is statism, giving the government absolute control over the life of the individual. It is anarchy, boldly advocating the overthrow of all other ways of life. It is dictatorship, which while talking of brotherhood, oppresses people under an iron heel. The writings of the Communists themselves show this description of them to be true. One of Lenin's classic statements was that "religion is the opiate of the people." That is to say, religion dulls the sensibilities of people, and makes them blind to the realities of their own needs and possibilities. Therefore, there is no place for religion in communism. Another of their spokesmen said in 1950, "The struggle against the Gospel and the Christian legend must be conducted ruthlessly and with all the means at the disposal of the Communists." Communism itself becomes the religion of the people, with their own leaders elevated to the place of God. While Stalin was living, these words of praise were written. "Father. What could be nearer and dearer than that name? Soviet people one and all call Stalin 'Our Father.' For like a loving, tender father, like a wise mentor and teacher, Stalin brings up the new generation of people, builders of communism." It is no wonder that the first thing the Communists

do when they come in is to destroy the Bible, silence the preachers, and close the churches, because communism denies everything the Bible teaches. According to communism, there is no God; man has no soul; there is no hereafter; a man's life is of no value; a person should own no property; one should have no home of his own; children do not belong to parents but to the government; there are no moral laws. Communism says that not love and kindness but force, power, cruelty, deceit, and extermination are supreme.

Communism says that there is no such thing as truth. There is only expediency. Again to quote Lenin, "Words have no relation to action. Words are one thing, actions are another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of evil deeds." Khrushchev says, "You should not take too seriously the treaties made with imperialists. Lenin, too, signed a peace treaty after World War I that remained valid only so long as it proved necessary." In other words, treaties are to be honored only so long as they serve the interests of the Communists. That is the reason successful negotiations cannot be carried on with the Communists. How can you negotiate with people who do not recognize the distinction between truth and falsehood? The Communists say one thing and do another. They talk peace and promote war. They use smiles to veil their evil intentions. They extend a hand of friendship, and when it is grasped, it becomes a mailed fist. A study has been made of nearly one thousand treaties and agreements which Russia has made with other countries which shows that she has broken her word to almost every country with which she has agreed. In broken treaties, she holds the record among all civilized countries of the world since the beginning of recorded history. Since people belong to the state, they may be slaughtered, imprisoned, reduced to slavery without even a second thought. John Noble in his book, "I Was a Slave in Russia," estimates that there are 28 million people in slave labor camps in Russia. When Khrushchev was boss of the rich Ukraine, he wanted to destroy private ownership, and collectivize the farms. When he met opposition, he simply produced a man-made famine and starved between 8 and 12 million people into submission. No one, of course, knows, with accuracy, but it is reliably estimated that in Russia 20 million people have been "liquidated," and that in China 30 million people have been murdered. This, then is the enemy we face—cold, cruel, crafty, ruthless, godless communism.

THE GOAL OF COMMUNISM

Shall we look, in the second place, at the enemy's purpose? According to their own spokesmen, it is nothing short of world domination. It was avowed in the very beginning, and it has never been changed or retracted. The Communist Manifesto declared that they would overthrow all existing social conditions. Again, to quote Khrushchev "If any one thinks our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin he is deceiving himself cruelly." And what are those teachings? Total warfare—political, economic, psychological, diplomatic, military, if necessary, global until there is complete world domination. The threatening words of Khrushchev still ominously echo in our ears. "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you." Thirty-five years ago, a three-point program or timetable was adopted by the Communists. First, they would take Eastern Europe. Second, they would take the masses of Asia. Third, they would take the rest of the world, including the United States. Some say that they have now achieved almost two-thirds of their goal. It scares us, doesn't it? Certainly, they are well along on the way, running about on schedule.

THE STRATEGY OF THE COMMUNISTS

Shall we consider now the strategy of the enemy? How do they go about accomplishing their purposes? They will engage in war if necessary, but they will win without war if possible. Khrushchev has declared that communism will prevail without a major war. Let us remember that communism is an ideology, a set of ideas, and when those ideas have prevailed communism will have won, as the Russians say, very probably, without a war. Every means is employed by the Communists to spread their propaganda. A skillful machine works steadily around the clock. They have schools for the training of people whose job it is infiltrate every phase of our society and sow the seeds of communism. They make their way into industry, labor, education, and yes, even religion itself. Communism never identifies itself as such. Rather it says, "I am simply here to show you a better way." Communist agents, cells, spies are everywhere. Their strategy is not so much to attack from without as to destroy from within. Like termites, they bore away unseen at the foundations of the structure of our institutions until they simply collapse. They work unseen, but with great effectiveness. Constantly the battle of minds, ideas and ideals is waged.

IS COMMUNISM MAKING PROGRESS?

Let us now ask how the enemy is making out. Have they made any progress? This question has already been partially answered, but let us pursue it further. When Karl Marx died 75 years ago, only 8 people attended his funeral. Fifteen years ago, there were 4½ million Communists in the world, holding in subjection 180 million people, about one-fourteenth of the population of the world. Today there are 33 million adherents to communism who have enslaved 900 million people, about 40 percent of the world's population. They control about one-fourth of the land mass of the world. Now of these 33 million adherents, only about 3 million are the trained, disciplined, hard core of communism. In Russia, not over 3 percent are Communists, but they rule with an iron fist. They are a frightening demonstration of the tremendous power that can be wielded by a trained and determined minority. For the 10 years following World War II, the Communists averaged adding 7,000 people every hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Since 1958, they have added 12,000 every hour, every day, every year. All of this without a major war. The question is often asked to what extent communism has infiltrated the United States. That, of course, is difficult to answer with accuracy. But people who have every reason to know, like J. Edgar Hoover, tell us that it is truly alarming. There is a strong Communist Party, but that is not the chief threat. It is the undercover, insidious, creeping paralysis kind of communism that we should fear most. There are disturbing reports of its influence in our labor organizations, our Government, our educational system, and even in our religious organizations. Not all who swallow the propaganda line do so deliberately. Communism is very subtle. It flies false colors. It represents itself as being a good cause. It parades under high-sounding names. It speaks of such things as peace, brotherhood, equality of opportunity, understanding, the right to enjoy the good things of life. Many a well-intentioned, unsuspecting person has been "taken in," without realizing what he was getting into. We do not have to exaggerate the facts to show that the rapid spread of communism should be of vital concern to every American.

THE NEED FOR SPIRITUAL DEFENSE

All of these things—the character of the enemy, the subtle strategy of the enemy, the amazing success of the enemy sound an urgent call not only for military preparedness and defense, but also an intensive and effective spiritual defense. As we know, the best defense is offense. We need not only to attack the beliefs of the Communists, but we need also to be loyal to our own beliefs as Americans, and as Christians as never before. We must oppose error with truth. We must, if you please, use our own propaganda. We must intensify our efforts to teach the younger generation such things as the existence of God, the sacredness of personality, the supremacy of spiritual values, the reality of moral standards, the intrinsic worth of every individual, the value of ambition, the pride of individual ownership, the desirability of healthy competition, the dignity of honest labor, the validity of our democratic processes, the exalted place which the church should hold in our lives. In other words, we must start emphasizing the things we have always taken for granted. We must be positive in our loyalties to the things in which we have always believed. We must realize that half-empty churches, unread Bibles, and worshipless Sundays pave the road for communism. A great English statesman said, "All that is necessary for evil to prosper is for good men to do nothing." We may be careless and indifferent and lackadaisical about Christianity and democracy if we want to, but let us not forget that the Communists are at work ceaselessly around the clock. In other words, we must not just be against communism. We must be for freedom. Also, we need to be on guard against those attitudes in ourselves and in others which "soften us up," and make us ripe for the inroads of communism. By that we mean such things as feeling that "the world owes me a living", the feeling that "the Government ought to supply all of our needs", the feeling that "that is of no concern to me, let somebody else do it;" the feeling of "why should I work? I'll just draw my pension and social security." We need to guard against the loss of individual enterprise; the centralization of great power in the hands of a few; the creation of more and more agencies and bureaus. We need to be careful that we do not lose our ability to think for ourselves, to reach our own conclusions, to formulate our own actions. When we do, we make ourselves vulnerable to the infiltration of communism.

CHARACTER IS THE BEST DEFENSE

Around the ancient Kingdom of China, there was a great wall. In those days, it was impregnable. The enemy could not scale it or dig through it. It would seem then that the kingdom was secure, but not so. History shows that the enemy made several invasions. They did not destroy the great wall. They simply bribed the gatekeepers who opened the gates and let them in. It is the character of a people which determines the strength of their defenses. It is not our military might alone which will determine our defeat or our victory. Let us remember how communism has spread without firing a shot. It may be the story of the Great Wall of China all over again. In the final analysis, we shall stand or fall on the basis of what we believe, what we live, what we are willing to die for.

WE ARE AT WAR WITH COMMUNISM NOW

Some expert students of communism have recently written a book called "Protracted Conflict." It declares that world war III has already begun, and that we are in the midst of it right now. It gives the Communist master plan for world conquest. Consider these words from the book: "Whether the American people can muster

the requisite determination and preparedness will depend upon their recognition of the basic facts of the world today. We are in the midst of a world revolution. It will end only in total victory or total defeat. The fact that bombs are not falling must not blind us to this crucial reality. The great hope, and as yet, it is only a hope, is that we will rally for effective defense and for a bold counteroffensive before it is too late. Already the enemy has had a leadtime of 40 years in training professionals in the arts and sciences of nonmilitary warfare. Isn't it about time we did likewise?"

THE URGENCY OF THE HOUR

As we think of the urgency of spiritual national defense, these words of Josiah Gilbert Holland express our need:

"God, give us men.
A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts,
True faith and ready hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flattery without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog,
In public duty and in private thinking.
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife,
Lo, freedom weeps, wrong rules the land,
And waiting justice weeps."

Tenth Anniversary of American College of Foot Orthopedists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, August marks the 10th anniversary of the American College of Foot Orthopedists. I am pleased that Dr. Robert Schleider, of my constituency, is president of the eastern division of the American College of Foot Orthopedists.

I would like to call the following article to the attention of my colleagues in commemoration of this anniversary:

TENTH ANNIVERSARY AMERICAN COLLEGE OF FOOT ORTHOPEDISTS

August 1961 marks the 10th Anniversary of the American College of Foot Orthopedists. The American College of Foot Orthopedists is that specialty of the healing arts whose fellows devote the major part of their practice to foot orthopedics with official recognition and sanction as specialists in this branch of medicine.

The primary ideals of this group is to promote greater understanding of the specialty of foot orthopedics; to maintain the highest standards in treatment; to continue research in this field and to educate the public of the importance of orthopedic care as a vital health measure.

In achieving its objectives, the American College of Foot Orthopedists is presently engaged in the following projects:

1. Fostering research in the study of edema in the foot and ankle and study of the osseous development of the child's foot.

2. Standardization of nomenclature.

3. Survey questionnaires and compilation of statistical data.

4. Preparation of bibliographies on orthopedics.

5. Preparation and revision of abstracts and summaries on outstanding scientific references.

6. Preparation and revision of instruction manuals for writing and presenting research reports.

7. National, divisional and State meetings for the purpose of exchanging ideas and promoting mutual understanding.

8. Of utmost concern is maintaining the highest qualifications in the field of orthopedics.

There is much to be accomplished in the future in order to meet the requirements of our ever-increasing population. We, as podiatrists, look forward to the continuance and expansion of the activities in the health field. We dedicate ourselves to continued cooperation with all health agencies, the Council on Youth Fitness and the Council on the Aged. The members of the ACFO will cooperate in every way with the American Podiatry Association's representatives to these councils, and in the field of foot health. We will endeavor to serve humanity to the best of our ability.

Administration Abandonment of Policy of Massive Retaliation Endangers the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now it is out in the open. Administration spokesmen are no longer hinting at the abandoment of the policy of massive retaliation in any war the Communists start, they are openly advocating it. At this point, I would like to include an article from the Wall Street Journal clearly pointing up the position of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the President's most powerful military adviser, favoring a return to conventional combat in preparation for limited war and also an article from today's New York Times in which Chester Bowles, the Assistant Secretary of State, is quoted as disavowing the policy of massive retaliation as part of the administration program.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

WAR, LIMITED—GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR'S VIEW THAT UNITED STATES MUST BE READY FOR CONVENTIONAL COMBAT IS INGREASINGLY VALID

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is hardly coincidence that the military doctrine of preparedness for limited war without the use of nuclear weapons set forth in Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," is in close accordance with the purposes of the additional military expenditures advocated by President Kennedy. For Taylor, as the President's personal military adviser, has been wielding very considerable influence on White House military thinking.

Taylor is an uncommonly brilliant, magnetic and persuasive personality, with the double background of a glamorous combat record in World War II plus an unusual range of intellectual interests.

He undertook a delicate and dangerous scouting mission behind the German lines in Rome and was one of the first officers of general rank to parachute into France in June 1944. He is an accomplish linguist, master of several European languages, with an excellent knowledge of Japanese and a fair knowledge of Chinese. He was an eager educational innvoator when he was superintendent at West Point and during his 4-year term as Army Chief of Staff conceived some strong and definite ideas about American military policy which he set forth in a book after retiring from the service.

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE

Taylor's reemergence into a position which perhaps carries greater power and influence than he possessed as Army Chief of Staff (where he often felt frustrated by the combined opposition of the Navy and Air Force representatives) marks the eclipse of massive retaliation as the keynote of American defense policy. In its place has come the so-called policy of flexibile response. As General Taylor writes in "The Uncertain Trumpet":

"The national military program of flexible response should contain at the outset an unqualified renunciation of reliance on the strategy of massive retaliation. It should be made clear that the United States will prepare itself to respond anywhere, any time, with weapons and forces appropriate to the situation including massive retaliation.

"There are still voices to assert the impossibility of having a limited war in the NATO area. Such an assertion means that any collision of patrols over, say, Berlin, would automatically result in general atomic war. It offers no alternative other than reciprocal suicide or retreat in the face of the superiority of Soviet conventional forces. Such talk does little to reassure our allies. Furthermore, it is nonsense. If men who are both sane and determined continue to direct nations, they will initially take all measures short of general war to resist aggression—regardless of the nationality of the aggressor."

General Taylor's thinking parallels rather closely that of a German-born Harvard professor, Henry A. Kissinger, who spends a good deal of time these days commuting between Cambridge, Mass., and Washington as a consultant to the President. Kissinger leaped into international fame in 1957 with the publication of a book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," maintaining the thesis that even a nuclear war could be kept limited by employing only smaller tactical weapons, not the biggest bombs, with their awesome blast and fallout potentialities. In this work, which was widely quoted on both sides of the Atlantic, Kissinger argued that the threat of all-out war "purchases deterrence at an exorbitant risk."

"It requires us," he continues, "in every crisis to stake our survival on the credibility of a threat which we will be increasingly reluctant to implement and which, if implemented, will force us into the kind of war our strategy should make every attempt to avoid."

The course of events in the last years, and especially the demonstrations of Soviet skill and power in rocketry, have lent support to the thinking of Taylor and Kissinger. As Soviet power to inflict devastation on the United States has become more visible there is less credibility in the idea of the United States resorting to thermonuclear weapons as the solution for a hassle over Berlin or as a reprisal for the infiltration of Communist guerrillas into South Vietnam or Thailand.

Yet there must be some response to such provocations, or there is a bleak and dreary prospect of the non-Communist world being

nibbled away or intimidated into submission by a series of adroit acts of aggression, no one of which will seem provocative enough to warrant resort to ultimate weapons. Here is where the doctrine of flexible response, provided the men, the training, and the tools are in adequate supply, seems to make more sense than the vague threat of a reaction so awesome and so grave in its possible consequences for America itself that it becomes less and less credible either to friend or to foe.

UNWRITTEN RESTRAINTS

If the United States is unlikely to try to obliterate Moscow and Leningrad if an American convoy is held up outside Berlin, the Soviet Union is equally unlikely to aim bombs at New York and Washington, if an American military guard brushes the obstruction aside. Both sides in the Korean war placed themselves under considerable unwritten restraints. It is possible that this decade of perilous brinkmanship will witness other conflicts waged with nonnuclear weapons.

Possible, but, of course, not certain. There is no umpire with power to insure that the ground rules of limited warfare will be observed. Neither Taylor nor Kissinger rules out the possible necessity of resorting to nuclear weapons, if the very existence of America is at stake. Neither does President Kennedy, as his sober reference to the desirability of fallout shelters proves.

But there is a clear tendency today, reinforced by the stalemate of mutual terror which has been created in the field of nuclear weapons, at least to experiment with limited warfare, which could even take economic or diplomatic, as well as military forms, to make the big bang of nuclear detonation the last, not the first resort.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1961]

BOWLES SAYS MASSIVE RETALIATION POLICY FADES—TELLS ENVOYS UNITED STATES DEPENDS ON NORMAL BUILDUP

(By Lawrence Fellows)

NICOSIA, CYPRUS, July 31.—Chester Bowles said today that the United States was trying to edge away from the policy of massive retaliation.

The Under Secretary of State made the remark in an hour-long address to U.S. diplomats who are stationed in 21 countries in North Africa and Middle East. They are meeting here.

The United States is relying more on building up its conventional strength on the ground, Mr. Bowles said.

At the same time, he added, the United States is putting more weight on the political approach in areas of sensitivity abroad.

IDEAS MOST POWERFUL

The feeling in the Kennedy administration, he said, is that the force of political ideas is far more powerful than the sum of military strength and national wealth of any country.

The policy of massive retaliation was enunciated by the late John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. It meant an overwhelming attack by the United States in reply to military aggression.

In addition to moving away from this policy, Mr. Bowles said, the administration is trying to assert more leadership over those countries that are friendly to the United States but bring the Nation into embarrassing diplomatic situations.

He did not enlarge upon this statement in the meeting, which was closed to all but the diplomats. The speech was summarized afterward by Carl Rowan, Assistant Deputy Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Mr. Rowan used a hypothetical example to explain.

"If the United States takes a position in favor of self-determination, it does not want a friendly nation to destroy it," he said. The allusion could have been to the French in North Africa or the Portuguese in Angola. "Men have the God-given right to govern themselves," Mr. Rowan added.

AID POLICY EXPLAINED

In his talk to the diplomats, who will confer for 4 days, Mr. Bowles also said the administration wanted to make it clear that programs of assistance were not measures taken out of fear of communism.

The point Mr. Bowles made was that assistance was given because it was right to give it and not in an attempt to buy support.

The great advantage that lies with the United States in the fight for world opinion, Mr. Bowles added, is that it wants only to achieve for people what they want for themselves. The Soviet Union has the disadvantage of wanting to dictate to people how they should live, he declared.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation must not make a unilateral commitment disavowing the full use of nuclear power for massive retaliation in favor of General Taylor's flexible response. To do so commits us to a contest with the Communists in their own area, where they are strongest, and on their terms. This is the surest way to give Khrushchev the excuse he needs to push the world into war. We have kept the peace because of his fear of our massive retaliation and, in my opinion, this is the only policy which will give us the strength we need to prevent war, or to win it, if the Communists start it.

Limited war for the United States is not possible any longer—that is, if we hope to win victory over the Communists. We cannot match them in manpower and using our resources to put out the brushfires they start simply depletes our strength and endangers our position in the long run.

We are superior in nuclear power and we can maintain that superiority if we use defense funds for missile development and research. This is the policy of strength Khrushchev will understand and which will keep him in line in Berlin and other parts of the world where he plans to divert our attention and our strength.

For the sake of all those who will be called upon to fight, for the sake of the millions who will die at the hands of the marching Communist hordes, in behalf of the freedom of this Nation and the liberty of all mankind, I implore the administration not to weaken us further by exhausting our defense dollars in a buildup of conventional weapons, obsolete ships and aircraft, and manpower, but rather speed up research and development of modern weapons and modern power of warfare which will blast Moscow from the face of the earth should the Communist dictator be so foolish as to plunge the world into the horror of war.

The danger is too great that limited war will not stay limited but will expand to nuclear, either with smaller tactical weapons or then the largest weapons. Therefore, no war must be permitted to begin or even be contemplated as so-called limited. [The next war God forbid, will be nuclear.] We must not let it start in the guise of a limited engagement that then expands.

In short our only hope for peace is the continued threat of massive nuclear retaliation against any aggression. Under no circumstances must we unilaterally commit ourselves to refrain from massive retaliation because this ties one hand behind us, and invites a limited war, which might never have started except for our implied suggestion that we would not use nuclear weapons.

United States Should Protect Interest in Soviet Airline Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a group of our colleagues engaged in a most interesting colloquy concerning international air competition, and the manner in which the odds seem whelmingly against our American-flag airlines.

Now our carriers are about to get a real challenge—from Aeroflot, the Soviet airline owned by the Kremlin and operated by the Red Air Force. Negotiations between the Soviet Government and our State Department are now in progress.

I have before me a new warning as to what our country faces in the form of subsidized government-owned competitors. As useful and informative as the discussion by our colleagues was, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent edition of the San Diego Evening Tribune is just as illuminating.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune entitled "United States Should Protect Interest in Soviet Airline Conference" in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES SHOULD PROTECT INTEREST IN SOVIET AIRLINE CONFERENCE

The United States had better have its guard up and its eyes open in the negotiations now underway with the Soviet Union over a commercial air treaty between the two countries.

This issue is loaded—heavily in the Russians' favor.

The reason is simple. Pan American World Airways, one of the two airlines involved, is a free enterprise American corporation. Aeroflot, the Soviet entry, is part of the Russian Government—actually, a part of the Red air force.

Besides having to operate efficiently and safely in the interest of the traveling public, Pan American has to operate profitably, in the interest of its 40,000 public stockholders.

It has to satisfy banking and insurance company creditors who have advanced the company hundreds of millions of dollars to finance its jet fleet.

Aeroflot has no more need to show a profit than has one of Premier Khrushchev's jet bombers.

Costs widen the gap in true competition.

Pan American has to pay about $6 million for a jet airplane.

The price of a Soviet TU-114, or any other aircraft which Aeroflot might use on a route

to the United States, is meaningless. Labor and materials costs in the Soviet Union can't be estimated in terms of dollars, since these items bear no relationship to American costs.

Some Pan American pilots can make as much as $30,000 a year. An Aeroflot pilot is paid the equivalent of $8,400 a year—less than a third as much. The same disparity in wages probably exists throughout Aeroflot's personnel.

Wholly government-owned, and with no need to show a profit, the Russian airline could operate in a manner that its American free enterprise competitor couldn't match and stay in business for long.

It could offer service far in excess of need, disregarding losses which simply would be absorbed by the Government.

If the American counterpart were forced into this uneconomic competition, the results could be disastrous to the financial soundness of the airline and to the savings its stockholders have invested in it.

American-flag airlines flying the North Atlantic already have complained to the Civil Aeronautics Board that KLM, the Netherlands airline, and SAS, the Scandinavian airline, are offering passenger and cargo service in excess of requirements.

Competition with subsidized, low-pay, foreign airlines is an old story for Pan American, which has done a good job in holding its own. But the Russian challenge is more serious.

The U.S. Government representatives in the current negotiations—at which Pan American is only an observer—should make certain that American interests, both private and national, are safeguarded.

Declaration of Independence for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a considerable portion of our Nation's citizenry is deeply disturbed by the speed with which the Federal Government is usurping individual and States rights. Opposition to Federal assumption of activities historically carried out by State and local governments and by private enterprise is mounting faster than the collectivists or Socialists in this country would like to believe.

On June 30, 1961, the Holbrook Tribune-News, a newspaper published in Holbrook, Navajo County, Ariz., published a "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D." The declaration reiterates those principles of free government and individual responsibility which underlie the original Declaration of Independence and which are no less applicable today.

Under leave granted, I include the "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D." in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE FOR 1961 A.D.

"The true danger is when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients and by parts."

—EDMUND BURKE.

In the years 1957, 1958, and 1959, this newspaper published a modern declaration of independence fitting the times. If the original, authored by Thomas Jefferson, was a great document—as the entire world acclaims—then the circumstances that forced citizens in the New World to separate from the mother government should be as compelling today as then.

Evils complained of in 1776 were either valid or imaginary, and if valid, their character has not changed in the intervening years. Because of apathy and enjoyment of abundance by the great majority of Americans, there is a grave danger American liberty is disappearing; that the ultimate result of recent trends will be on overgrown, arrogant, dictatorial bureaucracy that demands more and ever more taxes to support bureaucratic tyrants, originally supposed to be servants of the people.

Believing with Daniel Webster that "Nothing will ruin the country if the people, themselves, will undertake its safety; and nothing can save it if they leave that safety in any hands but their own," it is deemed appropriate, again, to use Jefferson's original as a guide in reasserting the fundamental principles upon which the American Government was established.

This editor hopes that the great basic truths spoken by one of America's greatest patriots, Patrick Henry, that "No free government or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles," makes it timely—especially in the year 1961—to point out the dangers of gradual encroachments upon individual liberty by our present highly centralized Federal Government.

A restatement of the basic rights of individual American citizens, with a list of the more important of their grievances, may cause responsible people to reexamine what is happening to their liberties.

Inasmuch as history has shown that the natural results in government, of whatever form, is tyranny, it may be beneficial to remind those who represent us in our Government of Cicero's admonition that "The administration of government, like a guardianship, ought to be directed to the good of those who confer, not of those who receive the trust."

With these hopes in mind, following is this editor's "Declaration of Independence for 1961 A.D.":

We proclaim anew that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We reassert the self-evident truth that all men are created equal before the law; that the U.S. Government, and its agencies, have been instituted to provide this equality and freedom under the Constitution of the United States of America, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We declare that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they have become accustomed.

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing inevitably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute bureaucracy, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and provide new guards for their future security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of American citizens; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to list their grievances of repeated oppressions and usurpations by a bureaucratic government.

Firm in the belief that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is essential to the security and perpetuity of a free government, we, the people of the United States, in order to retain a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do recite the evils that beset us, and reaffirm the basic principles of American freedom and justice.

Our Government has created and erected a multitude of new offices, which have adopted endless rules and regulations, having the force of statutory law, but without the sanction of the people, and sent forth swarms of officers to harass the people, and eat out their substance with unbearable taxes.

It has inaugurated, and continued, a program of gratuities to foreign, and in many cases, alien nations under a guise of improving commerce and friendship, neither of which have been forthcoming, and such gratuities, together with the compensation of the Army of military and civilian staffs dispensing such gratuities, have resulted in burdensome and unconscionable taxes.

It has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

It has combined with others to subject us to jurisdictions foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws.

It has imposed grievous taxes in the forms of fees, licenses, and stamps on us without our consent.

It has abrogated the Bill of Rights substituting therefor arbitrary rules and regulations of a multitude of its agencies, changing the relations as between sovereign States, upsetting traditional laws of the same sovereign States as to relations to one another, and created and perpetuated fictions of the wildest imagination to entrench itself in power over State legislatures and the people.

We, as citizens of a blessed land, appealing to the aspirations and hopes of all good men, in the name and authority of the people of the United States, set forth in all seriousness, candor, and good intent, the following principles:

No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life, or limb, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation for values established by his peers. Such public use of property may not be to satisfy the whim or fancy of some subordinate Federal agency, bureau, commission, or official, but shall be established beyond reasonable doubt to be in the interest of the welfare of all the people.

No person shall be compelled to perform the duties of any Federal agency, including the collection of taxes, fees, duties, and licenses, without just compensation for the services required, nor be punished for declining such services whether compensation is made or not.

In all criminal prosecutions, arising out of, or because of, violations of rules and regulations promulgated by the agencies of the Federal Government (which neither the Congress nor the people have enacted in the usual legislative process), the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of his peers in the state and district wherein the violation shall have been committed, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

All political power is inherent in the people, and the Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and has been established to protect and maintain individual rights as opposed to bureaucratic rights. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny nor disparage others retained by the people; the powers not delegated to the Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

No fiction as to the general welfare shall be employed by any branch or department of the Government to impose laws, regulations, or rules of doubtful application to legalize the desires, objectives, or programs of the Federal Government, or its agencies, bureaus, commissions, or officials.

Programs or projects designed for the general benefit or interests of the people shall be inaugurated and carried out by the National Government only upon petition of those so to benefit, and shall not be planned, authorized, inaugurated, nor promulgated by any Federal agency except upon specific direction of the people as expressed by petition or as the result of a public election in which the majority shall have approved of such action.

The police powers of the Government shall not be used to harrass, coerce, or otherwise, influence citizens to comply with arbitrary rules, regulations, projects or programs of Government agencies, commissions, or bureaus without the specific approval, after review, by Congress; in all matters of conflicts between individuals, or groups of individuals, and any Government agency, actions in the several courts of the Nation shall place the burden of proof of wrongdoing upon the complaining agency, commission, or bureau, and citizens concerned shall be presumed to be innocent until acceptable evidence in the proper court proves the contrary.

Arbitrary penalties and punishments promulgated by Federal Government agencies, commissions, departments or bureaus, without the express approval of Congress, shall be carefully reviewed by competent counsellors before becoming the basic law of the land, and failure to have such review and approval of Congress shall be construed as to make such penalties and punishments null and void and of no effect.

As between States, the Federal Government, nor any of its agencies, branches, commissions or bureaus, will favor or support one as against another; and the courts shall render decisions upon the basis of justice and equity between States, being mindful in all cases that the people's rights are first, States' rights second, and national rights are third, as to disputes arising concerning property and resources. In no case, except upon the considerations of national defense, security, or emergency, shall the National Government and its departments, agencies, commissions, or bureaus, impose its will or desires upon the States or their people, to satisfy bias, prejudice, or advantage because of the viewpoint of any States concerned.

Within the basic law of the land, and the Constitution of the United States, exploration and exploitation of natural resources is reserved to the people, as individuals first, as to the States second, and only within such limitations as may appear to be in the national (not bureaucratic) welfare and interest, to the Federal Government third. The exceptions noted shall not be used as fictions by the Federal Government or its agencies, branches, bureaus, departments, or commissions, to usurp the prerogatives of the States or of the people.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a discerning warning on overspending was voiced by Mr. George Minot, managing editor of the Boston Herald, in his column of Sunday, July 30. I include it with these remarks:

ERA OF CHEAP MONEY AHEAD—DOMESTIC SPENDING WAY UP

While you have been worrying about the crisis our finances have been going to pot. In the last few months the administration has been putting new spending programs on the statute books at a rate that should fill a prudent man with horror. The lives of everybody in the country, and those of our children and grandchildren, are being made over by the laws Congress has been passing and the President has been signing.

Hardly an eyebrow was raised the other day—and the story was deemed so unimportant that many papers didn't bother to print it—when Senator WILLIAMS, Republican watchdog from Delaware, told the Senate that the Federal deficit has been mounting at the rate of $1 million an hour ever since Mr. Kennedy took office. He went on to say that the New Frontier has been expanding Federal payrolls at the rate of more than four employees every 5 minutes since the inaugural.

DEFICIT HORRIFYING SURPRISE

Then this last week it was officially revealed that WILLIAMS was modest in his charges. The Government itself revealed that its budget deficit in the last fiscal year was almost $4 billion. This was a horrifying surprise, yet it caused not a ripple of alarm. Everybody, you suppose, had forgotten that President Eisenhower, in his final budget message, had estimated a surplus of $100 million.

The deficit figures mean we have been operating in the red at the rate of around $150 million a week, and during much of that time you heard double talk about balanced budgets, fewer Government employees and smaller staffs at the higher level. The American people do not begin to realize yet the manner in which Washington is taking control of the lives of almost everybody. There is something for almost everybody—the urban redevelopment people, the historic, recreation and conservation crowd, and of course the farmers, veterans, aged, and ill.

And all these benefits, these promises of easier lives for the student, the home buyer or builder, the civic center lover, and all the others, are coming on top of huge new defense expenditures. Not a soul in authority has suggested we cut back some of the huge political domestic handouts in view of the new defense expenses coming up. You can see $5 billion of red ink immediately ahead without half trying.

TAXPAYER GETS HEAVIER LOAD

The other day in the midst of some big international blowup somewhere or other, Congress quietly voted to increase the Government's debt limit by $5 billion dollars—to a total of $298 billion, an amount that staggers the imagination. In hurried and routine fashion Congress went on to add $400 million to interstate highway construction in the new year and the same day assured pensioners $825 million a year more in benefits.

Spending plans already approved indicate a budget of $100 billion a year before the end of Kennedy's first term. Today it is $87,730 billion. If all of the President's requests are approved by Congress—and so far the Kennedy people have been getting as much or more than they have asked for—between $40 and $50 billion will be added to the taxpayer's load over the next 4 years.

All this is being done with the idea that a big boom is now underway and that added taxes coming in will take care of the huge outgo. That is what the spending is for, of course. It is to spur the boom. As the summer drones along—and people either are half worried to death about nuclear war or decide to forget the whole business and go off to the beach—effects of Congress' generosities are not yet being realized.

WATCH SPECK ON THE HORIZON

Business is good, if not spectacular, and prices are steady. There are quite a number of things on the market you can buy cheaper than you could last year at this time. This is a good time to buy what you need. This price stability is not going to last forever. Prices are going up. The value of the dollar is going down. This administration is committed to cheap money.

Deficits are going to be even bigger. It is going to be impossible to hold the wage-price spiral. There is no sense in becoming an alarmist, but next summer's vacation is going to cost you more than this year's, and your dollar next year will not buy as much in the food, clothing, appliance line as it will today.

It may seem silly to yell about inflation when prices have been so stable for so many months, but if you will keep your eye on that speck on the horizon you may see it grow into an inflationary cloud that will come closer to destroying us than anything that comes from foreign shores.

Do not be too sure that this is not the real aim of our enemy in the East—that we spend ourselves into bankruptcy, when the dollar and the doughnut come to have equal value. Then we, and our allies along with us, would be just as much captives of the Commies as if they dropped bombs in a dozen different countries.

SOME URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

The Wall Street Journal revealed the other day how utterly fantastic some of these Government spending orgies are. Under the beautiful phrase of "urban renewal," the paper told how the old rivers and harbors pork barrel handouts had been put to shame. It told about the little town of Mercedes, Tex., with some 10,000 people, that got $234,000 for a new sewer system; of East Granby, Conn., that got $246,000 for its 2,434 people; of Lithonia, Ga., $102,000 for its 1,667 people; Atchison, Kans., $1,916,800 for its 12,500 people.

There was the town of Wink, Tex., where the Federal Government had allotted $478 for every man, woman, and child of its 1,800 population. This is to remodel the town's business district, "all three blocks of it," goes on the account. The publisher of the Wink Bulletin hit the nail on the head: "You can hardly spend money like this in a little town without doing some good."

This is how former President Eisenhower put it to a Republican gathering in Pennsylvania:

"The picture of Government, as I see it, is of a gigantic Santa Claus, and we're dancing around the Christmas tree, hoping for our presents. But each package is marked in fine print, so we don't have to read it, 'You don't have to pay for this, but your grandchildren will'."

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KINSTON CLINIC,
Kinston, N.C., July 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record as strongly endorsing H.R. 211 which I understand was introduced into the House by you. It is my understanding that H.R. 211 will create a Captive Nation's Committee and that this committee will orient itself toward doing something for the captive nations. In the name of God and humanity this is something that we must undertake. This action is long, long past due.

I trust that all will support this bill and help you as much as possible. I am in great sympathy with your work against the Communist cause.

Sincerely,

J. C. PEELE, M.D.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Resolution 211 submitted by you to the House on March 8, 1961 deserves the serious attention of every American.

It is very important at the present moment to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism, the clever tool of which communism happens to be.

Very truly yours,

BORYS HRYWKO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

NORWOOD, PA.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD.

DEAR SIR: I am intensely interested in your House Resolution 211. I hope you will have great success.

I am very proud of Representative WALTER also.

I think it is a privilege and a duty to help other nations but to give up our privilege is something else.

I am so very glad when I read of our representatives taking a courageous stand—"To help the strong to stand and to raise the weak."

Gratefully yours,

JENNIE VAUGHAN SMITH,
Mrs. Lewis Smith.

JULY 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heard you on Dean Manion's program last night (July 15). Let me first of all compliment you on your fine efforts in Congress to defeat the spread of communism. Secondly, I would like to obtain a copy of the House Resolution 211 that you mentioned on Manion's Forum. I believe that is the name of the bill you were referring to last night.

Thank you for your time and effort and good luck in Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL RYAN.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

P.S.—Any related information to this subject would also be appreciated.

SEABROOK, N.J., *July 17, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Pennsylvania.

DEAR SIR: My sincere appreciations to you for your courageous stand on the behalf of the enslaved east European nations. Your House Resolution 211—to form a special Committee on the Captive Nations—is a magnificent document.

Being a U.S. citizen of Estonian origin, I shall retain close interest in the progress of the resolution.

Wishing you personal and professional success.

Most sincerely,

JULIAN SIMONSON.

CHARLESTOWN, MASS.

DEAR SIR: I have just heard you on the Dean Manion radio program.

May I say I agree with you 100 percent, and you are to be highly commended for introducing your House Resolution 211.

I shall write to my Congressman (MCCORMACK) today. I trust I shall hear you on the Dean Manion program again and I shall get others to write sponsoring House Resolution 211. Thank you.

Sincerely,

HENRY MCCARTHY.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR SIR: The House Resolution 211 which you submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, has my fullest support.

With the weapons of truth, the facts and common ideals, it would be possible to overwhelm Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in the newly independent and underdeveloped nations.

Therefore, I hope that the new Resolution 211 gets the full support of the Congress.

Very truly yours,

PETRO OPOSKYJ.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

BROOKFIELD, WIS., *July 17, 1961.*

Hon. DAN FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your resolution to create a special committee on captive nations has my full support. Please send me a copy of this resolution (House Resolution 211) and any other materials you have on the issue.

Sincerely,

MARK TIMLER.

UNIVERSITY CLUB,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: May I congratulate you on your House Resolution 211. When manned by patriotic Congressmen like you, the Captive Nations Committee will do a more useful foreign policy job than the Department of State has produced since the New Deal.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. GRANLUND.

THE DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIANS FORMERLY PERSECUTED BY THE SOVIET REGIME,
Chicago, Ill., July 15, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the membership of our organization, we would like to declare our strongest support for your move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We believe that the creation of the committee is not only advisable but essential, for such a committee will serve as the most reliable source of information and data on nations enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

Being of past refugees from the U.S.S.R., we feel we are in a position to pass judgment with ample knowledge upon the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

We assert that the U.S.S.R. is not a free federation of republics analogous to the federation of American States, nor that the people of the U.S.S.R. do form a single nation. The U.S.S.R. is an empire, consisting of various nations ever eager to escape Soviet Russian slavery. That is the most vulnerable spot in the imperial structure of U.S.S.R.

It is our belief that at the present time of dying colonialism, bringing this fact into sharpest focus would be to the advantage of our Nation, and a precise and most appropriate policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the captive nations would be a most effective weapon in the cold war confronting our Nation today.

We are writing our Congressman, the Honorable DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI, asking him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

T. LYSENKO,
President.
F. REWEUNO,
Secretary.

How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which apparently appeared in Trade Journal, Warner & Swasey, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, entitled "How Much Federal Aid Did the Pilgrims Get":

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID DID THE PILGRIMS GET?

They were in a depressed area. No one guaranteed them high prices for anything. Their only roads and schools were built by themselves. For security they did their own saving, or starved.

All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self respect.

The sum of these three traits became America.

But what's going to be the sum of the traits you see today—the traits of character, or rather lack of it, that demand more money for less work, put security above self-respect, pamper self-pitying criminals instead of punishing them, give away resources we desperately need to protect ourselves, listen to weaklings that want Government to take care of them when they should take care of themselves.

Long years of early-American self-respect and hard work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it, in half the time.

Preservation of the Bald Eagle in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of the Senate an article by an able and distinguished author, our colleague, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska. The article, entitled "Senator Offers to Share Alaska's Eagles With Other States," printed in the July–August 1961 Audubon magazine, is presented with the same skillful style as other writings to his credit.

Senator GRUENING is also the author of "Mexico and Its Heritage," which was written in 1928, and is still considered the outstanding reference work on that nation. More recently, he published a scholarly book entitled "The State of Alaska," on a subject with which few men could write with more authority.

Starting in 1939, Senator GRUENING served almost 14 years as the Governor of Alaska under the U.S. flag, and was one of the first two men from that new State to be elected Senator, a record of public service and achievement equaled by few Senators. Senator GRUENING is one of the outstanding conservationists of our Nation. His action saved the bald eagle in Alaska.

The Senator's article in the Audubon magazine on Alaska's preservation of bald eagles, our national emblem, is deserving of the attention of all those who believe in the protection of our wildlife. I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Audubon magazine, July–August 1961]

SENATOR OFFERS TO SHARE ALASKA'S EAGLES WITH OTHER STATES—IF IT'S FEASIBLE, 49TH STATE WILL HELP TO TRANSPLANT NATIONAL BIRD, SAYS SENATOR GRUENING—NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY'S BALD EAGLE SURVEY WINS HIS SUPPORT

(By ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator From Alaska)

The continental study of the bald eagle now being conducted by National Audubon Society is a most commendable effort to prevent the extinction of our national bird—especially in the contiguous 48 States.

We in Alaska are proud of our abundance of bald eagles there and I would like to urge strongly that, after suitable studies, an effort be made to transplant some of these birds to the lower 48 States.

It has been a great source of satisfaction to me to see eagles in great numbers in my home State. They can be seen soaring over Juneau, the capital, and, on a recent trip from Haines to Klukwan, a distance of perhaps 14 miles, I counted 64 bald eagles.

It has been my privilege to take a leading part in providing protective legislation for the bald eagle in Alaska, especially in bringing to an end the bounty system which resulted in the killing of some 150,000 of these splendid birds. I particularly want to set the record straight about the period during which the bounty was paid.

Articles have appeared (not in Audubon magazine) stating erroneously that from 1917 to 1952 Alaska paid a bounty for killing the bald eagle.

A similar error also occurred in an important book on the birds of Alaska which says that the Bounty Act was repealed on March 2, 1953. These statements are incorrect by a number of years.

The Eagle Bounty Act was repealed on March 21, 1945. I would like to explain the exact circumstances which led to the repeal of the Eagle Bounty Act and the subsequent protection of the eagle in Alaska, all of which have led to the tremendous proliferation of this noble bird in Alaska and the possibility, which I have suggested, of transplanting some of these eagles to States where they are extinct.

When I came to Alaska as Governor in 1939, I noted how widely the system of bounty payments, in order to destroy animals which were considered detrimental commercially, was used, and was particularly shocked at its application to the eagle. I communicated with various experts and sought all the literature available. My study convinced me that the eagle, for the killing of which a bounty of $1 was paid under an Alaska law, was by no means a serious predator, and that such losses as might result from its predation would be more than offset by other values if the species could be preserved.

In my first message to the Alaska Legislature in 1941, I treated the subject of bounties very fully, saying:

"Over a quarter million dollars—$260,000—were expended on bounty payments in the last biennium on wolves, coyotes, hair seals, eagles, and trout. The usefulness of these various bounties, the amount of damage done by the predators on which the bounties are paid, the effectiveness of the bounty method of extermination as against some other method where extermination appears desirable—these are varyingly controversial issues. With so large a sum involved it would seem only proper that those who desire to expend these public moneys should assume the burden of proof that these expenditures are essential and represent the best method of dealing with the situation.

"Since the last meeting of the Territorial Legislature, eagles, on which the Territory has been paying a bounty of $1, have been protected by Federal statute. It is now against the law to kill an eagle anywhere in the United States except in Alaska. While Alaska was exempted out of consideration for existing Territorial legislation it would seem reasonable for us to move in the direction of practice now established everywhere else and at least to cease paying a bounty on this national bird.

"Twenty-five thousand dollars was appropriated for the last biennium for Dolly Varden trout bounties. There seems to be little question that quantities of rainbow trout tails and young salmon tails have been included in the trophies presented for collection. Further, Dolly Varden trout are admittedly predators on stickleback which in turn are destructive on salmon. The Fish and Wildlife Service has expressed to me its view that such expenditures are unwarranted unless and until careful research establishes their value. However, this is a question for the Legislature to decide. Meanwhile no request has been made for funds to continue eagle and trout bounties. (This means that I did not request the customary appropriated item for eagle bounties.)

"The matter is treated more fully in the current biennial report of the Territorial Board of Budget, signed by the treasurer, auditor and Governor, and I commend this fuller treatment to your attention. A good deal of the bounty legislation in the past has been in part motivated by the economic needs of Alaskans, who are assisted through these bounties. It is, I think, desirable not to confuse this issue with relief. Federal and Territorial appropriations are increasingly taking care of that aspect of the problem."

However, legislation which I had introduced to suspend the payment of bounty on eagles was not enacted by the 1941 Legislature. The legislators reflected the generally held belief of the people of Alaska that the eagle was a predator on salmon, the salmon fishery being Alaska's principal industry, and it was alleged that eagles also preyed on poultry, young lambs, etc. So, unable to get this legislation repealed, I deleted the appropriation item for eagle bounties from the appropriation bill which had been inserted into it, although I had purposely omitted that item. This meant that no bounties were paid during the following biennium. However, until the law was repealed, those who shot eagles were still entitled to the bounty, and the accumulated eagle claws of the birds that had been killed became a mounting obligation for the Territorial treasury.

In the next session—in 1943—I again urged the elimination of the eagle bounty, and when this was not forthcoming, I again deleted the item from the appropriation bill.

In the 1945 session, I was able to secure the passage of an act repealing the eagle bounty, and that act (ch. 31 of the session laws of that year was signed by me on March 21, 1945.

Immediately thereafter, I requested the Fish and Wildlife Service to take the necessary steps to see that the eagle was protected by amending the law which had been passed by Congress protecting the eagle throughout the Union but which specifically excluded Alaskan eagles from that protection. This exclusion resulted from the efforts of the then Delegate in Congress, Anthony J. Dimond, who was also reflecting Alaskan sentiment of that day, and based his successful efforts to get Alaska excluded from the Federal protection on the fact that the Territorial law provided bounty for killing the eagle. (However, that amendment of the Federal act did not take place for some years.)

Meanwhile, in Alaska, in the absence of the dollar incentive to shoot an eagle, the eagles began to proliferate immediately. This is highly gratifying to me, as it is to most Alaskans, and it is my earnest hope that we will be able to share our birds with the other States.

There are two ways by which this could be done. One is by our fellow Americans coming to Alaska and seeing the eagles. The Haines-Port Chilkoot scenic area is even stressing in its travel folder that "here is an opportunity to photograph the American bald eagle by the dozen in its last resting ground." So it is clear that apart from the abstract and spiritual values in preserving our national bird, there is also a practical and material value.

The other way in which Alaskans could share the eagle would be, as I have suggested, by transplanting some of the birds to the lower 48 States. That is a matter for ornithologists to study. I hope it may prove to be practical.

Let Us Not Be Trapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a timely article on Moscow's relations with Cairo, contained in the latest issue of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. This article, entitled "Let Us Not Be Trapped," exposes the basic fallacies behind the assertion that current differences between the Kremlin and Cairo imply that a break is in the offing. This reasoning also assumes that it would be to the interests of the United States to bend over backward so as to accommodate Mr. Nasser at this time. However, as this article so cogently argues, Nasser is too committed to the Soviets to play the role of an anti-Communist crusader, and furthermore, it is to his advantage to play the East against the West. This article reveals that Nasser's anti-U.S. policies have not changed. Therefore, it would be the height of folly to permit the current differences between Nasser and the Kremlin to blind us with regard to their common enmity toward our country. The article follows:

LET US NOT BE TRAPPED

(By Dr. Albert Simard)

In recent weeks reports have appeared in the Western press concerning the current war of words between Moscow and Cairo. According to these dispatches, Premier Khrushchev himself has allegedly lost confidence in Nasser's leadership. The Soviet press has denounced the Cairo regime for trying to curry favor with the "Western imperialists" by harassing Arab Communists. Cairo, in turn, accuses the Soviets of interfering in the internal affairs of the U.A.R.

The charges and countercharges have aroused the expectations of American editorial writers, columnists, and anonymous U.S. Government officials. They share the belief that a break may be in the offing and that now is the time for the United States to "cash in" by weaning Nasser from his Soviet benefactors.

Yet, only 2 years ago, the world witnessed a similar bout between Cairo and the Kremlin. Then, Nasser gave exclusive interviews to American reporters in which he warned the United States that the Soviet Union was on the verge of swallowing up the Middle East, Africa, and South America. Implicit in Nasser's dire admonitions was the proposition that, if the United States were more understanding with respect to Nasser's aspirations, he would prove to be a firm barrier to Communist designs.

The New York Times summed up the immediate reason for Nasser's conversion at that time: "Nasser was the hero of the Arab world. Today, he is virtually isolated (Apr. 4, 1959). The New York Times' estimate was based on the fact that Nasser's effort to subvert neighboring Arab countries, in line with his dreams of empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf, had gone for naught. Moreover, Nasser's political drive was aggravated by the growing bankruptcy of the Egyptian economy. Obviously, such a serious state of affairs required substantial dollar injections and Nasser hoped that his anti-Communist sales talk would do the trick.

While Western journalists were being briefed about the Red danger, Nasser made sure that the door to the Kremlin never closed. In January 1959, he sent Khrushchev a cable full of effusive praise and admiration, both for the Soviet dictator and the Soviet policy. "The Soviet Union's real assistance," he told Khrushchev, "and appreciated effort is met by us with veneration and esteem." Three months later, one of Nasser's leading commentators told the Arab world: "There is no difference between dollar and ruble slavery."

Today, the conjuction of circumstances has once again prompted Mr. Nasser to frown at Moscow and smile at the West. His foreign policies in the Arab world and in Africa are floundering. Many of the newly created states are keeping Nasser at arm's length. The very nature of Nasser's rule does not permit such embarrassment and, therefore, he is desperately seeking a new and more spectacular posture. Furthermore, the Nasser government has initiated a grandiose industrialization program which will require hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Mr. Nasser is perfectly aware that U.S. aid programs are now up for discussion. It is, therefore, not surprising that he should broadcast to the West his brand of of anti-communism, just as he did 2 years ago.

In view of the foregoing, it would be most tragic if the U.S. Government allowed itself to be ensnared by Nasser's "new look." Two years ago, Nasser warned the United States about Soviet inroads in Africa. However, the Nasser regime proved during the Congo crisis that it was as vicious a foe of the United States (and U.N. policy) as the Soviet Union. Two years ago, Mr. Nasser appeared to be concerned about Soviet inroads in Latin America. However, Nasser's own agents in Panama have striven to do as much damage to U.S. interests there as the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Nasser has played a major role in egging on Castro and his cohorts to incite the peoples of Latin America against the United States.

In the last analysis, the crux of the issue is Nasser's attitude toward the United States. No government, during this postwar period, outside of the Soviet bloc, has shown such animosity and hatred toward the United States as the Nasser regime.

The idea that the United States may now be able to win over Nasser by generous dollar handouts is a "pipe dream." The United States has given hundreds of millions of dollars worth of aid to the U.A.R., but this generosity has not altered Nasser's anti-U.S. policies. Secondly, Soviet grants to the U.A.R., including military aid, total over $1 billion. The close economic link-up between the Egyptian economy and the Soviet bloc is a fact of life. Nasser cannot be "pried loose" by additional dollar handouts. In this connection, the Cairo radio network recently carried the following commentary on American aid: "The countries which get more aid from the United States are those which are causing more tension in the international situation and more harm to world peace. The United States has incurred the enmity of the Arab people as a whole" (May 27, 1961).

The present battle of words between Moscow and Cairo does not alter the underlying nature of relations between them. (Is it not perfectly conceivable that this propaganda warfare was deliberately contrived by both parties in order to trap Uncle Sam?) It is most essential that the United States develop a long-term and realistic policy in the Middle East so as to strengthen our position and prestige in that area of the world. Hasty measures prompted by the devious tactics of an unscrupulous dictator are no substitute for such a policy.

"One recent (U.S.) loan was for a modern communications system between the Egyptian and Syrian regions of the U.A.R. which will be of considerable help to Mr. Nasser in tightening his grip on his empire. It can be argued that this is hardly in the interests of the United States or of the Syrian people, who have little chance to express anything but patriotic feelings these days. Mr. Nasser is still putting a periodic squeeze on Jordan. The new American-financed communications system should help him considerably when the time comes for the next squeeze" (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 26, 1961).

Doctor in Britain Warns of Socialized Medicine Evils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those who point to the British system of socialized medicine as an example of why we should adopt a similar program in the United States, I would like to call attention to the following letter I received from a doctor in Britain and also an article he enclosed from the Daily Telegraph, a British newspaper:

DEAR MR. ALGER: I have read in the Journal of the American Medical Association of the contretemps regarding a Mrs. Muench of Gonzales.

I thought that you would like to read the enclosed news-cutting from our oldest and very reputable medical journal, although not our most widely circulated, unfortunately.

If the U.S. doctors wish to try a State-sponsored health service, let them read this article to appreciate what has happened to the British doctors, members of a now underprivileged profession. How I wish that I could practice in the United States.

Yours very sincerely,

A. A.

PRIVATE COURT FINES ON DOCTORS CONDEMNED—COMPLAINT THAT MINISTER IS JUDGE AND JURY

The method of fining doctors who do not treat their patients properly by private courts violates the most elementary legal rights of the practitioner, the Medical Press says today. The minister is both judge and jury and once he has dismissed an appeal the doctor is powerless.

The journal comments on a speech by Mr. Powell, Minister of Health, at Winchester on May 24, in which he referred to "the curious sort of court by which an Englishman is tried if he happens to be a doctor."

The decision whether action is taken by the medical services committee or local executive council against a doctor rests with the clerk to the council, a bureaucrat with no legal training.

The committee consists of members of the executive council, usually minor local

politicians and includes a number of doctors, none of whom, unless by accident, has any legal training.

SEVERE PENALTIES—NO RULES OF EVIDENCE

After deliberation a decision is made. It may involve the infliction of a penalty of as much as several thousands of pounds, far larger than is inflicted for most felonies.

And it is all so delightfully informal. There are no rules of evidence. There is no cross-examination by a trained lawyer; indeed he is the one person scrupulously excluded from the proceedings. There is no evidence on oath, and consequently, no risk of prosecution for perjury.

The Medical Press says that the conclusion is inescapable that the proceedings represent in reality sittings of the minister's private court in which he is both judge and jury. The most elementary legal rights of the practitioner were violated during the court.

The fact that they may be conducted with scrupulous fairness does not in any way alter the fact. Nor can any amount of dialectical subtlety gloss it over.

SUPPRESSION OF NAMES—SYSTEM WAS INHERITED

On the reasonable question of why the names of defrauding doctors should be suppressed and those of defrauding greengrocers or bookmakers freely revealed, the answer was that the doctors had "not been found guilty by common law but by private tribunal." A doctor deprived unjustly of £20 could do nothing about it.

The Minister, "clearly uneasy at the position," is not blamed for the system which he had inherited from his predecessors. They, too, had merely extended a process that had been growing for a generation, "the insulation of the bureaucracy against the law." The guilt lay with Members of Parliament.

The proceedings of the "courts" usually received the widest publicity in the Press. If the public concluded that doctors were "a pack of rogues," it could scarcely be blamed, says the journal.

For Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gordon W. Rule, a much-respected attorney of Washington, D.C., has recently written a letter which was published in the Washington Post.

This letter suggests that the States take decisive action to halt the ever-increasing holocaust that takes place on our highways particularly during long holiday weekends.

Mr. Rule helped prepare the Small Boat Act and urged support for its passage. In proposing this legislation he was particularly concerned with the great loss of life as the result of unregulated motor boat operations.

No subject is of more importance to Americans than the great loss of life on our highways. In view of this, Mr. Rule's comments are most timely.

Under consent to extend my remarks, I wish to insert Mr. Rule's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your interest and that of my colleagues:

FOR SAFER HIGHWAYS

Prior to the Fourth of July holiday, the radio repeatedly urged motorists to drive carefully. During the 4-day period of this holiday, the same radio gave a running account of the death toll from traffic accidents which ultimately set a new and sorry record. This same routine will be dusted off and repeated over the Labor Day holiday—when perhaps another record of fatalities will be set on our Nation's highways.

It so happened that I drove to an ocean beach that weekend and when I went the posted speed limit, every other car on the road passed me despite signs reading, "Speeders Lose Licenses." This mortifying experience, plus the radio news, made me think again about the 40,000 people being killed each year by automobiles.

The more I thought about this annual slaughter the more it seemed incredible that effective means had not been devised to substantially reduce these deaths. I recalled the agitation for seat belts, the radar enforcement techniques, the suspension or revocation of the operator's license exercise, the requirement of financial responsibility of the owner, etc., all of which have some merit but obviously have not solved the problem.

In analyzing this problem, I came to two basic conclusion: first, the driving of a motor car must be considered as a privilege rather than a right in our society; and, secondly, the serious nature of the problem warrants the use of severe corrective measures. In short, I believe the time has come to not spare some peoples' feelings, in the attempt to save other people's lives.

Reasoning from these two conclusions, I believe there is a way—if the States have the courage to embrace it—to impress car owners with their responsibilities to such an extent that accidents and fatalities will be drastically reduced.

The States today have two controls they can exercise over the operator by reason of the driver's license they require and they have control over the car by reason of the license tags they require.

Specifically, I would urge all of the States to authorize the suspension or revocation for cause and after proper hearing, of the license plates for the car itself, in addition to the individual operator's permit. This means a physical removal of the plates from the car. (One State recently passed such a law.)

If a car owner knows that his or her investment in that car can be immobilized by reason of having no tags, I am sure much more attention would be paid to careful and prudent driving. Actually, the entire family would see to it that the car was properly driven and each member of the family would become an enforcement officer.

Extreme? Hard on the whole family? Of course the answer is "Yes," but isn't it time we did more than try to impress drivers with signs reading, "Speeders Lose Licenses," when convicted speeders are left with the same car to get in and drive without a license? And we know they do just exactly that.

Certainly it's a tough suggestion, but that's the only way to deal with a condition that takes 40,000 lives a year in this country. Suspend or revoke the license tag for the car, in addition to the driver's permit, and you will make converts out of a lot of otherwise careless drivers. Such treatment would quickly get home the point that driving a car is a privilege and not a right and until that is accomplished we are simply "spinning our wheels."

I repeat, the time has come to not spare some peoples' feelings, in the attempt to save other peoples' lives.

GORDON W. RULE.

Now, Just Why Did You Join the Peace Corps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very encouraged by several of the excellent reports I have received on the progress being made by the Peace Corps volunteers training on the Berkeley campus of the University of California for secondary school teaching assignments in Ghana.

Since many of us know very little about these training programs, I would like to bring my colleagues attention to a very interesting article which appeared in the July 16 San Francisco Chronicle describing a typical day of training for these dedicated young Americans:

NOW, JUST WHY DID YOU JOIN THE PEACE CORPS?

(By Nancy Griffin)

At 7:45 a.m. under a hospitably warm July sun, the dusty-green Berkeley campus is redolent of eucalyptus and of that California shrub which always smells like burnt sugar.

But room 22 of Earl Warren Hall has only a new-classroom smell of institutional varnish.

No windows, either; nothing but a slide projector in the back, a brown blackboard (a brownboard?) up front, with an outdated map of west Africa pulled partly down over it, two large "No-smoking" signs—and rows and rows of seats, a lot of them already filled by young men. (The girls got there on time, all right; it was just that most of the early birds seemed to be male.)

"Soyez bienvenue" says one of them, after assuring me this was indeed the classroom headquarters of Peace Corps trainees at the University of California. (By the end of the day I discover the 58 Corps volunteers at Berkeley are spending a good 7 hours daily in that room, Saturdays included.)

That is as close as I come to an official welcome. No one pays much attention as I settle back into a seat high in the back and watch the rest of the class drift in, the barelegged girls in their summer dresses slightly outnumbered by the men, the whole group indistinguishable from any college class—except maybe by the absence of horseplay. Likewise plenty of laughter, but no giggling.

There are still about 10 minutes to check through my sheaf of background material—a mimeographed roster of the volunteers' names, ages and backgrounds; a Washington description of the project; the university's release on the "rigorous and rewarding" training program, "under eyes at least as critical as those (the volunteer) can expect abroad."

I knew beforehand that this University of California contingent is one of three pioneer Peace Corps units. (The others are at Rutgers and at Texas Western College.) After 8 weeks at Cal, the Berkeley volunteers expect to be sent to Ghana, which has asked for American teachers to staff the new secondary schools it's building at the rate of one every other month.

But not until Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah formally signs contracts with the United States, and himself makes the an-

nouncement, can this legitimately be called "Project Ghana." Meanwhile, these volunteers are officially said to be training for service in "some west African nation."

In any case, Dr. Nkrumah has probably never had more devoted American readers: Stacked on nearly every volunteer's notebook is the red-yellow-and-green paperback edition of "Ghana," Nkrumah's autobiography.

At 8 a.m.: Dr. William Stiles starts a 2-hour session of health education with a discussion of hemorrhaging and shock, followed by a Navy film on first aid (or in Government language, "Personnel Damage Control"). Most graphic.

Later Dr. Stiles announces a night meeting at Herrick Hospital, where volunteers are to get emergency room experience: "Perhaps you will see an autopsy or two." ("A bit of a sadist, isn't he?" murmurs a volunteer to his neighbor.) Next is pulse-feeling; it's like being in a nurse's aid training class again.

At 9 a.m.: Ten-minute break; everyone scrounges for dimes to feed the coffee machine across the way, or sprawls on the lawn with cigarettes. (Books, board and lodging are all provided by the Corps. Extras, of course—the cigarettes, the coffee and cokes—comes out of the volunteers' $2-a-day salary. That would be 25 cents an hour, if these were 8-hour days.)

I make my first mistake: "Why did you join the Peace Corps?" I inquire of a friendly girl in gray gingham who asked me to sit by her.

She stays friendly. But like nearly all her fellows, she is defensive about reporters and tired of being asked that question—by people at home, by newspapermen, by the examining psychiatrists from Langley Porter.

At 9:10 a.m.: More health education: fire prevention and artificial respiration, by Fire Chief Al Hanson, who's taken the trouble to brief himself on Ghana. Four volunteers willingly volunteer to stretch out and help demonstrate the back pressure-arm lift method. As supplements, the Red Cross has furnished enough booklets to go around.

(I am puzzled at first by all this harping on medical techniques. But it makes good sense to Project Director Dr. Morton Gordon of the university extension, who is administering the program. "Over in Africa," he says, "any European—which means any American, too—is automatically regarded as an authority on practically anything, especially away from the cities.")

At 10 a.m.: Half-hour break. Dr. Stiles suggests practicing artificial respiration on the grass, but the sprinklers are going. Dozens of volunteers converse, though they're inclined to freeze if I make a move toward writing anything down. Among them:

Maureen Pyne, 22, a Chicago redhead who got her B.S. from Alabama's Spring Hill College. ("She speaks and writes French fluently," says the official roster.)

Steve McWilliams, 22, with a 1961 B.A. in conservation from the University of Colorado. ("Among his special studies were ornithology and the teaching of geography. He has worked summers as a forest laborer, airplane cleaner, kitchen helper, and janitor.")

Susan Bartholomew, 23, from Minneapolis, with bangs and a thick cute pigtail. ("Graduate studies at Harvard, A.B. magna cum laude from Boston University, Phi Beta Kappa, working knowledge of French, elementary Russian, spent the summer of 1960 in Guinea with 'Operation Crossroads-Africa.'")

Ed Mycue, 24, of Dallas, who has been going to school and working in Boston at its educational TV station. ("He was graduated magna cum laude, is skilled as an automobile mechanic, carpenter, plumber, and metal worker.")

Arnold Zeitlin, 29, with degrees from Pennsylvania and Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism. Arrived late because he had to give a week's notice to the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette where he was TV and movie critic.

Nearly all are still surprised (it is only the program's third day) to find themselves in Berkeley.

"I was in such a hury," says a girl from Philadelphia, "I walked straight out of the house without my coat." Peace Corps examinations had been between May 27 and June 5.

With remarkable speed, Washington had somehow between then and the end of the month weeded out those it wanted, run security checks (including six references apiece), paid some attention to preferences—although a good share hadn't mentioned Africa—and, by telegram and last-minute telephone calls, collected its choices at Cal by the pre-Fourth of July weekend.

At 10:30 a.m.: African history and anthropology by Dr. Robert Lystad of Johns Hopkins, who clearly loves his subject. (During the time he and his wife lived in west Africa, the Africans he dealt with called him "the children's white friend"; and when they left, the Lystads rated a farewell ceremonial libation of gin and chicken. I got this not from Professor Lystad but from the jacket blurb on his book "The Ashanti," another piece of required reading.)

We cover 11 centuries before lunch, stopping frequently for questions from the class on slavery and the slave trade. Fascinating names along the way: Fernando Poo, a person (first to cross the Equator) as well as an island. And the Oni of Ife, still potent religious leader of the long-flourishing Oyo-Yoruba Empire (geographically next door to Ghana in what's now Nigeria). When we get to the Ashanti Tribe of northern Ghana, "I'll try not to be prejudiced," says Dr. Lystad, "but they're my people."

At 12:30 p.m.: Long hot walk across campus ("that's how they plan to keep us in condition") to International House for lunch. This is where the volunteers are staying, except for Richard and Antonette Port, the only married couple in the project, who balked at being installed in separate wings. ("I told them that was one sacrifice I wouldn't make for the Corps," says Richard.)

Youngest volunteer is 19 and the oldest 35. Most are between 22 and 24. "But you mustn't trust that list," a girl warns me as I check the roster again. "It's not very accurate. They have me down as 22, and I'm really 23."

Age seems irrelevant anyway: These are adults. They wear their learning lightly, too. I have to keep checking the roster to find out all they've accomplished in their first fifth or quarter of a century. No wonder their hackles rise when foes of the program call them "Kennedy's Kiddies."

At 1:30 p.m.: Back to Warren Hall for a lecture by David Apter, associated professor of political science at Cal and director of studies for this Peace Corps program. He too is an authority on Ghana, where he has lived; one of his books is also on the required reading list.

We spend the afternoon wrapping up the history of colonialism. This isn't so superficial as it sounds. Professor Apter is jamming in facts at a great clip, hardly stopping for breath. Moreover, it appears that each volunteer is expected to reorganize his notes for each course into a usable, readable, textbook, augmented by outside reading.

"African history is not only long but deep," Dr. Apter emphasizes, "and no less deep for our ignorance of it."

There is a short break somewhere in mid-afternoon, when I consider trying the why-did-you-join-the-Corps question again. I am deterred, by a voice in another conversation floating across the lawn: "Tell the next person who asks you: 'Well, the Foreign Legion has closed down and I wanted to run away from home.'"

At 4 p.m.: Lectures over. Other days there'll be still other subjects: American problems—political, economic, social, international—and about 75 hours in British educational philosophy as it's practiced in Ghana. When things are organized, there'll be an hour and a half of physical training in the late afternoon—swimming and barefoot soccer, among other sports, for the men; swimming and ping pong for the girls. "I hear that ping pong is practically Ghana's national pastime," says one of them.

At 5:45 p.m.: After-dinner coffee in the sun with Peter Dybwad ("22; New Jersey; history major at Wesleyan; outstanding job as chairman of blood bank drive, has traveled in West Africa," says the roster); Barney Chessin, Rahway, N.J. history teacher ("23; fluent in Hebrew; working knowledge of French"); bearded Bob Klein, 32-year-old New York City teacher; and 1960 Stanford geography major Susan Hastings.

The university has thoughtfully installed a red screen in the International House dining room so that volunteers can eat behind it en masse, undisturbed. Nobody does. But they still talk mostly shop: The language training in Ghana's national Twi (pronounced more or less Tschvee), to be given by Ghanaian students in the United States, has been postponed until the following week.

The next morning is to be practice-teaching. Most volunteers—perhaps 80 or 90 percent—are trained teachers, but not necessarily experienced, yet.

Geographically, the group hails from nearly everywhere except the Deep South. A couple are Negroes—one of them, Ray Spriggs, of West Chester, Pa., a 1960 graduate of Nkrumah's alma mater, Lincoln University.

Several seem concerned with what hard-bitten newsmen think of them. But they appear to have a calm self-confidence unmarred by brashness or unduly starry eyes.

At 8 p.m.: After another long walk, we get to Herrick Hospital just at dusk, in time for a cigarette on the roof as the lights come on in the hills and across the bay. "This isn't really worse than the schedule we had at home in Boston," says Antonette Port. "Both of us were getting up at 6:30, and going to school and teaching at the same time."

At 8:15 p.m.: Dr. Stiles once more, with Herrick's staff doctors and nurses, explaining the 3-hour shifts the volunteers will take by twos in the hospital emergency room—daily and throughout weekends as their schedules permit. (There go their free Sundays.) We also get a short tour of the hospital—but no autopsy tonight.

At 10:30 p.m.: The corps saunters by twos and threes back to International House to start their night's studying. I'm on a bus for home, exhausted. But in the end I even have an answer to that question: "It's almost too simple to talk about," says one girl. "We don't expect to be miracle workers, but I think we all feel we have an obligation to the world. And things are going backward fast enough as it is without our standing by and not trying to stop them."

Nothing New in the Recent Communist Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many people, some even Members of this body, seem to be unduly impressed by the fanfare with which the latest Communist manifesto was announced. Some see in it cause for fear of a dynamic society which threatens, through peaceful coexistence, the rest of the free world. Others read into the proposals new military strategy with which we cannot cope. A calm, reasonable analysis of the statement shows that there is nothing new in the Communist world. The people are promised the same "workers paradise" except the time of achievement has been set ahead. The world is warned, although not too openly, that the basic concept of communism, world domination has not changed and that every immoral, unethical, or cunning scheme will be used against all free societies.

The Communist program is no threat to free governments or to free people. Under our system of free enterprise, we need no paternal government to keep us strong and to move our economy ahead. The slave states of communism can never catch the free world in an economic race. We need not fear the military might of the Communists if we recognize the objective, our own destruction. We can keep ahead in military strength by maintaining a strong and solvent economy, spending our defense money on nuclear power, and rooting out and exposing subversion where it is gnawing away at the foundations of our national structure.

Two interesting views of the Russian proposals are contained in the following editorials, the first from the Wall Street Journal and the second from today's New York Times:

[From the Wall Street Journal]
THE CHALLENGE OF HOT AIR

From the reaction of some people in Congress, you would think the Kremlin had done something vitally important in issuing the new draft program of the Soviet Communist Party.

Senator FULBRIGHT solemnly declares that the big question is the maturity of our response, adding that we must develop our economy. Senator MANSFIELD says that if the American people ignore this challenge, it will prove we are taking too much for granted and not using our capabilities to the full. He also observes that the foreign-aid bill's prospects have picked up, and that the President's domestic program must also be passed, in the light of this new challenge.

And what, pray, is this dramatic new challenge? It's just hot air and wild promises, expressed in the purest pie-in-the-sky language. For example, here is a forecast of life in the Soviet Union in the near future:

"The people's standard of living and their cultural and technical standards will improve substantially; everyone will live in easy circumstances; all collective and state farms will become highly productive and profitable enterprises; the demand of the Soviet people for well-appointed housing will in the main be satisfied; hard physical work will disappear; the U.S.S.R. will become the country with the shortest working day."

Any tourist who has had a chance to take a close look at the Soviet Union knows what poppycock all this is. There are the vast slums of the cities, with the people jammed together and using communal kitchens and bathrooms; even the new construction is shoddy. Speaking of the disappearance of hard physical work, old women still sweep the streets with primitive brooms.

Out in the country one often feels as though he has just moved back about a hundred years. As for Soviet agriculture becoming productive and profitable, that will be the day; farming is perhaps the greatest single Red economic failure.

Living conditions are gradually improving somewhat; yet, ironically, the new program in some ways appears to be a retreat from earlier promises. It is much vaguer, in terms of economic goals, than some experts expected. It pushes some of the promised material blessings off as far as 1980, whereas Khrushchev has talked of catching up with the United States sooner than that.

We suspect that the American people understand better than some Senators the true nature of the Soviet challenge. There is a challenge, all right, but it is a challenge of aggressive militarism and space technology. The Soviets have been able to create such a challenge by preventing their own people from attaining decent living conditions, and that is still the main direction of their policy. So the one thing we do not have to worry about is a challenge in Soviet living standards.

Certainly cheap Soviet talk is no justification for the administration's lavish spending at home and abroad. It is hardly logical to use a threatened rise in Red living standards as an excuse for more of the Government spending that can damage this country's financial and economic underpinnings—and thus threaten our own living standards.

To be sure, it's not surprising that American politicians should seize on this document to push their own schemes. But they are not doing any service for the American people. They ought to reflect on what is perhaps the best comment on the new program; it comes not from Washington but from a Moscow hotel maid: "Fine promises, but I shall be in my grave by then."

[From the New York Times]
THE NEW COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

This newspaper devotes eight pages today to the full text of the latest Communist manifesto, the so-called third Soviet program, embodying the basic ideas of Premier Khrushchev. As the Soviet dictator is the most powerful adversary of the free world, and as the first maxim of survival must always be "know thine enemy," this document should be studied by all who value freedom. This is Premier Khrushchev's counterpart to Hitler's "Mein Kampf," and the world can neglect it only at its peril.

The importance of this document to the outside world lies not in its profusion of pie-in-the-sky promises to deflect attention from the continued shabbiness and the physical and spiritual hunger of Soviet life, nor in its fantastic picture of a future Utopia where everything shall be free except freedom.

Its overriding importance lies in Premier Khrushchev's renewed proclamation that the Soviets can reach their unalterable goal of complete communism, including the withering away of the state, only when the whole world has become Communist, and that meanwhile they will use the Soviet state as a power apparatus to bring this about.

In short, this is a new declaration of war against the free world—military, political, economic, and propagandistic war. It expands in thousands of words what the Soviet chieftain compressed in four words: "We shall bury you."

This is both a Communist and a Russian document. Through it marches an older Russian imperialism which conquered all neighboring peoples and expanded the Duchy of Muscovy into the Russian Empire, now stretching from the Elbe to the Bering Strait. Through it runs the Messianic faith of the Russian soul that Russia has the mission to save the world—a faith of many facets which first proclaimed Moscow to be the "third Rome" of a Christian world and now the center of the Communist world.

All these elements are mobilized and tied into the Communist doctrine to give it greater potency, including the Russian sense of timelessness which always looks not to the present but to the future for fulfillment. But Soviet strategy does not depend on them alone. It seeks to avoid a nuclear war that would destroy the "Communist motherland," but short of such a war all means must be used to reach the goal.

Therefore, under the guise of "peaceful coexistence," it continues to stir up revolutions and Communist "wars of liberation," to exploit nationalism where it serves its purposes and to denounce it where it does not, to try to wreck all free world defense organizations, to lure the new and still inexperienced states into its net and above all to seek to disarm the free world while keeping its own arms intact.

The world has been warned again.

Drill Press Operator Speaks Eloquently for His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Lester L. Poteet is a drill press operator in a California aircraft factory. He is sick and tired of this country being kicked around. He has suggestions as to what is wrong and what the remedies are. Recently he wrote me about it. Although I do not agree with all Mr. Poteet had to say, the substance of it seems to be a fairly accurate expression of the American people's instinct for national survival. I, for one, have a tremendous respect for the collective judgment and wisdom of the American people, as well as a hearty respect for that survival instinct. I have asked that Mr. Poteet's letter be reproduced here because it is well that those in Government pause occasionally to acquire the essence of the people's thoughts, which in the end, is the strength of our Nation.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: The overthrow of the U.S. Government from within has been in the making for some time. For years the people attributed the disastrous results of our foreign policy merely to stupidity and to the ineptness of our high officials. But more than stupidity is rampant in Washington.

Our State Department effectively delivered the peoples of China into the hands of the Reds. One of the master architects of this act of great infamy was Owen Lattimore, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Lattimore worked from a desk in the State Department. At the time of this writing, Lattimore is in Outer Mongolia striving to have that Red satellite admitted to the United Nations. Our President has promised to give his (Lattimore's) "expert opinion" serious consideration. Of course Cuba is the place where one worldism in the State Department became so bold discretion was forgotten. Our State Department supported Fidel Castro. State Department-backed Fidel Castro was given diplomatic recognition and a fond pat on the head, this in the light of evidence to show the State Department had been thoroughly informed of Castro's Red connections.

Meanwhile, back at the U.N., that "stalwart" fighter for the United States, Adlai Stevenson (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) is working industriously for the admittance of Red China into that organization. An article datelined London quoted Mr. Macmillan—after his visit with the President—to the effect that Mr. Kennedy told him (Macmillan) it would take a year to prepare the American people to accept the seating of Red China in the United Nations. Chiang Kai-shek is enraged, and rightfully so, at the impending sellout of his people and of Formosa which he feels is imminent. Our State Department, and President Eisenhower (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) squashed our friends, England and France, when they went into the Suez to stand up for their rights granted by treaty. The Cuban invaders were doomed to slaughter and capture on the beaches when some as yet unnamed person or persons rescinded the air support promised them. These Cuban patriots were fighting for us. They deserved our full support. The infamous tractor deal, begun at the behest of our own President (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) and the subsequent attempt at fulfilling his "unofficial" proposal, by a committee notoriously known for their one world activities, was crushed by the indignation and loud protest of the American people.

J. Robert Oppenheimer, the security risk scientist, the consort of known Communists, an advocate of a one-world government, has turned up in Latin America recently ostensibly to teach our neighbors how to resist communism. Alger Hiss (a member—or former member—of the Council on Foreign Relations) is lecturing in our universities.

The House Un-American Activities Committee is under attack by the one worlders. The Connally reservation is under attack by the one worlders. Free enterprise is under attack by the one worlders. The tragic significance of these things are shocking beyond belief. It is almost impossible to absorb the knowledge that it could be happening in this great country of ours. This desire of a one world is registered in the highest offices in the land. There are organizations crying for a sane nuclear policy, pleading with us, the United States of America, to lay down her atomic weapons and surrender to Russia. This writer has read articles in the public press of recent date with a Ford Foundation byline urging the United States to give up Berlin. The insidious campaign has begun to prepare the American people to accept defeat in Berlin. If the past performance of the Council on Foreign Relations can be considered as a guide, they will again succeed as they did in Korea when Gen. Douglas MacArthur was fired at their direction. MacArthur wanted to win that war and was denied the opportunity. I, and millions of other Americans, are behind the preservation of the United States, and for the freedom of our Republic under the greatest Constitution ever devised by mortal man. We want our representatives to obey the Constitution and the country to be governed by that Constitution, and not by Presidential order.

This is a lengthy letter and turgid with criticism. Its purpose is twofold: to let you know that the people are indeed aware of what is happening. And, secondly, to let you know what the people would like to see done in Washington. Never before has it been my experience to see men in the shop (I work as a drill press operator) gather at breaktime and lunch period to discuss things political. The people I talk with for the most part have little faith in the Kennedy administration (on the other hand, they had small faith in Eisenhower's administration), and especially in the State Department. Remember, too, these are union men and traditionally support candidates of the Democratic Party. The time has come when a man cannot be known by his label—only by his actions.

All the weaponry in the world will not save us unless our leaders have the will to use them. The will in Washington is soft. It is more than soft, it is flabby. It is like the underside of a fish, flacid and weak, vulnerable to the first thrust. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the majority of our elected officials are honest, sincere, representatives. By the same token, it is agonizingly apparent that most of the key positions in our Government are held by members of, or proponents of, the Council on Foreign Relations, i.e., in sympathy with a world federation. If a solid bloc of patriotic representatives would go before a nationwide audience via the press and television with the avowed purpose of exposing the one world group existing in Washington and promising to return America to the principles of the Constitution, cheers of exultation would sweep the country.

Among other things, the United States should do: Castro's government must be toppled at all costs, by force of arms if necessary. For the self-preservation of this country, it is imperative that Russian influence be forbidden in this hemisphere.

The B-70 bomber should be in the air right now. The United States should have a bomber fleet of decisive power aloft 24 hours a day, and the Russians should be informed of this fact. We should have our missiles aimed at the vitals of Russia, and they should be informed of this also. Every effort should be made to advance our space program. We should resume nuclear testing but very discriminately, bearing in mind the awesome effects of atomic radiation. From a position of invincible strength, we should dispense an incessant torrent of our peaceful intentions to all nations. We must inform the peoples of the world that we are a sovereign, successful nation with the greatest freedom and greatest opportunity of any nation ever established. If America's greatness was extolled because of our free enterprise system with half the energy exhibited by the Communist exhorting their ideology, there would be no contest.

We must not denounce or turn our backs upon nations because their governments are different from ours. Most of the world is not culturally, or temperamentally, or economically prepared to adopt our system of government. Let's help and be friends to those countries who are on our side regardless of their political systems with the single exception of those nations infected with Marxist communism which is committed to the cause of world government. We must cease the trading of and the sale of any and all supplies, products, and manufactured articles to the Soviets and the Soviet bloc nations. This country now sells precision instruments to Russia (the infamous ball-bearing episode is a case in point). Adlai Stevenson advanced a plan recently to share any new knowledge obtained from atom testing in the future with the members of the U.N. This is not only folly, sharing our advances and secrets with Russia is suicide.

It is utterly preposterous that our lawmakers acquiesce and subscribe to the foreign aid program that funnels our hard-earned dollars into Soviet bloc nations. No aid whatsoever should be given to the Soviets, and to the Soviet bloc nations. We should give aid to our friends. We should give aid in the form it will be the most appreciated, and in a form that cannot be hurled back at us should the honeymoon end. Obviously, the aid that should be given is food. Our storehouses are bulging in direct contrast to our dwindling gold reserve. Food should be given to our friends, but it should be preceded by advanced publicity in the towns and the cities and the villages, explaining explicitly where the food comes from, why we are able to produce such vast quantities, and that they are receiving the food because they are our friends. The food should be accompanied by actual farmers who grow it, dispensed by them direct to the people. Any nation who rejected such a proposal should receive no aid. We should be selling what America stands for instead of selling America short.

We should support the fight against communism in the film industry and in our universities. We should hear comment from Washington in support of these supremely loyal Americans. We have every right to expect and demand the press to editorialize in favor of free enterprise, to publish the mistakes and defects of our leaders boldly. Too often, left-wing writers monopolize the pages of the press with artfully slanted reporting. Sad but true, a one world sympathizer can get a bigger play in the press than an organization like the American Legion, to wit, Steve Allen and Linus Pauling, with their "better Red than dead" philosophy. We should expect our Supreme Court to perform its duties as Americans and not a one worlders. We should demand that the Supreme Court pass judgment on the Communist Party in the United States and render them bereft of constitutional immunity. The Communist Party should have been identified by the Supreme Court as an enemy of the United States and outlawed at least as far back as the Korean war.

This letter has only scratched the surface of what ails America. The conclusions stated herein are the writer's own and were derived solely from perusal of the public press, radio, and television. I have no friends in politics, no organization or group behind me. But my neighbors and friends are becoming increasingly aware of the debacle facing us unless our foreign policy is drastically changed. I know they are concerned and aware of what is going on because they tell me they are. They have voiced the opinions stated above and are doing so more and more.

Yours for a better and stronger America,

LESTER L. POTEET.

Sacrifice Means Action, Not Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I voted on Monday, July 31, in favor of the authorization requested by the President permitting him to call up the so-called

Ready Reserves and to extend such tours of active duty as may be necessary, in his judgment, to better prepare us to respond to the Soviet menace posed over Berlin. With some reservations, I shall also vote later this week to give the President the additional $3.5 billion of defense spending he says is necessary.

Those reservations stem from the fact that we have already seen a considerable increase in defense spending since the Kennedy administration took office, including one increase as recently as 4 weeks ago when a spokesman for the administration said, in effect, "our defense budget is now adequate to meet all contingencies," and from the further fact that there is as yet no evidence whatsoever—outside of a vague promise to submit a balanced budget next year—that this administration understands that U.S. strength depends on more things than mere military might.

If the point of all this is to convince Khrushchev that—this time—we mean business, I hardly think that the Russians are shaking in their boots. Last Monday's resolution states only the bare words necessary to give the President what he wanted, but the accompanying report says, in brave language:

[This] * * * will reaffirm to the nations of the world the dedication of the people of the United States to the cause of peace and freedom.

And, again:

[This] * * * is America's answer to the threat to our survival.

Then, in more matter-of-fact language, the report explains that the resolution "authorizes the President to order to active duty, without their consent, up to 250,000 members of the Ready Reserve." Thus we have the something less-than-voluntary sacrifice of some 250,000 reservists and their families, while, following the example of their leaders, the other 170 million-odd Americans go merrily on their business-as-usual way, catering to their own personal desires and preoccupied with their own, rather than the Nation's security. What is needed is evidence of our total determination to win the cold war—a determination which the American people, in my judgment, yearn to express but cannot express without strong leadership—the course we are following will not make the Berlin crisis any more real to the great majority of Americans than was the so-called police action in Korea—a war that was not a war and one that we could not win.

Certainly, the sacrifices so far demanded by the President's response to Khrushchev's threats are nowhere near as wide nor as equal as they should be. This does not mean that I advocate the declaration of a national emergency, or an immediate tax increase, or anything of the sort for the time being, but I do think that it is urgently necessary for Congress to undertake—by itself if the administration does not cooperate—an immediate review of the various domestic spending programs we have so far passed this year, as well as of those still awaiting our consideration, and that we put them to this test: Do they facilitate the winning of the cold war? If they do not, they should be put aside for the time being, in favor of a pay-as-we-go preparedness basis, and a determination to preserve not only the form but the historic substance of our Republic which combination will provide the Soviets with much more impressive evidence of our willingness to sacrifice, and of action which—because it involves us all—speaks louder than any words of resolution.

African Odyssey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I called to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Mr. Walter K. Mickelson, publisher of the New Ulm Daily Journal, entitled "Ghana Drifts to Red Dictators." One of those accompanying Mr. Mickelson on this African odyssey was Mr. Harold M. Fredrikson, a Minneapolis attorney who collaborated with Mr. Mickelson in writing articles which appear in a booklet entitled "This Is Africa."

I ask that an article entitled "Dictatorship Grows in Ghana," written by Mr. Harold Fredrikson, together with another article written by Mr. Mickelson entitled "Ghana Maintains No Color Bar—Africans Insist Upon Equality," be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks:

DICTATORSHIP GROWS IN GHANA
(By Harold M. Fredrikson)

ACCRA, GHANA.—Today's answer to the question: Is Ghana a Communist state?—would seem to be: Almost, but not quite. The drift appears inexorable; the timetable short.

"Utter nonsense," one might say, "to come to so damning a conclusion after but 3 days in a country so complex as Ghana."

But the tell-tale signs—a one party system personal dictatorship, government ownership of land, government domination of labor and of agriculture, the destruction of personal freedoms, a party-sponsored youth movement, attacks upon the churches, loss of independence of the judiciary and of the legal profession, the disappearance of a free press—all of these and more are readily apparent for the inquiring eye to see.

It's a land of 7 million people, possessed of vast mineral resources (bauxite, manganese, gold, diamonds), of productive lands and forests (large producer of hardwood lumber, and the world's largest producer of cocoa). It is native Africa's most advanced economy and has the most stable currency. And Africa's fiery, most articulate advocate of anti-colonialist, anti-West pan-Africanism is its president, Osogyejo Dr. Kvame Nkrumah.

Ghana today commands an importance out of all proportion to its size. A few years ago Ghana, in relation to Africa, might have been compared to Castro's Cuba telling the Western Hemisphere how to mind its business. Not so with Ghana today.

Historically, Ghana is divided into tribal regions, each possessed of its own language and native king and council. All tribal land, traditionally, belonged to the "stool" (e.g. the Kingship, as distinct from the King personally), and the tribal council possessed the right to depose a king for "abuse of power."

Nkrumah has made use of both these tribal traditions in consolidating his iron grip on Ghana.

The Congress of the People's Party (with 78 out of 104 seats in the one-chamber parliament) bears a relationship to Ghana comparable to that of the Communist Party to the U.S.S.R.

All organized labor including the medical profession (which functions only as state socialized medicine) is controlled by the Trades Union Congress (TUC).

Some months ago, TUC became an affiliate of the party and is housed in a new government building. Similarly, about a year ago, the farmers' (principally cocoa growers) cooperative societies and the farmers cooperatives bank disappeared and were succeeded, respectively, by the Ghana Farmers Council and National Cooperative Council (both party affiliates) and by the Ghana National Bank (wholly government owned).

Its first mission: To take over five gold mining companies. On March 8, 1961, the Government announced formation of its own state buying agency to "take over the entire business of cocoa buying firms whose licenses are being withdrawn."

Mr. Adamafio, general secretary of the CPP recently stated that the TUC should be renamed "CPP (Industrial Wing)" and the Farmers and Cooperative Councils the "Agricultural and Cooperative Wings of the CPP."

Furthermore, he said, "The Government is only an agent of the CPP; the CPP is Ghana; and Ghana is the CPP. Ghana is determined to achieve her goal of a welfare socialist state."

The CPP has its own newspapers, and effectively controls Ghana's press.

"The Party Is Supreme," scream the in-color front page mastheads of the party's the Ghanaian Times and Evening News.

In dedicating the party's soon-to-be completed training school for party members, Nkrumah had this to say:

"Every one of us will pass through a course in the institute for proper orientation and adjustment.

"All members of the central committee (e.g., that is of the party), all party functionaries, all ministers of state, chairmen of public boards, and other key public officials, must at all times feel conscious of the truth that in ourselves, all of us are nothing except what the party has made us, namely, agents for execution of the party's program."

GHANA MAINTAINS NO COLOR BAR—AFRICANS INSIST UPON EQUALITY
(By Walter K. Mickelson)

ACCRA, GHANA.—While visiting the new handsome American Embassy at Accra, I met the Reverend Harold Ottomoeller, missionary for the Lutheran Synodical conference for Nigeria and Ghana. He headquarters in the eastern edge of Nigeria where he heads up the school system.

He succeeds the Reverend William Schweppe, cousin of Dr. Carl H. Schweppe of Dr. Martin Luther College of New Ulm, and who is now located in northern Rhodesia. Ottomoeller has 500 African (colored) teachers and 8 white teachers under his school management. There are about 17,000 children in his schools; 250 to 300 in high school.

His mission to Accra was to get some land from the government on which to build a Lutheran church. He found the going slow, not because the government was opposed to his church, but because he had no funds to

use in slipping under the table to get faster action.

Ottomoeller says there is much more corruption in Ghana than in Nigeria. He told of an Italian contractor who won the bid to build a number of $35,000 homes. He collected $150,000 in bribe money to go to the officials but then skipped the country. His stranded workers decided to build the homes for $25,000 each and they made money.

An English firm bid on some other houses but the government decided to give the contract to the Russians who probably will build better houses for less and show up the English.

Ottomoeller's brother graduated from Dr. Martin Luther College in New Ulm. Mrs. Herman Brinkman in Truman is his aunt and Henry and Paul Ottomoeller, Truman, are his cousins.

The pastor chuckled when I told him a friend in New Ulm asked me to look up a friend at Calabor, which he said is a suburb of Lagos. Actually, they are 700 miles apart.

Americans just have no concept of the vast distance in Africa. We have already traveled about 5,000 miles in Africa and have seen very little of it. Roads are poor so you almost have to travel by plane. Most of the planes are British or French owned and operated and are pretty good.

One is almost overwhelmed by the black masses encountered everywhere, usually 10 Negroes to 1 white. There is no color bar. The whites and blacks mix everywhere in stores, banks, churches and clubs. Some of the prominent whites have Negro wives and you often see white women eating or drinking with black men.

Bright blue, scarlet red and yellow are the favorite colors the women wear in their wrap around gowns. Girls who can't be over 15 carry their babies on their backs in Indian-style papooses. When women carry heavy burdens they usually balance them on their heads.

Both men and women are fine physical specimens and they marry early. It is not uncommon for a 15-year-old girl to have a baby before she marries.

The Negroes are friendly and curious, but they are as excitable as a flock of turkeys. So far they have been very kind. We try to be polite and tactful and a smile is the same in all languages.

Most of them live in hovels as poor as any you see in Mexico, but not as bad as in India. The names on some stores are amusing, such as "Glory Hallilujah Book Store," or "Going to Heaven" school bus.

They have a smattering of English but prefer to talk their tribal languages. We find they don't like to talk politics.

Money disappears as quickly here as it does in New York or Paris. They love "dash" which is something free—something for nothing. On the whole the Africans remind you of a big group of poor but smiling children who don't know where their next meal is coming from—and care less.

This Is Bull Run Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I have already submitted for the RECORD, the first of two articles on Bull Run by Robert D. Byrnes, Washington correspondent for the Hartford Courant. I found "This Is Bull Run Today" very interesting, and offer part 2 for the RECORD:

THIS IS BULL RUN TODAY—HALLOWED GROUND WHERE CONNECTICUT TROOPS FOUGHT BRAVELY IN A LOST BATTLE

(By Robert D. Byrnes, the Courant's Washington correspondent)

One of the few spots of the Bull Run Battle terrain where it seems certain a visitor today can be sure he is on ground Connecticut troops were a century ago is Braddock Road in Centreville.

Stone gateposts, now almost entirely hidden by shrubbery, show the name of Royal Oaks, and at the end of a long, curved drive is what was once a large and imposing wooden house. The house, said to have been built in 1710, has a long veranda, shaded by two massive oaks, from acorns which are said to have been brought from England. The house, long deserted and uncared for, is now being dismantled, board by board and brick by brick, for reconstruction in another part of Virginia. The land has been zoned for business.

Within the past few months workers at Royal Oaks turned up a bottom from a Connecticut uniform.

Bull Run, for which the Federals named the battle, probably would be called a brook in Connecticut. In the area in which the Connecticut troops saw action, it now appears to be about half as wide as Hartford's Park River east of Broad Street. The bank on the Washington side of Bull Run in most places drops straight down for 20 feet or more, and that also seems to have been the condition in 1861.

The Confederate front extended for 8 miles along the southern bank of Bull Run with the left at Stone Bridge which carried the Warrenton Turnpike across the run. The bridge is still there, though no longer used, and the present Lee Highway goes off to the left where the run goes through a culvert. This is one of the many relocations of roads during the past century that makes retracing of the detailed action difficult.

Both Beauregard and McDowell had planned attacks to roll up the other's left flank, and both had planned to start the action Sunday, July 21. Beauregard's plan was to put his army behind Centreville and cut McDowell off from Washington. McDowell planned a wide sweep to his right, crossing the run some distance above the Stone Bridge, which was guarded by Confederate artillery, and sweep down on Manassas, leaving the Confederates penned between his army and Bull Run. There was a snafu in the Confederate orders, and before Beauregard's right wing moved, McDowell was across the run west of Stone Bridge so the Confederate forces had to shift to their left and extend their line there to keep the flank from being turned.

The Connecticut Brigade was not a part of the main McDowell flanking move and all the accounts seem to be in agreement that it moved from Centreville along the Warrenton Turnpike toward Stone Bridge. The 1st Regiment history says it moved out of Centreville at midnight July 20, on the Warrenton Turnpike and was detached to guard that road, apparently while the main force swung off to the right for the flanking movement. General Tyler's report, dated July 27, 1861, says the brigade moved from Centreville at 2:30 a.m. "to threaten the turnpike bridge on Bull Run."

Various accounts of the battle speak of the weather as hot, a July condition in northern Virginia that hasn't changed in the past century. Family traditions have it that when the sun rose, that Sunday morning, it seemed to hang in the eastern sky as a huge, blood-red disk.

Available records do not indicate what the Connecticut troops did during the remainder of the night and the early forenoon. In the early hours of daylight units of the two armies were shooting each other near Stone Bridge, but the Connecticut units do not seem to have been involved in this. Beauregard assumed that units of his right wing were already across Bull Run on their way to Centreville where he must have supposed the Federal forces were still waiting. It was not until 9 a.m. that Beauregard got word that the Federal forces had crossed Bull Run about 2 miles to the west of Stone Bridge in great strength and were moving around the Confederate left flank. The Confederates then started rushing reinforcements to their left.

In this concentration of the battle on the Confederate left flank, the Connecticut troops, probably without having been very close to Stone Bridge, left the turnpike and moved to their right, and the reports pick them up after this shift had been made.

About 10 a.m., according to the 1st Regiment history, the troops advanced across Bull Run and formed a line of battle beyond Young's Ranch. Fry's account says: "We followed a gorge or bed of a brook (from the run) and then formed line of battle on open plain." Fry also says General Tyler ordered the band to strike up "Yankee Doodle" while we pressed forward and crossed the run. This seems to be the only reference to music in the battle accounts. Colonel Keyes, in his report, says from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. his brigade was in constant activity on the field of battle.

Around midday a force of Confederate infantry and cavalry came up on the right of the Connecticut-Maine brigade for what seems to have been the first frontal action for the Connecticut troops. General Tyler's report says "after some severe struggles" the brigade drove the Confederates back until the brigade advance "was arrested by a severe fire of artillery and infantry sheltered in some of the buildings."

At this time the main battle was still going in favor of the Federal forces, but the Confederates were beginning to resist more effectively. It was probably at about the time of the Connecticut engagement that Confederate General Bee was rallying his troops to join the Virginians of General Jackson "standing like a stone wall."

The 3d Connecticut and the 2d Maine were ordered to take the battery that had stopped the Keyes brigade advance. The Keyes report says these two regiments moved to the base of the slope, where they were ordered to lie down and load and then charge up the hill. At the top, Keyes reported, the Confederate fire was "so hot that exposure to it for 5 minutes would have annihilated my whole line." In his postbattle report, Keyes wrote: "The gallantry with which the 2d Maine and 3d Connecticut charged up the hill upon the enemy's artillery and infantry was never, in my opinion, surpassed."

The reports gloss over the retirement, but it took place and the troops took shelter. According to General Tyler, the move was a march by the left flank across an open field until the line was sheltered by the right (south) bank of Bull Run.

Fry quotes General Tyler, in presumed excitement, asking the men, "Can't you take that bayonet at the point of the battery?"

During the engagement, the Connecticut troops apparently moved some distance to their left, though still on the Confederate side of Bull Run, for the next part of the Tyler report has the Keyes brigade preparing to attack a Confederate battery placed on a hill below the point at which the Warrenton Turnpike crosses Bull Run, which is at Stone Bridge.

Confederate battle reports give some indication this battery may have been the artillery section of the 5th Brigade, Virginia Volunteers, commanded by Capt. H. G. Latham.

It was now late afternoon. The turning point in the main battle had just been at 4:40 p.m. Just before that time, the Confederates observed a large body of troops coming toward the field of battle from the southwest. Signalmen reported to Beauregard they believed these were Federal troops from the Shenandoah Valley and Beauregard was ready to order a retreat. But he waited until the last possible minute and just before then, a breeze unfurled a Confederate flag at the head of the advancing column. These fresh troops were too much for the Federals, and they retreated.

Back in the Stone Bridge sector, Tyler's report says the Confederate battery he had been preparing to attack was removed from the hilltop. The Keyes brigade was around the base of the hill and on the point of ascending it when Tyler discovered the Federal troops were in retreat and he was in danger of being cut off. Again, the reports do not detail the retirement.

Fry says the Connecticut troops crossed Bull Run to the northern side, and this may indicate that they marched across Stone Bridge, for Fry is specific that the troops later waded Cub Run. It was a Confederate artillery shot, destroying the Cub Run Bridge and causing a jam around its approaches, that set off the panic that turned the retreat into a rout.

Cub Run is a stream about the same size as Bull Run and about halfway between Bull Run and Centreville. After crossing it, according to Fry, the Connecticut troops "formed a line again and faced to the rear." There they met and repulsed a charge by Confederate cavalry.

Col. R. C. W. Radford, 30th Virginia Cavalry, in his report, says, "I then charged upon them between Cub Run and Bull Run but soon came upon a column of infantry about 5,000 strong, posted on each side of the road in thick woods, supported by a battery of three pieces."

Radford's account does not match Fry's account as far as location is concerned, as the Virginian has the clash between Bull Run and Cub Run, while Fry placed the Connecticut troops across Cub Run. There was some other important Confederate confusion on geography in this area.

Fry credits the Connecticut brigade with being the last of the Federal troops to leave the field at Bull Run, though he doesn't specify exactly what he means by that. The 1st Regiment history says it returned to Centreville, and its former camp "by nightfall."

Fry, in what is probably a classic summary of an army in defeat, reports that at Centreville "it seemed as if we had never been so tired, so disheartened, so thoroughly disgusted with everybody and everything as we were then."

There wasn't even rest at Centreville, for at 10 p.m. the troops got peremptory orders to continue their retreat to Falls Church. They arrived there at 9 a.m. the next day, after a night march. And then it rained, a daylong summer downpour.

As in so many cases where history is reviewed, "ifs" abound on Bull Run, and one of them could have meant greater glory or ignomy for the Connecticut troops. Confederate President Jefferson Davis had arrived at Manassas late on the day of the battle and in an evening conference considered ordering immediate pursuit. This tentative decision was based in part on the report of an officer who claimed he had been as far as Centreville and found it deserted. The immediate pursuit was abandoned when it was discovered the officer had a reputation for not being very accurate and actually had been only as far as Cub Run. The Monday rain not only turned the terrain into mud, but raised Bull Run to depths that would have made at least some of the fords unusable.

"If" the Confederates had pressed the pursuit, would they have come up with the Connecticut troops before they left Centreville? "If" they had, would the Confederates have been pinned between the Connecticut troops and the flooding Bull Run, or would the Connecticut troops have broken and let the Confederates push on toward Washington?

Most of the retreating Federal forces didn't stop at Falls Church but fled all the way to Washington. The Connecticut troops not only stopped there, but, working through the rain on Monday, salvaged much of the equipment that had been abandoned by the other troops.

Contemporary accounts indicate Federal morale was buttressed considerably when the Connecticut regiments later staged a dress parade at Fort Corcoran, a part of the Washington defenses.

The 1st Connecticut came through the battle without having anyone killed. Its losses were eight enlisted men wounded and one officer and eight enlisted men missing. The casualty reports for the rest of the brigade showed: 2d Connecticut, 2 enlisted men killed, 1 officer and 4 enlisted men wounded, and 1 officer and 8 enlisted men missing; 3d Connecticut, 4 enlisted men killed, 1 officer and 12 enlisted men wounded, 18 enlisted men missing; 2d Maine, 13 enlisted men killed, 2 officers and 22 enlisted men wounded, 3 officers and 115 enlisted men missing.

The Connecticut regiments, as 3-month volunteers, were mustered out in the summer, but few of the men left the conflict. Fry said that 500 of the original muster held Army commissions before the war was ended. This number included 3 who became major generals, 4 brigadier generals, and more than 80 field and staff officers. By comparison, Douglas Southall Freeman, in his book "Lee's Lieutenants," counts 42 from the Confederate Army in the battle who became general officers of the Confederate Army during the course of the war.

Public Facility Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the 1961 omnibus housing bill, I referred frequently to that section of the bill devoted to community facilities, and I pointed out that the measure, as it was before this House, provided 10 times more the amount initially asked for by the administration.

The administration had asked for $50 million for this purpose and the committee, over the objections of the minority members, saw fit to insert in the bill $500 million, while at the same time $150 million was still available, having been previously authorized by the Congress.

Now there is a total of $650 million available for community facilities projects, and, in my opinion, this constitutes an invasion of private enterprise for in many instances these cities would use their own credit and credit facilities to obtain the necessary funds for various public works projects. This has been the historic right of all communities—and while I recognize that in some instances Federal assistance is useful and worthwhile, more often than not, cities, counties, and other political subdivisions will now look to the Federal Government for funds for all kinds of purposes.

A recent editorial in the Daily Bond Buyer, Mr. Speaker, sums up clearly some of the abuses that can flow from an uncontrolled extension of this practice of Federal subsidization of purely local matters, and I think it will be of particular interest to many Members of this body, especially those who still cherish the concepts of freedom and free enterprise.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD the editorial to which I refer, published in the Daily Bond Buyer on July 24, 1961:

PUBLIC FACILITY FINANCING

An all-embracing housing bill was recently enacted by Congress which really covers the waterfront in its efforts to provide something for everyone. It carries a $5.6 billion price tag which makes it the most costly housing program in U.S. history.

Aside from its pure housing aspects there are loan and grant programs for urban renewal, parks and recreation, hospitals, small business, public works planning and last, but by no means least from our point of view, public facilities.

The new act increases the borrowing authority for the public facility loan program from $150 million to $650 million. Of the new $500 million authorization, $50 million is set aside for loans to States or municipalities without regard to population limitations for acquiring, building or improving transportation facilities and equipment.

Loans from the remainder may be made to municipalities or other political subdivisions with populations of under 50,000 at an interest rate of 3⅜ percent. This represents a substantial change from previous policy.

Aside from increasing the authorization from $150 million to $650 million, the interest rate is now substantially lower, the population ceiling is upped from 10,000 to 50,000, and while the original program had been limited to loans for water and sewer systems and gas transmission lines, it could now be used to finance any type of public works.

The original concept, which seems to have been entirely discarded in the new act, was to provide financing for small communities which was not otherwise available at reasonable term. "Reasonable terms" meant an interest rate determined by the Community Facilities Administration.

Less than 6 months ago, on February 1, the CFA reduced this rate to 4⅛ percent for general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent for revenue bonds for loans with 30-year maturities. Prior to this reduction the rates had been 4⅜ percent for general obligation bonds and 4⅝ percent for revenue bonds.

On July 1 a single rate of 3⅜ percent went into effect as a result of the new housing law. This is no longer a reasonable rate but an extremely generous one, a full one-half of 1 percent or more below the recently reduced rate. In fact it permits municipalities to borrow at a cheaper rate than even the Federal Government itself, for Treasury bonds of about 20 years maturity are selling to yield about 3.90 percent at the present time.

Whether Congress realizes it or not it has placed the Government in the municipal bond underwriting business, for better than one-third (34.5 percent) of the dollar volume of municipal bonds issued by communities with a population of less than

50,000 during the first quarter of this year was underwritten at a rate of 3⅝ percent or more.

Most of these issues were probably underwritten by the small local dealer who has spent considerable time and effort in developing a local market for his community's securities.

Since President Kennedy, who is not particularly noted for his conservative leanings, had requested Congress to approve only a $50 million increase in the community facilities program at the interest rates then in effect, we can only surmise that there must have been some plain and fancy political footwork in the Congress to bring about the much more liberal provisions which were finally enacted.

All reasonable individuals, including investment bankers, would agree that where an essential public facility is needed but cannot be financed through private means then the Federal Government should provide the means in one way or another. But we cannot see how or why the Federal Government, now operating at a substantial deficit, should begin providing capital for municipalities when private capital is available at reasonable terms.

Nation in Need of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent daily newspaper of Willows, Calif., the Daily Journal, points out editorially in its July 28, 1961, issue that although there assuredly is no room in the current budget for frills, it is to be hoped that Congress will not consider wealth producing reclamation projects in the West in the category of economic superfluities.

The Willows Journal calls attention to the fact that western reclamation areas for the most part do not produce surplus crops, but rather those vital crops that improve the national diet.

The editorial follows:

NATION IN NEED OF RECLAMATION

In view of the Nation's commitment to a substantial buildup of its armed strength and its ideological war against communism, there is assuredly no room in the budget for frills.

It is to be hoped, however, that Congress does not consider as frills wealth-producing reclamation projects such as the Tehama-Colusa Canal, which will irrigate more than 175,000 acres, mostly of dry-farming land, in this area.

If, as an example, a farmer spends money for a new harvester, which will pay for itself over a period of years and increase his income, to boot, then most assuredly he is indulging in no frill by buying it. On the contrary, he is making a wise capital investment in the future of his farming operation.

So is it with irrigation. The Long Canal, as an example, will increase per-acre dollar value of production more than fivefold, according to a highly conservative Reclamation Bureau estimate.

Not only will farmers make repayments on its cost from their increased receipts from irrigation, but also the higher value of crops and of land provide a larger tax base. The entire economy, not only the farmers and the economy of the area, benefits.

James K. Carr, Under Secretary in the Interior who is well known in Glenn County, made this clear in an address to directors of the National Reclamation Society.

"The reclamation program," he said, "was founded on a firm foundation that Western reclamation development was so valuable to the people of the United States that the national taxpayers would carry the interest charges on the investment necessary to develop the West.

"Western reclamation areas, for the most part, do not produce surplus crops and there is no question that crops on Western reclamation projects are those vital crops that improve the national diet.

"They have been islands of stability during periods of recession. They have slowed the migration of our young people to the cities because they make a better living possible on the land.

"More than that, they have stimulated industrial development and manufacturing enterprises * * * which supply the fabricated materials for these huge projects."

The Long Canal and other such wealth-producing reclamation projects are, indeed, capital investments in the future wealth, stability and power of the United States. Unfortunately, however, the Federal budget, unlike a farmer's or businessman's budget, does not differentiate between current expenditures and capital investments. This, perhaps, is partly responsible for the feeling among some Members of Congress that reclamation costs are to be considered in the same category as current expenditures.

Mr. Carr cited figures showing a dangerous lag in reclamation development during the previous administration.

During the 10 years before World War II an average of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget was devoted to reclamation development.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, this was cut to five one-hundreths of 1 percent—only one-tenth as much.

Meanwhile, the Nation's population is increasing by 8,000 persons a day, while agricultural land is being gobbled up at the average rate of 3,000 acres a day by subdivisions, highways and other public works.

To longer delay necessary reclamation projects, such as the Red Bluff diversion dam as a start to the Long Canal, would be short-sighted, misguided economy indeed.

E.F.D.

Opposition to the $95 Million Electric Power Generating Facilities at Hanford, Wash., Is Now Nationwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives, by a vote of 176–140, deleted from the AEC authorization bill the $95 million electric power generating plant at Hanford, Wash., my mail contains hundreds of telegrams, editorials, and letters approving the House action. At the same time it is urged that the House should stand firm in its decision.

From Los Angeles comes this expression of support:

It is my sincere desire that you and your colleagues who are alerted to the danger of the Government going into private business will be able to impress upon other Members of Congress to join you in the mighty stand you took against harnessing the Government's new plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash.

From Marshall, Tex.:

From all appearances this was another example of Federal expansion in the whole electric power field and this would make the AEC emerge as a new Government power agency.

From Cleveland, Ohio:

We oppose $95 million project at Hanford, Wash., to produce electric energy for commercial use. We believe this is the domain of private utility industry.

From Chicago, Ill.:

This project adds nothing to technology * * * the power is not needed * * * coal is a vital link in national defense and the industry and its employees would be injured.

From Huntington, W. Va.:

We continue to oppose inclusion of $95 million for electric facilities at Hanford, Wash., because we believe that the proposed conversion of Hanford to the generation of power would be contrary to the best interest of the coal industry.

The following four editorials are a sample of the many appearing nationwide in opposition to the $95 million Hanford project:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, July 19, 1961]

HOUSE SAYS "NO" TO PUBLIC POWER MOVE

Ever since Government power advocates got their big feet in the door under Franklin Roosevelt, electric energy produced by Government agencies has grown from about 5 percent of the national total to about 23 percent.

Growth of public power dropped off somewhat under the Eisenhower administration. But under the New Frontier, the push is on again.

Public power seemed necessary enough a quarter century ago. Private utilities had lagged in extending electricity to rural areas. Rates were high. But times have changed now, and private utilities are meeting growth and price responsibilities.

Fortunately, Congress put the brakes on expanded public power, at least for the moment, in a significant vote the other day. The House rejected, 176 to 140, the Kennedy administration's proposal to convert the plutonium-producing reactor at Hanford, Wash., into a powerplant at a cost of $95 million.

This move is aimed at putting the Government into the atomic power business for the first time. Its result, in our view, would be to create a dangerous precedent and, at the same time, produce power inefficiently in an area where power needs are being amply met.

In the field of atomic energy, private companies have put $600 million into research to produce A-power at prices competitive with conventionally produced energy.

The big reason for expanding Government power into new fields in the face of that record seems to be a desire to reduce the role of private power. Wherever that motive is apparent, we hope Congress continues to stamp on it, hard.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, July 15, 1961]

TURNBACK ON THE TVA PATH

What may be a significant victory for free enterprise, in the currently crucial area of private versus public power, was won Thursday in the U.S. House of Representatives. By

a vote of 176 to 140, the House said "No" to the inclusion of public power generating in the atomic energy program.

The vote itself approved an amendment which eliminated the sum of $95 million for electric generating facilities at a new nuclear explosives producing reactor at Hanford, Wash. The support for this Republican-offered amendment was bipartisan, including Democrats from several Southern States—an area in which political maneuvers by the Kennedy administration have previously succeeded in breaching conservatism. It is encouraging that this vote has been won, because it may indicate a buildup of congressional opposition to a widespread administration assault on power generation by private corporations.

The Hanford project is but one example of this assault. It is a very good example, however, because it illustrates the devious way in which the public power advocates are exploiting every opportunity. A nuclear plant like the one at Hanford has a defense function which is readily identified with the cold war. It is in the business of supplying atomic weapons. The public power provision was slipped into the authorization measure for a free ride. As Raymond Moley wrote on this page recently, the Kennedy administration is determined to use the cold war threat "to bring American industry and American life generally into the grip of a vast Federal socialism."

Arizona and the whole region of the Southwest is one of the target areas. Arizona Public Service Co., along with other private power firms, is fighting against an Interior Department decision to federalize the transmission of electrical energy from the Colorado River storage project. Every conceivable bid for public and congressional support against the private utilities is being made by the Department and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. But the Hanford vote in the House shows that Congress is alert to the tax losses and the bureaucratic encroachment on private business which public power brings.

Not long ago on the Manion Forum, newly elected Republican (and conservative) Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, declared that the Federal Government is guilty of a paternalism that can lead to dictatorship. "We canot hope to defeat international communism by becoming more and more like the very system that seeks to destroy us," he said.

The steps toward a hopefully benevolent version of that system are frighteningly evident in the New Frontier program. The attempt to spread TVA-style public power into the Western States is part of this socialistic explosion. The private power companies have ample facilities, in production or planned, to provide for present and future requirements—as taxpaying corporations. They must be allowed to do so, or a vast segment of U.S. business will be jeopardized by unfair, tax-free competition under the shadow of a Federal Government seeking to be all powerful.

[From the Williamsport, Pa. Sun-Gazette, July 7, 1961]

TIME TO SAY "NO"

Public power advocates are devising a new raid on the pocketbooks of American taxpayers.

In their eagerness to knock out private utility systems and sabotage private enterprise, they have framed two costly proposals they want Congress to enact in its current session.

They are demanding that Uncle Sam add another quarter billion dollars to the tax burdens of all the people for a steam-powered electric generating plant at Hanford, Wash., and transmission lines for distributing the power to be created at the Colorado River storage project.

Each of these undertakings fits into their scheme for a Federal power empire.

There does not appear to be a valid need for either of them so far as national defense or consumer demands for electricity are concerned. Once built, however, they would become competitive with investor-owned power companies.

It is to be remembered in this connection, that private companies are subject to taxation. They pour millions of dollars into the public treasury in Federal, State and local taxes. A Federal power system, on the other hand, pays no taxes and has frequently required concessions and subsidies from the Federal treasury.

Considering how few benefits there are to recommend the Hanford powerplant or the transmission lines, we hope the proposals are rejected and that Congress calls a halt to spending taxpayers' money for no better purpose than to put Government in competition with America's free enterprise system.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, July 12, 1961]

NEW PUBLIC POWER GRAB

As the age of electrical power produced by atomic energy gets its start, Government has added a powerful new tool to those of regulation, taxing and direct competition in attempts to cripple private utilities. The issue appears most clearly in the Hanford, Wash., new production reactor, designed to generate enough power for a city of one million population. Congress will act, probably in a matter of days, on funds for construction of the powerplant as part of the 1962 Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill.

For the backers of Government power, whether it is hydro, steam, or atomic, the Hanford proposal provides a new argument. This time it is "national defense." The proposed plant will be dual-purpose, comprising a plutonium and power producing reactor similar to such an outfit said to be in use in Russia now. If atomic disarmament negotiations with Russia should be successful, it is represented that the plutonium producing part could be shut down, and power production continued—but plutonium could be resumed quickly if atomic weapon needs became apparent.

The double purpose argument, of course, completely ignores the fact that if agreement should be reached it would necessarily extend to such potentials for manufacture of plutonium for bombs. The expectation that Russia might agree to permit operation of an atomic energy electrical powerplant capable of fast conversion to weapons materials is silly. Nevertheless, the national defense argument is being advanced.

Public power has always marched in by way of the back door. Originally, flood control projects were the excuse. Hydro-power was a byproduct, to be sold by Federal agencies at low cost. The fact that all taxpayers in the nation contributed to resulting low regional power rates never has made the slightest dent in the thinking of Federal power advocates. In the TVA area, hydropower at bargain rates ran short so the Government agency began building ordinary steam generating plants.

If Congress gives approval to the Hanford project, it will mean two things—(1) That Government steam generating plants will be extended to areas outside of TVA; and (2) that the Atomic Power Commission will join the Interior Department and the Army engineers as a third Federal agency in the electrical power business.

Meanwhile, reorganization of the Federal Power Commission in Washington is underway, with every indication that expansion of electrical power systems at taxpayer expense is going to be the policy. The REA already has been assigned a new and expanded role in general "rural development" as well as merely a power-supplier.

Opposition to expansion of government power does not mean that private utilities need be regarded as simon pure, or that they are above taking advantage of their customers, given the opportunity. Rather, the question is one of private enterprise vs. socialism. The utility serving this area, for example, reported taxes amounting to $11,730,000 last year, which was twice as much as it paid for fuel to generate electricity, and well in excess of its $10,926,000 operating income.

Such a tax burden obviously places a private business at a vast disadvantage in competition with tax-financed utilities which pay only token fees, have no problems of raising capital and are not expected to net a profit.

The advantages of government operations go to users in favored regions. Not only are low rates offered citizens, but low rates to industry provide distortions in the employment picture. While most citizens, including those in Wisconsin, furnish the taxes, a relatively few reap the benefits. It is one more field in which government can give or it can take away, and where its role as regulator of taxpaying business is suspect because of its own role as competitor.

Cuban Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Carlos Todd, editor, Cuban Information Service, Coral Gables, Fla., before the National Association of Manufacturers board of directors, the Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1961.

I have read Mr. Todd's address with concern. I do not necessarily subscribe to everything he has said; I do not know the facts as he apparently knows them. I wish I could say that what Mr. Todd has said is not the basis of concern and is not true. Unfortunately, I am very much afraid that such is not the case.

I am not an alarmist, but I am convinced that the American people should have a more realistic understanding of the Cuban situation, which is all too often labeled "tension." I know of no better way of presenting Mr. Todd's remarks to a vast cross section of our population than through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that everyone on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD list will read this address and evaluate it according to his individual dictates.

The address follows:

Gentlemen, I am honored twice today. Never has it been my privilege to address such a distinguished audience, composed of the industrial leaders of the United States. And never did I have the opportunity of visiting this great metropolis of the Middle West, an enormous city of enormous resources, which impresses the new visitor with the energy and activity which have made this country great.

When I was asked to speak to you, I was given a great latitude of choice in subject matter. It is my intention to discuss today "Tension in the Caribbean," a theme that has been ever-present in the news for the past 30 months.

I deliberately picked on the misnomer "tension," to show the fallacy that lies in the use of that word when it is applied to the Caribbean situation today.

I am a Cuban citizen, born in Cuba, who has lived most of his adult life in that lovely and unfortunate island. As a political editor of the newspaper Times of Havana, I lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality the Communist conquest of Cuba.

I have been witness to the total eradication of all freedoms in Cuba; to the destruction of its wealth and industry by the Red invaders; to the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and to the poisoning of the minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of a people who were once gay and happy and carefree.

I have seen all this happen before my very eyes; and I cannot dismiss it, as so many people do, with the word "tension." For you hear today about tension in Laos, in Vietnam, in Berlin, and tension in the Caribbean.

It is totally inadequate to say that I speak to you today about tension in the Caribbean, when the so-called tension has become open warfare to the death.

There may be some among you that still believe that the word "war" implies only much shooting and desolation and nothing else. Only very recently, we have had occasion to witness this type of warfare in the ill-fated, abortive invasion attempt by a handful of young Cubans who willingly sacrified their lives for the cause of freedom.

Nevertheless, that skirmish—for it was no more than that—was only a small armed engagement which served to accentuate the other kind of war, a war that is being waged relentlessly in the Caribbean and in every corner of this earth, the war for public opinion.

That tyrant and superb politician Adolph Hitler wrote in "Mein Kampf" that public opinion "was the mightiest factor of our time." He used it well and used it to the hilt. He has been surpassed and left far behind by Soviet Russia, which adopted some of his methods and added embellishments of her own.

This war—the war of advertising, for that is what propaganda really is—is being fought with tenacity, intelligence, and diligence by international communism.

The immediate and direct result of this type of warfare is what you call tension, under the accepted semantics of the Western World. But it remains war to the death, no matter what you choose to call it. Mao Tse-tung recognized the principle years ago and wrote, "Politics is war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed."

This tension, this war without bloodshed in the Caribbean, dates from the time that Fidel Castro, together with his Communist master, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, landed in Cuba in December, 1956. From that moment, and throughout the succeeding months, tension increased fearfully within the island of Cuba; but it had not, as yet, reached any appreciable degree outside the country.

Tension in the Caribbean began from that date as it inevitably begins in every single place in the world where the Communists initiate their well tried and successful program of infiltration, subversion, propagandizing, and bribery to secure total power in any area. The Congo, Laos, Viet Nam, Berlin, Cuba—every single focus of tension can be directly attributed to Communist action.

Open bloodless warfare—tension, if you insist in calling it that—intensified and finally burst forth from Cuba with explosive force, immediately after Castro and his Communists came to power on January 1 of 1959.

It became open warfare in the armed sense when the Cuban Communist government attempted an abortive invasion of Panama in April of 1959. It is worthy to note that the invaders were politely returned to Cuba by the Panamanian government. Castro tried again, in August of that year, to invade the Dominican Republic, in an attempt that also died at birth. The seas around the island were containing armed Cuban Communist aggression.

They did not and have not contained the open bloodless warfare, the tension that has spread throughout the countries of South and Central America. It has become impossible to limit that warfare to the Caribbean, to quarantine it, as you would a deadly disease, from the rest of Latin America. It is increasing daily, and it is achieving new victories and faithful adherents in this hemisphere.

It has invaded this country today, and for the last 7 weeks it has become the subject of urgent discussion from the top of the White House down to the home of the humblest citizen who reads newspapers or watches television.

For the origins of this tension, one may begin with the relationship that existed between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, Central and South America, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those relations were at an all-time high; and the political, commercial, and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your Government was a strong bond for hemispheric unity.

Curiously enough, the policy of the "good neighbor" became, unconsciously to Latin American nations, the policy of the "good father." An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians receive their share of largesse; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, while leaving the Latin American republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the pater familias of the hemisphere; and in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship.

You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing had been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered "safe" by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between tolerance and contempt becomes very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tinpot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships; revolutions, and the installment of the so-called "independent governments of the left." The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of your hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better Humpty-Dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel: international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of "an independent government of the left" in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the pristine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special Government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism, took over Fidel Castro. Your "independent government of the left" became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"He who remains silent; relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, jail its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America. "You are with communism or against it." And never forget that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The recent fiasco in Cuba has only served to confirm that conviction to Caribbean and other Latin American nations. The harm that has been done by the failure of a small expedition is incalculable; and you now

stand on the threshold of a "Gotterdammerung" in this hemisphere.

For the tension, the open warfare that emanated from little Cuba has grown to monstrous proportions in Latin America, and your own security is being threatened, according to the recent words of President Kennedy.

They have served, if only momentarily, to give pause to the Communist offensive; and they have brought some measure of hope to those people of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, which have always looked to the United States as the paladin of freedom and the shield against Communist aggression and intervention.

For the moment only; for that aggression and intervention has been made perfectly evident in the Caribbean today, with a Cuba invaded and conquered by the evil forces that guide the moves of the men of the Kremlin and Peiping.

The Presidential words did not allay the fact that the defeat of an invasion of Communist Cuba has been a major defeat for this country in the eyes of all Latin America and the world. Condemnation for the American-backed invasion in the United Nations and in many Latin American quarters is not a condemnation for U.S. "intervention" in Cuba and I say intervention between quotation marks. The condemnation comes because, in the eyes of the world, this country lost.

Will Rogers said it in well-chosen words, viewing the American political scene years ago, when he stated, "On the day after election, they do not ask you whether you held a nice, clean campaign. The only question they ask you is: Did you win?"

And that is the only question that was asked silently by the nations of Latin America after the failure of the U.S.-backed, Cuban-manned invasion. Did you win? Nothing else. For nothing else matters.

Consider, gentlemen, that these nations who regarded you as a protector—although they paradoxically screamed intervention just recently—have only to glance at the map of the world to judge you a bad security risk.

Within the short space of 16 years, the Communists have won control over more than 800 million people in 13 countries; and they have advanced from their initial base in Russia to win sensational successes in four continents—including North America. It is incontestable to say at this moment that they are winning that war to the death, the war of tension. And it is perfectly evident that, with the exception of the Cuban skirmish, they have done it without resorting to an all-out shooting war.

Indeed, they have won an armed clash at your very doorstep, which has left the people of this country stunned and aghast at their impotence before the Communist invader.

The world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted this attack and acknowledged a small armed victory with impunity—no matter what other considerations must be taken into account by you—has not been lost on Latin Americans.

Weak countries, like people, will forever look to the strong for guidance and help. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us Latin Americans in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act against the armed might of Soviet Russia and its Chinese ally, already firmly entrenched across the straits of Florida?

Be certain that no matter how you act, you will find worldwide criticism hurled at you. You are called imperialists and aggressors without sending a single armed man into Cuba. You will be called much worse if you do. The Communists will hold a worldwide propaganda feast, and the United States will be served up with an apple in its mouth.

Yet, if you are to survive as a Nation, if you are to keep what little prestige American power still maintains, you must act, and you must act quickly. Otherwise, Khrushchev's words will become tragically prophetic within a very short time: "Your grandchildren will live under Communism." The man means what he says. He intends to see to it that it becomes a reality.

We Latin Americans are accused of being dramatic, passionate, and mercurial in our ways. Underneath that exterior, we are all hard realists. And it is difficult for us, as realists, to understand exactly how you have permitted such open and arrogant Communist intrusion in your own bailiwick, with total impunity for the intruders on our hemispheric and your national security.

It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

It is happening again. But this time the enemy is organized on a worldwide basis and is busily subverting, infiltrating and corrupting the very system that you are called upon to defend * * * and doing it from within your own borders. And you are tacitly permitting him to do so with ghastly unconcern.

Do not believe for one moment that the rest of Latin America is not going to follow in the footsteps of Cuba. The Southern Continent will go entirely Comunist; and it will do so very soon, unless you act rapidly to prevent it.

To those of you who still do not believe that a well-organized, aggressive minority can take over a country with frightening ease, let me point to the case of Cuba. And, gentlemen, do not forget that right here, in the United States, a well organized, aggressive minority succeeded in changing your Constitution. Recall the 18th amendment. Recall, please, that a majority of your people bowed to the wishes of a well organized, aggressive minority, which condemned you to years of prohibition.

Meanwhile, the Communists are busy with plans for their Latin American takeover. Czech machineguns are being shipped to Colombian Red elements; and frenzied efforts are being made to unite them into a cohesive and effective force. In Cuba, Castro's guerrilla tutor is training Cubans for the invasion of Venezuela and Panama. The main attack is being directed against Venezuela, where Betancourt's hold becomes more tenuous with every day that passes. Brazil is another danger zone. Only in Peru—where documents of the most incriminating nature were abducted from the Cuban Embassy by Cubans, proving a huge conspiracy against the Peruvian Government—has communism been contained—not defeated.

At the moment, you stand tied hand and foot by the very entangling alliances that George Washington warned against. Whilst Soviet Russia conveniently ignores the United Nations and international treaties when it suits her—and gets away with it—you are ensnared in a web which will eventually smother you to death; and which is now being used with diabolical cleverness to stay your hand in your own defense.

The weapons that you have at hand in the international arena lie forgotten by your former Latin American allies. The Rio Treaty and the Caracas declaration, which provided the means and the force to cast out communism from this hemisphere, are crumbling into dust.

You are being slowly and inexorably surrounded. Most of Europe is gone. Asia is practically gone. The entire West Coast of Africa, facing the Atlantic, is going. Latin America is about to go.

It does not take much imagination to see the realization of Lenin's dream when he said, "We shall surround the United States. Without having to fire a shot, it will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

If this country is to survive, it must accept not only the responsibilities, but also the risks, of power. And it must come to understand one of the basic laws of power: it must be demonstrated or it must be used. Otherwise, power is nonexistent.

As Americans, you are faced with the greatest challenge that history has ever hurled at you. As Americans, you have always been mortal enemies of tyranny and despotism; of mass executions and mass imprisonment; of the concentration camp and the torture chamber; of viciousness and cruelty and oppression. Time and again you have fought against these things; and now you must fight against them once more.

Yesterday, you called these things nazism and you fought them and won. Today these same things are called communism; and again you must fight and win. For if you do not face the issue squarely, you will go down to inevitable defeat, and the entire world will become prey to the forces of evil.

Your forefathers never wavered, never hesitated, never counted the risks, never considered the odds, and they won. You, their descendants, cannot allow this precious heritage to be destroyed.

The fate of the entire world is at stake. You hold too much of the future of mankind to allow it to slip so heartrenderingly from your hands.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, a Fine Sailor, an Excellent Leader and Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a noted philosopher once said:

The body politic is composed of three groups of people; the first group doesn't particularly care what happens; the second is satisfied to watch; but the third and smallest group makes things happen.

Adm. Arleigh Burke ranks high in the third group. Whether on the bridge of a rolling destroyer in the South Pacific, on a flattop in the Philippine sea, or at his desk in the Pentagon, Arleigh Burke surrounds himself with action. He has always made things happen. He is retiring July 31 after 37 years of distinguished naval service, but I am confident that wherever he goes he will continue to make things happen for the good of this country.

Being a Navy man myself, I have closely followed Admiral Burke's career since World War II. The unprecedented progress the Navy has made in all phases of sea warfare during his tenure

as Chief of Naval Operations is a matter of record. The Congress, as well as the American people, are proud of their new Navy, developed and inspired by this great sailor.

The lasting imprint he leaves on our national defense posture under present world conditions can now be fully appreciated. When we realize the vast extent of the oceans and seas of the world, and the many farflung nations of the free world, do we fully realize the value of the Navy's extension of our national power and security. Admiral Burke has seen to it that strong naval forces are properly deployed and on hand in the tension areas of the world. The events of the past few years have shown that he has kept them there ready to respond to the needs of our great country, and to preserve the freedom of the seas and for the commerce of the world.

Admiral Burke has become recognized throughout the country and the world, as the chief spokesman and philosopher for U.S. seapower. Confronted with the paradox with the United States as a maritime people dependent on world resources and world trade to supply its tremendous industrial machine to insure its security, progress and high standard of living but continued to be psychologically a narrow concept of national self-sufficiency, Admiral Burke set his course to close this gap in our national thinking.

Not since Mahan have we had such clear and meaningful pronouncements on the importance of seapower to the economic and military strength of the United States, thanks to Admiral Burke. His speeches, as well as his testimony before committees of Congress, have lighted impressive beacon points of policy which will be kept burning by the dedicated responsible leaders of our Nation and our Navy who follow.

Arleigh Burke is retiring from his beloved U.S. Navy at a most demanding period in our Nation's leadership for freedom. It is a fine tribute to Admiral Burke to say simply, "Well done." Because of what Admiral Burke has accomplished America is well prepared to face with confidence and high hopes the wonderful future, security and progress that lie ahead—based on the freedom of the seas and the skies above maintained by the U.S. Navy for the benefit of all the world's peoples.

ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Arleigh A. Burke was born far from the sea in Boulder, Colo. on October 19, 1901. On June 8, 1923, he was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy, commissioned ensign in the U.S. Navy, and married to Miss Roberta Gorsuch of Washington, D.C.

Throughout his professional career, Arleigh Burke had prepared himself for combat with the enemy having served in battleships, destroyers, and having received the degree of master of science in engineering at the University of Michigan. Then, when World War II came, he found himself, to his great disappointment, in a shore billet at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington, D.C. After persistent effort on his part, he received orders to the South Pacific where, under Admiral Halsey, he successively commanded Destroyer Division 43, Destroyer Division 44, Destroyer Squadron 12, and Destroyer Squadron 23. This latter squadron, known as the "Little Beavers," covered the initial landings in Bougainville in November 1943, and fought in 22 separate engagements during the next 4 months. During this time, the "Little Beavers" were credited with destroying 1 Japanese cruiser, 9 destroyers, 1 submarine, several smaller ships, and approximately 30 aircraft. Because he pushed his destroyers just under boiler-bursting speed, he became known as "31-Knot Burke."

From destroyer command in the South Pacific, he reported in March of 1944 as Chief of Staff to Commander, Fast Carrier Task Force 58, Adm. Marc Mitscher. While serving with this famed carrier force, Arleigh Burke was promoted to commodore, and participated in all its naval engagements until June 1945 shortly before the surrender of Japan. He flew many combat missions. He was aboard both *Bunker Hill* and *Enterprise* when they were hit by Japanese suicide planes during the Okinawa campaign.

At the outbreak of the Korean war, Adm. Forrest Sherman, then CNO, ordered Admiral Burke to duty as Deputy Chief of Staff to Commander Naval Forces, Far East. From there, he assumed command of Cruiser Division Five, and in July 1951 he was made a member of United Nations Truce Delegation to negotiate with the Communists for a military armistice in Korea. After six months in the truce tents, he returned to the Office of Chief of Naval Operations where he served as Director of Strategic Plans Division until 1954.

In April 1954, he took command of Cruiser Division Six, and in January 1955 assumed command of Destroyer Force Atlantic Fleet in which capacity he served until he succeeded Adm. Robert B. Carney as Chief of Naval Operations in August 1955.

Admiral Burke has received numerous combat awards during his 37 years in the Navy including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, and the Purple Heart. But none are more cherished than two awards which came early in his career. In 1928 while serving aboard the U.S.S. *Procyon*, he was commended for the "rescue of shipwrecked and seafaring men," and in 1939 while serving in his first command, U.S.S. *Mugford*, he was commended when his destroyer won the fleet gunnery trophy with the highest score that had been achieved in many years. His ship also stood third in engineering competition and high in communication competition.

Admiral Burke's current residence is Admiral's House, U.S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C.

LIST OF CITATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN AWARDED ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY

For his service in Destroyer Squadron 23, Admiral Burke was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Cross, the Legion of Merit, and is entitled to the Ribbon for, and a facsimile of, the Presidential Unit Citation awarded Destroyer Squadron 23. The citations follow, in part:

Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commanding officer of a destroyer division and subsequently a destroyer squadron operating against enemy Japanese forces in the South Pacific area from early February to December 1, 1943. Throughout this period, Captain Burke led his forces in many offensive operations. His indomitable fighting spirit and great personal courage contributed directly to the success of our forces in that area and were in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

Navy Cross: "For extraordinary heroism and distinguished service as the commander of a destroyer squadron operating in the northern Solomon Islands area during the period from midnight October 30 to noon November 2, 1943. [His] squadron, as a part of a task force, participated in the first bombardment of the Buka-Bonin area and also in the first daylight bombardment of the Shortland area. During the night of November 1–2, a heavier gunned Japanese naval force was met and decisively defeated with the loss to the enemy of one cruiser and four destroyers sunk, and an additional two cruisers and two destroyers damaged. The action contributed much to the success of our operations at Empress Augusta Bay. Thereafter, a heavy air attack by 67 enemy dive bombers was fought off with a total of 17 enemy planes being destroyed."

Legion of Merit (with combat "V"): "For exceptionally meritorious conduct . . . as commander, Destroyer Squadron 23, in action against enemy Japanese forces northwest of the Bismarck Archipelago, at Kavieng, New Ireland, and the Duke of York Island, February 17 to 23, 1944. [He] expertly directed his squadron in destroying two Japanese naval auxiliary vessels, one large cargo ship, a minelayer, four barges and inflicting severe damage on enemy shore installations and subsequently effected a skillful withdrawal without damage to his vessel."

Presidential Unit Citation to Destroyer Squadron 23: "For extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese forces during the Solomon Island campaign, from November 1, 1943 to February 23, 1944. Destroyer Squadron 23 operated in daring defiance of repeated attacks by hostile air groups, closing the enemy's strongly fortified shores to carry out sustained bombardments against Japanese coastal defenses and render effective cover and fire support for the major invasion operations in this area. The brilliant and heroic record achieved by Destroyer Squadron 23 is a distinctive tribute to the valiant fighting spirit of the individual units in this indomitable combat group of each skilled and courageous ship's company."

As Chief of Staff, commander 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific (Task Force 38), Admiral Burke was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star Medal, a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit, and a letter of commendation, with authorization to wear the Commendation Ribbon. The citations follow, in part:

Gold Star in lieu of second Distinguished Service Medal: "For * * * outstanding service * * * as Chief of Staff to commander, 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific, during action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area from December 15, 1944, to May 15, 1945 * * * Commodore Burke was in large measure responsible for the efficient control under combat conditions of the tactical disposition, the operation, the security and the explosive offensive power of his task force in its bold and determined execution of measures designed to force the capitulation of the Japanese Empire * * * throughout the seizure of bases at Iwo Jima and Okinawa, including two carrier strikes on Tokyo, a carrier strike on the Kure Naval Base, and an engagement with the Japanese Fleet on April 7, in which several hostile men-of-war were destroyed by our aircraft. * * *"

Silver Star Medal: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity as Chief of Staff to Commander 1st Carrier Task Force in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific War Area, May 11, 1945. When the flagship on which he was embarked was hit by two enemy suicide dive bombers, Commodore Burke proceeded to a compartment in which personnel were trapped by fire and heavy smoke, and succeeded in evacuating all hands. When the flagship to which he had removed his staff was in turn hit by a suicide plane on May 14, he again arranged for the transfer of his command to a new ship. In spite of all difficulties, he maintained tactical control of the task force throughout, thereby contributing materially to the success of the operations."

Gold Star in lieu of the Second Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct . . . as Chief of Staff to Commander, Carrier Task Force, Pacific Fleet, from March 27 to October 30, 1944. (He) planned and executed a long series of successful offensive operations in support of the reduction of the other perimeter of Japanese defenses in New Guinea, the Carolines, the Marianas, Halmahera, and the Philippine Islands. Largely as a result of Commodore Burke's superb professional skill, tireless energy and coolness of decision throughout these operations and during repeated air attacks carried out in strength against heavily fortified strongholds in enemy-controlled waters, the Pacific Fleet has been brought within range of the Japanese Empire itself to continue our relentless drive against the enemy."

Letter of Commendation: "For distinguishing himself in action with enemy, while serving as Chief of Staff to Commander, 1st Carrier Task Force, Pacific on May 11, 1945. When the ship in which he was embarked was hit by two enemy aircraft . . . with utter disregard for his personal safety, (he) efficiently organized the evacuation of endangered personnel. His courage together with his prompt and efficient action was responsible for saving these men."

Admiral Burke is also entitled to the Presidential Unit Citation to the U.S.S. *Bunker Hill*, the Presidential Unit Citation to the U.S.S. *Lexington*, and the Navy Unit Commendation to the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. Those vessels were, at various times during his period of service, flagships of the fast carrier task forces in the Pacific.

From September 1950 until May 1951, he served as Deputy Chief of Staff to commander of U.S. Naval Forces, Far East, and for "exceptionally meritoriosu conduct (in that capacity) from September 3, 1950, to January 1, 1951 * * *" he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the third Legion of Merit. The citation further states:

"Bringing a sound knowledge of naval administration and professional skill to his assigned task, Rear Admiral Burke reorganized the rapidly expanded staff to meet its ever-increasing responsibilities and, through his unusually fine conception of the essentials of modern warfare, materially improved the mutual functioning of the Operations, Plans, and Intelligence Sections of the Staff * * * [and] contributed immeasurably the the success of naval operations in the Korean theater * * *."

While serving as commander, Cruiser Division 5, from May to September 1951, and also as a member of the Military Armistice Commission in Korea, Admiral Burke was awarded an oak leaf cluster in lieu of the fourth Legion of Merit, by the Army (Headquarters, U.S. Army Forces, Far East) by General Order No. 5, as follows:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services as a delegate with the United Nations Command delegation, United Nations Command (Advance) in Korea, from July 9 to December 5, 1951. Admiral Burke's keen discernment and decisive judgment were of inestimable value in countering enemy intransigence, misrepresentation and evasion with reasoned negotiation, demonstrable truth and conciliatory measures. As adviser to the chief delegate on all phases of the armistice conferences, he proffered timely recommendations for solutions of the varied intricate problems encountered. Through skillful assessment of enemy capabilities, dispositions and vulnerable abilities and brillant guidance of supporting staff officers (he) significantly furthered progression toward success of the United Nation's first armed bid for world peace."

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with gold star, the Legion of Merit with two gold stars and oak leaf cluster (Army), the Silver Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon, the Purple Heart Medal (for wounds received while serving on board the U.S.S. *Conway* during July 1943), the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with three stars, and the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon, Admiral Burke has the American Defense Service Medal, fleet clasp; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two silver stars and two bronze stars (12 engagements); the American Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Europe clasp; the National Defense Service Medal; and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon, Korean Service Medal, and United Nations Service Medal. He also has been awarded the Ul Chi Medal and the Presidential Unit Citation from the Republic of Korea.

ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, U.S. NAVY CHRONOLOGICAL TRANSCRIPT OF NAVAL SERVICE

June 1923 to April 1928: U.S.S. *Arizona*.

April 1928 to June 1928: U.S.S. *Procyon*.

June 1928 to September 1928: Fleet base force.

September 1928 to May 1929: U.S.S. *Procyon*.

June 1929 to September 1930: U.S. Naval Academy Postgraduate School, Annapolis, Md. (under instruction).

September 1930 to June 1931: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (under instruction).

June 1931 to May 1932: Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. (under instruction).

June 1932 to April 1933: U.S.S. *Chester*.

April 1933 to September 1934: Base force, U.S. Fleet.

September 1934 to April 1935: Staff, base force, U.S. Fleet.

May 1935 to June 1937: Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

June 1937 to June 1939: U.S.S. *Craven* (DD–382) (executive officer).

June 1939 to July 1940: U.S.S. *Mugford* (commanding officer).

August 1940 to January 1943: Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

February 1943 to May 1943: Destroyer Division 43 (division commander).

May 1943 to August 1943: Destroyer Division 44 (division commander).

August 1943 to October 1943: Destroyer Squadron 12 (squadron commander).

October 1943 to March 1944: Destroyer Squadron 23 (squadron commander).

March 1944 to July 1945: Staff, First Carrier Task Force, Pacific (chief of staff).

July 1945 to October 1945: Headquarters, commander in chief, U.S. Fleet (hdq., special defense section).

October 1945 to February 1946: Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

March 1946 to September 1946: Staff, Eighth Fleet (chief of staff and aide).

September 1946 to March 1947: Staff, U.S. Atlantic Fleet (chief of staff and aide).

April 1947 to July 1948: Navy Department, Washington, D.C. (member of general board).

July 1948 to December 1948: U.S.S. *Huntington* (CL–107) (commanding officer).

December 1948 to January 1950: Office of CNO, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

January 1950 to August 1950: Department of Defense, Research & Development Board, Washington, D.C. (Navy Secretary, R. & D. Board).

September 1950 to May 1951: Naval forces, Far East (deputy chief of staff).

May 1951 to December 1951: Cruiser Division Five (CO) (also delegate, military armistice to arrange armistice between U.N. forces and Communist forces in Korea).

December 1951 to March 1954: Office of CNO, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. director, strategic plans division).

March 1954 to January 1955: Cruiser Division Six (division commander).

January 1955 to June 1955: Commander Destroyer Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet.

August 1955 to present: Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

The Soviet Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following thoughtful analysis of the Soviet menace, which appeared in the June number of the magazine The Fifteen Nations:

ANALYSIS OF THE MENACE

(By Suzanne Labin)

"Where weapons balance, stratagems prevail"

This aphorism of the Chinese military theoretician Sun Tsé, born in the fifth century B.C., contains the essence of present Communist tactics. Due to the equilibrium obtained in the nuclear field, the Soviets have shifted their assault to the field of political undermining. Consequently, the decisive front is going to be that of the "War of Brains" and of the "Subversive War."

The tragedy we must get out of as quickly as possible is that of the Western World concentrating on the only war which may never happen, the missiles war, and ignoring the one which is at present being fought and through which the struggle will be decided; I mean the political war. If that aberration is not corrected within the next few years, we have to face the death—and a shameful death—of the Western civilization.

The following are the chief weapons of the political warfare waged by the enemy:

PROPAGANDA

Propaganda of a size and an intensity never seen before in human history, a titanic, multifarious, and unflagging flood, unlimited in its hoax, invading everything from bushes to palaces, direct or stealthy, provoking or insidious, thrilling or paralyzing, but always and everywhere planned and scattered with an extraordinary care.

Western leaders often dismiss Soviet steps by saying, "It is sheer propaganda." They are much mistaken. With the Soviets, it is when propaganda comes in, that things become serious. In the present antagonism between the free world and the Soviet world, the front of propaganda has become more decisive than the military one.

Words are the bullets of the 20th century; a widely spread newspaper is more powerful than 10 aircraft carriers; underdeveloped peoples are more easily caught up by 1 television network than by 20 dams; 10 Communist cells undo the work of 5 regiments; and the Secretary for Information is more important for the defense of the country than the Minister of Defense.

ORGANIZATION

This new and dreadful force is Lenin's main invention. It is an adaptation to the era of the masses of the power of intrigue, the theory of which was formulated by Michiavelli in the era of the princes. It is carried out by bolshevism through the most different chanels: about 2 million committees, cells, circles, friendly associations, fronts, trade unions, more or less openly controlled by Moscow, from Greenland to Cape Horn, going through the Empire State Building, the Vatican, and the jungle. Propaganda sows only the seeds, but it is the

organization that spreads the disease and transforms adepts into soldiers.

INFILTRATION

In all the bodies and institutions which play a part in the shaping of political opinions or decisions, the Communists introduce stealthily some of their men who serve them underhandedly. Everywhere throughout the world such media as the press, the television, the radio, publishing houses, cinemas, theaters, chansonniers, schools, universities, parties, unions, ministries, the police, the churches and the army all shelter occult relays of the Soviet. Some of these auxiliaries are the hirelings of the Kremlin; others, who are quite sincere, have been fooled, without even noticing it, by a huge network of professional mind manipulators.

CRYPTO-COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

Infiltration of the free movements is not enough for the Communists; in addition, they set up and colonize numberless parallel organizations calling on people for a thousand sorts of activities—cultural, sporting, artistic, domestic—and controlled under cover by Communist groups so that they act, sometimes unconsciously, in the direction most favorable to Moscow's purposes. The number of these organizations which fool a huge public is reckoned at several thousands throughout the world.

THE POPULAR FRONTS

One of the basic practices of communism is to take advantage of the perils endangering this or the other conquests of great value—liberties, union rights, national independence—in order to induce some of the parties who want in all fairness to ward off the menaces, to conclude an alliance with it. Then it creates committees of so-called union where the Communists immediately strive to bluff, intimidate, plunder, then isolate and if necessary suppress their partners so that behind the common front a single head is emerging: their own.

ORGANIZED JOURNEYS

The Communists have raised to a truly industrial level the visits to their countries of delegates who get mystified and seduced by a huge delusive machinery. The part played by these visits in the spreading of errors and sweetening distortions about the Communist system is considerable. Thus, some of the outstanding Western personalities reported enthusiastic appreciations of Stalin's Russia at a time when we know now the country they toured was crushed under the most abominable tyranny of all times. In spite of that, the huge trade of sugared testimonies on communism is expanding more than ever; especially on Communist China.

THE KNOCKING DOWN OF ANTICOMMUNISTS

One of the primary conditions of the success of a conspiracy is to discredit those who denounce it. Therefore, one of the main tasks of the Communist apparatus of the political warfare is to slander by all possible means the stanch anti-Communists. Alas, this witch hunting by Moscow's inquisitors has succeeded so well that many circles in the free world have been penetrated with the idea that it is wrong to fight systematically totalitarian communism—which, however, does attack freedom in the most systematic manner. Here we find a most serious sign of moral surrender of the free world.

TORRENTS OF WORDS

One hundred and fifty thousand hours per week of radio propaganda in all languages; 200 big propaganda films per year (plus countless small movies); 120 million propaganda books issued every year; 2 billion propaganda pamphlets issued every year; and 20,000 stars sent every year on publicity and propaganda missions all over the world.

VIOLENT MEANS

The war of words is spiced and, if need be, relayed by a whole range of sharper activities such as economic sabotage; violent manifestations; street rioting; guerilla warfare. Also in semidarkness: kidnappings, murders, poisonings. And, still further, this time in total darkness, sheer gangsterism. Chinese communism has become the chief opium dealer in the world, and this with three objectives: to get money, to compromise people, and to weaken the physical and moral health of the free world.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

The proof that Communists rely primarily on political warfare is evidenced by the fact that they have established some hundreds of special schools to teach it. They cover a tremendous network, ranging from evening courses to universities where the higher staff of the political warfare are most carefully trained. They systematically teach all the techniques of the manipulation of minds: the art of sophism, of spying, of sabotage, of committee intrigues, of stirring the crowds, and of seducing the elite. Some thousands of pupils of every race on earth spend there, every year, some millions of hours to receive theoretical and practical tuition.

OVERALL VALUATION

This apparatus contains many other gears which it is impossible to display in this short survey. Nor is there enough room either to analyze the whole range of psychological and logomachic means used to circumvent good wills and to mystify minds.

To sum up the situation, we have reckoned that for its whole machinery of propaganda, infiltration, and undermining, the Soviets spend more than $2 billion every year and use 500,000 overt or covert agents all over the world.

We are confronted with the most colossal apparatus to subjugate public opinion which has ever been created in history. This apparatus, which is an international appendix of the Soviet state apparatus, has become a sui-generis factor of modern events. It does not spring from a vice or a whim of the Soviet leaders; the latter have got to destroy the free world, otherwise freedom will destroy them. And their only weapon to that effect is a colossal political undermining.

But what is still more serious is that, in front of such a titanic propaganda apparatus, the effort put forth by the West in this field is less than one-hundredth of the Soviet attack. Here is the whole tragedy.

We must avoid carefully two dangerous mistakes. The first is to believe that the Communist Party is still keeping anything in common with the doctrine from which its name is derived. Henceforth, communism is nothing else than the Soviet plan; which in its turn is nothing else than a system of totalitarian power, trying to extend its grasp by every possible means. For communism, nowadays, the doctrine is nothing, the committee is all.

The other mistake is to measure the impact of the political warfare of the Soviets according to the strength of the Communist Parties. The machinery of this warfare operates chiefly in non-Communist circles, and its only task is to insure the daily servicing of Moscow's foreign policy. Therefore, it is a grievous illusion to believe that a country is safe because its Communist Party is weak, when the arguments of international policy favorable to the Kremlin are largely echoed in there. Such is, unfortunately, the case in most of the democratic countries.

SUCCESS ALREADY ACHIEVED BY THE SOVIETS THANKS TO THE POLITICAL WAR

In order to realize how wrong it is to think that the Western World must defend itself chiefly through weapons, one has only to note that not one single free world position has been lost because a rocket was missing from our arsenal. All of them were lost because of lack of foresight in our heads and lack of will in our hearts as regards the political warfare of the Soviets.

From south to north, from east to west, the way to the Kremlin is opened not by sputniks but by committees. Let us quote only the latest examples showing that the political warfare produces territorial and strategical conquests which until now could only be secured by the use of arms.

The overwhelming Soviet expansion following World War II was the result of the concessions of the Allied Powers at Yalta. But such concessions would never have been thinkable if the leaders of these powers had seen in the Soviet regime as hateful a despotism as Hitler's. The very fact that Roosevelt could have believed that Stalin's regime had some kind of relationship with the values the democracies had fought for, amply repaid the Kremlin—in a single day under the Crimean sun—for the billions of roubles it had invested during many decades to spread that illusion.

As to China, it succumbed only because the United States gave it up into the hands of Mao. And they did so because they believed in the huge soporiferous literature scattered all over the world by the crypto-Communists to convince people that Mao was not a Communist but a genuine agrarian reformer.

Let us recall the tremendous part played by propaganda in the failure of the European army. Day after day, crypto delegations would keep on knocking at the doors of parliamentarians to hand them petitions intended to coax or to intimidate them; 15 million threatening or insidious letters were mailed to them. The terrible pressure of this staging, which had no parallel in the history of political conspiracy—a real "Iliad" of Soviet propaganda—brought about a number of hostile votes sufficient to overthrow the majority; the EDC was rejected. This was a turning point in postwar history and a major Soviet victory due only to intensive propaganda.

In the streets of Tokyo there was no Soviet missile, and yet President Eisenhower was driven out of them only by the deeds of a few students groups properly intoxicated and handled. Two-thirds of Laos have slipped into the Soviet camp, while its tutors of the SEATO were counting the missiles, through a cheap pro-Soviet intrigue staked on local ambitions. Iraq, though integrated as it was in the expensive military network of the Baghdad Treaty, was extracted from that treaty and shifted to the philosovietic camp through an internal upheaval which took place at little cost in the face of all the missiles. Guinea and Ghana are becoming Soviet relays by the will of only a few scores of autochthons who have been placed in the controlling posts and properly shaped by the special schools of the Soviet machinery for $100,000 without any of the hundred million dollars of missiles being able to prevent it. The Congo crisis was entirely due to Communist propaganda and complicities, displayed at the bush, shop, mess, or drawing room level. In Cuba, at the very foot of the huge launching strips of the American rockets, the Soviets are taking root by a simple and classic political penetration.

There may come a day when the Government of Panama will fall into the hands of some popular liberating national front against Yankee imperialism, a front which will have crystallized in the backrooms of the cafes some 50 teachers, 40 barristers, 30 sergeants, 20 journalists and 10 aboriginal dockers around 5 Communist agents used as seeds, through a purely political operation for the whole of which Moscow will have disbursed hardly $1 million. On that day, I say, the United States will give up the Panama Canal without firing one missile out of its arsenal of billions of dollars. And that will be the beginning of its end. The

Western World will die like a languid giant, stuffed to the neck with superweapons which will never have been used, under the sting of thousands of political fleas fostered by Moscow. It will die as a victim of the lack of understanding of political war.

Finally, it is necessary to point out that the value of our defense depends upon the results of propaganda even from the military point of view. Indeed, an atomic war is decided within the first quarter of an hour. Now, on the very day the Kremlin is convinced that the Western leaders, tied up by an opinion rendered stubborn and irresolute by Soviet propaganda, would hesitate one quarter of an hour to retaliate—on that very day, indeed, the Kremlin may launch an attack.

The saddest point here is that one-hundredth of the money swallowed up by the complex of the missile gap which worries the Americans so much would be sufficient to fill up the far more serious propaganda gap. And this, in its turn, would be enough to reverse the world situation in a few years. Indeed, concerning security, the return of the "dollar for the mind" which allows the enlightening of brains is 1,000 times higher than the return to the "dollar for the steel" which produces only weapons.

H.R. 8230, the Agricultural Act of 1961, Is a Boon to Farmers and Urban Residents

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8230) to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interests of consumers, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8230, known as the Agricultural Act of 1961. This bill seeks to reduce our tremendous farm surplus and at the same time protects farm prices and income. These programs seek further to improve the distribution of agricultural commodities, to expand exports, and to protect the interests of consumers throughout the country.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, Subcommittee on Agriculture, I have become familiar with some of the recent developments in agriculture, the tremendous technological improvements in the production of wheat and corn and other food products, the declining income in the face of inincreased efficiency and the intolerable surpluses in corn and wheat. Every one apparently agrees that the farmer who has nearly tripled his output per manhour in the past 20 years deserves more for his efficiency than the 60 or 70 cents per hour he is now averaging.

Agriculture is still the most important industry of our country and the mainstay of our economy. It provides the basic necessities of life, food, and fiber. The farms of our country feed not only the 180 million people of these United States, but serve the needs of additional millions in underdeveloped and poverty stricken countries throughout the world. They accomplish this result with fewer farmers, but with superior technological skill and with improved and expensive machinery. Agriculture provides the basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the country. Certain programs which ostensibly benefit farmers and farms also carry with them tremendous benefits to urban dwellers and residents of suburbia. As consumers we realize that without the produce, the food and the fruits of farms, we in the cities could not feed ourselves very long.

Much criticism has been raised against the price-support program, the payment to farmers for taking out land from production of grains and wheat conditioned on dedicating the retired acreage to soil conservation. The storage costs of wheat and corn during the past several years has carried with it a storm of criticism and a resentment on the part of the taxpayers. There has been so much criticism at this phase that the taxpayer blames the farmers for these costs and desires to terminate the agricultural programs. Those who criticize the price support of corn and wheat and advocate a free economy for the farmer overlook the fact that we subsidize labor in the form of minimum wages, social security, compensation, and disability benefits. They overlook that we subsidize the railroads and the airplane industries with tax concessions and subsidies. They overlook that the maritime industry is aided by the Government with mortgage assistance for construction of the merchant fleet. They overlook the fact that the building industry is subsidized by Government guaranteed loans at low rates of interest.

Furthermore, under a price support system and under the practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would cost more to lend or purchase the surplus crops than it would to pay the farmer for retiring acreage from production. Savings are found in two forms: one, in reduced storage costs, and two, in lower monetary advances for purchases or loans on surplus corn or wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the participating farmers.

It is noteworthy that the high storage charges are paid not actually to the farmers but to warehousemen who are not connected in the main with the agricultural industry.

It is my opinion that we in the cities for our own interests should support this bill. This measure will help our farmers and the agricultural industry upon which we rely so heavily for our food, our fruits, and for our fiber. Food to the consumer is a bargain, despite the various packing processes which the housewife and the consumer demand and the series of distribution costs which add to the ultimate consumer price, the real cost of food today is cheaper than ever before. Food takes a smaller part of our income than heretofore. Today a factory worker can purchase more food with pay for one hour of labor than he could in years gone by.

An hour's average pay of a factory worker today will buy just about twice as much food as it did in 1929. The cost of food which could be purchased for one hour of factory labor is as follows:

Item	Unit	1947–49 average	1960
White bread	Pound	9.9	11.3
Round steak	do	1.6	2.2
Pork chops	do	1.8	2.7
Sliced bacon	do	1.9	3.5
Butter	do	1.7	3.1
Cheese	do	2.3	3.4
Milk, delivered	Quart	6.4	8.8
Eggs	Dozen	1.9	4.0
Oranges	do	2.9	3.1
Potatoes	Pound	24.8	31.8

Food that takes an hour's pay of the average industrial worker in this country would require 2 hours in England and Germany, 4 hours in Austria, 4½ hours in France, and more than 5 hours in Italy.

A Russian must work three and a half times as long as an American to get a pound of potatoes, four times as long to get a pound of beef rib roast, eight times as long to get a dozen eggs and nine times as long to get a pound of butter.

America's great plentifulness of food, at low cost, can be traced primarily to the fact that our farmers for 11 consecutive years, 1942–52 inclusive, enjoyed prices at 100 percent of parity or above. Farmers invested their increased earnings in new productive resources and in new methods. This brought about the greatest advance in efficiency ever known to agriculture anywhere in the world.

In America today one farmworker produces enough food and fiber for 26 persons. One hour of farm labor today produces four times as much food and fiber as in 1919–21.

In contrast, the employment of about half of the work force of Russia is required in agriculture to feed that Communist nation, and in most areas of the world the great majority of the population is engaged in agriculture and food still is scarce.

Another reason for supporting this bill is that the general economy would experience a substantial buoyancy by the restoration of rural purchasing power which the legislation seeks to achieve. The greatest underdeveloped markets for the goods produced by factories and labor in the cities now are in rural America. A study by the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Administration showed that the rural communities purchased over $1 billion worth of electrical appliances during last year. Maintaining the purchasing power of the farmers helps the urban worker, the businessman, and the manufacturer.

I trust that this measure will be approved.

A Respected American Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a highly respected citizen of southern California who for many years has been a leader in civic affairs and a promoter of sound government on all levels—Federal, State, county, and city.

Mr. James L. Beebe, whom I have personally known for many years, is an outstanding attorney who has voluntarily given many years of his life in helping to solve many of the difficult and complex civic problems in California and the Nation. His letter to me and the statement which he enclosed concerning the present challenging situation which the United States finds itself in and the manner in which we are attempting to solve, or neglecting to solve, some of the problems which vitally affect the present and future security of this nation reveals the concern that most of the people who write to me have about the future of the United States.

I submit herewith Mr. Beebe's letter and statement with the hope that his views and opinions may shock some people into a realization of the present situation of the United States on foreign relations and domestic problems:

JULY 27, 1961.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of the House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: I am enclosing to you a memorandum stating my thoughts on some of the war problems we now face.

I was glad to see the firm position that the President took on Berlin Tuesday night. I hope he maintains it.

Our greatest weakness so far in 1961 has been strong talk on Laos and weak action; strong talk on Cuba and disgraceful retreat; a complete surprise in South Korea; fear to resume testing nuclear bombs because of what the neighbors might say, although undoubtedly required for our own safety.

The question that many of us are asking is: Will the United States likewise back down on Berlin by some kind of agreement, notwithstanding the strong statements which were just made? I hope not.

I regret the memorandum is not shorter.

With kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

JAMES L. BEEBE.

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. BEEBE

For the first time in my life I fear the United States of America may not survive. I do not fear war; I fear that we shall go down the drain through subversion and folly. I have talked with a number of men recently and find that they feel the same alarm.

I shall not list here all of our failures—at the conference table, in our ill-conceived policies, and in our apparent misinformation or lack of information.

But look at only a few:

1. Our policy of self-determination in which we have advocated the breakdown of colonial empires, thus bringing into being small nations with no capital, inadequate resources, no training in self-government, and lacking the self-discipline and self-restraint necessary to slowly accumulate capital and slowly learn the hard lessons of self-government. The inevitable result will be Marxist nations (socialist or Communist) mainly because Marxism promises most immediate advances and does not require the self-discipline and the self-restraint necessary for freedom in life, business, and government. These small nations do and will envy us. They will expect us to support them. Our European friends will continue to be weakened by this movement.

2. Our actual support of Communist governments—in Red Poland, Yugoslavia, etc.—using our wealth to maintain these coercive minority governments in power, governments which repress our friends among their people, and finally at Russia's demand will battle us, if the occasion arises. And we just dedicated a new steelmill in Red Poland, built by our funds.

3. Our subsidization of food sales to Communist governments, relieving them of the full cost, freeing their use of funds for other purposes, and placing the subsidy of communism on the backs of the American taxpayer.

4. Our folly in assisting to destroy Batista and to install Castro, a then known Communist, in Cuba.

5. Suspension of nuclear tests, with no proof the Russians have done so, and continued negotiations we know will be fruitless, while we fail to advance in the science. This seems to be based on some fear of what others might think.

6. Strong talk in Laos and then retreat.

7. The abortive Cuban invasion and the folly of tractors for Cuba. Also continued U.S. support of Cuba financially by trade and through the United Nations. Since I started to write this, Castro has further shown his contempt for us by hijacking a plane. We should demand its surrender at once or go and get it.

8. Our aid in the destruction of Trujillo.

9. The great surprise in Korea, with our policy there apparently still undetermined.

10. Our policy of aiding with large sums so-called neutrals who seldom vote with us in the United Nations; who criticize us often; and who do not hesitate to oppose our policies.

11. Our policy of putting more and more of our destiny in the hands of the United Nations, which will shortly be controlled by countries hating or envying the United States of America, some of which will be dedicated to our destruction.

12. Our criticism of our friends and voting in the U.N. against them.

I do not wonder at Khrushchev's statement that he will bury us. The monument to be erected over the grave should be one to our subversion and folly.

The steady advance of communism has been aided and abetted within the United States of America. Somewhere down the line, where information is prepared and suggestions of U.S. policy made, are spies or Communists or Communist sympathizers or softheaded intelligent people, and probably some of each. But the results have been disastrous over the past 20 years.

The Armed Forces now will not allow a Marine band to appear at a patriotic rally against communism at which will be shown the film "Communism on the Map." That film has been shown twice to overflow audiences at the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce—conferences sponsored by my committee. More conferences on communism are demanded and will be held.

Never have I seen so much patriotic interest as now exists. We are in war—let us no longer talk of the cold war. And we win or we do not survive.

Members of the Senate and Congress, of course, know much that I do not about what is going on. But as for me, I believe—

We must quit retreating.

We must take our stand.

We must stop supporting Communist governments in our foreign aid program and our food program.

We must stand by our friends.

We must resume nuclear testing promptly.

We must not give the U.N. control over our money and our policies.

We must keep the Connally amendment.

We must root out the people in any department who have been responsible for the bad decisions of the past 20 years (the men and women down the line who prepare information or who initially write or revise reports have much control over policy).

We must make our Nation respected and not be too fearful of what the neighbors might say.

Red China must not be admitted to the U.N.

Outer Mongolia must not be recognized. Owen Lattimore was one of the architects of our fatal China policy. And now he appears in Outer Mongolia and the talk of recognition has begun.

This is no partisan matter. Bad decisions have not been limited to one party. I wish the President well. His decisions may mean our survival as a free people or our enslavement. I will support him in all his decisions I believe good. But I cannot be called upon to support, blindly, any President.

We are willing to face war; we are willing to make sacrifices for our safety; but we are fed up with bad, incredibly bad, decisions, and with indecision.

Since I started to draft this letter I heard the President on television last night.

I approve his stand on Berlin; I approve increases in arms and Armed Forces. I do not approve the foreign aid bill, as I believe (1) Congress must control the purse strings, (2) aid to Communist and to some Socialist nations will aid Khrushchev, Mao and company and not us. Also, I believe we should not undertake big new social programs when we need to concentrate on war in all of its phases. Further, we should critically examine some of the social programs which are greatly abused and weaken us.

JAMES L. BEEBE.

Their Best Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much attention has been directed to foreign affairs these days that we are tempted to miss the comparison that could be drawn between conditions in the United States and some nations abroad.

On Friday, July 28, the Chicago Tribune had an interesting commentary which is deserving of the attention of the Members of Congress. I submit for the RECORD this editorial entitled "Their Best Hope":

THEIR BEST HOPE

The military junta now established as the Government of South Korea has charged 51 persons with stealing the election which returned former President Syngman Rhee to office for a fourth term on March 15, 1960.

If we may be permitted to suggest a line of defense, it is that the defendants go to trial before Judge John M. Karns, of East St. Louis. Although it may be argued that Korea is off Judge Karns' beat, his jurisdiction has proved to be sufficiently elastic to

bring him to Chicago as acting county judge. In that capacity he found reasons to dismiss vote fraud charges against 677 precinct officials in last November's election.

Judge Karns' compassion might conceivably stretch to accused Korean vote thieves also.

This Is Bull Run Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the country watched with interest last weekend the reenactment of one of the major conflicts of this Nation's Civil War of 1861 to 1865. The First Battle of Manassas holds an important place in our history, and I want to congratulate the Virginia authorities, the directors of the spectacle and those devoted historical buffs who engaged in the spectacle.

Bull Run holds a particular place in Connecticut history as well. Robert D. Byrnes, the correspondent of the Hartford Courant with whom many of the Members of Congress are familiar, has taken the occasion of the anniversary to review the part of Connecticut regiments in the action and I found his article exceptionally interesting. I offer the first of these articles for the RECORD:

THIS IS BULL RUN TODAY—PLACID CHARM NOW FILLS THE CIVIL WAR GROUND WHERE CONNECTICUT TROOPS WERE SWEPT INTO BITTER HISTORY

(By Robert D. Byrnes, the Courant's Washington correspondent)

(Main battlefield, which Connecticut troops never reached, was where Confederate General Jackson won his sobriquet when his Virginians held "like a stonewall.")

Falls Church, Va., today is one of Washington's booming suburbs. It has a population of 10,500 and the chamber of commerce cites such suburban convenience as being only 8 miles from the center of Washington, 20 to 25 minutes by car and 35 minutes by bus from the Nation's capital.

On June 18, 1861, when the 1st Connecticut Volunteers went into camp there, Fal's Church was a village, though already one with history going back to the Indian wars and the French and Indian War. The community takes its name from the 1769 church built by the Fairfax Vestry, with George Washington a member of the building committee. The church was named for the Little Falls in the Potomac 5 miles away.

It was on July 16, 1861, a Tuesday, when the Connecticut regiments moved out of Falls Church on their way to Bull Run, the first full-scale engagement of the Civil War.

On July 23, 1861, just 100 years ago today, the Connecticut troops were back at Falls Church. Sunday, July 20, they had sweltered and fought around Bull Run. Monday, in a pouring rain, they had worked all days salvaging equipment in the Falls Church camp that had been abandoned by other troops who had fled all the way into Washington after the rout following the Confederate victory.

To the Connecticut soldiers of a century ago, Falls Church was enemy territory. The official records of the 1st Regiment note that it was "a position peculiarly exposed to attack" and the "rebels" could reach the rear of the Connecticut position easily from either Ball's Crossroads or Bailey's Crossroads, now also thriving suburban communities. The 3d Connecticut Volunteers moved out to Falls Church on June 24 and the regimental record notes it was "then the extreme and much exposed outpost of the Union lines."

Bull Run was close enough to Washington even 100 years ago so many Members of Congress and other Washington citizens drove out to see the battle—and added greatly to the turmoil when they fled as the Union troops (but not the Connecticut regiments) broke and ran back to Washington. The distances today, with automobiles and good roads, are even shorter, relatively. Highway engineers and developers, with bulldozers, cottages and ramblers, and suburban shopping centers have changed much of the landscape so it would be unrecognizable today to the men who marched across it in 1861.

Falls Church sources say the Union campsite was in the area that is now the Seven Corners shopping center, and the center of it probably was where the suburban branch of a Washington specialty store now stands. Driving over the terrain of the Bull Run campaign, walking through some parts of it, consulting reference works and checking with northern Virginia residents whose families lived in the area at the time of the battle, produces very little that can be pinpointed today as the place where a Connecticut regiment marched or fought.

The official military reports of both Union and Confederate commanders in the library of the National Park Service headquarters at the Manassas battlefield are helpful in many respects. In others they are frustrating, for the authors went into detail only on their advances, in most cases, and said little or nothing about retirements.

The troops on the way to Bull Run probably weren't much interested in landmarks or topographic features at the time, though coming back they learned a lot about the two major streams, Bull Run and Cob Run, which they had to wade. The attitude on the advance, as expressed by a Connecticut veteran who wrote under what seems to have been the pseudonym of "Frinkle Fry," in a book published in Hartford in 1872 was:

"After whipping the rebels we were to take the cars at Manassas and proceed to Richmond which we were to take early the next morning before sunrise."

This spirit of finishing the job in a hurry, with everybody playing a star role, was much in evidence as the war started.

Connecticut had been allotted only one regiment in President Lincoln's first call or 75,000 3-month volunteers, but because Gov. William A. Buckingham was a personal friend of Lincoln, according to a contemporary account, the State was permitted to raise three regiments for the first contingent.

There were problems, even before the battles started. Col. John Arnold, commander of the 3d Volunteers, resigned, and Governor Buckingham appointed Lt. Col. John L. Chatfield, of Waterbury, who was in the 1st Regiment, as colonel of the 3d. Lt. Col. Allen G. Brady, of Torrington, second in command of the 3d, considered Chatfield's promotion over his head from another regiment a violation of militia regulations and refused to recognize Chatfield as commander of the regiment. Brady was "deprived of his sword" at the time, but later served with distinction.

The 1st Regiment went into service under command of Col. Daniel Tyler of Norwich, a West Point graduate in 1819. Company A was from Hartford and was commanded by Capt. George S. Burnham, with 1st Lt. Joseph R. Hawley second in command. Tyler was promoted to brigadier general on May 10, 1861, the day the regiment sailed from New Haven for the 3-day voyage to Washington. Burnham was promoted to colonel and given command of the regiment, and Hawley advanced to captain, in command of Company A.

The 2d Regiment was commanded by Col. Alfred H. Terry of New Haven, with David Young of Norwich as lieutenant colonel, and Ledyard Colburn of Derby as major. The 3d Regiment seems to have been the last of the first contingent to be organized and the official State records say it went into camp at the Albany Avenue Fairgrounds in Hartford, May 9.

The 1st Regiment reached Washington, May 13. After about 2 weeks in camp in the Glenwood section of Washington, the 1st marched across the Potomac on June 1 as the Union forces moved to secure the Virginia side of the river opposite Washington. The march was over the Long Bridge, site of the present 14th Street bridges, near the Washington Monument.

The 1st must have moved through or past the plantation of Robert E. Lee, now Arlington National Cemetery, to reach Roach's Mills on what was then the Alexandria & Leesburg Railroad, where it encamped.

The railroad provided some mobility but the use of it brought the 1st into the shooting war for the first time. On June 16, a train that had been used for a reconnaissance trip was ambushed by Confederates at Vienna and George H. Bugbee of Company A was severely wounded. Except for Maj. Theodore Winship, who had been killed in the Battle of Big Bethel, near Newport News, 7 days earlier, Bugbee's was the first Connecticut blood shed in battle during the war.

According to Fry, the man who shot Bugbee was identified after the war as Frank Williams, who had a wartime career of his own in the Confederate Cavalry under Mosby.

The 1st moved from Roach's Mills to Falls Church on June 18. On the next day it was joined there by the 2d Regiment. The 3d Regiment and the 2d Maine, the latter in gray uniforms which caused permanent embarrassment to a Confederate officer who rode into their midst during the Bull Run Battle, also moved into camp at Falls Church and the four regiments became the 1st Brigade under Col. Erasmus D. Keyes.

Movement of the Federal troops across the Potomac into northern Virginia served several purposes, one of which was to keep the Confederates from possessing Arlington Heights, from which they could look down into Washington. Another was to appease the public clamor in the north for action and "on to Richmand."

On the Virginia side, the Confederates built up their forces for defense of their northern frontier. In command was Gen. Pierre G. T. Beauregard, "Old Bory" to his soldiers who had been in command at the bloodless Confederate victory at Fort Sumter. Beauregard, in a June 5 proclamation to the people, told them "a restless and unprincipled tyrant has invaded our soil" and "all rules of civilized warfare are abandoned and they proclaim by their acts, if not on their banners, that the war cry is 'Beauty and booty.'"

The Civil War was the first major conflict in which railroads were an important military consideration. One of the railroads ran from Richmond to the Shenandoah Valley, where there was another Confederate army. A junction point on this railroad was Manassas, whose name the Confederates gave to the two battles, and where Beauregard had his headquarters. Today Manassas has the appearance of a community where nothing exciting ever happens, with some of the buildings in the small business center looking as if they may well have been standing when Beauregard came there.

Manassas was well situated with rail connections to Richmond and the South, and to

the Confederate Army under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston which had been at Harpers Ferry, as the jumpingoff point for an attack, for which Beauregard planned, that would capture Washington and end the war. Manassas was equally advantageous to the Federals, for its capture would cut Johnston off from Richmond and open the way to "take the cars" for the Confederate capital and the end of the war.

On July 16, the Federal forces moved out of Falls Church. The three Connecticut regiments, with the Maine infantry, constituted the First Brigade of the First Division. The Norwich West Pointer, General Tyler, commanded the division. The First Brigade led the way, with the First Connecticut covering the left of the head of the column and the Second Connecticut the right. The first day's march took them to Vienna, about half a dozen miles from Falls Church. The next day they made another dozen miles. On July 18 they arrived at Centreville and camped there.

Coming into Centreville, the Federal troops were on the Warrenton Turnpike. Today the former Warrenton Turnpike is Lee Highway, named for the Confederate general, and some of it is a modern four-lane divided road. Centreville is so named because five roads come together there. One of these is Braddock Road, named for the British general who passed that way on his ill-fated march to the West before the Revolution in company with the then young Virginian, George Washington.

Dan Patch Record Still Stands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I was happy to attend the Dan Patch Days celebration in Savage, Minn. Home of the fastest racing pacer in history, the city of Savage is a booming area contributing a great deal to the economy of Minnesota. Because of its growing importance to the North Star State, I ask to have made a part of my remarks in the RECORD a brief history of this city, reported in the July 27 issue of the Dakota County Tribune:

NEW INDUSTRIES AND DAN PATCH FAME SPARKED SAVAGE GROWTH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dan Patch Days at Savage, an annual event, will be held on July 28, 29, and 30 this year. This festival is sponsored by the Dan Patch Days, Inc., a group of civic minded gentlemen from Savage. Dan Patch Days again will feature a queen to be crowned Saturday night and a huge parade, Sunday noon. Queens are listed elsewhere.)

DAN PATCH DAYS PROGRAM

Friday night, July 28: Carnival.

Saturday, July 29: Carnival and kiddie parade and contest at 1 p.m.; Bowles dancing troupe, 8 p.m.; queen crowning, 8:30 p.m.; kiddie matinee from 1 to 5 p.m.; dancing at 9 p.m., with Jolly Musicians orchestra.

Sunday, July 30: Carnival and grand parade at 1 p.m. Prize drawings at 4 p.m.

Dan Patch Days Inc., are composed of members from the volunteer fire department, VFW Warren Butler Post 6212; Savage Lions Club; American Legion; Dan Patch Post 643, of Savage.

Committees for Dan Patch Days have previously been mentioned. A complete booklet with all information has been printed and distributed.

Although Savage has grown into a little giant of industry, featuring much machinery with horsepower of steam, gasoline, and electricity, the celebration each year in July at Savage, features the one-horse power of the historic Dan Patch, a racing pacer, who set the fastest record of 1:55 for a mile, back in 1906. No horse has beat this record to date.

Dan Patch was owned by W. M. Savage, who trained the famous horse at Savage on the only enclosed racing track of a half mile in the world.

The little village of Hamilton, on the Minnesota River bank, located just out of the Burnsville, Dakota County borders, in Scott County, in 1904, changed its name to Savage in honor of Mr. Savage, owner of the famous horse.

Dan Patch was not only the pride and joy of Mr. Savage, who paid $60,000 for him, but he was the idol of every horse lover in the Nation.

Horseracing was the top sport in the early part of the century and a picture of Dan Patch appeared in every feed store, blacksmith shop, livery stable, public meeting hall, and many general stores throughout the country. Every young boy's ambition was to see Dan Patch race. He was the main attraction at the Minnesota State Fair and other racing expeditions in the Nation.

Mr. Savage added another honor to his horse a few years before his death, when Savage built a gasoline-powered railroad from Minneapolis to Northfield and Randolph and named it the Dan Patch. It is now the Minneapolis, Northfield & Southern Railway.

In 1916 Dan Patch died and his master died 36 hours later. The horse is buried in an unmarked grave at Savage and his master rests in Minneapolis. A year later, the big barn and covered track burned. Then the whole community lapsed into quietness.

In 1928 a syndicate built a dog racing track at the old Savage race track. That venture was short lived because authorities claimed it conflicted with the Minnesota antigambling laws. This property was wrecked in 1938.

About 1940 the new Highway 13 was relocated through the village of Savage and things were beginning to look up again.

About 1942 the operators of the present Savage Tool Co., came quietly to town, and bought a site and established a large plant.

Next Cargill, Inc., came to Savage and bought a part of the Ed Hanson farm, which included some of the old W. M. Savage farm, on the Minnesota River bank. Cargill built a shipyard there and work was begun dredging a 9-foot channel in the Minnesota River, making it ready to launch seagoing vessels. Savage was designated by the WPB for the rail-river-ore transfer.

Ed Hanson, the man who sold Cargill the property which started the boom, was the former trainer of Dan Patch. For many years he farmed and Savage traded horses in the northwest.

Today an airplane vistor over Savage, little giant of industry, will pass over the skyscraper towers of Cargil, Inc., and Continental Grain; then at the entrance to the Cargill base is the new long building for the Producers Container Co., which turns out 2½ million cans for Green Giant Co. at Le Sueur, that was finished in 1958.

The tool company which is Continental Machines, Inc., located in the downtown business area, employs between 500 and 1,000 men and women, since 1946.

Southwest of there is the Richards Oil Refinery, which came there in the mid 1950's; also the Continental Grain, whose storage bins were built in 1960.

Behind a row of trees is located the Master Specialty Co., whose owner is Harold Petsch of Prior Lake. Here a dozen employees turn out plastic mops, brooms, car carriers, rotary hedge trimmers, and so forth. Harold's factory has a branch in Stuttgart, Germany.

In an old garage, Ralph Stroud and Joe Kottom own and operate Stroud Manufacturing Co. They make scales for weighing gun power, used by sportsmen, which are accurate to one-tenth of a grain.

The latest industry is a cement works built by Crow & Crow, similar to that at Rosemount.

However great the boom at Savage, the ghost of the great Dan Patch of the past is prominent at Savage:

Large letters on the water tower spell "Savage—Home of Dan Patch." Then there is the Dan Patch Bowling Lanes; Dan Patch Cocktail Lounge; Dan Patch Apartments (once the Budweiser Club of the 1930's known as Little Reno, when the slot machine had its day).

A man named "Dan Patch" who works at Continental Machines, has a sign on his garage, "Home of Dan Patch."

Oldtimers like to take out time and discuss memories of Dan Patch. Bob Allen and Ben Morlock are among the few who can point out the horse's burial spot. Ed Hanson's son can tell some of his father's experiences as Dan Patch's trainer. Ben Morlock, justice of the peace, is an antique collector, especially of Dan Patch lore which includes, the horse's nickel-plated feed box and a cutter he used to haul in winter.

The home of Harry Hersey still stands. He was the driver of Dan Patch on Sept. 8, 1906, before 90,000 people at the Minnesota State Fair, when the horse set the world's fastest pacing record of 1:55 for a mile.

It is often wondered why Mr. Savage chose this location to train horses. He also had other racing horses besides Dan Patch. The answer is simple. It is because the spongy bottom-land ground along the river was ideal for horses.

Another question asked many times is, Why has this quiet little river town become a boom town? The answer is also obvious.

This location is ideal for transportation with two paved highways, Nos. 13 and 101, at its boundary, the Omaha Railroad, and the Minnesota River traffic; a low tax compared to the Twin City taxes; the ease with which workers may come and go.

In recent years, many housing projects in Savage and bordering the village, have developed. Several apartment houses are being built to help take care of the increased population. New modern schools, the Savage-Burnsville system, is one of the largest and most up to date in the country. This school is largely supported by the taxes from Northern States Power Co.'s Blackdog plant in Burnsville.

There is no telling how much more industry will come to Savage, but regardless, the ghost horse will always ride through the village and Dan Patch will always be their mascot.

Recently Savage has added to its business district a doctor, dentist, attorney, a bank, a newspaper, a surveyor, a bowling alley, a variety store, a wash and dry establishment; a service center (utilities) and a new Standard station; truckstop cafe. A shopping center in the village and one bordering the village are being planned.

Village officers at Savage are:

Mayor, Mark Egan; village clerk, John Bergman; trustees, Cliff LeVille, Merle Madsen, Cleve Eno; treasurer, Virginia Emerson.

This area has perhaps made the biggest progress of any in the last 150 years, when the Sioux Indians paddled their canoes up

and down the river which was then lined with forest and swampland. The first sign of progress came when the Savage community's first steam locomotive was brought by flat boat in the late 1860's and set upon the rails of the St. Paul & Sioux City Railway; then made its maiden run from Savage.

Labor Bosses in the Role of Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a person cannot serve two masters. The conflict of interest is such that despite the good intentions, the vying factors create a situation which the most honest man can hardly resolve. In Government, when public officials act in a manner which is contrary to their public duty, the moral condemnation of the public is sufficient to oust the official from power. The problem of the conflict of interest is being considered by the Congress and there is no problem which gives legislators greater concern. Codes of ethics in the law, in Government, and in business frown upon a duality of position. Labor representatives cannot act for management because they may be disposed to fail in their obligations to their membership.

A few years ago, because an industry was about to fail, a union decided that it would act in a dual capacity as a representative of labor and as management.

It felt that by disclosing its dual activities that it could operate successfully and defy the biblical mandate that a person cannot serve two masters. Recent developments indicate the truth of the biblical mandate that no matter how sincere the intentions, the conflict creates insurmountable obstacles.

An editorial by Richard A. Lewis in the Wall Street Journal of August 1 sets forth the efforts of a union to act in a dual capacity of representative of labor and manager of a firm. Criticism has been raised and I believe that the article by Richard Lewis is informative and domonstrates that a union cannot successfully wear two hats—the hat of labor and the hat of management. The article follows:

LABOR BOSSES—UNION-RUN HAT FIRM LIFTS SALES BUT STIRS WRATH OF ITS RIVALS—COMPETITORS HIT LOW PAY, SAY UNION USES ITS POWER TO PUT PRESSURE ON BUYERS—AN ANTI-IMPORT DRIVE GAINS

(By Richard A. Lewis)

NEW YORK.—Can a union successfully wear two hats—functioning in its traditional role as spokesman and bargaining agent for its members and also taking a part in management decisions on production, wages, and other matters affecting not only union members but the general public?

For years, Walter Reuther and other articulate labor leaders have argued that such a union voice in corporate management is an unqualified necessity. Only in this way, they contend, can companies avoid costly "mistakes" which endanger workers' incomes and job security.

While Mr. Reuther has been making speeches on this controversial topic, one union, acting on its own, has actually made the big leap to the corporate directors' table. It is the AFL–CIO United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union. Because of some of its managerial activities, it may be worthwhile to examine in some detail the hatters' operations.

A POT OF MONEY

There are other reasons why the Hatters are worthy of attention. The union has achieved such dominance in its industry, critics charge, that it probably has more to say about what a woman will put on her head than such famous firms as Hattie Carnegie, Lily Dache, Sally Victor and Mr. John. Standing out like a giant among the 700 generally pigmy-size manufacturers, in the women's hat field, it lends money to some of the employers it bargains with and serves as a landlord to others. The union's $11 million welfare and retirement fund is described by one manufacturer as "the only pot of money in the industry."

As a representative of workers, the Hatters' union collects dues from about 95 percent of the Nation's 20,000 millinery employees; another 20,000 of its members work in plants turning out men's hats, caps and hat bodies. As a capitalist, the union collects dividends on 60 percent of the stock of Merrimac Hat Co. of Amesbury, Mass., the Nation's largest producer of fur felt bodies, from which women's hats are made. Six top union officials also sit on Merrimac's nine-man board; Alex Rose, president of the International and a power in New York State's Liberal Party, is a chairman of the board and Gerald R. Coleman, the union's executive secretary, doubles as Merrimac treasurer.

If you were to form a judgment from its press clippings alone, the union's venture into corporate management has been a sparkling success. "What really distinguishes this union is its broad-angle vision of its responsibilities," declared the Reader's Digest in a 1959 article reprinted from American Business magazine. "Industrial statesmanship" and "union pioneer" are other descriptive terms applied to the Hatters' Merrimac venture. Victor Reisel, the nationally syndicated columnist, calls it "a do-it-yourself prosperity formula without the use of Government money."

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PLUS

Union President Rose, himself, calls Merrimac "an example of private enterprise plus." Early in 1959 the union moved in with $300,000, helped reorganize the company and bought 6,000 shares of its 10,000-share capitalization. The foundering firm's facilities had been shut down for several months and its 250 workers had almost lost hope of further employment at the plant. Today, employment at Merrimac is heading for an expected 12-year high of 350 workers as the fall seasonal hat production peak approaches.

Production at Merrimac is running at the fastest clip in more than a decade. Sales last year rose to $2,216,987, up 37 percent from the last year under nonunion control; and Hans Rie, the Austrian-born president of the company, who was retained from the previous management, reports this year's volume is running "at least 25 percent ahead of 1960." Merrimac, moreover, has paid regular dividends in each of the past 2 years and the union already has thus received a $24,000 return on its original investment.

Despite this glowing record, there has been an increasing rumble of complaint lately here and there throughout the hat industry about the means the union allegedly has used to write its success story. Like many an old-time capitalist, the union has been accused of keeping wages too low in its own plant. And like some more modern corporate bosses, it's also being accused of that current affliction, conflict of interest.

FIGHTING IMPORT COMPETITION

The alleged conflict is not the usual one, for most hat makers concede the union is doing a good job for Merrimac. Instead, they complain the union bosses are taking their new role as entrepreneurs in the hat body business so seriously that they are aggressively using their union power to try to snuff out the principal competing source of these materials—imports from Europe. Milliners purchase hat bodies, block them into various shapes and then bedeck them with flowers, feathers, or ribbons to turn them into the fancy creations that women buy.

One manufacturer says he came into his shop one morning during the busiest part of last fall's season to find none of his blockers had shown up for work. Blockers are the skilled workers who shape the hat bodies into finished form. The manufacturer says it was made clear to him that the blockers were not supposed to handle imported hat bodies. The hat maker immediately picked up his phone and placed a large order with Merrimac; by 1 p.m., he says, his blockers were back at work—working on the imported hat bodies that had been forbidden in the morning.

"Before the union bought that factory, it wouldn't have cared if you had bought your hat bodies from a Chinaman," snorts another angry hatter. "Now they've become quasi-managers, interested in their investment from management's point of view."

The union makes no attempt to conceal its campaign against imports. But it insists it is doing so out of concern for hat workers' health which it says can be damaged by the mercury sometimes used to treat fur used in foreign hat bodies. Another declared motive in the union anti-import campaign is to "save" the American hat body industry.

In a plea for higher tariffs on imported goods before the House Committee on Labor earlier this month, Hatters' Union Secretary Coleman said that, since 1950, the number of U.S. hat body producers has shrunk from 15 to only 4 as domestic production has slumped from 646,260 dozen to 176,437 dozen in 1960. The number of imported hat bodies also was lower in 1960 than in 1950, 155,895 dozen against 255,969 dozen, but these foreign hat bodies last year were equal to 88.3 percent of domestic production, against only 40.2 percent in the earlier year.

Mr. Coleman conceded that a factor in the falloff in domestic hat body production has been the growing female practice of going hatless. But he insisted, "The extremely large amount of imports coming largely from Italy has continued to flood the U.S. market, and the domestic industry has continued to decline at a dramatic rate."

What Mr. Coleman neglected to mention in his prepared statement is that the union's Merrimac operation, by its own reckoning, now accounts for "about 60 percent" of domestic hat body production. (Other industry sources put Merrimac's share even higher—closer to 70 percent.) Or that Merrimac's own ruggedly competitive tactics may have been a factor in the demise of some of the U.S. hat body firms.

A BACKBREAKING TASK

Says Randal McLachlan, who closed his Danbury, Conn., hat body factory, George McLachlan & Sons, Inc., this spring, shortly after Merrimac stepped up its marketings of competing men's hat bodies: "It's as simple as this—Merrimac is making and delivering hat bodies for $14.35 a dozen and I was breaking my back to make them for $17.50."

Merrimac admittedly has lower wage rates than most of its competitors in the hat body field. Its average is presently about $2.15 an hour, 10 to 20 cents lower than in Danbury and other hat centers. This differential existed before the union took over the management of Merrimac and has persisted since then, much to the dis-

tress of Merrimac's few remaining competitors.

"We certainly didn't expect the union would give us competition," grumbles one small hat-body producer. "When they took over in Amesbury, they said they were going to straighten out labor costs, but they never did."

There's some question about the status of the Hatters' Merrimac investment under the AFL–CIO ethical practices code, which forbids unions from investing in companies they bargain with. The Hatters have partially sidestepped the issue by having local 87 at Merrimac bargain with a team of three non-union company executives, though the union-dominated board must ratify any contract. (The workers received a 7½-percent raise when the union took over the company.) In addition, George Meany, president of the labor federation, has ruled the code provision is intended principally to prevent union officers from lining their own pockets to the detriment of their duties as labor leaders. And not even the Hatters' most bitter critics have accused Merrimac's new managers of profiting personally at the expense of either the company or the union.

Many milliners, meanwhile, question the value of "saving" the domestic hat-body business, at least at the price of restricting imports. They consider imported bodies a better buy for their price, and fret that the switch to what they consider inferior U.S.-made bodies will hurt sales.

MILLINERS' COMPLAINTS

"I'm known for making a quality product; how can I justify my price if I use a cheap piece of goods?" asks one milliner who specializes in hats with hand-finished touches. Another hat maker argues: "As a style business we should be entitled to use what we think is right for the product." Others fear the loss of the "imported" on the label will diminish the prestige of their hats. Nevertheless, for the fall season now getting under way, many milliners, including a number who have always used imported bodies, say they will buy only from Merrimac.

Significantly, Robert Lubin, sales agent for Alexander Hat Co. of Reading, Pa., Merrimac's only major domestic competitor in the women's hat-body field, asserts the union's antiimport campaign "hasn't helped me a bit."

Importers naturally are upset. "The union fails to tell the public on whose beard it shaved to accomplish its claimed 'salvation' of the hat body industry," complains Leonard Weintraub, president of the Importers Hat Body Association, a small trade group made up of about a half-dozen firms. He charges the union with "intimidating hat manufacturers indirectly and directly and forcing them to buy domestic hat bodies, even against their own wishes." The importers' loud complaints, in fact, prompted a Justice Department investigation of alleged restraint of trade in the industry last fall, but nothing came of it.

Meanwhile, the union's crusade against imports seems to be working. In the first 4 months of this year, imports of hat bodies in the $6 to $9 a dozen range, directly competitive with Merrimac's own line, dropped 44 percent below the 1960 period. Higher priced hat bodies, costing $39 and up a dozen, are almost a foreign monopoly and are imported with little union opposition. However, importers some day may find trouble here, too, since Merrimac this year announced it was starting production of a higher priced line.

The union, moreover, is continuing to base its anti-import arguments heavily on the "poisonous mercury" theme, much to the distress of many milliners who fear that if women ever get wind of this idea they will give up wearing hats completely.

GLOSSIER HATS

Union Secretary Coleman, in a demonstration, places two felt hat bodies on his desk at the Hatters International headquarters in New York. One is green and the other blue. The green one, he notes, is glossier and softer to the touch.

"You know what the gimmick is; its mercury," he asserts. This "gooey metal," he says, can affect a hat worker's central nervous system and give him the shakes. Indeed, says Mr. Coleman, its use caused Victorian England to believe all hatters were mad, a concept Lewis Carroll immortalized in Alice in Wonderland.

The evidence to document this claim is inconclusive. It's true that four States in the United States outlaw the use of mercury in hat body manufacturing, while many European countries permit it. But importers claim the mercury is used abroad only in fur processing, and by the time it arrives in a hat body is present in amounts too small to affect a worker's health.

Last year, in its bargaining with the Eastern Women's Headwear Association the principal millinery employers' group, the union was able to get a "sanitary clause" written into the standard contract, providing that employees shall not be required to work on or handle any articles which contain mercury or other "noxious, deleterious or poisonous substances."

There ensued what might be called the "battle of the testing laboratories." The union sent samples of imported hat bodies to one research lab, which discovered traces of mercury in all the samples. The union then declared its members "will not work on these poison hats."

IMPORTERS' COUNTERATTACK

The importers, in turn, sent a coded batch of sample hat bodies, its own and some of Merrimac's to another testing laboratory, which found in some cases the Merrimac hat body samples contained more mercury than the imported samples. The explanation, according to importers and Merrimac's rivals, was that Merrimac uses imported fur, treated with mercury, in making its hat bodies.

Another jolt for the union came when a labor arbitrator agreed in effect with the importers last fall when he dismissed a union complaint that the Yvette Hat Co. of New York was violating its contract with the Hatters by using mercury-treated bodies; he ruled there was no proof the workers' health was endangered. Importers also have circulated a 1954 statement from the U.S. Public Health Service that the Service knows of "no case where individuals engaged in blocking and trimming and other handling of such (mercury-treated) fur felt hat bodies have suffered any ill effects." The statement adds: "We also know of no ill effects which might occur to anyone wearing a hat made from a mercury carroted (treated) fur body."

Despite the furor over mercury, the union in some cases freely allows its members to process mercury-bearing imported hat bodies, particularly higher-priced ones of a type not obtainable in the United States. Mr. Coleman admits this happens, and says, in explanation, "There are no notes to this symphony we're playing. There are half a hundred different reasons going at any one time that determine how hard we will be pushing against imports."

For all their grumbling about the union's "dominating, controlling attitude," as one manufacturer puts it, milliners concede they are not likely to fight back very strongly, because of their small size in relation to the union. It collects 10 percent of every hatmaker's payroll for its welfare fund, plus another 1 percent to help finance an industry promotion campaign.

With the welfare fund and other enterprises, the union has spent $1 million since 1956 for what it calls direct aid to the industry. This includes the $300,000 Merrimac investment, but the greater part of it is accounted for by union participation in the promotion campaign and loans to hat firms in Chicago, Baltimore, Massachusetts, and New York City.

The Hatters' Union even has a voice in determining some milliners' rents, since it took a first mortgage on a New York City building that houses some 40 millinery shops (it stipulated as part of the agreement that the rents would not be raised for 5 years). It also owns another building outright which houses millinery shops.

Your Forest Ranger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a very interesting article written by Mr. L. E. Stotz, a U.S. forest ranger on the Allegheny National Forest, Warren, Pa.:

[From the Ridgway (Pa.) Record, July 28, 1961]

YOUR FOREST RANGER

(By L. E. Stotz)

Except for Twin Lakes and Loleta, which are under daily supervision by concessionaires, the recreation areas on the Allegheny National Forest are entirely dependent upon the cooperation of the users to prevent undue wear and tear on the improvements that have been placed there for their convenience and enjoyment.

One of the things that regular users of the campgrounds and picnic area like most is the informal atmosphere that prevails. Visitors are left to their own devices. In general, our faith in the innate goodness of people has been well founded. Most of them cooperate fully. A few do not. It is among the latter group that we find the following characters:

1. The "caveman" who fears the night and builds a fire large enough to keep saber-tooth tigers at bay. The troubles is, he usually builds it on top of a fireplace and the intense heat from his bonfire warps the metal grate and cracks the stonework around it.

2. The "musclemen" who insist upon moving picnic tables away from their designated locations, but who never move them back again when they are through with them.

3. The "handyman" who improvises outdoor furniture from poles and wire and who drives nails at eye level into trees from which he strings wire and rope. He never removes the nails after use and usually leaves some of the wire or rope dangling.

4. "Neanderthal man." This throwback from caveman days has traded his stone ax for a shiny metal one. Like a child with a new toy, he chops into live trees to see the chips fly.

5. The "bottle buster." The tinkle of broken glass charms him more than the song of a bird. He hates barefooted children and leaves in the grass and along stream edges a trail of broken glass on which children cut their feet.

6. The "initial carver." He never took to heart the old adage: "Fools' names like fools' faces always appear in public places." His

initials can be found etched into picnic tables and on shelter posts.

7. The "table burner." A rare species that occasionally run amuck at night smashing and burning picnic tables.

8. The "pushover". A vandal who thinks big. He tackles outside toilets, toppling them over and burning them.

8. The "pioneer." This type doesn't like to be fenced in. He resents wooden post or stone barriers designed to keep cars from running wild over recreation areas. He will exercise the greatest ingenuity to circumvent them.

10. The "sniper." Garbage cans and recreation area signs are big game to this intrepid hunter.

11. The "squatter." With house trailer or tent, he stakes a claim for the summer on a public campground thus monopolizing a site that others might enjoy for overnight camping.

12. The "cyclone." After he has camped or picnicked, the area looks as though a cyclone had struck. The ground is littered with paper plates, watermelon rinds, corn husks, tin cans, and bottles.

13'. The "strawman." He leaves a pile of moldy straw wherever he has camped for he never cleans up the bales of hay that he has spread on the ground for his bed.

It is this small group of unthinking and destructive campers and picnickers who make repair and replacement costs so high on national-forest recreation areas. Because of them, some of the money that could have been used for the development of new recreation areas and the improvement of others has been drained away for the repair and replacement of existing improvements.

High-Flying Aviation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a most significant editorial pointing up the need for a local voice in such a vital matter as the safety and welfare of the people affected by the location of an airport, appeared recently in the Long Island Daily Press. This editorial highlights the need for a curb on such arbitrary action as manifested by the FAA in the matter of Mitchel Field. I heartily compliment the Long Island Daily Press on this forthright editorial which I am certain clearly reflects the views of the people of Long Island who have been suffering so undeservedly from the noise menace and other hazards of low-flying planes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the editorial to my colleagues and ask permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HIGH-FLYING AVIATION AGENCY

The Federal Aviation Agency takes a mighty high-flying attitude by insisting on a general airport at Mitchel Field.

FAA flies in the face of public interest and commonsense.

The Air Force abandoned Mitchel Field as unsuitable in a heavily populated area.

Long Island needs the acreage for other uses—an expanded Hofstra College, Nassau Community College, possibly a Veterans' Administration hospital, and a medical college.

The FAA's stand is that it has first claim on the property and will use it as a general airport, or a good part of it, or nobody else will get it at all. The only question here is: Does FAA have power to exercise its will over a community in such a situation? We certainly hope not.

Public sentiment generally and Long Island's congressional bloc solidly oppose an airport at Mitchel Field. It just isn't the place; the acreage is needed for other community needs.

The FAA says it will adhere to its plans "until a superior alternative is offered." What cynicism. The superior alternative, of course, is the planned development of Mitchel Field—without an airport.

The Trucking Industry Replies to Life Magazine Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, there appeared an article in Life magazine titled "Danger to the Railroads," which was inserted in the Appendix of the June 12, 1961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the request of several of my constituents engaged in the trucking industry, I have been asked to insert the following reply which appeared in the June 26, 1961, issue of Transport Topics, the national newspaper of the motor freight carriers:

ATA LETTER TO LIFE EXPOSES ERRORS OF FACT IN ITS EDITORIAL

(The following is excerpted from a letter written to the chief editorial writer of Life magazine by Walter W. Belson, assistant to the president, American Trucking Associations, in protest to the inaccuracy of an editorial printed in the June 9 edition of Life. The editors of Life have agreed to publish a much smaller excerpt of the letter in their issue of this week.)

Will a great national publication use its editorial page to admit it is wrong—when it is wrong?

Or does its power over a huge audience and its leadership disposition to speak ex cathedra on public affairs make it shrink from such admission? Here is a question which goes to the heart of the integrity of such a publication. It happens that Life can give the answer—and I believe it is big enough to give the right answer.

Your editorial "Danger to the Railroads" (June 9) is so harmful to the trucking industry, that had it been concerned with an individual rather than a collective industry, I am sure it would constitute a cause of action for false and defamatory statements.

I am not sure that you are aware that your editorial projects your influence into a legislative battle before the Congress, but it does. The damage to our industry arises from your seriously inaccurate statement of the terms of rate competition between railroads and trucks. The statement, if true, would justify your position in part. If untrue, as it is, it damages severely our industry and invalidates a part of your argument. As to the defamatory implications, they go to the same point.

Under the subhead "Unfair Regulations" your editorial repeats a false statement continuously made by railroad propgandists. You say "truck and barge operators, on the other hand, may set any rates the traffic will bear and can change them at will."

This statement is false.

A single call to the Chairman, any member of the Interstate Commerce Commission or its public information section would have given you the truth. The truth is that the motor common carrier, the principal for-hire truck competitor of the railroads, is regulated in precisely the same terms and to the same extent as the railroads, and in the words of an ICC report, is, if anything, more stringently regulated. Beyond ICC regulation, it is a fact that local and State regulations on size, weight, length, speed, and safety requirements give the motor carrier a regulatory straightjacket far more confining than the rails. A copy of the Motor Carrier Act is enclosed.

It has been a favorite propaganda contention of the railroads that they are regulated and their competitors run wild; that they suffer from "archaic regulations" imposed when they were a monopoly and that they no longer are; that the "dead hand" of regulation stifles railroad managerial discretion. Your editorial advances that thesis and the particular inaccuracy complained of does the damage.

What is the truth?

I am enclosing a full copy of a talk made by the Honorable Anthony Arpaia before the Third Michigan Railroad Seminar at Ann Arbor, Mich., in February of 1957. Conditions described then are since unchanged except for a further beneficial attitude toward rails in rate matters developed by the ICC in a mistaken interpretation of the Transportation Act of 1958. Mr. Arpaia at the time of his address was a member of the ICC. His statement was not unique—it has been voiced by many ICC authorities. You will find * * * this comment (in the Arpaia talk):

"Railroads alone file with the (ICC) an average of over 3,000 rate changes every working day of the year. During the year 1956 (last full year at the time of his talk), how many rates out of the million or more rate changes filed by railroads were adjudged to be unlawful by the Commission after protest by competing forms of transportation? Ten thousand? Two thousand? One thousand? One hundred? No. Just exactly 12.

"EFFECT OF RATES ON TRAFFIC

"Now, how much traffic was involved in these 12 cases? In other words, how badly hurt were the railroads by our finding that these rate changes were unlawful? If they had been able to obtain every single pound of the traffic involved, from competing forms of transportation, which, of course, is hardly likely, they would have added only $1,228,879 to their gross revenue; $1,109,359 of this amount from water carriers and a mere $119,520 from motor competitors. This represents only eleven-thousandths of 1 percent of the total revenue of railroads for the year 1956."

Does that surprise you? Does that sound as if the railroads are frustrated in their effort to set rates? It could have been discovered, along with the fact that motor common carrier trucks are subject to precisely the same rate, route, and service regulation as the railroads, by the single call to the ICC.

That false statement, expressed in the same factually careless manner so familiar in railroad arguments, has done a great disservice to the trucking industry. The reason is that railroads are now campaigning for a program of deregulation, common ownership, and other special privilege which, if successful, will wreck the trucking industry and bring transportation inefficiency and chaos to our economy. Your editorial progresses that lobbying campaign most effectively.

Your editorial advocacy of a program by which "We could get more of the freight

'boxcars' off the highways, where they inconvenience and imperil the public, onto railroad 'piggybacks' which can haul them most places cheaper" defames the trucking industry. The implication clearly is that our "boxcars" are especially dangerous. The fact, ascertainable from National Safety Council or any other reputable body is that the record of the trucking industry is greatly superior to that of the passenger car. The last figures available (for 1959) show that trucks as a whole, comprising 16 percent of all registered vehicles, compose only 11 percent of vehicles involved in traffic accidents, a remarkable figure when it is realized that these vehicles operate under all weather conditions when passenger car owners have the option of keeping cars off the streets and roads, and exercise it widely.

MINUTE ACCIDENT RATIO

Specifically, as to these "boxcars," if you will consult the National Safety Council you will find that our intercity common carrier units, competitive with the rails, have an accident ratio of 0.058 per 100,000 miles as compared with the passenger car rate of 1.4 per 100,000 miles or twice as good.

We have spent millions of dollars and an aggregate of many millions of hours of time in driver training, inculcation of highway courtesy, and safety education to produce the superior performance just mentioned. We deserve better than the defamatory implications of "boxcars" imperiling the public in their conventional use of roads for which this industry pays for the right to operate.

Your editorial is not only inaccurate and very harmful to the trucking industry, in tone, but it is also baffling to those of us who are familiar with Life. The quality of your editorial personnel and of your research resources makes it almost unbelievable that you could come up with the kind of analysis of transportation reflected in your editorial.

Whether anyone likes it or not, the railroads are the victims of a technological obsolescence. At one time the economic structure of this country was such that railroads had an ideal opportunity to become strong and healthy. In fact they were the key to growth, for along their tracks cities grew as industries developed, and products of land, mine, and forest moved to market.

VICTIM OF BAD PLANNING

Had their construction been planned on an engineering and economic basis rather than as stock promotion and stock jobbing enterprises, they would have been supremely strong and healthy business enterprises in their early and middle years. Not only that, but they would now have a complex of tracks devoid of duplication and with promise of fairly easy accommodation to the changing terms of transportation requirements, particularly the line haul in conjunction with other modes.

But they were not so built, and having been born out of economic wedlock they have never, as a whole, since the very beginning, enjoyed the status in transportation which their performance and potential might have entitled them to occupy. In addition they have been inconstant trouble with huge mileages frequently in bankruptcy or receivership over the years. You should note with interest at this time, and for the first time in many years, no mileage is in bankruptcy or receivership so far as I know—and you might balance this against your belief they are in special trouble currently.

Your mention of the decline in the railroad percentage of intercity freight, intended to make some kind of strong point, is actually meaningless. Did you or anyone else expect with the emergence of newer, and for many purposes better, transport facilities, the railroads could maintain a traditional slice of the total pie—a slice which was theirs only because they were at one time the only mechanical land transport available?

What does the declining share signify? A steady attrition of their total freight traffic volume? If that is what you were conveying, and it seems clearly to be, you have done a disservice to readers interested in the truth. For the fact is that while the railroads' relative share is declining percentagewise, their actual volume hauled is far above their total of all but the war years.

The year 1929 was their greatest volume-of-freight-traffic year, except for some abnormal years during World War II. In 1929 they handled 450 billion ton-miles and did it with a work force of just over 1,600,000 employees. But, their average for the past 5 years has been 606 billion ton-miles, handled with less than half as many employees. Now how important is their decline of percentage of the total business?

RIGIDITY AN OBSTACLE

Let us return to technological obsolescence. The hard facts are that the railroads, tied as they are to the inflexible route patterns laid out from 50 to 100 or more years ago, are no longer responsive to either the geography or the requirements of a great deal of our manufacturing complex. They are rigid—not flexible.

They just don't go where the business is—as once they did nearly 100 percent. That's the hard fact of progress which they face and that's at the bottom of their problem.

The remedy for railroad rigidity seems to have escaped your attention. It is one long advocated by transportation experts and endorsed by the trucking industry. It is called coordination of transportation. Under such a program, railroads would make joint rate and service arrangements with motor carriers, just as they do with each other, and traffic would move freely by truck-rail arrangements where such were of economic or service value to the shipper. Truckline salesmen could "sell" coordinating rail service and rail solicitors could do the same for truck service. The trucking industry already has such arrangements with air freight and they work out successfully.

We think the main reason for rail failure to coordinate goes to the problem raised in your editorial when you described railroad management as "often inefficient" and said that it "pursues archaic and unreliable methods." This is an example. They want to own and operate the Nation's transport or they won't play—a rule or ruin policy which hurts them and the shipping public as well as our own industry.

Another surprisingly limited viewpoint expressed in your editorial which excites our speculation as to just how thoroughly you investigated the movement of freight or passengers today, has to do with the so-called efficiency of the rails.

Your comment that "per employee they can carry six times as much freight as trucks, and per gallon of fuel three times as much" is economically meaningless to more and more shippers as time goes on. A case in point: Why don't you use rail carload freight service to deliver Life and Time magazines, if the advantages you mention are persuasive? You don't of course—you use a good deal of truck service. What makes you believe that your problem in this area is so much different than modern manufacturers of a great variety of items?

You can produce the same apparently stunning cost figures on the movement intercity of people. Five hundred of them can be loaded into a passenger train in New York and hauled to Chicago, for example, far, far cheaper than if they used their private automobiles. There is only one problem—people prefer to use their cars for this purpose for a variety of reasons which overwhelm the thought of piling into a train and taking advantage of the unquestioned economy of such mass movement. So, as I say, your reference to costs in this connection is meaningless—worse it is very misleading when you stop where you did.

ADDED TRAFFIC THEORY

Your editorial would cure the railroad problem by taking "ICC control off their floor prices." You may not be aware of it but this is the added traffic theory and it goes like this: Make it possible for the railroads to get greater volume through permission to drop their rates to any point they find necessary to do so, and lo and behold they will build up big profits with which to modernize, experiment, improve management, etc.

This theory has within it the old fatuity about losing money on every item but making it up by volume. It has the further defect pointed out above—cut rates alone will not procure certain traffic. Motor carrier rates now are generally above rail. Finally let me point out that this theory collapses in the face of one hard fact which you have overlooked: Railroads have added one-third to their ton-mile performance since 1929, as noted, and handle it with a smaller physical plant and 50 percent fewer employees and are still, you say, in trouble. Here is the added traffic theory at work—an increase of one-third in volume with the same facilities and fewer personnel—and it doesn't seem to work does it? Moreover it has been accomplished under protective regulatory supervision which has allowed them to go down to out-of-pocket costs as a rate bottom. One can only imagine what their distress might be if they had had a free hand in setting a bottom to their rates.

"GLAMOUR" AIDS RAILROADS

The glamour of the railroads and the momentum of their past importance has carried over today into attitudes which your editorial, and others, express. Our industry, composed as it is of so many small business organizations, achieves its great economic impact through the cumulative efforts of a great many, rather than the few railroads represented by the 100 odd trunk lines.

As always, we are entirely agreeable to discussing this or any other subject involving our industry with Life editorial or policy personnel, either here or in New York and at your convenience.

Both the operating side of this industry, and I am confident the supplying industry side, will be hopeful that you see fit, editorially, to correct errors and to repair to the extent possible, some of the real damage which your comment has done this and related industries.

National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Gallery of Art with its many cultural services, is such a treat that I believe that the American people will be more than pleased with the fine events, tours, films, and lectures, that are available and planned for the month of August 1961. I am therefore submitting these for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—AUGUST 1961
CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sunday 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Chinese art treasures. An exhibition of paintings, calligraphies, porcelains, ancient bronzes, jades, enamels, lacquers, carvings, and silk tapestries, sponsored by the Government of the Republic of China. Central gallery, G–7 through G–15. Through August 13.

New publication: "Horace Walpole," by Wilmarth Sheldon Lewis. A book based on the 1960 A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts delivered at the gallery; 215 pages, with 72 illustrations; size 7¾ by 10½ inches. Price $6.50 postpaid.

Recent publications: "Chinese Art Treasures." Exhibition catalog of 326 pages with text, 140 illustrations and 8 color plates. Size 11 by 9 inches. Price $5 postpaid. Two by two inches color slides. Fifty slides of objects in the Chinese Art Treasures Exhibition. Complete list available upon request. Price 35 cents each, postpaid. Color postcards. Five new postcards of K'anghsi and Yung-cheng period porcelains in the Widener Collection at the National Gallery of Art. Price 5 cents each.

Sunday films: On Sunday during August, a film on the National Gallery of Art entitled "Art in the Western World," and the television film, "Time Enough To See a World," will be shown.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, JULY 31 THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 6

Painting of the Week: Gainsborough. "Master John Heathcote" (Given in memory of Gov. Alvan T. Fuller, by the Fuller Foundation) Gallery 61, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Composition. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday films: "Art in the Western World" and "Time Enough To See a World," Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, AUGUST 7 THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 13

Painting of the week: Braque. "Still Life: Le Jour" (Chester Dale Collection), gallery 62, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: "Color and Value." Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday,1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday films: "Art in the Western World" and "Time Enough To See a World," Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, AUGUST 14 THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 20

Painting of the week: Manet. "The Dead Toreador" (Widener collection) gallery 76. Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Form and Space. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday films: "Art in the Western World and "Time Enough To See a World," Lecture Hall, 4.

MONDAY, AUGUST 21 THROUGH SUNDAY, AUGUST 27

Painting of the week: Reynolds. "Lady Elizabeth Delmé and Her Children" (Mellon collection) gallery 59, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Line. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Tuesday through Saturday, 11; Monday through Saturday, 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday films: "Art in the Western World" and "Time Enough To See a World." Lecture Hall, 4.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, Republic 7–4215, extension 272.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this

---

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Foreign-Aid Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the foreign-aid bill for 1961 (S. 1983) is a matter of legislation now requiring the attention of Members of the Senate. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Should Keep Control Over Foreign-Aid Spending," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of July 21, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD KEEP CONTROL OVER FOREIGN AID SPENDING

People can argue ad infinitum about the number of billions which the American taxpayer should be willing to contribute to the "economic development of less-developed countries and areas, with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources." Doubtless there are humanitarian reasons for many of these activities, although their relation to American interest and security seems difficult to establish.

The Act for International Development (Senate bill 1983 sets no overall price tag on foreign aid beyond the $8,800 million in loans over 5 years, plus some $1,700 million in grants to be made available in fiscal year 1962. However, the bill gives the President such wide authority to tap other programs and resources, including military and strategic stockpiles, that the total could be far greater. An estimated total outlay of $10,529 million over the next 5 years, not including $1,885 million in military aid plus "such sums as may be necessary" to implement the act, is probably close to reality.

Whatever the total, it is an amount which caused Arthur Krock of the New York Times to report widespread fear that "without new and more painful price inflation the economy cannot furnish $7,300 million more for foreign aid and also finance the welfare measures urged by the President." Furthermore, it is curious that such a measure should be urged by the same administration that wants to impose new taxes on corporations that set up plants in other countries—genuine foreign aid as opposed to giveaways.

However, the central objection to this bill is the method designed to get the money without troubling Congress to appropriate it in the traditional way. This foreign-aid bill contemplates "back-door spending" on an unprecedented scale, a practice which Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri Democrat, has described as reprehensible. The annual appropriation system, which has taken care of vastly expanding Government activities, including two major wars, an expensive police action and billions in foreign aid, is not considered adequate to finance the social development of Africans, Asians and Polynesians. So Congress is asked to authorize the President to make loans for projects in unspecified areas of up to $900 million in 1962 and $1,600 million for each of 4 years thereafter and to get the money for this purpose by borrowing from the Treasury—in other words putting the whole thing on the cuff and outside the regular appropriation process. The bill grabs $300 million a year from repayments to the Treasury, which would in normal circumstances go to reduce the national debt or even to relieve the taxpayer.

In attempting to defend back-door spending, the State Department points to other programs which have been financed by this inflationary method and adds that it is necessary in "helping the aid agency to administer a long-range development program." This is not an impressive argument. The U.S. Congress constantly appropriates money for domestic long-term projects, and the military departments receive their money through the usual appropriation process. Why should the bureaucrats in charge of a speculative foreign-aid program be an exception to this prudent practice?

In addition to the loans, which are to be handed out through the back door, and the grants for which Congress is graciously permitted to appropriate the money, the administrators of this act have access to an undetermined amount by tapping other agencies and resources. About $6,100 million remains unexpended from previous assistance programs, including $2,400 million for military aid.

The bill is also questionable because of many grants of power to the President seemingly out of proportion to the objects of the bill. For example, the administrator is required to make all facts and figures available to the General Accounting Office—unless deterred by "a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to such request and his reason therefor." Thus it would seem that there need be no accounting to Congress of the way vast sums are spent if the President is willing to state why the information should be withheld. However, similar clauses have appeared in earlier foreign-aid bills.

It is hard to believe that any Congress worth its weight in Federal judgeships would surrender the power of the purse, carefully reserved to Congress in the Constitution. To do so for no more critical emergency than the doling out of funds to less-developed countries, however promising, could set a precedent for more bypassing of Congress for all kinds of projects.

The Rule of Law and the Impending Communist Crisis in British Guiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Brendan F. Brown, a member of the faculty of the Law School of Loyola University of the South, has recently delivered an address entitled "The Rule of Law and the Impending Communist Crisis in British Guiana."

Dr. Brown has done a tremendous amount of research with respect to communism in British Guiana. His address should be of interest to all Members of Congress. I include it herewith:

THE RULE OF LAW AND THE IMPENDING COMMUNIST CRISIS IN BRITISH GUIANA

Mr. Harry B. Fonde, president of the Mobile chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and Mr. Keith Bruner, president of the New Orleans chapter, and charter members of the Mobile chapter of the Federal Bar Association, I am very happy and privileged to be here tonight in my capacity of national vice president of the Federal Bar Association, fifth district, to present the charter, authorized by the national council, for the establishment of a chapter in Mobile, Ala. I congratulate all of you for the vision and initiative which gave birth to this chapter. I especially commend Mr. Bruce Key for his fine work in the formation of the chapter.

Your president, Mr. Fonde, has kindly asked me to address you this evening. I have chosen a subject which relates to the implementation of the rule of law, that order of right and wrong which is discovered by reason alone, and which is the vitalizing force of every just legal system. This implementation involves the use of authority and its relation to freedom.

BRITISH GUIANA HAS BEEN THREATENED BY COMMUNISM SINCE 1953

Last February, I spent an unexpected 3½ days in Georgetown, British Guiana, following presentation of a paper at the 12th Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, held in Bogotá, Colombia. I was urged to visit Georgetown by Dr. James Persaud, long an influential member of the community, my former student at the Catholic University of America, and, for more than 20 years, my godson. I had not seen him since 1957, when he flew to London to be with me at the historic convention of the Anglo-American bar, though we had corresponded regularly. What I saw and heard concerning the Communist menace there came as a complete surprise, and led to my determination to acquaint my fellow countrymen with the grave probability of the communization of British Guiana within the near future unless this is prevented by the transitional continuation of adequate British political authority and the implementation of a constructive policy by the United States of America.

British Guiana was recaptured from the Dutch in 1803. It has been a British colony since 1814. It is strategically located with regard to other South American areas which are infected by communism. Located in northeastern South America, it lies between Venezuela on the west, Brazil on the southwest and south, Surinam on the east, and the Atlantic Ocean on the northeast. It is not far from Cuba, where Castro has achieved an incredible breakthrough of our traditional policy of keeping the Americas free from the penetration of antidemocratic influences. Dr. Cheddi Bharat Jagan, leader of the People's Progressive Party, and presently minister of trade and industry in British Guiana, has visited Castro within recent months, and hailed him as a great liberator. Following the example of Castro in Cuba, Jagan will put British Guiana into

the Soviet orbit, if he can. Like Cuba, so also British Guiana is a gateway to the United States. It is part of the soft underbelly of our country.

Communism has threated British Guiana since 1953, but especially since the Castro revolution. Recent governmental seizure of more than 50 denominational schools, so as to vest control of education in the state, is typical preliminary Communist technique. It is the latest significant evidence of the Communist purpose of the People's Progressive Party. During the past 4 years, Jagan has appointed Communists to official positions.

In August 1961 the political crisis will reach a new peak of danger when the revised constitution will become effective, and the general elections, which occur every 4 years, will take place. This constitution will allow British Guiana internal independence, and there is the grave prospect that Jagan and his People's Progressive Party will be returned to power. The crisis has been precipitated, like those in Africa and Asia, by the failure of colonialism and the blind spot of the free world which has prevented it from countering the international revolution of atheistic communism by a constructive, aggressive, cooperative plan, worldwide in scope, based on moral capitalism, with secret and original techniques, limited only by the inhibitions of the basic morality of the Western World.

The dramatic and unbelievable origin of communism in British Guiana must be linked with the equally bizarre and fantastic story of the marriage of Cheddi Jagan, his indoctrination in Marxist ideology by his wife, and his subsequent failure to shake off the effects of her early indoctrination. The incredible story goes back to the late thirties when Jagan, an East Indian, racially, chose the United States rather than Britain for his higher education. He obtained the degree of doctor of dental surgery at Northwestern University in Chicago, and later a degree in sociology at a Young Men's Christian Association college.

Jagan met his wife while he was a student at Northwestern. She was a nurse and a member of the Young Communist League. When he returned to British Guiana in 1943 to establish himself in a dental practice, he at once joined her in intense political activity, which they have continued ever since. She exerts wide influence among certain sections of the East Indian population which comprises about 48 percent of the approximately 580,000 persons, inhabiting British Guiana.

Without question, Cheddi Jagan is and will continue to be a great political force in British Guiana. While there, I did not have occasion to meet him or his wife, but I did have the pleasure of meeting and dining with his brother, a most likeable and personable young man, at a semiofficial dinner. Like his brother, he is also a dentist. As I talked with him, but not about politics, I thought how sad it was that Cheddi had come under the ideological influence of his wife, Janet, and how pathetic it was that she had become the pawn of the international Communist conspiracy, prompted no doubt by misguided humanitarian motives.

To understand communism in British Guiana, therefore, it is necessary to look for the woman—cherchez la femme. She is the driving force behind Cheddi Jagan. She will never be satisfied until British Guiana has become part of the Communist world.

What is the evidence to show that British Guiana has been threatened by communism since 1953? In that year, British Guiana received a new Constitution, granting limited self-government. But in October of that year, the British called in troops and suspended the Constitution to prevent a Communist coup by the People's Progressive Party, which Dr. Jagan and his wife had formed in 1950. An interim government of nominated members began to function in December 1953.

Leaders of the People's Progressive Party had Marxist ideas and had attended Communist-front meetings in various parts of the world. The judgment of the British Labour Party in 1953 has been vindicated by what followed the Castro revolution in 1960 and 1961. Clement Atlee, former Prime Minister and prominent in the Labour Party, correctly appraised the situation when he concluded that the Guianese political leaders "were either Communists or Communist dupes." (Tomasek, Robert D., "British Guiana: A Case Study of British Colonial Policy," 74 Political Science Quarterly 393 at p. 403, No. 3, Sept. 1959.) The Labour Party was correct in 1953 when "in early November the National Executive Committee advised its local branches not to provide a platform for Jagan and the other leaders." (Tomasek, p. 403.) It is significant that the pro-Communist Guatemalan Congress passed a resolution which condemned "the aggression of British Guiana by imperialistic English troops." (Tomasek, p. 404.) It called on the Parliaments of Latin America to express their indignation.

In his book, "Forbidden Freedom," at pp. 56 and 57, which Jagan published in the United States in 1954, he admitted making the following statement on March 10, 1953, as a protest against the subversive literature bill:

"In Kenya, the Africans are not only killing white men who take their land, but are killing their own people who turn stooges, and that may be done to stooges (here) who are fighting the cause of the Government and not the people."

In that book, at pages 57 and 58, Jagan also admits that the Guianese Minister of Labour made the following statement on September 24, 1953, though he glosses it over as political rhetoric:

"They say they are going to take away the Constitution from us, but I would like them to know that when they attempt that, Her Gracious Majesty will not only hear the explosion of the atomic bomb in the hinterland of Australia; but she will hear it in the mudlands of British Guiana, for we intend to fight to the end. I would like not to discuss our plans for the intended action which we will take, but will keep it a secret until it becomes necessary to put it into operation."

This statement connects with the charge made in the British white paper that there was a well-developed cell system organized by the People's Progressive Party with "a hard core of some 400 or 500 party members who are ready to do violence. * * * " (Jagan, p. 59) The British charges of Communist domination of the People's Progressive Party were corroborated in 1955 by the action of Mr. Forbes Burnham, a political leader of great stature and former People's Progressive Party chairman, who split with Jagan over the Communist issue and assumed the leadership of the People's National Congress, an opposition party. While Burnham, a Negro, has always remained anticolonial, with a personal dislike for Britain, largely because of the color discrimination which he experienced while a law student at the University of London, Guiana scholar of 1942, he was convinced that the Communist issue had dwarfed the importance of the national struggle.

But Burnham was not able to stop the People's Progressive Party, in the elections of 1957, from obtaining nine seats to his three, with two scattered seats. The bulk of the African vote went to Burnham in the 1957 elections. Thirty-five percent of the population is of African descent. Since 1957, the People's Progressive Party has been Communist-led, though the bulk of its support is gained on racial (East Indian) and not ideological grounds. The political crisis in British Guiana will reach an unprecedented peak of danger with the taking effect of the new constitution and the general elections of August 1961.

The new constitution resulted from a series of conferences in London, in the spring of 1960, between the British colonial officials and eight representatives of political organizations from the colony, in addition to Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham. It will provide a greater degree of self-government than now exists. At the London conference on constitutional development, Iain Macleod British Secretary of State for the Colonies, "announced that the British Government had accepted the principle of independence for the colony * * * and indicated that British Guiana was likely to attain its independence within 2 years of the 1961 general election." Britannica. Book of the Year, 1961, British Guiana, p. 121.)

The present elected unicameral legislature will be replaced with a 4-year bicameral elected legislative body of 35, and a nominated senate of 13. The Governor will no longer have full executive control, with the Council of Ministers acting only in an advisory capacity. Rather executive powers will be vested in a Cabinet headed by a Prime Minister and a maximum of nine other Ministers including an Attorney General. Though appointments in the police will be on recommendation by a Police Service Commission, a Minister will have police in his portfolio. Foreign affairs and defense will continue to be handled by the British. The power of the Government of the United Kingdom to legislate for British Guiana by order in council under the British Guiana Act of 1928 will be retained in the new constitution.

Jagan is completely dissatisfied with the new constitution to the extent that he will use all means to achieve independence even "if it means raising hell" (the New York Times, Friday, Apr. 1, 1960, 6C, p. 6, column 5, "Guiana's Charter Effective in 1961"). He has been quoted by Sokolsky, the columnist, as saying: "We have friends with rockets, guns and gold," meaning that Soviet Russia will support him. After the London conference, he left for home by way of the United Nations, Venezuela, and Cuba.

The impending political crisis is being precipitated by the prospect of a political victory in August 1961 by Jagan's People's Progressive Party which will contest as many as 35 seats with two anticommunistic political parties, i.e. Brunham's People's National Congress and D'Aguiar's United Force. A coalition of the two anticommunistic parties would insure Jagan's defeat, but this is not possible.

The U.F. was formed in 1960 after Mr. Peter D'Aguiar, "one of the country's most successful businessmen and known everywhere as a man of public integrity," failed to induce the leaders of People's National Congress to broaden its foundation, especially its racial basis which has become heavily African, and to strengthen its administrative potential so as to make it a truly national party. He has included members of all racial groups on his executive committee. From my long talk with him last February, I know he is making heroic efforts "to break through the barriers of race by offering a policy that will defeat communism, integrate the peoples of British Guiana into a harmonious whole, and provide an economic program that will solve the unemployment problem (a staggering 20 percent of the working population)."

Mr. Antony Tasker, Bookers public relations director in British Guiana, and Mr. Keith Tisshaw, speaking for the Demerara Bauxite Co., exhibited an amazing and pathetic ignorance of the objectives of People's Progressive Party when they wrote that they would cooperate and get along with People's

Progressive Party if returned to power. They are apparently ignorant of what Jagan stressed in his book, "Forbidden Freedom," at page 29; namely, "We are a Socialist Party and nationalization of all major industries is our objective." To a Communist government, nationalization means confiscation without any, or any reasonable, compensation.

THE POLITICAL CRISIS IN BRITISH GUIANA LIKE THOSE IN AFRICA AND ASIA HAS BEEN PARTLY GENERATED BY THE FAILURE OF COLONIALISM TO ACHIEVE SOCIAL JUSTICE

In the early 19th century, Africans were imported as slaves to work on the sugar plantations. Later, indentured Chinese, East Indian, and Portuguese labor was brought in after abolition of the slave trade. Immigration ceased in 1917. As a colony, British Guiana was intended by the colonizing country as a reservoir for agricultural, mineral, and forest resources, and as a purchaser of manufactued goods, made outside the colony. Typically absentee landlordism was the rule.

Today almost all the sugar in British Guiana is grown on 17 large plantations, 12 owned by Booker brothers. These vary in size from 1,000 to 13,000 acres. The average size is 7,000 acres. Approximately one-third of the cultivated area of the country, namely, about 4 percent of the coastal belt, is devoted to the production of sugar. Wage labor is used.

Rice is grown on the coastal strip by a peasant community of small farmowners or tenants. Six acres constitute the average holding. Rice production is second only to that of sugar in annual cash value. Full use has not yet been made of the timber resources which cover about 86 percent of British Guiana.

The problem of social justice in British Guiana is how best to attract the investment of capital, which will be satisfied with a reasonable interest return, so that the balance may be used for higher wages for those working in the sugar fields and rice paddies. Trade unionism, reasonably fostered by adequate legislation, can be a key method, along with taxation, in producing moral capitalism in British Guiana. It is to be emphasized that neither the capitalistic system nor capitalistic colonialism is per se incompatible with social justice. They are such only when abused. Their abuse has been partly responsible for the crises in Africa, Asia, and South America including British Guiana. But these crises should be and should have been met by removal of the abuse, not by sudden and unreasonable surrender of political authority by the colonial power.

Britain has been making steady efforts to eliminate conditions which Jagan's P.P.P. has exploited. Obviously, it is difficult to attract foreign capital to British Guiana because of the precarious political situation. But many of the recommendations of the International Bank Mission have been implemented.

As between British colonialism and Soviet imperialism, the moral weight is on the side of the former. Despite the many injustices perpetrated by British colonialism over the centuries, and that of other Western nations, generally speaking, the right of the individual to be free from positive acts of the state to make him its creature was accepted. Western colonialism never denied its responsibility under the natural and supernatural laws, as does Communist imperialism.

Communism has made great strides in South America, as well as in other parts of the world, because of inadequate emphasis has been placed upon the social justice of the natural law of right reason, not only by positivists, who admit no ethical order of ought, but also by those responsible for the rule of a supernatural law (i.e., the law which God directly communicated to man, as understood by Christians, Jews, Hindus, Mohammedans, or other theological groups). Specifically, the failure of Christian religious leaders, whether Catholic or Protestant, to correlate the implementation of the objective natural law with that of the supernatural law resulted from an ignorance of such scholastic writings as those of St. Thomas Aquinas, the 13th century Dominican. Efforts were made to save souls principally from an altogether too narrow and abstracted view of the divine law, a view which overlooked or disregarded man's continuing conditions and obligations in everyday life according to natural law. The divine law includes elements reached both naturally and supernaturally. There was a lack of appreciation that the kingdom which Christ set up is a supernaturalization of the ordinary principles of justice recognizable by natural reason.

CURRENT WORLD CRISES HAVE PRINCIPALLY RESULTED FROM WRONG ATTITUDES BY THE NATIONS OF THE FREE WORLD AS TO THE PROPER USE OF ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL AUTHORITY

Why has the Western World in general and the United States in particular acquired a sort of a guilt complex in the use of political and economic authority? What has become of the revolutionary spirit and dynamism of the United States in its formative period? Has the cry for freedom which gave it birth in the 18th century and nourished it in the 19th and early 20th ironically become the source of its destruction? Has the cry of Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death," which actually meant "Give me human dignity or give me death," been transformed into a plea for a false freedom in the abstract to conserve or not to conserve the intrinsic value of the human person for his own sake; or a freedom to accept or reject those new means which the reasonable man would regard as indispensable, from time to time, for the maximum and most efficient advancement of that ultimate value? Has the liberty of Patrick Henry become the freedom to use the instrumentalities of Western democracy to destroy the very purpose for which they were created?

Unfortunately, because of a false concept of freedom, the United States, in the past, has not made it a condition precedent to the acceptance of its assistance that the leaders of the country in question carry out the natural law principle of social justice within, and prevent Communist penetration and infiltration from without. Too long has the policy of world aid by the United States been pitched on the lowly level of self-interest, on the theory that we were buying friends, or at least strengthening them militarily as allies in case of war. It has not been projected on the true plane of Christian charity, or even international social justice.

Man is entitled to the maximum enjoyment of happiness and the goods of this earth within the limits of the particular economy and the ethical inhibitions which prevent him from paying an unreasonable price for those goods. It is imperative that the United States convince the leaders of the peoples of the Americas, indeed of the free world, by every means allowable by right reason, that they must swiftly implement this principle. If the masses of a particular country are incapable, because of intellectual limitations or abject poverty, of realizing that the materialistic advances resulting from communism would be obtained at too high a price because the cost ultimately entails the degradation of man for the machine and its products and the supremacy of the ideals of the Marxist revolution, then their political freedom must be temporarily curtailed. But if the leaders of a nation limit such freedom in order to deny or postpone social justice in the sense of a living wage and the constant improvement of physical conditions for the happiness of man, then the United States and the other free nations must seek to reeducate such leaders or, failing in this, to use their economic strength and prestige in a positive way so as to promote the cause of natural law leaders in the particular community in coming to power. This is precisely what Soviet Russia has done since the close of World War II for the promotion of its own antinatural law ideology. This accounts for its amazing success.

Let there be a worldwide counterrevolution against communism to extend the authority of the natural law so as to make the issue of the cold war more intelligible. It is ambiguous to state the issue in terms of whether or not a free world or a slave world is to survive, because free and slave in this connection mean different things to different men. Actually, the issue is not adequately joined by this juxtaposition of adjectives. Rather, the issue is whether human beings are to be considered as cattle to be better fed, housed, educated, and the like by the state for any purpose decided upon by those who happen to wield sovereign power, or whether men are to be regarded as beings with an irreducible core of moral autonomy to be better fed, housed, educated, and the like by the state for their own sake.

There is no issue between atheistic communism and natural law capitalism as to the necessity of producing the optimum amount of material progress by the positive intervention of state power, domestically, internationally, and interspacially. Each expects a maximum effort on the part of the individual consistent with his capacities. Each contemns a laissez-faire attitude passed on the premise that sociological planning is unnecessary.

It is only accidental, however, that atheistic communism and natural law capitalism often produce similar good social effects by identical mechanical processes through the assertion of political authority. This is so because the causal connection between human happiness in its widest spiritual connotation and the satisfaction of the animal needs of man is not inevitable. But the relation between that happiness and the realization that in a particular community those needs are being satisfied, within the limits of an objective criterion of rationality, to an extent proportional to its own economic and intellectual resources, and to the duty of other communities in world society to supplement these, as measured by the behavior of the reasonable nation, is essential. Thank you for your wonderful attention. Good night.

Naming of Polaris Submarine After General Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I recommended to the Navy that a Polaris submarine be named after Gen. Casimer Pulaski, the Polish patriot who fought bravely in the American Revolution.

I now urge my colleagues to support the following resolution which was sent to me by Swoboda Society of the Polish National Alliance:

JULY 22, 1961.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a regularly held meeting of the Swoboda Lodge No. 509 on Sunday, May 14,

1961, to be presented for consideration and adoption at the next regular meeting of Council No. 53 Polish National Alliance.

"Whereas a number of Polaris submarines are now being constructed for the U.S. Navy; and

"Whereas it is traditional that submarines and other major vessels are given appropritae and distinguished names; and

"Whereas Gen. Casimer Pulaski, the great Polish patriot and general in the Continental Army during the American Revolution led the French and American cavalry during the seige of Savannah, Ga., and was mortally wounded at this siege; and

"Whereas Americans of Polish ancestry will feel justly proud if one of the Polaris submarines were to carry the name of one of its most distinguished and honored sons and heroes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the proper governmental authorities be petitioned and urged to name a Polaris submarine *"Gen. Casimer Pulaski";*

Resolved, That this resolution be presented for approval at the next regular meeting of Council No. 53, Polish National Alliance, at Schenectady, N.Y.;

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Polish American Congress and the home office of the Polish National Alliance.

VICTOR P. SZYMANSKI,
President.
STANLEY J. BUZANOWSKI,
Secretary.

Tribute to Girls State and Girls Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American Legion Auxiliary annually sponsors a most commendable program in youth citizenship training: Girls State and Girls Nation. The purpose is to give high school students a greater understanding of the processes of government and their approaching citizenship responsibilities.

During this week, students chosen for unusual ability of leadership will be in Washington to attend the national meeting and to represent their respective States. From Wisconsin, we have two outstanding individuals: Miss Jacqueline Ann Damgaard, of Madison, and Miss Fran Marie LeVevre, of Jefferson.

Representing a constructive, creative effort to imbue in youth a greater understanding and sense of responsibility for citizenship, I ask unanimous consent to have the brief statement from the American Legion Auxiliary, Washington headquarters, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY: GIRLS STATE AND GIRLS NATION

Girls State, culminated by Girls Nation, is the youth citizenship training program conducted annually by the American Legion Auxiliary to give high school juniors practical experience in the processes of government and thus a clear understanding of their approaching citizenship responsibilities.

Girls State sessions, sponsored by 51 State and territorial departments of the American Legion Auxiliary, are held each June or July in State capitals or on centrally located campuses in each of the 48 continental States, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone. There, high school juniors chosen with the aid of their school principals for qualities of leadership set up their own miniature city, county, and State governments and learn to administrate them according to the rules and procedures set by actual State and local law. They learn by "doing" it.

From Girls State, two senators are selected to represent their constituents at Girls Nation, sponsored in the Nation's Capital in July by the national organization of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Girls Nation, 1961, will be held at American University, July 30 to August 5.

Girls Nation, in its first 3 days, will organize political parties, the Nationalists and the Federalists (with the aid of practical advice from representatives of both the Democratic and Republican National Committees) hold national conventions for the nomination of candidates, climax campaigns with a national election and install the winners in office.

From this point on, Girls Nation moves in a dual role: As a senate, which meets to enact legislation, and also as a Government administration, complete with elected and appointed officials. Girls Nation will then visit the White House and learn first hand how the Federal Government functions through briefing sessions on Capitol Hill and at various Government Departments including those of Justice, Defense, and State.

Next fall, when the girls return to high school as seniors, they will report to their classmates (as well as to local civic, church, and fraternal clubs) on what they have experienced and learned as delegates to Girls State and to Girls Nation. By summer's end, the American Legion Auxiliary thus will have added 17,000 to the 227,000 girls so far trained as knowledgeable and experienced citizens through this program.

A Letter From the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury Relating to the Continuance of the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a letter sent by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; and the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, to Members of the Congress in relation to legislation authorizing the continuance of the foreign aid program and all appropriations to carry it forward.

The within letter of the two Secretaries presents in a most effective manner why the President's recommendation should be enacted into law.

In the world of today where survival is involved, the Congress must legislate in a realistic and practical manner so that our Government can effectively obtain maximum results in our national interest. The President's recommendations will enable the maximum results to be obtained. The joint letter of Secretary Rusk and Secretary Dillion presents sound reasons why such legislation is necessary and practical in the world of today.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 18, 1961.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: The Congress will shortly be acting upon legislation authorizing the continuance of the foreign aid program and on appropriations to carry it forward. We believe that the passage of the foreign aid legislation as requested by the President is of such critical importance to our national interest that we are taking this unusual step of communicating with you personally regarding certain key questions that have been raised during the congressional hearings.

Are the sums requested for foreign aid necessary?

The continuance of economic and military assistance on the scale proposed by the President is compelled by our commitment to our own freedom and to the building of a decent world order. With respect to economic assistance, nations old and new are struggling along the path from formal independence into nationhood and are determined to have the benefits of modern civilization. If the democratic world does not help them, the Communists will leap aboard this great revolution of freedom, seize it, direct it to their own ends, and make it the instrument of their limitless imperialist ambitions. We will be false both to our own national interest and to our obligations to others if we allow this to happen.

With respect to military assistance there is an inescapable partnership between economic and social progress on the one hand and conditions of essential security on the other. The Communists continue to use internal subversion, paramilitary action and the shadowing threat of military attack to bring other peoples under their domination. In this way they threaten the peace of the world and the security of our own Nation. Under these circumstances we must continue our military assistance program. Minimum levels of safety require the sums requested.

Why is borrowing authority important to the aid program?

For two reasons: First, if the United States is to be of substantial help to the less-developed nations in their efforts to meet the demands of their people for economic growth, it will be imperative in many cases to provide assurances that our loan aid will be forthcoming in known amounts over a period of several years—that is, to make long-term commitments. Such assurances are vital in helping the recipient countries to make the hard political decisions involved in self-help measures and internal reforms necessary to economic and social progress. Moreover, our ability to pledge aid in advance will be a significant factor in obtaining assurances of contributions from other industrialized nations.

Second, for the United States to be able to give these essential assurances of aid over a period of years, it will be necessary to free our development lending program from the difficulties of working under the uncertainties inherent in annual requests for funds. It must be put on a basis where there can be reasonable assurance of the availability of known levels of funds over a reasonable period of years, against which forward commitments may be made. Borrowing authority is the customary method used by Congress to finance U.S. Government lending agencies which must make such forward

commitments. It is the established, practical means by which this crucial need of the aid program can be met.

Is borrowing authority fiscally irresponsible?

The answer to this question is categorically "No." Borrowing authority has been used by the Congress to finance more than 20 Federal lending activities, beginning with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932 and continuing through action by the Congress in the current session in the Area Redevelopment Act, the Veterans' Loan Act, and the Housing Act. Borrowing authority would not require an increase in the public debt or borrowing from the public any more than any other form of funding. Whether such an increase may be necessary will depend at any given time on the overall receipts of the U.S. Government as compared to its overall expenditures. Thus the effect of the aid program on the public debt would be exactly the same whether the program were funded by borrowing authority or by annual appropriations. Activities under the borrowing authority would be included in the annual budget just as they are for the more than 20 existing activities now financed through borrowing.

The request for borrowing authority made 4 years ago by President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and Under Secretary Herter for the Development Loan Fund was made at a time when it was intended that the DLF should make loans repayable in local currencies. It should be noted that under the new program loans would be repaid only in dollars.

In sum, we are convinced that borrowing authority for long-term development lending is fiscally sound and represents the most efficient and least costly method of providing development assistance.

Would a multiyear authorization of appropriations do?

No. Such an arrangement still would not provide the needed basis to give reasonable assurances of funds for future years in cases where this would be important. Such an authorization would not provide congressional authority for advance commitments. The future availability of U.S. funds would still be subject to annual appropriations in amounts which could be known for only 1 year at a time.

The nature of the annual appropriations of process simply does not provide the reasonably assured availability of future funds for development lending required by other nations if they are to undertake long-term development programs depending on the future receipt of agreed amounts of funds. This need would not be met even if, for example, it were to be agreed that funds should be made available by borrowing authority authorized by legislation—but only on an annual basis. Such an arrangement would still not provide the congressional authority required to make the needed advance commitments.

Would borrowing authority deprive Congress of control?

No, it would not. The President is asking the Congress to exercise its power to make a national decision that the United States will participate in the process of development for a realistic period of 5 years. This action will announce a national policy of the greatest significance. The President's proposal does not ask for any reduction in the control of Congress over the aid program except in the single essential that Congress itself will establish a policy that a specific amount of funds will be available for a stated period unless reasons of sufficient consequence arise to curtail or revoke them.

Within this single premise the proposed statute does everything reasonably possible to preserve to the Congress effective control. The proposed statute does not ask that the funds be made available all at once but only by annual increments. It would establish criteria for their use. Quarterly reports are to be made. Standards for loans will be set by an interagency loan committee. All grant aid will still be the subject of annual aid legislation which will be presented to both the authorizing and appropriating committees. During this process all development lending operations will also be reviewed. The Congress could take action in the annual aid bill or at any other time during the year upon the basis of the quarterly reports to change the lending criteria and other provisions covering loans or to curtail or even to end the borrowing authority or any part of it.

It is important to realize also that the proposed legislation makes the new lending program subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, now generally applicable to existing Government lending activities financed by borrowing authority. Under these provisions, the executive branch will submit each year to the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate for approval a budget program containing estimates of operations for the following fiscal year.

What advantage would borrowing authority, subject to such controls, have?

It would have a very significant advantage. It would create a strong presumption, which does not exist under the present system, that funds in known amounts would be available for the continuation of the program, even though the Congress could take later action to the contrary. The developing nations will feel safe in the conviction that the Congress, once having asserted its policy, will not reverse it unless it finds that the purposes of the legislation are not being fulfilled or that other circumstances of an exceptional nature make such action necessary.

Can we afford foreign aid in the amounts needed?

Certainly. The funds requested for fiscal year 1962 will be less than 1 percent of our gross national product. In fact the dangers and potential costs of any alternative are so great that we cannot afford not to carry on our aid program at the level needed for its success.

We sincerely hope that this letter will help to resolve the principal questions with which the Congress seems to be concerned in the President's proposals for the new foreign aid program. We urge you to support the President's request for authority and for funds and to make it possible for our Government to act with assurance and continuity.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.
DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Proposed Congressional Hearings on New Khrushchev Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Communist, non-Communist, and Western Alliance nations—presented with a new Communist program by Mr. Khrushchev—now find it necessary to evaluate its significance to world affairs.

According to early analysis, Mr. Khrushchev's program represents one of the most dramatic and far-reaching manifestos in the Communist world since Lenin's edicts in 1919. Because of its possible impact on the world peace, we cannot let this stand alone. Rather we must attempt to determine its significance, and develop policies and programs to counter it.

For a starter, I am suggesting hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. The purpose would be to get expert opinion and evaluation of Mr. Khrushchev's recommendations. This would include: Assessing its long-range objectives, determining any significant changes in Communist policy, and developing policies for coping with whatever new threat may be posed by the program.

In the past, the world has been warned by Lenins, Hitlers, Stalins, and others, of designs for world conquest. Too often, such handwriting on the walls of history has been ignored. What has been the result? War, crippling and death to millions, inestimable damage to property, retarding of human progress, and threats to the existence of freedom.

In my judgment, we must not again repeat this mistake. The Western nations—and particularly the United States—would commit a grave error if we failed to (a) put in perspective the real significance of this Communist document; (b) developed countermeasures to cope with any new threats; and (c) prepare a comparative document, demonstrating how freedom, not only now better serves a people, but how it will cap Communist programs for the future.

By obtaining evaluations from qualified individuals in our intelligence, military, diplomatic, and other services—including possibly Mr. McCloy, who has just returned from having an extensive visit with Khrushchev—I believe we could obtain testimony that would be beneficial, not only in evaluating the significance of Mr. Khrushchev's proposals, but in helping to determine policies for the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have a series of articles carried in the Christian Science Monitor reflecting United States and free world response to the Soviet Premier's recommendations printed in the RECORD as follows:

First. "Soviet Pie in the Sky: Vast New Program Challenges West," by Paul Wohl and Joseph C. Harsch; second, "Soviet Party Program"; and third, "Europe Skeptical of New Soviet Plan."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PIE IN THE SKY: VAST NEW PROGRAM CHALLENGES WEST

(By Paul Wohl and Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—The Soviet leaders have published their prospectus for the future, the draft of a new party program, and it resembles the program of March 1919, as little as today's powerful Soviet Union resembles the embattled Soviet Republic of 42 years ago.

The party asserts that the present draft was adopted unanimously by the June plenum of the Communist Party central committee 6 weeks ago. If this was so, one wonders why the publication had to be delayed until July 29, giving the party members little more than 5 weeks to study it.

As announced last January, the program is to be discussed intensely by the party rank and file. This discussion must be completed before the Republic party congresses convene. These precede the party congress of the Soviet Union in October. The first Republic congress, that of Azerbaijan, is to open on September 6.

HURRY SURPRISES

No other major new policy departure of recent years has been crammed down the throats of the party members in such a hurry, nor at a time so unfavorable to earnest discussion of a book-size document. It is indeed difficult to imagine Soviet Communists poring over so long and intricate a text during the next few weeks when so much depends upon the early gathering of the crop.

Two features of the draft program which immediately have held the attention of the West are its claim that "the historic mission of communism is to assert everlasting peace on earth" and its promise to outstrip—10 years hence—the United States in per capita production.

The section of the program devoted to future economic feats strikes readers at first glance as a guarantee that Moscow will not risk such a spectacular economic future in a political poker game over West Berlin.

Yet overtaking of the capitalist West, and especially of the United States, has indeed been promised so often by the Communist leaders that this may not be taken seriously by so earnest, intelligent, and, as a whole, well-informed a group as the young Soviet elite of today.

The prospectus—for these sections of the draft party program certainly read like a prospectus—extends over two decades. The first decade ends in 1970, the second decade in 1980. "In the subsequent period the construction of the Communist society will be fully completed," the draft declares.

The promise for the first decade, as far as the attainment and surpassing of American living standards is concerned, is as open to interpretation as most speeches of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. Read at close range, the draft program states that the Soviets promise to surpass the United States in per capita production, but apparently only in industry.

Of living standards, it is merely said that they "will improve substantially." By 1970 "everyone will live in easy circumstances, all collective and state farms will become highly productive and profitable enterprises," the draft declares.

The promises for the second decade are breathtaking.

It is not impossible that—if peace prevails—the Soviets may come close to their production goals by 1980. But that does not mean that they will have surpassed the West or the United States, because capitalism, too, must be expected to progress during these 20 years.

The draft program denies this possibility, stating that "world capitalism now has entered a new, third stage of general crisis," and that "on the whole it is ripe for the Socialist revolution of the proletariat."

Politically more interesting are the passages about transition to communism and about communism's relationship with the underdeveloped countries.

The party no longer is called the vanguard of the proletariat, nor does it represent the three classes of the Stalin era—workers, peasants, and intelligentsia—but it "exists for the people and sees the purpose of its activity in serving the people," the draft says.

The Soviet state having become "a state of the entire people, dictatorship of the proletariat has ceased to be indispensable for the U.S.S.R.," it continues. Mr. Khrushchev expressed himself in a similar vein when questioned by Siberian workers on his return from Communist China in October 1959, but now this important new departure is on record.

DEMOCRATIC BLOC URGED

As far as the colonial or recently colonial nations are concerned, the program welcomes nationalism as "containing a general democratic element" and advocates "a national democratic bloc of all progressive patriotic forces." A fraternal alliance with these nations is described as "a cornerstone of the Soviet Union's international policy."

Although slightly muted, there still is revolutionary thunder. The accent, however, is not on an old-style violent revolution but on the ushering in of a society of a new type which no longer is distant vision. "The present generation shall live under communism" is the concluding note, and the construction of communism is described as "the Soviet people's great internationalist task in keeping with the true interests of the international proletariat and all mankind."

The program, which in coming weeks will be read in many parts of the world, marks a new phase in Soviet thinking and is likely to appeal to many people, especially among the underprivileged majority of mankind. In addition to being a prospectus for the Soviets themselves, it represents an ideological challenge which the West will have to study carefully.

Moscow's new 20-year "pie in the sky" (Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's plan for reaching the Communist millennium), is as interesting for the timing of its publication as for its content.

Its content is a promise to the Soviet people of achievement in their present generation of free housing, free transportation, and free food (a partial list)—and all this with peace as well.

This is a butter-instead-of-guns portrait of the Soviet future including even an end to dictatorship by the hierarchy of the Politburo. It stands as the first new departure in Soviet long-term planning since Stalin's reverse emphasis on guns.

WEST REUNIFIED

The question which concerns the West is: Why publish it on this particular weekend, 4 days after President Kennedy's call to arms?

Those who prefer to see everything coming from Moscow from the gloomy side may conclude that it is designed to relax the West's guard just as the West is beginning to pull together and gird up its collective loins for the confrontation over Berlin.

They may be right.

But an alternate thesis is as plausibly tenable, although no more provable.

The tough Soviet posture on Berlin has produced some remarkable results in the West. It has dynamited the legislative log-jam in the Congress in Washington, clearing the way for Kennedy legislation, including some rearmament. It has melted British reluctance to join the European Common Market and also much of the Continent's reluctance to Britain as a prospective member.

It has washed the ground out from under Western European neutralism, galvanized the British trade-union movement out of its slumbers into startling action against Communists in its midst, restored Hugh Gaitskell to solid leadership of the British Labor Party, and turned Britain and West Germany into present allies and prospective partners.

It's not too much to say that the few weeks of the Berlin crisis have done for Allied unity what Western leaders in their wildest dreams hoped of achieving in a decade.

RELAXATION HINTS

In brief, the Berlin crisis, instead of stampeding and fragmenting the West, has driven it more closely and effectively together than anything since the first blockade of Berlin.

If the Kremlin can read the signs of the times, it must have concluded after reading the Kennedy speech and noticing that Britain had decided to apply for membership in the European Common Market with West Germany that its "Operation Berlin Crisis" had become counterproductive.

But if counterproductive, how to turn it off?

In fact, Soviet diplomats for several days have been putting out diplomatic relaxation hints in Western capitals and suggesting that it might be helpful for Western governments to make some further suggestions about the time, place, and subject matter for an East-West conference. Since this represents a backpedaling in Moscow, it needs to be covered up by some diversion or distraction. What better coverup than to launch the boldest, dreamiest, whipped-cream-covered picture of the future for Soviet man since Marx and Lenin let their imaginations run?

And it has the obvious advantage of being more in the authentic original stream of Marx-Lenin dreams than anything emanating from Moscow since Stalin tramped the romantic side of communism out of the textbooks and human life.

It is said that Stalin killed communism and converted the Communist movement into a weapon for reviving a Russian military empire. The new Khrushchev plan might be called a revival of the romantic stage of Communist dreaming.

CARROT DANGLED AT HOME

If Moscow policy is to be turned firmly toward achievement of anything even approaching the lotus land of plenty and leisure sketched out in the Khrushchev blueprint, then it must start cutting back not only on production of guns against the West but also on outlays for aiding the uncommitted countries and even the backward Communist countries, of which China and East Germany are the hungriest examples.

It is certainly doubtful that Mr. Khrushchev can proceed fast or far toward the cornucopia state while bending all his efforts toward attempting to humiliate the West in Germany. The two tasks are irreconcilable.

He must have debated at some point in recent weeks whether to offer the Communist clans in Moscow in October "blood, sweat, and tears" for West Berlin or pie in the sky for all good Communists willing to follow the Moscow party line instead of wandering off the reservation after the dogmatists of Peiping and East Berlin.

Where he will place the emphasis when the time comes we cannot know. We do know that this past weekend he did offer utopia at the end of 20-year rainbow.

And we do know that as of this past weekend he tempted his followers with the carrot of prosperity at home in 20 years rather than victory in Berlin in 1 year.

Certainly there is no assurance that Mr. Khrushchev means what he appears to mean.

He can always defer utopia and blame the West for the delay. Perhaps he will next week or next month or tomorrow.

It does remain a characteristic of Russian history that its leaders swing from foreign adventure to domestic rainbow hunts and vice versa.

If Mr. Khrushchev now should turn his attention inward, it would not be the first time in the history of his country that its czar abandoned an unpromising or dangerous imperial adventure beyond the frontiers under the cover of some bold new plan for making Mother Russia happier at home.

SOVIET PARTY PROGRAM

Following are the main points of the draft party program of the Soviet Union:

1. The present generation of Soviet people shall live under communism.

2. Elimination of wars is the historic mission of communism.

3. The capitalist system is ripe for being replaced by communism. This transition is to be made peacefully, but where the capitalists resort to violence against the workers, communism will be introduced by force (revolution).

4. The United States has become the biggest international exploiter, but it is past its zenith and has entered the stage of decline. Great Britain, Germany, France, and Japan also have lost their former power.

5. Yugoslav revisionism is the chief danger in the Communist movement today. The struggle against it and against [Chinese] dogmatism and sectarianism will be required from all Communists.

6. Fraternal alliance with the underdeveloped and newly emerging nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America is to be a cornerstone of Soviet international policy.

7. Communism is described as a classless social system, with all means of production publicly owned and all citizens enjoying full social equality. Abundant production will allow realization of the principle of each contributing according to his ability and receiving according to his need.

8. Between now and 1970 the Soviet Union will overtake the United States in production per head of the population. All demands of the Soviet citizens for higher living standards and satisfaction of their cultural, food, housing, and leisure-time demands will be met.

9. Between 1971 and 1980 the foundation for full communism will be laid. The stage will then have been set for gradual introduction of full public ownership and for application of the Communist principle mentioned in No. 7.

EUROPE SKEPTICAL OF NEW SOVIET PLAN

LONDON.—The Soviet Union's new 10-year plan got a skeptical reception in Europe, with even the Communists reacting cautiously.

French political observers scornfully dismissed the give-away program with this remark: "Everything will be free except freedom."

Caution was displayed by the Communist press both in Western Europe and behind the Iron Curtain.

In Rome, the Communist Party paper Unità carried lengthy extracts of the manifesto and noted that "civilization is advancing." Unità promised fuller comment in a few days.

In Budapest, the Hungarian party organ Magyar Nemset said the program was "of historical importance. [It] will be a world-shaking factor."

But the manifesto was published in Warsaw without comment and the Polish man-in-the-street reacted with characteristic canniness.

"It sounds fine," said one Pole. "Who would not like free bus rides, free meals, and all that? But where will the United States be in 20 years? How can we tell now how things are going to be anywhere in the world in 1980?"

The Pole's opinion was echoed in Tokyo, where Jankiro Satro, director of the opposition Socialist Party's information bureau, said it was "unthinkable" the Communist society could surpass the United States by 1980.

In East Germany, a Communist spokesman declined to comment and the main party paper Neues Deutschland carried a two-paragraph report of the release of the document in Moscow on the bottom of its front page, promising "a detailed report of this historic document" in Monday's issues. Observers believed official East Germany would remain silent on the manifesto for some time.

It was noted the plan promised a cut in the working week by 1970 and this was taken as meaningless in East Germany, which freely admits a shrinking working force together with other economic ills.

There was no immediate reaction in Peiping to the program, published in Moscow Sunday.

A brief report, including only headings of the program, appeared in the New China News Agency for foreign countries but nothing was published in local newspapers.

In Belgrade, Yugoslav Communist leaders kept silent about the program which carried a warning on Yugoslav revisionism. The contents of the document were not mentioned by press or radio there.

Newspapers noted the program was expected to revolutionize Soviet life and open development prospects over the next 20 years.

In The Hague, Hein Vos, a member of the Dutch Labor Party executive, said all the free social benefits promised must be paid either from taxes or from increasing prices far above their real value.

He said communism could not escape the Marxist truth that any change in economic conditions would produce a change in ideological views.

In Vienna, the Austrian Communist Party paper Volksstimme front-paged important points from the new program and noted the Soviet party had set itself the task of securing "a standard of living * * * higher than in any capitalist country."

The Vienna independent paper Presse said the new program promises paradise on earth.

In Copenhagen, the press played down the program. The conservative Berlingske Tidence said it marked the next phase toward pure communism and possible elimination of the party.

In Sweden, the story won prominent play. The Socialist Tidningen headlined: "Fantastic Soviet Plan." The liberal Dagens Nyheter headlined: "Khrushchev promises Free-of-Charge Society."

Marketing of Raisins Is Outstanding Achievement Pointing the Way to a Stable and Prosperous Farm Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8230) to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interests of consumers, and for other purposes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I have long advocated the extension and improvement of the Federal marketing order program to other farm crops as a substantial step toward an adequate and sound, long-range farm program. I deeply regret that President Kennedy's recommendation for such a program was not included in the farm bill recently passed by this House, although that bill did add new crops to the existing program as established in the Federal Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, as amended.

Because of limitation of commodities eligible for marketing orders under that program, most of the crops grown in districts represented by the Members are not presently covered by orders, and it is my experience that most of the Members are understandably not familiar with the program and its possibilities. I am convinced that if our farmers throughout the country knew how these marketing programs work, they would strongly support the plan, which benefits both farmers and consumers.

There has come to my attention a letter, actually in the nature of a report, written to Mr. Ken Birkhead, assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, by my valued constituent, Mr. A. Setrakian, Chairman of the Federal Raisin Advisory Board and the Raisin Administrative Committee. Mr. Setrakian, whose great energy, persistence and unselfish dedication have been a major factor in the success of the raisin marketing program, has presented a clear picture of the operation and benefits of the program through the years since it was established in 1949. He graphically shows how achievement of stability has brought this industry through difficult times with comparative prosperity. His conclusion is significant:

It is no wonder that raisin producers are enthusiastic about their operations under the raisin marketing agreement. Instead of having to plead for subsidies, they enjoy a decent income under a sound economy and can take just pride in contributing to the American way of life.

I am happy to advise the Members that within the past week the Secretary of Agriculture has approved a proposed marketing agreement for central California grapes for crushing. I have every hope that through a pending referendum, grapegrowers will approve the proposed order overwhelmingly, and will thus bring the advantages of this program to our entire grape industry and insure growers of crushing grapes a return equal to that now enjoyed by farmers who convert their grapes to raisins.

Mr. Setrakian's letter so well describes the actual results of a Federal marketing program that I am asking that it be reprinted here in full and I most earnestly commend it to the attention of all my colleagues who share my concern over our farm problems:

JULY 22, 1961.

MR. KEN BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with a deep sense of appreciation that I avail myself of this opportunity to report to you how producers of at least one segment of the Nation's agricultural economy has benefited through operation of a Federal marketing agreement and order.

Producers who are disposing of their commodities in orderly markets through the establishment of Federal marketing orders include a wide range from apricots to potatoes.

There are Federal marketing orders covering the orderly and stabilized marketing of citrus fruits, apricots, avocados, cherries, dates, dried figs, Tokay grapes, nectarines, peaches, pears, plums, fresh prunes, dried prunes, potatoes, carrots, cucumbers, lettuce, onions, peas, cauliflower, tomatoes, almonds, walnuts, filberts, and raisins.

It is interesting to note that some of these marketing orders and agreements have stood

the test of years from as far back as 1939 and 1941. Almost every year in the 1950's saw the adoption of at least one Federal marketing order, covering some agricultural commodity.

While my knowledge regarding the operation of the Federal marketing orders affecting all the multitude of commodities now in effect does not permit me to speak authoritatively on all of them, I am impressed with the fact that not a single marketing order covering these agricultural products listed has been discontinued. Obviously, producers are achieving, through these orders, objectives sought—else they would have long since been abandoned.

However, there is one Federal marketing order on which I feel qualified to discuss with knowledge and experience. That is the Federal marketing order for raisins.

The facts are these: Going back to 1946, the postwar adjustment year, the price for raisins soared sky high; $360 per dry ton. Then came 1947 and we raisin growers paid dearly for the joyride of the previous year. The production of raisins increased by many thousands of tons—but prices dropped from $360 a ton to $100 a ton. The raisin producing area suffered economic chaos. The only reason raisin producers were saved from complete bankruptcy and ruin was because the Federal Government stepped in to purchase 127,000 tons of raisins for use in various school feeding and welfare programs.

Then came 1948 and the raisin growers again found themselves in a fearful economic mess. Again the Federal Government stepped in to purchase a large tonnage of raisins—but the Government made it clear that unless the industry itself would develop a self-help program for the solution of the over-supply of raisins, further Federal help could not be expected.

Raisin producers formed the Raisin Overall Working Committee to study the problem in the hope of bringing order out of chaos. Officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture worked closely with the committee and finally a raisin order was formulated, adopted, and established to apply to the 1949 production of raisins.

Prior to the adoption of the raisin program in 1949 producers were becoming panic stricken and were uncertain whether or not they would lose their vineyards, their homes, their very livelihoods.

A new dawn of hope and confidence came with the birth of the raisin order and brought with it the determination to place the economy of the raisin industry on a sound and lasting foundation. And that is exactly what happened.

How does the program operate to achieve this benefit to the industry?

It is a very simple operation. Each year the administrative committee decides the tonnage of raisins which will be placed in the free tonnage pool and sold through domestic outlets at reasonable and fair prices. This decision is reached after careful study that the tonnage of raisins in the free pool will not cause an artificial shortage and inflationary prices or overabundance and depressed prices.

All raisins surplus to the free pool which, without a program has plagued the raisin growers year after year, are placed in a surplus pool to be used for export consumption or disposed of in channels not competitive with the free-pool raisins.

The expanding export market for California-produced raisins has been stimulated through the knowledge of buyers in foreign markets that prices for California raisins are uniform and that the raisins they buy today will not be available at a cheaper price to a competitor tomorrow.

The raisin order has helped the raisin industry to export large quantities of surplus raisins year after year. The order has been the one instrument which has enabled raisin producers to realize reasonable prices for 100 percent of their production.

As a result the general public has benefitted by being able to buy quality raisins at a reasonable price and the industry has realized a stabilization of production and marketing that had never before been possible.

How Federal marketing agreements work for the benefit of the Nation's agricultural economy is graphically seen in the operation of the California raisin program in contrast to the overall grape growing industry in our State.

The graps season of 1951 and 1952 can be taken as a real testing period to bring out the advantages to agriculture of operating under a Federal marketing order.

In 1951 California produced the largest grade crop on record—3,200,000 tons and grape production for 1952 was 3 million—making a total tonnage of 6,200,000 tons for the 2 years. In these 2 years, raisin producers converted some 2 million fresh tons into raisins—or some 500,000 tons of raisins. On this raisin tonnage approximately 350,000 tons were consumed in domestic markets and the balance of 150,000 tons were disposed of in export markets.

Operating under the raisin marketing order, growers received approximately $40 a ton (fresh basis) for their grapes. In contrast, growers who delivered their grapes to wineries for crushing realized an average of only $28 per ton.

In other words growers who enjoyed the benefits of the marketing agreement realized some $24 million more for their fresh grapes in raisin form during the years 1951 and 1952 than did growers who sold for crushing without a marketing program.

Commenting on the success of the raisin program, Jesse W. Tapp, chairman of the Board, Bank of America said: "Congratulations for the fine accomplishment to date and all good wishes for the future."

Dr. Harry R. Wellman, executive vice president, University of California, said: "The activity of the raisin group is the one bright spot in an otherwise dark picture in the grape industry."

It would appear from the above record that without a marketing order many of the raisin growers and handlers would have suffered heavy financial losses.

We believe that the raisin program has accomplished what President J. F. Kennedy advocated in his farm message to the Congress of the United States when he said: "I am convinced that the objectives of these programs will, when accomplished, provide for a reasonable balance between surplus and demand. They will eliminate the hardship and suffering which inadequate returns force upon so many of our families; they will reduce our surpluses to manageable proportions. They will relieve the taxpayer of the unnecessary drain upon the Federal budget. They will spur our national economy, and they will assure the consumer of stable price levels."

The raisin program has shown that so far from taking subsidies from the Federal Government, as it did in the early years of the program, the raisin industry through its own efforts in expanding export sales and enjoyed fairly reasonable returns so that in the language of President Kennedy, it has "relieved the taxpayer of the unnecessary drain upon the Federal budget."

We believe that our experience shows that when growers organize themselves under marketing orders and make use of the tools which the Government provides for them they very soon get their house in order and place their own economy on a sound basis. On the other hand, growers who do not avail themselves of such helps to establish marketing orders and agreements to bring reasonable balance between supply and demand suffer recurrent staggering losses. This is evidenced in the overall grape industry.

From 1934 to 1948 (omitting the war years and the postwar adjustment year of 1946) growers delivered 9,460,000 tons of fresh grapes to wineries for crushing and realized an average return of $19 per ton. During the same period growers converted 10,104,000 fresh tons into raisins and realized $20 per ton. Almost an identical price.

But from 1949 (the year the raisin order became operative) and including 1960, growers delivered 15,353,000 tons of grapes to wineries at an average return of $39 per ton. Growers in the same period, converted 10,154,000 tons of fresh grapes into raisins and realized a return of $50 per ton, or a difference of $11 per ton in favor of the raisin grower.

It is so obvious that had growers been organized under a grape stabilization program they would have realized approximately $150 million more than they did for the grapes delivered for crushing.

The raisin order enabled the raisin growers to achieve the following objectives:

1. To give equal benefits to each and every grower;
2. To establish the orderly marketing of raisins;
3. To reestablish trade confidence;
4. To bring about reasonable allocation and utilization of raisin grapes;
5. To equalize the burden of carrying surplus raisins over to another marketing year; and
6. To make it possible for raisin growers, large or small, to share benefits of each year's production equally.

In doing so, the raisin growers were able to make the raisin industry—the largest dried fruit industry in California—a good and profitable industry. The story of that order presents one of the most brilliant chapters of success in the history of American agriculture.

It is no wonder that raisin producers are enthusiastic about their operations under the raisin marketing agreement. Instead of having to plead for subsidies, they enjoy a decent income under a sound economy and can take just pride in contributing to the American way of life.

Sincerely and respectfully,

A. SETRAKIAN,
Chairman, Federal Raisin Advisory Board, Raisin Administrative Committee.

Mr. James J. Rowley Appointed Chief of the U.S. Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to note the appointment recently announced by the President's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, that Mr. James J. Rowley will assume the office of the chief of the U.S. Secret Service on August 31.

A man of unquestioned ability who has served in this agency for over 23 years, Mr. Rowley, brings to the office many attributes that will insure the highest degree of safety and security for our President and his family. I am especially pleased to note that though

he was born in Bronx County in New York City he exercised a most prudent choice in going to Brooklyn, N.Y. for his higher education. As a fellow alumnus I can assure him that St. John's University which awarded him the degrees of LL.B. and LL.M. welcomes this new honor which he so well reflects upon her.

I hope that Mr. Rowley's tenure will be serene and uneventful and I am certain that the vigilant care of our President and his family can be in no better hands. It is with pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the biographical sketches of Mr. Rowley which recently appeared in New York newspapers.

Government Restrictions on Oil Imports Have Created Artificial Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Oil Users Association of Miami, Fla.:

Government restrictions on oil imports have created all the evils of wartime rationing and black marketing without curing any of the problems the controls were established to correct.

This charge was made today by Gen. E. A. Evans, managing director of a group of more than 20,000 oil consumers. He was commenting on recent statements by coal interests that loss of coal markets have been caused by residual oil imports.

General Evans pointed out that "mechanization, the high cost of transporting coal, and the conversion of the railroads to diesel are the real reasons for fewer jobs in the coal industry. The restrictions on residual oil, imposed in 1959, have not put a single coal miner back to work," he said.

Government restrictions on oil imports have created artificial shortages, and the price has been bid up by consumers more than 30 cents a barrel over normal, Evans said. Oil users on the eastern seaboard are being penalized with high oil prices for unemployment in the coal fields—a condition that is totally unrelated to oil imports.

"Black market conditions have been spawned by the import controls," Evans said, "just like under wartime rationing. Quota ticket holders can turn a profit of more than 30 cents a barrel for oil they never own and never sell—and, for that matter, never touch.

"Consumers have become completely dependent on suppliers who have been given quotas under the Government imports program," Evans continued. "If a consumer does not have a long-term supply contract, he may find himself competing under black market conditions for a supply of oil that only partially meets the needs of oil users."

General Evans said consumption of residual oil by utilities and other users in the United States has remained almost constant. But refining technology has vastly improved. Today, domestic residual oil is being made into gasoline and diesel fuel. The difference has to be supplied by imports.

"There should be no restrictions on the rights of oil users to make up domestic shortages of residual oil through imports," he said.

America's Answer to Izvestia: Self-Determination for Captive Nations, House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, I introduced House Joint Resolution 447. It seeks a formal recognition by the United States of the total war being waged by the allied 98 Communist Parties of the world.

On June 20, Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, printed a three-column article attacking this resolution. This article did not deny any material allegations of House Joint Resolution 447. It did not deny the Communist total intransigent war dedicated to the defeat of the United States, first, and the free world later.

The substance of the Izvestia article can be summed up in these words: "We are at war with the United States and the free world. Our victory and their defeat is inevitable."

The editor of Izvestia is Mr. Alexei Adzhubei. He is Mr. Khrushchev's son-in-law. My answer letter to him follows:

Mr. ALEXEI ADZHUBEI,
Editor, Izvestia, Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics.

DEAR MR. ADZHUBEI: I have carefully noted the Izvestia article of June 20, 1961, which purports to answer the statements and conclusions contained in House Joint Resolution 447, and in my address to the U.S. House of Representatives on June 12.

The present crises between the Soviet and the free world is inevitably leading us toward the grim possibilities of mutual destruction.

If the Soviet is unalterably committed to world domination, then there can be no accommodation of our self-interests. Then, the stark reality for the United States is survival.

If, however, there is a genuine desire to maintain a peace based upon mutual survival, then an examination of the issues that divide us may be useful.

The writer, Mr. Yu Filonovich, has partially clarified the issues between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is my purpose to fully clarify the issues in order to avoid miscalculations by either your country or mine.

The Izvestia article has not attempted to refute the basic statements of fact embodied in this resolution. The content of the article confirms the following recitals in the resolution:

"A. The Communist movement is a political entity which is irrevocably committed to impose a Communist dictatorship upon all nations of the world, including the United States.

"B. The Communist movement is an international alliance of 98 national Communist Parties engaged in a joint endeavor to disintegrate and defeat all non-Communist governments.

"C. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union dominates the International Communist Alliance. All Communists and Communist Parties acknowledge their allegiance to and solidarity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"D. The Communist alliance is conducting a total global war, with nonmilitary weapons for the seizure of power throughout the world. Its campaign is conducted in the framework of military concepts.

"E. This Communist world war utilizes and engages the military, economic and political power of the subsidiary Soviet bloc nations and the allied Communist nations."

This implacable Communist war confines the United States to the apparent dire alternatives of surrender or thermonuclear war.

On January 6, 1961, Mr. Khrushchev, in a major address, suggested the possibility of a peaceful surrender by the United States and the free world.

This assumption by Mr. Khrushchev is a serious miscalculation on the part of the Communist hierarchy. I consider it my responsibility to advise the Communist Party of the Soviet to correct that misapprehension of the intent, courage, and determination of the American people.

The United States will never submit to either a peaceful or a nonpeaceful surrender. Nor will it allow itself to be surrendered by its leaders in public office.

The second alternative is thermonuclear war. Mr. Khrushchev fully appreciates the magnitude of losses that this eventuality would produce.

There is another alternative. It is contained in House Joint Resolution 447. This resolution would recognize the Communist world war. It defines the scope, the strategy and tactics of this conflict. It identifies the soldiers, the generals, and the parties to this war.

House Joint Resolution 447 clarifies the issues. It calls for the United States and the free world to counter and compete in this war with effective weapons and organizational solidarity.

Your Izvestia article boasts: "Today the enemies of peace and progress no longer see communism as a spectre, but as a gigantic, incarnate, material power. That is the reason for such feverish searches for ways, means, and weapons—anything to stop or slow down the inexorable movement of life."

I reply to you that communism is a smog with which you are blotting out human freedoms and aspirations. The captive people you rule autocratically, in the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe, in Asia, do not want your slave labor serfdom.

We challenge you to hold free elections in the captive nations to allow these people a free choice and a self-determination of their future.

Your article further states: "Neither Marines, nor the newest theories of renovating capitalism, nor the most threatening resolutions adopted 'as a last hope' will help the old world. Even PILLION won't help."

My answer to you is: "It is not a question of Marines, or theories, or resolutions, or even of PILLION. It is a question of concerted action by all free peoples of the world fighting for survival, for freedom, for an enduring peace. When the United States awakens, when it decides to wage war against Communist parties using your own weapons against you, your era will be at an end. Then the era of peace with justice, the era of genuine peace in which man can reach the fulfillment of his highest aspirations, will begin."

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. PILLION.

Long Lane to Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, to some it may seem useless or even hopeless at this time to continue our efforts to achieve a workable disarmament agreement.

William Stringer, however, in a recent article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, has clearly stated there are worthy reasons for not abandoning the studies on disarmament underway these days within the State Department, and for proceeding apace with building a Disarmament Administration of real stature and staff through congressional enactment as proposed by the Kennedy administration.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this timely article to my colleagues' attention.

LONG LANE TO DISARMANENT
(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—In view of the tension over Berlin and the Soviet "nyet" on the nuclear test ban, it might seem profitless to pursue further the goal of disarmament at this time.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev seems little interested in arms control. Moscow talks between U.S. disarmament negotiator John J. McCloy and Valerian A. Zorin have got nowhere. The once-feasible goal of beginning some kind of disarmament conference July 31 is being abandoned.

And in Washington offices preoccupied with developing a strong posture on Berlin, there is apprehension that continued pursuit of disarmament might, as of now, be interpreted by the Kremlin as a sign of Western weakness.

Yet there are worthy reasons for not abandoning the studies on disarmament underway these days within the State Department, and for proceeding apace with building a Disarmament Administration of real stature and staff through congressional enactment as proposed by the Kennedy administration.

There may even be worthy reasons for continuing to talk arms control with Moscow, however unpleasant Mr. Khrushchev may be in his present phase. After all, somewhere the East-West dialog should continue.

There is need to press on through the disarmament desert because, for one thing, this objective of arms limitation engages, and will continue to engage, the attention of humanity. Somehow, says the conscience of mankind, the arms race must be halted if the world is to survive.

New possibilities, sometimes electronic, sometimes based on a mutual trust which now is nonexistent and sometimes posited frankly on mutual distrust, continue to appear in the field of arms control. The experts from Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are prolific here, and ideas churn.

For instance, a denuclearized area in Africa is proposed, as a testing ground of disarmament. Surveillance satellites offer ways and means of avoiding surprise attack. There is even the suggestion that there be a "purple telephone" on the desk of Premier Khrushchev, and another on the desk of President Kennedy, whereby either might instantly ring the other if by miscalculation or accident the missiles threatened to fly.

As has been frequently observed, when hundreds of thousands are engaged in military armament, a few hundred people in the government should be working at disarmament, whatever the current atmospherics.

Then there is a second reason for continuing the effort. That is, simply, that the American position is constantly being watched and weighed by the rest of the world. It is being noted even at the moment when Secretary of State Dean Rusk is pointing out that the world struggle at base represents an attempt at global coercion by the Sino-Soviet bloc—coercion of the rest of mankind.

The Soviet pose on disarmament seems, at first sight, to belie this division of the world into the helpful and the oppressors. Premier Khrushchev is proposing total disarmament in 4 years, and until this project is carefully examined for inspection guarantees (while disarming) and feasibility generally, it looks favorable, to the uninitiated.

In this circumstance, a Washington decision to quit talking, quit studying, quit proposing arms control would seriously damage the Western cause. The United States must continue to come up with intelligent, impressive control plans. The Soviets must appear to be the blockaders, as indeed they in fact are. The United Nations General Assembly will tackle the topic again this fall.

The disarmament experts have their difficulties. The Soviet turnabout on nuclear testing was a sharp blow. Washington's present agency is affected somewhat by that overabundance of concepts and conceptors that seems the hallmark of the Kennedy regime. Mr. McCloy will one day hand over the reins of a super-demanding assignment to a new chief.

But the work goes on with hope and with diligence because, somehow, it must.

The Need for Preparedness and a Forceful Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address which I had the honor of delivering before the State convention of the Arkansas Department of the American Legion on July 28, 1961, Little Rock, Ark. I have the distinct privilege, and consider it a very definite honor, to serve on the National Committee on Americanism of the American Legion.

In recent days we have witnessed an attack against such patriotic organizations as our own American Legion. The American Legion has maintained a position of leadership in our Nation since its inception and continues until this day in the forefront in the promotion of patriotism for our beloved country. It is always a source of pride for me to take part in the program of this great organization of which I am privileged to be a member. My address before our own State convention is as follows:

THE NEED FOR PREPAREDNESS AND A FORCEFUL POSITION

It is good to be here. It is good to be among brave men who have risked their lives in defense of their Nation's honor; among men who love their country and are ready to fight for it.

You have paid me a high compliment in asking me to address you at this impressive State convention. I hope to repay you in common coin.

I bring you strong words. My message is freedom and my counsel is military strength and preparedness.

Since the outbreak of World War II, the independence of the United States and the rest of the free world has been challenged by two pernicious revolutionary forces—first fascism; now, international communism. All of you contributed much to the successful defeat of fascism. Presently, you have willingly joined other Americans in the job of ridding the free world of this second and more serious challenge to its security. No less than Premier Khrushchev himself has told us that communism will bury us and that our grandchildren will be converted to its twisted tenets.

These words are not the idle remarks of a harmless madman. They are made by an eminently shrewd and competent political adversary, and they are based on his cold calculation that the existing balance of power between the Western World and the Communist bloc has tipped conclusively in the latter's favor. For proof, Premier Khrushchev has noted the rapid expansion of communism since World War I. Prior to 1940, the Soviet Union was the only Communist regime, "with not more than 17 percent of the territory, 3 percent of the population, and about 10 percent of the output of the world." Today, Communist countries cover about one-fourth of the territory of the globe, have one-third of its population, and their industrial output accounts for about one-third of the total world output.

These ominous facts—and facts they are—have encouraged the Communist leaders to double their efforts toward their avowed goal—total world domination. The struggle against communism is now being fought on an ever-widening number of fronts—ideological, psychological, political, economic, and military. The threat to U.S. and free world security has increased since the fall of Hitler's Germany and Tojo's Japan. The battle is still in doubt, though the Communists have admittedly achieved a number of bridgeheads on American and free world ramparts.

The free society, informed by representative government, need not perish from this earth, if the friends of popular government are willing to sacrifice the necessary human and material resources to defeat those who fight so ardently for Communist victory. As Edmund Burke aptly observed, "Evil triumphs if good men fail to act." And act we must. And act we will on every cold war front on which the Communists seek to engage us.

The military competition between the Communist and Western worlds, in both its physical and psychological aspects, is clearly the most important battleground of the cold war. However important are other forms of Communist power, the military strength of the unholy Communist alliance is unquestionably the most formidable obstacle to world peace and the institutions of the rule of law among nations. It is the major challenge to our liberties. Failure to recognize and appreciate the critical importance of military force in international relations will lead us to make the same mistake France made between World Wars I and II; the same mistake which Japan, Germany, and Italy made with repsect to the military might of the United States. None of these countries backed their political objectives with enough, nor with the right kind of, military power.

The Communist-ruling elite has learned this lesson of history well. The use of force and the provocation and pursuit of war are

integral parts of Communist ideology and the principal instrument of its political designs. To the Communists, all of history is a class struggle which ultimately leads to the final victory of communism over capitalism. With victory supposedly assured the Communists are willing to use force to aid these so-called inevtiable forces of history.

Until 1956, Communist dogma with respect to the use of force in international relations was unambiguously stated by the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International. That Communist meeting proclaimed that "the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without violence; that is, without armed uprisings and war against the bourgeoisie." In simpler words, the Communists declared war on anyone who disagreed with them.

With alarming consistency, Communist groups across the world have used military force or the threat of it to gain their objectives. They have shown no more scruples in using violence; they have been checked by no ethical restraints in gaining what they were after. Expediency has been their watchword; political advantage their guiding standard.

It is instructive to review the rise of Communist world power and to chart its manifold successes. We can thus gain some insight into the character of our antagonist. We can better grasp the lengths to which the Communist bloc is willing to go in undermining the independence and strength of the United States. We can more clearly understand the military steps we must take to counteract and overcome the Communist menace.

While we negotiated for a just peace after World War II and while we patiently sought to erect and preserve a world order acceptable to the common interests of free people everywhere, the Soviet Union, in league with Communists throughout the world, directed its efforts to the further breakdown of world peace. It energetically sowed discord in every corner of the globe and eagerly awaited the time when it could exploit the resulting chaos in its favor. Again, the Red army stood poised and battle prepared to secure Communist rule.

For the first time in Western history, Russian troops after World War II occupied half of Western Europe from Poland and Eastern Germany in the north to Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria in the south. Political domination accompanied military control over this vast and strategically important area. Ten countries which had been independent in 1939 fell under the Communist boot less than a decade later.

The Communists were militarily no less active in Asia. Taking advantage of the power vacuum left in the wake of Japan's defeat, Communist Huk troops in the Philippine jungles challenged the authority of the central government. India, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia—all newly established nations—likewise found themselves assaulted by Communist military threats.

Most disturbing, however, was the triumph of Red forces in China in 1949. Led by Mao Tse Tung, Chinese Communist troops drove the Nationalist Chinese armies of Chiang Kai-shek into the sea. Communist military power frustrated, possibly irrevocably, the erection and preservation of a free, Christian, and democratically oriented China—an objective to which this Nation has been dedicated since the open door policy of William McKinley.

Once established securely on the Asiatic Continent, the Communists again tested their military strength against the United States. On June 25, 1950, the North Korean army attacked the South Korean Republic. After General MacArthur's United Nation's force thrust the invaders back to the Yalu River, the Chinese Communists entered the war and fought on for 2 additional years. The Korean war demonstrated that the Communists were willing to commit open military aggression to gain their political goals.

For the disbeliever, the Communists offered further evidence of their unprincipled use of military power in the bloody suppression of the East Germans in the summer of 1953 and in the ruthless crushing of the Hungarian revolt 3 years later. The Communists had come to power by the sword, and they continued to maintain their control by the sword.

There was bitter irony, therefore, in Khrushchev's words before the 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress of February 1956, a short 8 months before the Hungarian uprising. Khrushchev explicitly rejected the Leninist doctrine of the inevitability of war with capitalism. He proclaimed that the ultimate of victory of communism could be secured by nonviolent means. Instead, he announced a new era of competitive coexistence between the capitalist and Communist worlds.

Did this mean an abandonment of Communist use of force in the continuing struggle for world domination? Did this proclamation herald a policy of gradual or complete Communist disarmament? Were the Communists finally prepared to beat their swords into plowshares? Nothing could have been further from Khrushchev's mind. War and force are still in the service of Communist objectives.

Although it may be difficult to accept as fact, we are in greater military danger today than ever before in our Nation's history. Since Khrushchev's rise to leadership of the Soviet Union, Communist military strength has been increased and greatly diversified. Moreover, it shows no signs of weakening in the next few years. Latest published reports indicate that the Soviet ground army is almost two and a half million strong—at least twice the size of the U.S. Army and Marines combined. This mighty ground force is organized into approximately 175 divisions, half of which are mechanized and which possess considerable mobility and firepower. Experts on Soviet military power are generally agreed that the Russian Army is well equipped with modern arms and supported by an armored force of approximately 35,000 tanks. Many Soviet military units are also equipped with tactical nuclear weapons and are trained in their use. Backing the Red army is an even larger force of 8 million men under arms from China and the satellite nations.

The Soviet Navy, while inferior to the fleets of the Western Powers, is still quite formidable. Its backbone is a huge submarine fleet of approximately 450 submarines, some with missile-firing capabilities. It also possesses a variety of surface vessels and an air arm of about 3,000 to 3,500 airplanes, composed mainly of torpedo carriers and medium bombers.

Finally, we have the Soviet Air Force. It is far more formidable than the Russian Navy and perhaps the most significant threat to our security. It commands a fleet of more than 1,000 bombers, some capable of hitting U.S. targets with nuclear weapons. This bomber force is complemented by a growing number of Soviet intercontinental missiles which are cruelly tipped with massively destructive atomic warheads and are directly aimed at our major cities.

The enormous size of Communist military power belies Khrushchev's implied renunciation of war as an instrument of Communist penetration and casts doubt on the sincerity of his call for peaceful coexistence. Only 2 weeks ago, on July 9, he announced a significant increase in the Rusisan military budget. Two days later, he declared that the Soviet Union would use force against any United Nations decision which might threaten its security. These actions openly ridicule his own proposal for peaceful coexistence.

If we ponder the events since Khrushchev's alleged rejection of the inevitability of war in 1956, we are made aware once again of the almost enthusiastic willingness of the Communist bloc to brandish or actually employ military power, when it suits its interests. On at least three occasions, Soviet rockets have been threatened against free world positions—against Britain and France during the Suez crises; against the United States if it should intervene in Cuba; and against U.S. bases after the breakup of the Paris Summit Conference of 1960. In addition, the Soviet Union has expressed little interest in a feasible, inspection-proof nuclear test ban agreement, and has all but torpedoed disarmament talks in Geneva.

Communist military strength has also been successfully concentrated in Laos in the past 2 years. Troops loyal to the royalist government have been increasingly hard pressed before the combined Communist forces of the Lao rebels and the Communist North Vietnamese. The revels have repeatedly violated the ceasefire agreement whenever it would result in territorial or strategic gain. At the same time, the Communists have talked of their desire for peace.

The forceful Communist takeovers in Europe and Asia are now matched by a more serious Communist military victory in Cuba. Here, only 90 miles off the coast of Florida, a Communist regime flourishes. Cuba provides the Communist movement with its first secure foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Already large numbers of Communist advisers from the Sino-Soviet bloc have descended on Cuba.

Politically, Cuba is a base of operations for Communist agitation and propaganda against the other nations of Central and South America. It encourages Communist groups throughout these countries to establish similar regimes in their respective nations. The continued existence of the Castro brand of Communist domination also lends support to the false argument that communism is the inevitable wave of the future.

We must be concerned, too, about the potential military problem which Cuba poses for our security interests. First of all, we must be concerned about the large amount of arms and ammunition which the Castro regime has imported from the Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc countries. Last November, the State Department released information about the military equipment which the Castro regime received from Communist countries since it came to power on January 1, 1959. Included in these shipments were an estimated 45,000 automatic rifles, 10,000 submachine guns, 150 mortars, 40 tanks, 10 assault guns, 60 armored personnel carriers, 220 different types of artillery pieces, 10 helicopters, and 8 Russian MIG jets. This is an extraordinary amount of military equipment for so small a country as Cuba. With such large stocks of military supplies at its disposal, Castro's Cuba will be difficult to overthrow by the Cuban rebel army. The growing military strength of Castro's army was demonstrated in the abortive April invasion of Cuba. Defeat of the anti-Castro rebels was in no small way due to the superior firepower and mobility of Castro's forces. Castro's guns, tanks, and artillery, proved too much a match for the outnumbered and outgunned rebels. Castro's military success warns us that our military intervention in Cuba—if such a policy is dictated by future events—will not be an easy venture. We are placed on notice that a large invasion force will be needed to subdue Castro's army.

The great quantities of military equipment being shipped into Cuba give us cause to worry beyond their use in maintaining the Castro regime in power. There is the g ow-

ing danger that Cuba will serve as an arsenal and base of operations for Communist military activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Through arms and manpower, Castro can support and, indeed, provoke Communist uprisings in Central and South America. Stocks of Castro guns have recently been uncovered by police forces in Brazil, and Castro supporters have been captured in an invasion of Panama 2 years ago. Moreover, Cuba itself can serve as a military base for the Soviet Union. Potentially, it can provide Russia with bases for its troops, its intercontinental missiles, or its submarines. The stationing of Soviet military bases in Cuba would be a clear danger to our security and would not be easily tolerated by the U.S. people.

Finally, there is the matter of the Guantanamo Naval Base. The military value of Guantanamo stems largely from its geographical location. It controls the Windward Passage into the Caribbean Sea and is a critical link in the Key West-Guantanamo-Puerto Rico-Trinidad chain which protects the Panama Canal and the entire Caribbean area. It also provides considerable protection to shipping vessels bringing strategic raw materials from South America.

There is no question that we take our rights to Guantanamo very seriously. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have continually reaffirmed the justice of our legal position at Guantanamo. As President Eisenhower pointed out, "our rights in Guantanamo are based on international agreements with Cuba and include the exercise by the United States of complete jurisdiction and control over that area." The U.S. Government, the President went on to say, "has no intention of agreeing to the modification or abrogation of these agreements and will take whatever steps may be appropriate to defend the base." I am certain that all of you here are willing to support these words with military action, if our rights in Guantanamo are challenged.

In no less degree are we willing to fight for our rights in West Berlin. We are ready to exert the might of our Military Establishment to discharge our obligations in Germany and to retain our honor intact. To impress the Communists, we are ready to follow the President, if he finds it necessary to mobilize the Nation's Reserve Forces or if he decides to raise the level of our military preparedness.

But it is important to remember that the military threats to our Nation's security posed by Cuba, Laos, or West Berlin, are not separate and unrelated crises. Each must be placed in the proper context of the full range of military threats which the Communist world presents to our independence and security objectives. Parts of the military threat should not be permitted to distort the whole character of the military challenge we face. Seen in the background of the gradual evolution of Communist power, which I have tried to sketch, Laos, Cuba, and West Berlin as well as future military crises which await us are simply parts of a greater pattern of Communist attempts to secure domination over the entire globe. We must match and better the military strength of the Communist world in its various manifestations. The United States and the rest of the free world have the necessary economic power and manpower pool to deny the Kremlin leaders their goal of global victory. We have the men, money, and know-how to build and maintain an invulnerable deterrent against a general war, and the capacity to obliterate Russia and the remainder of the Communist world, if they should initiate a nuclear war. We also have the means at our disposal, if we are willing to use them, of building larger conventional forces to deter Communist military provocations of less than total proportions. We need a large and sufficiently diversified military force which is capable of applying the right amount of military might to punish the size and seriousness of the Communist breach of the peace. This is to advocate what commonsense already prescribes: let the punishment fit the crime. You do not use a sledge hammer to hang a picture on the wall, nor do you break rocks with a wooden mallet. So you do not use the atomic bomb against dispersed guerrillas in jungle hideouts, nor employ guerrilla troops against massed field armies of men and machines. We need more bombers and missiles. But we also need more ships, submarines, and ground troops than we presently possess. Only then will we be able to deal with any future military crisis, whatever its size, on a regularized, predictable basis. With proper military preparation, the crisis mentality of our foreign policy need no longer plague us. Implied in the very idea of a crisis situation is the element of insufficient military preparation. An expanded Military Establishment with a wide variety of subtly shaded capabilities will provide the required support for our political objectives—the maintenance of our independence and the spread of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

I have described for you a displeasing picture of Communist military might and of the gravity of its threat to our way of life. However, knowing the strength of our enemy and the nature of his motives is important, if we are to prepare ourselves adequately for the great enterprise of defending our homes, our Nation, and our freedoms.

So much for the military preparedness to maintain our forceful position in the world. Military preparedness is of prime importance, but it is not the only weapon in the arsenal of the so-called cold war.

I am prompted to discuss with you for a moment a subject that is not a part of military warfare, but is psychological—and, therefore, just as much a part of the battle in which the United States of America is engaged as the race for dominance in outer space. One of the Nation's outstanding historians and a businessman of distinction, a New Englander, a graduate of both Princeton and Columbia Universities, Carleton Putnam, has recently published a book entitled, "Race and Reason," from Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. This book has been endorsed by prominent geneticists, zoologists, psychologists, and other scientists of proven reputation throughout the country. The words of this outstanding American are so meaningful that I am taking the liberty of making his own words a part of my message to you today. Hence, I would like to quote from his book to show one of the facets of this cold war for the hearts and minds of men:

"The economic weapon brandished over the head of one's opponent is a common technique of the equalitarian. The nonequalitarian scientists have been forced largely into the universities of the South, where they are biding their time. My files provide ample proof of this. One letter from a prominent northern psychiatrist goes even further, 'Where in the United States could a psychologist, sociologist, or anthropologist find employment if he openly and unreservedly espoused the theory of the racial inequality of man?'

"It is folly to talk of freedom, either of the press or of any other kind, when such a situation exists. Probably never in the history of the United States have we seen such a stranglehold by the national press and other mass media of communication in suppressing the viewpoint of a great section of the country. The extent to which certain of the more authoritative and influential newspapers and magazines, such as the New York Times and the Time-Life group, are using their columns for sheer propaganda has become laughable. In a moral sense we are confronted with what might almost be called a trilogy of conspiracy, fraud, and intimidation: conspiracy to gain control of important citadels of learning and news dissemination, fraud in the teaching of false racial doctrines, and intimidation in suppressing those who would preach the truth. To speak of academic freedom in the United States today is to make a mockery of the term.

"Besides intimidation there has, of course, been a false indoctrination of our younger scientists, although some hope on this score may be found in the following statement in a letter to me from a distinguished scientist younger than I am, a scientist not a southerner, who is a recognized international authority on the subject we are considering: 'About 25 years ago it seemed to be proved beyond a doubt that man is a cultural animal, solely a creature of the environment, and that there is no inheritance of instinct, intelligence, or any other capacity. Everything had to be learned and the man or race that had the best opportunity for learning made the best record. The tide is turning. Heredity is coming back, not primarily through anthropologists but through the zoologists. It is the zoologists, the animal behavior men, who are doing it, and the anthropologists are beginning to learn from them. It will take time, but the pendulum will swing.'

"Near the close of his autobiography Lord Tweedsmuir, who knew both the English and American scenes well, states: 'Something has happened. A civilization bemused by an opulent materialism has been met by a rude challenge. The free peoples have been challenged by the serfs. The gutters have exuded a poison which bids fair to infect the world. The beggar on horseback rides more roughshod over the helpless than the cavalier. A combination of multitudes who have lost their nerve and a junta of arrogant demagogues has shattered the comity of nations. The European tradition has been confronted with an Asiatic revolt, with its historic accompaniment of janissaries and assassins. There is in it all, too, an ugly pathological answer, as if a mature society were being assailed by diseased and vicious children.'

"These lines written at the outset of the last World War, would seem to hold fully as true today. The free peoples are still challenged, but the challenge for the moment is more from within than without, the diseased and vicious children have insinuated themselves into our midst and have taken on the trappings of respectability. Some even sit on our university faculties. As a part of the process, the attack on Christianity, which Gladstone perceived 90 years ago, has continued. 'I am convinced,' wrote Gladstone, 'that the welfare of mankind does not now depend on the state and the world of politics; the real battle is being fought in the world of thought, where a deadly attack is made with great tenacity of purpose and over a wide field upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the Gospel of Christ.' This attack has had a twofold Asiatic aspect. On the one hand, there has been the open aggression of Japan, Russia, China, and the Middle East, and on the other the indirect impact behind our lines of devious oriental thinking and the pervasive mood of appeasement, of resignation under evil, and of expediency, so characteristic of the eastern mind. The it's-too-late attitude, the if-we-must-choose between - surrender - and - extinction - we'll choose-surrender spirit were not the attitude or spirit of our American forefathers; they were not the creed of Patrick Henry. Part of all this is undoubtedly the fault of an abuse by its votaries of the earlier American gospel. The abuse opened the way, first, for a discrediting of freedom and individualism, and then for the substitution of equalitarianism as a new gospel. We cannot afford to make that mistake again.

Christianity is the religion of freedom and individualism—it is also the gospel of compassion."

In glaring support of true Americanism is the opinion of the distinguished editor of the Indianapolis Star, Jameson G. Campaigne, in a recent book entitled, "American Might and Soviet Myth." He states: "For the first time in our history the people of the United States face the possibility of a war upon their own soil which could destroy our country and drive us into enslavement. Lincoln once said 'All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not, by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.'

"This is still true. Only by suicide can America die. But circumstances have changed since Lincoln's time, and in this era of the atomic bomb and guided missile, error and confusion in military and diplomatic leadership endanger us as never possible before. It is through our leaders that we may at last, in Lincoln's words, cause our own destruction, as no foreign commander could, even now.

"It has been your habit as an American to leave foreign affairs to the experts. But look at the mistakes the experts have made in China, in Korea, in Europe, in the Middle East. Today the security of the United States is in greater danger than it was 10 years ago or even 5. The so-called experts, who have taken your tax money and made American foreign policy, have succeeded only in making your life less secure, your home less safe, and your freedom less certain than ever before in our history. Unless you assert your power as freemen to change a foreign policy that has failed, that is failing, our Nation may indeed soon die."

What is the fundamental problem that you face, and I face, as Americans living under the shadow of atomic war? There is only one threat. It is the menace of communism spreading from its base in the Soviet Union to cover one third of the globe.

What cause do we espouse? We espouse the cause of true Americanism in calling for enforcement of our Constitution which, therefore, means the preservation and enforcement of the rights of the States or the people respectively to govern themselves. We speak out for the principle of government along State lines, as envisioned by our forefather. We speak out against our States being lumped into regions and appointed, not elected, officials forcing the breakdown of States rights and local self-government through the handing down of rules and controls by Federal appointed agencies. We call for reassertion of the free enterprise system and the reassertion of human rights and individual liberties through the greatest system of government the world has ever known, the system of State governments in our American Republic.

Bootstraps for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to report to Congress that strides are being made in South Dakota toward the ultimate solution of the so-called Indian problem. These strides are being made through industrial development on the reservations.

First, I would report that about a year ago the Wright-McGill Co. established at Pine Ridge on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation a factory for the manufacture of fishing lures and fishing equipment. In the short time they have been in operation they have already expanded to the point where they are employing 280 local Indians. This, Mr. Speaker, means $280 an hour that is going into the reservation to provide homes, community, and family development. For the first time in the history of the Sioux these people are becoming self-sufficient.

Second, the Standing Rock Sioux used $250,000 from their rehabilitation funds to construct a blanket and mattress factory at McLaughlin, on the Standing Rock Reservation, which should go into operation this month. Just how many Indian people will be employed is not yet known, but it is hoped that as the plant develops, 100 to 150 families will be employed on that reservation. Certainly these are significant steps in the ultimate solution, the only solution to what has been known for a hundred years as the Indian problem. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article in the August 1961 issue of Catholic Rural Life.

BOOTSTRAPS FOR INDIANS

The old fable of the man who lifted himself by his own bootstraps has become so much a part of our folklore that politicians now refer to any self-help plan as "Operation Bootstrap"—giving people the means to help themselves.

The American Government has given the American Indian everything: free food, free clothes, free homes, free medical care—everything except freedom and the one thing he needs most: opportunity. Confined to their reservations, allowed to do nothing, Indians like anybody else under the same circumstances tend to deteriorate mentally, physically, morally. There is room in farming and ranching only for about 15 percent of them, and this proportion has made the grade despite less training, financing and equipment enjoyed by the 9 percent of non-Indian Americans who are farmers.

Another 5 percent have a benefited from a sadly inadequate Government relocation effort under which Indians are moved to industrial centers, the head of the family trained in an industrial job and the mother and children helped in making adjustments from wigwam to apartment. During the WPA days of the depression, Indians, whom we trained to operate heavy machinery went on to private companies and did well. They prove the ability of the Indian to adjust and to become stable, productive citizens when given the one thing he needs most: opportunity.

The remaining 80 percent remain wards of the government, shackled by bureaucracy, the dole, relief checks, lack of training and opportunity.

Puerto Ricans remained in this same condition despite expensive efforts by our Government to improve their lot. It was only when Puerto Ricans themselves undertook to solve their own problems—not by sending Puerto Ricans to industry but by bringing industry to Puerto Rico—aided by tax concessions, on-the-job training, and so forth, that they climbed out of the quicksand of self-perpetuating poverty. More than 600 new factories in Puerto Rico have created more than 100,000 jobs, quadrupled gross production, nearly quadrupled average family income to the second highest level in Latin America, cut infant mortality 50 percent and increased life expectancy an equal amount.

Patterned on the highly successful Puerto Rican "bootstrap" bill, the Indian version is H.R. 313. By 10-year tax exemptions and service provisions it is designed to help the Indians industrialize their reservations, become self-supporting. The tax concessions will be made up many times over by removing Indians from relief rolls and making productive, taxpaying citizens of them. More important than the economic improvement is the improvement in the mental, physical and moral condition of an entire people who ask for nothing except the opportunity to become self-supporting.

We have examined this bill and find it worthy of a Christian's support. We have personal knowledge of a factory operating for the past several years on a reservation in North Dakota. It has been a boon to the Indians not only financially but in all the ways described in this article, proving the Indian's need and ability. The American Indian has been the stepchild of his native land much too long. It is high time we admitted him to the family.

Power Play Aimed at School Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was printed in the July 28, 1961, issue of the Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press. This is a newspaper which consistently follows a liberal editorial policy and is a strong supporter of President Kennedy and the current administration.

POWER PLAY AIMED AT SCHOOL BUDGETS

An administration power play threatens to kill the program to aid schools in federally impacted areas—a program under which 23 of Ventura County's 32 school districts receive a sizable share of their budgets.

The administration has been pushing for a $2.5 billion Federal-aid-to-education program to include all public schools in the Nation. That proposal has been blocked by the House Rules Committee.

Now, in an attempt to force approval of the entire aid-to-education program, congressional leaders are threatening a Presidential veto of the impacted-areas appropriation.

But the two programs are not related.

The impacted-areas laws were enacted in 1950 when Congress decided that local citizens cannot afford to pay the entire cost of education when an influx of Federal workers adds to a community's school bill without increasing the local take in taxes.

Under a complicated formula, the Federal Government pays a share of the cost of educating each child whose parents live in Government-owned housing or who are employed either directly by the Government or by a federally engaged contractor. Part of the payment goes to construction of schools and part to the operating budget, including teachers' salaries.

California received almost $40 million in Federal assistance to its schools last year, more than any other State. The 13th Congressional District's share was nearly $5 million, of which Ventura County received about $750,000 for operation and maintenance, plus about half that much for school construction.

It is not unusual for Presidents—or congressional leaders—to withhold approval of an appropriation to "blackjack" votes for another program. But we believe that tying the impacted areas appropriation to the Federal aid to education bill is a cynical, deplorable parliamentary trick which can cause hardship for countless school districts.

President Eisenhower several times sought a reduction in the impacted areas fund; but Congress always rebuffed him because 319 of the 437 members of the House represent areas which benefit from the program.

Congressional leaders today may say—and mean it—that if the House blocks or votes down general aid to education, then there will be no aid to impacted areas. But the program's supporters always count on the weariness of the session's end to separate the carrot from the stick. This should work again.

I call particular attention to the following excerpt from the editorial:

It is not unusual for Presidents—or congressional leaders—to withhold approval of an appropriation to "blackjack" votes for another program. But we believe that tying the impacted areas appropriation to the Federal aid to education bill is a cynical, deplorable parliamentary trick which can cause hardship for countless school districts.

Most Foreign Aid Funds Not Subject to Long-Term Borrowing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, OF NEW JERSEY, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 2, 1961

As the House of Representatives approaches one of its most crucial debates of this session—the President's foreign aid legislation—it is as important that we understand what is not being proposed as well as what is being proposed.

The bill reported by the committee authorizes a total appropriation of $4,355,500,000. Of this, $1,800 million is for military assistance and $2,555,500,000 is for economic assistance. Appropriations will be required to be made in the normal manner for all of the military assistance—$1,800 million—and for 65 percent of the economic assistance—$1,655,500,000.

Despite our lengthy and detailed hearings, I have found widespread misunderstanding on some basic points. Most glaring misapprehension exists as to the scope of aid which would be financed by borrowing from the Treasury, undoubtedly caused by the prominence which has been given this issue. A prevalent assumption by many people is that borrowing authority would cover the entire economic aid program. This is not true.

The issue of Treasury borrowing as opposed to regular appropriations by the Congress relates, as far as fiscal year 1962 is concerned, only to $900 million of funds programed for development loans. It authorizes Treasury borrowing for development loans up to the amount of $1,600 million a year for the next 4 years, but this authority, relating to future years, does not directly involve the fiscal 1962 foreign assistance authorization. The bill as reported requires that all loans made under this authority are to be repayable only in U.S. dollars. Except for this $900 million to be available for loans, Congress will exercise exactly the same control that it exercises over all other appropriated funds.

It is not correct to say that Congress loses control over the development loan program, since the bill as reported makes the Government Corporation Control Act applicable to this program. This requirement means that the Congress will have to approve the budget submitted for development loans each fiscal year.

All other kinds of aid will continue to be financed by annual appropriations. These items include development grants, supporting assistance, and contributions to international organizations, the contingency fund, and administrative expeses. They account this year for over half of the program authorized by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also overlooked in the discussion of borrowing authority is the fact that some 37 programs in 26 agencies and departments have been financed by borrowing from the Treasury—3 of them in this session of Congress. Therefore, direct Treasury financing is not a new approach to legislative programs. It has in the past brought greater value to the funds expended and has instilled a sense of stability and responsibility in the participants. If we are seeking to instill stability and responsibility in the less developed countries, this is the only possible approach to this goal.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a commitee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JULY 17, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD:

Your discussion of the captive nations resolution that you have introduced in Congress sounds most encouraging to us. We heard it on the Manion Forum yesterday. I've grown old and gray waiting for one President after another to find out what to do to defeat communism. We must discredit it and Khrushchev, too, to throw him off balance.

We will get nowhere as long as he can strut before the world and get away with it. Why have we been silent about those promised free elections? Why did we leave it to Adenhower to talk about the way they flee their paradise? We should still be talking about Katyn Forest and all the other cruelties.

The Senate should keep up a prickly heat on doing the things so boldly talked about. I will send a card to my Congressman urging him to support you, though he probably is already doing so.

I am proud of our delegation there in Washington.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. W. E. SHAFER.
ADA E. SHAFER.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The House Resolution 211 which you submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, deserves the attention of every legislator.

With the weapons of truth, the facts and common ideals it would be possible to overwhelm Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in the newly independent and underdeveloped nations.

Therefore, I hope that the new resolution gets the full support of the Congress.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
ROMAN POCZTAR.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 23, 1961.*

DEAR SIR: The House Resolution 211 you submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, has my complete support.

It is very important at the present moment to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism, the clever tool of which communism happens to be.

Very truly yours,
IWAN PAWNYK.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The House Resolution 211 you submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, should be supported by all.

With the weapons of truth would be possible to overwhelm Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign everywhere.

I hope that the new Resolution 211 gets the full support of Congress.

Very truly yours,
STEFAN ZACHARKIW.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

CLINTON, N.Y., *July 15, 1961.*

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Have just listened to your broadcast on the Manion Forum. I am all for Resolution 211, but I do not understand why this Government does not outlaw the Red party. We accept their cultural exchange, and all the rest of this outrageous nonsense, knowing full well that we are adding to their prestige by so

doing. We are getting ready for a hot war with Russia, yet at this very moment our athletes are over in Russia, with our flag and the Russian flag flying side by side.

On August 31, 1960, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, said on the floor of the House, that on Friday November 2, 1956, a high official in the U.S. State Department sent Tito a cable telling him the U.S. Government does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union. That was 5 days after the Hungarian Revolt. The Hungarians had won the revolt and drove the Russians out, but 48 hours after Tito got that cable from the State Department, they returned and reinvaded Hungary and smashed the revolt. No wonder people hate us, this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 17407, August 31, 1960. I wrote to Senator KEATING for the name of this State Department official but as yet he has not answered my letter.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARY J. MCGINNIS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
May 23, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Your House Resolution 211, submitted to the House on March 8, 1961, deserves the serious attention of everyone.

It is very important at the present moment to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism, the clever tool of which communism happens to be.

Very truly yours,

PAUL PRYSIAZNY.

STATESVILLE, N.C.,
July 17, 1961.

HONORABLE FLOOD: I am with you in full, as stated on the Dean Manion program Sunday. Push H.R. 211, and enlist all help possible in enacting it.

Keep America free.

Yours,

W. A. CAMPBELL.

LIGONIER, PA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I would like to add my voice to the millions of other Americans in supporting your House Resolution 211 pertaining to the Captive Nations Committee. Why are efforts such as yours never reported in the papers but have to be brought to the people by Dean Manion in his effort to back constitutional government?

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. KNOX.

FEDERATION OF UKRAINIAN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS OF AMERICA, INC.
New York, N.Y., July 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The fifth Congress of Ukrainian Students of America (SUSTA) which was held at Wayne State University in Detroit during the Fourth of July weekend has mandated the newly elected executive board in its resolutions on international affairs to communicate to you and to your colleagues in the Congress of the United States our wholehearted and unanimous support for your proposed bill to establish a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations, whose tenure would endure until such time as all the enslaved countries enumerated in the House Joint Resolutions 454 and 459 of July 17, 1959 and the Senate Joint Resolution 111 of the same date are made free and independent from Russian domination and Moscow-inspired communism.

Our fifth congress has urged the executive board to offer every form of assistance that we may mobilize. Enclosed is memorandum 3 as our first step toward implementing the wishes and resolutions of the Congress of Ukrainian Students of America. Furthermore, all the members of the executive board, a few of whom had even been born and escaped from the captive nations area, have expressed their willingness to testify in behalf of your proposed bill to establish a permanent congressional Committee on the Captive Nations.

The executive board is preparing a special report and memorandum which will be forwarded to you and to the House Rules Committee as well as to certain other Members of Congress under separate cover. It will explain the necessity and feasibility of the recent proposal of Congressman FLOOD in behalf of the captive nations.

It is significant that your proposal be expanded to include a recommendation that the President of the United States of America invite the leaders of the free world to Washington for the observance of Independence Day or during July for the commemoration of Captive Nations Week; and that the President together with the leaders of the countries of the free world issue a joint new declaration of independence that will assume as our common fight a universalized declaration of independence for all nations and all peoples everywhere and for all times, foremostly for the long-ignored non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union itself such as Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, and the others. The synchronization of the commemoration of the captive nations week with our own Independence Day celebrations is vital.

Yesterday, I spoke with Congressman ADAIR, of Indiana, during the 12th Colgate foreign policy conference at Colgate University in Hamilton, N.Y., regarding your proposal. ADAIR, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, indicated that there is a move to downgrade your proposal and to form a temporary Subcommittee on the Captive Nations as part of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I expressed my doubt as to the effectiveness of such a subcommittee which would be forever buried in the millieu of so many other less consequential affairs of state. Furthermore, only congressional committees with full status receive an independent budget for operations. This fact alone underscores the necessity for Congress to adopt your bill rather than a watered-down proposal. ADAIR is responsive to full committee status.

Moreover, our executive board is making recommendations to the executive board of the U.S. National Student Association (USNSA) before and at its forthcoming congress in August to adopt the following resolution:

1. Urge the formation of the collegiate Captive Nations Week movement by forming Captive Nations (study) Clubs at the various colleges and universities;

2. commemorate annually Captive Nations Week as a permanent extracurricular college activity;

3. mandate the USNSA vice president for international student affairs to establish a student committee to make a study of the conditions of the lack of academic freedom and student rights in the captive nations area and to publish that study so that its members and collegians at large may be more knowledgeable, more favorable, and more familiar with selecting student programs and action projects which would increase attention and promote the cause of academic freedom and student rights of the collegians within the captive nations area here within our own environment;

4. endeavor to establish a coordinating secretariat for both student unions and interested student organizations in the Western Hemisphere to promote the freedom and independence and the human liberties of the peoples of the captive nations through a pan-American effort;

5. request that the U.S. Postmaster General issue a commemorative stamp to honor the spirit and the fight for the captive nations for liberty through a Captive Nations Week commemorative series; moreover, urge that the U.S. Postmaster General continue and expand the present champion-of-liberty series, whose further extension is in doubt;

6. form a permanent commission to the USNSA Executive Board which would be composed of USNSA national, regional, and local officers as well as the national officers of such student organizations in the United States as the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America, the Lithuanian Student Association, the Association of Hungarian Students of North America and such other student organizations that may express a desire and willingness to cooperate in the study of the plight of the captive nations and in the promotion of the celebration of Captive Nations Week;

7. strive for a rededication to human freedom and national freedom, as well as reaffirm our belief that democartic government of the people, by the people and for the people is a universal right and principal, a basic craving of all mankind.

Moreover, we would be very grateful to you, if your office forwarded a letter to the executive board of the USNSA in support of a captive nations week movement on the college level and in favor of the ideas outlined above.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the chairman of the House Rules Committee with a letter recommending that the latter give this matter a prompt and fair hearing with favorable action in behalf of your bill to establish a permanent congressional Committee on the Captive Nations.

In your already very busy schedule, should you find time—we would appreciate a reply regarding our requests as well as our suggestions. Thank you very much for your initiative in the matter of the proposed bill. Our executive board supports you 100 percent in your proposal to form a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations with full committee status and an independent budget, which should endure until such time as human rights, academic freedom and student rights as well as national independence are attained by all dominated peoples in the captive nations area.

Best wishes and very warm regards,

Sincerely,

WALTER D. PRYBYLA, Jr.,
President.

MARCH 24, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The House Resolution 211 submitted by you to the House on March 8, 1961, has my full support.

It is very important to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain the help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism which communism really is.

Very truly yours,

WASYL RAJCA,

PARMA, OHIO.

MAY 24, 1961.

DEAR SIR: House Resolution 211 deserves the support of all.

With weapons of truth and the facts it would be possible to overwhelm Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in the newly independent and underdeveloped nations.

I hope that the new Resolution 211 gets the full support of Congress.

Very truly yours,

WALTER KMET,

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Physical Fitness Program Saluted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every Oklahoman is proud of the role which Coach Charles B. "Bud" Wilkinson, of the University of Oklahoma, has taken in the development of a physical fitness program for our Nation's youth, and in the selection of the Muskogee, Okla., School System to initiate this program.

This is a tribute not only to a fine city but also to the dedicated men and women who teach in the school system of Muskogee. As an Oklahoman, I am proud of many things in our State, but no part of the Sooner State has done more to advance the well-being and progress of our people than Oklahoma's schools. The President has made a wise choice in Coach "Bud" Wilkinson and in the city of Muskogee.

I submit a copy of Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 656, adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature, expressing its support and encouragement to the President's program of physical fitness, and commending Coach Wilkinson and the city of Muskogee School System.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 565

Concurrent resolution expressing support of the people of Oklahoma for the President's physical fitness program and commending the Muskogee school system for its selection as the first pilot program

(By Ruby, Haworth, and Spaker of the house and Shoemaker and Bohannon of the senate)

Whereas the physical condition of all of our citizens contributes to the strength of our Nation; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called this problem vividly to the attention of the people of America and has instituted a program of physical fitness which, if pursued diligently, will correct and improve many of the physical needs of our youth; and

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed one of Oklahoma's leading citizens, Coach Charles B. "Bud" Wilkinson of the University of Oklahoma, to organize a program for the improvement of the physical standards of the Nation's youth; and

Whereas Muskogee, Okla., school system has been chosen as the first pilot program for physical fitness in our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the 28th session of the Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein):

Section 1. That the Legislature of Oklahoma hereby expresses its support and encouragement to the President's program of physical fitness to the end that all children in our State, as well as our Nation, will be permitted and encouraged to meet the minimum standards of physical fitness.

SEC. 2. That the officials of the school system and the citizens of the city of Muskogee be commended and congratulated for their selection as the first pilot program for physical fitness in the Nation.

SEC. 3. That the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress be advised through the Oklahoma congressional delegation of the enthusiastic support of the people of Oklahoma for the President's program of physical fitness.

SEC. 4. That proper authenticated copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to the president of the Muskogee, Okla., School Board, Coach Charles B. "Bud" Wilkinson, University of Oklahoma, and the chairman of the Oklahoma delegation in the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 18th day of July 1961.

J. D. MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 24th day of July 1961.

GEORGE NIGH,
President of the Senate.

American Business Cycle Policy at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the able lecture which follows was delivered by Mr. Gerhard Colm, chief economist of the National Planning Association at the University of Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany, on July 28, 1961. It deserves the attention of all those concerned with the state of the American economy:

AMERICAN BUSINESS CYCLE POLICY AT THE CROSSROADS

(Lecture presented at the University of Frankfurt (Germany) on July 28, 1961, by Gerhard Colm, chief economist, National Planning Association.)

The American 1960–61 recession might have pleased the professional economic observer. Both the beginning of the recession and its probable duration were pretty well predicted in advance. It is also a consolation that the recession was mild and of short duration. Indeed, it was the mildest of the four postwar recessions. In the second quarter 1960—the peak of the preceding cycle—the gross national product amounted to $506 billion. In the first quarter 1961 it amounted to $495 billion (in 1960 prices) and is likely to reach $525 to $530 billion in the fourth quarter 1961 with still further gains expected for 1962.

In spite of this apparently good performance there are serious worries about the state of the American economy. The satisfaction about the quick recovery is impaired by the fact that unemployment has remained high. The index of industrial production in June had risen by 8 percent above its low point in February 1961 and has recovered the ground lost in the recession. However, the unemployment, amounting to almost 7 percent of the labor force, showed no improvement from the recession level and remained substantially above the 4 percent which is often regarded as a tolerable, even though not a desirable, rate. Even with the expected further rise in production, unemployment is expected to fall only slowly. This has given rise to the concern with unemployment as a structural or chronic phenomenon on which cyclical swings in unemployment are superimposed.

A second concern is with the question of how long a vigorous recovery movement will continue. The recovery after the 1957–58 recession was cut short, coming to an end long before a full employment level of production was reached. We are asking ourselves the anxious question: what is the likelihood that the 1961–62 recovery movement may also remain abortive and be cut off before full employment is reached?

We have had four recessions in 12 years, each of short duration and relatively mild. Nevertheless, the prospect of frequent fluctuations at a high but below full employment level is not encouraging. The concern with these prospects is widely shared by economists within Government, business, labor unions, and research organizations. However, the explanation of the causes and the opinions about the best remedies differ widely. I will attempt to outline three different approaches to interpreting and combatting these conditions. Because of the limitations in time, I must greatly simplify the positions taken. They will appear in my presentation as more clear cut and distinguishable from each other than they actually are.

I

There is first, I may say, the conventional position that the Government should pursue an effective anticyclical policy. Frequent recessions certainly are discouraging to business enterprise and therefore may well have a dampening effect on economic growth. Therefore, an improved anticyclical policy of the Government may also contribute to the solution of the growth problem.

During the whole post-war period economists have proposed plans for a refined anticyclical tax policy. During the last few months these efforts could record a great success through the recommendations of the Commission on Money and Credit but at the same time, so it appears, the U.S. Government missed a chance to practice what the advisors preached.

Last month the Commission on Money and Credit issued a report in which a greatly improved program for anti-cyclical policies is one of the highlights. It proposes that the built-in stabilizers be strengthened by delegating to the President the power to reduce or increase the first-bracket rate of the personal income tax within specified limits when slack or excess demand is indicated by available statistics. The President should announce to the Congress when the statistics indicate the need for a change in tax rates. The announcement to the Congress should be made 60 days before the effective date in order to give Congress a chance to veto the change in tax rates if a majority is inclined to do so. The anticyclical measures would be reversed when statistics indicate that the critical condition has disappeared. But a tax cut cannot be maintained for longer than 6 months unless special action for its continuation is taken.

It is significant that the men of public affairs who were members of the Commission—bankers, industrialists, union leaders, and farm leaders—could with only a few exceptions agree on such proposals, which will appear rather radical to many Congressmen.[1]

The Commission also recommends anticyclical variations in expenditure programs but places much less emphasis on these as compared with changes in tax rates. This is in contrast with the discussion and practice of the 1930's. At that time tax rates were relatively low so that they offered only limited leeway for reductions. This is different now with high tax rates, which at least have the advantage that they can be substantially reduced. Anticyclical expenditure policy also is less popular because it is believed that it may lead to make-shift programs. The really worthwhile programs usually require longer periods of preparation and initiation than is desirable for an antirecesson measure. Keeping worthwhile programs "on tap" leads to the paradoxical situation that people have to wait for a re-

Footnotes at end of speech.

cession in order to have desirable programs undertaken. Thus, much can be said in favor of anticyclical variation in the method of financing rather than in expenditures. On the other side of the argument, it probably remains true that a change in public works expenditures has a greater and more direct effect on employment and incomes than a change in tax rates. Also long term expenditure programs can in many cases be stepped up in pace or slowed down depending on economic conditions. In recent years one of the most effective means of anticyclical policy has been the variation in financial terms for residential construction; however, residential construction has appeared to be somewhat less responsive in the current cycle.

The refined anticyclical tax policy, as proposed by the CMC is expected to result in measures without the delay of drawn-out deliberations in the executive branch and in Congress. There is a serious question on my mind if not the existence of such a mechanism for semiautomatic tax action would contribute to a general feeling that the recession is being taken care of and that no more needs to be done.[2] Also the tax cut will not take place as promptly after the turning point towards a recession as it may appear. There is a fourfold timelag involved. First, the statistics which are used for "triggering" the mechanism become available only some time after the event (although methods for reducing this lag might be devised.) Second, in order to avoid responding merely to temporary statistical oscillations, crucial statistical series will have to indicate slack or excess demand for a considerable time before they can be used to "trigger" a change in tax rates. Third, the President's announcement of needed tax reduction would become effective only after 60 days in order to give Congress a chance of preventing the tax reduction from becoming effective. Finally, there is at least a short interval between the effective date of tax reduction and the time when payroll deductions and other income tax payments are actually reduced. Thus, the tax reduction would become effective at best 6 to 9 months after the actual turning point. In case of the most recent recession the CMC proposal would have become effective only after recovery was well underway. Thus, whatever merit there may be in a tax reduction at the time of recovery the proposal would not give an effective instrument for mitigating a recession.

The proposed mechanism is based on the conviction that positive congressional action to combat a recession would take too long a time. Discretionary action by the Government, as recently authorized in Great Britain, on the other hand, would not be feasible under American separation of powers between the executive and legislative branch of Government. Therefore, it appears quite logical to provide for a tax change under specified conditions subject to possible veto action by the Congress. Still this is a time-consuming process. I wonder if this might not be a challenge for Congress to develop a method for positive legislative action which under specified conditions would require less than the 2-month waiting period.

The proposed anticyclical mechanism is based on the conviction that the government should release purchasing power to consumers and increase its own expenditures when a slack appears and reverse these actions when the slack disappears. This, however, would not prevent a new recession from taking place even before the full employment level of production has been reached. Sole reliance on an anticyclical mechanism presupposes that the economy, although interrupted by infrequent recessions, is expanding vigorously and adequately.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The final version of the CMC report happened to be prepared at a time of a recession in the United States. Some economists urged the new Kennedy administration to recommend to Congress a temporary tax cut and a larger and quicker expansion in Government expenditure programs. Some increase in Government programs has been taking place as a result of steps taken by the previous administration. A further increase has been initiated by President Kennedy, but the current plans amount to somewhat less than had been recommended. The President did not suggest a tax cut at all.

His reasoning was probably that he is more concerned with the longer run political and economic problems of the United States than with the recession. He therefore assigned a higher priority to the increase in programs for defense, foreign aid, space research, housing, urban renewal, area redevelopment, education, and more adequate unemployment insurance. He feared that a proposal to reduce taxes, even temporarily, would increase congressional resistance to additional long range expenditure programs at the same time.

In spite of the concern with the recession the medium and longer term aspects of economic development demanded growing attention. That the recession was of short duration was satisfying but would the recovery be sustained and lead into a higher rate of growth than was experienced in the past or would recovery again be abortive and lead over into a new recession?

II

This leads to the second aspect of current thinking on cycle policy. Paul Samuelson and other economists have developed an explanation of why the recent recoveries remained abortive. One of the main reasons, in their opinion, is the fact that in a recovery period tax revenues rise by so much that a substantial part of increasing personal incomes and corporate profits cannot be used directly for additional expenditures but are absorbed into the Treasury and therefore have a deflationary impact. Thus, each of the calendar years 1958 and 1959 the cash budget showed deficits of $7 to $8 billion but shifted to a cash surplus of $3.6 billion in 1960. This phenomenon is only the reverse of the built-in stabilizers. They help to mitigate the downswing in a recession but also tend to dampen the recovery.

Furthermore, as soon as the economy pulled out of the recession the monetary authorities became concerned again with the price rise and adopted a mildly restrictive monetary policy—long before there was a threat of inflationary pressure from excess demand.

What is the likelihood that the present recovery too may be cut short before reaching the full employment level? The present vigor of the recovery movement is sparked primarily by two factors, namely the increase in Government expenditures and the switch from inventory liquidation to inventory buying. Consumer buying, business investment in plant and equipment, and residential construction are proceeding on a high and somewhat rising level but show no spectacular increases.

Some of the economic advisers of the administration believe that the pace of recovery may slow down once a higher plateau of Government expenditures has been reached and the inventory cycle completed, unless consumer expenditures, business fixed investments, and residential construction are stepped up. These expenditure increases would be reduced if the Treasury is permitted to take too big a tax bite out of rising incomes and profits and if the monetary authorities apply credit restrictions as soon as the slightest rise in prices occurs.

Therefore, thought is being given to a tax reduction in 1962 which would not merely be of the temporary antirecession type. In this connection the emphasis of the Council on the latent full employment budget surplus is significant. Assuming we had today full employment incomes and profits, Federal revenues would give us a surplus of $7 to $8 billion above the current level of Federal expenditures. The staff of the Joint Economic Committee has estimated even a higher latent budget surplus.[3] This surplus, however, is a ficticious figure because the full employment level of incomes and profits may never be realized unless taxes are reduced and/or Government expenditures are stepped up.

The idea of a permanent tax cut in 1962, as a means of promoting continued recovery, has more political appeal than a temporary tax cut as an antirecession measure. In spite of the general recognition by professional economists that deliberate budget deficits are a powerful antirecession weapon Congress is more inclined to vote a tax reduction in a recovery period when revenue yields are rising and a budget surplus is in sight. A tax cut during the recovery period would however be ill-timed if the recovery should turn out to be more vigorous than is now expected, particularly when Government expenditures should rise faster than expected. The alliance between economic reasoning and political expediency might become quite dangerous if a new doctrine developed according to which a recovery period, rather than a recession period, is the appropriate time for tax reduction.

Also, the Council of Economic Advisers has been emphatic in urging the Federal Reserve authorities and the home credit agencies to continue their policies of "nudging" down the long-term rate of interest. Less emphasis is given to the short run rate of interest because of its effect on the balance of payments situation.

The administration has recognized the possibility that prices and costs may continue to inch upward and that this may have undesirable effects on the competitiveness of American industry. On the other hand, it is also recognized that it would be undesirable to combat a rise in prices and costs by restrictive credit policies before coming near a full employment level of production. Therefore, it follows that other approaches should be developed to deal with so-called market power or cost-push inflation. The President has appointed an Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy for developing recommendations in this field. The committee, initially busy with other topics, has recently begun discussions of this problem. With what I believe to be a temporary alleviating of the price and wage pressure, this problem has moved somewhat into the background. At present, the open-market policy of the Federal Reserve is supplemented by the "open mouth" policy urging business and labor to exercise self-restraint. We must wait and see whether the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy will put some teeth into the "open mouth."

In this section we have been dealing with fiscal and monetary policies which would remove obstacles in the path of full recovery. While these views go beyond recommending occasional "shot in the arm" policies to combat recessions they emphasize negative measures, designed to remove obstacles from economic growth. I will deal in the next section with a third approach that emphasizes positive measures in support of economic growth.

III

A positive long-term approach to economic growth uses the national economic budget as a tool or at least as a frame of mind. It looks at available men, technological advances, and machines, not as a cause for em-

barrassment but as an opportunity to meet needs of highest urgency.

Without assuming any spectacular change in productivity, labor force, and hours of work, one can estimate the increase in total production under full employment conditions which appears feasible and necessary under given economic and social institutions. In the coming decade the labor force will increase at a higher rate than in the past due to the period of a high and rising birth rate during the last two decades. The rate of improvement in output per man-hour also is expected to rise due to rapid advances in technology. In the light of the spectacular technological possibilities (automation) it may even appear surprising that productivity has not risen more in recent years. Our statistics can measure only the net increase in output, and I surmise that we have had positive and retarding factors operating at the same time. Also many of the new technologies are still in the initial stages in which their effects have not yet been realized fully. Therefore, I would expect an increase in the rate of growth in output per man-hour not only in manufacturing industry but also in banking and other services in the future. Laborsaving technological developments become of social benefit only insofar as, in the process of growth, additional demands and, therefore, additional work opportunities are created, or the desired period of work over one's lifetime is reduced.

The Council of Economic Advisers regards 3.5 percent as a rate of growth which appears normal under existing conditions and attitudes but would and should be increased by tax incentives and other measures, such as support of education, research, and training. Our NPA projections indicate a continuing growth rate of 4½ percent as feasible without need to resort to "heroic" measures to force a higher rate of growth. Thus, for example, for 1970, potential gross national product (in present prices) should be about $790 billion or $275 billion above the 1961 gross national product.

Part of this increased output will be preempted by expenditures needed to accommodate the increased work force and tools of production. In 1970, the labor force will be almost 20 percent above its current level. Simply to supply goods and services enjoyed by the present population would require over $60 billion of additional output, while supplying them with the current per capita amount of educational and other nondefense Government services would require another $10 to $12 billion. Finally, supplying these additional workers with the current amount of capital stock per employee would require some $150 billion of which about $18 billion can be considered as coming out of the potential 1970 output. Thus, of the potential increase of $275 billion between 1961 and 1970, almost $100 billion would be needed to provide for the additional labor and capital at present standards of living. About $175 billion could become available for additional programs in the public sector, for improvements in private consumption, for increased capital exports or foreign aid, and for speeding up the modernization and expansion of our productive plant. This is a large amount for additions in these public and private fields. But it is not an exorbitant amount in view of the tasks that need to be performed. Depending on the judgment concerning the urgency of these tasks in relation to the desirability of leisure, the increase in production can be stepped up or reduced by greater change in the hours of work, retirement age and other factors influencing the size of the available man-hours.

The approach I am outlining would assume as a working hypothesis that the relative division of expenditures between private and public sectors will remain approximately the same as it is at present. This hypothesis can later be modified if high priorities either in the public or in the private sector suggest a modification of this division. Such a modification could be accomplished through upward or downward revision in taxes.

At present, the public sector (including transfer expenditures) amounts to almost 30 percent of the gross national product in the United States while excluding transfers it amounts to 20 percent. Dividing the potential increase over current levels in production in the same manner gives us a hypothetical increase in Government goods and services expenditures of per year almost $60 billion by 1970. Are there highest priority needs in the public sector which would require use of these potential resources? I do not pretend that I can discuss here the answer to this question of what is likely to emerge in the United States. I only note that this kind of question is being asked and debated, although in a still unsystematic and desultory manner. A few years ago President Eisenhower asked a citizens' committee to look into certain aspects of defense needs and what could be done to meet them. The committee, the so-called Gaither committee, presented him with a report which stated such high figures both for what the members thought was needed and what could be afforded by using the potential of the American economy that the report was never made public and was buried under a top secret label. Later President Eisenhower appointed a special Committee on National Goals which published an admirable statement on the needs in various fields but did not discuss the crucial question of priorities nor undertook to relate the growth potential to these specific goals.[4] President Kennedy has stated in various messages what, in his opinion, are the current needs in defense, education, housing, urban renewal, and foreign economic development aid. However, he, too, has not yet presented any consistent and long-term program of what needs and can be done. Some official estimates have been made of the needs in the field of water resources development, retraining, social insurance, and most recently, of measures needed in support of air transportation. A congressional commission will report soon on the long-term needs in outdoor recreation. The Budget Bureau has recently compiled a budget outlook covering 4 years beyond the insuing year as a guide for budget policies.

In some fields private research organizations have gone far beyond the official statements. Thus, in the field of urban renewal, estimates have been published of the needs for interrelated public and private outlays which indicate that present plans hardly begin to scratch the surface of the task. The Conference on Economic Progress, a private organization, under the direction of Leon Keyserling, has developed budgets of public and private needs based on a high rate of economic growth.

Crucial for the whole Government sector is the future for defense needs. If they have to be stepped up nondefense programs must proceed more slowly than otherwise. If the needed increase is substantial even some relative rise in the public sector through increased tax rates should be considered. If defense expenditures can be reduced nondefense programs can advance more rapidly. In this case through substantial tax reduction it may be possible to allow a percentage increase in private consumption somewhat larger than the increase in the public sector.

If defense expenditures will continue to absorb the present 9 to 10 percent of the gross national product, the increase over current levels in the nondefense Government programs (excluding transfers) may amount to $35 billion in the year 1970. Urban renewal and improved mass transportation in metropolitan areas would certainly absorb a considerable portion of that increase. It would probably be executed through local authorities and financed largely by their own bond issues. However, Federal guarantees or occasional purchases of bonds by a Government finance corporation (like the FNMA purchases of mortgages) may be needed to provide proper incentives for a program of adequate size and character. It would also require close cooperation between the public and private planning and investments for urban renewal. The largest increase in investments would presumably come from private sources.

A second area which requires Government initiative is a comprehensive program in scientific research. The President announced landing a team of men on the moon as an objective to be achieved before the end of the decade. This proposal found only moderate popular support (according to the Gallup poll) and certainly did not evoke undivided enthusiasm. Actually a space expedition to the moon could only be regarded as one byproduct of a many-sided interrelated research effort which would affect all sciences and would have its primary payoff in applications here on earth while at the same time making research expeditions into space possible and serve as a dramatic demonstration of a scientific achievement.

Capital export and foreign assistance to the underdeveloped countries is another field in which substantial increases will be needed.

Greatest need in the private sector is the increase in the standard of living of the still approximately 8 million families with submarginal incomes. Simply raising these families to decent standards would require about $15 billion of the potential added output in the private sector. Private and public measures which increase the productivity of workers, either in their present or higher skilled jobs, are the best means to accomplish this purpose. They include: Government programs for education, mental and physical health, labor mobility, public and private measures to reduce discrimination in employment practices, and to encourage the employment of handicapped and older workers.

I could go on and on enumerating things which need to be done and must be done before we can really say that we have become so affluent that a substantial increase in leisure is more important to our society than an increase in production.

There is no question in my mind that the urgent tasks in the public sector could absorb more than the $35 billion increase in funds which would become available for nondefense purposes if a full-employment gross national product in 1970 were divided in the present manner between defense and nondefense tasks of Government and private activities.

Once a broad, long-term outline of the high-priority activities in the public sector has been formulated and debated, we should go ahead—building up and developing the programs year by year in accord with the long-term plan. If Government outlays are established in accordance with such an outline as based on full employment prospects then the rise in the Government sector would act as a stimulus when actual gross national product drops because of a recession or a slower rate of growth. Such a procedure would give the best chance that the private sector will expand, both in investment and consumption, so that potential production both in the public and the private sector will be approximately realized. The increase in the private sector, irrespective of whether it expands independently of the public sector or is stimulated by the public sector, will then produce the revenues which will approximately

Footnotes at end of speech.

match the increase in Government outlays.

This is not a drastic departure from the past. The quite regular increase in State and local outlays has been one of the supporting factors of growth in recent years. Also Federal Government programs have at times greatly added to aggregate demand but in spurts and lags. Most of the larger private enterprises are now planning their investments on a longer term basis. This practice is believed to be in the interest of the corporations and at the same time contribute to more stable economic growth. Is it really such a revolutionary proposal to ask that the Federal Government, the largest undertaking in the country, follow the same practice?

This approach does not mean that the Government sector should necessarily grow continuously in size relative to the private sectors of the economy. The approach could be developed with the Government sector remaining the same proportion to the full employment size of the economy, a reduced proportion, or expanded proportion. However, under this approach the programs in the Government sector would play a different role in the dynamics of economic development, having a growth-inducing and growth-supporting effect not only once in a while in a recession but consistently. The effect would be consistent because increased Government and private spending would maintain the demand and encourage the prospects for expanding markets, while at the same time many of the Government programs would improve the efficiency in private production. The Government would act as a "built-in stabilizer," but stabilizing not only by reducing cyclical fluctuation but by helping to sustain an adequate rate of growth.

The national economic budget approach does not suggest a reform which could be adopted in a formal manner by one act of Congress. It is a proposal which first should begin to permeate the thinking in the executive and legislative branches and in the business community and then lead to long-term programs in a number of specific areas without becoming incorporated in one all-embracing master plan.

This national economic budget approach is primarily designed to assure that the Nation's resources are allocated to highest priority needs and that full use is made of potential resources.

Such long-term Government programs would also help in making decisions in the tax adjustments discussed in the previous section. I believe it is probably right that the present "implied full employment budget surplus" is an obstacle to sustained recovery and growth in the American economy. But before taxes can be reduced the legislators must know what part of this surplus is likely to be wiped out by an increase in expenditures. It may even well be that some part of government capital outlays (e.g., outlays of the authorities for urban renewal) should be financed not by taxation but by bond issues. Also tax adjustments should promote a relationship between capital investment and consumption, which sustains a high rate of growth. All such questions can best be examined within the framework of a national economic budget.

This point may require a brief explanation. Neoclassical thinking is inclined to believe that all that is needed to increase the rate of growth is an increase in the proportion of national income devoted to saving and investment, and a decline in the proportion used for private consumption or government services. Three important qualifications are needed with respect to this proposition. One is that sustained growth requires not only an increase in capital but also a corresponding increase in aggregate demand. There may be countries—a possible example is Great Britain—where an inadequate expansion of investment results in a relatively low rate of growth. But there are also other countries in which the rate of growth has been dampened by an inadequate expansion of aggregate private consumption and public demand. The United States and Canada in recent years may be examples in this category. A second qualification is that capital needed for expansion consists not only of plant and equipment but also of the very important social overhead investments (such as transportation facilities, water resources, and the intangible investments in education, health, training, technology, and also in such factors as labor-management relations). The third qualification refers to the fact that we had over the decades not only laborsaving but also capital-saving technological advances. Thus, even a constant proportion of capital investment may support a rising rate of economic growth.

A policy designed to increase the rate of growth in the American economy from the 2½ percent rate of recent years (1953 to middle of 1961) to 4½ percent will require long term planning of Federal programs. It will also require that business managers in their investment and modernization decisions raise their sights and use market potentials as their guide. Whether an increase in the rate of growth will also require special measures shifting, for example, a substantial amount of taxes from corporate profits to consumption is difficult to predict. Under conditions in the United States, I believe that a substantial increase in the rate of growth is possible with only a small increase in the rate of a full employment gross national product going to plant and equipment. This is a highly controversial issue among American economists

If policies in the public and private sector are oriented toward a determined long-term goal of growth cyclical policy could be made an integral part of such an approach. Monetary policies, fiscal policies, and debt management policies can be most effective if the basic strength of economic expansion is assured. In the absence of such basic strength an economy which is pepped up by periodic shot-in-the-arm injections may only bump along from one recession to another one.

If a part of the public outlays (e.g., for urban renewal and mass transportation) is financed by bond issues a considerable contribution to an anticyclical policy could be made by debt management policies.[5] In a period of prosperity the bonds of these authorities should be issued at the public market in competition with private issues at interest rates needed to place them. In periods of slack, a government finance corporation may acquire such bonds financed in turn by government debt transaction. In such a period the financing of the public or semipublic undertaking would not divert funds from private use, but would form a net addition to national investment and therefore would have an expansionary effect.

Having reached this point I realize that the title "American Business Cycle Policy at the Crossroads" is wholly inaccurate. First, there is no crossroads. I did outline three approaches: the conventional anticyclical policy designed to mitigate a recession by a variable expenditure and tax policy; the newly emphasized policy which proposes measure of tax adjustments and monetary policy designed to remove obstacles in the path of sustained recovery; and finally a government policy which affirmatively supports sustained economic growth. However, these are not three different roads, among which American policy has to choose. Rather the suggestion is that sustained economic growth is the main road and that adjustments for the removal of obstacles and cyclical variations are important paths which feed into the main road.

Thus, the title is also wrong when it suggests that the main objective is the combatting of the business cycle. The superior objective is the promotion of well-being and performance of necessary national tasks which require sustained economic growth. If this goal is successfully pursued it will be that much easier also to combat economic fluctuations.

---

[1] The CMC report also recommends measures in support of growth but is less specific in that respect. A critical view of too frequent tax and expenditure changes as a result of the emphasis on anticyclical policies was taken by the CMC Vice Chairman H. Christian Sonne, in a dissenting footnote and a separate report, published in June 1961.

[2] These proposals reflect largely recommendations made by a group of academic economists 12 years ago at NPA's Princeton meeting on fiscal policy (September 1949) published by Joint Committee on Economic Report, 81st Cong., 1st sess., hearings, p. 6 ff.

[3] The Joint Economic Report 1961. Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 328 (May 2, 1961), p. 120 ff.

[4] There is a chapter on economic growth which is valuable in itself but not related to the goals discussed in the other parts of the report.

[5] Mr. Sonne, in the separate CMC report, quoted above alludes to this possibility.

The 1961 Graduate of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much about juvenile delinquency and irresponsible youth, it is worthwhile, I believe, to pause occasionally and reflect on some of the accomplishments of our young citizens. For example, one young man from my own congressional district has given me just cause for pride and, at the same time, reaffirmed my faith in our future generation.

James Dan Batchelor, of Durant, Okla., has been named the 1961 graduate of the year by the international legal fraternity of Phi Delta Phi. Under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the RECORD the summary of his activities which appeared in the fraternity's publication, the Brief.

Perhaps this listing of outstanding achievements will serve as an incentive for some; for some it will no doubt be a reassurance. For me, it will be a justification of faith in a fine young man who will go on to compile a still more impressive record in the future:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE GRADUATE OF THE YEAR: JAMES DAN BATCHELOR

Province X, Holmes Inn (University of Oklahoma). Age, 25. Hometown, Durant, Okla.

LAW SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

National president of the American Law Student Association 1960–61; second vice president, American Law Student Association, 1959–60. Member of Oklahoma moot

court team which went to the national finals in New York City and placed second in both 1959 (to Willamette) and 1960 (to Ohio State). Member of the first-place team in southwest regional moot court competition in both 1950 and 1960. Winner of first place in junior moot court competition 1960.

Member of board of editors of Oklahoma Law Review. Notes certified for publication include: "Trusts: Spendthrift Trusts in Oklahoma" (May 1961); "Domestic Relations, Custody of Minors" (August 1961). Comment on "Oklahoma Law of Presumptions" certified by editor in chief as in editorial review.

Member of board of governors of Oklahoma College of Law. Vice president of freshman class; McGuiness Fellow; member of Oklahoma evidence research project; eligible for Coif.

FRATERNITY ACTIVITIES

Magister of Holmes Inn 1959–60 during which time membership of inn was practically doubled.

UNDERGRADUATE RECORD

B.S. with honors, Southeastern State College of Oklahoma. President, Oklahoma Intercollegiate Student Association 1956. Omicron Delta Kappa; blue key; Pi Kappa Delta (forensic honorary); Sigma Delta Tau (honorary English fraternity). Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities, 2 years.

First place, debate in following tournaments: Tulane University, 1956; Baylor University, 1956; Pi Kappa Alpha regional, 1956; Oklahoma Intercollegiate, 1957; Missouri Valley, 1959.

Superior, extemporaneous speaking, Pi Kappa Delta National Tournament 1955, 1957. One of top six debaters at Dartmouth Debate Tournament 1957. Second ranked individual speaker at Notre Dame National Tournament, 1957.

Civil Defense Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this week I have sat in a quiet committee room and listened to one expert after another give my Military Operations Subcommittee his blood-chilling estimates of the carnage we might expect in the event of a thermonuclear attack upon the major cities of our Nation.

I have heard, too, of the appalling lack of preparedness of our country as a whole, and our citizens individually, to meet such a catastrophe. Our subcommittee has been told that tens of millions of American citizens could be protected against fallout if adequate shelter is made available.

Certainly the Federal Government, under the Constitution, bears the burden of providing for its citizens an adequate defense. However, there rests with each individual citizen also the responsibility of providing for his own protection, even as he puts a lock on his door or removes his car keys from the ignition. In the event that public shelters are not readily accessible, in the event that the amount of warning time is brief, it is essential that suitable provisions be made in every home for an area safe from fallout.

It seems to me essential that the Government accord each individual citizen and private corporation the necessary incentive to provide such shelter areas. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation which would allow as a tax deduction an amount equal to 50 percent of any expenses paid or accrued by a taxpayer in the construction of an approved civil defense shelter, allowable for the taxable year in which the shelter is completed, but which would also include any expenses incurred during the preceding taxable year. Such shelters would be constructed to meet specifications established by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

I urgently call the attention of my distinguished colleagues who serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means to this legislation. It demands their swift action.

Controls Under Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, last week when the omnibus farm bill, H.R. 8230, was debated on the floor of the House, the following remarks were made:

Mr. SANTANGELO. We have seen the spectacle of a farmer dramatizing the situation by the gift of a Cadillac car for not producing feed grain. Can you tell this body how much it would have cost the Government if this gentleman had planted the corn or feed grain?

Mr. COOLEY. It certainly would have cost the Government far more than the farmer received from the Government for not planting corn under this new program.

Mr. POAGE. According to the information I have, that would cost the Government about 50 percent more had this gentleman not collected those payments and gone ahead and planted all his land in unneeded grain. In other words, he would come out with $4,500 or more, whereas he has actually received about $3,000.

I thought it would be helpful to have Farmer William T. Smith's position properly represented to the House. Therefore, following the debate I telephoned Mr. Smith in New York to inquire as to whether the additional cost reported by the gentleman from Texas is accurate. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Smith's comments, which were taken over the telephone verbatim with his permission, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is absolutely untrue that it would have cost the Government 50 percent more had I not collected these payments and gone ahead and planted the 104 acres that the Government is now paying me not to plant. I utilize the corn that would have been raised on this 104 acres for feeding. I would not have taken a loan on this crop, so Mr. POAGE's statement is entirely wrong. In other words, in this particular case it would not have cost the Government a penny if I had gone ahead and planted corn on these 104 acres. This is why I bought the Cadillac to show how ridiculous this whole program is. In addition to that, I will fertilize and take good care of the other 150 acres I planted in corn this year and probably will grow just as much without the diverted acreage. Then this fall I'll plant a wheat crop on the same diverted land. It won't be harvested until next year, so I'll be following the same program. Furthermore, the new feed grain program makes it possible to take out any land you want, and I have taken the poorest land out of production. Other farmers do the same.

When asked his opinion on the wheat program, Mr. Smith said:

Historically the wheat program has been a failure. Under this program about 30 percent of the potential wheat-growing acreage has been taken out of production, yet on the 70 percent of land left we are still producing the same amount of wheat. The yield on less land has been the same or better than the original amount of land. In my opinion, the feed grain program will lead in the same disastrous direction without solving the surplus problem.

When asked about the feed grain program, Mr. Smith stated:

This is morally and economically wrong. This is a major step toward Federal control of all farm commodities. This is Mr. Freeman's model program of how to start Government controls of farm commodities. I know I am just one farmer, but there are a lot who feel the same way I do. If these programs continue, we will have an inspector on each corner of the farm dictating our every move.

Combating Centralization of Power in Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Senator COTTON placed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Hampton (N.H.) Union suggesting a program of individual responsibility in combating the alarming centralization of power in the Federal Government.

The editorial proposed a do-it-yourself habit, recommending that the best way to protect local self-government is to exercise it. It suggested that individuals try to solve their problems individually or cooperatively before turning to the Government for help. It also proposed that local officials not turn to Washington, hand outstretched, palm upward.

I am proud to say that the people in my district believe in this philosophy and practice it. Recently I placed in the RECORD a news release about a building firm in Rapid City, S. Dak., which is providing low-cost housing without Federal financing or controls. This housing is available to families in the $300 to $400 per month income bracket. This is a fine example of private enterprise doing what the Government has been attempting to do for years without much success.

Another trend away from Washington aid is the decision of the South Dakota Board of Regents, on which I formerly served, to try to find private financing for the $375,000 needed to build a student union building at the school of mines and technology in Rapid City. An $800,000 building is being planned, and the college has over $400,000 available. It would be a simple matter to obtain the remaining money from the Housing and Home Finance Agency at a low interest rate. Instead, however, the regents propose to sell bonds to private investors to finance the project.

I am sure there are many here in Washington who will applaud this trend away from dependence upon Washington. Too often recently individuals, local and State government has fallen into a pattern of turning to Federal Government on every type of problem, with the result that the bureaucracy here in Washington has grown in size and power. I hope there are more who will follow the lead toward greater self-reliance of the independent, vigorous, aggressive people in South Dakota such as the Knecht Institute for Essential Housing and the South Dakota Board of Regents.

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call attention to a very fine organization which has contributed much to America and to the world in the field of sports. The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States was established on January 21, 1888, and it has been going strong ever since.

I include herewith a special release by the Helms Athletic Foundation, through its managing director, W. R. "Bill" Schroeder, Los Angeles, Calif., which gives in detail the history of the organization in the field of amateur sports in the United States and throughout the world:

THE AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION OF THE UNITED STATES

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is one of the most remarkable organizations in existence. It was established at New York City on January 21, 1888, following a preliminary meeting which was held on October 1, 1887. The AAU, as the organization is commonly known, was created at a time when there was great need for exacting supervision of amateur athletics in America.

Prior to the formation of the AAU, amateur athletics in America were controlled and supervised by the National Association of Amateur Athletes of America. This was an organization which had good intentions, but it was not adequate nor gifted with manpower in sufficient quantity to exercise control over a rapidly expanding amateur athletic program. For years, New York City and the surrounding area had been the scene of most amateur athletic competition.

By 1888, amateur athletics had grown to become popular in many sections of the United States, but supervision of them beyond the Far East was lacking. There was therefore need for an organization to give them guidance on a national basis. Thus the AAU was instituted.

Evidence of the fact that amateur athletics were suffering from growing pains is noted by representation which was granted charter membership in the AAU at the inaugural meeting—Athletic Club of the Schuylkill Navy, of Philadelphia; New York Athletic Club; Detroit Athletic Club; Chicago Amateur Athletic Association; Columbia Athletic Club, of Washington, D.C.; New Jersey Athletic Club, of Bayonne; Staten Athletic Club, of West Brighton, Staten Island; Pastime Athletic Club, of New York; Olympic Athletic Club, of New York; Cape May, N.J., City Athletic Club; Warren Athletic Club, of Wilmington, Del.; Chester City, Pa., Athletic Club; Nassau Athletic Club of Brooklyn; and the Stevens Institute Athletic Club of Hoboken, N.J. It wasn't long before other clubs in various sections of the Nation were brought into the fold.

The initial officers of the AAU were President Harry McMillan, Philadelphia, and Secretary Otto Ruhl, of New York City.

Within 2 months after it was created, the AAU had broadened its membership to more than 20 clubs. The AAU's first championships were those for boxing, wrestling, and fencing, held at New York City on April 6, 1888. These were followed by gymnastics championships, also held at New York City on April 28, 1888.

The first national AAU outdoor track and field championships were staged at Detroit on September 18, 1888.

After the AAU was organized, there was, quite naturally, bitterness between the National Association of Amateur Athletes of America and the Amateur Athletic Union, the former being responsible for most of it. Both claimed jurisdiction over amateur athletics in America, although the AAU gained much more ground on this score than did its adversary.

So incensed did the NAAAA become that it elected to stage a western championship meeting in Detroit, with intended opposition to the AAU's national title engagement. This prompted the AAU to adopt this resolution on August 25, 1888:

"*Resolved*, That any amateur competing in any open athletic games in the United States under the rules of the approved National Association, will be debarred from competition in any games held under the rules of the AAU."

The AAU's resolution was looked upon by the NAAAA as a declaration of war, and such seemed to be the case. When the national association held its national championship meeting in New York City, all of the athletes who participated in it were promptly barred by the AAU.

One of the strongest clubs in the NAAAA was the strengthy Manhattan AC of New York City. However, this club elected to compete in the AAU's championships in Detroit. Hostilities between the AAU and the NAAAA continued for more than a year.

Realizing that the fight between two hostile organizations was dealing a lethal punch to amateur athletics in America, two prominent members of the AAU board, Col. A. G. Mills of the New York AC, and A. C. Stevens of the New Jersey AC, proposed a truce plan to President Harry McMillan. The latter then appointed a committee to meet with a similar committee representing the NAAAA.

The result of the meeting was that hostilities ceased, and the NAAAA agreed to relinquish control of amateur athletics, terminate operation, and encourage its member clubs to join forces with the AAU. Now, alone, the AAU was in complete charge of amateur athletics in America, jurisdiction which it has held since 1888.

Today, the AAU claims jurisdiction of these amateur sports in the United States: Basketball, boxing, gymnastics, handball, track and field, swimming (including diving, water polo, and synchronized swimming), wrestling, weightlifting, volleyball, bobsledding, ice hockey, horseshoe pitching, judo, baton twirling, and luge. Previously the AAU claimed jurisdiction over other sports, including underwater spearfishing.

Not in boastful manner, but with pride, the Amateur Athletic Union evaluates, in its own words, its firm stand on amateur athletics insofar as athletes are concerned: "The AAU insists that its athletes receive a square deal. Those familiar with the organization can truthfully say that the Amateur Athletic Union has made amateur sport in America what it is today and has given it a firm standing. It has made other organizations possible. It unceasingly strives to keep apart in competition the amateur and the professional, and at all times aims to protect the amateur."

The Amateur Athletic Union is remarkable in that the majority of its operation, by far, is conducted by sportsmen and sportswomen throughout the United States who freely, generously, and unselfishly contribute their services without compensation, and without thought of recognition or benefit.

There are but few who are identified with the AAU who receive remuneration for their services, to which they are entitled as full-time employees. However, these few contribute services far beyond the line of duty, and are constantly on call—day and night.

Elected officers of the AAU, other than salaried secretaries of the organization, receive no compensation, nor do national or association committee chairmen or committeemen, nor do the thousands of officials who supervise countless athletic events. Furthermore, the activities of all of the latter, including travel, are carried on at their own expense. In addition, the AAU officials render their services to collegiate athletic programs throughout the Nation on the same basis.

It would be impossible to estimate the expense which would be necessary to compensate AAU officials—as in football, baseball and various other sports—if they were to be remembered with even modest fees for their services. It might exceed a million dollars a year—possibly much more.

Surprisingly so, and despite the success which the Amateur Athletic Union has enjoyed, its achievements and its contributions to a worthy cause, the organization has been subjected, on countless occasions, to criticism—sometimes sharply, and often times unjustly so. Those who have done this, it has been found, have not been aware of the true facts at hand.

Those who have been quick to judge with disfavor upon AAU actions and decisions, down through the years, have, for the most part, been those who, themselves, have contributed very little to amateur athletics.

Those athletes who have been benefited immeasurably by AAU supervision who have elected to direct harsh criticism against the Amateur Athletic Union, might well weigh their own circumstances, and finally judge if they might have been at fault.

Like any other organization of comparable stature, the AAU has its adopted rules and regulations. Those who accept them, and abide by them, in proper procedure, are never endangered. Those who abuse them, and violate them, are subject to disqualification. If the AAU did not have this control, amateur athletics in America would be right back where they started when the AAU took over with courage in 1888.

In 1938, on the 50th anniversary of the AAU, Daniel J. Ferris, long the secretary of the Amateur Athletic Union, and now honorary secretary, reported:

"The Amateur Athletic Union, as organized in 1888, was a union of clubs, with a board of governors of 12, but the expansion of sport in the United States under its auspices met with such spontaneous approval that clubs sprang up all over the land, and it became at once apparent that the mechanism of athletic government was becoming too unwieldy.

"The system of scheduling games led to much confusion, and the AAU was often called upon to adjust differences as far west as the Pacific coast and as far south as New Orleans, until the activities in the late eighties became so great that the older heads in the union realized that something must be done to remain intact and still have control.

"In 1889, Col. A. G. Mills, a member of the AAU board, worked out what was termed, and still regarded, the 'Mills reorganization plan.' Colonel Mills, the farseeing man which he was, suggested that each section of the country, as it was growing rapidly and developing, should have home rule, and instead of the union being an association of clubs, it should become a union of associations, active and allied.

"Colonel Mills' plan, after having been given proper study and consideration, was brought to the attention of athletic leaders in the East, West, North, and South, and was finally presented to the Amateur Athletic Union in meeting at the Columbia Athletic Club House in Washington, D.C., in 1890, and was adopted unanimously.

"In the spring of 1891 the association was thus formed, being designated as 'Metropolitan, New England Atlantic, Central, and Pacific Coast Associations.' Each held conventions, electing officers and four delegates to the AAU. Two of the latter from each association were chosen to become members of the board of governors.

"The wisdom of the Mills plan was immediately apparent. A market increase in interest, both locally and nationally, was instantly noted and has continued unabated since 1889. A liberal estimate of the number of competing athletes in the year 1888 in the United States would be approximately 3,000. Today, there are millions."

Now, in 1961, there are 51 associations which comprise the AAU family, as follows: Adirondack, Allegheny, Arizona, Arkansas, Carolinas, Central, Central California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Florida Gold Coast, Georgia, Gulf, Hawaiian, Indiana, Inland Empire, Intermountain, Iowa, Kentucky, Lake Erie, and Maine.

Also Metropolitan, Michigan, Middle Atlantic, Midwestern, Minnesota, Missouri Valley, Montana, New England, New Jersey, New Mexico, Niagara, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Ozark, Pacific, Pacific Northwest, Pacific Southwest, Rocky Mountain, South Atlantic, South Texas, Southeastern, Southern, Southern Nevada, Southern Pacific, Southwestern, Virginia, West Texas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The basic fundamentals and principles of the Amateur Athletic Union, like those provided for in the Constitution of the United States, have changed but little as the years have passed. Those precepts which were adopted by the AAU in 1888, and the early years of the organization covered amateur's athletism well and quite definitely. However, legislation of them, as trends have demanded, have been changed immeasureably in order to maintain a progressive and current pace.

The work which is carried on by the Amateur Athletic Union, in the interest of amateur athletics in America, is voluminous. This is of significance for most of this work is carried on by those who contribute their services.

Briefly, the Amateur Athletic Union supervises those amateur sports over which it has control, registers and protects their participants from professional interference, supervises and conducts district and national championship meetings, and provides the officials to direct them, coordinates international amateur athletic relations, shares in the U.S. Olympic Committee's far-reaching activities, and participates in the U.S. Olympic Fund campaigns. In addition, the AAU participates actively in the U.S. Olympic development, and physical fitness programs.

The operation of the AAU, throughout its livelihood, has been sound, and it has been controlled with firm hand in order to protect the ideals which the organization covets, and has taken the responsibility to champion.

The Amateur Athletic Union has never been controlled by a chosen few. To the contrary, it has been supervised by election of its member associations in every section of the Nation, all of whom have equal rights and privileges, and the opportunity to exercise them. Annual conventions and meetings are open to those who hold membership in the AAU, and who are delegated to be represented.

Those who hold membership in the Amateur Athletic Union family, all of whom treasure this affiliation, are amateur athletes, and former athletes, coaches, sportsmen, civic leaders, patrons of amateur sports, and men and women of distinction—including doctors, lawyers, judges, government officials, business executives, and those identified with religion. All of these hold high the ideals which are fostered by the Amateur Athletic Union, and it is their demand that the rules and regulations which they, themselves, have adopted, be enforced.

So then, as America's freedom liberties allow, the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is an organization which was designed by the people, and for the people—as those who would be willing to devote the time and effort would serve in the cause of amateur athletics in a nation which regards them as an important part in the American way of life.

In view of the fact that all who are identified with the Amateur Athletic Union have equal power of election, by majority vote of their district associations, the AAU is an organization of free enterprise, and it is one of unchallenged dignity and integrity.

Those who may choose to direct criticism toward the AAU may just as well point their finger at a doctor in Massachusetts, a lawyer in North Carolina, a coach in California, an athlete in Ohio, a former athlete in North Dakota, a judge in Illinois, a civic leader in Arizona, a business executive in Colorado, a patron of wholesome amateur athletics in Louisiana, and more than a million good American citizens in every State of the Union, including Alaska, and Hawaii.

Should there ever come a time when any agency might question the integrity of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, and the operation which this wholesome organization has carried on in proper manner for a period of 74 years, there will be quite a crowd of distinguished visitors in the city in which the discussion might be held—to uphold the AAU cause.

As the years have mounted, the Amateur Athletc Union has joined hands with the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the YMCA, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the Armed Forces of the United States, the Youth Services, and the People-to-People Sports Committee, in a common cause—to protect cherished amateur athletics. Their memberships total millions of American citizens.

The Amateur Athletic Union has never, in its history, restricted any American—regardless of his race, color, or religion—to any participation whatsoever. Its activities—competition or supervision—are available for one, and for all. The AAU has been America at its best—its very best.

Insofar as the 1961 AAU controversy is concerned, it seems that there are a few athletes, and former athletes who gained fame as the result of AAU opportunities, who are biting the hand which has served them well and attentively at a time when they were in need of supervision and guidance. Relative to the 1961 European track and field tour, a worthy American good will mission, the athletes who qualified were offered the privilege of making the trip. Those who were not receptive were not forced to go, nor was any action taken against them. Such things happen every day in every walk of American life. This isn't unusual. It is routine. Some are making a mountain out of a molehill.

Those athletes who made the trip to Europe in 1961, under able and experienced AAU guidance, represented the United States of America well. It was a wonderful way for them to "fight" for their country.

As it turned out, there were quite a number of young athletes who were members of the American team. The experience which they gained in international competition in Russia, Germany, England, and Poland might well be classified as an Olympic development program, pointing toward the Olympic games of 1964 at Tokyo, Japan. Some of those who competed in Europe this year will be potential American standard bearers in Tokyo in 1964.

No one, with wholesome thinking, ever intended international athletic competition to become a battle of nations. Those who might strive to bring this about would destroy the friendly relationships which amateur athletics continually cement.

Some, during the 1961 AAU controversy, have singled out a few members of the AAU family for criticism. If those who meted out such criticism only knew of the time and effort which those who have been unjustly offended have contributed to the amateur athletic cause down through the years, in the interest of American athletes, they would—or should—be ashamed over their caustic and improper remarks.

The staging of an athletic event, with AAU sanction, requires weeks and months of planning, preparation, and supervision by those who contribute their services—expressly for the benefit of athletes who participate in them, and for those followers of sports who enjoy watching the athletes in action. Generally, the profits from such athletic events are small—but whatever they may be are most often returned for the benefit of amateur athletics, or for worthy charities. On many occasions it is difficult for those who supervise amateur athletic events to meet expenses.

It is a matter of record that those who sponsor amateur athletic events give every possible consideration to the competing athletes. Generally, they house them well, make special entertainment available for them, remember them with proper and suitable awards, and host them with care and dignity. As such conditions prevail, the average amateur athlete will not endure any hardships whatsoever on the per diem allowance which is now in effect.

It is true that the average amateur athlete trains well and arduously for competition, which, of course, is expected of him if he is to excel and gain recognition for his personal achievements. However, the average amateur athletic lives well and enjoys many special benefits, including travel, good housing and good food, and coveted awards. The AAU does not deal abuse to amateur athletes, as some have erroneously charged. To the contrary, the AAU cares well for the amateur athletes who compete under its supervision.

The majority of the amateur athletes appreciate the good care which the AAU has provided for them. Some of these have been

active in U.S. Olympic fund campaigns, realizing that they, themselves, are the ones who are to eventually be benefitted by a trip to a foreign land. There are others who do not participate in U.S. Olympic fund campaigns at all—leaving this burden up to the AAU and its affiliated agencies, including the NCAA, NAIA, and the U.S. Olympic Committee. The time and effort which is contributed by those AAU people who participate in U.S. Olympic fund campaigns, is enormous—for the benefit of amateur athletes. A thankless job, too.

It's about time that a great many should begin to "thank" the AAU for noble services rendered to amateur athletics—rather than to unjustly blast the good organization, as some have unwisely done. A real champion is not one who will crouch in his corner and fire away relentlessly—under cover. A real champion will face the test with those with whom he may have differences—and no AAU committee has ever failed to grant a fair and proper hearing.

A MAN'S MAN

(By Theodore Roosevelt)

In the battle of life it is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of a deed could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasm, the great devotions, spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement; and who at the worst if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold timid souls who knew neither victory nor defeat.

In Response to Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a column by Scripps-Howard writer Henry J. Taylor deserves the attention of our colleagues, and I am pleased to include it at this time:

On ending his report to the Nation about Berlin, President Kennedy said he had found the burdens of the Presidency even greater than he thought when he ran for office. He asked for suggestions and for the public to help him.

The humbleness in this plea is enormously appealling and the sincerity unquestionable. "To know," the Bible calls it; a profoundly meaningful word.

Progressively fighting for the right, as the President is, is the noblest effort the world affords, and I do not like to put things too strongly, but I believe that the greatest help the President, and therefore our Nation, can receive is within his own grasp and at his command.

Surely it must begin with the abandonment of inexperienced and immature young associates who are his closest official advisers in the White House. They are intellectuals, fresh from college faculties, but not one has had any experience in Government or equally large affairs or been tested in anything like the burdens to which the President himself refers.

Next, great help will flow to him when, in so properly calling for sacrifices, he himself takes this flag out front. The basic sacrifice any official can make—and it is soon recognized by the public—is not to play politics—with the people's money, with policies, with decisions, with appointments, or anything else—and to forget the next election. Yet it is clear that politics as usual, political spending as usual, and all the casting about for reelection is in practice from the White House down.

Great help would come to the President's hallowed task by postponing or abandoning other programs which, while desirable or popular, are not essential. Yet, instead, added programs are being sponsored without apparent heed to the cost of it all or how we are to pay for the total load, except through a deficit without tears.

The weapon Russia wants most is an inflated and unstable America. And little separates the Russian sword from our throat. We are faced by a problem of priorities in spending. We need an immediate decision on where to proceed and where to hold back. Not a better life, but humanity in its vastest meaning, is at stake.

It will be profoundly helpful to the President if he attempts to redeem to the American people the promises made and then contradicted or not kept, and at the same time he speaks no word that exceeds our Government's willingness and capacity to act, as in the tragedy of the unsupported warnings to Russia regarding Cuba and Laos. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world, and therefore to peace, as eloquence without performance.

Thus a mass of uneasy thoughts burst in today. But the American people would recognize a change in course very fast and respond with a roar of approval, support and allegiance. Otherwise, any President must face a division between those who believe with their ears and those who believe with their eyes. And to force that unwanted division on us would be unworthy of this hour.

Northeast States Water Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support the Northeast States water compact which the House has under consideration, because it provides an intelligent approach to a complex problem.

For years New England has been beset by floods due largely to the overflowing of the Connecticut River. New England represents a very important segment of the United States, both industrially and economically, and it is necessary that the States involved in these floods, and States affected by recent hurricanes—particularly the one in 1955, join together to provide means for properly conserving their water supply and regulating its flow.

During the debate on the bill it was noted that Maine and Vermont had not signed the compact. Maine's major rivers flow to the sea and hence it is not so concerned as the other States where the dangers of flood and conservation problems are more prevalent. Vermont is the locale of a large part of the Connecticut River, whose waters pass through Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Vermont has a lesser equity in the trouble caused by its own waters than have the other States affected by those waters. It can be said that Vermont has done much to control the waters of the Connecticut River by erecting dams at selected sites.

The water problems of our country and the necessity for water compacts is best appreciated by recalling that California obtains some of its waters from the Colorado River some 500 miles away, and that New York obtains some of its waters from the Delaware River, considerably distant from the metropolis.

Obviously it is necessary for States to ally themselves with one another, depending on their geographic location and water resources, in order to protect their own interests.

The main objection on the part of the minority to this resolution lay in the fact that the seven representatives of the Federal Government were giving voting privileges. This made it possibe for the seven commissioners to commit the Federal Government without the problem coming before the Congress. This is one phase of the legislation which I did not approve and voted for the motion to recommit in order to eliminate this defect. However, I support the concept of a Northeastern States compact completely and vigorously.

Potent Prescription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of July 31, 1961, entitled "Potent Prescription":

POTENT PRESCRIPTION

Despite the efforts of drug-industry defenders to spread tranquilizing ointment on the controversy, there is considerable public concern over the cost and quality of our drugs. The hearings of Senator KEFAUVER'S Antitrust Subcommittee have clearly indicated that the old Pure Food and Drug Act is in need of stronger supplementary medicine. The reform bill offered by Mr. KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER cannot simply be dismissed by indignant talk about statism.

In opposing the bill, the American Medical Association asserts that the profession itself is capable of being the sole watchdog over the efficacy of new drugs. But the AMA's own record hardly inspires confidence. Until 1955, the AMA Journal would accept only advertising that had received the seal of acceptance of the organization's council on drugs. That year, the program was dropped—after a Chicago public relations firm submitted a report suggesting ways in which the Journal's advertising linage could be increased.

The prescription was effective. Advertising revenues rose from $4,184,000 in 1955 to $7,997,000 in 1960. In dropping the Seal of

Acceptance program, the AMA inevitably created the impression that it was less interested in policing misleading claims than in fattening its advertising linage.

At present, the Government can only determine whether a new drug is safe. The Kefauver-Celler bill would extend this power and enable a finding on the efficacy of a drug. In view of the hundreds of new wonder drugs which are flooding the market—not all of them adequately tested—it is difficult to see how the industry can object to an impartial finding by a public body. The reform has wide support from leading medical experts—including two members of the AMA's own Council on Drugs.

Concerning the high cost of medicine, the Kefauver-Celler bill would empower the Government to establish generic names for drugs. This would enable a doctor to prescribe the less-costly generic name rather than the frequently more expensive brand name—extending to patients a saving already available to institutions. Since the Kefauver hearings produced evidence that the profits of larger drug firms are twice the average for all industry, this seems a reasonable way to help restore some balance.

This newspaper is not convinced that licensing of drug firms, as proposed by the reform bill, is as yet imperative. But improved testing procedures and the establishing of generic names seem a minimal prescription. The principle of public regulation was established a half century ago in the Pure Food and Drug Act. The users of prescription drugs are often the aged and disadvantaged. They are entitled to every reasonable protection that Government can offer.

Use of Urban Renewal Grants by Small Towns and Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal on July 3 carried an article describing the use of urban renewal grants by small towns and communities in the Nation. This article was reprinted on page 11199 of the RECORD.

Generally speaking, the article was written so that it casts doubt on the propriety of these grants. Editorially, the Journal charged that the program was a pork barrel. Yet the picture of grants in motion across the country was one of substantial activity in reconstruction, or replacing dusty, curbless streets by paved ones, as well as the construction of public works and new cities in the Nation to be a substantial public investment.

It deserves to be remembered that while the Federal debt has increased only about $11 billion since 1945, State and local debt has gone up by almost $45 billion. State and local taxes, between 1948 and 1960, went up 260 percent. The pressure on the local ability to pay for necessary improvements has been severe.

At the same time, the process of decay has been accelerating. The war, when few public improvements were possible, put a heavy burden on communities to catch up in subsequent years. The growth in population, now documented in the 1960 census, found communities spreading and growing, using up land, moving on to new schools and new facilities so rapidly that there was not time to replace the old.

East Granby, one of the communities mentioned in the article, is located 15 miles northwest of the capital city of Hartford in my district. Its population almost doubled in the 10 years between 1950 and 1960, from 1,327 to 2,434. It lies within the orbit of two standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined by the Census Bureau, Hartford, with 525,000 people and Springfield, Mass., with 478,000.

The town has an area of 17.8 square miles. As the population of Hartford County grew, homes were built throughout the available area. The devastating floods of 1955 struck savagely at some of these homes and destroyed a whole section. It was in the course of rebuilding the town after the flood that East Granby produced a workable plan for its future, won Federal assistance, and is embarked on a general program with State and local contributions to make a better community.

This story has been ably told State Representative Leonard E. Krogh of East Granby, who read the editorial when it was reprinted in the Hartford Times and wrote a reply which I offer for the RECORD.

I might point out that proponents of urban renewal legislation have consistently pointed to the needs that exist in our smaller communities. They have more difficulty in securing credit or in arranging financial aid. Special priorities are written into the law in behalf of communities with less than 10,000 population. This is an example of how one town has used this aid on the road back from a disaster. And I would point to this conclusion drawn by Mr. Krogh:

I cannot agree that human suffering should be a matter of public concern only in communities above certain size.

Congress did not intend it to be, and the use of the flood disaster provisions of the urban renewal program to assist East Granby in rebuilding is fully in accord with the belief that we must stand ready to attack urban blight and aid orderly growth in large and small communities alike.

The article follows:

I take exception to an article from the Wall Street Journal which was reprinted in the Hartford Times under title of "Metropolis of East Granby—Should It Be Given Funds for Renewal?"

The article concludes that "if people were willing to be bluntly honest," this program would be known as "the Federal pork barrel project."

I don't consider the removal of slums and blight, aid to flood disaster areas and the creation of decent housing for people forced now to live in the slums to be pork barrel legislation.

The Granbrook Park section of East Granby was devastated by the floods of 1955. Two people were killed and over 100 homes were damaged or destroyed. After the floods some people repaired their homes and moved back in. Others simply rented their buildings to low-income families. Many homes became slums. Tax revenue was very low, far lower than the high cost of police, welfare, and other town services that had to be performed for the people living there. The danger of periodic flooding remained. Much of the flood devestation remained because no one could afford the cost of repairing it.

As a last resort we applied to the Urban Renewal Administration for help and qualified as a flood disaster area under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949. We also qualified for help under the Connecticut flood redevelopment assistance program.

With Federal and State help we adopted a comprehensive plan of development, provided flood plain zoning for all low lying areas in town on which permanent buildings are prohibited, adopted a building code to preserve our existing buildings and to prevent residential decay, and worked out a relocation plan for the families to be displaced.

Then as part of project activity we acquired 190 parcels of land at fair market value, relocated 23 families in decent housing, demolished 71 buildings and graded the site.

The entire 47 acres will be retained by the town as a park.

We are a fast growing town. Our population has more than doubled in the last 10 years.

The difference between our situation and the urban areas that the article seems to imply are the only logical recipients of such Federal aid, is this: We have been able to take precautions at modest cost today to avoid the creation of problems that can only be solved at fantastic cost tomorrow.

I cannot agree that human suffering should be a matter of public concern only in communities above a certain size.

Especially when the same philosophy would find it perfectly proper for the citizens of East Granby to help pay for the redevelopment of New York City with our Federal tax dollars but, because we are small, New York City would have no obligation to help pay for our redevelopment program.

In my town $7,000 is 1 mill on the tax rate.

So, to solve our problem alone we would have had to raise our mill rate 36 mills to provide the portion of project cost paid by the Federal and State Governments in addition to the $50,000 that we have already provided.

I am proud to think that in our country three levels of government can work for the common good regardless of community size.

The Wall Street Journal article seems to imply that the fact that the Urban Renewal Administration puts no limit whatever on the size a city must be to get urban renewal grants is bad.

I think it is one of the great strengths of the program and provides one of the few areas in which our Federal system, through the democratic process, with the cooperation of Federal, State and local government, can successfully attack one of the greatest social problems of our time.

Of course there are elements of pork-barrel politics in the redevelopment program, just as in the farm price support program or the legislation permitting oil depletion allowances, either of which, by the way, cost the American taxpayer many times more per year than does urban renewal.

Change the name if you wish from urban renewal to something else, but remember that when public funds are used for the public good, our 2,434 citizens, or any others, may have just as much need as if they lived in Times Square.

Beatnik Philosophy on Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith, an article by a well-known person, Edith K. Roosevelt. This article calls attention to one of the professors we have in our universities and the down-grading of patriotism and Americanism, both of which are an expression of love of country. Instead of emphasizing both Americanism and patriotism, pseudo liberal professors want to enjoy all the privileges and rights of their American freedom but to disdain any thought of patriotism. Americanism and patriotism are elements of loyalty which apparently this instructor opposes.

The article follows:

BEATNIK PHILOSOPHY ON CAMPUS
(By Edith K. Roosevelt)

Something is wrong with American youth. Police records disclose soaring crime rates. The military is voicing serious concern that young recruits "lack real loyalty and convictions." Employers these days find it more and more difficult to get a young person to do an honest day's work.

A number of scapegoats are blamed for our moral failure on a national scale, including working mothers, television thrillers, and an excess of creature comforts. But one major cause seems to have been overlooked—the subversion of the American character in our schools.

To cite a typical example of the beatnik philosophy offered our youth, listen to Robert B. Heilman, executive officer of the English department of the University of Washington, as he tells Phi Beta Kappa students that Americanism is a vice with guillotine functions.

"As an example of a cliche term that has a national spread and that can have Fourth of July maginot line, and guillotine functions, let us take the term "Americanism." This is a term that has no objective meaning and it is harmful because it arouses nationalist emotions that blind us to real problems of value."

Apparently, Mr. Heilman's words about "the underlying vice of the term Americanism" strike a responsive chord in some influential academic circles. Mr. Heilman's address is the lead article in the spring issue of Western Humanities Review, a quarterly published by the center for intercultural studies at the University of Utah.

Mr. Heilman explains that "the underlying vice of the term Americanism, is that it implies a regional monopoly of merits" and is "a piece of intellectual and moral provincialism."

Views such as his are commonly aired by university-bred thinkocrats who, while ridiculing pride and faith in America, extoll the "African personality" and the right to self-determination for every atoll of natives outside the Soviet slave empire.

Other cliches which regularly receive the raised eyebrow treatment are the Jeffersonian concept of the individual's right to the pursuit of happiness and the role of reason in human affairs.

In Mr. Heilman's view, "comfort is an attribute of the henroost and the cowbarn" and "happiness is a seductive mirage."

Are Americans to be taught then that the traditional American goal of the better life is only a mirage?

Beatnik philosophy teaches young people there are no absolutes and no ends worth striving for.

"For the equating of reason with what we like or what we strive for—be it a petty profit or a noble end—is a cliche of our whole culture," says Mr. Heilman.

What kind of citizens, parents, or human beings are produced when young people are taught that Americanism, happiness, and reason are mere cliches?

Mr. Heilman describes them:

"The citizen who escapes from the bonds of cliches will not get a medal for bravery or an honorary degree; he will not be celebrated in textbooks as a man ahead of his time, or be chosen his city's man of the year."

Truer words were never spoken. The pursuit of excellence can only flourish where reason, virtue, and patriotism are nurtured by the guardians of our culture.

Commonsense Thinking on Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for a little old-fashioned, commonsense thinking on the handling of money, individual or Federal, I am happy to refer you to the following column from the Dallas Morning News, written by a long-time friend and most able writer, Lynn Landrum:

DEFENDING BY DEFICIT RISE
(By Lynn Landrum)

Finance is not the columntator's forte. On a personal level it has been his policy to pay cash or do without. Mostly he has done without. It may be that you can't run the United States that way. The columntator never had the responsibility of the United States.

But it sticks in the basic thinking of this column that something from nothing won't go. And it is simply incomprehensible how the President expects a deficit of $3 or $4 billion to be any sort of preparation for a war that could leave a lot of the world burned to a cinder.

Mind you, the column is for every dollar necessary for raising our Armed Forces to the level of adequate defense. But how in the name of common gumption can you face so huge an increase in the budget without a corresponding reduction in other expense? When the house on Billy Goat Hill has to be repainted, there is always some other project which has to wait until the paint job is paid for.

But Mr. Kennedy, who wants us to tighten the belt at home, seems bound to pour out other billions on schools, on medicine, and on a Peace Corps—to say nothing of aid for every mud-hut country in Africa, Asia, and the isles of the sea.

The columntator is generous. But when he puts his hand in his pants pocket and finds nothing there but a hole, he doesn't go down to the bank to go on somebody's note. He doesn't make himself responsible for somebody's mortgage. He doesn't call in the neighbors and give away his lawnmower and his wheelbarrow. He and the little lady walked until they could pay all cash for their first Ford—and the Ford man looked at them as if they were financial freaks that must have come out of the ark or something.

Now is the time to raise taxes—yes, if that is what it takes. But now is the appropriate time to trim the fat from the New Frontier. We don't have to buy friends abroad. We don't have to buy votes at home. Things are as serious as John F. Kennedy says they are. The unfortunate thing is that Mr. Kennedy sometimes acts as if he didn't believe what he himself is saying.

Draft the freedom riders to fight for freedom. Tax the freedom lovers at home. Cut out the froth and the flummery on appropriations. Get on a cash basis and quit climbing Rock Candy Mountain.

It is a hard world in which we live and hard cash is a very present help in time of trouble. The sooner Washington wakes up to that simple fact of life, the safer this country is going to be. Americans may be soft in some spots, but surely we aren't soft in the head. Let first claims come first. And if the barrel is empty when 3d, 4th, and 44th claims come up, let them wait. That isn't profound. But it makes sense.

West Should Win Back Tshombe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the distressing developments in foreign affairs has been the continued chaos in the Congo and the impractical position taken by the U.N. in its deliberate antagonism of pro-West Katanga Province and its tacit cooperation with Communist-inclined leaders.

The vital stakes in the Congo were especially well presented in an editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times on Monday, July 31. This thought provoking commentary is one of the most penetrating I have read on the Congo situation, and I insert into the RECORD the editorial entitled "West Should Win Back Tshombe":

WEST SHOULD WIN BACK TSHOMBE

World communism is reaching for one of the richest prizes of all in the Congo, the mineral-rich Katanga Province. Offers of economic aid by the Soviet Union have been accepted by the Katanga leaders and representatives of President Moise Tshombe are prepared to visit Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia for the avowed purpose of strengthening Katanga's ties with the Communist bloc.

These are unmistakable signs of a complete reversal for the West in its relations with a segment of the Congo that was at one time more clearly anti-Communist than any other.

It is true that almost any strange development can be expected from the confused Congo political situation. The leaders, locked in a bitter struggle for temporary advantage over one another, often seem to act without reason and according to no particular pattern of conduct.

But the fact remains that Russia is on the verge of winning an important cold war victory by default. For if the Soviets extend their influence into Katanga, they will be

in a position to control 70 percent of the world's cobalt supply.

Radioactive cobalt is an important element in hydrogen bombs, thus potentially is the most lethal force on earth. It is also a valuable weapon in the medical world's fight against cancer. The nonradioactive variety is used for high strength steel alloys, used in conventional weapons, and for casings for missiles requiring tremendous heat resistant qualities.

While present U.S. stockpiles of the metal are held to be sufficient to meet foreseeable needs, the West should certainly do more than sit idly by while the Communists gain access to territory that can prove of immense strategic and political value to them. The world knows that Tshombe was anti-Communist from the beginning. He took Katanga out of the Congo Republic because he objected to attempts by the late Patrice Lumumba to draw the new nation into the Soviet orbit.

Now, if the Tshombe government joins hands with the Communists, the Russian triumph will have added impact in Africa and elsewhere among uncommitted nations.

As long ago as July of last year, we said: "It would appear that Katanga's Tshombe is the West's best bet and should be encouraged."

Unfortunately, this advice was not followed. The West supported U.N. action in the Congo. The United Nations and Tshombe were never able to settle their differences, with the U.N. concentrating on the larger problem of restoring order throughout the Congo and Tshombe objecting to interference in his affairs. Then when Tshombe was held prisoner by his Congo foes, he got little help or encouragement from the West.

The result is the free world is confronted with a situation that requires swift counter moves. Tshombe must be convinced that Moscow isn't interested in him; Moscow, as always, is interested in promoting discord and strife in the Congo and Africa.

If this can be done, the Allies will be in a position to work for understanding and mutual accord that will revive Katanga's former friendship for the West. As we said before, the West would be well advised to find out who its friends and enemies in the Congo are and to act accordingly.

World War I Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, we continue to receive a substantial volume of mail which seems to question whether or not hearings have been held on a separate pension measure for World War I veterans.

During the first weeks of July, the committee did hold hearings and representatives of the major veterans' organizations—including Veterans of World World I of the U.S.A., Inc., appeared before the committee. The latter group felt the most acceptable measure was H.R. 3745, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. Under date of March 28, 1961, under our own name, we introduced H.R. 6009, a measure which is almost identical to Mr. DENTON'S bill.

On July 11, 1961, we appeared before the committee and submitted the following statement in support of our bill and H.R. 3745. We felt this entry in the RECORD was necessary to correct the widespread impression that hearings have either been denied or delayed. True, as yet the committee has made no favorable report, but on the other hand, neither has there been an adverse report against these bills.

During our entire time in the Congress, both during the 86th Congress and in this session, we have urged and will continue to urge that a separate World War I veterans' pension bill be favorably reported out of committee in order that the House of Representatives can work its will on this legislation.

Our statement as set forth below clearly expresses our position:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my office has received a large volume of mail for several years relating to World War I pension legislation; and in talking with many House Members who are not members of this committee, I find they, too, are deeply interested in this legislation.

My bill, H.R. 6009, is one plan for our World War I veterans. There are others. Ours would provide a monthly pension of $102.38 to veterans of World War I who served at least 90 days—and who were released or discharged therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. Payment of pension would be limited to veterans whose annual income, if single with no dependents, does not exceed $2,400; and if married with dependents, does not exceed $3,600. In the determination of these income figures, social security benefits, Railroad Retirement benefits and annuities or other pensions would be excluded.

The paramount purpose of the bill is to provide a more livable income to those of the Nation's 2,673,000 World War I veterans who, for the most part, are now retired on very meager sustenance.

In 1960, the average age of these men was 66.2 years, an age when the vast majority of them have passed their effective working period and have retired. But to retire on $2,400 a year—and in most cases much less—is to retire to four walls and to the loneliness and lethargy that are so often the undeserved lot of the elderly.

There is no maudlin sentimentality on my part in referring to the veteran of World War I as the "forgotten hero." His condition is a reflection of actual fact. When the last bit of the great mass of ticker tape settled gently on Fifth Avenue in New York, in 1919, the World War I veteran moved from the service of his country into an effort to reestablish himself and raise a family—but in his case, without the aid of education, or housing, or farm, or small business assistance. And, in the midst of his striving, he was whipped by the worst depression this country has ever seen. He struggled through, but when the Congress was generously distributing, and let me emphasize, well-merited benefits to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, the World War I veteran was being ignored, or could we put it—again forgotten. His fair requests are being shunted aside even today when he has reached the point where the Nation can demonstrate its appreciation to him through provision of a modest monthly pension to those of his number who face bleak prospects in their declining years.

At the time these remarks were prepared, I was unable to obtain a breakdown of the incomes of World War I veterans. However, the table on page 378 of the committee's hearings in 1959 in the "Operation of the Pension Program" reveals that for men over 65, 25 percent in 1957 had incomes from $500 to $999; 18.3 percent had incomes from $1,000 to $1,499; and 11.4 percent had incomes from $1,500 to $1,999. For all categories of income below $2,499, the table indicates that some 72.7 percent of men over 65 received less than that amount in 1957. Roughly based on these figures, 70 percent could probably be taken as the percentage of World War I veterans who would be covered by our bill. This would include about 1,850,000 to 1,870,000 veterans. The figure reflects both the plight of these men and the need for remedial legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans of World War I fulfilled an obligation that attends every freeman—that of serving his country in time of need. Indeed, it should rather be called a privilege. But the Nation, too, has an obligation to these men beyond the waving of flags and streamers at joyful victory parades. I submit this obligation has as yet been unfulfilled. I urge that this committee move now on this opportunity to assist these forgotten men in this—their greatest hour of need. To do this would not be doing something through sentimentality or in a spirit of charity, but rather with a feeling of gratitude and appreciation and with the sense of paying a debt that is long overdue.

The Responsibility of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested absolute control in administering the taxpayers' dollars in the foreign aid program. Under the Constitution the Congress is charged with this responsibility which, in my opinion, it cannot shun.

In the brief period since January 20 of this year, deficit spending has become the byword and has the complete approval of our Secretary of the Treasury. What does the future hold in relief for the American taxpayer, should Congress be brainwashed into giving the President the complete authority he desires? Slipshod management of the funds is a national scandal and has been over the years, regardless of administration.

Let us stand firm in shouldering our responsibilities as representatives of the American people.

The following editorial, from the July 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, is an excellent exposition of why Congress must keep its check on orgy spending in the foreign aid program:

CONGRESS SHOULD KEEP CONTROL OVER FOREIGN-AID SPENDING

People can argue ad infinitum about the number of billions which the American taxpayer should be willing to contribute to the economic development of less-developed countries and areas, with emphasis upon assisting the development of human resources. Doubtless there are humanitarian reasons for many of these activities, although their relation to American interest and security seems difficult to establish.

The Act for International Development (Senate bill 1983) sets no overall price tag on foreign aid beyond the $8,800 million in loans over 5 years, plus some $1,700 mil-

lion in grants to be made available in fiscal year 1962. However, the bill gives the President such wide authority to tap other programs and resources, including military and strategic stockpiles, that the total could be far greater. An estimated total outlay of $10,529 million over the next 5 years, not including $1,885 million in military aid plus such sums as may be necessary to implement the act, is probably close to reality.

Whatever the total, it is an amount which caused Arthur Krock of the New York Times to report widespread fear that without new and more painful price inflation the economy cannot furnish $7,300 million more for foreign aid and also finance the welfare measures urged by the President. Furthermore, it is curious that such a measure should be urged by the same administration that wants to impose new taxes on corporations that set up plants in other countries—genuine foreign aid as opposed to giveaways.

However, the central objection to this bill is the method designed to get the money without troubling Congress to appropriate it in the traditional way. This foreign aid bill contemplates back-door spending on an unprecedented scale, a practice which Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri Democrat, has described as reprehensible. The annual appropriation system, which has taken care of vastly expanding Government activities, including two major wars, an expensive police action and billions in foreign aid, is not considered adequate to finance the social development of Africans, Asians, and Polynesians. So Congress is asked to authorize the President to make loans for projects in unspecified areas of up to $900 million in 1962 and $1,600 million for each of 4 years thereafter and to get the money for this purpose by borrowing from the Treasury—in other words putting the whole thing on the cuff and outside the regular appropriation process. The bill grabs $300 million a year from repayments to the Treasury, which would in normal circumstances go to reduce the national debt or even to relieve the taxpayer.

In attempting to defend back-door spending, the State Department points to other programs which have been financed by this inflationary method and adds that it is necessary in "helping the aid agency to administer a long-range development program." This is not an impressive argument. The U.S. Congress constantly appropriates money for domestic long-term projects, and the military departments receive their money through the usual appropriation process. Why should the bureaucrats in charge of a speculative foreign-aid program be an exception to this prudent practice?

In addition to the loans, which are to be handed out through the back door, and the grants for which Congress is graciously permitted to appropriate the money, the administrators of this act have access to an undetermined amount by tapping other agencies and resources. About $6,100 million remains unexpended from previous assistanoce programs, including $2,400 million for military aid.

The bill is also questionable because of many grants of power to the President seemingly out of proportion to the objects of the bill. For example, the administrator is required to make all facts and figures available to the General Accounting Office—unless deterred by "a certification by the President that he has forbidden the furnishing thereof pursuant to such request and his reason therefor." Thus it would seem that there need be no accounting to Congress of the way vast sums are spent if the President is willing to state why the information should be withheld. However, similar clauses have appeared in earlier foreign-aid bills.

It is hard to believe that any Congress worth its weight in Federal judgeships would surrender the power of the purse, carefully reserved to Congress in the Constitution. To do so for no more critical emergency than the doling out of funds to less-developed countries, however promising, could set a precedent for more bypassing of Congress for all kinds of projects.

A Declaration of Independence From Federal Dependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in our daily mail we receive many expressions of deep concern over the centralization of power in our Federal Government. Unless we strive to limit and curb the powers of our Federal Government, there may well be the need for other city governments to rise up as did Newburgh, N.Y. Fremont, Nebr., is one of these cities which has felt the need and has expressed its resistance to the further encroachment upon their freedom by the Federal Government.

I present for the reading of the Speaker and my colleagues a letter received this morning from Mr. E. A. Jaksha, chairman of the Declaration of Independence Committee, Fremont, Nebr., concerning the recent events in the city of Newburgh, N.Y.

With Mr. Jaksha's letter is a copy of "A Declaration of Independence From Federal Dependence" of the Fremont Chamber of Commerce. The Fathers of our great Republic were vitally concerned with individual liberty and thus gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution providing for our freedom and the preservation of our individual rights. Under unanimous consent, I include the declaration accompanying Mr. Jaksha's letter in the RECORD:

DECLARATION
OF INDEPENDENCE COMMITTEE,
Fremont, Nebr., July 26, 1961.

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEERMANN: Recent news stories deal with events at Newburgh, N.Y., and the desire of that city to run its own affairs without dictation from Federal agencies and to take measures at the local level to balance the budget.

We respectfully submit that economic and social problems cannot be legislated for every community from the Federal level. Further, we doubt that such action by a Federal agency is consistent with the desires of most taxpayers and citizens.

The attitude that local citizens are not capable of making local decisions is common with those who lean toward the philosophy of state domination over man.

The Federal money being doled out comes from every taxpayer's earnings—including taxpayers of Fremont, Nebr. We believe that the citizens of Newburgh, N.Y., have a right to impose conditions of qualifications for welfare and to administer their own local government.

Local unfortunates have a right to help from fellow local citizens, and local citizens have an obligation to be charitable. However, charity must be deserved, and local citizens are a better judge of need than some remote, self-perpetrating Government agency.

Karl Max would be delighted to see in action the demonstration of his theory, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Respectfully,

E. A. JAKSHA,
Chairman, Declaration of Independence Committee.

A DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL DEPENDENCE

Whereas we, the members of the Fremont Chamber of Commerce are in agreement with the principles of individual freedom, a free market, and limited government; and

Whereas we believe the present trend in political thinking and fiscal policy will ultimately destroy our free institutions and the savings of our people and our children; and further we believe this same trend in political thinking and fiscal policy mortgages the future of our children to ultimately leave them economically destitute; politically enslaved, and defenseless; and

Whereas our Nation's strength lies in local, county, and State government, by citizens using local, county, and State funds; and that under the trend of the present political philosophy our people are slowly and surely being lulled to sleep and deprived of their substance; and

Whereas we deplore those Federal agencies and representatives of Federal agencies who, in addition to their primary function, engage in activities designed to expand and perpetuate those functions beyond their original design and concept.

We, therefore, call upon all chambers of commerce and all like-minded groups throughout these 49 States and territories who hold to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and under which it has prospered; and who hold with us to the principles of individual freedom, a free market, and limited government, to make and to project this same declaration:

To steadfastly resist further encroachment upon these principles by action of the Federal Government;

To limit our use of Federal funds and to seek a corresponding reduction in tax levies and governmental controls;

To avoid being deluded by glib tongue, trite phrase, and uneconomic thinking with promises of personal and financial security through the bait of Federal aid; there being no Federal aid, since Federal aid is our local money less the high cost of freight for political brokerage on its long trip to Washington and back, returned with the barnacles of Federal restrictions and bureaucratic controls; with a belief in Almighty God, we therefore declare that those steps necessary to reestablish a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, be taken by all the people, not tomorrow but today; and further, we in Fremont

Resolve, To take those steps necessary to bring again to the banks of the Platte those functions of Government now mushrooming on the banks of the Potomac.

Hamilton F. Mitten, Eugene W. Buch, Gordon Pelley, H. W. Thinrod, M. E. Welstead, Farrell Johnson, Paul R. Todd, O.D., William F. Zimmerman, H. A. Westphal, Grant M. Coover, R. W. Wiechman, V. J. Kasper, David Kavich, Edward A. Jaksha, Lester Oesseker, David G. Mitten, Homer M. Turner, J. Martin Jetter, Earl J. Lee.

Address of Hon. Charles E. Goodell, of New York, Before the 62d Annual Convention, Western New York Volunteer Firemen's Association, Dunkirk, N.Y., Tuesday, July 25, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and colleague Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, from the neighboring 43d District of New York, addressed the 62d Annual Convention of the Volunteer Firemen's Association of Webster, N.Y., held this year in Dunkirk, N.Y. Congressman GOODELL is one of the ablest and most effective young men in Congress today. Because of the timeliness and thought-provoking content of his remarks, I should like to include his speech at this point in the RECORD:

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to participate with you in this 62d Annual Convention of the Volunteer Firemen's Association of Western New York. You meet in the year 1961 and it is perhaps my most important job today to erase all doubt from your minds that this is a perilous year in the history of mankind.

We are a free country. As freemen, we cannot afford the luxury of passing responsibility on to other people. We cannot afford to sit here this morning and tell ourselves simply that President Kennedy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State will make decisions for us. To a large extent the decisions of these men are limited by public opinion. You and I will not make the final awesome decisions upon which depend the survival of our way of life, but we will have a profound influence on those decisions.

We do not approach these issues in partisan fashion. As elections come and go, the political party which does not control the White House will continue to exert a critical yet responsible influence on this country's foreign policy. Today my criticisms and my suggestions apply equally to all Americans in leadership capacities.

I wonder sometimes if our leaders in Washington have a clear perspective as to the position this country occupies in world affairs. We are supposed to be the leader of the free world. We oppose communism. We know it is evil. Communism knows no moral standards. Communism is oblivious to all the values we hold dear as freemen. Under communism, man becomes an instrument of the state. He has no essential dignity. He has no rights. Everything is subordinated to man's single obligation to serve the state until the Communist millennium is reached. The road to that millennium is paved with the blood and the agony of mankind. God have mercy upon us if the Communists ever have the power to grapple their chains of slavery around the entire globe.

Two weeks ago I urged that this country should begin immediately to test awesome and spectacular nuclear weapons of destruction. I urge it again today. If we don't make the decision to go ahead soon, the Communists will one day stalk freemen with terrifying new powers and we will then be faced with the choice of surrender or certain death. Genuine disarmament will only come when the Communists are convinced that freemen understand the realities of survival as clearly as the Communists do. If we can convince Khrushchev and his gang that they are losing the race for the so-called ultimate weapons of destruction, they will then—and only then—be ready and anxious to call the armament race off and agree to reliable control over the fearful weapons of the future.

Today I would like to discuss briefly with you some issues which in my opinion carry life or death consequences of our civilization. The free world is on the defensive. First of all, there has been a great deal of talk about Berlin. Berlin is a contrived crisis which has been blown up by Khrushchev in order to put us off balance. There will be no war over Berlin. There was grave danger of war for a while, but so long as we stand firm and make our firmness unmistakable to Khrushchev, there will be no war over Berlin. Our President and our people have not, and must not, show any signs of weakness on this critical issue.

Every day, as the British Foreign Secretary put it, thousands of East Germans flow over the borders into West Berlin, "voting with their feet" against communism. The Berlin issue actually is one of the few in which freemen have attained dazzling success over communism. A firm, unyielding policy will keep it that way.

But in other areas of the world, freemen are on the defensive—in Laos, in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba, and in South America, in fact everywhere on the face of the globe. Why are we spending most of our time fending off the lethal punches of communism? We have the muscles. We have the stamina and the courage. We have the experience to beat the Communists in the world arena. In short, we are a heavyweight champion, in fighting trim, but we are losing. Why? We are losing because the free world has walked into the ring against brass-knuckled communism with pillows tied to both of our fists.

One of the great shining ideals of American foreign policy is the doctrine of self-determination. It means in simple terms that every country has a right to determine its own destiny itself. The people have a right to determine for themselves the form of government best suited to their needs. I believe in this ideal and I am sure all of you do.

But what has happened? We know that the Communists are experts in the realities of power. They have refined the technique of infiltrating a country, taking over the army, the police, or one of a dozen other key power centers in a country. Then, when the time is ripe, they move from within and destroy that country's power to determine for itself. They do this for the most part in Cuba with Cubans, in Mexico with Mexicans, in Venezuela with Venezuelans. But they have no scruples about sending vast numbers of aliens into a country at the crucial moment when it is tottering and about to fall. This happened in Laos, in Korea, and it has happened more recently and in a little different way in Cuba.

So while the Communists train a disciplined international force to conquer from within, we proclaim self-righteously that it would be wrong for us to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We even give these countries our money and let them pour it down the drain with the excuse that if we objected we'd be "interfering in the country's right to determine its own destiny."

I say to you that we have an inalienable right to determine the destiny of our own dollars spent abroad. But we have a greater obligation than this. We cannot stand by and watch free countries fall under the domination of communism through internal subversion. We must recognize that internal subversion by a small clique of Communists is a form of aggression. It is direct interference with the right of a country to its own self-determination.

Cuba is the most notable recent example of our folly in this respect. The Communists are laughing at us over Cuba. They really can't understand how we could be so foolish as to permit the continued buildup of Communist power 90 miles off our coastline. There are even indications now that Castro is clearing several areas that look suspiciously like missile sites. Castro obviously is stomping his heel on the free aspirations of Cubans who should be able to run their own affairs. He is doing so with massive aid from the international Communist movement. It's time that we moved in—and I say this without qualification or reserve—it's time we protected ourselves and the Cuban people by removing the cancer of communism from Cuba. Without direct surgery, the cancer will spread.

Ah, but a great cry will go up from those who tell us "if you do that you are no better than the Communists themselves. If you interfere in Cuba, how are you any different than the Russians in Hungary?" I would answer simply, "Have we gone so far that we can no longer recognize the difference between fighting for what is right and fighting for what is wrong? Is it wrong to fight for the eternal values we hold sacred?"

American policy toward Communist subversion abroad is very much like a U.S. marshal on the old frontier who decided to clean up the town but was too timid to use the weapons of his enemies. With lawlessness rampant in the streets, he didn't want to interfere with the peoples rights by using a gun. Can you imagine such a marshal? We all know and the people then knew that such a timid marshal would soon be buried on "Boot Hill" while the outlaws destroyed all the rights of the people in that frontier town.

The men of the old frontier knew better than this. They knew the score when it came to dealing with lawlessness. It's about time the men of the New Frontier—Republicans and Democrats—added up the same score with respect to communism.

Now let me make it clear that I don't think we can solve the world's problems simply by sounding the bugle and marching our armies. The world needs a more constructive answer than the militant brandishing of deadly arms. I am saying, however, that many of our constructive efforts abroad are being compromised by our unwillingness to deal in the harsh realities of international power. We can stop communism dead in its tracks if we will just recognize the simple truth that we are engaged in mortal combat with communism throughout the world, and if we then go out and fight that combat with no holds barred. We are not going to win many battles for freedom whne we are afraid to give air cover to freedom fighters because we might temporarily smudge our image of popularity with the masses of the world. We talk of prestige in the world, but our concept of prestige is superficial and meaningless. The simple fact of the matter is that we can neither be popular nor respected in the world while we are losing to communism.

If we, through the Organization of American States, the United Nations, or through support of the Cubans themselves, liberate Cuba from Castro, the world will not be long in doubt about the difference between Cuba and Hungary. We would set up a legitimate Cuban government on an interim basis, guaranteeing the basic liberties of the people such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom from the oppression of a police state. Then we could create the climate for a free government truly responsible to the will of the Cuban people. Within a short time elections would be held in Cuba. The blood

bath of Castro would end. The Cuban people would be truly masters of their own destiny and the great ideal of self-determination could be legitimately realized. We would be saying to the world that it is the right of the Cuban people to determine the form of their own government and we are going to protect that right against her enemies—all enemies of Cuba from within and without. The inspirational ideal of self-determination would be given new power and meaning. We would announce to the world that this ideal is too important to be sacrificed to Communist subversion. No Communist government could ever take over a country in the free world unless it did so through free elections. And make no mistake about it, there has never yet been an instance in which a free people has voluntarily chosen communism in open and honest elections. I doubt if there ever will be. By clearly enunciating this kind of foreign policy we would be recognizing the unmistakable truth that when communism takes over, self-determination of the people in that country is no longer possible.

There is one other point I would like to drive home this morning with reference to America's position in the world. We must swing back on to the offensive in the struggle for men's minds and hearts. When Khrushchev contrives a world crisis over Berlin, we must mount a powerful counteroffensive of truth. Khrushchev has many times promised that he will permit free elections in East Germany and Hungary and Poland and Czechoslovakia. We should constantly remind the world of Khrushchev's discarded commitments to the millions of good people behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for freedom. We don't have to brandish weapons of war or threaten to roll back the borders of communism with our armies in order to put Mr. Khrushchev on the international hot seat and keep him there. In addition, we can counter Berlin pressures by imposing economic sanctions against the Iron Curtain countries in selected places that will give Mr. Khrushchev acute pain.

Khrushchev is striving to win the minds and hearts of the awakening masses in Asia and Africa and South America with lies and deceit. We are letting him draw a fake international portrait of communism as a movement which is responsible to the needs of the people. We are letting Khrushchev boast of inflated material accomplishments of 5-year and 7-year plans under communism while the truth is muffled and confused.

If our way of life cannot win the struggle for men's minds in open debate in the international arena, then the dark ages is truly settling upon us already. Our most deadly weapon in this struggle with communism is the truth. We should never cover our faults with deceptions. Our statements to the people of the world should always be the simple unadulterated truth. The truth will triumph over Communist deceptions and lies if we use it unflinchingly and imaginatively, backed up by the naked power to counterbalance the brute force of communism.

And so, the hour is late for America. We must face the fact that you can't fight a vicious, unscrupulous enemy by the Rules of Queensbury. War is a pure question of power: Moral power, brain power, military power, and many, many other kinds of power. Cold war is no different in this respect. The truth is on our side. If we unleash our power and fight the cold war with the same determination and intelligence and courage with which we have fought hot wars in the past, we will triumph.

Let's start by organizing, training, and equiping a Cuban military force that can restore freedom to the Cuban people. Let's give them air cover, naval protection, and, if necessary, troop support. When the Communists and the craven neutralists throughout the world see that we are strong and resolute in our devotion to freedom, that we will not permit the ugly cancer of communism to take root in the Western Hemisphere, they will have more respect for us. Those are terms they understand. The outlook for real peace would thereby be greatly enhanced. The danger that Khrushchev might underestimate our readiness to fight over Berlin, if necessary, would be eliminated. In short, the air would be cleared of all the confusion of purpose which now beclouds America's position in the world.

I say with confidence today that the free world must feel once again the strong hand of America's leadership at the helm. The self-doubters and the fuzzy thinkers throughout the world who seek compromise with communism must be drawn once again to the banner of fortitude unfuried over America. I have faith that the American people will respond as never before in our history to the call for greatness demanded by the terrors of our age. With God's help, our misfortunes will then yield to the immense power of a liberty-loving people, united and ready to fight for the things we believe in for all mankind.

America's Answer on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which was broadcast over WDSU-TV and WDSU radio, New Orleans, La., on July 26, 1961:

AMERICA'S ANSWER ON BERLIN

The news out of Washington today is grim. But it is not defeatist.

The newswires carry sobering stories that America is shifting into a higher gear to prepare for a war we hope never comes.

From Washington we learn that the draft call for September is going up to 20,000 men. The July draft call was 8,000. Congress has been asked to appropriate $3 billion more for military spending; $200 million more is being asked for civil defense, for such items as bomb shelters to protect Americans in event of a nuclear attack. Congress is being asked to okay calling up a quarter million reserve fighting men.

These steps were called for by President Kennedy in his Tuesday night speech televised to the Nation.

Mr. Kennedy told us what must be done. He said we must be prepared to fight over Berlin. It was made clear that war is far from a certainty but it was just as plain that a full-scale nuclear war is possible if Russia attempts to seduce West Berlin.

President Kennedy simply and forcefully explained the meaning of Berlin, calling the city a showcase of liberty, a symbol, an island of freedom in a Communist sea, a beacon of hope behind the Iron Curtain, an escape hatch for refugees.

Above all, said the President, Berlin has become the great testing place of Western courage and will—a focal point where our solemn commitments and Soviet ambitions now collide.

The President said he was still willing to talk over the matter with Russia if talk would help, but he warned we must be prepared to resist with force if force is used against Berlin.

This station believes President Kennedy is not bluffing. We believe that his strong stand was wise and that it will be taken with cold seriousness by the Kremlin.

In an earlier editorial we suggested that when Khrushchev applies pressure to us, we should apply pressure to him. President Kennedy's plan of action should create plenty of pressure on Premier Khrushchev.

If unity of the United States, Great Britain and France stands in the face of a Berlin showdown, the West will prove to Russia we cannot be bluffed.

This unity, coupled with the American determination expressed by Mr. Kennedy, should convince Mr. Khrushchev that he is up against an alliance determined to stand firm.

Americans Have Right To Know What Their Billions Are Doing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a timely editorial which recently appeared in one of Maine's leading newspapers, the Portland Press Herald.

This editorial poses questions that all of us in the Congress have been asked many times by constituents. It has put into proper perspective the question whether we are satisfied with the results of our Government spending to date, and, if not, what are we going to do to improve the situation in the future?

I urge that this editorial be read not only by my colleagues, but by the President and those with sensitive positions in his administration:

AMERICANS HAVE RIGHT TO KNOW WHAT THEIR BILLIONS ARE DOING

Although a good many billion American tax dollars have been spent to hold communism in check and to maintain defenses the Berlin crisis drives us to spend billions more.

In the enthusiasm greeting the President's uncompromising reaction to the Soviet threat the new spending is not merely accepted but welcomed and there's little disposition to question the nature of the need.

But it is highly proper for the Nation to know precisely what it has bought with the vast sum of money already expended. Have we gotten all that we intended in exchange for the large amount of money we have spent?

Certainly these questions should be answered as we prepare to pour out additional money.

If more spending, more taxes will carry us out of the danger we are in, the price is cheap, indeed. But if we are to continue to dole out more good money after bad, then we only compound our troubles.

What have we bought, then, to date? Has our costly foreign aid program curbed the spread of communism? Have our gigantic defense appropriations provided us a military machine ready in ample size and strength and preparedness for a sudden Soviet all-out onslaught? And have we provided the civil defense preparations to afford reasonable survival prospects for as many as possible of our people?

If the answers to these questions are mainly in the affirmative, not necessarily

unqualifiedly so, the money taken from the American people has been invested well and the returns will more than justify the sacrifice. But negative answers would demand an immediate review of policy, program, and execution and caution in further generous spending until we had settled on how and where to spend wisely.

Has our foreign aid program achieved its aim of blocking the march of communism by winning and holding the friendship of peoples and governments who are fair game to the Communists? Before he was elected, President Kennedy told us emphatically we had failed miserably. Never, he said, were our public relations so poor. If anything, the situation has worsened since he took office. The billions we have passed around liberally in foreign aid have apparently bought us very little, certainly not our money's worth.

How about our defenses? Are they strong, modern, ready for action, sufficient? Considering the tremendous amount of money allotted to our military forces since the last war we should have a first-class war machine. But do we?

Well, obvioulsy our defenses aren't sufficient for we are about to enlarge them. And there is real question whether our Navy can cope with Russia's uncommonly large submarine fleet. Our combat-ready Army is tiny in comparison with the Russian. Our Air Force is powerful and ready to strike, but even it, according to its own walls, lacks the number of heavy bombers it ought to have. It is generally recognized that we would be in an impossible position it we had to fight Russia on our own in conventional conflict.

And as for civil defense, there is practically none. A nuclear response from Khrushchev to our Berlin stand would, our experts tell us, wipe out much of the country and cause up to 70 million casualties within a few hours. Our civil defense approach has been negligible, confusing, aimless; the result is that the American people, on the eve of what could bring upon them the catastrophe that has hung over their heads for so many years, have no notion of what to do, or how, or the means with which to do it if they did.

The fact seems only too clear that our generous spending has not bought all that it was supposed to obtain. And, this being the case, it is fair to speculate on how much different the situation today might have been had we elected to invest all of our money in our defenses rather than speculatively on friendship buying. It is possible that with such armed might as we would have had as the result of such unprecedented spending the Berlin crisis would have never arisen.

But we didn't so spend and the danger of Berlin is present. The only course open, it seems to us, is to reexamine our whole approach to the problems of containing communism and saving our national skin. Certainly we cannot afford, from the standpoint of either our economy or our security, to continue to throw money away. And as clearly we must awaken to the basic fact that money alone, regardless of how much, is not necessarily the key to our fate.

Mexican Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, Saturday, July 29, 1961:

MEXICAN PEACE CORPS

The bracero program has been called the Mexican Peace Corps because it provides farm labor for the United States and the nucleus of a strong middle class in Mexico.

Many of the Mexican laborers who earn dollars in U.S. fields are men staking themselves to a start in a business or profession in their own country.

These hard workers, imbued with the concepts of democracy and capitalistic gains, will form an important anti-Communist element in Mexico.

The bracero program is foreign aid at its best—U.S. funds paid willingly by private enterprise for a service performed by deserving citizens of another country. San Diego and the Southwest should be proud to be a part of it.

The 15th Anniversary of the Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1961, the Republic of the Philippines celebrated their 15th anniversary of the establishment of their Republic.

My good friend, Mr. Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of the magazine known as Bataan, has published in his July issue, a compilation of the statements made by leading Americans on this occasion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this compilation:

John F. Kennedy, President: "On behalf of the people of the United States, it gives me great pleasure to extend hearty congratulations and best wishes to the people of the Philippines on the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President: "With our staunch friends and firm allies, the people of the Philippine Republic, we of the United States take great pride in celebrating the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence and the 185th anniversary of American freedom.

"We revere our common heritage and rejoice in the freedoms that are ours, as we reaffirm our faith in the principle on which our Nation was founded.

"Our mutual desire for a Philippine Government 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' forged a common bond of friendship which long ago overcame all obstacles and proved itself in the crucible of war—as we stood together in World War II and Korea. This kinship of spirit and determination is now further strengthened by our mutual quest for lasting peace, security, and freedom for all peoples.

"As our two countries have stood shoulder-to-shoulder in defending democracy in the past, so now we are joined in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to insure the peaceful development of our neighbors and allies in the Pacific. This alliance aims at bring about a position of military sufficiency among member nations, as well as strengthening free institutions by promoting economic and social progress through greater individual-nation effort and the enterprise of nations acting collectively.

"Out of the cooperation and common purpose of joint endeavors as this, we dedicate our resources and energies, that poverty, illiteracy, and disease will be brandished—as peace, security, and integrity are attained for the nations of Asia. To this high purpose, we, the Goverment and people of the United States, pledge our firm support.

"Philippine history is a proud record of dedicated service to democracy. You, who have inherited this glorious past, are fully aware of the even greater challenges and opportunities which lie ahead. America is assured, our people are confident, that the Philippine Republic will continue its growth as a strong bastion of freedom in Asia; that in the future it will wield ever greater influence for peace and security throughout the world.

"We celebrate this anniversary of independence for our freedom-blessed countries with a promise—a promise to nurture the unshakable spirit and devotion to principles which inspired our common past. Standing always together—as independent, equal and vigorous partners—we can, with willing hands and strong convictions, seize the opportunities that clearly lie before us. We can lead the world to a new era of peace, plenty and freedom."

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State: "July Fourth holds a proud significance for the peoples of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States as the date on which they achieved independence.

"Through the grim experience of war our peoples know that in our era the enjoyment of freedom, though the aspiration of all men, can no longer be taken for granted as our natural due. To preserve freedom under the challenge of alien ideologies, we must be willing to defend and strengthen our free institutions as ardently as we worked to establish them. We must, as vigorously, strive to advance the social, economic and political conditions in which they flourish.

"This is the lesson implicit in our observance of Independence Day."

Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense: "On behalf of the Armed Forces of the United States I send hearty greetings on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of your nation's independence.

"The Republic of the Philippines occupies a special position in the affection of the men and women of our Armed Forces—a position based on mutual respect and understanding, tested in the crucible of World War II.

"Your nation has been a strong partner of the United States in the effort to maintain the defense of the free world. As a member of the defensive alliance which composes the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Philippine Republic is joined with the United States to provide for security against armed aggression and subversion. We are pledged to the economic progress and well-being of the southeast Asian countries.

"In keeping with the traditional love of freedom, the Philippine Republic has chosen active participation in the struggle against communism. Its choice and the cooperation between this Republic and the United States are clear evidence to the world that the two nations share a mutual interest in the aspirations of freemen everywhere."

Robert F. Kennedy, U.S. Attorney General: "I was honored recently to present a check for $2 million to Ambassador Romulo, in payment for Japanese property in the Philippines which has been disposed of. This was the largest of 75 such payments and the first to be made in the United States. But its chief importance, to my mind, lay in what it symbolized the bonds of mutual trust, understanding, and cooperation between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines.

"There are bonds forged in war, peace, and the present cold war challenge to the free

world. On our mutual birthday, let us reaffirm these bonds and go forward against the challenge, as allies and as friends."

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army: "On behalf of the U.S. Army I want to express my sincere congratulations to the Republic of the Philippines on its 15th anniversary. The bonds of friendship between the people of our two nations have been strengthened on many battlefields, beginning at the time of Emilio Aguinaldo, extending through the bitter defeat on Bataan, and climaxing in the final victory of World War II.

"Your fighting contingent with the United Nations force in Korea demonstrated your belief that aggression must not be permitted to go unchecked. As a charter member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, your nation has firmly allied itself with other free nations in the quest for a just and lasting peace.

"Born in the troubled aftermath of World War II, beset initially by internal unrest, your lands and economy ravaged by war, the Republic of the Philippines has earned worldwide respect by her struggle to take her rightful place in the family of nations. Today your country represents a powerful force for good in the Far East, a living example to all emerging nations of democracy in action.

"It is no coincidence that the anniversaries of our two republics fall on the same date. The Filipino and American people, bound together by destiny, friendship, and mutual respect, chose it that way. We of the U.S. Army remember our warm association with the Philippine Army, and send our best wishes to you on your 15th anniversary.

John B. Connally, Secretary of the Navy: "On behalf of the personnel of the U.S. Navy, may I extend to the people of the Philippines our warmest and most effectionate greetings on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines.

"The history of the Filipino people and that of the U.S. Navy is and has been inextricably intertwined, and is bound by generations of close friendship and interdependence. This friendship is strong and growing and has withstood—and indeed, been tempered and strengthened into an invincible bond—by the fires of combat and turmoil as we have struggled and fought side by side for the freedom and dignity of man. With pride, respect and admiration we have watched the emergence of your great democracy in southeast Asia until today the Republic of the Philippines stands like a beacon of hope to others less fortunate.

"On this day of independence of both the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, we rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our heritage and with pride and confidence in your continued progress under the banner of freedom, we of the U.S. Navy proudly salute the people of the Philippines and wish you very success."

Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary, Department of th Air Force: "Congratulations from the U.S. Air Force to the people of the Philippines on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines. The Fourth of July commemorates a heritage of freedom and democratic ideals for both nations. May our friendship and dedication to the cause of freedom continue as an example for democracy in Asia."

J. Edward Day, Postmaster General: "It is a pleasure to salute the Philippine Republic on the occasion of its 15th anniversary as a self-governing nation. We are bound by ties that preceded the shedding of American and Filipino blood at Bataan and Corregidor, and we are happy to share our Independence Day with the people of the Philippine Islands.

"In his state of the nation address to the Fourth Congress in Manila on January 23, President Carlos Garcia reaffirmed this simple truth: To be and remain free you must be informed, and to be adequately informed you must have unshackled sources of information.

"Freedom of communication is also the historic objective of the U.S. Post Office Department. We believe that the free flow of mail from country to country promotes international understanding and is one of our principal weapons against communistic doctrine.

"Last year surface mail from the United States to the Philippines totaled more than 5 million pounds, and two airlines transported close to 200,000 pounds of mail. Much of this mail, I am convinced, carried a message of our way of life and standard of living which has more meaning to the freedom-loving people of the Philippines than the propaganda spread by the Communists.

"May I extend my warmest congratulations to the Filipino people on this felicitous occasion. I am sure our relations will continue to be most cordial."

Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior: "One of the proudest days in the history of the democratic free peoples of the world occurred on that July 4, 15 years ago when the Republic of the Philippines was born.

"That moment marked the culmination of decades of sincere and warm relations between American and Filipino citizens who—through years of war and peace—jointly created a community based on free, democratic ideals.

"Working hand in hand for half a century, the American and Filipino Governments established and extended the blessings of democracy, making the Philippines an example for other peoples striving for freedom in Asia and throughout the world.

"I add my greetings and best wishes to the Republic of the Philippines on this auspicious day which both our nations celebrate."

Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture: "I welcome this opportunity to convey my sincere salutation to the Bataan Foundation and its supporters, and warmly commend its efforts to keep alive the spirit of Bataan. That spirit symbolizes the close relationship between the people of the United States of America and of the virile young Republic of the Philippines.

"It is fitting that our two countries have an Independence Day in common, for we are in accord on so many other things. We have both developed as God-fearing, liberty-loving peoples. When our fundamental way of life has been endangered—as in the dark days of World War II—we have fought shoulder to shoulder in the common cause. And now, with freedom's soil beneath our feet, our mutual interests are being advanced today through our common effort to promote stability and peace in our problem-racked world. May the spirit that reached its zenith at Bataan and Corregidor guide us in this effort."

Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce: "It is with pleasure and pride that I extend warm congratulations to the Philippine Republic, on the 15th anniversary of its independence.

"In the 15 years since the legal bonds between the Philippines and the United States were severed, the bonds of friendship and commerce between our two peoples have continued to grow, based on mutual respect and dedication to liberty.

"In those years the Philippines has made astounding progress. Its gross national product has more than doubled, reaching some 9.5 billion pesos in 1960, reflecting rapid expansion both in agriculture and industrialization. Foreign trade has risen even more rapidly, from $360 million in 1946 to over $1.1 billion in 1960, illustrating the rise of Philippine products in international commerce.

"This is an admirable record, and we are proud that U.S. business, through trade and investment, has contributed to this progress. All signs point to a further rise in economic development in an atmosphere of free enterprise and liberal trade.

"On this Fourth of July which commemorates independence for both our countries, we look forward to unbroken years of even closer association in friendship and commerce."

Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor: "Since the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed on that historic date in 1776, the Fourth of July has symbolized the universal aspirations of mankind for individual freedom and human dignity. It is significant that the people of the Philippines Republic should have chosen this date 170 years later, to mark their own national independence.

"Today, liberty is a bond between our peoples. But it is not the only bond. We in America share the desire of the Filipinos for a better standard of living. And we applaud the efforts of the Philippines Government to bring the fruits of social welfare and social justice to all its nation's people.

"We are confident that these efforts will continue to inspire the admiration and the emulation of all free nations of southeast Asia. To this end the people of the United States join hands with the people of the Philippines Republic in a common observance of Independence Day."

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare: "It is a pleasure to join with all those who are celebrating the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence this Fourth of July.

"The people of the Philippines are to be congratulated on the great strides forward which have been made in the fields of health, education, and welfare. I wish you continued progress in these and your many other fields of endeavor in the years ahead."

CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate: "I take great pleasure in joining with my Filipino friends, who have so amply demonstrated that democracy can thrive in Asia, in commemorating our common day of independence.

"It is fitting that we should pause this day and dedicate ourselves again to our common task—that of providing a better life for our fellowmen and of defending our freedom against all those who seek to subvert or destroy it. We face many challenges in the years ahead, but our cause is just, our resolve firm, and our courage high. I feel confident that we shall not waiver in fulfilling our sacred responsibilities. I am certain that freedom will prevail."

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate: "In view of the fact that I served on the committee in the U.S. House of Representatives which favorably reported a bill to grant independence to the Philippines and was present in Manila in November 1935, when the first president of the Republic was inaugurated, it gives me unique pleasure to extend warm greetings to the Republic on its observance of independence day.

"It is particularly appropriate that the Republic of the Philippines and the Republic of the United States of America celebrate their independence day together. In so doing, they demonstrate to the world that freedom can be fully enjoyed only to the extent that it is fully extended to all nations which treasure it for their people and will defend it for future generations.

"My country can take pardonable pride in the fact that it has returned what was a colonial possession to its own people for their own management and control. The Republic of the Philippines can be proud of its sound and rapid growth in the climate of liberty it has so richly earned.

"With their other allies in the Pacific area, these two Republics can hold aloft a beacon

light of hope for oppressed peoples on all the shores of this vast ocean region and point the way for peaceful progress for all mankind."

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate: "Few in the world can know better the sound, meaning, and opportunity of freedom than our heroic and determined workers for a better world in the Philippines.

"It doesn't seem possible that it has been only 15 years since the Filipinos gained their independence, because your nation has made an enormous contribution through work and example during that period.

"My best wishes for an outstanding celebration on July 4. We shall be thinking of you as we observe our independence that day as well, Mr. Yap."

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, U.S. Senate: "As the United States prepares to celebrate its 185th anniversary of freedom, July 4, 1961, it is fitting that one of the stanchest allies of the free world community should celebrate theirs on the same date.

"Just as our minutemen have been called to rid the world of oppression and slavery of every kind, so have the peoples of the Republic of the Philippines joined in the fight for peace when aggression was brought to their threshold. Throughout World War II, from the initial air attack on Manila December 8, 1941, until cessation of hostilities, the Philippines poured every ounce of its national strength into the fight against oppression. Since that time, its energies have been directed in helping keep the world a society of free people with unqualified rights to live and worship as one chooses within the framework of democracy.

"The United States is proud of the success the Philippines have attained since becoming a free and independent Republic July 4, 1946. A concrete example of this was the final $20 million payment from the Philippines in May 1961, on a 10-year-old debt of $38 million the United States advanced for their military forces.

"The support these courageous islands have given the United States and its allies in commerce on the seas and negotiations at the conference table in years since the conflict, have aided the cause of freedom immeasurably in the cold war for peace.

"It is with admiration and deep respect that I join in the salute on your 15th anniversary."

LISTER HILL, chairman, Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate: "It is a privilege and a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to congratulate and salute the people of the Philippines on the occasion of their national holiday—July 4, 1961. I recall that it was on the 4th day of July, a decade and a half ago, that the flag of a free and independent Republic of the Philippines was first raised on the flagstaffs of what had been Americas largest territory. I remember that the whole world was watching Manila on that July 4, 1946—on the 170th anniversary of American independence—when both Filipinos and Americans solemnly gathered and joyfully witnessed the peaceful beginning of a new nation dedicated to liberty, democracy, and freedom.

"This new independent democracy faced new, immediate, and challenging problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction. A devastating war had destroyed nearly everything except the courage, the determination and the faith of a brave people. During those first days, many wondered whether the fledgling Philippine democracy could long survive, beset as it was with such enormous problems. But in a few short months all fears were allayed. In the years that followed, the wisdom and strength, the vision and the outstanding leadership of the people of the Philippines wrought from the crucible of adversity, an astounding feat of nation building.

"Today the free world is grateful to see a proud Philippine Republic facing its future with courage and confidence. Yesterday, perhaps the people of the Philippines depended more on the people of the United States. Today, the great Philippine nation, under the inspiring leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, provides a beacon of hope for democracy and liberty for other nations. The free world looks to the wise counsel and leadership of the people of the Philippines. We are honored in the United States to have the assistance and advice of a famous Philippine soldier, statesman, and distinguished friend of democracy—the brave and gallant Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo.

"Our two countries are equals bound together in friendship and mutual respect. Together we seek an end to injustice, tyranny and exploitation. Together we face a new and relentless form of totalitarian imperialism. Our hallmarks are cooperation, diversity and honest disagreement, and we are allies always against poverty, sickness and illiteracy—partners on the path to progress.

"We who fought side by side at Bataan and Corregidor know that the price of our liberty and the safeguard of our freedom is nothing less than eternal vigilance. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that our two nations, blood brothers in war and firm partners in peace, celebrate jointly our days of independence.

"As a faithful friend, I salute the free people of the Philippines and rejoice with them on the 15th anniversary of their independence."

KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senate: "The onslaught against freedom is as old as history itself. Throughout the life of the human race, man has constantly been thrust into the arena of conflict to defend liberty, whether it be his own, his community's, or his nation's.

"But the story of freedom, the exhilarating narrative of man's dedication to achieve the noble heritage of individual liberty, is more than a recitation of defensive actions, of resistance movements.

"Though achievement of liberty itself frequently has been sparked by reaction to overt suppression—reaction manifesting itself oftentimes through revolutionary movement—the preservation and maintenance of independence has followed another path, that of freemen working together in peaceful pursuit to strengthen the institutions of democracy.

"So it is that on this 4th of July we celebrate freedom's birthday in the sister republics of the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines. Our observance is more than a tribute to those who made the ultimate sacrifice in removing the chains of bondage.

"We not only pay homage to the brave men and women who fought and died to obtain the independence which we celebrate on July 4 but to salute those who worked effectively to preserve our free way of life since the time independence was first gained in our respective nations.

"Words alone can never render the gratitude and deep pride we all feel toward those who stood on the firing line to achieve the birth of freedom in our nations.

"One-hundred eighty-five years ago our American Declaration of Independence was signed. A dear price was paid for the fulfillment of the able aspirations of those who fought at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge.

"Since that time, Americans have been called upon time and again to answer the clarion call when our freedom was threatened. The course of our 15 years has not always been turbulent. When we have been free from military activities defending our liberties, the free institutions of our great self-governing society became stronger and the opportunities provided by them have been made equally available to more and more people.

"Today, America stands as one of the bastions of freedom.

"Another great stronghold of freedom is our warm friend and respected ally in the western Pacific, the Republic of the Philippines. History's recitation of the attainment of freedom by the Filipinos is as bright as is ours in America.

"Here, too, men and women fought and died to remove the oppression and abuses of the conqueror. We in America are proud to have participated in this venture for liberty and to have played a role in the supreme attainment of that undying pursuit culminated in the birth of your Republic 15 years ago.

"The memories of our most recent mutual struggle when the malignancy of the tyrant spread over the free soil of the Filipino still sear our hearts as we recall the dark days of Bataan and Corregidor.

"But whose memory is not stirred with exultation as we recall General MacArthur's battle cry of 'I shall return' reaching its highest promise with the restoration of freedom in your land?

"The independence achieved by you of the Republic of the Philippines on July 4, 1946, was warmly shared by your friends in America on that date.

"Today that warmth of association is even greater—as I can testify from the generous hospitality demonstrated to me last December on my most recent visit to your country—and the bonds which entwine our aspirations and deeds as one are made of freedom's firmest steel.

"We stand together in mutual trust and esteem, independent in our respect for human dignity and individualism, but dependent upon each other as friends who are ready to march forward in the pursuit of a just and eternal peace or to hold firm against the encroachments of a would-be Communist aggressor who would dare to repeat the follies of the past and attempt to stifle liberty.

"Ours is a friendship that has endured the most severe tests and challenges of the past, and I am confident that as we celebrate in unison the anniversary of freedom's birth, we will be rededicating ourselves to the furtherance of this common bond in our efforts to further preserve and enhance the freedom and dignity of mankind everywhere."

FRANCIS CASE, U.S. Senate: "The Philippine and American people are observing July 4, 1961, as freedom's birthday. This day is a symbol of liberty for the free world. However, we need to take stock: Will freedom survive? Are we willing to sacrific in order to remain free and expand liberty in the face of potential Communist domination?

"America has remained free for 185 years. The Philippines, 15 years an independent nation, have shown that democracy, the right of the individual and the responsibilities of liberty can prevail in that part of Asia.

"I congratulate the Philippine people for their success in making freedom work. You have proved dramatically to the freedom-starved nations that it can work for them, also.

"With God's grace and the determination of Philippine and American people working together, we can and will expand freedom to others."

DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate: "We, in New Mexico, feel the deepest bonds of brotherhood between the people of the Philippines and the United States, because it was on the embattled peninsula of Bataan and the Island of Corregidor that the Filipinos and the Americans stood side by side in a tragic hour of history.

"New Mexico members of the 200th Coast Artillery (AA) were there, and are amongst those whose names are enshrined in the history of both our countries. Bonds of mutual esteem, friendship, and confidence were forged between the American people and the Filipinos in those terrible hours. Consequently, we share a common concern for liberty and a vivid memory of the price of liberty.

"Let us never forget the cost of freedom and let us teach our sons to hold it dear."

HOMER E. CAPEHART, U.S. Senate: "I am delighted to join those supporting freedom, in celebrating the 15th anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines. It is indeed fitting this should be celebrated the same day the United States of America celebrates the 185th anniversary of its liberty. July 4 is a date of great historic significance to the United States and now is equally important to the Philippines.

"We will never forget the brave citizens of the Philippines who fought side by side with the brave Americans at Bataan and Corregidor.

"The fundamental objectives of the United States in the Philippines remain to encourage the development of a free Philippine nation strong and secure in its independence, stable in its government, and based on a healthy and steadily expanding economy. We seek to encourage its continuing identification and alinement with the free world, and to assist it to exert its influence in the Far East as an effective and constructive example of the benefits which can accrue to people everywhere under a representative form of government.

"I stand ready at all times to lend my support and efforts to help the Philippines remain strong and free."

STYLES BRIDGES, U.S. Senate: "It is certainly heartening to note that the Republic of the Philippines has pursued a policy of democracy and freedom since its independence which is in marked contrast to other nations in southeast Asia and elsewhere who have used their freedom unwisely and have fallen prey to Communist propaganda tactics.

"The free and democratic government of the Philippines, as well as the excellent Philippine-American relations, exemplifies the fact that Philippine citizens and their leaders have learned well the lessons of democracy.

"I greatly appreciate having this opportunity to comment on your country, and I do want to extend my heartiest congratulations to you on the 15th anniversary of your independence."

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate: "It is fitting that on July 4, the birth date of American independence, we in the United States send messages of greeting to the Republic of the Philippines. The 4th of July also marks your day of independence. Just as our two countries have a common feeling about this day, we share a mutual goal in the extension of freedom to every land. My wish is that every 4th of July shall find us united in the bonds of enduring friendship."

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader, House of Representatives: "I received your letter of April 26 and it is always a pleasure for me to rise and salute our friends in the Philippines. All peoples celebrate with jubilation and in due solemnity their independence day. To each nation its independence day is its national holiday. We have been observing the anniversary of that historic event for 185 years; to us it has been and remains the most significant single event in our history. July 4 is our Independence Day, and by a happy coincidence that day is the independence day of another people whose fate and destiny have been guided and guarded by the citizens and Government of this great Republic. July 4 is also the 15th anniversary of the Philippine Independence Day, marking the 15th year of the birth of the Philippine Republic.

"We have always been ready, and still are, to be of assistance to them in every possible way. In war and in peace we have stood by them, and have publicly vowed to help them in their struggle for freedom. This pledge was carried out at the end of the last war, and since then we remain allies and friends. Both peoples have come to realize that it is for their mutual benefit to maintain such firm friendship, such loyal alliance made and cemented for the good of all concerned, in defense of freedom and independence.

"On July 4 the sturdy and stouthearted Philippines celebrate their Independence Day, the historic anniversary of the 15th year of the birth of the Republic. That Republic during that short and stormy period has become a veritable and formidable bastion of freedom in the whole southeast Asia, and we all salute the Philippine people on this 185th anniversary of our own Independence Day, as our most devoted and loyal allies in our common struggle for the preservation of democracy and freedom in the world."

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator: "I am happy to learn that on July 4 the Republic of the Philippines will again join the United States of America in solemn observance of freedom's birthday.

"In view of the bond of friendship between our two nations it is appropriate that we join hands on this occasion to rededicate our lives to the preservation of free nations where the blessings of freedom and opportunity exist as long as men remain free."

CARL VINSON, chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives: "On the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Philippines, may I take this occasion to again express my high admiration and profound respect for the people of the Republic of the Philippines.

"So long as democracy exists, and freemen can state the truth, the world will know of the valor of those Filipinos who fought to preserve their homeland in World War II.

"Two great nations, the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, can be eternally proud of the trust and confidence that each holds for the other.

"Our friendly relationship for many years is proof to the world that we together practice the democracy we preach and that our form of government is the greatest form of society yet devised by man.

"Your ancestors and our ancestors knew oppression, thus both nations have earned the right to the title of defenders of freedom and stanch advocates of a representative form of government in which the dignity of man is paramount.

"I know the American people will continue to treasure this remarkable, imperishable friendship that exists between us."

HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives: "I have taken a personal pride in the progress made by the Republic of the Philippines and have derived the keenest satisfaction from its continuing and growing bonds of friendship with the United States. I offer my warm congratulations and heartfelt good wishes to the Republic of the Philippines on its 15th birthday coinciding with the 185th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. May both of our countries go forward in the tradition of freedom in which they were founded and stand as joint bulwarks of freedom facing to the West, to the East, to the North and to the South against the aggression of those who would seek to destroy us."

BRENT SPENCE, Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives: "I congratulate the Republic of the Philippines on the 15th anniversary of its independence. It is singularly appropriate that the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States should celebrate their independence on the same day.

"The Government of the Philippines has shown that it appreciates its freedom by its courageous fight for those principles and its ever-increasing friendship for the United States. Freedom is a priceless heritage and we must preserve it by our eternal vigilance.

"It is our solemn duty to see that free government is established and nourished in every land where freedom is desired. I know the people of the Philippines will steadfastly stand beside us in this fight in order that not only we, but the rest of the world, may have freedom.

"We rejoice with you when we celebrate our Independence Day."

WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives: "May I join with the many other Americans who are extending congratulations to the people of the Republic of the Philippines in their stanch defense of democracy and freedom, which has been so important in advancing the cause of civilization and in promoting the integrity and the best interests of individual citizens.

"On July 4, 1961, the Republic of the Philippines will once again join with the United States of America in observance of their respective birthdays—the 185th anniversary in the case of the United States, and the 15th anniversary in the case of the Filipinos.

"We are all aware of the importance of the cause of freedom, of the maintenance of the integrity of democratic institutions in the Philippine Islands, and I extend my sincere best wishes to the citizens of the Philippines in their observance of this important milestone in their stanch maintenance of democratic principles."

EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives: "This 15th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines has a special significance at a time when the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny are engaged in a battle for mastery.

"It is not only the facts of economic development in the Philippines that engages the attention of the world but also its outspoken and concrete social endeavors to prove ultimately that social welfare and individual responsibility can go hand in hand in the making of a better world.

"I can do no better than to repeat the words of President Garcia, 'The bonds of friendship and mutual interest which link the Philippines and the United States, our closest ally and friend, remain firm and enduring.'

"Corregidor and Bataan are, for both of our countries, monuments to liberty. That we, in the United States, have chosen to perpetuate the memory of our common devotion is evidenced by naming two streets in the Nation's capital 'Corregidor' and 'Bataan.' We have not forgotten, nor shall we ever forget."

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House of Representatives: "I certainly do appreciate your informing me that Bataan is planning to publish a special independence edition commemorating the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence and the 185th year of American freedom.

"The Spirit of '76 lives today. In this fast-changing world of atomic energy and space exploration, the same issues are at stake: shall freedom or tyranny prevail? But freedom is more than a word, it is more than an abstract idea, it is a way of life.

"What can Americans and Filipinos do to preserve the liberty they love? We must be

willing to guard and defend our cherished freedom; we must, as President Kennedy said, 'Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.' To this task we bend our heads and our backs so that those who follow will share the blessings of liberty which we inherited from the past.

"Again, let me say that it is indeed a pleasure to participate in celebrating jointly the Fourth of July—the day of independence of the Philippine Islands and of the United States."

FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives: "Independence is a word that shall always evoke a deep emotional response in those who have breathed its essence. Independence is the herald of freedom. It is an honored status, an expression of human dignity, collectively in the Nation as in the person. In the present context of events, its significance has never been greater.

"Independence is the language of democracy. Newly disguised barbarians are seeking acceptance in the modern world by terrorism and deceit, odious methods well known to history from time immemorial. Self-government—the highest manifestation of civilization in the ancient as in the modern world—is once again challenged by those who lust for power.

"Independence is not inconsistent with the concept of world unity and world brotherhood in freedom. It will not however coalesce with world domination by tyranny. As now the circle of freedom slowly constricts, we in the United States and our brothers in the Philippines, who recognize the enlightened purposes and necessities of our advanced civilization, must turn our faces against the common enemy.

"In the Philippines you stand at the outer perimeter of reason and humanity. Your courage, your wisdom, and your faith will meet its greatest tests in the years immediately ahead. Your example will in great part determine the choice of others, who will be either depressed or inspired by the course you take.

"The mutual anniversary of independence which we share with you on July 4, although a time of rejoicing, must yet be a time for reflection. It must strengthen us in our common responsibilities and purposes. We shall stand together saluting this occasion which symbolizes our common ideals; as children of the same God.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., House of Representatives: "The people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands have good reasons for a common celebration on July 4, 1961. This date marks the 185th anniversary of the independence of the United States and the 15th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines.

"Self-government in the Philippine Republic has been a gratifying success. It is a bastion of democracy and freedom in the Far East. America has no better or stronger friend in the troubled Pacific area. As we look with grave concern upon events in Asia, Americans are comforted to have such a friendly ally in a critical area of the globe.

"There has been no diminution of mutual regard, respect and admiration between the two nations during the years of Philippine independence. In fact, the ties of friendship and dependence upon each other grow stronger and firmer with the passing of the years.

"The people of America enthusiastically admire the progress of the fine Philipino people under such leaders as President Carlos P. Garcia. The Filipinos are a courageous people and are determined to preserve their national culture and their independence. In their aspirations, they have the deep friendship and the support of the people of America."

CLARENCE J. BROWN, House of Representatives: "I am happy to learn that on July Fourth the Republic of the Philippines will once again join my country in the solemn observance of freedom's birthday—the 185th anniversary of our own Declaration of Independence, and the 15th anniversary of the complete independence of the Philippines.

"For many years there has been a close association and friendship between the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States. The two countries and their peoples have worked together for the maintenance of liberty and freedom. Those of us in the United States are especially proud of the great progress the Filipinos have made since their nation became independent 15 years ago.

"If we—the American people and the United States Government—have in any way made easier your great accomplishments, we feel well repaid.

"It is my hope and expectation that throughout the years to come our two nations may continue their close relationship for the benefit of all mankind and peace in the world."

CARROLL D. KEARNS, House of Representatives: "On the joint anniversary of freedom—the 185th birthday of America and the 15th birthday of Philippine independence—celebrated on July 4, 1961, I want to extend congratulations to our friends across the Pacific.

"The people of the Philippines and the Americas have stood together these many years in the preservation of freedom, and I trust they will always be friends.

"My heartiest felicitations on the celebration of Philippine Independence Day."

TOM MURRAY, Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives: "This July Fourth is a day of joy and happiness for 28 million Filipinos and 183 million Americans. It is their and our Independence Day. On the observance of the 185th anniversary of our Independence Day and the 15th anniversary of their independence Day we gladly join our fast friends and faithful allies in the Philippines.

"Our cordial friendship and admiration for the Filipinos, of course, long antedates their independence. More than half a century ago we helped them to cast off Spain's oppressive rule, and we took them under our protection. For more than four decades we safeguarded them against their foes and helped them in every way possible. We guided them through the difficult path which, after the last destructive war, led to their complete independence. In the course of that time the people of this country and their Government took a particular interest in the well-being of the Filipinos. Through welfare, charitable and educational organizations we built schools, hospitals, and churches in the Philippines. Medical and health services there did an immense amount of good, first in reducing the death rate throughout the islands and also by eliminating the root cause of a number of deadly diseases, such as malaria.

"During the last war their fate and our fate was wrapped up in one. Our victory meant their victory, and their eventual freedom. And less than a year after the conclusion of the war in the Pacific, we helped the people of the Philippines to become a free, sovereign and independent nation. We have since watched them rebuild their war-ravaged country, and have helped them to strengthen their financial, political, social and educational institutions.

"Today this youthful, promising and vigorous Republic is an important force for peace and stability, for prosperity and progress, in the Pacific area. It is also a faithful and loyal ally of this country in its unending struggle against Communist totalitarian tyranny. We all salute the gallant Filipinos on the 15th anniversary of their Independence Day and wish them prosperity and peace."

ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Labor and Education, House of Representatives: "It is with great pleasure that I congratulate you for the fine idea of publishing a special edition observing the 15th anniversary of the Republic of the Philippines. That youthful and vigorous Republic has become a bastion of democracy and a key to our policy in the Pacific area. In their appreciation of and devotion to democratic principles, gallant Filipinos have fulfilled all expectations. I am indeed proud that we, on the celebration of the 185th anniversary of our Independence Day, join hands with our Filipino friends and allies in the observance of the 15th anniversary of their independence day.

"Cordial greetings and congratulations."

THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives: "It is a pleasure to extend greetings to the Philippine people on the 15th anniversary of their national independence. The coincidence of the day of their independence with that of the American people gives emphasis to the common purposes that have bound our two countries in peace and in war. In these unsettled times it is not enough that we celebrate our national independence with unrestrained joy. We must regard it as an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to maintain that independence; to remember those of our fellow men to whom national independence is only a silent memory; and to provide those who have never experienced its exhilaration with a worthy example of its real meaning."

ROBERT J. CORBETT, House of Representatives: "On her 15th anniversary the youthful and vigorous Republic of the Philippines is a living and powerful force for peace in southeast Asia. She is also our most faithful and loyal ally in our ideological warfare against Communist totalitarian tyranny. We are proud and honored in having the gallant and stout-hearted Filipinos on our side in this relentless struggle.

"The Republic of the Philippines, by its devotion to democratic principles, and by its firm resolve to fight for freedom, has become an object of admiration for all lovers of freedom. In the course of their brief but significant history Filipinos have learned to appreciate and value highly the blessings of free democratic institutions. They were denied freedom for centuries, and they suffered under Spain's colonial administrators, but from the moment they became our wards, and their fate placed in our care, we did our best to inculcate in them democratic ideals.

"During the last war they fought on our side as allies and brothers-in-arms. Soon after that war they earned their long-cherished and well-deserved independence. We were happy to see the birth of the Republic of the Philippines, and gladly did all we could to help the new-born Republic stand on its feet and grow stronger. Anxiously and gladly we watched it gather strength and attain maturity, so that on its 15th birthday, which by a happy concident is the 185th birthday of this great Republic, it has become a powerful and decisive force for stability and peace in the entire Pacific area. Greetings to the proud people of the Republic of the Philippines on their 15th Independence Day."

John Patterson, Governor of Alabama: "As Governor of the State of Alabama, I am very grateful for the opportunity of joining with the people of the Republic of the Philippines in celebrating Independence Day. It is, indeed, a real pleasure to send congratulations and warmest greetings to our

friends in the Philippine Islands and to extend our very best wishes for a continuation of close and friendly relations between our country and yours in the years to come."

Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona: "It is indeed a privilege to have the opportunity to extend to the citizens of the Republic of the Philippines greetings on the occasion of their 15th anniversary as a Republic and on the 185th anniversary of the birthday of America.

"The close-knit ties of these two great Republics stand as a bulwark of freedom and an inspiration to the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

"It is my sincere hope that as the years progress, Philippine-American cooperation will continue to increase daily."

William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska: "As Governor of Alaska which has only recently been accorded full membership in the Union of States, I am pleased to comment on the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence.

"There is more than coincidence in the fact that our Nation on the same day celebrates its 185th birthday. The Filipinos are our closest Asian friends, and in all Asia their Government is the most nearly like our own.

"During the last great war the soldiers of the Philippines fought side by side with ours in a great struggle marked by deeds of magnificent bravery.

"The Philippines are democracy's Asiatic show window. Our friendship is one which must always endure for our nations have common interests and we must advance and prosper together or the cause of freedom will suffer.

"Here in Alaska, we count among our valued citizens those of your nation who have come to make a home in a new and rugged land. They daily offer evidence of sincere devotion to public interest and to freedom and democracy. Hard working, gay of spirit even in adversity, they are loyal to those common causes which we hold dear.

"On behalf of all Alaskans I wish your nation continued success and progress."

Orval E. Faubus, Governor of Arkansas: "As Governor of the State of Arkansas, it is indeed a pleasure for me to send greetings to the Philippines on your 15th anniversary celebration.

"During the past the Filipinos have ably demonstrated their steadfast devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy. They are to be commended for the undaunted courage they have exhibited during times of world tension. We in the United States appreciate the friendship and mutual esteem which has existed between our two countries.

"I take this opportunity to wish you a happy and joyous celebration on this very special occasion."

Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California: "We often say, here in California, that we are the gateway to Asia. In a sense this is, of course, true. The commerce of America flows from California westward to the islands that represent freedom on the far edge of the Pacific. But it is the Philippines that repsent the true doorway to Asia.

"When the Philippines won their independence, there were, in the United States, those who decried the freedom being granted. They raised fears that the years have proved groundless. They suggested that this great rock of democracy would crumble in the sea of adversity and turmoil which surrounded it.

"Their lack of faith in the Filipino people lives only to mock them. The steadfast men and women of the Philippines under the magnificent leadership of Ramon Magsaysay and Carlos P. Garcia have shown that the ideas of freedom and the principles of democracy grow as rich a crop under the Far Pacific sun as they do here on the western shore of the gentle sea.

"We look to you to maintain the faith in freedom which you have shown you so well understand.

"All of us in the United States look to you with hope and with confidence."

Steve McNichols, Governor of Colorado: "Please extend my congratulations and fond regards to the citizens of the Republic of the Philippines on the 15th anniversary of Filipino independence.

"The extremely close affiliation and friendship between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America—developed upon a basis of mutual trust and appreciation—provides a firm anchor for democracy in Asia.

"I share the opinion of many Americans and Filipinos that this bond between our two nations will grow firmer and warmer under the leadership of your President Garcia and our President Kennedy.

"Congratulations on this significant occasion."

John Dempsey, Governor of Connecticut: "It is a genuine pleasure for me to express to the readers of Bataan magazine the greetings of the people of Connecticut on the occasion of the joint celebration of the independence of the United States and of the Republic of the Philippines.

"The history of Connecticut shows that the tradition of independence goes back far beyond the time, 185 years ago, when the United States declared itself to be a free and separate nation. It is 223 years since the people of Connecticut adopted a written constitution, known as the 'Fundamental Orders,' which embodied principles laid down by the founders of this colony that 'the foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people.' Thus, the people of Connecticut have adhered to the democratic way of life for well over two centuries. We heartily welcome to the free world's family of nations a republic like the Philippines which adheres steadfastly to the same principles.

"Democracy is undergoing a serious challenge in many parts of the world, particularly in Asia. It is a comforting assurance, therefore, to know that the Republic of the Philippines stands as a champion of democracy in Asia. The United States looks to the Philippines to set an example to other nations who are now faced, or are likely to be faced, with the necessity of making a choice between democracy or some other way of life.

"Again, my congratulations to all the people of the Philippines on the celebration of your 15th Independence Day."

Elbert N. Carvel, Governor of Delaware: "My warmest congratulations to the people of the Republic on the anniversary of Philippine independence. The democratic process which characterizes the free world can survive only when our countries stand side by side in its defense. Delaware is halfway around the globe from your country, but distance is no barrier to men joined in the common desire for freedom from oppression."

Farris Bryant, Governor of Florida: "It is my pleasure to send these words of greeting to the people of the Philippine Islands on the 15th anniversary of their independence.

In the shift from dependence to independence, the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States have maintained a mutual respect and a mutual dedication to the goals of freedom and of democracy.

"I am confident that together, in unity and mutual respect, we will celebrate many more anniversaries of freedom so meaningful to both our Nations."

S. Ernest Vandiver, Governor of Georgia: "The thousands of Georgians who shed their blood on Philippine soil during World War II, in order that the liberty of Filipinos might be restored, join me in a heartfelt message of congratulations on the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence, July 4, 1961. We view with pride the growth of democracy in these islands because of the part Georgians—in the service of their country—played in assuring that freedom might live on in Asia."

Otto Kerner, Governor of Illinois: "July 4 affords us a moment's pause to consider the twin destinies of two great democracies—the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America.

"This date in history marks the signing of the noble Declaration of Independence for the United States 185 years ago and the 15th anniversary as an independent nation for the Republic of the Philippines.

"Our futures are linked in a tradition based on the unique value of the individual citizen. It is a heritage that gives its citizens the rights and freedoms and the consent to be governed. It gains its justice in the orderly observation of law and a responsibility to observe the common good and general welfare of society.

"We cherish this gift of freedom and are proud of the great progress the Republic of the Philippines has made in these short years to overcome the ravages of war, the threat of communism, and the rapid strides you have made in building a modern society.

"On behalf of the people of Illinois, I am pleased to convey our congratulations and best wishes to the people of the Republic of the Philippines."

Norman A. Erbe, Governor of Iowa: "I wish to take this opportunity to extend the congratulations of the people of the State of Iowa to the people of the Republic of the Philippines upon this their 15th anniversary of independence. It is highly fitting and proper that you should celebrate your independence on the same date annually that the United States celebrates its independence. The American people and the people of the Philippines have a very great common bond, that of democracy and freedom. We in America continue our support of the people of the Philippines in any way we can in seeing that democracy is not only preserved in your part of the world but that it is further extended to all of the people that have a firm dedication to the thesis of democracy."

John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas: "Independence Day, for you and us, is a time for mutual esteem, friendship and confidence between the people of our two countries.

Still, these better attributes of human nature need constantly to be renewed and Independence Day is a suitable occasion to be reminded of our common interests in free men and free nations at a time when these happy circumstances are being challenged on a worldwide basis."

Bert Thomas Combs, Governor of Kentucky: "It is with great pleasure that I extend congratulations from the citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the citizens of the Republic of the Philippines on the 15th anniversary of your independence.

"Just as our country gained its independence 185 years ago to become the seat of democracy in the Americas, so your country has done in your part of the world.

"On July 4, as our two countries join together to celebrate the birth of freedom, the people of Kentucky join with me in a salute to continued goodwill and cooperation between the Philippines and America."

Jimmie H. Davis, Governor of Louisiana: "The traditional and historic relationship between the United States and the Philippines is an alliance built primarily upon mutual friendship and respect between the two nations.

"It is nurtured by the continuing good will in the hearts of the citizens of the respective nations and far transcends any treaties,

legal documents, or other accepted tokens of international friendship.

"Our warm feelings for the Philippine people will continue as long as there are peace-loving men of good will in the world, which will be forever."

J. Millard Tawes, Governor of Maryland: "I am grateful to you and to Bataan Magazine for affording me this opportunity to send a message of congratulations to the people of the Republic of the Philippines on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the independence of their nation.

"In our struggle to preserve and expand freedom in the world, it is reassuring to us in the United States to reflect that your nation stands out as an example that democracy can exist and thrive in troubled Asia.

"As we observe our own Independence Day on July 4, we in this country will recall that it is also the birthday of our staunch ally in the fight for freedom, the Republic of the Philippines.

"The people of my State share with all Americans a feeling of high esteem and deep affection for the people of your country.

"We send you, on this anniversary, sincere felicitations, with the fervent prayer that the friendship between our two countries will continue through the years ahead."

John A. Volpe, Governor of Massachusetts: "It is an honor and a privilege for me, as Governor of Massachusetts, to extend the greetings of this Commonwealth, as well as my personal felicitations, to the Republic of the Philippines.

"July 4 is a day of special meaning for the Philippines—not only is it the 185th anniversary of the independence of the United States, but it is the 15th anniversary of the day on which the Philippines gained their independence.

"The bond of friendship between the two nations is longstanding and warm. It has always been based on common ideals and mutual interests.

"It is our earnest hope that in the years to come the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America may continue their friendship and their mutual efforts to preserve and defend democracy in the East and in the world."

John B. Swainson, Governor of Michigan: "As we join together for the 185th anniversary of American freedom and the 15th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines, the people of Michigan are happy to join with the Filipinos in observing this double anniversary.

"We will forever be joining in a common bond of love of freedom. May we always remember the responsibilities which accompany the joys of freedom. May I take this opportunity to extend to all your readers a most cordial invitation to visit our great State of Michigan?"

Elmer L. Andersen, Governor of Minnesota: "Americans, in General MacArthur's phrase, 'will always remember the devotion of the people of the Philippines to human liberty.' Truly, Americans will never forget the great contribution made by these people who joined our own fight against enslavement by a foreign ideology. The United States was proud to participate in Philippine independence 15 years ago.

"In a world besieged by the threat of despotism and oppression it is indeed heartening to see a young and vigorous nation achieve an ever-increasing position of importance in the world's economy through a democratic form of government. This offers concrete proof to those who would doubt or criticize or seek to destroy the ideals of freedom-loving people that ours is the good way—the right way—of achieving progress while still respecting the rights of the individual.

"We congratulate you, our good friends and stanch allies, as you celebrate an event of the utmost importance in the history of your country."

John M. Dalton, Governor of Missouri: "In the name of the great State of Missouri and all its citizens, I am privileged to send hearty greetings and warm congratulations to our friends, the officials and people of the Philippine Republic on the occasion of your 15th anniversary as an independent nation.

Proof that good government and healthy economic development succeed in a free society is furnished by the short but spectacular history of the Philippine democracy, as witness the growth of national product, manufacture and trade, the extension of essential public services to rural areas, an increase in local self-government, civil service reform improvements, and a progressive social welfare program.

"The American people hold the Philippine people in the highest esteem and look forward to unbroken years of continually increasing friendship."

Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska: "This year on the Fourth of July the Republic of the Philippines will celebrate the 15th anniversary of their independence. On this occasion heartiest congratulations and best wishes are extended to the Republic of the Philippines and its freedom-loving citizens.

"With faith in God and in the leadership of our great nations we can develop within ourselves the qualities of vigorous and stalwart citizenship, required to insure, 'That government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.' The position of our governments is visible proof that we honor and merit the grave responsibility placed in us to uphold the dignity of democratic nations.

"The freedom we enjoy; the cornerstone of our governments, the foundation of our way of life is our most precious possession and our most costly. Today this freedom is ours only because of long years of courage and devotion, of toil and sacrifice, of struggle and achievement on the part of countless millions of men and women. This freedom will continue to be ours only so long as the members of each succeeding generation of citizens faithfully nourish it, and valiantly defend it, not only against attack by enemies from without, but against such deadly internal adversaries as neglect of civic duty, disregard of right, indifference to wrong, and the evils of blind prejudice and intolerance.

"It is encouraging to note that your government and your people are assuming a leadership role in the cause of freedom in Asia. More nations and people like yours are needed to join the struggle for freedom throughout the world. Our bonds of friendship, mutual esteem and goals for a free world society must be welded ever closer together. We must work together in harmony to strengthen the cause of freedom and deomcracy.

"Democracy is the noblest word yet thought of by man to describe a social state national self-government. It is a way of life for free and upright people who take pride in governing not only their country, but themselves as well. The fundamental principle of democracy is that decision, direction, and action do not come down from rulers, by virtue of their position, but rather from the will of the people.

"In a democracy citizenship entails responsibility. Citizenship is far more than a legal status or a source of rights and privileges. It is a personal responsibility for the national well-being and the preservation of human values which make the democratic nation great and strong. This is a responsibility we can never escape. Ultimately we, the people of free nations, and we alone, can determine the destinies of our free nations, and in concert the destiny of the world, for government at any level can be no better than we cause it to be.

"If the cause of freedom is to survive, freedom loving peoples everywhere must actively participate in this endeavor. Those without the courage of their convictions and apathy towards their responsibility contribute nothing to this struggle. We must awaken to our responsibility and obligation not only to our own country, but to all mankind. We must enter into the ceaseless struggle to preserve and defend the rights of man in the cause of freedom. We must speak out with strength and vigor against what we know to be wrong.

"The great governments of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America are shining lights in the world today, toward which all freedom loving peoples look for guidance for the future. It is incumbent upon our governments and our people to maintain and improve our democratic processes. We must continue to lead in this endeavor if we are to achieve our goal of leading the world into the four ways of life which will provide freedom from want, freedom of expression, freedom from fear and equal opportunity for all mankind to enjoy the fruits of life to the maximum of their individual capacities."

Wesley Powell, Governor of New Hampshire: "It is a pleasure as Governor of the State of New Hampshire to extend my good wishes and the greetings of the citizens of this State to the people of the Republic of the Philippines on the occasion of the 15th Anniversary of their independence which will be celebrated on July 4, the 185th anniversary of the birthday of the United States.

"Your people have demonstrated successfully that democracy can live and thrive in Asia. As one of the free nations of the world, we welcome your support in preserving and strengthening the peace of the world.

"During the past 15 years, your country has continued to grow and prosper and because of your resources, both natural and human, I know that this national growth will be accelerated in the coming years. Your leaders are to be commended for their efforts and your people can be proud of their contribution to this record of progress.

"Once again, on this important anniversary, may I wish the people of your country continued success as a free society and pledge our cooperation in insuring solutions to our mutual problems."

Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey: "The people of New Jersey are pleased to send greetings and best wishes to the Republic of the Philippines on the occasion of the joint celebration July 4, of the 15th anniversary of Philippine independence and the 185th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence in the United States.

"We of the United States are proud of the achievements of the Filipinos under the leadership of freely elected public officials, in demonstrating democracy at its best, in action. The relations of our two countries can stand as a model of enlightened cooperation and mutual respect."

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York: "The special independence edition of Bataan magazine affords me a welcome opportunity of expressing the genuine good will of the people of New York toward the people of the Philippines. Philippine Independence Day is most certainly an occasion for celebration.

"The people of the Republic of the Philippines have shown that democracy can live in Asia.

"We for our part are proud of the results of Philippine-American cooperation. Our feelings toward the Filipinos are those of abiding esteem, friendship, and confidence.

"My best wishes for a happy celebration."

William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota: "It is a great pleasure for me to congratulate the people of the Philippine Islands for their astute political understanding of the democratic processes. Your success as a democracy is a tribute to your people.

"We were comrades in war and now we are comrades in peace. I hope that our people and your people can continue to face up to the responsibilities of this age intelligently and courageously."

Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of Ohio: "In behalf of the people of the State of Ohio, it gives me great pleasure to extend congratulations and good wishes to the Republic of the Philippines on the occasion of its 15th anniversary as an independent nation.

"Over the past 15 years, the people of the Philippines have proven their sincere desire to establish and maintain a democratic system of government. Under the vigorous and able leadership of their President, Carlos P. Garcia, they have reaffirmed the truth to other nations that democracy can exist in Asia.

"The Filipinos have made a significant contribution to the cause of democracy and they have gained the respect and admiration of other nations throughout the world for their willingness to remain independent and to continue the preservation of a friendly relationship toward the United States.

"It is with a deep sense of pride that we gratefully acknowledge the friendship which has been ours during the past and which we know will endure throughout the years which lie ahead."

J. Howard Edmondson, Governor of Oklahoma: "It is a pleasure for me to extend greetings and best wishes to our great friends in Asia. The Filipinos have graphically demonstrated that democracy can live and the cause of peace can be supported actively and forthrightly in the East.

"I have every confidence that the warm camaraderie we Americans feel for our Filipino friends will long exist and become an even stronger bond."

Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon: "It is a pleasure to learn that Bataan will be devoting a special issue to the observance of the 185th anniversary of America and the 15th anniversary of independence for the Republic of the Philippines. As one who spent nearly 2 years in the Pacific in defense of the freedom you and our people enjoy, I am extremely grateful for the opportunity of expressing my thanks to the people of the Philippines for maintaining liberty.

"Modern communications and transportation have brought us ever closer—far closer than was dreamed when the blueprint was worked out for the independence you now enjoy. Yet much remains to be done and may each of us take this occasion in 1961 to seek further ways to better understand one another's community. It is my hope that President Kennedy, who did not have his predecessor's privilege of residence in your great country, will visit you personally in the not too distant future."

David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania: "It is deeply significant that the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines should mark the anniversary of their independence on the same day, we for the 185th time, the Philippines for the 15th.

"Our two people have shared the great challenge freedom presents to those who hold it dearly. We have fought together in time of war; we have struggled together to insure a lasting peace; we are devoted to the aims of liberty in a troubled century.

"I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend the congratulations of the people of Pennsylvania to the citizens of the Philippines in this proud 15th anniversary of their independence.

Buford Ellington, Governor of Tennessee: "For more than six decades the fortunes of the United States and of the Philippines have been entwined. The blessings of close cooperation and democratic government have come to both countries as a result of this alliance.

"As we mark the 15th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines, it is a source of pride to Americans everywhere that the Filipinos stand as a proud example of the fruits of democracy in a troubled world. It gives me great pleasure to join in this tribute to a freedom-loving people who are ever mindful not only of the privileges of democracy but also of the awful price which this freedom has cost."

Price Daniel, Governor of Texas: "As Governor of Texas, it is a pleasure to extend congratulations to the Republic of the Philippines on its 15th anniversary of independence.

"It is appropriate that Filipinos and citizens of the United States, who share the ideals of freedom and democracy, observe the same great Independence Day—July 4.

"The Philippines has made outstanding progress in all major areas since 1946, and is to be commended on its growth and development as a nation and the dramatic proof that democracy can live in Asia.

"The bonds between our people and those of the Philippines are indeed strong and enduring. I count it a special privilege to be afforded this opportunity to extend greetings to President Carlos P. Garcia and the Republic of the Philippines on our common independence day."

F. Ray Keyser, Jr., Governor of Vermont: "May I offer my warm, personal greetings regarding the anniversary commemorating Philippine-American cooperation in keeping the world free from tyranny.

"July 4—marking the day when the Philippines and the United States will join hands and heart to mark the birth of freedom in our respective nations—is a date to be revered.

"Philippine-American relations should serve as an example to the world that tried and tested friendships can withstand the pressures from despotic governments seeking to rule the world.

"It is imperative to the future of freedom and liberty throughout the world that nations express the type of relationship being enjoyed between the Philippines and America."

J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia: "On behalf of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia, it is an honor for me to extend best wishes and congratulations to the Republic of the Philippines on the occasion of freedom's birthday through your magazine, Bataan.

"As you know, our forebears in Virginia played important roles in the United States fight for freedom, the drafting of our Constitution, and later the Bill of Rights. Virginians of today have great admiration for our Filipino friends. You have struggled also so that you may enjoy the rights and freedoms of a representative democracy. Our two great Republics must join with other freedom-loving nations in combating those forces of evil which are pressing down upon us. We cannot and we will not lose this struggle."

Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington: "It is a privilege for me on behalf of the people of Washington State to extend a warm and friendly greeting to the people of the Philippine Islands on the occasion of their 15th anniversary of independence. The Filipino people have distinguished themselves by their willingness to fight for freedom and to keep the eternal vigilance so necessary if democracy is to continue to exist.

"The people of the Philippines have demonstrated decisively that democracy can flourish in Asia. Your government is serving as an example to all the people in southeast Asia who have shown that they are sincerely interested in freedom and the economic development which freedom fosters.

"You may be assured that the people of Washington State will do all they can to enhance and sustain the historic Philippine-American friendship."

William Wallace Barron, Governor of West Virginia: "With unusual enthusiasm, I extend congratulations and best wishes to the Republic of the Philippines in its celebration of the birthday of freedom.

"On the 185th anniversary of the birth of the United States of America and the 15th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines, I am highly pleased to take official notice of the historic American-Philippine friendship. It is a warm relationship based upon mutual understanding and respect. The courage and inspiration of the American and Philippine people on Bataan and Corregidor will forever stand as a glorious tribute to this friendship and an unmatched love of freedom. It was one of the most inspiring chapters in the history of the free world.

"It is indeed a privilege for me to extend July Fourth greetings to the Philippines, rightly called Asia's showcase of democracy.

Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of Wisconsin: "It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to congratulate the Republic of the Philippines on the 15th anniversary of its independence. It's symbolic of the close ties that remain and will continue between the United States and the Philippines that you will observe your independence anniversary on the same day that we will observe ours.

"Though you are only in your 15th year as a republic, your history actually goes back farther than that of the United States. It is a matter of great interest and pride to me that the present era in your history actually started near the turn of this century with the beginning of the close Philippine-American relationship.

"Much has been demanded of you in the last 20 years. Your country and your people suffered greatly during World War II. Yet within a year after the end of that war you embarked on independence.

"Since then you have had severe problems to deal with. Recovering from war is a major task for a nation; becoming a new nation and enduring the growing pains of the early years is a tremendous task. You have had to do both. Yet you have not merely survived these trials; you have progressed and become stronger with each succeeding year. This is a tribute to your people and to your leaders.

"Now you are celebrating 15 years of independence and 15 years as democracy's island in Asia. As you go forward into the coming year, I join with other Americans in wishing the best for you, our stanch friend and ally."

Jack R. Gage, Governor of Wyoming: "It is a great privilege for me to extend greetings and congratulations from the citizens of the State of Wyoming to President Carlos P. Garcia and the people of the Republic of the Philippines on the 15th anniversary of Filipino independence.

"July the Fourth is a day of observance for Americans and Filipinos when on that day the United States and the Republic of the Philippines join in the celebration of their separate anniversaries of independence—the 185th year of independence in the United States and the 15th year of independence in the Republic of the Philippines.

"Americans and Filipinos have enjoyed warm friendship and sincere relationships for many years, a bond which was tightly sealed by events following the Japanese attack of December 7, 1941. Sharing the suffering and sacrifice and the glorious victory for the preservation of the freedom we cherish brought us more closely together as we continue to cooperate in extending the benefits of democracy."

Emmet O'Neal, former U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines and chairman, Corregidor-

Bataan Memorial Commission: "It is difficult for me to express what I feel for the Philippines as it approaches its 15th year anniversary. Were I merely an interested American citizen, making an honest appraisal of the record, I could heartily congratulate the Philippines and wish it well as time goes on. But I am more than that, for my stay in the Philippines and among the Filipinos has made me, not only an admirer, but a sentimental and affectionate friend. History will never adequately portray the courage, loyalty and deep feelings of the Filipinos for the United States and democracy and the Philippines have justified the faith and respect of all Americans who have honestly adjudged her trials and accomplishments.

"I can only say that I wish and expect that the Philippines and the United States will ever feel close to each other and that nothing can break the ties that have existed and still exist between us. To assist in that, I am giving much of my time to create on Philippine soil a visual interpretation of the deep sentimental tie that exists between our two countries. If our plans are successful, the magnificent memorial contemplated on Corregidor will tell all who view it the saga of our relationship and the fundamental things which can bring peace among all nations."

Myron M. Cowen, former U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines: "My congratulations to the Philippine people for having so successfuly completed 15 years of national independence and to Bataan magazine for so worthily commemorating their 15th national holiday.

"During this period, the United States and the Philippine Republic, united not only by a common Independence Day, but by common ideals, have stood together against brutal aggression, fought together and triumphed together. Never, surely, will either people forget that comradeship in arms from Pearl Harbor to the victory ceremony on the U.S.S. *Missouri*.

"We Americans are gratified by the way in which the Philippine people, by their economic and social progress, by their devotion to national independence and civil liberties, have justified our confidence in them when in 1946, after almost half a century of occupation, we voluntarily withdrew and bade them navigate on their own. Since then we have admired their successes in many fields. We are particularly proud to have among the peoples of the Far East so dependable an ally and friend. Nothing better symbolizes this friendship than our shared Independence Day.

"Yet our common gratification should not blind either people to the fact that tyranny once more stalks the earth in a new and more formidable aspect. It is challenging both freedom and democracy more fiercely than for many centuries past. At our very gates, in both the East and the West, stands an enemy who laughs at our respect for the human person, despises our religion, flouts our dearest ideals, and seeks to reduce us to mere segments of one universal ant hill.

"That freedom and democracy will not only survive but one day become the cherished heritage of the entire human race, I have no doubt. But meanwhile the trial will be neither easy nor short. The test will call for the most responsible leadership, the firmest character, and the greatest human integrity. Both Filipinos and Americans will do well to heed the ringing words of President Kennedy: 'Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country.'

"If we do this, if we gladly accept the necessary sacrifices, then we need have no fears of the dangers, anxieties, hardships that lie ahead.

"It is in this spirit that I send my greetings and heartiest congratulations to the Philippine people and to Bataan magazine."

George W. Healy, Jr., editor, the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La.: "New Orleans and the Philippines long have had a common bond, principally, I believe, because citizens of this port and the Filipinos are agreed that the time is gone when we can live unto ourselves.

"That there is active interest in Louisiana in trade between the Deep South and the Philippines is attested by actual shipments between the two areas.

"That this interest is increasing, it seems to me, is indicated by the sending of a trade mission of New Orleans' International House to Manila in May 1961 to seek ways to strengthen ties with your islands.

"This trade mission, I might add, included some of New Orleans' and the Mississippi Valley's outstanding bankers, publishers, business executives, and shipping authorities. The general manager of the port of New Orleans was a member of the mission.

"New Orleans has as residents a substantial number of nationals of the Philippines and of natives of the Philippines who have become citizens of the United States. It is my privilege to know many of these Filipinos both socially and in a business way, and I do not have an acquaintance with a single one whom I do not consider a good citizen.

"Official representatives of the Philippine nation who have served in New Orleans as counsuls or as members of the consular staff, in my opinion, have been ladies and gentlemen of the highest standing and have served both their own country and this port with great credit.

"I hope that New Orleanians who reside in Manila are held in as great esteem by Filipinos as the Philippine citizens who reside in New Orleans are held by citizens of our city."

United States and Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday's edition of the Wall Street Journal carried a column of comment on the President's speech on the Berlin crisis which I want to call to the special attention of my colleagues:

UNITED STATES AND BERLIN—PRESIDENT KENNEDY HAS DESCRIBED CLEARLY EXACTLY WHY WE MUST STAND FAST

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

While Uncle Sam's problems with his allies and Khrushchev over the Berlin crisis have scarcely begun, it is important for Americans to remember how solid a case the United States has for refusing to budge from that divided city.

And this case was dramatically described to the world in President Kennedy's speech the other day, a speech which may rank among the Chief Executive's most important state papers. Mr. Kennedy declared:

"We cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin, either gradually or by force. The solemn vow we each gave to West Berlin in time of peace will not be broken in time of danger."

The President got to the heart of the question in this eloquent tribute to that isolated courageous city:

"A showcase of liberty, a symbol, an isle of freedom in a Communist sea, a link with the free world, a beacon of hope behind the Iron Curtain, an escape hatch for refugees. Above all the great testing place of Western courage and will, a focal point where our solemn commitments and Soviet ambitions now meet in basic confrontation."

Mr. Kennedy made short work of the defeatist argument that Berlin is untenable, an argument that was also heard in the fall of 1958 when some misguided people were urging the United States to pull the rug from under Chiang Kai-shek and force him to abandon his island outposts, Quemoy and Matsu. President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles stood firm on this issue; there was no appeasement and there was no war. As President Kennedy put it: "Any dangerous spot is tenable if brave men will make it so."

MASSIVE OFFENSIVE

Of course, West Berlin could be overrun by a massive Red army offensive. But this is equally true of a great many other places along the frontiers of the cold war.

The old German Baltic Port of Luebeck, for instance, is located almost on the demarcation line, which can be reached by a streetcar ride and a short walk. Of course, such an exposed place could be seized; but the whole point of an alliance like NATO is to make it clear that no nibbling aggression will be tolerated. And this is just as true for West Berlin, repeatedly the object of NATO and specific American, British and French defensive commitments, as it is of any other spot on the free side of the Iron Curtain.

The policy of defending West Berlin, by force if necessary, is thoroughly bipartisan. The Truman administration employed the airlift that beat the first Soviet attempt to take West Berlin by blockade in 1948–49. The Eisenhower administration rebuffed Khrushchev's demands for the withdrawal of Western forces and the transformation of West Berlin into a "free city," originally presented with a 6-month time limit in November 1958.

The Kennedy message went farther than any declaration of President Eisenhower in two ways. It faced up frankly to the grim possibility of nuclear war. And it ordered a number of measures, calculated to strengthen the numbers, mobility and striking power of America's ground forces, at an estimated cost of over $3 billion. Of course, certain gimmicks that were used to soften the impact of Khrushchev's elastic ultimatum of November 1958—the Macmillan visit to Moscow, the invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States—can hardly be reemployed. And the Kennedy-Khrushchev parley in Vienna offered no hope on Berlin.

It would be wrong to interpret Mr. Kennedy's message as belligerent or as closing the door to a peaceful settlement on Germany and Berlin. Only the freedom of West Berlin is not negotiable. For any yielding there, however it might be disguised, would be an intolerable retreat from a delicate postwar balance of power in Europe.

There is a curious similarity between some passages in President Kennedy's message and the next to last paragraph in Abraham Lincoln's First Inaugural, pronounced on the eve of the Civil War 100 years ago. Both Presidents, confronted with crises of different origin, expressed the hope for peace, but not at the price of surrender. Both placed the responsibility on the other party in the dispute. Mr. Kennedy said:

"The world is not deceived by the Communist attempt to label Berlin a hotbed of war. There is peace in Berlin today. The source of world trouble and tension today is Moscow, not Berlin. And if war begins it will have begun in Moscow, not Berlin. For the choice of peace or war is largely theirs, not ours. It is the Soviets who have stirred up this crisis. It is they who are trying to force a change. It is they who have opposed free elections. It is they who have rejected an all-German treaty, and the rulings of international law."

HOW LINCOLN PUT IT

Lincoln expressed very much the same idea in this celebrated passage in his first inaugural:

"In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect and defend it.'"

It is this situation of confronting an intolerable threat of aggression (should the more extreme threats of Khrushchev's German agents to interfere with West Berlin's air communications and refugee centers be carried out) that will lend near unanimity to an affirmative response to the President's appeal for personal and national sacrifice. The average American does not know all the intricate details of the Berlin setup. But he has a pretty good instinct for rejecting the idea of being pushed around by a foreign dictator.

American policy in the threat of this crisis may be summed up in the Latin phrase "paratus in utrumque" (prepared in either case). If the Soviet premier has been running a bluff, trying to intimidate the Western Powers into retreat, a face-saving door of retreat through negotiation is left open. If he has reached such a state of megalomania as to believe that he can impose his will on the United States then the inevitable trial of strength may just as well come over West Berlin as over and other issue. America and its allies could not have a better moral case.

The Recovery of the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, who represents the First District of Wisconsin, has been granted the signal honor of delivering the main address at the opening of Girls' Nation at the American University. Over 100 outstanding young ladies representing the 50 States are assembled at American University to learn more intimately how this great Republic of ours functions. I believe his words have great significance for us in our time. In speaking to our youth he has addressed himself to our Nation by reminding us of our heritage—clarifying the problems we are facing in our present age and expressing our hopes for the future.

I am happy to include the complete text of his address and heartily commend its reading to all Members of the House:

THE RECOVERY OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

In the fall of 1945 I sat in my room on Guam, high on Mount Tenjo, overlooking peaceful Apra Harbor into which during the war we had slipped under cover of darkness for fear of detection by enemy forces, but which now glowed with friendly warmth of welcoming beacons. As I watched the ships slip silently into the safety of the harbor and others plow bravely through the ruffled waters into the darkness of the open sea, I was warmly aware that only a few months and the required number of discharge points separated me from my loved ones at home. I should have been completely relaxed and content with the deafening silence of the Pacific Island at night and the knowledge that I had it made insofar as returning safely home was concerned.

Yet I was restless. I was disturbed as I tried to interpret the meaning of the tremendous cost of the struggle through which we had passed. No one is more aware of the cost of war than a chaplain who, experiencing first hand the hell and heat of battle must spend the peaceful moments which follow dealing with the human suffering and the heartache caused by it. As chaplain aboard a heavy cruiser which operated in the Philippine and Okinawa areas, I had vivid memories of the wounded to whom I ministered in battle—some of whom would never be whole again; of the dead I had buried at sea; of the bodies mangled beyond recognition, I tried in vain to identify.

I recalled those with whom I had counselled whose homes had been broken up by the necessity of separation and the unusual circumstances of war; the heartsick and the disillusioned to whom I tried to impart hope; and those, who losing their faith in the integrity of man and the purposes of God, needed words of encouragement.

In the uneasy peace that followed the close of the war, I searched for an answer to this question: "Why all this wanton destruction of property and wealth; of material resources (man was never intended to squander recklessly)—why all this desecration of homes and corruption and destruction of human life only by default or design to bargain away piecemeal, the rights of individual men at home and abroad; only to repudiate perhaps not intentionally, but none the less in reality, the dignity of man by a creeping socialism which promises a utopia for all, while stripping the individual of the privileges to make his own decisions?

In search for the answer, I decided to delve more deeply into American history to rediscover in the interpretation of the human events out of which our beloved Nation was born—the dream which is America. I reasoned that if we could reincarnate that dream, we could discover wherein we fail and we might begin again to pursue in positive measure the dream we so highly prize. Surely I am not so naive as to believe that in a few minutes I can interpret what historians have taken literally thousands of volumes to write. But I shall try to open a window here and there through which we might get a glimpse of the background out of which the dream which is America was born and in which it nurtured and was matured.

Our first glimpse is of three visits by Lief and Thorwald—sons of Eric the Red to the shores of Labrador about the year 1000. These were but a brief prolog to the full and utterly amazing drama that was to begin some 500 years later.

Our second glimpse is of Christopher Columbus setting foot on the shores of San Salvadore in 1492.

Through another window of history we see several hundred men arriving in Virginia in 1607, looking for easy gold and adventure, but after a few years, reduced to 60 discouraged survivors willing to return to England should circumstances permit, because they discovered by bitter experience that the land would not yield up its wealth without effort.

Through another window we get a glimpse of the Pilgrims arriving at Plymouth with a dream they were determined to bring into reality—a dream of liberty of conscience they had sought in vain in Europe to achieve. We see them 3 years later after experiencing unspeakable hardship and privation unwilling to return to England—to exchange freedom of conscience here for material security there.

As the years pass in review, our window opens upon the lives of men like William Penn, Nathaniel Bacon, and Roger Williams who shared the conviction that every individual had certain rights by natural law and reasoned that government by the people must be the servant of the people not master of them.

We get a passing view of men like Benjamin Franklin who gave over 40 years of his life that the dream which was America could be enlarged by what he called the "cultivating of the finer arts and the improving of the common stock of knowledge."

Sam Adams, who expressed in vivid verbal pictures what was deeply rooted in the hearts of all who counted themselves privileged to share the dream which is America when he said, "I will oppose tyranny at the threshold though the fabrics of liberty fall and I perish in its ruins."

Patrick Henry, who speaking before the second Virginia convention in 1775, echoed the depths of the conviction of most early Americans when he said—"Is life so dear or peace so sweat as to be purchased at the price of chains? I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

From our windows of history we see George Washington, a man of wealth in his own right who did not count it loss to take time out to serve his country in peace as well as in war.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence (a document which molded the dreams of men into a charter of liberty for individuals) whose convictions it was that the desire of man was not to be a recipient of governmental paternalism but to be protected by government so that every individual might avail himself on equal terms of the unparalled opportunities that this continent of men breathing the fresh air of freedom afforded.

Our national history is an overwhelming testimony of men who, possessing a dream, believed in working and sacrificing to make that dream come true; who counted all loss but the eventual establishment of that dream as a reality.

What is that dream? I hesitate to give a simple definition of that dream because we as a nation of people have become prone to accept the error that a simple explanation of a truth destroys the authenticity of that truth. Yet, simply stated, the American dream is personal freedom.

We have used and misused; interpreted and misinterpreted these two words to such a degree that we are confused as to their true meaning—so much so that when the exponents of the Soviet colonial empire use them we cannot believe that their meaning is corrupted and warped to suit their own purposes.

Most of us have heard the rather stirring tune, "The Moon Belongs to Everyone—The Best Things in Life Are Free." We have allowed ourselves to be carried away into a sense of false security by the phrase, "The best things in life are free." I assure you, that the best things in life are not free. They are very costly.

Love is not free. It takes a heap of effort and heartache and soul searching, and the giving of self to attain satisfactory love. Few of us ever attain it simply because we are not willing to pay the price.

Honesty and integrity are not free. The price in terms of the sharing of self; of heartache in the loss of so-called friends; of loss of income from deals we must turn down; to keep our integrity is staggering. Would that more of us would be willing to pay the full price for integrity.

Respect (self-respect and the respect of others) is not free. It takes a heap of living and a tremendous amount of sheer fortitude to earn the priceless gift of respect.

Personal freedom is not free. The cost is beyond our human capacity to comprehend. It belongs to all of every race and nation and station in life and is desired by all. It is not inherited. It cannot be purchased with all the gold and silver in the world. It must be paid for over and over again with the life, the time, the talents, the concern and conviction of men and women of each succeeding generation.

What is this American dream we call personal freedom?

1. It is the freedom to express in our own way, without interference by Government or pressure groups, the dignity we possess by virtue of our creation by God;

2. It is the freedom to work where we please; in whatever capacity we choose; under conditions of mutual agreement between ourselves and employer without interference by Government or organization which force us to grant them authority to speak in our behalf;

3. It is the freedom to be active in an organization of our own choosing provided it operates within the law; to express our opinions of them without coercion;

4. To elect by secret ballot those who represent us and to remove from office without fear of reprisal, those we feel do not represent us;

5. It is the freedom to move about without police permit; to choose our place of residence; to enjoy the beauties of our land; to appreciate our common heritage and ownership of what in the hymn "America" is referred to as the "rocks and rills and templed hills."

6. Personal freedom is the assurance that our homes are our sacred castles and cannot be invaded without due process of law;

7. It is to hold a conviction without fear of reprisal by Government or any group of self-appointed protectors of the status quo;

8. It is the privilege of bearing arms in defense of our Nation in a time of crisis or to refuse to do so if our conviction is genuine;

9. It is the right to cast a secret ballot for a candidate of our choice; to campaign openly for the man of our choice just so long as truth is not crucified on the political scaffold of a campaign;

10. It is the freedom to worship as we please.

The American dream is all these and much more. Could it be possible that the dream so deeply embedded in our historic traditions—so much a part of the fabric of our own daily life and thought that it is taken for granted—could become dimmed and be in danger of being lost?

It was Wellington Griffith, Jr., who said, "Liberty is only one generation away from extinction."

It can be destroyed by our lack of vigilance as surely as by the loss of a war. The American dream is constantly threatened by forces, some insidious, some sincere, which work to dim it and annihilate it.

1. The dream is dimmed wherever men, because of differences in color or faith or national background or social status, cannot enjoy equally the rights of citizenship—the right to vote; to hold public office; to attend the school or church of their choice; to live in the home of their choice.

2. The dream is dimmed whenever men fear to express an opinion lest they be branded by those who do not share their particular point of view with such labels as: Un-American; Reactionary; Communist; Scab; War-monger; Member of silk stocking set; or one of a thousand nasty names coined to assassinate the character of another we dislike.

3. The dream is dimmed whenever men fear for their safety and life to tell the truth as they know it.

4. The dream is dimmed whenever a person is denied the privilege of working at the place of his choice without paying tribute to own a job; whenever he is chained to his occupation (as were his forefathers in Europe) by rules that prevent him from accepting other employment without payment of additional dues and fees for the privilege of working at another task; whenever a man cannot report for work without being intimidated by those who claim to be the protectors of his welfare while preventing him from earning a living.

5. The dream is dimmed whenever government tells a man how to operate his farm or his business or attempts to regulate by economic pressure and threat of investigation, his personal affairs.

6. The dream is dimmed and is in grave danger of being lost whenever Federal paternalistic measures invade the areas of individual and community concern; whenever government guarantees more and more material benefits while at the same time relieving the individual of more and more of his rights—giving him a pot of porridge while robbing him of his birthright of freedom; whenever governments of special privilege for pressure groups and not of and for the individual—the people—merely because these groups claim blocks of votes.

7. The dream is in grave danger of annihilation whenever ruthless, unprincipled men in positions of authority in strategic organizations are protected by law or at least remain untouchable by lack of law.

I do not presume to suggest that all is lost; that the dream has completely faded—but if the American dream is being dimmed or is in danger of being lost; what can you and I do about it? If anything is to be done, you and I must do it because apart from persons who are sold on the practicability of the American dream, nothing will be done.

I suggest for your consideration several things you and I must do if we are to preserve the dream which is America:

First, you and I must recognize and understand that government—local, State, National—is not solely the business of professional politicians. Government is our business. Those who are successful in their professions and work and businesses are not immune to the responsibility of taking time out to serve our Government in time of peace, as they find they must in time of war. Even a superficial study of American history clearly indicates that our forefathers who led this country through the pangs of its birth and fashioned and moulded the dream upon the anvil of trial, came from their shops and offices to serve in public positions because they believed in America. You and I must demand less from Government and give more to it, not in terms of taxes but in terms of time and effort and our own peculiar individual talents. If the American dream is ever lost, it will be because we were too busy to pursue it.

Second, we must demand that there be a minimum of Federal interference in the life of our citizens and a return of a maximum responsibility to the individual and his community. It is as true today as it was in 1887 when Lord Acton, who said, "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." When the problems of society are met by those who are closest to them there is a minimum of waste and a maximum of solution.

No man or group of men sitting a thousand miles away from your city—never having even visited your State, can solve the problems of your city better than you, who are a part of that problem.

There are other things you and I must do to preserve this American dream:

1. We must keep faith in the American way. We are not perfect because we are a Government of people and people are not perfect. But we do stand head and shoulders above all others;

2. We must be willing to make sacrifices of a very real nature in times of peace as well as war;

3. We must refrain from demanding special privileges for ourselves at the expense of others in our country;

4. We must be firm in demanding our right to hold to our own convictions yet be ready to protect the right of others to hold convictions which differ from ours.

5. We must be willing to cooperate as a nation with other nations in matters of mutual interest but at the same time we must not be ashamed of our national heritage nor be willing to sell that which we have gained through past decades of sacrifice for a World Order that would destroy all we hold dear.

I am proud I am an American. I believe in America. I believe in the American way. I believe that the greatest contribution we can make as a nation is not to stoop to the level of those who walk beneath us but rather to lift all nations to our plane * * * and we cannot do this by making apologies for being what we are or justifying the corruptions of other governments merely because we ourselves have not been and are not perfect.

This brings me to the final point. We can preserve the American dream only by knowing who we are; what we are and why we are what we are. In all dealings with other nations we must be willing to cooperate and compromise for the general welfare of the people of the world but we never compromise on the principle of the dignity of man nor barter away the freedom of any individual or state in appeasement of those who threaten to destroy us by force. Peace at any price is too big a price to pay for temporary security without honor.

The Soviet colonial empire based upon the theories of Karl Marx know what it believes and never bargains away the basic tenets of its political theory. We must be as firm and determined in our intention to protect the dignity and freedom of man and to preserve the cause of truth as those of Marxist leaning are to destroy the dignity and freedom of man and to corrupt the cause of truth.

It is a sad commentary on our age that we who are the recipients of liberty and freedom by tradition; we who so glibly take these things for granted, do not fully appreciate our privileged position. It is not until these things are no longer ours; until we have either by default or design bargained them away for questionable material and personal gain or a promised utopia that we know how wonderful and precious is the American dream.

Our struggle did not come to us like manna from heaven. It has come to us only after bitter struggle and continuing sacrifice. Unless we reflect the dream which is America in our daily life, how can we expect future generations to own it.

One day a little fish and a little crab met on the playground of their underwater habitation. It did not take the fish long to notice that the crab was swimming backward. He spent all day teaching the crab how to swim frontward. At the close of the day, they agreed to meet each other at the same place early in the morning. The following morning, they met according to plan. The fish noticed that the crab was swimming backward again, so it spent all day teaching the crab to swim frontward. At the close of the day, they agreed to meet again the next morning. They met as scheduled but the little fish noted that the little crab was swimming backward again. He spent all day teaching the crab

to swim frontward but before leaving him for the night decided that something was wrong and that he would go home with the crab to try to discover the cause. Upon entering the crab's home he found his answer. Papa and mama crab were swimming backward too.

Unless we who live translate each day, the dream which is America into our daily activities—how can we hope that future generations will own it?

The Softness of Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question "Will the British measure up to their responsibilities in the present crisis?"—a question frequently put by those who would cast doubt on the ability of the Western allies to cooperate in the great effort to keep Western Europe free—the distinguished journalist Joseph C. Harsch has some interesting and penetrating insights which he has set forth in a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor.

I commend this timely article to my colleagues attention:

THE SOFTNESS OF BRITAIN

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—Washington no doubt would be pleased and relieved if Harold Macmillan were to sound the fire alarm, call up the reserves, move extra troops to Germany, and by these and other devices provide a pyrotechnical demonstration of Anglo-American solidarity over Berlin.

What with public opinion polls presenting Americans as ready to do or die for Berlin, Britain's apparent preoccupation with other matters continues to lend credence to a public image much beloved in some American quarters of a Britain seeking to evade its responsibilities.

Similar quarters in Britain are equally enamored of the image of America as a place inhabited by persons itching to push the H-bomb buttons without the slightest thought for the possible consequences.

Any American knows the latter image does not entirely accord with the facts. Let it be pointed out the current Washington image of Britain overlooks the way the British do things.

For example, you can take a public opinion poll in the United States now and come up with 71 percent ready to fight for Berlin, 15 percent wanting to be "firm but cautious" and 14 percent against fighting for Berlin. Take the same poll asking the same questions in Britain and you probably would get exactly the reverse results. But there would be a difference in the meaning.

The Britons always talk pacifist—until just before the shooting starts. The peace ballot signers of the 1930's flew the Spitfires and Hurricanes which won the Battle of Britain. There is no recorded connection between what a Briton will say about an abstract proposition and what he will do in a concrete case.

For this reason the British Government never conducts public opinion polls, never pays them any attention when they are conducted, and does not worry, about public support if and when it thinks the time has arrived to sound the fire alarm. As of today it thinks that while the ringing of bells may be useful in America, such a step would not be useful in Britain. The time might come in October or November but not now.

Regardless of certain superficial similarities, British people are very different from American people. The two respond in different ways to different stimuli. Parade the Stars and Stripes in America and the crowd thrills with patriotism. Parade the Union Jack in Britain and everyone assumes it's a Tory Party rally and wanders away.

The British regard outward displays of patriotism as being in distinctly poor taste and will never be caught protesting readiness to do one's duty. It is far better form to assert you wouldn't. Of course, in the clinch you do.

Washington wanted Mr. Macmillan to lead a campaign against the Polaris base protesters. Mr. Macmillan refused on the ground that it would merely dignify and magnify a student rag. It turned out to be precisely a student rag.

Washington and Bonn were shocked by the London reception given Soviet astronaut Yuri A. Gagarin.

The seeming blandness of British Government behavior toward the Berlin crisis should not be mistaken for evidence that the British Government is asleep at the switch or doing nothing. Mr. Macmillan has announced he will have a statement on the Common Market on July 31. This seems far removed from Berlin but it isn't.

Berlin is a European concern. The Common Market is essentially continental Western Europe. London has never announced that it has the intention to seek admission to the Common Market. It probably never will announce such a decision. But the most open secret in London is that the action is forthcoming.

Britain cannot possibly enter the Common Market and evade its duties and obligations over Berlin. The British way of showing its solidarity with its allies over Berlin is not to talk boldly about Berlin but to get ready to do precisely what it is getting ready to do—join Europe.

And if the Britons show a certain reluctance to boast about readiness to face a nuclear war over Berlin it might be remembered that according to the experts the West might win but Britain would hardly survive. Besides, decisions in Britain are reached not by announcement and declamation but by osmosis.

South Bend Tribune Poll Backs President Kennedy's Stand on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting article from the July 26, 1961, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune entitled "Street Poll Backs President's Stand."

The poll shows that residents of South Bend support President Kennedy's call for strengthening our defenses in order to make clear to the Communist world the determination of the American people to defend freedom.

The article follows:

STREET POLL BACKS PRESIDENT'S STAND

(By Patti Last and James A. Griffin)

South Bend residents apparently agree with President Kennedy that it's time to fight fire with fire in regard to West Berlin.

A poll taken today in the downtown business district indicated an almost unanimous agreement with the President on his defense buildup for the impending showdown with Russia over the German city.

In a speech Tuesday night, Kennedy asked for increased money and manpower to meet the threat of Communist aggression in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Most of the persons polled today said it's high time for the American Government to take a firm stand—even if it means war.

The few dissenters to Kennedy's plan felt that the Berlin crisis was a highly exaggerated issue, a device to increase support for the President's legislative ambitions.

URGES DRAWING LINE

Douglas D. Seely, a lawyer, of 20138 Brick Road, said: "We have to draw a line somewhere and Berlin looks like the place. I certainly hate to see taxes raised but the Government should be able to effect economies in other branches. The President's stand is a strong policy statement and a good show of our determination."

"The so-called Berlin crisis is the most outlandish thing I've ever heard," said dissenting Jacob Walterhouse, 116 East Bike Street, Bremen. "The Russians have backed down in the past and they'll back down now over Berlin. I don't want any increase in taxes, especially Federal. This war scarce is just an attempt to give the American economy a shot in the arm."

Mrs. Homer M. Williams, housewife of San Diego, Calif., a former South Bend resident in the city for a visit, said: "It's time we got tough. We have leaned toward appeasement too much in the past. A strong stand by this country will show the Russians that we're not as fat and complacent as they think we are."

PRAISES ATTITUDE

"The policy speech was pretty good," said Glen Marvin, taxicab driver, of 56576 Hollywood Boulevard, "and shows that Kennedy has the right attitude. If Jack wants more money, then I'm ready to do my part. I have a boy who will probably be drafted and I know he'll want to do his part, too."

Mrs. Joseph Janso, 733 West LaSalle Avenue, said that all the steps requested by the President are "necessary and vital at this time. We can't be sure whether Russia will change its attitude toward Berlin but we'll prove our good faith toward our allies."

Mrs. Charles F. Nelson, a housewife, of 1245 North Twycenham Drive, said: "The speech took me out of a lethargy we all tend to have here in the Midwest. We feel we're hidden away, but the world is getting smaller all the time. I'm the mother of four boys and I don't like to think about the draft, but we can't sit back and be threatened all the time. We should be prepared, but I hope we don't go to war."

"We can talk and talk but maybe never straighten things out," said 18-year-old Karen Thomas, a student from Danville, Ill. "Sometimes we need action."

CALLS CRISIS SERIOUS

Henry E. Getz, an insurance man and bail bondsman of 3401 West Avenue, said: "No amount should be spared for the defense of our country. We should never underestimate our opponents."

"The crisis is probably a lot more serious than we realize," said 20-year-old Marilyn Haas, a city employee, of 1637 South Pulaski Street. "Maybe we're not aware of how bad it might be."

Det. Sgt. John E. Crawford, of the South end Police Department, said: "We've been asleep while other countries have been preparing for war." He says, "If it takes more taxes for preparedness—to put us back up on top where we belong—then we should pay more. If it's worth having, it's worth paying for."

"I expected this buildup 2 or 3 years ago," says 21-year-old Jim Laymon, an unemployed worker, of 433 South Mead Street. "It's about time we did something—I'm ready to go."

But George McKissick, an interior decorator, of 1024 South Main Street, cautions that "If we're not careful we'll be in war." But he does think we should "take a firm stand."

WILLING TO PAY TAXES

"I'm willing to pay more taxes if it means we'll prevent a war," says Miss Rubie Carter, a sales energizer from Moline, Ill.

But 25-year-old Richard Wilbur, of 512 Lindsey Street, a student, said, "If we have been preparing adequately for such crises for the last 8 years—and I think we have—then this particular crisis shouldn't necessitate a drastic increase in defense spending. President Eisenhower's conception of the Communist menace was more realistic than we can expect under the present liberal regime."

"If we want to keep freedom an arms buildup is a lot cheaper than shooting each other," says O. W. Tait, salesman, of 1435 East La Salle Avenue. "The Russians are probably more scared than we are," he said. "Maybe we should have done this a long time ago—in Cuba, for instance."

Miss Irma Samson, secretary, of 125 West Marion Street, said, "In my mind we're going to come out ahead—we're probably more prepared than we know. We've got to do something."

URGES PITCHING IN

"If the President thinks all of these things are necessary, then we should all pitch in," said Mrs. Mary Hodges, 502 South St. Joseph Street. "I don't know if we will be able to deter the Russians over Berlin. And nobody wants to pay more taxes."

Mrs. Armenter Miller, 1622 Sibley Avenue, says that "we can always pay the extra taxes. We can always make a living in this country and I'd rather pay taxes in a free country than in a slave one. Russia will leave Berlin alone, now that they know of our determination."

"The United States should show its autority," said 17-year-old Joseph Kish, of 2014 Dorwood Drive, a high school senior. "We should take any steps necessary to show that we mean what we say. America is ready to keep freedom bright in the world."

American Motors' "A–OK Quality Workmanship" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently American Motors President George Romney held a mass meeting with 22,000 automotive workers in Milwaukee to launch an A–OK quality workmanship program. I include an article on the meeting from the Kenosha (Wis.) News:

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND HEAR ROMNEY PLUG FOR QUALITY

President George Romney of American Motors today took his campaign for high-quality workmanship directly to the people making Rambler autos.

He spoke to about 22,000 American Motors Co. personnel here and in Milwaukee.

Romney urged their support in what he called an A-OK quality workmanship program. It's the latest phase in a seven-point quality drive.

In his peptalks, Romney asked American Motors Co. workers to build each Rambler as though it were their own.

The company president spoke to an estimated 13,000 office and production workers in Kenosha. He addressed 7,000 in a court at the west side plant at 11 a.m. He spoke to 1,500 at the lakefront body plant at 2:45 p.m. And he returned to the west side plant at 4 p.m. to talk to 4,500 second-shift employees.

Production was halted for 1 hour for each of the talks in Kenosha and Milwaukee. Following his latest speech here, Romney traveled to Milwaukee for a return flight to Detroit.

Romney's talks to mass audiences were designed, he said, to increase "Rambler's undisputed quality leadership."

The "A–OK" title for the new quality program is borrowed from America's space astronauts, who use it to signify all equipment is working properly. Rambler asked American Motors Co. workers to pledge that every 1962 Rambler will be "A–OK" when it heads off the assembly line, bound for a customer.

In Milwaukee, the American Motors Co. president told a press conference the quality campaign is not a result of complaints but of a company desire to improve the quality advantage held over competitors. "We're building the best cars in America today," he declared. "But we'll not be satisfied until we build the best cars in the world."

Romney said American Motors Co. workers know that the emphasis on quality has produced stable employment for them. He added the company has made progress in developing a desire among employees to do a good job.

But, he continued:

"In all segments of American life, not just the automotive field, we have just had an age of the goof-off, of sloppy workmanship, of a loss of feeling of pride of workmanship by executives as well as shop workers, a lessening of integrity and honesty. It's time we corrected it."

Romney told the Milwaukee press conference that 1962 car sales and production would top the approximately 6 million built and sold this year. He noted that sales had improved steadily in recent months, and added: "There is every reason to expect them to continue to improve into next year." Romney said Rambler dealers will begin the new model year in far better inventory condition than they did in 1960. "We will probably be on the short side," he explained.

New 1962 model Ramblers will start coming off the Kenosha assembly lines after a 2-week changeover shutdown which starts Friday.

Romney's face-to-face talks with employees today were the latest in a direct communication method he has employed at least once annually for the past 7 years. He credits employee cooperation with much of American Motors' spectacular rise in the auto field.

"The entire automobile industry is continuing to move toward the Rambler size and balance concept and emphasis on superior quality," Romney stated. "Our big advantage is being there first with the most."

Romney disclosed he has set up a special agency—known as the customer quality assurance department—reporting directly to him.

It will be headed by Carl A. Roesch, who took over the general superintendent's job at the new lakefront body plant here last summer. Roesch is a veteran of 36 years in car manufacturing. He became Hudson's factory manager in 1954 and came to Kenosha with the Hudson-Nash Kelvinator merger.

Roesch has been given authority to stop production lines any time the quality of work falls below established standards AMC says customers have a right to expect.

Romney explained the new agency headed by Roesch is a unique thing in the auto industry. It will consist of a team of quality specialists who conduct independent checks on functional parts and finished cars selected at random from a production line. Their daily findings will be made available to the regular manufacturing organization as a guide to improving procedures. Weekly findings will be reviewed by top management.

In his talks to the 22,000 American Motors Co. employees, Romney encouraged further development of individual responsibility and superior workmanship—with quality as the goal. He asked for employee suggestions on methods of improving quality and offered a 20-percent premium over the regular scale of payments for acceptable suggestions.

For the past several weeks, a series of intensified training sessions was held with company supervision on the subject of quality. Last week, United Auto Workers' officials heard details of the A–OK program and pledged full cooperation.

Independent surveys and reports from dual dealers indicate Rambler's product quality and owner loyalty is superior, Romney said. But he stated the company doesn't intend to stand still in its effort to "give Rambler customers much greater value in motor cars than is available elsewhere in the industry."

"Through a conscientious pursuit of basic product excellence in all phases of our operations I am convinced that American Motors can make a contribution in added value to the consumer, in the form of higher product quality, that will be as significant as the company's pioneering of the compact car concept in America."

In addition to the A–OK program, the American Motors quality campaign includes:

Authorization for more than $1 million for specialized plant equipment. (This facilitated manufacturing in the 1961 model run and will operate round-the-clock for the 1962 model.)

Enlargement of Rambler's engineering staff. (Top quality engineers are being designated to devote full time direction to design changes to improve quality of functional parts subject to stress and operational damage.)

Strengthening the auto division's manufacturing staff, thus freeing the time of top personnel for quality control work.

New design features in 1962 models to increase reliability of the product.

Instructions to company procurement officials to further tighten controls on parts received from suppliers.

Concerning the latter point, a policy letter has been sent to all major suppliers over the signature of John Secrest, AMC vice president in charge of purchasing. He informed heads of supplying firms that quality control would be intensified. On the basis of new data being compiled, supplier performance will be formally evaluated and rated. American Motors Co. purchasing officials plan early visits to suppliers to review quality control facilities and techniques.

American Motors has a battery of 800 regular plant inspectors on duty in subassembly departments. They are backstopped by electronic testing apparatus, capable of detecting even minor flaws in precision-made items.

Romney said today the A-OK program will be a continuing activity. He noted that U.S. consumers are leaning increasingly "toward the function and service cost rather than the showy factors in the major products that serve their daily needs."

As evidence of this, he cited the rising star of the Rambler-type compact car. "Compact cars are now accounting for well over a third of the automobile business, and this will rise to at least 50 percent by the end of this year," Romney predicted.

Comments on Hanford Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the comments of Elmer McClure, State master of the Oregon Grange following the vote in the House on the Hanford reactor generating facilities helps to put the issue in perspective, it seems to me. Since this issue has not yet been finally determined by the Congress, I believe that my colleagues may be interested in Mr. McClure's column from the July 20 issue of the Oregon Grange Bulletin:

COMMENTS ON HANFORD PLANT

(By Elmer McClure)

One of the week's greater disappointments was the House vote to eliminate from the atomic energy authorization bill the project to build a conversion plant to utilize the heat energy generated as a byproduct of the plutonium production process at the Hanford plant. This House vote, by the old nose count method of voting, is by no means the last word on this project. The Senate bill is expected to pass with this conversion plant item in it and it is quite likely that the House will reconsider its foolish and wasteful action.

At the present time this heat is being dissipated into the Columbia River and is very simply wasted. If the conversion plant were built this heat would produce roughly the amount of electric energy generated by Bonneville Dam. To waste this resource simply because it belongs to all the people and the electric energy it would produce would therefore be satagorized as public power, makes no sense at all.

Much of this power would replace the power the Hanford plant now buys from the Bonneville Administration and would simply permit BPA to sell this block of power to other users.

The almost invincible private power lobby in Washington, D.C., is advancing some rather farfetched arguments in opposition to the conversion plant. Their chief argument seems to be that to build the plant would put the Atomic Energy Commission into the electric energy production field. Isn't this, in reality, "featherbedding"?

If electric energy can be produced better and cheaper at and by atomic or plutonium plants as a byproduct of their process of manufacture, shouldn't that power be utilized? Does it make sense to throw it away because it belongs to all the people and is therefore public? Certainly no investor-owned industry would take such a foolish course. Imagine the reaction if sawmills, for instance, were not permitted to sell hog fuel, a byproduct of the lumber manufacturing process, because it competes with other types of fuel?

Many people are sincerely convinced, in spite of the preponderance of logic to the contrary, that private power is, in the long run, better for the country than public power and they are prejudiced against public power. But this is not the issue here. The Bonneville grid system is already established and accepted. The plutonium plant at Hanford is already there and producing the heat. The status quo could not possibly be upset by converting this waste heat into usable electric energy.

That the private power companies could possibly convince enough of our Congressmen that this was a new venture that would establish a bad precedent, that they voted to continue to waste a tremendously valuable resource belonging to every citizen of this country, is most disappointing.

We could expect better attention to the Nation's welfare by those entrusted with operating the Nation's business in the interest of all of us.

America, Too Young To Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, an outstanding student of military matters and a leading motivator in the field of aviation, recently engaged in an interview over radio station WMCA in New York as a guest on the "Barry Gray Show," and that colloquy I think deserves the attention of all of us who are interested in guarding the welfare of our country.

Major de Seversky is the author of a provocative book entitled "America, Too Young To Die."

A famous ace of World War I, a designer and builder of some of the world's great airplanes, a brilliant engineer and scientist, Major de Seversky is listened to whenever he speaks on military subjects. Frequently he has been so bold as to be ridiculed for his interpretation of world events, only to be justified later on as the course of history proved him right.

Major de Seversky was born in Russia, graduated from the Imperial Naval Academy in 1914, and lost a leg while flying a bombardment mission. Equipped with an artificial leg, he returned to duty and became the No. 1 ace in Russian naval aviation.

When the Bolshevik took over in Russia he left that country by way of Siberia, came to the United States and became a citizen in 1927, and received a commission in the U.S. Air Corps 1 year later.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the estimated cost of printing, I think it is important that the entire text of the radio interview mentioned should be incorporated in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Major de Seversky's talk with Mr. Barry Gray follows:

INTERVIEW WITH MAJ. ALEXANDER DE SEVERSKY, APRIL 25, 1961, OVER RADIO STATION WMCA

Mr. GRAY. My guest, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky; his newest book published by McGraw-Hill out today, called "America, Too Young To Die."

I'd like to read you this from the dust jacket: "Although famed as an ace of World War I, as a designer and builder of some of the world's great airplanes and an engineer, scientist and inventor, Major de Seversky is best known as a military authority.

"Time and again he has been subjected to criticism and ridicule for his interpretation of current events and his projection of things to come only to be vindicated by the course of history.

"Born in Tefils, Russia, he was graduated from the Imperial Naval Academy in 1914 and while flying a bombardment mission lost his right leg. With an artificial limb he returned to duty and became the No. 1 ace in Russian naval aviation. Five months after the Bolsheviks seized power he made his way to America via Siberia, became a citizen in 1927 and received the commission of major in the U.S. Air Corps 1 year later.

"In 1931 he founded the Seversky Aircraft Corp. making aviation history with the planes he designed, built and flew during the next 19 years. By 1940, appalled at official ignorance of military aviation's vast potential he devoted his time to a crusade for air power expressing his thesis in the best sellers, 'Victory Through Air Power' and 'Air Power, Key to Survival.'

"Books which rocked the Nation, the world an exerted great influence on the war effort. Major de Seversky has now written 'America, Too Young To Die.' It is his impassioned plea for action now. It will be a sobering and revealing reading for the entire Nation."

That's what the dust jacket says. I would add, as I've said personally all week long, that I received the book as an advance copy from McGraw-Hill about a week ago. I've done nothing but recommend it publicly and privately since that initial reading. I believe it should be must reading for everyone in the United States, up to and including our distinguished President.

Major de Seversky, I congratulate you and I welcome you.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be with you tonight.

Mr. GRAY. Major, in your book on page 28 you answer some of the questions that have been raised by either pacifists, dupes or unthinking people in the community.

This is one of the questions. You say that atomic war is unthinkable. It will mean the end of civilization and consequently no nation would dare embark upon it. Nuclear stalemate will last forever.

What do you believe is the truth to that statement?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, the truth is, to start with, that if the war is being fought with nuclear weapons, civilization will not disappear for the simple reason that in self-defense the extremely large megatonial weapons will not be used because they are self-defeating.

So, to start with, the weapons will be comparatively small, designed to destroy a given target.

Second, the present stalemate is not going to last forever. Very soon defense will catch up with offense and war will settle down again to old-fashioned attrition where you have to destroy the opposing military force over a period of time.

Therefore, unless the nature of man changes, I think that force will not be dispensed with, war will still be with us and there will be any apocalyptic destructions predicted because the same thing was pre-

dicted before World War II, when we predicted that huge bombers would destroy the civilization. Civilization was not destroyed and look at Germany. Germany was thoroughly destroyed. Eighty percent of its industry laid in ruins and people were saying that Germany would take a hundred years to recuperate from this terrific damage.

Yet, within 10 years, 15 years now, we find it is the most prosperous, wealthiest and vigorous nation in Europe today.

Mr. GRAY. That statement about it being destroyed for 100 years was about as accurate as Mr. Hitler's statement that the Third Reich would last for a thousand years.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. That's right.

Mr. GRAY. Major de Seversky, you believe then, because of the very nature of man, that we will have a third world war.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. We certainly will unless there is one possibility. That is that we may escape the cataclysm of war in that both societies, our society based on freedom and the other society, regimented society, recognize that this terrific armament race we will reach sooner or later more or less economic absurdity, and one or another society may collapse under the force of this economic pressure.

The only trouble, again, this is not a guarantee there won't be any war because, for example, take the Soviet situation. If the commissars in Russia begin to see the sign of disintegration within, I'm sure they will plunge the world into an atomic holocaust because they hope that from the ruins of the world communism will get second wind. And, therefore, they have nothing to lose because if they will not plunge the world into war they will be hung on all the telegraph poles by their own people.

So, they have nothing to lose. Even if they lose politically, suppose we will be able to win the war—not militarily but through economic pressures, ideological and political—even then if the Soviet state will start to collapse, the war is absolutely unavoidable.

Only perhaps if the Soviet state will collapse instantaneously, without any warning, we may expect cataclysm of war, but I doubt, at this moment, that it is possible.

Mr. GRAY. Major de Seversky, in your book you made two points that kept me up most of the night.

A. That we are destined to world war III, and

B. In our present condition militarily, America will lose that war.

Why will we lose that war; assuming that it will occur in the immediate future?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, for the simple reason that we are behind Russia in the decisive military weapons systems. Russia has today practically reached the saturation point in intermediate range ballistic missiles. All our bases and strategic points erected on this periphery to contain Russia could be destroyed in a few minutes, simultaneously throughout the entire perimeter.

They are already getting sufficiency in intercontinental ballistic missiles. My estimate is that they have about 200 intercontinental ballistic missiles operational while we will have, maybe, a dozen, not more.

They have long range aircraft with an intercontinental range. TU–114 can fly directly from Russia to any part of the United States and then turn back without refueling.

Mr. GRAY. That's the Illushian?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. No, that's Tupeloff.

Mr. GRAY. Oh.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Then, their artillery in the armies are very well equipped. Even in World War II they were superbly equipped with tank and the artillery, and Russia was far ahead of us in rocketry even in World War II, so obviously they have atomic capabilities and their armor and atomic capabilities and the rest of the army matches ours, and yet they are much more superior and they are geographically located in the center of the continent so they always can accumulate or mass the necessary numbers of men at the desired strategic point.

We, on the other hand, lack rocket development. Our boosters are small. It's true that we can deliver a nuclear warhead to Russia, but our warhead is about one-third the size or will produce only one-third of the devastation as compared to the Russian warhead and our strategic air command is comparatively getting small, for the simple reason that all B–47s are getting obsolete. They cannot penetrate Russia's defenses so that leaves only B–52. Most of them have to be refueled to reach Russia and we are running out of them and at the same time we don't replace them with anything. And by curtailing our B–70, we may have another gap in the future.

Mr. GRAY. Major de Seversky, you lay the blame for all of this, or most of it, in two areas, it seems to me: At the door of the previous administration, namely President Eisenhower, whom you supported initially, and secondly, at the door of the halls of the House of Representatives and the Senate committees who make appropriations in these areas. Is that an accurate description?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, no, I don't blame so much the Senate and senatorial committees for the simple reason that some of the facts were withheld from them by the executive branch of our Government and our Congressmen were not always able to vote intelligently on this subject because they were never given the facts any more than the American people.

Mr. GRAY. Hummm.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. In most cases they have to vote and approve things blindly as a rubber stamp of our executive branch of the Government. And this, I think, is the trouble. We lost civil control over the military. There is a notion in Washington that by giving unlimited dictatorial power to the Secretary of Defense, it in effect represents civil control over military. It's sheer nonsense, because a dictator in mufti is no less a dictator than a dictator in uniform.

The civil control over the military really means access by Congress and the people to the pertinent facts as to the State and nature of our national defense, and to see that our money and our resources are employed properly and prudently to provide us with sufficient and adequate defense. And, that information has not been available to our people since 1947, since we reorganized our National Defense Establishment under the so-called Unification Act of 1947.

Mr. GRAY. My guest is Maj. Alexander de Seversky, author of the new McGraw-Hill book out today called "America, Too Young to Die."

Major de Seversky, you've just mentioned the date 1947. That was during the mopping up period after World War II, when our Congress and our people in the world were reorganizing their thinking in terms of protection, of sovereignty and of the future.

Did we reorganize or did we continue on the same old plans?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. We continued on the same old plans. There was no reorganization at all. That was our trouble.

That trouble plagues all the victorious nations because all the nations who won the war, they always perpetuate the methods with which they won the war. What we actually did, we did not take advantage of the looming new military technology, but we simply, by law, perpetuated the World War II methods of war. And, that was our trouble, and we still continue to perpetuate the World War II methods of war.

We represent it by different sources, like limited war, or flexible response or contraforce and a lot of other things, but actually it is the same old strategy of World War II that has nothing to do with modern technology of war.

Mr. GRAY. You use an example in your book, of President Eisenhower, former President Eisenhower, sailing to Tokyo, protected, you say, by the 7th Fleet and you point out that with the Russian weapons he would have been just as safe in a rowboat.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, not exactly that way, no.

I said that what stopped the Russians from attacking him was not the 7th Fleet, but our nuclear ability to immediately retaliate for anything that might have happened to the President.

Mr. GRAY. That would be the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Yes, the Strategic Air Command, because, if they wanted to destroy the President, they could deliver only one missile and at such short distance, to the warship that he was on, it would not have been able to get out from the devastation target area of the explosion of an atomic bomb.

Mr. GRAY. That's 20 miles.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Yes—so, about in 20 miles.

But, of course, if they would have been fired a thousand miles away, it would be only in 10 minutes that his ship would have been destroyed and no 7th Fleet would have been able to protect him.

Mr. GRAY. Right.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. So, what did protect him? The capability of our Strategic Air Command, and under those circumstances he would have been just as safe in a rowboat.

Mr. GRAY. You make the recommendations that we abolish our plan of building these huge and obsolete carriers, dreadnaughts, destroyers and all of the rest, because you state that it provides nothing but a large target against the horizon.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. That's true, for the simple reason that to deliver this nuclear warhead from attack aircraft carriers is absolutely impractical and frightfully costly.

Because, take for example, the big B–52 bomber that can deliver nuclear warheads from here to Russia costs $7 million. But if you take in the cost of ships and everything, a small-sized medium bomber of the—that is on the attack aircraft carrier—will never be able to penetrate Russian defenses because it doesn't have enough, what do we call it, electronic countermeasures, to cope with the impulses of defense, it costs us $100 million because you have to take into account the cost of ships, you see, and task forces and everything that floats these airplanes to the target, and besides, they'll never survive in hostile waters.

So, this is everything down the drain.

I was very much interested in Secretary of Defense McNamara's speech. He said something here. He said:

"The future is, of course, uncertain, but one thing I'm sure. Whatever the future may bring our economy is strong and resilient enough to meet any challenge that may arise."

But, he must have meant except our own stupidity, because we really will never be able to meet the challenge of our own stupidity, and the result is that this great Nation today trails Russia in vital and important military weapons systems, and space technology shows that all the riches and all the brains of our country cannot meet the challenge of stupidity in Washington.

Mr. GRAY. My guest, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, author of the book, "America, Too Young To Die."

Major, we were talking about stupidity. Which of our Government officials would you accuse of stupidity, say, beginning with the Truman administration?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, a great many. All the concessions that we gave the Commu-

nists during the war was absolutely the product of stupidity and military ignorance, because we did not necessarily have to have Russian bayonets on our side. We could have finished up Germany with a preponderance of airpower just as we did Japan.

Japan surrendered without any invasion and without clash between our armies and the Japanese armies.

Second, after the war we gave Russia, for example, the best missile center in Nordenhausen where they had research and missile pads and missile research laboratory and test stands of a magnificance that we were able to get only 10, 15 years later. Now, we turned this marvelous equipment over to the Russians. I was there myself. Our soldiers were dusting and polishing to be sure that it goes to Russia intact and in good order and we, ourselves, didn't do anything about it. Now, how stupid can you get? Not only the fact that we turned over and gave to the Russians this magnificent equipment, but we ourselves were only lukewarm to create in our own country similar facilities for developing intercontinental rockets.

And the whole thing to me, and all the secrecy, for example, during war, of course, we have to have a secrecy classification, because during the war certain things, military things, ought to be kept secret. But our politicians found out very soon that it is a very convenient way to protect their own blunders. So, after the war, the secrecy was extended from the military department to all the departments. Every secretary of every department could classify anything that shows his blunders or stupidity, if you want to say it that way.

And, this is what is killing us, killing us that our people today are just as ignorant on the facts of military life as the Russian people. We don't know any more where we stand militarily than the Russians do, except with that tragic difference that in Russia, the Russian people are regimented and they could be cajoled and whipped into shape and ordered what to do.

In our society you cannot order an American to do anything that he doesn't understand and therefore we are going to have chaos. We cannot act until our population understands the problem and can act accordingly. For the last 20 years we were kept ignorant on the subject of national defense.

Mr. GRAY. Major de Seversky, you are extremely critical of the late Gen. George C. Marshall. You claim that his approach to war was old fashioned and cost us not only great numbers of casualties but millions of dollars in equipment and an extended war.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. That's correct, because General Marshall was a product of World War I, of 1917 experience, and he hasn't changed very much since then, and he tried to keep the—his plan of war in World War II—along the same pattern of 1917 war. This is exactly what this new generation of generals is trying to do—perpetuate the World War II in preparing us for world war III.

And, because of that mentality, because we did not take advantage of the new technology of war and tried to fight along the 1917 type of war, Marshall thought: we cannot win the war in Europe without Russian bayonets, and we could not also win in the Orient in the war against Japan without the Russian Army.

And, therefore, he recommended to President Roosevelt to keep Russia on our side at all costs. Now, I know that he was probably motivated by a very sincere desire to keep American losses to a minimum. But, he did not realize that by building up Russia as a great power and giving Germany, East Germany and Czechoslovakia to Russia, which enabled Russia to become a modern industrial society, he really jeopardized in effect maybe 60 million Americans in the next conflict.

Take the Berlin situation. Now, when you look back, what kind of mind could leave Berlin in the Communist sea without even providing access to it? Now for that stupidity, we may have to pay again. Sixty million American people may have to pay with their life for the stupidity in defending Berlin, because it may explode in a total war.

Mr. GRAY. You are highly critical of former President Eisenhower in your book, Major de Seversky. Why?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. For the same reason, that President Eisenhower had a magnificant experience in World War II and apparently he thought that these methods and this approach of war in our preparation to fight the next war ought to be along the same line.

When he became President, he naturally did not have time to study and analyze and appreciate the fantastic progress in military technology that made a lot of methods of World War II obsolete, and he tried, as I say, to instead of * * *. I think I already did say that instead of developing strategy based on new technology, that we are all the time trying to cramp the whole new technology into the old strategic bag of World War II experience. And from that grows all our backwardness in relation to air power today.

Mr. GRAY. We, at the present moment, have one of the largest standing armies in our history. Do you believe this is a wise investment, or a poor one?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. I think that it is not a wise investment for the simple reason that, as I feel, we are never going to fight any more large ground wars, and we are never going to fight so-called limited wars.

By limited war I mean that we are not going to fight Communist forces—Russian forces—on some other territory. In other words, there will never be another Korea because neither the Russians nor we will be able to withstand the terrific damage and loss of manpower in any such war, particularly since it will unquestionably be fought with nuclear weapons.

We can support rebellion—I mean we can suppress rebellion, support our friends, like in Laos. We can give them assistance, military assistance. We can help a lot of our friends in this respect; but to fight real ground war on some neutral territory against Russian ground troops in full fledged ground war, it will be disastrous.

To start with, war can be limited only by mutual agreement. If the both sides agree to keep it limited, then only can it be kept limited, and, therefore, it can never be decisive. No military or political objective will ever be gained through such a war.

What did we gain in Korea? We started at the 38th parallel and we finished at the 38th parallel.

And another thing——

Mr. GRAY. Do you believe that was a mistake?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Certainly a mistake, we should have gone right straight through. Several mistakes were made.

First, when the Chinese armies were marshaling in Manchuria we should have hit them with everything we had to start with. We probably might have even liberated China then. The whole setup would have been different. We certainly would have had a united Korea.

A second error was made that when we finally gathered sufficient momentum and forces to roll the Communists back to the Yalu River, then President Eisenhower stopped the war because he promised he is going to stop war in Korea right at the moment we could have licked the Communists.

And Russia, at that time, had no strength, no power at all to go to total war and they would have had to withdraw and it was the second—the third great error.

A great error again was in Indochina. Now * * *. In other words, we followed this saying, some people say we are arming not to wage war but to prevent war. I think nothing can be more stupid than this. Because, if you declare in advance you are raising an army, an army not to fight a war, why should anyone pay any attention to you? And the Communists didn't pay any attention to us, and in spite of the fact that we had an exclusive monopoly of the atomic bomb, and we had exclusive means of delivering the atomic bomb, they were expanding in Korea and into China because we, in advance, told them we are not going to fight a war.

Mr. GRAY. You make a very strong point about our oversea bases. A great many people seem to take comfort and solace from the fact that we have so many oversea bases around the world.

What do you think of that theory?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, our oversea bases are responsible, for example, for the fact that we don't have as large boosters for our rockets and don't have intercontinental range of our airplanes.

After the last war we were saddled with those bases. We were saddled for the simple reason that during the last war the airplane had become an important part of our military forces, but we did not have sufficient range nor did we have large destructive power and, therefore, we had to have forward bases from which to operate.

But, by the end of the war it was obvious that aeronautics would give us aircraft of intercontinental range, and there was no necessity of having those bases. But, the Army and Navy held on to those bases because it provided work for everybody, because if you have bases you have to have a Navy to supply those bases and an Army to garrison those bases, so everybody was in business. But actually, after the last war, in my last book which 11 years ago was published, I said that the bases were absolutely useless, that we must develop intercontinental range in our weapons. But, as I say, we did not develop, because we did not have to, since we had either fixed bases on land, or floating bases on aircraft carriers.

Now Russia, on the other hand, was isolated and we, America, were the only Nation to stand in their way, and they knew that in any military showdown, they would have to destroy us. So, they single-mindedly decided to take an intellectual approach to the thing and annihilate space through an intellectual breakthrough, and they developed long range rockets and long range aircraft which do not require any bases to attack, and later on this military necessity and this military effort to provide a capability to destroy the United States directly from their own soil was utilized for this space exploration and put them in space first.

Mr. GRAY. Do you believe, Major de Seversky, that President Kennedy, as a younger man and a more modern military veteran, recognizes these problems?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, we have to give him time, for the simple reason that, you know, you cannot assimilate those things virtually overnight.

And, another thing, every President immediately becomes a sort of prisoner of a most vociferous and powerfully political clique, and already I see the sign that some of those reactionary forces begin to spin the web around the President to isolate him from military reality.

But, fortunately, even though the President had a heroic record in the last war, he's primarily a civilian. He doesn't wear the blinkers of a World War II and he's a young and vigorous man, and I hope sincerely that he will not succumb and will not become an intellectual prisoner of the military clique which is wedded to the military past, and will

free himself and free the country from these obsolete notions which direct our military effort today.

Mr. GRAY. Do you believe, Major de Seversky, that we should have a unified armed force and abolish the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Air Force as entities?

Mr. de SEVERSKY. Definitely. I think we have to integrate our military forces into one single military force of the United States with one staff, one Chief of Staff, one promotion list and single uniform. Because, all our trouble today is a result of this interservice rivalry. The vast pie has to be divided absolutely evenly between three services regardles of their strategic contribution. It has been done ever since the last war and it reigns today. It is somwhat camouflaged now by appropriating money directly to the Secretary of Defense without specifying how much Army, Navy and Air gets, but actually, if those who are interested will look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find out that the pie is still divided evenly between the three services and it is completely unrealistic, and we are going to waste our national defense appropriation by perpetuating this sort of a system.

Mr. GRAY. Major—Major de Seversky, do you believe the lack of information, or the fault that we have in not having the information, can be laid at the doors of Congressmen, Senators, and Representatives?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Well, there may be some—

Mr. GRAY. Would you——

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. I mean, I cannot condemn the Congress as a whole, as a body. I think they are the victims of the same policies of our executive branch, as the people themselves, rather than that they are the cause of mischief. Because, after all, those policies have been inaugurated and carried out by our President * * * and we must remember also that our last President was a military man who won a great war and people respected him, and automatically began to treat him as though he was the greatest military mind on earth, greater than any other military leader, and they were uncomfortable to challenge him, and that was our trouble.

And the President, naturally, without help and without an enlightened public opinion, enlightened Congress and enlightened entourage around him, he certainly cannot function.

Mr. GRAY. Major de Seversky, I'm glancing at your book, and I think perhaps this should be the footnote to this discussion. You state in your book:

"No matter how enormous our latent potential, our current position is weak, our future perilous. Every sign points to a coming allout showdown with communism whose goal is world domination. The Soviet people are regimented and driven toward that goal.

"Their huge resources are mobilized almost exclusively for conflict. Russia is preparing for the war of the future. We are still, for the most part, plodding along in the past.

"From the President of the United States to the humblest citizen of this democracy we are unified on the question of our national aims. We are for the freedom and dignity of mankind. We are united in the conviction that America must be invincibly strong, but there seems to be no agreement on how we should achieve that strength.

"Our present danger lies in our failure to provide the overall organization to take full advantage of our unique skills, our superb capacity to create and product. This is the area in which the administration, Congress, and the Armed Forces of this Nation are in complete disunity and this is where the people of the United States through their elected representatives must assert themselves."

Major de Seversky, I should like to ask you to add to that. How do we assert ourselves, we the people of the United States?

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. In the first place it is very difficult for us to assert ourselves unless we have facts. You see, I'm convinced that in any human conflict when the total resources of one nation are pitted against the resources of the other nation, there are only two organizations or two systems that can commandeer the total resources of a nation, either through total regimentation or through total freedom.

The trouble with our Nation today is that we are half regimented and half free because freedom means access to truth and facts and, as I said before, for the last 20 years we did not have these facts and that's why I've written this book, because I try to tell the American people and bring out some of the facts so they know exactly where we stand.

And, I fervently hope that our President—present President, President Kennedy, will realize these facts and will continue to be in contact with the people as he has been during his election and immediately upon his inauguration. And, only in this candor and enlightening of the American people lies the salvation of freedom.

Mr. GRAY. Maj. Alexander de Seversky, I thank you.

I sincerely hope that every listener to this broadcast and the listeners and viewers of the many broadcasts and television programs that I'm sure you will appear on as a result of this book * * * that every listener and viewer will take advantage of the opportunity to read and absorb your book.

The book is called "America, Too Young To Die." It's published by McGraw-Hill. Its author, my guest, Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky. It is indeed a thinking man's book. I congratulate you sir and I thank you very much.

Mr. DE SEVERSKY. Thank you. I'm glad to be with you.

Resolution by the Arizona State Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the resolution passed October 29, 1960, at the annual meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association, recommending construction of all-Federal Colorado River storage project transmission system. This is a very controversial issue in my State. While I do not agree with all of the conclusions of the Arizona State Reclamation Associatiton on this matter, the resolution sets forth very well certain facts which bear on the overall problem and is, therefore, worthy to be brought to the attention of the Members:

Whereas the State of Arizona has a great and continued interest in the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power and energy produced at Colorado River hydroelectric plants; and

Whereas the 1.7 million kilowatts of generation in the Bureau of Reclamation Hoover, Parker, and Davis hydroelectric powerplants are coordinated through Bureau-owned backbone transmission lines; and

Whereas over 1 million kilowatts of generation at the Bureau of Reclamation's Glen Canyon and Curecanti hydroelectric powerplant will be coordinated through Bureau-owned transmission lines; and

Whereas Congress has appropriated funds in fiscal year 1961 for commencing construction of the Bureau-built backbone transmission system from Glen Canyon to Curecanti and from Flaming Gorge to Oak Creek; and

Whereas there is need for the Bureau of Reclamation to provide a backbone interchange transmission line between these two major Bureau of Reclamation systems on the Colorado River so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm prices, because—

1. Power and energy allotted to the State of Arizona from Hoover, Parker, and Davis plants on the Colorado River will be reduced by the operation of the Glen Canyon hydroelectric plant for many years, and the Bureau-constructed backbone interchange line would provide means of minimizing the reduction while at the same time increasing firm power output of the upper basin plants.

2. Construction of such a backbone interchange line would result in the lowest power interchange costs to the Bureau of Reclamation.

3. Operation of this backbone transmission system would allow the Government and the consumer to achieve the economies to be held from diversity between summer and winter peaks that are available within the five-State area; and

Whereas an allotment of power and energy to consumers in the southern division of the storage project market area was made known by the Secretary of the Interior on May 18, 1960; and

Whereas there is need for transmission lines to market this power in Arizona and the other southern division States at the lowest possible cost to the consumer, while at the same time producing the greatest amount of net revenue to the storage project; and

Whereas preference customers of the five-State area have conclusively determined that unless an all-Federal transmission system is built by the Bureau of Reclamation, the power customer will be substantially penalized by unnecessary increase in the cost of wheeling project power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body requests the Secretary of Interior to instruct the Bureau of Reclamation to program the construction of the storage project transmission system to include Bureau-built backbone transmission lines between the upper and lower basin hydroelectric system, the completion date of such facilities to coincide with the initial output of the first unit in the Glen Canyon powerplant, and such lines to be of adequate capacity to provide on a permanent basis:

1. The necessary interchange of power between said basins, considering Bureau, preference customer and private utility interchange, if the latter so desires.

2. Necessary capacity to transmit storage project hydroelectric power and energy permanently allocated to Arizona load centers as designated by the Secretary.

3. Additional capacity to transmit short-term sales to Arizona load centers as required to market energy available from Colorado River storage project generation at all times; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our congressional delegation and that they be urged to assist in all possible ways to accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

Adopted at Phoenix, Ariz., October 29, 1960.

Search Out the New Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Railway Carmen's Journal reprints the text of a commencement address delivered at Coe College in Iowa by Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In his inspiring remarks, the Secretary reaffirmed the basic principle that by legislating in the general welfare, Congress does not restrict freedom, but in fact "adds to individual freedom by creating the opportunities in which freedom can be exercised." This is a point which many tend to lose sight of and I commend this fine statement to my colleagues' attention:

SEARCH OUT THE NEW WAY

(By Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

In the Middle West—which Abraham Lincoln described as the great interior region, the Egypt of the West, where the culture of corn and cotton meet—in the Middle West, the pioneer dreamed of continental growth and expansion.

In the Middle West—in log huts set in the midst of prairie and of forest—he had the power of will to make his dreams come true.

In the Middle West—in the center of this varied and ample land—the ideals of freedom, of equality, of faith in every man and freedom of opportunity are deeply rooted. We strive for fuller realization of these same ideals today.

Here in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, then, I would like to talk with you members of the graduating class of Coe College about these ideals for which the pioneer moved westward. How do you move for them today? Do you fight for them proudly? Or are you—like so many others—somehow reluctant to pursue them? How will they shape your lives as you assume the responsibilities of citizenship?

The settlers of this State of Iowa—the sturdy men and women your own Grant Wood has pictured—did not move westward in pursuit of freedom.

They already had freedom in New York—Connecticut—Rhode Island, and the rest of the Eastern States.

No—they did not travel West—by foot and oxcart—in search of freedom. They moved their families and built their homes and churches (which so resemble those of my own Connecticut) in search of opportunity. They found it here in Iowa. They came to farm and to acquire land. And they did so on your rich dark soil.

Today, as we seek to build—as we acknowledge that in addition to the old ways we must seek also new ways and find new means—I am not worried about our pursuit of freedom. The bundle of rights that are ours to enjoy—the right to live where we choose, to worship where we wish, to work at what trade or profession we prefer, to become educated in schools and colleges we select, to decide for ourselves how we will enjoy our leisure time—these rights are ours as much as they were a century ago, when the Reverend Williston Jones realized that this great expanse of soil could be truly fruitful only if those who worked it enjoyed the good life of enlightenment and culture.

One must be free today—as then—to do these things. But being free is no assurance that these things can be done.

With freedom there must be opportunity. And that is what we now seek—the creation of opportunity to find employment, to earn decent wages, to enjoy good health.

And for our young people, we seek freedom of opportunity in education. We seek to help them to understand, to help them to achieve. We seek to imbue them with the desire for excellence, to enable each of them to fulfill his individual potential. We seek to nurture the spirit of the free man or woman so that he is fit to lead, or participate, in a world whose complexity and potential challenge the imagination.

These are our goals.

And it is the expert consensus that we have fallen far short of them, so far short that we are confused and endangered. We have not given men and women in every section of the land the opportunities they seek. We have not made it possible for our parents and grandparents to have the health care to which they are entitled. We have not given our youngsters the opportunities for education which they are able to absorb and we to give.

When I first accepted this speaking engagement, I did not know much about Coe College, I will confess. So I did some homework. I read about your college and its pursuit of excellence. I read about the ways in which Coe is trying to challenge its students, to improve its faculty, to achieve a rich, a youthful diversity.

I liked what I read. For, determined as we are to pay the price for national greatness, we must move as a Nation—through our democratically elected Federal Government. But we must move for excellence, too, as independent institutions and individuals, where our people live, in the cities and States across the land.

As I read, I came across a poem written by a graduate of Coe College, Paul Engle—a man whose creative writing workshops attract the best writers in the land of Iowa. I want to share a bit of this poem, "America Remembers," with you:

"O remember that in the general doom of nations, there
Is but one certain immortality
* * * and that is not the thrust
Of courage against the world, nor the beating down
Of all the barriers of a continent
However bravely—but the searching out
Of the new way that a new country makes,
From all the blind impulses of its life,
A vision of the universal heart
That recreates the living form of man
In the unique and individual way
That is the shape and spirit of that land.
And while you front your fate between the ocean and the ocean
Let the American quality, the dream
Of a land where men shall work their destiny
Deeply as they will, give you the power
To realize with proud and reverent heart
The strange identity of man as man
And fling it up against the dark of time
Where it may loom forever as the bright
Image of godhead in the simple man."

Today, as you front your "fate between the ocean and the ocean," I ask you graduates of Coe College to "search out the new way that a new country makes"—the new way Paul Engle described so eloquently.

I ask you if "the American quality, the dream of a land where men shall work their destiny deeply as they will," has given you the power to ponder thoughtfully and clearly about our Nation's goals.

You members of the graduating class—whether you know it or not—have already benefited from your Government's wish to provide young people with greater educational opportunity. The administrators of Coe College tell me they are pleased with housing provisions which allow them to borrow funds at a reduced interest rate for college housing. Under the National Defense Act, Coe College has received over $110,000 in the past 3 years for student loans and this summer will receive support for a language institute for teachers.

But do you realize what the Kennedy programs for higher education now before the Congress would mean to you who plan to study further, or to your younger sisters and brothers who graduate this month from high schools here in Iowa? Do you realize that these programs would help the Coe Colleges and univerairties across the land accommodate larger numbers of students without diminishing the quality of instruction? Do you realize that they would help needy youngsters in each of the 50 States who might without them fail to develop their full abilities?

How do you feel about these programs, and others like them—deep down, in your hearts? Do you join our critics who simply say: "Individual freedom is our most prized possession. New programs for education or for health mean greater activity by government—often Federal Government—therefore these programs would mean a loss of individual freedom."

Our critics are sincere. They are mostly serious-minded men and women speaking their honest doubts in good faith. Many of them are here in the heartland of America—here where so many of our ideas and customs first flowered.

Like them, are you somehow on the defensive—ashamed—about general welfare legislation? Do you think such laws are for other—foreign—lands?

Or do you recognize the fact that the very words "general welfare" are uniquely American words? Do you join me in affirming that the general welfare legislation now before the Congress adds to individual freedom by creating the opportunities in which freedom can be exercised?

You young graduates have studied history more recently than I. You know that general welfare legislation is of the essence of the American tradition.

You know that the legal authority for many of these laws is the "general welfare clause"—one of the oldest statements of purpose in the political experience of these United States. Before our Government was established, societies had been formed to promote the welfare of a king, an aristocracy, a military brotherhood, an economic class.

But the Pilgrims, en route to America, bound themselves to promote "the common good" on new soil. And the Articles of Confederation declared that the States had entered into a "firm league of friendship with each other * * * for their mutual and general welfare." After that, the Constitution specifically authorized the Government to "provide for the general welfare."

THE GENERAL WELFARE

There were always honest men and women—perhaps like some of you in this audience today—who questioned the meaning of the "general welfare clause" and what exactly could be done in its name.

Thomas Jefferson himself was one of them. In his pre-Presidential struggles with Alexander Hamilton, he stated one side of the classical argument.

Under the general welfare clause, Jefferson said, the Congress could lawfully appropriate money only for purposes specifically enumerated in the Constitution. If a proposed measure was not on that list of specifics, no money could be appropriated. (Is this not what some of you believe today?)

But Alexander Hamilton held that in levying taxes and spending money for the general welfare, the Congress was subject to only one limitation. The purpose must in

fact be general and not local. If the purpose was general, the Constitution approved.

And how to distinguish between a general and a local purpose? By "conscientious discretion," Hamilton said, "and the arguments for or against a measure in this light must be arguments concerning expediency or inexpediency, not of constitutional right."

At a later date when he was President, Jefferson came to agree with Hamilton completely. When it came to the purchase of the Louisiana Territory—a purchase which brought to the Nation the land that became Iowa—and which was not enumerated in the Constitution—Jefferson warned his friends in the Congress not to "entangle themselves in metaphysical subtleties" but to approve an act that promised such enormous practical good to the Nation.

History, practical experience, and the weight of judicial opinion have been on Hamilton's side of the argument.

For instance, during the great depression of the 1930's—before you young graduates were even born—the cry went out from all sides calling for the Federal Government to use its own powers to do two things: to bring about a revival of a stricken national economy and to create minimal standards of economic and social well-being below which no individual could fall.

In the end, measures like unemployment compensation and other features of the social security system created under the goad of the great depression promoted individual freedom by creating economic security and opportunity. These measures did not deny the individual his freedom. In fact, if they had not been created, there was the strong possibility that our democracy—as was true in many places in Europe at the time—would have suffered a grievous hurt.

And the several States lost none of their powers. Local communities lost none of their powers. Individual freedom was in no way abridged.

It is the same 30 years later. Last year Federal aid to education in all forms totaled $2.7 billion, including millions for school construction and teachers' salaries in school districts with defense installations. In the current fiscal year Iowa will receive about $6 million under existing Federal educational programs. Not once in my 6 years as Governor did any Connecticut mayor or school principal ever complain to me of a single instance of Federal control. And I know of no complaint from any other Governor of the 50 States. But I do know that this assistance creates countless opportunities for young people throughout the Nation.

Our proposals for Federal aid to education today rise from a nationwide need. The States and local governments, with their fairly rigid tax base, cannot unaided pay for the quantity and quality of education we need. For trained minds stand first among the Nation's natural resources.

I head a Department dedicated to that uniquely American principle—the general welfare of our people. You young men and women graduating today are benefactors of a serious business.

Many of you will now go on to more specialized kinds of education. Others will immediately take your place in our society.

It is my hope that all of you will conduct yourselves as educated men and women, able to think clearly and express yourselves compellingly.

It is my hope that you will joint our national quest for excellence—that you will join our quest for fuller freedom of opportunity. It is my hope that you will not be frightened into un-American silence, apologies, and denials whenever such constructive proposals as the general welfare legislation I have discussed today are under attack. It is my hope that, secure in your faith in our society, you will do your part to promote the general welfare of all our citizens.

It is my hope that you have gotten rid, as Emerson put it, of "the nonsense of our wigwams," whether that nonsense be a cramped intellect or a narrow dogma.

For your Nation asks much of you young people of today. It asks that the whole tone and thrust of your lives be directed toward the strengthening of our life together. It asks—whatever you do—that you strive in every minute of the day for excellence in your endeavor, not just for yourself, but for the people with whom you live.

For you work on a planet bizarre in its difficulties yet limitless in its possibilities for creative adventure. You live on a planet of abundance and peace—but also of poverty and ignorance. You will travel on a planet and who knows—perhaps away from a planet—where if you are thoughtful and knowledgeable—you can make our Nation friends—or, if you are thoughtless and selfish—deadly enemies.

This is your planet. This is your Nation. These are the responsibilities. Will you discharge them to the very best of your abilities? I am confident that you will.

Redevelopment of Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, one of the fundamental principles through which our society has grown is the spirit of cooperation. It was this sentiment which enabled the founders of our Nation to mold a socially and economically advanced unit. Today we are called on to engage in a great cooperative effort in the redevelopment of depressed areas. The Small Business Administration is one agency actively engaged in this effort. Recently, Mr. Phil David Fine, SBA Deputy Administrator, outlined the responsibilities of his agency in area redevelopment. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Fine's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY SBA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR PHIL DAVID FINE, AT MEETING OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS, JULY 12, 1961

Ordinarily, the occasion of a return to my home city of Boston brings me a sense of release from the seemingly never-ending flow of problems which are part and parcel of any government department in these fast-moving times.

The Small Business Administration is no exception to this concentration of activity. On the contrary, it seems to be the repository of more programs than any of us could have foreseen. And the responsibility for administering them leaves me little time on this trip for relaxation.

The scope of our Agency's activities has grown for two reasons. One, because the inauguration of any program intended for the better economic health of our Nation cannot overlook the importance of the 4,500,000 businesses in the Nation which are classified by our standards as small.

And the second reason is that, justifiably, President Kennedy's administration seeks wherever possible to incorporate the mechanics of new programs into existing Agencies. Theirs is the responsibility for carrying out new programs needed to spur our economy toward greater productivity.

For the reasons I outlined, the Small Business Administration finds itself tied in with such programs as the Urban Renewal Administration and, of more immediate interest at this time to New England as a whole, the Area Redevelopment Administration.

It is this program which, by enlisting the cooperation of existing Agencies and using the experienced personnel of these Agencies, the administration plans to aid the economic growth of the Nation, with emphasis on those areas where substantial and persistent unemployment exists.

These ideas are not new, but responsibility of the Small Business Administration in carrying them out is new. But we welcome the challenge.

In one particular area, the responsibility lies at my doorstep.

Let me outline the responsibility of the Small Business Administration in this program, including my own personal responsibility.

For those of you unfamiliar with the authority of the agency, the Small Business Administration is empowered to make loans under section 7 of the Small Business Act to small businesses directly where need be, and in participation—on both our immediate and a deferred basis—with banks and private lending institutions. The SBA may not make a loan to any small business if the needed financing is available elsewhere at reasonable rates of interest.

Under the Small Business Act of 1958, the agency is authorized, also, to make loans to State and local development companies for relending to small businesses or for the construction of facilities to lease to such small businesses.

Loans to State and local development companies, which are under sections 501 and 502 of the Small Business Investment Act, come under my direct responsibility.

I mention these programs because (as you have already been told by preceding speakers) loans under the Area Redevelopment Act will be processed by Small Business Administration financial examiners, giving us added responsibility.

These programs are important, also, because before a loan may be made under the Area Redevelopment Act, it must first be determined if the loan can be made by the Small Business Administration under our regular lending program.

Under the ARA, the following requirements exist:

The ARA Administrator, Mr. William Batt, must designate an area as a "redevelopment area."

On June 9, 1961, he announced 114 such areas. These are the so-called 5–A areas. In New England, they include, among others, Fall River, Lowell, New Bedford, and North Adams in Massachusetts; Ansonia, Bristol, and Danielson in Connecticut; Biddiford-Sanford in Maine, and Providence and Pawtucket in Rhode Island. Later, I understand, the 5–B, or rural and nonurban areas will be designated.

After an area has been designated, an overall economic development plan must be approved by ARA, but first the plan should have the blessing or approval of a designated State agency.

Then a project as a part of an overall economic development plan requiring financing must be approved by ARA. When that is done, the applicant comes to the Small Business Administration—we have field offices throughout New England.

If we determine the loan can be made under our own authority, we will do so. If not, we'll process it under ARA lending authority.

If the loan can be made by the Small Business Administration, it might come under section 7 of the Small Business Act or

under either section 501 or 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

I mention these specifically because each has separate loan limitations.

Under section 7 of the Small Business Act, the SBA may lend up to $350,000 to a business.

Under section 502 of the Investment Act, the ceiling for an individual loan is $250,000 (although under the law a local development company or a State development company may obtain loans for several small businesses up to $250,000 for each.)

Under section 501, however, under which loans may be made to only State development companies, the amount of funds a State development company may borrow to finance small businesses is limited only by the amount of its outstanding indebtedness to other borrowers. If, for example, the State development company has outstanding borrowings of $5 million from other sources, it is eligible to borrow up to that sum for financing small businesses from the SBA.

I should inject here that whereas in regular SBA business loans and section 502 loans, the interest rate is 5½ percent and on section 501 loans it is 5 percent, the rate charged on loans in areas having substantial and persistent unemployment is 4 percent. The interest rate on ARA loans is set at 4⅜ percent.

Under the area redevelopment program, we will be working directly with Mr. Batt, and we will cooperate and coordinate our activties to help the communities and individuals secure needed financing under existing Federal authority.

In some cases, where the financial needs of a particular community cannot be wholly met by any of the SBA programs, the financing may consist of a loan from the SBA to the extent that particular lending program permits, with the balance of the funds coming from the Area Development Administration.

What can such a program bring to New England?

I can best answer it perhaps by an example of a rural Alabama community of 2,000—all cotton farmers.

That is, they were cotton farmers when the weather was good and they had a crop.

Otherwise they were living at only a subsistence level. The community had a general store, a post office and little else. But some of the people got together, studied their problem and formed a local development company eligible for loans and our section 502 requirements.

Meanwhile they had found that a plant 35 miles away was thinking of expansion but was uncertain if sufficient trained manpower could be found.

Members of the rural community convinced the plant owner that they could supply the manpower if the expansion took the form of an additional plant in the rural community—it should be remembered that you cannot raid another community or State to entice an existing business away from there.

But this was an expansion program, intended to implement their existing production.

The rural community raised $10,000 and applied to us for $90,000 more.

We took into consideration in our evaluation the land that was contributed by one of the people in the town. We took into consideration also the feeling of the people of the town, for we knew that if these people established a business in there, they were not going to let it go.

The $100,000 loan commitment came through.

When the footings were poured, the manufacturer put signs on the town post office and the general store asking for applications for employment. He intended to hire 46 people. He expected that he might have 100 applications from the 2,000 people in the community. He got over 900 job applications.

Now remember that there are 2,000 people in this town. Nine hundred is a lot of job applications for 2,000 people, young and old. When the walls of the building were going up some 4 weeks later, the manufacturer made arrangements with one of the members of the community to use his barn. He brought in a dozen sewing machines. He had a training course to teach sewing on these machines and how to make pajamas. By the time the building was up, he had 50 trained employees ready to go to work. Today, a year and one-half later, he has 325 employees. We have lent to the development company in the community additional sums to expand.

This community is now reestablished and revitalized; it has now two sources of income—cotton, which it has always had, and also it has an industrial base. There is not one family in this town which does not have at least one member working in this plant. If the weather is bad, they still have food to eat and are not looking for doles or grants. And the manufacturer has expanded his operation considerably, not only there, but also at his original plant.

This southern Alabama community is cited as an object lesson because each one of the towns around it is now going ahead with its own development company and the people have the desire to aid themselves through this self-help program.

The area redevelopment concept is both old and new.

I say it is old because its roots lie in the cooperative spirit displayed by those who settled this New England area nearly 250 years ago—in 1620 to be exact.

And it is new in the sense that we in America are rediscovering—under the leadership of a New Englander, I am glad to say—the need for cooperation at all levels to bring employment to the unemployed; new business where it did not previously exist; new skills to replace those no longer in demand, and a sense of accomplishment which does more than merely satisfy our need for accomplishment.

This cooperation will augment payrolls, increasing buying power and consumer spending, not only here but across the country.

That increased buying power and spending potential, adding as it does to our gross national product, will serve notice to those who predict our decline as a nation—and who sit like jackals waiting to devour us—that the United States is a vibrant, growing economy.

It will tell these enemies who lie in wait that instead of surpassing us by 1970, as some of their spokesmen have freely predicted, they will find themselves still further behind us.

It will demonstrate anew that through leadership and cooperation a free economy can stand strong and firm, undaunted by all the isms with which our enemies would divide us, and proof positive that this Nation will ever stand as the bulwark of a free economy and freedom itself.

The Belgian National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Belgium. This small nation, like so many others, derives no small benefit from its national lottery.

In 1960, the Belgian national lottery gross receipts came to approximately $15 million. The net income, although not retained by the government, came to $6 million. The bulk of this money went to the social welfare fund and other charitable works. In 1960, some of the profit from the lottery was used to mitigate the distress of displaced persons in the former Belgian Congo.

Belgium has realized that a lottery can be of great worth in obtaining funds for deserving causes. We would do well to come to the same realization.

Soviet Blunders You Never Hear About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald titled "Soviet Blunders You Never Hear About."

In these days of harsh but necessary reevaluation and criticism of our foreign aid program, it is well to remember that we are not in a worldwide competition against an infallible force staffed by omnipotent supermen. The United States is not the only country who has made mistakes in her efforts to win the uncommitted countries of the world to her side. We often wrongly believe our Foreign Service is inferior to the Russian diplomatic corps because, while we publicize our mistakes, we rarely hear of Communist blunders in that field. I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body an excellent article by the Honorable James J. Wadsworth, our past Ambassador to the United Nations, which points out some of the Soviet errors in the field of foreign relations which have not been brought to the attention of the American public.

In reading this article, however, one must remember that despite Communist mistakes, we should not relax our own efforts to help the new and uncommitted nations of the world. This article should serve as a reassurance to all of us that the Communist system of subversion and infiltration has also made errors, both in judgment and execution. We must keep in mind, as well, that while we are competing with a nation that may make errors, it is a nation which still is grimly determined to win over the world to communism and has devoted over $5 billion in the last few years to insure the destruction of our ideas and beliefs all over the world. It seems clear to me that although a small part of our foreign aid dollars may indeed have been wasted, the many benefits accruing from this program have been such that we must step up our own foreign aid programs to meet this threat to freedom.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, July 30, 1961]

SOVIET BLUNDERS YOU NEVER HEAR ABOUT

(By James J. Wadsworth as told to Donald Robinson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—I want to clear up a deep, double-edged misconception that a lot of Americans seem to have. One part of it is a feeling that the people representing the U.S. Government overseas are an inept, bungling crew whose bunders continually lose us friends. This belief was, of course, reinforced by our problems in Cuba and Laos.

The second misconception is that Soviet Russia's representatives abroad are supermen who invariably do all things well.

Neither notion could be further from the truth.

John Hay Whitney, who was U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain for the past four years, said recently, "I watched our Foreign Service personnel close up. I found them to be a topnotch group of professionals—devoted and highly competent diplomats."

On the basis of my service in the United Nations, I completely agree with him. What is more, my experience showed that, man for man, the Soviet foreign service doesn't approach ours. I have talked with high officials of the U.S. State Department, members of the diplomatic corps, and ranking U.N. dignitaries, and I can report that Communists do not enjoy any reputation as diplomatic geniuses elsewhere in the world.

You've often heard it said, for instance, that Soviet ambassadors, unlike our U.S. envoys, can always speak the language of the country they're in. Not long ago, the State Department did a survey of Russian diplomats and discovered that 38 of the 61 Soviet ambassadors could not speak the language of the country in which they were stationed.

The Soviet Foreign Office doesn't even seem to recognize that a language problem exists. It assigned a man as ambassador to Japan, Nikolay T. Fedorenko, who was fluent in Chinese. The man it sent to Cuba, Sergey M. Kudryavtsev, could speak English, French and German, but not Spanish. Actually, a great many Soviet envoys cannot speak anything but Russian.

There have been some really fantastic boners by Soviet representatives abroad. Here are some you never heard about.

Afghanistan's wrong-way bakery: Back in 1957, the U.S.S.R. put up a huge bakery for Afghanistan, complete with its own mammoth silo and flour mills. It was to be a showcase of Communist industrial genius. Unfortunately, Soviet engineers didn't bother to check on Afghan eating habits, and they designed the ovens to bake bread in Western-style loaves.

At first, the Afghans wouldn't touch it. They eat their bread in thin, unleavened sheets—"chapati," it's called—and they wouldn't have anything else.

In desperation, the Afghans tried to feed the loaves of bread to the schoolchildren of Kabul and later passed it off on the Army.

Blunder in Colombia: The Soviets blundered as badly with Colombia. They made a deal in 1958 to ship 5,000 tons of wheat in exchange for a stock of fine Colombian coffee. This was to be the first of a series of happy, mutually profitable transactions, Radio Moscow proudly proclaimed.

But Moscow sent the wrong kind of wheat. It was only good for making spaghetti and Colombians are bread, not spaghetti, eaters.

Poisoned wheat for Egypt: The Soviets did worse in Egypt. In early 1958 they sent the Egyptians a shipload of wheat that was moldy and wormy and possibly poisonous. As I heard the story, some Kremlin bureaucrat had ordered the wheat stacked in a warehouse which was ordinarily used for storing insecticides.

Busted jeeps for Indonesia: It is astonishing how often the Kremlin gets itself into difficulties with defective goods. The State Department's top expert on Soviet trade told me of one occasion in 1957, for example, when Russia sold Indonesia 4,000 Soviet-built jeeps. Many of the jeeps turned out to be absolutely unsafe. When they were driven at high speeds, the steering gear failed.

Anti-Communist elements in Indonesia had a field day over the incident.

Junk for Argentina: The Argentines had the same sort of experience after they gave the Soviet Government a sizable order for steel cables, drills and power shovels. The Kremlin promised them the very best materials, but the steel cables split, the drills cracked, and the motors in the power shovels burned out. Naturally, there was considerable irritation in Buenos Aires.

Burma's hothouse hotel: Burma had a similar experience when it contracted with the Soviet Government to build it a new luxury hotel in Rangoon. Despite the searing heat of Burmese summers—100 degrees in the shade—the Russians forgot to install air conditioning.

The Burmese Government was furious. "What are you trying to palm off on us?" it demanded of Moscow.

The Russians had to spend $200,000 extra putting in an air-conditioning system this spring. What made their faces even redder was that they had to use an American-made air conditioner.

Cement in the rain: This must be said, too: Moscow doesn't learn much from its mistakes. A couple of years ago, it shipped a whole year's supply of cement to Burma immediately before the monsoon season. When the rains started, it hardened into an unbreakable, unusable mess.

Last summer, Moscow did it all over again. The Soviet press proudly announced a large shipment of cement to Guinea. The cement never reached Guinea at all. While it was standing on a dock in Liberia, awaiting transshipment, the torrential summer rains came. Again, the Soviet cement was ruined.

One can merely conjecture as to the fate of the Soviet Commissar for Cement.

Extra charges for India: Even the patient Indians have been distressed by Soviet business tactics. With a grand flourish, the Russians opened a steel mill for India at Bhilai in 1959. They charged the Indians very little for the mill, but they soon made up for that. First, they asked India $1,120 a ton for spare parts. Next, they raised the price to $1,400 a ton. At last count, they were demanding $5,040 a ton.

I was told that Prime Minister Nehru appealed personally to Khrushchev for more reasonable prices when they met at the U.N. General Assembly session last autumn. It got him nowhere.

A night out in India: Some people have an idea that Soviet officials are always on their good behavior abroad. I am sure the Kremlin would like them to be. But Communists have human weaknesses too.

Only recently, a Russian engineer working on the Bhilai steel mill in India went out for the evening with a pretty Russian woman interpreter and drank a bit too much vodka. He smashed up himself, his date, and a company car.

Insults for Indonesians: Prime Minister Khrushchev himself doesn't seem to care what friends he alienates. During a state visit to Indonesia in February 1960, Mr. Khrushchev was invited to a performer of Balinese dancers. The Indonesians are extremely proud of this subtle art form. Mr. Khrushchev spent the first half of the performance reading cables and talking with his secretary. He then noisily got up and left. He said he was tired and wanted to go to bed. The Indonesians were even more insulted when they offered Mr. Khrushchev a present of a magnificent, handmade, hand-colored fabric called "batik."

"I don't want any handmade stuff like that," Khrushchev snorted. "It represents a bygone day. Machines, that's what you Indonesians need."

Khrushchev was a gauche during his visit to India last year, criticizing India's form of government and its acceptance of economic assistance from the West.

The Madras Mail eventually declared, "It is unfortunate that the distinguished visitors from Moscow have fallen into the habit of lecturing Indians on matters which they are capable of deciding for themselves."

Backfire in Burma: Kremlin propagandists are constantly tripping over themselves. Just last September, they deluged Burma with copies of a new book praising the Communist regime in Outer Mongolia. It was the worst move imaginable in a devoutly Buddhist nation such as Burma, for the book bragged that the Communists had killed 37,000 Buddhist monks.

One Rangoon newspaper reprinted, word for word, the section on the slaughter of the monks. The headline was the title of the book: "Facts About the Mongolian People's Republic."

But let me underline one point here: The fact that the Communists make foolish blunders should not lead us to underestimate their threat to democracy. The Soviet bloc has spent more than $5 billion in the last few years on foreign aid-trade programs designed to win the uncommitted nations of the world over to communism. Some Soviet officials are very able and, unquestionably, communism has made alarming gains in large areas of Asia and Africa, and even in our own hemisphere.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, put it well:

"If democracy is to survive, we must do everything in our power to help the uncommitted nations not only to resist Communist pressure but to develop their own paths of freedom. We must be sure to send competent, well-trained men and women to represent us abroad, people who know the countries they're to serve in and who speak their languages."

In the past we Americans have made mistakes. It is up to us to avoid more mistakes in the future. We cannot afford them if we are to keep our freedom and our friends.

Meanwhile, it is some comfort to know that the Russians make mistakes, too. Plenty of them.

Economy Called for To Back Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an eloquent plea for fiscal responsibility as contained in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

THE NEED FOR ECONOMY

The American people are waiting for President Kennedy to recommend some economies to balance the 3½ added billions he wants—and is going to get—for defense.

The silence of the administration spokesmen suggests that economy is a dirty word

in their lexicon. The costly frills that the country knows it can get along without are to be retained in all their expensive glory, including the $40 million Peace Corps.

That is only one spot where money could be saved but it is a particularly good one because it is now apparent that the Peace Corps can be demobilized indefinitely without causing any harm. There is even talk of drafting the Peace Corpsmen into the Army. The disappearance of the Corps would take away Mr. Robert Shriver's honorific position as Director but perhaps President Kennedy can find some other public service for his brother-in-law to perform and, if not, Mr. Shriver can always come back to the school board in Chicago. He might even be restored to the position of president from which he resigned to undertake his Peace Corps assignment.

Other economies are in plain view. There are 50,000 more names on the public payrolls than there were the day Mr. Kennedy was inaugurated. At $3,000 a year, which probably understates their incomes, they are getting $150 million, all of which can be saved if the administration is willing to sacrifice some jobs for the sake of national solvency.

It would be no trick at all to knock a billion dollars from foreign aid gifts and grants. Comparable savings can be made in housing and road appropriations, other public works, and an assortment of subsidies of which the farm subsidy is perhaps the best known.

None of these ways of saving money is receiving administration attention. All of them should be.

With the exception of a few appropriations, like that for interest on the public debt, no appropriation should be regarded as above reconsideration and review.

If nothing else can be achieved in the time remaining before adjournment, Congress might usefully impose a blanket 5-percent or 10-percent cut on the departments and bureaus. Even the existing military appropriations themselves can be slashed at many points without seriously impairing the military potential of the United States. Admiral Rickover has said that military efficiency would actually be promoted by economies, and we do not doubt that on this point he is wholly right.

Dallas Initiative Claims Well Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Dallas are proud of the achievement record of our community. Dallas takes second place to no other city in its dynamic progress, in its advocacy of the hustle and sweat and individual initiative which is so much a part of the American tradition. Dallas business and industrial leaders have not waited on Government planning or Federal handouts, they have kept abreast of, and even ahead of developments in the space age until today Dallas ranks as one of the outstanding centers of the electronics industry and we have only just begun. For this success, men like J. Erik Jonsson, mentioned in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News, and others who were willing to risk capital and to stake their whole future in the development of a new industry, deserve great credit. Also deserving of credit are the people of Dallas who are sterling examples of all that is best in our people.

The editorial follows:

DALLAS IS LEADER IN ELECTRONICS

Seventeen thousand Dallasites earn nearly a hundred million dollars yearly by producing $263,372,000 worth of electronics products. Dallas Chamber of Commerce reports that the fast-growing electronics industry is our largest single employer and has unsurpassed growth potential.

Nationally, Dallas ranks with Phoenix and other leading centers for electronics. This metropolis has far outstripped other Southwestern cities, including Houston and Fort Worth. And, as Dallas magazine says, "No field offers more promise to the area than electronics."

Engineers and businessmen who pioneered in electronics here, such as J. Erik Jonsson and others, deserve the most credit. Their progress could never have been so great without the effective cooperation of the entire Dallas business community, working together within the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

New Frontier Debt Program Beats Mercury Space Program in Going Out of This World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of August 2 contains an editorial commenting on the fact that last week the Federal public debt reached a record high as it soared to $293,172,794,984.62.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing suborbital about the height of that debt—it is strictly all the way out of this world. The inflationary thrust of New Frontier spending programs suggests that we are on the threshold of even greater breakthroughs in new highs in public indebtedness. For example, with respect to 1961 and 1962 fiscal years, President Kennedy in 6 months has recommended a $15 billion increase in new obligational authority over the level recommended by President Eisenhower in January. Also, President Eisenhower pointed the way to balanced budgets for these 2 fiscal years with surpluses totaling $1.6 billion; in 6 months' time the Kennedy administration has changed those budget surpluses to budget deficits totaling more than $10 billion.

The Kennedy administration spenders are working hard to convince the American people that we can continuously spend more without pausing to review programs already on the books and proposals already presented for possible areas where cutbacks in spending could be accomplished. These administration fiscal astronauts would have the American people believe that we can spend ourselves into sustainable prosperity at home and security abroad through deficit financing on a spending-as-usual attitude toward nonessential domestic spending programs during a time of what the President has called international crisis.

The New Frontier program of soaking the kids with taxes tomorrow to pay for spending today does not have the support of the American people. We must call a halt to the bureaucratic advocacy by the New Frontiersmen of constantly increasing public debt for nonessential programs which are unwanted by the American people and supported only by highly organized special interest groups. If America is to avoid inflation and prevent debasement of the value of our currency, we must spend less for the unnecessary so we can spend what is needed for the necessary. A strong dollar is essential to a strong America, and the New Frontier officialdom must recognize that fact so we can succeed in strengthening our Nation for the cold war contest already in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I will include, as a part of my remarks, the editorial from the Wall Street Journal captioned "New Name for the New Frontier," which comments on the public debt level:

NEW NAME FOR THE NEW FRONTIER

Last week the national debt reached $293,172,794,984.62—a record high. Never in its history has the United States gone so deeply in the red.

And now, with the President asking for new billions for defense, it is likely that the debt figure next winter will climb even higher to something around $298 billion.

The sad part of this is not just the amount owed, although that amount is so enormous it sends the mind reeling, nor is it just the inflationary threats that new Federal deficits pose for the country. The worst is that the administration and many lawmakers not only shrug off this massive debt and this inflation, but indeed press for more and more nonessential spending to keep the debt forever climbing.

No longer need we wonder exactly what Mr. Kennedy meant when he urged a rush to the New Frontier. We have just reached a New Frontier called $293,172,794,984.62.

Unempoyment Compensation Benefits to People in Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include for the consideration of the Congress a statement made by a constituent of mine, William Netschert, of Daytona Beach, Fla., in connection with the proposal that has been made to pay unemployment compensation benefits to people in jail:

FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD AND ALL CONGRESSMEN TO HEED

The recent request of the John Howard Association, a nonprofit prisoner rehabilitation organization, to have prisoners' compensation as inmates covered by the unemployment compensation system, is the last straw in the efforts of do-gooders to use the system

of jobless benefits to bail out their waining influence.

After 25 years of maladministration under unconstitutionally discriminating statutes it has not yet dawned on the do-gooders that allowance of jobless benefits as a matter of right on a basis of need is contradictory in purpose. It does not seem to have penetrated their consciences that it is just as immoral to discriminate on the basis of need, as a matter of right, as it would be to misappropriate moneys in any trust fund, such as the unemployment trust fund under the social security system is.

It is, therefore, meet and proper to suggest to the Members of Congress a paraphrase of the Scriptures, legislators should render unto "charity" the things that are noble in purpose, and unto "equity" the things which are to be accomplished "in trust." So let it be with unemployment compensation.

WM. NETSCHERT, M.E.,
Employment Security Consultant,
Florida Legislature, 1961 Session.

Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., my hometown, has written to me on July 27, 1961, urging passage of the foreign aid bill.

As Mayor Barr's letter is excellently written and contains a thoughtful expression of his views on the urgent need for the U.S. foreign aid program at this time. I am placing this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it will receive wide distribution and receive careful study.

Mayor Barr properly states:

I would hope that the foreign aid program does not become a partisan or political issue.

Mayor Barr stresses that we in the United States have a strong moral obligation to assist the underdeveloped nations.

I commend this letter to the attention of the American people and to the Congress:

JULY 27, 1961.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: The strength of our Nation and the success of our struggle against world communism is everyone's concern, that of every public official, and of every American citizen.

That is why I am taking the liberty of expressing my views on the international development—foreign aid program proposed by President John Kennedy—and urging your unqualified support for that program.

President Kennedy's foreign-aid legislation goes a long way toward remedying errors of the past.

I am particularly impressed by the emphasis in the Kennedy program on the need for recipient nations to help themselves, to initiate social and economic reforms essential to their political and social stability.

For the first time, we will require countries to demonstrate their willingness to contribute to their own development and to the betterment of their people.

I believe the President's request for long-range financing and planning is equally essential.

We must recognize that foreign aid is not a temporary program. We cannot afford an annual tug-of-war over financing if we expect nations to develop the long-term plans and programs necessary for their own growth and progress.

We are locked in a test of wills with the entire Communist world. The Soviet Union is not reluctant to promise aid to nations over a long-term period. The multiyear provision proposed by President Kennedy would enable us to compete on equal terms with the Russians.

There are those who argue we are spending too much for foreign aid, that we cannot afford the sums needed for long-term economic and military assistance.

It seems to me that if we can provide more than $40 billion a year for military appropriations to defend freedom from communism, we can certainly spend less than one-tenth that amount for foreign aid, which is just as effective a weapon in our total struggle to preserve freedom and defeat the Communist peril.

I would hope that the foreign aid program does not become a partisan or political issue. As former Vice President Richard M. Nixon recently stated, "Congressional approval of a long-range foreign aid program is an absolute must if we are to be successful in our fight against world Communist aggression."

In my judgment, we would have a strong moral obligation to assist the retarded and underdeveloped nations even if no Communist threat existed. However, the existence of that threat makes our obligation that much more pressing. The serious Berlin situation, the many sensitive areas in the world, make it imperative that the world know of our Nation's unity, with no partisan or political reservation.

For these reasons, I urge your all-out support for President Kennedy's foreign aid program.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor.

Britain Makes Its Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in today's Evening Star entitled "Britain Makes Its Move":

BRITAIN MAKES ITS MOVE

Much more than commercial reasons, important as they are, is involved in the decision of the British Government to apply for membership in the European Common Market. For the ultimate goal of this continental economic community, a grouping of six nations that was formalized by the so-called Treaty of Rome in early 1957, is some sort of political federation that could in the long term give Western Europe a new and vastly more powerful voice in world affairs. But to be part of this collective voice, if one does in fact develop, Britain would be trading away a measure of its historical independence in European affairs—an independence that it has employed shrewdly and effectively in politics, economics, and even in military alliances. It is a mark of the times that a British Government of any party would even dare to consider a compromise of this independence.

There are, of course, good reasons why Britain's Conservative government is willing to do this today—under safeguards which it hopes to establish by negotiation. Foremost among the reasons is the economic one; namely, that the Common Market group has become steadily stronger in trade, particularly within itself, and that British markets on the Continent have suffered accordingly. With its overall trade balance now running a deficit—its exports not enough to finance its imports—Britain cannot afford to accept casually this decline in continental markets. A parallel effect is the political one itself; a prolonged decline of Britain's commercial influence on the Continent is bound to be accompanied by a decline in its political influence. One countermaneuver to establishment of the Common Market, the creation of a so-called Outer Seven in a European Free Trade Association, in which Britain has taken a leading part, has not quite proved an adequate answer.

Britain's agony in this matter, and it is hardly less than agony, has not been ended by the decision to seek membership in the Common Market. There are many technicalities to be negotiated, including the paramount one of how the imperial preference system of trading within the British Commonwealth can be adjusted to a new international relationship. Products of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, for example, have favored status for entry into the British home market—a status which presumably must be revised in some fashion reasonably acceptable to all parties. Negotiating safeguards for this Commonwealth trade will be one of the most difficult problems between London and the Common Market group.

Prime Minister Macmillan has warned that the negotiations may be protracted and that there is no guarantee of success. He already has drawn political criticism at home, not only from Laborites but from a segment of his own Conservative Party. Basically, however, he is displaying courage in exploring a course that could lead to greater economic and political strength of Western Europe in particular and the Western World in general.

High Cost of Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of July 28, 1961, entitled "High Cost of Drugs":

HIGH COST OF DRUGS

While much evidence is yet to be heard on its remedial proposals, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee is making an increasingly persuasive case for the need of legislation which will reduce the unconscionably high prices of prescription drugs, while at the same time assuring their safety and usefulness. In general, we think the key provisions of the Kefauver bill designed to accomplish these results are on the right track.

As might be expected in a probe of an industry so vast and so complex, the

Kefauver bill is full of controversial ramifications. Its main thrust, however, through a variety of means, is to induce more competition in the production and the sale of drugs, and thereby reduce their costs. The subcommittee record is replete with examples of drug costs (and of drug-company profits, as well), which are shockingly excessive by any standard of evaluation.

Among the intriguing goals of the bill is an effort to persuade doctors, in prescribing drugs, to a greater use of the generic (or official) names of drugs, rather than trade names which frequently command far higher prices for precisely the same product. Many doctors, according to the subcommittee, have refrained from this practice in the understandable fear that they might run the risk of placing an inferior drug in the hands of their patients. Other provisions of the Kefauver bill, however, are aimed specifically at assuring that such drugs in fact are not inferior, but that all drugs marketed are both safe and efficacious. This would be accomplished in part by authorizing the Food and Drug Administration (which now has the legal authority only to rule on the safety of drugs) to determine as well that they live up to the claims made for them as to usefulness.

A few weeks ago, at the start of the current round of hearings, we were impressed by the American Medical Association argument that every private physician must determine in the final analysis what drugs are useful for each patient, and that the new control proposed for the FDA might deny doctors access to drugs of possible value to one or another of their patients. In view of the testimony from individual doctors since that time, however, and in view of the explanations offered by Senator KEFAUVER, it is difficult to believe that useful drugs actually would be kept out of doctors' hands. In a very real sense, the FDA already is forced to consider the efficacy of drugs in certifying their safety, for there are few drugs in the entire armamentarium of medicine which do not have the potential for ill effects on someone. In practice, of course, the FDA must weigh these potentials for harm against the degree of curative benefit which each new drug possesses. We see no inconsistency, therefore, in broadening this evaluation of efficacy, or in the separate provisions of the bill which would impose tighter controls on misleading or false information which might be disseminated by drug companies to doctors in their extensive promotional campaigns.

There are other provisions—most particularly one which would modify product-patent rights on drugs—which require more testimony, especially that of patent exports. Indeed, the drug industry itself has not yet had an opportunity to present its side of the story. The subcommittee nevertheless has amassed a truly overwhelming amount of evidence in support of its charges.

Mr. Becker and Mr. Fulbright and Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Evening Star of August 2, 1961. This editorial is enlightening in that Mr. FULBRIGHT is always talking about proposals, negotiations and more talk. Never does he specify what kind of proposal nor does he ever say what we are to give when we negotiate. There is no doubt in my mind the only type of negotiation the Kremlin will understand is our strength and our action. But in talk the Kremlin seems to be able to outtalk us at every turn.

The editorial follows:

MR. FULBRIGHT AND BERLIN

In his Sunday television interview (ABC, "Issues and Answers"), Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, seems to have been implicity and rather sharply critical, in a vague sort of way, of the administration's handling of the Soviet-manufactured Berlin crisis.

Thus, although supporting the President's recent speech on the subject, the Senator has voiced the opinion that "we have been remiss in not making proposals that would give some opportunity for negotiation" aimed at averting a military test that could explode into nuclear war. And he has gone on to declare that "we should have conferences at the ministerial level to avoid a showdown. I don't see any great advantage in just taking the view that we will entertain no negotiations, we won't enter into any negotiations for any kind of a change. I'm for negotiation and discussion as opposed to ultimatums and showdowns."

Well, wholly apart from the completely nonspecific "proposals" he has referred to, it seems to us that Mr. FULBRIGHT has been less than helpful or historically accurate in suggesting that the United States has not sought (which it actually has, ever since 1945) to work out a decent German settlement on the basis of good and affirmative propositions. It seems to us, too, that his remarks have had the unfortunate effect—undoubtedly unintended—of leaving the impression that President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk are not really interested in negotiating with the Russians on Berlin, but instead are in a mood for "ultimatums and showdowns" to demonstrate to the Kremlin how tough our country can be—and it can be awesomely tough, of course.

The fact is, however, that our Government, as the President made clear in his somber address on Berlin, is ready and willing to negotiate honestly with the Kremlin in an effort to bring about an abatement of the crisis that Mr. Khrushchev himself, deliberately and with malice aforethought, has stirred up. This point has been underscored by Mr. Rusk, who will be in Paris a few days from now for conferences with the foreign ministers of Britain, France, and West Germany. As he told a news conference last week, these meetings, in addition to fostering allied unity, will "try to find opportunities for a peaceful adjustment" of the situation.

Unhappily, Senator FULBRIGHT's off-the-cuff TV remarks have failed to take into account these positive aspects of our American posture as regards Berlin. And this is doubly unfortunate, we think, because of his position as head of the august and powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Problems in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD a letter recently received from Mr. S. W. Bartlett, of Honolulu, Hawaii:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *June 30, 1961.*

Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN INOUYE: You and your colleagues and others in high Government circles are aware of gravity of this hour in international relations—and for once, I think, the American people share this awareness. It is my hope that this popular awareness will lead to a sense of the scope and urgency of the larger problem facing the free world, and will not lapse again into indifference if the crises of this hour are safely passed.

But to sustain this awareness the American people need to understand the nature of the long-range problem. I believe that such an understanding would help inspire in Americans the needed spirit of resolve and purposiveness, the willingness to sacrifice that the President has so often attempted to invoke without making it clear what sacrifices are needed, and in what awesome amounts.

Concerning the nature of the larger problem in international relations, it seems to me that there is one factor too often underevaluated. I refer to the contemporary emergence of mass communications as a weighty factor in the ever-precarious balance of power.

Since World War II many millions in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East have had their initial exposure to the varying images of the United States and Russia. Under prewar conditions of communications these same millions would never have heard of the two colossal powers struggling for control of them, and would have been too occupied with their own struggle for the next meal to care. Today the United States and Russia are thrust upon them willy-nilly in printed and broadcast word and picture, and in the person of official and unofficial representatives. They have well developed feelings about the United States and the U.S.S.R. And other millions just now being prodded into awareness by modern communications will rapidly develop emotional responses to the words "Russia" and "United States."

There is nothing new in the fact that most of these millions are acutely hungry from the day they are born to the day they die. Starving and discontented masses have always been a potential threat to world stability (witness the French Revolution, and our own American Revolution, which was fathered by discontent). But the explosive potential of discontented masses is increasing immeasurably with the march of technologically improved communications. For the first time in history the starving peasant in central and southeast Asia can compare his lot with yours and mine and thereby discover just how miserable he really is. Further, modern communications promotes within the starving peasant of Asia a feeling of community with the world's other unfortunates, a feeling that may already extend as far as the starving peon in South America.

No longer can the game of international politics be played by manipulating heads of state like pieces on a chessboard. An editorial in the March 16, 1958, edition of the Free China Fortnightly (printed in Taiwan) states:

"In east and south Asian countries, the United States has only attached itself to the upper stratum and operated through the bureaucracy. They have established close relations with the minority ruling class, and frequently knew them well personally. In the process the real people and masses are forgotten. In contrast the international Communists use an opposite method; they concentrate on working through the people;

their efforts are directed at the lower stratum. In ordinary times the east and south Asian countries are often pro-United States at the top and anti-United States at the bottom; whenever an upheaval occurs, the U.S.-backed upper level can topple overnight, thus effecting an immediate change in relations with the United States. The Communists have built on better foundations and can gain control of a country's people with no great difficulty."

The implication seems to be that the answer to our world problems lies in improving our public relations (propaganda) program; i.e., in making mass communications techniques work for us. But that would be too easy. Improved relations with the people of these poverty-stricken nations is vitally necessary, but mainly as a stopgap measure, a bid for more of the time that is running out on us.

How much time is needed? Several decades at least.

For at its root the problem remains poverty, not poor public relations. Let's face the fact that the awakening of poverty-stricken millions by means of mass communications has a natural tendency to work against the interests of those who represent established prosperity and/or a history of colonial exploitation—and that's us and our allies. As surely as the Western allies are the natural negative pole of awakening discontent, international Communists have assiduously worked to provide a positive pole around which to mobilize the discontented. The frequency with which they have gotten others to do their fighting for them is one measure of the Communists' success. To me it seems clear that, if the poverty of enough people the world over can be sufficiently alleviated, the appeal of communism can be expected to wane and war to become increasingly unlikely.

Many will object that our foreign-aid program so far has not earned us wide popularity. Objections put in this way are beside the point and underline the fact that our aid program to date was designed primarily to buy allies. As such, it was aimed at heads of state instead of at common needs and, in my opinion, has been too heavily weighted on the military rather than the economic side.

I am convinced that any serious and adequate effort at helping those in need to a self-respecting standard of living will mean demanding of ourselves the effort and sacrifices usually thought of as only appropriate to a wartime economy—allout crash production, much higher taxes, rationing, etc. The Russian people are making this effort. We can, too, if we can only find in our land that vital resource of which Russia has an abundancy—will and a sense of purpose.

There is a tendency among the usually knowledgeable to view as unrealistic and visionary what I am proposing here. Is it possible for the United States and her allies to make a significant dent in the seemingly hopeless poverty of one-third (or more) of this earth's population? C. P. Snow, in his book, "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution," writes:

"It is technically possible to carry out the scientific revolution in India, Africa, southeast Asia, Latin America, the Middle East within 50 years. There is no excuse for Western man not to know this. And not to know that this is the one way out through the three menaces which stand in our way—H-bomb war, overpopulation, the gap between the rich and the poor."

There are those who disagree with Snow, and who claim that our economy cannot stand the strain of dedicating the bulk of our productive energy to foreign economic aid over the distance of several decades. They may be right—and yet this objection, too, is beside the point, since we have no more choice than if we were to be faced with a shooting war of that duration.

For if it is true that prosperity promotes stability and responsibility, it is doubly true today that degrading poverty promotes a disaster. Picture the hazards of the coming years of cheap atomic weapons. The Nassers and the Castros of this earth will be able to obtain atomic weapons from one of the dozen or so nations who will be producing them in a few years, I am sure. Because their recently awakened and increasingly frustrated countrymen have nothing to lose but their miserable lives, many such Nationalist leaders will reach the desperate conclusion that using atomic weapons to blackmail the big powers is worth the risk. Or what of the day Mao Tse-tung joins the nuclear club? He has already endorsed nuclear war with the forthright statement that China has little of importance to lose. In a certain and very real sense, then, it is even in our interest that Red China should prosper economically, for a better fed Chinese populace can be expected to put pressure on doctrinaire Communist leadership to abandon the war chants. We have historical support for this reasoning in the case of Russia, where the leadership has retreated from strict Leninist revolutionary doctrine to a more responsible policy because the Russian people have had a taste of good times and want more of it.

In short, crass words, when people have finally gotten something to lose they are less likely to risk atomizing it.

In the interests of international stability and responsibility, then, these are the hard headed, realistic reasons why we should "go for broke" in our efforts to help one-third of the world's population get something to lose. But these are not the only reasons. As long as there are children starving elsewhere on earth, it is questionable whether we have the right to hold back the material blessings that are ours largely by accident of time and place.

Sincerely,

S. W. BARTLETT.

Opposition Expressed to Consolidating Indian Area Offices in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a task force report recommended to the Secretary of Interior that the Indian area officers of Muskogee and Anadarko be consolidated and moved to Oklahoma City.

I, personally, am opposed to this move because of difficulties and added complications it will impose on our Indian friends. It is difficult for me to see that the saving in money could possibly equal the service curtailed. The following telegrams, though only a token of the number actually objecting to the consolidation, solidly attests to the fact the opposition exists and is widespread:

ELGIN, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

My name is Norton Tequechi. I am a Comanche Indian and also a retired Methodist minister. I have lived in the Anadarko area all my life. My ancestors lived here before the white man. We want to continue our area office at Anadarko and not have to go to Oklahoma City. I know this best for Indians.

NORTON TEQUECHI.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Oklahoma City full of one-way streets. Indian always go wrong way. Lots of Indians probably killed when our office move Oklahoma City. Don't make much sense.

NATHAN DOYBEI,
Kiowa.

APACHE, OKLA.,
July 12, 1961.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Eastern Oklahoma Indians are Eastern Oklahoma Indians, Western Oklahoma Indians are Western Oklahoma Indians and never the twain shall meet in this generation. Suggest go slow policy with respect to Indian bureau change in Oklahoma.

JIM KARDOKUS,
State Representative.

ANADARKO, OKLA.,
July 12, 1961.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Oklahoma City too big for Indian to find anything, let alone area Indian office. Move to Oklahoma City cause town full of lost Indians.

GEORGE RED WING,
Kiowa.

CYRIL, OKLA.,
July 12, 1961.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I am president of Comanche Friendship Club. You move office Oklahoma City we not only lose office here, but advice and friendship of area officials who will be gone. Our business affairs will be much slowed up. Please don't do this to Indians. Office been here 100 years. Indian use to Anadarko. All Indians together in this.

MILTON SOVO.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Indian office here serves approximately 23,000 Indians. Anadarko is best location in Oklahoma for office. Indians cannot travel to Oklahoma City for business.

WAYNE DOUGLAS,
Methodist Minister.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I am a Caddo Indian. I live in Anadarko. I know you will be hurting my people, many of whom are too old, and do not have cars to go to Oklahoma City, if you move area office to Oklahoma City. Many are old and do not understand white man's ways. All have individuals in area office here they trust and have learned to communicate with. Please do not break this agreement to have an area office here, as so many treaties have been broken in the past.

FRANK HENRY,
Caddo.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Anadarko area office satisfies a need in western Oklahoma, not compatible with

tribes of eastern Oklahoma and the existing offices should therefore be maintained in status quo to best carry out Indian bureau program in Oklahoma.

VIRGIL UPCHURCH,
County Attorney.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Please reconsider consolidation and removal of Anadarko area office. The removal would work great hardships on Plains Indians and rural communities as a whole.

HASKELL B. PUGH,
Chairman, Caddo County Democrat Central Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I am definitely against the moving of the Anadarko area office. Please consider us when arriving at your decision.

ARTHUR PUNLEY,
Wichita Tribe.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

May I, as president of the Anadarko Chamber of Commerce, speaking in behalf of the entire board of directors, express that we are definitely against the consolidation of the Anadarko and Muskogee area offices, realizing what economy measures could be affected by this move.

W. S. HALL,
President, Anadarko Chamber of Commerce.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

There are more Indians served by Agency now than when it was first started. More people depend on Agency. Please reconsider movement of Agency.

BOB EVANS.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

To consolidate the area offices of Muskogee and Anadarko will cause an economic upheaval that would be almost destructive to local communities. It will destroy the energy and ambition of local people to further the development of preserving Indian lore and tradition. It will take away from local communities the influence needed to continue better services. It would not be for the economic good of the Government, Indians, and the areas of Oklahoma involved. It would be a big political mistake. Please leave the area offices as they are.

ALBERT CONNEL,
Chairman, Western Oklahoma Area.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Give further study to consolidate Anadarko area office and Muskogee office. The economy of this community would suffer greatly.

RALPH ELLIOTT.

FORT COBB, *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Anadarko area Indian office is satisfactorily answering the particular administrative needs of southern plains Indians. It's removal and consolidation with another area office would disrupt not only the service to the Indians but the economy of a dependent Indian community.

EMMETT MEEKS,
Mayor.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you consider carefully the consolidation of Anadarko area office and Muskogee office. Merchants very depressed over the idea and what it could mean.

JIM DARNELL,
Merchant.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do not consider the movement of Anadarko area office as we would all suffer in this community if such action was taken.

J. H. ELLIOTT,
Merchant.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Please consider consolidation of Anadarko and Muskogee office as a damaging thing to this small community that does not have industries to compensate payroll.

ROBERT CREWS,
Merchant.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

This appeal may sound selfish but I am a young married man with two children who has just recently gone in debt for a cleaning shop. A move of the Anadarko area office would not leave sufficient payroll here for me to make payment on my business. Please consider young businessmen like myself when arriving at a decision.

BILL WATSON,
Cleaning Shop Operator.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do not consider consolidation and move of Anadarko area office as it is beneficial to all parts of our small communities.

DONALD DAHL,
Merchant.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you consider all angles before making your decision in regard to relocating Anadarko area office.

ANDY ANDERSON,
Manager, C. R. Anthony Co.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

For the better interests of the people of Oklahoma, I request that you do not consolidate the Anadarko and Muskogee area offices.

TED JONES,
County Commissioner.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Please consider all persons that will be harmed in this area by the proposed relocation of Anadarko area office.

CHAS. F. GOODWIN INSURANCE CO.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Anadarko area office is of great help to all Indians and whites in this area. Please do not consider the movement of agency to Oklahoma City.

WAYNE MARR, *Mayor.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Indians that depend on agency are old and poor. They need the agency here, a million times more than they would need it in Oklahoma City.

ALFRED HUNTER,
Member, Delaware Tribal Council.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 13, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge you to consider what the consolidation of the Anadarko and Muskogee area officers would do to our community and tribes of this area.

VERNON MARTIN, *Merchant.*

APACHE, OKLA., *July 13,1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Why isn't Anadarko good location for Indian office? It's been good location in the past and would continue to be so.

BEN MOORE, *Merchant.*

APACHE, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Southern Plains Indians administrative needs most unique. Combining area office services with any other area and particularly relocating in another community would damage effectiveness and bring harmful economic distress to both the Anadarko and Muskogee Indian centers.

H. J. BODENSTEIN, *Merchant.*

FORT COBB, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I feel that present Indian Bureau setup in Oklahoma is result of best Bureau experience.

LEONARD RATLIFF,
Retail Merchant.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Proposed consolidation of Indian Bureau area offices in Oklahoma not believed in best interest of Indians. Strongly suggest full study be made before decision is reached.

JACK ALBERTY, *Merchant.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

As secretary of the Delaware Tribal Committee I feel that to transact business for myself and my people the place of transaction should be near our people. I, as well as my people, are against the removal of our area office.

WILLIAM EXENDINE,
Secretary, Delaware Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to enter protest against consolidation of Anadarko and Muskogee area offices for the following reasons:

1. Inconvenience to the Indians involved.
2. I do not believe that it will prove to be an economy measure for the Government.
3. It will seriously damage the economy of both Anadarko and Muskogee.

N. J. DIKEMAN,
President, First State Bank.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Proposal to consolidate Anadarko and Muskogee area offices most disturbing to this Indian center. We urge you to make a most critical study and weigh what we consider to be more harm than benefit.

WALDO ZERGER, *Merchant.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

We respectfully urge you to consider as illogical the recommendation to consolidate the Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices for relocation to another city. A successful pattern of service to Indian tribes would be disrupted.

B. M. MCGINLEY, *Cafe Owner.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Your consideration of the heavy economic loss to communities affected by consolidation of the Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices is requested. We see great damage here in this area where much of the surrounding land is Indian owned and not taxable.

CHAS. J. LOVELL, *Merchant.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Indian leaders here are asking that we as businessmen urge you to refuse the recommendation to consolidate the Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices. A great majority of the tribesmen appreciate the Bureau's service as it is now extended. Relocation of the area office can be disruptive.

SAM THOMPSON, *Mayor.*

VERDEN, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to study closely the harm to Indians as well as to Oklahoma communities if Muskogee and Anadarko area offices relocated.

KENNETH WILLIAMS, *Mayor.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

The economy of Anadarko depends greatly upon the area office of the Indian Bureau. The impact on this community from its loss would be disastrous. Unless its elimination as proposed serves a cogent purpose, we hope you will consider our community welfare along with other factors.

DR. J. B. MILES.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Late news report received in Oklahoma of plans to combine Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices will cause much economical hardship on Indians and local communities. This plan must be given careful thought before such a move is made.

INEZ VANCE,
Secretary, Wichita Executive Committee.

APACHE, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

United Press states Keeler report recommends consolidation of Anadarko and Muskogee area offices in Oklahoma City. I believe that this would not be in the best interest of the Indians served in these two offices.

TOM MAYNARD,
Cashier, First National Bank.

VERDEN, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

This entire community depressed by possibility of movement of Anadarko area office personnel. Anadarko with heavy Indian population has built its economy around Indian service. Consolidation of Muskogee, Anadarko area office elsewhere would be crippling.

C. E. NELSON,
President, National Bank of Verden.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Recent news story of plan to consolidate Anadarko and Muskogee area offices is quite disturbing to people in Oklahoma, especially will this plan work many hardships on Indians. Thoughtful consideration should be given before decision made.

MYRTLE HOLDER,
Past President, Delaware Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Would respectfully ask a careful study be made before decision on proposed consolidation of Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices be made. Indian people very concerned.

VIVIAN CARTER,
Member, Caddo Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully suggest that careful study will reveal that any proposed changes in Oklahoma Indian area offices will be neither feasible, economical or desirable.

IRA BROWN, *Retail Merchant.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Local Indians are distressed at press reports of elimination of Anadarko area office. Western Oklahoma tribes allotted under General Allotment Act appreciate a local office with decentralized bureau authority as presently exists in area office.

WALLACE KIDD,
Editor, Anadarko Daily News.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

According to the Keeler report it has been recommended that Anadarko area office and Muskogee area office be consolidated and located in Oklahoma City. All Indians involved in this consolidation would be seriously inconvenienced by this consolidation by reason of the fact their administration would be so far removed from their homes.

It would also seriously effect the economy of both Anadarko and Muskogee.

AMERICAN SAVINGS & LOAN,
JOHN J. POLLARD,
President.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Local people both Indian and white very concerned about plan to consolidate Anadarko and Muskogee area Indian offices to one in Oklahoma City. These Indian offices were located in present town many years ago to serve Indian people. A move would serve no purpose for Indian people.

JACKSON MCLANE, SR.,
Vice President, Delaware Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Why should our area office be moved. Haven't we Indian people had enough without having to go to a place such as Oklahoma City to have our affairs taken care of. It is hard enough for my people the way it is.

JESS PARTON,
Delaware Committeeman.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly request that you do not move Anadarko area Indian office as it will cause a great economic loss to the Indians of this area as well as all merchants.

ALAN HAIGHT,
Merchant.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I am very much against any plan to move Anadarko area office from present location. All my life this is the place I have handled my business. Would ask your careful thoughts on this proposed change.

FRANK EXENDINE,
Member, Delaware Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I am president of the arts and craft cooperative at Anadarko. Our group is violently opposed to the removal of our area office to Oklahoma City. We are trying to learn how to make a living the white man way. We don't want to go to Oklahoma City for help we now get.

MARJORIE SOVO, *Commanche.*

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*
Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

As president of the Delaware executive committee it is the sole desire after talking to my people that we do not want this area office moved as we know the removal will

cause us many hardships in the transaction of our business.

ART THOMAS,
President, Delaware Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA, *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

My people and I have always had our Indian business affairs near us so that we can do justice for our people. I recommend that we leave the area office here in Anadarko, Okla., as it is one of the last few things that we Indians have. Please don't make things any harder for us.

LEWIS ZADOKA,
Chairman, Wichita Executive Committee.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I live in Spencer, Okla., but my people live in and around Anadarko and I know it is hard for me to get to our place of business. I doubt that but a few could travel anywhere to get their affairs taken care of. This would indeed cause much hardship to my people. So therefore my people as well as myself are against the removal of our area office from Anadarko, Okla.

JESSE AHDUNKO,
Chairman, Caddo Executive Committee.

FORT COBB, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Believing that governmental service can best be rendered at the place where it is most needed, the elimination of the area office at Anadarko does not appear justified because of peculiar Oklahoma situation. Suggest proposed move be dropped or future study made.

JOE BOB TRUITT,
Retail merchant.

FORT COBB, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Your continued questioning of the task force recommendation to consolidate Anadarko and Muskogee area offices is encouraged. Both Indians and non-Indians here are greatly disturbed at the possibility and feel consolidation would be harmful to all concerned.

W. D. FINNEY,
President, Washita Valley Bank.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secreary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

My name is Enoch Smokey. I am a Kiowa Indian and have lived near Anadarko for more than 80 years. I wish to protest the moving of Anadarko area office to Oklahoma City. Many Indians in the western half of Oklahoma are in advanced years and it would make it impossible for us to transact our business in a satisfactory manner.

ENOCH SMOKEY.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Consolidation of two Oklahoma area offices has been proposed on several occasions and in each instance has been rejected after careful study. Nothing has since occurred to change the Indian situation in Oklahoma as investigation will reveal.

CARL WEST,
Retail merchant.

ANADARKO, OKLA., *July 12, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Our land, our freedom to move about, our hunting grounds, our way of life have gone and now our area office.

SADIE BEDOKA,
Caddo Executive Committee.

Philadelphia Capehart Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee of the U.S. Senate has expressed its unwillingness to allocate more than $550,000 under the Capehart housing law. Due to the cost of acquiring land for the construction of such housing facilities in the Philadelphia area for low-income navy yard personnel, the Philadelphia City Council, at the request of Mayor Richardson Dilworth, has endorsed the mayor's proposal that the city assume part of the cost of acquisition of the tract of land in the vicinity of the Philadelphia Navy Yard. This is the kind of cooperative spirit which will result in mutual benefit to the city and to the Nation.

I have included a copy of Resolution 180, which was passed by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia on July 20, 1961, in support of the mayor's proposal:

RESOLUTION 180

Endorsing the mayor's proposal that the city assume part of the cost of the acquisition of a tract of land in the vicinity of the Philadelphia Navy Yard for the construction of a Capehart housing project for low income Navy personnel

Whereas there is a need for housing for low income personnel employed at the Philadelphia Navy Yard; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee of the U.S. Senate has indicated that it is not willing to recommend the allocation of more than $550,000, under the Capehart housing law toward the cost of acquiring land for the construction of such housing facilities; and

Whereas the mayor of the city of Philadelphia appeared before this subcommittee and indicated that the city of Philadelphia would be willing to make available such funds as may be necessary in excess of the $550,000 required to pay for the acquisition of the ground located in Philadelphia near the Philadelphia Navy Yard; and

Whereas the Council of the City of Philadelphia believes that the acquisition of the plot of ground now under consideration for the construction of low-cost housing for Navy personnel would be beneficial to the city as well as to the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That it endorses the mayor's proposal that the city of Philadelphia undertake to make available such sum over $550,000 as may be necessary to acquire the land needed for the construction of low income housing for the personnel of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, under the Capehart housing law; and be it further

Resolved, That the city council will enact necessary legislation which will authorize the city to enter into an agreement with the U.S. Navy indemnifying and saving it harmless from any costs or liability in excess of $550,000 arising out of or pursuant to the acquisition of the aforesaid ground; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator Strom Thurmond, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee; Senators Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott; and Congressmen William J. Green, Jr., William Barrett, James Byrne, Kathryn Granahan, Robert N. C. Nix, and Herman Toll; Mayor Richardson Dilworth; and William Rafsky, director of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority.

Lubor Zink Describes the Communist Coup in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to Dr. Petr Zenkl for calling to my attention recent articles by Mr. Lubor J. Zink. Mr. Zink was born in Czechoslovakia and studied economics and political science at Prague University. After war service with the Allied Forces in England and France he joined the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs. After the Communist coup he escaped to the West with his family, and worked for the British Broadcasting Corp. until he immigrated to Canada in 1958. He is now editor of the Brandon Sun in Manitoba, and has won honorable mention for his editorials in the 1959 and 1960 Canadian Newspaper Awards. The first of his articles follows:

CAN IT HAPPEN HERE?

(The following is the first part of an address given by Mr. Zink to the Rotary Club of Brandon.)

Those of you who may have had an occasional glance at the editorial page of the Brandon Sun probably know that my favorite subject—apart from such minor digressions as city council performance, night shopping, etc.—is international politics and especially the general lack of understanding of the danger of communism to our society.

I realize that communism is hardly a suitable subject for a brief after-dinner speech which should be well larded with jokes to stimulate digestion, but perhaps you'll forgive me if I make no effort to make you laugh.

Controlling almost half the world, and having already established a foothold on the American Continent, a base on the doorstep of the United States from which it intends to spread, communism is not a laughing matter.

I am not going to bore you with the rather involved political and economic theory of communism, apart from saying that communism is not just another political movement fostered by some crackpot dictator, just another political party which competes for votes in parliamentary election contests, but a complete, self-contained social system and religion which has as much in common with Western social and religious concepts as water has with fire.

This complete spiritual incompatibility works as a tremendous advantage for communism in its program of infiltration and subversion of Western society, because it relies on and exploits the Western mind's reluctance (and often inability) to realize that the aim, and so to speak sacred mission of communism is not to modify but to destroy our society. Not physically, but functionally.

When Mr. Khrushchev said, "We will bury you," he did not mean a physical burial of you and me or President Kennedy, but the burial of parliamentary democracy, of the free enterprise economy, of every form of freedom as we understand it.

How, you may ask, can the Communists ever hope to achieve their aim in Canada where the number of organized Communists is negligible. Surely, it "cannot happen here."

I come from a country which had a parliamentary system very much like that Canada has now and which was generally considered a model of Western democracy in central Europe. Our Communist party, too, was negligible and most of our people used to pooh-pooh the danger of communism and say, "Surely, it cannot happen here."

Yet it did happen: and it happened so unobtrusively and so suddenly that people who, like most Canadians or Americans, thought that good citizenship consists of observing the laws of the land and minding one's own business, did not know what hit them.

True, there were many favorable conditions for a Communist takeover in postwar Czechoslovakia which do not as yet exist here—such as a virtual Soviet encirclement of the country, economy disrupted by 6 years of Nazi occupation, and several other factors peculiar to postwar central Europe—but on the other hand the Soviet Union was by far not as powerful as it is now. I do not think I will exaggerate when I say that the shift in power in favor of the Communist bloc which occurred during the last decade makes Canada almost as vulnerable to Soviet pressure as Czechoslovakia was in 1948.

Thirteen years ago a Communist takeover in Cuba would have been unthinkable. Today it not only is a fact, but Castro's Communist dictatorship is virtually unbreakable because the threat of Soviet rockets makes it almost impossible for the United States to intervene.

Under these conditions it is obvious that all that is needed for a Communist takeover of any Western country is a political upheaval within that country and a Soviet threat of nuclear retaliation for military intervention by that country's alarmed neighbors.

In the few minutes I have, I want to give you a brief outline of the technique of such a Communist-stimulated political upheaval and how it can happen in Canada.

The first precondition is to find a powerful cause for the largest possible dissatisfaction with existing political and economic conditions. In the case of Cuba it was easy to enlist popular support for Castro's revolution against Batista's rightwing dictatorship. In Canada such a convenient vehicle for Communist plans does not exist, but large-scale unemployment could easily provide the necessary spark and rallying point. Soviet trade policy, which is an instrument of Communist global strategy regardless of purely economic and financial considerations, therefore tries to exploit all factors which contribute to the growth of unemployment in Canada and other Western countries. In the meantime, our trade unions, some of which are already infiltrated by trained Communist organizers and agitators, are being subtly pushed into the political arena so that a leftist party would be ready to cash in on the hardship and unrest any new serious economic recession would automatically create.

You may have noticed that in Cuba, Castro paraded for quite a while not only as a patriot but also as a good Democrat. Any new leftwing party in Canada will be presented to the public in the same light, with such party's official leadership possibly sincerely devoted to democratic principles. But there will be, right from the start, a second-string leadership, manipulated by the Communists, ready to step in at the first opportune moment. In case of large-scale unemployment and industrial unrest it would not be inconceivable for a leftist party to gain power through legitimate parliamentary means. From then on it would be merely a matter of time for the Communists to gain full control of such a party and deliver Canada under Soviet domination in the same way Castro has turned Cuba into a Soviet satellite. And the United States would be just as powerless to stop the process.

All this may sound fantastic to you. Having seen it happen in a country just as industrialized, democratic and orderly as Canada. I do not consider it at all fantastic or impossible, especially when I cannot help noticing all the preliminary preparations for this seemingly incredible process going on right now all over the country.

Can't We Force Talks, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, newspapers of the country play a vital and most appreciated role in alerting the public to the issues of the day, both foreign and domestic. It has been noted by numerous commentators that the public seems far ahead of the Government leaders in their attitude and desire for a firm, imaginative foreign policy.

The reason for this clear-thinking public insight which stands in sharp contrast to the utter confusion in the State Department can obviously be traced to practical, forceful editorials bringing current issues to the public's attention. The Chicago Daily News, Thursday, July 27, contained one of these pertinent editorials which I submit for the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Can't We Force Talks, Too?"

CAN'T WE FORCE TALKS, TOO?

With their usual gift for distortion, the Moscow propagandists are trying to pin the warmongering label on President Kennedy's speech of Tuesday night. This is about the same as a burglar's complaint that his intended victim keeps a gun in the house.

It is true that the most attention-getting portion of the speech was that devoted to armament. Strength of weaponry seems to be the one language the Russians understand, and a clear statement of determination on our part to fight if necessary is essential at this point.

What should not be overlooked, however, either by the Russians or by Americans, is the position outlined by the President on negotiating differences over Berlin and other trouble spots. Mr. Kennedy emphasized that while the freedom of West Berlin is not negotiable, any number of other matters between the Communist bloc and the Western World are subject to adjustment or adjudication.

It is in this area that there is hope for peace as opposed to the catastrophe that would be sure to result from a continuation of the collision course now being traveled.

Here, it seems to us, is the opportunity for a peaceful offensive on the part of the West. Too often, the offensive in this area as well as in warlike preparations, has come from the other side.

It was Khrushchev who clamored for a summit meeting until he got it, who agitated for a conference on a nuclear test ban until he got that. That crowning irony is that he reaped the credit for an apparent willingness to negotiate and then torpedoed the conferences after they were called.

By advancing outrageous proposals, one after another, he has put the West in the position of eternally saying "no"—and then sometimes retreating to "maybe" or "yes" when the negative answer was correct in the first place.

The tendency now seems to be to hang back and wait for Khrushchev to call for more negotiations on Berlin. If he is the one who does the calling, the West will again be on the defensive, because his negotiating proposals will be designed to elict a "no."

This time, why can't the West clamor for a conference, with clearly stated aims consistent with the ideals of a free people? Why can't we demand, for one thing, that Russia live up to its postwar commitments in Berlin and in Germany?

The German people—all of them, not just those in West Germany—were promised free elections and the unification of their country. Russia has blocked that. In many other areas, such negotiations as there have been have gone only one way—Russia's way.

Our demands for negiotiations need not be farfetched or unreasonable in order to put the pressure of world opinion on Rusisa. And if the answer is a chorus of "nyet," the world will at least be better informed as to the real builder of the roadblocks to peace.

Battle on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of the Northwest Ruralite carries an editorial on the proposed Federal transmission system for the Colorado River storage project pointing out that this is the sort of fight with which those of us from the Columbia Basin area are familiar. Since this issue will be coming before the House in the near future, I commend this editorial to my colleagues' attention:

BATTLE ON THE COLORADO

The battle which was successfully fought in the Columbia River Basin 25 years ago is raging now along the Colorado.

Occasion for the fireworks is the rapid progress being made in construction of the giant Colorado River storage project by the U.S. Government. As was the case with the Columbia River, what happens to the power output will depend upon who controls the transmission lines.

Eighty-one representatives of public and cooperative electric systems in 11 States were in Washington recently to support appropriations for construction of an all-Fed-

eral transmission system for the Colorado River storage project. Six members of the group testified before the House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. Statements were filed by others.

The House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations also received a statement from Senator Moss, Democrat, of Utah, warning that the offer of five private power companies to construct the lines should be evaluated "by determining the overall effect of imposing an interconnected private monopoly on the people of the Rocky Mountain area."

Senator Moss charged that "wheeling arrangements, such as the one here suggested, encourage the creation of interconnected monopolies by the private utilities over which little, if any, control can be exercised by either the Federal Government or the individual States. The efforts of our Government," he continued, "should be directed toward curtailing and curbing monopolies—not toward fostering and encouraging them by placing a strangling tollgate on this great Federal reclamation project."

Pointing to "the historical monopolistic pattern of private electric utilities" and to "the long-standing philosophy of Electric Bond & Share Co. to eliminate competition for their subsidiaries, associates, or clients," Senator Moss declared: "This Congress should have no part in imposing a supermonopoly on the economy of the Rocky Mountain area nor in giving away any part of this great reclamation project."

He noted that five of the seven major Rocky Mountain electric utility companies were subsidiaries of Electric Bond & Share Co. prior to enactment of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, and pointed out that least six are now clients of Ebasco Services, Inc., the subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share.

Mayor William C. Henderson, of Colorado Springs, Colo., testified in favor of the Federal transmission program as a spokesman for mayors and other municipal officials of 13 communities in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico.

Marion Wilson, president of Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., told the subcommittee that "by constructing segments of the transmission system, the private utilities would control the entire billion-dollar Colorado River storage project with an investment equal to only 10 percent of the project's cost."

Power from the project "looks cheap only when compared to the price that these private utilities charge preference customers," he declared. "Without a Federal transmission system capable of delivering power to market areas, the value of a yardstick to measure the utilities' rates is lost."

Harvey F. McPhail, executive director of Colorado River Basin Consumers Power testified that the all-Federal system recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation and endorsed by Secretaries of the Interior Seaton and Udall "is wholly in keeping with the spirit and intent of the authorizing legislation. It will interconnect the project powerplants, permit operation in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, and transmit power to strategically located load centers for delivery to preference customers."

This is a battle that never ends. Public spirited people far from the Colorado River valley know this and will rally to support of Federal transmission. If they fail to do so, the trend will spread to other regions.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tribute by House Armed Services Committee to Hon. Paul J. Kilday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings before the House Committee on Armed Services on August 2, 1961, during which tribute was paid to Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1961

The committee met at 10 a.m., the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee come to order.

Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the committee.

The purpose of our meeting today is to do honor to one of the most distinguished members of this committee and the Congress, who is leaving the task of a legislator to assume the task of a jurist on the Court of Military Appeals.

It is no secret that the Committee on Armed Services, the 20th Congressional District of Texas, and the Congress are losing the direct service of one of the greatest men ever to have served in the Congress of the United States.

But while our loss in the Congress is irretrievable, nevertheless the American people and especially the American serviceman's gain is inestimable, because we all know that PAUL KILDAY will make available his unequaled attributes of wisdom, clarity, integrity and sincerity in the highest military court of the country.

PAUL KILDAY first came to the Congress in the election of 1938. He immediately became a member of the Military Affairs Committee in 1939. His reputation grew in leaps and bounds. By the time the Committee on Armed Services was formed in 1947, he had acquired a reputation as one of the Nation's outstanding legislators in military matters.

And each succeeding year he has added a laurel to that crown of greatness, which he wears so modestly and so unassumingly. For among the other great attributes that he possesses, none is more endearing than his sense of modesty, his sense of humbleness, and his sense of humility.

For 22 years he has devoted a major portion of his working hours, not only to the legislative problems of the Congress and the people, but more especially the problems of national security.

This is a sad occasion for me, because I am losing my right arm. But it is a happy day for PAUL KILDAY and his family, for he has achieved a recognition based upon his legal training which he so richly deserves.

Now he will be able to devote himself exclusively to the profession of his choice. He will be able to write in judicial terms those brilliant thoughts and conclusions which he has so often expressed as a Member of the Congress.

Hereafter they will carry judicial weight and that weight will be felt in years to come, for his opinions will most assuredly establish precedents that will be quoted by military lawyers yet unborn.

The members of the Committee on Armed Services have a token of affection and esteem for PAUL KILDAY, which I will present in a few moments. It is a token made of silver, because we wanted something that would demonstrate our imperishable feeling of friendship for this truly great man. On it is the signature of each member of this committee.

It is a fitting tribute to a man who has demonstrated time and time again his amazing grasp of military problems, his analytical ability in clarifying complex problems, and his gentle but nevertheless firm insistence upon writing into law proper conclusions upon which to base our military posture.

When PAUL KILDAY leaves this committee, the Armed Forces to a man will lose a legislative champion who has battled for 22 years for those rights and privileges to which service personnel are entitled.

And I think we can all recall occasions when his calmness and wise counsel has brought about the quick and successful passage of bills that might otherwise have passed into oblivion for lack of a clear explanation.

Just as the members of the uniformed services of the United States are losing a legislative champion, so do we as a committee lose a bright star, who has played a brilliant role in the development of our national defense and has brought nationwide prominence to this great committee.

And the Congress is losing a clear-minded, fair-minded, objective legislator, who, notwithstanding the time and devotion spent on military matters, has also had the ability to fully grasp the countless other problems that confront Members of Congress.

So, with a great deal of personal sadness because of your leaving, mixed with a sense of satisfaction that you are leaving us to accept an important position which recognizes your tremendous abilities in the judicial field, I present to you, PAUL KILDAY, in the name of the members of the Armed Services Committee, this silver tray, which symbolizes our very great respect and admiration and affection for you. [Standing applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ARENDS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Kilday and family and friends, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

On this occasion I believe I should make a formal statement to protect myself and all my legal rights. I am not just certain what kind of a proceeding this is: legislative, judicial, or quasi-judicial. But all I know is that as a witness in this case, in re PAUL KILDAY, I shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, without imploring help from anyone.

I am not a lawyer. I am not a member of the bar. As a matter of fact I never really knew what you lawyers meant when you referred to the bar, until someone generously explained to me that it is not the same as the 19th hole.

You who are learned in the law classify me as a layman. That is the legal way to speak to a plain country boy. You have me correctly characterized and classified.

You lawyers, who packed the Congress but refused to pack the court, have unwittingly taught me a thing or two. In the testimony I am about to give, let the record show that in this case of PAUL KILDAY, it is one of the few cases where the witness testifying sits on the bench with the judge himself. Maybe this has something to do with his personal ruling, that there should be a change of venue from the Congress to the Court of Military Appeals.

You see, while I am not a lawyer, I have been associated with you lawyers for so long I am beginning to talk your lingo. The lawyers on this side tell me, Mr. Chairman, that the lawyers on your side are outstanding that their reasoning is always excellent, but their conclusions are invariably wrong.

I know this, and it applies to you lawyers on both sides. You are the fellows we go to and to whom we pay a handsome fee to have you get us out of trouble we wouldn't have gotten into if we hadn't gone to you for advice in the first place.

Now, quite seriously, Mr. Chairman, for this is to me a serious occasion, however much I might try, I can't with levity conceal, even if I would, that which all of us on this committee so deeply feel.

There are no words by which I can adequately express our mixed emotions with the loss of PAUL as a member of this great committee.

We are at the same time both glad and sad. We rejoice that this honor as a judge on the U.S. Court of Military Appeals should come to PAUL KILDAY.

No one is more deserving, nor is there anyone more richly endowed with the knowledge, the habits of mind and temperament than he to serve in this important judicial capacity.

We all know the painstaking thoroughness with which he studied the legislation which constantly has been before our committee. He many times demonstrated his mastery of detail, and many times guided us through a maze of detail to a sound conclusion.

With the possible exception of our distinguished Chairman, Mr. VINSON, no one knows better than I the keen and penetrating manner in which he analyzed problems which were presented. It was my privilege, and truly a rewarding privilege, to serve with him on the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. His contribution to the work of that subcommittee is beyond measure.

Indeed, his contribution to the work of our entire committee is far beyond measure.

And so while we rejoice that this recognition of the talents and service of our colleague has been made by the President and promptly concurred in by the Senate, we are saddened with the realization that this committee and the Congress are suffering a real, a great loss.

To feel this way is doubtless selfish of us. Our loss is not solely PAUL KILDAY's knowledge and skill. That will be difficult to replace, if at all. Our loss goes even deeper.

Our loss is the presence of the man KILDAY, those attributes of character and personality that encourage and inspire. This cannot be replaced, not at all.

Texas and everything from it may be big, but they don't make them any bigger nor finer than PAUL KILDAY.

Mr. Chariman, we Republicans want PAUL KILDAY, the Democrat, to know that we con-

sider him one of the ablest and one of the noblest of men to serve in the Congress. We consider it a richly rewarding privilege to have served with him on this committee. We are grateful for his friendship. And I am proud to call him my friend. And we shall never forget him.

We wish for him and his wonderful family the very best of everything. [Standing applause.]

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman. After the very generous remarks made by you and the gentleman from Illinois, I know you wouldn't expect me to be able to properly respond.

Right now I am wishing I was just about half as smart as you said I was, in the remarks you made here, because then I could probably think of the proper things to say at this moment.

But I actually don't know any way to embellish the words "Thank you," if they are spoken sincerely.

So I do thank you, Mr. Chairman, and you, Mr. ARENDS, for the very generous remarks you have made.

I thank all of you for the good will and the good wishes which are carried with this tray. Nothing that you could have given me would have pleased me more than to have the signature of each member of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed my service here. In many respects I regret leaving, although I do look forward with a great deal of pleasure to serving on the bench.

The court is located at Fifth and E. That is not very far from this building. And we shall have the opportunity to be together as time goes on.

I appreciate the attendance of all of you here, and I particularly appreciate, of course, the attendance of the Vice President.

I am very glad my family got to hear what kind of a fellow I am. And I hope that they won't forget it when we get back home. And I trust that they can convince themselves that they are worthy to continue to live with me.

I do thank all of you. I appreciate the opportunity I have had to be associated with you. And I am glad to know that that opportunity will continue.

So I say it very sincerely, thank you. [Rising applause.]

Political Asylum in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention an article appearing in the Polish weekly Gwiazda concerning the defection to this country of Stefan Ufnal. Mr. Ufnal was a member of the crew of a Polish fishing vessel, who sought political asylum in the United States.

His case is similar to that of many people from Eastern European countries seeking freedom from tyranny in the United States, and I commend this newspaper article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER OF POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS COMES TO AID OF POLISH SEAMAN SEEKING FREEDOM IN THIS COUNTRY

On April 24, 1961, Stefan Ufnal, a member of the crew of the Polish fishing vessel, the MT *Dalmar*, defected this ship in Boston, in order to ask immigration authorities of the United States for asylum.

Thanks to the benevolent help of a certain compatriot from Boston, he came to live with some friends in Philadelphia, but did not long enjoy freedom, because, by order of the Immigration Office, he was arrested on May 5 and imprisoned at Moyamensing.

The case tended to cut the same pattern of drama as in similar previous cases.

Our young compatriot, who for years waited the opportunity to flee Communist tyranny, and when this opportunity at last came along, decided to seek freedom on American soil, is now under threat of deportation on the basis of the present fierce immigration laws of the United States, according to which anyone finding themselves in this country without a visa, is automatically subject to deportation.

PRISON INSTEAD OF FREEDOM

The Statue of Liberty—a symbol of hope for millions of people like Ufnal behind the Iron Curtain—has once again become the severe gendarme, who, instead of the desired road to freedom, shows these unfortunates the way straight behind bars.

Such thoughts must depress anyone who—seeking shelter in this country—finds himself behind the bars of a prison, to be kept there for long days, weeks, and even months, living through terrible anxieties as to his future fate.

"When I was unexpectedly transferred from the general cell to a single cell"—our Seaman Ufnal tells us—"I thought that sentence had been passed for my return and I was near suicide, so as not to be caught again in Communist claws."

"I was greatly comforted by Rev. Father Leon Krajewski, who visited me in prison."

RELEASE ON BOND

If today Stefan Ufnal is smiling and has a more cheerful outlook at the free world to which he has stretched his arms and yearned for long, long years—it must be admitted that gratitude is due to the Philadelphia Chapter of the Polish American Congress and its leaders, with President Hilary Czaplicki and Attorney Lucjan Pazulski at the head, who with true sincerity took the fate of the defected seaman to heart.

Ufnal's legal matters were energetically taken care of for the chapter for eastern Pennsylvania of the Polish American Congress by a prominent Philadelphia lawyer and legal adviser of that chapter, Attorney L. Pazulski, who succeeded in obtaining from the Immigrant Service a release of the fisherman from prison on $1,500 bond (July 7). This sum was laid out by Attorney Pazulski from his own pocket. The next step, which he intends to take up with competent authorities is to obtain legal status for Ufnal in this country by passing a special private bill in Congress.

It is worth mentioning that the local chapter of the Polish American Congress acted in the matter of Ufnal in strict contact with the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee in New York.

CHANGE OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

After talking with Mr. Stefan Ufnal, we turned to Attorney L. Pazulski and President H. Czaplicki, who are both well aware of the difficulties which will pave the way to obtain permanent residence for our seamen in the United States, but they believe in its successful conclusion.

"The most important thing, reflecting again on the Ufnal case"—our reporter was told by them—"is the necessity of changing present U.S. Immigration policies, because those at present in force are against the basic traditions of freedom of our country and stand in complete contradiction of what America proclaims to nations under the yoke of communism."

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee in New York, as well as other organizations concerned with immigration and escapee problems, has been striving for many years to change and liberalize the Immigration Act, so that persons who chose freedom for political reasons, may obtain asylum in this country without presently existing impediments.

WAITED FOR OPPORTUNITY

Stefan Ufnal was born in Lublin, Poland. Orphaned by his father, he was raised under the guidance of the Jesuit fathers. After the war he lived in Gdynia, from where he sailed with the crews of fishing vessels. Raised in patriotic traditions and attachment to faith, he could not reconcile himself from the very beginning with the Communist system forced on Poland.

He planned escape to the free world for many years and only waited for the first proper moment, which now came when the ship MT *Dalmar* from fishing the waters of Newfoundland, docked in Boston.

Our America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a sermon delivered July 2, 1961, by Dr. W. Paul Ludwig, at the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church of which he is pastor.

Both Mrs. Horan and myself were inspired by this message. It is a constructive appreciation of our country and a discerning appraisal of our moral duties if we are to protect and preserve this great Nation as the world citidal of freedom and the leader of Western civilization.

The sermon follows:

WHAT SO PROUDLY WE HAILED

(Sermon by Dr. W. Paul Ludwig)

At the conclusion of his first inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln, in language scarcely surpassed even at Gettysburg, said: "The mystic cords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

This can happen to you literally. It has happened to me as I have traveled across the States: The better angels of my nature have touched the mystic cords and the chorus of the Union has swelled in my heart.

Listen to the melodies—the heavy tones of a Pacific storm beating through the California redwoods; the splash of waterfalls cascading into the rebellious Columbia River; the creaking of the hay booms in Idaho; the nasal language of the Herefords on a Nebraska ranch; the soft thud of giant fir logs in a millpond; the swish of a skier's descent on the slopes of Mount Hood; the whirring of alfalfa mills in Colorado; the quiet music of the shadows in an Arizona

canyon; the sentinel voice of a strong legislator in the halls of the Nation's Capital—whatever the melody the familiar chorus is unforgettable:

"Land of the pilgrim's pride
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring."

Has any nation of the earth—including the brilliant civilization of the ancient Greeks—been so highly exalted as our own? Yet how many of us succumb to the sly doubts and subtle detractions of both foreign plotters and domestic critics. While honestly admitting our faults, how many voices do we hear today in proud acclaim and genuine love for these United States? Where do you find the contemporary counterpart of Daniel Webster's affirmation: "I shall know but one country. The ends I aim at shall be my country's, my God's and Truth's. I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American."

When Edmund Burke delivered his famous conciliation speech before the skeptical British Lords, he prophesied: "There is America, which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savage men and uncouth manners, yet shall, before you taste of death, show itself equal to the whole of our commerce which now attracts the envey of the world."

Even Burke's lively imagination could not have composed the story of "the star of empire moving westward." No one could have dreamed into reality the saga of the empire builders carving out a homeland for all lovers of freedom throughout the earth.

Not once but many times—and now more than ever—Longfellow's famed lines have been true for America:

"Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on Thy fate."

The political and military decisions of this grave hour in American history cannot be divorced from the fundamental faith that we have in our destiny as both the architect and the protector of freedom.

George Santayana could have chosen no more appropriate title than "Faith" for his stirring poem. Two lines of it distill the long epic of our national stamina:

"Columbus found a world and had no chart,
Save on that faith deciphered in the skies."

The skies over America are profusely studded with stars bearing the names of men of faith who moved through a trackless wilderness by looking upward for guidance—who looked not only to the stars but beyond them. If you want to know the story of America, decipher it in the skies; read it in the canyons and the rivers and the mountains to which the pioneer fathers have given their names.

Oliver Wendell Holmes gave the address some years ago at the 250th anniversary of one of New England's earliest churches. He reminded his audience that the Founding Fathers are greater now than they were in life. Time wears away their human imperfections. Nevertheless, Holmes warned, "When our citizens forget that they tread a sacred soil, that this land has its traditions which grow more venerable and inspiring as they fade, whenever the church is no longer dedicated to truth and America to democratic freedom; then, but not until then, will the blood of the martyrs be swallowed in the sand and the Puritan have lived in vain."

This anniversary of our nationhood is the appropriate occasion for a renaissance among us—a rebirth of devotion to the Nation which has thus far been able to preserve all the hopes we have ever cherished—a renewal of humble gratitude to God and to the God-fearing men who left their names on peak and prairie from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Many of them fulfilled the poet's prayer:

"Let me sleep among the shadows of the mountains when I die,
In the murmur of the pines and sliding streams,
Where the long day loiters by
Like a cloud across the sky,
Where the moon-drenched night is musical with dreams.

All the wisdom, all the beauty I have lived for, unaware,
Came upon me by the banks of upland rills;
I have seen God walking there
In the solemn soundless air
When the morning wakened wonder in the hills."

"The sacred soil we tread." What makes it sacred? It was a day long to be remembered for a group of men who stood before a large map of North America on the wall of an office in the city of Washington. The year was 1803. The office belonged to the third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson. The map we would scarcely have recognized.

Down one side the Pacific Ocean was indicated. Along the coast an indentation marked the mouth of the Columbia River. The river, discovered only a few years prior by Captain Gray, American master of a tiny fur-trading vessel, had been given the name of his ship, the Columbia. Inland the course of the river had been charted to the point where the first mountain range had barred the hardy explorers. East of that barrier a wilderness was marked on the map by one word, "Unknown." In the center of the chart, a large region was titled "Louisiana."

Jefferson smiled as he pointed. "Our map is out of date, gentlemen," he said. "Mr. Livingston just reports from Paris that Napoleon has sold Louisiana to us for 60 million francs."

"But, Mr. President, that's $11 million."

"Yes," replies the President, "600 million acres—2 cents an acre. If Congress approves, our border will no longer be the Rocky Mountain, but we'll press on overland to the Oregon country and the Pacific."

With the greatest single real estate transaction in the history of the world, the Louisiana Purchase—America became a world power. From that hour, the plains and mountain passes echoed the cries of men and beasts afflicted by heat and cold, by flood and famine, by sand and snow, by all the tempers which threaten the weary spirit of the pilgrim. In agony and bloodshed and heartbreak—yes, and in the glorious pride of possessing something which has been defiant and ruthlessly cruel these struggling caravans beat open a pathway to the sea.

You and I are the comfortable heirs to the Old Oregon Trail, the Barlow Road, the Applegate Trail—and others less famous which faith and courage pierced through the wilderness.

But it was not all faith and courage; it was not all honor and romance. On those frontier highways, we 20th century Americans are the heirs of some of the greediest and most vicious episodes in history. In some of those pioneer parties, the preacher rode, or the elder—and the Bible and the church were left on some lonely crest. But sometimes men rode in coarse self-sufficiency, deserving no higher title than plundering parasite.

These are the two contradictory answers bequeathed by the age-long struggle for independence and power. America's choice of answers will determine not only her own fate but the fate of many others. For it is still true, "our map, ladies and gentlemen, is out of date." Last night's map is out of date this morning. We are not separated from the universal hunger for independence which once inflamed the spirits of our own Nation's founders. In our time there will be no new nations to be purchased at 2 cents an acre, but there is a stream of infants emerging from the incubator of nationhood. They need our love and patient understanding and support.

When Lewis and Clark in 1804 started their famous expedition to the Pacific Northwest, they, of course, encountered Indians. The traditional scene was enacted over and over again: the long-stemmed peace pipe passing from red hand to white hand around the circle; the hanging of an American explorer's medal around the neck of the chief and the pious advice not to pay any attention of the British traders because from then on their "fathers" would be the Americans.

And now, how well can we in America fulfill the father image for the new nations of the earth? Ours must be wholesome parenthood, inspiring the children of the earth to confidently place their hand in ours, expecting and finding genuine sympathy and love and dependable guidance. We in the Christian church take our picture of the Father from Him whose perfect love has redeemed us. For those who seek freedom and those who would support, there is no substitute for a religious faith. Without it, tyranny multiplies and greedy aggression stalks the world without conscience.

"From war's alarms, from deadly pestilence,
Be Thy strong arm our ever sure defense.
Thy true religion in our hearts increase;
Thy bounteous goodness nourish us in peace."

You Can't Succumb to Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUIAN. Mr. Speaker, "You can't succumb to blackmail." These are the words of the great American, Adm. Arleigh Burke, recently retired Chief of Naval Operations, in discussing what our attitude toward the Communist menace ought to be. It would be well for the President to take these words to heart and follow them up with action.

The editorial in the Washington Evening Star of August 2, on this point, follows:

BURKE'S WARNING

Senators DODD and BRIDGES—Democrat and Republican respectively—have just joined in paying an altogether fitting bipartisan tribute to Adm. Arleigh Burke, now retired as Chief of Naval Operations after 42 years of distinguished service to the Nation.

Speaking from the floor of the Senate, both legislators have made a point of referring to a farewell interview given by the admiral last week, reported by L. Edgar Prina in the Star. They have made a point, too, of lauding him for the strongly worded candor of the views he has expressed and the counsel he has offered in the past on issues involving Soviet-American relations. In Mr. DODD's words, "he can well take pride in the many times he has been forthright and courageous on controversial questions."

In recent months, of course, Admiral Burke, along with our other military leaders, has been under orders from the President, the Commander in Chief, to subject his speeches to controls—and editing, if necessary—designed to waterdown statements that might tend to heat up the cold war. The White House, over the years, has often

sought to exercise this kind of influence, and it has done so under Mr. Kennedy with particular attention to the admiral's vigor and frankness of expression as regards the Communist menace.

For his own part, Admiral Burke does not believe that his language has been extravagant, and he feels that he would actually be more outspoken if he were living his life over again. As for dealing with the men of the Kremlin, he has had this to say: "You can't sell a little part of your honor. You cannot sell part of your virtue. You can't give away one baby—throw the baby to the wolves and expect the wolves will not follow the sleigh. They'll keep coming on—they'll want the next baby and more and more—you can't succumb to blackmail."

Some members of the administration may regard this statement as the sort of thing that Admiral Burke ought not to say even in retirement. The President, however, is not likely to take a dim view of it. After all, it constitutes a meaningful message, a pointed warning, for every American in connection with the Berlin crisis and the Kremlin's open reaffirmation of its intentions to bury the West and communize the whole world.

Opposition to Withholding Tax on Dividends Paid by Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter is from a banker in my district and voices his opposition to the withholding tax on dividends paid by mutual savings banks.

This letter presents the objection to this method of taxation very clearly and objectively and for this reason I believe it will be a valuable piece of information for the RECORD.

NEWBURGH SAVINGS BANK,
Newburgh, N.Y., July 28, 1961.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ST. GEORGE: I understand that a final decision is soon to be made by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with withholding taxes on dividends paid by mutual savings banks.

Newburgh Savings Bank at the present time has 35,605 accounts including accounts with children in the local schools. Most dividends credited to these accounts are not withdrawn by the depositors but are retained as savings. This is of benefit to the savings banks and to the depositors. Under the proposed method, taxes would be paid from savings rather than current funds.

The most undesirable part of this bill, however, would be its effect on depositors of modest means. The average deposit in a regular savings account in Newburgh Savings Bank is $2,545.09. With the current dividend rate of 3½ percent per annum, the average dividend received by each depositor would be $89.09. As a result, many dividends received are not subject to Federal income tax because of the limited income of the depositors. These would be the very depositors who would be burdened with the trouble of filing exemption certificates or claims for tax refunds from the Government.

I also feel that this bill would further complicate the present Federal income tax return and would confuse many people who are already reporting interest that they receive.

I further believe that the bill would cause the transfer of funds from mutual savings banks into other investments which would not be of benefit to the national economy. This would result in less money being available in savings banks for mortgage financing and other credit needs of the American public at the present time.

I hope you will give these views serious consideration when you make your final decision regarding this bill.

Very truly yours,
JAMES P. KEARNEY, *President.*

Guided Missile Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, over 12 years ago during his service in the House of Representatives, former Congressman Charles A. Plumley expressed great interest in guided missile research and development. At that time there were many who had serious doubts that missiles would play an important part in our national defense activity. Fortunately there were some Members of the House of Representatives who believed in the need for missile research and development. Charles A. Plumley was one of these. That his efforts were genuinely appreciated is evidenced by several letter I have in my hands from those in charge of missile activity. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY,
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Silver Spring, Md., October 12, 1957.

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Northfield, Vt.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLUMLEY: In a recent conversation with Tad Stanwick he indicated to me that you might be interested in having a little reminder of your visit to the Applied Physics Laboratory on June 16, 1949. Dr. Gibson, the Director of APL, and I recall with pleasure the occasion on which you brought Congressmen VINSON and MAHON to visit our laboratory and the enjoyable time we had showing you our various missile test vehicles.

You will be interested, I know, in hearing of the progress that has been made in missile development since your visit. Attached are photographs of two missiles which grew out of the development test vehicles you viewed during your visit. As you are probably aware, the Terrier is in operational use aboard the cruisers *Boston* and *Canberra* and the destroyer *Gyatt*. The Talos will be added to the fleet next year aboard the cruiser *Galveston*. In addition, it is being considered for use as a ground defense weapon in our Continental Air Defense system.

Dr. Gibson joins me in extending our warm regards. Should you have occasion to visit the Washington area, we would be delighted to have you pay us a visit.

Sincerely,
H. H. PORTER,
Assistant Director.

AMERICAN MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1957.

Mr. FLETCHER PLUMLEY,
Reynolds Metals Co.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FLETCH: With all this current to-do about guided missiles and their impact on international politics, I cannot but go back to 1949 when your fine father, in company with two other Congressmen, visited the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University.

At that time, I was associated with the laboratory and we were engaged in guided missile research and development. Things were looking pretty black at APL in that year of 1949. The Navy could not find enough money to keep our guided missile programs going and we were facing a possible shutdown.

I must say that their visit inspired and raised the morale of all of us at the laboratory. What was even more important, the much needed funds were provided and the research and development work continued. The result? The Terrier missile is in use in the U.S. Fleet today and the Talos missile, of even greater range, is being installed on other fleet units.

When others speak of contributions to our Nation's guided missile effort, my thoughts go back to that crucial visit of these three Congressmen, Mr. Plumley, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Mahon.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely,
TAD STANWICK,
Vice President.

Spain Thwarts Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, in our omnipresent struggle against oppressive communism, significant hope and incentive may be derived from the people of Spain who are celebrating their 25th year free from communism.

Most assuredly this victory will serve as an example of hope to the captive people of the Iron Curtain and motivate the free world to redouble its efforts toward the emancipation of all nations which have succumbed to the snare of the Reds.

This was no easy victory for the Spanish people—certainly they were courted by the Reds with a velvet lure and then odiously threatened. To snub such overtures represents the ultimate in courage, sacrifice, and self-control.

Undeniably religion has been the uniting factor with these Spanish people—their belief in God and faith in His wisdom guided them in overcoming the temptations for temporal gain that are so effectively used by the Communists in winning over peoples struggling for a livelihood.

Spain and her wonderful people are to be commended for the outstanding example they have given the world in resisting communism. The United States is also grateful to Spain for her permission to base defense installations in her country, without which our military

prototype would most assuredly be weakened.

My words of admiration for the Spanish people on the occasion of their 25th anniversary come from heartfelt admiration for their courage and tenacity, respect for their steadfast faith and perseverance and confidence that their sacrifices have not been in vain.

A Stand on Red China and Outer Mongolia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop fooling around over Red China and time that President Kennedy got rid of the agrarian reformers who are advising him on this subject. Let us stand firm for international morality and make it clear that we not only oppose Red China's seating in the United Nations, but the seating of Outer Mongolia, too. The editorial in today's New York Herald Tribune is excellent on the point:

NO COMPROMISE ON RED CHINA

Reiteration, in yesterday's Kennedy-Chen joint communique, of American opposition to seating Red China in the United Nations was appropriate and expected. But the communique did not settle those doubts, which have risen naturally from defeatist statements by administration leaders, about how vigorously the new administration is prepared to press its opposition.

On the annual question of whether the Assembly should debate Red China's admission, the margin of United States victory has been growing slimmer. Last year the vote was 42 against debate, 34 in favor, and 22 abstentions. What chance there is of keeping it off the agenda this year may well turn on the administration's making compellingly clear that this is a matter about which it cares.

It has reason to care.

Red China's admission would be a shattering blow not only to the United States and its Nationalist allies, but to the cause of global freedom and to the integrity of the U.N. itself.

By refusing the seat to the Mao government, the United Nations is not, as critics insist it is, ignoring 650 million people, pretending they don't exist or denying them representation. The Chinese people are already represented in the United Nations, both in the Assembly and on the Security Council. Only the Peiping government—a tyranny imposed on those people by force of arms—is excluded.

If Mao wants in, let him submit the choice to the Chinese people.

Those Chinese who are free to express their choice—the millions of oversea Chinese throughout southeast Asia, the refugees who still stream into Hong Kong—overwhelmingly choose the Nationalist alternative. To replace Chiang's delegation with Mao's at the United Nations would not give the Chinese people representation, but would take it away.

Red China has never repented its bloody war against the United Nations in Korea. It stands guilty of repeated aggressions, direct and indirect, against its Asian neighbors. It openly proclaims a doctrine of aggressive violence. It refuses to renounce force in the Formosa Strait. It preaches hate; monstrous, calculated lies are the staple of its incredibly vicious propaganda.

The U.N. Charter provides that, in addition to the original signers, membership is open to "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and which are able and willing to carry out these obligations." Among these obligations are respect for human rights, for international law and the sanctity of agreements, the peaceful settlement of disputes—a long catalog adding up to responsible good neighborliness.

By no contortion of semantics could Red China qualify, under the charter, for membership. For the Assembly even seriously to debate admission would demean its dignity and compromise the principles of moral order on which the United Nations rests.

Peiping has unendingly flaunted its contempt for everything the United Nations stands for. But if the United Nations is not to capitulate to its bullying, vigorous leadership is going to be needed from the United States—vigorous, uncompromising leadership, clearly unwilling to countenance defeat by default.

Welfare Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the social welfare lobby is at work again to thwart efforts of conscientious municipal officials to cut out the scandalous waste in the welfare program. The editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, today, on the city of Newburgh's attempts is most timely:

NEWBURGH DESERVES BETTER THAN BRICKBATS

The offense charged against the city of Newburgh is the attempt to retreat from Federal and State welfare.

The Newburgh government argues that the supposed beneficences from Washington and Albany are a costly way of committing economic suicide. Hence it would prefer, by its own stern relief code, to carry on alone if need be, and never mind about the Federal or State reimbursements.

But Attorney General Lefkowitz, who has to carry the legal ball for the New York social welfare mechanism, contends that the Newburgh program is in almost utter contravention of Federal and State law. And thus Newburgh must be enjoined from exercising its own judgment on the distribution of public assistance.

Now it is certainly reasonable that the Government paying part of the locality's relief costs will insist upon writing the rules and overseeing the application. If this makes for bureaucracy and helps to solidify the bottom economic layers in society, it is perhaps an inescapable part of growing social conscience.

When, however, a community like Newburgh feels that welfare has become oppressive and that corrective measures are desirable, this surely deserves open-minded attention.

It isn't necessary to applaud each of Newburgh's 13 rules, but home rule is still a potent force that deserves respect. Not all the wisdom necessarily resides with the Federal and State policymakers.

If the Newburgh code is indeed twelve-thirteenths wrong, as the State of New York contends, then perhaps there should be some rewriting or reinterpreting of the law. Because surely it ought not to be a crime to object to welfare and to express willingness to try self-propelled individualism.

Equal Educational Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the 11th General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization—UNESCO—adopted texts of a convention and a recommendation on discrimination in education on December 14, 1960. The object of both instruments, I understand, was to promote equal educational opportunities throughout the world. Neither instrument is legally binding in the United States, but I know many Senators have received correspondence apprehensive that they are. In order that the texts of this convention and recommendation may be understood better, however, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Department of State, and an inquiry from one of my constituents, on them be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. As Hon. Brooks Hays, Assistant Secretary of State, has stated in the letter:

The United States is not a party to the Convention Against Discrimination in Education, nor has the Senate been requested to give its advice and consent to ratification, as some reports have suggested.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *July 21, 1961.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am writing in regard to UNESCO. Have you heard of it? Its ready for ratification before the U.S. Senate now. Please investigate and think twice before you vote (if you do) for this creeping horror on our children yet unborn and the ones who are now living to have to live under such a burden. Why Communist Countries to shape our school laws?

Please let me know where you stand on this.

Yours truly,

DOROTHY E. SHIRLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1961.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: I am writing to give you information about two documents, a convention and a recommendation against discrimination in education which were adopted in December 1960 by the 11th General Conference of UNESCO. Some of this material may be helpful in your reply to Dorothy E. Shirley's letter which I return herewith, along with copies of the texts of the convention and the recommendation.

The basic purpose of these instruments is to encourage the elimination of discrimina-

tion and the provision of equal educational opportunities. The demand for expanded educational opportunities throughout the world led to a comprehensive study by the U.N. Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, in cooperation with UNESCO. This study, completed in 1955, revealed wide variations in many countries in educational opportunities. In most of the less developed countries it was found that there were fewer schools for girls, and the number of girls in school in the total school population lagged far behind the number of boys. Facilities in rural areas were often far less extensive than in cities, and various groups in the population—racial, religious, and those speaking a minority language—often experienced difficulty in achieving a full education. Because of these discriminatory practices, educational leaders in many countries believed their educational systems would benefit from a statement of principles which would be useful to them in helping to improve their own legislation and practices.

The recommendation and the convention are alternative documents, similar in substance. The recommendation differs from the convention in form and binding effect. The convention would require ratification and subsequent thereto would have legal effect in the countries which ratified it. The recommendation, on the other hand, has no binding effect, leaving it entirely to the competent authorities in individual countries to determine what suggestions, if any, in the recommendation they may wish to accept.

In response to the invitation of the U.N. Secretary General for comment on the matter under discussion, the U.S. Government observed in a communication to the United Nations in January 1958 that—"the United States believes that an appropriate recommendation at the international level would encourage the elimination of discrimination in education. The first consideration in any such recommendation should be to stimulate the greatest possible progress by means adapted to varying local needs and capacities. It is believed that a recommendation rather than a convention would be most suitable for this purpose since it could provide practical guidance on a wide range of different situations and could state objectives in terms of goals for common achievement."

Again in November 1959 in its reply to a UNESCO questionnaire on discrimination in education, the U.S. Government gave its opinion that a recommendation rather than a convention would be the more appropriate instrument on the subject.

UNESCO itself recognized that a number of countries might not wish to ratify an international Convention on Discrimination in Education because of constitutional structure, legislation, or special circumstances.

The 11th General Conference of UNESCO accordingly approved the text of a recommendation for use by those countries which considered a recommendation more appropriate. It also approved a convention for use by those countries which desired a binding instrument.

The United States is not a party to the Convention against Discrimination in Education, nor has the Senate been requested to give its advice and consent to ratification, as some reports have suggested.

I should also like to point out that, contrary to published reports, UNESCO's policy is not to interfere in the domestic affairs of its member states. This policy is incorporated in UNESCO's constitution which reads in part: "With a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the states members of this organization, the organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction."

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

Sweeping Sense Under the Rug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a lot of heat has been generated over the proposal to generate electricity from the otherwise waste heat which will be a byproduct of the reactor at the Hanford Atomic Energy Works in my State.

Ironically, the coal industry and the United Mine Workers are the principal opponents of this proposal, although the Hanford Atomic Energy Works is by far the largest single user of coal in the Pacific Northwest. Incidentally, addition of the generators would not affect the plant's use of coal either way.

Making this a dual-purpose reactor would cost $95 million, but the electricity produced would yield $7 million a year in revenue. It does not require an actuary to figure out that this is a good bargain—much better than many which the Congress has no hesitancy in approving.

Marquis Childs, in yesterday's Washington Post, made some illuminating comments on the Hanford reactor proposal. His article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1961]

SWEEPING SENSE UNDER THE RUG

(By Marquis Childs)

Operation Under the Rug is going full blast on Capitol Hill. With the necessity for voting additional defense appropriations the argument is advanced that everything else—aid to education, foreign aid—must be pushed aside or pared to the bone.

This view of what makes America strong, putting all the stress on weapons and how to use them, ignores many of the elements that underlie a vital and purposeful society. It overlooks the Soviet challenge not merely in weapons but in the field of economic growth and in the sharing with less developed countries of the techniques and the benefits of that growth.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the fight on the proposal to harness heat generated at the Hanford, Wash., plutonium works to create a great new source of power. That heat, when the new Hanford reactor is completed in 1962, will be dumped into the Columbia River.

Generators to harness this otherwise wasted energy would cost an estimated $95 million. They would generate as much power—700,000 to 800,000 kilowatts—as one and a half Bonneville dams, and Bonneville is one of the hydroelectric giants.

Nor are the proponents the wild spenders against whom conservative Republicans and Democrats like to inveigh. One of the stoutest advocates on the Senate floor was Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California. KUCHEL quoted a leading California industrialist and Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Eisenhower, John McCone, as urging approval of the Hanford power project.

McCone in his statement pointed out that it would give the United States now and for many years to come the largest atomic-generating plant in the world, far larger than the generator near Moscow over which the Soviets have made so much propaganda. Arguing the need to use this otherwise wasted energy so that more dams will not have to be built on the Columbia and conservation will in this way be advanced, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, quoted from an editorial in the Portland Oregonian:

"Ever since it went into operation during World War II it (the plutonium-producing plant) has been dissipating into the river enough heat to boil enough water to produce enough steam to spin turbines generating enough electricity to rival the output of Bonneville Dam. It is wrong to permit this waste to continue when with a relatively small investment there can be added to the Northwest Power Pool the equivalent of a major new hydroelectric project."

The Senate voted 54 to 36 to keep the Hanford power project in the atomic energy bill. In the House it was defeated, 176 to 140, with Democrats from coal-producing States, notably West Virginia, joining those who automatically oppose any public power project. The argument was made that the power is not needed, which is reminiscent of the effort to block the Tennessee Valley Authority with the cry that TVA's proposed power capacity was far in excess of anything that backward region could ever use. Incidentally, TVA is today the largest single purchaser of coal in the country.

Under the resourceful generalship of Republican Leader CHARLES HALLECK an attempt was made to tie a parliamentary noose around the Hanford project in that convenient mortuary chamber, the House Rules Committee.

Together with the drumbeat of military preparation Operation Under the Rug gives the impression of an impetuosity bordering on the frantic. This attitude belies the Nation's true strength.

It sometimes seems that there is a danger of sweeping not only such domestic measures as the Hanford project and aid to education under the defense rug but also the whole process of future negotiation over West Berlin and the need to take the political and diplomatic initiative. There are critics of President Kennedy's speech who feel that this side of the Berlin crisis came off second beat and that the areas of possible negotiation were brought in as a kind of afterthought.

The hope had been that constructive and far-reaching proposals would be forthcoming to seize the diplomatic initiative. Premier Khrushchev touched off the Berlin alarm as he has done two or three times before. But it should never be forgotten that under totalitarian control the switch can be reversed almost overnight. If the propaganda switch were abruptly shifted from threat to peace the drumbeat would have a lonely sound.

India's Prize Bond Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the gambling operation of the Government of India. India does not conduct

a national lottery, but rather operates a prize bond scheme.

India's prize bond program, patterned after the British premium bond scheme, revolves around the issuance of government bonds which, instead of bearing interest, offer the opportunity to win prizes. An amount equal to 3½ percent per annum of the total value of the bonds in each series is made available for prizes drawn quarterly.

In 1960, gross receipts from the sale of prize bonds came to $25 million. Prizes amounted to $1.3 million. The remainder of the receipts did not constitute a profit inasmuch as it represented a debt outstanding. The benefit of the prize bond scheme was that government bonds were made more appealing through the presentation of an opportunity to win large prizes. India realizes that a recognition of the gambling urge can be a great help in handling the nation's finances.

The New Soviet Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world—non-Communist is well as Communist—is now attempting to evaluate the significance of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's new program.

In evaluating his recommendations, we will need to determine the long-range objectives; any significant change in policy; the impact which attainment—full or partial—of stated goals will have on the interest of the United States or other non-Communist nations; and, if possible, determine its effect also upon progress within the Red orbit.

In attempting such an evaluation we will necessarily need the most expert available opinion and analysis. For this reason I suggested, yesterday, that hearings be conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee. I am hopeful that they can be undertaken in the near future.

Meanwhile, the Nation is benefiting from preliminary analyses of the significance of the new program. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have one such thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "The New Soviet Plan," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW SOVIET PLAN

Premier Khrushchev has reasserted his claim to leadership of world communism in the outline of the party program prepared for the 22d congress of the Soviet Communist Party in October.

In this first complete program since the Lenin manifesto of 1919, peaceful coexistence is proclaimed Communist doctrine. It has been espoused before, but never so officially.

To the West this is the important element in the new 20-year program. It indicates that Khrushchev is not only holding to his theory that war is not necessary to the world victory of communism—a victory he accepts as inevitable—but feels strong enough to declare it as gospel. Thus the challenge is thrown down to the "deviationists" in Red China, Albania, and scattered Communist parties elsewhere. Thus Khrushchev claims the title of prophet of Communist ideology.

Not that he shows any indication of seeing "peaceful coexistence" as the West sees it—an end to the threat of war. To Khrushchev it continues to mean unrelenting struggle.

Not that he has given up the Communist picture of the world. He says, for example, that the "Soviet experience has shown that the victory of the Socialist revolution alone provides all possibilities and conditions for the abolition of all national oppression, for the voluntary union of free and equal nations and nationalities in a single state." Here is typical Communist doubletalk.

He calls for the renunciation of war as a means of settling international disputes, for mutual trust between countries, for noninterference in internal affairs of other nations and for the right of all people to self-determination. Yet Soviet Union policies violate all of these fine precepts.

Where Khrushchev's dreams really soar is in the field of economics. He promises that within 20 years all Russians will "live in easy circumstances." Food and transportation will be free. Education and housing will not only be free but more than adequate. Soviet production will have left the United States far behind.

What this indicates but doesn't elaborate is the fact that the Soviet "paradise," where the state purports to solve all problems of the people, is far from its goals. Housing is still woefully inadequate and will be for years. The promise that even newlyweds will get an apartment of their own underlines the fact that now they move in with parents who already share quarters with other families. In these respects, the program is in reality a catalog of present shortcomings.

Economic gains of the U.S.S.R. have been tremendous since World War II. It has the potential for providing its people with decent standards of living. We may all hope that this potential will be achieved. But for now Khrushchev has to rely upon promises only, even as Lenin did 42 years ago.

Castro's Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of my constituents that is most timely, especially in view of the latest Cuban hijacking attempt in El Paso today. The writer, Mr. Ambrose Soldavini, 343 Park Avenue, Nutley, N.J., stated that though he has voted for me since my first election to Congress this is the first time that he has ever written to me, bringing an issue to my attention. Obviously concerned about the threat of communism and the Cuban situation, Mr. Soldavini told me of a news broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting Radio network on July 26, by Mr. Charles Warren, who is the chief of the Washington News Bureau for MBS. The subject of Mr. Warren's broadcast was Castro's Cuba and the Cuban Freedom Committee.

Mr. Soldavini praised Mr. Warren's broadcast so highly that I procured a copy of the script for myself. It is indeed a clear exposition of just what conditions exist in Cuba today. I am grateful to Mr. Soldavini for having brought the talk to my attention. And, I am grateful to Mr. Warren and the Mutual Broadcasting System for having brought home these facts to Americans. Since many of my colleagues, like myself, may have missed the live broadcast, I take this opportunity to make Mr. Warren's remarks available to all members, and all else who shall see this RECORD:

CASTRO'S CUBA

Communism continues to rear its ugly head just 90 miles from our shores. Today is the eighth anniversary of Castro's 26th of July revolutionary movement, and Havana is bedecked with Cuban and Soviet flags. Soviet Mig jet planes are zipping across the skies. Russian Cosmonaut Gagarin is making showcase appearances side by side with fellow-traveler Fidel Castro, and bands are blaring forth the Cuban National Anthem and then a few choruses of the "Communist Internationale."

This is the Castro government—the regime that holds its millions by the throat, with highhanded threats along with kidnaping, murder and all that goes with a Communist state, today celebrating the anniversary of its birth.

Just outside the city of Havana, there sits an Eastern Airlines Electra under heavy guard—the plane was hijacked earlier this week, by a Cuban-born waiter who became an American citizen just a year ago.

Rarely have the American people been so united as they are on the theme of Castro's Communist Cuba. The feeling is almost universal that the Castro government is an evil thing which must be pushed off the checkerboard of history. Yet in much of the anti-Castro talk one hears, even in politically sophisticated Washington, there is a certain vagueness. People know there are no longer any freedoms inside Cuba, and they know that the power-intoxicated Fidel Castro is reaching out toward other countries in Latin America.

People know, also, that Castro has broken many if not all of his promises, including his pledge of early elections, but they lack knowledge of details. From the American apologists for the Castro regime—and there are some, brazenly articulating their pro-Castro sentiments in books and over radio and television—we read and hear of the so-called improvements introduced by Castro. But the talk in this area is deliberately obscure with fuzzy references to help for the Cuban farmers through Castro's agrarian reform, unclear talk of better housing for the Cuban poor, unsubstantiated claims of a higher living standard for the Cuban workers.

In any case, there is a pressing need for concrete and relevant facts to place the unhappy picture of Communist Cuba in a perspective and focus where there would be as much clarity as there is now emotion.

CUBAN FREEDOM COMMITTEE

Such an attempt has been made, and successfully made, by an organization called the Cuban Freedom Committee located here in Washington. The organization is a citizens committee composed of Americans with a rich background of public service as well as of representatives of business and labor. Its advisory board includes Republican Congressman from Indiana, DONALD C. BRUCE,

Democratic Congressman from Illinois, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Dallas businessman Peter O'Donnell, AFL–CIO Inter-American Representative Serafino Romualdi and Gen. Albert Wedemeyer.

The Cuban Freedom Committee is engaged in broadcasting the truth into Cuba over Florida radio stations, and was formed some 6 months ago as an adjunct to the Christianform Committee.

In addition, the committee puts out explanatory literature on Cuba for Americans. A splended example of its work in this field is a short study entitled "Cuba Today" which in simple, concrete terms paints a realistic picture of Caribbean communism a la Fidel Castro.

I should like to share with you, ladies and gentlemen, some of the highlights of this brochure which came into my hands this past weekend.

The pamphlet suggests to its readers:

"When you hear of the blessings of Castro's Cuban paradise, just consider the following:

"In the Cuba of Fidel Castro, there is no freedom of silence. Everyone must show active support of the revolution or risk being branded as a counterrevolutionary. This means joining the militia, taking an oath of loyalty to Castro, doing whatever the Government tells you to do. It means being under constant surveillance, having your mail opened, your telephone tapped, being informed on by your neighbor and your fellow worker, and even by your own children, who, in true Communist style, are dragooned into the League of Rebel Pioneers after they reach the age of 7.

"There are no civil rights in Cuba. You have no protection against search without warrant or against arbitrary arrest or imprisonment. You may no longer assemble freely, nor can you read a newspaper of your choice, nor can you hear anything over radio or TV except the official line. You enjoy no security in your property rights, no matter how small.

"Class hatred is encouraged, especially hatred of the educated classes. You cannot leave Cuba without a series of permits, in particular the permit from the secret police. If you do leave, after all this, the National Bank will not let you take with you more than $5. If you are an engineer or a teacher you are not permitted to leave under any circumstances.

"If you are a worker, you are a virtual slave of the Government which controls job placements, wages, working conditions. You must work longer and harder than ever before, and for your harder and longer work you receive less pay. You have no right to strike and there is no collective bargaining. Your union leaders are appointed by the Government and do not represent you in any way.

"You perform militia duty whether you want to or not, and you drill long hours, evenings and on weekends, without compensation, of course. You attend rallies when ordered by your leaders and you demonstrate on the streets as the Government orders.

"Most businessmen are now working for the Government and can change their jobs only with the Government's approval.

"Professional people are also controlled by the Government, and must take an oath of personal loyalty to Castro. All lawyers have been declared surplus by Castro, with all legal decisions now being made by Government administrators.

"In the field of education, textbooks have been rewritten along Communist lines. Some 600 university professors have been purged because of their anti-Communist sentiments. Professors from the Soviet bloc countries have been imported to replace the Cuban professors expelled from the universities. All private schools have been taken over by the Government. And schoolchildren 13 years or more have been made teachers with strict orders to indoctrinate their pupils.

"The highly touted agrarian land reform has turned out to be a fraud. It is indeed true that the large private land holdings have been confiscated by the Government. But only in the rarest instances have they been distributed to small farmers. Most Cuban farmers today slave for the Castro government, which owns the stolen land.

"The so-called rent reform is just as phony as the agrarian reform. The landlords have been robbed of their property by the Government and are permitted to keep only their personal dwellings. The former tenant, the supposed beneficiary of the urban reform law, must continue to pay his same rent, but now to the Government, for a specified number of years. In addition, he is responsible for the taxes, repairs, and water rates, formerly paid by the landlords. The housing situation has become frozen, with private building construction at a standstill in the cities.

"The Catholic church is violently attacked because it dared publicly warn the Cuban people of the dangers of communism. The Government encourages organized Communist gangs to interfere with church services, profaning the churches and intimidating the worshipers. On one occasion, police authorities fined Catholics 100 pesos each, merely for having attended a service in the Havana Cathedral. Persecutions against Protestants, also, are now growing in Castro's Cuba.

"The Government takes particular pains to break up and destroy the family unit in Cuba, seeking to substitute for traditional family love and unity, obedience to the regime. Children are encouraged to report against parents, relatives, and teachers. The individual family member is under constant pressure to conform to the dictates of the state.

"Fidel Castro has openly announced his intention of starting revolutions throughout Latin America, including Puerto Rico. To this end, he has built, with Soviet aid, a powerful new radio transmitter, one of the largest in the hemisphere. On May 1 Castro proclaimed that Cuba is now a 'socialist republic.'"

This is Castro's Cuba.

West Virginia State Council of Carpenters and Joiners of America Endorses Leadership of President Kennedy in Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is continually mounting evidence of the unified support of the American people behind the resolute position taken by the President on the Berlin issue.

A recent Gallup poll reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the rank-and-file members of the two major parties on this issue, and only a very slight difference among the geographical regions of the United States.

In West Virginia, where our motto is "Mountaineers are always free," an unusual and commendable action was expressed by the West Virginia Council of Carpenters and Joiners in which the delegates to the State council resolved to pledge their full support to the position of the President in the current international crisis, "in order that the privileges, opportunities, freedom, and independence enjoyed by us be preserved for posterity."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the resolution of the West Virginia State Council of Carpenters and Joiners of America be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on Tuesday, July 25, 1961, the President of these United States called for partial mobilization of our resources as a deterrent to a threat to the freedom of the free people of the world; and

Whereas we believe this action should have been taken at an earlier date, we feel that the delay has been due to the complacency and apathy of ourselves and our neighbors; and

Whereas realizing where this action and any subsequent action of the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives could lead this Nation and its people, we pledge, each in his own way, to pray that God give them wisdom and courage in their future acts and deliberations in the preservation of the independence and freedom of our Nation; and

Whereas we realize that any partial or full mobilization of our forces will be costly, we further realize we can never permit a price tag to be placed on freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the West Virginia State Council of Carpenters, pledge to our Nation (as others have before) our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, in order that the privileges, opportunities, freedom, and independence enjoyed by us be preserved for posterity; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from West Virginia and Maryland.

Power Advisory Committee Favors Reactor Power Features

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy within the Congress on whether power features should be authorized for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., I feel the attention of the Members should be drawn to a resolution of the Washington State Power Advisory Committee in which it urges the Congress to authorize the addition of electric generating facilities to this project, and that funds be appropriated to commence construction of the facilities during this fiscal year.

The Washington State Power Advisory Committee has representation from both private and public power groups.

Under unanimous consent, the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the addition of electric generating facilities for the new production reactor would utilize byproduct energy which would otherwise be wasted; and

Whereas the power installation would eliminate a projected deficit of prime power in the Pacific Northwest in 1965–66; and

Whereas the facilities would permit the advance sale of a present power surplus which cannot be sold on a firm basis because of the impending shortage of energy in 1965–66; and

Whereas the facilities would lower the cost of producing plutonium 30 to 40 percent; and

Whereas facilities would enhance our national defense posture by providing for early reconversion to plutonium production after its production has been curtailed; and

Whereas facilities would benefit the prestige of the United States by being the largest nuclear powerplant in the world; and

Whereas facilities would tend to stabilize the economy of the Pasco-Richland-Kennewick area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Washington State Power Advisory Committee, That the Congress be urged to authorize the addition of electric generating facilities for the new production reactor and that funds be appropriated to commence construction of the electric facilities during this fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That the dual-purpose reactor be operated to benefit both public and private utilities and the industrial power consumers of the Pacific Northwest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington, and to the congressional delegates of the State.

Unanimously adopted July 27, 1961.

Foreign Aid on World Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

FOREIGN AID ON WORLD LEVEL

(Statement of Dr. Walter Eisenbraun of Dusseldorf Germany)

FOREIGN AID ON WORLD LEVEL

When last spring, on the occasion of the 17th Congress of the International Chamber of Commerce in Washington, I tried to get in touch with the representatives of the colored peoples, I was strongly impressed by their concerns, needs, and hopes. It was expressed over and over again that if no aid were given to them, even they who were full of goodwill to cooperate with the free world would be swept away giving way in their countries to communism, respecting anarchy.

They passionately pointed out that it was impossible to maintain a free economic system and a free democratic form of government in a less-developed country if the majority of the voting population was suffering from hunger and living under miserable conditions.

In fact, the gap between most of the developing countries on one side and the industrial countries on the other side has become wider during the last years, which is mainly due to the fact that with the percentual birth rate remaining essentially constant in the developing countries, the death rate of babies, children, and mothers has dropped considerably and general life expectation has increased because of the progress made in matters of medicine and hygienics. This in itself so gratifying development has caused an almost explosion-like increase in population in many developing countries which, in spite of the many efforts made, could not be matched by their economic evolution. General poverty has thus become greater.

These SOS calls and other experiences have convinced me that here lies the decisive challenge to the free world.

At that time I decided to do everything in my power and wherever an opportunity should arise to promote the idea of a rapid formation of a superordinate organization that is to give help to these countries, similar to that which after World War II Europe received under the name of Marshall plan. That is why for this year's group meeting, which is attended by a large number of our foreign collaborators, I have chosen "foreign aid" as a topic and want to express the hope that everyone may help to propagate these ideas in his country.

It can hardly be imagined what the world would be like today if the Marshall plan had not been carried through. Vast sums ($12.5 billion) which hitherto had only been earmarked for wars, were raised to mitigate economic and social need in Europe and finally to start integration of our continent. A marvelous gift of far-reaching political and economic consequence.

George Marshall has shown, what most matters today: The removal of causes of war and the uplift of the general standard of living all over the world, by overcoming narrowminded national thinking and by proving a true readiness to help the needy peoples.

Our strained world has got moving for good and all. Because of the reduced distances, because of journeys to Europe and America and through the influence of radio, television, press and film, the developing countries have come to know the standard of living in the economically developed countries of which, of course, they want to partake.

Poverty and misery are a constant threat to prosperity all over the world and therefore a large-scale aid program would also be in the interest of the helping countries themselves.

You all know that the East bloc under the leadership of Soviet Russia and the free-world are measuring their forces in a political and economic contest, the issue of which will decisively change the physiognomy of our world. During the first years of its existence, communism has hardly had any success in the countries of a lower economic standard. Russia herself was an underdeveloped country and as such was not in a position to compete successfully with the traditional industrial countries of the West. The economic and social form of the highly industrialized countries had greater attraction, greater prestige. But two world wars with all the attendant circumstances and an often awkward colonial policy have thoroughly destroyed this prestige.

Success and danger of communism have suddenly become evident, now it has been proved that a hitherto underdeveloped country, namely Russia, could develop into a powerful industrial nation, without depending on the economic and political systems of the Western industrial countries.

It is clear that these Russian successes have greatly impressed the developing countries and that Russia is doing her best to make as much political profit on such newly acquired prestige as possible. In this the Communist East bloc is helped by the economic political and human mistakes the Western industrial countries have committed in the past in what we now call the developing countries.

Poverty in many developing countries is unimaginable. Even today millions and millions of men (20 to 30 million) are starving every year in vast areas of the world. In the Western industrial countries the average annual income per head varies from $1,000 to $2,500, while the individual income in the developing countries amounts to $50 to $200. In other words: about 10 percent of the world's population, i.e. virtually the white race, dispose of more than 80 percent of the world income. Formerly, people in the underdeveloped areas only knew the same low standard of living of their immediate surroundings. Nowadays they are able to compare and quick to believe that salvation lies in a speedy industrialization, cost what it may.

While the process of industrialization in the Western countries was slow at its beginnings, the Communist method for them seems to offer the possibility of quick success. There is no doubt that the rigid organization of a Communist nation with all its powers can rapidly transform an underdeveloped country. It need not make allowance for personal sufferings and feelings. Apart from that, people that have been used to misery for centuries are insusceptible to human sufferings. So, what remains is the attraction of communism which by its unflinching organization can force the masses to achievements, restrictions of consumption, and investments that are impossible in the Western World.

These short indications show very plainly the magnitude of the problem with all the dangers and possibilities it implies and the only deduction we have to draw from it: to prevent that more countries are irreparably absorbed by communism because of a short-sighted policy of the free world. This is only possible, if we are prepared to pay a high price in return, i.e., if we give the developing countries a fair chance to keep up with the economic development of the Communist countries.

Not that the problem had not been sized up.

Here again—as in case of the Marshall plan—the United States has taken the initiative. In its wake numerous organizations with their various aid programs were set up, such as the UNO with its different sub-organizations for technical agricultural and cultural aid, the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the Development Fund for the areas associated to the Common Market, the European Investment Bank, and others more, not to mention the private associations. What is missing, however, is an expedient coordination of all means and possibilities at one place and their concentrated employment.

At first, I should like to show, in the light of some of the most important examples, what aid has already been given. The United States ranges at the top of the free world. She carries the main load. Since the beginning of systematic foreign aid in 1948 until March 1959 she has dealt out a sum of approximately $26 billion to other countries, $12.5 billion thereof through the Marshall plan.

Table 1 shows how these enormous sums were distributed:

	Billion
Europe	$15.0
Africa	0.2
Latin America	0.4
Near East	2.6
Far East	5.2
South Asia	0.9
Total	24.3
Superregional programs	$0.7
Other special programs such as combat of malaria, aid to refugees, etc	0.8
Total	25.8

Table 2 shows how the $15 billion for Europe were apportioned to the European countries. I give you this detailed specification because I want to derive from it a moral obligation for these countries to participate now on their part in a large-scale aid program.

	Billion
Great Britain	$3.8
France	3.2
Italy	1.6
Germany	1.6
Netherlands	1.0

Also, since 1947 the United States paid another $20.5 billion to 40 allied and befriended nations by way of military aid.

The Development Bank founded in 1958 which is granting long-term loans, is working with a capital of $418 million. The World Bank now disposes of a capital of $21 billion.

Furthermore, great quantities of food out of the agricultural surplus of the United States have been given to needy countries.

Since the end of the war private American investments in foreign countries have reached about $41 billion, 45 percent of them went to developing areas, with the chief stress (about 30 percent) on South America. Not quite 15 percent of the private U.S. foreign investments went to Africa and Asia and half of it to petroleum business there. In many years the yield flowing back by far exceeds the new foreign investments. This circumstance clearly proves the importance and necessity of a government aid.

Great Britain spends about $200 million yearly within the frame of the Colombo plan for the Asian sphere; apart from that she participates like other countries in the various international aid organizations. Private investments abroad are mainly centered on the British colonies and dominions.

France as well mainly invests in her oversea territories; the annual sum of her investments amounts at present to about $600 million.

Switzerland only contributes very modestly with an annual sum of 1.5 million Sfrs. paid to the international UNO organization for technical aid to economically backward countries. Another contribution is constituted by the making available of experts and the granting of scholarships on a bilateral, partly private basis. Switzerland intends to increase her foreign aid.

Table 3 shows the financial share of the German Federal Republic in the international organizations:

[In million deutsche marks]

	Total engagements	Already paid
World Bank	4,410	441
International Monetary Fund	3,306	1,437
International Finance Corporation	15	15
European Investment Bank	1,260	252
Development Fund for the areas associated to the Common Market	840	189
UNO-German contribution for technical help	17	17
The Federal Republic intends to contribute to the newly founded International Development Association (IDA)	218	----------
Total	10,066	2,351

Furthermore the Federal Republic, respecting the German capital market have so far placed credits up to about $450 million at the disposal of the World Bank.

Since 1946 the World Bank has granted credits of in the whole $4.426 billion, only one-third of which were covered by payments of the member countries ($1.447 billion) while the greater portion was constituted by loans raised and the sale of bonds. In the financial year 1958–59 alone, the World Bank raised $432 million in the international capital market. More than half of this sum; namely, $218 million came from the Federal Republic, which for 1958—59 was thus the most important financing source of the World Bank.

In the frame of bilateral agreements the Federal Republic has entered the following engagements (as per January 30, 1959):

TABLE 3A

1. The Argentine: Respite of 600 million deutsche marks for 10 years.

2. Greece: Promise of a 200 million deutsche mark loan over 20 years.

3. India: Respite of the engagements resulting from the Rourkela project of 700 million deutsche marks for 3 years.

Contribution to a joint aid of Western countries of about 170 million deutsche marks.

4. Yugoslavia: Agreement of 1956 provides for a long-term payment of commercial debts of the postwar period of 175 million deutsche marks until 1968. Granting of a loan of 240 million deutsche marks.

5. Turkey: Contribution to a joint aid of Western countries of about 210 million deutsche marks (1958). Advanced payment of 250 million deutsche marks on the basis of the so-called ammunition agreement.

By the way, in the frame of the London debt agreement 4 billion deutsche marks have already been paid. The total debt amounts to about 13 billion deutsche marks.

The reparation agreement with Israel stipulates payments of the German Federal Republic of in the whole 3.5 billion deutsche marks.

Private German direct investments abroad from February 1, 1952, until June 30, 1959, amounted to 2,394 billion deutsche marks, thereof South and middle America got 710 million deutsche marks; Africa, 153 million deutsche marks; and Asia, 94 million deutsche marks.

Investments of the private industry are still suffering from an insufficient support through Federal Government. Assurance and guarantee costs as well as the enterprisers' own risks are too high. Investments and deliveries are largely covered from the viewpoint of the least possible risk.

Foreign Office disposes of three funds for development aid, to which since 1956 220 million deutsche marks were assigned. The means are intended for the erection of model plants and training centers for agricultural, industrial, medical, and educational purposes. Also, means for 700 scholarships and 2,300 trainees were made available.

Seven head organizations of industry in 1957 founded a study group for cooperation in the developing countries. This group is recognized by the Federal Ministries as only consultative body for problems of technical aid.

In the middle of 1959 the German Foundation for Developing Countries was called into being, its 12 members being representatives of politics, economy, and science.

Altogether, a multicolored fan of individual efforts.

While, as we have seen, the Western industrial countries have for years been spending considerable sums on development aid, although, unfortunately, in a rather scattered form, the Soviet Union has only systematically built up her foreign aid during the last 3 or 4 years. Especially in the Afro-Asian sphere; that is, at the boundaries of communism, she is doing everything to give the impression that her economc aid is quantitatively and qualitatively superior to that of the West.

Table 4 shows the means the Soviet bloc has actually raised since 1954 for non-Communist countries. Altogether credits have been granted to the amount of $2.38 billion. Not quite one-fourth of this money was spent for military deliveries, mainly to Egypt, Syria, and Afghanistan.

The following countries may be considered as special points of gravity:

	Million
Egypt	$626
Syria	323
Yemen	59
Afghanistan	159
Ceylon	58
India	304
Indonesia	364
Yugoslavia	163
Argentina	102

It is beyond doubt that the Soviet Union will in future considerably strengthen her efforts.

In contrast with the important American aid out of budget means which for the greater part is given as a gift, the Soviet money is generally provided in the form of credits. Even Soviet military aid to Egypt and Syria was granted that way. However, Russian credit conditions are generally much more attractive than those fixed for a great number of Western credits where purely commercial considerations prevail. With a rate of interest of 2–3 percent the Soviet Union is conceding delays of 10–40 years and admitting repayment in kind respectively in local or free currencies.

Although the financial efforts of the East bloc up to now are by far outdone by the capital aid supplied by the Western countries, many developing countries and even some of the Western industrial nations themselves are under the impression that the Soviet Union already occupies a predominant place in the world's aid to developing countries.

This is essentially due to the following facts:

1. Russia has always distributed her aid in a very concentrated and precisely aimed form. Since Russia cannot help all countries to the same measure as the United States, she concentrates her aid on countries considered politically unstable. From the point of view of the benefited country, Russian aid often appears more important than that of the Western World.

2. Russia has cunningly stepped into the breach whenever the Western countries had just declined or only partly satisfied a demand for help. This method is also adopted with regard to the establishment of economic relations with new commercial partners. Especially in times of dropping world-market prices for raw materials and agricultural products, Russia approaches the developing countries and offers to buy their hard-selling surplus at a favorable price.

3. The rigid organization of the Soviet foreign aid makes the developing countries believe that Soviet measures are superior to those of the Western industrial countries. Whenever the Soviet Union is handling a project, there will only be one and the same interlocutor for the developing country to deal with, namely the Soviet foreign trade organization, while with the Western partners the financing has to be negotiated with banks or governments, the layout with consulting offices and the technical execution with industry.

4. Every help is accompanied by psychologically effective propaganda. Within the present Soviet aid program for Indonesia, for instance, for which approximately 500 million deusche marks are scheduled, two steel mills and a stadium are the main attractions. The stadium in Djakarta is sure to have an immense propagandistic effect, since in 1962 it will be the scene of the so-called Asian Olympic games.

A factor of special importance for future development is the identity of interests between the planned economy of the Soviet Union and the raw-material countries, which can more easily elaborate and carry through long-term development plans, if helped by firm purchase engagements. Very often, such

purchase engagements are not only the basis for the establishment of economic and political relations (see recently Brazil) with the Soviet Union, but they also partly substitute capital aid by enabling the developing countries to earn the means for their uplift rather than to borrow them. Such commitments are no heavy burden to Russia since she either has or simply orders a great consumption of agricultural products and raw materials from the developing countries.

Thus, for instance, in 1958, 51.2 percent of Egypt's exports went to countries of the East bloc, while in 1948 only 8.5 percent. A very similar movement can be observed in Egyptian imports. In 1948 6½ percent came from the East-bloc countries, in 1958 already 35 percent. Soviet Russia has become the most important trade partner of Egypt.

The situation is similar with regard to Afghanistan. In exchange for wool, raw skins, oil seed and dried fruit the Soviet Union supplied technical equipments. The Soviet share in Afghan foreign trade already amounts to 50 percent. Only recently a Soviet credit running over 40 years at an interest rate of 2 percent was granted the country. More examples could be found.

The free world as well will have to attach greater importance to the stability of raw-material prices which are of vital consequence to the developing countries. They absolutely need to export their raw materials at reasonable prices for otherwise they will lack the means to import the goods necessary for their economic development. There is little commonsense in pumping on one side billions into the developing countries and, on the other side, letting them down from time to time with their raw materials, resp. admitting the decay of raw-material prices to ruin their economic backing. Such a decay would—by the way—invariably bring about an economic recession in the industrial countries, for if the raw-material supplying resp. developing country were to suffer considerable losses in foreign exchange, orders to the exporting industrial countries would have to be limited or stopped altogether (see the Argentine, Brazil, etc.).

I now come to the human aspect of foreign aid. Over and over again the colored men from the developing countries declare: "All money and material aid will be worthless while no thought is given to men."

In the Soviet Union the necessary training of labor and leading personnel for the developing countries is directed by the central foreign trade organization. All persons Russia sends to these countries, get a special training for their range of functions that enables technicians and planning staff to behave tactfully and respect foreign customs. Within the sixth 5-year plan the establishment of a central training institute in Turkestan is scheduled. The Soviet Union is endeavoring to send staff from her Asian territories to Asian countries and Mohammedan Soviet citizens to the Arabian countries.

Great importance is attached to the formation of foreign students and trainees in the Soviet Union as well as in the developing countries themselves. According to press information there are 85,000 foreign students in the Soviet Union as compared with 45,000 in Great Britain, 35,000 in the United States, and 15,000 in the German Federal Republic. (Soviet Union, 2.4 million students; Federal Republic, 180,000; rate of population 4 to 1; 1 German student to 13 Soviet students.) Simultaneously, a number of Soviet training centers are being built directly in the developing countries, among others a polytechnical institute in Bombay and an institute for technology in Rangoon, with 1,000 places each.

In order to illustrate the human aspect and to show how things are done well and how they should not be done, I want to give the following examples:

In Nepal, Swiss experts of the Food and Agriculture Organization (UNO) are extremely successful in dairy and cheesemaking plants installed and directed by them, because they live in remote mountain regions under similar conditions as and in close contact with the local population. Done well.

American experts, on the other hand, are hardly ever set up outside the capital of Nepal, since they want to live also abroad according to normal American standards, which to the Nepalese population must appear utter luxury. Not good.

In Indian publicity parallels are frequently drawn between the German steel mill in Rourkela and the Russian steel mill in Bhilai. All such comparisons are to the advantage of the Soviet works. The Soviets have done good work; they must from every point of view be taken seriously as technical competitors. Apart from that it is pointed out that in the Russian works in Bhilai human relations are far more agreeable than in Rourkela. Although the 1,600 German engineers and specialists receive twice the pay they get at home, they are dissatisfied with the Indian people. They complain about their awkwardness and their technical inability. Contemptuous judgments of Indians are constantly and freely expressed. Result: exasperation on the German side and defiance on the Indian side.

In Bhilai Indian engineers and laborers are working shoulder to shoulder with 700 Russians and try to learn. In Rourkela all important work is done by the German mechanics alone. The Indians say "we don't learn from the Germans, they have only come to earn money, while the Russians help us."

In Rourkela, there is an atmosphere of irritation, in Bhilai good humor prevails. There the bad weather is being cursed, but not the Indians.

In Rourkela a separate hospital was built, since conditions in Indian hospitals were considered unbearable. The Russians renounced such a step and instead sent their physicians to an Indian hospital. The Germans built their own clubhouse with swimming pool, the whole fenced in to keep off curiosity. Again an affront that is stirring Indian irritation against colonial haughtiness.

The Russian engineers brought their wives and children along and thus avoided right from the beginning many differences with the population etc.

In this connection I should like to recommend the book "The Ugly American" which in the United States has become a best-seller.

I have dwelt on this point at some length because in my opinion, human contacts are of extraordinary importance.

No technical know-how and no financial aid, however high it may be, can substitute in the developing countries the value of trusting relations from man to man. It should be a matter of course to respect native cultures. Technical superiority is no justification for arrogance. The regard for native customs and cultural achievements, on the other hand, will create a climate of confidence and will give people of a developing country the feeling that, although in technical matters they need foreign help, they can meet the West in other fields on a level of equality. And this feeling is the most important prerequisite to a lasting partnership between the peoples.

In this connection I should also like to deal briefly with the problem of foreign trainees and stipendiaries. In most cases the young foreigners arrive with great respect for the host country. Very often they return with a feeling of disappointment to their own countries. They get a thorough training in the host country and learn a lot. Much is done for their formation and personal care. And yet, they return disappointed because they have not been able to establish contacts with the population of the country. And it is just the personal contacts that matter, if the great expenditures are to have the lasting effect both sides desire.

Soviet Russia has more fully recognized the significance of this problem than the West. She is paying much more attention than we do to the training of her own people that are going abroad and to that of foreigners coming to Russia or studying at Russian educational institutions.

Paradoxically enough, Soviet Russia with her Marxist-materialistic doctrine has been better known to respond to the ideal humanitarian side of human relations than the countries of the occident, which, in spite of their humanitarian outlook, rather overstress the material side of the aid.

I come back to my observation that Soviet Russia is above all courting the favor of the Afro-Asian sphere. Some years ago, Khrushchev said, the Soviet Union desired international trade mainly for political reasons. In fact, Soviet Russia has almost exclusively concentrated her capital export and technical aid on those countries that are adjacent to Communism. The south and southeast Asian countries with 40 percent and the Near East with 29 percent of Russian capital exports range at the top. India alone has received 19 percent and Egypt 15 percent of all Soviet capital aid.

In this part of our earth the free world has to be on its guard. Today, already more than half of the world's population lives in Asia. Before long, the Asian share in population is due to be three-fifths. While during the 19th century, there were two Asians for one European, there will presumably be four Asians for one European by the end of this century. The share of the technically advanced nations, now amounting to about one-third, will by then have dropped to one-quarter or even one-fifth. The growing up of two more milliards of men in the poor areas should fill the economically developed industrialized and rich peoples with panic and incite them to immediate action.

Who will be winning the race for the masses of Asia and Africa, the free world or communism? It is no exaggeration, if I repeat that this is the decisive challenge to the free world, the question of life or death for us.

Now, what is to be done and what is an appropriate world organization to look like and how is it to work:

1. We, i.e., the free world, must create something similar but even much more powerful and striking than the Marshall plan I mentioned before.

There is much likeness between the situation of Europe after World War II and the present situation of the developing countries.

2. It must be joined by all potent industrial nations and among them above all the countries that were so abundantly provided for by the Marshall plan and were thus set back on their feet.

3. The aid must be administered on a government level. Even though the help of private capital may be important, it is not fit to solve the great development problems of the world. Private capital can only be invested where there is a fair chance of security and profit.

4. Every scattering of aid actions must stop and all means of all countries should be coordinated at one place and under the direction of the most powerful Nation of the free world, the United States.

5. There is one more point that ought to be stressed: the United States cannot in future be left to carry the whole burden by herself. You all know the problem of the American balance of payment and you know the serious language Mr. Dillon, Under Secretary of State, used on the occasion of his last journey to Europe.

6. If properly enlarged, the newly founded International Development Association (IDA) may, in my opinion, be the suitable instrument. The characteristic feature of this new organization is to admit in special cases repayment of credits in soft currency or native products, a principle Russia has repeatedly employed. This possibility will probably be subject to severe criticism, but I think it is of greatest importance. For a way must be found to finance also those development projects that do not meet the rigid commercial conditions of the World Bank, but are of vital consequence to the prosperous growth of the corresponding country. The sum of $1 billion up to now at the disposal of IDA—to which, as I pointed out above, the German Federal Republic intends to contribute 218 million deutschemarks is, of course, completely inadequate.

7. This world organization should fix points of gravity, beginning with the countries in the immediate neighborhood of communism or especially prone to it. (See my observation on the Afro-Asia sphere.) The organization in Washington should be supported by parallel organizations in the corresponding countries that would have to do the preliminary planning of the most important projects, together with the local governments, and to report to Washington. These local organizations should already include representatives of the IDA so that an expert choice of projects would be granted. This choice, by the way, must not necessarily be an industrial or raw-material plant. Very often the development of their agriculture may be of greater value to the countries concerned. Once the developing countries realize that something is done for them and that they all will be helped in their turn, this will strengthen peoples and governments in their strife for freedom and national independence and encourage them to collaborate in this certainly very difficult task.

8. A reception and distribution organization should be set up, which grants the raw-material countries a relatively stable price for their products, in order to give them a safe calculation basis for their development projects.

9. It is of great psychological importance that America does not stand out as the only bearer of the new aid organization. It must be a true world organization, with its executive compromising personalities of all industrial countries of the free world. The national representatives shall be set to work in those countries, where their nation is particularly popular. Experience has shown that a purely American organization, as any other national organization, will be regarded with distrust.

I have already discussed these ideas 1½ years ago with our friend, Congressman CELLER, who then asked me to write them down in a short memorandum to be introduced to the official authorities in Washington, provided with his own additional observations. In this memorandum I particularly stressed the necessary cooperation of Germany which is held in high esteem in some of the developing countries.

I now come to the end:

One of the problems to be discussed at the summit meeting in May is that of the underdeveloped countries. This plainly shows that the central question of our time has been grasped by the great powers of West and East alike. What is at the bottom of it? Are the developing countries in their turn to be divided into spheres of interest, which would mean yet another triumph of the Eastern side and a retreat of the West, or—one hardly dares to hope—is there a chance of the two blocs cooperating in the interest of the hungry and needy peoples?

This would be glad tidings indeed, and a task worthy of humanity. Right now, however, we should unerringly do what is to be done next and mobilize, and that quickly, the forces of the free world, that are still great.

Let me end this with a short film calling to remembrance the historic speech of George Marshall before Howard University in 1947, which he concluded with the following words that also apply to our present situation: "Whatever action is possible to meet these pressing problems must be taken without delay."

International Voluntary Services Team in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, of interest to Members of Congress is a report by Mr. Lawrence Ulsaker, of my district, regarding his experience as a member of the international voluntary services team in Vietnam.

Because of the tense situation that exists in this area his report and efforts bear significance to all of our citizens and Nation:

IVS-USOM AGRICULTURAL DIVISION,
176 HAI BA TRUNG,
Saigon, Vietnam, July 16, 1961.

DEAR FRIENDS: Greetings—again from Quangngai, a rather conservative little town that I have had the pleasure to watch grow steadily since I first arrived on the 25th of April. I say conservative because these hardy people are cautious to change and outside influence. They even have their own peculiar accent which is different from that of North, South, or Central Vietnam.

Quangngai Province was suppressed and dominated by the Vietminh Communists from 1945 to 1955. During this time the town was frequently destroyed by bloody battles between the French and Communists. The twisted steel and crumbling buttresses of the bombed bridge that crossed the river just outside the north end of town are about the only visible remains of their bitter conflicts. Before they left the Vietminh burned most everything that had any value. People still have to use sugarcane residue (what's left after the juice has been pressed out) for fuel. Yet, they have retained their traditional dignity and politeness which so becomes them.

Now, highway traffic increases daily, many new buildings and houses are under construction, we're in the process of getting electricity and negotiations are being conducted to bring a sugar mill to town. The cinema shows movies 6 nights a week, formerly they only had one, and we even have a legitimate theater. Watching their scurrying efforts to establish themselves reminds me of when the playhouse summerstock first came to Battle Lake 3 years ago.

As far as my work here is concerned, it started out with pretty much of a "shotgun" approach. When I first arrived the provincial chief of agriculture asked me what my program was. Well, far be it from me to have the least idea of what type of program would be the most beneficial or feasible since nobody in Saigon seemed to know much about Quangngai Province; other than it was considered the poorest in Vietnam and grew mostly sugarcane. I explained I was simply an IVS representative and would like to know where he could use technical and/or financial aid in initiating steps to improve the agricultural output under his present program. I could then confer with IVS and USOM in Saigon to see how soon we'd be equipped to help him.

Now it must be kept in mind that these people were left holding the bag in 1954 with a powerful lack of administrators and technicians of all kinds and that the shortage is still all too evident. Anyway, after 2 weeks the only definite idea I received from the chief was: he needed to know what my program was.

During these 2 weeks, I had been making a survey of all the districts it was considered safe to go into, meeting these district chiefs, and Dr. Loh, the Chinese sugarcane technical assistant to Vietnam from Taiwan, had shown me the experiments and demonstrations he was engaged in. It was obvious there was a great agricultural potential here but there was also such a lack of the insect and disease controls, basic soil and meteorological data, and marketing information that it was still difficult to tell where we could make the best contribution. I did write up a tentative program for IVS in Quang Ngai which the chief of agriculture accepted favorably. Actually it was just an outline of the survey I'd drawn up to determine the existing problems and future needs of the agricultural population. This included observation of the methods of cultivation practiced, variety of crops cultivated, time of year these crops are planted and harvested and their average yield. Then from this data I figured—through experimentation—we could determine if it was practical to introduce new and improved cultivation practices; which crop varieties were best and if we had any better that were practical to introduce; if their date of planting was the most advantageous and finally if we could increase the yield per hectare per man-hour.

The provincial chief of agriculture then gave me some land that belonged to his nursery and the use of his two coolies. They had a mighty hard row to hoe as it was, so my driver, interpreter and I ended up donning those comical, cone-shaped coolie hats and doing most of the work ourselves. We're now about ready to harvest and tabulate the results of experiments with five varieties of beans, two of peanuts, four of sweetpotatoes, onions, corn, and sorghum. We also intercropped some sugarcane with beans; helped distribute a better variety of sugarcane to farmers, demonstrated better plows, an ox harness and a simple wheeled cultivator; and instructed the coolies in the use of a Landmaster (small garden tractor) which had been sitting in a corner. They didn't like it because it was too difficult to operate and wouldn't plow deep enough. Now it has replaced the two oxen formerly used.

After discussing, with USOM technicians, all the work that could be done in this province and what I'd already done we concluded that the areas of beans, sweetpotatoes and corn would be the most beneficial to continue work on. Beans and sweetpotatoes to be intercropped with sugar cane, and corn as a cash crop. Japan has a mighty market for corn and will purchase all Vietnam produces.

I'm afraid it'll be a long time before IVS can work themselves out of a job here. Free Vietnam is burdened with a relatively simple agricultural economy and practically free of agricultural economists. What's more, till now their economy has been limited to only two crops—rice and rubber—due mainly to the desires of a colonial power.

This nation has good soil and climate, its population is hard working and there are many undeveloped resources. These are the tools available to combat the many challenging difficulties present in Vietnam and the opportunity to overcome these difficulties is our main concern. It's easy to carry

on like this indefinitely but for those of you who are at all interested in America's stake in Vietnam it is not easy to overstress the value you would get out of the pamphlet by that name. You may obtain a copy of "America's Stake in Vietnam" for $1 by writing to American Friends of Vietnam, 62 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y. If I had the financial ability I'd send you a copy, but you know how it is.

On July 1 my interpreter and I drove up to Hue, the old capital of Vietnam. On the way we stopped in Da Nang and accepted an invitation to join MAAG's (the U.S. Military Advisory Group to Vietnam) picnic on the beach. They were celebrating a victorious athletic contest over the MAAG men from Hue. They trounced the Hue team in everything but Ping-pong. It's impossible for you to imagine how wonderfully good American hamburgers, hot dogs, beer and potato salad tasted for a change. After visiting awhile we continued up the scenic drive to Hue and stayed with the IVS team there.

This team consists of Jim Green, Jim Kelly, and their Vietnamese drivers and interpreters. Kelly is running some very interesting poultry experiments and Green is doing an excellent job in the Hue Agricultural College.

Monday morning we all drove as far north as possible—to the demarkation zone, 3 miles south of the 17th parallel. From an old, deserted French blockhouse we could look out over the broad, flat rice-paddy valley to North Vietnam. We were told the north side usually fly a huge red flag, about 50 by 20 feet. This sounds awful big to me. Anyway the day before we arrived a high wind had whipped it to shreds and the tough little South Vietnamese flag was all we could see waving. One wishes this was symbolic of something.

The Jims and I had received invitations from John J. Helbe, the Hue consul, to attend the consulate's Fourth of July celebration. It was a very pleasant affair; no speeches, fireworks, or hard drinking. There aren't many Americans in the area, a few missionaries, teachers, MAAG fellows, USIS (U.S. Information Service), ICA, and consulate personnel, so we became acquainted with people engaged in a wide variety of work.

I have met Americans employed in these same fields plus some private businessmen and a number of tourists throughout Vietnam, in Thailand and in Laos and I am always somewhat surprised at how little the majority understand of these peoples and their respective histories. I realize more and more what an incomparable advantage we, of IVS, have in acquiring intimate association with the native population.

We have a unique opportunity to do this in that we can gather observations from a wide variety of sources. We sit down with ICA and the host country's officials when they formulate agricultural policy that is to affect the area we're working in; and these meetings often range over more than agricultural policy. Most of us become good friends with the chief of province and his district chiefs. (I just sold my shotgun to Mr. Tat, the Quang Ngai provincial chief.) We always associate pretty closely with the missionaries in the area, likewise the MAAG personnel. Many of us teach English at night to civil servants, teachers, students, etc. Our experiments are carried out in cooperation with the host country's technicians and last but not least we're constantly in contact with that hard working, backbone of the country—the farmer. This is the man that most fascinates me and once you gain his confidence you get to know his every need, from more seed to another wife.

Last month I took a picture of one with his only child, a pretty 10-year-old girl. When I gave him the picture he exclaimed, "Ho. Now I don't look so old." I asked why he worried about that and he told me how his wife told him she could give him no more children so he must take another wife to beget a son. He wanted a young, healthy wife to insure a strong son but was afraid it would be difficult for him to attract one. The picture reduced his fear.

You can say all you want about these countries, but one should always use a tone of respect when speaking of their farmers. I think this holds true universally. They are backed by hundreds and hundreds of years of experience; which is often said to be the best teacher. They have a good sense of values; are hard working and usually very religious. They seem to have that independent but practical, good ol' Missouri "show me" attitude and I often see an ingenious use made of the materials at hand.

My 2-year tour of duty expires on December 1, at which time I plan to return home via India, the Middle East and Europe; mainly Norway. It sure would be good to hear from you in the next 4 months.

May the Good Lord bless and keep you.

LARRY G. ULSAKER.

The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the prize-winning essay for the State of Missouri on the subject of juvenile delinquency. This was a contest sponsored recently by the Missouri Police Chiefs' Association. The contest was statewide and there were over 2,000 entries. Judges in the contest were the two U.S. Senators from Missouri and our State attorney general, Thomas F. Eagleton.

With such a large number of entries from every corner of the State, the winner, Miss Sherry Mesle, brings great honor and distinction to the Fourth Missouri Congressional District, to her home city of Independence, Mo., to her school, and to her fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. F. Carl Mesle, Jr.

The content of this essay, as you will find, is most excellent and if the practices mentioned in the essay were more generally followed it could well be the country would enjoy a lower rate of what is called juvenile delinquency:

THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

As young people we cannot deny the fact that a very few juveniles are spoiling any good reputation which we have tried to make for ourselves. Yet, because we are so close to them in age, we are especially concerned about them, not only for the sake of our reputation, but as classmates and future citizens. We feel the very same emotions, have the same wishes, hope for the same happiness, and seek the same fulfillment; we know we are no longer children; we realize we are are not yet adults; but we are strongly aware of the capabilities which we possess, and the recognition which those capabilities deserve. We know how badly a teenager wants to be someone, to be respected, accepted, and liked.

The prevention of juvenile delinquency begins in the home. The parents are the most important instrument in shaping the life of their offspring. Strangely enough, the first year is the most important year in providing a sense of trust and security. The warmth of physical contact with the mother, the satisfaction of being fed when hungry, the comfort of being relieved from pain, and the love expressed in fondling and care are the things which instill and develop a sense of love, security, and trust. These are certainly the three qualities which a juvenile delinquent lacks.

It has been said that the child is the father of the man. If this is true, then it is the child that must be taught. Parents must be teachers. They can only teach love by loving, respect by respecting, behavior by behaving, responsibility by working, confidence by being confident, cleanliness by being clean. Example is the best teacher, and parents need to be the best teacher possible.

Parents should assume the role of counselor. Definite rules should be set down to make clear what behavior is expected and what isn't. Interests should be taken into consideration, and activities geared toward their development; if the child likes music, attend concerts; if he likes art, go to an art exhibit; if he is interested in science, go to a science fair. Education and learning should be made popular; family discussions on subjects from the world situation to sex would be much more efficacious than assigning books and articles to be read.

The culmination of providing, teaching, and counseling is a companionship which must exist between child and parents for the richest family relations. The companionship can be nurtured by family experiences; go on vacation trips; attend church together; support school programs in which the child participates; work together during "spring housecleaning" or in the garden or yard; go on a lark some evening, taking in a movie and ice cream; read every evening from a book. A family council promotes a restricted democracy within the family; the parents must remember to give consideration to the child's wishes; the child respects the final authority of his parents. Family life should be meaningful to a teenager. Home should be the place where he is always welcome and wants to go. The family is a miniature society to prepare the young person for life outside.

Outside the home, the church is the best able to instill values, morals, and a real purpose for living. If a purpose is offered, and can be applied to a young person's own life, he will strive diligently to fulfill this purpose. The church can be effective only if it provides both an emotional stimulus and an intelligent stimulus. Emotions are the strongest motivation from within which provide energy to tackle a job; but when emotions run dry, there has to be a reason, intelligent logic, to continue a person's efforts. The church is the best source for both emotional steam and intelligence reason.

Church-sponsored activities are inclined to be the cleanest in recreation, and the best chaperoned. Meetings can be planned by the young people themselves for purpose of worship, study, service, and recreation. Worship services can be in the form of talks, meditation, stories, or communism; an adult can minister by being in charge or bringing the message.

Study can be along the lines of church doctrine, scripture, or church music. Other topics can be presented by community figures; a police officer can give an interesting and informative lecture on safety and laws; a psychologist can lead a discussion on teenage problems, or the obstacles confronting early marriages; a politician can discuss local politics; an authority can explain communism, its methods, goals, and fallacies; counselors for colleges or universities can

offer valuable information on courses offered for various occupations by their schools; even ministers from other denominations can give church youth groups a broader knowledge of the natue of God.

Service projects are always welcome wherever there is need, and there is always a need. The church lawn needs weeding and mowing, the walks would be attractive if they were edged, and the classrooms could use straightening. Supervising the nursery, making dolls or stuffed animals for the children's ward of the hospital, or putting on a puppet show for junior church are good social mixers, and can be just as much fun as a party—especially if there are refreshments.

Of course, recreation ideas are never lacking: progressive dinner (what about a police escort for the car caravan?—the food is on the house), swimming party and picnic, skating party, hayride (properly chaperoned), group attendance of concerts, special movies, or plays, or almost anything the kids might think of. Adult supervision at planning sessions is necessary in case some small details are forgotten, such as making reservations or seeing to it that transportation will be available; they ought to go along on the outing, too, to bring the can opener, and to take the responsibility for any broken bones. Besides that, adults can be a lot of fun.

This sounds like the ideal church youth group, and it is; but there isn't any reason why every youth group can't be ideal. It provides close contact between minister and parishioners, boys and girls, and adults and young people; it provides rich experiences of worship, study, service, and recreation; it keeps young people active developing wholesome attitudes, sound minds, physical fitness, and spiritual values. Thus, the church can offer a purpose for life, and a code by which to live that life.

The third step toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency is a united community endeavor. The citizens, old and young alike, should be informed as to the activities of the young people. Do they realize that many parents just dump their kids at the movies on Friday night, and leave them there? Have they seen young kids "goofing off" at the pool halls? Have they noticed a gang of fellows loafing on the street corners? They have probably been scared to death by hotrods dragging on the highway.

One thing leads to another, and eventually they are labeled as juvenile delinquents. But the public should be reminded that in the beginning they are not juvenile delinquents, they are just kids who haven't been given anything to do. They have literally been ditched; so without supervision they just do what comes naturally. Citizens should learn that teenagers are people, too; they have good heads and strong bodies. The community should insist on and support a program of cooperation among businessmen, civic groups, the police department, and schools to provide activities which are appealing to teenage interests.

Summer athletics are a good start. A baseball league could be formed of teams sponsored by various merchants, with men who really know baseball coaching the teams. A city baseball diamond, a good one, should be provided. The games should be publicized, and the public urged to attend. At the end of the season, a special presentation of awards for all stars and champions would boost the enthusiasm. Kids need to be recognized for their accomplishments.

Tennis, badminton, and swimming are other popular sports. A local park with a baseball diamond, good tennis courts, a clean swimming pool, and a picnic area would be 10 times worth the time and money put into it. (The problem of maintenance would easily be a solution to summer jobs for young people.) Vacant lots available for sandlot baseball, basketball, or football would satisfy the need for spontaneous action.

A drama club sponsored by a civic group could offer serious instruction in dramatics, makeup, costuming, and stage management. Major productions could be put on for the community; the profit from the plays could go for more and better equipment for the next play. Another group could sponsor a music program, including a band, orchestra, and choir. Not only would the participating young people learn and appreciate the finer arts, but the whole community would benefit from the cultural offerings of such a program. To supplement these efforts, symphony concerts, plays, musicals, or lectures by professionals could serve by offering student prizes or special student performances.

Because science is becoming so prominent and adults are afraid this younger generation won't meet the test, they might see that we do by promoting science clubs. Lectures by qualified scientists and actual supervised projects and experiments would whet a young appetite for further learning and education in that ever-important field.

Community endeavors such as these would go far in cutting down the rate of juvenile delinquency; it would produce better citizens, who in turn would work toward a better society. Remembering the experiences and opportunities they had as young people, they would have a keen interest in providing the same environment for the next generation. If the home, church, and community would sincerely be concerned about the problem as they profess, they could prevent juvenile delinquency instead of fighting it.

Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the current session of Congress a bill, H.R. 7291, providing for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Foreign Service Academy Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to establish and maintain a United States Foreign Service Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the instruction and training of foreign representatives of the United States Government.

(b) In carrying out his functions under this Act, the Secretary of State shall act in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense; however, primary responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the Academy shall be in the Secretary of State. In the event of disagreement betwen the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense with respect to any matter arising under this Act, such disagreement shall be resolved by the President.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of State shall determine the location of the Academy within the United States in the following manner:

(1) The Secretary of State shall establish immediately a Commission, and appoint five members thereof, to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the Academy. The Commission shall make its report to the Secretary as soon as practicable.

(2) The Secretary shall accept the unanimous decision for a permanent location by such Commission. In the event such recommendation is not unanimous, the Commission by a majority vote shall submit to the Secretary three sites from which the Secretary shall select one as the permanent location.

(b) Following the selection of a location for the Academy, the Secretary of State is authorized—

(1) to acquire land from other Government agencies without reimbursement, with the consent of such agencies,

(2) to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise;

(3) to prepare plans, specifications, and designs, to make surveys and to do all other preparatory work, by contract or otherwise, as he deems necessary or advisable in connection with the construction, equipping, and organization of the Academy at such location; and

(4) to construct and equip temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, at such location.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of providing temporary facilities and enabling early operation of the Academy, the Secretary of State is authorized to provide for the erection of the minimum additional number of temporary buildings and the modification of existing structures and facilities at an existing State Department installation and to provide for the proper functioning, equipping, maintaining, and repairing thereof; and to contract with civilian institutions for such operaton or instruction as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of State may appoint or assign such officers and civilian instructors as the needs of the Academy require. The Secretary of State and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, are authorized to enter into agreements whereby members of the faculties of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy may temporarily serve as members of the faculty of the United States Foreign Service Academy.

SEC. 6. The supervision and charge of the Academy shall be in the Department of State, under such officer or officers as the Secretary of State may appoint for or assign to that duty, and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

SEC. 7. In the operation of the Academy the Department of State shall work in conjunction with the Board of Trustees.

SEC. 8. (a) The Board of Trustees shall consist of—

(1) the Secretary of State;

(2) the Secretary of Defense;

(3) three educators of prominence appointed by the President;

(4) two Members of the United States Senate, of different political parties, one appointed by the President of the Senate, and one appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(5) two Members of the House of Representatives of different political parties, one appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) Members of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for four-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment.

(c) In the event of a vacancy on the Board caused by death, resignation, or failure of reelection of a member appointed from the Senate or House of Representatives, the

vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 9. (a) The authorized number of students to be appointed to the Academy each year shall be as follows:

(1) four students from each State, two nominated by each Senator from the State;

(2) two students from each congressional district, nominated by the Representative from the district;

(3) two students from Puerto Rico, nominated by its Resident Commissioner;

(4) three students from the District of Columbia, one nominated by each of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

(5) one student from each State, nominated by the Governor thereof; and

(6) fifty students from the United States at large—

(A) forty-eight nominated by the President; and

(B) two nominated by the Vice President.

(b) No person may be nominated under clauses (1) to (5), inclusive, of subsection (a), unless he is domiciled in the State, or in the congressional district from which he is nominated, or in the District of Columbia or Puerto Rico, if nominated from one of those places.

(c) If, as a result of redistricting a State, the domicile of a student, or a nominee, nominated by a Representative falls within a congressional district other than that from which he was nominated, he shall be charged to the district in which his domicile so falls. For this purpose, the number of students otherwise authorized for that district shall be increased to include him. However, the number as so increased shall be reduced by one if he fails to become a student at the Academy or when he is finally separated from the Academy.

SEC. 10. In order to permit an orderly increase in the number of students at the Academy during the period ending not more than four years after the entrance of the initial class at the Academy, the Board of Trustees may limit the number of students appointed each year during such period.

SEC. 11. The Academy shall operate as a coeducational institution. No person shall be appointed to the Academy unless he shall have passed such physical and mental examinations as the Secretary of State shall prescribe. Such examinations, which shall be designed to measure physical condition, scholastic aptitude, and leadership qualities, shall be given annually in each State, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, at such time and in such manner as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 12. The students at the Academy shall receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point.

SEC. 13. The Secretary of State shall prescribe a five-year course of instruction and training for students at the Academy. The curriculum for the first four years shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of the degree of bachelor of arts. The curriculum for the fifth year shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of the degree of master of arts. In prescribing the course of instruction and training, the Secretary of State shall require instruction in three basic foreign languages, the history, culture, and customs of the nations in which students may serve, extensive United States history and governmental processes, psychological warfare, including Communist propaganda techniques, survival in jungle and remote areas, and military strategy in relation to diplomacy. Upon satisfactory completion of the first four years of the prescribed course of instruction and training, students shall be granted the degree of bachelor of arts, and upon satisfactory completion of the fifth year, students shall be granted the degree of master of arts.

SEC. 14. (a) The course of instruction and training at the Academy shall, during each year of its operation, be organized as follows:

(1) the months of September to May, inclusive, shall be devoted to classroom instruction of students at the Academy;

(2) the period from June 1 to June 30, inclusive, shall be devoted to annual leave for all students;

(3) the months of July to August, inclusive, shall be devoted to practical field training for students at the Academy.

(b) Such field training shall consist of service in positions under appropriate departments of the Government, whether within or outside the United States, by students assigned thereto by a faculty board on field training, with the approval of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 15. Each student selected for admission to the Academy shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated, he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction and training at the Academy; and

(2) accept an appointment and serve, as an officer or employee of the United States, in any position for which he qualified by reason of his special training at the Academy, for at least the five years immediately following his completion of the course of instruction and training at the Academy.

SEC. 16. (a) Each graduate of the Academy shall be available for appointment as an officer or employee of the United States, in any position for which he is qualified by reason of his special training at the Academy, in accordance with the following priorities:

(1) the Department of State;
(2) the Department of Defense;
(3) the Department of Commerce;
(4) the Department of Agriculture;
(5) the Department of the Treasury; and
(6) any other department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of State may, notwithstanding any provision of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, appoint a graduate of the Academy as an officer in the Foreign Service of the United States.

SEC. 17. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The United States Foreign Service Academy shall have power to acquire and hold real and personal property and may receive and accept gifts, donations, and trusts.

Mr. Speaker, at its national convention held last June in Atlanta, Ga., the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution favoring the creation of a Foreign Service Academy. Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Whereas the ultimate future of the world, whether it is to be composed of democratic free societies or communistic slave states, will not be decided on battlefields but rather in the minds of men; and

Whereas dedicated, well-trained agents are working for the Communist cause all over the world; and

Whereas there is a definite need for qualified career diplomats and personnel who are proficient in language, customs, and history of the country to which they are assigned to represent the best interest of our country; and

Whereas this need can be resolved by establishing an educational program to prepare Americans for effective service to foreign lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, assembled this 21st day of June 1961, in Atlanta, Ga., urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation encouraging the establishment of schools of foreign service in our colleges and universities and/or the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy.

Great Western Sugar Sales Top Last Year, but Competition Very Keen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a Dow-Jones teletype flash regarding the sugar situation which I feel presents a matter of grave importance to the agricultural economy and security of our Nation.

We depend upon sugar not only for food for our citizens and Armed Forces, but also for the manufacture of munitions.

I believe that is of such importance that every Member of Congress should be alerted to the difficulties facing us in the production of an adequate sugar supply, as well as some of the possible solutions. I, therefore, call to your attention the following teletype presenting the views of the present of the Great Western Sugar Co., Mr. Frank Kemp, who is one of the leading authorities of sugar in the United States and in the world:

GREAT WESTERN SUGAR—SUGAR SALES TOP LAST YEAR BUT COMPETITION VERY KEEN

DENVER.—"Great Western Sugar Co., is selling more beet sugar this year than in 1960. But the market is about as competitive as I've every known it to be," Frank A. Kemp, president, told Dow-Jones.

"I think the competitive situation is inherent in these large crops," Mr. Kemp said, "and the competitive market conditions will continue."

Though he declined to estimate sales and earnings Mr. Kemp noted that Great Western Sugar's production from its sugar beet crop harvested in the fall of 1960 was the largest in its history as a result of a record yield of 5,560 pounds of sugar per acre.

"We produced something over 25 percent of the beet sugar in the country," Mr. Kemp said.

"Great Western Sugar has 13 or 14 percent more acreage planted this year," Mr. Kemp said, but he noted "we've had a kind of difficult spring; a lot of hail in some areas and the crop hasn't progressed as well as the marvelous 1960 crop.

"Drought conditions in some areas are affecting contract beetgrowers," he said.

In the fiscal year ended last February 28, Great Western Sugar earned $6,071,990 or $2.79. A common share on revenues of $104,606,546.

This compared with $5,933,779 or $2.71 a share on revenues of $107,255,900 in fiscal 1960.

"Long-term prospects for the domestic beet industry depend in part on the final form of a new sugar act which it was hoped Congress would begin considering this year," the Great Western Sugar official said.

A 1960 amendment to the Sugar Act of 1948 has eliminated the Cuban sugar quota and American cane sugar refiners now are buying from other foreign suppliers under quotas allotted by the Government.

Shortly after the amendment acreage restrictions on sugar beet crops in the United States were lifted leading to increased production and price cutting.

"The trouble with this is that coupled with the uncertainty of the Cuban political situation it precludes long-range planning by the domestic industry," the Great Western Sugar Co. president stated.

"Both the beet and cane sugar industries earnestly hoped that the Congress would pass long-term sugar legislation this year," Mr. Kemp said. Instead the act was extended to March 31, 1962.

"Another new development is a surge of interest in sugar beets among farmers who had grown none before," Mr. Kemp said. The Great Western Sugar officials cited groups in three areas of west Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Maine, all demanding the right to get into the beet business.

"This may make writing of long-term legislation a little more difficult," Mr. Kemp added.

Hold Your Wallets, Here We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from that great Chicago newspaper, the Chicago Daily Tribune, on August 3, 1961, and entitled, "Hold Your Wallets, Here We Go," is certainly indicative of many of the ills of the United States today.

I commend it to the attention of all of the Members of Congress:

HOLD YOUR WALLETS, HERE WE GO

The extravagance of Congress has gone beyond the bounds of reason, let alone justification. The panicky reaction to the word "crisis" has loosed a barrage of appropriations in the hope, perhaps, that a few dollar bills will flutter down where they will be useful.

Look at what happened in a few hours on Tuesday:

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a $46.8 billion defense bill which included $753 million for long-range bombers the White House didn't even request.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee approved, by a landslide vote, the administration's long-term foreign aid program, which Senator BYRD says will ultimately cost $40 billion.

On the Senate floor the crisis was fought by resisting efforts to trim a $5.1 billion appropriation for welfare and labor programs.

This $5.1 billion hasn't the remotest connection with Berlin, but is nevertheless $297 million more than the administration asked for. The Senators who wanted to trim it had the unexpected support of Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, but even so they failed.

The fear in Washington no longer seems to be that Mr. Kennedy will spend too much, but rather that he will spend too little. The fiscal year 1962 is barely a month old and already the anticipated spending for the year amounts to a peacetime record of $88.5 billion. This is $7.6 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower's budget estimate in January, and herein lies another record. Never has actual spending run this far ahead of the budget—and there is still 11 months to go.

Instead of the small surplus expected in the Eisenhower budget, we now face an expected deficit of at least $6 billion.

After his inauguration, Mr. Kennedy succeeded in bolstering confidence in the dollar by proclaiming his belief in fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. Does he still believe in these things? If so, will he veto any of this spending? We doubt it because, for the most part, it carries out the domestic spending program to which he committed himself when he was not thinking of confidence in the dollar.

The administration and Congress must share the blame for rushing faster toward a deficit than any preceding administration and for a flagrant disregard of the budget. Until there is an end to this uncontrolled mania for spending, there will be little rest for the taxpayer and little hope for sound money or a sound economy.

Public Lines Are Best Deal on Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Central Valley project in California has operated for more than 15 years to the benefit of the people of the United States—the power users in public agencies and the power users in private agencies. In almost the first 15 years, through a system of Federal transmission lines, the Government has been able to distribute power to load centers without having to pay excessive tolls. The Congress has before it a request for funds to contract additional lines which would bring additional Central Valley project power to the California load centers. Private power companies are attempting to strike these appropriations for lines which have been so successful since the Central Valley project went into operation.

I am enclosing an editorial from the Sacramento Bee, of July 22, which explains the problem. Departmental witnesses have testified that the Federal Government would benefit financially if the lines are constructed by the Federal Government; conversely, the people of the United States would suffer if the request for these lines is not granted.

PUBLIC LINES ARE BEST DEAL ON PUBLIC POWER

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co., thwarted last year in its efforts to get the power generation concession at the Federal Government's Trinity Dam, now is attempting to convince Congress it should be given the right to transmit the electric energy.

Determined to go to great lengths to keep public power off the market, the company has made a rather enticing offer to the Bureau of Reclamation.

But neither Congress nor the people in general should be deceived. It still is a bad deal for the public and this fact was brought out convincingly by Federal officials in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations.

Floyd E. Dominy, Federal Reclamation Commissioner under this and the preceding Eisenhower administration, said it would be poor economics for the Government and the public to farm out the transmission of Trinity power to the PGE.

He said that by building its own transmission facilities the Government would save between $22 million and $27 million over the cost of renting PGE lines during the 50-year payout period.

But more important is the fact that, with the PGE wheeling the energy to the market places, public agencies which under the law have preference in buying the low priced Government power might be blocked out and this could result in the customers paying many millions of dollars more for their electricity.

It would have been wrong in principle for the Government to expend tens of millions of dollars to build the Trinity Dam and then allow a privately owned utility in effect to sit at the cash register by generating power from the water thus stored.

It would be doubly wrong in principle for the Government to build both the dam and the powerhouses and then have the PGE in effect operate a toll gate on the distribution of the energy.

The rivers belong to the people and it is the people's money which goes into developing the hydroprojects. The people then should derive the maximum benefits from these undertakings and this can be achieved only by having the Government generate and transmit the electricity.

And in addition to this palpably right principle is the fact that to do so is more profitable for the Government and the consumers.

A Plea for Proper Administration of Foreign Aid Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker at every sesssion of the Congress, appropriations are requested and granted for foreign aid programs to particularly assist what we popularly term "underdeveloped" countries. I have just received a letter which sets forth particularly well the feeling of so many Americans that such foreign aid is not winning friends for us in the countries to which we are offering our aid and friendship, and that the job we intend to do through such appropriations is not being done. I believe it is imperative that we receive from the agencies administering such funds assurances that the situation described in this letter can be and will be corrected, quickly and drastically, so that the planned programs may proceed without the possibility that the funds now being voted will be wasted in a manner so graphically described in the following letter:

GRAN HOTEL BOLIVAR,
Lima, Peru.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I have been in Peru for the last 3 weeks and because I speak Spanish I am able to converse with "the man on the street"—tax drivers, waitresses, guides, trainmen, etc. I am alarmed at the attitude (which is consistent among the

middle class people) toward the United States.

(1) I have been told so many times that the United States sent food to Peru for the starving people—but that the food was not given to the people but sold to them by the politicians here.

(2) I am told that $200 million has been appropriated for housing—but the housing has never been built.

Are these things true? Why don't we send a commission with the money to see that the work is carried out? Why don't we send a commission to see that the food is given to the people?

The Germans are building some hospitals here now, but they have a commission of Germans here who are superintending the building, paying the workmen, etc.

The average Peruvian says to me, "I don't want communism, but I can't see any other way to feed my children, get a home, etc."

This situation of all the money in the hands of a few families or politicians is forcing the people toward communism. I heard a Communist delegation addressing a group of farmers in Cuzco last week, and, of course, Castro is their hero.

The United States of America has become a joke because a man like Castro can shake his fist and we capitulate. We are going to lose South America to Khrushchev if we don't "get on the ball" and help the poor people, not the rich people.

I spent 16 days in the Soviet last year, and during this time I met several American professors who were traveling or studying in the U.S.S.R. and it was gratifying to see how these mature, educated, and well-informed men could defend the American system and tear down the Soviet system. Why can't we send our professors to these countries so they can talk with the people and turn them away from communism? Believe me, the situation is serious and frightening.

Cordially,

MRS. RUTH QUINN ARMSTRONG.

Hellenic University of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Boston, in which my district is located, whose citizens I am privileged to represent—has been respectfully and rightfully described as the "Athens of America."

The dedication of its residents to things cultural, traditional, and tasteful is world renowned. Their intense dedication has always been in the magnificent tradition of Hellenic civilization.

It is only fitting, therefore, that the Greek community of America is planning to establish in Boston—their great endowment of culture in the beautiful and practical form of a university to be called the Hellenic University of America.

A cherished friend of mine, His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America has provided the inspiring leadership so necessary to such a challenging venture.

The lay leadership for this unique Greek-American University has also been provided by a dynamic friend of mine, Judge John C. Pappas, whose vigor has sparked the efforts for the all-important fund raising campaign.

At a recent function honoring His Eminence, this dedicated spiritual leader delineated to his people the theme of Hellenic Christian education as the symbol of Greek tradition and ideals, and spoke of the "struggle for the survival of Hellenic Christian civilization until the very end."

With great pleasure, I include in my remarks the eloquent and inspiring and memorable address of Archbishop Iakovos delivered at Brookline, Mass., Saturday, June 24, 1961:

ADDRESS GIVEN AT BANQUET BY HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1961, BROOKLINE, MASS.

This evening we are not participating in an ordinary banquet. This is not the usual testimonial dinner, for it does not commemorate an anniversary or the termination of one's faithful service. We did not gather here this evening to praise anyone's achievements, nor to give encouragement and support to one who begins a new endeavor.

It is true, however, that those who organized this banquet graciously selected this occasion in order to convey to me an uplifting expression of moral support and spiritual encouragement. For this reason, I express to all of you my sincere gratitude. This banquet, however, is actually being given in behalf of education.

This fact does not greatly alter the essence of my first observation. For I recognize that education cannot possibly exist without people. It cannot stand alone. Education cannot be considered apart from its great donors and patrons—apart from those individuals who are devoted to its ideals—from teachers and students—from the guardians and trustees of institutions of learning. Consequently, this banquet should be given in honor of the dean, the professors, the trustees, and the students of our school—but, certainly not in my honor.

I do not desire to feign humility, but prefer to think that I am adhering to the ethical principles which should exist in our society and by which one should live. When it was suggested some time ago that this dinner be given in my honor, I did not object for two reasons. Without comment I accepted, first, out of respect for the trustees of the school and, second, in order to pay a tribute, long overdue but much deserved, to all those among you who have worked and are now working in behalf of education and culture. From this moment on, the banquet of this evening is in your honor.

We have not given you any recognition for all the work that you have done during the past 25 years for the benefit of our theological school. You have heard a few "thank you's"—but also how many bitter words. And this has happened because you have loved the school, because you have labored, because you have given, some from your abundance and others even from your deficit. And because you have loved the school, each of you has cultivated certain dreams about it. You visualized our school as a dynamic institution, as a serious academic plant of university stature. You expressed these dreams with faith—you made them the subject of discussion—and you have sacrificed time and money while talking and working for the school. At the same time, those who had not accomplished anything worthwhile or great in their life, came forward to slander you, to spread suspicion and to attempt a systematic attack against you. I warmly thank them, however, because they have swiftly awakened that spirit in our people which has raised the subject of education to the level of a sacred undertaking—worthy of sacrifice—and not one which leads uninformed individuals into fruitless conversations filled with prejudices.

Today, all of our people speak of the school and most of our people want to make the school an institution of academic excellence. There are many among us who are determined to see our school become the nucleus of a university, because they recognize that such a spiritual creation will be a fitting climax of their endeavors and the glorious justification of their struggle in America. Our people deserve just such a justification. Because our people are great in spirit and achievements.

Fortunately, our people are working—they are not victims of discussions. Our people are progressing—they do not waste their time in useless arguments. They give generously and eagerly—they do not restrict themselves to giving advice. They renounce and oppose negative criticism, a practice so ardently fostered by those who make up our living negative opposition.

I offer you these assurances as the responsible ecclesiastical and spiritual leader of our church, after an analytical study of the observations which I have made after visiting more than 300 of the total number of our communities, that are spread out from Canada to South America. The archdiocese expresses to you its deepest gratitude because you have always stood in the first line—the front line of responsibility toward the new generation and toward the generations to follow. You have stood bravely and proudly as standard bearers and defenders of our great ethnic and religious traditions and ideals. Our great traditions and the holy ideals of our role in our church will comprise the balance of my remarks to you this evening. Our ethnic traditions are principally two: excellence and culture. Excellence, not in a nebulous sense, but as a continuous effort toward progressive development and perfection of the individual.

The ideals of our religion on the other hand are also dual: The fulfillment of our moral and spiritual personality in intimate union with Christ, and the willingness to give freely—even to sacrifice—according to the example of our Saviour, for the survival and continuation of our threatened spiritual and moral precepts.

Basically our traditions and our ideals grew out of the history of Hellenism, a history which has recorded the internal and external struggles which have had as their goal the victory of light over darkness and of good over evil. The life of a man or the history of a nation which has not developed along such a line of struggle, is unworthy of anyone's consideration. Our history makes up a significant part of the history of our race. And this history shall always be a struggle for the survival of Hellenic Christian civilization until the very end. In this struggle we shall not be victimized by the defeatism of a few, nor by the negative attitude of others, we shall not be stopped by the preaching of those who foresee a rapid amalgamation, nor by the cries of the worshipers of so-called practical logic. They refer to the idea of the university—and yet, they have never given even $1 for the growth or for the maintenance of our established afternoon or day schools.

And since our traditions and ideals are not merely empty words, but actually make up our very history and life—for which we are ready to fight in order to preserve it undefiled—for this reason we officially declare, on this occasion, that Hellenic Christian education is the symbol of our endeavor. The ultimate goal of our efforts shall be the university—the climax of the programed growth and development of our school.

The creation of the college is a decision of the trustees and the faculty, and it shall be realized—in spite of the studies being

made by certain individuals, who in their great concern for us, are trying to determine whether proper authority has approved this step.

This year the theological school embarks upon a program of reorganization of its curriculum and faculty. With the currently available prerequisites for the fulfillment of this program, we will be able to have, within 5 years, two schools: a college of liberal arts and sciences, and the School of Theology. To this goal, I formally commit myself this evening. I am determined, with the help of the Almighty, to climb this difficult road if need be alone. I do not suggest that I am courageous or heroic. I wish to offer this assurance of my determination. I make this declaration fully aware of the responsibilities, which it implies. Of course, there is a vital need for your cooperation; and, I know that I shall have it, because I seek it in behalf of our beloved school.

An awesome obstacle on our road forward, however, is the current debt $435,000. Together we shall move aside this great roadblock, for I see your hands ready to join with mine in this great endeavor.

Tonight's banquet will be followed by 10 other similar functions, which will be held in the metropolitan centers and the largest communities of the archdiocese; such as Chicago, Pittsburgh, Washington, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Cleveland, Montreal, Toronto, New York, and Detroit. They will be held between now and October 29, when I shall prepare to depart for my trip to India. I would not want to leave the United States, however, before the entire debt of the school is paid; $350,000 of the $435,000 must be paid by September 1. I feel certain, therefore, that you can well imagine the pressure under which I find myself. But, my hope is in God, Who loves those who labor for good. And permit me to number you among those who love God.

I shall journey to India as chairman of our delegation to the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches. The delegation is composed of the Most Rev. Metropolitan Athenagoras of Elaia, the Rev. Fathers Georges Florovsky and George Bacopulos, Mr. Peter Kourides representing the laity, and John Demakis, a graduate medical student from Chicago, representing GOYA. I shall also have the honor to preside over the policy and reference committee of the general assembly. This committee traditionally carries the most serious responsibilities of all committees in the general assembly. I want to assure you that my dual role of president and archbishop has never flattered me. I grew in the service of the church, both here in America and in Switzerland, and I realize the responsibilities, obligations, and sacrifices necessary, if these high offices are to have content and prestige. I did not include in this reference to my responsibilities the obligation of silence, fortitude and spiritual endurance, so, imperative to an archbishop and to a president, so that he may hear all, and especially his so-called friends, who expect him to be enterprising, positive, iron-fisted, radical, remolder and revolutionizer of everything—and of course, from the very first week of his tenure of duty.

In the service of Christ, His Church, unity, ecumenicity, education, society or the people in general—one succeeds, when he is patient, and harkens to the voice of duty, and to the voice of God. The unity of the churches, the subject of international peace, the restoration of society, the education of all in Christ, the salvation of even one soul, are all sacred causes for which one must be ready and eager to offer his own soul. Without such an offering, without sacrifice, nothing can be accomplished. This example and lesson was clearly given to us by God, through His sacrifice of His only-begotten Son.

You may ask: Why should I say these things to you, this evening? I merely wish to emphasize that neither the union of churches—one of the growing concerns for which I shall travel to New Delhi, in behalf of our Ecumenical Patriarchate—nor the designation of our church as one of the major faiths in America—nor the academic maturity of our school, shall succeed, when the element of regular and unceasing sacrifice is lacking in our life.

And now, permit me to return to the banquet. My friends: I raise my glass in your honor, and to your health. I invite you to raise your glasses, and ask that you repeat the beautiful toast of David: "The Lord is my shepherd I shall not want; He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside still waters; * * * though I walk in the shadow of death I shall fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me; my cup runneth over, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

Live your life to its fullest extent in the Lord, dearly beloved, and be drunk from the cup of divine blessings—of divine grace—of divine love—and of your personal sacrifices in behalf of Hellenic Christian culture. May our college—our school—and the kindling of the first torch that will light the way toward the much desired university—comprise the glorious crowning of your struggles and sacrifices and the fulfillment of your true joy in Christ Jesus.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to include in my remarks the commencement address by the Very Reverend John Papadopoulos, the now retired dean of the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, in Brookline, Mass., on Sunday, June 25, 1961.

In his brief speech the former dean announces the start of standard collegiate classes and programs of university form and character next September at the theological school as a "resplendent symbol of gratitude of the Greek Orthodox people of America to their adopted country."

The dean also outlines the great classical education which students at the Hellenic University of America will receive.

The dean's address follows:

THE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE VERY REVEREND JOHN PAPADOPOULOS, DEAN OF THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CROSS IN BROOKLINE, MASS., ON SUNDAY, JUNE, 25, 1961

Your Eminence, Your Excellency, Your Graces, fellow colleagues, members of the graduating class, students, and ladies and gentlemen, on this important day of commencement which climaxes the 1960–61 academic year I am pleased to inform you of a most important decision reached by the house of trustees at its most recent meeting. This decision has set in motion plans to complement our theological school with a standard type college which will begin functioning this September and be completed in 4 years. The theological school will sustain a 3-year program of studies, and by 1965 acquire a graduate department for specializing in various theological fields. The college and the theological school will constitute regular university schools, and upon their foundation the holy archdiocese, in cooperation with the Hellenic University Foundation, will make every effort to acquire another school and thus will be the kernel of the Hellenic University of America.

This reality, which His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos has cultivated with deep insight since the first day of his enthronement, and whose program was formulated by committees of professors from the theological school and other distinguished institutions of learning, is the subject matter of this day on this auspicious occasion of commencement. Therefore, upon the 24th anniversary of Holy Cross Theological School which we observe today, the school appears before you with programs of university form and character. Twenty-four years of development for a spiritual institution are not much in comparison with the history of world-renown institutions of similar character, many of whom are our neighbors here in New England.

As you know, there have been numerous pronouncements made in Boston, and here on the spacious grounds of our theological school concerning the establishment of the Hellenic University of America. This is not a matter of vague daydreaming, but of concrete plans which are a necessity for the future of Greek Orthodoxy in America, and which should be made a reality in the near future of Greek orthodoxy in America, and tinent as a resplendent symbol of gratitude of the Greek orthodox people of America to their adopted country.

Multibranched and fruitful trees spring from tiny seeds. The seed of the future Hellenic University is to be found in the aforementioned college for Greek classical studies. Greek philosophy and the tripartite Greek civilization, as well as by the theological school for the study of Greek orthodox theology.

In its kind, with regard to its organization, its educational system and purposes, the college of the theological school will be similar to the American 4-year colleges of liberal arts. However, in its fullness, the college of the theological school will be cui generis, for it will have its own character in regards to Hellenic studies and Hellenic values and generally in regards to the Greco-Christian understanding of life.

For this reason the students in the college of the theological school will not take four or less courses only, as in American colleges, but six or seven. Besides this, apart from the required courses of Greek and English, in which the college courses will be taught, Russian, Spanish and French will be offered as electives. It is a fact that he who knows foreign languages renders himself more valuable and useful. Generally speaking, a classical education, which will be offered by the college of the theological school, is that which, according to the recent meeting at Hamburg, Germany, of the ministers of education of Europe, "creates better characters and good citizens, educated in the absolute principles of freedom, of democracy and human dignity." Therefore the value of a classical education for our youth is generally a real attested fact, and especially in the case of those who offer themselves to the service of the church and society.

Thus, after 4 years of study, during which the students of the college will have the opportunity, as well as the obligation, to take courses within a 4-year cycle of a classical program, as well as all the basic and specialized courses, they will receive a bachelor of arts degree.

It is understandable that, in order for this college to have satisfactory results, and indeed in view of the fact that the theological school will be accepting those who wish to serve the Greek Orthodox Church, not only as priests, but also as servants of its other spiritual and administrative branches, it is necessary that the choice of candidates for the college be made with strict criteria. Not all should be accepted who simply have a high school diploma, but only those who show proven signs of being endowed with qualities of both intellectual and ethical merit.

It is a constitutional need, in order that the theological school solve many of its basic problems, that those who register for study be distinguished as the choicest amongst the choice, for their love of study,

but above all for their mental and moral stability.

Graduates of the college matriculating in the theological school and destined for the highest office of the priesthood, will not be studying theology in order to exercise the profession of priesthood, but in order to fulfill a divine mission, as representatives of Christ or indeed of the God-man Christ Himself, whom every priest should obviously imitate in word and deed.

At all times, and especially today, in this confused age of social upheaval, when rational people desire to approach God, the church needs priests aflame with God-like zeal and dedication to the duties of their sacred mission; men who, according to St. John Chrysostom, should examine the weakness of his soul before taking upon himself the burden of his responsibilities toward God, toward the church and toward society. So much for the college.

Our theological school was founded in 1937 as a preparatory school destined to offer a 2-year course in Greek studies to those of our younger generation who wished to attend the University of Athens for theological studies. However, the advent of World War II forced the school to develop its potential first into a 5- and then into a 6-year course of study. With this program, which is still in effect, the theological school realized the goals for which it was founded. However, many of its graduates, for purposes of higher study and specialization find it necessary to matriculate in American, Greek and European universities, some of them while already ordained and others before ordination.

With the new program the theological school will not only meet the need imposed upon it for the complete preparation of our clergy but will also be projected, as it should, among international theological circles as the only Greek Orthodox university school in America. After the completion in 1965 of the first cycle of its 3-year university program at which time the graduate department will be founded, the school, without doubt, as was emphasized by the distinguished professor of the University of Athens, Dr. Constantine Bonis, who studied our situation 2 years ago, will become renowned among orthodox and nonorthodox alike.

Thus after a 4-year course the graduate will receive a bachelor of theology, and those who complete special studies in the graduate department will receive the degree of master of sacred theology. The theological school even today has a right to grant these two theological degrees. However, when its university status is recognized it will also be able to grant the degree of doctor of sacred theology as well as the honorary degree of doctor of divinity.

Today, upon the termination of the school year 1960–61, 14 are graduating from our theological school. Of the 14, 7 will be ordained in the near future, and the other 7 will continue in higher studies for 1 or 2 years at various universities.

Thus the total number of graduates of the theological school after 24 years of operation is increased to 263. Of these 263 graduates 223 have been ordained and are serving our holy archdiocese as priests in various communities. Besides the graduates continuing their education at American universities, six of them have been studying at the University of Athens and are now returning with degrees of that school. Two others are studying at the Halki Theological School in Constantinople, another two are at Bossey University in Geneva for ecumenical studies, and another two at Boston University. Upon the completion of their studies they will serve the archdiocese.

In bringing this address to an end I take the opportunity to report many thanks to all who this year have supported in many ways the theological school, especially all of you who have honored this modest occasion with your presence. I thank you.

Leaders the Key, Says Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of this morning's New York Herald Tribune, an interesting article by Earl Mazo appears under the headline, "Leaders the Key, Says Ike."

The story comments on the outstanding speech made by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, during the consideration by the House of the Defense Appropriations Act for 1962. Former President Eisenhower has made some very interesting and worthwhile comments on the Laird speech.

Mr. Mazo's column follows:

LEADERS THE KEY, SAYS IKE

(By Earl Mazo)

WASHINGTON, August 2.—Former President Eisenhower says that no increase in the military budget will assure an adequate defense if the Nation's top leadership lacks the will and understanding to act, when necessary.

His views were expressed in a recent letter to Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, following a speech by the Congressman which was somewhat critical of President Kennedy's performance.

"Dear MEL," wrote the former President, "I have read your discussion, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the philosophy—and some of the history—of our security effort."

"I particularly like your insistence that the greatest single factor in the kind of struggle in which we are now engaged is the maintenance of the will and determination to do whatever is necessary to defend ourselves and preserve our rights," he continued.

"Without this will, spirit, and understanding, the United States would in the long run be defenseless even though we should double our expenditures for weapons of war."

Representative LAIRD, in his speech, had declared that during the last decade or so "the Soviets wanted to decoy our vision by dramatizing one or two dangers, so we would forget other dangers and react in a way which would open our flanks—our military, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual flanks."

The Eisenhower administration "fell into none of these traps," he continued, "and I want the new administration to avoid them."

Representative LAIRD wondered, however, about the Kennedy administration's "will" and "understanding," on the basis of its record to date.

CITES CUBA DEBACLE

"We have but to point to the debacle in Cuba and our back off in Laos to show there were strong statements made by the President about how we would resist Communist aggression, but there was no action to back up these strong statements," he said.

"Strong statements are now being made on Berlin," he added, "will these statements cause us to blunder into war?"

The Wisconsin Representative had high praise for General Eisenhower's record and scorn for his critics.

"The Eisenhower administration is the first administration which did not disarm America after a war"—but, instead, it made the United States "the strongest, best prepared nation on earth," he declared.

It is "shocking," he added, that some seek to discredit the Eisenhower record, especially since "among the discreditors are those who fiddled soothingly upon their violins of praise for the Truman administration, which ignored the dangers of communism and dismantled the finest conventional armies and the largest air and sea armadas in history."

Call Halt to Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this morning's column by Donald Rogers in the New York Herald Tribune points up the need for our administration acting constructively in putting aside certain kinds of spending for the balance of the current crisis. His statement that "the mightiest Nation on earth can't meet its military obligations on a global scale while spewing its substance down every liberal rathole with total abandon" is especially appropriate at this time.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the August 3 New York Herald Tribune:

CALL HALT TO SPENDING

(By Donald I. Rogers)

The spectacular record highs set by the stock market were not solely the result of the renewed determination to build-up the defense and military programs. Many, indeed a majority, of the biggest gainers were the stocks of corporations unrelated to defense, and thus are impervious to increased defense expenditures, except in a general way.

The sudden spurt in buying which sent stock prices through all previous records, results from a conviction on the part of investors that the economy is due to be stimulated beyond anything in recognizable history. Wall Street is convinced that there are not even any remnants of a recession and that a new boom is underway.

Professional traders were happy with the administration's pump-priming programs, when such programs were needed. Since the market always performs barometrically, based on what traders expect will happen in the future, it's obvious that they no longer see a need for domestic spending programs designed to create jobs and titillate the flow of capital.

For the first time, then, Wall Streeters are beginning to back away from administration policy. They cannot understand the President's reluctance to cut back on any of the civilian programs to accommodate the military demands of the international situation.

No one has raised a voice over the President's request to spend $3.5 billion in the arms buildup, though some may sigh sadly at the thought of how much the services have managed to waste of past appropriations.

But Mr. Kennedy's total increase in spending requests has come to $10 billion. Much

of this has no connection with defense. That which hasn't, should be given most careful scrutiny by Congress.

The economy is getting charged up and more than half of the depressed areas show significant gains in employment. Yet plans go merrily ahead to administer the hundreds of millions appropriated to alleviate the distress in these areas.

Higher farm program costs are forecast, despite the fact that farmers want less of a Government program and that the hungry Communist world is not in a position to export food so that golden opportunities exist to sell surplus stocks of our food.

Federal employees got another whopping raise last year, but the congressional hoppers are crammed with bills to give them new benefits and allowances, many with administration approval.

The President still stubbornly insists on a $6.1 billion education program even though the mythical nature of the school classroom and teacher shortage has now dawned on nearly every one. Also, from his near-empty Treasury, the President is strongly urging the use of $4.9 billion in loans and loan guarantees for his housing program.

The debts of our States and cities are a mere fraction of the Nation's $293 billion debt, but new aid to sewage facilities, housing, urban problems, juvenile delinquency, and almost anything else you can think of is either already on the books or Congress is under White House pressure to pass it.

Since this military crisis seems real, the President should change his spending habits and he should tell the public that he 's going to do so. Even the mightiest natio.. on earth can't meet its military obligations on a global scale while spewing its substance down every liberal rathole with total abandon.

The public opinion polls and the off-year elections show clearly that there is no great public demand for such spending. Quite the contrary. The demand all comes from the professional liberals who think Americans are bright enough to make more money than any other people, but too dumb to have any idea what to do with it after they get it. Of course, the rich liberals mostly inherited theirs, and the poor ones are nearly all on public payrolls.

It's not too late for President Kennedy to act constructively. Congress appropriates the money and in many cases it already has. This does not mean that the President must spend it. President Eisenhower refused to spend money for several programs that Congress had approved.

Without losing face, the President could announce that the crisis requires us to put aside such spending for social justice as those charity housing projects for $8,000-a-year pauper families.

He could stop pressing for more spending. His image wouldn't suffer a bit. Responsible citizens would respond warmly, should he demonstrate such a sense of proportion.

Needed: Doublechecking of Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, at long last I have confirmation that a foreign policy briefing session of the State Department last April for newspaper editors of the Nation did not succeed in brainwashing a good friend and highly admired editor in my congressional district. Walt Woodward, in his capacity as president of the Washington Newspaper Publishers' Association, Inc., came to the Nation's Capital in April with an open mind and a determination to get the facts.

I had a special interest because Mr. Woodward is editor of the Bainbridge Review, a weekly newspaper in the suburban district which I live when I am home.

An editorial in the July 26 issue of his paper gives the results of his appraisal of the foreign aid controversy. I can sum it up by quoting in part one of his own sentences:

We think it would be wise for the Congress to tie a "watchdog" clause to the foreign aid money we sincerely hope it will appropriate.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the full editorial at this point with my own comment that I, too, hope Congress will appropriate money for foreign aid but only with the doublecheck of a full annual review of the program by the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD OK, DOUBLECHECK FOREIGN AID

Rarely do we comment here about nonlocal matters. It is our feeling that you know as much about the outside world as we do, and that we generally have no better background than you do against which to frame an opinion.

However, we did have the unusual opportunity to participate in the Department of State's first foreign policy briefing session in April. Because of this we not only feel we can comment on the present congressional battle over the proposed foreign aid appropriation, but we also feel that we have a serious obligation to do so.

We feel that a well-managed program of foreign aid is essential to the continued existence of the free world. That means the continued existence of you and yours as free and independent citizens.

But it doesn't appear that the Congress feels this way about it. If a substantial foreign aid budget is approved, its supporters will have to fight for every dollar of it. Last week, both Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Treasury Dillon made unusual and personal appeals to every Member of the Congress in support of the President's foreign aid bill.

On that same day, however, the House and Senate had agreed to give the President every penny of his space race budget. Two days before, the House Rules Committee had voted to pigeonhole all Federal aid to education bills for the balance of the session. These two events spell trouble for foreign aid, in our opinion. On the one hand, Congress—excited by the scintillating prospects of men in space and men on the moon—couldn't dole out the money fast enough. On the other hand, it refused to spend money for education domestically; I shudder to think what will happen to money for foreign aid when some disappointed education enthusiasts start moaning about how we ought to spend our money to educate our own children.

Meanwhile, foreign aid is a subject which has lost the happy, hopeful connotations it once had. There are "The Ugly American" and "Yankee, Go Home" and the Cuban mess and the loss of Laos. There is a general belief by most citizens that Uncle Sam, after pouring out billions of his dollars, nevertheless is unpopular, if not hated, abroad.

Yet we say here that it is our opinion that a well-managed program of foreign aid is every bit as important as Federal funds for education at home and certainly is worth more than excited overspending in a mad race to catch up in space.

The key to our position is that the foreign aid program must be well managed. It is obvious to us that under both Truman and Eisenhower we wasted untold millions of dollars in a wild spending splurge in the name of foreign aid. It is not yet positive to us that the Kennedy administration will do better; we do think it has men in the Department of State who now see that our foreign aid money must be spent in specifically directed programs to help the people of those undeveloped nations which still are undecided in a world divided between forces of freedom and tyranny. We meant to capitalize "people" because we think that, in the past, many of our foreign aid dollars went to fatten some ruling dynasties.

We think a simple program of helping some oriental farmer to harvest a better crop of rice from his land is vastly more important than building a boondoggling superhighway through his paddies.

It occurs to us that the Congress, in the past, has not been bashful about creating "watchdog" committees to doublecheck on the funds it appropriates. Generally speaking, we are not much for the legislative branch monkeying with the administrative branch of Government. In this case, and in view of the past record and the present doubts, however, we think it would be wise for the Congress to tie a "watchdog" clause to the foreign aid money we sincerely hope it will appropriate.

We firmly believe Uncle Sam must continue to be banker for the free world. But that doesn't mean he should throw our dollars away.

The Hour Is Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the importance of recognizing the Communist menace we face. A constituent of mine eloquently analyzed this threat in an address delivered recently.

I include, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, the address by David Hackett, of Elwood, route 4, Tipton County, Ind., in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend to the attention of my colleagues this fine speech:

THE HOUR IS LATE

(By David Haskett)

In November of 1917 a small band of Communists seized control of the Russian state. In the short span of 44 years, the Communist bloc has grown to include one-third of the world's people and one-fourth of the world globe.

What is the driving force behind this growing power? How can the free world stop this sweeping tide? We must find the answer to these questions for the hour is late.

First, the motivating force of communism is devotion to an ideology—a fantastic ideology of world domination. Karl Marx, who has become the father of Communist philosophy predicted a global revolution and the overthrow of capitalists by the proletariats, or working class of people. A dictatorship would then be set up for the benefit of the

workers. Everything and everyone would work for the benefit of the state. Thus, according to Marx, the slogan of communism becomes "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Marx reasoned that after this ideal final stage of communism was achieved, there would no longer be a need for the state to exist because the state was an instrument by which the ruling class oppressed the classes who were exploited. Since no one would be exploited, the state would disappear.

Lenin internationalized Marx by pointing out that the dictatorship of the proletariat could only achieve socialism, and that the transition to communism could not come about until all nations came under the control of the Communist Party. Only then would the state wither away. Thus, the inevitable aim of communism must be world domination.

How are these aims being achieved? The Communist ideology is achieving great success through protracted conflict. Dr. Robert Strausze-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, described the Communist strategy to the House Committee on Un-American Activities as follows: "The strategy of protracted conflict prescribes the annihilation of the opponent by a long series of carefully calibrated operations, by feints and maneuvers, by psychological and economic warfare, and by diverse forms of violence. It encompasses all known forms of violent and nonviolent conflict techniques, and fuses them into a weapons spectrum which begins on the left with the seemingly most innocent political activities, such as secret distribution of leaflets, and terminates on the right of the spectrum with the megaton bomb."

Louis J. Halle in his book "Civilization and Foreign Policy," summarizes the ends and means of communism as follows: "Herein lies the heart of the Communist movement. Peace is to be achieved by means of war between social classes. Freedom is to be achieved by means of dictatorship. The withering away of the state is to be achieved by making the state omnipotent. Consent is to be achieved by force. The prevalence of love is to be achieved by the evocation of hatred. This contradiction of ends and means pervades the Communist movement and is basic for it." So you see, communism has an outdated and unreal purpose. It is pursuing a false ideology, yet it is growing.

But what is our purpose? We have no definite purpose. We don't know whether we are at peace or at war. The Communists know they are at war, and they are fighting that war. We are constantly defending ourselves against the Communist strategy to maintain our status quo, while Russia is on the offensive.

We must formulate a purpose based on clear understanding of our position. I believe firmly in the words of Chancellor Adenauer, of Germany, who said "Communism is a false ideology. But it is an ideology and can only be met with moral and spiritual weapons. A nation with an ideology is always on the offensive. A nation without an ideology is self-satisfied and dead."

The evidence is inescapable. When will we Americans begin to fight the ideological battle and make personal moral responsibility our national policy? Unfaithfulness in the home, perversion in high places and low, decadence in the arts, lawless youth, class war, race war, dishonesty—these must be wiped out and replaced by a clean, straight, and God-directed America. We must be able to feel our country is living the ideals we have always stood for. We must renew the pride of our forefathers—first in ourselves, and then in our country.

In conclusion, I have attempted to answer two questions. First: What is the driving force behind the Communist bloc? The Communist ideology sees a utopia in which all mankind enjoys perfect equality in a classless, stateless society. This society, they believe, can come about by world domination. This domination is being achieved through protracted conflict which is nibbling away the free world, while that part of the world stands confused with this type of warfare.

The second question was: How can the free world stop the sweeping tide of communism? First, we must become informed of the world situation. Second, we must formulate an ideology—an ideology of personal moral responsibility. We need a change of motives and character, a great cleansing and uniting force for the Nation.

We are losing world war III, the hour is late, but not too late to turn to the answer.

Harvard, MIT Payments Big Boon to Cambridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Boston Herald on July 30, 1961, by Joseph P. Sullivan. It shows Cambridge as a most interesting and historic city in which to live and work. The city fathers and officials are justly proud of their two outstanding universities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard. Their relationship is one of close harmony and cooperation.

The city management of Cambridge is a very well run stable government and we have within our confines the greatest scientific and best electronics center in the entire country.

The article also relates the viewpoint of one of our most outstanding mayors, Edward A. Crane, of Cambridge.

I feel that the following will be of interest to my fellow Members of Congress:

HARVARD, MIT PAYMENTS BIG BOON TO CAMBRIDGE

(By Joseph T. Sullivan)

Anyone who says a community must be tax starved when educational facilities constitute one-third of its total land space certainly couldn't have Cambridge in mind.

In this historic city, a canoe ride across the Charles River from Boston, such educational giants as Harvard and MIT, although exempt from paying taxes, do however get along fine with the public till.

POWERFUL FACTOR

It is a relationship unique perhaps to the entire Nation.

As a result, says Mayor Edward A. Crane, "they are a powerful contribution factor to our economy."

Briefly, the relationship works this way.

When MIT, for example, purchases an apartment building to house students or classrooms it agrees to pay the city the going tax rate on the property for the first year. During the next 20 years this payment, "in lieu of taxes," is reduced annually by 5 percent.

Harvard doesn't have the same agreement but does pay in lieu of taxes on its land—and this year, Mayor Crane noted, is also voluntarily paying on two student dormitory buildings.

With this money, plus tax payments from both institutions on their investment properties, Cambridge this year has collected $349,000 from MIT and $288,000 from Harvard.

The investment properties include, for example, the old Ford motor plant near Boston University Bridge which MIT leases to Polaroid and the Harvard-owned building which houses the Cambridge Trust Co.

FIFTEEN NEW STRUCTURES

Since World War II, MIT has added 15 structures with a total value of well over $22 million and has spent over $7 million in either building additions or acquiring new properties.

Since 1946 the institute has paid directly or indirectly to the city more than $4 million.

Having MIT and Harvard, not to omit Radcliffe, certainly pays off in many other ways for the city.

Harvard alone has an annual payroll of $84 million, a figure constantly reflected in store cash register sales throughout the city.

The total number of persons employed at both Harvard and MIT, running the gamut from faculty to janitors, is 20,000, although there are no figures immediately available to show how many actually live in the city.

When the Lever Bros. plant closed 2 years ago Mayor Crane points out in comparison that its payroll numbered only 500 persons.

The most spectacular evidence, however, of the cooperation between the city and its educational institutions is the much-heralded "Technology Square," a five-building complex which will cover 15 acres and provide 3,000 jobs, plus, of course, putting new property on the assessors' list.

TWENTY-MILLION-DOLLAR COMPLEX

Once the site of the old Lever Bros. complex and 5 acres of slums, the new venture represents a total investment of $20 million by MIT and Cabot, Cabot, and Forbes, real estate developers.

It will primarily offer space for industrial firms, particularly lab space and administrative offices.

And MIT will not establish a single one of its own educational facilities in the square thus making the eye-catching project the first of its kind in the Nation. For the first time an educational facility will have established a facility to provide for the city in which it exists.

That the project will contribute to the industrial vigor of the city is indeed an understatement.

The first two buildings of Technology Square are expected to be completed in January of 1963. Focal point of the project will be a magnificent 20-story central office building.

Cambridge also benefits in other ways from its educational fortresses, beside the quite obvious fact that because of MIT and Harvard, its reputation is known around the world.

A downtown business block left to Harvard by Daniel A. Buckley, Cambridge newspaperman and real estate operator who died in 1907, yields an annual income of $50 million.

FOR SCHOLARSHIPS

This money goes directly into a Harvard scholarship fund for the use, only, of graduates of the Cambridge public school system. It constitutes the second largest scholarship fund at the university.

No wonder Mayor Crane says, parodying a well-known business slogan, "education is our most important product."

In other factors as pinpointed by this Herald survey, another in a series of stories

on Massachusetts cities Cambridge shapes up this way:

SCHOOLS

The city is about to complete a 5-year school replacement program. In the fall it will open its fourth new elementary school during this span. Each costs an average of $2 million and houses kindergarten through eighth grades.

After regular school hours and during the summer three specially designed rooms in each school are used for recreational purposes.

On the recreation front, incidently, the city boasts of its $2 million "Living War Memorial," which comprises a gym, swimming pool, and stage, one of the best such facilities in the country.

The city's school building advisory committee is also planning another elementary school.

In handling its school population, Cambridge gets a tremendous assist from parochial schools within its boundaries.

Of the 18,000 school age children in the city 7,000 receive their education in parochial schools.

POPULATION DIP

Primarily because of the exodus to the suburbs population is presently pegged at 107,000, a drop of about 13,000 in 10 years.

Yet, Mayor Crane says, city planning in all areas from roads to fire department service must take into account a population of about 150,000, the difference being made up by the thousands of college students.

The population, based on 107,000, breaks down to about 23,000 per square mile giving Cambridge the densest population in the State, second only to people-packed Somerville, which has 25,000 residents per square mile. Cambridge is 6 square miles.

TAXES

The 1961 tax rate is $69.80, a hike of $1.20 over 1960. The increase is tantamount to money spent removing last winter's seemingly never-ending snowfall.

WELFARE

Three million five hundred thousand dollars was spent in this department last year representing 20 percent of the city's budget. About 75 percent is reimbursed by the State and Federal Government.

Yet, Mayor Crane feels strongly that more funds should be forthcoming from the Federal Government.

Welfare, he contends, should be considered as an area or regional problem because in many instances the community involved is not responsible for the majority of cases on its relief rolls.

Can Cambridge, he says, be blamed when a firm in another town or city closes down and many of the unemployed move to the city seeking low rents?

DEVELOPMENT

Urban redevelopment

Besides the clearance of 5 acres for "technology square" the city is planning a 107-acre project in the Houghton area which is bounded by Western Avenue, Memorial Drive, McCarthy Road, Cowperthwaite Street, DeWolfe Street, and Massachusetts Avenue bordering on the Central Square Common. Possibilities for the area include new housing, a school, and a play area.

Two acres have already been cleared overlooking Harvard Stadium for 77 apartments of middle income housing, and projects in two other locations have bogged down because of inner belt delay.

Inner belt

To date only the Boston sections of the $150 million Inner Belt Highway have been laid out on the planning board. The Brookline, Cambridge, and Somerville sections are still up in the air.

According to a recent DPW estimate, the belt, even if Federal funds are granted, is still a minimum of 7 to 10 years away.

The city already has used its right, granted by the State legislature, to veto the inner belt from coming into the city.

If this veto power stands, says Mayor Crane, greater Boston's highway program is stagnated.

The mayor has little use for the veto power. "After all," he contends, "how, in effect, can a route be vetoed when it actually hasn't been proposed?"

INDUSTRY

"They talk about the textile industry leaving Lowell and New Bedford," says the mayor, "but it must be remembered that many soap, confectionery, and baking companies pulled up their stakes here.

"But, we're not going to the weeping wall."

Today, he said, what with the influence of MIT and Harvard, "we are in transition. We are becoming an electronics center."

Every missile that was put up by the Government, he points out, had at least one part made in Cambridge.

He said that even in this transition stage Cambridge has been able to add a net increase of $5 million to the tax rolls each year since 1945 and that valuations now total $242 million.

"This is a damn healthy economic climate for investment," he said.

And in view of the city's bright future, through the prime cooperation of MIT and Harvard, he can even consider himself, as he said, a "content mayor."

So content, in fact, that he'll seek reelection in November.

Outstanding Representative Public Service Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relative to the citation presented by the distinguished Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, to the retiring Chief of the U.S. Secret Service, Mr. U. E. Baughman, and to the other members of the Secret Service. The scroll presentation to the members was presented to Mr. James J. Rowley, the new incoming Chief.

There being no objection, the statement and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE
FOR A REPRESENTATIVE CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

On August 3, 1961, here in the Capitol, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, on behalf of the National Committee for a Representative Congress, presented the committee's Outstanding Representative Public Service Awards to members of the U.S. Secret Service and to the retiring Chief, Mr. U. E. Baughman. The scroll presentation to the members was presented to Mr. James J. Rowley, the new incoming chief. Other officials of the Secret Service present at the ceremony were Paul J. Paterni, Deputy Chief, Edgar A. Wildy, Assistant Chief, and Chief Inspector Michael W. Torina. Others present were Robert Austin, chairman of the National Committee for a Representative Congress, and Charles Kress, former mayor of Binghamton, N.Y., and former U.S. Treasury enforcement official who wrote the text of the award scrolls.

The National Committee for a Representative Congress is a group of public-spirited citizens organized as a nonpartisan group to promote and uphold truly representative government, and the committee awards are limited to specially selected Senators and Congressmen. In making awards to the Secret Service the committee announced that an exception was being made "because it felt the dedication, faithfulness, and devotion to duty displayed by the Secret Service makes that organization outstandingly representative of the highest ideals of public srevice."

Because the Secret Service works quietly and without fanfare this most effective Government Agency has not in the past received the amount of public recognition it has earned and deserves. The award by the National Committee for a Representative Congress is a timely and fitting tribute to the faithful men of the U.S. Secret Service who do so well protect the lives of our Presidents—even to the point of unhesitatingly sacrificing their own lives if duty requires. As the real extent of their public service is known better, I am sure these loyal and devoted men will have the warm appreciation of a grateful Nation, as they continue their fine work under the efficient direction of thier new Chief, the competent and highly respected Jim Rowley.

The text of the award scroll to the officers and members of the Secret Service follows—

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTTEE FOR A REPRESENTATIVE CONGRESS

OFFICERS

Robert H. Austin, chairman, civic leader and business executive.

Malcolm Currie, secretary, country editor, and publisher.

Fred Hammes, treasurer, CPA, Hammes, Rockefeller & Silloway.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dr. Clayton F. Andrews, past imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M. Shrine.

Gen. Charles Brandon Booth (retired), former national head, Volunteers of America.

Dr. Robert Bruce, former head, Conference of Congregational Churches.

Erle Cocke, Jr., former national commander, American Legion.

Col. Howard Ellis Cox, attorney, former national head, Military Order of World Wars.

Hon. James H. R. Cromwell, former U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

Hon. Ned Dearborn, fromer head, National Safety Council.

Mrs. Marie Friderich, past president, American War Mothers.

Hon. Carl S. Hallauer, chairman of the board, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.

Rabbi Jacob Hurwitz, Temple Israel, Conservative.

David R. Owens, Honolulu business executive, civic leader.

Mrs. Anne Peterson, coowner, radio station WTHE.

Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Ryan (retired), former Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army.

Dr. Guy Snavely, former head, Association of American Colleges.

Hon. Louis Taber, former head, National Grange.

Gene Tunney, civic leader, captain, U.S. Navy, former world heavyweight champion.

Dr. Charles R. Wilson, director, Colgate University Foreign Policy Conference.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A REPRESENTATIVE CONGRESS AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING REPRESENTATIVE PUBLIC SERVICE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SECRET SERVICE—FOR AN OUTSTANDING RECORD OF DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE

In exemplifying the best principles of representative government by faithfully and effectively serving the responsibility and trust imposed by the people of the United States to provide that their President and his family shall be kept secure from any violence or physical harm;

In stanchly upholding over the years a brilliant tradition of unselfish public service at the highest level, unhesitatingly placing official duty before any personal considerations of self, family, or even life, being the only group of our Federal servants whose daily duty demands that they walk with death at their side—ever ready and willing to shelter their Presidential charge with their own bodies and themselves receive an assassin's bullets;

In thus devoting their lives as dedicated men to serving humbly, in quiet unsung glory—their efficient achievements often known to but themselves and their leaders. Each a modest hero of courage and self-sacrifice, eternally conscious day and night, of his solemn obligation to do his fullest part and give life itself if so demanded, to make and keep the U.S. Secret Service a shining, untarnishing symbol of real faithfulness to high duty—of humble men nobly committed to the stern requirements of a grave public responsibility which insists that each shall be a man of whom the world can say, "Greater love of duty hath no man than that he be ever ready to lay down his life for that duty."

Attest:

ROBERT H. AUSTIN,
Chairman.
MALCOLM CURRIE,
Secretary.

Community Development in Western Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, certainly one of the most effective means of providing assistance to the newly developing nations of the world is through comunity development programs where aid is carried on at the grassroots level.

Earlier this year an international conference was held at Seoul, Korea, to discuss community development programs. One of the important addresses at this conference was delivered by the Honorable Oba C. D. Akran, Minister of Economic Planning and Community Development, Western Region, Nigeria. I commend the following excerpts of Mr. Oba's address to my colleagues attention, and particularly the final paragraph which expresses a challenge to the Western democracies and the hope of the underdeveloped countries that this challenge will be met:

THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

(An address delivered on May 8, 1961, by the Honorable Oba C. D. Akran, Minister of Economic Planning and Community Development, Western Region, Nigeria, and head of the Nigerian delegation to the conference)

1. Let me first express my appreciation for the honor conferred on me by this conference in inviting my views on a matter I believe to be of very great importance to underdeveloped countries, and of greater moment than peoples outside those countries would attribute to it. To the people of the United States I am also very grateful for the very generous way in which they have financed my travel to this conference. I am grateful, too, to the people and Government of western Nigeria and, indeed, of the whole Federation of Nigeria: it is because of the magnificent response of our people—particularly of western and eastern Nigeria—to the appeal of community development, and indeed, to the rapidly increasing rate at which that response is gathering momentum, that what I am going to say here, chiefly about western Nigeria, may be of some small use.

2. Western Nigeria is a territory comprising about 7 million persons on an area of 45,000 square miles. In the region's House of Assembly (i.e. the elective House) there is equal representation of all areas of the region, on a population basis—every adult male and female, aged 21 or over, being entitled to vote. The region enjoys a very stable Government which has the confidence of all its peoples.

3. I will begin by attempting a definition of the term "Community Development". Community Development is a movement designed to promote the voluntary participation of the people themselves in efforts to improve their level of living with as much reliance as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make these more effective.

4. With internal self-government in 1954, Community Development carried on for a while along colonial lines. But not for long. For now the grumbling of the people was of much significance. The process of reasoning together with local communities had begn. But this was the beginning also of something much more interesting: the beginning of the discovery of a vast heritage which was in danger of being lost—at least as a tradition of action. Native institutions acquired a new and important significance. Reawakened, these became automatic and very efficient organs of community development. At last, the communities were in fact being developed: the projects which they carried through now became part and parcel of the life of the villages.

5. In the circumstances of underdeveloped countries it necessarily devolves on Government to awaken among the masses of the people powerful incentive to work and to produce more. Government must devise ways and means of attuning the masses to the use of modern technology and scientific methods, particularly in the field of agricultural expansion and in industries. Finally, but by no means the least, Government must undertake the task of making its territory something more than a geographical expression—a nation, at peace with itself. But Government can achieve some measure of success in these things only if the race to catch up with modernity new methods find and strengthen links with the patterns of the past.

6. In western Nigeria the story of organized Community Development began really in October 1954 when a separate Department of Government—the Ministry of Development, as it was then called—was charged with special responsibility for Community Development. In the main, the work of the Community Development Section of the Ministry was in two parts; namely, youth clubs and organizations, and local construction projects.

7. Two major institutions of very great importance of fundamental education and to training in leadership came into existence, the one in 1949, the other in 1956. These are the Man O'War Bay Training Camp run by the Federal Government of Nigeria and the Shasha River Training Camp run by western Nigeria. In these two camps, regular courses are held during which men and women are taught the dignity of labour, the meaning of selflessness, the value of mortification and such other social virtues as humility, honesty of purpose, cooperation and truth.

8. It is evident that the system is succeeding. People have now started to undertake on their own construction of projects required to satisfy their felt-needs, such as building roads, village community centers, postal agencies, community school buildings, village markets, dispensaries, and maternity centers, without waiting for the Government to provide them. The policy is to share the cost of such projects between the Government and the people. The people's share takes the form of labor, land, cash, and materials. The Government provides technical advice and grants not exceeding one-third of the total cost of the projects. But there is need for better coordination of efforts, and to this we have devoted some attention since the beginning of this year.

9. We in western Nigeria, indeed all Nigeria, see community development as a very powerful instrument of nation building—whether from the economic, social, or political aspect. We are convinced that the immense importance of the part which traditional institutions and patterns can play cannot be overemphasized. We have, accordingly, in January this year, replanned our method of approach to give emphasis to the place of the village and of village institutions. We have divided the whole of western Nigeria into blocks of 10 villages, with an officer styled community development assistant in charge of each block. Next above this officer, and having control of a group of blocks (i.e., a division) is a community development officer. Over this other officer is a senior community development officer who takes charge of the largest field unit, a circle—i.e., a group of divisions. At the ministry's headquarters is a chief community development officer who, assisted by a principal community development officer and by a training officer, supervises the general affairs of the department, under the general policy direction of my permanent secretary.

10. I think the secret of our success has been in the strength of our community development in the broad sense of that concept. When I look to the future and to the vast problems that lie ahead, I am convinced that in order to go forward politically, socially, and upon a sound economic basis we need to strengthen more and more our community development.

11. I said before that the subject of community development is of great moment to those of us from underdeveloped countries. In Nigeria, for example, our problems of unemployment and of industrialization and of scarce capital are aggravated by the phenomenon which I like to refer to as the

"Missing Age." England, America, and the other advanced countries had a first industrial age which they revolutionized to produce the present age of rapid mechanization and of intricate technology, where the robot machines are displacing men with, they say, economic advantage. Because we are latecomers on the stage, we have missed the first industrial age—which we cannot now relive. This handicap, with all its difficulties of adjustment are baffling hurdles which nevertheless we must cross. It is no easy task for those of us who are at the helm of affairs in underdeveloped to lead men from the stage of peasant agriculture and introduce them abruptly to the age of complicated diesel machines. I think that the advanced countries do not sufficiently appreciate what contribution the underdeveloped countries are making to the course of democracy in that when, upon leaving the barren shores of colonialism we found our peasant economy in harsh competition with the machine economies of the advanced countries of the advanced, we did not intemperately take leave of democracy or break down in sheer frustration. Either would have been to the detriment of the course of Western democracy.

12. If I may end by making an appeal: the plank on which the Western democracies will founder is not the race of who arrives first at the moon, nor who first places a bus load of men in orbit around the sun. No; not on these or such like. But if ever democracy should fail in the emergent nations of Africa, then shall the Western Powers have truly failed. We in Africa are determined that it shall not fail. We hope you of the Western democracies will not fail us in what ought to be the joint venture to nurture democracy through the cultivation of community development.

No Compromise on Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the factors contributing to the general lack of confidence in our wavering foreign policy has been the administration's fantastic maneuvering on the issue of Red China's admittance to the United Nations.

The serious concern among our Nationalist Chinese allies is evidenced by the visit to this country of Vice President and Premier Chen Cheng. This visit has served to focus greater attention on our China policy, if not to clarify the innermost feelings and desires of the architects of that elusive policy.

The subject was dealt with by an excellent editorial appearing in this morning's edition of the New York Herald Tribune. That editorial follows:

NO COMPROMISE ON RED CHINA

Reiteration, in yesterday's Kennedy-Chen joint communique, of American opposition to seating Red China in the United Nations was appropriate and expected. But the communique did not settle those doubts, which have risen naturally from defeatist statements by administration leaders, about how vigorously the new administration is prepared to press its opposition.

On the annual question of whether the Assembly should debate Red China's admission, the margin of U.S. victory has been growing slimmer. Last year the vote was 42 against debate, 34 in favor and 22 abstentions. What chance there is of keeping it off the agenda this year may well turn on the administration's making compellingly clear that this is a matter about which it cares.

It has reason to care.

Red China's admission would be a shattering blow not only to the United States and ite nationalist allies, but to the cause of global freedom and to the integrity of the U.N. itself.

By refusing the seat to the Mao government the U.N. is not, as critics insist it is, ignoring 650 million people, pretending they don't exist or denying them representation. The Chinese people are already represented in the U.N., both in the Assembly and on the Security Council. Only the Peiping government—a tyranny imposed on those people by force of arms—is excluded.

If Mao wants in, let him submit the choice to the Chinese people.

Those Chinese who are free to express their choice—the millions of oversea Chinese throughout southeast Asia, the refugees who still stream into Hong Kong—overwhelmingly choose the Nationalist alternative. To replace Chiang's delegation with Mao's at the U.N. would not give the Chinese people representation, but would take it away.

Red China has never repented its bloody war against the U.N. in Korea. It stands guilty of repeated aggression, direct and indirect, against its Asian neighbors. It openly proclaims a doctrine of aggressive violence. It refuses to renounce force in the Formosa straits. It preaches hate; monstrous, calculated lies are the staple of its incredibly vicious propaganda.

The U.N. Charter provides that, in addition to the original signers, membership is open to "peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and which * * * are able and willing to carry out these obligations." Among these obligations are respect for human rights, for international law and the sanctity of agreements, the peaceful settlement of disputes—a long catalog adding up to responsible good neighborliness.

By no contortion of semantics could Red China qualify, under the charter, for membership. For the Assembly even seriously to debate admission would demean its dignity and compromise the principles of moral order on which the U.N. rests.

Peiping has unendingly flaunted its contempt for everything the U.N. stands for. But if the U.N. is not to capitulate to its bullying, vigorous leadership is going to be needed from the United States—vigorous, uncompromising leadership, clearly unwilling to countenance defeat by default.

Several Billion Candle Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States should by now be fully aware of the problem of watching over billions of dollars of public money. The control of public expenditure in Great Britain has become equally difficult, according to a recent article in the Economist, and I feel my colleagues would benefit from a reading and comparison of the equal concern now felt in that country over "hiding weaknesses under a bushel," so to speak.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the July 22, 1961, issue of the Economist:

SEVERAL BILLION CANDLE ENDS

(A first judgment on the Plowden report which was published just before we went to press.)

The Plowden report on "Control of Public Expenditure" bears many of the marks of an intelligent civil servant's document; senior officials from several departments sat on the committee with Lord Plowden and three other outsiders, and although the published report is issued solely in the names of these last four men, the views expressed carry with them a certain cachet of what is thought to be best by the wisest men in Whitehall. It is therefore reasonable to consider them with that leaning in mind. The report's main recommendation is quite obviously right. Whether or not government planning is to be regarded as a dirty word for outside industry, it is high time that government expenditure itself was planned. At present, says the report, "the tendency is for expenditure decisions to be taken piecemeal"; henceforth or, rather, once the necessary organizational changes have been made, "decisions involving substantial future expenditure should always be taken in the light of surveys of public expenditure as a whole, over a period of years, and in relation to the prospective resources."

The pill in the pudding is that, once the government has made these long-term surveys, the report assumes that it should not tell anybody about them:

"It is doubtful whether any government will feel able to place these surveys before Parliament and the public. To do this would involve disclosing the government's long-term intention for a wide range of public expenditure; and also explaining the survey's assumptions about employment, wages, prices and all the other main elements in the national economy. It would be surprising if any government were prepared to do this."

This is an argument that no government should be allowed to get away with—at least in the extreme form that appears to be adumbrated in this so authoritative report.

In fact, the case for maximum and informed and pertinacious public debate is strengthened by a consideration of the three examples of the sorts of decisions through which the committee sagely suspects that the largest amounts of public money may be being wasted today. The main fields of waste, it believes, lie in the "no man's land between policy and administration." The first typical sort of case "may be a subsidy to a farm or an industry or an area, given as a temporary pump primer yet continued despite the fact that the recipient has poor prospects of ever becoming self-sufficient again." Second, "the social changes of the last 15 years have altered the incidence of hardship, so that there now may well be excessive social services for some purposes and inadequate ones for others" (the report boldly suggests that some agricultural grants may come into this category). Third are cases in which quick changes and happenings in the military or international field, or in industry, agriculture or transport lead to a strong pressure for governmental action, often in the form of large capital projects: these cases often arise at short notice and with what appears to be pressing urgency, fanned by parliamentary and public opinion. The consequence may often be that they are

not subjected to adequate financial examination. These are all cases in which subsequent history often shows great waste.

The first two sorts of waste are of a kind that politicians find it difficult to cut out, until a mass of newspaper articles has helped to create an informed opinion in favor of doing so. The third sort of waste is implicitly blamed by the report on pressure by uninformed public opinion, but that pressure will certainly not be made easier to resist if the trend in any new system of long-term planning is for the Government to keep its long-term expenditure estimates secret to its pristine self and leave the public in the dark.

The second major potentiality for waste in the public service lies not in the way that the state takes its expenditure decisions, but in its system of control over the way in which those decisions to spend are carried out. Basically, the right trend here—to which the committee gives its blessing—must surely be to make the Treasury more of an efficiency audit organization and to leave more of the purely detailed management of expenditure to the departments themselves. "The Treasury," says the report, "should use the submissions on individual expenditures mainly to form a judgment on the efficiency of the department's administrative machine; and it should express its views about the administration rather than about the individual submissions themselves." In performing this salient Treasury task, the report notes that "increasing attention has been paid in recent years in the civil service to comparisons of performance of units in different departments but engaged in the same field of work, such as regional offices, hospitals, research establishments; and to comparisons of the way in which the same job is done by many departments, e.g., information work; building costs and so on."

It is important that these comparisons should be increasingly made, throughout the public service. And, once again, although one suspects that Whitehall would hate this, why on earth not publish them?

Within the individual departments, the report recognizes "the burden of work which falls on permanent secretaries in carrying out their triple function of policy advice, finance and management"; but hints delicately that some permanent secretaries should devote more time to the last. To help them, it recognizes that "the post of principal establishment officer, as adviser to the permanent secretary on staffing and organization, should be regarded as one of the most important posts." Does this go far enough? Should not most of the bigger departments have the equivalent of a general manager in them, separate from and just below the policy-advising permanent secretary? Any big commercial organization would be likely to arrange things that way; in a newspaper, which is not an entirely jejuene analogy, the editor (as policy-maker) and general manager are always separate posts.

The other big and remaining problem, which is not really solved by this report, is that of securing effective outside supervision over the whole machine. The report makes no mention of the case for having a senior cabinet minister, separate from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as a sort of director of the bureau of the budget to oversee Government expenditure as a whole. It says merely (and somewhat idealistically?) that there should be an improvement in the arrangements to enable ministers to discharge their "collective responsibility" for this; ministers should not regard themselves as poachers whose job is to get the biggest vote for their department, leaving the Chancellor as the sole gamekeeper.

The report also does not exactly overdo its enthusiasm for the parliamentary watchdogs in their Estimates and Public Accounts Committees. "We have not formed the impression," it says in one of several loaded negatives, "that the work of the committees, taken as a whole, is imposing an unreasonable load upon the Permanent Secretaries or upon the departments in relation to its intrinsic importance." But it does hope that the committees will realize that the Treasury cannot constantly be expected to give as much independent advice and comment to them on detailed points as it did when Government expenditure was much smaller and more directly Treasury-controlled than now. As for parliamentary control of the nationalized industries, "the overriding consideration in our view is to strengthen the managements"; once that is done, the report implies, Parliament should be careful not to keep getting in their hair.

Undoubtedly, there is a great deal of good sense in this. There is equally good sense in another polite dig that the report makes at the politicians—and one that is especially topical at this time: The committee is all against "attempts, at moments of inflationary pressure, to impose short-term 'economies' " in current Government expenditure. These "are rarely successful and sometimes damaging"; they are "frustrating to efficiency and economy in the running of the public services."

But, when all this has been said and fairly granted, and when tribute has been paid to the high value of much of this report, the main problem of watching over so many thousands of millions of pounds of public money remains. Perhaps the best solution would be to have some such body as the Plowden committee set up to review the situation and the mechanism every 7 years or so; but next time to make it even more an outside, and less an internal, committee; and all the time, instead of tending to hide both improvements and weaknesses under a bushel, to lay much more information about trends in the expenditure of taxpayers' money, and about internal audits of efficiency in spending it, frankly before the public.

Television Bill Extending Present Obscenity Penalties to Broadcasting of Crime, Violence, and Brutality Programs Hailed as Step in the Right Direction by Catholic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the principles contained in my bill, H.R. 8435, amending title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the present penalties for obscenity on radio and television programs shall extend to the broadcasting of crime, violence, and brutality programs have been hailed as "a step in the right direction" by one of our country's outstanding church leaders.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph E. Schieder, director, youth department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in testimony before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee, pointed out that there was a 98-percent increase in crime in the period 1950 to 1960, and that the year 1960 in itself presented to the Nation a 14.2-percent increase over 1959. He called these figures "shocking in the full sense of the word" and said they were "almost incredible statistics."

He declared that—

I cannot conscientiously dismiss the idea of a basic relationship between these gross percentages and the same decade in which television passed from the status of luxury to that of practical necessity, and proved to have an almost 'totalitarian grip on the minds of the people. Further, that decade saw the rise of the great program cycles which are recognized in the programing of the industry: the cops-and-robbers cycle, the cycle of the western, of the private eye, and so on. A minimum of recollection will remind us that the dominant characteristic of the cycles, however, has been crime and violence.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph E. Schieder then said:

Those of us who are professional youth workers have come to have a very healthy respect for the power and influence of so-called audiovisual techniques. There is hardly an up-to-date school or leisure-time program in the United States which is not equipped, today, with the latest technical facilities in sound, cameras, and projectors. The monetary investment alone, to say nothing of the operational successes, testifies to the extreme impact which such techniques have. Following that line of thought, therefore, I suggest that the same power—blissfully controlled in classroom, community center, parish hall—is literally raging uncontrolled from our television sets. And far from hitting an environment-disciplined audience, it is hitting an audience comprised of young people and children who quite normally savor the sweet taste of rebellion—a well-documented temptation to youth.

He went on to say that in looking to solutions to the rise in crime, we can accept solace from such effective measures as those established in Canada in the recent past, where a rigid penalty structure exists in reference to a hard and realistically broad definition of obscenity.

My bill, H.R. 8435, the principles of which this distinguished churchman called "a step in the right direction," is based on a 1959 amendment to Canada's criminal code, which provides that:

Any publication, a dominant characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of sex, or of sex and any one or more of the following subjects; namely, crime, horror, cruelty, and violence, shall be deemed to be obscene.

Certainly we can learn from Canada, and, in this instance, it is high time we did learn if we are to successfully protect the very foundations of our society from criminal elements.

My bill will arm the Department of Justice with power to deal with the undue exploitation for profit of crime, horror, cruelty, brutality, sex, and violence by those who broadcast programs which appeal to our baser instincts, and which go far beyond the bounds of liberty to license.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy has several times declared that there is a definite relation between our rising crime rates and some of our TV programs.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, recently produced written

evidence of orders calling for more stress on sex and violence on TV programs.

I include here, as part of my remarks, the statement of the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph E. Schieder, and the text of my bill, H.R. 8435:

TESTIMONY BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR JOSEPH E. SCHIEDER, DIRECTOR, YOUTH DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, REGARDING CRIME, VIOLENCE, AND BRUTALITY AS PORTRAYED ON TELEVISION

As director of the youth department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, I am honored to add my voice and opinions to the record of your inquiry into the portrayal of crime, violence, and brutality in television.

That these disorders are portrayed needs no certification: not only can we simply flick a television dial to prove the point, but also we can consult printed guides and newspaper schedules—to find the succinct sentences which describe a fantastic variety of bloody or brutal offerings.

At the outset, I note that in the last few days press notice has been given to a report prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in which some almost incredible statistics are projected: that there has been in the United States a 98-percent increase in crime in the period 1950 to 1960, and that the year 1960 in itself presented to the Nation a 14.2-percent increase over 1959.

These figures are shocking in the full sense of the word. Indeed, I strongly hope that they are sufficiently shocking to force a truly responsible public inquiry into their meaning for a free and democratic society. And, while it may seem too pat an approach, I cannot consientiously dismiss the idea of a basic relationship between these gross percentages and the same decade in which television passed from the status of luxury to that of practical necessity, and proved to have an almost totalitarian grip on the minds of the people. Further, that decade saw the rise of the great program cycles which are recognized in the programing of the industry: the cops-and-robbers cycle, the cycle of the western, of the private eye, and so on. A minimum of recollection will remind us that the dominant characteristic of the cycles, however, has been crime and violence.

Those of us who are professional youth workers have come to have a very healthy respect for the power and influence of so-called audiovisual techniques. There is hardly an up-to-date school or leisure-time program in the United States which is not equipped, today, with the latest technical facilities in sound, cameras, and projectors. The monetary investment alone, to say nothing of the operational successes, testifies to the extreme impact which such techniques have. Following that line of thought, therefore, I suggest that the same power—blissfully controlled in classroom, community center, parish hall—is literally raging uncontrolled from our television sets. And, far from hitting an environment-disciplined audience, it is hitting an audience comprised largely of young people and children who quite normally savor the sweet taste of rebellion—a well-documented temptation to youth.

I turn to another parallel. We have all heard it said that the United States is the most diet-conscious culture in the world. Millions of dollars are spent in the mere devising of biochemical and nutritional combinations which will effect this or that result: we put on, we take off, weight; we build up muscle, we break down fat. But common to all these regimens is the notion of consistency: "Be consistent and you'll make it." Similarly, our social and industrial psychologists, and even our mail-order charm courses, emphasize the role of habit in attaining this or that desirable trait. Thus it would be ludicrous, gentlemen, to ignore or deride the influence of habit, and the product of habit, when it comes to the impact of television on our society.

In terms of the work of this body, then, two paramount aspects of television must be considered the basis of investigation: that is, the power of the medium in itself, and the multiplication of that power by habitual resort to the medium. Add to these factors the excess and glorification of crime.

I for one do not hesitate to echo the sentiments of the Attorney General of the United States, as reported recently,[1] that the portrayal of crime and violence is "a major factor" governing the appalling increase of juvenile delinquency.

What are some of the observable effects of the type of of television programing we are discussing? For a moment, I would like to depart from comment on the clear-cut juvenile delinquency problem, and draw your attention to a more shadowy reality. In our regular dealings with great numbers of youth, the vast majority of whom would probably be labeled as "outstanding" or good, we find in the year 1961 young people possessed of an almost appalling sophistication. They are accustomed to the idea of vice, of violence, of the element of the brutal in human life, to a degree that stuns. Now, we are far from applauding the vague and naive young person; nevertheless, it is a serious matter when one encounters in fairly virtuous young people a tolerance of evil induced by nothing more nor less than the diet of terror fed them from the mass communications media—and more forcefully by television. I wonder if we intelligently and honestly can expect them not only to remain free of the taint, but to develop the public and private conscience upon which our society must rest. And I would say at this point that there is no dreamy indictment of the harsh realities of life in that last statement: yes—our young people must be aware of reality. However, I submit that the violence and brutality which we are discussing is not only excessive but also a distortion of reality which relegates the virtues, the law, and common civilization to a very poor last place.

Again, on the point that our youth should be made aware of reality, I submit that there is an astronomical distance between the portrayal of the universal idea of man's struggles and the portrayal in glowing and instructive detail of the techniques of sadism and brutality. Profoundly related to this aspect of the problem is the perversion of the awe-inspiring ability of the human being—particularly the young human being—to identify himself with an object or action outside of himself. To put it bluntly, we are in large part asking our youth to identify themselves with the cripples and scum of society.

The insidious character of the problem is highlighted in my opinion by the fact that we in the United States are not alone with the difficulty. As you may have seen in the press of a few days ago, England's Cardinal Godfrey and Dr. Ramsey both pointed the finger of guilt at graphic portrayal of vice as a central factor in the decline of British public morality. Considering this, I offer the opinion that the free and advanced nations of the West face a critical need to reinforce, or even rebuild, their internal, societal self-discipline—lest they abdicate their freedom and strength in favor of slow but certain moral decline. (And, in view of the FBI statistics, not too slow.)

What steps can be taken in the situation? A few suggest themselves immediately: industry self-policing, enforcement and where necessary expansion of existent legislative controls, and perhaps the most necessary, the relief of advertising and sponsorship pressures on program directors—pressures related to the "giving the public, or the kids, what they want" school of thought. The later often seems tantamount to offering courses in moral anarchy, and in terms of youth is often a degenerate appeal to buying power.

In looking to solutions, we can accept solace from such effective measures as those established in Canada in the recent past, where a rigid penalty structure exists in reference to a hard and realistically broad definition of obscenity. We can also see a step in the right direction in such legislation as that offered by Congressman MCDOWELL, whose bill 8109 is presently in committee. Whatever courses are taken, however, must deal with tremendous forces and already massively entrenched results.

As a citizen responsibly and professionally committed to the field of youth work, I strongly urge that research be matched by action, that the common good in the spirit and letter of our Constitution be a guide, and that economic and artistic freedoms and interests be expressed in disciplined contexts worthy of a free nation.

The consciences of youth themselves are in the process of formation, as are their tastes and habits. Let us not give them a serpent instead of the bread they deserve.

[1] Evening Star, July 12, 1961.

H.R. 8435

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the present penalties for obscenity on radio and television programs shall also include and extend to undue emphasis upon crime, violence, and brutality

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after chapter 97 thereof a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 98—RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

"Sec.
"2001. Obscene language.
"2002. Exploitation of sex.
"2003. Exploitation of crime, etc.

"§ 2001. Obscene language

"Whoever utters any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"§ 2002. Exploitation of sex

"Whoever broadcasts, by means of radio communication, any matter a predominant characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of sex shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

"§ 2003. Exploitation of crime, etc.

"Whoever broadcasts, by means of radio communication, any matter a predominant characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of crime, horror, or violence shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

(b) The table of chapters at the beginning of part I of such title 18 is amended by inserting after

"97. Railroads"

the following:

"98. Radio communication".

SEC. 2. The following provisions of such title 18 are repealed:

(1) section 1464 (which prohibits the utterance of obscene language by radio communication); and

(2) that part of the analysis of chapter 71 which reads as follows:

"1464. Broadcasting obscene language."

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 15. Radio communication and broadcast defined

"The terms 'radio communication' and 'broadcast', as used in this title, have the same meaning that such terms have when used in the Communications Act of 1934."

(b) The analysis of such chapter I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"14. Radio communication and broadcast defined."

Failure of the Soviet Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, all of us have read the newspaper accounts of the recently announced 20-year plan for economic development in the Soviet Union.

Mr. David Lawrence, in his August 1 column in the Washington Evening Star, has written a most interesting and informative analysis of this amazing document.

He points out the complete emphasis on materialism and material things—everything will be free—with the exception of men's minds, bodies, and souls. The comrades are offering a freedom found only in prisons and concentration camps in return for being fed, clothed, and housed in a tax-free Communist paradise.

The 20-year plan goes one step further in its dehumanization of Soviet workers as it changes the Communist Party slogan from "to each in accordance with his work" to "to each according to his needs." This concept, carried to its logical conclusion, would completely standardize all human desires and permit the state to dole out to each citizen just enough to keep him working productively—a type of "throw the dog a bone" philosophy long practiced by the Soviets on its citizens and its satellites.

Mr. President, I found Mr. Lawrence's comments most interesting. I am sure that many Members of the Senate will want to study them, and I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYTHING FREE, BUT LIFE IN SOVIET—LACK OF FREEDOM CALLED FLY IN OINTMENT OF KREMLIN'S NEW 20-YEAR PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

Every so often the Communist Party in Moscow has come up with a new 5-year plan or with a renewal of a previous 5-year plan. Nikita Khrushchev, however, takes a longer stride—he now proposes a 20-year plan. None of the plans ever reaches completion, but all serve a temporary purpose—to keep down internal unrest and to postpone indefinitely the reforms which the people have been promised.

If a plan doesn't materialize, that is, of course, supposed to be the fault of the capitalist countries. Hence it's necessary from the Moscow viewpoint to direct the finger of accusation constantly at the West—which is presumably seeking war or otherwise disturbing the even flow of welfare benefits inside the Communist countries.

The new 20-year plan announced by the Soviet Premier promises that two decades hence in Russia almost everything will be free—water, heat, gas, electricity, education, medical services, apartments and transportation. Also, taxes are to be abolished and meals will be free during working hours.

There is, however, one big fly in the ointment. Everything is to be free except life itself. In a jail, too, things are free—including food, light, heat, and rent. Taxes also are abolished, because there is no income.

The 20-year plan does not say a word about freedom from enslavement. There still is to be no such thing as free speech, free assembly, a free press, and freedom of worship. In other words, the human mind is to be kept under duress—in prison—indefinitely. The emphasis instead is on material things—as if spiritual things are of no significance. This concept, however, is the essence of communism.

There is another fallacy of gross proportions in the 20-year plan. Who is to produce all the goods? Who is to raise all the food? The Soviet people—of course—but they are to be rewarded only as the state sees fit. Up to now the slogan of the Communist Party has been: "From each according to his abilities; to each in accordance with his work." Now this has been amended in the 20-year plan to read: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This means that the central government decides what are the needs of each individual. Can human needs—material and spiritual—be standardized? Can all minds be made to conform to "need" only what the government says each person must accept as its measure of human comfort?

In order, of course, to show how hard it is to put the plan into effect, the Communist leaders are already pointing to the Western countries as obstacles. The Soviet Premier attributes all sorts of hostile motives to other nations and arrogates to himself the role of a virtuous and peaceful world leader.

The 20-year plan, set forth in a 55,000-word document, is the first major program of the Communist Party produced since Lenin's program of 1919. It is full of bitter denunciation of the system of free enterprise in the West. No mention is made, on the other hand, of the high standard of living of the 180 million people in the United States or of the rapid progress being made today in Western Europe, which, in the 16 years since the close of World War II, has experienced unprecedented economic growth and better conditions of living for the masses than ever before known on the continent.

It is the Communist strategy to attempt to tear all this down with sweeping phrases of derogation, but the truth does travel by word of mouth across the boundary lines, and despite the suppression of newspapers and radio, it does spread. There is, indeed, behind the Iron Curtain today considerable information as to how well Americans and Western Europeans really live.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." That's the real dilemma which the Soviet regime faces as it issues a smokescreen of thousands of words in the new 20-year plan. It leaves unanswered the $64,000 question: "How is it going to be possible to carry out a 20-year plan of free grants of everything if there is to be a nuclear war that destroys it all in just a few hours or days of missile-fire?"

Maybe Mr. Khrushchev is even more sensitive as a politician than he has been reported to be—for he knows his biggest potential enemy is a restless and desperate people inside the Soviet Union, and that a nuclear war, or a conventional war, can bring to Russia another revolution such as occurred in 1917, when the army joined the people in demanding an end to war.

There is a glimmer of hope for world peace in all this—if Mr. Khrushchev really is determined to accomplish even a small part of his 20-year plan. For he cannot achieve Utopia if he has to keep on building an expensive armament machine to back up his perennial threats of war.

Life in the Republic of West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, the Evening Star of August 1 contains an excellent commentary by Constantine Brown on life in the Republic of West Germany.

The article, written in a small West German town, emphasizes the cosmopolitan atmosphere that foreign tourists have created since West Germany became a mecca for visitors from all over the world.

The main attractions for tourists in West Germany are reasonable prices, courteous treatment and fundamental honesty—all the result of the free enterprise system as practiced by an industrious, prosperous and disciplined people.

Mr. Brown also records his impressions of the impact that foreign troops and foreign workers have had on the West Germans.

Again, he finds tolerance, understanding, and a desire to get along, particularly with the large numbers of Americans, British and French troops quartered there. The West Germans, realizing that these troops are a bulwark of strength against communism, stand united behind them. Foreign workers and refugees from East Germany have been integrated into the booming economy which still has a labor deficiency, another result of the vigorous and dynamic free economy of the country.

Mr. President, I recommend this reassuring article on conditions in West Germany to my colleagues and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST GERMANY BEEHIVE OF ACTION—COSMOPOLITAN REPUBLIC BELIEVED TO TOP ITALY AND FRANCE AS TOURIST MECCA

(By Constantine Brown)

DONAUESCHINGEN, WEST GERMANY.—As soon as the traveler crosses the border of Switzerland, one of the most prosperous and truly democratic countries in the world, into

the West German Federal Republic he feels he has entered a beehive of frantic activity.

This country, with a population as large as that of Britain, has become a truly cosmopolitan republic. It is, possibly, more of a mecca for tourists than Italy and certainly more than France.

In hundreds of cities and towns and its more than 200 spas, which have the reputation of curing or ameliorating almost every disease except cancer and pernicious anemia, one can see men and women from the United States, India, France, and Pakistan, Arabs in their white or maroon burnooses, Japanese, and South Africans. There is a wider variety of languages and peoples than in any other country this reporter has visited.

A conservative estimate places the number of tourists in Germany at about 16 million a year (only 3 million fewer than sunny and popular Italy). One of the main attractions of West Germany for foreign visitors is that there is no gyp. The prices (reasonable by American and French standards; not so reasonable by other standards) are the same for everyone, German or foreigner.

The Germans are disciplined and obey orders without question. And when Bonn or the regional authorities decree that all visitors must be treated alike by hotel keepers, restaurateurs, and taxidrivers—usually the curse of strangers in other countries—the orders are conscientiously followed.

Even in this small and unimportant town, the concierge of the hotel speaks five languages. The prices of rooms, meals, and service are posted in every room and there are no invisible extras.

Germany is truly cosmopolitan from two other points of view: the number and variety of foreign troops on its soil and the many foreign workers in almost every city and hamlet.

Throughout the land you will find American, British, French, Belgian, Danish, and Dutch uniforms. There is a massive concentration of American, British, and French troops from the Rhine to the Elbe. The others are represented by a few detachments of troops or individual officers attached to various headquarters. But by far the largest number of soldiers are the 8 full German divisions, each some 16,000 strong.

Usually the presence of foreigners in a nation creates resentment by civilians. This may have been the case in Germany some years ago. Now all the foreign forces—NATO allies—are regarded with friendliness and confidence by the civilians. Even the frictions which occurred until 2 years ago between American and German young people (the usual cause was the frauleins) have largely disappeared. There are skirmishes now and then between a GI and a young German over some blond resulting in a black eye or bloody nose. But the attitude of the German and American authorities is to let the best man win.

At this time, when black clouds are gathering from the East, there is only one sentiment—let's all stand united. The thousands of refugees who enter West Germany every day, not only from East Germany but also from other countries behind the Iron Curtain, are a continued warning—to the Germans at least—of what will happen to them if they and their allies let down their guard. Hence, friction, inevitable even among people of the same nationality and race, is glossed over. Everybody realizes the enormously important job to be done in the months ahead.

According to official figures, every 10th man working in German factories or fields is a foreigner who in 90 percent of the cases speaks only a few words of German. These are the men which the booming German economy has brought in to make up the labor deficiency. There are many Italians, Poles who have sought refuge from the Communist paradise, Yugoslavs who could not stand the heavy hand of Tito's Socialist regime, Turks who could not earn their daily bread in the reformed Turkish democracy of General Gursel, Belgians and Dutch former colonists who now find there is no room in their mother countries for the sudden influx of nationals from the lost territories.

And, of course, there are Germans from East Germany whose lands have been communized by the Pankow Government or who cannot endure the hardships of the peoples' regime. These latter, of course, are not classed with the foreigners. They are Germans who enjoy all important political rights and are an important segment in the federation's political life. Their number exceeds 3 million individuals.

Boston Speech of DAV National Comdr. William O. Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this time an excerpt account of the inspiring address delivered by DAV National Commander Cooper on the occasion of the testimonial banquet to Massachusetts Department Comdr. George A. Wells, in Boston, on April 22, last.

The account follows:

ADDRESS BY COMDR. WILLIAM O. COOPER

The national commander of the Disabled American Veterans last night in Boston called on Massachusetts leaders of his organization to take the lead in a nationwide fight to insure that every American has an equal opportunity to reach his highest possible level of individual productive capacity. He lashed out sharply at unequal opportunities in education and employment which he said enforce a continued low level of economic potential on generation after generation of Negroes and members of other racial and ethnic minorities.

"Lack of education is the gene that makes poverty a hereditary disease," said the national DAV leader, William O. Cooper, of Dallas, Tex. "Millions of American children throughout the Nation are growing up predestined by lack of adequate education to an endless continuation of the same low economic potential of their parents. These unfortunate young people are condemned, almost from the beginning, to a lifetime without useful contribution for themselves, their families, or their society."

The national DAV leader is in Boston to participate in a dinner honoring George A. Wells, commander of the Massachusetts DAV, and to inspect the activities of his organization in this State. He said that Massachusetts was one of the strongest and best organized of all DAV departments throughout the country. At the present time, the department, with more than 13,000 members, is the third largest State organization of the 200,000 member national veterans' group.

Cooper praised the DAV here for its record of leadership in civic affairs and complimented the Commonwealth for its farsighted efforts to provide equal opportunities for all segments of its population. He reminded his audience of the State's lengthy tradition as a champion of liberty and freedom for all men, and urged them to take an active part in a national campaign to eliminate social injustice and economic inequality.

"Since the days of Sam Adams, the gallant Minutemen of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill have stood as a symbol to the Nation and the world, of America's willingness to do battle for freedom and independence," said the national veterans' leader.

"But freedom takes many forms. Just because a man is not another's property, doesn't necessarily make him free. In the slums of every major city in the Nation today, economic slavery creates a tyranny far harsher than the plantation slave ever knew. Poverty, disease, ignorance, and despair are the shackles of today's bondage."

The outspoken DAV commander based his arguments on sound economic grounds as well as on the more obvious humanitarian reasons for the complete elimination of social injustice and prejudice-enforced economic inequity.

He said that the millions of Americans who live of, at, or below a subsistence standard of living are a drag on the economy and a blot on the Nation's reputation.

"These millions who are wasting away their lives on the very ragged edges of subsistence are a tragic and unforgivable waste of our greatest national asset," according to the veterans' leader. "Faced, as we are, with the growing competition of the exploding masses of Sino-Soviet imperialism, the American people and their useful contribution to our society are our most precious natural resources. A great deal has been said in recent months about expanding our rate of economic growth. There is only one way to accomplish that and that is through increasing the total productivity of our entire population—and every segment within it.

"Common labor is a shrinking employment base. A continued low level of education among these groups will, in the future of automation and machinery, insure a steadily growing unproductive or only partially productive population, enlarge the unemployment and charity rolls, and be an increased tax burden on the productive elements of the society."

Cooper said that the Nation must, in the years ahead, lower all employment and educational barriers against minority groups. He said that this cannot be achieved by Government action alone and urged that his organization, "as a representative of a broad cross section of Americans from every racial, religious and ethnic group," take the lead in encouraging a broad base of citizen support for equal opportunities for all Americans.

Kaysinger Bluff Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is our objective to call the attention of the membership to a recent editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times, a morning newspaper of Kansas City, Mo., under dateline of Wednesday, July 19, 1961, headed "In Clinton, Flood Control Gains Big Support." It occurred to us that the editorial is worthy of reproduction for the reason that the meeting about which

the editorial is centered becomes a rather unique event when 500 people attend and very few, if any, oppose a reservoir project. The editorial is as follows:

Over the last few decades, Federal flood control projects normally have encountered strong opposition. While most people recognize the imperative need of reservoirs and levees for farm and city protection, a few dissenters always have been highly vocal. It is significant to note therefore, that a public hearing on flood control last week in Clinton, Mo., failed to produce the usual objections.

The Kansas City office of the Mississippi Valley Association reports that "the meeting was unique in that there was no opposition voiced" to the proposed Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir project. Some 500 people attended. Kaysinger has stirred much enthusiasm among the people of west central Missouri who realize the tremendous recreational possibilities. And it is interesting to recall the controversies that other big reservoir plans have occasioned in the past. Tuttle Creek, for example. The bitterness caused unfortunate delays.

Obviously, the general public cannot be expected to react with unanimous favor to flood control projects that take over large agricultural areas and townsites. But the Clinton meeting suggests that more and more people realize how essential are the protection and excellent recreation that flood control provides.

Higher Education and the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, this House cannot evade the problems facing our Nation's educational system. The American people, in this challenging time, are concerned lest their investment in education today prove inadequate to the demands of tomorrow. I am confident, therefore, that, regardless of their individual viewpoint on the question of Federal participation in education, the American people will not tolerate evasion of the issue on the part of their elected leaders and representatives. Questions affecting the education of our people are of vital interest to every American who places concern for the future of this Nation above personal desires and prejudices. I submit, gentlemen, that these good citizens will not allow this body to shirk its responsibility to air the matter in free, open debate, and that in the very near future, this House must come to grips with the problems of the American educational system.

In expectation of that discussion, I wish to call attention to comments penned some months ago by my good friend and respected colleague, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana. In the April issue of the magazine Higher Education, Representative BRADEMAS discusses with admirable perception the responsibilities which rest with this Congress regarding education legislation. I ask that the Congressman's article be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE 87TH CONGRESS

(By Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana) [1]

(The reader is asked to keep in mind that Congressman BRADEMAS completed this article early in March, for what was then hoped would be a late March or early April publication. The ensuing developments in the Congress have borne out the major conclusions reached by Mr. BRADEMAS, and attest his splendid grasp of the issues at stake.)

The Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should or should not do in the field of education. Whatever particular policies it seems to be pursuing are often inconsistent with each other, sometimes in conflict. They suggest a haphazard development, wherein policies of far-reaching effect have been set up as mere incidents of some special attempt to induce an immediate and special efficiency.

Without a comprehensive, forward looking, and coherent public policy in regard to education the present educational situation in the Federal Government cannot be greatly improved.

This wry assessment does not represent the findings of one of the task forces commissioned by President Kennedy last year. The conclusion appears in a report published in 1931 by the National Advisory Committee on Education appointed by President Herbert Hoover.

I would begin an appraisal of the prospects for action by the 87th Congress on higher education by predicting that no grand design will be achieved. Rather I expect that Congress will continue its pragmatic, piecemeal approach in considering proposals in this field.

I anticipate that Congress will follow its pattern in higher education of enacting legislation aimed at meeting specific and widely recognized needs rather than pass any broad programs of aid. We can also assume that any education legislation will carry precautions against Federal interference.

For a variety of reasons, the outlook for favorable action by the 87th Congress on education generally, including higher education, is better than it has been for many years. A fact of major importance is that the President and the majority in Congress are of the same political party. Democrats in Congress are naturally more likely to look with sympathy at the proposals of a Democratic than of a Republican President, the southern Democratic-Republican coalition notwithstanding. In addition, I think that a bloc of 20th century Republicans is very likely to support a number of President Kennedy's recommendations on domestic policy, specifically including education.

I think it is also a matter of the first importance to recall that no candidate for the Presidency in history has given such attention in a campaign to the issue of education as John F. Kennedy.

[1] Member of the House Education and Labor Committee and its general and special Subcommittees on Education—87th Cong. On Nov. 4, 1958, Mr. BRADEMAS was elected as a Democrat to represent Indiana's 3d Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives. He received the B.A. degree from Harvard in 1949 and, as a Rhodes Scholar for Indiana, received the Ph. D. degree from Oxford University, Oxford, England, in 1954. He served as administrative assistant to U.S. Representative THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY, of Ohio, in 1955; legislative assistant to U.S. Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan, also in 1955; executive assistant to Adlai E. Stevenson, 1955–56; and assistant professor of political science, St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind., 1957–58.

Congressman BRADEMAS served in the U.S. Navy during World War II (1945–46).

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Because Mr. Kennedy gives every sign of being a Chief Executive who will exercise strong leadership, it would be wise to look to his special message to Congress on education of February 20, 1961, to see what he proposes in the field of higher education.

The President characterized his recommendations as "an essential though modest contribution which the Federal Government must make to American education."

In his message President Kennedy called for:

1. Extension of the present college housing loan program with a 5-year, $250 million annual program for residential housing.

2. Establishment of a new long-term, low-interest-rate loan program, also for 5 years, at $300 million a year, for academic facilities—classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

3. Inauguration of a 5-year program with an initial authorization of $26,250,000 for scholarships for college students chosen on the basis of talent and financial need. Twenty-five thousand scholarships would be offered the first year averaging $700 each, 37,500 the second, and 50,000 for each succeeding year, the maximum stipend to be $1,000. An additional allowance of $350 for each scholarship student would be provided the college or university he attended.

That the President's proposals for higher education are in fact modest is immediately apparent when they are compared with other recent recommendations made in this field. For example, the Task Force Committee on Education to Mr. Kennedy, chaired by the president of Purdue University, Frederick L. Hovde, urged a combined program of loans and matching grants for academic facilities of at least $500 million for the first year, this figure to increase in succeeding years. The Hovde Report of January 6, 1961, also called for an annual authorization under the college housing loan program of $350 million rather than the $250 million requested in the President's message.

The American Council on Education 1 month later, on February 11, 1961, proposed a comprehensive legislative program for higher education which included slightly less money for college housing loans than did the Hovde committee. The council also asked for a combined loan-grant program for academic facilities in the same ratio as the Hovde Report (70 percent for matching grants and 30 percent for loans) but for twice as much money. The ACE asked for a 4-year loan-grant program averaging $1 billion a year: the Hovde committee urged $500 million the first year; the President asked only $300 million, and for loans only.

Another indication that President Kennedy's recommendation for a new program for academic facilities is far from radical was the action taken on January 11, 1961, by the Association of American Colleges, the new president for which is another distinguished Indiana educator, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame.

The AAC asked not only for Federal loans for academic facilities but for the alternative of matching grants as well. Because the AAC represents 800 accredited liberal arts colleges, about 95 percent of all within this category in the country, and because some institutions had previously been opposed to Federal grants, the New York Times described this resolution as "significant."

I think it also significant that the 17th American Assembly of May 1960, held at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., in which this writer was a participant, strongly recommended Federal matching grants for academic facilities. I say "significant" because the recommendations of the assembly were considerably more conservative than those of either the Hovde committee, the ACE, or the AAC.

In sum, as the columnist Roscoe Drummond, who describes himself as "a middle-of-the-road conservative," wrote last month, "President Kennedy has submitted to Congress a prudent and carefully conceived aid to education bill which should win maximum Democratic and Republican support."

But resolutions and reports are not enough. Nor is it prudent to conclude that, because a bill has been assigned a high priority by the President, has attracted support in Congress, and even been favorably reported by the responsible committee, it will win early and easy passage. Why not?

The legislative traffic is heavy. In one session of Congress, some 15,000 bills may be introduced. Still more important, the President has many other measures in which he is interested. Legislation on higher education must in this sense compete with bills on depressed areas, housing, health insurance for the aging, and the minimum wage, to cite just a few major issues on which the President has pledged action.

The economic recession and the widespread unemployment which it brings is already demanding much of the time and energy of the new administration. Foreign policy aside, it is the battle to reverse the economic slump that will require most of the President's troops and supplies, for a time at least.

Yet President Kennedy has expressed himself with such urgency on education during the campaign and since his election that there can be little doubt that he feels deeply about the subject.

The proponents of a wider role for the Federal Government in higher education can take heart at other signs in addition to the President's commitment to action in this field. Two significant changes have already occurred in the 87th Congress that should make more likely legislative support for higher education.

PROSPECTS FOR SUPPORT

Speaker RAYBURN'S January victory in the struggle for control of the House Rules Committee over the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition removes a formidable obstacle from the path of bills for higher education as well as many other proposals that President Kennedy will offer. The leading figure in the House of Representatives in higher education, the father of the National Defense Education Act, and one of the ablest and most distinguished Members of Congress, CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, has left the Education and Labor Committee to join the Rules Committee. Happily, Congressman ELLIOTT will be replaced as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with higher education (the Special Subcommittee on Education) by one of the most intelligent and effective Representatives in the House, Mrs. EDITH GREEN of Oregon. The other Democratic members of this subcommittee are all strong Kennedy supporters: ROBERT N. GIAIMO of Connecticut, NEAL SMITH of Iowa, and the writer of this article.

The Republican members of the subcommittee, JOHN M. ASHBROOK, CHARLES E. GOODELL and ALBERT H. QUIE, are all young, able, and intelligent Congressmen and all likely to be somewhat more conservative with respect to education than the Democratic members but, I should think, open-minded.

In the Senate, the chief champion of higher education is Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Because the conservative coalition is less effective in the Senate than in the House, I should think the President's proposals for education would have far less trouble there. And therefore, as is likely to be the case with nearly all the Kennedy domestic programs, the House will be the chief battleground.

The second significant factor in the improved outlook for congressional action on higher education is the new chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York. Mr. Powell, who talked with a large number of university presidents during his 1960 campaign tour on behalf of the Kennedy-Johnson ticket, can be counted upon as a strong advocate of more Federal support for higher education.

It is also important to say that Mr. POWELL, author in past years of the controversial amendment to withhold Federal funds from educational institutions practicing segregation, has indicated he may not offer such an amendment to the Federal aid bill for elementary and secondary education this year. He hopes that Executive action will make such a rider unnecessary.

On the other hand, the Civil Rights Commission, on January 12, 1961, urged the Federal Government "by executive or, if necessary, by congressional action," to bar all aid from public colleges and universities that exclude or discriminate against Negroes.

At this writing, it is not possible to predict with any certainty the impact of the civil rights issue on legislation either for elementary and secondary or for higher education. I think the problem of aid to private and parochial institutions, on which I shall comment later, is likely to be a more dangerous reef for education bills than the issue of segregation.

TIME TO ACT

It is from beyond the committeeroom and the floors of Congress, however, that public opinion acts with force to enhance or impair the prospects for passage of specific legislation. For this reason, I must make the perhaps paradoxical point that on legislation of benefit to higher education, those with most at stake and most prestige to lend frequently do least for their own cause. Few college and university teachers and administrators have fought through the heat of the midday when legislation on higher education has been pending in Congress. Many, however, are articulate in their criticism of the shortcomings of Congress in attempting to remedy the shortages in education.

I find it revealing that major Federal programs in higher education have seldom been passed for the sake of higher education. The Morrill Act was enacted in the name of the mechanical arts and agriculture. The buildings the PWA constructed on college campuses during the 1930's were the fruit of an antidepression program. The GI bill was recommended as veterans' legislation. It was more on the "defense" in the title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 than on education that Members of Congress justified their votes for the bill.

I am aware that many university administrators feel that the needs of higher education are self-evident and that the national interest clearly requires Federal assistance. I have also detected a strong reluctance on their part to lobby for such assistance coupled with a considerable lack of knowledge of how to do it. That there is a price to be paid for such fastidiousness and ignorance I think the story of the (a) loyalty oath and (b) affidavit of disclaimer of disloyalty in the National Defense Education Act clearly illustrates. A similar oath and a disclaimer were included in the law which created the National Science Foundation a decade ago. I do not recall that these features aroused any strong protest from the university community. The oath and disclaimer were added to the National Defense Education Act in the Senate a matter of weeks before the bill was passed. Opposition, particularly to the affidavit, gathered force only after the bill was passed, and the regulations accompanying the law were published. Last year, while President Kennedy served in the Senate, he led an attempt to remove the disclaimer affidavit.

Although both former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy favor repeal of the affidavit and although certain organizations representing university teachers and administrators have passed resolutions for repeal, there has been astonishingly little mail to Members of Congress, even to those of us on the Education and Labor Committee, from either professors or presidents asking repeal. Members of Congress are very busy and are subject to a great variety of pressures. I would therefore ask: If only a few of those most directly concerned trouble to make their views known on an issue such as repeal of the affidavit, whey should Members of Congress become particularly excited? A Congressman who votes for repeal of the affidavit, even if supported by the views of Eisenhower and Kennedy, may face the charge of voting against loyalty. If the principle involved is cited as the reason a Congressman should be self-generating on this issue, I can only reply that there are more principles to champion than a Congressman has time for if he is to be an effective Representative.

There is, however, hopeful evidence that academic organizations and administrators are becoming more aware of the importance of organized support for Federal measures they regard with favor. I have referred to the January 1961 resolution of the Association of American Colleges for grants and loans for the construction of academic facilities for colleges and universities. I have cited the February action of the American Council on Education in proposing a massive program of nearly $6 billion of Federal aid to colleges over the next 4 years.

These are recent examples which indicate a change in attitude. But I must reiterate that resolutions are not enough. The land-grant colleges and the State universities, with their experience of dealing with State legislatures, are much more sophisticated and active in working in Washington for programs they favor than are the private colleges and universities. For example, it is now apparent that there is considerable organized support behind proposals to expand university extension programs backed by Federal funds. I expect that legislation to this end will be considered by the 87th Congress.

WHAT AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION?

For some of the reasons I have suggested, it is hazardous to predict in March what proposals offered in the 87th Congress will be enacted into law. I think we can fairly assume that during the next 2 years, the Congress will move to extend and modify the National Defense Education Act and that there will be a strong effort to make Federal funds available to the universities and colleges to build academic facilities, in line with President Kennedy's proposal for long-term, low-interest rate loans, at least, and perhaps through grants as well.

Unlike dormitories and student union buildings, which now qualify for construction loans under the college housing loan program, classrooms, and laboratories (for which, to repeat, President Kennedy has just proposed loans as well) produce no revenue and are therefore not "self-liquidating." If Congress should decide to provide institutional grants for academic facilities, as distinguished from loans, I believe Congress would wish to be certain that such grants would be used to meet genuine deficiencies in academic facilities and not be diverted to such purposes as gymnasiums, community service projects, or public relations programs.

The fact that the President recommended only loans and not grants for academic facilities unquestionably disappointed many colleges and universities. The Hovde Task Force has urged a larger amount a year for such construction, 70 percent of it in grants and the rest in loans. The grant proposal was especially significant to the many State

universities and land-grant colleges which are financed by State funds and have no authority to borrow.

Some university educators were also dismayed that the President had not asked for more money for higher education.

I would point out, however, that Congress has not yet passed legislation for aid to elementary and secondary schools, a far more widely debated and widely recognized need. It seems to me unreasonable to expect Congress to act favorably on a broader program for higher education until (a) there has been action on an elementary and secondary school bill, and (b) there has been a more aggressive campaign than at present on behalf of legislation for higher education.

I expect that President Kennedy and the friends of higher education in the 87th Congress will move to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act during this session. The recent report of the consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education of January 4, 1961, offers a useful starting point for a discussion of possible changes in the NDEA. The President has said he will send Congress his own recommendations on the NDEA at a later date.

The panel of 21 consultants included a heavy representation of capable public school administrators together with presidents and deans of colleges and universities, both private and State supported. In the group were such prominent commentators on educational policy as Dr. James B. Conant and Prof. Arthur Bestor. This was primarily an educational administrators' panel and the members therefore brought to their task an intimate experience with the NDEA as it operates.

The present act will expire June 30, 1962. The consultants urged that the law be extended for 5 years with a substantial increase in funds to enable institutions to make longer range plans. I think it likely that Congress will agree during this term to an extension of the NDEA for a period of 5 years.

The consultants also recommended that the loan program for college students be continued and that the provision of the law which permits cancellation of up to 50 percent of a loan for students who enter public school teaching be extended to all school and college teachers. This proposal, of course, raises the sensitive issue of whether Federal funds can appropriately be used for private schools. In this connection, it is perhaps significant that both the Hovde report and the more conservative 17th American Assembly agreed that the forgiveness feature should be extended to all teachers.

AID TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

I suppose this is as good a place as any to note that the general issue of public moneys going to private schools will be a major factor in the development of all legislation for education, whether for elementary and secondary schools or for higher education, and that tensions over the issue are likely to rise rather than to diminish.

There will be those who say that the Constitution is clear in specifying that Federal funds shall not be used for private purposes. Against this view, many will argue strongly that the national need for teachers is imperative and that Federal aid of this sort is being given an individual, not an institution.

President Kennedy certainly has made his position clear. He is opposed to any direct aid to private schools and believes such aid prohibited by the Constitution.

The President does not agree, however, that his proposal for scholarships that may be used by students attending private colleges is subject to the same prohibitions.

At his March 1 press conference, Mr. Kennedy said, "The aid that we have recommended to colleges is in a different form. We are aiding the student in the same way the GI Bill of Rights aided the student. The scholarships are given to the students who have particular talents and they can go to the college they want. In that case it is aid to the student, not to the school or college, and, therefore not to a particular religious group. That is the distinction between them."

INSTITUTES FOR TEACHERS

The consultants propose also a broadening of the summer institutes provided under title VI of the act, which now provide for summer training for elementary and secondary school teachers of foreign languages. They ask that the institutes also be operated for elementary and secondary teachers of English.

The letters that cross a Congressman's desk document the deplorable fact that our schools are producing too many semiliterates. Surveys such as the recent one of teacher preparation by the National Council of Teachers of English make it clear that we need more English teachers and better ones. It seems to me that the summer institutes in foreign languages operated under the NDEA and those in mathematics and science financed through the National Science Foundation have proved a most effective means of raising the competence of the teachers already in the schools by remedying their deficiences in subject matter and acquainting them with new materials and techniques.

I believe the case for adding institutes in English to the NDEA program is a strong one. With the inclusion of English, inservice training programs (which already embrace foreign languages, mathematics, and science) would cover most of the subjects essential for college preparation.

In this context, I think it also fair to observe that the institutes have restored to the liberal arts colleges and the universities a greater share of the responsibility for raising the level of competence of teachers in our schools. I have heard that the institutes are looked upon with disapproval in some universities as simply adding a further strain to overtaxed facilities and overburdened faculties. But the institutes and the idea of inservice training they represent are hopeful examples of a way in which higher education can directly and constructively influence the schools.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR STUDENTS

For the most part, the consultants recommended including more programs within the National Defense Education Act and more money for them. Their major proposal for a new title in the law, the creation of a Federal scholarship program for undergraduates, was in broad outlines adopted by President Kennedy in his February message. The consultants called for some 25,000 4-year undergraduate scholarships annually with awards of up to $1,000 a year for each recipient and $500 to be paid to the institution in which the scholarship holder is enrolled.

In the late days of debate over the National Defense Education Act in 1958 a scholarship program was dropped from the act. Although there was a good deal of support in Congress for a scholarship program, it appeared that the sacrifice of the scholarships was the price of acceptance of the rest of the bill by many Members of Congress. I would think the outlook for the President's scholarship proposal this year to be a far brighter one. If such a general scholarship program is passed early enough in the 87th Congress, there will probably be a waning of the support for the proposal of another champion of higher education in Congress, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, for an extension of the GI bill for some half million peacetime veterans.

CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDES

In attempting to assess the temper of Congress on legislation for higher education, I would say that most Members of Congress are aware of the immense pressures on the colleges and universities. The relentless projections show that college population will double by 1970 and that there will be a serious shortage of college teachers. Not only will it be necessary to raise faculty salaries to make university careers more attractive, but it will also be necessary to make the investment to expand satisfactorily the facilities and faculties for graduate study and research.

I believe that Congress will act to help the colleges meet the emergency of numbers. But this does not mean that we will see higher education "Federalized." The values and the vitality of our mixed system of private and public institutions depend on their continued support by tuition, philanthropy, and State and municipal funds. I think it is clear, however, that the size of the Federal Government's contribution to higher education will grow, and in terms of the economics of higher education, must grow.

Members of Congress also know that in addition to specific Federal programs affecting higher education, the Government makes grants for research to universities totaling some half billion dollars a year, which amount to a significant 15 to 20 percent of university budgets.

Congressmen understand, as well, that many irritations and some genuine grievances are generated both by the system of grants and by the Federal aid programs, which can be more accurately described as a purchase of services by the Government. For example, although 15 percent overhead payments do not fully cover such costs, no provision for administrative expenses is made in Federal loan programs. To cite another example, some argue that the Government gets campus facilities for ROTC programs free.

Not all of these difficulties can or should be resolved in such a way as to enable the universities to participate in Government programs at a bookkeeping profit. Yet I am convinced that a much wiser and more efficient use of Federal funds can be made and that new Federal programs can be better programs if university authorities take a greater part in what political scientists call the decisionmaking process.

A Proposed Communications Satellite Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the public investment in the development of an operable space communications satellite system is immense. There are significant public policy questions involved in determining its ultimate ownership and control. Prof. Dallas W. Smythe has proposed a public authority. I call my colleagues' attention to his testimony before the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee:

TESTIMONY OF DALLAS W. SMYTHE, RESEARCH PROFESSOR OF COMMUNICATIONS, INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 3, 1961

The following statement represents my own views. It does not represent those of my university. I have had no consulting

relationships with any company interested in communications satellites.

My statement concerns the question: "What are the most appropriate and effective roles for government, private enterprise, and other organizations in financing, developing, owning, controlling, using, and negotiating for the use of communications satellites, domestically and internationally?"

First, I want to compliment this committee for its foresight and wisdom in opening up for policymaking consideration this question. Since the first sputnik went up, almost all of the congressional attention to space and satellites has been directed to technology and the questions, how soon, how big, how successful. It is late to raise such questions as: Who will operate communications satellites? Who will "own" them? For what purposes will they function? Are we sure we have made the best tentative decisions on such questions? But while it is late, perhaps it is not too late.

The space age means that we have moved into a period when traditions must be challenged before we permit them to continue. One recalls Einstein's remark that the discovery of atomic power had changed everything except our ways of thinking. Nowhere is this truer than in regard to the implications of communications satellites. The attempt to reduce these satellites to the slogans and institutional forms which existed prior to 1957 can only hurt America and the American place in the world. My purpose today is to try to show that a new type of organization and control is needed for communications satellites. In doing so, I am mindful of (1) our foreign policy, where mutually respecting intercourse and aid is valued and the appearance of American domination or exploitation is to be avoided; (2) our space policy, where, closely tied with foreign policy, our purpose is full, imaginative, and peaceful development for the good of all nations; and (3) our communications policy, which historically has been concerned largely with antitrust and regulatory policy matters. I have two points to make.

I

My first point is that the present FCC policy is unsuited to the implications of communications satellites in the nuclear age. Briefly, the FCC appears to be bent on creating a consortium composed of the international communications common carriers which would own and operate the communications satellites under Government regulation. This policy rests on several assumptions, all of which are invalid, in my opinion.

Assumption No. 1 is that private ownership of communications satellites is possible. It isn't, in any meaningful sense of the word. For, as the Senators well know, in space no law exists as to ownership or other property characteristics. A passive satellite is as usable exclusively by Russians while it is over the U.S.S.R. as it is by us when it is over us, and once it is up there there is nothing we can do about it. An active satellite also has no property or ownership status in orbit. I agree with the authors of the united research report for NASA (p. 5), that "until greater understanding and international concord in this complex area are achieved it seems premature to treat space research derived and oriented products as traditional items of private property."

If communications satellites are not susceptible of property status, what then does the assumption mean when the FCC speaks of private ownership and operation of these things? It means merely that the use and benefits of the satellites are in the first instance reserved for the corporations which they intend should use them. This is, I submit, too limited a purpose to measure up to national policy requirements in the nuclear age.

Assumption No. 2, evident in the FCC public releases, makes this private benefit the plain purpose of its policy proposals. The first report in docket No. 14024, May 24, 1961 says:

Paragraph 6(d): "By reason of their experience in and responsibility for furnishing international communication service, the international carriers themselves are logically the ones best qualified to determine the nature and extent of the facilities best suited to their needs and those of their foreign correspondents, with whom they have longstanding and effective commercial relationships and who necessarily will have a substantial interest in the operations of any satellite system."

Paragraph 7: "These considerations, in our opinion, demonstrate the desirability of exploring at this time the means whereby the international common carriers may, collectively, but subject to appropriate regulation and safeguards, take such steps as are necessary to plan and effect the ultimate integration of satellite communication techniques into the fabric of international common carrier service."

Paragraph 8: "However, it appears that the adaptation and integration of satellite communication techniques to international common carrier operations is within the economic means of the existing carriers, although requiring cooperative arrangements among them. We fail to see why ownership participation by the aerospace and communications equipment industries will be beneficial or necessary to the establishment of a satellite communication system to be used by the common carrier industry. On the other hand, such participation may well result in encumbering the system with complicated and costly corporate relationships, disrupting operational patterns that have been established in the international common carrier industry, and impeding effective regulation of the rates and services of the industry."

Isn't there something wrong with the assumption that the first practical application of space satellites must be restricted to the service of corporate interests and bureaucratic operational patterns of organizations which were developed in the use of a now potentially partially obsolete technology? It brings to mind the fable of the procrustean bed.

Assumption No. 3 is that ownership of satellites must necessarily be in the same hands as ownership of ground stations. This is a wrong assumption. Its purpose is merely to extend control of policy, rates, revenues and service from the ground stations to the satellites. There is no reason why the satellites themselves might not be under separate control from the ground stations, just as presently each of two ground stations connected by cable or radio circuits may be operated efficiently under separate ownerships. As I will try to show later, if this assumption be changed, the legitimate interests and needs of the existing common carriers may be safeguarded while the noncommercial interest in the communication satellites is also protected. If, as I contend, this assumption is wrong, there is no need for a consortium.

Assumption No. 4 is that communications satellites are properly to be regarded as analogous to cables or wireless circuits between ground stations. They are not. In terms of operational characteristics, kinds of service capabilities, and the political and social implications of their existence and capacities they are sui generis. Therefore, any organizational plan which misconceives their nature is dangerously unrealistic for the national and international interests of the United States. I will return to this point later.

Assumption No. 5 is that a consortium of present carriers is a desirable or feasible device for operating the communications satellite systems. I have previously suggested that this assumption collapses if the assumption that there must be common ownership of satellites and ground stations is invalid, as I believe it is.

But assume, arguendo, that this assumption is at all tenable. The Senators are, I am sure, aware of the history of the Senate policy on merger of international communications carriers. You know, I think, that there have been over the past 30 years perhaps a dozen attempts to frame legislation which would permit some kind of permissive or mandatory merger of these cable and radio carriers. You are aware of the fact that no such legislation has ever been enacted, and that, historically, it has been the Senate's position that the provisions of the antitrust laws and of certain sections of the Communications Act of 1934 as amended (notably sec. 314) express a firm national policy against merger and monopoly in international common carrier communications.

In this context several questions arise: Has the FCC sought enabling legislation to reverse this longstanding legislative policy? Is the communications satellite consortium device not in effect a mandatory merger mechanism? Are the questions which proponents of international merger were unable to answer to the satisfaction of the Senate for 30 years to be forgotten?

While I would not be capable of speaking for the Senators in asking all these historic questions, I would like to raise some of them in the present context. This much I learned between 1939 and 1943 and in 1945 while working on some aspects of the proposals for international merger which were considered by Congress at that time. Some of the unsolved questions which I don't think the FCC has yet answered satisfactorily concerning the consortium are these:

Who is to set the terms on which proprietorship of the consortium is to be allocated? The present carriers? With other industrial groups added? Or, ultimately, the Government?

If securities are to be sold by the consortium, is the Government in effect guaranteeing the capital and a return thereon through its role in creating the consortium?

Who is to protect against wrong decisions on technology (if, e.g., a superior technique existing outside the consortium is rejected in favor of an inferior technique owned inside the consortium)?

Who is going to insure that newcomers to the business of conducting communications will have open access to the consortium?

Who is to have the authority to make decisions for the consortium—the corporate participants or, ultimately, the Government? In this connection, I note that Chairman Minow in testifying before the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee on June 14, 1961, said that the FCC would be in a "constant supervisory position" (p. 132), as also would be NASA (p. 135) and the Department of Justice (p. 136). But, he confused me by also saying (p. 137) that the decisions ultimately would be made by the private companies. Who will make the decisions?

Inasmuch as a supervisory role such as the FCC is undertaking partakes of the management function, how can the FCC serve both in this role and as regulator? Is there not a hopeless confusion of roles and identities involved in the consortium? Is in fact the real role of the FCC in the consortium proposal one of advocate and manager for the private companies rather than representation of an independent public concern? In this connection, one recalls the truism that where there is a coincidence between the public interest and that of the private companies under public utility regulation, there is no need for the regulatory agency, and that, where there is a conflict of interest, the public agency usually if not always falters

as against the perfectly valid objection of the private management that they have a legal responsibility to their stockholders to use their best judgment and that no regulatory law relieves them of this responsibility.

Perhaps the key question in this series concerning the consortium, however, is that in view of the intimate intermixture of Government and private influence in the decisionmaking process what becomes of the propaganda notion that this is private enterprise of a traditional sort?

I want to repeat that all of these knotty problems are avoidable, if the clear implications of communications satellites are heeded.

Assumption No. 6, in the FCC and NASA policies, seems to be that these agencies are qualified to make national policy for the organization and operation of communications satellites. This I would deny. Only Congress and then the President can do this, as the New York Times wisely pointed out in its editorial on June 1 and in a featured story on June 4.

And finally, assumption No. 7 is that we must proceed with private ownership of the satellites at least for the time being in order that time not be wasted and that we may proceed in being first with the communicaions satellite in operational orbit. This, too, I would deny. The relationship between a Government procurement agency such as NASA or a yet-to-be-created Communications Satellite Authority and private contractors is a well understood one. Procedures for it are familiar and available. If anything would save time in getting on with the job it would be to use these familiar procedures rather than to attempt to create a consortium. The amount of time wasted by private corporations fighting amongst themselves for their spheres of influence in the process of creating the consortium is enormous. The waste of Government administrators' time in creating and defending the consortium will also be enormous. The input of less time in creation of a straightforward Communications Satellite Authority, moreover, would yield sound results in terms of public policy—something which cannot be said for the consortium. Far from assuming that private ownership may properly be the mode while proceeding to get the satellites up, I would urge that current research and development contracts be examined to prevent the irremovable private foot from being put in the public door at this time. I quite agree with the authors of the United Research report (p. 44) that the most pressing decisions today relate to the research and development phase. They warn against the danger that "to proceed with research and development without a conscious decision as to operational control very likely decides the issue."

To sum up this first point: all of the undesirable consequences of the assumptions on which the FCC is presently working are avoidable if communications satellites are viewed as beyond the scope of private property, and are operated under a noncommercial Communications Satellite Authority. Then, just as now, competition which has been the principle underlying American international communications policy may be perpetuated between the present carriers and between them and new entrants—all of whom would continue to own and operate the ground stations and traffic pick-up and delivery facilities, as well as their present cable and radio facilities.

II

My second main point is that the organizational and policy implications of the facts concerning communications satellites clearly call for their operation by a noncommercial authority, and ultimately regulation by an international organization under U.N. control. In introducing this point, I would like, respectfully, to point out the unprecedented opportunity which confronts lawmakers in this matter. How many times have you seen situations where, but for private vested interests which it would be difficult to dislodge, great public benefit (in large measure of a noncommercial kind) could come from simple assertion of government responsibility in a particular area? Here is an area where there is great public benefit to be had, not only in our country but worldwide. And here is an area where there are no vested private interests, and where, unless you permit there to be, there will not be private interests in conflict with the public interest.

(a) Communications satellites are sui generis, a new technology in which a single system is the ideal and where private common carriers are unsuitable for operating or for ownership control:

1. Unlike cables and conventional radio stations, communications satellites require Government facilities for launching and tracking—i.e., they can only be "installed" by Government.

2. Unlike cable and conventional radio systems, communications satellites will only be possible by virtue of Government-supported research and development work on launch vehicles, tracking technology, power sources, communications components, etc. I don't know that anyone knows just how much the Government will have spent for this purpose, but doubtless it will run to the billions of dollars before communications satellites are operational. There is an appealing commonsense to the notion that the taxpayer deserves a direct return on this expenditure which he has paid for. Dr. von Braun has suggested that the revenues from communications satellites should be used to pay for the space research and development program. Under my proposal, they at least might be used in part to pay for the cost of research and development on the communications portion of the program, rather than being siphoned off as dividends for a private consortium. And we are here talking of large sums of money. For, to take just one rather conservative estimate—that made by the firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton in their study for Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (pp. 39A, 56A), the estimated volume of U.S. intercontinental revenue for communications carriers in 1970 will be around $500 million, and in 1980, around $1.7 billion—as compared with $126 million in 1960.

3. Unlike cables and conventional radio stations which may be legion, the technology of communications satellites tends to a single system for a number of interrelated reasons:

(a) Communications satellites, especially active and more especially synchronous equatorial satellites have an enormous capacity. This is what makes them so desirable. This distinguishes them from cable and conventional radio circuits which have severely limited capacity.

(b) Communications satellites have great flexibility. Whereas cables and conventional radio circuits are tied to their connecting stations, the active satellites can provide a varying number of channels between any two points on the surface of the earth with a relatively small investment to be made in ground stations (in the order of $1 million each). This means that the active synchronous satellite (which seems concededly the eventual goal) is roughly analogous to the central office of a worldwide telephone-telegraph system. Its service is thus multilateral rather than, as with the old modes, bilateral in pattern.

(c) Just as one telephone service is preferred to two in a city, one communications satellite system will be much more efficient than two or more for the nations of the world. Suppose that we put up a civilian communications satellite system and that it serves only part of the world. Suppose that the Russians put up a rival system and it serves only part of the world. The result is inefficiency. No such characteristic attaches to cables and conventional radio circuits which may be duplicated insofar as the demand warrants.

(d) Being large in capacity and multilateral in service scope, communications satellites could be used for cutthroat competition. Unless the communications satellite policy places them securely under U.N. auspices of one kind or another, they could become another battleground in the cold war, with United States and Russian systems vying with each other in ways which would be damaging to all nations. Here is a foreign-policy aspect of the communications satellite which has no counterpart in cable technology.

4. The very premium which the cold war puts on "firstness" in communications satellites distinguishes them from cables and wireless.

5. There is a need—based on our ICBM warning system capabilities as well as on general principles—to minimize the number of inoperative satellites (debris) in orbit. Duplication or triplication of communications satellite systems runs counter to this requirement. Again, there is no counterpart for cables or wireless.

6. As a single system with vast, flexible capacity, the frequency allocation aspect of communications satellites has a direct bearing on the foreign policy problem of relations with the new and developing nations. As General Electric said in its comments submited to the FCC in docket No. 13522 on March 1, 1961:

"Our temptation is to regard space communication as a concern primarily of nations with high technological development. In fact, its impact will be worldwide. It will either decrease or increase the problems and the opportunities for radio communication of the three-fourths of the world's nations only now developing their technologies.

"These nations do not now have the communication needs of highly industrialized civilizations. Right now, their need is not for high quality, high reliability, large bandwidth communication channels, but for simple, inexpensive, easily operated internal broadcasting plus local and international fixed services. They need the same opportunity which high-frequency radio offered to the United States of America and Europe 4 decades ago. At the 1959 OARC in Geneva, they expressed this as almost their sole concern.

"As their technologies develop, of course, their needs for higher quality, greater reliability and wider bandwidths will increase. Their technological development, and the resulting change in their communication needs, will undoubtedly be significantly more rapid than were those of the United States of America and Europe.

"As this filing will show, space communication offers the opportunity both for release of pressure on the high-frequency radio spectrum, and for worldwide high quality, high reliability, wideband radio communication. Once the latter service is established, cost of gradual inclusion of small and isolated nations is expected to be orders of magnitude less than is possible by any other means.

"In these circumstances, it is our responsibility as technological leaders to:

"A. Consult with new or developing countries of the world to find out their communication needs and their ideas for implementing these needs;

"B. Plan with these nations for optimum utilization of space communication resources for worldwide needs, present and future;

"C. Exercise great diligence and care, in setting forth our resulting plans, to make

our underlying reasons and motives plain" (p. 2–2).

No such implications attend cable operations.

7. Whereas negotiations concerning cables and conventional radio circuits involve only two countries, negotiations involving communications satellites are multilateral and potentially as extensive as the membership of the UN. I agree with the authors of the United Research report for NASA when they say:

"The establishment of a communications satellite system necessitates a sizable increase in the number and complexity of international agreements to be negotiated at a period in history when such negotiations have become vastly more important, difficult, and delicate. Moreover, because this technology has become a symbol of our national purposes and goals in the peaceful exploration of and scientific research in, the environment of outer space, it may be desirable to develop and pursue special new policies for its commercial application in international communications. It could have unusual value in implementing foreign policy, especially in the area of economic development assistance" (p. 6).

Is the presiding officer at these multilateral negotiations to be a representative of a public authority (national or international) or a representative of a consortium? Is America to be represented in such negotiations by officers of a consortium or by representatives of the state? In any event this characteristic marks communications satellites off from the cables.

8. Unlike the preceding points of difference which all assume common carrier traffic as the sole or chief function of communications satellites, I turn now to one extremely important area of differences: the potential of communications satellites for offering new services, the values of which are not measurable in ordinary market terms. Chief of these, of course, is broadcasting of radio, television, and perhaps even facsimile. Incidentally, satellite facsimile transmission of mail may make airmail obsolete. It is currently common to hear common carrier representatives belittling these potentials of the satellites. But there is evidence to the contrary. We know, for example, that General Electric has already done much of the planning and preliminary research necessary to the addition of broadcast channels to the synchronous satellite. Referring to communications satellites, General Sarnoff said in a speech in Montreux last May:

"Ten years hence, it is conceivable that a billion people in virtually every nation on earth will be watching the same program, at the same time and in color, with simultaneous translation techniques making it understandable to all."

We don't know and cannot imagine now just how the new services which communications satellites make possible will develop. But we can know that they will probably involve many noncommercial interests, even where direct broadcasting from satellites is not involved. But let us assume that the U.S.S.R. means what it says when it indicates that in its current program is the development of a cosmic transmitter capable of color television broadcasting. Under the impetus of a desire to be first in this area, one or the other side of the cold war is probably going to venture into direct broadcasting from satellites unless by prior international agreement the use of radio in the cold war is brought under common, civilized control. If this happens the people running the satellites are going to face all of the noncommercial policy problems concerning freedom of speech, censorship, good taste, and public service performance with which we are so familiar domestically.

Extension of the European Broadcasting Union's "Eurovision" network to communications satellites is ultimately a hopeful possibility. The point at this time is that for such a new service, a consortium originally justified on the basis of a false analogy to cable communications will be ludicrously inadequate as managers of communications satellites. I quite agree with the authors of the United Research report to NASA in their conclusions that "as new uses emerge, develop, and grow, the impact of satellite systems on social, political, educational, and economic relations between nations can become highly significant. The role that such improved international communications facilities can play in developing desirable growth in trade and commerce, economic development in new national and cultural and scientific exchange patterns can only be speculated on now and defined with the passage of time" (p. 7).

The foreign policy implications seem clear.

The implication of the preceding analysis, plus the facts that communications satellites are organizationally separable from the ground stations with which they would interchange traffic, and that private ownership of communications satellites as such is a meaningless concept, given the present state of international law, is that as a nation we should work toward two companion organizations for communications satellites.

(1) To conduct the operation of the satellites, we should have a public authority (which I have called the Communications Satellite Authority). This Authority would own such ground installations as are necessary for controlling the technical operation of the satellites, and it would hold such control over the satellites themselves as the emerging content of international space law may permit. The CSA would not own any ground facilities or operate any such facilities for the transmission of commercial messages by means of satellites. It would serve as a "carrier's carrier" for all existing and future common carriers and foreign administrations who would desire to use its facilities. When in the future, noncommercial and noncommon carrier services develop, the CSA would perform such functions in connection with such services as may be prescribed by the yet-to-be-described International Commission on the Use of Radio (ICUR).

The CSA should ultimately be thought of as an organ of the United Nations. While negotiations are underway in the U.N. to accomplish this objective, CSA might best be kept as an American public authority. This would be an interim organizational form for the communications satellites while they are in the developmental stage. It would seem that as soon as the satellites are operational the CSA should be transferred to its U.N. domicile. During the interim period of research and development, CSA would have roughly the same kind of organizational relationship to NASA and the FCC that the "line" organizations in the armed forces bear to the military research and development agency.

I want to make it plain that this suggestion entails no change in the business position of the existing common carriers. They would continue as competitive entities, transmitting and receiving their commercial messages. They would lease channel space from the CSA whenever they wanted to supplement or replace their cable or radio circuit facilities. No consortium would be necessary. No new antitrust problems would be generated. The FCC could continue with its usual functions of designating carriers for particular common carrier services, acting on rate proposals, and the like.

It is evident that one of the most important functions the CSA would perform would be the management of the flexible elements in satellite capabilities. In speaking of the operation of a synchronous satellite, RCA in its comments of March 1, 1961, in docket No. 13522 at the FCC might well have been referring to the CSA:

"The great flexibility of the system lies in the fact that each participating private or national service may establish, own and operate its own ground station equipment for transmitting and receiving signals of any category through the satellite repeaters. This is extremely important in view of the continuing competition among the commercial communications services within the United States and the desire of the other nations of the world to employ their own national services. With this proposed system, international agreement would be facilitated, since all of the existing services would have individual access to the satellite repeaters from their own ground stations, so that they could continue to conduct their business as they do today" (p. 6).

And in speaking of the versatility of the synchronous satellite, RCA might well have been referring to the central booking agency function to be performed by the carriers' carrier, CSA:

"This versatility permits truly global access to the system, though obviously such access must be coordinated with the technical and economic status of the system through assignments by a central authority. Access to the system requires specific technical facilities and conformance to operating procedures.

"Idle hours on particular channels between particular points can be shared with stations in other time zones which are required to be active, thus favoring maximum repeater loading and intense time use of frequency space which minimizes the need for increased frequency space. Global sharing under a carefully supervised scheduling of channel usage between various pairs of ground points can be accomplished entirely by switching of carrier channels." (Ibid., p. 22.)

The CSA would, of course, share in revenues from commercial traffic, just as any other connecting carrier does. Its rates should be set at a level which would cover its operating cost, amortization, insurance, etc., and which would support future research and development work plus, if possible, reimbursement to the U.S. Treasury for past research and development work on communications satellites.

(2) A second function is also called for by the present technological situation in communications. This is the function of providing a forum for reaching international agreement on various aspects of the use of radio. In the past the International Telecommunications Union has gotten its feet a little wet in this area and yet has felt that its principal function is to allocate radio frequencies and administer the registration of frequencies, rather than to get involved too deeply in the many problems concerning the operational use of the radio frequencies. Communications satellites will require general international policy on many aspects of the use of the frequencies. For example, the policy which would be followed by the CSA—the carriers' carrier—in making its facilities available to ground stations will have to be developed from scratch. It therefore appears likely that something like an International Commission on the Use of Radio will be needed. This also should be a United Nations agency when the time is ripe for it. In the meantime, the Communications Satellite Authority in the interim period especially, may have to rely on ad hoc negotiatory procedures, in cooperation with the State Department and the FCC.

To ICSU would also fall such tasks as providing the machinery for standardizing calling procedures for international telephone traffic. Presently there is no such standardization as will be necessary when the global telephone service now concerning telephone engineers is presented with differ-

ences in telephone dial symbols in various countries. Automatic dialing soon will be feasible on a transoceanic and even global scale, and it will be necessary that telephone dial symbols in all countries be standardized.

III

I will not quote back to you the many fine statements that Senators have made concerning our intentions to use our space capability for peaceful, useful purposes. Vice President JOHNSON, speaking to the U.N. Committee No. 1 in 1958 said in part:

"It is the American vision, I believe, that, out of this fresh start for humankind which space affords, man may at last free himself of the waste of guarding himself against his ignorance of his neighbors."

Communications is functionally related to peace; ignorance, to war. As we rightly fear the horrors of war, we put increasing emphasis on the necessity of better communications as a way to peaceful understanding between the nations of the world. I would agree with Mr. James M. Skinner, president of the Philco Corp., who in a speech last November suggested that communications satellites be turned over to the U.N. In part, he said:

"The United States now has the opportunity to give a convincing demonstration of its intention to use its technical achievements in space for peaceful purposes and thus bolster its position of world leadership. • • • Unfortunately, from the point of view of the rest of the world, we have talked primarily about our military achievements in space and the use of space for military purposes. These, of course, are very important, but would it not be a major asset in the court of world opinion if we could demonstrate not only our peaceful motives in the space program, but also the use of these developments of ours to provide a service which would be useful to everyone?"

The Senate, I respectfully submit, has for its discretion a rare opportunity to distinguish itself in creative public service. Here are these communications satellites—the first practical fruit of our space effort, laden with foreign relations significance. And here stands the administration with no policy fit for the occasion. The situation is unique. Communications satellite systems do not fit traditional patters by which Government discoveries can be turned over to private industry for commercial exploitation. We are dealing here with a fugitive, precious service—the communication of information, pregnant with all manner of psychological and political overtones. If we value the image which the world holds of us, the last thing we should do would be to place a commercial trademark on these satellites and this service. To do this is to confirm the worst elements in the foreigners' image of our country and its culture. In space, where there as yet can be no traditional private property, why do we not seize the golden opportunity and say that communications satellites will be devoted to public ends, and not to the pursuit of private gain?

Foreign Aid Does Need Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 22, there appeared an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Foreign Aid Does Need Strings," written by my good friend, Charles L. Dancey, which was provoked by the second in a series of articles being written by our Republican Party standardbearer last November, Richard M. Nixon. The editorial expresses my own feelings so very well, and I would commend its reading to all the Members of Congress:

FOREIGN AID DOES NEED STRINGS

Richard Nixon's article on foreign aid in the Evening Peoria Journal Star is unique in two ways:

First, it is perhaps the clearest and cleanest discussion of this subject, frankly pointing up the good and the bad with equal clarity, to be found; and second, its content and its timing serve to help the Kennedy administration effort in the Congress.

Apparently, Nixon isn't afraid to give Kennedy a helping hand, if that is the means of giving our country and its cold war position a helping hand.

The standard attacks on foreign aid which he recounted are pretty familiar, as is the basic defense that it is an element in the cold war that we simply cannot afford to abandon without forfeiting hope in many countries and in short giving Russia victory be default.

But when Nixon rapped opponents and proponents alike, we thought his brief analysis brilliant in its clarity and good sense.

That is when he said proponents like Adlai Stevenson who talk as if economic aid is the answer to all our problems, including Cuba, are talking dangerous nonsense—and that opponents who think the total answer rests in "strength at home" are doing the same.

There is no single, magic weapon at home or abroad.

He put it simply and straight:

"The Communist arsenal includes military, economic, political, subversive, diplomatic and propaganda weapons. They have used and will continue to use each of these weapons in the area and in the amount they deem necessary to win victory. We need the same weapons and we must learn to use ours even more effectively than they."

There's no question about this. History and Communist doctrine both show plainly that the Soviets have no favorite weapon, nor dominant weapon. If one is blunted they bear down with another. They will use them all or any selection that works effectively which generally winds up meaning sheer, brute force of the Red armies applied against neighboring populations which are then absorbed by the use of more sheer, brute force.

It winds up that way simply because most folks close to communism's borders see enough of what it means to effectively resist all other efforts.

The significant thing about our experience, specifically with foreign aid, it seems to us, is that the original policy of "no strings attached" simply hasn't worked out.

Foreign aid in the past has produced some spectacular successes. It has also produced some flaming failures. People have written books about the successes and made it look like the answer to all things. Others have written books devoted to the failures and made it look like a horrible mess.

It seems to us, however, that a pretty clear line appears to separate the wins and the losses. Aid with no strings was a great moral and propaganda concept, and it worked brilliantly in much of Western Europe. It succeeded phenomenally in Germany, and it functions brilliantly in Israel, especially.

But in undeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, it is a big, flat flop.

What is the difference?

Developed nations, ravished by war, could use the money intelligently and responsibly.

Undeveloped nations with inexperienced and often irresponsible leadership—sometimes, just plain corrupt leadership—do not use the money intelligently. Indeed, they often use it in ways that seriously damage their position and that of the United States.

What is badly needed is not to throw up our hands and give up, defaulting to the Soviets, who would certainly pick up this weapon and use it to the hilt.

What is needed is to use these 15 years of experience in how moneys did well and when moneys were wasted to develop a program of aid for specific purposes that have proven their worth, the performance of those purposes to be a condition of aid and to be monitored by the United States.

We make our own sovereign States meet such standards to qualify for Federal aid. It would hardly be demeaning to expect foreign nations to meet the same standard and procedures.

This money, used wisely, can be of great service to the cause of freedom. After 15 years of experience, we ought to know how to use it wisely if we just get off the theory that it must be shoveled out with "no strings."

The philosophy that aid is given to selected countries to use as they see fit in strengthening themselves needs to be replaced by a philosophy that aid is given for specific good purposes and hence goes to those countries who qualify by cooperating in achieving these good, humanitarian purposes.

Such a revolution in the aid program is our best hope.

C. L. DANCEY.

We Need Relief for Textiles, but Not at Expense of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am serving my 12th year as chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. I have probably worked as close to the cotton and cotton textile problem for a long period of time as any other Member here.

This year I joined with some 130 of my colleagues, with the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman CARL VINSON, acting as chairman, in efforts to get action by our Government to protect the domestic textile industry against increased imports of textile goods. Such imports have more than tripled in a very short time. It is my opinion that the cheap labor which is available to foreign mills makes relief under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act necessary.

Unfortunately, efforts at relief now seem to be directed toward either giving up foreign markets for U.S. cotton or reducing domestic prices to world levels. I believe this has resulted because the full story has not been told to my colleagues and to the President.

On July 27, 1961, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman VINSON, chair-

man of the congressional group, issued a news release in which, among other things, he stated the following:

The next concerns the differential that now exists between the domestic price of cotton and the much lower price at which cotton can be purchased by foreign textile manufacturers. Until this differential is offset, the U.S. industry is at a serious competitive disadvantage.

Earlier, on May 2, 1961, following the visit of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and Representatives of our group in the Congress with President Kennedy, the White House issued a news release which contained the following statement:

Fourth, I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry has, and does not receive, a cash differential to offset the competitive price of cotton sold abroad. Since we started offering cotton at competitive prices in world trade, the following payments have been made to the American textile industry to offset such competitive world price offerings in world trade:

1956–57	$13,895,998.11
1957–58	15,549,304.77
1958–59	13,159,356.04
1959–60	17,187,224.01
1960–61 (through Nov. 21, 1961)	14,208,530.78
Total	74,000,418.71

I am sure these facts have not been fully presented to our colleagues or to the President. It makes me fearful that the real desire of some outside interests is to use this issue to destroy all farm price supports. Some of these interests have opposed any price protection for the farmer over the years.

If cotton prices in the United States were dropped to world levels, with present high costs of production, it would bankrupt American cotton producers. On the other hand, unless our offering price on raw cotton in world trade is kept competitive, American cotton producers will lose their foreign exports which are one-third of their market; and this, too, would mean bankruptcy—and the effect in either case would be disastrous to the overall U.S. economy.

I repeat—relief for the American textile industry is needed. It should come under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The authority to limit imports is clear and the need is great.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a statement on competitive sales in world trade, the necessity for it, its justification and history, which I issued on February 14, 1961. This statement was carried in full in the March–April 1961 edition of Cotton Farming.

May I say, subsequent to release of the statement the majority leader advised me the quotation attributed to him by the press and been lifted out of context.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMIE L. WHITTEN, APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE FOR AGRICULTURE

An article carried by the American press under Associated Press dateline of February 10, 1961, quotes what purports to be a statement of the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, then visiting in Mexico, as follows:

"He said he hoped the cotton-dumping program would ease off, and pointed out that during the last 2 years it already has been decreased."

Competitive price is essential to sell and seling competitively certainly is in no way dumping. I trust if any such statement was made by our Senate majority leader it was in reply to a "loaded" inquiry and does not represent a prepared statement of the Government of the United States.

Selling at competitive prices in world trade is a right exercised by all nations of the world. Much of U.S. agriculture has historically been dependent upon export sales for its economic health. It is a matter of record that much of the present plight of U.S. agriculture is a direct result of our Government holding U.S. production off world markets for a number of years.

The words attributed to the majority leader are most unfortunate. They may be used by some to again argue that American products should be held off world markets at competitive prices. The Secretary of Agriculture of Mexico and other Mexican representatives have spent hours here in Washington trying to get us to agree to return to the policy of holding U.S. commodities off world markets at competitive prices, so as to hold an umbrella over the expanded Mexican production. This we have refused to do.

In the absence of international agreements, all countries offer the commodities they have for sale in world markets for what they will bring—competitive prices; and we have limited ourselves to less than our historical market. It appears, however, that those who can benefit from the United States holding its offering price above world market prices continue to claim that the United States should hold an umbrella over its competitors. They maintain that the United States is unfair when it attempts to preserve its share of export markets through competitive sales. They know that domestic price supports are to offset high American costs and have no relation to export sales at competitive prices. Except for competitive pricing, the Government would be billions of dollars worse off and American farmers completely bankrupt.

To return to the shortsighted, noncompetitive pricing of the past would wreck American agriculture, would greatly increase the drain on the U.S. Treasury, and would destroy any effort by the new Secretary of Agriculture to place American agriculture on a sound economic basis before he gets started.

We should review the record.

COMPETITIVE SALES FOR DOLLARS ESSENTIAL

The charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation has always provided for the sale of CCC-owned commodities in world trade at competitive prices. After war-time demand dropped off, the Department, as a governmental policy, refused to use this authority, presumably to help in the restoration of the economy of certain foreign governments. During a period of several years, the United States offered its agricultural commodities in world trade at fixed prices, which had the effect of holding an umbrella over our competitors, including Mexico, who offered their production at prices just under our offering prices. They got the markets, and we filled up our warehouses.

U.S. commodities, not offered competitively but held in warehouses, were then used to bring about further reductions in U.S. acreage for a number of basic commodities. During this period CCC holdings increased from $1 billion in 1952 to $5 billion in 1955.

Our committee, in an effort to find out why any Department would follow such a policy, developed the fact that the chief proponents of this policy of holding U.S. production off world markets were the large U.S. international producers and merchants who have huge investments and holdings in Mexico and other countries. The names and facts are to be found in volume I of our hearings for 1957, pages 121 to 149.

With regard to cotton during this period, the United States attempted to bring world production and supply into balance by reducing its production. Special committee studies show that acreage in the United States was reduced from a pre-war average of 28.4 million acres to 16.5 in 1955. They also indicate that during this period when the United States reduced its acreage, foreign acreage increased at a rate which more than offset U.S. production (pp. 100–102, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

These studies show further that foreign cotton production increased 49 percent between 1949 and 1954, while U.S. production, as a result of cuts in acreage, decreased 16 percent (p. 4, special CCC hearing, 1956).

While the statement attributed to the Senate majority leader has to do with cotton, the erroneous and shortsighted policy of our Government for a number of years applied to all commodities of which we had a surplus. Our committee studies show that, during the period 1951 to 1955, foreign countries increased production of all basic commodities (p. 83, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

COMPETITIVE SALES PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL

It was at the instance of our committee that the Department was finally prevailed upon to move back into world markets on a competitive basis, in line with the policy followed by other countries.

In 1954 the Department offered a limited number of commodities at competitive prices in world markets. These included small amounts of peanuts, whey, barley, beans, cottonseed oil, linseed oil, oats, rye, flaxseed, vetch, and grain sorghums. Sales totaled about $93 million (pp. 1691–2, vol. IV, 1957 hearings).

In 1955, after further urging by our committee, the Department offered all CCC-held commodities except cotton for sale in competitive world trade, including butter, dried milk, cheese, corn, rice, wheat, and soybeans, not previously offered. The resulting sales reached $219.5 million (pp. 1693–5, vol. IV, 1957 hearings).

By December 31, 1955, holdings of CCC-owned cotton had reached 7.9 million bales worth nearly $1.5 billion—all held off world markets due to the Department's erroneous export policies (p. 1686, vol. IV, 1957 hearings).

In January 1956, under continuing pressure from our committee, the Department finally offered 1 million bales of cotton for sale in world markets at competitive prices. Much to the surprise of Department officials, who expected a 6 months' program, this cotton was sold in less than 2 months (pp. 11–35, special CCC hearing, 1957).

Despite this successful experience, however, the Department delayed further offerings at the request of the large American international cotton traders. After three successive failures to make such offerings, the Congress passed the "Export Sales Act of 1956" which required the Department to use its authority to sell cotton and other commodities competitively in world markets.

Special studies made by the committee indicated that this new policy was well accepted abroad and gave confidence to users of American commodities that the United States would again become a regular and dependable world supplier of such commodities (p. 106, vol. I, 1958 hearings).

As a result of this new law, and further urging by our committee, the Department again began offering its commodities, including cotton, for export sales on a competitive basis. Dollar exports of U.S. products totaled $2.8 billion in fiscal year 1957, including 4.2 million bales of cotton worth $660 million. In fiscal year 1958, dollar exports again reached $2.8 billion, including 5.7 million bales of cotton worth $553 million.

The Department again abandoned its competitive export sales program for cotton for the crop year 1958–59 at the insistence of the same international cotton traders. While dollar exports were $2.4 billion during this period, cotton exports dropped to 1.3 million bales worth only $153 million (about one-fourth of the 2 previous years when the competitive export program was in effect.)

After a full investigation of the Department's failure to maintain export sales on a competitive basis in 1958–59, the Comptroller General of the United States ruled that it was in violation of the Export Sales Act of 1956. He stated, "This action, in our opinion, does not comply with the requirement of section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1853)."

Competitive sales were started again for the 1959–60 crop year as the result of special hearings and strong recommendations of our committee. As a result, dollar exports for the fiscal year 1960 increased to $3.2 billion. Cotton exports increased to 5.4 million bales worth $671 million, the levels of 1957 and 1958 when the competitive export program was in effect.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Special investigations made by the committee during the years 1954 through 1957 developed the following significant findings:

1. Reductions in U.S. agricultural production did not cut back world production. Foreign production increased as U.S. production was reduced. Between 1951 and 1955, foreign production of the basic commodities increased as follows: Cotton, 28 percent; wheat, 6 percent; corn, 19 percent; rice, 13 percent; tobacco, 9 percent; peanuts, 14 percent (pp. 83–89, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

2. Much of the increased production in other countries has been supported by American capital and know-how. The assurance of a U.S. umbrella over world prices has enabled those concerns to develop profitable operations in countries where labor and other costs of production are much below those in the United States (pp. 89–92, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

3. Nearly $1 billion of U.S. foreign aid has been used between 1948 and 1955 to promote agriculture in foreign countries. In addition, $710 million of U.S. counterpart funds has been used to improve and increase agricultural production. At one time, there were 738 U.S. agricultural technicians abroad under the foreign aid program advising other countries in these matters (p. 79, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

4. Cotton production in Mexico increased from a prewar 5-year average of 334,000 bales to 1.8 million bales in 1954. Mexican cotton exports increased during the same period from 105,000 bales to 1.2 million bales (p. 95, vol. I, 1957 hearings).

5. During the period 1935 to 1939, the United States had 42 percent of the world export markets for cotton. By 1955–56, this was reduced to only 19 percent and Mexico had become the second largest exporter with 16 percent of the world cotton market. Much of this expansion was U.S. financed (p. 249, vol. VI, 1958 hearings).

Her Challenge: To Represent State of Iowa, Its Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Iowa has been proud over the past 12 months to be represented by Miss Sally Neville, of Davenport, Iowa, as Miss Iowa.

This is a wonderful experience for any young lady to be chosen as the most beautiful in her State and to have attention and laurels heaped upon her. The wholesome reaction of Sally Neville is something for all of us to admire. Her head has not been turned by all of the glamour. She is still charming and unassuming. What the title of "Miss Iowa" meant to her is eloquently set forth in a guest editorial which she wrote for the Saturday Times-Democrat, of Davenport, Iowa, on July 22.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I take pride in calling attention to this editorial by Sally Neville:

HER CHALLENGE: TO REPRESENT STATE OF IOWA, ITS CITIZENS

Each year the Miss Iowa Pageant reenacts a modern parallel to the world's most enchanting fairy tale: Cinderella.

Throughout my year as Iowa's Cinderella countless people have asked me what it's all about. What do such affairs accomplish anyway?

To recount the finest and fullest year that can be given an Iowa girl can't be done in a few sentences, although I have often wished I could sum up my thoughts in a single word or two.

"Education" might be an appropriate description, for surely the year as provided an eduaction more extensive than one could receive in years of formal schooling. Cinderella sees first hand things she otherwise could only hear or read about—modern, complex equipment and procedures that are required in the agricultural field today.

She becomes acquainted with the place of advertising in the progressive world of business, the workings of our vital communications media, the core of American democracy functioning in an election campaign, the complexity of numerous occupations in industry.

These are but a few examples of the knowledge I have gained.

"Inspiration" might be another fitting word to describe the year. I have had the opportunity of working with civic and charitable organizations comprised of people who are working not for themselves, but unselfishly for others.

I recall with great joy the day I spent promoting a back-to-school safety program last fall.

Education, inspiration and many other words truly do pinpoint the year; but I think to label accurately this most significant year, I must use the word "challenge" because for 1 year it has been my responsibility to represent the State of Iowa and all its grand citizens.

Twelve months ago, when I received the title of "Miss Iowa," I was ecstatic with prospects of a year in which I would be Iowa's contestant in the Miss America Pageant and travel throughout the State.

I would be seeing and doing things I had only dreamed of before. The prospects for glamour and excitement were simply dazzling, yet how little I knew then of the real rewards.

The thrill of participating in the Miss America Pageant will long be remembered, but it wasn't the cheering of the crowds that lined the 7-mile boardwalk parade or any of the spectacular moments that brought me my greatest joy and fondest recollection; rather, it was the small, unobstrusive things—the arm about my shoulder and the words of a famed guest vocalist at the pageant's close and the books I received from one of the judges.

Of course, there is glamour, seven-course French dinners, and talking with noted people, but frequently the glamour is found in such places as a style show presented in a tent that is pitched in a cornfield, where the models must avoid the buckets that are catching the rain coming in through holes in the roof.

There has been so much more than I had imagined. I have witnessed in the last 12 months the enormous wealth of kindness and hospitality that prevails in Iowa.

My greatest reward has been the countless wonderful people with whom I have been associated this year.

I am eternally grateful to the people who have made it possible for my fondest dream to be surpassed.

With the title of "Miss Iowa" goes the greatest opportunity to be given an Iowa girl, for she for every hour of 1 glorious year represents the grandest State in the Nation.

Foreign Aid Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the numerous foreign aid lobbying outfits, the so-called Citizens Committee for International Development, has sent me a copy of a press release disclosing the total amount spent in the State of Michigan and in the various cities of Michigan for foreign aid programs during the period from January 1954, through June 1960.

The timing of this release on the eve of consideration of the foreign aid authorization bill underscores the obvious hope that pressures will be generated back home to bring Members of Congress in line in support of this bill.

I can assure the House that the strategy will not work so far as I am concerned, and I suspect will not work so far as the overwhelming majority of my constituents is concerned.

The report shows that for the 6½-year period, foreign aid expenditures in the State of Michigan totaled $20,044,067.

The expenditures during this period in cities in the Third Congressional District of Michigan are listed as follows: Battle Creek, $444,906; Coldwater, $408,089; and Kalamazoo, $278,532, or a total of $1,131,527 for the Third District.

In my judgment the attempt to sell foreign aid on this basis is a phony. Whatever the immediate and transitory economic benefits to my State, district, or communities, it is the type of economic benefit and gain which would re-

sult in a far more solid fashion from normal trade relations or transactions abroad. It is a charge against the taxpayers of the Nation, including the taxpayers of Michigan and the Third Congressional District. I would venture the guess that taxpayers of my district would be ahead in terms of financial benefit through tax savings if the foreign aid expenditures were sharply reduced or eliminated, and I am positive they would welcome the tax relief which this would involve.

The simple truth is that if and insofar as there is any justification for foreign aid in terms of the national interest and security of the United States, that is the sole justification for such expenditures of tax funds.

The effort to justify this program and its expansion on the basis of dollar returns in my district strikes me as lacking economic validity. The attempt to promulgate this type of information as part of the lobbying campaign for the foreign aid bill strikes me as political blackmail.

In Today Already Walks Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, some weeks ago, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], became involved in a short but spirited colloquy concerning the merits of teaching domestic science and home economics in our public high schools.

Yesterday there came to my desk a sprightly and informative speech delivered by Dr. Louise Surra Fernendez, director of home economics teaching curriculum, Department of Home Economics, New York University on June 28. It appears that the brief debate between Senator CLARK and myself on the Senate floor came to her attention and I must say that Dr. Fernendez does an excellent job of proclaiming the values and merits of training in the home building arts and sciences. I welcome her as an ardent ally and salute her for a masterful presentation.

Madam President, the Government Printing Office reports this speech can be printed at a cost of $202.50. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN TODAY ALREADY WALKS TOMORROW

(Speech given by Dr. Louise Surra Fernendez, director of home economics teaching curriculum, department of home economics, New York University, at the Standard Brands "Three R's" breakfast, AHEA convention, Cleveland, Ohio, June 28, 1961)

During the Senate debate on aid to education a couple of weeks ago, JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, said he was concerned that the money might be "frittered away for athletic programs, domestic science courses, and for all kinds of things." Up rose KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, and this dialog followed:

Senator MUNDT. I will not stand silent while domestic science training is being slandered on the Senate floor.

Senator CLARK. I think that a girl can learn to cook out of a cookbook or by going to the A. & P.

Senator MUNDT. Perhaps that is why so many people in Pennsylvania have ulcers.

Though I resent the label of "domestic science," I think we all owe Senator MUNDT a vote of thanks for this support, even though we may not all agree with his conclusions or with the limited scope and content implied for home economics.

That we (as well as other areas of education) have been the butt for much criticism in the past few years cannot be denied. But it seems to me that those who belittle our accomplishments are either uninformed or misinformed and living in a world far removed from reality. I agree that there may be individual mothers who may still teach their daughters and sons the myriad tasks of homemaking, but let me give you a few simple statistics: In 1959, 61 percent of women in the labor force in the United States were married, about 1 out of 3 workers is a woman. Women workers with children of preschool age have doubled in the United States in the last decade from 2 to 4 million. The picture in Canada is similar. The Canadian Department of Labor reported that 66 percent of all married women working had dependent children, as of 1958. And these figures do not include the millions of women who devote time and energies to volunteer and community work.

I ask you, How many mothers are at home to teach their sons and daughters the arts and skills and values of homemaking? Here's another set of facts that have a bearing on this point: There is every indication that the continuing expansion and changes in distribution of our population will continue. We are a people on the move. About 20 percent (34 million) change address each year. Migration shows great slow currents northward and westward. We work in large metropolitan centers and live in surrounding areas. Four-fifths of our Nation's growth between 1950 and 1955 was concentrated in the urban fringe around great cities.

Somehow I cannot visualize too many of these families devoting much time and effort to doing our job (if we, ourselves, are doing a good job) with their youngsters.

Another measure of our worth can be discovered if we assume that the teaching of home economics has disappeared from the face of the earth.

Would it make a difference if the teaching of home economics "disappeared?" To whom? To what extent? What would take its place?

The fact remains that as long as you serve the community's needs you need not worry too much about your popularity ratings. We could well take the words of Mr. Minow to heart. In criticizing TV programing he said about popularity ratings as a measure of worth, "If parents, teachers and ministers conducted their responsibilities by following the ratings, children would have a steady diet of ice cream, school holidays and no Sunday school. If such a code ill serves the young viewer, by extension how does it serve the country as a whole? It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims—you must also serve the Nation's needs."

It has been my experience that the greatest source of encouragement and support for our work in home economics education in the secondary schools has come from grateful parents who have seen the difference that home economics has made in the lives of their own children.

Does this mean that all is well with education or home economics? No. But I'm afraid that I'm not as pessimistic as some people have tended to be, nor as certain that we need no improvements as others have said. I believe the ferment this criticism has created has been, and continues to be, the most exciting aspect of all. It has made us all more aware and alert to our responsibilities and opportunities.

Robert E. Sherwood has said, "At times when the present is murky and the future a mass of black thunderclouds with visibility zero, we are naturally inclined to look backward into the past for guidance and even more for reassurance." The best answer I have found to this tendency to "look back" to a time when things appeared to be safe and comfortable was given by Max Lerner, the educator and columnist. His article was a protest against four fallacies which seem to be thriving in our postsputnik climate.

The first is the fallacy about academic and nonacademic subjects for school courses. "Suddenly," Mr. Lerner says, "our thinkers have made a great discovery; namely, that some high schools and colleges are teaching a number of damn-fool courses, such as cosmetics and coed cooking and the physics of home lighting. The result is a big outcry to scrap these and get back to math and chemistry and history and the other subjects that are academically valid." He continues, "I will join anyone in attacking whatever is mediocre, slack, and easy in our educational system. But some of the sleaziest and most mediocre teaching I have seen has been in the conventional academic courses, and some of the most exciting has been in the new courses which explore the frontiers of psychology, anthropology, philosophy, and esthetics. The kind of thinking that draws a line between subject matters, calling some acceptable and others taboo is old, weary, and conventional thinking."

"The second fallacy is the belief that there is some sacred principle of democracy for equality in education which requires us to treat all students as if they were exactly alike. The fact is, of course, that students—like all human beings—are terribly unlike. Some are quick, some slow; some are bright, some dull; some have a potential that stretches farther than you can glimpse, some have the most limited potential." He suggests that students should not be treated with less attention if they are slow or dull, but with a different kind of attention. And the average and bright ones, too, would benefit if we treated them in a way to develop their potential to the utmost.

The third fallacy has to do with localism in the financing and control of schooling. He feels that those who are unwilling to talk realistically about how to pay for better education ought to stop talking about how poor our present education is. And we who know how poor it is had better accept the only real source from which the added money can come—the General Treasury, located in the Federal Government.

The fourth fallacy is the currently fashionable notion that the Russians have found the key to good educational society, and that we ought to follow suit. The Russians have the capacity to gather all the current research and apply it systematically to their technology. But they are the last conceivable model for us to follow in education itself, which should lead to the stretching of the mind, not its hardening, and to the fulfillment of the personality, not its mutilation.

Dr. Stoddard in a recent article comments on this same question. He says, "The Russians have a monolithic, party-dominated system headed by one man. In Russia, variation amounts to subversion, local responsibility is an illusion, parental or pupil choice

a rarity. Do we really want that in America?" he asks. "Or do we prefer what the Bonn government has set up—a system of examinations through which the decision to go to the university, or not to go, is firmly made when a child is 10 years old? The result: Only 1 out of 20 pupils makes the grade."

How do you think these ideas affect us in home economics? We must think about it if we are to remain in the mainstream of educational progress.

Critics seem to forget that it is essential that faultfinding be preceded by factfinding. Alice was right when she told the King of Hearts that it was "nonsense to consider the verdict before considering the evidence."

I believe the foundation to our future growth and development in home economics rests with our philosophy. For what we believe affects everything that we think and say and do. What do you believe the role of home economics is in education and in the world of the future? Remember if it is really a sound philosophy, the basic ideas will not change much although the world will change rapidly. It will have a built-in flexibility which will keep us abreast and in certain instances, ahead of the times. We cannot become static nor fall into a pattern of prefabricated judgments. Remember the bed of Procrustes. In days of old, Bulfinch tells us, "evildoers and monsters oppressed the country." And prominent among these was a giant called Procrustes, or the Stretcher. He had an iron bedstead on which he used to tie all travelers who fell into his hands. If they were shorter than the bed, he stretched their limbs to make them fit it. If they were longer than the bed, he lopped off a portion."

One of the most basic questions often asked is this. How can we educate today's young people for the future in which they will live but that we cannot predict?

Laura Zerbes has one of the finest answers I've been able to find. "Anthropologists tell us that we can and must educate for adaptability, resourcefulness, flexibility, and readiness to adjust, but also for: steadfastness to human values, creativity and self-reliance. We must try to develop intercultural understanding and a concern for the common good. In a scientific age we should try to reduce strains and tensions, hunger caused by want, deprivation and denial, reaction and regression."

In other words, build the human value—and this is our greatest area of strength.

Incidentally, one of the books which every teacher should read if she wants to be more creative and develop the creative potential in her students is "Creative Power" by Hughes Mearns.

You will need to be quite sure in your own mind what it is you really believe about home economics in order to face the exciting, exacting future.

What would it be like, this world in the next decades? What kind of education will we need? What kind of jobs must our children make themselves ready to fill? What new opportunities will they face? What kind of people must they be to cope with the future's problems? The answers to such questions should be guiding what we do now, everyday, as well as give direction to our plans for the future.

Many changes are predictable. The influences which will drastically affect our future are all around us. As John Dewey said, "The future surrounds the present like a halo." Here are a few of the most important issues and influences; think about implications for home economics in these:

First and foremost is the problem of peace; without peace there will be no future for any of us. This is an issue none of us can evade. If we want peace we must make sure that our representatives in Government know our representatives in government know where we stand.

Our relations with other peoples of the world cannot be trusted to cultural and intellectual pigmies. We need education for all children and must fight to get and be willing to pay for the schools we obviously need. H. G. Wells once said, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and disaster." It was never more true than it is today. Truly the future is in our hands. This is a time of crisis. The Chinese write the word "crisis" with two characters. One stands for danger and the other for opportunity. Both danger and opportunity confront us.

Margaret Mead says that we built our country on the assumption that anybody can be President, but that we need now to act as if any of our children might reach the moon. We must be ready for the world in which the moon and outer space will be explored. She makes some interesting observations about the kind of world we are even now beginning to experience, where many of our daily processes will include machine links. Such aspects of everyday life as buying a ticket, cashing a check, applying for a job, getting into college, passing an exam, ordering a spare part, will depend on the accuracy with which someone turns a screw or punches a hole in an IBM card. It seems to me that life will become increasingly like a parachute jump—something that has to be done right the first time.

Thomas Watson, Jr. ("Mr. Automation" himself), president of IBM, has said, "Man has made some machines that can answer questions provided the facts are previously stored in them; he will never be able to make a machine that will ask questions. The ability to ask the right questions is more than half the battle of finding the right answer." We must increasingly be like the mother who daily asked her son (who inevitably became a scientist), "Did you ask any good questions today?"

I've tried to find some clues to the future in today's world. How they will affect us in home economics I hope you will figure out for yourselves.

In housing these are some features which may be of interest: add or take-away-a-room feature; adjustable and movable interior walls; circular rooms; new equipment and materials; move-a-house (secondhand houses will be sold for use somewhere else, or it will be possible to take your old home to a new job location). Other factors which will affect housing include decentralization of industry into satellite towns and smaller cities, use of revolutionary high-speed transportation, such as helicopters and monorail el trains. (Will we have helicopter schoolbuses) Perhaps commuting will be eliminated through a rearrangement of business and factory procedures—instant communications will make possible business offices in the suburbs, a core of "contact men" in the city itself, and factories in autonomous suburbs. Teams of planners for homes of the future will include "imagineers" and engineers, architects, home economists, psychologists, materials technologists, production and mechanical engineers, interior decorators, landscape architects, and acoustical experts.

New kitchen concepts will replace current classic work centers, because of further advances in the preparation and packaging of foods and the effects of improvements on the buying habits and food preparation. Cooking will be faster and more automatic and will require fewer utensils. Toting and carrying will be taken over by automatic conveyor systems.

The laundry will be a completely automatic and sanitary unit. Easy-care fabrics and noniron clothing will be cleaned in appliances using ultrasonic soundwaves. We will have disposable clothing sold at low prices for children, garage men, factory workers, housewives, and home handymen.

As for food, no pill will every substitute for meals, for food is tied in too closely with the joy of living. We will have better ways to process and package foods to retain nutrients and cut waste: preservation by ionizing radiation to kill microbes; dehydration by "freeze drying" (food dehydrated by microwave energy in below-freezing vacuum, put in airtight cans where they will keep for years; to use, simply immerse in water). Research may develop "fish farms" for easier, better source of protein.

There will be fabulous changes in the marketing and distribution of foods. Regional dishes and foreign foods will be made available on a worldwide scale. The number and kinds of special foods for the sick and for older people will increase. One of the innovations at the supermarket will be a home economist as one of the regular employees to stand by and help plan meals and parties.

Nutrition research has many exciting possibilities. One is the discovery that food is closely related to brain metabolism and mental health. Will the application of greater nutritional knowledge to the study of body chemistry mean freedom from certain mental disorders current today? Even now the B vitamins are being used to treat psychogenic symptoms of depression, anxiety, and extreme sensitivity to noise and light.

Does this mean we will have no more home cooking? On the contrary, with increased leisure and longer weekends there may be a rebirth of home cooking. Creative cooks will enjoy cooking, and others who do not care about cooking will be able to eat better because they can buy pre-prepared foods. I believe there will be many more men who will cook.

What changes does this mean for us in home economics? Our houses may become thermoelectric, ultrasonic, and electronic, and air conditioned from a central plant like our gas and electricity is now, and much of the equipment will be truly automatic (stoves that can be turned on and off by dialing the instructions from a phone booth). All of this may be paid for "on the cuff" through new concepts of financing which include monthly payments that increase as the family income goes up, for example. How will this affect the content and methods of teaching?

Although I have not had access to Miss Coon's report of her study about what we are now teaching in our secondary schools in home economics, I did hear a report of her findings at the North Atlantic Regional Conference. And, if what the teachers themselves have told her is true, we are way behind the times even now. In general, the teachers said they gave clothing and foods each one-third of the class time they had at their disposal. The other third was devoted to child development, family relations, home management, consumer education, housing and family health.

If we look at the way families are living, even today, and most certainly if we want to keep up with their way of life in the future, this implies that we must teach a lot more and better management in all areas. We must teach more consumer education and increase our offerings in home and family living, child development and problems of parenthood. In management, it is my hope that along with basic principles we learn more about, and use more often, the notion of "intelligent neglect" to avoid sterile stereotypes of management most people have now.

In teaching, traditional ways of teaching and learning will be greatly changed if current experiments and innovations continue to prove their worth. The chores associated with teaching will be lessened. Records will be kept through automation devices and techniques, for example. The amount of re-

search going on now in the use of aids to learning (TV, teaching machines, tapes, etc.) foretells greater knowledge and greater application of the psychological principles of learning. We will probably use many of our old techniques in new ways. We will have more team teaching, more teacher helpers (professional and nonprofessional), more adult education (14 years of schooling will be common). We need more interclass visitation; we should experiment in home economics with new grouping procedures. We will have new time arrangements in our schools—a 12-month school year with rotating vacations. We should do more about the role of the unknown in teaching to help students discover and think for themselves. Yet, Edgar Dale cautions us, "In our anxiety to get on the band wagon of these new teaching techniques we do not end by learning to do better something we should not do at all."

What can you do as an individual teacher, then, to keep up and move ahead? I have five suggestions to get you started. First, you can examine critically what you are teaching now. (Miss Coon's questionnaire may help if it is still available.) Second, you can decide what changes in emphasis and content you need to make. Let me caution you to "make haste slowly" at first. Be inquiring and diagnostic. Like a doctor, use every way you know how to discover what's wrong. Guard against "the invisibility of the obvious." Thirrd, perhaps all you need to do is to rediscover your enthusiasm for your job. For there is nothing more potent or more effective than an enthusiastic homemaking teacher. It's catching, that enthusiasm. Fourth, be a little daring. Try a new method of teaching—at least once a week. Teach something (content and skill) with which you are most familiar in a new way. If you're in a rut—pull out. Someone has said that the only difference between a rut and a grave is that one is longer and the other is deeper. Use your imagination. Be an "imagineer." Fifth, make your life out of school as rewarding for you as you know how. Use your leisure (and I hear you all thinking, "What leisure?") in such a way that you feel refreshed both mentally and physically when you get back to your classes on Monday morning. Someone has said that whoever put Saturday and Sunday between Friday and Monday certainly had teachers in mind. The first move is the hardest. So I hope you will resolve to begin now.

People, ideas, and money will be needed to take us from where we are to the place we hope to reach. But the most powerful of these are ideas. These are generated and applied only as we creatively combine experience, research, imagination, and wisdom. Ideas are needed to maintain balance and perspective, too.

In closing, I'd like to tell you a short story which best illustrates what I have tried to say in a few thousand well chosen words.

The story is about Dorothy Parker who came back from a visit carrying two baby alligators, a gift from a friend. She had to leave the house almost immediately so she temporarily placed them in the bathtub. When she returned later in the evening she found a note from her maid who had been with her for many years. It read:

"DEAR MADAM: I am leaving. I cannot work in a house with alligators. I would have told you this before, but I never thought the question would come up."

What will come up in the next 20 or 30 years we do not know exactly, but we do know that there will be changed. Change is a certainty for which our young people must be prepared. As teachers we must look to the past and learn to be better evaluators; we must look at the here and now and learn to become better generators; we must look to the future and become better prognosticators. These three—hindsight, insight, and foresight—can lead to a brighter future for home economics.

The Cuban Invasion—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished military correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, has written a two-part analysis of the attempted invasion of Cuba from the United States earlier this year which I believe deserves the widest possible attention. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend the articles to our colleagues.

The first article follows:

THE CUBAN INVASION, I—WHITE HOUSE DECISIONS CITED IN STUDY OF WHY LANDING IN APRIL WAS A FAILURE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The celebration, in Cuba last week deliberately emphasized the increasing strength of Premier Fidel Castro's pro-Communist state.

Part of the emphasis represents propaganda, but there is some truth behind the embroidered claims.

About 3 months after the United States-sponsored abortive invasion of Cuba, Dr. Castros' regime is stronger than it has ever been, physically and in prestige.

In April, when 1,500 to 1,600 anti-Castro Cubans, with United States support, attempted to overthrow the Cuban Government, Havana had only 9 operational military aircraft, all propeller-driven, except 3 jet powered T–33 trainers that had been armed. The Cuban militia, then equipped with Czechoslovak and Russian small arms, about 50 Russian tanks and self-propelled guns and small amounts of field artillery, was impressive in quantity but not in quality.

About 200,000 men and women had been armed, but most of these were ill-disciplined and sparsely trained, undependable against a good military force. About 15,000 to 20,000 regular army and militiamen had received more training and could be termed a "hard core," although their combat effectiveness and dependability were open to question. There was, in April, a Cuban anti-Castro underground, and about 2,000 guerrillas scattered in the mountains all over Cuba.

Today, with the victory at the Bay of Pigs behind them, the Cuban armed forces are far more confident, less likely to defect, better armed and trained. Between 20 and 30 Soviet Mig–17 jet fighters have been delivered to Cuba and are now in operation. Heavy crates, which may contain additional disassembled planes, have been seen. Some Cuban pilots have returned from jet training in Czechoslovakia. More arms and equipment for ground troops have arrived in Cuba from Communist countries.

GUERRILLAS ARE INACTIVE

The underground has been virtually quiescent; the guerrillas have been inactive; Dr. Castro's opposition is disorganized and downcast. The overthrow of Dr. Castro's government would be far more difficult today, even if U.S. forces were sent into the island, than it would have been 3 months ago. And the U.S. Government apparently has no plan for eliminating what many observers have called the cancer of communism in Cuba.

The April invasion has been widely ridiculed since its failure, and the Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been made the principal whipping boys. The impossibility of overthrowing Dr. Castro with 1,500 to 1,600 men appears self-evident; the rhetorical question, "How could anyone be so stupid?" has been a popular one around Washington in the last 3 months. Yet the operation in its original concepts was not as stupid as it had been made to appear and the responsibility for the mistakes appears to be widely distributed.

The story of the Cuban venture, pieced together from talks with many Government officials and from other sources, postulates many lessons of major importance in the Berlin crisis.

PLANNING STARTED IN 1960

Planning for the Cuban assault started in the late spring of 1960, when former President Dwight D. Eisenhower authorized the Central Intelligence Agency to organize, train, and equip anti-Castro Cuban refugees. Allen W. Dulles, Director of the CIA, and his Deputy for Operations, Richard M. Bissell, initiated the secret operation. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military were not initially given any details of the plans for employment of the Cuban refugees, but as their training progressed the Pentagon was asked to assign officers, training cadres, weapons and equipment to the CIA.

The plan, as it developed under the Eisenhower, and later the Kennedy administration, did not, contrary to published reports, commit U.S. Armed Forces to support of the Cuban refugees in actual military operations. Such a commitment was considered but never, as far as can be learned, officially approved, although it was not publicly and finally disapproved until a few days before the landing.

The original Eisenhower planning contemplated one or more series of relatively small landings to reenforce the anti-Castro guerrillas in the hills. Last November 30 had been, tentatively, one of the target dates for the invasion, but the impending change in administration as a result of the November elections forced its postponement.

About December, the character of the operation appears to have changed from dispersed guerrilla landings to the establishment of one beachhead. If the beachhead appeared to be firmly established, a Cuban government in exile could be flown in, and all Cubans would then be called upon to join in the revolt against Dr. Castro. Whether the United States would recognize this government and the kind and degree of support it might give it were apparently left open.

INVASION SITE SHIFTED

After the Kennedy Administration took office other changes were made.

The Bay of Pigs, closer to Havana but seventy-five miles from the nearest concentration of guerrillas in the Escambre Mountains, was substituted for another suggested beach, less than 100 miles to the east.

Perhaps more important, the preparations for the operation became so big and so obvious that it was no longer secret. Published stores about the refugee training camps in Guatemala and preparations in Florida plus the expectation that Soviet MIG–17's, now in Cuba, would soon arrive increased pressure on the administration for quick action and also rallied, within the administration, the opposition to any U.S.-sponsored intervention.

On April 12, 5 days before the invasion at the Bay of Pigs, Cuba, President Kennedy announced at a press conference that U.S. armed forces would "in no circumstances" be used to overthrow Dr. Castro.

THE INVASION FORCE

The Kennedy announcement meant that about 1,600 Cuban refugees, supported by 16 American-built B–26 propeller-driven light bombers based in Central America, transported by old U.S. merchant ships procured with U.S. funds, armed with Amer-

ican equipment and trained by American cadres but without the help of U.S. armed forces, would attempt to establish a beachhead in Cuba.

A second decision of major importance was made by the White House just a short time before the invaders actually landed at the Bay of Pigs on April 17. Two days before the invasion, preliminary air strikes were flown by a few B–26's piloted by Cuban refugee fliers, against some of Dr. Castro's airfields. The planes were based on Central America and landed in Florida after their mission.

The United States asserted these planes were flown from Cuban airfields by defecting pilots. A storm arose in the United Nations, and Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. delegate, who had not been informed fully of our Cuban plans, declared publicly with great emphasis that the planes came from Cuba. He was hastily informed by Washington of his mistake.

The invasion force left as scheduled from Central America, and was escorted at sea by U.S. Navy destroyers, with an aircraft carrier in the background. The naval vessels had orders to stay outside the Cuban 3-mile limit, but to be prepared for anything.

On the night and early morning of the invasion a key airstrike, flown by Cuban refugee pilots in B–26's, was scheduled to bomb the nine Cuban planes spotted in known positions on Cuban airfields. A few hours before the invasion was scheduled, while the ships were nearing the Bay of Pigs beaches, the airstrike was canceled by the White House.

The cancellation was apparently the result of representations by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and through him by Mr. Stevenson. Both of them were worried by the effect of a second air strike from Central America upon opinion in the United Nations and Latin America. The President ordered the CIA to cancel the strike, but, according to an administration spokesman, specified that the CIA had the right to appeal to the President and left the possibility of reversal open. The appeal was not made, according to the spokesman.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff were not aware of the cancellation of this key airstrike until after the beachhead had actually been established, according to Government sources.

By this time much of the damage had been done, for Dr. Castro's planes, alerted by the actual landings, were in the air attacking the invading ships, and were dispersed after their sorties to new airfields. Contrary to general opinion, the actual landings achieved, as Dr. Castro has since conceded, a tactical surprise, much as the Allied landings on the coast of Normandy in World War II achieved a tactical surprise. Dr. Castro knew the invasion was coming; it could not be a strategic surprise. But he did not know where or when.

After the landing, the Cuban refugee pilots were permitted to fly close support missions from Central America but with orders to touch down first at the Bay of Pigs airstrip (within the beachhead) to provide the verisimilitude of legality. But it was too late. The nine Cuban planes sank two of the Cuban refugees' ships before communications equipment and ammunition had been unloaded. And the three T–33 jet trainers, which had been armed by Dr. Castro, played havoc with the slow B–26's.

U.S. Navy pilots, flying in fast jet attack planes off the beachhead, armed and ready for action in case they should be ordered to intervene, saw the end of the invasion from the air as Cuban tanks rumbled down the roads. The invaders had run out of ammuntion; there was nothing to do but surrender.

The Cuban Invasion—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second article in a two-part series written by the New York Times correspondent, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, and published by the Times in its issues of July 31 and August 1.

The second article follows:

THE CUBAN INVASION, II—REBELS' DEFEAT IS ASCRIBED TO ERRORS IN PLAN AND EXECUTION IN WASHINGTON

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The invasion of Cuba last April, it is now clear, was lost in Washington.

The small invading force was adjudged shortly before the operation, in a written report submitted by a Colonel Hawkins of the Marine Corps, to be battleworthy and comparatively almost as well equipped as a similar U.S. unit. This judgment had some effect in Washington and, observers contend, was borne out by the actual fighting.

Despite the casualty statistics (some 1,200 of the 1,500 to 1,600 captured), the invaders gave a good account of themselves. Most sources agree that the refugees fought well until their ammunition ran out, that they inflicted more casualties on Fidel Castro's forces than he had conceded, and that the Cuban militia in the area of the landing almost immediately defected in scores to the invaders' side only to defect back again to Dr. Castro after the failure of the invasion became obvious.

Like the British and French invasion of Port Said during the Suez crisis of 1956, the Cuban operational plans and their implementation were watered down and the invasion was doomed by nonmilitary considerations.

The errors made and the blame for them are widespread.

ERRORS LAID TO KENNEDY

President Kennedy, new to supreme power, showed uncertainty in one of his first tests as Commander in Chief and met the opposing opinions of his advisers by compromise instead of clear-cut decision. His announcement a few days before the invasion that "in no circumstances" would U.S. Armed Forces be used to overthrow the Cuban Government should have led to cancellation, or major revision of the operation, for use of the U.S. Armed Forces was the one factor that could absolutely insure success.

Similarly, the cancellation of the preinvasion air strike—a key to the achievement of air superiority, a stipulated precondition for success—was the final counterweight against the invaders.

But it is also true that the President inherited the Cuban problem and a plan that had grown too big, physically and because of its political implications, for the Central Intelligence Agency.

In effect, everybody had a hand in the Cuban venture and yet nobody was clearly in charge. It was bureaucracy at its worst, with the right hand sometimes not knowing (as in the case of Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations) what the left hand was doing.

The close and careful liaison between political and military planning that is absolutely essential to strategic success was lacking.

In fact, neither the military nor the State Department was the primary planner or executor of the Cuban invasion.

The invasion, partly because the original plan just grew and expanded, partly in the interests of security and secrecy (which could not possibly be maintained when the operation became so large), was primarily the baby of the Central Intelligence Agency. The Agency made mistakes in planning, execution and judgment. Allen W. Dulles, its Director, and Richard M. Bissell, the Deputy for Plans and Operations and in direct charge of the Cuban affair, will probably bear the burden of failure by resigning their offices.

FAILURES OF JOINT CHIEFS

The Joint Chiefs of Staff made mistakes in failing to be explicit and emphatic—in not pounding the table enough and in failing to commit all their ideas and viewpoints to paper. (In the interests of secrecy much of the Cuban planning and direction was oral.)

The White House believes the military judgments were faulty and the studies inadequate, but Pentagon sources deny this.

The State Department and other advisers bear responsibility for contributing to confusion and defeat by insisting upon legalisms that the guilty conscience of a democracy so often demands when it resorts to naked force.

McGeorge Bundy, a Presidential assistant, shares and manfully has accepted blame for insufficiently emphasizing to the President the dangerous and negative aspects of the operation. And the President himself has assumed full responsibility for the failure.

But the assessment of fault, although essential to analysis, is far less important than the lessons learned.

The primary lesson is the importance of the principle of the objective, as it is known in military parlance, or in slang terms, "keeping your eye on the ball."

The original objective was the overthrow of Dr. Castro. Whether this was an adequate political objective, or whether there should have been another constructive long-term goal is open to question. But even this original objective was rendered impossible of accomplishment before the assault started.

A considered statement of what one is trying to accomplish, with political, military, and economic factors all carefully weighed, is the essential first step for any operation.

The operational plan must be capable of accomplishing this objective. In the Cuban invasion the objective itself seems to have become fuzzy, and the invasion plan as actually modified in execution could not possibly have accomplished the overthrow of Dr. Castro.

NEED FOR U.S. FORCES

The political and military disadvantages of any given plan must be weighed against the advantages obtained by accomplishment of the objective.

The disadvantages of the Cuban invasion were so great that either it had to succeed or it should never have been attempted. To insure success, the support of U.S. Armed Forces was essential, yet this was ruled out before the start of the operation.

The world respects power successfully used to accomplish national objectives. A successful invasion of Cuba and the overthrow of Dr. Castro backed by the United States would probably have overbalanced the adverse political, legal, and moral effects of our open intervention in Cuban affairs.

As it was, we suffered all the opprobrium that attaches to failure, and all the psychological and political disadvantages associated with the term "Yankee imperialism." And our backing of the Cuban refugees was

so thinly disguised that it immediately exposed Washington to the same charges we would have faced had U.S. Armed Forces been employed.

The second great lesson of Cuba is the importance of tight policy control, direction and management of any venture involving the application of military power, no matter how small.

This control and management must center in the President as Commander in Chief; each President will use the machinery of Government differently, but history has shown that ordered discussions and debates and staff work, and recorded decisions may bring new insight and prevent major mistakes. These procedures were largely lacking in the Kennedy administration prior to the time of the Cuban invasion.

MISTAKES OF THE CIA

A third lesson of Cuba is that no military or paramilitary operation should be under the control of the Central Intelligence Agency if it is of such a size and character that it is bound to become overt or open, rather than covert or secret. Operations of the size of the Cuban invasion should be managed by the Defense Department, which is far better staffed and has more expert military knowledge than the CIA.

Another lesson is the necessity of keeping all secret intelligence activities and operations under constant top-echelon surveillance and review. Machinery for a critical and objective analysis of all such efforts should be strengthened by the creation of a joint congressional watchdog committee, and by a careful supervision of the CIA by the National Security Council and other White House staff agencies.

But the Cuban failure offers no valid reason for dismembering the CIA, or for changing its name. Intelligence operations of many different kinds—black or concealed radio, propaganda, sabotage and so on—must be conducted by some agency of Government. Most of these do not properly fit into the Pentagon, except, of course, when the operation assumes a character distinctly military and a size and complexity that make the Pentagon the obvious place to handle it.

But specialized and distinctive secret operations of various sorts are best handled by some separate, centralized agency. There is no magic in separating these specialized operations from intelligence-gathering collection and evaluation; in fact the two must work hand in hand.

One man, as Mr. Dulles now does, could well head both, but the organization must provide, as CIA now does, for separate but coordinated efforts in secret operations and in intelligence.

LESSON FOR INTELLIGENCE

The CIA, whether we like it or not, is an inevitable part of the modern machinery for national survival in the nuclear age. It has made mistakes in the past and will again in the future. But it has also had great successes in the past, as in the U–2 operation. It must be improved, not made a scapegoat. It probably employs too many people and its administrative machinery could be considerably improved.

Power—the power of secret information—is insidious, and some of CIA's personnel need to relearn the lesson of humility and of human failure. But the CIA is here to stay.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff similarly is a key body in our national security machinery. They, too, have human weaknesses, and they, too, have made mistakes. But the principles they embody—differing military approaches to the same military problem; the right of dissent; collective wisdom as opposed to the judgments of a single military mind—are essential in the future as they have been in the past.

In sum, the failure of Cuba was a failure of bureaucracy, but as in all failures it was essentially a failure of men rather than of organization.

Rear Adm. H. E. Eccles, retired, comments in "Notes on the Cuban Crisis," a paper prepared under the sponsorship of the George Washington University Logistics Research project, that "somehow or other there seemed to be a complete divorce between the national policy and the power allotted to the task at hand."

He points out that "in great matters of state, the President simply cannot afford to leave these vital three (analysis of objectives, clear conceptual unity and careful followup) to his subordinates. The price of failure or of mediocre execution is too great."

And Admiral Eccles stresses that the Cuban venture again emphasizes that in "the protracted conflict with the totalitarian concept the fate of the free society will be determined much more by the understanding of human emotion and the exercise of intellectual power and moral values than by technological factors."

Glastonbury Miss Heads Girls' Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I learned earlier this week that a young lady from my district, Miss Susan MacDonald, was elected president of Girls' Nation. I offer for the RECORD news stories that appeared in the Hartford Times and the Hartford Courant about this outstanding and talented girl.

[From the Hartford Times]

MAY MEET FAMOUS COUNTERPART: AREA LASS HEADS GIRLS' NATION

A 17-year-old South Glastonbury girl was elected president of Girls' Nation Tuesday in Washington, D.C.

Susan L. MacDonald, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Berton A. MacDonald, of 1073 Main Street, South Glastonbury, won the 1961 election on a platform supporting intensive civil defense training.

Elected vice president was her running mate, Deborah Rosen, of Orangebury, S.C. Both girls campaigned on the Nationalist Party ticket to defeat opposing Federalist candidates from Mississippi and Idaho.

Earlier, Susan had been chosen majority floor leader of the Girls Nation senate at the convention, sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary.

The new presidential post may also win her a chance to meet President Kennedy Friday as Girls Nation delegates meet their counterparts in the National Government.

Susan, a senior this fall at Glastonbury High School, was chosen by her classmates to attend Laurel Girls State in Storrs and there won the chance to go on to Girls Nation.

At the State convention, she was also voted the outstanding girl and received the Joan Connell Memorial Award.

Susan, who wants to go into foreign relations work, will be president of her high school student council this fall. She has been active in scouting and was a leader this summer at the Girl Scout day camp in Glastonbury.

Connecticut's second delegate to the annual convention is Nancy L. Thompson, of 77 Golf Street, Newington.

Girls Nation, now in its 15th year, is held on the campus of American University in Washington. Nearly 100 delegates from 48 States and 2 U.S. territories are attending. Sessions will end Friday and girls will head home Saturday.

[From the Hartford Courant]

GLASTONBURY MISS HEADS GIRLS NATION

Susan L. MacDonald, 17, of Glastonbury, won the 1961 presidency of Girls Nation Tuesday in Washington, D.C.

Campaigning hard for civil defense on the Nationalist Party ticket, she defeated the Federalist candidate, Judy Simono, of Vicksburg, Miss.

Also elected with Susan was her running mate, Deborah Rosen, of Orangeburg, S.C., is vice president.

In a telephone conversation with her mother late Tuesday night, Susan said she was presented with roses before a reviewing stand at ceremonies held at Fort Myer, Va.

The defeated candidate during the same phone call told Mrs. MacDonald that Susan was a terrific person.

Susan is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Berton A. MacDonald, of 1073 Main Street, Glastonbury, and is one of more than 100 delegates meeting on the campus of American University for a week of mock-Government sessions.

Sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, Girls Nation is now in its 15th year. The delegates form parties, hold elections, establish a model government, and meet members of the U.S. Government.

Susan wrote her parents Sunday after her first airplane ride, which she said was bumpy, and said she was rooming in a modern dormitory with a girl from Nebraska. She also told her parents she had her picture taken with the Air Force Bagpipe Band.

Susan and Nancy Thompson, of Newington, were selected from Laurel Girls State, held in Storrs earlier in July, to be the Connecticut representatives.

At Girls State, Susan presented her party's platform to the assembly. She was also elected the outstanding girl by the other girls, and received the Joan Connell Memorial Award.

A junior in Glastonbury High School, Susan was chosen by her class to go to Girls State. The Glastonbury American Legion Auxiliary sponsored her trip to Storrs. The State auxiliary makes the trip to Washington possible.

Susan, who will be president of the high school student council this fall, wants to go into foreign relations.

She is active in girl scouting and was a leader at the Girl Scout day camp in Glastonbury this summer.

The sessions end Saturday morning.

American Nazi Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called on the Secretary of Defense to look into reports that a civilian employee of the Department, a strategic technician, has figured in the notoriety of the American Nazi Party of George

Lincoln Rockwell. This employee is reported to have furnished the so-called hate bus used by the Nazis to stir up racial and religious strife exploited by Communist propaganda. The employee has been reportedly involved in previous links with Rockwell's agitation. Surely an investigation of these reports is essential and, in my letter, I call on the Secretary of Defense to initiate such action immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I sent to Secretary McNamara follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing out of the deepest concern that, at a time when our Nation is seeking unity to face an unprecedented external peril, an employee of your Department is reportedly retained in a strategic job despite his association with George Lincoln Rockwell's so-called American Nazi Party to the extent that he purchased a hate bus for this group to send agitating stormtroopers through the troubled Southern States.

Communist propaganda seeks to undermine NATO, with charges of "nazism" and "revanchism" while applying pressure on Berlin. This is hardly the time for Defense Department employees to associate themselves with Nazi groups and even provide a swastika-decorated hate bus. The Washington Post on July 30 reported violations of law by the Nazi group and the impounding of the notorious hate bus, a vehicle exploited by the Communist propaganda press and television in Moscow, East Germany, Red China, and even Havana, Cuba.

The Washington newspapers' report on July 30 said that "Arlington police said that tags for the bus are registered in the name of Schuyler Ferris, an Army Map Service employe." This was contained in news on Nazi depredations in nearby Arlington, Va. Mr. Ferris has previously been mentioned in connection with Nazi agitation and a Fascist front group for Rockwell called fighting American nationalists.

The Rockwell group officially claims affiliations in various foreign nations, among them Germany, Japan, Italy, Spain, Argentina, South Africa, and others. The enclosed official letterhead illustrates the international character of the movement with which your employee is apparently linked. If so, he should be required to register as a foreign agent under the United States Code 18 and certainly should have no access to classified data or even the right of employment in any capacity by the Department of Defense.

The Communists have cleverly exploited and exaggerated the continued existence and revival of vestiges of Nazism. I do not understand how the U.S. Government can justify continued employment of an individual so unstable politically that he facilitates totalitarian extremism and propaganda activities, whether Nazi, Fascist, or Communist. He is hardly the man to have access to our strategic maps at a time when the Nation is mobilizing in response to the President's call for a militant alert.

I would appreciate knowing whether Mr. Ferris is to be retained and what actions have been taken in the matter. I regard this as a matter of gravity and am perplexed that such an individual has classified access to our Army's secret maps. Please advise at your earliest convenience on your inquiry and be assured of my sincere appreciation.

Yours truly,

SEYMOUR HALPERN.

Schedule of Grassroots Conferences in Third Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to represent the people of the Third District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to be of service, and it is my constant desire to serve my constituents in the best way possible. During my service here I have made it my regular policy to keep in close touch with the people of my district so that I may know how they feel about the many important issues facing us here in Congress.

In the face of the critical worldwide conditions presently before us these conferences become even more meaningful in reflecting the opinions of the folks in our district.

I have considered it my duty, as the representative of this great district, not only to be well informed of the opinions of my constituents, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with agencies or departments of our Federal Government.

Ten years ago I initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences throughout our district, and I have continued this practice each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also have a full-time congressional service office at the U.S. postoffice building in Dayton, where I can meet with people personally at any time that my official duties permit me to return to the district.

During the time I am in Washington attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my district service office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

In these ways I have sincerely tried to keep well informed as to the personal opinions of my constituents, and I have also tried continuously and sincerely to be of every proper service to them.

Members of Congress are constantly called upon to give careful and earnest consideration to legislation dealing with many complex national and international problems. These day-to-day decisions often affect the lives and living of every citizen in our Nation. Consequently, these personal and private conferences help me to serve all of the people in my district in a much more effective manner.

This year, during our official congressional recess, I am again taking time to hold these grassroots conferences throughout our district at convenient public buildings. I deeply appreciate the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available to me as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule I have arranged:

Dayton Post Office, Room 314, October 2 and 3, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Germantown City Building, October 5, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Miamisburg City Building, October 6, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Phillipsburg City Building, October 7, 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.
Brookville City Building, October 7, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Hamilton Courthouse, October 9, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Middletown American Legion, October 10, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.
Oxford Municipal Building, October 11, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Fairfield City Building, October 12, 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

I have been greatly encouraged by the increased attendance at these conferences each year. It is sometimes surprising to see how much can really be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down face to face and talk over problems of mutual concern.

Special appointments are not necessary for these conferences, and I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through these grassroots conferences will help me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of our important third district as their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Japanese Tool Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the membership a letter and a news article I received in today's mail:

Representative JOHN DENT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: After reading the following article in the Metalworking News, I wondered if you are familiar with the liquidation of the machine screw manufacturers because of imports from Japan.

"CONGRESSMAN HITS JAPANESE TOOL TARIFF

"WASHINGTON.—A Japanese tariff move against American-made tools was criticized by Representative JOHN DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, as indicative of the protective actions other nations are taking against U.S. products.

"He heads the House Labor Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment and has invited interested parties to give his group data on import competition.

"The subcommittee plans public hearings in various areas of the Nation later this summer and during the fall.

"Mr. DENT said last week the Japanese action to hike its tariff on American-made tools to 25 percent ad valorem means the 'Japanese tool industry has finally, with our

help, reached a position in production where they can meet their own needs, and are now doing what has been done by every other nation except the United States.

"'It is moving to protect the investment and jobs of the Japanese. Although they are not placing higher tariffs on certain other machine tools, it is only because they have not yet been able to produce their needs.'

"He noted the action of American lead and zinc producers in refusing a State Department offer of a subsidy in place of more tariff protection. This is just the beginning of an international trade revolution in the United States, Mr. DENT said."

It looks like a repeat of the wood screw manufacturing liquidation by Japanese imports. We know of only one manufacturer living who is still making screws (wood). It seems to us that about 90 percent of wood screws used in this country are imported.

The same thing is happening to the machine screw business, especially in the small size from No. 2 size to ¼–20 size. One of our competitors was auctioned off in 1956. Another is being sold today in West Warwick. Another in Providence is doing very poorly. And as for ourselves we are trying to sell out but nobody wants to buy us except for an offer of 20 cents on the dollar for the net worth of the machinery.

The Japanese are trying to sell us screws—Union Industrial Co., Ltd., of Aichi Pref. Their price delivered to New York port on 9/32- by ¼-inch steel is 58 cents per thousand; the American list price is $4.20 per thousand.

Our tariff is in error because it favors stove bolts—however less nuts stove bolts become machine screws, as you can see from the enclosed price list from Japan.

It is impossible to survive—God help America—not a single gun or missile can be held together without a screw.

Yours truly,

WHIT MOR, INC.,
HENRY POTUCHEK, *Manager.*

PAWTUCKETT, R.I.

"House Republicans Take the Initiative": New York Herald Tribune Cites Operation Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune the House Republican Policy Committee's Operation Employment received favorable mention as a way in which the Republican Party can make "itself felt not only as a responsible opposition, but as a creative opposition." Operation employment studies have touched a number of the important aspects of the American economy as these relate to jobs, on the farm and in industry, unemployment insurance and how to achieve the goals of employment as our dynamic economy moves forward. The efforts of some 50 Republican Congressmen, under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and many experts, drawn on a nonpartisan basis from the ranks of academicians and leaders in economic thought in industry, have gone into making the operation employment study a constructive step forward in the understanding of the problems we face in the realm of employment and in the formulation of policy to meet these problems.

The text of the New York Herald Tribune editorial follows:

HOUSE REPUBLICANS TAKE THE INITIATIVE

One of the Republican Party's chief problems nationally is making itself felt not only as a responsible opposition, but as a creative opposition.

The House Republican policy committee has embarked on a project which, if done well, can notably advance the party's cause and provide a pattern for the future. This—as reported by Roscoe Drummond—is a study-in-depth of the problem of unemployment in a prosperous economy. The committee expects to follow it with further studies, one at a time, on other key problems.

Whether called a committee or a task force, a study group operating in a political climate is likely to follow the "My mind is made up; don't confuse me with facts" principle. The policy committee group—the study is headed by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS—has sought to reverse this, going first to authorities in the academic and professional communities. About 2 dozen outside experts—both Democrats and Republicans—have contributed papers to the study. Their ideas and recommendations will be sifted by a working group of Republican Congressmen headed by Representative CURTIS, which aims to present an analysis transcending strictly legislative needs. Its intent, of course, is that legislation consonant with its findings will be introduced, but this is part from the study project itself.

The proof of the pudding will be in the product, scheduled to be presented to Congress soon. But the approach is sound; it is constructive; it is creative. It offers a ready means of enlisting the Nation's best minds in the formulation of responsible alternatives to administration policies, consistent with Republican principles and attuned to the developing needs of the Nation. It represents the kind of initiative on opposition party ought constantly to be taking.

Hail to Worcester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a very pertinent editorial, concerning the most recent award conferred upon my home community, as the outstanding Massachusetts City of 1960, which appeared in the Worcester Telegram, issue of June 17, 1961.

The editorial follows:

WORCESTER'S NEW AWARD

The latest award to Worcester takes appropriate notice of our assets as a center of education, commerce, and industry.

In selecting Worcester as the outstanding Massachusetts City of 1960, the government research bureau of the University of Massachusetts remarked on the amount of citizen action here. The same point won Worcester an All America City Award from the National Municipal League.

These awards are encouraging. They should stimulate further effort at community improvement, not blur over the difficulties we face.

As the Arthur D. Little, Inc., report brought out, Greater Worcester has economic problems of some substance. Such episodes as the rejection—at least temporarily—of a new zoning ordinance demonstrate that there are political problems, too. It is hard for everyone to agree on what the common welfare demands. Yet this is basic to a united effort to meet that demand.

We think the awards for Worcester are well deserved. This is a good city, and it is getting better. How much better—and how fast—depends on the time and energy that all those who care about the community are willing to invest in improving it.

Let Us Remember Our Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, many of us here have contended over the years that we do not do nearly enough to pay honor and tribute to the Nation's heroes.

A copy of the remarks made by Mrs. Myra C. Hacker before the Woman's Club of Teaneck, N.J., on February 27 of this year, has just been brought to my attention. It is an excellent reminder of the immense contributions which three great Americans, Washington Lincoln, and Edison, have made to our great country.

Mrs. Hacker is the wife of Ralph E. Hacker, one of our leading New Jersey architects. In June she was presented with a well deserved citation in commemoration of her great patriotic and civic work upon the occasion of her retirement as president of the New Jersey chapter, National Society for Constitutional Security. A Barnard graduate, Mrs. Hacker received her master or arts degree in public law from Columbia University. She served on the committee which rewrote New Jersey's State constitution in 1947 and was the recipient of a Latin American citation for her work in the field of education and toward world peace. She also served as chairman of legislation and civics for the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs and of the Barnard development fund in Bergen County. She also has held the office of vice president in the Woman's Club of Teaneck. Affiliated with many civic, educational, and university groups, Mrs. Hacker is presently first vice president of the National Society for Constitutional Security.

Under unanimous consent I include her fine remarks printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LET US REMEMBER OUR HEROES

(Statement by Myra C. Hacker before Woman's Club of Teaneck, February 27, 1961)

"Give them more heroes, and fewer villains, on whom they can pattern their lives. Encourage them to identify with persons, imaginary or real, whom they can love and

admire. Let us be done with extolling characters who are simply smarter, more cagey, or more crafty than the next one."

This statement by Dr. Martha M. Eliot, formerly of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was pertinent when she made it in 1955 at the Edison Foundation's National Conference, and it is equally applicable today. Dr. Eliott had in mind the specific need of the Nation's young people for worthwhile heroes; but her words might be applied also to the problem of the millions of adult Americans who are floundering through life for want of a pattern to live by, a purpose to guide them, a goal toward which to aim. Her remarks are in harmony with the intention of the New Jersey lawmakers in declaring February as American History Month, and with the action of those among us who commemorate, during this month, the birth dates of three great and exemplary Americans, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Thomas Alva Edison.

It is in the nature of human beings to seek out heroes with whom they may identify themselves, thus giving form and significance to their own lives. Children may pay this homage of imitation first to their parents, then to big brothers or sisters, to Scout leaders, to athletic coaches, or to teachers. As their minds and emotions develop, they grope also toward idealized characters beyond their day-to-day experience—such legendary figures as King Arthur, Robin Hood, or Paul Bunyan; such glorified present-day personages as Bob Hope, Jackie Robinson, or Tom Dooley, or such historic giants as the three men we honor this month. This need for heroes is so basic in most young people that, if they cannot attach, either personally or vicariously, to commendable models, then they will give their admiration to dubious ones—the neighborhood gang chief, or the dashing crook on the TV screen, or the grafter who gets away with it. And these heroes of our younger days have an unmeasured but tremendous influence on all the length of our lives.

The present generation is reaping the sad results of the great debunking era that was spaced between the two World Wars. It became fashionable then—it was considered smart, even scholarly—to besmirch our genuine heroes. Great men, from Washington on down, were depicted as mere fallible men, their failings and weaknesses magnified, their virtues belittled or travestied. The idols of that area came to be Al Capone and Little Caesar. At the same time, America was being downgraded; children were being taught, and they grew to be adults believing, that their America was a land of greed, hypocrisy, and injustice, and that it would be jingoistic or chauvinistic to feel or express pride in their American heritage. They would not grant that men in public life in the United States could and frequently did, act from other than self-seeking motives. That was the period when many lost souls among us offered their allegiance to the image of the supposedly more democratic People's Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Communist Russia which today is our avowed enemy in the cold war.

The leaders of American thought are now coming to realize—late, but, we hope, not too late—that cynicism as a way of life is negative, futile, self-destructive, and fundamentally false. Our entire sociopolitical system is built on the knowledge that man is good and can be improved; that, in the pursuit of happiness, he must seek, not mere creature comfort or self-aggrandizement, but wider fulfillment of his own potentialities and a greater contribution to the welfare of his fellowman.

"It is better," goes the proverb, "to light one candle then to curse the dark." We must find again the constructive, light-giving principles of the men who made America and made her great. In the lives of those men we can find inspiration for our own troubled times.

A recent study showed a significant change in the hero-images of adolescents. At the turn of the century, they tended to choose Washington or Lincoln as the man they would most like to resemble. In the 1950's, the choice would more likely be Joe DiMaggio or Satchmo Armstrong or Superman. This state of mind resulted largely from a failure of the schools and other communications media to acquaint the young—and the not so young—with their magnificent heritage of history and culture. There was too much emphasis, all around, on the passing scene, too much mistaking of the ephemeral for progress, too complete a sidestepping of the accumulation of experience and wisdom from the past, too utter a disregard of the eternal verities.

We are witnessing today, thanks largely to the good sense and the selfless efforts of men and women in the grassroots, a belated return to the appreciation of what America has stood for and what she must continue to represent. Evidences of this are American History Week in New Jersey, required courses in American and local history in many States, and the observance of Constitution Week. Also, it is no longer considered clever in the schools to deride religion; for the patriots who founded our country and those who have most nobly guided its destinies were all men of acknowledged faith.

New Jersey may well remember with pride her share in the establishment of our Nation. The "Cockpit of the Revolution" she was called. Her determined people issued their constitution 2 days before the announcement of the Declaration of Independence, and five of her statesmen were among the signers of that historic document, her soil was the locale of countless battles in the Revolution; Betsy Ross' first flag was flown by General Washington over his camp in New Jersey. The iron foundaries of our State were a large source of supply for Washington's armies. Jersey's delegates secured that a vital point be included in the legislative mechanism under the Federal Constitution: whereas the House of Representatives was to give a louder voice to the larger States, William Patterson's New Jersey plan secured equal representation for every State, large or small, in the Senate. When the Constitution was to be amended by the addition of the Bill of Rights, New Jersey was the first State to ratify. More than once, in those crucial formative days, events and people in New Jersey determined the fate of our Nation.

In the accomplishments of the three great men whom we celebrate this month, New Jersey also played a part. It was to Trenton that Washington made his famous crossing of the Delaware, in the Christmas season of 1777; and here, with courage, cleverness, and daring he surprised the enemy in a decisive encounter of the Revolution. Princeton also was the scene of a bloody engagement; and in that city the Continental Congress met in 1783 to draft peace terms with Great Britain.

When Abraham Lincoln decided to risk all to save the Constitution and the Union, New Jersey was behind him, without equivocation. Unlike parts of Maryland, which had to be bypassed on his way to Washington, New Jersey gretted him warmly when he was newly elected; and the Jersey volunteers were not laggard in manning the Union lines in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.

As for Thomas Alva Edison, every Jersey resident must know that he was one of us. Although born in Ohio and brought up in Michigan, he chose the Garden State as the place to make his home, to bring up his children, and to pursue the countless experiments which gave to the world such great inventions as the electric light, the commercially useful electric generator, the improved phonograph, and the motion picture camera.

Although we cherish our State's participation in the accomplishments of Washington, Lincoln, and Edison, we must, being forward-looking, concern ourselves even more with the lessons which we, as local citizens and as Americans, can take from the lives of these three men. For each of them embodies some of the heroic qualities which it would be well for us to recognize, to understand, and to emulate.

It is really unfortunate that the Washington's birthday holiday this year was snowed out in many schools, but we hope that the authorities took the occasion to remind their pupils of the day's significance. We need George Washington today as we have never needed him before. Like his monolithic monument in the Capital City, he stands out in our history, solitary, grand, an individual unswayed by the pressures of mass media or the frenzies of the crowd, firm in his foundations of principle and aspiring ever toward perfection.

George Washington is a living refutation of those economic determinists who claim that material gain is the chief motive power of our civilization. Like his colleagues in the founding of our country—John Adams, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, and James Madison—he was, first and foremost, a man of principle, who studied what was right, what was best for his State and his new Nation, and then acted according to his best lights. He could have lived an easy, pleasant life, and grown enormously rich and powerful, as a plantation owner and manager; but he chose the discomforts and the hazards of battle, first to guard the Virginia frontier in the French and Indian Wars, and then through the long and bitter perils of the Revolution.

For his services as commander in chief he received no cent of pay, no under-the-table emoluments—only the undying admiration of his soldiers for a commander who suffered as they did. During those 6 long years as the head of the Continental Army and the indispensable factor in its ultimate victory, he longed for his beautiful, peaceful estate, which was being neglected in his protracted absence. The war over, he had hardly retired to Mount Vernon when he was called on again, this time to preside over the Federal Convention and to serve for 8 years, in the various temporary capitals, while the United States was testing the workability of its new Constitution.

Then, as his second term as President drew near its close, he ultimately confounded those who cynically dubbed him a dictator by refusing to remain longer in office—he was no longer sorely needed, there were others who could take his place, and he was too fresh from the struggle against kings to want his country to have one. His retirement, to the home where all along his heart had been, was soon cut short by death; but the symbol of Washington as a man who put intelligent, farsighted, individualized public service above self-interest and complacency will never die.

But with all his high idealism, Washington was no soft-headed visionary. He was the original pro-American. True, he accepted the aid of foreigners in winning his war—of Lafayette, Kossuth, and Steuben, and he was proud to have his country a shining example of what free and noble men can accomplish; but he knew that our first concern, as a nation, must be for our own destiny, and our greatest dependence must be on our own strength, abetted by the God we serve and in Whom we trust. We cannot imagine George Washington traveling about the world, seeking to ingratiate himself with foreign peoples, trying to buy their love

with handouts, and granting them favors which undermine our own economic well-being. We certainly cannot conceive of his committing our national fate into the hands of a U.N. or a NATO or a SEATO or of a World Court in which our avowed enemy sits as a judge. As far as international policy was concerned, Washington was a stanch and level-headed do-it-yourselfer. Perhaps there is an echo of this in our young President's acknowledgment a month ago that we must negotiate not from fear but from internal strength.

Unlike many of our modern ideologists, however, George Washington did not confuse national strength with Federal bureaucracy. He and his cofounders had sacrificed so much to rid their country of an overbearing government that they were not inclined to chance a repetition of similar troubles here. They devised their system of checks and balances to keep the Executive and the judiciary and the legislature from exercising, any one of them, runaway powers. They devised the two-House system to keep the balance between States rights and popular ballot. They believed that the consent of the governed was necessary for the functioning of republican institutions, and that public officials should serve the public weal; but, to avoid mobocracy, they had the people express themselves through elected representatives; and they set about to establish—but always on the local level—systems of education which would the better fit the common man for self-rule. If Washington and Jefferson and Adams could now look down from his monument at the city which bears his name, we think they would be horrified at the ponderous parasitic growths which weigh down and all but crush the delicately balanced system of government they framed.

To Abraham Lincoln it fell to hold together the Nation that George Washington, more than any other man, had created. Although Lincoln had little formal education, he was a reading man, a thoughtful man, and an honest citizen. He knew that the Constitution was the ultimate law of the land, and that the law, so long as it remains on the books, must be enforced; and he recognized the solemnity of an oath. He was a reasonable man, a man of peace who loved his fellow man and hated human bloodshed; but he had sworn to uphold, as President, the Constitution of the United States, and uphold it he must, even if it meant a civil war to save the Union which that Constitution had established. It would have been much pleasanter for Lincoln, who had neither the taste nor the generalship for waging war, to have appeased the South, to have compromised on slavery and on the Union, with the excuse that it was not right for brother to slay brother. But Lincoln, like Washington, had the foresight, the courage, the devotion to duty, to meet force with force in the pursuit of the Nation's greatest good. At the cost to himself of agony, heartbreak, and death by assassination, he led us through the darkest days in our national history, not to gain power for himself but to preserve a government which was of, for, and by the people.

That famous slogan of Lincoln's, so often glibly mouthed, deserves a careful repitition today—government of the people, by the people, for the people. Lincoln was in every sense an American, in his birth, his upbringing, his tastes, his interests. A product of the American frontier, he did not go looking for new frontiers in order to sidestep the problems that faced him. Instead of jousting with foreign windmills, he put his heart, his soul, his very life, into solving the domestic dilemmas of slavery and secession. Lincoln did not want government for the good of the party in power, or for the benefit of far-off lands. It was the preservation of the free institutions of America for Americans to which he was dedicated.

History had demonstrated that the momentous decision of Abraham Lincoln—to accept the challenge of a fratricidal conflict—was as wise as it was courageous. No sane, just person likes war; and in the 20th century the word has become even more unspeakable than before. But, like it or not, we must realize that we are pitted today, as we were a century ago, against a force that has set out to destroy us; and the struggle is no less deathly because it is a cold war. To cry "Peace at any price" is to surrender, and to lose our freedom to world communism. That would not have been Lincoln's way. Our best hope for avoiding a shooting war is to make ourselves strong internally—in military, economic, and spiritual power; to be ready to wage limited or all-out war, if necessary (although we devoutly hope it will not come); and to forestall such a dire event by setting to the rest of the world, particularly to the enslaved Iron Curtain countries, an example of the national well-being which ensues where free institutions are cherished.

However, as matters are proceeding today, it is much to be feared that we are in more danger from within than from any overt acts of aggression by the Kremlin. Messrs. Khrushchev and company must take sweet satisfaction in seeing the colossus which is our Federal Government grow topheavy to the point of disaster with international commitments, internal taxation and debt, and the welfare state's obsessive desire to push-button every phase of our civic activity. We are getting to be like a family in which the parents refuse to let their numerous children grow up or to live their own lives, but insist on supervising their every adult action, even to the point of confiscating their earnings in order to give them to neighbors who don't really need them.

All of the great revolutions of history have been fought against the restrictiveness of "too much government." The average American family man of today surrenders one-third of his earnings in taxes; that means that he is working 7 whole days every month for the Government. If he is unusually capable, and is earning a large compensation, the percentages are much higher; and the trend on the Government take is ever upward. It was a situation much less drastic than this which gave fuel for the French Revolution, with its consequent Reign of Terror. It has been noted that the young American radicals of today, although some of them still fall for the Communist bait, tend to be on the far right; they are liberal, paradoxically, in that they want to reassert the freedoms and the natural rights of individuals for which Washington fought and Lincoln made his painful but heroic decision.

"The turn will come," says Senator GOLDWATER, "when we entrust the conduct of our affairs to men who understand that their first duty as public officials is to divest themselves of the power they have been given. It will come, when Americans in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation, decide to put the man in office who is pledged to enforce the Constitution and restore the Republic; who will proclaim in a campaign speech: 'My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones that do violence to the Constitution, or that have failed in their purpose, or that impose on the people an unwarranted financial burden. I will not attempt to discover whether legislation is needed before I have first determined whether it is constitutional. And if I should later be attacked for neglecting my constituents' interests, I shall reply that I was informed their main interest is liberty, and that in that cause I am doing the very best I can.' "

A man such as the Senator conceives would be hard to come by on our political scene, for power in Government generally breeds the desire for more power. It would take a public servant of the vision, stamina, and selflessness of a Washington or a Lincoln to restore our National Government to a safe and workable size and put power back into the hands of the local citizenry where much of it may be best administered.

Our third nomination for a hero-image for our generation, this American History Month in New Jersey, is Thomas Edison, whose birthday was on February 11. Although he eschewed active politics, Edison followed in the tradition of our other great Americans in his deep sense of personal responsibility and dedicated service. Edison had neither patrimony nor formal education to fall back on. No one paid him $700 a year to stay in college; no Government agency spotted him as a potential genius and set him up with laboratories and learned advisers. No guidance counselor, even, in elementary or high school, told him what was wrong with his background and what courses he should take. He did not adapt to the group in the sense of doing what everyone else on his age level and social level was doing. His equipment was a burning desire to know and to do, to bring light and beauty and interest into the lives of his fellow men; and he had the personal courage to face the loneliness, the risk of failure, the insecurity which his ambitions entailed. He knew what he wanted to do with his life, and that his goal was noble, and he kept on trying—often testing thousands of materials before he came upon one which suited the purpose of an invention.

Edison succeeded notably—he gave to mankind the age of electricity, and was honored even in his lifetime. But even if he had failed—how much more worthwhile would his life have been than one which is padded from the cradle to the grave, against the shock of effort and the spur of insecurity, by handouts from an overprotective welfare state.

There are many well-meaning people today who feel that our duty to our young citizens lies in rolling a velvet carpet along the road they will tread through life—in securing them against any hardship, any insecurity, any danger. But this attitude is as unrealistic as it is unfair. We live in a hard world in which we must earn our own salvation by exercising our free will in the choice of right paths, however steep, toward worthwhile goals. When our freedom is denied us by a tyrannical government, or by a smothering parent-state, we cannot pursue happiness as the Lord meant us to.

Let us therefore, if we want to help our fellow citizens, give them back their heroes, the man who built our Nation, the man who held it together with bruised hands, the man who enriched the lives of succeeding generations. And let us urge, "From their lives, take light for yours."

The Hanford Sham Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on July 31, the Washington Post carried a lead editorial entitled "The Hanford Battle." Because of the tenor of the statement and the shallowness of its arguments, I think the editorial should have been more appropriately titled "The Hanford Sham Battle."

It was a significant editorial, however, because it clearly identifies the Hanford proposal for what it really is. Despite the protestations of its proponents in both the Senate and the House that the Hanford project should not be considered in the light of the so-called private versus public power controversy, the Washington Post identifies it as "the major public power controversy before this Congress." Let the Members of this House not be fooled about the true publice power nature of the proposal; the Washington Post certainly was not.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are opposed to the addition of 800,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity to the plutonium production reactor being constructed at Hanford have been consistent in our efforts to keep the record straight by sound and reasonable arguments devoid of emotionalism. As a continuation of this policy, I think it would be appropriate to examine carefully the Washington Post editorial to see how well it stands up under the glaring light of exposure.

Let us examine it sentence by sentence. The editorial begins by saying:

The major public power controversy before this Congress concerns the proposal to construct a $95 million nuclear plant at Hanford, Wash.

As indicated before, this statement clearly recognizes the Hanford proposal as being a public power controversy. It might also be pointed out that there is more involved than merely a $95 million power generating plant because, if this project be authorized, an additional $20,850,000 will be required to construct the transmission system necessary to carry the power from the generating facility to power consuming centers. There is every indication, also, that an additional several million dollars will be required later to construct additional transmission lines. Perhaps we should use a figure of almost $120 million rather than $95 million when discussing this project. The editorial continues:

In essence, the choice is whether the new plant should be restricted to producing plutonium weapons, or whether in addition it should provide public power for the Northwest.

Again the editorial openly admits the public power nature of the proposal. It is a gigantic oversimplification to say the choice is whether the new plant should be restricted to producing plutonium or whether it should also provide public power. Those of us who have listened carefully to the extensive hearings and debate on this proposal are well aware that the issue is far more serious than the Washington Post editorial would have its readers believe. It would be more realistic to say the choice is whether we should lose hot air or waste Federal taxpayers' funds at this time in our national life when we are going to be called upon to spend ever-increasing quantities of funds for our national security and survival. The separate statement to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy report on the AEC authorization bill signed by myself and four other members of that committee clearly and succintly elaborated upon 10 compelling reasons why this project should not and must not be authorized. I would heartily recommend that this statement be made compulsory reading for the advocates of the Hanford project.

The editorial stated:

The Senate has already approved a dual-purpose plant, but in the House foes of public power have succeeded in deleting the provision for power from the atomic energy authorization bill.

The construction of this sentence seems to be designed deliberately to deceive the reader into believing that the House has created this disagreement. The record is clear—the House bill—H.R. 7576—which we are still considering, did not contain the Hanford project, but the Senate initiated the controversy by amending H.R. 7576 to include this and another project.

Here also the editorial attempts to characterize any Members of this House who in their wisdom and conscience evaluated this unnecessary project and alined themselves with the best interests of their taxpaying constituents as being "foes of public power." If this be the criterion for being a "foe of public power," then I can only say proponents of public power must be blind in their approach to any issue regardless of its merits and regardless of its cost to the Nation's taxpayers.

Continuing the editorial said:

To further complicate matters, Republican Majority Leader Charles Halleck is trying to prevent a House-Senate conference from agreeing on a dual-purpose plant.

I am sure the gentleman from Indiana will be both pleased and surprised to note that the Washington Post now considers him to be the majority leader, but I am not too sure our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will be willing to admit to the veracity of at least this statement in the Washington Post editorial.

It is completely unfair and purposefully misleading to accuse the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] of trying to prevent a House-Senate conference from agreeing on a dual-purpose plant. If the writer of that editorial had taken the trouble to read the gentleman's brief statement in objecting to the unanimous-consent request for the House to ask for a conference with the Senate on this question, he would have realized the purpose was to protect the rights of the majority of the House. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] properly pointed out—

Already in this session of Congress on several occasions the House has been foreclosed from working its will on a conference report because the other body acted first, and discharged the conferees.

It should be remembered that the issue in controversy was raised by the Senate when it amended H.R. 7576. The House of Representatives is not disagreeing with the Senate, but rather the Senate is disagreeing with the House. For this reason, it would seem to me to be appropriate for the Senate to request a conference to resolve the disagreement. As an example of what would seem to be the reasonable approach to such a question, may I refer my colleagues to page 13165 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, July 31, 1961, which shows the Senate action on the independent offices appropriation bill. On that occasion the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said upon passage of the bill:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

If the other body had followed this same procedure and requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote on the AEC authorization bill (H.R. 7576) the present situation would not have arisen. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] then would not have been compelled to try to protect the rights of the majority of the House of Representatives.

He is asking the Rules Committee to intercede so that the House would have an opportunity to strike out any public power authorization from a conference committee report.

The discussion on the previous sentence should be sufficient to indicate the desire of the gentleman from Indiana on this matter. As he so properly pointed out in his colloquy with the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. HOLIFIELD]:

After the measure left this body, it went to the other body. That item was put back in the bill in the other body; the bill was messaged back with the amendment. Under the regular rules that generally operated, the House would have acted first on the conference report. I have some very definite convictions about the right of the membership of the House of Representatives to have something to say about what finally shall be in these bills.

Mr. HALLECK seems determined to prove that nothing smacking of socialism will take place in Hanford.

All that I think needs to be said about this particular sentence is—thank heavens for Mr. HALLECK or anyone else who will do everything in his power to see that socialism does not get a hold in Hanford or anywhere else in this fair land of ours.

But scare words should not be permitted to becloud a simple question of commonsense.

This sentence is so ridiculous that it should not be dignified by any comment. It just serves to prove the old adage that commonsense is a very uncommon thing, and this Nation can well do without this kind of commonsense. The Montana Standard Post, of Butte, Mont., editorially "belled this particular cat" on July 24. The editorial pointed out that "socialism, not electricity seen as byproduct." I recommend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues so I am inserting it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

When the Hanford plant is constructed, it will necessarily generate steam which can be used for power as well as weaponry—the estimate is that it could produce from 700,000 to 800,00 kilowatts of power.

This, of course, is a misstatement of fact. The Hanford production reactor will produce byproduct heat which can be turned into steam.

It will not necessarily generate steam. The editorial does not point out that it would be uneconomic and wasteful to spend almost $120 million on the generating and transmission facilities required to use the heat for power production. Nor does it point out that these $120 million could be spent to far greater advantage in a multitude of other ways to strengthen our defense posture at this time when the President is calling for sacrifices from all of us.

If the Hanford plant should produce for peace as well as war, it would become by far the biggest nuclear power plant in the world.

The editorial might have gone on to say that it would be the biggest, most obsolete and unnecessary boondoggle in the world. As the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] so aptly pointed out during debate in the other Chamber on this project:

This would be like building the biggest Model T factory in the world.

He went on to say that "the wasteful expenditure of $95 million for an outdated, antiquated, inefficient 800,000 kilowatt teakettle would make us the technological laughingstock of the world."

Although it would involve no technical innovations, the size alone would be an advertisement of this country's determination to use atoms for peace.

Well, at least the editorial admits that this proposal would not contribute to technological development of the nuclear art. As far as Hanford's contribution to America's prestige, our extremely able colleague from California [Mr. HOSMER] has already pointed out the fallaciousness of such an argument by saying:

How much international prestige are you going to get by going back almost a century and a half in technology? None at all. The people overseas are going to look at such foolishness and laugh at us. We would not gain prestige; we would lose it by foolishness like this.

Furthermore, the Northwest is in desperate need of additional power to assure the region's growth.

In my opinion this too is an untrue statement. The public power proponents attempt to tell us that in the years 1965–66 there may possibly be a shortage of something over 100,000 kilowatts of power in the Bonneville area. They play down the fact that this shortage could only occur if there is at that time an almost unprecedented shortage of water in the Columbia River system.

The proponents fail to point out, however, that there is in the western part of the Northwest nearly half a million kilowatts of steam-electric generating capacity which at this moment is on reserve and which could be used in 1965 to meet any deficiency in hydropower. Furthermore, by 1965 there will be some 300,000 to 500,000 kilowatts of surplus power in Idaho, Montana, and Utah which can be exported to the western areas of the Columbia Basin to meet any possible power deficiency. So, I fail to see the "desperate need of additional power" in the Northwest. There is a desperate need for wise and sound use of Federal funds at this time.

The Hanford plant could also be used to facilitate the tieline which the Department of Interior hopes to construct as a power link between southern California and the Pacific Northwest.

This is perhaps the most significant sentence in the entire editorial, for it clearly points out perhaps the true reason for the public power proponents' vigorous fight to get Hanford authorized. There is obviously more than meets the eye. They must have this project as a key part in their plans to federalize western power development through steam generating facilities and, more importantly, to justify a prime leg of an all-Federal transmission grid.

Significantly, the dual-purpose conception is warmly endorsed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and by the Atomic Energy Commission, the agency which would administer the plant.

This again is an untrue statement. Some of the members of the Joint Committee endorse this project, but there is also a sizable number of the Joint Committee members who are vigorously opposed to it.

The editorial concluded:

For these reasons, we hope that Mr. HALLECK's maneuver will be rejected by the Rules Committee, and that Congress will have an opportunity to make the Hanford plant more than a factory for destructive weapons.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the sham battle which the Washington Post editorial attempts to purvey, I sincerely hope the large majority of the Members of the House of Representatives reject forthrightly the opinions expressed by that editorial. We should stand four-square with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in his sincere effort to assure that we have the proper opportunity to express again the will and determination of this body to delete the Hanford steamplant from the AEC authorization bill; and, thereby, save the taxpayers of this Nation almost $120 million for more vital purposes.

[From the Montana Standard-Post, Butte, Mont., July 24, 1961]

SOCIALISM, NOT ELECTRICITY, SEEN AS BYPRODUCT

The question of whether electric power will be generated as a byproduct at a plutonium plant at Hanford, Wash., being built by the Atomic Energy Commission will be settled by a conference between the Senate and House, the Senate having approved the idea while the House rejected it.

Because Democrats will dominate the Joint Committee, it has been predicted that the measure which calls for an expenditure of an extra $95 million will win approval.

But, meanwhile, let us in our mild way register an objection.

We might be in favor of it if we knew all about it or if we could even find out all about it. But we can't. Neither can anybody else. So much of the project is hidden by secrecy that it is not possible to make a clear judgment.

It is argued that sufficient heat to make 800 kilowatt-hours of electricity will be generated in the process of manufacturing plutonium out of uranium. It is enough electricity to serve a city of a million people. But how is anyone to know whether or not this is the most efficient use of the heat. It is said that otherwise the heat will be wasted. But how do we know?

It is impossible to get meaningful cost statistics, so no one excepting a few Government functionaries would know how much the electricity is costing.

We do not know whether the most important factor is politics, economics, defense or what. There was a strong suspicion among House Members that the most important factor was political, so the Members of that body defeated the proposal to hook on electrical generators to the $145-million reactor.

If the dominant factor is politics, then it is the old scheme by Fabian Socialists to capture or control the power of the Nation in order to implement their Socialist desires. It worked in the United Kingdom. Their motto is if you control the nation's power you control the nation.

This part of the argument deserves more than cursory consideration.

A project as steeped in secrecy as this one would be an ideal vehicle for Socialist plotters. Working behind a screen, they could have the country in their grip without anyone knowing about it until they sprung their trap.

But are we not making the plutonium in the first place to protect ourselves against just such a contingency?

So is not socialism the real byproduct, and not electricity?

DeMolay Honored in Middletown, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the future of America will depend upon the good citizenship resulting from the training of our young people. Today there are many opportunities and also many disappointments facing our country's youth.

In times like these it is encouraging to recognize the fine principles of such an organization for young men as the International Order of DeMolay. A number of the Members of this House and of the Senate have been members of this organization.

Our Third District of Ohio is glad to note that this year the DeMolay chapter in Middletown will celebrate its fifth anniversary. On October 14, 1961, the regular fall installation of officers will be held. It will be unusual in that two brothers will play the leading parts as Terry E. Lawrence, a Representative DeMolay and blue honor keyholder, the younger of the two, will be installed as master councilor of the chapter by U. Ronald Lawrence, a charter member of the chapter, Representative DeMolay, chevalier, past master councilor and blue honor keyholder. In addition the chapter will be presented three schoolbooks with a message from former Presidents of the United States personally inserted in each urging the youth to study their country's history, government, and liter-

ature. The presentation will be made by a former President's son.

Ohio will have its part in the ceremony, too, as a State senator presents an Ohio flag to the chapter. The City Commission of Middletown will proclaim DeMolay Week for the city and during this time the DeMolay boys will work for the city without remuneration.

Such organizations as DeMolay exemplify the very best kind of training for tomorrow's leaders.

The code of a DeMolay follows so that all may know of the aims of these young men:

A DeMolay serves God.
A DeMolay honors all womanhood.
A DeMolay loves and honors his parents.
A DeMolay is honest.
A DeMolay practices honest toil.
A DeMolay is loyal to ideals and friends.
A DeMolay's word is as good as his bond.
A DeMolay is courteous.
A DeMolay is at all times a gentleman.
A DeMolay is a patriot in peace as well as war.
A DeMolay is clean in mind and body.
A DeMolay stands unswervingly for the public school.
A DeMolay always bears the reputation of a good and law-abiding citizen.
A DeMolay by precept and example must preserve the high standards to which he has pledged himself.

Nation's Top Teenage Driver To Be Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the importance of safe driving habits in our youthful drivers cannot be overemphasized. The traffic toll in loss of human life, in human suffering, and in property destruction is staggering. If we are to ever make significant progress in accident prevention, our young people who are just learning to drive must prepare to assume their responsibilities for safety behind the wheel.

Tonight, here in Washington, America's top teenage driver will be honored. For the past 4 days, 50 young men and 1 young girl representing each of the States and the District of Columbia have been competing for the distinction and honor of being our Nation's outstanding young driver.

The occasion is the 10th annual Teenage Safe Driving Road-E-O of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. This year Jaycee-sponsored Road-E-O's in more than 2,000 local communities across the land attracted nearly one-half million contestants. Although just one youngster will be honored tonight, all America will benefit from this competition, because nearly a half million of her newest drivers have learned more about driving and the need for safety on the road.

I congratulate the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce for this fine program of traffic safety education. I commend the sponsors of the Road-E-O whose contributions make the program possible. They are the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, the Pure Oil Co., and the Chrysler Corp. I urge that they continue to promote safe driving through this worthwhile program.

The purpose of the National Teenage Safe Driving Road-E-O is "to instill in the minds of the Nation's youth in their formative years skill in driving, knowledge of the rules of the road, and to promote the establishment of driver training programs in all public high schools."

The contestants in the national finals here this week are champions all. I would like to recognize them and congratulate them on their achievement. They are: L. E. Ladnier III, Mobile, Ala.; Duane Torgeson, Ketchikan, Alaska; Thomas Edward DeKellis, Tempe, Ariz.; Bob Manatt, Hot Springs, Ark.; Nicky Ellis Carter, San Jose, Calif.; David C. M. Wood, Boulder, Colo.; Garry H. Sutliffe, Manchester, Conn.; Jay Todd, Seaford, Del.; S. Weldon Brown, Washington, D.C.; Henry C. Dolive, Deland, Fla.; Dewey Moss, Dalton, Ga.; Paul Kanemitsu, Kaunakakai, Molokai, Hawaii; Mike L. Taylor, Rupert, Idaho; David Robinson Bullen, Wheaton, Ill.; Gary Leslie, Indianapolis, Ind.; Alan Arthur Kirchhoff, Humboldt, Iowa; Janice Nusser, Garden City, Kans.; Dean W. Dixon, Russellville, Ky.; Lee Graves, Slidell, La.; Raymond Nelson, Hampden Highlands, Maine; John Carlson Ames, Pasadena, Md.; Paul Jasper, Boylston, Mass.; Carl Pickles, Clayton, Mich.; John Benedett, St. Charles, Minn.; Kyle Stephens Wood II, Hattiesburg, Miss.; Dwayne Ralph Brees, Princeton, Mo.; Carl Donald Lawson, Great Falls, Mont.; Robert L. Johnson, Hastings, Nebr.; Ronald Dee Larsen, Ely, Nev.; Andrew Christie, Jr., Kingston, N.H.; James Gottschamer, Kenvil, N.J.; Fred Smith, New Mexico; David Brownell, Castleton, N.Y.; Turner Bryson, Franklin, N.C.; Darryl Gait, Carrington, N. Dak.; Gary Clea Smith, Blair, Okla.; Tom Fountain, Springfield, Oreg.; J. Kenneth Gurysh, Northumberland, Pa.; Peter H. Yost, East Greenwich, R.I.; John Caldwell, Frogmore, S. C.; Larry Hanson, Rapid City, S. Dak.; Larry Davis, Covington, Tenn.; Jeff Crossland, Howe, Tex.; Robert E. McGee, Provo, Utah; Larry J. Day, Williamstown, Vt.; Mack W. Pitts III, Falls Church, Va.; Gordon D. Ham, Bellevue, Wash.; Paul Gockstetter, Benwood, V. Wa.; Leighton John Mangels, Jr., Brookfield, Wis.; James R. McCue, Cheyenne, Wyo.

These young contestants aspire to driving excellence and they recognize the seriousness of our traffic problems. In a letter addressed to the President and left with one of his assistants on their visit to the White House they asked his support for a program of positive action in the field of highway safety. They wrote:

In view of the serious crisis confronting our Nation and all the free world it is more important than ever that the United States have all its strength and power to cope with the many exigencies of the times. We the finalists of the 10th annual National Teenage Safe Driving Road-E-O call upon you, Mr. President, to invoke a meeting of all the Governors of all the States for the purpose of presenting the citizens of the United States with a plan for reducing the high toll of traffic accidents and fatalaties.

Again, I commend the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and its affiliated clubs throughout the Nation for their worthwhile and imaginative program of safe driving education. I thank their cooperating sponsors for helping make America a safer place to drive and I urge that they continue to enjoy the success which has marked the first 10 years of this fine program.

The Pharmaceutical Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey is often called the Medicine Chest of the Nation. The pharmaceutical industry in our State employs more than 15,000 people and includes some of the largest and most successful companies in the industry. More than 18 of these firms invest a total of $50 million annually in research alone, which accounts for so much of the progress the American people have enjoyed in reaching the highest standards of health the world has ever known.

The pharmaceutical industry is greatly concerned today about the impact on the general public of the hearings conducted recently by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, and is similarly fearful of the proposed Federal regulations which would be imposed on the industry by the so-called Kefauver-Celler bill.

An expression of this concern, of which all our colleagues should be aware, Mr. Speaker, is contained in an editorial published July 10, 1961, by the Newark Star-Ledger, one of New Jersey's leading newspapers.

The editorial follows:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, July 10, 1961]

UNDER FIRE

The pharmaceutical industry generally is conceded to have made remarkable progress during recent years in the development and manufacture of a myriad of drugs which have contributed substantially to the achievements of the medical profession in its attack on many ailments.

It's ironic, therefore, that the industry should come under fire at this time from certain congressional quarters.

The recent hearings conducted by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER were a prelude to the introduction of proposals, now before the Congress, which would clamp much tighter Government control over the pharmaceutical industry. Despite the hearings, it has not been demonstrated conclusively that this type of control is either necessary or desirable.

On the contrary, there is much evidence that it is totally unnecessary and is far from desirable.

Do we really need a czar to sit in judgment over the pharmaceutical industry and decree what drugs are to be made and who is to make them? If Washington bureaucrats are to be the arbiters of what's to be done in the drug industry, we cannot expect a continuation of the research and development programs which have resulted in the outstanding achievements of the postwar years. Such programs can flourish only in a climate of freedom. They most certainly will wither in the repressive atmosphere of a pharmaceutical czardom.

But what is perhaps most disturbing about the Kefauver proposals is the way in which they reveal an unfounded lack of confidence in the pharmaceutical industry. At the same time, they reveal a lack of confidence in the medical profession. For the doctor's judgment in regard to the administration of drugs would be superseded by the Federal bureaucracy.

That is why the American Medical Association is opposed to the Kefauver measure. There is no opposition to the current practice whereby the U.S. Food and Drug Administration checks drugs to determine whether they are safe. But the new proposal would go beyond that and have the FDA decide whether the drugs worked.

In opposing this proposal, an American Medical Association spokesman declared that "we believe that only the physician has the knowledge, ability, and responsibility to make a decision as to what drug is best for a particular patient."

Implicit in the Kefauver proposal is the belief that the physician is little more than a disinterested pawn in the hands of greedy drugmakers. But this belief certainly doesn't square with the facts.

The medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry are rightly concerned with the open attacks and with the innuendoes by those who apparently want the Government to control the practice of medicine.

But all of us should be concerned. Our health is our most precious possession. If the doctors become robots, controlled from Washington, the public will suffer. And the public means all of us, who at one time or another are dependent for good health, if not life itself, on the knowledge and ability of the medical practitioners.

Congress and Problems of the New Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the contents of the Government Relations Bulletin of the General Electric Corp. for July 25, 1961, which traces the progress and problems of the new administration.

It certainly is commendable to note the interest and comprehensiveness which mark this report. The degree to which all Americans study and learn from guides such as this will increase noticeably the knowledge they have of the governmental process.

The article follows:

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS OF THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

It is customary in America to speak of that felicitious relationship between Congress and a new administration in Washington as a "honeymoon." President Roosevelt's lasted several years. President Truman kept Congress in his confidence without serious conflict for more than a year. President Eisenhower's lasted 2 years, until his party lost control in Congress. Now that President Kennedy's first half-year in the Presidency is history, there are indications that these few happy months of cooperation are beginning to produce some strain, both in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

President Kennedy entered office with a well-publicized program. One independent source, Congressional Quarterly, has compiled from his speeches 220 implicit and explicit promises, which, added to the diverse pledges in the Democratic platform, comprise a monumental task for any administration. Whether and how the President and Congress are meeting these pledges is, of course, of interest to every American.

Overall, nearly every disinterested observer would agree that President Kennedy has fared quite well with his legislative program. At the start of his Presidential term, he pledged to obtain five major new programs. Of these, he has already signed three of them—aid to depressed areas, increased minimum wages, and an omnibus housing bill. This is a good batting average. The other two—medical care for aged and Federal aid to education—are meeting strong opposition, some of it from the New Frontier's dedicated supporters, but it is likely that the education aid measure at least will be passed in some altered form.

LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

Modification of House rules: The first major legislative victory for the new administration came less than 2 weeks after inauguration day. This was the key vote on changing the composition of the powerful House Rules Committee, which has a major voice in determining what legislation is acted on by the House. In previous years the committee's membership of 12 had been stalemated between 6 northern Democrats on one side and 4 Republicans and 2 southern Democrats, including the chairman, HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, on the other. The administration scored a notable victory when proadministration forces led by Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, won a 217 to 212 vote to expand the membership by adding two Democrats (proadministration) and one Republican. This action did not modify the power of the House Rules Committee but did give administration sympathizers a majority of one.

Temporary unemployment benefits: The administration's first achievement on substantive legislation came in the unemployment field—paying up to 13 additional weeks of unemployment benefits from Federal funds after State benefits had been exhausted. The 1961 Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act differed from its 1958 counterpart in paying for the first time Federal benefits financed by an additional Federal unemployment tax of fourtenths of 1 percent payable for 2 years and levied on all employers in all States. Under the earlier 1958 act loans were made to those States that desired to provide extended benefits—to be financed in each State as the States determined.

While the 1961 program was not seriously opposed—only 30 votes in the House and 4 in the Senate cast against final passage—there was a close vote (44 to 42) in the Senate when the administration barely beat down a proposal that each State should pay only for the extended benefits paid in that State. The President signed this program into law on March 24, 1961.

New Federal judges: The need for additional judges to try the increasing backlog of Federal cases in the U.S. courts has been evident for several years. Eisenhower administration recommendations for 45 new judgeships were disregarded by the Congress, but a Kennedy request for 59 received early attention, being raised to 73 in the final bill. It became law with the President's signature on May 19. Although to date only seven judgeship nominations have been sent up, the explanation for this, according to the New York Times, July 10, 1961, may be that: "The Kennedy forces, faced with putting several controversial programs through Congress are using this patronage weapon for all it is worth. It is to their advantage to delay a decision on many nominations until they see how legislative battles are going."

Depressed areas: Fulfilling his promise that depressed area aid would be among his first undertakings in office, President Kennedy on January 25 endorsed the report of a task force he had appointed to study the problem. As signed on May 1, the Area Redevelopment Act sets up an Administrator, in the Department of Commerce, directed to designate as redevelopment areas those sections of the Nation with "substantial and persistent" labor surpluses. Such areas will receive loans and grants for purchase of new plants and public facilities, technical assistance, vocational training programs with subsistence payments to unemployed, with provision for rural redevelopment. Total authorized funds amount to $394 million initially.[1]

Minimum wage: Adding several million workers to be covered by the minimum wage-maximum hour law, and increasing the minimum to $1.25 an hour was a pledge of the Democratic Party. This year, Congress enacted a bill stepping up the minimum by stages to $1.25 an hour, over a period of 2 years, and bringing under the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act about 3.6 million employees in certain retail and service establishments, construction firms, laundries, fish processing, and other businesses not heretofore included, grossing $250,000 annually or meeting other basic qualifications. The President signed it on May 5, 1961. This legislation will have no direct effect on General Electric operations since the company's pay scales have historically been substantially above any legislated minimums.

Housing: The $4.9 billion omnibus housing bill, covering private, public, college, elderly persons, and farm housing and urban renewal, was fulfillment of another pledge of the new administration. In a minor administration setback, the final draft omitted the 40-year, no-downpayment loan provision that drew the most unfavorable debate. This was reduced to 35 years, 3 percent downpayment. The bill includes authorization for 100,000 public housing units, $200 million for farm housing loans, $1.2 billion for college housing loans, $100 million for housing for the elderly, $2 billion urban renewal grants and other aids as incentive for more housing construction. This enormous program was sent to the President, and approved on June 30, 1961.

SOME EARLY SETBACKS

While these achievements represent substantial accomplishment, the Kennedy ad-

[1] The Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce released June 9, 1961, a list of 114 labor market areas designated as redevelopment (distressed) areas. Areas in which General Electric plants are located are as follows: Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Auburn, N.Y.; Logan, Ohio; Erie, Pa.; Scranton, Pa.; Providence, R.I.

ministration has sustained a few significant setbacks. The record to date, however, has been decidedly on the side of achievement. The few defeats include the following:

Reorganization plans: At about the time of his inauguration, President Kennedy laid great emphasis on the need for reorganizing the independent regulatory agencies, and especially increasing the degree of executive influence over them. While some changes have been made, it is in this field that the President has had two setbacks: the House voted down his reorganization plan for the Federal Communications Commission, while the Senate voted down his proposed alteration of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Farm program: The Kennedy farm proposals have been running into congressional trouble. After an initial victory on a feed grains bill, recent votes in committees of both Houses have gone against the administration. Prospects for future action on farm legislation are discussed below.

Civil rights: Despite campaign commitments for new civil rights protections, and introduction of bills by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, to accomplish the objectives stated in the Democratic platform, no legislative progress on civil rights has been made. One explanation is that administration forces are seeking maximum southern support for other programs before pressing for controversial civil rights changes.

Education: Fourth of the five major objectives set by the President at the start of the year, aid to education has run into unusual difficulties because of the controversy over aid to private and parochial schools as well as public. Therefore, while many administration strategists had hoped to have an education bill passed by now, it remains in the category of pending legislation.

CURRENT STATUS OF PENDING LEGISLATION

Several major proposals now remain before the Congress. While one or two of these might receive action in the waning weeks of this congressional session, most, if not all, will instead become the main focus of legislative attention in 1962.

Federal aid to public and private schools: Federal aid for school construction and schoolteachers' salaries was a principal pledge made by Nominee Kennedy in the 1960 campaign. A spate of such bills was introduced when Congress convened, but the administration endorsed the bills introduced by Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey. The Senate passed the Morse bill in May, and the House committee has reported the Thompson bill. However, neither of these bills provides for assistance to private—mainly parochial—schools, an issue which has stirred heated debate. While the President (a vigorous champion of parochial school aid as a Congressman) has indicated he now believes direct grants to parochial schools to be unconstitutional, he has also given reason to believe he will accept loans or some other form of aid. The controversy has become sufficiently involved that the main elements of education aid may not receive final action this year. If not, it will be a leading administration objective in 1962. Proponents of Federal aid to education argue the need for this legislation by pointing out the disparity in educational standards and spending in the various States, the inadequacy of existing financing in some States, the national need for better schools and teachers. Opponents contend that turning to the Federal Government as a regular source of financing public education will destroy local autonomy, impose undue tax burdens on some States, produce graduates of uniform mediocrity, and that the Federal Government already owes more than all the States together.

Health care for the aged: The administration proposal to include medical care as a benefit under the Social Security Act—fifth of the five objectives set at the beginning of this year—was introduced by Representative KING, Democrat, of California and Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico. It provides for limited medical care, service type benefits, to aged social security beneficiaries with increased payroll taxes upon a maximum yearly wage base raised to $5,000. Adherents point to an increasing number of elderly citizens with greater need for medical care. The opposition says that this need is being adequately met for the majority who want medical care protection through voluntary action—private insurance or otherwise—and that the 1960 action by Congress encouraging the States to set up programs for medical assistance for the aged should be given a fair chance. They also say that the proposed medical care service benefits violates the long standing principle that only cash benefits should be paid under social security. While hearings are scheduled before the Ways and Means Committee this summer, action in this session is doubtful. Health care for the aged is likely to be a major legislative objective of the administration in 1962.

Tax revision: For several years, almost everyone has agreed on the urgent need for revisions in the tax structure—and almost everyone has disagreed over which revisions should take precedence. As a result, no major modification of the tax structure has occurred since the mammoth tax reform law of 1954. This year, the administration has proposed several major changes, including: withholding taxes on dividend and interest payments, expense account limitations, repeal of the 4-percent dividend credit, elimination of foreign tax "havens," taxation of foreign income, closing of so-called loopholes, etc. A key proposal is one which would grant tax credits to stimulate investment in new and modernized plant and equipment. Many industry spokesmen have criticized the tax credit plan, preferring straight depreciation liberalization as an investment stimulus. Although tax revision is always controversial, major action on taxes is possible next year, for the first time in almost a decade.[2]

Omnibus farm bill: On March 16, President Kennedy requested Congress to adopt his program for stabilizing prices and reducing surpluses of farm commodities. His proposal would delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture and farmers themselves authority to formulate production-control programs. Both congressional Agriculture Committees have held hearings, but the form of the final measure is in doubt because, among other things, of the objections to the powers granted the Secretary. Proponents assert that the giant stockpiles and increasing productivity require bold measures. Opponents raise questions as to the costs to the taxpayer and the regimentation of the farmer. It appears unlikely that Congress will agree on a single solution to the farm problem, in one bill, and more probable that a series of stopgap measures will continue, with slight modifications, the present program.

Foreign aid: Foreign aid, or mutual security, beginning with the Marshall plan to rebuild the destroyed economies of Europe, has swelled into an international weapon against Soviet Russia. President Kennedy has requested $7.3 billion over a period of 5 years, with a provision for loans from the Treasury commonly called back-door spending. Proponents assert that such military and economic aid is essential for world peace and progress, while opponents argue the Nation can ill afford such an expanded program and protest lack of congressional control over financing. The mutual security program will undoubtedly be passed, but with some degree of modification.

Unemployment benefits, new Federal program: The Administration has requested, in addition to the promptly passed Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation bill, drastic revisions of the State unemployment compensation program. It proposes that the Federal Government establish minimum standards of unemployment benefit levels, provide permanent extra duration (up to 13 weeks), Federal grants-in-aid to States to help finance benefits, and an increase in the taxable wage base 60 percent and a permanent increase in the Federal tax, an extra 4 percent. Proponents argue that the States have provided inadequate benefits which also lead to unfair competitive advantages between States. Opponents say that benefits generally have kept up to date; that the proposals effectively submerge the State systems by substituting Federal controls and by turning to grant-in-aid financing which will not only destroy experience-rating but will eventually result in greater, not less differences in cost or benefit levels between States.

Patent rights in inventions: A Senate subcommittee has held hearings on two separate bills introduced by Senator RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, to modify the present system under which private industry can retain patents on discoveries developed in connection with Government-supported research and development. On the House side, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, has introduced legislation revising patent provisions of the Space Act so as to make possible retention of patent rights by contractors, with the Government having a royalty-free license. While this issue has seen relatively little publicity, it could have important effects. Some legislators and administration officials are advocating Government ownership of all inventions made in the course of Government contracts; others urge leaving patent ownership in the contractor, while reserving to the Government an unlimited right of use of patented inventions. The General Electric Co. favors a middle ground between these two positions. This position was presented by H. R. Mayers, General Patent Counsel, at a meeting called in Washington on June 27, 1961, by the Secretary of Commerce, to receive the views of representatives of industry and of selected Government agencies. Mr. Mayers' statement[3] was hailed as a constructive contribution on a most controversial issue.

Indemnification of contractors against nuclear risks: Another relatively unpublicized area of legislative activity in this Congress concerns the adequacy of present provisions safeguarding contractors against the risk of large damages in the event of nuclear incidents overseas. Also pending in Congress are proposals for indemnification of contractors against ultrahazardous risks arising generally from the defense program. Hearings have been held before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including testi-

[2] For an interesting analysis of the administration's tax proposals, from the company's viewpoint, write Government Relations Service, New York, for Tax Accounting Service's analysis in a letter dated July 7, 1961, to W. V. Merrihue, acting manager, GRS, from G. H. Kitendaugh, manager, TAS.

[3] If this subject matter is important in connection with your job responsibilities, you may obtain a copy of the statement by writing to Government Relations Service.

mony by a General Electric representative, on a proposal to remedy these gaps in present law.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: In Pittsburgh, on October 10, 1960, Candidate Kennedy urged creation of a Cabinet department to deal with urban development and metropolitan planning. Later, on March 9, in his housing message to Congress, President Kennedy recommended a Housing and Urban Affairs Department. Rural-State opposition during House hearings was reduced by suggestions for a small town and rural development agency within the proposed department, and there is probability of approval by Congress during the second session next year, if not later this year. Proponents argue that all urban programs, housing activities and related Federal operations should be consolidated. Opponents contend such a department would concentrate greater powers, centralize pressures on Congress for enlarged Federal participation in municipal matters and foster dependence on Washington instead of the State governments and localities themselves.

Other bills: Other legislation which may see action in this session of Congress or next include: Peace Corps (permanent legislative authorization); Youth Conservation Corps; increase in postal rates; reduction in duty-free allowances for oversea tourists; easing of restrictions on common situs picketing (secondary boycotts); Federal grants for control of water pollution; tax deductibility of business legislative expenses; easing of restrictions on trade and aid to Communist China; Federal aid for college and medical education; and Federal grants for community health activities.

NEW FEDERAL POLICIES NOT INVOLVING LEGISLATION

The changes in public policy which accompany a change in administration (and party) do not all take the form of new legislation. Many of the most significant new trends in Washington flow from actions of the executive branch alone. A new policy climate can be found in almost every activity of the U.S. Government. The following four areas are selected only as illustrating the kind of new direction which can be found in many areas.

Foreign affairs: The conduct of foreign policy is in the hands of the President far more than that of domestic policy. The new administration, coming into office on a campaign which dwelt heavily on America's world role, has brought in virtually a whole new team of individuals to conduct foreign policy. The period in which this new team has taken over has been a time of great strain and heightened tensions. It is perhaps too early, and at any rate inappropriate here, to attempt any appraisal of the effects of new or revised policies or the continuation of old.

Economic policy: The 1960 Democratic platform made a major attack on the alleged high-interest, tight-money policy of the preceding administration and the Federal Reserve, an attack echoed in somewhat muted voice by the nominee. At the time the new President took office, market conditions had reduced interest rates considerably. For the first few months at least, there was no conflict between the new administration and the Federal Reserve. As economic recovery now appears vigorous and upward pressure on interest rates now begins to be felt, some signs of disagreement between Federal Reserve and administration officials have been reported. There is, however, as yet, no suggestion of a return to the extreme easy-money policies which preceded the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord of March 1951.

Labor-management negotiations: One of the first changes in Federal policy which came to the public's attention at the start of the new administration was in the field of labor-management negotiations. In its first week in office, the administration stepped into a New York tugboat strike and got the parties back to work. Subsequently, intervention took place in every major labor dispute, though with varying degrees of success, as the reecnt maritime negotiations have shown. In contrast to the relative hands-off policy of the previous administration, a major role for the Federal Government in labor-management relations now appears likely during the coming 4 years.

Business relations: Relations between the new administration and the business community, which started with a display of overt good will on both sides, have recently become somewhat strained. As in the other instances cited, this is a matter of executive action rather than concrete legislation. To begin with, some of the new appointees, especially in regulatory agencies, troubled some members of the business community. The tax credit plan, designed to help industry, instead drew fire from industry sources. The most open break occurred when the Business Advisory Council and the Commerce Department severed connections for the first time in almost 30 years of a constructive relationship that began under President Roosevelt's first Secretary of Commerce.

Policy changes such as those in foreign affairs, economic policy, labor-management negotiations, business relations, and many other fields demonstrate that public policy is shaped not alone by legislation but by executive action as well. For members of General Electric management who wish to be better represented at Washington, this latter area of executive action needs to be watched more closely in the months ahead.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

The Postmaster as a Community Leader—Address by Senator Byrd, of West Virginia, Before West Virginia Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I made on July 29 before the West Virginia chapter, National Association of Postmasters, at Martinsburg, W. Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS, MEETING AT MARTINSBURG, W. VA., JULY 29, 1961

The New England essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, once said, "Conversation is the laboratory and workshop of the student." This convention of West Virginia postmasters will no doubt prove the correctness of Mr. Emerson's contention. Gathering together to discuss your problems should not only lead to solutions, but also to further progress in the mail service of the State.

Americans have always taken pride in our mail service. From childhood up, each of us has come to understand that despite the vagaries of weather—rain, sleet, snow, or the burning sun on a humid day—the delivery of mail is a certainty. Few of us realize, however, what it takes, administratively, to give America the best mail service ever.

But every step that is taken to improve and strengthen the postal service, is also a step that serves to bolster the economy of the Nation. This is proven history.

Take, for example, the suggestion which the postal service made to the banking business several years ago—that the mails should be considered for the sending of checks for deposit to customers' accounts. Within the span of a few years, the volume of such check-deposit mail handled by the Nation's banks has placed this service in fifth position among the more than 20 services daily performed by banks.

Within the past 10 days the postal service has launched a new program under the title of "Nationwide Improved Mail Service." As you know, the largest mailers in each city have been given membership in the Citizens Advisory Council for Postal Operations. As a whole, these large mailers generate approximately 70 percent of our country's mail volume. By working with these citizen groups, it may be possible to help them plan for a rescheduling of the vast amount of mail they now deposit in the late afternoon—a flow which creates an evening peakload of mail instead of a balanced flow during the entire course of the day.

Thus, this step—the creation of the Citizens Advisory Council—can only lead to a better than ever mail service, and this of itself will prove to be a boon to the economy of the country.

But the role of the postmaster goes beyond that of seeking ways to speed the delivery of mail. He must also have an intimate concern with the problems of his community—the social ones as well as the economic ones—for as his community grows and prospers, so will his post office grow and prosper.

The economic potentials of West Virginia are nothing short of tremendous. For the most part these potentials are inherent in our many natural resources—resources which literally beg for development and exploitation. The development of these resources, however, calls for the imagination, the energy, and the resourcesfulness of leaders in each and every one of our communities.

The postmaster, by his very position, is a leader in his community. He knows the shape and character of his community. He knows the human potentials of his community. It is logical, therefore, that he is also intimately aware of his community's social and economic needs, and perhaps has also given much thought to how improvements can be made in each direction.

This knowledgeable man, the postmaster—this man who has an encyclopedic store of community information—should be an active member of any local group of citizens concerned with community development. Moreover, he is an ideal man for such a group, because he has no ax to grind, no vested interest to be concerned with other than his vested interest in the growth and progress of his community. He can be an impartial arbiter of differences of opinion, a valued mentor whose thoughts would be respected.

Now that the Area Redevelopment Act is the law of the land, there is opportunity for every West Virginia community that has suffered economic decline to invigorate itself, to enrich itself with job opportunities through the attraction of new industries or the expansion of existing ones. Certainly, industry contemplating moving into a depressed community would be concerned with the kind of postal service that would be available. Here, then, would be an opportunity for a postmaster to secure the future of his community by pledging expeditious service—the kind of service that may require a bit of shuffling around of routes, a realinement of clerical help, and perhaps a rescheduling of working hours.

Tourism holds forth a great economic potential for West Virginia. There can be no denying the beauty and grandeur of our State. But there are other attractions which should interest outsiders and encourage them to visit with us. For example, in the very near future we are going to celebrate our 100th birthday as a State, and we shall do this with numerous activities in many sections of the State. Here, then, is a proposition for this convention to consider:

In certain instances the Post Office Department permits the use of slogans with cancellation dies. Permission has been granted for the use of such slogans as "Keep Maine Green," and others dealing with historical events. Why not plan now, on a Statewide basis, to have a cancellation die slogan such as: "Help West Virginia celebrate her century of statehood in 1963." This kind of cancellation die slogan on every letter mailed in West Virginia, could be very helpful in giving a solid spurt to tourism in our State.

I firmly believe that the postmasters of West Virginia can help our people end the paradox of economic distress amid the vast natural wealth of our State. I believe this because the postmasters of West Virginia have always been a constructive force—a progressive force which wisely maintains a mutuality of interest with the people of their communities. As people dedicated to the service of other people, our postmasters always seem to extend themselves beyond the call of the postal service. They represent themselves not only as servants of the postal system, but also as servants of the entire U.S. Government.

They willingly post their office walls with notices and announcements from a vast number of Federal departments and agencies. Often, their walls are not large enough for the posting of everything that is sent them, but they do their best to get the welter of such material pinned up for public perusal.

This very clutter of notices and announcements, however, often repels, rather than attracts, readers. Unfortunately, this may mean an unawareness of some important fact, or even a post-employment opportunity.

Take, for example, postings of civil service examination notices. Because of the excessively high rate of unemployment in our State, such notices of job opportunities are especially important to West Virginians. But if such notices are part of a clutter—as they most often are—they may not get read.

Here again, then, is an opportunity for the kind of community service that makes our postmasters outstanding citizens. A busy man always finds time for some additional work. In this instance, the additional work would be to advise local newspapers and radio stations of the civil service examination notices the moment they come to the office. You will find these news media more than anxious to make known, to the entire area that they cover, the Federal job opportunities that are available.

The good people that Uncle Sam wants for Federal employment may be your post office customers. Certainly, they could be members of your community. Thus, you may be performing a doubly good deed by widely publicizing Federal job opportunities—helping someone find useful employment, while helping the Government obtain the best possible employable persons.

Today, the U.S. postal service is the biggest mail service in the world. Although our country occuplies only one-fiftieth of the land surface of the globe, the people of America send and receive nearly two-thirds of the total world's mail volume. Yet, we are not satisfied. We believe we should be sending even greater volumes of mail—intracity, intrastate, and interstate.

The free flow of mail—of correspondence—is a guarantee of freedom, for so long as we can freely communicate among ourselves, we shall fight to be a free people. For the expeditious and free flow of our mails, we have our postmasters to thank. And in thanking you, our West Virginia postmasters, I am mindful of what William Makepeace Thackeray once wrote: "Next to excellence is the appreciation of it."

The Delaware River Basin Compact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make a few comments on the proposed Delaware River Basin compact. I was very much pleased to see this body pass this vital piece of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that the Senate will do likewise. Pennsylvania, under the leadership of Governor Lawrence, has already taken the inititive by signing into law a State supported Delaware River Basin compact. The needs of this project, however, demand that the Federal Government lend its support. To have a program that is really effective and useful, we must pass this legislation into law.

The need for a Delaware River Basin compact has long been a need of the country, and I would like to ennumerate a few of the major reasons to illustrate why this legislation is so important. Basically, Federal enactment of this bill would provide for a Commission that would make comprehensive plans for immediate and long range development of ways of using the resources of the Delaware. The Commission would make plans for navigation, electric power, conservation, dam building, and the maintaining of high quality drinking water. Philadelphia Water Commissioner Samuel Baxter said in an article that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on July 7, 1961:

> If proper dams are built (Philadelphia) has an adequate supply of fresh, natural water for as far ahead as engineers have planned: the year 2010.

With increasing water shortages occurring all over the country, the statement of Mr. Baxter certainly shows the merit of this piece of legislation.

First of all, the Delaware River Basin compact would have an important influence in the vital area of flood protection. Flood damage caused by these waters resulted in over $100 million worth of damage to homes, farms, factories, and communities on the flood plains, and the loss of over 90 lives in 1955. The lack of flow regulation on the Delaware also permits huge quantities of excess waters to go unused to the sea. This has resulted, during droughts, in serious water shortages. The sound policy of a Federal Commission in this field could well prevent more disastrous flood damage. In recent years the North, especially the Middle Atlantic States, has had to spend millions and millions of dollars as a result of floods caused by hurricanes. There is no reason to believe that these storms will not continue to rain destruction upon thousands of people. Surely, it would be more sensible to guide these funds in the direction of worthwhile preventive measures.

Second, the Delaware River Basin compact would have an important function in public recreation. Water related recreation sports would provide for the first time to millions of youngsters the opportunity of enjoying healthful, body building sports. Recent studies conducted indicate that the recreation demands of the people of the Delaware service area will be more than 6½ times the present level by the year 2010. In addition these studies show that State park facilities were being used at only one-third of their designed capacity in the year 1955. In an age when population is expanding in the United States at a fantastic pace—1,446,443 since January 20, 1961—we must provide the facilities to get the young people off the streets. With the rise in juvenile delinquency causing great alarm to us all, it is imperative that we make use of the means to alleviate this situation.

Thirdly, the Delaware River Basin compact would have the important function of dealing in the development of hydroelectric power and energy. The requirements of the Delaware River have increased rapidly in the past years. Still more important, the demands of the future will require the Delaware River Basin to provide much larger amounts of electric energy than it is presently doing. Figures show that the utility peak demands of the area will increase to a total of 34 million kilowatts by 1980 and to about 96 million kilowatts by 2010. Our country must constantly be looking to the future to stay abreast of the times. In other words, we must develop to the fullest extent all of our natural resources. We are fortunate enough to be blessed with great quantities of wealth; we must make full use of them.

Fourthly, we are constantly reading of the great perils of pollution to our rivers and streams. At present the waters that make up the Delaware River Basin are of excellent quality. However, the growth of population and industry will seriously endanger this present condition. Programs are needed to furnish data for future use in water-quality prediction. Sufficient treatment plants would remove the anticipated additional loads by increasing the efficiency of present levels of waste removal to the higher degrees that are technically possible.

As you can see, the needs for such a program are many. I like to think of this project as one giant conservation program that will save this country many millions of dollars in the future. Though the initial outlay will be heavy upon our Government, we cannot wait, with population expanding the way it is, until serious shortages and other problems engulf us. Though this program deals essentially with only one area of the country, it is in no sense a local project. The resources of the Delaware River Basin contribute to the social and economic well-being of over 21 million people which certainly makes up a large percentage of our population. The need for a Federal program will satisfy not only present needs, but the staggering demands of the future. During this period both population and employment will double. It now remains for the Congress of the United States to meet this problem.

School Bill Means 250,000 Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard many arguments within recent months about the need for Federal aid to education. Usually, we limit our discussion to the needs of the Nation, of students, of teachers, and our technology. Within recent days, however, the distinguished columnist, Sylvia Porter, has described still another factor in the school aid issue. In her column of July 28, she points out that our national economy would enjoy "a great and lasting boost" if we vigorously act to meet present and future school construction needs. She quotes from a Bureau of Labor Statistics studies to show that the approximately 250,000 full-time jobs for men and women each year would be created if we do the job that we know must be done.

Mrs. Porter is not arguing politics. As she makes clear, she is writing as a reporter on economics and finance. Her arguments should certainly be considered as we make our decisions on school aid.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have Mrs. Porter's column, entitled "School Aid Bill OK Means 250,000 Jobs," inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier Post, July 28, 1961]

SCHOOL AID BILL OK MEANS 250,000 JOBS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Battered by bitter racial-religious controversy, caught in emotional crossfires in both parties and in the White House itself, the Kennedy administration's school aid bill at this point seems doomed. "Only a miracle can save it," is the realistic judgment of an astute Washington source, and he adds, "The odds against this miracle are 75–25."

This being a realistic judgment, I'll not snipe at it, and certainly, in my role as a reporter on the economic-financial aspects of the news. I haven't the privilege of commenting on racial and religious controversy or emotional crossfires.

But as a reporter in the sphere of economics and finance, I do have the privilege of emphasizing that if a miracle were to occur, it would give our entire economy a great and lasting boost. The construction of a school doesn't mean just classrooms for kids. It means jobs for those involved directly and indirectly in building the schools, profits for employers in hundreds of industries and trades.

More specifically, the school aid bill could create up to 250,000 full-time jobs for men and women each year in coming years.

It could provide 100,000 jobs a year on the school construction sites, far more than 100,000 jobs a year off the sites.

It could create hundreds of thousands of jobs on top of these in the production of equipment going into the schools and among those benefiting from the respending of the paychecks and profits.

None of this is guesswork. By coincidence, this week the Bureau of Labor Statis-

tics released the first in a series of pioneering studies authorized by the 86th Congress to "determine the labor requirements of various types of construtcion that might be affected by Government action," and this initial study is on school construction.

School construction was selected for the first study for two reasons, according to James F. Walker, the BLS expert supervising all the surveys. The first reason is that public school construction already is so big, running over $2.5 billion a year and accounting for one-sixth of total public construction outlays. The second reason is that the need for new classroom space is indisputable—the U.S. Office of Education estimates that in the next 5 years alone, more than 427,000 new classrooms will be needed.

What does this study show? This:

Each $1,000 of elementary, junior, and senior high school construction results in 212 man-hours of employment.

Of these 212 man-hours, 84 hours are required for construction on the school site and 128 man-hours are required for offsite activities to produce and deliver the materials and equipment used in the construction of the school.

Since the cost of the average school in 1959 was $730,000—not including site and planning costs—and since each school took about a year to build, this construction created a year's employment for 81 workers—38 in direct construction and 43 in various other activities indirectly required.

Since school construction is running at $2.5 billion a year, this indicates that school building right now is the source of 275,000 jobs a year—115,000 onsite and 160,000 offsite—with manufacturing benefiting almost as much as school construction.

This, mind you, does not include the man-hours required to install utilities, prepare and landscape the school site. It does not include the man-hours required to produce the schools' furnishings.

It does not include the employment created by the respending of the wages and profits of the workers and their employers—"the multiplier effect" which Walker properly stresses as of major significance.

If a miracle occurs, we'll get this aid to employment—and that we need to spur employment is undeniable. And, of course, I've not even mentioned that while the men get the jobs they'll also be creating the schools in which our youngsters can learn how to survive and triumph.

Why I Will Vote Against House Concurrent Resolution 351

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 351 is scheduled to be considered first under suspension on the floor of the House next Monday, August 7.

I will vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351. A reasoned conviction compelled me to this decision, which was arrived at only after long and careful study of the language of that resolution in the light of President Kennedy's reply to the Russian demands on Berlin and his forthright address to the American people on July 25. It is not an easy decision to take a stand which may set one Member apart from his colleagues on an issue of this magnitude.

I will vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351 for the following reasons:

I am convinced beyond doubt that its language is inconsistent with the political objectives outlined by President Kennedy on the third Berlin crisis. President Kennedy has called for a change in the present unnatural situation with respect to Berlin and a partitioned Germany. That is, a change for the better based upon the freely expressed will of the German people. House Concurrent Resolution 351 does nothing more than call for a maintenance of a status quo on Berlin. That is, support for the partition of Germany which makes it convenient for the Russians to provoke a crisis in Berlin at times and under circumstances of their choosing. No expression of Congress should avoid the basic issue of a free and united Germany.

House Concurrent Resolution 351 will accomplish nothing more than is already known to and accepted by every American—that we will not stand by while the Russians extinguish the flame of freedom which burns in free Berlin. In my view Congress should not be used as a forum for telling the American people or any other people something they already know.

The Berlin crisis is primarily a political problem and secondarily a military problem. It is a political problem first because the people in East Berlin and in the Russian zone of military occupation have been denied the right of self-determination. The Russian autocrats have denied 17 million German people this universally accepted political principle and have imposed upon them an alien regime which lacks popular support and serves no interest but those of the leaders in the Kremlin. Unless we resolve that political problem we will be faced with recurring military crises on Berlin. President Kennedy has proposed that the political problem be resolved so that the military threat to the peace will be removed. The formula proposed by President Kennedy for resolving the political problem, is application of the principle of self-determination to the 17 million people in East Germany. House Concurrent Resolution 351 turns its back on this political problem and denies the solution thereto proposed by President Kennedy. Moreover it restricts our position to a defense of our legal rights to be in Berlin. I oppose such restrictions because it would tend to tie the hands of our President in his courageous efforts to bring a peaceful solution to the basic political problem resulting from the unnatural partition of Germany.

For all too long Presidents of the United States have been roundly criticized for advocating policies which are no more than reactions to Russian initiative. President Truman and President Eisenhower received more than their fair share of such criticism. Up until a few days ago President Kennedy was the target of criticism calling for positive, affirmative action to meet the worldwide challenge of imperial Russian communism. But his meaningful reply to the Russian aide memoire on Berlin and his stirring call for a positive solution to the problem of Germany has stilled, at least temporarily, those voices of criticism. The language of House Concurrent Resolution 351 provides no support to President Kennedy in the political initiative which he has taken. It advocates no more than maintaining the present unnatural situation with respect to Berlin and a partitioned Germany. Congress should not put itself on record as opposing change for the better in that situation of perpetual crises. My vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351 will put me on record as favoring change for the better and as an opponent of status quo.

Mr. Tijerina's Schools Break the Language Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article in the July issue of the Coronet magazine recites the stirring achievements of Mr. Felix Tijerina, of Houston, Tex., and the League of United Latin American Citizens in the field of education.

The article entitled "Now Juanito Can Read," tells how Mr. Tijerina became interested in the problems of Latin American children in Texas who often started to school without knowing enough English to prevent their being severely handicapped.

Mr. Tijerina, a distinguished businessman, reacted with a plan for helping prepare these children. This plan is attracting national attention because of its success and its great potential for good.

The Houston Press, June 21, 1961, printed another article concerning Mr. Tijerina's laudable venture into the field of education. I also wish to call attention to this article, entitled, "Little Schools of 400 May Spread to Far West."

Mr. Tijerina and the League of United Latin American Citizens and all others who have assisted in this extremely worth while undertaking deserve the respect, gratitude and commendation of all who stand for the best in education. They are providing the way for thousands of youngsters to break the language barrier, in a pioneering preschool education program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record the article "Now Juanito Can Read" from Coronet magazine, the July issue, and also an article entitled "Little Schools of 400 May Spread to Far West" from the Houston Press of June 21, 1961:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Coronet magazine, July 1961]

NOW JUANITO CAN READ—FELIX TIJERINA, FIELD HAND TURNED TYCOON, IS GIVING MEXICAN-AMERICAN KIDS IN TEXAS THE PRECIOUS GIFT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

(By Keith Elliott)

A pretty little girl with grave brown eyes held up her hand in a Ganado, Tex., classroom one hot, dusty day in 1946. It was Isabel Verber's first day in school. Shyly she spoke up: "Quiero, por favor, poquita agua." (I wish, please, a little water.)

The teacher, who spoke only English, ignored Isabel's request. At recess the child ran home in tears. Next day she returned to school, but she never forgot the frustration of her first day there. Instead of rankling, however, the memory of her despair grew into a determination to break the language barrier that has handicapped millions of Mexican-Americans in the southwest.

Ten years later, destiny brought the girl, now grown to womanhood and aspiring to be a teacher herself, together with the very man who could help her. Stubby, mustached Felix Tijerina, 56, was an energetic Houston businessman of Mexican parentage noted for his philanthropies. Isabel told him about the glass of water and the tears, and the telling took him back to the days before he had a Cadillac and a private plane and a chain of prospering restaurants—days when he picked cotton all day in the hot sun for 25 cents and couldn't say, either, "I wish, please, a little water."

Isabel told him, too, how some 50,000 Mexican-American youngsters reached school age each year without knowing a word of the English required in class; how 80 percent had to repeat the first year, and many soon dropped out altogether, mainly because of the language barrier. She mentioned the University of Texas study that showed native-born Mexican-Americans in Texas averaged only 3½ years of schooling.

"Isn't it a dreadful thing that our people's children still suffer because their parents speak only Spanish?" she lamented. "If only we could teach them English before they start school."

"Well, let's do it." Tijerina said impulsively.

The problem was, and still is, immense. The League of United Latin-American Citizens (LULAC) estimates that there are 10 million Spanish-speaking people in the continental United States, and 8 million of them are Mexican-Americans. The language barrier, LULAC officials have long agreed, is the biggest obstacle separating these Latin-American citizens of the United States from total acceptance and understanding. But in a matter of weeks the indefatigable Tijerina had launched a campaign that got to the heart of the problem, bringing new hope to millions of his people in the Southwest.

Felix knew that Mrs. Elizabeth Parris Burrus, veteran teacher at Baytown, Tex., had enjoyed singular success in teaching Mexican-American first graders. Tijerina went to see her and asked her secret.

It was fairly simple, the teacher replied. Most first-grade situations, she had learned in 20 years' experience, required just 400 words. Working slowly with these meaningful words helped Spanish-speaking youngsters make the transition into English. At Tijerina's request Mrs. Burrus drew up a list of her 400 "magic" words. Felix had the vocabulary printed in booklet form.

Then, with his own money, Felix established two tuition-free summer classes of 6 weeks which he called "Little Schools of the 400." Aided by the local LULAC, he enrolled 42 preschoolers who spoke only Spanish. In church-room classes at Ganado and Edna, near Houston, the wide-eyed children were exposed to English for the first time in 1957. The first teacher: Isabel Verber, whose childhood thirst and rejection had started it all.

Felix visited the classes constantly. Patiently, he helped teachers correct basic pronunciation faults. "Don't say jue," he would explain, "say you." Or, "It's mouth, not mouse, Juanito.") Finally, the 42 children were ready for the acid test. They entered elementary school.

And caramba. All of them passed the first grade. The year before, over half the Mexican-American first graders at Edna and Ganado had failed to pass first-grade work.

Isabel was ecstatic. "We've won," she said proudly.

Felix said: "We've just begun."

Such was the beginning of the "little schools," of which Texas' Gov. Price Daniel has said: "No other program has offered such hope for the Latin-American children of Texas. And it is all due to the work and faith of one man."

Felix Tijerina explains his work and faith simply: "A man does not wish just to take from his community. He must give, as well." What Felix has taken from Texas he has worked hard for. Until he was 14 he spoke only Spanish. His father died when Felix was 10, leaving the boy to care for his mother and three sisters. For 4 years he toiled as a field hand in the cotton and fruit farms around his native Sugarland. At 14, he landed a job as a bus boy in a Houston cafe. One day his bilingual employer gave him some good advice: "You wish to get ahead? Then speak as others speak. Learn English." Six months in a public night school followed, the only formal schooling Tijerina ever had.

Over the years, Felix has acquired the ability to speak and write flawless English. He has also acquired wealth. "It is simple to make money," he insists. "One merely finds a hunger and satisfies it."

The hunger that built the Tijerina fortune was for Mexican food. Starting with a one-man diner in 1929, the business has grown to a chain of thriving restaurants in Houston and Beaumont, and includes prospering real estate and banking interests.

True to his philosophy, Felix has given providently from the first. He has been a director of Rotary, twice chairman of the Houston Housing Authority and national president of LULAC. Hospitals, youth organizations and the Houston Opera are only a few of the causes that have known his financial backing and tireless campaigning. But the gift he most likes to give is education.

"I couldn't guess how many students have attended college with grants from the boss," says Antonio Campos, Felix's assistant and longtime friend. "Some men are compulsive gamblers or drinkers. Felix is a compulsive educator."

Once Felix lent a young Mexican-American $750 to enter medical school. Ten years later the loan was repaid. Felix laughed. "I had forgotten all about that loan," he said.

"Is that good business?" his assistant wondered.

"I think so," Felix replied. "I might have doubled my money by investing it. But this way, I've still got the money, and I've given the world a doctor. Isn't that a nice dividend?"

But nothing he had ever done was to pay such dividends, both in personal satisfactions and public good, as the "little schools of the 400." Tijerina plunged into the work with characteristic energy.

During 6 months following the Ganado-Edna success, Tijerina opened seven more schools near Houston. Felix poured out thousands of his own money for materials, salaries, and advertising the program among Mexican-American parents; he obtained LULAC's support for funds and recruiting preschool children. By the spring of 1959, the nine schools had taught basic English to more than 1,000 children. Less than 5 percent of them failed on entering formal school. Armed with statistics, Felix now moved for statewide support of his program. Austin, the State capital, became headquarters for his most telling assault on the language barrier.

He visited his old friend, Governor Daniel. Glowingly, he reviewed the success of the nine little schools, won the Governor's personal support for additional little schools. Felix registered as a lobbyist. He talked with legislators, senators and educators, imploring their help. Representative Malcolm McGregor of El Paso agreed to sponsor a bill to set up State-financed little schools throughout Texas. House Speaker Waggoner Carr went with Felix to see preschool English classes in action. Deeply moved by what he saw, he promised to help get McGregor's measure passed.

Finally the legislature met to consider dozens of school appropriations. Felix watched tensely as frugal representatives turned down recommendations one by one. Texas was facing severe budget problems, and Felix's hopes for a revolutionary new program seemed dim.

But when the McGregor bill came up for a vote, it carried without difficulty. The little restaurateur's friendly persuasion had paid off. The Texas Education Agency now had $1,300,000 with which to establish Tijerina-styled little schools throughout Texas.

Felix addressed the State senate after the bill was passed. For once he was at a loss for words in any tongue. Near tears, he said simply: "Thank you, gentlemen, for what you have done. May God bless you."

There was still work to be done. As administrators began hiring teachers for the initial State-supported little schools in 130 school districts, Felix was faced with an ironical problem. He now had to convince Mexican-American parents all over the vast State that here lay hope for their children.

It was a tremendous job, often a frustrating one. Many Spanish-speaking parents were reluctant to abandon their own lingual heritage. Others simply didn't know about the new program.

Felix discussed the problem with his friend Madison Farnsworth, a former executive with the Gulf Oil Corp. "I want only one thing for my people," he explained. "To erase forever the phrase, no hablo Inglés—'I don't speak English'—from their children's tongues."

"I have an idea," said Farnsworth. "If it works out, I'll be in touch with you."

The oil man telephoned a few days later. "Would $15,000 and a company airplane help you tell you story, Felix?"

"Will a chile burn your tongue?" said Felix gleefully. "Of course it will help. It should finish the job."

Now Felix, the LULAC, Gulf's publicity and advertising people, the Boy Scouts and scores of volunteers rallied to recruit students for the little schools. Leaflets were dropped from the Gulf plane. Appeals were broadcast in Spanish over 38 radio stations. TV studios ran a documentary film explaining the new program. Newspapers headlined the good word. Scouts carried handbills to remote Mexican-American settlements.

When State-sponsored little schools opened officially last summer, the language legions had reached more than 15,000 children in 81 Texas counties. Specially trained teachers, all bilingual, used stuffed toys, records, picture books and films to make the 400 basic "Anglo" words more graphic to youngsters. With patience and understanding they proved that "English can be fun."

Though Felix Tijerina is justifiably proud, he regards this as just a start. Next summer he hopes to see twice as many Mexican-American children taking preschool English courses in Texas. Felix has also talked with educators in other States with heavy Latin-American populations—New Mexico,

Arizona and California—in the hope of establishing other little schools where they are especially needed. He has addressed groups in Oklahoma, Iowa and Illinois, where migrant Mexican-Americans and their children go to harvest crops during the months when they might be learning preschool English; Felix's hope is to establish migrant little schols eventually for these people.

Meanwhile, through LULAC, pilot little schools are already operating at Elizabeth, N.J.; Santa Fe and Los Alamos, N. Mex.; and Santa Ana, Calif.; and at least one is being developed for New York City, to accommodate Puerto Rican preschoolers.

The walls of Tijerina's office are lined with civic accolades. Not long ago George Carmack of the Houston Press wrote: "If I had to name what I consider the best single civic program in this entire area, I think I would name the program that Felix Tijerina and his fellow LULAC's have set up to teach Latin American children English before they start school."

But little Victoria Vasquez voiced the tribute Felix treasures most. A fourth grader, she had been one of the first students in a little school of the 400. Proudly, she displayed a medal she had won in church for Bible interpretation. "I had to explain the story of the good Samaritan," she said.

"And how did you explain it?" Felix asked.

Victoria blushed. "I said the good Samaritan was a man like you."

[From the Houston Press, June 21, 1961]

LITTLE SCHOOLS OF 400 MAY SPREAD TO FAR WEST

If any man can say he has created something meaningful, that man is Felix Tijerina.

In the July issue of Coronet magazine is the story of Mr. Tijerina and his project of teaching Mexican-American children fundamental English.

But were it not for his initiative, interest and love of children, thousands of these youngsters would have difficulty in effectively communicating in English when they start their studies in American schools.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

Except among their own, they would be shut out. The answer lay in teaching the children basic English before they began first grade.

For if they entered school with the meager English they had simply picked up, they would surely fail, Mr. Tijerina reasoned. They would be unable to learn easily from an English-speaking teacher.

Mr. Tijerina decided to do something about this. With his own funds, he established tuition-free summer classes of 6 weeks, which he called "Little Schools of the 400"—because the children are taught 400 basic English words.

Aided by the League of United Latin-American Citizens, the schools flourished. According to "Papa Felix" there are more than 15,600 children studying in his classes this summer, all over the Southwest.

HIS THEME

Felix, 56, may become better known for his work in teaching children English than he is for the Mexican cusine in his well-known restaurants.

He said:

"There are 35,000 children in Texas alone who cannot speak English. Unless they learn, they will never be able to begin school in this country.

"It's a wonderful, gratifying accomplishment to know that out of my 600 children in the Houston area, only six did not pass first grade this year. Before, more than 75 percent had to repeat the first grade and they usually failed again.

"We have proven that we can help the children. Now we can get help from the State legislatures."

He continued:

"The people of Harris County made this possible here. On the 28th I am going on to the Phoenix, Ariz., Board of Education and then to New Mexico to explain how we succeeded. I hope they will adopt our ideas and use them in their own school systems."

PRAISED BY GOVERNOR

Felix smiled proudly as he described the action of Gov. Price Daniel in signing the bill at Austin, which incorporated his plan into many Texas schools,

Said Governor Daniel:

"No other program has offered such hope for the Latin-American children of Texas. And it is all due to the work and faith of one man."

The Nature of the Struggle We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune which discusses the true nature of the struggle in which we are engaged with the Communists. As this editorial so ably points out, the war between the Communists and the free world, cold or hot, will be a long one and our program to win it should be more far reaching than merely reacting to every emergency, each new crisis, every Communist inspired threat designed to throw us into a panic.

The editorial follows:

THE TWILIGHT STRUGGLE

President Kennedy has dealt with Berlin in terms of urgency and crisis, and his countrymen, having heard much talk from Khrushchev couched in similar tone, have taken him at his word. Congress is hurriedly responding to the President's call for more men, more arms, and more money.

There has been little popular disposition to question the President's assumptions that the test is imminent and that preparations must be made in haste. The recent bombast from Moscow would seem to bear out Mr. Kennedy's interpretation. But as soon as the President has delivered his appeal and measures are undertaken to meet his prescription, the Soviet reaction is that the people of the United States have given themselves over to war hysteria.

There may be a Berlin crisis in the making. It would be imprudent to say that Mr. Kennedy has reacted in an exaggerated way. Yet we now are beginning to hear that no informed person in Washington really believes that there is going to be a war. The casual attitude of our allies in Europe certainly does not suggest that this thought is entertained for even a moment.

Nor does the behavior of Mr. Kennedy and his lieutenants reflect any conviction that the Nation is now girding itself for Armageddon. Even while authorizations are being ground out to call up another 217,000 men, to mark bomb shelters and put warning devices in every home, and to spend an additional $3,454 million on military and civil defense, the administration proceeds simultaneously with a program of Government as usual.

Even in his message alerting the people to "a worldwide threat," Mr. Kennedy refers to our total responsibilities in a variety of other directions, most of them tiresomely familiar—foreign aid to backward countries, Federal aid to education, and so on. When Mr. Kennedy said that we "can afford all these efforts," and coupled that with the statement that we must not allow foreign threats "to disrupt or slow down our economy," he was voicing his accustomed prejudices in favor of big Government, big spending, and the welfare state.

And when Republicans in Congress started to challenge the administration to match some of the sacrifices it was calling upon the people to make, the response of administration spokesmen was cold. There was no readiness to abandon any project afoot or in prospect, or to abandon any nonessential spending and to retrench.

Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, said that such things as the housing and education bills are needed to promote "a strong economy to hold up our foreign policy and strengthen our defense posture." The reasoning does not track. If the Nation actually is in a crisis and is being driven toward ever greater deficits, then, surely, these things are both irrelevant and superfluous. How deficits do anything but promote inflation and weaken the economy upon which defense and all else rest is a mystery to anyone but Senator MANSFIELD and his associated spenders.

Indeed, the administration seeks to persuade the people that it is just as imperative to fight Khrushchev with half a billion for combating stream pollution and half a dozen billions to provide public housing for families whose incomes exceed $8,000 a year as it is to station men and arms to meet the shock of coming attack.

We submit that this outlook makes no sense. If the emergency is real, it requires Spartan measures by the politicians as well as by the people. Yet the politicians proceed as if the money barrel has no bottom and the durability of the taxpayer no limit, and as if the welfare State can exist while the garrison is facing siege.

So all this calls into some question both Mr. Kennedy's sincerity and Khrushchev's intentions. We know this much about each of them: It is Mr. Kennedy's habit to react to everything in terms of urgency. And it is Khrushchev's studious design to do everything possible to keep America off balance and to disorganize and demoralize it until it is ripe for conquest or psychologically prepared for surrender.

The Kennedy administration's contribution to disorganization is not inconsiderable. When everything is of equal importance—defense and farm subsidies, and free medical care, and the Peace Corps, and shooting a man to the moon—then it is hardly surprising that the impression develops that nothing is of too great importance.

And Khrushchev can promote the process of disorganization and frantic scurrying in every direction by merely turning on the propaganda. He can as easily turn it off. It must be remembered that his first threat to alter the status of Berlin was made in November 1958, 32 months ago.

Mr. Kennedy, in his inaugural address last January, summoned the American people to "a long twilight struggle, year in and year out," which would not be finished in 100 days, 1,000 days, in the life of his administration, "nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." This, we think, placed the contest in truer perspective than it stands now, amid the beating of the administration's distracting tocsins.

If it is such a struggle we face, let us have more light and less twilight from the New Frontier mentality. Let us put things in order, husband our resources, and our

strength, and remain calm. Let us subordinate the extraneous and unnecessary things so that we may save to pay the costs of this protracted test. Let us stop being deluded by the gospel that the way to strengthen the economy upon which our defense rests is to sap the same economy continually. And let us, as responsible citizens, cease responding with a conditioned reflex every time someone in Washington or Moscow chooses to ring the panic bell.

Long-Term Budget Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. David Bell, recently testified before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. His testimony related to the long-term budget planning of the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. David Bell be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DAVID E. BELL, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am very glad to appear before you today. The series of impressive reports which came from the hearings conducted by this subcommittee last year has been of considerable interest to those of us concerned with establishing the pattern of management and operation of the new administration. We will look forward with interest to any report that may come from your present hearings.

You have asked me to discuss with you the role of the budgetary process in national security policymaking and execution, particularly as it appears from the viewpoint of the Bureau of the Budget. I should like to place before you three or four ideas which seem relevant to your inquiry, and then I shall be glad to respond to any questions you may have.

Let me begin with two preliminary observations.

First, let me remind you very briefly of the basic origin and meaning of the Federal budget system. Speaking broadly, the Federal budget as we know it today is the product of a statute enacted by the Congress 40 years ago at the crest of a movement to reform obsolete fiscal procedures. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 included two major reforms which remain the basic foundations of the system today: one was the requirement that only the President (not his Cabinet officers or agency heads) may transmit a request for funds to the Congress; the other was the requirement that the President must transmit annually to the Congress a complete budget, showing all his proposals for spending and for raising the funds to support that spending.

These two reforms were of great significance. They gave to the President—and give him today—a major means for unifying and setting forth an overall executive branch program. And they give him a major responsibility for evolving a Federal budget that reflects his judgment of the relative priority of different Federal activities. Thus, the President's budget necessarily reflects his policy judgments, and the Congress in acting on the President's budget necessarily reviews those policy judgments as to the relative importance of alternative uses of national resources.

Thus, the essential idea of the budget process is to permit a systematic consideration of our Government's program requirements in the light of available resources; to identify marginal choices and the judgment factors that bear upon them; to balance competing requirements against each other; and, finally, to enable the President to decide upon priorities and present them to the Congress in the form of a coherent work program and financial plan. It operates as an extremely effective element of discipline on the President and the executive branch because it requires that each proposed use of resources—for defense, science, natural resources, or whatever—be tested against others and against the total size of the budget.

In passing, I might add that it seems to me the Congress, because it considers budgetary matters for the most part in fragmented form, does not face quite the same necessity to consider the effect of separate budgetary actions in relation to each other and to the entire budget. The Congress might well seek methods that would assist a more sharply focused consideration of such matters.

My second preliminary observation is that budgeting for national security is a most complex matter, because the national security itself involves so many factors. Our security plainly depends in large part on our own military strength—and planning and budgeting for military strength is difficult in a time of rapid changes in weapons technology. But, in addition to our own military strength, our national security depends in part on the military capability of our allies, which requires combined international planning, and, where military assistance is involved, our budgeting process must consider the relative importance of our direct military outlays with indirect outlays through military aid. Over and above military outlays, budgeting for national security requires us to consider the addition to our security that may be made by contributing to the economic and social development of other countries through foreign aid. And, finally, budgeting for national security requires us to consider the underlying strength of our national economy—the requirements of economic stability and growth, and of the skills, education, and morale of our people.

It is plain that considering the national security in this broad sense requires the President (and the Congress) to make a difficult series of choices, for which we do not have a satisfactory set of criteria. How do we weigh the value, for example, in terms of our national security, of a marginal outlay for military force as against a marginal outlay for basic scientific research, or for strengthening higher education? Difficult as such questions may be, they are real choices; they affect our national security in a true sense; and we have to make them as best we can.

Against the background of these conceptions of the budget process, I should like to suggest three lines of improvement in our budgeting for national security.

The first is to make sure that budgeting and planning are in step. Logically, budgeting and planning are two sides of the same coin, two aspects of the same process. A budget is the financial expression of a plan. However, on some occasions in the past, it has been possible for budgets and plans to be established on different bases: that is, there might be an approved plan to have certain forces in being, and simultaneously a budget providing for a different level of forces.

We intend in this administration to make sure that we plan to do only what we are willing to budget for—and to budget fully for what we plan. To accomplish this requires an appropriate interlocking between budgeting and planning at each step. This begins in the departments—and I call your attention to the fact that Assistant Secretary of Defense Hitch, testifying here last week, constantly referred to the "planning-programing-budgeting process" in the Department of Defense. In Secretary McNamara's mind, budgeting and planning are regarded, as they should be, as two aspects of the same process.

A similar objective guides the work of the Bureau of the Budget and the other units of the Executive Office of the President and the White House Office. All of us are endeavoring to tie budgeting and planning tightly together in the work that precedes Presidential decisions. We in the Bureau have established close working relationships with the Special Counsel to the President, the Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, and others who advise the President in reaching decisions on national security policy. We have also strengthened our working relationships with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers, in an attempt to make sure that our economic and budget policies are fully consistent, and that our budget and fiscal policies will contribute to the strength and vitality of our economy, both in the long and in the short run.

A second avenue of improvement in the process of budgeting for national security is to extend our time horizon further into the future. I need say little about this objective so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, as Assistant Secretary Hitch discussed it thoroughly last week. You will recall that it is Secretary McNamara's intention to prepare and keep up to date at all times a fully worked out plan and budget for defense programs extending 5 years into the future.

I am not sure we can reach very soon the same goal with respect to other aspects of national security activities aside from the military programs, but this is clearly the correct direction to move. In national security budgeting, and indeed in budgeting for all purposes, we must work with longer range periods than the single year which used to be our standard. I am pleased here to acknowledge the very useful groundwork laid by my predecessor, Mr. Stans, in the closing period of the Eisenhower administration. Among other steps in the direction of longer range budgeting, Mr. Stans last fall directed the Bureau staff in preparing a 10-year projection of the Federal budget for the period 1960 to 1970, which was most informative.

The fact that we want to move toward longer range budgeting, however, does not mean that we can do so easily. While some Federal agencies—such as the Federal Aviation Agency—are accustomed to thinking several years ahead, others are not, and it will take some time before we can obtain fully useful long-range projections from all agencies. However, even our initial steps in recent months to extend the budgetary time horizon have, in my opinion, paid dividends in permitting us to understand better the issues that will determine the size and nature of the budget in future years.

Our purpose here is to improve our lead-time for recognizing important developments in our public policies and for organizing ourselves to find solutions. Whether these issues relate to outer space, housing, education, transportation, urban affairs, science, defense, or whatever, we hope to be able through this approach to detect them sooner and meet them more adequately and with a better sense of priorities.

I should like in closing to point to a third avenue of improvement in budgeting for national security—an avenue on which we have, I think, still far to go. Our budget

for national security must reflect—and can only be as good as our strategy for national security; and I think everyone would agree that the United States has much to do to develop a fully satisfactory strategy for our security. What is the proper mix of military and nonmilitary measures? How can we guide the inevitable processes of change in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to produce free institutions and not communism? How can we step up the rate of economic growth? On these and many other issues affecting our national security, our budgeting can only be as good as our underlying strategy. Much of what is needed is quite beyond budgetary consideration, and improvement must come from analysis of our situation in the world, and imaginative thinking about the courses of action that are open to us.

In at least two respects, however, we can, I think, point to progress through the budget planning route. One of these is the development, described by Assistant Secretary Hitch, of the so-called program packages in Defense Department budgeting. This process of functional budgeting, under which the expenditures for strategic warfare are grouped together, as are those for conventional war, and so forth, permits more accurate comparative analysis of alternative possibilities, and a more realistic understanding of what is proposed to be done. So far as military planning and budgeting are concerned, we believe that this will represent a considerable step forward over the older method of grouping expenditures by service (Army, Navy, Air Force), or expenditure category (personnel, procurement, research and development, etc.).

A second step forward is the decision which underlies the administration's approach to the foreign aid program; namely, to build our economic and military aid efforts around "country programs." This permits us to consider in proper relation to each other, the various alternative military and economic measures we can take to assist a given country—and moreover to relate our aid appropriately to the country's own efforts, to our political objectives in the country, to our diplomatic and information efforts, and so on.

Thus, I believe the use of "program packages" in defense budgeting, and "country programs" in foreign aid budgeting, represent major advances toward sensible planning and budgeting for national security.

I do not wish, however, to minimize the basic difficulty of the problem. When we face the hard questions of how much of the Nation's resources we should devote to national security, and what is the optimum combination of activities to which to devote them, we cannot avoid a considerable degree of uncertainty and considerable room for difference of judgment. We have much to do to improve our understanding of these matters and the analytical framework of ideas which assists us in dealing with them. Any light your Subcommittee can shed on these complex and difficult problems will be most helpful.

I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Fallout Protection and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a selection of resolutions adopted at the 53d annual meeting of the Governor's conference on July 28, 1961:

RESOLUTION ON FALLOUT PROTECTION AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas it is abundantly clear that our Nation and all free peoples are desperately challenged by a hostile system which is explicitly and vigorously committed to the elimination of both freedom and human dignity; and

Whereas the American Nation and its people must stand firmly and purposefully in support of their fundamental beliefs or see those beliefs eroded throughout the world, nation by nation, through subversion and nuclear blackmail; and

Whereas, in order for the American people to have the will to defend their beliefs, they must have the capacity to survive a nuclear attack; and

Whereas the American people today do not have the facilities to protect themselves and their families from fallout, the most dangerous aspect of nuclear war, and their vulnerability constitutes a serious national weakness in the event of a crisis; and

Whereas fallout shelters could save many tens of millions of American lives in the event of nuclear war; and

Whereas fallout protection for our civilian population is possible and is feasible; and

Whereas it is a matter of utmost gravity to the strength and survival of the Nation and the preservation of peace that immediate steps be taken to obtain fallout protection for all our people and otherwise to reinforce our civil defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference hereby declares its support for and agreement with the judgment expressed by the President of the United States on May 25, 1961, that "* * * there is no point in delaying the initiation of a nationwide long-range program of identifying present fallout shelter capacity and providing shelter in new and existing structures"; and, further, that this form of survival insurance fully justifies the necessary expenditure of our effort, time and money; and be it further

Resolved, That since the best way to begin to meet the urgent civil defense requirements of our people is to initiate promptly a positive nationwide program for fallout protection, the Governors of our 50 States, for the safety of our people, the defense of our Nation, and the preservation of freedom, take executive action and request local legislation in line with national policy to:

1. Provide fallout shelters to the extent feasible in all State buildings as well as in other public facilities;

2. Provide income tax deductions (in those States having a State income tax), and exempt the cost of fallout shelters from local real estate taxes, up to a maximum of $100 per planned shelter occupant;

3. Stock foods, medicines, and supplies in strategic locations throughout each State;

4. Construct an alternate protected seat of State government and assist local governments in acquiring similar protected seats of authority so as to assure the continuity of government functioning in times of emergency; and

5. Revise, in cooperation with local governments, all building codes and specifications, where necessary, to permit fallout shelter construction; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby reaffirm the recommendations and resolutions adopted by the 1960 Governors' Conference on Fallout Protection and Civil Defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governors' Conference Standing Committee on Civil Defense meet with the President of the United States and cooperate with the responsible Federal officials in developing the necessary procedures and policies for the Federal Government's new and affirmative program for civil defense and in allocating among the Federal, State, and local governments the responsibility for such a program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman of the conference to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress; and that the leadership of the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is hereby solicited in this crucial undertaking to insure the strength and the survival of the American Nation and its people.

Greater Regulation of the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently a number of editorials supporting many of the major features of S. 1552, have been published in leading newspapers. The Baltimore Sun of July 18, the Evening Star of July 28, and the Washington Post of July 31 contained such editorials. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 18, 1961]

KEFAUVER ON DRUGS

Senator KEFAUVER has a fair general case to back up his bill providing for greater regulation of the drug industry. Profits in some—not all—sectors of the industry have been huge in the wake of various breakthroughs in new medicines. The competition among the companies has become intense and vast sums of money have been put into research and development on the one hand and distribution on the other. This in itself is not bad. Millions of people today owe their health and sometimes their lives to this competitive effort. But Senator KEFAUVER is probably right in insisting that frequently the process has got out of hand.

As for his remedies, a certain selectivity is required. The bill is probably sound in providing for a greater degree of control by the Food and Drug Administration. After all, why shouldn't the FDA, which already has the power to disapprove distribution of a dangerous drug, be able to withhold approval of one which is useless? The American Medical Association wants the determination of the efficacy of drugs left to the discretion of individual doctors—on the ground that this is the best professional opinion. But why shouldn't the FDA get the services of the best in the medical profession?

Some crackdown on fraudulent or unjustified advertising claims may also be advisable, though careful consideration would be required here. In the case of the so-called ethical drugs, which are advertised only in professional journals, a good deal of bureaucratic redtape might be avoided if the FDA restricted itself to riding herd on the periodicals' own fairly careful self-policing procedures.

One of the key provisions of the proposed bill would aim at simplifying the official names of the drugs, which now sometimes become so complex that the doctor simply falls back on a simple and easily remembered

brand name. The hope, and it is a reasonable one, is that doctors would then find it easier to prescribe the drug under its official name and thus permit the patient to do some price comparisons at a reputable druggist.

The drug companies themselves, as well as the public, should welcome a reasonable tightening up on the less responsible members of the industry. But Senator KEFAUVER is likely to get the effective cooperation he needs to pass a bill only if he curbs some of the more flamboyant and all-embracing charges to gave voice to during the hearings.

[From the Washington Star, July 28, 1961]

HIGH COST OF DRUGS

While much evidence is yet to be heard on its remedial proposals, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee is making an increasingly persuasive case for the need of legislation which will reduce the unconscionably high prices of prescription drugs, while at the same time assuring their safety and usefulness. In general, we think the key provisions of the Kefauver bill designed to accomplish these results are on the right track.

As might be expected in a probe of an industry so vast and so complex, the Kefauver bill is full of controversial ramifications. Its main thrust, however, through a variety of means, is to induce more competition in the production and the sale of drugs, and thereby reduce their costs. The subcommittee record is replete with examples of drug costs (and of drug-company profits, as well), which are shockingly excessive by any standard of evaluation.

Among the intriguing goals of the bill is an effort to persuade doctors, in prescribing drugs, to a greater use of the generic (or official) names of drugs, rather than trade names which frequently command far higher prices for precisely the same product. Many doctors, according to the subcommittee, have refrained from this practice in the understandable fear that they might run the risk of placing an inferior drug in the hands of their patients. Other provisions of the Kefauver bill, however, are aimed specifically at assuring that such drugs in fact are not inferior, but that all drugs marketed are both safe and efficacious. This would be accomplished in part by authorizing the Food and Drug Administration (which now has the legal authority only to rule on the safety of drugs) to determine as well that they live up to the claims made for them as to usefulness.

A few weeks ago, at the start of the current round of hearings, we were impressed by the American Medical Association argument that every private physician must determine in the final analysis what drugs are useful for each patient, and that the new control proposed for the FDA might deny doctors access to drugs of possible value to one or another of their patients. In view of the testimony from individual doctors since that time, however, and in view of the explanations offered by Senator KEFAUVER, it is difficult to believe that useful drugs actually would be kept out of doctors' hands. In a very real sense, the FDA already is forced to consider the efficacy of drugs in certifying their safety, for there are few drugs in the entire armamentarium of medicine which do not have the potential for ill effects on someone. In practice, of course, the FDA must weigh therse potentials for harm against the degree of curative benefit which each new drug possesses. We see no inconsistency, therefore, in broadening this evaluation of efficacy, or in the separate provisions of the bill which would impose tighter controls on misleading or false information which might be disseminated by drug companies to doctors in their extensive promotional campaigns.

There are other provisions—most particularly one which would modify product-patent rights on drugs—which require more testimony, especially that of patent experts. Indeed, the drug industry itself has not yet had an opportunity to present its side of the story. The subcommittee nevertheless has amassed a truly overwhelming amount of evidence in support of its charges.

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1961]

POTENT PRESCRIPTION

Despite the efforts of drug-industry defenders to spread tranquilizing ointment on the controversy, there is considerable public concern over the cost and quality of our drugs. The hearings of Senator KEFAUVER'S Antitrust Subcommittee have clearly indicated that the old Pure Food and Drug Act is in need of stronger supplementary medicine. The reform bill offered by Mr. KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER cannot simply be dismissed by indignant talk about statism.

In opposing the bill, the American Medical Association asserts that the profession itself is capable of being the sole watchdog over the efficacy of new drugs. But the AMA's own record hardly inspires confidence. Until 1955, the AMA Journal would accept only advertising that had received the seal of acceptance of the organization's council on drugs. That year, the program was dropped—after a Chicago public relations firm submitted a report suggesting ways in which the Journal's advertising lineage could be increased.

The prescription was effective. Advertising revenues rose from $4,184,000 in 1955 to $7,997,000 in 1960. In dropping the seal of acceptance program, the AMA inevitably created the impression that it was less interested in policing misleading claims than in fattening its advertising linage.

At present, the Government can only determine whether a new drug is safe. The Kefauver-Celler bill would extend this power and enable a finding on the efficacy of a drug. In view of the hundreds of new wonder drugs which are flooding the market—not all of them adequately tested—it is difficult to see how the industry can object to an impartial finding by a public body. The reform has wide support from leading medical experts—including two members of the AMA's own Council on Drugs.

Concerning the high cost of medicine, the Kefauver-Celler bill would empower the Government to establish generic names for drugs. This would enable a doctor to prescribe the less-costly generic name rather than the frequently more expensive brand name—extending to patients a saving already available to institutions. Since the Kefauver hearings produced evidence that the profits of larger drug firms are twice the average for all industry, this seems a reasonable way to help restore some balance.

This newspaper is not convinced that licensing of drug firms, as proposed by the reform bill, is as yet imperative. But improved testing procedures and the establishing of generic names seem a minimal prescription. The principle of public regulation was established a half-century ago in the Pure Food and Drug Act. The users of prescription drugs are often the aged and disadvantaged. They are entitled to every reasonable protection that Government can offer.

Pollution of Merrimack River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the serious problem of the pollution of the Merrimack River is more graphically pointed out with each passing day. The rapid growth of the cities and communities in the Merrimack Valley make this situation more acute with the passing of time. In the interests of the general health and welfare of the people of the valley action must soon be forthcoming in the eliminating this serious pollution problem and blight on one of the areas important natural resources.

Senator SALTONSTALL and I have called upon Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, to establish in Lowell, Mass., the Northeast Water Pollution Research Laboratory. This would be an important step toward the purification of the waters of the Merrimack and the cleaning up of what has been referred to as one of the biggest open sewers in the country. I call to the attention of the House the following letter from Lowell City Manager Frank E. Barrett to Secretary Ribicoff and a recent editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun:

THE CITY OF LOWELL, MASS.,
August 1, 1961.

The Honorable ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, in Lowell, are tremendously interested in the proposed legislation dealing with the Federal water pollution controls for the current year.

Specifically, we are primarily interested in the proposal that at least one water pollution demonstration and research facility be established in the northeast area of the country.

We feel that a study will show that Lowell is ideally situated for the location of the northeast area facility. As you know, the Merrimack River is one of the most important of the northeast rivers, extending as it does from the uppermost regions of New Hampshire to the sea, flowing through a large number of industrial communities.

Equally important is the fact that after 30 years of consideration the city of Lowell, this year, is establishing a $2½ million water treatment plant on the Merrimack River in Lowell in order to obtain an adequate water supply for the area, and to eliminate a water supply problem that has existed since the early 1920's.

The Merrimack River is fed, in part, by the Nashua River, and in Lowell the famed Concord River joins up with the Merrimack.

Lowell is classified as a distress area. The city has, however, made tremendous strides in changing its complex from that of a leading cotton textile center to one of great diversification.

We need, however, every bit of assistance the Federal Government can render, in order for us to obtain our goal of economic sufficiency. The location of the planned northeast water pollution facility in Lowell would contribute greatly to this end. We feel that we have a lot to offer in the attainment of this objective.

I, and other representatives of the city, would be happy to meet with you or your representatives, either here or in Washington, for a detailed discussion of the matter.

Respectfully yours,
FRANK E. BARRETT,
City Manager.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, July 29, 1961]

POLLUTION PROGRESS

Pollution of the Merrimack River has long been a problem of the valley in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. We recall that many years ago a public official referred to the river as one of the biggest open sewers in the country, as he urged correction.

Although several communities in New Hampshire have been making progress in cleaning up their local conditions through sewage disposal plants, the main project, from the mountain lakes to the mouth of the river at Newburyport is a huge proposition.

The mayor of Newburyport heads up a committee that is dedicated to the task of forcing cities and towns in the valley to do something about sewage right away. He claims that the clam beds have been contaminated and made useless for years because of pollution and foul waters that flow down the Merrimack, and he also pointed to several beaches in his area that have been closed because of health hazards.

We all agree, no doubt, with the mayor and look for the day when the waters of the Merrimack will be fresh and clear at all points. But time is still a major factor, and we cannot expect miracles in a brief space of weeks or months.

One of the most progressive steps toward improving conditions in the Merrimack comes with the announcement that both Congressman MORSE and Senator SALTONSTALL have recommended Lowell as the site for the northeast water pollution research laboratory. This would provide scientific studies that will eventually lead to purification of the waters of the Merrimack and other New England rivers.

We hope the laboratory will be established here at the central point of the Merrimack, and, like the mayor of Newburyport, we look forward to the time when the river water will be as clean as the proverbial whistle.

Fishery Research, Rehabilitation, and Development Projects—Recommendation by Wisconsin Fish Dealers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 15, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on S. 1230—a measure proposed to increase funds for fishery research, rehabilitation, and development projects.

As yet, however, no further action has been scheduled.

Today, I was privileged to receive from Mr. Alan Smith, chairman of the Wisconsin Fish Dealers' Association, a letter urging first, support of the bill; and, second, adoption of a number of amendments, as recommended by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Because of the significance to the fish industry, I respectfully urge that the committee give further consideration to this measure, as early as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have these proposals printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FISH DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
August 2, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR AELXANDER WILEY: We urge your support of Senate bill 1230 with the following amendments as recommended by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

1. The bureau suggests that of the funds that would be distributed under the terms of this proposed legislation, two-thirds should be apportioned among the States for the purposes set forth in this bill, i.e., for research, fisheries rehabilitation, and development projects. We believe that one-third of such moneys should be distributed as grants to educational and research institutions for fishery studies and for the training of scientific personnel.

The conduct of basic research and other fisheries studies in educational and research institutions is of the greatest importance to the advancement of fishery management and conservation. Training of scientific personnel for staffing State and Federal fishery agencies is lagging. In both cases much too little is being done to meet future needs.

2. The bureau believes that there should be a minimum and a maximum apportionment to the States, such as in the Dingell-Johnson Act (16 U.S.C. 777). Under the formula set forth in this bill, approximately one-fifth of the funds would go to a single State. We believe it is obvious that important fishery problems are not concentrated to that extent in one State. For this reason, the bureau would suggest that no State should receive more than 5 percent of the funds. Also, the bureau believes that no State involved in commercial fishery problems should receive less than one-half of 1 percent. Such minimum should be adequate for a single project.

3. The bureau suggests that this proposed legislation should require the matching by the States of Federal apportionments as in the Dingell-Johnson Act. This procedure is a well-accepted principle that insures greater interest on the part of the recipient and consequently better chances of accomplishing the purposes in question. Matching of funds on an equal basis should not be unduly burdensome to the individual States and will provide for adequate funds for long-delayed State fishery programs.

4. The Bureau suggests that Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands should be included along with the States as they have commercial fisheries also.

5. Funds apportioned to the States should remain available for a prescribed period, in the Bureau's opinion. The Bureau suggests this might be for a period of 2 years after the funds first become available, as in the Dingell-Johnson Act.

6. Provision should be made for the disposition of unused funds. If a State does not avail itself of funds apportioned to it, the unused balance of the funds might be made available for other use, such as for the commercial fisheries research and other programs of this department. A comparable provision is included in the Dingell-Johnson Act. Not more than 8 percent of funds available for distribution should be subject to use by the Secretary for his expenses in administration, investigation, and execution of the proposed legislation. Such a provision is contained in the Dingell-Johnson Act. If an allowance for expenses of this kind is not made, administration of the proposed legislation will require substantial curtailment of the current fisheries program financed by our regular appropriations.

7. Any legislation on this subject should, of course, set forth clearly the terms and method of payment of apportioned funds to the States and other essential details.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would result in the transfer to the Bureau of approximately $5 million annually for the purposes in question. The Bureau has proposed that, with the exception of approximately 8 percent, which will be needed for administrative purposes, the remaining 92 percent would be apportioned on the basis of two-thirds to the States for research and other purposes and one-third as grants to educational and research institutions.

WISCONSIN FISH DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,
ALAN SMITH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

What Is President Kennedy Prepared To Sacrifice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Chicago Daily Tribune and the Wall Street Journal raise a pertinent question in answer to the President's call upon the American people for sacrifices: What is the President prepared to sacrifice? Will he sacrifice politics as usual with the public purse? Is he prepared to halt the appeal for votes by the use of Federal funds for bigger and wilder Federal handout programs? The American people are willing to make any sacrifice, as they always have, to protect the Nation, but the least they expect is that the man they look to for leadership is willing to do the same.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

MR. KENNEDY ASKS FOR SACRIFICES

President Kennedy is going to get almost everything he asked for in his broadcast on Tuesday evening. The interviews with leading Members of the House and Senate of both parties leave no doubt on that score.

The only thing that could keep Congress from voting the addition manpower and the additional billions for arms would be a great clamor from the American people themselves against the program, and that is not going to be forthcoming. It will not be forthcoming for two reasons.

One is that almost all the people agree with the President on the importance of Berlin as a symbol and as an outpost. They are in accord with him, too, wheen he says a retreat from Berlin in response to Russian threats would prove devastating to our own future, to our alliances, and to the cause of freedom in the satellite countries.

The other reason is that the people have faith in the military judgment of their military leaders and even if they lacked this faith would have to admit that the ordinary citizen is in no position to measure military requirements. This is so because much of the information on which a judgment must be based is technical and much more of it is secret.

So Mr. Kennedy is going to have little trouble imposing new sacrifices on the American people. What was notably lacking from his speech was any suggestion that he was willing to sacrifice any slightest element of his New Frontier program for the sake of national solvency and the common good.

He called for a sharp revision upward of a military program he had recommended to the Congress as adequate just a few months ago, when the conflicts over Berlin, Laos, the

Congo, Cuba, and the rest were almost as clearly defined as they are today. But he did not call for a deficit-reducing downward revision of his estimates for the foreign aid that wins us no fast friends. In striking contrast, the British Government threatens to withdraw troops from Germany in order to save expense, and plans to restrict foreign aid and investment programs.

He likewise retains the voter-bribing subsidies that are the political essence of the New Frontier. Did Mr. Kennedy volunteer to cut down his raids on the Federal Treasury for housing, roadbuilding, farm payments, school support, and other luxuries that could surely be dispensed with, at least in part, until the financial and military emergency is overcome?

No, indeed. Mr. Kennedy will not sacrifice a single purchased vote, a single pet scheme to advance his political fortunes. He pretended to speak with authority in saying that the growing prosperity of the Nation would so greatly increase tax revenues that no harm would result from adding $3½ billion to the appropriations. Nobody can be sure of that; but everyone can be certain that a busted treasury and a resultant inflation will gravely hamper any nation's military efforts.

The President says there is no need now to raise taxes. Wait until next year, he argues, again disclosing his unwillingness to sacrifice any of his own popularity for the sake of the national welfare. Nobody wants to pay more taxes but if Mr. Kennedy will not economize on nonmilitary items and is determined to spend a lot more money, common prudence requires him to recommend new taxes now and to press for them with all the influence he can command.

In spite of the one-sided sacrifices he has called for, Mr. Kennedy can count upon the support of the American people. He has failed them but they will not allow that to alter their devotion to their country.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TASKS

When President Kennedy spoke to the Nation the other evening, the task before him was not that of convincing the American people of the reality of the Soviet menace or of the need for this country to face resolutely the crisis that menace directly poses at Berlin.

If anything, the country has been in advance of the President on these matters. Every measure of public opinion, before Vienna as well as since, suggests a people far more fearful that their leaders might accept humiliation in the name of peace that a people panicked by the prospects of a clash at Berlin.

So we think we can take it as settled that the American people—however others may feel—are prepared to make those sacrifices President Kennedy asked of them to meet this crisis. The Congress will vote the new arms, and those who are called upon to bear them will do so, as they have always done before.

Mr. Kennedy's true tasks, the other evening, lay elsewhere. The first, of course, was to convince Mr. Khrushchev of what he did not convince him at Vienna; that is, that our talk of firmness is not empty words. But beyond that, to give the American people the feeling that their leadership is not merely strong in intent but capable in action and wise in measures—or, put bluntly, to restore the confidence so badly shaken in the President's first 6 months in office.

As best we can judge, Mr. Kennedy performed the first task superbly. At least it is extremely difficult for us to imagine that Premier Khrushchev could have heard the President's words and regarded the specific measures he proposed without saying to himself, this is a man and a nation that means business.

There was no bombast in the President's tone or words. But he is adding, altogether, some $6 billion to the defense budget of last January; he is increasing the manpower of each of our armed services, stepping up their state of readiness and redeploying them into a more determined posture. Moreover, he should have made it clear even to Mr. Khrushchev that this is just a beginning, if more is needed. "We are clear about what must be done—and we intend to do it * * *. Everything essential to the security of freedom will be done."

Now we are not so foolish as to assume that the men in the Kremlin will necessarily reason like other men; other would-be conquerors before them have simply closed their minds in order to believe what they wanted to believe. So there is in the President's speech no guarantee whatever that the peace will be preserved.

But if it be not, the fault will not be any failure of Mr. Kennedy's to speak warning, or to give those warnings substance. We hardly see what more he could have done on that score.

And that in itself, we think, should help Mr. Kennedy on his second task. At least he has put aside the fears haunting a good many people before Vienna that he was not sufficiently aware of the nature of the Soviet menace—and that he might be tempted either to succumb to the wiles of the Soviet leader or to put so high a price upon peace that he would yield to threats.

The President also, we think, must have impressed his countrymen in another way. In showing firmness he did not rush to belligerence. There is not a single line in his speech that rattles the atom bomb or makes any threat to the Soviet Union; there was no indication that the President had his hand upon the panic button. Moreover, he showed plainly that while he was serious about the military responses, he was not foreclosing other responses to the Soviet challenge.

All this makes a good beginning on what remains the President's most crucial task, the restoration of confidence in the leadership of his administration. And it is now up to the President to complete it.

It is never enough that a President of the United States show his intent and will. He must also convince the country—and today, even the world—that he and those about him bring wisdom to the task of carrying out that intent. In short, that they have thought intelligently and truly know what they are doing.

If Mr. Kennedy has thus far fallen short in this task, for his political friends as well as for his opponents, it is largely because he has had the air of a general scattering his troops in all directions. In his first 6 months he has sent half-a-hundred messages to Congress on almost every conceivable subject, and he has called for more spending on almost every conceivable human activity.

Quite apart from political philosophy, none of this has suggested disciplined thinking or any awareness that the Nation's resources of money or energy needed to be husbanded for crucial tasks clearly seen. What has made the memory of the Cuban fiasco linger so long was not its immediate effects on Cuba but the whole air of improvisation that lay over it.

All this cannot be blown away in a single speech. Some uneasiness lingers over the President's plans for military spending, because only 2 months ago he was asking new billions of Congress, explaining that they would put us in a posture to meet the threats around the world. Now it is more billions still; and if the plans of July be necessary, it must mark as improvisation the plans of May.

Nor has the President yet banished all uneasiness about the scattering of our resources. The Government will spend $6 billion more on arms, but apparently not one penny less on anything else. That does not suggest the President himself has yet thought out clearly an order of national priorities.

For our part, we have no doubt that President Kennedy will get the support of the country for what he specifically proposes to do now about Berlin. But if that support is to include full confidence in the President's whole conduct of office, it must also be earned by something more than a mere calling up of arms.

Pope John XXIII's New Encyclical "Mater et Magistra"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Pope John XXIII's new encyclical "Mater et Magistra" is now receiving the close study and attention of scholars, clergymen, social scientists, legislators, and others throughout the free world and, I would imagine, in some quarters behind the Iron Curtain.

It is clear that Pope John has given us a statement of historic significance. It is also a statement which should give great personal comfort to all those who have worked for so many years to put democratic government in the service of man without impairing the freedom of man.

Much more study will be given to the encyclical in the years to come, but initial reaction has already been recorded. One of the most pertinent statements was made by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO in the July 29 issue of the AFL–CIO News.

Another analysis was given in my home State by the Advocate, official newspaper for the diocese of Newark, in an editorial of July 27. In the same issue, the newspaper carried a roundup of opinion from throughout the State. The variety of comment is another indication of the significance of the encyclical. I was particularly interested in the reaction given to Pope John's comments on international relations and the plight of farmworkers in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDE FOR A WORLD IN TORMENT

(By George Meany)

The social encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII provides highly significant signposts for human advancement at this most critical turn in the history of mankind.

Humanity now possesses the scientific knowledge and technical know-how for eliminating poverty, ignorance and illness. But in the hands of Communist dictators, bent on world conquest, this very knowledge and remarkable industrial progress have tended to menace mankind with the limitless horrors and destruction of nuclear warfare.

Whole peoples who once meekly submitted to a foreign yoke and degrading poverty no

longer accept their plight as a matter of fate. They are determined to win freedom from oppression and hunger, eager to build modern economies and improve their conditions. But this very laudable struggle for national freedom and economic progress is endangered by hypocritical forces seeking to exploit its efforts and sacrifices in the interest of the new Soviet colonialism.

These are the great opportunities and the grave dangers so characteristic of our times. It is against this background of developments that the social encyclical must be viewed.

Its calm analysis and constructive proposals for meeting such complex problems of our times as socialization, the elimination or reduction of economic imbalance within countries and the urgency of just relations between nations in different stages of economic development will attract much support among peoples of all faiths.

Labor everywhere will be deeply impressed by the encyclical's rejection of the belief held in certain quarters that socialization, growing in extent and depth, necessarily reduces men to automatons.

In view of what has been happening behind the Iron Curtain, free labor throughout the world will welcome the conclusion of Pope John XXIII that socialization can and ought to be realized in such a way as to draw from it the advantages contained therein and to remove or restrain the negative aspects.

Even the most rugged individualists will have to see the soundness and justice of the encyclical in stressing that "private enterprise must contribute to effect economic and social balance among the different zones of the same country" and that "public authorities * * * must encourage and help private enterprise, entrusting to it, as far as efficiently possible, the continuation of the economic development."

The social encyclical will arouse fervent approval, especially in the developing countries, for its forthright and sound consideration of "probably the most difficult problem of the modern world—the relationship between the political communities that are economically advanced and those in the process of development." We are confident that the peoples of the free world will view with full favor the indisputable conclusion of the encyclical that:

"Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persists. We are all equally responsible for the undernourished peoples. Therefore, it is necessary to educate one's conscience to the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and every one, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

Wherever labor is free to express its own opinion, it will hail the encyclical's eloquent plea for social justice and its insistence that the "workers should be paid a wage which allows them to live a truly human life and to face up with dignity to their family responsibilities." The international free trade union movement will certainly not fail to see the significance of the encyclical's forceful support of the worker's right to an effective voice in the running of industry and public economic planning.

The social encyclical should have a most salutary effect on the ranks of free world labor. It should go a long way toward removing the debris of prejudice left over from the lay-clerical struggles of the 19th century.

Once the air is thus cleared, a most serious obstacle to the greater unification of free labor, especially in Europe and Africa, shall have been removed. Such higher free world labor unity was never more urgent than it is today when the Soviet imperialist threat to human freedom, national independence and world peace is so grave.

Mother and Teacher

By his encyclical "Mater et Magistra" under date of May 15, 1961, Pope John XXIII has again marked his pontificate as one of enduring importance. His commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the monumental encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, "Rerum Novarum," begins with the summary of the major social advances begun by that document, but it adds a treatment, in some cases only in summary, of many pressing current affairs in our social order.

Writers have already noted the approval, subject to restrictions, which the Holy Father gives to our age's use of such social institutions as social security and insurance programs, as well as to such collective actions as unions and cooperatives.

This careful approval of the socializing movements of current decades may put to rest the fears of those Catholics who hesitated to support these institutions lest they lead to socialism. Pope John makes a pointed condemnation of socialism; but socialization is approved so long as the rights and dignity of individuals and the important principle of subsidiarity are safeguarded.

Throughout the entire teaching of this encyclical runs the theme of the common good of the world. The common or general good has always been stressed in Catholic social teachings; but Pope John makes it clear that in an age when communication and commerce have tied the world's nations closely together, the common good must be that of all the world and not just of one's own nation. Thus in the United States our management of food surplus must take into account the needs of underfed and emerging nations and not just that of America.

Pope Leo had brought to the world's attention the social aspect of private property. Pope John stresses this with the reminder that the world's wealth and resources belong to the entire world and not just favored nations. Failure to use the world's land and possessions in a spirit of universal justice and charity lies at the root of so many current disorders. Overpopulation, for example, will not be solved until this principle is acknowledged and made effective.

Catholic social teachers and scholars will do us a great service if they will unfold with diligence the full riches of this crowded encyclical. So many issues of wages and employment, agriculture and industry are here compacted that only the expert will fully appreciate the new advances and any new emphasis.

All of us, though, should read this encyclical in meditation and prayer. For us there is instruction and inspiration. For the world, there is hope and light to find a Christian way through the intricate relations, involvements of what has been until today a crazy mixed-up century.

Jersey Roundup on Encyclical

(By Ed Grant)

Newark.—"Amazing," "masterly," "superb" and "progressive" are some of the adjectives applied to Pope John XXIII's new encyclical "Mater et Magistra" by North Jersey experts in the social, international and lay apostolate field, whose opinions were solicited this week by the Advocate. At the same time, they stressed the need for a strong "followup" of its teachings.

Members of this panel, each of whom made an independent contribution, were Rev. Gerard Rooney, C.P., of Sign magazine, president of the National Catholic Social Action Conference; Rev. William J. Smith, S.J., director of the St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations, Jersey City; Rev. Aloysius J. Welsh, S.T.D., director of the Pope Pius XII Institute of Social Education; James Lamb, director of the Association for International Development, Paterson; Joseph Leto of the Young Christian Workers of St. Paul's, Ramsey; Dr. Howard T. Ludlow, professor of management, Seton Hall University; and Dr. John C. H. Wu, professor of Asian Studies at Seton Hall University and member of the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

In hailing the encyclical as progressive, Dr. Wu said, "In our church, it is the leaders who are in the vanguard, the faithful who lag behind. The whole body of the church should have followed the lead of Leo XIII in 'Rerum Novarum.' If this encyclical, published 70 years ago, had been followed with all of our strength, there would have been no room for communism.

"But we do not have to cry over spilt milk. We can hope that this time the process of carrying out the words of Pope John XXIII will be more effective and systematic. There is a difference between 1891 and 1961; there is now a remarkable awareness on the part of many members of the church of the necessity to respond to the leadership of our Holy Father."

Of the encyclical itself, Dr. Wu said, "It is most opportune; it not only restates but also develops the principles of 'Rerum Novarum' and brings them up to date, particularly with regard to the new world economic situation. It strikes at the roots of the problems between the Communist and non-Communist world.

"The encyclical restates in the clearest words the position of our church in social philosophy, as neither individualistic nor socialistic, but as having its center in man. It follows the words of Pius XII's Christmas message of 1942: 'The purpose of all social life remains the same, ever sacred, ever obligatory, the development of the personal values of man who is made in the image of God.'

"Even when the encyclical speaks of socialization, the central purpose is never lost sight of and the process of socialization, is envisaged by Pope John XXIII, serves to expand and perfect, rather than frustrate the human personality. This process must not be primarily a governmental process, but rather a free and spontaneous development of nonpolitical professional and social groups conscious of the need for enlarged social organizations to take care of the common good of mankind. We can no longer talk on a national level; our plan must have the background of the whole world.

"On our age, national economics are no longer viable, except in an international context, and it is imperative that more advanced nations take the lead in establishing a world economy which will benefit all, especially those newly developing nations who are so much in need.

"Particularly noteworthy is an explicit recognition of an increased need for free passage of people across national boundaries. This should include an opportunity for exiles to settle permanently in the countries of their choice."

Father Smith calls the encyclical an "amazing document" which will "enlighten minds and warm hearts for many years, perhaps centuries, to come. The message is global in outlook. And yet, the remarkable personality of Christ's vicar seems to enliven every page so that the reader almost feels it could have been addressed to him personally.

"Without doubt, 'Mater et Magistra' is unique, distinctive, and wholly characteristic of our reigning sovereign pontiff. The original message of Leo XIII was that of the pioneer. It was philosophic, basic, and

profound. The words of Pius XI were those of the modernizer. He builds the ideal of social order upon the foundation which Leo XIII had laid. Pius XII opened new doors and windows of his predecessor's edifice to let in rays of light and give greater illumination to the interior. But it was left to John XXIII to reveal how truly worldwide is the structure of the social order as envisioned by the church. Without apology, but in a spirit of profound faith and reverence, he assumes the role of champion of God.

"The working people, particularly trade unionists who have not lost the spark of idealism, will find solace and encouragement and strength in the Pope's evaluation of their role in society. They will be comforted to know how closely he identifies himself with their thoughts and hopes and aspirations.

"The ultraconservative, the idle rich, the materialistic minded 'let's keep up with the Jones' Catholic, and those who cry 'keep the government out of it' will find little comfort in the solemn pronouncements of the pontiff. The words 'social' and 'socialization' must now be accepted with proper respect by anyone who is seriously intent upon 'thinking with the church.'"

While cautioning that some passages must be read and reread for their full understanding, Father Welsh calls the encyclical a "masterly synthesis of Catholic social teaching. There is practically no area of human social activity neglected, yet in the main, the Holy Father's comments are consistently incisive and balanced.

"Readers will best appreciate the finely woven nuances of 'Mater et Magistra' if they have a previous familiarity with the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, but all who approach the study of Pope John's encyclical in good will should be duly enlightened and inspired.

"The archdiocese of Newark has a head start in implementing some of the Pope's directions. His reaffirmation that 'Christian social doctrine is an integral part of the Christian conception of life' and as such should be taught systematically in Catholic schools of every kind, 'especially in seminaries,' will be gratifying to authorities at Immaculate Conception Seminary, at which such courses have been conducted for over 20 years.

"Our own Pius XII Institute, St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations and adult education programs being instituted in more and more of our parishes offer excellent channels for reducing the papal social principles and directives to practice by way of the zealous lay apostles formed therein."

Father Rooney said that "The Holy Father has reaffirmed the profound concern of Christ and His church for the earthly needs of all people as well as for their eternal salvation. The Pope sees the solidarity of all mankind under God and outlines the laws of God whereby every man on earth should receive a fair share of the world's goods.

"The Pope applauds the advantages of modern science and technology, blesses the increasing socialization (not socialism) of modern states, encourages the desire of workers to share a greater degree of responsibility in ownership, management and profits and calls for the richer nations to help the poorer.

"In America, we can well be proud that a great deal of our social legislation already expresses the socal doctrine of Leo XIII and has anticipated much of the more detailed doctrine of John XXIII.

"Catholic social action groups will surely receive a tremendous stimulus to renewed action from this sublime document. Thus far, the failure of vast numbers of Catholics to understand the church's social doctrine has kept the spiritual influence of the church from properly fulfilling its mission to civil society. With the way to action so clearly pointed by Pope John, great energies in the church should now be released to enrich community life in America."

Striking parallels between the new encyclical and the language of mediation laws in the United States are pointed up by Dr. Ludlow, a member of the New Jersey Board of Mediation.

"In 1886, New York State established its board to provide 'for the amicable adjustment of grievances and disputes.' Later laws call for the desire to 'promote permanent industrial peace' (New Jersey), the advocacy of 'sound union-employer relationships' (California), the providing of both mediation and factfinding (Michigan), or contain similar phrases in keeping with this section from part II of the new encyclical:

" 'Modern times have seen a broad development of associations of workers for the specific purposes of cooperation, in particular by means of collective bargaining, and the general recognition of such associations in the juridical codes.'

"Of even greater interest is the fact that mediators usually await the call of the conflicting parties before entering a dispute. The Connecticut board in 1960 stated: 'The first responsibility for industrial peace rests upon unions and management.' in 'Mater et Magistra' we find: 'Only in the event that the interested parties do not or cannot fulfill their functions, does it fall back on the state to intervene in the field of labor.'

"The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service often violates the principle of subsidiarity when it intervenes in purely local labor matters, and the new encyclical warns of this form of encroachment in this manner: '* * * it is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies.'

"Whether on the Federal or State level, however, the mediation agency strives to meet the demands of both justice and the common good, while recognizing in the language of the encyclical, 'that the relations between the employers and directors on the one hand and the employees on the other, be marked by appreciation, understanding, a loyal and active cooperation, and devotion to an undertaking common to both.'"

Lamb sees the encyclical as a call to action for the lay apostolate, saying that it "leaves no doubt as to what should be the mind and action of Catholics vis-a-vis the staggering social problems that confront our human family.

"Here in the United States, the church grows in many important dimensions: sanctity, membership, sense of mission. Despite too-large contingents of rugged individualists, anti-intellectuals, isolationists and the like, lacking any real grasp of the implications of the mystical body, a beautiful and positive maturing is slowly (and painfully) taking place. It can be hoped that the new encyclical will accelerate the process.

"That more Catholics will come to see that foreign policy and international organizations must be everyone's vital concern; that high taxes can be a matter of justice; that it is essential for selfless and competent laymen to share themselves with the developing countries; that foreign students and visitors be warmly welcomed and shown what we believe—as Americans and as Catholics.

"Already inspiring efforts by an increasing number of bishops, priests, and laymen prove that we are beginning to understand what the holy father means when he says: "The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family imposes upon political communities enjoying abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and hunger and who lack even the elemental rights of the human persons.'

"And that since 'the church is confronted with the immense task of giving a human and Christian note to modern civilization,' we cannot flee from the truth that this involves personal knowledge, sacrifice, and commitment."

Speaking on that part of the encyclical which deals with rural life, Leo says, "The problems in agriculture have been given considerable thought by Pope John, in striking similarity to the way in which Leo XIII tackled the problems of the industrial revolution in 1891, stressing that there is a responsibility in solving these problems in justice and equity by Christian men.

"Industrial life should not dominate agricultural life causing misery and poverty of economic conditions substantially lower than other sectors of society. The gap which exists between them should be brought closer together in proper balance. To effect this end, the Pope said, 'the systems of social insurance and social security can contribute efficaciously—for restoring the balance in standards of living in the different categories of people.'

"Thus the Holy Father decries the plight of people such as the United States 2 million farm-wage earners who are deprived of a life proper to human beings because of their low-wage income, where wages and living conditions are caused by ineffective and neglectful governmental systems of regulation, and the indifference of people outside of agriculture.

"The Pope calls for order and a working together of all segments of society. Farmers are urged to pull together and form cooperatives to receive a fairer profit on his products.

"Most American farmers are organized as the Pope suggests, but the 2 million workers have no organizations, do not have the voice which Pope John states is necessary because 'no one hears, much less pays attention to isolated voices.' Attempts to include these workers in social legislation are frustrated by the strong factory-corporation farm lobby in Washington.

"It is significant to note the emergence of the factory-corporation farm and the rapid decline of family farms in America, substantiated by the fact that 5 percent of the farms hire 90 percent of the workers. It is the family size farm with its beautiful life that the Pope desires to save.

"Much of the world is engaged in agricultural production and the Pope's message is worldwide. He has given a clear directive to America and to our responsibility to poorer nations: that we offend against 'justice and humanity' if we 'destroy or squander goods that other people need in order to live.'"

Speech by Jesse R. Smith at Pioneer Day Celebration of Utahans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, last Saturday former residents of Utah now living in the Nation's Capital gathered to celebrate Utah's traditional Pioneer Day. It was only 114 years ago that the pioneers first came into the Salt Lake valley. On that occasion Mr. Jesse R. Smith, formerly a staff member of the

Senate Committee on Finance, delivered an excellent address, recalling to our minds the problems and the hardships of that historic trek which ended in the Salt Lake valley on July 24, 1847.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PIONEER HERITAGE

(Speech delivered by Jesse R. Smith on July 29 in connection with the Pioneer Day celebration of Utahans in the Nation's Capitol—at Fairfield Farm, Virginia)

It is a moving experience to review the history of the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo, Ill., to the Salt Lake Valley—particularly if one has driven across the country and has some idea of distances. But we are so far removed from those stirring days—our lives have been so transformed by the intervening 114 years—that it is virtually impossible to visualize conditions as they were then, or to comprehend the suffering, the hardships and privations they underwent, or to sense the indomitable courage they manifested when adversity was the darkest.

Twenty miles a day. What does 20 miles mean to you? If you travel by jet it represents 2 minutes. If you travel by car along a superhighway, it means 20 minutes driving time. How many of you have ever walked 20 miles in a day? To those pioneers—men, women, and children alike, generally, 20 miles meant 40,000 or 50,000 weary footsteps, up at 5 and confronted that night with the sure knowledge that many 20 miles lay ahead of them in the days to follow. Nor was it in weather of their choosing or along pleasant byways.

In rereading the story of the great Mormon trek, one thought occurs that had not been so apparent before—it was in the year 1846, not 1847, when the greatest sacrifices and suffering and stark tragedy occurred. It was in 1846 when the great test came—the test of survival, which they magnificently met; the year when hundreds of their numbers were quietly laid away in unmarked graves along the trail.

Let's go back to the summer of 1845. Their prophet, Joseph Smith, had been dead only a year. The Mormons were still numb from his tragic martyrdom. Their enemies, mostly ruffians of that era, had again become emboldened and from the communities around Nauvoo came persecution and oppression. At the Fourth of July celebration in a town 15 miles away, the Independence Day speaker told the assembled crowd that they, the citizens of Carthage, could not consider themselves free Americans so long as the Mormons remained in Illinois. Mobbings, and whippings increased and finally the leaders of the Mormon people and many of the people themselves became reconciled to the idea of abandoning their lovely city, "Nauvoo the beautiful," a community of fine homes, well laid out streets, good farms and an impressive temple which crowned the landscape. They realized that sooner or later they must remove themselves far to the West, to a place "which God for them prepared" where they would be secure from their enemies and build a place of thier own and live in peace and happiness.

And so in September 1845, the Mormon leaders reached an agreement—a written agreement—with the leaders of the surrounding communities, that they, the Mormons would leave Illinois in 1846. It was stipulated however, that they should be given time to settle their affairs, sell their homes and farms as advantageously as they could under the circumstances and be unharassed while making preparations for the long journey ahead.

They fell to work with a will. They were organized into companies, each having its own blacksmith shops and other facilities. Iron was brought in, even from distant places. The blacksmith shops sounded with activity early and late. The wheelwrights, the carpenters and cabinetmakers were busily engaged in making wagons and other conveyances. The women worked tirelessly getting provisions together and making clothing. But their enemies would not wait. There were evil men in the area who hated the Mormon religion and coveted their lands.[1] By the new year, 1846, the forces of oppression became so violent that the Mormons were faced with the danger of physical extinction. And so, in the dead of winter, they were expelled from Nauvoo.

The first flatboats started ferrying teams and wagons across the Mississippi in early February—Bancroft records it as February 10. The crossing of the river was stepped up each day. On the 15th, a blizzard struck, followed by intense cold and the river was frozen solidly so that the next day, February 16, the remainder of the emigration crossed over the ice to the Iowa side. This band of exiles made their temporary camp at Sugar Creek, a few miles into Iowa, barely out of sight of Nauvoo. The first night at Sugar Creek, nine babies were born[2] "in every variety of circumstance except those to which the mothers were accustomed," wrote Eliza R. Snow. On the morning of the 17th, all members of the camp gathered around to receive instruction and encouragement from their leader, Brigham Young. He stood up in a wagon and in a loud voice called, "Attention the whole camp of Israel." He told them that the Lord had been with them in times past and would continue to be with them if they kept his commandments; that His empire "was established and the powers of hell should not prevail against it."[3] And then with comparatively light hearts, this homeless band of exiles turned resolutely to the west and started their great trek through the wilderness.

Of this event Bancroft has written, "In the present instance though all were poor and some destitute, and though man and beast were exposed to driving rain and hail, and the chill blasts of a Western winter often sweeping down upon them unchecked from the limitless prairie, they made the best of it, and instead of wasting time in useless repining, set themselves at work to make the most of their joys and the least of their sorrows."[4]

Surely this was their finest hour.

The great migration continued westward, though at times their progress was slow indeed because of impassable mud and other inclement conditions of the winter and spring. But these exiles were not aimless drifters of the wilderness. They were a well organized, well disciplined people, purposeful, and with a destination in mind.

At night or morning all were called to prayers at the sound of a bugle. There were brass or stringed instruments in every company. Camp fires held their charm when the days work was finished. Dancing and singing was an indispensable part of their lives, and helped carry them on. Wise Brigham Young understood the value of wholesome recreation.

By April 24, the advance companies arrived at the east fork of the Grand River, about midway through Iowa—150 miles west of Nauvoo. We read, "Here a temporary settlement was selected which they named Garden Grove. Two days later a council meeting was held and 359 laboring men were selected to cut trees and make rails; 10 to build fences; 48 to build houses; 12 to dig wells and 10 to build bridges. The remainder were employed in clearing land and preparing it for cultivation. Every one was busy, and in a few days a respectable village, magic like, had risen in the wilderness."[5]

Then on westward they went and at a place they named Mount Pisgah, 30 miles farther, another settlement was founded as if by magic within a few days. Fields were plowed and planted; the succeeding bands of pioneers tended these fields and later companies harvested the crops. It was absolutely necessary that they raise their own food even as they marched. This was to be an important part of their diet that fall, winter, and the next spring.

What a sight this mighty exodus must have presented. We are told that at one time between the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers no less than 2,000 wagons could be counted wending their way through Iowa. And the "saints" had 30,000 cattle and immense flocks of sheep and other animals. By the end of August 1846, the bulk of the Mormons, some 12,000, were encamped on the Missouri, mainly at winter quarters, just north of what is now Omaha. Some were still in camps in western Iowa.

Back at Nauvoo, the remnant of the Mormons who had not been able to travel with the main group faced cruel persecutions, and finally on September 17, they were literally ejected from their city. The same day the gentiles took possession.[6] These poor outcasts, some 650 in number, settled temporarily 2 miles above Montrose at a site appropriately called "poor camp," and there underwent the most severe privations. Grain was scarce, and frequently they pounded up the bark of the slippery elm tree and mixed it with their wheat for nourishment. They were in the direst poverty when rescued by a company of men returning from winter quarters.

Meanwhile the "saints" at the Missouri River were afflicted by an epidemic called "black canker." There was a drought; the streams entering into the Missouri were sluggish and like open sewers, one writer observes. Sickness spread through the camps and took a frightful toll. At a place called Papillon, one-third of the inhabitants were stricken at one time. It was a struggle to dig graves quickly enough for the burial of the dead.[7]

Finally, better weather arrived, and the general health of the people improved. The axes and saws were busy long hours felling trees and making logs for houses. A flour mill was built, and—most important—schools were established for the children, even in those primitive surroundings. There was order, industry, and a love of truth in their lives.

The new year, 1847, was welcomed by celebration, feasting, and a sense of expectancy. Now the Mormons looked forward to the final phase of their journey. On April 14, Brigham Young led a company of 143 able-bodied men, 3 women, and 2 children with 73 wagons to blaze the trail; to find their future home, their new Zion. The route was along the north branch of the Platte, and since it was early in the season, there was little grass. Frequently it was necessary to fell cottonwood trees for their horses and cattle to browse upon, and at times they fed grain to the animals. Buffalo were in great abundance, as were other game and fish; thus there was plenty of meat.

The order of the day was: up at 5 with the bugle call, breakfast, horses fed and teams hitched and ready to move at 7—20 miles a day when the going was good, and resting on the Sabbath. Early in June they reached the Black Hills where grass was abundant. Here they rested a few days and built ferryboats to cross the river. A large company bound for Oregon gladly paid the Mormons in provisions to ferry them across the river. Then came South Pass, and on westward skirting the Colorado desert and on to the Green River where they were

Footnotes at end of speech.

met by Samuel Brannan leading a group of Mormons up from California, they having sailed around the Horn from Brooklyn in 1846. On to Fort Bridger, July 5, and here that famous character Jim Bridger told them he would gladly pay $1,000 for the first ear of corn raised in the Great Basin. July 12—the head of Echo Canyon was reached and realizing that the most difficult part of their journey lay ahead, Brigham Young dispatched a party of 43 men and 23 wagons and teams to move on as a vanguard, to make roads, build bridges up over the Wasatch Mountains and down into the valley of the Great Salt Lake.

This advance company, under Orson Pratt, was camped down almost to the mouth of Emigration Canyon July 20. On the 21st, Pratt and Erastus Snow crawled through the brush and scrub oak on their hands and knees, warned by the occasional rattle of a snake, up over the north side of the canyon entrance, onto the benchland and there beheld a mighty vista before them—the valley, and the lake shimmering in the distance. What emotion must have filled their breasts. "Hosanna, Hosanna to the Lord, Hosanna to the Creator of All," they cried. They went down into the valley, turned northward and reached the area which was later to become the business section of Salt Lake City. They returned to their brethren that evening and reported their findings. Next day seven men came down and made more extensive explorations. The following day, the 23d, the remainder of this advance group came into the valley, and started plowing and irrigating the land adjacent to a clear stream, the City Creek.

On July 24 Brigham Young and the main body of the pioneer band reached a point on Big Mountain, where the view of the valley was unbroken. President Young, who was ill with mountain fever, had the carriage in which he was reclining turned around so that he could see the valley. After gazing earnestly for several minutes (Wilford Woodruff tells us that President Young had already beheld the valley in a vision), he said, "It is enough, this is the right place; drive on." And so the pioneer band entered the Salt Lake Valley on July 24, the event which we now celebrate in this beautiful setting of Camp Marriott. They planted potatoes that afternoon.

The next day was Sunday and the pioneers held church service in their new Zion. It was recalled, by one of the speakers, that God had indeed blessed them for not one member of their group had died en route nor had any animal.[9]

During the ensuing weeks 12 other companies arrived in the valley, the last one late in October. At the close of the year 1847, the population numbered 2,095,[9] and already the fruits of teamwork and industry were evident. A village had sprung up; the beginning of a great city and the center of a great spiritual organization which was to cast its influence upon the nations was taking shape.

Of this great epic, Bancroft[10] has written "There is no parallel in the world's history to this migration from Nauvoo. The exodus from Egypt was from a heathen land, a land of idolaters, to a fertile region designated by the Lord for his chosen people, the land of Canaan. The Pilgrim Fathers, in flying to America came from a bigoted and despotic people—a people making few pretensions to civil or religious liberty. It was from these same people who had fled from old world persecutions that they might enjoy their descendants and associates, that other of their descendants and associates, who claimed the right to differ from them in opinion and practice, were now fleeing."

Surely there is no parallel to this story. What a priceless heritage, what a magnificent legacy is ours.

Edmund Burke wrote, "Society is a great and silent compact between the dead, the living, and the unborn." Ours is indeed a choice society. May we always be worthy of it.

---

[1] "Essentials in Church History," p. 404, by Joseph Fielding Smith.
[2] Ibid., p. 402.
[3] H. H. Bancroft, "History of Utah," p. 219.
[4] Ibid., p. 220.
[5] "Essentials of Church History," p. 406.
[6] "History of Utah," p. 230.
[7] "Bancroft," p. 248.
[8] "Bancroft," p. 263.
[9] "Essential of Church History," p. 461.
[10] "Bancroft," p. 217.

New Frontier Spending Feels the Pinch of the Debt Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the public debt today is approximately $5 billion higher than it was at a corresponding date a year ago. The debt is currently in the magnitude of approximately $293.2 billion. This is a record indebtedness in U.S. history and, indeed, in the history of all mankind.

The Congress recently enacted legislation providing a statutory ceiling for the public debt of $298 billion. The Wall Street Journal for today contains a short paragraph citing the possibility that the Treasury may find it necessary to return to the Congress with a request for an additional increase prior to the adjournment of the present session. That short paragraph from the Wall Street Journal reads as follows:

Treasury men sense new danger to the $298 billion national debt ceiling. They fear the freshly welling deficit may push the debt against the ceiling by December. Officials consider asking Congress to raise the legal lid anew before adjournment. They shudder at the idea of having to call a special session for the task.

Mr. Speaker, last June the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in support of the President's request for the record in peacetime increase in the statutory debt limit to $298 billion. At that time he presented a table to the committee which forecast public debt outoutstanding at various times during fiscal year 1962. The Secretary then informed the committee that $298 billion was the minimum degree of latitude within which he could operate the debt under the New Frontier spending proposals then submitted to the Congress. Since then we have had new spending recommendations from the administration and this raises a question as to the ability of Treasury officials to manage the debt within present limitations.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include a table forecasting outstanding public debt at specific periods within fiscal year 1962 as furnished to the Committee on Ways and Means by the Secretary of the Treasury last June. I call your attention to the fact that in evaluating this statistical table it should be remembered that this does not reflect the budgetary changes and additional spending proposed that have occurred since the middle of June.

The table follows:

Forecast of public debt outstanding, fiscal year 1962, based on constant operating cash balance of $3,500,000,000 (excluding free gold)

[Based on assumed budget deficit of $3,700,000,000 [1]]
[In billions]

	Operating balance, Federal Reserve banks and depositaries (excluding free gold)	Public debt subject to limitation	Allowance to provide flexibility in financing and for contingencies	Total public debt limitation required [2]
1961				
June 30	$3.5	[3] $286.4	$3.0	$289.4
July 15	3.5	288.6	3.0	291.6
July 31	3.5	289.6	3.0	292.6
Aug. 15	3.5	289.9	3.0	292.9
Aug. 31	3.5	290.1	3.0	290.1
Sept. 15	3.5	291.9	3.0	294.9
Sept. 30	3.5	288.2	3.0	291.2
Oct. 15	3.5	290.7	3.0	293.7
Oct. 31	3.5	292.2	3.0	295.2
Nov. 15	3.5	293.0	3.0	926.0
Nov. 30	3.5	292.8	3.0	295.8
Dec. 15	3.5	294.9	3.0	297.9
Dec. 31	3.5	292.4	3.0	295.4
1962				
Jan. 15	3.5	294.9	3.0	297.9
Jan. 31	3.5	294.0	3.0	297.0
Feb. 15	3.5	294.1	3.0	297.1
Feb. 28	3.5	293.2	3.0	296.2
Mar. 15	3.5	294.7	3.0	297.7
Mar. 31	3.5	291.2	3.0	294.2
Apr. 15	3.5	293.4	3.0	296.4
Apr. 30	3.5	292.7	3.0	295.7
May 15	3.5	292.9	3.0	294.9
May 31	3.5	291.3	3.0	295.3
June 15	3.5	293.6	3.0	296.6
June 30	3.5	290.1	3.0	293.1

[1] Assumes estimated budget revenues of $81,400,000,000 and estimated expenditures of $85,100,000,000.
[2] From July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961, the statutory debt limit is $293,000,000,000. Thereafter, but for this bill, it would revert to $285,000,000,000.
[3] Because the actual operating balance on June 30, 1961, is expected to be considerably larger than $3,500,000,000, the public debt subject to limitation will be about $289,000,000,000 on that date.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department.

Individualism and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in these days, when the skies of liberty are black in many lands and seem darkened in our own, and when the President in his inaugural address called upon all Americans to see what they could do for their country rather than what the country can do for them, it is indeed both interesting and heartening to have presented

in simple and understanding form a statement on individualism and freedom, what it is, and what it means in the way of rights and responsibilities.

From the town in which the "shot heard round the world" was fired in defense of individual liberty and freedom—a freedom from autocratic and bureaucratic control both from without and within—I present for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Concord Free Press, of Concord, Mass.:

INDIVIDUALISM AND FREEDOM

The freedom which we enjoy as our heritage comes from the individualism of our forefathers whose independent natures were unable to tolerate the yoke of oppression and invasion of their sacred rights. This freedom which was won through great sacrifice and personal loss was safeguarded by a constitution whose purpose was to protect the people from the tyranny and indignity which are inevitable where freedom is dead.

It is revealing to note that all these far-seeing, strong-minded men had little use for the government other than as a bulwark against tyranny and relegated its functions to those which the people could not properly do for themselves. Thomas Jefferson warned against placing too much power in the hands of the government, and this philosophy was subscribed to as a more or less natural law by his fellow countrymen. Great individualists such as Ben Franklin cautioned against the evil of security and believed most rigorously that man's progress was more governed by its lack.

No where is this feeling of individuality better or more lucidly expressed than in the writings and life of Henry Thoreau. Although he lived in Concord more than 100 years ago, his philosophy lives on, and he is being remembered this week by the society formed 20 years ago in his honor.

Thoreau, the individualist, believed fervently that "that government is best which governs least." His disagreements with local authorities will bear this out. His ideal was unfettered freedom for man, his manuscript taken from the pages of natural law.

It would be well for us to hearken to the words of one who had little use for materialism and less for regimentation. He held that man was made to be more than good, "he must be good for something." The real good in man is brought out and stimulated where the reward is greatest. The reward is greatest where freedom is least restricted. Thoreau held that "there are thousands hacking at the branches of evil to every one at the root."

Paraphrasing him, we might say today that there are many hacking at the roots of freedom goaded by a misguided belief in the need for more government controls, while those whose purpose is to nurture this tree are more interested in gathering the fruit.

Tribute to Charles A. Swain, Vice President, Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, all New Jersey shares in the pride recently expressed by an editorial writer in Cape May at the news that Charles A. Swain of that community has been elected this year as vice president of Kiwanis International.

Mr. Swain, a well-known businessman in his home town, has long been associated with good works and hard work. His fellow Kiwanians have chosen a man who will guide and help them meet the high standards of service that they have set for themselves.

Mr. President, an editorial from the July 13 edition of the Cape May Star and Wave expresses the high regard felt for Mr. Swain.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Congratulations All Around," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS ALL AROUND

The election of Charles A. Swain, one of Cape May's leading businessmen for many years, as vice president of Kiwanis International last week is a very distinct honor in which the entire community may well take great pride.

While the news from the international convention in Canada came as no surprise because Kiwanians of New Jersey and many other States had been promoting his candidacy for some time as a sincere tribute for the tremendous contribution he has made through the years to the worldwide service organization, it was received in his hometown with more than the usual degree of satisfaction that accompanies the proverbial hometown-boy-makes-good story.

Any community, large or small, can well be proud when one of its citizens or a native son is accorded an important honor or wins public acclaim for some accomplishment. Election to the top echelon of an international organization, which by its very nature is concerned with putting into practice the high ideals and objectives of Kiwanis is doubly significant for a small community such as Cape May.

What makes it still more gratifying to his friends and neighbors who know how he has dedicated so much of his time and effort to the service organization is that we have watched him, man and boy, pursuing and promoting the most commendable principles and objectives of organizations and movements in which he has earned the distinction of leadership.

Starting in early boyhood with a greater than average interest in Boy Scouting, Nick worked his way to the top to become not only one of the first Eagle Scouts in this section but a moving force in scouting over a period of years.

In his family life and in his business career as well as in the civic, fraternal, and religious life of the community, his has been a record of service above and beyond the call of duty. So it has been with his interest in Kiwanis which has taken him from youthful membership in the local club through all or nearly all of its offices, on to the district and State levels and up the ladder through a term as an international trustee and now as vice president of the worldwide organization.

But beyond the dedication, drive, and enthusiasm which have carried him to positions of honor and leadership in his chosen fields, we who have known Nick through the years have gained far more than gratification from his successes. Many of us and the community at large have benefited in many ways from his day-to-day practice of the high ideals and principles promoted by the organizaitons and movements in which he has taken a leading part.

We join his many other friends and fellow townsmen in congratulating Nick Swain on his most recent honor, in congratulating Kiwanis International for according such well-deserved recognition, and in congratulating ourselves for having one of our hometown boys achieve such a position of eminence among a topflight group of the world's business and professional men drawn together by strong bonds of high purpose, high principle, and a strong desire to be of service to their fellow men.

No Change in Soviet Objective of World Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate goal of the Communists never changes. Their final objective is to rule the world and every move made by the Kremlin is designed to reach that objective. One of the principle strategies of the Reds is to know when to retreat or to seem to change direction. The recently announced new program of the Soviet Union is merely another tactical move in the long cold war which they expect to win. In this connection I would like to call your attention to an analysis of the newest Communist plan which appeared in an editorial in the Dallas Times Herald in Dallas, Tex.:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Aug. 1, 1961]

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE PLAN—SAME OLD SONG, ANOTHER VERSE

The Soviet switch to a policy of "peaceful coexistence" should come as a surprise to nobody.

The Communists have had no change of heart. They are no less committed to world conquest and world domination now than at any time in the past.

This is a tactical rather than a strategic move.

Unfortunately, though, there are many well-meaning but uniformed Americans who are so anxious to avoid war or so anxious to read into the Reds' conduct some good intentions that they will be deceived by the announcement of a policy change.

It must be remembered that all Communists effort is aimed at furthering the Communist cause. War, peace offensives, subversion, guerrilla warfare, propaganda, economic pressure and negotiation are all weapons or tactics to be employed in what the Reds call "the struggle." The weapon or tactic employed is merely the one believed best for a particular job at a particular time.

Furthermore, there is considerable variation in meaning of terms between Communist and free worlds.

Peaceful coexistence to the average American—or the average citizen of any free nation—means merely live-and-let-live.

To the Communist it means the existence of both Communist and other states without overt warfare as long as they live on Communist terms.

That is the "Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence" which the Soviet people are ordered to support.

The party promises that free housing and free transportation are only a decade away but at the same time hedges by saying that

"complications in the international situation and a necessary increase in the strength of the Armed Forces can delay realization of the plans for the people's material welfare."

The policy is aimed also at lulling the western world into believing that the Soviets are really peace-loving, with no evil intentions against us. It is time to coincide with the beginning of our military buildup to meet the Berlin threat, with the obvious aim of discouraging such an effort.

But the Soviet also parades its military might—its new naval strength shown far greater than a year ago and its air force including powerful new bombers.

This adoption of a policy of peaceful coexistence represents no fundamental change in Soviet long-range objectives.

Communism still plans to bury us. The switch on grave digging is merely from blasting powder to pick and shovel.

Samurai Swordmaker Puts Knife to Cutlery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives a letter from Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and an article he wrote recently concerning Japanese steel and its importation into this country:

Hon. JOHN DENT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Your statement in the RECORD today was emblazoned with your usual brilliance and high vision, and I thought you might like to see my column on the same subject.

There is nothing in the RECORD that surpasses your material for straightforward thinking, and I only wish that we could get together sometime to discuss our mutual convictions.

If this column is worth placing in the RECORD, I will order a supply for mailing, unfranked.

Keep up the great work you are doing.

All good wishes.

Sincerely,

ED WIMMER,
Vice President, Public Relations Director.

SAMURAI SWORDMAKER PUTS KNIFE TO CUTLERY: SELF-REFORMED URGED ON BIG BUSINESS

(by Ed Wimmer)

A conference of Westinghouse managers from 10 States, meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, turned into one of the best audiences I have ever addressed.

My subject: "The inter-dependence of big and small business." * * * "What color and light can achieve in the rehabilitation of old neighborhoods," and "Not until big business adopts its own programs to preserve and perpetuate its smallest suppliers, distributors, and retailers, can big business hope to escape the growing socialistic controls now threatening to overwhelm our whole free enterprise system." Said one official:

"We've had our eyes on the biggest shopping centers; the biggest chains and discount houses, while all the time our greatest opportunity was resting with the almost forgotten neighborhoods of old established businesses."

After working on big business from the "outside" for 29 years, it was a satisfying experience to do some work from the "inside."

Haruo Ogiue, president of Wakataka Busan, K.K., Tokyo, Japan, is a prolific letter writer, and in one of his widely circulated communications Haruo writes about an American mail order company that sent him a famous-name cutlery set, for reproduction.

"We took the sample," reports Haruo, "and had the metal analyzed, putting the job of duplication in the hands of our oldest samurai swordmakers. They produced a set of equal quality cutlery in every respect, which we sold to our mail-order friends at one-tenth the cost of the American product. They sold $600,000 worth of these sets." Haruo continued:

"Here you have a concrete example of price comparatives that make those Americans wealthy who are represented properly in Japan. The American market is huge. Every man, woman, and child will spend an average of $6.02 this year for Japanese goods, and the biggest companies in the world, such as General Electric and Bulova, are either establishing offices and factories in Japan, or entering into agreements with our largest manufacturers. Why not you?"

Such duplication as Mr. Ogiue describes in his concrete example has been going on in every line of business and with the full cooperation of American "enterprisers" who, once they are on the gravy train of cheap imports, forget all about tariff regulations, American jobs, investments, or anything else. In the drug industry (which has been investigated so pulverizingly), billions have been spent in research of which foreign manufacturers have taken full advantage—producing one U.S. drug product after another for world markets at prices no American laboratory could ever hope to meet.

It's happening to dishes, clothing, textiles, bicycles, gloves, transistors, cameras, jewelry, plastics, machine tools, typewriters, sewing machines, bedspreads—you name it. Say some of our political leaders: "We can't regulate tariffs according to foreign wage patterns just yet. The countries we buy from would turn to the Communists, and that would be worse than going broke."

In other words, we can't afford not to destroy American industry in order to save it. What a dilemma.

Castro's Appeal for Protection Against the United States a Typical Communist Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald, of Dallas, Tex., relating to Fidel Castro's hypocritical appeal to the United Nations to protect him after his piracy of a U.S. plane:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, July 31, 1961]

PLANE'S WORTH $3.5 MILLION TO FIDEL FOR FLYING OR LYING

Fidel Castro apparently hopes to get more than $3.5 million use out of the hijacked Electra airliner he's holding at Havana.

And that doesn't include any flying time.

He has brought the case to the attention of the United Nations Security Council, he says, "in order not to give the United States a pretext for military action against Cuba." He asserts the United States is preparing to take military action against his country.

What Castro is really doing, though, is making use of a typical Communist technique. He charges he has been wronged in order to gain sympathy from the gullible or uninformed, to debate and delay action of any settlement while directing attention away from the Reds' preparation or weaknesses elsewhere.

This technique has been used many times—often with the United Nations Security Council or General Assembly as the soundingboard for Red propaganda.

Just now the technique could be put to use to take our attention away from Berlin, where Castro's Russian and East German comrades have placed themselves in an embarrassing position and now they may have to fight.

It could be used to give the other Latin Americans the idea that Castro is a peaceful soul who wants only the planes that are rightfully his—but is tough enough to keep those of the United States also. This, of course, would be a coverup for his business of trying to export the Cuban revolution to other Latin countries.

The United States may or may not go into Cuba with military force. That is a matter for the future. But if we should decide upon such a course, we need no pretext for it.

Fidel Castro and his comrades know as well as we do that the United States has ample reason to move against the island dictator to protect American lives, American property and Americans' right to freedom.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their res'dences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Freedom of the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "How Do You Stand, Sir?" by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, issue of July 4, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

Thus did Thomas Jefferson, working on a homemade portable desk, commence the Declaration of Independence which was ratified by the Members of the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776, in Philadelphia.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Although Jefferson did the actual drafting, he was assisted by a committee composed of John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Robert R. Livingston, and Roger Sherman.

It might be well for all of us to reread this document. The preamble and the definition of man's estate and Jefferson's concept of the role of Government are quite familiar to most of us. The balance of the statement is, I think, accurately described as a catalog of government tyranny—a bill of particulars—a list of grievances against the King and his Ministers.

The gentlemen of 1776 did not suggest that all governments should be destroyed or that man could prosper without government. Their complaint was against the exercise of unlimited power over their lives by a remote King.

Modern day cynics, who have made it their mission to debunk all historical fact, suggest that the Revolution was based primarily on economic reason and a desire on the part of some of the colonists to gain greater commercial advantage. I doubt if such a purpose would have enlisted the loyalties of those men who pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor.

The American Revolution was waged against governmental tyranny. It was fought against the concentration of unbridled power. It says that men are to be treated as equals—not as members of a group or class or collective.

The Founding Fathers didn't seek concessions from the mother country; they were not after subsidies; they didn't want programs of royal assistance; they were not asking for royal aid to a depressed area or the King's assistance for education. All they asked for was freedom and an opportunity to be the masters of their own destiny.

As governments grow in size and function, the freedom of the individual is diminished, and is transferred to government, equality disappears and the collective is exalted.

The proper function of government is to protect men, not to provide for them; to guard against the greedy reach of more powerful neighbors; to enlarge opportunity for individual responsibility, not to shrink it.

A government which focuses its attention entirely on man's physical needs debases man, for the soul feeds on freedom and responsibility and acknowledgement of God's sovereignty. How do you stand, sir?

Honey in the Rock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, quite often we who serve in the Congress are required to concentrate so heavily on major national problems that we temporarily lose sight of the real source of our national strength—the vitality which exists at the grassroots and in the communities of these United States. The many action programs which must be taken through the Federal structure of government occasionally cause us to forget that all of the good ideas do not originate in Washington, nor does all of the determination to pursue good ideas to a successful conclusion.

I was reminded of this circumstance yesterday with the publication of a review of the new folk drama "Honey in the Rock" by the New York Times on Sunday, August 6. This new play is an outstanding example of cooperative creative effort at the community level, and has become a source of pride for all of us who have watched it grow from an idea to a successful theatrical production which offers a slice of history, presented in a magnificent natural setting, to every American family in the eastern United States.

The story of this play—its origins, the obstacles overcome, and the persons responsible for its success—is contained in the New York Times review, and I believe that story merits the widest circulation. As a means of calling it to your attention, and of extending to you an invitation to see a vibrant re-creation of an important segment of our history, I, under unanimous consent, include the review in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DRAMATIC BOOTSTRAP—WEST VIRGINIA SPONSORS NEW AMPHITHEATER

(By Milton Esterow)

BECKLEY, W. VA.—In an idyllic woodland setting 2,500 feet high in the Allegheny Mountains—some 500 miles off Broadway—outdoor historical drama has carved itself another home. It is one of a number of arenas, mainly below the Mason-Dixon line, that will entertain about 450,000 persons from the United States and many foreign countries this summer.

Here in the hills of West Virginia, in the coal country pocked with deserted miner's shanties, a 1,000-seat amphitheater has been built on a gently sloping mountainside to recreate the glories of the American heritage and, hopefully, to attract tourists and revitalize a lagging economy.

In 900-acre Grandview State Park, the amphitheater, which opened June 27 with Kermit Hunter's "Honey in the Rock," an impressive play on how western Virginia became West Virginia, is 14 miles outside of Beckley. The seat of Raleigh County, Beckley is a neat, gracious town of 19,000 that has been relatively unaffected by the area depression.

SPARKPLUG

The launching of "Honey in the Rock" culminated a 7-year, $240,000 community and State project that was born in Beckley and is the personal triumph of a soft-spoken, self-effacing, 72-year-old man named Charles Hodel. Mr. Hodel who suffered the loss of his right leg when he was 9, publishes Beckley's two daily newspapers, the morning Beckley Post-Herald and the afternoon Raleigh Register.

The idea for an outdoor drama was first suggested in 1954. The following year, after a public meeting in Beckley, the West Virginia Historical Drama Association was chartered. This is a nonprofit producing group comprising farmers, teachers, housewives, bankers, and merchants. Mr. Hunter, a native of Welch, W. Va., drama professor at Hollins College in Roanoke, Va., and one of the more prominent writers of outdoor historical drama in the country, was commissioned to write a play.

DRIVE STARTED

A fundraising drive got underway. The dream foundered in the next couple of years as unemployment mounted in West Virginia and businessmen had to back out of money pledges. The association, led by Mr. Hodel, its current president, kept plugging. Mr. Hodel conducted what was virtually a door-to-door campaign.

Money started to come in. The chamber of commerce estimated that if the theater played only at 50 percent of capacity, it would bring $200,000 to $400,000 into the community in the summer, increasing retail sales by $2,500,000.

Mr. Hunter's "Unto These Hills," now in its 12th season in Cherokee, N.C., has attracted 1,500,000 persons and millions of dollars. Mr. Hunter also wrote "Bound for Kentucky!" which opened in Louisville last month. Among the other outdoor dramas are Paul Green's "The Lost Colony," now in its 21st season in Manteo, N.C.; Mr. Green's "The Common Glory" in Williamsburg, Va., and "The Stephen Foster Story" in Bardstown, Ky.

As the Beckley campaign continued, a businessman who had made a pledge which he later could not fulfill, offered a half-ton truck instead. Cash gifts ranged from 50 cents from school students to $3,000. Contractors gave material. Men from the sheriff's office volunteered to park cars and patrol the theater area. Radio and television stations gave free time for announcements publicizing the venture. An insurance man underwrote the insurance. Altogether, Beckley raised more than $70,000 to cover production costs.

STATE CONTRIBUTES

The State, nudged on by Mr. Hodel and looking toward 1963, when it celebrates its centennial, allocated $157,000 for the construction of the theater. The theater was completed weeks before the opening, which was attended by an audience of 1,020 and highlighted by a preshow ox roast.

The theater is a handsome one, with stereophonic sound equipment and a lovely open sky for its roof. There are 20-foot high stained pine wings shaped like louvres down the sides of the amphitheater leading into the wide and deep concrete stage. A grassy plot between the stage and the audience is used in several scenes. The air is cool and business at the blanket concession is brisk. With the help of the weatherman, "Honey in the Rock" will give 60 performances through September 3 at prices of up to $2.50.

Already, Beckley is finding honey in "Honey in the Rock." Thus far, attendance has averaged about 400 a night. Many of the rapt expressions seen at a recent performance are of people who have never before seen a play on stage. More than 14,000 persons from 44 States and 9 foreign countries, have paid their way in. Motels are adding units. Restaurants and hotels are remodeling. Gift shops are filling their shelves. Roads leading into the park are being improved. Railroads and bus lines are promoting tours.

The title of the play refers to the State's natural resources—coal, oil, gas. If the play has rough spots and if the technique of writing for a mass audience is not altogether subtle, Mr. Hunter has endowed his play with a sense of moral integrity. With taste and imagination he has integrated song, dance, and drama into the tumultuous days of secession, the birth of a State, the Civil War.

STUDENT PERFORMERS

The cast of 60 is made up mostly of college and university students from the area. Some of the acting is excellent. The direction, the choral singing, the settings, the costumes, the lighting, the special music, the dancing, contribute effectively.

Some of the good burghers of Virginia have indicated distress because the difference of opinion with western Virginia emerges as less than a friendly, brotherly affair. Mr. Hunter maintains that, historically, things just weren't too peaceful. And there will be those who may quibble over minor anachronisms. A local historian noted that the telegram received in the play in 1861 wasn't possible because the telegraph wire didn't arrive in the New River country until 1862.

PLAY'S MESSAGE

In any case, "Honey in the Rock" is a reality. Mr. Hunter's message is not only for West Virginia but also for the rest of the country. The honey is being drained from the rock, he is saying. The rivers are blackened and polluted. Forests are gone. Have we not sold our birthright for the making of money?

But Mr. Hunter is not discouraged. The honey is still in the rock, he says. There are men and women of vision and courage and the future lies in their hands.

In a time when America is busy reliving its past and looking toward the future, "Honey in the Rock," as a community and State project and as a play in a setting of breathtaking grandeur, perpetuates the magic of the theater and the majesty of the land.

Plight of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the New Haven Register of August 3, 1961, there appeared an editorial entitled "Financial Transfusion: A Railroad Necessity," in which the editor deals with the crisis affecting the New Haven Railroad.

The editorial bears out a point I have made several times in discussing the issue, namely, that in the immediate crisis, the only source of sufficient financial transfusion of money is the Federal Government itself. The inescapable fact is that the money must be made available or the trains will actually stop running. Recently the ICC has approved an additional loan of $5 million to keep the railroad running, but the situation will be much more serious than that, and there will have to be a complete reconsideration of the attitude of the Federal Government toward the New Haven Railroad and other railroads which have been brought to their knees by competition subsidized by the Federal Government itself.

Because the editorial deals so ably with this important issue, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL TRANSFUSION: A RAILROAD NECESSITY

The immediate job of the New Haven Railroad—and its new trustees—is to stay in business long enough for governmental aid to take hold and to provide the basis for a long-term reorganization effort. Even this, it seems, is not going to be easy.

It has been disconcerting in the past few days to hear the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission proclaim his belief that the railroad has slipped "into what I very much fear will be its final resting place."

Chairman Hutchinson's view, it seems to us, is one that nobody, in or out of Government, can quite afford in its extreme of pessimism. Because—the complete collapse and closing of New Haven Railroad operations is something that New England and the country cannot possibly accept or permit.

In a period of peace and highest prosperity we could not afford the death of this railroad.

In a period of long-sustained—and even rising—international tension the railroad's plight becomes a part of our whole defense posture. We have only to hark back to the gasoline rationing of World War II, to the drastic curtailment of truck transport and of highway passenger travel, to the dangerous wartime dropoff in seaborne oil shipments to New England, to realize that there can be no complacency—even in nonmetropolitan areas where commuter problems are not a factor—about the prospect of a shutdown in service for the New Haven Railroad.

Judge Anderson's Monday warning about the essentiality of early Federal aid is another matter. Said he:

"If the New Haven doesn't get the Government aid it will certainly fail." The Register has always maintained that direct Government subsidy—State or Federal—is not a long-term answer to the New Haven Railroad's problems. We remain convinced that the railroads can be made effective and self-supporting if the legislative imbalances and the political burdens—mostly in harsh taxes and stifling regulations—of at least five decades are cleared away and the railroads are put on a realistic competitive basis with other forms of travel and transport.

But in the immediate crisis the only source of sufficient financial transfusion is the Federal Government. The inescapable fact is that the money must be made available or the trains will actually stop running. And this is a calamity which, despite the ICC Chairman's dim view, would be too hurtful—in nationwide terms—to permit for even a day.

American Medical Association Strike Vote Rectified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for Monday, July 3, 1961:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION STRIKE VOTE RECTIFIED

In fear and definance, the 216 members of the American Medical Association's house of delegates last week again condemned President Kennedy's old-age health insurance proposal. In fact, they resolved that the profession "will not be a party to implementing any system which is un-American and detrimental to the public welfare." This implied threat of a doctors' strike, however, went too far. So the delegates were hastily recalled to clarify ambiguities and to correct a serious error.

To many a layman—and perhaps to many a doctor, too—this was not the only error in the resolution. For example, how would the American Medical Association prove that provision for old-age care by payments made during working years would "result in a deterioration of the type of medical care rendered the public?" After all, such care can be rendered only by doctors, and so only they could be responsible for its deterioration.

Unfortunately, the word "government" sets off an almost automatic reaction in the delegates. Thus, they came out against legislative authorization for the Food and Drug Administration's determination of the efficacy and safety of drugs, saying that "the

marketing of a relatively useless drug is infinitely less serious than would be arbitrary exclusion from the market of a drug that might have been lifesaving for many persons." Surely this reverses matters with a vengeance. It is not relatively useless drugs which wolud be barred, but positively dangerous concoctions. And should not the public be protected against them as against any other menace?

Happily, all of the Nation's 251,800 doctors do not feel as does a majority of the delegates. They brushed aside a proposal to have the American Medical Association poll the doctors to find out how many want to be covered by social security, yet it is estimated that between 40 and 50 percent of the country's doctors are in salaried positions or for other reasons already under social security.

So it seems a fair assumption that most of the profession, despite the standpat position of the American Medical Association, will cooperate when Congress, in response to a growing public demand, sets up an old-age health insurance plan. This is on the way because it is the only dignified and economical way to meet a serious human need.

Cooperative Apartments for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix following these remarks news stories, from the Newark Evening News of February 15, 1961, and the Princeton Town Topics of July 2–8, 1961.

These articles concern the Princeton Manor House, a new community of residential cooperative apartments planned for the elderly. This project has been "planned to be in striking contrast to the old folks' home idea." Princeton Manor House will be financed by the residents, who must be 55 or older, and will be completely self-sufficient.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News, Feb. 15, 1961]

COOP APARTMENT PLANNED FOR ELDERLY—WILL BE ON SITE NEAR PRINCETON

PRINCETON.—Plans for a $5 million community of residential cooperative apartments designed to provide older persons with security, comfort and physical care as well as social and recreational activities, were revealed today by O. Kline Fulmer, chairman of the board of trustees of Princeton Manor House.

The proposed center will contain accommodations for 400 to 500 persons, according to Fulmer. It will be financed by the residents, who must be 55 or older, and will be completely self-sufficient, with dining and full medical facilities.

Princeton Manor House will be erected on a 35-40 acre site within 10 driving minutes of Princeton, Fulmer said. Four or five sites are being considered and the final selection will be made shortly.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The main building, it is proposed, will have about seven or eight floors, comprised of residential elevator apartments. Some cottages and garden apartments may also be provided later.

Plans include a large modern dining room, hospital-infirmary, hobby shops, sewing rooms, and such recreational facilities as billiards, shuffleboard, a library, art rooms, TV parlors and general lounge rooms.

Outdoors there will be individual garden plots, bowling-on-the-green, golf-putting greens, numerous paths and picnic facilities. There will be a year-round sun deck, and an auditorium-meeting hall for general group entertainment, such as musicals and movies, and for religious services. The community will be nondenominational.

GUEST ROOMS TOO

Apartments will be varying sizes and include wall-to-wall carpeting, kitchenettes, full baths, large walk-in closets and private sun terraces. They will be equipped with individual thermostatic heat control and optional air conditioning. All apartments will be unfurnished.

Guest rooms will also be provided for the overnight use of tenant's visitors. The kitchenettes will have electric ranges, refrigerators and sinks so that residents may cook meals in their rooms although the basic monthly charge will include meals.

The dining room will be large enough to serve all residents at tables seating one to six. An experienced dietitian will plan the meals. Each person may sit at a table of his choice, and select his own companions. A private dining room will be available for parties.

The infirmary will include a pharmacy, radiological and therapy facilities, a physician available at all times, and nurses and aids for 24-hour service. Some apartments will be connected to the infirmary for ambulatory residents who need medical supervision.

Residents will purchase a lifetime lease contract upon entering into membership in the project. These contracts are expected to run from $8,500 to $12,000 for single occupancy rooms, and may go up to $24,000 for a double occupancy suite.

FIXED MONTHLY CHARGE

In addition, members will pay a fixed monthly charge which is expected to range from $120–$140 per person. This charge will include meals, utilities, maid service, flat laundry, cleaning services and the use of all recreational facilities.

Members may withdraw from the project at any time, although the lease contract will be good for the member's lifetime. Upon withdrawal a refund of the initial payment, adjusted to the period of occupancy, will be made according to Fulmer.

Any profit which may be realized from the project will be put into a special relief fund, to be directed by the board of trustees, Fulmer said. This fund will be applied to upkeep costs and other improvements.

REQUIREMENTS SET

Basic requirements for participation are that the member be 55 years of age or older, be completely ambulatory, free from communicable disease, not restricted to a special diet, have sufficient funds to cover the initial cost of purchase and have assured income to meet personal needs.

A physical examination will be required of all applicants.

"It is hoped," Fulmer said, "that construction can be completed by 1962." He said that at least 200 applications would have to be received before work could be started.

[From the Princeton Town Topics, July 2–8, 1961]

Otis Kline Fulmer, able Princeton architect and partner in the far-reaching firm of Fulmer & Bowers, who is the locomotive force in carrying forward the carefully projected plans for Princeton Manor House, $5 million community of residential cooperative apartments especially designed for older persons. While Manor House, currently pegged at 364 apartments, offers no easy panacea, it does represent a distinctive, refreshing approach to one of the Nation's most pressing domestic problems—a rapidly aging population—and breaks sharply with the unfortunate American tradition of attempting to place elderly citizens in social backwaters during their so-called declining years.

As early as 1946 Fulmer, then headquartered in New York following a year as director of design with the great—if controversial—Norman Bel Geddes, began wrestling with the problem of intelligently planned housing for retirement living, an area in which basic conceptions had been largely limited to real estate developments and old-folks homes. Major insurance companies, particularly those offering endowment policies as an effective way of covering those golden later years, seemed to be logical sponsors and to several of them Fulmer suggested the possibility of establishing policies that would yield life income and would also provide attractive residential opportunities. These first thoughts came to naught.

With his former Manhattan-based firm, Churchill, Fulmer Associates, flourishing, and winning recognition for its undertakings in the spheres of urban planning, large-scale housing projects and education, Fulmer continued to probe for the right kind of shelter environment for older, generally retired persons. By 1956, 4 years after he had moved to Princeton, he had completed preliminary drawings for what has since been developed into Manor House with its complex of supporting facilities, including a fully equipped infirmary, central, hotel-like dining arrangements and recreational and social outlets.

The next step, leading to the creation of a nine-member local board of trustees headed by the 56-year-old Fulmer, was suggested by the example of the highly successful Willamette View Manor in Portland, Oreg. He visited Portland in 1960, made arrangements for continuing consultation with Willamette Manor, and last February announced the first such retirement residence in the eastern United States. "There is," in Fulmer's words, "no speculation, no Government assistance, no mortgage financing and the trustees are giving their time, experience and effort without charge. Our progress is dependent entirely on the reaction of potential residents."

A native of McKeesport, Pa., and a graduate of Carnegie Institute of Technology and Harvard, Fulmer is one of the few American architects of his vintage who can claim a 6-month apprenticeship in the Soviet Union, where in 1932 he and his wife survived food shortages and a jolting crossing of Siberia via the Trans-Siberian Railway. During World War II, after he had been associated with the design and administration of the Greenbelt community near Washington, D.C., he was National Technical Director for Housing under the Federal Defense Housing Act.

For seeking workable approaches to the conditions presented by our mushrooming above-60 population; for advancing a housing prototype, organized along nonprofit and nondenominational lines, that could conceivably appeal to some 20 percent of the country's senior citizens; for his thoughtful concern for an architect's social obligation; he is Town Topics' nominee for Princeton's man of the week.

Greetings to National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 6, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the privilege of bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the House the fine words of greeting extended to the delegates of the 48th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by our great congressional leaders. Following are the words of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, our Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN III. I insert also a letter from the pen of the distinguished minority leader written to the delegates of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I just said to my beloved friends from the State which has given me the privilege and the honor of serving in Washington so long that during the last 14 days we have traveled around the world, and have visited with the heads of states in eight countries. Never in all of my 53 years have I been so proud to be an American.

I am proud because our people have a sense of history and a sense of adventure. I am proud because our people are stable and solid, yet unselfish. I am proud because our people realize that what affects the rest of the world is our concern.

Lady Bird and I have traveled in countries that have a population in excess of three-quarters of a billion people. In the whole world we are outnumbered 18 to 1. Yet we are conscious of the fact that a world will not long be peaceful where only one nation is affluent and all the others are impoverished.

The mother and father, wherever they live, cherish their young just as we do. But in most of the countries we visited their per capita income is less per year than yours is per week.

I told these people of the great progress we have made in the United States. I also disregarded the advice of some of the pessimists and I went out in the streets and the villages to meet the people.

There seemed to be calamities all around us. When we left the Philippines they had the biggest fire in history. When we pulled out of Hong Kong we were followed by the biggest typhoon in history. When we went down the streets of Vietnam it was on an evening when they were killing seven or eight people.

We found disturbances everywhere we went—but they were disturbances that were brought about because the Communist Party and its masters are trying to engulf and envelop areas and people who are resisting. Everywhere I went I also met people who loved America.

They told me that it was not the custom to shake hands in Thailand and they told me that it would be dangerous to walk through crowds on the streets of Pakistan. But in both of those countries it was only a short time until the young dashed through the police motorcade and security people and asked to grab our hands.

Their eager desire to greet a representative of America is one of the reasons I'm proud to be American and I am very proud to be here with you because you have helped to make America what it is. You have been concerned not only with our human resources but with our natural resources.

You have come here each year to give us the inspiration and the stimulation and the shove and the vision to go ahead and fully exploit and develop our great rivers and our great harbors. Because of that we are powerful; because of that we are leaders. So, in effect, you really constitute a substantial part of the leadership of all the world and we want to leave this a better world than we found it.

We want this world to be more enjoyable for our children than it has been for us. We have a higher goal and a higher ambition for them than our fathers had for us and we are going to realize it because men like you are not going to stand still. We are going to move ahead to new goals and to new achievements.

I am very grateful that you invited me to come here. I have taken too much of your time, but I am very appreciative of the contribution that you make to the development of the resources of this country. Thank you.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, MINORITY LEADER IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President and my fellow Americans, I'm delighted to see you. I'm a little late for the program—we had a minority leadership meeting this morning which encompasses among other things a session with the press, newsreel and TV cameras, and, since they shifted it from Thursday until Friday, that accounts for my delay, otherwise I would have been a little more punctilious. Now I come to greet you and I think I come to lobby you this morning. When I say greet you I probably in other years could have done it with greater ceremony, for, once upon a time, I was the unofficial mayor of Washington. You may be interested in knowing how you become the unofficial mayor. When I came down in an opposition landslide in 1932 my hopes were high, my ego had been lifted to the skies, and I thought I could command anything that was within the gift of the leadership in the Congress. And so promptly I put in for two committees—first, Appropriations—I thought it would be more fun to be on a committee where you spend money. Secondly, Ways and Means—If I couldn't get on Appropriations then I'd be where I could tax the life out of you and that probably would be equal fun. And when I submitted the list and the committee on committees finally gave it careful scrutiny, I came out not with two committees but with four. I was on Insular Affairs, believe it or not and on Immigration, and on Territories, and on the District of Columbia, and if Illinois isn't far set from the jurisdiction of any of those committees then I give up. So for 16 years I have served the people in the Nation's Capital as a member of the District of Columbia Committee before I fell from grace and went to the Senate. But you see when you become chairman of the District Committee you become the unofficial mayor of Washington. And so this morning I must greet you as the former unofficial mayor of Washington, and I'm afraid under those circumstances I cannot well present you a key to the city. Now the second thing I think I ought to do is to congratulate you as probably the most refined, the most constructive, the most dedicated, and the most unselfish lobby that comes to Washington.

I say a refined lobby in the sense that I've never found you pushy—I think it's because you have confidence in your own cause and you know what you're about, and I say constructive because you have that felicitous way of dividing up these projects that come to your attention, holding hearings on them, and doing a great deal of the spadework before they ever land on Capitol Hill. And then I say "dedicated" because you're dedicated to the conservation of natural resources. And, finally, I say "unselfish" because you cover the gamut of the whole country—and so I congratulate you as a great and unselfish, constructive lobby that does a great deal of good. Your very longevity and the length of these conventions and, Mr. President, it's my understanding that this is your 48th convention, is the best testimony I know as to the durability of the cause and the good work that you contrive. You see that it's an easy date for me to remember. Your first convention came when I was graduating from high school in a country town in Illinois. And so you've been coming ever since or meeting one place and another to advance the cause of rivers and harbors and the conservation of those natural resources that mean so much to the survival of this country. And it will continue and continue because you are engaged in something that is dynamic rather than static, it doesn't stand still—nature changes face constantly, and always and always there is more work to be done. I sometimes think of Churchill attending a temperance luncheon given by the Women's Temperance Clubs of London, and when the chairlady introduced him she said, "Mr. Churchill, we are so proud of you and what contributions you've made to the cause of empire, but there is one think that gives us great distress, you've also gained a world-wide reputation as a drinker of Napoleon brandy. In fact, Mr. Prime Minister, we are advised that if all the brandy you've consumed were poured into this one room it would come up to here on the wall." And Churchill looked at her hand, he looked at the ceiling, he looked at the floor, and finally he says, "Oh, my dear, so much to be done, so little time in which to do it."

Now, I said I came here to lobby you and I wasn't fooling, because you see I read these things that come out. You divide up these various projects in divisions and I suppose everybody who has a project likes to get into division 1. Now for a Senator to come and lobby you is like the old story, "Man bites dog." Now I may be violating a Federal law * * * why the law books, you know, are so far in extent and I don't know all the things that are in them * * * and this may be a sheer violation of law, but that's one of the risks and hazards that I've got to undertake. So you see, in division 2 marked "meritorious projects" is a project, in fact, it's second on the list. It has the docket number 1094–R1–1 and it's the Rend Lake project in Illinois and it's in the division of the lower Mississippi Valley. I know Rend Lake, I know what it means to southern Illinois, I know what it means to an area that has been tagged already as a part of the distress section and singled out for special consideration by the Congress. But I know the people there also, I know what they've done on their own and I know what the State has undertaken in order to consummate this, because one of the things we can do in southern Illinois, where temperatures are a good deal milder than they are in Chicago and the upper regions of the State * * * we can reach out, of course, and make some of these areas highly recreational in purpose and develop the water resources there and that's what would be consummated by the Rend Lake project. So, may I indulge, Mr. President, the rather prayerful hope this morning * * * and you can ignore me, if you will and it won't make any difference in our relations, because those will always remain fe-

licitous and sympathetic and understanding, but there would be joy in the morning and great rejoicing, if some day I picked up this folder of your and I found that Rend Lake had sneaked from division 2 to division 1, the projects that are endorsed. Oh, I would beat my breast in glee and I would go before the Budget Director and before the Appropriations Committee and the Public Works Committee * * * I'd say, "You can't turn it down, look what I've got, the Rivers and Harbors Congress has put it in division 1." I'm delighted to see you.

ADDRESS BY SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, old friend Bob Sikes, and my friends who are assembled here to do some of the world's great work—and when I say "world's great work" I mean just that, because if there was ever a time in this Nation's history, or in the history of the civilization that we know and love, when dedication, when patriotic endeavor should come and remain, and we should be willing to make the sacrifices that are necessary in order to maintain our liberties and our freedom, in my book, that hour is now—I believe that the civilization that you and I know and love, that has come down to us for more than 1,900 years, Christian civilization, stands in greater danger today than it has at any time in the 19 centuries than we've known it. The President of the United States yesterday, with courage and with candor and with vision, laid before a joint session of Congress, the people of the United States, and the people of the world, in unvarnished language, what we as Americans must do if we are to retain the freedoms and the liberties that we have so long enjoyed and if we are to measure up to the inarticulate longings of humanity throughout the length and breadth of the earth by being their leader, standing up, willing to serve humanity here and elsewhere in time of uneasy peace like we have now, or in time of great stress and strain when bullets are flying and bombs are dropping. I can remember in 1938 and 1939 when I'd been majority leader of the House of Representatives, up into 1940, President Roosevelt had recommended, on account of the condition the world was in, when part of it was already aflame with war, that we should spend a little money to be ready to defend ourselves if the time should come. I'm sure he thought, as I thought, that a great disturbance could not happen anywhere in the world without engulfing the whole world. They said: "Who's going to fight us? We have two big oceans to wrap around ourselves here; that's going to keep us safe and secure." Those oceans turned out to be the greatest hazards that we had. We didn't spend the money to deter our enemies; and then it cost us, in less that 5 years, more than $400 billion to keep international desperadoes off our shores. We all want to preserve this civilization, these priceless freedoms and liberties, let me repeat, but it's going to cost money and it's going to cost a lot of money. Not $400 billion in less than 4 years, but many billions, and we're trying our best, and our economy is rising—there isn't any question about that—we're trying our best to make our people prosperous enough that they can pay the taxes that we may appropriate the money to make ourselves safe. Now this thing of going around wanting to be free and bellyaching all the time about having to pay taxes for that freedom just won't work. No country on the face of the earth ever had liberty and retained it that didn't pay the price for it.

Well, I think Bob asked me here to welcome you to Washington. I don't live here, I've been in and out of here for a little more than 48 years, but I live in Bonham, Tex. I've never traveled over the world like LYNDON has. The principal traveling I've done is between here and north Texas that I like a lot. But I do, on my part, welcome you here and congratulate you on the great ideas that you have for the future of our country, for its development materially, and want to say that we join with you in that effort to make our country greater, more prosperous, more comfortable, more convenient. I think this Congress has done great work in the past; I'm sure it will do more and more in the future; and, therefore, I'm happy to join with you this morning in greeting and welcoming you to the Capital of your country. Thank you.

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: We should be very glad if you could have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the greetings which were extended to the delegates at our recent 48th National Convention by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and Senator EVERETT MCK. DIRKSEN, copies of which are enclosed.

With appreciation of your continued courtesy and cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. WEBB,
Executive Vice President.

Cold War GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks I have made today on the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Washington Post, issue of Monday, August 7, 1961, under the title "Second Red Astronaut in Orbit, Sleeps, Eats, and Talks To Earth." I think the article points up the necessity of educating the young people of America, and such an effort would provide the strongest possible argument for the cold war GI bill. Such progress on the part of the Russians and the President's recent callup for more men every month under the draft makes the emergency more critical. The bill will be reported to the Senate by the committee on Thursday of this week. I hope that the Senate will take favorable action on the cold war GI bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND RED ASTRONAUT IN ORBIT, SLEEPS, EATS AND TALKS TO EARTH—SPACEMAN EXPECTED TO LAND TODAY—CRAFT AND ITS PILOT FUNCTION NORMALLY; MOSCOW EXULTANT

(By George Syvertsen)

Moscow, August 7.—The Soviet Union's second astronaut was rocketed into orbit around the earth Sunday and continued his flight today after lunch, supper and a night's sleep aboard his spacecraft.

There were predictions that he would land today, after 24 hours aloft and 17 trips around the earth.

The spaceman, Maj. Gherman Stephanovich Titov, 26, who calls himself "The Eagle," said good night by radio at 6:30 p.m. Moscow time Sunday, 9½ hours after blasting-off time, and said he was settling down to sleep.

Moscow radio said he was scheduled to awaken at 2 a.m. Monday (7 p.m. e.d.t. Sunday) but overslept—until 2:37 a.m.

About a half hour later he radioed that he was feeling well.

Titov completed his 14th circuit of the earth at 5:45 a.m. Moscow time (10:45 p.m. e.d.t.). Tass said Titov had covered 574,000 kilometers (356,680 miles)—a distance far greater than from the earth to the moon.

His flight dwarfed the pioneer orbital exploit of his friend, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who made one circuit of the earth last April 12 in 1 hour and 48 minutes.

"Good night, I am going to bed," Titov radioed before signing off for the night.

"Everything in the cabin is the same as before," he radioed. He said the cabin's automatically controlled temperature and pressure were excellent. This was after his sixth orbit.

"I wish you had it so good," Titov wisecracked. "All goes excellently. I want to wish you, dear Muscovites, good night.

"Now I am going to bed. You do what you want, but I am going to bed."

Moscow radio said two-way radio and television communication with the spaceship would be temporarily suspended while Titov slept but that automatic devices would insure continuous operation of the spacecraft.

PULSE NORMAL

Weightlessness appeared to be having no physical effect on the young astronaut. A communique said that even while he slept his pulse was a normal 58 beats a minute.

It had been an active and exciting day for the spaceman. He operated the controls of his 5-ton craft, ate a three-course lunch, exchanged congratulations from space with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Gagarin, ate supper and went through setting-up exercises, Moscow radio said.

In between, Titov radioed greetings to all parts of the world as he flew over all continents.

"I am eagle, I am eagle," the young air force pilot said at one point in what appeared to be sheer exultation.

The display of Soviet technology, outclassing the two short U.S. sallies into space, set the stage for Khrushchev's speech tonight on the dispute over Berlin.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT

Khrushchev likes to have a major Soviet accomplishment just ahead of an important pronouncement.

The flight will have an incalculable psychological effect on people of the non-Communist world and is expected to lend even greater emphasis to Khrushchev's words.

There had been speculation that powerful Soviet rocket boosters would put a larger, two-man space ship into orbit. But the official Tass announcement gave the weight as 4,731 kilograms (10,430 pounds), about the same weight as Gagarin's spacecraft.

On his circuits of the earth, Titov was reaching a maximum altitude of 159.59 miles and a minimum of 110.5 miles, Tass said. Gagarin's orbit was more elongated, with a minimum height of 110 miles and a maximum of 188 miles. Titov's period of revolution is 88.6 minutes, Tass reported.

(The Soviet Ambassador in Canada, A. A. Aroutunian, told reporters in Nova Scotia the flight would continue for 17 orbits and end about 24 hours after takeoff. He was in Nova Scotia with Gagarin, who cut short his Canadian visit and headed home soon after he heard the news.)

The announcement of man's latest leap into space was broadcast over Moscow radio as the capital's citizens were leaving their

crowded apartments to spend a sunny Sunday on the city's river beaches and broad avenues.

The announcement said the spaceship, Vostok II, had been launched at 9 a.m., Moscow time (2 a.m. e.d.t.). Gagarin's pioneer ship was named Vostok I.

The broadcast said the flight was intended to study the effects on a human being of prolonged orbital flight and descent to the earth's surface.

Another purpose was to study man's work capacity during a sustained period of weightlessness.

Titov's flight program included maneuvering his ship with manual controls, and calisthenics. This indicated there was plenty of room in the spaceship to move around.

Two radio and television circuits sent a steady flow of messages between the spaceship and stations on earth.

Titov, the son of a schoolteacher, sent repeated reports that he was feeling fine. On his second orbit, Titov sent Khrushchev a message telling him everything was proceeding normally.

The Soviet Premier radioed back telling Titov: "All the Soviet people rejoice boundlessly in your successful flight and are proud of you."

Later Titov sent back thanks for Khrushchev's "fatherly concern," adding:

"I will carry out the assignment of the party and government without fail. Tell this to Nikita Khrushchev."

A Tass communique said that at the end of his third orbit Titov took a half hour out for lunch, then reported: "I have had my lunch. I feel excellent."

On the fourth circuit of the earth, Titov spent an hour resting as his space ship flew over Madrid, Paris, Copenhagen, and Leningrad, Moscow radio said.

Tass estimated Titov passed over Washington at 5:54 p.m. Moscow time (10:45 a.m. e.d.t.).

The Tass announcement invited the people of the world to listen in on the transmissions.

FREQUENCIES LISTED

"The pilot-cosmonaut broadcasts on the frequencies 15,765, 20,600 and 143,625 megacycles," Tass said. "Also installed on the space ship is a transmitter with signals on the frequency of 19,995 megacycles."

Soviet technicians on the ground watched Titov's reactions through the flight over a TV hookup. His condition and the functioning of the ship's instruments were telemetered back to earth. The ship was reported to have rocketed into an orbit close to the calculated one.

After completing the fifth circuit, Titov reported: "shipshape order on board. Am feeling fine."

Titov found time for supper on the sixth trip around the earth. On finishing the sixth circuit he reported: "Pressure in the cabin constant, humidity 70 percent, temperature 20° (68° F.); feeling completely comfortable."

Medical data transmitted to earth showed little effect on Titov because of the state of weightlessness, a communique said. Pulse and respiration were given as practically the same as readings taken before Titov went into space. His ability to work was in no way impaired, the communique added.

Russian listeners heard Titov's voice from space in a special home service broadcast. Said the spaceman:

"This is the eagle speaking. The flight is going excellently. I am feeling very well."

Tass published comments on the flight pouring in from all directions.

A. Nemiro, a doctor of physical and mathematical sciences at the Pulkovo Observatory near Leningrad, said the next stage of Soviet space exploration would be a landing of a manned spacecraft on the moon.

"We are sure that the day is not far off when Soviet scientists will ride cosmic ships into space and carry out astronomic investigations, observations and calculations in the depth of the space," he added.

PRAVDA PUBLISHES EXTRA

Prof. Boris Klosovsky, corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences, told Tass that in the future doctors may send people through space to treat many diseases, thus extending the lifespan.

The Communist Party newspaper Pravda took the unusual step of publishing an extra edition Sunday afternoon to report on Titov's flight.

A commentator from the Moscow television station gathered about 200 persons in the midst of Red Square and asked them about the flight.

"I am very happy to be living in a time when such great exploits are going on," said one.

"This great deed testifies to the great advancement of our socialist motherland," said another.

An African Negro speaking in broken Russian said: "This is all being done for the people fighting for peace."

Titov's feat was viewed in Western Europe as a triumph of Soviet science—and a possible prelude to a manned shot at the moon.

Scientists recognized the flight of Vostok II with its human pilot as a demonstration of bounding Soviet confidence.

Britain's top space watcher, Prof. Sir Bernard Lovell, told reporters:

"This is another important step in the Russian plan to populate the solar system beginning with the invasion of the moon in a few years' time."

Lovell, director of Britain's giant radio telescope at Jodrell Bank in northern England, said:

"I am far from being pro-Russian in the political sense; on the contrary. But I think one of the greatest dangers in the world today is to doubt their strength in science and technology."

Kenneth Gatland, secretary of the British Interplanetary Society, said: "This launching shows the growing confidence the Russians have in their six-engine space booster and its ability to send human astronauts into orbit for increasing lengths of time."

More cautious words came from Prof. Herman Oberth, West German pioneer in rocket technology, who helped to design the V rockets of World War II.

"Actual difficulties in manned space flight begin only if the man stays in space for several weeks," he said. "Then the muscles and tissues of the human body will suffer because weightlessness bars any exercise of the limbs."

Ohio Newspaper Commends Office of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently noted with some concern and dismay adverse comments in the RECORD and the press about a report recently issued by the Office of Education entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future." A majority of these comments have been made by those who are actively opposed to any Federal programs for financial assistance to the Nation's schools. These persons have seized on this report as an indication of the desire of the Federal Government to "control" education. I feel that too little has been said to place this document in its proper perspective. Therefore, it pleases me to bring to your attention the following editorial from the Toledo, Ohio, "Blade" of Sunday, July 9, 1961:

ANOTHER CONSPIRACY?

A minor hullabaloo has been kicked up around the country over a booklet on the U.S. Office of Education. Thanks to Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES of Akron, who stirred up the controversy, it could result in wider understanding of the Federal Government's role in public education.

But not if Mr. AYRES' wild and contradictory charges are taken at face value.

He contends that the booklet exposes a behind-the-scenes plot to usurp local school control. He also charges that the report is semi-secret, suggesting that something sinister has been conjured up by the administration.

Actually, the booklet reports the findings of a committee asked to review operations of the U.S. Office of Education and its organization.

The project was initiated by the Eisenhower administration, and the committee was appointed by the former commissioner of education who served that administration. Its work was not completed until this year, and the recommendations—advisory only—were printed in 2,000 copies of a 56-page booklet entitled, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future."

If that limited printing of recommendations—for office study only—is a secret plot, then Mr. Ayres has an exaggerated concept of public interest in reports of that nature.

As a matter of fact, the report had already been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before he sounded off Wednesday. Later last week it was distributed at the convention of the National Education Association in Atlantic City.

This is a conspiracy?

The committee chairman and author of the report happens to be Homer D. Babbidge, a Republican holdover as Assistant U.S. Commissioner of Education. Last year the junior chamber of commerce named him one of the Nation's 10 outstanding young men.

His report has three major recommendations:

Change the name of the Office of Education to the U.S. Education Agency.

Create a Board of Advisers to the Commissioner of Education, with members appointed by the President. It would be comprised primarily of laymen rather than professional educators to assist the Commissioner in forming policies that reflect the "broadest objectives of American society."

Set up four major bureaus in the agency to handle higher education aid programs, elementary and secondary aid, international education, and educational research.

This is what Mr. Ayres attacks as a "master plan for the Federal control of education." Yet the aid programs already exist and must be handled more effectively. Congressional grants for education are already 30 times larger than they were just over a decade ago.

What the committee recommends is not control over local activity but better control over what goes on in Washington, with an outside group of distinguished laymen to take a more objective look at it.

It is significant that the report stirred criticism at the NEA convention and has been frowned on by other professional groups. These are the very organizations

that have been attacked for trying to "socialize education.

The committee report, on the other hand, states that the Federal agency "must be an office of education, not an office of educators."

This is an admirable aim. As Mr. Ayres advises, interested citizens should by all means write to the U.S. Office of Education for copies of the report—especially since his public analysis is so distorted.

A Suggestion for the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on August 3 the Hartford Times published an editorial entitled "A Suggestion, Mr. President." The suggestion really is that Mr. Kennedy, our President, could dramatize his own inaugural appeal for sacrifice by making one of his own, namely, the sacrifice of objectives that are more politically than economically viable in the present world crisis.

The editorial, which is a very serious one published in an independent newspaper, endorses some of the positions that I myself have recently taken on the floor of the Senate. The editorial deals with some of the domestic spending measures and the necessity for paying more attention to the balancing of our budget, and to the admonitions of the President himself respecting care and control in the spending of money beyond budget requests.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUGGESTION, MR. PRESIDENT

We think President Kennedy has an opportunity and an obligation now to review the nonmilitary items of his budget and cut them back. The Hartford Times believes that the American people do not want or need all of the social-economic spending programs that have been submitted to Congress by the President simultaneous with military demands that will consume almost 60 percent of the Federal income.

Those who assume that we can afford both an enlarged, diversified, and strengthened Military Establishment and the uplift inherent in subsidies, grants-in-aid, and the race for the moon can hardly oppose a raise in Federal taxes. And that, we believe, is unnecessary at this time.

Reducing nondefense expenditures to offset an emergency request for some $5 billion more in national defense is in itself stubbornly difficult. As Arthur Krock pointed out recently, some $18.9 billion of that nondefense spending is considered politically uncontrollable. That means not enough Members of Congress have the courage to wield the knife on programs such as public assistance grants to the States, appropriations for foreign-aid development loans and grants, veterans' pensions and other benefits, agricultural subsidies, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Eisenhower budget set a level of $15.1 billion for such Federal "housekeeping" functions as agency upkeep and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is regarded as "controllable" spending. The Kennedy administration has added to this costs of the antirecession program and $435 million for NASA to meet the public clamor for speed in the space race. And the total additions amount to several billions of dollars.

Here are some of the curbs that might find prevailing support at this time—even among those who support the affected programs, their objectives and the demonstrated need for them:

Rigid economy in departmental and agency disbursements, established and enforced by executive order. Postponement of the legislation for added Federal educational grants and loans of $2.5 billion and to start the numerous smaller spending programs with which the President has deluged Congress. A halt or stretching-out of the $20-$40 billion project to land a man on the moon. A percentage cut in and "watchdog" auditing of foreign aid appropriations of nearly $51 billion in the Kennedy budget for military and directly related programs, and effective Presidential discipline of the wasteful interservice rivalries which still exist.

After an indecisive and unimpressive start Mr. Kennedy has regained the initiative in the contest of wills between the United States and the Soviet Union. His requests for more defense money and specific authorization for manipulating manpower have been granted with unusual unanimity and speed in Congress. But he has proposed neither the deferment of his nondefense spending programs nor upward tax revisions to pay for them. We think this is wrong for at least two reasons:

First, it goes against the grain of reason to insist that this or any society can eat its cake and have it too; can commit added billions for an all-front and indefinite war against Russia, expand the money role of the Federal Government in civilian affairs and hang it all on an "expanding tax base."

Second, a hopeless campaign to achieve basically sound socioeconomic goals, but at the wrong time, is prejudicial to the goals and will defer a later achievement of them. We are thinking now particularly of aid to education.

We may find that a continuation of the wage-price spiral will go on pushing up the costs of defense, making a tax increase unavoidable under any circumstances. Certainly in that event our nondefense commitments should be held to a minimum in every conceivable way.

Mr. Kennedy could dramatize his own inaugural appeal for sacrifice by making one of his own—the sacrifice of objectives that are more politically than economically viable in the present world crisis.

Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including a pertinent and timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, as follows:

WASTE VERSUS USE

The 54 Members of the U.S. Senate who salvaged the Hanford atomic power project from the oblivion into which it had been cast by the House deserve the gratitude of taxpayers and consumers. It is now up to a joint conference committee of the two Houses to seek to compose the differences.

The practical issue involved in the Hanford proposal is simple and clear-cut. It is whether the tremendous quantities of heat which will be produced by the new reactor being built in the State of Washington, to turn out plutonium for munitions, shall be wasted into the Columbia River, or whether it shall be utilized to generate as a byproduct possibly as much electric power as one and a half Bonneville Dam. The opponents of conserving this byproduct, principally the electric power and coal industries, are unwilling to approach the issue on the basis of practicality. They raise the ideological and, to some extent, emotional objection that it would put the Government into the business of producing and selling atomic-electric power and that this would be bad.

Why would it be bad? The Government is already producing and selling electricity fueled by waterpower and coal where there are practical reasons for it. What is so much different about electricity fueled by atomic energy?

The public has every right to demand that some part of the new atomic-electric plant should be operated solely in its interest. It was the public's tax payments that paid for the development of atomic fission at a cost of some $2 billion. It is the public's tax payments preponderantly, and in most cases entirely, that are paying for the construction of atomic furnaces to put this technology into practical use.

The public deserves some return on its investment in the form of electricity produced and distributed at the lowest practicable price. Representatives who vote against that proposition are going to have their work cut out for them explaining to their constituents how they can justify turning a public investment into a private monopoly.

Morality and Welfare Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, much has been written about the 13 points of the city council of Newburgh, N.Y., relative to the welfare problem. I feel this is as much a question of morality as it is a question of law. The distinguished columnist Alice Widener has written an article entitled "Why Can't We Try To Develop Morality?" which was published in the Indianapolis Star of recent date. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALICE WIDENER SAYS: WHY CAN'T WE TRY TO DEVELOP MORALITY?

NEW YORK.—Last winter, when the State of Louisiana tried to reduce its heavy tax burden, partly arising from a welfare aid to dependent children program fostering il-

legitimate births, the New York Times bitterly criticized Louisiana and declared editorially that in such cases it is the children who are important and the mothers are only "incidental."

Recently, when Newburgh in New York enacted welfare rules designed to reduce taxpayers' subsidy of illegitimacy, the New York Times stated, July 11, that Newburgh "is punishing innocent children in the name of 'morality' and driving or keeping the unfortunate off the relief rolls because the taxpayers are weary of their burden."

The Times sermonized, "The voice of man's inhumanity to his fellow man is loud in the land, applauding Newburgh."

In tune with this, a New York State welfare official in Albany accused Newburgh of "waging psychological warfare against the poor, the needy, and the unfortunate."

These emotional charges and assertions are misleading and grossly unjust.

Are mothers incidental? Should our society focus its attention on the infant and ignore the woman who brought it into the world? If this is to be the American attitude, then why not develop an American commune system like that of Red China where men and women cohabit to produce offspring for the state?

What is wrong with our trying to develop or maintain a decent morality in America? Why is it an example of man's inhumanity to man for hard-working people to rebel at paying taxes for subsidy of other persons' laziness, sexual license, freeloading and deliberate extortion of relief money?

Perhaps I have had an unusually fortunate life experience, but I can say truthfully that I never have met a fellow citizen who would callously refuse to help a truly needy or helplessly unfortunate human being. There are, however, many city, State and Federal bureaucrats who have misused and abused the public welfare purse to maintain themselves in personally profitable professional do-gooding office.

WITHOUT HURTING NEEDY

Here in New York City, Domenick Rainone of the welfare department told the New York Daily News, in 1959, that 65 percent of those on the relief rolls receiving aid could be dropped without cutting off truly needy.

On March 31, 1959, Kings County Judge John R. Sharkey sentenced nine mothers—all "clients" of Aid to Dependent Children—to jail for terms of 30 days to 1 year for chiseling more than $12,000 from the New York City Welfare Department. Among them, the nine "incidental" mothers had 42 children.

George Fowler reported in U.S.A. magazine, May 8, 1959, "Figures recently released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that the cost to taxpayers for the ADC program during the period December 1957, to November 1958, was $807,255,955. Since this huge figure represents only the Federal Government's half of the total, it may be seen that for an 11-month period ADC cost the Nation more than $1,500 million."

For fiscal year 1960, New York City Welfare Commissioner McCarthy requested a record budget of $264,524,538, an increase of $18 million over the previous year. "Similar increases are being requested in other big cities from coast to coast," reported George Fowler. "The ADC program is creating a condition of Federal-State-city subsidized bastardy in our country. The ADC's of welfare spell immorality and corruption of both recipients and donors."

Has anyone ever compared what some of the New Deal welfare laws were supposed to do with what they actually have done? Has anyone ever totted up the difference between what these laws were supposed to cost the taxpayers and what the laws actually have cost?

In England, the man who invented cradle-to-grave social security, Lord Beveridge, lived long enough to regret his scheme. He discovered that its inflationary effect wiped out most of its scheduled benefits.

It is time for eggheads to quit accusing taxpayers of hardheartedness and lack of social conscience merely because they seek to make sure that public money is well spent.

Suggestion for Ambassador at Large to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Harry F. Guggenheim, former Ambassador to Cuba and a man with long experience in Latin American affairs, recently suggested that the United States should appoint an ambassador at large to be in charge of our diplomacy in Latin America. In light of this very thoughtful suggestion, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA

(By Harry F. Guggenheim)

The Cuban problem has its roots in our apathy toward Latin America during the forties. This neglect was recognized too late by the Eisenhower administration, preoccupied by crises all over the world.

Fidel Castro's initial success was the product of idolization and propaganda by a few misguided American columnists and armchair diplomats. They proclaimed that this irresponsible demagog would bring freedom from dictatorship and add social gains to the Cuban people. His revolution was not unique, but typical of Latin American revolutions. It was not, as advertised, a social uprising of the Cuban people. They wanted to get rid of a dictator who had been there too long. The "outs" wanted in.

Of course the Cubans aspired to a fuller life, like all humanity. But the lot of the Cuban peasant was one of plenty compared to that of those in other parts of Latin America, and of other less-developed countries.

Castro came into power with the support of Communists and gangsters, with the financial backing of some Cuban and foreign capitalists. The revolution succeeded not by a mass uprising, but by the defection of the army, which is the usual pattern for successful revolution in Latin America. Latin America's opinion of the United States after the abortive invasion of Cuba can only be partially expunged with the removal of imported communism from Cuba. Latin Americans have known force and respect it. They deride weakness and failure.

NOTHING WE CAN DO

There is nothing we can do, short of allowing Castro and Khrushchev complete dominance of Cuba, to appease that element in Latin America unalterably opposed to the United States. This also holds for the Communists, fellow travelers, and allied elements in the United States. Though in a great minority in all of their respective countries, these groups are highly articulate. Some of them have been trained to agitate and fight in the streets. In Latin America they are especially dangerous, because if the authorities permit them to get out of hand they will spark revolution and anarchy. Many of the past rulers of Latin America neglected the need for social and land reform. They neglected the poverty of the masses due to lack of natural resources in many of those countries. Both of these conditions are highly inflammable. Conflagration can only be followed by anarchy or dictatorship of the right or left.

If we permit the continuance of complete dominance by dictator Castro and partner Khrushchev in Cuba, the international Communist dictatorship will spread throughout Latin America. If all of the accumulated wealth of these countries should be seized by the revolutionaries and held purportedly for the benefit of all of the people, they would quickly be reduced to a state of abject poverty. Cuba is an immensely rich island in natural resources and imported accumulated capital, but it would be bankrupt today without the support of Russia.

In spite of all the economic aid that we can pour into Latin America, the social development will be slow. Haste necessarily makes waste. In the meanwhile, unless our diplomacy is of a resolute order, directed by the most expert and experienced statesman, we shall lose all of Latin America. The time is too late for bungling by theorists and inexperienced reformers in our councils on Latin America, no matter how righteous their ideals.

FAR TOO PREOCCUPIED

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State are far too preoccupied daily, in this era, with emergencies all over the world to be able to devote the time and effort needed for effective consideration of the diverse problems of 20 Latin American countries. They cannot give adequate attention to the appeals of their respective Ambassadors, or even do courtesy to them. The Under Secretary of State is far too occupied running the Department of State to be of much assistance. So the whole job is thrown today, unlike the past, upon the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American affairs. But this is like sendiing a lieutenant colonel to do the job of a five-star general.

The Assistant Secretary should be a superb technician with a lifelong experience in Latin American affairs and of unusual and tried ability. We have such a man in the recently appointed Robert F. Woodward. But we cannot ask or expect him to be equipped to assume for Latin America much of the responsibility formerly taken by the President, Secretary of State, and Under Secretary. With our worldwide commitments and daily foreign relations problems, they are no longer available.

For most effective results, we need today a tried statesman of force, skill, and humanity in overall charge of our diplomacy for Latin America. He should be honored for his justice and judgment by the whole world so that his appointment would be an honor to Latin America and a reassurance for this hemisphere. He should have the title of Ambassador at Large. If such an appointment had been made before Fidel Castro, there would have been no Fidel. If we had had such a man after Fidel there would have been no ill-conceived, ineffective and immature invasion. It is very late, but still not too late for the President to save this hemisphere if he will act promptly and choose wisely a man to have overall charge of our Latin American affairs.

Only 160 A-Bombs Needed To Deter Berlin War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 160 A-bombs can obliterate Soviet war making capability, Khrushchev knows it and if Americans understand it too, war over Berlin is unlikely.

I base this statement on calculations showing that within a matter of hours U.S. Strategic Air Command's bombers can destroy the lifeline of communism's offensive network, the U.S.S.R.'s sprawling railway system.

Eighty-five percent of Soviet transportation moves on its overburdened railway system, which is so highly centralized that severing connections between approximately 160 load centers would shatter the country into many isolated segments and immobilize its military and industrial might.

Soviet military strength and industrial capacity are the principal forces on which communism relies to achieve world domination. Kremlin button-pushers cannot risk destroying them without endangering achievement of their goal. Even more important, losing them would permanently rid the world of the Marxist-Leninist cancer.

Soviet leaders are aware of this and thus are deterred from nuclear war. That is why they are concentrating on brushfire wars and cold war tactics.

However, no amount of retaliatory hardware will keep the Soviets deterred unless they remain convinced we are determined to use it if necessary. Keeping them constantly aware of our determination is the other side of the deterrent coin. It is as important in preventing nuclear attack as the hardware itself.

My analysis of targeting the Soviet railroad system to destroy Communist power is for illustrative purposes only and bears no necessary relation to SAC's actual plans for a retaliatory strikeback in case of nuclear attack.

The calculations I have made and why I am disclosing them is in an effort to convince the American people and our free world allies we are capable at this moment of deterring the Soviets from war by our ability to strike back effectively and impose unacceptable damage.

Public confidence in this capability makes more apparent to Soviet war planners our will to destroy their base of aggression if they attack. Thereby the strength of our deterrent is increased and the possibility of war by miscalculation is diminished.

Further, public confidence in our own strength has the bonus effect of denying Khrushchev the ability to blackmail concessions from the free world at Berlin and other trouble spots by rattling Soviet nuclear rockets.

I have drawn on no secret or classified documents in determining U.S. ability to destroy Soviet railways is a big deterrent to Communist aggression.

Anyone can conclude the Pentagon has ample retaliatory strike-back plans but cannot talk about them. And, anyone can piece together enough unclassified data, as I have done, to prove out our capability to destroy what Communist leaders know they cannot afford to lose.

The Soviet transportation system is noted for an especially heavy reliance on railroads, 85 percent of all tonnage, as compared to 50 percent in the United States. About 10 percent is shipped on inland waterways and the remaining 5 percent by highways, pipelines, coastal shipping, and air transports.

The Soviet national railway system covers about 80,000 miles in serving the two continents of Asia and Europe. Traffic density is close to theoretical capacity, and more than double that of U S. railroads. Constant heavy use of the system obviously affects its general state of repair and efficiency. One Soviet leader has complained that a third of the mileage is in poor state and subject to speed restrictions.

Not only is the rail system always under extensive repairs, it is not easily defended against attack. Although industrial and military installations can be defended because of their centralized nature, the sprawling and remote railroads are impossible to defend to an effective degree.

Recent information shows that the estimated number of major load centers fed by the Soviet national rail network is 160. Therefore, only 160 nuclear knockout blows need be pressed home at freely chosen, less-defended locations to fragmentize the U.S.S.R.'s interdependent society into 160 cutoff and isolated sections.

Without rail transportation, the Russian industrial and military power would be rendered impotent as effectively as by actual destruction of factories and bases. And the United States is capable of such destruction.

Informed public estimates of the number of operational nuclear capable aircraft maintained by U.S. military forces range upwards from 2,000. Only 8 percent of this number would need to survive a surprise attack and successfully penetrate the Soviet defenses to do the job. This estimate does not include the potential of this country's ballistics missile systems

During World War II the Soviet railroad system proved highly efficient. Huge track-laying cranes were used to replace bombed track and service was restored quickly to full service by replacing only a single panel of track.

In contrast, destruction to rail facilities by nuclear explosives would be massive and the repair problems vastly complicated by the presence of radiation. About 10 miles of new track would be needed for each of the 160 bombs for a total of 1,600 miles of ruined track.

Under peacetime conditions, according to the latest figures, the Russian economy is capable of laying down only about 534 miles of track a year. This is due to a heavy emphasis on industrial expansion. In order to conserve steel for industry, Soviet planners have consistently allocated a disproportionately small share of their nation's capital investment to the transportation system. Only by overburdening facilities to the maximum have transportation requirements been met.

A leading Soviet wartime planner has warned that the lack of proportion between the level of production and the size of the transportation system could bring the economy to a standstill.

It is therefore clear that this country is capable of deterring Soviet leaders from initiating nuclear war. This, of course, depends on an understanding by Soviet leaders that, if attacked, we possess the determination to strike back without hesitation and our targeting has been intelligently planned to destroy that which they know they cannot afford to lose.

Surplus Property for Domestic Programs of Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation prepared by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicates that during the period 1946 through June 1961 there was made available to institutions of education, health and civil defense personal property in the amount of $2,731,008,962 and real property in the amount of $817,847,256 or a total of $3,548,856,218. It will be noted from the tabulation every State in the Union has participated in this important program.

Numerous statements have been made by educators and administrators of schools and hospitals throughout the Nation that this program has been of inestimable value to them and that the scope of many of the educational programs of the various institutions would have been much limited without the availability of surplus property.

Despite the large amount of property that has been made available for our institutions the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has recently stated that large amounts of property are still needed to meet the requirements, particularly of our educational institutions. He points out that there are 97,500 elementary schools, 26,000 secondary schools, 1,900 institutions of higher education, 6,000 hospitals, and 123,000 civil defense units.

He further states that educational institutions are currently receiving about 73 percent with 16 percent to civil defense units and 11 percent to health facilities.

The tabulation furnished by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions 1946 through June 30, 1961 (acquisition cost)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$2,731,008,962	$817,847,256	$3,548,856,218
Alabama	79,607,436	15,292,000	94,899,436
Alaska	6,750,117	3,147,011	9,897,128
Arizona	25,845,113	8,054,376	33,899,489
Arkansas	29,759,667	26,434,527	56,194,194
California	313,430,175	60,125,442	373,555,617
Colorado	28,744,804	11,429,385	40,174,189
Connecticut	36,625,844	2,625,234	39,251,078
Delaware	10,200,697	2,363,512	12,564,209
Florida	94,821,843	22,753,341	117,575,184
Georgia	67,537,725	17,013,578	84,551,303
Hawaii	13,191,280	2,752,745	15,944,025
Idaho	16,321,643	22,169,721	38,491,364
Illinois	98,920,240	14,737,704	113,657,944
Indiana	61,176,615	3,912,550	65,089,165
Iowa	29,461,397	2,162,939	31,624,336
Kansas	29,194,645	9,581,743	38,776,388
Kentucky	50,717,814	2,664,682	53,382,496
Louisiana	45,026,014	12,895,789	57,921,803
Maine	19,918,180	535,217	20,453,397
Maryland	64,483,524	2,675,083	67,158,607
Massachusetts	80,356,167	30,419,842	110,776,009
Michigan	65,556,166	22,708,391	88,264,557
Minnesota	36,808,869	43,542,329	80,351,198
Mississippi	50,113,336	37,375,743	87,489,079
Missouri	62,128,813	34,896,223	87,025,036
Montana	12,810,256	524,970	13,335,226
Nebraska	23,877,453	1,104,309	24,981,762
Nevada	7,115,580	2,190,897	9,306,477
New Hampshire	11,216,334		11,216,334
New Jersey	49,622,972	916,863	50,539,835
New Mexico	21,453,860	8,757,653	30,211,513
New York	178,002,784	73,845,620	251,848,404
North Carolina	83,577,667	20,875,476	104,453,143
North Dakota	7,313,392	889,723	8,203,115
Ohio	108,082,207	10,757,064	118,839,271
Oklahoma	53,050,017	69,697,450	122,747,467
Oregon	44,067,005	14,813,187	58,880,192
Pennsylvania	116,808,499	4,255,339	121,063,838
Rhode Island	16,906,011	358,043	17,264,054
South Carolina	44,534,385	9,952,320	54,486,705
South Dakota	12,474,008	1,836,603	14,310,611
Tennessee	65,444,169	7,130,550	72,574,719
Texas	137,909,894	132,699,076	270,608,970
Utah	37,572,829	2,861,312	40,434,141
Vermont	8,094,921	69,911	8,164,832
Virginia	79,110,013	19,525,779	98,635,792
Washington	76,732,021	16,375,716	93,107,737
West Virginia	34,732,724	2,357,157	37,089,881
Wisconsin	52,403,021	1,266,467	53,669,488
Wyoming	8,456,499	1,569,879	10,026,378
District of Columbia	17,246,009	456,234	17,702,243
Puerto Rico	15,661,169	480,703	16,141,872
Virgin Islands	34,639	3,848	38,487
American Samoa	500		500
Guam		6,000	6,000

Cost, $95 Million, of the Proposed Hanford Electric Plant to Each of the 50 States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the percent of Federal taxes borne by each of the States and the cost to each of these States that would result unless the proposal to spend $95 million for electric generating facilities at the new Hanford, Wash., plutonium reactor is laid to rest:

Cost to the States of the proposed Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor steam electric plant

State	Percent of Federal taxes borne	Cost to the States
Alabama	0.98	$931,000
Alaska	.11	104,500
Arizona	.57	541,500
Arkansas	.47	446,500
California	10.96	10,412,000
Colorado	.94	893,000
Connecticut	2.17	2,061,500
Delaware	.56	532,000
Florida	2.51	2,384,500
Georgia	1.33	1,263,500
Hawaii	.30	285,000
Idaho	.27	256,500
Illinois	7.17	6,811,500
Indiana	2.28	2,166,000
Iowa	1.19	1,130,500
Kansas	.96	912,000
Kentucky	1.05	997,500
Louisiana	1.19	1,130,500
Maine	.43	408,500
Maryland	1.92	1,824,000
Massachusetts	3.47	3,296,500
Michigan	4.47	4,246,500
Minnesota	1.61	1,529,500
Mississippi	.45	427,500
Missouri	2.29	2,175,500
Montana	.28	266,000
Nebraska	.63	598,500
Nevada	.21	199,500
New Hampshire	.33	313,500
New Jersey	4.35	4,132,500
New Mexico	.37	351,500
New York	13.68	12,996,000
North Carolina	1.38	1,311,000
North Dakota	.19	180,500
Ohio	5.78	5,491,000
Oklahoma	.93	883,500
Oregon	.95	902,500
Pennsylvania	6.95	6,602,500
Rhode Island	.53	503,500
South Carolina	.61	579,500
South Dakota	.20	190,000
Tennessee	1.19	1,130,500
Texas	4.33	4,113,500
Utah	.36	342,000
Vermont	.17	161,500
Virginia	1.70	1,615,000
Washington	1.63	1,548,500
West Virginia	.68	646,000
Wisconsin	2.07	1,966,500
Wyoming	.16	152,000
District of Columbia	.69	655,500
Total	100.00	95,000,000

A Foreign Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gould Lincoln in the August 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star shows the lack of coordination in our foreign policy. We cannot succeed this way:

THE POLITICAL MILL—KENNEDY TEAM NEEDS SOME UNISON

(By Gould Lincoln)

Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, speaking in Cyprus to U.S. dipolmats stationed in 21 countries of Africa and the Middle East, has said the Kennedy administration is trying to edge away from the policy of massive retaliation, a policy enunciated by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Massive retaliation has been interpreted as an all-out reply with atomic weapons if the Communists start a war. Mr. Dulles' policy was in answer to boastful statements by Soviet leaders that they would blow us off the map.

According to Mr. Bowles, the Kennedy administration is looking to more conventional weapons to meet Communist aggression. Also, Mr. Bowles said that the administration is placing more emphasis on the political approach and on ideas. Almost at the same time that Under Secretary Bowles was delivering himself of these remarks, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara was telling a congressional committee that we would use nuclear weapons if necessary in the defense of West Berlin.

Like Mr. Bowles, the Secretary of Defense commented that the administration is laying emphasis on the buildup of conventional arms, but he added that we have stated categorically on several occasions that we will use nuclear power when necessary to oppose Soviet aggression in Western Europe.

President Kennedy, like everyone else in this country who speaks of war, wishes to avoid it and to bring all-out peace through just settlements of international differences. He has asked Congress for greatly increased appropriations for so-called conventional arms in hopes that if war comes it not be a nuclear war, with all the terrific devastation involved. But the President has never said this country would not go to nuclear warfare if necessary against Communist attack. Still, a foremost officer of the State Department suggests that we will not use our nuclear power if the Berlin crisis should lead to conflict and the Secretary of Defense is saying that nuclear power will be used if necessary.

What is the American people to believe? What, indeed, are our allies to believe, and the Soviet Government?

POLITICAL GESTURE?

If Mr. Bowles was merely trying to discredit the Eisenhower administration and its policies of defense it was just a political gesture. But if Mr. Bowles is for a minute seeking to convey to the world that this country will not use its full striking power against Communist aggression in Western Europe, he is doing a disservice to the American people and to the cause of peace.

Any such belief in the Communist mind might lead to a grave mistake and precipitate war instead of preserving peace, even a cold peace. The great deterrent to war ever since the close of World War II has been our nuclear power. Years ago, Winston Churchill, speaking in Fulton, Mo., said flatly that this power was the great check on Communist aggression. It has remained just that ever since.

We have not done a lot of saber rattling, an exercise in which Soviet leaders, including Premier Khrushchev, have frequently indulged. No one has ever heard Mr. Khrushchev say he would not use nuclear weapons. On the contrary, he has threatened us with complete destruction if we should engage in war with the Soviet Union. He continues today with such threats and boasts. The text of the Soviet Party's draft program for the years ahead states clearly that the ultimate aim of the Communists is the eradication of the capitalist system and at the same time of the form of government which we have today in the United States.

DECLARATION OF WAR

Editorially, the New York Times has described the Soviet manifesto as a new declaration of war against the free world—military, political, economic and propagandistic war. It expands in thousands of words what the Soviet chieftain compressed in four words: "We shall bury you." It has become trite to say that the only factor which impresses the Soviet Union is military power, but it remains in large part true. No one could read the Soviet manifesto (or program) without recognizing that the Communists

will go to the extreme limit to gain their ends—the control of all the world.

By this time they must understand that the working men and women of the United States are not looking to a Communist state and that they prefer freedom under our democratic form of government. But the Communists hope to win over to their ideas and beliefs new and underdeveloped nations of the world, many of them recently independent peoples who have lived in extreme poverty.

Mr. Bowles has suggested that the Kennedy administration will rely more on ideas than on arms in its battle against Communist expansion. No one will deny the value of ideas, least of all the American people who have fought for them since the days of the American Revolution against dictatorial power. But ideas without the force and willingness to back these ideas with arms, if necessary, have not prevailed so far. The Soviet believes the Communist idea will prevail without war—the revolutions can be bloodless. There is nothing in the history of communism in Russia or China or anywhere else to bear out such a theory. Bloodletting in Russia and China to force the people to the will of the Communist leaders constitutes some of the ugliest events in human history.

Annual Rally Men's Adult Bible Classes of Central Pennsylvania Counties Held August 6, 1961, at Rolling Green Park, Selinsgrove, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver an address at the annual Rally Day program of the men's adult Bible classes from counties in central Pennsylvania held at Rolling Green Park at Selinsgrove, Pa., Sunday, August 6, 1961, at 9:30 a.m.

The annual Rally Day owes its origin to two events that occurred at Rolling Green Park 33 years ago. On the first Sunday of August in 1928, Dr. Dunkleberger, of the faculty of Susquehanna University, assembled his Bible class at Rolling Green Park for an out-of-door service. On the same date Professor Gaugler, Snyder County superintendent of schools, brought his Bible class from Middleburg for a similar outing. Neither Dr. Dunkleberger nor Professor Gaugler knew of each other's plan for an out-of-door service.

As a result of the chance meeting of the two Bible classes the Tri-County Bible Class Rally was organized embracing Union, Snyder, and Northumberland Counties. Later the organization was extended to include Bible classes within a radius of 50 miles of Rolling Green Park. Today there is a well organized annual Rally Day observance participated in by men's adult Bible classes from six counties of central Pennsylvania. It was a pleasure to participate in the 1961 annual Rally Day program and to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE RALLY DAY PROGRAM SPONSORED BY THE CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA MEN'S ADULT BIBLE CLASSES, SUNDAY, AUGUST 6, 1961, ROLLING GREEN PARK, SELINSGROVE, PA.

It is a pleasure to participate in the annual rally of men's adult Bible classes from central Pennsylvania counties.

I appreciate the kind invitation to join you on such a solemn and sacred occasion.

The observance of rally day is deeply rooted in the history of religion and of the church.

It is a day for renewing our faith in God's kingdom—confirming our convictions and for taking an inventory of our religious standards.

Rally day—as observed this morning by the adult Bible classes from various counties—does not mean there is a dwindling of interest in Bible class activities.

It is evidence of the religious enthusiasm and faith of all in attendance.

This Rally Day observance is unique because it has gathered together the participating men's Bible classes from central Pennsylvania counties—in a spirit of love of God and in recognition of the importance of Holy Scripture in our individual and collective lives.

The Bible is the age-old and always reliable guide for our conduct.

The difficult and dangerous conditions we find in the world today can be mastered and improved if we will bring an ever-increasing proportion of mankind to an appreciation of the Bible message—and to the living of life according to the religious principle inculcated in the Bible.

In the books of the law and in the teachings and parables of Christ, we have the moral precepts necessary for the guidance of our conduct in all human relations—individual to individual, individual to government, and government to individual, and even government to government.

For though such individual human and Christian virtues are charity, self-sacrifice, and humility, may well be inappropriate to characterize governmental action—yet a government is as surely bound as an individual by the laws of justice and equity.

The government of any nation is in the position of custodian and guardian of the interests of its citizens—and it cannot, in the exercise of apparent virtue, sacrifice the material welfare, the military strength, or the prestige of this corporate body.

In the historical books of the Bible we have examples of right and wrong behavior—in the history of the Jewish people, and of their neighbor tribes and kingdoms in the ancient world.

These stories, rightly understood and pondered, carry their lessons for our conduct today—particularly in public business.

From the various books of the Bible which are grouped under the general heading of "writings"—we can draw many lessons helpful to our relations with our neighbors—and tending to the improvement of world conditions.

In the prophetic books—the devotional poetry and proverbial wisdom—we find material for the development of a spirit of prayer and worship.

In addition we find material for the growth of an adult outlook upon life compounded of serenity—a sense of proportion, a clear-eyed view of the world, and a focusing upon God as the source, guide, and goal of all our human life.

If, with this clear-eyed view of ourselves and our relation to God, we look upon our man-to-man relations with our immediate neighbors—we are likely to find much that is in need of correction—first in our own individual conduct and attitudes—and next in the community customs.

Our natural tendency toward selfishness leads us to dealings that may be within the law—yet cannot stand the bright light of moral scrutiny based on biblical principles.

In competition we may be unfair—vindictive—and merciless—or in trying to avoid the ill effects of competition upon ourselves—we may vicitimize our customers by agreeing upon and maintaining artifically high prices.

The problems of competition and fair trade—conspiracy and government regulation—are problems complicated and difficult of solution, and I make no attempt to offer here a one-short cure-all for this economic puzzle.

I do maintain, however, that the key to fair and equitable solution to all such problems of human relationships is the attitude of good will and devotion to justice founded on Biblical principles.

The religiously principled man will endeavor to turn an unprejudiced and objective eye upon his neighbors.

He will see that in the relations between man and his government—the citizen denied his full rights is also debarred from contributing his full share of judgment and support to his government.

Internationally, as well as nationally and locally, we must develop in ourselves a spirit of political good will, of teamwork, of fairness.

I am making no appeal for our being easy marks, or softly sentimental.

I have already said, and I reiterate for emphasis, that the primary purpose of government is to protect the interests of its own citizens.

Still each government, and all the citizens who are together responsible for the policies of each government, must act as bound by the divinely instituted laws of justice.

Entrenched selfishness, as a national economic policy, is shortsighted and self-defeating, but even if it were advantageous to us, we would be debarred from using it.

In national and governmental matters, as in individual conduct, there are moral absolutes, rules that must not be transgressed.

A government can stand strong and firm in the eyes of the world, and respected by the citizens of its own nation, only if those who make up that government—the officials and civil servants—and the citizens acting in their political capacity strive to govern their conduct by strict moral principles.

We in the United States are conducting a continuous campaign in this direction.

The code of ethics in government service adopted by House Concurrent Resolution 175 in the 85th Congress, expressed the feeling of the Congress about the moral responsibility of the individual in Government service.

A similar spirit is evinced in the recent Executive order issued by President Kennedy applying moral rules to the conduct of employees in the executive departments of the administration.

I think it is a very right feeling that lies back of these actions by the Congress and the Executive, and that this feeling reflects a popular conviction among the citizens that we must tighten up our observance of the moral code in our public service.

The attention given in newspaper stories to reports of bribery, collusion, conflicts of interest, and other aspects of the moral relationship between Government officials and private citizens is another indication of public concern in this field.

More strict adherence to a code of ethics in Government service would undoubtedly contribute substantially to the improvement of our foreign relations.

Our foreign aid programs have been dramatically portrayed notably in "The Ugly American" as severely handicapped by

unethical taking of financial advantages and indulging in luxuries, both by our own representatives and by officials of foreign governments.

Allowing for possible exaggeration and misrepresentation—or simple misunderstanding and misinterpretation—in some of the attacks that have been made upon our programs and the men who handle them—it remains true that foreign aid programs must be watched with a keen and conscientious eye for waste and misappropriation.

Any accusation must be answered with facts—any reasonable question raised must be satisfied by a full and honest report.

Our own code of ethics demands, however, that we condemn no man or group of men unheard.

In international relations the interaction of institutions and professional groups offers a wide field for the ordering of peaceful cooperation according to moral laws, and toward the attainment of good ends.

Cultural, scientific, educational, and professional groups have their vast contributions to make toward the improvement of life for the individuals in all countries, and toward the establishment of peaceful relations between countries.

Our traveling entertaining troops of musicians and actors—our sports teams, our exchanges of books, and our conferences of librarians—all contribute toward the welfare of the people and the peace of the world.

The more people are drawn together in affection by visiting each other, talking together, and developing their common interests, the more likely they are to bring their governmental actions into harmony.

Similarly the churches whose work in foreign fields has long been handicapped by the visible rivalry and occasional ill will displayed between denomination and denominations—can profit materially as well as spiritually by friendly cooperation.

Each denomination must of course be firm in holding to doctrine as it sees it.

Each man—and each church—must follow the dictates of conscience in this matter—and permit no compromise with conscience.

Nevertheless I think it is a tremendous development for good that the world is now seeing in the movements of prayer and moral action that are taking place, reaching beyond the boundaries of creed and sect, and joining together in common feeling and enprice, people whose traditional beliefs and modes of worship may be dramatically different.

It is excellent, I think, that there should be cordiality in agreement wherever possible, and cooperation and joint effort in many fields, both by the churches as organized groups, and by individuals of various religious identifications, in the great undenominational world enterprises.

There is a surge of moral force felt throughout the world in the form of various movements such as Father Keller's "Christopher movement," Frank Laubach's "literacy crusade," and many another application of moral urgency to the affairs of the world.

The Abbe Pierre, with his Paris ragpickers, and Father Bire, with his work for displaced persons, have captured the imagination and sympathy of the world.

Our churches join in discussions of theology and of the social applications of moral doctrine.

Churches act together in organizations like the World Council of Churches and its various agencies to bring the Christian conscience to bear on the world of today.

The churches of the United States join—well nigh unanimously—in sponsoring and supporting the great projects of aid to the people in need everywhere in the world; One Great Hour of Sharing, the Bishops' Relief Fund, the United Jewish Appeal.

Other collections—annual or to meet particular emergencies—have been managed by joint action of the churches.

Prayer and morally motivated actions have come together from many denominations and faiths in the support of such essentially religious activities as Project Hope, the Peace Corps, the medical missions of Dr. Dooley and Dr. Schweitzer, and many another effort to aid the sick and underprivileged and unhappy peoples of the world.

I do not believe there is any single one-shot cure-all remedy available or to be invented for the complex ailments that beset the world at the present time.

I do not believe there is any one simple and single defense against a subtle and unscrupulous enemy.

But I do think that there is one single element that is necessary to any step we may take to aid our friends, to defend ourselves, and to defeat our enemies, and that element is strict morality.

I believe that world dangers are to be averted, distresses alleviated, self-government and self-support encouraged by a combination of individual action—church and other group action, and governmental action.

For the accomplishment of this many-faceted task, we shall need—and I pray that we may have—unselfish good will, wisdom, untiring energy, and the grace of God.

Before concluding, I wish to commend the officers and members of the various Bible classes participating in this central Pennsylvania annual Bible class rally.

Your presence here this morning is a manifestation of your sincere love of Almighty God and your deep reverence for the eternal truths revealed by Holy Scripture.

During these perilous days when faith in God is being constantly undermined by the atheistic forces of world communism, it behooves us all to rededicate ourselves to the great affirmation of Christians the world over by saying in all sincerity: "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord."

With such deep-rooted faith in God we will obtain the courage and the strength to repulse the evil forces bent upon destroying every vestige of Christianity.

This is a fitting occasion to pledge anew our love of God and respect for the Holy Bible.

The sincerity of the American people in adhering to their religious convictions will play a vital part in this Nation's opposition to world communism.

If we remain true to our religious principles and to the Nation's ideals so eloquently symbolized by the flag of our country, we will be able under the inspiration of the cross and the flag, to march to the moral, the mental, and the spiritual mastery of mankind.

Textile Industry Needs Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Textile Needs," which appeared in the Fall River, Mass., Herald News on August 2.

TEXTILE NEEDS

The textile industry has been waging a prolonged battle against the flood of cheap importations that is endangering its existence. Up to date the Government has been unwilling to take any substantial step to stem the tide from abroad, but the industry continues to fight. The latest and most telling of the points it has made is that if present trends continue, it might be unable to take care of the Nation's defense needs.

Certainly the Government owes it to the country to make sure that its textile needs can be covered by plants here. It is unthinkable that this Nation should be dependent on others for goods which can perfectly well be produced here. Yet the industry spokesmen are not talking idly. They are quite right when they say that if the number of plants shrinks radically as a result of the imports from abroad, a crisis would find the country without the productive capacity it needs for itself.

The President has, in effect, told the Nation it is facing a long-term effort against a resourceful adversary. At some point along the line the effort to hold back communism may involve us in war. That being so, it would be the height of folly for the U.S. Government to permit the textile industry, so essential to any defense build-up, to decline.

It Is Easy To Spend Other People's Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in today's Wall Street Journal shows the path of bankruptcy the Congress has taken. It has done this without raising the necessary taxes. When the c.o.d.'s come in for payment, watch out.

THE FINE ART OF SPENDING

There's been much criticism of the administration's reckless spending in these columns, and a reader whose letter appears today asks, in effect, if there hasn't been too much.

That, of course, is a matter of opinion. But, in all fairness, it ought to be made plain that the administration has no patent on irresponsibility. When it comes to prying open the Treasury for political gain, Congress is sometimes way ahead of the White House.

Take, for example, the little frolic the other day in the Senate Labor Committee. Just for laughs, the Democratic majority got things rolling before Republican members appeared. Skipping debate, the Committee breezily approved in just three minutes a pair of multibillion-dollar boondoggles so outrageous that even the administration opposses them.

One is the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, a retread of the old CCC of New Deal days. The administration would like a corps of 6,000 youngsters. The Senate Democrats thought that figure niggardly. So they approved a corps 25 times larger—ultimately numbering 550,000—at a 4-year cost to the taxpayers of $525 million.

Next came the so-called cold war GI bill, which doesn't even carry a comprehensive price tag. As passed by the committee, it provides for peacetime servicemen the same Government benefits extended to veterans of World War II and the Korean war. Free higher education for draftees would cost an estimated $3.4 billion over 12 years; nobody knows what housing, rehabilitation, and the

rest would cost. Nor did any committee member seem to care.

As one Democrat quipped, "We've developed a new technique: Vote first and debate later."

Congress has indeed refined the technique of legislating without thinking. Because of administration misgivings, the two giveaways described above may not become law. Then again, they may very well; equally irresponsible legislation has been whooped through Congress already this year.

Perhaps the most reckless was the $5.6 billion omnibus housing bill. The handling of just one part of that package of political goodies—title V subsidies for local water, gas, and sewage plants—shows the technique of big spending raised to the level of artistic virtuosity.

Originally, the administration thought $50 million would do for these community facilities, and that's the way the provision came out of a Senate committee. On the floor, the Senators raised the ante to $300 million and earmarked $100 million for loans to improve mass transportation. As the housing bill swept to passage, Senator RUSSELL remarked: "The Senate no longer reckons any programs in terms of dollars. I know it would not make any difference if there were $99 billion involved. The Senate would vote it with a 'hurrah'."

In this case, the House had the last hurrah. That Senate figure of $300 million for community facilities quickly ballooned to $500 million. Even that wasn't enough for the congressional spenders. In the final, compromise version of the housing bill, title V was allotted $650 million—a fat $600 million more than the administration's first generous request.

Almost daily, theres the same bidding up of bills thought to be politically profitable. In both Houses, Senator RUSSELL'S observation applies: Dollar signs dissolve and disappear before eyes that are glazed by the votes to be got among farmers, old folks, city dwellers, suburbanites—anybody at all. So what if it takes millions and even billions to try to capture them? It's only money.

This also seems to be the sentiment of the reader who takes us to task for allegedly allowing Government spending to monopolize our thoughts. Look beyond the squandered billions, he says, and pay heed to the really important business of "resistance and survival" against the Soviet threat. But reckless spending and pyramiding of Federal debt obviously weakens the economy on which the Nation's defense depends. And it also may lead a determined foe to dismiss our occasional talk of resisting as mere words, not to be taken seriously.

So we plead not guilty to the charge of overconcern with wasteful Government spending. For we fail to see how the threat without and the frivolity within can be neatly separated.

Can You Justify Spending All Income Taxes Collected From Your Constituents in a Year, $95 Million, for Power at Hanford, Wash.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it takes all the income taxes collected from 430,826 taxpaying American citizens, on the average, to collect the sum of $95 million.

The number 430,826 also is just about the average number of persons each Congressman has as constituents.

Can any member of this body justify spending every cent of the income taxes collected from all his constituents for a whole year, $95 million, to build public power facilities at Hanford, Wash., new plutonium production reactor?

A vote to instruct House conferees not to agree to the amendment by the other body to the AEC authorization bill to spend $95 million for that purpose will avoid any necessity for attempting the impossible; namely, attempting to explain to each and every one of your constituents why you took every cent of the Federal income taxes each pays for a whole year and spent it in such a manner.

Tourist Expansion Program for Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the weekend, I was privileged to make a broadcast over a network of Wisconsin radio stations. In the address I discussed a number of topics of interest not only to Wisconsin, but reflecting upon national and international affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY OUTLINES TOURIST-EXPANSION PROGRAM FOR WISCONSIN

Friends, during this season, millions of Americans—including many of you—will take time out for a vacation.

Overall, about 85 percent of working Americans enjoy paid vacations, spending about $20 billion a year.

For Wisconsin, the tourist industry has become increasingly important to our State economy—its income amounting to about $600 million annually.

With untouched reservoirs of unique natural resources, however, I believe we can cut ourselves a still larger slice of this tourist pie.

Overall, tourism benefits not just a few, but many segments of the community's economy, including: services, transportation, accommodations, entertainment, cleaning services, products such as sporting equipment, souvenirs, fashions, etc.; utilities (power, water, light). The result: greater economic growth.

A great many communities, either by exploiting an existing potential or even by importing one, can probably turn themselves into "meccas" which will appeal to tourists. Examples of attractions:

A good inn, an historical landmark (battlesite, churches, mill, etc.);

A body of water; an animal preserve;

Hills, mountains, valleys, forests, or woods;

Geological formations and other natural or man-made features.

Additional programs that will develop tourist trade include:

A facelifting program for unsightly areas, refuse, junk; paint and spruce up; encourage clean, comfortable lodging places with well-cooked, well-served meals; developing or improving specific tourist attractions; obtain expert advice in restoring historic structures, draining lakes, etc.

In addition, we need strong forward-looking efforts to:

Improve our transportation system, especially the roads and trails leading to lakes, rivers, streams, and other recreational areas.

Expand and improve our already fine accommodations.

Further develop boating, skiing, and other outdoor sports.

Promote national and international tourist traffic, for example, through the St. Lawrence Seaway—particularly from our good neighbor Canada.

Generally, the expansion of the tourist industry, however, cannot be accomplished automatically or magically. Rather, it will require hard work; imaginative, creative salesmanship; further exploiting our recreational resources, and more attractive lures for visitors. This means real salesmanship in "selling Wisconsin" as a "top vacation spot" for Badgers, as well as for national and international travelers.

Incidentally, earlier this session, I invited fellow Senators and their constituents to visit Wisconsin and enjoy a truly great vacation, in a land of great natural beauty, unlimited opportunity for indoor and outdoor recreation, and a friendly, wonderful people.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN TOURISM

For the future, Wisconsin will not only be uniquely diversified, all-year-round vacation utopia for Americans, but an attraction for our friends and neighbors abroad. With today's economical and rapid-jet and conventional air—as well as sea-travel, more and more foreign visitors are beginning to visit the Midwest. Until recently, the majority of foreign vacationers practically ignored the United States as a vacationland.

Now, we have entered the "Visit-the-United States" tourist promotion field in competition with the other major nations in the world—most of which, by the way, have been promoting tourism in a big way for years.

For example, a U.S. Travel Service has been established in the Department of Commerce. In Secretary of Commerce Hodges' words, the new travel service is "important not only to attract the foreign tourist to our shores, but to send back a steady stream of contented visitors."

There are, of course, many problems which still must be solved in this connection. Let me review just a few:

Improvement of customs handling—the U.S. Customs for example lags behind other countries in the use of other languages as a sign of hospitality and welcome to foreign arrivals in this country;

The ironing out of financial difficulties foreign tourists encounter—usually having a lower cost-of-living and lower earning power in their home countries;

Some modification of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the issuance of visas authorizing aliens to enter the United States temporarily;

Establishment of U.S. tourist-information centers abroad.

In addition to Government-sponsored ideas for promoting the United States as a vacationland, private enterprise also is now spending approximately $15 million annually to promote foreign travel in the United States.

Our efforts during the past couple of years to encourage the travel of foreign tourists is beginning to show results. In Scandinavia, Germany, Switzerland, England and elsewhere people are planning—many of the first time—to visit our country.

Wisconsin offering a year-round playground for the pleasure seeking tourist—with such features as camping, riding, hiking, swimming, boating, fishing, hunting, skiing, skating, and other activities—will—if we promote creatively—act as host to more and more of these foreign tourists.

NO. 1 ISSUE: PEACE OR WAR

As we seek to promote tourism, and other programs for domestic progress—and find new ways to better serve and benefit our people—we cannot, of course, forget the hard facts of life in a war-threatened world.

The big issue, then, continues to be: peace or war.

Now, how can we best promote peace, or conversely, prevent war?

Confronted by an enemy who best understands the language of strength, we must:

Maintain and further strengthen our deterrent power;

Cooperate with other free nations to stop aggression and promote progress;

Win the majority of noncommitted nations; and, lastly

Develop an effective counteroffensive to whip the Reds on nonmilitary fronts, economic, social, cultural, ideological.

For that reason, I have supported efforts to:

1. Put more muscle into our Armed Forces;

2. Enact an effective mutual security program to strengthen the free-world alliances; and

3. Create an overall balanced force to defend ourselves against the Red enemy and to promote peace.

ANALYSIS OF COMMUNIST 20-YEAR PROGRAM

During this past week, Khrushchev published a new 20-year Communist program.

According to early analysis, Mr. Khrushchev's program represents one of the most dramatic and far-reaching manifestos in the Communist world since Lenin's edicts in 1919. Because of its possible impact on world peace, we cannot let this stand alone. Rather we must attempt to determine its significance, and develop policies and programs to counter it.

For a starter, I have suggested hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. The purpose would be to get expert opinion and evaluation of Mr. Khrushchev's recommendations. This would include: Assessing its long-range objectives, determining any significant changes in Communist policy, and developing policies for coping with whatever new threat may be posed by the program.

In the past, the world has been warned by Lenins, Hitlers, Stalins, et al., of designs for world conquest. Too often, nations have been blind to such handwriting on the walls of history. What has been the result? War, crippling and death to millions, inestimable damage to property, retarding of human progress, and threats to the existence of freedom.

In my judgment, we must not again repeat this mistake. The Western nations—and particularly the United States—would commit a grave error if we failed to:

a. Put in perspective the real significance of this Communist document;

b. Develop countermeasures to cope with ady new threats; and

c. Prepare a comparative document, demonstrating how freedom, not only now better serves a people, but how it will cap Communist programs for the future.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief look at some of the opportunities, as well as challenges that confront us.

Appreciating the chance to discuss them with you, I shall, as always be glad to get your reactions.

The Wrong Kind of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, many of us are convinced we may be waging war against the Communist conspiracy by a wrong kind of war. The Soviet achievements, though spectacular, are misleading. There is plenty of evidence that the Soviets do not want a shooting war. Their economy and production simply cannot stand it, and they are shrewd enough to avoid it.

I believe they are held in check solely by the threat of massive retaliation at the hands of our Strategic Air Command, the tremendous striking power of the B–52 bomber. But what of the future? If we can keep them off balance for another 10 years by reactivating the B–70 program, I believe we need have no fear of a military attack.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are at war with us, and a war in which we are not fighting back. It is a unique war, but a very dangerous one.

Our distinguished colleague, Hon. JAMES B. UTT, put it very effectively in his Washington Report for release August 10, which I submit for the attention of the House:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California)

Last week I joined with others of my colleagues in introducing a joint resolution expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties which constitute the International Communist conspiracy which is irrevocably committed to the dictatorial enslavement of every man, woman, and child.

These 98 Communist Parties are directed and controlled from the Kremlin. This international conspiracy is the most formidable foe which this country and the free world has ever faced. We have declared war upon lesser foes in the past; why should we hesitate to declare that a state of war exists and then proceed with every weapon at our command, both military and political, to the goal of total victory so that the blessings of freedom, hope, and spiritual statisfaction may be the heritage of all mankind.

This cannot be accomplished without such a declaration of war. Under this declaration, where a state of war exists, agents of the international conspiracy could be prosecuted for treason. Propaganda of the conspiracy could be confiscated, and the purveyors of this propaganda could be prosecuted, just as Axis Sally and Tokyo Rose were prosecuted for their propaganda in World War II.

We are spending more than $40 billion per year on military armaments to meet a war which I hope will never be fought. Russia has been restrained from military action directly against America, simply because of fear of massive military retaliation. Consequently, Khrushchev employs the other weapons more deadly than missiles.

Let us examine that arsenal of deadly weapons employed 24 hours a day by the international conspiracy: (1) propaganda, (2) organization, (3) infiltration, (4) popular fronts, (5) deceiving tourists in Russia, (6) destroying anti-Communists, (7) violence and murder, (8) Communist schools.

America and the Free World are absolutely unprepared to meet this onslaught. Our great military strength will not save us if we are conquered by a war of words.

Let us look at the volume of propaganda in this arsenal of words. The Kremlin uses 150,000 hours per week of radio propaganda in every language; 200 big propaganda films per year; 120 million propaganda books each year (millions of these are carried free in our mails); 2 billion propaganda pamphlets every year; 20 thousand Russian stars sent out every year on propaganda and publicity missions all over the world. Our propaganda is less than 1 percent of what I have just listed.

How frightened would you be if our military strength was equal to only 1 percent of that of Russia? One is just as deadly for you and your children as is the other, and yet at this critical time your military establishment has ordered that no one in the military may take part in any anti-Communist school or rightwing organization. Our Defense Department has fallen prey to Communist propaganda which is out to destroy all anti-Communist organizations.

America has never lost a war for lack of missiles, planes, or other weapons. Let's look at our losses and place the blame where it belongs: Yalta—a Communist victory because President Roosevelt did not recognize the danger of the International Conspiracy; China—we lost in a torrent of massive propaganda which convinced the world that Mao Tse-tung was an agrarian reformer; Korea—we had the armaments to destroy Red China. Again Communist propaganda convinced England that we should not destroy Red China and England demanded the removal of General MacArthur. It was not missiles that kept President Eisenhower out of Tokyo. It was Communist propaganda; Cuba—we did not lose Cuba to the Reds for lack of military power. It was Communist propaganda that we would offend other countries if we took the action which we should have taken.

Until this country recognizes that we are losing every engagement to Communist propaganda and takes positive action to meet this enemy with the same weapons they use, we will fall like a ripe fruit, without firing a single missile.

The Gambling Monopoly of the Austrian Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the gambling monopoly of the Austrian Government. Austria profits from several lotteries as well as from football and horseracing pools.

In 1960 the total gross receipts of the several operations came to $13.5 million. The total net income to the government, which was not earmarked for any specific purposes, amounted to $3.2 million in 1960.

Austria is another of the nations where the government recognizes that gambling is here to stay and profits accordingly. In Austria, the government takes a cut of all gambling revenues—even de-

riving operating and monopoly fees from casinos. When will we profit from the example of Austria and other nations showing similar wisdom?

Restore the Hanford Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of the Atomic Energy Commission's proposal to make productive use of the waste steam from the plutonium production reactor under construction at Hanford, Wash. The installation of power generators will produce 700,000 to 800,000 kilowatts of electricity, and the project will be completely self-liquidating.

In these troubled days, it is unthinkable that this Nation should waste a resource of this significance. This Hanford project will give the United States the world's largest atomic powerplant.

I was pleased to read in the August 3 edition of the Chattanooga Times an editorial which strongly favored House action to restore the Hanford project in the AEC authorizing bill. I would like to have this editorial included with my remarks:

RESTORE THE HANFORD PROJECT

The House should speedily reverse its shortsighted and thoroughly illogical vote against the Hanford, Wash., atomic power project.

Under this plan, heat which is not only going strictly to waste in the Columbia River as a byproduct of the Hanford plutonium reactor, but is harming the river's salmon runs, would be converted into 700,000 to 800,000 kilowatts of electricity for the power-short Northwest.

The $95 million in Federal appropriations involved would be repaid in full. The project was strongly backed by the Eisenhower administration and then Chairman McCone of the Atomic Energy Commission as a defense-strengthening measure. The Kennedy administration has continued that support.

As the Portland Oregonian, an independent Republican newspaper, said "the argument against admitting another agency to the Federal power field was meaningless." General Electric Co. was to build and operate the power reactor. Private utilities, now buying a major portion of the Federal power in the Columbia Basin, would get most of the Hanford production.

Nevertheless, the private utilities, joined by coal interests, have lobbied furiously against the project. And, although the Senate has passed the Hanford appropriation by 54 to 36, the House rejected it last month 176 to 140.

Coal, of course, has its troubles but, in the face of the facts as they are, its position amounts to head-in-the-sand psychology. The Washington Star has pointed out that Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, "has made clear that such a reactor at Hanford could not hurt the coal industry."

Reason, and advancement for a great American region, together with defense aspects involved in what would be by far the world's largest nuclear powerplant, strongly suggest another, clear look at this question by the Representatives.

Drugging the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of Friday, August 4, 1961:

DRUGGING THE PUBLIC

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who recently decided the boxing profession would be better off under Federal Government control, also has decided the American public would be better off if drug companies are regulated by the Federal Government. Therefore, in order to curb price gouging, KEFAUVER has introduced a bill to lower drug prices, warning drug makers they must accept a little more Government regulation or else be faced with direct Government control of the drug industry.

This is not the first time KEFAUVER has attacked the drug industry. Late in 1959 and in 1960, his Senate Antitrust Subcommittee held lengthy, well-publicized hearings in which KEFAUVER used every exaggerated claim, half-truth, and downright distortion of facts to convince the American public it was being mulcted by greedy drug manufacturers.

By omitting the costs of production, selling, research, administration, royalties, and taxes, KEFAUVER accused firms of selling drugs at a markup as high as 1,100 percent, instead of the actual 12 percent figure. So wild were his charges that the three minority members of the subcommittee—Senators HRUSKA, WILEY, and DIRKSEN—all complained of KEFAUVER's unfair methods.

It is an effective technique of demagogues, and a technique at which KEFAUVER excels, to convince the public it is being squeezed between the jaws of a monster, in this case greedy drug manufacturers. The truth is, however, that wholesale price indexes on drugs have steadily declined the past dozen years, while today's druggists' portion of the family medical budget is less than ever before. The high drug prices are largely the result of millions of dollars invested in research for new and improved products.

Few industries have performed more admirably than the drug industry, and it has not needed a push from the Government. Now KEFAUVER wants to change that pattern, so that big brother can have a hand in setting prices and determining how much money will be allocated for research. We might ask: Who is better able to determine drug prices, the competing companies or KEFAUVER's staff? Who should determine what new drugs to search for, scientists of the drug industry or a handful of Washington bureaucrats? Who should determine how much stockholders' money should be spent in search of those new products—drug company officials, whose record is outstanding, or those politicians who think nothing of scattering taxpayers' money in dozens of directions on any number of unproductive and wasteful projects?

Senator KEFAUVER has already played the drug industry for more than enough publicity. We suggest, therefore, that he turn his attention elsewhere. Then, while he is busy trying to run the affairs of another segment of industry, the drug manufacturers can get on with their job of protecting the health of the American public.

American Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, is the New Frontier penalizing business because it is successful? This appears to be the case, as is amply proved by Leslie Gould's article in the New York Journal American of August 4:

A.T. & T.'S ANTITRUST PROBLEMS—IT'S DONE TOO GOOD A JOB

(By Leslie Gould, financial editor)

There is no telephone service like that of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the antitrust lawyers to the contrary.

Anyone who has traveled to other parts of the world will confirm that.

This goes for quality of service as well as cost.

Part of the answer to this is that American Telephone is privately owned—by 2 million shareowners—and privately operated. Other telephone systems are government owned, except for that in Rome where it is run as a concession.

Yet, twice in the last 3 months statements by the head of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department regarding investigations have knocked down the price of A.T. & T. shares and upset the rest of the market.

A "ROUTINE" INQUIRY

In both instances, the market upsetting statements proved to be premature—to say the least.

One, which knocked down telephone shares for a $1.7 billion loss in value, was explained the day after the damage was done as being only a "routine" investigation.

The second took away $1 billion in market value for A.T. & T. shares, and all this was based on nothing more than that the Antitrust was considering a move to force A.T. & T. to divest itself of its oversea operations.

CUT RATES TO A FRACTION

In his offhand remark as to the oversea operations, Lee Loevinger, the antitrust head, said nothing about who or what was to substitute for the service. All oversea voice transmissions are received or sent from Telephone's facilities. Except for radio, they are carried over cables jointly owned with others.

On oversea business, a call to Europe was $75 when the service was inaugurated in 1927. Today it is $9 nights and Sundays, and $12 other times. Last year Telephone handled 3,700,000 oversea messages, and the company's share of revenue was $45 million, against its overall $8 billion business.

COST OF TELEPHONE SERVICE

There are ways of comparing A.T. & T.'s service with that in other lands. The cost—how many hours an average factory worker has to work to pay for his monthly phone bill of 50 calls—and the number of phones per population.

In the United States, the cost to the average worker is 2.41 hours. In London, 6.74 hours; Amsterdam, 4.42 hours; Zurich, 3.39 hours; Hamburg, 8.37 hours; Rome, 3.18 hours; Sydney, Australia, 3.92 hours, and Stockholm, 2½ hours—the closest to the United States.

LEADING THE WORLD

On the number of phones to each 100 of the population, in the United States it is 39.51 phones; Sweden, 35.30 phones; Switzerland, 29.65; United Kingdom, 15.03; Holland, 13.15; France, 9.06; Italy, 7.15; Japan, .521, and Russia, 1.91.

The trouble with American Telephone is that it is successful. If its management were bad and it barely made a profit, antitrust would not be bothered.

Maybe they would like the Russian system, where only selected few come by telephone books and those a couple of years or so out of date. Also try to get a number.

Utilization and Replenishment of U.S. Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a Nation, we need to develop more effective conservation, utilization and replenishment policies for our natural resources—if we are to meet the needs of a fast-expanding population of progress and of security.

Yesterday, I was privileged to discuss highlights of our needs—as well as propose solutions for fulfilling our national requirements, in a broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, yesterday proposed a national study for more effective conservation, utilization, and replenishment of U.S. natural resources.

In a broadcast over Radio Station WGN, Chicago, Senator WILEY stated:

"A nation's ability to meet challenges, to defend itself against enemies and to promote peaceful progress, depends upon a strong, purposeful, creative people, and adequate reservoirs of natural resources.

"Fortunately, we have been blessed with both of these assets.

"However, there are ever-increasing demands—particularly by a fast-expanding population—upon our mineral, soil, water, forest, and other natural resources.

"Consequently, it requires, in my judgment, a new look at our utilization, conservation, and replenishment practices. The objectives would be twofold: (1) To prevent too great depletion; and (2) attempt to assure an adequate supply for the future. Unless this is done, it could adversely affect our progress; and, also, weaken our ability to defend ourselves against threats to our security.

"Now, what should be done?

"First, let's take a look at the supply-demand situation in the Nation.

"According to experts: The production of mineral fuels, including oil, gas, coal, and nuclear fuel, will need to be doubled by 1975, and possibly doubled again by the year 2000.

"By 1980, we will need twice our current utilization of water, now totaling 300 billion gallons of water a day.

"In electric power, the Nation's production capacity also will have to be tripled by 1980.

"Timber requirements, too, are expected to double in the next 40 years.

"These are highlights of the national picture.

"Globally, also, a U.N. study indicates that world resources are too limited, even now, in 1961, to raise standards for all the nearly 3 billion people to current Western levels. What, then, about the future, with the population exploding at the rate of 5,600 every hour, or 49 million a year?

"Natural resources, we can be positive, will be of premium value.

"Now, what can we, as a nation, and citizens, do to insure better utilization, conservation, replenishment programs?

"As a first step, I believe that we could benefit immeasurably from a complete, evaluation study of our natural resources. Why? To determine, as accurately as possible, (a) the ability of our resources and reserves for fulfilling our national needs; (b) the urgency of shortages; and (c) to provide directions for future programs.

"Then, we need to take additional actions, including further develop, and, as necessary, expand, local-State-Federal efforts to conserve our forest, water, soil, mineral, and other resources; better educate our citizens on the need for conservation and sound utilization practices, particularly in avoiding waste; promote multiple-use policies for such resources as water and forests; develop replenishment programs—fuel, soil fertility, reforestation, water reserve, and other resources.

"In summary, a good program should include efficient use; adequate development to expand reservoirs to meet the requirements of national security and a growing economy; effective conservation to provide for future generations; efforts to discourage wasteful exploitation; and equitable distribution of benefits from resources."

CONCLUSION

"In the face of threats to our security by a great powerful enemy, communism, then, development of more creative programs to best utilize our human and natural resources, is not only desirable, but absolutely essential both for survival and for progress in a war-tense world," Senator WILEY concluded.

Increases in the Rates of Compensation for Service-Connected Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, along with other members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have been quite distressed at the action taken by the Senate Committee on Finance in regard to a very deserving piece of legislation, H.R. 879, which seeks to provide increases in the rates of compensation for service connected disabled veterans. Veterans' organizations are very much disturbed by the action of the Senate Finance Committee. I, under unanimous consent, include as a part of my remarks a recent letter addressed by the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans to each Member of the Senate on this subject, as well as another letter addressed to a newspaper correspondent bearing on this subject:

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is a very difficult letter for me to write to you. It involves the welfare of over 2 million service connected veterans of America's wars. Specifically, it involves the legislative plight of H.R. 879, which, as passed by the House of Representatives, would bring about a modest cost-of-living increase for those drawing compensation for service-connected disability.

As amended in the Senate Finance Committee and passed by the Senate, not only have the compensation provisions of H.R. 879 been materially reduced, and the section pertaining to multiple sclerosis deleted, but a wholly unrelated amendment to reopen the national service life insurance program has been added to it. The net effect of this amendment from a parliamentary standpoint has been to bring about a stalemate which effectively kills any chance for a compensation increase for this session unless something is done about it. We believe that the separate issues of compensation and insurance should be faced squarely and each on its own merits.

We do not believe it is fair or just for him who has borne the brunt of battle—the armless, the legless, the blind—and their dependents to be required to carry this controversial rider "piggyback" and alone. In order to allow the Senate to consider the provisions of H.R. 879 on their own merits I am respectfully petitioning you to introduce such a bill. If, for any reason, you cannot do this, I am requesting your advice as to how this regrettable impasse may be broken.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM O. COOPER,
National Commander.

AUGUST 3, 1961.

Mr. JACK ANDERSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. ANDERSON: I noticed your reference this morning to the national service life insurance matter and I am afraid you have this somewhat out of perspective.

H.R. 879 is a bill which provides for cost-of-living increase to veterans drawing service-connected compensation. This bill was passed by the House. The Senate Finance Committee cut the compensation provisions by $12 million and added the wholly unrelated insurance rider and the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee was subsequently passed by the Senate.

This insurance rider does not provide any means for a disabled veteran to reopen his life insurance and since it is wholly unrelated to the compensation bill, it runs into parliamentary rules in the House, which effectively stalemate the matter.

This insurance rider was known to be a highly controversial issue when it was added to H.R. 879.

For your information, our organization is in favor of reopening the national service life insurance, but we were not allowed to present our case to the Senate Finance Committee. This entire matter was handled without hearings and we feel that the much-needed cost-of-living increase for the veterans drawing service-connected compensation is now sorely jeopardized.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter which I have directed to each Member of the U.S. Senate for your information.

In addition to reducing the compensation provision of H.R. 879, the Senate Finance Committee also eliminated a provision in that bill which would extend the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 years to 7 years. This simply means that a veteran who is found to have multiple sclerosis, that such disease will be presumed to be service connected if it occurs within 7 years of his discharge.

As you know, medical science has not solved this dreadful disease and until they do, we feel that the veteran should be given the benefit of the doubt. There are probably not more than 400 cases of this sort, but they are tragic indeed and I think you should know that this provision was cut out of the bill by the Senate Finance Committee so that you may consider this issue in the proper perspective.

I hope you will see fit to publish more of the background of this legislation than is contained in your column in the Washington Post of today.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM O. COOPER,
National Commander.

What Business Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said on the New Frontier about encouraging business. Talk is cheap, but action proves the true intent. The following article by Donald I. Rogers in the New York Herald Tribune of August 4 shows what business needs to make this the most dynamic economy in the world without shackling controls and the inflation which results:

THE ULTIMATE LOSS
(By Donald I. Rogers)

The administration is increasingly worried about the Nation's hard-core unemployment problem and it is obvious from statements issued in high offices that even the lucid thinkers on the various task forces haven't yet figured out the way to solve it.

Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg lamented the fact that the number of workers idle for a half year or longer increased by nearly 100,000 in July to a total of more than 1 million, and in his announcement he declared that the figures show that economic recovery hasn't appreciably changed the situation for workers thrown out of jobs by automation.

Total unemployment did decline in July, but it was the long-term unemployed workers who disturbed Goldberg. He reminded the Nation that President Kennedy is committed to seek more job-aid measures from Congress unless the long-term unemployment problem improves. (Total unemployment has been running just under 7 percent of the total work force for 8 straight months.)

Mr. Goldberg and others of the administration act as though automation had just been invented. They act as though machines had never, in any other administration, replaced manual jobs.

Truth is, back when Henry Ford set up his first production line, automation was beginning to be an important factor on the American employment scene. When Mr. International Harvester invented his monstrous device, hundred of thousands of farm hands laid down their scythes, never again to mow hay by hand. Earlier, when A. G. Bell invented his jangling phone, thousands of messengers lost their jobs.

Automation has been an ever-present factor in the American economy and, save for temporary job displacement, has never held back the spectacular growth which in less than a century thrust this Nation from a borrower to the richest land on earth.

Why, then, aren't we reabsorbing these displaced workers into the economy? What has happened to them?

Without pointing to the obvious, that a certain percentage do not want to return to work, and that an additional percentage will not return until harsh economics will force them to, and that still an additional percentage flatly refuses to employ other skills, even though they may know them, we are not reemploying this hard-core, long-term group of idle workers because we are not permitting the economy to create the new jobs.

This is the lesson the Kennedy administration must learn—apparently the hard way.

Total unemployment in the Nation is running about 5.1 million, compared with 5.5 million in June.

If we are to find jobs for more than 5 million persons, the vast majority of those new jobs will have to be created in private industry, by private industry.

Facing the problem realistically, it must be realized that the percentage of unemployment in boom times has been rising steadily in recent years. Yes, in boom times. Whenever there is a cyclical recession, the recovery leaves a greater reservoir of long-term unemployed. Government should be concerned; but not solely in providing jobs with the taxpayers' money.

Since the industrial revolution, American businesses have expanded operations and hired more people whenever they have been able to do so.

What's stopping them now?

That's the question Mr. Goldberg should be asking of President Kennedy. Why havn't American businesses expanded, hired more people, solved this unemployment problem?

We asked several business leaders that question. The answer was the same in each instance: Profits aren't in sight.

Why, we asked, aren't profits in sight, when we seem to be bursting into a new boom? Again, the answers were the same: There is little likelihood of tax relief; there is definite likelihood of further wage demands which will cause a tighter pinch on profits.

Despite all of the additional investment that businesses have made in the last 10 years, the after-tax profits today are just about the same as they were 10 years ago. Yet sales are up, wages are up, taxes are up, even employment is much higher than it was 10 years ago.

The answer is that businesses haven't invested enough. Hard on our heels are the post-war baby-boom babies who, with diplomas in hand, will be knocking on the doors of personnel managers looking for jobs.

Unless the Government itself provides the climate and the incentive for businesses to invest much more, no amount of lamenting from the Mr. Goldberg will sovle the long-term unemployment problem. A Kennedy program of raising taxes so the Government can create jobs for the unemployed will only further stifle the incentive to invest, and the ultimate losses will be woeful.

Hanford Raises Basic Policy Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have another opportunity to express its will on the question of adding electric generating facilities to the new Hanford reactor. This will be a serious decision which every Member must make, for the outcome could have the effect of making a fundamental change in the basic policy which Congress has laid down for the AEC. Some proponents of a Hanford electric plant have tried to minimize the policy question or to say it does not exist in order to cloud the issue. For this reason and so that each of us may know just what is involved, let us examine the legislative history of the role which Congress has outlined for the AEC in relation to the generation of electric energy.

First of all, as some of the Members may know, the AEC published, in 1955, a tremendous three-volume legislative history of the entire Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In 3,994 pages just about every word that was ever spoken or written in the 83d Congress on this vital piece of legislation is recorded and indexed. This legislative history was compiled by Miss Madeleine W. Losee, the AEC's law librarian, and every student of atomic energy legislation owes her a deep debt of gratitude for her wonderful work.

If any Member doubts that the subject of electric power from atomic energy was not explored thoroughly and carefully in the 83d Congress, he need only look in the index to Miss Losee's legislative history of the act. There he will see more than three pages of entries under the heading, "Electric Power from Atomic Energy."

Section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides for the disposition of electric energy generated by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with its operations. The language has not been amended since its enactment in 1954.

The section reads as follows:

SEC. 44. DISPOSITION OF ENERGY.—If energy is produced at production facilities of the Commission or is produced in experimental utilization facilities of the Commission, such energy may be used by the Commission, or transferred to other Government agencies, or sold to publicly, cooperatively, or privately owned utilities or users at reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices. If the energy produced is electric energy, the price shall be subject to regulation by the appropriate agency having jurisdiction. In contracting for the disposal of such energy, the Commission shall give preference and priorty to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilities providing electric utility services to high cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Commission to engage in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use except such

energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities of the Commission, or of production facilities of the Commission.

During consideration of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 there was considerable discussion of the provisions of section 44 and of the prohibition contained in this section with respect to the "sale or distribution of energy for commercial use" by the AEC. From the legislative history of the act it may be seen what is and is not authorized under this section.

Seeking an interpretation of the then proposed section 44, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, engaged in the following colloquy with the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—Lewis L. Strauss—during the hearings on the bill. The gentleman from California put the question this way:

Let me ask you if your understanding of this is that the Commission is given a congressional direction at this time not to engage in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use except in a completely incidental way?

The Chairman of the AEC replied and the colloquy is recorded in this manner:

Mr. STRAUSS. That is our understanding.

Reperesentative HOLIFIELD. That is your understanding. That is my understanding as to the meaning of the language. So this changes the present law where the Commission can produce power for its own use and sell that power in the commercial channels to a considerable extent; does it not? It puts it on the basis——

Mr. STRAUSS. That is correct, Mr. HOLIFIELD, but as I testified at the opening of these public hearings, we have no intention of going into the power business.

When the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reported the legislation which became the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it had something significant to say concerning the provisions of section 44. Quoting the pertinent words of that report we see that—

Section 44 permits the Commission to dispose of usable energy generated in the production facilities or in the experimental utilization facilities owned by the Commission, but does not permit the Commission to enter the power-producing business without further congressional authorization to construct and operate such commercial facilities.

When the matter came to the floor of the House after the conference on the differing versions of the bill, the chairman of the Joint Committee, Representative Sterling Cole, Republican, of New York, offered these comments on the version reported out of conference:

The first area of difference was with respect to public versus private power issue. The other body had put in a provision authorizing, if not directing, but at least authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to build atomic energy plants for the purpose of generating commercial electricity. On the other hand, a provision was considered in the House which directed that the Commission should not participate in that very thing. However, in order to resolve that uncertainty, a provision has been adopted by the conferees which makes it very certain that the Commission may, if it obtains funds from the Congress, embark upon an atomic power reactor of whatever size it may feel desirable, but it must be on the basis of a research and development project and not for the pure and sole purpose of generating commercial electricity.

From the other side of the aisle at that time we heard from our former colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative Carl Durham, Democrat of North Carolina, whose words of wisdom, drawn from his many years in Congress and from his distinguished and dedicated service on the Joint Committee, often guided the Members on both sides of the aisle. Representative Durham had this to say about the provisions of section 44 as reported by the conference committee:

We have prevented the AEC from going into the power business. I do not believe any Member of the House wants the Atomic Energy Commission in the power business. But the AEC can only build a full-scale reactor in connection with its basic research programs. Of course, they can sell what comes from that, if necessary, or use it themselves. That is about as far as the bill allows the AEC to go into the power field. You have heard otherwise, but the problem is rather simple, and this is just what the bill does.

Thus we see the language of section 44 and some critical comments on the meaning of the language of this section. The meaning seems clear and the intent of the Congress in this matter seems clear also. However, rather than cut off my research into the legislative history of this section and rather than deny the Members the benefit of this research, let us look at some other comments on the problem of AEC in the power producing business.

When the different versions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as approved by the two bodies went to conference, the version approved in the other body included a section 45 which was added there by a vote of 45 to 41. That section read as follows:

SEC. 45. ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCTION. (a) The Commission is empowered to produce or provide for the production of electric power and other useful forms of energy derived from nuclear fission in its own facilities or in the facilities of other Federal agencies. In the case of energy other than electric power produced by the Commission, such energy may be used by the Commission, or transferred to other Government agencies, or sold to other users at reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices. Electric power not used in the Commission's own operations shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power in accord with the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

(b) The Commission may undertake any or all of the functions provided in subsection 45a, through other Federal agencies authorized by law to engage in the production, marketing, or distribution of electric energy for use by the public, and such agencies are hereby empowered to undertake the design, construction, and operation of nuclear power facilities and the disposition of electric energy produced in such facilities when funds therefor have been appropriated by Congress. Nothing in this Act shall preclude any Federal agency now or hereafter authorized by law to engage in the production, marketing, or distribution of electric energy from obtaining a license under section 103 of this Act for the construction and operation of facilities for the production and utilization of special nuclear material or atomic energy for the primary purpose of producing electric energy for disposition for ultimate public consumption.

In the Senate on July 21, 1954, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is now the vice chairman of the Joint Committee, discussed the provisions of the proposed section 45 with its sponsor, the former Senator from Colorado, Mr. Ed Johnson. The Senator from Rhode Island expressed the view that the proposed section would constitute "an authorization on the part of the AEC to build electric generating plants," Senator Johnson agreed.

The Senator from Rhode Island said also that the proposed section would provide "that the AEC should build its plants in parts of the country where the rates are already low. We would defeat the very purpose of the whole program." But Senator Johnson denied that his amendment—section 45—would provide any such thing.

In any event, the proposed section 45 was adopted by the Senate and became one of the matters to be settled in conference. The conferees eliminated the section and settled on the language of section 44 which is now contained in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Although we have seen what two influential Members of the House had to say about section 44 back in 1954, let us look at some other words on this section.

Commenting on the bill as amended in conference and reported to the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] said:

The amendment to section 44 introduced by Representative COLE and adopted by the House would preclude the AEC from selling or distributing any power not produced incident to the operation of its research, development, and production of nuclear material facilities. This effectively eliminates the Commission as an important participant in supplying atomic power to municipal and rural cooperative electric systems.

Now it goes without saying that the gentleman from California was opposed to this restriction on the role of the Commission in power generation. Despite his opposition, however, he recognized clearly that the restrictions were there and are still there, and that it was the intent of the Congress then that the AEC would not be permitted to get into the business of generating electric power for commercial use.

In the other body during debate on the act in 1954, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, commented:

I am very frank to say that I do not want to see the Government develop all the power which could be generated from uranium and plutonium. I should like to see the major portion of such power developed by private industry, but I would not want at this time to foreclose the Government from the authority to generate power from uranium and plutonium.

In reply the Senator from Rhode Island said in part:

We are trying to keep the Federal Government out of the power-producing business.

At another point in this colloquy we fined these remarks by the two Senators:

Mr. DOUGLAS. The language of the authorization bill is such that, in the opinion of

the majority of the Joint Committee, it would not permit the Commission to enter the power-producing business.

Mr. PASTORE. Except for the power which is necessary for its own operations. That is important.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would not permit the development of electrical power for industrial or commercial use.

Mr. PASTORE. A pilot plant in order to prove the effectiveness and practicability of a reactor could be built, but the Commission could not build a powerplant anywhere in the country to compete with already established public utility companies. We say, when you get into that, you get into the basic philosophy of whether the Government will be in the electrical business, or whether private enterprise will conduct it. At that time you will have to come back to Congress.

Shortly after this exchange, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who later served as chairman of the joint committee, directed a question to the Senator from Rhode Island. The brief colloquy is recorded in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask the Senator whether he does not agree with me that the bill does not permit the Atomic Energy Commission to generate electric energy as such for even its own operations, except in a pilot plant. Would the Senator not agree that if at Oak Ridge, for example, the Atomic Energy Commission required additional current for its gaseous diffusion plant, it could not take plutonium or uranium, or anything else, and generate current, except as a byproduct? In other words, it cannot set up a plant to generate current as current; it can only produce it as a byproduct. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not say that is bad; it does bother me, however.

Mr. PASTORE. We are getting down to the philosophy of the subject.

Concerning the question of whether the Commission has authority to construct nuclear power stations of substantial size, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] inserted in the RECORD in 1954 a statement which notes, in pertinent part:

The authority contained in S. 3690 permitting the Commission to build and operate atomic powerplants arises from the research and development provisions of the bill.

Any projects for atomic powerplants construction and operation by the Commission, either singly or jointly in participation arrangements with others, must be primarily for research and development purposes.

Varying amounts of energy may be generated by such projects. Section 44 authorizes the Commission to dispose of this byproduct power which would be, in fact, incidental to the research and development objective, but it is not the intention of the framers of this legislation to turn the Commission into a federally sponsored, commercial electric power generating agency.

This is not a power bill. This is a bill to advance research and development in aid of the art of making atomic machines—or of using atomic fuel—for the generation of power.

It would be impossible to account here for all of the remarks made in the House and in the other body on section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act. Suffice it to say that the section was debated at considerable length by both sides and that all agreed as to the limitations imposed on the AEC by the language ultimately adopted.

Thus there was established a clear legislative background on which opponents of the Hanford steamplant project can assert that the project is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Congress with respect to this section and the role of the AEC in the power-producing business.

If the Congress wanted to grant AEC blanket authority to get into the power business, or any other Federal agency for that matter, it had that opportunity in the language of the proposed section 45 which was adopted by the Senate and dropped in conference. The action of the committee of conference was sustained by both Houses, so there can be no doubt that the Congress expressed its will clearly on this matter, too.

Let us look for a moment at what was said at one point in the other body about section 45 and its effect. While the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was discussing this section, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] cut in to begin this exchange:

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield right there, the Senator has read the sentence to which my inquiry is addressed.

The Senator from Florida was referring to the first sentence of the proposed section 45. He continued:

The Senator from Florida is unable to see any provision which would appear to confine that sentence to the manufacture by the Atomic Energy Commission of power primarily for its own use.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct. I point out to the Senator the next sentence—

Which the Senator from Iowa read. Then he continued:

The staff of the Joint Committee has studied the amendment from various angles. We are finally convinced that there can be no question that this amendment would put the Atomic Energy Commission into the business of a production agency for the commercial production of electric power; and I submit that this is not the concept of the duties of the Commission. It will place it in the category of an operation.

This exchange, as well as any found in the legislative history of the Atomic Energy Act, characterizes accurately the purpose and intent of the proposed section 45 which the Congress did not adopt. When the Congress failed to adopt that section it said, in effect, that it was opposed to putting the AEC into the power-generating business for commercial purposes.

The Members should understand clearly that this section of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has remained unchanged for a good number of years. Strong opposition to the provisions of section 44 and strong support for section 45 was voiced that year, and I respect those gentlemen deeply and sincerely for their views on the important subject of the AEC's role in power production. But I must remind the Members that in subsequent Congresses our colleagues have not once attempted to resurrect section 45 or amend section 44 to give the Commission broader authority with respect to generation of a sizable amount of electric power for commercial use. Instead, they have chosen to leave the words of the Atomic Energy Act as they are and to leave the legislative history of the act as it is, and now seek a backdoor approach to the same end by means of this proposal to add 800,000 kilowatts of electric-generating capacity to the AEC's new plutonium-production reactor at Hanford.

We, who are opposed to the Hanford steamplant proposal, do not claim that it is in any way illegal for the Congress to authorize any Federal agency to perform any function or to engage in any sort of enterprise. It is for us here in Congress to decide, and only for us to decide, whether we shall change the established policy and authorize this project. But I would remind my colleagues that the Congress, in 1954, discussed this very matter at considerable length and explored it in considerable detail before arriving at a determination that the AEC should not get into the commercial power business. We cannot, in good conscience, overlook these facts of demonstrable history.

But I would suggest that the legislative history of section 44 has indeed been overlooked. The record of the debate on Hanford in the other body on July 18 seems to indicate this to me.

Through all of the legislative history of section 44 one word, more than any other, crops up time and again. It is the simple word "incident." This word is to be found in the language of section 44 and it is used to refer to power produced by the Commission. Read carefully the last sentence of section 44 and note where the word falls.

In my opinion much of the trouble with interpretation of section 44 rests in an understanding of what is meant by incident, or incidental. Webster's New International Dictionary, the unabridged second edition, dated 1942, defines "incident" as "coming or happening accidentally; not in connection with the main design; incidental; fortuitous." In this same dictionary, "incidental" is defined as "happening as a chance or undesigned feature of something else; casual; hence, not of prime concern; subordinate; as an incidental expense."

Let us now apply the test of this definition against the power to be produced at Hanford from conversion of the production reactor If the reactor design included, as in the initial authorization 3 years ago, features permitting conversion to power generation, is the power incidental? Does it happen as a chance or undesigned feature of operation of the reactor? Obviously not.

We see, therefore, that the Hanford project goes directly contrary to the intent of the Congress which, in 1954, said that the Commission should not enter the power-producing field except in the course of research and development. Not a single Hanford proponent claims that this is a research and development project; indeed not, for the funds would come under the heading of production of special nuclear materials.

It is within the province of the Congress to change its mind from one Congress to another or from one session to another. But after the careful analysis of this subject which was carried out in

these Chambers 7 years ago, I submit that Congress made up its mind once and for all on the role of AEC in the power field. I submit also that the Hanford project must fall of its own weight for this very reason.

We must not permit the back door to be opened at this time and in this manner to permit the AEC to enter the business of producing commercial electric power, for once opened, the door can never be barred again.

I would leave this suggestion with the Members. If the supporters of the Hanford project feel strongly enough and sincerely enough—as I am certain they do—that this proposal, which would put AEC into business as another Federal power-generating agency, is right and proper and just, let them come to the front door and ask that the Congress here assembled change the Atomic Energy Act to permit just this sort of thing. Let them introduce legislation to this effect for reference to the Joint Committee, for careful public hearings, and for action in these Chambers without affecting the other projects in the AEC authorization bill. If it be the will of Congress that the basic policy of the act be changed to permit this sort of activity on the part of the Commission, then so be it. But let the Hanford proponents establish a clear legislative record to reinforce their position. Let us not permit them to circumvent the clearly established intent of the Congress by going to the back door with a project of this importance.

Wisconsin Leadership Honored—Workmen's Compensation Law Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 4, a new 4-cent workmen's compensation law commemorative stamp will be released in Milwaukee, Wis.

Why in Wisconsin?

Because the Badger State—on May 3, 1911—enacted the first State compensation law for workmen to become effective in the Nation.

The stamp itself, as well as selection of Milwaukee as the site for issuance, reflects the leadership of Wisconsin in this, as well as other fields.

Depicting the significance of the stamp and its features, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of first, an article from the Sunday Washington Post entitled "Wisconsin's Leadership Honored," by Franklin Bruns; and second, an article from the Sunday Star containing a description of the stamp, by Belmont Faries, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S LEADERSHIP HONORED
(By Franklin Bruns, Jr.)

The 4-cent workmen's compensation law commemorative stamp, to be released September 4 at Milwaukee, Wis., will feature the scales of justice and equality, with a worker and his family balancing a representation of industry.

In the upper area is a dark bar, within which is the name of the State which passed the first validated compensation law, with the "O" of Wisconsin representing the fulcrum.

Norman Todhunter, New York illustrator, and a member of the Postmaster General's Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, conceived the design, which is in vertical format, with light and dark contrasts.

The left area is a dark presentation against a white background; the right half will be essentially white against a dark background. As a result of an understanding at the time of his appointment, Todhunter will receive no pay for his artistic contributions.

The workmen's compensation law commemorative stamp will be printed on the Cottrell presses, in a color yet to be announced, in panes of 50 subjects, electric-eye perforated. An initial order for 100 million of this stamp has been placed.

Collectors desiring first-day cancellations of the 4-cent workmen's compensation law commemorative stamp may send addressed envelopes, together with remittance to cover the cost of stamps to be affixed, to the postmaster, Milwaukee 2, Wis. The outside envelop to the postmaster should be clearly marked "First Day Covers, Workmen's Compensation Stamp." Collectors are cautioned that orders for first-day covers must not include requests for uncanceled stamps.

The pictorial portion of the first-day cancellation, to be applied at Milwaukee on September 4, will highlight elements of the State seal, and the motto "Forward."

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION
(By Belmont Faries)

The 4-cent workmen's compensation law commemorative stamp, to be issued September 4 at Milwaukee, Wis., will have an essentially abstract design seeking to communicate the ideal of law, perfect justice, the Post Office Department reports.

The design is divided down the center into halves, light on the left and toned on the right. According to the artist, Norman Todhunter, the New York illustrator, "this exact spatial symmetry suggests the idea of scales" with the "O" of the word "Wisconsin," centered above, as the fulcrum.

Exactly balanced on the scales are to the right a workman, his wife, and child, and to the left, a factory representing industry. Mr. Todhunter, a member of the Stamp Advisory Committee, contributed the design. The lettering, in Futura Medium, was executed by Jerry Mullen, of New York City.

The stamp will be printed in a single color in an order of 100 million. It will be issued in Post Office panes of 50. The engravers at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing were Charles A. Brooks for the vignette and Robert J. Jones for the lettering and numeral.

Covers for first-day cancellation, with remittance for the cost of the stamps, may be sent to the postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis. The outer envelope to the postmaster should be marked "First Day Covers Workmen's Compensation Stamp" and, in accordance with the 5-day rule, must be postmarked before midnight, August 30.

The pictorial portion of the first-day cancellation, to be used in Milwaukee September 4, will highlight elements of the Wisconsin State seal and the motto "Forward."

Medical Care for Illinois' Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the legislative proposals pending before the Ways and Means Committee is the administration's 1961 version of socialized medicine. In view of the emphasis being placed on defense spending and the need to maintain a balanced budget and a degree of fiscal responsibility even in the era of the New Frontier, it is well for us to pause and reflect on the tremendous burden the taxpayer would be forced to bear if even a portion of the administration's socialistic program would be enacted.

Recently the Illinois Legislature enacted and the Governor signed legislation coordinating with the Kerr-Mills bill passed in the 1960 session of Congress. The growing number of States which have developed legislative plans made possible by the Kerr-Mills law is testimonial to its practicality and the leadership and vigor present at the State level of government.

Therefore, I feel that Members of the House should be aware of the action of the Illinois General Assembly and the wisdom shown by the Governor in signing this bill. I insert into the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the August 3 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times which provides a concise explanation of the Illinois enactment. This editorial is entitled "Medical Care for Illinois Aged":

MEDICAL CARE FOR ILLINOIS AGED

A new State program of medical care for older persons with low incomes went into effect quietly this week when Governor Kerner signed two bills passed by the recent session of the Illinois General Assembly.

This State program, which grew out of the controversial Kerr-Mills legislation enacted by Congress last August, drew surprisingly little public attention during its trip through the legislature.

It may be helpful, therefore, to spell out here what the new program will mean to many older Illinoisans—and to the taxpayers who will be sent the medical bills.

First, the cost: The legislature appropriated $20 million to finance the program during the initial 2-year period. Under the Kerr-Mills legislation, that amount will be matched by the Federal Government. Thus, $40 million will be available to carry the program to July 1, 1963.

Illinois Public Aid Commission officials say that will not be enough money to provide all the medical services mentioned in the legislation signed by Kerner. So Illinois will start with a scaled-down program. The bills signed by Kerner called for 14 different types of medical services, including the cost of hospital and nursing home care, doctors, dentists, and drug fees, and home nursing care.

Under the tight program devised by Peter Cahill, chairman of the Public Aid Commission, Illinois will provide for qualifying old persons: Unlimited hospital charges, plus physicians feets for the first 30 days after the patient's discharge from the hospital. (Cahill estimates it would cost $105 million

to $130 million per biennium to provide the full range of services mentioned in the bills.)

Who can qualify for this service? Anyone over 65 earning less than $1,800 a year and having less than $1,800 in assets. For a married couple the combined income total is $2,400 and the asset ceiling $2,200. The home in which the elderly claimant lives is not counted in total assets. But the State can obtain a lien on the recipient's home after his death to recover the aid paid. In addition, claimants cannot accept the aid if they have a near relative able to afford the medical bill.

Finally, to save the State from paying small medical bills which the claimant supposedly can handle himself, the patient must apply the first 10 percent of his income and assets to his medical bill. That means a patient with a yearly income of $1,700 and $1,300 in assets must pay the first $300 in medical costs and the State will pay the rest.

IPAC Chairman Cahill estimates there are 975,000 persons in Illinois who are 65 and older. Of that total, he figures perhaps 450,000 have incomes of $1,800 or less, although he stresses that it is difficult to obtain accurate figures. Finally, he estimates that of "the 450,000, we might get from 230,000 to 300,000 who would be eligible for medical aid."

This Illinois program goes into effect at a time when there is renewed debate in Washington about the best way to finance medical care for the aged. A House committee now is holding hearings on the Kennedy administration's bill to do the financing through social security.

Critics of such programs as that established in Illinois and a dozen other States say these plans in cooperation with the Kerr-Mills legislation do not offer comprehensive enough medical services. We point out, however, that the Kerr-Mills legislation went into effect only last October 1 and that there has been no valid testing period of its effectiveness.

Until there is an opportunity to see the results of such tests, we suggest it would be premature to rush into a new and vastly more costly operation such as the social security plan would entail.

Greater Economic Feasibility for Hanford Electric Generating Facilities Shown by New Studies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have just been informed by the Atomic Energy Commission that the economic feasibility of adding electrical facilities to the Hanford reactor is even greater than we first thought.

As indicated in the letter we received today from the AEC, which I want to place in the RECORD, the net economic benefits are indicated to be almost twice as much as the studies early this spring showed. Unfortunately, the actual numbers are classified, since they would reveal production rates of nuclear material for our weapons program, although I think I can safely say that the benefits run well over $50 million.

After the Federal Power Commission, the General Electric Co., Burns & Roe, and the Atomic Energy Commission completed their studies early this spring, and the administration, based on these studies, proposed the construction of the Hanford reactor electric facilities, work continued on the feasibility studies. The General Electric Co. found that the reactor plant would actually have a better power distribution pattern than was first thought and would generate steam at 370 pounds per square inch in lieu of 235 pounds per square inch. This higher quality steam will permit more efficient conversion of the waste heat to electricity. The Atomic Energy Commission also found that the turbine generator capacity could be increased from 786 megawatts to 860 megawatts without an increase in cost.

The degree of economic feasibility of this project I think will meet anyone's standards for its justification.

I would like to have the unclassified portion of the Atomic Energy Commission's August 7, 1961, letter inserted at this point of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
August 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: This is in response to your letter of August 4, requesting an up-to-date report on the status of the design features of the Hanford new production reactor conversion facilities.

On May 22, 1961, the General Electric Co. made available to our Hanford staff revised technical assumptions concerning possible performance of the new production reactor which indicated increased steam pressures in the future, power-only, condition. Application of the revised assumptions leads to a steam pressure at the turbine throttles of approximately 370 psia, instead of the previous level of 235 psia, at the assumed power-only operating level of 3320 megawatts. The new information projects improved flattening of the neutron flux, improved orificing for water flow control, and the tolerability of higher water temperatures during the power-only period. There was no change in the reactor conditions applicable to the dual-purpose period.

Upon receipt of these revised assumptions from General Electric, Burns and Roe was asked to study alternate powerplant designs which would take advantage of the potential increase in efficiency and to evaluate the costs and benefits resulting therefrom. These studies were of course directly related to the Burns and Roe design effort on turbine generator specifications which is still underway. As a part of this evaluation it was necessary to coordinate the Burns and Roe technical studies with discussions with the BPA concerning the marketability during the dual-purpose period of power from plants of various capacities. The combined results of these studies indicate improved economics by sizing the powerplant at approximately 800 megawatts gross for the dual-purpose phase and 860 megawatts gross for the power-only phase. These values may be compared with case A-2 in the FPC report of 670 megawats during the dual-purpose period and 786 megawatts during the power period.

The resulting present worths and financial benefits, computed in the manner used by the FPC are given in the attached classified tabulation. As may be noted the improved design shows almost twice the net benefits calculated for the case used by FPC. This improvement is due both to greater efficiency associated with the higher steam pressure described above, and to the somewhat larger size of the turbine. It is presently estimated that the larger power capacity can be provided within the $95 million budget estimate.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, during last fall's campaign, Candidate Kennedy told the American people that, if elected, he would go to Washington and "get this country moving again."

In view of Marguerite Higgins' article in today's New York Herald Tribune, I am wondering in which direction our country is moving:

DIPLOMACY AND FULBRIGHT'S BOMB
(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINTON.—Senator FULBRIGHT, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, gave a spectacular example last week of the reason why virtually every professional diplomat in town cheered when his name was dropped from the roster of those likely to be named the New Frontier's first Secretary of State.

At precisely the most delicate moment, the Senator dropped a diplomatic bombshell in the most public way possible—a television program. The crux of the damage was contained in this exchange:

Question. In any negotiations over Berlin, Senator, would you be willing to accept any concessions on the part of the West which closed West Berlin as an escape hatch for refugees in any way?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I think that might certainly be a negotiable point. The truth of the matter is I think that the Russians have the power to close it [the escape hatch] in any case. * * * So why is this a great concession?

But as an appalled White House aid put it, it is not only a great concession but an "impossible concession" and one that has already been specifically ruled out by President Kennedy in his Berlin speech.

Even the Russians have long hesitated at giving the world the spectacle of turning back at gunpoint—for no other device would suffice—the men, women, and children risking all to get from Communist East Berlin to freedom Can anyone seriously imagine the West cooperating in this grisly spectacle of physically turning back those desperately seeking asylum?

And why should the West be entrapped into doing communism's dirty work? For there is every evidence that the Russians do not, in practice, have the power completely to seal off the Berlin escape hatch for the reason that to do so would bring more problems than it solves. Already even the few (so far) additional restrictions have panicked the East Germans into fleeing west at the rate of one every four seconds. Up until now the escape hatch has also served as a safety valve. It was the reason many East Germans stayed at their job, secure in the knowledge that if they wanted ultimately to leave they could. But any attempt to seal off the safety valve completely would bring an explosion throughout East Germany that

the experts agree, would make the revolt of 1953 look puny.

And finally how could the Kennedy administration, which is planning to make a case throughout the world on the principle of self-determination, be a party to denying this principle to the refugees who each day are "voting with their feet" for freedom?

Senator FULBRIGHT's inexplicable statement offers a double embarrassment to the administration. For President Kennedy is deeply grateful to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his great contributions in pushing the foreign aid bill through the Senate. The White House does not wish to embarrass the Senator by public repudiation. But at the same time, it must somehow reassure the violently disturbed people of Germany and Berlin that under the American system the responsible Democratic officials often do not speak for the Democratic administration.

The tragedy of this and other statements made on Germany last week by the Senator is that they came right after President Kennedy had, through a painstaking series of balances, struck a note in his Berlin speech that reassured Europe, but at the same time made plain to the Russians that this country was not bluffing.

This balance has been badly damaged. As could be expected, Mr. FULBRIGHT's statement was received enthusiastically beyond the Iron Curtain, particularly by the East German radio. In the West it brought an estonished demand for an explanation from West German Chancellor Adenauer. And the West German headlines were a mixture of anxiety and outrage.

"A moral low blow," said Hamburg's "Die Welt."

"Der Kurier," a Berlin paper, said "Senator FULBRIGHT * * * has a bad memory. We should like to remind him that his country also signed the Declaration of Human Rights of the U.N. Assembly. We presume that the Senator will read this declaration again before he pleads once more for the treatment of men as slaves of a regime."

Another Berlin paper, "Der Tag," declared: "We may congratulate ourselves that Senator FULBRIGHT did not become Secretary of State * * * we cannot understand how a man whom we regard as a friend deliberately wants to throw us into the teeth of our adversaries."

Said a European diplomat: "Isn't there some way to avoid—in such crucial times—a public clash on foreign policy between Democratic Party spokesmen and the President of the United States? Couldn't the American system provide for a sense of responsibility on the part of all Democratic leaders to a Democratic President?"

It is also a question being asked all over Washington except, it seems, on Capitol Hill.

The State Lotteries of Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this House the several state lotteries of Australia. Most of the states of Australia are currently operating lotteries—and they are profiting accordingly.

Five Australian state governments, including the governments of the three most populous states, conducted lotteries in 1960. Gross receipts amounted to $78 million. Net income came to $25 million.

Lottery income earned by all states is earmarked for hospitals, mental institutions, and welfare organizations. In addition, the lottery of the state of New South Wales was used to help finance the construction of a new opera house in Sydney.

The Australians, like most other peoples, see nothing wrong with lottery revenues. Why is America less wise in this respect?

Neutron Bomb Gives "Wider Choice Than Humiliation or All-Out Nuclear Action"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, development of the neutron bomb as a defensive weapon is the answer to President Kennedy's call for "a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear action."

Creation of this weapon offers a feasible and practical alternative to weaknesses in the Western economic, political and defense strategy. It fills the need for a politically acceptable nuclear weapon. Developing it can be accomplished within fiscal limitations. It could be used without the devastating nuclear side effects of less discriminate weapons. It could be used by NATO in Europe without precipitating a general nuclear war.

For these reasons prompt resumption of nuclear testing is necessary in order to give the West opportunity to develop the neutron bomb and provide the free world a new line of defense, a defense which can offer hope rather than total destruction.

The idea of the neutron bomb is one of the most important to emerge since that of the thermonuclear weapon. It can be used effectively against enemy troop concentrations in the field without damaging physical facilities and without creating widespread radiation fallout.

Should enemy troops invade Western Europe, the neutron bomb could be used on the battlefield to stem the aggressors without destroying the lives of the friendly population, without causing wholesale physical damage to cities and farmlands and without inviting a rain of Soviet nuclear rockets on the cities of NATO allies, including the United States.

Worldwide publicity and, to an extent, U.S. national policy, have stressed the destructive capabilities of present A-bombs and H-bombs ever since they were first devised. In contrast, there has been little interest in developing a national philosophy of nuclear restraint, and little interest in developing weapons to implement this philosophy of restraint. The neutron bomb is the first weapon which fills this gap. Only by testing can it be developed to an assured capacity.

President Kennedy has spoken of an alternative to "humiliation or all-out nuclear action" in the context of beefing up U.S. conventional forces. Although strengthening these forces, now unacceptably weak, is required, the President misconceives it as the alternative he seeks.

In both the short range and the long range communism's conventional forces will continue to outweigh the West's by wide margins. A nuclear "equalizer" is a continuous need if the West is to survive this handicap and stem the rising tide of communism. But, if the probability escalation is to be minimized, this "equalizer" must be a discriminate one, possessing these three essential characteristics:

First. The weapon's effects must be limited to the battlefield.

Second. The weapon's control must be safely delegable to subordinate military levels at the battlefield.

Third. The weapon's use must be designed strictly for tactical response against clearly aggressive, invading military forces in action, thereby denying the enemy excuse for escalation to all-out strategic nuclear action against nonmilitary targets.

The neutron bomb fulfills each of these requirements and is the positive antidote to the "no hope" philosophy certain leading intellectuals attach to the use of nuclear weapons of any size, under any circumstances. They reason that human nature should refuse to accept a "no hope" situation for long, but turn, instead, to almost any alternative which seems less hopeless. Their humiliating "better Red than dead" attitude is the result.

Now, before this debilitating attitude infects and undermines our national strength and character, President Kennedy should stop stalling the resumption of underground, fallout-free nuclear testing. He should order rapid development of the neutron bomb as a spearhead for revitalized Western defenses, stressing that it would fill our present gap in military capabilities by providing a flexible discriminate response to Soviet aggression.

Here lies a significant potential for the dynamic leadership and initiative this country needs so badly now, which Mr. Kennedy has promised, but has not yet produced.

This step will provide a defense more deadly to invading troops than any current means. It will afford a permanent answer to Red manpower superiority. It will greatly reduce the danger of escalation from limited war to nuclear war. It is economically, technically, and politically feasible.

To NATO European citizens, faced with crises far beyond Berlin, it offers hope for the first time for practical and safe use of nuclear weapons of unprecedented military effectiveness in their own territory, in their own defense against aggression.

"Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come." The neutron bomb concept could be the latest proof of the validity of this well-known quotation. There is every reason to believe it is.

The House Was Justified in Rejecting the $95 Million Hanford Steam Electric Plant and Should Not Be the Victim of Scare Tactics by Receding From Its Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of alerting the Members of the House of Representatives to the fact that the Hanford steamplant issue will be considered by the House as the first order of business on Tuesday, August 8, I have written the following letter to my colleagues describing the parliamentary situation and the motion that I will make to instruct the House conferees not to agree to "Project 62–a–6 electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., $95 million," as contained in the Senate amendment.

As mentioned in the letter, the proponents of the Hanford steamplant have failed to present conclusive arguments against the 10 critical points that were offered when the AEC authorization bill was on the floor of the House. Since that time, many threats have been directed against industry for the purpose of applying pressure on the Members of the House who supported the Van Zandt amendment which deleted the Hanford steamplant item from the bill by a teller vote of 176–140. In one instance the dire threat was made that if the Hanford steamplant project was not included in the AEC authorization bill, the bill would be skeletonized by taking from it many Federal projects in the field of atomic energy development, involving many of the Nation's leading manufacturers. Of course, should the bill be skeletonized and the development of atomic energy stymied, the responsibility would have to rest with those responsible for taking such action. In the meantime, however, those of us who oppose the Hanford steamplant project will stand by our guns because we feel the action taken by the majority of the House in rejecting the $95 million project was justified and for that reason, the House should not recede from its position.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1951.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Tuesday, August 8, the House will consider a rule (H. Res. 404) to take H.R. 7576, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, from the Speaker's table and request conference with the Senate thereon. It will be recalled that this bill as amended by the Senate contains the questionable Hanford steam electric plant which the House has previously rejected by a teller vote of 176–140. The Senate initiated the disagreement by restoring the project, but then resorted to the parliamentary maneuver of messaging H.R. 7576 back to the House without a request for conference. This was done to assure that the other body would get first chance to consider the conference report and thus leave the House in the position of bowing to the will of the other body or voting the whole bill down.

Immediately after the rule is approved—but before conferees are appointed—I will make the privileged motion to instruct the Managers on the part of the House to disagree with the Senate amendment which restored the $95 million Hanford electric generating facility. It is necessary to make this notion so that the House may have the opportunity to express its will on this particular project rather than having the will of the Senate imposed upon us. A roll call vote will be requested on my motion so the RECORD may show clearly the vigorous objection of the House of Representatives to including this item in the AEC authorization bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy indicated to the Rules Committee last Thursday that he personally would not be willing to agree to instructing the conferees on this question. The gentleman reminded the committee that on past occasions the other body has refused to meet with House conferees when they were previously instructed by the membership of the House. In answer to this may I point out that if the Senate refuses to go to conference on this question—regardless of the reason—the burden will be on that body for refusing the AEC authorization bill, and the House will have had the opportunity, to express its will on this particular project.

The Hanford issue has been discussed at considerable length since the bill was reported on June 21 (H. Rept. 562). In connection with that report, I joined a number of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in expressing your views in a separate statement relating to the Hanford proposal. In that statement we listed 10 reasons, compelling reasons, why the Congress should not authorize conversion of the Hanford reactor to generation of electric energy. I discussed these reasons with you in a letter sent to you on July 11, 1961.

In my opinion the proponents have failed to provide conclusive arguments against the 10 critical points which I and my colleagues raised in our separate statement on the Hanford steamplant. For example, they carefully avoid the legislative history of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and state categorically that this proposal is all the authorization that is needed to get the AEC into the business of producing power for commercial use, a business which, in the light of the legislative history of the basic legislation, is something that the Congress, in its wisdom, said that AEC must not enter.

The question has been raised as to what the effect would be should the House stand firm on its decision to delete the Hanford project from the AEC authorization bill and the Senate continue its position. Cannon's Precedents of the House of Represenatives seems to give an answer to this question:

"Statement with reference to an unwritten rule of conference that the House proposing an amendment on which agreement can not be secured must recede or accept responsibility for failure of the bill." (Cannon's Precedents, Vol. 8, p. 709, section 3209)

Therefore, I sincerely urge you to support my motion on Tuesday to instruct the House conferees to disagree with the Senate amendment in order that we have the right to work the will of the House on this project. Please remember that a vote to instruct the conferees can be interpreted as a positive vote for deleting the unnecessary and wasteful expenditure of this $95 million Hanford project from the AEC authorization bill.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Jaycees Oppose Plans of Kennedy Administration for Socializing Medicine and Effecting Federal Control of Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, at their national convention held last June in Atlanta, Ga., members of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce adopted two resolutions—one opposing H.R. 4222, the administration-backed bill for socializing medicine, and the other opposing Federal subsidies for public school construction and teachers' salaries—which I think every Member of Congress will want to read. I, therefore, wish to have the resolutions printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION ON OPPOSITION TO SOCIALIZED MEDICINE, ADOPTED JUNE 1961

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce is ever mindful of Federal legislative enactment which affects the economic and social lives of the people of this great Nation; and

Whereas there is currently pending in the Congress of the United States House bill 4222 initiating compulsory medical health care benefits under the social security system which is not in the best interest of the American people, and

Whereas enactment of this or similar legislation would be detrimental to the high standards of medical care, would deprive the citizens of the United States of the opportunity to provide their own medical care, would discourage our citizens of today from preparing for their old age and, at the same time, tend to remove the responsibility of men and women of America from caring for their own families; and

Whereas such legislation would be another step toward socialism and would jeopardize our free enterprise system which has made steady progress in extending and improving voluntary hospital insurance coverage of the aged under commercial programs; and

Whereas one of the present proposals has in it the element of Government determination of the price for hospital, nursing home and medical service fees and would restrict the beneficiaries in their choice of hospitals and physicians; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, would increase the cost of social security and would possibly be extended progressively to include comprehensive care for larger and larger segments of our population, thereby decreasing the take-home pay of the American citizen; and

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce believes this country has become great through the individual initiative of its citizens and that legislation of this type tends to surpress this initiative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, in convention assembled this 21st day of June, 1961, in Atlanta, Ga., hereby opposes the House bill 4222 now pending before the Congress of the United States or any similar legislation that may be introduced; be it further

Resolved, That the newly elected president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce be directed to request time to present personal

testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in July 1961; be it further

Resolved, That we believe that said proposed legislation would destroy our voluntary health program in the United States and further that it violates constitutional freedoms and the creed of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President and the Vice President of the United States of America, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and each Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION ON OPPOSING FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, ADOPTED JUNE 1961

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States of America certain legislative bills that would initiate a general program of Federal subsidies for public school construction and for payment of teachers' salaries; and

Whereas this organization realizes the importance of continued progress in providing school construction needs and in continued improvements in salaries paid to public school teachers; and

Whereas this organization humbly believes in the retention of the traditional methods of financing public schools, both in construction and payment of teachers' salaries; and

Whereas education now ranks among the country's biggest industries in terms of manpower, tangible investment and income; and

Whereas in the last decade available statistics show that the public schools did better—moneywise, salarywise, and constructionwise—than private industry and personal consumption, but handled by local and State appropriations; and

Whereas when the National Government guarantees services which it cannot itself provide, it inevitably tends to control the purveyors of said services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, in convention duly assembled, hereby publicly oppose any and all legislative programs of Federal subsidies for public school construction and payment of teachers' salaries;

Resolved further, That public school construction and payment of teachers' salaries continue to be a local and State government function;

Resolved further, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States of America, Vice President of the United States of America, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and each Member of the Congress of the United States of America;

Resolved further, That the press be sent copies of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce assign this resolution to a national vice president or committee of this organization for the execution thereof.

Truths or Lies—Article by Omar B. Ketchum, Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington Office, Appearing in the Monthly VFW Magazine

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I have pleasure and take pride in having received permission from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington office, to place before the attention of your own distinguished self and all the other Members of this great legislative body, and others who may also read, the text of a very significant, pertinent, and valuable article by Omar B. Ketchum, the distinguished director, appearing in the VFW magazine for August 1961, which issue of their very valuable veterans' magazine features their forthcoming 62d national convention to be held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 20–25.

Upon my concluding the reading of this splendid article by Director Ketchum, in which he sets forth those false charges as to veterans' benefits and also the truths relating to said benefits, I realized that the facts and analytical answers therein set forth would be of extreme value to all interested who had the opportunity to read the same.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I present the article "Truths or Lies?"

TRUTHS OR LIES—HERE'S A "TRUE OR FALSE" TEST FOR EDITORS HAUNTED BY "JUICY HANDOUTS" TO OUR NATION'S VETERANS

(By Omar B. Ketchum, director, VFW Washington office)

It is not unusual to read or overhear a silly statement concerning the cost of veteran benefits or "the juicy handouts to veterans who served a few weeks in military uniform." Metropolitan newspapers and tax conscious national magazines, in their fulminations against veterans benefits, have done an effective job in creating confusion and misunderstanding concerning the cost and application of veterans benefits.

What are the facts with respect to some of these misconceptions? Using a modified true or false presentation, the facts are as follows:

PROGRAM COSTS

1. The current cost of the veterans benefits program is higher than ever and threatens the national economy. True or false?

False. (a) From all angles the current cost of the veterans benefits program is less in dollars and less in percentage of national income.

(b) In the past 13 years the cost of the veterans benefits program, dollarwise, has dropped from $8.3 billion in 1947 to $4.1 billion in 1953, to the current 1961 estimate of $5.3 billion.

(c) In relation to national income (ability to pay) the current percentage cost of comparative veterans benefits is less than in the 1890's and 1930's, notwithstanding the fact that the number of veterans has increased from 3 percent to 14 percent of the total population.

(d) Where total Federal tax receipts are involved, the current expenditures for veterans benefits consume less than 8 percent compared to 30 percent in the early 1930's.

COMPENSATION

2. Veterans who received minor injuries in service receive monthly compensation payments for the rest of their lives. True or false?

False. Only those veterans who have service-incurred injuries, which are rated as 10 percent or more disabling, are entitled to receive compensation payments. If a compensable, service-incurred disability improves or disappears, compensation is reduced or discontinued. Thousands upon thousands of veterans who have service-connected injuries rated less than 10 percent disabling receive no compensation payments. Out of 22.5 million living veterans of all wars, slightly more than 2 million are receiving compensation for service-incurred injuries. More than one-half of these are in the 10, 20, and 30 percent ratings, which receive the lowest monthly compensation payments. Only about 82,000 are receiving compensation for disabilities rated 90 percent and above.

3. A service-disabled veteran who is able to work and support his family may receive compensation payments. True or false?

True. Compensation awards are based upon the degree of disability and whether it was incurred in service. The fact that a service-disabled veteran is able to work, own, or manage a business has no bearing on his entitlement to a basic compensation award.

PENSIONS

4. Veterans pensions are available to all who have worn the military uniform for a few weeks. True or false?

False. Veterans pensions are payable under certain conditions only to those veterans who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during a recognized war. Peacetime, or the so-called cold war veterans, are not eligible to receive veterans pensions. Out of 22.5 million living veterans, approximately 1 million are receiving veterans pensions.

5. Wartime veterans are automatically entitled to receive a pension upon application. True or false?

False. (a) With the exception of veterans of the Spanish-American War, who must meet service and age requirements, other wartime veterans must meet rigid tests of length of service, age, disability, unemployability, and income limitations.

(b) These war veterans (World Wars I and II, and Korea) must be rated permanently and totally disabled, using age and medical findings as the guide; must be unable to follow a gainful occupation; and must not have annual income from any source more than $1,800 where they have no dependents, or more than $3,000, if they have dependents.

(c) Income limitations are on an escalator scale ranging from $600 to $3,000 per year. Pension payments are also on an escalator scale ranging from $40 to $90 monthly. Maximum pension payments go to those with the lowest income and minimum pension payments go to those with the highest income within the limitations of $600 to $3,000 annually.

(d) For example, a veteran without dependents whose annual income from all sources is $1,750 and who is otherwise eligible for a pension, would receive $40 per month. A veteran with dependents, whose annual income from all sources is $2,900 and who is otherwise eligible for a pension, would receive $45.00 per month.

(e) A veteran without dependents, whose annual income from all sources is less than $600 and who is otherwise eligible for a pension, would receive $85 per month. A veteran with a dependent, whose annual income from all sources is less than $1,000 and who is otherwise eligible for pension, would receive $90 per month, plus a small additional allowance if he has three or more dependents.

(f) An income survey of pensioners is made annually by the VA and if incomes have increased beyond the limitations, the pension is reduced or discontinued.

BENEFITS

6. Veterans benefits are automatically awarded to veterans by the Veterans' Administration regardless of whether the veteran wants or needs the benefit. True or false?

False. With the exception of insurance dividends, and occasional congressional increases in benefit payments to those who are already on the VA rolls, veterans must file an application and prove their entitlement before becoming eligible to receive a benefit.

INSURANCE

7. The frequent dividend payments made to veterans on their insurance policies come out of taxes paid to the Federal Government. True or false?

False. Dividend payments to veterans are made from excess premium reserves. The premium payments were based on mortality tables that anticipated a higher death rate among GIs but the anticipated death rate, and the subsequent premium rates, were too high and the dividend payments have resulted.

VETERANS PREFERENCE

8. Veterans are the first to be hired on Federal Government job vacancies and are the last to be laid off when a reduction-in-force comes along. True or false?

False. (a) Veterans are required to take civil service examinations the same as nonveterans and must make a passing grade of 70 before they are entitled to a 5-point or 10-point addition to their examination grade. The 10-point addition is granted to those veterans who have a compensable degree of disability, or have been awarded the Purple Heart (combat wound) medal. A civil service register based on the examination grades, including the additional points granted veterans, is set up by the Civil Service Commission, with the veteran taking his place on the eligible Register in accordance with the total of his earned and added preference points. In the case of a 10-point veteran, he moves near the top of the Register in relation to the grade of any other 10-point veteran who is also listed on the Register.

(b) Using the job of an accountant as an example, when a request is made for an accountant the Civil Service Commission sends to the requesting agency the top three names on the eligible Register. If the agency is not satisfied with the names, it can call for more names and pass over the veteran or veterans at the top of the list by providing a written explanation to the Civil Service Commission for not hiring the veteran. If the agency does not like the background of any of the men whose names are submitted by the Civil Service Commission, it can transfer or promote a nonveteran status employee from within or outside the agency, without regard to the eligible Register.

(c) A veteran who is employed by the Federal Government has no preference in promotion and may be consistently passed over by the agency involved.

(d) Theoretically, veterans employed by the Federal Government are entitled to preference in retention when a reduction-in-force takes place. Actually, many devices have been employed to nullify this retention right. For example, designated competitive areas may limit retention preference to specific areas or activities within a single agency, or a single installation. Another device is to rewrite job classifications to eliminate veterans.

HOSPITALIZATION

9. Veterans and their dependents are entitled to "lifetime" medical care in Veterans' Administration hospitals. True or false?

False. (a) Dependents of veterans—unless they, too, are veterans—are not entitled to VA hospital and medical care.

(b) Only those veterans with a service-connected disability for which medical treatment is needed are entitled without question, to hospitalization and medical care in a VA hospital.

(c) All other veterans are subject to three requirements before being admitted to a VA hospital. First, the veteran must actually be in need of hospitalization and medical treatment as determined by competent medical examination. Second, there must be an available bed in a VA hospital which is not needed for a service-disabled veteran. The manager of each VA hospital makes this determination. Third, the veteran must sign an affidavit that he is not financially able to pay for hospitalization and medical treatment in a private hospital, and he must provide detailed information concerning his income and assets.

(d) Total VA hospital facilities could care for only about one-half of 1 percent of the total veteran population at any one time. These facilities could care for only 2½ percent of the total number of veterans in the course of an entire year. Millions of veterans have never applied for VA hospitalization and have never been admitted to a VA hospital.

10. A veteran can ride up to a VA hospital in a Cadillac, or with $1,000 in his pocket, and obtain free medical treatment. True or false?

True. No one has ever seen this happen but a veteran who lost a leg or arm on D-Day could drive up to a VA hospital in a Rolls Royce or Mercedes Benz with a pocket full of money, and receive free medical treatment if his service-incurred amputation needed attention.

Knuckling Under to Bullies Weakens Our Position in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer to the Berlin situation, and to every other Communist created crisis designed to further progress of the Communist conspiracy for world domination—and that is to back up our strong words with strong action. The Communists will bully their way to conquering the world and only the determined will of the United States stands in their way at this moment. We can solve the Berlin problem, we can put a halt to Communist aggression everywhere by taking action now against the Kremlin stooge in Cuba, Fidel Castro. Bring him to account for the unlawful seizure of American property and for kidnaping American citizens and we will serve notice on Khrushchev that the strength of America, the determination of America to protect its freedom is not a bluff and that we are prepared to fight and to win any war he starts either deliberately or through miscalculation. The case is well stated in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

PAYDAY AND BULLIES

The hijacking at El Paso has aroused the American people to a fever pitch, and at times they are hard to arouse. At heart we are isolationist. We want to get along. We are generous to a fault. But we do not like to be bullied, and we detest the role of a "sucker."

Truth is, bullies like Castro and Khrushchev pick on us and insult us because in many respects we have acted in our foreign policy in a way to encourage them.

Have you stopped to consider what we have done to inspire banditry and bullies?

1. We gave away—sincerely at the time—the freedom of Eastern Europe when Roosevelt and Truman sat down with Stalin.

2. We sold out Chiang Kai-shek—made it possible for Communists to take over China and isolated Chiang on Formosa.

3. In Korea we locked horns with Asiatic Communists, and disgracefully refused to whip them.

4. When freedom fighters of Hungary revolted against the Russians, we didn't move a hand to help them, after urging them by radio propaganda to cast off the chains of their dictatorship.

5. When an upstart like Egypt's Nasser seized the Suez, and the British wanted to teach him a lesson, we backtracked while Nasser "laughed up his sleeve."

6. We gave or lent some $95 billions in foreign aid in defense of freedom-loving peoples trying to keep their freedom—but included in those gifts Communists like Tito who took our money to destroy freedom.

No wonder a "pipsqueak" like Castro came to New York, cooked chickens in a hotel, and insulted America at every opportunity. No wonder he hijacks a plane, plays the visionary for "suckers" on deals like tractor exchanges, and calls us mosquitoes in a swamp.

There have been times, since 1946, when we have shown courage and boldness. Our defense of little Greece, the Berlin airlift, the magnificent direction of General MacArthur in Japan after the war, are top examples of American ingenuity and initiative at their best.

It is true that we must keep our heads and not let irritations induce an unwise impulsiveness. We must not rock the international boat, if the rocking can sink civilization.

But Castro and Mr. K. are straining our patience. Our ethical conduct, our morals, our generosity will not tolerate continued insults and backstabbing.

To sum: We ought to put Mr. Castro in his place, or we will not be able to live with the rest of the world or with ourselves.

Lullaby for Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the unfortunate developments of recent times has been the tendency for us to become completely self-critical, emphasizing our faults rather than our Nation's accomplishments. Obviously, the campaign tactics of the Democratic Party in 1960 have been greatly responsible for this attitude.

The same type of misguided approach has been used in comparing the advances of foreign countries with those of the United States. It was natural, therefore, that our attention be directed to the recent announcement of Soviet Dictator Khrushchev concerning the 20-year program that his regimented nation is embarking upon.

Mr. Speaker, in an editorial Tuesday, August 1, Chicago's American discussed this new Soviet plan in a most practical, intelligent manner with the proper perspective needed at this time. I ask leave to insert into the RECORD this editorial entitled "Lullaby for Russians":

LULLABY FOR RUSSIANS

The 20-year program which Premier Khrushchev presented to the Russians over the weekend should quiet the shakes of those Americans who have taken his word for it that he is about to bury us.

This document comes much nearer being a lullaby for the Russian public than a serious plan for outproducing the United States. And it attains a rare juvenile quality in the argument which Khrushchev offers the Russians in the effort to convince them that the struggle with the United States is just about won.

Communism, he says, "inevitably will take over from capitalism everywhere," because this is "the objective law of the development of society." If there is any law on the development of society it is simply this: Society develops as people develop it. It will never develop the way Khrushchev wants it to unless the West gives up the struggle to keep society free; and the West has just finished telling Khrushchev, through the words of President Kennedy, that it will defend freedom at any cost.

The rest of the program consists of promises. None of them is fortified with an explanation of what is being done to bring about their fulfillment; they are just carefree predictions of joys to come.

They are enormously important to the West, though, because the many miserable conditions which Khrushchev promises to correct add up to a dismal confession of communism's economic failure.

Before long, the program promises, Russians will have more meat, fats, fruits, and vegetables. This is an admission that the Soviet collective farm program is a flop.

In the second half of the program—at least 10 years from now—each family will have an apartment of its own, Khrushchev says, thus confessing the almost incredible fact that the Russian people do not have homes. They are sheltered from the weather by being jammed together, two families at least to an apartment, where they live always in each other's hair. Communism has failed to provide housing.

The Russians are promised "higher quality consumer goods, including durable and attractive clothes, all kinds of goods for cultural needs." The collective system has left the public crudely clothed and without the articles of comfort, convenience, and beauty that most civilized peoples take for granted.

Russian women will be relieved of such tasks as digging ditches and laying bricks; poorly paid workers ($100 a month or less) will get more money; more automobiles will be produced for the public (a promise that should be easily made good because almost none are produced for ordinary people now); education and school lunches will be free, and free homes will be provided for the aged.

What all this comes to is that Communist Russia, if Khrushchev can make good on his promises, will barely begin, 20 years from now, to approach the standard of living which free Western peoples enjoy now.

It is time for the West to stop letting Khrushchev, boss of the Communist system that can't do so many simple things, scare the daylights out of it every time he raises his voice.

The Executive Branch Must Never Control the Public Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, a Hearst newspaper published in my district on August 2, 1961, published an editorial strongly supporting my view that the executive branch must never be allowed to obtain control of the public purse. This is as it read:

LONG-RANGE AID

The House Foreign Relations Committee is supporting the President's long-range aid bill, but that doesn't mean the bill will pass. There will undoubtedly be a fight on the floor of the House against any attempt to bind future Congresses which no Congress has a constitutional right to do.

The argument here has nothing to do with placing limitation on foreign aid. It does have to do with the nature of our Government; with the right of the people to control Government authority; with a rejection of excessive authority of the Executive. This is always an important matter when a strong man is in office.

Granted that we may be on the verge of war and that foreign aid can be a weapon of war, it nevertheless is characteristic of the American system of government that sovereignty rests with the people and that they alone must have control of the public purse. The Constitution is absolutely clear on the subject. It is a characteristic of American history that whenever a President has fouled the Constitution, he failed in holding the good will of the people.

It is not necessary for President Kennedy to have a long-range aid bill.

Mr. Philleo Nash, Newest Frontiersman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the relationships between people and Government and between governments are more complex than they ever have been, it is a relief to know that competent men are to serve us in positions of authority. Mr. Philleo Nash, a native of Wisconsin and, I might add, one of its most distinguished citizens, nominee for Commissioner of Indian Affairs, is one of these able people.

From personal experience with Philleo Nash, former Wisconsin Lieutenant Governor, I can testify that he is more than qualified to handle the post to which he has been nominated. His knowledge of interior matters and Indian affairs combined with his knowledge of the vagaries of politics will serve him well.

Today's, August 7, 1961, Washington Post carried a witty and appropriate editorial on our Newest Frontiersman. With broad support from many quarters, including this fine newspaper, it is hoped that this nomination will be speedily confirmed by the Congress. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD:

NEWEST FRONTIERSMAN

The administration has nominated a remarkably well-qualified official for the important post of Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Philleo Nash has a grasp of both practical politics and the problems of the American Indian. The likable, genial, and persuasive Mr. Nash served as a White House aid on minority affairs for President Truman and later was elected Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin. He also is a trained anthropologist who has studied and worked extensively with the Indians.

Since January there has been no permanent head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Mr. Nash, however, served on the task force which has made major proposals for constructive changes in Indian policy. Although the appointment has been unduly delayed, Secretary of Interior Udall has made amends by finding the right man for the job. It will be hoped that Congress will swiftly confirm the appointment. Among other things, the city can use the insights of an anthropologist who understands the tribal ways of politics as well as of Indians.

Fact and Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the following article taken from one of our trade magazines, complimenting our chairman, PETER MACK, on his handling of subcommittee hearings on the joint resolution to provide the Securities and Exchange Commission with $759,000 to investigate the securities market:

WITH ALL THY GETTING, GET UNDERSTANDING—FACT AND COMMENT

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

SEC INQUIRY USEFUL

Now that the House Commerce Subcommittee has approved a joint resolution to provide the Securities and Exchange Commission with $750,000 to investigate the securities market, we hope that Congress will promptly complete passage of the legislation. Much of value to investors, the financial community and the Nation's economic health can and should result from this inquiry.

It has been apparent before and during Representative PETER F. MACK'S subcommittee hearing that there is concern in many quarters as to the adequacy of present safeguards in today's markets. In the unlikely event that the Commission's study concludes all is well in all areas, investor confidence will be fully restored. Those with the responsibility of safeguarding stockholders from malpractices will be able to rest easy. This seemingly negative result would of itself justify the probe.

But it is far more likely that some inadequacies of present legislation will be revealed. For maximum usefulness, we hope the SEC investigation will cover a very broad area and do it in depth.

It is heartening to note the support for the study expressed by the American Stock Exchange—now the subject of a more limited SEC investigation sparked by the Re manipulations—and the endorsement by the National Association of Securities Dealers, whose regulations have been receiving new scrutiny as a result of the apparently unending stream of hot new issues. New York Stock Exchange President Keith Funston's more tepid reaction as it pertains to his marketplace is understandable. The Big Board's regulations and the SEC's concentration on this major exchange are an effective guard against the repetition of the roaring twenties' flagrant abuse of investors.

Yet, to remain above suspicion the Big Board must submit to some attention in an investigation that is to cover all facets of the securities business.

More funds may be needed if the job is to be done comprehensively and well. We hope the Commission won't feel interim sensations are necessary to maintain public interest and to coax forth larger appropriations. Such tactics form the only possible danger.

Congressman MACK's conduct of the preliminary hearings give every indication that he and his colleagues are determined to have the SEC do serious work, with results that can be immensely useful to investors, the financial community and the economy.

Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Interior Plans for Coal Research Under the Randolph Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg, of the Atomic Energy Commission, with respect to the programs and projects which are planned to carry out the Randolph amendment which would authorize $5 million for research on nuclear processes in the utilization of coal. From the AEC letter is will be apparent that the Commission has very well-defined plans and projects to carry forward this program during the coming fiscal year if this amendment is adopted and funds are made available.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Chairman HOLIFIELD's letter of August 4, 1961, to AEC, and Chairman Seaborg's reply of August 7, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the correspondence is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
August 4, 1961.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: It would be appreciated if the Commission would provide the Joint Committee with a statement indicating the program and projects which would be initiated or accelerated in the event the Congress adopts the amendment submitted by Senator RANDOLPH and approved by the Senate, providing $5 million for research on nuclear processes which have application for utilizing coal.

A question has been raised as to the role of the Department of Interior in such a coal research program. It had been my understanding that the Department of Interior would actively participate in this program through its Office of Coal Research and the Bureau of Mines by means of arrangements between AEC and the Department of Interior for the transfer of funds for carrying out large segments of the program. It would be appreciated if you would indicate in your statement in general how these arrangements would be implemented.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: In your letter of August 4, 1961, you asked for information concerning the programs and projects which we would initiate or accelerate if the Congress adopts the amendment to our fiscal year 1962 authorization bill which authorizes us to spend $5 million for research on nuclear processes which would have application for utilizing coal.

In view of the fact that funds for such a program are not included in our fiscal year 1962 budget, we have not developed our plans as completely as we have for other programs which are in the budget. However, we have given quite a bit of thought to this area and the points discussed in this letter are reasonably firm.

There are a number of areas where nuclear energy holds promise of being of great assistance to the coal industry. The scope of the areas in which nuclear energy could be of help is very broad, extending from the actual mining operation through the development of new uses and new markets for coal and coal products. For example, nuclear radiation may make it possible to utilize coal as the raw material in the production of various materials for use in industry and agriculture which are now produced from other sources. Similarly, the heat generated by nuclear reactions may speed the day when gasification of coal is an economic reality rather than a dream, or it may point the way toward more efficient and more economic means of removing the coal values from their place in nature. Of equal importance is the fact that radioisotopes produced by nuclear processes may well be instrumental in improving health and safety conditions in mining operations as well as in showing the way to improvements in mining and processing operations themselves.

The programs which we would carry out starting in fiscal year 1962, should the necessary authorization and appropriations be given by Congress, cover all of the potential areas where nuclear processes may benefit the coal industry.

The largest program which we would undertake covers studies and research and development aimed at solving the problems of coal gasification. This program, which we estimate at approximately $2 million in fiscal year 1962, is divided into four parts as follows: (1) conceptual design of a nuclear reactor capable of delivering outlet coolant at 2,200° F. using long-lived low cost fuel, (2) conceptual design of a coal gasification plant to use the heat from such a reactor, (3) development and design of critical key components for the overall plant, including the reactor, and (4) an expansion of the work on high temperature, long-life fuels to be used in this reactor.

The results of this integrated program, some work on which has been underway for the past few years, should lead to a pilot plant and eventually to a prototype should the economics prove interesting.

The work on this program would be undertaken by our national laboratories and by industrial contractors, and would require very close cooperation with the Bureau of Mines, at the Morgantown, W. Va., site.

Another program, of almost equal magnitude, and possibly of more far reaching consequence to the coal industry in the event of success, deals with the possibility that chemical reactions induced by massive nuclear radiation may make possible the use of coal as the basic raw material in the production of chemicals which are used in large quantities by industry and agriculture. In this effort, we plan a two-pronged approach. One, which we estimate will cost of the order of $400,000 in fiscal year 1962, will be basic in nature and will be aimed at obtaining a better understanding of radiation induced reactions. This work would be done primarily at our laboratories and at those of the universities. The other part of this program would be of a more applied nature and would be aimed at determining the technical and economic feasibility of producing specific chemical compounds or mixtures of compounds by reacting coal with water, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, and other materials under the influence of massive nuclear radiation. This latter effort, which would cost approximately $1,500,000 in fiscal year 1962, would be carried out at our laboratories, at universities and in the engineering laboratories of industry.

Another program which we feel can have immediate as well as long range beneficial impact on the coal industry is a proposed $500,000 program aimed at the use of radioisotopes to improve health, and safety conditions of mining operations and to increase efficiency in mining, processing, transportation and utilization of coal.

There are several areas where it appears that use of radioisotope tracer and gaging techniques can be useful in mine safety. In fiscal year 1962, we propose to initiate studies on such things as:

1. The use of radiation from radioisotopes to minimize the probability of static discharge and thus to lessen the chances of mine explosions.

2. The use of radioactive tracers to follow the flow of noxious gaseous and liquid mine effluent and thus to improve the control of pollution from coal mining and processing operation.

3. The use of radioisotope gaging and detection equipment for on-the-spot checks of integrity of roof support structures, hoisting equipment, and other critical equipment.

Aside from the safety directed programs, we would undertake work aimed at using radioisotope techniques to improve efficiency of operation. Examples of such activities are:

1. Use of radioisotope gages in bore holes to determine quality and extent of reserves.

2. Use of radioisotope gages in analyses of coal for more efficient burning and processing.

3. Use of radioisotope sensing instruments to assist in the automatic control of mining, transport and processing equipment.

The work on utilization of radioisotopes by the coal industry would be done largely by industrial laboratories and it would require very close cooperation, not only with the Office of Coal Research of the Department of Interior, but also with the mine and processing operators themselves.

In addition to these programs which have fairly definite objectives, we would propose to institute a series of longer range studies to determine in what other areas nuclear processing might be expected to have a beneficial impact on the coal industry. Our initial efforts in this work would be to look at the feasibility, practicality, and potential long-range economics of using nuclear reactors at mine sites to produce high temperature, high pressure steam which might be used to extract the coal values from their place in nature, not as a solid, but as a gaseous or liquid material.

In this general study program, we would also try to find out if nuclear processes could make it possible once again for coal to be the starting point in production of such things as benzene and anthracene which were once produced from coal but are now largely produced from liquid or gaseous hydrocarbons.

These general studies would cost an estimated $400,000 in fiscal year 1962, and would be made by industrial contractors or our laboratories working in close cooperation with the Office of Coal Research and the coal industry.

As one last and much longer range effort to assist the coal industry, we propose a program of grants to universities in coal producing areas to encourage increased efforts on research and development aimed at improving coal mining, processing, or utilization by means of nuclear processes. The cost of this phase of our proposed program in fiscal year 1962 is estimated at $200,000.

With regard to your questions about the role of the Department of Interior in the program, I have already indicated that large portions of the program must, of necessity, be carried out in close cooperation with the Office of Coal Research or with the Bureau of Mines. While we have not yet developed the details of such cooperation, it is clear the the full talents of both agencies, and of the entire coal industry, must be brought to bear if the program is to be a success. Some programs, such as conceptual design of reactors, development of nuclear fuels, studies of the effect of massive nuclear radiations on chemical reactions, and the construction and operation of any nuclear pilot plants or prototypes which might develop as the program progresses, together with all aspects of nuclear safety, are clearly areas where the AEC will take the lead and the Department of Interior will furnish support. In other cases, such as the programs aimed at utilizing radioisotopes to improve safety or to enhance operational efficiency of specific mining or processing operations, it seems equally clear that the Department of Interior will take the lead and the AEC will give technical support to the effort. In still other cases, such as design and development of overall coal gasification plants or studies of the possible use of nuclear reactors at mine sites, the joint talents of both agencies will be required.

In order to assure a unified program, aimed at the primary objective of using nuclear processes to assist the coal industry, I would suggest that funds for the entire program be appropriated to the AEC with such transfer to the Department of Interior as is required being made after more definitive agreements have been reached between the two agencies.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

Senator Kefauver and the Swindlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson which appeared in the New Republic of August 7, 1961.

This well deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Tennessee results from his exposure of the shady practices—engaged in by certain elements of our society—where it hurts the most: the field of human health.

The article follows:

KEFAUVER AND THE SWINDLERS

Nobody has found in this quarter anything resembling blind partisanship in favor of the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator from Tennessee. His perennial aspiration for higher office has been viewed from this angle with a lack-lustre eye, and so have many of his ideas.

But the trend of events is forcing a change of attitude in at least one superficial observer. Today Kefauver is hated by every thief in the United States; and most venomously by the pious banditti who claim that they pick our pockets pro humanitate et gloria Dei. Which inclines one to adopt the slogan that Governor Bragg gave the Cleveland Democrats: "We love him for the enemies he has made."

The glorious part of it is that every arrant rogue who spits blasphemies at the very mention of Kefauver has ample reason for his rage. It is astonishing what a variety of rapscallions this one investigator has exposed. Purveyors of rotten foodstuffs; manufacturers of poisonous lipsticks; manipulators of the 3-inch yardstick, the 14-ounce pound, the box with the false bottom and any number of other pretentious rascals have been shown up for what they are. Recently he has been working on the pseudo-scientific quacks who sell goose-grease under a 5-syllabled name at a profit of 1,800 percent; and in this he has aroused the opposition of the lordly American Medical Association. His offense was bringing out the fact that the AMA's sacrosanct Journal has increased its advertising revenue several million dollars since it dropped its policy of affixng a special label to medicines proved to be honest.

A good deal of this work has been ignored by media of communication dependent upon advertising, but enough has been spread abroad to prove that it is not without cause that the felonious element in American business hates the man. And the force of this hatred has lifted him out of the ruck of anonymities whose period in Washington has benefited none but themselves and has put the Tennesseean in the relatively short list of those whose membership in Congress has profited the country as a whole.

The economic effect of KEFAUVER'S labors is an uncertain quantity. A fool and his money are soon parted, and there is not much that Congress can do about it. A certain number of Americans will continue to buy rattlesnake oil for a cancer cure, and pay its weight in gold for chopped hay in fancy packages, from here to eternity; for many men will believe what they want to believe, and above all they want to believe in miracles. Which makes it fairly certain that swindlers will live high through the predictable future.

But the psychological effect is apparent and excellent. After all, the mere existence of the pickpocket among us is not a serious threat to the survival of the Nation. What really hurts is when he comes to be regarded as a worshipful master instead of a scurvy knave. For if we lose our cash, we can earn more; but judgment is extremely hard to replace.

There is all too much evidence that in recent years the people of the United States have shown a woeful lack of judgment, in the marketplace as in the forum. We have been sold enough snake oil to float, not a battleship, but the Atlantic Fleet; and what is far worse, we have exhibited a tendency to erect the purveyors thereof into stages and heroes.

KEFAUVER has made this clear, not by the McCarthy method of insinuation and unsupported accusation, but by putting the cold facts on record. Every man accused of skullduggery has been given ample opportunity to disprove the charges, and one or two have actually done so. These have profited by the experience, emerging from the investigation with honesty stamped upon their record like a check certified at the bank.

But these, representing mistakes of the investigators, have been few. For the most part, what has passed before the committee has been an astounding procession of poisoners, extortioners, manipulators of cheating weights and measures, and hex doctors. Nor did these consist of human garbage scraped out of the gutters. Many of them are millionaires, some great tycoons with the ineffable gall to pose as pillars of society.

Perhaps the apothecaries, known now as the pharmaceutical industry, came off worst, but if so it was because their pretense, not their offense, has been greatest of all. There was no evidence that they have been distributing poisons, like the cosmeticians, nor contaminated stuff, like the deadly mayonnaise of recent memory. There was some testimony that they have made false claims for nostrums about as effective as Chief Ragged Bear's miraculous vegetable compound; but their besetting vice was avarice.

Public servants, they—at a profit of 1,900 percent. Nice work, if you can get it, and get away with it.

A National Symbol, Not a Pretty Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, our search for a national floral emblem has no greater champion than Margo Cairns, "the corn tassel lady," who continues to score points in favor of the corn tassel. She has supplied me with more imposing reasons why we should choose the corn tassel. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to call them to the attention of the Members:

A NATIONAL SYMBOL, NOT A PRETTY FLOWER

(By Margo Cairns)

How often we read the following:

"Scotland has the thistle, England the rose, and France the fleur-de-lis; but the United States has no national flower."

The thistle, the rose, the fleur-de-lis are not flowers in the actual sense; they are symbols of great events which tie them to the history of those three nations—Scotland, England, France. They are woven into the full fabric of these nations.

Scotland's thistle, England's rose, the fleur-de-lis of France do not need to be grown in greenhouses for they are engraved on the heart, sculptured in marble, embroidered in tapestries, portrayed in oils, renewedly created in gold, platinum, and precious gems.

There is no need in Scotland, England, or France to search for perfect soil where they will thrive for they are rooted in the minds of thinking people, freshened by the streams of memories, strengthened by national pride, and remain forever in full bloom as symbols of these nations.

Is it right that each Congress through 70 years should have been disturbed by the continuing chatter about a pretty flower, an ephemeral bit of color utterly devoid of historical significance? Is it not time to realize that a floral symbol, like our flag, must be the veritable expression of our traditions, our history, our greatness, our national dignity? Would Americans going into battle be inspired by the memory of the daisy, violet, goldenrod, margigold, or rose?

Oh, the strength in the memory of the corn tassel waving from "sea to shining sea," the floral symbol of pioneers fed and

nourished, of our Nation born through dependence upon its unfailing fruitage. Now, because of the wealth of its fruitage in food, industry, manufacture, and commerce, the United States has the place of a leading nation in the world—all in 354 years.

"Old Glory" is the flag of our Nation; the corn tassel, the flag of our rich and fruitland. May the hearts of all Americans be quickened by reverential memories, and soon proclaim the corn tassel the symbol of our national pride and gratitude.

Controlling the Pesticides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, widespread lack of knowledge as to the effects of pesticides is causing a serious problem in this country. Our Nation's streams, reservoirs, soil, and wildlife have all suffered considerable damage as a result of wholesale misuse of chemicals known as the economic poisons.

More intensive research is necessary to improve the effectiveness of these pest-spraying chemicals. There is an equally urgent need to inform the public about the dangers of their misuse.

On July 31 an informative editorial on the subject appeared in the New York Times, entitled "Controlling the Pesticides." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CONTROLLING THE PESTICIDES

Efforts to modify Government pest-spraying programs, so as to safeguard public health and minimize damage to wildlife, are making some progress. But the recklessness of official pest-control agencies is only part of the problem.

Government uses but a small fraction of the estimated three to four billion pounds of the so-called "economic poisons" that are being spread annually, and in increasing volume, across the American landscape. Most of the new, potent chemicals are sprayed or broadcast privately by farmers or householders with little thought given to the effects upon wildlife, to the consequences of a build-up of poisons in the soil, or the dangers of runoff into streams and reservoirs.

Drenching trees and the soil beneath them with DDT has been highly destructive of bird life in many communities, while failing to halt the spread of Dutch elm disease. There is evidence that some insect problems have grown worse with the use of chemicals, the effects of which are not yet fully known.

Federal and State studies of stream pollution show a growing number of instances where fish have been killed by agricultural poisons. In one example cited by the U.S. Public Health Service, fish kills occurred in 15 different tributaries in the Tennessee River Valley following the application of an insecticide to cotton fields in eight Alabama counties.

To meet this difficult and growing problem two things are necessary. The first is more intensive research into safe control methods and more specific poisons, i.e., materials that will kill the pest without damaging a variety of other living forms. The second need is for adequate information to the public about the dangers.

At present no agency of the Federal Government, and probably none in most States, has been given authority or direction to instruct the public in safe methods of applying pesticides and in the hazards of misuse. If the industry fails to assume its own responsibility, Government may have to step in with controls.

Hanford Reactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Stephen Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, in respect to the Hanford power facilities project recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission. The letter enclosed a pamphlet which was entirely irrelevant to the Hanford issue now before the Congress and does not merit further comment. However, in his letter, Mr. Dunn touched on a subject of broader importance than he gives it when he stated that the coal industry is "unalterably opposed to Government subsidy of a competitor."

This policy has many ramifications, one of which I discuss in my reply to Mr. Dunn. I assume that every Member received a similar letter from Mr. Dunn and so I believe my reply might be of general interest:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1961.

Mr. STEPHEN F. DUNN,
President, National Coal Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DUNN: Thank you for your letter of July 28 in respect to the proposed Hanford reactor generating facilities. I appreciate having your views although, as you may know, I supported the installation of generating facilities at Hanford during the debate on July 13 in the House.

However, I do have some concern about the more general question raised by your letter of whether the Government should subsidize one type of fuel to the disadvantage of others. The numerous studies made of the proposed Hanford facilities make it clear that this project is not such a case. The issue here is whether to make economic use of a byproduct source of energy from a reactor which will make plutonium for weapons or waste the steam into the Columbia River. You are mistaken in believing that the Hanford power facilities would affect the coal industry adversely.

On the other hand, there can be little question that the regular commercial type of atomic powerplant does represent competition for the fossil fuels such as coal. Since the Hanford issue arose, I have been looking into some aspects of the U.S. atomic power program, and I find that the government does appear to be subsidizing these commercial-type atomic powerplants through the prices it has guaranteed to pay through at least mid-1963 for the byproduct plutonium which they produce.

I wonder if you are aware of the fact that the present floor price the Atomic Energy Commission will pay utilities for their byproduct plutonium is $30 per gram, although the Commission estimates that its fuel value is only $9.50 per gram? The AEC price for plutonium thus appears to include a hidden subsidy of $20.50 per gram. I understand its value to a utility—on the average—is equivalent to about 1.5 mills per kilowatt hour of power produced from an atomic powerplant.

Your association doubtless is also concerned about the effect on the coal industry of the atomic powerplants which the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. and the Southern California Edison Co. are planning to build in the near future in California. As you know, the combined generating capacity of these two large plants will be about 660,000 kilowatts or approximately the capacity of the power facilities recommended for Hanford. Southern California Edison, I understand, is asking almost $20 million in direct Federal grants for its project, partially from funds which would be authorized by H.R. 7576.

In addition, these power company plants would be heavily subsidized by the Government under present plutonium price policies. The 1.5-mill-per-kilowatt-hour Government plutonium subsidy would amount to about $7 million or $8 million per year for the two California plants or a total public subsidy exceeding $200 million during their 30-year lifetime if the Government continues to pay the $30 price for plutonium. Of course, similar benefits are available to the large atomic powerplants built by Commonwealth Edison in Illinois, Detroit Edison in Michigan, and the Yankee Atomic Electric Co., in Massachusetts, and the plant which Philadelphia Electric Co. is building in Pennsylvania.

I appreciate your concern regarding possible effects of Federal policies on the coal industry and would welcome your comments on this question of the above-mentioned subsidy involved in the AEC's plutonium purchase price as well as on the provisions in H.R. 7576 authorizing Federal grants to private atomic powerplants.

By copy of this letter, I am raising with the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the basic question of why the taxpayer should be called upon to pay utilities a price for their byproduct plutonium which is any more than what the material is worth as fuel.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Friday, July 28, 1961, I had the pleasure of attending the Young Democrats of Indiana 12th biennial convention at the Hotel Claypool in Indianapolis, Ind. At the convention banquet held that evening, the guest speaker was Mr. William Moyers, Associate Director of the Peace Corps. Mr. Moyers' stirring remarks at this convention were overwhelmingly received.

Since Mr. Moyers' remarks represent a constructive creative effort to imbue in all citizens a greater understanding of the Peace Corps, I ask unanimous

consent to have his statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS, BILL MOYERS, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, THE PEACE CORPS, CONVENTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., JULY 28, 1961

The United States has long been committed—as President Kennedy recently stated—"to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself." The Peace Corps is a new dimension of our commitment to extend human freedom and dignity beyond the pale of plenty to a world of impoverishment.

It is not a new concept. Missionaries, voluntary agencies, and private institutions have been engaged in similar activities abroad for generations. But while the concept is not new, this is the first time the United States has sponsored a program of international service in which Americans offer themselves, on a volunteer basis, for arduous tasks abroad—without conscription, at low wages, under hard conditions, doing demanding work, waiving modern conveniences and comforts. It will be an experience in the difficult.

But if it works—and we are laboring under no illusion of panacea—the Peace Corps may reap benefits far greater than its cost.

First, it can help newly developing countries meet their urgent needs for trained manpower. These countries have leadership at the top level (often Western-trained). Unskilled manpower is usually plentiful. High-level experts and technical advisers can be brought in from abroad. But the missing link is middle manpower—surveyors, plumbers, civil engineers, social workers, forestry experts, public administrators, electricians, stenographers, and—most important of all, perhaps—teachers. "Send me 250 teachers for elementary and secondary schools," the prime minister of one African country said in April. "And send them by August."

Ultimately, local manpower must be trained to fill these jobs. But the new nations cannot wait that long. Their burning thirst for advance means a temporary infusion of manpower is immediately critical. The Peace Corps can help to provide that manpower.

Second, the Peace Corps may be the catalyst for a vigorous new effort on the part of the American people to understand what is happening in non-Western societies. Our general ignorance of what is going on in those countries is appalling—and dangerous. We simply do not understand, as a people, the why and how of the profound changes occurring overnight all over the world. Peace Corps volunteers returning home will build a reservoir of Americans with firsthand experience among the people and politics of many vital areas. They may generate a new awareness of this cataclyamic world to a public too often lethargic in its concern for world affairs.

Third, the Peace Corps—through careful selection and proper training of the men and women who go abroad—can help to reshape the identity of America. I believe the most important missing ingredient in our relations with newly developing countries is what someone has called "the personal touch." Pamphlets, radio broadcasts, films—as good as they are, are largely impersonal. To communicate our concern and interest, to express in an awakening land the values of a free and pluralistic society—people must work with people; people must teach people.

The Peace Corps is not attempting to transplant a culture to the millions of people in the world's underdeveloped nations who are only now beginning to realize and ask what can be theirs in terms of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Their way of life must be just that—their own.

What Peace Corps volunteers can carry with them beyond their skills is a spirit, a concept, an attitude, a frame of mind that says to these people: "We know what you are up against. We have climbed this way, too. We can understand your dreams because they still are our dreams. We know your aspirations and your determinations and we want to share what we know and what we have if it will help you to grow and prosper."

Americans have failed to realize that the revolution sweeping half the world is largely our own doing. By example and preachment, America has told the world's masses: "You can change your environment. You can master your circumstances. You can take fortune in your own hands and overcome nature's barriers in order to build and be free." What we told them and showed them they are now demanding. We ignited their revolution.

But the paradox of the 20th century is that in much of the world today the Communists are more closely identified with that revolution than we are. There was a time, someone has pointed out, when America projected an image that inflamed imaginations, set feet jiggling and hearts dancing. That image does not come through today. It is the Communist system that seems to hold out hope and relief and order. What is needed in the world is the image of an inspired American people reacting against the tyranny, poverty, disease, and hunger in a world seething with expectations.

"Yours was the first revolution," said Ashadevi, a spirited woman associate of Ghandi. "Do you think young Americans possess the spiritual values they must have to bring the spirit of that revolution to our country? There is a great valuelessness spreading in the world, and in India, too. Your volunteers must not add to this. They must be carriers of your best American values and ideals. Can they do it?"

That is the question.

The Soviets say "no." Only recently Khrushchev called American youth "nothing but dissident good-for-nothings." I disagree with him. This is a Nation of youth—45 percent of the population of America is under 25 years of age. Thomas Jefferson was 33 when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Alexander Hamilton was 31 when he produced the Federalist Papers. America has always expected much from its youth—and its youth have delivered. God save us from that day when we must say to the young men and women of America: "We cannot trust you. We cannot depend upon you. We cannot use you—except for fodder in the flames of war."

The United States has been at war since the first shot was fired at Concord—a war against the forces of coercion and despotism. Sometimes the war has been waged in armed conflict and at great loss of human life and property. I for one applaud the decisive steps undertaken by President Kennedy to prepare this Nation in the event we must again engage the enemy on those terms—with weapons that kill and maim and destroy.

But the absence of arms and military combat does not mean the absence of war. The conflict continues whether a shot is ever fired. We do well to remember that a bullet may kill a Communist but it can never defeat communism. The President was right, therefore, when he said the efforts to prepare for conflict over Berlin "must not divert us from our total responsibilities, from other dangers, from other tasks. If new threats in Berlin or elsewhere should cause us to weaken our program of assistance to the developing nations who are also under heavy pressure from the same source * * * then those threats will surely be the most successful and least costly maneuver in Communist history. For we can afford all these efforts, and more, but we cannot afford not to meet this challenge."

The Peace Corps is a part of the total American response to the challenge—an effort on our part to turn back the tide of impoverishment that threatens not only the physical life of man but his spirit as well. We must be prepared to meet force with force if necessary, but we must also press forward the offensive against those forces that take more subtle but nonetheless destructive forms.

All of us agree that we must defeat communism. But the question is how? The answer is not to stay at home, wringing our hands, paralyzed by our own cynicism and distrust, endlessly debating among ourselves who is the more loyal. The answer is to go where the Communists are competing for the hearts and minds and lives of people struggling to their feet—and looking for a hand to lift them. We will never—I repeat, never—see the triumph of freedom over tyranny unless we go where the battle is hottest—and that is in a thousand villages where restless people are awakening to the realization that a better life is possible.

There are many ways to serve your Nation. The Peace Corps is one. It is not easy to get in, for the tests are thorough, the interviews are probing, the training is rigorous. But once accepted, your contribution—however small—will have come at a critical hour in the life of our Nation. And if anyone asks why you should do this, why this should have been your choice, you need only recall the words of Edward Everett Hale more than half a century ago: "I am only one, but still I am one: I cannot do everything, but still I can do something."

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee

could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JULY 21.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We have honored "Captive Nations Week" with a proclamation by our acting mayor (now Mayor Schiro).

I have read with great interest what you are doing for the captive nations and we are writing our Congressmen to support you.

With enough pressure and publicity from the so-called free countries we could soon make the Soviet butcher forget Berlin.

Alas, I fear past and present administrations are too involved in the betrayals of these poor people—but our people are at last waking up to all these horrors and no telling what can happen from now on.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. GEO. SOULI.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Detroit, Mich.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

Whereas the week of July 16 through 22, 1961, is being observed in this country as the "Captive Nations Week," sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee; and

Whereas in 1959 the President of the United States of America signed a joint resolution, passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives providing for an annual observance of this week; and

Whereas Captive Nations Week was proclaimed by the President of the United States of America, who invited the people of the United States of America to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas many American patriotic groups and organizations will join in the ceremonies through the country in reaffirming the belief that "our freedom will be secure only when all men everywhere are free": Now, therefore

We—Americans of Ukrainian descent in State of Michigan, who today, July 16, 1961, are gathered for the annual picnic at the Ukrainian estate "Dibrova," sponsored by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—declare our deepest concern for the plight of the enslaved nations of central and eastern Europe and of Asia, now under the iron heel of Russian Communist dictatorship, among them Ukraine was one of the very first victims of Communist Russian aggression, falling prey to the onslaught of Red Troops as early as 1920–21.

We further request our Government and our Congress to stand firm on Berlin's crisis and to continue opposition to Red China's admission to the United Nations.

We wholeheartedly support the Flood resolution calling for a special committee on captive nations and urge our Senators and Representatives to lend their own support for its immediate passage.

We stand for the improvement of the "Voice of America" broadcasts to the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.

We urgently request Postmaster General to retain champion of liberty postage stamp series and to expand it by issuing a Shevchenko stamp this year in commemoration of the centennial of the poet's death, who was not only the greatest Ukrainian poet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for the liberation and emancipation of all enslaved peoples.

We urge our Senators and Congressmen to support House Joint Resolution 460 introduced by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI from Michigan on June 22, 1961, providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko.

VICTORIA, TEX.,
July 16, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Thank you for your appearance on the Manion Forum. I have written my Congressman asking him to support House Resolution 211, Captive Nations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. MCCARTY.

ERENKÖY, ISTANBUL,
July 21, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Yesterday I noticed in the Turkish newspapers, the bill which you have introduced regarding the commission to be formed in order to liberate enslaved nations under the despotic rule of the communistic regime.

Being the neighbor of the Soviet Union, understanding its cruelty, we greatly appreciate your efforts to free the enslaved peoples and eliminate the danger of spreading such poisonous ideas to other nations who are seeking freedom and democracy.

Please permit me to congratulate you on your election to the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania. Many years ago, while I was in the United States of America and a resident of Wilkes-Barre, I personally was aware of the good service you rendered to its people. You might remember me as oriental rug dealer Hassan Beck, living with Mr. and Mrs. Campbell.

Wishing you many years of useful service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HASSAN KURSUNLU.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,
July 19, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: May I say that I enjoyed your talk on the Manion Forum last week and that I support House Resolution 211 to the hilt. I shall let my Congressman know the same.

Keep up the fine work; it's nice to know there are men such as you in Washington.

Respectfully,

CLINTON D. CARR.

NORTH BRANCH, MICH.,
July 19, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I heard your speech on Dean Manion's program last Sunday and agree with you more than 100 percent if that is possible.

I wrote to Eisenhower, Nixon, and Wadsworth, when they were in office, and to their counterparts in the new administration urging them to bear down heavily on communism's most vulnerable spot—Eastern Europe. Our two best weapons in the cold war which, strangely enough, our officials have not been using to the full, are (1) Every time the Reds accuse the West of imperialism and colonialism, let us remind the world that Russia has been holding an empire of captive nations under duress ever since World War II. And when Khrushchev demands that foreign troops get out of the Congo and Angola, let us demand to know when he is going to pull his troops out of Hungary, Poland, the Baltic countries, etc. (2) If the Reds are really for the people, as they claim to be, let us ask why they are afraid to let the people, especially those in the captive nations, who know communism at first hand, decide in free and secret elections what kind of a government they want. And if the Red utopia were real, would it not spread like a prairie fire throughout the world without subversion or coercion?

I cannot understand why our officials did not use those weapons relentlessly long ago. Were they afraid of offending Khrushchev? He would fume and be offended at anything which thwarts his plans.

Cordially yours,

LEO J. WENDLING.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
July 19, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I want to congratulate you on introducing House Resolution 211. We must help these captive nations of the Communist regime regain their national and individual freedoms.

I am also against Red China and Outer Mongolia being recognized by the United Nations. I strongly urge you to fight against their acceptance and for a firm stand in Berlin. The American people are finally awakening. We need more men such as you in our Government continually fighting for our great heritage (freedom).

Sincerely,

WALTER F. KING, M.D.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 18, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Last Sunday night I heard you talk on the Manion Forum hour in connection with House Resolution 211, which creates a special committee for Captive Nations Week.

I am in accord with your ideas. If we had had something of that kind maybe we would have taken action in 1956 to recognize the new government in Hungary, and perhaps been able to release that country from behind the Iron Curtain.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. NILSSON.

FORT MADISON, IOWA,
July 21, 1961.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read the discussion given last weekend by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD over the Manion Forum on House Resolution 211 known as the captive nations resolution.

I sincerely urge your support of that resolution. It seems to me that we must take some such action as this resolution contemplates which I believe will make the American people aware of the plight of the people under the domination of the Communist regime, not only in Russia itself but in all of the other captive nations.

I would go further and advocate complete severance of diplomatic relations with all of these Communist gangster regimes.

I sincerely hope that you will give the Honorable Mr. FLOOD the assistance which he deserves.

Sincerely yours,

R. R. PHELAN.

POMONA, CALIF.,
July 17, 1961.

Congressman FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

YOUR HONOR: I heard your message on the Manion Forum. God bless another American.

May I have a copy of that resolution you introduced. If so, please send me one.

I am, respectfully,

SIEL ARMACH.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 5, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT, BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

AUGUST 5, 1961.

A MILITARY AND ECONOMIC POLICY THAT CORRECTLY REFLECTS U.S. STRENGTH

House Joint Resolution 505, to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, passed overwhelmingly. I was one of two to oppose it. I explained my position as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, in opposing this resolution, I am not doing so from any lack of patriotism, or in any way calling for a weakening of our Armed Forces, or indicating a division in American unity against a common enemy. I firmly believe we cannot defeat communism in limited wars by trying to outnumber them in manpower. The only hope for ultimate victory is to rely upon our superior nuclear power for massive retaliation which will mean the complete destruction of the Soviet Union if they are so foolish as to force a war upon the world.

"Giving the President almost unlimited, dictatorial powers to draft men may be misinterpreted by the rest of the world and the Soviets thinking we have changed from our policy of massive retaliation to one of putting out brush fires of the Communists' choosing. Any deviation from our policy of massive retaliation may mislead the Communists into starting a war they cannot win.

"The Berlin situation has not changed. Khrushchev is merely repeating what he has threatened before. The President's speech does not change the fact that we must rely on a powerful nuclear force in winning any war the Reds start. What is needed now, right at this moment, is action to back up the strong words the President used in his address to the Nation. That action can be forthcoming by moving to recover American property seized by the Communists in Cuba and thus serve notice on the Soviet Union that we are prepared to fight for freedom here, in Berlin, or anywhere it is threatened on our terms and under our rules and our choice of weapons.

"Putting hundreds of thousands of young men on draft call unnecessarily at this time, merely serves to upset careers and families without reason. There will be no problem in securing the manpower we need when we need it without giving added dictatorial powers to the President in the absence of an emergency or actual war.

"As a Member of this body, sworn to represent the people of my district and the Nation to the best of my ability, the only way I can emphasize my position for a military posture I think can win is to vote against this resolution. My 'no' vote is actually an affirmative vote. It is a call upon the administration to reemphasize the buildup of our nuclear power and the policy of massive retaliation. It is a call for action to back up our strong words. The action needed to halt present Communist aggression instead of waiting on Khrushchev's pleasure in Berlin, and I repeat, the action needed is to free American property in Cuba.

"In addition, and equally important, we need action on the domestic front in taking the steps necessary to maintain a solvent economy at home upon which we must build our defense posture. This means, not merely sacrifice on the part of the people, but sacrifice on the part of the Kennedy administration in cutting back on it's proposals for new programs, expanded welfare projects and higher and higher Federal spending. There is no point in giving the President unlimited power to call up our young men, asking them to sacrifice, when at the same time he has asked for more than $15 billion in new obligated authority over the Eisenhower proposals in 1961 and 1962.

"Our continuing mistake is in our appearing to have abandoned a policy of protecting American lives and property everywhere in the world. An immediate demand for the return or reimbursement of expropriated Cuban property coupled with an airtight economic blockade of Cuba will prepare the way for freeing Cuba from Communists. Castro must not be permitted to strengthen his military defenses; Castro must not be allowed to encourage hijacking or crime here and abroad against our citizens.

"We cannot permit any action of ours to project an appearance of weakness or an enemy may mistakenly initiate what he thinks will be a limited war. Any war in which we're engaged we must win. To win we must use weapons, we cannot match the enemy in manpower. Certainly we must never indicate that we may not use nuclear weapons. Since limited war can become full scale, even limited war by miscalculation must be prevented if humanly possible. The preventive is the ever constant threat of our massive nuclear retaliatory power, greater than all the rest of the world put together.

"Finally, our military strength is based on our economic solvency and productive ability. Burdensome taxation and ever increasing Federal nondefense spending is just as great a threat as military engagement. Indeed, it is more dangerous. There is less likelihood of any nation or combination of nations defeating us militarily, than there is in our "spending ourselves into bankruptcy", as Stalin predicted. Here the Kennedy administration is especially vulnerable.

"Under peril of national suicide, I believe we must cut back nondefense spending as we increase defense spending. We must be as tough as we talk and act to lead the free world successfully in these perilous times. Only this policy can prevent war."

A Petition From the People Called Methodists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following petition, signed by 242 Methodists, most of whom are my constituents, was received today. Undoubtedly other Members whose districts lie within the southern California-Arizona Conference of the Methodist Church will have similar comunications:

PETITION

To the President of the United States, the Congress, the Department of State, the United Nations, and all the peoples of the world:

We, the people called Methodists whose names are signed below, subscribe to and support the pronouncements from the Episcopal address and the resolutions of the general conference of 1960 which follow:

"The human race has within its hands for the first time, the power of its own annihilation. The evils implicit in applied science are compounded by the residue of problems growing out of World War II and an armaments race which, unless terminated early, can have but one result.

"Our objective must be nothing less than the abolition of the use of war by nations. Mere arms reduction or limitations are inadequate. Only complete disarmament, involving both nuclear and conventional weapons down to the levels required for internal policing, will deprive nations of the tools of war.

"Such complete disarmament must be universal to be acceptable to all nations. It must be enforced by a competent international agency, preferably a strengthened United Nations.

"We commend the President, the Congress, and the State Department of the United States on their attention to disarmament, but we call for an expansion of effort and staff to develop a comprehensive, safeguarded disarmament plan upon which to focus negotiations.

"We call upon the United States and all other governments to declare complete, universal, and enforcible disarmament to be their goal and to move in this direction.

"We further call upon the United States and all other governments to exert forceful, imaginative, patient, and dedicated leadership toward the achievement of such disarmament."

Original signers:

Bishop Gerald Kennedy.

District superintendents: W. M. Hildebrand, Herschel Hedgepeth, Stanley S. McKee, Edwin E. Reeves, Donald R. O'Connor, Frank M. Toothaker, Russell E. Clay.

Coordinating council executive staff: Frank S. Williams, Grover C. Bagby, Jr., Eugene E. Golay.

Board of Christian social concerns officers: Lawrence Hinshaw, Hal B. Dalike, J. Irwin Trotter, Mrs. Frances Troutner, Herbert M. Fink.

District secretaries: Donald R. Cook, Fred Rogers, George Root, Charles P. Hamby, Harrison R. Thompson, Roger Rose.

Committee chairmen: Grandison M. Phelps, Richard P. Edgar, Roy R. Jerome.

Members: Robert Kersey, Mildred Hutchison, Vivian Wilken.

Considering the fact that this House—with my affirmative vote in each instance—has so recently increased military spending, authorized activation of a quarter of a million reservists, and vigorously supported President Kennedy's firm stand in Berlin, one might question the propriety and timeliness of this action by representatives of one of the world's largest Protestant denominations.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that in our entire national history no petition by the people has been more appropriate, more timely, more desperately needed.

It is to be noted, however, that Methodists accept the possibilities of war. Our discipline leaves the question of

military service to individual conscience, supporting those who reach a decision of conscientious objection to killing other humans, but supporting equally those who determine that such is sometimes justified. Most of us reach the latter decision, and many of us have had to act in compliance with it.

The thing which I doubt that Christians who worship God in a manner inspired by John Wesley can accept in good conscience is that war is a desirable way of solving disputes, whether they be international or ideological.

The overwhelming majority of people in this Nation under God find the roots of their morality in the Old and New Testaments. To these people, killing one human is abhorrent; killing millions, tens of millions, is incomprehensible. Yet as observed in the petition, the capability, physically, is ours. History may demonstrate the necessity of its use, though this I cannot believe.

This moment in the history of God's creatures on earth dictates the timeliness, the propriety, the necessity for action urged by the petition. I am proud to represent in this House, Bishop Kennedy and the other signatories of the petition, who are my constituents. I am proud of Methodism's clear, courageous voice in these troubled times.

Comparison of Costs for a Peace Corpsman and ICA Technician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent comparison of the estimated cost of a Peace Corpsman and the actual average cost of an ICA technician was contained in the following article which appeared in the July 30, 1961, Washington Post:

PEACE CORPSMAN COSTS HALF AS MUCH AS ICA AID

(By Julius Duscha)

A Peace Corps volunteer will cost the Government less than half of what it spends to send a foreign aid technician overseas.

The Peace Corps estimates that the annual cost of training, transporting, equipping and maintaining a volunteer abroad will amount to about $9,000.

The International Cooperation says that it costs about $19,000 to get and keep a typical engineer, farm expert or other technician overseas for a year.

Both figures include administrative overhead costs as well as transportation home from an overseas assignment. In fact, the Peace Corps and the ICA estimates were prepared by the same ICA statisticians.

GET FOREIGN AID

In its early, hectic weeks last winter and spring, the Peace Corps depended heavily on ICA assistance. It was almost as if the Peace Corps were itself a foreign country needing American aid.

The big difference between the cost of training an ICA technician and a Peace Corps volunteer is salary.

A typical ICA technician would earn $9,900 a year and receive a 10 percent adjustment, presumably because of higher living costs. This would bring his salary to $10,890, which is more than the $9,000 total annual cost of training and maintaining a Peace Corps volunteer.

BICYCLE ALLOWANCE

The Peace Corps volunteer receives no salary but is allocated a $150-a-month subsistence allowance. He also accumulates a leave allowance at the rate of $12.50 a month and a readjustment allowance, payable upon his discharge of $75 a month.

There is a Peace Corps bicycle allowance, too, of $50, but it usually costs the Government about $750 to ship an ICA technician's automobile overseas.

The Government also provides $2,000 to the technician for a housing allowance and pays another $1,500 to transport his furniture overseas.

Then the ICA technician usually is married and has children, which means, for example, another $2,600 in travel expenses, if he has a wife and two children, in addition to the $1,000 it costs to get either a technician or a volunteer abroad. School allowances of $400 to $500 per child are also given the ICA aide.

If Peace Corps volunteers are married both the husband and wife must work on the same Corps project. A volunteer is expected to live simply. Only $20 a month is budgeted for housing.

PHYSICAL CHEAPER

Peace Corps medical examinations, including $15 for a once-over lightly psychiatric exam, cost only $42, compared with $85 for a foreign aid technician and his family, with no provision for psychiatric testing.

The Peace Corps volunteer will serve for 2 years. Two to three months will be spent training in the United States and 21 to 22 months working abroad.

The usual tour of duty for an ICA technician is 2 years, too, but less than a month is needed for training in the United States.

The ICA maintains 4,000 Americans overseas, 85 percent of whom are technicians. The Peace Corps plans to have 2,700 abroad or in training by next July.

JUST AS GOOD?

The figures do not answer, however, the difficult question of determining whether one Peace Corps volunteer equals one foreign aid technician.

So far the Peace Corps has selected volunteers with some training and often some experience in the work that they will be doing overseas.

All of the 40 volunteers going to Tanganyika to carry out surveys for road projects, for example, have had training and most have had experience as surveyors or engineers.

ICA technicians almost always have a great deal of experience in the work that they will do in a foreign country.

Another difference between the Peace Corps and the foreign aid technical assistance program is that the Peace Corps volunteer will work on projects as well as show persons how the projects should be carried out, while the ICA technician is only a demonstrator or an adviser.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun has done inestimable service for my hometown by pointing out, editorially, that much of the responsibility for civil defense rests with the individual. Because of this, I have introduced legislation designed to encourage construction of home shelters by granting a 50-percent tax writeoff on such construction. I am pleased that the Sun approaches this urgent matter in the same philosophy I hold, and I urge the attention of all readers of the RECORD to the editorial:

CIVIL DEFENSE

Probably the biggest question in the minds of many Americans today—resulting from the emphasis placed on the danger of war over Berlin—is what civil defense means to the individual.

The answer is relatively simple—it is the difference between life and death for many if an all-out war should come.

Then comes the question of whose responsibility it is to provide the protection needed, and the answer to this is deeply involved.

To be exact, civil defense starts at the outermost reaches of our military defense radar network, moves backward to our missile defense headquarters, radiates out to the many Army, Navy, and Air Force stations throughout the world, and then to the civil defense units for sounding of an "air raid alarm" if such proves necessary.

All of this is designed to give our Armed Forces an opportunity to set up their defensive patterns and to launch their counter-attack—and to give the people in threatened areas a few minutes to find havens of shelter.

From this it may be seen that the answer involves the Federal Government, the State government and local governmental agencies concerned with the defense of the people from attack.

At one time it was felt that evacuation of big cities would be the answer, but the time element involved with use of modern missiles has ruled this out and now the determination of effective shelter areas or the construction of such shelters is the major problem.

Here the matter becomes personal. The individual must determine for himself whether to depend upon a central shelter or to provide one for himself in his own home.

The Government has plans and details for home shelters which anyone may secure, and they have been devised to keep the cost at a minimum.

So it comes right back to the individual. If he owns his own home he may build his own shelter if he feels it advisable. For those who rent apartments the problem is more difficult and requires wider cooperation. Public shelters have been designated and more will be in the days to come, to meet this problem.

No one knows if war will come or if it will not. The Federal Government is doing its part to protect the people should it happen but in the final analysis much of the responsibility rests upon the individual himself.

Premier Fanfani, Spokesman for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the past week Italian Premier Amintore Fanfani held a series of very interesting talks in Moscow with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. The stand taken by Mr. Fanfani and the firm views expressed by

him should serve as a source of great encouragement to the West.

The Italian leader was not frightened by Khrushchev and his threats. He answered him frankly, bluntly, and with determination. He stated in unmistakable terms that Italy stands with the West and will not hesitate to support its Western allies, come what may over Berlin. With great calmness, as shown by few statesmen on such face to face occasions, Fanfani advised the Russian leader to carefully examine his own purposes and mind if he really desires to avoid a war over Berlin.

In fact, Fanfani even went so far as to warn Khrushchev against taking certain action regarding Berlin. "I urge you to think deeply and see whether all possible attempts at a solution have been made," he told Khrushchev. He then added that it would be "dangerous to believe that a solution of the present difficulties might come through unilateral acts."

He strengthened his warning by impressing upon the Communist leader that "the will to negotiate must not be taken for weakness." He reassured Khrushchev that "a will to peace" exists among the Western allies, but at the same time he expressed in clear and unmistakable language Italy's solidarity with her NATO allies and with the West.

I am not at all surprised to learn of Premier Fanfani's courageous stand and his admirable role in expressing Western determination. Italy is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and its leader therefore spoke with a considerable measure of authority. But I have known Mr. Fanfani for many years and he has always impressed me as a man of courage, of leadership, of statesmanship, and of ability. It was my good fortune to meet him in 1956, when he first came to visit the United States in his capacity as secretary general of the Democratic Christian Party of his country, and I had occasion to observe him closely.

Later, when he became Premier of Italy, I met with him on several occasions both in Italy and during an official visit to this country, and again I learned not only about his great courage but also his strong affinity to the United States. All of this he has now exemplified by his calm yet firm manner of talking to Khrushchev. In these confrontations with the Russian leader, Fanfani has spoken honorably yet tough, sincerely yet determined, a proud spokesman for Western civilization and the Western viewpoint in the present conflict between East and West. In this respect, he has been excelled by few statesmen of the West.

This honorable and fearless stand by Fanfani prompted one of our leading columnists, William S. White, to observe in his column of August 4, 1961, published in the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers:

Signor Fanfani of Italy—already the most faithful of all the partners in the Western alliance—is today a great man in the United States of America, among its leading politicians and its people alike.

Yes, it takes courage and leadership for one man to stand up, to raise his unterrified head, and to speak out loud and clear, against the backdrop of the cold war in the very heart of the Kremlin, and to say what Fanfani has said. And this he did despite the fact that Italy has the largest Communist minority within any country of the free world. If anything, his mission has served to encourage the peoples of the West. At the same time, it must have left an effective impression on Khrushchev that the West will not be terrified by his threats. In this respect, he has rendered a great service to the free world.

Hanford Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet's latest scientific accomplishment should provide sobering thought for all Members of Congress. Apparently there is general agreement among our own space experts and top defense officials that the newly developed ability to put a man in orbit around the earth has important military connotations. This being the case, there is added reason why we must maintain a most careful and most delicate watch over the course of our Ship of State.

Not that our objective is in any way affected. This Nation is committed to the defeat of international communism. Any other attitude would be fatal, for the Communist tyranny breeds on conquest and will retrogress, once more territory and more peoples are denied it.

Not that our answer to the Russians is to be revised. We have given our word on Berlin. Another achievement by Russia's scientists is of no consequence so far as our principles are concerned.

This weekend we look into the skies with mixed emotions. Knowing that a human being was revolving around the earth had to be a thrilling experience regardless of the insignia he wore. Our feelings, however, could not be of unrestrained joy because we realize that the nation this man represents would not permit even the scientists who made the feat possible to pay homage to the Supreme Being for the intellect which guided them; because we know that under the precepts advanced by Karl Marx the state alone—not society or the individual—is to reap the consequences of all technical advances; and because, so long as Khrushchev and his fellow butcherers are left to carry out the precepts, every new development that takes place behind the Iron Curtain will be utilized as a weapon in an effort to subdue the entire free world.

Congress will obviously make every effort to implement every phase of our defense program. Whatever military advantages Russia may have through the space ride must be dissipated through accelerated work in our space laboratories as well as in other areas of security operation. We have a costly job ahead, as has been emphasized by the weekend news story. We cannot withhold funds for defense purposes. It is all the more necessary for us to eliminate extravagances wherever else we can.

Tomorrow we can get off to a $95 million start in this pursuit of economy in Government. We can instruct our conferees on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee to stand firm on the House position previously adopted by a 176 to 140 vote to eliminate the Hanford project from H.R. 7576.

There is no military value to making electricity in competition with the industries and the people who pay our taxes. There is no military value in putting up a big plant to make power that is not needed. A vote against Hanford is a vote to prevent waste of the wherewithal that must be available to guarantee the safety of our country.

Peace Corps Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps has captured the minds and imaginations of thousands of Americans of all ages. It is encouraging, therefore, to note that the program has taken a big step toward full fledged status with its unanimous approval by the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

Just as encouraging to many of us is the recent action by the Technical Assistance Committee of the United Nations Economic and Social Committee in approving an international version of the Peace Corps.

The New York Times today has published a short but worthwhile editorial on this subject, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

PEACE CORPS PROGRESS

Events in both Washington and Geneva have moved the Peace Corps dream much closer than before to the effective reality it so well deserves.

Early last week it looked as if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee might recommend a 75-percent cut in President Kennedy's plan for a corps of 3,000 volunteers by the middle of next year, with a $40 million budget, which Republican Senator HICKENLOOPER had proposed. But administration pressure, under the leadership of Senator HUMPHREY, brought unanimous committee approval for the full program. We hope that Senator HUMPHREY is right in now predicting its overwhelming endorsement by the Senate and also by the House, where hearings are scheduled this week by its Foreign Affairs Committee.

And in Geneva the U.S. proposal for an international version of the Peace Corps plan

made notable progress last week. The Technical Assistance Committee of the United Nations Economic and Social Council approved it by a vote of 17 to the 3 by the Soviet-bloc members. Endorsement by the full council would clear the way for formal cooperation between the U.S. Peace Corps authorities and the United Nations and some of its specialized agencies.

The U.N. technical assistance programs are badly in need of the kind of workers which our Peace Corps organization can train and supply. And their work, in turn, could often be more effective under U.N. control, free of any suspicion of national self-interest.

How To Put Squeeze on Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following column by William S. White which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of today:

HOW TO PUT SQUEEZE ON CASTRO—UNITED STATES CONSIDERING ECONOMIC BLOCKADE, PERMANENT RESETTLEMENT OF REFUGEES

(By William S. White)

First, an economic blockade of Castro's Cuba. Then, a program of enduring and wide Federal assistance to Cuban refugees from Castro's Communist dictatorship—actually the creation of a Berlin-type escape corridor for the Western Hemisphere.

These are the emerging probable answers of the United States to Fidel Castro.

The Kennedy administration, beginning with the President himself, has reached the limits of tolerance with this tinpot Soviet satellite. Since the failure last April of the patriots' invasion of Cuba, Washington by necessity has followed a policy only to give Castro enough rope.

This was simply the only policy in sight, apart from a direct American military intervention, which President Kennedy could not in any case contemplate short of a military attack on us in Cuba, as, for example, on our Guantanamo naval base.

Thus the line here since April has been purely negative and waiting.

Castro, himself, however, is now giving handsome if unwitting cooperation to transforming that line into an affirmative and active one.

When he permitted his revolutionary regime to pass from ordinary Communist harassment to open banditry and piracy in the skies by the seizure of American aircraft at gunpoint, he made his greatest mistake of the last 2 years.

For this sort of conduct has made it difficult even for the do-nothing-but-talk people in Washington to continue to argue that because Castro succeeded a bad man in Fulgencio Batista, Castro obviously must be a pretty good man. Not even the Soviet Union openly employs, these day, the services of hired private gunmen.

More importantly, the President himself has at last really got his Irish up. The collapse of the invasion, to which he gave some assistance but not enough because he felt he could not, hit him very hard.

Too, the mere fact of its failure strengthened those wistfully attached to the notion that we could somehow talk Castro Cuba out of being a part of the Soviet apparatus.

They had a field day of I-told-you-so. They had always been against military solutions, they said. Well, look what happened when a military solution was tried. The argument amounted to saying that because an inadequate military measure was tried, any and all possible military measures would be therefore both wrong and inadequate.

This, of course, was nonsense. All the same, it had some effect; for nothing succeeds for the appeasement line like the failure of any line of action.

All these circumstances, plus an understandable reluctance really to go after Castro lest we seemed to be hauling up a howitzer against a Caribbean mosquito, effectively stayed the President's hand.

Now the whole scene has been changed—and largely by Castro himself.

Last year an embargo was put upon all shipments to Cuba, except for food and medicines. Now, the administration is working at a total embargo, to cut off the $50 million a year exports Castro is still permitted to send here. More significantly, it would cut off American food which Castro must have.

As a companion piece, the administration is asking Congress for authority for a broad refugee resettlement program which would permit Cuban patriots not merely to come here for asylum but to stay here for good.

This would take from a single State, Florida, the heavy and properly national burden of taking care of the current refugees. And it would beckon masses of new refugees, much as West Berlin serves as a gateway to freedom for the masses of Germans daily fleeing Communist East Germany.

It does not seem unduly optimistic to forecast that this steady loss of able people would become as draining to Castro as it has already become to the Soviet-German Communist regime in East Germany.

Since Nikita Khrushchev has been prepared to go to the brink of war to ease the Soviet pain in Germany, it is not too fanciful to suggest that Castro may one day feel an equivalent pain in Havana.

A View From a Tight, Small Compartment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 14 last, Mr. Ralph E. McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution—a leading newspaper published in Atlanta, Ga.—delivered a thoughtful, constructive, and courageous address which I am glad to place in the RECORD:

A VIEW FROM A TIGHT SMALL COMPARTMENT

(By Ralph E. McGill)

Seventy-two years ago, in December of 1889, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Henry W. Grady, spoke in Boston at the annual dinner of the Merchants Association.

Grady was seeking to bring the South back into the lifestream of the Nation. Industrial jobs were necessary to ease the poverty and tensions in his State and region. So, he detailed to his New England audience what then seemed to be the South's assets. And, of course, he sought to reassure his audience about the race problem. The years have proved him a poor prophet in his predicted schedule of industrial development. His image of the Negro's development as a contented man on his own plot of land, jogging his mule down the furrow, also was in error.

But in the great sense, Grady was right—and his words challenge us even now. The problem of race, he said in Boston in the last month of 1889, "is so bound up in our honorable obligation to the world that we would not disentangle it if we could."

"I would rather see my people render back this question rightly solved," said Grady, "than to see them gather all the spoils over which faction has contended since Catiline conspired and Caesar fought."

Almost three-quarters of a century have passed, since Grady spoke in Boston. The echo of Alabama's mobs and others that preceded them are in our ears and on our conscience. They are not the real face of the South, though our weakness is that we have permitted them to seem to be. It is my privilege to restate the honorable obligation of which Grady spoke and to say that despite the ugliness and viciousness of mobs, we are nearer the answer than ever before.

We are engaged in a struggle to do by law and the courts what men of free will have not been able, or willing, to do by themselves.

Historians have noted that our revolution, long before the fighting began at Lexington, was engineered by men who knew the law, men whose minds moved not in terms of violence and quick results, but in terms of law and the courts and the reasoned disciplined action that lies behind the law and the courts.

But ours has become an age of specialization "with every branch of learning, including the law, divided into tight small compartments," which makes it difficult "to retain the whole view of a profession that makes for pride and excitement."

Since the greatest social reform of our time is being implemented by courts, they and the legal profession inescapably are a focus of attention. That we have not been able to retain a whole view is testified to by daily events.

In the past 20 years, but more particularly since the U.S. Supreme Court decision of May, 1954, the leadership of the southern bar has not lived up to its responsibility. It was not until the spring of 1960 that the Georgia Bar Association heard one of its members publicly state the truth about necessary compliance with decisions of the Court. Nor was his heart lifted up by the considerable number of fellow members who later came to him to express appreciation and to say they wished they could have said what he did. "My clients do not want to be in controversy," they told him.

To this day, insofar as I can determine, not a single southern State bar association has gone on record with a resolution or declaration of court support which would have provided the people with an alternative to the peddlers of defiance. Only one city bar association in the South (Atlanta's) has made a public statement affirming the validity of court orders as they apply to schools.

While the bar associations in the South were silent, individual attorneys, described glowingly by the segregationist press as "constitutional authorities," were publicly and slanderously denouncing the Federal judiciary and assuring a troubled and indecisive public that the U.S. Supreme Court's school decision was not legal, did not have the force of law, and was communistically inspired. That this stoked the fires of violence is unquestioned.

One of the saddest aspects of the southern race problem has been that Governors have, by plan, had lawyers join with them in statements which deliberately deceived the people by distorting, and falsifying, the facts and the Constitution. All too often this alliance has been assisted by lawyer-Members of the Congress. One reluctantly

concludes all concerned know better, because they could hardly have been ignorant of the meaning of Supreme Court decisions. They, however, like the Governors, were and are, prisoners of their own excesses, the best illustration I know in our time of Frankenstein and his monster. And some of them, in private, are men deeply ashamed of themselves.

I do not, of course, mean to suggest that bar associations, or lawyers, should have agreed with the Court on the school case, or with other decisions in this field, although, to be candid, I would hope so. But what we have needed, from the bar, and from public leadership generally, has been a continuing defense of the integrity of the Federal judiciary. Had the people been told by bar associations that court orders require compliance, we would, I believe, have escaped some of the trouble caused by the deliberate deceit of the people by political leaders who invariably were loudly assured by a "leading constitutional authority" that they could, and would, defy the courts.

Another aspect of this agonizing dilemma requires thoughtful consideration. It concerns corporations doing business nationally. One dislikes to believe lawyers advised companies doing business across the Nation, during the moral dilemma of the student sit-ins, to follow local custom in the South while in other areas the same company was told to practice no discrimination. The sit-ins telescoped time and courts. They were able to do so because even to many of the extremists, it soon became impossible to defend a situation where persons of both races could stand side by side to purchase intimate items of underwear, for example, but were barred by custom, or decision of the management—not law—from being side by side while buying a sandwich or a cup of coffee.

Student boycotts produced desegregation of eating places in about 30 southern cities in less than a year.

A national public philosophy, including the morality of our problem of race, held in common by American business, would have prevented economic losses, social disorders, and bitterness. In this day of specialization, every branch of learning, including the law, is indeed divided into tight small compartments. This, I think, explains a part of the dilemma of lawyers. One of the tighest compartments is representing business clients and it is perhaps inevitable that lawyers should take on the neutral coloration of their clients and wait to advise about law until the public relations counsel has determined what the public policy shall be. I know the lawyer technically is not supposed to make moral decisions. We are told that this is the function of management. But, must the lawyer always be the neutralist in representing corporate clients whose scope is national? Is there not something here lost which is necessary to the law, management and society?

The Government has a large responsibility but it is certainly true there are large areas left to private choice. In a totaliarian society the State is all pervasive. In our society only a modicum of political moral and economic order is imposed by Government. Our kind of national community, therefore, depends partially on law but in a larger measure on the private decisions of millions of people. Our Government has a limited authority but within these limits it must be obeyed. Large areas, however, are left open for private action and choice. If a free society is to reach an established goal, across the board, it must do so to a great extent through individual decisions. This freedom implies a moral responsibility. This responsibility is that of free business, a free press, free labor, free civic groups, a free bar, and free men. If free Americans do not act responsibly, our Nation suffers, particularly in comparison with monolithic States where an established policy is quickly translated into practice. The painful fact of this is a nagging feature of our daily life. We cannot equate the moral value of the just deed of a free man with the same deed of a State automaton. If a group in a totalitarian society acts responsibly—there being no moral choice—there can be no moral credit.

A people who value a free society must act responsibly and strive to adjust their practices to their professions. When the decisions involved are legitimately private, not public, the only compulsion is conscience.

Therefore, failure to act on the part of the bar associations, of corporations, newspapers, labor, the clergy, and other elements of our society, is indeed a disservice to our free society and to the free enterprise system. This is true not only in a moral sense but in the more important one that makes for the viability of the whole society.

I think one additional reason why many of us, lawyers, and others, have not behaved well in this crisis, is the general failure to understand just what a legal decision is. Law, as I comprehend it, always represents—particularly constitutional law—the best considered judgment of men trained in the law, dedicated to principles on which the Government rests, and under oath to support the Constitution. In any legal case in which two positions are represented by able counsel, there are, of necessity, at least two points of view, each logical to the litigant and worthy of argument by counsel. In any case, one side is bound to lose, having contended and argued for a different result. Most decisions, it follows, are not acceptable to both sides. One of the main functions of the judicial procedure is to reach a decision which is final and which will, and must be, accepted, acceptable or not.

The whole system of law would be undermined if decisions unacceptable to one side should not in fact be accepted. The failure to accept a decision and to abide by the result, if widely practiced, would quickly undermine society. If decisions of the highest Court, because they were unacceptable to litigants and partisans, were disobeyed, no will, no contract, no pension right, no insurance policy would be safe or secure. Organized society as we know it would be impossible and people would have to come to rely on private force as a final arbiter of legal disputes. This would return society to a state in which might was right, no person was safe, and no right was secure.

I must enter a "mea culpa plea" for my own profession of journalism. Some of the failures of our regional press to offer truthful, honest leadership have been tragic in spirit and in the encouragement of extremists to violent defiance of law. And the business community and its chambers of commerce have been even less responsible.

But, I do not wish to belabor these points any further. I would like to tell a story of how exhilarating it is to see the words of the Bill of Rights stand up from the printed page and take on human form—to see law in action. It is the story of how desegregation came to a Deep South State university, and to a legislature which but a few hours before had been saying "Never."

January 6, 1961, in Atlanta, Ga., was not unlike other days before the annual session of the State's general assembly. The legislative leaders of senate and house had been in the city for a week. The Governor, questioned early, said he did not believe there would be any new school segregation bill introduced because none was needed. There would be no changes in the laws.

The then circulating issue of the citizens council weekly paper, in its usual makeup of bright red headlines, called on the legislators to defy all do-gooders, race-mixers, and those who would mongrelize the Caucasian race. It urged that Georgia continue to show the way in total resistance.

This was the situation at midafternoon.

But 100 miles away, in Macon, Ga., at precisely 3:18 p.m., a stone was thrown into the calmed waters of the segregation pool. It was in the form of an order by a Federal district judge directing that Atlanta Negro students, Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton E. Holmes, whose applications had been rejected, be admitted to the University of Georgia, at Athens, on the following Monday morning at 9 a.m.

On that Monday, an hour before the somewhat stunned legislature of a Deep South State with an elaborate set of laws, declared by their successful sponsors of but a few years before to be proof against all desegregation, could take their seats, the two students were admitted. The Nation's oldest chartered State university was integrated. The trumpets of the U.S. Constitution had blown. The fast-moving legal drama which followed had some of the elements of an old movie "chase." Lawyers for the State board of regents, knowing things would look better to the assembly if they made every possible resistance, hurried to Macon's Federal Building with an appeal for a stay so that an appeal could be made. A Negro lawyer raced along the same road and was in court to oppose. The appeal for a stay was granted.

So, back to the highway went the two cars. They drove another 100 miles to Atlanta's Federal Building where the students' attorney argued the delay was invalid because previous rulings had covered, and denied, the grounds for it. The appeals judge, in a written decision, agreed.

All over the State the meaning of constitutional rights began to come more clearly into focus as a people, fascinated, angry, and applauding, looked and listened.

The next morning the students were in classes. University officials, and at least 7,000 of the 7,500 students, behaved admirably. The evening before some 50 co-eds in the dormitory with Miss Hunter had spontaneously come to her room to make her welcome.

But the rabble-rousers had recovered from shock and were wildly vocal. A board of regents member, ironically also chief of the Citizens Council, publicly denounced the University President and did not deny published reports he had threatened him. During the day, resistance-minded students were encouraged and financed to action.

That night, after a close basketball game, lost in the last second to the ancient rival Georgia Tech, an incited, well-planned riot took place about the girl's dormitory. A 10 o'clock call by the mayor of Athens to the Governor for State troopers was withheld from the chief executive for about an hour and a half. At 12:20 a.m., the riot wore itself out. A few students, and eight men with a small arsenal of arms in a car and loaded revolvers, were arrested. Seven of the latter were admitted Klansmen. The Governor's executive secretary issued a statement praising the rioting students who did not submit to judicial tyranny. The two Negro students were suspended and removed from the university as a safety precaution and an aid to maintenance of order. There were immediate public protests that the wrong persons had been suspended.

Lawyers went back to work. Just after dawn the rival attorneys again were on the road to Macon. Those representing the Negro students argued that the constitutional right of a citizen of the United States may not be abrogated because there is a probability of disorder. Also, the constitutional rights of some may not be denied while others retain them. So it was that within hours the two students went back to classes under the umbrella of the Constitution of the United States. In addition, the court notified the State its laws withholding funds from the university under orders to integrate were unconstitutional and en-

joined the State from so doing. Public opinion, therapeutically shocked by the riot and the abuse of the university president by a regent, experienced a revulsion toward extremists' disorders.

Once the original shock was reduced, the legislature had 2 restive days. The rabble-rousers were shouting at them. But in those days the assembly members also began to hear from the alumni and parents. Equally important, they heard from the merchants and the power structure of the cities involved. The messages, by phone, wire, and letter, all read essentially the same: "We don't like integration, but don't close the schools."

Had a local school board been somewhere involved, it would have been different. The legislature would have been happy to have remained aloof. But it was Georgia's enormous good luck to have the legislature as a whole confronted with the decision to keep open or close the vast State university system. Many were graduates of it. Some had sons or daughters at Athens. A number of these were seniors.

Some of the letters received were touching in their sincerity.

"I hate what has happened. But my wife and I have worked hard and done without to send our boy to Athens. We want him to graduate. Don't send him home."

"Our two daughters are at the university. It will break their hearts to give it up. Try to hold things down. But don't close the university we all love."

The house floor leader announced that he had heard the voice of the people. He had received, he said, more than 600 letters and telegrams in 2 days and only 12 wanted the university closed.

It seemed, then, all of a sudden, that save for the handful of diehards extremists who railed furiously at the Governor, reminding him that he had pledged "never," everyone knew a turning point had been reached. Gov. Ernest Vandiver said Georgia would obey the courts. He brushed aside those who called him a traitor and demanded that he initiate defiance. Georgia's Assembly almost quietly abolished the old segregation laws in their entirety.

The anatomy lesson of this kaleidoscopic drama of law and violence is meaningful to the whole segregation picture. It represents a turning point in the Deep South pattern of pledged total defiance. Grounds for delaying maneuver are about gone. The many tests from Arkansas, Virginia, and Louisiana have stripped most of the fat off the appeals possibilities. The dismal abyss of no public education today is but a few steps away from any State which takes the course of defiance.

Leadership, which has become perhaps a trite and shopworn word, nonetheless remains the essential ingredient in each Southern State and each locality confronted with a school order.

Permit me to close with a story which illustrates the failure of the past and the hope of the present and the future.

Because of the processes of law three students have been accepted for entry to Georgia's Institute of Technology next September. I am well acquainted with the parents of one of these young men. This father and mother were themselves college graduates. The father of the young man of whom I speak took various jobs, all poor ones. They were all that were open to a Negro. Finally, he got a better one—as a chauffeur and butler. His wife became a cook. Next September their son will enter Georgia Tech, and President Kennedy's recent employment directive in the field of Federal contracts means he will be able to get a job as an engineer.

Is it not an accusation against all of us that we have waited so long to make a beginning?

Is it not well to learn how to accept the unacceptable?

The Dallas Morning News Editorializes on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial on foreign aid published in the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.:

LET'S STOP BUYING ALLIES

Congress is ready to give the President all he asks to bring Armed Forces up to a level adequate for the threats confronting us.

With that readiness the News has no quarrel. The President has at his disposal information not available to the people or to the press. If he thinks it will take 250,000 or 2,500,000 more fighting men to make the country safe, this newspaper would not oppose.

What we need to defend the United States, we must and will have.

But at a time when we are unbalancing the budget to rearm America, it is folly further to increase the deficit for political gimmicks at home or bighearted largess abroad. What may be postponed, we should postpone. What is not a practical economy, we should eliminate. What is not necessary, we should lop off without compunction or delay.

Foreign aid is sometimes represented as merciful charity. We are supposed to feed India—and India won't eat her beef cattle. Her people starve while beefsteak-on-the-hoof wanders around devouring foodstuff in gardens and fields.

We are supposed to raise the lot of some of our Latin friends to the south of us who may reach up for a breakfast banana, if they can beat the monkeys to it.

If beseeching starvationists will send over for our surplus food crops, they should be welcome. But it is time to tell the world two things:

1. Christmas comes but once a year. Right now Uncle Santa Claus has to pay his bills.

2. We are out of the market for allies who have to be bought and then hired to stay bought.

We are not hardhearted. We are not hostile. But we have spent, as no other nation in the world's history, billions to rebuild our former enemies. We have poured out, as no other land in all the annals of time, our surplus, and more than our surplus, for underprivileged and backward peoples.

We have no time for freeloaders, freeriders or freespenders of our hard-come tax money. We have an implacable antagonist to deal with. We aim to deal. And we aim to win.

A Man With Initiative and Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article which appeared in Life magazine, in its issue of July 21, 1961, entitled "You Have a Million-Dollar Face."

This article concerns a man named John Harkrider, who is a very dear friend of mine. I have known him for many years as a man with initiative, a man of ideas. To some it might appear to be unusual, but then John Harkrider is a most unusual man. Those of us who are privileged to know him closely and count him as a friend, admire him for his frank ways and fresh ideas. I always find his company stimulating. The article in Life magazine vividly illustrates the point, and for this reason I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MAN NAMED HARKRIDER MAY SNAG YOU WITH THIS LURE—"YOU HAVE A MILLION-DOLLAR FACE"

(By Eleanor Graves)

There was a time, not too long ago, when the best salesman for anything in the world was a pretty girl. On billboards, in magazines, and on television a toothsome smile and pleasing curves promoted everything from automobiles to cigarettes. If a man crept into any of these pictures, he supplied only a shoulder to lean on or a hand to hold the match. Today all this is changed. Men, often especially rugged types distinguished by eye patches, beards, or tattoos, have moved to center stage, and it is now often the young lady who holds the match.

In the current scramble for male models, by far the busiest and most unusual agent is John Harkrider, a balding, thickset man in his very spry 60's. On a recent morning in his New York office he received requests for: a man covered with freckles from head to toe, a teenager willing to swim with a shark, a man who would remove his dentures on TV, a Chinese man with a pigtail. Within half an hour the requests were filled.

This would have been possible only at the agency of which John Harkrider is founder, owner, talent scout, and booking agent. Harkrider is always on the prowl for new types, and he now has a roster of 1,746 part-time and full-time models. He is capable of instant improvisation and is convinced that he can solve any problem, meet any request. He instructs his models as they make the rounds of photographers and advertising agents, "Never say no. If they ask you if you can be there tomorrow afternoon in a suit of armor, say yes. I'll get it."

Once Harkrider was asked to produce a dozen men for a shirt ad. On the appointed hour he turned up with 12 clean-cut Ivy League types, only to discover that the ad was to be a Father's Day promotion and that every one of his models was 10 years too young. While the photographer and numerous assistants brooded over their dilemma, Harkrider disappeared. He came back a short time later with a dozen African masks which, with a great flourish, he set

jauntily on the young men's heads. The resulting photograph won an art director's award.

The Harkrider technique for finding models is simple. He roams the streets of New York, and whenever he runs across someone he thinks will photograph well, he strides up and introduces himself. With supreme confidence, Harkrider ebulliently tells the stranger, "You've got a million-dollar face." Then he presses his card into the hand of the startled man and walks off.

In an average day he hands out approximately 60 cards and maintains that almost all men are either vain enough or curious enough to call him and find out what it is all about. The subways under Grand Central Station and Times Square are particularly rich sources of talent for Harkrider. He also shops for faces at athletic events (tennis matches are the most profitable) and at Yale graduations.

His methods inevitably turn up a reasonable number of men who would like to make extra money or who simply find modeling a pleasant change of pace from their regular work. They get $15 an hour to start, can in rare cases make $200 an hour.

AN OPERA BASSO, A FUNERAL DIRECTOR

Among those on Harkrider's rolls are: a funeral director, an airlines pilot, an opera basso, and an insurance company executive (whom he captured in an elevator). Once the art director of the Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn advertising agency was looking for a certain type of model. Harkrider sold him on using a fellow Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn executive, collected a fee for the executive, and the usual 10 percent for himself.

The most difficult problem is getting his models away from their regular jobs. "Banks are the toughest," Harkrider says. "But Ivy Leaguers find it worthwhile to cut classes, and I have no trouble with my insurance man because he owns his own company."

Life with Harkrider is never routine. For his first appointment, one man who has since become a top model for another agency was told, "Meet me in the third phone booth from the left at 480 Lexington Avenue." When the man arrived at the booth, Harkrider explained that they were going to see an advertising agent a few blocks away who was looking for a model. As they walked down the avenue, the new model noticed with some alarm that every so often someone would step out of a doorway and fall in behind them. By the time they reached their destination there were 15 young men in Harkrider's train.

In the agent's office the men lined up and Harkrider made a snappy speech about each one. "This man's a Yale diving champion. Smile, son. Next. This man's got nothing to recommend him but a tattooed back. Take off your shirt, boy. Next." When he reached the newcomer, about whom he knew nothing at all except that he had an English accent, Harkrider unabashedly introduced him as the son of a belted earl.

On another occasion, Harkrider brought three taxiloads of men to see a lady photographer who was looking for a bathing suit model. As they crammed into her tiny office, Harkrider, in a voice that resembles a Marine D.I.'s, called out, "Last one in close the door. All right, men, strip."

Many models will not submit to Harkrider's treatment. Almost all of the top moneymakers began their modeling careers with him, but once established, many see no reason to put up with his antics. Harkrider looks on their defections with imperious disinterest. He is convinced that he not only gave most leading models their start but also that he played a large part in creating the new demand for the roughneck, or "heft," model. A few years ago, when he offered one of his "heft" men, the photographer took one look and said, "Get that rhinoceros out of here." Later the rhinoceros became a successful "Marlboro man."

HIS DREAM OF SINGING SPORTS SPECTACLE

Showmanship, or what some people consider an innate lack of restraint, comes naturally to John Harkrider. At the age of 14 he was playing juvenile parts in silent movies with Mary Pickford, Theda Bara and Rudolph Valentino. For many years he helped produce musical numbers for the Ziegfeld Follies and later worked on other Broadway shows and movies. By 1940 Harkrider was ready to produce extravaganzas of his own. Never a man for half measures, he laid plans for 20 separate operas to be composed around 20 different kinds of athletic endeavor.

Harkridger soon found that athletes who could sing—or singers who could throw a discus or run for a touchdown or slide convincingly into home—were rare. With what one of his associates calls "his atrocious conviction that whatever he is doing is right," Harkrider set about giving some of the men singing lessons and exercising the others. But the millions of dollars that his show was going to cost were also hard to find, and with the advent of the war Harkrider was suddenly reduced to a group of 4–F's who had only one thing in common: they were good looking. Undaunted, he went into the modeling business.

Harkrider believes in keeping his product in the public eye. Today he is a common sight on Madison Avenue, setting a brisk pace with a dozen men at his heels. At stop lights he raises his hand and bellows "Halt." He often drops in unannounced with his entourage at ad agencies and photographers' studios. This can be something of a trial to busy people. One of his models reports that there is a New York office with a sign on the door that says: "No dogs, peddlers, or Harkrider men allowed." One photographer has a rooftop studio with windows that reveal any approaching caller from knee to ankle. He finds this layout extremely useful, because whenever he sees a dozen or so pairs of male legs arriving at the same time he can refuse to answer the door.

But Harkrider can be blindingly persuasive, and even total strangers can be induced to go out of their way for him. A photographer once asked him for an attractive 4-year-old redheaded boy. A boy of this description was duly brought around for the photographer's approval, and an appointment was made to photograph the child the next day. The next day it rained, so the shooting was postponed over the weekend. On Monday it rained again, and the shooting was again postponed. That afternoon the photographer received a call from a lady who identified herself as the redheaded boy's mother. Her child was not a professional model, she said. She, her husband, and the boy had just been standing on the steps of St. Patrick's Cathedral when a man who called himself Harkrider walked up to them and said her son had a million-dollar face and that his picture could be in a magazine. The mother had thought then that this was a lovely idea. But now, the lady told the photographer with great regret, they had overstayed their vacation by 4 days and, million-dollar face or not, they just had to get back home to Cincinnati.

A Way To Save Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a subject about which considerable comment has recently been made is that of civil defense. Our President has properly taken an active interest in it and has called for strengthening our effort. Certainly we must continue to strive with all our energy and resources for an honorable peace; but we must nonetheless prepare against the eventuality that our efforts for peace may not be successful. We must also recognize that the road to peace may be a long and arduous one and there may be pitfalls and obstacles along the way. In an editorial appearing in its August 6 edition, the Newark Star-Ledger treated the subject intelligently and fairly. As the Star-Ledger points out, civil defense is a way to help keep the peace as much as it is a way to help save lives if the peace cannot be kept:

Despite an almost constant barrage of threats from the Soviet Union, the American people have not become overly excited about beefing up the Nation's civil defense.

The horrors of nuclear war have been pictured as so terrifying that many people conclude it is hopeless to try and provide any adequate protection from an atomic attack.

This hopelessness is reflected in Governor Meyner's statement that "we are fostering a cruel deception on the American people if we try to persuade them that they can have civilian defense through underground shelters in the next war."

This attitude contrasts sharply with that of President Kennedy, who is putting increased emphasis on a more adequate shelter program. In line with this policy, Kennedy has shifted civil defense direction to the Pentagon with orders for "a greatly accelerated civil defense effort, including a nationwide fallout shelter program."

Acting quickly on the Presidential directive, defense officials already are planning a survey of existing shelter facilities and are drawing up a program for shelters in office buildings, Government structures and other places where large numbers of people congregate.

It would be a mistake to be over-optimistic about the protection afforded by any shelter program. There is no overestimating the horrors of an atomic attack, and there is no doubt millions of persons would lose their lives in the event nuclear bombs were dropped on the metropolitan area. And the loss would be heavy even if there were shelters dotted throughout the area.

But does that mean we should be completely fatalistic about making provisions to save as many lives as possible? While millions may be doomed no matter what we do about civil defense, millions of lives may be saved.

It's true that even those who would be saved would have no picnic continuing to try and exist after the ravages of a nuclear attack. But does that mean that we should

throw up our hands in hopelessness and consign additional millions to death?

The fact is that no one knows exactly what would happen; where the bombs might hit; how wide an area of destruction; how long the fallout would linger. Prudence would dictate that we prepare as best we can, in the full knowledge that our best is not going to be nearly good enough.

Perhaps there is mightly little we can do. But if that little can save millions of lives, it certainly is worth doing.

A defeatist attitude will not help the cause of peace. On the contrary, it will encourage the attack we hope so desperately to prevent.

To contend that the money that would be spent on civil defense could be better spent on searching for some way to secure the peace amounts to setting up an alternative that is more fancy than fact.

We are, in fact, searching for peace, and there is no limit to what we willingly would spend to secure the peace. One of the ways we are attempting to prevent a world war is by building a deterrent force adequate to discourage a would-be aggressor.

And an adequate civil defense program is part of that deterrent force. Our ability to recover from an initial attack could be decisive. The enemy estimate of how quickly we could be knocked out might be the factor that tips the scales for or against an attack on us.

Civil defense is a way to help keep the peace as much as it is a way to help save lives if the peace can't be kept.

Retired Methodist Minister Grows Big Tomatoes of Unknown Variety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 3, 1961:

RETIRED METHODIST MINISTER GROWS BIG TOMATOES OF UNKNOWN VARIETY

There's a new variety of tomatoes now being grown in Lancaster County. They are big, red, and delicious, but they have no official name.

The Reverend J. W. McElrath has several rows of the variety in his beautiful and productive garden at his residence on Chesterfield Avenue Extension. He says the vines produce "hundreds" of pounds each year.

"They call this variety the '84' in West Virginia," said the retired Methodist minister. "It seems that in the year 1884 some large tomatoes were found floating in the Ohio River. Some were recovered by West Virginia residents who later planted the seed. It is believed there that the tomatoes came from Canada, but nobody is really sure."

Mr. McElrath said his son-in-law, the Reverend Ray Moore, of Mooresville, W. Va., gave him some of the tomato seed a few years ago, and the McElrath garden is proof enough that the variety likes Lancaster soil.

"Last year, some of the tomatoes weighed as much as 2 pounds apiece," Rev. McElrath said, "I guess we gave away hundreds of pounds to our friends. We have never sold anything from our garden. There's more than enough here for my small family and we give the rest to friends and sick people in the county."

Members of the Lancaster News staff are grateful to Mr. McElrath for a "bag full" of 84's. They graced several dinner tables last week.

Call 'em what you like, but they are delicious.

A Man Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to commend to my colleagues' attention the article on Premier Amintore Fanfani of Italy by the distinguished columnist, William S. White, that appeared in the Newark News and other papers last Friday, August 4. At this crucial period when the Communists are testing the strength, unity, and courage of the Western alliance, it is heartening to read Mr. White's stirring account of Premier Fanfani's confrontation with Khrushchev. Premier Fanfani—in Mr. White's words, "a civilized man in civilized resolve"—typifies the spirit of Western man that has been so many times grossly underestimated by totalitarian forces. Mr. White's column follows:

A MAN AMONG MEN: FANFANI TALKS UP TO KHRUSHCHEV FOR THE WEST

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Heroism has on the whole gone out in these days of massive alliances and counteralliances, in which vast blocs of "peoples" utterly overshadow people just as individual people.

Still, a singular hero, one man standing out erect against the great collective backdrop of the cold war, does now and then raise his unterrified head.

Such a man is Premier Amintore Fanfani of Italy. He has taken his stand, moreover, from a power base that is very small in a country that has borne many hard times. And that country almost certainly will be crushed like a bit of unnoticed garden under the wheels of tanks if the giants, the United States and the Soviet Union, ever come to war.

In his Moscow confrontation with Nikita Khrushchev, Fanfani has not only taken a line of honorable toughness and determination unexcelled by Allied colleagues from uncomparably more powerful countries. It is not only that he took off his coat, in figurative and literal bluntness, at the moment Khrushchev took off his own coat.

It is not only that he told Khrushchev, plainly and face to face, that Fanfani and Italy were staying with the West, come what might. And it is not only that he coolly advised Khrushchev to look into his own purposes and mind if he really wanted to avoid war over Berlin.

TABLEAU OF DIFFERENCE

This meeting was far more than all this. It was an achingly apt tableau of the differences between West and East, as perfectly symbolized by these two men and all they have and are.

Here, "standing up" all the way to the head of the immense, brooding hulk that is international communism, was an exact personification of what we mean by a phrase some do not use any more in this time of machines and monoliths. The phrase is "Western civilization."

The long story of that civilization would be a shorter and a poorer story indeed, but for Rome—whether one thinks of "Rome" as the cradle of Christian faith or simply as the universal capital of the finest works in art, in architecture, in the good life in general, which that world has ever known.

Here was Western man, the heir to centuries of fairness, of free government, confronting Eastern man, the symbol of a politics of brutality in a place of faceless men without pride in past or hope for future except for what might come from a frowning and shuttered thing called the Soviet State.

The westerner, Fanfani, had come from a land which has the largest Communist minority within any country of the free world. It is a minority nevertheless allowed, because Fanfani and Italy really believe in freedom to dissent, to go on not only undead but also unjailed.

NO MINORITY

The easterner, Khrushchev, is troubled by no minority. Nor is he hampered by the memories of far more than 2000 years of continuity which lay upon Western statesmen the deep necessity to think of the great past as well as of the dangerous future. (What monuments in Russia are left to be destroyed by bombs? The tractor works at Omsk? The missile factories at Tomsk, or maybe Leningrad?)

Still, in all his hardships, with all his knowledge that the Communists at home in Italy could press a button at any moment and perhaps smash his efforts to secure his country, here still stood Fanfani, the memorable picture of a civilized man in civilized resolve.

Whether his mission to Moscow will win him praise and new strength at home, this correspondent cannot say. But one thing is sure. Fanfani of Italy—already the most faithful of all the partners in the in the Western alliance—is today a great man in the United States of America, among its leading politicians and its people alike.

A Total Embargo and Other Firm Actions Should Be Taken Against Castro and Communism in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my weekly newsletter for August 7, dealing with the Cuban situation in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS: A TOTAL EMBARGO AND OTHER FIRM ACTIONS SHOULD BE TAKEN AGAINST CASTRO AND COMMUNISM IN CUBA

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

What to do about the continued disturbing influence of Fidel Castro in Cuba is certainly one of the most pressing and important problems facing the Nation at the present time.

While I feel every American wants to see the demise of Castro and of communism in Cuba as quickly as possible, the real problem is how best this may be brought about

and properly accomplished. The United States is obviously strong enough to move into Cuba at any time and take over the entire country by military force. However, this action is not considered practical by many, for many reasons. America would be charged with being an aggressor and warmonger in the eyes of many nations. As a freedom-loving Nation America must be particularly careful to keep our international image of promoting freedom and peace without prompting aggression unblemished.

Since Castro's first rise to power he has moved further and further toward communism and has sought more and more to aggravate the United States. On January 4 of this year the matter became so bad that the United States officially broke diplomatic relations with the Castro government of Cuba. Since then conditions have deteriorated further.

Last month Castro sympathizers hijacked an Eastern Airlines Electra jet. Castro not only has refused to return the plane to U.S. officials but has failed, as of this writing, even to reply directly to a U.S. request that the plane be returned.

The time has come for additional definite action to place this little but loud dictator in his proper place. Even though there has been a reduction in our trade with Cuba since the communistic turn in Cuba, some trade still is carried on with limited commerce. The State Department has advised that this Nation is now selling Cuban goods at the rate of $25 million per year. These are mostly foodstuffs; in particular, lard and other fats. The export figures reflect the lowest sales of any time in modern history with the rate twice that amount only months ago. However, this is too much. We must take steps to halt all trade with Cuba and this can and must be done in the form of a total embargo—a complete ban on the sale and shipment of all American manufactured or produced goods.

By invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act against the Fidel Castro regime, President Kennedy can halt all American trade with this nation which has proven an enemy to our country. This is a needed first step to let the people of Cuba and the world know that we will not tolerate the belligerence of Dictator Castro and communism.

The Congress is also urging the taking of other firm actions by the United States.

Postal Rates and Junk Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are fed up to the teeth with junk mail. There is no earthly reason why the taxpayers should subsidize the tremendous volume of worthless matter which the Post Office Department is forced to deliver at reduced rates.

I daresay that there are only a very few people who really enjoy getting such junk. We ought to allow such people to apply to get on a special list to receive junk if they desire it. But deliver the rest of us from getting smothered and buried.

With all the talk about the postal deficit, I cannot figure out why such junk mail should not pay its own cost of handling. This would not only help wipe out the postal deficit but it would cause those who mail such junk to think twice about the cost.

Now while I am at it, I would like to take a swipe too at the postal rates on magazines. As I understand it, the rates have always been low for the historical reason that this is a means of disseminating information for the enlightment of the people. I believe most people would view this argument more favorably if some of these magazines did not contain so much propaganda.

I would like to include with my remarks the text of an editorial in the August 6, 1961, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, entitled "Taxpayers Shouldn't Pay Postage for Mailing Mr. Luce's Magazine:"

TAXPAYERS SHOULDN'T PAY POSTAGE FOR MAILING MR. LUCE'S MAGAZINE

Several issues ago Time magazine surveyed the newspaper situation in the world's third largest city (New York) and found it to be in a sorry mess—"two of four morning papers and all three of its evening papers fighting for their lives."

Not surprisingly, two injured publishers struck back the next week in Editor and Publisher—a newspaper trade magazine.

It is not the purpose here to comment on either Time's attack or the rebuttal except to thank Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the New York Mirror, for his very enlightening information relative to circulation figures of Time's companion magazine—Life—figures which, we believe, should be brought to the attention of Postmaster General Day and Members of Congress.

"In the 6 months period ending December 31, 1960," asserts McCabe, "Life produced 2,781,304 subscriptions of which 2,092,192 were at reduced prices." During the same 6 months Time, Inc., according to McCabe, "carried 'unpaid arrears subscribers' to the extent that 2,228,512 copies of Life were given away."

In all, charges McCabe, 12,500,000 copies of Life were given away absolutely free in the 6 months prior to December 31, 1960.

The Luce empire has a right to give Life away to whomsoever it pleases. What is at stake is the right of the Luce empire to give away taxpayers' money under second-class mailing privileges, which do not begin to defray post office costs of distributing Life (or any other publication, for that matter) to subscribers across the Nation.

Currently, the President and Postmaster Day wish to raise the price of first-class mail to reduce the annual deficit incurred by the Post Office Department. This is a necessary, desirable move, but at the same time the raise is effected, second-class mailing and bulk mailing rights should be raised to the point where charges to the customer cancel out costs of the service.

There is no rhyme or reason why first-class mail users should underwrite the generosity of a Luce or any other magazine magnate.

Where Is the Yankee Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, August 7, 1961.

Mr. Canada points up a sad commentary on the attitude of those northern mortgage lenders who discriminate against borrowers because of race. It is high time the practice was stopped.

The letter follows:

WHERE IS THE YANKEE DOLLAR?

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

White people in the South get a continuous barrage of criticism and advice on how to handle relations with our colored fellow citizens.

When I have shown visitors the housing and schools and colleges available to and utilized by Negroes here, the visitors are amazed. But I have found only one or two northern mortgage lenders who are willing to back up the general preachments we get from the North with substantial investment in Negro homes financed by Government-backed mortgages.

We can point to the records of payment of such Negro mortgagors (often more prompt payers than most of our white mortgagors—possibly my company is not alone in never having had to foreclose on a Negro mortgagor) but we cannot convince the Up East mortgage lenders.

With more good jobs available to qualified Negroes there are some pretty homes—whole tracts of them—being sold to Negroes receiving favorable ratings from credit reporting agencies. Some farseeing and unprejudiced northern mortgagees are going to benefit by putting their credit where most northerners put their words and written statements.

GORDON L. CANADA,
Longtime Resident of Metropolitan New York.
ATLANTA, GA.

Hampton, for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1960, a distinguished Philadelphian delievered an address at Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., on the occasion of the initial convocation of the presidency of Dr. Jerome H. Holland. William H. Gray, Jr., Ph. D., D.D. is pastor of the Bright Hope Baptist Church, Philadelphia; former vice president of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches. He is a member of the Philadelphia Housing Authority and the mayor's scholarship committee of Philadelphia. Today, it is indeed a rare occasion that kind words are said about the South in the field of civil rights. Newspapers, television, and all other sources of communication give us a poor picture of racial violence and hostile feelings between races. However, I am well aware of the tremendous amount of work that must be done in the South before there is true harmony and equal feeling between the races. It is my belief that when an occasion occurs that shows real racial progress being made, it should be commended and lauded by all. Such an occasion occurred at the initial convocation of Dr. Jerome H. Holland's presidency. It was a speech that keynoted

how the South must eventually develop itself to accept full integration. Perhaps it was a speech of the future, but at any rate it was a step in the right direction. Dr. Gray made it very clear when he said:

Hampton must develop an educational program geared to meet the highest American standards, and designed to serve youth of every race, creed, and color.

With a world full of tension, and uneasiness, there is absolutely no room in the U.S. policy for segregation. We cannot afford to spare one youth the chance of a lost education, because of his race, religion, or creed. As numerous African territories gain their independence, the balance of power is rapidly turning away from the old colonial powers. If we expect to make friends with the new African states, and this is vital, we simply cannot discriminate against anyone. We must treat Negroes at home and abroad on a fair and equal basis if we expect to remain a leader in the world community of nations. Dr. Gray obviously observed this when he stated:

Americans of our generation have belatedly come to fully appreciate the fact that over two-thirds of the world's population is colored. Certainly, America's past practices and abilities have been deterrent factors in the building of relationships with these people.

I have included the full text of his talk for the benefit of the Members of Congress who may have an opportunity to read his inspiring words:

HAMPTON—FOR ALL AMERICANS

In 1870 Samuel Chapman Armstrong concluded his first annual report on Hampton Institute with these prophetic words:

"I think we may reasonably hope to build up here, on historic ground, an institution that will aid freed men to escape from the difficulties that surround them, by affording the best possible agency for their improvement in mind and heart, by sending out those whose culture shall be upon the whole circle of living, and who, with clear insight and strong purpose, will do a quiet work that shall make the land purer and better."

It is indeed paradoxical that 90 years later Hampton faces anew the opportunity of helping all Americans—white Americans, black Americans, brown Americans; Catholics, Jews, and Protestants—to become freed men in fact.

Contemporary history and the developments of this hour validate the vision and spirit of Armstrong.

In 1960 Indian youths in nearby Dunn, N.C., are still fighting for an opportunity to rid themselves of shackles of ignorance. On new battlefronts of racial misunderstanding throughout the South, Negro youth are still fighting against barriers to equal educational opportunities. Certainly there could be no more tangible manifestation of Armstrong's vision for America and his faith in the ideals of democracy than evidenced by the opening of Hampton's doors to Indian students in 1878.

Hampton was structured big in spirit. The very problems of our times demand that this institution, born in the morning of American freedom, must now crystalize and project a program that will train the type of leadership that will safeguard our heritage and build foundations for a free world.

Under the emerging administration of Jerome H. Holland, Hampton moves forward in 1960 to face new frontiers. Exactly 100 years ago, in 1860, Samuel Chapman Armstrong came to the mainland of the United States from his native Hawaiian Islands, to complete his education at Williams College. History demonstrates that he came physically, spiritually, and intellectually prepared to assume his responsibilities in a nation facing transition and internal strife.

Today Jerome Holland brings to Hampton the physical, intellectual and spiritual powers needed by this same institution to enable it to serve Americans during these times of international and domestic upheaval.

Believing implicitly in the American ideal, Jerome Holland gave democracy a try, and, like many others, discovered that Ralph Waldo Emerson was right in 1855 when he wrote:

"If a man can write a better book,
Preach a better sermon
And make a better mouse trap
Than his neighbor,
Though he builds his house in the woods,
The world will make a beaten path to
His door."

—*Common Fame, 1855.*

At Cornell University, nearly two decades ago, he won acclaim as an all-American football player.

May I add facetiously a word of caution to students at Hampton today. Remember, as an outstanding end, "Brud" Holland became nationally known for his play as a lineman and his ability to block, tackle, and catch forward passes. But, unlike most ends, he also excelled in his abilities as a broken field runner, and made the end-around play one of Cornell University's most feared offensive weapons. President Holland's versatile physical abilities suggest that even the most daring among you should approach his office with dignity and timidity, since he might still have the ability to outflank you.

During World War II, Dr. Holland served well as a personnel director of the Sun Shipyard, where he helped to keep supply lines open to men on fighting fronts.

As a research scholar at the University of Pennsylvania, he made an enviable record. As a director of the Pew Foundation, Dr. Holland served well the great and dedicated causes of that philanthropic organization.

In his 7 years as president of Delaware State College, he brought an era of new life to that institution. Under his creative leadership an unaccredited, floundering institution attained intellectual respectability and national recognition.

An experience at Delaware State perhaps illustrates dramatically the intellectual honesty and spiritual strength of the man. Coincidentally, it involved a football contest between Delaware State College and Hampton Institute.

Because Delaware State had won several early season games, the football player became overawed by their own abilities. The ego-centered stars of the team decided, without official permission, that it would not be necessary to practice during the week to beat a weak Hampton team. President Holland, however, in characteristic fashion, invited these stars to remain in Delaware as his personal guests, while the unexpected happened, the third team came to Hampton. Of course, Hampton won the game.

It was, however, a victory for Delaware State College, a triumph of right over expediency. For every student, for every member of that team, stars and third stringers alike, values were redefined and reshaped. This new sense of values would not only help them win football games, but help them win in the greater game of life.

Jerome Holland, then, truly has come to the kingdom for a time such as this, standing on the threshold of Hampton's new day he is ready to implement and fulfill the vision of Samuel Chapman Armstrong.

This, however, can be done only with your help—the support and cooperation of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends of institutions dedicated to the causes of democracy and freedom.

Hampton must develop an educational program geared to meet the highest American standards, and designed to serve youth of every race, creed, and color.

Remember, the integrated classroom—a burning issue of our day—is only a means to an end. The developing of integrated personalities must be the real end if democracy is to survive.

True integration denotes competency and excellence. There can be no double standards, no compromise. Stopgap educational objectives have no place in a curriculum designed to meet the needs of all Americans. The legal integration of America's educational institutions must be reached by traveling a two-way street.

America is ready to pay for efficiency—are we ready to pay the price to become efficient?

Recognizing that our American way of life depends upon the effective functioning of our unique system of democratic education, the Congress of the United States passed the National Defense Education Act in 1958, authorizing the expenditure of over $1 billion.

America needs and demands trained, qualified leadership. If Hampton is to become an institution serving all Americans—if Hampton is to develop integrated personalities, then academic excellency must have priority.

The walls of segregation and discrimination will crumble in the face of ability and competency. Wherever and whenever integration works best, foundations of competency and ability are readily visible. When men of competency and ability meet we see integration in action.

When Rafer Johnson, the world's greatest athlete, won the 10-event Olympic decathlon championship in Rome last summer, that was ability, that was efficiency, that was excellency, that was integration at work.

When Wilma Rudolph, of Tennessee State College, won three gold medals and the acclaim of millions as the world's fastest-running woman athlete in the same Olympic games, that was ability, that was efficiency, that was excellency, that was integration at work.

When Willie Mays goes to bat, catches a baseball or steals base; when Sammie Davis, Jr., acts; when Marian Anderson sings; when Thurgood Marshall pleads a case of constitutional law; when Mordecai Johnson preaches a sermon, that's ability, that's efficiency, that's excellency, that's integration at work.

Psychologists have long emphasized the fact that learning must be functional and complete. The person who says he can swim a river, yet fails 10 feet before reaching the other side, drowns, too. He certainly cannot get a passing grade in swimming.

Integration will work in America if we pay the price of preparation. Our forefathers must have envisioned this day when they sang:

"I want to be ready,
I want to be ready,
I want to be ready,
To walk in Jerusalem
Just like John."

Tomorrow's educational program must be designed to establish world-mindedness among the youth of America.

Our statesmen recognized the urgency of this problem in the establishment of the National Defense Education program. It was noted at the time of the passage of the Defense Education Act that, "of the 24

languages of the world spoken natively by over 20 million persons, only Spanish and French were studied by any appreciable portion of American high school students.

"Few, and in some cases none, of the languages spoken by more than three-fourths of the earth's population were taught in schools and colleges in the United States.

"For example, the United States has dictionaries and text materials for American use for only 4 out of 30 important Asian languages."

William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick in their best-selling novel, "The Ugly American," which is making diplomatic history, provide a compelling and memorable reading experience. These authors point out the failure of American diplomats abroad (specially in Asia), to read and speak the language of their assignments. The most important element in a good foreign service officer is the faculty of communication. We must learn how to talk to people of the world if we are to tell them the story of freedom and peace.

Today an emerging Africa gives new meaning to Wendell Wilkie's one-world concept and provides implications of a far-reaching nature for educational programs of the future.

Within one decade nearly a score of dependent countries in Africa alone have come forth as independent powers. Last month 13 African states, the homelands of nearly 40 million people, were elected to membership in the United Nations. As a result of their admission the African group of 22 countries now becomes the largest sectional association in the United Nations—one vote larger than the 21 affiliates of the Organization of American States.

Americans of our generation have belatedly come to fully appreciate the fact that over two-thirds of the world's population is colored. Certainly, America's past practices and attitudes have been deterrent factors in the building of relationships with these people.

Just as Hampton pioneered in giving America a revolutionary concept of technical education, today Hampton can send forth men and women who can provide much needed technical assistance to the emerging nations of the world—men and women who will build bridges of understanding.

Hampton, like other American institutions, must rededicate itself to imparting to youth a spiritual power that will enable them to withstand the vicious influences at work today that would disrupt and destroy their moral moorings.

In this global struggle against communism for the hearts and minds of men we must recognize that less than one-third of the world's nearly 3 billion population are Christians. If we are to have lasting peace, we must win the world for the Prince of Peace.

Christ's sermon on a mountain top classroom still holds the formula of victory for men of good will:

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

We can uproot the seeds of strife, and the hate dogmas that would destroy our peace only by developing spiritual engineers who are capable of building spiritual bases throughout the world.

Communism cannot and will not thrive in a climate of men who not only profess but practice Christianity. It takes spiritual power to practice democracy.

Pages of contemporary history are being written by men and women who have overcome because they have combined efficiency with spiritual strength.

On the international scene, the lives and contributions of Ralph Bunche and Martin Luther King testify to this fact. We may gain even greater insight and reassurance when we analyze the characters and contributions of men and women on national and local stages of action.

In Pennsylvania, Negro executives occupy two of the most sensitive jobs in State government. In addition to possessing superior skills and abilities, in addition to displaying qualities of excellency, in addition to being competent, they have demonstrated qualities of trustworthiness, loyalty, and devotion.

Andrew Bradley, a member of the Governor's cabinet and Secretary of the Department of Properties and Supplies of the State of Pennsylvania, directs one of the State's most vital jobs. He supervises over 1,400 employees, over 3,600 automobiles, over 1,800 trucks and a budget of $60 million. As vice president of the School Building Authority, he helps direct the expenditures of a $30 million school building budget. Finally, as a cabinet secretary, he directs and controls the central purchasing program for all State agencies representing expenditures approximating $100 million.

Andrew Bradley rose to this position of promience not merely because he is a certified public accountant, not merely because he is an astute politican, but because he possesses spiritual power that has enabled him to serve well two Governors of a great American State.

Catherine Coleman, a graduate of Hampton Institute, is the first Negro woman to head a major division in a State department of education in America. In Pennsylvania she is the director of the division of teacher education and head of the department of teacher certification. In the latter position she is responsible for every teacher's certificate issued in Pennsylvania; and today directs and controls the certification of the more than 80,000 schoolteachers in that great American State.

Obviously she rose to these delicate and strategic positions of trust not alone because of her ability or her doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Pennsylvania, but because somehow, somewhere while on these hallowed grounds, she got the spiritual power of an Armstrong—that intangible force that gave and will give Hampton its soul.

Today, students, faculty, alumni, and friends, I challenge you to launch out into deeper waters. With this dynamic new captain at the helm, I urge that you refortify yourselves with the spirit of your great leaders of the past—Hollis Burke Frissell, James Edgar Gregg, George P. Phenix, Arthur Howe, Malcolm Shaw MacLean, R. O'Hare Lanier, Ralph P. Bridgeman, Alonzo G. Moron, William H. Martin, and—Samual Chapman Armstrong—and that you rededicate yourselves to reaching educational goals that would truly make this the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, July 25, 1961, marked the ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It was an official holiday in Puerto Rico, and the commemoration of the event was by appropriate ceremonies.

Significantly, the White House on that date released the text of a memorandum from the President addressed to the heads of the executive departments and agencies which is to appear in the Federal Register.

Because of the importance of this memorandum to all Government officials dealing with matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, I feel it appropriate at this time to include it as an extension of my remarks so that its contents may be available also to the Members of Congress.

In addition, I offer the text of the President's July 25 message of greetings to the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

Following is the text of a memorandum from the President addressed to the heads of the executive departments and agencies:

"THE WHITE HOUSE.

"Because of the importance and significance of Puerto Rico in the relations of the United States with Latin America and other nations, it is essential that the executive departments and agencies be completely aware of the unique position of the Commonwealth, and that policies, actions, reports or legislation, and other activities affecting the Commonwealth should be consistent with the structure and basic principles of the Commonwealth. On July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under its constitution. This proclamation was the culmination of a series of legislative and electoral steps which began with the passage of Public Law 600, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 319 (1950)). Public Law 500 made provision for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. In a referendum, held on June 4, 1951, the proposals of this law received the overwhelming approval of the people of Puerto Rico.

"Following approval, a Puerto Rican constitutional convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by a referendum held on March 3, 1952. The Congress in turn approved this constitution (Public Law 447, 82d Cong., 66 Stat. 327 (1952)).

"The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution.

"On November 27, 1953, the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, exercising effectively the right of self-determination in a free and democratic way, had achieved a new constitutional status and that, in view of this new status, it was appropriate that the United States should cease the transmission of information with regard to Puerto Rico under article 73(e) of the Charter. (U.N. Gen. Ass. Res. 748 (VII) (1953)).

"All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President.

"The legislative steps which have led to the achievement by Puerto Rico of Commonwealth status have made inapplicable the provisions of Executive Order No. 6726 of May 29, 1934, insofar as they pertain to or are connected with the administration of the Government of Puerto Rico. This order no longer applies to Puerto Rico.

"This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register."

Message of greetings from the President to the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

"THE WHITE HOUSE.

"My cordial greeting and best wishes go to Governor Muñoz-Marin and the people of Puerto Rico on this ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth.

"The great social and economic accomplishments of the Commonwealth have evoked the admiration of your fellow citizens throughout the United States, and, indeed, of freedom-loving Americans throughout the hemisphere.

"In achieving the transition from a stagnant, low-income society to a dynamic, prospering community, Puerto Rico has been a source of hope and inspiration to those of us deeply concerned with charting new courses of social progress for our hemisphere.

"What we seek to accomplish in our Alianza Para el Progreso has already been accomplished to a remarkable measure in Puerto Rico. That the people of Puerto Rico have pioneered in translating objectives of social advancement, long-range economic planning, equitable tax structures, improved land use and vigorous investment in education, into visible realities is undeniable proof to all citizens of the Americas of the strength and creativeness of democratic ideals."

Endorsement for Program for International Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of the Citizens' Committee for International Development, dated July 10, 1961.

We will soon be considering this most important proposal and it is my hope that the administration will be able to count all of the Members of this body on its side in the aspect of the struggle for freedom that our foreign aid program represents.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, JULY 10, 1961

Our purpose in meeting with the President today was to give him our personal pledge and tell him of our conviction that the American people do accept the challenge to carry out to the fullest measure of their ability the responsibilities imposed on our citizenry in this critical decade.

Specifically, we informed the President of this committee's abiding confidence that the United States must maintain an effective program for economic and social development, as well as military aid, to other less developed nations which are seeking to develop the well being of their peoples in peace and freedom, and to advance their security. We believe that the security of this country, as well as the peace of the world, depend on a comprehensive efficiently operated foreign aid program, a program of a size and scope consonant with our responsibilities as the leader in the nineteen sixties of the free peoples of the world.

To this end, the citizens' committee endorses the program for international development which has been submitted to Congress by the present administration as the most effective program that can be devised within the context of sound economic policy.

It is our belief that the reasons which impelled our Nation to establish a program permitting other free nations to share our progress and maintain their strength, in freedom, are even more compelling now than in the days of our earlier foreign-aid operations, in the days of the Marshall plan, point 4, mutual assistance, and ICA.

The challenge to the free world, political, military, and economic, sharply increases week by week, even day by day. The totalitarian forces of the world are themselves expanding their own programs of aid and sending thousands of trained technicians, along with other forms of exploitation. Any withdrawal or reduction of the efforts of the United States in this field would be an abandonment of our responsibility, a demonstration of unconcern for the weal of free men, and an immeasurably dangerous threat to our own security and democratic way of life.

This committee points with pride to the notable successes of past programs through which we have assisted in the rebirth of a free and strong Europe, in the development of less privileged nations into societies that can with realism look forward to economic and political stability.

Our attention must now be focused on maintaining these successes and achieving new gains. We must focus not on weakness in the administration of foreign aid programs of the past. These weaknesses can be substantially mitigated by the determination to do so, expressed by the President, and by the steps now being taken to improve both overall administration and personnel selection by the new agency proposed under the President's plan and reflected in the current legislation. These moves, combined with the proposed planning of foreign aid on a country-to-country basis, will go far toward correction of the causes for criticism in the past.

We agree with the President that the annual appropriation machinery, through which foreign aid has been made possible in the past, seriously impairs the effectiveness of our development efforts. Our agreement stems from our own experiences in our private activities—business, labor, and community management. Accordingly, we support a modernized, business-type approach to foreign aid, pointing toward long-term development programs and the elimination of ineffective commitments to meet annual fiscal year deadlines. This can be achieved without sacrificing the safeguards of the annual review of the operations of the program by the Congress. We are sure that the long-term authority, under the new legislation, will permit more economic and effective planning with a maximum degree of self-help and sustained reform commitments on the part of the recipient nations.

This committee notes the fact that at present, a major part of all foreign aid is spent in the United States for materials and services and that the percentage of funds spent in this country is expected to reach 80 percent. We commend this objective as minimizing the outflow of dollars under the program, with its salutary effect on our balance of payments, as well as directly providing substantial employment in the United States.

We believe that the program for international development and the legislation currently before the Congress is sound in aim and purpose. There is no effective alternative to this program. Whether we maintain our position and leadership in this area or not, those who would destroy freedom throughout the world will continue their programs. We can ill afford, either out of our own economic and security interests, or equally important, out of our concern for the peoples in the developing nations of the world, to leave a vacuum to be filled unhindered by the forces of mass aggression and destruction of individual rights and freedom.

We invite—yes, we urge—all Americans of whatever political affiliation to join us in support of this program. We urge every citizen to recognize and accept his obligation to assure that this generation of Americans will have successfully carried out its responsibilities to our heritage, to our way of life and to our freedom-loving friends throughout the world.

OFFICIALS OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE OFFICERS

Chairman: Warren Lee Pierson, chairman of the executive committee, Trans World Airlines.

Treasurer: Daniel W. Bell, chairman of the board, American Security & Trust Co.

Assistant treasurer: Paul J. Seltzer, vice president, American Security & Trust Co.

Executive director: John J. O'Shea, assistant to the chairman, Bankers Securities Corp.

VICE CHAIRMAN

Hon. Eugenie Anderson, former U.S. Ambassador to Denmark, Minnesota.

Hon. William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, New York.

Thomas D. Cabot, chairman, Cabot Corp., Boston, Mass.

O. Roy Chalk, president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Myron M. Cowen, former U.S. Ambassador to Australia, Belgium, the Philippines.

Malcolm S. Forbes, editor and publisher, Forbes, Inc., New York.

Albert M. Greenfield, honorary chairman, Bankers Securities Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

Alfred M. Gruenther, former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, Washington, D.C.

Murray D. Lincoln, chairman, Nationwide Insurance Co., Columbus, Ohio.

Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.

George Meany, president, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

William S. Paley, chairman of the board, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York.

Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Ralph T. Reed, chairman of the executive committee, American Express Co., New York.

Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, president, Trenton Trust Co., Trenton, N.J.

David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, New York.

Walter Sterling Surrey, Surrey, Karasik, Gould and Efron, Washington, D.C.

Charles P. Taft, chairman, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Washington, D.C.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president, International Business Machines Corp., New York.

Harvey Williams, president, Philco International Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

James D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

All the officers and—

Robert S. Benjamin, chairman, United Artists Corp., New York.

Everett N. Case, president, Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y.

Alfred H. Edelson, president, Rytex Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

Charles W. Engelhard, president, Baker & Co., Newark, N.J.

Eugene E. Frazier, president, United Transport Services Employees, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Eleanor Clark French, New York, N.Y.

Albert J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D.C.
Walter Hochschild, chairman of the board, American Metal Climax, Inc., New York.
David Karr, president, Fairbanks-Whitney Corp., New York.
Mrs. Oswald Lord, former U.S. delegate to United Nations.
John Murphy, consultant, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Washington, D.C.
Thomas S. Nichols, chairman, Olin Mathieson Corp., New York.
Ross Pritchart, chairman, Political Science Department, Southwestern at Memphis.
Walter Reuther, president, UAW, AFL–CIO, Detroit, Mich.
Ralph I. Straus, R. H. Macy & Co., New York.
Ezra Zilkha, president, Zilkha & Sons, New York.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Henry C. Alexander, chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York City.
S. C. Allyn, chairman, National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.
Gustave G. Amsterdam, president, Bankers Securities Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
George S. Armstrong, chairman, George S. Armstrong & Co., Inc., New York City.
Jefferson A. Beaver, San Francisco, Calif.
Mrs. Rachel Bell, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Washington, D.C.
A. J. Bernhardt, general president, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Kansas City, Mo.
Harry R. Betters, executive director, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Sarah G. Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Andrew A. Boemi, president, Madison Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, Ill.
Lynn L. Bollinger, president, Helio Aircraft Corp., Norwood, Mass.
Hon. Charles F. Brannan, former Secretary of Agriculture, Denver, Colo.
A. Marvin Braverman, attorney, Washington, D.C.
George R. Brown, chairman, United Shoe Machinery Corp., Boston, Mass.
Raymond Buck, chairman and president, Commercial Standard Insurance Co.'s, Fort Worth, Tex.
William A. Calvin, president, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.
Edward W. Carter, Broadway-Hale Stores, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
Hung Wo Ching, president, Aloha Airlines, Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii.
Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.
Paul F. Clark, chairman, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.
Benjamin V. Cohen, attorney, Washington, D.C.
William Cohen, attorney, Louisville, Ky.
Joseph E. Cole, president and chairman, Cole National Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.
John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Rahway, N.J.
John P. Cunningham, chairman of the board, Cunningham & Walsh, New York City.
Donald David, chairman, executive committee, the Ford Foundation, New York City.
William L. Day, chairman, First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sherwood Egbert, Studebaker-Packard Corp., South Bend, Ind.
Dr. Milton Eisberg, president, Drug Fair, Arlington, Va.
Ray R. Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.
Hon. Edward H. Foley, Foley & Lynch, Washington, D.C.
Morris Forgash, U.S. Freight Co., New York City.
John M. Fox, executive vice president, United Fruit Co., Boston, Mass.
Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., president, the First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Loring L. Gelbach, chairman and president, Central National Bank of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio.
E. B. Germany, president, Lone Star Steel Co., Dallas, Tex.
H. E. Gilbert, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Cleveland, Ohio.
Harry Golden, editor, the Carolina Israelite, Charlotte, N.C.
Harry E. Gould, New York City.
Dr. Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers State University, New Brunswick, N.J.
Victor Gruen, Victor Gruen Associates, New York City.
Luther Gulick, president, Institute of Public Administration, New York City.
Bryce Harlow, former Special Assistant to President Eisenhower, Washington, D.C.
Marion Harper, Jr., chairman and president, McCann-Erickson, Inc., New York City.
J. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation, New York City.
Hon. George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Henry T. Heald, president, Ford Foundation, New York City.
August Heckscher, director, the Twentieth Century Fund, New York City.
Edward H. Heller, industrialist, San Francisco, Calif.
Conrad N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.
Mrs. Charles Hymes, president, National Council of Jewish Women, Minneapolis, Minn.
Claude A. Jessup, president, National Trailways Bus System, Charlottesville, Va.
Devereux C. Josephs, New York Life Insurance Co., New York City.
Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.
James M. Kennedy, chairman, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New York City.
Justin Kingson, West Warwick, R.I.
O. A. Knight, president, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, Denver, Colo.
Jack Kroll, manager, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mrs. Albert Lasker, New York City.
Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Tex.
Arnold H. Maremont, president, Maremont Automotive Products, Chicago, Ill.
Frank E. Marsh, president, Bay Area Council, World Trade Center, San Francisco, Calif.
John F. Marten, president, Great Western Financial Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.
Maurice B. Mitchell, president, Encyclopedia Britannica, Wilmette, Ill.
Walter C. Nelson, president, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Minneapolis, Minn.
Isadore Newman, II, president, Maison Blanche Co., New Orleans, La.
Dr. Quigg Newton, president, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Aksel Nielson, chairman, Title Guaranty Co., Denver, Colo.
Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C.
James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Denver, Colo.
Dr. John A. Perkins, president, University of Delaware, Newark, Del.
Don Petrie, vice president, Hertz Corp., New York City.
Dwight Phillips, Phillips Construction Co., Charlotte, N.C.
Paul Phillips, president, United Papermakers & Paperworkers, Albany, N.Y.
John A. Roosevelt, partner, Bache & Co., New York City.
Elmo Roper, Elmo Roper & Associates, New York City.
Michael Safer, president, Capital Steel Co., Baton Rouge, La.
Martin E. Schwartz, president, Schwartz Paper Co., Muncie, Ind.
John Sengstacke, publisher, Chicago, Ill.
Milton J. Shapp, Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
Benjamin W. Shipman, attorney, Los Angeles, Calif.
John A. Sibley, chairman, Trust Co. of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga.
Grant G. Simmons, president, Simmons Co., New York City.
Roger Sonnabend, president, Hotel Corp. of America, Boston, Mass.
Philip Sporn, president, American Electric Power Service Corp., New York City.
William Stern, president, Dakota National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.
Edward Durell Stone, New York City.
Oskar Stonorov, architect, Philadelphia, Pa.
Edwin J. Thomas, chairman, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
Mrs. S. Lennard Thomas, Montgomery, Ala.
William Tolley, chancellor, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
A. Van Hassel, chairman, Magor Car Corp., Clifton, N.J.
Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of the USA, Chicago, Ill.
Kenneth N. Watson, Jones, Kreeger & Co., Washington, D.C.
Sidney J. Weinberg, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York City.
Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., chairman, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.
Hon. Claude R. Wickard, president, Fairacre Farms, Inc., Camden, Ind.
Morris Wolf, former general counsel for FOA, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hon Stanley Woodward, Washington, D.C.
H. Zinder, president, H. Zinder & Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Dallas Has Become a Great City Through the Efforts of Its People and Its Business Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are fortunate enough to be from Big D never apologize for pointing with pride to the accomplishments of our great city. It is no accident that Dallas is one of the most thriving, forward looking communities in the world. This result has been achieved through the sweat and toil and daring of its people through the years. The people of Dallas are inspired with the philosophy which made our country great, the spirit of our forefathers who dared to do and who were unafraid of hard work and of tireless individual effort to bring about the fulfillment of their dreams of progress. This spirit, which underlies the great works of Dallas, is reflected in the city's business and industrial leaders. Dallas has always been a great center of activity and now, as we come full scale into the

space and electronics age, Dallas is again in the lead as one of the Nation's outstanding centers of the electronics industry. How Dallas does it is told in the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald, one of our outstanding newspapers:

ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY BECOMES BIG FACTOR IN DALLAS ECONOMY

Dallas economy at various times has been based on a number of different things.

In the beginning this became a city because the crossing of two railroads assured its future as a distribution center. That status has been improved with more rail service, a network of highways and excellent air service.

Other key factors in the changing Dallas economy have been cotton, petroleum, insurance, banking and finance, aircraft manufacturing, and the garment and fashion industry.

Most recent addition to the economy has been the buildup of an electronic industry.

Still the newest of our major industries, it turns out products with an annual value of more than a quarter billion dollars and employs nearly 17,000 persons with an annual payroll of nearly $100 million. Today Dallas is by far the most important electronics industrial center in the State and the outlook for the industry here in the space age is very bright.

Many cities are built because of a great natural advantage—a river, a harbor, mineral deposits or the like. Dallas was not.

It is true that this was the center of a great cotton producing area. But other cities were equally well situated to become great cotton centers. No oil is produced in Dallas County, but this is an important petroleum company headquarters center. Highways, railroads and air traffic were built because of the city.

The aircraft industry here got a good start at the beginning of World War II partly because of good flying weather and partly because of Dallas location with reference to distance from the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts.

But there was no particular reason why this should have become an outstanding insurance center, a banking and financial center or an electronics center.

Human resources and human effort rather than natural advantages have made this possible.

"Agricultural Zoning in Florida: Its Implications and Problems"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an article from the University of Florida Law Review, entitled "Agricultural Zoning in Florida: Its Implications and Problems." This article was written by one of the outstanding members of the Florida bar, Mr. James S. Wershow, of Gainesville, and I feel that this splendid discussion on agricultural zoning, which is of current importance throughout the country, will prove of great interest to my fellow Members of Congress and the public.

The article follows:

AGRICULTURAL ZONING IN FLORIDA—ITS IMPLICATIONS AND PROBLEMS [1]

(By James S. Wershow [2])

Countryside U.S.A. is changing. The urban sprawl, intensified by America's population explosion, is bringing new neighbors to farming communities—neighbors who work in the cities.

The lure of cheap land and low tax assessments has brought forth a flock of speculative builders and subdividers. Good roads and automobiles permit the urban population to spread over the countryside. Suburbanization reaches out for many miles, bringing into rural communities scattered homes and subdivisions, business centers and strip commercial areas, and industries and part-time farms. In the interest of all concerned this shift from agricultural use of land to urban use should be conducted in an orderly manner. Planned development, however, seems to be the exception; haphazard growth and idle land too often prevail, creating serious problems of taxation, utilities, and transportation. These problems, especially taxation, are particularly vexing to the agriculturist. His land, which formerly was useful only as a farm, becomes more valuable each year as residential and commercial developments encroach upon it. As a natural consequence, its assessed valuation may rise to the point that the land can no longer be used profitably for farming. The farmer is thus forced to sell his property to others who will subdivide it into smaller segments, on which the tax burden can more easily be borne. Attempts to solve this problem through legislation have become prevalent in recent years.[3] The purpose of this article is to show how this transition has affected the farmer, to discuss the validity and effectiveness of Florida's statutory remedy for the problem of increasing taxes, and to point out certain corrective measures that should help to alleviate the problem.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Any discussion of the means of protecting farmland from urban sprawl should be prefaced by a consideration of whether there is a need to conserve the land. On a nationwide basis, land in farm production has remained rather constant since 1920, while the population has expanded tremendously.[4] Between 1920 and 1953 approximately 400 million acres were farmed each year. During the same period the population of the United States increased from 105 million to 160 million, and average food consumption rose by more than 30 pounds per person annually over the rate prior to World War II. The farmer has had to meet the resultant problem of feeding an increasing population on a decreasing amount of land per person by increasing his productivity through more efficient and more scientific operations.

It may seem, because farm surplus is presently a national problem, that the conversion of farmland to nonfarm use is actually not a problem. A consideration of projected population estimates, some as high as 228 million by 1975,[5] destroys this illusion and indicates the necessity for positive action. The fact that there are large tracts of unused land does not mean that there is no problem. Other factors, such as location, weather, water, soil type, and fertility, must be considered. Most other uses of land are not as demanding as is agriculture in all these things. The time has come to begin solving the matter of land utilization.

Federal,[6] State, and county governments have all recognized the need for programs to preserve land for agricultural use. Aesthetic circles have also been concerned to prevent the rape of America's forests and farms by speculative builders who move into the countryside in search of cheap land.[7] Expansion of research and educational programs by State universities, agricultural experiment stations and extension services, and private organizations indicates the realization that no matter how efficient a farm operation may be or how much science is applied, the base of life is still the soil. The conclusion to be drawn is that it is imperative that much consideration be given to the conservation of farmlands.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has separated the serious and costly urban-agricultural conflicts generated by urban encroachment on rural land into the following problem groups: [8] (1) Excessive taxes resulting from a shifting of development and public service costs to farm taxpayers, (2) the adverse effects of nonfarm land uses on agricultural plants and operations, and (3) objections of nonfarm people to certain farming activities and practices. The avoidance of these conflicts and their corresponding problems is of principal importance to the farming industry. Anything other than positive action through rural zoning will invite unguided urban encroachment. Rural zoning works at the very source of the problem by separating agricultural from nonagricultural uses. The desirable degree of separation varies with the locality; the use of particular zoning tools will be guided by local objectives.

LEGISLATION IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

The two most active States in the field of rural zoning for the protection of agricultural interests have been Minnesota and California. The Minnesota statute [9] provides that land rural in character but not used for agricultural purposes is to be assessed at 33⅓ percent of its full value; land used for agricultural purposes, at 20 percent; and all other land at 40 percent.

California has several statutes included in its general real property tax legislation.[10] The reason for the enactment of the statutes is found in the fact that only 10 percent of California's 100 million acres is tillable, and only 3 percent is high-class soil. At the present time the urban population occupies roughly 4 percent of the State's area. Included in this 4 percent is half of what was the finest agricultural land in the State 10 years ago. California's long range goal is to retain the agricultural contribution to its economy. One method of accomplishing this is to set aside permanently the best land for agricultural production.[11]

During the past 7 years California has taken several steps toward the accomplishment of this goal. The enactments could well be called a statutory green-belt program. In 1953 a statute was passed establishing an inclusive agricultural classification of land as part of the county zoning ordinances.[12] In 1955 the legislature passed the Agricultural Extension Act, exempting agriculturally zoned land from annexation to a city without the owner's consent.[13] In 1957 the legislature went further and instructed tax assessors, in assessing land previously zoned for agricultural purposes, to take into consideration only its value for agricultural use.[14] In 1959 a statute was passed allowing counties to purchase interests in real property in order to preserve lands suitable for agricultural and recreational development and to lease the land back to the original owner.[15]

Even with all these statutes, however, the California agriculturist has not, in all cases, had his land assessed by the use of valuation factors relevant to agricultural use only. The statute pertaining to assessments [16] contains a clause that allows operation of the preferential assessment process only when "there is no reasonable probability" of the removal or modification of the zoning restriction within the near future. Experience

Footnotes at end of speech.

has shown that this statute will be of little real benefit to the California agriculurist who is surrounded by subdivisions.[17] In such instances the tax assessor will find it difficult to say that there is "no reasonable probability" that the agriculturist will not succumb to the overtures of the subdividers, the annexing city, or both. To remedy this situation the California legislature recently passed a statute [18] authorizing county planning commissions to adopt interim agricultural zoning as an emergency measure and permitting them to zone land so as to preclude it from losing its exclusive agricultural tax classification. The constitutionality of zoning under this statute will depend upon the protection it affords the public safety, health, and welfare.[19] Normally a court will not go behind a declaration of emergency and public purpose by a governmental body or substitute its own opinion as to whether an emergency does in fact exist.[20] Such declarations are conclusive upon the courts unless no statement of fact is included in the zoning ordinance showing the emergency to exist, or unless the facts intended to indicate the necessity of action are obviously insufficient to constitute an emergency.[21] Accordingly, in considering each petition, the commission must satisfy itself that a true emergency within the provisions of the statute exists.

Maryland also has realized the vital necessity of solving problems created by the urban sprawl. The Maryland law has stirred up much controversy. As originally enacted in 1956, it provided that "lands which are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use shall be assessed on the basis of such use, and shall not be assessed as if subdivided or on any other basis." [22] In 1957 the law was repealed and reenacted to read: [23]

"Lands which are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use shall be assessed on the basis of such use, and shall not be assessed as if subdivided or on any other basis. The State tax commission shall have the power to establish criteria for the purposes of determining whether lands subject to assessment under this subsection are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use by the adoption of rules and regulations. Such criteria shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

"1. Zoning applicable to the land.

"2. Present and past use of the land including land under the soil bank provisions of the Agricultural Stabilization Act of the U.S. Government.

"3. Productivity of the land including timberlands and lands used for reforestation.

"4. The ratio of farm or agricultural use as against other uses of the land."

The law became effective on June 1, 1957. On January 19, 1960, the Maryland Court of Appeals declared the law unconstitutional because it failed to meet two requirements of a valid tax exemption—reasonableness and public purpose. A month after the opinion was released a motion for reargument was granted and the opinion was recalled. However, on reargument, the original decision was reaffirmed.[24]

In March 1960 the Maryland Legislature adopted a proposed amendment to the State constitution stating that "the legislature may provide that land actively devoted to farm or agriculture shall not be assessed as if subdivided or on any other basis." [25] This amendment is subject to approval by the voters. At the same time, legislation was adopted to repeal and reenact the aforementioned statute and to clarify the public purpose to be served. In its present form it provides: [26]

"Farm or agriculture use-lands which are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use shall be assessed on the basis of such use, and shall not be assessed as if subdivided or on any other basis, it being the intent of the general assembly that the assessment of farmland shall be maintained at levels compatible with the continued use of such land for farming and shall not be adversely affected by neighboring land uses of a more intensive nature. The general assembly hereby declares it to be in the general public interest that farming be fostered and encouraged in order to maintain a readily available source of food and dairy products close to the metropolitan areas of the State, to encourage the preservation of open spaces as an amenity necessary to human welfare and happiness, and to prevent the forced conversion of such open space to more intensive uses as a result of economic pressures caused by the assessment of land at a rate or level incompatible with the practical use of such land for farming."

The same law authorized the State tax commission to establish criteria for judging whether farms that "appear to be actively devoted to farm or agricultural use are in fact bona fide farms and qualify for assessment under this subsection." [27] This bill was approved on March 23, 1960, and as of June 30, 1960, had not been subjected to court test.

Several other States are considering legislation dealing with the assessment problem. Oregon introduced a bill in its senate attempting to define the true cash value of real property used principally for farming.[28] Similarly, the State of Washington has passed a joint resolution that "lands which are actively devoted to farm or agricultural use shall be assessed on the basis of such use and shall not be assessed on any other basis.[29] Connecticut also has moved in this direction.[30] Similar bills have been introduced in the legislatures of Illinois,[31] New Jersey,[32] and Nevada.[33]

FLORIDA STATUTE 193.201

In 1959, upon the urging of the agricultural interests in the State and because of its own recognition of the problem created by the urban sprawl, the Florida legislature enacted section 193.201. The apparent reasoning behind the passage of this act [34] recognizes the importance of the economic benefit that the State of Florida receives from agricultural activities. One of the serious agricultural problems in the State today is caused by recent real estate development that has tended to increase real property tax assessment on agricultural lands to unrealistic and unfair proportions. It is alleged that agricultural production, which is so important to the economy of the State, will thus be "taxed out of existence." [35] Section 193.201 provides:

"1. The board of county commissioners of any county in the State is hereby authorized and empowered in its discretion to zone areas in the county exclusively used for agricultural purposes as agricultural lands; provided said lands have been used exclusively for agricultural purposes for 5 years prior to such zoning.

"2. In the event that the board of county commissioners zone said lands as provided in subsection (1) then the board shall notify the tax assessor on or before November 1 and the tax assessor shall immediately after January 1 of the succeeding year prepare and certify to the board of county commissioners a list of lands in the county so zoned as agricultural lands.

"3. The board of county commissioners shall examine said list and classification of such lands submitted by the tax assessor and shall make such reclassification as shall be appropriate or justified, and as reclassified shall zone such lands in the county for tax purposes only as agricultural.

"4. For the purpose of this section, 'agricultural lands' shall include horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, forestry, dairy, livestock, poultry, bee and all forms of farm products and farm production.

"5. The county tax assessor in assessing such lands so zoned and exclusively used for agricultural purposes as described and listed shall consider no factors other than those relative to such use. The tax assessor in assessing land within this class shall take into consideration the following use factors only: The cost of the property as agricultural land, the present replacement value of improvements thereon, quantity and size of the property, the condition of said property, the present cash value of said property as agricultural land, the location of said property, the character of the area or place in which said property is located and such other agricultural factors as may from time to time become applicable.

"6. The board shall keep a record of such lands so zoned for tax purposes only and restricted for agricultural lands and shall remove such zoning restrictions whenever lands so zoned are used for any other purposes."

In essence this statute allows the boards of county commissioners in the various counties the option of either adopting or failing to adopt the provisions set out in the statute.[36] There is no State agency, board, or department designated by the statute to have control over the commissioners' action; rather the matter is purely one of local option and concern. To come under the provisions of the statute lands must have been used exclusively for agricultural purposes for 5 years.

Constitutionality

Any study of section 193.201 requires a consideration of whether the classification of land for purposes of ad valorem property taxes is proper with reference to U.S. and Florida constitutional provisons.

The Florida constitutional provisions requiring uniformity and equality of taxation [37] have been held to apply only to the rate of taxation and to have no relation to property valuation.[38] Section 193.201 concerns itself only with the valuation or assessment of agricultural lands; it does not directly control the tax rate on the land. However, the Florida constitution does provide that the legislature shall prescribe such regulations as shall secure a just valuation of all property.[39] A strong argument could therefore be made that the prescribed statutory classification separating agricultural lands from other lands in the county is unjust. It is evident that the definition of agricultural lands contained in this staute [40] leaves much to be desired from the standpoint of definiteness and practical enforcement.[41]

The Florida Supreme Court has held that classification for the purpose of property tax legislation may be made with reference to similarity of situations, circumstances, and convenience to best serve the public interest.[42] The court has also held that the constitutional provisions requiring uniform and equal tax rate and just valuation contemplate rather than forbid property classifications.[43] The test as to the validity of the classification has also been held to be good faith rather than wisdom.[44] There is, however, a general conflict regarding what constitutes a reasonable classification of property for purposes of ad valorem taxation. A Florida statutory provision relating to the classification and grouping of lands has been held valid in light of all the provisions of the United States and Florida constitutions.[45] Classifications in other jurisdictions, however, have been held invalid as unreasonable when the volume per acre was made the test of taxability of timber; [46] un-

Footnotes at end of speech.

planted real property used for agricultural purposes was classified differently from improved land or land divided into blocks or lots; [47] and favoritism was given, over nonforest land, to the raising of forest products.[48]

The United States and Florida constitutions provide that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.[49] This clause of the United States Constitution is not intended to hamper the States in the discretionary exercise of their governmental powers so long as private rights are not arbitrarily invaded.[50] The constitutional guarantee of due process requires merely that all statutes shall operate alike upon all persons in similar circumstances; if a statute arbitrarily or unjustly discriminates among persons, due processes may be violated.[51]

It has been argued that section 193.201 provides a special tax concession to owners of agricultural lands and that owners of substantially similar land will be discriminated against if they do not receive this same concession. Moreover, since the language in the statute is so broad, any land in production for 5 years in a county that adopts the statute will probably receive the tax concession. A constitutional question arises from the broad language of the statute.[52] There are several loopholes allowing the special tax concession to be obtained by landowners other than farmers in agricultural production. A brief look at the subsection that defines agricultural lands [53] discloses that it is vague and ambiguous. The statute does not state how much of the land must be cultivated or to what extent it must be used. It would be a simple matter for real estate investors who own land previously used for agricultural purposes to fence an extensive area and purchase a few cattle or beehives and thus seemingly comply with the present definition of "agricultural lands" so that they could receive the special tax concession.[54]

The improper administration of such a clause could easily bring about arbitrary and discriminatory land classifications. When laws passed by the State are seen to have a reasonable relation to a proper legislative purpose, however, and are neither arbitrary nor discriminatory, the requirement of substantive due process is satisfied.[55]

From the standpoint of procedural due process, there is required a law which hears before it condemns, which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after a trial.[56] The most important element of protection afforded by the due process clauses of the State and Federal constitutions is procedural due process.[57] The rights embraced can be reduced to the single requirement of an opportunity to be heard. This, however, includes the requirements of notice and hearing in appropriate proceedings by a competent tribunal.[58]

Deprivation of procedural due process, with the resulting unconstitutionality, is the most persuasive argument that can be made against this statute; it makes no provisions for hearing or public discussion concerning the use of the land to be classified. In fact, the owner of the land is required to take no active part in the classification of his land.

Is Section 193.201 a Green-Belt Statute?

The term "green belt" is correctly applied to a statute that is a general zoning ordinance for rural areas; it provides an overall land use plan serving as an instrument for the conservation and preservation of agricultural areas.[59] This type of statute establishes in a community a green belt—a strip of land that otherwise might be completely developed for residential, business, or commercial uses.[60] Because the soil in such an area is valuable for agricultural production, the property is restricted to certain agricultural or recreational uses. In return for the restriction the statute offers a tax reduction.

To obtain green-belt zoning status the land must be changed from its existing classification by the zoning process. Zoning is derived from the police power [61] and is used for the general welfare of the community.[62] A change in zoning classification requires the tradtional rezoning process, which involves action by the proper governmental boards, request by the owner, and due public notice.[63]

Florida's statute does not provide for public hearing, public notice, or action by the owner. It does not necessitate a permanent restriction on the use of the land or special zoning.[64] All that is required is that the land must have been used for the past 5 years exclusively for agricultural purposes. The owner must conform to the vague and indefinite definition of "agricultural lands."

The apparent reason for application of the term green belt to section 193.201 is that the preamble to the statute [65] contains language that could be applied in describing an actual green-belt statute. The context of the statute, however, does not resemble true green-belt laws.

FLORIDA LAND INVENTORY

The previously mentioned California statutes are similar to the Florida act in that they allow a special tax concession for agricultural lands. The California statutes were enacted to protect a very small percentage of land that added significantly to the State's economy. This land was unique and could not be replaced in other parts of the State where the demand for real estate development was less critical.

There is some question whether this land situation exists in the State of Florida. At present an inventory is being conducted which should shed some light on the question of justification of the special tax concession in Florida.[66] The following chart shows, in acres, data regarding Florida's land inventory:[67]

	1954	1975 [1] (projected use)
Cropland:		
Truck	384,000	596,000
Citrus	550,000	874,000
Field	1,423,000	1,673,000
Other	1,086,000	986,000
Total	3,443,000	4,129,000
Pasture and range:		
Improved	1,500,000	3,000,000
Other	3,381,000	1,712,000
Total	4,881,000	4,712,000
Forest and woodland	23,047,000	21,700,000
Other:		
Urban buildup	1,147,000	1,914,000
All other nonagricultural uses	2,210,000	1,405,000
Total	3,357,000	3,319,000
Grand total	34,728,000	[2] 33,860,000

[1] Projected use.
[2] The total land area in 1975 will be smaller than in 1954, primarily because of the inundation of 18,000 acres of forest land and 850,000 acres of other land.

Since these figures [68] are based on variables that may alter radically with the unprecedented population growth in Florida, it is well to remember that once agricultural land is devoted to other uses, such as residences, roads, or subdivisions, it cannot be easily reclaimed for agricultural purposes. It is important to note that Florida agriculture supplies much more than local needs. Citrus fruit, winter vegetables, and cattle are substantial contributions to the Nation's food supply. Although it can be argued that Florida has an abundance of undeveloped land, nevertheless soil condition, accessibility, and other pertinent factors make its development on a realistic scale indefinite.

CONCLUSION

The relative newness of the Florida law and of similar statutes in other States precludes a reliable prediction of its validity. However, if Florida is to continue its unprecedented growth without the hazards that have characterized its spasmodic earlier periods of development, it must come to grips with the basic problem of financing growth. A realistic look at the Florida tax structure indicates that the present system leaves much to be desired. The reliance upon ad valorem real property taxation has resulted in major inequities. The failure of the assessment process under the homestead exemption has created a problem of great magnitude. Special interest groups within the State make change difficult.

In the present environment of rapid change, how effective will Florida's new statute be? The developing economic pattern demands that agricultural lands be protected from unreasonable ad valorem taxation if they are to continue to make an important contribution to the State's monetary status. Land, unlike other commodities, cannot be moved at will. The costs of developing prime land are high. Surely those who are willing to invest in agricultural enterprises should have the benefit of zoning protection adequate to insure their future growth and basic existence. The concept of taxation based on land use is not new. The basic philosophy behind the "green-belt statutes" is worthy of further consideration. Too often the forces of haphazard growth dominate the scene and bring about results that are far from ideal. This statute represents an attempt to delineate a pattern that must be further developed if Florida is to have a well-balanced economic structure. The argument that certain procedural aspects of the present statutes are unconstitutional, especially as they relate to the assessment procedure, merely sidesteps the basic issue. Any statute that has its birth in the throes of legislative controversy is at best an approximation of what the sponsors of the bill really intended. Technical phraseology must give way to a broad understanding of the basic problem involved. Nevertheless, the statute represents an attempt to bring order out of chaos—to solve the problem before it becomes more acute. This statute could conceivably be declared unconstitutional by the courts on numerous procedural grounds. Yet this will not resolve the basic problem. Legislative intent must be supplemented by a firm policy decision from the courts to set the entire controversy in its proper perspective.

---

[1] The author acknowledges the valuable assistance of Edward H. Heller, LL.B. 1960, University of Florida, in the researching of this article.

[2] B.A. 1933, LL.B. 1936, LL.M. 1939, Yale University; member of Gainesville, Fla., Bar.

[3] California Government Code secs. 35009, 65806; California Revenue and Tax Code sec. 402.5; Florida Statute sec. 193.201 (1959); Maryland laws 1957, ch. 680; Minnesota Statute sec. 273.13 (1959).

[4] See "Farm Land Disappears," University of California Extension Service, Sept. 1953.

[5] See Solberg, "The Why and How of Rural Zoning," U.S. Agriculture Information Bull. No. 196, p. 31 (Dec. 1958).

[6] The Soil Conservation Act, 16 U.S.C. sec. 590 (1958).

[7] See White, "A Plan To Save Vanishing U.S. Countryside," Life, Aug. 17, 1959, p. 88.

[8] Solberg, supra, note 3.

[9] Minnesota Statute sec. 273.13 (1959).

[10] California Government Code secs. 35009, 65806; California Revenue and Tax Code sec. 402.5.

[21] See "Conservation of Agriculture in Metropolitan Community," Santa Clara County Planning Department, May 21, 1959.
[22] California Government Code, sec. 35009.
[23] Ibid.
[24] California Revenue and Tax Code, sec. 402.5.
[25] "Exclusive Agricultural Zoning," Santa Clara County Planning Department.
[26] California Revenue and Tax Code, sec. 402.5.
[27] Op. Att'y Gen. Cal. 57/219; Letter to the author from John H. Keith, Chief, Div. of Assess. Standards, California Board of Equalization, Nov. 5, 1959.
[28] California Government Code, sec. 65806.
[29] *Davis* v. *County of Los Angeles*, infra, note 18, provided that this was the test for the validity of zoning ordinances that intimately concern the police power.
[30] *Davis* v. *County of Los Angeles*, 12 Cal. 2d 412, 84 P. 2d 1034 (1938).
[31] Ibid.
[32] Maryland Laws 1956, ch. 9, sec 1 (17).
[33] Maryland Laws 1957, ch. 680, sec. 1 (17) (b).
[34] *State Tax Comm'n* v. *Wakefield*, 161 A. 2d 676 (Md. 1960).
[35] Maryland S. 70, Maryland Legislature (1960).
[36] Maryland H. 87, Maryland Legislature (1960).
[37] Ibid. See also Howie, "Assessment of Farm Land in Rural-Urban Fringe," 22 Agric. Fin. Rev. 43, Sept. 1960.
[38] Oregon S. 98, Oregon 50th Legislature (1959), amending Oregon Revised Statutes, secs. 308.205, 325 (1959), and declaring an emergency.
[39] Washington S.J. Res. 18, 36th legislature (1959).
[40] Connecticut S. 672, Connecticut Legislature, January sess. (1959).
[41] Illinois H. 404, 71st general assembly (1959).
[42] New Jersey S. 81, New Jersey Legislature (1959).
[43] Nevada S. No. 54, Nevada Legislature (1960).
[44] See Preamble, Florida Statutes Annotated, sec. 193.201 (Supp. 1959).
[45] Ibid.
[46] This law has already been put into effect in Indian River County; see Florida Cattleman, October 1960, p. 50 B.
[47] Florida Constitution, art. IX, sec. 1.
[48] *Schleman* v. *Connecticut Gen. Life Ins. Co.*, 151 Fla. 96, 9 So. 2d 197 (1942); *City of Ft. Myers* v. *Heitman*, 148 Fla. 432, 4 So. 2d 871 (1941); *Rorick* v. *Reconstruction Fin. Corp.*, 144 Fla. 539, 198 So. 494 (1940).
[49] Florida Constitution, art. IX, sec. 1.
[50] Florida Statute, sec. 193.201 (4): "For the purpose of this section, 'agricultural lands' shall include horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, forestry, dairy, livestock, poultry, bee and all forms of farm products and farm production."
[51] An analysis of the legislative history of this act shows that the definition of agricultural lands came into being as a result of legislative compromise.
[52] *Hayes* v. *Walker*, 54 Fla. 163, 44 So. 747 (1907).
[53] Ibid.
[54] *State ex rel. Att'y Gen.* v. *City of Avon Park*, 108 Fla. 641, 149 So. 409 (1933).
[55] *Smithers* v. *North St. Lucie River Drainage Dist.*, 73 So. 2d 235 (Fla. 1954) (statutory classification and grouping of marginal lands within a drainage district on the basis of benefits received held constitutional).
[56] In re "Opinion of the Justices," 84 N.H. 557, 149 Atl. 321 (1930).
[57] *Monaghan* v. *Lewis*, 21 Del. 218, 59 Atl. 948 (1905).
[58] *Clearfield Bituminous Coal Corp.* v. *Thomas*, 336 Pa. 572, 9 A. 2d 727 (1939).
[59] Fla. Constitution Declaration of Rights sec. 12; U.S. Const. amend. V.
[60] See 4 Fla. Law and Prac., "Constitutional Laws" sec. 114 (1956).
[61] See 6 Fla. Jur., "Constitutional Law" sec. 314 (1956).
[62] This language was inappropriately taken from a statute dealing with agricultural cooperatives, Fla. Stat. sec. 618.01 (1959).
[63] Fla. Stat. sec. 193.201 (4) (1959).
[64] Again legislative compromise was responsible for the definition of agricultural lands.
[65] 6 Fla. Jur., "Constitutional Law" sec. 312 (1956).
[66] *Trustees of Dartmouth College* v. *Woodward*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat,) 518 (1819) (argument of Daniel Webster); accord, State ex rel. *Munch* v. *Davis*, 143 Fla. 236, 196 So. 491 (1940); *Fiehe* v. *R. E. Householder Co.*, 98 Fla. 627, 125 So. 2 (1929).
[67] See 6 Fla. Jur., Constitutional Law sec. (1956).
[68] Ibid.
[69] "Exclusive Agricultural Zoning," Santa Clara County Planning Dept.
[70] Ibid.
[71] See 6 Fla. Jur., "Constitutional Law" sec. 163 (1956): "The police power includes anything which is reasonable, necessary, and appropriate to secure the peace, order, protection, safety, good health, comfort, quiet, morals, welfare, propriety, convenience, and best interests of the public."
[72] See 6 Fla. Jur., "Constitutional Law" sec. 196 (1956).
[73] "Exclusive Agricultural Zoning," Santa Clara County Planning Department.
[74] Although the word "zone" is used in sec. 193.201, it is apparent that the legislature intended that agricultural lands be "zoned" only in the sense that lands used exclusively for agricultural purposes be designated in a separate category or classification for purposes of ad valorem tax assessment. Letter from Richard W. Ervin, attorney general, to Darrey A. Davis, Oct. 21, 1959.
[75] Fla. Stat. Ann. sec. 193.201 (Supp. 1959).
[76] In the State of California only 10 percent of the land is arable; of this, 3 percent is high-class soil. During the last 10 years one-half of the high-class soil has been used in real estate development to the detriment of the economy of the State. See note, 9, supra.
[77] Based on unpublished data used in the national inventory of soil and water conservation currently being conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The results of this study will be published later.
[78] The chart does not evaluate the agricultural usefulness of land not presently in production.

Washington Sunday Star Editorially Recognizes Achievements of Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the privilege of inserting to your attention, and the attention of all my other distinguished colleagues, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for Sunday, July 30, 1961. I am especially pleased so to do because it manifestly bases its editorial philosophy in this article upon some of the significant statements and conclusions announced publicly and to this great Congress by my distinguished colleague from California, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Speaker, the dedicated, intelligent, vigorous work of this distinguished Californian, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, in this field, as well as in the others in which he is charged with responsibility, is so clearly of lasting import and significance to our beloved Nation I know you join with me in expression of pleasure that this Sunday Star has editorialized our distinguished colleague's statements in this editorial set forth by saying, "the conclusions are worth repeating":

WHY WAIT?

In effect, in their latest testimony before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, some of our most distinguished scientists have merely confirmed the committee's 1960 conclusions on the subject. Accordingly, as summed up at that time by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, head of the Senate-House group, the conclusions are worth repeating:

"It appears from the testimony that for the next several years at least it will not be possible to detect and identify underground bomb tests whose seismic signals record the equivalent of nonmuffled bomb explosions of 20 kilotons or less.

"Further, it appears that for this same time period, it will not be possible to detect muffled tests of 100 kilotons or more (upwards, that is, of 100,000 tons of exploding TNT) set off deep underground in large cavities."

As a matter of fact, in their latest appearance before the committee, the scientists have been altogether pessimistic as regards developing a reliable detecting system. That is to say, they have bluntly asserted that there is little or no possibility at present of working out trustworthy ways and means of safeguarding against clandestine underground or outer space nuclear shots. Actually, as of this very moment, the Kremlin could be carrying out such potentially decisive experiments without our having the slightest awareness of them.

These experiments could be of revolutionary significance. They could have to do with the so-called neutron or death-ray bomb, and they could have to do, also, with antimissile missiles capable of destroying or neutralizing any rockets incoming from the enemy's launching pads. Certainly, considering the clear record of Soviet furtiveness and broken promises, they are experiments that the Kremlin could have been carrying out surreptitiously almost from the very day, nearly 3 years ago, that our country unwisely agreed to declare a moratorium on testing while seeking to work out an adequately policed ban on the whole business. Clearly, these possible clandestine shots by the Russians could give them a significant military advantage over us.

All this, it seems to us, adds up to a fairly simple conclusion: The United States, even as it carries out the new defensive measures proclaimed by the President, should resume underground nuclear testing without further delay. Mr. Kennedy appears to be hesitant on the matter. But why? Why should our country wait any longer before resuming the kind of detonations that the Russians may have been staging clandestinely, off and on, for the past 3 years?

In sum, given the utterly bleak record of the Kremlin's innumerable broken pledges, why should any American continue to accept an unpoliced ban on nuclear tests? The time has come for our Government, re-

gardless of what might be the reaction of world opinion, to resume underground experimental shots, and the sooner the better. Our very survival as a Nation may well depend upon it.

Adm. Arleigh Burke Challenges America's Courage in Speech at National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to include as a part of my remarks, a speech delivered last Thursday before the National Press Club by Adm. Arleigh Burke. In his remarks Admiral Burke clearly sets forth the Communist challenge to our freedom and reminds us of the great heritage we are dedicated to protect through our willingness to sacrifice, to fight, and to die, if necessary to keep the world free.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED), BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 3, 1961

It is a particularly great honor to be invited to talk before the National Press Club, for the members of the press through the years have proved themselves singularly effective in safeguarding the fundamental values and institutions of the American way of life. I have had the privilege and the responsibility of speaking in this room on two previous occasions, and on each occasion I have been impressed, perhaps even more than you, with the importance of this forum.

From the earliest days on record, the members of the press have been in the van of the efforts to mold our Nation and to preserve its security. Indeed, even before our Nation became a reality, Peter Zenger—with courage and determination—scored an important victory for freedom in the English Colonies. With the political freedom that was soon to follow, the press exerted a vast and continuous impact on the trend of our national affairs. The Federalist papers, for example, had a tremendous influence on the final form of our Constitution and on its ultimate ratification. And surely, as our Nation grew, no group of men played a more important role in directing our attentions and energies than men like Greeley, Dana, Reid, and Pulitzer.

Thus I feel greatly honored to have this opportunity to speak to the members of the press. You have inherited the proud traditions of your profession, and you bear the grave responsibilities which those traditions impose.

My own career in the naval service has now come to a close. After 42 years of duty—many years of peace, and some of war—I am starting my retirement with considerable anticipation. And I know my long-suffering wife shares that anticipation with me. There is no question that retirement brings with it a certain sense of relief. I've sailed with the Navy all my adult life, in fair weather and foul. And as I left her Tuesday, she still remained the finest fighting force the world has ever seen. I am confident she will move out smartly in the future, under the very able leadership of our new Chief of Naval Operations.

I have left my naval duties in the hands of Admiral Anderson. But there are other responsibilities that I can never relinquish: the responsibilities that every citizen in our democracy faces. For no matter what our professions may be, no matter whether we are active or retired, each of us bears the responsibilities of his citizenship. Each of us carries his own share of the responsibilities that are fundamental to our concept of government—responsibilities that are dictated by conscience and directed by principles. These responsibilities are not unique to our era. My father and your fathers—all of our forbears—were required to meet the same type of responsibilities. And fortunately for this Republic, history shows that our forebears met them well, met them with wisdom and with the God-given strength that walks hand in hand with courage.

Each age faces its own conflicts and its own challenges. But the fundamental fact of our age, a fact blurred neither by symbolism nor by rhetoric, is that the future of the free world, the conditions of human life for years to come, are being determined now. The fate of our country—the future existence of our way of life—depends on what we as a nation, what we as individual citizens are willing to do today. That is why I would like to discuss briefly some of the forces at work in this troubled world, and how those forces may well affect the lives of our own generation and of generations to follow. Now, I'm not really going to say anything new about those forces this afternoon. Nor will I advocate anything you don't already believe. But I do want to give added emphasis to the seriousness of the present world situation and to the tremendous importance of our taking the steps that President Kennedy called for last week.

Clearly astride our path toward a world of justice and order stands the relentless force of communism, a godless ideology that finds its seat of power and its center of control in the Soviet Union. Now one thing is most apparent about the leaders of the Soviet Communist state today. They have become confident—vrey confident. And with their confidence they have developed arrogance. That is why they are talking tough; that is why Khrushchev has dared to challenge us over Berlin. The reason for this confidence is that some fundamental changes have occurred in Soviet Russia, particularly in the last 5 or 6 years.

Just a little over 40 years ago, communism was virtually confined to a rented room in Zurich. When the Bolsehviks seized power they had nothing—certainly nothing to be proud of. In every area of the world there were countries with better industries, better schools, better farms, and better housing. The Communist leaders felt inferior—and they were inferior. But men like Lenin and Stalin were, above all, realists. They recognized this inferiority, and they developed programs to change matters. The fantastic cost of these programs—not just in rubles, but in degradation, deceit, and despair—was of no consequence. The Communist hierarchy readily accepted the law that "the end justifies the means." Purges, pogroms, and persecution were integral parts of their 5-year plans. Yet these men were as diligent as they were ruthless. They worked hard, with concentration and great singleness of purpose; and now, in the last decade, their plans have begun to pay off.

The Soviet emphasis on scientific training gave birth to sputnik, to lunik, and to their man in space. And this scientific skill, combined with espionage and dogged determination, produced the Soviet missile capability: the rockets which Khrushchev so often rattles at the free world. For the first time in Soviet history, they accomplished something before anyone else; and real accomplishment, in any society, is the father of confidence. The Communists now feel they are better than the rest of the world.

That is one reason why they are confident. But there is another reason which is just as important. The Communists have watched their enemies in the West very closely. They have looked for signs of weakness: for weakness in our alliances, for weakness in our decisiveness, for weakness in our will. The Communists have probed the soul of the free world to see if we really practice what we preach, if we are really willing to stand up for principles—rather than merely spout pious platitudes. They have watched our deeds and ignored our diction. And all too often they found us wanting, our words trailing off to inaction and our opulence expressing itself in complacency.

Many of the Communist leaders do not believe that we in the United States will stand up for our principles. They do not believe that we will risk a fight for what we know is right. Menshikov has expressed this attitude very clearly. He stated that "when the chips are down the American people won't fight for Berlin." He would like to promote such a notion.

And so with a growing arrogance born of their own confidence and of our suspected weakness, Khrushchev has thrown the issue of Berlin in our faces.

But in considering Berlin it is extremely important that we recognize one fact. The future of the half city of Berlin, this "bone in Khrushchev's throat," is not an issue distinct and separate from the many other pressing international issues that confront our Nation. Berlin is isolated geographically, but politically, it is intimately related with everything else that is unfolding in the world: with the Communist aggressions in Laos and South Vietnam; with Communist exploitation of the situation in Cuba; and with the growing pressures throughout Latin America. The question of the freedom or slavery of West Berlin is a very real part of all our relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

It is obvious that these relations are at present based on challange and response—whether that challenge and that response be in southeast Asia, in our own hemisphere, or in central Europe; and our willingness and ability to respond in one area is directly related to our willingness and ability to meet challenges in other areas.

Even if Khrushchev had no chosen to confront us with this issue at this time and at this place; or if the issue of Berlin becomes not a crisis but an unresolved question, we can be sure that the Communists will still continue to present us with other issues, at other times and other places, in their drive toward world empire. Sometimes these issues will be primiarily of a military nature. At other times they will be economic, or psychological, or political. But one thing is certain: The patterned policy of Communist pressure and conflict will continue at an accelerated rate as long as they can hope that such a policy will be rewarding.

Naturally, of course, our attentions are now focused on Berlin. Our efforts and our energies are directed toward Berlin because the issue is related to far more than the hopes and aspirations of 2 million Berliners, far more than to the ultimate reunification of a free Germany. Berlin is a smybol—a symbol of freedom—safeguarded by Western unity and resolve. And the nature of our response can either strengthen that freedom, that unity, and that resolve—or it can bring an end to our united strength. Our treaties and treaty obligations are all in jeopardy, and should we vacillate or falter, the ultimate collapse of NATO—of SEATO and CENTO—of all our arrangemens for mutual security, could well be measured in months, if not in weeks.

You can be sure that Khrushchev recognizes the broad import of this issue. He is initiating the crises in Berlin. There would be no crisis without his action. He is using this issue to test free world stamina, courage, and strength of purpose. He is initiating this test of will, or perhaps it should be, this test of willingness to stand for principle.

Khrushchev, perhaps better than many Americans, is aware of the profound effect this issue will have not only on those allied with us in common defense, but—just as importantly—on the uncommitted nations, on the emergent countries, on the wavering and the faltering. By pressing the question of Berlin in an acute and threatening form, Khrushchev hopes to impress these countries with the strength and power of the Communists, and to demonstrate that the way of the future will be the Communist way.

At this point in history there is little to be gained by examining the wartime circumstances and the subsequent treaty agreements which determined the present status of Berlin. Nor would it be profitable to reiterate the repeated violations of those agreements by the Communists in an attempt to pry concessions from the West, or to test the viability and the will of free society. It should suffice to say that the Kremlin has been able to exploit this situation for the simple reason that we trusted them as a wartime ally—that we failed to recognize that their good words were only a mask for their bad deeds.

We overlooked the fact that a favorite Soviet card game is "Otchko," where the rules make it illegal to deal off the top of the deck. And this time the Soviets have dealt themselves a good card, a high trump from the bottom.

Now the Communists are trying to force us to "knuckle under." They want us to accept their superiority—to back down—to "walk back the cat."

The complicating factor is that they don't plan to take over Berlin in one swallow. As Willy Brandt puts it, the Soviets will use "salami tactics" to slice away freedom a bite at a time, just as they are seeking to do in the rest of the world.

The Communists will not confront us with the direct question of Soviet Union Supremacy because they know we wouldn't accept that supremacy. But they will use the East German Government to serve as their proxy, to gradually erode our legal rights—rights that were obtained not by grant nor by negotiations with the Soviets, but rights that were won by war and confirmed by a series of agreements since 1944.

First they will want us to accept the validity of the "German Democratic Republic," a tyranny neither chosen by the people nor responsive to their will. The Communists will make it appear that what is at stake is not freedom of West Berlin and Western access, but merely a legal title, a paper transaction with all rights remaining intact.

In the beginning, the status of Berlin may appear unchanged. But with the passage of time, the controls will tighten; regulations will become more stringent. Bit by bit, we will be forced to pay greater tribute for access to Berlin—tribute in the form of harassment, difficulties, and delays. The encroachments on our rights will increase, and slice by inevitable slice, freedom will disappear until one day a city, now free, will be lost to the forces of communism without any issue appearing important enough for us to take a stand—without any "Pearl Harbor" to galvanize our actions.

That is why it is so important that we stand firm now, at the beginning, before the slicing process commences. Certainly, we should always be prepared to negotiate with the Soviet Union on the modalities, on the details of occupation and access to Berlin. That is in keeping with our national policy. But at the same time we can never negotiate on our fundamental rights in Berlin. We must make it firmly understood that our rights—our obligations—to live up to the treaty obligations we accepted in regard to Berlin, just as our rights and our obligations to free men everywhere, are not subject to negotiations nor to compromise. Our firmness, of course, will involve substantial risks—tremendous risks—but we must accept them. We must be prepared to do anything and everything our stand implies. The irony of the matter is that once the Soviets are convinced that we do mean business, that we will remain in Berlin at all costs, the risks of general war diminish rather than increase. The Soviets are well aware of our tremendous strength. They question only our willingness to use it.

Our ability to convince our Communist adversaries that we are determined to stand fast will, of course, depend on more than threats or statements of intent. The credibility of our position will depend essentially on two factors. The first of these, is the willingness of the people of the United States to acknowledge, and to accept, the possibility of a general war—the willingness to go all the way to win. Only after this decision has been reached and made abundantly clear both at home and abroad can the military decisions be made to handle the situation as it develops. But in times of peace—yet times of very definite peril—this willingness is sometimes difficult to engender. The pleasures of an easy summer and the comforts of a thriving economy can well obscure the seriousness of our times.

And it is here, in this area, that you gathered in this room can make your most telling contributions to our national security. For it is you, the members of the press, who make our citizens aware of the issues, who can inspire our citizens with the "will to win."

Without undue preoccupation with the military aspects, without belligerence or propaganda, without exaggeration or dramatic speculation, you can mobilize the opinions of 180 million people. You can point out the meaning of our commitment. You can discuss the pitfalls and the perils. And with such enlightenment will come the individual and national willingness that will give credence to our words.

Naturally, the credibility of our stand would be seriously impaired should we fail to support our national will with the material things, with military hardware to reinforce our determination to help make our resolution both effective and believable. That is why in his speech last week President Kennedy, when he addressed himself to the problem of Berlin, also called for increased measures to strengthen our military forces in order to give us the additional naval power, the additional ground forces and air support, and the heightened readiness, to more fully prepare us for whatever the future may bring, whether that future will continue to be an uneasy peace or a future darkened by limited or even a general nuclear war. Knowing the tremendous strength of our military forces, I can assure you that we will be ready for any eventuality.

The coming months and years will offer the supreme test of our concept of life, a concept based on the abilities of the sovereign individual; on disciplined individuals motivated by fundamental principles, by a sense of justice, by moderation and integrity.

We live in a free world, but we are confronted by a world of coercion, a world where men are disciplined by force, by terror and intimidation. There is only one effective response to this challenge. We must provide our own form of discipline—the discipline that springs from within: self-discipline. This is the only effective form of discipline possible in a democracy. For discipline imposed from some other source, such as laws or regulations, can have only a limited effect. Laws dictate what we should not do. But the vital issues of our times are not a question of what we should not do, but much more what we should do. When President Kennedy said "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country," I believe it was a question to which, deep in our hearts, we already knew the answer.

If we want to preserve our society, we must practice the virtues that we praise. We must work harder to enlarge the advantages of free competition. As citizens, we must be willing to compete with one another and with the world; we must be determined that the United States will win that competition. We must have the will to win. As a Nation we must strive to excel. Every worker, every union member, every executive, and every student must reemphasize the high standards of performance that are the backbone of our national strength. And with every act to improve ourselves and our Nation, we must recognize that the very heart of any nation is its principles. Our principles must be the driving force behind our actions and the standard against which those actions are measured. For our principles and our willingness to stand up for them made this Nation what it is today; and those same principles, that same willingness, will preserve us in the future.

As I close, permit me to voice one more thought, directed not to Americans but to those outside this Nation, to those who choose to stand with us, and to those who may choose to stand against us. In the tragic aftermath of the Second World War, the United States expended significant energy and resources for the cause of all mankind. With a compassion and an understanding unique in history, we have aided both friend and former foe alike to recover from the destruction brought on by war. In the interest of the dignity and welfare of man we developed the Marshall plan and other measures to alleviate misery, to raise hope in areas where there was only despair. We have not always been successful, but we have tried. We have given freely and we have asked little in return. But there is one thing that we will never give, either willingly or through coercion—and that is our freedom, or the freedom of those who ask our help.

There have been other men in other eras—who misconstrued the temper of our people. The last three wars were started by nations that did not realize we would fight for our principles. They judged our efforts to promote peace as a sign of cowardice. They looked on our debates as a sign of division. They ridiculed our efforts to help others as do-goodism, betraying weakness. To anyone in our era who might be prompted to make the same fatal miscalculation, I urgently suggest that he look to the past, before he projects himself into a fearful future.

Two hundred years ago our forefathers, while recognizing the horrors of war, understood that people must stand ready to fight for what is right. Despite the passage of time, despite the prosperity of our Nation, Americans retain this fundamental conviction. I am confident that they stand ready to meet the challenges of the future—whatever they may be.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The 15 Pillars of the Communist Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to recall to the attention of my colleagues the letter we received dated July 28, 1961, from Mr. H. S. Riecke, Jr., of New Orleans, La.

In this letter, the gentleman from Louisiana advised the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives of the things he woud do if he were a Communist (which of course he is not). In his letter, which follows, you will read what Mr. Riecke considers to be the 15 programs the Communist, Communist conspirator, or a Communist sympathizer in the in the U.S. House, Senate, or State Department would vote for. His letter follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *July 28, 1961.*

THE 15 PILLARS OF THE COMMUNIST STRUCTURE

If I were a Communist, a Communist conspirator or a Communist sympathizer in the U.S. House, Senate, or State Department, I would vote to:

1. Send billions of foreign aid to Iron Curtain countries (so that mother Russia can use U.S. money to keep these countries subjugated).

2. Send billions of foreign aid to neutral countries—to arm and fatten them (so mother Russia can take them over from the inside, using U.S. financing).

3. Abolish colonialism, as being undemocratic (so other stupid countries will give independence to their colonies, to let mother Russia move in and win these new nations over to her side, in the U.N. voting).

4. Leave Castro alone: he will strangle himself (so mother Russia will have air and missile bases 90 miles away, and so that communism can springboard from Cuba unmolested, into all Latin-American countries).

5. Admit Red China into the U.N. (since Red China would always vote with mother Russia. Also Nationalist China would disgustedly resign its own membership: a gain of two U.N. votes for mother Russia) and, when mother Russia gains U.N. control—boy.

6. Recognize Outer Mongolia, on the pretense of gaining an Asian listening post (another permanent U.N. vote for our dear mother Russia).

7. Ban A-bomb and H-bomb tests (since mother Russia is not yet ready to test her own nuclear bombs, and needs more time while the United States remains idly marking time).

8. Compromise in Berlin—just a little (so that mother Russia would split the Western allies; disrupt NATO; keep Germany permanently partitioned; encroach on all European countries, to take each country over from the inside. Otherwise mother Russia cannot subdue Germany, its most potent enemy—the U.S. best ally).

9. Encourage nuclear weapons—testing—including underground testing—by the United States under supervision by the U.N. (so that mother Russia could get all the results without cost; especially since mother Russia is so dangerously far behind the United States in this field).

10. Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee—that damnable patriotic group (since they are exposing mother Russia's sons and daughters in top echelons of U.S. Government).

11. Weaken the FBI—the main armorplate between Americanism and communism—that damnable J. Edgar Hoover—and get access to FBI records, through U.S. Supreme Court decisions (so that mother Russia's Communist spies could better defend themselves in court).

12. Encourage the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate to kill H.R. 3247, the amendment to the Smith Act—passed by the House on May 15, 1961, which overrides the 1957 Supreme Court decision—Yates case; and would prevent our Communist brothers from hiding behind the fifth amendment. On two previous occasions, the damnable patriotic House passed similar legislation, and we Communists were able to make the Senate kill it, but now we must make the Senate kill it again. (Otherwise, this legislation—H.R. 3247—will deal a lethal blow to our beloved Communist conspiracy in the United States).

13. Keep Warren, Brennan, Black, and Douglas intact on the Supreme Court. (In spite of the fact that Warren reportedly voted only 36 out of 39 times in favor of Communist principles versus constitutional American Government).

14. Socialize the U.S. Government: Federal aid to education; socialized medicine; FCC control of all TV and radio networks; farm control, etc., etc. (which all leads to socialism. And father Khrushchev has just recently told Nasser, publicly, that socialism leads directly to communism, just as "A" leads to "B" in the alphabet).

15. Smear the John Birch Society; the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade; the Cinema Educational Guild, Inc.; and the films "Operation Abolition," "Communism on the Map," and "Communist Encirclement—1961," as these damnable patriotics are like mockingbirds pecking at the sleeping eagle and awakening the eagle before our boa constrictor can "peacefully" strangle her.

And, oh, yes, we want peace. Peaceful, gradual, encroachment. War would be the one sure way for our Communist conspiracy to lose. We must encourage more Chamberlains to cry out, "Peace. Peace in our time. Let our children fight it out later." (When it is too late to defeat us).

Of course, the Goldwater-Tower-Byrd "conservative" anti-Communist movement is sweeping across the country like a plague, and will soon sweep us all out of office and into jail. But what else can we do. After all, we are Communists, Communist sympathizers and Communist conspirators and we must advocate the above 15 points.

H. S. RIECKE, Jr.

Address by Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Washington together with a speech by the Under Secretary of the Interior, James K. Carr.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE HENRY M. JACKSON

On July 18, the community of Ephrata, Wash., celebrated Billy Clapp Day in observance of the 43d anniversary of the first news story carrying Mr. Clapp's suggestion for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam. People from all over the Pacific Northwest came to Ephrata to honor Mr. Clapp, who still lives there, and the little group of farseeing men and women who fought the Grand Coulee Dam battle to a successful conclusion.

The principal speaker that day was the distinguished Under Secretary of the Interior, James K. Carr, who delivered a timely and significant address. Mr. Carr eloquently described the fight for full development of Grand Coulee and the Columbia River. Mr. Carr also has set forth clearly the great economic value to the region and the Nation from not only the power, but also the irrigation benefits from Grand Coulee Dam. And, more important, the Under Secretary sets forth the case for complete development of the Columbia Basin project, which is now only half developed.

REMARKS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JAMES K. CARR AT LUNCHEON HONORING WILLIAM "BILLY" CLAPP, EPHRATA, WASH., JULY 18, 1961

Mr. Clapp, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a real privilege for me to be a part of your tribute to Billy Clapp, who in conjunction with a band of dedicated and determined men and women, did so much to make the dream of Grand Coulee and the Columbia Basin project a reality.

Secretary Udall has asked me to bring his personal greetings to Billy Clapp and his friends. Secretary Udall is unable to be here today, and this very pleasant assignment has fallen to me.

Most of the time, we have the unfortunate habit of failing to acknowledge our gratitude for the personal sacrifices and contributions of our citizens until it is a matter of history. Once in a while, though, we recognize our collective debt before time has taken its toll of our pioneers. Today is one of these fortunate instances.

The growth of our great land from a few eastern colonies to a mighty colossus came

about because America spawned men of vision, men who looked forward despite hardship and personal sacrifice, men who continued to fight for a dream in the face of almost impossible odds.

It is in memory of this valiant vanguard that we meet today to honor Billy Clapp. We honor him for his full contribution to the Columbia River Basin project. We honor him also as a symbol of the determined men who turned Grand Coulee from a dream into a living monument to man's faith in the future.

In honoring Billy Clapp, we also pay homage to Gale Matthews, Ed Southard, Sam Hill, Paul Donaldson, Rufus Woods, A. A. Goldsmith, Frank Bell, Nat Washington, Willis Batcheller, and, of course, Jim O'Sullivan. We pay homage also to many others—the countless men and women of the Columbia Basin who supported this group morally and financially in the long struggle.

The Columbia River, through its enormous flow and rapid fall, is the greatest power stream in the civilized world. As a source of power, it is mightier than the Mississippi, greater than the Volga. It dwarfs the Ganges, the Euphrates, the Yangtze, the Yukon, and the Amazon in its value to man.

Fully one-third of the hydroelectric potential of the United States lies along this great river. Its waters coursing to the ocean mean life and progress to a great region of our country, and its contributions to America far transcend its immediate benefits in the Pacific Northwest.

To harness the waters of the Columbia required a daring spirit, a strength of will, and a vision of the future, as great as the river itself. The successful harnessing of the Columbia River, at Grand Coulee, has been described as an epic struggle made possible by the indomitable spirit of man.

It required the construction of the largest concrete structure in the world—an undertaking which has been approached only in the building of the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

It required 10 million cubic yards of concrete—enough to build a highway across the Nation.

It required materials which would fill a train some 3,000 miles long.

But, primarily, it required that the will of the people be made known through men like Billy Clapp and Jim O'Sullivan and their friends. It needed the essence of American spirit, fostered by undaunted courage and determined devotion, to become reality.

Billy Clapp supplied the idea—the idea of a dam across the Columbia at Grand Coulee. It was first publicized in the Wenatchee Daily World by Rufus Woods 43 years ago today.

Although history may have forgotten, 1 year later, Ole Kallstad, a carpenter here in Ephrata, wrote to the Bureau of Reclamation suggesting that power created by the Dam could be used to pump water into the Coulee.

Here was the idea. Here was the method. And, to their everlasting credit, we had the men who could carry forth through the long years of struggle which lay ahead. I will not recount the bitter fight which consumed the years. However, it was epic in its proportions.

Throughout the years, faced with failures, setbacks, hidden and powerful opposition, thwarted by lack of funds, Billy Clapp and his friends fought the good fight for an ideal—an ideal which is now firmly planted in America.

This band of men believed that the resources of the Nation belonged to the people of the United States, that the resources of water and land were to be developed for the benefit of the people, that the fruits of our resources belonged to the many, not the few.

Even as Billy Clapp unfolded the dream of a gigantic dam at Grand Coulee, an alternate proposal to irrigate the area through a series of gravity canals was being seriously pushed. I do not have to remind Billy Clapp of the forces of reaction which seized upon this proposal to thwart full development of the Columbia River.

There were public statements such as this: "Probably nothing more visionary or impractical or ruthless with waste of public funds has come in the mass of schemes to use the taxpayer's money than the Coulee Dam project."

A leading legislator said, "Grand Coulee * * * is the most colossal fraud in the history of America."

One newspaper in the area editorialized, "It is too great in volume, but it is vastly more impressive in the magnitude of its folly."

Even those who strongly urged the project could not have foretold the great contribution which Grand Coulee made to our Nation in time of peace and in time of war. Furthermore, in spanning the Columbia River, the project ushered in a new era of resource development in the Pacific Northwest, an era which stressed the multiple-purpose concept of resource development. The early backers, I am sure, did not realize the tremendous recreational and fish and wildlife benefits which would flow from this undertaking.

Many, I am equally sure, had notions of the terrific economic impact which would result. New opportunities for farmers, businessmen, the professions; for everyone, in fact. Yet, I feel that even the most liberal concept then existing would today prove conservative.

Recent studies by the Bureau of Reclamation illustrate the practical economic values to an area of continued expansion of irrigation development. For example, these studies found that a typical mature development involving 1,000 acres of new irrigation creates 13 farming opportunities, supporting 49 persons, and producing an average of about $140,000 of crops each year. Additional investment in farm property, machinery, equipment, and supplies totals about $425,000. More indirectly, the new 1,000 acres of irrigated land provide 66 jobs supporting 163 people in urban areas.

Hindsight is a questionable virtue, but had we known then what we know now, we would have built more Grand Coulees in the Pacific Northwest during those years. We would have installed more power. We would have developed more irrigable land. The lessons of the recent past prove that reclamation projects stand as oases of stability in the States where full development has been pressed.

In terms of the Columbia Basin, irrigation water has been available to thirsty lands of the project for only 10 years. In 1950, the project areas supported only limited dry farming and some stock raising. The population totaled a little more than 30,000—many of whom were engaged directly or indirectly with construction of the project facilities. Today, the project area encompasses a population in excess of 70,000.

Water is now available to over 440,000 acres with crops totaling almost $41 million grown this year. In the few years since the first water was put on the land, the cumulative gross value of crops total almost $200 million.

The total cost of works constructed by the Federal Government in this complex project exceeds $533 million. Income to the project from the sale of power generated at Grand Coulee Dam, together with the annual operation and maintenance payments by the water users, now totals over $204 million. Power sales account for about 94 percent of the total income.

A few moments ago I mentioned that Billy Clapp and his associates met with difficulties as they worked to bring about the Grand Coulee Dam and the Columbia Basin project. An undertaking of so vast and unprecedented scope could not be expected to be brought into being without a certain amount of complex problems. And so it is that even today we have encountered differences and difficulties.

We hear the statements: "Why worry about full development of the project—particularly in the light of the current crop surplus situation?" or "Why go on when further development will only mean more competition for the existing operation?"

I'm sure that Billy Clapp's close friend, Jim O'Sullivan, would give such statements short shrift. And, for far more than sentimental reasons, too. There are sound economic and social reasons which make continued development of the Columbia Basin project imperative. To call a halt when the irrigation potential is only half realized would be shortsighted, to say the very least.

One of the stratagems advanced by the adherents of the gravity irrigation canal to block development of the Grand Coulee was to seek restriction on the height of the dam. Ed Southard once wrote to Jim O'Sullivan, who was then in California, that "the high dam is the fight we have to win * * * the low dam is only half development."

And, so it is today. Four hundred and forty thousand acres in the project area is only development. Our Nation is not rich enough to let this land lie fallow. We must work this land—this land which has so much to offer to America.

The present problem regarding repayment of project costs has been with us for a decade. It is complex—but no more complex than the problems which were overcome by Billy Clapp and his friends in bringing this project to fruition. In fact, the repayment problem is paled by comparison.

Secretary Udall has endorsed the legislation to defer the 1962 drainage assessment, and the bill has been reported out by the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. We are hopeful that the measure can be passed this session.

A highly qualified three-man board has been appointed to review the situation and to consider actions which need to be taken to correct it. The board's report is due by August 1. By September 1, we hope to develop a proposed contract—based on the report of the board—which will mean positive growth, rather than negative stagnation. At the same time, we plan to offer suggestions to rid the project of problems that have plagued it for years.

We have reached the point where, like Billy Clapp and Jim O'Sullivan many years ago, it is time to stop talking and start acting.

We are determined to find a permanent and fair solution to the problem.

Once the basic policy outlines are established by the Secretary, the people of this area—in conjunction with the Bureau of Reclamation, under its Commissioner, Floyd E. Dominy—must work together constructively. We must be able to go to Congress next spring with an answer—based on an ability to repay—that will assure the full development of Columbia River Basin land. Today, we have half a project—which is much the same as building only half a dam.

This is our determination and we will work cooperatively to bring a new era of progress to the Columbia River Basin project—a new breath of life which, like the New Deal of three decades ago, put the dam across the Columbia. A new era which will mean renewed growth to this area, a new era which is based on the same dedicated purpose of the man and the others whom we honor today.

We honor Billy Clapp as an individual for his major contribution in the development of the great inland empire. We honor him also as a symbol of the spirit which made this project a reality—a spirit which joins

men like Billy Clapp in common cause to storm the ramparts of the mighty.

The story of Billy Clapp—a story also of Jim O'Sullivan, Paul Donaldson, Gale Matthews, Ed Southard, and Rufus Woods, and countless others in this area—is also part of a greater story.

Their efforts were a chapter in the fight of the people of the United States to wrest control of their natural resources from the hands of the shortsighted. Their was a fight of real progress versus timidity, faith versus failure, right versus might. They were fighters—in tune with the tides of their time, moving in the vanguard of the future.

Because they had a vision of progress, because they had courage to rebound repeatedly from failure, because they were determined to win, their efforts were crowned with success. With this legacy behind us, we must carry forth the work started by Billy Clapp's vision 43 years ago today.

With this spirit to guide us, with this example and other courageous examples to inspire us, we will fulfill the promise of this land. We will move forward to complete this great project, ever mindful that to falter and fail in our efforts is to repudiate the heritage bequeathed to us by Billy Clapp and those he symbolizes.

Chicago Labor's Future in World Trade Made in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, William A. Lee, longtime president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, recently spoke before the labor management executive's luncheon, and I believe his words deserve our attention and appreciation.

This luncheon was in conjunction with the International Trade Fair held at McCormack Place, the newest and largest addition by far to Chicago's well-known convention facilities. The trade fair brought together the products and goods of labor and management the world over. It was fitting that Chicago be the site of this representative fair, as it was appropriate that the leader of the great Chicago labor movement should address such a luncheon meeting.

President Lee spoke not only of the healthy relationship between worker and management in this country, and of the part the labor unions contributed in bringing this about, but also of the responsibility the labor movement has in aiding the underdeveloped areas of the world in effecting social reforms and providing a better way of life for their citizens. He considered that America is and shall remain the example for our neighbors in this and other hemispheres. Our help is needed to further democratic action in Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I am sure that organized labor in Chicago under the leadership of President Lee will be in the forefront in espousing the free labor movement in these countries and will prove of valuable help in instilling by example the democratic way of life to the underprivileged populations in the world. Under leave to extend my remarks I commend the following speech to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM A. LEE, PRESIDENT, CHICAGO FEDERATION OF LABOR, LABOR-MANAGEMENT EXECUTIVES' LUNCHEON, SPONSORED BY THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, MCCORMICK PLACE, THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1961

Thank you Mr. Heineman, Mr. Wirtz, my colleagues from organized labor, distinguished representatives from commerce and industry. Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to bring the congratulations of all organized labor in Chicago to the sponsors and exhibitors who are making the international trade fair an outstanding success. The proud showcase provided by this fair has brought together a splendid array of goods and services created by the talent of workers and management from all over the world.

The magnificient structure housing the fair—McCormick Place—is an example of the healthy labor-management climate prevailing in our city. Not 1 hour's time was lost by any worker on this building because of a labor dispute. And a leader of organized labor, Earl McMahon, president of the building trades council—serves with distinction as a member of the commission supervising McCormick Place. This is typical of Chicago—labor, management and government voluntarily developing ideas, and giving of their time, energy and resources to make Chicago a better place in which to live, work and learn. Everyone in this room, regardless of our primary job, takes on many other duties in the civic, charitable and educational life of our community.

This leads naturally to the theme of my remarks here. I deliberately selected the title "Chicago Labor's Future in World Trade," but the subject matter is somewhat different from the usual ideas we have of world trade. The label "Made in Chicago," of course, on any product testifies that it was produced by free labor and free management, whose skills and ingenuity have made our area the world's greatest workshop. And we realize that foreign trade can never be a one-way proposition.

I want to talk about the future of Chicago labor and management in another kind of world trade that I believe is even more important to our Nation's future—the exchange of ideas. We cannot escape the effect of what is happening beyond our shores. No matter how much we try, we cannot hide from the revolutions taking place in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. You are all familiar with the facts and figures, the cost, and the challenges. What can we in labor and management in Chicago do to help meet today's crisis and prepare for tomorrow's danger?

There is a charge of dynamite on our doorstep. Just a few cold figures reflect the explosive nature of the problem. In Africa a wage of $150 a year puts the worker in a higher class than most. Millions of Latin Americans are born on deadend streets and are doomed to live there until they die.

I don't have to go into the details of the social and economic conditions facing these people. However, they are now aware that things can and should be better. To paraphrase the advertising theme of a great Chicago corporation—"They expect more from life and they want to get it." They have seen the catalogs shipped by our giant mail order houses. They see our films showing a people with vigor and health. Their illiteracy and their grinding poverty makes them easy targets for the skillful propaganda of dictators and demagogs. They are stirring restlessly, unsure of their direction, but determined to do better for themselves and their children—by what ever name the change is known.

You know the facts. What can we do? The problems exist. Someone will try to fill the vacuum through promises ending in dictatorship. Tyrants will attempt to get political control by exploiting hardship.

A prominent Chicago banker said recently in a report on his travels in Europe: "Almost no one in Denmark is so poor as to welcome communism." Turn these words around—and we reach this conclusion: Millions of people throughout the world, notably in Latin America, welcome any kind of relief, real or imaginary, from poverty.

And the Communists are eager to exploit this situation; they permit no social reforms unless they dictate the patterns of change.

President Kennedy's eloquent plea for an alliance for progress is based on this principle: That we can and should encourage these countries to help themselves. The President has urged the leaders who guide the political destiny of our democratic Latin American neighbors to work for the improved economic and social welfare of their people.

We in American labor and management can demonstrate to the Latin Americans that they themselves can be the free instruments of social change. Democratic social reform is the swiftest and surest way to build stable and strong economies that can stand up to the promises and threats of communism and Castroism.

Free trade unions in these countries can be effective instruments in this direction. We in American labor are encouraging the growth of labor organizations in all of these countries. Obviously, our system of collective bargaining cannot be exported wholesale to other nations. However, we are showing that it is possible to attack problems in a democratic fashion—through organization, negotiations, and advances in social legislation.

And here is another reason why American labor is helping build the trade union movements in the countries our Nation is committed to assist: We are giving these people a sense of pride in participating in the present and in shaping their future. These are the keystones of political stability. They permit change without chaos. Individual dignity becomes more than a phrase. It is a new way of seeing one's own fate, with the knoweldge that life is not necessarily a dead-end street.

As the income of our neighbors rises with their hopes, they will have the purchasing power to consume what we in Chicago produce so well. This means markets—and more work for the skilled men and women in our labor force.

Already American labor has joined with the free trade unions throughout the world in establishing a training center in Israel for labor leaders of Asia and Africa. There they are learning what we in America have long recognized—that organized labor can be a vital force for social reform while maintaining a free society.

Within the past few weeks the AFL–CIO has voted to help finance a training center for Latin American trade unionists. This activity will take place on the campus of the University of Chicago. We are hoping it will bring hundreds of these people into our community, where they may learn how American labor, management, and Government work together in meeting problems. We want to show them how it is possible to differ without fear of domination. We want to invite them into our union halls, into our factories, into our homes, perhaps even into the collective bargaining scene itself. More important, it is our purpose to have them realize that they can work with management and Government in reshaping their

communities, in bringing education to the illiterate, in bringing hope to the young, health to the ailing, and comfort to the aged.

We ask your help in this enterprise. All we request is that you do what comes naturally in America. Each of us has many roles; in our organization, in business, in education, in charity, and in the community. We want to tell the world how we in labor and management in Chicago use our time, energy and resources—together—to create a better environment for us all.

This is what we want to demonstrate to those who will come here to learn what freedom has to offer. We know we will have your help because we all share the common burden and opportunity presented by the Communists' challenge to our way of life. This kind of world trade may not only affect our balance of payments, but can well decide whether freedom will survive.

In summary: American labor supports President Kennedy's program of aid to the nations groping for ways to meet their social and economic problems. We believe that free labor movements in these countries can help develop the democratic social reforms to emancipate people from poverty and ignorance.

We in labor and you in management, I believe, agree that this action would be wholly justified even if the Soviet Union or Red China or Castro's Cuba did not exist. We believe it is justified by principles that were at least 19 centuries old before Karl Marx was born—the principles that lead us to help the needy and to extend the hand of brotherhood to all mankind.

Past President of the American Bar Association, Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., Urges World Peace Through the Rule of Law of the Lawyers of the Americas

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a prepared speech by Charles S. Rhyne, resident of Washington, D.C., and who last year was the distinguished president of the American Bar Association.

Being very sure you also have the pleasure of personally having known this distinguished American lawyer for many years, as I have, I am sure you will appreciate my calling this remarkable address given by Mr. Rhyne at San Jose, Costa Rica, to your attention.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1961.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, 23d District, California, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Consensus of San Jose adopted at the recent Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law held in San Jose, Costa Rica, giving the views of leading lawyers of the 23 American nations on general principles and a work program which will aid in reaching the goal of the conference.

This conference, held under the auspices of the American Bar Association Special Committee on World Peace Through Law with funds supplied by the Ford Foundation, was highly successful and represents the first worldwide effort undertaken by lawyers to define and act upon a permanent long-range program to achieve the international rule of law.

This conference is to be followed by one in Tokyo, Japan, September 17–20, 1961, and subsequent conferences in Africa and Europe. A world conference of lawyers will then be held during 1962 to formulate a program for cooperative action by our profession on a worldwide scale.

If you have any questions relating to this program, I should be more than happy to answer them or supply such other materials and information you may desire.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. RHYNE.

CREATING A REALISTIC LAW OF NATIONS

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

We have met here on a noble task. We have come together for nothing less than to see if we cannot speed the day when the rule of law will replace the rule of force in international relations. With an object so exalted it is well to be humble and straightforward. It is neither the time for pious platitudes nor sonorous sentimentality. It would be wise to eschew both exaggerated hopes which we do not really credit and false modesty.

There are several parts to our task. One is to inventory and evaluate the existing legal institutions and rules of law in the world community. This great undertaking is a necessary precursor to putting such agencies to a new use.

The other is to explore and formulate plans whereby these existing institutions and law rules and perhaps new ones can be employed to seek the goal of world peace through law.

These tasks represent an unprecedented opportunity for the legal profession to perform an ultimate public service to all mankind. The task is so complex, so vast in reach and critically important to all peoples, that it challenges the imagination. But though it may intimidate the weakhearted, the challenge to the greatest minds of our legal profession will not go unanswered.

This is a historic occasion. This is the first of four such conferences. Very soon representatives of the lawyers of Asia, Africa and Europe will convene at similar gatherings; but here now for the first time—in San Jose—the organized legal profession declares its acceptance of this challenge of our times by setting events in motion with the ultimate objective of strengthening and expanding the rule of law in the international community.

FIRST EFFORT ON GLOBAL BASIS

Ours is the first nongovernmental effort to examine the whole of existing procedures, institutions, principles, and rules of law in the world community. To be sure, earlier significant steps have been taken, but unfortunately these have been fragmented. We are pioneers in looking for a complete, not fragmentary, plan of research and education conducted through a permanent organization, equipped to take constructive and continuous action to strengthen the role of law, and developed on a global basis.

GOAL MEASURED AGAINST PERIL

Many will shrug their shoulders at the proposals here and call them unrealistic. But bold and audacious as our program sounds, it should be measured against the insatiable demands of the day. When the perils of the world are contemplated, our goal sounds modest. And when it is weighed against the soaring ambitions and accomplishments of other professions, it takes on a new perspective. Scientists are splitting the atom and acknowledging no limit to what man can learn; deep sea divers are plumbing the depths of the ocean, and intrepid explorers are wintering in antarctic wastes; mighty nations are hurling astronauts into space and looking to the planets as the next goal in man's divine determination to explore. Shall lawyers sleep while all the world is astir? If man can conquer space, surely he can try to conquer himself—for that in essence is the meaning of what we seek here, to substitute the quiet law court for the angry test of arms.

WORLD PEACE OBJECTIVE

The conference title, "World Peace Through the Rule of Law," is an accurate description of our objective. We must identify specific areas where study, research, and other creative efforts can build a world of law. When such efforts are crowned by success, we will have provided for an orderly world.

While ours is merely the first step on a long journey, we knew already that thousands of the members of our profession will join us in this search for new legal pathways. Already evident is a worldwide spirit of cordiality, enthusiasm, and determination among our profession to do what is necessary to achieve success. Also evident is a realization that the making of international law must be a truly global process because of the dynamics of modern civilization.

This working paper incorporates in substance the ideas and information from some 10,000 lawyers in many nations. This synthesis confirms the fact that the rule of law is mankind's most universally known, respected, and utilized concept. It is that concept upon which rests the hopes and aspirations of all mankind for a better life, human dignity, and above all, for individual freedom. Members of the legal profession in the Americas, in Asia, in Africa, and Europe are as one in their unshakeable convictions that moral principles of fairness and reasonableness are fundamental to the rule of law. Without such a foundation, universal acceptance of such law will be impossible.

The keystone of the rule of law is the principle that all men and all nations are under and bound by law; that law is the constitutional framework within which individuals and governments function. Thus law is not, and must not be, a mere tool of the tyrant, or the means by which a false cloak of legality is placed over the machinations of those who would enslave mankind.

HARNESSING CAPACITIES OF LAWYERS

All peoples will be affected by this joint effort of the lawyers of the world. And that is why as we unite in this common cause—as we begin this first organized effort to build a world of law—we seek to harness the capacities of all lawyers in all nations, large and small. That is why in our next step we will seek through the legal profession to enlist wide and deep support among all peoples of the world. For only upon the consent of its constituents are just laws made. Any lawyer from any nation who aids in this program will have an equal voice in what is planned and what is done. Since our task transcends political boundaries it is well that we act as individuals representing personal views. As individuals we will not seek to impose but to share ideas and ideals in the widest possible cooperative spirit.

As we begin our labors we must realize the dimensions and urgency of our problems and above all—we must recognize that what we begin today is only a first step on a long and difficult journey taking many long years to complete. But legalizing the world is our task and our most demanding responsibility,

for if lawyers will not bring the rule of law to the international community—no one else will. We must further realize that for the solution of the complex and important problems before us there must be no ill-conceived plans. No program for a world of law can succeed unless it is universally conceived, universally executed, and therefore universally accepted. That is the reason for following this very ambitious global route of mobilizing the whole of the legal profession, and for worldwide consultation in which lawyers of all nations have the opportunity to participate.

INTERNATIONAL LAW LARGELY OUTMODED

International law grew up at a time when international contacts were few and spasmodic and when the world was not the intercommunicating and interdependent whole which it is today. Much of this law is out of date. Great gaps exist as many vital new subjects are not covered at all. When one considers the revolutionary upheaval and change wrought in the world community by science, commerce, education and emergent political forces, it is clear that international law must be brought into focus with modern man's needs and aspirations.

International cooperation across political boundaries has grown rapidly in the last decades not only through the United Nations but through the economic, social, and cultural agreements of a regional character. Trade, travel, language, and other barriers have diminished, age-old barriers of time and distance have steadily shrunk.

No nation is an isolated unit in today's world. Never before have nations been so interdependent. And, for that matter, never before have there been so many nations—over 100 as of now. Atomic energy and space exploration are dramatic new developments so recent they are hard to place in proper perspective.

Some 2 billion people in underdeveloped nations are in revolt against poverty, illiteracy and chronic ill health. The part that we lawyers can play in tranquilizing this seething unrest may seem remote until one considers that the best solutions lie in cooperative action by many nations. Any cooperative arrangement which reaches beyond the borders of nations can best be set up by international administrative agencies which have a legal structure under rules of law to insure fairness and reasonableness.

LAW AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IGNORED

The needs of the present are being attacked on a unified global basis in many fields and it is high time law played a more prominent part on the same basis. Law has a real and crucial contribution to make. Above all, the facts and developments outlined in the working paper illustrate the tremendous complexity of our world. Without the rule of law we will drift into chaos and anarchy. Social progress can be achieved on a lasting basis only through reason and law rather than through force. Yet so far law and the social sciences have been largely ignored. There is an unbalanced emphasis upon the technological and scientific. We have a great opportunity to inaugurate in government, law, and political science the kind of development and growth which the scientists have created in their field. We can develop a warless world by replacing the war system with a law system through creating such law and organizational growth.

THE WORKING PAPER

Viewed broadly the working paper for this conference is a most revealing document as much for what it does not—and cannot—record as for the recording of experience it contains. By reviewing the current status of law in the international community we get a world's eye view of the infancy of international law and the glaring gaps which exist in its institutions and fabric.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The record on use of peaceful methods of settling international disputes as reviewed in the working paper—when laid alongside current facts of common knowledge—dramatizes the fact that the speedy transportation and communications of our day have created a growing tendency to try for settlement of everything at high political and policy levels rather than through the older and slower but nevertheless more historically effective channels of diplomacy, arbitration, conciliation, good offices, mediation and judicial settlement. We have been working from the top down rather than from the bottom up. To analyze what this means and where it leads is lawyers' work in the highest public service traditions of our profession.

It is sadly evident that the mere existence of a competent World Court does not assure that it will be used. How to stimulate nations to use the Court is a problem which, unfortunately, our profession has never considered with the profound attention it deserves.

Whether the success of the European Court of Justice proves the need for a whole series of regional courts, or other courts of limited jurisdiction, is another area which the legal profession has not properly explored. Surely this is a neglect we cannot justify any longer in this era of accelerating change, which constantly multiplies the areas of international contact.

Rather shocking is the tendency—as spelled out in the factual report on use of international arbitration—that while needed now more than ever this method of peaceful settlement has fallen into almost complete disuse in the 20th century after a record of outstanding success in the 18th and 19th centuries. Here again the decline has never received the study it deserves. And again no one can dispute that this study is lawyers' work and lawyers' responsibility rather than that of the engineer, the scientist or the priest.

UNITED NATIONS

The review of the United Nations in the working paper demonstrates how inadequate the legal structure of the U.N. has become due to atomic energy, jet travel, the conquering of space, and the sudden emergence of many newly independent nations. Yet the U.N.'s many successes, despite its weaknesses make clear that in most of the endeavors initiated by the world peace through law program, we should use the U.N. and its agencies as a starting point. Somehow the world's peoples must learn to live within the framework of the United Nations. Our contribution must be in suggesting a better legal structure within which they may implement their shared international purposes. Within our countries our profession gives constant study and suggestions to governmental problems. But to the U.N. and world problems we have not devoted much of our time and our organized talents. This neglect must be remedied for we have a vital contribution to make. The unified organized voice of our profession speaking responsibly with worldwide backing in support of a strengthened U.N. could provide a new, fresh and creative element toward more world community order and stability.

GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE AND LAW

The working paper indicates that in the area of international commerce lies the most fruitful field for lawyer effort on a worldwide basis and that its needs are urgent. And here cooperation with many existing international organizations—business and legal—is essential.

The growing business contacts in our shrinking world have, out of sheer necessity, led to formation of formal and informal agencies to meet the inexorable new needs of closer intimacy. Like it or not, all nations are neighbors now, and they have developed, over a wide range of commercial affairs, an elaborate network of cooperation and regulation. The tremendous contributions which these efforts of industrialists, businessmen, and lawyers have made to the development of international law go largely unrecognized and unappreciated by our profession. Frankly, it is time for a change in our attitude and participation. Chaos and confusion can be avoided only if we have the initiative to do what is necessary to develop an institutional framework through and by which international commerce can properly function in an orderly legal manner.

This section of the working paper shows that through treaty, convention and custom, a vast number of rules of law are being formulated which effectively govern even the most complex transactions. Precedents and practices are being established which in time will become firmly embedded in international law. These supranational commercial institutions, many of them informal, must in time grow into administrative agencies with power to regulate conduct according to previously established rules of law. As business relations grow, frictions are bound to develop unless agreements on those rules of law are formulated and executed. This is lawyers' work.

Since the economic well-being of so many nations is increasingly dependent upon foreign trade and investment, action by our profession in this field will help lubricate frictions before they heat up into international fires. Rules for fair trade and competition internationally are imperative if business in the ever-expanding world markets is to be conducted openly and without undue discrimination.

RESEARCH

When one reviews what we have as outlined in the working paper against what we must have in a lawful world it is clear that the legal profession must generate a period of unparalleled growth in law if we are to achieve an effective world rule of law. No one can dispute that this growth must be founded upon effective and creative legal research which brings to bear the experience of the past on the urgent problems of the present and the future.

Day by day we lawyers do extensive research as a foundation for opinions we express as solutions to difficult legal problems of our clients. Thus here—as we are faced with the problem of collectively making our contribution to the solution of mankind's most difficult problem—realistic research as a basis for positive action is indicated as the starting point. Yet one of the most shocking facts revealed in our working paper survey of law in the world community is that governments throughout the world budget only the smallest fraction—or none—of available funds for research in the field of international law. Yet they devote tremendous resources to other no more needed programs. Collectively, governments spend upward of $50 billion per year on scientific research and some $100 billion for the arms we would replace with law. Evidently, law is taken for granted like the air we breathe. The growth of law to meet modern needs of the community of nations is expected to take care of itself. A moment of reflection reveals that the research needs in international law are staggering in their proportions and in their consequences if unmet. No one can dispute the premise that if we are to reach our goal, research in law must be intensified throughout the world. Lawyers, law schools, and scholars of every nation must be inspired and stimulated into just as much ferment and activity in this field as one now finds in science, medicine, agriculture, and other fields.

The United Nations is spending small sums for legal research in limited areas. Private foundations are supporting limited projects in a few law schools. Lawyer associations are giving meager support to specific research projects of a bread and butter category and are themselves conducting minor research in a few areas. But this is not the coordinated, basic, massive research required to develop and create ways and means to substitute law for force as the controlling factor in the world community.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW

The United Nations Charter speaks of decisions by the World Court based upon the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations. But a most exhaustive search in the best law libraries, and among the leading international law experts, has produced the rather startling answer that no one has yet elucidated these principles and, even more shocking, research in this area is of the most fragmentary nature. The Moses of international law has not come down from Mount Sinai. Who has first responsibility for this state of affairs? Without question, it is the legal profession.

That a research program in international law has not attracted the major interest and support of governments, and the public, represents a leadership failure by the legal profession. We have not collected the facts as to research completed, research underway, and research which must be done. We have not collected the facts to prove the value of research. From before the time of Grotius great men of the law have conducted monumental research programs, but their knowledge is today largely unused and gathering dust on unknown shelves. We must dust it off and put it to work for humanity. Teachers, physicians, and scientists have worldwide systems to exchange research knowledge and publicize their value for the service of mankind. Electronic aids in some cases have revolutionized their research programs—yet we of the law have not changed our research methods in 500 years.

Given a program of adequate research, lawyers can and will demonstrate their capacity for dedicated and creative efforts to develop a technology for world peace just as there now exists a technology for rockets, a technology for missiles, and a technology for war.

NEW RESEARCH TECHNIQUES

That we will, through improved and increased research, find new techniques to meet the legal needs of this interplanetary age is evidenced by the experience of the scientists. They are proving that concerted massive effort can find a pathway to the moon. The many breakthroughs in science have given the entire movement a vigor which has attracted the best minds and almost unlimited funds. With this example we cannot accept the idea that the law must continue to live in the rusty past, unable to break the cobwebs of static processes and procedures. We can give it verve, elan, and enthusiasm whereby the rule of law can make a great leap forward to meet the needs of the 20th century. The creative side of law is in fact illustrated by the very forces which bring us to this conference. The virility of this movement will cause our profession to grow in prestige and vigor for the job that must be done.

EDUCATION

National and international law are fashioned in large part by public opinion. To make the peoples of the world understand that their exalted vision of freedom, justice, and peace can only be achieved through the rule of law is therefore a major task. An informed public opinion is all important to our enterprise. Yet so far there is little appreciation of this. While there is public support for every phase of scientific development, peaceful or warlike, few are there who even think of the development of law as an essential instrument for harnessing science lest unharnessed it deal out death to mankind. The noble use of law to curb and control science against baneful abuse is our best selling point to marshal public support for an ordered world of peace. Yet science to the public remains glamorous and romantic; law seems to many dull, dour, and drab.

CHANGE NEEDED IN PUBLIC OPINION

That there must be a radical change in public attitudes is obviously the point at which we must begin. To create this essential change we must start by educating lawyers themselves, and then through lawyers, the general public. Law is only as strong as its support in public opinion, and that opinion must be based upon respect for fearless institutions and just laws. We must inculcate respect for international law in the minds of our people by rooting it so soundly in reason and moral principles as to withstand the attacks of those who fear law as a restraint on their selfish ambition. When this function is performed, stability and order will come into the world community.

The alternative to law is anarchy—among nations as among peoples. As reliance upon law is strengthened it will rise above prejudice based on ignorance and the distrust of governments who fear external controls, and become a new common ground for cooperative international effort.

ORGANIZATION

We bring to the task of developing a program for world peace through law the capacity of a group which knows more about government, more about peaceful resolution of conflicts between men and between governments, and more about public affairs than any other profession. Throughout the world, more lawyers occupy high positions of public service than the members of any other profession. Thus, we need not approach the added responsibilities of the task outlined at this conference with fearful reservations or faint hearts. Let us move forward, then, with confidence and with determination dedicated to the noble task to which we now set ourselves.

The working paper covers existing organization of lawyers in the field of international law. Nearly all nations have some form of local and national bar organization, and some internation associations are in being. One question we must answer here is whether these existing agencies are adequate for the tasks this conference decides upon or whether they should be supplemented by some new group specifically intrusted with the task of achieving our objectives. Obviously since existing institutions have not stimulated the all-inclusive program we here consider we must be prepared to consider something new. What this new requirement should be is a matter for most earnest thought.

The characteristics of a profession are a body of knowledge, technical competence, and a publicly asserted social responsibility. Our profession has all of these characteristics. The working paper makes clear that public service is a proud tradition of the legal profession in domestic affairs throughout the world. At the forefront of nearly all movements to improve the status of individual freedom, and the processes of government, generally one finds a lawyer. This public service trademark of our profession now meets its greatest challenge as we lift our eyes beyond the domestic to the global picture and consider the world's woefully weak legal structure. And while the working paper does not directly state it, it is certainly true from the record, that participation of lawyers in world affairs has been small in comparison to the contribution they are now called upon to make.

UNTAPPED TALENT

Ours is a relatively untapped reserve of talent on the world scene; we must organize this great potential for creative thinking and action. Our profession is not unlike a sleeping giant—this conference, those that are to follow, and the program they are expected to formulate should awaken this dozing Titan and stir his tremendous energies in an organized manner toward developing law according to the needs of an anxious world. Here in this wonderful Nation without an army we can start the great task of creating a gigantic army of lawyers dedicated to world peace.

World law requires worldwide cooperation; effort without proper organization would repeat the mistakes of the past. History is strewn with the failures of great jurists who tried in vain because they were lone voices crying in the wilderness.

RESOURCES WE CAN MARSHAL

We must prepare and organize our resources for this great crusade for peace through law. The resources we have to marshal on a worldwide basis include the following:

1. The professional competence of nearly 1 million lawyers, judges, and professors of law.

2. The proven capacities of several thousand national, provincial and local bar organizations.

3. The educational and research facilities of hundreds of law schools.

4. The centuries-old tradition of the rule of law among civilized nations.

5. The worldwide respect by all peoples for the rule of law as the common man's last great defense against tyranny—nationally and internationally.

6. The aching hunger of mankind for an enduring world peace—a peace that can only come when public opinion forces governments to adopt this program.

A world of law will be a world at peace. And as we proceed to build this world of law, we must keep before us high objectives of individual freedom and justice based upon our deepest convictions of the moral nature, dignity and destiny of man. We must create something practical and something worthy of this tremendous moment in history and of the struggles and issues it has disclosed.

WORLD TRENDING TOWARD CLIMAX

The whole world appears to be trending toward some kind of climax. Is this climax to be peace or war? What we do here, how well we do in the exercise of our foresight, wisdom and inventiveness can have a tremendous impact upon the question. Certain it is that peace will come from ideas and from people. The idea of a unified peaceful world governed by and operated under the rule of law has passed beyond the status of an idealistic dream to that of a necessity. In translating this idea from dream to reality we are not engaged in politics or propaganda but in saving mankind. What we seek we seek for all men. What we do we do for all men. What we speak we must speak to all men. With this universality of approach and with sound planning through careful research, education and organization we shall bring into being a world at peace under the rule of law.

The Haitian National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Haiti.

Haiti is a tiny and poverty-ridden republic in the Caribbean. Revenue sources are few, and the Haitian Government is thus well aware of the fiscal merit of a national lottery.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Haitian national lottery came to $3 million. The net income to the Government was $600,000. The proceeds were utilized for social welfare and assistance work.

The Government of Haiti has wisely realized that a national lottery can be an effective means with which to advance the social welfare of the people. It would seem to me that we here in the United States could benefit from the use of lottery money on behalf of the same goals.

Cape Cod National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a major step in the protection for the public use of scenic tracts of America was taken yesterday when President Kennedy signed the bill establishing the Cape Cod National Seashore. This is the first such area to be created since Cape Hatteras National Park was established in 1937. I am confident that other shoreline areas will follow Cape Cod and new recreation areas will be created in the interior of the Nation so that a fine record in outdoor recreation will be achieved over the next few years. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial about Cape Cod, which appeared in today's New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING CAPE COD

President Kennedy evidently took particular pleasure yesterday in signing the bill that created the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. He had supported this measure when a Senator. What the bill does is to set aside the whole outer beach and a considerable portion of the inner beach that fronts on Cape Cod Bay and enfolds Provincetown within its protecting arm. There will never be any more Cape Cod than there is today. If it had been left open to purely commercial development in this generation, it would never be recoverable.

The National Park Service does many things, most of them wise. It does not, however, do much that cannot be undone. It is the private developers who, in many cases, achieve the irremediable harm. Now we can be sure that if any modern or future Thoreau wants to walk along the sands opposite Chatham or the dunes to the north of Orleans, as Henry David Thoreau did over a century ago, he will be able to do so.

He can study the shore birds and the migratory waterfowl, although presumably he will not be free to shoot them. Some Cape Codders have nightmares of people thronging in by countless thousands. They might do that anyhow, park or no park. What the National Park Service can do is to enforce good manners in the visitors' relationships with nature.

Protection of the seashore is a national problem. Some years ago the Park Service found that only 15 percent of the total shoreline of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico was still available for public use. Movements are on foot to save areas on the Pacific Coast—for example, Point Reyes north of San Francisco. Our descendants for countless years to come will thank us if we act in time.

What's Good About U.S. Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was invited recently by the editors of Western Farm Life to submit an article on the positive aspects of American agriculture, our largest and most misunderstood industry. Western Farm Life is published by Fred Seaton, former Secretary of the Interior and once a member of this body. I wish to compliment Mr. Seaton and Mr. Phil Patterson, editor of Western Farm Life, for taking the broad view that our agriculture has many good points which far outweigh what is wrong with it. The article appeared in the August 1, 1961, edition of this widely circulated journal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S GOOD ABOUT U.S. AGRICULTURE

(By JOHN A. CARROLL, Democratic Senator from Colorado)

(JOHN A. CARROLL, U.S. Senator from Colorado, is a professional lawyer and a Democrat.

(CARROLL was born in Denver in 1901 where he attended the public schools, and graduated from Westminster College of Law. He served as U.S. district attorney and Denver district attorney during the 1930's. He was regional attoney for the Office of Price Administration (the Rocky Mountain area) in 1942–43.

(A veteran of both world wars, CARROLL served in the Philippines in World War I and in Africa, Italy, Corsica, and France during World War II.

(From 1947 to 1950 he was a Member of the 80th and 81st Congresses. During 1950–51 he was consultant to the President at the White House, and in 1956 was elected to the U.S. Senate where he currently serves. He is a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee.

(He is married and the father of one daughter.)

Not so long ago, and not so far away, there was an ingenious, hard-working craftsman who toiled long hours turning out both necessities and luxuries for his neighbors.

He got along reasonably well, but there were few years when he made any substantial profit above the living expenses of his family. His investment in tools and property was heavy; market prices for his goods rose and fell frequently; various other hazards made his economic future unpredictable.

But this man loved and respected his work. It gave him great pride and satisfaction to be able to produce his excellent wares, knowing how useful they were. He liked his way of living, and despite the frequent disappointments he usually said he wouldn't trade places with anyone—and he means it.

As the years went by, this craftsman became increasingly skillful. He kept solving production problems and finding better ways to do things. He put in more machinery and he continued working around the clock. Naturally he produced greater quantities of goods each year.

Gradually he began discovering that he could not sell all that he produced. His prices declined and his shelves sagged with a growing burden of unsold items. His continuing efficiency had put him in a serious predicament.

The authorities tried to help him. They encouraged him to take some of his plant out of production. They urged him to produce different products. They bought some of his output. But none of these ideas solved the basic difficulty.

While the authorities wrangled about the best solution some of his neighbors began to mutter. People don't like problems, and this man had become a "problem."

Some of them talked as if he were a beggar or a fool. They forgot that they had encouraged him (by incentive) to produce as much as he could, when an emergency had existed. They forgot that he had to continue working hard and producing more to pay for his investment in plant and equipment.

By any reasonable standard, this man was a spectacular success. He was efficient beyond anyone's expectations. But people were sneering at him because he had improved his techniques, worked hard and accomplished near-miracles of production.

If you have read this far, I am sure you recognize the central character of this homemade fable: The American farmer and rancher.

I expect to see the day when this man again will be the hero of the hour, the darling of the crowd. He will live to be appreciated more than ever in history—if only he can hold out a few more years.

The population of the United States, and indeed of the world, is growing at a fantastic rate. Someone will have to feed and clothe all the people, and nobody can do it like our farmers and ranchers.

Even today there are men, women, and children in our own country who do not get enough to eat and wear. In Latin America, Asia, and Africa there are hundreds of millions of them.

Famine, one of man's historic enemies, is claiming lives somewhere in the world at this moment. The Russians and the Chinese, our bitter rivals, cannot make their agriculture work a fraction as well as ours does. Hunger is taking a dreadful toll among Red China's millions.

The despots who rule the lands behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains would be delighted if they had our farm production "problems."

A recently published pamphlet of the U.S. Department of Agriculture observes:

"The amazing success story of this generation is the efficiency of agriculture.

"One farmworker today produces food and clothing for 26 people.

"One hour of farm labor produces four times as much food and fiber as it did in 1919–21. Crop production is 65 percent higher per acre. Output per breeding animal is 88 percent greater.

"But this technological revolution in agriculture has just begun. Only a few farmers are using all of the new technology to best advantage. Research is continuing to discover even more efficient methods and improved crops."

Think of it. Today it takes about 10 pounds of feed, on the average, to produce 1 pound of gain in beef cattle, according to the Department of Agriculture.

But if the best methods and rations presently available are used, 1 pound of beef cattle gain can be produced with only 8½ pounds of feed. And research is continuing to narrow the gap.

New machinery, new hybrid seeds and breeds, new fertilizers, new insecticides, better soil and water conservation, more efficient feeds and medicines, improved irrigation, rural electrification—all these have wrought a revolution since the days when my mother's people broke the sod of western Kansas and became pioneer plains wheat growers. Even since 1950, the average farm worker's productivity has increased by 48 percent.

But certain things are very much the same.

In our Great Plains and Rocky Mountain country a man has to be a devout believer and something of a gambler to live off the land. Any farming or ranching enterprise in our high and windy region is a risky venture.

Our farmer or stockman has to be tougher and calmer and more resourceful than most men to be able to endure seeing a fine stand of wheat or sugarbeets hammered down by 10 minutes of hail in midseason—or to try in vain to save the calves or the lambs from a sudden, heavy snowstorm late in spring—or to see some of the finest topsoil take off in the general direction of Texas on a windy winter day—or to wrestle grasshoppers, or floods, or parching drouth, or tornadoes.

You name it, and our farmers and ranchers have faced it and beaten it.

They have said a prayer, or maybe cussed quietly, and perhaps they have gone down into town to try to get another loan, and then they have started again.

Most of them have stayed with the land. Most of them still think they are lucky people to be living where they are and the way they are.

And we are the luckiest Nation on earth to have them.

Our Economic Weapons Against East German Pressure on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the last week of Congress, we have emphasized military responses to Communist pressures on West Berlin.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal pointed to some of the economic measures which we can take against East Germany, which depends on West Germany and the West for many vital industrial goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following excerpts from an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal, August 3, 1961, to my colleagues:

WESTERN ALLIES RELY ON ECONOMIC MOVES AS WELL AS ARMS BUILDUP

(By Ray Vicker)

One goal at this week's conference of Western leaders will be to give NATO a grab-bag of assorted countermeasures to use in response to any Communist squeeze on West Berlin. * * * If need be, trade embargoes could be extended beyond East Germany to include the whole Communist group of countries, although the difficulty of such a blockage inevitably would mount as its scope was extended.

One goal at this week's conference of Western leaders will be to give NATO a grab bag of assorted countermeasures to use in response to any Communist squeeze on West Berlin. This tactic, sometimes referred to here as "Operation Salami," involves counterstrokes designed to match each successive squeeze in severity. They would range from simple economic embargoes on selective products up to the final move—military action.

For instance, economists are now evaluating what would happen to East Germany's economy if the allies slapped on embargo on electronic tubes going into the Red satellite, in the event of a hostile East German action restricting access routes into West Berlin. Other studies are being made of the possible effects of an embargo on tool steels or steel plate shipments to East Germany. Without steel, hundreds of East German factories would face shutdowns and the Soviet Zone's entire industrial output would be endangered.

"Selective controls have an appeal to us," says one Western diplomat. "You wouldn't have to cut off much of the trade to cause serious disruptions to East German industry."

A British diplomatic official concurs: "Nobody likes the idea of sanctions, but there is no doubt that such sanctions are better than a nuclear war."

Present East German-West German trade now amounts to about $500 million in goods in both directions annually. This is equal to only about 2.4 percent of West Germany's total but is some 11 percent of East Germany's foreign trade. Moreover, it involves commodities such as hard coal, machinery and chemicals in addition to steel which the Red state cannot easily obtain elsewhere.

There are other economic weapons in the allied grab bag. For instance, East Germany has transportation weaknesses; it depends on using West German rail cars for much of its external trade shipments and has a similar dependence on West German barges which traverse its waterways. Also import restrictions by the West could reduce East German earnings of foreign exchange, reducing its ability to buy goods outside the Communist bloc. If need be, trade embargoes could be extended beyond East Germany to include the whole Communist group of countries, although the difficulty of such a blockade inevitably would mount as its scope was extended.

Queen for a Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the history of our country, many people have lived to be 100 or more years.

Rarely, however, have centenarians lived their complete lifetimes in one community.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to one such individual—Mrs. Fredarika Ulbrech—a 100-year resident of Trempealeau County, Wis.

For her birthday on August 13, her friends and neighbors are planning an open house celebration.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a heartwarming article by Mrs. L. E. Danuser, entitled "Queen for a Day." Reflecting the life and work of Mrs. Ulbrech—rooted deep in the heart of Wisconsin—and our country—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALE AREA WOMAN LIVES 100 YEARS IN TREMPLO

(By Mrs. L. E. Danuser)

GALESVILLE, WIS.—Many people have lived to be 100 or more years, but surely very few have lived an entire century in one county.

That is the life of Mrs. Fredarika Ulbrech of West Prairie who on Sunday, August 13, will be queen for a day as she observes her 100th birthday.

Mrs. Ulbrech, better known as Rika to her family and many friends, was born August 14, 1861, in a log cabin in Trout Run Valley a few miles southeast of Arcadia in Trempealeau County. Mrs. Ulbrech lived on the home place until her marriage in 1884 and then moved with her husband, Herman, just a few miles away to his farm at the head of Trout Run Valley.

Her only other move in 100 years of life was shortly after World War I when the Ulbrechs sold their homestead and moved to West Prairie, just off Highway 53 between Galesville and Winona. She's still in Trempealeau County.

Mrs. Ulbrech's parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Kiekhoefer, emigrated to the United States in 1854 in an old windjammer sailing vessel, taking 3 months for the voyage. The family traveled westward to the end of the rail line at Milwaukee, meeting en route the Ulbrech family and becoming lifelong friends with them. The two families made the perilous journey together from Milwaukee to western Wisconsin in covered wagons pulled by ox teams and settled on neighboring homesteads. They were among the first settlers in the entire region.

Education in Rika's childhood was pretty much of the catch-as-catch-can variety, which is to say sketchy at the best. The schools were rough-hewn, the books meager and the teaching altogether amateurish. The teachers, it was said, were often scarcely more educated than their pupils. But the old German families instilled in their children a love of learning, and Rika was a quick and ready learner. Since her earliest childhood she has read and studied, and she has retained most of what she learned.

Rika was the fifth of eight children born to the Kiekhoefers, and the only other child of the family still living is a sister, Miss Tena, now 93, who still makes her home in Arcadia. Another sister, Miss Matilda, died in 1952 at the age of 87. These three outlived their brothers and sisters by many years.

All five of the children born to Rika are still living. Mrs. Oscar (Lena) Wenger, lives near Arcadia and rarely misses a day that she doesn't call her mother; Roy, married and farming nearby, calls on his mother daily, as does Kervin, youngest of the family, who also farms in the neighborhood; and living with their mother are Allan, who works the home farm, and Miss Mae, who gave up her career as a registered nurse to care for her mother.

There is only one grandchild, Gary Ulbrech, of Winona, and his children, Terry and Tony, represent the fourth generation of Ulbrechs in America. Ulbrech died in 1937.

Although she has lived in Trempealeau County for 100 years, Mrs. Rika is not an always-stay-at-home. Within the past month she has made little trips, once to Rochester, Minn., for a visit of several days, and, more lately, to Galesville on a shopping trip and to Winona to sit for her portrait.

Alert and active, Mrs. Ulbrech is enjoying her long life to the fullest. She reads, sews, writes letters, and performs the lighter household chores, handicapped mostly by a slight loss of hearing. But she loves television and her favorite program is the Lawrence Welk show, and her favorite performer on the Welk show is Jim Roberts when he sings "I Believe."

How has she managed to be so spry at the century mark in her life? Mrs. Rika is unable to say. "Nothing special that I know of," she says.

She misses services at the Centerville Methodist Church occasionally, but only when the weather is extremely bad or when she feels "out of sorts."

Mrs. Ulbrech treasures an old walnut dresser given her by her husband's mother, and she still retains a chair which her parents bought her in Milwaukee and took with them to their pioneer homestead.

But most of all, Mrs. Ulbrech treasures a letter of congratulations she received last year on her 99th birthday from Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Women of the Centerville Methodist Church are arranging an open house for the 100th birthday celebration, with the assistance of the Ulbrech family.

Keep Strong, or Else You Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Washington Post carried in its sports section an article which should have been front page news in every newspaper across the country. It was an account of the message delivered to the football writers of America by President Kennedy's special consultant on youth fitness, Charles "Bud" Wilkinson, of Oklahoma.

In his compelling appeal for a more effective national fitness program in this country, Coach Wilkinson borrowed from Grantland Rice's famous poem, "The Final Answer," to warn the Nation:

Remember what I've told you: Keep strong, or else you die.

Because of its timeliness, I am making this entire article a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

AT CHICAGO MEETING—WILKINSON TELLS WRITERS: "IF FITNESS IS A JOKE, THIS COUNTRY HAS HAD IT"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Bud Wilkinson read the following poem by the late Grantland Rice to the Football Writers of America yesterday in Chicago:)

THE FINAL ANSWER

This is the word I bring you, from jungle and
from town;
From city street where weary feet are seeking vague renown
From cotton fields to northern snows, or
where the west winds cry,
This is the word I bring you: Keep strong or
else you die.

They speak of battle's finish, they talk of
peace to come;
They cheer for songs supplanting the bugle
and the drum;
They think of dreams in clover, beneath a
cloudless sky.
Remember what I tell you: Keep strong or
else you die.

Peace on this wartorn planet? I want it
understood—
I like a cheerful neighbor, but give me some
hardihood.
Give me the fiber needed to face what lies
ahead,
To make good for the living, to make up for
the dead.

The easy road is over, for in this swarming
hive,
Those who can take a beating are those what
will survive.
We've ripped a pleasant planet, it's too late
now to sigh.
Remember what I've told you: "Keep strong,
or else you die."

(By Dave Brady)

CHICAGO, August 4.—Bud Wilkinson, special consultant to President Kennedy on youth fitness, today told the Football Writers of America: "If physical fitness is a joke, this country has had it."

Wilkinson spoke in the Bernard Shaw room at the Sherman Hotel, named, of course, after one of the great intellectuals in our culture.

"I have asked the astronauts to make TV appearances to help us because of their obvious qualifications.

"You know what Gus Grissom told me?

" 'We're not fit because we're astronauts; we're astronauts only because we're fit.' "

After the speech, two sports writers, Furman Bisher of the Atlanta Journal and Bob Broeg of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch began doing pushups on the floor, completing 30 to the surprise of their colleagues.

Warren Giese, athletic director at the University of South Carolina and a longtime fitness buff, was visibly impressed by Wilkinson's plea.

"He's a great man," Giese said, and later asked Wilkinson if he could head up a statewide program in South Carolina.

Forthright Wilkinson, who is also athletic director at Oklahoma, admitted that only 326 of 10,000 students there participate in athletics because there are no programs for any but the varsity men.

He suggested that writers appeal to school superintendents and PTA groups because 25 percent of all Americans are in schools.

He outlined a program to be set in motion in public and private schools:

Each school has the responsibility to make a health appraisal of every child.

Schools through simple tests should identify the underdeveloped child who then should be required to participate in a remedial program.

Schools should have physical education programs based on testing at the start of each term and again at the end so each child knows where he stands.

Wilkinson said one of his three sons would be horribly knock-kneed today if an early examination had not resulted in corrective exercises.

"My boy had to wear triangles in his shoes for years, but he's glad today he did it," Wilkinson said.

In response to a question from the floor, Wilkinson said that Little League baseball was not the answer to fitness programs for the young.

"Suppose a boy is a leftfielder and no balls are hit to him and he either strikes out or walks in all his times at bat? What exercise does he get?"

At a later meeting, the Ford Motor Co. announced to the writers that it was sponsoring a nationwide competitive program for 6- to 10-year-olds "to create interest in sports and physical fitness * * *."

It will be known as punt, pass, and (place) kick and will be conducted in cooperation with the National Football League. The $2 million project will involve regional and national competition.

Pending Tax Legislation in Respect to Withholding on Dividends and Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include letters from two savings banks in our great city of Buffalo, N.Y., in reference to tax proposals which are now pending in the Committee on Ways and Means.

The letters follow:

BUFFALO SAVINGS BANK,
Buffalo, N.Y., August 4, 1961.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: Having spent over 25 years in the savings bank industry as an employee of Buffalo Savings Bank I am both interested and concerned with pending tax legislation in respect to withholding on dividends and interest.

I do not feel that the proposed system of withholding offers the best solution to the Treasury's problem of collecting taxes due on interest and dividend income. While I do not propose that this income should escape taxation it is my opinion that the suggested method of collecting the tax is unfair, unworkable, and economically unsound.

It is an established fact that the savings of millions of Americans are put to work by the savings banks of the country to finance the building of homes, the expansion of industry, and the construction of roads, schools, and public projects. The proposed legislation will directly effect this investment program by substantially reducing funds available for lending. It is estimated that roughly $2 million will be withheld by the savings banks and paid to the Treasury in the first year of operation. This will particularly hurt capital formation since it will collect the tax from savings rather than from current funds. Other investment media such as series E bonds and tax-exempt securities with tax-deferring or tax-free features will become more attractive for savers, causing a contraction in funds available for long-term investment by savings banks.

It is quite possible that the cost of collecting this tax both for the Treasury and the savings banks will far outweigh the benefits expected from the plan.

Savings banks serve many small depositors. An analysis of depositors accounts at Buffalo savings bank reveals that over 163,000 or 74 percent have balances of $2,500 or less. The amount withheld on these accounts would average only 69 cents per quarter or $2.76 annually. When the amount of paper work involved in processing this huge volume of small items from more than 500 savings banks is taken into consideration it appears that the system will be both costly and unworkable. Added to this will be the problem of confusion and misunderstanding on the part of the average taxpayer, the task

of quarterly refunding on the part of the Treasury, and the almost impossible job of matching many small amounts withheld with the correct taxpayer without some system of positive identification.

It is my belief that the least complicated and most economical method for assuring collection of this tax is through an expanded and more diligent use of information presently reported by us on form 1099. The present information return possibly combined with some form of taxpayer identification system would present a much more workable and economical solution to the problem.

I trust that you will give full consideration and study to the many problems that the proposed system presents before you cast your vote.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD A. SEITZ.

ERIE COUNTY SAVINGS BANK,
Buffalo, N.Y., July 31, 1961.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly urge you to seek modification of the Treasury Department's recommendation on income taxation of mutual savings banks. I believe the Department, in its comparison of "oranges and apples," has completely overlooked the fundamental distinctions of purpose and operation of savings banks and commercial banks and the differences in legal privileges and powers granted to them.

Failure to recognize these facts would force savings banks to completely change their character or merge into commercial banks or liquidate—a step which in any case would discourage thrift and deny to our economy a valuable source of savings for housing.

We are prevented by law from competing effectively for savings in every respect except that of the amount of interest dividend payable on deposits (and even that is restricted by regulation). Specifically:

1. We cannot offer to the public the convenience of an adequate system of branch offices (each of the three savings banks in Buffalo are limited by law to three city offices and one suburban office—the commercial banks have no legal limit in number and in Buffalo now maintain 73 city offices and 29 suburban offices).

2. We cannot enjoy the earnings realized from high yielding consumer credit and business loans.

3. We cannot accept checking accounts and create earnings on cost-free demand deposits.

4. We cannot offer trust, custodial and the other normal banking services which make a one-stop, all purpose, department store type financial institution.

Based on projected income for 1961, this bank, like others, would be forced to give up its only competitive advantage and reduce its dividend rate in order to make the statutory transfer of earnings to surplus and still pay the recommended tax. Such a reduction would be necessary even though current regulatory restrictions on dividends are below competing rates in other States.

Even today savings banks are experiencing a very slow growth in comparison to that of commercial banks and Federal savings and loan associations. The recommended tax formula would further hamper such growth and probably cause deceleration. The effect of this would ultimately force the results referred to at the beginning of this letter.

I am confident that there is a middle ground which can satisfy the needs of the Treasury as well as preserve an industry which has, for over 100 years, and should continue, to serve the economy of the country well.

Respectfully yours,

HARLAN J. SWIFT.

Founder's Day Commemorating the 125th Anniversary of the Incorporation of Hollidaysburg, Pa., Was Observed August 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 7, 1961, at 10 a.m. eastern daylight time, it was my pleasure to deliver the following at the Founder's Day celebration at Hollidaysburg, Pa., incident to the 125th anniversary of the incorporation of that community.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

It is pleasing to be invited to participate in the Founder's Day celebration commemorating the 125th anniversary of the incorporation of the borough of Hollidaysburg.

This community holds precious memories for the Van Zandt family because it was the birthplace of my late mother, Mrs. Katherine Smith Van Zandt, and also the scene of her marriage.

During my boyhood days I recall my mother expressing continued love for Hollidaysburg and Gaysport—where she spent her girlhood days.

Mother took great delight in telling us of her activities and in doing so she always displayed a trace of homesickness for the Hollidaysburg area.

Mother often spoke of the early history of Hollidaysburg—reminding us children that my grandfather, George B. Van Zandt, worked as a driver on the old Portage Canal.

Those who planned this Hollidaysburg Founder's Day celebration—commemorating 125 years of community incorporation—are to be heartily congratulated.

Today we should be reminded that towns—like individuals and like nations—wrestle daily with the conflicts between the old and the new in our culture.

It is important that we not neglect this thought in our moment of celebration.

It is important that we not turn our backs on the historical facts that surround the founding and incorporation of Hollidaysburg.

This is an appropriate time to increase our awareness of our past—and of our heritage.

Thus we will be better equipped to build for the future on a solid foundation.

It is good to get together like this to celebrate this 125th anniversary.

But I hope this anniversary means much more.

I hope it is an opportunity to take time out from our hectic lives to reflect and to appreciate.

This is something we Americans do far too seldom.

We are so busy making a living that we take too little time to reflect on the sources of our lives.

We are striving so valiantly to get ahead—to get on with the business of the day—that we often do not pay sufficient attention to where we are going—or where others have been.

We become so accustomed to having freedom, and money, and opportunity, that we take little or no time to reflect on the sources of our freedom, our wealth, our opportunity.

We tend to take our towns for granted and take too little time to appreciate them.

This 125th anniversary gives us an opportunity to stop for a moment; to step back and take a long look at Hollidaysburg—to reflect on its beginnings and appreciate it a little more.

The year 1836—the year that Hollidaysburg was incorporated—was a year of advancement in our Nation.

It was also a year of unrest in a relatively new Nation.

In 1836 more than 500 abolition societies were active in the Northern States.

The first cargo of grain from Chicago arrived at Buffalo for shipment by the Erie Canal.

David Bruce had invented the typecasting machine that year.

Disunion among the States was prophesied.

Texas declared her independence of Mexico.

Samuel Colt patented a revolver that became an important weapon in the Mexican war.

It was known in those days as the six-shooter.

In 1836 William Homes McGuffey began publication of his Readers with his "First Reader" and "Second Reader."

Martin Van Buren was elected President that year.

The Whigs had distributed their votes among favorite sons—hoping to throw the election into the House of Representatives.

But such was not the case.

However, Richard M. Johnson was chosen Vice President by the Senate of the United States—no candidate having received the electoral majority.

These are only a few of the events that occurred in 1836.

I mention them to give us a flavor of our national setting—the year that Hollidaysburg was incorporated.

Actually, the first settlement was made here in 1768—as your historical records will show.

It has been recorded that in the year 1768 Adam Holliday said to his brother, William, as he drove a stake into the ground on the hill above the Juniata River:

"Whoever is alive a hundred years after this will see a considerable sized town here—and this will be near about the middle of it."

Fifty years after Adam Holliday had driven the stake and made his prediction—a small village had sprung up and his children were enjoying the advantages of a civilized community—the result of their deceased father's labor.

In 1819 the pike came through.

The canal was completed to Hollidaysburg in 1832 and the first boat run was made that year.

The portage railroad was completed the following year—1833.

The Holliday brothers—Adam and William—did not originally intend to locate here.

Their original plans were to go to the Allegheny Valley near Kittanning.

But the beauty of Blair county appealed to them too strongly to be resisted and they resolved to settle here.

Adam Holliday purchased 1,000 acres of land on the eastern side of the river—including all of the site of Hollidaysburg.

His brother, William, obtained a like amount on the western side where Gaysport now stands.

This land was bought from descendants of William Penn.

The price paid has been said by some to have totaled 5 pounds Sterling per hundred acres—equal to $220.20 for each thousand acre tract.

Each brother built a log house on his tract—as both were men of families.

They resided on this land for many years.

Apparently, William kept his until death, but Adam was dispossessed of his on account of some imperfection in his title.

He was paid for it, however, by the Government some time after the Revolution, receiving $17,000 or $18,000 which "made him a very rich man for this region at that time."

You will recall that Adam and William Holliday were Irish immigrants and came here at a time when Indians were still fighting white encroachment.

These first settlers and those who followed were in search of farming land and agriculture was their major attention.

The coal in the mountains and the iron ore in the valleys were unknown and unsought—until the beginning of the 19th century.

Timber from which fortunes were made in after years was only desirable for fuel and for the few logs necessary to construct the humble homes or make rails to enclose the fields cleared by the power of much hard labor.

The first factories established in this new country were saw and grist mills, but were very small and insignificant in comparison with those of a later day and were run by water power.

A saw mill that would cut 2,000 feet of boards in a day was a good one for those times.

The grist mills ground from morning until night to make three to four barrels of flour.

As to the location of the first houses erected—authorities differ and it is doubtful that the exact truth can now be determined.

Mr. U. J. Jones—writing a "History of the Juniata Valley" in 1855 says that "Adam Holliday's house stood about where the American House now stands."

H. H. Snyder, esquire, writing some 25 years later located it on the southwest corner of Allegheny and Montgomery Streets.

Adam Holliday died at or near Hollidaysburg in 1801, leaving two children—a son, John, and a daughter, Jane.

The latter married William Reynolds of Bedford County.

John Holliday lived the greater part of his life here and here he died in 1843.

He had a family of 10 children.

Today as we pay tribute to Adam Holliday—the beloved founder of Hollidaysburg. We are reminded that among the fifth generation descendents of Adam Holliday is Hon. Joseph R. Holliday, a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature representing Blair County.

Therefore we salue him on this memorable occasion as the last male descendant of Adam Holliday.

Together with his wife, Mrs. Joseph R. Holliday, his daughter, and a sister and niece living in Indianapolis, Ind., assemblyman Joseph Holliday has shown keen and constant interest in all community programs.

He displayed special interest in project 60, which was launched in 1960 by local businessmen and which proved highly successful as a community program designed to beautify the business district of Hollidaysburg, the county seat of Blair County.

The exact date at which Hollidaysburg was laid out is in some doubt, but it was prior to the beginning of the 19th century, probably about 1790.

Whatever may have been the date, the original plot contained but 90 lots—60 by 180 feet in size and the streets were Allegheny, Walnut, and Montgomery.

A diamond was formed by taking 30 feet off the end of each of the 4 lots cornering there.

Hollidaysburg did not grow rapidly at first.

In 1814 there were but three houses, a small store, and a blacksmith shop.

In 1830 it was not nearly so large or important a village as Frankstown, but when the canal was completed and the great basin and terminus located at Hollidaysburg, the place immediately began to grow.

By the time the year 1836 arrived, the year of incorporation, it was a very important town.

The Hollidaysburg Sentinel and Huntingdon, Cambria, and Bedford County Democrat—the first issue of which was published in October 1835—in a descriptive article noted that the population was 1,200 and that no town in the interior of Pennsylvania enjoyed more advantages than Hollidaysburg.

The story of the first unified transportation system across our Commonwealth is an interesting one.

The Portage Railroad between Johnstown and Hollidaysburg was the key link in this advancing means of travel.

Spurred by the completion of the Erie Canal in 1825, the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1826 authorized construction between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh of a complete system of rail-water transportation.

It was completed in 1834.

The Portage Railroad was an ingenious system of levels and inclined planes over the mountains between Hollidaysburg and Johnstown.

It connected the eastern and the western canal terminals.

Canal boat cargo and passengers were transferred to railroad cars.

These were drawn along a series of levels and inclined planes to the summit; the process was then reversed until the cars reached the terminal of the other canal.

By 1840 boats were being hauled in sections and were reassembled at the Portage terminals.

Accounts of this transportation system indicate that the 10 inclined planes had a total length of 4.38 miles, overcoming 2,007 feet of elevation.

The high point on the summit level was 1,172 feet above the canal basin at Johnstown and 1,399 feet above Hollidaysburg.

The rails were of pine or oak—capped with a flat iron bar.

Cables were at first made of thick rope—later of wire.

Two stationary engines—one for emergency—stood at the top of each plane.

On the levels horses were first used and were not entirely displaced by locomotives until 1851.

At its most efficient period the old portage entailed 33 power changes and was easily disrupted by winter ice or spring floods.

In 1857 the line was purchased by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Charles Dickens and his wife visited America in 1842 and in his writings we find a vivid description of his travel on the old portage.

I quote it in part, as follows:

"Occasionally the rails were laid upon the extreme verge of a giddy precipice; and looking from the carriage window—the traveler gazes sheer down, without a stone or scrap of fence between, into the mountain depths below. It was very pretty traveling thus at a rapid pace along the heights of the mountains in a keen wind, to look down into a valley full of light and softness; catching glimpses, through the treetops, of scattered cabins; men in their shirt sleeves, looking on at their unfinished houses, planning out tomorrow's work; and we riding, onward, high above them, like a whirlwind. It was amusing too, when we had dined, and rattled down a steep pass, having no other moving power than the weight of the carriages themselves, to see the engine, released long after us, come buzzing down alone, like a great insect, its back of green and gold so shining in the sun. It stopped short of us. When we reached the canal, and, before we left the wharf, went panting up this hill again, with the passengers who had waited our arrival for the means of traversing the road by which we had come."

The historic canal began to fall into disuse soon after the completion of the railroad.

In a few years more it was entirely abandoned as a channel of commerce.

The water stood stagnant within its banks until a few years later when it was drained off and the embankments broken down.

The stone in the locks was taken away for other uses.

We are told the line is now only faintly traceable through Blair County.

But the old portage had lived a good and useful life and had been the means of bringing this town into full statue as an incorporated community.

Hollidaysburg had joined the ranks of the villages, towns, and cities which have so richly endowed our commonwealth with the reputation of abundant opportunity for individual advancement.

From the very beginning of our Nation's history Pennsylvania's growth was rapid.

We are reminded that on the eve of the American Revolution Pennsylvania was the third largest Colony—though next to the last to be founded.

Hollidaysburg and its leaders in all walks of life have joined with countless other citizens through the years to furnish leadership in social, cultural, economic, and spiritual matters.

We should respect and appreciate all the good that came from those who found their homes in this town in the years that have passed.

We should lift them high in this moment of recollection.

We should absorb their courage, their faith, their assurance, their willingness to labor, their ability to make changes and to walk in new paths.

No man can see an inch beyond the present but a careful observation of the present, together with a thoughtful study of the past, can furnish a basis for a bright and successful future.

C. & O. Canal National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, recently the Senate passed S. 77 for the establishment of the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park. Although enactment of this legislation would provide for a 15,000-acre park in the vicinity of our Nation's Capital, the bill is much more than a mere local measure, and this fact was recognized yesterday in an editorial in the New York Times. This editorial was timely, succinct, and to the point. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE C. & O. CANAL

The Beall bill to create a national historical park along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal is making rapid and constructive progress in the Senate.

While the narrow C. & O. route along the Potomac River is already under some protection as a National Monument, that designation was merely a crucial stopgap, ordered by President Eisenhower, to save the canal itself and a narrow strip along it from destruction. But the canal area should be a park, with enough space along the 165-mile

waterway to provide for public recreation and enjoyment. This is what the Senate bill now provides, allowing the Government to spend up to $1.5 million for 10,200 acres to add to the present holdings of 4,800 acres.

In the House the Mathias bill, with similar provisions, has not yet been reported. There is some talk of a compromise that would limit action this year to changing the status of the canal from a monument to a park, which would be almost meaningless. Certainly Members of the House must realize that this enormous natural area will serve the recreation needs of a large part of the East. It should not be considered merely as just another park for the capital, as some legislators are inclined to look at it.

Washington needs it, but so do the rest of us. And to wait longer to buy the necessary acreage can only mean paying more for it in the long run.

Impact of Communist Policy on World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Soviet Premier Khrushchev's 1961 draft program for the Communist Party has evoked a great deal of interest, and concern, not only in the United States, but around the globe.

For the most part, the recommendations contain little new in Communist policy. However, it does attempt to more clearly redefine—and refine—most major aspects of the Soviet system.

Because of its significance, we need to carefully evaluate it in terms of its impact on world affairs, particularly on world peace.

Also, we need to keep this doctrinaire statement in perspective—particularly, this means the correcting of distortions about the United States. According to Mr. Khrushchev, for example, our free society—with the highest, and still rising, standards of living in world history—is declining, instead of progressing far ahead of the Communists.

Obviously, this is ridiculous.

Unless we refute the allegations, however, such lies may stand as truth in the world mind.

On Sunday the Washington Post published an article by J. A. Livingston, entitled "Americans Stray Way Off Our Marx." Reviewing, and refuting, a number of Mr. Khrushchev's distortions, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS STRAY WAY OFF OUR MARX

(By J. A. Livingston)

Maybe you don't know it, but this is America:

"The growth and development of society are accompanied by the growing discontent of the working people and by a sharpening of the (working people's) class struggle against the (capitalist) exploiters.

"Social inequality is becoming more and more marked, the gulf between the haves and have-nots is widening, and the sufferings and privations of the millions grow worse.

"Unemployment is rising, the living standard is dropping.

"The purchasing power of society falls short of the expansion of production and leads periodically to destructive economic crises. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation, in turn, are still more ruinous and lead more rapidly to a relative, and sometimes an absolute, deterioration of the condition of the working class."

That is how America and other capitalist or bourgeois countries are described in the text to be presented to the 22d Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow in October.

VOLUNTARISM IN THE U.S.S.R.

A shabby world, indeed, compared to the glorious Socialist world projected by Marx and Lenin, which is described in these terms:

"In a historically brief period, without outside help, the Soviet Union built up a large-scale modern industry."

Question: Are sales of complete U.S. plants and machine tools during the thirties and the virtual gift of lend-lease machinery and other equipment during and after World War II not outside help?

"Led by the party, aided and fully supported by the working class, the peasantry took the road to socialism. Millions of small individual farms went into voluntary association to form collective farms."

Comment: To achieve this voluntary association, Stalin sent thousands of recalcitrant farmers to concentration camps; farmers slaughtered livestock rather than socialize cattle, horses, and other animals.

"Socialist democracy includes the political freedom of speech, the press, the right to elect and be elected, and the social right to work, to rest, to education, to material security in old age and in illness and disability. Socialist democracy does not merely proclaim the rights of the people, but makes it really possible for the people to exercise them. Soviet society insures the real liberty of the individual."

Observation: Yet, East Germans flee West, seldom do West Germans seek the sanctuary of communism.

SAVINGS, HOMES, AND STOCKS

Such is the double image Communists project—of themselves and the outer world.

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev twice visited the United States. He has seen the lineup of automobiles outside factories and supermarkets. He has noticed the wide variety of clothes, household wares, and foods in stores. And he has been plied with facts such as these:

Three out of four families have automobiles. Three out of four families have savings accounts. Three out of five urban families own their own homes (subject to mortgages, of course). An even larger proportion of rural families are homeowners.

Moreover, 14 percent of U.S. families own stocks in American corporations. This doesn't mean that everyone is wealthy, or that most workers are shareholders.

It does mean that more and more families are able to put something aside for investment after their living expenses. In 1955, only 1 U.S. family in 10 owned stocks, and in 1952 only 1 in 12, as against today's 1 in 7.

AND WHERE ARE THE CRISES?

More significantly, whereas one-third of the families in 1929 had buying power of about $2,000 at today's prices, by 1947 that proportion had fallen to one-sixth, and today it's down to one in eight. These include farm families, whose cash income is augmented by farm produce, retired couples, who own their homes, and single persons just starting to earn their living.

Furthermore, in spite of the recessions of 1948–49, 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61, real per capita income has risen 28 percent since 1947, and more than doubled since the great depression.

This hardly indicates that capitalism, as it's practiced in the United States, is outmoded or failing to meet the needs of the people.

But it is failing to comply with Communist doctrine. Americans refuse to roll over and play dead according to the Marx-Lenin script.

We haven't had an economic depression since 1937–38 and no crisis since 1929–33. We're simply way off our Marx.

A U.S. Polaris Submarine Named for Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I urged the Secretary of the Navy to designate one of our new Polaris missile-firing submarines in honor of a great American patriot, one who contributed immeasurably to the success of the American Revolution, the distinguished Polish count, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. One of our Polaris submarines, which will stand as our modern day sentinels of freedom against Communist aggression, has already been named in honor of another foreign patriot who served with distinction in the American Revolution, Lafayette. The naming of a second submarine in honor of the distinguished Polish count would not only honor his great services to our cause of freedom and independence, but would underline the great contribution that all Americans of Polish extraction have made and are making to the history and development of our country.

I was most pleased when Secretary Connally informed me that the name of Gen. Casimir Pulaski does in fact stand high on the list of those up for consideration when the decision with regard to the naming of new Polaris submarines is to be made.

In that connection, demonstrating the wide interest which my proposal has created among Polish-American organizations, I include the following resolution, unanimously adopted by Swoboda Lodge No. 509 of the Polish National Alliance, Schenectady, N.Y. The resolution follows:

SWOBODA LODGE 509 RESOLUTION

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a regularly held meeting of the Swoboda Lodge 509 on Sunday, May 14, 1961, to be presented for consideration and adoption at the next regular meeting of Council No. 53 Polish National Alliance;

"Whereas a number of Polaris submarines are now being constructed for the U.S. Navy; and

"Whereas it is traditional that submarines and other major vessels are given appropriate and distinguished names; and

"Whereas Gen. Casimer Pulaski, the great Polish patriot and general in the Continental Army during the American Revolution led the French and American cavalry during the seige of Savannah, Ga., and was mortally wounded at this seige; and

"Whereas Americans of Polish ancestry will feel justly proud if one of the Polaris submarines were to carry the name of one of its most distinguished and honored sons and heroes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this meeting that the proper governmental authorities be petitioned and urged to name a Polaris submarine *General Casimer Pulaski;*

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be presented for approval at the next regular meeting of Council No. 53, Polish National Alliance, at Schenectady, N.Y.;

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Polish American Congress and the home office of the Polish National Alliance."

STANLEY J. BUZANOWSKI,
Secretary.
VICTOR P. SZYMANSKI,
President.

House Small Business Committee Activities Cover Many Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, this is another of a series of reports on the many varied activities of the House Small Business Committee. Members may be interested in knowing that during the last few weeks the committee has been involved with such a variety of things as department stores, household movers, potatoes, tomatoes, and even saw the successful completion of an antitrust case which was initiated after the violations were uncovered by committee investigators.

Mr. Speaker, these periodic reports are made so that Members may become acquainted with the many types of functions performed by the committee, and to avail themselves of the committee's help if it is needed. Any Member facing small business problems in his district is urged to come to the committee for assistance.

The following short summaries show the types of activities with which the committee has been involved or has seen to a successful conclusion recently:

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

In a case brought to the attention of the committee by a Congressman from a Southwestern State, a small businessman who owned and operated two small department stores, one as a partnership and the other as a corporation, had been refused a loan by the Small Business Administration because the combined annual sales of the two stores exceeded the size standards limitations imposed by SBA regulations. The case was carefully reviewed and the committee recommended that the small businessman effectively divest him himself of the sole ownership of the stock of the corporation involved, in order that the two stores might be considered for loans on an individual basis rather than as an entity. This suggestion was followed, with the result that, after conferences with SBA officials, the Agency was able to approve separate loans, which were needed to permit the small businessman to expand his operations and employ a substantial additional number of people.

INVESTIGATIONS AND HEARINGS

At the request of several Members of the House, a special subcommittee of the Small Business Committee recently conducted an extensive investigation into alleged unfair pricing and marketing practices in the tomato production and distribution industry in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. The investigation disclosed extreme differences in the prices being paid to tomato growers and shippers and those being charged for tomatoes in the chain grocery stores in the area. As a result, a public hearing was held in the area by the special subcommittee to determine what action could be taken to save the many small businessmen who were suffering disastrous financial losses and failures as a result of the unfair practices. An abundance of testimony was received from the persons affected at various levels, as well as from buyers for the large chains. The printed record of the hearings were distributed during the first week of August 1961, and the report of the subcommittee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations will be submitted to the full committee and transmitted to the House at an early date.

At the instance of Members of the House, the same special subcommittee made an extensive field investigation into complaints received by Congressmen from small potato growers and distributors with respect to alleged discriminatory pricing practices in that field. This investigation unearthed a picture almost identical to that disclosed in the tomato industry. The special subcommittee's inquiry into the plight of small businessmen in this area is continuing and a full report will be made to the House in the near future.

OIL COMPANIES GUILTY OF ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS UNCOVERED BY COMMITTEE HAVE BEEN FINED BY U.S. COURT

During hearings held by the Small Business Committee in 1957, testimony was elicited to the effect that certain petroleum companies were following a policy of suggesting the retail prices to be charged for gasoline by their lessees. This was called to the attention of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice with the result that, in 1958, a Federal grand jury indicted 14 major oil companies for violation of the antitrust laws. The indictment charged that the alleged combination and conspiracy had had the effect of increasing, fixing, and controlling the prices of gasoline; suppressing price competition between the defendants, and restraining interstate trade in gasoline. The defendants were ultimately brought to trial in the U.S. district court for the Northern District of Indiana, and 11 were found guilty. On June 1, 1961, the U.S. district court imposed fines totaling $425,000 against the defendants, which were assessed as follows: Standard Oil Co., $50,000 and costs; Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., $45,000 and costs; Shell Oil Co., $45,000 and costs; The Texas Co., (or Texaco, Inc.), $45,000 and costs; Phillips Petroleum Co., $45,000 and costs; Cities Service Petroleum Co., $45,000 and costs; the Ohio Oil Co., $45,000 and costs; Central West Oil Corp., $50,000 and costs; Hudson Oil Co. of Illinois, Inc., $30,000 and costs; Tornado Oil Co., Inc., $20,000 and costs; Pacer Oil Co., Inc., $5,000.

While the committee does not necessarily subscribe to the view that the success of a congressional inquiry should be measured by the number of criminal prosecutions of malefactors engendered thereby, nevertheless, it must be a source of satisfaction to those who were injured and financially damaged, that those who were guilty of illegal practices which were uncovered by the committee have been subjected to judicial punishment.

PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES

For some time our committee has been concerned with complaints of small business household movers concerning Department of Defense Directive 4500.27. Under this directive, transportation officers were authorized to award bonus shipments to carriers who provided "exceptionally high quality of service." It also provided that "a preference for a carrier expressed by the property owner shall be honored."

Small business household movers complained that the bonus and preference provisions were harming them. The test of "exceptionally high quality of service" set up a subjective standard which permitted transportation officers to make their own determinations. Valid objective criteria were completely lacking. Such subjective standard frequently operated to the prejudice of the small business household mover.

The use of "shall" appeared to give the owner of household goods the mandatory right to select his own carrier. The larger movers, who were known by name or reputation to many of the owners of household goods, were frequently designated, to the detriment of the small business household movers who were unknown.

Our committee brought this matter to the attention of the Department of Defense, which has deleted the bonus provisions from its directive and has changed "shall" to "may," thereby making the preference provision optional.

Forgotten Point Roberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the forgotten places of the United States is situated in my congressional district. It is Point Roberts, a peninsula jetting below the 49th parallel south of Ladner, B.C. To reach this part of my district, I have to travel overland through Canada. There is no commercial air or water transportation for passengers across Boundary Bay which separates Point Roberts from the rest of Washington State.

It was 115 years ago that the Treaty of Washington set the boundary between the United States and British Columbia along the 49th parallel. During these years there has been peaceful relations between our neighbors to the north, with the possible exception of the Pig War on San Juan Island nearby. This arose over the shooting of a Hudson Bay Co. pig by an American and raised the question of jurisdiction over the island. Arbitration of the terms of the Treaty of Washington closed this issue forever and the Hudson Bay Co. moved to Victoria.

Point Roberts should not be the forgotten place it is, because it was here 100 years ago that a granite obelisk, first of a series of similar markers along the 49th, was placed to define the boundary between the United States and Canada. These markers are the only sentinels that stand on this border.

Mr. Speaker, the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald, in an editorial Thursday, July 27, 1961, turned back the pages of Northwest history to tell of the interesting events surrounding the placing of this obelisk. I believe this editorial is worth reading for it points out the symbolic and historical role of Point Roberts and its people, and brings to light the existence of a usually forgotten part of our country.

The editorial follows:

TURNING BACK THE PAGES OF OUR COLORFUL HISTORY BOOK

The ceremonies at Point Roberts this Sunday commemorating the establishment of the international border along the 49th parallel a century ago serve to remind us of our colorful past and the fact that we in northwest Washington do claim a rich heritage of history.

The events of 100 years ago—the Pig War episode and the San Juan dispute, the Treaty of Washington, which delineated American and British jurisdiction, the settling of Bellingham Bay—are interwoven into a rich fabric of local and national history.

Eight years ago, the centennial celebration which marked the settling of Bellingham Bay following the arrival of Henry Roeder and Russell Peabody was carried on in conjunction with Washington's territorial centennial. Roeder and Peabody had come to stay in December 1852, and Washington Territory achieved separate status in 1853 when the country north of the Columbia River was detached from Oregon Territory.

The Indian uprisings of that era resulted in the establishment of Fort Bellingham in 1856, with Capt. George Pickett—who later led the famed southern charge at Gettysburg—in command. From here, Pickett and his troops of D Company, 9th Infantry, were sent to San Juan Island to bolster the American position in the boundary dispute with England.

Recently a group of Canadian navy cadets landed on San Juan to pay tribute to that international affair and, in a gracious gesture, spruced up the historic sites. Despite the term "Pig War", the only shot fired was by Lyman Cutler, who killed a Hudson's Bay Co. boar that was foraging in his potato patch. That incident sharpened the tense situation, but war was averted.

Eventually, Emperor William I decided, as arbiter, that the international line ran on the other side of San Juan Island, and that the group belonged to the United States.

Meanwhile, back on the 49th parallel—agreed upon by the 1846 Treaty of Washington, D.C., as the international boundary from the top of the Rockies to tidewater—Boundary Commissioner Archibald Campbell and his surveying crew were placing the monuments along the imaginary line. The job was done in 1861, hence the centennial nature of Sunday's observance.

Point Roberts, the starting point and western end of the imaginary line, holds a unique geographical position because of the treaty establishing the 49th parallel. It is isolated from the rest of Whatcom County and the United States by Boundary Bay and its land access must be through Canada. Almost all of its summer homes are owned by Canadians.

But the several hundred year-round residents are stanchly loyal to the Stars and Stripes, despite their inconvenient location and the closeness of their ties with Canada.

For those who never have been to Point Roberts, Sunday should be a rewarding time to go. For they won't just be putting 100 interesting miles on the speedometer. Rather, they will be traveling 100 years backward in time.

Disease-Free Poultry Plan Outlined by Pathologist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, my State is vitally interested in and plays a substantial part in the poultry industry of the United States. Maine has long had a reputation for its high quality of hatching eggs, table eggs, broilers, and baby chicks. Our program of disease control is not current—we are extremely proud of our program which was established over 40 years ago.

One of our distinguished poultry pathologists is Dr. Harold L. Chute, professor of animal pathology at the University of Maine. He is widely recognized for his outstanding work in poultry diseases and on July 20, 1961, he presented a talk to the APHF Congress and his remarks were published in the August 2 issue of the Southeast Poultry Times. The consumer and those associated with the poultry industry have a deep interest in disease control in the industry. Because of the excellent job being done by Dr. Chute and the outstanding record of the State of Maine, I insert into the RECORD the reprint of Dr. Chute's remarks.

[From the Southeast Poultry Times, Aug. 2, 1961]

DISEASE-FREE POULTRY PLAN OUTLINED BY PATHOLOGIST

The State of Maine is in a unique position in the poultry industry of the United States. It exports more hatching eggs to foreign countries than any other State in the country.

Maine is 11th in broiler production and almost all of these chicks come from Maine eggs and are hatched in Maine hatcheries. The industry is highly integrated encompassing all phases from hatching to feed mills and to processing and marketing.

The State is also in a unique geographical position being bordered on two sides by Canada, one side by the Atlantic Ocean and on the other side by the State of New Hampshire. There are only five main roads which lead into New Hampshire.

Probably one of the greatest assets to the poultry industry, is a long history of good poultry disease control. Certain diseases including pullorum, typhoid, fowl pox, laryngotrachetis and psittacosis are rigidly controlled by the State department of agriculture through the division of animal industry. These diseases when diagnosed are subject to quarantine and birds can only be sold for processing and cannot move to another farm. Coupled with this is State control over the use of live biologics so that live virus products cannot be sold unless of proven use to the poultryman.

The State is also very proud of 40 years of control and practical eradication of pullorum and typhoid.

Testings in 1921 showed 22.3 percent infection. No infection has been found in 1961.

Recent practical examples of disease control have been established. Only two examples will be cited.

Farm A received 5,700 chicks from PPLO-free stock and were reared in isolation from feed servicemen, feed dealers, other poultrymen, and other ages of birds. At pullorum-typhoid testing time all the birds were PPLO negative. Monthly tests have established that for 11 months they have remained free of this disease.

Farm B was developed by building a new building with cement floor, insulated, central heating, bulk feed, screened doors and windows, and above all locked doors, and no persons were allowed on the farm except the caretaker who lived in a trailer nearby.

This flock has not been vaccinated and monthly blood samples for 6 months have revealed it to be PPLO free. The eggs were treated prior to hatching and the chicks injected at day-old with gallamycine—the object being to eliminate any residual PPLO infections. This flock was culled and selected at 10 weeks of age and without any special effort the culls dressed 4.26 pounds at the processing plant. This included both males and females.

With the above history and facts, it is reasonable to assume that disease-free poultry flocks and eventually an area can be established in the State of Maine. A program designed for a cooperative effort between the poultryman, university, State department of agriculture, and Animal Disease Eradication Division of the USDA is being established.

Poultrymen must provide a house with cement floors, screened windows and doors, locked doors, freedom from all visitors, servicemen, feedmen, salesmen, and neighbors. The farm must have bulk feed with outside filler pipes. The chicks, of course, must come from NPIP clean eggs and the farm must be approved by a committee and reach the above standards.

Want Freedom To Destroy Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, most of us were surprised and alarmed at the effrontry of the Communists to run ads in the leading newspapers across the country in the form of an open letter to the American people.

I view with the utmost contempt the efforts of any Communist to address me or any other loyal American as "fellow American." To have an organization dedicated to the destruction of freedom which follows the directive of Marx to "lie, lie, lie" and "deceive, deceive, deceive," cry out that it is being persecuted—that it only speaks for decency—is like having Satan claim to speak for Christ. All that honest Americans want is to compel Satan to identify himself as Satan and not as Christ. They must

come out in the open and register for what they are—enemies of freedom.

I commend the Burlington (Wis.) Standard-Press for its editorial and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD:

WANT FREEDOM TO DESTROY FREEDOM

A recent half-page ad which appeared in the Racine Journal-Times and other papers across the country was headed with the words, "An Open Letter to the American People." It was followed by a lengthy plea against the outlawing or subverting of any type of organization or political party in the United States and it bore the distinctive signature, National Committee; Communist Party, U.S.A., 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N.Y.

The ad, and the Journal-Times was careful to note that it was an ad even though it bore the structure of an editorial or feature story, regarded itself with the recent decision of the Supreme Court (anti-Communist cases, June 5, 1961) which upheld the registration requirements of the McCarran Act of 1950 and the membership clause of the Smith Act of 1940. These acts stated in part that the Government may license voluntary associations and require a public announcement of their membership and that it may imprison or fine members of these organizations who are found guilty of intent to overthrow the Government.

The Communists argue that these laws are unconstitutional in nature and that the Communists as "Americans want to maintain the constitutional rights to proceed in their own way toward their own new frontiers through the political parties and voluntary organizations of their own free choice." They go further to state that the Supreme Court ruling imperils all organizations in this country and could eventually destroy all who stand "for peace, economic security, and democratic rights—the trade unions, Socialists, the Jews, the liberals."

These arguments and others forwarded in the ad are ridiculous. We are here concerned with, and only with, a group whose advocated aim is the control and domination of the world. The Communist Party advances socialism (rule by every man—every man equal) as their religion and yet they themselves are controlled by a few men and they have annihilated millions of these "potentially equal men" in the name of world peace. Thus the first contradiction in their structure.

To allow the Communist Party to operate in this country without direct Government supervision is in direct contrast to the same Constitution which they use as the basis for their argument. It is a logical contradiction to give freedom to a group which advocates a denial of freedom and then to say that we are following the mandates of the Constitution.

The Supreme Court acted justly, wisely, and in the best interests of this Nation when it made this decision and it is our hope that the United States will remain just that, and that all alien and subversive elements which plot its overthrow will soon be swept away. It is our hope that the Stars and Stripes will fly long after the hammer and sickle has been buried under.

Dane-geld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 31, 1961, I reminded my colleagues that during the years since the end of World War II, the U.S. Government has given away over $90 billion in our so-called foreign aid program. In the near future, we will be asked to extend this foreign aid giveaway program under a new name—AID. This time, we are being asked to give our approval to U.S. borrowing, over a period of 5 years, $8.8 billion to finance a long-range handout program.

I pointed out, also, that we are being blackmailed by the beneficiaries of that program—those foreign emissaries who have threatened us, openly, by saying that if we do not continue to give them our foreign-aid dollars they will abandon the free world in favor of a higher bid by the Communist aggressor.

At this time, I think it is appropriate for my colleagues to read again the words of wisdom of Rudyard Kipling as written in his poem, "Dane-geld." His words, written many years ago, are most appropriate to the situation we face today in being asked to extend this program. A very pertinent part of Kipling's "Dane-geld" follows:

DANE-GELD

It is always a temptation to an armed and agile nation
To call upon a neighbor and to say:
"We invaded you last night—we are quite prepared to fight,
Unless you pay us cash to go away."
And that is called asking for Dane-geld,
And the people who ask it explain
That you've only to pay 'em the Dane-geld
And then you'll get rid of the Dane.
It is always a temptation to a rich and lazy nation,
To puff and look important and to say:
"Though we know we should defeat you, we have not the time to meet you.
We will therefore pay you cash to go away."
And that is called paying the Dane-geld;
But we've proved it again and again,
That if once you have paid him the Dane-geld
You never get rid of the Dane.
It is wrong to put temptation in the path of any nation,
For fear they should succumb and go astray;
So when you are requested to pay up or be molested,
You will find it better policy to say:
"We never pay any-one Dane-geld,
No matter how trifling the cost;
For the end of that game is oppression and shame,
And the nation that plays it is lost."

—*Rudyard Kipling*

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CANTATE RECORDS,
Beverly Hills, Calif., July 31, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations on your having introduced House Resolution 211 to create a Captive Nations Committee.

I am writing to my Congressman urging his support and hope that your efforts will prevail.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO K. EITEL.

PARMA, OHIO, *July 25, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to add my letter to any you might have already received in favor of a special permanent committee on captive nations—the resolution which you introduced during the last session of Congress.

The joint resolutions of 1959 as well as the Presidential proclamation mean very little because they could very easily be interpreted as vote-gathering devices and in fact they have already been considered as such in many influential circles. They would mean much more if the foreign policy of the United States was not one of containment—that is, containment of the U.S.S.R. within its present borders—but one of liberation, a word we preach so much but about which we do very little.

Such resolutions are sheer hypocrisy, without just a little action behind them. A permanent congressional committee could give these resolutions a soul. It would show the people of the United States that we are concerned and, through information gathered, could show them the reason for this concern. But most important of all, it would show the people in the captive nations that America cares enough about them to activate a permanent committee in the highest organ of our Government—the Congress. It would give them hope and perhaps cripple the tyrannical rule over them just a little.

Respectfully,

Z. M. HOLUBEC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heard you on the Manion Forum, July 9. Please send me a copy of your Captive Nations Committee resolution—House Resolution 211.

Support House Joint Resolution 447—the Pillion resolution. Thank you.

Yours truly,

DONALD E. MATATICS.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

ANKARA, *July 26, 1961.*

Mr. DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On the occasion of the Captive Nations' Week declared by the United States, the leader of the free world, I have the honor of submitting herewith the declaration prepared by the general headquarters of the National Liberation Union of Azerbeijan. It is quite pertinent to House Resolution 211.

With my deepest respects,

MUSTAFA VEKILOGLU,
Chairman, National Liberation Union of Azerbeijan. (Ex-Minister of Interior in the National Government of Azerbeijan.)

JULY 20, 1961.

THE DECLARATION OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION UNION OF AZERBEIJAN ON CAPTIVE NATIONS' WEEK

Various manifestations observed in the free world in support of the nations who have suffered Soviet Communist invasion and struggled for years to acquire again their national rights and freedom, gives us—the enslaved nations—the hope that our just cause will soon be realized.

The decree passed by the American Congress on July 17, 1959, and declared by President Eisenhower, concerning the Captive Nations' Week, calls upon the American people to be closely interested in the actual situation and distress of the nations who are under Soviet domination and to support their just national cause. The fact that the new President John F. Kennedy has identified himself in favor of this week, has become a great source of energy for the enslaved nations in their struggle and a relief for their distress.

The National Liberation Union of Azerbeijan, whose aim is the liberation and independence of Azerbeijan, welcomes with the deepest gratitude this noble initiative of the American Nation and of its President.

This statement, "the torch of freedom has always been carried from generation to generation by the Americans and now turned over to the young Americans who are born in this century," as pronounced by President Kennedy, encourages the nations who are fighting for their freedom. The United States of America is, indeed, the leader of the free world.

On the occasion of the Captive Nations' Week, declared by the Americans who have taken over the torch of freedom from the past generations, it will be stated, explained and written to the whole world that the principles of human rights cherished by the free world are being extensively violated by the Soviet Communist state. Especially the policy of Russification, the genocide, and the economic exploitation followed by the Soviets in Azerbeijan shall be brought before the eyes of the free world during the Captive Nations' Week. The National Liberation Union of Azerbeijan who adheres to the principle of "freedom for peoples and independence for nations" based on the national will, is convinced that the liberation of Azerbeijan and of all other enslaved nations is more important today than it used to be before. Again, on the occasion of the Captive Nations' Week we hope that the free and independent states will be more interested in the cause and problems of enslaved nations.

MUSTAFA VEKILOGLU,
National Liberation Union of Azerbeijan, General Headquarters.

ARLINGTON, TEX.,
July 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for your support toward the aiding of peoples of the captive nations. Please continue your efforts and not only to them but to all people who wish to retain or acquire their freedom and have dignity.

Sincerely yours,

V. A. PIETERS.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
July 22, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: For some time I have intended to write you to express the thanks of my husband and myself for House Resolution 211. This seems to us to be such an important and such a logical step in our cold war struggle with communism that it should be passed and implemented immediately.

Could you tell me if there is available any background information in the form of pamphlets or reprints on this resolution and the captive nations? I am on the planning committee of the social and economic issues study group of the Deerfield branch of the American Association of University Women. We will spend some time next year in studying communism and means of combating it. Since your proposal for the formation of a permanent Captive Nations Committee is one of the effective means which should be adopted, I would be very grateful for any information you can give me.

Thank you very much for your help in this matter.

Yours truly,

MARY M. KRAYCHY
Mrs. Stephen Kraychy.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
July 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a letter which I think you will be interested in seeing.

I heard your speech on Manion Forum a few weeks ago and it was very good.

You might remind Congressman HUDDLESTON, when you next see him, that you are counting on his support for House Resolution 211.

I suggest you photostat the enclosed letter and return the original to me.

Very truly yours,

WM. G. MORI.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
July 26, 1961.

DEAR SIR: This is written with the sincere hope that all Americans will give their full support to your measure, House Resolution 211, and to see that it is passed promptly.

Respectfully,

Miss LOIS C. STEVENS.

TNEMEC CO., INC.,
North Kansas City, Mo., July 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Have just been reading carefully the report of your weekly broadcast under the auspices of the Manion Forum under date of July 16. To me, it is most heartening to see this subject brought out and emphasized.

The Russian and Chinese so-called governments are distatorships based on treachery, terror, torture and murder. Such a government could not exist long where the population was informed. Such a government is the oldest type of government in human history.

It has always seemed to me that our own government was very wishy-washy in its propaganda program.

The program you outlined, if carried through as it should be, would be the best type of back-fire against Russia and its demands in connection with Berlin and in connection with its worldwide porgram of infiltration.

My very sincere wishes and hope for your program.

Very truly yours,

A. C. BEAN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *July 26, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. FLOOD: It was good to read your July 16 address before the Manion Forum and I heartily support your House Resolution 211 which I have written to my Representative to support. Thank God someone in Congress is keeping this sad situation in mind and trying to do something about this crime which cries to heaven for vengeance.

Yours very truly,

SHELDON J. HANEMANN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

HOUSTON, TEX., *July 23, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read a copy of the broadcast you gave before the Manion Forum on July 16. Thank you very much for it. I am today writing my Congressmen, urging the adoption of your resolution 211.

Sincerely,

Miss ERMIL LAUGHLIN.

Let's Get Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the official organ of the Democratic National Committee of August 5, 1961, appears an excellent statement, "Let's Get Going," written by John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, calling for bipartisan action and consideration in connection with foreign-aid legislation and legislation for the establishment of a Peace Corps.

I wholeheartedly agree with Chairman Bailey in his appraisal of the world's situation, a most statesmanlike statement, in which statement he sets forth, regardless of political affiliation, the importance of bipartisan action in connection with the field of foreign affairs.

Under former President Eisenhower, the Democratic leadership and the Democratic Party supported President Eisenhower on progressive legislation and particularly supported President Eisenhower in the field of foreign affairs and for a strong national defense. The

same support should be given by the Republican Members of Congress to the leadership of President Kennedy, for the leadership of the President, particularly in the field of foreign affairs showing to the world bipartisan support transcends party considerations.

In my remarks I include the splendid statement made by Chairman Bailey.

LET'S GET GOING

(By John M. Bailey)

Our Government is in the midst of deliberation on legislation of paramount importance to the conduct of U.S. foreign policy—the President's proposals for reforming foreign aid and establishing a Peace Corps.

We cannot conceive of these programs, per se, as Democratic programs or Republican programs. These are American programs. These programs in theory are not susceptible to partisan dispute.

Yet we do not call these programs nonpolitical. They represent the acme of politics. They are designed to implement U.S. politics for the development of universal freedom and justice.

We regret that, to many, "politics" is a dirty word. In the constructive sense, politics is the science and art of government—the theory of managing affairs of public policy.

We cannot conceive of poverty, either at home or abroad, as good politics or the spore of freedom. We cannot conceive of a civilized society which does not respond to man's need for food and housing and educational, social, and spiritual stimulation. As we strive to develop our own society—and this is an area of considerable partisan dispute—we cannot fail to do our utmost on behalf of those peoples outside our boundaries.

To those who shy from the cost, to those unwilling to make commitments over the long pull, to those who say "me first," we suggest a reexamination of the potential consequences of indecision.

As the elected head of the Democratic Party let me emphasize that we Democrats do not consider that the authorities granted in the foreign aid and Peace Corps proposals are partisan authorities.

But let me further emphasize that this statement does not imply any refusal to stand before the people and all critics, however partisan, with respect to the execution and administration of programs of such importance as these.

As partisan Americans first, I ask Republicans and Democrats to get going on the biggest business before us.

Now Is a Wonderful Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith the commencement address by James B. Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times, at the graduation of Smith College, June 11, 1961.

It is a long way from Saturday night's best customer at Robeson's Roof Garden, chief esquire of the Kappa Alpha Theta sorority, and the University of Illinois' best golfer, to graduation speaker at sophisticated Smith College and chief Washington correspondent of the erudite New York Times.

Most of those who knew Scottie Reston in those days would probably have predicted his fortunes as a member of the Walker Cup Team rather than as some of the stuffier ones over at the British Embassy now put it, "America's only foreign affairs writer, all the others are Reston rewrites."

It could be that Horatio Alger was a hundred years before his time. Today, instead of "Phil the Fiddler" or "Jed the Bootblack," it might have been "Scottie the Newsboy."

This speech has a little genius, a lot of good sense, and the inevitable Reston humor. It is all good family reading.

NOW IS A WONDERFUL TIME

(By James B. Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times)

This college was founded during the Reconstruction period after the Civil War. President Eliot of Harvard made the first commencement address in 1879, and when I see what kind of commencement speaker you have been reduced to today, I have to wonder whether you are headed in the right direction.

There must be some mistake. Nobody in these 82 years ever had less claim to address you than I. I know nothing about women's colleges. I am against all forms of segregation, including female segregated education. I have three sons and no daughters. Even my wife had no sisters, only three brothers, and when the last of our sons leaves home, she maintains that she is going to write a book entitled "Life in a Men's Locker Room."

Nevertheless, here I am, and if you don't mind, I will not follow the usual commencement practice of telling you that the world's in a terrible mess and it's all yours.

In the first place, it's not all yours. We intend to hang around for quite a while muddling along and standing in your way. And second, I happen to believe that this is a pretty wonderful period and that you are lucky to be sprung at this particular moment.

After all, you might have got out back there with that first class when the carpetbaggers instead of the Freedom Riders were invading the South, when Miss Smith had complained that women were denied "the means of happiness, usefulness and honor," and when men came home at night spouting to their wives about the glories of the tariff. Now we have Jackie to talk about—it's a big difference.

At no time in American history has this country been engaged in larger or nobler causes, and at no time has there been greater "scope for excellence," for women as well as men, than there is today. The whole world is in motion, Since the war one-half the people on the globe have changed their form of government, 800 million of them achieving independence for the first time. The old empires are finished. The domination of one people by another is all but over in the West.

As usual, a new tyranny is rising in the East devising new sorceries for the domination of man, exercising new and terrible forms of power. I will spare you the usual jargon about atheistic communism; I'm sure you have heard it mentioned before. But liberty is at stake once more. It is at stake in the midst of a social, scientific, and military revolution unmatched in the history of the world, and personally I think this is a pretty good row to get engaged in.

This, I take it, is what Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson were talking about when they spoke of liberty as being America's business. Other classes that got out of Smith had to be satisfied with puny little battles with the Spaniards, or the British, or the railroads, but history has handed you a battle for the world, full of philosophy. And not only the world, either. In the 15th century, a gal had nothing to dream about except the continents and the oceans and Christopher Columbus (who really was a dull man and always away from home), but you have the universe, the moon and the stars to dream about—all this and Comdr. Al Shepard too. And there, girls, if it hasn't occurred to you, is a man.

I am told you are a skeptical breed, up here in Northampton, and I suppose some of you want to know whether there is any chance of holding the universe together so that you can dream about it. I believe there is a very good chance indeed, and this conviction is based on something more than faith and hope.

A BALANCE OF POWER

At no period of history have enemies faced each other for so long over so vast an area and yet shown more restraint than the Western powers and the Communists. There have been many incidents and provocations, and a few proxy wars—and there will be many more—but in this generation of cold war there has been no direct test of arms between the major competitors. Whenever one of the great powers was so committed that the intervention of the second would have produced a world war, the second power abstained.

We were committed in Greece and Turkey in 1946–47, and the Berlin airlift of 1948–49, and in the Lebanon-Middle East crisis of 1958—and Russia abstained all three times. They were committed in Hungary, and the Chinese to a limited extent in Korea—and in both cases we either held back or limited our advance.

On our own side, no military man may fire a nuclear weapon, even if attacked, without the specific authorization of the President of the United States. It is also reassuring that even when the Russians first observed the America U–2 spy plane deep inside Soviet territory they did not shoot at it until they first reported back to Khrushchev and received his personal instructions to do so.

This is not the kind of thing that fills a girl with blissful serenity at night, yet there is a balance of power in the world today, and we have not been quite fair to the balance of power in this country. It is admittedly not our ideal, but war tends to break out not when there is a balance of power, much as we are inclined to think so, but when there is an imbalance, when one side gets a preponderance of power over the other.

Every Smith graduate, I feel sure, has memorized every detail of the history of Egypt and Babylonia, Persia and Greece, Greece and Rome, Spain and England, England and Napoleon—all testifying to the proposition that wars tend to break out when the balance of power is upset. I do not know how it is that the balance of power got such a bad name in this country, for our Constitution is based on it; this is what the separation of powers is; this is what labor-management relations are made of. And the most important single fact of the postwar world is that when the power of Britain and France, Germany and Japan collapsed, the United States moved in to establish a new balance.

"Have the elder races halted?" Walt Whitman asked—

> "Do they droop and end their lesson,
> Wearied over there beyond the seas?
> We take up the task eternal,
> And the burden and the lesson.
> Pioneers, O pioneers."

It is true that we are going to have great troubles in your generation. We cannot make our will or our power prevail everywhere. The balance is against us in places like Laos, right up against the Chinese border, just as the balance is against the Communists in Cuba. No doubt we shall lose many of these areas close to the Communist empire before your daughters sit where you are today. We cannot do everything. We are not omnipotent. The trouble with foreign affairs is that they are foreign; that is to say, they are beyond the reach of our will in many areas. But because we cannot do everything is no cause for despair.

We have already done a great deal. Surely there is no doubt that the Communists would stand today at the Pyrenees and the North Sea and on the Persian Gulf if the United States had not established a new balance when the elder races faltered. We have diverted the war from the field of open battle to the field of political and economic and ideological warfare, and it is here that the struggle will be waged in your time.

The problem now is to unify the Nation and coordinate its policies with the rest of the hemisphere and the Atlantic. The Communists are consolidating their empire by force; we have the much harder job of unifying the West by voluntary action. It is not only States rights that are increasingly outmoded but national rights, and we shall succeed in the defense of our society, I believe, in direct proportion to our success in unifying the free nations.

It all depends, of course, on how you look at all this. You can concentrate on Laos and conclude that we are being nibbled to death, or fix your mind on these hydrogen-tipped missiles zigzagging under the seas or roving on flatcars from one place to another until the day when you can easily imagine the whole place being blown up by accident.

There is, however, a moral obligation to be intelligent, especially, I suppose, if you went to Smith. Most people prefer life to death, even the Russians. Like ourselves, they are now a wealthy and powerful nation with much to lose by war, so why concentrate on the gloomy apocalyptic view of the world?

ATTITUDES MAKE THE CLIMATE

This, it seems to me, is one of the first free choices an intelligent person can make. There are few times in life when men and women have a wide range of free choices. When we are very young, we are directed by our parents. When we are well established, we are limited by the obligations of work and family. When we are old, we are bound by the frailties of life.

But there is a period, around college commencement time, when we are comparatively free to choose an outlook on life and what to do with our lives. The silliest thing to do is to condemn our own time, first because we cannot choose another time, and second because, at least to my way of thinking, it is a glorious time.

James Joll and Caryl Haskins, the president of Carnegie Institution of Washington, have recently been studying the so-called golden ages of history, Fifth Century Athens, Renaissance Italy, and Elizabethan England, and have been meditating on the happy thought that we ourselves may be living in what future historians may well regard as a golden age.

Mr. Joll observes that the first thing that strikes one about these golden periods of Athens, Italy, and England is that they were not characterized by the successful solution of political problems. These were times of great change, of intellectual excitement, when new creations and new experiences and viewpoints were coming into wide notice. All of them, Haskins notes, were eras of some physical security, but in all of them stability and security were far from complete, and there was a kind of partnership of disorder and hazard with vitality and creativeness.

"Our time," he concludes, "is marked by the same sense of physical frontiers close at hand, the same ferment of new ideas, the same vast and rending shifts in the individual's notion of the universe and his place in it; and most poignantly, of his very nature."

Where our time fails, I think, to match the qualities of the great epochs of the past is that it lacks their enormous self-confidence. Nothing holds us back so much today as our own self-doubt, and nothing, ironically, is more alien to the traditional American spirit of confident optimism. This national crying in our beer is what poisons the atmosphere of the time, and it is serious because, as Joll observes, it is the atmosphere, the climate of a time, that determines its place in history.

Therefore there is something to say, both in terms of personal and national well-being, for turning a cheerful face to the world. Good things sometimes come out of bad times. After all, this place was started during the administration of General Grant. The approach to life is half the battle. As G. K. Chesterton said, you can either take everything for granted or take it with gratitude. The difference between the two is the difference between the lightning and the lightningbug.

The approach is more important than the plan. You can't plan everything. This is what Hitler did. He gambled everything on a colossal plan which, if all had worked out exactly as imagined, would have transformed the world, but he didn't calculate all possible contingencies and ended up on the scrap heap of history.

SOME CLUES FOR AN ATTITUDE

Surely you have observed in your studies that most great men were able to believe in things beyond their vision. Not expecting everything, yet they managed to have a certain faith. Judge Holmes said it all in a prophetic passage away back in 1913.

"If I am right," he said, "it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views * * * but as I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than workingmen's disputes * * * I do not lose my hopes. * * * I think it probable that civilization will somehow last as long as I care to look ahead. * * * I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be, that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."

If we take these wider views of where we are, it is I think possible to get some clues about how to proceed, or at least what to avoid. We know, for example, that the coming 20 years will be an era of vast change; therefore we must nourish a flexible open mind and an adaptable spirit. We know that it is bound to be a period of extremely high taxation; therefore the acquisition of material things is likely to make even less sense than in generations past.

We know it will be a period of great mobility and of clashing national interests; therefore we must know more about the other cultures of the world. We know that medical science will expand our lives and that the new industrial revolution will increase our leisure; therefore it is all the more important to think of the whole span of life and give more weight to the enduring things of the mind and spirit.

Here we may reflect for a moment on the special place of women in such a world, for in the last analysis it is you who are going to have to civilize your men, if the thing is to be done, and who will probably have to struggle to create the moral atmosphere for a useful and growing life. This is especially true now, for in a time of turmoil the family is almost the only unit of society that makes much sense.

If you ask me how you are going to tame a man, and have five rebellious children, and remain beautiful, serene, and intellectual while keeping up with the cold war and running the League of Women Voters, I'll have to ask you to see my wife. But I do know that unless you try hard, it won't be done, and after all, life is a long process in which we all have to develop the courage to fail.

There is no easy answer to these complex problems, but my feeling about them was defined by Albert Camus just before he died.

"One may long," he said, "as I do, for a gentler flame, a respite, a pause for musing. But perhaps there is no other peace than in the heat of combat. 'Every wall is a door,' Emerson correctly said. Let us not look for the door, and the way out, anywhere but in the wall against which we are living. Instead, let us seek the respite where it is—in the very thick of the battle."

One final point. I congratulate the class of 1961, but in doing so a word about your parents. I am thinking of those anxious days at the start of the last World War when most of today's graduates were born. I am thinking of all that homework you helped them do in the early years and all that homework you couldn't help them do in the later years.

I am thinking about all those love affairs, real and fancied, you had to endure, and of all the trouble you had getting them into Smith, and all the trouble getting them out. But you've done it now, and I congratulate you. But don't think it's all over yet.

"Let's Do Something About Communism"—Guest Editor Lyman Peterson, the Paramount Journal, Paramount, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to your attention, and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a front page editorial by Guest Editor Lyman Peterson, "Let's Do Something About Communism," which recently appeared in the Paramount Journal of Paramount, Calif., an important city in the great 23d District of Los Angeles County, which I have the honor to represent.

I am sure you join with me in complimenting both Mr. Peterson and the publisher-editor of the Paramount Journal for placing this excellent and timely editorial in the middle of the front page of their newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, in several of the incorporated communities of the 23d District which I represent, there have been for some time groups of patriotic, alert, dedicated American citizens who are making it their business to not only study the subject of communism, but who are exerting every effort to identify the subversive, infiltrative activities of Soviet

communism in all of its secret ramifications, in the activities of our local, county, State, and national groups and organizations in this fair land.

May I repeat, Mr. Speaker, as a member for nearly 15 years of the House Un-American Activities Committee, that this is no time to try to weaken or lessen the vigor and effectiveness of congressional investigative committees in the field of national security. Rather we should make more efficient and effective our level of constitutional protection in the interest of national safety and survival.

The editorial follows:

LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT COMMUNISM—A GUEST EDITORIAL BY LYMAN PETERSON

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The face of mounting tension among free nations of the world over the insidious spread of communism, due in great part to the lack of understanding of the motives and methods of Communists, has inspired Lyman Peterson, principal at Los Cerritos Elementary School, to write the following thought-provoking article:)

Many Americans have recently informed themselves of the dangers which face us from the international Communist conspiracy. Increasingly we are becoming aware at last that for 40 years the Communists have waged undeclared war against the free world with propaganda bombardments, psychological operations, economic manipulations, technological advances (many of which were stolen through spy operations), and international blackmail.

Now, many of us are asking, what can the citizens of free countries do? President Kennedy hinted in his campaign last fall that "It is not what we can get from our Government; it is what we can do for our Government," and he said he planned to ask many things of us.

He instituted the Peace Corps, which though a wonderful project is only a drop in the bucket compared to what we need. No doubt he has many other plans. But perhaps he needs help.

We, the people, should let him know that we are aware of the dangers to our freedoms and that we will support vigorous, well-thought-out action on his part.

Following are some concepts and recommendations upon which many of us can agree:

1. The issue between communism and the free world is not primarily economic. It is totalitarianism versus freedom. We should tell this to the emerging nations of Africa.

2. The Communist intent is to achieve global supremacy through use of any methods, including those unethical and brutal.

3. There is no such thing as coexistence with a power which is not willing to have both sides coexist, but which dedicates itself implacably to the destruction of freedom. The Communists assert that annihilation of the free institutions of the world is their goal.

4. There is no cheap, easy, one-shot solution to the problem which faces us. A long period of troubled times lies ahead. We will have to dedicate our time, intelligence, and money, and forego much of our leisure, luxuries, and self-indulgence to the task. Such dedication is not without its benefits. It will give many of us a purpose in life beyond that of obtaining a patio, a lounge, a backyard swimming pool with beer, bikinis, and "lots of fun." (The writer does not think that these are bad. He just objects to their being given such high priority.) A more worthy purpose is preserving and developing freedom.

5. We must close ranks with our allies, hold frequent conferences with them and otherwise maintain close communications, cooperate economically with them to a greater extent and not succumb, as Stalin predicted we would, to selfishness and allow ourselves to be picked off one by one.

6. We should expend great efforts toward developing a common market in Latin America and in the Near East, similar, if possible, to the one in Europe. We appear to have a start on this now.

7. We must step up to the person-to-person contacts among Latin Americans, Africans, Asians, and North Americans in the form of regional conferences for educators, industrialists, economists, and potential leaders and expand student exchange programs at both high school and college levels. We should set up other schools for training farmers, technicians, civil servants, accountants, and other personnel from the underdeveloped countries of the world.

8. We should start negotiating with the Communists about Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia instead of submitting to discussion of agenda items which constitute threats to free territory and Western interests. In the area of diplomacy we should stop striving to be sweet and likeable and stop falling for blackmail and extortion. Let's stay away from summit diplomacy and also the conference table when it is clear that the outcome will be a further loss of territory or freedom.

This writer suspects that many times our delegates have been pushed unwillingly to a meeting by public pressure from an uninformed public full of hopes for easy solutions and naive willingness to give the other guy the benefit of the doubt. Our leaders should harden themselves against unwise public opinion and then explain the true situation to us. We'll listen and understand. As long as the Communists remain deceitful and dedicated to global supremacy, we'll benefit very little from negotiations with them. Watch what happens this fall when West Berlin is the subject of negotiations.

9. Let's step up our propaganda programs. We need to appeal to the emotions of man as well as to his intellect. Zounds. There is material aplenty for us to use.

How many Chinese had their hands tied behind them and were shot in the back of the head? Estimates range from 16 to 20 million. And this by the peace-loving agrarian reformers. How many Tibetans were murdered? Once, when an American reporter asked Mr. N. K. about Hungary, he replied, "Why don't you forget about Hungary?" and apparently the subject was dropped. How many freedom fighters were killed in Hungary?

What about that gigantic hoax which so many of us have forgotten when the Communists manufactured evidence that the U.N. used germ warfare and brainwashed a couple of pilots into confessions? Ignorant Koreans and Chinese believe that story even to this day.

On the more positive side we could broadcast the opinion that the end of communism is inevitable. We could keep alive the fierce hopes for freedom among those behind the curtains and encourage their spirit of resistance.

We could point out that the "Communist Manifesto" declared nationalism a defunct cause and show how the Communists are exploiting the desire for nationalism this very day; that Communists always promise land to the peasants (Russia, China, Cuba) and then take it away; that they shout "peace" to the top of their propaganda lungs and press forward in their attempt to dominate the earth; that they promise consumer goods for the common man while having full intention to spend their money and energies on heavy machinery and war production.

If we put our minds to it we could remember a few more counts upon which they are vulnerable.

Let us here insert a note for those critics of America, many of them highly intelligent and sophisticated and skillful with the pen, who say, "We cannot criticize communism until we perfect ourselves. What about our slums, our racial discrimination, our ugly Americans, our Madison Avenue boys, the quality of our television programs?" To these critics I reply, "Yes, by all means, let's work on these problems, but for humanity's sake, let's put first things first. Let's not divert our attention clear away from the dangers which threaten to destroy our freedoms."

How much publicity have the Communists gotten from Little Rock? It's astronomical. How many people were killed in Little Rock? None. How much publicity resulted when the Reds murdered 16 million Chinese? Not very much. We hate to think about such an atrocity. (We'd rather publish our murders one at a time.)

How many Americans of any color skin have heard the knock of the police on the door and were sent to prison or prison camp for 20 years without trial? None. How many Russians? Who can estimate?

Perhaps the literary elite, the intelligensia had better stop suckering even a little bit for the constant repetitions of the Communist line and do some careful thinking, much as Harry and Bonaro Overstreet did before they decided to write "What We Must Know About Communism."

The point is: humans will never get their houses completely in order; if we don't attack the biggest problem first and with our best minds we'll all be living in a society without respect for the individual and without rule by law. And we'll have a few more Pasternaks die of a broken heart.

10. Let's get organized. Our executive branch needs to be reorganized to direct the activities of existing and new agencies toward winning the conflict.

Before I finish, let me state that I am not a member of the Birch Society. I believe that the society has worthwhile aims. But it uses rather irresponsible methods of attaining those aims.

What we need is responsible, vigorous leadership from the President and from Congress. The people of good will are eager to do something. Let us not be divided in our efforts.

Mr. James J. Rowley Appointed Chief of the U.S. Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to note the appointment recently announced by the President's press secretary, Pierre Salinger, that Mr. James J. Rowley will assume the office of the Chief of the U.S. Secret Service on August 31.

A man of unquestioned ability who has served in this agency for over 23 years, Mr. Rowley brings to the office many attributes that will insure the highest degree of safety and security for our President and his family. I am especially pleased to note that though he was born in Bronx County in New York City he

exercised a most prudent choice in going to Brooklyn, N.Y., for his higher education. As a fellow aluminus I can assure him that St. John's University which awarded him the degrees of LL.B. and LL.M. welcomes this new honor which he so well reflects upon her.

I hope that Mr. Rowley's tenure will be serene and uneventful, and I am certain that the vigilant care of our President and his family can be in no better hands. It is with pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the biographical sketches of Mr. Rowley's which recently appeared in New York newspapers:

NEW YORKER TO HEAD U.S. SECRET SERVICE

WASHINGTON, August 1.—James J. Rowley, chief of the White House Secret Service detail since 1946, will become head of the Secret Service when U. E. Baughman retires August 31.

Pierre Salinger, White House press secretary, announced Mr. Rowley's appointment today on behalf of President Kennedy. Technically, however, the appointment will be made by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. The Secret Service is under the Treasury Department. Combating counterfeiting is one of its principal duties.

TWO IN RUNNING

Mr. Salinger said a new chief of the White House detail would be announced later. Either Gerald Behn or John Campion, both veterans of the White House detail, is expected to succeed Mr. Rowley. Mr. Behn, 41, is now the No. 2 man of the White House detail, and Mr. Campion, 53, ranks next.

Mr. Baughman, 56, has headed the Secret Service for 13 years and has been with the agency for 33 years.

Mr. Rowley, born in the Bronx in 1908, has been a member of the Secret Service since 1938. He joined the White House detail a year later, serving under Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. Mr. Truman made him head of the White House detail.

As head of the detail, he has been directly concerned with protecting the President and members of the President's family.

Mr. Rowley attended parochial schools in New York and was graduated from Fordham Evening High School. He went to work as a bank investigator, but continued his studies at night, eventually earning LL.B. and LL.M. degrees from St. John's University in Brooklyn. He joined the FBI in 1937, but a year later shifted to the Secret Service.

Mr. Rowley is married to the former Mabel Rita Cluen of the Bronx. They have three teenage daughters.

The Chief of the Secret Service receives $18,500 annually. The appointment is not subject to Senate confirmation.

SELF-MADE INVESTIGATOR: JAMES JOSEPH ROWLEY

WASHINGTON, August 1.—For 15 years, James Joseph Rowley's job has demanded that he walk with Presidents, see all and yet stay inconspicuous. How well Mr. Rowley succeeded is evident in his promotion today from chief of the White House detail to chief of the U.S. Secret Service. This is the Treasury Department agency whose principal functions are to guard the President and his family and to outwit counterfeiters.

One day while former President and Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower were in a throng of people, somebody tossed them a bouquet. Television viewers were startled and puzzled to see a man leap from nowhere and seize the flying bouquet. The man was Jim Rowley, whose job demanded that he risk his own life if necessary to protect the President. The bouquet, it turned out, concealed nothing, so Mr. Rowley turned it over to Mrs. Eisenhower.

Mr. Rowley once described the ideal agent for the White House detail. He should, he said, demonstrate alertness, intelligence, and the ability to make quick decisions. He must be a team man, self-assured without being overly aggressive, and certainly no prima donna. Those who know Mr. Rowley consider him an ideal agent.

He is a handsome, muscular man, close to 6 feet tall and weighs in at about 185. A friendly greeting and a smile are first nature to him. He has a high color. This may be a permanent mark of his high school days when the girls used to whisper to each other:

"Talk to Jim Rowley and watch him blush."

BORN IN THE BRONX

Mr. Rowley's parents were born in Ireland. Jim was born in the lower Bronx, October 14, 1908. He was a fine broth of a boy, excelling in baseball, football, basketball, and track. Three colleges offered him scholarships, but before he finished high school his father, employed by the city of New York, was killed at work.

Young Rowley got a job and attended St. John's College, Brooklyn, at night. He won his bachelor of laws degree in 1935 and went on to a master's in law. Not hearing about his final examination, he thought he had failed. Some years later he was asked why he had never picked up his diploma. On checking, he found that communications with St. John's had been blocked by his failure to pay a $10 fee. The diploma now hangs in the Rowley home.

Mr. Rowley first learned investigative work in Wall Street, where he checked credit risks and hunted hidden assets. Right at home, though, he nearly missed the most important opportunity in his life. In the same Bronx apartment house that he called home, there had lived for 2 years a dark-haired, dark-eyed, Irish lass named Mabel Rita Cluen.

One night she was asked to go on a blind date. The date was Jim Rowley. That was to be his last night in New York. He moved to Washington, where he had been working for some time, first with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and then with the Secret Service. Having found a new interest in New York he commuted weekends for 9 or 10 months. The couple was married in 1940.

DEVOTED TO HIS JOB

Mr. Rowley's devotion to his work and his family leaves him little time for play. His idea of a vacation, when General Eisenhower was President, was to take his family to a motel not far from the President's Gettysburg farm. The motel had a pool, so that Mr. Rowley could indulge his favorite recreation, swimming. However, a security telephone was installed in his room and he never really got away from the job.

A devoted Mrs. Rowley, who is as quick with the smile as her husband, thinks it's fine that he loves his work so.

"The biggest threat to a President's life is from the self-deluded who become the dupes of terrioristic or subversive organizations," Mr. Rowley once remarked. "They think that if you knock off the head man, you throw the country into confusion and inertia. They think they become heroes in their own groups."

So, among Mr. Rowley's self-imposed disciplines, is to watch for foreign reports of revolutionary or terroristic groups and note the methods they favor.

He is indulgent with his three daughters, Claudia, 18 years old, Linda, 15, and Donna, 13.

"He lets these girls wrangle him around," Mrs. Rowley reports laughingly. "He doesn't say no to them often. They kid him about his gray hair; his hair is still mostly black. I think he looks nicer since he got some gray hair."

SECRET SERVICE GETS NEW CHIEF

WASHINGTON, August 1.—The White House announced today the appointment of James J. Rowley, who has helped guard Presidents since 1939, as Chief of the U.S. Secret Service.

The appointment is effective September 1 on the retirement of U. E. Baughman, who has served the agency for 33 years. He was its Chief for 13. Mr. Rowley is a native of the Bronx, N.Y.

Mr. Rowley, after a year or more with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, entered the Secret Service September 12, 1938. He was assigned to the White House November 20, 1939.

At first he was an advance man in protective planning, traveling ahead of the President. In 1946 he became chief of the detail. This means that he has guarded the person of three Presidents—Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy—wherever they traveled.

The Secret Service is an agency of the Treasury. It has about 450 employees, in addition to the uniformed White House Police and the Treasury guard force. Although the White House detail gets more public notice, the detection of counterfeit currency and counterfeiters is a principal function of the service.

Mr. Rowley, as chief of the White House detail, was paid about $16,000. The salary of the Chief of the Service is $18,500. The appointment is not subject to Senate confirmation.

Mr. Rowley's successor as chief of the White House detail will be announced later.

SERVICE CREATED IN 1865

The Secret Service was created in 1865 by Secretary of Treasury Hugh McCulloch. The Service's first chief was William P. Wood. Prior to its formal organization, the Treasury had used agents for the detection of counterfeiting.

It was not until after the assassination of President William McKinley in 1901 that Secret Service agents were regularly assigned to guard the President and immediate members of his family. Funds were made available for the first time for agents to guard President Theodore Roosevelt.

Federal law also makes mandatory protection of a President-elect. Protection of the Vice President is at his request. Pending in Congress is a bill that would make mandatory protection of the Vice President or whoever is next in the succession to the Presidency. The bill would also permit the Secret Service to guard a President for 6 months after he leaves office.

Over the years the duties of the Secret Service have been expanded. An act of 1951 pulled together duties of the Service, including detection and arrest of any person committing any offense against the laws of the United States relating to coins, currency, obligations, and securities of the United States and of foreign governments, and counterfeiting and forging of Government transportation requests.

The Service also has jurisdiction over acceptances of loans or gratuities accepted by farm credit examiners or examiners of Federal Reserve member banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Land Bank, and certain other lending agencies.

The Third World War: Image in What Mirror?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the constant stream of our own propaganda, which incredulously supports the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. We are told that the cold war will be won in the underdeveloped nations, implying that victory will come soon if we bow, scrape, and politic with them. I think it is absurd to oppose our own tried and true allies who possess the real strength in the cold war, or a hot war. It is idiotic to turn our backs on our NATO alliance to put our faith in governments hastily erected on shifting political sands.

James Burnham, an outstanding writer and an editor of the National Review, sums it all up very clearly. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Burnham's excellent article in the RECORD:

THE THIRD WORLD WAR: IMAGE IN WHAT MIRROR?

(By James Burnham)

By its second vote against Portugal in the U.N. Security Council, the Kennedy administration has shown that its policy on the Angola-Mozambique issue is the result, not of a passing bright idea of one of the White House uncoordinators, but of deliberate decision.

From a strategic perspective, this decision is on its face preposterous. Portugal is our faithful ally and a charter member of NATO, core alliance of the Western World. She has placed her air bases and fine ports at our disposition. She has never played coy about her firm anti-Soviet, anti-Communist convictions. Until the present year's meddling by us, and certain others, her African provinces had been remarkably calm for this day and age.

Among the speedy consequences of our Angola votes and speeches have been the antagonizing of Portugal, France, Belgium, and Britain, and the stimulation of disorders in both Portugal and Portuguese Africa.

Why did the administration do it? What possessed Mr. Kennedy and his associates? One reason is a fundamental fallacy in our official doctrine: that "the main theater of the cold war" is the underdeveloped regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In truth, as the Kremlin strategists understand, the main theater is the earth's most highly developed regions: North America (above the Rio Grande), Western and Eastern Europe (including Russia).

IGNORANCE MULTIPLIED

Reasoning from its fallacy of location, Washington deludes itself with the illusion that the primitive jungles of Africa are more important than the advanced men, ideas, and machines of Europe. The absurdity should be obvious in the question: What will it profit you to gain the whole of Africa, and thereby lose your own Europe?

Second, there is also plain ignorance between the Angolan decision, or an irresponsible disregard of known facts. The Portuguese have been in Angola for 400 years. Before them, there was nothing, historically speaking: no nation, no civilization, nothing but scattered, warring, exceedingly primitive tribes. Ought Angola be liberated? But what is the Angola that can or could be liberated? As a nation, a society, a community, Angola exists only through Portugal. Take Portugal away, and a social chaos is left.

What could be sillier than the efforts of Chester Bowles and Soapy Williams to find some analogy with our own history and liberation? Where are the warring, primitive tribes that our ancestors found in this land? What will be our vote in the U.N. when delegations from the Iroquois and Sioux demand rule over the country we stole from them?

By a further irony, it is the Portuguese—in Africa as in Asia, Latin America and Europe—who have gone further than any other people toward that racial equality and multiracial society which our liberals profess as a controlling ideal. Brazil, which continues to be Portuguese in culture and tradition, is the one great example in history of a major and thriving multiracial nation. Though there are economic and social distinction in Angola, Mozambique, Goa, and Portugal itself, these are not based on race. Hotels, restaurants, schools, vehicles in Angola are integrated; jobs are open to qualified persons of any race—and Negroes do in fact hold high-level posts in both business and government; racial intermarriage is commonplace.

Still more disorienting is Washington's failure to comprehend the origin and aims of the Angola rebellion. With the general ferment in Africa, Angola doubtless could not have avoided troubles. However, the scale and ferocity of the recent actions is the result, not of spontaneous local resentments, but of conscious planning, support, and guidance from without. Thousands of rifles and submachine guns do not grow from jungle trees, nor do jungle medicine men know how to train modern guerrilla units. The planning and support, as I outlined in this column last January, come in part from the Toure-Nkrumah African group, more fundamentally from the Communist enterprise.

The Communists aim, as everywhere in Black Africa, to drive out the Westerners and create a social chaos which their apparatus can take over. But their more important objective relates to the main theater: to disrupt NATO and break the links between the Western allies. This objective is directly abetted by the White House policy.

WORLD ELECTIONEERING

Finally, and perhaps most important in explaining our Angola policy, is the fact that the two Kennedy brothers—Robert's influence should not be minimized—treat issues of international grand strategy in the terms they feel most at home with: those, namely, of electioneering in the modern, Madison Avenue style. They vote on Angola with Khrushchev, Sukarno, and Touré, and against Salazar and de Gaulle, because they wish to slick up the public image of the United States, as the image of a soap or an election candidate is slicked up by the Madison Avenue pros. With its image transformed to that of anticolonialist leader, the United States will win the world election.

The approach is pathetically naive. No revolutionary nationalist will, or can, allow the United States to give him liberation. His status depends on seizing liberation from the imperialists. In a U.N. committee, immediately following the Angola vote, the Ghanese delegate remarked: "And so, you Americans, what are you doing in the Virgin Islands? Your turn will come."

Even if it could be put over, the Kennedy-painted image is worse than useless. In their hearts, the leaders of the uncommitted nations despise us for kowtowing to them. What they really want to know is not whether we are brave enough to scold Portugal, Belgium, and Holland, but whether we can find the courage to stand up to the Kremlin.

If I Must Bear a Tag, I Don't Mind Being a Right Wing Radical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not believe in giving everyone a label, nor to tag those with whom we disagree with some identification meant to be derogatory. The latest attempt to tag a whole group with a single name is the attempt to label those of us who believe in constitutional government and conservative Americanism as "right wing radicals." Personally, I don't mind the label if it identifies me as one who believes in the free enterprise system, in the worth of the individual, and opposed to bureaucracy and ever-increasing Federal controls. An interesting discussion of the designation "Right Wing Radicals" is contained in this editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune."

RIGHTWING RADICALS

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the Arkansas statesman, has become alarmed at what he regards as the preaching of "right wing radicalism" by military officers in information programs. He sent a private memorandum to President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara deploring this alleged excess, but had nothing to say on the subject of left wing radicalism, Communist or other.

The brave helmsmen of the New Frontier, like Senator FULBRIGHT, are appalled by the rightist outlook; they have issued a directive commanding the officers to submit to "policy guidance" in their utterances or in educational programs reaching any part of the public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT thought that extravagant fears were being stirred up about Communist subversion in Government and elsewhere. He wishes his countrymen to forget that Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Lauchin Currie, and the rest of the boloes in the New Deal ever existed.

He also deplored a tendency to attribute international difficulties to softness toward communism, sellouts, appeasement, etc., as if these things bore no relationship to Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, the Communist conquest of China, the Korean war, Laos, and other causes and consequences of policy which occasion little rejoicing.

Then Mr. FULBRIGHT proceeded to the thought that the military were given to "equating social legislation with socialism and the latter with communism," although these things do seem to bear some relationship to one another. Itemizing, Mr. FULBRIGHT said:

"Much of the administration's domestic legislative program, including continuation of the graduated income tax, expansion of social security (particularly medical care under social security), Federal aid to education, etc., would be characterized as steps toward communism.

"This view of foreign menace renders foreign aid, cultural exchanges, disarmament negotiations, and other international programs as extremely wasteful, if not actually subversive."

Somehow Mr. FULBRIGHT did not mention the United Nations, but he did offer enough specifications to suggest that anybody who objects to anything sponsored by the New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier must be a "rightwing radical."

So, unable to persuade them, he proposes to shut them up with a White House gag.

The intolerence of the "liberals" seems to us to be far more pronounced than any expression emanating from the conservative side. First, Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was abused because, in a cold war with communism, he tried to teach his troops something about the nature of the evil they might be called upon to fight. Then disapproval was visited on a film intended to document what everybody knows—that Communists are out to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Now Senator FULBRIGHT quacks his alarm.

Maybe, to be on the safe side, we had better start referring to the Red Chinese as "agrarian reformers," join the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, subscribe to the Worker, and call Khrushchev "good old Nikita." Then we would be safe from Senator FULBRIGHT'S displeasure.

Wake Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am frightened by the world situation—frightened because America is still asleep and not fully awakened to what is really going on in the world.

The Soviet Union has been at war with us even before she became our ally in World War II. This has not been an openly declared war, but a cold, calculating war of deception, secret compacts, infiltration and double dealing, in which we have offered no competition to speak of. Such a war we are losing, and will continue to lose it, unless we place this country on a war footing. By that I mean not necessarily that we shall undertake a shooting war, but that we should be prepared to meet the kind of war which is being waged now, a limited war, or a nuclear total war.

This kind of mobilization of our total resources should come at once. There is no time to lose. The trouble with us is that there is always too much talk, too much delay from the proposal stage to the actual fulfillment of our plans—years sometimes go by on the most urgent projects. In the past, under our democratic system, such delays have not been fatal, but we are living in a swift-moving world today and have no time to lose. Instead of thinking in terms of years, we must now think in terms of weeks, days, even minutes.

We will never catch up with the forces of international communism at the rate we are going. Unless we mobilize and guard every measure of our security, we shall always be at a tremendous disadvantage against an enemy with single-minded purpose, where one man can push the button aimed at burying us.

Is it wise to put everything we do in a showcase for the world to see? The Communists know what we hope to do within the next 10 years. Do we know what they are going to do within the same period? We do not: We only know about things that have already happened. This places us at a tremendous disadvantage in a war of missiles and propaganda where the element of surprise counts the most.

And let us not delude ourselves that we can win this kind of war by pouring money all over the world. We would only bankrupt ourselves without getting the proper results. Thus, we would be playing right into the hands of the Russians. Nor is this what the underdeveloped and neglected peoples of the world want. What they desire is an end to their exploitation by strong governments and international cartels, which have robbed them of their natural resources by unfair dealings with traitors of their own countries who have had little or no regard for the sweltering and impoverished masses. What these peoples really want is not so much a handout but a recognition that they are human beings—equal to us in the eyes of God—and as such should be helped and not retarded in the development of their own natural resources.

The Russians have understood this and have won friends all over the world not so much by helping the peoples involved but by bringing home to them by skillful propaganda how they have been exploited by the Western Powers.

Yes, American and the free world are still not cognizant of the extent of this tremendous international Communist conspiracy and we are losing the battle on every front.

Regarding Berlin, I am convinced that we ought to stand firm. I am equally convinced that the Russians would not risk a war over it. Why should they? They are doing perfectly well by sticking to the philosophy of Lenin that "socialism—or communism—and peace are inseparable." Their strategy will continue to be to keep the world in a state of constant tension, on bankrupting the capitalist system, while it tries in vain to stop an ideological world revolution, the true significance of which the free world has not yet grasped. The U.S.S.R., which has sparked this revolution, has no real desire of improving the lot of man in the world, but it will continue to profit by this revolution because of a picture which has been painted depicting us as a sleeping giant which grew big and fat by taking advantage of little peoples throughout the world.

It is the picture of the ugly American, the ugly Englishman, and the ugly Frenchman that we must change and, I am sorry to say, we cannot do this with money alone.

Let me conclude, therefore, on what I think we must do:

First, let us tell the whole story to the American people and to our allies, let them understand that we are at war with a dangerous enemy which could destroy us, and that we must mobilize all our strength as though we were actually at war.

Second, streamline every agency of Government so that it functions in the most efficient manner with the best talent, without waste, and with necessary national goals to be attained for our own security and survival.

Third, having attained the strength which I know we can attain if we are all of one mind, then we should sit down and have a real talk with the Russians, and with strength, push agreements on all fronts—not just on Berlin, Laos, or Cuba—but let us seek the initiative and define our position in areas not yet mentioned. Then and only then will we be successful for the Russians will understand that we are talking from a position of strength and not just words.

Finally, we should seek international cooperation with the U.S.S.R. in the exploration of outer space for here is a field that provides hope for all mankind on earth. Together we can achieve travel through space and exploration and settlement of new planets without bankrupting the earth's resources, thus creating a better life for all peoples of the world and making war between nations unnecessary.

In the hope that we can, in our time, accomplish these things, I support a strong stand regarding Berlin as a step in the right direction, but please bear in mind, it is only a step—our goals are still far away.

Financing Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of all that has been written or said about Federal aid to education, I think the attached article by Raymond Moley, published in the Tax Review of July, is worthy of serious consideration:

FINANCING OUR SCHOOLS
(By Raymond Moley)

This year marks the eighth time that the U.S. Senate has approved a President's recommendation for general Federal aid to the public schools. But in all previous occasions those proposals have failed to become law. The measure is now before the House, which has frequently been a fatal stumbling block to school aid legislation. But whatever the outcome of the current debate, the drive for Federal aid of the kind proposed is rooted not in financial considerations nor educational policy. It is rooted and nourished in politics.

1. The plan proposed for Federal aid rejects or omits the difficult and harder-to-sell methods of encouraging States and local communities to solve their educational problems by ingenious devices to regain some of the tax sources preempted by the Federal Government or by revising State and local systems of taxation. It takes refuge in the well-tenanted confines of the Federal Treasury and relies upon the quick but illusory proposition that the Federal income tax is inexhaustible.

2. The proposal includes States which may need aid along with those which certainly do not need aid. Thus it is a measure to snare votes from the rich States—which are also more populous—to pass it in the House. There could be a harder word to describe this sort of reward for votes.

3. The pressure for Federal aid comes not from the people who are responsible for our

schools in the States and the thousands of local communities, nor from the parents directly affected, but from organized pressure groups and lobbies. These groups are in close collaboration with that part of the Federal bureaucracy which stands to gain greater power and prestige.

4. Because the sponsors of the plan reject aid to private schools not on the basis of any claim that they do not need help more than the public schools, not because they are not educating American children, but because so many voters are against any recognition of the religious bodies which are supporting such schools.

5. Because this issue is so attractive a vote-bait, or rather a bait for organized groups in Presidential elections.

6. Because as the alleged need becomes less, the pressure grows. It is a characteristic of political behavior that as a crisis fades, the efforts to give it importance increase.

7. The press and congressional leaders have gotten into the habit of measuring a President's achievement by a sort of box score. So many recommendations, against so many bills passed. So many times at bat, divided into the hits. There have been Presidents—great Presidents—who have been evaluated by something more than such a sporting chance.

STATES DO GOOD JOB

In a magnificent and truly spectacular manner, the States themselves have provided for public education in the past decades. Thousands of local communities have regarded the eduaction of their children as an end worthy of any sacrifice. They have been raising their taxes year by year to hire more teachers, to pay those teachers more, and to build for their children the best schools in the world. It is a reprehensible smear upon those devoted people to say—as so many are saying—that we have an educational slum with miserable teachers, untrained, undernourished and incompetent, and that States and localities lack the capacity to meet legitimate needs.

Between 1929–30 and 1960–61 public school enrollment has risen 45 percent, public school expenditures have risen 611 percent. Even allowing for a shrinkage in the value of the dollar by half, the record is still amazing. School revenues are now about $16 billion.

In the 7 years from 1945–46 to 1953–54 revenues available for schools rose $527 million annually. From 1953–54 through 1960–61 they have risen at $954 million annually. In the past 2 years, the amount has exceeded a billion. At that rate our schools can be supported in the decade ahead at a rate which will reach the $24 to $30 billion a year estimated to be needed by 1970.

DESCRIBED AS "TOKENISM"

The Federal aid plan, as amended in the Senate, would provide $850 million a year. This would leave the States and local communities with from 95 to 97 percent of the burden. It is strange indeed to assume that if the States are assumed to be able to raise that amount, that they cannot raise the additional 3 to 5 percent. They too will benefit revenuewise from the growth and expansion in the economy so ardently and eloquently promised by the present administration. In short the present plan is what I would call tokenism. Not a real assumption of the burden of the schools but a means of setting a precedent and establishing the principle that the Federal Government has a responsibility for the Nation's public schools.

Nevertheless, despite the fine record of the States and local communities in meeting their responsibilities, they are—like all of us—human enough to spare their taxpayers as much as they can. Hence the prospect of Federal aid has already tended to lessen their concern about meeting those responsibilities. It may well appear that, if this present plan goes into effect, the schools will be losing as much in State and local support as they will get from Federal largesse.

In fact the bill before the House seeks in a very clumsy way to prevent the States from lessening their contributions to education. It is required in section 106 in the bill that States cannot reduce their State and local expenditures for education; and, in fact they must keep up their full allotment. This they must do whether they need the money or not.

Since the end of the Second World War, State and local revenues have more than tripled while Federal revenues have less than doubled. State and local governments could increase their income at an even faster rate if the Federal Government would stop raiding their tax sources. The best way to help the States would be to reduce Federal expenditures and give the States more of a chance to breathe.

The most unimaginative of all methods of taxation is to load more on the Federal income tax. And perhaps since further Federal spending can be met only by borrowing, it is the easiest for politicians to use without meeting the indignation of taxpayers.

It is the Federal income tax—not the property tax—which has really reached its limit of return. It is already the highest in the world.

There are alternative ways of providing money for the States and local communities other than Federal grants. When a bill for Federal aid for schools was before Congress 12 years ago, the amount proposed annually was $300 million. At that time the amusement tax netted the Federal Government $450 million. It would have been very simple to turn that tax back to the States and let them use it—if they would—for school support.

ALTERNATIVES REJECTED

In the debate in the Senate this year, various suggestions were made of that sort, including a proposal to turn back 2 cents on every cigarette package. All such proposals were vigorously voted down. This was further proof that the majority was less interested in helping States support their own schools than in getting the Federal foot in the school doors of the Nation.

With reference to teachers' salaries and teacher supply, the statistics are irregular, conflicting, and confusing. The U.S. Office of Education in 1953 stated that there was a shortage of 72,000 teachers. In 1959 it said the shortage was 195,000. This brought down severe criticism and so the Office of Education omitted any guess at all in 1960. If the alleged shortage is determined by the ratio of pupils and teachers, it would seem to be its ideal to reduce schools to the Hopkins idea of a teacher for every pupil. But over the past 30 years the number of employees in public education (higher and lower) has increased 140 percent. Enrollment increased 45 percent. Between 1953–54 and 1960–61 the number of the instructional staff in the public schools has increased 39 percent. Pupil enrollment has increased 29 percent.

President Kennedy in his message deplored the dreadful number of uncertified teachers. But these have declined sharply in 10 years despite the fact that the standards of certification have been sharply raised.

The earnings of teachers have risen in 30 years from an average of $1,400 to $5,013. In constant dollars their earnings have increased 26 percent, or faster than all other persons working for wages and salaries. They have risen faster than those of Federal employees. In constant dollars their pay has increased in 10 years 40 percent.

Let us face a hard fact, however. The real trouble with teachers' salaries is the increasingly rigid salary schedules which are geared to college credit units and length of service rather than individual merit and performance. This deters many gifted students from entering teaching and it attracts many of lower capacities. We shall never be able to pay all teachers what good teachers are worth. Indeed, a really gifted teacher is not working for pay. She is teaching because she loves to teach. And never by any financial outlay can we get enough of the very best. They don't exist.

Finally I come to the issue of Federal control and the good faith of the sponsors and of Congress who have solemnly promised that there will be no Federal control.

CONTROL IN DOUBT

While there has been a tremendous effort to establish historical precedents for Federal interest in public education, the issue of the control of the schools, and what should be taught therein, seems to be settled by the language of the various Federal aid bills before Congress in the past 12 years. That at least is an acknowledgment of the principle of State and local control as an established national policy.

The sincerity of the pledge in the present bill I have already commented upon. Because in section 106 there is the compulsion on the States to maintain and increase in proportion to the Federal contribution the money spent in the States.

Many educators who have labored diligently for Federal aid argue that the control of education should pass from the local boards to the experts. For example, Dean McSwain of the School of Education of Northwestern University stated that "we have followed all too long the idea that the schools belong to the people. They do not." He added: "The boards of education have no right to tell us what to do as to the content of curriculums or method of instruction."

We also have the testimony of former Commissioner of Education Brownell, who said: "If Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control."

There is also the succinct statement of Max Lerner writing in the NEA Journal: "The choice before us is not a choice between the control of education by local officials and National Government officials; that is not the choice, and don't let anyone tell you that it is. The choice is between control by people who have not given their lives to education and control by those who have given their lives to education."

It is a strange contradiction that the Federal establishments should be responsible for the money exacted from taxpayers and at the same time that it should distribute money over which it has no control.

MORE THAN MONEY

Federal aid to education is not an issue that is capable of resolution by a calculation of dollars and cents and the alternative means of getting those dollars for promotion of a public service. It is not on a par at all with sharing the cost of interstate highways, or of rebuilding our cities, or of the relative ownership of mineral resources which mark our boundaries, or of the use and management of the waters that flow from State to State.

It is a matter that cannot be determined by the researches of task forces, or White House conferences, or of intergovernmental commissions. Nor can it be resolved by the capricious moving in Congress from one side to another. It is not a matter which should be at the caprice of parliamentary maneuver.

The issue is the means by which the minds and consciences of the generations can be enlightened and strengthened through what we call education. There are two concepts

as to how that should be done. The one is by the imposition upon our educational system of a great uniformity by a self-constituted elite, far removed from those who receive that education, from those who pay for it, and from those who under the laws of nature and of nature's God, bear the heavy responsibility for the welfare of the Nation's children. An elite which talks about efficiency and which is dedicated to social rather than individual perfection. An elite which would use the powerful instrument of a national ministry to enforce and apply its concepts.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY BEST

The other is the authority and responsibility of those directly interested. An authority which, because of the vast size of the Nation, exists in many forms and degrees of method and purpose. But a decentralized authority which permits the widest variety of experimentation and of ingenuity. It is out of this diversity that genuinely new and enlightened ideas are born and find their way by imitation and borrowing. This is the way of free institutions in which those who bear the responsibility learn by trial and error. It is better that a local school board, or a supervisory official, or a teacher may make honest mistakes and rue them, and correct them—than to be the creature, the mere agent, of a vast bureaucracy.

The issue before us is no more nor less than that. Whatever may be the mathematical count of a congressional majority, this issue will remain alive. For as Edmund Burke said: "The government of human beings is something more than a problem in arithmetic." Those who believe as I do may lose this battle; and the outcome of the war for freedom of local authority may well rest with generations to come. But we in this time and in this room will be judged by that result.

Domestic Spending Must Be Cut Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, every citizen believes, I am sure, that we spend whatever is necessary to maintain a strong and ready defense. The factor evidently overlooked by the administration is that there is a limit to the amount the people can be taxed and in order to have the funds necessary for arms and ammunition, we must cut back on domestic spending. It just doesn't make sense to think that we can continue to increase welfare and spending programs at the same time we are preparing to pour billions into strengthening our military. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune clearly indicates to what lengths of administration and some congressional leaders are prepared to go in continuing the buildup for domestic spending. I would like to call your attention also to an editorial from the Wall Street Journal concerning a mere $100 million additional authorization as a part of the agriculture conservation program. There are areas where we can cut spending without endangering our military buildup and I warn you, we had better start cutting:

HOLD YOUR WALLETS, HERE WE GO

The extravagance of Congress has gone beyond the bounds of reason, let alone justification. The panicky reaction to the word "crisis" has loosed a barrage of appropriations in hope, perhaps, that a few dollar bills will flutter down where they will be useful.

Look at what happened in a few hours on Tuesday:

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a $46.8 billion defense bill which included $753 million for long-range bombers the White House didn't even request.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee approved, by a landslide vote, the administration's long-term foreign aid program, which Senator BYRD says will ultimately cost $40 billion.

On the Senate floor the crisis was fought by resisting efforts to trim a $5.1 billion appropriation for welfare and labor programs.

This $5.1 billion hasn't the remotest connection with Berlin, but is nevertheless $297 million more than the administration asked for. The Senators who wanted to trim it had the unexpected support of Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, but even so they failed.

The fear in Washington no longer seems to be that Mr. Kennedy will spend too much, but rather that he will spend too little. The fiscal year 1962 is barely a month old and already the anticipated spending for the year amounts to a peacetime record of $88.5 billion. This is $7.6 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower's budget estimate in January, and herein lies another record. Never has actual spending run this far ahead of the budget—and there is still 11 months to go.

Instead of the small surplus expected in the Eisenhower budget, we now face an expected deficit of at least $6 billion.

After his inauguration, Mr. Kennedy succeeded in bolstering confidence in the dollar by proclaiming his belief in fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. Does he still believe in these things? If so, will he veto any of this spending? We doubt it because, for the most part, it carries out the domestic spending program to which he committed himself when he was not thinking of confidence in the dollar.

The administration and Congress must share the blame for rushing faster toward a deficit than any preceding administration and for a flagrant disregard of the budget. Until there is an end to this uncontrolled mania for spending, there will be little rest for the taxpayer and little hope for sound money or a sound economy.

BUYING BLANKS

Roughly half of President Kennedy's newly requested defense funds would go for plain old arms, equipment and ammunition. And the taxpayers are told they may have to dig deeper to pay for this military buildup.

Well, we are sure the military would like more bullets, and we know where the administration can find at least $100 million for them without new taxes.

Thanks to the lobbying of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., the taxpayers next year will spend $250 million, rather than a proposed $150 million, for the agricultural conservation program. Under this hangover of New Deal days, farmers are paid by the Government for adding lime to their soil to increase its productivity. A senseless subsidy any time, this is a plainly incredible one when farm surpluses are staggering and the Government confesses itself hard-pressed to meet urgent security needs.

In the fantastic bulk of Federal spending, $100 million is a relative trifle. But such trifles are multiplied many times over; each takes the sweat of thousands of taxpayers. And each $100 million of senseless spending would buy an awful lot of ammunition.

Congressman Lane Addresses Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of my remarks made as the principal speaker at the annual outing of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America, held at the Outdoor Amphitheater at Salem Willows, Mass., on Sunday, August 6, 1961. This outing which is conducted yearly, is well attended by the members and friends of this national old age pension group and has had as its president, Mr. Charles C. O'Donnell of Lynn, Mass., for the past 34 years.

Mr. O'Donnell during his entire life has been most active in his efforts in behalf of the elderly people, not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but throughout the entire United States. He is a very frequent spokesman on this subject matter before the Massachusetts Legislature, and over the years has appeared here in Washington to testify before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

It was my happy privilege on this occasion to extend the well wishes of those present to President Charles C. O'Donnell on the celebration of his 71st birthday.

The remarks follow:

Greetings, it is always a pleasure to meet the members of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America.

Your organized efforts in behalf of social security for the aged has been a strong influence for good in promoting improvements of the program year by year.

Earlier in 1961, 86 million persons, young and old, were insured under the Social Security Act. Of all persons aged 65 or over, nearly 3 out of 4 were receiving monthly benefits, or were eligible to receive them when they or their spouses retire.

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits were being paid to almost 15 million beneficiaries, at a monthly rate of almost $1 billion.

In Massachusetts alone, under the old-age provisions of the act, 293,000 persons were receiving a total of more than $22 million in monthly checks.

Then, on June 30 of this year, the President signed the Social Security Amendments of 1961.

This bill, inspired by the determination of Congress to further improve the program, raises the benefits in some categories, and makes additional persons eligible for social insurance.

Furthermore, it lifts the ceiling on wages that a person can earn without forfeiting his monthly benefits.

Men are now eligible, as women have been, to retire at the earlier age of 62 with reduced benefits if they choose to do so. About 560,000 men are expected to take advantage of this option in its first year.

Minimum benefits for those retiring at 65, are raised from $33 to $40. This is expected to help more than 2 million persons.

Benefits for aged widows, widowers, and parents, are increased by 10 percent. This will come to the aid of 1½ million individuals.

Eligibility requirements were liberalized so that persons who have been under social security coverage for one-quarter of every year since 1950, or since reaching the age of 21, will be entitled to benefits when they retire.

Fifteen million dollars was appropriated for the period from October 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962, and to be distributed to the States for the public assistance program; $456,000 of this will come to Massachusetts.

The expansion of the social security system will go into effect soon, in line with the tradition of Congress to make periodic improvements that will extend and increase benefits.

The Federal Government is doing much for its older people, but we must not overlook the fine work that is being done by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

About a year and a half ago, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aging, said: "Massachusetts may well be proud of its public assistance program for its aged. Massachusetts has also set a fine example for the rest of the Nation with its State housing program for the elderly."

While the proportion of persons receiving old-age assistance in our State was clase to the national average, a very large number of them were also receiving social security benefits, so that Massachusetts ranked second among all the States in this respect.

The old-age assistance program in Massachusetts currently pays an average grant of $100 a month, the third highest in the country. Persons qualified under this program are covered for medical and hospital care.

In the city of Boston, almost one third of the annual expenditures for old age assistance is for medical care. In the year 1959 this amounted to $30 million.

While older people appreciate this help they would much prefer a new health insurance program that would provide this care as a right and not a charity. The Congress is working on this major and complex issue. It is probable that after all the studies have been completed, and all the pros and cons have been aired, Congress will legislate a health insurance program for the aged in 1962.

In Massachusetts there are over 150 senior citizens groups with a total of about 15,000 members. Most of these groups are local organizations without financial assistance or any aid in their programs. Less than half of the groups have professional services to help them and less than half have any facilities for art and craft work. Two unusual programs for the use of leisure time in the commonwealth should be mentioned. Through the efforts of the State council for the aging, a sale was held in the State House last year, of handicraft produced by older citizens. The second has to do with opportunities for travel for older citizens by instituting a nonprofit travel organization, enabling those of 50 years of age and older to take a variety of trips at reduced rates.

I can't help but think what greater progress could be made, if more of these local groups joined up with the senior citizens and associates of America, under the leadership of your president—Charlie O'Donnell.

Charlie was the first to organize the elderly in this State. Due to his efforts, the legislature was constantly reminded of its obligations. As a result, Massachusetts has become the pioneer in legislation beneficial to the aged, and for this your president must be given a great deal of credit.

He knew that the aged must organize as a group, and through the right of petition, make certain that benefits would not only keep pace with the rising cost of living, but—of more importance—keep up with improvements in the overall standard of living.

For 34 years he has served as president of the Senior Citizens and Associates of America—battling all the way for your welfare.

A few days ago, he privately observed his 71st birthday.

On the occasion of your annual outing, you have the opportunity of making it a public celebration. Give him the greatest birthday gift of all—the heartfelt gratitude and friendly sentiment of all present—expressed by a resounding ovation for your honored leader, Charlie O'Donnell.

The Inter-American Economic Conference at Punta del Este Represents a Significant Effort To Outline a 10-Year Program for Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the important meeting of the Inter-American Economic Conference at Punta del Este demonstrates that we have reached, in the words of President Kennedy:

A historic turning point in the life of the Western Hemisphere.

Douglas Dillon outlined before the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference of Finance Ministers plans for the alliance for progress which add up to a $20 billion program of public and private investment in Latin America by nations of the non-Communist world, half of which would come from the United States.

Long-term loans of up to 50 years "at very low or zero rates of interest" are a central feature of the plan.

Mr. Dillon warned Latin America's wealthy landlords they would have to sacrifice many of their traditional privileges if the plan is to succeed. He also called for honest tax structures, surrender of vast landholding rights and other accommodations to the 20th century.

I include here a statement issued in connection with some preliminary findings of a study on Latin America now in progress at the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania:

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE: OPPORTUNITIES AND PITFALLS

(Statement submitted by Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.)

In view of the importance being attached to the Inter-American Economic Conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, the Foreign Policy Research Institute has decided to publish some preliminary findings of a study on Latin America now in progress at the institute. Copies of this brief report will be sent to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and officials of the Departments of State and the Treasury.

Using the methods and materials developed in writing the two recent institute books, "Protracted Conflict" and "A Forward Strategy for America" (Harper & Bros., 1959 and 1961), the institute is currently making a strategic and tactical analysis of the situation in Latin America. This study will attempt to provide a comprehensive and integrating perspective of political, socioeconomic, psychological, and strategic factors now operative in Latin America with a view to devising policies to cope with the challenges confronting the United States in that part of the Western Hemisphere. This brief report also draws upon the advice and opinions of Latin Americans from many countries with whom the institute has established contact for the purpose of this study.

The Inter-American Economic Conference at Punta del Este represents a significant effort to outline a 10-year program for Latin American economic and social development backed by the vast resources of the United States. This important meeting will demonstate dramatically that we have reached, in the words of President Kennedy, a historic turning point in the life of the Western Hemisphere and are ready to discuss realistically the economic problems confronting the Americas. But it is equally important to bear in mind that no one international conference, however successful its deliberations might be, can lead quickly to drastic economic changes in the lives of scores of millions of people. There are some indications that the Punta del Este Conference has already been oversold to the Latin Americans. Popular expectations have been raised so high that the Conference is saddled with an unfair burden. Many are bound to be disappointed in the results because they are unable to appreciate the gradual pace at which solidly founded economic growth must occur. Moreover, elements are not lacking which will, through negativist propaganda, seek to aggravate existing frustrations and heap ridicule upon any responsible plans which are advanced to allevate the real needs of the Latin Americans. The United States, therefore, should brace itself psychologically for a certain amount of unavoidable backlash and take prudent steps to minimize its harmful effects.

II

Up until now those who have expounded upon the Allianza para Progresso have focused attention almost exclusively upon government-to-government aid. Certainly this type of assistance, at least in the amounts currently being discussed ($500 million) and perhaps an even greater amount, is essential to get the job underway. But government-to-government aid represents only a fraction of the total panorama of possibilities, and a minor fraction at that. The tremendous amount of capital involved is not understood except in the most informed circules. Responsible United States and Latin American economic experts estimate, for example, that for steel and electric power alone, the area needs an amount of capital investment far greater than the entire Marshall plan. When other priorities are considered the total sum is completely beyond the willingness of the United States or any government to supply. The major portion of this development capital must come from nongovernmental sources both inside and outside Latin America. In a hemisphere where governments have at their disposal a small fraction of the total available current production, the predominant role which must be played by private economic activity in expansion of trade and the processes of overall growth should require no elaboration. There is a corollary to this attraction of large amounts of new private capital investment. It is incumbent upon the foreign enterprises already operating in Latin America to pursue policies which will make them fully acceptable in the society where they are operating.

III

The architects of the alliance for progress therefore need not draft their plan as if the U.S. Government must face the task of development alone. Few will question the necessity of governmental capital outlays for those projects which are prerequisite for

helping economic activity but which do not attract capital from private markets. Yet, in the long run the role of government should not be conceived as replacing or precluding private development investment. Rather governments should chart their political course and tailor their development projects with a view toward creating an economic climate in which investment and trade can be accelerated and the standard of living of all peoples can be raised. One way of accomplishing this is for the government concerned to supply not only primary investment capital but also guarantee capital in forms which can have substantial multiplier effects. The generation of psychological confidence is the foundation of sustained economic growth. The United States would do well to make at least a portion of its aid funds inspire the acceptance of a feasible system of private investment, ownership, and other financial guarantees by the governments of recipient countries.

IV

Economic guarantees alone are not sufficient. Political guarantees are also necessary. In fact, businessmen are turned from investment less by the risk of economic loss, a factor which they are capable of calculating, than by the risk of political loss, which cannot be predicted. The current reluctance on the part of U.S. venture capital to move to Latin America can be attributed almost entirely to fear of subsequent expropriation prompted by Castro's success in taking over foreign assets in Cuba.

V

The United States should seek to devise unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral approaches toward creating economic and political conditions which will contribute to an improved climate of commercial partnership between North and South America. Investors ought to be insured against Government-induced exchange obstacles, and confiscatory policies. Both through diplomatic channels and through less formal communications among public officials, economists, and businessmen, much can be done to foster wholesome cooperation between governments and private enterprise. Whatever treaties and other agreements are executed will be rendered less vulnerable to propaganda attack if our own information programs make clear that such arrangements are essential preconditions to a speedup in development.

VI

The United States, in furnishing unilateral guarantees, should not place U.S. businessmen at an unfair competitive advantage over their Latin American counterparts. In order to best focus capital from many sources policy should aim at promoting throughout the hemisphere a nearly symmetrical pattern of guarantees for all private capital. Protection cover probably should not extend to the full value of investment. Perhaps the optimum figure would be in the neighborhood of 75 percent. Furthermore, these "insurance policies" should be designed primarily to stimulate new or expanded capital investment in Latin America, not to attach retroactive guarantees to previous investments which have already brought a profitable return. Recent investments which have not yet paid for themselves might be included in this scheme.

VII

There is one area of investment which will deserve special emphasis during the next decade. Housing, more than land reform is the most pressing problem confronting the mass of the people in Latin America. Furthermore, it is a problem which can be solved without arousing the kind of political opposition from landowners which so often delays social progress.

A large-scale housing program would have several advantages. It would bring genuine social gains which could be felt by the people, and hence it would diminish the attractiveness of radical socioeconomic solutions. Housing, too, is a unique sector of the economy where the satisfaction of consumer desires and the stimulation of productive growth meet. Housing programs create not only jobs and purchasing power but whole new industries. Forest products, metals, plastics, factories for the production of prefabs, furniture, electrical powerplants, appliances, and many other lines of production are greatly stimulated by the building of homes in large numbers. Housing is politically attractive to all government sectors involved—local, regional, and national. Finally, housing programs by making human existence more attractive for large numbers of people provides an incentive to construct stable political communities in which freedom and legal rights are respected. Both governmental and private capital programs should be directed toward the building of small homes for individual owners or cooperative units in which each family could purchase its own apartment.

VIII

The area of housing is crucial, but this does not suggest that by itself it is a panacea. Housing programs must always be integrated with parallel programs of fiscal improvement, expansion of educational facilities, industrial development, administrative efficiency, and social modernization. These have been adequately considered in various expositions of the alliance for progress.

IX

In outlining the future economic program of Latin America, we should think in terms much broader than the confines of the Western Hemisphere. It should not be forgotten that the whole economic future of Latin America, as indeed that of the United States, is intimately linked with the growing vitality of the Atlantic Community. Thriving trade, productive expansion, and the harmonization of international development plans and other foreign economic policies among the member countries are the objectives of the newly formed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. By widening the membership of the OECD (the countries of Western Europe, Canada, and the United States) this Organization could constitute a major factor in the improvement of Latin America's economic position during the next quarter century. The United States should begin now to think of sponsoring some of the more industrial advanced Latin American countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Chile, and Mexico for membership in OECD. In this way Latin American views could be represented directly in the formulation of economic policy recommendations within the entire Atlantic Community of which Latin America is not only economically, but culturally and politically, a part.

X

Analyses of the Latin American situation frequently contain the misconception that the area is one in which virtually no responsible middle class leadership exists. This view sees a mass of poverty-stricken Latin Americans leading a hopeless life while a handful of incredibly wealthy and predatory families rule the nation. Such a picture distorts reality, weakens faith in evolutionary change, and increases the attraction of violent social solutions. Poverty is a problem and one which cannot be ignored. Yet, a balanced view of Latin America today cannot overlook the large and growing middle class which has exerted and is exerting positive leadership. From this group there is emerging a substantial group of young men and women who are as socially responsible as their counterparts in any country in the free world. Devoted to the system of private initiative which has contributed so much to the development of the United States, they see that the future of their area is social responsibility and economic growth. While spending an impressive amount of time and energy in halting the spread of communism in the hemisphere, they are also making every effort to bring their nations into full social maturity. The alliance for progress can only be effected in close and continuing cooperation with this democratic leadership.

The Inter-American Economic Conference will be a success if from it emerges the foundations of a development plan which takes full account of the realities. Such a plan will not raise false hopes founded on vast quantities of government aid which will not be forthcoming. It will, instead, look to a dynamic partnership between government and private groups in all countries which will produce, in the coming decade, a flourishing new world of economic, political, social, and spiritual opportunity.

The Department of State and Repatriation of Palestinian Refugees in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been bandied about that the House Committee on Appropriations has been pressuring the present administration to demand repatriation of a very substantial number of the million Palestinian refugees in Israel. As a member of that committee and as a supporter of the State of Israel since before its independence I did not believe this to be so and have been fearful of the consequences upon the economy and security of the State of Israel of repatriation of too many Arab refugees in Israel.

Accordingly, on July 14 last I addressed the following communication to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

JULY 14, 1961.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As one who has supported the foreign aid program during my years of service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I write to offer some comment on our proposed aid program in the Middle East; specifically our aid to Israel and our contribution to the UNRWA for the Arab refugees.

First, I note that the current legislation makes no provision for grant assistance to Israel. I have voted for grant aid to Israel since it was first authorized in 1951 because I believed it was essential to help that country absorb the Jewish refugees who were settled there after World War II. Most Congressmen favored aid to Israel, and her remarkable progress has vindicated our judgment, demonstrating that foreign aid can be effectively used when the Government and the people are ready and able to help themselves.

Now I see that it is proposed to terminate the grant to Israel, presumably because she has progressed to the point where she is in a position to finance her development by borrowing. But Israel is still a long way from economic balance and will continue to need external assistance for some years to

come, particularly when German reparations come to an end in 1963.

It is possible that Israel might have balanced her economy by this time if she had been permitted to live normally. But Israel is a besieged state. She is surrounded by hostile countries, some of whom—the United Arab Republic and Iraq—have been receiving weapons from the Soviet Union and some of whom—Jordan and Saudi Arabia—have been receiving military aid from the United States.

I have never been able to understand why our Government did not grant military aid to Israel—especially since we have not hesitated to provide military assistance to countries which have been at war with her. Any other country menaced by Soviet weapons has been granted our military aid, without question and without delay. And many of these countries have not shared Israel's dedication to freedom and her commitment to contribute to the defense of the free world.

As a consequence of our attitude, lacking military air and denied membership in any collective security system, Israel has been compelled to buy weapons from European countries and to divert a large part of her resources to defense. On top of this, Israel's economy has been further burdened because of the Arab boycott and blockade which has continued largely because it has not been effectively challenged by Western governments and the United Nations.

I am aware that our grants and loans have decisively helped Israel to surmount these economic obstacles and to overcome the handicaps she has suffered because of her heavy defense requirements. But now that grant aid to Israel is coming to an end, I am most concerned about the administration's future plans. I would like to inquire whether the administration intends to allow Israel to borrow adequate funds in the form of development loans under the new program. It seems to me that the very least we can do is to maintain our loans and surplus food shipments to Israel at a high level, so that she may continue to cope with the problems that confront a country which lives in a state of intolerable siege. I feel certain that many Members of the House share my views in this regard.

It is a source of great disappointment that the Arab refugee problem remains unsolved and that we must continue to appropriate funds annually for the UNRWA without any visible or tangible progress toward a solution.

But I would like to make it clear, Mr. Secretary, that, however much we may regret this expenditure, this is one item in the foreign aid appropriations which will continue to have my support and I think the support of Congress as a whole. It is a necessary and humanitarian measure. And it is not a heavy price to pay for stability.

This does not mean to say we are satisfied to let conditions remain as they are. Obviously we are not. All of us would like to see some constructive action. I would like to put my views on record because, judging from reports in the press, I am afraid that the administration may be moving in the wrong direction.

It has been reported that the administration is pressing Israel to repatriate Arab refugees because of pressure from the Committee on Appropriations. The Arab press has said that the administration is proposing that Israel take back as many as 250,000.

I am mystified by these reports because I do not believe that Members of Congress would hold up this appropriation in order to stampede the administration into undertaking an initiative that could prove to be both impractical and unjust.

Most people who have given thought to the problem are agreed that the large majority of the Arab refugees should be resettled in Arab countries. Of course, Israel should pay compensation for the property of those who do not return. Conceivably, Israel may be expected to repatriate some refugees to reunite families. But I do not see how anyone could expect Israel to repatriate any substantial number in advance of a peace settlement. The United Nations resolution of 1948, which is always cited in this connection, clearly intended that repatriation should come in the context of peace negotiations. And as long as Arab leaders refuse to negotiate with Israel, and persist in the threat of war, it is most unlikely that Israel would open its doors to potential enemies.

Father Vincent Kearney, associate editor of America, national Catholic weekly, wrote in that publication on April 9, 1960:

"Nor is it reasonable to expect Israel to commit national suicide by opening her borders to a million potential enemies—the displaced Palestine refugees. Israel still protests it is ready to negotiate a settlement. We cannot know what Israel will propose, unless the opportunity is given it to meet Arab leaders face to face."

Under these circumstances, I find it hard to credit newspaper reports that the administration intends to press Israel to take the initiative by offering to repatriate all who want to return. If these reports are accurate, then it seems to me that we are raising false hopes in the minds of the Arab refugees. The published texts of the President's message to the Arab leaders speak of "repatriation or compensation," but do not mention the word resettlement, so far as I can discover. It is wrong to foster the illusion in the minds of the Arab refugees that we really believe that the primary and initial burden rests on Israel and that we are indifferent to her security and survival. We should be clear on this issue and leave no doubt in the minds of the Arabs that we advocate resettlement as the logical solution.

Let me emphasize that members of the House Appropriations Committee would like to see this problem solved as quickly as possible. But it is precisely because we do want to see this issue solved, equitably and swiftly, that it is wrong to encourage the Arabs to believe that we intend to force Israel to repatriate them. If we persist in this line, the Arabs will never be willing to accept any resettlement. This would prove a disservice to the best interests of the refugees themselves and would make it necessary for us to continue the UNRWA appropriations indefinitely—a burden we have no right to impose on our taxpayers without the promise of progress.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN J. ROONEY.

The following is Secretary Rusk's reply:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, July 21, 1961.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: Thank you for the thoughtful comments, conveyed in your letter of July 14, concerning our aid programs in the Middle East. I appreciate very much having your views which in most respects parallel our own.

As you know the ultimate terms of foreign assistance legislation for fiscal year 1962 or the character of assistance to any specific country are not possible of definition at this time. As far as aid to Israel is concerned, we share your view that there should be no radical modification or reduction in programs previously carried out in that country. Such consideration as has been required has centered on how the Israel program can properly be fitted in to the general foreign aid framework which we are proposing. As in previous years, one question is whether the small grant aid component in the Israel program should not be shifted to the loan category under the new Aid for International Development program. Israel has an annual growth rate of 8 percent, a per capita income of something more than $1,000 per annum, and an ability to administer a technical assistance program of its own for the benefit of a number of other countries. These favorable and welcome developments, juxtaposed with the foreign aid criteria now before the Congress, support the view that while assistance to Israel should continue at present levels it may readily be on the basis of loans and surplus commodities rather than grants. What precise programs should be undertaken, and what agencies should extend the assistance, are matters still to be finally determined. I should like to assure you, however, that this administration has no intention of reducing the volume.

To turn to the question of the UNRWA appropriation, I am most grateful for your expression of support in the difficult question of how to diminish the substantial economic burden on this Government and at the same time meet adequately the humanitarian problem of the Arab refugees. Reports that the administration is pressing Israel to repatriate Arab refugees because of pressure from the Appropriations Committee or that we expect Israel to receive Arabs in a manner or in numbers to threaten her security are without foundation. The Department is not unmindful of congressional concern with appropriations made annually without visible evidence of progress towards an eventual solution of the problem. However, I would agree with you that more important is moving towards a satisfactory resolution of the Arab-Israel problem.

The amount that we are seeking for support of UNRWA in fiscal year 1962 is, as you remark, not a heavy price to pay for stability in the Near East area. However, last year, the committee of the conference on the authorization bill, in its report, specifically stated that the United States should successively reduce its contributions to UNRWA. The funds appropriated for UNRWA at that time were less than what we had considered to be necessary. Even now, UNRWA is faced with a shortfall in its basic relief budget. Although our request for funds for UNRWA in fiscal year 1962 is slightly above last year's appropriation for this purpose, the increment being specifically earmarked for the expanded UNRWA vocational training program, we quite frankly have had to bear in mind the fact that if inadequate funds are appropriated UNRWA will be unable to perform its responsibilities and as a result the refugee problem will be cast adrift. We are by no means wedded to the indefinite continuation of UNRWA, but believe, for the time being at least, continued support of the agency offers the most efficient and economical means of keeping the highly volatile refugee problem from erupting to the detriment of political stability in the Near East area.

With respect to a possible solution of the Arab refugee problem, the United States continues to support some reasonable implementation of paragraph 11 of the United Nations resolution 194 (III) which provides for the refugees the option of repatriation as law-abiding citizens of Israel or of compensation for those who do not wish to return. Any repatriation would, in our view, have to be so implemented as to take fully into account Israel's legitimate security and economic requirements. Contrary to press reports, the administration has made no suggestion either to Israel or to the Arab states of any specific number of refugees who should be repatriated. Nor does the Department have a specific plan in mind, but believes that, consistent with the U.N. General Assembly resolutions mentioned above

and the sentiments of Congress, the problem deserves our earnest study at this time.

I hope that these comments will clarify the position of the Department in these matters.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Some Depressed Areas Created by Washington Deskmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a number of people living in what they believed to be prosperous and happy communities, have recently been told by Washington bureaucrats that actually they are in depressed areas. This is the ridiculous extremes to which paternal government and uncontrolled bureaucracy leads us. It doesn't matter if your community is a going concern, handling to the satisfaction of its own citizens, the problems which come up from day to day, it has to be a depressed area if some bureaucrat in Washington decides it should be. Once the decision is made we appropriate more money to force aid upon people who do not want it. For my part I will trust the people to decide upon the economic condition of the areas in which they live. You may be interested in the facts concerning some of the communities designated as depressed by the Washington deskmen, as outlined in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

THOSE DEPRESSED AREAS

Senator JOHN TOWER of Texas announced indignantly the other day that the Kennedy administration, in its quest to find places where it could spend almost $400 million extracted from Congress for aid to areas of chronic economic depression, had designated 47 east Texas counties as depressed. It did so, he said, without their knowledge and without consulting business leaders.

Senator TOWER said that 6 weeks before Smith County was labeled a depressed area, two large industrial corporations had announced that they were about to construct plants there. He said that in a single week residents of the city of Tyler, in that county, had taken out permits to build $374,000 worth of houses, which would hardly suggest depression.

Similar complaints were heard from Nebraska, where 12 central Nebraskan counties were named as depressed areas by the Department of Commerce. They thus become eligible for redevelopment funds out of the administration's kitty.

One of these, Dawson County, is one of the most prosperous agricultural counties in the Nation, according to Representative MARTIN of Nebraska. The Census Bureau reported last year that agricultural production in the county amounted to more than $60 million. At Cozad, a town of 3,000 in Dawson County, the Monroe Auto Equipment Co., of Michigan, recently completed a new $4½ million plant offering jobs to 250 persons. It encountered difficulty in obtaining this many workers because of full employment in south central Nebraska.

Nebraska public officials and businessmen were equally bewildered by this surge of solicitude from Washington. The chief of the State division of resources said that all he had learned on a trip to Washington to be briefed on the workings of the depressed area law was that counties in every State would be found eligible.

So this program looks a good deal like a device to spread around political favor in the hope of expressions of gratitude at the polls, and the end is pursued even if the Democrats are obliged to discover depression where it doesn't exist.

It's Time for a Change—Before It's Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following special report of the Nation on the Central Intelligence Agency. This report, by Fred J. Cook, is dated June 24, 1961.

Mr. Cook took his information from published sources and I do not care to comment on the validity of all of his conclusions; but only say that it is time for a change—and we had better hurry, before it is too late.

The report follows:

THE CIA

(By Fred J. Cook)

INTRODUCTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"The only time the people pay attention to us," Allen Dulles once said of the CIA, "is when we fall flat on our face"—or words to that effect. But as Mr. Dulles would be the first to concede, the reason for the default lies not with the people, but with the CIA itself. The disastrous Bay of Pigs episode is not the only fiasco that can be laid at the door of the lavishly financed CIA. But in this latest fiasco more of the facts came to light than in similar earlier episodes. Now, therefore, seemed an excellent time, while the facts of the Cuban fiasco are fresh in mind, to take a look at an agency which is of vital concern to national security and the well-being of the people, but about which the people know less than about any major agency of Government. What interested us, as editors, were not the immediate causes of the particular fiasco; we do not propose to join the feverish postmortem search for scapegoats. Our concern was with the basic question: How did this extraordinary agency come into being? What is known about its record? How does it fit into the American constitutional scheme of things? On the face of it, an inquiry into an agency dedicated, as is the CIA, to secrecy in its planning, its operations, its personnel, and its budget, presents a difficult journalistic undertaking. But a considerable amount of material has been published about the agency and its operations, some of it clearly inspired by the CIA with the approval of its Director. True, most of the material is scattered and disparate, consisting of small items which, taken alone, have little meaning. But when put together by an astute craftsman, they form a significant pattern. The easiest part of our job was to find the craftsman. Fred J. Cook's special articles for the Nation—"The FBI," "The Shame of New York," and "Gambling, Inc.," have won him important journalism prizes for the last 3 years. In giving him the assignment, we told Mr. Cook to stick to the public record; we did not want him to attempt to seek out undisclosed facts or to probe into possibly sensitive areas. His assignment was simply to summarize existing published material which, long since available to potential enemies, was still not readily available to the American public. Mr. Cook has followed our instructions. There is not a fact hereafter set forth which has not already been published. Yet, put together, these facts add up to a story that proved new to us, as we are certain it will prove new to the reader. And enough of the known facts are presented to warrant an informed judgment about the agency. For what Mr. Cook proves is what Sir Compton Mackenzie demonstrated for Nation readers in another connection (see "The Spy Circus: Parasites With Cloaks and Daggers," Dec. 5, 1959); namely, that intelligence of the cloak-and-dagger variety is a two-edged sword, and that the sharper edge is sometimes held toward the throat of the wielder. And another lesson that Mr. Cook drives home is this: clearly the CIA must be divested of its action of operational functions and restricted to the sole function of gathering information for other agencies operating under customary constitutional safeguards.)

PART I. SECRET HAND OF THE CIA

Shortly before 6 p.m. on December 5, 1957, a faceless man dropped a letter into a mail box in New York City's Grand Central Station area. It was to the editor of the Nation. The opening sentence read: "As an American intelligence officer, I feel duty bound to state my apprehensions as to the future of my country." What was the basis of these apprehensions? The threat of rampant world communism? The menace of Soviet weaponry? The dangers of internal subversion? No. The writer, whose letter bore in almost every line intrinsic evidence of minute and intimate knowledge, was concerned about just one crucial aspect of the times—the mortal damage America was inflicting upon itself. This was a damage, he found, that resulted directly from the careers and the power and the misconceptions of two men: the late John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, and his younger brother, Allen Welsh Dulles, then as now head of the vitally important Central Intelligence Agency, the official eyes and ears of American foreign policy, the medium that gathers and sifts and judges information—and so conditions the minds and predetermines the decisions of American policy makers on the highest levels.

Now, 4 years later, in the wake of the Cuban disaster—and other less publicized but equally significant disasters—the words of the intelligence agent who unburdened himself in that letter read like the most infallible of prophecies. America was being pushed along the road to foreign policy disasters, he wrote, by the closed minds of the Dulles brothers—by their refusal to face facts as facts and their insistence on torturing facts into the framework of predetermined policy.

This is the way the intelligence officer phrased it:

"The following circumstances are cause for deep concern:

"1. U.S. foreign policy is not formulated on the basis of an objective analysis of facts, particularly those made available by intelligence service, but is being determined by John Foster Dulles' personal rash conceptions.

"2. The fact that Allen Dulles is in charge of collection and evaluation of all information makes it possible for the Secretary of State to distort the information received as

he sees fit. Facts thus presented disorientate not only the President and Congress but also the people of the United States.

"3. As a consequence, our foreign policy is not based on the real interests of the United States. It has suffered one defeat after another and may eventually draw us into a nuclear war."

Though John Foster Dulles since has died, Allen Welsh Dulles still rules the CIA, and the Cuban debacle that his agency sponsored, planned, and directed has provided graphic proof that he still retains his ability to "disorientate not only the President and Congress but also the people of the United States."

Cuba: The lost lesson

No issue of our times lies closer to the core of the decision of war or peace on which the very survival of mankind depends. For from our proper understanding of the facts, our recognition or denial of complicated and even at times transparent truths, must derive the formulation of our policies and the most fateful of our decisions. Cuba is only the most recent and most striking example. When the CIA spurred on the abortive invasion under the roseate delusion that Cubans were chafing to revolt against the tyranny of Fidel Castro, the United States achieved only the disgrace and opprobrium of a British-style Suez on an even more futile scale. Not only did the invasion fail ignominiously, but the attempt helped, if anything, to solidify the iron rule of Castro. It enabled him to pose as the hero of his people, successfully repelling a "foreign" invasion. It touched off a ripple of reaction throughout Latin America where people, while they may not want a dictator like Castro, want no more the gratuitous meddling in their internal affairs by the American giant to the north. It takes no seer to perceive that all the evil fruits of the Cuban blunder have not yet been reaped.

Shockingly, in this context come indications that the U.S. Government, instead of learning a most salutary lesson from the Cuban fiasco, has determined to turn its back even more resolutely upon facts and truth. In the last week of April, after officials on every level should have had time to digest the moral of Cuba, some 400 newspaper editors and columnists were called to Washington for a background briefing on foreign policy by the State Department. As James Higgins, of the Gazette and Daily (York, Pa.), later wrote, "There developed at this conference a very evident tendency on the part of the Government to blame the press, at least part of the press, for spoiling the plans of the Central Intelligence Agency." The Government theory plainly was, not that the whole conception was faulty, but that too much had been printed about the gathering of Cuban invasion forces—and that this had alerted Castro and ruined an otherwise promising endeavor. The head-on collison of this comforting theory with the most elemental facts about modern Cuba was ignored with great determination—with such great determination, indeed, that President Kennedy, in a speech to a convention of American newspaper editors, suggested that the editors, before they printed a story, ask themselves not only "Is it news?" but "Is it in the interest of national security?" Such a censorship, even if only voluntary, would inevitably result in increasing the blackout of information from which the American people have suffered since the end of World War II. As James Higgins wrote, "The truth of the story * * * was not to be considered an important measure of its rights to see print. * * * I got the impression in Washington of a governmental closed mind.

This is a liability that could be fatal to all mankind in a world teetering on the edge of thermonuclear disaster. What America so obviously needs is not fewer facts but more, not deceptive images that fit our prejudices and preconceptions, but truth—however unpalatable. What America needs is the unvarnished truth about Chiang Kai-shek, about Quemoy and Matsu, about Laos, about Latin America—and especially about Cuba, the island (as the President so often has reminded us) that is just 90 miles from our shores, the island about which our secret and public misinformation has been demonstrated to be quite literally colossal.

The Agency nobody knows

In this all-pervasive atmosphere of the shut mind and the distorted fact, Central Intelligence is the key, the vital Agency. Yet it is the one Agency of Government about which the American people are permitted to know almost nothing, the one Agency over which their own elected representatives are permitted to have virtually no control. CIA is the only Agency whose budget is never discussed, whose Director can sign a voucher for any amount without checkup or explanation. How many persons does it employ, how many agents does it have? Even Congressmen do not know precisely. Its Washington headquarters staff alone is estimated to consist of more than 10,000 employees; in total, it is believed to have more persons on its payroll than the State Department. How much money does it have at its disposal? Again, even most of the Congressmen who vote the funds do not know precisely. CIA itself says this figure is very tightly held and is known to not more than five or six Members in each House. CIA allotments are hidden in the budgetary requests of various Government departments; estimates vary from a low of $500 million annually to the $1 billion mentioned by the conservative New York Times. A billion dollars a year concentrated in the hands of one man about whose activities the American people are permitted to know virtually nothing—and about whose activities it appears to be suggested they should know even less—represents the kind of power that, in essence, can well determine the Nation's course and remove from its people the power of decision.

Two-headed monster

This danger that CIA may not just inform, but also determine policy, has been enhanced from the agency's inception by an authorized split personality. From the start, CIA has been a two-headed monster. It is not just a cloak-and-dagger agency entrusted with the important task of gathering information concerning our potential enemies throughout the world; it also has the authority to act on its own information, carrying out in deeds the policies its intelligence discoveries help to form. Though its overt acts are supposed to be under the direction of the National Security Council, the risk inherent in such a dual responsibility is obvious. With an end in view, can intelligence be impartial?

The hazards implicit in such a vast, concentrated, double-motive agency were not unforeseen. Harry Howe Ransom, of Harvard, in his "Central Intelligence and National Security," describes the reaction of Adm. Ernest J. King in March 1945, when the Secretary of the Navy sought his views on the formation of the proposed centralized intelligence agency. "King replied," Ransom writes, "that while such an arrangement was perhaps logical, it had inherent dangers. He feared that a centralized intelligence agency might acquire power beyond anything intended, and questioned whether such an agency might not threaten our form of government."

British intelligence, for centuries considered one of the world's most expert, has long held that the wedding of action to intelligence is a fatal flaw in CIA. So have others. In 1948, Prof. Sherman Kent, of Yale, himself an intelligence officer in World War II, wrote a treatise on the purposes and the dangers of intelligence operations in a book called "Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy." At the time CIA had just been formed and its performance lay entirely in the future, but Professor Kent struck out vigorously at what he called "the disadvantage of getting intelligence too close to policy." He added:

"This does not necessarily mean officially accepted high U.S. policy, but something far less exalted. What I am talking of is often expressed by the words "slant," "line," "position," and "view." Almost any man or group of men confronted with the duty of getting something planned or getting something done will sooner or later hit upon what they consider a single most desirable course of action. Usually it is sooner; sometimes, under duress, it is a snap judgment off the top of the head.

"I cannot escape the belief that under the circumstances outlined, intelligence will find itself right in the middle of policy, and that upon occasions it will be the unabashed apologist for a given policy rather than its impartial and objective analyst."

It takes no particular insight to find the seeds of the Cuban fantasy in that perceptive paragraph.

In the aftermath of so monumental a blunder as Cuba, however, it seems pertinent to inquire: Just what is the record of CIA? Are its successes overbalanced by its failures? And does it, in its dual role of secret agent and activist operative, not merely inform our foreign policy but, to a large measure at least, determine it?

Let it be said at once that there can be no exact scoreboard chalking up the runs, hits and errors of CIA. Allen Dulles himself has commented that the only time his agency makes the headlines is when it falls flat on its face in public. Its successes, he intimates, cannot be publicized for the obvious reason that to do so might give away some of the secrets of his far-flung intelligence network. This is true, but only partially so. For CIA, while it refrains from public announcements, does not disdain the discreet and controlled leak. And some of these leaks have found their way into such prominence as Saturday Evening Post exclusives.

Where the CIA succeeds

Despite the secrecy of CIA, therefore, there is on the public record, in the 14 years since its creation in 1947, a partial and, indeed, highly significant record of its deeds. And by this record it is possible to judge it. Let's look first at some of the achievements.

In 1955, a CIA communications expert, studying a detailed map of Berlin, discovered that at one point the main Russian telephone lines ran only 300 yards from a radar station in the American sector. The CIA dug an underground tunnel, tapped the cables and, for months, before the Russians got wise, monitored every telephonic whisper in the Soviet East Sector.

In 1956, when Nikita Khrushchev delivered his famous secret speech denouncing the crimes of Josef Stalin before the 20th Communist Party Congress, a CIA agent managed to get the text and smuggle it out to the Western world. Washington was able to reveal the explosive contents before the Soviets themselves had edited the speech for public consumption. The blow was probably one of the strongest ever struck at Communist ideology. Communist parties in the United States and other Western countries, long taught by Communist propaganda to regard Stalin with reverence, felt that the bedrock of belief had been cut out from under them.

The U–2 spy plane operation, a risky procedure that backfired disastrously in the end, was for years one of the world's most successful feats in espionage. From 15 miles up, this plane took pictures of such incredible clarity and detail that it was possible to distinguish between a cyclist and a pedestrian; its radio receivers, which monitored all wavelengths, recorded literally millions of words. A single flight across Russia often furnished enough assorted information to keep several thousand CIA employees working for weeks, and the flights lasted for 4 years before, at the beginning of May 1960, on the very eve of the scheduled summit conference in Paris, pilot Francis Powers took off on the mission on which he was shot down. The bad judgment implicit in ordering the flight at such a delicate time, the ridiculous CIA cover story that Powers was gathering weather data, the solemn promulgation of this fairytale and the swift subsequent exposure of the United States before the world as an arrant liar—all of this wrecked the summit, forced the United States to abandon the U–2 aerial espionage program, and inflicted enormous worldwide damage on American prestige. Whether, in the ideological war for men's minds, the ultimate tarnishing of the American image outweighs the positive details garnered by the U–2's in 4 years of successful espionage remains a forever unresolved point of debate. For one thing, the ideological war goes on, neither finally won nor irretrievably lost; for another, no one except on the very highest and most closely guarded levels of Government can possibly know just how vitally important were the details the U–2 gathered.

Though the U–2 program became, in its catastrophic finale, a fulcrum of policy, the significant pattern that emerges from the Berlin wiretapping, the smuggling of the Khrushchev speech, the years-long earlier successes of U–2, seems fairly obvious. All dealt with intelligence—and intelligence only. The intent was to gather the kind of broad and detailed information on which an intelligent foreign policy may be based. These activities did not in themselves constitute active meddling in, or formation of, policy. Unfortunately, not all CIA activities fall into this legitimate intelligence role; time and again, CIA has meddled actively in the internal affairs of foreign governments. And it is in this field that some of its most vaunted successes raise grave questions about the drift and intent of our foreign policy.

Where it fails

Here are some of the high spots of CIA in international intrigue:

In 1953, with Allen Dulles himself playing a leading role, CIA sparked a coup that ousted Mohammed Mossadegh as Premier of Iran. Mossadegh, a wealthy landowner, rose to political power by capitalizing on popular hatred of the British Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which dominated the economy of the nation, exporting Iran's greatest national resource by payment to the national treasury of what Mossadegh considered a mere pittance. Mossadegh set out to nationalize the oil industry in Iran's interest, allied himself with pro-Communist forces in Teheran, and virtually usurped the power of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi. When he did, a successful CIA plot bounced Mossadegh out of office so fast he hardly knew what had hit him; the Shah was restored to power; and a four-nation consortium, in partnership with the Iranian Government, was given control over the country's liquid gold. CIA showed a tendency, if not to brag, at least to chuckle in public about this wily and triumphant coup; but the aftermath has furnished no cause for unalloyed rejoicing. The United States poured millions of dollars into Iran to shore up the government of the anti-Communist Shah. A congressional committee found in 1957 that, in 5 years, Iran had received a quarter of a billion dollars in American aid. Yet the Iranian people themselves had not profited. So many American dollars had stuck to the fingers of corrupt officials that Iran was running up constant deficits, though the congressional committee found that it should have been fully capable, with its oil revenues, of financing its own national development. Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars in American aid, Iran remained so primitive that, in some isolated towns, in this 20th century, residents had yet to see their first wheeled vehicle; a whole family might live for a year on the produce of a single walnut tree; and small children labored all day at the looms of rug factories for 20 cents or less. Small wonder, as Time reported in 1960, that Mossadegh "is still widely revered"; small wonder either that a new Premier, appointed by the Shah in early May 1961, after a riotous outbreak in Teheran, was described by the Associated Press as the Shah's "last hope of averting bankruptcy and possible revolution."

In 1954, Jacobo Arbenz Guzman won an election in Guatemala and achieved supreme power. This democratic verdict by the Guatemalan electorate was not pleasing to the United States. American officials described the Arbenz regime as communistic. This has been disputed, but there is no question that Arbenz was sufficiently leftist in orientation to threaten the huge land holdings of Guatemala's wealthy classes and the imperial interests of United Fruit and other large American corporations. American disenchantment with Arbenz needed only a spark to be exploded into action, and the spark was supplied by Allen Dulles and CIA. Secret agents abroad spotted a Polish freighter being loaded with Czech arms and ammunition; CIA operatives around the world traced the peregrinations of the freighter as, after several mysterious changes of destination, she finally came to port and began unloading the munitions destined for Arbenz. Then CIA, with the approval of the National Security Council, struck. Two Globemasters, loaded with arms and ammunition, were flown to Honduras and Nicaragua. There the weapons were placed in the hands of followers of an exiled Guatemalan Army officer, Col. Carlos Castillo Armas. He invaded Guatemala, and the Arbenz regime collapsed like a pack of cards. It is perhaps significant that the Guatemalan blueprint was practically identical with the one CIA followed this April in the attempt to overthrow Castro. Only Castro was no Arbenz. In any event, Guatemala, like Iran, remains one of the CIA's most publicly acknowledged coups; and, like Iran, the sequel raises disturbing doubts about precisely what was gained. For the promises of the CIA-backed Castillo forces to institute social and democratic reforms have not yet materialized. Half of the arable land in the nation of 4 million persons still remains in the hands of 1,100 families. The economy of the country is dominated by three large American corporations, topped by United Fruit. Workers in the vineyards of United Fruit staged a strike in 1955 trying to get their wages of $1.80 a day raised to $3. They lost. And Guatemala is still a distressed country—so deeply distressed that the Kennedy administration feels it must have several more bushels of American aid.

In 1954 and again in 1958, the United States almost went to war with Communist China over the rocky islets of Quemoy and Matsu, squatting less than 3 miles off the Chinese coast. When Red Chinese artillery barrages blanketed the islands, heavily overpopulated with Chiang Kai-shek troops, American public opinion was conditioned to react angrily to these aggressive actions. What hardly any Americans realized at the time was that the Red Chinese had been subjected to considerable provocation. Allen Dulles' CIA had established, on Formosa, an outfit known as Western Enterprises, Inc. This was nothing more than a blind for CIA; and, as Stewart Alsop later wrote in the Saturday Evening Post, CIA agents, operating from this cover, masterminded commando-type guerrilla raids on the mainland * * * in battalion strength. The title to Alsop's article told all: "The Story Behind Quemoy: How We Drifted Close to War."

In 1960 and again in 1961, the landlocked Indochina principality of Laos threatened the peace of the world in a tug-of-war between East and West. Again the American public was confronted with glaring headlines picturing the menace of an on-sweeping world communism; it was given, at the outset at any rate—and first impressions in international sensations are almost always the ones that count—practically no understanding of underlying issues. Yet a congressional committee in June 1959, had filed a scathing report on one of the most disgraceful of American foreign aid operations. The committee found that, in 7 years, we had poured more than $300 million into Laos. This indiscriminate aid had caused runaway inflation and wrecked the economy of the country. At our insistence, a 25,000-man army that the Lao didn't want or need—and one that wouldn't fight—had been foisted on the Lao people. In a completely botched-up program, American resident geniuses spent some $1.6 million to build a highway, built no highway, and wound up giving all southeast Asia a vivid demonstration of the most unlovely aspects of the American system of bribery, graft, and corruption. As if this wasn't bad enough, little Laos fairly crawled with CIA agents. These gentry, in late 1960, in another of their famous coups, overthrew the neutralist government of Prince Souvanna Phouma and installed a militarist regime headed by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan. The Phoumi army clique had just one qualification to recommend it, but it was a qualification dear to the heart of CIA: it was militantly anti-Communist. Unfortunately, this attitude did not recommend the new regime as heartily to the Lao people as it did to the CIA; General Phoumi had almost no popular support, and when the Communist Pathet Lao forces began to gobble up vast chunks of the nation, there was hardly any resistance. The result was inevitable. The United States was placed in the humiliating position of practically begging to get the very type of neutralist government its CIA had conspired to overthrow. A greater loss of face in face-conscious Asia could hardly be imagined.

Revolutions for hire?

These are just a few of the best-documented examples of CIA's meddling in the internal affairs of other nations. There are others. There is the case of Burma, on whom CIA foisted unwanted thousands of Chiang Kai-shek's so-called freedom fighters—warriors who found it much pleasanter to take over practically an entire Burmese province and grow opium than to fight the Red Chinese. There was this spring's Algerian Army revolt against Gen. Charles de Gaulle, an event in which an accusing French press contends the CIA played an encouraging hand. CIA categorically denies it, but French officialdom, suspicious as a result of previous CIA meddling in French nuclear-arms program legislation, has refrained from giving the American agency a full coat of whitewash.

Such activities obviously range far beyond the bounds of legitimate intelligence gathering. No one will argue today, in the tensions of a cold war that at almost any moment might turn hot, against the need

for an expert intelligence-gathering agency. But does it follow that we need and must have an agency geared to the overthrow of governments in any and all sections of the world? Have we, who pose (most of us sincerely) as a truly democratic people, the right to send our secret agents to determine for the people of Iran or Guatemala or Laos what government shall rule them? We have never proclaimed this right; our public officials doubtless would express pious abhorrence at the thought. But, in the light of past events, we can hardly be surprised if, to the world at large, CIA actions speak louder than official protestations.

Nor can we escape the odium of regimes with which the CIA has saddled us. It follows as inevitably as day the night that, if CIA conspires to overthrow a foreign government on the blind theory that in the war against communism anything goes, the American people as a whole are burdened with responsibility for the regime that CIA has helped to install. And the record of such regimes in many remote corners of the world is decidedly not pretty. In the light of the past, it should be obvious that the future is not to be won by propping up puppets with sticky fingers.

On this whole issue, perhaps the most perceptive piece of writing was produced in the aftermath of Cuba by Walter Lippmann in a column entitled "To Ourselves Be True." Lippmann, fresh from recent interviews with Khrushchev, wrote:

"We have been forced to ask ourselves recently how a free and open society can compete with a totalitarian state. This is a crucial question. Can our Western society survive and flourish if it remains true to its own faith and principles? Or must it abandon them in order to fight fire with fire?" Lippmann's answer to this last question was a ringing, "No." The Cuban adventure had failed, he wrote, because for us it was completely out of character—as out of character as for a cow to try to fly or a fish to walk. The United States, of course, must employ secret agents for its own information. "But the United States cannot successfully conduct large secret conspiracies," he wrote. "The American conscience is a reality. It will make hesitant and ineffectual, even if it does not prevent, an un-American policy * * * It follows that in the great struggle with communism, we must find our strength by developing and applying our own principles, not in abandoning them."

Probing more deeply, Lippmann analyzed Khrushchev's philosophy and explained the Soviet leader's absolute belief in the ultimate triumph of communism. The Soviet Premier, he had found, is sincerely convinced that capitalism is rigid, static; that it cannot change, it cannot meet the needs of the people, the needs of the future. Only communism can, and communism will succeed capitalism as capitalism supplanted feudalism. This, with Khrushchev, is "absolute dogma." Having explained this, Lippmann then wrote:

"I venture to argue from this analysis that the reason we are on the defensive in so many places is that for some 10 years we have been doing exactly what Mr. K. expects us to do. We have used money and arms in a long, losing attempt to stabilize native governments which, in the name of anticommunism, are opposed to all important social change. This has been exactly what Mr. K.'s dogma calls for—that communism should be the only alternative to the status quo with its immemorial poverty and privilege."

We cannot compete with communism, Lippmann argued, if we continue to place "the weak countries in a dilemma where they must stand still with us and our client rulers, or start moving with communism." We must offer them "a third option, which is economic development and social improvement without the totalitarian discipline of communism."

Obviously, the philosophy of Walter Lippmann is several eons removed from that of the CIA man, whose record shows he has just one gage of merit—the rigid rightwing inflexibility of the anticommunistic puppet regimes that CIA has installed and supported. The record suggests that in the CIA lexicon there is no room for social and economic reforms; such phrases imply a possibly leftish tendency, and God forbid that we should ever back such. Let's give 'em, instead, a military dictatorship. This CIA philosophy-in-action is the very antithesis of the American spirit Walter Lippmann was writing about, and to understand how we came to be encumbered with it, one must understand the career and ties and outlook of one man—Allen Welsh Dulles.

PART II. ALLEN DULLES: BEGINNINGS

When Allen Dulles was 8 years old, he wrote a 31-page essay on the Boer War, an event that was then disturbing the conscience of the world. The last sentence read: "I hope the Boers win this war because the Boers are in the right and the british in the wrong." Questioned in after life about that small "b" in "British," Dulles explained that he wrote it that way deliberately because he didn't like the British at the time and hoped that small "b" would show just what he thought of them.

Now, 60 years later, Allen Dulles is very much the man foreshadowed by the boy author. The interest in foreign affairs that led him to write a small book on the Boer War at the age of 8 (it was actually published by a doting grandfather) has remained with him throughout his life. Some would say, too, that he retained the strong prejudices, or the stout convictions (depending on how you look at it), that led him at the age of 8 to refuse to dignify the British with a capital letter.

The future master of the CIA was steeped in the aura of international affairs from earliest childhood. He was born on April 7, 1893, in Watertown, N.Y., where his father, Allen Macy Dulles, was a Presbyterian minister. His mother, the former Edith Foster, was the daughter of Gen. John Watson Foster, who in 1892 had become Secretary of State in the Republican administration of Benjamin Harrison. Years later his mother's brother-in-law, Robert Lansing, was to serve as Secretary of State in the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

These family ties were to be influential both in the career of Allen Dulles and in that of his brother, John Foster, 5 years his senior. Allen graduated from Princeton with Phi Beta Kappa honors in 1914 and promptly went off to teach English for a year in a missionary school at Allahabad, India. Returning to Princeton, he got his master of arts degree, then followed in the footsteps of his older brother by joining the diplomatic service ruled by his uncle, Secretary of State Robert Lansing. On May 16, 1916, when he was 23, he went off to Vienna as an undersecretary in the American Embassy. Though the young man himself could have had no inkling at the time, this was where it was all to begin; here were to be woven the first permanent strands into the career of the future boss of CIA.

Beginnings in Vienna

Vienna was then the capital of the Austro-Hungarian empire, the partner of Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany in the bloody warfare of World War I. America herself was about to become involved in this most tragic of wars, from which the world has yet to salvage a formula for peace. In the striped-trouser set and the top-level society of Vienna, young Dulles, the nephew of the American Secretary of State, quickly made his mark; and when America joined the allies, he along with other members of the American delegation skipped across the border to Berne in Switzerland. It was here that Dulles got his first taste of the secret, high-level intrigue that so often determines the fate of empires and of peoples. As he later told a visitor: "That's when I learned what a valuable place Switzerland was for information—and when I became interested in intelligence work."

Dulles' interest doubtless was stimulated by the heady role he played in the very kind of top-drawer, behind-the-scenes maneuvering that was to mark the pattern of his later life. By the beginning of 1918, the creaky Austro-Hungarian Empire, exhausted by war, could perceive plainly before it the hideous specter of imminent collapse. Naturally, its Emperor Charles, with a ruler's primal instinct for self-preservation, wanted to salvage as much from the ruins as was possible. His negotiator in this laudable endeavor was his former tutor, Dr. Heinrich Lammasch. Lammasch had met the tall and charming Allen Dulles in Vienna; he was perfectly aware that the young man was the nephew of the American Secretary of State; and so, with an eye to establishing rapport on the highest possible levels, he approached Dulles and through him made arrangements for the salvage talks the Austrians so much desired.

The secret discussions which Allen Dulles thus played a key role in arranging began on January 31, 1918, in a villa in Grummlingen, near Berne, belonging to a director of Krupp's. Prof. George D. Herron, who often carried out secret assignments for President Wilson, headed the American delegation. Professor Lammasch and industrialist Julius Meini led the opposing bargain hunters. The Austrians were ready to promise almost anything in the hope of preserving the Hapsburg monarchy, and the Americans, evidently blind to the already tarnished luster of the throne, deluded themselves into the belief that they were really being offered a prize—that the Austrian Emperor might be propped up as "a useful force."

Finding these nice Americans so receptive, Lammasch was effusive in his promises. Austria-Hungary would be positively delighted to follow the American lead in everything, especially if (does this sound familiar?) the generous Americans would extend financial aid and help to build a bridge of gold between Vienna and Washington. Dulles' immediate superior, Hugh Wilson, was intrigued by the prospect, and all of the American delegation seems to have been quite enthusiastic. The British, informed of the proposal, were far more skeptical and warned against trusting too much in the performance of the Hapsburgs. Events proved the British so right. The Austrian monarchy collapsed, Charles abdicated, and the net result was a fiasco. Yet Time in 1959 could write of this period that Allen Dulles, in the Switzerland of 1918, "hatched the first of the grandiose plots which were to become his trademark."

Introduction to Germany

After Berne came the great peace conference at Versailles. Secretary of State Lansing, second only to Wilson among the American negotiators, saw to it that his two nephews had reserved seats at the great event. John Foster was given the task of studying such financial problems as reparations and war debts; Allen had an even more fascinating job as assistant head of the Department of Current Political and Economic Correspondence, a key organization that handled and channeled all communications to the American delegation. Allen Dulles' immediate boss was Ellis Dressel, a leading American expert on German affairs and a man who was convinced that the new Soviet Union represented a world menace, one that could be dealt with effectively (shades

of 1945) only through a partnership between America and a revived Germany.

This was not the prevailing view in that simpler world of 1918 in which hatred of militaristic Germany was the dominating factor. It is significant mainly because, for its day, it was an extreme view and because Allen Dulles was quite close to Dressel and shared many of his beliefs. In December 1918, and again in early 1919, Allen accompanied his superior on trips to Germany during which they conferred with high German industrialists. The bent of Dulles' own thinking at the time is indicated in a memorandum that he wrote on December 30, 1918, entitled: "Lithuania and Poland, the last barrier between Germany and the Bolsheviks." It evidently was based largely on information gathered from Polish and Lithuanian refugees, and it described the Bolshevik menace in the strongest terms. Dulles even advocated support of Polish-Lithuanian intervention in Russia, writing: "The Allies should not be deterred from a military expedition because of their fear that it would require hundreds of thousands of men."

Peace concluded, Dressel was sent to Berlin as American chargé d'affaires in Germany, and Dulles went with him. Here he was thrown into contact with a stream of German politicians, industrialists, and Army officers, many of whom were concerned about the new Communist menace and talked about the possibility of raising a European army—spearheaded by German generals, of course—to fight the radical Bolsheviks. Nothing came of these plans, and Dulles soon was transferred to Constantinople.

In later years, the stereotyped portrait of Allen Dulles given the American people by virtually all of the large media of information pictures a master spy, a supersleuth, who confounded his rivals in international intrigue from his earliest days. The image, contrasted with the reality of what came out of Dulles' first "grandiose plot" at Berne, seems considerably overblown, but it suffers even greater damage when one studies the acid pen portrait of Dulles in action in the Balkans left by a veteran American intelligence officer of the period.

Dabbling in oil

The disenchanted agent was Robert Dunn, a veteran and hard-bitten American newspaperman who had received his initial training in skepticism at the hands of Lincoln Steffens. Dunn later spent nearly 20 years in Naval Intelligence. He was a lieutenant in Turkey in those first years of the 1920's when Allen Dulles appeared upon the scene. Years later, in his book "World Alive," published by Crown in 1956, he wrote as follows:

"And now Mr. Secretary of State Colby's young men were arriving in the flesh to whistle at the nymphs on our office ceiling. Among the cooky-pushers strange to a naval staff came one bettle-browed Boston Brahmin, rich as a dog's insides with copper stock.

"One Allen Dulles, freckled, with toothbrush mustache, was a serious grad of the Princeton Golf Club, fresh from Versailles and drawing the fatal boundaries of Czechoslovakia."

Dunn continues by recounting how a London Times reporter happened to find in a secondhand bookstall an ancient volume from which anti-Semitic propagandists obviously had filched the ideas for the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion." Neither the Times reporter nor Dunn was very much excited by the discovery because, as Dunn wrote, the protocols had been well exposed by internal evidence as forgeries and hardly anyone took them seriously any more.

"But now [Dunn added], while Stamboul boiled sedition against the entente and Kemal chetties threatened siege, Dulles decoded to 'Secstate' academic analyses of that stale forgery. No wonder Roosevelt, later, was to growl at diplomatic myopia and the braid-on-cutaway tradition."

Such, on Dunn's testimony at least—and he soon took the first opportunity to get out of Naval Intelligence because he couldn't stand working with Dulles—was the well-coddled young man who, after 2 years in the Balkans, was called back to Washington to head the State Department's Division of Near Eastern Affairs.

The Near East, then as now, was a sensitive area, and for much the same reason—oil. British interests had had a hammerlock on the rich preserves of the entire Mediterranean basin and had tried to freeze out American rivals; but now such companies as Gulf and Standard Oil were no longer to be denied. The years during which Dulles headed the key Near Eastern Division were, as it so happened, the very years during which the Rockefeller interests in Standard Oil negotiated a toehold in the Iraq Petroleum Co., and the very years in which the Mellons of Gulf were laying the groundwork for valuable concessions in the Bahrein Islands. Both of these developments became public and official in 1927, the year after Dulles left the State Department to join the New York law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell.

His decision was motivated primarily by financial considerations. The highest salary he had made with State was some $8,000 a year, and he was a married man, with a growing family. Sullivan and Cromwell (in which older brother John Foster was already a partner) belonged to the legal elite of Wall Street—one of those law firms that have made themselves the virtual brains of big business, supplying indispensable advice on almost every financial, industrial, and commercial deal. It advised both the Rockefellers and the Morgans; it fairly reeked of the kind of money that solves all a young married man's most acute financial problems.

In this plush atmosphere, Allen Dulles quickly made himself at home. He had hardly fitted himself into his law chair, indeed, before he became involved in the kind of backstage masterminding that has come to seem almost second nature to him ever since.

The nation in question was the South American state of Colombia. By treaty, Colombia had awarded the Morgan and Mellon interests the extremely rich Barco Concession, so-called, in Notre de Santander Province. But in 1926, just as Allen Dulles was quitting the State Department, Dr. Miguel Abadia-Mendez was elected President of Colombia. He quickly proved to be a disturbing element in the placid world of American oil interests. He threatened to repudiate the Barco Concession; he aroused great popular support; and worried American oil barons decided they would have to act. They turned naturally to their legal brains. One such brain was Francis B. Loomis, a former State Department official; another, Allen W. Dulles. Pressure was immediately applied on Abadia-Mendez, but he, stubborn man, wouldn't yield. In August 1928, he accused the American companies of refusing to pay Colombia what they owed it for the years 1923–26 and reaffirmed his intention of revoking the Barco Concession. This led a secretary in the American Embassy in Bogotá to write Washington that he was convinced "the President will not withdraw his annulment of the agreement until he is forced to do so under the pressure of a hard and fast demand."

Colombia the gem

Force was applied. The State Department sent a sharp note to Bogotá. Colombia countered by threatening to nationalize all her oil fields. The United States served Colombia with a formal ultimatum. The Mellons threatened an economic boycott. Angry anti-American demonstrators paraded in the streets of Bogotá.

The full details of their labors probably never will be revealed, but the effects became obvious. In 1930, Colombia got a new President: Dr. Enrique Olaya Herrera, a former Colombian Ambassador to the United States and a well-known friend of Wall Street bankers. Soon after his election, he visited New York and was promised a million-dollar loan, provided the Barco Concession was honored. It was.

This adventure in the international diplomacy of oil, revealing in its way, was actually little more than a minor vignette in the ascending careers of Allen Dulles and his older brother, John Foster. The interests and outlook of the two were intertwined almost inseparably. They were partners in the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell; they represented the same clients and the same interests; their two careers moved together in measured cadence, almost like the steps of trained dancers. Most important among their varied interests, and claiming a major share of their attention, were some of Germany's greatest international cartels.

Three of their clients represented the very top drawer of German industry. These were the Vereinigte Stahlwerke (The Thyssen and Flick trust), IG Farbenindustrie (the great chemical trust), and the Robert Bosch concern. The legal wits of the Dulles brothers aided all three.

At the onset of World War II, the German masters of American Bosch Corp. began to fear for the safety of their holdings, and an elaborate corporate coverup was arranged. The Wallenberg brothers, Swedish bankers, agreed to take over American Bosch (with the promise to return it after the war, of course), but good American front names were needed to provide camouflage. Hence it developed that in August 1941, just a few months before Pearl Harbor, John Foster Dulles became the sole voting trustee of the majority shares. In 1942, the U.S. Government seized the shares, contending Dulles' trusteeship was meerly a device to cloak enemy interests.

Business before politics?

Equally close and equally significant was the role that Allen Dulles played in the great Schroeder international banking house. The parent firm was German and was headed by Baron Kurt von Schroeder. A genuine scar-faced Prussian, the Baron played a key role in the accession to power of Adolf Hitler. It was in his villa at Cologne on January 7, 1933, that Hitler and von Papen met and worked out their deal for the Nazi seizure of power. In subsequent years, von Schroeder remained close to the Nazi hierarchy. He was made SS Gruppenfuehrer (the equivalent of general), and he was chairman of the secret "Frenden-Kreis S," which collected funds from Ruhr magnates to finance Heinrich Himmler. Outside Germany, the Schroeder financial empire stretched long and powerful tentacles. In England, it had J. H. Schroeder Ltd.; in the United States, the Schroeder Trust Co. and the J. Henry Schroeder Corp. Allen Dulles sat on the boards of directors of both.

Almost any lawyer would contend, of course, that there is nothing wrong with selling his talents where the money is and that he has a perfect right to represent any client, no matter what his pedigree. The Dulles brothers, however, did not just happen to represent an isolated German client or two; they represented the elite of German industry, firms closely tied to the Nazi machinery, over a long period of time, on the closest terms and even in directoral capacities. Granted the complete propriety of the representation, it would be naive in the extreme to believe that such multiple, close associations do not sway political judgments.

In the long-forgotten records of the times, there are indeed some indications that this was so. In April, 1940, for example, Dr. Gerhart A. Westrich, one of Germany's

leading lawyers, a man who had handled some European affairs for Sullivan and Cromwell, came to America by way of Siberia, ostensibly as Hitler's special emissary to consult with American businessmen. He established residence on a swank New York suburban estate and before long he was consulting, not just with American oil and industrial tycoons, but with a strange assortment of factory workers and mechanics. The New York Herald Tribune exposed this suspicious activity and charged that Westrich had made misrepresentations in applying for a driver's license. John Foster Dulles immediately came to the Nazi agent's defense. "I don't believe he has done anything wrong," John Foster said. "I knew him in the old days and I had a high regard for his integrity." American agents began an investigation, however, and in 2 weeks Dr. Westrich was on his way to Japan.

The Westrich affair, inconclusive in itself, assumes greater significance when one considers the Anglo-American Fellowship and the America First Committee.

In Britain, the London branch of the Schroeder banking firm financed the Fellowship and concentrated on selling the Munich brand of appeasement to the British people. The Fellowship sought as members prominent names in the Conservative Party, big businessmen, bankers. These eminents were given the VIP treatment on conducted tours of Germany; they were entertained by Hitler and Goering, and von Ribbentrop exercised all the wiles of propaganda to sell them on the virtues of the Nazi system. There was no secret about this activity, no doubt about its aims and purposes. And so it is intriguing to find prominently listed as members of the Fellowship not just the banking house of J. H. Schroeder Ltd. itself, but the individual names of H. W. B. Schroeder and H. F. and F. C. Tiarks (see Tory M. P. by Simon Hoxey, published in England by Victor Gollancz). F. C. Tiarks actually served on the Fellowship's council, or governing body, and H. W. B. Schroeder and the two Tiarkses sat with Allen Dulles on the board of the J. Henry Schroeder Banking Corp.

On this side of the Atlantic, the incorporation papers for the America First Committee, devoted to persuading Americans to keep out of World War II, were drawn up in John Foster Dulles' law office. Records of America First subsequently showed that John Foster, the more famous of the two brothers during most of their lifetimes, supported America First financially. In February 1941 his wife contributed $250, and in May 1941 another $200. On November 5, 1941, just 1 month before Pearl Harbor, America First records listed a $500 contribution from "John Foster Dulles." Dulles himself, when questioned about these ties, protested: "No one who knows me and what I have done and stood for consistently over 37 years of active life could reasonably think that I could be an isolationist or 'America Firster' in deed or spirit."

Yet the deed and the spirit seemed to be implicit in a series of public speeches that John Foster Dulles made in the months before Pearl Harbor. On at least three occasions, he ridiculed the notion that America faced any danger from the Axis Powers. These, he said, were simply "dynamic peoples" seeking their rightful place in the sun. In a speech before the Economic Club of New York in March 1939, he said:

"There is no reason to believe that any totalitarian states, separately or collectively, would attempt to attack the United States or could do it successfully. Certainly it is well within our means to make ourselves immune in this respect. Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war upon us."

There is no public record that Allen Dulles shared either his brother's sanguine world outlook or interest in America First. But equally there is no record, public or private, that he didn't. All one can say is that, throughout their careers, the two brothers displayed a marked community of political views.

Then came Pearl Harbor.

When it did, a whole new career opened up for Allen Dulles. During his service in the State Department years before, he had become friendly with an Assistant Attorney General named William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan. When Pearl Harbor plunged us into World War II, Donovan was picked to head America's first superspy outfit, the Office of Strategic Services. He promptly contacted Allen Dulles and urged him to go to his old familiar stamping grounds in Berne, Switzerland. There Allen was to set up a European espionage headquarters. The reason Donovan picked him for the task was that he wanted a man who had high contacts inside Nazi Germany. On this score, Allen Dulles certainly qualified.

PART III. DULLES AND THE SS

The officially favored version of Allen Dulles' exploits in Switzerland in World War II goes like this: He was the very last American to slip legally across the French border in November 1942, as German troops came pouring into Vichy France in swift reaction to the Allied invasion of North Africa. His assignment in Switzerland was to find out who in Germany might be opposed to the Hitler regime and whether they were working actively to overthrow it. In true master-spy tradition, he put out his feelers and soon the fish were swimming into his net; soon secret anti-Nazis were coming to him to funnel him vital information and to give him the most intimate details about the plot to do away with Hitler.

Some of this happened, but it isn't all that happened. To understand the significance of developments in Berne, one needs to recall the background of the times. In January 1943, just as Allen Dulles' intelligence-gathering operation began to get going in full swing, Churchill and Roosevelt were meeting in Casablanca for the first of those summit conferences that were to determine the conduct of the fighting and, more important, the conditions for ending it. It was at Casablanca that the two great Allied leaders proclaimed the doctrine of "unconditional surrender" and vowed to "spare no effort to bring Germany to her knees."

Their proclamation came at a time when a witch's brew was already boiling inside Germany. German military strategy long had been predicated on avoiding a war on two fronts. This had been a cardinal principle of Hitler himself until the seemingly endless succession of easy victories unbalanced his judgment and propelled him into war with the Soviet Union. The limitless void of Russia quickly began to engulf the Nazi war machine, and then, on top of the Eastern struggle, had come the Japanese stroke at Pearl Harbor, a blow that had surprised Hitler almost as much as it had the American fleet. This development had thrown the tremendous power and resources of America into the scales against the Axis Powers, and soon both German generals and the more astute leaders of the SS saw that ultimate defeat was inevitable unless some compromise political settlement could be worked out with the Allies. A number of top-level conferences were devoted to this problem, both in the camp of the military and the camp of the SS.

In one of these secret conclaves in August 1942, SS-Brigadefuehrer Walter Schellenberg, one of Heinrich Himmler's brightest proteges and one of the most dangerous of Nazi secret agents, proposed a bold solution to his boss. Himmler, the master of the secret police for whom Kurt von Schroeder had raised funds in the Ruhr, was a cautious man where his own neck was involved; but he was extremely ambitious, too—and so he listened to Schellenberg. Schellenberg argued that the war was lost unless a "political solution" could be arranged. Only Himmler, he contended, could achieve this. Only Himmler could intrigue to spread dissension among the Allies, to split them apart, to achieve the needed separate settlement with the West. Himmler hesitated, caution warring with ambition. The argument between him and Schellenberg lasted until 3:30 a.m., but Himmler finally agreed to try Schellenberg's idea.

The prize at stake was enormous. If he succeeded, Himmler could make himself master of all Germany. The ruthless SS chief was well aware, as William L. Shirer makes clear in "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," that military cliques were plotting the assassination of Hitler. On occasion Himmler made a great pretense of activity and sent some of the more obvious bunglers before execution squads, but it seems certain he could have protected the Fuehrer much more efficiently than he did. It seems certain also that he gave the plotting generals loose rein, anticipating the situation that would develop if and when they succeeded in blowing up his revered leader. Himmler, with his iron grip on the machinery of the secret police, felt fully competent to deal with the generals; he feared no other rival in the Nazi Party; and if, in foreign affairs, he could achieve Schellenberg's "political solution," he could perpetuate the Nazi system with himself in Hitler's shoes.

Meet "Mr. Bull"

Such appears to be the compelling reasons that led Himmler and Schellenberg to send two SS agents to seek out Allen Dulles in Berne. The SS agents were a Dr. Schudekopf and Prince Maximillian Egon Hohenlohe. The Nazi version of these negotiations was contained in three documents written at the time, labeled "top secret," and preserved in the files of Schellenberg's dreaded Department VI of the SS Reich Security Office. Bob Edwards, a member of the British Parliament, cites these documents and quotes them fully in a pamphlet written this year, "A Study of a Master Spy (Allen Dulles)." In studying his account, upon which the following section is based, it must be borne in mind that the documents represent an enemy version of the talks and must, therefore, be read with caution; nor should it be forgotten that in the shadow world of the secret agency, duplicity is a common coin and truth most difficult to determine.

Edwards, who fought with Loyalist forces in Spain during the civil war in the 1930s, has been general secretary of the Chemical Workers Union since 1947. He is a former member of the Liverpool City Council, and has served in Parliament, elected with Labour and Cooperative backing, since 1955. He attracted considerable attention when he began protesting in the House of Commons about the activities of the Krupps and Bilbao and the danger of permitting the Germans to establish bases in Spain. As a result, "from absolutely reliable sources in Bonn," he says, he received a number of documents, including the three dealing with Dulles and the SS.

The first of these documents is a brief covering letter, of which only one copy was made. It is dated April 30, 1943, and is from SS-Hauptsturmfuehrer Ahrens to Department VI, dealing with: "Dulles, Roosevelt's special representative in Switzerland." The second is a record of conversations between Dulles, referred to throughout the report as "Mr. Bull," and Prince Hohenlohe, called "Herr Pauls." The conversations took place in Switzerland in mid-February 1943.

"Immediately on arrival," according to the memorandum on the Dulles-Hohenlohe talks, "Herr Pauls" received a call from a "Mr. Roberts," a Dulles aid and confidant. Roberts was anxious to arrange an immedi-

ate meeting with his chief, Allen Dulles. Hohenlohe stalled until he could check up on Dulles. From Spanish diplomats, from the Swiss and from representatives of some of the Nazi satellite states in the Balkans, Hohenlohe learned that Dulles operated on the very highest level, apparently with a direct pipeline into the White House, bypassing the State Department. This convinced the SS agent that he should, by all means, see "Mr. Bull."

He was greeted, he reported, by "a tall, powerfully built, sporting type of about 45, with a healthy appearance, good teeth, and a lively, unaffected and gracious manner. Assuredly a man of civic courage." The conversation was cordial. Hohenlohe and Dulles quickly established that they had met before, in 1916 in Vienna and in the 1920's in New York. With these preliminaries out of the way the SS report of the talk between "Herr Pauls" and "Mr. Bull" continues:

"Mr. Bull said * * * he was fed up with listening all the time to outdated politicians, émigrés and prejudiced Jews. In his view, a peace had to be made in Europe in the preservation of which all concerned would have a real interest. There must not again be a division into victor and vanquished, that is, contented and discontented; never again must nations like Germany be driven by want and injustice to desperate experiments and heroism. The German state must continue to exist as a factor of order and progress; there could be no question of its partition or the separation of Austria. At the same time, however, the might of Prussia in the German state should be reduced to reasonable proportions, and the individual regions (Gau) should be given greater independence and a uniform measure of influence within the framework of Greater Germany. To the Czech question, Mr. Bull seemed to attach little importance; at the same time he felt it necessary to support a cordon sanitaire against bolshevism and pan-Slavism through the eastward enlargement of Poland and the preservation of Rumania and a strong Hungary."

German hegemony

If this view seems hardly in accord with the publicly avowed Roosevelt-Churchill program of unconditional surrender and bringing Germany to her knees, the rest of the Dulles philosophy, according to this SS report, seems to agree even less with the ideals for which thousands of allied soldiers were at that moment dying. Herr Pauls reported that Mr. Bull seemed quite to recognize Germany's claim to industrial leadership in Europe. Of Russia he spoke with scant sympathy. * * * Herr Pauls had the feeling that the Americans, including in this case Mr. Bull, would not hear of bolshevism or pan-Slavism in central Europe, and, unlike the British, on no account wished to see the Russians at the Dardenelles or in the oil areas of Rumania or Asia Minor. Indeed, as Herr Pauls noted later, Mr. Bull made no great secret, though he did not speak in detail, about Anglo-American antagonisms.

The conversation now took an abrupt turn. Herr Pauls made what he described as a very sharp thrust on the Jewish question and said he sometimes actually felt the Americans were only going on with the war so as to be able to get rid of the Jews and send them back again. To this Mr. Bull replied that in America things had not quite got to that point yet and that it was in general a question whether the Jews wanted to go back. Herr Pauls got the impression that America intended rather to send off the Jews to Africa.

Discussing the reorganization of postwar Europe, "Mr. Bull" appeared to reject British ideas "in toto." Hohenlohe reported:

"He agreed more or less to a Europe organized politically and industrially on the basis of large territories, and considered that a Federal Greater Germany (similar to the United States), with an associated Danube Confederation, would be the best guarantee of order and progress in central and eastern Europe. He does not reject national socialism in its basic ideas and deeds so much as the "inwardly unbalanced, inferiority-complex-ridden Prussian militarism."

"Then Mr. Bull turned to the subject of national socialism and the person of Adolf Hitler and declared that with all respect to the historical importance of Adolf Hitler and his work it was hardly conceivable that the Anglo-Saxons' workedup public opinion could accept Hitler as unchallenged master of Greater Germany. People had no confidence in the durability and dependability of agreements with him. And reestablishment of mutual confidence was the most essential thing after the war. Nevertheless, Herr Pauls did not get the impression that it was to be viewed as a dogma of American prejudice."

The conversation continued with Hohenlohe trying to get some inkling of allied military intentions and with Dulles fending off his queries. The American agent did deliver, however, a pointed warning. He cited America's "expanding production of aircraft, which will systematically be brought into action against the Axis powers." Then:

"Mr. Bull is in close touch with the Vatican. He himself called Herr Pauls' attention to the importance of this connection, for the American Catholics also have a decisive word to say, and before the conversation ended he again repeated how greatly Germany's position in America would be strengthened if German bishops were to plead Germany's cause here. Even the Jews' hatred could not outweigh that. It had to be remembered, after all, that it had been the American Catholics who had forced the Jewish-American papers to stop their baiting of Franco Spain."

The third top-secret Nazi document deals with another talk between "Mr. Roberts," Dulles' righthand man, and another SS agent, identified only as "Bauer." This took place in Geneva on Sunday, March 21, 1943. It was a long, rambling, inconclusive rehash of the war and its issues, but certain strong strands emerge in the SS report. "Bauer" quoted Roberts as saying "he [Roberts] did not like the Jews and it was distasteful to think that they were now able to adorn their six-pointed star with an additional wreath of martyrdom." The coolness toward the British, the pro-German warmth was there. "Bauer" quoted Roberts:

"America had no intention of going to war every 20 years and was now aiming at a prolonged settlement, in the planning of which she wished to take a decisive part and did not wish to leave that again to Britain, bearing in mind the bitter experience of the past. It would be nothing else but regrettable if Germany excluded herself from this settlement, for that country deserved every kind of admiration and meant a great deal more to him than any other countries."

How much truth?

The impact of these reports, read 18 years later, can only be described as shocking. The picture that emerges is of a Dulles perfectly willing to throw the Austrians and the Czechs (whom the Allies then were publicly pledged to free) to the wolves; a Dulles who "does not reject national socialism in its basic ideas and deeds," despite the smoking furnaces of the Nazi charnel houses; a Dulles who, blaming all on Prussian militarism, was looking forward to seeing a strong and resurgent Germany dominating all of central Europe; a Dulles who was concerned primarily (as the Dulles of 1918 had been) with using Germany and Poland as buffers against Russia in the east; a Dulles who was concerned, as one would expect the Dulles of the 1920's to be, with keeping Russia out of the oil-rich Near East; a Dulles who seemed still to regard the British with a small "b," who looked with equanimity (as the Dulles who had represented some of the mightiest German corporations might be expected to do) upon German industrial leadership of Europe—a Dulles who paid "respect to the historical importance of Adolph Hitler and his work," who thought Hitler would have to go, but who did not make this seem like "a dogma of American prejudice."

One finds oneself asking the shocked question: Was this the real Allen Dulles?

It is not easy to decide. Always, in anything that touches upon the double-dealing shadow world of the secret agent, one must have more than normal reservations. This picture of Dulles is the picture that emerges from SS reports, but perhaps SS agents, like a lot of other secret agents, might have been tempted to tell headquarters what they knew headquarters wanted to hear. Even if the SS reports were completely accurate, there is no guarantee that Dulles actually believed all that the reports attributed to him. He was trying to pick the minds of his SS callers, as they were trying to pick his, and in the brain-picking duel, any agent might be likely to cloak, to a degree at least, his real beliefs and intentions and to pretend to what he did not really feel. Was this what Dulles was doing? Was he being extremely cordial and agreeable to Hohenlohe merely in the hope of luring information out of him? Or were at least some of those sentiments he expressed really his own?

Whatever the truth, there is no imputation in these documents that Allen Dulles was anything but a patriot seeking to further what he conceived to be the best interests of his country. Not his motives, but his judgments, are called into question as one peruses these SS records.

In any case, the SS portrait must be assessed against some checkpoints—Dulles' own known background and certain future developments, all of which seem to fall into a pattern. Dulles certainly played the master's role in cloak-and-dagger activities in Europe. He remained the boss of the Berne nerve center of intelligence throughout the war, and he came out of the conflict with an overpowering reputation as America's master spy. Under the circumstances, it is curious to find that the pattern of German rapprochement described in Hohenlohe's report was repeated again and again in other secret dealings by American agents.

For a soft peace

One of these negotiations took place in October 1943, when Dr. Felix Kersten, a Finnish masseur who had won the confidence of Himmler himself, went to Sweden to confer with an unnamed American agent. They discussed the danger from the east and a compromise peace. Tentatively, they agreed on the restoration of Germany's 1914 boundaries (this would have included France's Alsace-Lorraine), the ending of the Hitler dictatorship, reduction of the German Army, control over German industry, and an American pledge to forget about an enlarged Poland. Still later, in the spring of 1944, another American feeler was put out by a secret agent in Yugoslavia, again for negotiations that would involve the possibility of uniting the western allies with Germany for the struggle against bolshevism.

These repeated overtures would make it seem as if someone somewhere had some pretty determined ideas about a soft German peace and the building up of a strong postwar Germany to combat the Soviet menace. All of this occurred at a time when Russia ostensibly was our ally and was

locked in the fiercest of death grapples with Germany. If the Russians, who had their own spy system, were aware of these secret machinations—as they may well have been, for, according to the Germans, Hungarian agents had broken the code Dulles was using—the seemingly unreasonable Russian distrust of America would begin to seem less unreasonable. Such are the penalties of an intelligence operation that runs counter to the official policy of the nation employing it.

Whether Dulles himself had any responsibility for the persistent pro-German feelers is not established, but there is one further strong indication of his attitude toward Germany in one of his best-publicized exploits. Not long after his arrival in Berne, he received a call from an emissary connected with the military side of the crosshatch of plots involving the destruction of Hitler. His caller was Hans Bernd Gisevius, German vice consul in Zurich and a member of the Abwehr, the secret intelligence. Gisevius was a huge, 6-foot-4 German who had been connected with anti-Hitler plots in 1938 and 1939, before the outbreak of the war. He had close connections with some of Germany's top military leaders, who had long been convinced that Hitler would have to be removed from the scene. From Dulles, Gisevius and his fellow plotters wanted just one assurance—that, if they killed Hitler, Washington would support them in setting up a new and presumably anti-Nazi Government.

The German conspirators did not just ask for Washington's backing; they held out a threat. If the Western democracies refused to grant Germany a decent peace, they warned, they would be compelled to turn to Soviet Russia for support. This, it would seem, was hardly the tone of men inspired by great ideals. As Shirer perceptively remarks: "One marvels at these German resistance leaders who were so insistent on getting a favorable peace settlement from the West and so hesitant in getting rid of Hitler until they got it. One would have thought that if they considered nazism to be such a monstrous evil * * * they would have concentrated on trying to overthrow it regardless of how the West might treat their new regime." No such reflection appears to have occurred to Dulles. He was inclined to accept the demands of the plotters and urged Washington to back the bargain, to promise favorable terms of peace. In this he failed. Roosevelt insisted on "unconditional surrender."

In the light of what we now know, the wisdom of the deal proposed by Dulles appears to be highly dubious. One thing is certain: Himmler knew of the plots against Hitler and deliberately left enough of the plotters free to score the near miss of the 1944 bomb explosion in Hitler's East Prussian headquarters. Himmler certainly had every intention of dominating the Germany that would have survived the loss of the Fuehrer, and there can be little doubt that, if he had been successful, the Nazi system would have been perpetuated. This, at least, the doctrine of "unconditional surrender" avoided. The complete crushing of Germany, the freeing of the wraiths in its concentration camps—total victory and its revelations—made any apologia for nazism impossible.

Such an outcome could hardly have been achieved by the Allen Dulles who peeps out at us from the pages of SS reports or by the Allen Dulles who was ready, by his own admission, to deal with the military plotters.

PART IV. DULLES, PEACE, AND THE CIA

Allen Dulles came back from Berne with such a reputation as a clock-and-dagger mastermind that his exploits are still spoken of with awe. He was decorated with the American Medal of Merit, a Presidential Citation, the Medal of Freedom, Belgium's Leopold Cross, and France's Legion of Honor. These medals represented several triumphs in espionage.

The greatest feats stemmed from Dulles' contact with an employee in the German Foreign Office who has been identified only as "George Wood." A secret anti-Nazi, "Wood" risked death many times to make contact with Dulles in Berne. At each meeting, he delivered to the American agent copies of ultra-secret German documents. The impressive total of 2,600 documents reportedly was funneled into Dulles' hands by "Wood." Some are said to have been of such importance that they vitally affected the course of the war.

According to the Dulles legend, documents supplied by Wood gave the first clue to German experiments with the V–1 and V–2 rockets at the Peenemunde testing base on the Baltic. Dulles' information, it is asserted, warned the Allies in time, enabled them to raid Peenemunde with their heavy bombers, and set the rocket program back an all-important 6 months.

There is no doubt that the raid on Peenemunde did just this, but there is considerable doubt whether Dulles can claim sole credit for it. Winston Churchill, in his history of World War II, writes that German experiments with rockets at Peenemunde were known even before the war and that as early as the autumn of 1939 "references to long-range weapons of various kinds began to appear in our intelligence reports." Edwards, the British Member of Parliament, writes categorically:

"Finally, it is a well-known fact that it was not Mr. Dulles who distinguished himself by discovering the V-rockets, but unassuming Miss Constance Babbington Smith, the British expert on aerial reconnaissance photography, who on June 23, 1943, identified the launching ramps on an aerial photograph of Peenemunde. The British Secret Service had known about plans for building them ever since 1939."

Fewer questions have been raised about some of Dulles' other exploits. One of these dealt with a mysterious Nazi spy by the name of "Cicero." Edwards insists that the full story of "Cicero" has not yet been told, but the accepted version goes like this: From some of the documents given him by Wood, Dulles learned that the British Ambassador in Turkey, Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, had a valet who was actually a Nazi spy and who used the code name of "Cicero." The tip about "Cicero" came to Dulles just in time to alter the route of an American convoy and save it from a planned U-boat attack.

Even more important than saving a convoy was the final achievement credited to Dulles—the surrender of the German Army in Italy in 1945. Dulles arranged this through his contacts in the SS, specifically through negotiations with SS-Obergruppenfuehrer Karl Wolff. As a result, the German surrender in Italy came earlier than otherwise might have been the case, and presumably the lives of thousands of Allied soldiers were saved.

The Dulles ambivalence

With war's end, Dulles returned for a time to his law desk at Sullivan and Cromwell, but with his glamorous (and glamorized) World War II masterminding behind him, it was hardly to be expected that world events would leave him long alone. Both he and his older brother, John Foster, now began to emerge on the national scene in new and ever more powerful roles. The buildup for both was, and was to remain, tremendous. The Nation's largest news media agreed with virtually a single voice that John Foster Dulles was the infallible wise man of foreign policy; his ties to top-level German industry under the Nazis, his links to America First, his speeches proclaiming we had nothing to fear from the Axis, were all forgotten. Only some maverick columnists like Drew Pearson, I. F. Stone, Dr. Frank Kingdon, and Harold L. Ickes remembered the past. And who were they to outshout New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who discovered and proclaimed (years before Eisenhower) that John Foster Dulles was "the greatest statesman in the world" and "the only man in the world whom the Russians fear"?

Then—and since

Under the cover of such authoritative proclamations of highly disputable fact, the American public as a whole completely forgot that the Dulles brothers had been the high legal priests and the helpful manipulators of some of the greatest German trusts; and little significance seems to have been attached to the curious coincidence that, in the immediate postwar era, they became the spokesmen for a compassionate German policy. With the adaptability of lawyers and politicians, they seemed at times to ride both sides of the issue, but in the final analysis their weight appears to have been thrown on the pro-German side.

Typical of this ambivalence was the performance of Allen Dulles in the days right after the guns were silenced. In an article he wrote in Collier's in May 1946, he based his lead paragraph on the events of 157 B.C., comparing Berlin with Carthage. "Berlin remains a monument to Prussian and Nazi philosophy," he wrote. He suggested it might be a good idea to leave in the heart of Berlin a completely devastated area as a perpetual reminder of what the Nazis and Prussian militarism had wrought. "The central area, for example, a half mile radius around Hitler's Chancellory," he explained, "might be set aside as a perpetual memorial to the Nazis and to Prussia." Berlin should no longer be the capital of Germany; it should be regelated to an inconsequential role as a mere railroad and commercial center because "Berlin has lost its birthright. * * * It has lost it because for generations this city has housed the chief disturbers of world peace. Hence, as the capital of Germany, Berlin 'delenda ets.' "

Yet, in less than 2 years' time, Allen Dulles appeared to be worrying less about the horrors of Nazi and Prussian militarism and more about the virtues of a strong Germany. When congressional committees began debating the European recovery program, former President Herbert Hoover, John Foster Dulles, and Allen Dulles were among the leaders in the drive to rebuild German industry—with which the Dulleses, at least, had had the strongest kind of personal and financial ties. Describing this effort, Helen Fuller wrote in "The New Republic" in February 1948:

"For months, the Herter committee on European aid has been passing for a high-minded, bipartisan group of good Samaritans. Actually, the Herter bill that is being urged as a substitute for ERP was mainly a Hoover product. Chairman Christian A. Herter (Republican, of Massachusetts), a Hoover protege, allowed Allen Dulles, international banker and friend of Hoover, to do the drafting, called in other likeminded Wall Streeters to help."

The author went on to describe the "snail's pace" dismantling of German industry abroad, the concentrated "strong Germany" propaganda drive in the United States. She quoted John Foster Dulles' testimony, which seemingly straddled both sides of the issue. John Foster favored reparations and control; but he insisted it wouldn't be economical to duplicate Germany's steel industry in France, and all Western European countries would be positively "delighted to see Germany restored and smoke pouring out of the factories of the Ruhr as rapidly as possible." Acidly, Helen Fuller wrote: "The Inter-Allied Reparations Agency could show Dulles fat

official records to the contrary. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and many others want German equipment with which to rebuild their own devastated economies."

This is the background from which the "strong Germany" policy of today was to emerge. Whether the Germans of today are a completely different race from the Germans of the past who brought two of history's most horrible wars upon the world, whether the "strong Germany" policy represents the acme of wisdom of a disastrous gamble in power politics—these are questions that only the future can decide. What is important here is to understand some of the pressures producing the policy. When one examines these, one finds the Dulleses advocating a public policy that coincided neatly with the dictates of what had been their longtime private interests. The Allen Dulles of 1918, of 1942–45, of 1947–48, seems the same man, with the same strong alliances to top-level Germans regardless of their ideology; and it is this strong pull of private ties that becomes so disturbing when one tries to analyze the public performance of the man who was soon to become head of CIA.

Birth of the CIA

The Agency itself was essentially the creation of President Harry S. Truman, and it resulted almost inevitably from the painful lessons of World War II. Pearl Harbor had had a permanent and understandable effect upon the thinking of American leaders. In the post mortems conducted into that disaster, it had become apparent that ample information was available in Washington to have alerted Army and Navy commanders at the Pearl Harbor base of their danger; but no effective use had been made of the available intelligence, largely because there was no single agency entrusted with the accurate and speedy interpretation of such detail. The emergencies of war led to the hasty creation of OSS, but OSS was obviously a stopgap measure, not a final solution.

On October 1, 1945, immediately after the cessation of hostilities, Truman abolished OSS. The President apparently had a personal distaste for the nasty business of spying, and he was, in addition, under bureaucratic pressures from all sides to decapitate OSS. The President apparently had a per- intelligence services wanted no such powerful competitor; the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover long had felt it should be the sole gatherer and dispenser of vital information, both at home and abroad; and the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget both had the knives out for OSS. With the dissolution of the agency, however, a chaotic situation quickly arose. Intelligence reports from all the competing intelligence-gatherers flowed in bewildering profusion across the President's desk. Frequently, no two agencies agreed on anything; frequently, their analyses and predictions flatly contradicted one another. The result was that the President was almost as badly off from this plethora of advice as he would have been if he had had no advice at all, and he was left largely to follow his own hunches.

This obviously was no way to chart strategy among the perilous reefs of the cold war, and various solutions were proposed. Donovan, as early as 1944, had suggested to Roosevelt the creation of a Central Intelligence Agency so powerful it would dominate the entire field. Opposition to such a monolithic structure was led by the Navy, which took the position that each of the services, with its own special requirements and ends in view, needed its own agents. Admiral King, in addition, foresaw in a powerful Central Intelligence a possible threat to democracy, and in Congress there were very real fears lest, in our hunt for intelligence, we create a potential gestapo.

Giant step forward

The result was a compromise. Truman, by Executive order on January 22, 1946, set up the Central Intelligence Group, the forerunner of the present CIA. This was to be, as Ransom explains in his authoritative book, primarily "a holding company coordinating the work of existing departments." It functioned under an executive council, the National Intelligence Authority, composed of the Secretaries of State, War and Navy, and the President's personal representative. Under this setup, the practice began which continues today of having Central Intelligence provide for the President's personal eye a daily, exclusive and unified digest and summary of all important international intelligence. Truman, understandably, felt that a great step forward had been taken. "Here, at last," he writes in his memoirs, "a coordinated method had been worked out, and a practical way had been found for keeping the President informed as to what was known and what was going on."

The Central Intelligence Group, however, was only a temporary expedient, as OSS had been before it; and Congress, in ordering the semi-unification of the defense establishment in 1947, abolished CIG and created the present Central Intelligence Agency, functioning under a National Security Council, comparable to the former National Intelligence Agency. Before final action was taken, the advice of Allen Dulles was sought. This he gave in a significant memorandum dated April 25, 1947.

Dulles made six principal recommendations: CIA, he thought, should have absolute control over its own personnel; its chief should not have men foisted upon him for political or other reasons, but should have full say in picking his own assistants. The agency should have its own budget and the right to supplement this by drawing funds from the Departments of State and Defense. CIA should have "exclusive jurisdiction to carry out secret intelligence operations." It should have "access to all intelligence information relating to foreign countries." It should be the "recognized agency for dealing with the central intelligence agencies of other countries." And, finally, it should have "its operations and personnel protected by 'official secrets' legislation which would provide adequate penalties for breach of security."

Principle of separation

In his comments on the proposed agency, Dulles made several important observations. CIA, he felt, should be predominantly civilian rather than military in its high command, and if a military man was appointed to head it, he should become a civilian while he held the office. Its administration, he felt strongly, must have long-term continuity and professional status: its Director should be assured of long tenure, like Hoover in the FBI, "to build up public confidence, and esprit de corps in his organization, and a high prestige." He opposed the creation of an agency that would become "merely a coordinating agency for the military intelligence services" and warned that this "is not enough." Most significantly, in view of the future course of events, he recognized the dangers inherent in wedding information to policy.

"The State Department * * *," he wrote, "will collect and process its own information as a basis for the day-to-day conduct of its work. The armed services intelligence agencies will do likewise. But for the proper judging of the situation in any foreign country it is important that the information should be processed by an agency whose duty it is to weigh facts, and to draw conclusions from those facts, without having either the facts or the conclusions warped by the inevitable and even proper prejudices of the men whose duty it is to determine policy and who, having once determined policy, are too likely to be blind to any facts which might tend to prove the policy to be faulty. The Central Intelligence Agency should have nothing to do with policy. It should try to get at the hard facts on which others must determine policy."

The case could not be put better. With this strong, explicit statement, virtually every expert on the subject has always been in complete agreement. But, unfortunately, this wasn't the way CIA was to be set up, and this wasn't the way that increasingly, under Allen Dulles himself in later years, it was to run.

Rumors that this cardinal principle of intelligence—the separation of information from the roles of policy and action—might be flouted by the new spy outfit were current even as it was being created. In the hearings on the National Security Act of 1947, Congressman Fred Busbey sounded an anxious note. "I wonder," he asked, "if there is any foundation for the rumors that have come to me to the effect that through this Central Intelligence Agency, they are contemplating operational activities?"

The question wasn't answered at the time, but the act in its final form left the door open and "they" walked through. The Security Act charged CIA with five specific functions: to advise the National Security Council on intelligence matters related to national security; to make recommendations to the council for coordination of intelligence activities of departments and agencies of the Government; to correlate and evaluate intelligence and provide for its appropriate dissemination within the Government; to perform for the benefit of existing intelligence agencies such additional services as the NSC might determine could be more efficiently handled centrally; and finally, most important, "to perform other functions and duties" relating to national security intelligence as the NSC might direct. It is this "other functions and duties" clause that gave CIA broad powers to enter, not just the field of intelligence, but the field of overt activities.

The principle violated

The concentration of power in the hands of the Agency, implicit in its organization, was increased tremendously by revisions of the CIA statute made in 1949. Three major changes placed almost dictatorial powers in the hands of its Director. He was given the right to hire and fire without regard to Civil Service or other restraints. CIA was exempted from the provisions of any laws that might require publication or disclosure of the "organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries or numbers of personnel employed" (even the Bureau of the Budget was directed specifically to make no reports to Congress on any of these matters; in other words, CIA became a completely closed book). At the same time, its Director was given full authority to spend any amount on his personal voucher, without accounting. "This," as Ransom comments, "is truly an extraordinary power for the head of an executive agency with thousands of employees and annual expenditures in the hundreds of millions of dollars."

To counterbalance these sweeping powers, there were few restraints. Congress, evidently with that haunting Gestapo specter in mind, did specify that CIA should have no arrest or subpena powers within the United States. The FBI's files, while not barred to it, were not exactly opened either; for, while other agencies were required to report their intelligence findings to CIA, the FBI was not. The CIA may obtain whatever specific information the FBI has if it requests it in writing, but this is quite a different affair from being kept informed as

a matter of routine of what the FBI knows. Finally, a supposed safeguard was set up around those all-important "other functions and duties" the CIA was empowered to perform. These were to be embarked upon only at the direction of the National Security Council, presided over by the President himself. But, as Ransom points out, the principal intelligence adviser of the NSC is the Director of CIA. The Director is "a constant participant in NSC deliberations," and this, to Ransom, seems "to suggest that the scope of CIA operations is to a large extent self-determined. * * * Certainly Congress has no voice as to how and where CIA is to function, other than prohibiting it to engage in domestic security activities."

This is the powerful and secretive setup—doubly powerful and insidious in its influence because it is so secretive, so free of any effective checkrein—that Congress created to protect us against the possibility of an atomic Pearl Harbor. How has it functioned?

In the beginning, as was perhaps inevitable with a new agency, its performance could be described only as decidedly spotty. Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter was the first Director of CIA and guided its destiny through its first 3 difficult years. The Korean war came during this period, and with it came the first blunders of the new Agency in its primary role, the gathering of intelligence.

Early failures

For some of these errors in strategic foresight, CIA was not alone at fault; other older and better established arms of the intelligence services, the military and the State Department, were equally culpable. The first miscalculation—and one of the gravest in magnitude, for upon its accuracy rested the cornerstone of such deterrent policies as "massive retaliation"—dealt with the date Russia might be expected to detonate an atom bomb. All intelligence services agreed at the end of World War II that this feat would require 10 years at least, and all were astonished when the Soviets held their first successful A-bomb test in 1949. This shock was succeeded by one even greater, for the Russians in August, 1953, actually beat us to the first workable hydrogen bomb, and we learned some significant details of value to ourselves by analyzing their fallout. With these blasts, just as important though less obvious and less publicized than sputnik, "massive retaliation" became an unworkable two-way street.

The next flub involved Korea, but again, at the outset at least, CIA was no more at fault than others. All our intelligence services thought it highly improbable that the North Korean Communists would invade South Korea and touch off a war—but they did. This first wrong guess was followed by others. One of the great surprises was the appearance in the Korean skies of the Russian Mig-15, a warplane faster than anything in our arsenal and one that inflicted crushing losses on our B–29 bombers. Yet, even after the Mig–15 appeared, we continued our fatal underestimation of the Russians. Air Force Intelligence was of the opinion—and the other intelligence services seemed to agree—that the Russians could turn out no more than six Mig's a month by hand; actually Russian industry built 10,000 Mig's with great rapidity.

These initial blunders of intelligence in the Korean war were matters of relatively little moment compared to the final one that, in the fall of 1950, literally cost the lives of thousands of American soldiers. United Nations Forces, having recovered from their initial defeats, had driven the Red invaders from the north back across the 38th parallel, the dividing line between North and South Korea. A decision had to be made whether to continue the attack across the border, conquering all of Korea. This course was subject to one paramount danger. If U.N. forces pressed on into North Korea, would the Chinese Communists, with their hordes of manpower, enter the war?

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was confident that they would not. All of our intelligence forces agreed in essence on this forecast. In this, as in the recent Cuba invasion, our vision appears to have been blinded by our desires, and the intelligence for which we pay literally billions of dollars was abysmally wrong, while the advice of independent observers, whose minds were not chained by the demands of policy, was plainly right. In the Korean war, as in the case of Cuba, there were many clear and explicit warnings that a blind intelligence refused to heed.

One of these was delivered by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. An astute world traveler, Justice Douglas had been roaming through southeast Asia during the late summer of 1950. His pulse takings convinced him that, if our troops crossed the 38th parallel, the Communist Chinese would enter the war on a massive scale. He personally warned President Truman of this. A similar warning was sounded in Washington by the Indian representatives to the United States. But these uncommitted minds could not be expected to be so persuasive as those who were supposed to know.

Ransom, in his work on the CIA, describes the sequel in these words:

"Despite the continuous barrage of propaganda warnings and the carefully monitored movement of troops into Manchuria, intelligence analysts and the policymakers failed to consider seriously such threats and apparently neglected to read history, or they would have recognized the traditional Chinese fear of an enemy north of the narrow Korean waist. President Truman records in his memoirs that 'On October 20 (1950), the CIA delivered a memorandum to me which said that they had reports that the Chinese Communists would move in for enough to safeguard the Suiho electric plant and other installations along the Yalu River which provided them with power. Actually the Chinese had begun crossing the Yalu 4 days earlier with the apparent intention of throwing the United Nations Forces out of Korea."

The surprise was complete, and the massive Chinese onslaught threatened for a time to cut off and obliterate the U.N. Army. Even though MacArthur managed to rescue the bulk of his forces, he was driven back in a military debacle.

Criticism of the CIA may have had something to do with the decision of Admiral Hillenkoetter to leave his post as its Director and return to naval duty. He was succeeded by Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who had been Eisenhower's Chief of Staff in Europe. One of Smith's first moves was to telephone Allen Dulles. Dulles had served on a committee that in 1948 had examined the CIA setup and recommended some 50 administrative changes. Smith had read the report, and when he got Dulles on the phone in his New York law office, he spoke with characteristic bluntness.

As Dulles later recalled it, Smith growled: "Now that you've written this damn report, it's up to you to put it into effect."

Dulles agreed to serve with Smith. In November 1950, he left for Washington. He has been there ever since.

PART V. WITH DULLES IN IRAN

"I came down here to stay 6 months, and now see what has happened," Allen Dulles remarked to a friend some years ago, in a happier time.

A husky 6-footer, weighing 200 pounds, the boss of the CIA, with his bristling mustache and thinning gray hair, greatly resembles his late brother, John Foster Dulles, but in Washington he was generally the much better liked of the two. He was less of a messiah, more relaxed, more good humored. A man who seems to live with a pipe in his mouth, Allen Dulles looks more like a kindly, tweedy, college professor than a mastermind of secret intelligence, and he and his wife form one of Washington's most popular party-going couples. They frequently, however, do little more than put in an appearance and leave early. But even these fleeting visits cause some eyebrow raising, for most comparable commanders of secret agents, less gregarious than Dulles, shun the cocktail circuit with its built-in temptations to wag the tongue. This is a risk that Dulles assumes with apparent joyousness, and this much must be said for him: he has never yet been accused of dropping the wrong word into the wrong ear.

As far as personality goes, then (and, as everyone knows, it goes far), Allen Dulles has been and still is a popular man in Washington. At 68, he is still amazingly active. He plays a good game of doubles in tennis, still shoots golf at around 90 when he has a chance to play. Friends describe him as a man of "enormous patience," and to interviewers—he presents the candid and attractive face of a man who modestly deprecates his own cloak-and-dagger roles. "I've never been shot at," he remarked once, "and I don't know that anyone ever tried to kidnap me."

These engaging personal attributes have helped to carry Allen Dulles far and probably have helped to blunt much sharp criticism to which, otherwise, he might have been subjected. He became Deputy Director of CIA under Bedell Smith in August 1951, and in January 1953, with the advent of the Eisenhower administration, he was named director even as his brother became Secretary of State. Thus, as the New York Times noted at the time, the Nation in a most unusual move had placed "in the hands of two brothers the direction of open and secret foreign policy designed to win the cold war against communism."

The result became evident almost at once. Not just intelligence, but palace coups became the work of CIA. The intrigue that topples governments became increasingly its trademark.

Dulles had hardly made himself comfortabel in the CIA Director's chair when a major event abroad called for prompt and accurate analysis. In March 1953 the report of Joseph Stalin's death flashed over the wires to a teletype in CIA headquarters at 2430 E Street NW. in Washington. The dictator's demise raised immediate and tremendous questions. Georgi Malenkov appeared to be the No. 2 man in the Kremlin. He would probably succeed, for a time at least, to Stalin's power. What kind of ruler would he be? Would Russia be torn by revolution, by internal power struggle? Would she be more, or less, warlike?

Upon the answers to these questiohs depended America's posture, America's preparation to meet the changed world situation. CIA swung at once into a crash program designed to provide the necessary information. The instant Dulles got the word of Stalin's death, he began sending out orders to CIA agents and undercover men scattered throughout the world. He demanded from them information on what to expect—morale behind the Iron Curtain, arms shipments, troop movements, purges. Before long, detailed reports began to pour in.

Iran: a tangled web

While the foreign network was supplying oversea data, Dulles and the experts in his analysis section in CIA headquarters sifted reports and studied their voluminous files on Malenkov and the men most closely associated with him. From all of these sources, they compiled a picture and made an expert guess. A messenger rushed off to the White House with this CIA estimate: Russia was not prepared for war. There would be no revolution.

It was, as events were to show, a pretty accurate assessment, and it illustrates CIA's functioning at its best in the intelligence field that should be its primary business. But before many months had passed, CIA was to give another demonstration of its prowess, this time on a different and far more controversial level.

The development involved strategically important, oil-rich Iran. The Iranian border runs for 1,000 miles along that of the Soviet Union, and the natural resources of the country include an estimated 13 percent of the world's oil reserves. This liquid treasure, the one great source of true wealth in Iran, long had been exploited by British interests. Baron Reuter, founder of the British news service that still bears his name, had received in 1872 a concession that gave him practically a complete monopoly over Iranian industry. International complications prevented Reuter from doing much to exercise the concession for several years, but ultimately, in the early 1900's, he and others—including J. Henry Schroeder & Co., the international German banking house with which Allen Dulles later was to be connected—formed the Industrial Bank of Persia (later the Bank of Iran), which in turn helped to finance the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. It seems worthy of note that Frank C. Tiarks, one of Allen Dulles' fellow directors in the Schroeder banking enterprises, served also as a director of Anglo-Iranian Oil and that Sullivan and Cromwell, the New York legal firm in which the Dulles brothers were such prominent partners, was the long-time legal counsel of Anglo-Iranian Oil.

These old ties are stressed because they were lying there among the stage props in the background when Allen Dulles, just a few short months after he became CIA director, popped upon the international scene in a new and decidedly spectacular role. The immediate background was this: In 1951, a new political force that threatened old and dominant financial interests had arisen in Iran. This force was Mohammed Mossadegh, himself a wealthy landowner, but a man driven by a strong anti-British phobia. Mossadegh rose to power as Premier during a time of intense nationalism in Iran, and he capitalized on the sentiment of the hour by expropriating the properties of the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. The company's royalty payments had provided a major part of Iran's foreign exchange earnings; but with the seizure by Mossadegh, there developed a bitter international dispute. The huge financial interests of the West virtually boycotted Iranian oil. Mossadegh tried to make deals with smaller, independent American companies to work the Iranian fields, but the State Department frowned upon such free enterprise. The international oil cartel held firm—and Iran lost all its oil revenues.

Democracy—and oil

The resulting financial pressures on the Mossadegh regime were enormous. The United States offset some of these with foreign aid. In 1951, $1.6 million was allowed for a technical rural-improvement program. The following year, with Iran drained of all oil revenue, the American foreign aid grant was raised to $23 million, most of which was used to make up Iran's foreign exchange shortages. The Iranian financial crisis, however, remained desperate, and on May 28, 1953, Mossadegh sent a demand to President Eisenhower. Iran, he said, would have to have more American aid, or he would have to seek help elsewhere through the conclusion of an economic agreement and mutual defense pact with Russia.

Foreign analysts were convinced that Mossadegh had just one asset he could pledge to guarantee the safety of Russian investment—the rich Iranian oil fields and the refinery at Abadan, the world's largest, which Mossadegh had seized from Anglo-Iranian. It is clear that Anglo-Iranian had billion-dollar property interests at stake, but this underlying factor has hardly ever been mentioned in discussing the loftier picture—the stake of democracy: If Russia were to get Iran's oil, the Western democracies' position throughout the Middle East would be weakened, Soviet prestige would be greatly enhanced. This, naturally, was unthinkable, and so the Eisenhower administration, already greatly under the influence of the Dulles brothers, decided on a startling new gamble in international intrigue.

The President stalled Mossadegh for a month, then turned him down with an emphatic "No." Immediately afterwards, things began to happen. The step-by-step action was detailed by Richard and Gladys Harkness in a three-part Saturday Evening Post series, "The Mysterious Doings of CIA," which appeared in the late fall of 1954. The series bears intrinsic evidence on almost every page of having been written with the full, if secret, cooperation of CIA, and so its account of the coup in Iran is as authoritative as one can get. Obviously, this was one of those occasions when Allen Dulles, in triumph, permitted himself an audible public chuckle—and a discreet leak.

Enter the CIA

This, then, according to the Harknesses, is what happened:

On August 10, 1953, Allen Dulles packed his bags and flew to Europe, ostensibly to join his wife for a quiet vacation in the Swiss Alps. His departure coincided almost precisely with mounting developments in the Iranian pressure-cooker. Mossadegh was threatening to run Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlevi right off the throne and out of the country. The Premier had allied himself with the Communist Tudeh Party in Teheran and had acquired almost dictatorial powers. He was at this very moment conferring with a Russian diplomatic-economic mission. These conferences were a clear sign that the hour of supreme decision approached; yet, strangely enough, Loy Henderson, the American Ambassador to Iran, seemed to feel free to leave his vital post for a short holiday in company of Allen Dulles in Switzerland. Another visitor who seemed to be drawn as if by a magnet to Dulles' picturesque hostelry in the Alps at precisely this critical juncture was Princess Ashraf, the attractive and strong-willed brunette twin sister of the Shah, who, according to the Harknesses, "had had a stormy session with her brother in his pink marble palace because of his vacillation in facing up to Mossadegh."

The Alpine rendezvous of master-secret agent, diplomat, and Iranian princess would seem to indicate that perhaps wires were being pulled. This suspicion was reinforced when a fourth mysterious actor began to stroll slowly across the international stage. This was Brig. Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, best known for the not entirely brilliant conduct of the Lindbergh kidnaping case in 1932 when he had been head of New Jersey State Police. Schwarzkopf now began to move leisurely around the Middle East, stopping off in Pakistan, Syria, Lebanon—and Iran. He was an old hand in Iran, having served there from 1942 through 1948 as high-level adviser in the reorganization of the Shah's national police force. He was, he said, just dropping by "to see old friends again." Mossadegh and the Russian propaganda press distrusted this pat explanation and began to rail nervously at his presence; but Schwarzkopf, undeterred, visited with the Shah and had some intimate talks with his former colleague on the national police force, Maj. Gen. Fazlollah Zahedi. Almost at once, like cause and effect, a new and tougher attitude toward Mossadegh became apparent.

Triumph for the West

On Thursday, August 13, the Shah acted. By royal decree he deposed Mossadegh as Premier and installed in his stead General Zahedi. A colonel of the Imperial Guards was sent to serve the notice on Mossadegh, but Mossadegh wasn't ready to quit. He massed tanks, jeeps, and troops around his residence, and at midnight of Saturday, August 15, he seized the colonel of the Imperial Guards, clapped him in jail and proclaimed that the "revolt" had been crushed. The Shah and his Queen, taking Mossadegh at his word, promptly fled to Rome by way of Iraq.

Some hardier souls, including Schwarzkopf, remained upon the Iranian scene. The manipulations in which they now engaged never have been spelled out in detail, but it is understood that CIA cash flowed in copious quantities. The amount reliably reported is $19 million—and $19 million can influence a lot of men. What happened next in Iran would seem like proof of that theorem.

"On Wednesday, August 19, with the Army standing close guard around the uneasy capital [the Harknesses wrote], a grotesque procession made its way along the street leading to the heart of Teheran. There were tumblers turning handsprings, weightlifters twirling iron bars and wrestlers flexing their biceps. As spectators grew in number, the bizarre assortment of performers began shouting pro-Shah slogans in unison. The crowd took up the chant and there, after one precarious moment, the balance of psychology swung against Mossadegh.

"Upon signal, it seemed, Army forces on the Shah's side began an attack. The fighting lasted a bitter nine hours. By nightfall, following American-style military strategy and logistics, loyalist troops drove Mossadegh's elements into a tight cordon around the Premier's palace. They surrendered, and Mossadegh was captured as he lay weeping in his bed, clad in striped silk pajamas. In Rome, a bewildered young Shah prepared to fly home and install Zehedi as Premier, and to give Iran a pro-Western regime."

Triumph for our side. In the Harkness account, there is of course no hint of the years-long legal tie between the Dulles brothers and Anglo-Iranian Oil, nor is it emphasized that one of the major accomplishments of the coup in Iran was to save the billion-dollar scalp of Anglo-Iranian. The picture presented, obviously the CIA's flattering version of itself, was that the overthrow of Mossadegh had been accomplished by the Iranians themselves and that Iran was the showcase of a new method by which CIA would develop and nurture "freedom legions among captive or threatened people who stand ready to take personal risks for their own liberty."

This sounds fine if one doesn't analyze it too closely, but the hard sequel of events, unfortunately, has refused to reflect the lofty image. In the harsh afterlight, it has become abundantly apparent that all CIA accomplished in Iran was an old-style palace coup, with money in bountiful quantities and skillful press agentry pulling emotional heartstrings at a pivotal moment and achieving a much-desired end. But did this represent a great triumph for Western democracy in the ideological battle against communism? True, a new regime, oriented toward our side, had been installed. But was this new regime motivated by any loftier concept than the idea that what was good for Anglo-Iranian Oil was good for Western democracy? Events seem to say that it was not.

Five million dollars a month

Much of the sorry story is told in the 1957 report of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives. The report makes clear that in August 1953,

immediately afthe the overthrow of Mossadegh, a delighted United States began to pour mutual security funds into Iran at an average rate of $5 million a month and that this went on for 3 years "to make up deficits in Iran's Government budget." The committee found that, in 5 years from 1951 to 1956, the United States had donated a quarter of a billion dollars to Iran and that (the committee did not phrase it in precisely these terms, of course) all we had accomplished was to furnish the entire Middle East with a king-size example of graft and corruption. The committee was convinced that Iran, with some $300 million a year fattening its treasury from restored oil revenues, should have been fully capable of financing itself and providing for its own national development without any U.S. aid. Yet, despite its heavy oil revenues, despite the hundreds of millions of dollars in American aid, Iran's CIA-installed government was so corrupt that the national treasury constantly teetered on the brink of bankruptcy and reported ever-mounting deficits.

No triumph for the people

Here are some of the exact words of the House committee. The quarter-billion dollars in American aid was administered in such "a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner" that "it is now impossible—with any accuracy—to tell what became of these funds." Amounts requested for American aid to Iran "seem to have been picked out of the air." The American aid mission to Iran was concerned only with spending as fast as possible regardless of what the money was spent for, and members who objected to this "were either disciplined or labeled as incompetent." Improvement projects were so riddled with graft and corruption that, after 4 years, most still were not finished. A major undertaking was the construction of a multimillion-dollar dam on the Karadj River, but this project "has resulted in virtually nothing but the relocation, at a cost to the U.S. Government of nearly $3 million, of a road around the proposed site." Not only had no construction been started on the dam, there wasn't even a contract.

The effect of this type of American aid has been to make a bad situation worse. It is a hard thing to say, but true, that the American taxpayers have been milked of hundreds of millions of dollars only to provide the Communist system, on a gold plated platter with a priceless propaganda item. Our hundreds of millions of dollars have done virtually nothing for the people of Iran; they have enriched only the grafters and widened the gulf between the very rich and the abysmally poor. The congressional committee in 1957 found literacy so low in Iran that, even in the cities, some estimates placed it at not more than 7 percent. Time magazine, certainly not one of the world's ultraliberal organs, reported in 1960 that some families were still living on the produce of a single walnut tree, that tiny children worked all day at the looms of rug factories for 20 cents or less. Time, updating its report in May 1961, found that Iran, under the pressure of the flood of American dollars, was suffering from runaway inflation. Prices were jumping at the rate of 10 percent a year; a pound of meat in Teheran cost $1.15; wages remained so low that teachers were earning only $25 a month. The economy of the country was being strained to maintain a 200,000-man army, larger than the armies of either Western Germany or Japan. Elections had been so blatantly rigged that the Shah had been forced to cancel two of them and fire three key men in his immediate entourage. One of these was the chief of the secret police, who had built himself an ostentatious mansion near the Shah's own palace; another was General Ali Kia, chief of army intelligence, who, said Time, had "built a block of luxury apartments that Teheranis had taken to calling the Where-Did-You-Get-It-From Building."

This is what we have bought in Iran with our millions. The result we reap by such extravaganzas became clear this past May when 5,000 teachers rioted in the streets of Teheran in front of the Parliament Building. A police major lost his head, fired his revolver and killed one teacher, wounded three others. Teachers and students then fought bloody hand-to-hand skirmishes with police, paraded the dead teacher's coffin through the streets and forced the resignation of the Premier. The Shah hastily installed Ali Amini, a wealthy, French-educated landowner with liberal political views. Amini, concededly the last hope of avoiding revolution, took over a nation so badly looted that its Government debt, only $10 million in 1955, had soared to $500 million. He took swift stock of the situation and reported: "There is no life left in the economic and financial agencies of the Government." To striking teachers, he confessed: "The treasury is empty, and the nation faces a crisis—I dare not speak more openly lest I create a panic."

Yet some persons in Iran still were not worried. The commanders of its 200,000-man army and its massive police force felt fully capable of handling anything and everything. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, reported with a sense of shock: "Do you know what the head of the Iranian Army told one of our people? He said the Army was in good shape, thanks to U.S. aid—it was now capable of coping with the civilian population. That Army isn't going to fight the Russians. It's planning to fight the Iranian people."

Such, in the final analysis, is what the CIA and the corrupt Iranian regime that followed in its coupmaking footsteps have wrought in Iran. No demonstration of decadent capitalism could be more apt, more pat for Khrushchev's propaganda purposes. Here, in most graphic form, is a demonstration of the manner in which, as Walter Lippmann found, we have been doing exactly what Khrushchev expects us to do; we have been propping up dictatorial, corrupt, right-wing regimes—and so we have been proving his case for him. It should be obvious that the American ideal, if it is ever to be persuasive, if it is ever to have validity, must find loftier expression than the gun of the secret police chief clasped in fingers stained by many a dirty buck. It must concern itself with people, not with rulers; it must help the broad mass of the people; it must offer both freedom and hope, not oil profits and graft.

PART VI. JUST A LITTLE REVOLUTION

In March 1954, Allen Dulles was interviewed by U.S. News & World Report on the cloak-and-dagger activities of CIA behind the Iron Curtain. The question-and-answer sequence went like this:

"Question. It is often reported in the papers that you send in provocateurs to stir up revolution in the satellite countries. What truth is there in that?

"DULLES. I only wish we had accomplished all that the Soviets attribute to us.

"Question. Is that part of your function—to stir up revolution in these countries?

"DULLES. We would be foolish if we did not cooperate with our friends abroad to help them do everything they can to expose and counter this Communist subversive movement."

Tacitly, then, Dulles acknowledged that the CIA was fomenting violence and revolution behind the Iron Curtain, but he was putting it in the gentlest possible way and on the most acceptable possible plane. We were simply "cooperating" with our friends; we were simply helping them "to expose and counter this Communist subversive movement." It all seemed very mild and very logical the way Dulles put it, but revolution is never mild, nor is killing an appeal to logic. A little reflection about Dulles' statement leads inevitably to serious questions. Is it all really so simple? Just what is involved in stirring up a little revolution behind the Iron Curtain? Do such brush fires simply flare and burn themselves out, causing the Russians some well-deserved embarrassment, or do they in a very direct way involve the prestige and policy of the United States?

The answer seems clear and unequivocal to anyone who will study the record. It has been given in a number of places—in East Germany, in Poland, in Hungary, in the Middle East. Behind many of the eruptions that in recent years have shaken the peace of an uncertain world, close examination will reveal the fine, scheming hand of CIA. And it will reveal, too, that CIA time and again has stirred up the brush fires without any regard for the long-range consequences.

East Germany, 1953

Take, for example, the East German uprising of 1953, On July 17, just two months before Allen Dulles' startling coup in Iran, a series of anti-Communist riots broke out in the Soviet-dominated East Zone. In America, this was taken as an encouraging sign that all was not rosy in the communistic millenium and that perhaps the East Germans might throw off the yoke of tyranny. Such optimism was quickly dissipated. Though some of the anti-Communists were well armed, the revolt was quickly put down; and though great numbers of refugees fled across the border into West Germany, not all of the leaders of the rebellion were so lucky. The Eastern SSD (State Security Service) began a reprisal campaign that lasted for months and resulted in the seizure of hundreds of Soviet-hating Germans.

The significance of this counterdrive became apparent on November 17, 1953, when the New York Times reported that the East German Government had accused scores of its prisoners with being Nazi provocateurs. The East Germans claimed (one must always regard these Communist claims with caution, of course, but then in the secret war of CIA one has no other information on which to judge) that these Western agents had been caught with plans to blast railroad bridges and stations, burn factories and government buildings, and assassinate officials. Faked food stamps and counterfeit bank drafts designed to upset food rationing and bank credits were found in some of the prisoners' pockets, the East Germans asserted.

The Communists in the East Zone were incensed by these discoveries, but then presumably New Yorkers would be a little annoyed if a squad of Russian saboteurs should be caught with plans to blow up the Croton Reservoir. In any event, a number of the accused agents provocateurs were brought to trial. Testimony showed, the East Germans said, that these agents belonged to a mysterious organization headed by Reinhold Gehlen, a former lieutenant general in command of counterintelligence on the eastern front under Hitler. The East German trials resulted in the execution of four of these Gehlen agents and life imprisonment for eleven others, but not even these harsh sentences stirred up as much controversy as one other charge the East Germans made. They contended that, on some of the agents, they had found lists of names of prominent West German anti-Nazis who had been marked for ultimate liquidation.

Though it would seem extremely illogical for East German saboteurs to be carrying such lists around in their pockets, there can be no question that the East Germans, in jabbing an accusing finger at the Reinhold Gehlen spy organization, touched a sensi-

tive nerve. Gehlen at the time was a mystery figure, virtually unknown to the 48 million citizens of the Bonn Republic; unknown to American Congressmen because his name had never been mentioned on the floor of Congress. Yet Gehlen and the private cloak-and-dagger army he headed were indisputably real. In fact, Gehlen was America's No. 1 spy in Europe, he had literally thousands of agents on his payroll, and he was being financed to the tune of between $5 million and $6 million a year with CIA-channeled funds.

Daniel De Luce, one of the Associated Press' veteran foreign correspondents, in an article written some months after the East German revelations, lifted a corner of the veil of secrecy that for so long had shrouded Gehlen. Gehlen's organization, De Luce said, included the elite of the old German army's counterintelligence corps and agents of diverse nationalities scattered through Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Gehlen operated on the old secret service principle of never letting one agent know what another was doing, of tying all the threads together at just one place—the top. His thread-tying headquarters were located on American-requisitioned property near Munich in Bavaria, and were sealed off with barbed wire and guarded by armed state police like an atomic installation.

"On his secret reports which evaluate the findings of his costly anti-Soviet espionage program operating as far beyond the Iron Curtain as Siberia, much of American defense planning admittedly depends today," De Luce wrote.

The picture that emerges borders on the fantastic. American knowledge and security were being made dependent, to a vital degree, on men who were our recent enemies—men who had fought to the last gasp for a system that we had believed represented one of history's most monstrous evils. It is certainly questionable enough to have American foreign policy tugged and hauled all over the map by the super-secret activities of CIA cloak-and-dagger boys, operating free of any effective restraint or control; but clearly, in its relations with Gehlen, CIA had taken one further gigantic stride into the realm of dubiousness. Without the knowledge or consent of the American people or their representatives, it had placed some $6 million worth of annual reliance in the good faith of a recent enemy, commanding an unofficial army of foreign agents (many of them apparently former Nazis at that), and it had delegated to this weird, recent-enemy organization major responsibility for its own thinking, knowledge and safety. The secret pro-German policy, which seems to have had many powerful advocates in the highest American circles even during the horrors of World War II, had indeed brought us full-circle.

Plots—and more plots

Yet the American public as a whole remained almost completely unaware. Few major newspapers (the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was an exception) paid any attention to De Luce's revealing dispatch from Germany. John Foster Dulles' much-trumpeted policy that we intended to liberate the captive peoples—advanced, as events were to show, without giving the most elementary consideration to how this desirable end was to be achieved short of allout American aid and another world war—rolled like an avalanche downhill to fresh international fiascoes that served only to increase international tensions. Time and again, with CIA in the middle of the plotting, aided frequently by its Gehlen proteges, futile revolts and shortsighted intervention marked the consistently reckless course of American foreign policy.

Here, in capsule form, are some of the well-remembered highlights of the disastrous fifties that saw the whittling away, not just of American power, but of America's moral prestige:

The overthrow of King Farouk in Egypt in 1952. Communists inside Egypt reportedly were making immense capital from the antics of the lascivious regime of the pudgy monarch whose principal interest in life appeared to be belly dancers. An Army revolt was organized with Generals Mohammed Naguib and Gamal Abdel Nasser in the leading roles. The Harknesses, in their Saturday Evening Post revelations, straight from the horse's mouth, stated flatly: "Skilled American political operatives were available to advise leaders of a pro-American Egyptian military junta when the time seemed ripe for a palace coup, and they indicated how such devious matters were best arranged." It was another signal triumph for our side. The coup came off on schedule, Farouk fled—and then we got Gamal Abdel Nasser.

The Egyptian strong man whom we had helped to install apparently long remained a favorite of CIA—such a favorite, indeed, that in September 1955, a CIA agent took it upon himself to advise Nasser to ignore a forthcoming State Department note. The note was an attempt to limit Nasser's purchase of arms from Communist Czechoslovakia to a one-shot deal. It was considered important enough for Washington to send George Allen, then Assistant Secretary of State for Middle East Affairs, on a special trip to Cairo to deliver the message in person. The CIA evidently was disturbed by this attempt to pressure Nasser, and before Allen arrived, it effectively cut the ground out from under him by advising Nasser he could safely ignore the warning—a sequence that leads inevitably to the question: Who was running foreign policy, the State Department or the CIA?

We knew all along

The Suez crisis in October 1956. This might be described as the final flowering of our earlier intrigues with Nasser, and even the most charitable view must produce a blush or two at what can only be described as American duplicity. First, of course, we precipitated the crisis by offering Nasser heavy financial aid and then practically slapping his face by reneging on the offer. This touched off a chain reaction whose consequences would appear not to have been foreseen. Nasser seized the Suez Canal. And the British, French, and Israelis undertook the invasion of Egypt.

When this happened, we held up our hands in righteous horror at the warlike action of our allies and protested that we had been taken completely by surprise. John Foster Dulles testified: "We had no advance information of any kind [regarding the Israeli attack on Egypt]. The British-French participation also came as a complete surprise to us." This simply was not true. Two years later, in 1958, the CIA leaked to Don Whitehead, of the New York Herald Tribune, a version so detailed that it leaves little doubt that we knew—and knew precisely—just what was going to happen before it happened. According to CIA, American intelligence agents in Israel had noted and reported the mobilization of the Israeli Army; agents on Cyprus had watched and reported British and French activity in loading combat craft and marshaling war planes and paratroopers; they had even reported that the French had given combat briefings to newspaper correspondents attached to their invasion units. Twenty-four hours before the attack, the White House had a specific warning from CIA that the Israelis would invade Egypt, that the French and British would attack Suez.

Bearing all this in mind, let's listen to the insider's view contained in the letter written to the Nation by an intelligence agent in 1957, a full year before Whitehead's disclosures:

"I know that * * * Intelligence Service received information through various channels about the planned action. This information was duly transmitted to the State Department. Mr. [John Foster] Dulles knew the day and hour of the attack. Under these circumstances it was quite obvious that we should have dissuaded our allies from such a rash step. * * * Those in the know were surprised by the behavior of our Secretary of State at the time. Mr. Dulles' reply to a comment from a State Department official was that in our position, the best thing to do is to shut our eyes and see nothing. We shall win any case. Both the defeat of the Arabs as well as the loss of prestige by the United Kingdom and France will benefit us. The moral prestige of the West in Arab countries has suffered untold harm by the attack on Egypt. The case speaks for itself."

The invasion of Lebanon in 1958. If the CIA was not caught napping in the Suez crisis but was made to look bad for devious reasons of policy, there seems to be no question that it had not the slightest forewarning of the military coup by a group of pro-Nasser army officers in Iraq on July 14, 1958. King Faisal and Premier Nuri es-Said, pro-Western rulers of Iraq, were slain. Simultaneously, riots and insurrection shook the pro-Western government of Premier Chamoun in Lebanon. News of these events reached Allen Dulles about dawn on July 14. He promptly went into action. He got his brother, Secretary of State John Foster, out of bed, and he summoned the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to an emergency conference. With both Dulles brothers urging drastic action, the panic button was pressed loud and long. The American 6th Fleet was ordered to Lebanon; marines went charging ashore in a full-scale invasion. For a moment, world peace seemed to hang in the balance. Yet, in the calm of retrospect, this "crisis" action seemed to have almost farcical aspects. Riots, a little gunfire, the coups that overthrow governments are no particular novelty to the Lebanese. They seemed to have had no understanding, those simple folk, that the fate of the entire cold war depended upon events in Lebanon. Indeed, they regarded the landing of the marines more as an amusing and colorful sideshow; it was an event that turned an ordinary day into a fete day, and crowds lined the harbor front to watch the fun. Needless to say, a powerful nation does not look well in the robes of a circus clown, and it was freely predicted at the time that the hasty and ill-advised invasion would boomerang against American prestige. It did just that. Afro-Asian countries joined the Soviet Union in backing a U.N. resolution demanding that American troops get out of Lebanon; on October 31, the marines left—and Chamoun's government, which they had been sent to prop up, promptly fell. Chamoun remains bitter at the Americans, who, he feels, went back on promises they had made to him to support his regime at whatever cost. In the end, at great risk, we had pleased nobody; we had won ourselves another loss.

CIA on the Danube

The Hungarian revolt of 1956. The CIA's role in promoting and encouraging this abortive and tragic uprising, which we were not prepared to support after we had instigated it, remains shrouded in top-level, cloak-and-dagger secrecy. It seems well established, however, that arms were smuggled into both Poland and Hungary, either by the CIA or its Gehlen collaborators. When the Polish and Hungarian rebellions broke out in October 1956, both American official and public opinion appeared to be caught off base, and there were charges that CIA had been sleeping at the switch again. Not so, the agency said in self-defense. It had accurately predicted the outbreaks in both Poland and Hungary; its only error, a minor

one, had consisted in estimating that the Polish revolt would come first. More important than the unresolved issues of arms-smuggling and CIA alertness is still another unresolved matter—the responsibility of CIA in whipping up the Hungarian rebels to fanatic self-sacrifice in a hopeless cause. Although the fact cannot, of course, be verified, it has been charged that Radio Free Europe works closely with CIA. RFE's propaganda broadcasts during the bloody Hungarian revolt prolonged the struggle after it was hopeless and led to needless sacrifice, according to Leslie Bain, Budapest correspondent for the Reporter. "America will not fail you * * * America will not fail you," he quoted the propaganda radio as repeating over and over, after it had become apparent to all the rest of the world that America would. The ruthless suppression of the Hungarian revolt by Soviet tanks and troops was certainly a grim chapter that served to strip off before the eyes of the world the mask of Russian false pretensions. But let's not forget that American luster was tarnished, too. We had been exposed as a Nation that talked big, but that had no plan; we had been exposed as a Nation that had let those who trusted in our words go down to death, prison, and disillusionment.

Classic meddling

Such is the record of some of the CIA's more classic meddling in the internal affairs of Europe and the Middle East. It shows that even the agency's successes (as in the case of Farouk) have a tendency to turn into longrun disasters, and it indicates strongly that America is hardly qualified, by anti-communistic enthusiasm alone, to run the internal affairs of other nations all over the world. The record in these cases, such as it is, has been written; but there remains in CIA's behind-the-scenes masterminding of European affairs one large item of unfinished business that may be more important than all the rest—its long-term enduring relationship with the Gehlen secret service and the possible influence of that relationship in coloring our official attitudes toward such vital issues as Berlin and the equipment of the German Army with nuclear arms.

Clearly these are matters on which the peace of the world ultimately may hinge, and so it seems pertinent to inquire: Just who is this man Reinhold Gehlen to whom, largely without the knowledge of the American people or the American Congress, we so swiftly and so completely entrusted our safety after the end of World War II?

Herr Reinhold Gehlen

Gehlen is a product of the German Reichswehr, a lifelong professional soldier and, according to official assurances at least, no Nazi. A smallish, thin-faced man, he has a high forehead, receding fair hair and light blue eyes. The son of a publisher, he is quiet and scholarly in manner, but he speaks in the terse, clipped tones of a man long accustomed to command. He joined the Reichswehr in 1920; he fought in the invasions of Poland and France; and when the Russian war broke out, he was transferred to the Eastern Front where, in April 1942, he was selected to head the German Army's key new intelligence section.

He quickly became convinced that the Soviet Union could not be overwhelmed by military means alone, and he was, De Luce says, "one of the lost voices that urged the Nazi regime * * * to win over the Russian people by generosity while rooting out the Communist system." Instead some 2 million Soviet war prisoners were reduced to subhuman misery in Nazi extermination camps. The official recital of Gehlen's virtues continues by stressing the pessimistic accuracy with which he forecast events on the eastern front. His grim view of the war, it is said, almost earned him execution as a dangerous defeatist, but recurrent disasters so consistently fulfilled his dire predictions that he wound up being promoted to lieutenant general at the age of 43.

With the collapse of the Hitler regime, Gehlen saw to it that he got captured by the Americans. Here there appears to be a significant gap in the story. There is no hint of the nature of the contacts or negotiations that preceded his surrender, but one is confronted, out of the blue, as it were, with the picture of a prisoner of war being treated from the start almost like a very important personage. Gehlen, we are told, brought with him an imposing mass of secret information on Russia, and this presumably was a direct passport to American good graces. In any event, he was employed for 18 months combing through his own voluminous files and putting them in order for American intelligence. Then he was rewarded with as juicy an assignment as a war prisoner ever got; he was given autonomous command of his own army of private agents, with, as De Luce wrote, "a personally chosen German staff to organize cold-war espionage in the Soviet zone for the United States."

De Luce continued: "Gehlen's primary mission is to identify and locate at all times the forward Soviet and satellite armed forces. This is fundamental to allied security, including 400,000 American, British, and French troops outposting West Germany."

The British are shocked

Though the American public even today remains almost totally unaware of what we did or of its possible significance, our relations with Gehlen long have represented one of the most controversial aspects of our secret cold-war policies. Quite obviously, our whole attitude toward Germany, toward France and Britain, toward all of Europe, must have been conditioned by what for long years we were told—or not told—by the multimillion-dollar espionage ring of former German agents whom we had made our principal eyes and ears in Europe. This pivotal trust on such crucial matters has shocked our closest allies, the British, who do not play the game of intelligence that way; and since the past record would seem to indicate they play it pretty well, it is perhaps of some significance to trace further the career and the influence of Reinhold Gehlen.

The affair of Otto John

It must have been clear from the start that Gehlen's private army would have a highly equivocal status inside West Germany, where official security matters were in the hands of Dr. Otto John. All signs indicate that a fine, throatcutting duel was waged between Gehlen and John, with Gehlen doing his best to get Chancellor Konrad Adenauer on his side. He and Adenauer held a number of secret meetings in a house across the Rhine River from Bonn, and Dr. John, who later revealed these assignations, apparently was perfectly aware that the ground was being cut from under him. CIA ostensibly was working closely with John's security forces, but its money in multimillion-dollar amounts was riding on Gehlen. The private struggle between the two West German security chiefs came to a head in early July 1954, when Dr. John visited the United States. He went to Washington and had lunch with Allen Dulles. Outwardly, the two men gave every appearance of cordiality, but no one knows what went on between them, for on this matter CIA has never peeped a word. Dr. John returned to Bonn, and then on July 20, 1954, came an event that rattled official eyeteeth. Dr. John deserted to the Communists in East Germany, presumably taking with him a privately hoarded store of valuable state secrets.

This turncoat performance by West Germany's official intelligence master was an embarrassing episode, but it could hardly have broken the heart of Gehlen. He was left with a clear field—almost. One other potential rival, Friedrich Wilhelm Heinz, who headed the intelligence section of the Defense Ministry in Bonn, remained in the running, but he quickly proved no match for Gehlen. The result was reported in the New York Times on July 20, 1955, in a dispatch from Bonn. The German Government had just announced that it had decided to take over Gehlen's organization, then estimated to include 3,000 agents. The Times credited reports that "the mainstream of East European information received by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency originates with the Gehlen organization." Of Gehlen, it commented that he was inaccessible and "something of a legendary figure." The Times added: "He has been credited by some with great intelligence and denounced by others as a sinister figure."

Just a few months later, on September 1, 1955, the name of the mysterious Gehlen figured startlingly, if only momentarily, in an unusual upheaval in American intelligence. The Army announced in Washington that Maj. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, who had headed the Army's G–2 (Intelligence Corps), was being transferred to a Far East post. The announcement was made to appear routine, but John O'Donnell of the New York Daily News apparently was fed an earful by irate Pentagon brass. For O'Donnell disclosed that Trudeau's scalp had been demanded by Allen Dulles personally. According to O'Donnell, Dulles spelled out his case in a letter to the Secretary of Defense, and the feud was carried all the way to President Eisenhower himself for final decision.

In Dulles' official letter, O'Donnell wrote, the CIA head "charged that the Army's top intelligence officer, without consulting the Central Intelligence Agency, had talked with West Germany's Chancellor Adenauer here last June in an effort to undermine the confidence of Adenauer in a hush-hush CIA-bankrolled setup in Germany, headed by the mysterious Reinhart von [sic] Gehlen. Furthermore, said Dulles, the General had expressed doubts about the reliability of Gehlen as an individual and the security safeguards of the mystery organization."

The Pentagon denied quite vociferously that Trudeau, one of its favorite generals, the commander who had spearheaded MacArthur's drive to recapture Manila at the end of World War II, had ever committed such a breach of protocol as to question Gehlen's reliability. All he had done, said the Pentagon, was to express some doubts about Gehlen's security safeguards. Whatever the truth about the extent of Trudeau's criticism, the bare bones of the case boil down, it would seem, quite significantly to this: Reinhold Gehlen, just 10 years earlier the master of Hitler's intelligence on the Eastern Front, had sufficient influence through Allen Dulles to cost even the Army's G–2 chief his post.

Our German ally

Against this background, let's turn once more for an insider's view to the intelligence officer who wrote "The Nation" in 1957. His at least is not the conventional, official view, and under the circumstances, it may seem worth serious thought. He wrote:

"Our Intelligence Service in West Germany collected much reliable intelligence which should have led the State Department to reconsider its point of view on Dr. Adenauer's policy. Americans serving in Fontainebleau and in West Germany are very much aware that the Germans under the guise of 'friendship' are only intent on recovering their military might by using the United States as a springboard. Contacts with German military and other officials have convinced

me that the Germans hate and despise Americans. They cannot forget that the United States was their enemy in the Second World War. Adenauer's assertion of friendship serves as a smokescreen which enables West Germany to mark time. Eventually Germany will spurn American tutelage and proceed with her own ambitious plans. These plans, i.e., annexation of East Germany, restoration of eastern borders, etc., can be achieved only by a world war. The United States may find that instead of using Germany for its own purposes it would be bound to a German policy.

"The Germans are indeed playing the game their own way, nurturing plans for the future. This is corroborated by the fact that Gehden's intelligence service in West Germany frequently conceals important intelligence and deliberately issues misleading information, regardless of our agreement for exchange of information. Nevertheless, during this postwar period, Gehlen has been considered a most loyal ally and his service has been financed with American dollars.

"Communist propaganda refers to Adenauer's West Germany as a puppet of the United States. We prefer to regard her as our most 'reliable' ally. Both conceptions are wrong. Germany is our 'most dangerous' ally. Our friendship with her may have disastrous consequences for the United States.

"Under these circumstances, our preference of West Germany over our old and tried allies is unpardonable. British and French officers have often expressed themselves in my presence with an obvious feeling of resentment and bitterness over the U.S. policy of making yesterday's enemies today's principal partners."

With this attitude, Edwards, the British Labor, Member of Parliament and skeptic of German intentions, fully agrees. In his pamphlet on Allen Dulles, he has written:

"It is particularly worrying that Mr. Dulles and his agency should be maintaining close contacts with Gen. Reinhold Gehlen's West German secret service. Though it can be counted as a NATO intelligence organization, we think there is great need for caution in our dealings with it. It is extremely unlikely that General Gehlen has any very warm feelings for us. As for Mr. Dulles, he actually advertises his friendship with the general and after a recent visit to London went straight off to Bonn. But we have reason to believe that General Gehlen does not confine his interests to the East. The German secret service never has done so. So much the worse for us. * * * Beware the Germans, when they come bearing gifts."

An extreme view, possibly, but valuable for all of that as a caution, a warning, a reminder that there is another side to the German question. We are never told that any more, but then we have never been told about Reinhold Gehlen and his organization either—or about how we got where we are.

PART VII. THE ROAD TO WAR

One of the most significant informal conferences of the postwar era was held in Allen Dulles' CIA office on a cold and dreary morning in March 1952. His brother, John Foster, had just returned from the Far East, where he had added to his prestige by helping the Truman administration draft the Japanese Peace Treaty. John Foster was now about to become one of the most caustic critics of the administration that had employed him. He was full of very positive ideas about exactly what should be done to right the situation in the world.

Participating in this conference that was to forecast much of the global strategy of the Eisenhower administration before Eisenhower had even been nominated or elected were a number of important second-echelon officials—Allen Dulles, then the No. 2 man in CIA; Charles Bohlen, State Department Counselor; John Allison, then Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East; General Merrill, of Merrill's Marauders fame; John Ferguson and C. Burton Marshall, of the State Department planning staff.

John Foster Dulles opened the conference by expounding his views—and quite positive views they were. He sharply criticized Truman's order interposing the 7th Fleet between Formosa and mainland China. This John Foster said, was really "protecting" the Chinese Communists, then battling us in Korea, from counterattack by the Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek. He had discussed this "anomalous" situation with Chiang, he said, and Chiang, as was hardly surprising, fully agreed with him. Now, there were "certain islands" close to the mainland still held by Chiang's warriors, and Chiang, if given a "warrant" by the United States to insure him against the risks involved, could strengthen his already considerable forces on the islands and play merry hob with the Communists on the mainland. This, John Foster said positively, is what we should do; we should in effect, though he did not use the precise term, "unleash" Chiang; we should adopt a bold "forward" policy against the Chinese aggressors.

According to Stewart Alsop, who 6 years later revealed the details of this meeting in his Saturday Evening Post article, "The Story Behind Quemoy: How We Drifted Close to War," John Foster Dulles' proposal was received at first with tepid politeness. Allen Dulles asked a couple of deferential questions. Nobody seemed to challenge John Foster's thesis until suddenly C. B. Marshall, "a big, articulate, irascible man," blew his top. The course Dulles proposed, he said flatly, would mean direct American intervention in the Chinese civil war. Worse, if we gave Chiang a warrant on the offshore islands, we would by this action "convey to a foreign entity the power to involve the United States in war." Marshall denounced Chiang's mendicant and necessitous regime and branded any "warrant" that would permit such a regime to drag the United States into war "an act of supreme folly."

"John Foster Dulles [Alsop wrote] looked at Marshall as though he did not exist—a feat Dulles can perform brilliantly—and said not a word. There was an unhappy silence. Then Bohlen, the able diplomat, took over, asking Dulles questions which were politely phrased, but which nevertheless pointed up the risks involved in the course Dulles proposed. The meeting then broke up, on a strained and inconclusive note."

The islands under discussion were, of course, Quemoy and Matsu, huddling almost on the doorstep of the Chinese mainland. Small, rocky nubbins of land, they were of absolutely no strategic value, as such eminent authorities as Dwight D. Eisenhower and Douglas MacArthur agreed; yet twice in succeeding years, due to the supreme folly of Dulles' policy, they almost dragged the United States into war, almost touched off the third world conflagration which everyone so dreads.

Islands of folly

For John Foster Dulles wasn't to be deterred from his "bold forward" plan by the logical objections of men like Marshall and Bohlen. Almost as soon as he became Secretary of State, he loudly proclaimed what the newspapers dubbed the "unleashing" of Chiang. He did not go quite so far as to give Chiang a public "warrant," but the effect was the same. With our active encouragement, Chiang poured thousands more troops into the offshore islands, creating a situation in which he could claim that he had committed the very flower of his army there and so, when trouble arose, we were committed to support him. The situation has overtones reminiscent of those in Germany where, as the letter-writing intelligence agent remarked, we are so wedded to German policy that, if the Germans ever determine to reunite their country, we almost certainly will be dragged into war to help them.

In the Far East, time and again, a tinderbox situation has been created by the fatuity of the American obsession with Chiang Kai-shek. Powerful American business interests, in alliance with many of the power lords who dominate the larger media of information, long have persisted in viewing Chiang as one of the great men of his age, a statesman of nobility and stature, a leader who may one day win back China from the Communists if we only give him our help. This view has been so widely sold to the American people that it is considered virtually an act of treason in many circles to challenge it.

Yet challenged it must be. The record is clear and explicit, and it isn't at all what we have deluded ourselves into believing. Chiang has never been anything but a Chinese warlord with one guiding principle—the interests of Chiang. In his rise to power, he played footsie with the Communists, and not until he had won and wanted the big apple all for himself did he really break with them. The corruptness of his regime was one of the least-hushed World War II scandals. It offered the people of China nothing; American Army leaders in China found it almost impossible to get Chiang's "tigers" to fight, and the Japanese almost tore the country apart while Chiang and his inner circle waxed fat on the resources of the national treasury. As William J. Lederer writes in "A Nation of Sheep," the Chinese people became "sick of him and the Soongs" and "the rotten Chinese apple was ready to drop of its own accord." Although Chiang had billions of dollars' worth of American military equipment for his 3-million-man Army, these forces were composed of conscripts who had no love for Chiang; money for its food and pay went into the pockets of grafting officers. And so, when Communists applied pressure, the troops didn't fight—they either surrendered or joined up.

Chiang fled to Formosa, taking the contents of the national treasury with him. For 10 years now, Chiang's Formosan regime has been painted in the United States in glowing colors as a Western-style democracy. Actually, nothing could be further from the truth. As Lederer writes, Chiang's warriors, when they first arrived, "pillaged and robbed Formosa." They killed thousands of protesting Formosans with machinegun fire; and ever since, having taught the Formosans a democratic lesson by this process, Chiang's 2 million Chinese Nationalists have ruled some 9 million Formosans with an iron, dictatorial hand. According to Lederer, some 70 percent of Chiang's army is now composed of Formosan conscripts, who might fight to protect their home island but have no burning compulsion to help Chiang reconquer China. The Formosans themselves would like to be rid of the Nationalist monkey on their backs; and they have no love for the United States, which continues to prop up Chiang's discredited regime with some three-quarters of a billion dollars in annual aid.

Yet America's arch rightwing policymakers and its equally arch rightwing CIA under Allen Dulles continue to invest Chiang with a halo and to push him forward as our answer to communism in Asia. It is an infatuation that has brought us repeatedly into widespread disrepute.

Poppy fields of Burma

Consider the case of Chiang's Burmese opium growers. In 1951, following the collapse of Chiang's regime on the mainland, several thousands of his followers fled across the Yunnan border into Northern Burma.

American policymakers decided to arm and equip these Nationalist troops for a reinvasion of Yunnan Province. From Formosa, CIA allegedly masterminded the operation. Arms, munitions, supplies were airlifted into Burma, but despite this support, there is little evidence that Chiang's gallant warriors ever wreaked much damage on the Chinese Reds. Instead, the Nationalists discovered they could achieve the finer life more easily by growing opium, and a great number of them settled down in Northern Burma and proceeded to do just that.

The Burmese, a most unreasonable people, were not happy with this ideal, CIA-created situation. For some inexplicable reason, they seemed to resent the presence of this foreign army on their soil; and when Chiang's fighters, showing no regard for Burmese sovereignty, practically took over the state of Kengtung and established their own government, the Burmese actually filed a vigorous protest with the United States. As Charles Edmundson, former Washington editor of Fortune and a former foreign service expert, wrote in the Nation (Nov. 7, 1957), the American Ambassador in Burma hadn't been let in on the secret of what the CIA and the Chinese Nationalists were up to. The Ambassador, William J. Sebald, therefore denied in perfect good faith that America had anything to do with supporting Chiang's guerrillas in Burma. Burmese Prime Minister U Nu knew better and became so incensed he suspended all U.S. Point Four activities and almost broke off relations entirely. Eventually, our own Ambassador resigned his post in protest against our own program, and American prestige throughout Southeast Asia sported a couple of very unlovely black eyes.

A four-power conference finally reached an agreement about Chiang's opium-happy warriors. Some 7,000 were evacuated to Formosa. But even this didn't solve the entire problem. Sizable remnants of the Nationalist force continued to squat in their poppy fields, and as of this spring the Burmese Army was still fighting a guerrilla war in its own country in an effort to wipe them out. In this most recent fighting, the Burmese contended they had seized American arms and supplies only recently airlifted into Burma. Such charges, skillfully exploited by Communist propaganda, sparked riots that resulted in the stoning and wrecking of U.S. Embassy buildings in downtown Rangoon. When such outbreaks occur, the widespread impression given the American people in glaring headlines is that we have been most foully attacked again as a result of Communist machinations; hardly ever is there any appreciation of the fact that the Communists might find it impossible to get the people on their side without the help of the backfiring plots of our own cloak-and-dagger boys.

The "spooks" of the islands

Destructive as such incidents are to America's image, they do not menace the peace of the world like the more grandiose CIA endeavors that led directly to the crises of Quemoy and Matsu. In the early 1950's, the CIA established on Formosa an outfit known as Western Enterprises, Inc. This was a thinly disguised "cover" for CIA, whose agents, an incommunicative lot, became known on the island as "the spooks." These "spooks" played an active role in the buildup on Chiang's forces on the offshore islands and the raids that were launched from there. As Stewart Alsop wrote, the CIA was "responsible for organizing and equipping the Nationalist guerrillas who raided the mainland from the offshore islands." These "commando-type guerrilla raids" were "sometimes mounted in battalion strength," Alsop related. In addition, the offshore islands were used for reconnaissance, leaflet dropping, occasional bombing forays, and for blockading such Chinese ports as Amoy, on the mainland opposite Quemoy.

These offensive gestures apparently nettled the Chinese Reds, a very unreasonable and touchy folk, and in the first week of September 1954, they became so incensed that they blasted Quemoy with heavy artillery barrages. Two American officers of the Military Advisory Group stationed on the island were killed, and the American public, in its shock at such unprovoked aggression, was whipped up to the point where it might very easily have plunged into Chiang's war. In fact, Alsop wrote that "although no more than a tiny handful of people knew it at the time, the American Government came very close to responding with a conditional decision to go to war with Red China."

Alsop cited chapter and verse of the story. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, under the leadership of that old strong-China hand, Adm. Arthur Radford, voted overwhelmingly for war. They backed a policy, not just to launch bombing raids on military objectives opposite Quemoy, but to blast targets far inland in China. If the Chinese Reds responded with an all-out attack on Quemoy, we would use nuclear weapons. This, make no mistake about it, would have been World War III. Only Matthew Ridgway dissented and fought with all his power against such an "unwarranted and tragic course." Ridgway found an ally in Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who had been moved over from CIA and made Under Secretary of State when the Dulleses took charge. Smith shared Ridgway's horror of the prospect and telephoned his former chief, President Eisenhower, then vacationing in Denver, Eisenhower listened and scotched the reckless plan of the Joint Chiefs.

The 1954 crisis, given a chance, finally died down, and the policy known as the releashing of Chiang began. Until 1954, Alsop wrote, the offshore islands had been almost the exclusive playground of CIA; but, by the time of the first Quemoy crisis, CIA's thin cover of Western Enterprises, Inc., had been pretty well blown and control had been turned over largely to the Military Advisory Group. The presence of these uniformed military advisers on the islands represented, in effect, the public warrant John Foster Dulles had originally proposed we give Chiang; and when, in 1958, the Communist Chinese again shelled the islands, our prestige once more was on the line, and once more we were almost involved in war. Only a broad promise that we wouldn't permit Chiang to use the islands for any worthwhile purpose, not even leaflet dropping, smoothed over the situation.

And now Laos

The Burmese crisis that all but turned friend into foe, the recurrent crises on Quemoy and Matsu, vividly illustrate the manner in which the secret and militant activities of CIA create for us a foreign policy all their own. They illustrate the way the CIA tail wags the American dog and how such wagging can quite easily plunge the whole animal—and all his brethren—into the most horrible of history's wars. But Burma and Quemoy weren't the only examples in Asia of what is wrought by CIA. To these there must be added another example, and one of current crisis significance—Laos.

American blunders in Laos go back a full 6 years, and they are not by any means all of CIA's making, though it was reserved for CIA to write the final climactic chapter. To understand how CIA masterminded us into the hole in which we now find ourselves, one has to appreciate the background. Laos became a nation in 1955 as a result of the Geneva agreement that split the former French Indochina into its component parts. Laos was the interior principality, primitive, landlocked, with a 1,000-mile border with Red China. The Geneva agreement provided it was to have a neutralist government, but the evidence is abundant that we, no more than the Communists, wanted a neutral Laos. We wanted a Laos committed irrevocably to our side.

This becomes clear if one studies the findings of the House Committee on Government Operations which delved deeply into the Lao muddle in 1958 and, on June 15, 1959, filed a scathing report of what it found. What the committee discovered was that all sound military advice had been disregarded by the State Department in its determination to build up an anti-Communist Laos. The committee remarked acidly that Congress had always been assured that "force objectives"—the number of foreign troops the United States will support—are established on the basis of the military judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In Laos this simply was not true.

The Joint Chiefs, in fact, considered Laos militarily worthless and repeatedly told the Eisenhower administration so. The House committee wrote: "U.S. support of a 25,000-man army, of the entire military budget, and of segments of the civilian economy is, in fact, based on a political determination made by the Department of State contrary to the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." It pointed out that the Joint Chiefs, even after they had been asked to reconsider their views, had refused to budge. In a memorandum, they had said, the House committee wrote, that "mutual security support of Lao forces could not be recommended 'from the military point of view,' but acquiesced in the provision of such support 'should political considerations be overriding.'"

This, then, was the beginning. The House committee's findings make it clear that, for political considerations alone, we imposed upon Laos a huge and militarily unjustified standing army. We did this with no regard for either the characteristics or the desires of the Lao people. The Lao are Buddhists; they are, not in pretense but in actuality, a deeply peaceful people. As Keyes Beech wrote in the April 22, 1961, Saturday Evening Post: "In Laos not even the fighting cocks are bloodthirsty. They wear no spurs and do not fight to kill. As good Buddhists, Lao soldiers were no less reluctant. They generally aimed high and expected the other fellow to return the favor."

The cocktail circuit

In Laos, as in so many other of the world's trouble spots, the rightwingers in our own State Department and CIA dealt only with their rightwing counterparts, a small and wealthy ruling class and this class' military cohorts. As Newsweek reported last May: "Our allies, the traditional ruling class, had little interest in reform. The political methods they used—stuffing ballot boxes and intimidating neutralist voters—succeeded only in driving the moderates to the left. * * * The worst thing perhaps was that U.S. policymakers never came to terms with any elements in Laos other than those they considered to be militantly anti-Communist."

Tied to such interests, with viewpoint constricted to the cocktail circuits of Vientiane, we plunged headlong into Laos, apparently with no philosophy except that if we spent enough money, no matter how, we could buy ourselves an anti-Communist ally. As the House committee found, we repeated, on an even more flagrant scale, all the ghastly mistakes which it had criticized so strongly years previously in Iran.

Laos is about 99 percent agricultural. Its economy is primitive. The Lao farmer usually grows what he needs, barters off his surplus to supply his other wants. Money, in much of Laos, is virtually nonexistent.

Into such an economy, with evidently no regard for its disruptive effects, the United States in just 6 years poured $310 million. The result was almost inevitable. The wildest currency speculation took place; the Lao economy was all but wrecked; and the cost of living doubled between 1953 and 1958.

Cooperative graft

As in Iran, corruption flourished like jungle growth in the tropics. The House committee found clear evidence that both the Americans who were channeling the aid dollars to Laos, and the Lao Government officials who were dispensing them, dipped greedy paws into the golden stream. The committee flatly accused one American public works officer of accepting "bribes totaling at least $13,000." It recounted the sordid story of a former U.S. operations mission director who extracted a fantastic price for his decrepit 1947 Cadillac from an official of the Universal Construction Co., to whom he was awarding a contract. "Uncontroverted evidence," the committee wrote, "indicates that the vehicle was at that time inoperable, and that shortly thereafter it was cut up and the pieces dropped down an abandoned well. In the interim, it had stood rusting in front of Universal's main office, where it was the subject of scornful amusement by Lao and Americans alike."

One honest American who tried to do something about the mess was "railroaded out of Laos by his superiors." The railroading was sanctioned by Ambassador J. Graham Parsons, who presided over our aid efforts in Laos at their corrupt worst, and Parsons was rewarded for his watchfulness by being called back to Washington and made Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. In all of this time, the bulk of the American taxpayers' $310 million was used mainly to enrich an inner circle of palace thieves; hardly any of it was used to help the Lao people. Not until the elections of 1958 were imminent did the Americans distributing aid in Laos suddenly come up with a crash program that they labeled "Operation Booster Shot" to try to buy some good will on the mass level.

In one acid paragraph, the House committee summed up the operational mess:

"The concentration of the benefits of the aid program to the area around Vientiane and other centers of population, and the enrichment of, and speculation by, Lao merchants and public officials which attended the aid program, tended to lend credence to the Communist allegation that the Royal Lao Government was 'corrupt' and 'indifferent' to the needs of the people."

The people's voice

Even an idiot, it might be presumed, should have foreseen the inevitable consequences, but our CIA and our State Department remained blind to them right up to the last moment of inescapable truth. Ex-Ambassador Parsons was testifying before the House committee just as the Lao elections were being held in 1958. He insisted that he had reliable, "official" information that the results would be wonderful for our side. The Communist Pathet Lao, he predicted, would win only 2 of 15 contested seats, and this would mean that "the integrity and independence of Laos in the free world" would have been preserved intact.

Then the votes were counted. The Communists, instead of being crushed, won a crushing victory. The House committee later reported that the Communists had won nine seats, and their sympathizers an additional four. The Royal Cabinet, indeed, had to install the pro-Red leader as the minister who, in the future, would control U.S. foreign aid funds in Laos; it had to agree that, henceforth, two battalions of pro-Communist troops actually would be supported by U.S. funds. This was victory? This was assuring "the integrity and independence of Laos in the free world"?

In obvious disgust, the House committee wrote:

"In summary, the decision to support a 25,000-man army—motivated by a Department of State desire to promote political stability—seems to have been the foundation for a series of developments which detract from that stability.

"The aid program has not prevented the spread of communism in Laos. In fact, the Communist victory in last year's election, based on the slogans of "Government corruption" and "Government indifference" might lead one to conclude that the U.S. aid program has contributed to an atmosphere in which the ordinary people of Laos question the value of friendship with the United States."

When you can't buy—

It might, indeed. But what the House committee found wasn't the last, or the worst, of the debacle. The final chapter, an epic in blindness and futility, was yet to be written. For the simple truth is that, having failed to buy ourselves an ally in Laos, we next tried to procure one through the CIA's favorite device—the military coup. Allen Dulles' eager beavers engineered this with cavalier disregard of any superior strategy of the State Department or the desires of the new American Ambassador on the scene, Horace H. Smith. Keyes Beech in his Saturday Evening Post account describes the conflict between CIA and Smith in these words:

"On the political level, Smith's job wasn't made any easier by the fact that during most of his tour in Laos he was being crossed by Central Intelligence Agency operatives nesting in his own Embassy. As Smith saw it, the question was: Who was going to administer American policy in Laos—CIA or the Embassy?

"How many CIA agents were wandering around Laos during this period only the CIA could know. One of the more flamboyant, who blossomed everywhere, affected a copybook cover that included a manufactured British accent, a luxuriant mustache, elaborately casual but expensive clothes, and a cane with a secret compartment that held—not a sword, but brandy.

"As Ambassador, Smith favored a conservative coalition government which offered a little of something to all factions. CIA activists made no secret of their preference for a group of army 'Young Turks.'

"CIA's favorite boy was Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, the 41-year-old Minister of Defense, who was later to emerge as the government 'strong man.' Phoumi was strongly anti-Communist. He was also fervently pro-minister of defense, because that's where the money was."

The first blowup came in August 1960, when a paratroop captain named Kong Le, whose troops hadn't been paid in 3 months because his superiors were looting the till, became fed up with the state of affairs and led a coup. Successful, he raced all around Vientiane in a jeep bearing legends demanding the Americans go home. The CIA boys and the brains of the American military mission on the scene were stunned. Until Kong Le suddenly went off the deep end, they had considered him one of their very own fair-haired boys, and they couldn't understand what the devil had gotten into him. Nor did they like or understand any better what Kong Le did with his new-found power.

Neutralism: A dirty word

He called on Prince Souvanna Phouma to take over as Premier. Souvanna was a neutralist. Depending on how you look at it, he was a sincere neutralist, hoping to bring some kind of peace to his unsettled country, or he was just a weak-kneed tool of the Communists. The Americans, to most of whom neutralism was a dirty word anyway, took the second view. Ex-Ambassador Parsons, by this time promoted to the post of supreme authority for Far Eastern affairs, flew to Laos to try to get some understanding with Souvanna; but he and Souvanna had never wasted any affection on each other when Parsons was Ambassador, and so it was almost inevitable that they wouldn't achieve any meeting of minds now. They didn't. The American chips went down on the CIA's boy, General Phoumi. Given the green light, Phoumi in December 1960, actually fought a battle and captured Vientiane. Souvanna and Kong Le were chased out, and having no place else to go, they joined the Communist Pathet Lao. With him in retreat, Kong Le thoughtfully took 9,000 American rifles with which he armed the Communist forces.

Premature celebration

In Vientiane, General Phoumi and the CIA celebrated their victory. "The celebration was premature," Keyes Beech writes. "Looked at from a cold-blooded, cold war viewpoint, the bloodshed might have been justified if, as the CIA argued, bloodshed was necessary to 'polarize' Communist and anti-Communist factions. It might have been justified if strong and effective leadership had emerged from the smoke of battle. Unfortunately, neither of these things happened. 'Polarization' took place only at the top, between the same tired, familiar faces."

Souvanna and Kong Le, backed now by Communist manpower, began to carve up Laos. Phoumi, having distributed the best financial plums in the government among his relatives, seemed to have lost all interest in the dreary business of fighting. Everywhere the Pathet Lao forces were victorious. The puppet government we had installed was too corrupt and inefficient to oppose them; the 25,000-man army for which we had been paying for 5 years had never wanted to fight in the first place and wanted to fight even less in a corrupt cause; the Lao people whom we had not helped, but had only helped to ruin, could hardly be expected to feel that we were worthy of their ultimate sacrifice. So there we were, having made one of history's most colossal botches of everything.

The new Kennedy administration was bequeathed this little sweetheart of a problem. There the Communists were, overrunning all of northern Laos, gobbling up another country, and we were faced with just two unlovely choices. We could either go to war in defense of freedom against the Communist menace, or we could humbly sue for the reinstitution of the very kind of neutralist government (only it would be worse now because the Communists were stronger) that we had conspired to kick out.

Boxed into this dead-end street, President Kennedy at first talked tough and acted as if he would like to fight. But it quickly became apparent that the congressional leadership of his own party would have no part of such folly, and the result was the only result really possible—long-drawn-out, largely futile negotiations for a cease-fire in Laos and the return of neutralism, even if it meant the return of Souvanna.

No defeat that CIA has ever earned us has been more complete, more devastating. In face-conscious southeast Asia, we had lost all the face there was to lose, and even Thailand, long considered a stanch partner of the West, began to flirt with neutralist ideas. In such manner had CIA intriguing come home to roost. As Marquis Childs wrote from Geneva, where he was dancing attendance on the Lao peace talks, if CIA was to be thoroughly investigated in the aftermath of Cuba, "the role played by that agency in the mess in Laos is perhaps more relevant than the share of responsibility which CIA must bear for the Cuban fiasco."

PART VIII. FIASCO IN CUBA

In December 1960, U.S. Senator-elect CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island, made a quiet visit to Fidel Castro's Cuba. A former Foreign Service officer in World War II, Senator PELL was no novice in pulsetaking, and when he went among the Cuban people, he was surprised at what he found. He later capsuled his discoveries for the New York Herald Tribune in these words:

"The people of Cuba that I saw and spoke to during 3 or 4 days of quiet observation were not sullen or unhappy or dissatisfied. I am afraid that it is only true that they were still tasting the satisfaction of Castro's land reform, of his nationalization of U.S. companies and of the other much-touted reforms put into effect by Castro. The dispossessed and disgruntled were in jail or in exile."

Senator PELL returned to Washington and explicitly warned high officials of the Kennedy administration that the time for action against Castro was not yet.

During the same December, two other visitors to Cuba saw the same sights, came to the same conclusions, and wrote an article about them. These observers were Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S.A. (retired), holder of the Distinguished Service Medal for services in the southwest Pacific in World War II, and Jesse Gordon, public-relations consultant. In an article, "A New Look at Cuba—The Challenge to Kennedy," published by New World Review, General Hester and Gordon wrote:

"It must be pointed out that a Princeton poll, taken [in Cuba] last year, revealed 86 percent of the people in support of Castro.

"Most observers would agree that if elections were held tomorrow, Castro would be overwhelmingly returned to power.

"The morale of Cuban workers and the militia is high.

"There is no doubt about the people's spirit or their courage, tenacity and determination to hold onto the gains under the revolution.

"The U.S. military high command has plans for an invasion of Cuba. Should the Kennedy administration decide to continue along the reckless path of the previous administration, we fear disaster will result."

No prophecy was ever better justified by the event. No prophecy was ever less hidden under a bushel. At the end of March, Gordon personally mailed reprints of the article to the White House, the State Department and Members of Congress. But about 1:30 a.m. on Monday, April 17, some 1,500 Cuban exiles—trained, financed and masterminded by the CIA—stormed ashore at the Bay of Pigs on Cuba's south coast. The CIA, the Agency that is supposed to know all, had insisted that Cuba was ripe for revolution.

Never perhaps was an intelligence estimate more disastrously wrong. In a few hours, it became apparent that the Cuban invaders had not the slightest chance. They were overwhelmed, killed, captured. The CIA-planned coup, almost a year in the making, backfired so tragically that Fidel Castro was presented with an hour of triumph in which to strut. Instead of being overthrown, the power of his regime, thanks to CIA, was solidified in all of Cuba.

Commenting on the consequences almost a month later, Richard H. Rovere wrote:

"The passage of time does not reduce the magnitude of the folly in Cuba. The more it is examined, the worse the whole affair looks. The immediate consequences are bad enough: Castro's tightened grip on Cuba, the growing distrust of American leadership, the revelations of Central Intelligence operating procedures and of the bureau's mammoth incompetence. What is more painful, though, is the awareness that intelligence (as a quality of mind, not as data), and the best staff a 20th-century President has had, offered so little protection against enormous error.

"As it turned out, the nonprofessionals were mostly right, and the professionals were almost wholly wrong."

This, needless to say, is not the result that an annual $1 billion investment in intelligence is expected to achieve—especially on an island just 90 miles from our shores, an island on which we have a huge naval base, where there are many long-time American residents, where presumably we should have the most solid contacts. This wasn't Laos, thousands of miles away in another and remote corner of the world—but Cuba, on our doorstep.

Operatives on parade

How could it happen? How could our master intelligence Agency, CIA, be so completely wrong? These questions have been only partly answered, but even the partial answers throw the book at CIA. Let's look at one eyewitness account of the CIA in action. It was written by Thayer Waldo in the San Francisco Chronicle.

"This reporter (Waldo wrote) spent the first half of last year in Cuba. At that time, with the U.S. Embassy still in operation and fully staffed, eight of its personnel were CIA agents, three worked for the FBI, and each of the Armed Services had from one to five operatives assigned to intelligence work.

"No special effort was required to learn these facts or to identify the individuals so engaged. Within 30 days of arrival in Havana, their names and agency affiliations were made known to me, without solicitation, by other correspondents or Embassy employees.

"The latter included one CIA man who volunteered the identities of all three persons accredited to the FBI; and a Cuban receptionist, outspokenly pro-Castro, who ticked off the names of six CIA agents—with entire accuracy, a later check confirmed."

In addition to Embassy staffers, the CIA had a number of operatives (I knew 14, but am satisfied there were more) among the large colony of resident U.S. businessmen. One of these, a roofing and installation contractor, had lived in Cuba from the age of 6, except for service with the Army during World War II—as a master sergeant in G–2, military intelligence. Predictably, that known background made the man a prime target for observation by Castro's people when United States-Cuban relations began to deteriorate seriously. He was shadowed day and night, his every contact reported. Yet the CIA made him its chief civilian agent in Havana.

Unintelligent intelligence

Quite obviously, this wasn't a very efficient way for a superintelligence agency to run a secret intelligence network. But then, according to Waldo, Naval Intelligence was no more efficient. During most of 1960 and into 1961, it ran a major intelligence-gathering project at the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base. Some 3,800 Cubans are employed on the base, but they live outside Government property, most of them in or near Guantanamo City, 27 miles north. It occurred to Naval Intelligence that here, among these Cubans going back and forth every day, was a mass of raw human material from which could be culled significant data about the prevailing mood in Cuba. Naval Intelligence, as a result, ran about 140 interviews a day, questioning the Cuban workers about the attitudes of Cuban civilians toward Castro. Almost to a man, apparently, the workers assured the Americans that the Cuban people were very, very unhappy with Castro.

Waldo points out that naval-base workers are paid about 60 percent more than comparable workers in private industry, that the suffering Cuban economy offers few job opportunities to any man who might lose the naval-base plum he had—that, in a word, it should have been expected the Cuban workers would tell Naval Intelligence only what they knew Naval Intelligence wanted to hear. Waldo quotes a South American diplomat making this wry comment on this strange intelligence operation: "If I denounce my neighbor as my mortal enemy and then ask my servants their opinion, they are pretty apt to tell me that everyone else hates him, too—particularly if they like their jobs."

From such sources and from CIA's close contacts with émigré Cubans (who were convinced, naturally, like all émigrés, that great numbers of the Cuban people hated Castro as fervently as they did), American opinions appear to have been formed. It is necessary to use such qualifying words as "appear" and "seem," for it must be emphasized that any synthesis of the Cuba misadventure must be based on incomplete information—the kind that has become available by sweeping out from under official rugs.

Up to this point, the American people have been given no chance to find out for themselves what happened, what went wrong, who was responsible. Investigations have been held in secret, as if we were safeguarding the formula of some new miracle weapon; and when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testifies behind closed doors, one Senator shouts that he has been shocked out of his britches and all the Chiefs should be fired—others insist blandly that they weren't shocked, and nobody should be fired. Such are the baffling cross-currents in the world of secrecy we have substituted for the world of information. If, therefore, any officials would quarrel with this account of the Cuban fiasco, let them first quarrel with themselves—behind closed doors.

Beginning of the plot

It seems, then, to be well-established that in the spring of 1960, probably in late April or early May, the Eisenhower administration made a fateful decision. Castro, it felt, was moving steadily into the Communist orbit. CIA had information that some 80 Cuban fliers had been sent to Czechoslovakia to train on Russian jets; there were reports of construction projects inside Cuba that looked to CIA as if they might be designed to launch missiles. Castro, in addition, seemed to be stirring up trouble in Panama, the Dominican Republic, Haiti; he would have to go.

The strongest initial proponent of the "Castro must go" line appears to have been Republican Vice President Richard M. Nixon. He, it is said, argued strongly that we must support armed intervention in Cuba to get rid of Castro, and he finally won Eisenhower's consent. Once this basic decision had been made, our fate was in the hands of CIA, for CIA was supposed to know precisely how to run such delicate affairs.

This official misconception of CIA's omniscience and omnipotence quite obviously was based upon CIA's vaunted successes in overthrowing Mossadegh in Iran and Arbenz in Guatemala. Castro, we decided, was to be another Arbenz, and the Guatemala script that had worked so well was the one CIA elected to follow. In some ways, the situation seemed made to order for it. Castro's increasingly iron dictatorship, his merciless execution of dissidents were sending increasing hordes of refugees to our shores. The Miami area was swarming with them. All that CIA had to do was to train them, arm them, and mold them into an invasion force.

Gaggle of factions

Simple as this basic conception seemed, it required considerable doing. The anti-Castro Cubans were a gaggle of warring factions, ranging over all the hues of the political spectrum. They included brutal ex-cops who had served Fulgencio Batista without a qualm, arch conservatives who wanted their lands and money back, leftwing reformers

who wanted to preserve Castro's land policy and Castro's nationalization of vital industry, but without Castro's dictatorship. These groups were personalized in their leadership. On the far right were ex-Batista henchmen like Rolando Masferrer. Also far over to the right, but free of the Batista taint, was the Movement for Revolutionary Recovery (MRR), headed by Capt. Manuel Artime, who had been only briefly associated with Castro. On the left—reformers, but strongly anti-Communist—were the followers of the People's Revolutionary Movement (MRP), headed by Manolo Antonio Ray, Castro's former Minister of Public Works.

The CIA, with its pronounced rightwing proclivities which always seem to orientate it toward ruling shahs and military dictators, had to pick "its boys" from this divided pack; and its choice fell, where its choices always have seemed to fall, on the representatives of the right. Only in this case its choice was more unfortunate even than usual, for in Cuba the forces of the right were almost powerless to help it.

The choice that wasn't made

Virtually all sources seem to agree that there was just one effective resistance movement inside Cuba: the MRP headed by Manolo Antonio Ray. A quiet, soft-spoken architect and civil engineer, Ray had been one of Castro's most effective resistance leaders. For some two years during the precarious course of the Castro revolution, he had directed sabotage inside Havana; and when Castro came to power, Ray had been rewarded by appointment as Minister of Public Works. He served just eight months, then he broke with Castro. He realized by that time, he says, that Castro did not intend to live up to his democratic promises, that this regime was becoming increasingly dictatorial, increasingly communistic. So Ray once more went underground, setting up his own clandestine organization to fight the new dictatorship.

He managed to evade Castro's police and to work for eight months inside Cuba. In that time, he perfected an underground network that spanned the island state. Each province had its seven-man executive council, and in each province similar organizations reached down into the separate counties. Ray kept contacts between these underground groups to a minimum, tying the threads together only at the top, and soon the effectiveness of his growing organization was demonstrated by increasing incidents of sabotage.

Ray was certainly an effective leader, not much doubt about that. But, let's whisper it, he was "leftwing." The man still had faith in the original Castro program; he thought that land and industrial reforms were long overdue and essential to Cuba's ultimate prosperity. Those who want Cuba returned to its pre-Castro state seem to overlook the vital fact that this state was so bad it made Castro possible. Castro clambered to power over the ruins of a corrupt and brutal system. He had made great capital (see his program as he himself explained it in the Nation, November 30, 1957) out of the fact that 85 percent of Cuba's small-scale farmers did not own their land; out of the fact that more than half of the arable land in the nation was in foreign hands; out of the fact that more than 200,000 rural families had not a square foot of land on which to support themselves, while almost 10 million acres of untouched arable land remain in the hands of powerful interests. One of Castro's first and most popular acts had been to split up these baronial holdings. Ray believed that these objectives had been right, but he wanted them achieved in a framework of freedom. He explained his philosophy to the New York Post in these words:

"Our movement doesn't allow politicians to come in on the backs of the people just so they can get back into power and get money for themselves. [Ray did not explain how he would prevent this.] We've had enough of that. What we want is a continuation of social reform, not a government by the rich or the exploiters. We believe in a mixed economy of private enterprise, because it is effective and efficient, and government ownership of utilities and monopolies; because these things belong to the whole people. And there must be freedom. This, Castro has destroyed."

Such a program could not fail to be anathema to rigid, rightwing minds, or to those powerful American interests whose primary concern was the repossession of their vast, Castro-sequestered holdings in Cuba. With such a program, CIA would have no truck. Though Ray's underground organization was the only effective one, he had to go it alone. He got virtually no money, no supplies, no help of any kind from CIA. He established his own training camps and financed them by selling 1-peso stamps each month to sympathizers inside Cuba. Indicative of the support he had inside the country we were trying to liberate was the fact that his collections ultimately reached 60,000 pesos a month. CIA evidently drew no conclusions from this. All the time Ray was struggling to maintain himself and his underground organization, CIA was pouring a huge flow of cash (the total finally came to $45 million) into the promotion of its rightwing invasion.

Prying open the plot

Overall direction of the Cuban endeavor was in the hands of one of CIA's deputy directors, Richard M. Bissell, Jr., a former economics instructor at Yale. Under Bissell was a large corps of CIA agents and instructors, some Spanish-speaking North Americans, at least one Filipino, and—surprisingly—quite a number of eastern Europeans who couldn't communicate with their Cuban proteges at all except through interpreters. This was the staff that directed the training of the invasion troops in a number of camps carved out of the Guatemalan jungle. The first recruits, 32 in number, were flown to Guatemala in May 1960. They were put to work hacking out a training base on jungle acres donated for the purpose by Robert Alejos, a wealthy Guatemalan landlord. Later airstrips were built on wasteland along the fringes of Alejos' coffee plantation, and American jet pilots, in civilian clothes, were sent to Guatemala to train the Cuban fliers.

All of this activity was conducted for months without anyone in the United States outside of the highest official circles having any inkling of what was afoot. But a large-scale invasion cannot be kept hidden from public view forever, and in this case, in any event, secrecy arrangements were not of the best. Some of the Guatemalan airstrips were operated in full sight of travelers on the Pan American highway and the Guatemalan railroad, and in time the word began to get around. The Nation called public attention to what was going on last November, but the large wire services and major media of information continued to play blind, deaf, and dumb for nearly 2 months. It was not until early January that Time finally used a short article on the Guatemalan airstrips, followed within a few days by a much more detailed story in the New York Times. With these news pieces, the American public at large, for the first time and still only in a tentative fashion, began to acquire information about the plot we were brewing in the Caribbean.

Picking the leader

The publication of these first news stories almost coincided with a development of major importance in the Guatemalan camps. There CIA had picked its fair-haired boy, 29-year-old Manuel Artime, regarded by some of Ray's followers as a Franco Falangist. By January 1961, Artime was in solid with Frank Bender, the CIA area chief in Guatemala. Drew Pearson asserts that Artime was helped along the path to rank and glory by Bender's secretary, Macho Barker, whom Artime had promised to make sports czar of liberated Cuba. If true, this report would seem to indicate that Artime expected to dominate the Government of the new Cuba and to pass out the rewards. There are some other tenuous indications pointing in the same direction. The Chatanooga Times Washington correspondent, Charles Bartlett, later was to reveal the existence of a super-secret unit, known as Operation 40, apparently organized to act after the invasion, seizing control of the new Government and establishing a dictatorship, possibly under Artime.

With these machinations stirring in the background, the youthful Artime made his move at the end of January. With the full backing of CIA, he staged a coup in the training camps. He made fiery speeches to some 1,500 freedom fighters then in training. In some instances, he changed their commanders, installing his own men, and he appealed to all to join his banner. Most did, but some 200 balked.

Those "Democratic" rebels

Artime didn't stand for any nonsense from these recalcitrants. Backed up by CIA all the way, he had the 200 arrested and isolated under guard. Some managed to escape through the jungles and make their way back across Mexico to Miami. Others were talked into joining up. But there remained a hard core who stood by their convictions and refused to support Artime's budding junta. What happened to these stubborn ones should be an object lesson to a nation that has permitted its cloak-and-dagger boys to run their own private little dictatorships.

Long weeks later, after the Cuban invasion had failed, the story was told to the New York Times by Dr. Rodolfo Nodal Tarafa, a young lawyer who had been in the training camp at Trax, Guatemala, when Artime staged his coup. On January 31, Dr. Nodal said, the senior military adviser in the Trax camp, known to the Cubans only as "Frank," mustered the 300 training freedom fighters and told them their two commanding Cuban officers had been sent away for "playing politics." They would be commanded henceforth, "Frank" said, by Capt. San Román. This choice was distinctly unpopular with the Cubans in camp. Capt. San Román had been an officer of Fulgencio Batista and was reported to have fought against Castro in the Sierra Maestra. In San Román, the freedom fighters smelled the stench of the old, brutal Batista dictatorship; and since this wasn't the kind of "cause" for which they were prepared to die, 230 of the 300 asked to resign.

Theirs was supposed to be a free volunteer army, but of course such insubordination could not be permitted. Another agent by the name of "Bernie" was summoned to deal with the trouble. He charged the 230 recalcitrants with being Communists. He declared he had authority from the Democratic Reolutionary Front to name commanders, and he had picked Captain San Román for them. That was that. But the Cubans didn't seem to see the logic in this clear, democratic reasoning. It seemed to them that they were the ones who had been elected to do the fighting and the dying, and they should have something to say about the cause for which they were prepared to make such sacrifices. They demanded that their case be heard by the front within 72 hours.

Otherwise, they wanted to be discharged and returned home.

A committee of five was selected to present this protest. "Bernie" refused to receive the delegation. He agreed finally to talk to a single spokesman, and Dr. Nodal was chosen. The lawyer explained to "Bernie" that the freedom fighters were neither mercenaries nor conscripts, and that they could not accept commanders who represented the very antithesis of the ideals for which they were fighting. "Bernie" suggested that the troops agree to train for 5 days more while they waited for a representative from the Democratic Revolutionary Front to arrive. They agreed. But 7 days passed, and nothing happened. The troops again went on strike.

Iron beneath velvet

Now CIA took off the silken gloves of deceit. Threats and promises were freely employed. Gradually, the protesting troops were browbeaten into submission—all but 20. These 20 were obdurate. On February 11, while the rest of the men were on field exercises, one of the advisers asked 8 of the 20 to go with him. They thought, Dr. Nodal says, that there was to be another conference. Not until they had been led along a jungle track to a canvas-covered truck did they discover their error. There they were suddenly covered by three men holding Thompson submachineguns.

The eight were driven to La Suiza, an estate where there was a Guatemalan Army camp. There they were surrounded by 8 or 10 men with automatic weapons. Each of the eight was taken separately from the truck; each was taken into a small room, forced to empty his pockets, forced to strip off all his clothes.

"I felt sure this was it," Dr. Nodal said. "I was sure we were going to be murdered."

But not even CIA was quite equal to that. The men, deprived of "even our love letters," as Dr. Nodal says, were permitted to dress again. They were taken to a shed 15 feet by 30, with concrete floor and galvanized iron roof—a furnace by day, an icy igloo by night. Here they were imprisoned. For 12 days, they were not permitted to bathe or shave, to have clean clothes or to eat a really edible meal. Periodically, they were questioned by another CIA mystery man, known to them only as "Pat," the chief security guard. They were given lie-detector tests, virtually at gunpoint. The object was to make them confess that they were Communists, for obviously such stubborn and disagreeable characters simply had to be Communists. Naturally, they wouldn't admit it, and strangely enough, as far as can be learned, the lie-detector tests didn't show it. In frustration, the CIA finally flew the stubborn holdouts, now 17 in number, to a jungle prison in remote Peten Province in northern Guatemala. Here they were held under armed guard and warned they would be shot if they tried to escape. They were warned, too, that when the revolution succeeded they would be turned over the the new Cuban Government to face trial and, probably, execution.

This fate they were spared by the failure of the invasion for which, originally, they had trained so ardently. With that unexpected collapse of all its plans, CIA acquired, if not a change of heart, at least a twinge of discretion. It released the 17 "freedom fighters" it had held in cruel jungle imprisonment for 11 weeks, flew them back to Miami and dumped them out. There Dr. Nodal and the others started their own resistance movement. It has one primary, overriding principle: it will have nothing to do with CIA.

Kennedy's dilemma

Such is the background against which the CIA set out to insure the "liberation" of Cuba from Castro. No one in Washington, of course, had any idea of the manner in which CIA was indoctrinating the principles of democracy into its "freedom fighters" in the Guatemalan jungles. It has become obvious that no one on any level of government, not the Congress, not the President, had any clear conception of what CIA was up to or how it was running the store; yet it was in such a miasma of misinformation and noninformation that President Kennedy had to make a crucial decision.

It is not clear just when he first learned of the invasion plans set on foot by Nixon and Eisenhower. One version has pictured him as learning about the project for the first time shortly after the election. According to this version, the invasion has been scheduled for the late fall, but Kennedy was so shocked by the idea that the stroke was postponed to let him make the decision. Against the background of what is known, all of this appears unlikely; for Kennedy himself, in his television debates with Nixon, had proposed just such drastic action as the Eisenhower administration contemplated—and Nixon, it should be noted parenthetically, had held up his hands in pious horror at the thought. In any event, in January, Kennedy began to get detailed reports on the Cuban invasion project from CIA and from the State and Defense Departments. He was confronted with an evil dilemma.

The Cuban rebels had spent months in the training camps; they were ready to go; they could not be held in leash forever. Furthermore, the publicity so belatedly given about the Guatemalan training bases had stripped the mask from our CIA-overrun puppet state; embarrassed, Guatemalan officials yielded to public outcry and informed the United States we would soon have to get out. CIA further intensified the pressure on the President. Castro, it reported, was getting Soviet tanks and Migs; he was stepping up his counterintelligence activities throughout the nation. It was now or never.

Such were the strong pressures for action—for a decision, as Sherman Kent once wrote, "off the top of the head." Yet even so, inside the Kennedy administration, there was much soul-searching and a quite definite tug of war. The President himself, aware that the contemplated American-backed invasion would violate every provision of the 1948 Pact of Bogotá, prohibiting the use of force against the governments of American states, frowned on any direct American participation. Secretary of State Dean Rusk apparently doubted the wisdom of the entire venture, but he was not a strong enough man to fight for his convictions. Chester Bowles disliked the whole idea, leaked his dislike to the press, but apparently wasn't consulted in the final decision. Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was the one man with convictions who fought stoutly for them, but his protests were ignored. Determinative in making up the President's mind for him, it appears, was the information supplied by CIA, backed up by Navy Intelligence. This insisted that Castro's island empire was ripe for revolution. Independent analyses by amateurs that pointed to a directly opposite conclusion were ignored. It was decided to strike.

Shotgun wedding

Before the actual invasion, there was a CIA-arranged, shotgun wedding. CIA, a great togetherness outfit, wanted to get all the anti-Castro groups together pulling in harness behind Manuel Artime, the field commander it had already selected for them. With Bissell wielding the whip, it was announced on March 22 that a revolutionary council had been formed 2 days previously in Miami. The provisional president of the council was José Miró Cardona, who had been Castro's first Premier, but had quickly broken with the dictator. Manolo Ray was a member of the council, but its overwhelming complexion was conservative. It was understood that Cardona would become provisional president as soon as the invading troops had carved out a foothold on Cuban soil. Later there would be free elections. Just what trust should have been placed in these promises in view of CIA's action in investing full military power in Artime, in view of the murky Operation 40, remains a matter of conjecture.

Political control established, the next consideration was CIA's invasion plan. Originally, the cloak-and-dagger agency wanted to hurl all the available invasion forces ashore at one point in one all-out assault. From the first, it appears, Manolo Ray's MRP doubted the wisdom of CIA's military conceptions. Ray felt that the only way to overthrow Castro was to use Castro's own formula against him—to infiltrate Cuba with small guerrilla groups, to build up the program of sabotage and resistance within the country to the bursting point. So strongly did Ray feel about this that it appears he even contemplated taking his MRP out of the revolutionary front; but, in the end, he went along because, as he later said, "we did not want to give the slightest aid to the Communists."

Dubious military tactic

CIA's tactical plan raised other doubts. The invasion beach it selected was in the swampy, isolated Bay of Pigs, 90 miles southeast of Havana. The idea apparently shocked Col. Ramon Barquin, an Army officer who had been imprisoned by Batista, one of the most respected military figures among the émigrés and the man who almost certainly would have been Ray's choice to command the invasion had Ray had a choice. Colohel Barquin pointed out that only two narrow, easily defended paths led inland from the Bay of Pigs. One was a narrow road, the other a narrow railroad bed. On either side of these defiles, for a distance of 24 miles inland, stretched impenetrable, mosquito-infested swamps. "This swamp offers some advantages—you can't be flanked," Colquel Barquin conceded. "But it makes no difference; you can be stopped easily enough." All that Castro would have to do would be to concentrate tanks and troops at the mouths of the two funnels opening onto the central Cuban plain; his task would be like putting a cork in the mouth of a bottle.

The ways to disaster had now been greased by CIA decisions that, it would seem, had erred at each and every step along the way: the invasion ship was about to be launched. On March 29, after making some changes in plan, President Kennedy flashed the green light from the White House. One of the President's modifications banned U.S. aerial strikes in support of the invaders; the Cubans must do it on their own. Another dealt with the cleaning out of Batista supporters in the invasion army. The President himself, it is said, ordered the arrest of Rolando Masferrer, the best known Batista henchman; but, while this order was carried out, CIA heeded imperfectly the President's intent. Other Batista luminaries like Capt. San Román sailed from Guatemala in command of their troops.

The attack began with surprise raids by B-26's on Castro's airfields. They wrought some damage, but, as events were to show, not enough. This was the first failure, but it wasn't the most serious. For a strategic move that reads like something out of Gilbert and Sullivan, one has to thank the masterminds of CIA. On some level—on just what level and on just whose authority the American public, presumably, will never be permitted to know—the brilliant decision was reached that the Cuban leaders of the revolutionary front were not to be permitted to have anything to say, or to do, with their own invasion.

Climax to a nightmare

On April 16, the day before the actual invasion, Dr. José Miró Cardona and the members of his revolutionary council were in New York. They received word to go to Philadelphia. There they were met and flown to Miami. The instant they arrived they were conducted to a small, isolated house on the outskirts. Here they were held virtual prisoners. They were not permitted to use the telephone. They were not permitted to communicate with anyone. They were allowed only to listen to radio reports of how their invasion was being managed for them.

Here, perhaps, is the most fantastic episode of the entire fantastic nightmare. The success of the invasion from the outset clearly depended on a mass uprising of the Cuban people in its support. But Ray, the underground commander, the only leader who could have been effective in marshaling such support, was muzzled. Obviously, he was too leftwing, too dangerous a man. Obviously, too, CIA wasn't trusting any of the other members of the revolutionary council; it was making certain that they didn't interfere with CIA's invasion.

Some genius in CIA evidently decided that the Cuban people would arise en masse if a message was beamed to them from our Swan Island radio station off the Honduran coast. And so this message was concocted:

"Alert! Alert! Look well at the rainbow. The first will rise very soon. Chico is in the house. Visit him. The sky is blue. Place notice in the tree. The tree is green and brown. The letters arrived well. The letters are white. The fish will not take much time to rise. The fish is red. Look well at the rainbow."

This gibberish, as far as can be learned, was the only notice the Cuban people ever got. Ray's underground, so assiduously kept in the dark by CIA, didn't even know an invasion was coming off—and so did nothing. The Cuban people apparently didn't make much sense out of that fish and rainbow business—and so did nothing. The invasion troops stormed ashore and found Castro, much better informed than the underground, waiting for them.

The debacle was swift. The invaders stabbed inland along the one narrow road, the one narrow railroad bed. They penetrated for 20 miles, and then they were hit by tanks, by artillery fire, by strafing from the air. American papers carried glaring headlines about Russian Migs turning the tide, but less hysterical reports later showed that there wasn't a Mig in the air. Castro had armed some old jet-trainer planes, and these were enough. An ammunition ship, carrying practically all of the reserve supplies for the expedition, was sunk. The narrow road and railroad track were smothered by fire. On either side the jungles hemmed in the invaders. They could not advance, they could not escape; they could only surrender.

Postmortem debacle

Now, to compound the military disaster, came other disasters, the full effects of which almost certainly have not yet been totaled. First, there was the lying. As in the U–2 disaster, we tried to deny the self-evident truth. In a world that we expect to accept America's word as its bond, we deliberately set out to demonstrate again that this word was worthless. Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, Democrat, of New York, writes that, after the invasion had been underway for 24 hours, "an official representative of the State Department stood in the 20th Congressional District office in Washington and said that neither the CIA, the State Department, nor any other Government agency was involved 'in any way.'" Worse, far worse, was the spectacle in the United Nations.

There Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the U.N., a man of tremendous personal prestige not only among Americans but among the peoples of the world, put his prestige on the line in a lost and tarnished cause. Apparently, he hadn't been told the truth by his own Government; and so, replying to charges of American intervention made by the Cuban delegate, Stevenson denied categorically that the United States had had any hand—any hand at all—in the attempt to overthrow Castro. Such charges, he said, were a tissue of lies delivered "in the jargon of communism." He added: "If the Castro regime has hostility to fear, it is the hostility of Cubans, not of Americans. * * * If the Castro regime is overthrown, it will be overthrown by Cubans, not Americans. I do not see that it is the obligation of the United States to protect Dr. Castro from the consequences of his treason to the promises of his revolution."

To turn Stevenson's own phrase back upon him, what kind of jargon is this?

Even though television viewers who had venerated Stevenson turned away sick at the sight, American officials still were not willing to embrace truth. A determined effort was made, with the help of the Madison Avenue public relations firm that had been hired to handle pronouncements for the Cubans, to picture the invasion as no invasion at all—just a little guerrilla operation involving no more than 200 or 300 men, many of whom had succeeded in making contact with rebel forces in the interior of Cuba. This myth quickly was exploded by Castro. He paraded some 1,200 captives for all the world to see. He even had them tell their stories on television. There, in the full glare of the klieg lights, some were identified as former Batista thugs; and all, almost to a man, pleaded they had been deceived by the CIA.

Catastrophic as all this was, it was not the end of the catastrophe. Castro's police and army put on a nationwide hunt for subversives. It is estimated that 100,000 suspects were rounded up. Though many were finally released, hardly a single leader in Ray's underground escaped. Resistance leaders denounced CIA bitterly. Their organizations, they said, had been wrecked, and some wondered out loud whether this had been part of CIA's intention. In a Cuban prison, Associated Press correspondent Robert Berrellez met a 22-year-old Cuban who had been one of Ray's principal lieutenants in the Cuban underground. This Cuban complained bitterly that, a month before the invasion, the CIA radio station on Swan Island had actually broadcast his name to Castro's police. "This station paid tribute to me by name for helping exiles get out of Cuba clandestinely," the resistance leader said. "That tipped off G–2 and I was finally trapped."

In the light of such stories, can one wonder that many Cubans refuse to trust CIA any more? The extent of the distrust was clearly indicated in Miami on May 23, when Ray finally took his MRP out of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The move, he said bluntly, was in protest against the CIA's continued domination of the Cuban resistance, its continued playing of Cuban politics, its continued refusal to support MRP and its continued recruitment of former Batista officials for a new national army. This would seem to indicate that not even a disaster of the magnitude of Cuba can change the rigid mentality of CIA, can drag it—to use an old Stevenson phrase—"kicking and screaming into the 20th century."

Cuba, and CIA's infatuation with Batista bravos and authoritarians of the far right, are merely the final chapter in a book in which the plots, whatever else may be said of them, are all consistent. Iran, Guatemala, Laos, Cuba: in all of them, the CIA's fondest affection has been reserved for militarists with 19th-century social outlooks, for small and wealthy ruling cliques that have no sincere interest in the welfare of the millions whom they govern. The imposition of such governments merely stalls the future and gives Khrushchev his talking points. As Stuart Novins wrote in a perceptive final paragraph in his account of the Cuban fiasco in The Reporter:

"The tragic episode * * * raises a number of obvious questions about the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. But beyond that, there is reason to doubt that even if the attack had been successful, it could have produced a viable political resolution for the bloody turmoil of Cuba's recent history. To liberate Cuba from the outside, with a government to be imposed from the outside, is not the most promising way to promote a stable democracy in Cuba and to advance the social and economic welfare of its people. Not only does Cuba know this, but far more important, the rest of Latin America knows it too."

PART IX. A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

"If it is true that the agency [CIA] mapped the invasion plan, herded the Cuban resistance leaders around like redheaded stepchildren and conducted military operations in their stead, then we have trusted a Government agency to make all but war without the consent of Congress.—Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat of Florida, in the House of Representatives, May 1, 1961.

"I want my position to be crystal clear. The Pentagon, the military services, and the intelligence services of the Nation are to be the servants of the policymakers. They are not to be policymakers in themselves.

If we have learned anything in recent months * * * it is that the preponderance of the emphasis * * * on the part of the military, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the other intelligence services was overwhelmingly involved in the policymaking functions of the Government, to the point where the actions of the military and the CIA made policy through their preemption of the field.—Senator HUBERT D. HUMPHREY Democrat, of Minnesota, in the Senate, May 3, 1961.

These two quotes pose an issue that, in its depth and dimensions, appears still not to have been fully realized by the American people. This is no issue of internal organization. This is no technical issue, involving the combination of intelligence and action functions in one agency, the CIA, though that is part of it. This is an issue that goes to the very guts of the democratic processes. Involved here is the question of whether the "black" arts (sabotage, revolution, invasion) are to dominate all American democratic functions and to determine for our people willynilly, without debate, without knowledge even of what is at stake, the course their Nation is to take in the world. No lesser issue amounts to a tinker's damn here.

Congress alone, under our Constitution, is supposed to have the right to declare war. This safeguard was devised by the Founding Fathers with the wise intent of insuring that no Executive with a mania for power could ever determine for the people whether they were to live in peace, or to fight and die. Only the people through their representatives in Congress were to decide their own fate on this most crucial of all issues. Today, with intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads casting a dread shadow over the world, there is more need than ever before in history for an intelligent and informed electorate to exercise the restraints and the powers of decision guaranteed in the Constitution. Yet today we practice the "black" arts on such a farflung, billion-dollar scale, we throw around them such a mantle of spurious patriotic secrecy, that neither the people nor their watchdogs in Congress have the faintest idea what is happening until it has happened—until it is too late. In essence, CIA, which is at the root

of the evil, has become a Frankenstein monster dominating the Congress that created it.

The result is a twofold tragedy. Abroad, CIA destroys our prestige and undermines our influence. At home we do not even know what is happening.

Actions belie words

Our Presidents—Eisenhower was notable for this and was motivated, nearly everyone would agree, by a deep sincerity—proclaim our peaceful intentions, our devotion to the ideals of democracy and good will and world peace. The American people sincerely believe that this is what we stand for and cannot comprehend why the world at large does not believe in our so obviously good intentions. Our people do not understand that, even as our Presidents speak, the actions of CIA frequently invest their words with every appearance of the most arrant hypocrisy. The Presidents speak peace; but the CIA overthrows regimes, plots internal sabotage and revolution, foists opium-growers on a friendly nation, directs military invasions, backs right-wing militarists. These are not the actions of a democratic, peace-loving nation devoted to the high ideals we profess. These are the actions of the Comintern in right-wing robes. America, no more than the U.S.S.R., can speak out of both sides of its mouth and expect the peoples of the world to trust in its sincerity.

All of this goes on abroad, but at home the American public does not know for long months, if ever, what CIA has brewed. The power of a billion-dollar secret agency operating as a law unto itself is almost incalculable, not just in molding the image of America in foreign lands, but in molding at home the image Americans have of the world around them. Time and again American public opinion has been whiplashed into a warlike frenzy by glaring headlines picturing a callous Communist aggressor when, all the time, the CIA was the secret provocative agent. The crisis over Quemoy was a glaring example. The U–2 incident, in which our Government lied to "cover" CIA and pictured to the public a Russian bear reaching out with bloody paw to down our innocent little weather plane, was another. Less well known, but perhaps of greater long-range importance, is the manner in which our whole attitude toward Communist China has been deliberately colored, as Charles Edmundson has written, by "the State Department's repeated and sometimes incendiary statements that all Americans held prisoner in Communist China are held illegally and in violation of international law. Every well-informed correspondent and editor in Washington knows that many of the prisoners have been U.S. intelligence agents, whom China has as much right to hold as the United States has to imprison Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, the Soviet master spy." By such tactics, Edmundson writes, the American public has been bamboozled "to the point where a rational China policy has become a political impossibility."

Making peace difficult

It may even be that a rational policy of any kind has become a political impossibility. Cyrus Eaton, the multimillionaire Cleveland industrialist who has long championed a policy of coexistence with China and the Soviet Union, pointedly suggests that either CIA or some of its secretive governmental collaborators is indulging, within the United States, in propaganda activities designed to make any peaceful solution impossible. In a letter to Senator FULBRIGHT, Eaton charges that Federal funds are being funneled secretly into the promotion of demonstrations designed to inflame public opinion against visiting Iron Curtain diplomats. Eaton writes:

"An interesting question is, Who supplies the funds to hire the professionals who curround the embassies and follow foreign visitors with insulting signs and shouted epithets? I find it hard to believe, but I am informed that substantial funds for such undesirable activities come from Federal appropriations, under a disguised name.

"After the Soviet Deputy Premier, Mr. Mikoyan, visited me in Cleveland, I made a point of investigating the group of Hungarians who endeavored to molest him in Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago. It turned out that the identical people had gone into all three cities by car and had obviously been hired and financed by someone with ample funds, reputedly Uncle Sam. In Cleveland, representatives of the State Department gave every evidence of conniving with the Hungarian hecklers by putting at their disposal the routes and locations most advantageous for their hostile demonstrations against the Mikoyan party.

"I have also looked carefully into the background of the so-called Hungarian freedom fighters. Many of them turn out to be former officers of the Nazi army that invaded Hungary; they were, of course, obliged to flee the country when Hitler was defeated."

This is a truly sensational charge. Eaton's very name, of course, is anathema to right-wingers, but congressional attempts to investigate him have proved largely futile and he remains a powerful and influential man. Whether investigation would establish the validity of his charge remains uncertain; but in considering it, two facts perhaps should be borne in mind—the long love affair of CIA with the Gehlen agency, which included former Nazi officers and operated in Hungary, and the Cuban freedom fighters' recollections of the number of East European CIA agents who, with the aid of interpreters, directed their drills in Guatemala. If these should ever turn out to be true straws in the wind, if Eaton's charge should ever be substantiated, an entire new field of secret CIA activity might be exposed—one more pernicious than any other in its underhanded influence on American public opinion.

What kind of probe?

CIA is, of course, now being investigated. It is being investigated now just as it has already been investigated four times in the past—in private, in secret. Each investigation found flaws. Each reported CIA was working to correct them. Each succeeding probe found some of the same flaws and reported that CIA was working to correct them. And now, in 1961, we have come to our present pass.

In 1956, a congressional joint committee called futilely for the appointment of a watchdog commission to put a checkrein on CIA. The committee took some roundhouse swings at CIA's most precious forte, its iron-clad secrecy. "Once secrecy becomes sacrosanct, it invites abuse," the committee wrote. "Secrecy now beclouds everything about CIA * * *." The committee quoted with approbation the comment of Hanson Baldwin of the New York Times that CIA "engages in activities that, unless carefully balanced and well executed, could lead to political, psychological, and even military defeats, and even to changes in our form of government." The first part of that prediction has certainly come to pass. As for the second, the committee itself wrote: "Our form of government * * * is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system gets seriously out of balance at any point, the whole system is jeopardized and the way is open for the growth of tyranny."

The way is still open. For the Congress of 1956 did nothing. And we reaped the whirlwind in Laos and in Cuba.

The new, executive-style investigation ordered by President Kennedy can hardly be expected to meet the full need, the full right of the American people to know. Gen. Maxwell Taylor heads the President's new investigating board; the President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, sits upon it. So does Allen Dulles, the man being investigated. It may be noted that it is rare indeed when the defendant turns star prosecutor at his own inquest.

The record of the past few years seems to say clearly that the colossal mess CIA has created demands nothing less than a full-scale congressional investigation. It is not enough just to lop off CIA's operational arm and give its "black arts" intriguers to some other secret agency; we need to examine in detail just what the "black arts" have brought us, we need to consider whether they can ever be reconciled with the principles of democracy—the principles we profess. It is not enough just to give Congress finally, at long last, a watchdog committee (a move, incidentally, that is still by no means certain); we need to examine publicly, in detail, the qualities of mind and the kind of hidden interests that have placed our prestige unreservedly behind wealthy oligarchies and right-wing militarists in a world in which the growing clamor on every side is for social and economic justice, social and economic change. We need to discover how and why, as Walter Lippmann wrote, we are doing just what Khrushchev expects us to do, why we are doing his propagandizing for him. Only if we make basic determinations of this kind can we hope for the future. And we cannot make them if we do not first learn the who and the how and the why that have so often placed us on the wrong and losing side—if we do not clean out the forces that put us there. This, only an aroused Congress could hope to accomplish.

At stake: the world's faith

Both the faith of foreign nations in us and our own faith in ourselves are at stake, for both have been deeply compromised by the shady activities and the secrecy surrounding the shadiness that have become the twin hallmarks of CIA. When, hard on the heels of Cuba, the French generals in Algeria tried to overthrow Charles de Gaulle, we were confronted by all-but-official charges in the French press that CIA once more had egged on the militarists. M. Soustelle, at a luncheon in Washington last December 7, is said to have talked long and earnestly to CIA Deputy Director Richard Bissell, Jr., on the proposition that De Gaulle's program in Algeria could lead only to communism. CIA is said to have been impressed; General Challe, who led the revolt, is said to have had several meetings with CIA agents; he is reported to have been given the impression that he would have the support of the United States.

All of this Mr. Dulles and the CIA categorically deny. But Walter Lippmann reported from Paris that it is known that CIA agents meddled in France's internal affairs during the French debate on the nuclear-arms program. And the highest French officials, pleased by President Kennedy's prompt and wholehearted support of De Gaulle, have called the Algerian incident closed—but they have not, pointedly they have not, given a full and clean bill of health to CIA. It is a sequence that leaves a foul taste in the mouth. As the New Republic's Washington correspondent wrote, commenting on the French charges and recalling the background incidents of U–2 and Cuba: "Preposterous—? Certainly. And yet * * * and yet. * * * It is not that we think for a minute that the French charge is true, but that now we are suspicious of everything."

So we are. L'Express, with pointed intent, quotes Allen Dulles: "The countries which are the most powerful to resist Communist subversion are those where the military are in power." We recall this hard kernel of Dulles' philosophy acting itself out in Egypt, in Iran, in Guatemala, in Laos, in Cuba. Why not in France? Could it be possible in

so large a power, one of our oldest allies? Well—why not? In the secret world of CIA anything is possible—and no one knows. We can only wonder and doubt. And doubt does not inspire confidence abroad or fervor at home. It's time to clean house.

Communication Between Racial Groups of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on many occasions we hear the charge by those who do not know the facts that there is no communication between white leaders and Negro groups of the South.

Those who are intellectually honest with themselves know there is excellent communication between the racial groups of the South. Many examples of this longtime harmonious and workable relationship between whites and Negroes of Mississippi, for example, are to be found every day in my State as well as in other States of the South.

We hear charges also that our colored friends and citizens do not get the proper attention and consideration in connection with community and regional programs which will improve their positions.

The attached newspaper story of a recent Mississippi event refutes these false charges, and relates the opportunities afforded Negro landowners in Mississippi. They met in a special Negro Delta Field Day at the Delta Branch Experiment Station at Stoneville, Miss., to hear an address by Dr. D. W. Colvard, president of Mississippi State University.

Attending the session were about 1,000 Negro independent landowners and householders in one of the richest land areas of the Nation. They own their own land and maintain a high standard of living.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal of August 3, 1961, be printed into the RECORD so that all Members of the Senate may read firsthand an account of this meeting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS TOLD OF OPPORTUNITY—DELTA LANDOWNERS SHOWN LATEST DEVELOPMENTS AT FIELD DAY

GREENVILLE, MISS., August 2.—"Your opportunities are unlimited in Delta agriculture."

So Dr. D. W. Colvard, president of Mississippi State University, told nearly 1,000 Negro landowners attending the 21st annual Negro Delta Field Day at the Delta Branch Experiment Station Wednesday.

"But to take full advantage of the opportunities, you must be willing to train your minds to grasp and make use of the latest developments in agricultural research," he said.

CHANGES FOR BETTER

In citing changes in Mississippi agriculture, Dr. Colvard called attention to better crop varieties, better cattle, and better chemicals.

"Farming has changed from dependence on muscle of man and mule to a far greater dependence on mind, money and machinery," he said. "And the changes are just now beginning. They will continue at a faster and faster rate."

KEEP IN TOUCH

M. S. Shaw, Director of the Agricultural Extension Service at Mississippi State University, urged the Negro landowners to continue close work with the local county agents for faster improvement in agricultural improvements. Mr. Shaw introduced Dr. Colvard.

The group was welcomed to the experiment station by Dr. W. K. Porter, Jr., superintendent.

Also included on the annual field day were tours of experiment station research, demonstrations of farm machinery and discussions of new developments in crop varieties and agricultural chemicals.

Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the disturbing attitudes of too many of our citizens today is the effort to avoid voluntary military service or the draft. To me, such effort to escape a responsibility of citizenship is an indication of deterioration of patriotism on the part of those who have such an attitude.

From time to time in recent years there have been, as a means of reducing the draft requirements, proposals for establishment of some form of "Foreign Legion" units in our Armed Forces. Fortunately, these proposals have been rejected. The correctness of rejecting the establishment of a Foreign Legion in this country has been heavily underlined by the recent revolt of a large portion of the French forces in Algeria. The Foreign Legion aspect of the Algerian revolt by the French military has been largely overlooked in the United States.

Therefore, I was glad to note in the June issue of the VFW American Security Reporter an article entitled "A Lesson From the Algerian Revolt." The VFW American Security Reporter is, as Members of this body are aware, the very thoughtful and influential monthly publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, published under the direction of Mr. Ted C. Connell, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This article, by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs of the VFW, explains the important, but unfortunate, role of foreign mercenaries in the short-lived but potentially disastrous French military revolt in Algeria.

The article emphasizes why any nation that wishes to survive in the face of a threat such as is posed by communism today, must rely on its own strength and its own resources and its own patriotism, and not upon foreign military personnel, regardless of how professionally and technically proficient they might be. Because of the important thoughts contained in it, I include, at this time, the article, "A Lesson From the Algerian Revolt," from the VFW American Security Reporter.

A LESSON FROM THE ALGERIAN REVOLT

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

While the causes for the Algerian revolt were many and diverse, one very fundamental lesson emerges. It is a lesson which has not been too well pointed up or appreciated in the many analyses of the what and why of the turbulent but short uprising by the French military in Algeria.

Essentially it is this: the hard military core of the Algerian mutiny was comprised of elements of the Foreign Legion. Some of these units reportedly were 80 percent non-French personnel. These troops were acknowledged military professionals. They were highly disciplined; they were certainly obedient to their immediate military superiors. While they were highly efficient military men, they were not French and they did not have a French citizen's inherent patriotism to his country. It was not, therefore, mere coincidence that the mutiny against France was based upon non-French troops in the French armed forces.

This again demonstrates the historic lesson that a nation cannot safely place reliance upon foreign mercenaries in time of crisis. Algeria has demonstrated in this instance what Rome learned centuries ago, that a nation which declines to do its own soldiering with its own citizens, and thus resorts to dependence upon foreign nationals, is defaulting on its individual and collective responsibility and is inescapably headed for crisis, if not disaster. The assuring of a nation's survival cannot be entrusted to hired hands.

The C. & O. Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an editorial from the New York Times of August 7, 1961, in support of the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park. The editorial reemphasizes the reasons why the House of Representatives should make rapid progress on the measure to create a national park in the Potomac valley. The Times underscores the fact that this park, when established, will be a benefit to the entire Nation and not merely the residents of the Washington metropolitan area.

THE C. & O. CANAL

The Beall bill to create a national historical park along the Chesapeake and Ohio

Canal is making rapid and constructive progress in the Senate.

While the narrow C. & O. route along the Potomac River is already under some protection as a national monument, that designation was merely a crucial stopgap, ordered by President Eisenhower, to save the canal itself and a narrow strip along it from destruction. But the canal area should be a park, with enough space along the 165-mile waterway to provide for public recreation and enjoyment. This is what the Senate bill now provides, allowing the Government to spend up to $1.5 million for 10,200 acres to add to the present holdings of 4,800 acres.

In the House the Mathias bill, with similar provisions, has not yet been reported. There is some talk of a compromise that would limit action this year to changing the status of the canal from a monument to a park, which would be almost meaningless. Certainly Members of the House must realize that this enormous natural area will serve the recreation needs of a large part of the East. It should not be considered merely as just another park for the capital, as some legislators are inclined to look at it.

Washington needs it, but so do the rest of us. And to wait longer to buy the necessary acreage can only mean paying more for it in the long run.

S. 1722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Dr. Joseph M. Klamon, the distinguished instructor of business and public administration at Washington University, St. Louis.

Dr. Klamon is an old and respected opponent of the iniquitous "fair trade" bill now being heard in the Congress of the United States.

As a member of the bar, and a learned economist, Dr. Klamon has been able to forcefully and intelligently articulate the vices and evils so richly inherent in the "fair trade" proposals now pending.

This iniquitous legislation should be defeated as is so wisely advocated by Dr. Klamon.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT PRESENTED ON BEHALF OF THE CONSUMERS' FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS AND ST. LOUIS COUNTY BY DR. JOSEPH M. KLAMON, PROFESSOR OF MARKETING, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO., ON THURSDAY, JULY 27, 1961, AND FOLLOWING DATES, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1722, A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT, AS AMENDED SO AS TO PROTECT AND EQUALIZE RIGHTS IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF MERCHANDISE IDENTIFIED BY A TRADEMARK, BRAND, OR TRADE NAME

S. 1722 was introduced in the present session of Congress on April 27, 1961, by U.S. Senators HUMPHREY and PROXMIRE. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Speaking as an individual who has taught marketing in a number of universities for more than 30 years, and on behalf of the Consumers' Federation of St. Louis and St. Louis County, I wish to thank your committee for permitting me to appear in opposition to the aforesaid bill, S. 1722. This bill if enacted into law, would be very harmful to all consumers and to the public interests generally; it would virtually destroy much of our antitrust laws; it is very doubtful that the U.S. Supreme Court would sustain it; it would also seem doubtful that it would ever reach the Supreme Court if passed by Congress, because of the opposition of many governmental agencies, including perhaps the Department of Justice. I do not believe the public interest is ever served when interested competitors police each other's pricing policies. We urge your committee and Congress to reject S. 1722 for the reasons herein set forth.

Merely to identify myself for the record, I should like to say the following: My name is Joseph M. Klamon. I live at 8007 Stanford Avenue, University City, Mo. I teach marketing in the School of Business Administration at Washington University, St. Louis. I have taught in the Harvard Graduate School of Business, at Yale, William and Mary, Carnegie Tech, University of Pittsburgh, before returning to Washington University. I am a member of the bar in Missouri and also of the American Bar Association as well as the District Federal Bar in Baltimore, Md. The Consumers' Federation of St. Louis and St. Louis County has been in existence for some 30 years. On Tuesday, July 18, 1961 the St. Louis Post-Dispatch had a feature article indicating some of the activities of this civic group. I have been its economic adviser and consultant since its organization. It has successfully opposed in Missouri coal price fixing, milk price control, and all forms of Fair Trade laws, resale price maintenance, proposals in restraint of trade, on both the State and Federal levels. Our group has strongly supported the Missouri antitrust laws and has also strongly supported Federal antitrust laws.

Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia are the only areas that have not had fair trade price maintenance. We are very proud that Missouri, despite many efforts to pass such laws, has been able to resist this dubious blessing. We prefer price freedom to price fixing. In Missouri, a number of studies conducted by the press and others in re comparative prices on food, drug, and other essential items, invariably have shown that prices on such branded merchandise in Missouri are lower than in surrounding fair trade territory. The bill before you, S. 1722, is completely antithetical to any concept of price freedom and a free market; this bill is wholly at variance with the basic philosophy of all of our antitrust laws and any idea of a free economy or real price competition; it substitutes minimum or stipulated prices on branded goods for the present free market. All of our efforts of the past 30 years to resist so-called fair trade laws in Missouri, will be lost if S. 1722 is permitted to create strange, new property rights in brand names which continue even after a seller has parted completely with title to such goods and is allowed to dictate a stipulated retail price.

I do not believe S. 1722 will meet any other fate than that of the predecessors, the Miller-Tidings Act of 1937, and the McGuire Act of 1952. Again this is an effort to repeal the law of supply and demand. It is idle to suggest that the proponents of this type of class legislation want anything but higher prices. S. 1722 is economically unworkable, it is an effort to take a change of venue from the economic arena, the free marketplace, to the political arena; to me it is bad law, bad economics, and very poor public policy.

The interests of sellers and of buyers are not always the same. The trade groups sponsoring legislation such as S. 1722 do not confuse their interests with the public interests, rather they identify their interest as the public interest. In less than ten years discount houses selling branded merchandise have increased more than six- or seven-fold, from about 2,000 to more than 14,000. These are limited-service retailers that endeavor to sell branded merchandise on a limited-service basis at something below prevailing prices charged by full-service retailers or perhaps sometimes less efficient retailers. Obviously to enact a minium resale price law or to permit by law agreed upon or stipulated prices, regardless of the cost of doing business, would be difficult to enforce. In brief, unless you can abolish all discount houses and place restrictions upon a multiple brand policy it is very doubtful if S. 1722 could possibly be enforced.

On page 2, line 2 and following, a purpose of this bill is to "maintain the goodwill of the trademark, brand, or trade name identifying such merchandise." There is no evidence whatsoever that the goodwill or any meritorious product has been damaged, or driven from the market, by price competition. Consumers do not regard themselves as law-breakers if they are able to buy any durable consumer goods below generally prevailing prices from a retailer who operates more efficiently, has a greater volume, or an inherently lower cost pattern. Line 3 of page 2 of S. 1722 identifies a proprietor as one "who retains an interest in such merchandise, after he has sold it to distributors, by reason of his interest in stimplating demand for such merchandise through effective distribution to ultimate consumers and by reason of his further interest in the continuing protection of the goodwill associated with the trademark, brand, or name." Later on in S. 1722 an effort is made to give a manufacturer legal relief by way of injunction, damages, and court costs to protect this alleged property interest in a brand name even after title has passed completely from the maker to a seller. The Department of Justice and others as well have expressed doubt relative to the constitutionality or the legality of this substantive and novel property right which S. 1722 endeavors to create. The language of the bill makes the assumption that effective distribution and goodwill is protected and distribution facilitated by stipulated prices or minimum resale price control. All of the economic evidence would seem to be the contrary. Volume, effective distribution, and consumer goodwill would appear to be greatly enhanced by price competition. Line 17 through 19 of page 2 of this bill states categorically that "the marketing of such identified merchandise is depressed and the quality thereof moving in the channels of commerce declines," when there is serious price competition. There is no evidence of any direct, necessary causal relationship that price competition obstructs commerce in brand name merchandise nor that there is any necessary dilution in quality that flows as a conesquence of price cutting.

The definition of a proprietor as it appears on page 5, line 11 and following of S. 1722, introduces concepts of property interest in branded names that are entirely new and perhaps of doubtful legality.

In congressional hearings at the time the McGuire Act became law in 1952, and in later hearings such as those held on the Harris bill and on the bill now before you, S. 1722, spokesmen for various governmental agencies presented statements for the record in opposition to all fair trade laws and other attempts to weaken or nullify our Federal antitrust laws. I should be surprised if the Antitrust Division of Justice, the FTC, Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and similar agencies did not appear before you in opposition to S. 1722. If your committee would poll disinterested individuals connected with the faculties of perhaps the 100 top law schools and schools of business who teach in this field, I should be surprised if

you would find any appreciable number in favor of the bill before you.

S. 1722, the bill now before you, is essentially the same in purpose as the one introduced in the Senate 2 or 3 years ago by the same Members of the U.S. Senate who sponsor the present bill S. 1722. Senators HUMPHREY and PROXMIRE. It is also identical in principle to the bill introduced in the House by Hon. OREN E. HARRIS in 1958 as H.R. 10527. These bills represent the first effort to enact a substantive Federal stipulated price or Federal fair trade law. It is doubtful legally, but there is no doubt whatever, that it is completely contrary to our antitrust laws. If a bill such as S. 1722 is to become law, then we should at least be logical and do two things, first repeal our Federal antitrust laws, and second, perhaps apologize to the 16 electrical companies who recently pleaded guilty to antitrust law violations. We should stop deluding ourselves. Either we want competition and price freedom, or restraint of trade and price fixing. We not only need individuals who express their faith in competition and are professing free enterprises, we also need the practicing believers in free markets. Perhaps attention should be called to the fact that the press of the country is almost unanimously against fair trade price fixing.

Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations," written more than 150 years ago, and Prof. Frank Fetter of Princeton, less than 30 years ago, accurately described the true purpose of trade groups who sponsor laws such as the bill before you. Adam Smith said:

"People of the same trade seldom get together, even for purposes of merriment and diversion, but that the conversation turns in the direction of some contrivance to raise prices, or some conspiracy against the public interest. While the law cannot prevent people of the same trade from getting together, it should do nothing to encourage such meetings, much less make them compulsroy."

Prof. Frank Fetter, of Princetón, in more recent times said, "Whenever you hear of a trade group sponsoring a so-called fair trade law, it is time for all hands to be on deck, for the Republic is in danger."

Whatever the answer may be to absentee ownership, control, and finance, a sort of absentee landlordism, in both production and distribution, the abolition or restriction of a free market and price freedom definitely is not the correct answer. I do not know what the answer is, but I feel certain the substitution of price fixing or resale price maintenance, for price freedom, is not the answer, and our experience of the past 30 years proves this to be so. We are familiar with the enormous changes brought about by the industrial revolution, the factory system; in production we have moved from the handicraft stage, to the block assembly, to the line method of production. The changes in distribution in the past 40 to 50 years appear to have been no less drastic, and are still going on, in both production and distribution. Fifty years ago no one heard of the rack jobber, the discount house, the giant super drug, or super food store. We have eliminated many functionaries, but never the function. In the fiñal alaysis the basic problem in distribution is: who can perform the function most efficiently, or at lowest cost, and thereby win acceptance in a free market? There is no one answer, for some prefer or must buy with little service and some can afford the fullest service. It is of great importance, however, not to retard or hamper the introduction of new, and possibly less costly, methods of doing anything, in distribution or in production. The door must be kept wide open for all new inventions in all fields of endeavor, if a free economic society is to survive and living standards continue to rise. That type of production and distribution will survive that wins the widest public acceptance, and therefore deserves to survive. A false price level, over a longer period, tends to defeat itself.

This effort to force all dealers, all retailers, to charge the same retail price for branded goods, and thus eliminate the need of the public to shop around is doomed to failure for, in my opinion, vast numbers of people, in purchases of any significance or size, are most often influenced by rational buying motives. They always have and always will compare quality, durability, value, and price. In brief, the purchasing agent for the family has every reason and right to behave, when buying, in precisely the same fashion as does the industrial purchasing agent when he buys. Any effort by law to eliminate or to restrict the opportunity of consumers and the public to shop around for values and bargains and better prices is legislating economic nonsense and is doomed to failure, just as NRA, Miller-Tydings, McGuire, and 45 State fair trade laws never did work any too well and finally collapsed. Sponsors of fair trade pay scant attention to the economic reasons for the rapid growth of discount houses in just the past 8 years, from 2,000 to 14,000; the growth of rack jobbers; the legal basis for 18 State supreme courts declaring the McGuire act invalid; the reasons for the abandonment of resale price maintenance by practically all important manufacturers.

The problem here, again, is not big business versus small business, but lower cost or more efficient, or both, versus the opposite, large or small. It also involves the effort by law to force the lower cost to charge consumers the same as higher cost competitors, regardless of the willingness of such lower cost dealers to accept a smaller profit margin.

The bill before you is completely antithetical to any concept of price freedom and a free market; it is at war with the basic philosophy of all of our antitrust laws and any idea of a free economy or real competition; it substitutes a rigged price structure on branded goods for the present free market.

To me, this Federal fair trade bill, S. 1722, is an effort to modify or to repeal the economic law of supply and demand; it is idle to pretend that it is not class legislation, not in the public interest and intended only to help the trade groups who lobbied into law 45 State fair trade laws, and Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts. If enacted into law, this bill may very well suffer the same economic and legal fate that all of its predecessors, Federal and State, have experienced heretofore. Presently, we have a free market with almost complete price freedom at the retail level in all goods branded and unbranded. I do not believe the public interest is ever served when interested competitors police each other's pricing policies. I respectfully urge you to reject the bill before you.

Hon. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I join our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], in welcoming back to the Chamber our distinguished and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [CLARENCE CANNON]. In spirit and mental alertness he is one of the youngest men in the House. He demonstrates this daily by long hours and hard work. He has recently had a small sick spell, but now he is well, hearty, and active again in his duties.

The House rose and cheered the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MCCORMACK. This warm standing ovation to our chairman, Mr. CANNON, is just one of the many measures of esteem and affection in which he is held by all of us and a demonstration of the deep appreciation for the outstanding service he renders to his district, to the grand State of Missouri, and to the Nation.

Footnote on Buy-Off-Castro-With-Tractors Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor sent out in June by Adm. Charles M. Cooke, U.S. Navy, retired.

The self-explanatory letter is offered as a postscript to the miserably humiliating episode in which our Government and some citizens, doubtless well intentioned, sought to buy good behavior by a Communist dictator.

Admiral Cooke's experience in dealing with Americans held by Communists in China 15 years ago should have taught anyone the futility of such a course. To make a remark when the tractor deal was being supported was to be accused of being indifferent to the lives of the prisoners in Cuba. It is well t~ write a footnote at this time to show that the results of the misguided efforts in this most recent case were what they always are when such attempts are made. They do not make the tyrant more moderate; they only convince him that we are weak or craven and make him more arrogant and intransigeant:

SHOULD OUR GOVERNMENT WALLOW IN BRIBERY AND APOLOGY?

JUNE 16, 1961.

To the EDITOR:

In 1946 to 1948, when I was in command of the 7th Fleet, stationed in China, now and then officers and men under my command fell into the clutches of the Chinese Communists who had taken over most of north China while the Nationalist Chinese were in a life-and-death struggle against Japanese totalitarian aggression. Once, 7th Fleet planes operating over sea areas were forced to land in Communist-controlled areas because of weather conditions. Another time some of our men, hunting in areas in the general control of the Nationalist forces, strayed by mistake into areas where they were seized by Communist guerrillas.

In these two cases U.S. State Department diplomatic officials, "old China hands," offered their assistance in my efforts to effect

the release of personnel under my command. Upon my tentative acceptance of their assistance they went on to say that we would have to pay ransom, and would have to make apologies. I immediately rejected their offer of assistance, and though difficulties were encountered, I managed to effect the release in these cases. I know that similar recommendations were made later by our State Department in China, and were rejected by other military people as being completely unacceptable, if we were to maintain the dignity in the interests of the United States, which the oath to which we subscribed on entry into the service naturally required us to do.

The adoption and approval by the Commander in Chief of our forces, and by others, of bribing Communist Castro with tractors, goes beyond my understanding.

Adm. CHARLES M. COOKE,
U.S. Navy (Retired).

Knowing the History of the Foreign Aid Program It Is Unlikely the People Would Vote for It if Given the Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dean Rusk is quoted as saying in regard to foreign aid:

If a plebiscite was held on this program the instincts of the American people would carry it through.

I would like to inform the Secretary that I am confident this would not be the case in the area of the country I have the privilege to represent. The overwhelming bulk of my mail is opposed to the foreign aid program, not because the people of Dallas do not have humanitarian instincts, but rather because they have some very basic ideas about what is good for the United States and giving away our substance to the point of bankruptcy is not considered to be in our best interest.

For a keen analysis of the foreign aid program since its inception, I direct your attention to the following review of "The Patchwork History of Foreign Aid" by Lorna Morley and Felix Morley as it appeared in the Wall Street Journal. I would also like to call your attention to an excellent editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune which discusses the likely outcome of a national plebiscite on foreign aid:

THE ERRATIC COURSE OF FOREIGN AID

The history of U.S. foreign aid since World War II is a lesson in the durable vagaries of Government: The weaving in and out of personalities, agencies, and programs; the shifting humanitarian, economic, and political motives; the evolution of large-scale government-to-government aid, largely in response to the temporary situations, and successive crises of the cold war, into a seemingly bipartisan institution.

Foreign aid history is well traced in "The Patchwork History of Foreign Aid," a pamphlet by the father-daughter team of Felix Morley, Pulitzer Prize winner and former president of Haverford College, and Lorna Morley, Bryn Mawr graduate and a specialist in foreign policy research. They ask the question: Exactly how does continuing foreign aid serve American interests?

Foreign aid began as an emergency war-relief effort, a hopeful blueprint for world peace and cooperation. There were major U.S. loans to our wartime allies (the largest of which was the British loan in 1946 of over $3.7 billion on easy terms) and loans by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). Later, however, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) came under increasing congressional criticism as supplies donated to Eastern European countries fell under Communist control.

EFFECTIVE CONTROL

It was therefore decided in mid-1946 not to make a further U.S. contribution to UNRRA, and some months later then Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson declared there was no justification for making grants of aid without effective control by the grantors.

By 1947, even though the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter had been met on at least a subsistence level, economic stagnation in Europe proved dangerously stubborn in view of Soviet penetration and the onset of the worldwide cold war. This led to Greek-Turkish military aid, the Marshall plan of a 4-year economic aid project designed to restore a healthy European economy, and the Rio Pact for the hemispheric defense of the Americas.

For their part, the Soviets forbade satellite participation in the Marshall plan and to counteract it they organized the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) in October 1947. Then came the takeover of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet blockade of Berlin in 1948. The West countered in 1949 with the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the U.S. mutual defense program, which provided for military aid for the modernization of the armed forces of the European NATO members. "Their defense," said President Truman in a message to Congress, "is our defense."

About this time, Washington was coming around to the realization that the punitive peace imposed on Germany and Japan and involving the dismantling and decentralization of industry was impeding recovery of these countries, rendering them not only economic dependents of the United States but vulnerable to the intrigues of the Communists. Dismantling and interference were stopped, and the policy of demilitarization was switched to limited remilitarization.

Meanwhile, U.S. military and economic aid to China and Korea misfired badly. President Truman, in a policy statement in December 1945, indicated that any significant aid to Nationalist China would be contingent upon formation of a coalition government to include the Red Chinese and upon progress toward unity and peace. General Marshall personally tried to achieve these aims in his mission to China.

EMBARGO ON ARMS

To facilitate U.S. mediation, a U.S. embargo on arms for China, applicable to both parties, was imposed for a while. Advocates of extension of the Truman Doctrine to China argued in vain. The Communist takeover of the mainland was completed in 1949 and Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his remnants escaped to Formosa. In June 1950, a few months after Secretary of State Dean Acheson's National Press Club speech in which he drew a Far Eastern defense perimeter excluding South Korea, the Communists swept over the 38th parallel.

With the shooting, military aid loomed more important than economic aid. The military aid share of U.S. assistance went from 24 percent in fiscal 1951, to 38 percent in fiscal 1952, to a preponderant share in fiscal 1953, reaching about 70 percent in fiscal 1956 before subsiding. In addition, the United States concluded military pacts with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and, after the Korean armistice in 1953, with South Korea.

After the French collapse in Indochina in 1954, the United States helped forge the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Baghdad Pact, which plugged the gap between NATO and SEATO. The Baghdad Pact, however, was weakened by the British, French and Israeli invasion of Suez in 1956. This, in turn, led to the Eisenhower Doctrine, a guarantee of Middle East integrity, and the consequent Lebanese occupation by U.S. Marines in 1958, and to the reconstitution of the Baghdad Pact without Baghdad into the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO).

MILITARY BUILDUP

While the military buildup was going on, a new wrinkle was added to U.S. aid: Economic development began to get most of the emphasis. The change was signaled in President Truman's inaugural address in January 1949, when he said: "Fourth, we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of the underdeveloped areas."

Today hardly an underdeveloped nation anywhere does not crave a steel mill or an oil refinery or some other manifestation of industrialization. (Says India's Nehru: "Real progress must ultimately depend on industrialization.")

A variety of tools have been designed to spur developmental aid. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), for example, permits the sale of surplus farm commodities for local currencies, which are frequently reinvested by the U.S. Government in loans and grants for economic development. (But surplus disposal has also tended to depress world commodity prices and undercut the markets of allied or friendly nations.)

Other developmental devices include the U.S. Export-Import Bank, the State Department's Development Loan Fund (DLF), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), which dispenses the $600 million Castro appropriation for Latin America, and the International Development Association, a World Bank affiliate empowered to make extra-soft, low-interest loans to the poorer countries.

Even the Communists caught the development mania. By November 1960, the Sino-Soviet bloc had extended $4.6 billion in economic and some military assistance to 21 less-developed nations on four continents, principally to India, Afghanistan, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and Indonesia and recently to Ethiopia, Guinea, and Cuba. Some strategically located countries—principally India and Yugoslavia—take economic aid from both Communist and non-Communist sources.

DOLLAR'S WEAKNESS

At any rate, it is hard to disagree with the Morleys' conclusions that foreign aid has been a chief reason for the weakness of the dollar and our balance-of-payments difficulties and that "the patchwork history of foreign aid is more complicated than inspiring." Certainly uninspiring has been successive crises in such U.S.-aided countries as China, South Korea, Laos, Iran, Bolivia, Cuba, and the Congo. Certainly questionable is the theory that development can be spurred by aid to governments engaged in state planning or outright socialism.

Even President Kennedy is dissatisfied. In his message to Congress on foreign aid,

he criticized the "multiplicity of programs," all of them "bureaucratically fragmented, awkward, and slow," their administration "diffused over a haphazard and irrational structure," with many of their purposes "obsolete, inconsistent, and unduly rigid." In fact, the defects of the whole program "have begun to undermine confidence."

Does this mean the President wishes to cut back? Quite the opposite. The administration is pushing an omnibus aid bill calling for a record $4.8 billion in this fiscal year and a backdoor spending 5-year outlay of $8.8 billion out of a total of $26 billion, coupled with President Kennedy's admonition to Congress that the bill is "probably the most vital piece of legislation in the national interest that may be before the Congress this year."

All this is a far cry from Washington's farewell admonition to Congress that we should have "as little political connection as possible" with foreign nations. It is also quite removed from what a young Congressman told a meeting of Harvard students and professors on November 10, 1950—namely, that sooner or later we would "have to get all these foreigners off our backs." The Congressman's name: John F. Kennedy.

WILLIAM H. PETERSON.

IF THE PEOPLE COULD SPEAK

Perhaps the most amazing contribution to the Kennedy campaign to stampede Congress into a vastly expensive foreign-aid giveaway, now to be placed on an open-end basis of long-term assurances to the recipients, should be chalked up to Secretary of State Rusk.

"If a plebiscite was held on this program," he said, "the instincts of the American people would carry it through."

If one thing is certain, it is that the people have never been given an opportunity to express themselves on this subject, and it may be said with entire confidence that the politicians will see that it stays that way.

In fact, Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, contradicted Secretary Rusk by grumbling in a memorandum that if a national referendum were held on foreign aid, handouts would lose. FULBRIGHT blamed this on "rightwing radicalism," which he fancies pervades the outlook of the military leadership. He said it hindered "public acceptance of the President's program and leadership."

If these handouts worked, some of them might be justified, but the plain record is that they do not work. Even Chester Bowles, the Under Secretary of State, who yields to no one in the world-saving department, was constrained to admit the other day that it was not self-interest which prompted foreign aid but a mere vague humanitarian impulse. People, said he, "don't stay bought."

With so much of the world either neutralist or hostile, that is axiomatic, for most of these nations have their hands into the American Treasury up to their wrists.

If there was the slightest showing that handouts by the American Government to other governments produced solid economic results and discouraged communism, something might be said of the merits of the scheme. But the other day some of the people destined to be on the receiving end said that aid of this kind was a mirage.

Latin America is a special object of Mr. Kennedy's solicitude, but Latin American delegates to the Inter-American Industries Conference at McCormick Place said that development and growth could not be had through handouts by the American Government, but only through capital investment by American business.

The cochairman of the Venezuelan delegation termed aid, "a stopgap." He added, "You can't build an economy on aid."

No more enthusiastic is the response in El Salvador to Kennedy's proposals that Latin America may expect a nice slice of aid in return for instituting social, economic, and fiscal reforms. The newspaper Tribuna Libre remarks that the President is embarked upon an experiment such as biologists practice on guinea pigs, to be applied to other countries if the remedies succeed, but to be discarded in the event the subject "does not resist them and dies."

We should judge that the people whom Washington would benefit have a clearer view of the workings of foreign aid than does Washington itself. If Mr. Rusk should ever hold his plebiscite, we have no doubt that he would discover a similar illumination among American taxpayers.

VFW's Views on Service-Connected Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, last June 5 the House passed unanimously the bill, H.R. 879, which provided a cost-of-living increase for our service-connected disabled and a slightly higher rate for the more seriously disabled veterans. The Senate, I regret to say, has passed this measure with encumbering amendments, particularly the so-called Long amendment providing for reopening of the national service life insurance program for able-bodied veterans of World War II and Korea, but denying any protection for the service-connected veterans of World War II. I agree with the position of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In this regard, I, under unanimous consent, include in my remarks a copy of a letter sent to all Members of the House from the legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Francis W. Stover, which expresses his viewpoint on this subject:

Hon. ————,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ————: This is to advise you of the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to H.R. 879 which has been passed by the House, amended by the Senate, and is now lying on the Speaker's table.

The VFW supported H.R. 879 as approved by the House which provided:

1. Increases in the rates of service-connected disability compensation to reflect the rise in the cost of living since the last increase in 1957.

2. Increased rates to more adequately compensate the severely disabled.

3. Liberalized the presumption for service-connected purposes for the insidious disease of multiple sclerosis.

It was a pure compensation bill.

The Senate Finance Committee in its wisdom has amended H.R. 879 as follows:

1. The multiple sclerosis presumption has been deleted.

2. The cost-of-living increases for veterans in the 10-, 20-, and 30-percent groups have been cut.

3. An amendment has been added to reopen the national service life insurance program.

The bill was passed on a voice vote and returned to the House. The bill now contains two unrelated proposals—life insurance and disability compensation.

The VFW is grievously disappointed concerning the Senate action with respect to this bill. The service-disabled includes veterans who served overseas and in combat against the enemy and who deserve the highest consideration. It is most unfortunate that an unrelated proposal in holding up a compensation increase for the 2 million service disabled.

The VFW supports the reopening of the national service life insurance program. It does not advocate tacking such a proposal on to a compensation bill. It is the firm conviction of the VFW that the controversial insurance proposal should be considered on its own individual merits.

The VFW has been advised there are no plans to further consider H.R. 879 at this time. It would be deeply appreciated, therefore, for any efforts on your part to separate the controversial reopening of the national service life insurance program and the compensation increase bill, so that the service disabled will receive the much needed compensation increase you have approved.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The Paper Maginot Line—Is It the Best We Can Provide?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I must admit my own confusion a few weeks ago when the President of the United States was making a forthright and needed statement of U.S. principles and purposes to read in the next day's papers of a completely opposite course announced by our greatest ally, and copartner in world affairs, Great Britain.

However, according to the following editorial out of Canada, August 3, 1961, I was not the only person confused.

I sincerely believe that the American people can take a straight dose of bitter medicine, but do become a little punchy when the doctors cannot agree on the prescription.

It might be good for all of us to read the following editorial and then relax and enjoy it:

ATTACHMENT "A"

THE PAPER MAGINOT LINE; IS IT THE BEST WE CAN PROVIDE?

On one day last week the British Chancellor of the Exchequer stunned his countrymen with new taxes, soaring costs of goods and groceries, ascending expense for all borrowers. He alarmed his country's friends and allies; he told them Britain was trimming its military establishment and reducing its foreign aid. All this in the cause of "saving the pound" and Britain's fiscal honor.

Upon the evening of the same day the voice of the President of the United States of

America was heard around the world, declaring for peace but never surrender, announcing large additions to military expenditures, enunciating policies that must mean bigger American budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits. All this in the cause of saving the West from Communist machinations.

Note, please, that the two key currencies of the Western defense are involved: the U.S. dollar and the pound sterling. These are used as vehicles for commerce and finance by virtually all other nations and as a supplement for gold in the international monetary mechanism that makes possible trade, commerce, communication, and a mutuality of defense throughout the West. A heavy responsibility rests upon these two currencies. It is vital that their strength and integrity be unquestionable. This is of extra weight now, when there is a shortage of gold for monetary purposes—only 25 percent of the new supplies last year could be bought by governments—and when there are various proposals afoot that existing paper currencies should be made into a sort of superpaper to substitute for gold now growingly scarce because official prices cannot meet the competition of private demand.

If the Western stand against communism is to be based upon a wall of paper then the peoples of our lands have a right to wonder, and be distrustful of this modern maginot line. It is they who will be doing the paying and the dying.

If in the one day they are treated to the double spectacle of weakness and crisis on the British money side, and on the American money side the threat of further deterioration and erosion, the Western public could be pardoned for asking of its leaders: Is this the best you can do? Are you not failing us?

A.T. & T.: All This and Heaven Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post on Sunday, August 6, 1961, entitled "Who Owns the Heavens?" Again I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to my measure—House Concurrent Resolution 360—which would provide for Government ownership and control for at least two years of the proposed communications satellite system, while the far-reaching implications of ultimate ownership are explored:

[From the New York Post, Sunday, Aug. 6, 1961]

WHO OWNS THE HEAVENS?

When the outgoing Eisenhower administration revealed last January that it had approved plans to let private enterprise own and operate the communications satellites the Government was rocketing into outer space, our reaction was to dismiss the story as a farewell Republican gesture. It seemed an empty promise of a go-away giveaway that could never come true. The idea of turning over the new frontiers of the universe to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. seemed too fantastic to be taken seriously. We confidently assumed that the incoming Kennedy administration would keep the heavens in the public domain.

Our optimism has been rudely shaken. Influential elements in the Kennedy administration, as Post correspondent Milton Viorst reported from Washington Friday, seem to be eagerly following through on the Eisenhower promise. A.T. & T., together with RCA, Western Union, and several other private industrial giants, is dangerously close to concluding an arrangement with the Government that will make previous giveaways look like small handouts of the country's natural assets.

The President himself has apparently been swayed by the political pressures. Although his July policy statement on the planned satellite communications system laid down broad conditions intended to guarantee its operation in the public interest, he declared that the spacial network, halted in the same statement as a great step toward "world peace and closer brotherhood among people," should be privately owned. The major issue now under heated debate among Administration and industry spokesmen is concerned primarily with methods to reconcile the profit motives of the proposed consortium (which would produce the satellites and pay for boosting them into space) with the far broader responsibilities of Government.

Little opposition is evident either in Congress or in the Administration to the basically unsound decision to entrust so momentous an enterprise to private hands. Only a few lonely voices, notably that of Lee Loevinger, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, are heard protesting that the billions of dollars the American people have invested in space research will, in effect, pay off to a few operators dominated by the A.T. & T. monopoly.

We submit that neither the antitrust laws nor FCC regulations, however, strictly applied or carefully rewritten, can conceivably make this multi-billion-dollar giveaway less scandalous. No pattern of Government supervision will eliminate the hazards it creates for both the national interest and international relations. It is hard to believe that the planning in Washington has proceeded to its present stage without arousing loud protest either from the people or from any meaningful number of the lawmakers they sent to Congress.

On days such as this it is hard to believe Mr. Eisenhower is no longer President.

America Doesn't Dare Fumble on This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, this country is now in the midst of a most momentous and important meeting with the Soviet Union. At stake are the restrictions to be placed on Pan American World Airways by the Russians for that airline's operations into Moscow, and the reciprocal restrictions we will place on Aeroflot, the socialized Russian carrier.

Better than anything I can offer on the subject, Mr. Speaker, is an excellent article written for the Cincinnati Enquirer by its distinguished foreign news analyst, Mr. William H. Hessler.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include Mr. Hessler's searching analysis in the RECORD:

AMERICA DOESN'T DARE FUMBLE ON THIS—UNITED STATES-SOVIET AIR TRANSPORT NEGOTIATIONS MUSTN'T HANDICAP NATION'S AIRLINES

(By William H. Hessler, Enquirer foreign news analyst)

Next Tuesday morning, several American Government officials will sit down across the conference table from a Soviet delegation to negotiate an air transport agreement, if possible, and lay down the ground rules for direct commercial air service between New York and Moscow. If agreement is reached, the routes will be flown by Pan American, and by Aeroflot, the Soviet "commercial" airline.

For good or bad, this negotiation could be crucial in the cold war. It is really the first confrontation of U.S. free enterprise and Soviet socialist enterprise in direct competition. From the U.S. standpoint, the stakes are high. This is one encounter with the Russians in which we simply do not dare fumble.

These facts must be borne in mind.

The terms on which international air transport is carried on are made by governments, not airlines. Our State Department and Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) share the responsibility for making these bilateral pacts. The President has final authority to approve or not.

Pan American is a business corporation owned by 40,000 stockholders and employing around 23,000 workers. It has to make money to stay in business, as do other U.S.-flag airlines. Aeroflot is part of the Red airforce. It does not have to make money.

Pan Am pays up to $30,000 a year for pilots on oversea jet routes, while top rates for Aeroflot pilots are around $8,400. Salaries in other brackets are in like ratio—three to one.

If we ignore travel to intermediate points, traffic on the New York-Moscow route will be very one-sided. The year I flew to Russia, about 10,000 U.S. citizens also went, mostly by air. I asked in Moscow how many Russians (not officials) went to America that year as tourists. I was told less than a dozen.

The U.S. Government (incorrectly as I believe) requires U.S. oversea airlines (unsubsidized) to compete with each other and also with heavily subsidized, official foreign-flag airlines. Pan Am, TWA, Northwest, the main U.S.-flag oversea lines, have to live by the rules of free enterprise and sink or swim as private concerns. Yet they have to compete against national airlines which are really government agencies, not run in most cases for profit. Aeroflot is the extreme case, for it is part of the Soviet air force and its foreign routes are set up for geopolitical, not commercial, objectives.

These facts suggest how tough the problems are. We want to establish these routes. But we don't dare give Aeroflot such advantages that it can compete unfairly with a company we require to go into the open market for working capital and which has to pay two to three times the wage scales of foreign competitors.

Yet the record shows that the U.S. Government has given such advantages to foreign airlines many times. Neither the State Department nor the CAB ever has worked out a satisfactory philosophy of international air transport. Nor has the President. Nor Congress. Virtually every foreign government has just one oversea airline. It is an instrument of national policy. It is subsidized to insure its success. Usually the government bargains hard to get advantageous routes for it.

By contrast, the United States has rejected the single oversea airline concept. It insists on U.S.-type competition in a field dominated by national monopolies. Yet it requires U.S. airlines to fly some unprofitable "national interest" routes.

More serious, the State Department has used these bilaterals as bargaining points. It gave Lufthansa, when it started up, very generous privileges in many U.S. gateway ports, far out of proportion to the privileges granted to U.S. lines in Germany. It gave Air France first crack at the direct New York-Mexico City route, a rich prize.

In theory, an international airline is only supposed to be allowed flights sufficient to handle primary traffic between the two countries involved. But State has been indulgent, for diplomatic reasons. For example, KLM, by the international rules of the game, is entitled to perhaps three flights a week between Europe and New York. That is all its fair share of United States-Netherlands traffic warrants.

But in fact it has been making about 18 jet flights to the United States, 13½ of them to New York. This summer KLM will have 37 flights a week. This is made possible only because it fills its planes with third-country traffic—supposedly reserved for Air France, BOAC, Swissair, SAS, and others, plus Pan Am and TWA.

In other words, the State Department has winked at the rules, allowing KLM and several other foreign-flag lines to get far larger traffic volumes than are allowable—at the expense of U.S.-flag lines. As a result, the share of transatlantic traffic carried by U.S.-flag lines has been dropping, year by year, and is far below what it should be in view of the numbers of Americans traveling overseas by air.

If this continues, we are going to see our U.S.-flag airlines squeezed out by lower-cost, subsidized foreign-flag lines, just as our merchant marine was driven to the wall. And we shall lose an extremely valuable national defense asset in the form of fast long-range transport planes, crews, and facilities. We shall also lose (1) a major asset to our oversea commerce, and (2) an important dollar-earner of special value to our international balance of payments.

This problem is 15 years old and more. Now it arises in still more acute form, with the Soviet air treaty negotiations. More than any other foreign commercial airline, Aeroflot is an instrumentality of government. It has very good planes, as I know from flying in them, and good pilots—and personable stewardnesses, it last concession to bourgeois standards in modernization.

Aeroflot could compete on commercial terms. But it doesn't have to. It can pay whatever the cost of the planes may be without having to show a profit on the investment. It can carry passengers and freight at a loss, if for military or prestige reasons it wants to build up traffic to certain points overseas.

Moscow doesn't keep Aeroflot out of the negotiating process, as the United States does with Pan American, or TWA, or Northwest. It sends the head of Aeroflot as chief negotiator, for he is a government official, and an Air Force general. He speaks at once for the Russian Government, the Red Air Force, and Aeroflot. And Aeroflot is a bigger airline already than all U.S.-flag airlines combined.

The basic question, therefore, is just what State and CAB mean to do. On what terms are they going to put Pan American with its need for profitable operations up against Aeroflot, which can be subsidized without limit for reasons of prestige or strategy? Is it going to agree to terms that will let Aeroflot take 90 percent of the primary United States-Russian traffic, as KLM was allowed to do with United States-Netherlands primary traffic?

This is not only important for the future of our international air transport industry. It's also vital because we are setting the pattern, in this negotiation, for future United States-Soviet agreements defining the terms of "commercial" competition between free-enterprise operations and State-owned, State-subsidized operations in many other fields.

Despite their higher wage levels and other handicaps, U.S. airlines can stand up to subsidized foreign competition on world routes—if the ground rules are enforced. They can make up by efficiency, know-how, and incentive for those disadvantages. But they can't prosper, they can't even survive, if they are too greatly disadvantaged by the U.S. Government in the making and enforcement of bilaterals.

The U.S. Government has handicapped our oversea airlines seriously, in a misguided effort to be helpful to various friendly countries overseas. It must not augment that handicap now, by placating an unfriendly country. The projected Pan American-Aeroflot services are desirable. But they ought to be sanctioned only on terms that are truly equitable.

Text of Telegram Sent by the Assembly of Captive European Nations to President John F. Kennedy on July 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the telegram sent to the distinguished President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, by the Assembly of Captive European Nations urging that the United States not forget its responsibility to the people of Eastern Europe enslaved under Communist imperialism:

TEXT OF TELEGRAM SENT BY THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ON JULY 26, 1961

One hundred million freedom-seeking people in Eastern Europe who, through no fault of their own, were overrun at the end of World War II by Soviet troops and absorbed into slave empire, will be shocked, Mr. President, by one statement in your important address last night. They will note with profound misgivings that no word was uttered to affirm their right to self-determination which is as indisputable as is that of peoples in other parts of the world and pour cause, that of the German people. Instead they were told that the Soviet Union, the most rapacious imperialist power of our times, is entitled to security in Central and Eastern Europe. The revival of the war time myth that Soviet Russia was entitled to special rights at the expense of other nations to safeguard her security because she had been repeatedly invaded, is all the more regrettable as it is at complete variance with historical truth. Both czarist Russia and Soviet Russia have an unmatched three-century long record of aggression against and conquest of their smaller neighbors. Some of the countries represented by our assembly have been 10 times the victims of such Russian or Soviet invasions. This being the truth, to place security considerations of the Soviet Union before the right of self-determination of its victims is tantamount to recognizing rights of imperial conquest to big nations at the expense of smaller nations. It is tantamount to protecting the wolf against the lamb. Against such concept we must voice before the conscience of the world the protest of the enslaved nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It is up to the Western Powers to honor or forget their obligations under the wartime and postwar agreements pledging them to help our nations in the recovery of their independence and in the establishment of freely elected governments. But, we respectfully submit, there can be no doubt that neither the United States nor any other nation has the right to bargain away the inalienable rights of our nations in return for gains, real or illusory, in Berlin or elsewhere. We are sure that the people of our homelands would appreciate assurances to the effect that their rights are not negotiable.

Assembly of Captive European Nations: Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Lithuania, Chairman; Stefan Korbonski, Poland, Vice Chairman; Vasil Germenji, Albania; Dimitar K. Petkoff, Bulgaria; Petr Zenkl, Czechoslovakia; Ilmar Raamot, Estonia; Ferenc Nagy, Hungary; Vilis Masens, Latvia; Constantin Visoianu, Rumania; Brutus Coste, Secretary General.

Now Is a Wonderful Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most refreshing and stimulating commencement addresses I have ever read was delivered on June 11, 1961, to the graduating class of Smith College by Mr. James B. Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times.

Mr. Reston's address was published in the summer issue of the Smith Alumnae Quarterly and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a special pleasure to include it and to recommend it to our colleagues.

For those of us who have heretofore been preoccupied with the substance of Mr. Reston's incisive and informed comment on world and national affairs, I expect his address will also come as a happy revelation of his unusual talents as a literary stylist.

From whatever perspective we read it, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that our colleagues, Members of Congress, will find that Mr. Reston's commencement address is as relevant for us as it was for the seniors of Smith.

The address follows:

NOW IS A WONDERFUL TIME

(By James B. Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times)

This college was founded during the Reconstruction period after the Civil War. President Eliot of Harvard made the first commencement address in 1879, and when I see what kind of commencement speaker you have been reduced to today, I have to wonder whether you are headed in the right direction.

There must be some mistake. Nobody in these 82 years ever had less claim to address you than I. I know nothing about women's colleges. I am against all forms of segrega-

tion, including female segregated education. I have three sons and no daughters. Even my wife had no sisters, only three brothers, and when the last of our sons leaves home she maintains that she is going to write a book entitled "Life in a Men's Locker Room."

Nevertheless, here I am, and if you don't mind, I will not follow the usual commencement practice of telling you that the world's in a terrible mess and it's all yours.

In the first place, it's not all yours. We intend to hang around for quite awhile muddling along and standing in your way. And, second, I happen to believe that this is a pretty wonderful period and that you are lucky to be sprung at this particular moment.

After all, you might have got out back there with that first class when the carpetbaggers instead of the freedom riders were invading the South, when Miss Smith had complained that women were denied "the means of happiness, usefulness, and honor," and when men came home at night spouting to their wives about the glories of the tariff. Now we have Jackie to talk about—it's a big difference.

At no time in American history has this country been engaged in larger or nobler causes, and at no time has there been greater "scope for excellence," for women as well as men, than there is today. The whole world is in motion. Since the war one-half the people on the globe have changed their form of government, 800 million of them achieving independence for the first time. The old empires are finished. The domination of one people by another is all but over in the West.

As usual, a new tyranny is rising in the East, devising new sorceries for the domination of man, exercising new and terrible forms of power. I will spare you the usual jargon about atheistic communism; I'm sure you have heard it mentioned before. But liberty is at stake once more. It is at stake in the midst of a social, scientific, and military revolution unmatched in the history of the world, and personally I think this is a pretty good row to get engaged in.

This, I take it, is what Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson were talking about when they spoke of liberty as being America's business. Other classes that got out of Smith had to be satisfied with puny little battles with the Spaniards, or the British, or the railroads, but history has handed you a battle for the world, full of philosophy. And not only the world, either. In the 15th century, a gal had nothing to dream about except the continents and the oceans and Christopher Columbus (who really was a dull man and always away from home), but you have the universe, the moon, and the stars to dream about—all this and Comdr. Al Shepard, too. And there, girls, if it hasn't occurred to you, is a man.

I am told you are a skeptical breed, up here in Northampton, and I suppose some of you want to know whether there is any chance of holding the universe together so that you can dream about it. I believe there is a very good chance indeed, and this conviction is based on something more than faith and hope.

A BALANCE OF POWER

At no period of history have enemies faced each other for so long over so vast an area and yet shown more restraint than the Western Powers and the Communists. There have been many incidents and provocations, and a few proxy wars—and there will be many more—but in this generation of cold war there has been no direct test of arms between the major competitors. Whenever one of the great powers was so committed that the intervention of the second would have produced a world war, the second power abstained.

We were committed in Greece and Turkey in 1946–47, and the Berlin airlift of 1948–49, and in the Lebanon-Middle East crisis of 1958—and Russia abstained all three times. They were committed in Hungary, and the Chinese to a limited extent in Korea—and in both cases we either held back or limited our advance.

On our own side, no military man may fire a nuclear weapon, even if attacked, without the specific authorization of the President of the United States. It is also reassuring that even when the Russians first observed the American U–2 spy plane deep inside Soviet territory they did not shoot at it until they first reported back to Khrushchev and received his personal instructions to do so.

This is not the kind of thing that fills a girl with blissful serenity at night, yet there is a balance of power in the world today, and we have not been quite fair to the balance of power in this country. It is admittedly not our ideal, but war tends to break out not when there is a balance of power, much as we are inclined to think so, but when there is an imbalance, when one side gets a preponderance of power over the other.

Every Smith graduate, I feel sure, has memorized every detail of the history of Egypt and Babylonia, Persia and Greece, Greece and Rome, Spain and England, England and Napoleon—all testifying to the proposition that wars tend to break out when the balance of power is upset. I do not know how it is that the balance of power got such a bad name in this country, for our Constitution is based on it: this is what the separation of powers is; this is what labor-management relations are made of. And the most important single fact of the postwar world is that when the power of Britain and France, Germany and Japan collapsed, the United States moved in to establish a new balance.

"Have the elder races halted?" Walt Whitman asked.

> "Do they droop and end their lesson,
> Wearied over there beyond the seas?
> We take up the task eternal.
> And the burden and the lesson.
> Pioneers, O pioneers."

It is true that we are going to have great troubles in your generation. We cannot make our will or our power prevail everywhere. The balance is against us in places like Laos, right up against the Chinese border, just as the balance is against the Communists in Cuba. No doubt we shall lose many of these areas close to the Communist empire before your daughters sit where you are today. We cannot do everything. We are not omnipotent. The trouble with foreign affairs is that they are foreign; that is to say, they are beyond the reach of our will in many areas. But because we cannot do everything is no cause for despair.

We have already done a great deal. Surely there is no doubt that the Communists would stand today at the Pyrenees and the North Sea and on the Persian Gulf if the United States had not established a new balance when the elder races faltered. We have diverted the war from the field of open battle to the field of political and economic and ideological warfare, and it is here that the struggle will be waged in your time.

The problem now is to unify the Nation and coordinate its policies with the rest of the hemisphere and the Atlantic. The Communists are consolidating their empire by force; we have the much harder job of unifying the West by voluntary action. It is not only States rights that are increasingly outmoded but national rights, and we shall succeed in the defense of our society, I believe, in direct proportion to our success in unifying the free nations.

It all depends, of course, on how you look at all this. You can concentrate on Laos and conclude that we are being nibbled to death, or fix your mind on these hydrogen-tipped missiles zigzagging under the seas or roving on flatcars from one place to another until the day when you can easily imagine the whole place being blown up by accident.

There is, however, a moral obligation to be intelligent, especially, I suppose, if you went to Smith. Most people prefer life to death, even the Russians. Like ourselves, they are now a wealthy and powerful nation with much to lose by war, so why concentrate on the gloomy apocalyptic view of the world?

ATTITUDES MAKE THE CLIMATE

This, it seems to me, is one of the first free choices an intelligent person can make. There are few times in life when men and women have a wide range of free choices. When we are very young, we are directed by our parents. When we are well established, we are limited by the obligations of work and family. When we are old, we are bound by the frailties of life.

But there is a period, around college commencement time, when we are comparatively free to choose an outlook on life and what to do with our lives. The silliest thing to do is to condemn our own time, first, because we cannot choose another time, and second, because, at least to my way of thinking, it is a glorious time.

James Joll and Caryl Haskins, the president of Carnegie Institution of Washington, have recently been studying the so-called golden ages of history, fifth-century Athens, Renaissance Italy, and Elizabethan England, and have been meditating on the happy thought that we ourselves may be living in what future historians may well regard as a golden age.

Mr. Joll observes that the first thing that strikes one about these golden periods of Athens, Italy, and England is that they were not characterized by the successful solution of political problems. These were times of great change, of intellectual excitement, when new creations and new experiences and viewpoints were coming into wide notice. All of them, Haskins notes, were eras of some physical security, but in all of them stability and security were far from complete, and there was a kind of partnership of disorder and hazard with vitality and creativeness.

"Our time," he concludes, "is marked by the same sense of physical frontiers close at hand, the same ferment of new ideas, the same vast and rending shifts in the individual's notion of the universe and his place in it; and most poignantly, of his very nature."

Where our time fails, I think, to match the qualities of the great epochs of the past is that it lacks their enormous self-confidence. Nothing holds us back so much today as our own self-doubt, and nothing, ironically, is more alien to the traditional American spirit of confident optimism. This national crying in our beer is what poisons the atmosphere of the time, and it is serious because, as Joll observes, it is the atmosphere, the climate of a time, that determines its place in history.

Therefore there is something to say, both in terms of personal and national well-being, for turning a cheerful face to the world. Good things sometimes come out of bad times. After all, this place was started during the administration of General Grant. The approach to life is half the battle. As G. K. Chesterton said, you can either take everything for granted or take it with gratitude. The difference between the two is the difference between the lightning and lightning-bug.

The approach is more important than the plan. You can't plan everything. This is what Hitler did. He gambled everything on

a colossal plan which, if all had worked out exactly as imagined, would have transformed the world, but he didn't calculate all possible contingencies and ended up on the scrap heap of history.

SOME CLUES FOR AN ATTITUDE

Surely you have observed in your studies that most great men were able to believe in things beyond their vision. Not expecting everything, yet they managed to have a certain faith. Judge Holmes said it all in a prophetic passage away back in 1913.

"If I am right," he said, "it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views * * * but as I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than workingmen's disputes * * * I do not lose my hopes. * * * I think it probable that civilization will somehow last as long as I care to look ahead. * * * I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be, that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."

If we take these wider views of where we are, it is I think possible to get some clues about how to proceed, or at least what to avoid. We know, for example, that the coming 20 years will be an era of vast change; therefore we must nourish a flexible open mind and an adaptable spirit. We know that it is bound to be a period of extremely high taxation; therefore the acquisition of material things is likely to make even less sense than in generations past.

We know it will be a period of great mobility and of clashing national interests; therefore we must know more about the other cultures of the world. We know that medical science will expand our lives and that the new industrial revolution will increase our leisure; therefore it is all the more important to think of the whole span of life and give more weight to the enduring things of the mind and spirit.

Here we may reflect for a moment on the special place of women in such a world, for in the last analysis it is you who are going to have to civilize your men, if the thing is to be done, and who will probably have to struggle to create the moral atmosphere for a useful and growing life. This is especially true now, for in a time of turmoil the family is almost the only unit of society that makes much sense.

If you ask me how you are going to tame a man, and have five rebellious children, and remain beautiful, serene, and intellectual while keeping up with the cold war and running the League of Women Voters, I'll have to ask you to see my wife. But I do know that unless you try hard, it won't be done, and after all, life is a long process in which we all have to develop the courage to fail.

There is no easy answer to these complex problems, but my feeling about them was defined by Albert Camus just before he died.

"One may long," he said "as I do, for a gentler flame, a respite, a pause for musing. But perhaps there is no other peace * * * than in the heat of combat. * * * 'Every wall is a door,' Emerson correctly said. Let us not look for the door, and the way out anywhere but in the wall against which we are living. Instead, let us seek the respite where it is—in the very thick of the battle."

One final point. I congratulate the class of 1961, but in doing so a word about your parents. I am thinking of those anxious days at the start of the last World War when most of today's graduates were born. I am thinking of all that homework you helped them do in the early years and all that homework you couldn't help them do in the later years.

I am thinking about all those love affairs, real and fanciced, you had to endure, and of all the trouble you had getting them into Smith, and all the trouble getting them out. But you've done it now, and I congratulate you. But don't think it's all over yet.

U.S. Army Heraldry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by a friend of mine, Col. Ralph R. Burr which appeared in the August 1961 issue of the Army Information Digest.

Colonel Burr is commanding officer of the Quartermaster activities at Cameron Station in Alexandria, Va. The Army's heraldry section comes under Colonel Burr's command and the following article was written after several months of research on the part of Colonel Burr. It is interesting to me to learn from Colonel Burr that the Department of Army has what is probably the finest collection of books on heraldry assembled in a library at Cameron Station, and while this particular unit is a small one, I think that many Members of this body would find it very interesting to see this unit at work:

THE BEGINNINGS OF HERALDRY IN THE CIVIL WAR—SYMBOLS RALLY THE SPIRIT

A mistake in identification by a general early in the Civil War started the system of shoulder patches that now is common in the U.S. Army. The use of these distinctive unit emblems to identify soldiers as members of organizations with proud traditions all started when Gen. Philip Kearny, in the summer of 1862,, mistook some officers for stragglers from his own command. As described by Gen. E. D. Townsend, adjutant-general of the U.S. Army in his "Anecdotes of the Civil War," the resulting explosion was "emphasized by a few expletives."

"The officers listened in silence," recounts General Townsend, "respectfully standing in the 'position of a soldier' until he had finished, when one of them, raising his hand to his cap, quietly suggested that the general had possibly made a mistake, as they—none of them—belonged to his command. With his usual courtesy, Kearny exclaimed 'Pardon me; I will take steps to know how to recognize my own men hereafter.' "

The result was an order that officers of his command should thereafter wear "on the front of their caps a round piece of red cloth to designate them." Thus was born the famed "Kearny Patch." There is some evidence that General Kearny did not actually designate the shape of the patch, for at first almost any piece of red cloth was acceptable. General Kearny even donated his own red blanket to be cut up by his officers. Some covered their entire caps with red cloth.

Although Kearny had designated the patch to distinguish his officers, enlisted men of his command very soon adopted the red patch, often cutting up their overcoat red lining to make them. The men idolized Kearny and were anxious to identify themselves as members of his command. The practice is said to have reduced straggling—and even the Confederates are reputed to have given special attention to wounded and dead wearing the patch because they recognized the valor of Kearny's troops.

From that beginning, the idea spread to other divisions and corps. By March 1863, Maj. Gen. Joseph Hooker had provided the first systematic plan for the entire Army of the Potomac. It is said that Gen. Daniel Butterfield, Hooker's chief of staff, had much to do with designing the patches. At any rate, General Hooker ordered that the I Corps should wear a sphere, the II Corps a trefoil, III Corps a crescent, and XII Corps a star.

By the time the war ended almost all of the corps wore some sort of identifying mark. Usually they were, as with Hooker's first order, quite simple. The XV Corps, however, wore a patch that told something of a story—which is what heraldic symbols and insignia have done since the early Middle Ages.

The story goes that in the fall of 1863 the XI and XII Corps under General Hooker were sent to aid in the relief of Chattanooga. It became apparent that the eastern soldiers were better dressed. Corps badges were a novelty in the western units. This caused some sharp words between the men.

One day an enlisted man in the corps of Maj. Gen. John A. Logan was asked where his corps patch was. Clapping his hand on his cartridge box, he said "Forty rounds. Can you show me a better one?" Shortly thereafter General Logan issued General Order No. 10 prescribing that the badge for the XV Corps should be "a miniature cartridge box and above the box will be inscribed the words 'Forty Rounds'."

The badge of the 14th Army Corps also told a story. Members had often referred to themselves as "acorn boys" because at one time when rations were scanty, the men roasted and ate acorns. In 1864 their badge was designed in the form of an acorn.

Other deviations from simple designs included the IX Corps whose men wore "a shield with the figure 9 in the center crossed with a foul anchor and cannon"; The XVII Corps, an arrow; the XVI Corps four minié balls with the points toward the center.

Not to be outdone, the Engineer and Pontonier Corps adopted a badge of "two oars crossed over an anchor, the top of which is encircled by a scroll surmounted by a castle; the castle being the badge of the U.S. Corps of Engineers." The Signal Corps was two flags crossed on the staff of a flaming torch. The Department of West Virginia adopted a spreadeagle. The Pioneers wore a pair of crossed hatchets. Both General Sheridan's Cavalry Corps and Wilson's Cavalry wore distinctive badges featuring the crossed sabers.

In most instances the badges were adopted by a general order, often after competition for designs. However, several corps adopted badges without any order at all—they apparently just grew out of popular demand. One or two, on the other hand, never adopted any sort of insignia.

To a considerable extent the adoption of these corps badges was a morale building factor, and often the enlisted ranks contributed materially to design. From a humble beginning the wearing of the patch spread. The drives for unit identification, espirit de corps and pride in organization—factors in leadership, in discipline, in battle efficiency—made themselves felt.

A general rule was that within each corps the first division patch would be red, the second white, the third blue. When a corps had a fourth division, as was sometimes the case, another color would be designated. In the IX Corps it was green; in the XV, yellow.

It is obvious that the colors of the National Ensign influenced this choice of colors for the divisions. As a matter of fact, even before the first glimmerings of the patch in-

signia idea had manifested themselves, Gen. George B. McClellan, as early as March 1862, had issued orders directing that various kinds of flags should designate corps, divisions and brigade headquarters.

The 1st Division flag was to be red, 6 feet by 5, the 2d Division blue, the 3d red and blue. Army regulations already had prescribed colors of artillery regiments, infantry regiments, camp colors, standards and guidons of mounted regiments.

Not long after, the men themselves sought to have on their flags the names of the battles in which they participated. Authority for recognition of battle on the regimental flag came as a result of a joint resolution of Congress on December 24, 1861. By February 1862, such a high regard was placed on colors for regiments and batteries that General McClellan ordered that names of the battles in which units bore a meritorious part would be inscribed on the colors of guidons of all regiments or batteries thus engaged.

It must be remembered that in the type of fighting of the time, when men were usually massed in line, the sight of the flag, whether National Ensign or regimental standard, was a positive factor in leadership. The ranks could follow the flag. As long as it floated above the battleline it was a factor in advance—as well as a rallying point in a retreat. Great store was set on keeping the flag from even touching the ground. Conversely, to capture an enemy flag was highly regarded.

Units that were not yet entitled to battle honors were not to rest satisfied until they had won them by their discipline and courage. Here again is another example of proper motivation for further exemplary achievements by units. An example of the symbolism of the flag and its role in inspiring achievement was the action taken by the chief signal officer in 1862 when he issued the order—

"Any officer who distinguishes himself in battle and skillfully uses his flag (that is, the signaling flag) shall hereafter while serving as a signal officer bear upon his service flags a star and the name of the action in which the star was won, and upon completion of his service the flag will stay in his possession."

Thus the flag was used in prompt recognition of meritorious service—in effect, the same as presenting a medal—in an invaluable expression of leadership technique.

Still another incentive for superior performance was evolved by Gen. J. C. Douglas, commanding general of the 3d Division, XVII Corps. He awarded a flag to the units judged best in battalion drill, soldierly appearance, camp condition, discipline. The unit could keep the flag only by continuous winning of it; it was to be carried on parades and on the battlefield—and on the battlefield the commander could withdraw it from a unit that failed to demonstrate its right to retain it.

While heraldry in the modern Army embraces medals, in the Civil War period the various medals extant today had not been adopted. Congress, it is true, had issued several for various special reasons and many of the States issued medals as well. But it was during this conflict that the highest award that can be given an individual for heroism beyond the call of duty came into being. This was the Medal of Honor.

At first it was to be issued only to men in the ranks, but later it was changed to include officers and finally was changed in design. The original medal was designed by Anthony C. Paquet, and was later redesigned by Maj. Gen. George L. Gillespie.

Although not in the same category, the idea of using identification tags was first suggested during the Civil War by one John Kennedy. Not until 44 years later, however, was this idea adopted as an aid in identification and disposal of the dead and wounded.

Even after the war, veterans cherished their badges, and they were frequently seen in parades of the Grand Army of the Republic. Many veterans had models of their badges made in enamel, silver, or gold, and wore them pinned to the breast or suspended from a ribbon around the neck during the parades or at meetings or encampments of the GAR.

As it developed amid the exigencies of Civil War, symbolism took on added significance as a practical tool of leadership. Through the use of badges, flags, and medals, military leaders were able to communicate a pride in organization to their men. The resulting responsiveness manifested itself in heightened esprit de corps which has been time tested to the present day.

The Basic Issue Is Not Berlin, but Communist Plans for World Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while no one depreciates the seriousness of the latest Communist threat to West Berlin, it is important that we do not lose sight of the basic, worldwide struggle in which we are engaged. It is part of the Communist strategy to create situations which will lead the West away from the final Red objective and periodically raising the issue of Berlin not only accomplishes this purpose, but tests the strength and determination of the free world.

In this connection I would like to call your attention to a splendid article by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report.

BERLIN IS NOT THE BASIC ISSUE

(By David Lawrence, by cable from Europe)

The current discussion over the status of the city of Berlin—both its East and West sectors—does not come to grips with the basic issue. It deals with the symptoms, but it is not a realistic diagnosis of the trouble.

For of what avail is it to maintain the present arrangement in West Berlin, or to modify it with some other agreement that pledges access to the city, when the root of the problem—the future of the German nation as a whole—is neglected?

If military pressure is to be applied, and if the West is to prepare itself for a major showdown in its relations with the Soviet Union, would it not appeal more to the public opinion of the world to take our stand on a broad principle that seeks the establishment of a free and unified Germany?

It makes little sense to put off German reunification indefinitely. The German people, who have suffered in two world wars through the madness of their militaristic rulers, should be permitted to enjoy the fruits of a free election and the right to govern themselves.

What better cause to espouse today in this world of ideological conflict than self-determination for all the people of Europe? We seem to accept as the gospel of the hour that Africans should be rid of colonialism, but we ignore the very people who, by reason of their proven fitness for self-government, deserve to be freed from Communist "colonialism."

What an opportunity to raise a cry for freedom also for all those areas of Eastern Europe where Moscow's heavy hand is enslaving nations which were liberated once before.

Why should we sit by and concern ourselves only with keeping one part of Berlin from becoming captive, when it is even more important to emancipate an already captive East Germany?

Are there on our side perhaps those who fear a reunited Germany as a potential foe? Does not Mr. Khrushchev really fear it most? Surely the leaders of the German people in the new Republic, with its free government in Bonn, have by their conduct in the last several years shown that they have learned the lessons of freedom. They will never voluntarily give up their rights. They must not be left isolated and at the mercy of Soviet imperialism.

The German people can be effective partners in the Western alliance, and Nikita Khrushchev knows this. He is anxious to change the status of Berlin because he is afraid that continued control of a large part of the city by the West will perpetuate a "showcase of liberty," as President Kennedy called it in his forceful speech of July 25. As long as this is on exhibition every day to the East Germans, it keeps alive among them hopes for their own eventual rescue by the West.

The Soviet Premier professes to believe in the desirability of the reunification of East and West Germany. But his insistence on signing a separate peace treaty with the East German Government—a puppet in his hands—reveals, in fact, a sinister purpose to keep Germany permanently divided.

East Germany has never been ceded to the Soviet Union, and control of it was in actuality seized by the Communists in violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the agreement signed at the close of the war in Europe.

By what right do the Soviets put pressure on the East German people to prevent their passage into West Germany? Why do the Communists erect barriers and invoke restrictions of various kinds to keep the East German people from visiting their own capital in East Berlin? Surely this is a forerunner of the kind of life the people of East Germany will continue to suffer indefinitely unless the Western World comes to their aid.

The Soviet Union was a partner in the alliance which fought the war, and there is no basis in international law for modifying any agreement arising out of the war itself except by common consent. Certainly there is nothing which justifies the Soviet Union in continuing its control over East Germany. The presence of its troops is not for the purpose of protecting the East Germans but only to prevent them from uniting with their countrymen. The Western Allies long ago relinquished all control over West Germany, and it is incumbent upon the Soviets to do the same in East Germany, or be charged before the world with an occupation that has no legal status.

Britain and France and America must, therefore, face the true issue: Shall the 17 million people of East Germany be lost to democracy and forced into the straitjacket of Communist discipline as new generations arise there that know nothing of individual or national freedom?

We should vigorously champion their cause now, and launch before the court of public opinion throughout the world a massive plea for the restoration of freedom to all Germany.

We can make great progress toward winning the cold war and preventing a hot one, if we keep our eye on the real issue as outlined by David Lawrence. This is absolutely necessary before we commit ourselves to any negotiations over any part of the Berlin situation. Most of it is not negotiable and we cannot afford to go into a meeting with Khrushchev without learning well the lessons of the past. For a study of the lesson to be learned in Berlin, I refer you to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal and a second one from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

A LESSON IN BERLIN

[From the Wall Street Journal]

It's possible to be puzzled by a good many of the things in the administration's handling of the Berlin situation.

One might wonder, for example, why the President had to await a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev to understand what it is like to deal with Russian Communists. And it is quite possible to take issue with some of the specific moves the President has made in reaction to that new-found knowledge; there is a certain frenetic air in the calling up of the Reserves and the burst of arms building to meet what has been, and what will be, a continuing crisis.

Nonetheless there can hardly be any quarrel with the core of President Kennedy's policy towards Berlin. Firmness in the face of Russian threats is at the heart of the matter, and this Mr. Kennedy has demonstrated. Moreover, his moves taken as a whole, however one may judge each one individually, have been well calculated to give that firmness real substance.

Certainly they have given the Kremlin the impression of firmness and have had a noticeable effect on the Russian position. That is both good in itself and is in addition one more reminder that firmness is the best policy in dealing with Soviet Russia.

It would be naive to assume that Mr. Khrushchev's change in tone these past few days means that he has given up the struggle for Berlin, that by waving a few guns about we have given him such a fright that now he is going to be reasonable. On the contrary; the very essence of the Berlin situation is that it is part of a long-range struggle and that when the moment seems propitious Mr. Khrushchev will turn tough again.

But change of tone, there has been. The latest Communist party manifesto is as anti-West and anticapitalist as ever but it shows no enthusiasm for shooting wars. More specifically, for the moment Mr. Khrushchev himself has stopped threatening war over Berlin; he has shifted his propaganda back to "negotiation." And we doubt if he would have made even this tiny, tactical retreat if the United States and its Western allies had shown the slightest signs of weakness.

There is, to be sure, nothing new in this. Time and time again, at Berlin and elsewhere, the Kremlin has shown it will play its own brand of brinkmanship, walking right up to the door of war to probe our resolution, and then backing off whenever they find it firm. This happened when President Truman met them with the Berlin airlift and again in 1958 when President Eisenhower, more quietly but equally convincingly, stood his ground against Mr. Khrushchev's ultimatum.

The important thing is that this time the lesson be learned. Mr. Kennedy's brief dalliance with the idea that he could talk reason to Khrushchev will be a minor matter if he is not tempted by new sweet talk to succumb to it again. The sometime reluctance of our European allies, especially the British, will hardly be fatal if, this time, the experience teaches them the ancient lesson of dealing with bullies.

Learning that lesson is especially important now when the signs are beginning to suggest that there will be some negotiations over Berlin. There may be some arrangements that can be negotiated; at any rate it would be foolish to fail to try. But it would be folly to approach those negotiations from anything other than a position of both struggle and determination.

For the lesson from Berlin, past and present, is that this is the only way to impress the Russians and therefore the only way to make possible any real negotiation.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

AMERICA'S BEST ARGUMENT

Russia's armed strength in the vicinity of Berlin is Russia's best argument, and, indeed, the only argument by which she can hope to have her way in determining Berlin's future.

This was clear before Khrushchev's reply was received. It is clearer than ever now. Khrushchev still is offering nothing which will please the people in East Germany and, of course, nothing to win him friends in West Germany or anywhere else.

To the East Germans he offers a peace treaty that will leave them just where they are now, under Russian control, ruled by a hated native bureaucracy acting in Russia's interest. Every reason the East Germans now have for fleeing to the West will still be operative and the only change to be expected is that they may find it harder to make their way across the border than it now is.

Our best argument that we have no need to oppress the East Germans and no desire or intention to do so. We do not hate them as the Russian Government does; we do not fear them; we are more than willing to see them reunited with their brethren in West Germany; we have no need to rob them; we have no desire to exploit their industrial and agricultural skills as the Russians have done ever since the occupation began.

It is this difference which our diplomacy and our propaganda in the next few weeks must emphasize until everyone, the world around, understands that the Russians are in East Germany as oppressors. They wish to drive us from Berlin because, as long as we are there to protect the West Berliners from Russian tyranny, the hope of freedom will remain alive in all of East Germany and the blessings of freedom, both material and spiritual, will be manifest to anyone who travels from one side of the city to the other.

Our purpose in refusing to abandon Berlin is not to uphold a legalism. We have, to be sure, a valid claim to keep a garrison there, but our purpose is far bigger and more substantial than the mere assertion of a contractual right. We stand for the right of Germans to govern themselves in freedom. We wish to keep alive the hope of freedom in threatened lands and thus prevent any more of communism's easy conquests of peoples and territories.

If we are not content merely to stand on the diplomatic defensive, if we are not content merely to proclaim that we have legal rights that we mean to defend, we can hope to win without resort to arms. And even if, in spite of our efforts to avoid it, war comes, we shall enter it with a far wider and clearer understanding, both at home and abroad, of what is really at stake and why we are fighting.

Exhaustion and Apathy Are Beginning To Break the Communist Discipline in China

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news report from Hong Kong appearing in the New York Times of August 8, 1961. The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they do grind. As late as a year ago, many influential writers in our country were saying that Red China was here to stay—apparently forever. It supposedly had achieved wonders of efficiency, overcome the ancient problems of China, made the people happier and better off than ever before. Who could be so blind or prejudiced as to resist acceptance of Red China as a civilized member of society?

Well, some of us continued to resist, convinced that the glowing reports were not true and that, if we would just hold on a little longer to our faith in man and in God, events would demonstrate the cruel failures of the Communist regime, and expose the deceptions that so many had excepted as fact.

The attached report is typical of those now coming out of mainland China. How tragic it would be if foolish sentimentalists here and in other countries were to prevail in their efforts to get Red China into the United Nations at this time and needlessly give the sorely troubled regime a new lease on life. The Chinese people have worn down tyrants in the past, and they will do it again—if only we do not build the tyrants up.

The article follows:

SPREAD OF APATHY IN RED CHINA NOTED

HONG KONG, August 3.—Apathy is spreading like a disease among the people of Communist China, travelers and refugees report.

It is especially reflected, they say, in signs of breakdown in the rigid discipline enforced by the Communists since they came to power.

Trains are more often dirty than not, beggars are a common sight at all stations and tips are solicited as freely as in the outside world. Not long ago spotless trains, the disappearance of beggars and the absence of tipping were acknowledged symbols of the "new" China.

Theft, especially of food, has become increasingly widespread. Open defiance of authority, as personified by policemen, is reported by many refugees. The police for their part, have shown less inclination to take issue with minor lawbreakers.

INCREASING STRUGGLE

The apathy has become noticeable coincidentally with Communist China's increasingly difficult struggle to provide enough food and other consumer goods to meet the minimum demands of its burgeoning population.

It is believed to be partly a result of the continuing austerity and unrelieved drudg-

ery of the people's lives, partly a side effect of food shortages and consequent malnutrition, and partly, if not largely, a reaction to the visible evidence in the unimproving situation that the regime's plans have gone awry.

Despite a large shift of labor from industry, which is now marking time, to agricultural production, there are no indications that the situation is changing for the better.

Peiping is playing up disaster reports in key grain areas, apparently to prepare the people for a continuation of the present difficulties. For the last 2 years the Communists have ascribed crop failures to natural calamities.

DISILLUSIONMENT NOTED

Refugees express the opinion that many persons who welcomed communism and worked hard to carry out the regime's orders, including some Communist officials, now have little spirit left and are concerned only with the daily struggle for subsistence.

The food ration has declined steadily in quantity and quality. In the major cities, which are far better off than remoter areas, the staple food ration is ostensibly about 29 pounds a month. Usually this consists primarily of a flour made from maize or potatoes, with only a couple of pounds of rice or real flour. Factory workers get a little more.

Ordinary citizens are fortunate if they can buy in a month enough cooking oil for a day. Meat has all but disappeared from the diet of most persons. However, fish and vegetables sometimes are available. Sugar is provided only for the sick.

The fact that officials are obviously better off in many ways than the average citizen has contributed to the people's apathy. The regime has recognized this and has ordered lower-level cadres to give up their special mess halls and eat with the masses. But senior officials still have many special privileges and the words "fat pig" have come to mean anyone in authority.

Prof. Wayne Angell Discusses Problems Covered by the Joint Economic Committee's Review of the Operations of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Open Market Committee and the Economic and Tax Messages of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, early in June, Prof. Wayne Angell was here in Washington as an ad hoc member of my staff. Professor Angell is the head of the Department of Economics at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans., and is the vice chairman of the Franklin County, Kans., Republican Central Committee. In addition, he is a member of the Kansas house of representatives and is on the ways and means committee of that body.

Professor Angell attended a number of hearings conducted by our Joint Economic Committee, and has submitted a report analyzing those hearings and their relation to our overall economic situation. Professor Angell's report is so penetrating, pertinent and persuasive that I am taking the liberty of calling it to the attention of my colleagues. Under the leave to extend my remarks, I include the report:

Re economic problems covered by the Joint Economic Committee's review of the operations of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Open Market Committee and the economic and tax messages of the President

To: Congressman ELLSWORTH.
From: Wayne Angell.

My view is that contemporary political decisions regarding unemployment are primarily based on the assumption that the level of aggregate spending is not sufficient to bring about full employment. Those following this assumption advocate (1) increased Government spending to offset the so-called deficiency in the private sector, (2) reduced taxes to bolster private take-home pay thus boosting spending ability, and/or (3) easy monetary policy to reduce the cost of credit.

Since monetary policy as administered by the Federal Reserve System is by and large out of the control of the President, the alternative is Government deficit spending through increased Government expenditures or reduced taxes. As a consequence, potentially inflationary spending is generated. The independent Federal Reserve System leans against the wind and thereby interest rates are higher than desirable to promote investment and growth in the private sector. Of course, at this point we must recognize the gold problem. The outflow of capital will require interest rates to be higher than would be necessary for the purposes of promoting growth. To go on, that is, monetary and fiscal policy are contradictory. The penalty is reduced growth in the private sector and expansion of the Government.

These facts may be ameliorated if the Federal Reserve Board acquiesces to the political economic views of the administration. Even though the Federal Reserve System is an independent agency, continued pressure can be directed toward the officers, particularly the Chairman and the Board of Governors. The hearings of the Joint Economic Committee revealed the underlying disagreement between President Kennedy and Governor Martin. Kennedy wishes to pursue a policy of monetary ease to promote as low interest rates as possible without engendering heavy short-term capital movements abroad. Governor Martin primarily wants to prevent inflation.

Since capital movements are responsive to short term interest rates, the President and his advisers have attempted to persuade the Federal Reserve Board to nudge down the long-term rates while maintaining short-term rates near the present level. Attempts of the administration to keep rates low on home mortgages and reduce other rates which have not adjusted downward, have by and large been futile. For example, rates on FHA and GI home loans below the going market rate result in discounts which are passed on as costs to the buyer. As a result of such previous attempts, the Democrats have recognized the political desirability of changing the basic market pattern. Hence, the increased emphasis on the Federal Reserve Board and particularly the Open Market Committee.

In order to change the spread between long-term and short-term securities it was necessary to focus attention on the Open Market Committee. The committee was to nudge the long-term rates down by purchasing long-term securities on the open market. It was hoped that these purchases would increase the price and thereby reduce the yield of these bonds. The Open Market Committee has experimented with this nudging policy. Definitive results have not yet been obtained from this experiment. Many economists doubt the possibility for success, as the public's liquidity preference for short-term as compared to long-term would have to be changed. Without such a change the Open Market Committee in its purchasing operations will end up with virtually all the long-term securities. There is no real reason why an individual or a financial institution should give up liquidity by purchasing long-term securities without a compensating rate of return. On this point there was a great deal of confusion on the part of the Joint Economic Committee members, particularly Mr. REUSS who emphasized the desirability of Open Market Committee purchases of these long-term securities. He seemed to believe that the Open Market Committee's portfolio was very important. He pointed out continually that the Fed's Open Market Committee stock of securities had only short-term and intermediate-term securities. He failed to realize that it isn't important what securities are in the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee portfolio, although it may be important what length securities the Open Market Committee buys and what length of securities it sells. The length of maturity is important only on those securities that are outside government or any governmental agency.

Now, here let me insert my estimate of the Federal Reserve Board's attitude as portrayed by Mr. Robert G. Rouse, manager of the System open market account, Mr. Alfred Hayes, president, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and Governor Martin. They do not seem to anticipate that the nudging policy will be effective but are ready to make some gestures that will satisfy the administration without altering the basic monetary policy of the Fed. Martin expresses this policy by the statements: "We have a dual purpose, (1) to cause an increase in investment and (2) to moderate capital movements abroad;" and "as low interest rates as we can have without producing inflationary pressures." Here is the heart of the disagreement. The administration is willing to have some inflation if employment is thereby improved. Martin abhors inflation and properly so.

So we have in these hearings a vigorous attempt to expose and cajole the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve Board. Messrs. Rouse, Hayes, and Martin step softly and obviously avoid irritating the Democrats but never really agreeing to change. For example, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee asked Governor Martin a revealing question, "Will you ask the Open Market Committee to deal with the President's wish for downward adjustments in interest rates?" Governor Martin answered: "I want interest rates to be related to the flow of money in the economy," and "we made a bona fide effort to bring about a decline in long-range interest rates while maintaining short-term rates." Governor Martin continued by saying that such an attempt is very difficult to accomplish.

Now Kennedy has a perplexing situation. He can pressure Martin to resign—result: Republicans can hit him on inflation and continue the campaign debate or the President can use the Joint Economic Committee to expose and cajole. Then the Democrats can blame Governor Martin for any domestic, economic difficulties. It would seem that the latter course of action will be followed.

The administration is in real difficulty if the views which I gave to you the other day on the cause of unemployment are anywhere near correct. At that time I emphasized the futility of spending as the only technique for generating full employment.

Increased spending may well promote employment provided that such increased spending produces some inflation and subsequent reduction in the real wage of workers. The factor that has been ignored by so many economists since Keyne's general theory appeared in 1936 is the fact that in a private economy an employer hires a worker only when that worker produces a product whose value is equal to or exceeds his cost of employment. Obviously, no employer can succeed very long in hiring workers if their cost exceeds the value of their productivity. In economic circles the trend is toward increased emphasis on the firm where decisions are made on hiring and firing additional workers. Now this is not to say that the Government does not have any responsibilities in regard to the overall level of spending. The overall level of spending may cause a precarious downward spiral if Government fiscal and monetary policy is not utilized. But it is an entirely different matter to expect spending to generate employment through inflation than it is to expect monetary and fiscal policy to be used to maintain a sufficient level of spending so as to prevent a downward price movement. You see, decreases in prices are undesirable in that they increase the real wages of workers thereby causing many workers whose money wage rate is fixed to be unemployed. Then the task of monetary and fiscal policy is to maintain a sufficient level of spending so as to promote price stability. It must be the task of other aspects of governmental policy and business policy to promote markets that are competitive so as to bring about productivity increases necessary for higher real wages. For this reason one can safely support antitrust procedures to restore competition and to promote further extensions of international trade which reduce the ability of firms to administer prices and thereby reduce production. To conclude, let it not be said that the overall level of spending as affected by monetary and fiscal policy is unimportant but only that in emphasizing the level of spending too little attention has been given to price and wage rigidities and policies.

Governor Martin clearly recognizes the futility of our current economic policy which emphasizes only the level of spending. Martin says, "it is a mistake to assume that interest rates alone will cure unemployment." Martin also said, "Inflation, the depreciation of the dollar, does not put people back to work." Governor Martin insists that we have more than just monetary policy in our arsenal of tools to combat our economic problems of unemployment. He lists the various policies and techniques as, (1) monetary policy, (2) budget policy or fiscal policy, (3) debt management policy and (4) wage-cost factors which economists would describe as market policy. He says, "Everyone wants to put the whole weight on monetary policy."

If the administration turns to market policy it would seem that they will tend to rely on the market control techniques developed during our war experiences, namely wage and price controls. The futility of wage and price controls in a free system has not been given enough attention. If resources including human labor are not to be allocated or directed from one job to another job and from one use to another use, by our price mechanism, it must be allocated by the dictatorial control of a governmental agency. Our Republican Party seems clear and united on this score.

Going back to the Joint Economic Committee hearings, I want to relay the emphasis given by the Chairman and Mr. REUSS on the lack of information made available to the public concerning open market decisions. The Democrats obviously want more public information concerning the Open Market Committee's basis for decision. Such information would, of course, enable the Fed to be brought under the scrutiny of the public and, of course, of the Joint Economic Committee in a manner that the Fed has so far escaped. The Fed in a sense escapes because the technical question of monetary procedures have tended to cover up somewhat the fundamental goals and policies of the Federal Reserve Board. Of course, full disclosure of the Federal Reserve's open market decisions would cause traders to act to buy or sell prior to the Open Market Committee's transaction. Such buy-and-sell operations by the traders would tend to boost the prices of the securities to the level anticipated by the Government action. At this point prices and interest rates have adjusted but the reserve position of the bank system has not changed. In order to affect the reserve position, because that is what the Open Market Committee is after, the Fed's open market buy-or-sell order must be executed. It would seem that the buy orders would take place at a higher price and the sell orders at a lower price, the difference going to the first buyers or sellers. Mr. Hayes, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York gives a list of reasons for nondisclosure.

First, disclosure would interfere with the consumation of the Open Market Committee's objectives. Second, it would permit speculators to realize an unfair advantage. Third, it could very well cause some unnecessary disturbances in the market. Fourth, it would make open market operations more costly to the Federal Reserve System. Fifth, it could very well cause some misinterpretations and some misunderstandings.

Full disclosure presumes that the manager of the open market account knows of his specific action a day or days ahead. In practice, he knows only the broad policy as outlined by the Open Market Committee. He must execute buy and sell orders day by day to implement the Committee's broad policy. The manager cannot predict all of the circumstances of the market on any given day. Since most traders and dealers and other students of the market are aware of the broad policy decisions and of the direction that the Federal Reserve is leaning, disclosure would not seriously alter present knowledge for them. But since the manager of the open market accounts actions are very complicated and often involve offsetting transactions, the knowledge for such moves on the part of the public would often be misunderstood. For example, open market purchases are generally used to supply the commercial banks with additional reserves in order to promote monetary ease. However, in times of monetary stringency it may be necessary to make such purchases seasonally as during the Christmas holiday season or to offset capital and gold movements to the United States which would oversupply the commercial banks with reserve.

It seems apparent that the Joint Economic Committee overemphasized the entire question of disclosure as the Committee hearings wore on, less attention was paid to this question. However, the Joint Economic Committee mandates to Governor Martin and President Hayes still remain. These mandates were that the Open Market Committee decisions were to be made known to the Joint Economic Committee prior to their utilization.

A core of disagreement apparently exists between the administration and the Board of Governors. This disagreement wasn't underlaid to many of the periphery questions and comments that were made. It is very easy to misuse monetary and fiscal policy. As Governor Martin says, "The drunkard uses the lamppost for support not for illumination."

One final word in regard to President Kennedy's tax proposals. I indicated to you yesterday that a major overall tax reform is much more desirable than piecemeal changes. However, major tax overhaul is very difficult to accomplish for political reasons. As a result the President will undoubtedly continue to talk about major tax reform while only instigating minor changes from time to time. Many of the President's proposals are sound, particularly his emphasis on the narrowing of the tax base is to be commended. When the tax base becomes narrow through exemptions and loopholes, the tax rate must be higher than it would otherwise be. This increase in the tax rate has an economic disadvantage, the restraint placed upon incentive to economic activity. We certainly do not want a tax system which causes a great deal of economic effort to be exerted to avoid and escape taxation rather than to produce goods and services.

However, I am dubious of Kennedy's proposals to stimulate capital expansion and conversion of old plant and equipment. The President's recommendation for tax credits will tend to reduce the cost of capital expansion and hence to increase investment at the present time. Knowledge of this tax credit forthcoming may cause some to defer capital expenditures until the bill is passed. Then, too, such a subsidy may cause not an increase in investment but only a speedup in investment plans for future years. This program of tax subsidy runs counter to the basic philosophy of low tax rates and a wide base.

Alliance for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many disturbing reports reaching us from the Latin American Conference in Uruguay where Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon is supposedly solving the problems of our hemisphere with a liberal distribution of American dollars.

The disturbing reports are twofold: First, the Communist-inspired agitation in the area, coupled with the reluctance of the Latin American nations to join us in an efficient action against the Castro dictatorship; second, the report of commitments being made by our representatives relative to the international coffee market, reports that would indicate the possibility of American subsidies of international coffeegrowers.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I deem it practical that an editorial which appeared in the August 7 Wall Street Journal be inserted into the RECORD since it very briefly, but effectively, analyzes the developing problems to which I have alluded. I ask leave to place in the RECORD this editorial, entitled "Alliance for What?"

ALLIANCE FOR WHAT?

Like many other phony schemes, "global commodity price stabilization" has a surface appeal. And that is why the Kennedy administration plans to make it part of its vast "alliance for progress" aid program for Latin America.

The reasoning is that many of these countries are heavily dependent on a single crop—coffee is the notable example—and thus their

whole economies are affected by world price fluctuations. Obviously, the argument continues, the things to do is to regulate the prices by output controls, international agreements, and various other gimmicks.

So what's wrong with that?

One thing wrong is that attempted price fixing doesn't work any better in international commerce than it does within a nation. The history of price fixing is a long, sad record of black markets and economic stultification.

In the case of Latin America, price "stabilization" would only serve to perpetuate the very economic abnormalities it is supposed to correct. Some of these nations have such a glut of coffee that it would cover 2 or 3 years of normal exports. What they should have been doing long since is lessening their dependence on one crop and diversifying their economies. That way lie progress and prosperity. But if you undertake to prop their commodity prices they will naturally continue to lean on that crutch and do little or nothing toward basic improvements.

It's not too surprising that the Kennedy administration would fall for this hokum, since its general bias is in the direction of outworn theories of Government intervention. Still, we have a small suggestion: If these planners intend to push commodity price "stabilization," they had better think up a new name for that alliance for progress.

America Awake Can Still Survive; America Asleep Is Doomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some of us had the ill, or perhaps the good, fortune to live under communism as long as 30 years ago. We learned then what so many in America refused to learn. They called us emotional, alarmists, pessimists, even warmongers. But we had to keep on sounding the alarm, reporting what we had seen and knew communism to be.

It brings a sense of relief to have some one else also crying the alarm—someone like Eric Sevareid who cannot be dismissed by calling him a reactionary. Will people listen to him who would not listen to us? I only hope it is not already too late. Mr. Sevareid's article appeared in the Minneapolis Star of June 6, 1961.

The article follows:

"SHOWDOWN" WITH COMMUNIST WORLD HAS ARRIVED

(By Eric Sevareid)

NEW YORK.—I hope American nerves are strong; I know American heads are befogged.

The showdown with the Communist world conspiracy is on. We have entered the final stage of the long struggle to determine if we can hold our world position short of a great war. We are in that stage because Nikita Khrushchev has decided we are.

He did his best at Vienna to make us understand, just as Hitler did, time after time. It is wrong to think Khrushchev said nothing new. When he said, "No negotiations on anything unless it suits us tactically; no disarmament agreement, no test stoppage agreement, no United Nations save on our terms, no letup on Berlin"—when he said all this, in effect he was saying: "We have you. Why go on with the chess game?"

He has concluded that the Western alliance cannot be pulled together; that north Africa will soon be wide open to Communist exploitation with central Africa to follow; that southeast Asia is rapidly crumbling into Communist hands; that our Latin American flank is being turned.

He is now sure that the great game of isolating the United States, then impoverishing it, then breaking its will, is all over save for our helpless, thrashing convulsions which will be interesting and from time to time dangerous.

No doubt there are afterhour parlor games in the Kremlin these nights. Betting pools, for example, on the precise month when the United States, driven desperate by Castro's subversion of other Latin regimes, threatens to use force, whereupon Castro laughingly points out that he has short-range missile emplacements aimed at the lovely white city of Miami and would the United States care to test his will to use them?

I imagine they play an uproarious game of "Can You Top This?" reading selected items from the British and American press. The passionate claims of British Socialists that Britain will have more world influence if she gives up her atomic weapons must be a funnybone tickler to the men in the Kremlin.

These days they must particularly cherish the Whitehall-Lippmann theory that if we show willingness to renegotiate West Berlin, the Reds will obligingly give us at the bargaining table a stronger position than we have now.

Surely they adore reading the worrying, hair shirt arguments that the United States must not do this or that because it will offend world opinion, knowing as they do that there is no such thing in the moralistic sense—the proof of which is that after all their crimes, including Hungary, they enjoy more influence and respect in the world than ever.

They must love the British-American notion that the bosses of the new, neutral nations are somehow more high minded and spiritual than those of the committed nations.

They must have shaken their heads in happy disbelief when they read that conservative newspaper executives, calling on the President, said "No," when he asked if they accepted his premise that the United States has entered the most critical period in its history.

And they must love the large school of professional American liberals who assume that any given country, however barren and illiterate, however profound its background of violence and chieftainship, is capable not only of economic modernization but of parliamentary democracy.

The liberals with social-worker mentalities who do not grasp that illiteracy, low wages, concentrated land ownership and so on are not social problems but integral parts of a system of life and therefore enormously resistant to quick change by anything less than the totalitarian disciplines the same liberals abhor.

The liberals who assume that because a Marshall plan worked in modern Europe a similar plan can work among those regimes of Latin America where statistics are wild guesses, where trained economists hardly exist, where economic planning is finger painting, where, as between countries, there is very little background of communications, normal trade or even intellectual interest in one another.

The gamesmen in the Kremlin must smile in their sleep as they realize how deeply ingrained is the American illusion that a ton of wheat can offset a ton of Communist artillery shells, that a squad of peace corpsmen is a match for a squad of guerrilla fighters.

But I hope they frowned a bit when they read the angry retort of Defense Secretary McNamara when he heard for the umpteenth time, the pious theory that the Communists were gaining in Laos and South Vietnam because the regimes there are "unresponsive to the people's needs."

A burning sense of reality on a short fuse can make a quiet man shout (as I'm afraid it makes me shout these days) and McNamara shouted that the Communists are gaining in those countries for very simple reasons known as guns, bombs, fighters, and threats.

Frightened people in a score of desperate countries want to be on the winning, not necessarily the moral side; and we have to start winning soon. We are going to lose in several more places before we do.

We may as well face the fact that we will also lose in places we cannot afford to lose, until and unless we are willing to fight, no matter the reproving editorials in the Manchester Guardian, no matter what the temporary backlash of world opinion may be.

The relations between nations are not the same as those between individuals. We can afford to lose everything—except respect for our strength and determination. Lose that, and Khrushchev won't bother to sit down and talk again, even to say "No."

The New Industrial Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the article, "The New Industrial Revolution," written by Rev. Charles Owen Rice in the July 28 issue of the Commonweal, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe that Father Rice has given a clear and understandable explanation of our present economic conditions and the Members of this Congress will benefit from his summary and his conclusions:

THE NEW INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION—IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO STOP AUTOMATION, BUT IT SHOULD BE QUITE POSSIBLE FOR US TO MAKE IT AN ORDERLY PROCESS

(By Charles Owen Rice)

As we look back, we can see that the disruption and suffering that came with the industrial revolution were, in that historical setting, unavoidable. Society was unprepared for the changes which rushed upon it and was unequipped in every way either to understand them or order them to the common good. To be sure, the resultant horror was intensified by blindness, greed, and hardness of heart; it existed in the first place, however, not just because some could not see and others did not care, but because all were confused, baffled, and swept along. The constructive and daring planning that was required, in that day and for years to come, simply exceeded society's powers of willing, thinking, and doing.

We are in the initial stages of another revolution, the revolution of automation, which justifies comparison with the industrial revolution because it too will affect virtually all economic and social areas. The changes may not be so great, but they will come on faster and will extend further.

Telescoped into a shorter period of time, they will, in this fluid society, sweep into every nook and cranny.

It is not possible to stop this revolution, but it should be possible to make it an orderly process. Here in the United States we might be able to do that, because we have the size, the physical, and social resources and, also, enough experience with the process in its early stages to guide us. We can already glimpse the dangers and the dazzling possibilities; as yet, however, there is no sign that we will undertake the enormous and comprehensive adjustments of institutions and attitudes necessary to insure the orderly introduction of automation.

The transition from a mechanized industrial society to one totally automated could be very harsh and warrants comparison with the transition from handicraft to early industrialism. Automation is much more than a proliferation of machines of increasing versatility and productivity, much more than intensified mechanization. In automation, to be sure, machines grow larger and perform more tasks, but they also move into higher reaches of services. Machines direct other machines, turning them on and off and guiding them. Entire productive processes are carried out with no human intervention. As automation is developed and refined, human intervention is progressively removed, and machines become more sophisticated and self-sufficient.

Automation means all this, but even more. Of its very nature, automation is progressive, feeding on itself. The thinking machine, the cybernetics device, is part of the whole process, as are the simpler devices by means of which whole series of instructions are given to machines by other machines. Not only are men eliminated but they are often directed by devices, and directed with more efficiency and dispatch than they were by human supervisors.

On a higher level, the gathering, collation, analysis and use of information is being revolutionized by new devices and consequent new techniques. Automation not only produces goods faster but often improves quality, and it combines with the exploding fertility of chemistry to produce new varieties of goods, which may displace the old or open up entirely new wants and markets. And irrespective of chemistry, it adds to the available goods by doing the once difficult and forbiddingly expensive easily and cheaply. It has revolutionary implications for sales, warehousing, and distribution as well as production. It affects agriculture just as deeply as industry and commerce.

The enormous changes that have already occurred have come without the process of automation having been either coordinated or launched full scale. We are, in short, at the threshold either of great things and stirring times, or an awful mess.

A shortsighted attitude, which happily is losing favor, is to assume that while automation will in the long run make things better, at first it must make things worse. Proponents of this point of view note that every advance in human productivity has been accompanied by inevitable social discomfort but has always, equally inevitably, ended in a better way of life, at least materially, for the masses. One cannot deny that the people are indeed better off than when the process started, but the glaring weakness of this point of view is its glossing over of the terrible human cost of the early muddling through. A major and obvious measure of this cost is bolshevism, for the sufferings and injustices of the bad old days did not go unrecorded and unnoticed. If our society inherits the benefits of the early horrors, it is also being presented with a frightful bill.

There are, roughly, two great problems presented by automation. One is the problem of the suffering, temporary or not, that an uncoordinated and individualistic introduction of automation will certainly produce. The other is a greater and harder problem, that of preventing this uncoordinated and individualistic introduction from happening, and, instead, putting the process to work immediately and smoothly in the service of humanity.

The first problem is very present and very obvious, and it will not be neglected. This is not to say it will be solved completely, but it will be tackled, if for no other reason than the fact that there are now strong and articulate forces representing the victims.

The second problem, however, is infinitely more difficult. Comprehensive planning and coordination are necessary for the orderly and beneficent introduction of automation, but I fear that the men and forces which control capital and industry cannot make the turnabout in thinking that would lead them to embrace them. For one thing, they cannot bring themselves to accept the amount of government or quasi-government involvement that is required. Failing that, their whole outlook will also hold them back from setting up open, voluntary, private associations with sufficient authority to conduct the grave matter.

On this point is must in justice be acknowledged that such private arrangements are menaced by the law. Our healthy fear of monopoly and our previously salutary legal protections against combination and collusion do make the tasks of voluntary organizations doubly difficult. And as one studies the immense problem one can only regret that we have not spontaneously developed the quasi-public agencies of the sort that the papal encyclical, "On Reconstructing the Social Order," saw as necessary in our complex society.

Even if we managed to erect a control structure of some sort, though, we would have to face another problem. Would we be able to procure men to operate it? Could such a structure, or structures, attract and suitably reward with money, prestige, and freedom of action the superbly gifted men we would have to have? The probable answer is no. The industrial and financial community would not deliver up its best brains to any such structure and would not entrust its destinies to whatever men would shoulder the task.

While we weigh all the difficulties and all the reasons for not trying massive coordination, however, it is well for us to remember that we are not alone in the world and that our system is not the only one which is pondering automation. Communist economies are not so far advanced as ours, but they have not been idle. Russia already has a degree of automation, and the Chinese are far from unconscious of the opportunities the process offers them. It is just possible, too, that a controlled economy might do more with automation than a free one. Cybernetics with its faculty of gathering and analyzing information might be a superlative tool for consolidating power and manipulating human and material resources, and automation would probably do less social damage in a primitive than an advanced economy.

At the same time, we do have advantages. We have an early start, we have more trained people, and, very importantly, we have the capital. Automation requires capital; you might say it devours it. But while this hunger for capital can give us pause, it may impede our competitors for decades.

We are not at a stage in our knowledge where we can start suggesting even the beginnings of a procedure to harness automation comprehensively. Management consultants say, "Let us study and plan." Labor union leaders say, "Let us study and plan." Enlightened industrialists say, "Let us study and plan." Politicians say, "Let us study and plan." And the active congressional subcommittee under ELMER HOLLAND, which has been digging into the matter, after reams of testimony and a formal collection of statistics and prognostications of alarm and bounty, is at the moment so burdened down with raw facts that it too cannot say much more than, "Let us study and plan."

Under present circumstances it is reasonably certain that automation will continue to progress almost haphazardly, causing social damage that will have to be repaired. Automation increases the productivity of workers, and as matters now stand the increased productivity is not absorbed by the economy. Men lose their jobs or get only part-time work; young people seeking to enter the job market cannot find openings. Communities and vast industrial areas suffer and shrink, for job-loss stemming from technological change can inflict long-lasting social and economic damage over wide areas. To speak of something I see at first hand, the notoriously fast and sweeping changes in the soft coal industry have for more than a decade been depressing the entire Pittsburgh area and huge chunks of the States of West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, and Illinois, and the end is not yet in sight.

Only government can help the stricken areas, but the task is not simple, for automation is not the only force working against them. There is, for one thing, the persistent shift in population to the West and to a lesser extent to the South. Workers leave an area because they are either pulled or driven, and the very fact of their leaving is a social depressant, just as the fact of an influx is a stimulant for other areas. Sweden's experience, however, shows that when government marshals all its resources it can do a great deal for the blighted or merely depressed portions of a country. Loans, tax credits, grants for site clearance and preparation, judicious location of Government enterprises and similar measures can work wonders, and the Kennedy administration has committed the Federal Government to employ these measures while State and local governments are beginning to do what they can.

Corporations, for their part, have to refrain from irresponsible action. Granted that they have to follow their markets, that they have to seek room to grow, and that they have to pay some heed to comparative prevailing rates of pay (particularly if their competition has a great advantage over them in this respect), they must weigh these factors against the welfare of communities and people dependent upon them.

If a corporation is forced to move a facility it should do everything it can to help the afflicted community and workers. Many companies today are careful to prepare their abandoned sites for new enterprises; many even seek to find replacements, and they try to be just in the matter of bringing old workers to new sites and of retraining those left behind. But, although one hesitates to generalize, there are still too many others, perhaps the majority, which automate callously; too often, facilities are simply shut down or relocated in a harsh and irresponsible manner.

Morale has been shattered in various communities and workers reduced to a state bordering on hysteria by such tactics. The resultant bitterness and frustration are hardly good for business prestige; they certainly do not strengthen the position of capitalism.

America faces an important decision as to the value of the community-in-being. Shall we make an effort to preserve communities or shall we let them sink or swim? In the area I am familiar with, I see men cling to their communities with a pathetic determination, driving as much as 100 miles each day between work and home. The young

leave such communities, but the tenacity of those with roots must mean something. It might be, as some claim, that an attempt to keep life in these communities would hurt our overall economy, making it brittle, but I doubt it. If the motives of all the corporations were good and if their judgments as to the wisdom of their course were invariably sound, there might be less argument, but the opposite is true and the matter needs thorough examination.

The immediate material suffering of the workers affected by automation can be eased. Unions have an idea of what they want to do, and enlightened managements are dealing with them. The two main solutions are retraining and relocation of the displaced workers, the "saved labor," as some specialists refer to them. If workers are no longer needed on one job, they can be trained for another; if they are no longer needed in one area, they can be moved to another, preferably to the operations of their old company. In the period in between, before they get new work, they should receive financial assistance.

There is a principle here which is gaining acceptance, namely, that the workers should not bear the entire burden of automation and do all the suffering. This principle recognizes the great evil of the industrial revolution, that capital was accumulated for expansion at the expense of the workers, who starved so that the "dark satanic mills" could block out the sky.

There is one serious difficulty about this principle, though, and that is the possibility that full application of it could prevent accumulation of capital and sentence corporations to stagnation. With rare good will, corporations such as Kaiser Steel and Armour Packing are honestly studying the manifold problems of automation with their unions, but the basic problem is bigger than any corporation or union, and bigger than whole industries. Today many union leaders are beginning to realize that industry resources may not be great enough to relieve all the pain of automation, especially when it comes fast to an industry that is not too properous to begin with. They are also beginning to realize that retraining and relocation are not magic solutions because we cannot be sure that the new trade will continue to be in demand, nor the new location to provide work.

Various expedients have been tried, and others proposed, between unions and management as automation looms. The United Mine Workers accepted automation but insisted on very high wages and a royalty per ton of coal mined. The royalty has been used for pensions and a great medical program, but it has done nothing about the basic problem of technological unemployment. On the west coast the Longshoremen are trying a similar arrangement with variations.

The real solution is beyond the powers of collective bargaining, and all the unions can hope for is a mutually agreed upon set of rules to soften the blow. The leadership of virtually all industrial unions has accepted the inevitability of automation and is trying to make the best of a bad situation, getting as much justice and consideration for the displaced workers as possible. Among the old line crafts the situation is spotty. The building trades and the east coast longshoremen simply reject automation and have been getting away with it. The railroaders are fighting a rear guard action but the printing trades are locked in battle, still refusing to let automation sweep in unhindered.

Let it not be thought that automation poses no problems for the capitalist. It is expensive, it is volatile and, most troublesome of all, it is never final. A company may be ruined by delaying automation too long; but it may also be ruined by automating too soon, that is, using an early process when refinements are in flood that will make the initial automated process as outmoded as it made the old process; and the automation may be of the wrong sort; or it may turn out to be more expensive, cumbersome, slow, and wasteful than a manual or merely mechanical operation. Great computers have been yanked out, a fancy new automated post office has been closed, expensive and cranky electronic gadgets have been replaced by the simplest things—in one case by a man with a wheelbarrow.

Automation costs jobs, but in specific projects the saving seldom seems as large as was hoped. Thus the automobile industry's famous automated engine plants turn out a lot of engines and turn them out fast, but they require more labor, albeit of a different sort, than the original planning promised. There is also the nagging fact that, while this past decade saw the introduction of much automation, the all-important productivity per worker has not, on the national aggregate, risen significantly. This may be because at the end of the decade there was a recession and automated facilities were not running full tilt, but we do not know. On the other side of the ledger, we know that automation tremendously increased productivity per worker in the coal industry and probably saved the industry, even though it wrecked the surrounding communities.

One way or the other, automation is going ahead. It is the wave of the future and it cannot be resisted. It will revolutionize office work as well as production work, the farm as well as the city. It will make and break corporations and whole industries. It will strand millions of workers and make jobs for other millions. It will cause new communities to spring up and will add to America's melancholy roster of ghost towns.

Hopefully, many students of automation say that if times were prosperous and if our economy were growing as it should, automation would be taken in stride and would pose no problem. The five and one-half million unemployed, they say, are not so much caused by automation as they are an inhibiting factor on the process. One hopes these happy people are right but one cannot be sure.

We have had dips and rises in the economy in regular succession since industrialism began and there is some reason for believing that these have been caused, at least in part, by increases in mechanization and productivity. New mechanical processes make jobs as they are being created, cost jobs as they glut the market and then may make jobs again as they enable people to have a higher standard of living. If this is so, automation may make fluctuations more violent, and give us madder booms and sadder depressions.

The New Deal and World War II taught us a lesson that has gloomy implications for our present problem. Normal peacetime expenditures were not sufficient to pull us out of the great depression. Even a jaunty leader like Franklin Delano Roosevelt had neither the nerve nor the support, in peacetime, for the massive spending that would have righted the economy. However, war and the threat of war showed that the country could afford such spending and that the economy needed it and thrived on it.

Our economy would be much worse off today if we were not spending so much for defense, but we need to spend more and in other directions. We have places where the money would be well spent: highways, mass transportation, schools, prisons, colleges, mental hospitals and a host of social needs. But in all probability our people and our leaders have no stomach for this massive spending.

There is another hope for absorption of the mad productivity of an automated country and that is the underdeveloped nations of the world. Our helping of them, with or without the continuation of the cold war, could so stimulate our economy that automation would be robbed of the worst of its sting; but what changes of attitude and adjustments such a consummation would require.

This solution, starry-eyed and utopian though it may sound, is practical common sense. In the underdeveloped world they have an explosion of population; in our highly developed land we have an explosion of goods and food. We need each other and can help each other, but that does not mean that we will. Man's stupidity and hardness of heart are constants.

If automation becomes a tool at the service of the whole world, what happens when the rest of the globe is as highly developed and overproductive as we? We have the reaches of outer space then. Such speculation is beyond my present scope, but not beyond the scope of man's abilities and possibilities.

We should realize this: failure to rise to the full challenge of automation will be no small matter. It can result in second-class status for the United States in the next stage of industrial development, and that in turn can bring retrogressions and inversions of world-shattering extent and complexity. If such considerations do not lead us to give the matter our best efforts, I don't know what will.

Downey, Calif., Newspaper, the Downey Leader, Writes Significant Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of what appears to me as a very timely and pertinent, significant editorial appearing in the Downey Leader, published in the important city of Downey, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the great 23d District which I represent in this my 15th year in this great legislative body.

Not least of all in the text of this editorial do I call your attention, and the attention of all my other distinguished colleagues, to the basic, and I believe, literally true statement in the first paragraph of the editorial contained.

Mr. Speaker, the exact truthfulness of this paragraph is one of the basic reasons why I, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in this my 14th year as a member thereof, reiterate with all the vigor I have in me, the necessity of doing nothing in Congress which in any way—directly or indirectly—weakens our internal security against subversive communism, or other subversive influences which logically are determined to destroy our freedoms as guaranteed under our constitutional form of government. Mr. Speaker, I know you also join me in complimenting this very important newspaper publication in my congressional district on this editorial:

America's Greatest Gift

Communist rulers are sold on the idea that the total state can best organize social and material progress. Fired with dedication, they are aggressively and successfully selling communism in vast areas of the world where corruption and poverty drive people to desperation. The threat of military force encourages the uncommitted to listen, and discourages others from interfering.

A recent editorial in Life magazine expressed the opinion that, "The climax of the struggle with communism will come—soon. It has begun, and it is probable that in the present decade we shall either have negotiated our own surrender or communism will have become a disrupted, discredited, and disintegrating force. The time has come then for the United States to take its stand—unambiguously and implacably."

Military force is only part of the answer—barring miscalculation by one side or the other it may never be used. The United States, as the most powerful Western Nation, has to fill the role of senior salesman—offering ideas and practical action in a direct hardhitting attack on the problems which people face.

American enterprise, in the normal course of commercial development, has brought tangible advances to many of the world's underdeveloped areas.

A recent issue of U.S. News & World Report reviews achievements of private enterprise abroad. It tells the story of nine companies, whose operations span South America, Africa, and Asia. It says: "Working largely through local people, these companies have expanded from small beginnings into giant enterprises in their adopted areas. In the process they raised local living standards, helped to combat disease and illiteracy, created reservoirs of trained people. In short, they have done and are still doing many things that the new Peace Corps hopes to do.

"Altogether, more than 3,000 U.S. firms now operate abroad. They have added more than $42 billion worth of capital equipment to the basic wealth of their host countries.

"They add up to a 'peace corps' that often has been more effective than U.S. Government aid, and far more impressive than any Russian aid." American companies overseas take U.S. know-how with them, presently employ more than 2 million people of whom fewer than 20,000 are from the United States. They pay $7 billion a year in wages and about $4½ billion in local taxes.

In concluding, U.S. News observes that "Russia has nothing to match this private peace corps of business firms, as they bring new wealth and social progress to remote areas."

Every American and our own Government should be proud of the strength and accomplishments of our private enterprise system. The American people must understand that government can offer no individual security which they do not first pay for themselves. It can offer no safety from the drive of world communism unless it is backed by a majority of the American people, who take pride in their political heritage and have confidence in the free economic institutions which built this country and give us our strength.

America needs no apology and does not need to become a welfare state. But she does need a new spiritual force to match the Communist challenge—a new confidence and determination to sell the greatest gift she has: economic, social, and political progress based on individual freedom and opportunity.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Promotional Program by Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years chambers of commerce—local, State, national, and international—have made a tremendous contribution to economic growth and progress.

The chamber—recognizing the closely interrelated interests of all segments of the economy too—have become an increasingly strong voice in the formulation of public-interest policy in other fields.

Fundamentally, I believe this is an extremely healthy thing. Today, I was privileged to receive from Frank A. Hausheer, executive vice president of the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce a copy of its publication, Wisconsin Business. The feature article reviews the splendid way in which the Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce—serving well the interests of its members—is also undertaking vigorous, dynamic, broad-scope programs to promote statewide progress.

Illustrative of the enterprising spirit needed to move ahead on all fronts, not only State by State but nationally, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS—ACTION STATIONS

Meeting in mid-June at bonnie Maxwelton Braes, Bailey's Harbor, the State chamber's board of directors cocked a weather eye at Wisconsin's immediate future.

The economic barometer was edging up; all well and good. But what was needed from the chamber was a driving force that could help propel Wisconsin ahead dynamically.

Signaling, "Action Stations," the directors worked over, then endorsed an aggressive, new public relations programs to spur the State forward into fresh seas of economic success.

The chamber's new public relations program is aimed at two principal areas:

1. Industrial development.
2. Tourist and vacation development.

Considerable effort will be focused on industry and commerce already in Wisconsin, encouraging and helping it to remain here, expand and grow.

Realizing that "we must make things happen," Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce will strengthen its industrial development committee, work even more closely with allied units of State government.

Heavy emphasis will be placed on follow-up from industry inquiries, in or out of State, detailing the reason why Wisconsin is a good place to work and to live.

Several points to be stressed:

Wisconsin workmen, their skills, standards, wage rates, labor-management relations.

Industrial locations, available buildings, sites.

Transport facilities.

Natural resources.

Electric power and utilities.

Wisconsin communities, cooperative attitude toward industry, clean government, housing, educational and cultural facilities.

Plant location services.

Public service time on radio and television will be sought to laud the State's industrial climate, and features will be placed in national trade publications and other news media.

A major campaign will be launched immediately to promote tourist and vacation development. The tourist industry in Wisconsin now produces a hefty third of State income and needs special measures to enhance it.

While certain out-of-State cities and areas will get stepped-up promotional activities, Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce will lay down a heavy public relations barrage right here at home.

A View From a Tight, Small Compartment—An Address by Ralph McGill at Harvard Law School, June 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address given by Mr. Ralph McGill, the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, at the Harvard Law School-Graduate School Alumni Day on June 14, 1961.

Mr. McGill symbolizes the viewpoint and the hope of the New South and is a leader in the great tradition of American fairness and objectivity.

The address follows:

A VIEW FROM A TIGHT SMALL COMPARTMENT

Seventy-two years ago, in December of 1889, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Henry W. Grady, spoke in Boston at the annual dinner of the Merchants Association.

Grady was seeking to bring the South back into the lifestream of the Nation. Industrial jobs were necessary to ease the poverty and tensions in his State and region. So, he detailed to his New England audience what then seemed to be the South's assets. And, of course, he sought to reassure his audience about the race problem. The years have proved him a poor prophet in his predicted schedule of industrial development. His image of the Negro's development as a contented man on his own plot of land, jogging his mule down the furrow, also was in error.

But in the great sense, Grady was right—and his words challenge us even now. The problem of race, he said in Boston in the last month of 1889, "is * * * so bound up in our honorable obligation to the world that we would not disentangle it if we could."

"I would rather see my people render back this question rightly solved," said Grady, "than to see them gather all the spoils over which faction has contended since Cataline conspired and Caesar fought."

Almost three-quarters of a century have passed, since Grady spoke in Boston. The echo of Alabama's mobs and others that preceded them are in our ears and on our conscience. They are not the real face of the South, though our weakness is that we have permitted them to seem to be. It is my privilege to restate the honorable obligation of which Grady spoke and to say that despite the ugliness and viciousness of mobs, we are nearer the answer than ever before.

We are engaged in a struggle to do by law and the courts what men of free will have not been able, or willing, to do by themselves.

Historians have noted that our revolution, long before the fighting began at Lexington, was engineered by men who knew the law, men whose minds moved not in terms of violence and quick results, but in terms of law and the courts and the reasoned disciplined action that lies behind the law and the courts.

But ours has become an age of specialization, "with every branch of learning, including the law, divided into tight small compartments," which makes it difficult "to retain the whole view of a profession that makes for pride and excitement."

Since the greatest social reform of our time is being implemented by courts, they and the legal profession inescapably are a focus of attention. That we have not been able to retain a whole view is testified to by daily events.

In the past 20 years, but more particularly since the U.S. Supreme Court decision of May 1954, the leadership of the Southern Bar has not lived up to its responsibility. It was not until the spring of 1960 that the Georgia Bar Association heard one of its members publicly state the truth about necessary compliance with decisions of the Court. Nor was his heart lifted up by the considerable number of fellow members who later came to him to express appreciation and to say they wished they could have said what he did. "My clients do not want to be in controversy," they told him.

To this day, insofar as I can determine, not a single Southern State bar association has gone on record with a resolution or declaration of court support which would have provided the people with an alternative to the peddlers of defiance. Only one city bar association in the South (Atlanta's), has made a public statement affirming the validity of court orders as they apply to schools.

While the bar associations in the South were silent, individual attorneys, described glowingly by the segregationist press as "constitutional authorities," were publicly and slanderously denouncing the Federal judiciary and assuring a troubled and indecisive public that the U.S. Supreme Court's school decision was not legal, did not have the force of law, and was communistically inspired.

That this stoked the fires of violence is unquestioned.

One of the saddest aspects of the southern race problem has been that Governors have, by plan, had lawyers join with them in statements which deliberately deceived the people by distorting and falsifying the facts and the Constitution. All too often this alliance has been assisted by lawyer-members of the Congress. One reluctantly concludes all concerned know better, because they could hardly have been ignorant of the meaning of Supreme Court decisions. They, however, like the Governors, were and are, prisoners of their own excesses, the best illustration I know in our time of Frankenstein and his monster. And some of them, in private, are men deeply ashamed of themselves.

I do not, of course, mean to suggest that bar associations, or lawyers, should have agreed with the Court on the school case, or with other decisions in this field, although, to be candid, I would hope so. But what we have needed, from the bar, and from public leadership generally, has been a continuing defense of the integrity of the Federal judiciary. Had the people been told by bar associations that court orders require compliance, we would, I believe, have escaped some of the trouble caused by the deliberate deceit of the people by political leaders who invariably were loudly assured by a "leading constitutional authority" that they could, and would, defy the courts.

Another aspect of this agonizing dilemma requires thoughtful consideration. It concerns corporations doing business nationally. One dislikes to believe lawyers advised companies doing business across the Nation, during the moral dilemma of the student sit-ins, to follow local custom in the South, while in other areas the same company was told to practice no discrimination. The sit-ins telescoped time and courts. They were able to do so because even to many of the extremists, it soon became impossible to defend a situation where persons of both races could stand side by side to purchase intimate items of underwear, for example, but were barred by custom, or decision of the management—not law—from being side by side while buying a sandwich or a cup of coffee.

Student boycotts produced desegregation of eating places in about 30 southern cities in less than a year.

A national public philosophy, including the morality of our problem of race, held in common by American business, would have prevented economic losses, social disorders, and bitterness. In this day of specialization, every branch of learning, including the law, is indeed divided into tight, small compartments. This, I think, explains a part of the dilemma of lawyers. One of the tightest compartments is representing business clients and it is perhaps inevitable that lawyers should take on the neutral coloration of their clients and wait to advise about law until the public relations council has determined what the public policy shall be. I know the lawyer technically is not supposed to make moral decisions. We are told that this is the function of management. But, must the lawyer always be the neutralist in representing corporate clients whose scope is national? Is there not something here lost which is necessary to the law, management, and society?

The Government has a large responsibility but it is certainly true there are large areas left to private choice. In a totalitarian society the state is all pervasive. In our society only a modicum of political, moral, and economic order is imposed by Government. Our kind of national community, therefore, depends partially on law but in a larger measure on the private decisions of millions of people. Our Government has a limited authority but within these limits it must be obeyed. Large areas, however, are left open for private action and choice. If a free society is to reach an established goal, across the board, it must do so to a great extent through individual decisions. This freedom implies a moral responsibility. This responsibility is that of free business, a free press, free labor, free civil groups, a free bar, and freemen. If free Americans do not act responsibly, our Nation suffers, particularly in comparison with monolithic states where an established policy is quickly translated into practice. The painful fact of this is a nagging feature of our daily life. We cannot equate the moral value of the just deed of a freeman with the same deed of a state automaton. If a group in totalitarian society acts responsibly—there being no moral choice—there can be no moral credit.

A people who value a free society must act responsibly and strive to adjust their practices to their professions. When the decisions involved are legitimately private, not public, the only compulsion is conscience.

Therefore, failure to act on the part of the Bar associations, of corporations, newspapers, labor, the clergy and other elements of our society, is indeed a disservice to our free society and to the free enterprise system. This is true not only in a moral sense but in the more important one that makes for the viability of the whole society.

I think one additional reason why many of us, lawyers, and others, have not behaved well in this crisis, is the general failure to understand just what a legal decision is. Law, as I comprehend it, always represents—particularly constitutional law—the best considered judgment of men trained in the law, dedicated to principles on which the Government rests, and under oath to support the Constitution. In any legal case in which two positions are represented by able counsel, there are, of necessity, at least two points of view, each logical to the litigant and worthy of argument by counsel. In any case, one side is bound to lose, having contended and argued for a different result. Most decisions, it follows, are not acceptable to both sides. One of the main functions of the judicial procedure is to reach a decision which is final and which will, and must be, accepted, acceptable or not.

The whole system of law would be undermined if decisions unacceptable to one side should not in fact be accepted. The failure to accept a decision and to abide by the result, if widely practiced, would quickly undermine society. If decisions of the highest court, because they were unacceptable to litigants and partisans, were disobeyed, no will, no contract, no pension right, no insurance policy would be safe or secure. Organized society as we know it would be impossible and people would have to come to rely on private force as a final arbiter of legal disputes. This would return society to a state in which might was right, no person was safe, and no right was secure.

I must enter a "mea culpa plea" for my own profession of journalism. Some of the failures of our regional press to offer truthful, honest leadership have been tragic in spirit and in the encouragement of extremists to violent defiance of law. And the business community and its chambers of commerce have been even less responsible.

But, I do not wish to belabor these points any further. I would like to tell a story of how exhilerating it is to see the words of the Bill of Rights stand up from the printed page and take on human form—to see law in action. It is the story of how desegregation came to a Deep South State university, and to a legislature which but a few hours before had been saying "never."

January 6, 1961, in Atlanta, Ga., was not unlike other days before the annual session of the State's general assembly. The legislative leaders of the senate and house had been in the city for a week. The Governor, questioned early, said he did not believe there would be any new school segregation bill introduced because none was needed. There would be no changes in the laws.

The then circulating issue of the citizens council weekly paper, in its usual makeup of bright red headlines, called on the legislators to defy all do-gooders, race-mixers, and those who would mongrelize the Caucasian race. It urged that Georgia continue to show the way in total resistance.

This was the situation at midafternoon.

But 100 miles away, in Macon, Ga., at precisely 3:18 p.m., a stone was thrown into the calmed waters of the segregation pool. It was in the form of an order by a Federal district judge directing that Atlanta Negro students, Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton E. Holmes, whose applications had been rejected, be admitted to the University of Georgia, at Athens, on the following Monday morning at 9 a.m.

On that Monday, an hour before the somewhat stunned legislature of a Deep South State with an elaborate set of laws, declared by their successful sponsors of but a few years before to be proof against all desegregation, could take their seats, the two students were admitted. The Nation's oldest chartered State university was integrated. The trumpets of the U.S. Constitution had blown. The fast moving legal drama which followed had some of the elements of an old movie chase. Lawyers for the State board of regents, knowing things would look better to the assembly if they made every possible resistance, hurried to Macon's Federal building with an appeal for a stay so that an appeal could be made. A Negro lawyer raced along the same road and was in court to oppose. The appeal for a stay was granted.

So, back to the highway went the two cars. They drove another 100 miles to Atlanta's Federal building where the students' attorney argued the delay was invalid because previously rulings had covered, and denied, the grounds for it. The appeals judge, in a written decision, agreed.

All over the State the meaning of constitutional rights began to come more clearly into focus as a people, fascinated, angry, and applauding, looked and listened.

The next morning the students were in classes. University officials, and at least 7,000 of the 7,500 students, behaved admirably. The evening before some 50 coeds in the dormitory with Miss Hunter had spontaneously come to her room to make her welcome.

But the rabble rousers had recovered from shock and were wildly vocal. A board of regents member, ironically also chief of the citizens council, publicly denounced the university president and did not deny published reports he had threatened him. During the day, resistance-minded students were encouraged and financed to action.

That night, after a close basketball game, lost in the last second to the ancient rival Georgia Tech, an incited, well-planned riot took place about the girl's dormitory. A 10 o'clock call by the mayor of Athens to the Governor for State troopers was withheld from the chief executive for about an hour and a half. At 12:20 a.m., the riot wore itself out. A few students, and eight men with "a small arsenal" of arms in a car and loaded revolvers, were arrested. Seven of the latter were admitted klansmen. The Governor's executive secretary issued a statement praising the rioting students who did not "submit to judicial tyranny." The two Negro students were suspended and removed from the university as a safety precaution and an aid to maintenance of order. There were immediately public protests that the wrong persons had been suspended.

Lawyers went back to work. Just after dawn the rival attorneys again were on the road to Macon. Those representing the Negro students argued that the constitutional right of a citizen of the United States may not be abrogated because there is a probability of disorder. Also, the constitutional rights of some may not be denied while others retain them. So it was that within hours the two students went back to classes under the umbrella of the Constitution of the United States. In addition, the court notified the State its law withholding funds from the university under orders to integrate were unconstitutional and enjoined the State from so doing. Public opinion, therapeutically shocked by the riot and the abuse of the university president by a regent, experienced a revulsion toward extremists disorders.

Once the original shock was reduced, the legislature had 2 restive days. The rabble-rousers were shouting at them. But in those days the assembly members also began to hear from the alumni and parents. Equally important, they heard from the merchants and the power structure of the cities involved. The messages, by phone, wire, and letter, all read essentially the same: "We don't like integration, but don't close the schools."

Had a local school board been somewhere involved, it would have been different. The legislature would have been happy to have remained aloof. But it was Georgia's enormous good luck to have the legislature as a whole confronted with the decision to keep open or close the vast State university system. Many were graduates of it. Some had sons or daughters at Athens. A number of these were seniors.

Some of the letters received were touching in their sincerity.

"I hate what has happened. But my wife and I have worked hard and done without to send our boy to Athens. We want him to graduate. Don't send him home."

"Our two daughters are at the university. It will break their hearts to give it up. Try to hold things down. But don't close the university we all love."

The house floor leader announced that he had heard the voice of the people. He had received, he said, more than 600 letters and telegrams in 2 days and only 12 wanted the university closed.

It seemed, then, all of a sudden, that save for the handful of diehard extremists who railed furiously at the Governor, reminding him that he had pledged "never," everyone knew a turning point had been reached. Gov. Ernest Vandiver said Georgia would obey the courts. He brushed aside those who called him traitor and demanded that he initiate defiance. Georgia's Assembly almost quietly abolished the old segregation laws in their entirety.

The anatomy lesson of this kaleidoscopic drama of law and violence is meaningful to the whole segregation picture. It represents a turning point in the Deep South pattern of pledged total defiance. Grounds for delaying maneuver are about gone. The many tests from Arkansas, Virginia, and Louisiana have stripped most of the fat off the appeals possibilities. The dismal abyss of no public education today is but a few steps away from any State which takes the course of defiance.

Leadership, which has become perhaps a trite and shopworn word, nonetheless remains the essential ingredient in each Southern State and each locality confronted with a school order.

Permit me to close with a story which illustrates the failure of the past and the hope of the present and future.

Because of the processes of law three students have been accepted for entry to Georgia's Institute of Technology next September. I am well acquainted with the parents of one of these young men. This father and mother were themselves college graduates. The father of the young man of whom I speak took various jobs, all poor ones. They were all that were open to a Negro. Finally, he got a better one—as a chauffeur and butler. His wife became a cook. Next September their son will enter Georgia Tech, and President Kennedy's recent employment directive in the field of Federal contracts means he will be able to get a job as an engineer.

Is it not an accusation against all of us that we have waited so long to make a beginning?

Is it not well to learn how to accept the unacceptable?

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding columnist of the Arkansas Democrat, published in Little Rock, Ark., Mr. Karr Shannon, has written what I consider to be an outstanding article on Federal aid to education. This article appeared on August 8, 1961, and under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of this House to this very thoughtful article:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID MEANS ABSOLUTE FEDERAL CONTROL

(By Karr Shannon)

This humble scribe has just perused 56 pages of scholarly, socialistic, bureaucratic, flowery, vague, foggy, visonary, vicious plans for centralized control of the Nation's public schools in Washington.

Title of the pamphlet: "A Federal Education Agency for the Future" by a "Committee on the Mission and Organization of the Office of Education." The report is a definite statement of grand strategy for absolute Federal control of public education. Nothing less.

The committee advocates "a new and significant roll for the Federal education agency in the 1960's." The agency is told that it must go beyond its traditional functions of research, and "it must also prepare itself to assume larger responsibilities in carrying out the Federal policy through the administration of operating programs." Here's a paragraph of gobbledygook that is difficult to digest, but read it through:

Having identified an area of need, moreover, the Office must have the strategic mobility to bring to bear upon education problems of high priority the resources required. The dissemination of educational information, although an important function in itself, must be capable of meshing with the more substantive measures which may from time to time be needed. In other words, the Office must be a striking force ready to move along the educational problem front at home and abroad.

WIZARDS OF WASHINGTON

The committee report emphasizes the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that children are educated in a proper view of world affairs, intimating that State and local authorities see the needs "imperfectly." Only the Federal Government, according to the report, has the wisdom to provide proper education needs of children.

Anyone who says that this tremendous, bureaucratic plan will not eventually destroy local control of schools and the freedom of all school boards, State departments of education and teachers is either a victim of gross ignorance or is willfully misleading the people.

That Federal aid to public schools can come only with Federal control is not a bugaboo or threat; it's a fact.

It wouldn't make much difference about the safeguards against integration of races or other Federal control embodied in the first congressional appropriation of Federal aid to schools. There could be amendments later—after the program gained a head start. Or the Federal Office of Education could make its own regulations. If challenged, the Supreme Court would likely rule in favor of Federal control, especially as it pertained to integration.

From the time Franklin Delano Roosevelt came on the scene with his "more abundant life," Presidents and congressional majorities have yielded to centralized Federal Government; they have permitted the constitutional, sovereign rights of the people in their respective States to be gradually, and dangerously, reduced. In short, they have actually amended the U.S. Constitution from time to time, without it being "ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."

Also, the U.S. Supreme Court, made up of political appointees by the President, has been amending the Constitution and making its own "laws."

IT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Federal aid to public schools is unconstitutional, as unconstitutional as infringement upon the rights of freedom of speech.

Amendment 10 says: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The Constitution says nothing about education, nothing about schools. Therefore, the education of children comes under "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution." As a consequence, the powers and responsibilities pertaining to schools "are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

When the President, or a Member of Congress, or any other person advocates Federal aid to schools, he is advocating open violation of the Constitution. When an education leader, or State commissioner of education, advocates Federal aid for schools, he is sanctioning contempt for the Constitution of the United States.

The President, Members of Congress, and State commissioners of education are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The fact that other agencies are flouting the Constitution and drawing unlawful handouts is no justification for the schools, supposedly the mainstay of law observance and respect for the Constitution, to do likewise.

Publisher Finds Enthusiasm for Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Thomas W. Braden, the publisher of the Daily Blade-Tribune in Oceanside, Calif., in which he notes the enthusiastic response he has encountered to the Peace Corps.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAILY BLADE-TRIBUNE,
Oceanside, Calif., May 22, 1961.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: As I go about my extracurricular duties as a trustee of the California State colleges I am constantly struck with the enormous enthusiasm and interest which the Peace Corps idea has aroused in the minds of the students here.

Within the last 2 weeks I have made speeches at 3 of the 15 State colleges and I have talked to the presidents of all the others.

Nothing since World War II, it seems to me, has so aroused a generation of students to responsible thought about their country and the contribution people their age can make to their country's cause.

In other words, the President and you have aroused the practical idealism of the young adults of California.

I hope you can persuade our Congressmen and Senators that this bold and new idea is helping to inject a public philosophy into the next generation of American leadership.

There is nothing which could be more important.

Go to it.

Yours,

TOM BRADEN.

Gains in Biology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussion of missiles, H-bombs, and the space age, there is a marked tendency to overlook some of the really great potentials in other scientific fields. The following news article from last Sunday's New York Times—August 6, 1961—tells of some of the amazing possibilities in the field of biology and the improvement of man.

If we could only be free of wars and rumors of wars, think what could be done for the human race and mankind generally.

The article follows:

GAINS IN BIOLOGY—MAJOR DISCOVERIES ARE UNRAVELING THE MYSTERIES OF THE CELL

(By William L. Laurence)

Biology, the science of life, is progressing, markedly on two major fronts. On one of these, the mysteries of the living cell—the basic unit of life—are being penetrated and unraveled by advances in the new scientific discipline named microsurgery. It has made possible the transplantation of the nuclei of cells and the exchange of their heredity-carrying units. On the second front, life's complex chemical processes are being tracked down to the level of their simplest functional units, the molecule.

Discoveries being made on both these fronts, leaders in biology note, are leading to a revolution "far greater in potential" than the atomic or hydrogen bomb. It is essential, they emphasize, that we begin right now to consider the possible uses and misuses of the great biological discoveries in the making.

In the early stages, the guerrillas would avoid head-on clashes with Mao forces. They would conceal and guard the food, smuggling it to the hungry peasants to win their support.

Only after the guerrillas had the peasants of a whole area working with them would they carry the fight to the Communists.

Nationalist authorities, with whom this idea has been discussed, are not completely convinced it will work. They doubt whether enough guerrillas could be infiltrated into Red China to make it effective.

FOOD FOR WAR

They advocate a more direct and bolder plan: Chiang Kai-shek should open a beachhead on the mainland, then announce to the world that he merely wants to bring food to his starving countrymen.

He could contend that the Communists cannot be trusted to distribute food. They give the lion's share to soldiers and bureaucrats, even ship food abroad for displomatic gains, while their own people go hungry.

The beachhead plan has one obvious drawback. It could trigger world war III.

An answer may lie somewhere between the two proposals, perhaps a massive food-and-arms smuggling operation accompanied by a propaganda barrage.

How practical is the idea of guerrilla warfare, using grain more than bullets, behind Mao's lines?

Vice President Chen's secret report gave graphic evidence that rarely in their long history of hardship have the Chinese people suffered more cruelly than they do today.

Rice is rationed to the last grain. Meat, vegetables, poultry and eggs are unavailable in most areas, except in the so-called free markets at exorbitant prices. Diseases that go with famine have reached epidemic proportions.

Reluctantly, even the Communists have been forced to recognize the ghastly Horsemen of the Apocalypse who ride the land. With millions of peasants almost too weak to work, the commissars have ceased driving them from dawn to dusk. They have even suspended political and social activities that use up energy.

Although the penalty for stealing food can be death, famine breeds its own desperate bravery. Food stores have armed guards. Even small vegetable plots must be protected against looters.

Here, certainly are the ingredients for revolt.

BEHIND ENEMY LINES

But can guerrilla warfare succeed against Mao, the greatest guerrila of them all? Perhaps a partial answer can be found in a personal experience.

It was during another August, 16 years ago, that I rode as a war correspondent with Chang Shang-chih's guerrillas behind the Japanese lines.

Our small role was to harass a stretch of the Hankow-Peking railway 60 to 80 miles north of Hankow. Our hideout was in the mountains where grain often was growing on a 50–60-degree angle.

This was a land of no roads—only paths where the men wound single file through rugged mountains, then down into terraced valleys of shimmering rice paddies.

It was a land where a handful could hold off hundreds, then vanish to strike again.

One desperate day after Chang's guerrillas had been mauled by a Japanese patrol, we were huddled in a hut. Chang was exhausted, but he bared his teeth in a bitter smile and pronounced the guerrilla creed: "Many small victories will in the end make a big one." Then he turned over and went to sleep. Next morning, at dawn, he and his brave, ragged band were on the march again.

Our Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there follows herewith the report I made to my constituents 3 weeks ago on the subject of the foreign aid authorization:

The foreign aid authorization bill is before the Foreign Affairs Committee. We do not as yet know exactly what will be included in the committee's bill, but we are aware of what President Kennedy has requested.

The President has requested the largest amount in several years. He also has asked for two provisions which have not been included in previous foreign aid legislation. He is asking that part of this program be authorized for a period of 5 years rather than coming to the Congress on a year-to-year basis. Heretofore foreign aid has come before Congress in two ways—first for the annual authorization and then for the annual appropriation. Under the plan recommended by the President, the money would be available from the Treasury without a congressional appropriation, which is often called "back-door spending."

I view the foreign aid bill each year with mixed emotions. No one can deny that in some instances foreign aid has done a good job, nor can we deny that there were instances where it has done harm and actually injured the cause for which we are working. Except for the American people each year making their will felt through their representatives, foreign aid expenditures would have been far, far greater than they have been. It is easy for those close to the program to forget its basic purpose and get carried away in new proposals and projects. Congress has tried to apply the brakes.

My first contact with foreign aid was in 1945 and 1946 when I was with the military government in Korea. I saw Americans, with the best of intentions and sincerity, attempting to change an oriental economy and way of life into one like our own. We failed in doing it because we had the wrong approach. At that time I believed, and I still maintain, that the only successful aid that we can give a foreign people is to assist in educating them—I mean education in the broad sense—so that they themselves may improve their economy and culture in accordance with their needs. I am still trying to sell that philosophy, but I haven't had much success.

Included in our foreign aid bill are our programs which give military assistance, providing equipment and training to friendly allies such as Greece, Turkey and Pakistan. I believe our military aid should be considered separately from programs of economic aid, for it is materially assisting friendly foreign nations to defend themselves against Communist aggression. For years, however, the administration, regardless of party, has insisted on tying these programs together so that the popularity of military aid will "pull some of the unpopular facets of the program across."

The foreign aid bill will pass, but I will view it critically as I have always done. If some of us in Congress had not been putting

the brakes on extravagant expending, the foreign aid program would be worse than it has been and much more expensive for the American taxpayer.

Chen Left Report and a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing column from the Washington Post of Sunday, August 6, 1961, written by Mr. Jack Anderson, Drew Pearson's assistant.

CHEN LEFT REPORT AND A PROBLEM

(Drew Pearson is in Germany checking firsthand on the Berlin crisis. In his absence, his column is being written by his associate, Jack Anderson.)

(By Jack Anderson)

Formosa's tiny but tough Vice President Chen Cheng had another purpose for his mission to Washington besides announcing Nationalist China's determination to fight against the admission of Red China and Outer Mongolia to the United Nations.

He left behind with President Kennedy a report and a question.

The report, a document of the highest secrecy, contains startling new evidence concerning the magnitude of the famine in Red China and the temper of its suffering, starving people.

The question: Is the time near when Mao Tse-Tung can be given a taste of his own guerrilla tactics by opening a secret front against his tyranny deep in China's heartland?

Administration officials are pondering the possibility of dropping anti-Communist guerrillas into areas where the famine is most intense. They would be armed with light weapons for defense, with surplus food for offense.

ADVANCES DEPICTED

Dramatic advances in microsurgery were recently outlined in an address before the New York Academy of Sciences by Dr. Milan J. Kopac, professor of biology at the Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University. Progress on the chemical front was described in a recent Voice of America broadcast by Dr. Gairdner B. Moment, professor of biology at Goucher College. Implications of these discoveries for the future were also discussed by Dr. Philip Siekevitz, biochemist at the Rockefeller Institute.

Exploration of living cells by microsurgery presents many intriguing problems, Dr. Kopac pointed out. First of all, cells are so small that they must be magnified from 100 to 2,000 times in order for all relevant details to be properly seen. Too, cells are delicate structures and must be handled with extreme care. They must be maintained in the right environment usually in a solution of several salts in proper ratio and concentration. Temperatures must be maintained within narrow limits.

He noted that if one is to perform microsurgery on cells, the surgical instruments must be much smaller than the cells and one must position the instruments to the cell with extraordinary precision and delicacy. The minuteness of the cell—its diameter is six to eight ten-thousands of an inch, while its nucleus is less than three ten-thousandths of an inch—and the susceptibility of the nuclei to injury, has required the design of entirely new procedures in microsurgery.

TINY INSTRUMENTS

Advances in microsurgery, Dr. Kopac said, have been made possible through the development of microsurgical instruments—extremely minute needles, pipettes, hooks, scalpels, scissors and forceps—and of complex mechanical devices by which these instruments are placed into a cell so that the desired operation can be performed. With these highly precise mechanical devices, known as micromanipulators, "one can insert a needle or a pipette into a cell with a delicacy so exquisite and precise that a part of a cell or a nucleus can be removed and implanted into another cell or nucleus."

Ways and means for handling and measuring small volumes of liquid also had to be developed, Dr. Kopac added. This led to the design and construction of instruments named microinjectors. These, he said, "can measure or control volumes to less than one micromicroliter" (millionth of a millionth of a liter). A micromicroliter would be the volume of a drop of water divided approximately 50 million times.

The most important discoveries in biology, Dr. Moment said, are being made by studies at the molecular level which have "immensely enlarged our total understanding of what makes a living thing alive." They have opened up for human exploration "a new world of what goes on/inside the living cell" and have drawn "detailed metabolic maps which show the complex and interconnecting pathways taken by matter and energy during the multiform transformations within living things."

ORGANIC CARPENTRY SEEN

"When enough is known about amino acids (basic units of proteins) and nucleotides (units of the genetic material in the nuclei of cells)," Dr. Moment predicted, "it will be possible to produce at will undreamed-of forms of living things." "Here lies a revolution far greater in its potential significance than even the use of atomic energy. It may all sound fantastic, but so also did the use of nuclear energy only 30 years ago," he said.

A similar view was expressed by Dr. Siekevitz. As a result of the great increase in knowledge about life processes "we can see ahead the possibility, very small but yet distinct, of man's planning his own biological evolution," he said.

"We are now approaching the greatest event in human history, even in the history of life on earth, the deliberate changing by man of many of his biological processes," he said. "We will be able to plan ahead so that our children will be what we like them to be—physically and even mentally. At that point man will be remodeling his own being."

This, Dr. Siekevitz warns, makes it necessary for all of us, not only scientists, to begin right now to think about the future in such a context.

It becomes essential, he said "than man should have a purpose in mind—a concept of the future to give meaning to his fateful moves. Events in biological research are happening so rapidly that we will soon have to answer a new question. No longer, what creature is man? But what creature should he become?"

"It is the power of man's brain which has made nuclear energy possible, the power of our intelligence, which, because it is natural, places us not above nature, but as one with all living things," Dr. Siekevitz stated. "There is a golden age ahead on earth for our species; if only we use to their utmost capacity our heads and our hearts, our intelligence and our natural intuitive love for all that is within nature, for that beauty which is life itself."

VFW Legislative Director Cites Record on Compensation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter which Mr. Francis W. Stover, legislative director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, has submitted to each Member of the U.S. Senate with regard to the service-connected compensation bill H.R. 879.

I am happy to say I supported this measure in the committee, as well as on the floor of the House, and I am distressed by the fact that the Senate has adopted amendments which seriously reduce the benefits and delete a very important presumption; namely, the one relating to multiple sclerosis which was adopted only after the committee had received a recommendation to this effect from the National Institutes of Health. This entire question has been greatly complicated by the addition of the so-called Long amendment permitting reopening of the national service life insurance program. I agree with the chairman of our committee that these two matters are entirely separate and distinct and should be treated on their separate merits.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include as a part of my remarks the text of Mr. Stover's letter:

AUGUST 7, 1961.

Senator ———,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ———: On July 17 the U.S. Senate passed, with amendments, House-approved H.R. 879.

As approved by the House it was a pure compensation bill and provided:

1. Increased rates of service-connected disability compensation to reflect the rise in the cost of living since the last increase in 1957.

2. Increased rates to more adequately compensate the severely disabled.

3. Liberalized presumption for service-connected purposes for the insidious disease of multiple sclerosis.

The Senate, however, amended and passed H.R. 879 as follows:

1. The multiple sclerosis presumption was deleted.

2. The cost of living increases for veterans in the 10-, 20-, and 30-percent groups were cut.

3. An amendment was added to reopen the National Service Life Insurance program.

It was now a bill with two unrelated proposals.

The bill is presently lying on the Speaker's table. The VFW has been advised there are no plans to further consider the bill at this time, because of the insurance amendment.

The VFW has supported and will continue to support compensation increases as approved by the House. The VFW has supported and will continue to support legislation to reopen the national service life insurance program. The VFW, however, does not support the combining of these two proposals in a single bill and is extremely disappointed that they have been commingled

to the detriment of 2 million service-disabled veterans.

All agree, I am sure, with our President when he stated in his message to you favoring compensation increases the following:

"The American people have traditionally insisted that those veterans who were injured in the service of their Nation be treated justly and humanely."

The administration is opposed to reopening the NSLI program.

The Senate amendments would adversely affect 1,300,000 service-disabled veterans. The unrelated controversial insurance amendment is serving to obstruct the passage of this bill. One suggestion has been to introduce legislation in the Senate along the same lines as the House-approved H.R. 879. Any effort on your part to help provide compensation increases for the service-disabled will be deeply appreciated. The VFW is hopeful that this legislative impasse will be resolved in favor of those veterans who were disabled while serving overseas and in combat against the enemy—veterans who deserve the highest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Florida Governor Acts Swifty To Prevent Road Scandal Recurrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the new administration of Gov. Farris Bryant, of Florida, has moved swiftly to tighten up on the State's Federal aid highway program to prevent a recurrence of scandals uncovered by investigators of the Blatnik Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program. The following excerpt from the Engineering News-Record of August 3, 1961, summarizes the Governor's program:

The State of Florida has moved to prevent recurrences of scandals of the type that Blatnik committee revealed in its investigations there.

To tighten up on its Federal aid highway program, the new administration of Gov. Farris Bryant has:

Filled the State post of interstate highway administrator, which had been vacant for 18 months.

Established a project control center using data-processing equipment for a constant check on job performance.

Requested a comprehensive review of the right-of-way program by the bureau of public roads. A separate right-of-way division has been set up in the State road administration.

Changed State road board regulations to forbid starting any project until all right-of-way has been acquired. All sales of such property must be by competitive bidding or public auction.

Tightened and strengthened specifications for all jobs, with a new emphasis on control of procedures and methods.

Standardized procedures for work on design, drainage, and maintenance.

Introduced a rigid policy regarding acceptance of pay or gifts from contractors, suppliers, or consultants.

Altered change-order procedures so that no contract changes may be made anywhere, unless approved by the full board and made part of its minutes.

Ordered continued spot checks on all aspects of the road program by a roving investigative division of the Governor's office.

New Tom's Cabin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of August 7, 1961:

NEW TOM'S CABIN

Soviet propagandists have made effective use of lies about capitalist exploitation of American Negroes. Unquestionably, the distortions have been accepted by many in Africa and India. The truth seldom overtakes the canard, but the U.S. News & World Report has compiled some statistics which might be surprising to many in this country. For example:

The 19 million Negroes in the United States are estimated to have had income of more than $20 billion—$1,000 a year for every Negro man, woman and child in the country. Not a fortune by American standards but easily that compared to the $200 to $300 per capita income of Russians or the $50 to $100 of people in Red China.

It exceeds the average for Western Europe—$650—and for the individual countries of France and West Germany. It is roughly the same as the average per capita income of Britons. The comparison with the average African's income is far more striking, of course. In Senegal it's $182.

The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that Negroes who worked the full year in 1958 had a median income (half got more, half less) of $3,368, well above the average for the British worker, $2,234, and four times the $800 made by the average Soviet worker.

American Negroes own 4,500,000 automobiles, they favor models in the middle and upper price range. Thus there is one automobile for every five Negroes in America; only 1 for 850 people in Russia (and most of these are state-owned or belong to top party officials).

Almost every Negro child between the ages of 7 and 13 is enrolled in a grade school; 8 out of 10 are in high school age group. Dr. Ambrose Caliver, Negro chief of the adult education section of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, says, "The quality of education for Negroes is increasing phenomenally as equipment facilities and number of trained teachers increases."

It is in the Southern States (U.S. News observes) where the segregation fight is centered and where most schools are still segregated that the greatest efforts have been made to improve Negro education. Run-down, one-room schoolhouses for Negroes still exist in some rural areas, as they also do for white pupils. But school budgets show that these backward facilities are rapidly giving way to up-to-date consolidated schools in much of the South.

Negroes, many of them educated in the South, are finding good skilled and semi-skilled jobs in industry, white collar jobs in business and government. They own banks and businesses. There are 53 Negro-owned life insurance companies with assets totaling $23 million.

In short, American Negroes have it better than most Europeans and far better than others of their race anywhere. In the century of evolution from slavery the villified white South has played a major part and paid a huge price.

This is the kind of information the country should be spreading abroad instead of abject apologies for isolated, insignificant incidents.

Americans Will Respond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are way ahead of the administration in their willingness to make sacrifices for the defense and security of our country. The President has repeatedly called for special sacrifices in public speeches, but actions speak louder than words and I believe the country is looking to the President for leadership in curtailing unnecessary spending.

An editorial in the July 27 issue of the Mecklenburg Times, a newspaper published every Thursday in Charlotte, N.C., indicates how the people out in the country feel on this subject. I include this editorial under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AMERICANS WILL RESPOND

President Kennedy has set the preliminary stage for an America on wartime basis.

In his televised speech to the Nation on Tuesday night, the President reaffirmed this country's stand that we will not be forced out of Berlin; that we have a legal right to be there and that we are committed to protect the Germans, our defeated foes, from being gobbled up by the Russian Communists.

The President asked for $3,454 million in new military spending. He proposes to increase our armed services by more than 200,000 men. He wants the draft doubled and tripled in the next few months.

He also reaffirmed this country's stand that we want peace, but will not surrender; that we'll go to war if necessary. The President believes that the country's economy can stand the additional amount of military spending without a tax increase now, but hinted that he might ask for more taxes next January.

The United States always has responded to meeting sacrifices when the national security is at stake. It will respond again.

The response will come even though a great majority of American people are war weary. Wars just seem to come too often. With every war comes a sacrifice of civil and personal rights. These are to be expected during wartime, but unfortunately too many of these wartime lost civil and personal rights are lost forever.

The President said Tuesday night:

"Everything essential to the security of freedom will be done, and if that should require more taxes, controls or other new powers, I shall not hesitate to request them."

The President was asking the American people to start tightening their belts.

In view of the aggressive attitude of the Communist leaders, the President is right in asking us to start tightening our belts.

Many Americans are wondering today if the Federal Government itself should not start tightening its own belt. Since the end of the last war, the number of civilian Federal employees has stayed astronomically high. It is still increasing.

Can we afford to continue this spiralling of civilians on the Government payroll with the brink of war becoming more pronounced?

Perhaps there should be a moratorium called now on the many hundreds of federally sponsored domestic projects, which are costing countless millions of dollars a year and have no bearing on war or national defense preparedness.

Wars bring about a serious labor shortage on the homefront—the front that builds the weapons and feeds the men at the battlefront.

Wouldn't it be wise for the Federal Government to cut back to the bone, release tens of thousands of peacetime employees to private industry who will need them so badly as more and more employees are lost to the armed services and other services essential to the war effort?

Wouldn't it be wise for the Federal Government to return nonmilitary and nonnational defense controls and authority to the States?

In short, wouldn't it be wise for the Federal Government to concentrate its efforts on solidifying this country's defense and preparing to defend that defense? When a country is on the brink of war, it is no time to think of idealistic programs for our social economy.

Wednesday morning the newspapers carried headline stories of the President's speech. Rightly so. The front pages also carried stories of a request for half billion dollars so we can beat the Russians in getting a man on the moon.

Wouldn't it be wise to forget about a junket to the moon in these days? Why can't we forget the moon until after the next war is over?

The American people will make the sacrifices the President suggests. The American people unite as one when our national security is endangered.

As Americans, they expect all Americans to join in on the sacrifices from Washington on down to the town boards.

If war comes again, we'll prove again we are the best fighters on this earth. Maybe next time, we can also win the peace.

Declaration of Contraband Against Communist Arms and Munitions in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of calling attention to the joint resolution I have introduced today declaring Communist arms and munitions contraband in the Western Hemisphere, directing the President to promulgate specific contraband lists, including petroleum products, and directing the President to use appropriate U.S. forces to enforce the contraband.

The text of the joint resolution and my explanations thereof will be found in the body of today's RECORD during proceedings of the House of Representatives. These can best be read in context of House Joint Resolution 517 "declaring that a state of conflict exists between the international Communist conspiracy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same," text of which, together with my explanations thereof, starts at page 13759 of proceedings in the House for Monday, August 7, 1961.

That Omnibus Farm Bill of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 I made some rather facetious remarks in connection with the farm bill, the remarks being recorded on page A5914 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day.

The August 8 Sunday edition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer made similar remarks in an editorial.

As a lifelong dirt farmer, I should like to paraphrase the last sentence in that editorial. Yes, sir; this country has a farm problem—emanating from Washington many years ago—the problem is still in Washington, complicated by politics and sectionalism:

WHILE THE LITTLE FARMER STRUGGLES ALONG

Congress, as it usually does about this time of year, has passed another farm bill that will pay the big farmers more for doing less while giving almost no help at all to the little farmers who could really use a bit of assistance.

The measure now awaiting President Kennedy's signature is an abominable piece of legislation referred to as a compromise—probably because it satisfies nobody except the relative handful of well-heeled beneficiaries who will get richer at the Federal trough.

Small farm operators—such as those who are typical in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and elsewhere in the East—will soon find out that, once again, most of those billions in Federal subsidies are to go to the big farmers of the predominantly agricultural States, particularly in the Middle West. Apparently the farmers ranking in the upper fourth of the income scale will continue to get three-fourths of the Government handouts.

Wheatgrowers are promised a raise in subsidy from $1.79 to $2 a bushel. In addition they will be paid by the Government for taking from 10 to 40 percent of their wheat acreage out of production. The formula is tricky but most farmers will get about 90 cents to $1.20 for every bushel of wheat they could have raised and didn't.

Growers of corn and other crops will cash in, too, under various arrangements.

This bill is geared to the farms—many of them corporations—with vast acreage. They retire some of their acres, thereby reducing labor and overhead costs, and retain sizable profits with the aid of Federal subsidies for grain they raise and for grain they don't.

The little farmer has so few acres to begin with that he can't take any out of production and keep alive. Nor can he save on labor costs because the labor is his own.

It seems to us that Uncle Sam needs to take a fresh approach to the farm problem. First of all, surplus crops should be considered an asset instead of a liability in a world where millions are hungry and at a time when great effort is being made to expand world trade. Secondly, if the Government is determined to give economic assistance to farmers let the aid go to those who really need it.

Yes, sir, this country has a farm problem—and it's right down in Washington.

Shut-ins Plan Their own Evaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Luke Lewis, 640 North Summit Street, Bowling Green, Ohio, and a constituent of mine, has originated and put into being a plan worthy of the attention of all Americans. In a fast moving, missile age it is most refreshing to find emphasis and value being placed on the little big things, as Mr. Lewis is doing.

Mr. Luke "Red" Lewis, alert, peppery 61-year-old citizen, who is confined to bed for all but 1 hour daily has launched a little big plan. Its title "Shut-in Project for Forgotten People." This plan was launched in mid-June with a barrage of some 800 incoming and outgoing phone calls from "Red" Lewis' bedside; a task in itself as he has the use of only one hand. Mr. Lewis was concerned about the evacuation of the disabled in case of fire or disaster, bringing cheer to other shut-ins, interesting shut-ins in registering to vote, and providing fellow shut-ins with some type of communication with the non-shut-in world.

The evacuation plan has received the most urgent and prompt attention of Mr. Lewis. Through the medium of the press, the radio, and the telephone, he has prepared a list of 110 persons in the city of Bowling Green, Ohio, who would be in need of help and assistance in event of fire, tornado or any other major disaster. The list that he has prepared contains the name and address of each person, the location of their room, as well as the infirmity or affliction that causes them to need such help or assistance.

It has been a tedious and laborious task writing the names and compiling pertainent information about the shut-ins for Mr. Lewis. This particular task has fallen to another shut-in. She is 18-year-old Joane Marski, a polio victim who types with one hand. The two consult several times daily by telephone and met only recently in person.

Mr. Lewis discussed his evacuation plan for shut-ins with Mayor F. Gus Skibbie, Fire Chief Morris Instone and Sheriff Earl Rife, as well as Merle Klotz

and J. W. Burris, the fire chief and assistant fire chief, respectively, of Center Township, and has received their enthusiastic support.

At an initial trial-run recently, Mr. Lewis was removed from his home within 10 minutes from the time his call for assistance was made.

To implement the disaster-evacuation plan for shut-ins, the four service clubs, Lions, Exchange, Rotary and Kiwanis, have been asked to lend assistance to the fire and police units in the event of a disaster. This they have agreed to do. Mr. Lewis is also urging the service clubs to institute a Big Brother monthly visitation program for the shut-ins. "These people don't want sympathy," says Mr. Lewis. "They want a kind word and affection. Some of them have no visitors at all."

Already he has found the project has a number of possibilities for bringing cheer to others. For example, he learned that a blind lady was using a rope from her door to get to her rural mailbox on a heavily truck-traveled road. Through the use of his telephone, Mr. Lewis called this lady's case to the attention of Police Lt. Wayne Canfield, who purchased a new mail box for her and installed it next to her door.

Mr. Lewis has solicited assistance from the Bowling Green bookmobile librarian in providing reading material for shut-ins.

Mr. Lewis plans a campaign to register his fellow shut-ins to make them eligible to vote. "I don't care what their political party is: I think they should vote," said Mr. Lewis, a former Bowling Green constable.

He believes some of the needy shut-ins might like radios and is working on a plan to provide poinsettia plants and chocolates to each shut-in at Christmas time. By the time these plans are completed, Mr. Lewis will probably have others and his chain of ideas could go on ad infinitum.

As I have pointed out, this program began as an idea conveived by a shut-in. The idea has ignited action in our community and it is only fitting that it should spread throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

"Hope" Ship Had Excellent Success, Says Dentist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a letter from one of my constituents, Dr. Phillip T. Fleuchaus, of Daytona Beach, Fla., who has just completed a tour of duty on the SS *Hope*.

I think all of us are interested in having firsthand information as to how this people-to-people effort is working out:

"HOPE" SHIP HAD EXCELLENT SUCCESS, SAYS DENTIST

(NOTE.—The friendly impact of the U.S. traveling hospital ship, the SS *Hope I*, in Indonesia has been excellent and has left an everlasting impression of kind friendliness in Indonesia, according to Dr. Phillip T. Fleuchaus, Daytona Beach oral surgeon and Ormond Beach resident, who made the cruise aboard the vessel. In reply to a request from the Daytona Beach News-Journal, Dr. Fleuchaus had this to say concerning the cruise of the SS *Hope I* in a letter sent from Saigon, and dated July 7.)

DEAR SIR: It is very interesting to get letters from home and from other parts of our country giving conflicting reports on the activities of Project Hope. Since I have been a part of this program for 10 weeks I would like to give you my impression of *Hope I*.

Although I am very prejudiced, the *Hope* ship is doing a tremendous job in this part of the world. Wherever we have gone, the people have welcomed us with open arms and I believe we have been of great service to them. There are many problems connected with a program like this and the *Hope* ship has had its share, but overall I believe the impact on Indonesia and Vietnam has been excellent.

The amount of diversity of disease that exists in this area is too great to describe in one letter. Although we did not scratch the surface of their problems, we have shown them that we care and we have done all that we could humanly do under the conditions in which we must work.

There have been about 50 physicians and dentists that have rotated through this 9-month tour and each one has not only been extremely capable but he has been charged with the spirit of service to these people. There are 25 nurses on the ship and during this time in southeast Asia they have trained many Indonesian and Vietnamese nurses in the technique of American nursing.

Perhaps in this field alone a contribution has been made that will be everlasting and can never be measured in dollars and cents.

At present in Saigon, we are operating an 80-bed ship trying to treat as many patients as efficiently as we can. The doctors are working in the local hospitals as well as on board. Over 20,000 people have made application to see or be treated by a *Hope* doctor, and although many of the cases are untreatable, and although it will not be possible to take care of all those who are treatable, each of these people will be seen by our doctors. So many of the disease processes have advanced to such a degree as to make many of these patients incurable. So much of the pathology that we see we never have seen before, nor has it been described in textbooks.

Both the Indonesian and Vietnamese doctors are well aware of the problems that face them but their biggest problem lies in the production of more medical personnel and their allocation to neglected areas.

It is not unusual to see a hospital of 250 beds staffed by 1 physician, or even to hear about 1 physician for a province of 500,000 people. In the emergency hospital in Saigon over 2,000 outpatients are seen daily by 10 physicians. The dentist extracts teeth of 150 patients in 1 morning. There are many more statistics that could overwhelm you, but are these not reason enough for us to help?

It is easy for me to understand why there is criticism of this project, but I certainly do not think its drawbacks should limit another *Hope* ship.

Many people here also expected miracles. Perhaps they were promised miracles, and maybe there were a few miracles. We have not treated all the disease, and we have not trained all their doctors, but we have treated many and we have planted many ideas as well as giving encouragement to the people.

Although at many times it is difficult to communicate in words, it is not impossible to see the thankfulness in the eyes of the patients. How trusting these people are to come and be a patient on a strange ship where everything is so totally different to their way of life!

So for all those who question the effect of this project, may I say that we are not the answer by any means for the health problems of these countries, but we are Americans who have tried through a person to person relationship to help as well as understand their problems. Personally, it has been an invigorating experience. There have been many frustrations and I can't measure any contribution that I have made, but I have come to love and respect these people and would not hesitate to undertake another venture such as this.

I hope that if and when there is another *Hope* that the people of our city will support it wholeheartedly. The next project will be better and the one after that even still better.

I will be returning home in several weeks and it will be wonderful to see our lovely beach once more. I can state frankly that the beaches in Southeast Asia that I have seen can in no way compare to ours. I hope that this letter finds Daytona Beach in the thick of an excellent summer season, progressive as usual, and devoid of its petty problems.

Solid Fuels Rocket Successfully Fired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of gratification to me, and I am sure to all my colleagues that concurrent to the last Russian achievement in outer space, a major company in the United States, United Technology Corp., on August 5, 1961, successfully fired a giant solid propellant rocket. Even more gratifying is the fact that this firing was successful on its first test.

On July 17, 1961, United Technology Corp. made the following announcement:

Current achievements by the rocket propulsion industry give reassuring evidence of this Nation's ability to seize the initiative in the development of large solid propellant boosters. This has special significance in the light of President Kennedy's appeal for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement. Now the industry looks forward to the next significant advance—firing of flight-weight segmented solid propellant rockets of 250,000 and 500,000 pounds thrust at UTC's development center.

As predicted, more than 1 year ago, the 250,000 pound rocket was fired and achieved all test goals.

This major advance in the national booster program which offers great hope in our race with Russian scientists, received national coverage in the press of August 7, 1961. The announcement gave new hope to those who are betting on

solid rockets for the big booster in President Kennedy's "man-on-the-moon" program late in this decade.

Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, USAF, retired, president of United Technology Corp., revealed that his company had fired a record size "operational prototype" of a solid rocket motor.

The firing was conducted at UTC's isolated canyon facility about 60 miles south of San Francisco on Saturday. It was conducted for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Fired nose down, the giant conical rocket motor, 26½ feet long and 7½ feet in diameter at its widest point, operated for 80 seconds and produced approximately 250,000 pounds of thrust.

The firing sent flames high above the facility's concrete test bay which is built to withstand thrusts of more than 2 million pounds.

By clustering such motors, UTC spokesmen said, thrusts as high as 25 million pounds can be produced. The Atlas liquid fuel missile produces 360,000 pounds.

Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander, launch vehicle chief of NASA, termed the firing "most encounraging." Large rockets of both solid and liquid type are being developed for the moon program. Until recently it was taken for granted by most persons that liquid rockets would be used because large solids had never been built.

On the heels of Saturday's firing, UTC announced plans to test an engine twice as big as the one just fired.

Solid-rocket enthusiasts envision the first-stage booster of the nova moon rocket as a cluster of seven or eight individual rockets, each rocket made up of as many as six or seven segments piled one on top of another. In this way, they say, large weight-lifting capability can be obtained with components that are individually manageable in size and weight.

Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eugene Black:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By Eugene Black)

There is a limit to the funds that capital-exporting countries are willing to provide. There are also movements in the less developed countries themselves which vitiate all efforts to raise world living standards. One of the most massive of these obstacles is the tremendous rise in the populations of already crowded countries.

THE YEAR 1961 VERSUS 1950

For every four persons on earth in 1950, there are today five. For every 5 today, in 40 years there will probably be 10. In the past half minute alone, about 90 babies will have been born into the world; only 60 persons will have died, leaving a net increase of 30, or one every second. This rate of growth last year added the equivalent of the population of Italy to the world's millions, and the rate seems to be accelerating. In 1961 it will probably push the population of the world past the 3 billion mark, and it will double that figure before the end of the century.

Three hundred years ago there were probably no more than 500 million people alive in the world, and the total was increasing only slowly. This stability was maintained by an uneasy balance between high birth rates and death rates. Many babies were born, but many also died. Living conditions were such that many of the remaining children failed to survive beyond the age of 30.

DEATH RATE–BIRTH RATE GAP

In Europe, the picture began to change in the late 18th century. Populations began to grow, sometimes very fast. Elsewhere the balance of new lives against deaths has been upset largely in our own lifetime. The pattern has been a steep fall in death rates, with birth rates little changed. But the circumstances have been somewhat different from the earlier European experience. The population revolution has often been achieved very cheaply. In Ceylon, to take the best known example, the expenditure of $2 a head on a public health campaign with the prime purpose of eradicating malaria reduced the death rate by three-quarters over a single decade. Similar stories can already be told of public health programs undertaken in other countries, and there will undoubtedly be more in the future.

Of course, we welcome this trend, whatever the problems it may set for us. We all want to reduce the suffering and waste involved in premature death or disabling disease, and we can expect death rates to go on falling in the developing countries. Medical science continues to discover increasingly effective ways of promoting public health, and since governments can usually act on behalf of the community in putting these new techniques to work, we may expect them to be applied as soon as the money can be found to pay the accompanying bill. People will live longer in the future.

But if only 20 people—or even fewer—in every 1,000 are henceforth to die each year, then a birth rate of 40 per 1,000, which formerly just kept the population steady, will bring an explosive growth in numbers. And there is little reason to suppose that birth rates will soon decline to match the fall in death rates. It is much simpler to attack disease than it is to alter the reproductive pattern of a society. Medicine has yet to make available a cheap and easy method of regulating births. And not everyone wants fewer children.

What view are we to take of all this?

I am not convinced that population growth will eventually outrun the development of the world's resources. It is true that at present rates of consumption we will use up the known reserves of several important fuels and minerals within a few decades. Heavy demands will certainly be made on our agricultural resources, and there may be acute difficulty in organizing the movement of food and other necessities about the world on the scale required to meet the needs of a population twice its present size. But I am inclined to think that those prophets who forecast the exhaustion of the earth's resources, underestimate the ingenuity of man and the potentialities of science. And I am not too disturbed about the long-run problems of feeding the extra persons we expect, although I find myself a little out of sympathy with some of our professional agricultural optimists—it seems to me utopian to expect that every country will be cultivated as efficiently as Denmark, and that thereby the world could easily feed twice its present population.

But all this does not mean that we ought to welcome population growth on the scale that we see it today.

MORE PEOPLE WILL NOT ALWAYS MEAN MORE TRADE

Some people argue that a big population implies a good market for the businessman's product: he can use mass production techniques and charge low prices. They insist, too, that with a growing population, the businessman constantly finds demand exceeding his estimates. Optimism and production run high; new products win ready acceptance, while obsolete industries die painlessly; the incentive to invest is strong; and social mobility and change are encouraged. The burden of social costs is spread widely. By contrast, they suggest, a declining or even stationary population brings pessimism and economic stagnation; there is insufficient reward for private enterprise, and the state is thereby forced to intervene increasingly in fields better left to the private citizen.

This body of theory may conceivably be true in the circumstances of a rich country with resources to spare. But it is wildly irrelevant to the problems of most developing countries today.

It is, of course, a fact that some of the poorer countries do not have domestic markets big enough to support mass production industries. But it is clearly ridiculous to suggest that inadequate population is holding back the development of, say, India, which packs more than twice the population of the United States into less than half the space. Where most people go barefoot for lack of shoes, industry is not failing to grow because its products are not wanted. Where the agricultural laborer can find work to occupy him for only half the year, no further pressure is needed to make him wish for a different occupation. Where two-thirds of every dollar of income must be spent on food, where manufacturing industry is almost nonexistent, one need not worry that excessive saving will lead to underemployment of resources. The lash of further poverty is not required to drive these people to action. The developing countries need many things—not only capital, but the skills and health to make good use of it. By no means do all of them need population growth.

But need it or not, they have it. They should ask themselves if they can afford it. In Asia, in the Middle East, in Latin America, in Africa, the population of most countries is growing at the rate of 2 percent annually—and sometimes 3½ percent or more. In most of Latin America and Africa there is fortunately room for the extra people. In the long run, although not now, there should also be adequate resources available to feed, clothe, and house them. But in many parts of Asia and the Middle East, resources are few, and there is not nearly enough room. Agricultural land which once sufficed to support a stationary and much smaller population has already been divided and subdivided beyond the limits of effective cultivation. Cities are crowded to bursting, and are still getting bigger.

HIGHER LIVING STANDARDS REQUIRE MORE INVESTMENT

Population growth on this scale would be a serious challenge to a country with adequate living standards. Where incomes are very low, and economic development is a desperate need, such growth can be a crippling handicap.

The speed at which a country develops depends largely upon its ability to direct its growing resources to investment rather than to consumption, to uses which will raise tomorrow's output rather than satisfy today's demands. A poor society finds it difficult to save at all, and will be doing well if it can set aside 10 percent of its income. At this rate, if its population is growing, it will bare-

ly be investing enough to stay where it is. Yet the likelihood must be that it will invest not more than 10 percent, but less: a growing population with a high proportion of dependent children will find it increasingly difficult to spare any of its income from consumption.

Unless foreign aid can be increased, a country in this position is faced with a stark alternative. It must reduce its savings, or lower its living standards—although both are already inadequate.

The industrialized countries have shown their willingness to help. Common humanity and self-interest alike impel them to do so. All the evidence points to a greater flow of aid in the coming years. But I find myself increasingly doubtful whether domestic savings and foreign aid together will be sufficient to allow real progress, if present rates of population growth continue for long.

Figures are hard to come by in this field. But it may be possible to indicate some orders of magnitude.

ESTIMATED HOUSING COSTS

Some calculations have been made about the cost of providing houses in India during the next generation, if the population continues to grow at its present rate of about 2 percent a year. If you disregard the cost of rural housing, on the somewhat optimistic assumption that it can be carried out entirely with local materials and labor, then you still have to pay for the homes of nearly 200 million extra people who, it is expected, will be living in India's cities 25 years hence. Making full allowance for the fact that many of the extra persons will be children needing not new houses, but simply more space in existing households, a sober estimate of the cost suggests that in the 30 years between 1956 and 1986 a total investment in housing of the order of 118 billion rupees, or roughly $25 billion, will be needed. If you find a figure like that difficult to grasp, I may say that it is well over four times the total lent by the World Bank in all countries since it started business 15 years ago. Put another way, it is more than 30 times the initial resources of the International Development Association—and those resources are supposed to cover IDA's first five years of operations.

My cost estimate takes no account of the need to improve existing housing in such cities as Calcutta. It leaves out the cost of roads, sewage systems, water supplies and other services. Yet the problems of urban growth from only a small part of the challenge presented when economic development is attempted in the context of a vast expansion in population.

In the social field, many more new hospitals and clinics will be needed, simply to maintain present standards—standards which by common consent are sadly inadequate. Far more must be spent on education. Here look again at India, not because its problems are unusual, but because they are well documented. In 1956, about 31 million Indian children were getting an education—less than 40 percent of those of school age. It is mathematically certain that if the population grows as expected, a three or four-fold increase in educational investment will be needed if all children are to be receiving an education by 1976. When you come to productive investment, the story is similar. Enormous investments will be needed. But population growth does not only tend to reduce the flow of investment funds. It also means that the capital invested in industry must be spread increasingly thinly over the labor force: each pair of hands is backed by fewer dollars of capital. Productivity suffers, and the gap in living standards between the developing and the industrialized countries widens, instead of narrowing.

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR HIGHER LIVING STANDARDS?

I must be blunt. Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in many of the poorer countries. We are coming to a situation in which the optimist will be the man who thinks that present living standards can be maintained. The pessimist will not look even for that. Unless population growth can be restrained, we may have to abandon for this generation our hopes of economic progress in the crowded lands of Asia and the Middle East. This is not a field in which international agencies can do much. But there is scope for governments to act: it is time that they gave earnest attention to this threat to their aspirations.

Population growth does not alter the rules for successful economic development. On the contrary, it reinforces their strength by increasing the penalties for breaking them. In relation to the need, capital is short, and must be stretched as far as it can possibly go. In the developing countries, therefore, the first question to be asked of any economic policy must be: "Is this the road to maximum economic growth?" and if the answer is "No" we must look very closely at any doctrines which are put forward to excuse this sacrifice of economic advancement.

For the providers of economic aid, this situation implies a duty not only to see that the money is properly and efficiently applied, but also to guard against the temptation to use development assistance to achieve their own commercial or short-term political objectives, rather than to serve the priority needs of the recipient countries. For the developing countries themselves, it implies that they must realize that they least of all can afford to accept low returns on their investments. They cannot afford to waste scarce resources by putting prestige ahead of real need, by ignoring hard economic calculations, by refusing to accept productive capital while they debate for years the respective roles of public and private enterprise.

At best, and even if real sacrifices are made by the industrialized nations to increase the flow of aid, there is grave danger that, in the face of existing rates of population growth, the resources available for economic development will fall short of the needs of the developing countries. We bear a heavy responsibility toward succeeding generations to make the best use of all our resources.

Blockade of Cuba Called For

SPEECH

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, again we are hooked on the horns of a dilemma. Again we have to plumb the depths of our souls, asking ourselves whether it is better to let the enemy bring the battle to us or whether to take the battle to the enemy.

It is a traditional worry, one with which our leaders have been confronted several times. When is the right time to go to war? When is the right time to defend ourselves? And to what extent must we go to manifest that defense? These are questions we must resolve. These are questions we are being faced with today.

Khrushchev cries warmonger at us, and then says that his brand of communism will soon envelope our country. Khrushchev cries peace, and continues to feed arms and munitions to dissident factions of other countries. Khrushchev cries imperialist while his trained bands of brigands usurp more territory for Russia.

Now the many-headed, many-handed, many-footed monster has raised one of its ugly heads in the very vicinity of our shores. It should have been stamped down long ago, but it takes a little time to prove a man is a liar. This is especially so, when he has asked for, and has been given a helping hand in obtaining his position of power. Fidel Castro has been deceitful from the beginning of his reign.

The President has stated the country's position clearly and strongly. It is a position of policy, not a warning, not a threat. It is a position that will have to be followed up by action. Action that cannot be long delayed.

On the other horn on which we are being tossed is our tradition for peace, our tradition of waiting until we are knocked down before we defend ourselves. We are a peace-loving people, with a Government framed to promote peace. But then our lives and Government are based on the precepts of Christianity. We are intrinsically a God-fearing people, as contrasted with godless Communist-dominated countries. The love of peace has been bred into us since our country's beginning. Dictators are prone to mistake this for weakness—the dictators that have made this mistake lived just long enough to learn how serious a mistake they had really made.

We can just be pushed so far—and that distance decreases in proportion to the number of times we have been shoved. The limit has just about been reached with Berlin. It has been exceeded in Cuba.

The trumped-up crisis over Berlin will probably blow over when and if Mr. Khrushchev decides it can't be precipitated to his advantage. He has always used it to distract attention from various other nefarious activities of his.

I have repeatedly appealed for recourse to the Monroe Doctrine—and I make that appeal again. A blockade around the island of Cuba to stop all importation of munitions is called for, I believe. The stealing, hijacking, and kidnaping, and threatening of life has got to stop.

We cannot have communism breathing its hot, fetid breath down our necks off the shore of Cuba. We cannot have so close to our shores the enslavement of the freedom-loving peoples of Cuba. We cannot permit the Khrushchev crowd to think they have their foot in the door to the Western Hemisphere. We cannot permit the Castro-type propaganda to poison the thinking of the rest of the Latin-American countries.

The thorn should be picked from our side before it festers and spreads its poison throughout the rest of our body.

Everything Free, but Life, in Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, August 1, 1961:

EVERYTHING FREE, BUT LIFE, IN SOVIET—LACK OF FREEDOM CALLED FLY IN OINTMENT OF KREMLIN'S NEW 20-YEAR PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—Every so often the Communist Party in Moscow has come up with a new 5-year plan or with a renewal of a previous 5-year plan. Nikita Khrushchev, however, takes a longer stride—he now proposes a 20-year plan. None of the plans ever reaches completion, but all serve a temporary purpose—to keep down internal unrest and to postpone indefinitely the reforms which the people have been promised.

If a plan doesn't materialize, that is, of course, supposed to be the fault of the "capitalist" countries. Hence it's necessary from the Moscow viewpoint to direct the finger of accusation constantly at the West—which is presumably seeking war or otherwise disturbing the even flow of welfare benefits inside the Communist countries.

The new 20-year plan announced by the Soviet Premier promises that two decades hence in Russia almost everything will be free—water, heat, gas, electricity, education, medical services, apartments, and transportation. Also, taxes are to be abolished and meals will be free during working hours.

There is, however, one big fly in the ointment. Everything is to be free except life itself. In a jail, too, things are free—including food, light, heat, and rent. Taxes also are abolished, because there is no income.

The 20-year plan does not say a word about freedom from enslavement. There still is to be no such thing as free speech, free assembly, a free press, and freedom of worship. In other words, the human mind is to be kept under duress—in prison—indefinitely. The emphasis instead is on material things—as if spiritual things are of no significance. This concept, however, is the essence of communism.

There is another fallacy of gross proportions in the 20-year plan. Who is to produce all the goods? Who is to raise all the food? The Soviet people—of course—but they are to be rewarded only as the state sees fit. Up to now the slogan of the Communist Party has been: "From each according to his abilities; to each in accordance with his work." Now this has been amended in the 20-year plan to read: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

This means that the central government decides what are the "needs" of each individual. Can human needs—material and spiritual—be standardized? Can all minds be made to conform to "need" only what the government says each person must accept as its measure of human comfort?

In order, of course, to show how hard it is to put the plan into effect, the Communist leaders are already pointing to the Western countries as obstacles. The Soviet Premier attributes all sorts of hostile motives to other nations and arrogates to himself the role of a virtuous and peaceful world leader.

The 20-year plan, set forth in a 55,000-word document, is the first major program of the Communist Party produced since Lenin's program of 1919. It is full of bitter denunciation of the system of free enterprise in the West. No mention is made, on the other hand, of the high standard of living of the 180 million people in the United States or of the rapid progress being made today in Western Europe, which, in the 16 years since the close of World War II, has experienced unprecedented economic growth and better conditions of living for the masses than ever before known on the continent.

It is the Communist strategy to attempt to tear all this down with sweeping phrases of derogation, but the truth does travel by word of mouth across the boundary lines, and, despite the suppression of newspapers and radio, it does spread. There is, indeed, behind the Iron Curtain today considerable information as to how well Americans and Western Europeans really live.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." That's the real dilemma which the Soviet regime faces as it issues a smokescreen of thousands of words in the new 20-year plan. It leaves unanswered the $64,000 question: "How is it going to be possible to carry out a 20-year plan of free grants of everything if there is to be a nuclear war that destroys it all in just a few hours or days of missile-fire?"

Maybe Mr. Khrushchev is even more sensitive as a politician than he has been reported to be—for he knows his biggest potential enemy is a restless and desperate people inside the Soviet Union, and that a nuclear war, or a conventional war, can bring to Russia another revolution such as occurred in 1917, when the army joined the people in demanding an end to war.

There is a glimmer of hope for world peace in all this—if Mr. Khrushchev really is determined to accomplish even a small part of his 20-year plan. For he cannot achieve utopia if he has to keep on building an expensive armament machine to back up his perennial threats of war.

Khrushchev's Reply Evaluated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, with the Berlin crisis dominating much of our thinking today, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to two penetrating analyses of Premier Khrushchev's Berlin speech which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post and New York Times.

Each of these analyses points out several important omissions in the Russian leader's speech as well as the hopeful signs it contains, and I believe that they are valuable to us in keeping this vital problem in perspective.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1961]

DAMPING THE FLAMES

It is strange indeed for the man who started the Berlin crisis 3 years ago with an ultimatum now to be accusing the West of using the same tactic. Nevertheless, Mr. Khrushchev's much-advertised fireside chat yesterday was more conciliatory than might have been expected after the beautifully timed Soviet space feat. His concern about military hysteria and threats from the United States, and his call for negotiations on Berlin, are an oblique indication that President Kennedy's recent speech was understood in Moscow.

Mr. Khrushchev's forensic endeavors rarely fit a simple classification, and this was no exception. There was considerable bluster along with the honey. Insofar as his words can be taken literally, however, it was reassuring for him to say that there will be no Communist blockade of Berlin and no interference with Western rights. He had a point, too, in his discussion of the danger of a "war psychosis."

How this squares with the observation in other day by the Communist boss of East Germany, Walter Ulbricht, that he might try to close Tempelhof Airport, which is the lifeline of West Berlin, was not explained. Mr. Khrushchev could not resist another attempt to divide the allies or to blame the whole problem on West Germany. He conveniently neglected to mention that the defense increases in the United States which he criticized came only after the announcement of a Soviet buildup. It was particularly frustrating to have him declare piously:

"It is the Communists who want to exclude war between states from human life. This is the essence of the Soviet proposals on universal and complete disarmament."

This from the leader of the country that has torpedoed the negotiations for an enforceable nuclear test ban, that has blocked all efforts to reduce the danger of surprise attack, that blockaded Berlin in 1948, that helped unleash the war in Korea, that fueled the war in Laos and that is a close ally of the country encroaching upon India's borders. War is excluded, it seems, only if others do not resist Soviet ambitions.

But consistency never has been a requirement of Soviet propaganda. It now is evident that the Kremlin is embarked upon a massive campaign to switch the responsibility for the tension over Berlin to the Western refusal to sign a peace treaty with East Germany. If we let him get away with this it will be our own fault.

Meanwhile, though, the significant thing is that Mr. Khrushchev has backed away from some of his earlier militance and has invited discussions about Berlin. This may serve to damp down the threat of war—provided that the West couples its current defense preparations with equally careful diplomatic preparations.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1961]

KHRUSHCHEV'S REPLY

After a massive build-up that included a spectacular astronautical feat and a Moscow "summit" meeting with his east European satellites, Premier Khrushchev has now delivered a double-barreled reply to President Kennedy, in which he mingles peaceful professions with even more dire threats.

On the one hand the Soviet ruler, who precipitated the whole Berlin crisis, presumes to hammer at open doors by urging the Western Powers to "sit down honestly at a round conference table," to avoid a "war psychosis" and to "clear the atmosphere" by "relying on reason, not nuclear arms." That is exactly what the Western Powers ask the Soviet Premier to do, and do with more honesty and reasonableness than the Soviets have displayed in the innumerable fruitless conferences since the war.

On the other hand, the Soviet ruler announces that, in addition to the military measures he has already taken, he may mobilize more reserves and move more troops to his western frontier, and that he is developing rockets to destroy the United States and its allies. He couples to this threat a warning to the neutrals as well. He professes to do all this in reply to Western political, military, and economic preparations to resist his threatened attempt to drive them from West Berlin.

But he goes far beyond that. He accuses the United States and its allies, especially West Germany, all of whom are willing to live with the present abnormal situation, of plotting aggressive war and charges that their real purpose is to destroy the Socialist system, meaning communism, everywhere.

The Soviet Premier again asks the Western Powers to negotiate for their surrender on his terms—namely, a peace treaty with a divided Germany and their withdrawal from a demilitarized and neutralized free city of West Berlin, which would mean the early end of the North Atlantic Alliance. If the West rejects this scheme, as it is pledged to do, he proposes to make his own peace with his East German agents and put Berlin's lifelines under their control.

Certain passages in his speech and in Sunday's Moscow communique need further exploration. Both say that the matter of access to West Berlin will have to be settled by agreement with the East German agents. But neither says in so many words that these agreements must be made by the Western Powers. The communique suggests that the provisions for unhindered access to West Berlin are to be part of the separate peace treaty, and the Soviet ruler reiterates that "any blockade of West Berlin is entirely out of the question."

If that is so, if Premier Khrushchev makes recognition of Western rights in Berlin a part of his peace treaty and an obligation on both the Soviets and the East German regime, the Western Powers cannot object as long as these provisions are observed. Therein may lie a way out of the immediate crisis for both Premier Khrushchev and for the West.

National Milk Sanitation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of adequate uniform standards of sanitation for milk, in my judgment, would serve not only the interests of the dairy industry, but the American consuming public.

It is also important also to attempt to assure that differing standards do not obstruct the flow of milk in interstate commerce.

For this reason, I cosponsored S. 212, proposing the establishment of such milk sanitation standards.

Currently the measure is pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. As yet, no action has been scheduled on it. Fortunately, the House of Representatives Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has held initial hearings and according to present plans additional hearings will be held later this month.

Recently, I was privileged to receive views presented by Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative—one of the most outstanding farm organizations—on the National Milk Sanitation Act. Believing these astute observations deserve the consideration of not only the committees but of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Milo K. Swanton, a dairy farmer and executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative; a federation of 91 farmer cooperatives in Wisconsin. The dairy section, which is a division of our council of agriculture, includes 39 major dairy marketing associations that are farmer owned and controlled. Both collective bargaining and dairy processing types are included. Together they process or bargain for 65 percent of our State's annual 18-billion-pound production.

The area of regulation with which this proposed legislation deals has a significant effect on the dairy industry of Wisconsin. Hence our people, particularly our dairy farmers and their dairy marketing cooperatives have had a deep interest in this kind of legislation for a long time. Our organization has been on record for the past 4 years, by resolutions, in support of such measures.

Our interest is economic in nature. The nature of our economic interest in these bills, that pertain to sanitation and public health relative to interstate movement of milk, is quite similar to the interests of dairy people in many sections of this country. However, Wisconsin's interests may be broader due to the size of our industry and is more varied because of the wide ramifications of our diverse dairy programs of production, marketing and processing.

We recognize the basic importance of adequate supervision and regulation. We insist that the health and welfare of America's consumers must be protected by insuring sanitary qualities in milk. Back in 1957 in our State, we producers supported the enactment of a State law that required, after July 1, 1959, that all fluid milk in packaged form must meet the grade A regulations of the State or its municipalities. In connection with quality improvement in milk production and handling have been our programs to eradicate animal diseases communicable to man.

Our farmers and their dairy plants have teamed up with the State Department of Agriculture and with Public Health authorities in a concentrated effort to control tuberculosis in cattle. With the incidence of tuberculosis brought down to four one hundredths of one percent, our State for some time has been accredited by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a T.B. free area. Likewise the Federal department has also recognized our State as an accredited brucellosis free area in as much as the incidence of that disease in Wisconsin has dropped to much less than 2 percent herd infection.

We believe these facts show the willingness and the spirit of our people in producing clean wholesome milk. Furthermore they prove that health essentials are remarkably well cared for in a highly concentrated dairy producing region. They also show that the provisions of the Recommended Milk Ordinance and Code would be sufficient to control the production of wholesome and safe milk if utilized as indicated in the "National Milk Sanitation Act" now under consideration.

It is significant that Wisconsin has participated in the work of the National Conference of interstate milk shipments. It supports the policy of reciprocity of inspection and accepts milk from certified plants in neighboring states.

Arguments have been advanced in previous years against this type of legislation to the effect that consumers have more confidence in milk supplies under local regulation. It should be pointed out that in the legislation before you, inspection and approval is still a local responsibility. The great volume of intra-state operations is not involved. But if such arguments are raised in connection with interstate business, the objections are phoney in that consumers normally are not aware of the level of inspection authority, unless the local economic interests of the dairy industry involved seek to propagandize them so as to wall out competition on the local market.

Everyone grants the need for adequate sanitary protection of milk supplies. The legislation before you recognizes this need in the basic requirements of the U.S. Public Health Standards, Model Ordinance and Code. In fact, there is no substantial evidence to show that state or local regulations in excess of that code have demonstrated any significant superiority in milk quality from a public health point of view.

Thus it appears logical that excesses in regulation have been practiced for other reasons. The requirement that a lane must lead to a cow yard separated from the barn, and the requirement that all fluid milk producing farms must install pipe line milking facilities cannot be justified health-wise. The additional cost of such requirements both in time and labor must be reflected in higher milk prices to be borne by consumers.

Unreasonable and unnecessary requirements are restrictive and result in misallocation of resources within the dairy industry. Many years ago certain plants in Northwestern Wisconsin were assured a market for cream shipments into the Ardmour district of Philadelphia. They went to the cost and trouble of meeting abnormally strict farm and plant sanitary requirements. In short they made extensive investments on farms and in plants. In subsequent years their eastern outlet was lost. The point is that if the requirements had been reasonable, even though the market might have been lost, then these producers would not have been the victims of such mal-use of capital outlay.

Prices to consumers, accelerated because of restrictions that cannot be justified on a sanitary basis, tends to restrict consumption. Such restriction of use can be a far more significant handicap to health than the alleged health dangers that such restrictions were supposed to correct.

From the standpoint of market efficiency, consumers pay a very high price when health regulations are used for the purpose of establishing local milk marketing monopolies. The higher prices that must be received by producers often tends to build up excess production, with the result that fluid milk shed surpluses mount and the resultant low surplus price, in effect, tends to cancel out the sought-for economic gain that was originally intended.

On many occasions Wisconsin plants have dispatched tank loads of milk, under health permit for a distant market, only to have it rejected upon arrival based on some ridiculous technicality in regard to quality. The shipper then faced the problem of disposing as best he could at a fraction of the fluid price which would not cover the long haul cost or pay for the return long haul loads to Wisconsin. Significantly in some of these cases, the milk on arrival back at the point of origin was examined and found to have suffered no bacterial deterioration, even after 5 days on the road.

Because of such situations many of our plants have chosen to forego shipments with markets where such problems have been encountered. The loss on a single shipment

so handled can easily amount to $500. This our milk producers who are already receiving low prices, cannot afford.

The methods often used in granting and handling out-of-State permits for shipping milk into some areas are unduly restrictive to interstate commerce. Health permits are often on a temporary basis. Sometimes permits cost $300 to $400.

We believe that such unnecessary restrictive processes involving interstate shipments of milk would be effectively dealt with under the provisions of the National Milk Sanitation Act as outlined in the bills before you. Your responsibility in the regulation and safe facilitating of interstate commerce will be discharged constructively in the passage of this type of legislation.

We of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative and the Dairy Marketing Associations affiliated in our dairy section, sincerely urge your favorable consideration and support in passing the proposed National Milk Sanitation Act.

Doubts on Soviet Space Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. David Lawrence appeared in the Washington Star of August 8.

Mr. Lawrence poses some very practical and interesting questions on the latest Russian claims as to the circling of the earth by Maj. Gherman Titov.

Mr. Speaker, is it not remarkable that Russia is always there with a scientific achievement of great magnitude just at the right moment? Is it not quite wonderful that no one, apparently, ever sees the takeoff or landing of the astronaut? And, finally, Mr. Speaker, is it not just possible that we are a little gullible, and that there may still be some reasonable doubt about the accomplishments?

DOUBTS ON SOVIET SPACE FLIGHT—RUSSIAN SECRECY ON NEW EARTH ORBITING CALLED BASIS OF POSSIBLE HOAX

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—Until and unless the Soviet Union allows disinterested scientists and members of the press from other countries to witness the ascent into and descent from space of astronauts aboard satellites that circle the earth, the alleged exploit of Gherman Titov must remain a matter of doubt. It could have been the hoax of all times.

For everything that has been reported from Moscow and from other countries about conversations by radio to and from the satellite itself could have been reproduced artificially by tape recordings in advance without the actual presence of any astronaut aboard during the flight.

Indeed, a Reuters News Service dispatch from Cape Canaveral, Fla., on Sunday contains this significant paragraph about an American space project:

"A 2-ton Project Mercury capsule, it is hoped, will be launched into a single orbit by an Atlas rocket this month. This capsule will contain an 'artificial astronaut,' a 'crewman simulator' which will 'breathe, sweat and talk.'"

The foregoing experiment, if successful, is to be followed later by a manned capsule sent into orbit by the United States. But the press of the world will be invited to see the launching and the return and to hear the uncoded reports from the spaceship.

In attempting to get ahead of America, the Soviets may well have "simulated" the whole flight. It seems incredible, for instance, that Titov would actually sleep 8 hours while engaged on such a hazardous and momentous undertaking wherein every minute, it may be assumed, would require him to be alert to see that nothing went wrong mechanically.

It doesn't seem possible that the astronaut, who is but 26 years old and supposed to be in the air only 25 hours, would waste any of those hours in sleep, or that he really could be so calm as to drop off into slumberland at the appointed time with the greatest of ease. In fact, the Moscow report said that by prearrangement he was supposed to sleep only 7½ hours, but extended his slumbers by 37 minutes.

This recess, incidentally, afforded an opportunity for complete silence in communications while the satellite was supposedly over certain parts of the globe. Whatever messages came from the ship and were heard at all could easily have been taped beforehand and broadcast from the satellite. It is significant that nobody but the Russian ground staff could communicate with the satellite during its flight and that no conversations from outside Russia were permitted. There were no television reels shown in Russia of pictures taken at the beginning or ending of the flight, though even these could also have been taped beforehand. A Moscow dispatch by Reuters says:

"Details of the landing were not disclosed immediately, but it was believed the spaceship came down suspended from parachutes. The procedure involves the firing of a retrorocket to take the ship out of its orbit and head it back to earth. There is also an alternative method whereby Titov could be ejected in an emergency and descend in his space suit by parachute."

All this is the kind of hazardous performance which, in the case of American astronauts Shepard and Grissom, the press and its photographers were able to witness. Television cameras at once gave the entire world a bona fide movie of what was happening in both instances. Why, then, did the Soviets prefer to do it all in secrecy? A United Press International dispatch from Moscow says: "Western observers were not permitted to witness Titov's takeoff or landing."

The claim was made in one of the Moscow dispatches that television cameras, presumably aboard the satellite, were sending back pictures of Titov in flight. But these pictures could, of course, have been made before the ship left the ground.

Many similarities between the alleged flights of Gagarin and Titov were noted in Moscow press dispatches. The first thought of both astronauts was to send greetings to the Central Committee of the Communist Party and to Premier Khrushchev. The messages were obviously prepared ahead of time for propaganda purposes.

Plans are being made already to send Titov as a good-will ambassador on trips to other countries. The flight itself was timed to coincide with the meeting of the Western Foreign Ministers at Paris, and has all the aspects of a propaganda stunt, cleverly conceived and executed.

There is no reason to accept as a scientific fact that Titov made the flight—though the spaceship, with recordings aboard for intermittent radio transmission, may well have been functioning as it circled the earth.

The Russians do not hesitate to lie or forge official documents or to fake stories of episodes for propaganda purposes. Despite the skepticism that resulted from the contradictions in the Gagarin story, the Communists have dared again to ignore the press of the free world on the Titov demonstration. Scientists would gladly have come from Western countries to witness the ascent of an astronaut in or descent from an earth-girdling satellite—if such an event really took place in Russia.

A Liberal Arts College Advocates Public Enrichment Through Public Endowment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leavitt Barker, a distinguished attorney of my congressional district, has sent me a statement on Federal aid to higher education by the Beloit College Board of Trustees, of which he is a member. The statement is the result of several months of study and is as objective and balanced a view as I have seen. It recognizes that there may be certain defense needs that only the Federal Government may provide for in time. But it pleads for private support as the best long-term way to build good education and urges that where Federal aid must be given, it should be to individual students, rather than to individual institutions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement:

STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF BELOIT COLLEGE ON FEDERAL AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., is a private, undergraduate, coeducational, liberal arts college with an enrollment of about 1,000 students. Responsibility for its destiny and the quality of its service to society has been vested legally in a self-perpetuating board of trustees of 30 individuals by the State of Wisconsin under a charter granted in 1846. This board feels it is appropriate to establish its position with regard to the current public policy issue of Federal aid to higher education, for it feels that its own vital responsibility can be seriously affected by such policy and the form it may take. The term Federal aid to higher education in the context of this statement has reference only to gifts and loans made by the Federal Government to individuals and degree-granting institutions engaged in education beyond the high school.

We believe that Beloit College's commitment to public enrichment through private endowment throughout its 115 years of existence is in keeping with a basic and critical demand of our society. Private philanthropy is an essential element of a free society, for unless the citizens accept voluntarily their social responsibilities along this line they forfeit their opportunity to be free. Accordingly, public policy should encourage voluntary private support of higher education rather than drift toward ever greater reliance on compulsory governmental support.

We believe that a unique and highly constructive attribute of American higher education is its diversity of control. We value highly in particular the dual system of State tax-supported and private institutions. Competition among educational institutions is essential to quality, for it is the wellspring

of initiative and innovation. The more higher education receives its support from the Federal Government, the more it will become subject to influence and control by that source, and the more its product will become homogeneous and bland in nature.

We believe that the compulsory channeling of the public's funds to higher education through an extensive Federal program is generally not only dangerous public policy for reasons already given but is also circuitous and wasteful. There is only one source of funds for education or any public welfare expenditure; this is the income and wealth of the private citizen. What varies is the manner in which his resources can be made available. They can be paid directly to education in the form of tuition and fees. They can be given to educational institutions through gifts, grants and bequests. They can be collected through local and State taxes and turned over to individuals and educational institutions. Or they can be collected through Federal taxes and distributed to individuals and institutions. This Federal approach is ordinarily the most roundabout and dangerous; for the taxing authority is most remote from the source of funds, and control over the use of funds is centralized in one authority rather than dispersed among 50 States or a multiplicity of individual citizens and institutions.

On the basis of the foregoing statements it is clear that we are strongly opposed in principle to a general program of Federal aid to higher education. However, we recognize that the national interest is sometimes directly tied to the quantity and quality of certain programs and activities in higher education. Only the Federal government is able to determine these effectively and therefore is the appropriate agency for providing the initiative and encouragement needed. For example, military preparedness calls for substantial basic and applied research; effective international relations are aided by facility in foreign languages on the part of many of our citizens; and having an adequate supply of good teachers is a concern that extends beyond the bounds of any one State or the walls of any one institution. Federal support of such specific programs may be justifiable, but in every such case the special relevance to the total national interest needs to be clearly demonstrable. We believe that with all such support the purpose to be achieved and the operating procedures to be followed should be clearly defined by statute.

We are aware of the fact that the welfare of our Nation and civilization at large is critically dependent upon an unprecedented rate of increase in the quantity and quality of higher education in this country in the years ahead. It is reasonable under such circumstances to be apprehensive that the funds needed for such may not be forthcoming. In the presence of such anxiety, we are inclined unthinkingly to turn to the centralized coercive power of the Federal government to attain the end. But we must oppose such temptation lest we destroy by such action the very character of our society related to individual freedom and initiative which we want to preserve and foster through our higher education.

Should general support of higher education by the Federal Government be expanded as public policy despite our plea to the contrary, we urge that collateral measures be adopted which will encourage private giving and will support institutional diversity. In particular, we would favor tax programs which provide some relief to those who pay for education directly through tuition and fees. Also, we would support additional tax benefits to those who contribute directly to education through gifts and grants to particular institutions. Expansion of these tax inducements to private support of higher education could well be relied upon as alternatives to a massive Federal support program.

If outright grants of Federal funds are to be made, we urge that they be made to individual students rather than to individual institutions. Such a program has the advantage of letting the individual choose his own institution, thus stimulating healthy competition among a wide variety of separately controlled institutions. If grants of Federal funds are to be made generally to institutions of higher learning, we urge that the allocation of such grants be removed as much as possible from political influence by the interposition of some intermediate body similar to the National Science Foundation Board.

We recognize fully the burden of our own responsibility to this whole situation which our position as trustees of Beloit College imposes upon us. In evidence thereof we enthusiastically reaffirm our commitment to the principle of public enrichment through private endowment. And we pledge our full support to the continued strengthening of Beloit College in particular and higher education in general.

Siegrist and the News: Communist Propaganda—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Bob Siegrist, with radio station WAIT in Chicago, is not only an outstanding newscaster, but is equally efficient in uncovering the news as he is in reporting the facts.

Mr. Siegrist recently brought to light a situation at the Chicago International Trade Fair where he found that pamphlets which "have nothing to do with trade or commerce" were passed out at the exhibit by Communist Yugoslavia.

I am pleased to state that Mr. Robert C. Mudd, with the Balkans desk at the State Department, told a member of my staff this morning that the FBI had sent copies of the aforementioned pamphlets to his desk for screening. Mr. Mudd emphasized that the trade fair most certainly would not be the proper place for the distribution of propaganda and he would coordinate a review of the material with the Justice Department at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to check once again with Mr. Mudd later in this week concerning the Yugoslav exhibit, and it is my hope that the matter will have been resolved without any delay. There is some question in my mind as to whether there should be any trade promotion whatever between the United States and Soviet bloc countries. The Congress has just reemphasized its policy with respect to agricultural trade and it is now an adopted course of action to promote agricultural trade only with friendly nations.

Bob Siegrist discussed this conflict of policy in the following broadcasts which I am inserting in three parts. Part I is an excerpt from his newscast of July 31, which I include herewith:

We believe that our listeners will find particularly interesting a development which has come to our attention in connection with the 1961 Chicago International Trade Fair. Sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, the fair is underway at Chicago's McCormick Place. One of the fair's exhibits is that of the Independence Hall Association, of Chicago. This is a nonprofit, educational organization which, founded by Dr. Sydney De Love, Chicago banker and author of the book, "The Quiet Betrayal," undertakes to enlighten our citizens, especially our young, regarding our American heritage, and to develop a keener appreciation for that heritage and the blessings of American citizenship. The association's endeavors have been recognized by 27 national awards from such organizations as Freedoms Foundation, the American Legion, AMVETS, State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States.

Among the association's exhibits at the International Trade Fair are priceless original American historic documents and State papers, including such things as the original signatures of the 44 signers of the Constitution of the United States. Also included are replicas of the Liberty Bell and the Declaration of Independence.

Across the aisle from this American patriotic exhibit is a much larger exhibit by Communist Poland. Down the aisle and across from the Red Polish exhibit is another large exhibit by Communist Yugoslavia.

Suffice to say, the Communist exhibits are dedicated to convincing Americans that trade with communism can be profitable, and can lead, somehow, to international peace. Toward that end, Communist products are shown, and colorful, illustrated literature is disseminated—over the counter of the booths—to all who will accept it.

Apparently appreciating that the U.S. Departments of State and Commerce, and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry accept that there should be certain limitations upon the propaganda disseminated, the Yugoslavian delegation has been disseminating other, hard-core Communist propaganda from the backroom of the exhibit.

This, of course, will unquestionably be denied by the Yugoslavian delegation. Knowledge of this fact may even be denied by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and by those persons who, for the association, are working to make the fair a great success; to, as one key fair official put it this morning, promote the theme of world peace through world trade—or to prove that (as one Chicago newspaper reporter wrote, yesterday): "There are no barriers to friendship and understanding," at this gigantic exposition.

In substantiation of this report, this reporter has before him nine separate publications by the Tito-run Communist Yugoslavian regime which have been made available by the Yugoslavian delegation to its backroom visitors who, in quiet conversations, have indicated an interest.

Here are the titles of those nine backroom handouts by the Yugoslav delegation:

"The League of Communists of Yugoslavia"; "Yugoslav Foreign Policy"; "Social and Economic System in Yugoslavia"; "Social Management in Yugoslavia"; "1,000 Facts About Yugoslavia"; "Economic Planning in Yugoslavia"; "The Economy of Yugoslavia"; "Workers Management in Yugoslavia"; "Condemnation of the Crime."

While all of these nine pamphlets, all published in English by the Tito regime's official publishing house in Belgrade, are completely Communist propaganda, and have nothing to do with trade or commerce, that ninth, "Condemnation of the Crime," is particularly inflammatory.

It contains 36 heavily illustrated pages in behalf of Tito regime propaganda in behalf of the Communist claim that Khrushchev's Congolese stooge, Patrice Lumumba, was murdered by the anti-Communist West.

Ironically and symbolically enough, while the Communists were passing out this backroom propaganda at the Chicago International Trade Fair last week, a representative

from Red Poland, was lodging a loud complaint with the management against the ringing of the Liberty Bell by children visiting the Independence Hall Association's exhibit.

Equally ironic was the fact that the management of the trade fair refused to permit the Independence Hall exhibit to feature copies of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's great book, "Masters of Deceit," which, of course, is a magnificent textbook on the truth of communism as communism is rather than as communism professes to be.

Meanwhile, the Yugoslav delegates were becoming aware of the fact that their clandestine propaganda activities had come to the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Consequently, it is now impossible, as best this reporter can determine, for anyone, however starry-eyed appearing, to obtain this backroom literature.

Meanwhile, this reporter has been advised that a list of names and addresses of many of the persons who visited that Yugoslavian backroom and who signed to receive more of this propaganda, has been brought to the attention of the proper authorities, and that the Department of State has today requested all information which this reporter has available be sent to them on the subject.

Among other things to be determined is whether this backroom operation constitutes a violation of American law, of diplomatic protocol and/or of any agreements under which the Yugoslavs have been permitted to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair.

Meanwhile, this reporter would commend the following to the attention of the sponsors of that fair:

That cliche about peace through trade is worse than phony—it's suicide.

One cannot truly engage in profitable trade with the enemy. Only this past weekend Khrushchev, as a matetr of top-level Communist policy, reiterated this fact as he reiterated his intention to bury us, via economic and commercial competition, if possible, and by nuclear attack if necessary.

It strikes this reporter as particularly strange that at this moment when the President of the United States has officially admitted that Khrushchev threat, at this moment when the President of the United States is preparing to call up at least a quarter-million reserves; at this moment when the President of the United States seeks authorization for an additional nine hundred and fifty-eight and a half million taxpayers dollars for military hardware with which to meet the Khrushchev threat; that anyone can insist upon being so totally naive as to believe that Khrushchev is fooling, that we can trade with Khrushchev. Sure we can trade profitably with Khrushchev—for Khrushchev.

In summation, we offer the following reminder from V. M. Lenin, founder of the Communist Party as it is known, and as it functions today:

"When the moment comes for the hanging of capitalism, the capitalists, themselves, will bid for the sale of the hemp."

People in the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, both in Washington and in the country, there is a great division of opinion on the destiny of the Peace Corps. Some say it is bound to be a colossal blunder, and others say it will be a great success. I think it could be either, and it depends almost entirely upon the quality of personnel to be selected. If the Peace Corps' representatives selected are dedicated individuals with a desire to give a couple of years just as a missionary gives time for a cause, if they are model individuals, and if they are humble servants who will use commonsense, the program will become the first really successful technique since point 4, designed to reduce world tensions. As is the case with the foreign-aid programs, it is only 10 percent law and 90 percent administration. We have found that there have been two kinds of people administering the foreign-aid program; namely, first, the dedicated; and, second, the mediocre, who merely want a salary. Country by country, the bad examples and failures have been where the mediocre and those lacking true dedication to the job were administering the program. While some good people may be eliminated because they serve without salary in the Peace Corps, it will eliminate the mediocre who merely want a salary. The fact that they have been flooded by applications of people who want to work without a salary indicates there is a reservoir of dedicated people available.

I spent last Saturday on the campus of Iowa State University with a group of men and women who are in training for a project on St. Lucia. I was very impressed with the caliber of persons in training. They have an orientation schedule consisting of 12 hours per day and 6 days per week and are obviously a dedicated group with an intense desire to give 2 years to the betterment of mankind and the removal of the causes of tension just as a missionary would give time to his church. It has become obvious that people throughout the world will sacrifice both peace and freedom from dictatorship for freedom from hunger. Wherever they secure freedom from hunger, they will consider independence a top national goal. Since nations that are hungry for a minimum standard of living represent the balance of political power in the world today and will represent the balance of economic power, their race to secure freedom from hunger before they lose independence may determine our future as well as their future. Thus, our future depends both upon our ability to protect ourselves and infant or weaker nations and upon reducing the productivity lag of relatively undeveloped nations. A Peace Corps of dedicated persons, though much less expensive for the American taxpayer than many mutual security projects, can be more effective.

I intend to closely follow the development of this program to see what kind of personnel are acquired. An article appearing in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of July 2, 1961, under the byline of Fletcher Knebel gives information on the person selected to head the program, R. Sargent Shriver, and I expect to have information later on other personnel. Following is the article on Mr. Shriver:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, July 2, 1961]

"SARGE" SHRIVER: IDEALIST OF THE KENNEDY CLAN

(By Fletcher Knebel, of the Register's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A modern St. George, once more reluctant than the dragon, is seeking to slay American fears and apprehension about a much-publicized venture—the Peace Corps.

He is R. Sargent Shriver, 45-year-old brother-in-law of President Kennedy, Director of the Peace Corps, a man known as the idealist of the vast Kennedy clan.

An unlikely combination of good works, dedication, and shrewd politics, Shriver is a handsome 6-footer, weighing a trim 175 pounds. His black hair, flecked with gray, his brown eyes, and his animated profile provide a combination that makes grown women melt upon sight.

FERVENT TONE

On the job, he is an inexhaustible generator of energy who tends to infuse those about him with sparks of the cause. He speaks swiftly, brimming with ideas and enthusiasm, often poking with his right forefinger in the manner of President Kennedy.

On the propaganda stump for his project, he is a combination John Wesley, Billy Graham, and Dr. Tom Dooley.

He manages to inject pitches of fervor in his conversational tone that leaves even semihostile audiences feeling as though they'd just come out of church.

BLUNT ANALYSIS

The other night in Atlantic City, N.J., where he spoke to the section of the National Education Association, he was introduced by William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA, as a man who could preside over one of America's "most smashing failures or one of its shining successes."

Shriver put it more bluntly to President Kennedy when Mr. Kennedy asked him to take charge of the Peace Corps after Shriver turned in a task force report pronouncing the project feasible.

"Mr. President," he said, "this could either be the worst boondoggle in history or a real going outfit. I'll try to make it a going outfit."

Although the Corps outwardly appears to be off to a modest but solid start, Shriver has no illusions.

"I'm a pessimist by nature," he says, "and this thing has hundreds of unsolved problems still ahead."

STRIVES FOR GOOD RACIAL RELATIONS

Off the job, which isn't often, Shriver has a zestful, light-hearted approach to life. He cusses moderately, laughs frequently, plays fast tennis, and throws himself into the family life of the Kennedys.

In the field of good works, he believes in practicing what he preaches. In addition to their own three children, he and Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver have two 16-year-old foster daughters whom they plucked from the slums of Chicago. Another foster daughter is now married.

All his life he has tried to make good racial relations a personal reality. He grew up playing with Negro children near Westminister, Md., and in Chicago he was the driving force of the Catholic Inter-Racial Council.

He and Mrs. Shriver always have entertained Negroes in their home as a matter of course.

As president of the Chicago school board, he was distressed at animosity between the races and did his best to take practical steps to ease tension and increase understanding.

GOOD POLITICS, TOO

Kennedy aids credit Shriver with the smartest move of the Kennedy-Nixon campaign, John F. Kennedy's phone call to Mrs. Martin Luther King, when the fiery Negro preacher had been jailed in the Georgia State prison.

At the time, Shriver suggested the call as the "natural and humanitarian thing to do." He also felt it was good politics.

The Kennedy campaign crew was in the O'Hare Inn after a tour of the Chicago suburbs about 2 weeks before election day. Shriver and Harris Wofford, now a White House aid, decided that somebody in the Kennedy party ought to call Mrs. King.

FEARED A VETO

Shriver copied down Mrs. King's number on a slip of paper and waited in Kennedy's suite until other campaign aids were busying themselves in another room. He feared that if he made the suggestion with them present they might try to veto it.

"I think you ought to call Mrs. King," said Shriver.

Kennedy went to the window, thought for a few second, then wheeled and said: "OK, but who's got her number?"

Shriver grinned. "I just happen to have it with me," he said.

For several days Shriver was the center of staff controversy. Some heatedly declared that he had lost the election for Kennedy by urging a move that would lose the South. Shriver merely argued that the call was right and the right can't be bad politics.

Shriver turned out to be correct. Kennedy received a topheavy majority of the Negro vote. In Illinois, which Kennedy took by fewer than 9,000 votes, Shriver printed 1,500,000 leaflets describing Kennedy's stand on civil rights—and his call to Mrs. King—and circulated them to almost every Negro home and gathering place in the State.

CAUGHT THE EYE OF JOE KENNEDY

Born on a farm near Westminister, Md., November 9, 1915, Shriver was prepared as a boy for the clanlike life of the Kennedys. Five families of Shrivers, part Lutheran and part Catholic, lived within a mile of each other and shared a common swimming hole. Family picnics would fetch as many as 150 Shrivers.

His mother was Catholic and his father an Episcopalian who became a convert to Catholicism.

The elder Shriver owned a cannery, and Shriver earned 20 cents an hour working cutters, shredders and other machines in the plant.

He attended parochial school, then the Canterbury School in Connecticut, and finally Yale University, where he played baseball, ran the Yale Daily News and was graduated with honors. He also was graduated from the Yale Law School.

AT GUADALCANAL

He spent 4 years in the Navy. As a fledgling gunnery officer of the U.S.S. South Dakota, he was aboard the battleship during the night battle of Guadalcanal when the ship was hit 115 times in a vicious point-blank range fight with Japanese surface craft, including battleships.

He transferred to submarines, and one war patrol put him off Tokyo Bay for almost 2 months before the sub cruised off upper Japan to sink what little Japanese shipping was left.

After the war, during a year he spent working as a production editor on Newsweek, he met Joseph P. Kennedy.

The Irishman with the Midas touch took a liking to Shriver and made him assistant manager of the Merchandise Mart in Chicago with instructions to turn the deficit of that largest private office building in the world into a paying proposition. That Shriver and his coworkers did.

KENNEDY AS CUPID

Eunice Kennedy was then working in a new juvenile delinquency bureau of the Justice Department in the Truman administration. From her stories, Joe Kennedy got the idea the unit was poorly managed and he "loaned" Shriver to the unit to put it on an efficient basis. Shriver stayed at the job 15 months.

There is also a suspicion that Joe Kennedy was placing an extremely eligible bachelor within working proximity of his daughter in hopes that romance would bloom.

At any rate, it did. They courted for some years before their marriage, May 23, 1953.

"I spent half my time courting Eunice in slums, prisons, and dope rehabilitation centers," says Shriver. "She is the most compassionate woman I know and she was always working on some project to help people.

"I had to wait 5 days at the Federal reformatory for women at Alderson, W. Va., to propose. She was down there on some kind of study and I went after her."

ORDERED TO HEAD PEACE CORPS

In Chicago, in addition to running the Merchandise Mart, the school board and the Catholic Interracial Council, Shriver found time for a variety of civic projects. Indeed in certain social work and educational circles, he was better known than his brother-in-law, Jack Kennedy.

He labored throughout the long primary campaigns for Kennedy, sweated out Negro and farm delegates at the convention and then headed the campaign drives in the Negro, business, and farm sections. He confesses he was far more successful with the Negroes than with businessmen and farmers.

Before the inauguration both Kennedy and Abraham Ribicoff, the new Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, wanted Shriver to become Under Secretary of the Department. Shriver turned it down flat.

"With Bob Kennedy as Attorney General," he told the President-elect, "it would be an awful mistake to make me a sub-Cabinet official."

On Inauguration Day, President Kennedy informed Shriver that he intended to announce establishment of a Peace Corps at once and he wanted Shriver to head it. Shriver demurred, but offered to head a task force to see if the idea was feasible.

COULDN'T HIT IT

For 3 weeks he worked in a room in the Mayflower Hotel with a group of professors and educators he had summoned to Washington. President Kennedy pestered him, couldn't understand what was taking him so long.

"But I couldn't sleep at night," says Shriver. "We couldn't come to grips with the thing. Here was a great, fine, beautiful idea, but we couldn't seem to get anything tangible or workable out of it."

Finally they hammered out the rough plan for a pilot program, quite restricted and with more controls than many had envisioned at the start. He submitted the report to Mr. Kennedy along with the names of five men fitted to head it. His name was not included.

ALMOST BELIEVE IN IT

But Mr. Kennedy refused to announce the establishment of the Peace Corps until Shriver agreed to take charge. In the end, he caved in. For 4 months now, he has been driving his staff and scurrying up to Congress to inject large doses of reassurance and confidence into the reluctant legislators.

Old bureaucrats in Washington find themselves being forced against their will into a belief the Peace Corps may succeed, thanks to Shriver's unflagging enthusiasm.

Says one: "On the first day with Sarge, you say what a pitchman. On the second day, you realize your're looking at sincerity and dedication. On the third, you come to believe in miracles and that somehow Shriver will make it work."

Shriver, himself, is a little too busy to be sure. In and out of his office flows a steady stream of the young, the hopeful, patriotic.

He thinks that's fine and he just hopes enough of them will still feel that way 2 years from now to make the Peace Corps a going outfit.

An article appearing in the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of August 2, 1961, under the credit line of Nick Baldwin gives information concerning the Peace Corps personnel in training at Iowa State University and other information relative to the project. Following is the article:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune, August 2, 1961]

EIGHTEEN ARRIVE FOR IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY PEACE CORPS—WILL TRAIN FOR WORK ON ISLAND

(By Nick Baldwin)

AMES, IOWA.—"I feel that people in the highly developed countries have lost a sense of purpose and think nothing of the intangibles.

"They only want to know what they will get out of this or that or what it will mean to them socially."

The speaker was Madge Shipp of Detroit, Mich., 1 of 18 Peace Corps volunteers to arrive Tuesday for a 4-week training course at Iowa State University here.

In the Peace Corps Miss Shipp saw an opportunity to get away from the materialism of everyday living and a chance to help where help is most needed.

"Scholarships have been given so people from underdeveloped countries might come to this country for study but that is not enough," she said.

THEIR LEVEL

"To benefit the masses we must go in the field and work with them and on their level," she said.

At 55, Miss Shipp is thus far the oldest volunteer to have been accepted for training by the Peace Corps.

In order to join, Miss Shipp is giving up a $6,600 contract with the Detroit school system, where she has been teaching on the elementary level for the past 20 years.

The 18 men and women who arrived Tuesday are being trained for work on St. Lucia, a West Indies island about 25 miles south of Martinique.

The St. Lucia project is being administered by Heifer Project, Inc., a nonprofit organization that distributes livestock and poultry to areas throughout the world where this help is needed.

Like her fellow volunteers, Miss Shipp is a college graduate.

SCIENCE DEGREE

She received a bachelor of science degree from Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti and in 1957 she decided to work for an advanced degree.

She worked nights and in her spare time and last year was awarded a masters degree in education from Wayne University in Detroit.

At Iowa State, the men and women will receive instruction in health education, soil technology, animal husbandry, poultry husbandry, horticulture, physical education, and American studies.

Lambros Comitas, from the department of anthropology at Columbia University, also arrived on the campus Tuesday and will lecture on the social and cultural history of the West Indies.

Following their training here, 12 from the group will be selected for the St. Lucia assignment and will receive further instruction at a training site in the West Indies Federation.

The remaining six either will be rejected and returned to their homes or assigned to other Peace Corps projects.

For two of the men, traveling to Iowa State was like homecoming.

George F. Askew, 22, of Hillsboro, son of a livestock and grain farmer, received his bachelor of science degree in agriculture and livestock here in June.

Rolfe A. Leary, 23, of Jesup received a bachelor of science degree in forestry at Iowa State in 1959.

PURDUE DEGREE

He went on to obtain a master's degree in forestry from Purdue University at Lafayette, Ind.

Askew said he considers the Peace Corps an ideal medium for a college graduate to make use of his recently acquired knowledge to help others.

During their 2-year stay on the island of St. Lucia, volunteers will receive $10 a month each for personal expenses.

Their room and board will be paid by Heifer Project, Inc., and their salary, $75 a month, will be banked for them in this country and they will not be allowed to draw on it until their return.

Robert Bryan of the Peace Corps public information office in Washington, D.C. said the purpose of curtailing funds is to discourage excessive spending during their 2-year stay in a foreign country.

"We want them to have decent housing and food but also we want them to live on a level with the people of St. Lucia with whom they will be working," he said.

Assignments awaiting the volunteers when they arrive in St. Lucia will include distribution of Heifer-donated poultry and livestock, help organize more 4–H clubs in the island, help establish an adult education system, work with a chain of medical aid stations and teach agricultural methods to young people.

The men and women are scheduled to fly to St. Lucia as a group about the middle of September.

At Iowa State, the volunteers are living and eating at the Memorial Union Building.

Minnesota Troops Reenact Bull Run Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently 50 young men from Minnesota and their officers came to Washington, D.C., to partcipate in the reenactment of the First Battle of Bull Run at the Manassas Battlefield in nearby Virginia.

Those participating in this historic reenactment included:

Lt. Col. George J. Pozzini, Capt. James B. Fleming, 1st Lt. Benjamin W. George, 1st Lt. Robert J. Reichow, 2d Lt. Roger G. Benson, P. Sgt. Jack C. Felix, Sp5. Hollis J. Seim, Sp4. Jerome J. Schmehl, Pfc. Terry P. Poierier, Pvt. Kenneth G. Tschida, all of Stillwater, Minn.

1st Lt. Lawrence F. McNamara, 2d Lt. Peter A. Fasbender, Sfc. Henry M. Gydesen, S. Sgt. Roger A. Myers, S. Sgt. Charles E. Peterson, Sgt. Robert L. Schroeder, all of Hastings, Minn.

1st Sgt. Clarence A. Loer, M. Sgt. William M. Gruenzner, M. Sgt. Kenneth B. Troke, P. Sgt. Robert H. Werner, Sgt. LeRoy F. Czaplewski, Sgt. Donald J. Wanek, all of Winona, Minn.

M. Sgt. Richard E. Betterly, Sfc. Rollie J. Dankers, Sfc. James W. Nash, Sgt. Gordon E. Riegelman, Sgt. Gordon M. Dankers, Sgt. Richard C. Strom, all of Red Wing, Minn.

Psg. David R. Zimmerman, 2d Lt. Roger A. Wohlers, Ssg. Don H. Hardacker, Ssg. Robert J. Steinbruckner, Sgt. Donald J. Cooke, Sp. Murray C. Applebaum, all of East St. Paul, Minn.

1st Lt. Vale C. Pengra, M. Sgt. Kenneth J. Eastlund, Sfc. Marvin W. Bohnen, S. Sgt. Raymond L. Corniea, Sgt. Glen A. Boland, Sp4. Dale A. Wicklund, all of West St. Paul, Minn.

2d Lt. Roger T. Nation, Sfc. Dale S. Sowers, Ssg. Marvin R. Dahl, Ssg. Thomas P. Young, Sgt. Darrel D. Upton, Sp4 Joel P. Miedtke, all of Minneapolis, Minn.

Sgt. Raymond E. Meschke, Sgt. Gerald W. Kokoschke, Sp4. Larry O. Twedt, Pfc. Richard J. Wolesky and Pvt. David A. Schultz, all of Faribault, Minn.

These young men are members of the 135th Infantry, Minnesota National Guard, which is the direct lineal descendant of the 1st Minnesota Regiment. The 1st Minnesota Regiment served with greatest courage and honor throughout the Civil War, taking part in most of the major battles.

As part of this regiment's record, Capt. James B. Fleming of Edina, Minn., compiled an account of the 1st Minnesota at the Battle of Bull Run for the information of his men, and I would like it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Captain Fleming's account follows:

FIRST MINNESOTA AT FIRST MANASSAS

(By Capt. James Fleming)

As we are winging our way eastward toward the Nation's capital it might be worthwhile to spend a little time thinking about the trip the 1st Minnesota made in June 1861. Let us go back 100 years and a month and spend a brief moment on the 1st Volunteers' journey to Washington, D.C.:

"At 5 o'clock on the morning of Saturday, June 22, the regiment was formed on parade ground at Fort Snelling preparatory to setting out for the front. Colonel Gorman reported its numerical strength to be 1,023, probably 900 men or more were in line. Religious services were held and a brief address by Chaplain E. D. Neill, learned scholar and divine, accomplished historian and earnest patriot. He cut the service short as the men were restless, and the good steamers *Northern Belle* and *War Eagle*, lying at the fort's wharf, just under the bluff, had steam up ready for departure" ("Minnesota Volunteer Infantry History," p. 24).

The 1st Minnesota, after a brief parade through St. Paul, headed down river to La Crosse and Prairie du Chien, Wis. The railroads ended at these two river towns. Neither town had a depot large enough to handle the entire regiment so the unit was split in half for its trip to Chicago. The regiment arrived in Chicago at 6 o'clock in the evening on the 23d of June. The unit then marched through the streets of Chicago to the Pittsburgh and Fort Wayne depot. They boarded the train for Harrisburg, Pa. at 10 o'clock that same evening. At 10 o'clock in the morning on the 25th the 1st arrived at Harrisburg.

The trip from Harrisburg to Washington was made in cattle cars. Prior to that the "1st" had been riding on first-class passenger cars. The men had to march through Baltimore to catch the train for Washington. Two months before, the 6th Massachusetts had marched through Baltimore and a terrible riot had taken place. The boys from the North Star State passed through without incident. The "1st" arrived in Washington at 10 o'clock in the evening on June 26, 1861.

The regiment was assigned to a camp located at Alexandria, Va. While training at Alexandria the regiment became part of its first brigade organization. With the 5th and 11th Massachusetts regiments and Battery I, 1st U.S. Artillery, it constituted Gen. W. B. Franklin's 1st Brigade of Gen. Samuel P. Heintzelman's 3d Division of General McDowell's Army of northeastern Virginia. All of the aforementioned officers were Regular Army officers with many years of experience.

About the time the 1st Minnesota arrived in Washington the stage was being set for the battle that was to follow at Manassas, Va. During the first half of July Confederate forces were taking positions in northern Virginia not 25 miles distant from Washington. Their main positions were located on a small stream known as Bull Run. The word "run" is a term native to certain parts of the South. It connotes a stream larger than a brook and smaller than a creek. Bull Run passes through the area of Manassas, Va.

Many reasons led to the bitter conflict at Bull Run. Many people in Washington, including President Lincoln, were very uneasy over the closeness of the Confederate Army. The President urged General McDowell to move out of the proximity of Washington and to do battle with the Confederate Army that was commanded at this time by Gen. Pierre Beauregard.

Another reason existed, and probably in the final analysis led to the battle. Most of the volunteers had enlisted for only 3 months. Their terms of enlistment were soon over.' Unless McDowell moved quickly he would have no army with which to move. It might be explained that the 3-month enlistments did not apply to the 1st. These men had enlisted for a 3-year period before they left Minnesota.

Therefore it was with considerable prodding that McDowell moved the Union Army out of Washington. He had pleaded with Lincoln that the troops were not sufficiently trained to enter combat but Lincoln informed him of the fact that the Southern Army was no better trained.

The Union Army moved down the Warrenton Turnpike toward Bull Run. The move started on the 16th of July. The march was slow inasmuch as the planning of the march was poor and march discipline was very bad, but gradually the Army neared the Confederate positions along Bull Run. By July 19 the 1st had reached Centerville, Va. They were at this time in the rear of McDowell's army. On July 21 Tyler's division started a demonstration against the Confederate positions at the Stone Bridge. This demonstration was to act as a ruse in order for the plan of McDowell to take shape.

Hunter's and Heintzelman's divisions moved down the Warrenton Turnpike until they reached the Cub Run bridge. At this point, behind the screen provided by Tyler's division, they were to move north through a small valley, cross Sudley's Ford and hit the left flank and rear of the Confederate Army. The whole march was about 15 miles in length. The 1st crossed the ford about 11:30 on the morning of the 21st.

Shortly after crossing the ford the regiment was ordered to support Rickett's Battery. To do this the 1st had to cross in front of the enemy's line for almost a mile until they marched into position on the brink of Henry Hill. They were at the extreme right flank of the Union Army. In order for the 1st to reach Henry Hill they first had to cross Young's Branch, a small tributary of Bull Run.

The New York Fire Zouaves had preceded them a few minutes before and had taken

a fierce beating at the hands of the Confederates. By the time the 1st had reached the position, quite a number of dead and wounded Zouaves lay about the area, certainly not a pleasant sight to the yet unblooded men from Minnesota. It was necessary for the regiment to split and allow the artillery to pass through thus supporting Rickett's Battery.

By the time the 1st reached the Henry House Plateau they were literally only yards from the Confederate positions. Because of their red shirts the 1st was not fired upon by the Confederates as they were thought to be the 4th Alabama. However, when a Colonel Boone of the Confederate Army rode into the Minnesota position to tell them not to fire on their friends he was immediately captured. This incident was observed by the Confederates who realized at once that they confronted the enemy and therefore let loose a fierce volley into the Minnesota lines.

To give one an idea of the closeness of the line, the Confederate Artillery was only 350 yards away from the Minnesota lines. The battle raged back and forth across the small plateau. One moment Rickett's Battery would be in the hands of the enemy and the next it would be retaken by the 1st. This happened several times until Colonel Gorman realized that he was vastly outnumbered and to continue the battle would only lead to the complete annihilation of the Minnesota regiment. He observed that the greater part of the Union forces were now withdrawing and so ordered the regiment to fall back. It might be noted at this point that of all the Union regiments retiring from the field of action, the First Minnesota had probably the most orderly withdrawal. It should be mentioned that throughout the entire engagement and all the way back to Sudley's Ford, the regiment fought in two distinct parts.

The men recrossed Young's Branch and marched northward on the Sudley Road. To illustrate how orderly the retreat was, it should be pointed out that the 1st followed the exact route back to the Warrenton Turnpike that they had taken that morning. Most units of the Union Army broke and ran taking the shortest route possible back toward Washington.

The regiment arrived in Centerville after dark that same day, tired and worn out. Besides fighting a fierce battle the unit had marched nearly 30 miles. Shortly after its arrival in Centerville, the regiment received orders to continue its march all the way back to Washington. The distance was 25 miles.

Briefly let us examine the cause of the Union defeat. Confederate Gen. Joseph E. Johnston arrived about noon on the 21st with 10,000 men. This part of the Confederate Army was to have been "bottled up" by a similar force under the command of General Patterson of the Union Army. General Patterson, completely inept, failed to even locate the Confederate force. As a result Beauregard's Army was reinforced at a critical moment, and the tide, which had been going with the Union, suddenly turned. Much has been said concerning the panic of the Union Army. No one can explain why these things happen. Most of you know something of mob psychology and this perhaps would explain part of the cause. Also many dignitaries from Washington, along with their families, had driven down to Bull Run to observe the battle and have picnic lunches. When the battle turned against the Union these people really hit the panic button and started a mad dash for Washington. The road was clogged for miles along Warrenton Turnpike. Needless to say this factor also added to the confusion.

The 1st Minnesota received some severe losses. The official war records show that the regiment had 42 officers and men killed and 108 officers and men wounded, thus totaling 150 officers and men killed and wounded. As near as one can tell from the records, the 1st Minnesota suffered the greatest losses in killed and wounded of all the regiments engaged.

When one compares the strength and losses of the two armies the following results are noted. The Union Army had a total strength of approximately 35,000. Of this number 5,000 saw no action. Four hundred and sixty Union soldiers were killed, 1,124 were wounded and 1,312 were captured or reported missing. The approximate strength of the Confederate Army by noon the 21st was 32,000. Three hundred eighty-seven were killed, 1,582 were wounded and 13 were captured or missing.

This should give you some insight of the unit you are representing. Wear your black hats jauntily, your red shirts and black trousers proudly, for you are representing truly one of the finest regiments that fought in the Civil War.

Siegrist and the News Communist Propaganda—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is part II of Bob Siegrist's newscast of August 1:

Yesterday, we reported that, last week, Communist Yugoslavia's delegates to Chicago's International Trade Fair had been distributing trade-and-commerce-type literature at their exhibit's front counter—and more hard core, non-trade-and-commerce-type Communist propaganda in the exhibit's back room.

We recited last night the names of nine of such printed-in-Belgrade propaganda pamphlets which had been placed in our possession.

We reported that, after the Yugoslav delegates became aware of the fact that their backroom activity had come to the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, they apparently halted that activity.

And we added that our report would "unquestionably be denied by the Yugoslav delegation," and that "knowledge of this fact (might) even be denied by the (Chicago) Association of Commerce and Industry, and by those persons for the Association who are working to make the fair a great success."

Thus, were we not a bit surprised then to read the following story on our United Press International newspaper wire this morning (we quote it in full):

"CHICAGO, August 1.—Officials of the Chicago International Trade Fair have denied a broadcaster's allegations that they ignored a 'backroom propaganda shop' at the Fair.

" 'The situation has been blown all out of proportion,' Ralph Bergsten, managing director of the fair, said last night.

"Bergsten said all goods and material displayed, sold or given away at the fair by foreign exhibitors had been inspected by the U.S. Customs Service.

"In a broadcast over two radio stations (WAIT in Chicago and WMIL–FM in Milwaukee) yesterday, commentator Bob Siegrist said the Yugoslav delegation to the fair was handing out Communist propaganda. Siegrist said fair officials did nothing about it because they 'were interested in not hurting the Fair.'

"Bergsten said he learned late last week that Yugoslav delegation was giving out literature to which some persons objected. He said he obtained a sample and telephoned the FBI.

" 'They (the FBI) asked me to mail the pamphlet to them and I did,' Bergsten said. 'To my knowledge that ended the affair and the matter is in their hands.'

"The fair manager said he received no further complaints about the literature.

"In his broadcast, Siegrist said Fair officials were aware of the 'clandestine literature' but did nothing about it."

(End quote the story by UPI, whose Chicago bureau we yesterday alerted in advance to the fact that we were going to deliver our report, and with whose Milwaukee reporter we discussed the matter during an interview last night).

In like vein, we were not surprised to find, in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which we had also alerted to our intention, a story, which, under the headline, "Reject Charge of Propaganda at Trade Fair," had this to say:

"Following a charge by a radio broadcaster that Communist propaganda was being distributed at the Yugoslavian exhibit at the Chicago International Trade Fair, fair officials said last night that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been in complete touch with the situation since the fair's opening day.

"They also said that no governmental exhibit is permitted at the fair without the prior approval of the State Department and the Commerce Department, and that both Departments had cleared the Yugoslav exhibit.

" 'Thus the fair, in effect, is implementing the official trade policies of the United States,' a spokesman for the fair said."

While this doesn't surprise us, we are not surprised either to learn of similar reports and denials in other papers this afternoon. We shall, for the moment at least, confine our attention to the UPI and the Tribune stories.

As regards the UPI story, we appreciate the attention which it gave our efforts but, in all respect to UPI, we are compelled to note that its lead, and its conclusion claim that we claimed that fair officials ignored the Yugoslav delegation's backroom propaganda activity.

As those who heard our yesterday's broadcast know, as our last night's scripts, and the tape recordings of that broadcast prove, we did not make that claim.

As for the UPI story's second paragraph quotation of the fair managing director, Ralph Bergsten, as saying "The situation has been blown all out of proportion," we challenge Mr. Bergsten now to specify, please, how that has been done and by whom? All we did was tell the truth. Since when did the truth blow things out of proportion?

As regards the UPI story's third paragraph statement:

"Bergsten said all goods and material displayed, sold, or given away at the fair by foreign exhibitors had been inspected by the U.S. Customs Service."

This is to report that at our request customs officials at the Port of Chicago today checked the list of the nine pamphlets which we reported as having come from the Yugoslav exhibit's backroom, then advised us later that none—none—of these nine pamphlets had been previously called to their attention at the Port of Chicago—that, prior to today, the Chicago customs men had assumed that they had prechecked all of the Yugoslav literature and, therefore, that customs agents had been asked to launch an investigation into how those nine pamphlets were brought into this country.

Medical Program for Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a statement by Mr. John M. Spindler, of Manitowoc, Wis., which I believe warrants the consideration of Congress, as well as of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The statement contains a proposal for assuring greater protection to seamen for treatment of sickness or injury.

We recognize, of course, that in consideration of matters relating to employer-employee relations, it is necessary to consider all sides of the question.

Because of my constituent's interest in revision of the law relating to medical treatment of seamen, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the statement, as well as the proposed amendment, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and proposed amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN M. SPINDLER

It has been long established in maritime law that in the absence of unusual circumstances, a seaman is obliged to seek out the nearest U.S. Public Health facility for the treatment of sickness or injury. If he unreasonably fails to do so, and even though his employer may be legally liable for the disability he is suffering, some cases have held that the employer is not responsible for paying for the seaman's care at the hands of private physicians and hospitals.

Today most maritime employers have hospital and accident insurance which insurance would pay for a seaman's care at a private facility whether his sickness or injury is work-related or not. Where such insurance is not a part of the employment contract, and the seaman is suffering from sickness (rather than from a work-related injury) I can see where the U.S. Public Health Service is the only care available to a seaman outside of him paying his own expenses.

However, where a seaman suffers a work-related injury, his employer should be obliged to take care of him. The old rule that the seaman must seek out the nearest U.S. Public Health facility is outmoded considering the fine modern hospitals and capable doctors which can be found at or near the seaman's residence. To require a seaman to travel to Chicago or Detroit (which I understand are the only two Public Health hospitals on the Great Lakes) for treatment of an injury caused by his employment is ridiculous in this day and age. The cost to the Government of assuming this burden of care which is properly the responsibility of the employer and his insurance carrier must be staggering.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 298 AND S. 1019

Add: "SEC. 3. Any person who has received a tortious or work-related injury and to whom hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment is available through a facility operated by the United States, is not obligated to use such facilities but may seek care and treatment at private hospitals or by private physicians and dentists and if a tort liability for said injury is established upon some third person or if work relationship can be shown the fact that the injured person did not obtain his care at facilities provided for by the United States will not prejudice said person's right of recovery against such third person or his employer for the cost of such private treatment and care in any State or Federal court."

Renumber section 3 as section 4 and section 4 as section 5.

At line 8, page 1 add: "or can establish work relationship upon his employer".

At line 3, page 2 add after "person", "or employer".

At line 9, page 2 add after "person", "or employer".

At line 21, page 2 add after "person", "or employer".

Address by Newton N. Minow, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Newton N. Minow, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, to the Conference on Freedom and Responsibility in Broadcasting, Northwestern University School of Law, Chicago, Ill., August 3, 1961:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE CONFERENCE ON FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY IN BROADCASTING, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 3, 1961

It was only 11 years ago that I sat in this room as a law student. I listened intently to dedicated professors who emphasized the meaning of a lawyer's responsibility and of public service. I took this teaching to heart and to mind. Through this school, I obtained my first job with a distinguished law firm founded by the man in whose memory this building is dedicated, Levy Mayer. Northwestern University Law School signally honored me by recommending me as a law clerk to the Chief Justice of the United States. Then my law professor, Carl McGowan, recommended me as an assistant to Gov. Adlai Stevenson. My debt to Northwestern is deep and enduring.

Since my days with the State government in Springfield, I've been fortunate enough to enjoy a most challenging and rewarding private practice, but last January I found the lure of another tour of government service irresistible.

Many of my professors and other students of this school have taken similar paths. My teacher, Nat Nathanson, now serves on the Council of the Administrative Conference of the United States. My teacher, Bill Cary, is now Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. My teacher, and former partner Bill Wirtz is now Under Secretary of Labor. Henry Geller is now Associate General Counsel of the FCC. George Ball is now Under Secretary of State. My teacher Fred Inbau has been a valuable consultant on Chicago's police problems. My teacher Walter Schaefer is now a justice of the Illinois Supreme Court. Otto Kerner is now Governor of Illinois. Dean Barrow is a distinguished legal scholar and consultant to the FCC. Arthur Goldberg is Secretary of Labor, and Governor Stevenson—an alumnus and teacher—represents us in the United Nations. And I could go on about this institution but I fear it would make Harvard jealous—and add to Yale's growing inferiority complex.

To my school and Professor Coons, I can only say "thank you." Now that I am a public servant, I'm afraid I cannot do as much any more for the alumni fundraising drives. But if Northwestern is interested in a television channel, or a stake in the world communications satellite, I wish you'd let me know.

I was invited to come to this Northwestern conference last February before I was even sworn in to my new job. Since then, lots of things have happened. A speech which I made last May received a very low rating with some broadcasters. The Commission has taken a series of actions which some broadcasters regard as intrusions into their private affairs. Conversely, many citizens have agreed with me that it was about time to inquire whether the public interest has been adequately served.

Perhaps the most controversial news just happened in the past 2 weeks. A television station dropped the "The Untouchables" from its schedule in favor of a better program balance, replacing it with the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. We can only speculate about the reaction of the television audience when they see what comes out of those violin cases.

So you see, things have changed since I accepted your invitation. Broadcasting magazine had this to say about this conference in its July 24 issue:

"From a standing start a few weeks ago unusual interest suddenly is being manifested in the symposium on broadcasting at Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago next month.

"The reason isn't difficult to discern. Broadcasting has been subjected to unprecedented criticism and the regulatory vise has tightened in the intervening weeks. The symposium, which first had the aspect of a prosaic, legalistic study of communications history now is being built up as a historic debate on freedom and responsibility of broadcasting—mainly television."

Perhaps this may be a historic debate, but I assure you I have not come here to create sensations nor to seek headlines. My own views and philosophy about broadcasting have received wide exposure. This position has been attacked as censorship—despite my specific statement in that May speech as follows: "I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship. There will be no suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes. Censorship strikes at the taproot of our free society."

Nevertheless, the censorship alarm has been sounded, or shouted, or whispered, or printed, and so I want to take this opportunity to discuss it in depth. For many years, the word "censorship" has smothered and obscured analysis about the relationship between government and broadcasting. Instead of being the beginning of thoughtful debate, the word "censorship" has inhibited discussion because nobody—least of all me—wants to be put in the role of censor. For that reason, let us calmly discuss censorship: what it is, and what it is not.

When gentleman cry "censorship"—somebody invariably reaches for a law book.

The mixed nature of this audience poses a problem. I hope that the lawyers will not indulgently when I go over familiar grounds and that the broadcasters will similarly be indulgent when I deal with well-known regulatory patterns. You can all be consoled with the knowledge that what you will hear from me is only a "summary of argument." I do have a law book available—a lengthy legal memorandum which documents the legislative, administrative, and judicial history in point. This is being released now, and it will save you from hearing a string of citations and footnotes.

First of all—what is censorship?

The dictionary says a "censor" is a "person whose task is to examine literature, motion pictures, et cetera, and to remove or prohibit anything considered unsuitable." The Supreme Court says that the term censorship, "as commonly understood, denotes any examination of thought or expression in order to prevent publication of objectionable material." We see that censorship is "previous restraint" of communications or publications. Even as early as 1644, when John Milton attacked censorship in his "Appeal for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing," he "vigorously defended the right of every man to make public his honest views 'without previous censure'."

Naturally, our concern here is with two special limitations on consorship: The first amendment which prohibits abridgement by the Government of freedom of speech, and that section 326 of the Communications Act, which very wisely proscribes any censorship by the Federal Communications Commission.

I am going to explore these at length, but, first I want to make an admission against somebody else's interest: There is much censorship—even as it is defined here—there is much censorship in broadcasting today. It is as much to be examined, spotlighted and at times deplored as any form of censorship by a Government agency. And since it is done by our own governmental licensees every broadcast day, it violates the spirit of the first amendment and section 326 of the act just as surely as if we had done it ourselves.

The censorship I speak of here takes two forms:

First, rating censorship: A result of the almost desperate compulsion of some of our licensees to work and to plan and to live by the numbers, always striving to reach the largest possible audience, in order to attract and hold the mass advertising dollar. At best, only the majority interest can be served here, and the interests even of massive minorities and, therefore, at worst, the majority or massive minority interest can be badly served; and the public interest again is trampled.

The first amendment embodies the fundamental idea that minority views will and must find their place in a free market of ideas and communications. When the broadcaster ignores minority tastes and needs to serve only the majority which the advertiser seeks (and this sometimes means rejecting a program which many millions of of people want to see) he is unconsciously rejecting one of the fundamental concepts upon which our society is based and upon which, to quote Judge Learned Hand, "we have staked our all." And, he is doing so using public property and in the role of public trustee.

Let me give you an example: The networks produce some magnificent informative programing. The need for this kind of programing is both urgent and obvious: It deals with many critical issues arising in our troubled times, such as Berlin, colonialism, space, Cuba, medical care, education. Yet often over half the networks' affiliates won't carry these programs. Instead, they substitute a commercial program designed to get a better rating. You can be sure that their schedules aren't overbalanced with public-service programing. It's simply that too often when presented with public service of a high caliber, these "trustees" choose to reject their opportunity to serve that smaller audience—sometimes in the millions.

The other form of censorship I speak of is what Clare Booth Luce has called dollar censorship. Here, the broadcast licensee simply abdicates his own judgment and turns programing decisions over to an advertiser or his agency. The advertiser is not licensed or required to serve the public interest. His interest is directed almost entirely to increasing the sale of his product, a perfectly legitimate private interest—true. But when a broadcaster defers to the advertiser in permitting the private interest to have priority over the public interest, the result is censorship—and in a most pernicious form.

Sometimes the results can be as serious as in the "rating races" I have talked about. And sometimes, they can be downright silly. Take a look at the testimony elicited at our recent hearings in New York City. An electric company wanted a different title for Kipling's "The Light That Failed." And the Civil War drama, "The Andersonville Trial" came up on camera as "The Trial of Captain Wirtz," because the advertising agency "wanted to disguise the fact in the South that this was going to be Andersonville." What's more— the agency nudged out President Lincoln's name because Chrysler sponsored the program. As for Edith Wharton's bleak tragedy, "Ethan Frome," the agency inquiry was: "Couldn't you brighten it up a little?"

Now these examples are amusing—but they are also frightening for it is obvious that the public interest has simply been conveniently forgotten, and that the public's taste and knowledge has been treated with contempt.

I hope that you will keep these forms of private censorship in mind while we examine just what the Commission does that brings its critics to cry "Censorship."

First of all, I believe that the Commission clearly does not censor anything. We don't censor rock and roll, or Westerns or quiz shows, or even overdoses of brutality. Nor do we say: "Put on this program or do not broadcast that program." Even in such matters as obscenity, lotteries and political broadcasts under section 315, we are only concerned after the broadcast, not before. We never view a program in advance of broadcast and prevent its being seen by the public.

You surely know that the Commission looks to the applicant's overall—and I stress the word "overall"—programing proposal to determine whether granting him a license would serve the public interest. At first we look at his proposals. Later, when the station comes up for renewal, we also examine overall performance during the license period, and when more than one applicant wants the same facility, we compare their programing proposals to determine which one would best serve the public interest. It is this that is called "censorship." It is this, they tell us, that violates the first amendment and the Communications Act.

Let us review their arguments at some length.

First, the analogy to newspapers: The first amendment prohibits governmental concern with the content of a newspaper; ergo—the Government is similarly barred from concern with a broadcaster's programing. Some of you will say that I have erected a strawman—that this is not a serious argument in 1961. I hasten to assure you that I have not. I have heard this argument from persons in the highest positions in broadcasting—and within the last month. To again quote Broadcasting magazine: "The Nation's press is interested too. Although most editors and publishers have gloated over the broadcaster's plight because of competitive instincts, the more discerning ones know that if censorship through program control strikes broadcasting, the press is only one step removed." (Editorial, Broadcasting magazine, July 24, 1961.)

Thomas Jefferson once said that "were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." I'd like to paraphrase that: Were it possible to have broadcasting without any governmental regulation, I should not hesitate a moment to abolish the FCC. No one who believes in democratic ideals would hesitate—if it were possible. But it is not possible—and broadcasters—especially oldtimers—know this better than anyone else.

In the mid-1920's, broadcasters had little more than token regulation, as the result of a series of court decisions limiting the scope of the Radio Act of 1912. The result was complete chaos. Stations "jumped" frequencies—interfered with each other at will—and stepped up power to the destruction of other stations' service. Broadcasters petitioned, cajoled, and literally begged the Congress to restore order—and the Congress responded with the regulatory pattern we now have.

First and foremost, the Government assumed control over the airwaves. Congress set up a regulatory agency—the Federal Radio Commission between 1927 and 1934 and since then the Federal Communications Commission—to give out temporary, not permanent, licenses to use frequencies. It directed that licenses be granted or renewed only where it was found that the public interest would be served. It specified that the license vests no ownership right, or any right to operate the station or use the frequency beyond its term, which was not to exceed 3 years. In effect, it authorized the granting of a renewable, limited privilege.

The Supreme Court has succinctly stated the basis of Government regulation; namely, that radio "facilities are limited; they are not available to all who may wish to use them; the radio spectrum simply is not large enought to accommodate everybody. In enacting the Radio Act of 1927 Congress acted upon the knowledge that if the potentialities of radio were not to be wasted, regulation was essential."

Here the analogy to newspapers becomes nonsense. The Government does not, cannot, and will never license newspapers. There is no physical limit on their number; anyone who has the means is free to publish a newspaper. But the Government must license radio stations, because in radio there is far too little room. In short, the first amendment requires the Government to keep its hands off newspapers. There is no censorship—no prior restraint. But the amendment necessarily works out differently for broadcasting simply because broadcasting is different. There is a prior restraint—because it is necessary—but this restraint is against getting into the business in the first place—unless you have a liecnse.

Is this a denial of free speech? The Supreme Court in the NBC case squarely addressed itself to this point. The networks there argued that the Commission's chain broadcasting regulation must fail because they abridged the networks' right of free speech. Here is what the Supreme Court said:

"If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged of many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to governmental regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. But Congress did not authorize the Commission to choose among applicants upon the basis of their political, economic, or social views, or upon any other capricious basis. If it did, or if the Commission by these regulations proposed a choice among applicants upon some such basis, the issue before us would be wholly different. The question here is simply whether the Commission, by announcing that it will refuse licenses to persons who engage in specified network prac-

tices (a basis for choice which we hold is comprehended within the statutory criterion of 'public interest'), is thereby denying such persons the constitutional right of free speech. The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without a license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act of 1934 was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for the licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, or necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the act, is not a denial of free speech."

I have read the entire holding because it is the only ruling of the Supreme Court directed to this first amendment argument. It flatly says that the denial of a station license, if valid under the act, is not a denial of free speech.

And so we must resolve another question: whether under the act, the Commission may validly consider, in making its public interest finding, the station's overall programing.

Let's first look at the act itself. Not only does the act employ the broad public interest standard but it contains several other explicit references to programing. It gives the Commission authority to "prescribe the nature of the service to be rendered by each class of licensed stations and each station within any class" (303(b)). It bestows power to make regulations "requiring stations to keep such records of programs * * * as (the Commission) may deem desirable" (303(j)). "Records of programs?" What for, if the Commission has no concern with programing? In 1934 sections 325 (b) and (c) were added for the specific purpose of sustaining the Commission's authority over the programing of stations whose transmitters were located just across the American border but who used American studios. This was to get at border jumping by persons whose licenses had been terminated by the Commission for programing reasons. Are we to believe that the Commission has such authority over programing from foreign transmitters but no authority to consider the overall programing of American licensees?

The legislative history of the Radio Act of 1927 is important here. None of the men prominent in the hearings or legislative debates showed any doubt as to the power of the Commission to consider programing as one facet of the public interest in the classification of stations and the assignment of frequencies and the renewal of licenses.

Section 29, the "censorship" provision of that act, was intended as a reference to the First Amendment and not as a separate limitation upon the authority of the Commission. It was thought to exclude certain arbitrary judgments by the Commission in considering program content—such as Partisan interference with political opinions broadcast on the station. Still, the Radio Commission felt from the very beginning that it was barred from interfering—prior to broadcast—with any specific program. Nevertheless, right from the outset, the Radio Commission considered program content when it developed general standards for the evaluation of programing in renewal and in comparative proceedings. Renewal proceedings were held for 164 stations, whose past operations raised questions as to whether they were serving the public interest. Eighty-one were renewed, 26 were denied (and the stations were deleted) and the other 57 stations surrendered their licenses. Moreover, the character of programs broadcast was a key factor in deciding which of these stations should be deleted.

Support for this procedure came quickly from both the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court. In the Nelson Bros. case, the Supreme Court stated that the "* * * character and quality of services * * *" were relevant elements of the public interest standard. And in the KFKB and Trinity Methodist cases, where the Commission had denied renewal applications, the Court of Appeals squarely upheld not only the Commission's authority to consider past programing on a renewal application, but also its construction that the prohibition of censorship related only to previous restraint of specific programs.

The KFKB case was memorable. A station had been licensed to one Dr. Brinkley, who advertised his hospital and prescribed for patients—sight unseen—over the air. One script ran: "Probably he has gallstones. No, I don't mean that, I mean kidney stones. My advice to you is to put him on prescription No. 80 and 50 for men, also 64. I think he will be a whole lot better. Also, drink a lot of water."

The Commission's remedy: no license.

The court agreed, saying: "It is apparent, we think, that the business is impressed with a public interest and that, because the number of available broadcasting frequencies is limited, the Commission is necessarily called upon to consider the character and quality of the service to be rendered. In considering an application for a renewal of the license, an important consideration is the past conduct of the applicant, for 'by their fruits ye shall know them.' (Matthews vii: 20.)"

The appellant contended: "Censorship." The court answered: "There has been no attempt on the part of the Commission to subject any part of appellant's broadcasting matter to scrutiny prior to its release. In considering the question whether the public interest, convenience, or necessity will be served by a renewal of appellant's license, the Commission has merely exercised its undoubted right to take note of appellant's past conduct, which is not censorship."

When Dr. Brinkley moved his practice to Texas, with a Texas studio and a transmitter located in Mexico, Congress countered with section 325(b), expressly—as I have said—to give the Commission control over such programing.

In the Trinity Methodist case, the station had been used to attack religious organizations, obstruct the orderly administration of justice, defame certain groups, and indulge in similar highly personal attacks. The court held that it was the Commission's duty to consider these actions of the appellant in deciding whether to renew its license and that a refusal to renew on the basis of this record was "* * * neither censorship nor previous restraint, nor is it a whittling away of the rights guaranteed by the first amendment, or an impairment of their free exercise."

Now with full knowledge of these early developments, Congress extended the life of the Radio Commission three times between 1927 and 1934, and in that time it considered many amendments. Here are the words of the then chairman of the FRC testifying at a congressional hearing in 1934: "Our licenses to broadcasting stations last for 6 months. The law says that they must operate in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. When the time for a renewal of those station licenses comes up, it is the duty of the Commission in passing on whether or not that station should be relicensed for another licensing period, to say whether or not their past performance during the last license period has been in the public interest."

Still the Congress carried over the identical provisions affecting programing into the Communications Act of 1934, and in so doing it can only have ratified this interpretation.

What did the industry think in 1934? The National Association of Broadcasters in 1934 told a House Committee considering one Communications Act proposal:

"It is the manifest duty of the licensing authority, in passing upon applications for licenses or the renewal thereof, to determine whether or not the applicant is rendering or can render an adequate public service. Such service necessarily includes the broadcasting of a considerable proportion of programs devoted to education, religion, labor, agriculture, and similar activities concerned with human betterment.

"In actual practice, over a period of 7 years, as the records of the Federal Radio Commission amply prove, this has been the principal test which the Commission has applied in dealing with broadcasting applications."

And on January 15, 1934, Broadcasting magazine under the same editorship as today, editorialized: "Under the radio law, the Radio Commission cannot censor programs. But it can consider the merit of programs in passing upon applications of stations for renewals of their licenses, just as it did in deleting the stations formerly operated by Brinkley, Baker, and Shuler."

Far from being critical of the Radio Commission's examination of overall programing, there is much to indicate that the Congress thought it wasn't enough. The debates in 1934 indicate a strong dissatisfaction with the Radio Commission in failing "to take the steps that it ought to take to see to it that a larger use is made of radio facilities for education and religious purposes." And so the new Commission was required in the new act to study this question and report its recommendations to Congress. This was done, and the FCC reported that there was "no need for a change in the existing law * * *" and that—"in order for a nonprofit organization to obtain the maximum service possible, cooperation in good faith by the broadcasters is required. Such cooperation should, therefore, be under the direction and supervision of the Commission." (Report of the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Jan. 22, 1935.)

The Federal Communications Commission, like the Radio Commission, from the beginning accepted the importance of program service in its public interest determinations, and this view has, of course, continued down to the present time, and has been consistently sustained in the courts. I am going to review these cases briefly.

In the NBC case the Supreme Court rejected the notion that the Commission should be little more than an electronic traffic officer, to prevent stations from interfering with one another. The Court pointed out that the act does not limit the Commission merely to engineering or technical supervision but puts upon it "the burden of determining the composition of the traffic." Congress, it said, gave the Commission a very large grant of authority—the public interest, convenience and necessity.

The same Court in the Carroll case flatly stated that "* * * the qualifications of the licensee and the character of its broadcasts may be weighed in determining whether or not to grant a license." In the Simmons case the Commission had denied a license to an applicant who proposed to broadcast all of the programs of a national network, irrespective of their quality or the need of the community for other programs. The court of appeals affirmed. And in the Noe case the Court, citing Trinity Methodist, pointed out that if the winning applicant in the comparative case should "* * * in the future fall short of the rules and regulations of the Commission in regard to proper programing, the Commission may always review the matter in a renewal proceeding or otherwise."

There are many other decisions to the same effect, and they all boil down to a summation by Attorney General Rogers in his 1959 report to President Eisenhower (p. 30–31), that "in every case in which the

question has been presented, the courts have upheld the Commission's authority to concern itself with a licensee's program policies and practices. No action by the Commission has ever been held by the courts to constitute censorship or to violate constitutional protections of freedom of speech or of the press."

And to those of you who think that all the present debate started with the New Frontier, let me read Attorney General Rogers' fourth recommendation to the FCC in the same report: "Adopt a program of more intensive scrutiny of licensees' past performances in connection with renewals. It might be appropriate for the Commission to adopt a system similar to that followed by the Internal Revenue Service which chooses a certain number of returns at random for a spot check in depth. The Commission might follow the same course by requiring narrative and detailed accounts of past operations, and, in addition to acting on specific complaints, choose a certain number of renewal applications or all the licensees in a particular community for close examination, requiring more detailed information where necessary, and setting questionable cases for hearing. The procedure would include consideration of advertising practices, material which has been advertised, and action taken on complaints by the Federal Trade Commission. The procedure should emphasize a comparison of the licensee's actual performance with the promises he made as to his programs and operations when his license was originally granted or last renewed. The licensees would thus be put on notice that from time to time they might have to give a detailed accounting as to their operation in the public interest."

There is one other aspect of the judicial history—which I believe must stump the critics—and that is the Commission's practice in comparative hearings. The Commission has always compared the programing proposals of competing applicants to determine which applicant will best serve the public interest. And the courts have approved this in every case where the issue has been raised. The court of appeals has said, "Such a comparison of proposals is not a form of censorship within the meaning of the statute."

This power of the Commission to compare the programing proposals of mutually exclusive applicants is virtually conceded. Yet the critics balk at the same exercise of authority in noncomparative cases. Is there any real difference? I think not. Service to the listening public is still the vital element of the public interest, and programs are still the essence of that service. The public interest exists, whether there are competitors for the channel or not.

Finally, some more recent legislative history. In 1952, Congress revised section 307(d) so as to simplify the procedure which governs the granting of renewal applications. But in doing so, the Senate report stated: "It should be emphasized that while the recommended amendment does eliminate the necessity for the type of involved and searching examination which the Commission must make in granting an original license, it does not in any way impair the Commission's right and duty to consider, in the case of a station which has been in operation and is applying for renewal, the overall performance of that station against the broad standard of public interest, convenience, and necessity. This authority of the Commission is made explicit by specifying that such renewal grants are subject to findings by the Commission that the 'public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served thereby.'"

And, in amending section 315 in 1959, Congress explicitly incorporated one of the Commission's existing programing requirements—namely, "the obligation imposed upon (broadcasters) to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance."

There ends my summary of the authorities. I am sorry to have gone on at such length, but I don't consider it a very tortuous trail. The cases, the history of regulation and the legislative history, are consistent, and I think they establish two things: One—that the no-censorship provision refers to previous restraints, in the sense that the Commission may not enjoin stations from broadcasting any particular program or type of program, and two—that the Commission has the authority and the duty to consider a station's programing in determining whether the grants of applications for construction permits or license renewals are in the public interest.

Well then—how do the critics answer all this? Simple. They ignore it. They argue each time as if the slate were completely clean. Don't study the law books. A station is like a newspaper. Getting into programing must inevitably lead to bureaucratic judgment of what constitutes good programing. Tastes will obviously be imposed. There is simply no way to draw a proper line between permissible review and censorship. Freedom of speech cannot be qualified without being destroyed. Therefore, other than in such areas as obscenity or lotteries, the Commission, they conclude, cannot concern itself at all with programing content. Their argument to the Commission—the very agency charged by law with the protection of the public interest, is often the same as their answer to their critics: "If you don't like it, turn your set off."

As you may have gathered, I cannot accept these arguments in the face of the law and the Commission's lawful duty. If they are serious arguments, however, then such arguments should be addressed to Congress.

They were addressed to Congress in 1947. After the issuance of the Blue Book, the NAB urged Congress to amend the act so as to give radio the same degree of freedom from governmental regulation of content as newspapers. In the hearings before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the matter (S. 1333, 80th Cong. 1st sess.), Senator Wallace White, the committee chairman and one of the fathers of the Communications Act, said "* * * there is a vast difference in principle between the absolute right of anyone who wants to go into the newspaper business, and the necessarily limited right to operate a broadcasting station" (p. 120). He stated (p. 126): "I do not accept in any degree that there is no difference between the power of Government with respect to newspapers and the power of Government with respect to radio communications" * * * if you (radio people) are placing your feet on that foundation, (you) are just indulging in dreams. Because Congress will not stand, in the long run, for any such interpretation." Other Senators were equally critical. One—Senator Edwin Johnson—declared that notion that "radio presents a direct analogy to the press" is "as farfetched as comparing an elephant to a flea."

Still, I would like to meet this argument head on—the argument that "you can't draw a line." It seems to me that just because it is difficult to delineate the exact limits of a law does not mean that the law should not be enforced at all. I wonder what would have been the history of the Sherman Act and similar broad statutes if that standard had been applied to them.

If the Commission ever oversteps its permissible province in the area of programing, the doors of the courtroom are open. Any case the Commission decides must be on a public record. Any arbitrary action will meet rejection by the judiciary. The courts will give the full measure of protection to anyone who has a legitimate claim to any intrusion on his freedom. But those broadcasters who would clothe themselves with the arguments of John Milton should also be prepared to serve the public interest.

Think what these advocates are urging when they say that the Commission cannot concern itself at all with programing content. What if a radio station proposes to play the record "The Old Gray Mare, She Ain't What She Used To Be" all day long, every day for a 3-year license period. Or a TV station comes up for initial license or renewal and proposes to broadcast only private eyes. But under the "Hear no evil; see no evil" view I have described, the Commission is helpless—it must find that a grant of these applications is in the public interest. The Dr. Brinkleys and the Reverend Shulers of KFKB and Trinity Methodist could all be welcomed back. It was all a mistake: their operation is in the public interest and maybe their ratings were high enough to rationalize their continued use of the public airwaves.

I would reply to this proposition as did Senator White at the 1947 hearings I referred to: "But so long as we have in the law that basic conception that an applicant has no absolute right to a license but must establish to the satisfaction of the Commission that he is serving a public interest or meeting a public necessity or a public convenience, something which seems to me to be basic in our law, I just do not see how there can be any judgment as to whether a station is serving a public interest or not unless there is a chance to view and review the programs which a station has been passing out to the listening ear of the American public."

You will say that I am posing a typical situation. So I have. Because they show the utter fallacy of this proposition. Now let's take a more typical example: A TV station proposes to present no or almost no educational, religious, or public affairs programing and very little local live programing. I submit that the Commission is free—and indeed obliged—to require such a station to show, in a hearing, how such a proposal can be said to meet the public interest needs of its service area. This requirement is not censorship. The Commission is not prescribing the specific programs to be presented. It has a right to ask why that applicant should have a piece of a precious resource.

"Well, all right," say the critics. Maybe the Commission isn't censoring by prior restraint—but it's using a device just as awesome: fear of subsequent punishment. Maybe the broadcaster is free to air what he chooses, but then you say, "If you do not measure up to the Commission's public interest standard, you may end up without any license. You have us groping."

They certainly would be groping, if it were so. But it's not. The Commission requires applicants to set out their programing proposals. We take those proposals seriously whenever we grant a license. If the applicant did what he said he would do, there obviously can be no controversy between him and the Commission at the time of renewal. But if he fails to honor his own application for reasons of business expediency, then this constitutes bad faith on the part of the applicant. Then there is going to be a controversy, and the issue between him and the Commission will not be programing—it will be his character or fitness to be a licensee.

Finally, I would say to those who argue about "subsequent punishment": "Your quarrel is not with the Commission, it is with the act itself. For, the act says that you get only a temporary license, and that at least once every 3 years you must come back to the Commission and establish that your overall operation meets the public interest. If Congress wanted to eliminate this fear of a subsequent accounting of your pub-

lic trust, it would have given you a permanent license. But Congress decided upon exactly the opposite course, and we intend to follow it. It wanted an accounting to make sure that those using this valuable portion of the public domain were not getting rich on their promises by shortchanging the public on fulfillment. Frankly, Congress invited an even greater threat: a competing application at your renewal time—and then a comparative hearing where you must prove your ability to better serve the public interest than this new applicant."

I submit that a broadcaster making a good faith effort to serve the public interest can have no real fear of "subsequent punishment" by the Commission. There need be no triennial flirtation with a new flame. For the licensee necessarily has very wide leeway as to programing. If he makes a bona fide effort to meet what he deems to be the needs of his area, there is little chance of controversy between him and the Commission.

Then, why so much controversy? Now I believe we are down to the nub. What's behind the outcry?

The trouble, in my opinion, is that far too many licensees do not regard themselves as "trustees for the public." The frequency is regarded as "theirs," not the public's; and, the license is not one to operate in the public interest but rather to get the greatest financial return possible out of their investment. When the Commission, in discharging its public interest responsibilities, challenges such operations, the first, almost reflex reaction is the cry of "censorship."

What shall we do? Surrender to the men who "want provocative programs that don't provoke anybody?" Or to the advertising agencies who reportedly "want a strong, hard-hitting, noncontroversial show that won't offend anybody"—and above all, no "gloom." What is the future of a medium under such influence?

Let's think, for example, what would have been the fate of the world's great dramatists if they were solely dependent upon television for performance of their plays. Under the advertiser's code of censorship, would any of them have made the grade? Ibsen, Shakespeare, Shaw—"Sorry, too provocative"—too concerned with morals and conflicts of their times. "Will—how many times do I have to tell you—you can't have a couple of sweet, lovesick kids killed off at the end." Seriously, I am informed that good, creative writers today are turning out routine TV shows but under pseudonyms.

At the same time, the amount of violence, murder, mayhem, and sadism on TV shows increases—because in somebody's opinion—the sponsor's, or the agency's or the networks—the ratings demand a jolt. If this is the public interest, I can only echo the words of Mark Twain, "The more you explain it, the less I understand it."

To answer my own question: "No—we are not going to surrender in our efforts. In fact, we've done a few things recently that should make our purpose clear. Some of you will recall first in its July 1960 programing statement, the Commission stressed that licensees must make a good faith effort to find and fulfill the programing needs of their service areas. We mean just that. On June 28, 1961, we denied an application for a new FM station by a party who had made no effort to ascertain his area's needs but instead had submitted a "standard" programing proposal.

And, in doing so, I am sure we will have the support of almost all the broadcasters. Gov. LeRoy Collins honorably exemplifies the best in broadcasting. Most broadcasters take pride in their service. They know that broadcasting is more than a business—that it constitutes vital public service element to their community. They are proud of this. And, proud people resent those whose only interest in broadcasting is the dollars-and-cents sign—those fast buck operators—many of them new to the industry and lacking in a tradtional dedication to serving the public interest. Thus, the Commission, in discharging its responsibilities, is serving not only the public but the responsible broadcaster also.

On July 13, 1961, we informed every broadcaster of a change in the Commission's renewal policy. In the past, we granted renewals even though there had been a substantial failure to live up to the programing representations, where the applicant "upgraded" his proposals and gave reliable assurances that these new proposals would be carried out. This will no longer be the case. We have put our licensees on notice that "proposals versus actual operation" is of vital concern to the Commission, that licensees are not entitled to one or any license period where they do not have to make a good-faith effort to deliver on their public service proposals, and that if they have not been endeavoring in good faith to discharge their representations, they should take immediate steps to do so.

Finally, we have issued a proposed revision of the programing sections of our application forms, in order to obtain greater information as to the applicant's programing efforts, both proposed and in actual operation. We are seeking more information about the opportunities afforded for local expression, on the presentation of controversial issues, and on program categories, with special reference to educational, political, local news, and programs for children. We have also taken a first step in dealing with the failure of the network affiliate to carry the network public affairs programing. We propose to require the applicant to set out the amount of such programing which it carried. Unfortunately, as I made clear in a concurring statement, this gives us only half the facts. I propose to add another question calling for the number of hours and time slots of network public affairs programs which were made available to a station and when not accepted, the general type and source of programs which it did broadcast instead. Surely, the public is entitled to know which licensees consistently reject network public affairs programs and whether they were rejected for reasons having to do with ratings and dollars. The valuable grant to use a scarce public channel should go to those who provide more public service in preference to those who choose to provide less.

Now I submit that this pattern of activities is not censorship. It is the very reverse of censorship. We are not seeking Government prescription of programing. On the contrary, we are seeking diversity of programing by the licensee as a result of his good faith and diligent efforts to discover and meet his area's needs. Surely, to quote from the Simmons case, censorship is "a curious term" to apply to a requirement that licensees make such efforts in living up to their responsibilities.

I think broadcasters were given a very apt reminder of those responsibilities by the court of appeals recently in the Television Corporation of Michigan case: "All too often in cases like the present the broadcasters involved appear to be chiefly interested in the revenues to be derived from operating their stations in the most profitable manner. It seems clear in the present case that WOOD–TV will make more money in its new location than in the old: it is moving to a more prosperous and more highly populated area, and its advertising revenues will no doubt increase. But such considerations, though legitimate, cannot be controlling. Television and radio are affected with a public interest: the Nation allows its airwaves to be used as a matter of privilege rather than of right. The interests which today are profiting so handsomely from radio and television may in the end find it in their own best interest to treat their businesses primarily as a public trust."

This important teaching of the court should be studied by all of us. And while we are studying, let us heed the conclusions contained in the report of the President's Commission on National Goals which was submitted to President Eisenhower on November 16, 1960. "The American system of broadcasting is deeply entrenched and is founded on the rock of freedom from Government interference. It is not, however, beyond critical examination in the light of its performance. It is too easy to say that the people are getting what they want. The fact that large audiences can be attracted by fourth-rate material does not acquit the broadcasting companies or the Government which has an ultimate responsibility for use of this valuable and scarce resource, from asking whether the public interest is being adequately served."

The President's Commission concluded: "Thus far, television has failed to use its facilities adequately for educational and cultural purposes and reform in its performance is urgent."

And I would add that programing responsibility is so urgently needed in these critical days. To those few broadcasters and their professional associates who would evade the Nation's needs crying "Censorship! Oh where will it end?"—I ask: "Responsibility—when will it begin?"

Trend of the Economy—Antibusiness Winds in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very interesting analysis of the separation of the Business Advisory Council from the Department of Commerce, by Nate White, business and financial Editor of the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. White's comments appeared in the Junly 13, 1961 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I recommend that every Member of Congress read this analysis.

TREND OF THE ECONOMY—ANTIBUSINESS WINDS IN WASHINGTON

(By Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

BOSTON.—The Kennedy administration is gradually building up an antibusiness sentiment. No attack by the administration is direct. It is a nibbling, sidewise, erosive thing. Through acts of the administration itself the Kennedy team is tossing away valuable support in the business community.

The latest is the separation of the Business Advisory Council from the Department of Commerce. The BAC took the step itself after Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, showed a personal failure to understand the fundamental function of the BAC and a hostility to it.

Mr. Hodges has earned his place in business history as the man who burned one of the Government's most useful bridges to the business community. Since the Commerce Department is the department concerned with business, Mr. Hodges' actions are of

dubious value to the welfare of the country, as well as the business community.

Even Franklin D. Roosevelt knew that the Government could obtain useful value from a close relationship with the top echelon of the American business community. John F. Kennedy seems to be too busy to have reached this point of development.

When the New Deal President was under the most vicious kind of hostile attack from the traditional organizations of Americran business, he undertook to build a bridge between the Government and the business community. His first Secretary of Commerce, Daniel Roper, went to work and formed the BAC.

The BAC has never had a publicity staff as such. It has never gone on the record. It has never campaigned for positions or policies. Its function has been to assist and consult with the Government and remain anonymous. If it had done more to build a public record, it might not have become the victim of cavalierism.

With other business organizations, such as the National Association of Manufacturers, which took large page advertisements in major papers to criticize and attack the New Deal, attacking him, the BAC became a source of strength and usefulness to Mr. Roosevelt.

The BAC also served President Truman well in the postwar readjustment period, and in the Korean war, Charles Sawyer, President Truman's Secretary of Commerce, used the BAC in his work to counteract postwar recession.

In 1942, when the United States was deeply involved in World War II, President Roosevelt's Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, during a BAC meeting began the building of a second bridge to the business community, the Committee for Economic Development. He, together with William Benton, Paul G. Hoffman, Clarence Francis, Marion B. Folsom, Thomas B. McCabe, and others, realized that the United States faced an enormous job of war conversion and of postwar readjustment. Only the top leadership of American business could achieve the kind of policy decisions required. The CED was one answer and it was to cooperate with the BAC informally in the war and postwar period.

The traditional organizations of American business, based on delegate memberships and embracing all kinds of businesses, were not the kinds of organizations needed to do the big jobs. They had different kinds of functions to perform. They were structually incapable of providing the policy cooperation required. They were not leakproof. They could not handle confidential material by their very method of operations. Their members were many times of insufficient stature in the business community itself to do the job, although occasionally their leadership was top level.

The BAC was never a "shadow cabinet," as many people have written. It seemed to be. It was a sounding board for policies. It met at fine resorts. Where else would it meet? These were men who headed multibillion-dollar corporations. Should they meet in a motel on a busy expressway into Washington?

For these petty reasons, their meetings in expensive resorts, their failure to hire public relations experts, their determination to remain ananymous, their determination not to act as a shadow cabinet but to serve as a bridge of understanding and cooperation between Government and business, the BAC members have been unjustly attacked and criticized in the Congress and by newcomers in the Washington press corps who simply were not around in the days of open warfare between Franklin Roosevelt and the business community.

Those who remember those days of the vicious warfare between the White House and business (and the shooting was certainly two-way), have often noted how quietly and effectively the BAC and its public counterpart, the CED (which does make reports and is not formally an adviser to the Government) helped to bridge over critical problems—particularly the problems relating to the war and postwar readjustment. It is tragic that one of these bridges has been destroyed.

President Kennedy and Secretary Hodges have just deprived the American people of the consultative help of multibillion dollars in the finest intellects and finest leadership in the Nation.

The BAC says it will continue as the "business council" and that it hopes to provide its services, "when asked," to the entire Government. It thus has kicked the dust off its feet in Secretary Hodges' face. Mr. Hodges was inhospitable to the BAC from the beginning. He wanted to water it down, make it semi-on-the-record, make its meetings a playground for public relations techniques, television, and press grandstanding. He failed. And he now has succeeded in burning the bridge. The BAC never has and never will force its views on Government. It don't function that way.

If the BAC matter were the only incident of growing hostility to business in the administration, it could perhaps be written off as a dulled appreciation of the BAC function by the Commerce Secretary.

But businessmen who have direct dealings with the administration report that the hostility to business is growing elsewhere. It is evident in the continued side attacks in letters written by junior members of the antitrust division of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Similarly, Members of Congress, supporting the administration, have increased their antibusiness attacks. Business representatives, testifying before congressional committees in good faith, are crudely and rudely handled.

The impression is gaining ground that the Kennedy administration is subtly trying to break General Electric, General Motors, and American Telephone & Telegraph, and others, and that it is doing it in devious ways.

One reason given for the administration attack on the BAC was that it was a potential instrument of "price fixing."

Obviously, the business community itself has sacrificed its own good name and its own leadership by the criminal connivance to defraud the public disclosed in the antitrust convictions against the major electrical companies. That the chairman of General Electric at the time of these convictions was also chairman of the BAC is a fact cited to discredit the BAC and throw doubts on its function, even though the G.E. official immediately resigned his BAC post.

Business must clean its own house, and it is the function of the antitrust division of Federal regulatory agencies and of committees in Congress to make sure that business does clean house and keep it clean.

Unfortunately corruption in Government and in business, as well as in labor organizations and in other areas of daily activity is all too apparent in the United States. Value must be rebuilt into the business community, and business itself must do this. With the help of Government, as well as the regulation of Government, it can do this.

It is unfortunate that the Kennedy administration is early setting the business community against it. It is going to need the support of this community, and the business community needs the support of the administration.

The Nation is in a tough military-economic struggle with a vicious Communist enemy. It is not the time to burn bridges. It is the time to build them.

The administration cannot function in a vacuum, talking only to labor and farm leaders. Its labor-management committee is not thoroughly responsive to nor representative of American business.

Key to Peace: Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry J. Taylor. The Nation that will not fight for its life is already dead:

IF WE'RE AFRAID TO FIGHT, WE'LL DIE IN A WAR THAT NEED NOT BE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In some of his most ringing speeches President Kennedy is doing our country a profound disservice. The President himself and the White House speech helpers—Schlesinger, Acheson, Bowles, Neitze, Bundy are all eloquent men. Surely, they are sincere, but they are also wrong. For they are talking way beyond their willingness or capability to act.

The more eloquent and convincing the words, the more the damage when they are not backed up and are then repudiated.

This makes our Nation's official words hollow at best or, at worst, downright false. It was demonstrated in the eloquent warnings to Castro and then to Russia about Laos, which turned out to be bluff.

Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world and, therefore, to peace. Nothing is so dangerous for the security of the United States.

REDS WILL DECIDE

Russia, not America, will choose whether we are to have war. Russia holds the horrible initiative in this, because Russia would be the aggressor. She will not stay her giant paw just because we prefer not to be stormed or do not want war anyplace on earth.

And unless all history from the days of the dinosaurs is reversed, Russia will, in time, storm us—unless we recover the key to peace.

That key is our own willingness to fight.

No one need inform me about the unthinkable cataclysm of war. If I had my way I would wipe out of my own life every moment of more than 6 years in war. So may we settle that point, except among morons. But are we right to dwell solely on the horrors, when to fear war too much is the surest way to invite it?

NOT BY FLEEING

We cannot possibly avoid war if we behave like a boxer, dazed and uncomprehending, who flees from the ring (Cuba) as soon as his opponent doubles his fists. Why, we stood with Washington at Valley Forge and we were born to honor, bright with glory, and the vision, "Liberty or Death." Are we to make a mockery of this?

Our leaders are lagging. Their public is way out ahead of them in sensing we must stand up to the bully. And, once again, with that intiutive sense for justice, which makes us a great people, the average American is right.

Aggressor nations choose their victims among windy bluffers, not among those of sober strength; among the craven, not among those with stout hearts, great productivity and an absolute determination not to be trod upon.

We must first feel this determination and stout-heartedness and then make it known by our actions. This feeling—this will—is the factor that counts. This, and only this, will stand guard for us in the perilous years ahead. The words will largely take care of themselves and are relatively unimportant.

A brave nation needs no other ornament.

DOLLARS WON'T DO

Our vast foreign aid programs are no substitute. We can live without them, but we cannot live without a willingness to fight. We cannot do with dollars what must be done with guts. In fact, the more we talk exclusively about money, tractors, ransoms, and enlisting America's youth in a Peace Corps—as if these would give us security—the softer we sound for conquest to the barbarians.

Men died for what we have. Our heroes fought for this country and unless we are still willing to fight for it—not just talk for it or spend money for it—we will lose it.

"My son, that which I bequeath you, you must own anew if you would keep it," says an epitaph in a Concord graveyard.

ONLY ONE CHOICE

We must banish defeatism. We have only one true choice for the future. We must never be too afraid to stake our life and honor against all the might and fury of the disciplined and ruthless enemies of the United States.

To do otherwise is like the mole baiting his own trap. But once we act like the Americans we really are, our enemies will respect us too much to risk war against such a Nation; for we are the greatest power on the face of the earth.

By not being afraid to fight we will, with that key, open the only door to peace. And if we are afraid to fight, you and I will do nothing but die in the war that need not be.

Let's Ban the Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the July issue of the Air Force and Space Digest, dealing with the subject of nuclear testing. I believe this editorial excellently documents why continued suspension of nuclear testing should be of grave concern to all Americans:

LET'S BAN THE BAN

(By Claude Witze, senior editor, Air Force magazine)

President Kennedy found his interview with Premier Khrushchev in Vienna a sobering experience. There was no loss of temper, he told the Nation upon his return, and there were no threats or ultimatums. But he repeated that the meeting was somber. Progress? None was either achieved or pretended, although the two K.'s did agree that an effective cease-fire is essential in Laos. But even while the President was speaking the Soviets were egging on their rebel allies in that country, and the next day Padong fell to the Reds. It is evident that Mr. Khrushchev, who has described himself as the locomotive of history, has no intention of either slowing down or being switched onto a siding.

Of the other issues discussed in Vienna the tinderbox is supposed to be Berlin, but anyone even halfway familiar with the vagaries of Russian negotiations would hesitate to make book on it. Our opponents are masters at the art of distracting attention. The very fact that this technique is a favored Kremlin ploy lends, in our opinion, more than passing importance to the major issue on the Vienna agenda that does not involve somebody else's geography. The sum of what was said about the negotiations on a nuclear test ban apparently is that Russia no longer wants an agreement in this area, if it ever did.

A workable nuclear test agreement, obviously bogged down in the Geneva conversations and not made more likely in Vienna, is a cherished ambition of Mr. Kennedy and several prominent members of his administration. After all, if achieved, it would be a basic first step toward the genuine disarmament or arms control program they hope is possible. During the presidential campaign Mr. Kennedy may even have created his own quandary of today by announcing that he, if elected, would make one last effort to get something fruitful out of the Geneva meetings, which have been underway since 1958.

Well, he has had his try and it has been rebuffed. It fell just as decisively as did Padong. This could have been anticipated, we believe, from the facts as recorded by the Atomic Energy Commission in its annual report to Congress for 1960. AEC made it clear that it is almost impossible to contrive an effective control system—basic to a test-ban agreement. The United States suspended tests with the start of the Geneva talks in October of 1958, a step that was billed as not necessarily halting our technological progress on nuclear weapons but which certainly had that effect. For all practical purposes our development of improved nuclear weapons stands at the 1958 level. This is a unilateral ban, self-imposed, unpoliced. AEC did not say so, but there is real national peril in the probability that Russia has made substantial nuclear progress and better weapons while we have been leaning on hope.

Military observers have been present at all of the negotiations to date, but there appears to have been a minimum reliance on U.S. military intelligence and judgment. There is no record, to our knowledge, of the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If they are known, they have not been made public. The late Thomas E. Murray, an AEC member for about 7 years, has written that "if the Joint Chiefs of Staff were asked—and the American people are entitled to pose this question—whether our test policy is endangering our overall national defense position, their answer would be yes." The reference here, of course, is to our failure to press on with improved nuclear weapons. Another aspect of the matter is our evident policy determination to prepare a deterrent force of ICBM capabilities while defense against ICBM's remains a major mystery. Further nuclear tests are essential for intelligent research work designed to solve this mystery. It is clear that a breakthrough in this area alone, which the Russians could achieve while we observe our self-imposed discipline, could be the most important development since the perfection of the ICBM itself.

Likewise, our future deterrent force will rely heavily on Polaris and Minuteman. Each of these has a much smaller warhead than Atlas or Titan, a situation which could conceivably be corrected through further research and testing.

It is mid-June, at this writing, and indications are that the United States has not abandoned hope of an agreement, despite Russian intransigence. Russia, by its own statement, now considers that communism is on top in the world struggle and there no longer is any reason to negotiate seriously with us on arms limitation, test bans, or anything else. In the face of this President Kennedy is determined to continue the test-ban talks, undoubtedly for the purpose of making it clear to all the world that the U.S.S.R. and not the United States, is responsible if they fail.

This is not a situation that we can live with as freedom continues to fall back on a dozen fronts from Havana to Hanoi. If it turns out further that the enemy has not been wasting these 3 years, that he has developed and produced a Sputnik of the weapon world for his arsenal, we will know why our announced determination to fight did not deter him. Mr. Kennedy is the man who must make up his mind when and whether we will end the moratorium on nuclear tests. The peril of delay is not just the peril to hopes of future agreement with Mr. Khrushchev. The real problem is whether we are heading for the day when a summit conference to determine the fate of the world may not even include the United States on the list of conferees.

The Case Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe our most important task is to protect the soundness of our currency against the disaster of inflation. That is why I fight so hard against the many administration proposals for increased Federal spending which add to inflationary pressures and threaten our whole economic structure. An inflationary spiral which could further cheapen our dollar and result in our economic collapse could be as fatal to our free way of life as Communist bombs devastating our cities. The disease of the spirit, exemplified by the acceptance of inflation as a spur to economic growth, is exposed in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

DISEASE OF THE SPIRIT

With understandable pleasure at the economic recovery so far, President Kennedy the other day said that the second quarter of 1961 "was the first in 8 years in which our production has increased without an increase in the overall price index."

His pleasure, of course, is rich in political overtones. Not only because good business is good politics for the party in power, but also because the situation he describes sounds like a stinging refutation of the argument that he has embarked the Nation on an inflationary course. If prices are relatively stable, how can there be inflation?

Actually, there's no paradox. The Nation has enjoyed relative price stability for several years, and nothing President Kennedy has done in 6 short months could reasonably be expected to significantly affect the price level so soon. But that does not mean he has not set the dial for inflation; he most certainly has, with his huge spending for anything and everything, his deficits, and his cheap money bias.

Just how and when this will be reflected in a new wage-price spiral, we know no more than he. It is conceivable that it would not be so reflected for some time; inflation is not a definition of a wage-price spiral, but a cause of it, and in times past it has taken months and even years for an inflation to translate itself into a spiral. Meantime, it's true enough the inflationary spending the President has set in motion is likely to accelerate the boom he so devoutly desires.

If these are reasonable possibilities, then what's the fuss about inflation? An inflation both stimulating and painless begins to sound more like a good thing than a bad thing, and a number of people in Washington do view it that way.

The case against inflation in present circumstances, it seems to us, is not that it is sure to bring on a disastrous bust any time soon. It may do that, given the right combination of conditions. But the more certain case against inflation is less dramatic and more complex, which makes inflation all the more insidious.

To begin with, the inflation will soon or late, this year or next year, show up in a wage-price spiral. Even if it is a gradual one, it is painful for almost everyone, and especially for those whose income depends on a dollar of stable purchasing power.

Moreover, it is not true, whatever the Government's economic experts may think, that our economy needs the stimulation of inflation in order to grow. Some of the most prosperous periods in our history have been noninflationary. The incredible prosperity of West Germany, with its soaring economic growth, is grounded in anti-inflationary policies.

Indeed, the kind of growth inflation spurs is almost bound to be harmful. An excess of money in the economic body opens the way to all kinds of diseases. Anything goes; marginal ventures are undertaken; factories are built that never should be built; unjustified expansions are carried out. Speculative excesses multiply in the stock and other markets. This is not theory; it has happened in the not so distant past, and some of it is already happening again.

When that distorted growth gets sufficiently out of hand, and speculative fever is consuming the populace, then you may in fact have the conditions for a thorough crash. Let us not be so naive as to think that the Government or anything else has outlawed the possibility of depression.

Short of that, there is still another vicious effect of inflation. A Government policy of inflation is basically a dishonest policy. It is a refusal by Government to meet its fundamental responsibility of providing sound money; and it rests on the dishonest assumption that one can have things one can't pay for.

Thus it generates a certain looseness among the people: Men work less than they are capable of; a so-what, get-rich-quick psychology grows. If war has been called a moratorium on morality, so in its own way, is inflation. It is a disease of the spirit before it is a disease of the economy.

For these reasons no Government has the right to adopt a policy of inflation. And we as a Nation must be getting a little morally calloused to even let it try.

Resolution Commemorating the Centennial of the Land-Grant Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed Senate Resolution 47 was passed in the senate in the State of Illinois on May 17, 1961, commemorating the centennial of the Land-Grant Act of the U.S. Congress approved by President Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862, which gave rise to the broadening of the scope of the educational opportunity in higher education together with research and the extension of services to the general public.

The advances made by the University of Illinois, as the land-grant institution of the State of Illinois, are well known throughout the institutions of higher education, especially as its unprecedented growth and achievement in educational instruction and research.

We, of Illinois, are proud of our university and that its further development in educational fields will be a contribution to the welfare of the people:

Whereas the 68 land-grant colleges and State universities in the 50 States and Puerto Rico will observe in the academic year 1961–62 the centennial of the signing of the Land-Grant Act by President Abraham Lincoln (July 2, 1862), and

Whereas Jonathan B. Turner, a prominent farmer of Jacksonville, Ill., and onetime professor at Illinois College, was a pioneer in the development of the concept and an influential leader in the movement which brought about passage by the Congress of the United States of the Land-Grant Act, and

Whereas the Land-Grant Act in the 100 years since its enactment has inspired and broadened the American tradition of educational opportunity and has enlarged the scope of higher education, in instruction, research, and in the extension of its services to the general public, and

Whereas the University of Illinois, which was established under the Land-Grant Act, has brought far-reaching benefits to the economy of the State of Illinois, to its civic and cultural growth, and to the well-being of its citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 72d General Assembly, That the State of Illinois hereby gives official notice to the land-grant centennial observance; that commendation is given to the University of Illinois, as the land-grant institution of the State of Illinois, for major contributions through teaching, research, and service since its opening on March 2, 1868; that the people of Illinois during the period of the centennial observance be urged to give special attention to the benefits to this State and Nation from all the institutions of higher learning and to how those benefits may be conserved and enlarged in the period of unprecedented growth which lies ahead; and that copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of State to the board of trustees of the University of Illinois with a request that a copy be forwarded to the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities for inclusion in the official proceedings of its centennial convention to be held in Kansas City, Mo., November 12–15, 1961.

Adopted by the senate May 17, 1961.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

Automation and Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to insert the editorial, "Automation and Society," which recently appeared in the Pittsburgh Catholic, a weekly publication of the diocese of Pittsburgh.

I am sure the Members of Congress will be impressed by the interest shown by all segments of our society and the support that is being expressed daily for a program that will assist our unemployed in securing training which will permit them to again take their place in our economy by helping them to become employable:

AUTOMATION AND SOCIETY

What does the employment future look like under automation? Consider some of the newest devices which the Holland subcommittee was told of during its recently concluded congressional hearings on automation and unemployment:

An automatic law clerk gadget, which performs 7 man-hours of legal research in minutes. This machine, in order to get the answers to a question involving tax exemptions, analyzed 400 laws from 50 States, typing out in less than 10 minutes all of the statutes and case citations involved.

A phonetic typewriter which automatically transcribes from the spoken word. The present model, still imperfect, puts down exactly what it hears and therefore is not orthodox in spelling. But a union official stated that when perfected it could eliminate the jobs of 1,500,000 secretaries, stenographers and typists.

An automatic sales clerk which dispenses as many as 36 varieties of merchandise, accepts payment up to $5 and gives the customer the exact change.

A reading machine that scans and transmits entire typewritten pages at the rate of 1,800 words a minute, doing the work of 24 key punch clerks.

What will be the impact on employment in this country when the trickle of these devices becomes a flood? Some idea is available from industries where technology has already taken over in varying degrees. Union and industrial leaders who testified before the Holland subcommittee painted this picture:

From 1950 to 1960 the number of workers in factory production in the United States fell 10 percent while production rose 43 percent.

Railroad productivity rose by 65 percent during the postwar period, while employment fell by 540,000. Productivity in the soft coal industry in this same period rose by 96 percent, while employment was falling 262,700.

In the steel industry, steel production and shipments were almost identical in 1950 and 1960, yet in 1960 there were 80,000 fewer production workers employed and the work week averaged 3.3 hours less than in 1950.

It is estimated that 10,000 computer installations will be made in 1961, each affecting 140 jobs or a total of 1,400,000. Twenty-five percent of the jobs affected will be eliminated.

The committee noted that the United States is the first nation in the world in which the number of productive workers has declined while total output continued to rise.

Does all this mean that automation is bad? Of course not. In the Holland committee's words, "* * * automation is the promise of the future. It is the means whereby the conquest of natural forces can be opened to the abundant benefit of mankind. Automation is not something to be feared and avoided. It is something to be harnessed and encouraged."

But the tendency is to spotlight automation's benefits to the neglect of the human problems it creates. Says the Hol-

land committee: " * * * the obvious and highly publicized advantages of automation should not be allowed to overshadow the plight of the little man searching for a place in a growing economy." It adds: "Certainly a great injury will be inflicted on this generation and future generations, if nothing at all is done to halt the relentless growth of the mass of jobless, rootless, disillusioned and frustrated workers displaced by technological changes. Workers should not be forced to match wits with machines but should be given the opportunity to rise as high above the moron mentality of machinery as their God-given talents permit."

As a result of the findings of the Holland subcommittee, a bill has been introduced (H.R. 7373) calling for federally financed programs to retrain unemployed workers in new skills. The bill was reported out of subcommittee last week and if approved by the Committee on Education and Labor is expected to reach the floor of Congress in August. Certainly it deserves close attention.

Automation can be a great blessing. But we must make sure that it does not destroy the dignity and God-given rights of the human beings it is supposed to serve.

More Knowledge Needed of Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, San Leandro, Calif., a city within my congressional district is endeavoring to implement a true people-to-people sister city program.

One of the basic weaknesses in our current international relations is a lack of knowledge about the geography, economy, and social structure of the nations within the international community. I believe that when a project such as this encourages individuals to make a detailed study of their international neighbors, it not only enhances their better understanding of the people involved, but it lays the foundation for a realistic approach to the diplomatic transactions between the nations themselves.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the San Leandro Morning News which clearly depicts the endeavors of the people of one American community in trying to dispel ignorance about the great nation of Brazil. From the earnestness of this study, it may be concluded that when a city is finally selected for affiliation, the ties between San Leandro and its sister city will be closer and will surely lead to a refreshing era of friendship and cooperation between the peoples involved:

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News, July 29, 1961]

MORE KNOWLEDGE NEEDED OF BRAZIL

Patterns of considerable interest have begun to emerge during the meetings of the San Leandro Town Affiliation Committee and several of them pinpoint shortcomings in the thinking of residents of the entire United States. Attitudes which create a great deal of criticism of (North) Americans all over the world.

The Town Affiliation Committee has been meeting for several months with its sights set on a South American city and Brazil has been under discussion for some time as a possible country from which to select our sister city.

Yet at Thursday evening's meeting there seemed to be abysmal lack of knowledge regarding South America in general and Brazil in particular. The new capital of Brazil, a politician's dream city of white marble, mosiac sidewalks and fountains has received wide newspaper and magazine publicity for a year or more. Life magazine has been running a series of highly informative articles about South America. In fact this week's issue has an excellent discussion of the races, terrain, and inheritance of the southern continent.

In this one series of articles, a wealth of information has been given regarding the geographical problems. The bewildering diversity of racial stocks, the political and commercial disunity of a land area larger than the United States and Canada combined.

The 200 million people of South America have no common language and live in 20 republics. Natural barriers in many cases have still to be conquered, the high, rocky spine of the Andes have divided the east and the western section of the continent.

Impassable and ancient jungles, the 25-million-year-old rain jungle for example, have stood as a barrier to progress. Brazil's highly fertile plains in Parana state, the rich pampas of the Argentine as contrasted with the barren sand wastes of the Atacama Desert.

Only 5 percent of land in South America is tilled and 14 of her nations derive income from a single product with their economy constantly at the mercy of shifting world markets.

South America has a variety of rich resources poorly put to use. Brazil has a quarter of the world's known iron supply. Chile has the largest copper deposit found anywhere. Venezuela is the world's largest exporter of oil. Bolivia sells 15 percent of the world's tin. However, there is one lack in natural resources, South America has little coal—the one mineral so essential to the growth of a modern economy.

A few hours of serious reading can acquaint anyone with the staggering social and economic problems of Brazil and South America.

We do not think that a mere desire to affiliate with a Brazilian city is enough. We think that all committee members should promptly begin studying the country. If books and articles needed for better knowledge of Latin America are not available at our library they should be obtained with all speed. In view of the U.S. need for understanding South American countries we think that San Leandrans in general and particularly affiliation committee members should familiarize themselves with the history, culture, social, and economic background of Brazil and South America. A special South American section in the library would place material at the fingertips of all interested persons.

A request for this special information center will be made by Chairman Robert Hintz but it must be read by committee members if San Leandrans are to profit from affiliation with a Brazilian city.

San Leandro's sister city must be chosen with care and not with speed. Our relationship with this city must be based upon sound knowledge, we cannot afford a failure in view of the disturbed world situation. It has been pointed out that San Leandro has a great deal to offer another city, this is true but South American cities and people have much to offer North Americans. We must approach these cities with humility and an open mind and a desire for sincere cooperation on every level.

The "sister city" relationship should proceed with care, obtaining knowledge of the country and its people, a careful awareness of South Americans' widespread underlying mistrust and resentment of the United States. The program is one of great potential, an opportunity to dispel the complaint that "The United States has ignored and neglected us."

Actions not words will count. Words have been cheap in South America ever since the time of Spanish conquistadors. Leaders have made promises which have not been kept. San Leandro in selecting a sister city has an opportunity to prove to one city and possibly to all South America that the people of the United States are interested in them, by learning about their country, by remembering that our Latin neighbors have their pride and are in a position to offer us a fair exchange of spiritual and cultural values.

There is an opportunity to combat the term "imperialist" and to dispel forever the illusion that the United States is a nation of aggressive, money-mad, uncultured, uncouth and spiritually impoverished individuals. This means the acquisition of knowledge and broader horizons for everyone is a necessity.

The Socialists Believe Federal Medical Aid Is Socialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those who claim that we who oppose Federal medical aid unfairly term it socialistic, I call attention to an editorial, which I include herewith, from the Wall Street Journal:

GOOD FOR A LAUGH

Some of our best friends are Socialists. In fact, they're shouting Socialists with whom we've broken many an argumentative lance. But the clash of convictions is good-natured; we always agree that socialism is what we're talking about, whatever name it may go by in the political marketplace.

Just the other evening, we were discussing "socialized medicine." Our friends didn't flinch at the phrase. No, it was agreed that once the Government began taking care of the health of some of the people, political pressure ultimately would require the Government to minister to all the people. Anything short of that would be rank social injustice.

In the course of our amicable debate, it was decided that the essential elements of socialized medicine (or whatever polite name the politicians gave it in the beginning) would be compulsory coverage, regardless of individual wish or need, and necessary Government control of the huge outlays of public money required by such broad coverage. Sooner or later, the Government would have to supervise hospitals, nursing homes and medical practitioners—anything and anybody handling the public business.

There was a footnote to our argument a couple of days later, when one of our friends called to ask if we'd seen what Welfare Secretary Ribicoff had said in Washington. Testifying in behalf of the administration's plan to provide medical care for 14 million elderly Americans under social security, Mr. Ribicoff was hotly indignant that anyone should call the scheme "socialized medicine."

Why, the Secretary said, he personally had reviewed the plan and removed "all the elements which could be called socialistic." It gave our Socialist friend a good laugh.

Piloting on Inland Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, traffic on our inland waterways continues to be an important part of our commercial transportation system.

To fully benefit from the real potential of our inland waterways, however, there is a need for adequate and constantly updated policies. This relates not only to modes of transportation, but also laws and regulations affecting personnel, including pilots.

Today, I was privileged to receive from a Wisconsin constituent a letter outlining problems in this field.

To give my colleagues in the Senate—and particularly the members of the Labor Committee—the benefit of these ideas, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being a constituent of yours of the great State of Wisconsin and the village of Trempealeau, I feel that I can depend upon you and your honorable colleague, Senator PROXMIRE, to look into the subject matter of this letter.

I am a licensed pilot on the Inland Waterways System, and a part of the vast water transportation system of our country. As a matter of fact, it is my livelihood and that of thousands of other men, a goodly number of them fellow Republicans.

SUBJECT 1

Senator, I respectfully request you to look into the situation whereas the personnel manning the vessels that comprise our water transportation system are not covered by the laws of the land which call for a 40-hour workweek. Certainly we are taxpaying bona fide citizens and it seems deplorable that we should be excluded from the coverage of the laws of the land of the country.

Fortunately, I am employed by a company with a union contract. The job requires a man to work 84 hours a week. We receive 1 day off for each day we work, so we average out to 42 hours a week.

It seems companies with union contracts and fair wages have no protection against ratecutting, so they are unable to compete with firms exploiting their help. Some of them give one-half day off, many of them no time off at all, working their help 84 hours a week. The water transportation help has no protection under the 40-hour workweek law. Some of the companies seem to be forcing conditions to where they were 30 years ago. Under these conditions the only help available is roustabouts and alcoholics that drift from job to job. Fair competition is good, but hardly think this could be called fair. If this is allowed it will cause at least a 25-percent reduction in the labor force and much lower wages. This will hurt the economy of the country when it can least afford it. The minimum wage law was extended to cover marine personnel. Then why not the 40-hour workweek?

SUBJECT 2

Why shouldn't diesel vessels operating on the inland waterways require licensed officers and be under the inspection and jurisdiction of the U.S. Coast Guard marine inspection.

Years ago it was necessary to enact marine laws governing the inspection and operation of vessels, also requiring them to have licensed and competent officers. Those laws were enacted when steam and sail were the only motivating power. A diesel engine wasn't dreamed of. Those laws which are extremely antiquated, which cover steam and sail only, are still in effect. Ninety-five percent of the vessels operating are diesel today, and according to those ancient laws, are not under marine jurisdiction. The Coast Guard has realized the need of amending those laws and endeavored many times to have them amended. The action has been beaten down by lobbyists and the influence of the operating companies and of diesel engine manufacturers. Vessels are operating daily on the rivers without licensed and competent officers. In fact most of them are. They are transporting huge amounts of tonnage, many times the amount carried by steam vessels operating when the laws were enacted. This situation is glaringly deplorable to most of us. These vessels are carrying cargo and have crews aboard and should by all means be covered by marine laws and carry licensed officers. Would it not be a terrible situation if the ships at sea were not governed by marine inspection and jurisdiction, and not be required to carry licensed officers? One must have a license to drive a truck, an auto, or airplane, then why not a pilot or engineer on a vessel carrying crews and transporting up to 40,000 tons of cargo. On the rivers, rules of the road and navigation are constantly violated and ignored, in many cases because the incompetent men operating the vessels are simply unfamiliar with them. It requires years of experience to become eligible for a license and become a competent officer. Yet vessels are operating today with so-called officers who have a bare minimum of experience, thereby endangering life, limb and property.

Needless to say, there would be a great opposition by the companies to action in the Legislature on the conditions outlined above. However, it is past time for fairness and democracy to prevail.

Senator a great number of competent officers and personnel on the waterways have become extremely perturbed because of the conditions outlined in this letter, and a concentrated effort is being made to present the facts to our respective Representatives and Senators in Washington. We feel it is high time for the above situation to be rectified and we have full confidence that you and your colleagues, who govern our land, can and will endeavor to bring about a halt to the flagrant abuse of your constituents by the select few who are responsible for the situation outlined in the subject matter of this letter.

A Suggestion, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, as the administration continues to lead us into a period of ever-expanding Federal programs, thinking people across the country finds itself in today. Their fears and hopes are reflected in the mail I receive, in newspapers, in articles, and conversations. One of the best expressions of this concern appeared in the following editorial from the Hartford Times of August 3:

A SUGGESTION, MR. PRESIDENT

We think President Kennedy has an opportunity and an obligation now to review the nonmilitary items of his budget and cut them back. The Hartford Times believes that the American people do not want or need all of the social-economic spending programs that have been submitted to Congress by the President simultaneous with military demands that will consume almost 60 percent of the Federal income.

Those who assume that we can afford both an enlarged, diversified and strengthened Military Establishment and the uplift inherent in subsidies, grants-in-aid, and the race for the moon can hardly oppose a raise in Federal taxes. And that, we believe, is unnecessary at this time.

Reducing nondefense expenditures to offset an emergency request for some $5 billion more in national defense is in itself stubbornly difficult. As Arthur Krock pointed out recently, some $18.9 billion of that nondefense spending is considered politically uncontrollable. That means not enough Members of Congress have the courage to wield the knife on programs such as public assistance grants to the States, appropriations for foreign aid development loans and grants, veterans' pensions and other benefits, agricultural subsidies, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Eisenhower budget set a level of $15.1 billion for such Federal "housekeeping" functions as agency upkeep and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is regarded as "controllable" spending. The Kennedy administration has added to this the costs of the antirecession program and $435 million for NASA to meet the public clamor for speed in the space race. And the total additions amount to several billions of dollars.

Here are some of the curbs that might find prevailing support at this time—even among those who support the affected programs, their objectives, and the demonstrated need for them:

Rigid economy in departmental and agency disbursements, established and enforced by Executive order. Postponement of the legislation for added Federal educational grants and loans of $2.5 billion and to start the numerous smaller spending programs with which the President has deluged Congress. A halt or stretching-out of the $20 to $40 billion project to land a man on the moon. A percentage cut in "watchdog" auditing of foreign aid appropriations of nearly $51 billion in the Kennedy budget for military and directly related programs, and effective presidential discipline of the wasteful interservice rivalries which still exist.

After an indecisive and unimpressive start, Mr. Kennedy has regained the initiative in the "contest of wills" between the United States and the Soviet Union. His requests for more defense money and specific authorization for manipulating manpower have been granted with unusual unanimity and speed in Congress. But he has proposed neither the deferment of his nondefense spending programs nor upward tax revisions to pay for them. We think this is wrong for at least two reasons:

First, it goes against the grain of reason to insist that this or any society can eat its cake and have it too; can commit added billions for an "all-front and indefinite war" against Russia, expand the money role of the Federal Government in civilian affairs, and hang it all on an "expanding tax base."

Second, a hopeless campaign to achieve basically sound socioeconomic goals, but at the wrong time, is prejudicial to the goals and will defer a later achievement of them. We are thinking now particularly of aid to education.

We may find that a continuation of the wage-price spiral will go on pushing up the costs of defense, making a tax increase unavailable under any circumstances. Certainly in that event our nondefense commitments should be held to a minimum in every conceivable way.

Mr. Kennedy could dramatize his own inaugural appeal for "sacrifice" by making one of his own—the sacrifice of objectives that are more politically than economically viable in the present world crisis.

What's Russia Doing About Civil Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, President Kennedy and other responsible officials of our Government have been trying to arouse our Nation to a better understanding of why we must develop an adequate civil defense program.

I am including in the RECORD today an excellent article which appeared in the August edition of the Air Force and Space Digest, which shows so graphically how the Soviet Union has been preparing its people since as early as 1920.

I hope this article will contribute toward the present discussion and will help impress upon the American people that as individuals they should not wait until either the Federal or State Government moves in this program, but rather should determine what they themselves can do.

Recently, I included in my newsletter a brief note that the Office of Civil Defense had prepared an excellent "do-it-yourself" booklet on constructing bomb shelters. I am inspired by the fact that almost 1,000 of my constituents have requested copies of this booklet through my office to date. This indicates that there is a growing awareness among the people, but I fear that this awareness has not been developed among the great masses of people in the United States.

There is no question in my mind that an adequate civil defense is just as much a part of our overall strategy for the defense and survival of freedom as all other military developments. Should the Russians be foolish enough to start world war III, the Kremlin, in its appraisal of the possibility of ultimate victory, undoubtedly will take into consideration to what degree the American people are prepared to survive nuclear attacks. I am convinced that the risk of the Soviets attempting a surprise attack would diminish in direct proportion to our survival preparation—particularly if the Russians know that the American people are so thoroughly prepared for a nuclear attack that the vast majority of our citizens would survive.

This article refutes, to a great extent, claims frequently made by sophisticates in our country that we Americans are unnecessarily fanning war hysteria.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

WHAT'S RUSSIA DOING ABOUT CIVIL DEFENSE?

(By Leon Gouré)

Russia has devoted considerable attention to civil defense preparedness. Here is an authoritative report on the Soviet program in this area as it emerges from recent publications within the U.S.S.R.

BACKGROUND

Soviet leaders have been concerned with civil defense since the early 1920's. They have at various times embarked on extensive civil defense training and construction programs. Between 1935 and 1959, six mass civil defense training programs were instituted. During World War II, when such training was compulsory, 137,000,000 persons are said to have taken the 28-hour civil defense course. During the second World War, the Soviet population had considerable experience in shelter life. The importance of civil defense as a factor contributing to Soviet war readiness has been stressed by the top marshals of the Soviet Union and has been discussed by ministers of defense at party congresses—although Premier Khrushchev has made the point that Russia, because of its size and industry dispersal, is less vulnerable to attack than western countries.

Soviet manuals stress that civil defense—

Must protect the population against all types of weapons: conventional, chemical, bacteriological, nuclear. The threat of the socalled ABC weapons, which are termed "means of mass destruction," has been especially stressed since 1954.

Must provide important industrial, administrative, and other vital installations with the ability to continue their operations "under condition of attack from the air."

Must be based on the mass participation of a trained population and must be able to deal quickly with the damage and casualties from an attack.

ORGANIZATION

Soviet civil defense organization works through the national, territorial, and local administrations and the economic institutes. The small full-time professional staff, which was headed until recently by a first deputy minister of internal affairs (MVD), develops operational and organizational systems and conducts research. Full-time staffs at the republic, territory, regional, district, and city levels direct the work of formations and groups organized on the bases of existing services and volunteer teams. The formation of civil defense units according to a prescribed table of organization is compulsory for all republics, provinces, counties, cities, districts, factories, collective and state farms, large institutions, and large public buildings and apartment houses.

In a Soviet city there are 11 different civil defense services—medical, shelter, decontamination, and so on—headed by the mayor and a civil defense staff. This organization is duplicated on the district level and in large industrial installations. On the lowest level, in apartment houses and farms, there are the so-called volunteer self-defense groups, each containing eight specialized teams—medical, shelter, firefighting, and other duties. A group of about 48 persons is organized for every 500 residents or more. The units in urban centers are to be supplemented by special rural formations and military or militarized units which come to the assistance of the cities following an attack.

According to a West German writer, Soviet Premier Khrushchev has claimed that 22 million persons, or 10 percent of the entire population, now serve in civil defense groups. This could be a goal rather than an actuality.

TRAINING

The Soviet authorities have been insisting on the importance of training the entire population in civil defense. Since 1955, three compulsory training programs for all persons over 16 years of age have been completed. In 1955 there was a 10-hour program, from 1956 to 1958 a 22-hour program, and in 1959 a 14-hour program which stressed practical civil defense work. A new 18-hour program has now gone into effect to stress practical work in postattack operations. The training programs familiarize the population with the nature of modern weapons and their effects, teach them to use individual means of protection and how to behave in shelters, and instruct them in first aid, firefighting, decontamination, and, in rural areas, veterinary assistance to farm animals.

All training is conducted in small groups at places of employment, apartment houses, or farms. According to Soviet press reports the training has been uneven, lagging especially in rural areas, and at times has been only perfunctory, but constant efforts are made to improve its quality and to check its effectiveness.

SHELTERS, OTHER PROTECTION

There is little information available on actual construction of shelters by the Russians, although general information on Soviet shelters exists in abundance.

While the Soviet population made use of a variety of shelters during the Second World War, few of these would be suitable for present conditions. According to Soviet civil defense literature, the requirements of a modern Soviet shelter are:

That it have a fire-resistant roof and be capable of withstanding the thermal radiation of a nuclear explosion.

That the roof be below the surface of the earth and provide a sufficient attenuation factor for fallout radiation. Soviet standards on permissible radiation levels are on the whole similar to those of the West: Fifty roentgens is considered to be the limit of permissible immediate doses; 100 roentgens is an outside permissible cumulative dose over a relatively short period of time.

That the roof be capable of withstanding the collapse of the building above, the attentuated blast wave of a nuclear explosion, and direct hits by small or medium-caliber high explosive and incendiary bombs.

That it have at least one emergency exit with a tunnel, located so as not to be buried under debris.

That permanent shelters in likely target areas be capable of hermetical sealing against seepage of chemical-biological-radiation weapon agents and of blast wave, and be equipped to allow relatively long-term occupancy.

Soviet manuals describe a wide variety of shelters: Heavy detached shelters, detached shelters, subways, basement shelters, field and emergency shelters. Only deep underground shelters, according to Soviet sources, can survive near the ground zero of a nuclear explosion. Such heavy detached shelters are built as tunnels with reinforced concrete walls and have space for upwards of 150 persons, filter-ventilators, steel airtight double doors, food and water storage, toilet facilities, communication equipment, and possibly chemical air purfiers and bottled oxygen.

Another heavy detached type is similar to a World War II bunker with very thick reinforced concrete walls and roof, designed to withstand probably 200 to 300 pounds of pressure per square inch. Such shelters may be two stories high and have equipment similar to that in the deep underground shelters.

A detached shelter frequently described in Soviet literature is the so-called "layer" or "pit" type. This shelter has a roof of one

or more thick slabs of reinforced concrete covered with a layer of earth, which may be several feet thick. It is supported by concrete or brick pillars or internal walls which divide the shelter into compartments. Such shelters are partially or completely underground and will probably withstand in excess of 100 pounds of pressure per square inch. They will also be equipped with double doors, filter ventilation units, toilets, water, and other such necessities. These shelters may have space for from 150 to several thousand persons.

Some Soviet leaders have indicated that the Soviet Union intends to make extensive use of subways as shelters. There are subways in operation in Moscow and Leningrad. This year the Kiev subway will begin operations. These subway systems are fairly deep. The Moscow one could shelter, on lower platforms and in tunnels, from 1 to 2 million persons or 20 to 40 percent of the city's inhabitants.

The Soviet basement shelter is a special area of the basement of an apartment house or public building designed to meet certain specifications. It has a roof of reinforced concrete, supported by steel or reinforced concrete beams, capable of withstanding the collapse of the building above. It is fireproof, completely underground, and capable of being hermetically sealed. Its basic equipment includes airtight double metal doors of the bulkhead type, a filter ventilation unit, one or more emergency tunnels, toilets, water, heating, telephones, and possibly bottled oxygen. Depending on the building, it may occupy the entire basement or only part of it. It is divided by interior walls into compartments. The recommended capacity of such a shelter is 100 to 150 persons. It may be designed to withstand between 10 pounds pressure per square inch and 100 pounds pressure per square inch. According to Soviet manuals, such a shelter would be expected to survive the blast "at some distance" from ground zero.

In addition, Russian publications speak of field and emergency shelters, mostly of the fallout type and usually less permanent. They are to be built by the population when the Soviet Government announces a "threatening-situation" alert. These would consist of various types of earth-covered trenches, dugouts, galleries, or tunnels in mountain sides. Their walls would be made of precast concrete, wood, metal sheeting, or other handy materials.

These shelters are to be built in both cities and rural areas, but especially the latter. They would hold from 25 to 60 persons, perhaps have heating and a simple ventilation system but not running water. They may or may not have metal doors. For the most part they do not appear to be designed for long-term occupancy. Shelters of this type can be built in 1 day or less provided the necessary material is available. If the shelters cannot be hermetically sealed, the people using them are instructed to wear their gas masks during an attack. One-family shelters of a similar sort may also be built in suburbs at the cost of the families concerned.

Russian publications also have stressed the use of gas masks, protective clothing, and chemical warfare decontamination kits. No such equipment has been issued to the general public, but there has been wide training in their uses.

EVACUATION

In 1959 Soviet literature began to mention evacuation of the urban populations in conjunction with the "threatening-situation" alert. The present plan calls for the evacuation of the nonessential city population to rural areas. Also to be evacuated to suburban areas are various civil defense groups. It is likely that key elements in industry, the party, and the administration will also be evacuated to shelters outside the cities. Nevertheless, the authorities at present still appear to plan to leave a part of the "productive" elements of the population in the cities.

With civil defense in mind, Soviet city planners have recommended measures to reduce population density in large cities. Civil defense requirements are to be incorporated in the development of new urban districts or centers.

POSTATTACK OPERATIONS

Present Soviet civil defense plans call for large-scale rescue and evacuation operations in the disaster zone immediately after attack in order to give prompt aid to casualties and limit damage. The disaster area is to be reconnoitered by teams equipped with radiological and chemical detection equipment, of which the Soviets have a considerable variety. Following this, first aid, firefighting, rescue, and decontamination teams move in. Manpower will be provided by surviving civil defense formations, special rural and military formations, and civil defense units from other cities, as well as mobilized citizens who are at hand. Only regular civil defense units will have radiological equipment and chemical detection kits. Rescued persons will be evacuated to uncontaminated areas where mobile or stationary decontamination and medical units will take care of them. Food and other essential supplies are to be provided by special civil defense service teams.

It is evident that this system would be effective only in a zone of partial destruction. In the zone closer to ground zero, intensity of destruction, high rate of radiation, and a probable firestorm would prevent timely rescue of persons not adequately sheltered. Those in surviving shelters are apparently expected to be able to wait until the rescuers reach them.

The extensive Red civil defense program does not appear to have either greatly reassured or greatly alarmed the Soviet citizenry. The program has been in effect for a number of years. The Russian people had considerable experience with such programs in the second World War period. And the Soviet citizen is used to compulsory training courses and so-called "voluntary-compulsory" participation in varied government schemes.

In sum, Russia is engaged in a serious, energetic civil defense program—one that makes a major contribution to her overall strength.

The Commonsense of Conservatism Is Spreading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the basic foundation of conservatism is just commonsense—the urge to return to those principles of thrift and individual freedom which created this Nation and upon which it has become great, strong, and powerful. Because conservatism is basically good commonsense, we find a rekindled interest in conservative principles throughout America. The following interesting observations in an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor should be food for thought for those who are continuing to beat the drums for more Federal spending, an enlarged Federal Government, further invasion of the rights of the States and the people:

CONSERVATISM ON THE RISE?—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE MIDWEST

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

Recently while partaking of the warm hospitality of the Milwaukee Journal, there was the usual exchange of questions and information. The Journal's genial chief editorial writer, Paul Ringler, asked: "Do you find in your wanderings much validity for the claim that conservatism is on the rise in this country?"

I said that it was my impression that this was so. He asked for specifics. I cited recent TOWER and GOLDWATER speeches where I had seen audiences more enthusiastic than usual. When businessmen hammer their dinner tables in response to a speaker's remarks, this is something for an off-election year. In fact, when businessmen respond like that, it would be something for any year—including a presidential campaign period.

Then I cited visits to several college campuses, where a number of youngsters had come up to me to discuss politics—and where the evidence of conservative leanings was strong.

"But," came the question from another editor, "couldn't it be that the conservatives merely are more vocal than they were?" I had to admit this might be so.

Later, on reflection, I remembered that I had left out some other specifics. I recalled that I had been in several student eating places where I had overheard conservative talk (anxiety over excessive spending, etc.) that would have to be considered spontaneous. And I had talked to several professors along the way who had volunteered the information that conservatism was gaining ground on campus. These professors did not necessarily share their students' sentiment.

Prodded by the editors' questions I decided to make a few more inquiries. What, for example, would the onetime Wisconsin Progressive leader, Philip La Follette, have to say about this? Said Mr. La Follette, who certainly couldn't be accused of wanting to forward the conservative movement in America:

"I have noted it among young people apparently in the age group of 21 to the late thirties. They are beginning to wonder who is going to pay for all this aid and assistance—not just abroad, but right here at home." He continued:

"I'm not saying they are correct, but I have noted it: I get up to the university area a lot (the University of Wisconsin is fairly close to my law office), and I hear them talk. And I have children, and I hear them talk.

"I distrust the comments on this subject from the normally conservative people or the normally progressive people. These younger people aren't necessarily conservatives. They are just concerned about who is going to support the people at the upper end of the line and the people at the lower end of the line. They're asking, 'who is going to pay the bill?'

"In their view it is a nice dinner, but who is going to pick up the check?"

An interesting answer, this time from a Republican, came from the son of Mr. Republican, himself, Robert A. Taft, Jr.:

"In my trips around the State and to colleges I can't say that I really have seen an upsurge of conservatism. But I think there is increased feeling everywhere and particularly among young people of both parties that inflation has to be checked. They feel that we must watch our spending or we're heading for a bust.

"Young Republicans at colleges are organizing and speaking up more than before. I think there was a feeling among Republican students of being ashamed to state their views. This definitely is changing. For ex-

ample, at Antioch College there is a Young Republican group that certainly is willing to stand up and be counted. And Antioch has been a place that has been known for its liberalism."

There were a lot of other answers. But these seemed to be the most interesting, an expression from a onetime Progressive and from a Republican in very good standing—comments that, when analyzed could well be saying about the same thing.

Is conservatism on the move? This may be a moot point. But there does seem to be evidence of more concern with governmental spending, particularly among the young people of both parties.

Hood River County, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Oregon Grange Bulletin carries an extremely interesting and informative article on Hood River County, Oreg. As the article points out, this area boasts a diversified economy as well as outstanding scenic and recreational attractions. I invite my colleagues to read the article and to visit Hood River County in the great Pacific Northwest:

HOOD RIVER COUNTY, OREG.

(By Earl Moore)

Looking out to the south end of Hood River County you can see Mount Hood, Oregon's highest mountain, which rises to a height of 11,245 feet above sea level. It is from its streams that most of the water comes to irrigate the crop grown in Hood River Valley.

The first white men to visit this valley were the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1805, but trappers and fur traders soon followed, passing through on their way to the Willamette Valley.

LAND SETTLED

The Nathaniel Coe family were the first permanent white settlers, filing on a donation land claim in 1854. This claim was located where the city of Hood River now stands. Other settlers followed shortly after and the records show Nathaniel Coe to be the first planter of fruit trees in this locality in 1855. But, it was not until about 1900 that fruit production became a major enterprise, although E. L. Smith had planted a 30-acre commercial orchard in 1876.

Irrigation was pioneered in Hood River Valley by Frank Davenport, and the Farmers Irrigation Co. put the first unit of its system into operation in 1897. There are now six other irrigation districts in addition to the Farmers, irrigating a total of 19,000 acres. Irrigation was one of the major developments of the valley, thereby insuring the success of the fruit industry as it is now known to our customers in many parts of the world.

INCOME DIVERSIFIED

The income of Hood River County has been nearly equally divided between timber and agriculture for many years. The lumber industry dates back to 1861 when Peter Neal built and operated the first mill on Neal Creek at a site a short distance from where the Pine Grove Grange hall is now located. In the heart of Hood River Valley at Dee, shortly after 1900 the Oregon Lumber Co. began operation of a mill and logging camp. This has been the major lumber operation in the county over these 60 years. A few years back the Oregon Lumber Co. holdings were purchased by the Hines Lumber Co., which also has a hardboard plant at Dee, using waste material such as slabs, bark, and sawdust from the mill to manufacture hardboard. This plant is in continuous operation employing 250 people.

Of the 242,000 acres of forest land in the county, 65 percent is Federal, 23 percent private, and 12 percent county owned. Hood River County has one of the few county forests in the United States. The nearly 30,000 acres of county forest is managed by the U.S. Forest Service through a 99-year cooperative agreement. On a sustained yield program, the national and county forests are yielding 42 million feet annually, county forest's average annual cut is 3.2 million feet at present, but the county yield will be several times this amount 30 or 40 years hence, a large share of the county land being cutover or brush land that has a new crop of timber growing on it. At such a time as this land comes into full production it will mean much more to the economy of Hood River County.

FRUIT IMPORTANT TO AREA

Apples and strawberries were the fruits that built up the reputation of Hood River Valley as a fruit producing area. The Clark seedling strawberry was in high production for many years, many carloads being shipped each year for about a 50-year period, 1890 to 1940; in 1930 at the peak of production 975 acres were in strawberries. These berries for many years were grown mostly for the fresh market, Clark seedling being one of the finest shipping berries ever grown. With the coming of World War II and the shortage of harvest labor, the berries all went out and for a number of years no berries were grown commercially, but at present there is a small acreage of cannery berries in production with the better growers getting yields of 5 to 10 tons per acre.

The Spitzenberg apple, which helped to make Hood River famous in the fruit markets of the world, is fast fading out of the picture. At one time the Spitz was second in volume only to the Yellow Newtown, Hood River's old standby. Red Delicious have been increasing in popularity and production for many years and in a few years the big Red Delicious may be the major variety grown in the valley.

PEARS PROVE PROFITABLE

In agriculture, it is interesting to note how things beyond our control influence production trends. Hood River Valley has a very good example of this in fruit. In 1919 the acreage of pears in the county was very small, but extreme cold temperatures in December 1919, killed many apple trees and this started a trend of pear planting that is still continuing. Pear production has been larger than apple output during the past year and Hood River Valley has the largest production of Anjou pears of any district in the world, with our Apple Growers Association marketing the largest block of Anjou pears in the country.

The Lambert cherry is another of the fine high quality fruits grown in Hood River by many growers. Although the acreage is small, Hood River Lambert cherries are often found topping the market in eastern terminals.

Bartlett pears are also a major crop, a normal crop being about 20,000 tons, of which about 10,000 tons are processed in Hood River by the Apple Growers Association cannery and shipped out as canned products. A small tonnage of Bartletts are packed for the fresh market and the balance goes to outside canneries.

PEACHES PURCHASED LOCALLY

Peaches are also grown in a small way and in recent years the Red Haven variety has been planted with some very fine fruit of this variety being produced, which are sold largely in the Portland and local markets.

Livestock and field crops account for only 5 percent of the agricultural income in the county, but there are some farm operators that have consistently stayed with this type of farming for many years and are quite successful.

One of the recent developments in the handling of apples and pears has been the bulk or tote-bin method. Bins that will hold 20 to 25 bushels of fruit are used to pick in and are handled with tractor forklifts in the orchard, with mechanical handling at the packing and storage plants thereby handling the fruit with less bruising and eliminating a large amount of hand labor.

While about 75 percent of the fruit in Hood River is marketed cooperatively through the Apple Growers Association, there are still several very successful independent fruitgrowing and shipping firms in the valley.

MASTER HEADS FIRM

The Hood River Pomona Grange Master, Walter Wells, is the head of a very successful family fruit operation that grows, stores and packs, delivering packaged fruit at the door of retail markets in Portland and central Oregon. Walter started in the early twenties and at one time in the early years of his operation, sold apples and cider house to house from The Dalles on out through central Oregon. This operation has expanded over the years until at the present they operate around 200 acres of orchard and a packing plant with cold storage of 100,000-box capacity (which was designed and built by the home crew). Delivery of a larger percentage of this fruit is to Portland or central Oregon by Wells & Sons trucks.

Wells has very good helpers that have grown up with the operation such as sons, Gowland and Bill, with son-in-law, Lorn Magnusen; this being truly a family operation where all members of all the families lend a hand at it.

CHAMBER HONORS WELLS

At the chamber of commerce awards banquet this year an award was given to Walter in recognition of outstanding orchard operations in Hood River, where a very successful orchard operation has been built up with a marketing program at the same time, with a reputation for good fruit so that they have been able to supply the same customers year after year for many years.

All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy, but this doesn't need to happen in Hood River Valley since it is one of the finest recreation areas in Oregon. From skiing or winter sports on the slopes of Mount Hood to boating and water skiing on the Columbia River, with all the mountains, lakes, and good fishing streams between, you need look no further for the finest recreation in the world.

The National Lottery of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this

House the national lottery of Poland. This lottery was not established by the Communists, for lotteries in Poland are traditional—they date back to 1808.

The Communist Government of Poland operates the national lottery in much the same way as do the governments of other nations. In 1960, gross receipts came to $53 million. The government profit was close to $17 million.

Actually, most Communist Governments are not prone towards lotteries. Only a few of the Communist Nations utilize them. Of those European Nations not operating lotteries, the overwhelming majority are Communist. The reason is quite simple—the Communists frown on gambling as being frivolous and undesirable in what they call the new Socialist man. This is just another manifestation of human individualism that the Communists refuse to recognize—we are in rare company.

Cape Cod Conservatism: A Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored and thankful for the privilege accorded me on Monday, August 7, to attend, with some of my distinguished colleagues of Massachusetts and the Congress, the signing of the bill relating to the preservation of the beauties and most attractive features of Cape Cod.

As the author of H.R. 6720, which I introduced on April 8, 1957, in the 85th Congress, the first bill looking toward the proper conservation and development of Cape Cod presented to the Congress, I am naturally gratified that this legislation has finally been enacted into law.

The bill had bipartisan support, and several of my most distinguished colleagues of the Massachusetts delegation and of the House worked and cooperated wholeheartedly to make this legislation a reality.

Our great and beloved President himself and his colleague at the time, our distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, introduced this basic measure in the Senate, and my valued and distinguished friends and colleagues, Congressmen EDWARD P. BOLAND, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, and HASTINGS KEITH, introduced appropriate measures in the House.

Congressman KEITH, who represents the Cape Cod district, labored very ably and tirelessly in behalf of the bill. The able and distinguished gentleman from Texas, Congressman J. T. RUTHERFORD, and the outstanding members of the House National Parks Subcommittee, as well as the able, distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, and the gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, whose Public Lands Subcommittee did much of the initial work last year, rendered most valuable contributions in working out some of the perplexing problems that developed. Our colleagues on the Senate side also made unstinted contributions in behalf of the bill.

It was especially gratifying, in the most practicable sense, considering the difficulties and circumstances, that the bill for the most part takes into account the rights of private property owners and various communities on the cape, as well as the rights and interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On the whole, I think it can be said that the bill, as enacted, represents about as fair and just a compromise as was possible in the light of the very various interests that were involved.

In a matter of this kind, where the broader, long-time interests of the people as a whole must be served, it is virtually impossible to please everyone concerned, but I think that this particular bill has gone a long way in that direction and, to say the least, leaves a minimum of dissatisfaction.

I earnestly hope that the Department will carry out and administer the project provided by the bill in such a way to insure the conservation and most suitable development of one of the Nation's most cherished areas—our beloved Cape Cod.

Mongolia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the question of Outer Mongolia is one that points up once again the lack of principle and continuity in our foreign policy. I have been attending the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conferences for the past 7 years. At every one of these conferences and at every Council meeting in the spring, the Communists have presented resolutions urging the admission of Outer Mongolia into the Union. We fought back, with the full approval of our State Department. We said repeatedly that if this province, because it cannot qualify in any way as a nation, were admitted, we would walk out. We persuaded the British and others to stand with us and we accomplished the purpose of our State Department and our Government. This September we will appear at Brussels. When this question is brought up again we may well find ourselves with the rug pulled out from under our feet by our own Government. If this were to happen, we would look ridiculous to our allies and absurd to our opponents.

The following article by Mr. George Sokolsky gives a brief sketch of Outer Mongolia and its peoples. The article also calls attention to the fact that Mr. Owen Lattimore is now in this Province, undoubtedly as an agent of the U.S. Government, because it has proved impossible for any ordinary citizen or Congressman to get a passport to travel there.

MONGOLIA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Cut out of China or Siberia or Turkestan, whichever you choose, is Mongolia. The Mongols have played a curious role in history, suddenly emerging to significance in the 12th century and conquering much of Europe and Asia and then receding to a small, insignificant collection of tribes. Genghis Khan, who brought the Mongols to power was born in the region of Lake Baikal. He married the daughter of the chief of Karakorum, where he established his capital. Then he subdued the whole of Mongolia.

In 1211, he began to conquer North China and in due course took the entire country. He also moved westward and conquered Turkestan and the great cities of Khiva, Samarkand, and Bokhara. Thus, Genghis Khan not only possessed military power but he accumulated great wealth. He then moved into Persia, the Caucasus and Russia and into India.

Having conquered so much of the world, he returned to Karakorum in 1224 and set himself up as a great ruler, but he did not live long.

Modern Mongolia is a large country of 1,367,000 square miles, but its population is small, 2,500,000, and it is likely to remain small because much of Mongolia consists of the Gobi Desert, a land which is useful for cattle and horse grazing but for little else.

When China became a republic, Mongolia was divided into two parts, Outer and Inner. The latter part, closer to China, attracted many Chinese, who introduced Chinese methods of agriculture. Urga was the capital of Mongolia and I have been on the Kalgan-Urga Road in my day. It is a land without any excitement.

It is to be noted that although the Chinese are often referred to as a Mongoloid people, they are not Mongols; nor are the Japanese. In fact, the Mongols are closer to the Turkish tribe called the Uigurs, who ultimately showed up in Hungary and Finland.

Since the Russian conquest of the Amur region by Muraviev-Amursky in 1858, Russia has sought to conquer the whole of Mongolia and Turkestan. One of the earliest wars fought by China against Russia was over the Ili region of Turkestan. The Amur, which became the dividing line between Siberia and China also establishes the historic fact that the Maritime Provinces of Siberia are more Chinese than Russian territory.

There is no natural boundary line between Mongolia and Siberia or Mongolia and Turkestan. Therefore, the same people are to be found in all these areas. Some of these people are still Shamanistic in religion; most of them are Moslems. The Mongols, up to the conquest by Soviet Russia, were Lamaistic Buddhists; that is, they took their religion from Tibet rather than from China. And, as in Tibet, an unusually large number of men and women were monks and nuns, and therefore celibates, thus keeping the population small, averaging about two per square mile.

Undoubtedly, this has changed somewhat under the Communists, who do not believe in religious restraints. Increased populations, however, can only produce famine, as the land is not suited for the production of food and there is little or no mineral wealth. Some oil has been found in Chinese territory adjacent to Mongolia, but it is not economically significant.

Mongolia is now a state, a satellite of Soviet Russia, functioning as an independent Communist country under the Soviet system.

Owen Lattimore, an American who lived in Tientsin and is very influential in the State

Department, is one of the very few Americans who knows Mongolia. He is in that country now, although how he got a passport to go there or what he is doing there is not known—except that Lattimore's presence in Mongolia synchronizes with the State Department's activity in favor of getting Mongolia into the United Nations.

Neither Red nor Nationalist China supports the idea of a separate Mongolia, which historically is a part of China. The admission of Mongolia into the United Nations is a State Department trick to divert attention from the admission of Red China. It is not attracting favorable support in Asia, although Soviet Russia is pleased with the idea.

A Savings Banker's View of Income Tax Withholdings on Interest Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters opposing the proposal to withhold taxes on the interest accruing to savings deposits and the tax on dividends. Much of the opposition has been emotional. Many people complained that this innovation was an intrusion and that the redtape necessary to obtain a refund would be burdensome and intolerable. The proponents of the proposal believe that a great amount of income would be derived from this source. Not knowing of any facts to the contrary, I could not refute the argument that many taxpayers are not declaring the interest on their savings. A letter from Henry P. Sutphen, Jr., president of the American Irving Savings Bank of 335 Broadway, New York, N.Y., was so informative that I believe that my colleagues and the readers should have the benefit of his viewpoints. The most impressive fact gleaned from Mr. Sutphen's letter was that approximately 70 percent of the savings accounts range from $1 to $2,500, and that the top interest figure upon which taxes would be payable would be only $87.50 per annum.

It appears from the information contained in the letter that the revenue to be derived would be insignificant, and the difficulty in obtaining refunds would be oppressive to the taxpayer. It is likely that many taxpayers from whom the taxes would be deducted from the bank would be either unaware of the right to obtain a refund or would overlook the opportunity to obtain it. This information, in my opinion, is one of the most forceful arguments I have received against the proposal to withhold taxes from interest payments on savings accounts and on dividends.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN IRVING SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N.Y., August 3, 1961.

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SANTANGELO: As the Representative of the 18th Congressional District in which our office at 81st Street and First Avenue is located, I would like to take this opportunity to express to you our views on two tax proposals which are currently under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee, i.e., the withholding tax on interest and dividend payments and the corporate income tax on mutual savings institutions, such as this bank, and savings and loan associations. At this point, let me emphasize that we are fully aware of the necessity for the Government to collect as much in taxes as is possible under present tax laws and, further, that it is highly probable that additional taxes must be raised at a later date, as was intimated in the address of the President last week.

Regarding the withholding tax on interest and dividend payments, it goes without saying that individuals should report interest on savings deposits in their tax returns and it is our belief that the great majority comply with the law. This proposal, however, will penalize a large number of depositors of small means by imposing a tax on their savings accounts where no income tax may be payable because of insufficient income. To illustrate, this bank as of June 1, 1961, had 72,866 savings accounts on its books of which 50,527 or 69.3 percent were in amounts ranging from $1 to $2,500. This group had on deposit with us an amount equalling 16½ percent of our total deposits. The interest which would be paid on the top figure of $2,500 would amount to only $87.50 per annum. It is not unreasonable to assume that the great majority in this group are not subject to tax. Although a claim for a refund may be made, the delay in processing millions of such claims would result in the small saver being deprived of the use of his money for an indefinite period of time. This withholding, consequently, is not in the same category as withholding on salaries where consideration is given to total income from such a source as well as the number of exemptions which can be claimed. We have no information on these other factors which are taken into account in the tax calculation.

A further important objection to this withholding proposal is the heavy expense to institutions as well as to the Treasury Department in the administration of such a measure. The details in handling claims for refunds in themselves would appear to be very large in view of the many individuals and tax exempt organizations involved. It has also been reported in the press that those who are not taxable could file exemption certificates. The burden, both on the banks and the Treasury Department, in keeping track of these certificates would seem to be a staggering one.

All of the savings banks have cooperated wholeheartedly in the voluntary campaign instituted by the Treasury Department during the past year or so for the reporting of such interest. It would be wise to continue this voluntary effort.

Turning to the proposed corporate income tax on mutuals and savings and loan associations, the imposition of such a tax would seriously affect the ability of the banks to continue paying current dividend rates, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, to maintain an adequate surplus and reserve position for the protection of depositors. As you know, the only function of a mutual savings bank is to act as the depositary for the savings of individual people, and to reinvest these funds at the best return available in the market. The type and quality of these investments is strictly regulated by State laws pertaining solely to savings banks, and the types of services which can be offered to depositors is also strictly controlled by law. A further important factor is that, being a mutual organization, a savings bank can provide adequate reserves for its depositors only by retaining sufficient earnings after dividends, with no outside capital being available to margin growth. A commercial bank, however, performs the function of financing business of many kinds and it can also offer under the law other services which are forbidden to savings banks. Further, it has access to the capital market to sell stock to provide for growth.

Being a specialized thrift institution, a savings bank pays out a high percentage of its earnings in dividends or interest payments, so that the saver can receive the highest possible return consistent with safety of principal. You may be interested to know that over the past 5 years this bank has paid to depositors in interest over 87 percent of its earnings. During this period, we have paid the highest rate permitted by the regulations of the Banking Department and we have also maintained the same percentage of reserves to deposits.

We have made some calculations as to the effect of an income tax in our position, based on the assumption that the regular corporate tax of 52 percent after interest payments will be levied on the balance of earnings. It would be necessary to reduce the interest rate by one-half of 1 percent in order to add to surplus and reserves the same percentage of deposits as we now do. If the present interest rate should be maintained, it naturally would reduce the addition to surplus and reserves by over 50 percent, or from approximately $800,000 to $400,000, an amount which is very nominal in relation both to our total assets of $200 million and to our interest payments to depositors of $6,500,000 annually.

It is highly probable that the imposition of such a tax would result in either a diminution of the protection from losses afforded to depositors by our present surplus and reserve positions or a reduction in the interest rate paid to savers. Based on past experience, the latter would lessen the amount of savings channeled to savings banks, which, in turn, would lessen the amount of our funds which could be invested in mortgages. The latter outlet, as you know, is the major investment media for savings banks.

In greater or lesser degree, all savings banks would be similiarly affected. We do not feel that the lack of such a tax creates a tax inequality with commercial banks, thereby resulting in unfair competition. The latter perform a completely different function than do savings banks and consequently offer much broader services to the public and are well compensated for so doing.

I trust that you will excuse the length of this letter, but the issues are complicated and important. The imposition of either of these proposals would be very detrimental to the small savers, the housing industry, and consequently the national economy.

Very truly yours,

HENRY R. SUTPHEN, Jr.,
President.

Against Peacetime GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from a young man which really buoyed up my spirits. Ronald Dobrunz minces no words in expressing himself simply and forthrightly. It is indeed heartening to have this expression from a young man who, I am sure,

loves his country and wants to see it prosper under free enterprise and a maximum of opportunity for the individual. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the text of the letter in the RECORD:

PEORIA, ILL., *August 6, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: The newspaper reported that a GI bill for peacetime veterans is moving through the legislative process. I would like to go on record as being firmly against such legislation.

The United States has long provided individual freedoms and economic opportunities for its citizens. It is the privilege and the duty of each citizen to protect this country from those who would destroy the American way. To me, serving in the Armed Forces means much more than the opportunity to receive a free handout from the Government. Serving means an opportunity to protect those free institutions which I hold dear.

It is my opinion that the moral strength of this country and our willingness to fight against communism will continue to decline as long as we continue to place our emphasis on the free handouts and the other material benefits which we can squeeze out of the Government.

I served as a peacetime veteran in Japan. Since I am now attending evening college at Bradley University, I would probably receive substantial benefits from this legislation. Nevertheless I strongly urge you to vote against this bill.

Very truly yours,

RONALD C. DOBRUNZ.

The State Master's Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following comments of Mr. Elmer McClure, State master of the Oregon Grange, on the proposal to provide hospitalization insurance under social security. These comments appear in the current issue of the Oregon Grange Bulletin, dated August 5, 1961. As the column points out, Oregon's Grange has been on record in support of this approach to the problem of medical care for our older citizens for several years.

The article follows:

THE STATE MASTER'S COMMENTS

(By Elmer McClure)

The Anderson-King bill, calling for extending the social security program to provide health insurance for our retired citizens, is having tough sledding in the Senate committee despite the preponderance of evidence to support such legislation.

Last year the White House Conference on Aging, despite all-out efforts to prevent such action, recommended medical coverage under social security as the No. 1 need of the Nation's older citizens.

Medical coverage under social security was one of the leading campaign issues in the presidential election and President Kennedy has personally given strong support to this legislation since it was first proposed.

The special Senate Committee on Aging has found that "most people over 65 do not get the medical care services they require."

Even a recent public opinion poll by one of the Nation's most accurate pollsters shows public sentiment heavily in favor of the program. Yet, Congress delays and Washington political observers feel that the bill will not pass this session unless strong support for it is rallied at the grassroots level.

The American Medical Association is the chief opponent of this program despite persistent evidence that many doctors throughout the country, who treat older people and therefore have personal contact with the problem, favor medical coverage under social security. Most doctors recognize that independence is essential to maintaining the dignity and morale of older people. All too often this hard-won financial independence is completely swept away from older people by a single illness. Skyrocketing medical and hospital costs make even a routine illness a catastrophe for our senior citizens.

The cold, hard fact is that 55 percent of all older persons had cash incomes of less than $1,000 in 1959. In that same year, average hospital bills for this age group were around $700. Since that time hospital costs have continued to race skyward but there is no evidence that income in this group has increased appreciably.

The Kerr-Mills program, passed by the last session of the Congress, calls for participation by the indiivdual States and, as of this date, more than half of the States have failed to pass any companion legislation that would enable their retired citizens to receive aid from this source. The legislation passed by the Oregon State legislature will give only a very limited amount of help in this age group.

The Oregon State Grange has been on record in favor of broadening the social security program to provide medical coverage for several years and I am again writing Oregon's congressional delegation asking them to give all possible aid to the Anderson-King bill. I urge all subordinate and Pomona Granges to take similar action.

It might be well to recall to mind that the social security program is self-financing and therefore is not a drain on the Nation's Treasury. The Anderson-King bill provides for an increase in social security taxes to pay for the broadened coverage provided in the bill.

Our senior citizens are in dire need of this legislation, our people want it, the administration wants it, the majority of Congressmen and Senators say they want it—so why should it be bogged down in a congressional committee?

Barbershop: A New Supermarket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, savings banks sell life insurance, drugstores sell hardware, meat markets sell toys—the trend of America is to develop bigness and eliminate inconvenience for the consumer, especially the housewife. One of the newest approaches to concentrated salesmanship are the "barberamas" which have been developed by an enterprising man, Richard W. Stephan. An article contained in the San Diego Union, I believe, explains clearly the new approach. Barbershops now will be a marketplace as well as a place for tonsorial perfection:

BARBERS MARKET STEPHAN WARES

(By Carl Plain)

If Richard W. Stephan can turn the trick, America's barbershops will serve as miniature supermarkets for the sale of his men's grooming aids.

Stephan, 51, is president of Stephan Co., Fort Lauderdale, Fla. A genial salesman with a broad Boston accent and a build to match, he is out to improve the professional flair—and incomes—of barbers throughout the land.

With the help of barbers, he expects to make a sizable dent in the U.S. male cosmetic market, estimated at $439 million a year. He is persuading the tonsorial artists to display self-service racks of Stephan's products. The barber can double his money by selling a rackful of merchandise which costs him $16.25. By so doing, he can help himself—and Stephan Co., too.

Although the Stephan plan of marketing consumer goods through barbershops was not introduced until last June, the firm's sales climbed to $2.55 million in 1960 from $2,064,901 the year before. Stephan forecasts a $1.5-million jump this year, with a proportionate rise in earnings from 1960 net of about $155,000, or 46 cents a share on the 363,750 shares outstanding.

Growth potential in this unique program is attracting considerable investor attention. Stephan Co. made an initial public offering of 150,000 shares at $4 each last October 27. Lately, the stock has been trading around $19.50 in the eastern over-the-counter market. An American Stock Exchange listing is due next month.

FATHER FOUNDED BUSINESS

Stephan is the last born of 11 brothers and sisters. His father, K. H. Stephan, a German immigrant who ground barber tools and surgical instruments, founded the family business in 1897 and built it into a $5-million-a-year complex of barber, beauty, electrical, cutlery, and sports goods by 1929, when a $900,000 loss in the stock market crash nearly wiped him out. He died in 1935.

Young Richard and his mother picked up the shattered remnants of the business in 1938.

"I told mother that as long as we had the hair tonic, we didn't need to worry," Dick Stephan recalls. "The assets in the business were under $2,000 and I had just $1.78 in my pocket. I delivered $28.38 worth of merchandise to one of the old accounts and asked for cash. 'If you don't pay me now,' I said, 'you're not going to get any merchandise, because I don't have any money to buy the bottles.' "

The customer came through and the business was on the recovery road. Stephan gradually expanded it, selling exclusively to Barbers. Well off by 1952, he moved from Boston to Fort Launderdale to fish, golf and relax. After 1½ years, he turned his energies back into the business.

PLANTS LOCATED IN THREE CITIES

"I got tired of loafing," he explains. "I wanted to get back to work."

Today, the company has plants in Worcester, Mass.; St. Louis and Fresno. Although corporate and sales offices remain in Fort Lauderdale, Stephan virtually runs the business from his briefcase. He's on the road 39 weeks a year.

He is in San Diego this weekend for the second in a series of "Barberamas" which the firm is presenting for barbers in 12 U.S. cities. The programs feature educational pointers on haircutting, shop neatness and all-around service.

Stephan sees no limits to the progress that Stephan Co. and barbers, working together,

can achieve. He claims most other national producers-distributors of hair preparations have antagonized barbers by going into competing retail store channels. He declares, "We'll never do that, and the barbers know it."

Until last year, when Stephan Co. came out with 7 new items in 11 packages, about 85 percent of its sales were in one item—hair tonic—known within the company as the bottle of gold. Professional-size bottles of various preparations still account for the bulk of the business, but sales of retail items are moving up steadily. Future introductions may include deodorant and shave cream.

Looking ahead, Stephan sees the company's sales climbing to the $16–$18 million range by 1965 and earnings rising in the same ratio, with some increase in dividends from the present 10 cents quarterly. As of now, he says, there appears to be no need for additional public financing before 1965.

Curiosities in the Arms Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the diversified problems drawing congressional attention at this time, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD a series of editorials, all of which are clear and concise and do not require my elaboration.

They represent the type of grassroots thinking that is found throughout the country but is thoroughly lacking and desperately needed here in Washington, especially within the inner sanctum of the administration.

I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "Curiosities in the Arms Buildup," an article from Chicago's American by Columnist Henry J. Taylor, "Dillon: A Crow Guarding Corn," and an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, "Red China Is Moral Issue":

[From the Chicago Tribune]

CURIOSITIES IN THE ARMS BUILDUP

Walter Trohan of our Washington bureau quotes Adm. Arleigh Burke as saying after his retirement as Chief of Naval Operations that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, personal military adviser to President Kennedy, tried and failed to sell his doctrine of primary emphasis on conventional warfare to two sets of chiefs of staff.

"Now," remarked the admiral, "he has succeeded in selling it to a lieutenant, junior grade." The reference was to President Kennedy, who held that rank in the Navy in World War II.

This anecdote does point to some very curious things in Mr. Kennedy's call for a buildup of arms and men to meet any challenge Khrushchev may present over Berlin.

First, Mr. Kennedy used to lament what he called America's missile lag in relationship to Russia. During the campaign last year he deplored his estimate that America should be "second best." Even after his election he made mournful reference in his state of the Union address to "the wasteful duplications and timelag that have handicapped the whole family of missiles."

But now that Mr. Kennedy is President and can presumably do something about this sad state of affairs, he isn't interested. Most of the 3½ billion in additional defense appropriations he is being voted is to be used to put additional ground Army divisions in the field and to arm them with conventional, nonnuclear weapons. This is doubly puzzling because the inspired stories now coming from Washington present the improbable thesis that NATO is already stronger than the prospectice enemy.

Again, his personal adviser, General Taylor, who has apparently sold him on the old fashioned doctrine that infantry is still "queen of the battlefield," is on record publicly as saying that the United States possessed ten times the nuclear retaliatory power required to wipe out any potential enemy.

His testimony to this effect was given before the House appropriations subcommittee for defense and was released by that body May 9, 1959. Yet, when General Taylor retired that same year, he was still bleating that the Nation's need, despite its overwhelming capacity to obliterate an attacker, was for "balanced forces"—i.e., more ground Army.

His book, "Uncertain Trumpet," was an appeal for return of the army to the place of chief of the Nation's defense forces. From an officer who has been, for 4 years, Army Chief of Staff, the thesis could not be considered unexpected.

The Kennedy administration's response to Admiral Burke's tart comment is that the shift in defense plans and the switch in emphasis to conventional forces had been in the making months before Taylor was recalled to active duty. Perhaps so, but the general has been around in an advisory capacity since the Cuban invasion flop 6 weeks after Kennedy took office, and the Kennedy program would seem to follow his exact prescription.

There is, not unnaturally, widespread fear of nuclear war. Indeed, it is Khrushchev's chief stock in trade. He plays on it endlessly. The Kennedy buildup seems to assure him that, if there is a showdown over Berlin, he is invited to participate in a limited, nonnuclear war, in which the United States is content to fight, not to exterminate Soviet imperialism, but to maintain the status quo in a circumscribed area.

This would seem to be Korea all over again, and on no better terms for the United States.

[From the Chicago's American, Aug. 4, 1961]

DILLON—A CROW GUARDING CORN

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Secretary of the Treasury is intended to be the watchdog of the Nation's moneybags. He greatly affects our taxes, which now cost us more than we pay for our food. He is the No. 2 man, after the Secretary of State, in the President's Cabinet.

But the New Frontier requires a free-spender, not a watchdog, in the Treasury post. And when C. Douglas Dillon asked for the place the day was won. Dillon guarding our money is like leaving a crow to guard the corn.

Once a banker and later the second in command in the State Department under President Eisenhower, the public and our newspapers pictured Dillon in the watchdog image.

Yet, he was as welcome to the New Frontier as the ace of spades is to a gambler. For the truth is that, able as he was in many ways, Dillon was a fountainhead for spending in the State Department.

He repeatedly counfounded the Treasury Department specialists—who are among the most competent people in the entire Government—Maurice H. Stans, the then Director of the Budget, and other caretakers appointed to protect the taxpayers.

SOFT SURRENDER ON TARIFFS

He did so by what many regarded as soft surrenders in tariff talks, by loose foreign loan agreements and by condoning the enormous waste in American counterpart funds blocked abroad. In fact, the Treasury's present Secretary continually battled many of his own State Department colleagues who urged more prudence.

President Kennedy did not "suck in" Dillon, as is sometimes reported. He simply knew his man. In their preliminary discussion the President-elect was absolutely aboveboard, frank and fair with Dillon in every respect. It was Dillon who sought the job. Why? Because he was determined to stay in Washington; it is as simple as that.

Accordingly, when testifying before the Senate-House Finance Committee in behalf of his own confirmation, every word Dillon said had the watchdog tone. He stated: "Everything we do depends on having a sound economy, which, in turn, means a sound fiscal system." He called a balanced budget "essential for national security." He stated that our colossal debt should be reduced, thereby relieving the taxpayers' burden of more than $8 billion a year to carry it.

WATCHDOG QUITS WATCHING

Promptly thereafter the taxpayers' watchdog quit watching. Dillon had not been on guard 90 days before he announced that President Kennedy's vastly increased budget deficit from added spendings "is not a cause for alarm." Dillon forecast an even bigger deficit in the next fiscal year. "This, too," he said, "will be entirely appropriate."

All this might be largely Dillon's own affair. But it is not his affair alone, because his background can mislead taxpayers into assuming that a determined and prudent hand holds the Treasury's tiller to help defeat programs which would rob us through wasted revenue and inflation and push us further toward the welfare state to which the new administration is committed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Aug. 5, 1961]

RED CHINA IS MORAL ISSUE

Americans who abhor the bloody Red China regime—and this includes the vast majority of Americans—will hail President Kennedy's reaffirmation of U.S. opposition to seating the Chinese Communists in the U.N.

At the conclusion of 2 days of discussions with Chen Cheng, Vice President and Premier of Nationalist China, the President also pledged continuing U.S. support of Taiwan in the U.N., and in the form of further military and economic aid.

There has been a good deal of misunderstanding between Nationalist China and the Kennedy administration that has needed clearing up. There was confusion last month over a U.S. plan to propose adding a seat to the U.N. for Red China (in hopes of maneuvering Peiping into refusing to join the organization while Nationalist China remained a member). There continues to be defeatist talk among administration leaders on the chances of keeping the Red China debate off the agenda this year.

The joint communique which the President and his visitor issued resolved some of these doubts; it did not settle others.

It emphasized "the deep and lasting friendship" existing between Taiwan and the United States. It said talks between the two leaders had been "characterized by a spirit of understanding and mutual interest."

But the document made plain that the United States failed to persuade the Nationalists to withhold a veto of the admission of Communist Outer Mongolia to the U.N. This is disappointing—not because of the stand of the Nationalist Chinese, for that was expected, but because it indicates the admin-

istration is unsure of its ability to block Red China's admission, and is seeking diversions which do not meet the fundamental issues of right and decency that are involved.

Some U.S. officials fear that a veto of Outer Mongolia will endanger Nationalist China's seat by swinging many delegates to support of the Communist Chinese.

This may be. But it isn't a point which should be permitted to override other, deeper considerations in this controversy.

Red China is an outlaw government. Its admission to the U.N. would be a shattering blow to the prestige and integrity of the world peace organization. The Peiping government, which openly proclaims a doctrine of world revolution by violence—atomic violence if need be—has been guilty of repeated aggression against its Asian neighbors. It warred against the U.N. in Korea.

These are factors to be considered by the U.N. itself if it is not going to demean itself by yielding to Communist bullying.

The United States has demonstrated—and has now reiterated—its opposition to Red China's admission. It should do more. It should vigorously assert its leadership to strengthen the U.N.'s backbone on the issue. It should not descend to international logrolling by offering to trade support for Outer Mongolia, a Communist puppet, for support for Nationalist China. There is no moral justification for such a move.

Support for H.R. 6725

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1961, I introduced H.R. 6725, a bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit.

This, the Truth in Lending Act, would require all persons extending credit to another to make full disclosure in writing of all finance charges prior to consummation of the transaction, under regulations to be prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In a report to the House Banking and Currency Committee on July 18, 1961, the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency stated:

> The Housing Agency strongly supports the objectives of H.R. 6725, especially because of their salutary effect upon mortgage financing. We therefore favor enactment of legislation along the lines of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans buy on the installment plan, which means that they need credit. Since this is true it behooves the Congress to see that they are informed of the true annual interest rate and all charges that will accrue as a result of this extension of credit.

I have urged our distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, to order hearings on H.R. 6725 just as soon as possible.

The American people have a right to know how much they are paying for the privilege before credit is accepted by them as a means of obtaining the consumer goods which make our standard of living possible. That applies to all extensions of retail credit.

Emphasis on Buildup for Conventional Warfare Encourages Khrushchev and Endangers the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the administration is playing a dangerous game by making it appear that we will in any way weaken our position of leadership in nuclear military weapons in favor of a buildup of conventional weapons and manpower. We cannot match the Communists in a military manpower race; they far outnumber us and put no value on human lives, so that they can sacrifice millions of men to reach their objective of world domination. We have kept the peace in these past years only because the Russians knew that we had the power to smash their cities and the will to do so if they were so foolish as to plunge the world into war. Only this fear of massive retaliation will force Khrushchev to a reasonable solution of world problems. If he is convinced that our policy has changed, that we will not resort to nuclear weapons in case of attack, there is no doubt but that he will have the courage to start a war. How far the administration is willing to go in departing from a policy which is the best preventive of war is indicated in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

CURIOSITIES IN THE ARMS BUILDUP

Walter Trohan, of our Washington bureau, quotes Adm. Arleigh Burke as saying, after his retirement as chief of naval operations, that Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, personal military adviser to President Kennedy, tried and failed to sell his doctrine of primary emphasis on conventional warfare to two sets of chiefs of staff.

"Now," remarked the admiral, "he has succeeded in selling it to a lieutenant, junior grade." The reference was to President Kennedy, who held that rank in the Navy in World War II.

This anecdote does point to some very curious things in Mr. Kennedy's call for a buildup of arms and men to meet any challenge Khrushchev may present over Berlin.

First, Mr. Kennedy used to lament what he called America's missile lag in relationship to Russia. During the campaign last year he deplored his estimate that America should be second best. Even after his election he made mournful reference in his state of the Union address to the wasteful duplications and timelag that have handicapped the whole family of missiles.

But now that Mr. Kennedy is President and can presumably do something about this sad state of affairs, he isn't interested. Most of the $3½ billion in additional defense appropriations he is being voted is to be used to put additional ground Army divisions in the field and to arm them with conventional, nonnuclear weapons. This is doubly puzzling because the inspired stories now coming from Washington present the improbable thesis that NATO is already stronger than the prospective enemy.

Again, his personal adviser, General Taylor, who has apparently sold him on the old-fashioned doctrine that infantry is still queen of the battlefield, is on record publicly as saying that the United States possessed 10 times the nuclear retaliatory power required to wipe out any potential enemy.

His testimony to this effect was given before the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense and was released by that body May 9, 1959. Yet, when General Taylor retired that same year, he was still bleating that the Nation's need, despite its overwhelming capacity to obliterate an attacker, was for balanced forces—i.e., more ground army.

His book, "Uncertain Trumpet," was an appeal for return of the Army to the place of chief of the Nation's defense forces. From an officer who had been, for 4 years, Army Chief of Staff, the thesis could not be considered unexpected.

The Kennedy administration's response to Admiral Burke's tart comment is that the shift in defense plans and the switch in emphasis to conventional forces had been in the making months before Taylor was recalled to active duty. Perhaps so, but the general has been around in an advisory capacity since the Cuban invasion flop 6 weeks after Kennedy took office, and the Kennedy program would seem to follow his exact prescription.

There is, not unnaturally, widespread fear of nuclear war. Indeed, it is Khrushchev's chief stock in trade. He plays on it endlessly. The Kennedy buildup seems to assure him that, if there is a showdown over Berlin, he is invited to participate in a limited, nonnuclear war, in which the United States is content to fight, not to exterminate Soviet imperialism, but to maintain the status quo in a circumscribed area.

This would seem to be Korea all over again, and on no better terms for the United States.

Resolution by Illinois State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, even though the universities and colleges throughout the Nation are selective in their choice of professors, yet, unfortunately, nearly all of them strictly enforce the rule of age retirement, regardless of their indispensible teaching and research value to the educational system.

Just such a situation confronts the University of Illinois in the case of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and head of its clinical science department.

Fortunately, one of the rules of the University of Illinois' provisions in retention of the services of a distinguished professor is by a vote of the board of trustees.

The board of trustees of the University of Illinois will meet in Champaign on August 10, 1961, and the following letter will be submitted to them, together with

the correspondence herein, implementing this request.

It is fortunate that Dr. David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois, is a person of high integrity and one of the outstanding administrators in the educational field. He holds a high place as one of the most distinguished educators in the United States. At least, we can feel assured that he will give this matter his most serious attention and, certainly, add to the prestige of the university, if it is at all possible to recommend the retention of the services of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, in emeritus status, so that he can continue his work at the university for the public good and the advancement of medical science.

The Illinois State Legislature, passing House Joint Resolution 53, attesting to his scientific contributions to mankind in his continuing studies in the field of medicine, to be completed in the future, together with specific writings in medical research to be compiled and published, is indicative of the high esteem in which Dr. Ivy is held in the State of Illinois.

The letter and resolution follow:

JULY 16, 1961.

To: The Honorable Otto Kerner, Governor and ex officio member and the members of the board of trustees, University of Illinois.

Subject: Emeritus status of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy.

The following suggested recommendations are presented in order to implement House Joint Resolution 53 (attached), unanimously adopted by both house and senate in the 72d session of the Illinois General Assembly.

The board of trustees of the University of Illinois to:

1. Confer emeritus status upon Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and head of the clinical science department, to be effective on the date of Dr. Ivy's actual retirement.

2. Extend Dr. Andrew C. Ivy's tenure in his present position as distinguished professor of physiology and head of the clinical science department, through August 31, 1963, on a year-to-year basis, in accordance with the existing statutes and rules, made and provided, and the requests as set forth in Dr. Ivy's letters (copies attached) to and through the office of the dean of the college of medicine, dated April 25 and July 18, 1961, respectively.

3. Provide in the University of Illinois, College of Medicine, internal budget the sum of $100,000 or so much as is necessary thereof, for the biennium 1961–63, for the operation of the clinical science department.

The above suggested recommendations are presented for the objects and purposes to provide time and a place in order that Dr. Ivy shall have the facilities to complete certain important research and writing projects as herewith enumerated:

First, he is at present engaged with four other persons in making a scientific analysis of the results of giving Krebiozen to over 4,200 patients with advanced cancer who were treated by over 3,000 physicians. The average results show that pain relief occurred in 64 percent and that a decrease in the size of the tumor occurred in 33 percent. In 870 patients with cancer of the breast, the tumor decreased in 48 percent. In 70 cases of brain tumor in whom either coma, semicoma, or mental confusion was present, the mind cleared in 80 percent. These results will be presented soon to the appropriate officials in Washington, D.C., for the performance of a final study. We must keep Dr. Ivy at work so the test in Washington, D.C., can be conducted.

Second, Dr. Ivy is studying the clearing of cataract, another supposedly incurable disease. He and the doctors associated with him have cleared the cataract in 90 percent of 30 dogs blinded because of cataract. This observation on dogs is now being extended to human patients. Twenty-five percent of those people who are blind are blind because of cataract. This study is too important for the prevention of blindness to permit Dr. Ivy's research to come to an end by his enforced retirement.

Third, Dr. Ivy has now studied the cause of hardening of the arteries in animals. He and his students have found that this disease is primarily due to hereditary susceptibility and to eating too much food containing cholesterol. If too much cholesterol is eaten in the food, the body stores the cholesterol because it is more difficult to oxidize or burn up cholesterol than other foods. Dr. Ivy and his students have during the past 6 months discovered a way to decrease the absorption of cholestero. by the intestine. Dr. Ivy should be kept on the job so that this discovery on animals can be applied to human patients.

Fourth, Dr. Ivy is a world authority on peptic ulcer and has written a 1,200-page book on stomach and duodenal ulcer. He is now looking for the hormone which causes the formation of excess acid by the stomach. He has discovered a hormone, which stops the formation of acid by the stomach. At present this hormone is not pure enough to use on human patients with ulcer. And further research is required to purify it.

In keeping Dr. Ivy occupied in medical research for 2 more years, we are keeping on the job a man which a joint committee of the general assembly in 1955 called one of the world's great scientists. We are keeping a scientist at work who is now as productive in medical research as any other scientist at the University of Illinois. A man who has an active, alert, energetic, and productive brain and a healthy body and whose goal in life is to help people should not be forced to retire.

Dr. Ivy also plans to write during the next few years seven books, the notes and rough drafts of which with supporting research results are already in existence. The tentative titles are as follows: (1) "Physiology of Gastro-Intestinal Tract," (2) "Physiology of the Symptoms and Signs of Disease," (3) "Physiology of Hardening of the Arteries," (4) "The Treatment of Cancer With Krebiozen," (5) "Search for the Natural Causes of the Remission of Cancer," (6) "The Treatment of Senile and Traumatic Cataract With Krebiozen," (7) "The Physiology of the Genesis of Premature Aging."

EXISTING STATUTES BY WHICH DR. IVY'S TENURE AS HEAD OF CLINICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT MAY CONTINUE ON A YEAR-TO-YEAR BASIS AND PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1961–62

3. (A) Whereas the legislative resolution recommends to the board of trustees and university administration that the department of clinical science with the undersigned as head be continued with the "necessary facilities now had and needed"; and

(B) Whereas the university retirement system act provides "that upon the written request of the employee and upon certification of the employer, in exceptional cases and for substantial cause, retirement shall be deferred for a period not to exceed 1 year at any one time"; and

(C) Whereas the undersigned believes that the adoption of the resolution by the 72d General Assembly of Illinois constitutes an exceptional case and a substantial cause within the meaning of the University Retirement System Act.

(D) Therefore, the undersigned requests that the Department of Clinical Science be continued for 1 year from September 1, 1961, through August 31, 1962, and that the "necessary facilities now had and needed" be provided.

4. The budget proposed for 1961–62 is as follows:

1. Ivy, A. C. (no salary)	$1
2. Wojciech, Roman (Res. Assoc. Clin. Sci.)	6,000
3. Nonacademic salaries:	
E. L. Faler (chief clerk 1)	6,000
Michael Batina (caretaker 1)	3,600
Total	9,600
4. Operating expenses	6,000
Total	21,601
Shall apply for retirement annuity—	
If salary is paid	18,500
Total	40,101

Yours sincerely,

A. C. IVY, Ph.D., M.D.,
Distinguished Professor of Physiology and Head, Department of Clinical Science.

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY 122 MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY ON MAY 18, 1961

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

Whereas the 68th (1953) session of the Illinois General Assembly did approve House Joint Resolution 10 and House bill 823 that directed the appointing of a commission, with an appropriation of $10,000 of public tax funds, to determine the merits of a controversy within the College of Medicine at the University of Illinois, regarding a new drug Krebiozen, which at that time (1953), held out substantial promise of being biologically active in the treatment and control of cancer in patients; and

Whereas the 68th session of the general assembly did appropriate public tax funds to defray the costs of such investigation commission, the members of which freely and amply gave of their own time and serious attention and consideration to this highly important matter of examining the evidence submitted, relative to the controversy surrounding the drug Krebiozen; and

Whereas the investigation commission did recommend, in their ad interim and final reports, submitted to the 69th session of the general assembly, that, "In view of the tremendous public interest that exists in Krebiozen and as to whether or not it has any efficacy or beneficial biological activity in cancer patients, we hope that means can be found to conduct a controlled study until the merits of the substance can be finally determined;" and

Whereas the 72d session of the general assembly affirms the public policy previously taken and recommends that further and continued testing and research shall be carried on regarding the drug Krebiozen by the drug's sponsor, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and head of the clinical science department, college of medicine, University of Illinois, an institution of higher learning in the State of Illinois, and supported by public tax funds, appropriated by the Illinois General Assembly; and

Whereas in the field of medical research no one gained greater national eminence and world renown than Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who was chosen by the American Medical Association to represent the United States on ethical practices at the Nuremberg trials in Germany, following World War II, as the medical scientific consultant to the Prosecution Military Tribunal No. 1, Nuremberg trials; and the investigation Commission's report states, "this Commission likewise is

convinced that Dr. Andrew Ivy's motives are entirely honorable and sincere; that his personal integrity is above reproach; that his acts surrounding the research on Krebiozen were in conformity with the highest ethical and humanitarian plane, and that his testimony before this commission reaffirmed in our minds his reputation as a great scientist; the record shows that the development and growth of the college (of medicine, University of Illinois) under his administration was unparalleled;" and

Whereas Dr. Andrew C. Ivy has reported to the American Institutes of Chemists as to the methods and procedures of production and the chemistry of Krebiozen; further, graduate students in the college of medicine, University of Illinois, have also studied and engaged in the methods and procedures of production and chemical analysis of Krebiozen; and

Whereas the 72d session of the general assembly takes legislative notice of an action recently taken by a Federal court, wherein the court also desires to know the merits and truth regarding the drug Krebiozen and has concurred in and joins with the proponents of Krebiozen in a test, under conditions previously arrived at and previously agreed to; and to be conducted by the proponents and the National Cancer Institute within the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Whereas the Federal court has maintained that this test of Krebiozen, to determine the merits, truth, and usefulness in the management and control of cancer in the patient, to whatever degree attainable, must be determined in order that the truth can stand forth regarding the drug Krebiozen; and

Whereas the 72d session of the general assembly again takes legislative notice regarding the merits and truth of the drug Krebiozen, in that several thousand cancer patients have been treated with the drug Krebiozen by hundreds of medical practitioners, and such cancer patients are in varying stages of health; from being relieved of pain in varying degrees to again taking their places in society as useful, self-supporting citizens within their communities; and

Whereas it is evident there are citizens in Illinois and other States and countries who are or have been afflicted with the dread disease, cancer, and who have received treatment by medical practitioners by the use of the drug Krebiozen and are today alive and well; and, after a period of 10 years, Krebiozen continues to hold out the very substantial promise and assurance that there must exist merit and truth within the drug Krebiozen to manage and control cancer in the patient; therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, reiterates its previous public policy and recommendations regarding the further research and testing of the drug Krebiozen and again reaffirms that the investment of public funds spent to date, here in Illinois, in the investigation, research, and testing of Krebiozen shall be further implemented, and that the proponent of Krebiozen, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and head of the clinical science department, college of medicine, University of Illinois, shall continue to be head of the clinical science department and to be further provided with the necessary facilities now had and needed to further the research and testing of the drug Krebiozen in the management and control of cancer in the patient.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman's Life and Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers on yesterday carried the news of the death, at the age of 83, of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, Pennsylvania-born initiator of Moral Re-Armament. He died in Germany following a heart attack. Death came near the spot where he launched a global moral force in 1938. Many of us in Congress have great respect for Dr. Buchman, for his dedicated life and great work. We deeply regret to note his passing. I submit herewith a summary of his life and principles prepared by Moral Re-Armament and ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman's life was dedicated to raising a world force to answer the materialist ideologies of our age.

He was described on his 80th birthday in an editorial in Germany's leading paper, Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung, as "becoming more and more the conscience of the world." Another leading European paper wrote of him, "in this age of painful division, Frank Buchman is the one white man whom the statesmen of Asia and Africa trust."

He had a global view of the situation confronting the statesmen and a passionate concern for individuals. These two qualities singled him out as the man to whom people in every walk of life turned for advice and direction.

Robert Schuman of France said of him, "I am eternally grateful to Frank Buchman. He has helped and encouraged me from the first moment." Chancellor Adenauer of Germany, who came with his whole family to the Moral Re-Armament World Assembly in Caux, Switzerland, just after the war, remained a constant friend. Adenauer paid tribute to the moral courage which Buchman showed in creating a world ideological force to turn the tide of materialism. "What you have done through Moral Re-Armament," he said, "is absolutely vital for the maintaining of world peace."

Prime Minister U Nu of Burma said, "Dr. Buchman has all the qualities that inspire confidence and the tenacity of purpose which will accept nothing short of complete success." The secretary of the Presiding Abbots' Association of Burma, taking part with four senior abbots in the celebration of Dr. Buchman's 83d birthday in Caux, declared, "A personality like Dr. Buchman comes once in a thousand years to lead humanity. That is why we have come 6,000 miles for the privilege of meeting him and giving him our highest blessing."

Dr. Bernardus Kaelin, 12 years abbott primate of the Benedictine Order, said, "We have every reason to thank God that He has chosen a man, Dr. Frank Buchman, to formulate such an ideology as Moral Re-Armament and inspire others with it. He is an instrument of God. We of the Catholic Church are grateful that there is such an ideology. It is bringing back to their faith many men who stand aloof or who were going another way—men whom we priests and pastors find it impossible to reach.

"May Moral Re-Armament win the whole world. The greatest gratitude we can show to Frank Buchman is to stand up for its ideas."

The central point of the ideology of Moral Re-Armament is change.

What is needed, Buchman declared, is social change, economic change, national change and international change, all based on a drastic change in human nature. "Until we deal with human nature thoroughly and drastically on a world scale," he said, "nations will continue to follow their historic road to violence and destruction."

The assemblies of Moral Re-Armament, held on every continent, have drawn a response from representatives of 120 nations during the past 18 years. In 1952, Dr. Buchman's work earned the grudging respect of Moscow. In a series of broadcasts Moscow Radio attacked it as "a global ideology with bridgeheads on every continent, having the power to capture radical revolutionary minds." Hundreds of Communists on every continent abandoned communism in favor of a superior idea of world change through a moral ideology. Eudocio Ravines, many years a member of the Comintern and founder of the Communist Party of Peru, said after accepting Moral Re-Armament, "Western civilization will collapse unless we conquer the hearts of men with the moral standards Frank Buchman has given us. He is leading a force on the road to world renaissance. It is humanity's one hope."

As well as Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma; Presidents Magsaysay and Garcia, of the Philippines; President Diem, of Vietnam; former Premier Kishi, of Japan; Rajmohan Gandhi, grandson of the Mahatma, were among the vanguard of a growing number in Asia who welcomed the ideology of Moral Re-Armament as being above race and class, answering the needs of the heart, and changing the motives of men and the policies of nations.

Indian leaders turned to Buchman after Kerala, the first state in the world to vote itself Communist, overthrew the Communist regime. They knew that without an ideology to unite the non-Communists, the Communists would take over again at the next election. Catholic, Moslem, and Hindu leaders went to Caux, seeking an answer. They included Mannath Padmanabhan, 83-year-old leader of the liberation struggle. Archbishop Gregorious of Trivandrum said later, "History will record our permanent gratitude to Mannath Padmanabhan, not only for having ousted the Communist regime, but for creating the unity of all communities following his return from Caux." Padmanabhan himself said, "Kerala can never be grateful enough to the ideology of Moral Re-Armament."

Leaders of Cyprus too, have repeatedly expressed their gratitude for the part played by Buchman in ending the bloodshed on their island. Archbishop Markarios said in Dr. Buchman's London home, "I have come here to bring my personal thanks for what MRA has done in bringing an answer to Cyprus." Vice President Dr. Kutchuk said, "MRA will save the world from communism, dictatorship and war."

In a press interview 2 months ago, Buchman described his vision for humanity: "It is that the whole world will learn to live like sons of God, where no man demands too much for himself while any other man goes hungry, where character not color becomes the yardstick of human values, where it is normal to live as one honest, pure, un-

selfish, loving, united family throughout the earth."

Frank Nathan Daniel Buchman was born in Pennsburg, Pa., on June 4, 1878. His family came originally from St. Gallen, Switzerland, arriving in Pennsylvania in 1740. An ancestor, Theodore Bibliander (Buchman), was the successor of Zwingli in the Theological Seminary at Zurich, and the first translator of the Koran into German. Another ancestor fought with Washington at Valley Forge. Frank Buchman's uncle was the first man in America to enlist in the Union Army under Abraham Lincoln. He was later killed at Bull Run.

Fifty Members of the U.S. Congress cabled him this year stating, "We are grateful for the moral stand you have taken over the years to show America what a nation under God is meant to be."

Frank Buchman had a fundamental faith in the availability of the guidance of God for every man. The decisive point in his career came in 1921 when, in obedience to such guidance, he resigned from a college position offering security and comfort, to create a world force of men and women in every walk of life who would live the answer to a divided world.

Frank Buchman had been prepared for this work by his studies and graduation from Mühlenberg College in Allentown, Pa., by his foundation of the first hospice for destitute boys in Philadelphia, by his experience on the staff of Penn State College, as it was then called, and by travel in Europe, Asia, and Africa, which had given him a wide understanding of men and affairs.

During these years of preparation his genius for friendship became apparent.

In 1915 he first met Gandhi who remained his friend for life. He visited Dr. Sun Yat-sen in Canton where they had long talks. "Buchman is the only man who tells me the truth about myself," said that founder of modern China.

Friends of those early days constantly welcomed him back to their countries. Baron Shibusawa, the founder of modern industrial Japan, entertained him in 1915, and his great-grandson is now one of the leaders of Moral Re-Armament in Asia. One person in Britain who responded to his call was Lady Antrim, lady-in-waiting to two Queens of England. Two of her great-grandchildren give their full time for Moral Re-Armament. It is typical of Buchman's relationship with people—once a friend, always a friend.

During the twenties and thirties this network of friendships developed into an effective force in the life of nations. In South Africa a group of students from Oxford, whose lives had been changed by meeting him, were instrumental in bringing understanding between Briton and Boer. The name "Oxford Group" was given to their work.

Thirteen years later the Honorable J. H. Hofmeyr, Deputy Premier under Field Marshal Smuts, cabled to the British House of Commons, "Buchman's visit to South Africa started a major and continuing influence for racial reconciliation throughout the whole country, between white and black, Dutch and British, on which the future of democratic institutions in South Africa may largely depend."

Men from this rapidly growing world force around Frank Buchman were invited by the last President of the League of Nations, Hon. Carl J. Hambro, President of the Norwegian Parliament, to a special meeting of league delegates. He introduced them with the words, "These people have succeeded in fundamental things where we have failed. They have created that constructive peace which we have been seeking in vain for years. Where we have failed in changing policies, they have succeeded in changing lives and giving men and women a new way of living."

Buchman recognized early on that the basic problem of our age was ideological. He believed that only a passion can cure a passion, only an idea can defeat an idea—that unless the democratic nations demonstrate compellingly a better idea than totalitarianism, they are sooner or later doomed to destruction. Neither anticommunism nor antifascism cures the basic problem.

MORAL RE-ARMAMENT LAUNCHED

Accordingly in 1938 he launched Moral Re-Armament—a uniting moral ideology, based upon the absolute standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love under the guidance of God, which, if lived out in the policy of nations, would change the course of history.

Frank Buchman had the deep conviction that "labor led by God can lead the world." He said, "Before a God-led unity every last problem will be solved. Empty hands will be filled with work, empty stomachs with food and empty hearts with an idea that really satisfies."

This drew a worldwide response from the workers and their leaders. Ben Tillett, leader of the London dockers, on his deathbed sent this message to Buchman: "You have a great international movement. Use it. It is the hope of tomorrow. Your movement will bring sanity back to the world." John Riffe, executive vice president of the CIO, said, "Tell America that when Frank Buchman changed John Riffe he saved this country $500 million.

THE WAR YEARS

In mass meetings in Britain and across America, he led a force that during the war years gave to thousands the secret of high morale and a basis of hope for lasting peace.

Gen. John J. Pershing broke a lifetime rule and wrote the foreword to Buchman's handbook, "You Can Defend America," which was distributed to hundreds of thousands in war industries, schools, and homes throughout America. It was described by the U.S. War Department as "the most challenging statement of this country's philosophy of national defense that has yet been written."

During this period Frank Buchman was attacking both Fascist and Communist. Gestapo documents, discovered and published after the war, denounced him and condemned his activity for "substituting the Cross of Christ for the swastika, and uncompromisingly taking up a frontal position against national socialism."

During the war many of his men served with gallantry and distinction on all fronts, winning decorations for bravery. Buchman worked ceaselessly to keep intact a force that would be able, immediately on the cessation of hostilities, to take up the work for which they were trained, that of bringing the answer to hate and fear, and making lasting peace possible.

CAUX

In 1946 the Moral Re-Armament world headquarters in Caux, Switzerland, was opened. In the last 15 years 125,000 representatives of 120 countries have come for training. Among these have been Prime Ministers, Cabinet Ministers, and Members of Parliament, and a broad section of industrial, trade union, and student leadership from all over the world.

Similar assemblies were held on Mackinac Island, Mich., where new buildings to house 1,200 people have recently been put to use. Last year one of the most modern and best equipped television film production studios in America was opened there.

A group of European political leaders, among them Prof. Hans Koch, head of the East Europe Institute and adviser to the German Government on Russian Affairs, summed up the achievements of Frank Buchman's life in five spheres of contemporary history.

FIVE HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENTS

1. The laying of the foundations for a new trust between Germany and France and for a common destiny for the peoples of Europe: Basic to this was the restoring of Germany to her place in the family of nations which found its first decisive expression at the Caux assemblies. For this service Frank Buchman was honored by the German Government with the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit, while at the same time the French Government made him a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. King Paul of Greece also conferred on him the Knighthood of the Order of King George of Greece.

2. The unity brought between Japan and her neighbors in southeast Asia: The first representative group of Japanese leaders to visit Europe and America after the war was invited by Frank Buchman. Their apology in the U.S. Senate marked a turning point in the relations between Japan and her former enemies. In 1956 the Japanese Government awarded him, in person, the Order of the Rising Sun. In the same year the Chinese Government on Formosa conferred on him the Grand Cordon of the Brilliant Star, the Philippine Government their Legion of Honor, and the King of Thailand made him a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Crown of Thailand.

Following the 1960 Tokyo riots, Prime Minister Kishi informed Dr. Buchman, "But for Moral Re-Armament Japan would be under Communist control today."

3. The creation in Africa of interracial unity, the saving of nations from bloodshed, and the building of a moral force to undergird self-government: Former Mau Mau leaders and Kenya settlers trained by Buchman have been credited with preventing bloodshed in crisis points in East and Central Africa. Jean Bolkango, as Vice Premier of the Congo, stated, "Were it not for the work of Moral Re-Armament in the Congo we would have known a far worse catastrophe." Buchman also played a part in the peaceful attainment of independence by both Morocco and Tunisia, and his influence saved bloodshed in Nigeria and hastened the day of peaceful self-government. In South Africa, Afrikaners and revolutionary leaders of the African National Congress found common ground in a change of heart. Manilal Gandha described this development in his Natal newspaper, "Indian Opinion," as "A new dimension of racial unity." A prominent African Moslem leader summed up Buchman's work, "You are doing for Africa what Abraham Lincoln did for America—binding up the nation's wounds and setting the people free."

4. The building of an ideological bridge where the world of Islam unites East and West to answer communism and war: Buchman was convinced that the lands of Islam were meant to be a bulwark against materialism and "a girder of unity for the whole world." Muslim leaders responded. Mohammed Ali Jinnah said to Buchman, "You have the answer to the hates of the world. Honest apology is the golden key." The Shah of Iran personally welcome Buchman to his country and is regularly represented at Moral Re-Armament assemblies. He recently conferred the Imperial Order of the Crown on Dr. Buchman, and Prime Minister Amini last week wrote Buchman, "We have noted with great satisfaction and confidence the work accomplished by Moral Re-Armament task forces in different parts of the world, and look forward to the coming of such a force to Iran in the near future." The secretary-general of the Arab League, Abdel Khalek Hassouna, said, "The Arab regards the emergence of MRA as the most significant factor on the world stage today."

5. The demonstration of an answer to the issue of race in America which has riveted the attention of leaders of Asia and Africa: It was Buchman's conception to invite Afri-

can leaders who had responded to MRA, men of courage and integrity, to come to America to bring a constructive note into the racial problems. The film "Freedom," made by Africans in Nigeria, brought an answering message to the Southern States. Its performances in Little Rock paved the way for the historic reconciliation between Governor Faubus and Daisy Bates, leader of the Negro people of Arkansas. Dr. G. Lake Imes, secretary to the late Booker T. Washington, said of Buchman's initiative, "It is the boldest and most audacious approach to the fundamental problems of human relations in our age."

THE CROWNING EXPERIENCE

During the spring of 1958 a force of 300 drawn from 30 countries brought the play "The Crowning Experience" to Atlanta, Ga., where for 4 months it played to multiracial audiences. The National Association of the Colored Women's Clubs of America presented Buchman with their annual award as "the greatest humanitarian of them all."

After breaking the 123-year-old attendance record of Washington's National Theater, "The Crowning Experience" was made into a full-length technicolor film. Today it is being acclaimed in Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America. Hollywood actor Joel McCrea said, "It is the kind of picture the world is waiting to see, portraying the true America to which the world will respond." Arturo Lanocita, Italy's most influential film critic, wrote in "Corriere Della Sera," " 'The Crowning Experience' is right out of the class of the everyday film. It transcends the cinema."

The bold use of the stage, music and every form of dramatization marked Buchman's arresting approach in reaching large groups of people of different types and backgrounds. Japanese, Africans, Chinese, Tunisians, Indians, each in their own languages have written plays depicting the ideology of Moral Re-Armament applied to their situations, while other casts have performed plays in all the major European languages. The all-African film "Freedom" has gone to 65 countries in 13 languages. Frank Buchman had the art of inspiring great creative powers in those among whom he worked. Elisabeth Bergner described the Moral Re-Armament theater as "the most intelligent plays being produced in our time."

One of these plays, "The Tiger," written by Japanese students who participated in the Tokyo anti-American riots, has been performed on three continents in the last year. After presenting the play in the United States, where they apologized to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower for their part in the Tokyo riots, the cast is now moving through South America. They are part of what "El Pais" of Montevideo described as "the greatest ideological offensive ever launched in Latin America."

In the past 12 weeks in Brazil, 500,000 people have seen "The Tiger" and attended MRA mass demonstrations—fruit of a strategy planned with Frank Buchman earlier this summer. Ninety thousand crowded the football stadium in Manaus. In the city regarded as the stronghold of communism, the "Diario de Pernambuco" reported, "Recife is being completely carried away by Moral Re-Armament." An American news correspondent said, "I have seen a more effective strategy to answer communism in 24 hours here than in 20 years in Washington."

The archbishop of Natal, Dom Marculino Esmeraldo de Sousa Dantas, commenting on the work of Frank Buchman, said, "Moral Re-Armament is fire from heaven to purify the earth. It is a great universal movement with God in control."

With all the wide expansion of his work and influence, Buchman always remained the same human, approachable, friendly person. He simply said of his life work, "I have been wonderfully led."

He is remembered by thousands of ordinary folk who met him in hotels, on trains, in homes where he was an honored guest, as the man who always understood them and considered them his friends. People were his great interest and study, the kindling of their faith and character his greatest job.

His own faith was that of a child, full of the practical presence of God. It was an ideology, valid for men and Nations in this confused age.

BRAVE MEN CHOOSE

In his last birthday speech, "Brave Men Choose," which reached by press and radio an estimated thousand million people, Buchman declared, "We are facing world revolution. There are only three possibilities open to us. We can give in, and some are ready to do just that. Or we can fight it out, and that means the risk of global suicide. Or we can find a superior ideology that shows the next step ahead for the Communist and the non-Communist world alike.

"There is no neutrality in the battle between good and evil. No nation can be saved on the cheap. It will take the best of our lives and the flower of our Nations to save humanity. If we go all out for God we will win."

The words he most frequently quoted, and with great emphasis, were those of his fellow Pennsylvanian William Penn, "Men must must choose to be governed by God or they condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants."

How the Wrong People Get Charged With the High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by Mr. Roscoe Fleming, of Denver, Colo., showing how the wrong people get charged with the high cost of living.

The article is as follows:

Once a nice lady went into a trading-stamp dispensary or super-supermarket. After walking for an hour, and after getting lost once or twice in its mysterious reaches and being rescued by a clerk who himself didn't seem too sure of the way to daylight, she pushed the cart up to the checker, who offloaded and rang up the following items:

3 magazines	$0.95
2 pairs of nylons	1.89
Work gloves for her husband	1.29
2 light bulbs	.75
A wave-set kit	1.93
4 rolls of tissue	.50
2 rolls of waxed paper	.39
A large skillet	1.95
2 dozen paper plates	.98
A jar of instant	1.15
5 cans of tomatoes	.85
A loaf of bread	.22
5 frozen meat pies, ready to heat and eat	1.00
A plastic sack of carrots	.29
Total	14.14

The nice lady reluctantly fished out a $20 bill, and while she was waiting for her trading stamps and her change, she said tartly to the checker:

"Those farmers surely must all be getting rich."

A farm magazine says that the cello bag costs more than the farmer got for the carrots; that the cans and labels cost more than he got for the tomatoes; the bread wrapping and slicing more than he got for the wheat; and the aluminum pie tin cost more than he got for the meat.

Moral: It seems easy enough to be useful; but what on earth do you have to do to be liked?

Siegrist and the News—Communist Propaganda—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I include part III, the final excerpt of Bob Siegrist's broadcast of August 1, concerning Communist propaganda at the Chicago International Trade Fair:

This reporter learned today from customs officials at the port of New York that so much Communist propaganda is permitted by existing American law to enter this country that, as one New York customs official told us, "it would be almost impossible to tell whether it would have been cleared."

He further explained that if it had come in under diplomatic seal, customs officials could not question it anyway and he, like other officials with whom we talked today, pointed out, that anyway, since it did not advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force it probably would not be of any violation of U.S. law—unless it had been smuggled into the United States and smuggling could be proved.

As regards the UPI story, paragraph 4 which said, "Siegrist said fair officials did nothing about it because they 'were interested in not hurting the fair,' " our last night's listeners, as we've also pointed out yesterday, will also recognize, and our script and tape recordings also prove, that we did not say this in our broadcast. We will say now, however, since it has been brought up, that we have been advised that at least one highly placed fair official did say precisely that to Dr. Sydney De Love, operator of the Independence Hall Association American exhibit. De Love, upon discovering the Yugoslav delegation backroom activity, summoned the FBI last Friday morning.

We knew it yesterday, but didn't say it on the air—we do now.

And as regards the Chicago Tribune story:

That story's claim, "that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been in complete touch with the situation since the fair's opening day," becomes a little dubious in view of the established fact that the fair opened last Monday, and that as we pointed out, Dr. De Love discovered the backroom operation, and then upon that discovery, Dr. De Love summoned the FBI last Friday and the FBI conducted its inquiry—an inquiry of which, obviously, the Yugoslavian delegation became aware, and, in turn, ceased the backroom propaganda pamphlet activity.

As for the Chicago Tribune's statement that the fair officials "also said that no governmental exhibit is permitted at the fair without the prior approval of the State Department and the Commerce Department," this is to report, and very positively, that, today, after this reporter confronted a representative of the Department of Commerce in Washington with the Tribune claim, the representative of the Department of Commerce made a careful check and then reported back to us, and for publication, that

the U.S. Department of Commerce approves, only in a "general way," any such foreign exhibits at such nongovernmental and commercial trade fairs as this one in Chicago and, therefore, he said for the Department of Commerce, that the Department of Commerce has no authority to help to arrange such exhibits, to approve or disapprove such exhibits, and, certainly, therefore, no authority to even attempt to screen, at any time, what propaganda or other literature may or may not be disseminated by any foreign delegation.

Therefore, obviously enough, the statement that the Commerce Department, "had cleared the Yugoslav exhibit," was erroneous.

Now as for the rectitude of that claim as regards State Department clearances, this reporter who has been in contact with the State Department several times again today as he was yesterday, this reporter can best allude to the fact that after confronting a spokesman of the State Department with the Tribune story today, that spokesman suggested that we could best handle the situation by alluding to his yesterday's statement to us that what the Yugoslavian delegation was doing at the Chicago International Trade Fair, with reference to this backroom propaganda activity, came as a complete surprise to the Department of State and they did not know about it until we called it to their attention yesterday—so much so—as we reported last night, that the spokesman requested yesterday and again today, that we supply the Department of State with all the information which we have been able to compile.

They have asked for last night's broadcast. They have it—a copy of our script, a copy of the tape recording. They will get a tape recording of tonight's broadcast and a copy of tonight's script.

As for the Tribune printed fair official claim that, "the fair, in effect, is implementing the official trade policies of the United States," now this reporter does not take exception to that statement tonight—any more than he did even suggest anything to the contrary yesterday. It is a policy of the U.S. Government under cultural exchanges, et cetera to permit such exhibits, but the entire genesis of this story—and here's the point to which we will stick. The entire genesis of the story, which makes it a story, the story which we broke yesterday, was simply this:

With the obvious permission of the United States, Communist Yugoslavia, like Communist Poland, was permitted to establish its exhibit at the Chicago International Trade Fair but, without the knowledge, without the consent of the Government of the United States, the Communist Yugoslavian delegation did establish this backroom dissemination of hard-core Communist propaganda which had absolutely nothing to do with trade, nothing to do with commerce, and consequently nothing therefore with the announced objective of the International Trade Fair in Chicago.

Furthermore, we are simply amazed at the fact that spokesmen and apologists for the trade fair have put themselves in the strange position of registering what seems to be resentment over our report—over even seeming, in part at least, to take it as something of a personal affront..

We are amazed at their failure to recognize and to admit that, beyond this backroom factor—let's face it—let's face it, everything that the Communist Yugoslavian delegation and the Red Polish delegation is doing at the trade fair is—to the Communists—in the interest of Communist propaganda—primarily (as concerns that literature available at the front counter) that—by which some strange miracle, which even Khrushchev officially denies, we can peacefully coexist via such means as international trade with international communism whose czar, Khrushchev, warns us we could not do even again today.

Meanwhile, this reporter deeply appreciates the interest that we have stirred up on the part of listeners and on the part of other reporters and their publications, and we understand that tomorrow at least, one Chicago newspaper will break out with photographs of the nine pamphlets which we used at our microphone last night.

A Healthy Reversal in Television Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, many television programs have emphasized violence, corruption, and programs which have been detrimental, not only to the youth of our country, but to the viewing audience. I was very pleased to receive a letter from Mr. Theodore F. Koop, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., which indicates a reversal in television trends.

Educational programs, political discussion, and inspirational stories are being substituted in the place of some of the stories of violence, death, and racketeering. I am certain the audience will appreciate reading the communication from the vice president of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1961.

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SANTANGELO: "Berlin: Act of War?" a searching analysis of the Berlin crisis and its implications for all Americans will be presented by the CBS television network on Friday, August 18, from 8:30–9:30 p.m. CBS news has given top priority to this report, which brings sharp perspective to today's most critical issue. I hope very much that you will have an opportunity to see it (channel 9 in Washington).

I would also like to give you a glimpse of the highlights of the coming season's CBS news television schedule which is bound to create a greater national awareness of the issues and developments of our times.

On October 5 from 10–11 p.m., the CBS television network will present "Where We Stand III," the third installment in the distinguished series covering the Nation's problems and progress. (To avoid confusion, all times used in this letter will be Washington clock time.)

Beginning with the first of a three-part series on "Eisenhower and the Presidency" on October 12, CBS reports will be presented on Thursdays three times a month at 10–11 p.m. Among other subjects scheduled are reports on Brazil, Venezuela, Greece, obesity and the exploration of outer space. On the fourth Thursday of every month, CBS is scheduling other such news and public affairs programs as "The Great Challenge," discussions of great issues by public figures and authorities; "Year of Crisis," a yearend roundup report by CBS news correspondents around the world; "At the Source," on-location interviews with prominent persons; "Joint Appearance," combining the interview and debate formats, and featuring the chairmen of the Democratic and Republican national committees on August 10; and such CBS news specials as "Berlin: Act of War?"

"Eyewitness," a study in depth of the news story of the week, will appear on the CBS television network every Friday beginning September 22, from 10:30–11 p.m. "The Twentieth Century" will feature both contemporary subjects such as "The Airport Jam," "Boom in Puerto Rico," and "Hungary Today," and historical studies such as "Women Get the Vote" and "Al Smith," on Sundays, 6–6:30 p.m.

Important public figures will be presented for a half an hour at 12:30 p.m. on Sundays on "Washington Conversation," in relaxed, unrehearsed closeups in which the week's guest may comment informally on current affairs.

A new half-hour morning series, "Calendar," will appear Monday through Friday, 10–10:30 a.m., presenting news and informational services to the daytime audience. Under the auspices of the Learning Resources Institute, "College of the Air" will offer "The New Biology," a Monday-through-Friday course for college credit which local stations will carry at different times.

After an auspicious beginning last February, "Accent" will continue its half-hour exploration of art, music, drama, literature, science and education. Beginning on September 23, it will be presented from 1–1:30 p.m. on Saturdays. This series has focused on such personalities as the President's wife, Field Marshal Montgomery, and the guitarist Andres Segovia. "Camera Three," devoted to the arts and culture, will be shown in the fall from 11–11:30 a.m. on Sundays.

"Lamp Unto My Feet," a CBS Television Network stalwart for 13 years, will continue to present the religions of the world against the background of our culture today on Sundays from 10–10:30 a.m. Another religious program, "Look Up and Live," which gives fresh emphasis to religion through music, poetry and ballet, will appear each Sunday at 10:30 a.m.

Among a number of special CBS News reports scheduled is S. 1983, a study of the U.S. foreign aid program, August 4, 9:30–10 p.m. Another is on the publicly financed American hospital ship *Hope*, which provides free medical aid to the world's underprivileged, September 20, 8:30–9 p.m. Also planned for the coming season are six 1-hour public affairs programs.

The expanded regularly scheduled CBS News "hand news" programing in the coming season will include: two 5-minute news programs—Monday through Friday, 11:55 a.m. and 3:55 p.m.; "Douglas Edwards With the News"—Monday through Friday, 6:45–7 p.m.; "The Saturday News With Robert Trout"—Saturdays, 12:30–1 p.m.; "The Sunday News" with Harry Reasoner—Sundays, 11:55–12 Noon; and "Sunday News Special," with Walter Cronkite reporting—Sundays, 11–11:15 p.m.

In addition the CBS Television Network offers afternoon news to its affiliated stations from 5–5:10 p.m. daily. CBS News will continue to feed all the Presidential news conferences to the network. And, as the occasion calls for them, there will also be half-hour, hour, or longer news specials such as our recent special reports on astronauts Shepard, Grissom, and Gagarin.

I think you will also be interested to know that CBS News produces more than 55 percent of the entire programing of the CBS radio network.

If at any time you would like further information about this programing, please do not hesitate to let me know.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THEODORE F. KOOP.

Fairfield County's Service Trades: Healthy and Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is my good fortune to represent Fairfield County, Conn., one of the country's fastest growing and most prosperous areas. This growth is reflected not only in the increasing diversification of manufacturing but also, quite dramatically, in the steady rise of service trades. These are the enterprises that do things rather than make things. This subject is discussed in detail in an interesting article by Mr. Harold E. Rider, president of the Fairfield County Trust Co. in Stamford in the following article, which first appeared in the American Banker. I think it will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY'S SERVICE TRADES: HEALTHY AND GROWING

(By Harold E. Rider, president, the Fairfield County Trust Co., Stamford, Conn.)

In Fairfield County as in the United States, one industry continues quietly to keep right on growing. Through postwar recessions, dips and adjustments, the service trades—comprised of people who do things rather than make things—have steadily climbed an upward path.

Between the 1954 and 1958 U.S. Census of Business Survey, the growth of service trades in Fairfield County climbed in dollar value from $72 million to $108 million. Today, with payrolls running at $37 million yearly, receipts will total just under $120 million at year's end, up 66 percent from 1954 and 11 percent from 1958.

In terms of employment the service trades sector has grown by 50 percent in the past decade. Today's 30,000 service jobs make up one-eighth of total county employment of 225,000 and equal one-fourth of the number of manufacturing jobs.

In Fairfield County, a balanced manufacturing mix, high income levels and leisure time have turned "services" into one of our fastest growing and most important "industries."

ECONOMIC BASE

The manufacturing product mix of Fairfield County industry is soundly diversified and growing at a healthy clip. Products cover a broad spectrum: everything from ball bearings, surgical instruments, electronic devices and fabricated metal parts to hats, plastics, aircraft, pencils and purses.

The "value added" of county manufacturing—the value of that portion of manufacturing originating wholly within the county—climbed from $561.1 million to $956.2 million between 1947 and 1959, a hefty 70 percent. When 1960 data have been totaled the value added undoubtedly will have passed the $1 billion mark.

Between 1947 and 1959, for instance, the value added of apparel, leather goods, textile and related products was up 104 percent. Rubber and plastic products were up 115 percent. Electrical machinery leaped 204 percent and instruments and related products (including mechanical and optical instruments, lenses and surgical supplies) were up a hefty 137 percent.

Family disposable income, both total and per family, rank about the highest in the Nation. In the 5-year period between 1955 and 1960 total family disposable income increased from $1.3 billion to $1.7 billion. On a per family basis the 1960 amount of $8,839 was a significant $1,000 more than in 1955.

And they spent: Per family retail sales of $4,671 in 1955 had grown to $5,932 by 1960.

Leisure time, a by-product of our high standard of living, coupled with the natural blessings of rolling hills, lakes and nautical Long Island Sound, have combined with diversified manufacturing and high incomes to spurt the county's service industries' growth.

SERVICE, SMILES AND DOLLARS

The service industries' growth in Fairfield county has kept well ahead of the U.S. average and above Connecticut's growth, too. Between the 1954 and 1958 Census of Selected Services, for instance, dollar receipts of the different business services jumped 50 percent or $36 million, compared to Connecticut's 42 percent and the U.S. growth of 38 percent.

Fastest growing segment of the service group has been business services, a reflection of Fairfield County's industrial balance. The growth of the business segment of the county service trades jumped 106 percent or over $14 million in receipts between 1954 and 1958. By the end of last year receipts had risen 11 percent or $3.1 million over 1958.

Reflecting the growth of county industry itself, advertising agencies, building services, business consultants, research, development and testing laboratories, have lead the way.

HOME OF THE CONSULTANT

With 185 business and management consulting firms—more than any other type of business service—Fairfield County today may well be the "home of the consultant." With some 400 employees and receipts around $7 million a year, these firms make up the biggest sales segment of the business services.

These figures are, perhaps, not so surprising when considered along with one of the county's key industries: Research and development. Of the 360 R. & D. firms in Connecticut, employing some 12,000 scientific and technical workers, one-third are in Fairfield County.

THE UPWARD PATH

County towns showing the greatest gains in service sales durng the 1954–58 period were: Stamford, 88 percent; Danbury, 82 percent; and Norwalk, 57 percent. Bridgeport's gain was 20 percent. Sales for Fairfield County as a whole increased 50 percent with a 25-percent gain in the number of firms.

When all the most current census of selected service statistics are released later this year, we don't expect they will startle anyone in Fairfield County. Fairfield County's services trades are steadily climbing the upward path.

A Fate Worse Than Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Eric Sevareid is one of America's most astute political commentators. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. Sevareid which appeared in the New York Post of August 7, 1961.

It appears from Mr. Khrushchev's timetable that he plans to plunge the Communist world into the depths of materialistic capitalism. I can think of no better fate for the Russian people than to join us in the enjoyment of our way of life.

The article follows:

TIMETABLE

(By Eric Sevareid)

LONDON.—Until the other day when Khrushchev promulgated the new Communist charter and vision for his people we had been worrying exclusively about what Russian communism was doing to other peoples, and it comes as a wrench to start grieving about what it is going to do to the Russian people. It is going to impose affluence and leisure upon them, and they ought to be warned.

In the same document in which Khrushchev declares that the United States and other Western societies are past their zenith and in decline, he sets out a detailed schedule for the Russians to travel precisely the same route. It is the first time that socialist planning anywhere has included suicide as a goal and named the date.

In 20 years, says the document, everyone will live in easy circumstances, all collective and state farms will become highly productive and profitable, the demands of the Soviet people for well-appointed housing will in the main be satisfied, hard physical work will disappear, and the U.S.S.R. will become the country with the shortest working day.

Obviously the Russian censorship concerning life abroad has left the Russian people in the dark, and the full horror of what is planned for them has not yet penetrated their minds. That is the trouble with their closed society—they are unable to spy out the secret weaknesses of enemy countries and so fall right into the capitalist trap.

As is well known, the strength of the democratic system is that it forces its opponents to imitation. As soon as their farms become highly productive, they will realize an anti-Marxist fact: People can eat only so much bread or potatoes or rice a day. Ugly aluminum storage bins will deface the broad vistas of the steppes. Strawberries will rot on the ground, little pigs will be plowed under, but in Moscow restaurants and supermarkets the price of both strawberries and roast pork will continue to rise, leading to a furious campaign against middlemen who have been working a full 8-hour day, the traitors. Walls will be covered with posters saying the revolution has come and you'll eat strawberries.

This will do no good and black markets will develop, people secretly trading carloads of strawberries for valuable antiques like peasant stoves, icons, carts and village pumps. Dwellers in millions of well-appointed homes will spend their leisure time carting their high-fi and TV sets, their automatic toasters, washers, drippers and dryers and dispose-alls to and from the repair shops—between trips to the garage to see how they're coming with the distributor on the sport car.

After a while wives will ask husbands to sit for a little talk after the children are in bed. Millions of couples will conclude that their life has become overcomplicated. They just don't seem to have the time for each other as they did in the old days when he worked the night shift and she worked the day shift—and why don't they all go on a long camping trip, learn to work with their hands again and get back to the simple life? A walking trip, of course, to avoid the traffic.

Other husbands will conclude that this business of sitting around the house half of each day is getting on the wife's nerves and losing dad the respect of his children through overfamiliarity. Anyway he's bored with the do-it-yourself set of tools, with the

free lessons in Chinese on TV, and has discovered he's no good at watercolors, let alone oils. So he decides on "moonlighting" and drives a taxi at night, shrinking under the "nyaahs" of the regular drivers as they deliberately brush his fenders at the stoplights.

Leaders in dentistry will call all-Soviet conferences to campaign against children buying sweets with their large allowances because, as in Britain, they average about six cavities per month. The party itself will proclaim a physical fitness campaign because the age of the auto has softened the leg muscles of the youth, as in America, and football coaches and army instructors are viewing with alarm. A TV series will deride "the fat comrade."

A commission will be formed of leading intellectuals to define the Soviet purpose and to set new moral and spiritual goals for their people. A new phrase will be invented, "the lost generation." Idealistic college boys will drink coffee all night while complaining that their fathers had all the fun—revolution, war, conquest, purges, and slave labor camping.

The Kremlin (that part of it not torn down for new parking space) will be overrun with emissaries from backward countries demanding grants and soft currency loans and threatening to turn to America if Moscow doesn't kick in. New schools will be set up to train foreign aid administrators, some of whom will be ridiculed in a book called "The Ugly Russian."

Visiting lecturers from Asia and Africa will inform uneasy Soviet audiences that: "The trouble with you Russians is that you want to be liked, when you should want to be respected. You are trying to buy everybody's friendship and it can't be done. We suggest you make a small start by persuading your tourists abroad to stop throwing heavy tips around which only earns you the contempt of our people. Ruble worship, you must realize, is not an exportable religion to older cultures."

Khrushchev's new document opens the way for a brand new Western foreign policy called "self-containment." All we have to do is sit tight for 20 years and the Russians will do themselves in.

Legislation To Bring Labor Unions Under Antitrust Law Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points up the danger Government intervention poses for labor unions. While labor has been able to fare pretty well under friendly administrations by getting special consideration denied to other segments of our society, an aroused public opinion could reverse the trend and labor could find public opinion and administration decisions running against them. The best solution to the problems created by the growth of powerful labor unions is to bring these organizations under antitrust law so that they will operate by the same rules of the game as all the rest of us. The working men and women of this country, and indeed, labor unions themselves, would be benefited by such legislation. My bill, H.R. 8407, is an attempt to correct an inequity which now exists in our country by expanding antitrust law to include the activities of labor organizations. I am hopeful this measure can be seriously considered by the Congress as a basis for bringing about the best possible labor reform in the interest of the whole country. The editorial to which I referred is included herewith to show that labor would be better to depend upon the rule of law to govern its activities rather than to continue to hope that it can always be the benefactor of a friendly administration:

FRIENDLY COERCION

On a tour of U.S. missile bases now abuilding, Labor Secretary Goldberg has taken pains to explain to the unions the nature of their no-strike pledge to the administration. He wants it understood that the pledge is entirely voluntary—so long as nobody breaks it.

"This is a test we are making," said Mr. Goldberg. Washington won't get tough while the pledge is kept; if it's broken, he warned, "the President will have no hesitancy in going to Congress."

What is being tested, clearly is the administration's tactic of trying to head off militarily harmful and politically embarrassing labor disputes by simultaneously appealing to the patriotism and brandishing a bludgeon. Inevitably, the administration had to do something about the scandalously strike-ridden missile sites. The results so far are self-evident: Where work-stoppages last year cost an average of 7,000 manhours each month, only 209 manhours were lost last month.

What should also be clear to unions generally is the willingness of even a friendly administration to resort to compulsion. Implicit in the newly created Missile Sites Labor Commission are Government controls patterned after those of World War II. Then, in the early postwar years, there was frequent Government intervention in labor-management disputes.

Nowadays, talk in Washington drifts persistently in the direction of compulsory arbitration of disputes throughout the economy. Strikes, not only in defense industries but in autos and airlines as well, are officially described as intolerable.

Perhaps the unions see nothing to fear in all this. After all, they faired pretty well in the past under the interventions of sympathetic administrations. Once again, they expect understanding from the White House. But the times and tempers change. Public attitudes toward unions are shifting, and political attitudes may follow suit. At least the administration's resort to a big stick at the missile bases should remind unions that Government interference—no matter how friendly—can be Government coercion.

Challenge in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet success in orbiting a man for more than 25 hours provides more dramatic evidence that in the struggle with the Communist world, brainpower is indispensable, and education is a vital factor in determining national strength. For an excellent statement of the implications of educational mobilization in the Communist nations I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues an address by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, at a conference on educational administration at Harvard University on July 20. In this speech, Commissioner McMurrin stressed his belief that American education must meet the challenge of Communist education without compromising our tradition of local responsibility for support, control, and quality of the schools.

EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL GOALS

An examination of the present predicament of our Nation reveals two basic and related propositions on Government that deserve our most serious consideration. The first of these, that in a sense expresses the very meaning of democracy, is the assumption that there is an inevitable coincidence of the good of the individual with the good of the society taken in its totality. It is the common belief that a course of action that genuinely ministers to the dignity and intrinsic value of the individual and cultivates his talents and capabilities and encourages his commitment to high purpose must of necessity build into the social structure and the state a strength that will guarantee their full integrity and their lasting power in the presence even of great adversity. But this is an assumption that has never been fully tested by our Nation or by any other nation, for in circumstances that have seriously and fundamentally challenged the strength of the democracies, as in the event of war, they have resorted to various forms of regimentation that have at certain points suspended the principles and practices normative for a democratic society. This regimentation together with the upsurge of power produced by the emotions of a society in imminent danger has successfully carried us through the great crises of the past. The question that we now must ask is whether without the regimentation of human souls and their resources that we quite properly abhor, and through a protracted period of collective anxiety that commonly weakens rather than strengthens a nation's character, we have the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources to guarantee our security in the presence of totalitarian states of great power. It is now entirely clear to us that whatever may be the quality of individual life in a totalitarian society, a vast potential of national power is provided by the monolithic structure of its purposes and institutions. We must assess our own policies and actions in terms of that power.

OUR TASK THE MOST DIFFICULT THAT ANY NATION HAS FACED

Our task, therefore, is a formidable one, and quite certainly the most difficult and historically the most portentous that any nation has faced. It is a task that falls especially on education—to make the American faith come true, that this Nation in dedicating its energies to the well-being of the individual will not only not sacrifice its national character, but will make of itself a citadel of such strength that it cannot fail.

But now we are confronted by problems of a new order that place upon the educational establishment a social responsibility of new dimensions and greater proportions and that must claim from us a maximum of effort for their solution. Internally and in our relations with the world we are involved in increasing social complexities that pertain especially to vast industrial expansion,

the new technologies, and increased intercommunication of all kinds, and it is becoming increasingly clear that we face the risks of serious shortages, misplacements, and imbalances in the education and training of our people that may affect the stability of our economy and the quality of our culture.

THE AGE OF SIMPLE SECURITY AND COMFORT LIES BEHIND US

Most importantly, we are now in the presence of a new and unknown and persistent danger, where the great power of our adversary lies in its capacity to regiment its total human and material resources for the achievement of its national and international purposes and in its commitment to an economic and deterministic theory of history that describes ours as a dying culture that must inevitably submit to a triumphant communism. It is clear that the age of our simple security and comfort lies behind us and that in our future whatever is most precious to us as individuals and as a nation faces daily the possibility of catastrophic destruction and is at all times threatened by those large and small events that in various and insidious ways may erode our freedom and otherwise affect the quality of our lives.

It is here that we encounter the second factor in the traditional faith of the American people that is now called into question by us, the common assumption that because fundamentally as a democratic people we are on the side of righteousness, our Nation and our culture must inevitably prevail, that whatever may be the disposition of our individual talents and energies, the future of our society is guaranteed. But recent and contemporary history gives no support to the easy and unsophisticated optimism of the 19th century that was so long an ingredient of our national consciousness and that in large measure accounts for this simple faith. It is now the beginning of wisdom in such matters to recognize that there are no guarantees and that without a more adequate cultivation of our human resources and deployment of our collective effort righteousness will surely fail and we will fail with it.

However much we may long for the assurances of yesterday, it is against a portentous background of continuing social, political, and cultural crisis that we must define the meaning of education for our society. When we ask the question of our educational responsibilities, the quality of our competence, the extent and depth of our resources, and the strength of our personal and collective commitment to education, we must not forget that we are threatened internally by bigotry, irrationalism, cynicism, complacency, and despair, and externally by an inordinate increase in the power of the totalitarian states and by the prospect of an apocalyptic destruction. And we must not forget that the decision for history is not already written into the necessary structure of events, but will be determined by the balance of statesmanship, of human commitment, and of disciplined and creative intelligence.

THE MONUMENTAL TASK

It is entirely proper, therefore, that we pursue with much care the task of defining and describing what have come to be called the national goals—ends to be progressively achieved for the well-being of the individual and in the domestic life of the state. We cannot depend on fortuitous complexes of circumstances or accidents of history to satisfy our national purpose. Nor can we emulate the totalitarian states in the manipulation and regimentation of our people in satisfying such demands as the technological manpower needs of our economy. The former would invite continued confusion; the latter would destroy the very foundations of our democratic life. Rather we must protect the quality of our society by preserving a genuine individualism that encourages and in various ways rewards independence in thought and action while at the same time we clearly identify the large needs of our society and move to satisfy them. In the individual this will demand a sense of civic purpose and dedication and a genuine internal moral and intellectual discipline. For the Nation it will mean the collective effort of our best minds in determining the courses proper for social action and will require a large measure of trust, mutual confidence, and faith in the processes of democracy. It is not enough that we do as well as has been done in the past. Our Nation is in deadly peril and it must now achieve a degree of competence and strength that has not before been known. But this, nevertheless, must surely be possible to us if we are willing to command our resources and our talents with a stern determination.

THE ENORMOUS BURDEN ON EDUCATION

It would be a gross misconception of the character of the problem of the individual and his society, or the individual and the State, to suppose that it is one of simple proportions. And it would be equally in error to suppose that the task of the administration of education in the matter of the individual and the national goals will not be in the future one of great difficulty. But the difficulty of our task must not be allowed to deter our efforts and our determination. Of central importance here, of course, are the educational functions proper to the Federal Government and the various relationships that obtain between agencies of the Federal Government and the educational institutions themselves as well as their governing bodies in the States and the local communities. The related issues of Federal aid to education and Federal control of education are basic to any discussion of these issues.

I would like to make it unequivocally clear that I regard Federal financial support of education as justified on grounds of both principle and practical necessity, that I am fully committed to the control of education by State and local authority, and, further, that I believe that the enactment of the administration's proposals for Federal aid now before the Congress, which legislation has my full and enthusiastic endorsement, will in no way result in Federal control of education or endanger the values that have traditionally attached to local control.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The justification for Federal financial support of education is simple and compelling. In principle it is the obvious fact that education both in general and in specialized forms nourishes the welfare of the people and is in the national interest. In practice such support is justified by the plain fact of financial need that some States or communities are either unable or unwilling to satisfy. The extent and quality of education throughout the Nation is now of urgent concern to every public-minded citizen. We cannot afford weak links in our educational system. We cannot afford any longer the waste of human resources that has been permitted in the past.

The Federal Government has invested public funds in education since before the adoption of the Constitution. For the fiscal year 1959 alone, which provides the latest complete figures, the expenditure, exclusive of loans, was nearly $2½ billion. It is not likely that most of those who are today opposed to Federal aid on the basis of principle, or who believe that it is inevitably conducive to Federal control, would advocate that the laws authorizing this expenditure be abolished. They are aware that the present advanced state of our science, agriculture, and the vocational arts is due in considerable degree to Federal expenditures in their support. And they know full well that the expenditure of these funds by agencies of the Federal Government, however much it has affected and influenced the quantity and character of American education, has not wrested the control of education from private, State, and local institutions and administrative agencies. And they know that if these Federal funds were not forthcoming they could not be replaced from other sources.

If the administration bills now before the Congress are enacted they will be administered in full conformity to the spirit and letter of the law, which in each instance provides that "no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

Some of the opponents of Federal aid to education have in recent weeks exploited a report of a committee of the Office of Education relating to the function and organization of the Office in their efforts to establish the ridiculous claim that plans are in the making for a Federal grab of the control of education. That report was prepared by a committee appointed last October by my predecessor in the Commissioner's office. The degree to which it and its authors have been misrepresented and the extent to which its plain purpose and meaning have been distorted by persons holding responsible public trust are appalling. I would like to say again that I am a firm advocate of local control of education and I know that the President and Secretary Ribicoff are as dedicated to local control as any principal, school superintendent, or school board member. Moreover, I have never encountered a disposition to favor Federal control on the part of any person in the Office of Education, or elsewhere in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or in any branch of the Federal Government or of any State government or in any educational institution. On the contrary, respect for the principle of local control of education is so universal throughout the Nation and in the Government that there would seem to be no just grounds for supposing that control cannot and will not be protected. The experience of hunderds of colleges, universities, and school districts that have already received billions of dollars in Federal funds without Federal controls should be ample evidence that control is not an inevitable accompaniment of Federal support.

The administration bills for assistance to elementary, secondary, and higher education have been wisely conceived in terms of need and the ability of the several States and individual institutions to satisfy that need. They represent the general concern of all the people for the education of all the people and in the national interest they bring to the level of Federal action the principle of equalization already accepted within the States. They assume that the Federal capacity for taxation should be employed for the general welfare when State and local revenue resources prove inadequate. Moreover, they are designed with full safeguards against the possibility of any control of the schools by the Office of Education. If these bills are not enacted into law it will be a great loss for the Nation, for not only will there be a deficiency of funds necessary for the improvement of the Nation's education, there will be, also, the discouraging evidence that the American people are not fully committed to decisive united action in the solution of one of their most crucial and pressing problems.

There is much to be said in favor of preserving our present pattern of local control of education. My own position on this matter is not dictated by any fear of the Federal Government, because I am unable to

think of the Federal Government as belonging less to the people than do local governments, and the facts are quite plain that there is not less competence or integrity in Federal office than in private places or in local public office. But it is very important that the schools be kept close to the people whom they serve and that the people not only maintain a vital interest in them but assume as well the primary responsibility for their support, ther operation, and their quality. Moreover, control of the schools by the Federal Government would inevitably result in a degree of standardization in curriculum and practices that would destroy much of the variety and diversity in American education that is basic to the pluralistic quality of our society. Without genuine diversity in the foundations of our culture, the life of our society would lose much of its personal character and would take on the dull mechanized quality taht is so characteristic of life in the totalitarian states.

We may take confidence from the fact that our educational establishment has firm foundations and that with an increasing measure of public interest and support it is moving steadily in a good direction. Nothing in the whole life of our culture justifies our pride more or is a more profound source of our strength than the intellectual freedom that characterizes the pursuit of knowledge in our schools and universities, or the universal character of our education that has brought us near a general literacy and has produced such a large measure of knowledge and disciplined intelligence. We must protect these at all costs.

Today the ugly forces of suspicion and false representation that threaten civic trust and unity are again in our midst. There are new accusations of disloyalty and there is new talk of special oaths and tests of loyalty in education. This could be the beginning of a new moral confusion in the public mind that might well compromise the precious quality of our intellectual freedom. It must be resisted with great strength, for when that freedom is lost, all is lost.

And there is a not inconsiderable reaction against the democratic character of our educational policies and practice in favor of an aristocratic philosophy of eduaction that would lodge our confidence in a highly cultivated elite rather than in the generality of well educated people. We must never forget that the most precious qualities of our Nation are inextricably tied to our democratic education. One of our most pressing responsibilities is the achievement of greater intellectual rigor and excellence at all levels in our schools, colleges, and universities, for we must exact from our students, teachers, and research scholars an ever larger measure of achievement in knowledge and creative activity. But this can and must be done within the framework of our indigenous educational philosophy that is in principle oriented to the meaning and purposes of a domocratic society.

Our schools and universities are integral to the very character of our society and our national life. Their strengths and weaknesses are strengths and weaknesses of our society. Their achievements are to the credit of the entire community, as the community must bear the responsibility for there failures. By and large the American people have received the kind of education they have wanted and have been willing to pay for in talent, effort, and money. Now with an increased sensitivity to the profound value and importance of education relative to both the internal and external problems of the Nation, they are asking for a general tightening up in the quality of our institutions and a more exacting demand for scholarly productivity. Fortunately there is good evidence that they are willing to invest a larger measure of their human and material resources to this purpose. Whatever difficulties we may face in the administration of eductaion or in its substance, it is our responsibility now to secure for them this higher excellence and larger productivity. Nothing less than this is worthy of our abilities or of our commitment to high purpose.

American Committee on Italian Migration Urges Enactment of Legislation To Admit Close Relatives of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Rev. Caesar Donanzan, P.S.S.C., executive secretary of the American Committee on Italian Migration in New York, and the statement of that committee:

AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON
ITALIAN MIGRATION,
New York, N.Y., August 8, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Knowing your past effective interest in the amelioration of our immigration laws, I take the liberty of forwarding you a copy of a statement drawn up by the directors of this committee. Its contents are self-explanatory.

It is our confident hope that, in concert with your colleagues, you will have the opportunity to enact—before adjourning—legislative measures aimed at the admission of close relatives of American citizens.

As the third page of the statement clearly shows, the registrations filed by U.S. citizens, who eagerly wait to be joined by their dear ones, keep increasing while the annual quota number allotted by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 remains pitifully low.

Appreciative of your cooperation and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
REV. CAESAR DONANZAN, P.S.S.C.

STATEMENT

At the present time at American consulates abroad there are petitions for (1) thousands of husbands, wives, and children of aliens legally residing in the United States and for (2) sons and daughters, brothers and sisters of American citizens. They all face the dim prospect of a prolonged separation of many years before they can expect to be reunited with their loved ones.

These are the unfortunate victims of circumstances whose hopes of reunion with their kin were raised with the filing of immigration petitions, only to be shattered at the offices of our consuls abroad who have the unwelcome duty of informing them that years will elapse before they can expect to receive a visa to enter the United States.

This situation is especially grave in Italy and in other countries where the annual allotment of immigration visas is small.

In September of 1959, with the passage of Public Law 86-363, the 86th Congress took a step forward in alleviating the situation by permitting the entry, on a nonquota basis, of 2d, 3d, and 4th preference applicants for visas who had been registered on a consular waiting list prior to December 31, 1953.

We express our deep concern over the many problems—psychological, moral, and economic—created by a situation which can easily be remedied.

It appears that H.R. 6300 introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER on April 13, 1961, and a similar bill S. 1809 introduced by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN on May 4, 1961, whose intent was to facilitate, among other provisions, the reunion of aliens with their close relatives here by reallocating unused quotas, requires further study and consideration and will not be enacted into law in the current session of Congress. Should, however, H.R. 6300 and S. 1809 be taken up soon, we strongly endorse the recommendation made by the U.S. Department of Justice that unused visas be issued on a first-come-first-served basis.

Unless and until permanent provisions such as those contemplated in H.R. 6300 and S. 1809 are made, it is urgent that immediate emergency measures be taken before the adjournment of this session of Congress to reunite families that have been separated for years.

Consideration and quick action are requested on the following proposals:

1. Nonquota status for spouses and unmarried children of aliens legally residing in the United States who are presently registered in the third preference category.

2. Nonquota status for close relatives (sons, daughters, brothers and sisters) of U.S. citizens who have been registered in the fourth preference category for the period from January 1 to December 31, 1954.

Incidentally, it is to be noted that the persons for whom relief is requested are dependents, for the most part (spouses and unmarried children of aliens legally residing in the United States) and they can, as consumers, indeed serve as a stimulant to the economy.

Visa Office Bulletin No. 79 issued by the U.S. Department of State on May 1, 1961, listed the following countries with their respective registrations of second, third, and fourth preference cases (parents and unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens; spouses and children of aliens legally residing in the United States; sons and daughters, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens):

Quota and subquota areas and registered demand

Australia	134
China	114
Chinese persons	2,327
Cyprus	258
Barbados	362
British Guinea	251
British Virgin Islands	227
Jamaica	902
Malta	294
Trinidad	238
Greece	6,999
Hungary	1,706
India	177
Iran	156
Iraq	163
Israel	234
Italy	138,378
Japan	733
Lebanon	193
Morocco	302
Palestine	337
Philippines	1,636
Portugal	3,888
Rumania	790
Spain	756
Tunisia	217
Turkey	826
United Araba Republic	580
Yugoslavia	2,135
Others	5,897
Total	171,210

Southern California International Exposition of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1961

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, along with my esteemed colleague, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, and with the Honorable JAMES C. CORMAN, on August 7, 1961, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill sponsoring a Southern California International Exposition to be held in 1966. Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE sponsored an identical bill in the Senate on the same day.

LOCAL SUPPORT

From the State legislature on down to the Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners and City Council, endorsement of this important event has been registered. The support is overwhelming.

Assurance of basic support for the project by all important segments of the community, such as industry, labor, civic groups, and so on, is of vital importance to the success of the program.

VENTURE MUST BE SOUND

One of the greatest concerns over sponsorship of such an event as the Southern California International Exposition is the fiscal soundness of the venture. Myriad problems, beyond the span of individual comprehension, are certain to arise. Ceilings to curb exorbitant salaries, to prevent abusive use of expense accounts and other slush funds are vital to sound operation. Adequate accounting and auditing mechanisms and procedures require scrupulously abiding standards. Competitive bidding and denial of favoritism in construction, leasing and the thousands of other transactions inherent in such an undertaking are indispensable. Especial concern must be directed at winding up the affairs of the managing corporation after the exposition has run its full course.

The above considerations barely scratch surface, but they are indicative of portending problems.

EXPOSITION TREASURER: IVY BAKER PRIEST

It was with great confidence that I was to put full faith behind the Southern California International Exposition when I learned that Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest Stevens, former Treasurer of the United States, serves as treasurer of the exposition. Full and unflinching confidence may be vested in her, as representative of the caliber of personnel promoting this great international event.

And, with Fred Hall, former Governor and Supreme Court Justice of Kansas, serving as general manager of the exposition, the topflight leadership driving the event is well toward significant accomplishment.

BENEFITS

It is my hope that southern California itself, Long Beach and environs will be substantially benefited as a result of hosting the Southern California International Exposition. Some of these benefits might include: First, the encouragement of international exhibitors to settle and open up branch offices; second, the reciprocal advantage of local firms developing contacts for expanding new domestic and oversea markets; and third, the generation of tourist revenues. Benefit to the community should have a lasting effect.

In addition, benefits from a successful program of this kind should inure to the benefit of the United States. On a national scale, for example, some of these benefits might include: First, promotion of international good will; second, furtherance of world trade and development of new international markets; third, familiarization, through an international showcase, of large groups of people with the latest technical advancement and industrial programs, with the concomitant of showing off our proud industrial might; fourth, stimulation toward improvement of domestic products by providing competition among national products. The international competition thus fostered, within reasonable tariff regulations, might tend to curb inflation by forcing industry to keep costs down.

EXPOSITIONS INCREASING

Today a rising groundswell of international expositions, world fairs, and other events are underway. With this newly introduced legislation my colleagues and I have sponsored, Southern California is in early on that rising swell. It remains a question of policy to be decided by Congress whether the Southern California International Exposition will be favored financially.

PRECEDENT OF GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Since 1867 Congress has traditionally provided financial contribution to these events of international significance. To date about 60 such events have received Federal recognition by grants of money. To mention a few: the New York World's Fair, 1939–40—$3,275,000—out of a total of $27,829,500 in subscribed funds; the San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition, 1939–40—$1,700,000; the Universal and International Exhibition at Brussels, 1958—$16,400,000.

TRADE FAIRS

In addition, the Commerce Department's Office of International Trade Fairs encourages U.S. participation in international trade fairs. It was not until 1954 that the U.S. Government gave official support to the participation of Americans in international trade fairs. At that point, the Soviet Union had already participated in 133 international trade fairs since World War II. Since 1954, and through October 31, 1959, there have been 82 official exhibits in 28 countries, participated in by more than 5,000 American contributors, and viewed by more than 50 million people. This is another good way to sell America to peoples of foreign lands.

SEATTLE'S CENTURY 21 EXPOSITION

Our good friends to the north in Seattle have the privilege of hosting the first international exposition to be held in the United States for 23 years. Seattle's Century 21 Exposition will open April 21, 1962. It will be followed by a New York exhibition in 1964. Dallas, and other communities are also considering similar undertakings in various stages of planning and development.

Seattle's Century 21 Exposition was bolstered by receipt of $9 million in 1959 when the U.S. Congress appropriated that sum to become prime exhibitor. Authorization—dollar ceiling Congress OK's—for Century 21 was $12.5 million. No authorization or appropriation has yet been accorded to California. The bill I introduced August 7 would open that door.

INCREASING COMPETITION

One thing is certain. Because of the profusion of local interests pushing such events, some sort of standardized criteria of recognition by Congress will have to be established. Otherwise, conflicts of exposition dates, and an overabundance of these events will diminish their value and importance. Otherwise, objections regarding tariff regulations to international shipments of sample goods, and so forth, will rise to plague the Congress.

IDEA IS SOUND; PLANNING MUST BE SOUND

The basic idea of a Southern California International Exposition is sound. If the planning and support is likewise sound, the Southern California International Exposition will benefit the Nation and the State.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Gains in Biology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussion of missiles, H-bombs, and the space age, there is a marked tendency to overlook some of the really great potentials in other scientific fields. The following news article from last Sunday's New York Times—August 6, 1961—tells of some of the amazing possibilities in the field of biology and the improvement of man.

If we could only be free of wars and rumors of wars, think what could be done for the human race and mankind generally.

The article follows:

GAINS IN BIOLOGY—MAJOR DISCOVERIES ARE UNRAVELING THE MYSTERIES OF THE CELL

(By William L. Laurence)

Biology, the science of life, is progressing, markedly on two major fronts. On one of these, the mysteries of the living cell—the basic unit of life—are being penetrated and unraveled by advances in the new scientific discipline named microsurgery. It has made possible the transplantation of the nuclei of cells and the exchange of their heredity-carrying units. On the second front, life's complex chemical processes are being tracked down to the level of their simplest functional units, the molecule.

Discoveries being made on both these fronts, leaders in biology note, are leading to a revolution "far greater in potential" than the atomic or hydrogen bomb. It is essential, they emphasize, that we begin right now to consider the possible uses and misuses of the great biological discoveries in the making.

ADVANCES DEPICTED

Dramatic advances in microsurgery were recently outlined in an address before the New York Academy of Sciences by Dr. Milan J. Kopac, professor of biology at the Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University. Progress on the chemical front was described in a recent Voice of America broadcast by Dr. Gairdner B. Moment, professor of biology at Goucher College. Implications of these discoveries for the future were also discussed by Dr. Philip Siekevitz, biochemist at the Rockefeller Institute.

Exploration of living cells by microsurgery presents many intriguing problems, Dr. Kopac pointed out. First of all, cells are so small that they must be magnified from 100 to 2,000 times in order for all relevant details to be properly seen. Too, cells are delicate structures and must be handled with extreme care. They must be maintained in the right environment usually in a solution of several salts in proper ratio and concentration. Temperatures must be maintained within narrow limits.

He noted that if one is to perform microsurgery on cells, the surgical instruments must be much smaller than the cells and one must position the instruments to the cell with extraordinary precision and delicacy. The minuteness of the cell—its diameter is six to eight ten-thousands of an inch, while its nucleus is less than three ten-thousandths of an inch—and the susceptibility of the nuclei to injury, has required the design of entirely new procedures in microsurgery.

TINY INSTRUMENTS

Advances in microsurgery, Dr. Kopac said, have been made possible through the development of microsurgical instruments—extremely minute needles, pipettes, hooks, scalpels, scissors and forceps—and of complex mechanical devices by which these instruments are placed into a cell so that the desired operation can be performed. With these highly precise mechanical devices, known as micromanipulators, "one can insert a needle or a pipette into a cell with a delicacy so exquisite and precise that a part of a cell or a nucleus can be removed and implanted into another cell or nucleus."

Ways and means for handling and measuring small volumes of liquid also had to be developed, Dr. Kopac added. This led to the design and construction of instruments named microinjectors. These, he said, "can measure or control volumes to less than one micromicroliter" (millionth of a millionth of a liter). A micromicroliter would be the volume of a drop of water divided approximately 50 million times.

The most important discoveries in biology, Dr. Moment said, are being made by studies at the molecular level which have "immensely enlarged our total understanding of what makes a living thing alive." They have opened up for human exploration "a new world of what goes on inside the living cell" and have drawn "detailed metabolic maps which show the complex and interconnecting pathways taken by matter and energy during the multiform transformations within living things."

ORGANIC CARPENTRY SEEN

"When enough is known about amino acids (basic units of proteins) and nucleotides (units of the genetic material in the nuclei of cells)," Dr. Moment predicted, "it will be possible to produce at will undreamed-of forms of living things." "Here lies a revolution far greater in its potential significance than even the use of atomic energy. It may all sound fantastic, but so also did the use of nuclear energy only 30 years ago," he said.

A similar view was expressed by Dr. Siekevitz. As a result of the great increase in knowledge about life processes "we can see ahead the possibility, very small but yet distinct, of man's planning his own biological evolution," he said.

"We are now approaching the greatest event in human history, even in the history of life on earth, the deliberate changing by man of many of his biological processes," he said. "We will be able to plan ahead so that our children will be what we like them to be—physically and even mentally. At that point man will be remodeling his own being."

This, Dr. Siekevitz warns, makes it necessary for all of us, not only scientists, to begin right now to think about the future in such a context.

It becomes essential, he said "that man should have a purpose in mind—a concept of the future to give meaning to his fateful moves. Events in biological research are happening so rapidly that we will soon have to answer a new question. No longer, what creature is man? But what creature should he become?"

"It is the power of man's brain which has made nuclear energy possible, the power of our intelligence, which, because it is natural, places us not above nature, but as one with all living things," Dr. Siekevitz stated. "There is a golden age ahead on earth for our species; if only we use to their utmost capacity our heads and our hearts, our intelligence and our natural intuitive love for all that is within nature, for that beauty which is life itself."

Food Shortages in Sino-Soviet Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, following my visit to Berlin and Western Europe, I commented upon some of the serious food shortages which were facing the Sino-Soviet countries, particularly in Communist China, East Berlin, and in the Soviet Union itself.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Tristam Coffin in the New Leader of July 31 entitled "Agriculture Studies Red's Food Shortage" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I wish to commend Mr. Coffin for his excellent research and his revealing report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE STUDIES REDS' FOOD SHORTAGE

(By Tristram Coffin)

Reporters sitting stiffly in the huge ornate State Department auditorium all noticed it—the tough, straight line of the President's jaw, the somber look in his eyes, his hands always in motion behind the lectern. There was no bantering, no sudden flashes of the old smile at last week's press conference.

John F. Kennedy is completely absorbed in the drama over Berlin; he is determined to win, and is exhibiting a mastery of psychological warfare that no one but Richard Nixon would have thought possible. He is responsible for a dazzling display of toughness and olive branch—leaked stories, well-timed statements, words from Capitol Hill, even photographs of himself with General Maxwell Taylor and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara—all designed to give the impression that Washington has cocked the gun, but won't shoot unless it has to.

Behind this strategy of bringing maximum pressure on Russia to back down in Germany is the decision that Premier Nikita Khrushchev must be jolted into realization that he has gone too far in his taunts, that the West can stand just as close to the fire as he. A sample of the kind of word which gets back to Moscow was the retort of the

Soviet Ambassador at a private party in Washington the other day. Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov, who has the bland manner of a department store floorwalker, said he was sure the United States would never fight over Berlin, that he knew many Americans and they assured him of this.

Meanwhile, there is increasing evidence building up in Washington that the U.S.S.R. is not ready or getting ready to fight. Khrushchev seems to be involved in a struggle to maintain his power: He has been conducting widespread purges which have already affected some 43 members of the Central Committee, and his recent speeches throughout the provinces have revealed general dissatisfaction with agricultural production, housing and consumer goods. In addition, the entire Communist empire, including such new recruits as North Vietnam and Cuba, is facing serious food shortages.

In a sprawling, shoebox-type building far off the beaten path for intelligence operatives, scholars in shirt sleeves are amassing hard facts on this Communist calamity. And, according to these U.S. Department of Agriculture experts, the worst is yet to come.

This winter and next spring may decide whether the People's Republic of China can stay in business. Russia faces no such excruciating problem, but 2 bad years in the virgin lands means there will be less to eat. East Germany is already rationing some food. Bulgaria is trying to buy grain in Australia. Cuba started lard rationing July 20, and meat and fish shortages are admitted in Cuban broadcasts. The North Vietnamese Minister of Agriculture, in a June 29 appeal to "carry on urgent work in the rice fields," said, "The situation is unsatisfactory." Long food lines are also appearing in other satellites.

The critical situation in China which has already produced extreme belt-tightening, large-scale malnutrition and edema, and some famine, has four causes:

1. The Peiping Government has been trying to blame everything on the weather. The searing drought in the north and heavy floods in the coastal areas are the worst in 300 years, the Chinese people are told.

One explanation offered is a mysterious change in the wind pattern. The winds which spread the monsoon waters far inland into the wheat producing areas of the north weakened in 1959, and almost all the rain was dumped on the coast. The Government's year-end report said that in 1959 some 100 million acres, or more than a third of the cultivable land, was scourged by natural hazards. Forty-nine million acres were seriously affected.

In 1960, 148 million acres, more than half the cultivable land, was damaged, 49 to 64 million acres seriously. This is a bad crop year, too. A few days ago, a Chinese statement revealed that "The natural catastrophes—floods in large areas, unprecedented droughts, typhoons, hailstorms, contamination by disease—are continuing for the third year and have caused considerable loss, particularly in agriculture, and also have affected some branches of light industry." The fall sown winter wheat crop is particularly poor.

2. China has 15 million new mouths to feed each year. Thus, in the 3 years of calamity, the population has grown by 45 million.

3. Food production reached a peak in 1958, a peak China is not likely to reach again for many years. The 1958 breakthrough in rice, corn, cotton, and tobacco came after years of hunger and austerity, and apparently went to the heads of the Peiping authorities. They thought they had licked the farm problem and could turn to heavy industry. Agriculture's need for investment capital, labor, fertilizer, feed, and equipment was largely ignored.

4. The commune system was adopted after the good crops of 1958, despite cautionary words from Moscow. Peiping was going to show the world, and Russia too, how to leap forward. It was a rough trampling of the centuries-old traditions of the Chinese peasants, turning them from workers into numbers in a great semimilitary regiment that moves from place to place with no chance to put down roots. This, as the U.S.S.R. predicted, partially from its own experiments, removed incentives, and cut down production.

A direct report on July 13 from a Yugoslav correspondent in Peiping, Vasil Magdeski, said all food is now rationed in China, as well as cotton products, and that the cost of living has risen sharply. The monthly rations of cereals, when it is available, is about 31 pounds, meat about 7 ounces and sugar about 1 pound, while milk is given in limited quantity only to children under 2 years of age. Cotton coupons will provide only 40 inches per person per year. One quart of milk costs the equivalent of 67 cents, and 1 pound of sugar costs about 75 cents.

The Yugoslav observer ascribes the Chinese food shortage to inherited low productivity, natural disasters, accelerated construction and heavy industry which "have not only absorbed tens of millions of peasants who were more than needed in agriculture, but also the major part of the financial and materials means," and hostility to the communes. He adds that an "irregular supply of raw materials" has cut down production in light industries.

The real crisis will descend on China this winter and next spring. This is why it recently used its scarce credits to purchase 4 to 5 million tons of grain. But the internal transportation system is highly inadequate for handling large additional traffic in bulky supplies, and the ghastly specter of famine destroying millions in interior areas is very real. If the spring crop is again bad, one of the worst catastrophes in man's history will unfold.

Incidentally, Russia has not been able to furnish China with grain. In fact, in 1959 China shipped $450 million worth of rice to the U.S.S.R. in return for machinery. It is doubtful that the rice shipments are continuing, however.

In Russia, no one will starve this winter. Yet a more sophisticated people, demanding more and more a higher standard of living, will find meat and grains scarce. Khrushchev, who billed himself as a kind of Henry Wallace of Russia, will look like a chump. And the Communist reputation will take a nosedive if it cannot provide a good dinner for its own people after all these years.

The reason for Russia's trouble is a gamble that lost. According to Dr. Lazar Volin, the Agriculture Department's knowledgeable Russian expert, the Soviets have not been able to boost production per acre in many years of trial. More food demands more acres. Thus Khrushchev, who is a master propagandist, is not so good a farmer, pushed the virgin lands program with great ballyhoo.

But the 90 million acres involved, which are located in Siberia and southeast Russia, are in large part marginal lands. The frost-free season in Siberia and Kazakhstan is quite short, and there is a constant threat of late spring and early autumn frosts. Winter wheat cannot be grown in wide stretches. Fruit trees are in peril from killing frost. In addition, the rainfall is scanty and unevenly distributed. Late spring and early summer droughts are frequent and often accompanied by scorching dry winds or sukhovei.

For 2 years, 1959 and 1960, drought and dust storms have swept millions of acres of the virgin lands, and Khrushchev himself admits 1961 is not a good year. He recently spent some weeks away from Moscow in the agricultural areas exhorting the peasants to raise their sights. It is reported, too, that he was personally investigating incredible tales of mismanagement and theft on a massive scale.

Khrushchev's big push on the virgin lands robbed the Ukraine and Caucasus of labor and equipment, and this, in turn, has prevented European Russia from increasing its yield. A million farmworkers, 200,000 tractors, and 75,000 huge combines were shipped to the virgin lands.

As a sidelight on this, the First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Washington a few years ago was being questioned by a Unitarian youth conference on the mechanics of his government. He maintained that Khrushchev was not a dictator, but was chosen by a majority of the central committee, and could be deposed by the same group.

"Under what conditions might he be deposed?" an insistent boy asked.

The First Secretary replied, as if mentioning the impossible, "This might happen if the virgin lands program was not a success."

Part of Russia's trouble—and this has spread to Eastern Europe which has ceased to export food in great quantities—is that the Communist system of denying incentives to individual farmers simply has not worked, East Germany has an additional headache; it can't get farm labor. Defections to the West have badly hit its manpower supply.

Chen Left Report and a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column from the Washington Post of Sunday, August 6, 1961, written by Mr. Jack Anderson, Drew Pearson's assistant.

CHEN LEFT REPORT AND A PROBLEM

(Drew Pearson is in Germany checking firsthand on the Berlin crisis. In his absence, his column is being written by his associate, Jack Anderson.)

(By Jack Anderson)

Formosa's tiny but tough Vice President Chen Cheng had another purpose for his mission to Washington besides announcing Nationalist China's determination to fight against the admission of Red China and Outer Mongolia to the United Nations.

He left behind with President Kennedy a report and a question.

The report, a document of the highest secrecy, contains startling new evidence concerning the magnitude of the famine in Red China and the temper of its suffering, starving people.

The question: Is the time near when Mao Tse-Tung can be given a taste of his own guerrilla tactics by opening a secret front against his tyranny deep in China's heartland?

Administration officials are pondering the possibility of dropping anti-Communist guerrillas into areas where the famine is most intense. They would be armed with light weapons for defense, with surplus food for offense.

In the early stages, the guerrillas would avoid head-on clashes with Mao forces. They would conceal and guard the food, smuggling it to the hungry peasants to win their support.

Only after the guerrillas had the peasants of a whole area working with them would they carry the fight to the Communists.

Nationalist authorities, with whom this idea has been discussed, are not completely convinced it will work. They doubt whether enough guerrillas could be infiltrated into Red China to make it effective.

FOOD FOR WAR

They advocate a more direct and bolder plan: Chiang Kai-shek should open a beachhead on the mainland, then announce to the world that he merely wants to bring food to his starving countrymen.

He could contend that the Communists cannot be trusted to distribute food. They give the lion's share to soldiers and bureaucrats, even ship food abroad for diplomatic gains, while their own people go hungry.

The beachhead plan has one obvious drawback. It could trigger world war III.

An answer may lie somewhere between the two proposals, perhaps a massive food-and-arms smuggling operation accompanied by a propaganda barrage.

How practical is the idea of guerrilla warfare, using grain more than bullets, behind Mao's lines?

Vice President Chen's secret report gave graphic evidence that rarely in their long history of hardship have the Chinese people suffered more cruelly than they do today.

Rice is rationed to the last grain. Meat, vegetables, poultry and eggs are unavailable in most areas, except in the so-called free markets at exorbitant prices. Diseases that go with famine have reached epidemic proportions.

Reluctantly, even the Communists have been forced to recognize the ghastly Horsemen of the Apocalypse who ride the land. With millions of peasants almost too weak to work, the commissars have ceased driving them from dawn to dusk. They have even suspended political and social activities that use up energy.

Although the penalty for stealing food can be death, famine breeds its own desperate bravery. Food stores have armed guards. Even small vegetable plots must be protected against looters.

Here, certainly are the ingredients for revolt.

BEHIND ENEMY LINES

But can guerrilla warfare succeed against Mao, the greatest guerrilla of them all? Perhaps a partial answer can be found in a personal experience.

It was during another August, 16 years ago, that I rode as a war correspondent with Chang Shang-chih's guerrillas behind the Japanese lines.

Our small role was to harass a stretch of the Hankow-Peking railway 60 to 80 miles north of Hankow. Our hideout was in the mountains where grain often was growing on a 50–60-degree angle.

This was a land of no roads—only paths where the men wound single file through rugged mountains, then down into terraced valleys of shimmering rice paddles.

It was a land where a handful could hold off hundreds, then vanish to strike again.

One desperate day after Chang's guerrillas had been mauled by a Japanese patrol, we were huddled in a hut. Chang was exhausted, but he bared his teeth in a bitter smile and pronounced the guerrilla creed: "Many small victories will in the end make a big one." Then he turned over and went to sleep. Next morning, at dawn, he and his brave, ragged band were on the march again.

Four Freedoms Awards Go to Four Great Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last evening the Four Freedoms Award dinner was held here in Washington, at which function the Four Freedoms Awards for 1961 were presented to the Honorable Abraham A. Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; our genial colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, Senator Pat McNamara; Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and the Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, for their work on behalf of the solution of some of the pressing problems of the aged in America. The Four Freedoms Foundation is making great progress in its building of housing for the elderly at Miami, Fla., at Detroit, Mich., and at other places.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg's remarks were delivered for him by Under Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz which seem to me to catch the spirit of the program for the aged in America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Secretary of Labor Goldberg's remarks as read for him by Under Secretary Willard Wirtz.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ON ACCEPTANCE OF PLAQUE AT THE FOUR FREEDOMS AWARD DINNER BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR GOLDBERG, SECRETARY OF LABOR, AS READ BY UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR WILLARD WIRTZ

I accept this award gratefully, proudly, but most of all humbly.

Such recognition can be only in the smallest measure a reflection of anything I have done to further the purpose of meeting the problems brought by advancing years—for I have done all too little.

My feeling is rather of being invited to participate in a program others have already instituted; and it is this opportunity for which I am grateful.

Older people have become in many ways our most underprivileged minority—a universal minority to which we all seek membership, sometimes desperately, but which, when we enter upon it, more often than not turns desire to disillusion and dashes hope with heartbreak.

To believe deeply that life has a divine pattern is to deny the completeness of today's design of it for so many—a design which commits one of every four people over 65 to living alone, which denies medical aid to so many just when they need it most, deprives people of recreational opportunity just when they are free to enjoy it, faces them with stairs—literally and figuratively—just when it is hardest to climb those stairs.

Life was not given man on terms that make it a bitter disillusionment. What failure there has been is ours, and ours to repair.

President Kennedy has committed himself and this administration to those changes in our system of things which will let the evenings of our lives be times of new opportunity, new activity, new usefulness, new belief in ourselves. This is part of what freedom must mean.

But Government can only be the agent of national purpose, helping to carry forward people's enterprise. Four Freedoms House, Inc., reflects the willingness of the American labor movement to accept responsibility in matters which go beyond the concerns of the bargaining table, and fall, instead, within the realm of public service.

I think of Robert Frost's poem about the homeless hired man, who returned, mortally tired, to the farmhouse where he had once worked. He had, in the poet's phrase, "nothing to look backward to with pride, nothing to look forward to with hope." The farmer wanted not to take him in; this was not, he said, the hired man's home; and "Home," he added, "is the place where, when you have to go there, they have to take you in." But his wife replied, "I should have called (home) something you somehow haven't to deserve."

This is the spirit which inspires Four Freedoms House, and to which we all here subscribe.

Dallas, a City of Great Promise Through the Efforts of Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News gives the reason that Dallas is one of the outstanding communities in America, offering a good life to its citizens and an attractive spot for business and industrial development. The growth and progress of Dallas and the bright promise of the future has been made possible through the industry, the hard work, and the imagination of the people of Dallas inspired by the basic tenets of the free enterprise system which affords opportunity to those willing and eager to strive for success. As one who is highly privileged to be the Representative of the people of Dallas County and the spirit they reflect, I am proud to include, as a part of my remarks, this editorial tribute to a great city:

A VERY STRONG CITY

Strong leadership is keeping Dallas vigorous and growing, just as it built a city despite lack of natural advantages. Outsiders often appreciate the human elements in Dallas' success story more than those who live with it.

"Few cities have grown so rapidly as Dallas in the last decade * * * yet Dallas, thanks largely to its leaders' willingness to risk their money in their own city, suffers relatively few of the horrors which the boom has brought to its contemporaries."

That quotation is from "The Future of Our Cities," which highly praises Dallas and its leadership. Author Robert A. Futterman, a successful real estate operator, owns no

property here, but wishes he did. "A very strong city," he calls Dallas.

One source of current strength is the downtown Dallas program of the Downtown Dallas Committee, a separately financed group functioning through the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

Effective use of newspapers, radio and television stations and other media, with special promotions, has enabled downtown Dallas, headed by Lee Starr, to accomplish much in 2 years.

More Dallasites, as well as out-of-towners, have been brought into the stores, parking lots, theaters, restaurants, and other enterprises in the heart of the city. There is abundant evidence that all of Dallas benefits.

Future plans are promising. They include an August 13–19 Salute to Youth Week, in cooperation with the Junior League. Young people will be honored for civic work.

More than 150,000 working women of Metropolitan Dallas will be honorees at elaborate events in October. November and December will bring special holiday observances.

Downtown Dallas has proved to be good business. It is even more profitable in revitalized community spirit and cooperation. It is the combination of energy, brainpower and teamwork that are needed to keep Dallas the retail, wholesale, financial, and cultural jewel of the Southwest.

Main Street, U.S.A., Is in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the problems of America's small towns and rural areas in a rapidly changing economy are of deep concern to those of us who represent the part of the country consisting in the main of the smaller communities.

But our concern, I am happy to state, is shared by others who live in the larger metropolitan cities but recognize the importance of small towns to the social, cultural, political, and economic well-being of the Nation.

The Senate a short time ago demonstrated its concern when it approved, without dissent, a proposal to establish a special commission to study the problems of our small towns and rural areas.

This measure, which I introduced and in which my homestate colleague [Mr. CASE] joined as a cosponsor, is now awaiting action of the House.

Today, with the intention of focusing further attention on this problem in the hope that new interest will be generated in behalf of the measure by the House, I want to refer to two additional metropolitan voices which join in the discussion of the need for the study of the difficulties confronting our smaller communities.

Both are distinguished newspapers, and they have devoted their editorial space to a discussion of what can be done to help our small towns. The first editorial is from the July 29 issue of the Denver Post. The second is an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald, which was reprinted in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader a short time ago.

Both of these editorials are worthy of the attention of the Congress, and in particular, of the attention of the Members of the other body where the bill awaits action. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, July 29, 1961]

MAIN STREET, U.S.A., IS IN TROUBLE

The story of the smalltown youngster who leaves his drab hometown for the bright lights, excitement and opportunity of the city is a familiar one in America.

To use the lingo, the average small town is "a good place to be from."

It's been that way for a long time.

Today, there is mounting concern for the fate and future of the small town. Religious groups, sociologists, and politicians are suggesting that the fading away of the small town is a cause for more than mere nostalgia.

It is a major loss, both economically and socially, to the United States, they are saying.

Economic pressure on the smaller communities comes from two directions. As farms become larger, fewer people are needed to work the land. Thousands of families leave agriculture each year. They no longer shop in the smalltown stores and patronize the professional people there. They no longer use the libraries and schools.

Meanwhile, the major cities, with their better salaries and greater job opportunities, attract new millions annually—from both small towns and farms. Superhighways make it possible for shoppers to bypass the small communities in favor of the cities.

It can be argued that this is simple economics at work. The inefficient must pass away.

But is it that simple? The ultimate result might be even costlier.

Why abandon a host of positive economic and social values simply to rebuild them again in the suburbs of the large cities? Why feed the cities wave after wave of new population when many cities find their present problems practically insoluble now?

The problem, of course, hasn't the character of an imminent crisis. Nevertheless, year by year, it is coming into sharper focus.

Congress now is earnestly concerned. Under legislation sought by Senators MUNDT and CASE of South Dakota, as well as by House Members, a preliminary study would be made to see just what can be done about small towns.

Then, as Senator MUNDT suggested, a Federal clearinghouse might be established to give leadership in rebuilding smalltown economic patterns.

Further action, if such is indicated, could proceed from there. Among the proposals is a suggestion that some defense contracting be aimed in the direction of the smaller communities.

Certainly, studies ought to be made. Anyone who has visited the smaller towns, including those in Colorado, must be aware that great investment would be required to replace the many advantages these communities already provide.

And it is ironic that, while they are losing population, small towns are offering an increasingly better life to their residents—better utility service, automation in living and closer contact with the main stream of American life by way of television.

To let the problem go untended would be a shameful waste.

[From the Omaha World Herald]

NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE LOOKS AT RURAL RENEWAL

"All one has to do," said Nebraska's State Senator William Brandt of Unadilla, "is travel through the small towns and see the vacant houses and business buildings, all of which represent lost tax value to the State."

The loss is greater than can be measured in tax revenue, as the senator is well aware. He and Senator Edwin McHugh have introduced a resolution to create a legislative council committee to study the problem of declining rural communities.

The State proposal is in line with a similar move in Congress. A bill sponsored by South Dakota's Senators, KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, has already passed the Senate and an identical measure, the Beckworth-Berry bill, is pending in the House along with a similar measure sponsored by Representative JOHNSON, Democrat, of Maryland.

The Mundt-Case bill would look into the problems of towns of less than 10,000 population, which means all but 11 Nebraska communities, and into counties of less than 50,000 population, which means all Nebraska counties except Douglas and Lancaster. The Johnson measure proposes a study of communities of less than 25,000 people.

The purpose of these look-see proposals is to stem the decline and meet future needs of small towns and rural areas.

The problem in many ways is similar to the rotting areas within big cities—declining population, deteriorating public services, smaller tax revenues.

Among the strongest backers of these studies are churches which have large membership in smalltown and farm areas. Lutheran, Baptist and Methodist Churches have endorsed the Mundt-Case bill, as has the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

As in the case of declining areas in the big cities, delay worsens the plight of the quiet small towns that are swiftly growing quieter. Both State and Federal authorities seem to believe that if something is to be done the country should make a decision and start doing it within the next 2 years.

Will They Vote for Failure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star, Sunday, August 6, 1961:

WILL THEY VOTE FOR FAILURE?

While President Kennedy is beating the drums for his multimillion-dollar long-range foreign aid program, a committee of Congress has just issued a report on the almost total failure of the foreign aid program in Peru. We hope Members of Congress will read this report instead of filing it away in the wastebasket—as usual. If they do, they will not vote for the almost unlimited authority the President is asking over foreign aid funds.

The House Committee on Government Operations decided late last year to investigate a "successful" foreign aid program. It had been criticized for only investigating foreign aid operations that were a complete mess, as in Laos. So they found out that Rollin S. Atwood, until recently Regional

Director of the Office of Latin American Operations of the International Cooperation Administration thought very highly of the Peru program. He described it as "one of the finest programs ICA ever had. It is one that has achieved the objectives of the United States perhaps better than any other program we have had in Latin America." So the committee expected to find good news about foreign aid in Peru.

Here is what they found: A $14 million food relief program was started. "The primary purpose of the program was feeding hungry people. Less than 6 percent of the food was distributed free in the drought area. At least one-third of this (grain) was sold to millers and distributed through normal commercial channels. Whether any of this reached drought victims cannot be determined.

"Almost 25 percent of the food provided remained undistributed at the time the drought was officially declared over. Almost one-half of this amount still remained in warehouses a year later.

"Although USOM (local ICA field office) Director John R. Neale had received instructions to obtain ICA/W (Washington headquarters) approval of the projects proposed by the Government of Peru to be financed with the sales proceeds, he failed to do so.

"As a result of Neale's failure to carry out his duties as USOM Director, at least 60 percent of the sales proceeds were used improperly. An instance of improper use was the unapproved construction of eight houses at Puno and their sale, below cost and on an installment basis, to prominent persons in the town.

"A $2 million loan to Peru intended to aid its economy through construction of a road to open isolated areas for agricultural development and colonization, was the subject of such faulty and inadequate planning that after construction had actually started, the route had to be completely changed, when belated soil tests established that the areas to be served by the original route were unsuitable for farming. Washington was not advised of this change until this fact was uncovered by an ICA/W auditor.

"The road finally constructed under this loan ended in the middle of nowhere—'on the side of a mountain'—at a point about halfway along the projected route.

"A $125,000 irrigation project built at Pampas de Noco does not irrigate. The reason the project was not feasible seems incredible, in any properly planned irrigation project—it was simply that there was not enough water available in the area to make use of the projected irrigation works.

"USOM Director John R. Neale entered into a conflict of interest situation for personal profit when he organized and invested in the corporation Negociacion Bazo Velarde, S.A. for the purpose of operating a farm which was receiving aid under the U.S. program." Neale did not tell the truth when questioned by ICA. Also ICA had enough information to make an investigation but it was 4 years before any action was taken. Even then "both Regional Director Atwood and Ambassador Achilles (Theodore C.) persisted in impressing on the board their beliefs that Neale was simply a victim of spite. Neither appeared to have any knowledge of the actual facts.

"There were no end use checks made of the drought program. ICA/W on the basis of information from various sources, could have taken action to correct this situation." Special audits finally came when Congress began its investigation.

"USOM/Peru Deputy Director Coon tried for over a year to get action from responsible ICA officials on his charges of Neale's maladministration in Peru, only to get rebuffs from ICA director Smith (James H. Jr.) and Regional Director Atwood. It was not until it became known that he was to appear before a congressional committee that P. S. & I. (ICA Office of Personnel Security) was finally directed to investigate Coon's charges.

"After failing for over a year and a half to make any substantial inquiry into the charges that a USOM employee (a Peruvian national) had improperly profited from the sale of some $42,000 in surplus grain stocks, IOGC finally reopened the case, one day after this subcommittee had expressed interest in the case."

Now this is an example of what Regional Director Atwood called a foreign aid program "perhaps better than any other program that we have in Latin America." We wonder what the worse programs are like. Atwood also called Neale a man who "made perhaps the greatest contribution to the entire technical cooperation in Latin America * * *" and one of the "most outstanding technicians we have in the field." If this is so, those not so outstanding must be awful.

Nothing in the new Kennedy program would correct the kind of situation described in Peru. It would only make it more permanent and worse. At the same time, if ICA officials think the program in Peru is so great, it seems only logical to suppose that there are scores of other cases—as already shown up in Laos and Vietnam—all over the world of mismanagement, conflict of interest, stupidity, poor planning, waste, and entrenched bureaucracy.

American taxpayers who support the foreign aid program should send for the committee report "U.S. Aid Operations in Peru" from PORTER HARDY, JR., of Virginia who headed the investigation. Address, House Office Building, Washington. People who oppose the foreign aid program should write their Congressmen, same address, and tell them to read the report before they vote for more foreign aid.

The Hanford Reactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the most heated debates over peacetime development of atomic energy has been taking place in the Congress. It concerns the proposal to use now-wasted steam from the production of plutonium at the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford, Wash., plant for the production of some 800,000 kilotons of electricity. On two occasions the House has voted to oppose this provision in the AEC authorization bill. Many of us on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are convinced that the private power interests in alliance with the coal industry have been responsible in large measure for this defeat. This antagonism for what is widely accepted as a very useful and important project has virtually convinced the Joint Committee that the time for a major investigation of the nuclear power program has arrived. I think the opponents of the Hanford project have invited this investigation by their activities in recent weeks. The Joint Committee does not intend to stand by and watch the nuclear power program, which is of vital interest to the entire Nation, be strangled.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from today's Washington Post indicating the dangers to the nuclear power effort, and an editorial from the same paper on the subject of the Hanford reactor be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAGGING REACTOR PROGRAM THREATENS TO BLOCK UNITED STATES FROM A-POWER GOAL

(By Howard Simons)

The United States is in danger of missing its declared objective to produce nuclear power competitive with conventional power in areas of high fuel costs.

This goal was set by the Atomic Energy Commission as a 10-year objective in 1958.

Unless a decision is made sometime in the next 10 months to bolster the Nation's sagging nuclear power reactor program, the 1968 target date could be missed. If this happens, it would also mean that the United States misses an opportunity to be the only nation to meet its stated goal for atomic power development.

The Soviet Union, France, and the United Kingdom have all reduced their previous predictions for nuclear power production.

It is generally conceded that action must be taken by fiscal year 1963 to insure meeting the target date. Otherwise, there might not be enough time thereafter to build large power reactors and then operate them for the period of time necessary to prove them out.

The challenge is largely political and economic rather than technical. In fact, in many instances, technology has outpaced construction of power reactors.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, currently chairman of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has repeatedly blamed the AEC's decision in 1954 and 1955 to enter into a "partnership" with private industry as the primary cause for the lack of achievement of economic atomic power. HOLIFIELD has claimed that private industry has failed to produce.

Industry spokesmen, defending industry's position, say that two large nuclear power plants of the type desired are now under consideration.

One of these is the recently announced Pacific Gas & Electric Co. boiling-water reactor to be built at Bodega Bay north of San Francisco. The other—hard put to find a site—is a pressurized reactor plant suggested by Southern California Edison. Each would have a generating capacity of more than 300 megawatts and be competitive with conventional power.

Moreover, industry spokesmen point to a recent General Electric Co. offer to sell a series of atomic powerplants rated up to 500 megawatts to the utility industry. These plants, GE reports, can be expected to produce electricity at a cost equal to electricity from conventional plants in high-fuel-cost areas. This offer, industry spokesmen say, insures the 1968 target date.

Two counterarguments are heard. One is that both of the proposed nuclear powerplants have been in the wind for some time and are not being built. The other is that an offer to sell does not guarantee a utility company to offer to buy.

In recent testimony before the Joint Committee, AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg conceded that during the past 2 years "our experience in the cooperative prototype power demonstration program has been disappointing, although much has been learned about reactor technology."

Seaborg went on to say that the AEC had selected four reactor prototypes it felt should be constructed as a necessary part of the program to achieve competitive nuclear power. Only one of the projects has reached fruition.

If the 1968 target date is to be reached, AEC officials suggest, it will require the construction of several large nuclear power stations over the next 3 to 4 years. The plants needed are pressurized or boiling-water reactors in the 300- to 400-megawatt range.

Additionally, prototypes of other reactors for research and development are needed. These include an organic, a 50-megawatt boiling-water, and a 20-megawatt pressurized-water reactor.

Seaborg also testified that it may be necessary to take new measures to assume that the 1968 target date is met. One approach, he said, might take the form of additional incentives.

The AEC is now studying such incentives as capital grant, operating subsidy, fast tax writeoff and financing of long transmission lines. One incentive—modifying prices of nuclear materials—has already been implemented by the AEC.

If this approach fails, Seaborg said further, a different approach may be necessary. This he defined as Government construction and initial operation of the prototype plants. At the end of a fixed period, the Government would be committed to sell the plant and a utility to buy it.

What happens this year in the decision to meet the 1968 target date will greatly affect the atomic equipment manufacturers.

It is feared in some quarters that unless large nuclear powerplants are constructed soon, the equipment manufacturers may disappear as a viable industry.

THE HANFORD SETBACK

For the moment, it appears that the opponents of public power have persuaded the House of Representatives that the United States should not build what would be the world's biggest nuclear powerplant. But the setback which the House gave the proposal for a dual-purpose nuclear plant in Hanford, Wash., is by no means final. There is a chance that the question may come up for a third vote if the House conferees hold they are not bound by instructions aimed at assuring that only plutonium bombs will be produced at Hanford.

Even if the dual-purpose proposal fails this year, the arguments for it are so persuasive that we are confident there will be a reconsideration. In an economy-minded Congress, there is special force to the argument that it is plain wastefulness to let the heat produced by the new plant escape without paying its way.

The fact that a score of Congressmen voted against a dual-purpose plant because progress on atomic power might imperil the coal industry suggests the myopia that now prevails. If the proponents of a nuclear powerplant present their case effectively, the chances are good that Hanford will ultimately produce heat—and light.

Lindsay Asks Rusk, Is Bobby Meddling Again?—No Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the Cuban tractor fiasco, I called attention to Bobby Kennedy's pathetic attempt to direct from behind the scenes, Mr. Hooker's futile blackmail negotiations with Castro. I need not emphasize the fact that the aforementioned activity ended with the administration in complete disgrace.

Now I find that my good friend and colleague, JOHN LINDSAY, has written to Secretary Rusk in order to obtain his thoughts regarding Bobby's behind-the-scenes maneuvering on the Berlin question. Mr. Rusk's silence has expressed more than any number of words.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Doris Fleeson from the Washington Star dated August 9, 1961, discussing the Lindsay letter, to be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

LINDSAY AWAITS RUSK'S REPLY—DELAY IS CITED IN ANSWERING CRITICISM OF ROBERT KENNEDY-MENSHIKOV MEETING

(By Doris Fleeson)

When a Member of Congress does not receive a reply to a letter he has written a member of the President's Cabinet it is news, for Congress controls the purse strings.

It is especially noteworthy when this occurs in the Kennedy administration, which is justly renowned for its personal courtesy to Senators and Representatives. The noteworthiness increases when the letter is written by a liberal internationalist who is also a Republican.

Few Democrats receive from their President and his aids the tender loving care accorded such Republicans, who are all too few for Kennedy purposes in this session of Congress. They are particularly treasured in the House where the Kennedy Waterloos most frequently take place.

Still it is possible that Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York City's silk stocking district, was not too surprised when Secretary of State Rusk failed to answer his letter of July 27 last though a reply was requested before the Secretary left the country.

The letter follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First I should like to congratulate you for the splendid off-the-record presentation that you gave to the Senate-House foreign policy group at luncheon last week. As I wrote you when you first took office, I was delighted with your appointment and I have no cause for regret over my vote of confidence. I increasingly like your brand of 'quiet diplomacy.'

"Therefore, I was all the more disturbed when I read yesterday, in a column by Joseph Alsop, of a meeting, apparently supported by the President, between the Attorney General, unaccompanied by anyone else, and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Menshikov. According to the Alsop report, Berlin and related matters of the greatest sensitivity, possibly affecting the safety of the entire world, were discussed, the Attorney General reportedly authorized to speak for the President.

"If the report is correct, I am deeply disturbed about this turn of events.

"First, it bypasses your office and your Department, and in so doing runs great risks.

"Second, it appears to be part of a growing pattern—namely, the conduct of foreign relations in a casual or loose-reined ad hoc manner, too often involving personalities untrained in foreign policy and the art of diplomacy.

"Third, it makes it difficult for those of us who have a responsibility to our constituents and to the country to make sound evaluations which should lead to bipartisan support on foreign policy.

"I should be pleased if you would advise me whether the meeting occurred as reported. If so, I would like to know the circumstances surrounding it and your frank opinion as to whether this is a proper way in which to conduct foreign policy in general or to negotiate on the explosive question of Berlin.

"Respectfully yours,

"JOHN V. LINDSAY,
"*Member of Congress.*"

The Attorney General is, of course, the President's brother, Robert.

Opposition to Tax on Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention to a very perceptive letter written by Mr. Clifford B. Reeves, of Pelham, N.Y., to the editor of the New Rochelle Standard Star. Mr. Reeves' letter was printed in the Standard Star on Friday, July 21.

In his letter, Mr. Reeves urges that pending legislation be enacted to reverse the recent ruling of the Treasury Department against the tax deduction previously permitted to organizations for the costs of expressing their views on public issues and pending legislative questions. Mr. Reeves stresses the importance of encouraging all Americans to actively participate in public affairs. His letter is one of many which I have received urging support for legislation introduced in the House to reverse the 1959 Treasury ruling to which I have just referred.

I commend Mr. Reeves for his active interest in this important issue and ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX ON CRITICISM ROBS BUSINESS OF PROTECTION

To the STANDARD-STAR:

Copy of a letter sent to the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

"DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Business corporations, and the men who run them, are under constant pressure from the public, the press, their local communities, and public officials, to speak out on national problems, and to throw the weight of their influence into pending legislative questions.

"Business corporations are a highly important factor in our society today; and it seems quite right that they should engage in such activities, to protect the interests of their customers, employees and shareholders, as well as the general public interest. In fact, I feel they have a positive duty to do so.

"However, in 1959 the Treasury Department issued a regulation that prevents corporations from deducting, as a business expense, any amounts spent to influence legislation, or inform the public about legislation. It seems to me this comes dangerously close to a misuse of the taxing power, to effect censorship and to discourage free discussion of legislative matters. In fact, it is a 'tax on criticism.'

"Nothing could be better, calculated to discourage participation in public affairs by the business community. In addition, it is an

unfair blow to the press of the country, since it will deprive them of revenues from advertising used by corporations to present their views on public questions. Why should the view of business corporations be taxed, while the view of other groups are not taxed?

"There are various bills now before Congress, which would cure this situation, and I hope that you will support them. One is H.R. 3974, sponsored by Congressman DOOLEY, of New York. Others include H.R. 45 introduced by Congressman TEAGUE, of TEXAS, and H.R. 640 introduced by Congressman BOGGS, of Louisiana.

"I urge you to look into this whole question and do what you can to prevent this abridgement by the Treasury of the right of free speech through the device of a tax regulation.

"Sincerely,

"CLIFFORD B. REEVES.

"PELHAM."

Remarks of Robert Johnston, State of Illinois, Director of Labor, at Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill., May 6, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a letter I received this morning from my good friend, Frank McCallister, director of the Labor Education Division at Chicago's Roosevelt University, in which he calls my attention to the remarks of Robert Johnston, director of labor of the State of Illinois, made May 6, 1961, at Roosevelt University's Conference on Labor Legislation. Frank McCallister's reputation as an outstanding authority on labor education extends throughout the entire United States. I am sure my colleagues will agree with his evaluation of this speech as outstanding and deserving of wide circulation.

I commend this excellent provocative speech to my colleagues for reading and study, which, I am certain, they will find most worthwhile; and ask that it be included in the RECORD following Mr. McCallister's letter:

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY,
Chicago, Ill., August 7, 1961.

HON. ED. FINNEGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Would you please have this outstanding speech entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Several high officials in the labor department think it is one of the best and most important speeches ever given by a director of labor. It deserves wide circulation and inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will insure that.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK MCCALLISTER,
Director, Labor Education Division.

REMARKS OF ROBERT JOHNSTON, ILLINOIS DIRECTOR OF LABOR, AT CONFERENCE ON LABOR LEGISLATION, MAY 6, 1961, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILL.

Chairman McCallister, my good friends, I am glad to be here with you today. I was not advised whether my topic, "The Problems of Federal-State Policy in Labor Relations," was supposed to represent the salad for this luncheon meeting, or the red meat and potatoes, or just a watery fingerbowl at the end. Whoever picked the subject, however, served me with a large slice of pretty peppery controversy.

The legislative handling of labor relations policy sometimes reminds me of the story of a wise old father who was giving his young son some advice before the boy established his law practice in another city.

"Join all clubs you can," the old man told him. "Get on all of the committees to raise funds and to carry out projects for public improvements. Get your name up as a do-gooder. That'll mark you as a man of ideas and vigor and great public spirit.

"And then, if you don't get your own way when it comes to doing the job, you can always tangle it up and block the action by arguing that it's the State's responsibility, or the Federal Government's, or better still, both of them. That'll stop everything."

I should like to preface my discussion with several observations which I take to be so plain as to be axiomatic.

The Federal Government has, not to my knowledge, ever moved into a legislative area solely for the sake of preempting authority. Where the States have done the job and done it right, their authority has not been disturbed. The job has been theirs. The Federal Government does not move into legislating on some subject until there is overwhelming pressures for such legislation; it doesn't send scouts out to find jobs and authority that it can grab off or pirate. It moves in response to public pressure, when the need is clear and present, and when Congress can be convinced against a great amount of normal reluctance and indecision to take on the job.

Second, there are 1,200 and more special lobbies and associations registered in Washington, most all of them devoted to getting something out of the Government for private interests, and to preventing action in the public interest.

Third, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce devote 99 percent of their time and energies to killing off public measures. They have dropped the threadbare argument of State's rights and now argue States' responsibilities. Out in the State, the Illinois Manufacturers Association and the Associations of Commerce and Industry blitz the legislature every 2 years with the argument that it (whatever it may be) is not the State's responsibilities but the Federal Government's. It's a "now you see it, now you don't" apparently foolproof process for killing legislation. It's sort of like turning out the lights in the ballpark just as the pitcher fogs a fast one to the plate: somebody's going to get beaned, and it's the batter trying to make a hit for the general welfare, or the umpire who represents the national administration.

Fourth, no one has ever been able to show me how the States, operating as 50 separate entities, can legislate effectively on broad national problems involving tens of millions of citizens in many States, working for corporations and subcorporation owned by superholding companies that stretch across scores of State lines. You cannot any more solve interstate, national problems affecting giant corporations and gigantic numbers of persons, than you can row a battleship with a teaspoon. The NAM-U.S. Chamber of Commerce-Goldwater-Dirksen to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. A. A. Berle, one of our greatest authorities on the American corporate structure, has pointed out in his excellent monograph "Economic Power and the Free Society," that many corporations are bigger, more powerful, and have bigger payrolls and budgets than whole groupings of States. He says:

"Today approximately 50 percent of American manufacturing—that is everything other than financial and transportation—is held by about 150 corporations, reckoned, at least, by asset values. If a rather large group is taken, the statistics would probably show that about two-thirds of the economically productive assets of the United States, excluding agriculture, are owned by a group of not more than 500 corporations. Many of these corporations have budgets, and some of them have payrolls, which, with their customers, affect a greater number of people than most of the 90-odd sovereign countries of the world. Some of these corporations are units which can be thought of only in somewhat the way we have heretofore thought of nations."

How far do you think the powerful State of Illinois could get in legislating a policy that would affect and guide the labor policies of the American Telephone & Telegraph, or the minimum wage policies of U.S. Steel Corp.? Do you think the GE price-riggers would ever have been punished under the State laws?

I think we have to face the hard facts that—regardless of State pride or the nostalgic emotions of certain political and economic parties—several things have occurred which make State action ineffective, somewhat ludicruous at times, and impractical. This brings me to the fifth axiom.

Corporations have grown across State lines; so has employment and employee representation. The Constitution is specific in delegating to the Congress the formulation of national policy affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and this commerce clause has historically been invoked by interstate companies to defeat unwanted State regulation. Certain areas falling withhn the police powers of the States, or affecting only intrastate commerce are reserved to the States.

My sixth axiom is that where everything is left to the States, you have an ungodly hodgepodge of patchwork regulations, coverages, standards, exemptions, qualifications, and directions. The uneven, sometimes conflicting and competitive social-economic pattern of the States by its nature makes for a total lack of uniformity in policy and administration of laws affecting labor relations.

If I wanted to set the alltime record for filibuster, I would simply read off in detail the variations in State laws and regulations. Let me give a few examples. Illinois has no State minimum wage law; of the 17 States which have a statutory minimum wage, the rate ranges from $1.50 down to 75 cents an hour, and the coverage is a patchwork; of the 12 States which provide for administrative wage orders, the wages are $1 in 7 States, and below that in 5. We recently succeeded in improving the Illinois unemployment compensation system; until then, we were far below 35 other States, and there is still much improvement to be desired.

Let me give you an example of the results of this patchwork, hodgepodge system, as it affects the Federal-State relationships.

Under the new minimum wage law, there will still be 900,000 Illinois workers not protected in nonagricultural industry; 870,000 not protected in nonmanufacturing industry; 370,000 unprotected in retail trade; 384,000 still unprotected in the service trades. The fallacious argument that the States can and will do the job has produced exemptions that leave gaps in the minimum wage coverage that you could run an army of lobbyists through.

Let us take the case of a minimum wage for children in agricultural employment. Nine States, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia have legislation covering employment outside of school hours, and the allowable age ranges from 14 down to 10 years. Fifteen States allow employment during school hours, and the age allowable ranges from 16 down to 12 years. How you can educate children by putting them to work in

the fields at 10 years of age is something I haven't been able to fathom.

Of the 50 States, 13 have State labor relations acts. Only three cover agricultural workers. When you consider the fact that America is tending to the factory-sized, factory-operation farm—what I call the Sears-Roebuck farmers—with workmen and their families hired seasonally, fired indiscriminately, paid low wages, refused the right of collective bargaining, exempted from minimum wages, it makes you think of the English coal miner in the time of Adam Smith. This is not economic justice or sound public policy; it is saber-toothed economics and nothing else.

What do you think makes for big welfare rolls, high relief costs, public hospital charges if it isn't such policies as this and discrimination in hiring?

Only Hawaii provides unemployment insurance for agricultural workers, but no group is more preyed upon by the seasonal hiring and firing policies.

Only 14 States have laws prohibiting discrimination in the employment of older workers; only 19 States have fair employment practices laws, and if you left it to the Illinois manufacturers and the Illinois Association of Commerce there'd never be such a law in this State. I feel quite confident this mile-wide gap in our public policy will be closed this year—after 14 years of the hardest and bitterest battles.

Let us look at the child labor-school attendance laws. All States have such laws—except Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia which repealed their school attendance statutes. (Parenthetically I would like to say that I believe those States should reenact their laws, extend the inschool age to 45, and cover all Governors, members of the State legislature, police forces, and other public officials.)

Now, please note that over half the States permit the release of children from school—attendance requirements, and their employment in industries and offices, after the eighth grade in school—which means at 14 years.

We raise a great clatter and commotion about the necessity; for more and better education, and more scientists, mathematicians, physicists and what have you, and then we provide that children can quit school after they've barely learned the rudiments of reading, writing, a little arithmetic, and some bit of history.

Does this make sense?

When the Taft-Hartley law provides for enactment of State so-called right-to-work laws, a whole group of southern reactionary States, with the aid and abettance of their labor departments, rush in to enact such statutes. Why? To undercut the organization of Negro and other exploited workers, and to secure for their factories and businesses an unfair advantage by undercutting northern business.

I say quite frankly that if all matters were left to the States, we would still have slave labor in parts of this country, and indentured servants in many other parts—and the State departments of labor would be supporting their State systems. If you doubt this, look at some of the recent peonage cases in certain States.

Here in Illinois, we have had a 25 year deterioration of the southern 23 counties, until it has become a thoroughly depressed area. But did the State department of labor—or the Governors—or the legislature do anything constructive about it, other than passing some very niggardly bills? They did not. It took Senator PAUL DOUGLAS 4 years to pass the bill, and then he had to wait for a Democrat, President Kennedy, before he could get around a veto and get the bill signed.

What I have pointed out in regard to the patchwork hodgepodge of State law in regard to child labor, school attendance, employment of the aged, child employment in agriculture, unemployment coverage of agricultural workers, and State minimum wages is not all of the picture: It goes that way clear across the board—in regard to workmen's compensation, employment of women, factory inspection, safety rules, garnishment of workers' wages (Illinois has presently the most unjust garnishment laws imaginable, and one of the worst of all of the States) overtime pay, equal pay for equal work, and many other matters of policy.

The laws are riddled with conflicting provisions, inequities, substandard requirements. These produce a deadly effect in depressing our national standard of labor welfare. Business, as a simple matter of equalizing competitive advantages, of providing uniformity of operations, and of saving untold amounts of taxes that are now wasted on unnecessary administration and relief charges produced by this patchwork systems, out to demand one uniform national policy. The U.S. Department of Labor seeks endlessly to get the States to adopt a uniform pattern of law, and uniform standards. As a liberal estimate, I would say the States have given 25 percent compliance. Right now the U.S. Department of Labor is seeking legislation to protect some 500,000 migratory laborers—one of the most cruelly exploited groups in this country—and you can have one guess who opposes them: the big farmers of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and all of their associated business lobbies in Washington.

We hear a lot about the Federal Government taking over State responsibilities. If the States discharged their responsibilities as they should, the Federal Government wouldn't touch them. More often, the States are standing, hat-in-hand, before the White House asking the President to do something that—out in the boondocks—they are saying the Government has no business meddling with.

States rights are not being taken away; they are abandoned by the States, either directly or through such inaction as passes the point of public sufferance. Sometime back, President Eisenhower appointed a distinguished Commission headed by the late Meyer Kestnbaum of this city, to make a Federal study and to "designate functions which the States are ready and willing to assume and finance that are now performed or financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government." That Commission labored mightily for 2 years. Do you know what it found? I'll tell you—just two programs, vocational education and Federal grants for municipal waste treatment plants, that the States were ready, willing, and able to take over.

The truth of the matter is that States are not so constituted as to legislate intelligently and effectively in the area of labor relations; and most of them lag back hoping that the Federal Government will take over a job they say ought to be left to themselves but which they won't do. America's labor pattern and industrial complexes have grown in conformity to the interstate commerce clause, not according to State lines. That's what makes us a Nation instead of a confederation or association, and the Constitution provides for it. Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution fixes the power of Congress, and the first power it confers is to "lay and collect taxes" on a national basis; a few lines further it grants the power over commerce between States.

I know of no way to repeal the march of corporate and union progress. The Sherman Antitrust Act may put an occasional few executives in jail and subject them to fines, as in the case of General Electric, Westinghouse and others, but it hasn't stopped corporate growth. The Taft-Hartley law and the Landrum-Griffin Act may hobble unions, but they will not halt the march of union progress.

It seems to me that the proper area of interest, and the proper division of interest is for the Federal Legislature to establish national requirements and standards, with national enforcement in all areas where national action is reasonable; that it is the State function to make its own intrastate legislation and administration of the law conform to national standards so that one State will not be chiseling on another; that the two may cooperate in matching funds for various programs (as is provided in Senator DOUGLAS' area redevelopment bill) with the States administering the program in accordance with minimum Federal standards.

If you leave it to the States to go willy-nilly their own separate ways, you will never achieve uniform standards which are economically healthy for our entire national society.

Why are the States so curiously ineffective in legislating uniform and acceptable standards of labor relations? I think many factors undermine effective action at the State level. In this, I am speaking primarily of establishing the standards, rather than administering them, because once the standard is satisfactorily fixed, it is to be presumed that the laws will be enforced.

Let me explain what I mean by factors operating against effective State action.

1. State legislatures are ponderously overweighted on the side of rural representation which demonstrates a peculiar narrowness in regard to urban labor-industrial relations in spite of the fact that ours has become an urban population. The State legislatures are not representative of the State population patterns, consequently they do not know, have little reason to know, what is really needed, and to understand the complex facts of labor-industry relations.

2. State legislatures are a particular target of organized lobbies; they are smaller than Congress, close to home, and much more prone to collapse under the well-organized, well-financed, well-directed pressures of lobbies. This is shown in any number of instances. It takes a pretty tough legislator to stand up against home-district pressures, pleadings, and threats. If the same man were in Congress, he would be further from the fountainhead of pressures, less accessible to threats, and more imbued with a national welfare viewpoint. In the State legislature, the lobbies can get at the lawmakers with much greater effect.

3. State Governors often are inclined to coast along, not proposing or fighting for controversial programs, in the expectation that if they do not infuriate too many groups, they will be a ripe candidate for the U.S. Senate at the end of 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. To the great credit of Governor Kerner, it should be said right here that he has proposed liberal programs without fear or favor. Many other Governors are not so forthright, and we ought to know; we just got rid of one of them.

4. States are proverbially broke, and so they never appropriate sufficient enforcement funds for the laws now on the books. The result is that enforcement and inspection services crawl along at a snail's pace. Inspectors are ill-paid, ill-educated, and are too often ripe for favors in return for lax inspection. We are drastically revising upward our factory inspection system, conducting classes for the inspectors, and doing everything possible to tighten up this serv-

ice. Too often, an inspector is met with a glib, guided tour of the plant, a pleasant chat with the manager, and ushered out with a pat on the back and an empty head and notebook. This is what you call local friendship, otherwise known as "pulling the wool over the eyes."

5. Because of the legislative patterns in the States, lobbies have been highly successful in jamming through restrictive bills that undermine effective regulation of labor-industry relations. If you don't believe it, look at the right-to-work laws, which actually mean right to bust the unions and exploit the employees.

6. The State departments of labor in a far too overwhelming number of cases are perfectly willing to stumble along without taking any direct stand for progressive legislation, and firm enforcement thereof. They use the excuse that they can't get bills through the legislature, they can't get funds for enforcement of the statutes now on the books, they can't get the personnel they need, the problem is too complex for State action, there's too much opposition, or it's after all a Federal responsibility. The leadership of State departments has, in my mind, proved lame, ineffective, and for the most part nonexistent. The States' directors of labor should be a commanding voice, and an effective force in demanding and getting uniform labor standards among the States, progress in national standards, effective enforcement, and genuine collaboration between the Federal Government and the States in coadministration of joint programs on a systematic and rational pattern. However, if the directors have taken the lead, I have yet to hear of it.

7. Finally, I want to mention the effect of Parkinson's law on the State departments. That, you know, is the law that you make the responsibilities you have as complicated as possible, claim more responsibilities whether or not you can discharge them, in order to get more excuses to build up your nest of employees; and the more employees you have, the bigger you look, the bigger salary you can claim, the bigger title you will have, the less will be done, and the tougher the job will look. This infects National agencies as well as State, but fortunately Congress is much more active than the State legislatures in scotching this system, and requiring a performance accounting once a year.

Too many departments of labor are giving too much energy to building up patronage fiefdoms of their own, and too little attention to doing the real job that needs to be done in elevating the labor standards in this country. I'd rather have 10 dedicated, hard-hitting, incorruptible factory inspectors than 500 men that couldn't tell a punch press from a valve grinder.

The inevitable result of such factors as I have mentioned is that public pressure will demand national action to correct abuses, and national action will be taken.

The working people of this country have two major protections againts exploitation and discrimination. One is the union organization and union contract; the other is effective, sound, well-enforced, strongly administered law. I am proud that Henry Ford II said last April 20 of my own union, the United Automobile Workers, that "whatever differences our company may have had with the UAW we have developed a genuine respect for the determination of its leadership to keep it free of corruption."

Much can be accomplished in bringing some system and order into the Federal-State sharing of labor relations policy, if both the State governments and the Federal Government will work consistently, faithfully, and through the proper machinery to achieve this.

First, the State departments of labor must come alive, and take an active interest in sound nationwide policy. They ought to have an executive committee that will work with the U.S. Department of Labor in presenting the States' views, and in fixing areas of specific interest. This committee should seek to devise some expansion of the matched-fund administration sharing in labor policy, in areas where this can effectively be carried out.

State departments should accept Federal leadership in the establishment of standards. Only thus can chiseling be ended, and a fair and equitable national pattern be established. This, I would say, is true across the board on all programs, with due provision for relief in proven hardship cases. The States ought, in their wisdom, to be able to go higher than the national standards in their own laws, but not below them.

The State's executive committee should make an annual report, compiled from the reports of the individual directors, to the U.S. Department of Labor, on the administration of State laws, new laws enacted, subjects covered, the effectiveness of cooperative programs, cases of malfunctioning administration, and failures to meet the minimum national standards. Such a report would be of vast benefit to the U.S. Department of Labor, and quite conceivably could save large sums which it now must spend in compiling information.

Finally, I would hope that such a committee would work to end this "let George do it" business—the "you first Gaston, no, you first Alphonse" act—that bedevils effective legislation on labor relations. I mean, it ought to put an end to this business of arguing against Federal action in Washington on the grounds the State will do it; and defeating State legislation in the various capitals with the reverse-twist argument that it's a Federal job.

Administrative responsibilities—if the States face up to their part of the job—can be more and more shared with the States, as labor relations law evolves. Making laws, administering laws, is a matter of political action which ought to be guided by economic realities and social and economic justice. This being the case, I think that it is high time we who are involved in labor relations policy take as our text a statement made by a Chicago industrial leader, Arnold H. Maremont. He said:

"Responsible union leaders do not argue that labor ought to engage in politics for the purpose of clobbering business. Conversely, anyone who argues that business must get into politics in order to take a fall out of labor is doing a distinct disservice to himself, his corporation, and his country."

If we go at the job with this spirit, then results may confidently be expected. And they will be constructive results, not a bedlam of law and administration.

Thank you.

Judge Walter Scott Pope, of Texas: Good Fighter for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an article that appeared in the Abilene Reporter News of July 23, 1961, on Judge Walter Scott Pope, a fine and honorable citizen.

Judge Pope, of Abilene, Tex., served with honor and distinction on the Texas Insurance Commission for 7 years during a very creditable period in the life of that commission. A longtime friend of mine and an effective fighter for better government in Texas, Judge Pope is a man whose strength of character is deserving of commendation in his community, State, and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter News of July 23, 1961, entitled: "Bible, Determination Shape Life of Attorney-Businessman."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIBLE, DETERMINATION, SHAPE LIFE OF ATTORNEY-BUSINESSMAN

(By Joe B. Pouns, Reporter-News staff writer)

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."—Matthew 6:33.

This verse from the Holy Bible and the determination to emulate an uncle, the late William H. Pope, were the two main factors in determining the future of Judge Walter Scott Pope, Abilene octogenarian who has distinguished himself in the fields of law and insurance.

His first inspiration came when he was a young farm boy living on a Coleman County farm, south of Santa Anna but nearer the present community of Rockwood. One day his father read a letter from William H. Pope, uncle of the hard-working youngster, and in it was the news that the writer of the letter was soon to take a degree from the University of Georgia. Right then, Walter Pope decided that he, too, would obtain an education.

Another event that had a great deal to do with shaping the man who was to become the "father" of the automobile insurance law, who pioneered in workmen's compensation laws, and who served for 7 years on the State insurance board. That was the day he was selected as a delegate to a Young Men's Christian Association convention from the University of Texas, to be held in Nashville, Tenn. Although his determination was strong to complete his education at the university, young Walter Pope was more determined to attend the convention and made up his mind to do so even if that action meant sacrifice of his education.

Fortunately, he was able to attend the convention, where he received great inspiration, and was also able to complete his college education.

The spry, active octogenarian was born at Walnut Springs, Tex., on December 15, 1880, the only child of the late Mr. and Mrs. John T. Pope. The family moved to a farm near Rockwood when the boy was only 7 years old.

There were few schools in the country at that time and the nearest church was 16 miles away, so young Walter Pope had little opportunity to gain an education during his young childhood and even as a young man. Most of his days were spent on the combination farm and ranch. On Saturday afternoons he would get a break, however, for that was the day he could get away from the usual chores to "salt the cattle."

In his late teens he received that inspiration to obtain a college education. He had attended grade school not more than 17 months in his entire life at that time because of the scarcity of teaching facilities, and his vocabulary was limited to just a few hundred words.

The young man did some studying at the nearest school for a short time and, when he still lacked 3 months of being 20 years of age, took entrance examinations at the University of Texas, in 1901.

His success in passing the examination likely was the most important event in his life. It led to a stay of 6 years at the university where he obtained an academic degree, in 1906, and a law degree, in 1907. In later years the education he obtained at the school and the contacts he made there brought honors and wealth to him.

Although the young farm lad has entered the university with a minimum of scholastic training, he was able to pass his courses and to take part in extracurricular activities. He played a prominent part in Young Men's Christian Association work and he and others on the campus were instrumental in building the first YMCA building on the campus.

He assisted in the establishment of the Delta Tau Delta (scholastic) fraternity at the university, in 1904. He was a charter member of the fraternity and served as its first president.

Shortly after getting out of law school, Pope opened a law office at Anson, in 1907, and he was destined to live there almost 22 years, until that February day in 1928 when he received a call from then Gov. Dan Moody that he wanted Judge Pope to serve on the Texas Insurance Board at Austin.

The appointment was a complete surprise to Judge Pope and he recalls that he told the Governor that he knew little about insurance. Moody replied: "You know the law and the rates, and remember when you increase insurance rates they effect a great many people." That was Moody's complete message.

Judge Pope says his years at Anson didn't bring in a great deal of revenue, but he retains many pleasant memories of events there. For one thing, he met, wooed and won for his bride Miss Ena Steele, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Isaac M. Steele of Anson. He and the young schoolteacher were married at the home of her parents on November 17, 1909. She had received her education at Denton Normal; had taught at Hamlin, Oak Grove, and Anson.

Two sons were born to this union. They are Walter Pope, Jr., born June 2, 1911, and John B. Pope, born August 11, 1913. Both are now married, live in Abilene and practice law here. Walter, Jr., is married to the former Ida Vickery of Lima, Peru, and John is married to the former Dorothy Ball of Houston. There are four grandchildren.

It was at Anson, too, that his parents spent the latter years of their life. They moved there at the same time their son opened his law office there.

Judge Pope recalls vividly one of the biggest civil suits in which he ever participated. That was while he was living at Anson, too. He and his partner, the late Judge John B. Thomas, father of District Judge Owen Thomas of Abilene, were employed by the original owners to foreclose a $500,000 lien on the O-Bar-O Ranch in Kent County. Two years and three trials later the case was settled in Federal court here in favor of the plaintiffs, who were given possession and title to the property.

Another attachment Judge Pope has with Anson is the fact that he is the oldest stockholder and director of the First National Bank of that city. He has been an inactive vice president of the bank since 1952. Further, along with other property holdings, including seven farms, Judge Pope still owns business property in Jones County and this area.

At the time Pope went to Austin the insurance commission was new, with a life insurance commissioner, a fire insurance commissioner and a casualty commissioner. The Anson man became this State's first casualty insurance commissioner.

It was while he served on that insurance board that he made a speech in Dallas which the United States Daily carried in full and which laid the foundation for the workmen's compensation and automobile insurance laws.

That speech came after Pope had spent many days studying all phases of the insurance business. He was able to get the insurance companies to print uniform standard policy forms and endorsements at their own expense. Manuals also were printed for use of insurance concerns.

Even now, officials of the insurance commission at Austin say that some of the ideas promulgated by Judge Pope make up the foundation of the casualty insurance business.

He served on that commission for 7 years. At the oconclusion of his term he and members of his family remained in Austin for about a year and a half before moving to Abilene.

Judge Pope found time to do other things than serve the insurance board while a resident of Austin. For one thing, he was working every spare minute he could in behalf of the university, in gratitude for the education he had received there, for his fraternity, and for his fellow man.

While in Austin he helped to organize the University Baptist Church and taught a Sunday school class there for years. Also he assisted in the formation of several exstudents clubs in several of the major cities of Texas at about the same time.

In Abilene he also has had a busy life. Practice of law, Baptist Church affairs, and politics along with farming interests and business affairs have kept him busy. Even now he maintains a daily schedule at his office in the Mims Building.

Actually, he hasn't sought much law business since the chief justice of the Texas Supreme Court presented him with a certificate in 1957 showing that he had practiced law 50 years. But he still maintains a keen interest in the law and just recently attended a meeting of the Texas State Bar Association. He is about the only citizen in Abilene who attends every session of Federal court held here.

He still maintains an interest in the Baptist Church too, having served as a deacon at the First Baptist Church here for 16 years—from 1936 to 1952. He joined the Baptist Church when he was 13 years old and has been active in it almost ever since. He served as deacon at Anson, Austin, and Abilene.

A lifelong Democrat, Walter Pope has never voted any other ticket. In 1913 he served as a presidential elector for the biggest congressional district in the world—one that stretched from Mineral Wells to El Paso—and cast his vote for Woodrow Wilson. He was elected a delegate to National Democratic Conventions in 1932, 1944, and 1952, and the voters in this area have elected him as a delegate to State Democratic conventions on several occasions.

He and Judge W. R. Ely of Abilene were guests of honor at a $50-a-plate dinner hosetd by Democratic leaders in this area in March 1959.

Included in his record of public service are two occasions when he served on the Federal rations board—during World War I and World War II.

Many have been the honors that have come to the attorney-churchman. On one occasion he was given distinguished service chapter citation by his fraternity at the university "for the service to the school, his fraternity, and to his fellowmen." Only two such awards are made annually and only 150 have been awarded by that organization in its 100-year history. His two sons have served as presidents of the same fraternity and both are also graduates of the University of Texas.

In 1940–41 he served as a director for the Texas State Bar Association for the 24th Senatorial District.

In 1945 he was elected president of the Texas Ex-Students Association. He served for two terms.

The attorney says the Lord has spared him because he has had a "partnership with God" down through the years. He and Mrs. Pope reside at 726 Davis.

Democracy for Working Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on June 22 of this year, I introduced in the Senate S. 2134, a measure to provide the secret ballot for union members, to determine whether or not they wish to strike. This bill is cosponsored by six of my colleagues, and it has been referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Since the introduction of this measure, considerable support has been demonstrated in behalf of this proposal. Among such support have been editors of leading newspapers throughout the country.

Typical of the editorial responses received on this bill are three editorials I have with me today, which I wish to bring to the atention of my colleagues.

In last Sunday's edition of the Chiacgo Sunday American, Editor Lloyd Wendt wrote:

> The bill would have immense value to union members in giving them some say on decisions that profoundly affect their lives, and to the whole country in helping to prevent costly, useless, and unwanted strikes.

This really is the heart of this proposal, to give the union members a voice in the decisions that vitally affect them. And the proposal goes beyond that, also, in the area of public protection, as the Chicago American points out in this comment:

> A law like this would certainly have averted the utterly pointless steel strike which lasted from July 15 to November 7, 1959, and accomplished nothing but to lose billions of dollars in wages, industry earnings, and tax revenues. The only visible purpose of the strike was to prove that David McDonald, Steel Union president, could squeeze out a wage raise, even though it did cost workers 4 months' pay.

One further point made in the Chicago American editorial should be brought out, and it is one which I hope will be given careful consideration by the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who are to consider this measure, because I expect the usual deluge of propaganda will soon be forthcoming from those who are afraid of this bill because it will be good for the working men and women of America.

The Chicago American said:

> Congress should pass this bill. The arguments against it are precisely the arguments against democratic procedure anywhere, and they're not very good ones. It

will be difficult for union leaders to convince workers that it would be bad for them, as union members, to enjoy the same rights they take for granted as citizens.

This is a point which I hope every Member of the Senate will keep in mind in considering this measure. The Chicago American has said it as well as anyone, concisely on the issue that is of concern, giving to the labor union member his democratic rights.

And why is the question of democratic rights at issue?

The Chicago Daily Tribune, in a recent editorial on the same subject, in speaking of the present procedures followed by many unions in obtaining authority to strike from their members, said:

The so-called strike authorization votes often held before contract negotiations are rarely secret, usually farcical, and serve more as a lever for union negotiators to use against management than as an accurate reflection of rank and file sentiment.

Mr. President, all the editorials I present today—from the Chicago American, the Chicago Daily Tribune, and the Brookings Register, in my home State—are thoughtful presentations dealing with the problems confronting dues-paying union members; and all agree that the action recommended in our bill is not only necessary, but should be taken immediately.

I only add this comment, Mr. President: that right now we are witnessing contract negotiations in the automobile industry. Other negotiations of the same nature will be taking place in other industries in the future.

It seems to me that inaction on the part of the Congress with respect to this measure, S. 2134, is not in the public interest, and does nothing to protect the rights of the honest working men and women who are so deeply involved in the area of collective bargaining. They should have their voice in these matters; and it is my hope that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will initiate early hearings on this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago's Sunday American, Aug. 6, 1961]

FOR DEMOCRACY IN UNIONS

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, has introduced a Senate bill that would give union members the right to vote secretly on whether they want to strike. The bill would have immense value to union members in giving them some say on decisions that profoundly affect their lives, and to the whole country in helping to prevent costly, useless, and unwanted strikes.

Under MUNDT's bill, contract negotiations between union and management would be carried on as they now are, in the 60 days before the old contract expires. If union representatives weren't satisfied with the results, they could call a referendum in which members would vote to accept or reject management's final offer.

A law like this would certainly have averted the utterly pointless steel strike which lasted from July 15 to November 7, 1959, and accomplished nothing but to lose billions of dollars in wages, industry earnings and tax revenues. The only visible purpose of the strike was to prove that David McDonald, steel union president, could squeeze out a wage raise, even though it did cost workers 4 months' pay.

MUNDT's proposal would also put a limit to the Teamsters autocracy of James R. Hoffa, who has made no secret of his intention to gain such total power over the transportation industry that he could paralyze the country almost at will.

The bill would not affect any union's inherent right to strike. It would merely set up democratic procedures for unions, and keep union leaders from arbitrarily punishing the public in pursuit of their own wishes. It would enable members to decide their own union's affairs free from intimidation, either by their leadership or through group pressure.

Congress should pass this bill. The arguments against it are precisely the arguments against democratic procedures anywhere, and they're not very good ones. It will be difficult for union leaders to convince workers that it would be bad for them, as union members, to enjoy the same rights they take for granted as citizens.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

VOTING BEFORE A STRIKE

One of the more sensible proposals for preventing wasteful strikes is the one offered jointly by Senators MUNDT and MCCLELLAN. The South Dakota Republican and the Arkansas Democrat have introduced a bill which forbids union officers to call a strike without approval by a majority of union members in a supervised secret ballot. Mr. MUNDT spoke of the bill in his broadcast on Sunday.

There is abundant justification for some such requirement, and few men are better aware of it than these two Senators who have spent years investigating the manner in which union affairs are conducted.

Senator MUNDT said in his broadcast that a secret strike ballot would very likely have prevented the missile base strikes and we have no doubt that he is right. There is no better witness to the effectiveness of a secret ballot than Mr. Joey Glimco, who would almost surely still be running the Chicago taxicab drivers' union if his opponents had had to identify themselves openly. Voting secretly, in a supervised election, they didn't have to worry about what Glimo or Hoffa might do to them afterward.

The so-called strike authorization votes often held before contract negotiations are rarely secret, usually farcical, and serve more as a lever for union negotiators to use against management than as an accurate reflection of rank and file sentiment.

Secret ballots are required by law only for the initial selection of a union as bargaining agent and at the close of the 80-day cooling-off period provided for by the Taft-Hartley Act before a strike is resumed. As matters stand, there is no sure way in many unions by which a majority of members can prevent a strike they don't want.

The Mundt-McClellan proposal calls for 60 days' notice before an election, which would give the union members a chance to study the issues, and for supervision of the election by a three-man committee, one member picked by the union, one by the employer or employers, and one by both.

Senator MUNDT is correct in pointing out that the bill would not limit the right of unions to strike. All it would limit is the power of union bosses to call strikes which their members don't want or don't understand. This power should have been limited long ago.

HE'S HUMPTY-DUMPTY

The excesses of Jimmy Hoffa and his Teamsters Union can lead to but one end—his downfall. This swaggering little boss, associate of outlaws, has in his hands today the seeming power to penalize the economic life of the Nation. He might do just that, although it is likely that his native shrewdness will prevent him from going that far.

He has had a string of unbroken triumphs. Lawyers by the score surround him, advise him. He has unlimited defense funds. Somewhere in the background lurks the shadow of jurors bought, or officials too weak to do their job. He has made a mockery of every law of the land.

There was an earlier thug who was the despair of the Nation—one Al Capone. He ruled Chicago, and gangster associates seemed to rule much of the Nation. But in the end, he was brought to trial and convicted.

Such—or worse—will be the fate of Hoffa. Someday, somehow, he'll go too far. Outraged citizens will rise up, and his empire will end.

Perhaps that end may come more peacefully than it now appears, for there is now in the U.S. Senate a bill introduced by KARL MUNDT and six of his associates to guarantee the democratic procedure of the secret ballot in all strike votes.

Under it, collective bargaining negotiations would be carried on as they now are, in the 60 days before a strike vote. Any changes in the existing contract desired by either party must be disclosed to the other. At the end of the 60 days, if union representatives are not satisfied with the company offer, they would call for a referendum of their members, and the voting would be by secret ballot.

Importantly, union members would have an option—to strike or to accept the employer's final offer. If the vote is to strike, the union leadership then has a lawful right to do so. If the vote were to be for acceptance of the employer's offer, he would be bound to sign a contract embodying his last pledges.

There is protection here for the public, from strikes which should not have been called in the first place; for the labor leader, from the charges of making a decision not in keeping with the wish of the majority of the workers; and for the company, from the unilateral action of power-mad, money-mad labor leader who seeks to justify his high pay and existence by ordering the strike. Lastly, it would protect greatly the worker from poor leadership.

Senator MUNDT is joined in the sponsorship of this bill by Senator FRANCIS CASE and others. Certainly, they are doing the country and all its citizens a great service. Let's hope this bill passes—and soon.

Flag Day Address by Daniel E. Lambert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniel E. Lambert, fifth district commander of the American Legion, Department of Maine, delivered an excellent address at the Flag Day program of the Daniel E. Geagan Post, American Legion, in Brewer, Maine.

The address is worthy of a place in the CONRESSIONAL RECORD, where it can

be widely read. Mr. Lambert's remarks follow:

My fellow Americans, we observe each June 14 as Flag Day to commemorate the anniversary of that first Continental Congress resolution in 1777 which established the flag of our Nation.

This is a time to reflect on our national banner and its glorious history. The U.S. flag is the third oldest national flag in the world—older than the Union Jack of Great Britain or the Tricolor of France.

The original resolution adopted by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, in Philadelphia, read as follows:

"Resolved, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white, that the Union be 13 stars, white on a blue field, representing a new constellation."

You will notice that although the resolution specified the colors for the Nation's flag, it said nothing definite about the flag's arrangement. This is the reason that a variety of American flags were in evidence during this Nation's early days. However, a resolution which became effective on July 4, 1818, limited the flag to 13 stripes and the addition of a white star to the field of blue for each new State joining the Union. Thus was the die cast for our glorious banner as we know it today.

The story of Betsy Ross and the first American flag has become as traditional in the minds of our Nation's youth as the legend of George Washington and the chopping down of his father's cherry tree. Unfortunately, neither story can be proved as having actually taken place.

According to legend handed down by word of mouth, it was in June 1776 that a committee composed of George Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross, called upon Betsy Ross, a young Philadelphia widow who supported herself and her family by her needlework. They described a flag they had in mind and asked Mrs. Ross if she could make one for them. She agreed. This first flag is said to have been made almost a full year before the Continental Congress resolution of 1777.

If the story cannot be proved to the satisfaction of the historians, neither can it be conclusively disproved. For this reason, it will probably continue to be a respected part of our American tradition.

The colors contained in our flag may thus be explained:

The red is for valor, zeal, and fervency.

The white is for hope, purity, cleanliness of life, and rectitude of conduct.

The blue, the color of heaven, is for reverence to God, loyalty, sincerity, justice and truth.

The star is a symbol of dominion and sovereignty, as well as lofty aspirations.

The constellation of the stars within the Union (one for each State) is emblematic of our Federal Constitution which reserves to the States their individual sovereignty, except as to rights delegated by them to the Federal Government.

For more than 9 score years the U.S. flag has been a banner of hope and freedom. Born amid the first flames of America's flight for freedom, the flag today is a symbol of a country which has grown from a meager group of Thirteen Colonies to a mighty Nation of fifty sovereign States. The fluttering folds of Old Glory have proved an inspiration to countless millions. Valiant men have followed this flag into battle with unwavering courage. The history of the stars and stripes is steeped with moments of greatness which not only established a great Nation but also a lofty ideal.

Consider the words of the brilliant Henry Ward Beecher who said:

"A thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag but the nation itself. And whatever its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belongs to the nation that sets it forth.

"The American flag has been a symbol of liberty, and men rejoiced in it. The stars upon it were beams of morning light. As at early dawn the stars shine forth even while it grows light, and then as the sun advances that light breaks into banks and streaming lines of color, the glowing red and intense white striving together, and ribbing the horizon with bars effulgent, so, on the American flag, stars and beams of many colored lights shine out together."

From the lofty pinnacle of American idealism, our flag is truly a beacon of enduring hope that floats over an assemblage of people from every racial stock of the earth. Its spirit is the spirit of America, and its history is the history of the American people. We are the weavers of the American flag and everything that it stands for.

Every member of the American Legion—every veteran—realizes just what love of God and country and respect for the flag mean. Legionnaires consider it their duty to see that the people in their community know how to respect and display their flag.

I would like to conclude with these words by President Woodrow Wilson:

"I always have the same thought when I look at the flag of the United States for I know something of the struggle of mankind for liberty. When I look at that flag it seems to me as if the white stripes were strips of parchment upon which are written the rights of man, and the red stripes the streams of blood by which those rights have been made good.

"Then in the little blue firmament in the corner have swung out the stars of the States of the American Union.

"So it is, as it were, a sort of floating charter that has come down to us from Runnymede, when men said: 'We will not have masters; we will be a people and we will seek our own liberty.'"

Voters for the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, within the past 48 hours I have issued a statement calling for the formation of groups known as Voters for the Constitution, whose objective would be to elect men to public office who are pledged to restore the Constitution through valid measures for its enforcement. Many interpretations have been placed on this statement, and so that Members of this House may have the benefit of the full statement, I include it, under unanimous consent, in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

VOTERS FOR THE CONSTITUTION

A recent memorandum published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1961, is truly shocking. Under the beguiling cover of reiterated assertions about the constitutional principle of civilian superiority over the military, it attempts to discredit the professional officers of our armed services for their strong stand in support of the Constitution and their opposition to internal communistic subversion in the United States. The same paper urges programs that could only result in further impairment of the sovereignty of our country by progressive weakening through various socialistic and international undertakings.

An insidious attack on the officer corps and a clandestine assault on the very foundations of our system of government, what could be better calculated to silence our officers sworn to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic? The case of General Walker is but one example in what appears to be a pattern of organized intimidation to prevent our officers from alerting their commands and the public to the menace that they are sworn to oppose?

The silencing effect of that memorandum on the freedom of our officers to discharge their duty to speak, suggests that the hour is late. It also emphasizes the necessity for our sovereign people to protect themselves against further impairment of their system of government through valid enforcement of the Constitution.

With this objective, I urge the citizens in all States, in line with those of Texas and Virginia, to organize groups known as Voters for the Constitution.

I urge also that these voter organizations undertake to retire from public office, both State and Federal, all those who have been unable or unwilling to initiate and enact measures to defend our people and the States from tyrannical usurpations and to replace them with those who can and will.

The resulting lineup would be between (1) those who wish to maintain our liberties and freedom under the Constitution as was carefully provided for by the founders, and (2) those who accept or welcome Federal usurpation which aims at overthrowing the Constitution and establishment of autocratic rule.

In the final issue, which would be constitutional liberty against centralist slavery, the people of the United States, acting in their highest sovereign capacities through their legislatures, can and must restore the Constitution through valid measures for its enforcement.

Expanding Private Enterprise Support of U.S. Policies Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, I proposed greater utilization of U.S. businesses operating abroad, to give support to U.S. foreign policy.

Generally, the response from business leaders was good—in some cases, inspiringly patriotic.

To provide greater coordination and direction for such efforts, I proposed a conference of leaders of businesses and industries engaged in operations overseas.

The proposal was sent to the White House. Regrettably, the response was almost completely apathetic.

To date no action has been taken.

However, the country, I believe, constructively benefits from a number of independent actions being taken to better coordinate with, and give greater support to our foreign policy by private enterprise.

The Business Council for International Understanding, for example, is conducting special programs throughout the country. A number of our major corporations—including companies from my own State—are participating in this effort.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a brief résumé of the BCIU program.

Reflecting constructive efforts of this organization—encouraging business to cooperate to further strengthen our foreign policy—I ask unanimous consent to have the résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS' ROLE IN THE BCIU PROGRAM—WITH PROPER TRAINING BUSINESS CAN IMPROVE ITS IMAGE ABROAD

(By Otto Schaler)

The question of U.S. prestige, our image abroad which was given such prominence during the 1960 presidential campaign, has had the careful attention of U.S. business leaders for some years.

Chief executives of a number of American firms with important international projects met with President Eisenhower in 1955 and agreed that self—and national—interest prescribed the use of business channels to combat hostile attempts to show us as an exploiting force in other lands. For this purpose, the group constituted itself as the Business Council for International Understanding (BCIU). BCIU is headed by Charles M. White, chairman of Republic Steel Corp.

With foreign markets gaining strength as living standards rise, U.S. industrial and business firms are concentrating today more on foreign operations than ever before. Even medium-size companies are attracted by new opportunities well beyond their domestic areas. Many are establishing licensing arrangements and joint ventures which often make these oversea activities as important to them as those at home. New foreign subsidiaries are spawned day in and day out.

SIGNS OF LIFE

With increasing frequency, export departments are becoming "international divisions" headed by senior company officials and embryos of "world corporations" give signs of life alongside the few already drawing breath.

The balance sheets generally show good prospects if not good results for these business ventures. The far-seeing members of the business community know that the books that their accountants keep do not tell the whole story of U.S. firms in foreign lands—their relationships with the indigenous population nor the outlook for healthy coworking in years to come.

They know that the considerable influx of U.S. business into the markets of other nations quite naturally result in real public opinion problems as local, vested interests are affected. There is now evidence that U.S. business expansion generates serious concern even in the highly industrialized countries of Europe which have extremely close ties with us.

Individually, U.S. firms—including those that often have substantial, well-balanced public relations departments, supplemented by special counsel and service organizations to assure good community standing for their domestic operations—in few cases provide for comparable staffing internationally. Generally, the man in charge abroad quite rightly feels that the community relations responsibility is his. Whereas, if he has a legal background he will seldom presume to be without specialist help where legal matters in a foreign milieu are concerned, he still too rarely admits to the need of specialized assistance when dealing with strange publics. Only among some of the most experienced international operators, usually the oil companies, the necessity for competent international public relations practice is given recognition.

THE AMERICAN ABROAD

Foreign attitudes, objectives, and viewpoints are just that. But, this applies to us when we are abroad. American tourists are known to ask, "What is that in real money?" when a price is quoted in local, not U.S. dollar currency. A German or Englishman, approaching an American storekeeper this way will get a response but certainly anything but goodwill. And, we're not generally considered particularly sensitive.

Directly in line with this attitude is the rationale "We haven't done an adequate job of selling the American way." Exhibitionism is not an attractive characteristic in people or in peoples. Neither can enjoy good opinion for long without deserving it—in the local sense. Putting one's best foot forward is not by way of requiring others to get in step. To intrude on the public, to force public attention does not establish bonds beyond economic intertwining for other than momentary mutual benefit. Only relationships based upon two-way communication create understanding and the necessary base for building confidence and respect.

Good performance and good qualities must be put forward thoroughly interpreted in terms of indigenous concepts. There is no shortcut or nostrum that will substitute for the simple formula of applying purposeful intelligence to understanding.

One classic example is that of a soap company plunging to develop a Middle Eastern market in an area where women wear veils, and crimes are punished by mutilation. Displaying a picture of the Venus de Milo on the package doomed this venture to failure before it got started. Less obvious is the experience of an aspirin manufacturer who correctly assumed Latin Americans had headaches, too. But, sales didn't develop. Careful investigation disclosed that locally people expected and prepared for only one headache at a time. Even the 12-tablet package appeared as an extravagant investment.

MORE THAN PROFITS AT STAKE

Assignments to international responsibilities without adequate preparation and consideration of the human factors have often proved costly. At a time when nations are rebelling against any form of colonialism, the bungling of businessman, government official, tourist, or any other representative of the United States on the foreign scene is greatly magnified. Individual or nonconforming business firm causing friction in relations with nationals of the host community engender ill will which transfers to the disadvantage of all others who represent the same country in the area whether business, government, or private. That is not a situation unique for Americans; other nationalities have identical problems in this regard.

If a country is well regarded, it will benefit all those identified with it. Customers prefer to buy from people with good reputation and companies they recognize as responsive to public opinion. Conversely, public resentment will pressure even the most friendly Government to adopt discriminatory measures.

PEOPLE THE KEY

The company which transplanted a crackajack salesman from Cleveland, Ohio, to Rio de Janiero, Brazil, to live at the "level of an ambassador" because he can sell and had had Portuguese in high school, is gambling in a big way. It is estimated that roughly only 50 percent of those sent overseas work out well.

To bring up the odds, BCIU determined the need and now sponsors a 4-week training program for International Business Executives at the American University in Washington, D.C. Here middle and upper echelon executives and their wives concentrate on—

1. Understanding the people of other countries.

2. Interpreting aspects of U.S. life and culture.

3. Developing an elementary knowledge of the language of a land in which they may live or with whose nationals they may come in contact here in the United States.

4. Gaining a practical concept of actual business, social, and domestic situations to be encountered abroad.

Over 140 executives—presidents, vice presidents, general managers, division managers, engineers, public relations managers of firms for Cuba, Libya, the European marketing coordinator for an auto manufacturer, and others—as well as their wives have been graduated from the BCIU training program since its inception in September of 1959. Interestingly, the most enthusiastic acceptance of the program is by those who have had the greatest foreign experience. Just under half of the "trainees" are not expecting an assignment abroad. They hold headquarters-based responsibility for some phase of their firm's international operations. Companies are enrolling managers of foreign affiliates—often nationals of those countries—to better equip them for coworking and more important assignments in the future. Foreign firms are invited to enroll English-speaking executives.

Experienced business men, distinguished academicians and senior officials and specialists of the government have worked together in planning the course content and are represented on the training program's faculty. In addition to language instruction, there are seminars on:

Contemporary America in global perspective with emphasis on the U.S. economic system, corporate strength, American capitalism, separation of powers in the U.S. Government, how Congress makes up its mind, the Presidency and big government, the American party system, federalism in operation, foreign policy and its instruments, social classes and their mobility.

The arts in America—literature, painting, movies, drama.

American and foreign cultures in comparison of values and attitudes, social relations with foreign people, adjustment to foreign cultures, communications in language and action, patterns of cultural change.

Foreign ideas about American society and culture.

Interpreting America to other people.

Special lectures on labor in American foreign relations, the Communist challenge to American business, the role of the military in underdeveloped countries, and nism, its development, aims, and threats.

It is one of the peculiarities of human nature that the visitor from another country is catapulted into the role of authority, a spokesman for his home land. The training program course endeavors to help the participant equip himself to do justice to this responsible part of his foreign assignment. It is up to him to be able to tell about our way of life, whether it be cultural, social, economic or political. He should know his country's heritage and contributions to human progress. He needs to know about the evolution of the U.S. economic system, people's capitalism and the history of the labor movement, the principles of government that have earned the United States its key place among the world's nations. For proper balance, he must also know a good deal about communism, its development, aims, and threats.

TIME IS MONEY

To Americans, time is money. But to millions of people, particularly in the Middle East and the Orient, this is incomprehensible. What would amount to a short business transaction by telephone in America, may, in other areas of the world, require hours of preparatory get-togethers. True, we frequently get a lot more accomplished by doing things our way in our country. Successful overseasmanship requires a sincere effort to become part of the Rome in which you find yourself, the effort to adjust to different circumstances, strange ways.

Mistakes inevitably occur. When they are honestly made and honestly corrected the nationals of the host country tend to forgive readily. Their response is usually patience in the face of sincere attempts to understand. The trainee studies the area of primary interest to him in the course of the program from the aspects of:

Origins and colonial backgrounds.

Winning of independence.

Development and current status of relations with the United States.

Views of the United States.

International organizations operating in the area.

Current issues and problems there.

Modern political and social movements and trends.

Economics and economic development.

Social security programs.

Technical assistance programs.

Observations on living and doing business in the area.

Private consultations are arranged with officers of U.S. Government departments and agencies, international organizations, foreign diplomats and businessmen who know the area and can provide background and guidance on commercial and political aspects of doing business there. The wife of the oversea executive is a decisive element in the success or failure of his mission. The number of men who have had to be returned home because their wives could not adjust to the unfamiliar environment is a matter of real concern and has been given special consideration.

In the wives classes, emphasis is on, for example: What the United States stands for, its system of government; cultural differences around the world; the American overseas and answering questions about the United States of America; the importance of wives in their role as example of American homemaker; living abroad—housing, health, children, school, heating, utilities, servants, local services, markets, and marketing; and establishing social contacts—basic matters of protocol, entertaining, and finding a place for service in a foreign community.

The wise wife learns that she should admit her lack of knowledge of many of the local social graces and that she must quickly learn those that will make her fit into the routine of the community. People engaged in communications are well aware of the need of talking the same language. Language proficiency is urged upon all oversea personnel. The most modern methods of instruction in the spoken language, using special tape recording equipment, are employed in the program.

BUSINESSMEN AND OFFICIALS

BCIU members believe that business can develop coworking abroad without the specter of suspicion regarding ulterior motives so often ascribed to official Government projects. Still, the need for better appreciation of each other's efforts is recognized by both business and Government. A new program has been set up by BCIU and the State Department under which U.S. Foreign Service and U.S. Information Agency officers, going abroad or on home leave, visit corporations which operate in the countries of their assignments. It gives each a better insight into the foreign problems and policies of the other.

Mexican and North American businessmen, in equal parts, have organized the "Associacion pro Entendimiento Internacional" (APEI). With CARE, the worldwide, private relief agency as its partner, APEI operates 150 clubs for farm youth along the line of the 4–H approach. It has introduced the revolutionary, portable "Cinva-Ram," an inexpensive tool for durable construction of law-cost rural housing with native soil and a minimum of cement.

APEI has initiated "Empresas Juveniles" (Junior Achievement) so that Mexican teenagers, the coming generation, may learn the free enterprise system of doing.

Columbian business leaders have initiated a counterpart Council in that Latin American nation. Interest in forming others has been shown by the business communities of the Philippines, Iran, and Pakistan.

In addition to public relations-oriented programs described so far, BCIU sponsors a series of recorded radio interviews and panel discussions, between top U.S. businessmen and their foreign counterparts on national and international issues for broadcast in Latin America and other foreign countries.

BCIU and its member companies continue to explore additional ways of constructive coworking with and in foreign communities on a business basis to help secure the type of expanding world economy in which free enterprise is understood and has the opportunity to grow to the advantage of more and more of the earth's people.

The Automated Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article that appeared in the magazine Rod and Transit published by the Department of Public Works in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the subject of the Automated Highway:

THE AUTOMATED HIGHWAY

(By Charles Ashley)

A bid to have the Federal Government locate here an automated highway on which motorists would pass control of their cars to automatic electronic devices which would actually drive the vehicle, was made by Massachusetts' Department of Public Works Commissioner Jack P. Ricciardi.

In a letter to Gov. John A. Volpe, Ricciardi suggested that the chief executive contact Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges in Washington and present arguments in favor of having the "drive itself" roadway constructed in the northeast industrial section of the Nation, particularly in Massachusetts.

Roads suggested by Ricciardi as suitable or adaptable for the test included Interstate Route 95 from Boston to the Rhode Island State line. The highway is in a construction stage where electronic control devices could be installed and it has a minimum of access and exit roads.

Another route suggested was Interstate Route 93 running to the New Hampshire line and portions of Route 128 could also be used.

It was also pointed out that Massachusetts has a wealth of skill and experience at close hand for such a project, such as the research experts at universities, particularly Massachusetts Institute of Technology. An existing contract between MIT and the State department of public works for such research projects is already in effect.

The proximity of electronic manufacturers and researchers in private industries, notably along Route 128, Electronics Row, was noted as another inducement, as was the experience already gained by State highway engineers who have perfected, working with MIT, such electronic devices that measure terrain for the best grades and estimate costs of land used. Scores of the great MIT experimental laboratories, widely known for the part they have contributed to national defense, are also at the command of the State engineers for such a program.

It was also noted that Massachusetts is the President's home State and has already pioneered in New Frontier projects.

After a series of meetings with those experts who have been working on automated highways, the department of public works commissioner said he had been informed that the Federal Government has been told by the test engineers that this "let the car drive itself" road is definitely not a researcher's dream, but is actually "technically feasible" and ready for actual road testing.

Models and a short test track have already proved out the experiment. The various techniques have been narrowed down. One would use a wire buried in the middle of the test road as a steering device. Another guide mechanism would be an offset guard rail structure.

It has been concluded that such highway equipment locked into electronic devices placed on vehicles would take over the steering, regulate the speed and braking. The safety factors in the use of such an automated highway would include elimination of accidents causel by driver fatigue so often experienced during long drives on continuous express highways, and cut another crash cause; weaving from one lane to another—"The Eager-Weavers".

Such controlled roadways would reduce traffic flow on standard highways, reduce the necessity of building more of that type at a time when so many are obsolete even before they are finished, that is, they cannot carry the planned traffic flow.

Researchers have told Federal and State officials the electronic traffic control system would permit bumper to bumper travel at speeds up to 100 miles and hour, but added that such speeds would not be practical. Speeds of 55 to 60 miles an hour would be more logical even on such automated roads.

In case of a breakdown, the plans call for an electronic device to flash a warning in the master control post spotting the exact location of the disabled vehicle. Traffic on the highway would be slowed or halted and a recovery car would be dispatched to the scene—all automatically.

It is estimated that the cost of equipping the roadway would be $30 million and placing the devices on the vehicles would amount to an additional $20 million, a total of $50 million to put this automation into effect.

HUAC and Its Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HUAC AND ITS FOES—HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HAS WON RESPECT FROM MANY BY ENEMIES IT HAS MADE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

For a certain section of American public opinion, it is always open season on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or HUAC, to use its convenient abbreviation.

It is understandable that this organization is not popular with Communists and fellow travelers and the continuing blasts against the committee from these sources may be discounted. But many individuals and some newspapers that have no sympathy for communism, that might generally be described as "liberal," join in the hue-and-cry against the HUAC and all its works.

When students, egged on by known and identified local Communists, put on a riotous demonstration against hearings of the committee last year in San Francisco, finally requiring the intervention of the police, there was a nationwide campaign designed to represent the students as civil libertarian martyrs. A film showing some of the disorderly shenanigans at the San Francisco hearings has been assailed with extraordinary virulence. There has been a consistent attempt to represent the committee as manned by a peculiar collection of benighted bigots, irrational crackpots and publicity hunters, as a disgrace to Congress which should be summarily abolished.

The ardent crusaders against the committee overlook the fact that there is a good deal of rotation and shifting in its bipartisan membership. Consequently the HUAC, like other congressional committee, is almost bound to be reasonably representative of an elected Congress which, in turn, is reasonably representative of the grassroots sentiment of the American people.

An image has been created of the committee as an irresponsible inquisition, running about on wild fishing expeditions, serving no useful legislative purpose, operating outside any procedural and legal safeguards and restrictions, taking sadistic pleasure in browbeating innocent and patriotic Americans, all without any clear mandate from Congress. The ascertainable facts reveal a very different picture.

HOW THE LAW READS

The duties of the committee, as defined in Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946) are to make investigations of: (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries, or of a domestic origin, and attacks the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation; and (4) to exercise watchfulness over the execution by administrative agencies of laws relating to subversive activities and internal security.

It is a frequent allegation of critics of the HUAC that it has not rendered any service in proposing legislation, that its investigations have not helped to uncover Soviet spies and subversive agents. But the factual record shows otherwise. Every annual report of the HUAC contains specific suggestions for remedial legislation. There were several predecessors of the HUAC, committees which carried out the same functions under differing titles. Between 1941 and 1958 these committees offered 80 legislative suggestions, of which 35 were enacted into law. HUAC investigations helped to cast light on the doings of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and various Soviet agents.

It is untrue, despite strenuous efforts to create the impression, that the HUAC functions like a star chamber, picking witnesses out of a hat, observing no legal restraints, imposing sentences at its discretion. It is not a court of law and has no punitive powers. Anyone subpenaed by the HUAC may have the advice of counsel and may submit a prepared statement for inclusion in the record.

The courts have consistently refused to abridge the right of congressional committees to carry out investigations and to have recalcitrant wtinesses, unless they seek asylum in the fifth amendment, cited for contempt of Congress. And it is a rather striking example of "doublethink" that the same type of people who applauded committees which went after the "merchants of death" in the 1930's without gloves, which got the oil magnate, Harry F. Sinclair, sent to jail for contempt of Congress, which delved into the business affairs of J. P. Morgan, are inclined to denounce the HUAC as an intolerable tyranny.

NEED AND JUSTIFICATION

This, of course, leads to the question whether there is need and justification for such a body as the HUAC. Perhaps "un-American" was not the best word that could have been chosen; "anti-American" might have been a more accurate description of the activities which the committee is empowered to investigate and expose with a view to preparing the ground for remedial legislation.

That there is an organized anti-American campaign of subversive propaganda, emanating from Moscow and Peiping, with branches in other Communist-ruled countries, such as Cuba, can hardly be denied. This campaign is an important weapon in the cold war. It does not seem unreasonable that the American people, through a properly constituted committee of its Congress, should keep an eye on this campaign. A free society can and must, if it is to remain free, tolerate heresy, the expression of unpopular dissenting views. But it is under no obligation to remain passive in the face of hostile conspiracy.

Many sincere people who have no sympathy or association with communism have taken up the cry against the HUAC, often, one feels, on a basis of insufficient knowledge of HUAC's actual record and of the larger issues of the cold war. But a disproportionately large share of the drumfire of attack on the committee comes from individuals, organizations, and publications with Communist and fellow-traveler associations.

As Grover Cleveland was loved for the enemies he made among crooked politicians of his own party, the HUAC may properly be proud of many of the enemies it has made.

Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, Honored by National Federation of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and I introduced identical bills (H.R. 4580 and 4581) as a bipartisan effort to preserve permanently from Federal extinction the completely State-financed rehabilitatively oriented aid-to-the-blind programs in our States of Pennsylvania and Missouri.

In this Congress as in the last, Congressman CURTIS and I have again joined forces, not only to protect and benefit the blind people of our own States, but, in an endeavor to make available to the blind in every other State the opportunities for achieving self-support which the Pennsylvania-Missouri State plans for aid to the blind afford.

At the national convention of the National Federation of the Blind, held July 4–7 in Kansas City, Mo., Congressman CURTIS received an award from this organization for his long-time labors in Congress to assure continuance of the Pennsylvania-Missouri State blind-aid programs, and for his other services to the blind of America.

I congratulate my distinguished colleague from Missouri upon receiving this well-deserved recognition.

I commend the National Federation of the Blind for its good judgment in selecting Congressman CURTIS as the recipient of its distinguished service award.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the presentation address, delivered by John F. Nagle, Chief of the Washington Office of the National Federation of the Blind, be printed in full:

ADDRESS OF JOHN F. NAGLE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND, WHEN PRESENTING THE NEWEL PERRY AWARD TO HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS AT BANQUET, JULY 5, 1961, AT KANSAS CITY, MO., DURING 21ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Statesman and scholar, educator and lawyer, Member of Congress from the Second District of Missouri since 1950—this is THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Nationally recognized as a leader in the Republican Party; nationally acclaimed by both Republicans and Democrats as one of the ablest Members of Congress—constructively partisan, never acting at the sacrifice of principle; prepared at all times to join forces with all who seek to promote responsible legislation and sound causes—this is Congressman CURTIS of Missouri.

Only member of his party in Congress from Missouri for many years—elected and reelected to office in spite of rising adverse political tides—THOMAS B. CURTIS is a legislator of the finest caliber, guided always by principle rather than expediency; with the courage, the independence, and the determination to fight for his beliefs.

We of the National Federation of the Blind have much cause to know and to appreciate Congressman CURTIS' qualities, both as a person and as a legislator. All federationists have become familiar with his name as he has labored in Congress after Congress to protect from Federal extinction the rehabilitatively oriented, completely State-financed aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania, as he has worked to preserve permanently these programs for the blind of his State and the State of Pennsylvania, to secure the benefits of these programs for the blind of every other State.

Although not as well known, Congressman CURTIS is one of the stanchest supporters of our right-to-organize bill. He shares with us our belief that those who are blind have the right—and should be free to exercise the right—just as do all other Americans—to join with others to forward shared goals and common purposes, to speak freely without fear of retribution or reprisal. Congressman CURTIS believes as we do that we who are blind are uniquely qualified to contribute to the improvement of programs designed and intended to assist and to benefit blind persons. He believes that we who are blind should be welcomed and should be sought after as members of committees and similar

advisory bodies to participate in the deliberations and decisions which result in policies and procedures affecting programs designed and intended to assist and to benefit blind persons as they strive to function fully, though blind, in our sight-oriented society.

Tonight, we honor Congressman CURTIS for his legislative efforts in our behalf, in behalf of all blind people in America—but though these efforts have been great, we honor him for much more than this.

We honor Mr. CURTIS tonight for his attitude toward us and our aspirations; for his understanding of our goals and our objectives.

Congressman CURTIS is not like so many who wish us well, promise us much—and then promptly forget us; who profess deep sympathy for our problems—and then act with callous indifference toward them; nor is he one to preach to us of freedom—while we work our way out of captivity alone.

Mr. CURTIS is much more than a remote but willing friend; he is a member in our crusade, a comrade who joins with us in our struggle to gain independence for the dependent; to gain dignity for the demeaned and the degraded; he joins with us to change dreams into reality, and he asserts with us that all men, whether blind or sighted, have the right and the need to function to the fullest extent of their being.

Mr. CURTIS, this is why we honor you tonight. We want you to know—we want all to know—that we thank you for joining with us in our cause; we thank you for the strength you bring to our cause.

But above all else, we honor you for your understanding of the true nature of our cause—

For understanding that ours is not a complaint that we are blind, but rather that we are thought to be helpless because we are blind;

Ours is not a complaint that there is a lack of jobs that we can do, but rather that there is a lack of those who will hire us to do the jobs that we can do;

Ours is not a complaint that life owes us a living, but rather that life owes us a fair opportunity to earn a living, and to live with pride in our work, dignity in our status and decency in our standards;

Ours is not a complaint that we are refused special treatment, but rather that we are refused equality of opportunity;

And finally, our plea and our goal are not that we be sheltered and protected from the tumult and the turmoil of the world, but rather that we be allowed to share with all others in the duties and the responsibilities for making it a better place for all mankind—including ourselves.

Chancellor Clifford C. Furnas, of the University of Buffalo, Named Chairman of the Defense Science Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Defense Secretary McNamara has named Chancellor Clifford C. Furnas, of the University of Buffalo, chairman of the Defense Science Board. Knowing Dr. Furnas personally and the past performance he has rendered to the Government, this selection is very excellent.

Secretary McNamara said the chairman is the key individual in Defense Department efforts to increase the effectiveness of the Board, which supplies counsel on research and engineering matters.

Dr. Furnas, who served as Assistant of Defense for Research and Development in 1955–57, was instrumental in organizing the Board, formed in 1956 on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Before his new appointment he was serving as an ex officio member.

The Defense Science Board advises the Secretary and director of defense research and engineering on overall research and engineering and provides long-range guidance in these areas to the Department.

Dr. Furnas is chairman of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel, a member of the Naval Research Advisory Commission, and on the board of trustees of the Aerospace Corp., a nonprofit agency which handles systems of planning and guidance on space and missile programs.

He was formerly a member of the Aero Commission and is a past chairman of the Guided Missile Commission of the Research and Development Board.

At this point I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the August 9, 1961 issue of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y.

The editorial follows:

KEY POST FOR FURNAS

Chancellor Clifford C. Furnas of the University of Buffalo will bring a rich background to his assignment by Defense Secretary McNamara as Chairman of the Defense Science Board. Dr. Furnas served midway in the Eisenhower administration as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development and has since been active in advisory agencies counseling the various armed services. He is a man of strong views as to why the United States has lagged behind Soviet Russia in the space race.

That two national administrations in a row have called on Dr. Furnas for important services, speaks well of the regard in which he is held. It is good to know that while continuing his demanding work at the University of Buffalo, Dr. Furnas will be in a position to make new contributions to free world defense as a top research adviser.

Politics and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized policy of the city of Newburgh raises age-old questions about the idle poor. This is one of the more unpleasant and emotional problems that exists in our modern industrialized society, and Eve Edstrom, in a recent article appearing in the Washington Post, has done an excellent job of leading us through the maze of epithets back to stern reality.

When we get the facts on this problem, the question of formulating a social policy to meet these conditions becomes a vital political issue. Above all, however, it would seem that before we make such important judgments we should get the facts on the matter.

Eve Edstrom's article does an excellent job in presenting certain facts which to date have not been given sufficient attention, and it should be read by all who are concerned with the problem of public welfare.

NEWBURGH IS A MIRROR REFLECTING ON US ALL

(By Eve Edstrom)

The time was ripe for Newburgh, N.Y., to happen.

In towns and cities throughout the Nation, costs of municipal services have been going up, up and up. But most aggravating to the American taxpayer has been the mounting cost of public relief.

In the three decades since this Nation adopted its public welfare programs, the rank and file taxpayer never has accepted the notion that anyone need live on the dole.

And so when Newburgh announced its crackdown on welfare chiselers, reaction was enormous. Newburgh was seized upon as an example of how to cut back mounting relief costs and teach a lesson to ne'er-do-wells.

In newspapers, in townhalls, in forums across the Nation, the Newburgh story became the focus of a debate that grew more emotional, more politically charged, as each day passed. As if by a Pavlov dog reaction, conservatives grabbed the issue as ammunition for their particular outlook on the world; liberals, with the same conditioned reflex, sensed the need to rally in opposition.

An examination was begun of the facts behind the words. And with that closer look came a singular discovery: in the 3 weeks since its welfare crusade began, Newburgh has been unable to find one able-bodied male to put to work.

That fact, and others like it, began to give a different complexion to the Newburgh case.

FACT SHEET

Any discussion of Newburgh must take into consideration both the claims of Newburgh City Manager Joseph Mitchell and the facts as developed by New York State officials. These are:

Claim: Newburgh welfare rolls include many able-bodied recipients who should work for their relief checks. Mitchell estimated that these men could be drawn from at least 60 families.

Fact: One man, a white, unemployed steelworker who is a native of Newburgh, was considered able to work. But he was excused when he reported for duty because his wife was in the hospital and there was no one to care for their five children. This able-bodied man, incidentally, has one eye.

The absence of any appreciable number of able-bodied males on relief since Mitchell's crackdown began squares with the facts as they existed prior to the enactment of the controversial welfare code. For example, in July 1960, only one man was employed under Newburgh's work relief program. Despite national publicity crediting Mitchell with seeking to put relief "chiselers" to work, Newburgh had had a work relief program for some time.

Claim: Newburgh's relief rolls are loaded with "undesirable newcomers"—migrants from the South—who came to this Hudson River Valley city to get on relief.

Fact: In all of 1960, exactly $205 was paid by Newburgh to newcomers on home relief, the category of local aid for jobless families. Furthermore, New York State reimbursed Newburgh in full for that expenditure.

During that year, no payments were made to newcomers on aid to dependent children

rolls, the category of aid for families whose fathers are dead, have deserted them or are incapacitated. For all categories of aid, including payments to the aged, Newburgh paid only $1,395 to newcomers in the last 2 years.

Claim: With 5 percent of Newburgh's 31,000 residents on relief, the city is suffering from an unusually heavy welfare burden.

Fact: The percentage of Newburgh's population on relief in 1960 was 2.9 percent, the lowest percentage of five comparable cities and a percentage which was below the statewide average. Although 41 of the State's 65 welfare districts qualified for special welfare aid because home relief payments were made to more than 1 percent of the population last year, Newburgh was not among them.

Claim: It was necessary to muster welfare recipients at police stations because of the existence of possible fraud.

Fact: Although practically every adult who could walk was put through this procedure, not a single case of fraud was uncovered.

THE SYMBOL

Despite these facts, Mitchell's charges and his program for Newburgh emerged as a symbol of welfare reform.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, declared that every city should adopt the Newburgh program aimed at putting chiselers to work and denying aid to unwed mothers. GOLDWATER—voicing the views of many—said that he doesn't want his tax money spent for "children born out of wedlock" and he is "tired of professional chiselers walking up and down the streets who don't work."

In similar vein, the Richmond Times-Dispatch, in applauding that Virginia city's efforts to adopt some features of the Newburgh plan, editorialized against the "shiftless, slothful parasites who make `careers of milking the public."

This reaction was typical of that voiced throughout the Nation. In counties and cities in every section of the country, the public was told that those on relief live the "life of Riley" and this must stop. Short shrift was given to the arguments of social welfare leaders who insisted that Newburgh was far from a symbol of welfare reform but rather that its crusade was a "hoax" against the helpless.

But Charles Collingwood, in a New York CBS broadcast on the Newburgh affair, warned that before advocates "pick a symbol, make sure that it really symbolizes what you mean it to."

"The way to do that is to investigate your symbol pretty thoroughly in the beginning," Collingwood said.

Ostensibly, the Newburgh case had its beginning in the concern of citizens over alleged increases in welfare rolls which, according to Mitchell, would necessitate tax increases if public relief was not cut back.

A sort of white paper on Newburgh's welfare problems was drawn up by, it was believed, an impartial citizens' committee. It was only later last month that Newburgh's press revealed that City Manager Mitchell served as secretary to the citizens' group and wrote its report.

On the basis of that report, Newburgh's four Republican city council members—over the strong objections of Democratic Mayor William Ryan—adopted a stringent 13-point welfare code, to be effective July 15.

The most controversial provisions of the code would cut off families from relief after 3 months of aid in any given year; deny relief to mothers of illegitimate children if additional children are born out of wedlock after the family has qualified for relief; require able-bodied males to work 40 hours weekly for their relief checks, and limit aid for newcomers to 1 or 2 weeks.

Such requirements are in conflict with New York State welfare laws. Consequently, New York State could lose its entire welfare allotment from the Federal Government because Federal rules require a State welfare program to be uniform for all political divisions. A child in Newburgh, in other words, must be treated the same as a child in Albany.

Therefore, the first step in testing the legality of the Newburgh code was taken Friday when New York State sought an injunction to block enforcement of the code.

However, Newburgh has been unable to take any appreciable action under its welfare regulations because, to date, it appears that the code is based on assumptions of conditions that don't exist.

One of these assumptions, as stated by New York State Welfare Board Chairman Myles Amend, was that "95 percent of those on relief are lazy bums and maybe 5 percent are decent people. I think they have their percentages reversed."

Amend's statement appears correct in light of the fact that Newburgh's screening of welfare cases has yet to produce a "lazy bum" to put to work.

The sum total of Newburgh's "crackdown" is this:

Two mothers of illegitimate children were urged to become self-supporting. They were warned that if they bore any more children out of wedlock, their home environment would be studied to determine if the children should continue to live at home.

One family receiving $60.27 a month in cash relief was told payment would be made by voucher until there was an explanation for the spending of an insurance check received last fall.

On the basis of the above it would appear that Rabbi Norman Kahan of Newburgh's Temple Beth Jacob is correct when he states the Newburgh relief crackdown is a "great deal to do about nothing."

But Rabbi Kahan, who is president of the city's ministerial association, does credit the Newburgh plan with an unpublicized product: Fear.

"People were afraid they would be socially and economically ostracized if they spoke out against the program," he said. "Initial reaction was definitely reminiscent of McCarthy days and, to some extent, it is still going on.

"For example, a teacher in one of our public school classrooms asked how many children belonged to Rabbi Kahan's congregation. After the children raised their hands, the teacher said: 'Your Rabbi is wrong. He is condoning the behavior of immoral women and, as a man of the cloth, he should favor morality.'"

Such statements stem from the widespread belief that relief grants are "bonuses for illegitimacy," that they encourage illicit sex behavior.

"It is not moral to finance bastardy," said Newburgh City Manager Mitchell in justifying his program.

But figures available at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that it is not the relief rolls that are spawning this Nation's illegitimate children.

Eighty-seven percent of this country's illegitimate children are supported by parents, relatives, or by sources other than public relief. Only 13 percent are beneficiaries of the Federal-State relief grant programs in operation in the 50 States.

And if the relief program contributes in any way to the illegitimacy problem, it is through the inadequacies—and not the adequacies—of relief payments.

In Washington, for example, when relief grants fell 22 percent short of basic shelter and food needs, the "grocery bag baby" became a common phrase.

This phrase developed because mothers sometimes entered into illicit relationships in return for a bag of groceries. These mothers were motivated by the thought of food today, not payments for babies 9 months hence.

Even so, the majority of families on relief in Washington and the majority of families on relief in Newburgh—80 to 90 percent by City Manager Mitchell's own estimates—do not have illegitimate children.

It is politically unwise to suggest that the blind, disabled, or aged be denied relief, because such people appeal to our basic desire to be humane. Similarly, it is unwise to suggest that relief be denied to hungry, innocent children.

But denial in the latter instance becomes palatable to the public when justified on the grounds that either the children's father is a "lazy bum" or that the mother is an "immoral woman." It is then that the desire to be humane is overshadowed by the American belief that anyone worth his salt should earn his keep.

This is the basic conflict in the administration of public welfare programs today—and it is this conflict that the Newburgh case has publicized.

But the motivations behind City Manager Mitchell's actions in the Newburgh case are more difficult to assess.

He has issued numerous conflicting statements. For example, he said that unless the welfare code was adopted, Newburgh's citizens faced a tax increase. But after the code was enacted, he still maintained that tax increases were necessary.

Similarly, Mitchell issued a statement reflecting a sizable drop in relief cases in June, but then the figures were retracted and only a nominal drop was shown.

To this reporter, Mitchell said that tax increases probably would not be needed because both the welfare code and publicity concerning it caused appreciable reductions in welfare cases. In 1960, he said, dependent children's cases rose from 90 in January to 116 in June, while in 1961 they decreased from 160 in January to 119 in June.

Mayor Ryan points out that welfare comparisons normally are made on a month-by-month basis. In the above instance, both the January and June figures for 1961 are higher than for previous year.

Initially, Mitchell also announced that his 13-point code represented only the beginning of measures to curb welfare costs. But a few days later, he said that Newburgh would proceed slowly under the code.

However, Mitchell has remained consistent in stating that he always has been a Republican and "a Conservative in my thinking."

And caught up in the Newburgh controversy with Mitchell are the two men who may well be rivals for the 1964 Republican Party presidential nomination.

Senator GOLDWATER, unchallenged leader of the Republican Party's right wing, first entered the Newburgh picture by writing a letter to Mitchell expressing admiration for him and his program. Subsequently, when Mitchell visited in Washington July 18, he had a much-publicized meeting with GOLDWATER.

This caused many newspapers to criticize GOLDWATER for interfering in a local situation involving New York's Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who is the unchallenged leader of the Republican Party's liberal wing. GOLDWATER, in a letter to Rockefeller, declared he had no intention of "taking political shots at you."

Mitchell, however, has continued to embarrass the Rockefeller administration.

What Mitchell, a native of Chevy Chase, Md., hopes to gain from his many statements—other than continuing national publicity—is anybody's guess.

But the furor he has caused not only will be felt in many communities for a long time but in the Nation's Capital as well. The basic issue in the Newburgh case is not whether it is a hoax but whether it is not

time to re-examine this Nation's welfare policies.

Even the friends of public welfare programs observe that they perpetuate dependency, that measures enacted 30 years ago are no answer to conditions as they exist today. And neither are the hit-and-miss solutions being tried in some communities.

That is why the Kennedy administration is reviewing the Nation's relief program.

Lincoln Memorial Would Benefit All America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, this country owes a great deal to our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has just reported to the House H.R. 2470, my bill to establish a fitting national memorial at Lincoln City, Ind., in what now is Spencer County. Here it was that he spent some 14 of his most formative years, from age 7 to 21. There is a national memorial at Hodgesville, Ky., where he was born, and one at Springfield, Ill., where he later lived and is buried. But it was at what is now Lincoln City, Ind., where he learned many of the lessons of life that were to stand him in such good stead during the dark days of the Civil War. It was here that he grew from boyhood to manhood. It was here that his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln, died and is buried. The Sunday Courier and Press of August 6 of Evanville, Ind., contained a fine editorial on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Sunday Courier and Press, Aug. 6, 1961]

LINCOLN MEMORIAL WOULD BENEFIT ALL AMERICA

A minor bill before this year's Congress is of special interest to Indiana, but has real significance for the entire Nation.

The United States is being asked to create a national memorial on the land owned by Tom Lincoln in Spencer County, the nearby gravesite of Nancy Hanks Lincoln, and some additional 200 acres. Most of the land is already State owned, and would be donated to the Federal Government.

The cost to the Government is fairly small. Total development cost is estimated at somewhat over a million dollars, but this will be spread over at least several years. If the House and Senate decides to impose a spending ceiling, this would seem to be in order. Indeed, it might encourage private participation in this memorial to the Great Emancipator.

The appropriation would provide a measure of substance to an important American tradition. The boyhood of Abraham Lincoln is one of the stories that puts history in human terms, and at the same time provides inspiration for generation after generation. Preserving the site of that boyhood and recreating some of its conditions will emphasize the essentials of the story for countless young Americans, both present and future.

The timing of the project could hardly be better. America's traditional values are being tested today both at home and in world affairs.

Events of the cold war have posed the question of just how much we are prepared to sacrifice for the ideals of freedom. At home, belief in individual integrity has been subjected to a silent and therefore particularly sinister assault.

Americans are reacting strongly to these pressures. We are proving to ourselves and the world that we are willing to pay the price necessary to preserve freedom despite Communist pressure. Many of our citizens also are regarding our traditional values with new respect, precisely because of the big-government theorists, the "beat" fringe, and the confidence-game artists who pose as organization men.

In reestablishing time-honored values, we will inevitably turn on many occasions to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. The national monument in Spencer County would help in bolstering that tradition.

New England Council Supports Study To Benefit Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news release of the New England Council for Economic Development, in behalf of their sound and reasonable support for the expenditure of $139,000 for further study and design of a contract to benefit the coal industry.

The New England Council, antagonist of coal in the current residual oil fight, today gave its support to a $139,000 contract to benefit the coal industry.

Lauding the announcement of Interior Secretary Udall as "a step in the right direction," James Couzens, chairman of the fuel committee, said, "this new contract, first of over 100 to be evaluated and accepted, calls for a study designed to identify new products which would enable new coal markets to be generated.

"At last," Couzens continued, "we are going to consider ways to find a place for the coal industry in modern-day America. Government and coal interests have too long tried to solve coal's problems by keeping America back in the coal age. In Florida, California, Hawaii, New England, and in many other areas of this Nation that have no original sources of fuel, we have too long been forced by government edict to burn uneconomical coal or to buy other fuels at prices held high to protect the coal interests.

"The members of our council, representing the interests of consumers already are paying their share of nearly $200 million of depressed area legislation primarily aimed at relief of the burdens of the coal miner. Our members are equally willing to pay their share of the Interior Department's study to find new uses for coal.

"With all of our vigor, however, we will continue to oppose those who would restrict our free choice of residual oil and other fuels."

Since March 10, 1959, imports of residual fuel oil have been restricted by Presidential proclamation. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is currently reconsidering its recommendations, which were the basis of the proclamation, as they concern residual fuel oil imports.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I issued a statement, giving my views on Federal aid to education. Because of the widespread interest that has been expressed, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to make it available to readers of the RECORD.

STATEMENT ON SCHOOL BILL BY HON. JAMES J. DELANEY, OF NEW YORK

Good education is an absolute necessity for the welfare and future of our country. We all agree on this.

We can, and do, disagree as to methods. There are those who oppose Federal aid to education of any kind, fearing Federal control, and who feel that education must remain the responsibility of the States and local communities. Others are convinced that Federal aid is imperative, but should be extended only to the public school systems. Still others, and I am among them, have an equally strong conviction that if Federal aid is to be granted, then it should be made available to all students.

In a democracy there should be freedom of choice in education. If and when the Federal Government is to contribute to education, it should do so without discrimination.

At the present time there is no Federal public school system of education in the United States. Rather, our educational system is a pluralistic one.

In addition to the 50 different public school systems in the 50 States, there is a vast system of privately controlled schools in the country.

If it is in the interest of national defense or in the interest of the general welfare to aid education, then the Federal Government should accept as a fact the pluralistic educational system that now exists and help each and every pupil attending any and all of these schools.

A most potent objection to the "public school bill" is that it offends justice by including private and parochial school children in the formula which determines the amount of aid which goes to public schools.

Under this bill, the Federal Government is saying to the parents of 7 million children in private and parochial schools: "We are going to give your State so many dollars a year for every child in a private or parochial school, but we have made sure that not a penny of this aid can be used for their education in these schools."

So long as these children are excluded, it violates logic and justice to count them for the purposes of increasing the aid which goes to public schools.

This is discrimination, and I shall not vote to legislate discrimination.

The problem of aid to education must be related to the problem of democratic survival. It must be hinged upon the concept that if we are to survive as a free people we must develop individuals who are creative, each according to his or her God-given endowments.

In a free society, the individual is the prime concern. In a totalitarian system it is only the state that counts.

The existence of a free society is conditioned upon the existence of unshackled individuals with differing views and different approaches. Diversity is the quintessence

of democracy. Uniformity is the hallmark of totalitarianism.

We, therefore, cannot solve this problem in terms of shiboleths and slogans such as "separation of church and state." It must be solved in terms of people and how best they can be trained and developed each to contribute his best to the common problem that confronts our Nation and the free world.

If we are to give aid only to children who attend public schools, and exclude all others who also contribute to the making of our national life, we shall be taking the first long step in the direction of rigid uniformity, which is the thing we are striving to avoid.

Democracy is predicated upon diversity Our Nation was built upon diversity. The production and reconciliation of diverse views is what makes for progress and vitality and freedom.

If we are now to impose a rule of thumb that only public school children shall be aided by the Federal Government, we shall be paving a road that can lead only to a totalitarian result.

The great generalities of the Constitution interpreted narrowly and rigidly can lead to disaster.

But here not even constitutional principles are involved. There is not a single word in our Constitution about schools and education. Public schools came along after the Constitution was written.

The tragedy here lies in the fact that proponents of strictly public school aid rely upon extraconstitutional slogans that have no relation to the real issue a hand—and that issue is whether we shall maintain in our national life that measure of diversity which is so essential to democratic survival.

Freedom of mind and freedom of religion are the essence of a free and open society. An open society is legally tolerant of varying ideas and beliefs. In an open society there is not, nor can there be, a state-established orthodoxy in belief to which all must conform. A free and open society provides constitutional guarantees to protect the rights and liberties of the individual.

The rationale behind separation of church and state is equally applicable to separation of school and state. State monopoly in education is not desirable in a democracy. To maintain a totalitarian state, a monolithic school system is necessary.

In case it be suggested that fear of a monolithic system is exaggerated, attention is called to a brochure issued last April by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," and is the report of a committee appointed to make recommendations for the reorganization of the U.S. Office of Education.

This report should be studied by all who are concerned with the future of education. It gives detailed plans, which, if put into effect, would have the Federal Government reach into every public school classroom in the country, dominate the teachers, establish required teaching techniques, and dictate the curricula. The language is suave and sometimes oblique, but the purpose is clear.

Examine this paragraph: "In summary the committee recommends a new and significant role for the Federal education agency in the 1960's. This agency must, over the next decade, not only perform its traditional functions, it must also prepare itself to assume larger responsibilities in carrying out Federal policy through the administration of operating programs. It must assume a new role, speaking within the Federal Government for the long-term interests of education. And it must render assistance in the development of public educational policy."

It is interesting to consider 11 future programs that are suggested:

1. Grants to States for elementary and secondary education.
2. Grants for higher education physical facilities.
3. Grants to States for vocational education.
4. Increased aid to graduate education.
5. Expanded educational research in all areas, including graduate education.
6. Strengthening of educational statistics programs.
7. Increased financial assistance to students for higher education.
8. Increased financial assistance for teacher education.
9. Broadening of Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction.
10. Marked increase in international educational assistance.
11. Broadening of Federal interest to include educational activities and service outside the structure of organized education.

On the surface, all of these suggested programs have merit. But add them all up, and the result will be Federal dominance of education, and, eventually, Federal control.

In contrast to this, there are at the present time some 11 Federal education programs which respect the right of the student to select the school of his own choice, and which steer away from Federal control.

All of these programs have worked well and are in keeping with the American tradition. These existing programs serve as an exemplar for any Federal aid to education and avoid the monolithic character of the education program of the Soviet Union. These programs respect the civil rights of some 7 million students attending nonpublic schools and will give to the Nation the benefits of their God-given talents.

There are other objections to the public school aid proposals which I have not discussed in this presentation. There is the matter of double taxation. There is the question of equitable distribution of aid to the States. These subjects can be developed at another time.

The heart of the issue is that if we surrender freedom of choice in education, a totalitarian system of education will become inevitable. Freedom and coercion cannot live side by side. We cannot preserve a free society by following totalitarian methods.

(NOTE.—Eleven present Federal programs: (1) GI students, (2) National Youth Administration students, (3) congressional and Supreme Court page boys, (4) V–12 officers training students, (5) war orphans, (6) ROTC students, (7) NDEA fellows, (8) NDEA loan students, (9) NROTC students, (10) NDEA institute students, (11) National Science Foundation students.)

H.R. 4580: A Bill To Aid Rehabilitation of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for many years my State of Pennsylvania and the State of Missouri have maintained aid to the blind programs financed entirely from State funds. These programs were established, not merely to provide subsistence to needy blind persons, they were established and have been maintained as rehabilitatively oriented public assistance programs—directed toward assisting needy blind persons to work their way from dependence upon blind aid to the achievement of economically independent lives.

But, for the past 10 years the Federal authorities have threatened these State blind aid programs with extinction, and they have only been saved from extinction by congressional action. However, these congressional actions have served but to save these programs for the time being. The bill I have introduced today is designed to permanently grant to the States of Pennsylvania and Missouri the right to continue to operate their State financial blind aid programs, free from further Federal interference. My bill also would allow other States to establish programs with the distinctive features of the Pennsylvania-Missiouri plans.

How do the solely State supported aid to the blind programs in Pennsylvania and Missouri differ from blind aid programs financed in part by Federal participating funds?

The entirely State financed blind aid programs in these States are more liberal in their eligibility requirements than those pertaining under Federal law and regulations; these same States also maintain federally supported blind aid programs and these jointly operated programs are run in compliance with the rigid eligibility standards required by Federal law and regulations.

For more than 10 years Pennsylvania and Missouri have been threatened by the loss of Federal funds employed in their Federal-State blind aid programs unless they would adopt the Federal eligibility standards for their completely State financed blind aid programs.

For more than 10 years Pennsylvania and Missouri have persisted in their determination to retain the more liberal eligibility standards in the programs which were paid for by their own funds. They have continued to refuse to accept Federal standards in programs which did not use Federal money.

The bill I have introduced today would recognize the right of these two States to operate their State blind aid programs in accordance with their own determinations; it would settle the perennial Pennsylvania-Missouri aid to the blind problem permanently, and it would permit other States to establish programs with the unique features of the Pennsylvania-Missouri programs.

Adoption of my bill would settle the following issues which have been raised in title X, the blind aid title of the Social Security Act:

First. It would recognize and protect the right of States to use their own money in the establishment and operation of improved and enlightened social welfare programs for their blind citizens.

Second. It would recognize the right of Pennsylvania and Missouri to continue permanently their rehabilitatively oriented, entirely State financed aid the blind programs free from further Federal interference; and it would recognize the right of any other State to establish similar programs with the distinctive

features of the Pennsylvania-Missouri State blind aid plans.

Third. The amount of each State's Federal grant for its federally supported aid to the blind programs would continue to be determined by the prevailing Federal standards and on like terms to all States. The means test established by Federal law and regulations would apply to all States for the purpose of determining the part of any State's expenditures that would be covered by the Federal grant.

Fourth. No limitation or requirement on the allowance exceptions from the means test in the direction of greater liberality would be imposed upon any State plan in order to retain a title X Federal grant for federally eligible cases.

In order to prevent the States from circumventing the minimum standards of the Federal program by transferring blind aid recipients to a drastically less adequate State program, the States would be permitted to increase, but not decrease the extent to which the recipients' earnings, income, or resources might be excepted from the means test.

Fifth. Not only would the enactment of my bill protect and preserve the solely State supported blind aid programs in Pennsylvania and Missouri, but it would serve to encourage other States to develop their plans of aid to the blind in the direction of rehabilitation, and away from the lesser goal of providing marginal subsistence to their clients.

The constructive character and the rehabiliitative orientation of the State plans of aid to the blind in Pennsylvania and Missouri are in full accord with the repeatedly expressed intention of Congress that the federally supported aid to the blind programs in the States should be constructive in character and rehabilitative in orientation—that they should be a help to blind persons to the attainment of self-support.

In the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, Congress incorporated the exemption of earned income principle in the aid-to-the-blind title as an encouragement to blind persons and a help to them to work their way off the public assistance rolls.

In the 1960 Social Security Act amendments the exemption of the earned income of blind aid recipients concept was again endorsed as a rehabilitative measure when the exemption of a fixed amount of monthly earnings was abandoned in favor of a sliding-scale formula which would permit a gradual transition from dependence upon blind aid to economic independence.

In the 1956 Social Security Act amendments "self-care" and "self-support" were added to the purpose clauses of the public assistance titles and declared to be among the objectives to be served by these Federal-State programs.

Why should the blind aid programs in Pennsylvania and Missouri, which are paid for entirely from State funds, which have as their purpose the assisting of blind persons toward the congressionally approved goals of "self-care" and "self-support" be threatened by Federal authorities and be in danger of extinction simply because these completely State-financed programs have more liberal eligibility requirements?

Instead of being threatened with extinction these programs deserve the commendation of the Federal authorities because of their high purposes, because of their congressionally endorsed purposes; and other States should be encouraged by the Federal authorities to establish programs for their needy blind citizens similar to those in Pennsylvania and Missouri—and they should be helped by the Federal authorities to establish such programs.

Sixth. The bill I have introduced today would restore to the States their right to establish public assistance programs for their blind citizens with standards more liberal than those permitted under Federal law and regulations.

My bill would restore to the States their right to spend their own funds as they choose in such programs.

All this can be done without any cost to the Federal Government since my bill provides that Federal participating money may only be used for cases which would qualify under the Federal definition of need.

I believe that, because the State blind aid programs in Pennsylvania and Missouri have been geared toward rehabilitation, they have been responsible for the successful restoration of many blind persons to useful, productive lives.

It is my hope that Congress will approve my bill, thus assuring the blind people of Pennsylvania and Missouri the continuance on a permanent basis of the programs of aid in their States which have had such a beneficial effect upon their lives.

It is my hope that Congress will adopt my bill so that blind men and women in other States may benefit by the establishment of public assistance programs similar to the Pennsylvania-Missouri plans—plans operated at State expense—plans oriented and operated to assist blind people to realize their fullest potential as participating, contributing, responsible citizens, freed from dependence upon programs of public assistance, living normal lives, working and living to the full in all activities in our society.

Needed: Plane Hijacking Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of Congress have been shocked by the incidents of airplane hijacking that we have witnessed in recent days.

This week the Senate Commerce Committee approved a bill that will provide stiff new penalties for the hijacking of aircraft.

The Senate bill provides for treating the hijacking of an airplane just as piracy on the high seas is treated.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following excellent editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of August 7, 1961, entitled, "Needed: Plane Hijacking Law":

NEEDED: PLANE HIJACKING LAW

The fact that Cubans were not involved in the attempted hijacking of an airplane in Texas tends to siphon off some of the tension that was building up over the incident.

This is well. While it does not lessen the seriousness of this form of lawlessness it permits calmer consideration of what needs to be done. It improves the odds in favor of arriving at right answers.

It is readily apparent that something needs to be done at the Federal level to pull the checkrein on hijacking in the wild blue yonder. At present we have no Federal law covering it.

This automatically leaves a lot of jurisdictional loopholes through which clever lawyers can be trusted to maneuver their clients to delay trials or perhaps even escape punishment for offenses.

It is essential to close all escape hatches as the first step in meeting the problem.

A strong Federal law, moreover, would have psychological impact that might yield enormous dividends in the overall effort to put an end to the hijacking. The Federal kidnaping law is generally given a great deal of credit for slowing down that kind of crime in the United States.

Some people, including Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, and Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Republican, of Michigan, are advocating the death penalty for hijacking on the airplanes.

The Federal Aviation Agency doesn't go quite that far, but it has put forth a suggestion for a strong Federal law that should win support in Congress.

The suggestion, made to the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, would make airline hijacking punishable by life imprisonment. The law, naturally, would bring the full force of the Federal Government to bear on the problem. It would eliminate jurisdictional loopholes. It would strengthen the hand of the United States in going after hijackers who manage to get out of the country. And it would give the hijackers their just deserts when they are caught.

It is a serious problem that we are facing. And the adoption of legislation with sharp teeth should be a must on the agenda of Congress in its current session.

At the Death of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, citizen of the world, and international leader of Moral Re-Armament, devoted the greatest service of his life to defeating communism. He was the inspiring force behind the people to people movement to stimulate a moral rejuvenation throughout the entire non-Communist world.

It was his concept that communism could be slowed, stopped, and finally defeated by strengthening the moral values of men and nations, and thereby isolating the materialism and atheism of communism. Non-Communist nations, he felt, were experiencing a moral breakdown that was opening them further to the domination of communism.

His death will certainly create a void in the free world's peaceful offensive against the onslaught of Russian imperialism. It will not be soon that as effective a soldier in the struggle for men's minds will take his place on the battlefield. Dr. Buchman's great efforts, successful in concrete instances all over the world, have evoked praise from all corners of the globe.

The following are but a few of the comments about Dr. Buchman and Moral Re-Armament:

"In this period of history so fraught with danger, we need more than ever an ideological concept which is superior to communism. I welcome the fight of Moral Re-Armament, beyond every difference of class, race and nationality, for the preservation of freedom and for peace. It is our task to ensure that our children likewise and grandchildren can grow up in freedom."—Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the German Federal Republic.

"No technical progress, no political structure can ever by itself impose or preserve a just peace, unless that peace is buttressed by an unshakable moral force. In these times of danger through which we are living, faith in the right idea is in fact the only real bastion which can effectively counter materialistic godless communism. Through commitment to that idea, Moral Re-Armament is making a practical and priceless contribution to the survival of our Western civilization."—Robert Schuman, former Prime Minister of France.

"At this hour when the very foundations of our free society are being threatened, MRA gives to those who fight a strong backbone and a clear vision of the future. We are creating this year an MRA Asian Centre in Japan where the statesmen from East and West can meet and develop a strategy to save our continents. We shall produce in our nations a society which will make the Communist society look outmoded and reactionary. And we challenge Europe and America to do the same."—Nobusuke Kishi, former Prime Minister of Japan.

"I invite the leaders and people of Africa to give priority to the Moral Re-Armament of our nations. Moral Re-Armament is the ideology of freedom. It is the ideology which Africa needs today."—William Tubman, President of Liberia.

"Material rearmament alone has been proved a failure. Moral Re-Armament remains the essential. My desire is that your message, which is founded upon the essential moral values and the will of God, reaches the masses of this country."—Mohammed V, late King of Morocco.

"A hundred Indians who take orders from God and cease worshipping, flattering and pleasing men, whoever they may be, will produce a mighty national renaissance. A hundred Indians who are absolutely honest about their lives and ready to trust God and risk their jobs, position and popularity will bring the nation back on the right road."—Rajmohan Gandhi, grandson of Mahatma Gandhi.

"To all Latin Americans concerned about what to do for their countries I want to say that we must seriously plan practical steps now for bringing the answering ideology of Moral Re-Armament."—General Hugo Bethlem, former Brazilian Ambassador to Bolivia and Pakistan.

"I see in Moral Re-Armament a new affiliation open to every freeman in the democracies. We are going to win this ideological war with moral principles and clean hearts."—Dr. Alejandro Zorillo De San Martin, President of the Uruguayan Parliament.

"Moral Re-Armament is the ideology that can confront communism. This is the moment to go in force with this ideology to Latin America. As commander in chief I offer you all the aid possible so that Moral Re-Armament can reach its objectives in Peru."—Gen. Nicolas Lindley, Commanding General of the Peruvian Army.

"When you and I were young, there were moral fences on the road of life. We did not always keep to them. But we always knew when we crossed them. But today all the moral fences are down and look at the world. Your job is to build these fences anew."—Sir Richard Livingstone, former Vice Chancellor of Oxford University, speaking to Dr. Frank Buchman.

"The free world must give everything for Moral Re-Armament or it will lose everything to communism. It calls for a superhuman effort this year. We must outbid the Kremlin."—John McGovern, 29 years Socialist Member of Parliament.

"It is significant that at a time when Africa is saying to the white man, 'how soon can you leave?', seventeen African nations are saying to Moral Re-Armament and Dr. Frank Buchman, 'how soon can you come?' Freedom must come for the Africans, but without MRA there will be chaos."—Philip Vundla, elected spokesman of 600,000 Africans in Johannesburg.

"If reconciliation has come between nations that were enemies like France and Germany, could it not now happen between countries that for years have worked together? For that we need an ideology. We need the tidal wave of Moral Re-Armament to sweep across the world. In Caux I have found hope."—Gen. Marcel Carpentier, Commander Allied Land Forces (NATO), Central Europe 1953-56.

Elimination of Residual Oil Import Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely and truthful statement issued by the Oil Users Association on the unpopular and unfair system of residual oil import controls. This program places a direct hardship—financially and otherwise—on the industries, large apartment houses, and buildings, and all of our institutions in the New England States. It is sincerely hoped that this administration will eliminate for all time this oil import quota system before the adjournment of this Congress.

The statement follows:

Under the Government system of residual oil import controls, holders of quota tickets are making 30 cents a barrel in windfall profits simply by owning these right-to-buy coupons. And this premium is being passed along to the perennial patsy—the long-suffering U.S. consumer.

This charge was made today by Gen. E. A. Evans, managing director of the Oil Users Association, in a statement challenging coal industry requests for a continuation of import controls.

"Where petroleum is the principal energy source," Evans said, "the price of petroleum products is a vital factor in the level of industrial activity and the level of employment.

"Coal cannot be substituted for oil in many industries. The result of import controls on oil is to increase prices and create hardships for oil users. The very existence of controls destroys normal market flexibility between buyer and seller and results in premium values on oil that comes in under quota—as well as on the quota import tickets. By profiteering on tickets, large sums of money are being made without actual possession of the hard-to-get oil."

Evans declared the residual oil import controls have not—and will not—put a single coal workers back into the mines.

"It is cruel, indeed," commented Evans, "to continue making false promises to coworkers that import controls will give them back their jobs when, in fact, oil imports have nothing to do with coal employment.

"Mechanization, and conversion of the railroads from coal to diesel, are the chief causes of unemployment in the coal industry. The oil quotas simply aggravate this problem by creating unemployment and depressed areas in New England and other parts of the eastern seaboard."

Cadillac for Every Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Eastern Indiana Farmer, August 8, 1961:

CADILLAC FOR EVERY FARM

Every time opponents of the Kennedy administration's farm program use William T. Smith's Cadillac to bolster their argument, this gives a sledge-hammer blow to a wedge between city dwellers and farmers. It accomplishes little else.

William T. Smith, you remember, bought a $6,100 automobile with his advance feed grains program payment and put a sign on the car.

"Thank you J.F.K." the sign read. "Thank you Orville. Thank you, if you voted for them. We didn't. We bought this car with money we received for not growing corn."

The Smith story reminds us of a farmer we know in Iowa. As a young man he married money as well as farmland. He started a seed corn business, also.

One year this Iowa farmer, Bart, we will call him, bought 60 acres of bottom land. A creek swamped the land so regularly that it sold for $75 an acre.

Then surveyors, drilling to find a suitable spot on which to build a telephone-television relay tower, discovered limestone under Bart's $75 an acre farmland. The stone was only 10 to 20 feet below topsoil.

A huge, international building materials company leased the property and within 2 years, hundreds of gravel trucks and railroad cars carried away crushed rock each month.

Bart's royalties were 5 cents a ton and gave him $30,000 to $50,000 each year.

Bart invested this money in other farms. For example, he bought another 40 acres of creek bottom land, heavily timbered, for $100 an acre. He cut the timber and put the land in continuous corn.

Bart boasted that he sold the black walnut logs from the timber for more than the 40 acres cost.

When Eisenhower was U.S. President, Bart stored his corn each fall. He built cribs and filled them. Then he would joke: "I'm going to keep on building cribs until the Democrats get back in."

Last month we visited Iowa and found Bart prosperous and contented. He said he had just received his first payment under the feed grains program.

"See, what did I tell you?" he said. "Kennedy was not in office more than 6 months until he wrote me a check for $3,000. He is taking care of me. That is more than Eisenhower did in 8 years."

Bart's friends know he is a wise man who understands his good fortune, though he enjoys giving good natured ribbings to his less fortunate farm friends. Bart would not pull the stunt pulled by the New York farmer who bought the Cadillac.

That administration opponents would use either of these two farmers, William T. or Bart, in attempting to discredit the administration's farm program is disappointing. Using the Cadillac farmer in place of factual arguments only takes dignity from the dissenting cause.

Administration partisans were happy to release these additional facts about William T. Smith. He does farm a 1,200-acre dairy and poultry farm near Big Flats, N.Y.

Kennedy defenders point out that Smith inherited this large farm, a consolidation of seven smaller farms.

Smith, they claim, is part owner of a bowling alley and of a housing corporation. He operates a restaurant and a dairy products business. For a time he manufactured plastic canoes on his farm.

All of these business activities are fine for William T. Smith, since he has capital, 1,200 acres of debt-free farmland, and can afford sufficient hired help.

That is a difference between William T. Smith and most American farmers—those for whom the feed grains program was enacted.

Congressman Ed Dooley Speaks Out in His Usual Forthright Manner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the able Representative from New York, EDWIN DOOLEY, has succeeded in exploding a most insidious myth. The charge has often been made that the recent action of the Committee on Rules with respect to the various bills on education has shielded many Members of Congress from having to take an unpopular position in open opposition to the general school aid measure. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As evidence of this fact, Congressman DOOLEY, last week released the entire text of the speech he had originally prepared for the floor debate on H.R. 7300. He was firm in his conviction that, given the facts, the vast majority of his constituents in Westchester County, N.Y., would understand the reasons underlying his opposition.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the editorial carried by all newspaper affiliates of the Westchester County Pubishers, Inc., an independent newspaper chain, on the day that Mr. DOOLEY's speech was reprinted. The following is entitled "Westchester and the School Aid Bill," as it appeared in the Reporter-Dispatch, White Plains, N.Y., Friday, August 4, 1961:

WESTCHESTER AND THE SCHOOL AID BILL

Hard facts can become like scalpels when used to slash through the emotionalism which fleshes the skeleton of our educational system and covers organic disorders which enfeeble that system.

Rarely are such facts compiled, organized, and courageously expounded to form an honest appraisal and to establish a sound opposition to illogical "aid" programs.

But Congressman EDWIN B. DOOLEY, of Westchester, in a speech prepared in opposition to the Federal-aid-to-education bill being pushed by the Kennedy administration, does just that—he lays the bill bare for what it is, and educational delusion and an economic snare, a "pork barrel" measure loaded with glaring inequities.

Mr. DOOLEY says, for instance: "For every $1 of Federal tax paid by Westchester residents in support of this bill (the School Assistance Act of 1961), only 27 cents would be returned as assistance to public school districts in this county."

The annual tax cost of the bill to Westchester residents would be $6,215,000. That would be more than the annual cost to each of 21 whole States and more than the total cost to 5 States, North and South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, and Alaska.

New York State, which needs 10,200 classrooms, would get an allocation of $44,748,000; Indiana, which has more classrooms than it needs, nonetheless would get more than $65 million.

Only 237 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts have borrowed up to their statutory debt limits.

Mr. DOOLEY argues that high income States which are going to pay most of the costs and receive the smallest allocations of "aid" are the actual areas where the greatest increases in school enrollment have taken place; that the actual amount of aid is distorted in the public mind, its size amounting nationally to only about 4 percent of what the States and localities themselves would spend during the same period, even if they did not increase their own efforts by a penny. The proposed aid would represent only about 2½ percent of New York State's and just over 1 percent of Westchester's normal expenditures.

Mr. DOOLEY makes sense with two additional points:

Westchester would be better off if New York and 35 other States were excluded entirely from the "benefits" of this Federal program. "The discrimination against New York," he says, "then could well be justified in terms of national needs, for we would then be attempting to raise the level of educational opportunity for the children of those States, which, because of their lack of wealth, are unable to do so entirely on their own."

The national average of public support per school pupil is estimated at $390. In Westchester it amounts to $750. The bill would allocate to New York State the minimum of $12 per school-age child of which Westchester's share, Mr. DOOLEY says, would come to no more than $8 and perhaps less.

On the basis of all this, Mr. DOOLEY concludes: "This bill aims at no national emergency, provides no specific remedies, and makes no attempt to define particular needs." So he will vote against it, in its present terms.

The Congressman, of course, must be aware that his stand won't even command respect for its frankness and courage, much less for its logic, from those who aren't concerned with equities or practicalities.

From them, he must know, he can expect only a storm of intemperately abusive pressure—pressure to ignore justice for his taxpaying constituents and even to violate his own conscience in this matter. For it seems to be the hallmark of "liberal" thinking that it has neither patience nor understanding for the views of others.

So it would only be right and fair if those who agree with Mr. DOOLEY were to take the trouble to tell him so.

When Did Outer Mongolia Cast Off Its Red Shackles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, what possible benefits to us from recognition of Outer Mongolia?

[From the Saturday Evening Post, August 12, 1961]

WHEN DID OUTER MONGOLIA CAST OFF ITS RED SHACKLES?

For some reason the State Department appeared surprised because Chiang Kai-shek was said to be "upset" by reports that Washington was about to recognize Communist-satellite Outer Mongolia as an independent republic worthy of a seat in the United Nations. Ambassador Everett Drumright was called back to Washington from Formosa, presumably to be given instructions on how to explain to the generalissimo that our trafficking with Outer Mongolia was just a little shenanigan between the United States and the U.S.S.R. which needn't mean anything to Formosa.

But what in the world is the point of giving non-Communist Asia even 5 minutes of the shakes to revive this often-exploded notion that Outer Mongolia is independent? If President Kennedy or Dean Rusk or whoever is responsible for this bizarre idea would brush off the published hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations—before Senator Patrick A. McCarran's subcommittee in 1952—the ancestry of this hoary heresy would expose its shabbiness. On page 4522 et seq. of the aforementioned hearings is the testimony of William C. Bullitt, our first Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Mr. Bullitt testified that Owen Lattimore, an expert on the Mongolian question, came to him in Moscow early in 1936 on the way from a visit to Outer Mongolia. Lattimore, according to Bullitt's testimony, urged Bullitt to recommend to President Roosevelt that Outer Mongolia be recognized as a "fully independent" republic.

"I asked him," said Mr. Bullitt, "if there was no Soviet control of the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia. * * * And he replied there was no Soviet control whatsoever. * * * I asked him if the GPU, which at that time was the title of the Soviet secret

police, had no control there, and he said they did not, that the Mongolian People's Republic was independent and that his advice, which he urged me to telegraph at once to President Roosevelt, was that the American Government should immediately recognize the independence of the Mongolian People's Republic."

All this came as quite a shock to Mr. Bullitt because only a month earlier he had had a revealing conversation with an old acquaintance of his, an assistant commissar named Karakhan, who had been quite active in Outer Mongolia on behalf of the Soviet foreign office. Karakhan, according to his own statement, was sent to Outer Mongolia in 1934 to "finish off any signs of restiveness under Soviet control." On his return to Moscow Karakhan called on Bullitt at the U.S. Embassy.

"I said to him that I had heard he had been out there to finish off the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia, or rather any signs of independence in it, and he said that indeed he had, but it was a very small affair." Explained Karakhan, "After all, in a country of nomads there are only 300 or 400 people that count, and all I did on a given night was to have about 400 people seized by the GPU agents in the army and police force, and I had them shot before dawn and installed the people that the Soviet Government wished to have installed."

It seemed incredible that a Soviet official would be so frank with a foreigner, but Mr. Bullitt assured the committee that he had known Karakhan since 1919 and that they were, as the phrase is, "just like that."

Mr. Bullitt also knew, before the arrival of Lattimore in Moscow, that the U.S.S.R. had signed a protocol of mutual assistance with Outer Mongolia and that the Chinese had made "the strongest kind of a protest" against the infringement of the sovereignty of China. "I was obliged to conclude," said Mr. Bullitt, "that either Mr. Lattimore knew nothing about the subject on which he was supposed to be the leading American expert or that he was deliberately attempting to assist in the spread of Communist authority through Asia. I left the matter * * * with a question mark in my mind."

Recently Mr. Lattimore visited Outer Mongolia again, and this time his pet project, which has been turned down repeatedly, seems about to be accepted. Why? If Outer Mongolia is any less a Soviet satellite than it was in 1936, evidence is lacking. Isn't this where we came in?

Where Are We Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the problems which face our country and every individual citizen are increasing daily. The manner in which we, as individuals, recognize and formulate our position toward their solution will determine the place our country will hold in the world today and in the future.

An editorial which appeared in the April 20 issue of the Downers Grove Reporter points up some of these vexing problems. We must all joint together in our firm determination and share the responsibilities of maintaining the strength and respect our Nation enjoys. The editorial is as timely now as it was in April and I commend it for your reading.

The editorial follows:

POSITIVE GOALS

We heard a speaker the other day who, more than any other we have heard or read, stated the problem and the solution to the greatest threat facing us today.

In the fight against communism, said this man, it is not enough merely to be "against" this ideology * * * we must be "for" something as well.

Many Americans, almost all of us are "against" communism; but, when it comes to a critical, individual analysis too many of us as individuals and groups either are not "for" anything or are not sure just what we do stand for.

The dedicated Communist, whether he be white, yellow, or black, has no doubt what he stands for * * * he can articulately state the aims, purposes, tenets, and premises of the philosophy he believes.

Most important of all, the Communist is willing to make any sacrifice including life itself to advance his cause.

Against this single-minded, dedicated group our much vaunted free Western civilization has reeled back both physically and spiritually in confusion and, in some cases, outright terror in the past 16 years.

What are we "for" * * * what do you stand for, what do I stand for, and what do Americans stand for?

This is a question which must be answered and answered positively if we are to escape defeat.

In our cherished belief in the right of a man to say what he thinks, in our zealously guarded national sympathy for the underdog, whoever or whatever he may be, and in our defense of minority groups within our own country, too many of us have lost sight of some basic fundamentals.

In our enthusiasm some of us carry the defense of the right of free speech to the point where we are protecting, encouraging and promoting the aim of those within our midst who would destroy the philosophy which protects them and ourselves at the first opportunity.

From recent news stories it would appear that some ultra-conservative groups are as great a threat to our liberties and as devisive an influence as the ultraliberals and outright Communists.

Many of us know what we are against. We are against bigotry, prejudice, tyranny, big government, bores and loud-mouths.

Also * * * in our revolt against the strict morality of the early 1900's we have become cynical to the point of fetishism. Too many of us tend to sneer at patriotism, terming it chauvinistic.

Too many of us tend to sneer at anyone who publicly professes a strong belief in anything * * * some of these people we call "bores, loudmouths and worse."

Listed among the seven reasons in a recent daily newspaper why the morale of the U.S. Communist Party remains at a high pitch despite an actual dwindling of strength during the past 20 years is:

"They are convinced that our system, by stressing grays rather than blacks and whites, will turn out students marked by 'uncertainty, vacillations, aimlessness, indecision, and chronic lack of deep convictions' that will make them incapable of the self-discipline and self-sacrifice necessary in global competition between our two systems."

Think it over carefully and decide whether there is or is not an uncomfortably large measure of truth in that statement.

The armed services attempt to teach elemental, straightforward simple patriotism to recruits in the ranks * * * to many recruits who have no desire to serve their country in the first place, feel no personal responsibility or duty in the second place and, if given the opportunity, would use any kind of means, clout, pull or what have you to avoid being where they are in the third place.

What the youth of this country believes in, if it believes in anything, is but a reflection of what the parents of our youth believe . . . if anything.

We will state here and now without much fear of contradiction that the mothers of well more than half of the draftees serving in our Armed Forces have raised their sons to believe that anything is better than having to serve in the Armed Forces.

Fathers pull strings, or attempt to and mothers say: "Let someone else do the dirty work, but not my son."

We are a peace-loving people . . . too many of us are so peace loving that we believe in peace at any price.

We watch the disarmament talks and atom bomb ban talks with hopeful eyes, through rose colored glasses . . . forgetting that never in the history of civilization has disarmament prevented or even delayed a war . . . and conveniently ignoring the absolute, incontrovertible fact that the other "side" by their own statements and actions does not, has not, and never will intend to disarm a single solitary soldier until it has won total victory.

We are a high-minded, materialistic, sentimental, peace-loving people.

We are experiencing what some hopefully call a spiritual rebirth . . . more of us are becoming Christians than ever before; but, we strongly suspect it is a form of pacifistic Christianity when it should be a militant Christianity.

Christianity and communism are totally incompatible . . . Communists recognize this, many Christians apparently do not, or prefer not to.

Mighty Rome and opulent Carthage in the final years before their inevitable fall were unaware of their approaching doom and tragically mistook moral decay for "modern, enlightened culture and philosophy," while continuing to do "business as usual," and pursue "pleasure as usual."

Mighty and opulent America is exhibiting trends which are all too alarmingly similar.

And so, just what do we believe * * * just what are we for?

It is time for decisions on a national as well as on a local level. Decisions which must be made by each and every one of us and soon, before there is no time left for decisions.

Are we for peace at any price, disarmament at any sacrifice, a higher standard of living and lower taxes at the ultimate expense of our freedom?

Are we for conformity, security, and ourselves regardless of others, are we for freedom of speech and action to the point of encouraging treason?

Or are we going to do it the hard way and be for self-sacrifice, self-discipline, courage, and plain, ordinary, simple, patriotic loyalty?

Do we or do we not believe in our Nation's traditions, aims, and purposes to the point where each of us is willing to lay his or her life on the line to defend them if necessary?

We have come a long way—downward—as individuals and as a nation from "Teddy" Roosevelt's philosophy of meeting life and its problems headon, of enjoying the struggle and, by our very efforts, winning the fight.

A great American once said, "Give me liberty or give me death," another said, "My country right or wrong."

Some of us today say, "Give me peace, I will accept anything, any indignity, any sacrifice to gain that goal."

Others say, "I will decide for myself if my country is right or wrong, and if I think it is wrong I will not lift a finger to save it."

The rest of us sit back and hope that the first bomb will fall on us so that we will not have to make decisions, or face the reality of fighting, surviving, and winning.

We can yet save ourselves—if we have the courage and willpower to do so.

If we do not have that courage and will power, this flame of liberty born in 1776, burning for such a short time in the span of history and now flickering, will be snuffed out just as surely and inevitably as every mighty, opulent—and decayed—civilization has been snuffed out before it by a more determined, more dedicated foe.

The Community College Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include one of the many thought-stimulating broadcasts in the public interest delivered over station WBZ, radio and television station in Boston, by Paul G. O'Friel and James E. Allen, on the subject of further educational opportunities afforded to our students in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAM

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

In this highly technical age, a college education is becoming ever more important for young people.

Despite this fact, many high school students have found almost insurmountable barriers in the path to higher education. First of all, there's a fierce scramble for the number of college places available. Secondly, sending a youngster away to college is too much of a financial strain for many families.

The Massachusetts Regional Community College program has been set up to help remove these barriers. It's opening up new berths for students in the first and second years of college. And it's bringing education closer to home, so costs can be kept to minimum for both the students and the State.

The program was started a year ago in Pittsfield, with 150 students. This year there'll be three other community colleges operating—in Boston, Haverhill, and Hyannis. Two more colleges will be opened in 1962 and eventually nine are planned across the State.

For the coming fall term there will be places for roughly 1,000 students. And there are still vacancies at all four colleges. At Pittsfield, Hyannis, and Haverhill, the number of open berths is fairly small, between 15 and 30. But here in Boston there are at least 75 places to be filled. If work on the college building moves rapidly enough, the number may be as high as 275.

There was a problem finding a location for the Community College in Boston last Spring. The final decision for use of a former Boston University building in the Back Bay was not made until after schools closed in June. Thus, interviews for admissions got off to a late start.

The junior college curriculum has two basic purposes.

One is to prepare students in liberal arts and sciences for transfer to 4-year colleges. A few of the first-year students in Pittsfield have already made this jump; others are scheduled to go in February.

The second part of the program—and it's equally important—is to train students for more advanced positions in business and industry, than they could qualify for as high school graduates. In an era when Massachusetts' industrial future depends on the quality of its manpower, this type of training is vital to the State's economy as well as the welfare of its young people.

The community colleges alone cannot solve the State's higher educational problems. The regular State colleges and the University of Massachusetts will also need additional resources in the critical period ahead. But this new junior college program is designed to fill a definite, almost desperate need. Every effort must be made to assure its success.

Lindsay Awaits Rusk's Reply—Delay Is Cited in Answering Criticism of Robert Kennedy-Menshikov Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Republican Members, I have a high regard for the competence of the Secretary of State. This stems in part from the opportunity I had to serve with Mr. Dean Rusk for a time during World War II. Lately, a justified concern has arisen about the State Department's control over the conduct of American foreign policy in the Kennedy administration. This concern is highlighted by the following Doris Fleeson article from the Washington Star of August 9. Representative LINDSAY's letter deserves a prompt and complete reply:

LINDSAY AWAITS RUSK'S REPLY—DELAY IS CITED IN ANSWERING CRITICISM OF ROBERT KENNEDY-MENSHIKOV MEETING

(By Doris Fleeson)

When a Member of Congress does not receive a reply to a letter he has written a member of the President's Cabinet it is news, for Congress controls the purse strings.

It is especially noteworthy when this occurs in the Kennedy administration, which is justly renowned for its personal courtesy to Senators and Representatives. The noteworthiness increases when the letter is written by a liberal internationalist who is also a Republican.

Few Democrats receive from their President and his aids the tender loving care accorded such Republicans, who are all too few for Kennedy purposes in this session of Congress. They are particularly treasured in the House where the Kennedy Waterloos most frequently take place.

Still it is possible that Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York City's silk stocking district, was not too surprised when Secretary of State Rusk failed to answer his letter of July 27 last, though a reply was requested before the Secretary left the country.

The letter follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First I should like to congratulate you for the splendid off-the-record presentation that you gave to the Senate-House foreign policy group at luncheon last week. As I wrote you when you first took office, I was delighted with your appointment and I have no cause for regret over my vote of confidence. I increasingly like your brand of quiet diplomacy.

"Therefore, I was all the more disturbed when I read yesterday, in a column by Joseph Alsop, of a meeting, apparently supported by the President, between the Attorney General, unaccompanied by anyone else, and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Menshikov. According to the Alsop report, Berlin and related matters of the greatest sensitivity, possibly affecting the safety of the entire world, were discussed, the Attorney General reportedly authorized to speak for the President.

"If the report is correct, I am deeply disturbed about this turn of events.

"First, it bypasses your office and your Department, and in so doing runs great risks.

"Second, it appears to be part of a growing pattern—namely, the conduct of foreign relations in a casual or loose-reined ad hoc manner, too often involving personalities untrained in foreign policy and the art of diplomacy.

"Third, it makes it difficult for those of us who have a responsibility to our constituents and to the country to make sound evaluations which should lead to bipartisan support on foreign policy.

"I should be pleased if you would advise me whether the meeting occurred as reported. If so, I would like to know the circumstances surrounding it and your frank opinion as to whether this is a proper way in which to conduct foreign policy in general or to negotiate on the explosive question of Berlin.

"Respectfully yours,

"JOHN V. LINDSAY,
"Member of Congress."

The Attorney General is, of course, the President's brother, Robert.

Canada Having Trouble With Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report should be of interest to those, in this country, who point to Canada's experiment with socialized medicine as an argument to set up a similar system in the United States:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE: UNDER FIRE IN CANADA

REGINA, SASK.—The Canadian Province of Saskatchewan is having second thoughts about its ambitious plan for socialized medicine.

Times are hard in Saskatchewan. Drought on the prairies has reduced tax revenues and raised the cost of welfare payments. Officials can't quite see where the money is to come from.

Local doctors, meanwhile, have come up with a scheme which they say would be much less costly than the Government's plan.

The college of physicians and surgeons suggests that the Government subsidize the

voluntary medical-care programs already in existence. The 40 percent of the population which is not presently covered could be brought in, the doctors say, at a cost of $3.5 million yearly. In contrast, the plan for socialized medicine would cost an estimated $20 to $25 million per year.

Saskatchewan doctors have campaigned against socialized medicine from the start. Now, hard times are winning converts to their side.

We Will, If We Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely editorial which appeared in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes on August 10, 1961:

WE WILL, IF WE MUST

Veterans throughout the Nation are generally in accord with the statements uttered by President John F. Kennedy on July 25 when he served warning to the Soviet Premier that, while this Nation is desirous of peace, it will fight for its rightful and legitimate objectives.

Americans have finally come to the realization that Communists recognize only superior forces. It is the one deterrent to further acts of aggression on the part of Premier Khrushchev.

In moving to "beef" up the numerical strength of our Armed Forces President Kennedy has served warning that this Nation will not again be caught unprepared for any acts of aggression on the part of the Soviet dictator. In too many instances this country has been lulled into a false sense of security and then has paid the price in men and money to rearm and fight off its enemies.

It is gratifying to note that the Congress has accepted the President's recommendations for increasing the might of America. There has been swift and speedy action on Capitol Hill to comply with all that the President has asked.

With increased draft calls and a considerable number of reserve components readied for action, there are bound to be some dislocations in our pattern of living. As yet the President has not called upon the Nation to undergo substantial sacrifices. If the situation worsens that call will be made and as loyal Americans we will all do the things which are asked of us.

The time has come when we must resolve that we will never retreat again from the Communist menace. We must strengthen our position at home and with our allies so that Russia will know we mean what we say. It is to be hoped that the action taken by the President will not serve to lull our allies into a complacent mood with the feeling that the United States, as it has done so many times in the past, will carry the ball. This is a time of mutual endeavor so that we can honor all of our commitments, promises, and pledges.

Once again the United States is faced with a predicament of not wanting to fight, but we have the high resolve to fight if we must to maintain our honor and agreements with other countries.

Potential aggressors might do well to look back into history before goading this Nation into war. Were they able, Kaiser Wilhelm and Adolf Hitler could bear eloquent testimony to the strength and might of an aroused America. We don't want to fight but we will if we must.

Lindsay Awaits Rusk's Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and hard-working colleague the gentleman from New York Congressman LINDSAY, has identified, in a recent letter to the Secretary of State, a most remarkable development in the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Nation—a development which, I am sure, has caused Secretary Rusk as much concern as it has caused Congressman LINDSAY and other thoughtful Members of Congress.

Although I can readily appreciate the difficulties which the Secretary is experiencing in framing a responsive reply to Congressman LINDSAY's letter, the situation is one of grave import which demands an explanation.

Doris Fleeson in her column which appeared in the Washington Star of August 9, 1961, points up the matter in her usual crisp fashion:

LINDSAY AWAITS RUSK'S REPLY—DELAY IS CITED IN ANSWERING CRITICISM OF ROBERT KENNEDY-MENSHIKOV MEETING

(By Doris Fleeson)

When a Member of Congress does not receive a reply to a letter he has written a member of the President's Cabinet it is news, for Congress controls the purse strings.

It is especially noteworthy when this occurs in the Kennedy administration, which is justly renowned for its personal courtesy to Senators and Representatives. The noteworthiness increases when the letter is written by a liberal internationalist who is also a Republican.

Few Democrats receive from their President and his aids the tender loving care accorded such Republicans, who are all too few for Kennedy purposes in this session of Congress. They are particularly treasured in the House where the Kennedy Waterloos most frequently take place.

Still it is possible that Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York City's silk stocking district, was not too surprised when Secretary of State Rusk failed to answer his letter of July 27 last though a reply was requested before the Secretary left the country.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: First I should like to congratulate you for the splendid off-the-record presentation that you gave to the Senate-House foreign policy group at luncheon last week. As I wrote you when you first took office, I was delighted with your appointment and I have no cause for regret over my vote of confidence. I increasingly like your brand of 'quiet diplomacy.'

"Therefore, I was all the more disturbed when I read yesterday, in a column by Joseph Alsop, of a meeting, apparently supported by the President, between the Attorney General, unaccompanied by anyone else, and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Menshikov. According to the Alsop report, Berlin and related matters of the greatest sensitivity, possibly affecting the safety of the entire world, were discussed, the Attorney General reportedly authorized to speak for the President.

"If the report is correct, I am deeply disturbed about this turn of events.

"First, it bypasses your office and your Department, and in so doing runs great risks.

"Second, it appears to be part of a growing pattern—namely, the conduct of foreign relations in a casual or loose-reined ad hoc manner, too often involving personalities untrained in foreign policy and the art of diplomacy.

"Third, it makes it difficult for those of us who have a responsibility to our constituents and to the country to make sound evaluations which should lead to bipartisan support on foreign policy.

"I should be pleased if you would advise me whether the meeting occurred as reported. If so, I would like to know the circumstances surrounding it and your frank opinion as to whether this is a proper way in which to conduct foreign policy in general or to negotiate on the explosive question of Berlin.

"Respectfully yours,
"JOHN V. LINDSAY,
"*Member of Congress.*"

The Attorney General is, of course, the President's brother, Robert.

Red Industry Bluff Should Be Called

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, for years we have been hearing about Soviet superiority in all fields. Too long we have accepted Communist claims at face value, ignoring the facts hidden behind them.

This revealing and accurate report by the well-known labor writer, Victor Riesel, should be must reading for everyone. Therefore, I would like to insert "Red Industry Bluff Should Be Called," by Victor Riesel, in the RECORD:

(By Victor Riesel)

PARIS.—After days of poring over confidential reports out of Moscow, there is only one conclusion. The Russians have developed a brand of poker as sensational as Russian roulette. They play this international poker with steel nerves. They always stand pat on a four flush, always bluff, and seemingly always win. They're desperate inside but play every outside hand out of strength they just don't have. And it's time to call a few hands—and then there'll be peace.

There have, for example, been a series of strikes—because so many skilled workers are so ill housed, ill fed, ill clothed, and fatigued from overwork, they just don't worry about the new firing squad laws, or the "antisocial element" law. Under this statute, Communist Party officials call a block (street or neighborhood) meeting, charge the dissident or striker with being socially undesirable, and exile him to Siberia or to a distance of not less than 60 miles from his home.

Nonetheless, there have been big strikes at Siberian hydroelectric plants, longshoremen stoppages on the Odessa docks, constant slowdowns in coal and uranium mines, circulation of protests in East German steel

mills and truly herculean sabotage in Hungarian plants and collective farms.

Chairman of the Board N. S. Khrushchev himself is disturbed by the unrest and the possibility of new strikes such as shook East Berlin and Posnan some years ago. Reports to the intelligence services of most Western nations indicate that he has beefed up his secret police. This police force is not yet the GPU of old Stalin, but its files on dissenters are being beefed up along with it.

The purges are coming, make no mistake about that. Why? Because Soviet industry does not move nearly as swiftly as Khrushchev's tongue or unsheathed shoes.

Pick any industry except the spaceship business, be it chemicals or milk, including goats. By our standards, they're 25 years behind the times. Look at the railroads. They are the guts of the Soviet economy, because virtually everything inside Russia moves on trains, when they move.

Pity it is that no one bothers to tell our people about the creaky Russian transport system which would fall apart during the strain of a war, even a brushfire war. And all the time our folks think the Soviets are 9 feet tall. A report reveals that we have 220,000 miles of rails to the Soviet's 75,000—and they have twice the distance to cover.

Furthermore, the Red railroads are predominantly single track with virtually no mechanization except around the big cities. No one has yet seen a pushbutton, automated freight yard inside Russia.

And though practically everything the Russians need to transport moves on rails, the report I have just read states that the Kremlin does not seem to have even a single steel boxcar.

Here, then, you have the pattern for the high button shoes condition of the Soviet economy. The experts say that Russia's rail system, which is one-third the size of ours, requires 10 times as many employees per route mile as ours does.

Now multiply the railroad story by 50 other industries. You get a picture of a Potemkin economy—all false front, like a movie set. Millions of workers are tied to their jobs at subsistence wages—and sometimes not even that. That's why there's unrest, strikes, slowdowns. That's why N. S. Khrushchev is using the old hard sell technique to bluff us—we the people who invented Madison Avenue.

We don't have to fight him. Let's just call his bluff once. Then he'd have to show his fourflush. Russians don't go away mad. They are realists. They'd stop bluffing. Then we could really talk about everlasting peace.

A Distinct Public Service Performed by WIP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Eichmann trial draws to a close following many weeks of almost unbelievable testimony, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to the distinctive public service performed by an independent radio station in Philadelphia—WIP—which has been rebroadcasting the complete trial with concurrent English translation every night on its FM facility.

I do not know whether any other radio stations in the Nation, or anywhere in the world outside of Israel, for that matter, have carried this entire historic proceeding. Mr. Harry Glascock, vice president and general manager of WIP, is to be congratulated, along with his entire staff, for their initiative and resourcefulness as well as spirit of public service in carrying the details of the trial of the hideous exterminator of millions of people during World War II.

WIP engaged an Israeli electronic engineer and shipped him hundreds of reels of recording tape as well as recording equipment in order to have every word of the trial on tape for rebroadcast in Philadelphia. This is in keeping with the station's tradition of broadcasting in full every session of the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, and the President's news conferences.

Normally I would hesitate to single out a single station among the many good ones in Philadelphia for a tribute of this nature, but the circumstances are such in connection with the Eichmann trial that I feel justified in doing so.

Discrimination Under Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette, entitled "Television Decision Is Blow to Packers."

The editorial clearly outlines the background and implications of a recent Federal court decision which held that the package television contract between the National Football League and the Columbia Broadcasting System violates the terms of a judgment under the antitrust laws handed down by the court in 1953.

The court decision again highlights the chaotic condition of the Federal antitrust treatment of team sports. For example, baseball has been held to be exempt from the antitrust laws, while football is subject to their restrictions. This latest decision, for another example, throws out a contract for one league while another league operated under a similar contact last year without challenge.

All evidence points to the need for special treatment of team sports under the antitrust laws since, in this field, the unbridled competition which the antitrust laws seek to foster leads straight to monopoly and economic destruction of the weaker teams, as the editorial points out. The courts have invited congressional action to solve the contradictions and chaos inherent in the present situation.

I know this problem is of deep concern to members of the House Judiciary Committee. That committee has worked valiantly in the past in an effort to prevent the destruction of such team sports as football. I am hopeful that action can be taken in this session of Congress to correct, at least, the harmful effect of the recent court decision on football's television contracts.

The editorial follows:

TELEVISION DECISION IS BLOW TO PACKERS

The decision of a Federal judge that the package television contract between the National Football League and CBS is in violation of Federal antitrust laws and is invalid holds serious consequences for the Green Bay Packers.

Last year the Packers received revenues of about $120,000 for television broadcasting of their games. Under the new package contract this year they would have received some $332,000.

Why the great difference? Under the new plan, CBS would get exclusive rights to broadcast all NFL games, and this is obviously more valuable to the network than individual contracts with some of the teams. Also, under the new plan, television revenues would have been spread equally among all NFL teams.

The Packers have always been at a disadvantage in negotiating individually for television rights since their broadcasts cover a much smaller market area than the large metropolitan cities in the league. And now that Minneapolis is in the league their coverage area has been further restricted.

The NFL felt it could legally enter into a package contract with CBS since the American Football League operated under such a contract last year without challenge from the Government.

However, the NFL is in a somewhat different position in this matter as compared with other professional sports organizations. The Federal Government sued the league for violation of the antitrust laws in its television and radio practices some years ago. As a result, a Federal court handed down a judgment in 1953 imposing certain restrictions on these practices.

When the new television contract was concluded this year the league went back to Judge Allan K. Grim in Philadelphia and asked him whether the new contract was legal under his judgment. The Justice Department objected, claiming the new contract was in violation of the 1953 decision. And now Judge Grim has so ruled.

Judge Grim based his decision on the argument that under the league contract individual NFL clubs eliminated competition among themselves in the sale of their television rights. Actually this is what the league and the clubs were trying to do, since they know that if this isn't done, some clubs will prosper greatly from television and others, like the packers, will suffer greatly financially. This could lead eventually to elimination of the smaller cities from the league.

Competition is usually regarded as a healthy thing in our free enterprise economic system, but there are situations where unbridled competition can lead to monopoly and this seems to be one of them. In the meantime it is difficult for the average football fan to understand why the Federal Government prevents one professional league from packaging its telecasts and allows the other major league to do so.

Since the Federal judiciary and the Justice Department seem to approve of this discrimination, the remedy for the NFL appears to be some positive legislation by Congress guaranteeing equal rights to both professional football leagues.

Resolution by Pennsylvania State Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on July 31, 1961. The resolution urges the issuances of special commemorative postage stamps on the 100th anniversaries of the Altoona conference, the Battle of Gettysburg, the Gettysburg Address, and the burning of Chambersburg, and for a special commemorative postage stamp showing the Pennsylvania memorial at Gettysburg on the 50th anniversary of the final day of the great reunion when Union and Confedereate veterans agreed that friendship and goodwill have been completely restored between them.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the leading part taken by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania among the Northern States of the United States in efforts to maintain and defend the Union against secession and disruption during the Civil War will induce many Pennsylvanians as well as citizens of other States to visit the historic places of Pennsylvania associated with that great conflict during the present centennial period; and

Whereas this same interest will lead them to seek significant mementoes reminiscent of these historic places and of the great events which occurred there, and especially commemorative postage stamps, which are among the most valued and treasured mementoes of historic events; and

Whereas the Altoona conference of September 24–26, 1862, was called by Gov. Andrew G. Curtin, of Pennsylvania, to bring together the Governors of the loyal Northern States in a firm expression of support for the Union cause; and

Whereas the Confederate invasion of 1863, which threatened Pennsylvania's rich farm areas and even her great industrial cities, might have brought defeat to the Union, but was halted at Gettysburg, Pa., in the decisive battle of the war on July 1–3, 1863; and

Whereas President Lincoln in his brief address at the dedication of the national cemetery at the battlefield of Gettysburg on November 19, 1863, gave classic and lasting expression to the principles of American democracy which men fought for in that battle and in that war; and

Whereas the people of the borough of Chambersburg in Franklin County showed the extent to which Pennsylvanians were prepared to go in support of the Union when they refused to pay a ransom of $100,000 to a Confederate army, and as a consequence saw their homes and places of business burned on July 30, 1864, at a total loss of more than $1,600,000; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1910 erected the largest monument on the battlefield at Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the soldiers from Pennsylvania in that great battle; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on July 1 to 4, 1913, was host to a great reunion of Union and Confederate veterans when the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Confederate Veterans met together in a hearty reunion of former foes which symbolized a united nation; and

Whereas these significant events and places in Pennsylvania associated with the great conflict to preserve the Union are all exceedingly worthy of commemoration by the issuance of special commemorative postage stamps: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States to introduce legislation or make representations to the Postmaster General of the United States for the issuance of special commemorative postage stamps on the hundredth anniversaries of the Altoona conference, the Battle of Gettysburg, the Gettysburg Address, and the burning of Chambersburg, and for a special commemorative postage stamp showing the Pennsylvania Memorial at Gettysburg on the 50th anniversary of the final day of the great reunion when Union and Confederate veterans agreed that friendship and good will have been completely restored between them.

Revolutions Without Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in these recent weeks of distressing tensions in our international community, I was highly pleased to reflect on and concur with an editorial entitled "Revolutions Without Violence," which appeared in the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal on Monday, August 7, 1961. While this particular editorial points primarily to President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress in Latin America, it also tends to demonstrate with clarity and intelligence the road by which a private citizen may approach consideration of our international relations and sharpens the focus on our modified concepts of foreign aid now being debated in the halls of Congress.

The editor states:

But the Alliance for Progress goes further. Its avowed aim is revolution—revolution without violence, revolution without Castros.

The editor continues:

Now the United States is going into business in competition with the Communists. Our slogans might include the words "established 1776"—"benefit by our longer experience"—or, "we do it without violence." Russia's slogan might claim to do it faster.

The merest acquaintance with the chronology of human events reveals that revolutions are as old as recorded history and as current as today's news bulletins. Familiarity with our own record will limit much of the difficulty in understanding current revolutions in the international community, for 1961 is still part of the age of revolution that was launched in 1776.

Our foreign assistance programs in Latin America, in the Far East, and in Africa are designed to catch the imagination of the great masses of humanity which now seek to experience the spark and spirit of our own American Revolution. It is this spirit which attracts their vision to the United States as struggling infant and under-developed nations seek to establish their own governments and societies which will foster, provide, and guard personal freedoms and opportunities.

One of the fundamentals a citizen must grasp is that every age has had its problems, its dangers, even its moments of desperation. Ignorance, disease, poverty, and hunger are as old as mankind; they will not be banished easily or swiftly. As patience recognizes that great and effective results will not be easy, persistence appreciates that even slow progress will grind to a standstill unless effort is vigorous and continuous.

I am pleased to include the entire editorial mentioned hereinbefore as part of my remarks:

REVOLUTIONS WITHOUT VIOLENCE

The Alliance for Progress in Latin America, which is now getting organized in a conference at the ministerial level in Uruguay, reflects the most promising and creative American thinking in foreign affairs since the Marshall plan and NATO. But its object is different.

The Marshall plan sought—and achieved—the recovery of free Europe. NATO achieved a defense organization which put limits on the further advance of communism in Europe. But the Alliance for Progress goes further. Its avowed aim is revolution—revolution without violence, revolution without Castros.

This aim is a bold challenge to Russia in an area of activity which Moscow claims as its very own. Actually, the Communists don't make revolutions: they infiltrate, pervert, and take over revolutions started by others. Nevertheless they have been, until now, the only firm advertising expert services to revolutionists the world over.

Now the United States is going into business in competition with the Communists. Our slogans might include the words "established 1776; benefit by our longer experience"; or "we do it without violence." Russia's slogan might claim to do it faster.

This is something we ought to be doing even if the Communists didn't exist. It is decent to help one's neighbors. It is to our national interests to have peaceful change in this hemisphere. The people are growing impatient for better living standards, land reform, political reforms, housing, education, and—when the groundwork has been laid—industrialization. Even the aristocratic classes in Latin America are beginning to understand that these things will come violently if they don't come peacefully.

The problem is whether the people will be too impatient to wait—whether they will call in the other firm which promises more speed. Time is running out, and the cold war hangs in the balance. We can lose the cold war in our own hemisphere.

In Uruguay the main problem is setting up the administrative machinery. Estimates are that it will be 18 months before the Alliance for Progress gets into high gear. The Marshall plan developed faster because Europe had more skilled leadership, more stable political setups, more trained technicians and managers, and highly developed industry in being.

Two of the big problems in Latin America are taxes (far too low, and too easily evaded by the wealthy) and population growth (the highest in the world) which threatens to wipe out all gains while furnishing more fodder for violence. These are just two difficulties of the many the cooperative effort will face.

Yet our method is really faster. The energies expended in violence—as in Cuba, which has sent Che Guevara to Uruguay to sell the Communist product—are not available for peaceful construction. Trying to go too fast makes for great waste. Only the Alliance for Progress can hope to build from the ground up with no lost motion.

America Is a Great Battlefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by the Honorable Mark Lane, Democratic Assemblyman from the 10th Assembly District of New York County. Assemblyman Lane delivered this speech on July 31, 1961, in accepting an award of the Washington Temple, in Brooklyn, N.Y. His stirring words remind all of us that civil rights is the great unfinished business of Congress:

REMARKS BY MARK LANE IN ACCEPTING AWARD OF WASHINGTON TEMPLE, BROOKLYN, N.Y., AS FREEDOM FIGHTER

America today is a great battlefield. The soldiers carry no weapons save their own courage and their determination to be free. They carry but one shield against terror and stones and bombs and arsonists and invitations to riot issued by men in high places including Governors and Senators and State legislators. That shield is the knowledge that they are right and the conviction that they will suffer, if need be die, but they shall not turn back.

Who are these warriors, unafraid? Who are these heroes who ride by bus and train into the dark night of Alabama, into the depths of Mississippi—who submit themselves to beatings and scorn, to jail and chain gangs. They are in most cases children. Negro children and white children. Children from the North and children from the South. In the absence of strong and consistent moral leadership by men in high places, our Nation is led in this most wonderful and turbulent time, by children. I am honored to be associated with them and it is on their behalf and in the name of the more than 200 young people arrested recently in Jackson, Miss. that I accept the award you have conferred upon me.

Your award states that I have suffered "humiliation and jailing". The only humiliation I suffered during that day spent in a hot Jackson jail came from contemplating the question asked of me by a Mississippi detective. "Isn't there discrimination in New York?" he asked. Alone in my cell I recalled that perhaps no area in the portions of Georgia, Alabama, or Mississippi that I visited was as sharply segregated as the city of New York or as the Assembly District that I represent. I thought of the fight on the floor of the New York State Legislature last year when the Neanderthal wing of one of the major parties spoke out against the compromised and almost meaningless fair housing bill as "going too far." I though of the sell out by the Albany politicians in passing for the first time in the history of New York State a residency welfare bill, a bill conceived in bigotry, based upon false presumptions, indeed the father to the present Newburgh welfare atrocity—a bill signed in an act of abject surrender by a man who pledged that he would never sign such unfair and un-American legislation.

The only humiliation I suffered followed the rejoinder by the Jackson police chief that we had violated a call for a "cooling off period" by a man high in the councils of Government. To him I say, we have all of us, for 200 years of slavery and for 100 years since, cooled off. We are frozen in the ice of our leaders' indifference. From this point on we move forward and those who do not understand the forces of history will be left standing far behind as mere bystanders. To those who counsel that we should be satisfied with the progress that we have made in recent years we reply that it is 7 years since the U.S. Supreme Court decision and less than 7 percent of the Negro children in the South are attending integrated schools. At this rate the southern schools will be integrated by the year 2054. Perhaps judged by standards of 50 years ago this might be considered progress but we live in a jet age world today. Soon all of Africa will be free. Then will we still be trying to get a glass of orange juice in some second rate southern luncheonette?

This battlefield stretches before us. It runs from Old Mole Hill in Mississippi straight through to New Rochelle, N.Y. It runs through every dirt crossroads town in Georgia and the Carolinas and the red clay hamlets of Alabama but let us not forget that it passes through Newburgh, N.Y., and Albany, N.Y., and every single upstate town and city in New York. Let the representatives of our State in the councils of world politics remember when they call upon men in other lands to join with us to bring freedom and democracy to the world, that that is part of the unfinished business here at home. The battles yet unfought in America must be won before we can join that exclusive club called the free world. America does not deserve the self-proclaimed title of "leader of the free world" until all of its citizens are free. Free to go to school. Free to vote. Free to travel. And our leaders do no honor to the cause of liberty, to the deep strivings and hopes of our people by pretending that no problem exists. I call upon the Congressmen and Senators of our great State of New York. Travel to Jackson, Miss. and see how free our land is. Issue a proclamation of liberty from the city jail in Jackson and men throughout the world will listen and will detect a deep note of sincerity—a new meaning. This is not my challenge. It is the challenge of America, 1961. Our soldiers are in jail now as I speak to you. Let our generals join them, or step aside.

The Lotteries of Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about the lotteries of Switzerland. There is no national lottery in Switzerland, but a number of the cantons have grouped together to run several regional lotteries.

Gross receipts in 1960 came to about $5 million. Profits amounted to some $1.2 million. Some of the cantons use their share of the income for private charity cases, while others use it for public charities or cultural organizations.

The Swiss are widely and rightfully famed for their interest in charitable causes. In addition, they have recognized that lotteries can be helpful devices to assist their endeavors in this direction. When will America wake up to the worth of State and national lotteries?

Communist Propaganda at the International Trade Fair in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda activities of the Yugoslav Communists at the International Trade Fair in Chicago has attracted considerable public attention. A series of nine Communist tracts have been distributed through the Yugoslav exhibit at the fair. These pamphlets have been analyzed by Dr. Slobodan M. Draskovich, a well known authority on the tactics of the Tito brand of international Communism. Under leave previously granted, I include the text of the article by Dr. Draskovich, under the title "Communist Propaganda at the International Trade Fair in Chicago":

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AT THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR IN CHICAGO

As they approach the grounds of the International Trade Fair in Chicago, visitors can see the slogan "world peace through world trade" boldly displayed on the front of the main building. And most visitors believe that this is the basic rule for all exhibitors, regardless of the country which they represent.

That, however, is not the case. It is not the case as far as the Communists are concerned, for they do not believe in world peace, unless it is Communist-imposed and Communist-controlled peace, peace of the grave and of the jail for all nations, and unrestricted tyrannical power for the Communists. Consequently, the slogan about world trade serving the end of attaining world peace has a different meaning for them. Like everything else, world trade is only means for the attainment of Communist world dictatorship. Until that end is attained, the Communists are to use all means, any and every opportunity to work not for peace or freedom, or equality or progress, but for communism. In other words if Yugoslavi and Polish Communists are participating at the International Trade Fair in Chicago, it is not because they would be desirous of promoting world peace and understanding, but because they deem the Trade Fair to be a good opportunity for Communist propaganda, glorifying communism and attacking and detracting the free world, especially the United States of America.

The nine pamphlets distributed clandestinely by the officials at the Yugoslav stand at the International Trade Fair in Chicago are a telling example of Communist concepts and methods. These nine pamphlets are:

1. Josip Broz Tito, "Yugoslav Foreign Policy."

2. Ivan Laca and Momcilo Grujic, "The League of Communists of Yugoslavia."

3. "One Thousand Facts About Yugoslavia."
4. "Condemnation of the Crime."
5. Dr. Leon Cerskovic, "Social and Economic System in Yugoslavia."
6. Branko Kubovic, Jakov Sirotkovic, Berislav Sefer, "Economic Planning in Yugoslavia."
7. Dr. Pavle Kovac, "Worker's Management in Yugoslavia."
8. "Social Management in Yugoslavia."
9. J. Davico, M. Bogosavljevic, "The Economy of Yugoslavia."

1. The pamphlet on Yugoslav foreign policy contains the speech which Tito delivered at the U.N. General Assembly on September 22, 1960, in New York. It is well known that that XV General Assembly which saw all the leaders of the Communist world assembled around their boss Nikita Khrushchev, was also a special occasion for a display of complete Communist unanimity between Tito and the Soviet Union. Tito took the same position as Khrushchev on the problem of Germany, on the problem of colonialism, on the problem of disarmament. Claiming to be deeply disturbed by some trends of development in international relations, Tito said:

"What is the only lasting positive alternative to the present negative developments in this sphere? We are firmly convinced that the realization of general and complete disarmament alone provides such an alternative. This is precisely the reason why the Yugoslav Government has—in addition to the support given to other comprehensive measures leading toward general and complete—welcomed the proposal set forth in the statement of the Prime Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Mr. Khrushchev to the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 18, 1959, as well as later Soviet proposals indicating a broad and direct approach to actual disarmament measures" (p. 28 of the pamphlet).

Besides this clear and unveiled endorsement of the Soviet Union, the other most important point in Tito's U.N. speech is his concept of coexistence. On pages 35 and 36, he goes beyond proclaiming the virtues and merits of coexistence, but states very bluntly that coexistence should not "mean the preservation of existing relations," but on the contrary should be sought "in order to replace present tensions and mistrusts," with the intention of "making it a starting point toward more active relations and more fruitful and broader cooperation among all states and nations," which Yugoslav representatives always, without exception, can visualize only under socialism, i.e., communism.

2. As for the pamphlet about the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, it suffices to quote a few sentences, which are self-explanatory. (We need, of course, not be concerned with Communist democratic verbiage.

"The League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) is the leading political organization of the working class and working people of Yugoslavia. It is fighting for the development of socialist society and for its evolution toward communism" (p. 7).

The LCY combats "anti-socialist manifestations and influences" (p. 7).

"The scientific theoretical foundation in the practical work of the League of Communists is Marxism. The League of Communists strives for a creative attitude toward Marxism, for its continual elaboration by generalizing the experiences of socialist development in Yugoslavia and in the world and by utilizing the achievements of scientific thought" (p. 8).

In present-day Yugoslavia the League "has acquired and plays a distinctive role in every sphere of socialist democracy and in the various organizations of the working people" (p. 9).

"The League of Communists fosters among its members the idea of proletarian internationalism and instructs the Yugoslav peoples in this spirit. The principle of proletarian internationalism enjoins the Communists primarily to fight steadfastly for the victory of socialism in their country and to extend support to this struggle in every other country" (p. 42).

3. The booklet "One Thousand Facts About Yugoslavia" is a typical Communist propaganda brochure, mixing irrelevant statistics with arbitrary data destined to glorify the nonexisting achievements of communism and with outright lies. The pamphlet speaks about prewar Yugoslavia as a country run by the "Serbian bourgeoisie." During that time, "agrarian, peasant and social problems rent the country, while on the other hand those who championed progressive social trends were subjected to the most severe persecution." Let it suffice to say that the most complete and democratic agrarian reform was instituted in the small principality of Serbia in 1836, i.e., more than one century before Tito was imposed by Moscow as ruler of Yugoslavia. Besides, the charges of persecution of progressive elements are completely devoid of foundation. Mosa Pijade, one of the leading Yugoslav Communists, who died in 1957, was allowed, while in jail, in prewar Yugoslavia to translate Karl Marx' "Das Kapital" and have it published. It is true that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was outlawed in 1921, but only after overwhelming evidence was accumulated and made public about its subversive and revolutionary activities, which culminated in an open appeal to armed overthrow of the existing order.

The events of 1941 are also shamelessly distorted. The pamphlet portrays the Communist Party of Yugoslavia as a patriotic force, which rose up and rallied the people to fight the Nazi invader. The truth is, of course, that at the time of Hitler's invasion of Yugoslavia (April 1941) Hitler and Stalin were allies and the Yugoslav Communists played during the 2 weeks of war (April 6–17, 1941) the role of Quislings, sabotaging the war effort to the full. According to their own admissions, they started fighting the Nazis only after June 22, 1941, when Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union. The national and democratic resistance movement of Gen. Draza Mihailovich had started the struggled against the invader immediately after the occupation and as soon as he was able to rally the remnants of the Yugoslav Army, which was undermined by the Communist fifth column and the Croatian Ustashi (Hitler's and Mussolini's agents). The first conflict between the Chetniks of Draza Mihailovich and the Nazis took place on May 8, 1941, i.e., more than 6 weeks before the Communists decided that they were "patriots" and that Yugoslavia was invaded by a foreign power.

In the pages concerning the organization of the state and authority, there is much democratic verbiage, but it is not enough to conceal the basic fact that all power in Yugoslavia belongs to "the working people," i.e., the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and that the so-called division of power (executive, judicial, and legislative) is a shameless hoax, since there is only one power in Communist Yugoslavia, the power of the League of Communists and its federal executive council. The pamphlet must concede: "The power of the courts to decide on all matters regarding the rights and duties of the citizens and to impose sanctions is based on and derives from the uniform authority of the working people. Thus one cannot really speak of a separate judicial power in Yugoslavia, but only of the judicial functions of the one single authority which exists" (pp. 27–28).

Among countless falsehoods, let us mention the statement (p. 40) to the effect that "the Constitution guarantees freedom of conscience and of religious teaching."

Not less bold and shameless is the assertion that the Yugoslav Communists applied in agriculture the principle that "the land belongs to those who work it" (p. 50). It is notorious that the story of Yugoslav agriculture under communism is the same as the story of agriculture and the peasants under any Communist regime, i.e. the story of the most brutal repressions, plunder, exploitation and coercion.

4. The pamphlet "Condemnation of the Crime" is a typical Communist rabble-rousing brochure of 36 pages, destined to inflame passions against the colonialists and glorify the well-known Congolese postal embezzler, murderer, and Communist agent Patrice Lumumba, following his death in January 1961. It must be said that the Yugoslav Communist propaganda experts took great pains to avoid any direct, explicit reference to the United States or America. But in view of the fact that the Yugoslav Communist Government and all the Yugoslav press has always, without exception taken the same stand as the Soviet Union and Red China on the problems of colonialism, Africa and the Congo, blaming the "colonialists" and Western "imperialists" for all the trouble and praising as the only true and legitimate representative of the Congo, the Communist agent Patrice Lumumba, this venomous pamphlet is an effective anti-American weapon, which the Yugoslav representatives at the International Trade Fair in Chicago were bold enough to distribute in this free country. The whole pamphlet leaves no doubt as to who is accused as the main culprit for the death of Lumumba. Speaking in the Marx and Engels Square on February 14, 1961, Dusan Petrovic, chairman of the central board of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Siberia, stated among other things: "We assert: his (i.e. Patrice Lumumba) murder is the result of shameful colonialist, imperialist interference in the affairs of the Congo" (p. 20).

What the authors of this pamphlet carefully pass under silence is the fact that while the Communist authorities of Yugoslavia did their best to organize throughout the country demonstrations against the capitalists and Western imperialists, that occasion was used by the people, especially in Belgrade, to demonstrate against the secret police. In the clashes which took place in Belgrade between the youth which was supposed to demonstrate against Belgium and the United States, and the police, about 70 members of the police suffered grave injuries and had to be taken to hospitals. The picture on page 13 illustrates this unforeseen aspect of the Communist-staged demonstrations against the West.

All the pamphlets listed above under 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, do not deserve within this survey separate analyses, since they follow the pattern of Communist propaganda: that conditions in prewar bourgeois Yugoslavia were bad and that they have now, that capitalist private ownership has been abolished, improved beyond recognition. What stands out, is the open adherence to the basic tenets of Karl Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the assertion that under Communist guidance Yugoslavia has made great strides toward progress and happiness of the people.

However, the first thing to consider is that Communist statisticians feel no obligation toward truth at all, but obligation toward their Communist superiors. Thus, the statistics produced do not necessarily bear any relation to the real state of affairs, but are completely arbitrary. Second, there are basic facts which no amount of statistics can wipe out of existence. One of the most striking is the fact that capitalist Yugoslavia, with primitive agriculture, was a country which not only was able to feed its people, but was a well-known exporter

of a number of agricultural products. Communist Yugoslavia, on the other hand, in spite of all its progress, was unable to feed its people, and was several times on the verge of starvation of millions in towns and villages. Moreover, that starvation danger was relieved only owing to the help from the capitalist West, above all the United States.

It should be stressed that in all the nine pamphlets which the Yugoslav Communists have been distributing to Americans at the International Trade Fair in Chicago, there is not one word about the $3 billion of U.S. economic, technical, and military aid which they have received from the United States in the last 15 years and without which Communist Yugoslavia would have been bankrupt long ago.

Whether we should let Communist regimes take part at our trade fairs is a separate question, into which we do not intend to go here. But it stands to reason that trade fairs should not be occasions where we would make it possible for Communists to spread Communist propaganda, attacking the American economic, political, and social order, with the aim of destroying it.

U.S. Croplands Found Shrinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House on June 15, I pointed out the expectation that in the next 40 years Americans will turn more land to urban uses than they have needed for all our cities, towns, and villages in the more than three centuries since the founding of Jamestown. One aspect of the effect of this metropolitan growth is described in the accompanying article from the New York Times of August 6, 1961.

It is increasingly apparent that we must coordinate our efforts in the fields of city planning, agriculture, natural resources, recreation, wildlife preservation, and sheer living and breathing space.

The article follows:

U.S. CROPLANDS FOUND SHRINKING—MILLION ACRES LOST YEARLY TO GROWTH OF SUBURBS

(By Donald Janson)

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND., August 2.—More than 1 million acres are going out of cropland annually, largely to accommodate urban sprawl.

The figure is taken from a new national inventory of soil and water conservation needs.

The inventory indicates that the Nation's cropland will be converted to city and other nonagricultural uses at an accelerating rate.

"This trend is likely to speed up as more and more people require more space in which to live, work, and play," Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, told the Soil Conservation Society of America this week.

"The rush of city dwellers to the suburbs and beyond spreads the responsibilities for conservation to urban areas," he said.

"Soil and water conservation is not for farmers alone," he asserted.

MAJOR PROBLEM SEEN

The inventory shows that 75 million acres of highly erosive land should be removed from cultivation, Mr. Williams reported.

Cropping this land, much of it in the high plains of the West, depletes the soil and creates dust and washout hazards for neighboring farms and ranches.

Getting this marginal land permanently converted to pasture is "one of the major conservation problems of the future," Mr. Williams said.

The Great Plains conservation program, which offers farmers Federal technical and financial help in making the transition, has made some strides in recent years. But annual appropriations have been insufficient to enroll all the marginal farmers who have sought aid, for example, in shifting from growing wheat to growing livestock.

Mr. Williams said the inventory showed that 444 million acres were being cultivated, an equivalent amount is in pasture and approximately the same acreage is in woodland.

Two-thirds of the total, including two-thirds of the crop land, needs some kind of conservation treatment, he said.

Erosion is the major problem on 237 million acres of crop land, the inventory shows. Walter C. Gumbel, president of the society, said agriculture was losing 400,000 acres of crop land a year through erosion.

BETTER GRASS NEEDED

The inventory, begun in 1957 and completed except for State-by-State summaries, is the first of its kind. Thirty thousand people in 3,000 counties analyzed the land and water resources in all of the Nation's rural, privately owned property to produce it. The Government will publish a summary soon.

The inventory identifies 13,000 natural watersheds, the first time the Nation has had a count. About half were found to need flood-control projects. Others need work to control erosion and drainage or to provide irrigation or recreation facilities, or to develop municipal and industrial water supplies. Many need multipurpose projects.

Mr. Williams disclosed the findings at the closing session of the society's 3-day annual meeting. Other speakers joined him in stressing the need for converting poor crop land to such soil-conserving uses as pasture and for more widespread use of such soil and water conservation practices as terracing and strip-cropping.

They agreed that removal of erosive land from wheat, corn and cotton production would help reduce Government-held surpluses in those crops.

Full Employment Depends Upon Cost of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the copy from an advertisement by the Warner & Swasey Co., which appeared in this week's edition of U.S. News & World Report. The truth of the statement that the best way to cut unemployment is to cut costs is a valuable lesson for those who believe you can continually increase wages without either increasing productivity or prices:

YOU CAN FORCE EMPLOYEES TO PAY HIGHER WAGES BUT YOU CANNOT FORCE CUSTOMERS TO PAY HIGHER PRICES

A major cause of unemployment is high wages that are not earned. Today the industries with highest wage scales have double the national rate of unemployment.

Higher wages without increased production to earn them of course increase the cost of what is made; that increases prices; that means fewer people can buy. And that is what is causing unemployment today.

Benefits won't cure it—you'd have to keep paying benefits forever, and no nation can do that. The only permanent cure is more efficient production, to reduce costs and broaden markets.

With all the world's unfilled wants and needs, America isn't overproduced, it's only overpriced. To cut unemployment, cut costs.

Family Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the House today has approved the expenditure of $200 million primarily for planning purposes, for civil defense. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the only practical insurance we can have against the wholesale death that would result from a thermonuclear attack is the simple, inexpensive family fallout shelter—self-constructed and self-financed.

Official estimates place the possible casualty toll as high as 70 million Americans in a full-scale attack. A group-shelter program, currently stressed by the administration, is designed to save from 10 million to 15 million lives. The cost would exceed $200 million.

But, mass shelter would be of little value to the suburban or rural family. In less than 24 hours from the hour of attack they would be just as subject to the lethal rays of nuclear fallout as any city dweller—no matter how remote their homes from actual target areas.

President Kennedy proposes to spend $93 million for survey purposes alone in his group-shelter program. From this we can assume the total cost of the completed program would run into the billions, if it is intended to protect a major segment of the population.

We face a dangerous enemy; an enemy armed with the destructive force of the atomic age. It would be suicidal to ignore this threat or to fail to recognize that Berlin or some future world crisis might provoke a nuclear exchange.

By law and tradition the Federal Government bears the burden of providing for the national defense. But, with the mounting costs of maintaining military supremacy, the race for space, expanded foreign-aid programs and other expenditures directly tied to our security and

survival, the Government cannot afford to assume the additional cost of a truly adequate nationwide shelter program.

The individual, whenever possible, should be given the opportunity to share the cost and responsibility of providing for his own protection and the protection of his family.

With this view in mind, today I filed a bill which I hope will prove the needed spur to such an individual effort. It would allow taxpayers a deduction from gross income for one-half the expenses incurred in the construction of a fallout shelter of approved design. The allowance would be granted for the taxable year in which the shelter was completed, but would also include expenses incurred during the preceding year. Private corporations which lease property for residential purposes as well as individual taxpayers would be eligible for the deduction.

I hope the day never comes when American families are forced to retreat to such shelters, but I feel they are sufficiently important to our national defense to provide the public with whatever incentive is necessary. The possible loss of tax revenue would be insignificant compared to the number of lives such shelters could save, or when compared to the cost of a federally financed shelter project that could offer equivalent protection.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, filed a similar bill last week. He urged then, as I do now, that the distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means give this legislation their prompt attention and consideration.

Time To Give Some Thought to Role of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the thoughtful editorial, included herewith, by David Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report, raising a question as to the proper role of the United Nations in international disputes. In my opinion, the U.N. was never intended to become a superstate and we should make sure that it does not evolve into one which would jeopardize the sovereignty of the United States and put us at the mercy of an organization which very easily may become completely controlled by the Communist bloc and those nations which seem to have a preference for that system of government.

The editorial follows:

U.N.—MEDIATOR OR MEDDLER?

(By David Lawrence, by cable from Europe)

Say the word "sovereignty," and you are mentioning the most sensitive word in the language of diplomacy. Yet there is dismay when a country refuses to let the United Nations mold its sovereignty into whatever pattern an articulate majority may happen to improvise.

For, while the United Nations was never authorized by its charter to become a superstate, some members today insist on such a role whenever their political interests seem to be benefited thereby.

Few will deny that the United Nations has been a great experiment and that it represents a step forward in international relations. What was previously an occasional conference or international convention now has become a permanent institution, with a machinery of diplomacy that has never before been established. But, while crediting the U.N. with noble purposes and worthy aims, it should be recognized that the organization contains the seeds of its own destruction. This has become particularly noticeable in the Tunisian affair.

Tunisia is a sovereign power. France is a sovereign power. The two governments signed a treaty at the time France granted independence to Tunisia in 1956. Under the terms of the existing agreement, France retained possession of a naval and airbase at Bizerte, though there are provisions in general terms implying the eventual withdrawal of the French forces. The President of Tunisia became restless over what he chose to consider a delay in negotiations. For some unknown reason, he provoked an incident—he sought to blockade the Bizerte base, and his troops fired on the French. This, of course, is the quickest way to bring a controversy into the crisis category, and thus place it before the Security Council of the United Nations.

But what then becomes the duty of the U.N.? Must its members immediately take sides? It is proper, of course, for a request to be made by the U.N. to each of the belligerents to stop fighting. But when both have obeyed, is it up to the U.N. to prescribe the terms of peace? Such a procedure means imposing the will of a majority of the members of the U.N. on one or the other or both of the disputants.

It is a well-known fact that the U.N. is divided between Communist and non-Communist blocs, and that even those countries which profess to be neutral are in one way or another alined with the Western or the Eastern bloc. Also, there is an African bloc of new states which act in concert emotionally rather than juridically. Special meetings of the General Assembly sought by this group only add propaganda fuel to the flames of controversy.

Surely, all this introduces a Machiavellian aspect to current diplomacy as the end is made to appear to justify the means. This is in disregard of the pleas of the many statesmen of history who have called incessantly for a world of law, instead of a world of political machination.

How can we look forward to a world of law if we ignore the first principles of adjudication—namely, that the facts be brought forward in order that a judgment can be formed as to the rights of the parties to the controversy? Plainly, it was the duty of the U.N. not to depend upon one man—the Secretary General—to act as a mediator. It would have been better if, after requesting both sides to cease fighting, the Security Council had appointed a special commission of experienced jurists to offer good offices to both sides, so that a settlement could be reached directly between them.

Instead, the Secretary General of the U.N. took it upon himself to accept an invitation from the Tunisian Government to intervene. On his own initiative, he went to Tunisia, and thereupon addressed a letter to the French Government. He made therein statements which were construed in Paris as far from impartial. He said later he was merely interpreting the "intentions" of the Security Council members. Is this his function?

International controversies are delicate matters. Disputes that call for mediation must be handled with due regard to the sensibilities of both sides. There is no power in the office of the U.N. Secretary General—or in the U.N. itself—to tell sovereign nations what they must do. Nor is he given any right to enter the court of public opinion with statements than can prejudice eventual settlement of a dispute. Such overzealousness becomes sheer meddling.

Nations are proud and sensitive—they do not readily recede from an announced position in a controversy and thus suffer humiliation at home and abroad. It is important for the mediators to try to develop through a confidential negotiation the best face-saving settlement that can be devised. This is the essence of mediation.

The U.N. can function as a mediator, but it must never become a meddler.

Co-op Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I am happy to present to this Congress the remarks of Mr. Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, REA, before the annual meeting and headquarters dedication ceremonies of the Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Cambridge Springs, Pa., on August 5, 1961.

Inasmuch as the connection between the Cambridge Springs, Pa., project and the history of the rural electric cooperatives are so closely entwined, I would appreciate very much if the Members of the House would try to find time to read this interesting and enlightening speech:

CO-OP SECURITY

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, REA, before annual meeting and headquarters dedication ceremonies of the Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Cambridge Springs, Pa., August 5, 1961)

I am happy to be your guest here in Cambridge Springs today and to have the privilege of participating in the dedication of your splendid new headquarters building. The Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association was the first rural electric co-op to be formed in Pennsylvania, and now you are the first to complete an all-electric headquarters. I know that all of you are proud of your board of directors, your fine manager, Bill Wenner, and of your pioneer cooperative.

In a number of ways, Pennsylvania has been a pioneer State in rural electrification. It was here in 1923 that Gov. Gifford Pinchot began his now famous giant power survey, nearly one-third of which was concerned with the distribution of rural power. Another Pennsylvanian, Morris L. Cooke, was director of that survey, and he went on to become a member of the power authority of the State of New York—picked for the job by the then Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1935, Cooke became the first REA Administrator. And it was right here in Cambridge Springs that John M. Carmody, the second Administrator of REA, first talked about using REA financing to build a cooperative generating plant, and

he discovered that even just talking about such a possibility could bring wholesale power rates tumbling down.

You can see that Pennsylvania has been an important State in the rural electrification movement. The movement that began here in Cambridge Springs in 1936 has grown now to include 13 co-ops in Pennsylvania serving 85,000 rural consumers. Thirteen has not been an unlucky number here, and we want to make sure that it never becomes unlucky.

We are receiving a good bit of mail at REA these days—and some of it is critical. I should explain that a lot of the criticism comes from people who turn out to be executives of power companies or directors of power companies or in some cases, just plain citizens who read the power companies' propaganda. Among other things, these correspondents insist that REA's job and your job is completed because 97 percent of the farms in the United States are receiving central station service today.

We answer all these letters promptly, pointing out that our job is far from finished. Farm consumers are using 10 percent more power each year, and that means that the capacity of your systems must be continually increased. Some of you may remember that when REA began, systems were built on consumption estimates of from 40 to 100 kilowatt-hours per month. Those estimates were all right 25 years ago, but the national average is four times that high today, and your cooperative here is far above the national average. You are presently using power at the rate of about 585 kilowatt-hours per month per consumer—and the end isn't in sight. Besides, REA borrowers are adding new consumers to their lines at the rate of more than 100,000 meters per year. These are two big reasons why our job isn't done, by any means.

To tell you the truth, I suspect that many of our correspondents, particularly those associated with power companies, know very well why REA must continue to function. They know that the demand for power is rising every year, because it is rising for their own companies. Their employees write articles for the trade journals telling how difficult it is to keep pace with demand. When they continue to insist that we aren't needed anymore—when they insist that our job is done—it leads me to believe that their real aim is deliberately to cripple our REA-financed systems, and ultimately to destroy cooperative rural electrification. The organizations you built when you couldn't get power any other way have been too successful. The rural territory the power companies refused to serve 25 years ago now has taken on a new look in their eyes because of your success. They did not want it then. They did not consider it important. But they want it now, and many of them are out to get it—and are prepared to destroy the cooperative systems to gain this end.

So when we talk of security and the need for protecting the future security and effectiveness of the rural electric systems, representing both a large initial investment on the part of the public through REA, followed by the growing investment of millions of rural consumer-members, we are not pipedreaming. We are talking about definite dangers and immediate needs for action.

The REA program was undertaken to do a job, to provide electric service to rural consumers as widely as possible and at as low a cost as possible. Your cooperative, and hundreds like yours, were formed to do that job. You have already done a remarkable job. You have built electric facilities necessary to bring electric service to over 97 percent of the farms of the Nation, and you are repaying your REA loans with interest in the most amazing repayment record in the history of modern finance, public or private. Out of over $4 billion borrowed by over 1,000 borrowers, there is today only 1 borrower behind schedule on payments, and this delinquency amounts to only $82,890.

But if you—and we—are to continue to do the job with which we were charged, we must look to the future security and effectiveness of these systems. This means we must look not only to the ability of these systems to survive, but also to their effectiveness in doing the job for which they were created—supplying electric service to rural areas on an area-coverage basis at as low a cost as possible.

This means we must have the electricity itself—the power supply needed to meet the growing needs of rural areas. It means that the power must be available, not only in sufficient quantities, on a dependable basis, but at as low a cost as possible and on terms that are fair and reasonable. It must be available on terms that give each system the full opportunity to serve all loads in its area—the bigger and better loads as well as the small expensive ones; the denser areas as well as the thin areas. This is the key to operating economies that can and will spread the benefits of lower cost electricity throughout rural areas.

So here is the unfinished job of REA and the systems with which we work in our electric program. Here is the significance of our concern over power supply, dual rates, discriminatory and crippling wholesale power contracts. Here is the importance of REA-financed generation and transmission as an available alternative to such unhealthy power arrangements, and here is the urgent need for territorial protection.

The present threats to rural electrification are not limited to letters alone. There is a mounting attack today on the territorial integrity of co-ops.

The attack is coming from two general quarters. One arm of the offensive is the dual or penalty rate power contract. The penalty rate is a device by which a commercial power supplier tries to deprive a co-op of the load advantages of industrial and commercial power users in its area. The companies charge one rate for power to serve residential consumers and a higher penalty rate for power to serve larger consumers. I am sorry to report that the penalty rate clause is not uncommon today. Last year 189 REA borrowers had to purchase their power under such contracts from 19 different power companies.

In one of my first addresses as REA Administrator, I announced that henceforth REA will no longer give its approval to penalty rate contracts between suppliers and our borrowers. I am happy to report that several suppliers have indicated that they will abolish such rate clauses from their future contracts with our borrowers. But the dual rate is still a very real dagger pointed straight at the heart of our cooperative systems.

And this is not the only threat to the survival of our cooperative rural electric systems. There is a powerful segment in the commercial power industry that is fighting the REA program with every weapon at its command.

It carries on a bitter campaign of misrepresentation, nationwide, in an effort to turn public opinion against you—and people like you—who have done such a magnificent job in serving our rural areas. It attempts to brand as "socialistic"—or worse—cooperative organizations like this which are really individual, private enterprise in the highest sense of the word. These cooperatives represent the banding together of private individuals to provide for themselves service which was not available from any other source. They are not—you are not—taking any handouts from the Government. You are borrowing money on a straightforward business basis—at interest—and you are paying it back with interest.

The current complaint that 2 percent loans bear an interest rate below the Federal Government's average cost of money overlooks the fact that there have been times in the past—and may very well be times in the future—when it was and will be above the Government's cost of borrowed money. This rate was fixed under the Pace Act in 1944 to stabilize interest costs for REA-financed systems and to facilitate their future financial planning. It was fixed to permit the extension of area coverage rural electrification to the whole Nation, including the Great Plains and the Far West.

This 2 percent interest rate is not any threat to the power companies. Our cooperative systems are not competing with them. The cooperatives have their areas. The power companies have theirs. We are not seeking to put them out of business. We ask only that they accord us the same considerations.

But this vocal segment of the power industry misrepresents this story deliberately because it seeks to destroy REA as a source of credit for your systems. I dare say they would be just as opposed to our loaning money to you at 4 percent. They want to force you into a money market over which they exercise some substantial influence and where you would have to deal with them on their terms—terms that would go far beyond the subject of interest rates.

And now we are hearing complaints from the power companies over the "secrecy" which they say shrouds the determinations of REA in making generation and transmission loans.

As a practical matter there has been very little "secrecy" on loans at REA. Most prospective borrowers make no secret of the fact when they come to REA for a loan today, and I doubt if there is any power company that does not know it when there is an application filed affecting its operations. Usually these appliactions are filed only after long periods of fruitless negotiations with the power company in question. This was true of the recent Indiana loan. It is true of others that are currently under consideration. In fact, there is a point in every REA study of a generation loan application at which the applicant calls on power suppliers, informs the company of its plans to generate its own power, and asks for the last best offer of the power company. REA considers this offer in its final determination on the application.

But we do feel at REA that we have an obligation to the applicants who come to us with their problems, and we respect their confidence on information which they have gathered and supplied to us in confidence. Usually the mere fact of filing an application is not a confidential matter, but engineering and business data submitted in support of the application is usually considered confidential. And let me recall with you the days when even the fact of filing an application was considered highly confidential, because the word on this could touch off a rash of spite line activity that could destroy the co-op project before it got started.

The controversy over "secrecy" today has similar implications. Today the power companies want to know, not just whether or not a generation or transmission loan application has been filed, but what sort of a price they have to meet to prevent the granting of such a loan. They are determined to keep your rural electric systems in a state of dependency for power supply to hasten the day when they can ultimately be absorbed or destroyed.

To provide an escape from such dangers I have established a new criterion for the making of generation and transmission loans by REA. In the past, REA has approved such loans only under two general conditions: When the supply of power is undependable or inadequate, or when the cost of power from a co-op's own facilities will result in

lower-cost power to the consumers. Our new G. & T. policy states that REA also will make such loans to assure the security and effectiveness of REA-financed systems. Now I think that constitutes fair warning to power suppliers who continue to harrass our borrowers with unfair and discriminatory power contracts. The Rural Electrification Act makes it clear that a co-op has the right to serve any rural consumer not already receiving central station electric service—and that means farmers, nonfarm residences, businesses, and industries. The future security of our borrowers depends on their serving all types of loads within their territories, and we are not going to stand by and see them deprived of the right to serve large consumers by the companies that sell them power. If a cooperative can't get the kind of wholesale contract it deserves, and it turns to REA for help, we are going to take a look at the possibility of a generation loan.

The question of penalty rates continues to be but one aspect of the larger problem of power supply. With the demand for power doubling in rural areas every 7 years, REA is taking other steps to assure its borrowers of a continuing supply of adequate, dependable, and low-cost power to meet future needs. Here at Northwestern, you have been struggling for years to keep your wholesale power costs from getting out of hand, and REA is going to back you up in that struggle. On June 15 of this year, I signed the largest single loan in REA's history. It was for $60,225,000 to Hoosier Cooperative Energy, Inc., of Osgood, Ind., and it will finance construction of a 198,000 kilowatt steam generating plant and transmission lines to serve all the power needs of 16 distribution co-ops in southern Indiana. The loan was approved after REA studies showed that the members of Hoosier will save $5.5 million on their wholesale power bills during the first 10 years that their own plant is in operation. I hope that those are 16 co-ops who will never have to worry about the future security of their power supply.

In addition, we have established within REA a new Power Supply Division, which will handle all generation and transmission loan applications and which can turn its attention to any trouble spot in the Nation.

These are some of the things that REA is doing to combat the threats to co-ops that are coming from penalty rate contracts, and raiding and pirating of co-op territory.

Now there is another arm of the attack on co-op territory today. It is clear to us that much of it is coming from power companies in our cities. There is a growing tendency today for cities to reach out and annex suburban areas—areas presently served by REA borrowers and areas which were rural when our borrowers began serving them. We believe that co-ops should have the right to stay in the territories they developed in good faith and not have to surrender them to others.

Both REA and attorneys for the U.S. Department of Agriculture have looked into this matter of territorial encroachment carefully, and we are convinced that the only effective protection to our borrowers must come from legislation on the State level. In a few States, co-ops have such protection now, but more must be forthcoming if cooperative rural electrification is to survive.

Here in Pennsylvania, your territories are virtually unprotected. Pending before the Pennsylvania Legislature, however, is House bill 1532. This measure would prohibit duplication of existing electric service and extensions to unserved premises located within 300 feet of another supplier, except upon Public Utilities Commission order based on inadequacy of service. Several States already have similar antiduplication laws in force today, and the most recent was signed into law last June in Oklahoma. I already have written Governor Lawrence expressing REA's interest in this bill because it is so vital to the security of REA-financed cooperatives in Pennsylvania. While the measure does not represent complete protection, it is certainly an important step in the right direction.

This administration believes that REA has a responsibility for helping to make your cooperatives secure. These rural systems are built by the investments of many people, and these people are entitled to have their investments protected.

But so much of the responsibility for your survival rests upon the cooperatives themselves, upon members like you. I hope that everyone of you here today is fully conscious of the valuable property you own in the Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association. You have a $4 million property here, and you already have a net worth amounting to 36 percent of assets. In plain language, that means that you people already own more than one-third of a $4 million concern. The way you get to own it is by paying off your debt to REA, and you have just paid off your first two REA notes well in advance.

It gives me pleasure now to present to your president, H. M. Burrows, your A and B notes with REA, marked paid in full. Those are notes for the loans you got back in the early days of the co-op, when some critics claimed that REA would never get its money back. You and all REA borrowers are answering those critics today by establishing the best credit record in the history of any lending program. Congratulations to all of you.

In addition to your payments to REA, you people here also are getting back some of the money you have paid in. Northwestern already has paid you $336,000 in capital credits refunds, and another batch of checks is going out next December.

Always remember what you have built here, and don't let anybody take it away from you.

Capital credits refunds are one way to keep a co-op strong. Another way is through a good information program. Your co-op has published a member newsletter for 12 years, and you have done an excellent job of keeping the editors of local newspapers informed of developments. Bill Wenner tells me that you are now running a contest on the subject, "I Remember When the Lights Came On," and that not one entrant has yet been critical of the way in which you have delivered service.

You have concentrated on improving power use, and your co-op has become a model for the whole Nation in this field. You have done pioneer work in providing service entrances, and you have won both the National Electrical Manufacturers Association award for power use and the Look magazine award for writing.

You are on the right track. It is these things that create good member relations which, in turn, create good public relations.

I am aware that you face difficult economic problems in this area. Both the Erie and Meadville labor market areas were among the first designated by the Department of Commerce as eligible for assistance under President Kennedy's new Area Redevelopment Act. You have suffered from persistent unemployment and underemployment in both your urban and rural sections for some time now, and I am glad that this new financing tool is now available to help you create new job opportunities.

The people in your co-op have been working hard in this direction. You have participated in several industrial development groups in your service area and in the adjoining towns. As you come up with sound, practical ideas for new enterprise, I know that your plans will get sympathetic treatment from William Batt and his new Area Redevelopment Administration in the Commerce Department. In addition, all the considerable resources of the Department of Agriculture are being mobilized under our rural areas development program to give you technical help and find financing to help start some homegrown industries in your service area.

I hope that all of you will continue to take leadership in these activities to build a more prosperous rural America. This new headquarters, now a showplace of modern power us as well as a business office, is a promise of better things to come for all rural people. Let us dedicate this new building to the future of rural electrification—to a secure and vigorous future, full of promise for new enterprise and a more rewarding way of life in rural America.

Edith Nash Takes Over at Georgetown Day School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Edith Nash, of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., wife of Philleo Nash, who was recently nominated by President Kennedy as Chief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, will bring great ability and charm to the Washington educational scene. I include an article on Mrs. Nash by Elizabeth Ford in the Washington Post for August 10, 1961:

In taking over as director of Georgetown Day School, Edith Nash may well do so with the pride of a parent whose brainchild has grown up and become a success.

She was one of the most active members of the group which organized the experimental school in 1945, and her husband was the school's first president. She even worked there for awhile as assistant to the director, Agnes O'Neil, who retired last June after 17 years in that position.

"It was wartime," she recalled. Her two young daughters, now also grown and well on the road to success, were going to crowded District of Columbia public schools. "I felt they were missing out on what they ought to learn."

Other wartime Washington parents had the same idea. And so the school began.

Mrs. Nash isn't the only member of her family who will be getting used to a new job in the next few weeks. Her husband, Philleo Nash, former lieutenant governor of Wisconsin, has just been named by the administration to the post of Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

The Nashes first came to Washington from the Middle West in the 1940's when he took a job at OWI. Mrs. Nash, who is not the handfolding type, soon flagged down a stint of her own at the Congressional Library.

Next came some pretty steep rungs on the ladder, but Nash flew up them and into the White House as an aide to President Truman.

After that, there were two primaries and two general elections out in the Badger State and Nash won three out of four. During their political period, Mrs. Nash went with him on all his campaigns—"there were corners in Wisconsin you would not believe existed"—and speechified to women's groups. She describes her platform appearances as "the kind of thing a politicians' wife is asked to do."

When Nash was defeated last November, they returned to Washington.

"We just closed our front door and came East."

At present, they're living in a small apartment here but "we still have a big house out in Wisconsin, stuffed with furniture."

The nominee for the post of head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is a trained anthropologist and so is his schoolteacher wife.

Admits Mrs. Nash, "I never took any courses in education. I studied at Vassar for a year. Then I went to the University of Chicago and majored in anthropology."

It was there that she met her future husband.

Mrs. Nash is thoroughly convinced that anthropology has as much to do with teaching as it has to do with the Bureau of Indian Affairs—and that's a lot.

"Anthropology," she explains, "is basically concerned with how people develop in a given culture. And children—all children—come from a culture made up of parents, community, and school."

She also thinks that American culturp has at least two outstandingly important contributions to make to all young people.

"First," says Edith Nash, "Americans have great curiosity about the real world outside themselves. And that's important in science and mathematica. Second, Americans have an openhearted attitude toward people in general. This makes them ready to absorb a school experience which tries to make them feel equal respect for races other than their own * * *"

At Georgetown Day School, children are motivated to learn. In general projects like history, geography, social study, they learn through discussion or through putting on plays or by going on special field trips. Each year, the ninth-grade students go to New York where they visit the U.N. and see an off-Broadway show. This year, they'll travel out to Bethlehem, Pa., to study a steel plant.

Classes are small—never more than 20.

Among innovations for 1961–62 will be a new, separate building for the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades.

In addition, Mrs. Nash, who believes that some of the basic theories of math can be taught in first grade—"I don't mean we can teach them to do quadratic equations"—has also added a Ph. D. in math to the teaching staff. "She'll interpret new approaches to math materials to the other members of the faculty."

School bells ring at Georgetown Day on September 11.

Texas Manufacturers Association Opposed to Centralization of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me deep satisfaction to include, as part of my remarks, a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Texas Manufacturers Association in a recent meeting, in which attention is called to the dangers inherent in the centralization of power seen more and more as the goal of administration proposals:

CENTRALIZATION OF POWER

It now appears that the Federal administration through its recommendations to the Congress, is attempting to centralize control of Government, the economy, and social services in Washington.

This is being done in many, varied, and sometimes devious ways, thus shielding the dangerous trend from view, unless the package is considered as a whole. These efforts include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The control of city development through programs of urban development and other grants-in-aid with Federal strings attached.
2. The control of factory location—through depressed area legislation.
3. The control of local school systems, and educational process through Federal aid to education programs at all levels.
4. The control of the employment market through selective channeling of Government purchases.
5. The control of the farmers through farm aid legislation and administrative edict.
6. The control of hospitals, and ultimately medicine, through various legislative proposals.
7. The control of capital and capital usage through tax manipulations.
8. The control of wages through legislation and, possibly ultimately of prices.

These serve to illustrate a dangerous trend that should be halted before it progresses too far: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas delegation in the National Congress be respectfully requested to scrutinize with care all legislative proposals, and use their every influence to the end that the Republic may be preserved, and that people's freedom be protected against the dangers that may result from the centralizing of control—over the lives of the people—in the hands of a few.

Passed and signed on this the 14th day of July, 1961 by the board of directors of the Texas Manufacturers Association in Odessa, Tex.

Signed LAWRENCE S. JONES,
President.

Attest:

ELI J. BURRIS,
Secretary.

Statement in Opposition to H.R. 6747, Which Would Abolish the Juvenile Court in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which I submitted to the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. Unfortunately I was not able to appear in person to present my statement and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, Senator HARTKE, has graciously agreed to make my remarks a part of the permanent record.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE SENATE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE ON THE JUVENILE COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for affording me this opportunity to submit a statement on proposals to amend the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

You are considering here today two bills which are of great importance to the District of Columbia: H.R. 6747, which would destroy the years of good work and nullify all of the experience already gained by the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and S. 486, introduced by your distinguished chairman, Senator ALAN BIBLE of Nevada, and cosponsored by you, Mr. Chairman. The future of the Juvenile Court in the District of Columbia depends upon which of these two bills the Congress enacts.

H.R. 6747 would abolish the Juvenile Court, transfer its jurisdiction to the Criminal Court, and reduce the age limit from 18 to 16 so as to preclude those over 16 years of age being treated as juveniles and requiring that they be treated as criminals as a matter of law.

At the present time the juvenile court is swamped with cases and the sole juvenile court judge cannot possibly handle the situation, although his efforts have been heroic. Funds and facilities for handling the juvenile delinquency problem in the District of Columbia are woefully inadequate.

This situation, however, does not offer itself as evidence that the court should be abolished—on the contrary, we should strengthen it and provide it with necessary funds so that it will become a model for all juvenile courts throughout the country.

The present judge—the one person who is most familiar with this situation—has often stated his support of additional judges and facilities. Many, many of the civic organizations in the District of Columbia have spoken out in opposition to H.R. 6747. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency adopted a resolution in opposition to this bill on May 10, 1961.

Recognizing the need for a renewed and vigorous attack on the problem of juvenile delinquency, President Kennedy, on May 11, established by Executive Order the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

This Committee will study all of the aspects of the juvenile delinquency problem in this country and report its findings to the President. This, Mr. Chairman, is the first time that the Federal Government has ever coordinated its efforts in this field.

Heretofore several agencies of the executive have handled these problems as best they could. In the Senate of the United States you have had for some years now a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which has been charged with the responsibility of investigating the juvenile delinquency problem.

Without adequate funds to handle the enormous problems presented by juvenile delinquency in the United States, this subcommittee has long done excellent work within the limited scope permitted it by its investigative mandate.

Similiarly, I applaud your efforts, Mr. Chairman, in opening this investigation into juvenile crime and delinquency in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6747 would—to a large extent—negate all of these splendid beginnings and put us back where we started.

It is respectfully suggested that the proper procedure for us to follow is not one which would destroy the present system but rather one which would strengthen it.

With that purpose in mind I have proposed that the Congress consider and pass a bill which would provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, on a temporary basis, to serve until such time as the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime shall submit its recommendations. Bills which would, in part, do this have been introduced in both the House and the Senate. The distinguished chairman of the Senate District Commit-

tee has introduced S. 486; the Honorable JAMES MORRISON of Louisiana, the Honorable EDITH GREEN of Oregon, and I have introduced similar measures in the House (H.R. 5988, H.R. 7012, and H.R. 7020).

Mr. Chairman, the 1960 report of the Fulton County, Ga., juvenile court, should prove of great interest to this committee. This court, which is located in Atlanta, is one of the finest examples of how a juvenile court should be operated. Under the able leadership and guidance of Judge William W. Woolfolk, Fulton County is making great strides in its treatment of the juvenile delinquency problem.

At this moment Fulton County is fast completing the modern child treatment center you see illustrated on the cover of the 1960 report.

Fulton County has recognized the problem and sought to solve it. There has been no backsliding in Fulton County.

I submit that we cannot afford to destroy the juvenile court of the District of Columbia—the court which should become the model for all other juvenile courts in the United States. The additional provision of H.R. 6747 which would reduce the age limit to 16 is without question a step in the wrong direction. To permit this is to deny all of the evidence which years of experience has taught us is the proper procedure with regard to juvenile crime.

Thank you.

Top-Level Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York has many attractions but one of the most oustanding is that of the Centenary College choir of Shreveport, La. This choir is performing at New York's largest music hall—seating an estimated 6,000 people—and is a credit to its native State and to the music community. If one wishes to enjoy a truly rare treat with all the loveliness and pristine beauty of young southern womanhood and the handsomeness and enthusiasm of young southern college men, one should present himself at one of the four performances being held each day in Radio City Music Hall at 50th and Broadway, New York City. It is a performance which the music and entertainment lovers of this country will not forget.

On Saturday, July 29, I caught the Air Shuttle Service from Washington to New York City to spend a part of that day with Dr. A. C. Voran, director, and members of the Centenary Choir from Centenary College, Shreveport, La. The choir began a 4-week engagement in New York City on July 5 and is being held over an additional 3 or 4 weeks, which will break all Radio City Music Hall records for summer attendance.

I had been hearing many fine reports regarding the work and performance of members of the Centenary College Choir and I arrived at the Music Hall in time to see one of the regular performances they give each day. Only 30 of the 40 choir members appear for a performance, thus allowing some time off for sightseeing and relaxation. With the opening of a curtain, emblazened with a map of the United States on which Louisiana and Shreveport were prominently identified, and to the music of the Music Hall's 54-piece orchestra, a loud backstage voice announced the choir: "It is a privilege to have the famous Centenary College Choir from the Centenary College, Shreveport, La.," and the entire choir swung into their featured act—a medley of Stephen Foster's "My Old Kentucky Home," "Beautiful Dreamer" and "Camptown Races"—entitled "Playtime Down South."

I have had the opportunity to listen to the choir perform in Shreveport on many occasions and they have always given a performance of merit and have reflected real credit upon Centenary College and Louisiana, but after 4 active weeks at what is probably this country's largest music hall these lovely young ladies and young men showed the poise of veterans on the stage and were superb.

Everyone to whom I spoke in New York lauded the work of the Centenary Choir. One of the most welcome tributes, however, came from the practiced ear of the Music Hall's Walter Farrar who wrote—

This group is one of the best choral groups that I have ever seen or heard in this huge theater. They look good. They carry themselves like true ladies and gentlemen and show good manners. This group is a credit to their parents, their college, Shreveport, and are good representatives of their lovely State of Louisiana.

I think one of the finest things which the choir has done during its stay of more than a month in the largest city of the Nation has been its ability to make friends locally. The stagehands, the ticket takers, the box office personnel, and others around the theater all praise the choir members for their fine conduct as representatives of Louisiana. Even those who passed on the street, having previously seen the performance, were loud in their praise of the fine manner in which these young men handled themselves, both on and off stage and they especially praised their ability to make friends.

I do not know that the choir will return to New York in the future but I can say that Centenary College Choir will take back to Louisiana very happy recollections of a visit of almost 2 months in the Empire State. At the same time I believe that the people of New York, together with visitors there, will long remember the Centenary College Choir.

Analysis and Comments by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., on "Import Restrictions and Fuel Costs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, all of us long ago have known figures can be used in any fashion to suit the purposes of the users.

I am happy to be able to present to the Congress at this time an analysis and comments concerning an article from the New England Business Review. For too many years, the coal industry, both management and labor, has been the victim of misinformation widely circulated.

The real serious side of this situation, however, is caused by the fact that all too often the picture on residual oil and coal is painted by artists of such national reputation, such as the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, and others, that the reader automatically assumes that the facts and logic being presented are gospel truths.

It is, therefore, with some personal satisfaction, because of my early background in the coalfields, I have long ago decided that if the truth were known to the American people, that the injury that has come about caused by the almost unrestricted importation of residual oils would be corrected.

I, therefore, present both the article from the Business Review and an analysis, as follows:

In its June and July issues the New England Business Review, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, printed articles entitled "Import Restrictions and Fuel Costs."

The July article was devoted to a factual presentation of the arguments both for and against import controls on residual fuel oil and was in keeping with the tradition of a Federal Reserve bank for objective reporting on important economic issues.

However, the general tenor of the June article appears to be that residual oil costs (no other fuels are mentioned) in New England have increased as a result of the Government's imposition of limits on excessive residual imports, althought this conclusion is somewhat qualified by a suggestion that the long-term trend in residual prices has been upward and that some price increases would have taken place anyway.

Despite this modification, however, the implication is that controls are to blame for price increases, and the article has been so interpreted by many of its readers. For instance, the New York Journal of Commerce has cited it editorially as proof that residual import controls should be abandoned, and other publications have reported it as evidence that prices have gone up because of import controls.

Because the question of residual import controls is so serious to the economy and security of America, as well as to the various domestic fuels industries and their employees, it is extremely important that an institution carrying the prestige of a Federal Reserve bank should be completely clear and impartial in any report it may make on the subject.

There are several points in this article which obviously do not meet this standard. On June 29 the National Coal Policy Conference sent a telegram to the Boston Federal Reserve Bank requesting clarification or explanation of 17 specific points in the article which we felt were unclear, misleading, or erroneous. Finally, in a letter dated July 12 and signed by Robert W. Eisenmenger, acting director of research, we received answers or comments on the various points we raised, and these have been given cognizance in the following comments on the original article:

1. The article states: "Following the imposition of import restrictions posted prices of residual oil at the ports rose 25 cents per barrel by January 1961."

Comment: The article never made it clear what "posted prices" were referred to, although Mr. Eisenmenger in his subsequent letter to NCPC said that they were "tank car highs," reported at the ports of Boston, Providence, New Haven, Portland, and Albany, as reportel by Platt's Oilmanac. Tank car highs are the highest quoted price for residual, in a given area. It is not even an average of the "highs" printed by the Oilmanac.

The article carefully refrains from pointing out that posted cargo prices on January 1, 1961 (as they are today) were the same as they were when controls were first instituted ($2.26 per barrel in Boston), and for 8 months of that period they were lower. It also does not explain that only prices at cargo levels can accurately reflect the real price effect of import controls. Cargo prices do, and have over the years, reflect shortages of supply, changes in demand, etc. Tank car prices, on the other hand, while they fluctuate more than do prices for full tanker lots, reflect various U.S. domestic costs and charges, such as land transportation charges, or merely the desire for an additional profit by importers or distributors.

In this connection, it is significant to note that on July 14, 1959, the net price to cargo buyers was reduced 9 cents a barrel, from $2.09 New York to $2, and from $2.10 a barrel Boston to $2.01. This cargo reduction was not passed on to barge and tank car buyers, however. Then, on August 7, the price to cargo buyers was advanced 10 cents per barrel, to $2.10 in New York and $2.11 Boston. This 10 cents a barrel advance was added to Boston barge and tank car postings, thereby increasing Boston terminal terminal operators' cargo-tank car margin from 44 cents a barrel to 53 cents a barrel.

Actually, the margin between cargo prices and tank car prices has been increasing for the past 5 years. From a normal 20 cents a barrel margin in December 1957, the cargo to tank car spread increased to 40 cents a barrel New York and 53 cents Boston by September 1960.

It is difficult to see how a fair appraisal of the New England residual oil price situation could have been made without calling attention to these significant facts. They are readily available from Platt's Oilgram Pricing Service, the accepted standard in the trade, but no mention of them was made in the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston article.

2. The article makes a special point of the fact that prices have risen since the imposition of import controls in March 1959.

Comment: This is correct, as far as tank car posted prices are concerned, although the amount of the actual increase to consumers is highly debatable. However, the Federal Reserve bank report fails to point out that prices in March 1959 had been driven to an unusually low level by a great flood of imports, dumped at predatory prices on the east coast which were the direct cause of the Government being forced to impose mandatory import controls as a national security measure. This dumping was accompanied by a 40 million barrel increase in imports in one year (1958–59). This dumping of imported residual on the domestic market, at prices slashed to undercut domestic fuels, brought posted tank car prices down to $2.54, the lowest price they had been since July 1955. Yet, with no explanation of this, the Federal Reserve bank compares prices at this low point in 1959 with those of July 1960 and January 1, 1961, in an attempt to show that controls have caused price increases. It would certainly have presented a much more accurate picture of price movements, in relation to import controls, to have compared present prices to prices which prevailed in 1956, 1957, and 1958 before heavy dumping in the late fall and winter began to force prices down to the eventual unnatural flow which prevailed when controls had to be applied. An eminent oil economist recently said, "The price of residual fuel, unlike other petroleum products, remains lower than in 1958—a recession year in which demand lagged and there were no import controls."

3. The article states: "If the entire increase (of 25 cents a barrel) had been passed on to the consumer, the total annual cost to New England would have approached $10 million (not including consumer prices generated by the increased fuel costs in manufacturing and utilities)."

Comment: This is a prime example of the questionable statistics used throughout the article. New England consumes about 70 million barrels of residual fuel oil each year. If, as the article states, import controls have pushed the price up 25 cents a barrel, then the annual cost to New England would be $17.5 million—not $10 million. It is interesting to note that the New England Council has also used publicly the figure of $10 million as the alleged cost of the import control program to New England, but it based its estimate upon an estimate of an alleged price increase of 15 cents a barrel for 70 million barrels. Here again, however, those seeking to wreck the control program arrive at their estimated damage figure by comparing present prices to the unnaturally low prices which prevailed just before the program began. They fail to point out, for example, that if New England were paying today what it paid on an average throughout 1957, the extra cost for residual would be 70 cents per barrel more on cargo purchases level, or by the same token, it is paying $49 million less now, under controls, than the same amount of oil would have cost then.

4. The article states that since 1959 New York has had a two-price system—one for domestic consumption and the other for export—and the difference between the two prices has been 22.5 cents since July 1960. "As this residual oil for export must compete with foreign oil at world prices, the difference between the price for domestic and the price for foreign consumption is an indication of the extra cost that the east coast consumer is forced to pay."

Comment: This statement also indicates a complete lack of knowledge of the residual oil market on the part of the person or persons who prepared the article. There is no export, as such, of residual from the U.S. east coast. The reference could only have been to prices of residual for bunkering of foreign ships, which is not at all a valid comparison with domestic prices. The residual market for ships bunkering has always operated in a different pattern from the market for domestic consumption. Sales for bunkering must compete with prices at all ports of call to be made by each vessel, including those near the source of production, and it is normal practice to bunker at whatever port of call offers the most advantageous price.

5. The article says the fact that residual oil prices on the west coast have either declined or remained constant since 1959 is further proof that controls have increased prices on the east coast.

Comment: It is commonly accepted among those knowledgeable about the oil trade that there is absolutely no comparison between prices on the east and west coasts. The east coast must import all of its residual. The west coast is a surplus producer of residual and actually exports sizable amounts to Japan, and in 1960, 5.8 million barrels moved from the west coast to the east coast. The surplus supply situation is complicated by the fact that, because of the nature of the California crude, residual made from it cannot be burned there at certain times because of its smog-producing qualities and is exported while the lighter oil is being brought in. It would be strange indeed, in view of these entirely different conditions, if residual prices did not behave entirely differently on the west coast than they do on the east coast.

6. The article states: "In order to determine the precise effect of import restrictions on residual oil prices in New England, the Federal Reserve Bank at Boston sent a questionnaire to many of the region's users."

Comment: When this statement is examined more closely, the small size of the sample upon which the study was based becomes apparent. The article states that 42 percent of residual in New England is consumed by industrial plants, 26 percent by utilities, and 26 percent as a heating fuel. The replies, according to the article, represented about 10 percent of all New England industrial purchases and 30 percent of utility purchases.

What this means is that about 11 million barrels of residual, out of a total consumption of 70 million barrels, were used to reach sweeping conclusions about price trends for the area. The Federal Reserve Bank obtained information on utility purchases totaling about 5.5 million barrels a year. Yet, there was available to the bank figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission on actual purchases of 16.5 million barrels showing the exact prices paid by these utilities for residual oil, including all handling up to the boilers. When asked why these FPC figures were not used, the bank replied by linking the FPC figures with a report published by National Coal Association based entirely on the FPC figures and declaring, "The NCA/FPC figures are somewhat biased." As far as can be determined, this is the first time the FPC figures, which are copied from reports filed according to law by utilities, have been challenged as biased toward the coal industry.

7. The article states: "Utilities also paid much more for their oil." A table based upon the bank's own price survey showed the estimated average prices paid f.o.b. port for oil in 1959 were $2.20 a barrel and increased to a range of from $2.37 to $2.45 a barrel in 1960.

Comment: The FPC figures show that oil costs to New England utilities increased by only 3 cents a barrel, f.o.b. plant, between 1959 and 1960 and that they actually decreased by an average of 23 cents between 1958 and 1960. The Federal Reserve Bank seeks to impeach the validity of the FPC figures by charging they are biased. The statement is based on reports here (presumably meaning Boston) that New England utilities received a payment on 1959 oil purchases which was not adjusted and was reflected in the lower 1960 figures. If large scale adjustments, sufficient to make significant changes in oil cost figures, were actually made, no one at FPC is aware of the fact and such adjustments are considered to be highly unlikely.

8. The article states that the average price paid by the military for residual oil in New England increased from $2.15 a barrel in 1959 to $2.43 a barrel in 1960—an increase of 28 cents a barrel.

Comment: Paul H. Riley, deputy secretary of defense for supply and services, said a check of Military Petroleum Supply Agency records reveals that the cost of residual fuel oil in New England increased only 8 cents during the period, as contrasted with the 28 cents price increase alleged by the bank. This is cited as another example of the questionable figures used in the survey.

9. The article states: "If periods of crisis such as the postwar shortages, Korea and Suez are eliminated, the most striking feature of the trend in residual fuel oil prices has been their steady, long-run increase."

Comment: This statement is simply not true. The fact is that residual oil prices have increased only 4 cents a barrel over the pre-Suez crisis period whereas crude oil prices have increased 10 cents during the same period.

10. In his letter to NCPC, Mr. Eisenmenger listed only one purchaser of residual fuel oil replying to the bank's questionnaire who bought 1 million barrels of oil or more.

Comment: The Federal Power Commission report on fuel consumption and costs shows that six New England electric utility plants—not companies—used in excess of 1 million barrels of oil in 1959. It is simply not logical to assume these companies purchased such large amounts of oil in small quantities under tank car rates or that they paid tank car highs for the oil. What this clearly indicates is that the Federal Reserve Bank survey was concentrated among the small users of residual and that the highest posted price reported was considered in arriving at its conclusions about the fluctuation of prices.

In conclusion, it seems to us that the excerpts printed above from the Federal Reserve Bank article, together with our comments, raised serious questions not only as to the validity of the conclusions but also as to the method in which the information was compiled and the manner in which it was assessed. The inconsistencies and contradictions in the article became apparent when it is carefully studied.

The great damage from the article can result from the fact that most people will accept, without question, the findings of such a highly respected institution as the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. If the bank leaves the very definite impression that the import control program has resulted in greatly increased fuel costs for New England, while completely ignoring other facts and factors which highly qualify this conclusion, then a program adopted by the Federal Government in the interest of national security will be seriously jeopardized.

Youth and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered at a luncheon today at the Mayflower Hotel given in honor of 135 Civil Air Patrol cadets who are visiting this country in connection with the annual international air cadet exchange. The luncheon was sponsored by Mr. Sam Pryor, Jr., of Pan American World Airways. The address was as follows:

YOUTH AND GOVERNMENT

(Address by Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, New York, at luncheon for Civil Air Patrol cadets, August 10, 1961, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

First of all, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating Mr. Sam Pryor, who has sponsored this luncheon, for his great interest in matters of public benefit. This is not the first time that Mr. Pryor has been in the forefront where the U.S. Government and the American people have been involved. He has successfully contributed toward keeping America's prestige high throughout the world by his invaluable suggestions, his sound advice, and his patriotic deeds.

And you, Mr. Toastmaster, should come in for your share of the bows because of your long devotion to the problems facing this great city of Washington, as well as our Nation. You have indeed, in my estimation, earned the title of "Mr. Washington, D.C." I want to commend you also for your many years of work with the Civil Air Patrol, particularly in furthering these exchange tours which have become an important program in our efforts to strengthen the friendship and understanding between the people of America and the nations participating in this problem.

Whenever I get involved in anything related to airplanes, I am reminded of a rather unusual airfield, connected with the CBI theater of operations in World War II. This field was located smack in the middle of the Indian jungle, with wildlife surrounding its perimeter and one lone Air Force sergeant in charge.

The sergeant got so lonely he adopted a lion cub, and brought it up as a domestic animal, which is no mean trick in itself. But the lion respected the sergeant and did what he was told. And one of the cardinal rules he learned in cubhood was to keep off the landing strip at all times.

Well, one day, just as a plane was approaching, the sergeant saw the lion stretched full length on the strip. Shouting and waving his arms, the sergeant charged the lion, but the lion wouldn't move. So the sergeant kicked him and cuffed him, but the lion only growled a little and still wouldn't move. Flabbergasted by the crisis, the sergeant seized the lion by the tail, dragged him forcibly from the strip and kicked him into the underbrush, then raced to the control tower just in time to make contact with the incoming plane. When he got to his office at the top of the tower, there, in one corner, lay his lion, fast asleep. Which goes to prove what can happen when you provide the proper training in youth.

Well, the subject at hand today is youth and government, on the one hand, airplanes on the other. Personally, I have always been a strong advocate of the entrance of youth into government here in the United States, in the interest of world progress.

It is therefore no surprise to me that the youth of the world is vitally interested today in the development of the airplane as the chief beast of burden in the present century.

This of course was the cornerstone of the movement that grew into being as the Civil Air Patrol, to which you all belong. Born in the critical period immediately prior to World War II, the Civil Air Patrol performed many functions and services contributing both directly and indirectly to the ultimate victory of the Allied cause.

One of the most important services in this respect was the patrolling of the Atlantic coast, in search of submarines. The coastal patrol was carried on for 18 months before Regular units of the armed services were in a position to take over. During this period CAP pilots flew more than 86,000 missions, reported 173 submarine sightings, destroyed two submarines with bombs and depth charges, and reported information to Regular Army and Navy bombers that led to the destruction of many more. So important were the services of the CAP in the eyes of the Federal authorities that the 80th Congress passed Public Law 557, establishing the organization as a permanent civilian auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force.

Now, that is what I would call a prime example of success in the field of volunteer endeavor; a glowing example of what can be done by civilian volunteers with the interest of the Nation at heart.

And as one to whom our Government is of prime concern, I can only wish that American youth would enter into politics and government with the same idealistic zeal as that demonstrated by the young members of the CAP back in the 1940's.

The need for youth in Government today is greater, perhaps, than ever before and I am glad that the recent presidential election emphasized this point. Both the presidential aspirants presented a far more youthful element than is generally the case in our presidential contests.

When John F. Kennedy became President of the United States, I was delighted that one of the first programs to be introduced by the new administration was the Youth or Peace Corps program. Never before in American history has the Government sought to employ the youth of the Nation in a more constructive purpose. And to my way of thinking, the move could well have been inaugurated a long time ago.

It is a sad but true observation that over the past 40 years the Soviet Union has given high priority to youth programs, injecting its propaganda stream into virtually every country on the globe, while we, with immense publication and distribution services at our command, have failed to match their output or even come close to matching it.

Consequently, the view of the United States among the underdeveloped countries of the world is one based largely upon the works of writers unfriendly to our cause.

In a recent visit to Japan an American official was engaged in a discussion with a group of college students, who constantly made reference to the great American historian, Foster. Puzzled, the official inquired as to whom Foster was, since he knew of no such great American historian. As it turned out, Foster was none other than William Z. Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, whose books on American history had been translated into Japanese. With so-called "histories" of this nature filling the bookshelves of foreign libraries, no wonder there are some strange ideas afloat as to the goals and principles of this great Nation.

In conceiving the Youth Corps idea, the Kennedy administration has decided to fight Communist falsehood with the vigor and fire of youthful enthusiasm, employing the resources of the country to its best advantage at a time when nothing but the best will do. In every country where the Youth Corps sends its representatives, Communist falsehoods will topple in the face of truth. For, as every American knows, the so-called "Ugly American," despised on foreign shores, has virtually nothing to do with Americans in reality. Indeed, the "Ugly American" is largely the figment of anti-American propaganda, palmed off on persons who have seen very few flesh and blood Americans, if any at all. The impression created by the real thing, as represented by the Peace Corps, should go far in destroying the myths fostered upon the people of Europe, Africa, and Asia by those who would defame us at every opportunity.

With the passage of time it has grown clear that the youthful people are not quite so foolish and the older generation not quite so wise as once was generally believed. In the days when there were relatively few executive jobs available in the fields of industry and commerce, the old men seized them and held on for dear life, establishing an artificial framework to sustain themselves in office to prevent the young men from challenging their authority. But with the advent of mass production, mass buying, and a greatly accelerated economic pace, executive jobs multiplied in the economic field to a point where young men were at last allowed to demonstrate their mental capacity along that line. And, lo and behold, they turned out to be the equals of their elders in many instances and their superiors in others.

So clear was this result in commerce and industry, as measured in terms of dollars

and cents, that the old barriers suddenly collapsed and youth moved in to assume a place of consequence.

In Government, however, there was no such measuring stick, and there the young men and women were shunted aside in the traditional manner, to such an extent that they came to feel unwanted. This is not so today, however, with the advent of the Kennedy administration.

And President Kennedy has been proven absolutely right in encouraging youth. The American Government needs the fire of youth to spur it forward to meet the tasks ahead. It is, therefore, significant that the Peace Corps idea evolved under the administration of a youthful President, whose interest in the talents of youth has been clearly in evidence from the moment he assumed office.

I can only hope, with the pressure of the times bearing down upon us in the years ahead, that the accent on youth is to be stepped up here and in the other free nations of the West. For strength and clarity are what will be needed in these times, and youth has demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, its readiness in both respects.

Just Plain Jack Makes the Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Art Hoppe has continued his column in the San Francisco Chronicle on "Just Plain Jack," copy of which follows:

JUST PLAIN JACK MAKES THE PARTY

(By Art Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in television land. It's time once again for another visit with Just Plain Jack, the true-to-life story of a simple young millionaire's struggles to achieve world peace, social justice, and rapport with his wife.

As we join Just Plain Jack and the beautiful society girl he married, Jack is in the brown study, studying.

JACK. Let's see. The East Germans stop us at the border. So we send an armored train. Then they'll send tanks. So we send two divisions. Then they'll send four divisions. So we send——

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL (shuffling in happily on water skis and tousling Jack's hair). Now put your silly old papers away and help me plan the party.

JACK. Party? Another one? After that Mount Vernon affair?

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Don't be an old grouch. This is going to be a wonderful party. Even better than Mount Vernon.

JACK (suspiciously). What are the water skis for?

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Well, instead of that stuffy old boat ride down the Potomac, all the guests are going to come on water skis. Down the Hudson to the Statue of Liberty. Isn't that a wonderfully quaint place to have a party?

JACK. It'll cost a fortune.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Silly. Tiffany's is donating the skis. They're only 12-karat. And the National Association of Manufacturers is buying me the Statue of Liberty. They're the sweetest men. They don't even want a mention. And the Everfloat Gleaming Plastic Speedboat Co. of Sheboygan.

JACK. Now look, that's just how you got into trouble on that Mount Vernon thing, soliciting donations.

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. But, Bunny, I just took your advice. "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask rather." So I asked them.

JACK. I'm sorry, Dear, but the whole thing is out of the question. We can't possibly * * * (Portly Pierre, the faithful family retainer, bursts in puffing a cigar nervously).

PORTLY PIERRE. Bad news, Chief. The papers are still grumbling about Cuba. The editorial writers don't think you've got a solution for Berlin as good as theirs. And we've got to get the people's minds off world affairs. Say. You want me to go push Carolyn in the pool again?

JACK (gloomily). Can't. She's gone and learned to swim. Hey. (He brightens as he turns to his wife.) Darling, I've been a bear. You go right ahead and hold your party. We'll paint the statue an antique gold. And, Pierre, send an invitation to Charlie de Gaulle. Better ask if he can water ski. And * * *

BEAUTIFUL SOCIETY GIRL. Oh, Bunny. You're wonderful (music, "Home Sweet Home.")

Can De Gaulle make a big splash? Will the NAM keep its word? Tune in again, folks. And in the meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: Nothing takes your mind off your troubles like just plain jack.

House Judiciary Committee Backs Cramer Plan for Vote Fraud Investigations by Amendment to Civil Rights Commission Extension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the action of your Judiciary Committee, which, on Tuesday, approved an amendment I offered broadening the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include all Federal vote fraud cases.

My amendment will authorize the Commission to investigate all voting irregularities involving the election of presidential electors, U.S. Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. Presently, the Commission is limited to investigating minority group deprivations only. Such a limitation is unwarranted if the objective is, as it should be, the preservation of everyone's right to vote.

It is my belief that a person's voting rights are his most precious constitutional possession. The right should certainly be safeguarded and protected whether or not a minority status is involved.

At present, there is no agency of Government authorized and equipped to investigate such cases. It is my belief that my amendment will make up for this deficiency.

The Commission on Civil Rights, under the committee bill, is being extended for an additional 2 years. With the broadened jurisdiction approved by the Judiciary Committee, the Commission can serve an even more worthwhile and useful function in the future in guaranteeing everyone's right to vote.

Because Attorney General Robert Kennedy has expressed his support for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and due to his announced belief that the franchise and other civil rights must be extended to all equally, I have already called upon him to support my clean-election amendment.

I hope and trust that I can look forward to the full backing, not only of the Attorney General, but the entire Congress on this most important amendment.

I am inserting into the RECORD a report on our Judiciary Committee action which appeared in the August 9 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

HOUSE UNIT BACKS PLAN FOR RIGHTS AGENCY TO CHECK ALL VOTE FRAUDS

WASHINGTON.—Over objections of liberal Democrats, Republicans gained House Judiciary Committee approval of a plan to expand the Federal Rights Commission's activities to include investigations of all types of vote frauds.

The move to expand the Commission's jurisdiction was approved, 16 to 10, as an amendment to a bill extending the life of the 5-man agency for 2 years, to September 9, 1963. At present the Commission has authority to investigate election irregularities involving the denial of voting rights to anyone because of race, color, or creed. But under an amendment sponsored by Representative CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, investigations could be conducted in any cases where fraud at the ballot box was suspected.

A FORM OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CRAMER and the 13 other GOP members of the committee said the Commission should have the authority to consider any violation of voting privilege inasmuch as this is a form of civil rights, too. They saw no necessity for limiting the Commission's investigating function only to cases where Negroes or other minority groups are denied the right to vote.

The amendment reflected the resentment that still exists among Republicans over last fall's presidential election and the feeling that former Vice President Nixon's chances may have been hurt by election irregularities.

Chairman CELLER, Democrat of New York, and other liberals on the Judiciary panel argued the Cramer amendment was unnecessary, contending the Justice Department already has authority to look into national elections when fraud is suspected. Others argued the Commission would be gaining too much authority of a quasi-judicial nature and the expansion would lead the agency into a field not intended by Congress when it created the unit several years ago.

WOULD DISCOURAGE VOTE FRAUD

Nevertheless, GOP members said the commission would help focus the spotlight on voting fraud cases, and the mere fact that it had investigative power would tend to discourage fraud at the ballot box. They argued the Justice Department has only limited authority to check into irregularities.

While the amendment may remain in the bill on the House side its prospects for acceptance appear dim in the Senate, where liberal Democrats are firmly in control and are unlikely to go along with the provision unless it is sanctioned by the administra-

tion. But Mr. CRAMER and other Republicans believe the amendment will at least serve the purpose of embarrassing the Democrats: If it is dropped along the way it will suggest a Democratic indifference to vote frauds, the GOP reasons.

The committee voted down, 17 to 7, an administration recommendation that the commission be made permanent. Another amendment to extend it for over 5 years instead of 2 was beaten down by voice vote.

The full text of my amendment provides that the Civil Rights Commission shall:

4. Investigate allegations in writing, under oath or affirmation, that certain citizens of the United States are being unlawfully accorded or denied the right to vote, or to have that vote counted, for presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate or the House of Representatives, as a result of any pattern or practice of fraud or discrimination relating to the conduct of such election.

Oberlin's John Kennedy Joins Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as the Peace Corps has developed, it has been encouraging to see the response from volunteers all over the United States. Coming from all age groups and all walks of life, they have given the Corps a large supply of talent to choose from. Among those now in training camps across the country is John C. Kennedy, the former registrar of Oberlin College, who left his job to put into action his college's motto, "Learning and Labor." The training which he and others will have is well discussed in a recent article in Time. It follows:

PEACE CORPS BOOT CAMPS

After 30 years at Ohio's Oberlin College, John C. Kennedy, 57, last week left his job as alumni recorder, rented his 15-acre farm, and drove off with his schoolteacher wife, Miriam, 53, to join the U.S. Peace Corps. At Pennsylvania State University, the Kennedys began a 7-week cram course with 153 other recruits from 42 States, the biggest single corps group yet launched. Their goal: 2-year jobs as teachers' aids in the rural Philippines. "All our lives we've wanted to do something like this," said Quaker Kennedy. "We've talked about doing something personal for peace. This is our chance."

John Kennedy is the oldest trainee at Peace Corps boot camps, now operating on seven U.S. campuses, from Harvard to Berkeley. Most recruits are in their early 20's; the Kennedys know they may wash out before they ever reach the Philippines. But so may others much younger. If the Peace Corps fails, it will not be for lack of talent to choose from. At the rate of 100 a day, some 12,250 Americans have now volunteered. For brains, looks, and verve, those chosen so far would rank high in any enterprise.

SIXTY HOURS, SIX DAYS

Penn State's contingent had no need for the word of welcoming brass that the Peace Corps is to be no immature "kiddie corps." Arms aching with shots for everything from typhoid to TB, they began studying 60 hours a week on a 6-day schedule (plus exams on Sundays) that is twice the load of ordinary Penn State students. In the Philippines, they will mainly teach elementary science, serve as models of spoken English. But to prepare, they are tackling everything from Philippine history, culture and economics to family habits and sex mores (advice from one Filipino lecturer: "No touch.")—plus first aid, nutrition, U.S. history and world politics. Said one awed Penn State professor: "I wish we had a whole university with folks like this. They're pushing the life out of us to get started."

So it went last week at all the other centers:

Farthest along are 78 Colombia-bound volunteers (all men) at New Jersey's Rutgers University. Sponsored by Care, they have spent six 60-hour weeks studying Spanish, United States, and Latin American culture, how to play soccer and how to ride a horse. Next month they shove off for 2 years of digging wells, building roads and schools in remote mountain villages.

Newest trainees are 18 men and women who started work late last week at Iowa State University. Directed by an organization called Heifer Project, Inc. (which since 1944 has shipped more than 800,000 farm animals and chicks to 60 countries), Iowa State's farmwise corpsmen will spend a month boning up for a tour of improving soil and livestock production on the West Indian island of Santa Lucia. One of Iowa State's volunteers is Madge Shipp, a Negro schoolteacher from Detroit whose age, 55, almost matches Penn State's Kennedys. She quit her $6,600-a-year teaching job because "I feel that people in the highly developed countries have lost their sense of purpose. The Peace Corps is a chance to get away from the materialism of everyday living."

At Harvard, 45 men and women (including three married couples) are training for secondary-school teaching in eastern Nigeria. Picked from 1,400 candidates, they will spend 7 weeks at Harvard, then travel next month to the cooperating University College at Ibadan for 4 months of orientation and practice teaching.

Ruggedest assignment belongs to 43 men at Texas Western College in simmering El Paso. They are surveyors, civil engineers and geologists (median age: 26), headed for road building in transportation-poor Tanganyika. Up at 5:45, they tackle Swahili, East African culture, U.S. history and world politics, study Thoreau, Marx, and Lenin, after lunch head for the dusty hills to lay out imaginary roads. Then comes an hour of physical conditioning ("We don't hike up mountains. We run up them"), followed by more classes after dinner. "I never worked so hard in my life," says one weary student. "Tanganyika can't be any tougher than this." Late this month the group will go to Puerto Rico for 3 weeks of campout training, followed by 7 more weeks of intensive language study at a center on the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro. To one of their Texas Western professors, who has taught for 20 years, "this is the smartest bunch I've ever seen." Equally admiring is the mayor of Tanganyika's biggest city. Dar es Salaam, who visited El Paso last week to inspect the troops. "I am impressed," said he, "with the zest of these young men."

Living and breathing Ghana night and day are 58 men and women at the University of California's Berkeley campus. Next month, after 8 weeks of 12-hour days at Berkeley, they start 2-year, no-vacation jobs in Ghana, teaching English, French, math, chemistry, physics, and biology in secondary schools. To prepare, they have delved into such matters as leprosy, midwifery, "how to be a woman in east Africa," and bush nutrition (fish heads are good, but you don't have to eat the eyes). They have spent a required 9 hours each in the night emergency ward at Berkeley's Herrick Hospital. Ghana itself may not be all that grim. The Ministry of Education, their boss, recently crashed through with $1,960-a-year salaries (in addition to the Peace Corps' $75 a month). Three highly educated Ghanaians are on hand at Berkeley to teach Twi, one of Ghana's principal languages. Alarmed at the erudition of these teachers, one recruit joked: "My God, we're being sent out to lower their standards."

Soon bound for Chile and 10 more weeks of training are 42 of the 50 volunteers at the University of Notre Dame. Largely planned by Notre Dame's president, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, their goal is better farming and lower infant mortality (8 of the women are nurses) in Chile's hardscrabble Central Valley. So poor are the valley's campesinos that almost any contribution is bound to be visible. Putting themselves under orders of Chile's Institute of Rural Education, Notre Dame's corpsmen (ages: 19 to 40) hope to teach hygiene, nutrition, child care, introduce simple games such as volleyball, build chicken coops where chickens now run wild. What they hope for, sums up Bob Woodruff, 23, "is the chance for personal contact instead of dollar diplomacy. This country is too fat, physically and intellectually. It's our duty to help."

HUAC and Its Foes—House Un-American Activities Committee Has Won Respect From Many by Enemies It Has Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when there are so many attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities by the leftwing press and others, it was gratifying for me to find an objective editorial in today's Wall Street Journal by the well-known and competent William Henry Chamberlin.

The editorial follows:

HUAC AND ITS FOES—HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HAS WON RESPECT FROM MANY BY ENEMIES IT HAS MADE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

For a certain section of American public opinion, it is always open season on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or HUAC, to use its convenient abbreviation.

It is understandable that this organization is not popular with Communists and fellow-travelers and the continuing blasts against the committee from these sources may be discounted. But many individuals and some newspapers that have no sympathy for communism, that might generally be described as liberal, join in the hue-and-cry against the HUAC and all its works.

When students, egged on by known and identified local Communists, put on a riotous demonstration against hearings of the committee last year in San Francisco, finally requiring the intervention of the police, there was a nationwide campaign designed to represent the students as civil libertarian martyrs. A film showing some of the disorderly shenanigans at the San Francisco hearings has been assailed with extraordinary virulence. There has been a consistent attempt to represent the committee as manned by a peculiar collection of benighted bigots, irrational crackpots and publicity hunters, as a disgrace to Congress which should be summarily abolished.

The ardent crusaders against the committee overlook the fact that there is a good

deal of rotation and shifting in its bipartisan membership. Consequently, the HUAC, like other congressional committees, is almost bound to be reasonably representative of an elected Congress which, in turn, is reasonably representative of the grassroots sentiment of the American people.

An image has been created of the committee as an irresponsible inquisition, running about on wild fishing expeditions, serving no useful legislative purpose, operating outside any procedural and legal safeguards and restrictions, taking sadistic pleasure in browbeating innocent and patriotic Americans, all without any clear mandate from Congress. The ascertainable facts reveal a very different picture.

HOW THE LAW READS

The duties of the committee, as defined in Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946) are to make investigations of: (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries, or of a domestic origin, and attacks the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation; and (4) to exercise watchfulness over the execution by administrative agencies of laws relating to subversive activities and internal security.

It is a frequent allegation of critics of the HUAC that it has not rendered any service in proposing legislation, that its investigations have not helped to uncover Soviet spies and subversive agents. But the factual record shows otherwise. Every annual report of the HUAC contains specific suggestions for remedial legislation. There were several predecessors of the HUAC, committees which carried out the same functions under different titles. Between 1941 and 1958 these committees offered 80 legislative suggestions, of which 35 were enacted into law. HUAC investigations helped to cast light on the doings of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and various Soviet agents.

It is untrue, despite strenuous efforts to create the impression, that the HUAC functions like a star chamber, picking witnesses out of a hat, observing no legal restraints, imposing sentences at its discretion. It is not a court of law and has no punitive powers. Anyone subpenaed by the HUAC may have the advice of counsel and may submit a prepared statement for inclusion in the record.

The courts have consistently refused to abridge the right of congressional committees to carry out investigations and to have recalcitrant witnesses, unless they seek asylum in the fifth amendment, cited for contempt of Congress. And it is a rather striking example of "doublethink" that the same type of people who applauded committees which went after the "merchants of death" in the 1930's without gloves, which got the oil magnate Harry F. Sinclair sent to jail for contempt of Congress, which delved into the business affairs of J. P. Morgan, are inclined to denounce the HUAC as an intolerable tyranny.

NEED AND JUSTIFICATION

This, of course, leads to the question whether there is need and justification for such a body as the HUAC. Perhaps "un-American" was not the best word that could have been chosen: "anti-American" might have been a more accurate description of the activities which the committee is empowered to investigate and expose with a view to preparing the ground for remedial legislation.

That there is an organized anti-American campaign of subversive propaganda, emanating from Moscow and Peiping, with branches in other Communist-ruled countries, such as Cuba, can hardly be denied. This campaign is an important weapon in the cold war. It does not seem unreasonable that the American people, through a properly constituted committee of its Congress, should keep an eye on this campaign. A free society can and must, if it is to remain free, tolerate heresy, the expression of unpopular dissenting views. But it is under no obligation to remain passive in the face of hostile conspiracy.

Many sincere people who have no sympathy or association with communism have taken up the cry against the HUAC, often, one feels, on a basis of insufficient knowledge of HUAC's actual record and of the larger issues of the cold war. But a disproportionately large share of the drumfire of attack on the committee comes from individuals, organizations, and publications with Communist and fellow-traveler associations.

As Grover Cleveland was loved for the enemies he made among crooked politicians of his own party, the HUAC may properly be proud of many of the enemies it has made.

State Department Official Tips Hand Over Borrowing Authority in Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the August 9 issue of the New York Times, Mr. Theodore Tennenwald, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State with intimate responsibilities in the foreign aid program, took the able and respected Arthur Krock to task for his recent column on the administration's demand that Congress give it authority to commit the Treasury to $8,800 million for foreign nations development loans over the next 5 years. He accused Mr. Krock of indulging in the omission of pertinent facts and inaccurate statements of facts. Some of Mr. Tannenwald's statements had the familiar ring of extravagance so characteristic of the executive branch in its insistence that it be given this carte blanche authority. So I discussed it with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. GERALD FORD, a ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and one who has heard the testimony on foreign aid budgets for several years, past and again this year. He was appalled that such a high ranking official, although conforming to the bureaucratic pattern, would indulge in the very thing he deplored—omission of pertinent facts and inaccurate statements.

Congressman FORD felt compelled to try to correct the record of misinformation and inaccuracies spread by this high official here on the eve of floor debate in the House. His refutation is in the mail today and I asked him for a copy of it. Using the administration's own testimony, Congressman FORD conclusively and, to me unassailably, proves that all the reassurances offered about Congress having full control of the use of the $8.8 billion is an unvarnished red herring.

Dissemination of the truth about the matter is so vital to orderly and responsible disposition of the question that I take the liberty of inserting Congressman FORD's letter at this point:

AUGUST 10, 1961.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I do not recall an important issue before the Congress in recent years on which there has been more confusion, so much uncertainty, and so much conflicting statements from responsible sources as currently pervades the Halls of Congress on the administration's urgent request for authority to borrow $8.8 billion from the Treasury over the next 5 years for foreign aid development loans. The letter of Mr. Tannenwald, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, in your August 9 issue epitomizes the situation. It is appalling, but not exactly surprising, that a high official of the administration—he is closely identified with the foreign aid program—would make some of the statements he does in a letter denouncing Arthur Krock's August 4 column as "omitting a number of pertinent facts and not stating accurately other facts." Pertinency is often a matter of opinion; on occasion, so is accuracy. For my part, Mr. Tannenwald is in some respects guilty of what he deplores, and the average reader, not intimately acquainted with the hard and practical legislative facts of life, the technicalities of legislative procedures, or the machinations of bureaucracy, might be moved to wonder why Mr. Tannenwald apparently was not fully conscious of the impact of all he said. As I shall submit, he even went so far as to put himself in direct opposition to testimony of his superiors. And as others have done, he hangs on legalisms and indulges in technicalities.

I will say this: Near the end, he voluntarily tipped his hand. He revealed that the administration proposal is an all-out effort to secure, right now, $8.8 billion without the Congress—short of most extreme circumstances—interfering with its use by the executive branch over the next 5 years.

1. Mr. Tannenwald correctly notes that, as now written, the legislation requires the President to annually submit a budget to Congress under the Corporation Control Act showing how the funds are to be used, etc. Then he says:

"The President will not be able to obligate or spend these funds until Congress has enacted an authorization in an appropriation bill for the use of the funds."

There are many Members of Congress who regard this as opposite to what no less an authority than Treasury Secretary Dillon told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the following exchange taken from the printed record:

"Senator WILLIAMS. As I understand it, and I think we ought to get this clear, you come back each year and report to Congress, but you do not need any additional action on the part of the Congress to get the money, if we approve this bill as it is written; is that correct?

"Secretary DILLON. That is correct."

I fail to see how both can be right.

2. As others have done, Mr. Tannenwald indulges the obvious when he asserts that Congress would have full legal power to limit the use of these funds. Of course, it would. It is a rare occasion when the Congress is without raw legal power—note the word "legal"—to change its mind and amend a law in practically any way it deems appropriate. But hanging on legalisms here substantially begs the question—certainly where delicate and far-reaching arrangements with sovereign foreign nations are involved. Listen to what his superior, Secretary Rusk, told the House Committee on Appropriations on this question of annual congressional control over these funds:

"Secretary RUSK. As a matter of the law and the Constitution, it [Congress] would have the same control. However, I would be less than candid if I did not say that the exercise of that control by the Congress on an annual basis would be a more serious step

in terms of our commitments and relations with other governments than would be true under the present arrangement."

3. This very question of control by Congress is so crucial to the understanding and consideration of the proposition that I again quote from Secretary Dillon. He was asked what would be the situation if Congress decided to cut a part of the $8.8 billion but in the meantime under long-range programing, commitments had been made with foreign countries. Could Congress then limit expenditures below what had been committed? Would these commitments not be obligations of this country with each nation with which we had made them? Listen to the reply:

"Secretary DILLON. I would like to be perfectly clear on that, Senator. Congress does have the authority to limit it, and could limit it, but it would have the effect of the United States not living up to its commitments. So I believe there would be very strong pressure on Congress not to have the United States default on a commitment which it had legally made."

In the face of that statement, Mr. Tannenwald says Mr. Krock was "incorrect" when he suggested that if Congress were to limit or terminate the previously granted borrowing authority the United States would be in default in its foreign aid commitments. Then hanging on technicalities, he concludes that "there could be no question of a default."

Well, Secretaries Rusk and Dillon say otherwise.

4. Then Mr. Tannenwald takes Mr. Krock to task for suggesting that the alternative proposal for a 5-year authorization for appropriation, to be followed by annual appropriations as at present, would "commit Congress morally" to supply the actual appropriation. Well, I readily concede it is a proper question to consider and that there should be a clear understanding at the outset, but I would recall that in this current session, when the $500 million special aid for Latin America was up under essentially identical circumstances, much was made of the moral commitment to supply the funds which the Congress had authorized to be appropriated last year. And every dollar was supplied.

But there seems to be no doubt in the executive branch about the moral commitment question if this 5-year, $8.8 billion direct Treasury borrowing proposition is adopted. Secretary Dillon again:

"I think there is a strong moral obligation to put that money up, and I do not think we should try here to say anything else than that at all."

5. Yet Mr. Tannenwald persists. He says: "This is not so" to this statement:

"Since technically the Executive could commit in 1 fiscal year the entire $8.8 billion Congress had given it for 5 years, there conceivably could be no money left for Congress to recapture."

He suggests ignorance of the difference between the commitment and the legal obligation of funds. Well, once again, let's call on the Secretaries. They are the two highest officials of the administration actively supporting the proposition before the Congress and they have been up and down every side and facet of the matter. I have already offered several quotes that bear rather realistically on this point—so realistically in fact that they satisfy me that here again the criticism hangs largely on legalisms and technicalities. But here is another from the printed committee hearings:

"Mr. PASSMAN. In effect, the executive branch could if it should so determine, commit the entire $8.8 billion during fiscal year 1962 on a conditional basis?

"Secretary DILLON. They could commit $1,187 million firmly, and they could commit the rest of it conditionally.

"Mr. PASSMAN. It could be be committed, nevertheless?

"Secretary DILLON. Conditionally, it could be."

Unquestionably, the several quotes from the two Secretaries are ample basis for the conjecture that there conceivably could be no funds left to recapture.

In conclusion, this long-term financing proposition, and some others similar to it and now rather commonly known as "backdoor" financing, raises questions vital to the orderly processes of representative government. The Congress, as the directly elected representatives of the people, has but one certain and continuing way to effectively control the Government. That is the power of the purse. No other certain way exists. So when such a proposition as the pending $8.8 billion, 5-year borrowing authority is submitted, above all things we must know its full dimensions and characteristics before we vote. Do what we will—but know what we are doing. The legislative committees have submitted it to the two Houses of Congress in essentially the form advocated by the executive branch and without substantial alteration of the intents which accompanied it. It comes to the floor for debate heavily clouded by confusion, by uncertainty, and by conflicting statements—assurances on the one hand that Congress will retain control and warnings on the other that if it does exercise its powers to limit the funds, it will be accused of defaulting on commitments. Mr. Tannenwald's letter in substantial measure follows the pattern.

I am honestly convinced that the administration on the one hand when making commitments to foreign governments maximizes the difference between its new backdoor method of financing a substantial part of the foreign aid program and the traditional congressional method of funding where true legislative control exists. On the other hand the executive branch minimizes the difference between the alternative methods of funding or downgrades the uniqueness or lack of congressional control of its proposal when submitting the proposition to the Congress. The executive branch seems to want it both ways.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Robert Moses, New York's Man of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, New York State has been blessed for over 30 years by having as one of its most distinguished citizens, the Honorable Robert Moses.

He has been the chief architect and engineer of the system of State parks and parkways, as well as the famous Jones Beach on Long Island. He has done wonders for the city of New York and has served as chairman of many commissions within the State of New York that have brought about more pleasure, comfort, and convenience for the people of New York State than any known man in history.

Robert Moses is a man who is unique unto himself. Political parties have come and gone and he has served honorably and well, regardless of which political party is the controlling factor at any given time.

Recently, Robert Moses had the honor of having conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of fine arts of Niagara University, N.Y. I have the honor to insert herewith, a statement conferring this degree by the president of Niagara University and I am also inserting a list of four degrees and 21 honorary degrees conferred on Robert Moses from 1909 to 1961.

I am sure it would be hard to find any other individual who has received or is more worthy of the honors conferred on Mr. Moses.

The statement and list are attached:

DOCTOR OF FINE ARTS: HON. ROBERT MOSES

Magnanimity means literally "greatness of soul" and it is fortitude carried to the degree of heroism—a high excellence in every kind of virtue. The magnanimous man is the great man and no man can be called great unless he is also magnanimous. This man that Niagara University is privileged to welcome today is truly a magnanimous man. He takes little delight in praise and honor—he is strong in adversity—quick to help others—he is independent—plain with ordinary people, always at ease with important people—he declares his views frankly and openly; he is not afraid of men's blame nor does he seek their praise, but only to do what is right. He abounds in confidence, in God and in himself under God's omnipotent help and he is secure and stable, without fear.

This great man, veteran of 40 years of dedicated service to God, country, and New York State—currently directing the construction of the $720 million State power project, adjacent to Niagara University which proudly bears his name, has played a prominent role in the development, past, present, and the future of the Empire State. Honored by diplomats and statesmen, educators, and national leaders, the powerful and the humble, this man stands as one of the great cooperators in God's plans for the universe by using God-given talents to harness the forces of nature.

Niagara University is deeply honored to welcome such a giant among men as one of her most beloved guests and place upon his shoulders the hood of her doctorate proclaiming Robert Moses, honoris causa, a doctor of fine arts.

ROBERT MOSES DEGREES

Bachelor of arts, Yale, 1909; Oxford, 1911.
Master of arts, Oxford, 1913.
Doctor of philosophy, Columbia, 1914.
Honorary master of arts, Yale, 1936.
Honorary doctor of laws, Syracuse, 1936; Union, 1938; Bates, 1945; Princeton, 1947; Hofstra, 1948.
Honorary doctor of engineering, New York University, 1950.
Honorary doctor of laws, Columbia, 1952; Yale, 1952; Harvard, 1953.
Honorary doctor of engineering, Michigan, 1953; Manhattan, 1954.
Honorary doctor of laws, Long Island University, 1954.
Honorary doctor of humane letters, Colgate, 1954.
Honorary doctor of laws, Pratt, 1955.
Honorary doctor of engineering, Brooklyn Polytechnic, 1956.
Honorary doctor of engineering, Buffalo, 1959.
Honorary doctor of humane letters, Fordham, 1959.
Honorary doctor of engineering, St. John's, 1959.
Honorary doctor of fine arts, Niagara, 1961.
Honorary doctor of laws, New York Law, 1961.

Castro Appeals to the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, since Members of the House of Representatives are charged under our Constitution with the authority to vote upon declarations of war, it is especially important that Members never substitute emotionalism for prudence nor either hearsay or assumptions for documented facts. While a minority may let emotionalism dominate, the majority are usually hesitant to say anything. This tends to give a misleading impression, for I am sure the vast majority have and will carefully and thoughtfully exercise the great responsibility the American people and the world expect of the Members of Congress.

The following editorial from the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune of August 7, 1961, sets out many facts which seem to have been overlooked, and studying it should help one reflect upon the situation:

CASTRO APPEALS TO THE U.N.

The Texas plane hijacking incident last week unfortunately gave Fidel Castro another opportunity to charge that the United States was planning war against Cuba.

The Cuban delegate to the United Nations, in a letter to the president of the U.N. Security Council, said U.S. Congressmen had made an "insolent threat of war" and Cuba was "in imminent danger of aggression that is threatening her territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty."

If the Congressmen had waited to find out the facts about the Texas incident before "popping off," Castro would not have had this opening for making a little propaganda that might help his cause with some other Latin American countries. It is regrettable that the Congressmen were so irresponsible.

Cuba has asked the U.N. council to take "appropriate measures to avoid a repetition of such incidents." There are no appropriate measures the U.N. can take to silence Members of Congress. The right of Congressmen to express their views can't be suppressed. It is to be hoped, however, that the party leaders and the administration will use their influence to calm down those who talk before they think and before they get the facts.

One fact that seems to have been lost sight of is that Castro has offered to place the disposition of the American commercial airliner which Cuba seized in July in the hands of the U.N. Security Council. The U.N. council has taken no action on the suggestion.

Castro's offer is tricky. He wants the U.S. reaction to his own illegal action in refusing to return the airliner interpreted as a threat to peace. He is contending that the airliner is being held in Cuba because a Cuban company has obtained court orders attaching the plane to satisfy an unexplained debt.

Thus Castro is making the same case, even though it probably is completely phony, for holding this airliner that is being made by American business concerns for holding Cuban planes which were seized in the U.S. to satisfy claims of American creditors. And some of those Cuban planes were hijacked, too.

The Cuban Government last weekend made another offer to return the Eastern Airlines plane which is more hopeful than a U.N. solution. Cuba said it is ready to return the plane if the United States releases a Cuban patrol boat that it claims was stolen by "counter-revolutionary" elements and taken to a U.S. port.

The Cuban message noted that the United States had informed the U.N. Security Council that the American Government would protect foreign ships and planes from court-ordered sales if the United States was asked to do so through diplomatic channels. The Cuban message went through diplomatic channels—it was sent to the Swiss Embassy which represents United States interests in Cuba.

There is every reason to believe that the return of the plane can be arranged without taking the rash measures proposed by some Members of Congress.

Foreign-Made Consumer Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the opposition to the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment—of which I am chairman—is beginning to show its poisonous fangs in the form of unwarranted, unproved charges of bias and discrimination against importer groups. This is an old story in Government: when you cannot fight opposition with the facts, destroy the opposition with untruths or half truths.

No person, no group has been denied the witness chair; and while all have been invited, most of the witnesses have been Americans injured by imports. It is no fault of the committee that the free trade advocates have not accepted invitations to appear. If any group refuses to come before the committee and still criticizes its procedures, it must have something to hide.

The largest and most powerful group of lobbyists in and out of official Government is at work to counteract the effects of the study on imports. There are at least three official studies being made by the administration spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. The list of registered foreign lobbyists will fill a catalog. Some of the largest law firms in the country are representatives of foreign governments, importer groups and exporters with their fees running into huge sums of money.

The story of imports can never be fully told, because the man who loses his job to a foreign worker has absolutely no voice on the American scene. How can the unemployed glassworker in Arnold, Pa., or Charleston, W. Va., pit himself against the foreign trade representative whose foot presses open almost any door on Capitol Hill?

How can an American worker who fought valiantly for years under the banner of "Buy union-made goods," "Shop at union served stores," "Build with union craftsmen," understand the new philosophy which makes it almost treasonable to suggest that American-made goods create better working conditions for American workers than goods imported from low standard countries.

If this Nation continues the trend to foreign-made consumer goods, the American producer will be forced to step up his program of automation, more workers will be thrown out of work, and within 5 years the country will be in the worst economic mess of its entire industrial life.

This Nation has no monopoly on brains, skill or production processes. There is nothing to stop every nation from overproducing its requirements and to let any nation build its economy on an expectation of flooding the American market with its surplus is unfair to both the American as well as the foreign nations' economies.

I recognize the lift that will come to our industrial picture with the additional defense spending and the position of Secretary of the Treasury Dillion who wrote me just last week defending foreign aid spending because it makes jobs for Americans.

However, I also recognize the simple economic facts of life. You can't buy from yourself with money you receive from selling to yourself without running out of one or the other, either money or customers. When I am told that unless we buy from other countries, they couldn't buy from us, I have to admit it doesn't impress me. Why? Simply because every nation on earth protects its employment by tariff, embargos, money convertibility, or quotas on foreign goods coming into their country in competition with domestic industries.

The simple answer—but, of course, simple answers are not desirable—is for the world to be cut into hemispheres or continental trade areas. The only protection against the trade and economic groupings being set up in Europe and South America is for this Nation to create a North American trade area with Canada, Mexico, Central America, and Carribean Islands. Each trade group must have its own money exchange, its own external protections.

It is plain horsesense to recognize the need for protection within the trade group of countries. What good will it do a nation producing goods for trade with its member nations if an outside nation has the free entry into the trade group with a competitive product produced under conditions of lower wages, lower taxes and, in most cases, subsidized by the producer nation.

The member nation can produce and sell in competition with other member nations because they will and must be competing in a production climate of basic equality in exchange values, wages, taxes and a common military as well as economic front.

This does not bar outside trade but it will force all nations into trade groups that will become self-sufficient in both consumption as well as production. If a trade group lacks certain products it will certainly remove all restrictions against the importation of the things the member countries need and in turn other trade groups will do the same.

Does it not seem silly for any nation with the means, the men, the money

and the market, to idle the means and the men and give the money to another nation along with its market, exposing its economy to the creeping paralysis of depression, recession and oblivion.

The theory of world free trade is idealistic and a worthy goal for mankind. However the proponents of theoretical utopia must recognize the realistic and practical results that must follow the attainment of the goal. It means that no nation can live better than another economically. It means that free enterprise as we have known it will be wiped from the face of the earth. It means that all trade, all production, all consumption, all profits, wages and transportation will be directed, dictated, and regulated by government—not for the betterment of the individual but for the stability and security of the governments.

I am not one who shouts against communism or socialism as an answer to every question I cannot answer. I cannot help but observe in passing, however, that the end result of an equalized world economy may well be the end of personal freedom, personal ambition and personal fortunes. This may be what we are seeking and if it is, the people ought to know.

When you stop to think about the number of laws and regulations passed by the Congress and State legislatures to keep competition in the United States within limits and then say that it is fair to force American industry and workmen to compete with competitive industry and workmen not bound by the same rules, you are either plain stupid or intentionally dishonest.

I prefer to believe the first, but I am getting mighty suspicious of the influence of the second reason.

The same freetraders and Government officials who promote the idea of GATT and OCED sit idly by while Florida puts a one-eighth-cent-a-pound—tariff—fee on imported chickens from Georgia, and Georgia retaliates with a 5-cent-a-box—tariff—in the form of sales tax or inspection fee against the importer of goods from another State.

For instance, if you live in one State with a sales tax and buy a set of furniture in another State, you have to pay 4 percent of your cost to the State residence before you can import the furniture.

Another prime example is whisky. Whisky produces more national and State revenue per ounce than any other volume product in America and yet it cannot be moved across most State lines without violating a protective State tariff law—State tax.

The proponents of free trade in our Government told a glassmaker that the copying of his exclusive design by a foreign glassmaker, who was flooding the American market at a price about one-third his cost of production, was allowable because it gave the American consumer a bargain and it added to the purchasing power of the housewife's dollar.

Why then does not the same administrative body force the governments of the various States to relinquish their taxing powers when such powers are used to protect their merchants and State revenues by prohibiting the personal purchases by citizens who move across State lines unless they pay equalizing taxes—tariffs—as they reenter their respective home States?

Why does one State put up protective barriers against milk from another State?

In plain words, Mr. Gullible—the average American—is told that it is all right for the Nation to close its plants, cut its revenue and add to its unemployed in order to give the American housewife a cheaper, foreign-made product, but that is wrong for that same housewife to buy a cheaper product in one State if she lives in another.

A Canadian may sell gas to American buyers without paying one-cent to the American Government but an American cannot buy one cubic foot of gas from an American gas distributor or producer without paying a tax or tariff.

You can go on for days and never run out of examples of the double standard practiced by the very Government departments and officials that demand a practical administration of economic laws nationally while completely ignoring the economic application of international laws.

For instance, the Government sets a quota on the importation of foreign oils—crude and residual—and yet sits idly by while importers practice a type of smuggling that brings into the United States millions of barrels above the set quotas.

This well-known, but somehow not seen, operation is known as the "Brownsville loop" operation. Ships come into Brownsville, Tex., stop but do not unload for a limited time period. Then they move the oil on to their point of destination not as foreign oil but as part of the domestic oil supply.

The coal miner who loses his job because of this illegal operation is ridiculed as a selfish man without regard for his lesser endowed neighbor in Venezuela and the coal mine operator who claims "foul" is told that he is more interested in his profits than in the goodwill we are buying with his taxes. Funny thing, in most instances, I have found that the only reason oil is shipped here is because there is profit in it.

Goodwill is a wonderful thing, but try and make a profit out of a bankrupt coal mine with a lot of goodwill on the books.

Another great fooler that is fed to Mr. Gullible is that the exportation of goods creates jobs for Americans while the importation of goods does not take jobs from Americans.

For instance, the auto workers are told that it is all right for Volkswagens to come into America at a price less than the auto worker can make the American car for because they buy the steel from America and it makes jobs for the steelworkers. The steelworker is told that it is all right for foreign steel to come into America because the foreign country if buying cotton and giving the cotton workers a job. The shirt maker is told it is all right for the 11 cents an hour Hong Kong shirt to be sold in America because Hong Kong buys its coal from the United States.

The one thing that everybody seems to forget is that if Volkswagens did not come into the United States, the American auto worker would make that many more cars and would use the steel that is sold to Germany. The same is true of cotton. If Japan did not ship in millions of yards of textiles, the American textile workers would buy the cotton here in America. If Hong Kong was not shipping shirts more shirt plants would open here and buy the coal now purchased by Hong Kong. This could go on and on. You say, how can you justify or prove your case? My answer is simple and true. Read American history. In spite of arguments to the contrary, very few advocates of free trade that I know personally are not paid in one form or another for advocating free trade.

I am compiling a list of law firms, individuals and organizations, that represent or front for foreign-made goods, foreign nations, and foreign trade organizations for the information of the House of Representatives.

Russia Should Pay Up in U.N. or Get Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is just sound reasoning that before you have a voice in the affairs of any organization you must be a member in good standing. Over the past year the Communists have made considerable noise in the United Nations and have gravely influenced many of its decisions. In keeping with the usual Communist philosophy that they are not bound by any of the rules expected of more enlightened governments, we find that Russia and her two voting provinces in the U.N. owe more than $26 million of their share of maintaining the United Nations. Because the United States has been putting up most of the money to run the U.N. and will, undoubtedly be called upon to make up any deficits, I think there should be only one solution—either Russia should pay up or get out. If the Communists do not see fit to take either course and if the U.N. feels that Russia should sit in the councils without paying, then the United States should call the whole thing off and withdraw. The following article from the U.S. News & World Report reveals the financial condition of the U.N.:

U.N.'s LATEST PROBLEM: $40 MILLION IN DEBT

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The U.N. is so short of money it may have to pull U.N. troops out of the Congo and the Gaza strip next spring.

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld warns of the threatened cutbacks in the budget message he is submitting this month.

Old debts are unpaid. At midyear, Russia and her two voting provinces, the Ukraine and Byelorussia, owed more than $26 million for the Congo and Gaza. France owed $9.5 million for the Congo.

Unless the U.N. can collect these and other debts, or dig up new money, Mr. Hammarskjöld says, the U.N. will be $40 million in debt by the year end, up to $60 million behind by March, about $90 million in the red at the end of next June.

Appendix

Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a number of newspapers recently published a series of three articles about the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.

I ask unanimous consent to insert these articles, distributed by United Features Syndicate under the byline of L. M. Berniere, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Article 1]

THE SENATE'S QUIET PERSUADER—NICE GUYS FINISH LAST?—GENIAL MIKE MANSFIELD PROVES IT ISN'T TRUE—MONTANA SENATOR'S SOFT MANNER IN STEERING KENNEDY PROGRAM SEEMS TO BE PAYING OFF

(Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, is anything but the commonly accepted prototype of a Washington politician. Yet he holds one of the Capital's most powerful political jobs and has proved, in these first 5 months of the new Congress, that he knows well how to get what he wants in gaining enactment of the administration's legislative program. And although they may not agree with him on this program, Senators on both sides of the aisle look to Majority Leader MANSFIELD with respect. Here, then, is the first part of a profile of MIKE MANSFIELD—the man, the public servant, the scholar, the student of foreign affairs.)

(By L. M. Berniere)

WASHINGTON.—Baseball's firebrand, Leo Durocher, once said: "Nice guys finish last."

Maybe in baseball, but not in the U.S. Senate, where one of the nicest—and quietest—"guys" rules as the new top man: the majority leader.

The "nice guy" is Senator MICHAEL JOSEPH MANSFIELD, of Montana, a gentle fellow who is as plain as the name he goes by—MIKE—and as unpretentious as the battered old sweatshirt and faded blue denims he wears in an occasional softball game.

MANSFIELD'S ascension to the majority leadership is an important byproduct of President Kennedy's New Frontier. For 3 years, he had served as understudy and assistant to the Senate Democratic leader—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas.

Then, pupil succeeded teacher when last November's Democratic Presidential election victory made JOHNSON Vice President of the United States and, as such, Presiding Officer of the Senate. From this lofty vantage point, JOHNSON now watches his former pupil in action in the Senate as the majority leader.

Any similarity between teacher and pupil—in technique, tactics, personality and method—is purely and simply nonexistent. In these respects, and others, the two are 180-degree opposites.

JOHNSON was the flamboyant, razzle-dazzle, hard-driving man in motion who stood astride the Senate like a colossus—the complete boss, the complete extrovert. In the cloakroom, he was a backslapper, a lapel-grabber and ear-whisperer who skillfully blended stern persuasiveness and drawling cajolery.

MANSFIELD is none of these. Rather, this pipe-smoking, ascetic-looking man is an almost shy introvert who, as Democratic leader, has wrought a quiet revolution in the Senate with his soft manner, his genial personality, his unobtrusively efficient way of doing things.

With his quiet competence, MANSFIELD has succeeded for the most part in keeping the Senate in line, in delivering the necessary support to the new administration's legislative program, in maintaining party unity (mostly) among such geographic and ideological opposites in his party as Virginia's HARRY F. BYRD and Oregon's WAYNE MORSE.

And, in a city where political ego is accepted currency, MANSFIELD is disarmingly humble and frank.

"I've been very lucky," he tells visitors to his unpretentious suite of offices. "We shouldn't get any idea that we are big shots because we have been lucky enough to win an election. Luck plays a large part in this profession. I feel extremely lucky—I was the first born in this country of my family, Irish immigrants."

Luck, perhaps. But hard work, and perseverance, were the ingredients of success for MANSFIELD, who was born in New York, March 16, 1903. At the age of 3 he was brought to Great Falls, Mont., by his parents. His mother died when he was 6. His father, Patrick, a sturdy 85, is still living in Montana.

At the age of 14 and before he'd finished the eighth grade, MANSFIELD fibbed about his age and enlisted in the Navy—embarking on a military career that was to include service as a sailor, soldier, and marine, all within a 5-year span.

During World War I, he served 19 months in the Navy, 10 of them overseas, then enlisted in the Army in hope of drawing occupation duty in Germany. He wound up in California.

After a year of this, he joined the Marines to see the world, and did. He served in China and the Philippines during his 2 years as a devil dog. In 1922, he returned to Montana as a shoveler and then as a mining engineer in the Butte copper mines.

In 1927, he passed entrance examinations and enrolled at the Montana School of Mines as a special student, then matriculated as a special student at Montana State University in 1930. Up to now, he still hadn't graduated from grammar or high school.

Then, at age 30, as a university senior, he at long last completed his high school requirements and got his A.B. degree. He won his master's degree in 1934, then studied some more at the University of California. He joined the faculty of Montana State University as a professor of political science and of American and Far Eastern history.

The school of hard knocks, and of formal education, gave him the experience and training, the keen understanding of human problems, the gentle forbearance, the barbed-wire resoluteness, the code of fairness and integrity which have made him a success at whatever he tackled.

MANSFIELD crossed the threshold into a distinguished political career in 1942 when he was elected to the House of Representatives, replacing Miss Jeanette Rankin—the only Member of Congress to vote against the U.S. declaration of war against Japan following the Pearl Harbor attack.

As a freshman Congressman, he achieved an honor which comes to few first-year Members—he was made a member of the all-important House Foreign Affairs Committee, a tribute to his knowledge of Far Eastern problems. In 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt tapped him for a special factfinding mission to China. There, he noted the growing Communist strength that eventually was to result in the Red takover of the China mainland.

After World War II, President Truman offered MANSFIELD the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. MANSFIELD respectfully declined the honor because he felt he could be more useful in Congress. In 1951, he served as U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly.

Then, after 10 years in the House of Representatives, MANSFIELD ran for the Senate in 1952—and won.

He took the oath as Senator along with another Senate newcomer who was destined for bigger things—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. They worked together, and played softball and touch football together. Eventually, they also served together on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

MANSFIELD went on to become one of the Senate's most articulate—and most expert—spokesmen on foreign policy. And, in 1957, he rose to the No. 2 spot in the Senate Democratic hierarchy—party whip. This made him assistant to Majority Leader JOHNSON.

In the showdown for the Democratic presidential nomination at Los Angeles in July 1960, MANSFIELD backed a loser—JOHNSON. But, when Kennedy drafted JOHNSON as his running mate and the ticket squeezed through to victory in November, MANSFIELD was thrust into a new role.

Now, reluctantly, he was the No. 1 man in the Senate.

[Article 2]

THE SENATE'S QUIET PERSUADER—MANSFIELD NO BACK SLAPPER, BUT HE WAS FAR AND AWAY THE FIRST CHOICE AS LEADER—DIDN'T SEEK TOP JOB, WONDERED ABOUT POSSIBLE CRITICISM ON GROUNDS OF RELIGION

(This is the second part of a penetrating profile of a rare species of Washington politician—Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.)

(By L. M. Berniere)

WASHINGTON.—Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, is a rare political species.

This humble son of an Irish immigrant isn't quite sure whether he was cut out to be a politician. And he didn't want the No. 1 Senate job he now holds.

"Sometimes," he told a visitor recently, "I wonder why I'm in politics. I'm just not the type who can go around slapping people on the back."

But his colleagues long since became aware that he didn't have to be a back slapper to win their support and their admiration. They were impressed by his quiet persuasive-

ness, his keen intellect, his homespun integrity.

So it was that when the Senate Democratic leadership became vacant by reason of LYNDON B. JOHNSON's election as Vice President, there was no doubt as to JOHNSON's successor. To a man, his Democratic colleagues and two former colleagues—President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson—had but one choice: Mansfield.

There was doubt only in MANSFIELD's mind. For one thing, he had some misgivings on religious grounds. With a Catholic now in the White House for the first time, MANSFIELD felt there might be critical public reaction if he, also a Catholic, were installed as Senate Democratic leader. (His fears proved unfounded.)

"Furthermore," MANSFIELD said gravely, "I didn't want the job. I prefer being just a Senator because, when you are majority leader, you lose a certain amount of independence you have when you are just a Senator."

But "Senator MIKE" is not one to run away from a call to duty.

Once MANSFIELD took over the leadership, he knew exactly how he wanted to run the job. And once he began running the job, it became evident that he had brought to the task an approach and a method of operation completely different from that of his predecessor—JOHNSON. The pupil was not following the teacher's style.

This battle-lean (164 pounds) 6-footer determined at the outset that the leadership "is not going to be a one-man operation." To his lieutenants—Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida—he delegated definite responsibility. He has seen to it that they take their turn on the Senate floor as acting leader.

He restored to committee chairmen their historical power. He calls them together from time to time and seeks their advice and counsel on method, strategy, and procedure on legislative matters.

"Collectively, they represent a great amount of wisdom and knowledge," MANSFIELD said recently of his chairmen. "I can only profit from meeting with them."

In the beginning, MANSFIELD set forth this line of procedure: "I will be the leader, but responsibility will be diffused. I would like, if possible, to make our efforts cooperative. If there is a decision to be made, I'll make it—no one else—but only after consultation, advice, and counsel."

He likewise laid down a code for dealing with his fellow Senators: "I will endeavor to get my colleagues to see my point of view by persuasiveness and logic. There will be no pressures of any kind. In my book, every Senator agrees or disagrees on an equal footing, and is given equal consideration. I treat them as I would like to be treated."

Soon after he took over, there was some grumbling among his party members because he put through a motion to have Vice President JOHNSON preside over meetings of Democratic Senators.

"It was my own idea," MANSFIELD explains. "I felt that the Vice President should be given more recognition than in the past; that if he came to the Democratic meetings, he should not be left outside the door or given a back seat. This gives him no authority, but he is there if his advice and counsel are needed. I think it right and proper to do so."

The grumbling soon ceased, and MANSFIELD went ahead with the big job of trying to unite his party behind the President's program.

MANSFIELD himself shuns labels which would characterize various shades of political philosophy and attitudes.

"I don't like terms like 'middle of the road,' 'conservative' or 'liberal,'" he says of his own political philosophy. "I'm just a Democrat. I don't like to be labeled. I want to retain as much independence of judgment as I can. I'm not going to vote for anything because it is liberal or conservative. The people of Montana sent me here to do my own thinking and to express my own judgment."

But MANSFIELD is realistic. He is quite aware that there are sharply varying shades of attitudes, different political philosophies within the Senate Democratic ranks and that they must be dealt with.

"The big challenge of the leadership job is to keep the different segments of the party together," MANSFIELD says. "The Republicans you don't worry much about because you expect opposition from them. Within our party there are diverse elements. It is incumbent on me, and I am determined, to bring a fusion of views in order to pass responsible legislation. That legislation is going to be the President's program.

"I think the President has been moderate in what he has proposed, understanding in what he has suggested. Based on his 14 years in Congress, he is aware of the need for cooperation with the Congress. But he recognizes the fact that, under the Constitution, he has well spelled-out responsibilities and he intends to assume them.

"President Kennedy has an extraordinarily keen sense of historical perspective. He knows the line of demarcation between the legislative and executive branches."

MANSFIELD is confident that, as far as the Senate is concerned, "we'll get President Kennedy's program through."

He has his work cut out for him, but two of the administration's Big 5 legislative proposals—aid to depressed areas and an increased minimum wage—have already cleared Congress. The others are aid to education, housing, and medical care for the aged.

MANSFIELD got off to a promising start. He put the Senate's new session on the road without letting it get rutted in time-consuming debate over rules changes traditionally aimed at curbing civil rights filibusters. He won swift Senate confirmation of the new President's cabinet and of some controversial appointees. He steered the depressed areas bill through the Senate after beating off a determined conservative attempt to amend it.

Perhaps the biggest victory of his first 10 weeks as leader came when he took on one of the Senate's most formidable figures—Chairman HARRY F. BYRD of the Finance Committee. BYRD fought to make a key change in the Kennedy proposal for extending unemployment benefits. The administration measure seemed doomed. But, over a 24-hour period, MANSFIELD rallied his forces and repulsed the BYRD effort by a two-vote margin.

"The most difficult period of this session lies ahead of us," MANSFIELD said recently.

He has not underestimated the task, or the challenge, both at home and abroad.

[Article 3]

THE SENATE'S QUIET PERSUADER—STRONG, POSITIVE PROGRAMS IN LATIN AMERICA, AFRICA SEEN AS NEEDS BY MANSFIELD—MAJORITY LEADER SUGGESTS ACTION FOR THE UNITED STATES IN DEALING WITH TROUBLE SPOTS OF WORLD

(This is the conclusion of a three-part profile of one of Washington's most powerful yet least known political figures—Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.)

(By L. M. Berniere)

WASHINGTON.—"We face the most difficult problems as a people that we have ever had to confront."

These grim and challenging words were uttered in calm and measured tones by a recognized congressional expert on foreign and domestic problems—Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana.

As Senate Democratic leader, as Senator from Montana and—in his own words—as "just a Senator," MANSFIELD must grapple with a great complex of problems. Some are political; some nonpartisan. Some are global; some strictly local. But no matter how preoccupied he may be with all others, he never takes his eye off the big one—peace and survival in this troubled world.

He seems to have a prescience about certain things, can sense trouble brewing. Long before Laos became a big headline word, MANSFIELD foresaw the difficulties that have shaken that tiny Far Eastern constitutional monarchy. He foresaw the chaotic situation that developed in Africa and repeatedly urged sympathetic U.S. action toward the new nations emerging in the dark continent.

Over the years—as sailor, soldier, marine, mining engineer, college professor, Congressman, foreign affairs expert—he has learned to recognize trouble in many forms, to look it straight in the eye, and to try to do something about it.

This is the way it is with the ills of the world today.

As a starter, MANSFIELD feels that a reassessment and reevaluation of U.S. foreign policy is long overdue. He is "delighted" that President Kennedy has taken steps to strengthen NATO because "in the last 10 years—and that takes in 2 years of a Democratic administration—it (NATO) has been more a symbol than a shield."

Here is how MANSFIELD sizes up the troubled world, area by area:

Latin America: "The policy should be to treat that area at least on an equal basis with the rest of the world. In my opinion, it should be given priority. There is need to develop a comprehensive economic and social program, based on the Act of Bogotá, which will cure the basic ills of the area—poor housing, illiteracy, poor sanitation, inadequate medical care.

"There should be more private ownership of land in small individual lots so the people can have a vested interest in something that will give them hope, love of country and, if need be, something to fight for.

"We don't want to take the lead in Latin American affairs, nor be left in the rear. We want to be in the ranks with our Latin American affairs, nor be left in the rear. We want to be in the ranks with our Latin American neighbors on a basis of mutual equality, trust, understanding and good will."

Africa: "While it has become involved in the cold war to an extent, I hope we can bend every effort to try to insulate Africa from the cold war so that the newly independent nations will have a chance to develop and achieve maturity.

"I don't think there should be any military aid to any part of Africa. The emphasis should be on economic assistance. Instead of advocating bringing so many students from Africa to this country, it should be just the reverse—we should help them build schools and train people, their own people, so that they can help in the growing process of their homeland. Too many foreign students who come here are loathe to return to homelands which need their people so badly."

Middle East: "I hope and believe that President Kennedy will do his utmost to bring a meeting of the minds between the Arabs and the Israelis to achieve a degree of stability in that area."

Far East: "We should forge closer ties with Japan because, together, we can form the basis for stability in the Pacific area.

"I'd be opposed personally to admitting Red China to the U.N., or to the United States recognizing Communist China.

"I would advise the possibility of exploring diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia—which is not Red China—if, in doing so, a U.S. diplomatic mission can be sent to Ulan Bator, the Mongolian capital. The main purpose would be to have a U.S. mission in a country facing both the Soviet Union on one side and China on the other so we can get a better report on what is happening. It would be a window looking East and West.

"History warrants serious consideration of this. Russia and China are in a race to give aid to Outer Mongolia and to send in technicians.

"I also hope for some sort of reciprocal agreement whereby a certain number of accredited correspondents would be allowed to go into Red China. This would enable us to get firsthand reports from our own people rather than secondhand from correspondents of other countries, and there would be less reliance on Chinese publications on what is happening.

"This is all-important because Red China has drastically curtailed access to Chinese newspapers and magazines. Our sources of information are drying up rapidly."

Berlin–Germany: "President Kennedy has restated the policy of the Eisenhower administration to defend Berlin. I am pleased that Germany came across with a sizable contribution in the field of foreign aid. I hope this example will be followed by our other friends in Western Europe and Japan. That way, the burden of responsibility, which now rests on the United States, will be dissipated and a cooperative program will be undertaken to assist other nations of the world."

And what of the United States?

MANSFIELD makes no apologies for patriotic sentiment or partisanship: "This country means everything and all things to me," he said fervently. "We are extremely fortunate in having as President a young man—a product of this century—who has gone through the fire of war, who has had 14 years in Congress, and who has maturity, confidence and assurance in the face of the most difficult decade the Nation has ever faced."

There is every indication that the feeling is mutual—that the President feels fortunate that the helm of his party in the Senate is held by the firm and steady hand of MIKE MANSFIELD.

Retraining for the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of the State of Delaware, the Honorable Elbert N. Carvel, is deeply concerned with technological unemployment which has reached extensive proportions.

Many national and State leaders are joining in a common effort to analyze and seek new programs of public action which will stimulate the private economy to return our unemployed unskilled and semi-skilled workers to full-time employment.

Delawareans had an opportunity to express their views on the effects of changes in the industrial complex and the new demands of technological advancements in the first State at the August 7, 1961, meeting of the Governor's Committee on Retraining for the Unemployed in Dover, Del.

Mr. James J. LaPenta, Jr., an articulate spokesman, and vice president of the Delaware Labor Council, appeared before the Governor's committee and pointed to basic conditions which have had an adverse effect on Delaware's economy.

I include his testimony here as part of my remarks:

STATEMENT BY JAMES J. LAPENTA, JR., VICE PRESIDENT, DELAWARE STATE LABOR COUNCIL, TO THE GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON RETRAINING FOR THE UNEMPLOYED ON MONDAY, AUGUST 7, AT DOVER, DEL., AND TO THE DELAWARE FULL EMPLOYMENT SURVEY COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, WILMINGTON, DEL.

The question of jobs for a growing labor force in the 1960's is one of the most important issues of domestic economic policy and, until it is answered, there can be no certainty about America's growth potential.

There is little disagreement on the extent and the nature of the problem, but there are a multitude of suggested solutions. These run the gamut of letting the market adjust itself to virtually total economic planning with attendant controls. Neither of these extremes will be accepted.

You will note, throughout this presentation, I do not call for massive government intervention on either the Federal or State level. It is, however, the responsibility of government to create conditions conducive to economic expansion. There are some people who would insist that the government stay out of the picture. You and I know this is impossible. The government cannot sit idly by watching the rise of unemployment and its attendant economic and social costs. It is the responsibility of government to anticipate and to identify those trends causing unemployment problems, and it has the responsibility to participate in the solution of those problems once they occur.

This effort will demand the fullest cooperation between industry and labor. It will require the closest of partnership between Federal and State Governments. It will need the support of private citizen and public official.

The future of our country will depend on the speed and discernment we give this effort fostering faster economic growth than that of the past. Only a high and sustained rate of economic growth will allow us to give attention to the great priorities of our international and national needs. In a world where human freedom and Communist tyranny are waging a struggle we cannot stand up overseas if we fall down at home by failing to make our vaunted American economy provide full employment, maximum production, and purchasing power for the American people.

Our rate of economic growth must be sufficient to provide jobs for all the new people who come of working age and enter what we call the labor force each year, without taking jobs away from those already employed who have not advanced beyond working age.

This growth, too, must be sufficient to prevent improvements in machinery and working skills, in technology and automation from resulting in unemployment of workers and idleness of plant capacities.

This is most vividly illustrated by the following statistics: [1]

1. The United States is the first Nation in the world where total output continued to rise while employment of productive workers continually decreased.

2. Production rose 43 percent, employment of factory workers decreased 10 percent, population increased 19 percent. This was between 1950 and 1960.

3. The last three recessions increased in severity while the ensuing prosperity periods grew shorter: 1949–53, prosperity period lasted 45 months; 1954–57, prosperity period lasted 35 months; 1958–60, prosperity period lasted 25 months.

4. Rate of unemployment grew with each recession: 1954, 6 percent; 1958, 7½ percent; 1961, 8 percent.

5. Rate of unemployment grew also during prosperity peaks: 1953, 3 percent; 1956, 3.9 percent; 1959, 4.8 percent.

6. Estimate of unemployment expected in 1962—when production has greatly increased and national economy will have recovered considerably—5 to 6 percent.

7. Between 1960 and 1970—26 million young workers will enter labor market—and if present conditions continue, 7.5 million will not have completed their high school education; and this means they will be wholly unprepared to work in a world where major technological advances are being made daily.

8. Twenty percent of the Nation's unskilled workers are unemployed today; 40 percent of men between the ages of 45–64 who are unemployed have been so for over 16 weeks.

9. During the sixty's greater job opportunities must be created—possibly 4 million a year—to provide employment for average yearly growth of 1,350,000 and annual displacement of 2.5 million workers from rising productivity through automation.

10. Ten thousand computer installations will be made in 1961—and each installation affects 140 jobs—therefore 1,400,000 workers will feel the results of this growth of automation this year.

11. In the steel industry—steel production and shipments were almost identical in the years of 1950 and 1960—yet—in 1960—80,000 less production workers were employed and the work-week averaged 3.3 hours less than in 1950.

This brief analysis now acquaints you with the national problem and makes it understandable as to its relationship with our State problem, and I now address my remarks to this area.

The State labor council has repeatedly stated its awareness of the hard economic facts of life—that the Delaware economy is now tied inseparably to the national economy.

Delaware began to experience in the last two recessions 1957–58 and 1960–61 labor surpluses (unemployment) reflecting the national average. In the first two postwar business declines 1948–49 and 1953–54 unemployment in Delaware was below the national experience.

The causes of this increase in unemployment over our previous experience came from:

(a) Tremendous population growth of 50 percent in the postwar period increasing the number of young new entrants (school graduates) each year into the labor force and new entrants moving from other labor areas into the Delaware labor area looking for job opportunities.

(b) Change in our industrial complex by plant closures due to plant obsolescence causing technological unemployment (Pullman, Delaware Floor, Malleable Iron, Pyrites), and structural unemployment caused by the decline in the railroad industry, and cyclical unemployment in the durable goods industries (auto and steel) whose ups and downs are sensitively attuned to the business cycle.

[1] Source: Report of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation of the Committee on Education and Labor, 87th Cong.

(c) Technological displacement in rural areas by increased mechanization on the farm and displacement of the family operated farm by the corporate farm. This combination of technological and structural unemployment added to our labor stream a number of workers seeking full-time and part-time employment.

(d) Finally, two unusual situations, the finishing of the Tidewater construction project placed an unprecendented number of construction workers, who, when unemployed, are normally placed in the category of seasonal employment. These workers were put on our covered unemployment list, and went into our labor surplus figures although some of them had returned to former or other labor markets. The termination of the Government tank contract with Chrysler at the Lenape Ordnance Depot in Newark affected approximately 800 workers.

I might add, here, that item (a) is the cause of the anomaly of unemployment and employment showing simultaneous rises.

The past month, for example, employment rose 6,700 to 188,900, but unemployment also rose from 10,500 to 12,000.[1] This portends of worse to come, mind you, because it represents a labor surplus (unemployment) of over 6 percent during the so-called recovery phase of our economic cycle, and furthermore, this is only covered unemployment (those eligible for unemployment compensation). It does not take into account those unemployed who are not eligible for unemployment compensation, those underemployed (on short workweeks and part time), and those longtime unemployed who have exhausted their benefits.

Now, for the purpose of analysis, I have used statistics, and for the purpose of identification, I have classified kinds of unemployment. I warn you, however, bare statistics or classifications should not be allowed to overshadow the human consequences and economic problems that go with the grim specter of hard core unemployment—poverty, crime, disease, degradation, and racial discrimination. Statistics cannot dramatise the burden of the curse of skill obsolescence, nor can it explain satisfactorily the unskilled men without a job, on one hand, while there are highly skilled jobs not manned, on the other. We must not allow cold statistics to sentence the jobless to economic death and allow men to rust in idleness while they, and others, lack the goods they are capable of producing.

There is no more reason to accept such ever-rising levels of hard core unemployment than to accept an epidemic of smallpox. In the case of this economic disease, as well as the physical disease, the cause is well known and stabilizing remedies are effective when applied.

SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM

Cyclical unemployment: As previously stated, Delaware's economy is tied inseparably to the national economy. Since the national economy determines the amount of cyclical unemployment during any of the respective periods (prosperity, stagnation, recession, recovery) of the historic short-term business cycle and this cycle, in turn, is affected by the many private decisions of the private business enterprises and the monetary, fiscal debt management and budget policy decisions that are made by the Federal Government, both of whose influence are not contained within the geography of any narrow State boundary, there is not much we can do in this area.

However, this does not mean that programs of State origin helping to alleviate cyclical unemployment must:

1. Wait upon Federal action.
2. Cost the State a lot of money in terms of public expenditure.

The appropriate things to do under these circumstances are:

1. Provide unemployment benefits that adequately provide purchasing power needed to maintain the temporary jobless (60 percent of the State's average weekly wage is a good criterion). Provide for temporary extension of unemployment benefits for those exhausting their benefits during the cyclical recessionary period.

2. Review all State public works projects that have been approved and where possible start these construction jobs and telescope their estimated period of construction so that more employment opportunities would be available during the high unemployment (recessionary) period.

Technological unemployment: This unemployment caused by plant closures due to obsolescence and loss of job skills by management efficiencies introducing mechanization, automation, and laborsaving devices require training and retraining programs. I propose:

1. Participation and the fullest partnership by the State government and its agencies with the Federal Government in the new programs (area redeveopment bill and the proposed Manpower Development and Training Act, H.R. 7373) and the revitalized established programs of the U.S. Department of Labor and its Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

2. A greatly strengthened State program of vocational training.

3. More effective guidance and counseling through our public education system and the Employment Service of the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

4. Financial incentives through supplemental unemployment benefits while under training. (Using the UCC to administer this program.)

Structural unemployment: Caused by area (Delaware, e.g., decline and mechanization of farm economy) and industry (railroad) decline and industrial migration, this situation requires:

1. A tripartite State government, management, and labor committee to promote and foster rational industrial development programs on a State and local basis.

2. Enactment of a State minimum wage law and enactment of a prevailing-wage law for all public construction.

3. Items 1, 2, and 3 under the Technological Unemployment title plus a strong education program but, if not successful, a strong enforcement statute against the evils of racial and age job discrimination.

Two other kinds of unemployment need passing mention: (a) seasonal (farm is at present inadequately handled — nonfarm needs improved eligibility under Unemployment Compensation Commission; (b) frictional—those voluntarily leaving or quitting their jobs and seeking new jobs.

I want to close with the following strong recommendations:

1. Our State's public education system must play a vigorous role, a key role—more guidance programs, and an effective and appropriate State vocational program.

2. The Employment Service of the Unemployment Compensation Commission must be strengthened and its techniques, operations, and procedures improved.

(a) Expanding the counseling service to meet more fully the employment needs of young people, older workers, members of minority groups and persons living in rural areas.

(b) Expanding the statistical division in order to distinguish more clearly and in greater detail the various types of unemployment I have described and to more accurately measure and report these characteristics so that the right programs can be applied.

(c) Provide for a research division to gather quantitatively and qualitatively all the information about the factors determining mobility in our labor force to counteract the slowing down of labor mobility and propose the means of reaccelerating this important ingredient of a dynamic and viable economy.

3. For all industry to cooperate with the Commission on the development of an accurate and up-to-date reporting system and to use the placement service it can provide.

[1] Source: Delaware Unemployment Compensation Commission, July report.

The John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of all Members of Congress to the 1960 Annual Report of the John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc. This very interesting and most informative report documents the most valuable public service in the field of health that the foundation is performing through the use of its assets. More than $8 million was made available by the foundation in 1960 for the support of medical research, treatment, and training.

As one aspect of the program, grants are made to hospitals to finance the training of hospital staff and to provide the facilities that are required to reduce the time lag that exists between the findings of the laboratory and their clinical use in the care and treatment of patients. For example, the foundation is assisting hospitals in 29 cities in the financing of the training of personnel and the purchase of equipment for two lifesaving procedures, open-heart surgery and the use of artificial kidneys, to provide treatment to patients with congenital heart defects and chronic kidney diseases. In addition, the foundation is sponsoring research into a wide range of diseases in 85 institutions in 53 cities.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the 1960 Annual Report of the John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN A. HARTFORD FOUNDATION APPROPRIATIONS IN 1960 TOTAL $9,042,000, LARGEST IN ANY YEAR—GRANTS SUPPORT OPEN HEART SURGERY, KIDNEY DIALYSIS, AND CARDIOVASCULAR CENTERS IN 35 U.S. CITIES—ANNUAL REPORT LISTS OTHER RESEARCH ADVANCES

NEW YORK, July 16.—A pioneering program of research and clinical support by the John A. Hartford Foundation, Inc., is enabling medical centers in 29 cities throughout the country to prolong the lives of hundreds of children and adults previously condemned to early deaths, the foundation's 1960 annual report disclosed today.

As a result of foundation grants, two lifesaving medical procedures—open heart surgery and kidney dialysis or separation—have been made available by hospitals in these cities to patients suffering from congenital heart defects and chronic kidney diseases.

Cardiovascular diagnostic centers have been set up in six additional cities through foundation support.

The foundation appropriated $9,042,000 in 1960, with $8,353,500 of this amount devoted to support of its programs of medical research, treatment and education. The 1960 appropriation was the largest in any year to date by the foundation, its president, Ralph W. Burger, reported. In the last decade, the foundation, the country's fourth largest, has made grants totaling $39,980,000 "to reduce the timelag that exists between the findings of the laboratory and their clinical use in the care and treatment of patients," he explained.

Mr. Burger said the foundation is currently supporting in 85 institutions in 53 cities across the country 113 investigations of the cause, prevention and treatment of a wide spectrum of illnesses ranging from heart and kidney diseases to metabolic, neurological and skin disorders.

He said these institutions reported substantial progress during 1960 in foundation-sponsored research on leukemic cancer, arteriosclerosis, identification of "coronary" candidates, intracardiac valves, microsurgery of small blood vessels, stomach ulcers, birth trauma, staphylococcal infections, birth defects, multiple sclerosis, chemosurgery for neuromuscular diseases, pesticides in foods, nerve regeneration, psoriasis, eczema, eye diseases, anemias, and organ transplantations.

OPEN HEART SURGERY CENTERS

Mr. Burger declared that the foundation's research and clinical support of open heart surgery and kidney dialysis exemplifies its primary concern with circulatory and blood vessel diseases as the country's leading cause of death. The John A. Hartford Foundation is credited with ranking after the Federal Government's National Heart Institute and the American Heart Association as the country's third largest supporter of heart disease research.

The foundation supported a research and clinical program in open heart surgery in 19 cities last year, Mr. Burger reported. It provided funds for the purchase of complex equipment required for positive diagnosis and for monitoring and controlling patient physiologic functioning during surgery and post-operatively, as well as funds for salaries and training of doctors and hospital technicians, funds for all laboratory expense, and funds for subsidizing the hospital expense of select research patients. These cities and institutions follow:

Albany, N.Y., Albany Hospital; Buffalo, N.Y., Buffalo General Hospital; Burlington, Vt., Mary Fletcher Hospital; Charlotte, N.C., Charlotte Memorial Hospital; Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Clinics; Des Moines, Iowa, Methodist Hospital; Erie, Pa., Hamot Hospital Association; Grand Rapids, Mich., Blodgett Memorial Hospital; Hanover, N.H., Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital; Kansas City, Mo., Research Hospital; Milwaukee, Wis., Evangelical Deaconess Society of Wisconsin, Deaconess Hospital; Minneapolis, Minn., Mount Sinai Hospital Association; Nashville, Tenn., Vanderbilt University Hospital; Newark, N.J., United Hospitals of Newark; New York City, N.Y., Presbyterian Hospital; Philadelphia, Pa., University of Pennsylvania Hospital; Providence, R.I., Rhode Island Hospital; Seattle, Wash., Providence Hospital; St. Louis, Mo., Barnes Hospital.

By diverting the circulatory flow through a heart-lung machine, open heart surgery permits the surgeon for the first time to view the diseased heart clearly and to correct defects in its valves and walls precisely. It is estimated that 50,000 children are born with congenital heart defects each year. Seventy-five percent of these defects are believed to be surgically correctible.

In an effort to make lifesaving treatment possibilities known to more persons and especially to those far from giant metropolitan medical centers, the Foundation has underwritten the development of cardiovascular diagnostic centers in the following cities and institutions: Akron, Ohio, Children's Hospital; Bismarck, N. Dak., Bismarck Hospital Association; Detroit, Mich., Harper Hospital; Neptune, N.J., Fitkin Memorial Hospital; Portland, Maine, Maine General Hospital; and Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse Memorial Hospital.

KIDNEY DIALYSIS CENTERS

As part of its program of kidney dialysis support, The John A. Hartford Foundation has purchased artificial kidneys, underwritten the salaries and training of physicians, researchers and hospital technicians or covered the expense of hospitalizing research patients and others during the development period, in 10 cities and institutions as follows:

Boston, Mass., Peter Bent Brigham Hospital; Buffalo, N.Y., Buffalo General Hospital; Chicago, Ill., Passavant Memorial Hospital; Cleveland, Ohio, Cleveland Clinic Hospital; Jacksonville, Fla., Baptist Memorial Hospital; Kansas City, Mo., Menorah Medical Center; Milwaukee, Wis., Evangelical Deaconess Society of Wisconsin, Deaconess Hospital; Providence, R.I., Rhode Island Hospital; Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Hospital; Winston-Salem, N.C., North Carolina Baptist Hospitals, Inc.

NEW USES FOR DIALYSIS

Use of the artificial kidney was confined until recently to cleaning the blood of impurities in acute kidney failure or to ridding the body of poisons accidentally swallowed. The John A. Hartford Foundation's program has helped introduce intermittent dialysis on a continuing basis for patients with chronic kidney failure. The blood of these patients is shunted from a wrist artery through the artificial kidney and back into a wrist vein. Tubes are permanently implanted in the artery and vein. Between treatments, a curved bypass bridges the tubes.

Already, long-term dialysis, referred to as kidney laundry service, has transformed the outlook for patients who would otherwise become fatally poisoned from the accumulation of kidney wastes. The dialyzer has been used also to overcome kidney shock resulting from hemorrhage during childbirth, for treating edema, and for restoring kidney response to diuretic agents. Three million Americans are believed to suffer from kidney diseases.

SPECIAL CARE UNITS

In keeping with its aims of speeding medical research benefits to the patient, the foundation during 1960 also helped to maintain special hospital units for research and care of metabolic disorders, or for care of critically ill persons in the following cities and institutions:

Albany, N.Y., Albany Medical Center; Boston, Mass., Peter Bent Brigham Hospital and Children's Hospital Medical Center; Chicago, Ill., Chicago Wesley Memorial Hospital and Passavant Memorial Hospital; Cleveland, Ohio, University Hospital; Pittsburgh, Pa., Shadyside Hospital; Portland, Maine, Mercy Hospital; Red Bank, N.J., Riverview Hospital; Utica, N.Y., St. Luke's Memorial Hospital Center.

NEW RESEARCH ADVANCES

Among significant investigations sponsored by the John A. Hartford Foundation last year, Mr. Burger singled out these examples:

Cancer: Development by the University of Miami School of Medicine of (1) a blood oxygenator-blood dialysis apparatus which automatically monitors and maintains physiological balance during prolonged perfusion of patients with cardiopulmonary distress, and (2) development of an abdominal tourniquet which permits regional perfusion of highly toxic anticancer chemicals in the pelvis without danger of leakage and damage to other parts of the body.

Progress at Mary Imogene Bassett Hospital, Cooperstown, N.Y., in successfully replacing nonfunctioning bone marrow in irradiated patients, a procedure which has potentials for lethal radiation of cancer and for surmounting the tissue rejection reaction in organ transplants.

Isolation at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, Buffalo, N.Y., of three similar viruses from the cancerous tissues of three separate human leukemia patients, implicating viruses as a possible cause of leukemia in humans.

Arteriosclerosis and other vascular diseases: Important findings about the cause and treatment of arteriosclerosis, the principal factor in heart attacks and strokes, at Harvard University School of Public Health and Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; University of Miami Medical School, Miami, Fla.; University of Pennsylvania Hospital and Presbyterian Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.; Roper Hospital, Charleston, S.C.; Touro Infirmary, New Orleans, La.; and Mt. Sinai Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.

Identification of coronary candidates: Development at New York University Medical Center of a highly accurate predictive formula for detecting individuals most prone to coronary heart disease, as an early means of saving lives by forestalling attacks through preventive therapy.

Heart valve lesions: Progress at Presbyterian Hospital, Philadelphia, and at Providence Hospital, Seattle, in developing synthetic intracardiac valves for the replacement of damaged human heart valves.

Microsurgery: Successful use of the binocular microscope at Mary Fletcher Hospital, Burlington, Vt., in microsurgery on blood vessels of less than 4 millimeters including application in coronary occlusion and in a cerebral vascular accident.

Stomach ulcers: Discovery at the Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, of an agent secreted in the stomach's antrum which inhibits the excessive production of gastric acid, a step toward control of peptic ulcer formation.

Birth trauma: Progress at Baylor University College of Medicine, Houston, Tex., in developing transitional care of the neonate and an artificial placenta to protect newborns afflicted with cardiac and respiratory distress in the first 24 hours of life. Such babies have been prey to cerebral palsy and other birth trauma-implicated ailments.

Staphylococcal infections: Definitive findings at Barnes Hospital, St. Louis, Mo., on the extent of operating room air contamination and surgical infections by staphylococcal bacteria as a major step toward meeting this problem scientifically.

Birth defects: New findings at St. Barnabas Medical Center, Newark, N.J., on the role of physical and mental stress during pregnancies leading to cleft lip palate and other defects in newborn children.

Multiple sclerosis: Progress at White Memorial Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif., in studying the antigen-antibody mechanism of multiple sclerosis, a progressively fatal disease affecting the brain and spinal cord of 300,000 people in this country.

Chemosurgery: Expansion of chemosurgery techniques for the treatment of Parkinson's disease at St. Barnabas Hospital for Chronic Diseases, New York, N.Y., to alleviate related neurological and neuromuscular diseases like multiple sclerosis involving tremor, involuntary movements, deformities, paralysis, and muscular rigidity.

Pesticides in foods: Development at Stanford Research Institute at Menlo Park, Calif., of a practical screening test involving gas

chromatography to determine quickly the presence of toxic pesticides like DDT on fruits and vegetables.

Nerve regeneration: Progress at James Whitcomb Riley Hospital For Children, Indianapolis, Ind., in measuring the physical and chemical alterations found in disorders of the central nervous system as a basis for developing specific treatment of congenital malformations, muscular malformations, tumor, trauma, and inflammation in neurological diseases.

Psoriasis: Discovery at Stanford University Medical Center, Palo Alto, Calif., that this chronic skin disease affecting 2 to 3 million Americans may be an allergic reaction to an antigen in the patient's own blood system.

Eczema: Effective control of this chronic children's skin condition at New York University Hospital, New York City, by simple use of a crude coal tar extract without altering diet, injecting desensitizing agents or using expensive steroid preparations.

Eye diseases: Encouraging progress at the Retina Foundation, Boston, Mass., in developing synthetic substitutes to replace diseased tissues of the eye, including damaged sclera, lost vitreous gel and cornea transplants.

A plastic anemia: New findings at the Children's Hospital Medical Center, Boston, about the use of steroids and hormones for treating aplastic anemia and to help restore the bone marrow (blood-forming) function when depressed by drugs and other toxic substances in children and older persons.

Next: Tissue and organ transplants

Following its success in helping to make cardiovascular surgery and kidney dialysis widely available, Mr. Burger said the John A. Hartford Foundation has mapped a program of grants designed to help usher in an important new stage of medicine: the routine transplanting of tissues and organs like the heart, lungs, and liver.

On this surgical frontier, the foundation has backed a kidney transplant team at Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston, since 1954. This is the group which has performed 15 successful kidney transplants in the past 6 years. All except one have involved identical twins. The major obstacle to transplants between nonrelated persons thus far has been the host's foreign tissue rejection reaction.

"Medical researchers are increasingly confident that they can break the barrier which until now has made impossible transplants in other than identical twins," Mr. Burger said.

In order to spur a broad investigation of this antigen-antibody reaction to foreign tissue, The John A. Hartford Foundation has given a grant of $455,000 to Peter Bent Brigham Hospital this year, Mr. Burger noted. The latest award brings to nearly $1½ million the amount of Hartford Foundation grants to the Peter Bent Brigham staff for research in metabolic disorders and in kidney transplant problems.

OVERCOMING THE IMMUNOLOGIC BARRIER

Similarly, the Hartford Foundation is supporting establishment of a burns research and treatment center at NYU Medical Center. In skin graft experiments on students and fellow doctors, the NYU unit is attempting to find out what it is in the host's system that attacks the transplant and its antigens.

At Wayne State University Hospital and Harper Hospital, Detroit, a Hartford Foundation grant is also supporting investigations in the chemistry and physiology of the rejection mechanism.

"Studies at these institutions and elsewhere have demonstrated that the technical problem of surgical transplantation of organs has been completely surmounted," Mr. Burger said. "The only real challenge to the permanency of transplants is the body's rejection reaction to foreign tissue. The foundation intends to give every assistance to medical science in hastening the day when diseased organs, glands or other tissues can be removed and replaced with healthy substitutes."

FOUNDATION HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The Hartford Foundation was originally established by John A. Hartford to distribute his personal charitable donations. He left it the bulk of his estate; and his brother, George L. Hartford, who died in 1957, left his entire estate to the Foundation. John A. Hartford was president of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. and George A. Hartford was chairman of the board. The Hartford Foundation's income is used primarily for support of medical research, treatment, and education on the major and minor diseases that kill or disable millions of Americans.

Soviet Retribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a column which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express entitled "Retribution, Russ Style" is worthy of widespread attention in my judgment.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent column, written by Mr. George Todt, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRIBUTION, RUSS STYLE

(By George Todt)

"When we take over the United States, we are going to have to liquidate (murder) 90 percent of the American Communists"—Matt Cvetic, "The Big Decision," page 176.

The above quotation was an interesting one I found while reading Matt Cvetic's knowledgeable book, "The Big Decision."

It was what a Russian representative of the Communist "world government" clique told Matt in a private conversation.

It shows how stupid and fanatical the American comrades must be—to work like eager beavers for their ultimate doom.

When Matt asked Comrade Mirkov why it would be necessary to liquidate so many local Reds after a Communist triumph in the United States, he receives this eye-opening reply from the boss:

"Comrade, they are not worth it. Not only are they poor quality Communist revolutionists, but look at it this way: If their own country cannot trust them then how can we?"

THOSE WHO PLAY

Actually, this figures. Russia was long conquered and dominated by the Mongol horde of Genghis Khan and his sons from 1227 A.D. until the time of the brutal Czar Ivan the Terrible.

There is a strong imprint of the Mongol technique for making war engrained in the modern inhabitants of the Iron Curtain countries today—which is almost exactly the same area as the Mongol Empire at its high tide of conquest.

Once the Mongols conquered the dukes of Muscovy—but the latter have hundreds of years later, conquered the Mongol Empire in reverse. But there is still much of their former masters in them.

For instance, Genghis Khan would have slit the throats of traitors who betrayed their trusts to him for exactly the same reason as that which was outlined to Matt Cvetic by Comrade Mirkov.

"The Big Decision" makes for worthwhile reading.

Not long ago Matt appeared on Ralph Storey's "Story Line" at KNX radio station in Hollywood. He received an avalanche of mail.

The American people are really waking up nowadays.

CBS publicity and Matt showed me a photostat of a letter he had written to Ralph after the show, and it is worth repeating here:

FROM MIDDLE OUT

"After more than 20 years in the fight against international communism, I am convinced that, if the independence for which our forefathers fought is to be preserved, our Nation must show courage by taking strong positions on three major issues.

"1. We must lead the nations of North and South America in enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in the Cuban situation. While our diplomats haggle over a Kremlin-instigated Berlin crisis, the Soviet Union and her satellites, including Red China, are pouring armament, munitions and men into Cuba.

"For the past 15 years the Kremlin has dragged up the Berlin crisis to camouflage her activities in other parts of the world—and our diplomats still have not wised up. It is my candid opinion that, unless our government shows some backbone by enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in the Cuban crisis, time may be running out on us.

"CAN EXPECT PAY

"2. We must never recognize Red China. We recognized the Soviet Union in 1933. Since that stupid diplomatic move, we lost half the world to the Reds. Recognizing Red China, according to the Kremlin's plan, will hasten our own end.

"3. We must never permit Red China in the United Nations, if you can call that monstrosity a United Nations.

"The reason I take the position I do in the above three issues is because, from my work within the framework of the Communist Party, I learned that these three objectives—conquering Central America and getting recognition for Red China—were necessary preludes to conquering the United States.

"WITH A CLOUT

"If we are to preserve our freedom and the independence that was won for us 185 years ago we are, as a Nation, finally in a position where we must show courage (guts)—the same kind of courage which motivated our forefathers to place their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor on the line for America."

Matt Cvetic, FBI counterspy, infiltrated the ranks of the Communist Party in the United States for 9 brutal years—and knows the score.

He recently received the annual Americanism Award of the California AMVETS convention held in San Diego.

His thoughtful words to Ralph Storey are worth our thinking about now.

Some Are Surprised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER L. McVEY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, a quiet laugh is sometimes a powerful broom for sweeping accumulated tensions out of

the mind, thus leaving us more able to handle life's dozens of minor and major irritations with grace and humor. Because the editorial comment "Some Are Surprised," written by Mr. H. K. "Skeet" George, caused me and my staff to chuckle, I would like to share it with the Members of this body.

The comment appeared on August 7, 1961, in the Caney Chronicle, which is one of our finest papers in my State of Kansas. You will be interested to know that Mr. George is the brother of Hon. Myron George, who has served as a Member of this body. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include "Some Are Surprised":

Many Americans are more surprised than scared by the Russian feat of sending a man many times around the world in a spaceship during a 24-hour nonstop schedule. And most of those who are surprised are the oldtimers like myself. The younger ones believe a trip to the moon is not long away.

They tell the story about old Grandpap when he saw his first train. "They'll never get it started," was his prediction. After it pulled away from the station he gave out a new gem of wisdom: "They'll never get it stopped."

That's the way a lot of oldtimers have viewed the spaceships. Our predictions have been a bit on the glum side.

But mark my word. The first guy who falls off one of them things is going to wish he were riding in a buggy pulled by old dobbin. And no one ever rode anything very high and very fast who didn't eventually take a fall.

It could be Khrushchev.

Viewing the Aggressions of World Communism in Broad Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have long been of the conviction that there is a vital need that our national strategic planners must view the aggressions of world communism in broad perspective. This means, of course, that we must view communism's various political, economic, and military thrusts as integral parts of an overall plan of conquest. There has been too much tendency to fasten attention on individual dangers with the resultant failure to evaluate such aggression in terms of the overall Communist scheme of global activity.

It is only when each Communist threat or actual aggression is evaluated in terms of its relation to the other danger spots that the full significance of the Red plan of conquest can be fully appreciated.

The July issue of the VFW American Security Reporter contains one of the finest articles I have yet read on this matter of viewing Communist efforts in their overall meaning rather than as individual and isolated dangers. Although there is no doubt but what our Nation and the free world are approaching a period of great crisis over Berlin, we must be constantly on guard that the Communist planners do not exploit a Western preoccupation over Berlin by triggering a new aggression in a distant portion of the world.

It is in this connection that I believe that the article in the VFW American Security Reporter entitled, "The Tightening Noose," is particularly timely and useful. This article analyzes the obvious but often overlooked strategy that communism is employing in southeastern and southern Asia. As the article points out, a major Communist objective is the encirclement of India. This strategy is, unfortunately, moving with tragic momentum. The drive into Laos with its dangers to the entire southeastern peninsula, increasing Soviet influence in Afghanistan, the Red conquest of Tibet, and increasing Soviet pressure against the historic buffer states of Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan on India's northern borders, are indeed tightening the noose about India and Pakistan.

I believe this article, "The Tightening Noose," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, National Security and Foreign Affairs of the VFW, will be of particular interest to Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the following article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIGHTENING NOOSE

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corp., retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, VFW)

One of the most serious shortcomings of the Western World is its tendency to view Communist strategy in isolated segments. This, of course, in turn results in a failure to grasp fully the grand strategy of communism's unrelenting aggressions. Without such a full strategic appreciation, the West can react only on an isolated basis, and consequently an inadequate one.

For example, whichever area of difficulty—Berlin, Cuba, north Africa, Laos—communism decides to emphasize immediately becomes the area of preoccupation in Western eyes. While the Reds may put the emphasis on an area and thus shift their spotlight to another section of the global stage of conflict, the master script continues to be played by all of the Red performers.

The paradox of Western failure to see with broad strategic vision is underlined by the fact that the Communist strategy is visibly unfolding in clear view. Nowhere is this more obvious than in southeastern and southern Eurasia.

Laos, for the moment, monopolizes Western attention which is currently characterized by its almost pathetic pleading for the Reds to agree to a cease-fire in that area. Of course, the Reds have not agreed to a cease-fire for the simple reason that they will have more key control points, more high ground, and more vital areas to occupy. Only at such time as it is momentarily to the advantage of the Reds' conquest to agree to a cease-fire for purposes of deception will they go through the motions of appearing serious about a cease-fire.

But Laos in itself is not the total target. It is the wedge that strategically fragments all of southeast Asia to assure from the Red standpoint the eventual piecemeal capture by subversion or force of South Vietnam, Cambodia, Siam, and Burma. It opens the road to Singapore and control of the vital Straits of Malacca. It points the way toward ultimate control of Indonesia's treasure trove of natural resources.

And yet the control of southeast Asia, as important as it is in itself, is but the flanking action of a far vaster operation that even now is underway—the encirclement of India. The importance of the subcontinent of India has long loomed large in the thinking of communism's master planners. Their blueprint for world conquest gives heavy emphasis to this populous, large, and strategically located subcontinent containing the nations of India and Pakistan. The importance of India becomes evident from even a cursory glance at the map, for the successful culmination of communism's sweep around the Asiatic periphery of Eurasia requires the subjugation of India. That area is destined to be either a crucial obstacle or a helpful stepping stone in the Red advance toward Suez, the Mediterranean world and Europe.

The deliberate manner in which the forces of Red aggression in Asia are being focused on India is both astute and alarming. So extensive is the scope of the strategic scheme that is now unfolding that its increments appear as major separate threats. And yet they are all coordinated portions of the grand strategy.

Viewed from the standpoint of the Indian subcontinent, the southeast Asian Peninsula stands as a protecting flank against the Red thrust out of the power base of Mao's China. Success of Red aggression in the southeast Asian Peninsula would change that area from a protecting flank to a springboard for envelopment.

This penetration of southeast Asia dovetails neatly into the ruthless Red conquest of Tibet which has brought Red pressure squarely up against India's buffer border states of Nepal, Sikim, and Bhutan. Isolated by geography and long forgotten in much of the western strategic thought, these tiny nations today are being increasingly squeezed by Red pressure from the north. Tiny in size, their importance is large. Red China's campaign against Nepal is being conducted with the usual Communist devices of trade, subversion, and military power. In June of 1960 Mao Tse-tung pointedly indicated his intentions with a vicious attack against the Nepalese border district of Mustang. The pressures are continuing. Red control of Nepal would remove the last major obstacle on the ancient gateway between Tibet and India.

Far to the west, on the northwest border of India, is the ancient invasion route through the Khyber Pass. Here again the Red pressure is being increased. Fragmentary news of increasing unrest and conflict on the Afghan border constitutes a clear signal that here also a Red thrust is being made from the north, pointed southward against the Indian subcontinent.

The Soviet Union, like the czarist regime before it, covets and understands the strategic significance of the buffer kingdom of Afghanistan. The Khyber Pass has long been a major target of Russian imperial—and later Soviet—strategy. Indeed, the western world has been all too slow in realizing the grave implications of reports that Afghanistan is rapidly approaching the status of a Soviet satellite.

Thus, communism is thrusting outward from its power base in Soviet Russia and Red China, exploiting its massive land power against India and Pakistan. No longer, either, is this Red power confronted with the effective resistance previously afforded by British seapower control of the Indian Ocean. Unfortunately, since the end of World War II, British seapower has virtually disappeared from this area, thus creating a vast power vacuum extending from Suez to Singapore. This facilitates and encourages the southern extension of Red aggression.

Since the end of World War II the world has repeatedly witnessed how swift has been the reflex action of communism in filling power vacuums. If the West—and this means in this instance the United States—doesn't fill this one by rapid creation of an Indian Ocean Fleet, the Soviet Union with her growing seapower will do so. This is a situation in which the United States has adequate warning; it has the time; it has, in its vast inventory of mothballed vessels, the means. Destiny will demand a stiff penalty if the United States defaults on this opportunity to loosen the Red noose now being tightened around India and Pakistan, and thus strengthen this protecting bulwark against the Red drive toward Suez and the Mediterranean world.

Mortgages Versus Installment Debt—An Eye Opener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, while all of us who are homeowners bemoan the amount of interest that we pay on our home mortgages, many people are not aware that annual payments of interest and principal on installment debt—TV, washing machines, cars—is three times as great. This in spite of the fact that outstanding nonfarm residential debt is eight times greater than outstanding consumer debt.

J. A. Livingston, writing in the "Business Outlook" column of this morning's Washington Post, has raised some pointed questions about our installment debt policies, and I urge my colleagues to give this article their careful consideration:

MORTGAGES VERSUS INSTALLMENT DEBT
(By J. A. Livingston)

Henry Gregory, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Rocky Mount, N.C., is no bystander in this argument.

"Naturally, being a savings and loan operator," he writes, "I consider homeownership of foremost importance. But from a realistic standpoint, an electric refrigerator, washing machine, and often an automobile, are far more essential. A house can be rented, but the average American housewife must have appliances to operate her home efficiently and meet the needs of her family."

Whereupon, Gregory demands: Why do the President and politicians periodically make a national issue of low interest rates on housing when the costs of financing automobiles and household appliances take so much more out of the consumer.

Why, he wants to know, don't the politicians get wholeheartedly behind the truth-in-lending bill of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and compel banks, installment finance companies, department stores, appliance vendors, and automobile dealers to tell customers plainly and unmistakably:

1. The amount in dollars and cents the customer pays for credit.

2. The real, honest interest rate per annum, whether 6 percent, 9 percent, 18 percent, or more, which the money actually costs.

Writes Gregory: "If our President and political leaders genuinely and honestly are concerned about the interest burden, why don't they point the finger at high charges in consumer financing instead of making a play of helping people by trying to get interest rates on home loans reduced by a quarter of 1 percent.

"You and I know that the interest rate on housing is 'chickenfeed' compared to the charges on consumer financing. In many instances, the 11.6 percent becomes 15 or 20 percent by the time you add together all the closing cost which the consumer is faced in buying apliances and automobiles on time."

James Tobin, one of the three members of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, a former professor at Yale, and one of the country's distinguished economists, provides statistics to support Gregory.

As a witness before Senator DOUGLAS' Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Dr. Tobin noted that although outstanding nonfarm residential mortgage debt is more than three times outstanding installment consumer debt, annual payments of interest and principal on installment debt are about three times the payments on mortgages.

Installment debt turns over so fast that annual payments actually exceed the principal outstanding. Here are estimated figures in billions:

	Installment	*Mortgage* [1]
Total debt	$43.3	$142
Annual payment	47.0	16

[1] Nonfarm, 1- to 4-family dwellings.

Out of every $100 of disposable income, American families pay about $13 to meet installment obligations and about $5 to meet interest and principal on mortgages.

"It is clear," said Dr. Tobin, "that credit purchases and repayments have a substantial impact on the level of consumer demand."

That's hardly an overstatement, considering that interest alone amounts to about $6 billion annually on installment debt, as against about $7 billion annually on three times as much mortgage debt.

If that's the case, a Government which is periodically in a sweat about getting interest costs on mortgages down in order to help homeowners ought to be equally concerned in seeing that installment borrowers get the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the cost of the money they borrow.

To properly compare what they're asked to pay for an automobile or a refrigerator or a TV set, householders need to know not only the price but the financing load. Without the second, they can't know the first.

Yes, sir, Gregory has a point.

Cultural Strengthening of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of us in all NATO countries have insisted since the formation of the alliance that the political, economic, and cultural ties of the western world should be strengthened as well as the military.

A very excellent argument setting forth in forceful terms this idea is contained in the NATO letter of July 1961. It is written by Sami Kirdar, a devoted backer of the NATO idea and an excellent journalist who is well and favorably known personally by my wife and me. I am sure that Mr. Kirdar's article will be of value to Members of Congress and to all who are interested in a stronger NATO alliance.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDING OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE
(By Sami Kirdar)

(NOTE.—The author of this article is a Turkish political journalist and writer and a former professor of the Instanbul Fine Arts Academy.)

No peace based on mutual understanding and respect between East and West can be achieved so long as the Communist leaders preserve as their ultimate aims the outright capitulation of our system and the total overthrow of our principles of freedom and the rule of law. But short of betraying themselves, can the dictator-prophets of communism change or soften the dogmas of their secular religion, dogmas which deny all other faiths and which seek to impose, by fair means or foul, the propaganda of the cult throughout the whole world? For generations to come, our prime concern will continue to be our own defense and this has now taken on an economic and ideological form.

What is the significance of the ideological struggle which is being waged by the Soviets under the guise of 'peaceful coexistence'? Once again, it would be ingenuous to imagine that we are dealing with an ideological confrontation along Western lines, i.e. a free debate on two social systems. If we are to avoid an ideological setback involving serious consequences, we must organize our defense in this sphere just as we have done, from the military viewpoint, through NATO. It is not a question of urging our ideology against that of the Communists but of enabling the uncommitted countries to compare the two systems and to draw their own conclusions.

AN ALLURING FORMULA

The North Atlantic Treaty has made it possible to unite the military forces of a group of countries confronted with a common threat: Soviet imperialism. This union not only prevented an armed attack on the members of the alliance but also on other non-Communist nations. Our retaliation force was created solely in order to protect our civilization and the freedom of our people; but it has not thereby destroyed the aggressive intentions of our opponents—it has merely caused them to change their strategy. For this reason, the Soviet leaders brought out the alluring formula: peaceful coexistence.

In a speech delivered at Novo-Sibirsk in October 1959, Mr. Khrushchev himself explained the meaning of this formula: "Peaceful coexistence is a continuation of the struggle between two social systems but by peaceful methods. We believe that this struggle should be economic, political and ideological but not military." It would be a mistake if we were to take Mr. Khrushchev too literally. Experience gives us reason to fear that if we ever become militarily weak, the Russians will not hesitate to resort to armed action.

If the danger is not at present purely a military one, should we not examine the situation in its new form and take the necessary steps to meet it? This does not imply the abandonment of our existing military or-

ganization but, on the contrary, the increasing of its effectiveness. Parallel efforts in other fields would help to provide our defensive system with a structure better adapted to its task.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR

Peaceful coexistence, invented by the No. 1 Soviet leader, is in fact a declaration of war against the West in another form. But it is war which is utterly different to wars involving military science, the use of arms whether conventional or nuclear. It may seem less destructive but it could have far more tragic consequences since it is directed against our intellectual freedom and the very fountainhead of our civilization. Its battlefield takes in the whole world and its chief weapon is the exploitation of the legitimate aspirations of those underdeveloped peoples who constitute the majority of the earth's population.

The Soviets are past masters in the art of propaganda and psychological warfare whereas we still hesitate to go all out in this realm, either to avoid provoking the Communists or because it conflicts with our concepts of morality.

In the report which he submitted to the London Atlantic Congress, Father Jean Daniélou observed, "We must not neglect the psychological factor in the defense of the free world. In the first instance, it should consist of objective information exposing the lies of Soviet propaganda. And it is certain that, in the long run, this determination to be objective will arouse a more solid confidence than swiftly dated slogans. In the second instance it is essential that the Atlantic Community should be aware of the spiritual values which it represents.

"What the Atlantic Community claims to be defending is not just a civilization of which it is one manifestation and, as the Community itself recognizes, an imperfect manifestation—a civilization, moreover, which might well find expression in other ways; it is not just for ourselves but for all the peoples of the world—especially for those who have not yet had full access to that civilization or who have been robbed of it by violence—that we defend these values. The struggle in which we are engaged is not ours alone. We feel ourselves responsible because the values which we seek to defend and to promote are not only the expression of an ancient heritage but the permanent conditions of a human civilization."

Mr. Khrushchev recently reaffirmed at Alma Ata his determination to wage a ruthless battle against the West. If we are to take up the challenge we should revise our means of defence and adopt a suitable strategy in the political, economic and ideological fields.

COMMUNIST DOGMATISM

The Soviets believe that the new path of peaceful coexistence will lead them more swiftly to their goal which is the destruction of all non-Communist order. Their judgment is right in the sense that Communist activity always flourishes in conditions of general disturbance and discontent. As they themselves choose the time and place to light the fuse they have the advantage of being able to take their opponents by surprise. And how many peoples have accepted communism of their own free will? All those countries which have been converted to communism were converted by force of arms and force cannot triumph except in an atmosphere of disorder.

The Communists make impressive promises to those people who lack the prosperity and the technical and intellectual opportunities of the western world. But these promises cannot be kept for the simple reason that it is materially impossible for the Communists to satisfy the needs of all the underdeveloped countries. Nor can the West satisfy all these aspirations, despite the fact that its economic and technical resources are infinitely greater than those of the Soviet bloc. What should we do to fulfill the obligations which our civilization imposes on us as regards underdeveloped nations? We should help them to help themselves in line with the principle laid down by President Kennedy in his inaugural speech.

The danger which threatens us does not lie in the confrontation of two social systems but in Communist dogmatism. Unless we are prepared to look on passively at the attacks launched against our civilization and our cultural values we must organize ourselves in order to combat those who, under the pretense of defending the disinherited, would deny us any political, social, or ideological rights.

OUR SPIRITUAL VALUES

We should therefore develop an overall plan which could be carried out by suitable interrelated organizations. Two organizations exist already: NATO, for military and political questions, and OEEC for economic questions. The latter could form part of our defensive system since one of its main objectives is aid to underdeveloped countries. But we need a third organization which would have the task of defending our spiritual values by strengthening Western cooperation in the cultural, scientific, and technical fields and, especially, on behalf of underdeveloped countries.

In present circumstances it would not be easy to set up a new organization. Among the existing organizations equipped to carry out the task, NATO comes immediately to mind, one of its departments being concerned already with cultural activities. But these activities are extremely limited because of the inadequate number of senior staff in that field and the restricted financial means available. It would be necessary to set up within NATO a Division of Cultural Affairs capable of playing its part; and it would not be in the interest of member countries to refuse the extra financial burden if the strengthening of our defensive system required it.

Another solution would be to call on the Council of Europe, whose aim is to "effect a closer union between its members so as to protect and promote the ideals and the principles which are their common heritage." This solution seems practical in the light of the work carried out by the Strasbourg organization (first and foremost, the Human Rights Convention), and its efforts to coordinate European cultural activities.

SURMOUNTABLE DIFFICULTIES

If it were decided to entrust this task to some organization other than NATO, two difficulties of a political nature would arise: (1) the question of the adherence of the United States and Canada; (2) the reservations of the neutral countries. But these difficulties do not seem insurmountable.

The Atlantic Ocean is no longer a barrier between Europe and North America but a link. In an age of supersonic aircraft, intercontinental rockets and communication via the stratosphere, national boundaries are no longer geographical but political, economic and, above all, ideological; and, from this viewpoint, North America and Europe from a single unit. The federative republic of the United States—the daughter of Europe, to use General de Gaulle's expression—is today the leader of the West. In short, the two great nations on the other side of the Atlantic are natural members of any organization which may be set up in this old continent of Europe which gave the world a love of liberty and a sense of the dignity of man.

President Kennedy's speeches and his recent contacts with several leaders of Atlantic countries demonstrate the importance which he attaches to our defensive system. If our common cause calls for changes in certain outside commitments accepted by the United States, we may be sure that those changes will be made.

It seems unlikely that the neutral countries could object to the defense of our common ideology. Indeed, it may be asked how those countries could survive after the material or moral destruction of those other nations which are defending our Western heritage. Neutrality is a position which is recognized by European tradition, founded as it is on the rule of law. If this rule of law were to vanish, could the neutral countries rebuild it through their own means?

The essential thing is that we should increase our capacity for collective resistance to our enemy's attacks by doing away with double-banking of effort and that we should combat the subversive activities of the totalitarians. The creation of the NATO shield saved Europe and the free world from Soviet occupation. We must now organize our ideological defense in order to safeguard our spiritual and moral values.

Secret Service Chief's Wife: She's With the Home Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that there is an item of family interest in the recent promotion of Mr. Gerald A. Behn in the Secret Service as head of the White House detail. We are usually well informed of the biography of the men appointed to outstanding positions in the Federal Government, but we so seldom hear of the members of his family who have shared for many years in the daily efforts and dedication to duty that lead to recognition and service of immeasurable value.

It is my pleasure to acquaint you with the family of Mr. Behn through an article that appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 6, 1961, by Marie Smith, as follows:

SECRET SERVICE CHIEF'S WIFE: SHE'S WITH THE HOME GUARD

(By Marie Smith)

Pretty, suntanned Mrs. Gerald A. Behn, wife of the new head of the White House Secret Service, jokingly tells her husband that when he retires she is going to start traveling while he stays at home.

During his 22 years with the Secret Service, handsome, brown-eyed Jerry Behn has traveled all over the globe in his job of protecting Presidents and their families, while his wife, Jean, stayed at home. Only traveling she did with him was in 1940, the year after her Christmastime marriage to the young agent from Flint, Mich.

"I did go with him then to Charlottesville, Va., for a month; to Bar Harbor, Maine, for 2 months, to Poughkeepsie, N.Y., for 2 months, she recalled.

That's when her husband was on "diaper detail," the term Secret Service men apply to the duty of protecting Presidential children, whether they're in the cradle or in college. In his care at that time was Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who was a student at the University of Virginia.

Now it looks as if Mrs. Behn may go with her husband again.

If President Kennedy goes to Hyannis Port, Mass., for a vacation later this summer, Mrs. Behn hopes to follow her husband there. She and Mrs. James J. Rowley, wife of the present head of the White House detail, who is being promoted to Chief of the Secret Service, plan to take a cottage there to be near their husbands while they are on duty with the President.

Mrs. Behn, who met her husband when she was in high school in Flint, Mich., and he at the university, has souvenirs from most of the far-off places he has been.

He's not the picture-postcard-sending type when he travels—"he usually telephones," said Barbie (for Barbara), their 16-year-old daughter—but Jerry Behn always brings back gifts from his travels.

On the mantel of their attractive home at 2652 North Richmond Street, Arlington, are two of them: a figurine of an organ grinder he brought from London and a handsome brass tray from Pakistan.

"He usually brings me perfume and gloves but once he brought me a mink stole," Mrs. Behn added.

Although Behn has been assistant head of the White House detail since 1949 and was in line for the step-up, announcement of the promotion "caught us a little by surprise," Mrs. Behn said.

It came on Barbara's 16th birthday and Mrs. Behn was baking a cake for her. Her husband telephoned the news just after President Kennedy announced his appointment, so Jean Behn decorated the top of the cake with "Happy Birthday, Barbie" and "Congratulations Dad." They had a double celebration that night at dinner. Mrs. Behn served a prime rib roast, her husband's favorite food.

"He likes peanut butter too," chuckled Barbie. "Mother catches him in the kitchen snitching peanut butter between meals."

Mrs. Behn said her husband does have a little-boy fondness for peanut butter and she always keeps a jar in the kitchen for him.

Right after the announcement of Jerry Behn's promotion last Wednesday, the telephone in their home started ringing with calls from well-wishers and it kept ringing for 2 or 3 days. "Jerry's folks (Mr. and Mrs. Arthur C. Behn of Lake Fenton, Mich.) called and said it was the same there. His mother said she tried to clean house and had so many interruptions she forgot what she was doing. They're very proud of their only son," Jean Behn related.

Mrs. Behn said she doesn't expect his new title will change their life very much. Ever since President Kennedy took office, Jerry Behn has been the man nearest to him when he appears in public and will continue.

It does mean, however, that he won't be the advance man for the President's travels as he has been in previous years. He'll go with the President now.

Jerry's first trip, his wife recalled, was with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt for his meeting with Prime Minister Winston Churchill at sea during World War II. That time Mrs. Bhen did not know where he was until they came back and the trip was announced.

There have been other secret trips since and Mrs. Behn keeps these secrets as well as her husband does.

Husky Jerry Behn, 45, and slightly gray at the temples, has many hobbies, one of them woodworking. He has garnered many compliments on the mahogany mantel and bookcases he built at one end of their living room, and also on the handsome antique pine coffee table he made.

Mrs. Behn helps him in sanding and refinishing furniture but confesses she has no real hobbies. She once collected antiques but gave that up "before it got out of hand," she said. An antique clock which belonged to her grandfather ticks away on the mantel. She likes to sew, play golf, and swim, and she keeps a scrapbook on her husband—pasting in pictures and stories about him.

She also belongs to the Secret Service Wives Club which holds four dinner meetings a year to which husbands are not invited.

The Behns have two daughters, both blond, blue-eyed and pretty. Sandy, the oldest, was married in May to James A. Poole and lives in Arlington. Barbara is a student at Washington-Lee High School.

Mrs. Behn paid her husband's job the supreme compliment a few years ago when she wanted to introduce Sandy to some young Secret Service agents. But she was too late. Sandy was romantically interested in someone else. Now there's hope that Barbara may marry into the Secret Service and follow in her dad's footsteps.

Commitments to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, with which I am in full agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDECISIVE DEALER

Until Treasury Secretary Dillon spoke at the inter-American conference in Uruguay this week, the administration's aid plan for Latin America consisted mainly of a slogan "Alliance for Progress" and some vague promises and exhortations.

Now, although much remains hazy, some things about the alliance are becoming clearer. The cost, for instance. Projected U.S. spending in Latin America would surpass our Marshall plan aid to Europe, despite all the differences of time and circumstance.

In the postwar period, the U.S. contributed some $12 billion to Europe's recovery. Now, U.S. aid outlays for Latin America have already doubled from last year to $1 billion annually, and could go higher. During the next decade, Secretary Dillion foresees outside investment from all sources of at least $20 billion. He also promises U.S. loans at little or no interest—practically outright grants—for periods up to 50 years.

All this, obviously, represents a truly massive U.S. commitment—one, moreover, largely in advance of self-help measures within Latin America.

Certainly, a case can be made for aiding Latin America so long as the United States is giving so much aid to the rest of the world. The simple facts of geography and our security interests make it a key area for us, especially when the Communists are working hard there. There's also some truth in our neighbors' complaint of neglect; since 1945, less than 5 percent of the total U.S. foreign-aid outlay of $90 billion has gone to the score of other countries of this hemisphere.

But the case for approaching Latin America in a new spirit of priority depends on Washington's willingness to face up to the corollary: A changed U.S. approach to the rest of the world. If Latin America's needs are deemed to be of cardinal importance, as our massive aid plans plainly imply, then other claims are not so important, and should be cut back to fit the new pattern of aid-receiving priority

Yet the administration doesn't appear to have established such an order of priority. On the contrary, the attitude seems to be that the United States can assume huge new burdens in this Hemisphere, and go right on carrying a host of other nations besides. There's even talk of still another Marshall plan for Africa, as well as greatly increased aid to underdeveloped countries everywhere.

The U.S. Government had better begin making some hard decisions. Otherwise, the setting of Secretary Dillon's remarks—a hastily converted gambling casino—may turn out to be unpleasantly symbolic of the U.S. policy of trying to stake everybody.

In Opposition to the Proposed Death Tax on Thrift Institutions—A Bankers' Bonus Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will read for the RECORD, because I feel it is of sufficient importance, the testimony I gave this afternoon before the Committee on Ways and Means concerning the proposals to tax thrift institutions:

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN OF TEXAS

Mr. Chairman, it is very generous of the committee to hear me.

I have the highest respect for the tax lawyers in the Treasury who are working so diligently to find ways to improve our tax laws.

I have no doubt these people are deeply committed to the principle of "tax neutrality." In proposing to increase taxes on the thrift institutions, which would shift competitive advantages to the commercial banks, these people are no doubt genuinely concerned with correcting what appears to them to be inequalities in the Government's treatment of competing classes of financial institutions.

The unfortunate fact is, however, that the nature of commercial banking is little understood, and a great many people mistakenly see similarities between commercial banking and the operations of the thrift institutions, where no similarity really exists. Furthermore, because the nature of commercial banking is so frequently misunderstood, a great many people who are otherwise well informed are not aware of the tremendous favoritism and the vast subsidies which the Federal Government pours into the commercial banks. Accordingly, it is my purpose today to invite the committee's attention to these subsidies and preferential laws so that the committee can better weigh the question of equity between the commercial banks and the thrift institutions.

I also have great respect for the two authors of the bills which the committee is considering, and I know they intend to do only what is fair.

Despite the authors' good intentions, however, these bills go a great deal farther and faster toward taxing the savings and loan associations and the mutual savings banks out of existence than anything the administration has suggested.

Furthermore, the immediate effect of these bills would be to raise interest rates in general, and home-mortgage rates in particular. They would increase the cost of the savings institutions and drive up their lending rates, which, of course, is one of the main reasons why the commercial bankers are demanding this legislation. When the savings institutions raise their lending rates, we can be sure the commercial banks will promptly raise theirs. This will happen even though the legislation contains no taxes for the commercial banks, closes none of the special tax loopholes the commercial banks enjoy, and even though the commercial banks pay no interest whatever on most of their deposits. In other words, this is banker legislation, and it would cost the general public several dollars in increased interest charges for every new dollar the legislation would bring into the Treasury.

The bankers have been beating the drums for this legislation for a long time, and, recently, beating them faster and faster. They have now worked themselves into such a frenzy that their cannibalistic instincts are showing. The feast dance is on. The bankers have their competitor in a pot—or so they think—and are about to boil him.

They tell me, Mr. Chairman, that out in real cannibal country, where I imagine things are relatively simple, a book which is at the top of the bestseller list is one titled "How To Serve Your Fellow Man."

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that I appreciate the difficulties of trying to legislate on such a complex matter in an atmosphere of hysteria. I hope that the committee will take plenty of time to consider, as I know you will, all of the equities at issue in this legislation.

This is not a case where tax neutrality in the usual sense of the term will provide or even permit nonpreferential Federal treatment of the commercial banks and the private thrift institutions. I have conservatively estimated the various Federal subsidies to the commercial banks at $5 billion per year. True, a large part of this subsidy can and should be eliminated. Furthermore, the big tax loopholes which have been put into the tax laws mainly for the benefit of the commercial bankers can and should be eliminated. I will offer some specific suggestions on this as I go along.

But the point is, even if the bankers' special tax loopholes were closed and all the Federal subsidies to the commercial banks that conceivably could be eliminated were actually eliminated, Federal subsidies to the commercial banks would still be overwhelming. In other words, this is not a case where the Ways and Means Committee can say we will have tax neutrality and let the other committees worry about neutrality in other Federal laws and programs. The Congress could not eliminate all of the preferential treatment which the Federal laws give to the commercial banks, as opposed to the thrift institutions, without overturning the whole banking system and recreating it on principles which would be new to any we have ever known in the banking system in this country.

The claim is being made, of course, that the commercial bankers are at a disadvantage with the thrift institutions under the present tax laws because, it is said, these laws permit the thrift institutions to accumulate money for lending faster than the banks can accumulate it. Let us examine that proposition and examine, also, the subsidies and preferential treatment which the commercial bankers enjoy under Federal laws.

SUBSIDY NO 1. FREE USE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S POWER TO CREATE MONEY

First and foremost, the commercial banks enjoy the free use of the Government's power to create money.

Mr. Chairman, you know that the commercial bankers are the only people who are permitted to manufacture money and who can manufacture money without the threat of going to the penitentiary.

The Constitution assigns to Congress the power to create money, but Congress has delegated this great power to the commercial banks. It has not delegated any of this power to the savings and loan associations or the mutual savings banks or the credit unions or any of the other competitors of the commercial banks. Only the Federal Reserve banks and the private commercial banks can use this privilege of creating money.

The committee knows, of course, that there have been societies in times past in which the government or the head of the government either sold or gave away the government's power to collect taxes. I am not suggesting that the committee would wish to sell or give away to private interests the Government's power to tax; but I do point out that if this privilege were given to some private group, it would be no greater privilege than the Federal Government has extended to the private commercial banks in delegating to them the Government's power to create money.

The Federal Reserve Bulletin of July 1961 reports that the commercial banks of the country have assets amounting to $252 billion. In contrast, the total capital accounts of these banks, plus their borrowed capital, amounted to only $23 billion. By total capital accounts we mean, of course, all of the stockholders' investment, plus the earned surplus of the banks, plus the undivided profits of the banks—in other words, every penny which the stockholders have any claim to in the banking enterprise. Where did the other $229 billion of assets come from—the difference between the banks' total assets and the stockholders' equity? The commercial banks have acquired these $229 billion of assets simply by manufacturing money out of nothing more than thin air and the Government's inherent and constitutional power to create money.

The previous Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, understood this. Let me quote a passage from an interview with Secretary Anderson that appeared in the August 31, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report (p. 68):

Question. Do you mean that banks, in buying Government securities, do not lend out their customers' deposits? That they create the money they use to buy the securities?

Answer. That is correct. Banks are different from other lending institutions. When a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or a credit union makes a loan, it lends the very dollars that its customers have previously paid in. But when a bank makes a loan, it simply adds to the borrower's deposit account in the bank by the amount of the loan. The money is not taken from anyone else's deposit: it was not previously paid in to the bank by anyone. It's new money, created by the bank for the use of the borrower.

I wonder how the bankers can keep a straight face while complaining that the tax laws permit the thrift institutions to accumulate funds for lending faster than the commercial banks can accumulate them. The argument is utter nonsense. The commercial banks do not have to accumulate funds for lending; they create the money they lend, just with a stroke of a pen. When a commercial bank makes a loan to a business firm or to an individual, it creates the money loaned. When a commercial bank buys a Government security, it creates the money to buy it. When a commercial bank buys debt obligations of the State and local governments, it creates the money it uses to buy obligations.

While I am on this subject, let me clear up two other fallacies about commercial banking.

Fallacy No. 1: The commercial banks create money on their reserves against demand deposits only.

The fact is that commercial banks expand on their reserves against time deposits just as much, if not more so, as they expand on their reserves against demand deposits. I have questioned a great many commercial bankers, several Federal Reserve bank presidents and members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and they have all stated that reserves against demand deposits and time deposits are commingled and mixed. In point of fact, when a commercial bank computes its required reserves, it computes a single amount which is a weighted average of its required reserves against both demand and time deposits. In other words, when a commercial bank has an increase in time deposits, the reserves set aside against those time deposits permit the bank to create new money in the form of demand deposits.

Fallacy No. 2: Required reserves reduce the commercial bank's lending power.

This is completely untrue. Required reserves do reduce the lending power of the thrift institutions, but they do not reduce the lending power of the money-creating banks.

We have all heard the claim that the member banks of the Federal Reserve

System are required to pay a large portion of their funds into the Federal Reserve banks as reserves, and we have also heard the complaint that the commercial banks receive no interest on these funds.

The truth of the matter is that the commercial banking system never paid any funds into the Federal Reserve banks to receive the reserve credits which they have with the Federal Reserve banks. The Federal Reserve banks created these reserves, using the Government's power to create money, just as the commercial banks have used the Government's power to create money when they have made loans or investments.

On April 12, 1961, member banks had $16.2 billion of reserves covering both time and demand deposits. Their time and demand deposits, on the other hand, amounted to $171.4 billion, meaning that they had used the Government's money-creating power to create $10 for each $1 the Government had itself created.

This brings me to subsidy No. 2.

SUBSIDY NO. 2. FEDERAL LAW GIVES COMMERCIAL BANKS INTEREST-FREE USE OF DEMAND DEPOSITS

The committee would be greatly surprised, I am sure, if someone proposed that we pass a law which would assure some manufacturer or some industry that it would receive its raw materials free of charge, at the expense of the people who own the raw materials. Some members of the committee might even be surprised to know that we have a Federal law which assures the commercial banks that they will have interest-free use of most of their depositors' funds. Yet that is the case.

Since the beginning of the capitalistic system, at the end of the Middle Ages, bankers in all capitalistic countries have paid interest for the use of depositors' money—that is, up until 25 years ago. Over these centuries bankers had to compete for the use of the public's money. The rate of interest a banker paid was his way of attracting funds, just as is true of the thrift institutions today.

But back a few years ago, the commercial bankers got a bright idea for a Federal law which would relieve them of the necessity for competing for depositors' funds. True, the bankers create the money they lend or invest. But such money, the moment it is created, becomes the property of some bank depositor. When a bank creates money to make a loan to a customer, that money then belongs to the customer. He can draw it out and put it in some other bank. And, of course, in theory he can keep it out of all banks, in cash; but as a practical matter individuals, and business firms have to have checking accounts these days, and the Government gives the commercial banks a monopoly on the demand deposit business.

Customers did move funds from one bank to another when banks were competing in the interest rates they paid on these deposits.

In the early 1930's, the bankers put on a drive to have Congress pass a law to make it illegal for them to pay any interest on demand deposits, which of course, accounts for most of the bank deposits. Congress finally passed that law.

The idea was not inspired by any early religious edict against interest taking. On the contrary, the law only forbids the banks to pay interest, not to take it. In fact, the bankers made two arguments for this law. First, they admitted its purpose was to stop competition between and among the banks to attract demand deposits, and the claim was that this was necessary to save the small banks. The second argument was that relieving the banks of the normal competitive free-enterprise burden of competing would compensate the banks for the cost of the FDIC insurance premiums which they were then expected to pay, to build up an adequate FDIC insurance fund.

Well, Congress passed that law in 1935, and the banks have had their demand deposits free of charge and at the depositors' expense ever since.

The savings and loan associations, on the other hand, paid an average of 3.7 percent on their funds in 1960, and the mutual savings banks paid an average of 3.6 percent.

As to the compensation for the FDIC insurance premium, this turned out to be much more than a free gift. All other kinds of business firms have to pay their own insurance premiums without reimbursement from the Government. An argument could be made that this ought to be the case with the commercial banks because the insurance is for their benefit. It gives people confidence to put their money in the bank who otherwise would not trust the bankers with their money.

More than that, the bankers have never built up an adequate insurance fund. They subsequently got Congress to pass a law which gives the FDIC the privilege of drawing on the Federal Treasury up to $3 billion any time the FDIC needs the funds to meet the insurance claims, and they pay nothing for this commitment. I will come back to this subject later.

It is enough to say now that the commercial bankers have a vast windfall in the Federal law which stops competition between and among the commercial banks themselves for deposits. They are going much too far, it seems to me, in asking now for a Federal law which will eliminate their competition from the thrift institutions.

Now let us consider just how great this subsidy to the commercial banks is. How much are commercial banks reaping in benefits at the expense of the public from the Federal law which denies the public the right to competition for demand deposits? The commercial banks now have $129.2 billion of demand deposits. If they were paying only the average rate which prevailed on 90-day Treasury bills during the first half of this year, they would be paying the depositors of these funds a yearly interest rate of 2.35 percent. In other words, the banks would be paying depositors over $3 billion a year for the use of their demand balances. In contrast, the total amount of their insurance premiums last year was only $70 million. So this Federal law not only has the effect of making the public pay the bankers' insurance premiums, it has the effect of making the public pay the bankers another $43 bonus for each $1 of insurance premium.

Who is paying these benefits to the bankers?

The Federal Government itself maintained an average balance of $4 billion with the commercial banks during the past fiscal year. So if the banks had paid for the use of these funds at the Treasury bill rate, they would have paid the Federal Government $94 million a year. This is $94 million out of the taxpayers' pockets and into the pockets of the bankers.

Who else is subsidizing the bankers?

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, the savings and loan associations and the mutual savings banks are themselves forced to subsidize the commercial banks. They, too, must have checking accounts.

The last available report, which is for the end of last year, shows that the savings and loan associations had demand balances with the commercial banks amounting to $1.8 billion; and the mutual savings banks had demand deposits with these banks amounting to $557 million. At the Treasury bill rate, the commercial banks would be paying these thrift institutions $56 million a year for the use of these funds.

Finally—and this is to me most disturbing—the State and local governments have approximately $11.8 billion on deposit with the commercial banks in demand deposits, drawing no interest. In other words, Federal law also denies the State and local governments interest for the use of their funds. If the commercial banks were paying the Treasury bill rate for the use of State and local government funds, they would be paying the State and local governments $278 million a year.

It seems to me this law which prohibits the commercial banks from paying interest on demand deposits ought to be repealed, certainly as it applies to the funds of the State and local governments. If the Federal Government wishes to pour this vast subsidy into the commercial banks, then it ought to use its own funds for the purpose. But it seems to me the Federal Government has gone too far in denying the State and local governments any right to receive a revenue on their funds. The lost revenues are very badly needed by the State and local political subdivisions, for schools and other community facilities. I hope the Governors, the mayors and other local officials will interest themselves in seeing to it that the rights of the State and local governments are restored.

Mr. Chairman, I have secured from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation a breakdown of the demand deposits of the States and political subdivisions, on a State-by-State basis, which indicates how the various States are affected by this Federal law. With your permission, I will offer this tabulation for the record.

Demand deposits of States and subdivisions by State, insured commercial banks, Dec. 31, 1960

[In thousands]

State:	Demand deposits
Alabama	$256,597
Alaska	7,815
Arizona	105,217
Arkansas	101,941
California	778,568
Colorado	89,602
Connecticut	101,582
Delaware	24,524
District of Columbia	119
Florida	414,958
Georgia	241,105
Hawaii	62,037
Idaho	82,364
Illinois	702,058
Indiana	446,238
Iowa	203,131
Kansas	389,871
Kentucky	132,240
Louisiana	378,466
Maine	28,122
Maryland	135,463
Massachusetts	347,745
Michigan	428,013
Minnesota	247,755
Mississippi	206,791
Missouri	378,767
Montana	72,368
Nebraska	110,026
Nevada	35,724
New Hampshire	31,898
New Jersey	417,822
New Mexico	89,494
New York	1,083,281
North Carolina	167,118
North Dakota	25,674
Ohio	535,035
Oklahoma	231,543
Oregon	145,076
Pennsylvania	420,551
Rhode Island	39,016
South Carolina	108,318
South Dakota	66,114
Tennessee	228,722
Texas	648,785
Utah	103,878
Vermont	17,697
Virginia	182,063
Washington	195,957
West Virginia	100,812
Wisconsin	183,511
Wyoming	47,270
Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	71,526
Total	11,650,373

Source: Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Aug. 3, 1961.

I hope the committee will inquire very carefully into the reasons why the commercial bankers want this legislation. Is it really because the thrift institutions are taking lending funds away from the commercial banks? The thrift institutions do not destroy money; they do not absorb money and they are not depositories of money. In other words, all of the funds deposited or invested in these thrift institutions go immediately back into the commercial banks and are available to the commercial bankers for lending or investment.

The commercial banks have no less funds available for loans and investments than they would have if the thrift institutions did not exist. We must conclude, therefore, that the thrift institutions are cutting not into the amount of funds which the commercial banks have available for lending, but into the number of customers who might be knocking at the banks' doors asking for loans. In other words, these thrift institutions are an external force of competition which is helping to keep interest rates down.

As the committee considers the merits of the battle which the commercial bankers are waging against their great adversaries—I hope it will keep in mind just how formidable a foe of commercial bankers these institutions are. Let me put it this way: If the commercial banks were paying 3 percent interest on their demand deposits, instead of having these deposits free of charge—they would be paying the depositors $3.9 billion a year. In other words we accept 3 percent as a reasonable rate, then the benefits which the commercial banks are receiving from this one subsidy alone is $3.9 billion a year. That happens to be more than the gross income of all the savings and loan associations, before payment of operating expenses and payment of taxes. And it is almost as much as the gross income of the savings and loan associations and the mutual savings banks combined. In other words, the bankers are really waging war on a very tiny, infant foe.

SUBSIDY NO. 3: INTEREST ON U.S. GOVERNMENT DEBT OBLIGATIONS, ACQUIRED THROUGH FULL USE OF GOVERNMENT POWER TO CREATE MONEY

The commercial banks now hold $61 billion of U.S. Treasury obligations. Last year the Treasury, and the taxpayers, paid the banks the gigantic sum of $1.8 billion in interest on these obligations. This is another huge, outright subsidy.

As former Secretary of the Treasury Anderson has explained, the commercial banks acquired these Government obligations simply by creating the money. They used the Government's power to create money without charge, in order to create money to lend to the Government at a steep interest charge.

There is no reason whatever for the Federal Government to do business in this way, except for the reason of giving the commercial banks another subsidy. The Federal Government does not need to have the private commercial banks create money to buy its debt obligations, because the Government's own banks—the Federal Reserve banks—can do this. When the Federal Reserve acquires these securities, the interest payments go back into the Treasury, instead of out of the taxpayers' pockets and into bank profits.

Furthermore, the Federal Reserve banks could acquire these Federal obligations without increasing the money supply of the country by so much as a penny, so there can be no valid argument that this would be inflationary. The Federal Reserve has wide discretionary powers, not only to determine what the total money supply of the country will be at any given moment, but to determine how much of that money shall be of its own creation, and how much shall be of the commercial banks' creation.

In truth, the Federal Reserve banks now have some $27 billion of U.S. Government obligations, and they receive a very tidy interest income on these—enough that last year they paid their expenses of $154 million and returned $897 million to the Treasury. But for reasons best known to themselves the Federal Reserve people prefer to have any given money supply made up of a minimum of Federal Reserve bank money, and a maximum of private bank money.

SUBSIDY NO. 4: FREE FEDERAL RESERVE SERVICES

What do the costs of running the Federal Reserve banks go for? Why are Government funds used to pay these expenses instead of being paid back to the Treasury?

The fact is that approximately $120 million a year—which is most of the cost of operating the Federal Reserve banks—is the cost of providing free check clearing, free telegraph service, and other free services to the commercial banks. If the Federal Reserve did not provide these services, the commercial banks would have to pay the expenses of private clearinghouse associations to perform these services. These free services, provided at taxpayers' expense, are not, however, just for the benefit of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. The nonmember banks also enjoy their use, indirectly, through their correspondent banks.

This is another $120 million yearly subsidy to the commercial banks.

SUBSIDY NO. 5: INTEREST-FREE DRAWING PRIVILEGE ON THE FEDERAL TREASURY

Let us come back now to another aspect of the FDIC insurance fund.

Despite the fact that the Federal law arranged to have the general public pay the commercial banks for what was to be the cost of the FDIC insurance premiums, and also gave the banks a tremendous windfall in addition, the commercial banks have never really paid these insurance premiums—certainly not in amounts necessary to build up an adequate insurance fund.

The real insurance behind FDIC insurance is the fact that Public Law 363, approved in 1947, gives the FDIC the privilege of calling on the Federal Treasury for funds any time they are needed, up to an amount of $3 billion. In other words, the FDIC has a standing commitment on the Treasury in the amount of $3 billion. If you or I or any business firm obtained a loan commitment of this kind from a private bank, or from an insurance company, we would have to pay a commitment fee. The going rate of such commitment fees is 1 percent. Thus, if the FDIC were paying the going rate for its commitment on the Treasury, it would be paying the Treasury $30 million a year.

So this is another $30-million-a-year subsidy which the taxpayers are paying indirectly, to the commercial banks.

It may be only coincidence, but it happens that the Treasury is never empty of this $3 billion, should the banks need it. The Treasury keeps a minimum of $3.5 billion on deposit with the commercial banks at all times. So that $3 billion is, in effect, set aside, at all times, always available should the banks need it to meet their insurance demands. But it is costing the taxpayers much more than the 1 percent which I have suggested the banks should pay on it. These idle funds are costing the taxpayers the average interest rate

they pay on the whole Federal debt, because if they were not kept in the banks, they would be used to reduce the national debt by this amount.

SUBSIDY NO. 6. SIX PERCENT INCOME FROM UNNEEDED INVESTMENT IN FEDERAL RESERVE STOCK

Federal Reserve banks sell a certain amount of stock in these banks to the private commercial banks that are members of the System. In fact, Federal law requires them to sell this stock and requires the member banks to buy it.

Yet the Federal Reserve System has no need whatever for the funds it derives from the sale of this stock. Indeed, the funds are not even invested. Yet Federal law requires that the private banks be paid an annual income of 6 percent of their investment in this so-called stock. In other words, the Federal Government pays the banks 6 percent on the safest investment in the world, which is an investment in the Government of the United States.

This Federal Reserve stock outstanding amounts to some $400 million; and banks receive an annual income of $24 million on this. This is another outright subsidy to the commercial banks of $24 million.

More than that, most of the $24 million is tax-free income to the banks. Federal law provides for this.

Mr. Chairman, it would not be possible to make an accurate dollars-and-cents total of all the Federal subsidies to the commercial banks. There are several which I have not yet mentioned. For example, there is one tremendous loophole in the tax laws which are of special benefit to the commercial banks, and it would be difficult to make a dollars-and-cents estimate of the value of this. Even more important, the commercial banks enjoy a limited monopoly in the banking business, by reason of the fact that the Federal Government maintains some stiff restrictions and barriers to keep new competitors out of the banking business. Banking is not the kind of free enterprise we know in farming, or in running a retail store, running a manufacturing business or any other kind of commercial enterprise. Any citizen can go into these businesses whenever and wherever he pleases, if he has the capital. Not so the banking business. The Federal Government keeps most of the would-be newcomers out of this field. I will come back to this protected monopoly status of the commercial banks later, and also to the tax loophole.

Let me sum up, however, those subsidies which I have mentioned so far, for which we do have dollars-and-cents estimates. Altogether, they come to more than $5 billion a year. I have recapitulated these Federal subsidies to the commercial banks in the table below.

Summary table of subsidies to commercial banks provided by Federal law and programs—(not counting tax loopholes and Federal barriers to keep out new competitors)

[In millions]

Value of interest-free use of demand deposits (computed at 2.35 percent or average rate on 90-day Treasury bills)	$3,036
On demand deposits of:	
(a) Savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks	$56
(b) Federal Government	94
(c) State and local governments	278
(d) Other depositors, except banks	2,608
Interest received by commercial banks on U.S. Government obligations acquired with created money	1,800
Cost of free Federal Reserve services	120
Interest-free commitment on Treasury for $3 billion (computed at 1 percent commitment fee)	30
Interest on $400 million Federal Reserve bank "stock" (at 6 percent) (not including value of tax-free income status)	24
Total subsidies	5,010

SPECIAL TAX LOOPHOLE MAINLY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE COMMERCIAL BANKS

As the committee knows, the general rule for taxpayers who trade in securities, or have gains or losses from the sale of other investments, is this: If a taxpayer's capital losses within the year exceed his capital gains, he can charge off the losses against ordinary, taxable income only up to $1,000 per year, regardless of the amount of his net loss.

But not so for the thrift institutions which are the subject of the present legislation and, coincidentally, the commercial banks also. These are permitted to charge off losses without limit against ordinary income.[1] This means that the commercial bankers, who are the main beneficiaries of this loophole, can, and do, engage in what are for all practical purposes "wash sales." When the market value of the securities they hold goes down, the banks can sell these securities, write off the loss against ordinary income, but immediately buy other securities which are for all practical purposes identical. Then when the value of these securities goes up again, they can sell the securities and pay only the 25-percent capital gains tax on their profits.

This loophole applies not just to Government securities. It applies to any and all types of debt obligations which the banks buy and sell. The loophole was put into the law in 1942, incidentally, on the advice of some of the bankers as to what should be done to assure the bankers' all-out cooperation in meeting the financing needs of World War II. That was almost 20 years ago and the financing needs of World War II have long since disappeared, but the loophole still remains in the law.

I wonder why the proposed legislation before the committee today makes no provision for closing this loophole.

In actual experience, the commercial banks paid last year an effective income tax rate of only 38.4 percent. Except for this loophole, the banks would have been paying more nearly in the neighborhood of the 52-percent rate.

Before leaving the matter of the bankers' taxes, Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from commenting on another tax angle which seems very wrong to me. This is the fact that they not only acquire the securities of the State and local governments with bank-created money, which costs them nothing, but they then pay no income tax on the interest they receive on these securities. The commercial banks now hold some $17.6 billion of State and local bonds, all acquired on bank-created money, all tax exempt.

Notwithstanding this tax loophole, and all the vast Federal subsidies to the commercial banks, the Treasury people seem to be laboring under the impression that the thrift institutions are taking lending funds away from the commercial banks, and also that the thrift institutions and the commercial banks are equally involved in the same kind of lending.

Thus, the Treasury Department's report of July 1961, titled "The Taxation of Mutual Savings Banks and Savings and Loan Associations," at page 3, speaks of "logical and equitable" application of taxes as between the thrift institutions and the banks as follows:

"From the viewpoint of a logical and equitable application of the Federal income tax, the mutual thrift institutions should be able to retain corporate earnings tax free only under a formula consistent with established concepts for computing bad debt reserves."

And, again at page 8, the report states:

"Moreover, other financial institutions which compete for the savers' dollars, such as commercial banks, do in fact have to depend primarily on surplus built up after taxes, rather than on access to the equity capital market, in order to obtain the protective capital cushions which all businesses need."

And finally, at page 11 of the report, we find this statement:

"It has been stated that a policy of tax neutrality toward competing financial intermediaries promotes a more efficient utilization of economic resources as established by the marketplace."

In plain words, Mr. Chairman, the Treasury people are under a misapprehension that cutting the allowable bad debt reserves of the thrift institutions will, insofar as the Federal Government's intrusions into the marketplace are concerned, better equalize competition between these institutions and the commercial banks.

But I submit, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government's role in the marketplace is overwhelmingly on the side of the commercial banks. More than that, the thrift institutions are not taking lending funds away from the commercial banks. And they are not in the same kind of lending business to such an extent as to warrant the same ratio of reserves for bad debt, or what the Treasury calls "capital cushion."

The thrift institutions are in the long-term investment business, such as housing loans running for 20 to 30 years. Their investments are not liquid, and they are relatively high risk investments, being subject to the risks of the business cycle, relocations of population, the drying up of industry in particular areas, and even the possibility that within the

[1] Sec. 582(b).

next 20 to 30 years some entirely new type of shelter may be developed for both people and business. The commercial banks are supposed to be in the commercial banking business. They are supposed to be making short-term low risk loans. They have no business being in the investment business.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDES MONOPOLY POSITION FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS

Mr. Chairman, the commercial banks should not be aided and abetted in their effort to choke off competition from other types of financial institutions. Of course, this is a final step. They have already been extremely successful in throttling competition among themselves; and this has been achieved in large part through the assistance of the Government, particularly in setting up almost insuperable bariers to entry into the commercial banking business.

First, let us take a look at the sharp decline in the number of commercial banks in the United States. In 1920 there were nearly 31,000 banks. Today—according to the July 1961 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin—there are 13,465 commercial banks. In other words, there are only 43 banks today where there were 100 some 40 years ago.

But since 1920 our population has risen from 106 million to 179 million. The population per bank in the United States was only about 3,400 in 1920. Now the population per bank exceeds 13,000. So the average bank now has 3.8 times the customer potential that prevailed in 1920. That alone should put the commercial bankers in an enviable position. But that isn't all that has happened.

In practically every community in this country the number of banks has been reduced to the point where only a very few control the business. Here are some figures from the 1960 annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:

In no less than 58 out of a total of 65 metropolitan areas surveyed, the 3 largest commercial banks have more than 50 percent of the deposits of all the banks in the area.

In 33 metropolitan areas, the 3 largest commercial banks have more than 70 percent of the deposits of all commercial banks in the area.

In 22 metropolitan areas, the 3 largest commercial banks own more than 80 percent of the deposits. And in six metropolitan areas, the three largest commercial banks hold over 90 percent of the deposits.

It's pretty hard to drum up any competition among commercial banks when so few control so much. And this concentration picture is bound to get worse before it gets better, as anyone can see by just looking at the newspapers day by day and noting the large number of bank mergers that are taking place.

Superimposed upon all these concentrations in local areas is the dominant position of the largest commercial banks in the country. The top 10 commercial banks—6 of which are located in New York City—on June 30, 1961, held $48.2 billion of deposits. This represents 21.7 percent of the $222 billion of deposits held by all commercial banks in the United States. These few giant commercial banks set the whole pattern of interest rates charged by commercial banks throughout the country.

ENTRY BLOCKADED

Nor is there much hope that the number of commercial banks will be increased in the foreseeable future, even though, as I have pointed out, there is nearly four times the potential business for the average bank there was 40 years ago. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have set up more than ample barriers to new entrants. In fact, the only way you seem to be able to get into the banking business today is to be in it already.

But it hasn't been enough for the banks to cut down the number of competitors, increase concentration in the hands of a few of the largest banks, and to block the entry of new banks. Now they resort to the tax route to hobble the competition of the savings and loan companies and the mutual savings banks. What about the credit unions? They compete with commercial banks, and do a pretty good job of it. Will the commercial banks appeal to Congress to cripple the credit unions, too? They are probably next on their death tax list.

PROPOSAL WILL INCREASE MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

The Treasury Department expresses concern over the impact this proposal may have on the housing program. The Treasury report states:

"The continuation of proper housing programs requires an adequate supply of funds for home mortgages. Consequently, from the viewpoint of our housing programs, any change in the current tax treatment of these institutions must be weighed in the light of its possible adverse effect on those programs."

The Treasury estimates that in a period of tight money, the proposal may cause a loss of anywhere from $500 million to $2 billion in the supply of mortgage money and that this might cause a reduction of from about 3 percent to as much as 10 percent in the volume of residential construction.

The Treasury Department does not carry its analysis to the point of the effect this proposal may have on mortgage interest rates.

We can be sure of one thing. It certainly won't contribute toward a decrease in mortgage rates, and I would remind the committee that an increase of 1 percent in mortgage interest rates can mean more than a year's pay of an average family added to the cost of a $15,000 30-year loan.

It is my prediction that this proposal will reverse the recent downward trend in mortgage interest rates.

PUBLIC INTEREST DEMANDS FAIR PLAY IN THE MARKETPLACE

There was a time when businessmen believed that the best way to get ahead was to produce a better product for a lower price. Now the technique seems to be to try to cripple one's competitors by some sort of a death tax. This is what the commercial bankers are trying to do in sponsoring legislation to increase taxes on savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks.

The commercial bankers who have over the years generated such intense hatred against thrift institutions by the use of misleading and distorted information should be ashamed of themselves.

The views of bankers' leaders in the American Bankers Association do not impress me as being in accordance with the views of bankers I know. Bankers are leaders in community life as well as in State and National affairs. It is seldom that you find them putting up such a terrific fight for something that is purely selfish and inimical to the general welfare.

If the attitude of the bankers is to be determined by their attitude in this case, Congress must be more careful to safeguard the public interest against them. We cannot make a goose the guardian of the shelled corn.

Commercial bankers who really want to protect the public interest can find many subsidies to remove and many tax loopholes to close, without damaging the public interest as in the case of this legislation.

Forty percent—over 40 percent, Mr. Chairman—of the home loan financing is done through the institutions that the commercial banks are attempting to penalize and destroy in this attack.

My idea of bankers drawn from the image of the good bankers I have known all my life is contrary to what the leaders of the bankers are doing here. This is a bad proposal. It is a bank bonus bill. It would be rejected.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Outer Mongolia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an editorial appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of August 12 entitled, "When Did Outer Mongolia Cast Off Its Red Shackles?" This excellent article serves to refresh our memory regarding the previous attempts to secure recognition of Outer Mongolia.

The roles played by William C. Bullitt, then U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Owen Lattimore in 1936, with Lattimore urging recognition of this "independent" country, places new significance on Lattimore's recent visit to Outer Mongolia.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me, in view of Ambassador Bullitt's testimony regarding Russia's complete dominance in this area, that any official of our Government would feel that recognition of this puppet regime would serve any useful purpose.

Russian dominance was obvious and apparent 25 years ago, and there is no reason to suppose that this control has lessened over the years.

It would appear that U.S. officials, urging recognition of Outer Mongolia, are ignoring the testimony of history.

Mr. President, I recommend this fine editorial to my colleagues in the Senate and request unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN DID OUTER MONGOLIA CAST OFF ITS RED SHACKLES?

For some reason the State Department appeared surprised because Chiang Kai-shek was said to be upset by reports that Washington was about to recognize Communist-satellite Outer Mongolia as an independent republic worthy of a seat in the United Nations. Ambassador Everett Drumright was called back to Washington from Formosa, presumably to be given instructions on how to explain to the generalissimo that our trafficking with Outer Mongolia was just a little shenanigan between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. which needn't mean anything to Formosa.

But what in the world is the point of giving non-Communist Asia even 5 minutes of the shakes to revive this often-exploded notion that Outer Mongolia is independent? If President Kennedy or Dean Rusk or whoever is responsible for this bizarre idea would brush off the published hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations—before Senator Patrick A. McCarran's subcommittee in 1952—the ancestry of this hoary heresy would expose its shabbiness. On page 4522 et seq. of the aforementioned hearings is the testimony of William C. Bullitt, our first ambassador to the Soviet Union. Mr. Bullitt testified that Owen Lattimore, an expert on the Mongolian question, came to him in Moscow early in 1936 on the way from a visit to Outer Mongolia. Lattimore, according to Bullitt's testimony, urged Bullitt to recommend to President Roosevelt that Outer Mongolia be recognized as a "fully independent" republic.

"I asked him," said Mr. Bullitt, "if there was no Soviet control of the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia. And he replied there was no Soviet control whatsoever. I asked him if the GPU, which at that time was the title of the Soviet secret police, had no control there, and he said they did not, that the Mongolian People's Republic was independent and that his advice, which he urged me to telegraph at once to President Roosevelt, was that the American Government should immediately recognize the independence of the Mongolian People's Republic."

All this came as quite a shock to Mr. Bullitt because only a month earlier he had had a revealing conversation with an old acquaintance of his, an assistant commissar named Karakhan, who had been quite active in Outer Mongolia on behalf of the Soviet foreign office. Karahkhan, according to his own statement, was sent to Outer Mongolia in 1934 to "finish off any signs of restiveness under Soviet control." On his return to Moscow Karakhan called on Bullitt at the U.S. Embassy.

"I said to him that I had heard he had been out there to finish off the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia, or rather any signs of independence in it, and he said that indeed he had, but it was a very small affair." Explained Karakhan, "After all, in a country of nomads there are only 300 or 400 people that count, and all I did on a given night was to have about 400 people seized by the GPU agents in the army and police force, and I had them shot before dawn and installed the people that the Soviet Government wished to have installed."

It seemed incredible that a Soviet official would be so frank with a foreigner, but Mr. Bullitt assured the committee that he had known Karakhan since 1919 and that they were, as the phrase is, "just like that."

Mr. Bullitt also knew, before the arrival of Lattimore in Moscow, that the U.S.S.R. had signed a protocol of mutual assistance with Outer Mongolia and that the Chinese had made "the strongest kind of a protest" against the infringement of the sovereignty of China. "I was obliged to conclude," said Mr. Bullitt, "that either Mr. Lattimore knew nothing about the subject on which he was supposed to be the leading American expert or that he was deliberately attempting to assist in the spread of Communist authority through Asia. I left the matter with a question mark in my mind."

Recently Mr. Lattimore visited Outer Mongolia again, and this time his pet project, which has been turned edown repeatedly, seems about to be accepted. Why? If Outer Mongolia is any less a Soviet satellite than it was in 1936, evidence is lacking. Isn't this where we came in?

Pessimism Is Only Half the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as the cold war of words and preparations heightens over Berlin, it becomes increasingly important for us to keep the facts contributing to this crucial problem in perspective.

At times like this it is all too easy for us to see only negative value in each new development, but Marquis Childs, writing in this morning's Washington Post, has pointed out that there is much to be encouraged about in Britain's decision to apply for membership in the Common Market.

Mr. Child's answer to the question of what stands between the forces of pessimism and optimism is particularly pertinent:

In the view of this observer it is simply the will, the resolution, to do what must be done in this hour and that is, above all, to prepare to meet calmly not just the immediate threat against Berlin but the long pull.

This is a pointed and timely article and I comment it to my colleagues' attention:

PESSIMISM IS ONLY HALF THE STORY

(By Marquis Childs)

PARIS.—Depending on whether by temperament you are an incorrigible optimist or a confirmed pessimist, two diametrically opposed views of the state of the Western alliance are readily at hand. They are as different as night and day, black and white.

The pessimist has no trouble in finding material to put together his picture. The dark doubt is with respect to a unifying and directing force in the face of the Berlin crisis. Or, to put it another way, the question is whether there is a sufficient appreciation of the gravity of the crisis among the Western partners to enable them to submerge their differences and unite on a common position both for strength and eventual negotiation.

The enigma is France. Somewhere above the earth—not in a space capsule but in a gently floating free balloon—is a presence, a great presence, called Charles de Gaulle. In his lofty isolation President de Gaulle has become increasingly removed from public opinion in France and in the world and from the lesser men who are the ministers in his government.

From his vantage point the Berlin crisis appears to have been greatly exaggerated. If his ministers correctly reflect his view then, as he sees it, Premier Khrushchev has pressed the Berlin button and the United States has reacted by automatically pushing the crisis button. This was a mistake, since simply by "standing firm and refusing to be rushed into ill-advised proposals for 'negotiation' Khrushchev will abandon his threats."

De Gaulle may be right; he has often been right in the past when others were wrong. But the consequences if he is mistaken could be so very grave that steps for meeting both force and an ultimate confrontation with the Soviets are vital. This is the argument the Americans put up at the Conference of the Western Foreign Ministers.

De Gaulle's detachment from what seem to be the glaring realities of the situation in France and North Africa is also a cause for concern. He has thus far refused to consider a compromise of the Tunisian dispute by agreeing to negotiate on the basis of a future date for giving up the French base of Bizerte although that base, just as with the British in Suez, can hardly be held in the midst of a hostile population. Tunisia is in the meantime moving increasingly away from the West.

Serious newspapers, such as Le Monde and Figaro, have begun to discuss possible dates for a new putsch by the army and the ultra rightists to overthrow De Gaulle. The bomb attacks multiply in Algeria and Paris. And for the first time this observer has heard the name of a possible successor to De Gaulle—the extreme conservative, Antoine Pinay.

As to the other principal partner, Britain, the pessimistic view is not so dark. Yet the British, under the mellow sun of the Macmillan government, have been for years living far beyond their means and the recent crisis of the reserve backing of the pound was more serious than the public has been told. The stern measures taken to meet this crisis have absorbed the attention of the British public to the exclusion of the Berlin crisis.

So much for pessimism, now for the view of the optimist. It begins with the fact that Britain has applied for membership in the Common Market and, despite all the reservations that must be entered because of the Commonwealth and Britain's associates among the Outer Seven, the belief here is that within 6 to 9 months the United Kingdom will be a part of the European economy.

A Europe united will have far greater productivity and greater manpower for war or peace than the Communist bloc. Under circumstances of unity and strength decisions can be taken to meet threats such as that now directed against Berlin. A force for freedom will have come into being at least equal to that of the Soviet Union on the one hand and the United States on the other.

What is it then that stands between these two so opposed pictures, the dark of the past night and the hope of a promising new day? In the view of this observer it is simply the will, the resolution, to do what must be done in this hour and that is, above all, to prepare to meet calmly not just the immediate threat against Berlin but the long pull.

For De Gaulle, what must be done—beginning, for example, with the necessity to make peace with the Algerian rebels—is far more difficult than for the others, if only because these necessities have so long been postponed.

Doctors Can Help Patients Avoid Overpriced Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has studied in great detail and at great length the vitally important drug industry of our country. I am proud to have taken part in that careful study as a member of the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

The drug investigations have focused the spotlight of public opinion on certain highly questionable practices aimed at pegging prices at artificially high, fixed levels.

We all know who pays the bill. It is the consumer, which means all of us. It is also the taxpayer, which also means all of us.

Mr. President, people write to me, and to virtually every Member of the Senate and House, every day of the week asking that we do something about excessive Government spending.

Our Federal Government is the biggest single consumer of almost every commodity and every service that is bought and sold today.

What protects the consumer therefore protects the Government and its taxpayers.

I submit that one way to keep Government spending in check is to take a close look at the goods and services which the Government buys. If they are overpriced, the taxpayers are being gouged.

Thus, a few days ago I was proud to support the effort to maintain the General Services Administration's longstanding practice of defending the Government against what it considers to be unfairly high utility rates. This, to my mind, is real economy in Government.

In like manner, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee is defending the Government—and all its taxpayers—against inordinately high prices of certain basic items like drugs. The Government buys millions of dollars worth of drugs every year.

But we in the Congress and those in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government cannot fight these battles alone. Others must also take part. The medical profession can take an important part in keeping drug prices in line for the patient, who is also the consumer and the taxpayer.

A few weeks ago I was interviewed on this subject by Mike Marsh, a reporter for Labor newspaper. This is a national weekly journal published in Washington by some of the oldest and most respected unions in the Nation. The interview article was published on July 22.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARROLL SAYS DOCTORS CAN HELP GREATLY TO BRING DOWN HIGH PRICE OF DRUGS

What can be done to bring down the high price of prescription drugs? One thing that would help, Senator JOHN CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, suggested this week, would be for doctors to "inform themselves about the cost of the drugs they prescribe for their patients."

As a member of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, CARROLL has played a leading role in the investigation of drug prices led by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee. Commenting on that probe, CARROLL said "the evidence was crystal clear that the prescription drug industry's profits were exorbitant, its prices were unreasonable and its advertising methods were not in the public interest."

KEY ROLE OF DOCTORS

As for practical action, CARROLL stressed in an interview with Labor the key position of the Nation's doctors. "Doctors," he noted, "are dealing with low-income people, aged people, working people. The ordinary person, when he is sick or his child is sick, does not ask about the cost of the doctor's prescription."

But later, CARROLL said, people may blame their doctor when they find how much the prescription costs them. "Actually," CARROLL stressed, "it's not the doctor's fault. Nor is it usually the druggist's fault." The fault lies, he suggested, with the big drug companies.

"But doctors could take a look at drug prices," CARROLL said. "They could bring pressure on the drug companies, asking them: 'Why are your prices so high?' "

SALUTARY EFFECT

Also, CARROLL suggested, if doctors would check up, they could learn whether the same drug is available much cheaper under another brand or under its generic (medical) name, and then write their prescriptions accordingly.

The Colorado Senator noted that the American Medical Association has recently made plans to spread the word more widely among doctors about the different brands and the generic names of the newer drugs. CARROLL hailed this move and suggested it is one of the salutary effects of the drug price probe.

In Government action also against high drug prices, CARROLL said, "we need the cooperation of the medical profession. I can't understand why every doctor in this country wouldn't favor a fair and reasonable program to bring down the price of drugs."

Waldo G. Miles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very well-deserved editorial in the Bristol Herald Courier in regard to the Honorable Waldo G. Miles, who was selected by acclamation to be president-elect of the Virginia State Bar Association for 1961–62.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH HONOR GOES TO ONE OF OUR OWN

The Virginia State Bar Association is an organization of some 2,000 members, by and large all capable attorneys who are leaders in their respective communities and in the State.

But certainly none are more able nor more versed in the art of leadership and service than is Waldo G. Miles, of Bristol, who was chosen by the bar association yesterday as president-elect for 1961–62.

This honor, accorded to Mr. Miles by acclamation, means he will serve as the Association's president in 1962–63. He is only the second Bristolian in history to win the post, and the sixth attorney from southwest Virginia to be so honored.

Obviously, the members of the State bar association have recognized what Bristolians have long known—that Mr. Miles is a man of high professional competence, a man of dedication to whatever labors he undertakes, and a man who is willing and able to serve in whatever capacity his fellowmen may proscribe.

Of special note in recent years was Mr. Miles' service as president of Bristol Memorial Hospital. In that capacity, he was largely responsible for action which made it possible for the hospital to receive Hill-Burton Funds from both Virginia and Tennessee in order to construct a new addition, which is now being built.

In addition, Mr. Miles has served on the Bristol Red Cross Board of Directors, as a director and executive committeeman of the chamber of commerce; as president of our mental health clinic; and currently, as a member of the Bristol, Va., school board, and the State Democratic Central Committee.

Those who know him personally are highly gratified that the bar association has chosen so wisely. And all Bristol can be proud—as can all southwest Virginia—of this high honor accorded one of our own.

Our heartiest congratulations, along with our best wishes, go to Mr. Miles as he proceeds to carry out his duties as president-elect this year and as president of the bar association in the year which follows.

Khrushchev Tells West To Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was extremely interested in a column by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "Khrushchev Tells West: Surrender," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

In his analysis of the speech by Soviet Premier Khrushchev, Mr. Lawrence states:

A reading of the full text of the speech of the Soviet Premier on Monday night reveals a bold demand for surrender, couched in argumentative but seemingly conciliatory language.

This assessment of the remarks of the Russian Premier is most informative and I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV TELLS WEST: SURRENDER—SOVIET DICTATOR SAYS THIS IS THE WAY FREE WORLD CAN END WAR PSYCHOSIS

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—All that Nikita Khrushchev wants is the surrender of the West on the Berlin issue without war. This, he is confident, would do away with the war psychosis, and he frankly declares that the further development of communism would thus be assured, not only in East Germany but in the satellite countries as well, which, he confesses, might otherwise succumb to Western influence.

A reading of the full text of the speech of the Soviet Premier on Monday night reveals a bold demand for surrender, couched in argumentative but seemingly conciliatory language. Parts of the speech could well have been uttered by President Kennedy or by any other Western statesman. For example, Mr. Khrushchev says:

"Life demands that statesmen should not only say reasonable things but also should not permit themselves in politics to cross the line when the voice of reason falls silent and a blind and dangerous game with the destinies of peoples and states begins."

"Let us honestly meet at a round table conference. Let us not create a war psychosis. Let us clear the atmosphere. Let us rely on reason and not on the power of thermonuclear weapons."

But such passages were interwoven with denunciations of the alleged war passions of the West, and with boasts that the Soviets can destroy not only the United States, but Western Europe, with thermonuclear weapons. Mr. Khrushchev blandly reverses himself again and again, and, instead of using the voice of reason, employs the voice of the bully as he says:

"If the Western Powers persist in their refusal to sign a German peace treaty, we shall have to settle this problem without them. It goes without saying that in that case the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) would attain full sovereignty and, therefore, the question of the use of communications with West Berlin running across its territory would have to be decided by agreement with the GDR (East German) Government. As to the agreements between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers on the question of access to West Berlin concluded during the occupation period, they will become null and void. It would seem that all this is natural and quite fair and should not evoke objections or discontent on anyone's part."

This is as plain-spoken a demand for surrender by the West as could be written. Then, as a kind of face saver for the West, the Soviet ruler promises that, as a matter of practice, East German authorities will be kind and cooperative, and that the Soviets "do not intend to infringe upon any lawful interests of the Western Powers." Mr. Khrushchev urges that the Communist regime in East Germany be trusted, and adds:

"Barring of access to West Berlin, blockade of West Berlin is entirely out of the question. All this is only a figment of imagination of those who want to incandesce the atmosphere in order to prepare war."

The whole speech is an attempt to put the blame on the West through "mobilization" of Western military forces, as Mr. Khrushchev describes it. By contrast, he wishes the world to know that—at least, for the time being—Russia isn't increasing her armament or preparations for war.

But is there any real clue in the speech to what could happen in the all-important "negotiation" that the Soviet Premier says he wants? Hopes, however mistaken they may prove to be, are based on this suggestion in the speech:

"We propose that it should be stipulated in the peace treaty that the free city of West Berlin shall be granted the freedom of communication with the outside world. We agree to the establishment of any most effective guarantees of the independent development and the security of the free city of West Berlin."

But Mr. Khrushchev wants an end to any military occupation of West Berlin and, when Western troops have been removed, he expects East German Communists to take care of the people of Berlin. He says that "access to Berlin and the question of a peace treaty as a whole is only a pretext" for the West, and that if the peace treaty were dropped, it would be regarded as a "strategic breakthrough and would widen the range of their (Western) demands at once." He then reveals his true reason for stirring up the Berlin crisis and for his basic fears, as he says:

"They (the West) would demand the liquidation of the Socialist system in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany). Were they to attain that, too, they would, of course, set the task of annexing from Poland and Czechoslovakia the territories restored to them under the Potsdam agreement. And were the Western Powers to attain all this, they would advance their main claim; the abolition of the Socialist system in all countries of the Socialist camp. This is what they would like to do right now."

So the stalemate continues, and the big question is whether Mr. Khrushchev will really start a war. His words are strong, but they are no more to be trusted than those of any dictator. Hence the West has no choice but to insist on a free Berlin and even a free and reunified Germany.

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, some of the most telling arguments for S. 404, the Youth Conservation Corps bill reported from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, come from men who served in the old Civilian Conservation Corps.

The August 1961 issue of the American Legion magazine carries my article in favor of the bill. Its publication prompted the chairman of the Veterans Advisory Commission in Philadelphia, Mr. William J. Lederer, who serves also as secretary of the board of directors of the Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia, to write me concerning his experience in the CCC's in Montana.

Mr. Lederer concludes, from his background of military, veteran, and civic experience, that "reestablishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps is one of the most important programs needed to safeguard the internal strength of the United States."

And I was proud to read his statement that "the people at Malta, Mont., invited most of the members of my camp into their homes and treated us like their own sons."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article and letter.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD CONGRESS REVIVE THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS?

(By Senator METCALF, Democrat, of Montana)

Twenty-eight years ago, President Franklin D. Roosevelt started what was to become one of the most successful projects of the New Deal. That was the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC.

The theory was simple: We had a lot of young men out of work, outdoor work was good for them, there was a lot of outdoor work to be done, so let's get these boys into the woods.

I recall the concern in my native Bitterroot Valley in western Montana when these young men, many of them from city slums, arrived. The fears were quickly laid to rest. They developed character and confidence as they planted trees and grass, built recreation facilities, bridges and fire towers, strung telephone lines, cut trails and fire lanes.

Last year the Western News in Hamilton checked on the present whereabouts of those CCC boys who came to this Montana camp. Several have responsible positions with the Forest Service. One is a senior editor of Time, one a bank president, another our State prison warden. Many of the rest have made their mark in law, teaching and in the community they came to love and adopted as their own. Another CCC camp alumnus is Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota, who deserves the Nation's thanks for his brilliant, continuing leadership in water pollution abatement.

The proposed Youth Conservation Corps, like the CCC, has the twofold purpose of providing healthful training and employment for young men and accelerating needed conservation programs. There would be a corps of eventually 150,000 young men, supervised by conservationists. Pay would be modest, the period of enrollment 6 months. The bill (S. 404) as introduced by Senator HUMPHREY is identical to the bill approved by the Senate last year. It is before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Our Nation now has, similar to the time when the CCC was established, much work to be done in fields and forests, and young men in need of jobs. I say let us get on with the unfinished business of conservation of our natural resources and, in so doing, develop and conserve the greatest resource of all, our youngsters.

VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 8, 1961.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator from Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: After reading your comments in the August 1961 American Legion magazine, I decided to write this letter.

During 1941 I served as a member of a CCC camp located at Malta, Mont., and I can tell you that my military and veteran's experience leads me to conclude that the reestablishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps is one of the most important programs needed to safeguard the internal strength of the United States.

As secretary of the board of directors of the Crime Prevention Association of Philadelphia, I review hundreds of cases annually concerning teenagers whose acts of delinquency and crime have destroyed their lives and caused untold damage to the welfare of citizens along with great destruction to property.

I know that a CCC program would not only provide an opportunity for most of these young men to receive an opportunity for a constructive life but would also provide for them discipline and the spiritual values which are absent to most of their environmental backgrounds.

There are many former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps who are willing to volunteer our time and resources to assist in the establishment of this program. I also know that some of our finest fighters during World War II owe their training to their tenure in the CCC camp.

Incidentally, the people at Malta, Mont., invited most of the members of my camp into their homes and treated us like their own sons.

I believe your views express the thoughts of most of the former members of the CCC program.

Wishing you continued succes, I am,

Respectfully,

WILLIAM J. LEDERER,
Chairman, Veterans Advisory Commission.

Elections of Presidents and Vice Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a very interesting and informative column entitled "For a Better Republic," appeared in the August 14 issue of Newsweek magazine under the byline of Raymond Moley.

In this column, Mr. Moley analyzes several proposals for reforming our method of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents. I think it is significant that he singles out the constitutional amendment proposed by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] as the only one which would retain the Federal, representative character of the Republic.

In light of the interest in revising our system of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A BETTER REPUBLIC
(By Raymond Moley)

A Senate subcommittee has held lengthy hearings on the long-needed reform in our method of electing Presidents and Vice Presidents. Thirteen proposed constitutional amendments are pending in the Senate. Former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower have called for reform.

To meet the need for public education and understanding of the problem, the American Good Government Society, 800 Du Pont Circle Building, Washington 6, D.C., is organizing a committee representing every State and is issuing a fine statement of the problem and proposed remedies.

Since all efforts in earlier years have failed, the danger is that in frustration a method might be adopted which would be worse than the present system: Straight, popular election. In fact, two of the proposed amendments would provide just that.

One of these, sponsored by Senators SMITH, MORSE, BEALL, CHAVEZ, and AIKEN, would nominate candidates in a nationwide primary, with a runoff in case no candidate secured a majority in his party. Then there would be the election, with another runoff if no candidate received a majority. All these primaries and runoffs would be between July and December. Another popular-election proposal, by Senators KEATING and MANSFIELD, is only slightly less objectionable.

IRREPARABLE DAMAGE

Popular elections would irreparably damage the very nature of the Republic. The States would lose control of their own elections. The President and Vice President would be responsible only to a vague general will identical with Rousseau's plan for democratic despotism, the concept behind the French Revolution. Congress would continue to be a representative body. Thus there would remain only half a Republic.

State laws would substantially be wiped out so far as Presidential elections were concerned. Political-party organization, now based on a representative principle, would have to be reconstructed.

Most serious would be the practical impact upon those who might aspire to be candidates. Under the Smith-Morse plan, an aspirant would have to campaign over the Nation two and possibly four times in less than 4 months. Nobody but a Kennedy, a Rockefeller, a Ford, a Du Pont, or a Getty could afford the expense, unless he became obligated to vast special-interest groups. Nobody but a super Paul Bunyan could survive the physical strain.

The only one of the proposed plans which would retain the Federal, representative character of the Republic is that offered by Senators MUNDT, MCCLELLAN, HRUSKA, THURMOND, and MORTON. (This was formerly called the Mundt-Coudert plan.)

TRUMAN'S PLAN

It would presumably retain the present system of party nominations and elect electors in newly created districts equal in number to the Members of the House from each State, with two elected at large. If no candidate should receive a majority of electors, the President and Vice President would be selected by a joint session of Congress from among the three candidates having the highest number of votes. To prevent a deadlock, the choice on the fifth ballot would be between two candidates for President and Vice President respectively.

Former President Truman's statement on the subject shows a most interesting maturity of judgment. He said that the present system of giving all electoral votes to the candidates with the popular majority in each State encourages "the emergence of the big cities into political overbalance, with the threat of imposing their choices on the rest of the country." He would follow the Mundt principle of election by districts with two electors elected at large in each State. But Truman would use the existing congressional districts rather than creating new ones. Also, in case there is no majority he would retain the old method of election by the House of Representatives, with one vote per State. In my judgment, his idea of using existing districts is better than MUNDT's, but MUNDT's plan of election by a joint session of Congress is preferable. Either the Mundt or Truman plan, however, is in the true principle of representative government.

Cold War Parable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 11, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, our international problems sometimes appear insoluble. Pundits proclaim their profundities and their endless ramifications. In quest of solutions we sometimes run the risk of missing the simple facts of human nature which underlie all difficulties among people and nations.

A pungent commentary by Roscoe Fleming, published in the Denver Post of July 29, gives us a little more insight into our problems in West Berlin. It was written immediately after President Kennedy delivered his magnificently firm but calm message to the Nation on the crisis we face.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLD WAR PARABLE
(By Roscoe Fleming)

Once a group of nice families wanted only to live in peace and get on with their business, each under its own vine and fig tree.

But the next block was a rowdy neighborhood, and the people there behaved as if they didn't want to live in peace with anybody. Their young ones acted like juvenile delinquents, and they especially bullied a family whose home was in the second block, although it was related to those in the first.

The tough kids threw dirt on its lawn, blocked the alleyway to keep its folks from going in or out or getting groceries, broke the windows and slung in dead cats, and generally acted uninterested in integrating.

Their old man was always leaning over his back gate, and sometimes he shook his fist, too. Whenever someone tried to intercede from the first block, the kids would say:

"Leave us alone, see, or our old man will lick your old man and set fire to your house, see."

After standing this for quite a while, the nice families decided that life wasn't worth living that way. So one day when the rowdies stopped the grocery truck, some of their muscular young men went over and cleared the way, saying to the rowdies:

"Can the bluster, buster, or we'll dump you on your cans."

The rowdies gulped and got polite all of a sudden. Their old man went back in the house and slammed the door. And the neighborhood enjoyed a little peace and quiet, for a time at least.

Moral: Bragging is offensive, but a little muscle in the bustle sometimes goes a long way toward bumping off trouble.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Berlin: Background for Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. John F. Bridge appears in the Wall Street Journal of August 14.

The article presents a scholarly history of the story of Berlin. It proves once again that small episodes, small minds, and, above all, lack of philosophical historical knowledge can indeed turn victory into defeat:

BERLIN: BACKGROUND FOR CRISIS—HOW WORLD WAR II ATMOSPHERE, HORSEBACK AGREEMENT MOLDED EVENTS

(By John F. Bridge)

The origins of such great political crises as Berlin are often obscure. One reason is that the original facts behind them are often trivialities of history. It is only at some later date, under some different circumstances, that those original facts come to take on far more meaning than ever envisioned.

Thus, it was longstanding but obscure facets of the Croatian question in Austrian politics that in 1914 led to the assassination of an Austrian archduke and the beginning of World War I. The rather minor decision at the end of that war to give a recreated Poland a corridor through former German territory to the sea was the eventual excuse Hitler used to start World War II.

Berlin is little different. Leaf through encylopedias, reference books, and the volumes of memoirs written by and about the great leaders of World War II who set the face of present-day Berlin, and there is little concrete information as to how it all came about. A reader cannot escape the impression that the actual division of Berlin into zones, and the division of Germany into areas of occupation, were almost incidental developments at the time they took shape. None of the great allies—Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States—paid very much attention to Berlin at the great wartime conferences. But of them all, the United States paid the least attention.

To understand how this could be—considering the situation of August 1961—the psychology of the World War II era must be remembered. It was totally different from what now prevails, and is perhaps worth recollection in some detail.

In all the Allied capitals Hitler and the German—"the unspeakable Nazi" in Churchill's famous phrase—were villains nonpareil. The Soviets at that time, and since, may indeed have committed far greater genocides; but somehow Hitler's crimes against Jews, Dutchmen, Czechs, and dissenting Germans, among others, had inflamed all the world, and the Soviet crimes were overlooked and hushed up. The fervor was reminiscent of the religious wars of 17th century Europe, or of the Crusades.

RUSSIA'S VICTORIES

In addition, the Soviets had won the admiration of all the West for their stand against the German invaders. The first Russian victories against Hitler, coming after months of defeats for the Allies, were really the first land successes anyone had been able to score against the German war machine. The victories, and the tenacious Russian resistance in defeat, were all the more dramatic because so little resistance had been expected from the Soviet Army. Only a few years before, the tiny Finnish Army had inflicted disastrous rout after rout on the Russians before Stalin had reorganized his forces to barely defeat the Finns. Against the background of the Finnish debacle, it was expected that the Germans would go through the Russians, as it was so often said at the time, "like a hot knife through butter."

So in both Washington and London there was both extreme concentration on Germany as the foe and admiration of the stand the Russians were making. Too, it was an era when sweeping phrases and grand pronouncements were apt to be accepted at face value. Both President Roosevelt in Washington and Prime Minister Churchill in London were expert phrasemakers. It was the era of the grand cliche: Total victory; unconditional surrender; everlasting peace; global amity; democratic unity (which equated the Soviet slave laborer with the American worker) were typical phases, and, most importantly, they were phrases which were believed.

To be sure, grand phrases, and a certain amount of belief in them, are typical of all wars. But these had a particularly empty sound in the postwar world which was to follow, for they had been so believed by the men who uttered them that the United States and Britain were led into moves which were all but disastrous to the West.

These phrases were particularly believed in Washington, and because the United States was the most powerful in the Anglo-American alliance, the protests of the English went unheeded. Indeed, Prime Minister Churchill was often looked on with suspicion as an "old Tory" in Washington, when he occasionally endeavored to raise some caution signals about Moscow.

There were other reasons why Washington was so warm toward Moscow besides Russian arms success and the common cause against Hitler. It must be remembered that World War II followed closely on the heels of the depression and the economic experiment days of the New Deal. In those days, "capitalist" was almost as bad a word in Washington as in Moscow; class consciousness had been deliberately fostered and the Soviet workingman was often held up as more the partner of the American worker than his employer. The Soviet anthem "Meadowland"—indeed many aspects of Red culture—were much admired by U.S. intellectuals. And any intellectual who dissented or who raised questions about the Soviets was apt to be summarily read out of the club.

And the same psychology prevailed in the Washington bureaucracy. While there was some direct Communist penetration, it was this psychology which was to prove so damaging. If one authentic chronicle of the times and feeling, "Roosevelt and Hopkins" by Robert Sherwood, sheds little light on the making of the present Berlin crisis itself, it sheds interminable light on this now-forgotten mood which made the crisis possible. As this book illustrates with its praisesome account of the activities of the Iowa welfare worker who became Roosevelt's plenipotentiary to Stalin and alter ego, the summum bonum was "getting along" with the Russians. The whole spirit was the one that is summed up in the once popular but now ludicrous idea that giving Stalin his way with Eastern Europe was a diplomatic success "because it proves we can get along with the Russians."

If all this makes strange reading in August 1961, it is no less germane to how Berlin came to be what it is—half Red, half free, deep within Communist Europe. This atmosphere made possible the desultory, haphazard policymaking which brought things to their present pass.

Just how haphazard Berlin policymaking was is underscored by a review of the main events in its history.

HUMBLE BEGINNINGS

It all started in 1943. Neither the Russians nor the Americans, seemingly, had done much thinking about the shape of the postwar settlement besides the ringing cries for total defeat of Germany. Hitler dominated Europe and much of European Russia. Americans had yet to set foot on the Continent.

At this time the British, more experienced than either the Russians or Americans with foreign affairs, began to consider what would be done with Germany once it was defeated. But as Winston Churchill points out in "Triumph and Tragedy," the concluding volume of his memoirs, the underlying belief in Washington and London was that the Russians would have to be enticed into a joint occupation.

As strange as this may sound now, it was perhaps plausible at the time. The Russians had entered into the abortive nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany. This was executed in the West as a device for protecting Russia, which was considered a very unaggressive country, perhaps because Karl Marx had said Communists, per se, were incapable of aggression. It followed from this that the Russians would be reluctant to pursue the war once their own territory had been rid of the Germans. The Americans and British, and particularly the latter, anxious to have the benefit of the Russian might in crushing Germany, therefore were to bend considerable energy to keep the Russians in the fighting until all Germany was in ruins.

So Prime Minister Churchill set up the Cabinet Committee in the summer of 1943 to study the occupation of Germany, under Clement Attlee, a Socialist. It "recommended that the whole country should be occupied if Germany was to be effectively disarmed, and that our forces should be disposed in three main zones of roughly equal size, the British in the northwest, the Americans in the south and southwest, and the Russians in an eastern zone." The approximately arithmetical division of Germany into three parts left Berlin well within the Russian zone. So the committee recommended "Berlin should be a separate joint zone, occupied by each of the three major allies."

These British recommendations were forwarded to the joint United States-British-Soviet group which had been set up to handle political questions, the European Advisory Council. "At the time," Mr. Churchill recalls, "the subject seemed to be purely theoretical." It "did not bulk in our thoughts, nor was it raised by any of the leaders at Teheran" in November 1943.

DIFFERING VIEWS

That is Mr. Churchill's view, anyway. Mr. Sherwood, in "Roosevelt and Hopkins," takes a different one, and reports at least three conferences between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin on what was to be done with Germany.

None went very far nor concerned the British Cabinet study proposal. Roosevelt ventured a rather grandiose piece of map redrawing under which five separate German states would be created. Stalin advanced this thesis: "He felt that to leave the principle of unconditional surrender unclarified merely served to unit the German people, whereas to draw up specific terms, no matter how harsh, and tell the German people that this was what they would have to accept, would, in his opinion, hasten the day of German capitulation."

Mr. Churchill formally brought up the Cabinet proposal at the Quebec conference in September 1944 and the outcome was to prove fateful in the whole story of Berlin. Only Roosevelt and Churchill of the Big Three were present. The Cabinet proposal was part of a long report covering a multitude of matters. The President assented, the Berlin part of the report drawing, in Mr. Churchill's words, "little or no discussion." The report was remanded to the combined Chiefs of Staff. So the study begun by a group of British bureaucrats as a theoretical subject had now been adopted by the Americans with no discussion and, as events would develop, would be considered a firm policy guide by the military in the coming conquest of Europe.

It was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander, Allied Forces, whose lot it became to make the moves that have brought much of the controversy in the West over Berlin policy. As noted, complete military victory over the Germans was the Allied goal. General Eisenhower felt called on to pursue this victory without much regard to other matters.

The whole question of Germany and Berlin did not intrude into Eisenhower's plans until after France had been liberated and the Ruhr reduced. True, General Montgomery had pleaded to be allowed to make a dash for Berlin at this point but his request had been refused; there simply were not enough forces, and the main objective in the coming conquest of Germany was to be the destruction of the German armies.

Eisenhower's plan for this final stage was to be a three-pronged attack. The British were to attack in the north; the strongest, American, force was to drive in the center, with a third force of Americans and French in the south. Montgomery, backed by Churchill, again asked to be permitted to go for Berlin. But this would have required the transfer of forces from the center to the north and Eisenhower demurred.

He writes in "Crusade in Europe": "I already knew of the Allied political agreements that divided Germany into posthostilities occupational zones. This future division of Germany did not influence our military plans for the final conquest of the country. Military plans, I believed, should be devised with the single aim of speeding victory. A natural objective beyond the Ruhr was Berlin. It was politically and psychologically important as the symbol of remaining German power. I decided, however, that it was not the logical or the most desirable objective for the forces of the Western Allies." The Russians meanwhile were only 30 miles from Berlin and Eisenhower decided to stop his armies at the Elbe River, well within the occupation-zone-to-be of the Russians, but far short of Berlin. Stalin, receiving a copy of Eisenhower's pronouncement about Berlin, agreed readily: "Berlin has lost its former strategic importance."

Before the defeat of the German armies could be carried out, however, the Yalta Conference took place and the rosy aura of a perfect United States-Soviet-British postwar world began to crumble. Berlin was not much of an issue—it was only briefly discussed, Stalin agreed to the old British cabinet plan, and it was decided that Berlin would be occupied by whoever got there first. But the Russian insistence that Poland be handed over to its mercies convinced all but the most optimistic that trouble portended. Mr. Churchill was particularly perturbed.

THE PRESIDENT DIES

And as the Allied armies crashed ahead in the West, and the Russians attacked in the East, and Germany crumbled, President Roosevelt died. President Truman took power, completely in the dark as to what arrangements had been made in secret conferences. In May the Americans were on the Elbe, 200 miles inside the Soviet sector, the Russians were in Berlin, and Hitler was dead.

Mr. Churchill now began to have serious second thoughts about the whole German arrangement, spurred along in his worry by the Russian takeover of much of Austria. On June 4 he messaged President Truman concerning the scheduled pullback of U.S. forces to their own zone: "I view with profound misgivings the retreat of the American Army to our line of occupation in the central sector, thus bringing Soviet power into the heart of Europe and the descent of an Iron Curtain between us and everything to the eastward. I hope that this retreat, if it has to be made, would be accompanied by the settlement of many great things which would be the true foundation of world peace."

Then, as Mr. Churchill writes: "On June 12, the President replied: He said that the tripartite agreement about the occupation of Germany, approved by President Roosevelt after 'long consideration and detailed discussion' with me, makes it impossible to delay the withdrawal of American troops from the Soviet Zone in order to press settlement of other problems."

Mr. Churchill quickly replied, "we are obliged to conform to your decision" but added: "It is not correct to state that the tripartite agreement about zones of occupation in Germany was a subject of 'long consideration and detailed discussion' between me and President Roosevelt. References made to them at Quebec were brief, and concerned only the Anglo-American arrangements which the President did not wish to raise by correspondence beforehand."

It was to fall to President Truman, new as he was on the scene, to bring some order out of the chaos, in effect to trade the U.S.-held territory in the Soviet Zone for the Russian permission to allow the Americans and British to assume their zones in Russian-conquered Berlin. It also fell to Mr. Truman to arrange that some Western access to Berlin be guaranteed, a matter not theretofore considered.

Mr. Truman was to make his mistakes, but he made them under most difficult circumstances not of his own doing. Commenting on the Quebec Conference and the impact on Germany and Berlin in his "Year of Decision," he said something many of today's statesmen would do well to ponder:

"This shows conclusively that heads of state should be very careful about horseback agreements, because there is no way of foretelling the final result."

The Threat of Communism to North American Shores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, from August 4 to 6 of this year, the International War Veterans' Alliance held its 22d annual convention at Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Composed of veterans from Canada and the United States, this organization graphically illustrates the comradeship which exists between the veterans of our two countries.

The President of the International War Veterans' Alliance for this year was Dr. O. H. Hoffman, of Hannaford, N. Dak. His timely and thought-provoking address is, in my opinion, deserving of more widespread publicity. In emphasizing the threat presented to our hemisphere by Castro's Cuba, Mr. Hoffman gives expression to the concern of the average American over the proximity of communism to our North American shores.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hoffman's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comrades of the IWVA, again we meet in an annual convention of the International War Veterans Alliance. We meet to renew our pledge as set forth in our Constitution: to promote good will among war veterans of the United States and Canada who fought for the same cause; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecreate our comradeship of the battlefield by our devotion to service and helpfulness to one another and to our respective countries.

In the last three wars we stood side by side to defend the principles on which our countries are founded. We will and we must stand side by side in any other world conflict.

Today, more than ever before, the Western Powers need to stand together. Since our last convention the danger from the communistic nations has crept closer. They have for the first time taken control of a nation in the Western Hemisphere. From this start there is grave danger of other Latin American countries falling to these false ideas of what liberty should be. On account of our good neighbor policy of noninterference we have let this happen. Where will it end? Other countries in our hemisphere are ripe for a dictator under communism.

This is a time for grave decisions. The Soviet Union has the advantage of picking the time and place for any action. They can create a Pearl Harbor. They know that a democracy such as ours, who rules by consent of the governed, is slow to move. We are continually on the defensive. For this reason the Western Powers must always be prepared and watchful. We know the Soviets plan to rule the world.

Are we prepared should the Soviets decide to strike? If not, why not? We have the resources for military preparedness. Has the easy living of our two countries brought us to the stage where we are not willing to sacrifice any of it to save ourselves from the slavery of communism? Why are the East

Germans still fleeing to West Germany after 12 years of Soviet rule? Why are the Cubans trying to flee to other countries? Where are we going to flee if Russia conquers America? Perhaps you think this is being an alarmist. Read your histories, then look at the trend in the last generation.

I have no fear of the result if the Western Powers hold together and exert themselves to the same extent as the Soviets. But if each says it is the affair of the other, then I fear what the future holds for us.

Our organization wishes to preserve peace. We are against war. But there are worse things than war and being a satellite of the Soviets is one. Being prepared will be the best preventative of war.

Our two countries will stand together. If one should fall the other could not long survive. The free world depends on us as the bulwark of personal liberty, free elections and the land of opportunity for everyone.

In our last world wars it was said, and with some truth, there are no victors, we all lost. Do not be too complacent, if the Soviets win the next war there will be a victor and you will soon know it. Millions will be executed in each country as they have before. It will be those who believe in personal liberty and you know which group that is.

How are we keeping up the home front today? The veterans organizations are active in trying to keep the youth of today physically fit, mentally alert and to instill the love of flag and country. The students exchange program with foreign countries is a wonderful program for international understanding. The IWVA program of sending an outstanding boy from North Dakota and Minnesota Boys States to Manitoba Boys Nation and doing the same from Canada to the States is a very worth while project. Let us encourage these things in our veterans organizations, in our schools and in our homes. We are members of nearly all the recognized veterans organizations in the United States and Canada. The veterans organizations are a potent influence in our elections and in our way of life.

It is our purpose to promote good feeling between our two countries. Of course, we have some differences, we would not want it any other way. We are separate and independent countries. But when we hear others criticize one of our countries, let us put in a few words of praise for the many ways we benefit by our mutual cooperation.

Berlin Is Not the Basic Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. David Lawrence that appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of August 7, 1961.

The indicated editorial follows:

BERLIN IS NOT THE BASIC ISSUE

(By David Lawrence by cable from Europe)

The current discussion over the status of the city of Berlin—both its East and West sectors—does not come to grips with the basic issue. It deals with the symptoms, but it is not a realistic diagnosis of the trouble.

For of what avail is it to maintain the present arrangement in West Berlin, or to modify it with some other agreement that pledges access to the city, when the root of the problem—the future of the German nation as a whole—is neglected?

If military pressure is to be applied, and if the West is to prepare itself for a major showdown in its relations with the Soviet Union, would it not appeal more to the public opinion of the world to take our stand on a broad principle that seeks the establishment of a free and unified Germany?

It makes little sense to put off German reunification indefinitely. The German people, who have suffered in two World Wars through the madness of their militaristic rulers, should be permitted to enjoy the fruits of a free election and the right to govern themselves.

What better cause to esponse today in this world of ideological conflict than self-determination for all the people of Europe? We seem to accept as the gospel of the hour that Africans should be rid of colonialism, but we ignore the very people who, by reason of their proven fitness for self-government, deserve to be freed from Communist colonialism.

What an opportunity to raise a cry for freedom also for all those areas of Eastern Europe where Moscow's heavy hand is enslaving nations which were liberated once before.

Why should we sit by and concern ourselves only with keeping one part of Berlin from becoming captive, when it is even more important to emancipate an already captive East Germany?

Are there on our side perhaps those who fear a reunited Germany as a potential foe? Doesn't Mr. Khrushchev really fear it most? Surely the leaders of the German people in the new Republic, with its free government in Bonn, have by their conduct in the last several years shown that they have learned the lessons of freedom. They will never voluntarily give up their rights. They must not be left isolated and at the mercy of Soviet imperialism.

The German people can be effective partners in the Western alliance, and Nikita Khrushchev knows this. He is anxious to change the status of Berlin because he is afraid that continued control of a large part of the city by the West will perpetuate a showcase of liberty, as President Kennedy called it in his forceful speech of July 25. As long as this is on exhibition every day to the East Germans, it keeps alive among them hopes for their own eventual rescue by the West.

The Soviet Premier professes to believe in the desirability of the reunification of East and West Germany. But his insistence on signing a separate peace treaty with the East German Government—a puppet in his hands—reveals, in fact, a sinister purpose to keep Germany permanently divided.

East Germany has never been ceded to the Soviet Union, and control of it was in actuality seized by the Communists in violation of the letter as well as the spirit of the agreement signed at the close of the war in Europe.

By what right do the Soviets put pressure on the East Germany people to prevent their passage into West Germany? Why do the Communists erect barriers and invoke restrictions of various kinds to keep the East German people from visiting their own capital in East Berlin? Surely this is a forerunner of the kind of life the people of East Germany will continue to suffer indefinitely unless the Western world comes to their aid.

The Soviet Union was a partner in the alliance which fought the war, and there is no basis in international law for modifying any agreement arising out of the war itself except by common consent. Certainly there is nothing which justifies the Soviet Union in continuing its control over East Germany. The presence of its troops is not for the purpose of protecting the East Germans but only to prevent them from uniting with their countrymen. The Western Allies long ago relinquished all control over West Germany, and it is incumbent upon the Soviets to do the same in East Germany, or be charged before the world with an occupation that has no legal status.

Britain and France and America must, therefore, face the true issue: Shall the 17 million people of East Germany be lost to democracy and forced into the straitjacket of Communist discipline as new generations arise there that know nothing of individual or national freedom?

We should vigorously champion their cause now, and launch before the court of public opinion throughout the world a massive plea for the restoration of freedom to all Germany.

What Price Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Kennedy administration is talking about the need to increase employment and to stop the outflow of U.S. gold, our Federal Government is buying steel girders in West Germany for installation in a bridge being constructed across the Panama Canal.

Last fall candidate Kennedy professed great concern over employment in America's steel industry. I, too, was concerned about employment of steelworkers then, and I am concerned about the less than full employment in the steel industry that exists now. The West German steel industry is operating at greater relative capacity than our domestic industry. If these girders for the Panama Canal bridge had been made in the United States, their domestic procurement would have created jobs for American workers.

The New York Times article of Sunday, August 13, which reported on the Panama Canal project, states that West German steel mills underbid offers of American steel companies even after a differential was allowed to domestic producers under the Buy American Act. At the present time an unrealistic differential limitation of 6 percent makes the Buy American Act largely inoperative. This 6-percent ceiling could and should be revised upward by an Executive order issued by the President. The fact that depressed industries in the United States are being underbid by foreign producers for contracts with the U.S. Government is evidence of the need for an upward adjustment of the 6-percent Buy American differential.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I will include the article from the New York Times to which I have referred in my remarks:

BRIDGE JOB GAINS AT PANAMA CANAL—SUPERSTRUCTURE IS STARTED FOR SPAN AT BALBOA

BALBOA, C.Z., August 12.—Erection of the steel superstructure for the $20 million fixed bridge across the Panama Canal at Balboa started this week when two 40-foot girders were bolted into place at a site near the east approach.

Coincidentally, the cofferdam for the last of the 13 reinforced concrete substructure piers was lowered into place near the canal channel.

Superstructure work for the three-span bridge of arch-truss design is being done by the John F. Beasley Co., of Dallas, Tex., under a $9,119,000 contract awarded in February 1960.

Under the contract, most of the beams and girders are being rolled and finished in West Germany. The first were landed here in mid-June, and all steel is due by mid-October.

Prices quoted by West German mills underbid offers of several American steel companies even after a differential was added to the cost of the former. But by an odd quirk, some beams and girders will be American steel after all. German mills would have had to retool to meet specifications for certain sizes and shapes. So they are buying these members in the United States, shipping them to Germany for finishing and testing, then back across the Atlantic to the Canal Zone.

The superstructure for the 6,200-foot bridge will be 5,425 feet long. The deck of the main span across the canal channel will be 201 feet above mean high water. Any ship will be able to pass under it.

Foundation work on the bridge is several months behind schedule but canal officials believe the structure as a whole will meet its original completion target of late 1962.

The prime contractors for the foundation work are the Fruin-Colnon Co., of St. Louis, with the LeBoeuf & Dougherty Co., of California.

In early 1960, failure of two cofferdams being set for water piers near the canal channel caused the first major delay. The cofferdams had to be redesigned.

The second sizable delay arose early this year when a small concrete batching plant owned and operated by a Panama City subcontractor proved unable to deliver wet-mix fast enough for continuous pours on the big key piers. Three months of pouring time was lost while a fast, high-capacity plant was bought in the States.

Eight of the 13 piers are complete and several of the 5 others are well along. All major approach factors are ready except for final details. These include east and west bank abutments and two overpasses. Approaches formed by earth fills were finished first to provide time for subsidence.

On its west bank the bridge joins a link in the Pan-American Highway, which runs through the Canal Zone for 5 miles before entering the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama. On the east bank, the bridge has approaches leading directly into both Balboa, C.Z., and Panama City, Republic of Panama.

The 1961 Agricultural Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the House members of the conferees considering S. 1643 had specific instructions from the Committees as a Whole that they would not agree to the provisions in the Senate bill of sections 401 (a) and (b). The conference report on S. 1643 omits these provisions, the Senate having agreed to recede.

It comes to me as a great surprise that in the statement of the managers on the part of the House is included the entire subsections 401 (a) and (b).

As the House bill, H.R. 8023, did not contain subsections 401 (a) and (b) and, as a result, no vote was taken on these sections, the House managers went beyond their power to speak for the House of Representatives as to its intent with regard to these two subsections.

Peace Corps: Texas to Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Saturday, August 12, I visited the campus of Texas Western College of the University of Texas at El Paso, Tex., where 43 trainees of the Peace Corps are undergoing rigorous preparation for service abroad, most of them for service in Tanganyika in east Africa.

Accompanied by Dr. Joseph M. Ray, president of Texas College and Dr. Kelsey, who is in charge of the Peace Corps trainee program on the Texas Western campus, I visited them there.

The trainees are following one of the most rigorous courses of physical and intellectual training ever given on the campus of a college.

Their instructors on the Texas Western College campus advise me that they have never taught a more dedicated, highly intelligent group of people. They are civil engineers, geologists and surveyors who will go to Tanganyika to undertake the building of a system of rural roads to tie the villages and towns and areas of Tanganyika together with a transportation net.

These trainees work long hours in the classroom and in the field in preparation for the tasks they face in east Africa.

I have been requested to have printed my brief remarks to the Peace Corps trainees at El Paso last Saturday in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, OF TEXAS, TO THE PEACE CORPS TRAINEES AT TEXAS WESTERN COLLEGE, EL PASO, TEX., AUGUST 12, 1961

Dr. Ray, Dr. Kelsey, Peace Corps trainees, just 2 days ago it was my privilege to have lunch with your dynamic, energetic National Director, the Honorable Sargent Shriver, Jr. From him, from Dr. Ray, from Dr. Kelsey, and from other sources I have had high praise of your devotion and dedication, before I had the privilege of seeing you in person.

You two score trainees of the Peace Corps, now soon to depart for the loneliness of high individual responsibility in the separate roads you travel to the remote villages of Tanganyika, are a select group of Americans. You are set apart from your fellows by your willingness to forgo profit, by your desire to work for the zest of the work alone. Only volunteers can come here in your group; only the dedicated will remain.

Many countries have sent forth armies to foreign lands to conquer for gold and glory. Many commercial agents have gone abroad from many lands for the profits of their employer. Many religious missionaries have been martyrs in foreign lands for the glory of the martyr's cause and church. But you go as a special elite, not to conquer for your country, not to make profit for any person or country, not even to impress your religion upon others. You have volunteered as true servants of the ideal of service. You are going on mere subsistence without compensatory salaries, but out of your great zeal to help others. You are giving up some of the best years of your lives, that many other peoples might have far better lives.

America is proud of you, with a special kind of pride, a pride that some of her own are specially endowed with a great generosity of body and mind and spirit and will, over and above the normal human endowment in such idealism.

It is not too much to say that the best hopes of America go with you. If you succeed, and succeed you must, probably not very much credit will be given you in this generation, because it will take another generation, or maybe five of them, to weigh and measure the extent of your sacrifice and your contribution. But if you fail, the scorn of nations will fall upon you. So, fellow Americans, you go to difficult tasks, needing all your powers of body and mind and spirit for the work ahead.

But as you work in some remote village in the Highlands of East Africa, if doubts assail you (and don't they assail all men?), if illness overtakes you; if other factors thwart your hopes and dreams, do not falter. You carry the banner of peace and friendship and helpfulness and self-sacrifice for all of us. And, if pain racks your body, or fatigue pulls you down, remember that we, unknown to you and you to us, are thinking still and praying with you for the success of your high adventure in selflessness.

You few thousands of the Peace Corps, you chosen few, represent American idealism at a new peak. You carry the true spirit of America in your hearts. Up to this point in history, you may well represent America's finest hour.

Abraham Lincoln called Americans, "This almost chosen people." If any Americans are the chosen people, you are they.

God bless you in your noble aims. Let us pray that your sacrifices are not in vain, but that they will inspire millions of other people around this world to similar crusades for peace among men. May you enlighten the mind and lighten the burdens of all mankind.

The National Lottery of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia is one of the few Communist nations to operate a national lot-

tery—most Communist regimes dislike gambling inasmuch as it is yet another manifestation of the human individualism that they are seeking to eradicate.

Czechoslovakia's lottery, while not one of the largest in the world, is uncommonly productive as far as profits in relation to its size. In 1960, gross receipts slightly surpassed $12 million, and the government's income was better than $9 million.

The Czechoslovakian Government may not like gambling—or the individualism that it implies—but it can recognize a moneymaking proposition when it sees one.

Tribute to Vice President of Republic of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today I was privileged to be present at a a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, testified. His statement was a brilliant example of a man who understands what he is talking about. I recalled that it had been the privilege of Mrs. Wiley and me a few days ago to attend a state dinner honoring the Vice President of the Republic of China. At that time Dean Rusk spoke briefly and impromptu in relation to our relationship with China and the Vice President of the Republic of China, who was a guest. I ask unanimous consent that Dean Rusk's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF TOAST MADE BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT A STATE DINNER HONORING THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, AUGUST 1, 1961

Secretary Rusk: Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Chen, distinguished guests: I know that you would wish me at the very beginning to express our thanks to those who have helped to make this a very pleasant and informal evening. First, Mic Hyman Shulman and his Navy Band String Ensemble, who entertained us during cocktails; Capt. Dale (Harfum) and the U.S. Marine String Ensemble, who are with us during dinner; and Captain Mitchell and the Army Strolling Strings, who took us to the Monseigneur nightclub in Paris, from the U.S. Army. Could we express our thanks? [Applause.]

Thank you, very much.

Mr. Vice President, we are deeply grateful for this opportunity to bid you welcome. We are especially grateful that you have brought with you a distinguished body of colleagues, including your Foreign Minister and other associates in your Government, your Ambassador to Washington, and your able and veteran Ambassador to the United Nations in New York. These are old friends, these men whom you bring with you, and we welcome them. But you have given us a special treat this evening because of the charming and gracious ladies who are members of your party. And I wonder if I might ask the ladies from China who are present please to rise and let us greet them. [Applause.]

Thank you, very much.

One of the elementary principles of good international relations is the principle of reciprocity, and Mr. Vice President, it is perfectly obvious to all of us, I am sure, that our guest list this evening was prepared on the basis of the loveliness of our ladies who could join us here this evening.

It is difficult, sir, to speak just with the mind about China, because Americans who think of China and speak of China must do so with their hearts as well. There are many speeches about China which could be made on an occasion like this by any American. We could speak, for example, of the more than a century of affection for China and the Chinese people, an affection which endures in this country. And if we have been disturbed, distressed, upset, appalled by events in that great country, part of it is the feeling that a lover has gone astray; because every American child has grown up with a sense of respect and affection for your great country.

We could make a speech about our comradeship in war, the service we had together in uniform; you, sir, and I, myself, and many hundreds of thousands of Americans were engaged in that great struggle. We can recall General Chennault's flyers, who wore on their jackets a message in Chinese which, in effect, said that this is an American flyer who is helping China fight the enemy, and that it is the duty of every Chinese to risk his life to bring this flyer back to his base. And the heroism shown in that process is something which Americans shall never forget.

I, myself, sir, can remember in Burma how difficult it was for me as an American officer to shave in front of a mirror hanging on a bush without two or three Chinese soldiers standing around, fascinated by this mysterious operation. And I can remember after the war reflecting with my commanding general upon our experiences in China and Burma, when he remarked, "You know, the only things we did not like about the Chinese were their American characteristics."

We could make a speech, sir, about the great debt which we owe to your country, its traditions, its art, its philosophy, its contribution to the enrichment of American life and culture. Anyone who has seen that stunning exhibit in the National Gallery in recent weeks will have a full appreciation of what we mean.

But apart from the past, we could make a speech about the promise and the future of China, about what you and your colleagues have done on the island which is now your primary responsibility; the revolution in the life of the people which has occurred under your leadership, the demonstration that economic and social development can occur quickly and that American aid can make its contribution to a total effort which revolutionizes the life of an entire people.

And we can speak of the future in longer range terms. We can think of that China of which you are the spokesman; we can think of the day when the Chinese people will once again be free. So, Mr. Vice President, our hearts are full, if our tongue is halting, with all that China means to the American people. We appreciate your being here. The President and the rest of us have greatly benefited from the discussions which we have had. It has been an inspiring, a fruitful, and a frank discussion of the sort which can take place only among close friends.

So, ladies and gentlemen, it is with deep honor that I ask you to rise to join in a toast to the President of the Republic of China. [Applause.]

Vice President Johnson Reports on the Importance of the Far East to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has written a magazine article on his recent tour of six countries in the Far East.

The Vice President met the people of these countries face to face and sought to understand them and their problems. In his article in Parade magazine of Sunday, August 13, Vice President JOHNSON states that we must not sell short the peoples of Asia—that freedom is still alive in that part of the world and that friendship for America is still there.

The article is most interesting, informative, and reassuring.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the article by the Vice President in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A BIGGER BOWL OF RICE

(By LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States)

I have become a firm advocate of the concept that Americans at all levels must get out into the countries of the world and meet the people face to face.

This was brought home to me most forcefully on my recent trip to the Far East.

For Asia's struggle is about people—about the hopes and fears and miseries and frustrations of a vast sea of human beings. It is not really over anything so complicated as Marxian philosophies or Jeffersonian principles.

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru explained it this way: "Poverty—the whole economic problem—is at the heart of the problems of Asia and Africa. All other problems in India are secondary, and in many cases are affected by it. We have a politically conscious mass of people who think that they deserve everything—and do—but India is unable to supply it."

Yet I wonder how many Americans realize that the people of Asia are just like you and me, sharing the same dreams and needs and worries. They are struggling and crying and fighting today for a bigger bowl of rice, better homes in which to live, good schools for their children, freedom from malaria and cholera and dysentery, and a place of dignity and a bit more sanity in this troubled world of ours. Either we produce quick and convincing evidence that these things can be achieved through the institutions of freedom, or the masses will turn in desperation to something else.

We must take action. It is high time the representatives of our country got out of their air-conditioned offices and limousines and went out to meet the people—I mean the masses who are going to determine the fate of these countries.

I was warned in advance that I should not mingle with the people in Saigon—that I might reach out to shake a hand and pull back a hand grenade. Others speculated that I might face dangerous demonstrations. Well, I walked the streets of Saigon and mingled among the people in the post-midnight darkness; and I walked into the huts of villagers who did not expect me. I was surrounded by throngs in every land we

visited, and I never saw a hostile hand or heard a hostile voice.

I am convinced that friendship for America is still there. But we must be sure not to sell the peoples of Asia short.

The reactions of the common people that I saw convinced me that they will rally to the cause of freedom if we can get Americans to assert and emphasize the vitality of our way of life.

For instance, in a hospital near Saigon, Lady Bird talked to a lad whose face had been shot up * * * to another whose leg had been mangled by a mine planted along a footpath—both victims of Communist Viet Cong terror tactics.

"LYNDON," she said afterward, "I had read how the Communists strike in the night, killing village officials, murdering health project leaders, slaying agricultural experts, burning schools, and all that. But you just don't realize what a nasty business this is until you see the innocent victims.

"I felt like crying when that boy whose leg was nearly blown off told me that as soon as he could get up he was going back and fight."

The next day, I talked with President Ngo Dinh Diem about the Communist campaign of terror and destruction against his young Republic.

I had barely mentioned newspaper stories suggesting that American troops would be needed to keep the Communists from overwhelming South Vietnam, when he replied, in effect:

"We don't need American troops. We have the men, and they have the will to fight; they are determined to remain free. We need your material and your guidance, but the peoples of South Vietnam are ready to spill their own blood for their own liberty."

I was to hear similar words from Prime Minister Sarit in Thailand, and in both instances it was with much pleasure and a little shame: pleasure that the urge for freedom was so much stronger in southeast Asia than I had been led to believe; shame that so many Americans seemed to be caught up in a contagion of despair.

We should not despair. I confess that I began my journey to Asia fearing I would be saddened and disillusioned by a spectacle of people meekly resigning themselves to slavery. Instead I have come home a missionary, eager to tell the American people that communism is not riding any tide of inevitable triumph in Asia. Throughout south and southeast Asia I found the backbones of people a lot stronger and their determination to remain free a lot more vibrant than I had ever dreamed would be the case.

Some critics said it wasn't dignified for me to mingle with the crowds the way I did, but dignity isn't winning freedom any friends in Asia today. I don't want Asians to lose hope, to become the drowning man who clutches at a straw, for I know that communism can't win unless Asians lose hope and make communism the straw they clutch at.

Perhaps nothing impressed me more on this trip than the magnitude of squalor and human misery. I knew poverty as a boy, and even in recent years I have seen a great deal of it in my own State and in the rest of our Nation. I had read a great deal about the role that poverty, illness, and illiteracy are playing in the revolutions that shake our world today; but not until this trip was I so acutely aware of the fact that they are communism's best allies.

And make no mistake about the people's desire for change. The thirst for learning is absolutely astounding. The joy and gratitude in the faces of Indian mothers whom I saw at a school dedication were obvious, And consider Thailand. Although she is next door to embattled Laos and directly in the path of the Communist aggressors, the largest single item in the budget is for education. In Taiwan I learned that 98 percent of eligible children are in school—a claim that few if any of our United States can make.

And we must let Asians know we regard them as equals in both the community of nations and in the family of man.

In this connection, President Diem expressed surprise when I told him that President Kennedy had asked me to solicit his views and those of other Asian leaders.

"We aren't used to people asking us what we think," he said.

We dare not be so arrogant as to assume that we have all the know-how, all the skill, all the conviction, all the love for liberty. The best housing project that I have ever seen was in Pakistan, where President Ayub Khan is providing such admirable leadership. This Karachi project is not luxurious—just two concrete rooms, a concrete floor, a fireplace in which to cook, and a bath and toilet with running water. A family pays $3 a month and becomes owner of the house in 20 years.

The Pakistani Government, Ford Foundation experts, and Greek architects got together to meet the people's needs in a really practical way.

Is Asia worth it? As I left I knew that I could come home and say that Asia's populations are so large and her resources so abundant that free nations dare not let them fall under Communist control. I knew that I could talk about the speed with which our world has shrunk and seek to inspire action based on fear that Communist bombers and missiles in Southeast Asia would represent an added physical peril for us Americans.

But I know that the real reason why Asia is worth our effort and sacrifice is a moral reason. Asians want to live under institutions of freedom and personal liberty, and they are willing to pay the price for it. Our own claims of love for liberty would become a shallow mockery if, out of either despair or selfishness, we turned our backs on them. We shall keep faith with them—we shall honor our pact with governments, yes, but also with the hungry, hopeful, plain people of Asia.

The Dutch National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Holland. In reality, there is nothing too startling about the Dutch national lottery. Holland is a small nation, and the lottery is not a large-scale operation. Actually, Holland is just another example of a nation where the gambling urge is recognized and properly channeled. In serving this purpose, the Dutch national lottery need not produce vast revenues. Holland simply recognizes that if people must gamble, it is better that they be able to do so under government auspices.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Dutch national lottery came to $10 million. The Government profit was somewhat over $1.5 million. This income from the lottery is not earmarked for any specific purposes but is regarded as general revenue.

Holland realizes that the gambling urge, being ineradicable, is better recognized and channeled than disregarded. We would do well to come to the same realization.

Commemoration of Veterans of the United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on Sunday, August 6, 1961, the Honorable C. C. Horton, commissioner of veterans affairs for the State of Alabama, delivered the memorial address at the convention of the International War Veterans' Alliance in Winnipeg, Canada.

Mr. Horton's remarks give eloquent testimony to the friendly spirit of cooperation that has always existed between Canada and the United States. In commemorating the veterans of both our countries who gave their lives for the cause of freedom, Mr. Horton truly illustrated that the border between Canada and United States is indeed a border without bayonets. Coming from the heart of America's Southland, his remarks also signify the unity of brotherhood which stretches from border to border throughout our two countries.

I believe that Mr. Horton's address is so noteworthy and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, I think I would not flatter you overly if I said that I consider this visit to your annual convention to be one of the greatest privileges ever extended to me. To come from my native Alabama, down in the deep South, from the very shores of the Gulf of Mexico, across the broad expanse of the United States and over the friendly border of Canada to address the International War Veterans Alliance composed of veterans of these two great nations, is no small honor, and I am fully appreciative of the priviledge which is mine.

I bring to you from the people of the United States, and particularly the people of my beloved southland, the kindliest of greetings and a warm feeling of kinship and comradely interest. In my own humble fashion I would like to reiterate the words of our President who a few months ago addressed your Parliament and told you of the love and esteem we of the United States hold for you in Canada. Just before I left my hometown of Montgomery, Ala., a friend of mine—a veteran of World War I—handed me a souvenir which he had carried with him since that time 43 years ago when he was overseas with the Rainbow Division of the American Expeditionary Forces. It was a souvenir of the Canadian YMCA, and with pride he pointed to the back page of the program which emphasized over and over again that there was no charge for the meals, no charge for the beds, no charge for anything which could be provided by the people of Canada to its soldier-neighbors from across

the border. I have it here with me now, a souvenir of Liege, Canadian YMCA 1919.

We are gathered today for a grateful and patriotic duty. We are here to renew friendships and to make acquaintances among ourselves as veterans—to fraternize and enjoy fellowship one with another, but most of all we are here to memoralize those men of both nations who no longer exist in the land of the living because they answered a call to duty, and in so doing, gave up their lives. It is a time of sacredness, a time of memory and a time of thankfulness. Sacredness because one cannot approach the altar of death without looking toward the great Infinite whom we all worship and to whom we all must look for eternal life. A time of memorial because we must remain always aware of the sacrifices made by those who kept our countries strong and great, and who preserved the freedoms which we today enjoy. Thankfulness to Almighty God for the good earth of Canada and of the United States, out of which he created the brave fighting men of these two strong nations who when their flags were challenged required no indoctrination of mind, or brainwashing of spirit, in order to respond to the call of their land. Because they learned to worship their God and to respect their flag at the knees of their fathers and mothers. It is not strange, therefore, that on the two major occasions when the democracy of this earth has been threatened that it was the Canadian soldier and the American soldier marching in step, shoulder to shoulder, head high and side by side, who rose to beat down the forces of evil, which sought to destroy the things we worship and the things we love.

Let us consider for a few moments and be reminded that memorials have ever been a great and inspiring influence in the life of any nation. Much that we know about the Chaldeans, the Assyrians, and the Egyptians is derived from their memorial stones. The Romans and the Greeks left beautiful monuments to stand as perpetual reminders of the glory and achievements of their people; and their poets sang of deeds and virtues, of ideals, and valor; of steadfast home and country—and they made those deeds immortal. When the children of Israel passed over the Jordan, God commanded Joshua to take 12 men, each of whom should gather a stone from the river bed and place them in the Promised Land. "And when your children ask their fathers in time to come saying, "What mean ye by these stones?" Then shall ye answer them, "The waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the Covenant of the Lord; and these shall be for a memorial to the children of Israel forever." Memorial stones, memorial services—these perpetuate great truths and speak ever to coming generations a glorious heritage of the past.

So while they who sleep the everlasting sleep cannot hear our voices and those among their relatives who listen to these words will not be consoled by them, it is to arouse our own spirits and mind that we memorialize their sacrifices on this day and pledge a new and everlasting allegiance to our two great and friendly nations, who, thank God, have never found necessity to arm or fortify the boundaries between them, because they are truly kindred spirits who think alike, love alike, dream alike, and fight alike. It is not probable that I would ever again have occasion to address a gathering such as this, and therefore you will forgive a personal reference of one who had two sons in World War II and who himself served in World War I. I must say that I feel a deep and abiding kinship with all of you—for in that mysterious way in which the Lord works to perform his miracles, who can say but that my sons stood with your sons in the red mists of battle, or but that I knew you in the long ago. So permit me then to say that I come to you with love and esteem, with affection, with a devotion to you and the things you stand for, because in this crowded world filled with greed and jealousy and envy, it is heartwarming to come to a land where souls think like your souls, where minds share the same beliefs, and where we worship the same true God.

In the 12th chapter of Exodus, verse 14, we read, "This day shall be unto you a memorial." This is but one of many references in the Bible concerning memorials. In this instance the people desired to set aside a day to remember their deliverance from the destroying angel. In Esther 9: 27 and 28, we have another account of the founding of the Jewish National Memorial Day. It was a day when God decided the lot in favor of the Jewish nation. We are told what great care was taken that their national deliverance might be kept in remembrance. It was a day when they recognized the hand of God in their deliverance, and it has been faithfully kept throughout all their generations from that day until this.

But let us not forget that we have a double reason for observing memorial occasions such as this. The Jews had a bloodless victory; but ours was purchased at the price of precious lives, even those of some of your own sons and husbands and fathers. So, on this occasion we reverently pay tribute to those who have passed into the great beyond and honor to those veterans who have been spared to be a part of our two great countries today.

On this day, in this hour, both nations again face a crisis in more than one area. In Cuba, in Berlin, and the Far East, and even in Alabama. Ours has ever been a Nation that struggled for what it felt was right in the sight of God and man. We thank God that we stand today in unshackled manhood under our native skies, to render fitting tribute to the dead, and homeage to those who still carry on as earnest citizens in a troubled world.

History tells us that the ancient Romans used to place the statutes and busts of their distinguished ancestors in the vestibules of their houses that they and their children might be reminded of and led to imitate their noble deeds. There is no doubt that the influence of this practice was most happy upon the living, awakening high and noble aspirations. The young grew up to revere the worthy ancestors whose statutes they daily saw, and to emulate the qualities which gave to their ancestors such lasting fame. In these days we have no busts of honored ancestors in the porches of our dwellinsg; but we have something more impressive in occasions such as this, when noble characters are extolled and heroic deeds are recounted in the hearts and minds of those assembled for this solemn day; and the results are just as happy, and more so, than were those flowing from that honored Roman custom.

History is also written in our cemeteries throughout our two great countries and on foreign soil where our patriots have died in battle and were buried there. Not all at one time, but as the days pass, another and then another soldier joins the immortal ranks, and his resting place is marked. And on this occasion we hold in reverent memory not only those who passed while in or after service in other wars, but we are vividly aware of those of our own generation who also made the supreme sacrifice.

Down in the States I remember a little piece of poetry written by a young member of the U.S. Navy who gave up his life on a small Pacific island called Kwajalein, but who before he died wrote inspiring lines and left them behind as a challenge to you and me. Not knowing that fate decreed his last resting place to be far away from home, he dreamed of a return to loved ones and said:

"When we come home again
Forget the band.
Just have the things we fought for
Well in hand.

Stand guard, unceasing guard
On every passing trend
To see if it be enemy
Or friend.

Yes, when we come home again
Forget the band.
Just keep those things we died for
Understand?"

So, my friend, let us resolve in these sacred moments of our memorial to the war dead of two great Christian nations, that we will keep the things they died for and that we will always understand.

For in those far away places, with the strange sounding names our brave sons of World War II indeed gave their all in the crucial hour.

Man of Canada and of the United States alike answered the call. We went forth with vision clear and mind alert. We fought for our convictions, we did not flinch nor stir one inch from honor's narrow way. While we honor ourselves and our heroic dead, let us do all that men may do to hasten the coming of that great day when peace and good will once more shall prevail over all the land and over the terrible tense world to its uttermost end. Nothing can perish. How then shall actions crystallized out of the souls and prayers and tears of millions pass utterly away. The gathering hand of time puts in the sickle and the comrades of the dead—like them—will rest one day in the silent furrows of life. Let us so act, that when one by one the living soldier shall join the ranks of the dead, he shall carry with him the remembrance of the grand army of martyrs who are still marching onward beyond the stars.

And when we go to the hospitals and see the toll that suffering and strain and illness has taken of the hospitalized veterans, how can we fail to reach out to them and out to their families and show them that we really care.

Our memorial services should teach us Christian patriotism. I am alarmed, and I know you must be, too, over the lack of patriotism we see demonstrated in our two great countries today. It bothers me to hear about the disrespect shown our flags by seemingly unpatriotic individuals and groups. We need a patriotism which is opposed to selffishness, and self-seeking, which reproves all anarchy and disorder, which denounces every attempt to plunder the treasury by turning public office into a way of serving only private ends. These things and others like them do not grow in the same soil with patriotism. Never should we forget that Christ, too, was a patriot. And a religion without patriotism is not inspired by Christ. Christ loved his nation. He came first for his own people, preached first to his own people, and wept when they would not attend the things that would make for their peace.

Again, our memorial services teach us the value of peace. It shows that war at best is a necessary evil, to be justified only by a righteous cause. It shows the cost of war. What our wars have cost us in dollars and cents some day may be wiped out and forgotten, but that which they cost us in hundreds of thousands of precious lives will never be forgotten. At a great price we obtained this freedom. It was the price of blood of a nation's heroes whose memories we honor. Our nations will not soon forget the value of peace purchased at such a cost.

One more strong truth ought this occasion to bring us—self-sacrifice. In Scotland there is a battlefield on which the natives and their Saxon foes met in terrible encounter. No monument marks the spot, but a singular little blue flower grows there and there alone. They call it the flower of Col-

loden because it sprang from the soil in which the bodies of patriots were buried. The seeds were there, of course, but needed the baptism of blood to make them grow, and now every blue flower on Colloden Field, as it bends its head to the summer breeze, is a tender memorial of the brave spirits who dyed that soil with their hearts' blood.

The choicest flowers of human civilization are always Colloden flowers. They spring alone from soil that has been watered by sacrifice. Freedom is one such flower. Religious liberty is another. Christianity is another. It sprang from the blood-dewed ground at the foot of a cross. Then do not expect to do a man's full duty in the mere payment of taxes and in the correctness of a well-ordered life. He who is not willing to open his veins to help sanctify his country, is not worthy of his inheritance. No man has begun to be a real citizen of these Republics until his citizenship has cost him something. The measure of life is not its span, but the use made of it.

To these patriots' families and to those of us who were their friends and neighbors, we realize how futile are mere words to express our deep and abiding sympathy. May you feel that they are at rest—in endless peace. Generation after generation, all the shadowy peoples of the past have lived as we live—perplexed and mystified by death; have gone into the great beyond with hearts filled with wistful longing—as all must go.

Is there anything beyond the darkness into which generation follows generation and race follows race? Surely there is an afterlife for all who have been loyal and true; a life to which light and peace shall come, where the burden shall be lifted and the heartaches shall cease; the hope and fulfillment that escapes us here shall be given to us to be ours forever.

And so the blessings of the past encourage us to hope also for the future. We believe that He who molds the destiny of nations is with us. "God reigns; let the people rejoice." Our trust is in God and we cannot but believe that the same divine hand which has guided us through all the perils of the past will still hold the helm of the ship and guide us safely through every coming storm.

Across the length and breadth of Canada and of the United States there have been erected many towering monuments of granite and stone enumerating the names of those whose sacrifices we honor here today. Sometimes I think when I recall to my mind a poem of the long ago—no one need ever engrave these names upon a marble shaft anywhere under the blue canopy of heaven for there is a Greater One who knows them all.

"We only know they fought and died.
And o'er their graves the wind has sighed,
For many a long, slow-footed year,
And winter snows have drifted here.
Yet, in the dawning warmth of spring,
The joyous birds come here to sing.
We only know that rest is sweet,
To tired hearts and toiling feet.
That they who sleep beneath the sod,
Give all they had to give to God.
And, in the radiance of His throne,
Their names are known—Their names are known."

John Philip Sousa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia voted unanimously to report the Kearns-Matthews bill to provide for the preservation and restoration of the home of the famous composer, John Philip Sousa, at 318 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

The bill authorizes the placing of statues to John Philip Sousa and Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, scientist author of the original Pure Food and Drug Act, in Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol Building.

The District of Columbia is often defined as a State in congressional enactments, yet it has never been favored with statues of any of its famous citizens in Statuary Hall.

Yet the Nation's Capital is overrun with more than 200 statues of famous citizens, distinguished soldiers, Presidents of the United States—all from other States of this Union.

My dear colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] offered the motion to report the Kearns-Matthews bill to the floor, after holding the very successful hearings on the legislation on July 13 which were attended by more than 400 interested citizens and cultural leaders.

Support for the Kearns-Matthews bill came from citizens throughout the Nation stirred by the loyalty, patriotism, and love of country expressed in Sousa's great music.

The Kearns-Matthews bill would establish a Presidentially appointed board to raise the needed funds on a national basis.

The board would be authorized to accept donations of funds, services, and property, and to conduct a nationwide fundraising campaign.

In addition to the Presidential appointments the board would include the conductors of the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Bands. All of these bands were conducted by John Philip Sousa.

Honorable Hughes Spalding Honored on 75th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last week one of Georgia's most beloved and distinguished citizens—Hon. Hughes Spalding, of Atlanta—observed his 75th birthday. Throughout his long and useful life, Mr. Spalding has given unselfishly of his time and talents to the civic, religious, humanitarian and financial programs of our State. His dedication to and achievements for the public good have earned him the respect, admiration and gratitude of all Georgians. I am pleased to join with his many friends and admirers in extending heartiest greetings to him upon his birthday and in expressing the sincere hope that Georgia and the Nation will have the benefit of his services and counsel for many more years to come. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article and editorial about Mr. Spalding which appeared in the August 11 issue of the Atlanta, Ga., Constitution.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

ONE HUNDRED HONOR HUGHES SPALDING AT 75TH BIRTHDAY DINNER PARTY

About 100 close friends and business associates honored Attorney Hughes Spalding on his 75th birthday Thursday at a dinner party at the Capital City Club.

Spalding has had a distinguished career in civic, educational, and religious affairs. He served twice as chairman of the University System Board of Regents, and served 13 years as chairman of the Grady Hospital Authority.

He was active in efforts which brought about construction of the new 21-story Grady Hospital building. He was twice appointed by Popes as privy chamberlain of the Sword and Cape.

SPALDING CARRIES HIS HONOR LIKE HIS YEARS

Hughes Spalding is one of those shapers and movers who preside at the summit of Atlanta's planning and direction. He was honored by his friends at a 75th birthday dinner last night. And he deserves honor.

Twice chairman of the University System Board of Regents, twice appointed by Popes as privy chamberlain of the Sword and Cape, and for 13 years chairman of the hospital authority that built his biggest monument—the 21-story Grady Hospital—he has given more than monetary service to schools, church, mercy, and community growth. He has given much of his life to these things.

And he carries his 75 years as he carries his honors—with grace.

Jobs Go Begging in Our Dynamic Economy: Newspapers Scratch for Recruits—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at an earlier point in the RECORD I inserted the first of two articles from the Christian Science Monitor pointing out that the newspaper field is one in which there are jobs that are going begging, jobs that need men to fill them, in our dynamic economy. This second article appeared in the August 9 issue of the Monitor and I should like to place it in the RECORD at this point to go with the article previously inserted on this same subject:

WHY GRADS QUIT PRESS JOB

(Last of two articles)

(By Theodore Peterson)

Why have young persons been forsaking journalism?

One reason is money. Remarked one 1953 journalism graduate: "I wanted to go into journalism. The editors wouldn't let me. They offered me $65 a week. I could get $100 in public relations, and I could hold my head a little higher with $100 in my pocket."

Actually, newspaper salaries have been steadily rising in recent years. Last summer 73 percent of a cross section of United States

newspapers said they had raised beginning salaries within the past 2 years, and their increases averaged 14 percent.

Yet newspaper salaries had so far to climb that they still cannot compete with those in allied fields. Pay in journalism remains at the bottom of the field competing for liberal arts graduates.

SENSE OF FRUSTRATION

Perhaps more important than money is an apparent disenchantment with journalism. Once young persons entered journalism with a sense of mission, as others entered social work. They knew the pay was low, but they felt the cause was noble. But now many young people realize that the average newsman cannot remake the world. Usually, they find, he is an anonymous craftsman helping to turn out a mass-produced product.

Some who still bring dedication to journalism lose it after a few years. Feeling stifled and unappreciated, they leave for more lucrative fields. Said one: "No one seemed to care whether I stayed or left, whether I worked hard or didn't." Said another: "The editors have no imagination. They discourage creativity. They accept the routine and fail to demand the superlative. What kind of a challenge is that?"

NEW CONCEPTS

Schools of journalism can perhaps share the blame for that disenchantment. Preoccupied with technique and trivia, many of them in the past and some even today have failed to challenge the intellect of the superior student.

Fortunately, that was truer in the past than today. Since roughly the end of World War II, schools of journalism have been going through a quiet revolution in their curriculums, their staffs, and their objectives.

They have changed from trade schools for newspaper reporters into professional schools serving magazines, broadcasting, advertising, and, perhaps debatably, public relations as well. They have become less intent on teaching students the tricks of the trade than on giving them a genuinely liberal education which puts the various mass media into their proper social, economic, historical, and philosophical contexts.

They have made scholarly competence at least as important as practical experience in hiring new staff members. They have become research centers and have turned to other academic specialties—economics, sociology and psychology, for instance—for help in solving communications problems. They have become centers of graduate study. And increasingly they are becoming centers of informed criticism of the mass media.

Thus, the change is by no means complete. Most schools have scarcely begun to make the change. Some are unlikely to. But enough have to show the drift of journalism education.

INTELLECTUAL EFFORT

For some, the change has been so great that school of journalism is an obsolescent term. Some have traded the word "journalism" in their titles for "communications."

The change is more than just semantic. Early schools were largely training grounds for newspaper work, their courses heavily practical. By World War II, journalism educators had begun to halt the proliferation of practical courses and to trim off existing ones. They had pretty much agreed that they should teach courses with intellectual substance.

They also had begun to look beyond their newspapers to increase offerings in broadcasting, trade and technical journalism, magazine work, advertising, and public relations.

Since the war, the change has been not only in the media studied but also in the approach to the courses. To learn the role of the mass media in society, students now study critically the history and philosophy of press freedom, the economic structure of communications systems, press systems in other lands, the whole realm of popular culture. They learn communication theory, get a good grasp of research techniques. (Although describing the changes thus briefly is a little like describing "Hamlet" as a ghost story; the fact is that journalism schools have intellectualized their offerings.)

They have continued to draw on the liberal arts colleges for the bulk of their students' work. Typically, the student takes only about a fourth of his work in journalism, the rest in liberal arts departments.

WELL-TRAINED STAFFS

Journalism faculties, too, have changed. Once the schools chose teachers more for practical experience than for intellectual brilliance. Just before the war 5 percent of the journalism teachers in accredited schools and 10 percent in nonaccredited had no college degree. Only 35 had the doctorate. Today the college of journalism and communications at Illinois alone has more than half that many.

The faculty attitude also has changed. Most journalism faculties today are interested not just in newspapers but in all of the media. They see them not just as vocational outlets for their students but also as institutions of far-reaching social consequence. They try to understand how they operate, why they operate as they do, how they affect society. Teachers are less defensive, more objectively critical of the media than prewar teachers, and they have a stronger interest in research.

Before World War II, journalism schools did little research. What little they did was highly practical and evanescent. Research went by default to sociologists, political scientists, and others who become interested in some problem involving the press, studied it, then passed on to something else. Few had a long-term dedication to communications research.

RESEARCH SOARS

Today many journalism schools have formal research programs. Among the best-known are those at Minnesota, Michigan State, Stanford, Wisconsin, and Illinois. This spring Stanford announced that it had received more than $250,000 in new grants for three major projects. Last year Wisconsin reported more than 30 research projects underway.

As research has grown, so has graduate instruction. Before World War II, only a handful of schools offered the master's degree and only one the doctorate. Today the great majority of accredited schools have master's programs. Nine schools offer the doctorate in communications or journalism.

Graduate enrollments have risen as undergraduate enrollments have slipped. Last fall, when undergraduate enrollments again dropped, the number of graduate students rose by 101 to 1,041. The shift has been most dramatic in the few schools emphasizing graduate instruction. About one in four journalism students at Illinois was doing graduate work last year. Eleven years ago that figure was 1 in 19. In the same period, the ratio has change from 1 in 8 to 1 in 3 at Minnesota, from 1 in 4 to 1 in 2 at Stanford, from 1 in 10 to 1 in 3 at Wisconsin.

Schools of journalism have been as backward in publicizing those changes as the mass media have been in acquainting young persons with their career opportunities. That is unfortunate. For the democratic form of government, in theory and in fact, puts strong reliance on the press system. Journalism is an increasingly important and responsible calling, and it deserves the brightest young minds that the Nation can supply.

A New Stadium for the Americas at Texas Western in El Paso, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Saturday it was my privilege to attend and participate in the ground-breaking ceremony for a new stadium being constructed on the campus of Texas Western College of the University of Texas, at El Paso, Tex. This stadium to seat tens of thousands and tens of thousands, is unique in that it is being constructed with the proceeds of bonds voted upon themselves by the people of El Paso County, for a stadium to be constructed upon a portion of the campus of Texas Western College, for use of the college, a Texas State-supported institute of higher learning.

The site of the stadium will be less than 1 mile from the Rio Grande River, and overlooking the city of Jaurez, Mexico. It is approximately 1 mile from the point of intersection of the three States of New Mexico, Texas, and Chihuahua, Mexico.

I have been requested to have printed in the RECORD my remarks at the ground-breaking ceremony.

Participating in the ground-breaking ceremony were El Paso County Judge Woodrow Bean; the Honorable Ralph Seitsinger, mayor of El Paso; Dr. Joseph M. Ray, president of Texas Western College; and the Honorable Thornton Hardie, chairman of the University of Texas' Board of Regents, and other persons and officials.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the ground-breaking ceremony for the new stadium in El Paso, Tex., last Saturday, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The text of a speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, at the ground-breaking ceremonies at the new stadium on the Texas Western College campus, Saturday, August 12, 1961.)

Mr. Chairman, Judge Bean, Mayor Seitsinger, President Ray, fellow Texans, fellow Americans, we officially break ground for this Sunbowl Stadium in this heartland area of the great Southwest, but this is a symbolic breaking only. The real ground breaking was by all the qualified voters of El Paso County, the day they voluntarily voted a tax on themselves to build this great stadium on the campus of Texas Western College, of the University of Texas, a State of Texas supported institution of higher learning.

This is an example of democracy in action in the finest American and Western tradition. Here is cooperation in a friendly, harmonious spirit between all levels of government, El Paso County in planning to build and paying for the stadium, the State of Texas in building this great university on whose campus this fine stadium is to be built, and the U.S. Government in using this university college as a place for training one of the first Peace Corps units to be pre-

pared for dedicated service beyond the seas, this unit of Tanganyika in east Africa.

So, from the bountiful hearts of the people of El Paso County and city, to the spirit of emergence into the scientific age that is gripping the tribes and people of the highlands of east Africa, this structure will have its influence for good in the growing recognition of the people of the world that what affects one country or area or region, affects all.

No country, region, or people can live in a compartmented isolation, separate and apart from all the rest of the world. This university and this stadium are being built for service, not merely to El Paso and Texas, but, on broader fields, for service to all the Americas and to mankind.

It is a high honor and a great privilege to me to be invited to participate in this ground breaking. El Paso has been, for me, a place of beginning. Thirty-four years ago this fall, I came to El Paso to begin my first practice of the law, and 33 years ago, I brought Mrs. Yarborough out here as a bride. I am thankful that she could make this visit with me again today.

Thirty-four years ago this fall, I was a spectator for the College of Mines, predecessor of Texas Western, in the football games it was playing then in the El Paso High School stadium. For four football seasons, I was a resident of El Paso and a follower from the grandstands of the Mines football teams. So I have a special personal interest in seeing this stadium built, because, among other uses, Texas Western's football teams will represent this school here, and Sun Bowl National postseason classics will be held each January 1.

This stadium idea, like so many other things held dear by Western civilization, came to us from ancient Greece.

This spot would thrill the heart of an ancient Greek architect. This natural amphitheater, this natural bowl, set in these sharp, rugged, rocky hills, almost as bare of vegetation as at creation's dawn, looking out over the Rio Grande, and over the city of Juarez, Mexico (itself a city of over 300,000 population) is not unlike spots picked thousands of years ago by Greeks for their own Olympic stadiums. The millenniums have passed; the idea and ideals still live here in a land far removed from ancient Attica. Why do Greek stadiums crumble now on a hundred hillsides in the Greek Mediterranean world, while the New World builds stadiums with a rush never witnessed in the birthland of these great structures?

The answer is short and simple. After the Olympiads had been contested for a thousand and two hundred years, they were abolished by the Roman Empire in the fourth century of the Christian era because they had grown corrupt. Winning for money had grown more important than true sportsmanship; foreign athletes were hired to run in the Olympic games because local athletes refused to do it any longer for love of the game, and widespread gambling and profit on the games further corrupted them. Profits replaced the Olympic ideals as the incentive for the games, and they died.

So the ancient Olympics give us a modern lesson—to keep our amateur athletics amateur, to keep our youth strongly competitive for the love and zest and spirit of the game, and to stamp out gambling on all athletic contests. We must have sports for the spirit of it, and not for profit alone, or our stadiums will crumble, too.

May we keep the spirit of clean sportsmanship all over America. Here in my home State, I hope the urge to excel for excellence sake, the desire to win for the spirit of the sport, will bring our youth in ever-increasing numbers to the field as competitors in a stadium such as this will be.

May the footprint of a point shaver for profit never stain a stadium track or field in our great land.

The physical unfitness of our people can be toned up to some degree and measure in the stadiums of America. Every person who competes in this stadium should be a better person for it, and our Nation will benefit in the toned-up bodies of those of our people who train here.

One of our great needs in America is for a physical toning up. When the people of El Paso County voted these bonds to further athletic fitness in this fine college, with an enrollment of over 4,000 persons, you voted money for a national purpose and goal, no less than for your county's development.

The rigorous training the Peace Corps volunteers are receiving here at Texas Western for service in Africa is illustrative of that good physical condition which is required of America's youth.

So in this groundbreaking this morning, we watch the beginning of construction of an edifice for disciplining, through rigorous physical training, the bodies of the youth of the land. Such training is more than worthwhile; it is imperative for national survival. In breaking this ground, let it be our fervent prayer that this stadium field will always be trod with honor, will always inspire the competitive spirit of true sportsmanship, and will add to the high qualifications life's journey demands of all who attain their full potential for themselves and for mankind.

Now, let us have the shovel; I see it is golden as a miner's shovel at Texas Western should be.

Outstanding Labor Productivity in Williamsport, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to call to my colleagues' attention an advertisement which will appear in the Friday, August 18, edition, of the Wall Street Journal and the August issue of Dun's Review and Modern Industry. This ad is actually a testimonial letter written on behalf of the M. W. Kellogg Co., manufacturers of power piping, an industry that moved into the Williamsport, Pa., Industrial Park about a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues may know, the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. has for some time engaged in an ambitious and farsighted program designed to attract new industry to the heart of the market location, central Pennsylvania. A featured portion of this program has been the sponsorship of a series of advertisements proclaiming the advantages of industry locating in the central and eastern portion of Pennsylvania. The testimonial of Kellogg's general manager, Mr. John M. McAneny, printed as one of the series, is an eloquent statement of satisfaction with people, their productive abilities and Kellogg's new location—as well as a stirring tribute to the initiative of the people of Williamsport in their program of attracting new industry. The people of north-central Pennsylvania are pleased and proud in the knowledge that their talents have been so recognized and signally honored:

THE M. W. KELLOGG CO.,
POWER PIPING DIVISION.

Following are the principal reasons why the M. W. Kellogg Co. selected Williamsport as the site for their power piping headquarters and manufacturing facilities.

1. Our principal product is the manufacture of intricate piping systems for modern powerplants. This work demands the most careful manufacture and the highest degree of craftsmanship on the part of our workmen. We have found in Williamsport a reservoir of skilled workmen who have met the extremely high standards required for this type of work. Many of these men have improved their natural skills by taking courses at the Williamsport Technical Institute, which has a history of turning out graduates skilled in all the arts and crafts required by all types of central Pennsylvania industry.

In addition to possessing the skills required for our exacting work, the type of workmen living in the Williamsport area reflects the age-old tradition of American labor, who still believe in giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. As a result of this philosophy, which has been bred in the bones of central Pennsylvania residents for generations, we anticipated labor productivity in excess of that we enjoyed in other areas of the country; and after 6 months of operation, I am happy to inform you that our confidence was not misplaced. Labor productivity in Williamsport has been outstanding, not just from one or two individuals, but from the entire production group.

2. Since it was our intention not only to build a manufacturing plant but also to establish our division headquarters in the same city, it was necessary that we locate in an area which would be acceptable to our salaried supervisory and technical personnel. Since many of these employees were transferred from cities in the metropolitan area, we sought a location which would combine most of the advantages of big city living with the economy and social contacts normally associated with small towns. In Williamsport, we found the happy medium—the city with a trading population of 75,000 is sufficiently large to support fine hospitals, good schools, several colleges within a 25-mile radius, excellent fire and police protection, fine residential sections and a populace with a fierce degree of civic pride.

3. We decided to locate our plant and headquarters offices in a city where we would represent a sufficiently large segment of the industrial economy as to be important to the community and, at the same time, not so large that the fortunes of the city depended upon our commercial success.

Very truly yours,

JOHN M. MCANENY,
General Manager.

Need for Nursing Homes—Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, health care legislation for the aging places almost as much emphasis on the avail-

ability of nursing home care as it does upon hospitalization. In the health care for our older citizens bill which I and my Republican colleagues have sponsored and in the administration's proposal, provision for nursing home care is a major factor. For the chronically ill, especially, the cost of care is considerably lower when the nursing home is adequate.

The need for modern nursing homes and facilities for the aging therefore is becoming more and more urgent. The newer projects not only are a far cry from many of the former down-at-the-heel mansions in deteriorating neighborhoods, but they also represent an increasingly promising investment for private enterprise.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very cogent analysis of the nursing home situation and the opportunities it offers for private investment, as well as Government encouragement. The article entitled "Nursing Homes—A New Lending Opportunity," is by Robert J. Teran, and appears in the monthly magazine "The Mortgage Banker," for July 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NURSING HOMES: A NEW LENDING OPPORTUNITY

No longer the lost sheep of mortgage financing, the nursing home at last is coming into its own, and in a great big way. In fact, a nationwide boom in the development of new nursing homes is in the making.

The new nursing homes of today are being built specifically for the care of the sick and the elderly, at costs ranging anywhere from an average of $5,000 a bed on up as high as $7,000. Also, there is a pronounced trend away from the crowded, deteriorating neighborhoods of the central city and to the growing higher income suburbs. In the Chicago suburban area, for example, according to figures released by the Illinois state regional health office, in one 6-month period alone licenses had been issued for the building of 6 new nursing homes and construction plans were approved for at least another 10 such projects.

From a mortgage point of view, a nursing home should be the type of investment in which the financial market would be interested. It is, after all, the type of enterprise from which, with intelligent business practices, an excellent return can be made.

It is, indeed, as one mortgage lender sums it up, "a first rate deal. The physical security when a lender makes a loan on a nursing home is terrific. It is not," he points out, "just a brick and mortar thing. It is a very serious enterprise, dealing with human life—not just a commodity."

Today, some 500,000 of this country's older citizens live in nursing homes. As America's older population continues to increase, and some experts estimate that by 1980 the number of Americans 65 years of age and older could well climb upwards of 11 percent of the total population, it is only logical to expect a corresponding increase in the chronically ill. Already, caring for the chronically ill presents a sizable challenge—a recent National Health Survey has found that one of every seven Americans has chronic or permanent health impairment. This challenge will grow, and along with it the need for better nursing home facilities.

But, however great future needs might prove, the need—right now—is already pressingly urgent. It is, as the American Medical Association phrases it, "the most urgent health care need before the Nation today." And only a "strong program" of nursing home construction can alleviate the pressure. Nationwide, according to FHA Special Assistant for Nursing Homes Mrs. Helen Holt, there is an immediate need for a minimum of at least 264,000 additional nursing home beds. And this is a conservative estimate.

Figures published as of a year ago showed some 245,831 skilled nursing home beds in the United States. The total estimated capacity of all current-day in-patient facilities, other than for general hospitals, stands at 450,000 beds. This figure, of course, includes both proprietary or commercially owned enterprises and those under public or nonprofit ownership.

In any discussion, however, of these figures, it must be kept in mind that there is considerable variation in counting since the term "nursing home" varies in its meaning, depending both upon popular usage and State law. In some States, for example, the term encompasses facilities which provide boarding home care only. In other States a "nursing home" may denote anything from a children's convalescent home to the county poorhouse; it may encompass any institution from those providing every general hospital service, except surgery, to those offering only the simplest of supportive services to relatively well older persons.

In essence, though varying widely in accommodations and in services rendered, nursing homes generally are facilities where chronically ill oldsters receive supervised nursing care, in contrast to the shelter or boarding home variety where patients receive no nursing care. Of course, in the field of proprietary operations, a nursing home and a home for the aged is each a different thing. A proprietary nursing home, basically, is what its name implies—a home for the ill or chronically ill, not a home for the aging.

Despite these many variations in definition, the painful fact must be faced—these facilities, by whatever name they might be called; are far too few in number. They fall far short of the need; the supply does not meet the demand.

A growing need for a long time, it is one of which everyone has been aware—this need for expanded nursing home facilities. The means of providing them, however, has been slow in coming. Congress, recognizing the deficiency, lent its assistance by adding—in the Housing Act of 1959—Section 232 to the National Housing Act. This is the section which authorizes the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on qualified proprietary nursing homes.

Newest of the FHA programs, the Nursing Home Program is aimed at providing nursing homes which are economically sound and structurally adequate for the safety and proper care of occupants. As spelled-out in the law, the purpose of Section 232 is "to assist the provision of urgently needed nursing homes for the care and treatment of convalescents and other persons who are not acutely ill and do not need hospital care, but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services."

Except, of course, for modifications necessitated by the nature of nursing home mortgage insurance transactions, the program's operating procedures and related administrative regulations are similar to the FHA 207 program which covers mortgage insurance on multi-family rental housing projects.

A nursing home, on which FHA is to provide mortgage insurance, must be licensed or regulated by the State in which it is located. The skilled nursing care and all other related medical services must be prescribed by or performed under the direction of persons licensed to provide them. And it is specifically provided in the statute, that FHA cannot insure a nursing home mortgage without first receiving from the responsible State certifying agency a certification that an actual need for the home does exist and that reasonable minimum standards for licensing and operating are in force.

Within the statutory limits of $12.5 million, the maximum insurable mortgage amount is 75 percent of the FHA-estimated value of the property. (This means real estate value, not income potential.) It can cover, of course, either the construction of a new home or the rehabilitation of an existing structure; and it may include advances made during construction. On rehabilitation projects, the mortgage amount may not exceed five times the cost of the new improvements. Maximum mortgage maturity is 20 years.

Originally, these mortgages carried a 5¼ percent interest rate and, therefore, could be sold—on the then-existing market—only at a substantial discount. This, combined with the 25 percent equity requirement, made it impossible for the program to get off the ground. In June of last year, however, the rate was increased to 5¾ percent, but then in February, at President Kennedy's direction, it was brought down to the current 5½ percent. The FHA mortgage insurance premium is one-half of 1 percent.

Depending on the number of beds and other facilities contained in a proposed nursing home, the amount of the insured mortgage may vary from a low of around $200,000 to maybe $1 million or more, with an average somewhere in the vicinity of $500,000.

Just now really getting off the ground, the section 232 program holds great promise. And as a program, after all, which provides 75 percent financing, it adds a new dimension to the business. Traditionally, an anathema in lender circles, with few lenders—in pre-section 232 days—willing to risk a nursing home venture, nursing homes today are looked upon as good investment risks. Lenders, now, are interested.

There are those, of course, who insist the program will never amount to anything until the financing maximum is upped to 90 percent. One sponsor's agent goes so far as to state flatly that "at 75 percent financing, the nursing home program has no interest for anybody." By far the greater number of people, however, share the opinion that 90 percent might be better, but even 75 percent is better than nothing and maybe, if anything, it is actually beneficial for the FHA insurance limit on this type of property to be pegged at the 75 percent maximum. A 90 percent maximum, they are quick to point out, would make it all too easy for the wrong type of individuals to get into the business. Too many people would be encouraged to try their hand at running a nursing home—people who couldn't or wouldn't make a go of it. One disastrous result could be cut-throat competition which would serve only to lower standards generally.

As already emphasized, this particular FHA program is just getting underway. But progress is steady and uphill. According to latest available figures, there were—as of April 1—36 active projects, for a total of 2,932 beds and an overall mortgage amount of $15,862,160. As of last November only 23 projects were listed as having active status. FHA reports, too, a total of 86 firm proposals—and four mortgages actually in force, for a mortgage amount of $1,164,200.

In evaluating a project's chances of success or failure, FHA's main concern is: is it a going business, will it have a reasonable chance of success? Assessing, in this way, the economic value of a business is something new for FHA. No other FHA program operates with such a feature.

FHA does not, incidentally, decide the rates which a nursing home's patients are to be charged. This is totally within the discretion of the management. FHA's only concern in regard to a project's income or to

the rates which patients may be charged is that they be competitive and within the reach of those seeking such accommodations as the individual project is equipped to offer. A project's income, at least, should be sufficient to meet all operating expenses and debt service.

Profit margins of nursing homes vary widely, naturally—depending heavily on the type of clientele served and the services provided. As a rule of thumb, however, the upper grade type of nursing home operation can be expected to garner an average after-tax profit of anywhere from 15 to 25 percent of gross income. A project's occupancy rate, naturally enough, can be a strong determining factor. In a recent edition of the Chicago MBA's Appraisal Brief, it was reported that "the average occupancy of all nursing homes in the State of Illinois has been running from 85 percent to 90 percent. The break-even point with maximum financing is generaly about 65 percent occupancy. It takes anywhere from 1 year to 18 months for a new establishment to gain full occupancy." This, of course, is just one State's experience, but it is reflective of conditions generally.

There is no room for second guessing in the planning of a new nursing home. Once the building is constructed, there is no going back. The die is cast. The entire project is only as good as it was originally planned. Basic to the planning of any project is its size—how many rooms, how many beds? And which is best, a small-size project of 20 or even fewer beds; or the larger, more complex type of facility providing, for example, 150 to 200 beds? Or what about a 1,000-bed institution?

FHA limitations, for insurance purposes, set the minimum number of beds at 20. Experienced operators claim that a 50-bed operation is preferable, for it offers the likeliest chances of success. Generally, it is agreed, that for the best possible operation—from a profit potential standpoint—it is wise to keep the number of beds under 100. Individual operations do run higher, of course. Currently under construction in the Chicago area, for instance, is a project which will have 144 beds; and under proposal in various sections of the country are 200-bed, 400-bed and even 600-bed operations.

One authority in the field—Arthur A. Ehrlich, of Arthur Ehrlich Associates, a Chicago firm which has worked closely with many sponsoring groups in the planning and development of nursing homes around the country—is of the opinion that "a nursing home of 50 beds or less can be operated successfully, if it is being handled by an individual operator or if it is self-sponsored. If, however, the sponsoring agent is to consist of a group of interested parties, with a professional administrative staff in charge, then," Ehrlich advises, "it should be a 100-bed minimum.

"For total efficiency, and to maintain a warmth of relationships within the overall project, 200 beds make a good maximum," he suggests.

The modern nursing home, it would appear, cannot be an economic success if there are less than 50 beds. Certain services and facilities are basic and the cost per bed, or per square foot of area for these facilities, becomes prohibitive for developments of a smaller than 50-bed capacity.

Another important point, and a somewhat controversial one, is the ratio of private rooms to 2-bed and larger rooms. Surveys show that the higher the cost and the better the location, for any one particular operation, the larger the percentage of private rooms. In no case, however, should this figure exceed 10 percent of the total number of beds.

There are many angles to getting a nursing home into operation. First, of course, any prospective sponsor must acquaint himself with the many, many details of what is, after all, a very specialized undertaking. He gets before taking any formal action, as much information as possible. Next, he consults with the director of the FHA field office serving the locale where his contemplated project is to be located, since the program is administered directly by local FHA insuring offices. This is a fundamental step which must be taken before he makes formal application for his insured mortgage.

When the applicant appears and presents his proposal, FHA first considers the location of the proposed home. If the location is acceptable, FHA then moves on to analyzing the structure which is contemplated and gives an explanation of the mortgage loan and financial requirements to the sponsor.

It is at this preapplication conference that the feasibility of the project, and the acceptability of the sponsor, is determined. At this time, the proposal is outlined in detail and the sponsor must be in a position to discuss, among other points: the need, anticipated sources of patient referals, number of beds, the likelihood of receiving State certification, various financial requirements, services to be provided, type and experience of the management and the professional qualifications or skill of the sponsor and his employees.

Once a commitment is issued, construction may proceed. Once FHA insurance is granted, the loan is ready for placement. A wise move, in the initial proceedings, is for the sponsor to work first with preliminary drawings. These will be sufficient to secure a commitment. Final working drawings can then be completed after the commitment is secured. Generally speaking, the full "mechanics of closing" can be completed in about 120 days, from closing date.

Working capital never should be less than a minimum 2 percent of the amount for which the commitment is issued. Often, 10 to 15 percent is a more realistic figure. Actually, the amount required is determined by the local FHA director on a case basis, depending upon the financial responsibility of the sponsor.

For rehabilitation projects, all requirements relating to new construction projects are likewise applicable, except that in existing work minor deviations from specific requirements are permissible provided the essential features and the intent of the standards are observed. An existing structure, to be rehabilitated, must be adaptable in size, shape, and construction to the proposed use and, in addition, it must be basically sound in sufficient respects to warrant reuse. Otherwise, the construction cost of utilizing the existing work, not to mention the acquisition cost of the existing improvements, could exceed the cost of constructing a new project and thereby defeat a primary purpose of rehabilitation.

Any feature of a project which is likely to involve excessive maintenance or operating costs must be replaced or corrected unless the project income will be sufficient to meet such expenses without jeopardizing the financial success of the project. A cost certification, indicating actual costs of all improvements, is required by FHA upon completion of the improvements.

To make its nursing home program workable, both in effecting new construction and in promoting rehabilitation where desirable, FHA has kept its regulations, its operating procedures, and its minimum property standards—for the nursing homes to be covered by its mortgage insurance—as uncomplicated as possible. Nevertheless, because the program is still so new, considerable redtape and delay is sometimes encountered; all of which gives rise, naturally enough, to a certain amount of griping and lamentation over how slow FHA is in getting moving on the program. Comments in this vein, however, are not necessarily consistent with the facts.

Mortgage brokers, too, look upon this field of nursing home investment as a bright new prospect. They are anxious for the mortgage banker, the fellow who originates and services loans, to get into the picture, for he is the one best equipped to "wrap up the package." Once FHA issues its commitment in the local mortgagee's name, "it is a simple matter, then," says one eastern broker, "for the mortgagee to come to us and we, very easily, will place the loan and get the take-out from one of our lenders."

Numerous examples of successful mortgage banker ventures in nursing home construction and financing are already a matter of record.

One such case history—Sheridan Pavilion, a $1,250,000 project being built in Chicago—is the first proprietary skilled nursing home in the Midwest area to receive an FHA mortgage. The mortgage amount is $836,600. A 144-bed operation, the 42,000 square feet, 4-story structure will be air conditioned and will provide an impressive variety of patient facilities, including occupational and physical therapy, social programing, barber, beauty, and dental. There is to be, also, a chapel in addition to lounges, administrative offices and various staff facilities. The project will be medically supervised, with a former executive director of Chicago's famous Michael Reese Hospital being retained as a consultant. The originating mortgage firm is H. F. Philipsborn & Co.

Another major effort in this field, and likewise in Chicago, is Marine Manor—a new construction project being developed by Dovenmuehle, Inc. A $919,500 project, it is designed to provide a 150-bed capacity.

In making the process of building nursing homes easier and more attractive for the mortgage banker and for the investor, the Federal Government's role—through its special program of nursing home insurance—is, however simple, a most effective contributing force. Reduction of the risk, through FHA insurance, enables an increasingly greater volume of funds to be brought out of the private sector of the economy.

An Answer for CRAF—Clifford D. Currier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that Congress has again authorized more airlift for your armed services. Well over a year ago my airlift committee brought attention to the shortages of airlift and recommended immediate action to remedy the situation. The Congress was quick to respond as were President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara.

As a result of our joint efforts modern cargo and troop carrier planes are now coming off the production lines. In addition, a new type pure jet cargo aircraft is now in advanced stages of development. I am proud to report that a modernized MATS will soon be able to carry our Army units farther and faster than ever before. However, there still exists one severe deficiency in our national military airlift. This deficiency is

the fact that not one truly modern cargo aircraft is currently operating in CRAF—the civil reserve air fleet. The reason for this situation is that the civil carriers and the air frame industry have been unable to arrive at a feasible financial plan to procure modern uncompromised cargo aircraft. Fortunately for these United States we still have the best schools and the most brilliant students in the world. I wish to present to the Congress today "An Answer for CRAF." It was written by a recent graduate of the great Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, Clifford D. Currier. It examines objectively the financial problems involved and presents a solution which is notable in that it does not require Government subsidy. I commend the attention not only of the Congress but of the Secretary of Defense and particularly the civil carriers in the air frame industry to this possible solution to this problem:

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCING EQUIPMENT FOR THE AIR CARGO INDUSTRY

(By Clifford D. Currier)

INTRODUCTION

Within the last half decade the United States has experienced technological developments which have revolutionized concepts of offensive and defensive war. Of vital importance to the Nation's defense is the fundamental strength and capability of the civil air fleet. Vast technological changes have brought about rapid obsolescence of assets and have changed approaches in concepts of productive capacity in both the airframe manufacturing and air carrier industries.

The Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift was to bring these two important military and economic problems of 1960 into meaningful perspective. Under the leadership of Mr. L. MENDEL RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee, the subcommittee made a comprehensive study of the entire problem to determine the capabilities of the civil and military air fleets in order to establish the preparedness of this aspect of the Nation's defense. In the special subcommittee report it was revealed that under Joint Chiefs of Staff plans for 1959, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps logistical requirements in time of war were dependent almost entirely on the capabilities of the commercial fleet of aircraft.[1] The civil air fleet was found to be grossly inadequate to the task of supporting the cargo requirements of the Armed Forces in either general or limited war. In addition, testimony before the subcommittee indicated that financial difficulties experienced by both producers and purchasers of jet passenger equipment have retarded the development of the jet cargo capability. It was reported that only one-tenth of 1 percent of all domestic cargo is shipped by air. Estimates presented to the subcommittee indicated that a figure of 1 percent domestic cargo shipped by air transport would increase the cargo moved by the civil fleet 36 times.[2]

Further study into the problems of raising capital now being experienced by the air carrier industry, and into the potentialities of the newest developments in air cargo equipment, indicates the necessity for a new Government-air carrier industry relationship, in order that development of jet air freight may become a reality. It is the purpose of this paper to propose a plan which would encourage private enterprise to assume the financial task of developing the air cargo industry. It will provide a basis for overcoming inadequacies of the civil fleet from the standpoint of the national defense, and at the same time encourage development of related aircraft industries by alleviating many of their financial problems. The plan is intended to be the basis whereby the legislative and executive branches of Federal Government, with the least cost and involvement of public funds, could establish the necessary impetus that not only would allow but could impel this segment of the free enterprise system to sustain its own development.

CHAPTER I—BACKGROUND

In the U.S. House of Representatives, April 22, 1960, marked the conclusion of hearings conducted by the Rivers Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift which was established under directive of the Armed Services Committee to study U.S. airlift preparedness. For nearly 2 months military leaders, Government officials, and business executives had given their views on the national airlift capability. The subcommittee was especially concerned with the cargo capabilities of the Nation's civilian air fleet for purposes of national defense. Testimony revealed a deficit in our cargo airlift capacity over our potential military needs. Reasons for such a deficit was the subject of varied opinion as interested parties presented their views.

The Civil Aeronautics Board was represented by its Chairman, Mr. Gurney. The Board's position on the question of air cargo development was that the civil deficit was the result, in part, of a lack of incentives designed to give impetus to the purchase of modern economical all-cargo airlift. Mr. Gurney, speaking for the CAB, stated, "We want to find a means of expanding both the quality and quantity of the civil air fleet."[3] It was proposed that one method of bringing this about would be to increase the proportion of military cargo carried on civilian airlift.

Quoting the CAB Industry Advisory Committee Report dated September 1959, the chairman testified that priority cargo demands in wartime would considerably exceed the amount of lift capacity available. To quote Mr. Gurney, who had previously placed the CAB on record for considering the development of the air cargo industry necessary for the national defense, "wholly apart from our need for a strong civil reserve air fleet to supplement the military fleet, the board's concern in time of peace is because of the fact we are convinced that there is a tremendous cargo market available for carriage provided the capability is there. An example of the size of the market, the civil air industry carried less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total cargo that moved in domestic common carriage.[4]

A Mr. Burwell represented the Independent Airlines Association. As president of that organization he presented two major proposals for development of civilian air cargo capabilities. First was the establishment of a Government corporation whose function it would be to "purchase the modern aircraft available and sell or lease them to commercial operators.[5] Such action would in effect transfer the initial risk and expense to one of Government undertaking. Secondly it was proposed as a possible supplement to, or alternative for, the first suggestion that the Congress pass S. 2774, a bill originating in the Senate and sponsored by Senators MONRONEY and SYMINGTON which would make possible a Government guarantee on loans obtained to purchase modern cargo aircraft.[6] The bill also provided for more active participation on the part of those benefiting by the act in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program. The Independent Airlines Association by their proposals joined others in outlining the necessity for Government assistance to bridge the period of uncertainty and risk involved in development of the airfreight business.

The Department of the Air Force was represented, in part, by its Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, General Wheless. A written statement "The Air Force Policy and National Airlift" was submitted to the committee which favored use of military funds for procurement of civil airlift to promote development of civil capacity. "Such growth can be encouraged by increased use of civil carriers in lifting military cargo and passengers in peacetime, consistent with reasonably economic use of NATS" (Military Air Transport Service). It was further stipulated that such a policy must be supported by "suitable agreements and contracts backed by necessary legislation." General Wheless emphasized that a policy of apportioning more military cargo business to the civil carriers would be detrimental to the defense system unless civil performance was guaranteed and readily available to the Secretary of Defense under all circumstances. The "suitable agreements and contracts" were to include provisions making purchase of modern cargo aircraft mandatory and guaranteeing union and executive personnel would not bring about work stoppages which would delay military shipments. The Air Force statement made it clear that increased shipment of military cargo via commercial airlift should begin as soon as the above conditions and requirements become practicable. Concerning implementation of a program to improve civil airlift the Air Force outlined a need for joint governmental action in the field of aircraft development. "Establish with FAA (Federal Aviation Agency) and the civil carriers a program oriented toward joint military/civil development of a new cargo aircraft."[7]

The testimony by representatives of the civil airlines, both freight and passenger carriers, supported the Civil Aeronautics Board position in favor of increasing the share of Government and military cargo business allocated to the air cargo industry. In addition, many branded the current procurement practices followed by MATS as not consistent with furthering development of a modern cargo fleet, since the so-called part 45 contractors by merely leasing aircraft were eligible to bid on military carriage thus adding to an already cutthroat competition while contributing nothing in aircraft to the national defense.

As a group the airlines represented were generally consistent in their approach to cargo development. All considered it essential to have the Federal Government assist them in some financial manner because of the uncertainties involved. Great amounts of capital necessarily would be committed in develpoment of cargo aircraft and in selling the service. The airlines position was clear that in order for them to be willing to undertake such risks they would need, individually and collectively, more cooperation and assistance from the Federal Government.

In order that the Nation might benefit from legislative results immediately obtainable, the Special Subcommittee on National Airlift concluded its hearings and submitted its report to Congress. Recommendations were filed which programed interim modernization of MATS and funds for research and development of an uncompromised all cargo aircraft. It was further recommended that congressional appropriations earmarked for purchasing airlift services from commercial airlines by MATS, known as the congressional set aside, be restricted to participants in the civil reserve air fleet (CRAF) program.[8]

On July 28, 1960, the General Accounting Office submitted its report to Congress on the Nation's military capabilities. A study from July 1, 1959, to April 30, 1960, indicated MATS to be on the average 6.2 percent be-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

low its programed wartime aircraft requirements for the period.[9] In conjunction with this study data was gathered on the capabilities of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet whose mission is to assist MATS in carrying out wartime airlift. Members in CRAF are parties to a contractual agreement with the Air Force to provide airlift in times of war. To quote the GAO report, "In the cargo area the CRAF capability is not only grossly inadequate in terms of capacity, but it is limited and outmoded in terms of equipment." [10] Available cargo aircraft were not only found deficient in amount but also in speed.

Based on Air Material Command figures the GAO found the Air Force has spent $70.4 million for commercial augmentation in 1959, $21.6 million of which was for the procurement of cargo airlift. Under present circumstances the GAO reports commercial augmentation is not profitable enough for commercial operators to induce them to buy modern aircraft by reason of the large number of bidders and the short-term contracting procedures of MATS. The report stated unequivocably "The CRAF cargo fleet will be modernized only when commercial business makes it economically feasible." [11]

In concert with the Special Subcommittee on National Airlift the GAO report recommended commercial augmentation awards be made only to those airlines participating in CRAF. Also for the sake of providing stability and economy for those contracting with MATS the report recommended MATS have the option to lengthen the duration of the contracts from 1 to 3 years provided the service rendered the Government was satisfactory. The report concluded: "The objective of inducing civil airlines to build modern cargo fleets through procurement of peacetime military airlift can only be partially attained." [12] It was held that the amount of cargo which MATS may contract to move "is not sufficient to persuade civil airlines to procure the number of modern cargo aircraft necessary to eliminate the current deficit in wartime cargo requirements. Until responsible officials realize this and develop a concrete plan to eliminate the cargo deficiency, substantial expenditures will continue to be made without generating the number of desired cargo aircraft necessary to meet wartime requirements." [13]

Hearings were conducted by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on S. 2774, a bill to foster national defense and worldwide airfreight commerce through Government guaranteed loans to certain qualified air carriers for the purpose of facilitating their purchase of new, all-cargo airlift.[14]. The bill restricts purchase to aircraft of U.S. manufacture, a provision which may have proved objectionable to many of those interested in this type of legislation by reason of a possible favoring of purchase of the Canadian CL-44. Whatever the cause, hearings were concluded within 3 days and the legislation was abandoned.

Although the S. 2774 hearings were of short duration one proposal for tax relief was outlined for those airlines desiring to develop air cargo capabilities. Such a proposal adds a third dimension to the financial incentives which are, or could be, offered by the Federal Government in varying amounts to further air cargo development: commercial augmentation by MATS; guaranteed loans; and tax relief incentives.

Legislative actions have sought to improve the air cargo defense capabilities of the Nation within the next fiscal year. The House Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 11998, the Department of Defense appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1961, recommended modernization of the military airlift capability to the extent of $359,288,000. Of that amount $200 million would be allocated for procurement of the most modern cargo aircraft available. Some $50 million would be committed for research and development of a "commercially compatible, uncompromised cargo aircraft." [15] The remainder of the funds were to be used for modifying existing aircraft to cargo needs. The committee report stated, "It would be unwise for the Government to procure all the aircraft that might be required in time of emergency for assignment to military commands where they might sit idle for years. To do so would ignore the airlift capability inherent in the civil fleet." [16] The committee also recommended continuance of the annual commercial airlift set-aside, at $80 million, and coupled it with the restriction that procurement by MATS of airlift from civilian lines be limited to participants in the civil Reserve airfleet program. "It is not the intent of this committee that this limitation should in any way destroy or eliminate open competitive bidding, but rather that only those who actively participate in the CRAF program should be eligible to bid." [17]

H.R. 11998 was amended by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the degree that the net appropriation for airlift modernization was reduced by $50 million.[18] The bill thus went to a conference committee where final agreement resulted in the compromise appropriation for research, development, and interim modernization of military airlift of $310,788,000. This figure became law as a part of Public Law 86-601 signed by the President July 7, 1960.

A great opportunity is afforded the airline industry as a result of a large commitment of public funds to actual purchase of equipment and spare parts and to research and development of aircraft of advanced design. Commercial airlines wishing to develop air-cargo capabilities may realize considerable savings and require less financial commitment of their own because of the nature of the airframe manufacturing business. Orders placed for large quantities of aircraft by the Government absorb the initial costs of setting up the assembly line which allows commercial purchasers to place orders at significantly reduced prices.

A course of action to end cut-throat competition among bidders for Government airlift has been announced recently by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board in the past has made exemptions which would allow bids lower than the standard rates established to be accepted by the Military Air Transport Service. This procedure resulted in the lowest possible cost to the Government for air carriage of military passengers and cargo. Bids below actual costs were received by MATS. However, cut-throat competition was beginning to reach the stage where responsible airlines could no longer justify carrying Government cargo except to keep personnel employed during slack seasons.[19] To alleviate this condition and to encourage purchase of modern aircraft convertible to either passenger or cargo service the CAB has declared it will not grant exemptions for bids below 2.9 cents per passenger statute mile. In effect, a floor has been placed on bids for MATS civil augmentation carriage. The floor of 2.9 cents is higher than the usual costs per passenger-mile and therefore provides a margin of profit.[20] It is reasonable to assume that all bidders will bid 2.9 cents, which gives effect to the rules recently established by the Air Force on MATS procurement practices.

The new Air Force policies for awarding commercial airlines contracts to carry cargo and passengers complement those announced by the CAB. Only one contract item will be awarded any one carrier until each has received an award or no further items remain. In making awards, MATS will give first preference to those carriers proposing performance with turbine-powered aircraft which are convertible to cargo use. The carrier offering the greatest expansion capability in an emergency in aircraft comparable to the type offered for performance of the item, within each preference, will receive the award on that item. Also within each preference, and all other factors being equal, award will be made to the carrier having the greatest number of modern CRAF allocated aircraft in its possession.[21] It is now clear that those airlines having the most modern passenger and cargo aircraft available and by participating in CRAF may enjoy stable revenues for extended periods of time by contracting for MATS commercial cargo and passenger requirements. Such a situation will no doubt be encouraging to airlines wishing to finance new equipment.

In the past, Federal Government has been greatly responsible for financing the development of the aircraft industry. Since the first funds were applied to develop aircraft during World War I the Government has continued its traditional role. World War II began an unparalleled amount of expenditure on development and production. Recently appropriated funds for development and purchase of cargo aircraft show clearly the intent of Congress to contribute to development of an industry which benefits the Nation's economy and its defense.

Considerable attention has been directed to the question of airline subsidies in recent years by both Congress and representatives of the industry. Direct subsidies have been appropriated to the local service airlines operating in the less populated areas of the United States totaling some $60,300,000 for fiscal year 1960.[22] This may be unsought business according to Leslie O. Barnes, president of Allegheny Airlines. Mr. Barnes contends, in an article entitled "Airline Subsidies—Purpose, Cause and Control" that congressional appropriations seeking to develop air routes to outlying areas result often in a financial burden being placed on the smaller companies who must serve the routes designated by the CAB. According to Mr. Barnes these routes often do not provide enough traffic to make operations economical. The article described the situation, as follows: "The demand for service appears to parallel the increasing competition between cities for new industry in their own struggle for economic survival and their increasing isolation brought about by the steady and persistent curtailment of rail service." In conclusion, Mr. Barnes outlines the need for the airlines to take the initiative in plans to develop service between the less populated areas of the Nation. He appealed to the CAB and Congress to support some program not yet proposed that could be initiated by the industry and that would be designed to improve revenues and reduce costs.[23]

A well-established source of revenue to airlines is mail shipped by the Post Office Department. There is little doubt that this form of subsidy will continue to grow. In 1957, the Postmaster General made the following public statement: "Basically, the Post Office can no longer rely to the extent it once could on the railroads of the country for carrying mails between post offices." Mr. Summerfield described the decline in mail carrying trains from 10,000, 25 years ago, to the 2,600 at present. Seventy percent of all post offices, it was reported, "cannot be reached directly by train connections." An experimental program has been airlifting a billion nonairmail letters annually.[24] Further benefits from increasing the amount of mail shipped by air were described by Mr. Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, "Ordinarily mail and some 50 percent of oversea parcel post could move by air at a 15 cent per ton-mile rate possible with

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

cargo jets and still provide a profit to the Post Office." [25]

The future of the air cargo industry is largely hindered by development in the past, and because of this, the role of Government necessarily remains of primary importance. Although subsidies in their various forms have been highly criticized, they have been declared as essential to the well-being of the industry. Subsidies, however, have never served to solve financial problems but only to alleviate them. It is imperative, therefore, that the underlying financial problems of the air carrier industry be examined and solved before the growth potential of the air cargo industry may be realized.

CHAPTER II—FACTORS EFFECTING THE FUTURE OF THE AIR CARGO INDUSTRY

The purpose of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was to insure growth, provide stability, and aid development of the air carrier industry. Powers to regulate subsidy and mail rates, to prescribe requirements for those companies desiring entry into the industry, and to establish and certify the routes to be serviced, were vested in the Civil Aeronautics Board.[26] Legislation has been enacted to supplement and assist the Board in its functions, but certain chronic problems continue to prevail throughout the industry.

At the present time, 78 percent of all aircraft capacity operated by commercial carriers is composed of obsolete or obsolescent piston aircraft. From 1958 to 1959, civil air fleet certificated revenue ton-mile capacity increased 1 billion ton-miles, with the addition of 179 turboprop and jet aircraft, an increase of 10.8 percent in 1 year.[27] A rise in capacity of 10.2 percent has been reported for the first 6 months of 1960. As of January 1, 1960, 261 additional jets and turboprops were scheduled for delivery by 1962, which is expected to increase airline capacity rapidly in the near future.[28]

By expansion and technological development, the airline industry has been able to increase its capacity by large proportions. However, since 1955 an estimated 50-percent increase in competition has taken place for service along the 50 most traveled domestic routes. The 12 most profitable routes are estimated to have 5 or more competing airlines, while the average competition per route is 3.[29]

In view of high costs and declining load factors, resulting from intense competition and increasing capacity, airlines are suffering a decline in their profit margins.[30] The results of this economic trend are not entirely evident, but in the period 1952 to 1957 consolidated operating revenues of the industry increased from $768 millions to $1,419 millions, while net incomes declined 50 per cent from $54 million to $27 million, with sharp declines, therefore, in the after tax return on invested capital.[31] In the year 1958, deficits were reported by three major lines. This was to begin a period of more serious financial troubles within the industry. The pattern was still more evident when Capital Airlines in 1959 was unable to meet its debt obligations. Despite a 5-percent average fare increase allowed by the CAB, in the first 6 months of 1960 domestic trunk airlines reported a net loss of $7.2 million.[32]

The report of the Aviation Securities Committee of the Investment Bankers Association, presented before that organization's convention in 1958, outlined the impending financial problem, "the problem of a proper Government-industry relationship to insure survival." To further quote the report, "* * * we believe it is in part an investment banking problem. Primarily it is a problem of recreating the economic soundness of a crucial industry in order to reestablish its financial priority in our capital markets commensurate with its strategic priority to our Nation." The Aviation Securities Committee urged the Civil Aeronautics Board to reevaluate its utility concepts and replace them with an "investment-market, cost-of-capital approach" when establishing rates. Inadequate ratemaking policies on the part of the CAB were held to be detrimental and restricting to the income prospects of the airlines.[33]

Not unlike many industries of more recent origin the airlines have incurred problems arising from fast growth. Of primary consideration to those institutions providing capital for airlines is the ever growing proportion of debt to total capital, reflected in current balance sheet figures. As a percentage of total capital employed in the industry, debt increased from 28.3 percent in 1955 to 51.9 percent in 1959.[34]

In March 1959, the Senate Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on S. 1368, a bill to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft. The hearings were to bring considerable attention to the problems confronting the air carriers and related industries involved in aircraft manufacturing. To quote the Senate report on the bill, "As a part of the transition from piston to jet powered aircraft, the Nation's airlines are now in the process of carrying out large scale reequipment programs which it is estimated will cost approximately $4 billion by 1962. Seldom, if ever, in the history of American private enterprise was a single industry been required to convert so much of its equipment in such short order and at such high risk." [35]

Submitted with the report were estimates that held the cost of financing these reequipment programs would require some $1.4 billion in immediate capital, of which some $600 million was reported to be unavailable.[36] It was revealed that airlines may have to resort to leasing, conditional purchases, equipment mortgages and like arrangements in order to complete the transition into jet aircraft.[37] The extreme shortage of available capital for purposes of financing such aircraft has reportedly created the necessity for separate financing of aircraft components.[38] An example of this approach to jet aircraft financing in terms of the magnitude of the separated items would be the cost of the engines alone, which are approximately 25 percent of the total cost of a single aircraft.[39] Financing $4 billion of jet equipment by 1962 would require approximately $1 billion for engines.

In order to assist the air carrier industry in component financing, legislation in S. 1368 proposed amendments to sections 503 and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Ostensibly these amendments were to give full protection to a lessor or to a person having a security interest in, or security title to, any civil aircraft, aircraft engine or propeller under contract of conditional sale, equipment trust, chattel or corporate mortgage, or other instrument of similar nature by relieving that person or lessor not in physical control of the property from liability for damages caused under certain conditions by that aircraft property, their interest in which, previously may have made them liable.[40] Components of aircraft, such as engines, are now to be allowed separate registration of title with the CAB. These amendments became law on July 8, 1959, and will undoubtedly facilitate the purchase of all cargo jet aircraft by component mortgages since, by establishing protection similar to railroad equipment obligations, the risk to the lender has been considerably reduced.

During the hearings on S. 1368 Senator MONRONEY, sponsor of many bills concerning aviation, outlined what he termed "a very favorable tax situation applicable to aircraft," one which makes it possible to write off such assets within 7 years.[41] The advantages which might accrue to a carrier by the allowance of a fast writeoff on a straight-line basis are offset upon purchase of modern, more expensive aircraft by the resulting net addition to the existing high percentage of expenses to revenues in the industry. Depreciation, therefore, is a major problem to an expanding airline. Aircraft book values may be suddenly and seriously affected by a phenomenon currently described as "mass obsolescence of the entire piston fleet." [42] This factor necessitates a fast writeoff of the aircraft to decrease the possibility of severe loss. Competition in the industry does not allow outdated equipment to retain its earning power.. As earning power declines, the necessity for an abrupt change in assets becomes more acute, while the ability to make the change becomes more remote.

The currently high operating ratios of the industry suggest the individual airline company's expenses are excessive. Aggregate expenses of 12 major domestic trunklines rose 17.7 percent in the first 6 months of 1960, while revenues rose only 9 percent. Depreciation charges increased 27.8 percent in the first 6 months of 1960, reflecting the delivery of new jet equipment.[43] Presently, depreciation charges account for approximately one-tenth of total operating expenses of the 12 largest domestic trunklines, and the rising cost of modern aircraft will continue to increase this expense item on a straight-line basis.[44]

Renting aircraft would probably provide a greater operating expense than does purchase and depreciation of the asset over 7 years, but requires no high-cost capital initially. Charges against income resulting from a lease agreement may be no improvement in terms of operating results, but may be the only alternative for airlines unable to obtain financing.

A statement submitted to the Senate Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Walter Williams, Acting Secretary of Commerce, summarized the need for legislation concerning Government recapture of subsidy because of capital gains realized by airlines from the sale of obsolescent aircraft. Quoting Mr. Williams, "the public interest in efficient, economical, and safe operation of subsidized air carriers would be better served if subsidies were calculated in such a way as to permit reinvestment of capital gains in more modern and efficient aircraft without affecting mail rates.[45] Public Law 85–373 amended the Civil Aeronautics Act for just that purpose. The CAB under the statute, "shall not take into account in determining the 'need' for subsidy" (compensation for carrying mail) capital gains "from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment," if the carrier gives proper notice of investment or intent to invest in flight equipment and presents proper evidence supporting its objective. Under the law, capital gains from this source also may be applied to "retirement of debt contracted for the purchase or construction of flight equipment." [46] Subsidized airlines are therefore in the same position as nonsubsidized lines with respect to capital gains retention with the exception that the nonsubsidized may apply such gains to dividends or other corporate purposes.

In reports submitted to the CAB, subsidized airlines estimated they might realize from the sale of used aircraft in the period 1956 through 1960, net capital gains after taxes of $66,276,000.[47] Mr. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association outlined the significance of such capital gains as follows: "The ordinary and usual rule of thumb employed by lending institutions is that they will lend up to 75 percent of the book value of new aircraft. Hence if an air carrier is able to make a downpayment out of equity or other subordinate money on the order of $1 million on an aircraft

Footnotes at end of speech.

priced at $4 million, it can borrow the remaining $3 million, assuming it can service the debt."[48] A dollar of funds made available from the sale of aircraft generally makes possible the receipt of credit for three, provided the various financial institutions such as insurance companies and investment banking houses are willing to assume the risk.

Theoretically, if the subsidized airlines were to realize some $66 million in capital gains by disposing of the estimated 500 to 600 obsolescent aircraft, approximately $200 million additional financing might have become available in the period, 1956 through 1960. Because of fast obsolescence of the piston fleet the used aircraft market proved limited in its ability to absorb these planes. Consequently, financing based on the proceeds realized from the sale of old equipment has in some cases been unobtainable.[49] Therefore, the legislatively provided avenue for the reinvesting of capital gains in new equipment has not been entirely successful.

In the Robinson Airlines case of 1952, the Civil Aeronautics Board rendered the opinion that use of equity capital was more desirable than the use of debt in airline financing. The Board's opinion was based on the risks inherent with fixed obligations in an industry of narrow profit margins. To quote the Board's findings, "Transportation as a whole, and air transportation in particular, as we have seen in the not too distant past, is subject to sharp contractions during the recession phase of the business cycle."[50] The use of equity funds, however, is not always practical since lack of marketability resulting from declining or persistently low earnings may prove this method more costly in terms of the net amount realized on the securities by the corporation. The Civil Aeronautics Board maintains, "the airline industry characteristically is one of relatively small permanent capital investment in comparison with nontransport utilities. The largest share of its capital is invested in assets having a high rate of technological obsolescence."[51]

The sources of funds for new equipment, which airline companies primarily rely on, are retained earnings; depreciation accruals; and the proceeds from the sale of equipment.[52] The ability of an airline to raise funds for new equipment depends on the company's ability to earn a satisfactory return, and its ability to dispose of its obsolete equipment without incurring large losses. Present economic conditions create an unsatisfactory basis on which air carriers must enter the capital markets. High operating ratios characteristic of the industry make airlines vulnerable to slight increases in expenses and small declines in revenues.

Rising costs have been cited as a constant threat which may increase expenses, and in turn, aggravate the fundamental financial weakness; namely the high proportion of expenses to revenues. Pan American Airways' treasurer testified that an increase in expenses of 5.6 percent or a decrease in revenues of 5.3 percent would have eliminated any operating profit in 1955.[53] In that same year the domestic trunk airlines reported an average net income, as a percentage of operating revenues, of 4.6 percent. In 1959, this average was to decline to only 3.9 percent.[54] Increasingly narrow profit margins show clearly the necessity for creating a means whereby new equipment might be financed without adding to operating expenses. Secondly, a means must be found to reduce high expense items in order that future financial needs may become more readily obtainable.

In the past, air cargo development has been limited by two important factors: high costs of operation and the limited operational capabilities of piston aircraft. Air freight companies have sought to develop their business by conversion of passenger aircraft to cargo use. Such aircraft have proven limited in their ability to transport large tonnages for long distances and in their capacity to lift the so-called outsized cargo items. This general lack of inherent cargo-carrying capability has been a key factor in limiting the expansion of such enterprise, and has been chiefly responsible for the high operating costs characteristic of the business.

Recognizing the need for an uncompromised all cargo jet aircraft with operating capabilities substantially superior to competing modes of cargo shipment, the various aircraft manufacturers have conducted extensive research and development programs. Of primary importance are the commercially compatible cargo aircraft developed by Canadair, Ltd., and Lockheed Aircraft Corp.

Canadair Ltd. developed the CL–44 turboprop transport for either bulk or palletized cargo. In its various compartments the CL–44 is capable of carrying a maximum of 60,000 pounds of cargo for 2,950 miles. Maximum speed for this aircraft is 378 miles per hour. It requires over 5,000 feet to take off with a normal load and 2,000 feet to land. Cargo must be raised higher than truckbed height in order for it to be placed in the main cargo compartment, which requires special loading equipment or apparatus. On the basis of weight transported at 3,650 hours annual utilization, direct operating costs (excluding depreciation) were an optimum of 4.3 cents per nautical ton-mile, and a long range (4,000 miles) figure of 6.2 cents per nautical ton-mile. The CL–44 costs approximately $5 million to the purchaser.[55]

The Lockheed Aircraft Corp. has developed the C–130 series of all cargo jet transports which vary in both purpose and cost. The cargo payload capabilities vary from 38,000 pounds for the shorter range C–130B, to 35,000 pounds for the extended range C–130E. The C–130C aircraft is capable of transporting a payload of 36,700 pounds, while incorporating a new innovation known as "boundary layer control" which allows the aircraft to take off in 1,400 feet and land in less than 700 feet on unimproved fields. At low weights the C–130C is able to take off in less than 500 feet.[56]

The cost of Lockheed's 130 series varies from $2.1 million for the C–130B to the maximum of $2.9 million for the C–130C. All aircraft of the series may be loaded directly from the ground or from truckbed height. Time required after a landing of any aircraft of the series to refuel, unload and reload, is less than 25 minutes.[57]

The most recent development in cargo aircraft is Lockheed's "Super Hercules" turboprop transport. This aircraft will carry a 77,000 pound payload. Optimum direct operating costs were computed to be 3.7 cents per nautical ton mile or 4.3 cents long range (4,000 miles).[58]

Air cargo transports recently in development would appear to possess inherent capabilities which will revolutionize our freight transportation system. Aircraft such as Lockheed's C–130C, with its tested capability for short takeoff and landing on unimproved terrain, would make possible direct service to rural or nonindustrialized areas without the necessity of the locality assuming the burden of financing terminal facilities. Such products as livestock could be loaded and delivered within a few hours, thereby eliminating loss of weight and feeding costs in transfer. Complete flexibility of service would be possible, for the modern jet cargo fleet would be capable of shifting thousands of miles to the source of demand within a few hours.

It is foreseeable that industries would change production planning to take advantage of this new flexibility. Production could be brought closer to actual day-to-day demand, since deliveries could be made within a few hours after the product was completed to any point in the Nation or overseas. It is conceivable that an auto dealer in New York could order cars for his customers from Detroit, and be able to deliver them the same day. The reduction in overhead costs and inventory, made possible by fast-time transport at costs comparable with slower and less flexible modes, will prove valuable to the industrial community.

Although many factors such as limited operation in adverse weather may hinder jet-cargo service, the extreme reduction of the time factor and the improvement of the capabilities of the service will serve to create its demand. Already, the Railway Express Company has an agreement with seven airlines which provides for coordination of air freight and surface express between areas lacking air terminals.[59] Pan American Airways and Ryder System Inc. have established a "joint air-truck network between Latin America and 700 U.S. cities."[60] Clearly the factors once limiting air-cargo development will give way to technological improvements, provided a sound and economical means for financing such development becomes available.

CHAPTER III—PLAN FOR FURTHERING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AIR CARGO INDUSTRY

The special congressional Subcommittee on National Military Airlift, in studying the capabilities of both the civil and the military air fleets, revealed that under Joint Chiefs of Staff plans for 1959, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps logistical requirements in time of war were dependent almost entirely on the capabilities of the civil fleet of aircraft. The civil air fleet was found to be "grossly inadequate" to the task of supporting the cargo requirements of the Armed Forces in either general or limited war.

Financial difficulities experienced by both producers and air carrier purchasers of jet passenger equipment have retarded the development of the jet cargo capability. The aircraft manufacturers have experienced considerable excess capacity because of the shift from production of military aircraft to the production of missiles. The air carriers suffer from rapid obsolescence of the piston aircraft which make up approximately 75 percent of the civil fleet. Low earnings resulting from high operating costs and high depreciation charges have severely restricted the ability of the airlines to raise new capital for purposes of purchasing new jet equipment. Because airlines have been primarily interested in the development of the passenger business, financial difficulties have resulted in practically no development of the civil cargo capability.

Further study into the problems now being experienced by the airline industry has indicated that it will be necessary to alleviate many of the industry's financial problems before airlines will be willing to apply risk capital to development of a cargo airlift capability. Increasingly narrow profit margins in the industry indicate a necessity for creating a means whereby new cargo equipment might be financed without adding to operating expenses. Secondly, a means must be found to reduce high expense items such as depreciation and operating costs in order that better operating results might attract more capital into the industry. The airlines must reestablish an attractiveness in the capital markets in order to obtain the enormous amount of capital necessary for expansion with new jet equipment.

Legislation passed by Congress to assist air carriers has proven inadequate to the task of alleviating basic underlying economic weaknesses within the industry. The airline problems are private enterprise problems; they must be solved by private capital. It is necessary for private enterprise to form

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

new institutions designed to rectify financial ills which inhibit the growth of the airline industry.

It is suggested that private corporations established for the purpose of renting modern jet cargo aircraft to air carriers desiring to develop the airfreight business, would provide the means whereby air carriers could develop such business without raising funds. By merely renting cargo aircraft when cargo business justified such rentals, an airline would not be subject to the risks inherent in investing large sums of money in assets whose potential earning power is, at this time, unknown. Lower cost operations for the airlines could result from greater utilization of maintenance facilities, personnel, and pilots, through expansion into the cargo business. This would be possible because private corporations renting jet cargo equipment could offer low-cost rentals based on a reciprocal agreement that the lessee airline provide maintenance and flight crews for the rented aircraft.

In addition to assuming the economic function of financing the development of the civil air-cargo capability, private air-cargo development corporations could also function to provide a market for the large number of obsolescent piston aircraft which are now becoming increasingly more difficult for airlines to dispose of, as the transition to jet aircraft progresses. If private corporations were to provide such a demand for obsolescent aircraft in sufficient amount, airlines would be relieved from taking possible losses from the sale of obsolescent equipment, and, or, the necessity of writing off such equipment against current income. Consequently more favorable operating results would be possible for air carriers, if their obsolescent capacity could be eliminated. More favorable operating results would enhance the airlines' ability to raise capital on favorable terms and would encourage development of the airfreight business.

A general reduction of the passenger capacity within the industry would occur as a result of private corporations purchasing obsolescent aircraft and retiring them from service. Such a reduction would allow more intense utilization of the more economical modern jet aircraft within the fleet. New jet aircraft already scheduled for delivery would provide additional capacity for growth in the industry. The reduction of present passenger capacity would serve to limit the adverse effects of cutthroat competition generally associated with the present condition of capacity increasing at a more rapid rate than demand.

In summary, the private corporations envisioned would serve two purposes. First, they would function to provide the air carrier industry with modern jet cargo aircraft and would assume the risk of financing such aircraft. Secondly, they would alleviate financial problems of the air carriers by providing a market for obsolescent piston aircraft. In order for corporations to be established to carry out the above functions, it is necessary to establish a basis upon which such private corporations may attract capital.

The ability to obtain sufficient capital often has been recognized as prerequisite to the future success of an industry. Private investors in the past have been hesitant to assume risks, the rewards for which, may be subject in large measure, to the uncertainties arising from Government regulation. Legislative and executive policies necessarily change, and it is because of such potential change that investment values in regulated industries may be threatened. Just as Government must remain flexible in order to meet changing polititcal needs, so must an industry be allowed to remain flexible in order to meet its ever changing capital needs. When Government becomes dependent on an industry to provide an important element of the national defense, while at the same time, it must regulate that industry for the public welfare, that Government, in support of its regulatory powers, must allow a satisfactory basis upon which such industry may obtain capital.

The potential growth of the air freight business could be a basic factor underlying the marketability of new common stock. The capture of only 1 percent of the total domestic cargo carriage market is predicted to increase the freight volume now carried by air 36 times. The same risks would be incurred by subscribers of jet cargo equipment corporation common stocks as are incurred by investors in any new business venture. As in any free enterprise venture it is ultimately up to corporate management to overcome the uncertainties involved and make the business profitable.

Legislation would be needed to encourage private corporations to assist the air carrier industry in improving the civilian cargo capability. It is suggested that such legislation should provide for purchase by the Federal Government of obsolescent piston aircraft of prescribed specifications from any private corporation established for the purpose of purchasing from American aircraft manufacturers, and renting to commercial airlines, a modern jet cargo fleet. Such corporations should be required to join in an air cargo development program created by the above-mentioned legislation in order to be eligible to sell obsolescent aircraft to the Government.

The purpose of the Government in acquiring the obsolescent fleet is to ultimately relieve financial pressures on the commercial airline industry in order that it may develop capabilities needed for the national defense. A new form of Treasury obligation, termed credit certificates, would be issued to the newly formed private corporations in the development program in payment for the obsolescence aircraft, upon the condition that such aircraft had been, in turn, purchased from commercial airlines through an exchange of the private development corporation common stock.

The Treasury credit certificate would represent a new form of financing as well as a Government guarantee of credit. Just as a $1 bill, the silver certificate, when issued by the Treasury, is a form of debt, the new credit certificate would represent an obligation to the private development corporations incurred by the Federal Government through its purchase of an obsolescent fleet of aircraft. Unlike the Treasury silver certificate, the Treasury credit certificate would bear interest for a limited time, and would not be legal tender. Secondly, Treasury credit certificates would be nonredeemable, because their only purpose is to provide risk-free earning power for development corporations, in order that the development corporations may establish an attractive basis for the issuance of common stock.

Credit certificates would not represent continuous financial support to the air carrier industry since the development corporations, under the proposed legislation, would agree to a contractual requirement that surplus reserves be established each year out of earnings to provide for mandatory amortization of Treasury credit certificate assets over a prescribed number of years. At the end of the prescribed number of years the interest payments would be suspended. In years of no net earnings the reserve requirements and amortization requirements would be waived by the Government. All earnings retained by development corporations in excess of established reserves for the purpose of accelerating the amortization of the Treasury credit certificates would be nontaxable.

Under the concept of the development program, the Government takes on no contingent liability. The interest payments on the Treasury credit certificates represent a type of indirect subsidy through which the private development corporations aid the air carrier industry. As the Treasury credit certificates are amortized, the cost to the public declines. In addition, a date for the suspension of interest is established which makes it possible for the Government to determine the maximum cost of the development program before it is enacted, since the amount of aircraft to be purchased by the Government in this manner may be prescribed by law. By transformation of the declining asset values of the airline industry into Treasury credit certificates, a Government-industry relationship is established which, in effect, compels development corporations by amortization requirements to retain earnings, thereby encouraging the increase of productive capacity by internal financing, while at the same time, reducing the cost of the Government support. As diagram B shows, the decline in the Treasury credit certificate account after amortization is offset by the increase in the fund for purchase of new jet cargo equipment account.

DIAGRAM A

1. Example of a private development corporation balance sheet before amortization of Treasury credit certificates. Assume $6 net earnings:

Balance sheet

DEBITS

Cash	$4
Fund for purchase of new jet cargo equipment [1]	2
Treasury credit certificates	100
Jet cargo equipment	100
Total	206

CREDITS

Common stock	200
Retained earnings	4
Reserve for amortization of Treasury credit certificates [1]	2
Total	206

[1] A portion of earnings set aside as required by development program legislation.

2. Balance sheet after amortization of Treasury credit certificates. The Treasury credit certificate account is credited $2 and the reserve for amortization account is debited $2.

Balance sheet

DEBITS

Cash	$4
Fund for purchase of new jet cargo equipment	2
Treasury credit certificates	98
Jet cargo equipment [1]	100
Total	204

CREDITS

Common stock	200
Retained earnings	4
Total	204

[1] Reserve is written off against Treasury credit certificate account.

Enactment of development program legislation of a type previously described would induce private investors interested in the development of the air cargo industry to promote corporations and raise funds in order to establish a low-cost equipment rental service for the benefit of air carriers desiring to contract for commercial and Government air cargo business. Private development corporations established for this purpose would enter into agreements with various airlines providing for purchase of an amount of obsolescent aircraft which met prescribed operational requirements in exchange for an amount of the private development corpora-

tion's common stock. The amount of common stock an airline would receive would be equal to the undepreciated book value of the aircraft plus an additional amount of stock which would provide the airline with a capital gain. The capital gain would serve to induce air carriers to participate in the development program. A subsequent exchange would be arranged under the development program with the Federal Government wherein the development corporations would receive interest-bearing Treasury certificates for their newly acquired obsolescent piston aircraft equal in face value to the total amount of stock paid to the air carrier.

Stockholders of airlines would benefit from the immediately profitable liquidation value of corporate assets declining rapidly in value. The stock received by the airlines from development corporations could be distributed by the airlines to their respective stockholders as a partial liquidating dividend; sold to raise funds; or retained as earning assets.

Private corporations in the air cargo development program would assume the task of writing off the obsolescent asset values in the air carrier industry, and in so doing, provide a means whereby that industry may improve operating results and prevent capital losses. Development corporations, by buying the obsolescent aircraft of an airline, would decrease the depreciable assets on the books of the airline. Depreciation charges against income would be reduced, thereby improving operating results; provided the airline would be successful in greater utilization of its more economical modern aircraft. By subscribing for use of cargo aircraft offered by development corporations, airlines could begin developing cargo carriers on an above cost basis without any necessity for capital outlay or the raising of funds. The airline would not be required to rent cargo aircraft, and would do so, only when it desired to contract for cargo business. However, lower cost operations could result from greater utilization of maintenance personnel and pilots through expansion into the cargo business, since development corporations could offer low cost rentals based on a reciprocal agreement that the lessee airline provide maintenance and crews for the rented jet cargo equipment. In addition, if an airline elected to retain its development corporation common stock, it could receive back part of its rental payments in the form of dividends.

A general reduction of the passenger capacity within the industry would occur as a result of the development program. Such reduction would allow more intense utilization of the more economical modern aircraft within the civil fleet. Without seriously affecting the net fleet capacity, over a period of years it would be feasible to retire through the development program considerable portions of the obsolete passenger fleet because of the rapid additions to capacity attributable to the jet and turboprop aircraft scheduled for delivery by 1962.

The reduction of passenger capacity for a short period would serve to limit the adverse affects of cutthroat competition generally associated with the present condition of capacity increasing at a more rapid rate than demand. The development corporations would absorb nearly the entire market for obsolete aircraft and provide the seller with a capital gain, thus giving substantial effect to the airline reequipment financing legislation passed by Congress in 1958.

The Civil Aeronautics Board estimated in 1958 that air carriers might realize approximately $66 million in capital gains by disposing of some 500 to 600 obsolescent aircraft. The following is an example illustrating the development program. Assuming the development corporations were to provide the industry with a 10-percent capital gain equal to one-half the maximum amount estimated by the CAB, the private development corporations could procure an amount of aircraft equal in book value to $330 million by exchanging $363 million of their own common stock. This would provide the industry with a $33 million capital gain and would serve as an inducement for airlines to participate in the program. In this example, private development corporations would receive from the Federal Treasury $363 million in Treasury credit certificates in exchange for the obsolescent fleet.

By way of further example, a 5-percent yield on $363 million of outstanding Treasury credit certificates would provide initial earnings of $18,150,000 for corporations in the development program. The issuance of an additional amount of common stock over a period of years would provide funds for the purchase of a sizable jet cargo fleet.

The base rate of return provided by the unamortized Treasury credit certificates plus the potential growth of the airfreight business would be the basic factors underlying the marketability of the development corporation's common stock. The same risks would be incurred by subscribers of development corporation common stock as are incurred upon the formation of any new enterprise. Uncertainties are faced by managers of any new business venture, but with the capabilities demonstrated by modern jet cargo aircraft, the capture of only 1 percent of the total domestic cargo carriage market is predicted to increase the freight volume now carried by air 36 times. Clearly the potential demand for cargo equipment will be attractive enough for risk capital to assume the responsibility of free enterprise development, once investors realize they need not be subordinate to large debt structures made vulnerable by high operating ratios.

Amounts totaling $310,788,000 were allocated in the Department of Defense appropriations bill for 1961 for modernization of the U.S. military airlift capability. An additional amount of $80 million was established as the annual Military Air Transport Service commercial airlift set-aside subsidy for fiscal year 1961, which provides an amount of potential revenue for airlines contracting for military airlift as incentive for them to increase their cargo capacity. As described in chapter 1, approximately one-fourth of the MATS commercial airlift subsidy is applied to the shipment of military cargo. Since the Civil Aeronautics Board will not allow bids below those recognized as necessary for reasonably profitable operation, airlines are assured of revenues when contracting with MATS. The Military Air Transport Service will award military airlift contracts only to those carriers in the civil reserve air fleet program with the greatest cargo capability. Legislation creating the air cargo development program could require development corporations to participate in the civil reserve air fleet program in such a way as to induce commercial airlines to increase their cargo capacity by requiring use of some development corporation air cargo equipment in order to be eligible to bid on military airlift contracts. If such provision were included in the proposed legislation, development corporations would be assisted in their role of improving the civil cargo airlift capability by being provided with another immediate source of revenue besides Treasury credit certificates.

The following are proposed uses for the obsolescent fleet of aircraft acquired by the Federal Government, which will show why the development program suggested will be less costly than any method of improving civil airlift capabilities yet proposed. An adequate portion of the retired civil fleet should be converted to cargo configuration and held in reserve until such time as the current military airlift deficit is eliminated. A substantial portion of the fleet could be effectively utilized in a program to develop the transportation systems of underdeveloped countries. International banking organizations such as the World Bank could assist such countries in purchasing at very low cost a complete and flexible transport system. The United States could lead in furthering the nonmilitary progress of the countries participating. In addition, the United States could establish trade agreements wherein the countries purchasing aircraft at low cost would agree to import from the United States aircraft engines, parts, tools, and fuel, thereby adding to a more favorable U.S. balance of trade. Because of the limited operational capabilities of the obsolescent aircraft to be sold to underdeveloped countries, careful administration of the sales by an agency such as the Federal Aviation Agency could prevent detrimental competition with established routes of American international air carriers.

Since the only expenditure of the Federal Government in acquiring the obsolescent aircraft is the expenditure of interest payments on the Treasury credit certificates, the Government could conceivably realize a net profit on its transactions with private development corporations. For example, assuming that private development corporations were required to amortize all Treasury credit certificates within 10 years, under the rules previously defined, and provided the interest payments were to be suspended at the end of 10 years, if private development corporations were to earn no profit, and were unable to amortize any of the credit certificates in the first 10 years, the Government, in acquiring $363 million of aircraft would break even by liquidation of the aircraft at less than half their book value. Total interest payments would equal $181,500,000, and it would be necessary for the Government to liquidate the obsolescent aircraft for that amount to break even. Because the Government pays out only the interest on the Treasury credit certificates, it may sell the obsolescent aircraft for much less than book value. An airline to sell at less than book value would have to sustain a loss on its investment. Assuming that private development corporations were successful in earning a reasonable return, enough credit certificates would be amortized to reduce interest payments by the Government considerably. This would allow the Government to sell the obsolescent aircraft at a fraction of their book value and still break even. The ultimate purpose of development program legislation is to avoid, if possible, any net expenditure of public funds on a program designed to benefit the public and improve the national defense.

In conclusion, the development program proposed, if inaugurated by legislation, would allow and encourage private enterprise and private capital to effect economic improvements and establish a sound and reasonable basis for the development of the much needed air cargo industry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, report of Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift, No. 53, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

2. U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, hearing before the Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift, No. 54, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

3. A bill, S. 2774, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

4. General Accounting Office report, July 28, 1960.

5. U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, Report of Committee on Appropriations, No. 1550, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

6. Barnes, L. O., "Airline Subsidies, Purpose, Cause, and Control." Journal of Air

Law and Commerce, Northwestern University Law Review, autumn 1959, volume 26, No. 4.

7. U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, hearings of Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 2229, volume 181, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

8. "Aviation Securities Committee Report," Commercial and Financial Chronical, New York, December 18, 1958, volume 188, No. 5804.

9. "Air Transport," Standard & Poor's Industry Survey, New York, October 1960.

10. U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, hearings before the Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1368, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

11. U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, report of Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, No. 221, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

12. Public Law 86–81, Federal Statutes at Large, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1959, volume 77, page 180.

13. U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, hearings before the Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1753. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., volume 181.

14. Transportation Industry Survey, Moody's Industrials, New York, September 9, 1960.

---

[1] U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Cong., Report of Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift, No. 53. p. 4032.

[2] H. Rept. No. 53, op. cit. 1, p. 4043.

[3] U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Cong., hearings before the Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift, No. 54, p. 4485.

[4] Hearings, op cit. 3, p. 4483.

[5] Hearings, p. cit. 3, pp. 4542–4543.

[6] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., S. 2774.

[7] Hearings, op. cit. 3, p. 4362.

[8] H.Rept. No. 53, op. cit., p. 4053.

[9] Government Accounting Office Report, July 28, 1960, position A, pt. 1, p. 1.

[10] Op. cit., position C, p. 2.

[11] Op. cit., position C, p. 8.

[12] Op. cit., position B, p. 8.

[13] Op. cit., position B, p. 9.

[14] S. 2774, op. cit. 6, p. 1.

[15] U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Cong., report of Committee on Appropriations, No. 1561, p. 17.

[16] Ibid., 15.

[17] Op. cit., p. 18.

[18] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., report of Committee on Appropriations, No. 1550, p. 29.

[19] Interview with L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of Special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift.

[20] Letter to the Secretary of the Air Force from the Civil Aeronautics Board, Aug. 23, 1960.

[21] Interview, op. cit., 19.

[22] L. O. Barnes, "Journal of Air Law and Commerce," vol. 26, autumn 1959, No. 4.

[23] Ibid., 25.

[24] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., hearings of Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, S. 2229, vol. 181, p. —.

[25] National military airlift hearings, op. cit. 3, p. 4748.

[26] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, vol. 188, No. 5804, Thursday, Dec. 18, 1958, p. 33.

[27] National military airlift hearings, op. cit. 3, p. 4460.

[28] Standard & Poor's industry survey, "Air Transport," October 1960, p. A26.

[29] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, op. cit., 26, p. 65.

[30] Standard & Poor, op. cit. 28, passenger load factor defined as "percentage of seat miles actually sold in scheduled service."

[31] Ibid., 29.

[32] Standard & Poor, op. cit. 28, p. A26.

[33] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, op. cit. 26, p. 31.

[34] Standard & Poor, op. cit. 28, p. A40.

[35] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., report of Subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, No. 221, p. 2.

[36] Ibid., 35.

[37] S. Rept. No. 221, op. cit., 35, p. 2.

[38] Ibid., 37.

[39] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., hearings before Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1368, p. 78.

[40] Public Law 86–81, Federal Statutes at Large, vol. 77, p. 180.

[41] Senate hearings, op. cit., 39, p. 78.

[42] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, op. cit., 26, p. 66.

[43] Standard & Poor, op. cit. 28, p. A26.

[44] Ibid., 43.

[45] U.S. Senate, 85th Cong., hearings before the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1763, vol. 181, p. 4.

[46] Public Law 85–373, Federal Statutes at Large, vol. 72, p. 84.

[47] Senate hearings, op. cit. 45, p. 23.

[48] Op cit. 45, p. 46.

[49] Op. cit. 45, p. 44.

[50] Op. cit. 45, p. 78.

[51] Ibid., 50.

[52] Standard & Poor, op. cit. 28, p. A40.

[53] U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., hearings before subcommittee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1368, p. 78.

[54] Ibid., 52.

[55] Interview op. cit., 19.

[56] Ibid., 55.

[57] Ibid., 56.

[58] Ibid., 57.

[59] Moody's "Transportation Industry Survey," Sept. 9, 1960, p. 1955.

[60] Ibid., 59.

How the CIA Tail Wagged the U.S. Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am bringing to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following extremely important and interesting article from Look magazine for July 18, 1961, by Tad Szulc. Mr. Szulc was South American correspondent for the New York Times for 5 years. He has recently been transferred to the Washington bureau of the Times and is now diplomatic correspondent for Latin American affairs.

Mr. Szulc shows how the powerful Central Intelligence Agency ignored President Kennedy's ban on Batista followers, approved a foolhardy military plan, and kept the underground in the dark. He makes a strong case that, before it began, the invasion of Castro's Cuba was doomed:

The tragedy of the Bay of Pigs—the weird and dramatic 72 hours last April when a miniature army of Cuban rebels senselessly hurled itself against Dictator Fidel Castro's heavily armed fortress—deserves a unique place in the annals of military and intelligence disasters.

World War II proved that even the most carefully planned and executed landing operation may end in shocking failure. But the anti-Castro invasion was doomed from the beginning by misleading intelligence reports, faulty planning, disregard for the political realities and astonishing ignorance of subversion procedures. Disobedience of orders—including one from President John F. Kennedy—and outright deceit added to the confusion and insured defeat.

The CIA field agents who planned the invasion kept their superiors in the dark about many aspects of their handiwork. The incredible mismanagement of these agents during the months of feverish preparations for the landing in Cuba has never before been completely revealed.

The basic error was made early. The Central Intelligence Agency estimated that an attack by 1,300 men would cause the instant collapse of a Communist police state defended by 300,000 troops. On the strength of this estimate, the United States gave full approval to the operation. Yet, while approving this foolhardy plan, the CIA allowed the destruction of a promising guerrilla movement inside Cuba which might have succeeded in overthrowing Castro.

As preparations for the invasion began, at least 100 Castro spies circulated freely in the buildup area in Florida. Their photographs were on file in the Dade County sheriff's office, but no effort was made by Federal authorities to remove them from the scene, or to conceal the movements of the anti-Castrol fighters from these informers.

While the Castro spies operated freely, two Federal agencies detained groups of anti-Castro revolutionaries. The Federal Communications Commission impounded a rebel boat which broadcast anti-Castro propaganda, and requested the indictment of the boat's operators for broadcasting without a license. And a boat carrying explosives for the Cuban underground was captured off Tallahassee by a Fish and Wildlife Service patrol boat.

Perhaps this failure to inform other Federal agencies of U.S. aid to the anti-Castro Cubans was motivated by security. If so, this was one of the few instances of security during the months of preparation. Many Cuban waiters in Miami could give the names of the CIA agents in charge of the operation, and the Cuban rebel chiefs blandly advised newsmen to "clear it with the CIA" when they sought permission to accompany the troops.

In short, the Cuban invasion of April 17 never had a serious chance of success. It should not have happened. Experienced Cuban leaders had predicted a fiasco weeks before the attack was launched. But this march toward catastrophe won the specific military endorsement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the approval of most top White House and State Department political experts. On the basis of such recommendations, President Kennedy gave the orders for the doomed invasion to proceed.

Yet there is massive evidence indicating that neither the President nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff—nor possibly even CIA Director Allen W. Dulles—was fully aware at any time of the details of the plans being carried out by their subordinates in Florida, Louisiana, Central America and the Caribbean. These details made the difference between possible success and certain disaster.

THE MISTAKES THAT BROUGHT DEFEAT

If the President had known the full and appalling truth in time, it now seems likely that he would have corrected some of the glaring errors—or perhaps countermanded the offensive. What were some of these major misjudgments?

Acting on its assumption that Cubans would rise against Castro as soon as the invasion began, the CIA decided to commit virtually the entire striking force in one place.

Worse yet, influenced by political considerations, the CIA eliminated the anti-Castro organizations inside Cuba from the operational picture. This destroyed the very machinery that might have brought about Castro's downfall.

At the same time, the CIA ignored President Kennedy's directives excluding Batistianos—followers of Dictator Fulgencio Batista, who was overthrown by Castro in 1959—from the "Liberation Army." As a result, after the failure of the invasion, Castro was able to present to his television audiences more than 100 captured members of the rebel force who were known Batista followers. The group included several former police agents with criminal records—men hated by most Cubans, pro-Castro or anti-Castro.

The tangled story of the invasion that failed began late in May 1960, when anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in Florida set up the first centralized rebel organization—the Revolutionary Democratic Front.

The Movement of Revolutionary Recovery (MRR), which had been formed earlier by a group of onetime supporters of Castro, included some of his best military officers. They hoped to "salvage" the social and political revolution and to save it from the inroads of dictatorship and communism.

The MRR fighters excluded Batistianos, who had previously organized several anti-Castro factions in Miami. The most notorious of these was the private army of ex-Senator Rolando Masferrer, who had made himself infamous during the Castro revolution by carrying out a brutal campaign of repression in Oriente Province.

The MRR later joined with traditional Cuban political leaders in launching the Revolutionary Democratic Front. One member of the front was Lt. Manuel Artime Buesa, 28, a former official in an agrarian reform zone in Oriente under Castro. He was destined to be the man around whom much of the rebel tragedy revolved.

The front was pledged to the goals of democratic social revolution, but it was, on the whole, a rather conservative group. Its political appeal inside revolution-conscious Cuba was severely limited. Nevertheless, it was the best Cuban group that could be found, and so by the middle of July 1960, the Eisenhower administration decided that it should serve as the nucleus of the "Liberation Army."

The front purchased or leased several isolated farms in Florida to use as training grounds for volunteers. Certain American and Cuban corporations with interests in Cuba contributed much of the money needed for these preparations.

Most of the rebels were taught parade-ground drill and the use of M-1 rifles, while Castro was giving his militia tough mountain training and receiving the first shipments of heavy Soviet arms.

Soon after Guatemala's President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes broke relations with the Castro regime, the U.S. Government worked out a secret agreement with him, authorizing establishment of bigger training camps on Guatemalan soil. Richard B. Bissell, a deputy of Dulles, took command of the increasing elaborate operation at CIA headquarters in Washington. His chief field representative was Frank Bender, who had acquired guerrilla experience with the French underground during World War II.

Within 60 days after the United States took charge, Lieutenant Artime emerged as the favorite of the CIA planners. He had no military experience of any consequence, but his youth, his oratorical gifts, and his political views—an odd blend of revolutionary slogans and basic conservatism—appealed to Bissell and Bender.

The initial plan worked out by the CIA and Artime bore no resemblance to the final operation. It called for creation of 30 guerrilla-and-sabotage groups inside Cuba under orders to go into action at the moment rebel sea and air landings were made. Assaults by these units in 30 preselected areas were counted on to throw Cuba into such chaos and confusion that Castro would be unable to deploy his well-armed forces adequately to head off the invasion.

Already available in the Escambray Mountains of Cuba was an ill-armed but effective band of 200 or 300 anti-Castro fighters. These men—who might have been enlisted in the planned guerrilla-and-sabotage operation—had defied Castro for months. Castro had finally dislodged all the peasants in the area to prevent them from helping the guerrillas with food and weapons, and had set up roadblocks to halt the movement of supplies and volunteers to the hills.

POLITICS DESTROYS THE CUBAN UNDERGROUND

Here was a ready-to-fight anti-Castro force inside Cuba. All it needed from the CIA was food and weapons. But adequate aid never came. Why?

Survivors of this group who escaped to Florida said political considerations cost them CIA help. The Escambray commanders were reluctant to swear unquestioning allegiance to the Revolutionary Democratic Front. Therefore, they were seen as unwelcome rivals of the Miami group and left to fend for themselves until too late. Supplies were finally parachuted to them between December 1960 and March 1961, but by then the perimeter held by the underfed, inadequately armed guerrillas had shrunk perceptibly. The parachuted supplies fell into the hands of Castro's militiamen, and the Escambray operation was doomed.

Even with the loss of the Escambray Mountain fighters, other effective underground groups were growing increasingly active in Cuba. The principal clandestine organization—People's Revolutionary Movement—led by ex-Castro Minister of Public Works Manuel Ray, was attracting many prominent people.

Although the CIA knew of the Escambray Mountain guerrillas and the Cuban underground, it abandoned the initial plan to make use of these groups. The reasoning behind this change of plans is one of the fundamental mysteries of the whole Cuban undertaking. Two explanations have been given: political divisions in the anti-Castro forces, and the blind overconfidence of the CIA in the alternate single-landing plan which led to disaster.

While the neglected groups inside Cuba suffered from lack of supplies and direction, a deep division became apparent in the forces being trained by the CIA. Artime, the leader favored by the CIA, edged closer and closer to rightwing groups. There were even reports that he had become involved with Batistianos, the worst crime in the Cuban revolutionary demonology. The CIA did not withdraw support from Artime, however, and those who criticized the young leader—who now called himself captain—soon found themselves squeezed out.

As the struggle for control continued, Manuel Ray came from Cuba, demanding recognition and support for his Cuban underground. Ray arrived in the United States with a clear political program calling for continuation of the social revolution in Cuba, but under democratic leadership. A smear campaign was unleashed in Florida to present him as a "dangerous leftist" and the proponent of "Fidelismo without Fidel." Rightwing Cuban politicians and businessmen, who were worried about their confiscated property, passed along the word about "this dangerous man Ray." The CIA field agents went along with the anti-Ray spokesmen. Ray found that his underground fighters would not share in the financial aid given to other anti-Castro groups, nor receive the weapons and explosives they needed.

Ray explained over and over that his group favored a democratic, anti-Communist Cuba, but that it was unrealistic to expect that the clock could be turned back on some of Castro's social reforms. The nation could not regress to the social and economic status of the Batista days, he argued. Even when he and his companions cited pronouncements of the U.S. Government expressing sympathy for the pure goals of the Cuban social revolution, the response was shrugged shoulders.

Thus long before plans were ready to oust Premier Castro, a battle for the political future of Cuba was already raging in Miami hotel bars and rooms. The debate also divided men in the faraway training camps of the "Liberation Army." Because the CIA had power to offer or refuse aid to one or the other faction, the agency found itself in the position of a political arbiter.

It chose to back the rightwing groups.

This choice—which could influence the long-range foreign policy of the United States toward Cuba—was made without consulting the President or the State Department. With the decision to limit support to rightwing Cubans, the ICA assured the defeat of the planned anti-Castro invasion.

In Guatemala, the official policy of excluding Batistianos was never put into effect. Artime gave the San Román brothers, former Batista officers, high commands. Other Batistianos were streaming into the camps. Now the CIA took the position that the Batistianos were experienced military men and proven anti-Communists and therefore should not be barred from the "Liberation Army."

About 200 of the anti-Castro troops in Guatemala rebelled against this reversal and were imprisoned by the rightwing command. Most of them were subsequently released and returned to Miami, but the CIA kept 17 of them under heavy guard on an isolated island in Guatemala until after the invasion.

Manuel Ray demanded that the Bastistianos be weeded out of the anti-Castro army. He also asked for the full support of the Cuban underground. A representative of the Revolutionary Democratic Front signed a secret pact accepting Ray's conditions, and on March 20 the CIA-trained troops and the Cuban underground seemed ready to work together. Dr. José Miró Cardona, a candidate acceptable to both Ray and the Front, was named chairman of a joint Cuban Revolutionary Council, which promptly issued a general mobilization order. But under the surface appearance of order, confusion still prevailed.

In Miami, a team of top guerrilla leaders sat playing cards, working crossword puzzles and wondering why they had not been enlisted in the impending attack. All were former captains in Castro's forces, and several had gone through the U.S. Army's Jungle Warfare School in Panama. Their request for boats and weapons to use in a landing in their native Oriente province had brought them such inadequate equipment that they had abandoned the projected mission as suicidal. (The radio they were offered did not work, and a 50-caliber machine-gun issued to them did not fit its mount. The food supplies were totally inadequate. "Was somebody trying to send us to our death?" one of them asked incredulously.) Ignored by the CIA, they kept on playing cards.

In the last week of March, it was an open secret in Miami that the invasion was approaching and that somebody had decided on a one-thrust, do-or-die attack, despite the alarmed warnings of experts that the single landing would invite carnage, and court disaster.

Recruits were assembled every evening at the general staff building in Coral Gables, issued khaki uniforms and driven to the deactivated Marine Corps Air Base at nearby Opa-locka. From there they were flown to Guatemala in unmarked U.S. Air Force transports.

Families and friends gathered to bid them farewell and press into their hands paper bags with sandwiches and cold chicken. There was feverish activity at the Front's headquarters on Biscayne Boulevard. Doctors and nurses were leaving for the field hospitals. The whole movement could not have been more obvious to the Castro agents if the rebel volunteers had marched down Flagler Street with drums and fifes, and signs proclaiming, "Guatemala, Here We Come."

In these final days of preparation, President Kennedy ordered the Immigration and Naturalization Service to arrest ex-Senator Masferrer. (After the invasion failed, Masferrer was released on bail pending a hearing.) CIA Director Dulles assured inquiries that all Batistianos had been weeded out. Unknown to him, such Batista officers as the San Román brothers were then reconfirmed in their commands.

Ten days before the invasion, Captain Artime was given the top command by the CIA, which failed to consult Manuel Ray on this vital decision. This violated the secret agreement, and Ray considered quitting the Revolutionary Council. But then, in the interest of unity, he told his followers to go to the Guatemala training camps.

His men, however, got only as far as a farm near the Bauer Drive on the outskirts of Miami. About 120 of them were placed under guard there by Front and CIA agents, along with a contingent of officers who had escaped from a Cuban prison in December. Inexplicably, they were prevented from going to Guatemala.

At this very late stage, Ray was still confident that the underground would be called upon to play a major role in the forthcoming attack, though he had not been told when the invasion would occur.

Oddly enough, the Ray underground began receiving explosives and weapons from the CIA in the last few weeks before the invasion. Consequently, it launched a major sabotage campaign designed to soften up the defenses of the Castro regime before the big assault. They set on fire the big Hershey sugar mill and burned the huge El Encanto department store in Havana and a wholesale house in Santiago.

The underground's plans—which, unbelievably, were not coordinated with the invasion plans—called for a concentrated sabotage campaign in the second week of April, with Havana powerplants, major highways and railroads as the main targets.

The "National Co-ordinator" of the underground was smuggled out of Cuba and taken to New York for sessions with the Revolutionary Council. He was supplied with two tons of powerful C–4 plastic explosives and ordered back to Cuba. But neither he nor any other leader of the underground was told that the date for the invasion had already been set and that the invasion armada was being assembled in Puerto Cabezas in Nicaragua.

CASTRO'S "DESTROYED" AIR FORCE STRIKES

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff had approved the idea of carrying out the landings on the swampy coast of Ciénaga de Zapata, in the elongated Bay of Pigs. But not a bridge was blown up nor a railroad line destroyed to prevent Castro from bringing forces swiftly to this invasion point. The CIA, with supreme confidence in its plan, and determined to keep out political groups it did not favor, had neglected to inform the Cuban underground of the date or place of the landing.

The underground "co-ordinator" was fast asleep in a modest Miami home when the news of the invasion came at dawn of April 17. His voice broke when he asked me on the telephone at 5 a.m., "Do you really mean that an invasion has started without us?" It had indeed. Since midnight, rebel soldiers in leopard-spot camouflage uniforms had been pouring ashore from five Liberty ships, chartered by dummy operators for the CIA and the Revolutionary Council.

At daybreak, C–54 and C–46 transport planes, flying from Guatemala and Nicaragua, began dropping paratroopers over the Bay of Pigs swamp. Eight or nine rebel B–26 bombers and obsolete P–51 fighters flew cover over the beachhead.

By midmorning, however, it became horribly clear how badly the invasion planners had miscalculated the entire project. The tiny Castro air force—which was supposed to have been destroyed on the ground two days earlier by Guatemala-based B–26's painted with Cuban insignia, or to have defected at the news of the invasion—quickly gained control of the air. That was the beginning of the end of the beachhead.

What the rebels had momentarily gained by the element of surprise was promptly lost by their inability to follow up their initial success. Before noon of April 17, the Castro aircraft had sunk the Liberty ship carrying all the communications equipment, the entire fifth battalion of the invasion force, and stores of weapons. (These extra weapons had been brought for the guerrillas that the CIA expected to materialize in these remote marshes.)

In the first hours of combat, a rebel column had thrust almost 30 miles inland along a narrow road leading from the swamp toward the heartland of Cuba. But a battalion of Castro's well-trained militia from Cienfuegos was able to halt the surprised rebels long enough for heavy reinforcements to swing into battle.

These reinforcements, including Soviet-made tanks and heavy guns carried on flatbed trucks, were able to reach the beachhead area swiftly, using highways that might have been cut by the underground. Lacking any advance information, the underground fighters did nothing. The equally bewildered civilian population was mystified. And so, it seems, were the invasion troops themselves.

Testimony by many of the prisoners indicated that the invaders fully expected sea-and-air support by U.S. forces. The original plan seemingly called for participation in the invasion by U.S. aircraft and Navy ships, but 2 weeks before the attack, President Kennedy resolved to let the Cubans go it alone. Cuban rebel soldiers were not told of the change in strategy, except for Kennedy's statement in a news conference several days before the attack that no American would become involved in the anti-Castro enterprise. (The five-ship armada, however, was escorted by two U.S. destroyers as far as Grand Cayman Island.) This was the final ingredient in the inevitable defeat.

Even in the closing moments of this drama, the fantastic confusion that characterized the rebel undertaking from the moment of its inception was still apparent. Aboard a ship off the coast of Cuba, a rebel captain commanding a guerrilla force that was to land in his native Oriente Province unbelievingly read sealed orders instructing him to land in a province he hardly knew. He sailed away.

In a house near Miami, guarded by armed CIA agents, a virtually captive Cuban Revolutionary Council listened incredulously to radio newscasts narrating the tale of the disaster. An elderly man wept while staring at the duffel bag containing the field uniform he hoped to wear as he stepped ashore in Cuba to proclaim a rebel government.

In Caribbean waters all around Cuba, passing ships and yachts picked up exhausted and half-dead rebel infiltrators who had boarded small craft in Florida for commando landings to help a revolution that never had a chance.

In 72 hours, it was all over.

Chancery Explosion Is District of Columbia's New Blight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, a new kind of blight has struck Washington neighborhoods and turned quiet streets into vehicular battlegrounds. The blight is called the chancery explosion.

One month a fine old couple lives in the house next door. Next month it is sold to a foreign government for a chancery—the office building for the ambassador and his staff.

As the Washington (D.C.) Star pointed out yesterday, in a front-page article:

The curbs are marked for the exclusive use of the staff. When the spaces are full, diplomatic cars may park double in the streets, immune from the law.

And while United States Steel or IBM wouldn't stand a chance of getting a fine home zoned for office use, foreign countries have been most successful.

According to the Washington (D.C.) Star:

David M. Key, a retired Foreign Service officer and general manager of the American Foreign Service Association, appealed in person a month ago to the Chief of Protocol, Angier Biddle Duke. He also wrote Secretary of State Rusk.

Having served in several foreign capitals, he says that these cities may enforce local zoning laws and that the United States, to his knowledge, does not and should not try to ride over these laws.

In the capitals he has served in, the U.S. chanceries are in areas used for office buildings. The United States, he says, did not insist that the chanceries be next to or near to its embassies.

Since the United States is generally required, in locating its chanceries abroad, to observe the laws and zoning regulations applicable to business-type buildings in the capital cities of those nations with which diplomatic relations are maintained, such foreign nations should, in the interest of comity, observe the laws and zoning regulations with regard to the location of business-type buildings in the District of Columbia and locate chanceries in business areas rather than in residential areas to the detriment of such residential areas.

It seems to me that this is a matter deserving of immediate consideration by the Members of this body.

I include here the text of a House resolution I am introducing today, and the article from the Washington (D.C.) Star of August 13, 1961, to which I have referred:

HOUSE RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING THE UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that since the United States is generally required, in locating its chanceries abroad, to observe the laws and zoning regulations applicable to business-type buildings in the capital cities of those

nations with which diplomatic relations are maintained such foreign nations should, in the interest of comity, observe the laws and zoning regulations with regard to the location of business-type buildings in the District of Columbia and locate chanceries in business areas rather than in residential areas to the detriment of such residential areas.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 13, 1961]

CHANCERY EXPLOSION IS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S NEW BLIGHT

(By William Grigg)

A new kind of blight has struck Washington neighborhoods and turned quiet streets into vehicular battlegrounds.

The blight is called the "chancery explosion." It has well-to-do matrons muttering under their breath and retired admirals and generals up in arms.

One month a fine old couple live in the house next door. Next month it is sold to a foreign government for a chancery—the office building for the ambassador and his staff.

The curbs are marked for the exclusive use of the staff. When the spaces are full, diplomatic cars may park double in the streets, immune from the law.

A few years ago there was little trouble. Embassy staffs were small. They occupied a few rooms in the embassies. And there were fewer embassies.

Now, as Washington grows in importance, embassy staffs explode from their old offices. At the same time, a host of colonies suddenly become independent nations and set out to buy embassies and chanceries.

And while United States Steel or IBM wouldn't stand a chance of getting a fine Northwest home zoned for office use, foreign countries have been most successful.

Neighbors enter the battle before the District Board of Zoning Adjustment to no avail, in most cases.

Before 1958, zoning officials point out, residents could not even do that. Foreign countries could buy buildings and do what they wanted with them. Regulations adopted in 1958 changed that slightly.

Since 1958, a total of 20 applications have been made to the board for exceptions to permit the construction of chanceries or the use of homes for chanceries in areas zoned residential.

The board has denied two. Two others were withdrawn by the applicants.

Residents have attempted to fight the board's rulings in courts but in each case have failed.

Economics, the psychology of status seeking and the desires of the State Department conspire against the citizens' groups.

A real estate agent explained, "The economics are overpowering. The seller gets a better price than from purchasers who would use the building as homes.

"The foreign country gets a building for a price lower than prices for comparable space in a commercially zoned area. The country also gets the prestige of a fine home at a good address.

"That impresses visitors who come to the offices or to parties."

POSITION OF UNITED STATES

The State Department explained its position in the case of Brazil's application to use 4510 42d Street NW., site of the Washington Home for Foundlings, for its chancery:

"The District of Columbia was originally created not as a residential area but as the seat of the U.S. Government, with the thought in mind that foreign countries would send their diplomatic representatives here."

The late James E. Schwab cast the sole vote against Brazil in the five-man board. "Unless the board applies to this appeal the same test it would apply to similar use by a nonprofit organization, the board will," he said, "as a result of the precedent established, lose actual control over the location of chanceries in residential areas."

Mr. Schwab's prediction has been proved wrong twice.

BOARD BALKS

The Board balked recently when asked to permit Ghana a chancery at 2907 Ellicott Terrace NW. An earlier application for the use of the same address by West Germany had been withdrawn before the hearing. The Board found the Ghana chancery "not compatible" with the terrace's homes.

Vigorous neighborhood action also fought an attempt to establish a chancery for Gabon at 2129 Bancroft Place NW. this year. The Board ruled that, with no off-street parking provided for chancery workers and visitors, the application should be denied.

The plucky Bancroft residents' success against Gabon came just after a battle against the Cameroun Republic.

The Republic wanted to use 2128 Bancroft as a chancery. That address and 2130 had been used as offices of the government of Chile, but neighbors said the buildings had reverted to residential status when Chile moved out.

INJUNCTION DISSOLVED

The neighbors obtained an injunction, saw it dissolved a few days later. Like many recent cases, residents got a geography lesson, little more.

Neighbors fought the Netherlands Government when it wanted to build a $3 million chancery at 4200 Linnean Avenue, near Upton Street NW., and failed. Waverly Taylor, Inc., then managed to get a District Court restraining order but it was dissolved.

The Czech chancery at 1612 Tilden Street NW. stirred neighbors who claimed the Board failed to protect the integrity of the area. One resident said the Czechs were likely to use the building for "nondiplomatic activities customarily carried on under diplomatic guise." He meant spying.

But District Court found the Board acted "reasonably."

Thus, the "blight" advances. Often it advances outside the control of the Board. Foreign governments with property established before 1958 can do pretty much what they want to with their buildings.

IMMUNITY GIVEN

Governments with property bought since then still retain a great measure of immunity. Fire laws, for instance, can't be enforced.

Kalorama citizens are now fighting with their backs to the wall. They list 62 chanceries and 20 embassies in their small triangle bounded by Rock Creek Park, Connecticut and Massachusetts Avenues NW.

Some, of course, fight, fail, and flee.

Mrs. Maryland McCormick, widow of Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, strongly protested the granting of a request for the establishment of a chancery for Mali at 2130 R Street NW.

FIGHTS GO ON

A few months after her protest failed, she negotiated with Cyprus for the sale of her home in the same block. The sale went through when the board agreed it could be used as embassy and chancery.

Others are still fighting.

David M. Key, a retired Foreign Service officer and general manager of the American Foreign Service Association, appealed in person a month ago to the Chief of Protocol, Angier Biddle Duke. He also wrote Secretary of State Rusk.

Mr. Key said he and a local lawyer told them there was no proper objection to embassies, of whatever nationality, because they are residences. But the office of the Ambassador and other officials, he said, ought to be treated like any other business office.

Mr. Key does not feel he achieved anything.

Gover M. Koockogey, president of the Kalorama Citizens' Association, this past week tried a new offensive. He got the North Washington Council of Citizens' Associations to approve a request to the Zoning Board, the District Commissioners, and the Senate and House District Committees.

A BASIC REQUEST

The request is simple: Enforce the zoning laws, giving applications for chanceries the same breaks, but no more, than applications for other offices.

Mr. Key says if the council's request is granted, there would be no logical cause for upset international relations.

Having served in several foreign capitals, he says that these cities may enforce local zoning laws and that the United States, to his knowledge, does not and should not try to ride over these laws.

In the capitals he has served in, the U.S.'s chanceries are in areas used for office buildings. The United States, he says, did not insist that the chanceries be next to or near to its Embassies.

THREE HEARINGS SCHEDULED

On Wednesday, hearings on three more chanceries will be held before the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

The owner of 3421 Massachusetts Avenue NW. will appeal on behalf of the Republic of Sudan to establish a chancery there. The owner of 7119 16th Street NW. will make a similar appeal for the Republic of Upper Volta.

The Republic of Panama will ask permission to establish its chancery at Woodland Drive and 29th Street NW.

Judge Russell E. Train of the U.S. Tax Court here got his first notice of the hearing in a news report Tuesday in the Star.

THE JUDGE'S STATEMENT

Next day he wrote the Board: "I fail to understand why neither I nor any other neighbors insofar as I have been able to determine have been served with an official notice of the hearings as required by law.

"There are five [embassies] within one block of my own house. All of this has been accepted in good grace by myself and my neighbors but always with the firm understanding that only embassy residences are involved and never chanceries.

"Should the application be granted, the existing difficulties reportedly encountered by the State Department in assisting foreign governments to find suitable embassy residences will be immeasurably aggravated. It will become clear that assurances to the effect that only embassy residences are involved are meaningless.

"I will state now in all frankness that my own attitude and, I feel sure, that of my neighbors, will change from one of friendly acceptance to one of hostility."

Jobs Go Begging in Our Dynamic Economy: Newspapers Scratch for Recruits—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the basic theme of the study "Employment in Our Dynamic Economy," conducted by the Republican policy committee is that automation produces

more jobs than it displaces, albeit it is difficult to identify the newly created jobs because they are frequently in fields seemingly unrelated to the field in which the automation has occurred. Yet, any concentrated study will reveal where these new jobs are and common observation shows that economic advancement creates jobs for millions.

My good friends of the press frequently ask where are all these new jobs going abegging. Well, some of them apparently have been right under their noses. I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the August 8, 1961, Christian Science Monitor entitled "Newspapers Scratch for Recruits."

NEWSPAPERS SCRATCH FOR RECRUITS—I

(NOTE.—American journalism offers one of the most challenging opportunities to young people embarking on their careers. But newspapers are having trouble in filling vacancies with topnotch recruits. Theodore Peterson, dean of the College of Journalism and Communications at the University of Illinois, gives some of the reasons for this situation in two articles written for the Christian Science Monitor.)

(By Theodore Peterson)

One day last spring, a journalism graduate at a midwestern university told his dean he would like a job with a large daily about 500 miles away. As soon as the newspaper's personnel manager got a note from the dean, he phoned the young man to come for an expense-paid interview. He hired the young man on the spot, for $100 a week, and agreed to let him take time off this summer for a European tour with the university's glee club.

None of that graduate's journalism classmates had to take the first job to come along. For again this spring, schools of journalism had far more jobs than graduates.

Behind that situation lie a couple of minor ironies of the past decade.

One is that the mass media, which have done an efficient job of selling soap, soup, and cereals to the consumer, have failed miserably in selling their own career opportunities to the Nation's youth.

Another is that journalism enrollments have been skidding steadily downward at the very time schools of journalism have been shucking off their vocational training for a respectable professionalism.

SHORTAGE STUDIED

Whenever editors and publishers gather, staff recruitment is likely to come up for discussion. The shortage of newspaper talent is so acute that the Wall Street Journal has set up a public service organization to study and help solve the problem.

More than two-thirds of the dailies in the U.S. regard a personnel shortage in their news departments as a leading problem, according to a study done for the Wall Street Journal. Newspapers need 3,500 new workers a year, about 1,000 more than the total annual crop of journalism graduates. Even of that crop, newspapers are getting an ever smaller share. Advertising, broadcasting, and public relations are claiming a high proportion of graduates. But those fields also are hit by the manpower shortage.

High school students are indifferent for the most part to the genuine opportunities in journalism. Only about one in five of those working for their school newspapers and yearbooks intend to make journalism a career. The huge majority of boys and girls at a conference of the Columbia Scholastic Press Association in 1959 saw journalism as a low-paying occupation, lacking in prestige, and not conducive to a good family life.

INTEREST FADES

Even many journalism graduates who go into newspaper work lose interest after a few years. Ohio State University questioned members of the 1953 graduating class of representative schools of journalism to find out what they were doing 6 years after graduation. About 5 of every 10 had gone straight from the classroom into the newspaper city room. But only 3 of every 10 were still there 6 years later.

Although publishers realize they are losing out on the manpower hunt, so far they have done more talking than acting. True, 95 percent of the papers belonging to the Inland Daily Press Association have some continuing program of recruitment, but many programs are little more than gestures.

Newspapers are far more aggressive in seeking their share of students already committed to journalism than in encouraging new ones to enter the field. More and more, newspaper personnel managers are making an annual swing among the journalism schools in search of talent. Some 25 recruiters from New York to Los Angeles visited the Missouri School of Journalism last year. At least one Midwest daily sends its representatives 500 miles away in its talent hunt.

NO PINCH—YET

Some editors, especially of metropolitan dailies with national reputations, say they feel no personnel pinch. "We've always had our pick of the crop," one such editor remarked recently, "and the job hunters have always come to see us." But the editor is afraid that situation will not continue, so he has visited schools of journalism in his area to get acquainted with their directors and their programs.

Many an editor who once argued that all journalism graduates were hopeless incompetents and their professors academic charlatans now is meekly calling on journalism schools to ask if please, they can find him a good reporter or copy desk man.

The heads of schools of journalism are embarrassed at the number of times they must say "no" to such requests. In recent years, they have been listing 3, 4, as high as 10 job offers for every graduate.

For in the past dozen years, their enrollments have dropped alarmingly. The precise extent of the drop is hard to determine, but all studies agree it is large.

The 73 journalism schools replying to an annual survey in 1948 had a total enrollment of 16,619; the 101 schools reporting last fall had a total of 11,390. Enrollments in all journalism schools fell by about 49 percent between 1948 and 1957, according to a study by the Associated Press managing editors. Another study showed that enrollments of 10 representative schools had dropped by about 56 percent in that same period.

Fiscal Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials, one from the Washington Post of August 13 gives the typical "line" advocated by those supporting "backdoor" spending.

The other, from the Muncie Star, gives a good explanation why we should not resort to this measure:

FISCAL FOLLY

Remember the good old days when the dollar was worth almost 60 cents? Well, those days have long since been gone and the systematic devaluation of the dollar has just about become an established fact. The American taxpayer, when he thinks about it at all, seemingly accepts it as a way of life. Yet that fact of life, reflected in this national debt of almost $300 billion, already costs taxpayers more than $8 billion a year in interest alone.

Testifying before the Senate-House Finance Committee prior to being confirmed as secretary of the treasury, C. Douglas Dillon said, "Everything we do depends on having a sound economy, which, in turn, means having a sound fiscal system." A balanced budget, he said, is "essential for national security." Yet 3 months later Dillon assured taxpayers that the administration's spending orgy was no cause for alarm, and he described the expected fiscal deficit as "entirely appropriate."

The fact is that inflation has become a way of life simply because for almost 30 years politicians have been wed to the illusion that it is good for the economy. They have sold the public on the notion that it is a necessary stimulant for keeping away business doldrums. Not even our frightening loss of gold reserves, our balance of payments deficit, high-priced, uncompetitive products—not even these necessary byproducts of inflation have discouraged our fiscal follies.

The only reason the United States has not yet been the victim of runaway inflation, like France and Germany previously, is the ability of our economy to function despite impediments erected by the Government, to shrug off most political manipulation. But for all its industrial might, our economy can not withstand forever every assault made on it in the name of New Deal economics. Unless the Federal Government sharply curtails its spending policies and unless it retires part of its national debt each year, the Nation sooner or later will face a crisis of immeasurable and perhaps unmanageable proportions.

BORROWING TO SAVE

It is highly gratifying that the Senate has upheld the principle of long-range foreign aid authority in the initial test. Defeat of the Byrd amendment, which would have required annual appropriations, does not necessarily mean that an adequate borrowing authorization will have clear sailing. But the decisive 56-to-39 vote by which the amendment was turned down attests a welcome understanding by legislators of the importance of the 5-year commitment power.

That importance is, simply, in the added effectiveness and efficiency which should be possible with continuity. With annual appropriations, projects in underdeveloped countries are too often on a hand-to-mouth basis. This makes for waste. It deprives our aid program of the leverage it needs to induce other governments to plan thoroughly, institute national discipline, and commit their own resources on a country-wide basis.

Rather ominously, soundings in the House indicate a somewhat closer division between proponents and opponents of long-range authority. Here President Kennedy will have to use his utmost persuasion and charm. The borrowing authority that he seeks is not a new phenomenon—it has been used over more than 30 years by more than a score of agencies, with conspicuous success and without any raids on the Treasury.

Combined with more selectivity in the aid program, it will help avoid the lack of coordination that Congressmen complain results in money down the drain.

There are few if any more compelling tasks before the country than to make the economic aid program more effective. Foreign aid is a burden, yes; but it is far less of a burden, proportionately, than it was a decade ago. It is small indeed compared with the burden of armaments—and Congress has added several necessary billions to that burden with scarcely a murmur.

Yet if we are fortunate and a clash of arms is averted, it is in the countries where people are struggling for dignity and a better life in freedom that the contest for the kind of world we want to see may well be decided. That is the fundamental and persuasive justification for granting the President what he has asked.

Dr. Burns' Voice of Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has established the practice of calling in theoretical experts in various fields to advise them in their consistent effort to create a world of utter confusion.

The collection of experts that President Kennedy has developed in his Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Dr. Walter Heller, have been busy explaining to the country, and presumably the President, economic theories which are intended to explain our problems and offer a magic solution under the general prescription of centralization of government and restriction of individual economic liberty.

We, as a Nation, have been fortunate that Dr. Arthur F. Burns, who served as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has seen fit to challenge the exaggerated economic theories now reigning supreme in Washington and in doing so has provided a true public service by bringing a reasonable voice to bear in the discussion of the American economic position.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of Saturday, August 12, entitled "Dr. Burns' Voice of Reason" which provides sound, constructive comments and interpretation of the conflicting economic views as expressed by Dr. Burns, a practical, sound economist, and Dr. Heller:

DR. BURNS' VOICE OF REASON

For several months Dr. Arthur F. Burns, who was Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has been engaged in a running debate with the members of President Kennedy's council, headed by Dr. Walter W. Heller.

Dr. Heller and his council expound the familiar theory that there is a growing gap between what we are producing and what we ought to produce [Dr. Burns calls it the theory of neostagnation]. Their remedy is that the Government should spend more money to stimulate the economy and that, in their own words, "public expenditures of high social utility ought not to be deterred by fears that the economy will soon be up against its capacity to produce"—in other words, fears of inflation.

The Heller formula is made to order for politicians who, having promised big spending programs in exchange for votes, are now able to dignify their pet programs with a semblance of economic justification.

Dr. Burns' latest volley in this exchange appears in the current monthly survey of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, and deserves the widest reading.

Using the council's own figures and reasoning, Dr. Burns finds that "with one very minor exception, the American economy of our generation has succeeded in escaping from its chronic, persistent slack only during wartime [the Korean war]."

This, as he says, is "a caricature." These are the very years in which American borrowing and spending, both Government and private, have grown faster than ever before in peacetime. How then can Dr. Heller's council say that more spending would have reduced the so-called gap?

Federal spending alone has shown a relentless and alarming tendency to pyramid year after year; the expected figure for 1962, Dr. Burns points out, is already $7.8 billion ahead of 1961 and seems destined to grow even more. Spending in 1961 was $5 billion ahead of 1960, and so on. The boom of 1959–60 was short, he said, not because the Government spent too little, as the council alleges, but because "spending kept climbing long after the recession had ended, with the cash deficit soaring to an annual rate of over $15 billion in the first quarter of 1959, which caused fears of inflation, thereby forcing an abrupt shift of policy."

This lesson, Dr. Burns says, should not be lost on us. "It is precisely because the ways in which we fight recession have longer run consequences that we must not permit compassion for the unemployed to lead us into actions which, while immediately beneficial, may seriously injure the entire population a little later. Since defense outlays must go up, other programs should be cut. Since our economy is recovering and employment is again rising, we can with good conscience subdue our impatience for economic improvement.

"Let us not exaggerate the shortcomings of our economy or belittle the achievements of the past," he writes. "In the postwar period our economy has extended, if not improved on, its historic rate of growth. Perhaps the greatest economic triumph of our generation, although we too often show little appreciation of it, is the reduction of the swings of the business cycle and the blunting of their impact on the lives and fortunes of individuals. We should strive to do still better in the future."

Dr. Burns' voice is that of reason amid panic, and confidence amid uncertainty.

Death of a Farm Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of Al Loveland, of Janesville, Iowa, on Monday, August 7, 1961. Albert J. Loveland was one of the best-known Iowans among the farmers of Iowa. I knew him as a personal friend for more than 10 years, and all who knew him held him in the very highest respect. Even those who violently disagreed with him on issues never doubted his sincereity or integrity or his courageous dedication to what he believed was right. The deep sympathy of all Iowans is extended to the loved ones he left behind. I know the outstanding life he led; his outstanding public service and his noble outlook on life will always be a source of consolation to them. He was one of the best men I ever knew.

Following is an editorial from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, of August 10, 1961:

DEATH OF A FARM LEADER

Albert J. Loveland, Janesville, Iowa, farmer who died Monday, was the man who helped other Iowa farmers produce for World War II.

He has been interested in farm programs since the first corn loan. He had served as township and county chairman of the old Agricultural Adjustment Administration before he became a member of the State field force in 1939. He became chairman of the State committee in 1941 and served until 1948.

He later was an Undersecretary of Agriculture in Washington, an unsuccessful Democratic nominee for U.S. Senator, State administrator for the Office of Price Stabilization and a supporter of Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan and President Harry Truman.

His most important job, however, probably was his work as State AAA head in the days when the emphasis shifted from reduction to production in farming because of the war.

Al Loveland was a pleasant, genial, and loyal man. He was loyal not only to farming but to his own farm at Janesville. He always went back to it to "pick a little corn" as he said after his senatorial race or to perform some other farming task.

Calm in the Face of Soviet Threats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. William S. White, that appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Friday, August 11, 1961.

The indicated column follows:

CALM IN THE FACE OF SOVIET THREATS—PRESIDENT'S UNMOVING ATTITUDE VIEWED AS MAKING KHRUSHCHEV MORE SHRILL

(By William S. White)

The dialog across the world between President Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union is falling into fixed and vastly different tone patterns, though Mr. Khrushchev's pattern is in two predictable parts.

The Russian's is alternately the voice of coaxing and of strident threats. Mr. Kennedy's has now settled into the voice of a calm, unmoved determination which, among other things, is beginning to make his antagonist sound a little shrill, a little unsure.

Mr. Kennedy, these days, is refusing to respond either to Mr. Khrushchev's bait of

a heavy reasonableness, or to his inevitable second-day mood, in which he brandishes new atomic weapons of unthinkable frightfulness.

Always, whatever the elderly Russian says and however he says it, the younger American says the same thing: We will neither give up nor negotiate any of our basic rights in Berlin. We will negotiate, more or less anywhere and more or less anytime, on anything and everything that is truly negotiable. We seek no war and will go to any honorable length to avoid it. If fight we must we will fight a war—not simply for Berlin, but for Western Allied rights in that last outpost of the free world, that token of the Western right to stay in Europe itself.

Mr. Kennedy's most recent press conference sharply illustrated the deeply conscious policy of the U.S. Government to talk softly—and not even to mention that big stick which all the same it is carrying. "Think of it always; speak of it never," Winston Churchill once said of what the then hard-pressed allies had in store for Hitler's Nazis.

Our line now is about that—"Think of it always; speak of it never." Thus, the President has adopted a manner which though not jaunty is deliberately casual. He refused to dignify by so much as an indirect comment Mr. Khrushchev's latest threat, that the Soviet Union might build a rocket having explosive power equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT.

It is, of course, impossible to tell from this side of the world what effect this cool ignoring of one of the most inflammatory speeches in all the cold war may have had on Mr. Khrushchev himself.

It is reckoned here, however, that if all human experience, among Western men anyhow, has any meaning at all, the President's attitude has largely broken this latest of Russian propaganda spears.

For Western peoples at least know that any man who in any confrontation with another begins to use an almost hysterical violence—of words—is rarely speaking from strength, but usually either from frustration or unease.

Bound up in the President's policy of treating Mr. Khrushchev's worst outbursts with the thunders of silence is something more than a mere propaganda tactic. (It is welcomed, too, by the leading politicians in both parties here.) For in plain truth, Mr. Kennedy is the spokesman for great power and for a country already deeply with him in this trouble.

He has no need to terrify his own people into supporting him. Moreover, he knows there never was any future in trying to outshout any Communist, whether a two-bit cell organizer or the present Czar of all the Russians. Somebody, in any contest, has got to have some sense of responsibility. And, so far in human history, that somebody also usually wins in the end.

Indeed, there are very high officials here who believe the main effect of Mr. Khrushchev's bouts of violence is to destroy his alternating claims that he is a reasonable fellow at heart. And they even believe that the uglier he talks the less likely he is to push the Berlin crisis over the abyss into war.

An Opinion on Borrowing Authority in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is now debating the Mutual Security Act of 1961. The question of financing the foreign aid program through the granting of "borrowing authority" is the uppermost issue of this debate. The Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram, in its August 3, 1961, edition, carried an editorial entitled "Each Year a Coffin Nail" which in my opinion correctly reflects the views of the voters in my district on this issue. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the editorial "Each Year a Coffin Nail":

EACH YEAR A COFFIN NAIL

The foreign aid program is vital to the security of the United States. The 5-year borrowing authority to finance this program is not. It does, in fact, represent a serious danger to the future of democratic government.

In the coming weeks Congress will decide not only the question of foreign aid, but also whether or not it will sacrifice its and the people's right to control such programs in the future.

Congress has put itself in this unfortunate position in which a compromise may be the only satisfactory answer. Because it consistently has put off debate and passage of the annual foreign aid measure until late each year, Congress has made it virtually impossible for the program's administrators to properly plan and carry out its goals in the most effective manner.

Every year the State Department, the ICA and other agencies involved have been left in the air as the fiscal year ended because Congress had not yet acted upon their budgets for the coming year. It was not only impossible to plan for the future, but it was almost impossible to effectively administer the current program.

Thus arose the plea by believers in foreign aid that long-range planning be permitted in order that a better job could be done to combat the spread of communism and assist underdeveloped nations achieve a way of life compatible to modern civilization.

The need for this ability to formulate long-range plans is evident, but the request has gone beyond sensible and safe bounds. An overall foreign-aid authorization should be made for a period of perhaps 5 years in order to establish a sound program. There is no need, however, for appropriating funds for a 5-year period. This would only increase bureaucratic power at the expense of the people's power as expressed by Congress.

Should Congess add this retreat from its prerogatives to the many it has taken in the past, it will open the door wider to future inroads on the American democratic system by a strong centralized government. An America without an effective Congress is no America at all.

Proponents of the 5-year appropriation plan argue that it would make the foreign-aid program more efficient. This may be, but efficiency at the sacrifice of the people's power to review, if not to alter or cancel, is an efficiency that strongly resembles the centralized state systems which the American people profess to abhor.

Those who claim that efficiency would result from the 5-year plan tend to ignore the fact that a mistake once started would be difficult to stop. At least under the present system, as bad as it may be, there is a possibility of changing a plan or correcting a mistake once a year. And while quicker action can be taken by one man or a few men, there is no place in the history of man to show that, in the long run, this form of government is better for the well-being of the people.

It also should be remembered that the efficiency or inefficiency of the foreign aid program is not solely the function of Congress. In many cases, it is the administration of the program that is inefficient. This will not be corrected by financing on a 5-year basis.

It is generally agreed that something better than the present system must be found. The best answer, from the standpoint of the American people would be to have Congress act promptly each year to finance for the next year a portion of long-range program previously determined by the administration and authorized by Congress. This would provide flexibility as well as promote efficiency while maintaining the people's control over their future.

If a compromise is necessary it should be one that will continue some elements of the people's power while granting leeway by the program's administration.

This could be done through a 5-year authorization combined with a 2- or 3-year borrowing authority rather than the requested 5 years. The 5-year authorization for the program would grant sufficient time for the administrators to plan ahead from 1 year to the next, and a 2-year appropriation would give them greater assurance than they have at present that the money will be forthcoming. At the same time, the people, through Congress, would still retain some of their right to alter or correct the program as the situation might warrant.

The cry now is for efficiency. Efficiency in every aspect of government. Instead of trying to instill a sense of efficiency in men, however, the attempt is being made to instill efficiency through centralized government. This has not worked for long in the past, and it won't work in the future. Every loss of the people's power to make the basic decisions is another nail in the coffin of democratic government.

A Time for Austerity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in his inaugural address, President Kennedy's most widely acclaimed passage was:

Ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

I submit, Mr. President, that in view of the circumstances which have arisen since that noble declaration of January 20, 1961, that it is time for the Kennedy administration itself to heed this clarion call.

I think sufficient demonstration has been given that the people of America are ready and willing to do what is necessary to preserve our freedoms. However, it seems to me that the administration and the Congress have acted at cross-purposes with the President's admonition to the people.

Nowhere have I found evidence that the Congress or the administration is willing to take that first, vital step demonstrating to the people of America that we must now take "first things first" and establish a system of priorities on nondefense government spending.

This is illustrated most pointedly in a recent editorial in one of our South Dakota daily newspapers, the Madison Daily Leader, in an editorial entitled "A Time for Austerity."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME FOR AUSTERITY

The alacrity with which Congress is responding to the President's call for strengthening our defenses will impress the free world, especially our European allies. But how about the lesser nations?

We are parading our power. But in this nuclear age power has ominous connotations for the people in the smaller countries. Many of them already look on us as a colossus, an extravagant colossus, even a nation of pampered playboys. They are inclined to wonder about the ruggedness of our people. Some even regard us as a nation gone soft and are not too eager to aline with us. Our high standard of living arouses their wonder but hardly their admiration.

And their confident admiration is what we need to inspire. It would be of great importance to us if we could restore their faith in our ability to recapture the fortitude by which our pioneers built this land.

But when these little people look toward Washington, what do they see? Preparations for tremendous spending. But they hear no pay-as-we-go talk. They remember President Kennedy's exhortation to Americans to ask what they can do for their country, but they hear no hint of any austerity program.

If they saw an America tightening its belt, uniting for whatever sacrifices may lie ahead, our stock would soar with the Latin Americans, with the Africans, with many as-yet neutral Asian nations. Even the British might be drawn closer to us; the British understand the uses of austerity.

Back of all this is an even graver question. Can we hope to win the great world struggle in which we are engaged, and still keep all our luxuries? Such an attitude could bring us a tragic awakening.

Shirley Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star yesterday—August 13—published an editorial entitled, "Good Shirley Compromise." It hailed the agreement reached by Federal and Virginia State officials for widening of Shirley Highway from four to eight lanes, and suggested that anyone who doubts the urgency of the project "take a drive over the highway during any rush hour—or try to." Reading it, anyone who has ever undergone that drive can only say, "Amen."

As the editorial said, this was a true compromise. Each side receded from its previous position, in the interests of easing the burden of commuters compelled to travel Shirley to and from their place of daily work. All concerned are to be complimented for their determination to work for the public good.

Those of us who have been concerned with finding ways to ease the bumper-to-bumper jams on Shirley Highway now are waiting anxiously for these officials to return to Congress with specific proposals. Enabling legislation then can be pushed to prompt enactment. We are confident this will be soon, and that the legislation will be approved before we adjourn sine die.

Also in yesterday's Star was an item concerning another phase of the Shirley Highway problem—the expeditious movement of rapid-transit buses when the highway is widened. We hope this problem can be solved as satisfactorily as the basic highway dispute appears to have been settled.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial and the news item from the Washington Sunday Star for August 13, to which I have referred, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GOOD SHIRLEY COMPROMISE

Rush-hour victims of the daily traffic congestion on Shirley highway will hail the sensible compromise relief plan worked out by Federal and Virginia officials. Each side has made concessions and thus made possible an agreement to add four lanes to the four already trying futilely to cope with the morning and evening bumper-to-bumper processions. More drastic proposals have been laid aside for future consideration, so that a start can be made soon on a program for immediate relief.

There has been too much delay on this start already, because of a deadlock between the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the Virginia department of highways over Virginia's plan for paralleling Shirley with a second expressway from Woodbridge to the Potomac shore. There had been disagreement, furthermore, as to what Virginia's share of the cost of any improvements should be. Now, happily, Virginia has decided not to press at this time for a second expressway and to support instead the widening of Shirley to eight lanes. In turn, the Federal Government has said it would pay 95 percent of the cost of the widening, provided Virginia takes over maintenance and supervision of the improved highway. State officials have accepted this proposal.

We concur with Federal Roads Director Whitton that the situation on Shirley has become so critical that action by Congress at this session to authorize this project is justified. And if any member of Congress doubts the urgency of the undertaking, we suggest that he take a drive over the highway during any rush-hour period—or try to.

SHIRLEY BUSES MAY GET LANES

Exclusive bus lanes on the new, improved Shirley Highway now being planned were suggested yesterday in an agreement of cooperation between the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the National Capital Transportation Agency.

The agreement, emphasizing coordination of planning for mass transit in connection with widening of Shirley Highway, was announced by Secretary of Commerce Hodges.

One aspect of the agreement is to consider recommending that Virginia highway officials provide exclusive bus lanes for express transit service during rush hours once the Shirley Highway is widened from the four to eight lanes.

A few weeks ago Virginia and Bureau of Public Roads officials agreed that Shirley should be widened by four lanes and brought up to interstate highway standards.

Yesterday's agreement followed talks between C. Darwin Stolzenbach, administrator of NCTA, and Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator.

Natural Gas Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, not long ago I received a letter from Mayor Middleton, of Bowling Green, Mo., pointing out problems encountered under the present law respecting natural gas rates. Because of my concern in this matter, I joined Senator CARROLL as a cosponsor of S. 1946. It is my hope that action can be taken in amending the Natural Gas Act to better protect the consumer. However, amending the act to eliminate tentative increases subject to refund or amending the act to prevent tentative increases subject to refund while another tentative increase is in effect, will not solve the entire problem. Action must also be taken to expedite consideration of applications while retaining thorough examination. This may require more manpower as well as reorganization.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from Mayor Middleton and also a report from Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, concerning the letter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF BOWLING GREEN,
Bowling Green, Mo., June 6, 1961.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: I, as mayor of Bowling Green, am well aware of the problems of our local distributor of natural gas, the Bowling Green Gas Co. Mr. Hood, the manager, has operated this plant for a number of years, and the public relations of the company are good. However, they are faced with the same problem as all other distributors of natural gas; that is the continuous increase in their cost of gas purchased which is directly affecting literally millions of people, and they want to know why some settlement fair to all concerned cannot be reached.

Under the Natural Gas Act as it is now written, the pipeline companies are permitted to put into effect proposed rates under bond until the Commission can finally determine what the fair rate should be. The local company has no alternative but to pass on to their customers this increase charged them by the pipeline company, the result being that even though these rates are being collected under bond it's causing a severe hardship on the utility and some dissatisfaction among their customers, and I, as mayor of Bowling Green, would appreciate any effort on your part either by an amendment of the Natural Gas Act or by some method which would relieve this bottleneck that now exists in the Federal Power Commission.

The gas company informs me that when and if there ever is a final determination reached on these rate cases that it would be a tremendous job to properly refund these excess charges, if any, back to their customers. They, themselves, in the 29 years of their local operation have never increased

rates to their customers except in an amount which equalized the additional cost of their gas purchases, and if these increases continue to pile one on another this refund problem becomes greater.

As a representative of the citizens of Bowling Green I would appreciate any effort on your part that might in the end solve this problem.

Yours very truly,
W. B. MIDDLETON, *Mayor.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, July 20, 1961.

Hon. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: This is with reference to your letter dated June 26, 1961, enclosing a letter dated June 6, 1961, from Hon. W. B. Middleton, mayor of the city of Bowling Green, Mo. Mayor Middleton seeks action to expedite rate determinations by this Commission and thus overcome the problem of excess charges collecetd subject to refund.

The Bowling Green Gas Co., which distributes natural gas in the city of Bowling Green, Mo., obtains its natural gas requirements from Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. In 1954, Panhandle Eastern filed a rate increase in the rates to be charged the Bowling Green Gas Co. and other customers. Following a period of suspension, the increased rates became effective subject to refund as provided by the Natural Gas Act. Hearings in that proceeding have been concluded and the matter was decided by the Commission's opinion (No. 344) and order determining issues and directing rate filing, issued April 27, 1961. The company filed an application for rehearing of such opinion and order, and, by further order of the Commission issued June 26, 1961, such application was denied.

In 1958, 1959, and 1960, Panhandle Eastern filed further systemwide rate increases with this Commission each of which, among other things, proposed further increases in the rate to be charged the Bowling Green Gas Co. Each of these rate increases was suspended and thereafter at the end of such suspenison periods became effective subject to refund in the manner provided by the Natural Gas Act. Hearings on these three cases are now in progress.

This Commission has no jurisdiction over rates covering sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale. It has no jurisdiction over rates charged by a local distributing company to ultimate consumers. Such rates are generally under the jurisdiction of State or local regulatory authority. Thus, refunds made pursuant to orders issued by this Commission are made by pipeline companies to their local distributing company customers and other wholesale customers. The distribution of such refunds by the local companies to the ultimate consumers is made in the manner and to the extent as may be ordered by the regulatory authority having jurisdiction over such local companies. For example, in 1956, pursuant to an order of this Commission, Panhandle Eastern refunded about $39,476,000 to its wholesale customers. The proportionate amount refunded to the Bowling Green Gas Co. was $31,443. The distribution of the refund which Bowling Green received was presumably made in accordance with rulings of the Missouri Public Service Commission.

The Commission realizes that increases in the pipeline rates over which it has jurisdiction are frequently passed on to ultimate consumers through increases granted to the distributing companies by the local commissions having jurisdiction over such companies. Each increased rate is carefully and completely examined as expeditiously as possible through the medium of investigation of a company's books, records and operations, and public hearings or settlement conferences following investigation by the staff of the Commission. Only such increases are allowed as are proven to be justified. The applications are being processed as fast as practicable, with the available staff, consistent with a thorough examination.

Legislation is presently pending in Congress which would prevent a proposed increase from going into effect at the end of the suspension period while there is already in effect a pending increase the reasonableness of which has not yet been determined by the Commission. The Commission, in its report to the Congress on this legislation (sec. 3 of S. 666—87th Cong., recommended that section 3 be enacted. A copy of the Commission's report is enclosed for your information.

In accordance with your request, the letter from Mayor Middleton is returned to you herewith.

Sincerely yours,
JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

Phoebe Apperson Hearst Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, December 3 of this year marks the 120th anniversary of the birth of one of our outstanding American women, Phoebe Apperson Hearst. In her early years, Mrs. Hearst was a teacher who at first hand learned the problems of our schools and educating our children.

Out of this experience, she saw the need 65 years ago of bringing together parent and teacher to further the understanding between the home and the school and to insure that the best education possible was given to the children of her day.

It was from this beginning that we have today the Parent-Teacher Association, an organization of men and women working constantly and vigorously for the betterment of our schools. During the first 5 years of its existence, Mrs. Hearest, who joined with Mrs. Alice Birney to found the organization, financed the expense entirely by herself.

Her contributions in the field of education were not limited to the establishment of the Parent-Teacher Association. She established the first kindergarten in the United States and the first school for teachers of kindergartens.

She was the greatest single benefactor the University of California ever had, giving funds for campus development, for its earliest buildings and acquiring for the university some of its great art treasures. She was the only woman to serve through the years on its board of regents.

Mrs. Vonnie Eastham of Chico, Calif., has been waging an untiring campaign to win for Mrs. Hearst some of the national recognition this great educator and humanitarian deserves. Among her suggestions I would like to endorse here are two:

First. That December 3 be declared Phoebe Apperson Hearst Day throughout the Nation in recognition for this great woman's contributions for education.

Second. That during the year 1962 a commemorative stamp be issued in recognition of her founding of the Parent-Teachers Association. This will mark the 65th anniversary of this event.

I want to endorse these to the fullest and also call to the attention of the Congress the action of the California State Legislature, and I submit herewith Joint Resolution No. 1 of the Senate of the State of California:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Phoebe Apperson Hearst

Whereas Phoebe Apperson Hearst was a great American woman humanitarian and philanthropist who is noted as the cofounder of the Parent Teachers Association and the organizer of the Travelers Aid Society and as being instrumental in the restoring of Mount Vernon; and

Whereas, by her generosity and consciousness of the tremendous requirements of education today, Mrs. Hearst gave millions of dollars to education and has properly become known as the greatest single benefactor of the University of California; and

Whereas it is only fitting and proper that recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp be given to Phoebe Apperson Hearst for her multitudinous projects and activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Phoebe Apperson Hearst; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Printers Ink Comments on the Ugly Stepsister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the opportunity to address the Roadside Business Association at its convention. The text of these remarks appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 19—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A4562–A4563. Printers Ink, in its July 21 issue, took note of my comments and wrote an editorial on them. I should like to place that editorial in the RECORD at this point.

CHAMPION ON CAPITOL HILL

The other weekend while leafing idly through a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as is our wont on a long, hot, summer

Sunday afternoon—we came across an item that all but upended us on the greensward.

Unbelievable but true, there it was—a spirited defense of advertising from that most unlikely quarter, a Member of Congress. True, pursuing the thought wasn't easy. Our champion in this case, Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican Representative from Missouri, chose to couch his peroration before the Roadside Business Association convention in those rotund phrases and florid figures so dear to the hearts of congressional orators. Here's just a small sample to show you what we mean: "If mass distribution is looked upon by the public as Cinderella's ugly and spiteful stepsister, then mass advertising is her most ungainly feature and outdoor advertising the hairy wart on her nose."

So, bruised as we've been by the unflagging hostility or ill-concealed ignorance about advertising currently prevalent on Capitol Hill, we found it well worth hacking our way through the verbiage. For there, glowing like a rose in a dustbin, was CURTIS' strongly stated belief that advertising plays a vital role in mass distribution, which is the key to our mass-production economy and future growth as a nation—and that its chief problem is its image.

CURTIS also added a thought, from outside the ranks, that we in advertising might well ponder. "The advertising profession in aggregate must hire and pay well a good public relations expert to set straight—for the public—the important economic function that advertising serves in an affluent society such as ours."

Eisenhower's Reasons for Discounting Conventional War Against the U.S.S.R

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared this morning in the New York Daily News.

We should look over the facts that Mr. Frank Holeman cites in this very illuminating history of President Eisenhower's reasons for discounting conventional war against the U.S.S.R.

President Eisenhower knew war, modern war, and nuclear war, and his knowledge and experience should be sought and used at this time in our country's history.

(By Frank Holeman)

WASHINGTON, August 13.—A good many Air Force and Navy officers here are unhappy with President Kennedy's response to the Berlin crisis. Instead of building up the Army for conventional warfare to hold the city, they wish he'd take a leaf from former President Eisenhower's book.

A year and a half ago Ike's answer to Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threat to sign a separate peace treaty with the East Germans and hand them Berlin was simple and blunt: If you start a war in Europe, Russia will be blown off the map.

"We are certainly not going to fight a ground war in Europe," Ike said at a press conference March 11, 1959. "What good would it do to send a few more thousands or indeed even a few divisions to Europe? With 175 Soviet divisions in that neighborhood, why in the world would anybody dream of fighting a ground war?"

Ike never came right out and said he would use nuclear weapons to defend Berlin. He said the allies would decide when the time came.

But Khrushchev got Ike's grim meaning. And the Red boss let his deadline slide by without any drastic action.

A lot of people criticized Ike's policy of massive retaliation—holding the threat of all-out atomic war over any aggressor. But there is one thing you can say for it. It worked in Berlin.

It worked in Korea too. When the truce was negotiated in 1953 as the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles got all the U.N. countries with troops in Korea to agree that, if hostilities resumed, the war would not be limited to Korea. This was a license to use the atomic bomb against Red China. The Reds have never crossed that truce line again, in force, to this day.

As a matter of fact, massive retaliation has worked so well that Khrushchev appears to have adopted that policy himself. He once warned President Kennedy not to start a military action against Cuba, pointing to rockets which could (allegedly) wipe out Washington. Now, trying to get his way in Germany, he talks about making a super H-bomb with the destructive power of 100 million tons of TNT.

K. MAY THINK WE SHY AT ATOMIC WAR

President Kennedy said he ordered the buildup to give the United States a greater choice than "humiliation or all-out nuclear action." But last week Khrushchev cockily served notice that atomic weapons would undoubtedly be used in any war between Russia and the United States. Neither side would surrender, he pointed out, until it had used its best weapons.

Air Force and Navy partisans argue that Kennedy's Army buildup may actually encourage Khrushchev to grab for Berlin, not deter him. He might interpret the new emphasis on modernized conventional weapons as a sign that Kennedy, and the United States, will shrink from atomic war to save Berlin.

These officers contend that the only thing Khrushchev really fears is the total annihilation of Russia by atomic weapons. Of course, the Air Force's Strategic Air Command and the Navy's Polaris submarines and aircraft carriers can do that job a lot better than the Army, although some troops have short-range rockets and atomic cannon. So there is a little interservice jealousy over appropriations in all this.

Ironically, Ike the old five-star general, made all three services mad at him, at various times, when he was in the White House by cutting back their funds.

IKE WARNED OF SCIENCE-MILITARY AXIS

And in his unusual farewell speech to the Nation from the White House last January 17, Ike warned his countrymen against letting the munitions lobby and the scientists get too much power.

"We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex," he declared. "In holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

I once heard Ike explain his position about like this:

Our struggle with Soviet imperialism may go on for generations. We need a Military Establishment which will keep the Reds at bay, but not wreck our free economy. Our political freedom depends on our economic freedom. We have the Armed Forces, and our muntions industry, only to defend that free way of life.

"The reason we have them is to protect the great values in which we believe, and they are far deeper even than our own lives and our own property, as I see it," he explained in his final press conference, last January 18.

HE UNDERSTANDS THE DANGER

I know it's kind of open season around here now to criticize Ike, and the events of his two terms in the White House, but I want no part of such sniping.

In my opinion he is one of the few men of our time who really understood all the dangers we face—foreign and domestic—and all the good things America stands for. And he had a workable plan to defend them.

He didn't want people worrying about atomic war all the time either. He wanted us to enjoy our freedoms while keeping up our guard.

I'm mighty glad to see him getting active in public affairs again, and President Kennedy conferring with him from time to time.

Maybe, with his tremendous prestige, Ike can help keep the Nation on the great "middle of the road" to peace with freedom at home and abroad.

Unexpected Favors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Kenneth Crawford that appeared in the edition of Newsweek magazine of August 14, 1961.

The column follows:

UNEXPECTED FAVORS

(By Kenneth Crawford)

When Nikita Khrushchev first emerged as the new manager of the Kremlin, we sometimes wondered how such a seemingly clownish man could have managed the ascent to power. Later we came to reassess him as an almost incredibly cunning character whose every act, whether pounding a desk with a shoe or creating a Berlin crisis, had some purpose. If we didn't understand the purpose, we concluded that it was too subtle for our comprehension.

In the light of the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting in Vienna, and what has happened since, we may now be justified in doubting whether our first impression was any wider of the mark than our reappraisal.

Things had been going badly for us up to the time of Vienna, Cuba and Laos were frustrating and humiliating. All of southeast Asia seemed doomed. We were emerging from a recession but the recovery was thin and unemployment continued high. The country remained tolerant of President Kennedy because he was personable, had done well in purely domestic matters, and was new to the job. But confidence was slipping.

UNWITTING HELP

Khrushchev changed all this. Or, rather, he made it possible for Mr. Kennedy to change it. The President's factual television report on Vienna and his follow-up speech calling for augmented military capacity reversed the trend. Nothing could have illustrated the reversal more dramatically than the unanimous House and Senate decisions to increase expenditures for the

armed services. Congress is almost never single-minded in matters of this importance—not even in wartime. Its unanimity in this case reflected an extraordinary degree of national determination and unity.

Congress's eager approval of the President's military buildup was the more remarkable because the measures recommended, while useful in improving the Nation's military posture generally, won't give the West anything approaching equality, much less superiority, in the Berlin area. Indeed, their direct bearing on the crisis will be slight. The Soviet Union has 20 divisions there and about 150 more within reach. The West has about half that strength in the area and a fraction of the East's reserve strength. In a conventional war, the Soviets would have superiority. Mr. Kennedy's new program notwithstanding. If it comes to atomic war, the balance will swing our way but not because of these new measures.

NEW INITIATIVE

The President's explanation that he wanted to have "a wider choice than humiliation or allout nuclear action" made better political than military sense. But the political sense it made was justification enough. His initiative produced a show of firm national purpose. It served notice on Khrushchev that he couldn't have Berlin for nothing—that he'd have to fight for it or give something to get something in negotiation. It restored respect for Mr. Kennedy's leadership. It will give economic recovery a further push—perhaps enough of a push to make a real dent in unemployment. And it virtually guarantees enactment of the pending foreign-aid bill. If it costs Mr. Kennedy anything, it will be his school and old-age health legislation, which may have been lost for this year in any case.

Khrushchev did the President no favors out of the goodness of his heart. He quite obviously miscalculated the American reaction to his Berlin threats. He had plenty of precedent for this. Stalin's seizures of Poland and Czechoslovakia in the forties were so crude that they produced the Marshall plan and he passed up a chance to wreck the plan by participating in it. Later the Berlin blockade inspired the U.S. rearmament that made intervention in Korea possible. Gentler Soviet policies—or even gentler Soviet talk about much the same policies—would probably have lulled America to peaceful sleep.

Khrushchev seems to be somewhat more adroit than his predecessor in the conduct of Soviet foreign affairs, but that doesn't make him a Red Disraeli. Perhaps no Communist boss can ever see around the chips he carries on his shoulders. It is possible that when Khrushchev's motives become so obscure that we don't understand what he's up to, he doesn't, either.

The Safety Valve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, within the past week I have returned from a visit to the Seventh Congressional District, of Missouri, and during that time I had occasion to speak with many of my constituents about some of the grave problems facing this Nation. I have returned to Washington with an increasing awareness that the American people are ahead of their leaders in their willingness to make whatever sacrifices that are necessary in our struggle with international communism. They are concerned that some of our top officials believe we can buy victory with more foreign giveaways. They do not believe that our country can compromise with evil and they feel that whatever negotiations we may undertake we should not negotiate away a single inch of free land or a single person who believes in freedom.

I believe the spirit which I encountered is exemplified in an editorial by the owner and publisher, Mr. Kenneth G. Meuser, which appeared in the August 4 issue of the Monnett Times entitled "The Safety Valve," and under leave to extend my remarks the editorial follows:

THE SAFETY VALVE

Only if our Nation follows a course that will merit respect among other nations of the world can we expect to live in peace.

We cannot continue to have insults heaped upon innocent agencies in the form of hijacking and seizure of aircraft, surface craft, people and privately owned possessions.

We have allowed our prestige to become damaged while we profess to be "the arsenal of democracy." We live in a world of gentle resignation to the fates while Communist bandits try our patience to the breaking point.

I think that many good men in high offices have tried to steer our course of peaceful diplomacy among other nations of the world. In too many instances they have backpedaled when they should have gone forward.

Actually being a "have nation" turned out to be to our detriment. In many instances we wanted to show the "have not nations" that we were fine people. We demonstrated this fact in many ways.

The milk of American kindness still bubbles all over the globe. Instead of flexing our muscles we have won the grand championship of most generous Santa Claus in operation giveaway.

In another sense we have been afraid to show strength through strong retaliation for fear of provoking Communist nations into an atomic conflict.

Too often we have answered Communist insults with passive compromises.

Our people have passed through the phase of "peace at any price." I hope that our Executive and congressional leaders are aware of this fact.

America and its democratic allies are going to survive only if we have renewed awareness that we gained our autonomy, earned respect and prestige over a 185-year period that started with our determination initiated in the American Revolutionary War.

Back in 1917 when a German U-boat sank the U.S.S. *Lusitania* our indignation boiled over into collective and positive action. I would hate to think that we have grown soft during these 45 years.

I don't want war and I don't expect that we will have war if we show our courage against aggravating Communist belligerents. We aren't winning popularity among friendly, neutral, or enemy nations if we allow Cubanitwits to step on our toes. I doubt if our friends in the NATO and SEATO countries look to us as their "arsenal of democracy" any more.

The late President Teddy Roosevelt gave our people a transfusion of positive and militant respect at the turn of the century when he coined the adage of "walk softly and carry a big stick."

Since the end of World War II we have proceeded cautiously, ever so cautiously. At the same time by comparison we have the greatest military stick in the history of mankind.

It isn't too late for America to regain her respect among nations. In so doing we won't win a global popularity contest, but in a scramble for survival who wants to be popular?

American people are against cream puff capitulation. They are ready to wheel out the biggest stick in the world and back up our words with manpower, materiel and decisive action.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Gives Views on Back-Door Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, August 7, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried as its lead editorial an analysis of the U.S. foreign aid program and the proposals relative to it which are now before the Congress. This editorial does not concern itself with destructive criticism, but carries forward its avowed statement, "the Globe-Democrat has always been an advocate of foreign assistance, intelligently handled." Because of the timeliness of this matter, I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

BACK-DOOR FOREIGN AID

During the last 15 years, taxpayers of the United States have spent some $80 billion for foreign aid. That means an average of more than $5.3 billion a year—a tremendous amount of earned national treasure.

The people, therefore, have every right to scrutinize the Kennedy administration's foreign assistance program, which seeks to change the scope of our help—it frankly needs changing—and pyramid its cost by giving the President what amounts to a blank check on the Treasury for up to $8.8 billion.

Mr. Kennedy sought $4.8 billion from Congress for the next year's aid schedule. Senate and House committees reported the measure out, but pared the total to $4.3 billion.

In addition, the White House wants authority to lend other countries up to $8.8 billion during the next 5 years—without further consultation or action in Congress.

This is the bone of slashing contention in both branches of Congress, especially in the House. It is called back-door spending. The President could use this fund as he wished, and Congress would have no check against this phase of foreign aid. It is a back door to the Treasury.

This blank-check phase of the foreign aid bill should never be passed. It robs Congress of a constitutional function—control of spending through definite appropriations.

If the President can be given a blank check for foreign aid, he can be given lump billions to carry out his will or whim in defense, social welfare, agriculture. If it's legal and becomes a precedent in one program, why not in another? Such is the highway to dictatorship.

Dictatorial practices are doubtless outside the President's thought and hateful to him. Yet what is sought in this measure is a tool of socialistic dictation. Unchecked purse-strings mean unchecked power in government.

As the Globe-Democrat has said before, there is sound basis for the argument that long-range planning is often wise in foreign aid, if it is to be practical and effective. But there could be long-range lending commitments, without this back-door type of Treasury raid.

For domestic projects we have extended commitments from Washington, which must be implemented from year to year by Capitol Hill appropriation. An outstanding example is the Interstate Highway System. Why should multimillions be distributed abroad, bypassing Congress, when this procedure is wisely not permitted at home?

The amount sought for the new fiscal year—$4,300 million—may or may not be what is required for an intelligent mutual assistance schedule. Who can possibly know? The last 2 years the aid appropriation has been mounting.

America's foreign assistance is an experiment unparalleled in world history. On the whole, the billions in bounty have been worth the sacrifice. In many instances there has been prodigious waste, some avoidable, some perhaps not.

We cannot with humanity, statesmanship or in frank self-interest cut this help flow off. But it should be more carefully screened—which would be less likely under the "back-door spending" approach.

The Globe-Democrat has always been an advocate of foreign assistance, intelligently handled. We are convinced a decidedly more realistic attitude about this program should be adopted by Washington.

Now that the foreign aid field has extended mainly into Africa, South America, Asia, and the Orient, a far different formula is needed:

The United States should use its grants and loans only to help those states willing to help themselves, that are honest friends to Western purpose.

More rigorous means must be devised to see the funds are not frittered away or pillaged by graft.

States or governments that try to extort American help by threatening to go Communist should be abandoned. Our aid should not be subject to threats and bidding.

Nasser tried that in Egypt; the State Department turned him down. Russia gave him only part of what he demanded and now relations are worse than ever between Cairo and the Kremlin.

Should a nation threaten to jump to the Red camp if it doesn't get what it wants from Washington—let it go.

We want no more peoples behind the Iron Curtain, but such countries or governments are either bluffing or utterly untrustworthy. We can help friends with dollars; no one buys friendship with dollars.

Proposal for U.S. General Assembly Self-Determination for Berlin Key to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a thought-provoking article written by the Honorable Meyer L. Casman, which appeared on the feature page of the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 8, 1961. Mr. Casman, a Philadelphia attorney who has lived in Germany, served as one of the chief prosecutors at the Nuremberg trials as president judge of the Civil Act Court, and later as judge of the Supreme Restitution Court. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, of the Graduate Engineering School at the University of Michigan, and of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He is a former president of the Philadelphia chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

The article follows:

PROPOSAL FOR U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY: SELF-DETERMINATION FOR BERLIN KEY TO PEACE

(By Meyer L. Casman)

Since the end of the Second World War, we have tried and tried to have the principle of self-determination applied to Berlin and the rest of Germany. At the conclusion of that war we had taken it for granted that we could now put it into practice, for had not all the Allies (including Russia) set down this principle as basic in the St. James's, Yalta and Potsdam agreements? It was even basic to the United Nations Charter where in article 1, section 2, it calls for, "respect for principle of * * * self-determination of peoples."

Even before Russia became one of our allies, Roosevelt and Churchill made it the basic of the Atlantic Charter; prior to that it had been the basic of Wilson's 14 points. Prior to that it had been the hope of oppressed peoples over the centuries.

But when we tried to put it into practice after the war, there came a "nyet" from Russia. The all-Berlin elections of 1946 did not suit the Russians, so they dictated a Communist regime for the east sector, irrespective of agreements to the contrary, just as they caused the Berlin airlift. Since then, so persistent and strong has Russia been against self-determination for Berlin, and so resolved was she to hold on to East Germany, that we had given up all further efforts in this respect.

Now that we have been forced away from merely standing firm on our war-won and agreement-acquired rights in Berlin, we find that we might "eventually" bring the Berlin problem before the United Nations—not saying which organ of that organization—and only if forced to do so, will we presumably bring it before the Security Council, where Russia maintains a well-exercised veto.

It should be obvious that currently Khrushchev's policy has been to wage his cold war just short of interference from any international body. He has succeeded in keeping us from the initiative in this respect by his repeated charges of our aggressive war (as in case of Cuba, the U–2 incident, etc.) both in the Security Council and the General Assembly of the U.N. The last thing he wants is U.N. interference.

Can there be any harm now, in addition to our "firmness" as to Berlin and our preparation for war, in invoking the General Assembly of this international body in behalf of self-determination? I believe not. I believe recent developments on this principle of self-determination can augur a turning point on the Berlin stalemate, perhaps for the rest of Germany and even perhaps for all captive nations, as well as colonies.

The astute French President Charles de Gaulle first rekindled the idea of self-determination for Algeria. Russia insisted (despite—or because of—France's opposition) to the internationalizing of the problem and forced it into the General Assembly.

There, Russia shed bitter tears on these "enslaved peoples," and persisted in the inclusion in the preamble to the Algiers resolution that, "all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom." The final resolution not only stated that the Algerian people had the right of self-determination and that the U.N. would guarantee this right, but also that the U.N. "had a responsibility to contribute toward the successful and just implementation of this right."

After months of prolonged and heated debates, during which Russia repeatedly wept for these "oppressed peoples" who had never had their opportunity at the "inalienable right to complete freedom," the vote, December 19, 1960, on the resolution was 63 for, 8 against, and 27 abstentions. The United States voted an abstention.

In my opinion it would repeat this declaration of right to self-determination for "all peoples," no matter where sought to be applied. It would certainly not be able to do otherwise for Berlin, even if the Russian and satellite delegations turned coat. And I do not think, with this administration, that there would be any doubt as to where the United States would stand, except in forefront, on such a resolution.

With the United States attitude on Angola made clear, the United States should be able to lead a perhaps unwilling Afro-Asian block to follow suit. We have reason to have confidence in our present leadership in the United Nations.

It behooves us therefore to see to it that such a resolution is introduced and caused to be made one of the first considerations of the next General Assembly meetings. Then could follow other such resolutions for the other "enslaved peoples" so that not only anticolonialism but also antisatellitism would be the rule of the world.

The United States could and would be the rightful leader of such a liberation movement. How else could we implement the joint resolution of Congress of 1959 in behalf of freeing the captive nations? And this should be done before Russia is given a chance to change or destroy the United Nations.

It is only in such attacks in the General Assembly where we could take the initiative, attack Russia and hit it where it is the most vulnerable.

The General Assembly is the policymaking body of the whole world. It has a tremendous moral force because it has open debate. It is thus the educational forum of the world. It is our leadership for a moral, law-abiding world, that will bring the greatest results.

How many can recall President Eisenhower's leadership during the Suez Canal invasion by Britain and France? Russia was very outspoken at that time saying that if these countries cannot abide by the General Assembly's resolution they should be thrown out of the United Nations.

The support given the General Assembly and the moral backing of the principle of self-determination in the Algerian case mentioned should greatly nullify any prospective invective Russia might use against the resolution here recommended.

With a self-determination start on Berlin, and evolving this into a reaffirmation of United Nations Charter provision of self-determination as the basis for this future world of ours, and the utilization of this principle under United Nations supervision, we could indeed look forward to a world of peace, a lessening of tensions and genuine reduction in arms.

Castro Should Be Named Pirate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a joint news release by Mr. Wil-

liam K. Shearer, publisher of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Banner, and Mr. Charles M. Barrack, editor of Evolve, a campus publication at the California State College at San Diego. This news release purports to point up the piracy in which Fidel Castro is engaged, and demands quick and positive action against this piracy.

The release follows:

CASTRO SHOULD BE NAMED PIRATE

President Kennedy, in his July 25 address to the Nation, said:

"In these days and weeks I ask for your help and advice. I ask for your suggestions, when you think we could do better."

The petitions which we are today filing with the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee represent the advice and suggestions of approximately 1,000 southern Californians on the subject of the Castro inspired hijackings of American planes.

The petitions read: "In view of the ever-increasing acts of piracy and tyranny toward American life and liberty,

"We the undersigned citizens of the United States herewith petition the Congress, under authority of article I, section 8, paragraphs 10 and 11 of the U.S. Constitution, to define the recent acts of the Cuban, Castro, as piracies or offences against the law of nations, and to issue letters of marque and reprisal to one or several of our number, or to those Americans best qualified in the judgment of Congress to act under the authority of such letters of marque and repraisal, or as Congress shall direct."

Article I, section 8, paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Constitution of the United States read:

"Congress shall have power to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the laws of nations; to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

In other words, Congress has the right and power to define acts of piracy. It is our belief that the Castro, Cuban Government, by its actions, justifies this definition.

Since Castro seized the Government of Cuba, this conduct has not been characteristic of that normally associated with legitimate governments. From the start, Castro has acted in a manner becoming only to brigands and pirates.

It is, therefore, time to deal with him on the terms which he, himself, has established. He should be named a pirate, treated as such, and denied the honor and dignity associated with legitimate governmental leadership.

We wonder just how long Castro would last if a price were placed upon his head as a pirate?

Letters of marque and reprisal are within the constitutional framework established for dealing with piracies. Under this procedure, private individuals or persons designated by Congress are authorized by the Government to take back property in restitution for thievery. The issuance of such letters of marque and reprisal would assist in placing Castro in the class to which he has relegated himself—that of a pirate.

There is no problem in finding people who will accept these letters of marque and reprisal. We have a signed statement by a U.S. citizen which reads:

"If the Congress of the United States should issue letters of marque and reprisal against Pirate Castro, of Cuba, and/or his associates, I hereby state that I would consider it an honor to once again serve my country, under authority of such letters of marque and reprisal, or as Congress may direct."

Within the last few days, a court in Miami has awarded $6,800,000 in judgments to two American businessmen robbed by Castro. There are millions of dollars more of just American claims against the Castro regime. These people have a right to seek restitution. Letters of marque and reprisal would make possible the recapture of some of this lost property, and such letters are within our historic framework for dealing with piracies.

It is up to the United States to take appropriate action to protect the lives and property of our own people. We can find no satisfaction in the United Nations. America must make her own decisions, take independent action under the Monroe Doctrine, and back up her decisions with her own might.

Castro may complain that certain Cuban airplanes have been hijacked and sold in the United States. An examination of the record of these hijackings will disclose that until private citizens secured court judgments against Cuba, through due process of law, all such planes were returned to Cuba by the United States.

How can we expect other nations to respect us in dealing with Soviet Russia when we demonstrate that we are not competent to handle little Cuba? As Congressman UTT has said:

"There has been no doubt in my mind that the Western Powers would defend West Berlin, but I wonder how we can make West Berlin believe this when we take no action against Castro when he has one of his lieutenants hijack an American plane, flying over American territory, and take it to Havana to be used for further blackmail. If the President had ordered an aircraft carrier or two to sail into Havana Harbor the next morning, after the hijacking, with orders to move in if Castro did not release the plane and passengers forthwith, this would have been far more convincing than his speech on West Berlin."

Another ill effect of failing to deal directly with Castro is that, inspired by the Cuban hijacking escapades, every domestic hoodlum who has ever had any basic predilection to steal an airplane is now convinced that open season on aircraft has been declared. This has resulted in the serious injury of two American citizens in a hijacking at Chico, Calif., and has caused untold danger and concern to many other citizens who have been victimized by these plane thefts.

A person boarding a plane today does not know whether he will arrive at his intended destination or wind up a captive of the Castro Communist regime in Havana.

Of course, we support the rugged increase in penalties for hijacking which is being considered by the Congress.

As the leader of the free nations of the world, does America not have an obligation to the people of Cuba? Castro does not represent the majority of the people of Cuba. He has not lived up to his promise to provide free elections for the people of that country. He has outlawed other political parties. He has established a system of political spies which is almost beyond the comprehension of American citizens. We must realize that it was through our help that Castro came to power in Cuba. For this reason, if for no other, we have an obligation to the Cuban people.

But even more important than any obligation we may have to Cuba's enslaved people is the obligation of the U.S. Government to provide safety for its own citizens. The fact is that Castro is building up missile bases which are an immediate and potential threat to our own land. Authorities in the field believe that if Castro is not stopped now, within 3 years much of Latin America will fall under the crimson shadow. For the sake of our own national security, we cannot tolerate this build-up.

These petitions are a means of focusing attention on this problem, and represent one approach to dealing with the pirate, Castro. We urge strong action by Congress to eliminate this constant menace to American lives, property, and, world prestige.

Openly declaring Castro a pirate, and dealing with him on those terms, is the best approach to the entire problem. Castro has done nothing which would entitle him to treatment on a plane of equality with legitimate national governments.

We urge your careful consideration of these petitions and the policies they suggest.

The United States and Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of our consideration of the authorization for the Agency for International Development it seems to me the following article by Peter Duignan is especially appropriate.

He is curator of the African collection in the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and his recommendations are not only timely, but they are the product of actual experience in Africa.

The article follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

(By Peter Duignan)

Few countries in the world today have closer links with the African Continent than the United States. One of every 10 American citizens has one or more African ancestors. Americans have long traded with Africa. As explorers and missionaries, frontiersmen and soldiers, tobacco farmers and mining engineers, our countrymen have helped to open up its interior.

Slaves, of course, were the major item in our trade with Africa between 1619 and 1861, when the last slave ship was captured and its captain hanged in New York harbor. A nobler cause was served by the American Colonization Society, formed to return freed slaves to their homeland. In 1821 the first shipload of freemen arrived in west Africa, and Liberia was formed. With the discovery of diamonds and gold in the 1870's and 1880's, Americans flocked to South Africa. Later, American capital and technical know-how helped develop the mining industries of the Katanga and the Copper Belt (in northern Rhodesia).

Once Africa was carved up by the European powers, however, Yankee ships and business groups were generally excluded (although missionaries were welcomed). This trade monopoly was broken in 1919, but even then not many U.S. firms were interested. As a result, Africa in modern times has not been significant to us either as a place of investment (it receives less than 3 percent of our foreign investments) or as a trading partner (only 4 percent of our imports come from Africa and only 3 percent of our exports go there).

Today, the spread of the cold war to Africa has changed our attitude. Now we are concerned. The United States, even though it has encouraged anticolonialism, has begun to fear the consequences of weak and unstable or unfriendly governments taking over important areas, for Africa is vital to our defense plans. As a supplier of minerals—gold, copper, cobalt, chrome, manganese, uranium, and diamonds—and as a strategic military base the continent has taken on increasing importance to this country. The

strategic value of much of the continent as a staging area is obvious, but the dominating position of some of its port cities is sometimes forgotten. Cape Town, for instance, controlling the passage between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, is critical to east-west sea and air traffic as well as communication to Australasia and Antarctica.

Morally, Africa also represents a challenge to U.S. traditions of democracy, freedom, and self-government. The peoples of the underdeveloped areas are looking for ideologies and for economic and political systems to satisfy their needs. We need to show Ghanaians and Somalis not only that our economic system is more dynamic and more humane than Marxism, but also that our spiritual heritage offers greater potential for developing man's nature.

What, then, should be our policy toward Africa?

Many have come to the conclusion that the United States should embark on a new course. Colonialism should be denounced; America should back African nationalist movements, even at the expense of existing good relations with those of its allies which still have colonies on the continent. The white settlers in Africa should be regarded as a liability and abandoned. All would then be well, and economic development and parliamentary democracy would follow.

This interpretation depends on highly questionable assumptions. Political independence for underdeveloped countries does not necessarily promote development. Although Eire "smashed the yoke of British imperialism," Ireland remains a kind of European Basutoland, forced to export her manpower and dependent on remittances from overseas. When Indonesia got rid of the Dutch, it contracted economically.

Neither is it true to suppose that political independence, even when linked to some degree of economic development in a backward area, will lead to the emergence of that kind of liberal, parliamentary democracy of which many of us are thinking. The evidence tends the other way. The chances for Western-style democracies are dim. State planning, prevailing authoritarian traditions, and an indigenous middle class consisting mainly of civil servants are not the right props for a stable parliamentary regime. Already seven of the new states of French Africa have one-party governments. Ethiopia, Liberia, Ghana, and Guinea have stifled political opposition and have interfered with freedom of speech and the press. Military dictators hold sway in Egypt and the Sudan, and the Congo is threatened by chaos and rule by caudillos.

The trend seems inevitable. Most African territories became "free" before they became nations. Independence was won too easily and too quickly to mold diverse peoples into one nation. Unfortunately, African nationalism has tended to be negative. It has been against alien rule but it has not been for very much of anything, nor has it been able to construct a public philosophy to which all sections of society assent. Black states suffer not only from tribal and religious divisions but also from a struggle between the traditionalists and the modernizers. The clash between the educated and the chiefs, between the fetish priest and the doctor, will not soon be settled. To hold these states together, power will have to be concentrated within a limited group, because democracy with liberty and stability cannot be ordered to work, and the African as a rule is not capable of making it work.

In addition, a new scramble for Africa is on. This new scramble is being fought with dollar and ruble loans, high-powered propaganda, the armed infiltration of irregulars, and the diplomatic and military pressures of heavily armed continental bloc. Under these circumstances, the outlook for the new states is not a cheerful one. In the last century British liberals used to back small nations struggling to be free. This made some sense, not merely for religious and economic reasons by also for military ones, because the new Balkan States had some chance of defending themselves? Science has changed the military situation; now, only large continental blocs can wage wars successfully. From the military point of view, the new Afro-Asian states are already as obsolete as the aid squadrons with which they hurriedly equip themselves.

There is not any force in the much repeated arguments that the metropolitan countries should plan their policies so as to win the sympathy of the "uncommitted" nations of Asia and Africa, which are supposed to hold the future world balance of power in their hands. This point of view neglects the military realities of power, and looks upon the present struggle for world supremacy as a sort of ideological beauty competition in which the panel of judges is made up of Asians and Africans.

A tough policy against its own settlers will not really add to the strength of the West. Nations are influenced by ideas, but ideological considerations only rarely outweight economic and strategic factors. Asians and Africans are no different from anyone else, and are not easily influenced by gestures. Not even the wholesale expulsion of all whites from a country like Southern Rhodesia would induce any African state to support NATO, unless the ruling groups of that state felt that its interests were better served by joining the West rather than by remaining neutral.

It is doubtful that the West would be justified in subordinating its interests to the real or imagined demands of neutralists. For when all is said and done, it is only the strength of the West, and nothing but its strength, which has made it possible, up to now, for the Afro-Asian countries to afford the luxury of neutralism. Once the West weakens, the fate of the new countries is not likely to be any different from that of, say, the Georgian Social Democrats, who were overthrown by the Soviet armies after the First World War.

To look at the question the other way round, the friendship of all the uncommitted nations would not help the West in the slightest if we allowed our economic and military defenses to crumble. The disintegration of Western power would only be speeded up by the contraction of Western influence in areas inhabited by white minorities in Africa; to encourage this process can thus hardly be described as being advantageous to the United States. Hence the myth that colonialism was an unmitigated evil should be countered. Just because the Russians are using anticolonialism does not mean that we have to do the same.

It is dangerous just to be anticolonial without preparing an alternative to colonial rule. Unless we want two more Congos on our hands, nothing is to be gained by ejecting the Portuguese from Africa at the present time. A better policy would be to aid them in developing these provinces, and to press them to start training Africans in self-government so as to make possible an orderly transfer of power, as in Nigeria. If the Portuguese will not cooperate, then the areas should be declared U.N. trust territories.

What positive steps can the United States take to help ensure a stable Africa?

First, we can practice democracy more fully ourselves. Color bars and segregation must end. Little Rock and New Orleans have lowered our prestige abroad; racial inequality is morally wrong and offends men of color. We look like hypocrites—denouncing colonialism in the U.N. and practicing segregation in Georgia.

Africans now insist on running their own show; they demand the right to make mistakes and to adopt political and economic systems different from ours. We should be sympathetic and make it clear that we support the legitimate aspirations of all Africans—white and black alike—for self-government, a decent standard of living, and an opportunity for all men to progress. Our policy should strive to help these states lay the basis for democratic societies by transforming their economic systems. Meanwhile, it will be necessary to accept the fact that the new states will not be parliamentary democracies. But the United States is interested in a stable, developing Africa, not just in supporting revolutionaries.

We should encourage moves toward unity and regional associations. Bigger units are required if territories like Gambia, Chad, or Upper Volta are to become viable. Self-determination is not a cure-all, especially in Africa where self-determination for each and every ethnic group would lead to chaos—there are over 600 peoples on the continent. The end of colonialism has already fragmented the former European empires, resulting in a lot of little states without any real justification for independence. This multiplication of countries unrealistically inflates their value, as each one gets a vote in the United Nations. Indeed, one could argue that Africa is already grossly overrepresented in the General Assembly. Herein lies a danger. The big powers will, in the long run, be even more adverse to being ruled by majorities made up of Nicaraguas and Gambias than they have been in the past. This conceivably could wreck the U.N.

The United States can do much more in the way of education, exchange scholarships, and technical training. Increased private capital and Government loans will certainly have to be provided these new nations. Although African states are becoming independent, they are not really free—every new state depends on its former colonial ruler or looks elsewhere for capital, weapons, and trained men.

Having won political freedom, the blacks now desire freedom from want and disease. They will not wait or take no for an answer. Either we help them or they will go to Communist countries—and who can blame them? The United States cannot supply all the capital needs of the new countries; other nations will have to help. The sacrifices are worth it if we gain a stable continent. Aside from considerations of the cold war, it is morally fitting that the United States help Africa now, for the New World was partially developed by the labor of millions of Negro slaves.

The greatest problem facing the new Africa is not colonialism. Rather it is a compound of poverty, Balkanization, cold war, the revival of tribalism, customs that conflict with modern ways, and the rule of caudillos. A cautious and empirical U.S. policy—one, indeed, that would embrace transitional use of colonialism—should be aimed at overcoming these problems. The penalty of failure would be disaster for Africa and for the entire West.

SUGGESTED READING

Cohen, Sir Andrew, "British Colonial Policy in Changing Africa," 1959. Excellent account by ex-Governor of Uganda.

Hatch, John, "Africa Today—and Tomorrow," 1960; paperback. A country-by-country review of recent history and problems.

Hodgkin, Thomas, "Nationalism in Colonial Africa," 1956. Best general survey of nationalism in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mason, Philip, "An Essay on Racial Tension," 1959. A review of social conflict in South Africa.

Perham, Margery, "African Discovery: An Anthology of Exploration," 1957. Fascinating excerpts from journals of great 19th century explorers.

Sampson, Anthony, "Commonsense About Africa," 1960. Provocative study of newly independent and soon-to-be independent states of Black Africa.

Schweitzer, Albert, "African Notebook," 1958; paperback.

"The United States and Africa," American Assembly, Columbia University, 1958. Eight essays by American experts.

Berlin and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted, Friday, July 28, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

BERLIN AND THE PRESIDENT

President Kennedy has taken a strong stand on Berlin. Our national policy now recognizes clearly the war being waged against us by the Soviet Union. We applaud his blunt statement that we will not be intimidated; we will not be forced out of Berlin. We are relieved that a firm position has been adopted, and we are solidly behind the President, regardless what the Soviets may say or do next. We believe the vast majority of Americans feel the same way.

In making his firm stand against the march of communism, the President pointed out that Berlin is only part of the global war that has engulfed us for a generation. In this we wholeheartedly agree.

Mr. Kennedy was commendably humble in the face of his awesome responsibilities, and he directly asked for the help and suggestions of the American people.

We are eager to offer these sincere suggestions, and we urge every citizen to respond to the President's plea.

First, Mr. President, we believe the people are ready to follow your lead in making any sacrifice necessary, not only to contain the spread of communism but to defeat and destroy this monstrous tyranny. This means no more business as usual while we bend to the task. Even more important, we believe this means no more politics as usual.

In order to pay for increased arms and the political warfare necessary to destroy the enemies of freedom, should not the first sacrifice be some of the unnecessary welfare programs at home and abroad constantly being thrust upon the Nation by the President's own advisers? Federal school aid, urban renewal aid, medical care aid, farm price supports, to name a few, and every form of no-strings-attached foreign aid are among the first sacrifices * * * sacrifices that must be made to insure the financial stability of a nation dedicated to a continuing war against communism.

And while we're sacrificing, cannot we sacrifice some of the professors, economists, and political theorists who have been pouring socialism and appeasement into the President's ears? We simply cannot afford to have starry-eyed and misguided proponents of the welfare state advising our President at any time much less in a time of national peril.

These are sacrifices, Mr. President, which we firmly believe the vast majority of the American people want you and the Nation to make right now. And they would underscore your statement in such a way that not even the Kremlin can miscalculate our grim determination to lead in the spread of freedom around the world.

National Home Rule Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1961, at the request of Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, president of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, with headquarters in Altoona, Pa., I introduced H.R. 8612 designed to promote the public welfare by providing that all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used for road improvement purposes only, and, for the purpose of spurring improvements on all classes of public highways.

The bill, if enacted into law, would be cited as the "national home rule road program" and is sponsored by the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, a civic, nonprofit organization, incorporated under the laws of Pennsylvania and whose sole object is to stop the concentration of power in Washington through the restoration of home rule, thus ending the deplorable situation resulting from the diversion of motor funds as described in the following editorial titled "Deplorable Situation," which appeared in the August 4, 1961, edition of the Altoona Mirror:

DEPLORABLE SITUATION

The Nation's motorists, including those in Pennsylvania, are paying $4.3 billion annually into the Federal Government's coffers in highway-user taxes, but they are getting only about 60 percent of that huge sum back in highway improvements. The local communities receive nothing.

That, in brief, is the complaint of Thomas S. Stephenson of Altoona, Pennsylvania Home Rule Association president and well-known authority on road affairs—local, State and National.

Mr. Stephenson is fully justified in his assertion that "the Federal-aid highway policy is directly responsible for the deplorable condition of hundreds of thousands of miles of State and local roads." Best of all, he asks that Congress adopt amendments to the Federal highway acts to rectify this deplorable condition.

The Bureau of Public Roads, under jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, is to blame for an obsolescent policy that now diverts approximately $1.7 billion annually of highway-user excise tax revenues to the Federal Government's general fund for other purposes. As Mr. Stephenson points out, the policy, in effect since 1921, is applicable to "the days of the model T Ford. We are now in V–8 traffic and the year is 1961."

The proposed Stephenson amendments, contained in a national home rule road program, would end this disgraceful diversion of motor funds and return the money, paid by the motorists in excise taxes, to the States and their political subdivisions, without matching strings attached. The States would share 50 percent of the now diverted funds, the cities, boroughs and townships the other 50 percent.

For Altoona it would mean an additional estimated $130,000 a year for street improvements, sorely needed. Every political subdivision in Blair County and in the State, beside the Commonwealth itself, would benefit from the proposed Stephenson amendments.

Motorists in the several States now pay five or six highway-user taxes, a staggering load for the benefits they receive. Pennsylvania's automotive taxes, fortunately, may be used only for highway and allied purposes, but the real rub is the Federal policy of taxation on highway users.

Only 60 percent of the Federal take in automotive taxes is used for the Federal-aid system, in which Pennsylvania is participating. Yet when the Interstate System is completed at a cost of $41 billion sometime between 1972 and 1975 it will carry only 20 percent of the total highway traffic.

State and local roads and streets, which now carry 34 percent of the total highway traffic and which are not a part of the Federal aid system, receive nothing in the way of Federal funds.

The proposed Stephenson amendments would direct that all revenues from the Federal gasoline, oil and other excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund. Sixty percent (the same amount as now allocated) would be used for the Federal-aid system and the remaining 40 percent would be returned to the States and the cities, boroughs and townships. The Interstate System still would have ample funds for completion of the Federal program. The States and local communities would have the additional funds for improvement of their systems to meet present-day traffic needs.

The Stephenson proposal would guarantee the motorists, who pay the bill, full benefits from their tax payments. It is decidedly unfair for the Federal Government to collect billions of dollars in highway-user taxes and divert approximately 40 percent to foreign aid and other governmental expenses not related to highway construction and improvements.

The Stephenson proposal merits the consideration of all taxpayers, particularly the motorists who are being "bilked" by the Bureau of Public Roads archaic policies. Area Congressmen would do well to study and support the amendments which would rectify a deplorable condition and provide the motorists with the adequate roads and streets for which they are paying, but are not receiving.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I wish to insert a copy of H.R. 8612, which is now pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "national home rule road program". The purpose of this Act is to promote the public welfare by providing that all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used for road improvement purposes only, and, for the purpose of spurring improvements on all classes of public highways, to aid in increasing employment in the roadbuilding and allied industries, and to promote the civic welfare of every State and community in the Nation, by providing that all classes of roads on the public highway systems be made eligible for Federal aid.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 209(c)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to transfer to trust fund of amounts equivalent to certain taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the taxes received in the Treasury before October 1, 1972, under the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—

"(A) section 4041 (diesel fuel and special motor fuel);

"(B) section 4061 (motor vehicles);

"(C) section 4071 (tires and tubes);

"(D) section 4081 (gasoline);

"(E) section 4091 (lubricating oil);

"(F) section 4226 (floor stocks); and

"(G) section 4481 (use of certain vehicles)."

(b) Section 209(c)(3) of such Act (relating to liabilities incurred before October 1, 1972, for new or increased taxes) is amended by striking out "the following percentages" and inserting in lieu thereof "100 percent", and by striking out subparagraph (A) through (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) section 4041 (diesel fuel and special motor fuel);

"(B) section 4061(a)(1) (trucks, buses, etc.);

"(C) section 4071(a)(1), (3), and (4) (certain tires, tubes, and tread rubber);

"(D) section 4081 (gasoline); and

"(E) section 4481 (use of certain vehicles)."

(c) Section 209(f)(4) of such Act (relating to 1972 floor stocks refunds) is amended by striking out "the following percentages" and inserting in lieu thereof "100 percent", and by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) section 4061(a)(1) (trucks, buses, etc.);

"(B) section 4071(a) (1), (3), or (4) (certain tires, tubes, and tread rubber); and

"(C) section 4081 (gasoline)."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply only in case of transfers to and refunds from the Highway Trust Fund with respect to months beginning more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "Amounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "Sixty percent of the amounts", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Forty percent of the amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriation Acts, to meet those obligations of the United States incurred under section 214 of title 23 of the United States Code.".

SEC. 3. Section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 120. Federal share payable

"The Federal share payable on account of any project on any Federal-aid system shall be 100 percent of the total cost thereof."

SEC. 4. (a) Chapter 2 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 214. State and local highways

"(a) Sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year out of the Highway Trust Fund established by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to carry out this section shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States in the same manner as funds are apportioned for the Federal-aid primary system.

"(b) Fifty percent of all funds apportioned to a State under this section shall be expended by such State on State highways which have not been designated as part of a Federal-aid system. Such funds shall be expended on such State highways in accordance with the laws of such State relating to the expenditure of motor vehicle taxes and other roadbuilding revenues.

"(c) Fifty percent of all funds apportioned to a State under this section shall be allocated by such State to those of its political subdivisions having jurisdiction over local streets and roads. Forty percent of such funds shall be allocated among such political subdivisions based upon the ratio which the population of the particular political subdivision bears to the total population of the State, and sixty percent of such funds shall be allocated based upon the ratio which the mileage of the local streets and roads of the particular political subdivision bears to the total mileage of all local streets and roads within the State. Such funds shall be expended on such local streets and roads by the political subdivision in accordance with the laws of such State relating to expenditure of motor vehicle taxes and other roadbuilding revenues."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 2 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "214. State and local highways."

The President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Ceres Courier, Ceres, Calif., concerning the Berlin situation.

The Ceres Courier, which is published by Maitland Pennington, is one of the many small weekly newspapers in California which are close to the people and often accurately represent the grassroots feeling about the great issues of the day.

I am sure that this expression of support of President Kennedy and his position in Berlin is multiplied many times throughout our great Nation, and I think it important that both the President and Mr. Khrushchev are aware, with no chance of misunderstanding, of the feeling of the people of the United States in this time of crisis.

Following is the text of the editorial:

THE PRESIDENT

Speaking in a controlled and extremely serious manner, the President of the United States made it fully clear that it is not the intention of the Government of the United States to take a surrendering step regarding the Berlin issue.

The President appropriately pointed out, Berlin is the outpost of American freedom, that in Berlin are Americans, British and French. All of us are there as a result of agreement reached with the Russians. It is our right and duty to stay there until we are all agreed on some solution to the whole problem of Germany.

The people of the United States will face the situation for what it is, a grave and bleak prospect. They will face it without dissidence, realizing fully that a break in our own ranks, or the ranks of our allies, is the certain route to extermination.

American citizens will hopefully make minor sacrifices now in the great hope that such sacrifices will eliminate for untold millions the necessity of making the supreme sacrifice.

War is not imminent, or certain. We believe that once the world knows we, the citizens of the United States, will not shirk our responsibilities, that we have fought and will fight again for principle and what we believe right, the prospects of war will diminish.

To remain free, we must be strong. To be strong, we must make sacrifices and suffer inconveniences. This we must and will do.

The President knows we will march to the Rubicon with him, and cross it if necessary.

A Congressional Report on the Public Defender Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I made on Thursday, August 10, 1961, before a luncheon sponsored by the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Legal Aid Work and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, at the Hotel Park Plaza, St. Louis, Mo.:

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT ON THE PUBLIC DEFENDER LEGISLATION

I need not quote the sixth amendment to this distinguished group. You and many others like you have been engaged for many years in trying to make the guarantee of this amendment truly meaningful. Largely due to these efforts there were at last count in the United States 77 public defender organizations, 14 private defender organizations, and 5 combining these two forms. Every State now furnishes some kind of legal assistance to indigent persons charged with crime, usually in the form of assigned counsel who are paid on a fee basis.

But the Federal Government has lagged behind the States. Although the indigent criminal defendant is provided legal assistance if he wants it, the lawyer who is called upon to supply this assistance does so without remuneration.

You will recall that it was in the *Johnson* v. *Zerbst* case in 1938 that the Supreme Court made it forever clear that a defendant is entitled to have the assistance of counsel for his defense or otherwise the Federal court has no authority to deprive him of his life or liberty. A year later, 1939, the first case of an indigent defendant on the calendar in the northern district of California was that of a man who under the influence of intoxicants stole some rotary locks from the Post Office Department and then attempted to sell them to a postal inspector. When he appeared before District Judge Michael J. Roche, the judge recognized him as an old offender who had often appeared before him in the State court. Judge Roche proceeded to instruct him concerning his right to counsel and explained that if he was without funds or friends or other means to provide counsel for his defense, the court would be happy to appoint an attorney to represent him. "Hell, no," the accused replied. "Judge, the last time I had one of them guys, I got 60 days for stealing me own overcoat."

I do not believe the situation is that bad, but nevertheless it is true that a large proportion of court-appointed attorneys have had relatively little experience in criminal trial practice. Although they may conscien-

tiously try to carry out their responsibility toward their clients, they are not really equipped to provide effective counsel. As Justice Rutledge once commented, "Serious criminal cases are not proper subject matter for legal apprentices, however capable and hard working."

The system has other grave shortcomings, but I need not enumerate them to an audience as knowledgeable on the subject as this one. The effect of these shortcomings has been commented upon only recently by Justice Brennan: "The victims of the limitation upon the State's obligation to provide counsel are the indigent—they are the helpless, the weak, the outnumbered in our society."

Since the 75th Congress I have introduced in each Congress thereafter legislation to establish a system which would guarantee truly adequate representation for indigent defendants in the Federal courts. The bill provided for the office of public defender for those Federal district courts with a sufficiently large volume of criminal cases, and for a method of compensating court-appointed attorneys in the smaller districts. In effect it combined the best features of both the public defender and the assigned but compensated counsel systems.

But the bill lagged in committee. While it invariably had the support of the Attorney General, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and various legal aid societies, we heard little from individual members of the judiciary, the law schools, or the bar. We didn't really know what they thought of the proposal. The limited correspondence we received on the subject was about evenly pro and con, and seemed to cancel out each other. The enactment of legislation, I can assure you, requires clear-cut support.

In the 86th Congress I decided that the bill had lain fallow long enough. It was time to find out whether it would meet the problem for which it was designed, what its defects might be, and the extent to which the legal profession favored it. To get this information I simply wrote to every Federal judge and to several hundred members of the American Bar Association and various law school faculties. Several of you in the audience, I am sure, received my letter and its request for your views on my bill.

The report that grew out of this correspondence was printed by the committee in February 1960. It disclosed that out of nearly 500 judges, lawyers and law school deans and professors who responded to my letter, 89 percent approved the general approach embodied in the bill. A few preferred only a portion of the bill or an entirely different approach, and only 5 percent opposed any legislation at all on the subject.

The responses strongly refuted some of the arguments that I had heard vaguely advanced in opposition to the bill. One of these arguments was to the effect that an independent bar is just as essential to the preservation of freedom as is an independent judiciary or the Bill of Rights in our Federal and State constitutions. But an attorney from one of our great Southern States commented, "I hope that the bill will pass by a large majority as a signal recognition by our representatives that a real right to counsel is a precious right, one that was hard won, and one that is denied to many people in other parts of the world."

Another old argument that was somewhat similar charged that the public defender system would lead to "socialization" of the legal profession. That argument is old hat. If you are opposed to anything call it socialistic or communistic. Yet in response to my letter a former president of the American Bar Association known to all of you wrote that "lawyers, by supporting this bill are not unloading upon the public a personal obligation of the bar. This obligation is that of the public and the fact that the bar alone has borne it in the past is no reason to continue a system that is inadequate and unreasonable."

Supreme Court Justices and district judges, who are perhaps the persons most familiar with the present system and its unhappy results, were firm in their condemnation of its deficiencies. Their letters contained references to it in such terms as "shocking," "hit and miss," "haphazard." The law school deans and professors sent me highly literate and thoughtful dissertations on the subject, indicting the present system and urging correction. But perhaps the most firm support for the constitutional right to an adequate defense came from the lawyers themselves, the individual members of the American Bar Association. They registered their approval most eloquently, buttressed by solid facts, and illustrated by incidents out of their own experience. One attorney even sent me a poem registering his support for the bill.

I also received a number of excellent suggestions for improving the bill. Some thought the judicial council of the circuit ought to exercise control over the appointment of public defenders. Some thought the public defenders should be equipped with investigators and technical experts where necessary to prepare a competent defense. Others thought that even where the court had a public defender office, the court should still have the authority to appoint a separate counsel or an additional counsel. Some thought that it should be made clear in the bill that the defendant was entitled to counsel as early as arraignment and preliminary examination. The judges were particularly concerned that the conditions under which an indigent defendant could appeal his conviction were spelled out more clearly.

The most common suggestion was that the salary of the public defender should be at a level nearly commensurate with that of the prosecuting attorney and that appointed counsel should receive $50 a day instead of $35. Also frequently appearing was the suggestion that there should be some statement as to the qualifications of attorneys who were to be appointed as public defenders. And judges and lawyers alike felt that the maximum annual amount allowed any single district for compensation and reimbursement of all appointed counsel should be raised from $5,000 to $10,000 annually.

All of these suggestions obviously had merit and I rewrote the bill to embrace them. I also included an authorization for the court to appoint, on a reimbursable basis, representatives of legal aid societies as defense counsel in individual cases. To put a ceiling on all expenditures for the defense of indigent defendants, I added a statement limiting annual appropriations for this purpose to an amount not exceeding the fines, penalties, and forfeitures collected by the courts during the most recently completed fiscal years. This, in 1960 amounted to about $2½ million, far more, of course than will be needed to operate the proposed system.

I introduced this bill (H.R. 2696) into the 87th Congress on January 16, 1961, and it was referred to a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Because of the substantial body of opinion already at hand, it was not considered necessary to hold further hearings. Three weeks ago the subcommittee took up this bill and after much debate approved it with some amendments. Briefly, the amendments to the bill require the approval of the Judicial Conference for the appointment of public defender and assistants; one public defender may be appointed for each district instead of at each term of court; the provision for the appointment of investigators was deleted, as was the language relating to cities of more than 500,000 population and those with less than that figure.

Finally, the requirement that the public defender shall act as counsel for each defendant to whom he is assigned at every stage of the prosecution, is being rewritten for clarification.

I am hopeful that the bill can be reported out favorably by the full committee and passed by the House before the end of the current session. A similar bill, I might add, is already under consideration in the Senate (introduced by a Republican, an indication of the nonpartisan nature of this legislation).

This legislation, if enacted, should have a number of desirable effects. It should encourage the development of similar systems in other jurisdictions of the United States and upgrade the administration of justice generally. Justice Brennan has deplored the fact that "too many cases come from the States to the Supreme Court presenting dismal pictures of official lawlessness, of illegal searches and seizures, illegal detentions attended by prolonged interrogation and coerced admissions of guilt, of the denial of counsel and, downright brutality." The public defender's chief responsibility is to safeguard the constitutional rights of those charged with crime, and the very existence of this office should discourage the kind of official recklessness that results in appellate court reversals. If there had been a public defender office in the District of Columbia, for example, the Mallory decision and the many painful interpretations that have come in its wake would never have been necessary.

Only as late as June 12, 1961, the Supreme Court overturned the 26-year-old conviction of a youth of subnormal intelligence who had been arrested and held incommunicado for 8 days without counsel prior to his arraignment (*Reck* v. *Pate*). While the conviction was reversed on the grounds that the defendant's confession was coerced and therefore inadmissible, I am sure that had the defendant received adequate representation at the time of his trial, the correction of this injustice would not have had to wait 26 years, if, in fact, the injustice would have occurred at all.

By providing indigent defendants with skilled and experienced counsel the system should do much to upgrade the conduct of trials. Not only would fewer unscrupulous and perjured defenses be attempted, but the quality of the defense would assure the accused that his day at court was a fair one. My good friend, Judge Irving Kaufman, observes in this respect:

"The imposing arsenal of personal guarantees and rights which are accorded the defendants are but empty forms unless effectively marshaled and utilized by competent defense counsel. At the heart of any system of justice worthy of the name is the right of a man accused of a crime to a meaningful day in court; to the right to have the prosecution put to its proof before an impartial trier of facts, to have irrelevant matters excluded from consideration; to the right to cross-examine prosecution witnesses and to the right to present his own side of the story. To breathe life into these rights and to make the practice of justice equal to its theory, a civilized society recognizes an additional right—the right of an accused to counsel."

The public defender should also help to bring about more efficiency in court procedures and in disposing of court calendars. The public defender would not ask for repeated continuances in the hope that key witnesses will somehow disappear or that in the next term of court the defendant might draw a more lenient judge or jury. The experience of the public denfender would also expedite the trial by eliminating unnecessary technical objections and preliminary tech-

nical battles. Needless proof could be avoided through a stipulation of facts where these can be safely conceded. In many similar ways the public defender could make possible significant economies in criminal justice, and at the same time protect the rights of his clients.

He should also play a constructive role in reshaping the attitudes of offenders toward society. My good friend, Jim Bennett, Director of Prisons, has pointed out how the prisoner, after a trial that he considers unfair, "leaves the courtroom with his heart pouring forth hate and venom. Since rehabilitation to be true and lasting must come from within, nothing can be done with him until he has been purged of this rancor." The Prison Director believes that "much of the antagonism aroused can be avoided by fair and just treatment and representation throughout the proceedings. By minimizing errors, misunderstandings, and friction during the criminal proceedings, mental strains and tensions can be lessened, bitterness avoided, and the number who are incurably warped substantially reduced."

The public defender should also prevent much of the resentment that convicted defendants experience after they plead guilty and receive a substantial sentence. Nearly 90 percent of all Federal convictions are obtained on pleas of guilty; many of the defendants enter this plea after waiving in ignorance the benefit of counsel or succumbing to the insistence of a court-appointed attorney who is too busy to prepare a competent defense or to explain the consequence of this plea. One such prisoner wrote the Department of Justice:

"I have been sentenced for 2 years and 3 years probation. When I was judged by the honorable Judge * * *, I was asked by my attorney to plead guilty. Please believe me, I didn't know, nor did anyone explain to me the meaning of pleading guilty. I have never in my whole life, I am 40 years of age, committed any crime before. Since I am serving this sentence, I have learned by pleading guilty, that I have committed myself to something that I was not aware of. This is understandable, when you realize that I have had but 4 years of schooling, and the ways of the courts were foreign to me."

A meaning ssytem of representation should greatly reduce the number of appeals, so many of which grow out of the prisoners' belief that they have been denied their constitutional right to a fair trial. Jim Bennett told me of one prisoner who, after serving 8 years, was released on a writ of habeas corpus because of errors in the trial. This prisoner had filed 58 petitions, motions, and suits before he was finally released on a technicality. It is little wonder, then, that about one-third of the work of the circuit courts is devoted to hearing writs and motions filed by prisoners under section 2255. If the prisoners had been represented initially by defenders in whom the courts had confidence, there would be fewer hearings on these writs, many of which are, of course, without merit.

It seems to me that the public defender system would also do much to raise the status of the criminal lawyer generally. Too many lawyers, in my opinion, are reluctant to handle a criminal case, although this reluctance is not without basis. If the defendant is particularly unpopular in the community, some of the unpopularity tends to rub off on his defense counsel. And, of course, lawyers are apprehensive that if they accept cases of this kind their regular practice will be adversely affected. The public defender should have no hesitancy in representing defendants who have incurred the hostility of the community. It would be his job and so regarded by the community and his fellow lawyers.

Finally, the enactment of public defender legislation should not be without significance in achieving the greater purposes of our Nation. We prate of equality before the law; we boast of equal justice, but there is no such equality if the affluent defendant is represented by counsel and the indigent defendant is not. Justice, it has been said, is the bread of the nation since all hunger for it, but often the poor and the lowly must do without it.

We are in the midst of a time of crisis, a time of cold war that seemingly threatens to erupt at any moment into a conflagration of unprecedented proportions. Neither side stands to gain by atomic war, and it seems likely that the cold war will continue for a generation and more to come. It is a cold war waged for men's minds, hearts, and loyalties. Upon the outcome of that war will depend the survival of the democratic system of government. The United States now occupies a position of leadership in the democratic world, and in that position its words and actions are being studied by the Communist bloc, the uncommitted nations, and even the governments that have so far cast their lot with us. We must maintain that leadership if the free world is to endure, and we can do it only by demonstrating that the rights and needs of men are best served by a democratic system.

The Communists are using every possible means of discrediting and embarrassing us, including our court procedures and system of justice. You have already read, I am sure, some of the articles that have been published by impressionable observers commenting on the great strides the Russians have made in improving their court system. In their own press our judicial system is depicted as unjust, unfair, and weighted in favor of the rich and against the poor. This propaganda is, of course, intended to have an influential effect upon the uncommitted peoples of the world, most of whom are relatively impoverished and hence quick to identify themselves with the victims of injustice.

The trouble in obtaining approval of my bill is found in the old saying, "Every man loves justice at another man's home; nobody cares for it at his own." There is too much apathy and indifference to the plight of the poor devil standing alone before the august judge amidst the majestic surroundings of the court, standing there bewildered, seeking advice, counsel, and guidance.

The public defender legislation should, of course, be enacted on its own merits. But it is also a way or reaffirming to the world that all our citizens, regardless of their positions in life, their power, their wealth, or their poverty or color, are afforded the equal protection of our laws and our Constitution. This audience, I am sure, will agree with me that the Congress of the United States should provide this reaffirmation by making the guarantee of the sixth amendment an unquestioned reality.

The Late Dr. Frank Buchman, a World Figure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written this past week relative to the decease of that much respected resident of Allentown, Pa., who became a famous world figure as the founder of the movement known as Moral Re-Armament. I refer, of course, to the late Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an excellent editorial on this subject which appeared in the Morning Call, a newspaper of the said city of Allentown, on August 9, 1961, as follows:

HIS A CREED FOR ALL

Frank N. D. Buchman, the son of a Pennsburg grocery clerk, who claimed Allentown as his home and became a world-renowned figure by his unflagging adherence to a simple Christian ideal, has been gathered unto his God. Behind, he leaves a permanent mark on the minds of men.

In almost every part of the world this morning someone is living the basic creed of Moral Re-Armament: Absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, absolute love.

His was a creed that all could understand—the Christian as well as the non-Christian. And in it millions saw a bright hope for real peace in the world.

In a unique way, Dr. Buchman was able to associate himself at once with potentates and kings, with emperors and dictators, with businessmen and union leaders and with the man on the street in scores of nations on the several continents.

In the same way his organization was unique. No one knows how many members it has because it kept no such records, collected no dues, required nothing more of anyone than that he or she subscribe to the simple tenents of the movement. It was not a part of any church or denomination. Its followers were asked to participate within the framework of their own religious beliefs.

Because he so frequently moved in the high circles of Government and because his associates were more often than not men who made decisions regarding the fate of nations, Dr. Buchman quite naturally became at times a controversial figure, and his work was subject to scathing attack. But it never faltered, actually, and his followers never lagged in their enthusiasm as they increased in number over the years.

Dr. Buchman did not live to see his ideals create the world for which he hoped. A lesser man would have faltered in his faith. He did not. Deep in his heart he maintained the conviction that somewhere, sometime men would see the light of his message and the work of four decades would come into fruition.

The trumpets of war still blare stridently and the world may still have to undergo new and unspeakable bloodbaths. But great and good ideas never die, and someday, when peace does come, it may very well be written that it came because a man like Frank N. D. Buchman walked so many of the highways and byways of this earth, bearing his message of good will among men so quietly and yet so eloquently.

Disarmament for World Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is considering the President's

bill to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. I am hopeful that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will take up the bill before the end of August. With luck and hard work we may still be able to pass it in this session.

Some people have shrugged their shoulders at the idea of a Disarmament Agency in a world of an arms buildup. The atmosphere of Berlin seems a strange atmosphere in which to consider spending money to do research for disarmament. However, I think reflection on the matter suggests that the arms race in and of itself is extremely dangerous; ultimately, the only real protection for American and world security is an end to deadly weapons and the even more deadly trigger finger atmosphere. The following article by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, appearing in today's Washington Post, provides an excellent summary of why we must not overlook any possibility for disarmament and why the U.S. Disarmament Agency is an absolute must for world peace and security:

DISARMAMENT—AGENCY IS URGENTLY NEEDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Can President Kennedy expect to mobilize congressional support for a vast, new more-armaments program, and at the same time mobilize congressional support for a vast, new disarmament program?

If the present need is for an all-out effort to build military strength, is this the time for an all-out effort to get everybody to agree to decrease military strength?

Since the Soviets have rejected any inspection they cannot veto and since we will not accept disarmament we cannot inspect, is this whole disarmament exercise so meaningless that we might as well put it in charge of an office boy?

In other words, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lean back and yawn as it takes testimony this week on the proposed new U.S. disarmament agency for world peace and security—or should it sit bolt upright in the conviction that this is urgent, imperative, and significant business?

I believe that creating the proposed disarmament agency is urgent, imperative, and significant business.

My conviction is that the Congress will be making a grave mistake if it passes over this present opportunity to make the cause of world arms control—and disarmament—a major American concern with an agency operating at the highest level of Government, manned by the most competent people the President can command in order to devise the soundest conceivable program.

There are solid reasons why, despite surface appearances to the contrary, the disarmament agency is timely and needed:

1. Disarmament is a worldwide preoccupation. It is a deep and abiding concern for millions and millions of people—and rightly. The prospects of disarmament may be more difficult and more remote than the most wishful think and less difficult and less remote than the most cynical think. It may be as remote and difficult as getting to outer space seemed a decade ago.

2. Discussion and debate on disarmament are not going to be adjourned because there is fighting in Laos, tension in Berlin, or conflict in the Congo. There have been almost continuous disarmament negotiations with the Soviets for the past 4 years. The United States has not been well prepared for these negotiations. It's time we were.

3. Sometime there has got to be a will and a method to control the horrendous weapons. A balance of military strength is safer than an imbalance but an uncontrolled thermonuclear arms race could explode any time and something like 100 million casualties would be part of the consequence.

4. Of course we won't get disarmament until there is a change of attitude on the part of the Soviets on inspection and control. But regardless of the attitude of the Soviets—even if they only talk about it on Sunday and run away from it on Monday—the United States ought to be ready with the most practicable, thoroughly considered, wisely devised, and workable disarmament program which our best brains can produce. Our position on this matter before the whole world ought to be positive, constructive, and compelling.

John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament adviser and one of the Nation's ablest public servants, and William C. Foster, who will probably succeed him, are convinced that the proposed new disarmament agency is the best means of achieving all these purposes.

Operation Swift Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 7, 1961, as guest of the U.S. Army, I was privileged to visit the portion of my district in which Operation Swift Strike was being conducted. I was privileged to watch the airdrops at Patrick, S.C., in Chesterfield County, in the eastern part of the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District.

I hasten to congratulate our Army and our Air Force on the efficiency and intensity of the operations. I salute those brave men who participated, and who dropped from the sky to the ground, risking their lives, or serious injury, to train for the defense of our country. Each man who participated deserves the acclamation of this entire country.

I was proud of the fact that South Carolina Air National Guard participated, and that other men and units from South Carolina were active throughout the operation.

We were thrilled to see General LeMay, General Trapnell, General Adams, and other high-ranking officers of our military on the scene to watch the operations. The 101st Airborne participated vigorously in the strike, as did active and Reserve air units in the various fields in South and North Carolina.

On hand were thousands of patriotic citizens, characteristic of my section of the country, who came to watch their soldiers and their Army and their Air Force in action. I know they were proud of what they saw.

I was pleased to see so many Boy Scouts from the Pee Dee Council. General LeMay was most courteous in going over and speaking to these young men.

We went by helicopter from Darlington County Airfield to the scene of the drop. At the scene we were briefed by some public relations officers on the activity and the general conduct of the exercises. I was happy to report that while I was there not one single man who dropped was injured seriously, credit to the training being given our troops in these days and times. I did see two men whom I thought would be injured but their emergency chutes opened, showing again the safety precautions our Army takes with the troops under its jurisdiction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to publicly thank the Army for issuing me the invitation and for allowing this Member of Congress to witness this historic, necessary, and thrilling event. We have a great country, and we have great fighting men, and I am proud of both.

Supersonic Transports Reported Possible by 1970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing the United States, from the standpoint of national prestige, national defense, and the national economy, is the development of a commercial supersonic transport plane.

A report issued recently by three cooperating Government agencies expresses the view that a 2,000-mile-per-hour plane could become an actuality by 1970.

The report by the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Defense, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration makes it clear that Government financial backing is essential if an American-built supersonic commercial transport plane is to become a reality.

This is a conclusion which the Committee on Science and Astronautics reached last year following a series of public hearings on the matter. In a report to the House, in June 1960, the committee states:

The committee believes that to undertake development of a supersonic transport in the United States will have significant effects upon American industry and commerce, level of employment, and scientific advancement. The committee feels that a Government program for such development can be justified in the national interest. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the Congress make available the necessary financial assistance.

Following the issuance of the FAA-DOD-NASA report, the committee held further hearings in August of this year at which it reviewed with N. E. Halaby, Federal Aviation Administrator, and others, the progress being made in the development of a supersonic commercial transport plane.

It is anticipated that as a result of these new hearings a further report by the committee will subsequently be forthcoming.

In the meantime, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article from the Shreveport (La.) Times by United Press International on the FAA-DOD-NASA report.

The article follows:

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORTS REPORTED POSSIBLE BY 1970

WASHINGTON, July 23.—A new Government booklet estimates that the United States can develop a commercial transport plane which will fly 2,000 miles per hour by 1970–71.

The publication says the cost of developing such a plane is so great that Federal money will have to be used. But it says there should be a world market for more than 200 such planes and the Government should be able to get some of its money back through their sale.

The report was issued by the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It stresses that there is much to be done before a supersonic transport plane—able to fly three times the speed of sound—becomes an actuality.

But it notes that the B–58 and B–70 bomber programs and research into supersonic flight "provide the United States with a unique capability for developing a supersonic transport."

It states that the two biggest reasons for such a transport are economic benefits and "the maintenance of the present leadership and prestige of the United States in aviation matters."

FAA has asked Congress for $12 million for research on the supersonic transport during fiscal 1962. NASA plans to spend about $8.5 million this year.

Aviation industry representatives have told the Government agencies they must have a new type engine for the 200-foot long transport. Research must also be done on wing design and on fuselage and wing materials. Another problem is what effect the "sonic boom" will have at 2,000 miles per hour.

Conduct of Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter received from one of my constituents which is critical of the conduct of our foreign affairs. I have selected this letter because it is representative of opinion in my district and also because it is so forcefully written:

JULY 28, 1961.

Congressman CHARLES GUBSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been watching American prestige dropping, due to our vacillating foreign policy and our spineless attitude toward Cuba. How long are we going to allow this newest Hitler dictate to the United States?

The latest of a series of outrages is the stolen airplane incident. It seems to me that we should tell Castro that we want it back within a certain period of days, and if it is not returned we should go in force to recover it. I am not advocating war just for the sake of war, but if we do not make a firm stand soon we might not have anything left to fight for.

If I may digress for a moment to point out that the American public is tired of being fooled, and weary of fighting wars to lose the peace. We have followed a pattern beginning with Roosevelt and his very stupid mistake of allowing Russia to enter Berlin first. The errors were compounded by the following random examples:

1. Encouraging the Hungarian revolt and then not helping them.

2. Playing a game in Korea with an artificial border; having victory in sight and then laying off in a one-upmanship way.

3. Engaging in a limited action in Laos that accomplished less than nothing.

4. Supporting West Germany is fine, but paying the whole bill is another example of Yankee foggy bottom. West Germany is fat with wealth and in a much better financial position than the so-called victorious allies.

5. And now Cuba. If we were going to support a revolutionary attack on Castro we should at least do it right. The comic opera results were appropriately climaxed by the tractor fiasco.

Believe me, it is about time the American public were let in on the secret and allowed to make some decisions. I don't think they could do any worse than our CIA, foreign diplomats, career politicians, and (bless them) college professors. If I thought that it would do any good to write to Mr. Kennedy I would do it, but it would probably be read by some civil servant in this bureaucratic mess and filed as a crank letter.

Seething with indignation, I remain someone who would like to be proud of being an American again.

MILLICENT HORNE,
Mrs. W. A. Horne.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.

The Exodus Begins in South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the growing wave of self-expression by the natives of Africa has been recognized and aided by almost all the original colonial governments. There have been incidents of violence; there may be more. But almost everywhere there has been the acceptance that freedom and self-government is the heritage of Africans quite as it is for Europeans, Americans, and Asians. In one country, however, this recognition has not been granted. And the people in control of the government continue to fly in the face of the inevitable. The English-speaking white people in the country refuse to accept or share in the blame for the unenlightened, cruel treatment that the nonwhites have received from the government. Their objection to the stupid, inhuman policy of the Verwoerd Afrikaner government cannot, however, be expressed in the manner of men under law. For though they represent close to 45 percent of the white population, the English-speaking whites have no practical voice in the government. Their alternative is to move from the land of their birth, leaving businesses and all else behind. In an article in today's Washington Post, Mr. Stanley Uys describes this exodus of the talented from the Union of South Africa. With the departure of these moderates, the ultimate native explosion becomes more inevitable.

Though other sections of the world occupy our immediate attention, we must not forget the powder keg that is South Africa. While there is still time, we must seek to stir a breath of reason into the hearts of the anachronistic Afrikaners.

The article follows:

CAPE TOWN.—"I am leaving South Africa for the simple reason that I have become a foreigner in the land of my birth."

These words, uttered by an English-speaking South African shortly before he emigrated to Australia, express the feelings of scores of other South African emigrants.

Since the proclamation of the republic on May 31, English-speaking South Africans have been required to undergo a personality change. Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd has told them to become true South Africans.

Although they number 1.25 million in a total white population of 3 million, English-speaking South Africans know that their traditions count for nothing in the republic. The painstaking removal of royal emblems from public buildings by government hammer and chisel crews is merely the culmination of 13 years of tradition dishonoring; a political process designed to eradicate English traditions and replace them with Afrikaner republican traditions.

Rapidly, Dr. Verwoerd is creating a norm for a loyal republican: A citizen who cherishes, or at least respects, the republican sentiments of the Afrikaner (Dutch) section, and who supports the race policies of the nationalist government, which has fostered a policy of separation of the races, called apartheid.

The transformation, within a year of Radio South Africa from an impartial corporation into an openly propagandist service, proclaiming racist policies and laying down standards of patriotism, illustrates vividly the change that has come over the country.

It is from this atmosphere, and from the threat of a clash between Afrikaner and African nationalism, that English-speaking South Africans have been emigrating by the score. There is no immediate panic. Superficially, everything is reasonably quiet and orderly. But every week some of South Africa's most valuable citizens board ships and and planes and leave for Britain, Australia, Canada—for good.

The erosion of talent is one of the most alarming features of life here today. A staggering number of university professors and lecturers have quit the country. Very few replacements are available and educational standards are falling. Architects, lawyers, doctors, businessmen are leaving. This is the caliber of emigrant South Africa is exporting.

They go with very little fuss. Others join them when they can sell their houses and liquidate their assets. Husbands or wives often leave furtively on quick reconnaissance trips abroad to see where they would like to settle—a trifle ashamed to admit that they are among the quitters. Altogether they number only some thousands. They are the intellectual, professional, and business elite though. Some are not even embittered. They simply shrug their shoulders and declare they have lost faith in South Africa's future.

On the whole, however, there has been a hardening of attitudes. The conquered English-speaking section is hostile toward the Afrikaner faction. The Afrikaners are violently hostile toward the liberals who

undermine white supremacy. The Africans themselves, sullenly licking their wounds after two disastrous clashes with government, are looking for an opening through which to reopen the struggle for political rights.

An amazing change has come over the 1½ million coloreds (of mixed race descent) who live mainly in the Cape Province. Historically a politically apathetic community, anxious to be regarded as an appendage of the white population, it has now swung into revolt against apartheid almost overnight.

Dr. Verwoerd's refusal to make even minor concessions to the coloreds has forced their leaders into making unprecedented demands for equal rights.

Political activity is at a low level. Dr. Verwoerd is believed to be preparing for a snap general election in October to secure a new 5-year term of office before the economic situation deteriorates further, and the white parliamentary opposition is reconciled to losing even more ground in this election.

The 12 million nonwhites will take no part in the election. With the exception of about 25,000 registered colored voters, the nonwhites are excluded from all white elections.

Meanwhile, the tourists come and go, the warm beaches of the Natal coast are crowded, the cafes offer soft lights, good food, and music—and the casual visitor would never suspect that South Africa, the major bastion of white rule in Africa, is anything but a happy, sunny, prosperous country.

A Mighty Storm Is Raging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of August 11, Life magazine has presented a thoughtful and important editorial entitled "A Mighty Storm Is Raging." It is timely today and I am glad to make it available to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A MIGHTY STORM IS RAGING—SCOPE OF KHRUSHCHEV'S MANIFESTO POINTS UP FAILURE OF THE WEST TO EXPLOIT OUR DEEDS AND AIMS

Nikita Khrushchev's draft of a new program for the Soviet Communist Party is a truly formidable document. Its very length—47,000 words—is impressive, but so are its contents. It is history (ranging from Marx's Manifesto to orbiting space), economics (the self-destroying "contradictions" of capitalism), political science (the future management of everything from agriculture to education). It is even religion, complete from the Marxist-Leninist revealed truth that communism is history's chosen instrument, to Khrushchev's own 12 commandments. Like a Biblical prophet of old, he rumbled his own apocalypse: "A mighty unifying thunderstorm, marking the springtime of mankind, is raging over the earth."

Ostensibly, it is the chart of a 20-year task ahead for the party, to take Russia from its present Socialist base into pure communism and a literal paradise on earth. Actually, it is also a blueprint and battle plan for all the world's 36,880,000 Communist Party members, who now control a third of all mankind and already have a going operation to "break the decayed capitalist shell" and conquer the remaining two-thirds. His prescribed tactics—phrased in an Orwellian "Newspeak" which often uses a word to describe its opposite—are ominous for any in the free world who still think that communism can ever permanently be appeased:

Peace: In 1984's lexicon, of course, this means war. So it does for Khrushchev, but in a much more subtle way. As before, he supports peaceful coexistence between capitalist and socialist states. Does this mean an end to struggle? On the contrary, it forms the basis for "a specific form of class struggle" in which the Soviets will oppose all wars except "just anti-imperialist wars of liberation"—another Newspeak phrase for the sort of infiltration by Communist guerrillas who are taking over Laos. In short, coexistence bars all wars except the ones the Soviet wants.

United fronts: Non-Communist liberal parties often join Communists in supporting specific aims. Khrushchev gives his blessing for work within bourgeois parliaments. But in surprisingly candid language he makes clear that all such alliances are temporary and can be betrayed: success for Communists depends on how well they "master the use of all forms of struggle—peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary—and how well they are prepared to replace one form of struggle by another as quickly and unexpectedly as possible."

For the Soviet people themselves, Khrushchev's promises were radiant, and often touched with a lofty spirituality as when he pictured the Soviet new man as one "who will harmoniously combine spiritual wealth, moral purity and a perfect physique (developed through mass sports)," or again in his 12 precepts for Soviet morality: devotion to party and country, conscientious labor for society, high sense of public duty, brotherhood, respect for family and offspring, and honesty and truthfulness. In the utopia ahead, this dutiful, moral, muscular new man would see taxes abolished, free rent, gas, and subway rides, "the world's shortest and highest-paid working day," catered meals to liberate the housewife—and a lots more.

But even in the easy realm of promises he was cautious enough to put in some fine print or vitiating exceptions:

Democracy: With pure communism approaching, the gospel according to Marx requires the state (in Russia, the Communist Party) to wither away, along with Lenin's dictatorship of the proletariat. Khrushchev handles this with magnificent semantic acrobatics: "The party holds that the dictatorship of the working class (i.e., party) will cease to be necessary before the state (again, party) withers away. The state will survive until the complete victory of communism." In short, party dictatorship will wither but party dictatorship will flourish.

Elections: Stalin's personal dictatorship, which he never once mentions by name, is implicitly condemned as the familiar "cult of the individual" which is "incompatible with Leninist principles." To prevent its recurrence, Khrushchev promises that a fourth of the Central Committee and Presidium will be replaced at each election with individuals limited to three successive terms. Could this replace even him? Hardly: "Particular party workers may, by virtue of their abilities, be successively elected to the leading bodies for a longer period."

Freedom: Many will be surprised to learn that "freedom of speech, of the press" already exist. It is interesting how he translates this freedom in the role of the arts: they "must be a source of happiness and inspiration to millions of people, must express their will, must enrich them ideologically and educate them morally."

There are lots of holes in the program, to be sure, and Americans may smile that Khrushchev is promising, as the ultimate goal of communism, many things we take for granted, such as adequate housing, clothes, shoes and kitchen appliances. Many upper-class Communists, say our Kremlinologists, may find it an old familiar mixture.

But it will undoubtedly have an enormous and popular appeal to most Russians who are hungry for a sign of hope. And it will have an undoubted impact on the other big audience it is aimed at—the emerging peoples of new nations who are promised "rapid economic and cultural progress" that "transforms a backward country into an industrial country within the lifetime of one generation" and "lifts the people out of darkness."

We can only blame ourselves if we fail to get its chief message to us: total, endless war in which there can be no final settlement short of our destruction or surrender, a war to which the Khrushchev creed does, indeed, bring a high order of devotion, of duty (unswerving to communism) and even of truthfulness—in informing us of our intended fate.

Whether or not Khrushchev can fulfill all its grandiose promises, he has put the West at a disadvantage by once again showing the world that communism does have a grand strategy, does have a long-range plan that embraces both past and future, can paint its own destiny in terms to convince millions that it is history's destined instrument. So saying, it makes us ask: Why has the free world no high-powered task force, no combined cold war high command, making equally potent use of our own impressive history of hundreds of millions brought to independence and freedom, of our economic miracles in rebuilding the postwar world, and of master plans to help the emerging nations "lift the people out of darkness"?

William Whyte Discusses New Ideas in Preserving, Developing Open Spaces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, the Forests Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture held hearings on H.R. 6289, a bill to create a scenic and recreational area known as the Ozark Scenic Riverways in southern Missouri. At the time of these hearings, Mr. William Whyte testified on the new concept which is embodied in this bill, a new concept for the administration of open areas under Federal control. Mr. Whyte, best known for his book "The Organization Man," is now associated with the Rockefeller Bros. Fund studying this problem. He is the author of the Urban Land Institute's Technical Bulletin 36, "Securing Open Space for Urban America: Conservation Easements," and a Life magazine article in the same area.

Mr. Whyte has given a great deal of thought to the needs which we will face for open space as the American population continues to grow. This is a problem of prime concern to all Americans and there must be thought given to finding new ways to overcome the problem and improving the ways which already exist. Mr. Whyte's discussion of this new concept is worthy of the attention of all Americans. For this reason I am inserting it in the RECORD below:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM H. WHYTE ON H.R. 6289, OZARK SCENIC RIVERWAYS BILL, AUGUST 8, 1961, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

For the past 5 years I have been studying ways and means of saving our open spaces: in particular, the application of the easement principle. Part of the answer to the open space problem seems simple enough; buy the land and make it into a park. So we should, but even if we vastly step up our park programs, there isn't the money to buy all the space we would want to save and furthermore, there are lots of areas where conventional park development really isn't the answer. The most challenging question, then, is this: What practical way is there to save open space without having to buy it all up?

This is why I wish to testify in favor of H.R. 6289. It is important for the great benefits that it promises for the Ozark Riverways; it may be even more important, however, as a model that can stir imaginations and stimulate similar programs all over the United States.

The core of H.R. 6289 is its use of easement principle. It is an ancient one; under our law of eminent domain, the public can buy the full bundle of property rights from the landowner—the fee simple.

But the public does not have to buy the whole bundle of rights. In many cases, its purpose can be served by buying only one or a few of the rights in the property. As with outright purchase, the requirements are, simply, that there be a public purpose involved in the purchase and that the landowner be given fair compensation.

For example, if the Government wants to make sure that no tall buildings or towers are built around an airfield, it does not have to buy up the surrounding property; it often buys an air safety easement from the landowners—that is, the landowner's right to put up a tall building or tower.

Easements have also been very useful in protecting highways; when you drive along the New York Thruway, for example, you note that it is through a natural uncluttered landscape; one reason is that the thruway people bought scenic easements at the time they purchased the land for the right-of-way; the owners kept title of the land covered by the easement but gave up the right to develop it with signs or commercial structures.

Until recently, these precedents didn't stir much interest. It's the bulldozer that's done the job; because of the frightening rate at which our open spaces are being destroyed, planners and officials have been forced to seek new ways of saving the landscape, and in this search a new potential for the easement principle has been found.

As a basic illustration, think of a stream valley, for here you find the universals of a problem that is remarkably similar from State to State. It is a valley that has not yet been ruined; the subdividers are pushing outward from the cities toward it, but there is still time to conserve the best part of the area. The local government, let us further assume, has done a good job of surveying the assets of the region and has worked up a sound plan. One part calls for purchase in fee simple; at one end of the valley there's a national reservoir and park site and this land will be bought outright. Then there's the use of the police power; the bottomland immediately bordering the stream is a flood plain and the local government has zoned this against development. The plain is a great sponge, and it would be clearly harmful were it covered with houses. Come flood time the poor devils who lived in them would be hurt; and even more, so would be the people who lived downstream.

This, clearly, is a proper exercise of the police power. But what about the rest of the land? Here the public wants a benefit—the continued openness of the land—and it cannot compel it with the police power. Instead, the local officials go to the landowners and say something like this: we believe it will be to the public purpose to have this land kept open. We know you probably want to keep it open anyway. Nevertheless, you do have a right to chop it up into a subdivision, or otherwise develop it. We want to buy that right away from you.

You will keep title to the land, you can continue farming it, or using it, as you have in the past. You don't have to give the public access to your property; the public's equity is that it be kept unspoiled. If the public also wishes to buy access—say, for fishing rights on part of the stream—that too can be negotiated but it is not necessarily a part of the easement.

The cost? The rule of thumb in easements is that the price should be the difference between the fair market of the land with the easement and without it—in other words, the money value the landowner is giving up. This depends on time and place: in an area predominantly in farming the landowner is giving up very little; (scenic easements along the Great River Road in Wisconsin, for example, cost an average of $15.06 per area, roughly one-fourth of the fee cost). In built-up areas near the city, however, the speculative value of the development rights is such that easements could cost as much as the fee simple. It is not a device, in short, that can save an area that's already overrun.

Advantages to the landowner:

1. Because other landowners in the area are covered by the plan he gets flank protection.

2. Integrity of an agricultural area is assured; thus protecting him from adverse land uses.

3. Tax protection: he escapes the vicious spiral that is forcing many farms into subdivisions. Assessments cannot be raised to match value of the land for subdivision since the land legally cannot be subdivided.

4. Enhancement of value of the rest of his property; because of the guarantee provided by the easement, value of abutting land is increased.

Advantages to the public:

1. Achieves conservation of prime land without having to bear fee simple costs.

2. Land remains on the tax rolls.

3. No maintenance cost: the landowner maintains it.

4. Most important, the land remains productive and alive. It is not institutionalized open space; it is the natural, living landscape—the kind we treasure most of all.

The Ozark riverways is a broader example of all these points than the small valley I have been using; for that reason it could prove the most important of all—and for the small valleys, too. In areas all over the country open space plans are being pushed. Thanks to a virtual wave of open space enabling acts and grant-in-aid programs communities have at last the tools to cope with the problem. (New York, $75 million; New Jersey, $60 million; Wisconsin, $50 million). Title VII of the Housing Act, pioneered by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, by providing $50 million in seed money grants is spurring States and local government to further action.

But what about the plans themselves? What is needed is a bold, imaginative example. The Ozark riverways is just that: it makes so much good commonsense and it makes it with such a broad sweep that it can spur the plans of every State, county, or township with a river or a stream in it.

Disarmament Agency Is Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on this 16th anniversary of the end of the most destructive war in world history, we must keep before us the ultimate objective of free men everywhere in the world: a true peace under law. The Red action in East Berlin in the last 48 hours has pointed up again how close we are at all hours of these days to the occurrence of an incident that could spark off another armed conflict. The President's forceful assertion of our position and the concomitant recall of certain of our Reserve forces will suffice, we all hope, to deter the Reds from such conflict. These considerations of the moment serve also to emphasize how urgently the world requires immediate establishment of the U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

Today a committee of the other House will begin its hearings on the disarmament agency bill. The urgency of the need for the disarmament agency is the subject of today's column in the Washington Post by the distinguished commentator, Roscoe Drummond. Mr. Drummond's treatment of the topic is such that I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Can President Kennedy expect to mobilize congressional support for a vast, new more-armaments program, and at the same time mobilize congressional support for a vast, new disarmament program?

If the present need is for an allout effort to build military strength, is this the time for an allout effort to get everybody to agree to decrease military strength?

Since the Soviets have rejected any inspection they cannot veto and since we will not accept disarmament we cannot inspect, is this whole disarmament exercise so meaningless that we might as well put it in charge of an office boy?

In other words, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lean back and yawn as it takes testimony this week on the proposed new U.S. disarmament agency for world peace and security—or should it sit bolt upright in the conviction that this is urgent, imperative, and significant business?

I believe that creating the proposed disarmament agency is urgent, imperative, and significant business.

My conviction is that, the Congress will be making a grave mistake if it passes over this present opportunity to make the cause of world arms control—and disarmament—a major American concern with an agency operating at the highest level of Government, manned by the most competent people the President can command in order to devise the soundest conceivable program.

There are solid reasons why, despite surface appearances to the contrary, the disarmament agency is timely and needed:

1. Disarmament is a worldwide preoccupation. It is a deep and abiding concern for millions and millions of people—and rightly. The prospects of disarmament may be more difficult and more remote than the most wishful think and less difficult and less remote than the most cynical. It may

be as remote and difficult as getting to outer space seemed a decade ago.

2. Discussion and debate on disarmament are not going to be adjourned because there is fighting in Laos, tension in Berlin, or conflict in the Congo. There have been almost continuous disarmament negotiations with the Soviets for the past 4 years. The United States has not been well prepared for these negotiations. It's time we were.

3. Sometime there has got to be a will and a method to control the horrendous weapons. A balance of military strength is safer than an imbalance but an uncontrolled thermonuclear arms race could explode any time and something like 100 million casualties would be part of the consequence.

4. Of course we won't get disarmament until there is a change of attitude on the part of the Soviets on inspection and control. But regardless of the attitude of the Soviets—even if they only talk about it on Sunday and run away from it on Monday—the United States ought to be ready with the most practicable, thoroughly considered, wisely devised, and workable disarmament program which our best brains can produce. Our position on this matter before the whole world ought to be positive, constructive, and compelling.

John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament adviser and one of the Nation's ablest public servants, and William C. Foster, who will probably succeed him, are convinced that the proposed new disarmament agency is the best means of achieving all these purposes.

California's Coordinated Water Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a sudden awakening to the need for coordinated planning for the development of water resources is observed throughout the United States. Requirements shoot to the top of forecast charts. Supplies have been polluted or overextended. Many urban areas in the humid zones have been jolted out of their complacency with regard to the vital resource, water.

In the arid West, and particularly in California, the needs for resource planning and water conservation and use was recognized much earlier. With a severe drought in progress there, however, the interest is even more intense today.

In 1959, under the alert leadership of Gov. Edmund G. Brown, a long-range coordinated, multiple-purpose State water plan was adopted by the California Legislature. Other States might profit from study of how this plan put forward by a farsighted and dynamic Governor came into being and what its purposes are.

As one with a lifelong interest in fish and game matters, I am glad to say that my State has been in the forefront in developing the idea of multiple uses and comprehensive conservation programs in relation to her water projects. The State water plan provides for fish and wildlife enhancement as well as other water needs.

The California Water Commission is required to determine the relationship of water projects proposed in California to the approved statewide plan in advance of release of priority of State water right filings. This protects the integrity of the comprehensive plan without concentrating the construction of projects in the hands of the State.

Mr. William E. Warne, the very able director of the California Department of Water Resources, former Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation and Assistant Secretary of Interior, has written an article explaining the California water plan. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

CALIFORNIA'S STATE WATER PLAN

(By William E. Warne, director, department of water resources, Sacramento, Calif.)

From close at hand, it often is difficult to see when a basic change has been made. Often, such fundamental actions are left to the historians to identify.

It has escaped many that just such a basic action was taken by the State of California in 1959 when it adopted under Gov. Edmund G. Brown's leadership the State water plan as expressed in bulletin No. 3 of the department of water resources. Then followed the approval of the State water project, financed to the extent of almost $2 billion, for immediate construction.

Bulletin No. 3 set out a long-range plan for the development of California's water resources, comprehensive in nature, and then said:

"The job is a big one, and will require the combined efforts of the Federal Government, the State Government, and local agencies, as well as private entities and individuals, with the State logically taking a leading role in administration and coordination as well as financing and construction."

With the adoption of this plan, for the first time a State of this United States assumed the role of the coordinator of its own comprehensive water development, and pledged itself to construct the needed projects which others might not build. California at that point matured, and became master of her own destiny. This came just in the nick of time, too, because already water needs beyond the reach of authorized Federal programs and beyond the scope of local and private interests were being felt and untended.

California then soberly, after much debate, with eyes fully open, voted to build the statewide project which is destined to become the initial unit of the fulfillment of the State plan.

These are very important decisions, and in the decades ahead, yes, even generations ahead, they will be referred to as crucial to the new California that will develop.

From bulletin No. 3, let me quote the statement of what the plan, now adopted, does:

"1. It evaluates the water supply available to California and describes the places and characteristics of its occurrence.

"2. It estimates the water requirements, both present and future, for all purposes for each area of the State, as best as can be foreseen now.

"3. It points out (a) the watersheds where present estimates indicate surplus waters exist over and above the future needs for local development, and gives an estimate of such surplus, and (b) the areas of deficiency and the estimated deficiency for each such area.

"4. It outlines existing and prospective water problems in each area of the State.

"5. It describes the beneficial uses to which the remaining unappropriated waters of the State should be put for maximum benefit to the people of all areas of the State.

"6. It suggests the manner in which the waters of the State should be distributed for the benefit and use of all areas.

"7. It proposes objectives toward which future development of the water resources of the State should be directed in all areas of the State, and suggests broad patterns for guidance toward these objectives.

"8. It defines these objectives in terms of potential physical accomplishments, which may be used to measure the merits of projects proposed for construction by any agency.

"9. Finally, it demonstrates that the waters available to the State of California, including the State's rights in and to the waters of the Colorado River, are not only adequate for full future development of the land and other resources of the State, but also that physical accomplishment of these objectives is possible."

The State water plan was not sucked out of someone's thumb. It was developed out of the accumulation of decades of basic data and surveys of needs and requirements.

Through the adoption of the plan, note that the State of California made no effort to preempt the field of construction and did not do so. The plan anticipates that local, private, and Federal agencies will build those units of the comprehensive plan that fall into their programs and are of sufficient interest to them to warrant their efforts.

The comprehensive plan very likely will never be completed because it is in effect without end. Some of the projects are a long, long way in the future, beyond our ability to see plainly all needs and all possibilities of satisfying them. Therefore, like a camera, it has placed the nearer objects in much sharper focus than the farther ones. The plan is flexible and subject to continual refinement. But it exists and it is useful, especially as a guide to what needs to be done next and how to avoid doing an expedient thing now that will stand in the way of doing a much more important thing later.

The plan made possible the State water project and the State water project is essential to the welfare of the whole State as California forecasts its growth to 1990.

The plan was built on earlier plans, just as it may in turn eventually become the foundation of later plans. Previous studies that approached the State water plan in scope and magnitude began with "The Irrigation of the San Joaquin, Tulare, and Sacramento Valleys of the State of California", published in 1874 by the House of Representatives as Executive Document No. 290, 43d Congress, 1st session. A long list of additional State and Federal reports followed. One of these led directly to the Central Valley project. Bulletin No. 3, however, is the most comprehensive and has led directly to the State water project.

Best Fidelity Bonding Rate—Trade Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months our newspapers and magazines have been filled with criticism and condemnation of labor unions. I am not denying that there have been abuses. However, I am very happy to have this opportunity to call to your attention a

very favorable, and enviable, trade union record.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a paragraph from a report on trade unions prepared by Mr. Henry Mayer, of New York:

XI. WHO HAS THE LOWEST HONESTY FIDELITY BONDING RATE IN AMERICA?—TRADE UNIONS

The American Surety Association, which comprises all of the companies in the bonding field, has just completed a survey of its bonding rates with respect to so-called honesty fidelity bonds. It concluded, on the basis of the survey, that the trade union movement has the best bonding experience in America—and that includes all of business, banks, and fraternal organizations.

Disarmament Agency Is Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist Roscoe Drummond. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 14, 1961.

Mr. Drummond brings us to the realization that just as surely as we must remain strong, and become stronger, in our competition with the Soviet Union, so must we also prepare for disarmament. We must work continually to find some means of coming to agreement with the Soviets in the area which will determine the future of mankind: disarmament. The urgency of this need should be seen clearly by all of us.

Mr. Drummond's article follows:

DISARMAMENT AGENCY IS TIMELY AND NEEDED—WILL CONGRESS ARM AND DISARM, TOO?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, August 13.—Can President Kennedy expect to mobilize congressional support for a vast, new more-armaments program, and at the same time mobilize congressional support for a vast, new disarmament program?

If the present need is for an all-out effort to build military strength, is this the time for an all-out effort to get everybody to agree to decrease military strength?

Since the Soviets have rejected any inspection they cannot veto and since we will not accept disarmament we cannot inspect, is this whole disaramament exercise so meaningless that we might as well put it in charge of an office boy?

In other words, should the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lean back and yawn as it takes testimony this week on the proposed new U.S. Disarmament Agency for world peace and security—or should it sit bolt upright in the conviction that this is urgent, imperative and significant business?

I believe that creating the proposed disarmament agency is urgent, imperative and significant busines.

My conviction is that the Congress will be making a grave mistake if it passes over this present opportunity to make the cause of world arms control—and disarmament—a major American concern with an agency operating at the highest level of government, manned by the most competent people the President can command in order to devise the soundest conceivable program.

There are solid reasons why, despite surface appearances to the contrary, the disarmament agency is timely and needed:

1. Disarmament is a worldwide preoccupation. It is a deep and abiding concern for millions and millions of people—and rightly. The prospects of disarmament may be more difficult and more remote than the most wishful think and less difficult and less remote than the most cynical think. It may be as remote and difficult as getting to outer space seemed a decade ago. Disarmament is a vital world topic and the United States ought to be putting some of its best men and best minds into showing how it can be realized.

2. Discussion and debate on disarmament are not going to be adjourned because there is fighting in Laos, tension in Berlin or conflict in the Congo. There have been almost continuous disarmament negotiations with the Soviets for the last 4 years. The United States has not been well prepared for these negotiations. It's time we were. There will be disarmament debate at the U.N. next month—and we ought to be far better prepared.

3. Sometime there has got to be a will and a method to control the horrendous weapons. A balance of military strength is safer than an imbalance but an uncontrolled thermonuclear arms race could explode anytime and something like 100 million casualties would be part of the consequence. All humanity's stake in bringing armaments under control and in reducing them is so great that the competence and concentration which we put into it cannot be too great. We ought to be its architect in chief, its advocate in chief.

4. Of course we won't get disarmament until there is a change of attitude on the part of the Soviets on inspection and control. But regardless of the attitude of the Soviets—even if they only talk about it on Sunday and run away from it on Monday—the United States ought to be ready with the most practicable, thoroughly considered, wisely devised and workable disarmament program which our best brains can produce. Our position on this matter before the whole world ought to be positive, constructive, and compelling.

John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament adviser and one of the Nation's ablest public servants, and William C. Foster, who will probably succeed him, are convinced that the proposed new disarmament agency is the best means of achieving all these purposes. We haven't in the past put the competence and resources into the study of disarmament which were needed. As a result some of our positions have been inadequate and half-baked. That isn't good enough.

A strong, cogent, realistic disarmament position is crucial to the U.S. foreign policy and the case for the disarmament agency is urgently valid.

Antitrust Laws and Professional Team Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for a number of years legislation has been pending in the Congress with respect to antitrust laws and organized professional team sports. Among the matters dealt with by such legislation has been the televising of games. In my opinion, legislation should be enacted to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt those aspects of professional team sports which are necessary to the continuance of professional baseball, football, basketball, and hockey. For this reason, I joined as a cosponsor of S. 1856.

Recently, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried an article concerning television and professional football. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFICULT TO FIND THE REASON

(By Robert L. Burnes)

The gentlemen who operate the various clubs in the National Football League and who have done an excellent job of building this into a pleasant, prosperous and enjoyable enterprise have been known occasionally to cry "wolf" on the necessity of purchasing tickets in advance for their games.

Now, tossed for a long loss by a hard-to-figure Government decision on their television contract, the same operators are alarmed over what the future might hold—and with good reason.

To cut through the morass of legal technicalities, it can be stated that the governmental decision, outlawing the television package the league contrived with the Columbia Broadcasting System, could within a few years bring the following results:

1. It could mean the end of professional football in tiny Green Bay, a community which has competed on even terms with the big boys and even has a stadium seating more people than the population of the town.

2. It could force other clubs with modest seating capacities to the wall and perhaps into oblivion. This would have to include the football Cardinals particularly as long as they are playing in Busch Stadium.

MUST TURN TO CONGRESS

3. Instead of the tight, closely contested battles which are now the league's trademark, where any team on any Sunday has a chance to knock off any opponent, within a few years you could have a situation where a handful of teams would be routing surviving opponents by scores of 60–0.

Such results coming out of this one decision seem almost unbelievable. Yet league officials and other observers of the football scene maintain that this is true. So do television officials.

League officials are bitter, not only about this turn of events but the lateness of the decision, only a couple of months before the season opens. They are also puzzled.

"This television package was put together months ago," one league official said bitterly in New York the other day. "Commissioner Pete Rozelle worked on this thing night and day from the time he took office. He checked every step with attorneys and with television people. He had reason to believe he was conforming to everything.

"Even if he wasn't," the man went on, "why did the Government wait until the last minute to take action? This could bankrupt several clubs."

It is too late to do anything about it this year, he admitted. There is no immediate redress through the courts. The only thing that can be done is to get some legislation through the Congress spelling out what professional sports can and cannot do in the way of televising games on a package basis.

CLUBS MUST MAKE OWN TV DEALS

Briefly stated, the league television package with CBS was worth $9 million spread over 2 years. There are 14 clubs in the league and they would share equally in the revenue. This meant that each club would receive a little over $300,000 in television money each season.

That money would take care of the payroll and some other expenses. Now the budget has to be rewritten.

The budget already is geared to a certain level. Player contracts have been signed. Tex Schramm of the Dallas club told the judge hearing the case that he needed $60,000 a Sunday at home, plus 40 percent of the road gate, plus the television money to break even.

What happens now? The club now must make their own television contracts. It won't net them as much money in most instances. Beyond this, the better clubs will be able to build up networks. For this they will receive more money.

Where this hits a city like Green Bay is that a television sponsor must study the number of potential viewers. If he has a choice between Green Bay, for instance, with a population under 40,000, or Chicago, with an area population of over 5 million, you know which one he will take.

The more television money a team gets, the better it can build up its team. Conversely, the team with no television or little revenue will lose players.

That's one of the things which puzzles the National Football League. Ultimately this could mean a loss of revenue to the Government because a drop in attendance would mean a drop in tax money.

What is also puzzling the National Football League is why their contract is nullified and that of the American Football League isn't touched.

"They've had this package since the day they started," the man said. "Without it, the American couldn't have gotten off the ground. Don't get me wrong. We don't want them to get clipped. We just want to have the right to do the same thing. Frankly, we can't figure where they're right and we're wrong."

Whatever the situation, the problem is a tough one. It puts a greater premium on ticket sales. In this instance, this applies to the football Cardinals who have a fine team and could be one of the best in the league this year. If you haven't bought your season tickets yet, you should. Now it is something more than a matter of passing interest. It is one of vital concern.

Dilemma of the Captives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thoughtful and timely editorial from the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., that appeared in the issue of Monday, July 31, 1961. The editorial follows:

DILEMMA OF THE CAPTIVES

At the table were many exiles from the Iron Curtain countries. Typical was a clear-eyed, strong-faced Pole who once had been a prosecutor in wartime Poland's underground law enforcement system.

What did these men want? A good deal more, some said, than the annual lip service they feel is being paid their cause by such things as Captive Nations Week, with accompanying proclamations and exhortations.

Representing nine Eastern European satellites with nearly 100 million people, a tightly held grouping that is said to add a third to Soviet power, the exiles call for bold, positive measures to press before the whole world their case for self-determination and new freedom. They are ready with specifics. Their organization, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, ticks off what they would like the United States and the West to do:

Reaffirm steadily the wartime and postwar commitments for free elections and other guarantees of liberty in most satellite lands.

Call upon the United Nations again and again to debate and review the denial of self-determination in the nine captive nations, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania.

Stress at every high level Western meeting that any general European settlement must include acceptance of this principle.

Exert continuing pressure on Moscow to withdraw agents and armed forces from the satellites.

Promote worldwide opposition to the spread and maintenance of Soviet colonialism.

To develop this aggressive thrust against Soviet satellite control is, in the exiles' view, to create an Eastern European political deterrent useful to the West as a buttress to NATO's military deterrent.

They believe this new deterrent will work by unsettling Moscow, by producing instability both in the satellites and in Russia itself, by persuading Red leaders that military transit and communications through the satellites would be dangerously insecure in any actual operations against the West.

The captives and their exile spokesmen make plain that full freedom is of course the final goal. But as realists they know that is a great distance away. The bold program they want today is one they think necessary to sustain the captives' hopes.

The hard task of Western leaders is to find that policy and action which extends genuine but not false hope, which keeps our silent allies at firm resolve short of premature, self-destructive revolt.

Significance of St. Lawrence Seaway to World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John S. Stillman, Assistant to the Under Secretary of Commerce, at the International Seaway Festival, Ogdensburg, N.Y., on Monday, August 7, 1961. Mr. Stillman is a distinguished New Yorker and and able and conscientious member of the New Frontier:

SIGNIFICANCE OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TO WORLD TRADE

(Address of John S. Stillman, Assistant to the Under Secretary of Commerce at the International Seaway Festival, Ogdensburg, N.Y., Monday, August 7, 1961)

It is a distinct pleasure to be here today. Not only to return to my own State—but to bring you the greetings of President Kennedy and Secretary of Commerce Hodges—from the New Frontier in Washington to this vital frontier of the north country—with its unique problems and opportunities.

Three of your counties have already been designated as "redevelopment areas" by our Department and Jefferson County will be designated in a few days. Thus, even though the President has led the country to a significant economic recovery in the last 6 months, we in Washington are all very conscious of the continuing level of 6.9 percent unemployment in the Nation and 10 percent here in this area (down from the 14.2 percent of 6 months ago).

I will return to the economy, business matters, and the Commerce Department later, but I would like first to speak of the significance of the seaway, as this is a seaway festival.

As you probably know, the St. Lawrence Development Corporation is under the direction and supervision of Secretary Hodges. However, I recognize that one of the most difficult tasks that could possibly confront anyone speaking about the St. Lawrence Seaway, in Ogdensburg, is to find anything that is new and hitherto unsaid about this project.

While there may be some doubts as to whether the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway project has attained all that its fondest boosters hoped in the fields of trade and commerce, there is no doubt that the public attention that the seaway has received in the past years has been beyond its warmest supporters.

In the many years prior to 1954, when the idea of a St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway was meeting with opposition in every section of the country except in the few States in the Great Lakes Basin, those who supported this undertaking, I am sure, would have given anything they possessed to secure a fraction of the public attention that it has received since this job was gotten underway and been successfully completed.

I am certain that no one knows better than the citizens of this area that publicity alone cannot measure the success of the seaway project, nor can solve the many problems which lie ahead before the seaway is able to make its maximum contribution to the United States, to Canada, and to world trade.

I am proud as a Democrat and a member of President Kennedy's administration to speak of the great St. Lawrence Seaway project because my party and our President have been supporters of this great national development for many years. It was in his inaugural speech as Governor in 1929 that Franklin D. Roosevelt first spoke out officially on the need to develop this great resource. He supported St. Lawrence development throughout his 4 years as Governor and 13 years as President, even discussing it in his last press conference in March 1945, despite the press of the problems of a global war. President Truman also supported the project—but throughout the thirties and forties Congress would not act, largely as a result of the pressure of other transportation interests and east coast ports.

In 1954, however, our present President, then a Senator from Massachusetts, spoke out and voted in favor of building the St. Lawrence Seaway. Despite the traditional views of New England legislators and the wishes of some of his constituents, he acted in this courageous fashion because he sincerely believed the development of the seaway would benefit the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Over the period of 20 years previously, from 1933, on six different occasions not one Massachusetts Senator or Representative has voted for the seaway. In the same year, 1954, Senator Kennedy also showed his breadth of view of national and world problems by being the only New England Senator to support an amendment to strengthen the President's powers to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties.

Thereafter, with congressional opposition broken, the two great branches of government worked together to make the long-awaited seaway become a reality in 1959.

The 1961 season marks the third year of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes Seaway as an artery of our foreign trade and commerce. It is the third year in which this area qualifies as the fourth seacoast of the United States. I am sure that I do not have to call to your attention the fact that through the month of June this navigation season shows an increase in cargo tonnage of 13.4 percent for the Montreal-Lake Ontario section. In fact, in these 3 months downbound traffic was 5,272,180 tons—an increase of 48.9 percent over the comparable period for the last year. This is only in part a function of the increase in United States and Canadian exports. There was a slight decline in upstream traffic.

Traffic for the month of May 1961 through the Montreal-Lake Ontario section reached the highest monthly point since October 1959. Downbound tonnages for both sections also reflected substantial increases.

Certainly all of these recent statistics are giving a better picture, although, as you know, traffic volumes were somewhat overestimated in the seaway's planning stage. Certainly these figures are signs of a vigorous and expanding transportation complex.

Much has been written and much has been said since this great waterway became a reality in 1959. Heated discussions are heard about whether the St. Lawrence Seaway is a luxury or a necessity. Opinions on the benefits to be derived from the transportation standpoint may remain conflicting. Part of this unquestionably stems from the fact that the project was debated vehemently by both detractors and rabid supporters for years. I am sure that, while the fondest hopes voiced for the seaway have probably proven a bit too optimistic, the direct predictions certainly have not come to pass.

Here at Ogdensburg I am pleased to be able to say to you I have noted a basic business vigor that assures that this project is sound, is solid, and has better days ahead.

Before I left Washington, a matter relative to the St. Lawrence Seaway was called to my attention which reminded me of the two presidents of New York construction companies who were very jealous of their competitive standing. They met one day to match notes and to have a drink or two, and one of them said his company had received an order for a 50-story skyscraper and had finished it in a year. The other one, insistent on topping his colleague, said: "That is nothing. My firm received an order for a skyscraper twice as tall as the one you built, in January." The first builder interrupted and said: "I suppose you are going to tell me that you have already got that skyscraper built." "Hell, no," said the second boaster, "we are already throwing tenants out for nonpayment of rent."

Before I left Washington, I noticed that the Federal Maritime Board had decided to institute an investigation of conference rate practices here in the Great Lakes. Certainly, when you are being investigated by the Government, you know you have become of age. In all seriousness, however, I do believe it speaks well for your trade and commerce to know that the Federal Government is interested in it and will take the necessary steps, under the law, to assure that all shippers, similarly situated, are similarly treated.

The Department of Commerce has within its organization the Maritime Administration. It is the duty of this organization to address itself to the maritime needs of our country. Since the founding of our nation, the importance of a strong American merchant marine has been many times forcibly demonstrated. Those who first colonized and explored the country came here in ships, and ships were their first means of communication and trade with each other and with other countries. In war, merchant ships served first as the only American Navy, later as an important supplement to the regular Navy.

The United States was the leader in many maritime innovations, including the steamship, but after the Civil War the merchant fleet was neglected in favor of expansion of internal transport. Leadership in the development of the potentialities of steamships was left to Great Britain. Consequently by the first decade of the Twentieth Century, American-flag ships were carrying only one-tenth of the Nation's trade.

As in the preceding centuries, the last 50 years have brought many occasions when the security of the Nation was dependent in large measure on the availability of a strong and active U.S. merchant marine.

At the outbreak of World War I, most of the foreign-flag vessels, which at that time carried nearly 90 percent of the U.S. foreign trade, were withdrawn from our service. Goods piled up on our docks for lack of ships to carry them abroad. We had to do without essential imports. Our shippers were at the mercy of foreign carriers, freight rates soared.

When we became an active participant in World War I, we had to rely on our allies to transport our army and to carry its food and weapons. A huge and costly shipbuilding program was undertaken, but very few ships came off the ways in time to be of any use before the war ended. We were then left with hundreds of ships for the most part unsuited to peacetime trades.

At the approach of World War II, the situatiton was quite similar, with our fleet deteriorating in size and quality, a large part of our goods were being carried in foreign-flag ships. But that time we undertook a shipbuilding program soon enough and were able to build shihps fast enough to meet the tremendous demands for shipping capacity of a worldwide war.

During this period of crisis, the survival of not only our allies but of the entire free world depended upon the capacity of the American merchant marine to move troops and supplies for the armies, cargoes essential to the life of the civilian populations, and the raw materials needed for producing weapons that were all necessary to the successful prosecution of the war.

After the war, these same ships moved the supplies needed for rehabilitation of devastated countries. Many of them were sold in the United States and abroad to build up lost or damaged fleets. Others were placed in reserve fleets at various points throughout the United States for use in future emergencies, the fleet on the Hudson at Tompkins Cove pictured in this week's Life is very near my home.

Such emergencies were not long in coming. When war broke out in Korea in 1950, several hundred of the reserve ships were sent back into service to move troops, supplies, and equipment, and also to carry foreign-aid cargoes essential to the preservation of the freedom of other countries throughout the world.

When the Suez Canal was closed in 1956, reserve fleet tankers were activated to provide the extra capacity needed for hauling petroleum the long way around Africa. Again when war threatened in Lebanon, the American merchant marine provided support to our military forces.

Today the Berlin crisis has brought a new call for ships of the national defense reserve fleets. Believe me when I tell you that we shall be stronger at the bargaining table on the Berlin issue with the Russians because we have our 2,000-ship reserve fleet ready to supplement our 950 operating ships at any time.

This is a practical lesson in the value of a merchant marine to the national defense. Less dramatic but also important is the contribution which a U.S. merchant fleet makes to the economic welfare of the country, by assuring uninterrupted movement of the agricultural, manufactured, and raw materials in the foreign commerce which is necessary to the continued and ever-increasing prosperity and well-being of the country. We depend upon a large variety of imported foods, raw materials, and other products to maintain our high standard of living, and to supply necessary elements of many of the exports which we send to other nations.

Now, another of the duties of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce has that is important to your area is the determination of essential ocean trade routes and services. Such determinations are required in connection with the subsidy operations of the Government.

The ocean routes between the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River ports of the United States and those of foreign countries were first declared essential to the trade and economy of our Nation in 1956. This determination opened the way for American ship operators to apply to the Federal Maritime Board for operating differential subsidy for services on these trade routes. At the time that these findings were announced, the Department of Commerce said that it had taken the action after having given careful consideration to the economic and national defense factors. The action, in essence, expressed our faith in the possibilities of the future not only for the postseaway period which began in 1959 after completion of this great project, but also for the years ahead. By establishing an essential trade route into the Great Lakes, the Department of Commerce was staking its judgment upon the continued economic growth of both the United States and Canada. We envisioned divergencies of some Atlantic and gulf coast traffic to the Great Lakes ports for shipment through the St. Lawrence Seaway and the generation of a great deal of new traffic from the expansion of established industries, and the establishment of new industries at or near the Great Lakes ports. All of these pointed toward very substantial future movements of cargo over the Great Lakes trade routes.

We discovered rather swiftly that opening the Great Lakes for American ships was a pioneering effort. As in every new venture, the early days of the undertaking were rough. The Maritime Administration acted as a negotiator between the American shipping lines that were experiencing difficulties in serving the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway trade and commerce and the officials charged with operating that newborn project. To the credit of the American shipping industry and to those in charge of the new seaway, we were able to work out most of the difficulties. In all areas we were able to effect some improvement. Nevertheless, proving once again that Government aid cannot do the job alone, one of our great American shipping lines unfortunately got discouraged and abandoned its attempt to establish a service into this area.

We continue to work toward the ideal of accelerated development of U.S. flag shipping service and commerce in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and its adjoining territories. In keeping with this determination, the Maritime Administration has this summer decreed that several existing U.S. foreign trade routes may be extended into the Great Lakes. This makes it possible for the Federal Maritime Board to employ the operating differential subsidy program and the trade concept to develop the trade and commerce of the Great Lakes area. We have proposed that trade routes from South America, the Far East, Africa, Australia,

New Zealand, Indonesia, Malaya, Singapore, India, the Persian Gulf, and the Red Sea be extended to serve these waters that flow past Ogdensburg.

We have made it possible for American ships to come into the Great Lakes whenever cargo offers for these ports I have listed, and to receive Government encouragement in the making of such voyages. Our efforts have already borne fruit. Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., became the first U.S. shipping line to respond to this proffer by the Maritime Administration. Today this great American shipping company is offering services from Great Lakes ports to South America, to Africa, to the Scandinavian countries, and to the Baltic. We are certain that this is just the beginning of new growth and new services under the American flag for this area.

I am happy to be able to report to you at this time that just as you here in this northern frontier of the United States are meeting the challenges that lie ahead by refusing to be tied to old and outworn concepts—we particularly commend you for the foresight shown by your new International Bridge to Prescott, the Ogdensburg Port development, and the areawide planning of the St. Lawrence Valley Association—so, too, in Washington, D.C., the Kennedy administration is sweeping away the cobwebs of inaction to meet the broader challenges that face our Nation.

The President has said that we live at a very special moment in history, that we are caught up in the adventures attendant to the modernization of world society. He has urged us all to remember that, rather than being discouraged and disheartened by the growth of the Soviet empire since 1945, we should note the more remarkable event—that these 16 years have seen the most extraordinary growth in the individual liberty of individual countries that the world has ever seen. It is the goal of our national policy to see that liberty continues to grow and spread. In the field of trade, just as in the crisis of Berlin, we must meet Communist aggression and turn it back, hopefully short of the necessity for conflict.

We are aware at the Department of Commerce that the aim of Soviet policy remains today what it has always been—the worldwide spread of its political system and the eventual breakdown of Western democracy. Blocked by the unity and help of our industrialized Western nations, world communism has been trying to achieve its ends by penetrating the newly developing countries. The Kremlin seeks to bind the new nations of the world to Moscow and so weaken the West by a loss of prestige, markets, and sources of raw material. The Soviet bloc today has undertaken an intensive trade drive and a formidable program of economic, technical, and military assistance. All are designed to win customers away from the Western World.

Before 1954, the Soviet Union showed relatively little interest in building up trade with less developed countries. Since then, it is eagerly making trade offers both for imports and exports. It has increased the number of its trade missions and its participation in trade fairs. It has mounted an intensive campaign to push through bilateral trade agreements with developing nations. Are they succeeding? Well, as of last year, Soviet bloc nations signed 206 such agreements with 32 different countries. Now, what exactly does this mean to us here on this new fourth seacoast of the United States? Secretary of Commerce Hodges has said that too many of us today think about our dangers and tend to forget our opportunities.

As President Kennedy put it, our fundamental task in the 1960's is not negatively to fight communism. It is to make a historic demonstration that, in the 20th century as in the 19th century, economic growth and political democracy can develop hand in hand.

This great St. Lawrence project and the manner in which Ogdensburg and other cities of this vigorous area have responded to the opportunities which have been presented here are proof of our ability to make the most of our opportunities. While the Soviet bloc has just boasted of what it hopes to attain in 20 years, we are every day attaining here a standard of living and an industrial growth greater than ever before in history. The 1960's will be a crucial decade of development. It must be a period in which we will emerge with an enlarged community of free, stable, self-reliant nations, with reduced world tension and insecurity.

This administration, pledged as it is to a new vigor in American affairs, has already charted a long-range program which will enable us to be a leader and a good neighbor of the community of free nations. In this plan, the American business community is going to have to assume new responsibilities and accept some revolutionary challenges.

The place of the United States in the world of international trade, manufacturing and finance has changed drastically in the years since World War II. For example—in the last 3 years we had a deficit in our balance of international payments of roughly $11 billion, causing a serious loss of gold. To meet this problem President Kennedy, on February 6, among other things, announced a stepped-up export drive and major new programs to attract foreign funds to this country by encouraging a far larger inflow of foreign tourists and promoting more foreign investment in American business. These three programs are all the responsibility of the Department of Commerce and are of obvious importance to this area. The travel program is being administered by our new U.S. Travel Service.

Another example of the change in world business is the extent of direct American business investment abroad—now about $33 billion. To service these needs Secretary Hodges is tomorrow announcing a major reorganization of the foreign operations of our Department. He has already taken on the role of America's most energetic salesman and is doing everything possible, under the law, to get American products a wider foreign market. Our vigorous export expansion program, besides improving our international balance of payments, will stimulate domestic business by getting more American firms—firms here, in Ogdensburg and Massena, for example—to enter the export field and take advantage of the large world market that exists for American goods.

Secretary Hodges has upgraded the work of our foreign service commercial officers. He has stepped up the responsibilities of our Department of Commerce regional export expansion committees and has increased our official trade missions overseas. While the Department of Commerce continues to stress the importance of the American image in our exhibits at international trade fairs, we are paying more attention to the problem of selling American goods. As a personal note, I am myself leaving in a few weeks for the trade fair in Zagreb, Yugoslavia. This is just 1 of 12 such fairs our Department is operating in cooperation with the U.S. Information Agency all over the world this year.

I am sure that everyone in this great productive area has heard about the establishment of the Department of Commerce's first permanent U.S. trade center, which we opened in London last month. We expect to open another such center in Bangkok early in 1962, and we are planning other trade centers in Western Europe, Latin America, and Africa.

At the same time—in order to be successful in our export drive—we recognize that our American industrial plant is rapidly becoming obsolescent in relation to our competition in Japan and Western Europe. The part of the Commerce Department devoted to domestic business therefore has also been reorganized to meet this need—to encourage more research and development and modernization in industry and to make U.S. firms more competitive in every way.

Of course such modernization, as it entails automation, carries with it lots of problems, too—as the unemployed worker of the aluminum plants in Massena know only too well—and this brings me right back to my opening remarks about the program of the Area Redevelopment Administration. Also the President's 21-man Labor-Management Advisory Committee is working on these problems. Our Department works closely with the Labor Department in providing staff support to this committee. I could spend another whole evening just discussing with you these problems. I would also sometime like to tell you about the other activities of our Department—which are both varied and fascinating—our statistics gathering functions of the Census Bureau and the Office of Business Economics; our scientific activities: Patent Office, the Bureau of Standards, Weather Bureau, and Coast and Geodetic Survey; the Bureau of Public Roads, and national transportation policy staff. I have already mentioned the Maritime Board and Administration.

Just as the vigor of the American dream of a great seaway joining our midcontinent to the ocean was capable of being translated into a reality, so, too, must we bring into a reality a situation where American labor and American management can work together. The private and public sectors of this economy can, together, bring to fruition the opportunities that face us. The development of an expanding world trade requires a high and expanding rate of economic activity in the United States, a steady international flow of the world's raw materials at a reasonably stable price, and foreign buying power based on healthy trade. Today these questions of international economic policy become questions of foreign policy.

Now that your seaway is here, the vessels of the world bring these problems to your doorsteps for your careful consideration.

I would be remiss speaking here across from our friendly neighbor, the great Dominion of Canada, if I did not refer to our good relations and many joint efforts—of which the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development is an excellent example. Another is the Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, of interest to all lake and seaway shipping.

Your seaway has added a new dimension to the vital problems of trade and commerce, not only for us in the United States, but for our good neighbor, Canada.

I am sure that you share with me the conviction that, despite its birth in compromise and controversy, we are well on the way to realizing the bright promises of this project.

Overkill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial that appeared in

the New York Herald Tribune of today's date—August 14. The editorial is inserted in full—and what more need be said?

OVERKILL

Military experts are saying that a 100-megaton bomb such as Mr. Khrushchev talked about—one with a wallop equal to 100 million tons of TNT—would be too big to be efficient. That's nice.

Freight Cars and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important firms in the congressional district I have to represent is the Pullman-Standard plant which is located in Michigan City, Ind.

Unhappily, this plant is now in the process of shutting down the third time this year because of the lack of orders for freight cars. The Pullman-Standard Co. reports that about 600 jobs will be affected. In a city the size of Michigan City, this number of jobs represents a substantial impact on the local economy.

At this point in the RECORD I should like to include two editorials from the Michigan City News-Dispatch which effectively summarizes the problem caused by the slowdown in freight car production:

FREIGHT CARS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

One of the big questions in the defense buildup currently underway is why the Nation's freight car fleet is being allowed to deteriorate.

The state of the fleet is reflected in industry figures which show that it is in the worst condition it has been in since the depression, both in number of cars and in serviceability.

The fault certainly doesn't lie with freight car builders; they are begging for orders. Last year the commercial manufacturers—such as Pullman-Standard in Michigan City—operated at only 40 percent of capacity.

These same companies are capable of turning out 10,000 cars a month; yet at midyear 1961 there was a backlog of orders totaling less than 2 weeks work.

A person need only recall the days of World War II to cite the importance of railroad freight transportation in time of national emergency.

Why Congress and the military arm of the Government continue to ignore this vital facet of national defense is hard to understand.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

Elsewhere in tonight's News-Dispatch is an announcement that the Michigan City Pullman-Standard plant will shut down next week.

The reason: A lack of orders for freight cars.

Twice before this year there were similar announcements—and between these several-weeklong layoff periods, production was touch-and-go, at best.

Herein lies a strange paradox: There are no orders, yet railroads need rolling stock.

Here is what industry figures show on need:

During 1960, more than 70,000 freight cars were scrapped, while only 46,000 new ones replaced them. This year so far, the ratio has more than doubled.

The average age of the present class I railroads' fleet of 1,650,000 freight cars is 18½ years, and about 10 percent are unfit for service.

Despite an expanding economy, the Nation's freight car fleet actually has shrunk about 5 percent during the past dozen years.

Why aren't the railroads buying freight cars?

Their reason is: No money.

The 1961 Yearbook of Railroad Information, just out, says of the financial picture:

Railroad earnings in 1960, rather than rallying as had been expected from the depressed levels of the recession year 1958 and the strike year 1959, dropped even further—by $50 million from 1958 and by $311 million from 1959.

Net income in 1960—fading for the fifth consecutive year to only half of what it had been in 1955—was lowest since 1949, and the margin of earnings on net investment was only 2.13 percent—lowest since 1938.

To these statistics, Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, adds that 37 of 107 class I railroads failed to earn enough during the first 5 months this year to cover fixed charges.

The railroads—while acknowledging such factors as a general economic slump and higher operating costs—point to present Government policies as the basic reason for their financial condition.

They say conditions would improve if the Federal Government, among other things, would repeal the 10 percent excise tax on passenger traffic, take a more realistic tax treatment of the depreciation of railroad property to stimulate capital investment and plant modernization, and maintain a handsoff policy toward mergers.

They also cite such inequities as various State tax assessment formulas, pointing out that in 17 States the railroad assessment is approximately double the regular rate, in four States three times as high, in three States nearly four times, in one State five times, and in another eight times.

All this may seem to be high-level finance and far removed from Franklin Street, Michigan City, Ind.

But translate into dollars the 600-plus Pullman-Standard jobs that evidently depend upon a solution to this problem—and it quickly becomes an intimate community bedfellow.

Not only do families of these workers find themselves without paychecks—but the general economy suffers, as well, each time a layoff occurs.

It should be the obligation of every Michigan City citizen, therefore, to press actively for a solution.

Write your congressional representatives today—and urge that they give their prompt attention to the question of the railroads' financial plight.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *August 7, 1961.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Offie Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: Your H.R. 211, creating a Captive Nations Committee, is of great importance to our Nation and the world. Such action as it proposes is long overdue. This bill represents a concrete expression of offensive action against the Communist conspiracy. Why have we been content to remain forever on the defensive against this diabolical monstrosity? All loyal Americans will join you in your effort. We hope that you and your colleagues who believe as you do will push this unrelentingly until it is an accomplished fact.

Coexistence with communism is a delusion and a lie. Either freedom wins or communism wins. If freedom is to win, we must carry the offensive to the Communists by effectively aiding the anti-Communists in the captive nations. By taking this guerrilla offensive against the Reds it would relieve current Red pressures against us and strengthen the fight for freedom. Why have we failed to learn the value of the underground of World War II?

No more summit meetings with Khrushchev, but a summit of all free nations to implement H.R. 211.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. A. MACHOTKA.

MILLINGTON, TENN.

Hon. D. J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This little copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is highly effective in informing the people. Have you any copies of H.R. 211? If you do, would you please send 100 copies to me.

Mrs. VICTOR D'ASARO.

ISTANBUL, ANKARA CAD. 54,
August 3, 1961.

Hon. Mr. FLOOD,
Member of the Congress,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SIR: We were most pleased and grateful to learn about your projection in the 87th Congress of the United States of America, concerning the destinies of the peoples under the oppression of the U.S.S.R.

One of the peoples living within the "prison of the nations"—U.S.S.R.—as slaves, are the Crimean Turks. In 1941, during the German occupation the Crimean Turks formed voluntary legions and fought against the Communists to protect their religious freedom relatively granted, and to prepare the way to the prophesied future political freedom of their people. The Soviets, being the enemies of freedom, deported the Crimean Turks to Siberia and central Asia in the summer of 1944. The North Caucasian Moslems, who had been removed from their lands for the same reason as the Crimeans, were allowed to return to their countries later. But the Crimean Turks were deprived of this right because of the strategical importance of their homeland, the Crimean peninsula.

The Crimean Turks had gained their independence in 1410 from the Golden Horde empire and lived as a khanate till 1783, the date of her annexation to the czarist Russia. In 1917, during the Bolshevik revolution, the Turks of the Crimea declared their independence and had their first historical parliament.

The Crimean people are only a part of the 40 million Turks living today in the U.S.S.R. and their destiny is the same.

The Crimean Nationalists in the free countries are making efforts toward the freedom of their brothers in the Soviet Russia, praying to God for their lives and expect the help of the free nations of the world, above all, of the United States of America, who is the leader and protector of freedom. Therefore, the free Crimeans are grateful to you for the new hope you enlightened in them.

We ask God's help on you in your honorable act of humanity, in the fight of freedom and independence of the enslaved people. Please, be sure, that we are always ready to do our part.

With the best regards, we remain.

Yours sincerely,

MUSTECIB ULKUSAL,
President of the Crimean National Center.

CLOSTER, N.J.,
August 6, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would be grateful if you would forward one copy of House Resolution 211, 87th Congress, regarding the captive nations.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL OWEN SHANNON.

TACOMA, WASH.,
August 4, 1961.

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We want you to know that we back your resolution on captive nations all the way. If you should have any literature on captive nations that you would like distributed please feel free to send it to us.

No doubt you are familiar with the remarks in the Senate of Senators MUNDT, THURMOND, RUSSELL, and BRIDGES on pages 12997 through 13006 and including 13011 and 13012, July 29, concerning the censoring of the military and the action taken by the Foreign Relations Committee in issuing a secret directive for the censoring of anti-Communist activities within the Armed Forces training program.

We plead that a full investigation by appropriate bodies within Congress be made to find out why it is that anytime anyone tries to alert the American people to the true nature of communism, it is immediately squelched by hidden forces within our Government.

Why couldn't the refugees from all the Iron Curtain countries and Cuba be offered a chance to form a freedom army? I believe this was discussed by prominent Members of Congress as being within the realm of possibility. We must followthrough on proposals of this sort, which really "make sense" in this struggle against communism.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. E. O. KOSKI.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 5, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Kindly send me a copy of House Resolution 211 calling for the creation of a special House committee on the question of the captive nations.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN H. JOHNSSON, Ph. D.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 5, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the membership of our organization, we would like to declare our strongest support for your move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent committee on captive nations in the House of Representatives.

We believe that the creation of the committee is not only advisable but essential, for such a committee will serve as the most reliable source of information and data on nations enslaved in the U.S.S.R.

Being past refugees from the U.S.S.R. and other communistic countries, we feel we are in a position to pass judgment with ample knowledge upon the state of affairs in the Soviet Union.

We assert that the U.S.S.R. is not a free federation of republics analogous to the federation of American States, nor that the people of the U.S.S.R. do form a single nation. The U.S.S.R. is an empire of the international communistic conspiracy. It is time for our leaders in politics, education, and religion to recognize the American Communist Party for what it is. It is a branch of the Kremlin's international murderous conspiracy, as other communistic parties in all communistic dictatorship regimes including the communistic party of the Soviet's branch in Yugoslavia. All communistic parties now, as before, and for future, are enemies of the free world and dangerous for peace in the free world. Communism is not an ideology, philosophy, political science, or a new religion. Killer Khrushchev keeps repeating that he is going to bury us. Are we going to ignore Khrushchev's warning just as we did Hitler's and his "Mein Kampf"?

It is our belief that at the present time of dying colonialism, bringing this fact into sharpest focus would be to the advantage of the captive nations, and a precise and most appropriate policy of the U.S. Government with respect to the captive nations would be a most effective weapon in the cold war confronting our Nation today.

We are writing our Congressmen Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD asking them to support your Resolution 211.

Sincerely yours,

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH,
Secretary of American-Serbian Veterans Chicago Group, Formerly Active in Yugoslavia.

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., August 2, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is my pleasant task to convey to you the warm thanks of our assembly for your tireless efforts in connection with the observance of Captive Nations Week. First, we are indebted to you for having initiated and pressed for the adoption of the resolution establishing a House Committee on Captive Nations. Secondly, we owe you gratitude for the vigor with which you pressed for the issuance of a Presidential proclamation. Thirdly, we are appreciative for the warmth and conviction you have put in your many interventions during Captive Nations Week. Be sure that we have read with great interest your plea in the Manion Forum on behalf of the Captive Nations Committee. With no less interest did we read the fine debate you initiated on July 24. In all these actions you evidenced purposefulness and leadership of a quality one does not encounter too often.

We can hardly stress enough, at this juncture, our conviction that our nations can be and should be an essential asset of the West as the latter prepares to meet the Soviet showdown on Berlin. As we put it in an editorial in our ACEN News (copy enclosed), to counter Soviet strategy on Berlin "all levels of Western deterrence must be rendered effective. The Soviet rulers must not be permitted to discount the possibility that the Western response to a blockade of free Berlin might land them in the allout war they are so anxious to avoid. They must be and can be made to realize that, even without resort to strategic nuclear weapons, the West is capable of denying them the victory they are seeking. In combination with their allies in the captive lands, the nonstrategic forces of NATO can be made to represent a risk far greater than the Soviet rulers are prepared to accept."

We are confident that you share our views and will keep advocating measures that would strengthen what we call the Eastern European deterrent. As we have so many times stated, the most effective measures the Western Powers can undertake to this end now is to show that the freedom of the captive nations is an objective of Western policy. And they can prove it by taking to the United Nations the issue of the denial of self-determination to these nations.

Unfortunately, after a few indications that the whole issue of self-determination in Europe will be activated, we have witnessed recently a revival of the false concept that the Soviet Union, i.e., the wolf, is entitled to be concerned with its security, to be safeguarded against its neighbors and victims, i.e., the lamb. The corollary of this idea is the nefarious "friendly governments" concept. Against this the people of our homelands would expect us to voice a strong protest. And so we did in a telegram to the President of the United States of which we previously sent you a copy.

With sincere expression of our appreciation for your participation in our Captive Nations Week dinner, on July 20, and with the best wishes, I remain,

Truly yours,

BRUTUS COSTE,
Secretary General.

PROPOSED SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS—TWO RESOLUTIONS ON EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE IN U.S. CONGRESS

Two resolutions affecting east-central Europe are at present before the U.S. Congress. The first one (H. Res. 211), introduced on March 8, 1961, by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, calls for

the creation of a Special House Committee dealing exclusively with the interests of the captive nations. The ultimate aim of the committee would be to restore freedom and sovereignty to the captive nations. The resolution has since met with enthusiastic public response.

The second resolution (H.J. Res. 447), introduced by Representative JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York, on June 12, 1961, states among others:

"The United States formally recognizes the de facto total global war being waged by the Communist Parties of the world, jointly and severally, against each and every government of the free world, its citizens, and its institutions; and

"The United States formally recognizes the de facto war being waged specifically against the United States, its citizens, and its institutions, by the Communist Parties of the world, jointly and severally, and

"The United States formally and solemnly declares that a state of war exists between the United States and the Communist Parties of the world, jointly and severally."

The resolution calls for immediate concerted action by all who oppose communism, including "all people under Communist tyranny who aspire to freedom."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN U.S. CONGRESS

Mr. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, addressing the House on May 24, called attention to "the willingness and determination of the Republican Members of the House to strengthen the hand of the President, to strengthen the officials of our State Department, and to strengthen the position of our Ambassador to the U.N., by cooperating in the creation of the Special House Committee on Captive Nations." Upon his request a statement of policy, approved the previous day by the House Republican policy committee in support of his resolution on the subject, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It read:

1. The primary issue of our times is the struggle between atheistic, totalitarian, imperialist Communist slavery and the libertarian governments of the free world.

2. The nature of this struggle is primarily psychopolitical and the Soviet Union depends heavily upon propaganda as it wages its campaign in subversion and aggression. This propaganda is based upon the demonstrably false promise that world communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism.

3. This fallacious promise can be effectively countered by the assembling and forthright utilization of all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, mainland China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other subjugated nations.

4. The Soviet Union has displayed to all the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of an interest in its brutal suppression of the people of these captive nations.

5. The captive nations constitute a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by the Soviet and Chinese Reds as well as a positive means for the advancement of world freedom in this psychopolitical struggle.

6. The President and the Department of State will draw needed strength in this struggle from a continuing exposé of Soviet imperialism.

Resolutions in favor of a House committee have also been introduced by the following Republican House Members: Messrs. AYRES, BOW, and BRUCE, Mrs. CHURCH, Messrs. COLLIER, CONTE, CORBETT, CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DWYER, Messrs. HALPERN, MILLER of New York, Messrs. SCRANTON, SIBAL, and WALLHAUSER.

Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, of New York, on May 29 joined in support of the resolution to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations which was originally sponsored by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. He said:

"I believe that it is in our national interest to provide every possible help and moral encouragement to the captive nations in their struggle to regain their national freedom, independence, and human dignity. We must give heart to these enslaved peoples by showing that they have not been forgotten during this black period in world affairs when they are enduring great mental and physical suffering. We must also provide all possible hope to them for their future survival, as nations and as individuals, so that they can reestablish and rehabilitate their national life and culture.

"The peoples of the captive nations are today silenced peoples, unable to speak their minds, unable to practice their religious beliefs, and unable to live as free human beings. Their indomitable will for freedom, however, has not been crushed. They may be silent and grim today, but they are waiting patiently and hopefully for tomorrow. This patience and hope must be kept alive under all circumstances. To give up hope, to lose courage, means to lose everything."

Representative DAN. ROSTENKOWSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, on May 25, introducing in the House an identical resolution, emphasized that "with the second anniversary of Captive Nations Week observance only a few weeks away, the House can take the lead in making this year's observance a still more successful one by creating this special committee. The existence of such a committee would be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we do not nor shall we ever write off the captive nations. This committee would be complete evidence to the position expressed by the President in his State of the Union message: 'We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the eastern European peoples.'"

Representative GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, Republican, of New Jersey, in testifying before the House Rules Committee on June 8 on his own resolution for the establishment of the committee, said: "The truth is that the Soviet Union is the world's greatest colonial power, and a brutal, rather than a benevolent one. This fact could be thoroughly documented by a Captive Nations Committee investigating the actual conditions that exist in the Soviet satellite nations."

STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 2, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It has just come to my attention that on March 8, 1961, you introduced House Resolution 211 calling for the creation of a special House committee dealing exclusively with the interests of the captive nations. I would like to tell you how much I approve of this measure. It is a farsighted move, which if put into effect, might insure that the United States wins the cold war.

In contrast to many, I believe that the captive nations are in many ways America's most valuable allies. Aside from their own well proven desire for freedom they are the Achilles heel of the entire Soviet Empire. Our sincere dedication to their freedom, if shown by deeds not words, will not only rid them of the tyranny under which they now suffer, but will also help insure the security of the free world and particularly the United States.

In case you have not seen a copy of it, I am enclosing a copy of a study of U.S. foreign policy toward Eastern Europe which was submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last year. While Mr. Hadik and I have continued to work on these problems, I feel you may find some useful information in this study.

With all best wishes for the success of your resolution, I remain,

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. MALOY.

Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding educators in the country today is Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh in my congressional district. He has made great contributions to the cause of higher education and enjoys a fine reputation throughout the country.

Dr. Litchfield has written me pointing out the great need for Congress to act on titles II and IV of the National Defense Education Act, and including statistics on the number of recipients of funds under these titles. Because of Dr. Litchfield's experience in the field of education, I believe his suggestions merit attention. I therefore include his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
August 9, 1961.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORHEAD: As you know, on July 18 the House Rules Committee voted to table all three of the principal education bills that had been introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. These bills include H.R. 7904, for amending and extending the National Defense Education Act of 1958, in the provisions of which the colleges and universities of the Nation are vitally interested.

Titles II and IV of the National Defense Education Act, for the national defense student loan program and the national defense graduate fellowships, respectively, appear to be the crucial items of the National Defense Education Act so far as the political effects on individual Congressmen of a failure to renew them at an early date are concerned; of these two titles, title II, for the NDSLP, is the more crucial because it affects a much greater number of students and their parents.

Since the spring term of 1958–59, when the NDSLP was put into effect, more than 1,450 institutions of higher learning have come to depend on NDSLP funds for a large part of the financial support given an increasing number of their students. The students receiving this aid live in all parts of the Nation and their parents, as well as many of them, are voters in probably every congressional district. Unless title II of the NDEA is amended by April 1962, the appropriation for this purpose for fiscal year 1963 will probably be so delayed that the award of funds to the participating colleges and universities will be too late for use in Sep-

tember 1962. It follows from this that, if action on the NDEA as a whole is put off until the 2d session of the 87th Congress—at which time we may expect that the same set of crosscurrents that delayed action this year will again be present in force—the result may well be a delay in legislation of such magnitude that the Student Loan Section of the Financial Aid Branch, Office of Education, will be unable to inform the participating schools of any forthcoming NDSLP funds in time for this information to be put to use for the 1962–63 academic year. The colleges and universities that rely on these funds will certainly be unable to meet from their own resources the fiscal requirements that the successful administration of the NDSLP to date has created, with the result that tens of thousands of students throughout the Nation will have their studies interrupted. The blame for the situation thus created will most probably be placed on the 87th Congress and its individual members as well as on the administration and, so far as I can see, the Members of Congress will have no way to escape it. To a less extent, failure to act on title IV in time will have a similar effect.

More immediately, unless title II of the NDEA is extended this session, the Financial Aid Branch of the Office of Education will be unable to authorize the participating institutions to award NDSLP funds to freshmen who will be matriculating in September 1962; this authorization should be in the hands of participating institutions by the winter of 1961–62 if it is to be usable. This means that between 35,000 and 40,000 graduates of our secondary schools in the spring of 1962 will be denied the NDSLP support they will need to enter college.

Inasmuch as neither title II nor title IV, nor the amendments proposed for them, involves conflicting interests of a critical nature such as have delayed action on the school assistance bill, for example, and because failure to amend and extend them at an early date would probably produce adverse repercussions on the Members of Congress as well as serious injury to the Nation's program of higher education, the House of Representatives would probably be wise to take the action that is required to have their Rules Committee report out these portions of H.R. 7904 that are necessary for amending and extending titles II and IV so that Congress can act on this legislation this session. The action should be taken on all of the amendments proposed in order that the complexities of administering the new enactments can be resolved in time to prevent undue interruption of higher education.

These views, based on our experience with titles II and IV during the last 3 years, are summarized for your information because we believe it possible that Congress may not be fully aware of the extent to which titles II and IV have affected the operation of more than two-thirds of the Nation's institutions of higher learning and the careers of tens of thousands of students working for degrees. At the University of Pittsburgh, for example, we have awarded NDSLP support to more than 1,900 students, 900 of whom will receive NDSLP support in academic year 1961–62. The comparable statistics for the Nation as a whole are approximately 330,000 and 100,000.

In summary, failure to act in the first session on titles II and IV of the NDEA will interrupt the education of tens of thousands of highly qualified students and will create serious difficulties for the participating institutions of higher education. The responsibility for this situation will rest squarely on the Congress and the administration. These being the circumstances, I am asking that you give serious attention to the need for action to extend and amend titles II and IV of the National Defense Education Act in this session of Congress.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD H. LITCHFIELD.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 12, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The Dallas Federal Building was given unanimous approval by the Public Works Subcommittee on Public Building and Grounds after the General Service Administration officials once again gave complete answers to the Members' questions as to need and merit. This action must now be followed by full committee approval. Then the funds must be approved by the Appropriations Committee. It is my hope that the Speaker and Democrat Members will continue to give their support. Otherwise, the funds will not be forthcoming. Since delay in time is costly, fiscal responsibility suggests the support of all Members of Congress. (Yearly rentals of $990,000 will be saved by erection of the building). I shall endeavor to expedite the building supported by facts showing efficiency, economy, and service, justifying immediate construction.

As each piece of legislation is accompanied by a rule, Resolution 406 stipulated by the Rules Committee outlining the ground rules of debate on the bill provide an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor. This particular rule stipulated 1 hour debate, etc. Normally, I vote for the rule in order that the issue may be heard, pro and con. In this instance I voted against the rule as evidence of my complete disapproval in the subject matter as unworthy of the time of the House. There are now 7,465 employees in the Labor Department. If there is anything we don't need, it is more Federal employees, generally, or specifically, another Assistant Secretary of Labor. The reason given was the increasing number of women in the labor force, but this is not justification. Indeed, it is my view that the legitimate role of Federal Government is overemphasized in the employment field. By stressing the Federal role, many assume that it is the Government's function to assure employment. This, if course, is part and parcel of socialism.

The threat to life and property of U.S. citizens posed by Castro and Communists in Cuba is evidenced increasingly by airplane hijacking. Our condoning the Communists' occupation of Cuba feeds the danger and assures the acceleration of communism's success in this hemisphere and elsewhere in the world. It is almost unbelievable to me that the very threatening of U.S. lives within the United States has not yet awakened this administration to the Cuban danger. Meanwhile, (1) criminal elements at home and abroad are incited, (2) Castro continues to build his military might in Cuba, (3) Castro's lieutenants fan out across Latin America preaching peaceful coexistence and laying the foundation for communism elsewhere, (4) Khrushchev is encouraged, sees no firm action on our part, even on our own doorsteps, (5) other trouble areas are invited, (6) Khrushchev continues to undermine the United Nations by refusing to pay his share and promoting subversion within member nations to undermine their governments, (7) United States bleeds itself economically in accelerated defense and foreign aid, even to strengthening socialist and Communist nations, (8) United States accelerates socialist schemes, spending fantastic sums, unbalancing the budget and threatening our economy which undergirds our defense and personal freedom.

What in the name of heaven are we trying to prove to ourselves and the world? That (1) we will not protect our sovereignty and our citizens in the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine? (2) we will not free Cuba from the Communists? (3) we are blase or unaware of the history of the spread of communism as it will relate to Latin America? (4) we will acquiesce and appease in other areas as well as Cuba? (5) Mr. Krushchev is to be invited to bluff and succeed? (6) the United Nation's failure is to be permitted to hold an umbrella over communism's growth and success? (7) we can, by the sheer weight of dollars, buy peace and friends? (8) no limit to the money we can spend and the taxpayers pay, and we must socialize the United States in order to beat socialism and communism?

As I see it, (1) we must strengthen our defense, (2) we must free Cuba from communism, (3) eliminate most foreign aid, (4) cut down domestic spending, (5) work toward reducing debts and taxes, (6) resume nuclear testing, (7) issue ultimatums to Russia and other enemies coupled with a clearly stated U.S. foreign policy, followed by withdrawal of recognition of Russia if overt corrective action by Russia fails to materialize. Under penalty of our murder or suicide we must stop sidestepping a showdown with Russia. Time is on Russia's side as we refuse to face this inevitable showdown which will not go away. We must stop the farce of pretending that we can negotiate with Russian leaders whose speeches and actions demonstrate over and over their complete duplicity. Indeed, duplicity is their dedicated belief, in action, justified as a means to an end. We must not continue to seek contractural obligations—Berlin, disarmament, nuclear test ban and others—to which we will bind ourselves and they will knowingly and gleefully violate, becoming stronger as we get weaker by such violation. We must stop the farce of our honoring commitments which the Kremlin successfully violate while we dignify them by holding a mantle of respectibility over their lying, cheating, and deceiving.

Finally, we must lay down our own policy, self-conceived and self-interested (not a dance step following Russia's lead), for peace and justice draw a line against further aggression and make it stick—or we are doomed for destruction.

James Morris: President, Texas Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District of Texas is justly proud that one of its own, James Morris, of Anahuac, has been elected president of Texas Future Farmers of America. My district is richly endowed with some of the finest agricultural soil of this Nation. Those who till it carry a great responsibility. The Future Farmers of America are helping immeasurably to train our young farmers for this task and I am particularly proud that this young man in my district has been given the responsibility to lead the State chapter of this organization.

An article recently appeared in a very fine newspaper of the Anahuac community, the Progress, describing the important details of this honor. The article follows:

ANAHUAC YOUTH WINS STATE FFA PRESIDENCY

Anahuac High School graduate James Morris moved into a new world of honors and responsibility in Dallas last Friday, when Texas Future Farmers of America elected him their president for the coming year.

Boosted by several hundred delegates from the southeast Texas Rice Belt area IX as their candidate, James won out in the annual election of officers, taking the lead in balloting over nine other regional candidates.

He is the third area IX candidate in as many years to win the Texas FFA presidency, and area IX also named its representative in the State sweetheart contest, Miss Charlene Wright of Livingston, as the successful candidate for that honor. In the competition for top talent team in the State, another area IX group, the team from Burkeville, Newton County, was winner.

Candidates for the office of State president were required to address the 4,000 State convention delegates in a 5-minute talk on their qualifications for office, and each candidate had to answer three thought questions on FFA goals and purposes.

With his election as State president, James Morris becomes the principal public relations representative for 36,000 Future Farmer members in 900 chapters all over Texas.

During his year in office, he will be expected to carry on a continuous schedule of public appearances before civic groups of all types over the length and breadth of Texas. In October he will be leader of Texas delegates to the National FFA convention in Kansas City, and a long list of other official visits to Texas and out-of-State points is already set up on his calendar.

He set out on the first round of these activities this week, with talks scheduled Tuesday at the Texas Farm Bureau Institute in Mineral Wells, and Thursday at the Baytown Rotary Club in Baytown. In the next few weeks, he is scheduled to address the Texas Vocational Agricultural Teachers convention in Austin, the area III FFA awards banquet in El Campo, and the area X meeting in Corpus Christi.

Valedictorian of his class at Anahuac High School, James has set his sights on a career in the field of engineering. Prior to his election to the State FFA presidency, he had been accepted for enrollment as a freshman student at Rice University in Houston for the 1961–62 term.

His college education will be postponed for a year, but as State FFA president, he is eligible for two scholarships to apply on his expenses when he enters college in 1962. One of these is given by the Santa Fe Railroad, the other by the Texas Farm Bureau Federation, and their combined value is about $2,000.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. James of Anahuac, James is a talented and likeable young man whose honors for scholarship, FFA achievements and sports prowess have been accepted with commendable modesty. This week, he asked the Progress to publish the following statement regarding his latest achievement:

"I want to express my sincere appreciation to all of the people who have contributed so much to my success. The most wonderful advisor any FFA member could ever want, Warren L. Griffin, has contributed more than anyone else to helping me become a State officer. All of the help, advice and moral support he has given me has made a great difference in my life. To the other members who traveled to Dallas and did so much to help me in my campaign, Tommy Willcox, Bill Munger, Jimmy Sutton, Robert Farber, Jerry Ray King and Willie King, Jim Fitzgerald, and George Smith, I want to express my appreciation.

"I hope that now I will be able to repay Mr. Griffin and these boys by serving them and the Anahuac chapter to the utmost of my ability, as State FFA president."

Let's Not Let It Happen Here in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, New York City like many other cities has a tremendous problem with juvenile crime. The New York Times has always pointed out the deficiencies in the program which New York has attempted to carry out to help solve the delinquency problem. Recently it pointed up the need for facilities which would care for and treat wayward girls so that they will become useful and healthy members of society instead of hardened criminals—a result which all too frequently occurs.

We in Congress bear a peculiar responsibility in this particular area: we do not legislate for New York City, but we do legislate for the District of Columbia. At the present time the age at which juveniles are sent to the Juvenile Court in the District of Columbia is 18.

There is a bill—H.R. 6747—which, if passed, would abolish and destroy the Juvenile Court in the District of Columbia and lower the age from 18 to 16 years, under which children would be considered juveniles. This would help create a situation which would be analogous to that referred to in the Times editorial which follows. At the same time there are bills now before the District Committees of the two Houses of Congress which would enlarge and improve the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia by adding two additional judges to that court. In the House these bills are: H.R. 5988 (Mr. MORRISON), H.R. 7012 (Mrs. GREEN), and H.R. 7020, which I introduced.

I urge our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to read the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on August 11, 1961, and determine for themselves which of these proposals would benefit the city of Washington.

WAYWARD GIRLS—II

"The law is a ass, a idiot," a Dickens character observes in "Oliver Twist"—and that is how the law appears as it applies to adolescent youth in trouble, especially to wayward girls.

The majority of States have long used less than 18 as the standard of age jurisdiction for juvenile courts. New York State is one of only 6 States that still say that a youngster, on becoming 16, is an adult under criminal law, subject to adult procedures. Some social measures are available to judges to save a youth from a record, but these are not mandatory.

With this old-fashioned reliance on the punitive approach, it is hardly surprising that conditions for wayward girls are among the country's worst. Sentenced girls between 16 and 21 years after being behind bars in New York City's women prison wind up at Westfield State Farm prison or reformatory.

Far in the hills, in dreary, closely guarded buildings, called firetraps by the State commissioner of correction, Paul McGinnis, the girls get no real help on their problems for lack of a treatment program. On a recent visit a Times writer found pregnant girls locked into small, dark rooms, and 26 babies in the medical building.

Is not the State "a ass, a idiot" to expect these girls or their children to grow up straight after Westfield? Why should even one pregnant girl or a baby be inside this institution or in the city's women's prison?

Clearly some soul-searching is needed in Albany. The State needs to bring the law into line with other States, giving our juvenile authorities the jurisdiction over girls and boys to age 18, and broadening social and therapeutic services to redeem—not further embitter—these young people.

The State needs to find immediately decent, wholesome facilities for the sentenced girls, especially the pregnant girls and mothers with babies.

It needs to experiment boldly with open institutions, perhaps with small-group homes and special schools. They must be staffed with therapists, and be near to, not isolated from, New York City, to which most of these girls return. Good penology requires that families, friends, and community be involved in rehabilitation.

A citizens action committee, alarmed by backward conditions here, is now being formed of leaders in industry, the clergy, the press, and the medical profession. It will review the correction system and recommend solutions. We urge it to give the plight of wayward girls first priority.

Manion Forum—Communism—House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Manion Forum is a most valuable communication vehicle for the preservation of the liberatarian concepts of our U.S. Constitution. It carries on an instructive and informative crusade to warn us against our prevailing drift toward economic socialism and political totalitarianism.

It was my privilege to broadcast, on Sunday, August 13, an address on the subject of the war being waged by the international Communist conspiracy against the United States and the free world. The broadcast follows:

FREE WORLD SHOULD DECLARE WAR ON COMMUNISM NOW

DEAN MANION. What is the precise nature of our expensive and harrowing trouble with Soviet Russia? Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the influential Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, calls the trouble competition. Very recently he told an educational conference at Stanford University that, in order to win this competition, the United States must

surrender its sovereignty and change its outdated Constitution (San Fracisco Examiner, July 29, 1961).

On the other hand, J. Edgar Hoover, the respected director of the FBI calls our trouble a war with communism in the course of which we have been invaded and which, at the moment, we are losing.

It is high time for the American people to decide which of these two divergent viewpoints is correct and then proceed to enforce that decision upon their Government at Washington.

I have a realist at this microphone now who is in frank open agreement with J. Edgar Hoover. He startled Congress and the country a few weeks ago by proposing a declaration of war. In the meantime, more and more of his colleagues are coming around to the belief that he is right.

I have asked him to come here and tell you about his realistic proposal. It is a pleasure to present the Honorable JOHN R. PILLION, a courageous Congressman from the 42d District of New York.

Mr. PILLION. Thank you, Dean Manion. I would like, first, to express my personal gratitude to the Manion Forum for its outstanding contributions to the strengthening of this Nation.

On June 12, I introduced in Congress House Joint Resolution 447. This resolution calls upon Congress to recognize the existing total global war being waged upon the free world by the International Communist conspiracy.

The resolution not only would recognize this war, but would affirmatively declare war upon the 98 Communist Parties operating throughout the world. These parties are jointly and irrevocably committed to the disintegration and destruction of the free world.

Under this resolution, the United States would call for a concerted global effort on the part of all the free world, all nations, all religions, all unions, all free institutions, to join in countering the total Communist war.

No sober-thinking American can reflect upon the past, assess the present, and look to the future without asking this question: "If the Communist sweep continues, how long will it be—3, 10, 15 years—before the United States becomes another captive nation of the Communist-Soviet Empire?"

Let us look at the causes of today's crises. The Communist Internationale was established at Moscow in 1919. It wholly adopted the Marx-Lenin concept of combining all human forces into one gigantic revoluntionary war. It adopted new forms of war, all on a world scale.

Ever since then, the Communist Internationale has carried on continuing campaigns of infiltration, subversion, and all other forces of revolutionary and guerrilla warfare. It has mastered the strategies and techniques of quasi-military conquest.

Today, the Communist Parties have a force of 36 million member agents distributed throughout the world. They owe a single allegiance, not to any nation, not to any church, but solely to the Communist-Soviet conspiracy.

The alliance of Communist Parties has repeatedly and openly declared its incessant war against the free world. The Moscow Manifesto to December 1960 pledges all these parties to an intensified offensive. Yet, the free world simply cannot grasp the deadliness of this conflict.

KHRUSHCHEV KNOWS DESTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES IS A MUST

Two weeks ago, Khrushchev again called for an increasing Communist effort against the United States as his major target. He knows that if the United States falls, the free world is left defenseless.

In the past 20 years, this enemy has seized power in all of middle Europe, including East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. In Asia the free world has lost Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

We are now confronted with Communist-inspired crises in Berlin, in Loas, in the Congo, in British Guiana, and in every part of the free world. This Nation is in grave peril. The danger is today. It increases every hour, every day.

For the past 35 years, U.S. policies have consistently failed to check the Communist drive. Our attitudes toward Communist nations have shifted from direct aid to political bribery, to conciliation, negotiation, and appeasement.

As a consequence, our foreign policies of containment, massive retaliation, foreign aid, summit meetings, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, have all proven to be mere figments of our own gullibility.

Underlying the record of continuing Communist victories and U.S. defeats, is the ignorance of the anatomy of the enemy forces. We have failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons of this implacable enemy. We have failed, even, to identify the principal enemy—the 98 Communist Parties.

Cuba is a classic example of the defeatist psychosis imbedded in U.S. policies. Castro had a long record as a murdering Communist agent. This was well known to the State Department. Yet, it was U.S. aid and connivance that delivered the Cuban people to the Communist dictatorship—another major political crime.

The recent abortive Cuban invasion was a disgraceful fiasco. It was ill conceived, ill timed, inadequately planned, underpowered. It was a successful failure. The tractors-for-prisoners scheme proved to be another defeat—a diplomatic misadventure. Cuba glaringly exposes the futility of U.S. policies.

The Communist power struggle is, in essence, a dual war. The major campaign is the war being waged by the 98 Communist Parties. This is a shadowy, secretive war of geopolitics, propaganda, agitation, incitement to riot, and subversion.

This is the war that we are unable to see, to understand and to cope with. The 98 allied Communist Parties are dominated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They receive their policy directives and execute the strategies issued from Moscow. As First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev is the commander in chief of this Communist army.

The parallel campaign in this dual war is the one being conducted by the Soviet Union and its satellite and allied nations. This alliance of nations is dominated by the Soviet Union. As Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev is commander in chief of the Soviet bloc nations, and commands their military and economic power.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union conceives, plans, organizes, and coordinates the execution of the strategies and tactics of each of the 98 Communist Parties of the world. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union also conceives, plans, organizes, and coordinates the military and civil actions of the Soviet Government, and of the satellite nations.

Both campaigns in this total war have one common purpose—the domination or destruction of all non-Communist nations. The Communist Parties carry on a unilateral campaign of war. The United States, in the meanwhile, is obsessed with a unilateral delusion that we are at peace.

The steady relative decline of the strength of the free world has resulted in our present position of extreme peril. Khrushchev has repeatedly declared that the Soviet has a military superiority over the United States.

SURRENDER OR ATOM BOMBS ONLY CHOICE OF FREE WORLD

The choices of the free world are steadily being narrowed down to the grim alternatives of surrender or thermonuclear war. Mr. Khrushchev keeps suggesting the possibility of a peaceful surrender by the United States, and the free world.

It is the responsibility of all Americans to advise Mr. Khrushchev and the Communist Party to correct their miscalculations as to the courage and the determination of the American people.

The United States will never submit to either a "peaceful" or a nonpeaceful surrender. The second alternative is a preventive thermonuclear war. Neither the Soviet nor the United States can afford the devastation of a nuclear war.

There is a third alternative. It is embodied in House Joint Resolution 447. This resolution would realistically recognize the Communist world war. The passage of this resolution will signal the beginning—at long last—of our offensive against the Communists. It will be a war, not of missiles or marching soldiers. It will be, basically, a war of economic, political and psychological weapons.

We will never, however, submit to the slavery of Communist tyranny, whatever the cost may be. This resolution would not create a new war. It recognizes an existing war. It is not a war against any nation. It is a war against those organizations, those parties, those persons who are already waging war upon us.

Permit me to cite some of the practical results contemplated in this resolution:

First, by identifying the enemy, and by recognizing the war which the Communists are waging against us, we shall have a basis for shaping effective policies to prosecute this war. How can we formulate effective programs to defeat an enemy if we neither specify who he is, nor acknowledge that we are at war with him?

Second, the United States cannot survive this war alone, nor can we win it alone. The resources of all the free world must be totally committed in this life-and-death struggle. The leadership must come from the United States. How can we expect other peoples to resist Communist threats and bribes, if we in the United States continue our policies based upon fiction and fantasy?

Third, we must face the stark reality. The Communist philosophy allows no compromise. Our domestic programs must be subordinated to, and consistent with the all-important cause of survival."

We are being warred upon. Let us declare this war. Let us win this war. I invite you to deliberate upon the future of this Nation. You can participate in the choice of that future.

Please communicate your conclusions to the President, your two U.S. Senators, and your Representative in Congress.

Public Reaction to "Defense" of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1961, I included in the Appendix of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three extensions of remarks dealing with our Nation's social security program. These extensions begin on pages A2638, A2653, and A2655.

The purpose of my remarks at that time was to make more generally available to the public a perceptive and constructive article by Mr. Ray Peterson entitled "The Coming Din of Inequity."

The author of the article, Mr. Peterson, is an able and respected actuary and is also a recognized authority on social security. The main purpose of Mr. Peterson's commentary was, as he said: "To show there are excellent reasons for grave concern as to the probable ultimate effects of continued distortion and misrepresentations by interpreters of the Social Security Act, by statements of inadequately informed Members of Congress, and even by publications of the Social Security Administration itself."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peterson described how the social planners have worked to achieve greater social adequacy to the detriment of individual equity. The consequence of the social planners' endeavors has been to virtually destroy the theoretical relationship between contributions paid by and benefits received by an individual. Mr. Peterson pointed out that "if large classes of persons receive benefits of greater value than the taxes paid with respect to them, then somebody else must pick up the tab." These unearned benefits, according to Mr. Peterson, are in one sense a subsidy which the older generation has voted for itself, and in another sense a debt representing the present work of the subsidy which that same generation has assigned to younger generations for services or payment. Mr. Peterson demonstrated that the burden being passed on to future generations is a growing one and that because of that debt taxes with respect to the average new entrant will always exceed the value of the benefits such a new member will receive. Hence, "The Coming Din of Inequity."

Mr. Speaker, a Member of the other body included in the RECORD of July 12, 1961, beginning on page 11471 a defense of the social security program as a rebuttal to Mr. Peterson's analysis. This response to the Peterson article was prepared by Dr. Wilbur Cohen, an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Wall Street Journal published a part of the Cohen article. Reader response was quick, to the point, and devastating. I will include as a part of my remarks some of the letters received by the Wall Street Journal as printed in the issue for Friday, August 11, 1961:

MANHASSET, N.Y.

OUR READERS' CASE AGAINST SOCIAL SECURITY—FAIR SHARE?

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I was alarmed by the statement of Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen, in his defense of social security (July 26) referring to a suggestion that there be no further increases in social security benefits:

"If this recommendation were followed the result would be that the aged and other groups looking to old-age, survivors and disability benefits as their major source of support, would be effectively excluded from getting their fair share of the increasing productivity and affluence of our society."

Their fair share? By what right can one segment of society claim a share (fair or otherwise) in the productivity and affluence of others?

J. NELSON.

ARLINGTON, VA.

THE DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUAL

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In his article (July 26) Wilbur J. Cohen makes several interesting statements concerning social security:

(1) That the program is flexible and can be changed from time to time to keep pace with changing conditions. This is only too true: Whenever more money is needed, Congress has only to reach into the taxpayer's pocket. The rising tab for social security may not mean much to high-salary groups, but to the millions of small wage-earners, that monthly bite is beginning to look very big.

(2) That social security differs from voluntary insurance. Certainly it does. What individual would deal with an insurance company which forced him to buy insurance, told him how much and exactly what kinds? All, it may be added, without any contractual assurance that the payments would be forthcoming in time of need. For regardless of Congress' laudable concern that the program should be in balance, there is only one source of added income if more funds should be needed; and there is a limit to the amount which can be squeezed from the long-shuffering American public even in the name of security.

(3) Says Mr. Cohen, "As our society becomes more affluent it will recognize that it can afford to do more for its disadvantaged members." Here the key word is "disadvantaged." As our society becomes more affluent, there should be fewer of these unfortunates all the time, and a smaller percentage of our larger incomes should be sufficient to take care of them. Social security, however, presses unwanted and unneeded protection on rich and poor alike. Moreover, the cost to the poor represents a much higher percentage of income than the cost to the rich.

Those of us who long for the opportunity to take care of ourselves find it ever more discouraging, as big Government saps the limited extra resources which might have given us a chance to exercise initiative during our working years and attain self-respecting security in retirement.

C. F. GRIFFITH.

LAKE BLUFF, ILL.

ROBBING OUR CHILDREN

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen in his article in defense of Social Security has presented one of the clearest statements of the erroneous rationalizations used to protect the Social Security system from criticism.

Perhaps the most frequently used word in Mr. Cohen's article is insurance. The substance of his defense is that social security system is a system of social insurance and considerations of equity can be disregarded. A most important characteristic of insurance is the protection people acquire by pooling small amounts to offset the risk that any one of them will suffer a large loss. The only benefits falling into this category under the social security program are the disability and the mother's and child benefits, constituting less than 20 percent of the cost system.

The remaining funds are combined to provide income to individuals in their old age. This is a savings rather than an insurance function. If the device of a tax transfer between generations had not been employed, it would have been clear to the older generation that no substantial increase in retirement income can arise because the taxes have been put into a common fund, since the large majority of people who pay taxes into the system also can take benefits out of it.

The primary misuse of words, therefore, comes about in terming the social security system as insurance. It is a social system of enforced savings supported by a compulsory tax with only incidental insurance characteristics. In the tests upholding the constitutionality of the social security system, the social security system has never been defended as an insurance program but has been upheld as being within the taxing powers of the Federal Government.

Mr. Cohen also puts great emphasis on the chief actuary's statement that the program is actuarially sound. He would be unable to produce any actuary who would be willing to term any private retirement program as actuarially sound which is operated on a similar pay-as-you-go basis. The distinction between a private and public program lies in the ability of the State to enforce a compulsory tax on future entrants. It is only through this compulsory, and increasing, tax that the social security system can be shown to be an actuarial balance.

Furthermore, actuarial soundness should be divorced from financial soundness. Under a compulsory tax program, the actuarial balance sheet can always be balanced by an increase in future taxes. This is where the social security is subject to its greatest criticism. While the legislators have always been willing to provide full benefits for the older employee, they have not been willing to levy a tax which is sufficient to provide even the present benefits.

Mr. Cohen defends this approach by stating that full reserve financing in the social security program is not practical nor desirable nor essential for financial soundness, and that any attempt to go to a full reserve basis would create very serious problems. The only objection to full reserve financing that had any substance was that the social security system was conceived in a depression period, at a time when it was feared that use of high level tax rates would be deflationary and bar recovery of the economy. This reason has ceased to be effective for at least 20 years. The only serious problem posed by the full reserve approach would be to avoid excessive governmental spending of the reserves which would be created.

The serious problem that would be created by full reserve financing would be that people would become aware of the tremendous additional debt to which they have become committed under the present social security system. They might realize that it is in addition to, and larger than, the present national debt and that a substantial portion of the ultimate compulsory tax rate represents the interest on this debt, a debt created by the grant of large benefits to the present older generation on a free basis. This can conceivably be justified by a liberal social philosophy but it should not be confused with an insurance system.

The source of whatever actuarial and financial soundness the program has, is found in the ability of the Government to require future generations to pay, either in the form of direct compulsory taxes or as increased consumer prices (to pay the employer's share of the tax), the cost of not only their benefits but also of those being granted to the present older group. Mr. Peterson is perfectly correct in indicating that, given a voluntary choice, an employee entering the work force after 1968 could provide himself with substantially greater benefits from this money under any private plan. He will be prevented from doing so by tax laws enacted by the present generation. This is the heritage we are handing down to our children.

DAVIS H. ROENISCH.

MOORE, S.C.

VICTIM NOW, THIEF LATER

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Wilbur J. Cohen implied that younger workers should not mind being treated inequitably in financing those receiving social security benefits. I want to say that I detest this inequity, and consider the money taken from me as stolen, just as surely as a thief takes money with a gun.

This is not freedom, taking from one to pay to another. Each time the benefits are increased the tax payment must be increased. I have nearly been benefited to death.

W. C. HOLLIFIELD.

SABOT, VA.

ARGUMENT BY INNUENDO

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

As an actuary who is disturbed over the ready bandying about by politicians of such phrases as "actuarially sound," I would like to register my concern over articles such as Mr. Cohen's. He attempts to gloss over the very real actuarial and economic difficulties inherent in our social security system. He evades answering Mr. Peterson's arguments, but rather resorts to a repetition of social welfare platitudes involving the aims of the system, to imply by innuendo that criticisms of the system are based on a lack of public responsibility.

For example, he contends that the appearance of Mr. Peterson's article in the Journal of the American Medical Association is in itself evidence that Mr. Peterson is only "engaged in an effort with the AMA to try to discredit the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and to shake the people's confidence in it."

By the same line of implication, one might say that since Mr. Cohen is employed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he is only attempting to keep his political sinecure. This is not a conclusion I wish to draw, but only an indication of the sort of results to expect from Mr. Cohen's manner of reasoning—or rather lack thereof. Ironically, the article appearing in the Journal of the AMA was only a condensation of Mr. Peterson's scholarly treatment of the subject in the "Transactions of the Society of Actuaries—side by side with numerous articles by the actuaries of the Social Security Administration.

As an actuary and student of our social insurance system, I would like to record my agreement with the bulk of Mr. Peterson's arguments—and disagreement with those of Mr. Cohen's.

GORDAN R. TRAPNELL,
Fellow, Society of Actuaries.

CHICAGO, ILL.

ALLISON PARK, PA.

INSURANCE FLEXIBILITY

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your article on social security by Mr. Ray M. Peterson and the rebuttal by Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen was a very interesting comparison of the thinking that prevails today on insurance matters that the Government controls.

The entire insurance industry is undergoing a major marketing revolution that competition has brought about.

The question of flexibility of Government actions came up as an example of an advantage for the Government's way of doing things in social insurance. This can hardly be the case, for in order to make a change, Congress must convene, debate, and pass the necessary legislation. The next step is the customary presentation of the tab.

I would like to suggest that Mr. Cohen take a trip to see his local insurance agent. There he would learn all about endorsements and forms used to make the private insurance contract as flexible as a rubber band.

I am not against the social security plan for it is a good idea and a sound base on which to build additional retirement plans. I just wish that Congress would wake up to the fact that if it exercised a little more wisdom and fiscal restraint in other matters, the Nation's elderly could enjoy their hard-earned, fixed retirement benefits.

JOHN A. BATTLE, Jr.

SEWICKLEY, PA.

A QUESTION OF COMPULSION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I would like to ask Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen one question in reference to his "social security defense." If social security is as fair, just, and good as he claims, why must it be compulsory?

DAVID K. CRANSTON.

FALSE EQUATION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur Cohen evaded the principal issue in his retort to actuary Ray Peterson. The fact is that the team of Wilbur Cohen, et al., has repeatedly misrepresented the social security system to the American people during the last 20 years.

The most flagrant example of double talk occurred in his report in December 1960, to the President when, in his capacity as Chairman of the President's Special Task Force on Health Benefits via Social Security, he said, "This system permits people to contribute during their working years to the relatively heavy costs of medical care in their later years. Full freedom in the choice of qualified physicians and medical facilities would be assured. The proposal used the tried and tested insurance method of payment for hospital and medical care with which millions of Americans of working age are familiar through Blue Cross and other private insurance."

Rarely have so many false statements been packed into so few words. The administration's Government medical care bill via social security does not permit people to contribute. It compels people to pay taxes. Wilbur Cohen has consistently promoted the idea that social security taxes are contributions, and that individuals would be permitted rather than compelled to pay these taxes. Furthermore, the taxes would not be paid during one's working years to pay the cost of medical care in one's later years. On the contrary, taxes paid now would be used immediately by the Federal Government to purchase health care for today's beneficiaries. Tomorrow's benefits will be underwritten by tomorrow's taxpayers—not prepaid by today's workers and employers.

The sentence equating social security taxes and benefits with Blue Cross and other private insurance is not only incorrect, but is clearly in conflict with Wilbur Cohen's statements in the Wall Street Journal, in which he differentiates between the word insurance as used in the private sector and the word insurance when used as a part of a social insurance Government program.

The main objective of Ray Peterson's article was to plead for candor and forthrightness in the presentation of schemes controlled in their entirety by the Federal Government via payroll and business taxes and Federal administration of the benefits. The proponents of Government medicine have never been willing to present their case to the public honestly. On the contrary, they have, as Wilbur Cohen did in the paragraph quoted above, uniformly appropriated the words of private enterprise and voluntarism because of their acceptance by the public.

F. J. L. BLASINGAME, M.D.
Executive, Vice President, American Medical Association.

AMARILLO, TEX.

ARBITERS OF ADEQUACY

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Wilbur J. Cohen's article in defense of the social security system is another sterling example of distortion used by so many of the key members of this administration in support of the welfare state.

Of course, Professor Cohen "believes" in all facets of the social security system, past, present, and future. He has written all the social security legislation since the Social Security Act was proposed in 1934, or has been a powerful figure in the writing. And, in the new position he holds, he controls the mechanisms which guide the great engine for social legislation.

Mr. Cohen makes much of the fact that if private health insurance provides socially adequate protection to the American people, we have no reason to fear possible extension of the program to all age groups. He neglects to add that it is he and the social planners like him in Washington who will decide the issue of "social adequacy."

TOM W. DUKE, M.D.

NEW YORK CITY.

ENTITLED TO NOTHING

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

"The man who is covered under social security from age 21 to 65," writes Wilbur Cohen in your July 26 issue, "has 44 years of earnings out of which to pay toward the cost of his benefits." "His" benefits? That just isn't so.

If social security were really insurance, a taxpayer's estate would acquire a vested right in what was paid in by him and his employer for his benefit. As Mr. Cohen well knows, a man (or a woman) may pay social security taxes for 44 years, live well beyond age 65, without either himself or his estate ever becoming entitled to a dime of social security.

We are all paying taxes into a general fund which will (or will not, as the case may be) be sufficient to pay a dole to those, and only those, who meet the means test.

LESTER E. WATERBURY.

The South Carolina Student Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, since the founding of our republican form of government, the perennial problem which we face daily is a properly and adequately informed public. Our schools and colleges have always strived to lessen this problem by teaching the fundamentals of the Government under which we live. However, as we all know, there is a very distinct line drawn between theoretical knowledge and practical experience.

We, in the State of South Carolina, have a very unique organization which provides the college students of our State with an opportunity to integrate theoretical knowledge with practical application of their ideas on county, State, and National issues. The organization to which I am referring is the South Carolina State Student Legislature. This very fine organization was started by an

act of our State legislature in 1957. This act also gives the participants in the South Carolina State Student Legislature full access to all the facilities of the statehouse when the students convene for 3 days in December.

There are many organizations in existence which afford high school and college students the opportunity to become acquainted with and engage in forum discussions of current events and governmental problems. The South Carolina State Student Legislature is, however, unique in that each year various college students of South Carolina, through their elected representatives, duplicate and perform all the functions of the State government.

Representation to the South Carolina State Student Legislature is afforded each campus by allowing 1 congressman for every 250 students or "any fraction thereof" and 2 senators per school. These senators and representatives may be chosen from the various campuses in one of two ways, depending usually on the size of the campus involved. On relatively small compuses, campuswide elections are held. On our larger campuses, delegates are chosen from within the various student government organizations. Both the student house and senate have a complete slate of officers. The speaker and speaker pro tempore are elected "on the last day of the legislative session of each year, as the last order of business of the house of representatives." Candidates for the offices of speaker and speaker pro tempore may be "any duly authorized member of the house of representatives, or elected officer of the house of representatives in good standing."

The lieutenant governor also serves as the president of the senate. He is elected on the last day of the legislative session of each year, as the first order of business of the general election, and is chosen from "any duly authorized senator, representative, or elected officer, in good standing." The president pro tempore of the senate may be chosen from "any duly authorized senator, or elected officer of the senate, in good standing." He is elected "on the last day of the legislative session of each year, as the last order of business of the senate."

All officers serve terms "which shall commence with their assumption of office, and shall terminate at the next following election for this office."

Both the house and the senate have a full complement of officers including a clerk, a reading clerk, a recording clerk, a sergeant at arms, and a chaplain.

The following are the standing committees of both the house and the senate: Agriculture, commerce and manufacturing, education, finance, judiciary, local legislation, penal and charitable institutions, police regulations, rules, credentials.

The South Carolina State Student Legislature also has a department of justice composed of a chief justice and four justices. The chief justice is elected "on the last day of the legislative session of each year and is the first order of business of the general election." The other members are appointed—two by the governor, one by the speaker of the house, and one by the lieutenant governor. It is the function of the supreme court of the South Carolina State Student Legislature "to hear and rule on all cases arising from the actions of any member of the executive, legislative, or judicial department of the South Carolina State Student Legislature, or from the acts, laws, rules of the departments, general rules, the constitution, or any other matter requiring a judicial interpretation or ruling arising in the South Carolina State Student Legislature, unless provided for in the acts, laws, rules of the departments, general rules, or the constitution of the South Carolina State Student Legislature.

Qualifications for the position of chief justice is the same as those for the governor and lieutenant governor. The term of office for the chief justice coincides with that of the other elected officers.

The governor is elected on the last day of the legislative session each year, as the last order of business of the general election. In order to qualify for candidacy, he must be a "duly authorized senator, representative, or elected officer, in good standing."

The governor is the official spokesman for the student legislature and besides his appointive power, he has the power to veto as well as the authority to appear before either house to present reasons for his veto.

There are other officers, appointed by the governor, which complete the full slate of officers: Treasurer, press secretary, and secretary to the governor—their positions are all self-explanatory. The remaining two offices are those of secretary of state and attorney general.

The secretary of state is in charge of printing the journal of the South Carolina State Student Legislature and assisting the governor in carrying out his duties concerning the traditional banquet and serves as host (or hostess) of this affair. It is also the duty of the secretary of state to assist the president of the senate and the speaker of the house in assigning committees appointments and assisting said committees in their operations, at the request of the president of the senate, the speaker, or the chairmen of the respective committees.

It is the duty of the attorney general to "report all legislative and judicial activities to the governor, keeping him well informed as to legislative proceedings." This officer is charged with representing the South Carolina State Student Legislature in any hearing that may come before the judiciary of the South Carolina State Student Legislature, or any of its branches. This officer assists committees with matters relating to the proper procedure in carrying out their duties.

Now that I have acquainted you with the purpose and officers of the students' legislature, let me try to explain their legislative program. The method by which bills are assigned to a specific committee, and their final passage or defeat follows along the same procedure as that of our regular legislative process. All participating colleges are requested to submit proposed bills to the lieutenant governor at least 4 months prior to the December session. These delegations are not limited in any way as to the nature of their bills. Once these bills or ideas for bills, whichever the case may be, are received, they are processed (proper wording, and so forth) and then referred to their respective committees. These committees are usually appointed and functioning 3 months prior to the convening of the student legislature.

Gentlemen, this fine program for the college students of our State, aside from its instruction and practical aspects has produced some eye opening results. Our State legislature has enacted into law almost verbatim all bills which have been passed by the South Carolina State Student Legislature. Our State legislators are aware of the conscientious effort exerted by the participants of the student legislature, and rightly so. In my concluding remarks, let me say that we should all lend an ear to the message which the college students of South Carolina are trying to bring forth. This is our answer to the rioting students of other countries. This is our answer to the despondent critics of college students. This is our answer to the question "What are our college students doing to prepare themselves for the responsibilities they will soon shoulder as the leaders of our country?"

The Mysterious Juniper—Nature's Problem Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of Northwest Ruralite carries an informative article on the juniper tree of central Oregon. I believe that my colleagues and others will find this of interest.

The article follows:

(By Paul Hosmer)

One of nature's puzzling mysteries is the juniper, a homely, scraggly tree found in very few parts of the world and almost worthless for commercial purposes. It is a pungent aromatic evergreen sometimes called western cedar and related to the cypress family. The hard way, it is known as juniperus occidentalis, and is one of the oldest woods known to man. The United States is home to 15 of the approximately 40 species of juniper known to man, but only 12 attain the stature of trees, and a bare 7 are of any economic value.

The peculiar, hardy tree is believed to have originated in the Hold Land—legend has it that the cross of Jesus was fashioned of Lebanon cedar, a species of the juniper—but the largest stand of juniper on earth is

in central Oregon, more than a million acres in the Deschutes country alone.

The pollen and cones of juniper will not cross with any other tree, and the occasional juniper found in a pine forest was probably seeded by a passing bird. Last March 29, a phenomenon of the tree's sex life was observed in the Tumalo section north of Bend, Oreg. Early in the morning, the male junipers began exploding, drifting a cloud of dull grayish powder across the country to settle on everything, including other junipers. The peculiarity of the species was strange to even many oldtimers of the area.

Even in growth the juniper is an oddity. The trunk flares out at the butt after manner of cypress, and straight grain is hard to find in its tortured, corkscrew trunk. The juniper forms itself into masses called "flakes," never more than seven to a tree. The wood grows out from the heart in a sort of petal pattern and turns back into the heart again, so that a cross section of juniper sometimes resembles the rough pattern of a flower. The wood can be easily split along the lines of the flakes, which are the only useful parts of the tree.

The juniper can be fantastically old. While it is a porous wood, the tree grows very slowly and annual growth rings run as close as 125 to the inch. Ralph Bailey, a pioneer authority on juniper, once used a magnifying glass to estimate the age of a tree at 1,400 years, but Forest Service experts say there are junipers in the national forest more than 2,000 years of age.

The juniper is one of the few woods of no substantial commercial value. It burns with a hot, quick flame and a pleasant odor, but has a tendency to pop and throw off sparks. Juices of the berry are used as flavoring, the birds feed on them at certain seasons and early settlers and indians used the berries for a tonic. They are also used in some forms of perfume. Indians in the Oregon country used the bark and shredded wood fiber for clothing and other purposes. The juniper has lasting qualities which fit it for use as fence posts, and everybody is familiar with the delightful use of juniper for Christmas decoration. On the perverse side, a pencil factory was formed in Bend to use juniper in lead pencils, but not enough straight-grained juniper could be found to make it pay.

But probably the most valuable use for juniper is in wood turning. It is the most colorful wood known, and for many years Bend novelty manufacturers earned favorable publicity and a sizable income for the city turning out small bowls, salt and pepper shakes, napkin rings and the like, and in one instance, a matched board of sufficient size was made into a giant grandfather's clock now valued at $2,000. Oldtimers at Bend recall the 1920's and 1930's when almost every family in town owned a small woodworking lathe. Juniper tree hunters were jealous and secretive of their finds, and a good tree was sometimes cut and moved into town at night. It took juniper men a long time to find out that only one tree out of several hundred is worth bringing in, and one valuable tree might be the only one in the area. They also learned that good turning juniper was never found out on the level sand flats, easy to get at, but are almost always found growing in ledges of rimrock. It was soon found, too, that the easiest way of getting a juniper tree down was to pull it over with a line attached to a truck. One good tree, naturally, lasted the home wood-worker a long time, but most of his spare time was spent in hunting it.

The experts learned to pick a solid tree by the sound of the ring of the hammer. The flakes were usually split apart and only the most valuable pieces brought in. Ralph Bailey estimated that if he and his crew found one good tree out of a hundred in a day's time, this was about average.

It was also he who found the juniper tree with the largest usable flake ever discovered in central Oregon—a board 22 feet long came from it. Bailey also owns a large bowl made from the largest piece of blood-red juniper ever discovered, and he considers it a collector's item not for sale.

Besides straight grain, the coloring and pattern is the most important quality of high-grade juniper turning wood. The blood-red variety is most valuable, but the colors run from almost black through red, yellow, brown, and white and an extremely rare hue of orange; which is almost impossible to finish since no lacquer will stick to the oily wood.

The largest juniper tree in Oregon stands in a cutover section of pine forest at the very southwest corner of the Deschutes National Forest, near the famous Hole-in-the-Ground area. Another oddity, the Twin Juniper, two identical symmetrical trunks growing from the same root, can be found about 10 miles east of Bend, just off Highway 20. Forestry men term it a sport, but one early-day homesteader of the area claims it to have been brought from the Holy Land as a seed by a bird. Scoffers to the contrary, his theory provides for interesting controversy.

Again to the matter of wood turning. Ralph Bailey is one who has stayed in the business and made a success of it. In 1959, his firm of Ralph Bailey & Co. in Bend turned out more than $90,000 worth of business—but most of it in myrtle. Because of the difficulty in finding good wood, he has turned to myrtle, as have most of the others. His son-in-law, William Fox, also operates a wood-turning plant using myrtle, but he provides a quantity of Oregon juniper novelties for sale at the Crater Lake Lodge for the summer tourist season. W. H. Kay at Sisters, Oreg., sometimes operates a small sawmill cutting juniper fenceposts and saves all the good turning pieces he can get for which he receives $800 per thousand. This is good money—but it may take him a year to collect a thousand feet.

One feature that has slowed up production of juniper wood novelties has been the fact that up to a few years ago, no known method has been found for successfully curing green juniper. Consequently, this meant trees for turning wood had to have died standing up several hundred years ago. However, Mr. Bailey found that by packing blocks of juniper about an inch oversize in alternate layers of juniper shavings and paper in a cardboard box, he could dry the green wood in about 6 months. Another experimenter found he could spin the moisture out on a high speed lathe. But these methods meant extra time and work and were not profitable.

Bailey bemoans the fact that young men today refuse to take up a livelihood that requires the use of the hands for skillful work, and the precision art of turning out juniper bowls and plates and other novelties is another art rapidly disappearing into the past. Bailey trains his woodworkers himself and has all the modern machinery available, but the juniper tray or salt cellar still has to be turned out a piece at a time.

No way has been discovered of duplicating turning work, no machine has yet been invented that can make more than one bowl or tray at a time, although this can be done with carved work.

Most expert woodturners take up the art simply because they like it. Bailey has a crew of five and his woodturners can make around $20 a day. Himself, he is mostly concerned with the selling, packaging, and general marketing, but still does some of the turning when necessary.

L. F. Van Leuven, another man devoted to the art of juniper wood turning, specializes in small wooden novelties such as bears, cats, birds, and elephants. He turns them out in multiple, through the use of a hand-carved model in a control block with wood blanks clamped under the duplicating chisels. Van Leuven thinks he has turned out more wooden elephants than any man alive. But he, too, has been forced to turn to myrtle wood from the Oregon coast for most of his work.

VanLeuven has been turning out quantities of wood novelties for more than 20 years and admits that while he will never get rich at it, he loves the work and the satisfaction of making things with his hands. He likes the hours, too. He works when he feels like it.

But not all of the expert workmanship of juniper is found in the working of the wood itself. The craftsmanship begins right in the log. Each piece of rough wood has to be studied carefully for defects, and only the best pieces selected for use. It takes a lot of experience to recognize a good piece of turning wood in the rough log. The operator must select only those pieces which will yield all the qualities he insists on—freedom from cracks and checks, superior grade and richness of grain and color, as well as the largest sizes.

But despite the careful workmanship and the caution in selecting the raw wood, the final stage in working juniper is most important. It must be carefully sanded and dipped in clear lacquer to bring out its fantastic beauty of coloring and grain. In old days, rival wood workers guarded these finish formulas as prize secrets and toiled hours mixing various ingredients, but nowadays, they agree a good job can be done with a standard lacquer from any reliable paint store.

It seems queer that no commercial use has ever been found for the hundreds of thousands of acres of juniper going to waste in central Oregon's high desert country. Even the lowly poplar tree has been found suitable for a form of pulpwood, but there seems to be no purpose for the mysterious juniper tree. It's hard to believe that today's science can't make something out of this strange tree but a beautifully colored ashtray or a Christmas wreath.

Big Rockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to present for the reading of the Members an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times of Thursday, August 10, 1961, entitled "Moving Forward With Big Rockets." I believe this will be of general interest and it is as follows:

MOVING FORWARD WITH BIG ROCKETS

Washington space officials have been quietly putting forth quantities of information on American space progress and plans since the Soviet came up with its claim of 25 hours of orbiting the earth by Titov. This information is not necessarily new nor has all of it been classified in the past. What is being done is to gather together a tremendous amount of data on U.S. space

development as of now and mold it into a single picture.

This picture is a brilliant one—extremely encouraging. One high official interpreted it as meaning that Russia, even if Titov's flight was genuine, must start development of an entirely new generation of larger and more powerful spacecraft and rockets than the Soviet has now. What Russia has now won't match the job that will be done with what the United States already has under way.

Presumably this means a terrific race for the next few years between the United States and the Soviet in developing and building huge rockets and spacecraft. Either nation could win this race, but U.S. scientists believe that our greater knowledge of outer space, created through the diversity of our satellites, will put us on top.

The United States will average a billion dollars a year for the next 5 years on monster rockets and spacecraft aside from costs of general space research. The program calls for landing an Apollo spaceship on the moon with a crew of three and bringing them back some time in 1966 or 1967. Such a spaceship would weigh up to 150,000 pounds against 10,000 for the claimed Titov orbit craft.

Such plans already have been well publicized. The point now is that American space scientists say there is little question that all time schedules—already cut in half from schedules of a few years ago—can be met.

Spaceships to take men to the moon and back will meet many space obstacles, particularly radiation, not faced in an earth orbit. Time itself actually is the only real obstacle that must be overcome by both the United States and Russia in this new race. Scientists know that what they plan can be done. But it takes time to develop spaceships from Russia's 10,000 pounds and our hundreds of pounds into sizes of 100,000 to 150,000 pounds—plus rocket engines having millions of pounds of thrust against today's engines of thousands of pounds of thrust to lift the spaceships. A moonshot requires much greater lifting power than an earth orbit to get the big spaceships beyond all effect of the earth's gravity.

The first of America's giant Saturn boosters now is en route by water—rivers and Gulf of Mexico—to Cape Canaveral. It is the first U.S. booster to match Russia's present boosters. A special multimillion dollar launching pad is being constructed for Saturn—no pad we have now would hold it. Nine Saturn shots, each perhaps an improvement over the previous one, are planned. The first is to come in September.

By 1964, Saturn is expected to be functioning with 1,500,000 pounds of thrust. But while the United States is doing this, no one can say what Russia will be doing.

Beyond Saturn lies Nova (Exploding Star), the rocket for a three-man crew to the moon and back. Canaveral can't be used for Nova—there isn't space. Desert islands out in the Atlantic are being considered as sites for its launching pad. Nova will be 400 feet long and weigh 10 million pounds. Original plans were to complete all Saturn developments before starting Nova—to digest the knowledge gained from Saturn. Now, Nova development and Saturn development are going along together, though not at identical stages.

American scientists know that Russia has the edge now in actual lifting power of rockets and size of spaceships sent into the outer regions. Russia also apparently leads in guidance systems—Soviet shots that could be tracked showed accuracy in reaching targets beyond anything this country has produced.

But American scientists believe that this country's tremendous success in general space research and development has put us well ahead in reentry—despite the supposed ease of return of Gagarin and Titov—and in knowledge of a multitude of outer space problems which must be licked for the big shots. Some of our scientists are quite blunt in saying that we have solutions for outer space obstacles which Russia probably may not even know exist.

The real heartache for American scientists is to decide between liquid fuel and solid fuel for the big boosters. Liquid fuel means long preparatory periods for launching but may be more reliable. Solid fuel—actually a rubbery, gelatinlike substance—has many advantages but up to now shows a tendency to clog up some of the delicate instrumentation in rockets in which it has been used.

Several tests of big-thrust rockets (big thrust compared to anything now in use) have been made in the past 10 weeks. United Technology Corp., a subsidiary of United Aircraft, this week successfully ground tested an engine of 220,000 pounds thrust. United Technology now says that this engine can be developed into a single engine of 3 million pounds thrust, with clusters of the latter reaching to 25 million pounds thrust.

However, Aerojet-General Corp., says it successfully ground tested an engine of 500,000 pounds thrust June 3. United countered that this was not a flight-weight engine—that it was built with excessively heavy casings which make it unusable as an actual booster. Aerojet countered with a flat statement that its engine is of flight weight.

However, Aerojet conceded that firing of its engine was 47 seconds against 80 seconds for United's. Anything less than 80 seconds firing time is looked on as putting dangerous stress on various components of the engine. Thiokol Corp. also is known to have test-fired a 450,000 pounds thrust solid fuel rocket—other details of which are secret—in the Nike-Zeus antimissile program.

Whatever the exact facts may be about these claims, they show that the United States is moving steadily and successfully along the line of rocket boosters of power and spaceships of weight virtually unheard of until very recently.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Wiley Urges Three-Point Program on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the slamming shut of the gates between East and West Berlin represents a provocative act—a flagrant violation of postwar treaties.

Paradoxically, the Reds have created a new explosive situation. Yet, propagandawise, they are blaming the West—claiming that we are using the Berlin crisis to create war hysteria.

If we let them get away with it, then we, ourselves, are at fault.

Actually, we have an excellent case to present to the court of the world opinion: First, we are right, under international law; and, second, the propaganda value of the exodus, en masse, of the East German people too loudly refutes Khrushchev's claim that grandchildren of the West will live under communism. Rather, it demonstrates that not even the present generation behind the Iron Curtain wishes to live under communism.

Because the Reds, however, are obviously going to push the world closer to the brink of war, we must steel ourselves for successive provocative acts, as the deadline draws nearer for a signing by Khrushchev of a separate peace treaty with East Germany.

Over the weekend I was privileged to discuss other aspects of the Berlin crisis in an address over radio station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, the world is teetering dangerously on the brink of war.

In Berlin, particularly, the Soviet-created crisis threatens to result in a showdown of force between the Western alliance and the Communist world.

In the minds of millions of people, the question is now being asked: Can a nuclear-missile war be avoided?

For reasonable people—concerned with peace, rather than power seeking—the answer is obvious: Yes, we must avoid a war.

However, it is difficult to predict tactics or strategy of Communist thinking.

Because of the suicidal dangers of risking a third world war, even the Communist leaders—we hope and pray—will realize its inadvisability.

Despite Khrushchev's missile flexing, the West is rightly standing firm against Red coercive efforts to obtain one-sided concession in Berlin.

Adhering to a tough policy, Khrushchev has nevertheless indicated that he is willing to further confer on the issues of Berlin and Germany. OK let's talk to him. But—let's not go emptyhanded to a conference.

What should be the foundation of Western policy? Among other activities, the following:

1. Mobilization of military forces to demonstrate to Khrushchev that the West intends to protect its rights, live up to its obligations and commitments, and not make any one-sided concessions;

2. Educate the world opinion—a growing influence in determining disputes—to the real factors behind the Berlin crisis—not allow judgments to be formed on distortions by Communist propaganda;

3. Propose alternatives to a showdown of force over Berlin, including: (a) U.N. participation in a settlement of the issues, (b) a voice by the German people—by secret ballot—in determining their future, or (c) agreement to accept the nonwar status quo—until progress can be made toward resolving the differences between East and West in both the cases of Berlin and Germany itself.

As for Communist policy, Khrushchev continues to threaten to sign a separate treaty with East Germany. What would be the significance of such a treaty?

Realistically this would be a mock gesture. The East German Government continues to be a puppet—with Moscow pulling the strings. The omnipresence of 450,000 Soviet troops in East Germany assures that this puppet doesn't act by itself. Presumedly the signing of a separate treaty then could only have one real objection: Provide a false-front effort to shift blame for troublemaking over Berlin from Moscow to the Red overlords of East Germany.

However, the world, I believe, will not be fooled by such deceptive shenanigans.

As events progress toward a climax, we must not lose the battle by default or inadequacy. Rather, we must adequately present our case and demonstrate a willingness to support the cause of justice with whatever force is necessary. A strong policy will, I believe, avoid a defeat over the Berlin-German issue; perhaps obtain at least continuation of the status quo; and, we hope and pray prevent a third world war.

The Friend Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives begins discussion of the foreign aid bill, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a grassroots, people-to-people assistance project that has its origin and headquarters in the First District of Kentucky.

I refer to the Friend Ship to Jordan project through which small gifts from hundreds of Americans are making possible the filling of a shipload of medical equipment, agricultural tools, and school supplies for Arab refugees in Jordan.

The people of western Kentucky and other States are grateful for the inspired leadership of Dr. Walter O. Parr, of Paducah, Ky., who originated and is directing the project. Dr. Parr is known and admired by thousands of people in Kentucky and throughout the South. His tireless efforts during the past year have made the Friend Ship to Jordan a success.

My hometown of Murray, Ky., has responded to Dr. Parr's efforts and is contributing a truck to Jordanian farmers. Other small towns have made similar contributions.

I am proud to have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives the part of Kentucky where Dr. Parr makes his home and headquarters—the district whose citizens have responded so enthusiastically to this private aid program.

Western Kentucky has known natural disasters in the past. In 1937, a flood of the Ohio River inundated more than two-thirds of the city of Paducah. It is particularly appropriate that a program of assistance to less fortunate people should be headquartered in Paducah.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include as a part of my remarks a recent article in Time magazine about Dr. Walter O. Parr and his Friend Ship to Jordan:

THE FRIEND SHIP

Walter Parr of Paducah, Ky., can spot the two turning points in his life to the day and minute. The first came when he was 18 and riding his horse one night near his hometown of Bowie, Tex. Suddenly a ball of fire seemed to flash across the sky in front of him, and he heard a voice say: "I am God, who has called you." Walter Parr knew then that he would devote his life to the ministry. When he told his English-born mother about it later, she exclaimed: "I knew it would happen. We never told you before, but when you were a baby, your father and I put you on the altar and dedicated you to God."

Walter Parr's second turning point came in 1952, when, as a minister of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, he was seeing his marine sergeant son off to the Korean war. Standing on the San Diego dock studying his son's troopship loaded with men and means of war, Pastor Parr made a private promise to himself: "If my son returns, I will load a ship like that and send it to Korea with the things of peace and good will."

Marked man: He had learned something about the ways and means of international relief as regional director of the Christian rural oversea program (CROP) at Fort Worth, and when his son returned from Korea, Parr was four times as good as his word. He resigned his pastorship and organized World Friendship, Inc., which sent four shiploads of staples to Korea.

Appendix

Wiley Urges Three-Point Program on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the slamming shut of the gates between East and West Berlin represents a provocative act—a flagrant violation of postwar treaties.

Paradoxically, the Reds have created a new explosive situation. Yet, propagandawise, they are blaming the West—claiming that we are using the Berlin crisis to create war hysteria.

If we let them get away with it, then we, ourselves, are at fault.

Actually, we have an excellent case to present to the court of the world opinion: First, we are right, under international law; and, second, the propaganda value of the exodus, en masse, of the East German people too loudly refutes Khrushchev's claim that grandchildren of the West will live under communism. Rather, it demonstrates that not even the present generation behind the Iron Curtain wishes to live under communism.

Because the Reds, however, are obviously going to push the world closer to the brink of war, we must steel ourselves for successive provocative acts, as the deadline draws nearer for a signing by Khrushchev of a separate peace treaty with East Germany.

Over the weekend I was privileged to discuss other aspects of the Berlin crisis in an address over radio station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, the world is teetering dangerously on the brink of war.

In Berlin, particularly, the Soviet-created crisis threatens to result in a showdown of force between the Western alliance and the Communist world.

In the minds of millions of people, the question is now being asked: Can a nuclear-missile war be avoided?

For reasonable people—concerned with peace, rather than power seeking—the answer is obvious: Yes, we must avoid a war.

However, it is difficult to predict tactics or strategy of Communist thinking.

Because of the suicidal dangers of risking a third world war, even the Communist leaders—we hope and pray—will realize its inadvisability.

Despite Khrushchev's missile flexing, the West is rightly standing firm against Red coercive efforts to obtain one-sided concession in Berlin.

Adhering to a tough policy, Khrushchev has nevertheless indicated that he is willing to further confer on the issues of Berlin and Germany. OK let's talk to him. But—let's not go emptyhanded to a conference.

What should be the foundation of Western policy? Among other activities, the following:

1. Mobilization of military forces to demonstrate to Khrushchev that the West intends to protect its rights, live up to its obligations and commitments, and not make any one-sided concessions;

2. Educate the world opinion—a growing influence in determining disputes—to the real factors behind the Berlin crisis—not allow judgments to be formed on distortions by Communist propaganda;

3. Propose alternatives to a showdown of force over Berlin, including: (a) U.N. participation in a settlement of the issues, (b) a voice by the German people—by secret ballot—in determining their future, or (c) agreement to accept the nonwar status quo—until progress can be made toward resolving the differences between East and West in both the cases of Berlin and Germany itself.

As for Communist policy, Khrushchev continues to threaten to sign a separate treaty with East Germany. What would be the significance of such a treaty?

Realistically this would be a mock gesture. The East German Government continues to be a puppet—with Moscow pulling the strings. The omnipresence of 450,000 Soviet troops in East Germany assures that this puppet doesn't act by itself. Presumedly the signing of a separate treaty then could only have one real objection: Provide a false-front effort to shift blame for troublemaking over Berlin from Moscow to the Red overlords of East Germany.

However, the world, I believe, will not be fooled by such deceptive shenanigans.

As events progress toward a climax, we must not lose the battle by default or inadequacy. Rather, we must adequately present our case and demonstrate a willingness to support the cause of justice with whatever force is necessary. A strong policy will, I believe, avoid a defeat over the Berlin-German issue; perhaps obtain at least continuation of the status quo; and, we hope and pray prevent a third world war.

The Friend Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives begins discussion of the foreign aid bill, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a grassroots, people-to-people assistance project that has its origin and headquarters in the First District of Kentucky.

I refer to the Friend Ship to Jordan project through which small gifts from hundreds of Americans are making possible the filling of a shipload of medical equipment, agricultural tools, and school supplies for Arab refugees in Jordan.

The people of western Kentucky and other States are grateful for the inspired leadership of Dr. Walter O. Parr, of Paducah, Ky., who originated and is directing the project. Dr. Parr is known and admired by thousands of people in Kentucky and throughout the South. His tireless efforts during the past year have made the Friend Ship to Jordan a success.

My hometown of Murray, Ky., has responded to Dr. Parr's efforts and is contributing a truck to Jordanian farmers. Other small towns have made similar contributions.

I am proud to have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives the part of Kentucky where Dr. Parr makes his home and headquarters—the district whose citizens have responded so enthusiastically to this private aid program.

Western Kentucky has known natural disasters in the past. In 1937, a flood of the Ohio River inundated more than two-thirds of the city of Paducah. It is particularly appropriate that a program of assistance to less fortunate people should be headquartered in Paducah.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include as a part of my remarks a recent article in Time magazine about Dr. Walter O. Parr and his Friend Ship to Jordan:

THE FRIEND SHIP

Walter Parr of Paducah, Ky., can spot the two turning points in his life to the day and minute. The first came when he was 18 and riding his horse one night near his hometown of Bowie, Tex. Suddenly a ball of fire seemed to flash across the sky in front of him, and he heard a voice say: "I am God, who has called you." Walter Parr knew then that he would devote his life to the ministry. When he told his English-born mother about it later, she exclaimed: "I knew it would happen. We never told you before, but when you were a baby, your father and I put you on the altar and dedicated you to God."

Walter Parr's second turning point came in 1952, when, as a minister of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, he was seeing his marine sergeant son off to the Korean war. Standing on the San Diego dock studying his son's troopship loaded with men and means of war, Pastor Parr made a private promise to himself: "If my son returns, I will load a ship like that and send it to Korea with the things of peace and good will."

Marked man: He had learned something about the ways and means of international relief as regional director of the Christian rural oversea program (CROP) at Fort Worth, and when his son returned from Korea, Parr was four times as good as his word. He resigned his pastorship and organized World Friendship, Inc., which sent four shiploads of staples to Korea.

Inevitably, Walter Parr became a marked man—marked, for one, by Jordan's Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Yusuf Haikal, who read of his one-man Korean relief program and invited him to Jordan last year to learn of Jordan's needs at firsthand.

Reliefer Parr has been working on the Jordan project ever since. Concentrating on four States—Kentucky, Georgia, Florida, and Texas—he is collecting some $1 million worth of goods. Already in hand, among other things, are: 3 tractors; a one-half ton truck; a 9-passenger station wagon; an ambulance, a fire truck; 200 head of sheep; 10 Jersey heifers; 10 beef cattle; a raft of school supplies; $300,000 worth of drugs, medical supplies, and hospital equipment; refrigerators; washing machines; sewing machines; salt and pepper shakers; can openers; frying pans; about 200 baby beds for a refugee children's hospital, baby bottles, diapers; agricultural tools, such as hoes, rakes, and plows; 2 pianos; 2 freight carloads of lumber.

SPIRITUAL VIEWPOINT

Last week slight, 61-year-old Reliefer Parr was in western Kentucky beating the bushes for $5,000 to buy well-digging equipment to help Jordanians supply themselves with the Middle East's greatest need: water. This week he is scheduled to visit Atmore, Ala. (population 8,173), when the town will present a new tractor and a carload of timber for the Jordan boat, scheduled to leave October 1, under the name *Jordanian Friend Ship*.

Presbyterian Parr hopes he is helping fight communism as well as discharging a Christian mission to mankind. "We must attack communism from a spiritual viewpoint," he says. "Just the idea of friendship is worth a lot." After the trip to Jordan, he plans more one-man relief projects along the same lines. "But perhaps not on such a large scale," he admitted last week. "I'm getting old, and it takes a lot of work to get together a ship."

Development and Conservation of Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Aurora, Colo., relating to the development and conservation of water resources.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Colorado River storage project and participating projects were authorized by Public Law 485, providing for the construction of certain dams, powerplants, and related transmission facilities; and

Whereas the Colorado Water Conservation Board is the official State agency responsible for determining policy for the development and conservation of water resources in the best interests of the State of Colorado; and

Whereas the said Colorado Water Conservation Board has, after exhaustive analysis, determined that the future development and conservation of the remaining water resources of the State of Colorado will be served best by the construction of an all-Federal backbone transmission system: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Aurora, Colo., That the city of Aurora accepts the findings of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and joins with certain other municipalities of the State of Colorado in recommending to the Congress of the United States that the findings and recommendations of the respective Secretaries of the Interior under the Eisenhower administration and under the incumbent Kennedy administration be accepted and that appropriations to implement these recommendations be made during the current session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved that the Secretary of the Interior and the investor-owned utilities be urged to direct their efforts to the establishment of proper interconnections between the Federal and utility systems in order that the benefits to be derived from such interconnections may be shared by the customers of both, and the net revenues to the participating projects be maximized; be it further

Resolved that this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this meeting of the City Council of the City of Aurora, Colo., and that a copy be forwarded to each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado, the Secretary of Interior and the Colorado Water Conservation Board.

Resolved and passed this 7th day of August A.D. 1961.

HENRY W. ALLARD, *Mayor.*

Attest:

R. B. JOHNSTON, *City Clerk.*

An Injustice Which Should Be Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a penetrating editorial the New York Times has highlighted the issue in the current consideration of legislation which would extend the bracero program—Public Law 78—for another 2 years.

As the Times editorial so correctly states the issue:

This measure ought not to become law unless it is amended so as to give better protection to American farmworkers from the direct competition of low-paid imported labor.

I urge all who are interested in correcting a major social injustice which has been perpetrated on our domestic farmworkers to read this editorial:

THE FARM LABOR BILL

The Mexican farm labor bill (H.R. 2010), which would extend Public Law 78 for another 2 years, is now before the Senate. It has already been passed by the House. This measure ought not to become law unless it is amended so as to give better protection to American farmworkers from the direct competition of low-paid imported labor.

Public Law 78, due to expire at the end of the year, is the statute under which several hundred thousand Mexican "braceros" are admitted to this country temporarily, largely to harvest the crops on western and southwestern farms. The 50-cent minimum wage for the Mexicans, provided in the present law, has protected them from still lower wages. But it has also established what is in effect a wage ceiling for American farm workers in the areas where the braceros are employed—the wage level at which the Mexicans can be made available. And worse still, this unofficial ceiling has been frozen at 50 cents by Public Law 78 for the past 10 years.

H.R. 2010 should be amended so as to require farmers who employ braceros to pay them wages that are at least equal to the average State or national wages being paid to farmworkers generally at the time—whichever is the lower. To make adjustment to this provision easier for employers the amendment should also provide that farmowners need increase their wages no more than a certain amount in any one year—possibly 10 cents an hour.

If these changes are not made and the bill should be enacted, President Kennedy should veto it.

The Man With a Storybook Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to have inserted in the RECORD an article on the varied and praiseworthy career of one of my constituents, Mr. Edward Brown, of Hanover Township, Luzerne County, Pa., which was featured in the July 23, 1961, edition of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent. The article was written by an outstanding journalist and historian of the Wyoming Valley scene, Mr. Sheldon C. Wintermute, a staff writer of the Independent.

Mr. Speaker, in days when most newspapers bulge with scandals of all descriptions, it is a delight to present the life story of Ed Brown.

Ed Brown was my football coach at Wilkes-Barre High School. I remember him well for his fine conduct and for his ability and sincerity in his main profession, education.

Although he never became a football all-American, in my earnest opinion, Ed Brown, at the age of 75, has definitely proved a different and more important kind of all-American in his lifetime. This is indicated in his response to the query: "What job did you like best?" Ed Brown replied:

The job I've been doing for 50 years—teaching Sunday school.

The indicated article follows:

THE MAN WITH A STORYBOOK CAREER—EDWARD BROWN, 75, CAN'T REMEMBER A DULL MOMENT

(By Sheldon C. Wintermute, staffwriter)

You name it and he's done it.

And then to top it all off, he can rummage through his desk and finally find a Silver Star awarded to him for gallantry in 11 air missions over the frontlines in World War I.

Don't expect to find the subject of this story, Edward Brown of 419 River Road, Buttonwood, Hanover Township, propped in a rocking chair at his home.

At 75, he still displays much of the activity that has marked his packed-with-adventure life and he's as much at ease in heavy traffic in his Buick sedan as he was in the cockpit of a World War I plane.

A few weeks ago he and Mrs. Brown took off for Penn State campus for the 50th reunion of the class of 1911.

At the end of the festivities, Mr. Brown was known campuswide as "the man with the storybook career."

The story of "Brownie," as he is known to the surviving members of the Penn State Class of 1911, starts in a farmhouse at Dundee, Hanover Township, where he was born December 15, 1886. He was educated in the one-room school at Dundee, but decided in sixth grade he would not stop plugging until he had a college education.

FATHER WAS CANALMAN

His father, Hendrick Brown, was a boatman on the old canal from Nanticoke to Maryland. His grandfather, William Brown, was one of the first constables in Luzerne County.

By working on the farm and later in restaurants, Mr. Brown was able to win his diploma at Wilkes-Barre High School and then enrolled in Penn State.

Although he had to work his way through college, he found time for active participation in all sports. He was a member of the Penn State varsity football teams of 1908, 1909, and 1910. He is remembered as a "light and fast end"—having weighed only 135 pounds at that time.

He played against the Carlisle Indians, captained by Jim Thorpe, when the famous Penn State-Carlisle Indians game was played at the old Driving Park in Kingston before 10,000 fans and ended in an 8–8 tie.

ACTIVE IN ALL SPORTS

Although football was his favorite sport, he went out for the baseball, basketball, and wrestling teams at Penn State. He was instrumental in advancing wrestling from a class to a major sport at Penn State and was manager of the 1908 wrestling team, which was the first to enter in competition with wrestling teams from other colleges. For this he received the Stevens Wrestling Trophy.

Upon his graduation from Penn State in 1911 with a degree in forestry, he won a Government appointment as a U.S. forester in the Toiyable National Forest, with headquarters at Austin, Nev.

He recalls traveling West from Chicago to Battle Mountain, Nev., on a Union Pacific train crowded with "sports enthusiasts, gamblers, wild women, and just plain passengers" all on their way to Reno, Nev., for the world heavyweight fight between Johnson and Jeffries.

As a forester, he surveyed homestead claims and during the winter ran sheep and cattle boundaries. While on survey he was entertained at ranches where he learned to ride wild horses and rope cattle.

Early in 1912 the young forester resigned from his Government post to accept the position of physical director at the new YMCA in Ellensburg, Wash. The same year he transferred to Ellensburg High School as athletic director and instructor in manual arts.

The University of Washington made him a "nice offer" and in September 1914, he entered that school to take special work in history and mathematics and serve as wrestling coach.

Early in August of 1915 he sailed from Seattle for New York, via San Francisco and the Panama Canal, and arrived in Wilkes-Barre in time for the start of school in 1915 to join the faculty at Wilkes-Barre High School as a mathematics teacher.

ON MEXICAN BORDER

When Pancho Villa made the headlines in 1916, the classroom life proved too dull for Mr. Brown and he went to the Mexican border at El Paso, Tex., as a second lieutenant of artillery with the 28th Division.

In July 1917 he was promoted to first lieutenant and sent to Camp Hancock, Ga.

When the Army air service got rolling, that caught the eye of Brown and he transferred to that service in January 1918 and was sent to Fort Sill, Okla., Dallas, Tex., and Mount Clemons, Mich., for flight training.

He was sent to France in July 1918 and completed training at Tours, France. He was assigned as an instructor, but in October requested frontline duty and it was granted. He joined the 50th Air Squadron for the St. Mihiel and Argonne offensives and was in one of the first three planes over the frontlines for the big offensive on November 1 at 6 a.m.

After 11 successful target missions over the frontlines, Pilot Brown was summoned before Colonel Milling of the 1st Army and was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. He left the front on December 3, 1918, and ordered to Bordeaux, France, for debarkation. He arrived at Camp Meade, Md., February 11, 1919, for discharge.

He returned to the University of Washington in Seattle and from 1919 to 1920 was wrestling coach and director of intramural sports.

SERVED IN ASSEMBLY

From 1920 to 1923 he was athletic director and instructor of biology at Wilkes-Barre High School, resigning in 1923 to open Brown's Nursery in Hanover Township, which he operated until 1929. From 1924 to 1930, Mr. Brown represented the second legislative district in the house of representatives in Harrisburg.

The field of education beckoned once again and from 1930 to 1934 he was a school textbook representative for Lyons & Carnahan and Longman, Green & Co., both of New York.

When the Civilian Conservation Corps was formed in 1934 he tossed textbooks aside to become a chief forester in the CCC. He was instrumental in the completion of the first type map of all Pennsylvania methods of accomplishment for timber surveys.

Returning to business in 1942, he joined the Carr Consolidated Biscuit Co. as production and material manager and held that position until his retirement in November 1955.

Mr. Brown and his wife, the former Mary Emanuel, of Hanover Township, whom he married in 1920, now keep busy visiting their 5 sons and 3 daughters and 12 grandchildren. For a man with so many varied and interesting positions during his life, Mr. Brown was asked: "What job did you like best?"

His answer was a new surprise: "The job I've been doing for 50 years—teaching Sunday school."

Production and Reproduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the August 11 issue of U.S.A.

Although this is written in a light vein, there is far more commonsense and logic in these few paragraphs than we get from many people roving our modern world, who are always looking for a new and, usually, impossible solution for the day-to-day, human problems:

PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION

On July 21, James Reston commented in the New York Times, "Part of the reason why the President's foreign aid plan is in trouble right now is that the startling rise in population in the underdeveloped countries tends to wipe out the gains made by the vast outlays of American aid. * * * Indian officials have told the United States that the effect of the $3 billion received from the United States is largely being nullified by the increase in population."

Mr. Reston concluded, "Immense progress is being made in the field of production, but it is being wiped out by the velocity of reproduction and the problem is not likely to be solved by leaving it to the birds and the bees."

Certainly, the economic problem is not to be solved in India by an American gift of $1 billion a year for 5 years, as President Kennedy suggests. But the question of why such aid should be continued despite its inefficacy is a subject which Mr. Reston and all other liberals always are willing to leave to the birds and the bees.

Pollution of Interstate or Navigable Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the need for controls to curb pollution of interstate or navigable waters was recognized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961, which President Kennedy signed into law on July 20, 1961.

I wish to call attention to the reaction to the pollution control law by the official publication of the Texas Water Conservation Association. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial that appeared in volume 17, No. 10, of the publication Texas Water, in July.

The article is entitled "President Signs Federal Pollution Control Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT SIGNS FEDERAL POLLUTION CONTROL BILL

President Kennedy signed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961 on July 20. Public Law 87–88, acts 87th Congress, 1st session.

The act boosts the present Federal antipollution grants to municipalities for sewage treatment or other antipollution projects from the present $50 million annually to $80 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; $90 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $100 million for each succeeding fiscal year to June 30, 1966.

The measure takes the administration of Federal water pollution control away from the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service and gives it to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It also amends the 1956 act by striking out "interstate waters" and inserting in lieu thereof "interstate or navigable waters."

SEC. 8(a) of the 1961 Act provides that: "The pollution of interstate or navigable waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of

any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this Act."

Thus Federal jurisdiction in pollution control now extends to both interstate and intrastate streams. However, in recognition of the primary responsibility of the several States in this field, the act provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may undertake to abate pollution of interstate streams only on request "by the Governor of any State or a State water pollution control agency, or the governing body of any municipality."

In no field has the Federal Government tried to get the States to assume their responsibility more than in the field of water pollution abatement and control. In the 1956 Act, the Federal jurisdiction was limited to interstate streams. But, with few exceptions, the States have done little in the past 5 years in this field. President Eisenhower vetoed the 1960 bill on the grounds that water pollution control is a State and local responsibility.

Unless the States, including Texas, do more in the next 5 years than they have in the past 5, we predict that Congress will again amend the Federal law by striking the provisions requiring "request of the Governor or State water pollution control agency, or governing body of a municipality" before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may step in and abate pollution of intrastate streams.

The Federal Government has spent billions of dollars on water supply projects to meet the Nation's needs and Congress is not going to stand by and watch these supplies destroyed by pollution.

Here Comes the Bull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the rural areas of America are just as interested in what is happening in Washington as are the cities. Further, they are most alert to whatever legislation is considered here.

An excellent weekly, the Abington Journal of Clarks Summit, Pa., has recently editorialized on fair trade legislation, and I hasten to bring the editorial to the attention of the House:

[From the Abington Journal, Aug. 10, 1961]

HERE COMES THE BULL

Better brace yourself for another assault on your pocketbook, folks, the "fair trade" monopoly seekers are riding again. Almost everyone has got used to the fact that the beautiful expression, "fair trade," means only price fixing and price gouge, so that latest word is that a new expression has been coined as a slogan for the fair traders to carry into legislative battle.

It is "fair competitive practices," which sounds very ethical and honorable and judicious indeed, but it is really the same old "fair-trade," baring its fangs at your pocketbook. At one time, these laws which make it illegal for a merchant to sell a national branded item to us for a price lower than that set by the manufacturer, were in force in 48 States, now they have been cast out of all but 27 and enforcement is weak in some of these.

It would seem that monopoly is on the run; still the advantage of securing a law that protects a manufacturer from the effects of competition is so great that the price fixers have had little trouble in raising a new bag of lucre for the use of lobbyists in pressuring our legislators. This time they aren't going to fool around with the States. They are starting their operations with the objective of making "fair competitive practices" effective in all of the States by making it a national law.

This law, if passed would rob the consumer, abridge retail freedom, reduce competition, and in the long run promote the sale in the United States of competitive products made in foreign lands with foreign labor. It would mean that, to buy certain articles, no matter where the buyer went in the United States he would have to pay the price which the merchant, would be satisfied to sell at smaller profit, but of the manufacturer, who would exercise a monopoly protected from all but his fellow manufacturer—and we have seen in the recent price-fixing cases brought by the Government against the electrical manufacturers just how much competition be would have to worry about.

Being poor is no fun but it would be even less fun if the Government passes laws to make us poorer.

Hibernians Pray for President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial by Hon. James J. Comerford, editor of the National Hibernian Digest, which appeared in the issue for July–August 1961:

HIBERNIANS PRAY FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By James J. Comerford, national editor)

It was most gratifying to learn that thousands of Hibernians offered special prayers on Sunday, June 30, 1961, for President John F. Kennedy. In these prayers, they asked God to give His divine guidance to our President and give His divine protection to our country—the United States of America.

This day of prayer for the President was designated by our national chaplain, His Excellency, Most Rev. Lawrence J. Shehan, bishop of Bridgeport, Conn. Our national chaplain acted wisely. He gave the necessary counsel and advice to the members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America. His chaplain's message, published in the May–June issue of the National Hibernian Digest, which notified members that July 30 was to be set aside as a day of prayer for the President carried these serious words: "In order to lead our country safely through its perils, it is necessary that our President should have almost superhuman wisdom. Certainly, he needs divine guidance and supernatural strength." This is a quotable quote worthy of the attention of all Americans.

President John F. Kennedy is a member of the AOH. He joined it in 1947. Massachusetts is the jurisdiction in which he is an enrolled member.

Members of the AOH in America in the past prayed for Presidents on many occasions during times that stress and strain confronted them. To pray for those who are in lawful authority is part of their heritage. But this is the first time that a fraternal brother of theirs holds the office of President of the United States. His name is Kennedy. He is a Hibernian.

On the young shoulders of President Kennedy rests today the security of the United States against communism as well as the freedom of the rest of the world from communistic oppression. Let us remember him in our prayers every day. His daily task is greater than human endurance is expected to handle. As our national chaplain has so aptly said, "Certainly he needs divine guidance and supernatural strength" to lead our country safely through the perils of today.

In Unions There Is Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on August 8, in the Sherman Hotel, of Chicago, Maurice R. Franks delivered a memorable address to the Chicago Rotary Club No. 1. Mr. Franks is president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and a lifetime student of labor-management problems.

I ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD since I believe his counsel is wise and I am gratified by his support of the legislation which a number of us have introduced (S. 2134) to guarantee labor union members the right to vote secretly on the question of whether or not to call a strike.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN UNIONS THERE IS STRENGTH—TOO MUCH STRENGTH, IN FACT, WHICH MUST BE CURBED

(An address by Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and editor of Partners magazine, delivered before Chicago Rotary Club No. 1, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., August 8, 1961)

I am grateful for this opportunity to come before my fellow Rotarians today to discuss a subject of vital national importance and, I believe, of deep and mutual concern.

I am especially grateful to our chairman for making clear in his introduction that I am a product of the labor movement. For indeed, ladies and gentlemen, I am just that. I spent better than a quarter of a century in the union labor movement. And what's more, I believe as much today as I always have believed, in unionism as a highly valuable economic institution. I believe that unions, where needed and when properly operated, have much to offer our progressive economic society.

Furthermore, speaking frankly, as my name suggests that I do, I am convinced that if it hadn't been for the stupidity, the avariciousness and the plain shortsightedness of the businessman himself, particularly the businessman of yesterday who didn't give a damn about his workers' welfare, who cared not in the least whether his workers ate or slept, who provided

abominable working conditions all around—that if it hadn't been for him, there would have been no need for workers to band themselves together in order to obtain economic justice. But those are the facts of labor history—and those would be the facts of tomorrow's development if we had no unions today.

UNIONS, GOOD OR BAD

So there is no longer a question in my mind—or in yours either, for that matter, of unions to be or not to be. The question today is, what kind of unions are we going to have? Good unions or bad unions?

Now, I acquird my personal philosophy of unionism from the true fathers of the American labor movement—from such men as Samuel Gompers, Daniel Willard, and Warren Stone—from men who did not believe in and did not practice the kind of unionism we see about us today. These men taught me that labor and management are not natural-born enemies, that they are indeed fellow human beings, who are natural-born friends and allies—partners, if you please—partners in a common cause—partners in production—partners in producing the most of the best for the least, for mutual benefit. The unions should be with us to emphasize this relationship and to help realize its social and economic advantages. Good unions do so.

But it is impossible to have good unions with bad leaders. And today, ladies and gentlemen, we have some pretty bad leaders—some of the worst type our minds can imagine. We have among us a hierarchy of union leaders whose sense of social and economic responsibility is seriously lacking, and whose tremendous power and exercise of power accomplish far more evil than good. Such is the extent of the evil power they wield that, if allowed to go unchecked, it will not only wreck the labor movement which the world has grown to respect, but it will wreck our Nation to boot.

THE DANGEROUS POWER OF LABOR LEADERS

When you stop to consider the power of some of our greatest labor leaders today, the effect is frightening—as menacing as any hostile power abroad in the world. When a man like David McDonald, who heads the United Steel Workers Union, snaps his fingers, down goes the steel industry and the vital production thereof—down goes the employment of almost every steelworker—down goes the American economy—down goes the very safety of the Nation itself.

When a man like Walter Reuther winks his eye, down goes an auto industry and the employment of millions of workers, directly and indirectly affected. When Jim Carey pulls the switch, down goes a vast segment of the electrical industry—to which our entire economy is tied and upon which much of our Nation's overall defense development is dependent. When Joseph Curran calls the shot, shipping on our east coast comes to a halt. And when Harry Bridges waves his flag, all west-coast shipping stagnates.

Ladies and gentlemen, this sort of thing exceeds all reasonable authority. But, even so, it does not match the authority acquired by the gentleman whose name I've saved for you. I refer to James Riddle Hoffa.

That middle name of his certainly is appropriate. For, as a labor leader, this Hoffa is indeed a riddle to all of us who believe in good unionism. If that man ever cracks his whip, down will go everything.

In unions there is strength—and should be. But it is men like Hoffa, and the other union leaders I have mentioned, whose conduct supports the second part of my thesis—too much strength—excess strength that must be curbed, if we as a Nation are to survive and not be made ready for the burial job Nikita Khrushchev promised us. For unless the powers of such labor leaders are curbed, our free society will one day be struck dead and belong only to a bygone era.

S. 2134

Now, fellow Rotarians, this brings me to the precise reason for my coming here to talk to you today—to explain to you how this alarming excess of power wielded by the big bosses of the labor movement can be checked—and without sacrificing any of the principles of good unionism.

It was my privilege early this year to work closely with Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the drafting of proposed legislation which, if enacted, would markedly cut down the personal powers of the individual union autocrat and refer vital economic decisions to the ones who alone have a right to make them—the members of a negotiating union themselves. This legislation, drawn up in the form of Senate bill 2134, would render it impossible for any strike to be called at the snap of any union leader's fingers, or at the crack of any union leader's whip.

This bill—and let me repeat its listing, so that the number will sink into your minds—S. 2134—was introduced in the Senate by Senator MUNDT on June 22 with the cosponsorship of Democratic Senators JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and Republican Senators WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, and FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota. And incidentally, it has the complete backing of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. It is thus a bipartisan bill. And here is its preamble:

"S. 2134 is a bill to strengthen democratic processes within labor organizations respecting the calling of strikes, to protect union members against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of union members, to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce, and to promote the growth of the Nation's economy through reducing economic waste by providing for an impartial secret strike vote."

Such is the purpose of this proposed legislation—this Senate bill S. 2134. It is to curb the autocratic power of a union's leadership to singlehandedly shut down an industrial operation, large or small. It is to make a union leader and his negotiating committee the servants of a union membership, as they are intended to be, and not their finger-snapping masters, as our American free society never intended they should be. It is to support the highest offices of collective bargaining, the institution our early labor movement made every human sacrifice to achieve for the worker, and to sweep from the scene the disreputable spectacle of collective bludgeoning—bargaining, not in good faith, but with the cudgel of a phony strike threat lying handy on the union side of the table.

Senate bill 2134 would make good-faith bargaining bilateral and of obligation to both sides. It would enable the union to shape its final demands, and the employer to make his final offer, before any strike vote could be taken. And only when such a deadlock, if one occurs, has been reached, will the situation be referred to the employees to be affected for their decision by protected secret ballot.

To clarify these proposals further, let me read to you Senator MUNDT's own presentation, in the course of the speech he delivered on the floor of the Senate on June 22, the day he introduced S. 2134:

"Briefly our bill would operate in the following manner. Under existing law, the duty to bargain collectively requires that any party desiring to modify or terminate an existing contract must serve written notice on the other party to the contract of the proposed modification or termination 60 days prior to the expiration date of the existing agreement. Our bill provides that no strike ballot shall be taken during this 60-day period, but, that if a labor organization desires to obtain authorization for a strike, a strike ballot shall be taken on the 60th day or as soon thereafter as is practicable. This procedure will allow approximately 60 days of honest collective bargaining negotiations in an atmosphere entirely free of strike threats, since there will be no authorization on which to base the threat. Also, it is fairly certain that by the 60th day, the issues between the parties will be pretty clearly drawn, which means the employee will be able to make his decision on the basis of well defined contentions and specific counterproposals."

Further quoting Senator MUNDT's remarks, "Any strike ballot taken on or after the 60th day will be supervised by a three-member election committee. One member will be selected by the union, one member will be selected by the employer, and a third member will be selected by the union and employer members. If they cannot agree on such third member, he will be selected by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The bill requires the voting to be by secret ballot, and the committee is directed to count and process the ballots in such way that the identity of the voter will be unknown to the election committee and to all other persons.

"Where appropriate, the strike ballot will be stated in terms which will reflect a choice, by the employee, between a strike and an acceptance of the employer's final offer in settlement as stated by him."

Still quoting Senator MUNDT, "If in the balloting a majority of the affected employees vote in favor of a strike, then the union representative has full legal authority to call a strike. He is, however, under no legal obligation to call a strike immediately; and if he desires to negotiate further, the authorization granted by the balloting has a 60-day life.

"If a majority of the affected employees vote to accept the employer's final offer in settlement, the employer is then legally obliged by the requirements of good faith bargaining to sign a contract incorporating the terms and conditions as stated by him in his final offer."

CONCLUSION

Now, fellow Rotarians, you will recall that I said in my opening remarks that I was extremely grateful for this opportunity to discuss this problem with you. Well, that was no casual statement. I meant what I said. And for a very good reason.

I believe that the Rotarians of this great city of Chicago—and, in fact, the Rotarians of the Nation as a whole—are in an ideal position to help promote the passage of the bill I have discussed from this platform. Most of Rotary's members are employers, well geared to lend responsible influence to their employees. If the Rotarians here today were to go forth from this meeting and as soon as possible explain the proposals contained in Senate bill 2134 to the people on their payrolls—as some businessmen throughout the Nation have already done and are doing—I believe that we would stand a very good chance of getting this bill enacted into law.

Many businessmen I have come in contact with—and, I may say, quite a few of them are fellow Rotarians—are victims of the little bug whose bite fills them with timidity. They will wholeheartedly approve a worthwhile project but only behind closed

doors. In public they are hesitant to mention it, to give it the boost that it needs. Then there are others who will not take time out to study important issues such as S. 2134 and they are what may be termed "rather naive."

But the time has come, please believe me, when the businessman—whether he be a Rotarian or not—must shake off his chronic timidity—which, if I may say so, is used here mostly as a polite term for lethargy. The time has come when every businessman owes it to himself and to our free society to stand up and be counted, to stand up in front of his employees and tell them what, in his opinion, they can do in their own behalf.

Now your employees may not be able to stand up and be counted, if their particular position is such as to make them too conspicuous. But I'll tell you one thing you can help them do, in this instance. You can encourage them to sit down and be counted. You can encourage them to sit down and write their Congressman and Senators, telling their Representatives in the Nation's Capital that this is the kind of legislation they need and want. Because, unless a groundswell of popular opinion—and especially of worker opinion—is generated and made to reach all of our Federal lawmakers, the bill we have been discussing just doesn't have much of a chance of passage.

I thank you.

Foreign Aid Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial that appeared in the Newark (N.J.,) Star Ledger on August 14, 1961, is directed to an important part of the mutual security program and I sincerely hope that the administration will never forget its obligation and intention to supervise strictly the distribution of foreign aid funds.

Every dollar spent should return its full value:

FOREIGN AID CLUB

The Kennedy administration has promised to tighten up on the administration of foreign aid, if it wins approval for the financing program by which long-term borrowing would bypass Congress.

The foreign aid administration made the pledge in a letter to 30 Congressmen as part of an effort to persuade a reluctant Congress to agree to give the administration the added authority.

This is a strange "club" to use over the heads of Congressmen, many of whom have been quite vocal in complaints of waste in the administration of foreign aid. The letter could be viewed as an admission by the foreign aid officials of at least some measure of sloppiness in the handling of the billions of dollars in aid.

With this admission in hand, Congressmen certainly would be derelict in their responsibilities if they failed to insist on a tightening up in foreign aid procedures—regardless of the fate of the long-range borrowing plan in the current foreign aid bill.

Eliminating waste and inefficiency should not hinge on a congressional surrender on a program about which it has reservations. The long-range borrowing proposal should be considered on its own merits, and be accepted or rejected according to its assessment by the majority in Congress.

Making the efficiency effort dependent on approval of long-range financing is tantamount to blackmail. The pledge of efficiency should stand independent of this aspect of foreign aid.

Whether or not the long-range feature finally is approved, billions of dollars will continue to be spent on foreign assistance. It should be handled in as businesslike and efficient a manner as possible.

Servants of World Trade and Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently the new British tour ship SS *Canberra* paid a visit to San Francisco on her maiden voyage where a civic luncheon was given welcoming the ship and the tour.

Sir Donald Anderson gave the address for the occasion which not only contains a lot of history, but some pertinent observations on our maritime problems; and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

SERVANTS OF WORLD TRADE AND TRAVEL

(An address by Sir Donald Anderson, chairman of the board, P. & O.-Orient Lines, London, before a civic luncheon welcoming to San Francisco the SS *Canberra*, sponsored by British-American Chamber of Commerce and Trade Center, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Area World Trade Association, Marine Exchange of the Bay Region, World Trade Center Authority, San Francisco Port Authority, and San Francisco Commercial Club, Friday, July 21, 1961, San Francisco Commercial Club)

The first time I saw San Francisco as one should see it—from the Pacific—was when I was here in 1958 in *Himalaya*, the first of the P. & O. ships in our P. & O.-Orient Pacific service. San Francisco has many claims to fame, but as a shipping man I regard it first and foremost as one of the great Pacific gateways, one of the great ports lying on the Pacific periphery, giving character to the Pacific and taking character from it.

In 1958, P. & O.-Orient was only just beginning to be known here. There were those who saw that we had pegged a claim, but who wondered whether we were going to stay to work it. I had the honor of being entertained at a luncheon such as this, and made it plain then that we were going to work our claim, and that we intended to back our efforts with our full resources. I think I can assume that now, 3 years later, there is no need to reiterate this.

Six months ago you gave a wonderful welcome to *Oriana* and to my brother Colin who was on board. Now you are giving the same welcome to *Canberra*, and these two ships are proof that, in addition to the other seven postwar units of the P. & O.-Orient Lines fleet on this side of the Pacific, we have ventured, on our own initiative and responsibility, $85 million of our company's funds in two outstanding ships, specially designed to expand ocean travel within the Pacific, to the Pacific, and from the Pacific, in the sixties and the years beyond. So I have the warm feeling that we are now accepted as part of your great community here. Our ships, our offices, our staff are all at your service, and our object will always be to see to it that of all the ships that serve this port, none sail with a higher reputation than ours.

Being British, I am naturally interested to know what part British firms played in the development of San Francisco, and I have a little scrap of history on this subject which may be new to you.

Years ago I was staying with W.J.K., now head of the firm of Jardine Matheson, the greatest of the old China firms. Before the war, Jardine's employed over 100,000 Chinese alone. They were known to the Chinese as the Princely House. They have more commercial history in China and Japan behind them than any other firm in eixstence. W.J.K. had an English friend who turned up in Shanghai before the war with the intention of studying Buddhism. He was fitted out with a donkey and a guide, and set off for a Buddhist monastery. Before he got there he was set upon by bandits, and returned to his friend K. in Shanghai with no donkey, no guide, no money, and no further ambition to study Buddhism.

But he was a historian, and since K. had always wanted somebody to work up the records of Jardine Matheson's for a history of the firm, his friend was let loose on their old papers. One day he came in a state of great excitement to report that he had found a map of part of the waterfront of San Francisco, showing the firm's property marked on it, and asked whether the partners realized that they owned much of San Francisco. They didn't. He had found also a plan for the town hall, based on the designs of the assembly rooms in Dumfries in Scotland, where the firm originated. That plan of the then waterfront is still in the office records in London, and indeed I have a copy of it here. A few weeks later, much disappointed, he reported further that he had found papers showing that Jardine's had sold the property in I think 1856. Jardine's at that time had needed a Pacific base for their sailing ships, which carried on such an extensive trade with China in those days, and so they had to make one. They showed some foresight in picking on San Francisco. They showed less, perhaps, in letting it go.

In just the same sort of way, P. & O.—the company I serve—was behaving at the same time. From its first incorporation, in 1837, it never owned a sailing ship. P. & O. was the first shipping company to open up regular steam communication between England and Egypt. Before this, the mails, which then were the most important consideration, were carried by the Admiralty in sailing ships, which were slow and uncertain. P. & O. managed to get the contract from the post office, away from the Admiralty, by charging far less and guaranteeing such quicker delivery by its steamers.

This was in 1840. Supported by mail contracts, all secured by tender, a service was opened to India by 1842, to Malaya by 1845, to Hong Kong and Shanghai by 1848, to Australia by 1852, and to Japan by 1864, which as you will recognize was very early in the history of modern Japan. This, of course, was all before the Suez Canal was opened in 1869.

The P. & O. Co. developed its own transport system between Alexandria at the mouth of the Nile, and Suez at the head of the Red Sea. It built paddle steamers for service up the river, and camel trains and resthouses for passengers across the desert. The company operated two separate fleets—one between England and Alexandria, the other based on India between Suez and eastern ports. All the coal they needed had to be shipped out via the Cape of Good Hope in sailing ships, and stocked to maintain their own supplies at ports en route. There were no lights or aids to navigation in the Red Sea, and so they provided their own.

There were no docks or repair yards at any of the ports. There was no provision for fresh water or food, or fresh vegetables at ports en route, and so they started their own farms, made their own water, built their own dockyards, and recruited their own crews.

Today we still employ Indian and Pakistan seamen on deck and in the engine room, often from those same villages where they were first recruited over 100 years ago, and many a man in the company's service can look back to a father and a grandfather before him. Only the other day, Her Majesty the Queen honored the engine room serang, or headman, in *Canberra* with the British Empire Medal, given to him for 40 years meritorious service at sea, and the whole of this has been spent with P. & O.

So P. & O. has a Pacific background too, but primarily in the Australian and Oriental sections of the Pacific. We do not nowadays have to buy the waterfront in San Francisco to achieve our base. These facilities are provided by good friends here, and many of the physical risks and difficulties our forebears had to take a hundred years ago have now disappeared. Perhaps the chief differences between sea transport at that time and today are three—first, the navigational and practical hazards involved were then far greater; by our standards, aids to navigation were primitive in the extreme, whilst communications were nonexistent. The man on the spot had to get on with it and provide himself with what was needed. And the history of the company shows how effectively he did so. Secondly, the rewards of success were correspondingly higher. If the venture succeeded, the payoff was relatively much richer than it is today, when international transport is an ill-rewarded business. Shipping, which requires great capital investment, shows a much lower return on capital than the average of other types of enterprise, while airways tell the same story. Transportation, in competition with the world, is not a gold mine. I am, of course, thinking of those companies which operate in the international sphere, and not of those which operate nationally under different conditions.

The third great difference between conditions today and yesterday is that the field of operation open to us then was virtually unlimited. Up to 1852 the navigation acts had given very considerable protection to British shipping, and great was the distress and opposition of British shipowners to the repeal of these acts in that year. They were at that time inefficient and in a bad way. The American sailing ships were better designed, better built, better manned, and better handled. So the British shipowners held protest meetings, and felt certain that they would be ruined, and they were obviously right. From then onwards, British shipping has had no protection whatever from the competition of the world, and from that very moment British shipping began to flourish as never before, until in 1914 it represented the astonishing figure of some 40 percent of the world's shipping. Along with the shipping of other maritime countries, British shipping could and did serve the trades of every country in the world, in free competition. That picture has been much changed.

Today, more and more of the world's carrying trade is being reserved by one government or another to ships of its own flag, because they cannot secure the cargo they need unless it is reserved to them. In other words, the merchant is not allowed to ship as he chooses. I am not talking now about subsidies. Subsidies we may dislike, but at least they do not actually remove any proportion of a country's trade from open competition. They merely make it easier for certain ships to compete. But when a country so arranges matters that its trade, or part of it, is reserved for its own flag ships, that is the beginning of madness in oversea transport.

Ocean transport is the cheapest form of transport per ton mile that has ever been developed, but its cheapness must depend on the two-way use of the ships involved, and over the years this has been achieved with remarkable simplicity and efficiency. It only needs two countries which have a common trade each to decide that its own exports or imports must be carried in its own ships to insure that all the ships in that trade are empty in one direction, and that transport costs are doubled. And the end of this road is therefore a position in which all the world's shipping is empty at least half its life, and transport costs are just double what they should be. I do not pretend to be unbiased in considering this matter. It is in our interest that we should be enabled to compete over as wide a sphere as possible. We ask nobody to guarantee us a living, but only that traders should be allowed to use our services if they suit them better than any others.

The justification for this view is not that we should prosper, for there is no reason why anyone but ourselves should be interested in that. The justification is that transport costs are an important component in the economics of every country, and indeed every man, in the world, and that it must be wrong to load these costs, against the interests of those who have to pay them, by failing to take advantage of the most economical way of providing ocean transport. Ships alone can remove a surplus harvest from one country, and put it cheaply into another. Ships alone can feed millions and provide raw materials for industry. Over the last century, an extremely sensitive, flexible and economical apparatus has been developed, and the benefits of this are being thrown away for the benefit of the few, but to the detriment of the many.

Looking to the future, therefore, this is the great problem for the shipping industry of any country which regards itself as a common carrier to world trade. How can we prevent what were once open spaces from being fenced in against us?

The P. & O. group is sometimes thought to be interested only in passenger ships. Of course, these are the more conspicuous, and they get the greater publicity, but the major part of our investment in shipping, and our revenue from it, comes from freighters and tankers, owned by some 14 companies, separate shipping companies, which together compose the group. So far as the United States is concerned, our interest in cargo is small, and so when I touch on one problem that now faces us in the United States, I speak not in the injured tones of one who is likely to be directly affected to any important extent, but rather as one who realizes the indirect effect on shipping all over the world of every action taken by the most powerful commercial nation in the world, and of this action in particular. This problem—its short title being the dual rate system in cargo liner trades—is one that has been blowing up over several years. It moves from court to court, from committee to committee, but so far it is moving to no solution that seems to us acceptable, for the solutions put forward threaten the whole structure of cargo liner services. The threat is not to P. & O., nor to British shipping, nor to non-American shipping. It is, in our view, a threat to all shipping carrying on cargo liner trades. The difficulty springs from the antitrust ideology. Hitherto, by suitable legislation, the shipping conferences, which combine to agree on freight rates, but which compete in every other direction, have been exempted from the normal provisions of antitrust law, because conferences and a dual rate system have been found not only necessary for traders and shipping companies alike, but in themselves not harmful. It is now being urged in the United States that if shipping conferences and the dual rate system are to continue, they must be put under close Government supervision. Since conferences are international, with the United States at one point in each service, but with one or more, often several, other countries at other points in the service, the United States is asserting the right of one country to approve and veto the terms and conditions under which shipping companies under all flags give service to various countries.

No one disputes the right of a sovereign state to do this in respect of its own domestic trades, even though we in the United Kingdom, and many others elsewhere, have never found it necessary. But no other free country in the world has yet attempted unilaterally to regulate the services of foreign shipping companies engaged in international trade. Conside what it means. The United States seeks to assert the right to approve or disapprove of rates and conditions of sea carriage in a liner service between itself and, say, the United Kingdom, Holland, and Germany. No one can deny a similar right to the United Kingdom, Holland, and Germany, who are equally interested, since trade is moving in both directions between all four countries, but the United Kingdom, Holland, and Germany may each have a different idea of the correct rate of freight on drainpipes, and each may differ from each other and from the United States. What then? The shipping companies serving all four are going to act illegally in one country or the other, and the only way in which their Presidents may avoid the risk of being sent to jail, if they are careless enough to visit the United States, is either to refuse to carry drainpipes, in which case they will equally render themselves liable in the United States for refusing the obligations of a common carrier, or to discontinue their service. And this, of course, will be as true for an American shipping company as for a foreign shipping company.

What then would have been achieved? On the one hand a doctrinaire adherence to an antitrust ideology. On the other hand, the destruction of a system of ocean transport which has been developed over a century, and which alone can give the shipper in international trades the continuity, the security, and the flexibility which he needs. You may think that I am exaggerating when I propound this result, and I hope very much that I am, but no one can deny that this is the way that things have been moving so far, and that if the United States of America—today's leader in world trade—should adopt this new technique, she will be followed by others, and a series of head-on collisions will take place. I can only hope that the submissions which have been made by the shipping industry before the appropriate committees on this subject, will not pass disregarded.

In the North American Continent, as I have said, P. & O.-Orient Lines are known for their passenger ships, and when we mounted our trans-Pacific service the first thing we had to do was to decide whether to assume a protective coloring or not. Should we cater for American passengers most effectively by pretending to be American, or by being unashamedly British? We could, after all, try to make Americans feel that they had not really left the States behind them when they boarded our ships. Alternatively, we could make it obvious that they had. The conclusion which we came to was, in short, first of all that a carbon copy never beats the original and, secondly, that being British comes quite naturally to us. So we decided to be British. We do not use tea bags. If someone asks for a cracker, he will probably be given an indoor firework, and early morning tea is almost forced upon passengers. But we decided at the same time that we must

not be insular, particularly since we are so far away from our particular island, and we therefore paid especial attention to having our coffee weak enough, our beef tender enough, our salads varied enough, our water iced enough, and our plumbing plentiful enough. Behind this screen of light tanks we arranged our heavy guns. We put into service the best ships we had, all custom built and of postwar design, followed them with *Oriana* and *Canberra*, and we concentrated on giving the best service we could. So we are not copying. We are trying to lead, and this leads us into decisions which may seem strange.

Why, we are asked, when you have seven postwar passenger ships do you build two more and put another $85 million at stake? What about the jets? What about the difficulties of unsubsidized passenger ships in the Atlantic? How can you do this without help from your Government? And anyway—why do you do it? Well, we never like to deny too firmly the possibility that we may be crazy, because one never knows. But we work it out this way. On short runs the passenger ship is unlikely to stand up to the jets. On the long routes which we cover, we can offer something which no aircraft can offer, however fast it flies, however large it grows, however French the champagne it serves. We can enable people to live like a lord without going to the trouble of being one.

A rapidly increasing number of Americans are finding that the world is round, and that they can get to Europe by going west as a change from going east. The Orient has an infinity of interest to offer en route, and not everyone has yet seen it. Moreover, the cure for many of the world's thrombosis is now at everyone's disposal. The cure was not discovered by the Stanford University Research Department. Like so many fabulous medical discoveries, it was made years ago by, let us say, the Indians and the Matto grosso of Brazil. It was made by whoever discovered the dug-out canoe. We have somewhat improved the formula. We have elaborated the canoe, but the idea is the same. Maybe they were seeking more women. You, on the other hand, may be seeking fewer worries. They were seeking more territory to conquer. You are seeking a smaller premium on your life insurance policy. But the answer is the same. Travel by water and, statistically, you will live almost forever.

P. & O.-Orient Lines have no patent rights in this cure. A.P.L. and Matson have both for years put an excellent brand on the market, and as their juniors in this trade we respect and admire their pioneering and promotion in the Pacific, of which we are now doing our share.

Gentlemen, you in this city have greatly supported us by your encouragement in the past. You have welcomed our new venture with great generosity. My remarks may have been diffuse, but their intention was to show that we truly are what we regard ourselves as being—servants of world trade and travel—and always at your command.

Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from resolutions adopted by the American Baptist Convention:

EXCERPT FROM RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, PORTLAND, OREG., JUNE 17, 1961, DIVISION OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERN, AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, 152 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK, N.Y.

FAMILY LIFE

We reaffirm our concern for the unity, nurture, and Christian growth of American Baptist families; and

(a) We call upon pastor, parents, and other Christian workers to give renewed attention to the Christian nurture of youth through meaningful experiences of study, worship, and fellowship.

(b) We urge American Baptists to encourage their Representatives in Congress and their Senators to consider carefully the problems of the cost of medical and hospital care for the aged, and to seek appropriate legislation to make it possible for them to meet such costs.

(c) We urge American Baptists to support legislation removing statutory barriers to the dissemination of birth-control information to married persons by physicians, hospitals, governmental agencies, and other responsible community and family service agencies.

Address of Senator Kefauver Before 4–H Club Conference, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], delivered a talk last week to a 4–H Club conference here which gave a clear and balanced summing up of the processes by which the Congress considers, amends, and adopts bills which become national law.

He also touched on the problems of resource development as exemplified by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and on the role of young people in shaping legislation of the future. His message is so clear and sensible that it might well be recommended reading for many mature citizens as well as young people.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Senator KEFAUVER'S remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE AT 14TH REGIONAL 4–H CLUB CONFERENCE, JEFFERSON AUDITORIUM, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1961

I am always pleased to talk to young people. And I am especially pleased when those young people are recognized leaders, as all of you are.

As I have told many groups like this, I am less concerned about the past or the present than I am about the future of our Nation and other free nations.

No one, of course, can predict the future with absolute accuracy. But we can make some "educated" guesses. From the qualities of leadership which I see here today, I would say that freedom's future will be in good hands.

You come from the same part of the country that I do. This is a region that I dearly love and to whose progress I have always tried to contribute.

Progress has not been easy for the South. But little by little, the human and social antagonisms that separate man from man and retard progress are slipping away, and a great new South is emerging.

This would have been impossible without such landmarks in Federal legislation as the TVA Act, which became law a few years before any of you, I am sure, were born.

Like most laws, the TVA Act began with an idea—an idea shared by great Americans like the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, a Republican, and by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Democrat.

Their idea was simply this: For years, the Tennessee River had been an untamed enemy of the South. Harness it, they said, and floods can be controlled, ships can carry goods from the Appalachians to the Midwest or the gulf, and electric power can be generated to turn the wheels of farm and industry and light millions of homes.

Never before had such a concept of resource development been proposed for a whole region. As is the case with many bold new ideas, this one created great controversy—in Washington and across the land.

But that is the beauty of our American system: An idea is proposed; it is freely discussed and argued; then, by one democratic process or another, it is rejected or approved.

This is how it is with every piece of legislation which comes before Congress. In the final analysis, its fate is dependent upon whether your elected Senators and Representatives, and the President, think it is good for the country.

As I have said, a bill presented to Congress starts with an idea. It may be an idea originating with a Member of Congress or one of its committees, with the President or one of his departments, or with some non-Government group.

Of course, the idea must be constitutional or at least thought to be. You could not, for example, make a law stick which would abolish the Supreme Court, although the number of its members can be changed by legislation.

Once a bill has been drafted, it may be introduced in the House or the Senate, or both, with this exception: all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives. This is required by the Constitution.

First, the bill is read by title and given a number, preceded by "S." for a Senate bill and "H.R." for a bill introduced in the House of Representatives. Then, it is printed and referred to the appropriate committee—by the Vice President in the case of a Senate bill and by the Speaker if it's a House bill.

A Senate bill seeking to amend the Sherman Act relating to monopolies, for example, would be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee and then to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am chairman.

Incidentally, I hope all of you know what the Sherman Act is. Some witnesses who testified before our subcommittee recently in hearings on the electrical industry—and they were college graduates—told us they had been unaware of this law until long after they had graduated.

Now the idea for a bill of the nature I have described probably would have originated in a series of investigative hearings conducted by our subcommittee.

This was true of identical bills introduced by me in the Senate and by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, in the House to restore competition to the drug industry.

Our Senate subcommittee began holding hearings on the drug industry nearly 2 years ago and on the basis of what we found,

Congressman CELLER and I introduced corrective legislation just this year.

Now our Senate subcommittee is holding hearings on the bill itself. We have had testimony from several eminent doctors—some who are for the bill, some who are against it, some who have suggested changes.

Eventually, we will hear from another side—representatives of the drug industry itself. We will also want to get the views of the agencies in Government who would have the job of administering and enforcing the law.

After that, the bill with any proposed amendments will be considered by our subcommittee and sent back to the full Judiciary Committee with our recommendations. If it is approved by Judiciary, it will be placed on the Senate calendar or pushed ahead by the Senate Rules Committee.

Now the bill, with any committee or subcommittee amendments, is read in full in the Senate. There it is discussed and perhaps changed, or the Senate may send it back to the committee for changes. Or, the Senate may then and there reject it.

On the other hand, the Senate may approve it. In that event, the bill comes up for third and final reading and if it is approved, it is signed by the Vice President as presiding officer of the Senate.

Next, the bill goes to the House, if it has not already been acted upon there, and follows much the same route: It is considered by committee and changed, approved or rejected either by the committee or by the House.

Sometimes a bill gets bottled up in a committee. In that case, it can be forced out to the floor of the Senate or the House by the action of the full membership.

Sometimes, too, the version of a bill finally approved by one House is not the same as that finally approved by the other. When that happens, a conference committee appointed from both Houses gets together and tries to agree on a single version. The Senate and the House then must agree on this single version.

The bill now goes to the President. He has several choices. He may sign it into law within 10 days. But if he merely holds it for 10 days while Congress is in session, it becomes law without his signature.

If the bill reaches him less than 10 days before Congress adjourns and he neither signs nor vetoes it, the effect is a veto. This is known as a "pocket veto."

However, if the President vetoes the bill at any other time while Congress is in session, the bill goes back to Capitol Hill with a message giving his reasons for rejecting it. If two-thirds of the Members of each House vote to override the veto, the bill becomes law. Otherwise, the veto stands.

To young people, this all may seem to be a slow process. In many ways congressional processes could be streamlined; I don't think any Senator or Representative would claim that the system cannot be improved.

But there is this advantage: There is less likelihood of snap judgments when Congress takes as long as it does to study a bill, to hear all sides, to weigh all the arguments, and then vote.

Perhaps as you grow older and more experienced, you will discover ways in which we can improve not only our procedures for making laws but the many other mechanics of government as well.

Wisdom is not the only monopoly of those with gray hair. Throughout history, it is the youth of the world who have carried the banners of ideas and progress, who have brought civilization a more intelligent view of its destiny.

The task which lies before us who are not so young is a formidable one. The task which lies before you—tomorrow's leaders—may be even more formidable.

But a formidable task is almost always an exciting one. And I am confident that whatever problems may become yours to solve in the years ahead will be tackled with the kind of enthusiasm, intelligence, and vision that has always characterized America's great leaders.

Thank you.

Was President Duped on TVA Rate Boast?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, with great fanfare and Madison Avenue technique, the announcement was recently made at the White House that TVA was lowering its rates. A New York City public relations firm was employed to whip up excitement over this news and canned releases and pictures appeared all over the country, to the glorification of public power generally and TVA in particular. But Electrical World for July 24, 1961, completely demolished this story by reciting the facts and showing up the performance as a misleading publicity stunt. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the article from Electrical World:

WAS PRESIDENT DUPED ON TVA RATE BOAST?

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The news services and newspapers around the country carried stories datelined July 11 from Washington indicating that Federal power had scored another triumph, bringing lower electric rates to those consumers in the TVA area. Even the New York Times put the story on the front page and devoted a full column to it. The implication was clear that TVA was lowering its rates.

The story had originated at the White House with President Kennedy standing by and nodding approval as members of the TVA board disclosed rate decreases in their area. An official release, prepared for the occasion by Doremus & Co., public relations counselors in New York, was made available for the hapless reporters who couldn't make the White House ceremony.

The Doremus & Co. release opened, "The board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority announced today the availability of a new and lower electric power rate for residential, farm, and commercial users."

White House reporters went off to file the stories clearly indicating that TVA was cutting its rates.

Those few who wanted to dig deeper for the facts would have been amazed to find that:

TVA did not reduce its rates in any manner whatsoever. Its own rates to every one of its customers remain the very same as they were before the widely heralded White House announcement.

TVA's only action was to permit two of its utility customers to charge less for the electricity they sell to ultimate residential and commercial customers. These two utilities serve a mere 4.3 percent of the residential consumers and 5.4 percent of the commercial consumers in the Tennessee Valley area.

The rate change reflects no glory on TVA or on federally produced power. Any credit must go to the two relatively small utilities that did cut their rates with TVA permission.

In effect, President Kennedy let the White House be used to announce relatively small rate reductions by a rural electric cooperative in Mississippi and a municipally owned system in Alabama.

To the credit of the New York Times, it must be said that this widely respected newspaper sought to put the story in perspective with a front-page article 2 days later that characterized the rate cut announcement as a "stunt."

In a neat job of tailoring its story to its audience, Doremus & Co. released another version of the TVA rate announcement for New York underwriters next day assuring them that the rate change "in no way affects the wholesale rate at which TVA sells electricity to the local distributors in its region." This release went on to say that the retail rate would have no adverse effect on TVA's power revenues and that its only effect would be to enable those distributing systems with lower operating costs to pass on these savings to ultimate customers.

TVA's wholesale rate had not even been mentioned in the glowing release at the White House.

A spokesman for Kentucky Utilities Co. came nearest characterizing the significance of the White House announcement. Said the KU spokesman: This action "was about the same as if an individual General Motors car dealer cut his prices by $100 and the carmaker decided to take full credit for the price cut."

There is some doubt whether President Kennedy realizes even yet that his office was used to foster a misleading story about TVA rates. It must be that TVA executives did not fully appreciate the interpretation that would be given their statement.

It may be conjectured that this announcement praising Federal power and the accompanying endorsement by President Kennedy was timed to create the proper atmosphere for the House vote next day on the Hanford reactor power facility.

If that was the purpose, it failed. The House next day voted 176 to 140 to knock out the Federal power generation facilities for the Hanford reactor.

The Razor Edge of Danger for American Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., recently wrote an article for the Detroit News wherein he commented on the dangers facing America and the principles in which we profess to believe and upon which this Nation was founded. This article was so thought-provoking that it was reprinted in the Sunday edition of the Washington Star. Mr. Romney's comments are, in my opinion, the most realistic commentary on the problems of the day that I have read anywhere. For those of us who believe in the basic strength of the free enterprise system I believe this article will provide food for thought. We must keep in mind that an economic system based upon freedom of opportunity demands a great degree of responsibility

on the part of the individual. If we as citizens do not face up to our responsibility our system could fail. We must not underestimate the dangers of Communism but we must also recognize the dangers of relinquishing our individual responsibilities to government.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the article written by Mr. George Romney, as follows:

THE RAZOR EDGE OF DANGER FOR AMERICAN SURVIVAL

(By George Romney, president of American Motors Corp.)

"Every good and excellent thing stands moment by moment on the razor edge of danger and must be fought for."—Thornton Wilder, "The Skin of Our Teeth."

America's success has been so great it has created new problems whose solution will require new and greater struggles.

Not since the Civil War have we faced a more grave national crisis. The very survival of our Nation is at stake.

America's only previous confrontations with danger of this magnitude were the American Revolution itself, the governmental crisis under the Articles of Confederation, and the Civil War. Today we are engaged in a titanic struggle for survival in the ideological field, the scientific field, the military, technological, propaganda, and political areas. Truly, we stand on "the razor edge of danger."

BULLETS AND BLANK CHECKS

While the danger is the greatest the world has ever seen, it is not primarily because of communism that we face the struggle for survival. It's not the uncommitted nations, or an atomic intercontinental ballistic missile war, or international economic competition—serious and decisive as these are.

Underlying their danger is a greater danger—the decline of religious conviction, moral strength, national purpose, and personally responsible brotherhood and citizenship. To the extent that we possess or lack these qualities, we will win or lose our struggle for survival.

Our ability to overcome our domestic problems and meet our international obligations depends on restoring our spiritual and moral health and in fully meeting our obligations as free American citizens.

We need to understand the basic principles of the world's authentic revolution—the American Revolution. Then we will recognize their partial realization at home and the urgency of further progress. We also will appreciate their universal value in helping others to free themselves from various forms of bondage, as they struggle to make their own free choices and play their part in achieving world order through universal human brotherhood, dignity, and voluntary unity. A fresh commentary on this subject has recently come from Dr. Albert E. Burke, the "Angry American" described in Look magazine of August 1, 1961. He said:

"We can't defend what we don't understand. The future for our kind of freedom depends upon how well we explain ourselves—to others and to ourselves. If we put our faith in bullets and blank checks passed around by blank minds it won't be communism that wins the world. It will be democracy that loses it."

VAST NUMBERS ARE MISLED

Our international adversaries deify the state, proclaim the supremacy of the material, and deny existence of a Creator. Despite this coldblooded and ruthless philosophy, they have convinced a vast portion of the world's people that their concern for human beings is greater than ours.

What a grim irony. Their flint-hard materialism is interpreted as being idealistic and even more spiritual than ours. And our society, built on a foundation of spiritual concepts, is stigmatized as being ruthlessly materialistic.

There are many causes of this. As a businessman, however, I will largely discuss some causes in the area of industrial responsibility.

Our present identification with materialism, in part, grew out of industry's public reaction to political attacks of the 1920's and 1930's. In replying, industry's answer was deficient and the emphasis wrong, in my estimation. The answer ran as follows:

With 6 percent of the world's people, we are able to produce 50 percent of the world's goods. We have more bathtubs, telephones, automobiles, refrigerators, and taller buildings.

This, of course, was a materialistic answer. It gave no recognition or understanding whatsoever of this fundamental fact:

Our material accomplishments are derived fundamentally from our political concepts, and our political concepts are derived fundamentally from our moral and religious concepts.

The acid test of a civilization is not its monuments nor its materialistic accumulation. It is what kind of men it produces.

The men who built the bedrock on which our society stands had a balanced and all-inclusive concept of man. They applied it religiously, politically, economically, and socially.

Industry's principal defense against present attacks in the political and economic area also is wrong, in my opinion. The prevalent thinking seems to run as follows:

Labor unions, bursting with new economic power, have now developed greater political power than industry. Therefore, it is necessary for corporations and other business organizations to plunge businessmen as businessmen headlong into politics.

This is wrong.

In a society premised on our political principles, it is wrong for an economic organization to seek to directly or indirectly shape its members' political activity or action. Neither should the citizen delegate his political birthright to economic organizations. It is also wrong for the citizen to exercise his rights primarily on an economic basis.

THE REMEDY IS POLITICAL

What then is right?

Let us begin with a statement of need:

We need greater citizen participation in meeting our political and economic problems in this country. This requires persuading more people to exercise their citizenship as citizens. The important words are "as citizens," and not as businessmen or union members or any other designation of an economic or other special-interest character.

Why do I say this? Because when we encourage people to exercise their citizenship on the basis of their economic interest or affiliation, then we unwittingly accept the fundamental premise of the enemy, namely; economic determination is the important factor in society after all.

Most certainly citizen apathy in the political realm is one of our great deficiencies. Let's correct it politically, not economically. Otherwise, we relinquish a cherished political heritage for a mess of pottage.

The unwillingness of people to say what they think is another serious deficiency of our times. Too many people limit their personal expressions to views they think their associates and their social or political groups want to hear. Too many are concerned about what speaking their minds will do to their business. Too many are fearful of what it will do to them socially or politically. Too many mouth things they don't really believe. Too many say nothing at all about subjects on which they have ingrained personal convictions.

Look at the record of performance in recent political campaigns. The major parties are just as averse to forthright commitments on genuine issues as weak-kneed citizens. By their very nature, the major political parties are principally concerned with winning elections. I don't dispute the fact that nominating candidates and winning elections is a very necessary function and should be a key function of a party. But party principals and their spear-carriers have been so concerned with that function that they avoid public discussion of vital issues.

Why? Because they have put victory first and fear offending important organized minorities and losing votes. To win elections they avoid being right too soon on controversial issues. Consequently, understanding and action on current vital problems is deferred. This procrastination can produce deplorable problems. Witness the recent financial crisis and the virtual breakdown of representative government in Michigan.

OUR GREAT NEED NOW

Never in our history has there been a greater need than now for the intelligent discussion of basic issues. This country desperately needs a political organization which dedicated citizens will wholeheartedly support because it is realistically defining and seeking solutions to the real issues—and doing so on the basis of the facts and of fundamental American principles. Only a political organization that will put these activities above winning a given election will command widespread respect and dedicated support.

I do not favor three parties, but either one of our major parties must become a genuine citizens' party, freed of minority group domination, or a separate political instrument must provide the political means for citizens to put the issues ahead of the mere winning of political office for its candidates.

How can we have Government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Only by providing adequate means by which the will of the people can be effectively registered after meaningful discussion of current fundamental issues that informs the people on the proposed solutions of the parties and the candidates.

The growth of excessive power is another fundamental and imminent danger in our society. Unfortunately, we have lost our understanding and fear of power. This constitutes an added hazard. For when anyone questions the magnitude of private power in industry, in unions, or in government, he immediately is confronted with specious arguments that people blindly accept as valid. Therefore what is said is often dismissed.

They are misled by this argument:

Without such concentrations we could not enjoy the material abundance which has been so impressively created. For the sake of military defense, technological improvement, efficiency and economy, America must endure present and even greater organizations of power in industry, labor and government.

I disagree. In too many instances we have already created private power of such awesome magnitude that we are facing the further expansion of governmental power of staggering proportions for the purpose of offsetting this private power. That, I believe, is the root of our domestic problems.

The excessive concentration of private power is most pronounced in the collective bargaining area. America's unequaled potentials for further progress require genuine collective bargaining, big and strong companies, and big and strong unions.

EXCESSIVE POWER IS STIFLING

I firmly believe in collective bargaining on a continuing basis, but I am vigorously opposed to our present swollen forms of union and employer power. They have made col-

lective bargaining a process of power conflict, not of industrial democracy. As a consequence, America is being divided into warring political and economic camps. Unless industrial sanity is restored, we may be robbed of our heritage and our future.

Our traditional concern was that any form of excessive power must be divided. History clearly shows that unless such power is dispersed, it sooner or later is abused.

Such proposals as factfinding with recommendations, public wage-price hearings, compulsory arbitration, plant seizure, and labor courts constitute inadequate—even futile—efforts to deal with the symptoms of a sore-ridden free industrial society.

We must deal instead with the real cause—excessive collective bargaining power concentrations. This is a sinister disease that is producing the sores. It is eating at the vitals of America, economically and politically. It is putting our industrial costs and prices on economic stilts at a time when international economic competition is in the early stages of growing more intense.

The early labor laws and industry laws designed to remove obstacles to our further progress are incomplete. They are far from adequate for dealing with today's new problems. Here are some reasons why:

Franklin D. Roosevelt correctly recognized that by the late 1920's, industrial, financial, and agricultural power had become excessive. He found it necessary to lead a peaceful revolution by creating a countervailing economic power. He accomplished this through the process of collective bargaining and the labor laws. Thereby he made a necessary contribution to the Nation's economic development. The immediate effect was the needed division of economic power, and stimulation of progress by widespread correction of indefensible abuses in American industry.

But Roosevelt went even further. He undertook to offset the political influence of industry and agriculture by encouraging union political participation. The consequences, in light of subsequent developments, warrant reexamination, because in the intervening period the new power of unions has grown to be tremendous—so tremendous that employers in vast industries have combined their power to offset swollen union power. The resulting collective bargaining power struggles have created the current trend and peril.

The current trend is toward even further concentration of power—this time in governmental hands—to offset the excessive concentrations of labor and industry power. It is time to halt this trend by revising our basic economic laws to reflect the fundamental fact that the common interests of labor and management exceed their special interests and that the freedom of both depends on industrial competition that protects the general public.

BASIS FOR NATIONAL POLICY

In a free society, competition and separate enterprise cooperation based on our proven principles of sharing economic progress among consumers, employees, and stockholders must be the foundation of national economic policy and private economic activity.

If any group monopolizes all the benefits of progress, the Nation suffers from maldistribution and imbalance.

This frequently happens when the basis for future sharing by one or two groups is determined in advance without regard to the interests of all. For example, wages or dividend payments fixed this year for the next 3 years could be so far from the progress results in 1964 that the labor or stockholder share could be either excessive or deficient. Needed is an equitable method of sharing actual progress, not hypothetical progress with employees.

Here is the dilemma:

The collective bargaining laws and premised on the principle of monopoly and compulsory cooperation.

The antitrust laws, and those relating to industry, are premised on the principle of competition and voluntary cooperation.

Thus, we have a built-in conflict in our basic economic laws.

Both employers and unions mass their Gargantuan economic power or their not inconsequential political power for collective bargaining purposes. The collective bargaining laws impose no real limits on the power moves of either side.

If we maintain this pattern, and continue in this direction, the Government is going to step in and control bargaining. This would bring Government control or determination of wages. If this is done, similar control of prices is inevitable. This could prove fatal.

With such controls, I believe the economic freedom and flexibility required for needed levels of progress and progress sharing will disappear. Government control and Government decision will be substituted for the decision of free organizations, and ultimately of the people as consumers.

ANTITRUST LAWS INADEQUATE

Our antitrust laws also need to be modernized and strengthened, not relaxed. They miss today's target. They fail to reflect adequately the conditions of today's competition. They do not provide for economic birth in fully established basic industries—only for economic death. Many such industries are now dominated by one or two companies. This excessive concentration is experiencing growing intellectual and political attack and declining public confidence.

Either the American people are going to have confidence in the ability of the competitive principle to protect their interests in the marketplace, or they are going to turn to their public servants for the exercise of the type of control they think is needed.

Our economic progress has been importantly the result of a sufficient number of sensitive power centers free in their response to change. This has produced superior industrial flexibility and strength.

Centralization of wage and price control in Government could prove as inflexible as present agricultural control.

In a period when two-thirds of the people in the world are still hungry, we approach our agricultural problem primarily on an isolationist, nationalistic basis. Our granaries bulge. Yet our programs deliberately curtail the productivity of our land and artificially inhibit our advancing technology.

Internationally, we are an island of prosperity in the midst of world poverty and starvation. We are like a rich man in a very poor village, who has more than he personally can consume, but artificially raises costs and prices and doesn't adequately help others to help themselves improve their own economic circumstances.

Fifty-five percent of U.S. farmers desire to be free of all controls according to the polls. Whether or not such polls are an accurate reflection of farm opinion is not necessarily the important point. The vital question is whether, on a centrally controlled basis, we are approaching the agricultural problem soundly from the standpoint of our present world interest rather than from the narrow past based on economic nationalism and political interest.

The technology of agriculture in this country has moved like lightning in the last 20 or 30 years. Farm costs have been slashed and on a volume production basis could be slashed further. Therefore, we can meet our moral responsibility, strengthen freedom, enlarge our world food markets, and strengthen our economy by cutting agriculture loose from present Federal controls. We should let it compete flexibly on a world price basis.

OUR TECHNOLOGY AIDS SOVIET

Unless we face up to doing it soon, the Russians will beat us in using modern agricultural technology to help the hungry.

After studying our technology and agriculture, the Russians are moving earth, if not heaven, to copy our achievements. They intend to exploit them first to meet the requirements of people around the world for food. The fact that our agricultural problems are complicated by the self-interest positions of other friendly nations should not deter us from approaching our problems on a sound basis.

In addition, we must devise faster and more effective ways to help the less developed nations develop their resources and meet their other economic needs.

As a nation we are in the best position to take a seven-league-boot stride forward in this area. Out of our own success we can devise the quickest and best methods of helping to create a world society that is well fed and well housed. Only by doing so can we live in a world based on freedom and complete human fulfillment instead of coercion and crass materialism. Let us hope we make the most of this opportunity; it could be our last.

In our own lifetimes, we've watched the already costly Federal Government become an octopuslike creature, increasingly difficult to control. But if businessmen, unions and farmers continue to join the parade to Washington for special favors, how can we expect to curb the further intrusion of government into economic affairs?

Likewise, if States and local communities continue to look to the Federal Government for primary help on tasks which the States and communities should undertake themselves, how can we expect to keep Federal Government power distributed and dispersed?

The steady drift toward big government will not be arrested unless we do three things:

Resolve the above conflicts and rigidity in our national economic policy.

Reestablish the responsibility and independence of State and local governments.

Strengthen the spirit of self-reliance and generate a renewed appreciation of voluntary cooperation as the primary mechanism for expressing this self-reliance.

The most powerful force on earth is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people. To mobilize it requires the type of leadership that encourages the voluntary action of the people, individually and jointly, above the extension and expansion of governmental responsibility and power. We need such leadership locally, nationally, and internationally. We need it in peace as in war.

DUTY OWED TO LESS FORTUNATE

Locally, we need further to develop voluntary cooperative mechanisms that will enable metropolitan communities to eradicate slums, arrest the encroachment of blight, reduce the cost of good health and provide better programs and opportunities for their youth.

By fleeing to the suburbs, none of us is morally relieved of the responsibility of assisting in the improvement of the central city where we earn our keep. Those who have not had the same opportunity to escape crowded and decayed areas must not be abandoned by the fortunate ones who, whatever their reasons, have broken away from the urban scene.

Recently Dr. Arnold Toynbee, the renowned British historian, observed that free societies are stronger in wartime than totalitarian societies. He attributed this to the fact that free men can combine their

efforts in face of a common danger better than those who are enslaved. He noted, however, that because of the central direction of human effort, totalitarian societies are more effective in peacetime, because in free societies human effort in peacetime lacks comparable and essential unity and organized purpose. Here is another major challenge.

Let me state some basic convictions: Despite its protection of choice and diversity, I believe a free society through effective use of voluntary cooperation can be more flexible, efficient, and effectively unified in peace as well as in war. Its basic unity can be more effective where the need clearly exists. It can develop the cooperative means by which it can and must identify and cope with new problems as they are arising.

Crises or emergencies resulting importantly from procrastination and self-interest conflict can be largely avoided if we retain and use the freedom of action by which we are sufficiently flexible in meeting fundamental problems. We must have the flexibility to deal with them in their early stages before they reach such overwhelming proportions that extraordinary application of central governmental power is demanded.

Finally, the elimination of domestic racial discrimination is imperative if we are to be true to our own principles and lead the world through example and persuasion to liberty and brotherhood.

Our greatest weaknesses are personal indifference, ignorance and apathy.

Conversely, our greatest need is an aroused and informed citizenry dedicated to the acceptance of individual responsibility; energetically aware of what America and the world can be, and convinced that we are capable of building new order for the ages, based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and the belief in our Creator and our inescapable obligation to obey His laws as we individually understand them.

This is the bedrock foundation of the incompleted American Revolution, politically, socially and economically.

Unless more of us exercise our divinely endowed personal power and responsibility, tyrants will exercise it for all of us. We must serve God and all mankind or lose our freedom and face destruction.

Summer Recess for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as we move now into the third week of August the question has really become academic, but there continues to be a great deal of interest in some sort of reorganization of congressional sessions so that Members might have at least 1 or 2 weeks in the middle of the summer to spend with their families, always barring, of course, some emergency such as the Berlin crisis that might require our time in Washington around the clock.

It is especially significant that interest in this proposal has not been centered exclusively with those Members of Congress who have families of small children. In that connection, I include a thoughtful and provocative editorial from the Leader-Herald of Gloversville, N.Y., of August 9, 1961, which discusses this question most persuasively.

SPLIT SESSION CONGRESS

Leaders of Congress are driving to adjourn by Labor Day. While Members would scatter to their homes, to build their fences, in many cases their wives and children will have to remain behind in Washington for the opening of the school term. They had been marking time all through the summer waiting for the family vacation that will not now come.

For this reason, Members of both Houses of Congress are pressing for resolutions that would set up split sessions conforming more or less with the school year. They feel that they would be better legislators if they can live a more normal family life. The loveliest lobby—the wives of Congressmen—is ardently pleading for passage.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has been made the whipping boy, if the idea fails, because he opposes it. As a bachelor he does not see its value. There are even greater obstacles, the need for quick action in the state of the world. But something should be done for the family, too.

Longevity Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of S. 1459, which recently passed the Senate. It is a companion bill to H.R. 6092. All this bill does it to place postal employees on the same basis as Federal employees in other Federal departments and agencies in respect to longevity increases. All it does is to correct an existing inequity. Certainly all our Federal employees should receive fair and equal treatment right down the line. I am sure this proposal will receive overwhelming support when it comes to the floor, and I hope the committee will see fit to report it promptly so that it can be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

In this connection, I am including a letter from Gurden M. Higley, legislative chairman, Local 89–1566, United Federation of Postal Clerks:

HARRISBURG, PA.,
August 14, 1961.

Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: S. 1459 has passed the Senate, and now awaits action of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and finally approval of the House. Enactment of this bill will place postal employees on the same basis as Federal employees in other agencies.

Under present law, employees under the Classification Act receive longevity increases equal to the amount of a regular within-step increase of the grade, after 10, 13, and 16 years.

Postal field service employees receive a fixed amount of only $100 for each longevity grade after 13, 18, and 25 years of service.

I believe the statement contained in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee Report of June 27, 1961 (favoring S. 1459) states simply and with clarity why the enactment of this bill is fair and justified, and I quote report No. 74:

"An employee in the postal field service receives a within-step increase each year after entering the service until he reaches the top step of his pay level at the end of his sixth year of service. These within-step increases bear a direct relationship to his pay in very much the same manner as is the case under the Classification Act. In level 1, the within-step increase is $130. In level 2, it is $135. In level 3, it amounts to $145. In level 4, it is $160, and so on up to the top of the postal pay schedule. However, when a postal employee becomes eligible for a longevity increase, he receives only the flat $100.

"The bill corrects this anomaly by providing that longevity increases shall be in the same amount as the regular periodic within-step increases of the various pay levels. Also the bill changes the service requirement for longevity increases from 13, 18, and 25 years to 10, 13, and 16 years in order to more nearly correspond with the 10-, 13-, and 16-year within-grade requirement under the Classification Act."

We feel this inequity affecting Postal Field service employees should be corrected and our group should be treated as fairly as other Federal employees.

We earnestly solicit your help in the early passage of this bill in the House. Thank you.

Sincerely,

GURDEN M. HIGLEY,
Legislative Chairman, Local 89–1566,
United Federation of Postal Clerks.

West Berlin: How the City Became a Symbol of Freedom for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second and final article by John F. Bridge on West Berlin, its history background, and the causes of its present plight.

These two articles appeared in the Wall Street Journal on August 14 and 15.

The Journal is to be highly commended for publishing this factual history of one of the principal reasons for the present unrest from which the world suffers:

HOW CITY BECAME SYMBOL OF FREEDOM FOR WEST

(By John F. Bridge)

"Berlin, we were convinced, was an experimental laboratory for international accord. If we could learn at the conference tables to conduct our business as friends, we could eventually live together as friends and ultimately work together in world partnership. A modus vivendi between East and West was our first objective."

So wrote Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower in "Crusade in Europe" of his philosophy during the early days of Allied-Soviet control of Berlin. The philosopsy was widespread in the United States, and the basis of such policy as there was. Though Churchill was already having serious reservations about its

practicability, as the result of Russia's gobbling up East Europe despite the Yalta agreements, Britain was also going along with the idea.

In the years since 1945 Berlin has indeed become a laboratory but hardly one of international accord. Even before the experiment could be set up, there were rumblings of trouble. Germany was to be governed by an Allied Control Council, consisting of the military commanders of each of the four major victorious powers. But General Eisenhower, while he found the first meeting on June 5, 1945, in Berlin cordial enough, discovered Marshal Zhukov hemmed in by all kinds of advisers, including Andrei Vishinsky; the mershal had to take these into consideration in everything he did. But beyond this initial sign of trouble to come, the haphazard policies that had grown up for the occupation of Germany left the new President Truman with some most difficult problems to work out.

Since at the war's end the Russians occupied all of Berlin, while both the American and British forces had advanced well within the agreed-upon Russian zone of Germany, some method had to be worked out to get everyone within the proper zones. Behind the diplomatic verbiage, the unspoken situation was one of "who's going to give up territory first." Only the Americans seemed to have faith that everyone would act properly, and bit by bit even this was tarnished.

MR. TRUMAN ACTS

Mr. Truman finally broke the logjam, after a visit by Harry Hopkins to Stalin, by messaging the Russian dictator and Mr. Churchill in early June 1945: "As to Germany, I am ready to have instructions issued to all American troops to begin withdrawal into their own zone on June 21 in accordance with arrangements between the respective commanders, including in these arrangements simultaneous movement of the national garrisons into Greater Berlin and provision of free access by air, road, and rail from Frankfurt and Bremen for U.S. forces."

The "free access" matter was crucial. The years of preliminary negotiations setting up a divided Berlin, going back to 1943, had not provided any method or guarantee for supply of Allied forces in the German capital. As Mr. Truman noted in his memoirs, "Year of Decisions," the arrangements "would be silly" if they led to "an isolated Berlin * * * to which we would have no access." He advised the military to press ahead for such agreements along the lines of his message to Stalin, and Marshal Zhukov and Gen. Lucius Clay sat down to work out the details late in June 1945.

Mr. Truman wrote: "The Soviet agreed to provide unrestricted use by the Allies of the standard-gage railroad from Goslar to Berlin via Magdeburg. The Allies were also given the use of the Hanau-Magdeburg-Berlin autobahn, but were refused free use of the Berlin-Frankfurt autobahn. The Allies were to have an airlane some 20 miles wide from Berlin to Magdeburg and two lanes from Magdeburg to Frankfurt."

These agreements were not formalized in any treaty. They were merely a verbal agreement between the two military commanders. There were still widespread hopes, at that time, that "trusting" the Russians would lead them into friendly relations with the West. Too, Marshal Zhukov was particularly liked by Western leaders and he reciprocated—probably to his own detriment, for as relations eventually worsened he disappeared to a remote command. General Clay in time came to express regret for the verbal character of the agreement. But as Mr. Truman noted in his memoirs, if the Russians didn't intend to honor the agreements, putting them on paper wouldn't have helped.

The Berlin meetings of the Allies rapidly became anything but a showcase of international accord. Russian intransigence became a constant concomitant to the meetings. The most minor decisions, in the Western view, had to be referred back to Moscow and the answers were often weeks in coming.

GLOBAL TROUBLES

The big blowup over Berlin—the blockade of 1948–49—was still several years away. And while relations between the West and Soviets within the city were often difficult, the main troubles were elsewhere; the hopes of cooperation in the postwar world were rapidly being dissipated at the United Nations, in Greece, Turkey, and Iran, where West and East came into conflict. One Western reaction was the Marshall plan, which further enraged the Russians.

As for Germany, it was becoming evident that East and West had different basic ideas. The West, led by Mr. Truman, continued to push for a unified Germany with a central government in Berlin. The East, it became increasingly evident, was set on a divided Germany, communizing its own sector and hoping eventually to pull the Western sector behind the Iron Curtain. The rosy aura of World War II days had given away to cold war by 1948, though the Russians were not yet aware of the depth of the Western determination that was suddenly and triumphantly dramatized in the Berlin crisis of 1948–49.

The background, briefly, was economic as well as political. Ever since World War II the Russians had been able to flood Berlin and West Germany with paper currency because they had been given plates duplicate to those used to print the Western currency. They had used this to depreciate the currency, aggravating inflation and the difficulties of economic reconstruction. Since the Russians were looting their own zone, rather than reconstructing it, they were already suffering a propaganda disadvantage in the eyes of the Germans.

The West decided on a currency reform, issuing new paper in its occupation areas, which were being economically united in a "bizonal" plan. Partly as a result of these moves, the Russian representative walked out on the Allied Control Council on March 20, 1948. And a few days later the Russians said that on April 1 they would start checking all U.S. personnel and freight passing through their zone.

Wrote Mr. Truman: "Our military government authorities rejected these conditions. They pointed out that we had been assured free access to Berlin at the time our troops withdrew from Saxony and Thuringia into their own zones. The Russians claimed no such agreement had been made. They declared they had the full right to control all traffic in their zone. They began to stop our trains at the zonal border and turn them back when the train commanders under orders, refused to submit to inspection. Between April 1 and July 1 Russian orders sealed off all highways, rail, and river traffic into and out of Berlin. 'Technical difficulties' was given as the reason by the Russians."

He added: "What was at stake in Berlin was not a contest over legal rights, although our position was entirely sound in international law, but a struggle over Germany and, in a larger sense, over Europe. In the face of our launching of the Marshall plan, the Kremlin tried to mislead the people of Europe into believing that our interest and support would not extend beyond economic matters and that we would back away from any military risks."

THE BERLIN AIRLIFT

The U.S. reaction was dramatic—and unexpected by the Russians.

On June 26 Mr. Truman discussed the crisis with his Cabinet and directed that an airlift of emergency supplies, already underway, be put on a full-scale basis and every plane available be pressed into service.

Month by month the number of planes involved and the tonnage flown into Berlin airports was increased. Always the question was whether the Russians would go to war to stop the airlift. But Western determination paid off. Talks with the Russians were undertaken to get the blockade lifted, but while there always seemed bright possibilities at the highest levels of negotiation, the plans invariably were blocked at the working level. The battle of diplomacy spread to the United Nations but also bogged down there too.

Meanwhile the machinery of the Kommandatura, the four-power governing agency for Berlin itself, also broke down because of Russian obstacle making. And as part of its intrigues the Soviets tried to boost the power of the German Communists on the Berlin city council. As a result of these two moves the government and Berlin itself were from that time split into Allied and Russian regions and governments, ending for all practical purposes the original idea that Berlin was to be treated as a single unit, the capital of a nation which was to be reunited.

The longer the airlift went on, the more efficient it became: at the peak 8,000 tons of food, coal, and other supplies were crossing the "airbridge" daily. Finally, in late January 1949, Stalin gave a hint he might back down. On May 12, 1949, 14 months after it had started, the blockade was dropped. Mostly as a face-saving measure, it was agreed by the West that the Council of Foreign Ministers should convene to discuss matters arising out of the situation in Berlin and matters affecting Germany as a whole.

SYMBOL OF DEDICATION

Coming on top of the Red coup in Czechoslovakia, the whole incident had galvanized Western Europe. Both there and in the United States and Britain the last defenders of giving the Russians their way in the hope they would then "be good" were in retreat. All the West began to see clearly the need to arm against the Soviet menace. Discussions soon got under way which culminated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. U.S. behavior in this crisis was probably a mean reason for the support it won in the Korean crisis which was to hit in June 1950. Berlin, in Mr. Truman's view, had become a symbol of America's—and the West's—dedication to the cause of freedom.

The experimental laboratory for East-West cooperation thus wound up as the laboratory for American and Western determination to stand against the Russians.

Once more, in November 1958, the Russians were to try to squeeze the West out. Mr. Khrushchev at that time delivered an ultimatum saying that he would, in 6 months, sign a peace treaty with East Germany. The effect, presumably, would be to enable the East Germans to ease the West out. When the West—now headed by President Eisenhower—gave no sign of giving in, the ultimatum was allowed to expire with the Foreign Ministers convening once more to discuss German problems.

The mechanics of that squeeze were much the same as those now being applied. The laboratory is the same. There is little to indicate that, if determination be maintained, the outcome won't be the same.

The National Lottery of Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about

the national lottery of Chile. In Chile, as in many other Latin American nations, lotteries are frequently used to assist charitable and welfare organizations. These lotteries are thus of great national benefit.

In 1960, the gross annual receipts came to $23 million. The net income to the Government in that year was some $5.5 million. Some of this money was paid as a tax and entered the Government's general revenues. About three-quarters of it, however, was earmarked for institutions such as universities, the Red Cross and public health service posts.

Chile is another of the nations that has enabled the gambling urge to work for the general good. In the United States, we are unhappily still depriving ourselves of these benefits while at the same time succoring an organized crime empire that is to no small degree dependent upon gambling moneys.

The Tender Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 3, 1961. The contents of this editorial are pertinent today as we begin the debate on the foreign aid bill for 1961:

THE TENDER TRAP

In a recent letter to every member of Congress, Secretary of State Rusk and Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that, in order to help the less-developed countries, U.S. foreign aid must be financed several years in advance and extended on the basis of long-term commitments.

"Such assurances," said the administration spokesmen, "are vital in helping the recipient countries to make the hard political decisions involved in self-help measures and internal reforms necessary to economic and social progress."

This is curious logic. It's sensible enough for the United States to withhold help from those countries which show no willingness to help themselves. And even in the best of circumstances, necessary "strings" on U.S. aid may be resented. But it's one thing to run that limited risk, and quite another for the United States to plunge into long-term commitments before aid-receiving countries get around to making hard political decisions. Such overeager assurances of aid could get the United States inextricably involved in the domestic political squabbles of such countries.

Committing U.S. resources on the strength of shaky promises is also plainly self-defeating. Such "encouragement" of reforms long postponed is likely to discourage reform; why should there be self-discipline when Uncle Sam is ready to assume the burden? Why, for example, should a Latin American regime give up politically inspired inflation when it already has a U.S. pledge to bail out the economy?

Already, some Latin American politicos are grandly inflating public expectations of U.S. generosity under the "Alliance for Progress" aid plan, the better to back out of promised (and unpleasant) reforms when the relatively modest amount of actual U.S. aid is made known. Washington seems more enthusiastic about the measures "necessary" to economic and social progress than some countries which cry loudest of the necessity for swift progress.

So a trap in the administration's long-term approach to aid is the tender-hearted temptation to take words in place of deeds. But we do the less-developed countries no kindness—quite the contrary—when Uncle Sam promises billions to cushion any hard political decisions.

A Climate of Honor and Trust in International Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the House is considering authorization for loans to be made by the Agency for International Development I find the attached article by R. G. Follis, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. of California, most interesting:

A CLIMATE OF HONOR AND TRUST IN INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT

To stand on their own feet, to become stable, free and strong, to grow and to prosper, the newly emerging nations of the world must import large amounts of foreign capital and skills. Outright gifts and loans from friendly foreign governments, while they help get things started, are almost never enough to get them finished. And among the international investments that have helped these nations, those of the oil companies, comprising one-third of the total, are the largest.

Contrary to what many might think, it is not always easy to arrange to import such capital. These projects involve years of planning and hard work, the spending of vast sums of money, and are subject to the natural hazards of oil exploration itself with its heavy odds against success. In Australia, the last 10 years of effort and the spending of $200 million by oilmen has resulted in no commercial production. In Brazil, the spending of $300 million and 6 years of work have brought the same result. Forty years of exploration in the Philippines have resulted in a total loss to date. The countries involved, however, received bonus payments, investment within their borders, employment of their citizens, and other benefits.

These investments are not the same as those spread over a wide variety and number of ventures. In each country, the risk is all in one piece—and the oil companies who venture in these foreign lands assume it all. The host country, by sharing in success, receives money to develop its own national economy at no cost or investment by government or people. The country, however, does not share in the cost of failure.

Before making an investment of this magnitude, commonsense dictates that previous agreements be reached as to the share of profit the country is to receive; and the share the company is to receive if oil is found; how they receive it; rights and obligations on both sides.

Usually, these take the form of concession agreements. They permit an oil company to go ahead in the face of the existing risks, with the assurance that the ground rules will not suddenly be changed by one side later on. But the development of the oil resources of a country is a widespread and complicated business. Inevitably, differences of opinion and disputes between company and country will come up. But friendly discussions, in an atmosphere of good will and in good faith, will usually bring a mutually agreeable solution. These are allowed for in such agreements. An example is the agreement between Saudi Arabia and the Arabian America Oil Co. Here, such discussions have forged even stronger links between country and company, including the now widely accepted principle of sharing profits equally.

The success of these agreements is now a commonplace. It is therefore all the more surprising to hear from some current sources and individuals the thesis that after oil is found and developed, a host government can, in fact, as a matter of patriotic necessity should, declare a one-sided amendment to the agreement which would give them part or all of the investing company's share of the profits.

There is, of course, no historical, logical, moral or legal support anywhere for this unique doctrine in any true civilization founded on law and not upon force. But, legality aside, if such a principle were accepted, the practical effects might well be disastrous.

The need of the newly developing nations for outside capital does not stop with the discovery of oil. New capital investment is then more necessary than before. This is because the country's new wealth lies not in possessing the oil, but in selling or using it or its products.

Even that, however, is not enough; the capital invested by the oil company is still just a shove, although a big one, in the direction of economic well-being for the host country. Success and good faith on both sides attracts more foreign capital to create more real wealth, a better life.

But if this is an ascending spiral, one-sided abrogation and bad faith breeds a descending one; new and desperately needed capital investment is scared off and even that already invested seeks to cut activity or escape altogether. The stability and development, freedom and political independence of the new nation can be permanently retarded.

A man's word must be his bond. So must the word of a company, or a nation. Trust to the faithful performance to the letter and spirit of a contract freely entered by both sides—and from which both benefit—has for centuries been, as it is now, one of the indispensable foundations of a civilization founded upon law.

R. G. FOLLIS,
Chairman of the Board.

Columban Sister Tells of Progress in Fight Against TB at Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Gertrude Ann Kray, staff writer of the New World, in a recent issue which pertains to Sister M. Aquinas, superintendent of Rottonjee Sanatorium in Hong Kong.

Sister Aquinas wishes me to convey to the Department of Agriculture and to the Members of Congress that American rice is far superior to the rice from any other country and it is deeply appreciated. Sister Aquinas also praised the powdered milk and powdered eggs as being most useful. She would appreciate help in securing cooking oils, canned vegetables, butter, and cheese, and anything else would certainly be put to good use. Cooking oils, however, was placed on the top of the most needed items.

The article follows:

COLUMBAN SISTER TELLS OF PROGRESS IN FIGHT AGAINST TB AT HONG KONG

(By Gertrude Ann Kray, staff writer)

An Irish-born Columban nun, a full-fledged M.D., visited Chicago last week and expressed admiration for the city's medical work, praise for the country's surplus food administration, and gratitude for the pharmaceutical house that provided her hospital with $40,000 in surplus drugs in the last few years.

Sister M. Aquinas, medical superintendent of Rottonjee Sanatorium on Queen's Road East, Hong Kong, is a specialist in chest diseases and was honored 3 years ago with a fellowship in the American College of Chest Physicians.

En route back to Hong Kong after a year's postgraduate study at London's Brompton Hospital, she was interviewed last Friday at a press luncheon in the Stock Yard Inn, hosted by Joseph B. Meegan, executive secretary of the Back of the Yards Council.

Her visit to Chicago was arranged by Dr. Otto Bettag, former State director of public welfare and now medical director of the DuPage County Tuberculosis Sanitarium.

Dr. Bettag met the dynamic, 41-year-old nun in 1958 at the meeting of the American College of Chest Physicians in Hong Kong.

Her visit here included stops at the Veterans' Administration Hospital (TB division) at Downey, Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium, Cook County Hospital, and other medical centers.

"Tuberculosis is our main problem," Sister Aquinas said. "In Hong Kong the disease attacks the bone. When children are afflicted it is particularly sad. However, we are making progress."

She listed overcrowding, poverty, and unemployment as the main causes of the disease.

"We have been encouraged by progress in the last 8 years, since the death rate has dropped to about 80 per 100,000, compared with 6 per 100,000 in the United States."

Over 1 million refugees complicate the problem in a city already overcrowded.

"The British Government has resettled some 500,000 refugees in new housing and progress has been made toward converting swampland to habitable acres. It is a great step," she concluded.

The hospital is a combined enterprise of private funds and Government aid. It is a former British naval hospital; its equipment was taken by the Japanese in World War II.

Later it was acquired by the Hong Kong Tuberculosis Association and given to the care of the Columban Sisters with the support of civic and governmental bodies.

It takes its name Rottonjee from the donor of the building to the Hong Kong Tuberculosis Association. There are 20 Columban Sisters on the staff.

"Hospital food is good," she said, "thanks to the U.S. Department of Agriculture which supplies surplus dried milk, rice, cooking oil, and other foods.

"You may know the food is ample and nourishing when expatients often come back to us for a meal," she said with a twinkle.

Sister Aquinas told of the TB insurance plan—a pilot project—through which chest X-rays are given at 6-month intervals with free care if the disease is detected. This costs the individual the annual equivalent of $2.25.

The plan provides that the individual must first pass the initial X-ray test to become insured.

"The plan is working so well that hospital facilities are kept very busy," the nun explained.

"We are most grateful to the American pharmaceutical houses who supply us with surplus drugs," she said, and was quick to add that "progress is so rapid in the discovery of new drugs that many good and usable products are out-of-date, almost before they are on the market.

"In the last 3 years we have received $40,000 worth of these surplus drugs."

The Columban order, to which Sister Aquinas belongs, is about 40 years old and is devoted entirely to missionary and medical work. The local house of the order, 6635 North Ashland, is the headquarters of Sisters who are studying at local universities for a career in the mission fields.

Sister Aquinas left Tuesday on her way back to Hong Kong. There she'll resume her duties as superintendent of Rottonjee as well as her lecture programs in medicine at the University of Hong Kong.

En route she will visit the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn., and hospitals in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Manila, and Tokyo.

Committee Wants Multiple Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Western Interstate Committee on Public Lands recently adopted a resolution which refers to legislation before the Congress.

I particularly refer to Members of the body to the principles of multiple use upon which this resolution is based. I agree with this principle and have supported legislation that would help assure the operation of our national forests under this concept. I believe that the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission should conclude a study and report upon the needs for wilderness areas before any legislation concerning such areas is passed.

The resolution follows:

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, JULY 18, 1961, HOTEL SIR FRANCIS DRAKE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Whereas national legislation and regulation which establish wilderness preservation areas are contrary to the multiple-use principle in the management of Federal lands; and

Whereas enactment of special interest legislation and regulation would seriously handicap multiple-use management of Federal lands; and

Whereas wholesale withdrawals of public land would be detrimental to the general tax structure and would limit and reduce the normal operation and development of the following industries: mining, timbering, reclamation, recreation, grazing, oil and gas and dependent service industries in the Western States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western Interstate Committee on Public Lands, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to oppose the wilderness preservation system as proposed in the Wilderness Act as an infringement on the administrative flexibility of the present system and because the announcement of such a proposal would subordinate policy decisions to a small council of nonrepresentative users; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to oppose all of the legislation and regulation not in accord with the multiple-use principle in the management of public lands; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the western office of the Council of State Governments to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the congressional delegations from the Western States.

U.S. Congressman Daniel K. Inouye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, an article in the June-July issue of Paradise of the Pacific magazine has put into words the deep and sincere respect and admiration many of us feel for the Congressman from Hawaii, DANIEL K. INOUYE.

This respect and admiration stems from his ability as a legislator which was quickly recognized and from the reputation he has established as a man of his word.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this article entitled "U.S. Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE" in the Appendix of the RECORD so that many more Americans can read about the unusual background of our extraordinary Congressman from Hawaii, DAN IOUYE:

U.S. CONGRESSMAN DANIEL K. INOUYE

(By David Fitzsimons)

The friendship between LYNDON JOHNSON and DAN INOUYE has puzzled many people; when INOUYE backed JOHNSON for the Presidency, they questioned why he supported a conservative southerner. INOUYE responded by attributing to JOHNSON much of the recent progress in civil rights. In addition the Vice President had been an ardent worker for Hawaii and sponsored appropriations for the East-West Center.

As for the Vice President's fondness for DAN; it has been suggested by JOHNSON that Texans have not forgotten INOUYE's 442d Combat Unit which saved a lost battalion of the 36th Texas Division in France, in 1944.

Whatever the reasons for the root of their friendship, at the 1960 Democratic Convention in Los Angeles, LYNDON JOHNSON against the wishes of his advisors, surprisingly selected this relatively unknown Congressman from Hawaii for one of the two seconding speeches to his nomination. "Get someone well known," he was advised, but JOHNSON prevailed, and DANIEL INOUYE prepared his tribute.

This 1 minute speech did not change history, but it did point up the phenomenal acceptance which has followed INOUYE during his short stay in Congress and has been characteristic of his whole political career to date.

DANIEL INOUYE (In-o-way) was selected Congressman of the United States in July 1959. When he took the oath of office that August, he proudly became America's first Congressman of Japanese ancestry.

On his third day in office, he was exposed to Washington's high-powered press; he was misquoted and ungently chastised for a misinterpreted opinion on District of Columbia home rule. Islanders were uneasy at the thought of bad press so early in the game. But only a few days later (after the press had apologized) DAN was back in print, and far more favorably this time:

"DAN arrived as an invited guest at the White House dinner for Khrushchev. As he stepped out from a limousine in white tie and tails, he was approached by a Russian who said, 'You must be one of the American millionaires.'

" 'No,' said INOUYE, 'in fact far from it. These clothes are rented. I own only my shoes.'

" 'Why should you do that?' asked the Russian.

" 'To do great honor to the people of Russia,' replied INOUYE.

" 'Thank you,' said the Russian."

The rise of DAN INOUYE has shown a great degree of astuteness in the evolving politics of Hawaii; and his sojourn in the U.S. Capitol has required far more deftness than the average freshman in the House of Representatives.

INOUYE was not looked upon as just a new Congressman, but rather as an emissary from an island community which is mythically and romantically designated the "melting pot of the Pacific." He was expected to be an instant authority on all Asian matters; yet, at the same time, he was evoking comment because he was completely American, soft spoken, and not pretentious.

Although not a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he was selected for a Pacific tour which included American Samoa, the trust territories, Guam, the Bonin Islands, and after a brief respite in Hawaii, on to Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, Quemoy, Hong Kong, and the Philippines.

On January 5, 1960, Congressman INOUYE was selected by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the "Ten Outstanding Young Men of 1959."

The highlight of this first session of the 86th Congress was his trip through the Pacific. He was impressed with the American policy of assistance without dictation in the territories. And in Japan he was thrilled to receive an unprecedented 40-minute conversation in private with the Crown Prince and Princess.

Regarding the official theme of the tour, "Cooperation Between East and West Against Communism," he stressed the need for improved communication between the two areas: "Friction between free world nations benefits only one cause, the Communist cause." Particularly he emphasizes the need for press exchange with an examination of our attitude toward Red China * * * "a 25-million-man army and the largest Asian navy cannot be ignored, nor the fact that China will soon be the third largest industrial nation in the world."

INOUYE favors international banning of nuclear weapons: "It took only 2 million tons of TNT to obliterate Germany; what can happen with the 35 billion tons of power which we now have in the United States alone?"

During the second session, the honors continued to fall. He was picked as a delegate to the interparliamentary Union in Tokyo. He was chosen for an important position in Eisenhower's people-to-people program. And in February of this year he attended an interparliamentary conference in Mexico.

Following his reelection last November, as a sophomore congressman, INOUYE was made the incredible offer of a seat on the all important Foreign Affairs Committee. Even more incredible to some observers, he refused the post and requested a seat on the Agricultural Committee because there he felt he could be of more service to his home State. "I'm convinced the people of Hawaii can't live on mere prestige and publicity."

It is this attitude which has been the key to his legislative work since 1959. A great deal of consuming work was required to bring the new State under existing laws, and to promote programs which were too long delayed during territorial status.

DAN defines himself as a moderate-liberal, although the Hawaiian scale may not be as far right as nationally. His legislative program reflects this, with emphasis on wages, veteran's benefits, medical aid, appropriations for the University and the East-West Center, price supports for coffee, sugar allocations, interstate highway funds, defense funds, as well as votes for civil rights and against the Landrum-Griffin labor bill. However, more time and experience is required to determine his overall profile.

The childhood of DAN INOUYE has been painted as one of near poverty, but poverty is a relative judgment, and in the areas that counted, he was quite rich. And he remembers his childhood with obvious pleasure.

DAN's father, Hyotaro Inouye, was 19 years old when he decided to get an education, attending school from 1914 until 1925 to receive a high school diploma. In the interim he met and married Kame Imanaga, foster child of a Methodist missionary. Mother Inouye was gentle, efficient, firm, and religious in her handling of the children. All went to church. And all took music lessons. "It took the family over a year to pay for a $50 piano," DAN poignantly recalls.

From the age of 10, during the summers and after school, DAN enhanced the economy of the family by holding many miscellaneous jobs, but with no particular career in mind. Then, while attending McKinley High School, a kindly doctor refused a fee for setting a broken arm, and DAN, dramatically impressed, decided to become an orthopedic surgeon.

Several years later Glenn Miller put him "in the mood" to consider extending his talent for music into an orchestral career. When 1941 came, he witnessed history being made at Pearl Harbor; DAN wrote his experiences on paper, and won a highly coveted national prize. Subsequently he contemplated journalism as a profession.

But when the time came to enter the university, DAN returned to his earliest ambition and entered as a premedical major * * * working nights as a medical aide for his sustenance.

In 1943 the 442d combat unit was established for men of Japanese descent. INOUYE a university freshman, volunteered. Refused at first because of the critical need for civil medical aides, he persisted and was finally accepted as the next to last volunteer in the original unit.

Training for months in Mississippi and in the initial European campaigns, DAN rose to staff sergeant. In November 1944, Bruyeres, France, a battlefield commission made him the youngest (age 20) officer in the outfit.

The last big push up the Italian peninsula, where the 442d became the most decorated unit of the war, grew from a diversionary action to a full-scale offensive, spearheaded by these Americans of Japanese ancestry. Hill by hill, village to village, mountain after mountain the Germans were pushed back. By April 1945, the enemy was against a wall; only two routes were available for evacuation of their Riviera bases, and one was being closed by partisans.

The Germans laid plans for withdrawal through the Po Valley, the heights of which were heavily fortified. For several days the 442d attempted flanking movements against these defenses, but as German evacuation from the coast began, a frontal assault was launched.

On April 21, 1945, Second Lieutenant INOUYE led company E, under artillery cover, up the slopes of Mount Marciaso, commanded by the 361st Panzer Grenadier Regiment. Forty-five yards from the main enemy force, they were pinned down by three machine-gun nests. Overcoming the first impulses of fear, Lieutenant INOUYE, already pierced through the stomach by one bullet, crawled forward to within a few yards of the first emplacement. Suddenly standing, he ran forward, and destroyed it with a grenade. Running to within 10 yards of the next nest, he silenced it with 2 grenades. "I'm blessed," he thought as he ran, but to his right he saw a German fire a rifle grenade. The explosion shattered INOUYE's right arm.

Throwing with his left, he killed the soldier and went on to destroy the third machine-gun. Company E burst forward to be raked by a fourth gun which, before it could be overrun, crumpled INOUYE's right leg. With a tourniquet on his nearly severed arm, and with the help of another soldier, INOUYE insisted on proceeding up the hill to make sure the ridge was secured.

"I was in the aid station when they brought DAN in," says Chaplain Hiro Higuchi. "It was on the next to the last day of combat. I heard DAN tell the medics, 'Never mind my right arm, it's gone anyway. Attend to the others.' Then he looked at me and said, 'You know, Chaplain, I won't be able to play the piano any more.' "

On May 2, 1945, German forces in Italy surrendered; May 9, 1945, victory in Europe. During the war, DANIEL KEN INOUYE had been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and 14 other citations.

For 20 months he rehabilitated in mainland hospitals. There he had the opportunity to meet new people, places, and ideas; there he contemplated the future. The loss of his arm concluded all hope for either a medical or musical career, but other needs existed where his mind and voice could be used. Mentally agile and infused with energy, he turned his eyes toward law.

Discharged as a captain in 1947, he returned to the University of Hawaii to major in economics and government. He purred through school; he courted and married Margaret Awamura, young speech instructor at the university; and he found time to be active in the community as commander of the DAV, vice president of the 442d Veterans' Club, and chairman of the Oahu Veterans' Legislative Committee.

Receiving his bachelor of arts in 1950, he chose to continue his education at George Washington University in the District of Columbia, where his studies would include firsthand contact with the Nation's Capital and politics. His academic record was exceptional, and he impressively achieved his juris doctor in only 2 years, graduating in the top 10 percent of his class.

Returning to Hawaii late in 1952, he accepted an appointment as assistant public prosecutor of the city and county of Honolulu. He dove directly into politics. The growth of the Democratic Party in Hawaii, as well as the political activity of the Nisei, dates primarily from World War II. Consequently, the emergence of veterans' political influence lagged considerably behind that of the mainland, which saw the rise of Richard M. Nixon and John F. Kennedy in their respective parties.

However, in April 1954, a minor insurrection occurred in the seventh precinct of Honolulu's Fourth District. A group of young Democrats challenged the precinct chairman, who happened to be Territorial secretary, for the seats in the Territorial convention. The two delegations, each supporting different candidates for party leadership, threatened to split the party. A compromise, giving each delegation half-votes, handed the INOUYE faction its first victory and a great deal of favorable publicity.

Later in the year, INOUYE decided to run for the Territorial legislature from the solid Republican Fourth District. One of the Democratic old guard attempted to head off DAN and a corunner, Spark Matsunaga, by suggesting that public prosecutors in a U.S. Territory were prevented by the Hatch Act from running for public office.

The story was leaked to the press and burst into print with indignant cries against the maneuvering. INOUYE and Matsunaga resigned their positions in October 1954, but the public support and publicity they had received virtually insured their election. In November, 11 young Democrats swept into their first terms in the legislature. They banded together to form the major faction of their party, and consequently controlled the house. DANIEL INOUYE, freshman legislator, was chosen majority floor leader. But, in deference to experience and position, one of the party leaders was selected speaker of the house.

The resulting impasse was inevitable. A group of young liberals, overflowing with enthusiasm and inexperience while trying to promote a new program, were no match for a wily speaker, a stubborn Republican minority, and the vetoes of a Republican-appointed Territorial Governor.

A special teacher's pay raise was declared illegal because the legislation was improperly written. As the last day of the session arrived and little of their program was off the ground, the clock was pulled. April 29, 1955, lasted for 28 days.

INOUYE and his colleagues attempted to salvage their program, finally threatened to dethrone the speaker, and the session ended. Money hadn't even been allocated for printing the session's records.

Peace was made. The young liberals applauded the speaker (who later became a Republican) for having taught them a lesson, and they castigated the Republican Governor for his vetoes. Strangely, the debacle became a victory; they gained prestige as their sincere efforts at change were applauded by the voters, who with the patience of born islanders, knew that experience would make the young legislators a valuable asset to the Territory. No confidence was better placed than in DAN INOUYE.

In 1956, he was reelected from the fourth district. He entered a battle for the speaker of the house, lost, and was again selected floor leader. First grade fumbles behind them, better established within the party, and with a new speaker and Governor, the young Democrats redeemed themselves with a laudatory session. Most of them have since gone on to higher elective or party positions.

After two terms in the House Inouye turned his eyes in 1958 to the Territorial Senate. Elected by a heavy majority, he immediately found himself again in a fray with the old guard. He threw his weight behind Nelson K. Doi for president of the senate, and won an initial victory when the caucus chair was relinquished to Doi. Consequently, when the former chairman attempted to call a caucus, Doi and Inouye boycotted it. The old guard gave in, but Doi was subsequently defeated at president-designate.

Then, midway through the session, statehood was granted to the Hawaiian Islands. On February 26, 1959, INOUYE announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate. His credentials were more than adequate. In addition to his legislative experience, he had served in many posts within the party hierarchy; he was also a director of the Central Pacific Bank, an active leader of many service organizations, and as a public favorite he had no equal.

Having been the first to announce his candidacy for the U.S. Senate, he was suddenly faced with complicated problems of protocol and party adhesiveness. INOUYE hesitated and finally stepped down. No one knew exactly why he had been willing to do this but that his modus operandi includes consideration for the party, is not disputable.

Throughout his own campaign for Congress, he actively supported other candidates of the Democratic Party. On July 28, 1959, although Jack Burns, Democrat, lost in a close race to William Quinn, Republican, for Governor, Dan Inouye was tendered the largest vote in Hawaiian history, more than 111,000—indicating a vote-getting power among Democrats, Independents, and split-level Republicans.

In the following year he boosted that vote to over 135,000—close to 75 percent of the total vote cast. Though the results are overwhelming, INOUYE's campaign techniques have never been particularly colorful or arousing. Seldom emotional, he maintains a sincere "quiet sell" manner. But, he is in possession of a deadly acumen that leaves his opponents helpless in the clinches.

Political prophets foresee a great future for this competent tepid-electric personality who appears so easily to "win friends and influence people." And generally it is assumed that DAN INOUYE will be candidate for the U.S. Senate in 1962. It is also assumed in Democratic quarters that unless DAN commits some serious mistakes, the chances of his being defeated are as slim as a whim. The opposition, however, is optimistic and expects to fight this time with an extremely influential candidate. Even so, as one rising young Republican perfidiously remarked: "Good-gawd-a-mighty, I'd rather run against Abe Lincoln."

The Decline of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, many historians have attributed the decline of Rome to a gradual erosion and surrender of power by the Roman Senate. The Roman Senate delegated much of its power and constitutional authority to the emperor and to a vast, ever expanding bureaucracy. Through this policy, the Roman Republic was doomed forever.

It is un-American, undemocratic, and unthinkable that this Congress, as representatives of the people, would abrogate its power and constitutional duty to appropriate and control foreign aid funds.

The following article by Rowland Evans, Jr., reprinted in the Greenville, S.C., News, first appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Greenville News, Monday, August 14. I hope Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this House will read the article by Mr. Evans and this editorial before voting on this dangerous effort to give unelected bureaucrats a blank check and back-door approach to the taxpayer's money:

THE DECLINE (AND FALL?) OF CONGRESS

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—There is a curiously unreal quality about Congress these days. The stage is there and on it one can see the usual props—the lights and scenery, the snuffboxes, the dignified tread of the southern grandees, the brisk efficiencies of the young Kennedy men.

The props are all there and the actors tell their lines without a flaw, but nobody is watching.

This is one of the central facts about the new administration. For years, ever since the binding caucus was abolished, the men of Congress have been yielding their power bit by bit to the White House to make the great political decisions of the Federal Government. The power drains out like sand in an hourglass.

They long since have given up most of their constitutional rights to "regulate commerce." These have been absorbed by the alphabet agencies downtown—the ICC, the FCC, the FPC, the Tariff Commission.

When World War II pushed the United States to the peak of world influence, and the demands of diplomacy and power compelled swift decision, the jealous Senate began to yield to the White House a little here, a little there.

These subtle additions to the executive power—found in such documents as the Formosa resolution—virtually conceded the power to declare war, which had become a meaningless function anyway. During the Eisenhower years, the slipping away of congressional power was partially hidden by the simple and abnormal fact that Congress was under strong Democratic control.

Political competition between the Johnson-Rayburn Congress and the Eisenhower White House made for zestful drama and gave Congress the illusion of power. Senator Johnson, now the Vice President, was the most skillful political showman in town.

For 2 years before the political conventions in 1960, the Senate was the seedbed of presidential ambitions. This added to the excitement of the place and made the Senate the most enthralling stage in town—but it did not conceal the fact that in his struggles with Congress, President Eisenhower was usually the winner.

In today's Senate, Kennedy is no longer there, while JOHNSON is in a less powerful position. Vice President Nixon, whose every ruling and tie-breaking vote oozed with political significance, has also departed.

Vanished and almost forgotten, too, are the great investigations of the McCarthy era when a single Member of the Senate had an almost life-or-death power over the careers of men downtown.

It has odd ramifications, this slow trickle of power from the Congress to the White House. As the sands of real power dribble away, the symbols of power take their place—like gleaming new office buildings.

One might think from the generous proportions of the new House Office Building that the membership were about to double or that the two old buildings were about to be demolished. But the membership is limited by law to 435. And the old buildings will remain.

The Senate built its own new office building 2 years ago, side by side with the old. Ninety-six Senators were housed in the handsome old structure. Now 100 will be housed in the old and new.

With the new buildings, and the new subways and the elegant new facade of the Capitol itself, have come the Cadillacs and the Lincoln Continentals, to carry the leaders and the assistant leaders and the other hierarchs on their appointed rounds.

If the erosion of congressional power continues, it may be only a question of time before a Cadillac becomes the standard perquisite for Senators—a small solace for diminished influence.

Very soon now the President is likely to get a brand new grant of jealously guarded power from Congress. This is the power to finance foreign aid over the next few years by borrowing from the Treasury instead of obtaining appropriations from Congress. This new authority will tilt the hourglass a bit more steeply toward 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Perhaps the hourglass will some day start to tip back. Congress has slapped down the President on several occasions this year, voting down three of his reorganization requests and denying his appeal for new powers to control farm production. On Thursday, the Senate ignored the President and approved millions of unasked dollars for bombers.

But these rebuffs seem more like exceptions that prove the rule. The trend is the other way. It is hastened by the publicity engines of the executives, by the glamor of the White House, by the President's dominance in foreign and military policy, and by the marvels of modern communication.

The trend is the other way and to hear them talk, the men of Congress know it.

CONGRESS RUNS OUT

A report on the gradual drift of power away from Capitol Hill and toward the White House was reprinted on this page the other day.

By coincidence, a striking example of that trend appeared in a news story on the front page of the same edition. The example may, indeed, prove to be the most far-reaching erosion of congressional authority to take place in many years.

The issue revolves around President Kennedy's foreign aid program. The President asked Congress to grant authority for foreign aid spending over a 5-year period rather than on the year-to-year terms customary in the past.

This means that the foreign aid lending authority would be empowered to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury up to the limit authorized for the period by Congress. No longer would it have to appear before congressional committees each year to justify its past actions or to spread before the representatives and the public its plans for the future.

To Mr. Kennedy, this is flexibility. To us it is usurpation.

The Constitution gives to Congress and Congress alone the power to levy taxes. By authority of the Constitution, and with the overwhelming approval of the public, it has clung to this control of the Nation's purse strings.

At its worst, the new approach would enable the administration to make errors undetected by Congress over a 5-year period. At its best, it means that Congress has simply surrendered its constitutional authority to check the executive department annually.

That sturdy conservative, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, offered an amendment when the bill came before the Senate to restore the constitutional prerogative of the Congress. Forty-six Democrats and 10 Republicans, caught in the blush and fever of the New Frontier, overwhelmed 16 Democrats and 23 Republicans to swell the flood of power in its sweep toward Pennsylvania Avenue.

Centralization of authority is both sad and dangerous. In pondering the matter, however, perhaps we should take back a word used above. For what is both sadder and more dangerous is that this is not so much usurpation of power by the executive as it is abandonment of responsibility by the legislative branch.

In the article reprinted here, Rowland Evans, Jr., of the New York Herald Tribune declared that the trend is "hastened by the publicity engines of the executives, by the glamour of the White House, by the President's dominance in foreign military policy, and by the marvels of modern communication."

Mr. Evans overlooked one factor. Power is not only attracted to the White House. Congress is increasingly willing, even anxious, to pass it to the White House—by the bucketfuls.

Truth in Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a very well written essay by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO entitled "In Your Interest." This article explains the need for the truth-in-lending bill, sometimes referred to as the consumer-credit-labeling bill. The text of the statement follows:

IN YOUR INTEREST

A consumer buys a product on the installment plan. His purchase contract calls for monthly repayments to cover principal and carrying charges. The true interest rate isn't stated. Has the consumer the right to know?

State law permits a loan company to charge 3 or 3½ percent per month interest on the unpaid balance on a small loan. The true annual rate isn't indicated. Has the borrower the right to know?

Few Americans have any notion of the real cost of the money they borrow. The careful shopper who prides himself upon getting a bargain often dissipates far more than he saves by accepting extortionate installment terms. Unscrupulous merchants and lenders often go to extremes in making credit easy because of the rich interest crop to be harvested.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has long taken the position that the consumer is entitled to full disclosure legislation regarding costs of consumer credit. This year, the Senator and 21 of his colleagues have jointed together in introducing S. 1740, the "truth in lending" bill. The Senators are of the view that there is a great public need for a bill requiring the seller or lender to state the true annual interest rate on consumer credit.

Senator DOUGLAS introduced a "consumer credit labeling" bill into the Senate last year. Hearings were completed on the bill, which was similar to this year's "truth in lending" bill. The hearings aroused considerable public interest and support as they revealed startling abuses of consumer credit.

EAGER BORROWERS

Americans are the world's most eager borrowers. Two out of three U.S. families are in debt. About half make regular monthly installment payments each month before meeting other family needs. A third make regular monthly repayments on mortgages. Another quarter owe for personal loans, charge accounts, and similar credit. Many families carry more than one kind of debt. In family life as in American business and government, credit makes the mare go.

Personal debt in America has mounted to $200 billion. Of this, about $140 billion is mortgage debt, while installment debt accounts for another $55 billion. About 13 cents out of every dollar of personal income goes for repayment of installment loans.

Mortgage credit has increased sixfold since World War II's end, while installment credit has increased eightfold. Today, the demand for such credit—and its supply—is among our most important economic indicators. During more prosperous moments, the business and Government economists worry lest installment debt be expanded too rapidly. During recessions, cheers go up every time consumer credit shows signs of expansion.

Almost every American family uses some form of consumer credit at some time during its existence, but it is used least among the very poor and the wealthy. Consumer credit is used with most frequency by those middle-income families with incomes of from $4,000 to $10,000 annually.

Installment buying has made possible the American standard of living. Home ownership would be far less widespread were it not for long-term mortgages with repayment stretched out for 20, 25, or 30 years. At least two-thirds of all automobiles and half of TV sets are bought on credit. The small downpayment with the regular monthly repayment have given the consumer a unique role in American life.

Consumer credit is of major importance to U.S. industry and its workers. Without it, the wheels of industry would soon grind to a jarring stop and millions would be thrown out of jobs.

Because it is so vital to all, consumer credit should be treated with respect. If the consumer loses faith because he is swindled, cheated, or fooled, the results will be catastrophic. A law to deter the serious abuses of consumer credit is worthy of widespread public support.

National concern with the size and cost of the Federal debt is fully understandable. On the other hand, it is difficult to understand the woeful complacency about the size and cost of consumer debt. The installment buyer is left entirely to his own devices although all of us will sink if he goes down.

Easy credit and the ruthless imposition of consumer debt upon the unwary have led to frightful abuse and sometimes to tragic consequence. Because of ignorance regarding the true costs of money, lives have been needlessly scarred or even wrecked. Unless excesses are halted, the entire American business community may be discredited.

If the real average price of personal and mortgage credit is 6 percent, consumers will pay out $12 billion in interest each year. If the price is 8 percent, consumers will pay out $16 billion—about half the Nation's annual education bill.

A 1-percent increase in interest rates is great enough to price hundreds of thousands of moderate-income families out of the housing market. On a $13,500 mortgage, 1 percent represents a monthly payment of $11.25 over a 25-year period. The homebuyer who fails to note the interest charge carefully may find that he has saddled himself with a burden beyond his ability to carry.

Mortgage interest rates generally are clearly stated. The consumer is usually able to tell what his annual interest rate will be. This has led to greater understanding and care in signing home purchase contracts.

TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Installment credit and personal loans are an entirely different matter. These generally are of relatively short term—1, 2, or 3 years, or a period of months. Usually, interest is figured from a complex table and is stated in terms of a monthly rate. In some cases, a flat service charge of so many dollars per hundred is added on. Often, no provision is made for rebate when repayment is completed in advance of the stipulated term of the loan.

Sellers in the consumer credit market often advertise loan charges as "just pennies a week" or a "dollar a month for each $50." To the unwary, the cost seems small. Actually, the interest charges continue at a "dollar a month for each $50" over the life of the contract. The actual cost figures out to $12 a year for each $50, or a rate of 24 percent.

To confuse the more wary, the seller often seeks to set up repayment schedules of 7, 9, or 26 months, or some other such odd period. This makes it difficult for the buyer to compute the interest rate, especially when the salesman persists with a high pressure sales talk.

The low-income family has least understanding of the abuses of consumer credit. Unable to buy higher cost items for cash, these families often turn to unscrupulous merchants who pad high profits with still higher carrying charges.

Helen Hall, director of New York's famed Henry Street settlement, filed a statement during last year's hearings on the "Consumer Credit Labeling" bill. She related the case of a shipping clerk with take-home pay of $68 a week.

The shipping clerk, his wife, and three children were radiant with happiness when they were able to move from a furnished room to a five-room apartment in a low-income city housing development. Faced with the need to furnish the apartment, they turned to a peddler who had always sold them everything they required from soap to shoes.

The peddler took the family to a furniture store where they were sold a bill of goods—$1,800 worth of furniture on the installment plan. The peddler came to their apartment to collect the downpayment and then disappeared from the scene.

From then on, the family dealt with a finance company. Payments were $60 a month. The family had no contract, only a sales slip from the furniture store.

After 2 months, the jerry-built furniture started to come apart. Complaints to the store were of no avail. Finally, in desperation, the family withheld payments, although money was set aside to meet them.

The finance company turned the case over to the city marshal's office. Following investigation, payments were reduced to $28 per month, but the full debt remained to burden the family.

"Today, 3 years later," wrote Miss Hall, "Mr. Phillips is still paying off his furniture. The furniture is falling apart, but the company has made sure it will be paid because his wages have been garnisheed."

WAGES GARNISHEED

The case of William Rodriguez, made news because it was climaxed by tragedy. Easy credit at high cost entrapped Rodriguez, who found his way out in suicide at age 23. Rodriguez supported a wife and four young children on a mail order clerk's pay of $66 weekly. He owed $700 in time payments.

Two reporters investigating the death of the young Puerto Rican found that a finance company had garnisheed his wages for $80.20, an acceptance company for $34.15, and a furniture store for $167.

"I'm up to my neck in debt and can't go any further," Rodriguez wrote in his suicide note. Police found in the young father's pocket a bill with a note warning that if he didn't pay up his employer would be notified.

A Washington Post and Times Herald reporter found in 1960 that easy credit at high prices is readily available to anyone with a job and a wage to be garnisheed. After the District of Columbia's easy credit mill was exposed, the capital's garnishment law was improved. Throughout the country, however, the courts in too many cases still serve as collection agencies for loan firms who justify their high interest charges on the ground of risk taking.

A prize-winning series of articles by Washington Star Reporter Miriam Ottenberg revealed finance charges on used cars as high as 30 percent, credit insurance costs double the normal and balloon payments of $200 or more still due on an auto after the final payment was made. Miss Ottenberg reported that the courts have ruled that finance charges are not interest and do not come under Washington, D.C.'s usury laws.

Reporter Ottenberg described how buyers were enticed into used car lots by advertisements offering a used car for $1,495, with only a dollar down. She reported that the customer would end up paying a total price of $2,195. The additional $700 covered loans from two finance companies to cover a down payment and a heavy insurance bill. The buyer affixing his signature to the complex contract proffered him was hooked.

The Ottenberg series revealed tie-ups between used car dealers and finance companies. Concealed in the fine print of purchase contracts were true interest charges of 20 percent, hidden insurance charges, and lump-sum payments due after regular installments were completed.

Thanks to the Ottenberg articles, Congress enacted reform legislation for the District of Columbia. The new law left much to be desired, although it was an improvement. Annual interest charges of from 16 percent on new cars to 32 percent on used cars over 4 years old are still legal.

TRUE RATES

Throughout the Nation, the purchaser of a new or used car on installments is still very much at the mercy of the fine print. Used cars financed in the 26 States without rate regulation carry true interest charges up to 275 percent. In some of the 25 States with "regulation" true interest charges are as high as 43 percent.

The common true interest rate on small loans is actually 30 percent. Rates of 36 to 42 percent are permitted in many States. Legal maximums under present State law run from 24 to 48 percent. To the borrower, the rate is stated as 2, 3, 3½, or 4 percent per month on the unpaid balance.

Some consumer credit ads are viciously misleading. One placed before the Senate subcommittee proclaimed boldly that Florida law now permits a "new and better way to borrow." The ad stated in smaller type that there would be "no monthly interest charges" to borrowers. The key word was "monthly." Repayment, of course, was clearly on a monthly basis.

The more sophisticated and the better credit risk usually turns to banks for loans. Even these borrowers are woefully ignorant of the true cost of money. Professional and businessmen who borrow for personal needs or who buy on credit are among the ill-informed.

Ten thousand commercial banks underwrite or directly finance $15 billion in consumer credit. These banks usually advertise loans at a stipulated annual rate, although an increasing number advertise a monthly interest charge. True interest costs are usually far higher than advertised rates.

The borrower of $1,000 repayable over 1 year in regular installments may think that he is paying only 6 percent on his bank loan. But the borrower actually has the use of $500 on the "average" over the year. His true interest rate is 12 percent.

The common rate for personal loans at a bank is 12 percent. The legal permissible maximum under State law runs from 12 to 42 percent. Maximum rates for credit unions is 12 percent by law.

Richard L. D. Morse, professor of family finance at the Kansas State University, last year presented to the Senate subcommittee a survey showing responses of lending firms to a survey on interest rates. Each lender was requested to ask what the monthly payment would be on a $200 loan to purchase a $300 used car, to be repaid in 12 monthly installments. Each was also asked to state the annual interest rate on the loan.

Five lenders said the monthly repayment would be $18.67. The same lenders reported four different annual interest rates for the same amount of repayment; 12 percent, 9 percent, 6 percent, 8 percent, and again, 12 percent.

Four other lenders reported a monthly payment of $18.33. Each of the four stipulated a different interest rate on the identical repayment: 7.5 percent, 10 percent, 13 percent, and 9 percent.

The true annual interest rate with a repayment of $18.67 is about 22 percent. The true annual rate with a repayment of $18.33 is approximately 18 percent.

These were chartered lending concerns, supposedly experts in their fields. None was a fly-by-night firm. Each had years of experience in consumer finance.

Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board has confessed that he is confused by the vagaries of consumer finance. Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, Ford Motors vice president in charge of finance, has stated that the "variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension."

"It is impossible," the Ford official added, "for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives elsewhere."

TRUTH BILL

The "truth in lending" bill would require full disclosure of charges to the consumer. It would in no way interfere with the buyer-seller relationship, nor is it an attempt to regulate the terms of installment buying. The bill is an attempt to prevent the abuse of consumer credit so that it may remain a bulwark of the U.S. living standard and a useful and legitimate tool of commerce.

The measure would require the following information to be disclosed:

The cash price, or, in the case of installment credit, the delivered price of the article or service to be performed;

The amount to be credited as a downpayment and/or trade-in allowance when the purchase is to be financed through consumer credit:

The difference between the two amounts: the actual amount of the purchase price being financed;

A listing of all charges in connection with the transaction not directly resulting from extension of credit. In the case of an automobile, this would include a listing of all insurance charges;

The total amount of cost to be financed;

The finance charge expressed in dollars and cents. This would include all interest, service charges, discounts, and other charges incident to extension of credit;

The finance costs expressed as a simple annual interest rate on the outstanding unpaid balance or obligation due.

The bill would require the seller or lender to give the consumer the basic information he requires to make an intelligent decision. It would give the consumer an intelligent

yardstick that he could use in shopping around to compare actual prices and the costs of credit.

Mutual savings banks, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Home and Housing Agency, savings and loan associations, the AFL–CIO, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have recorded themselves in favor of the bill.

Opposition has come chiefly from small loan associations, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, retail stores, and easy credit merchants of various kinds. Each of these has stated that business has nothing to hide. Each, however, is vigorous in its desire to continue the present camouflage.

The opposition argues that a Federal law represents intrusion into States rights. The truth is that State law has permitted sad abuse and that few States have shown any desire to correct present ills. Further, the bill is well within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government under the Constitution's money clauses.

The usual arguments regarding the creation of a vast Federal bureaucracy to enforce the law have also been raised. The same argument was raised when the Automobile Information Disclosure Act was passed in 1958. With passage of this law, the pack has disappeared from auto retailing. Consumers now know what is on the car and what the manufacturers' list price is for each item. The law has helped the consumer, has helped to restore true competition, and has brought a measure of truth and sanity into auto advertising. No great Federal bureaucracy has sprung up to plague the auto industry.

The argument has also been raised that it will take an expert to compute the true interest rate, and that the ordinary salesman cannot do so. This argument was effectively answered by Earl B. Schwulst, president of the famous Bowery Savings Bank of New York.

"They have tables. You can figure [the true interest rate] out to the dollar. They have tables to figure that very easily," Mr. Schwulst said.

"I recognize," added the banker, "the importance of consumer credit and I know that if we didn't have consumer credit and installment credit the economy would probably not have grown and expanded as it has, and I would never say that this credit per se is a bad thing. I know that many people would be unable to enjoy many of the blessings of good living if they were not able to borrow or purchase on credit. And this bill does not say that consumer credit and installment credit are bad."

There are many good reasons for a full disclosure law in the field of consumer credit. Not the least of these is the improvement of business ethics. But, the marketplace aside, life in latter-day 20th century America demands that the consumer be entitled to know the truth about credit and its costs to him.

America has boasted across the world of her free enterprise system. But no enterprise system is truly free if it is based upon withholding the truth from the average citizen. A free society demands that the consumer be given the facts by which to make an intelligent choice, whether he takes advantage of that knowledge or not.

A free enterprise system should be one of fair competition. Unless the consumer has a yardstick by which to measure the costs of credit, there will be little fair competition. Unless our economy is competitive, the Government ultimately will be forced to regulate prices and profits. The "truth in lending" bill would help the business community by protecting it from the unscrupulous dealer and lender. The merchant or lender who is honest and aboveboard has nothing to hide.

Economic stabilization demands information regarding the costs of credit. Unchecked personal credit expansion can lead to large-scale defaulting on debt. The result can be crash and disaster. By the same token, too great an expansion in any one period can lead to excessive contraction in the period following as people repay debt. This creates recession and unemployment and is in nobody's interest over the longer run.

Today, America faces grave danger from the abuses of consumer credit. Even teenagers are being urged to open up revolving credit accounts, complete with service charges.

As Senator DOUGLAS has said, the very least we can do is require the contents of the teenage credit package to be labeled accurately. The same would hold true for the parents who are also susceptible to the credit habit.

Some have argued that the demand for credit is inelastic and self-regulating, that the price of credit has little to do with demand. If this is true, supply and demand have indeed become meaningless in our world.

The argument in any case has little validity as a reason for not providing full information to consumers. If the truth is made known to those who buy on time, greater elasticity together with greater economic stability may result in our economy.

U.S. Airlines Finding Deadly Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written of late about the financial fix in which our commercial airlines, both domestic and international, find themselves. At home, we are finding that there is altogether too much competition between domestic airlines, with the result that, unless the CAB speeds up obvious mergers, the weak must fall by the wayside.

Likewise, the international field presents a similar problem. Our U.S.-flag carriers are privately owned by American stockholders and nonsubsidized. Their foreign competitors are, for the most part, owned by their governments and heavily subsidized. It stands to reason that this is a most inequitable arrangement.

The problems these carriers of ours are facing, Mr. Speaker, were very intelligently spelled out in a recent editorial in the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans. I commend this editorial, which follows, to the reading of the membership of this body:

U.S. AIRLINES FINDING DEADLY COMPETITION

Around the airports the commercial flying business looks brisk enough, but in the balance sheet the figures are mostly red. The contradiction is easily explained. Passenger traffic and operating revenues have continued this year at around the all-time records set in 1960. But the entry of the large luxury jets has meant also excess seating capacity, steeply higher expenses, and multimillion-dollar interest-bearing debts incurred to pay for the costly equipment. The net of this is some $20 million of domestic airline losses for the first half of this year.

Among the largest losers are the oversea carriers, which additionally feel the wounds of hot competition from foreign carriers, subsidized directly or indirectly by their home governments. That, presumably, accounts for the vigor of the demands made by the American-flag airlines upon the Civil Aeronautics Board to call to account immediately foreign carriers which are charged with cheating on rules and violating the intergovernmental agreements. CAB is the overseeing agency (in the United States) and may review carrier situations as the public interest requires.

Being private enterprise, American-flag airlines must pay their own way. The foreign carriers, either Government-owned or aided with one kind of subsidy or another, usually escape some of the concern with immediate earnings, debt interest and dividends, and the inherent advantages these carriers enjoy can be multiplied by ignoring the rules.

American carriers say formally the Royal Dutch and the Scandinavian lines have hogged much of the traffic between the United States and their countries by employing unfair and prohibited passenger promotion tactics. According to a Pan-American World Airlines charge, these competitors have increased flying frequencies far beyond that warranted by the traffic between the areas served and by going after third country passengers in excess of the number permitted as fill-ups; all this in violation of the intergovernmental agreements.

The Dutch and Scandinavian lines have been carrying four-fifths or more of the United States-Dutch-Scandinavian passengers, leaving Pan-American only a minor share of the business. A new worry for the U.S. lines is the United States-Soviet agreement, now in negotiation, for air flights between the two countries. There should be direct service, of course. However, Aeroflot, the Russian carrier, is completely a Government operation. Moscow may at times be more interested in monopolizing the passenger traffic than in making the service pay for itself.

Paying their crews two or three times as much as foreign lines do, American-flag carriers are in a difficult competitive position. It is a position that becomes intolerable if the foreigners are permitted to ignore regulations in their drives to capture the business. Unless there is a reasonable sharing of passengers, the American-flag lines will probably have to seek Federal subsidies or drop their transatlantic business. We'll see what CAB can do, if anything.

The Arab Blacklist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, we are presently considering the mutual security bill providing for loans and grants to friendly countries to improve their economy, to fortify their resistance against communism and to encourage them to pursue a democratic form of government. In doing so, we should not neglect our friends and aid those who practice discrimination to hurt our

friends. The secret documents indicate that we are aiding Lebanon, the United Arab Republics, and the Arab countries. There is no doubt that the practices of the Arab countries have insulted our citizens of Jewish faith who wear the American uniform and who wear civilian clothes. The practice of the Arab countries against Israel and Jews is so well known that in the July issue of Fortune magazine the startling disclosures as to the extent of the Arab practices were set forth. The article follows:

THE FRAYED ARAB NOOSE

A growing number of U.S. businessmen are getting caught in the crossfire of the 13-year-old war between Israel and the Arab world. The military front is quiet, but the Arab States are persisting in their attempt to cripple Israel by economic blockade. The Arabs not only refuse to trade with Israel, but they also threaten economic sanctions against any outsider who does business with the young nation. Any U.S. firm dealing with the Israelis is in danger of being placed on an Arab blacklist and thus cut off from Arab markets.

A number of U.S. companies, including Shell Oil and Socony Mobil, have closed up their operations in Israel. But many defied the blockade—among them, Emerson Radio, General Tire & Rubber, Dow Chemical, Fairbanks Whitney, and Merritt-Chapman & Scott. These companies have been restricted in one degree or another in their dealings with many of the Arab nations, especially the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq.

The Arabs now blacklist over 300 firms from all over the world, more than twice as many as 4 years ago. The number of U.S. firms on the list has risen from about 20 in 1957 to nearly four times that. The lengthening blacklist is actually an indication that the boycott is nothing like the tightening noose around Israel that Arab propagandists claim it to be. In fact, the Israel economy is steadily improving, despite Arab efforts to strangle it.

In the early days the blockade was unquestionably serious and expensive for Israel, for it deprived the country of normal sources of oil, ships, and food. Prior to 1956 and the Sinai campaign, Israel lived from ship to mouth. Deprived of access to Middle Eastern oil, the Israelis hauled crude from such distant sources as Venezuela, and paid a premium of as high as 30 percent for it. A $45 million exploration and development program brought in enough Irael oil to supply a tenth of its own needs. Finally, the Sinai campaign opened up the Red Sea port of Eilat, two pipelines were constructed from there to Haifa, and Israel now buys Persian Gulf crude at regular prices.

The boycott on shipping forced Israel to build up rapidly its own merchant fleet from 22,000 tons in 1948 to 475,000 tons (1965 goal: 750,000 tons). Similarly, Israel was compelled to develop agricultural crops that it possibly would not have considered if it had been free to trade with its neighbors. One example is cotton, a crop that was first sown in 1953. Today Israel grows 11,000 tons of good-quality fiber a year, enough for its own needs.

Despite the boycott, Israel's economy has thrived. Last year each sector of the economy set new records. But a chief problem continues to be an unfavorable balance of trade. In 1960, Israeli imports of goods and services amounted to $658 million, exports to only $350 million. The resulting gap is now bridged by U.S. aid, Jewish philanthropy, and German reparations and restitutions payments. As these diminish, Israel must produce more for itself and for export.

The key to increased Israeli development is foreign capital investment. In 1960 alone, the government approved 440 new foreign investments. And Israeli authorities estimate that more than 210 U.S. companies and businessmen now have stakes in Israeli industry, with a total value of $150 million. But with still more needed, the government last year launched a program to attract $500 million in new foreign capital.

Here is where the Arab blockade could hurt badly—if it were effective. But significantly, more and more firms are willing to take the chance of investing in Israel. In 1960 a number of U.S. companies began operations in the country: Sheraton opened a 200-room hotel in Tel Aviv; Helene Rubinstein started construction of a cosmetics plant; and Miles Laboratories became the first major foreign investor in the pharmaceutical industry when it announced plans to build a $1,700,000 citric-acid plant in Haifa.

The growing willingness of U.S. and European investors to ignore Arab threats is, of course, due in part to sympathy with the Israeli cause. However, this factor is of less importance than the Arabs would have the world believe. The fact is that Israel offers economic opportunities which make it worth while for many types of investors to ignore Arab threats. (Israel's per capita GNP—$1,050—is 13 times greater than Egypt's.) Indicative of the changed outlook is the attitude of R.A. Hutchinson, a vice president of Studebaker-Packard, which opened an assembly line in Haifa in 1960. Said Hutchinson, "We deal with all the Arab States. But if they choose to stop their purchases following our agreement here, that's their affair, not ours."

Moreover, the capricious manner in which the boycott is applied invites defiance. It is not a crime under the blockade regulations simply to sell goods to Israel, but it is considered "illegal" to invest in Israel, to set up offices there, or to enter licensing and technical agreements with Israeli firms. But some U.S. companies, such as Bulova Watch, which do nothing more than sell their products to Israel, have found themselves summarily placed on the blacklist.

Faced with such arbitrariness, formerly hesitant investors have apparently decided that they might as well be hung for sheep as for lambs. Furthermore, the chances are good that the hanging will never come off anyway. A great many U.S. investors active in Israel have not been placed on the blacklist; some have been put on the list and then removed for no apparent reason. As a spokesman for a U.S. electronis firm that has been dealing with Arabs and Israelis alike put it, "The Arabs are a fairly pragmatic group." A number of companies have ignored Arab threats, continued dealing with Israel, and then discovered that they still hadn't lost their Arab customers. Fairbanks, Morse was blacklisted last year after it went into partnership with the Israeli Government in order to develop a revolutionary plant to remove salt from water. Despite this, it has had inquiries about the machinery from Arab governments.

Boys' Nation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to your attention an excellent program, which I believe is of general interest to our membership and which I think is doing a great deal to develop our youths' interest in and knowledge of our Government and its operation. I am pleased, also, to commend a young man from Louisiana who has actively participated in this program.

The American Legion has a fine program which it has been supporting for many years, called Boys' Nation program. Under this program, the boys from the 50 States in the Union learn the art of local government, government at a State level, and finally Government at a national level. It involves a study of different levels of our government, terminating with a 10-day study of the Federal Government in action.

Recently, a young man from my congressional district, John T. Cox, Jr., of Springhill, La., has won the highest award under this American Legion sponsored program It is called the Boys' Nation Award John was first elected president pro tempore of the senate in the Pelican State program at Baton Rouge, La. He was then elected as federalist senator, and president pro tempore, the highest honor ever won by a Louisiana delegate in Boys' Nation.

It was my pleasure to have had John Cox, Jr., in my office and to have talked to him at length. It was also my privilege to take him to lunch and to show him around the Capitol in Washington during his short stay here as a member of Boys' Nation. I was impressed with his interest in all Government affairs and especially his interest in current events that are transpiring from day to day and that affect the entire future of this country.

John is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Cox, Sr., of Springhill, La.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion does many fine things. Pelican Boys' State program is one of the finest comprehensive programs in the Pelican State from which I come. Thousands of boys train and work and compete for the privilege of representing the Legion in the Pelican State program, and they know that if they make good on a State level, they will come to the national level as a member of Boys' Nation. I hope this program will continue to grow and expand and young men like John Cox, Jr., will continue to participate in it. Our Nation, going through a series of crises as it is, needs trained leadership which young people with enthusiasm and new ideas can offer.

Repealing Sections 1176 and 1177 of the Revised Statutes of the United States Relating to the District of Columbia

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas whether or not if this bill, as it is amended will leave with the District Commissioners powers to regulate commercial practices, notwithstanding the repeal of sections 1176 and 1177.

Mr. DOWDY. As I understand the matter, the District Commissioners will have the same licensing privileges in these matters as they do in all others.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the question with Mr. Tobriner and he assures me that he feels they would have the power to regulate commerical practices and that the passage of this bill was in order and very much desired by the Commissioners.

Mr. DOWDY. That is true. The Commissioners have asked for it, and I believe it is a good bill.

Harriet Pullen, Notable Alaska Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an excellent article, in the Reader's Digest series entitled "The Most Unforgettable Character I've Met," concerning perhaps the outstanding woman pioneer of Alaska's gold rush days, appears in the August issue of that magazine. It concerns Harriet Pullen, one of the brave and noble characters of that memorable frontier episode. It is written by Herb Hilscher, who, as a child, came north to Skagway with his parents, and thus early was nurtured on the adventure of that pioneering exploit, and has since written well on the old Alaksa and the new.

I first met Harriet Pullen in the mid-thirties, when her fame in the Far North was well established. Herb Hilscher's literary portrait of her not only accords her full justice, but well re-creates the atmosphere of those romantic days when the finding of gold in the Klondike brought long-forgotten Alaska to the attention of millions of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that Herb Hilscher's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER I'VE MET

(By Herb Hilscher)

In 1900 we Hilschers—my parents, my brother and I—debarked at Skagway, tumultous gateway to Alaska. Its mud streets were churned by horses; wood sidewalks clattered with the tread of boots. Too young to appreciate the adventure, I was thankful to snuggle in the lap of the deep-bosomed, redheaded woman who had welcomed us into her big house. Which is how, age four, I fell under the spell of Ma Pullen, heart and soul of that remarkable hostelry, Pullen House.

"Hey, Herbie, come on outside with me," my older brother called.

I shrank even smaller. "Never mind, sonny," said Mrs. Pullen, who understood little boys. "Have some oyster crackers."

As my parents and Ma Pullen talked, I nourished my confidence with oyster crackers. I fancied they must be some Eskimo delicacy. But soon I was trotting after 13-year-old Dan Pullen, oldest of Ma's own brood, gawking at the gold-rush curious that over-flowed the sun porch, and deciding that Alaska wasn't so different from home. With her Haviland china, running water in every room and an unerring instinct for the appropriate nicety—like crackers for a frightened four-year-old—Ma had made Pullen House an oasis in the raw frontier.

We stayed a week. My father, who had a chronic case of Klondike fever, suffered from it long after the gold paid out. His scheme was to barge a load of cattle down the Yukon River to Circle, drive them overland to Fairbanks and settle there. He beamed as Mrs. Pullen extolled this marvelous idea. At last the arrangements were made and we set off.

In 30 days we were back, lucky to be alive. A fierce wind had run our scow aground, pounded it to pieces and, though Dad managed to haul his two small boys and wife from the wild Yukon, he lost just about everything else he owned. At Pullen House, Mother went from one sobbing fit to the next. Ma Pullen, imperturbable in crisis, merely shifted her ground. "I told you so, John Hilscher," she lectured with a straight face. "The idea of giving a woman such a fright."

Whereupon she whipped out of her massive cash register enough money for three steamer passages and, as Father struck north to recoup his loss, my mother, my brother and I sailed gratefully back to Seattle.

Not until years later, when I heard about Ma's own first days in Alaska, did I realize the unshakable strength behind her inconsistency. She had arrived in that incredible year, 1897. Why? "They told me there was a gold rush on and everybody would be rich."

The widow of a Washington State rancher, she had to provide for four small children. And so, $7 in her purse, her youngsters in the temporary care of friends back in Washington, Harriet Smith Pullen stood alone on the Skagway beach on a rainy September afternoon. She was 36, a tall, handsome figure of a woman, red hair massed atop her head—and absolutely incongruous in the milling horde of ruffians, scoundrels, black sheep and lost sheep who had answered the cry "Gold."

Mercifully, a man came up and asked Mrs. Pullen if she could cook. He was building the Moore Wharf and had lost his kitchen hand to the gold fields. "Pay's $3 a day, grub's in the tent. There'll be 18 for supper."

The tent was pitched so low she had to work stooping over. The "grub" consisted of maggoty potatoes and a side of ham aswarm with black flies. As a final insult, the departing cook had left a towering heap of rancid kettles and pots. Briefly Ma considered turning back. "But, I thought, back to what? I could build as good a new life for my children in Skagway as anywhere. It was up to me." She treated herself to a 5-minute cry, found an apron and prepared supper.

Much later that night, in the jumble of tents and shacks along the muddy rut that was the town's sole street—they called it Broadway—Ma found an unoccupied cabin. She huddled on a bed of straw and listened to the raucous merrymaking from four nearby saloons. Every gust of wind sounded like a stealthy hand on her door. It was a long time before she fell into a troubled sleep, and when the sun woke her she was still clenching in her fist a stout chair leg.

She had survived. But $3 a day would never fetch her children. There was a way for a woman to make money in Skagway that year—one enterprising lass auctioned herself off for $5,000—but it was hardly Harriet Pullen's way. Unexpectedly, one of her lumberjack boarders provided an answer: "I'm going over the pass tomorrow, Miz Pullen, and I'd sure admire to buy a couple of your pies for the trip."

That night, after she'd scoured the last of the dishes with ashes (soap cost a dollar a bar) Ma hammered some tin cans into pie pans, baked six dried-apple pies and, in the morning, sold them for a dollar each. Soon she was making apple pies by the dozen; later, as their fame spread from White Pass to the Chilkoot and back to neighboring Dyea, by the hundreds. And before Christmas she was hugging her children to her in the tiny cabin.

"They thought I was a wonderful mother and had given them a straw bed because it was fun. I looked at those sleeping little redheads and thanked God for His generosity."

Boomtown-style, prices soared—$2 for a meal of bread, beans and coffee, $50 for a bolt of cloth. Still Skagway grew, thronged by a never-ending stream of newcomers and swollen by the hundreds who had failed to get over White Pass. They called it Heartbreak Trail, this slot in the gaunt mountains that walled the Yukon from the sea. It was only 45 miles from Skagway to the head of river transportation, but men aflame with dreams of gold and glory were flung back by the howling winds and tortured switchbacks of the mountain trail. "If only I'd had a horse," they moaned.

Ma Pullen listened, looked at the tons of provisions dumped on the beach, rotting, and thought of the seven horses she still owned back in Washington. By spring she had enough money to send for them. "Then," she told me with that marvelous poker face, "I quit cooking and began running a pack train to White Pass."

They said Ma was crazy when she loaded up for her first trip. "Seems so," she allowed, and cracked her long whip. She carried supplies in a four-horse wagon to the foot of the pass. Then, transferring gear to her horses' backs, she led them as far as the summit. There she turned over her load to a grateful sourdough. Back before nightfall and $25 richer, she was ready to roll again by 4:30 the next morning.

Heartbreak Trail brought out the worst in men. Once Ma came upon a half-maddened sourdough whose horse had wedged a leg between two rocks. "Come on, blast you." he was shouting as he tore at the broken ankle and the horse shuddered with pain.

Ma protested, "That animal is in misery," but the sourdough snarled, "Mind your business."

She did. Fetching her revolver, she dispatched the suffering beast with a single shot. When the infuriated sourdough turned on her, she leveled the gun at his head. "You look like you're in a misery of sorts, too," she said quietly. The argument was over.

Soon, however, civilization began crowding out the stampeders. By 1900, when the railroad over White Pass was built, Skagway's wild spree was over. For Ma Pullen, it was time for another shrewd look around. The town remained a tourist lure and the Klondike's chief port of entry and, as once she'd risen to its need for pies and pack horses, she new plunked her savings down on a big hourse just off Broadway and ordered a huge sign painted. "Pullen House," it said, and for the next half century it marked Alaska's most astonishing hotel.

Illustrious names signed the guest book: Robert Service, Jack London, President Harding, Herbert Hoover. But for every celebrity who broke bread at Ma's table and moved on, there remain hundreds of other men and women whose lives, in some important way,

were shaped by Harriet Pullen, and who then went on to shape Alaska.

Elmer Rasmuson, today president of the National Bank of Alaska, grew up in Skagway and, with the other local lads, spent uncounted hours fishing the fine trout stream just behind Pullen House. Each boy brought Ma his string. "She couldn't use all those fish," Rasmuson recalls, "but she'd take every one, hand over a sugar doughnut or a fat slice of hot bread bathed in butter and, dead serious, say, 'A day's pay for a day's work, that's my motto.' "

Robert Sheldon, former member of the Alaska Legislature, remembers Ma as "a one-woman Salvation Army who mothered everything that came her way." Sheldon came to Skagway in the days when it was still easy to forget this was part of the civilized world. Ma reminded him. "I spent 5 years at Pullen House and it was always, 'Mind your language, Bobby,' and 'Please don't stuff all that pie in your mouth at once,' until finally I could pass for a human being."

My father never did strike it rich in Alaska, but the brief taste of the north country had hooked me. In time I signed up as a ship's radio operator on the Seattle-to-Skagaway run. Whenever I saw Ma, her greeting was always the same: "Why, it's my oyster-cracker boy. Tell me, what's new?"

On one of my visits we spoke of Ma's own children, of Dan—who had been the first Alaskan appointed to West Point, an All-American tackle, and a hero in World War I before he died suddenly in his thirties—and of the others, all off on their own now. I asked if she wouldn't prefer to have one of them back with her. "That doesn't matter, what I prefer," she said softly. "They must have a chance to build their own lives, just as I did. I only hope they have as much fun."

By this time Ma was famous all over the Northwest, as much of a tourist attraction as White Pass. Down to the wharf she'd ride to meet the weekly steamer, erect and smiling, her ample figure pulled into a Lillian Russell hourglass by one of her special Spirella corsets.

"There's Ma Pullen," a passenger would shout, and they'd rush for the rail. She never disappointed them. All the way back to Pullen House she peppered her guests with vivid anecdotes out of Skagway's past, for Ma had become unofficial custodian of the memoirs of the great gold rush.

Ma's meals were prodigious. And her museum now filled the sun porch and two rooms besides with goldrush relics and memorabilia, as complete a record of a fascinating era as could be found in Alaska. It included gaming tables, Indian craft and, it seemed to skeptics, practically anything the townsfolk wanted to get rid of. "Maybe it is junk," Ma said (it was not), "but it used to be theirs, and now they're paying 50 cents a head to look at it."

Nor was Ma above doing a little promotion. When one of the town's saloons closed, she ostentatiously bid on the singularly lifelike painting of a nude that had hung behind the bar. There was considerable tongue clucking in Skagway—and an upsurge in museum patronage. But no one ever again saw the famous nude: it had done its work and undoubtedly had been tucked away in the cellar.

But neither her stories nor her food nor her museum was the essence of Harriet Pullen. Rather it was the great goodhearted warmth of her, and that unquenchable spirit, symbolizing Alaska to all the thousands who passed her way. Ma, for instance, knew that I had a hankering to be a writer. For years she'd corner me on each visit and say in all innocence, "You know, someone's going to have to write a book about Alaska one of these days and tell the world what it's really like."

I got the message. But it was not until after World War II that I finally began working on the project. "Oh, what a wonderful idea," she exclaimed when I told her. "How clever of you to think of it."

I planned to take a copy of the book to Ma, and inscribe it right there in Pullen House with a few words about how she had shaped my feeling for Alaska. But one summer morning in 1947, before I had finished correcting proofs, she fell and broke her hip. In the hospital she developed pneumonia, and just 4 days shy of her 87th birthday, Harriet Pullen was dead.

As Ma had insisted, they blasted a grave out of the sloping rock behind Pullen House and laid her to rest. The hotel still stands there, deserted. And if anybody ever suggests tearing it down and building something useful on the site, you will hear the loudest yowl out of Alaska since Siwash George Carmack panned those first nuggets out of the Klondike. It will be the protest from Ma's boys—all of us.

The Barbarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune shows clearly how fruitless it is to believe that we can negotiate successfully with Khrushchev. He has stated clearly enough on every possible occasion that his goal is to rule the world. Even beyond the stated objective of the Communists to impose their system on all men, Khrushchev is now following the pattern of all would-be dictators who seek control of the world through personal ambition. Because he has no sense of decency, no moral qualifications which rule the minds of other men, he has no sense of honor which would bind him to any agreements he makes. Negotiation with such a ruthless barbarian is fruitless and can lead only to disaster for the free world. There is only one language he understands, the language any bully understands, strength and a determination to put an end to his bullying tactics. Once he understands clearly that we will fight for the freedom of Berlin, or any other area he threatens to enslave, and when he understands that we will fight with every weapon in our possession and will direct our attack toward his sacred homeland, then and then only, will he be deterred. Our present course of allowing him to make steady inroads into free lands must eventually lead to total disaster.

The article follows:

THE BARBARIAN

The foulness of Khrushchev's tongue is only matched by the foulness of his soul and of the doctrine of enslavement he seeks to advance. He goes from excess to excess in his vile threats, and so it is impossible to say that in any particular utterance he has succeeded in outdoing himself.

But, in the leprous apocalypse which he pictured at a friendship rally the other day, when he stood figuratively amid the ruins of the Acropolis, blasted by his bombs, he showed a limitless capacity for evil which no Attila or even Hitler could equal.

For this man, by his own testimony, would see civilization reduced to rubble if anyone refuses to let him have his way.

"Hundreds of millions of persons will die" if he has to enforce his will by nuclear war. What would be spared? "Nothing. Bombs do not choose." He would allow no "open cities," such as spared Rome and Paris and Manila in World War II.

And all of these horrors are advanced as evidences of his own sanity. Bring such catastrophe upon the world for the sake of the freedom of 2,200,000 persons in West Berlin? It is a fairy tale that the West would fight. "What man of common sense can believe such nonsense?"

And why, then, pose such a dreadful dilemma to humankind? Because the prestige of the Soviet Union requires that he do so. At stake is not a peace treaty to force recognition of the detested Communist Government of East Germany, or to seal off West Berlin and its people behind the Iron Curtain, but the question of our fight for the recognition of our grandeur.

A grandeur that would be expressed in a hole where stood the Louvre, in the dust of the Parthenon, and the temple of Athene Nike, in the blasted wreck of the British museum, the dismembered stones of the Colosseum and the Pantheon, the rubble of the Pitti and Uffizi palaces. "Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair."

Khrushchev, like many a tyrant before him, works on the blackmail of terror. He has a purpose. It is not only to scare off all opposition, but to break the Western alliance on the rock of ruthlessness.

To Sir Frank Roberts, the British Ambassador in Moscow, he prophesied 200 million deaths if the West stood up to him. Twenty Russian nuclear bombs—10 on Britain, 10 on France—would wipe these countries off the map.

To Premier Fanfani of Italy he pleasantly remarked, "Technicians make me laugh when they argue over the question of whether five or maybe six rockets armed with nuclear warheads might be needed to demolish Great Britain. We have at least 12 already pointed at that target."

Then, as he tells it, he asked Fanfani where the North Atlantic Treaty organization rocket bases were located in Italy, and, informed that they were in orange orchards, said wolfishly that he would not hesitate to send rockets raining on the orange orchards of Italy.

When the ambassador of Greece said he did not believe Khrushchev would ever give orders to drop rockets on the Acropolis, Khrushchev relates that he replied: "I would not like to disappoint you, but you are deeply mistaken. I will not hesitate to give orders to my military people to crush military bases of the North Atlantic bloc located in Greece. And they would not, of course, have any mercy on the olive groves or on the Acropolis because bombs do not differentiate."

So, to our friends: Get out of NATO. To both them and us: Get out of Berlin. And if the terror works there, what next? West Germany, western Europe, Britain, the United States, the world. The human race would be backed off the globe and a barbarian would preside as the terrestrial god. Those who would "rather be Red than dead" could then have the opportunity of judging which was the better fate.

Oneonta Little League Baseball Team Displays Outstanding Ability and Sportsmanship in New York State Finals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the 32d District of New York I find myself in the enviable position of representing two separate New York cities whose Little League baseball teams were locked in a tight clash last weekend to determine the New York State champions in the Little League, with the honor and distinction of representing the Empire State at the 1961 Little League world's series in Williamsport, Pa., next week. These cities were Oneonta and Schenectady. Both are great cities. Both fielded great Little League teams. Both of them unfortunately, could not win.

As it turned out the Schenectady team, representing my home city, won this game, a real cliff-hanger, by the score of 1 to 0.

But while Schenectady won the game and the New York State pennant, the Oneonta team demonstrated great ability, magnificent sportsmanship, and covered themselves with glory. They have everything to be proud of and I am glad to salute them. They have brought great credit on their city, their coaches, their parents, and all who have made the Oneonta Little League system possible.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Oneonta Star of August 14, 1961, expressing their tribute to the Oneonta Little League team:

ALL SUPERPROUD OF LITTLE LEAGUERS

The weekend is over and with it the fabulous dreams of baseball grandeur that couldn't help but pop up in Little League minds—and in many an adult's.

The Oneonta kids breezed exactly halfway through the playoff games that could have led to a world championship before they ran into a team that could stifle the hefty local bats.

It is not easy to accept defeat with a shrug, but if ever a team had a right, if not the inclination to do it, it is this gang of kids who have grown up to baseball excellence among us.

At Haverstraw last weekend Schenectady was in its fifth State final. It even has a Williamsport title in its history a half dozen or so years back. Islip was the defending State champ, loaded with players who had experienced their first big league thrills a year ago. Oneonta? It was already six times as far as it ever had gone before—and it did itself proud all the way.

To the hundreds of Oneonta folks who had no direct connection with this Little League band of 14-, 11- and 12-year-old boys, this midsummer event was something special. The exploits of the boys on the field, so far above what had ever been done before, captured everyone's attention. It excited the city, it united the city. It leaves memories—happy ones—to many more than the families of the players.

As have few other events in recent decades, the triumphs and finally defeat of the 1961 Oneonta Little League team, meant something to the city these boys can call their own.

The Foreign Aid Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when both the House and Senate are considering the administration's foreign aid proposal, I think it is important to recognize that while the bill is entitled "The Mutual Security Act of 1961," mutual security funds are a very small percentage of the total amount. Most of the money in this bill is destined to be channeled into social and economic reforms rather than mutual security.

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask permission to insert my weekly "Report from Washington" on the subject of foreign aid as follows:

One of the most important, yet least understood issues before the Congress is the issue of foreign aid. This week this issue was the debate on the floor of the House. The foreign aid issue is perhaps the most controversial matter to be decided upon during this 1st session of the 87th Congress. By the time my words reach you on this program it is probable that the issue will be resolved—one way or the other.

Nevertheless, I would like to discuss foreign aid with you today on our "Report from Washington."

Of all the aspects of the foreign aid issue, the greatest controversy has centered over whether the Congress should give the administration authority to commit this country to long-term loans to foreign countries and to permit these loans to be made over a 5-year period with no annual review, by the Congress or its duly constituted Appropriations Committee.

The more common word for this procedure is "back-door spending," or raids on the Federal Treasury, whereby the Foreign Aid Administrator, without prior congressional approval, is permitted to go directly to the Treasury and borrow money for foreign development loans.

Thus far, our experience with back-door spending in domestic legislation has been virtually disastrous. Largely through this loose system of controlling the public purse strings, our national debt has skyrocketed to the astounding figure of almost $300 billion and many long-range commitments.

The first Government agency to be given this blank-check authority was the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation. On June 30 of last year, this agency had advanced $106 billion by the back-door route, and net losses at that time in cancellation of notes and appropriations to restore impaired capital, totaled over $18 billion.

Hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee revealed that if the administration is given this blank-check lending authority, interest rates are contemplated as low as 1 percent, and some probably will be interest free. In some cases terms of repayment up to 50 years will be permitted, with no repayment of principal for initial periods, up to 10 years.

The past history of our foreign aid program, in my opinion, does not give us cause to increase the amount of funds or the authority of the bureaucrats who administer the program. For example, at the present time the foreign aid administrator has a $5½ billion surplus—that is, money which has been previously appropriated by the Congress but which the State Department has been unable to spend. This does not indicate to me that there is a need for still more funds when $5½ billion previously appropriated has not been used.

A recent investigation by the Committee on Government Operations of our foreign aid to Peru—thought to be one of our more efficient or model aid programs—reveals some shocking examples of what happen when administrative agencies are given a free hand in the spending of tax dollars overseas, far from the watchful eyes of the Congress and the press.

For example out of 106,000 tons of grain costing $14 million, which was sent to Peru for drought relief, there was evidence to show that only 5.7 percent of the grain was actually distributed free to hungry drought victims. A large portion of the remainder was sold by the Peruvian Government and its high officials, into regular commercial channels; and at least a part of the proceeds were used to purchase real estate and to construct eight houses which were then sold to some of the local leading citizens at prices below cost.

A $2 million loan to Peru was intended to aid its economy through the construction of a farm to market road. After the route was laid out, soil tests were taken, and they showed that the area to be served by the original route was unsuitable for farming. The road finally constructed under this loan ended in the middle of nowhere on the side of a mountain, and it is estimated that an additional $2½ million will be necessary to complete it, at which time it will serve no purpose. Furthermore, the Secretary of State ordered his subordinates not to testify even though summoned by the congressional committee.

These are only a few of the reasons why I expect to vote against the administration's request for long-term financing authority in our foreign aid program. There are, of course, much more fundamental issues involved which time does not permit me to discuss on this program. But, the volume of our mail opposed to further wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars on foreign giveaways, assures me that there is almost unanimous agreement in our Seventh Congressional District on this particular issue. We can't influence religion, culture, or loyalty by purchase or giveaways, and I feel by now we have proved this—to the detriment of our national and personal dignity. To say nothing of our bank balance.

Record of Mercy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun recently ran an editorial which makes an appeal far beyond the limitations of the Fifth Massachusetts District. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that they will help

spur contributions to the Red Cross, which for 80 years has symbolized the very finest in human compassion and generosity:

RECORD OF MERCY

Disasters of nature and of human accident cannot be prevented. They strike free men and Communists alike. But in considerable measure they can be planned for, and today in many American communities they are.

We can thank the Red Cross, perhaps the most remarkable service agency in human history, for the fact that this is so.

At the end of this month, it will have been helping communities and individuals cope with disaster for a solid 80 years.

No longer do we wait for flood, fire, hurricane, tornado, drought, earthquake, mine collapse, plane crash or train wreck to happen. Most areas have plans and trained people ready to act. And local Red Cross chapters know they can call on the national organization the moment trouble grows too big.

In its eight decades, which began with help for victims of a grave forest fire in upper Michigan in 1881, the Red Cross has managed nearly 8000 separate disaster operations. That comes to more than eight a month for the whole span. The average has been 25 a month in recent years.

Set against the multibillion-dollar outlays the Government makes today for defense, foreign aid and other major enterprises, the $323 million spent by the Red Cross at home and abroad in 80 years seems a modest expenditure.

But that sum has come from voluntary contributions of the people, even though the agency has national official status under act of Congress.

More than four-fifths of the Red Cross's disaster relief dollar goes for long-term individual family aid—for food, clothing, medical care, replacement of household things, repair and rebuilding of homes. And most of the money is spent in the stricken communities, to help shore up their often disrupted economies.

If we have not experienced disaster in some form, we have all seen its ravages pictured in photograph or movie film. For 80 years, ever since the infant Red Cross reached out from its birthplace in Dansville, N.Y., to the fire victims of Michigan, this great agency has been setting the picture right again.

Many Americans through their generosity and good efforts have had a part in that enterprise. More than ever will their aid be needed if the Red Cross is to serve in the future as it has up to now.

A Two-Faced Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the New England Council of Boston, Mass.:

"A two-faced approach," today declared Charles W. Colson, Washington repsresentative for the New England Council, referring to a statement filed with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization by the B. & O. Railroad.

OCDM is currently reviewing the 1959 quota restriction on imports of residual fuel oil and has asked for statements from interested parties.

"In New England, Florida, Hawaii, and other parts of the country," Colson continued, "we have no original sources of fuel and must pay heavy transportation charges to obtain it. The B. & O.'s claim that loss of revenues to the railroads is an argument for using coal is an attempt to hornswoggle the Government.

"There is no question that coal has been a major source of revenue for many railroads over the years. Even so, despite the obvious advantages of purchasing their fuel from their No. 1 customer, the railroad industry has converted fully to diesel oil.

"If, as the railroads charge, the continued transportation of coal is necessary to maintain rail facilities, then it makes infinite sense that the railroads should reconvert to coal. Better sense by far than that the Government should force small consumers to continue to operate under a controlled program that is costing us over $120 million a year.

"Everyone will appreciate, I am sure," Colson continued, "why it is difficult for us in New England to listen sympathetically to the railroad industry's plea that we should use a fuel which even the railroads, who stood to gain so much by its transportation, found uneconomical."

Oregon's One-Man Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of Ford Times magazine carries the following brief article on Granite, Oreg., which may be of interest to my colleagues. I urge all of them to pay a visit to Oregon and suggest that their plans should provide for at least a temporary increase in the Granite population.

OREGON'S ONE-MAN TOWN: THE 1960 CENSUS GAVE GRANITE A POPULATION OF THREE BACHELORS, BUT NOW TWO ARE GONE—SO OTE FORD IS HIS OWN GOVERNMENT

(By Bruce M. Wilkinson)

An elderly man who lives in a weather-worn little group of frame buildings deep in the Blue Mountains of Grant County, Oreg., is treasurer, de facto mayor, and sole citizen of what can't help but be the smallest town in the United States.

The town is Granite (population 1). Only a ghost could be smaller; the question is, are there any other populated towns with which Granite would have to share its distinction? None has as yet come forward.

Granite is located about 45 miles west of Baker in the once prospering eastern Oregon goldfields, and isolated from the rest of the county by 4 or 5 months of winter that only snow cats can penetrate. This fragment of a once riotous gold-mining camp is still incorporated, but Otis Ford, 78, is the only resident left.

The 1960 census gave Granite a population of 3—against 40 in 1950—at a time when the city limits were shared by 2 other bachelors. But one hanged himself. The other moved a few miles away into the hills, to a cabin on Ten Cent Creek where he could carry on his prospecting away from the distractions of city life.

Thus "Ote" Ford alone took over the duties of mayor that were abandoned by one of the bachelors, and the obligations of citizenship that he and the other had shared. He is now the government and population combined, in a community that around the turn of the century was the outfitting headquarters for some 1,200 people working the gold mines and raising sheep.

There are other people who hang their hats regularly in Granite, but these are summer visitors who do not rate in Ote's book as residents. Even his nephew and nephew's wife, who stay in Granite as much as 9 months of the year, have not been honored with the mantle of citizenship, although inclusion would boost the treasury.

Ote runs a careful government with no worry about elections or council meetings. He sees to it that Granite's coffers are properly enriched when such steady revenue producers as the State highway and liquor apportionments come through on a quarterly basis. Some recent payments from this source were in amounts of 10 cents, 16 cents, and, much more substantial, $1.25—all based on the nonexistent population of three.

A self-service water supply for which users are supposed to pay $1 a month adds sporadically to the treasury. Sometimes a summer visitor will hand Ote $5 for the water bill, which can run revenue up to $30 a year.

Living in his one-room log house with 20 cats for company, Ote is not unaware of the tourist appeal of his one-man town, and is friendly with the sightseers who travel to see this municipal curiosity.

As he sizes it up, the smaller Granite becomes, the more prominent it is, and he is proud of the population peak—or "unpeak"—it has achieved.

Congress Must Accept Responsibility for Reckless Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that many of the increased spending proposals are administration-inspired, we cannot get away from the fact that Congress must bear the final responsibility for spending the taxpayers' money. The Members of Congress will be called to account at the polls next year for the handling of the peoples' money. It is our responsibility to appropriate and our responsibility to thwart raids upon the treasury. It is difficult enough to ward off the repeated challenges of the administration for wild spending sprees, we should certainly not be encouraging spending programs even beyond the wildest dreams of the planners in the executive branch. In this connection, I think the following article from the Wall Street Journal makes interesting reading:

THE FINE ART OF SPENDING

There's been much criticism of the administration's reckless spending in these columns, and a reader whose letter appears

today asks, in effect, if there hasn't been too much.

That, of course, is a matter of opinion. But, in all fairness, it ought to be made plain that the administration has no patent on irresponsibility. When it comes to prying open the Treasury for political gain, Congress is sometimes way ahead of the White House.

Take, for example, the little frolic the other day in the Senate Labor Committee. Just for laughs, the Democratic majority got things rolling before Republican members appeared. Skipping debate, the Committee breezily approved in just three minutes a pair of multibillion-dollar boondoggles so outrageous that even the administration opposes them.

One is the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, a retread of the old CCC of New Deal days. The administration would like a corps of 6,000 youngsters. The Senate Democrats thought that figure niggardly. So they approved a corps 25 times larger—ultimately numbering 550,080—at a 4-year cost to the taxpayers of $525 million.

Next came the so-called cold war GI bill, which doesn't even carry a comprehensive price tag. As passed by the committee, it provides for peacetime servicemen the same Government benefits extended to veterans of World War II and the Korean war. Free higher education for draftees would cost an estimated $3.4 billion over 12 years; nobody knows what housing, rehabilitation, and the rest would cost. Nor did any committee member seem to care.

As one Democrat quipped, "We've developed a new technique: vote first and debate later."

Congress has indeed refined the technique of legislating without thinking. Because of administration misgivings, the two giveaways described above may not become law. Then again, they may very well; equally irresponsible legislation has been whooped through Congress already this year.

Perhaps the most reckless was the $5.6 billion omnibus housing bill. The handling of just one part of that package of political goodies—title V subsidies for local water, gas, and sewage plants—shows the technique of big spending raised to the level of artistic virtuosity.

Originally, the administration thought $50 million would do for these community facilities, and that's the way the provision came out of a Senate committee. On the floor, the Senators raised the ante to $300 million and earmarked $180 million for loans to improve mass transportation. As the housing bill swept to passage, Senator RUSSELL remarked: "The Senate no longer reckons any program in terms of dollars. * * * I know it would not make any difference if there were $99 billion involved. The Senate would vote it with a 'hurrah.' "

In this case, the House had the last hurrah. That Senate figure of $300 million for "community facilities" quickly ballooned to $500 million. Even that wasn't enongh for the congressional spenders. In the final, compromise version of the housing bill, Title V was allotted $650 million—a fat $600 million more than the administration's first generous request.

Almost daily, there's the same bidding-up of bills thought to be politically profitable. In both Houses, Senator RUSSELL's observation applies: Dollar signs dissolve and disappear before eyes that are glazed by the votes to be got among farmers, old folks, city dwellers, suburbanites—anybody at all. So what if it takes millions and even billions to try to capture them? It's only money.

This also seems to be the sentiment of the reader who takes us to task for allegedly allowing Government spending to monopolize our thoughts. Look beyond the squandered billions, he says, and pay heed to the really important business of resistance and survival against the Soviet threat. But reckless spending and pyramiding of Federal debt obviously weakens the economy on which the Nation's defense depends. And it also may lead a determined foe to dismiss our occasional talk of resisting as mere words, not to be taken seriously.

So we plead not guilty to the charge of over-concern with wasterful Government spending. For we fail to see how the threat without and the frivolity within can be neatly separated.

Kennedy and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, from time to time I have reported to you on the great difficulty which has been encountered by members of both parties in trying to get action on a program for cutting down foreign imports of foreign minerals in order to resurrect our domestic mining industry and on the problems which our domestic sugar producers have been having in attempting to get a fair share of our own market for domestic production. You have also heard many speeches from the well of this House condemning the activities of this administration and past administrations in failing to give adequate protective support to domestic industries from foreign competition.

I have read today a most interesting analysis written by Mr. Philip Geyelin, staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal, on proposals which are being actively considered by this administration to create an effective joinder of the United States with the European Common Market to the further detriment of many of our basic domestic industries. According to his analysis the moves of the European Common Market presently being made will harm exports from the United States of wheat, corn and feed grains, motor vehicles, iron and steel, petroleum, coal, and many others. To offset this possibility the administration proposes legislation permitting it to cut import tariffs across the board so that the European bloc can ship to our market more readily in the hope that we will get some reciprocity in our export program. The article indicates that although the administration recognizes the damaging effect which this move would have on many industries, nevertheless it believes that the export considerations make the move worthwhile.

I strongly urge every Member to study this article with care as it is certainly a strong warning of the problems which every Member will face next year when these proposals are forwarded by the administration for action by Congress.

KENNEDY AND TARIFFS: HE WANTS BROAD POWER FOR CUTS TO BAR LOSS OF EUROPEAN MARKETS, HE'LL ASK LOANS, OTHER AID FOR FIRMS HIT BY IMPORTS; ATLANTIC COMMON MARKET? OPPOSITION SURE TO BE STIFF

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The United States as a member, or at least a limited partner, in Europe's Common Market?

Remote as that possibility may seem, it is currently is getting dead-serious consideration, largely as a matter of economic self-defense, by top trade stategists in the Kennedy administration. No sudden U.S. leap into the six-nation society is intended, to be sure, despite Britain's recent lead. But the prospect of ultimate, intimate U.S. participation in an expanded Atlantic Common Market is privately looked upon by key presidential counselors as no more than the logical, long-range consequence of drastic new free trade proposals now quietly being readied for delivery to Congress next year, when the administration's present tariff-cutting powers will expire.

Important details must still await the findings of a maze of committees, task forces and study groups. Protectionist pressures in Congress, already potent enough to assure a major battle next year over any effort to renew the 27-year-old Reciprocal Trade Act, may temper the current mood. But the sentiment among high officials in the State Department, the Treasury and the White House now leans heavily toward this approach:

A request to Congress for the most sweeping powers ever handed a U.S. President to slash tariffs, not by the complex, item-by-item trimming process now required, but in broader strokes by which import duties on whole groups of commodities would be lowered by a given percentage. Authority for this would not only be far wider than at present, but much longer lasting than the traditional temporary grants; the most recent extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act was for a 4-year period ending next June 30.

IMPACT ON EXPORTS

The immediate objective would be to haul the United States actively into Europe's fast-paced, trade-freeing drive. If this country lags behind, administration analysts increasingly believe, U.S. exports will suffer from growing discrimination in a thriving market now accounting for nearly one-third of American shipments abroad.

But there are also larger political aims: Transatlantic trade freedom, according to some top Kennedy advisers, would clear the way for far more intimate economic and political collaboration under an "Atlantic community" flag. Its absence, they warn, threatens to shift the West's economic and political center of gravity eastward from the United States to Europe.

"We simply can't afford to be left out of the Common Market movement," warns one high administration official. "If the United States wants to exert leadership over the free world, we must be in a position to work from within."

Such sentiments are certain to bump into stony resistance on Capitol Hill, where protectionist strength is growing and likely to grow further, especially if unemployment continues high in the face of economic recovery. So the administration strategy, as it now stands, will be to link its tariff-cutting proposals with sweeping plans for easing the impact of tariff cuts.

The key feature: A basic shift away from upward tariff rate adjustments or import quota controls as the major instruments for protecting domestic industries threatened by imports. They would be replaced by a "distressed area" approach. Tariff or quota pro-

tection would remain for exceptional cases, such as industries vital to national security. But the accent would be on increased Government aid to rehabilitate firms, industries, or communities suffering from the impact of competitive imports; the Government would provide loans or other aid to help divert factories to new products, to train idled workers in new skills, or to relocate them in new areas.

CURB ON TARIFF COMMISSION?

One practical effect of all this would be to put a big crimp in the powers of the Tariff Commission, the watchdog agency established by Congress to keep an eye on import trade that threatens injury to domestic firms. Much admired by many lawmakers and businessmen and strongly backed by foreign trade men in the Commerce Department, the Commission is also roundly denounced by free trade advocates as the major obstacle to the negotiation of reciprocal tariff concessions with foreign lands. Under escape clause provisions of the trade law, the Commission can recommend tariff boosts to protect firms losing business to imported wares; under peril point provisions, it can recommend to tariff negotiators the level below which the duty on any particular item ought not to be cut.

The Commission's findings, though not binding, greatly sharpen the political pressure on the President to go along.

How deeply, or quickly, the administration would cut into existing U.S. tariff barriers is not yet clear. But the objective is ambitious: To equip this country with sufficient leeway to participate freely in the sort of wholesale knocking-down of tariff walls now speeding ahead in Europe, where two separate trade blocs seem headed toward amalgamation into one.

The key unit is the 4-year-old Common Market, so far embracing six continental nations: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and little Luxembourg. It aims not only at progressive elimination of all tariff barriers within its confines, but at gradual construction of a uniform set of tariff walls against the outside world, and adoption of common economic policies in such matters as farm price supports, foreign exchange controls, antitrust measures, jobless benefits, old-age pensions, and other social security charges on employers.

Much less ambitious is the rival European Free Trade Association, a largely British brainchild set up 2 years ago. It was designed chiefly as a bargaining counter for its "Outer Seven" members (Britain, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Portugal) in dealings with the "Inner Six." The EFTA offers none of the key economic integration features of the Common Market; it promises progressive internal trade liberalization while leaving members free to fix whatever rates they like with respect to the outside world. With Denmark as well as Britain applying for Common Market membership and other EFTA countries likely to follow suit, this grouping is destined to dissolve, U.S. analysts believe, leaving one big European trading bloc.

AN EXTRA COST

Amalgamation or not, one impact on U.S. exporters of Europe's tariff-cutting spree remains the same: Because the member nations of both blocs, or of a combined one, are freeing their own goods from tariffs while maintaining duties on most goods purchased from the rest of the world, most imports from the United States and other nonmember nations will necessarily arrive in Europe's markets burdened by an extra cost, compared with those locally produced.

A study by the Chase Manhattan Bank, for example, figures U.S. machine tools will compete with German machine tools in the French market at a 5-percent to 15-percent import duty disadvantage by 1966, when Common Market tariff adjustments are complete. The impact on U.S. exports to the "Six" will vary, however, this survey says. Items likely to be partly displaced by European products would include: Machinery, electrical equipment, finished chemicals, wheat, and fats and oils. The same applies to a lesser extent, the bank reports, for motor vehicles, iron and steel, corn and other feed grains, tobacco, petroleum and coal. But U.S. exports to the Common Market of aircraft, scrap metals, metal ores, basic chemicals, cotton and soybeans, it's forecast, would feel little impact.

Summing up, Chase's analysts conclude that "many American producers will find European competition increasing difficult to meet, and some products successfull exported to Europe may cease to move there."

The Common Market's plan for uniform external tariff barriers adds an additional problem for outside wares; because the process entails gradually averaging out duties of such low-tariff lands as West Germany and the Netherlands with those of high-tariff Italy and France. U.S. shippers will encounter higher tariffs on a host of items they now sell heavily in, for example, West Germany, without any assurance of comparable gain, at least immediately, from the trimming of external tariffs of France or Italy.

SHIPMENTS OF LEATHER

Examples: U.S. manufacturers have been shipping a high volume of sheep and lamb leather to West Germany and the Benelux trio at tariff rates running from 6 percent to 8 percent of the products' value. They've established no real market, however, in France and Italy, where duties range from 13 percent to 23 percent. But the new common external tariff will be about 10 percent when it goes into effect, meaning a boost in West German and Benelux rates for U.S. shippers of these items; with no market established in France and Italy, prospects would hardly be bright for a compensating gain from lowering of tariffs there.

Perhaps as important a problem for the U.S. exporters, many administration trade strategists will tell you, is a less tangible one: The new dynamism, as one official puts it, that the Common Market is bringing to Europe. The hot breath of stiffer competition, as internal tariffs drop, is causing many a marginal concern on the continent to wither away or merge with stronger rivals. The tariff-free market that will be opened up—the Common Market now almost matches the United States in population—puts new premiums on adoption of cost-cutting mass production methods and will require greater attention by Europe's manufacturers to consumer whims. The upshot, analysts believe, will be sturdier competition from Common Market firms for Yankee businessmen in Europe, in the United States, and elsewhere.

Many U.S. manufacturers have met this threat to their exports by setting up or expanding production facilities within the Common Market. This is a major reason why U.S. corporations this year are expected to spend $4.5 million on new plant and equipment abroad, up 20 percent from 1960.

So far, U.S. officials concede, there's no clear statistical evidence of injury to U.S. exporters from the Common Market, even though the group's internal tariff rates have already been cut by 30 percent. In fact, the figures suggest the reverse: Last year, U.S. exports to Europe climbed to $6.2 billion from $4.3 billion in each of the 2 previous years; shipments to the Common Market rose from $2.4 billion in both 1958 and 1959 to $3.4 billion last year.

SPARKED BY PROSPERITY

But the analysts note that the upward surge of U.S. exports to Europe has been sparked by that continent's economic prosperity. Moreover, the first 10-percent round of internal tariff cutting by the Six was automatically extended, without reciprocity, to other nations of the Western world. There's this added worry: While the booming Common Market now shows every sign of seeking to ease the impact of its preferential trade policies on outsiders, an economic slump could quickly alter this mood. And the machinery now working toward trade liberalism can as easily be used for protectionism if the Common Market management desires.

Thus, U.S. policymakers see some urgency in the need for this country to move dramatically toward free trade. If the postwar trend in that direction should falter now, they argue, the result might not just be a freezing of the world tariff structure but retreat toward protectionism. "We must use our influence now to make sure the Common Market makes its external tariff walls as low as possible," says one U.S. trade authority.

Lately, developments at a little-noticed trade conference in Geneva have sharpened the administration's sense of urgency. Under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a pact providing for reciprocal trade concessions among most of the free world's trading partners, the United States is struggling to work out concessions with the Common Market to ease the external effect of the group's internal tariff cutting. The Six have offered to extend to outsiders the remaining 20 percentage points of the 30-percent tariff cuts made so far between market members—provided adequate reciprocity is forthcoming. Privately, the Six have indicated willingness to interpret the word "adequate" in extremely liberal terms.

But U.S. officials, though armed with a theoretical 20-percent tariff-cutting authority under present law, insist they are so restricted by "peril point" provisos and other restraints that their offerings would average out to less than 2 percent. Not surprisingly, the negotiations, by reliable report, are not going well. "We can't even offer the appearance of reciprocity," complains one trade official involved.

The administration's critics are sure to argue that the Common Market should lower its external tariff walls without requiring reciprocal U.S. concessions. Failure to do so, it will be contended, amounts to trade favoritism; it will also be argued that Europe's capacity to take such a big fling at free trade stems in great part from the postwar industrial rebuilding job done largely with lavish U.S. aid.

Budget economizers will also attack the cost of any program of Government help in bailing out industries suffering from competition from abroad; others will argue against such schemes on philosophical grounds.

As for the notion that the United States might actually join the Common Market, even its advocates agree it would be wisest, as one puts it, "not even to think of the trade issue next year in that specific context. At this point, as long as we do the tariff cutting, we don't have to decide about institutionalizing relations with the Six." At the most, this Nation could be expected to participate only on some sort of associate basis which would not involve the supranational aspects that full membership in the Common Market would entail.

Crooked River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Bend (Oreg.)

Bulletin of August 2 points up some of the many benefits in addition to irrigation which stem from a reclamation project such as the Crooked River project in Crook County. I think it will be of interest to those who may forget that the reclamation program also represents a multiple-use approach to resource development:

CROOK COUNTY RESIDENTS PLEASED WITH NEW PRINEVILLE RESERVOIR

PRINEVILLE.—Completion of the Prineville Dam across the Crooked River early this year brought a score of undisguised blessings to Crook County with the beginning of summer, and incidentally changed the face of the county more than any event since the volcanic age.

That was the gist of countless street corner discussions and official meetings held as the completed dam began to form the extensive lake, estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be some 10 miles in length.

Major benefit from the reservoir, when water is released in 1962 into all the canals and laterals still under construction through the farming area around Prineville, will be the addition of some 7,500 acres of dry land to the Ochoco Irrigation district.

Water from the Ochoco Reservoir, a smaller unit near Prineville, has maintained irrigation on 8,500 acres, according to LaSelle Coles, Ochoco Irrigation District manager and a leading national authority on the subject.

FIGURE GIVEN

The new reservoir will bring that total to approximately 16,000 acres of farm and ranch land.

Another benefit, just beginning to be realized in the first summer of the lake's existence, is the recreational addition to the county. Construction of a State park, with boat ramp, docks, picnic grounds and camping grounds has been underway this summer, and plans are being made to add a county park next year through the cooperation of local organizations, according to County Judge Ervin Grimes.

The impact of the lake as a tourist attraction is expected to be felt more keenly in 1962 as knowledge of the lake spreads to other areas. Payrolls of construction crews building the dam were a major benefit to the Prineville area last year.

PLANTED IN LAKE

For fishermen, thousands of fish were planted in the lake early this year by the State, and even in the early season, fishing began to be reasonably satisfactory. Of keen interest were the thousands of young trout planted in the Crooked River's new reservoir, where no trout have been. By next year, it is said by sportsmen, the lake will be a top fishing spot in the State.

The new Juniper Canyon road built in the spring as an access to the State park and the midregion of the lake, will also be an aid to hunters during the bird and game seasons, sportsmen state. Although an old road formerly existed into that part of the county, the road was dubious in bad weather, and there were no camping facilities such as will be offered at the State park.

According to Bureau of Reclamation statistics, the Prineville Dam has a maximum height of 245 feet and carries Highway 27 across its 800-foot width at the top. Behind the dam, the reservoir has a maximum storage capacity of 155,000 acre-feet. The lake filled in its first spring to within a dozen feet of highwater line, and complete filling is expected in normal years by the Bureau, even if all water is sold for public use and the lake is drained to dead storage level.

ADDED INTEREST

Engineer's figures set the area of the reservoir at 3,100 acres impounded in a shoreline that ranges from sheer cliffs to sloping shores. Several deep inlets and coves mark the shoreline, and for added interest the lake contains a major island rising steeply from the water.

The dam is 21 miles south of Prineville. A diversion canal has been built beginning 8 miles south of Prineville on the Crooked River and leading to the edge of Prineville. From there a distribution canal leads north, circling around Prineville for a length of 16 miles. Two large pumping stations lift the water in the distribution canal at key points, and 35 miles of laterals extend from this canal.

In early summer a bill was introduced in Congress, both in the House and Senate, for an extension of the irrigation project to carry water to 2,890 additional acres of dry land, at a proposed cost of $995,000. Authorization of the project will probably not be made until 1962, according to a time estimate by Coles, who stated that the new extension would, if approved and money appropriated, bring four new areas into the OID, for a grand total of 18,890 acres.

CONTROL FACTOR

A benefit not much discussed, possibly because not in evidence, is the flood control factor of the dam. Floods which were a recurring possibility in early spring and which have forced evacuation of homes on various occasions, will be effectively prevented by the stanch dam astride the sometimes rampant Crooked River.

The Prineville Dam was constructed under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation, with Keystone Construction Co., a Hudspeth enterprise, as the prime contractor. The Bureau owns a marginal strip around the entire circumference of the lake, protecting the natural and ruggedly scenic shoreline from private construction. Behind this strip, much of the land is owned by the Federal Government under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and some sections are privately owned ranchland.

Khrushchev's Idea of Coexistence Is Complete Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, any thought of successful coexistence with the Communists is sheer folly. The only terms upon which Khrushchev will negotiate is complete surrender to his impossible demands to accept the enslavement proposed by the Soviet Union. We cannot afford to yield one more inch of free territory, or bargain away the liberty of one additional single individual in the hope that we may buy freedom for ourselves. Unless we stop the Communists now in Berlin, in Cuba, and everywhere else by letting them know for certain that any further aggression means the complete destruction of their homeland, we may as well kiss freedom goodby, for any appeasement at this moment will certainly bring on world war III. In this connection I would like to call attention to the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune.

We must abandon our continuing policy, or lack of policy, which indicates clearly that we prefer to continue sidestepping the showdown with Russia. The firmer and tougher we are, the less likelihood of war by miscalculation, which would expand into nuclear all-out war. Russia respects strength—any bully does. There is far less likelihood of declared nuclear war than there is the limited or miscalculated war.

The article follows:

THE WAR OF NERVES

The world is obliged once more to attend Nikita Khrushchev's latest polemic on Berlin and to attempt to wring refinements of meaning out of the standard mixture of threats and invitations to the West to see things as "reasonably" as he professes to do.

Thus the speech fortified, on the one hand, those who prefer to think that a "deal" can be arranged, while, on the other, it confirmed the contrary belief that no business can be done with Khrushchev except by capitulating to his terms.

Here are examples of the threatening Khrushchev:

"We must not permit West Berlin to become a kind of Sarajevo, the Serbian town where rang out the shots announcing the outbreak of the First World War.

"The Western powers are now pushing the world to a dangerous brink, and the threat of military attack by the imperialists on the Socialist states is not ruled out.

"When a situation like this arises, it would be impermissible for us to sit with folded hands. History teaches us that when an aggressor sees that he is not rebuffed, he becomes brazen, and when, on the contrary, he is rebuffed, he cools down.

"If the imperialists do unleash war, the Soviet Union, without any rise in its military budget or calling up reservists, has the necessary means of combat to strike a crushing blow not only at the territory of the United States, but also to render harmless the allies of the aggressors."

Then comes the switch to the reasonable Khrushchev:

"Let us sit down honestly at a round conference table. Let us not fan up war psychosis. Let us clear the atmosphere. Let us rely on reason and not on the force of thermonuclear weapons."

"We do not intend to infringe upon any lawful interests of the western powers. Any barring of access to West Berlin, any blockade of West Berlin, is out of the question."

"We are doing and will do our best to solve the disputed international problems by peaceful means and in a quiet atmosphere. The Soviet Union does not want to fight anybody. We do not want anybody else's territory."

"If the Western Powers reconsider their position, hearken to the voice of reason, and express readiness to conclude a German peace treaty together with us, we shall be only too glad."

It is, as you see, a nice blend. The man is a sane lunatic. In one voice he preaches reasonable accommodation together with the annihilation of civilization—the destruction of the homes, cities, and cultural monuments of the western world, with the people who go with them.

But inasmuch as Khrushchev cannot be unmindful that the gamble is no sure thing—that the same fate could just as readily be visited upon the Communist world—it would seem apparent that he recognizes that this is a contest of wills, and he is betting that the will of the west will not be equal to the test.

So he plays on the frayed ends of nerves, with all of the confidence that the terrorist always enjoys against decent people. Any victory through coercion would find him taking credit for a contribution to "peace." Any resistance by the west to surrender he would equate with "aggression." This is all part of the Marxian jargon of "objective law," which can be simply translated in terms of the old formula, "Heads I win, tails you lose."

Khrushchev says that western obduracy leaves him no line of retreat. To put off the crisis would mean that communism was conniving with the forces of western intransigeance, to "retreat under their pressure."

He has said all this countless times, and we had better start getting ready to believe him and to defend ourselves. For the ugly realities aren't simply going to go away, nor is there any hope that the warders will cart Khrushchev off to the nuthouse.

Mutual Security Act of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes it in order to consider H.R. 8400, the Mutual Security Act of 1961. It provides 8 hours of general debate and waives all points of order. It has been already well said that this is a strange way of bringing this rule out, namely, the waiving of points of order. Many of us have been disturbed about this very thing. We are especially disturbed by the fact that when the witnesses were asked about these points of order they said merely that they thought there were a good many of them, and one witness stated that he thought there were 19.

It seems to me that it has always been poor policy to vote down a rule but, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time when there would be some justification to vote down a rule it is in this particular instance. I have no doubt, however, that the rule will pass and that the bill will be considered.

I am not opposed to foreign aid, which I think is a better title for the bill, or to mutual security, if that title is preferred. I have voted for this kind of legislation although, as the chairman of the committee has also well said, this is a totally different bill from any bill that has ever come before us heretofore. But I have voted for this kind of legislation for 15 years. I am not opposed to it per se, but I am opposed to this bill, and I am opposed to a great many things in the bill.

First of all, I am very much opposed to the argument which has prevailed on the floor of this House for many years, which is nothing new, and this is not special to this administration; and the argument runs something like this: Oh, if you do not vote this bill out, everything will collapse overnight, everything will end, nothing will go on, it will be a calamity, it will be a cataclysm.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be the case. At the present time the unexpended funds total $5,443,412,000. There is an increase in this fund over the 1960 unexpended balance of $729,747,000.

Now, it will be argued that these funds, though unexpended, are already authorized. Nevertheless I think anyone will agree that it will take at least 1 year, and that will be hard work—more normally 2 years—in order even to expend this money. Therefore, the program will go on exactly as it is for 2 years, whether you and I vote for this bill or not.

In the additional views in the report on page 105 the following figures are given, and I have no reason to question them. The foreign aid bill for the fiscal year 1962, as reported by the committee, specifically authorizes $4,355,500,000. The new sums will be made available despite an estimated unexpended balance as of June 30, 1961, of $5,443,412,000, of which approximately $145,500,000 remains unobligated.

It seems perfectly obvious from these figures that the programs will go on. It also seems to some of us that this will be an excellent time to pause, to look over these programs, to weigh the evidence, the evidence of waste, the evidence even of malfeasance, and see where these programs have to be changed and what has to be done about it.

We also have the sentimental appeal which invariably comes up also at this point in our deliberations, and that is, someone will say, "Will you let the starving starve and the little children die?" There is no reason for either of these things to happen. In this list of unexpended funds there are 20 different agencies listed, and I should just like to tell you what is still unexpended in the children's fund: $8,542,000. And in the U.N. Relief and Works Agencies, $9,274,000. So you see these programs also will be amply cared for.

Finally, because my time is very short, I should like to remind this House that not very long ago we were told on the highest authority that 17 million Americans went to bed every night hungry. If this is the case, and we have no reason to doubt it, I think, Mr. Speaker, it will be well perhaps to care for 17 million Americans with some of this new money and let these programs continue while we examine them carefully and while we put them in proper prospective.

In Praise of Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excellent editorial from the August 11, 1961, issue of the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus which points up the importance of training more of our young people for public service:

PUBLIC SERVICE SCHOOL

Princeton University received a $35 million bonanza from a small group of anonymous donors who specified the money is to be used for creation of a professional school to prepare individuals of outstanding talent for careers in the public service. Specifically, the donors have in mind the training of carefully selected postgraduate students for high level tasks in the Federal Government, especially for activity in the Foreign Service field.

It is apparent that possessed of this tremendous sum Princeton will be able to create a remarkably effective institution for training an elite group to cope with the difficult politico-scientific age in which the world lives today. An idea of the size of the gift may be gleaned from the knowledge that this endowment is larger than the basic trust funds of all but about 30 of our colleges and universities. A pity some of the money could not have been diverted to other institutions more greatly in need than opulent, powerful Princeton.

But what is most significant is that this great university will soon be training individuals for public service, an area of education in which this Nation is woefully weak despite efforts of the Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and Cornell's School of Business and Public Administration. When we compare training opportunities in public service with opportunities for medicine and the law, the facilities are meager and the output is small.

We have been prone in this Nation to ridicule and downgrade a public service career. We have used the word "politician" as a bad word, signifying something low and slightly disgusting. The I-didn't-raise-my-boy-to-be-in-government forces have been vocal and emphatic. But now that more than ever in history our national security, our very continued existence rest with these "politicians," we have gradually accepted a new face on the matter. That we must have a better grade of competence in government at highest levels now gains more acceptance among us. Gradually the notion that a public service career is a last resort or a minor disgrace is disappearing. And it is high time.

Perhaps the professional school which Princeton can now set up will be a mighty stimulus to public service careers. Perhaps it will help point up for many young men of ability and character the extensive range of usefulness found in these careers. And the recompense for jobs of this kind will be gradually bettered; that too is imperative.

As the age of science moves ahead in a rapidly shrinking world, mankind leans more heavily than ever on brains and training and character of human beings. The United States must recognize this before it is too late.

Finland's Trade Relations With the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune recently featured two articles on Finland's international position and her trade relations with the United States. These informative reports are a distinct service for all who are interested in the prospect of increased trade with this rapidly developing nation.

In the first article, entitled "Finland Strives for Economic Neutrality," the author, David Steinberg, presents a graphic historical account of Finland's search for independence on the international economic battlefield.

In the second piece, "Finland Easing Trade Barriers in Move To Lure U.S. Investors," he sets forth facts and figures about Finnish production, the total employment Finland enjoys and the current liberalization in its foreign investment legislation.

These articles, which stress the potentials of beneficial trade with this hardy Scandinavian country, are significant for American industry and investment capital. Finland has alined itself with the free world and merits our respect as a small nation that is progressive and whose private enterprise system is based solidly on principles of economic freedom.

Under unanimous consent, I include these short articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, July 9, 1961]

FINLAND STRIVES FOR ECONOMIC NEUTRALITY

(By David Steinberg)

HELSINKI.—For 800 miles along the Soviet Union's northwest frontier Finland is the thin buffer between East and West. In this fact are the compelling arguments for Finnish neutrality in a world where a growing economic hot war parallels the political cold war.

As the most industrialized nonsatellite abutting the Soviet Union, the squeeze on relatively isolated Finland is tight and the would-be consequences direct. Holding apart viselike international pressures preoccupies Finnish businessmen and officialdom. Their success or failure may serve as a guidepost for the political and economic realization of other noncommitted nations.

In politics, the legendary individualism of 4,500,000 Finns expresses itself in a multiple-party system and a fierce ballot-box independence. Though the last general election gave 25 percent of Parliament to the Communists, this sizable minority holds no government posts. Nor do the other 75 percent fear Red influence.

"We are Finns first and party members second," chorus all segments of the population.

Indeed, a Bolshevik takeover seems unlikely in a nation which has twice warred with the Communist colossus since proclaiming independence in 1917 after centuries of Swedish and czarist Russian domination.

Finland's true search for independence is on the international economic battlefield, where her businessmen present a united front of shrewd horse traders—seeking neutrality through the principles of free trade.

Following the 1944 winter war with the U.S.S.R., Finland was presented with a reparations bill by the Soviets (greater than that levied on Japan by the Allies after World War II). One positive feature of reparations was the Russian demand that payment be in new machine lines, which Finland promptly established in new plants with the latest tooling. Until 1952, when the bill was paid in full, Finland's economy was anchored in Soviet soil.

Once relieved of the costly drain, Finnish businessmen went first to their most accessible market, the Soviet Union, and asked payment in the future for goods previously supplied without charge. Next, they turned westward in the hope of building a firm base of East-West trade with emphasis on traditional pulp, paper, papermaking equipment, icebreakers and new machine lines.

From the immediate postwar years, when almost all exports went east, Finland successfully has reversed the trend. Last year only 20 percent of her exports moved behind the Iron Curtain, with 14.2 percent to, and 14.7 percent from the U.S.S.R. In the fast-growing precision engineering and machine industry, however, 65 percent of this basic equipment still feeds Russian production.

ON BARTER BASIS

Under the restrictive bilateral agreements through which the Soviet Union prefers to trade, Finnish exports are paid for on a barter basis. The Finns view the Russians as reliable business partners but not particular friends. However, for a small country like Finland there is a low saturation point for the consumption of Russian oil, chemicals, wheat and raw materials—and Russia refuses to pay for Finnish imports above the bilateral quotas with convertible currencies.

It is unnatural to expect Finland to be immune to Soviet pressure. On the other hand, the Finns are adamant in their demand for international trade that will best suit their domestic economy. As a result, they hold their commerce with the Russians to the level set by the amount of Soviet imports they can absorb.

To mollify the Soviets, Finland attempts to raise Iron Curtain dollar volume each year while holding down the percentage of total trade. This means sending most of Finland's new output to the West.

The goal most private businessmen, government enterprises and industrial cooperatives strive toward is an East-West balance that will assure Finland of markets and supplies from all nations. To this end Finland, after ironing out the implications of her bilateral Soviet pacts, this month gained associate membership in the European Free Trade Association.

For Finland, EFTA membership will safeguard her British trade relations and protect her competitive position in third markets, but may be damaging to her domestic textile industry, subsidized agricultural sector, heavy tractor output and certain other smaller consumed goods industries. The move is typical of Finland's fearless calculated risk business planning.

As a union of EFTA with the common market grows imminent, Finland eagerly anticipates economic integration with all the free world nations of Europe, while retaining vital trade links with the Soviet bloc. Once achieved, she should be well on her way toward guaranteeing political independence through economic strategy.

FINLAND EASING TRADE BARRIERS IN MOVE TO LURE U.S. INVESTORS

(By David Steinberg)

HELSINKI, July 9.—At Chicago's International Trade Fair later this month, Finland will display her products and industrial development in a bid to step up two-way trade with the United States as part of the hardy Scandinavian nation's drive for prosperity through trade.

Except for a handful of America's most progressive internationally minded corporations (and not by accident among our most successful), Finland too often is a zero in foreign trade calculations of American business and investors—deleted from consideration because commerce with Russia ignorantly is interpreted as signifying existence of another Red satellite.

June 11 marked the final day of one of the U.S. Department of Commerce's most successful oversea trade fairs and missions—held in Finland. The revitalized Commerce Department has, since last year, been blazing new foreign trade trails for American business. In announcing the Helsinki fair and trade mission, Grant O. Olsen, Chief of the Nordic Section, explained the choice of site:

CHALLENGING OPPORTUNITY

"Finland is one of our traditional markets (as a source of pulp, paper, and papermaking machinery) that offers a challenging opportunity to American traders. It is enjoying presently a high level of economic activity. Gross national product was 8 percent greater in 1960 than in 1959 and 90 percent greater than in 1938. It has eliminated a high percentage of restrictions affecting American goods, its financial controls on current transactions have been relaxed and it participates in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the European Free Trade Association."

It may be added that Finland also enjoys total employment, with 105,000 persons (about one-third of the labor pool) in industry, and expects a 400,000-man increase in the labor force over the next 10 years. Full employment means heavy purchasing power and the Finnish standard of living reflects it. Industrial and residential building is at a high level and retail sales are climbing.

The Commerce Department recognized Finnish economic achievements when it themed the Helsinki Fair to consumer goods. Underestimating Finland as a market, investment site and as a source for custom-made specialized machinery and distinctive imports of high-design consumer products seems to be the province of American business.

PLUS AREA FOR SOME

For some companies, including Ford, GM, Gulf Oil, IBM, ITT, Jersey Standard, P. Lorillard, National Cash Register, Singer Sewing Machine, United Shoe and a few others, Finland is an important plus in oversea operations. Hercules Powder recently stepped in with a chemical plant to supply the booming woodworking industry. And there are in force a number of U.S. licensing agreements.

Anticipating awakened interest in Finland as a trading partner and undeveloped tourist area (also as a gateway to travel in the U.S.S.R.), Pan American World Airways last month inaugurated direct jet service from New York to Helsinki via Oslo and Stockholm with a spectacular northern route on which the sun peeks over the horizon precisely at midnight.

Finland's current efforts to liberalize "our outmoded" foreign investment legislation and further ease trade barriers should rouse interest, but for the moment the "Land of the Midnight Sun" remains profitlessly and senselessly remote in most American foreign business planning.

Finland is not a pot of gold for American business at the end of an Arctic rainbow, but within limits there appear fascinating possibilities.

A HEALTHY MARKET

To an American consumer goods manufacturer, with lines competitively priced against those of Germany, Britain, and other European producers, Finland can be a small but healthy market and a base for other Scandinavian sales. Unfortunately, geography works against Finland as a path for major operations in either European trading alliance.

For American producers of heavy equipment and machine tools, expanding Finnish industry and public works programs can be alluring prospects.

For American importers (beyond traditional pulp and paper). Finland's daring modern design of handicrafted glassware, pottery, jewelry, lighting fixtures and exclusive textiles, and sportswear often outclass similar products of neighboring Scandinavian countries now in vogue here.

Perhaps the most intriguing potentials in Finland, where a severe shortage of domestic capital hampers essential industrial expansion, exists for the American investor. While present Finnish law is not particularly conducive to foreign investment and many local business men admit to some fear of heavy American capital inflow ("We could be bought out overnight by a single large U.S. corporation"), the need is overcoming extreme conservatism in the money market and legislative revisions are in the wind.

Surprisingly, the first Americans to see the investment future in Finland have been our shady promoters, who were unable to convince hard-headed Finns that their intentions—or interest rates—were honorable.

Long before "rugged individualism" was coined in America, the Finns had a word for it, "sisu," which also may be translated freely as "guts."

In today's bitterly divided world, Finnish "sisu" is building an independent nation oriented in its philosophy of life to the West but in its will to live by the common sense principles of economic freedom.

As reports of new American business transactions concluded behind the Iron Curtain increase, it seems foolhardy to overlook the trading possibilities with a rapidly-developing nation that has chosen to fight its unyielding geography and ally itself with the free world.

We Can and Should Have Both

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the growing community college movement of our Nation is well known and I have again introduced legislation in this Congress—H.R. 16—to provide Federal assistance to the States for expansion of these important institutions. In line with that interest, I am pleased to comment to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the East Oregonian of Pendleton, Oreg., which discusses one of the basic aspects of the community college approach to post-secondary education. It should be pointed out that Mr. J. W. Forrester, Jr., the editor of the East Oregonian, is a member of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

WE CAN AND SHOULD HAVE BOTH

The Oregon Legislature this year made it easier for communities to have community colleges. Substantial State financial assistance will be provided them and they can use legislation which provides that a large number of school districts can be joined to provide the tax base for a community college.

Until recently the only community college in Oregon was at Bend. It has suffered financial problems since its beginning because only the Bend School District was supporting it. It had some State and Federal financial aid, but it was small.

With the assistance provided by the 1961 legislature we may expect to see the creation of many community colleges. School districts ranging from Port Orford to Florence this month approved a community college to serve their area. One is on the way up the coast in the Astoria area. There will be others.

The community colleges program will be administered by the State board of education which also is responsible for the State's elementary and secondary schools.

It is the view of most persons who have studied closely the community college program in other States that Oregon's program can go in either of two directions. It can be a 2-year terminal program that concentrates on vocational courses. Or it can be a combination of that program and a second program which offers formal education courses which will permit those students after 2 years who wish to go on to 4-year institutions and graduation with BA or BS degrees.

The granddaddy of the community college program is the State of California. It has some 70 community colleges. All have the two-headed programs—terminal that includes vocational courses and formal which permits transfer to a 4-year institution with full junior-year status. Most States have copied the California formula.

While the State Board of Education will administer the community college program in Oregon the State Board of Higher Education has much more than a passing interest in the program. This is so for several reasons. In the first place, the board of higher education wants to be sure that those students who want to go on from community colleges to 4-year institutions have course credits that will be acceptable at a 4-year institution if courses for that purpose are given them. Secondly, as the numbers of students who want education beyond the high school skyrockets in the decade ahead the board of higher education must be responsible for taking care of the bulk of them.

It has seemed to several members of the board of higher education that as its task of taking care of all who want education beyond the high school grows, a community college program must be part of the package. Because of this members of the board have been studying the community college program in depth.

In recent months they have been interviewing candidates for the presidencies of University of Oregon and Oregon State University and more recently for the position of chancellor of the State system of higher education. Those educators have provided the board with much valuable information on the education-beyond-the-high-school problem. Most of them have testified that their community college programs are so designed that a student can either take a terminal (2-year) program that is in most part vocational or a program that will lead to matriculation at a 4-year institution.

And they have told the board that those who take the latter program have been coming into their 4-year institutions fully capable of doing junior year work. Furthermore, they have said that most of these transfers from community colleges do fully as well in their junior and senior years as students who have had all their work in 4-year colleges.

Now, to the other side of this—the side of those who think the community college program should be terminal. The editor of the Oregon Statesman, Charles A. Sprague, is on that side and last week he discussed at length his opinion. We quote some excerpts from Mr. Sprague's opinion:

"I don't want to see these community colleges mere appendages of the institutions of higher learning. Their emphasis should be definitely vocational and terminal, and not just a convenient and economical educational interval between high school and university. This would not foreclose students in junior colleges from altering their direction and going on to universities—if their interest is roused and their capacity evident. Some will do just that. It may take them a little longer to get their bachelor degrees bu the extra time will not hurt.

"The danger is that the educationists will load the community colleges with lower division work, aping the 4-year institutions. That would be a mistake, for in such an atmosphere the student wanting practical courses in business, trade, or technical subjects would probably suffer. With six institutions scattered over the State offering the usual college academic courses, it is easy enough for students to get to one—and be where they belong if they are going in for study of arts and sciences.

"In my opinion the community college should offer:

"1. General courses, picking up deficiencies in high school work, and offering advanced general education.

"2. Vocational training in business courses and in some trades and technical studies. The new age calls for workers with intelligence as well as skills, those who can service and run the instruments of this age, who can become leadermen and foremen and plant executives—and go just as high as their capabilities will permit. Community colleges can be their training ground."

There is much to be said for Mr. Sprague's viewpoint. Certainly, we would not want a community college program that did not have a strong terminal (2-year) educational program. But we think it is possible, and preferable, to have with that terminal program a program that will permit those who want to get college degrees to transfer to 4-year institutions with full junior class standing.

If all who will want to go to community colleges in Oregon would be satisfied with no more than 2 years of education beyond the high school we would settle for Mr. Sprague's program. But the experience in other States is that many students who do not know either whether they can do 4-year college work or whether they want to do it when they enter community colleges find that after 2 years that they want to go on and get degrees at 4-year institutions. We would like to see Oregon accommodate them and we think it can.

American Foreign Policy Must Not Build Up and Strengthen Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am utterly amazed at the suggestions in this article from the New York Times written by Tad Szulc:

LATINS PRESS U.S. FOR CUBA ACCORD—HAVANA AND MOSCOW ALSO SEEK TRADE RESUMPTION

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, August 14.—The United States has begun to feel strong pressure for friendly coexistence with Cuba from a number of Latin-American republics.

There also are strong indications, according to diplomatic sources here, that Cuba and the Soviet Union are most interested in an accommodation between Washington and Havana.

According to diplomatic analysis here, this effort from Cuba and the Soviet Union aims at reopening trade between the United States and Cuba to relieve the worsening food shortages and deteriorating economic situation plaguing the Havana regime.

A second objective is believed to be the winning of Washington's tacit acceptance of the existence of a Communist state in

Cuba to increase the respectability of the Government of Premier Fidel Castro in Latin America.

An inclination is said to be developing in the Western Hemisphere to accept the Castro regime as a member of the Inter-American community in relatively good standing. Curiously, the economic conference in progress in Punta del Este, Uruguay, is reported to have strengthened this trend, partly through the efforts there of Maj. Ernesto Guevera, Cuban Minister of Industry.

It remains the United States position that normal relations with Cuba are out of the question as long as a Communist regime apparently dedicated to spreading its influence across Latin America and to the eradication of democratic institutions, remains in power in Havana.

But the new pressures in favor of an accommodation are creating a political problem for Washington at a time when the policy here is to concentrate on the economic and social development of Latin America through President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program and, in effect, to isolate Cuba.

HOPES FADE FOR WIDE TALKS

Conversely, the sentiment that the Cuban issue is a bilateral dispute between Havana and Washington is quietly killing the hopes held here earlier this year that the Punta Del Este economic parley might be followed by a political Inter-American conference on the Castro regime.

Continuing opposition from some of the key Latin American Governments, like Brazil, Mexico and Chile, makes it unlikely that such a conference can be called in the foreseeable future, diplomats here believe.

The Cuban interests in improving relations with the United States have been partly manifested through hints dropped by Cuban officials and by Soviet diplomats in private conversations.

At least, observers here said, Havana wishes to avoid Washington's invoking of the Trading with the Enemy Act, which would cut off what remains of trade between the two countries.

AIRLINER TO BE RETURNED

After having held a hijacked Eastern Air Lines Electra in Havana since July 24, Premier Castro offered late last week to exchange the airliner for the return of a patrol boat brought to Key West, Fla., by escaping Cubans. The exchange is to take place tomorrow.

In a change of attitude, an official radio commentator in Havana had some kind words for President Kennedy for the first time in many months as he discussed last Thursday's Presidential news conference.

And observers here would not be surprised if the next step in Cuba's current shift of policy were an application for membership in the Intra-American Development Bank, through which much of the alliance-for-progress aid is to be dispensed to Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know this writer, nor do I know from what sources he obtained the material upon which to base his assumptions, but I am concerned with the kind of thinking that would make possible a change in our foreign policy in order to help build up Communist Cuba. There can be no reason sufficient for us to take such a disastrous step. No pressure, from any source, friend or foe, should be allowed to influence the United States of America to recognize and assist in establishing a successful Communist regime in Cuba. By what possible stretch of the imagination could such a policy be interpreted to be in the best interest of the United States?

What concerns me even more than the newspaper article is the fact that some important spokesmen within the administration have been hinting that such a policy may be in the making. Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Members of this body to take whatever steps necessary to prevent the administration from encouraging to even the slightest degree any thought that we can be pressured, bribed, or lured into making any such agreement with Cuba or any other country who chooses to become a satellite of the Soviet Union which is bent upon our destruction.

Once again, this article reminds us of another dangerous moral. The passage of time strengthens the Cuban Communists where police control, and terror and intimidation, and imprisonment have supplanted free speech and elections by popular consent.

As Castro and the Communists are condoned and not removed by the United States they are gradually accepted as a fact. Necessarily then freedom loses and communism gains—right at our doorstep. The hemisphere and the free world thus suffers a loss and opens the door for future Communist successes.

This hemisphere must be freed of communism. That is our job, the United States of America. We dare not dodge it. We must not postpone it. What now is U.S. policy?

Courage at El Paso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure that Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON spoke for all of us when he wrote to President Robert Six, of Continental Airlines, concerning the El Paso incident.

I ask unanimous consent that Vice President JOHNSON's letter be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, August 7, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT SIX,
President, Continental Airlines,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR BOB: Warmhearted praise is the very least that the country and the Government can have for the courage and the quick, correct and brave thinking that was displayed by you and your staff to nullify the attempted piracy of your jet flight on August 3.

A wrong decision could have meant injury and possible death to many persons but all of the decisions were right. The passengers, who always look to the crew for guidance, generally kept cool and collected, and on the ground, personnel acted swiftly to meet the crisis.

You got the word quickly, I understand, and promptly went to the scene to give your support and assistance to the personnel already acting to save the passengers and crew. I know that the frontline troops always are heartened by the sight of their commander and the knowledge that his leadership is immediately available to them. The conditions in El Paso paralleled such a grim battle situation.

I wish you would express for me to all of the personnel involved directly or indirectly my personal congratulations and that of all the people of your country.

Yours sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The Press Lives by Disclosures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD an article from Nieman Reports, July 1961, by Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I believe that the Members will find these remarks well worth reading. They pertain to a subject that all persons concerned about the future of representative government are finding of increasing importance and concern—reporting:

THE PRESS LIVES BY DISCLOSURES

(By Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.)

A century ago when an external threat to the survival of the Nation was undreamed of, Wilbur Fisk Storey, editor of the Chicago Times, declared: "It is a newspaper's duty to print the news and raise hell." This incisive judgement on one journalistic purpose was questioned recently by President Kennedy when he expounded before an audience of American publishers the problems of a free press in the cold war. Mr. Kennedy proposed a voluntary censorship of news on matters involving the national security. He called for more self-restraint or self-discipline in such matters by the press. At the same time the President recognized the responsibility of newspapers to inform the public, in his words, "to arouse, to reflect, to state our dangers and our opportunities, to indicate our crises and our choices, to lead, mold, educate, and sometimes even anger public opinion." The dilemma, as he defined it, concerns "a free and open society in a cold and secret war." Speaking of the monolithic and ruthless conspiracy which confronts the free world, Mr. Kennedy said:

"Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried, not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not lionized. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. It conducts the cold war, in short, with a wartime discipline no democracy would ever hope or wish to match. Nevertheless, every democracy recognizes the necessary restraints of national security—and the question remains whether those restraints need to be more strictly observed if we are to oppose this kind of attack as well as outright invasion."

The occasion for suggesting consideration of voluntary censorship was the ill-fated Cuban invasion, in which operation some newspapers, as you know, disclosed active participation by the Central Intelligence

Agency. While one may sympathize with the busy public servants who were harassed by newspaper reports of CIA activity, one must weight against such inconvenience or interference the traditional safeguard of press freedom, protected by the Constitution as a fundamental bulwark of our free society. One may respectfully assert that the editor in Chicago uttered a cogent and wise maximum when he declared that it is a newspaper's duty to print the news and raise hell.

Admitting the roughness of the language, this is not a frivolous conception of a newspaper's responsibility to the public it serves. On the contrary, the statement implies the essence of a free, inquiring, critical press. It recognizes, I suggest, a newspaper's obligation to print a full and accurate account of the news, to interpret its significance or meaning in the broader context of the issues of the day, and to comment on events with vigor, sound reasoning and moral purpose irrespective of the popularity of the views expressed or any denunciations that might thunder from high places of authority.

Before commenting on the conflict between censorship and this obligation of the press, let us recall several eloquent statements on the value of the press to a free society. Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

James Mill concluded:

"Without the knowledge of what is done by their representatives, in the use of the powers entrusted to them, the people cannot profit by the power of choosing them, and the advatages of good government are unattainable. It will not surely cost many words to satisfy all classes of readers that, without the free and unrestrained use of the press, the requisite knowledge cannot be obtained."

C. P. Scott, editor of the Manchester Guardian, stated:

"At the peril of its soul [the newspaper] must see that the supply [of news] is not tainted. Neither in what it gives, nor in what it does not give, nor in the mode of presentation, must the unclouded face of truth suffer wrong. Comment is free but facts are sacred."

James Bryce wrote:

"Democratic government rests upon and requires the exercise of a well-informed and sensible opinion by the great bulk of the citizens."

Justice William O. Douglas wrote:

"The command that 'Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press' has behind it a long history. It expresses the confidence that the safety of society depends on the tolerance of government for hostile as well as friendly criticism, that in a community where men's minds are free, there must be room for the unorthodox as well as the orthodox views."

"The press lives by disclosures," as the London Times observed in a wise assessment of the role of the press. More than a century ago, 1851, British officials were agitating for censorship after Lord Palmerston had been disclosed as backing a clandestine operation by Louis Napoleon to become Emperor of France. In reply, the Times disagreed that the purpose of a newspaper is "to share the labors of statesmanship, or that it is bound by the same duties, the same liabilities as Ministers of the Crown. The purposes and duties of the two powers are constantly separate, generally independent, sometimes diametrically opposite. The dignity and freedom of the press are trameled from the moment it accepts an ancillary position. The press can enter into no close or binding alliances with the statesmen of the day, nor can it surrender its permanent interests to the convenience of the ephemeral power of any government. The first duty of the press is to obtain the earliest and most correct intelligence of the events of the time, and instantly, by disclosing them, to make them the common property of the Nation. The press lives by disclosures.

If the foregoing consensus means that the press must serve no master but the public interest, and that the disclosure of the truth is indispensable to an informed public opinion on which rest sound public policies, it is my view that editors can best contribute to the public welfare by the exercise of each individual conscience in covering the news and commenting on it. If the editorial opinions of a newspaper are to be sound, meaningful, and influential, in shaping the great potentialities of American life in a free society, those declarations of opinion must rely on the most complete, unrestrained, accurate account of the consequential events of the day. Self-imposed censorship, voluntarily agreed to—conformity to a code of suppression designed to protect the general welfare—would warp the integrity of the news on which sound opinions rely.

Voluntary censorship has been accepted during periods of war as a temporary abridgment of a protected right in order to safeguard American lives engaged on the fighting fronts. But wars have involved a controlled press for only a limited duration. The competitive challenge of the Communist world, it is widely accepted, may threaten the Nation for decades. Not with open war but with covert means, our opponents may be expected to test the foundations of freedom.

An ever-widening circle of news suppression over an extended period would merit the people's loss of confidence in the press, deepening as the suppressions or distortions inevitably came to light. Could we accept the decline of an informed public opinion after editorial debate had become an empty ceremonial dependent on a pale replica of the facts? Voluntary censorship in the cold war under Government tutelage would, in time, I suggest, stifle the initiative, the curosity, the skepticism which goad responsible editors to ferret out the facts of important news situations. Valid interpretations and informed discussion of the issues would falter. Enlightened public opinion would languish in a twilight of half-truths. The "collision of adverse opinions," in John Stuart Mill's phrase, would no longer supply the remainder of the truth which men must share with their government to insure that sound decisions are taken and constructive policies are supported.

The press is a tribune to defend the undefended, a chronicle to record its times, an examiner of controversies; it monitors the economy and the social progress of its age, it is a journal of man's successes and failures, a fighter for progress and reform; it is a herald of events, an observer of the tides of change, a commentator on the great issues confronting the Nation, a reporter of happenings in public life, a review of the policies—good and bad—of its leaders; the newspaper is a challenge to the policymakers, a guardian of man's liberties; it is a mirror of man's aspirations; a sentinel to protect the public. If the press is all these things—if it offers enlightenment to guide a free society toward a more noble destiny—could it serve unimpaired for long under the restraints of even self-imposed censorship? Would not the honored institution become enfeebled and decline in its capacity to support the Nation's struggle against tyranny or, conversely, to challenge decisions which, in a climate of moderation, might be recognized as inimical to America's best interests? A free institution would slowly lose its character and abandon its tradition. If "the press lives by disclosures," a muted journalism would debase the truth and be undeserving of the trust imposed in it by the writers of the Constitution.

Surely nothing involving human judgment is absolute or perfect. Flaws of character, errors by prejudice, weakness, unconscious bias, any of these would prevent perfection in the exercise of sound news and editorial judgment in deciding what facts an editor who is also a patriotic citizen should suppress in the interest of military security. If we can agree that no responsible editor would deliberately injure the Nation's security, would it not be wise to accept the damage, caused by a mistaken judgment rather than acquiesce in a code of censorship administered by men of goodwill but no less fallible? Mr. Kennedy recognized the need for vitality in public discussion of national affairs when he told the publishers, "Without debate, without criticism, no administration can succeed—and no republic can survive, that is why our press was protected by the first amendment."

In May the President conferred with a group of newspaper executives at the White House. It was reported that the Government and the press will continue to study the objective of protecting security without censorship and will meet again in several months.

In conclusion may I quote from an editorial carried in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which summarizes the problem we have been examining:

"In the case of the Cuban affair, many newspapers of Florida agreed among themselves to say nothing about the training of refugees for the invasion. The New York Times, on the other hand, sent Latin American experts to Miami to obtain and publish as much information as they could obtain from refugee leaders.

"Obviously, the editors of the New York and Florida papers differed in their judgment, as was their right. But it seems also obvious that if all of the newspapers had agreed to conform to a code, in cooperation with a Government agency, the American people would be less able to evaluate the Cuban adventure and use its lessons to decide their future course. They might never have learned of the failure; they might not be in a position to demand an accounting."

There is no doubt that the existence of an aggressive and inquiring press is and will be an inhibiting factor in the sort of operation the CIA attempted in Cuba. But it would be better to conclude that maneuvers of this sort should not be undertaken by an open society than that our society should become less open. Perhaps a choice need not be made. This much, however, is quite clear: a free, aggressive, inquiring and above all pluralistic press is indispensable to a free society. In full knowledge that some newspapers may abuse their trust, the free society must rely upon the discretion and sense of responsibility of individual editors and publishers instead of trying to impose upon them all a monolithic uniformity like that of the totalitarian press.

Mr. Kennedy himself gave a partial answer to his own argument for considering press restraints. He said: "Even today, there is little value in opposing the threat of a closed society by imitating its arbitrary restrictions. Even today, there is little value in insuring the survival of our Nation if our traditions do not survive with it."

With that we fully agree.

Hijacking of Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues

the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 11, 1961.

The Times has taken a less excitable view of the recent hijackings that have plagued our airways than some. The counsel of moderation in our approach to a solution is well founded. Apparently none of the hijackers has yet been shown to have been doing the work of Dr. Castro.

The bill passed by the Senate the other day is the first legislative attempt at a solution. Unfortunately it provides the death penalty for hijackers, which is going too far. It is distressing that some of our colleagues in the Senate have seen fit to put the value of the hijacked property above that of the hijacker's life.

The editorial follows:

HIJACKING OF AIRPLANES

Congress is naturally alarmed and indignant over the rash of airplane hijacking, but the answers are not to be found in extreme reactions against Cuba, as some Senators demand. As President Kennedy said yesterday, "We should not get overexcited about matters when our information is so faulty—so incomplete."

In the last two highjackings, as Mr. Kennedy pointed out, the men involved were psychopaths. As it turned out, neither had anything to do with Cuba. The Eastern Airlines Electra now being held in Havana was hijacked by an American citizen of Cuban descent, but there is no reason to doubt he acted entirely on his own.

The United States has reasons that the Kennedy administration, as well as Congress, considers valid to oppose the Castro regime and to work for its overthrow. However, U.S. policies have to be based on legitimate provocations. It would have been disastrous if the State Department and White House had acted without ascertaining the facts in the hijacking cases. The United States gains, not loses, by acting, as Mr. Kennedy said yesterday, with the prudence worthy of its world responsibilities.

The menace of hijacking should be treated as something apart from Cuba. This the Senate did yesterday in passing a bill aimed at imposing the death penalty on hijackers. As the debates indicated, there is some doubt whether this is a solution. The type of person who performs such deeds is not likely to respond to the fear of extreme punishment. This crime is a contagion of madness that requires a number of remedies and time to work itself out.

Lincoln, Nebr.: The Lilac City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each of the Members of the Senate has his special liking and admiration for the capital city of his State.

It would not make news for any of us to extol the virtues and happy circumstances which inhere in our own State's capital.

However, when there is a well-written article about that city from one who comes from afar, then we tend to become very proud of the favorable impression created and passed on.

In the September issue of the Senior Citizen, just off the press, an article entitled "Lincoln, Nebr.: The Lilac City," appears under the byline of Lora Kelly, of East Liverpool, Ohio.

It is packed full of interesting observations and many items of information about Lincoln, Nebr. In order that my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may share in this appraisal of the State capital named after our Civil War President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR.: THE LILAC CITY

(By Lora Kelly)

When you write to your rich Aunt Minnie who lives in a place called Lincoln be sure to specify the State on the envelope. If you forget the proper address your bright ideas may wind up in Uncle Sam's dead-letter bin for there are 42 postoffices bearing that name in these United States.

But if she lives in Lincoln, Nebraska's capital city, perhaps you can make up for your seeming neglect by dropping in for a visit, a personal contact far more rewarding (perhaps in her will) than a mere greeting card.

Although the largest and most important of the numerous Lincolns doesn't claim to be a resort city you will find plenty of things to do or see, even if you haven't any well-heeled relatives to show you around. First, you will note that here is a cosmopolitan city which around a hundred years ago was only a cluster of frame shacks and log cabins on a lone prairie. You will be impressed by its abundance of trees and shrubbery, particularly if you go in springtime. The fine residential sections, the orderliness of the downtown district, and a refreshing air of cleanliness over all justify its popular nickname, the Lilac City.

The most unusual feature of the landscape is the capitol building which dominates the skyline for miles. Architecturally it is a radical departure from most of the Greek temples and rococo palaces of most statehouses. Rising sharply 400 feet in the air is a central tower surmounted by a gold-glazed dome topped by a 27-foot, 8½-ton bronze figure of the Sower, symbolizing agriculture. The white stone shaft rises from a two-story building in the form of a cross within a square, the sides of the square being 437 feet, and thus it forms four inner courts and adds to its utility by giving to each room or office an outside exposure.

Aside from its design the structure is unique in other ways. When it became apparent in 1919 that the old capitol was no longer adequate, the legislature voted approval for the construction of a new one. Even its method of construction differed from the conventional in that it encased the old one whose segments were removed piecemeal through new doors as the work proceeded. It took 10 years to build but when it was dedicated in 1932, it had been fully paid for by annual tax levies of 22 mills, and the State incurred no indebtedness. A signal honor was accorded it by 500 outstanding members of the American Institute of Architects who ranked it fourth in a list of 25 best buildings in the world, surpassing even such masterpieces as the Parthenon in Greece and the Chartres Cathedral in France. The genius of the drawing board, Bertram Goodhue who designed this rare combination of dignity, utility and charm died 6 years before his dream became a reality, but he left an enduring legacy of which all Nebraskans are rightfully proud.

But regardless of its outer aspects this capitol has another distinction which sets it apart from sister States. It houses the only unicameral legislature in the Union, the traditional bodies, house and senate, having been unified in 1937 and the number of lawmakers—known as senators—reduced to 43.

Since this is Lincoln's chief landmark you may spend some profitable hours exploring its interior and adjacent State buildings. The State historical society's vignettes of pioneer life recall Nebraska's part in the winning of the West. This State museum also displays relics of Indians who once abounded in the region. A large collection of paintings in the Sheldon Art Gallery which has an eye-catching facade attests to Lincoln's prestige as a cultural center.

If you happen to be curious about what was going on hereabouts 8 million years ago, just step into Morrill Hall's storehouse of life at the University of Nebraska. Among its exhibits is a restoration of a mighty elephant, the largest prehistoric animal ever found on this continent.

Eons ago he was a Grand Old Party who paddled around the marshes long before there were archeologists or even politicians to give him or his fellow fossils lasting fame.

The university itself brought the torch of learning to the sparsely settled State as early as 1869. Chartered in 1871 it now ranks in size among the top 25 universities throughout the country. More than 40 buildings occupy the main campus, a nostalgic spot to well over a hundred thousand alumni. The State's enormous output of corn, wheat and other grains flowing through giant elevators is more or less remotely associated with the university's college of agriculture where today's prospective farmers learn about scientific field crop production and soil management. It has its own vast campus, also a museum of antiquated farm machinery used by pioneers, a striking contrast to the tractor testing laboratories in which the students set world standards.

In addition to land development the university is also concerned with wider horizons of the space age. The Mueller Planetarium offers a star show three times a week to which visitors are welcome. Whether you are a confirmed stargazer or know nothing about stars except that they are visible only at night, you will be fascinated by the sweeping view of the realm earth's scientists are trying to conquer.

Nebraskans have always placed a major emphasis on education. The Nebraska Wesleyan University founded by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1871 is the largest Protestant college in the State. The Seventh-day Adventist institution, Union College, still on its original location is said to be the oldest of its kind in the Nation. The School Music Hall contains curios donated by native members of the faith in Pitcairn Island. Looking toward the future is the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education, a national center seeking solutions to the problems which beset this somewhat brave new world.

Lincoln has no lack of entertainment, indoors or out. Its 24 parks and playgrounds covering a total of 1,365 acres abound in dance pavilions, tennis courts, golf courses, and swimming pools, one of which is supplied with real sea water. Six theaters, three drive-ins, and an amusement park also cater to the populace though, of course, the big special event of the year is the State Fair every September. Its grounds of 300 acres are crisscrossed by 4 miles of streets, with a full complement of attractions and accommodations for thousands of visitors.

Pioneers' Park has plenty of picnic tables for small groups and a Pinewood Bowl for the large audiences attending summer operettas and starlight concerts. There is also

a zoo where the deer and the buffalo roam in their natural setting. Some of the small islands inside the park's confines serve as refuges for wildfowl. Antelope Park is another mecca for those who seek outdoor recreation.

Converting summer pools into icy surfaces for winter skating is a common procedure in many locations but Lincoln reverses the process in the recently built Pershing Municipal Auditorium when it floods and freezes its arena for ice skating in the summertime. The building itself was named in honor of Gen. John J. Pershing, commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe during World War I, once a resident of Lincoln.

Another figure of national prominence was William Jennings Bryan who as a young lawyer came to Lincoln in 1887 to hang out his shingle for practice. Chosen in 1896 as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago his eloquence so swayed the assembly that he was nominated for the Presidency. Hailed as the Boy Orator of the Platte—he was only 36—his Cross of Gold speech on that occasion is regarded as a classic of campaign oratory. Though his party leadership continued over two more nominations his influence waned with the successive defeats. When his political star was no longer in the ascendant he returned to Lincoln to publish a weekly journal called the Commoner and to appear on Chautauqua lecture platforms throughout the country. He died only 5 days after his participation in Tennessee's sensational Scopes monkey trial in 1925. Lincoln still remembers him kindly as one of its most distinguished citizens of the past.

The city's early history appears to be well-seasoned with salt. It was one Capt. W. T. Donovan who first saw possibilities for future commerce in the site back in 1856. Then it was merely an expanse of flats bordered by marshes and prairieland but he noted that creeks flowing into Platte tributaries were incrusted with salt. Two years later he was in business. The arrival of two salt boilers named Cox and Beckham marked the beginnings of a habitation and a name. Although the tiny settlement was laid out in 1859 to serve as a seat for Lancaster County the first permanent families did not move in until 5 years later. They were members of a Methodist colony under the leadership of Elder J. M. Young who built cabins and established a female seminary, an early start in Nebraska's interest in education and religion, the forerunner of the 125 beautiful churches which serve all denominations in Lincoln today.

Originally called Lancaster it was later named Capital City. It would be natural to assume that the present corporate label stemmed from Republicans who, then as now, regarded Lincoln as their patron saint. Such was not exactly the case, however much the newly organized party coveted the honor. It was really brought about by Democrats who lived north of the Platte and wanted the seat of government to remain in Omaha when the State was admitted to the Union in March 1867. The postwar Lincoln was not the national hero he has since become and the Omaha faction thought his name would be enough to defeat the bill for relocation. But the political ruse failed. Democrats south of the Platte ignored party lines and to a man voted for both the removal and the new name.

The following year State documents and furnishings were brought to Lincoln by covered wagons in the dead of night lest armed Omahans should resist the transfer. In the meantime the population had increased to around 500 served by grocery and clothing stores, a bank, livery stable, lumberyard, barbershop and even a newspaper. The new legislature authorized land grants for railroad construction, also for the University of Nebraska. The first railroad reached Lincoln in 1870 when the population had grown to 2,500.

In the meantime Lincoln continued to grow. Small industries arose, stockyards and packing plants were built, and railroad shops expanded to give unemployment to the population which reached 60,000 in the 1880's. No longer a grassroots town exclusively, Lincoln developed into the progressive city you see today. The Sower atop the Capitol tower is a meaningful symbol of the Cornhusker State's pioneer strength which is still going strong. Your Aunt Minnie can look up to the sower with unqualified pride.

Do You Dare To Design Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, every American is willing to fight to preserve the freedoms that have been guaranteed to us in our Constitution. We understand the meaning of political freedom; but in too many cases, the connection between economic and political freedom has not been made clear to our people.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have been concerned with global statistics dealing with gross national production and the rate of our economic growth as contrasted with that in other countries. Yet, these overall figures result from the inspired thinking of countless engineers, designers, and salesmen throughout our land. They must meet the ever-changing needs of American consumers and provide them with better products at lower prices. America's economic progress depends on these talented individuals and the maintenance of adequate incentives for their efforts. They must also be given the freedom to dream and innovate. One of the most thought-provoking statements that has come to my attention is entitled "Do You Dare To Design Freedom?—The Organization of Society," by Mr. Bay E. Estes, Jr., vice president of marketing with the United States Steel Corp. It was delivered before the annual awards luncheon of the Industrial Designers Institute in Chicago on June 22, 1961.

Mr. Estes is eminently qualified to discuss this important subject which has been long neglected by many academicians.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Estes' address at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DO YOU DARE TO DESIGN FREEDOM?—THE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

(By Bay E. Estes, Jr., vice president, marketing, United States Steel Corp.)

Your profession, industrial design, has progressed tremendously in recent years. It has grown in numbers. It has gained in acceptance and use by industry. Most important, it has made great strides in its ability to make major contributions to the progress of companies, of industries, and of our national economy.

Yet, in my judgment, there exist several barriers to further growth and progress of industrial design; and others may be developing. Some of these could, in time, even jeopardize the future of your profession, at least, as you know it. Others are merely stumbling blocks of the sort which to some degree limit the quality of the industrial designer's work or the extent of the contribution which he can make.

One important limitation on industrial design as a vital factor in industry, and an equally vital force in our national economy, is the failure of many businessmen to recognize the functions of the industrial designer and to take full advantage of the contribution he can make. Fortunately, this limitation is not permanent and progress toward its elimination is being steadily made.

What are the functions of the designer? I certainly don't need to tell you; but, perhaps, as industrial designers you may be interested to know what I as a marketing man consider them to be.

In the broadest sense, the designer should be at the same time an analyst of the present and an architect of the future. From a marketing point of view, it is the function of industrial design to create products which appeal to buyers through appearance, and which satisfy users through performance. From an artistic or esthetic point of view, it is the function of design to achieve a "rightness" about things—to make every product fitting with respect to form, function, materials, and techniques.

It is up to industrial designers to sense and anticipate changes in tastes, in technology, in science, and in culture. At the same time, it is these very changes which necessitate the practice of the industrial designer's art to help advance society's progress.

Thus, the industrial designer—seen in the round, from every perspective of his activities—is successively, and often simultaneously, an analyst, an artist, an artisan, an engineer, a technician, a salesman, a psychologist, and an economist.

So, the designer thinks scientifically as well as creatively. He designs with facts as well as ideas. He has to know materials and markets as well as forms and functions. He must never forget that a company is known by its end products in the hands of the public. The results of his decisions with respect to the appearance and function of industrial products are soon reflected in the profit or loss of the company he serves.

Let's turn to another problem. There is a current point of view that sees the designer as a marketing mountebank who foists upon the public something called "planned obsolescence"—who conjures up gimmicks and gadgets to enslave affluent consumers into wastemaking purchases that are not really wanted, needed, or even useful.

Such a downgrading of the designer's art and the public's intelligence needs no extended rebuttal here. Changes in product design evolve from the widening needs of people, from technical advancements, improvements in materials and methods of fabricating them.

If "planned obsolescence" means "planned improvement"—a better product tomorrow to replace yesterday's best effort, then it is a reason for pride and not apology, for commendation, not criticism. True, the "planned improvement" may not always meet with success in the market place—there are designs which fail and products which don't sell, just as there are books which no one reads and plays which close down, because no one goes to see them.

But industrial design will have a place as long as men keep striving to improve their condition—and designers will come up with new ideas as long as there are people to use them.

Is the art of industrial design keeping up with the pace of today's scientific progress?

Are designers improving their knowledge and mastery of materials as rapidly as science is revolutionizing those materials?

Let me explain what I mean by talking about steel—the material I know best. As designers, do you think of steel as one material—or do you think of steel in terms of thousands of different materials?

For example, when you consider wood, in terms of design, you think, almost automatically, of teak, mahogany, pine, cherry, fir, walnut, and so on. You would no more design walnut into a product that called for teak than you would design sterling silver into a product that called for structural steel.

How much do you realy know about the revolution that has transformed steel, a brawny man's metal, into a light, bright, shimmering substance with all of the beauty and glamour that goes with feminine elegance?

Of course steel is a metal with muscle. Of course it can do the heaviest jobs that designers demand. But it can also "glitter and gleam." It can be shaped with the utmost freedom of form.

I wonder whether some designers may not have become so conditioned by habit in their thinking that they are overlooking—to their own great disadvantage—many of the wonderful and beautiful possibilities of steel as a designer's material?

As one well-known designer put it, "I sometimes think we suffer from hypnotic fixation when we always assume that strength requires bulk."

Imagine how attentively you would listen to the salesman who walked into your office and announced a revolutionary new material which could be fabricated into a honeycomb of foil-thin sheets about twice the diameter of a human hair and which was so strong that it could be employed to cover the surface of an airplane and endure the extreme stresses and temperatures involved in flying at three times the speed of sound?

Imagine how interested you would be to learn that this new material, spun into a continuous strand, had a tensile strength of 600,000 pounds per square inch and that this might someday be increased to 1 million pounds per square inch. Also, imagine that you were told this fabulous new material could be woven into a fabric finer than a butterfly's wings or twined into a rugged mat that could take dynamite explosions as though they were a baby's punches.

Suppose you were told that this new material could be woven to 400 strands per linear inch compared to 50 strands per inch in luxury stockings—and that this same material could also be used in larger sizes to screen and sift slag, coal, and other heavy, abrasive materials.

Suppose you learned that in another form this new material would last at least four times as long as ordinary steel, and that it was three times as strong.

Suppose this salesman told you that his new material could be supplied with magnetic or antimagnetic properties, that it possessed strength, hardness, ductility and toughness, corrosion resistance, and the highest modulus of elasticity of all the structural materials available to you.

Imagine your interest on hearing that this new material also offered great variety in its surface appearance—that it could be supplied in mat finish, sand-blasted finish, coated with vinyl plastic in any color and in dozens of surface patterns, prepainted, coated with various metals, or with numerous patterns embossed into its surface.

Consider how impressed you would be to learn that this material would take more fabricating operations than any other known to man—that it could be drawn, welded, forged, riveted, bent, bolted, and brazed, stamped, spun, sheared, split, and soldered, punched, painted, and even porcelain-enameled.

This amazingly versatile material of many forms, gentlemen—as you have probably guessed by this time—is your old friend, steel, a friend whom you have known so long and so well that you have come to take him for granted, and failed to appreciate fully his many unique qualities.

Steel—the wootz steel of Damascus, the making of which Aristotle described in 384 B.C. Steel—the wako steel which the Japanese used to make swords in the first century. Steel—with which the Turks smote the Crusaders and the Romans conquered the Gauls. Steel—which the Celts used for wheel tires for their chariots before the birth of Christ.

Yes, steel which today soars skyward to the edge of outer space in the engines and the skins of supersonic planes, their sides seared to a sizzling red by the friction of the atmosphere and their steel wings with a cutting edge so razor sharp that, when these planes are in the shop, the wings must be capped by rubber guards to prevent mechanics from getting cut.

How easy it is to design by habit. How easy it is for men to live for centuries with a material and fail to follow the almost fantastically unbelievable transformation of this material from ancient to modern use. How much knowledge you designers must master to keep up with the teeming technology of our times.

Happily, I can tell you that we at U.S. Steel are doing much to ease your task in this respect. We are not designers. It is not our function to design products, but rather, to contribute to their design in terms of our technical know-how. We are specialists in the field of materials and their application. We provide engineering information, architectural application advice, and metallurgical service at every one of our district offices.

We can assist you in selecting, from our 10,000 different steels, the proper steel with the required metallurgical and physical characteristics to serve the form and function you want to design into end products.

Moreover—although we do not and will not presume to displace the valuable service of industrial designers—which, incidentally, we ourselves use in our own business—we can assist you in selecting the proper steel for the esthetic qualities you wish to achieve in the form, features, and function of the product you are designing.

Let me give you some examples of how these amazing new steels and this comprehensive application engineering service have worked out to the benefit of steel users. Working with one company we have helped designers to create a steel residential door, using urethane foam as a core material. This door costs less than a wood door and as a result of the interest which was aroused at last year's home show in Chicago, it is now in production.

As you probably know, we retained Peter Muller-Munk to design a modern modular concept of office furniture in steel. You may be interested to know that when another designer saw Mr. Muller-Munk's creation, he seized upon the idea of applying what he saw in the steel office furniture to the design of a stove. Thus, design ideas are realized in many forms and in many materials. And when I say "many materials" I am thinking entirely of steels—because that is what our modern steels are—they are literally many different materials suited to many different uses and many different effects.

To help you achieve your aims in design, we have specialists in every field of steel technology: metallurgists, specialists in coating steel, in joining steel, in forming of steel, and in basic physics. We have available specialists in almost every use of steel one could name: automotive, public utility, highway, architectural, packaging, household, residential construction, industrial equipment and machinery, transportation and containerization, and agricultural. All these man can help you make full use of steel's advantages.

Now, let's turn for a moment to some restrictions which sometimes prevent the designer from taking full advantage of the superb potentials of our new steels—potentials which can greatly improve the efficiency, appearance, and economy of the products you design.

I am referring to the multitude of codes and regulations, some of them obsolete, which are maintained by various organizations, including city, State, and Federal governments. I have no quarrel with codes as such. In most cases, they are necessary restrictions on individual freedom in the interests of public health and safety. But we do ask your cooperation with us in doing what you can to see that codes are brought up to date to recognize the properties of today's stronger and more useful steels.

There is a natural conservatism among code-writing bodies which is understandable and even desirable. But a code can be a crutch for a lazy mind to lean on, and there is always a tendency among less creative people to view innovators with suspicion.

But with the improved performance characteristics of the newer steels demonstrable by laboratory and field tests, there is no longer any reason why our codes should be less abreast of modern technology than, for example, the codes of Europe. So, when you find that you are not permitted to take full advantage of the performance potentials you know exist in the steels you want to use, you should consider urging a specification group or a government body to bring its code up to date.

But you must do even more, I believe, if you are to maintain your integrity and freedom as a designer. You must do more than know the materials available to you. You must do more than advocate the removal of obsolete code restrictions, which prevent your using those materials to full advantage.

These limitations, hampering as they are to your creativity and freedom as a designer, are far less threatening to your design career than another more fundamental, more menacing trend which threatens your freedom as a designer, your liberty as an individual, and the future of your country as a free Nation.

I have described the designer's functions as providing fitness in form, in function, in materials, and in techniques for the end products of our civilization. His art aims to produce useful things of beauty. But success in these objectives does not alone assure the future of design nor the future of industrial design as a profession.

The whole essence of the designer's art is choice—the whole usefulness of the designer to society depends upon his ability and his freedom to choose function rather than fiction, to choose beauty rather than ugliness, to choose satisfaction instead of frustration.

Choice is not only the essence of the designer's art, it is also the root of man's freedom. Thus, you, as designers, must ardently defend your own freedom of choice by adopting, as one of your chief concerns, the freedom of choice for all other men in society. In the words of William Allen White, "Liberty is the only thing you can not have unless you are willing to give it to others."

Why are designers especially responsible for freedom and why should they be especially responsible to a call upon their efforts in freedom's defense?

The designer occupies a unique position among the professions of our time. He stands at the junction point of all the work and thought which lead to the progress of our society. The designer is the bridge be-

tween art and science, between industry and the civilization to which society—or at least its thinking members—aspire.

The designer, even more than the artist, is the bridge between the material and the spiritual.

As Goethe said, "On and within the earth we find material to fulfill the highest earthly needs, a world of matter devoted to the cultivation of man's highest faculties. But on that road of the spirit will be found always sympathy, love, and well-regulated free activity. To stir these two worlds to confront one another, to manifest their reciprocal qualities in the transient phenomena of life, that is the highest stature to which man must develop."

That is the stature to which industrial designers must aspire, to stir these two worlds to confront one another—but note that this requires, to use Goethe's words, well regulated free activity.

What Goethe is saying is simply this: The designer must be under discipline, but the discipline must be his own. Goethe did not say "well-regulated by the government"—he said, "well-regulated free activity."

Thus, the designer must possess a dedication to freedom. No designer who respects the integrity of his profession can approve of compulsion over the creative energies, activities, and choices of men. For the true designer, as for the true philosopher, compulsion must be limited to the minimum required for the prevention of force or fraud by the few against the many, or by the many against the few.

But today the prevailing ideology of our times seems to favor compulsion over more and more of man's activities, more and more limiting of his freedom of choice. Confusion surrounds the popular concept of freedom and wraps it in a suffocating coat of compulsion and shields it from the invigorating winds of challenge and reality.

Often there are many possible designs for a product, but there are only two basic designs for the organization of society: one is a system of compulsion, or slavery—the other a system of freedom, or voluntary cooperation through contract. There is no permanent "middle way."

At this moment, our Nation is trying to decide which path it will take—the path of greater compulsion or the path to greater freedom.

What will be the future design for our society? This is the overwhelming problem facing the industrial designer and every other creative person—artist, teacher, thinker and producer in our land.

There is no doubting the path we are following at this moment. We are marching rapidly down the path of compulsion—and by popular vote.

If you feel a sense of frustration in the practice of your profession, if you feel that limitations upon your liberty are impeding your progress, is it not possible that these frustrations stem from the compulsions placed upon you as an individual and a taxpayer, and upon your clients or your employers whose enterprise is being stifled by bureaucracy, wasteful Government spending, and even outright discrimination against those who want to work with freedom from compulsion?

Our Creator sublimely designed men and women to be free and their faces and bodies to be beautiful, and their freedom of expression, creativity, and action to be a part of that beauty. But today we have denied this dignity of the individual in much of our American life—and the dignity of the individual person, in much of the world beyond our shores, has been destroyed by political, economic, and spiritual slavery.

In our own country we speak of "the economy" as if it were a machine and we chart its "growth" in dollars of "gross national product," which are as fictional in meaning as they are diluted in real value by inflation. We ignore the reality that the economy is not only products—even more it is people—and economics is not statistics but rather the material manifestation of human action and the satisfactions underlying freedom of choice.

Instead, some people would treat economics as if it were "ego-nomics" in which the free decisions of people in the market are replaced by the egocentric dictates of government bureaus and commissions. Which leads me to ask: Have you ever thought about the slight difference—insofar as its effect upon man's economic condition goes—between the choice-destroying ruling of a commission and the choice-destroying command of a commissar?

If designers are to preserve their integrity and their freedom they shall, I believe, have to understand that freedom of design—like freedom of speech or of religion—cannot long exist without economic freedom. They shall have to realize that a state which begins by dictating economic action ends by dictating every action—for there is scarcely any human action which does not have an economic aspect. There is no free press where there are no free presses. There will be no freedom in design if there is no freedom for designers.

So, designers will have to help in the struggle—and it is a struggle, I assure you—to persuade the people of this nation to gain economic understanding. Perhaps, I should say "regain" economic understanding, for this is a matter of old fashioned common sense, not erudition. Too long we have operated on the apparent theory that the possession of specialized knowledge is the equivalent of an education—and that such an education relieves a man of the need for using his intelligence. For understanding we have subsituted slogans; for synthesis and comprehension we have substituted semantic symbolism.

All through the ages, man has been coerced, enslaved in one land after another. And now a newer, more ominous slavery threatens to engulf the world. And in our own country, cult of growth for growth's sake, parading as progress, but looking very much like the statism that other lands have accepted, is loudly proclaiming its supposed superiority over our traditions of individual dignity and liberty.

Here is a challenge for today's designer. Here is man's most daring design—the design for the freedom of the human spirit and the creative energies of free people. Here is a challenge for the designer who would aspire to the highest achievement of his art. The designer has liberated modern man from the ornate monstrosities which cluttered up the lives of his 19th century forebears. He has given the gift of his art to every well-designed product of this modern day and has placed pleasure, movement, and beauty in the products man uses, in the planes he flies, in the homes where he dwells. Will he be content to be confused in his economic thinking and behavior while he tries to be clear in his art?

I do not think so. I think he will want to join his freedom-seeking fellow men and strengthen the bridge between art and knowledge. I think he will want to strengthen that bridge so that men can move more surely toward the freer use of their energy and creativity.

If I should be wrong—if designers should confine their attentions to their purely professional concerns, then the sea of vulgar taste, vulgar thought, vulgar art and design—and the coercive political and economic philosophies under which they thrive—will engulf the designer along with all of his fellow citizens. We shall become as drab as Russia—or worse. It is no coincidence that decadence in art, delinquency in youth, decay in morals, and deterioration in economic and political freedom are often found together.

It is in your hands, now, today, to help fashion a new edifice of human freedom that will survive the onslaught of creeping communism surrounding us without and the creeping coercion and collectivism trying to socialize us from within. It is in your hands—and in mine—and in the hands of all of our fellow men to face our moment of truth.

What are the alternatives before us?

One is the soft and slippery slide down the slopes of welfarism into the slough of socialism—and from there into the engulfing quicksand of communism.

The other is the long road reaching upward to the design of man's full and final freedom. It is a steep and tortuous trail leading to the top of a beautiful but rugged mountain, its peak hidden in the white clouds of the future. This is a rough road, difficult with duty, serious with study, fervent with dedication but glorious with achievement. It is the only road a man with self-respect can take.

I have no doubt which road the industrial designer will choose.

The Goal of the True Conservative Is To Help Man Achieve Happiness

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many definitions today as to what we mean by conservatism and what a true conservative stands for. If I had to find a one-word description of the goal of conservatism, I would say it is "happiness." Our Founding Fathers said it clearly in the Declaration of Independence when they put forth as a stated objective, "the pusuit of happiness." They referred, of course, to the ultimate in happiness which man attains through the opportunity of complete development of the whole man as so ably described by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in his book, "Conscience of a Conservative." An individual can reach full development only in a free society such as envisioned by the framers of our Constitution. The conservative, therefore, believes it is essential that Government stay within the bounds set for it in the Constitution so that individual rights will be protected and each of us will have full opportunity to become whatever we desire in order to reach the fullest enjoyment of happiness. Happiness is synonymous with a system of limited government which permits human beings maximum freedom to do what they want, and go when they want commensurate with extending the same freedom to others.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal offers some food for thought on conservatism:

CONSERVATISM—REAL AND UNREAL

It is a familiar phenomenon that any movement will generate its own extremists or attract them to it. And, the world being

as it is, the extremists sometimes get more publicity than the real representatives of the movement.

The "liberals," as the word is currently used in American politics, have long had this problem. And now the "conservatives," enjoying a boom in the country if not in Washington, are having a taste of being linked to extremists.

So perhaps it may be useful to take a brief look at what does constitute the main stream of contemporary conservative thought. It is, of course, no single, rigid body of doctrine; as Prof. David McCord Wright notes in Modern Age magazine, it is "a spectrum of thought, not a single beam." In other times some who would today be called conservatives were called liberals, and today some of conservative view find the conservative label unsatisfactory. The label is only a convenience; what matters is the thinking.

In any case, conservatism is—and this the liberals rejoice in overlooking—a highly intellectual movement. Both historically and at present it embraces, under whatever label, some of the world's most brilliant minds in the field of economics and politics. Locke, Burke, Mill in the past; Von Mises, Hayek and a host of others today. Many articulate conservatives teach at universities, and in recent years there has been a new surge of conservative opinion among college students as well.

Most conservatives would agree on certain fundamental principles, whatever their other differences. They start from a philosophy of man which puts the stress on his individuality and diversity, and from this it follows that his fullest development will be in conditions of maximum economic and political freedom.

How is it, then, that conservatives are sometimes viewed as reactionaries hankering for an unattainable past? Partly, no doubt, because of the extremists. As for the main stream of conservatism, this view is a misapprehension.

Conservatives do indeed value order in a society, and only a foolish society would not; devising institutions that combine order with maximum individual liberty is one of man's more complex intellectual undertakings. They do value the teachings of the past, as it would not be very intelligent to ignore them. While they do not oppose change, they do oppose reckless or thoughtless political and economic tinkering.

That is the exact opposite of a reactionary view. After all, what conservatives today want to conserve is the most revolutionary body of political thought on record—the doctrine of freedom as expressed in the writings of this Nation's architects.

It must be said that history provides much support for the conservative view. The great threat to man's freedom has always been the power of the state. There is a danger in the constant encroachments of the central government; how can there not be a danger? Order preserved by a reasonable degree of government is one thing; but constantly growing state power can only be at the expense of the individual.

So there is nothing negative about opposing that trend and urging a Jeffersonian limited government. That is only another way of saying that the fullest prospering of the individual and the community depends on staving off all-powerful government.

For our part, it matters little whether or not we are called conservative. What we are, however, trying to say is that the approach to life which is usually called conservative is an intellectually respectable movement firmly grounded in commonsense and man's experience.

It has nothing in common with authoritarian secret societies or with strident, indiscriminate accusations of communism, although conservatives are the strongest foes of communism. Yet individuals and groups like the John Birch Society are being publicized as conservatives and exaggerated out of all proportion to their significance. If some of these people sound a little silly when they go around appealing for the impeachment of the Chief Justice, it is no less silly to regard them as some kind of threat to the Nation.

The groundswell of genuine conservative thinking in America is a healthy thing, particularly at this time. It will be a pity if a few extremists, abetted by exaggerated comment, succeed in distorting its meaning.

A Second Look at the President's Council of Economic Advisers' Economic Theory

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, professor of economics at Columbia University, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, and former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has analyzed and taken exception to the economic views presented by the current Council of Economic Advisers headed by Dr. Walter Heller. On April 27, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2885–A2887, I inserted Dr. Burns' first commentary, as it appeared in the Morgan Guaranty Survey, on the Heller Council's views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reply of the Council was placed in the RECORD on June 15, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 7833–7836, by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The reply, and Dr. Burns' further comments appear in the August issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey. I should like at this time to place in the RECORD the second look which Dr. Burns has taken at the Heller Council's economic theory.

A SECOND LOOK AT THE COUNCIL'S ECONOMIC THEORY

(By Arthur F. Burns)

In my Chicago address of April 21, which was largely devoted to a report by the Council of Economic Advisers released on March 6, I expressed concern about the economic theory that underlies the major policies of the new administration. The Council has now issued a reply to my critique. It is a serious and closely reasoned reply, as was to be expected. But while it clarifies some issues, it beclouds others, and it has left my concern undiminished.

THE CHICAGO ADDRESS

It will contribute to clarity, I think, if I summarize at the outset the main points of the Chicago address:

1. The economic policies espoused by the Council are based on the theory that there is "chronic slack" in our economy, that there is a "growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce," and that this gap has shown "especially since 1955 * * * a distressing upward trend." Hence, in the Council's judgment, "economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem"; that is, our Nation has to cope not only with a recession and its aftermath, but also with a problem of secular stagnation.

2. Before accepting this theory, it is desirable to examine the evidence cited by the Council in its support—namely, the duration of successive upswings of the business cycle, the level of unemployment at successive cyclical peaks, and the magnitude of the gap between what we can and what we do produce. When this evidence is analyzed, it turns out that the Council's theory rests fundamentally on the fact that the business-cycle expansion of 1958–60 was exceptionally short and incomplete. Although this is a disturbing fact, it provides a slender basis for a theory of secular stagnation.

3. Not only that, but there is a better explanation of what happened between 1958 and 1960 than is offered by the neostagnation theory. Although many factors contributed to the unsatisfactory character of this expansion, three developments were decisive: First, a violent shift in Federal finances after the first quarter of 1959; second, a sharp tightening of credit conditions; third, the protracted steel strike.

4. We have, then, two very different interpretations of recent economic developments. According to the theory just sketched, the early onset of recession was due to special factors that need not be repeated. According to the Council, on the other hand, the early onset of the recession provides one more symptom of the chronic weakness of our economy.

5. The two theories have different policy implications. On the basis of the Council's theory, "We face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to full recovery is a long one." On the basis of my interpretation, the current problem of recovery is not very different from the problem we had to face in 1949, in 1954, and again in 1958.

The rest of the Chicago address dealt with policy issues explicitly. Before returning to this subject, it is desirable to stop and see whether, or in what degree, the basic issues of fact and interpretation have been resolved by the exchange of views.

THE COUNCIL'S REPLY

One way of reading the Council's reply is as follows: Since the Council agrees with the interpretation of the incomplete expansion of 1958–60 which I had presented as an alternative to its theory of a growing gap between what our Nation can produce and what it does produce; since the Council no longer speaks of a distressing upward trend in the gap, nor of chronic slack in the economy; since the Council's defense of the evidence originally presented to support its theory is confined to the statistical procedures of estimating the gap; since even this defense emphasizing the size of the gap in the fourth quarter of 1960, when the existence of a gap of some size is not in dispute; since the Council no longer claims that the problem of recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem; since the Council also agrees that the problem of speeding recovery is not very different from that faced in earlier recessions of the postwar period, but merely urges that we try to benefit from past mistakes; since the desirability of achieving a higher rate of economic growth or of meeting urgent national requirements, such as a stronger defense, is not at issue; in view of all this, it would be possible to conclude that the Council and I have now reached substantial accord in our diagnosis of the state and needs of the American economy.

Regrettably, this is not the only way of reading the record. All things considered, it is better to take the Council at its word on what is chiefly at issue than to speculate on the precise meaning of its pronouncements or reticences on subsidiary issues. The Council states plainly, and without any

qualifications, that it considers its earlier analysis to be "sound" and my criticism "mistaken." Not only that, but the Council defends stoutly its gap estimates and even refers, in the course of discussing a technical point, to the "growing gap." Since it is clear that the Council believes its own gap estimates, it must still believe that, quite apart from the recession, there is chronic slack in our economy. It must still believe that the gap between what we can produce and do produce has been growing, that economic recovery is therefore far more than a cyclical problem—in short, that unless the Nation attends to the Council's warning, our economy faces a problem of secular stagnation. The Council's theory has not lost its true character—nor its capacity for good or evil—by appearing in a more technical dress.

INTERPRETATION OF THE POSTWAR PERIOD

In the Chicago address I attempted to test the soundness of the Council's theory by examining the individual blocks out of which the theory is built. I doubt whether much enlightenment can be gained by discussing in detail the individual points of the Council's reply. It will be more useful, I think, to take another look at the general architecture of the Council's theory, and to test it by examining its implications for events about which we have some definite knowledge. If the Council's theory is sound, it should provide a reasonable interpretation of the American economy in the postwar period. Let us see whether it does this well enough to serve as a guide to current policy.

According to the Council, the potential output of our economy has grown at an annual rate of 3.5 percent since the first quarter of 1953. The Council's report of March 6 shows these estimates in graphic form, quarter by quarter, through 1961. In earlier years, that is, between 1947 and 1953, the growth of potential output is said to have been more rapid, proceeding at an annual rate of 4.3 percent. Although the Council has not presented estimates of potential output for the earlier period, this can easily be done by splicing the 4.3 percent growth curve to the 3.5 percent growth curve in the first quarter of 1953.[1] With these records at hand, we can see how the actual output of our economy differed from what the Council tells us was its potential output, quarter by quarter, since 1947.

This comparison leads to the following results: From the beginning of 1947 through the first quarter of 1951, actual output was below the potential output. From the fourth quarter of 1953 through the second quarter of 1955, a gap again emerged. Finally, starting with the first quarter of 1956, a gap appears in every quarter up to the present time. The Council has summarized the record since 1953 by reporting that, "especially since 1955, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend." The Council has not commented on the gaps of the earlier period. But it is clear that, if the Council is right, the gap has persisted even longer than it has reported. Indeed, it appears that our Nation has suffered from insufficient spending—let us keep in mind that the Council attributes the gap to a deficiency in total demand—throughout the postwar period, except for the interlude of the Korean war and a few months in 1955. Or to put this conclusion in another way: with one very minor exception, the American economy of our generation has succeeded in escaping from its chronic, persistent slack only during wartime.

This picture of the American economy as being characterized by chronic slack, caused by a chronic deficiency of demand, strikes me as a caricature. I may, of course, be mistaken. But I simply do not know how to reconcile this picture with the growth of our gross national expenditure, which more than doubled between 1947 and 1960; or with the increase of indebtedness, counting both the private and public sectors, from about $400 billion at the start to almost $900 billion at the end of this period; or with the rise of the consumer price level by nearly 40 percent, of which only about a third occurred during the Korean war; or with the growth of real output of about 60 percent; or with the growth of employment of nearly 10 million; or even with an average unemployment rate of 4.96 percent—an average which omits the protracted Korean episode, but includes all the recessions of the postwar period, and is based throughout on the current definition of unemployment, rather than the more restrictive definition which ruled until the end of 1956.

These doubts are not relieved when I contemplate the remedy, required by the Council's theory, for the allegedly chronic deficiency of demand. This remedy takes no account of the specific causes of the deficiency. It calls merely for the application of "standard fiscal and monetary measures"—in other words, lower interest rates, a more rapid increase of the money supply, larger Federal expenditures, possibly also lower tax rates, in one combination or another. Surely, expansionary fiscal and monetary measures were not neglected during the postwar period. But if the Council's theory is right, they were applied on an insufficient scale or less steadily than the proposed governor of policy—that is, the gap in demand—required. Even in years of boom, such as 1947 or 1956, it appears that the Government would have needed to augment the Nation's aggregate demand.

But if such policies had been followed, would not the pace of inflation have been faster, perhaps very much faster? I have no doubt that, in these circumstances, the rate of unemployment would now and then have been materially reduced. Yet I find it difficult to believe that the average rate of unemployment over the entire period would have been any lower, or that the average rate of economic growth would have been any higher, or that the distribution of our national income would have been more conducive to general welfare, or that the deficit in our balance of payments would have been any smaller, or that the dollar—which has come to serve as an international reserve currency—would still command much respect.

The test of experience to which I have subjected the Council's theory is not very reassuring. If it be thought that the test is severe, I can only say that a theory designed to guide the Nation's economic destiny deserves nothing less. However, the implications that I have drawn from the Council's theory must not be confused with the Council's own thoughts about this or that year or years. I should expect that, when faced with an actual situation, the Council would neither take its computations as literally as I have, nor carry out the logic of its theory as remorselessly. However that may be, it appears from my test that the Council's method of diagnosing the state of the economy and its prescription for filling arithmetically contrived gaps in demand can lead to serious errors of policy.

POLICIES FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Equipped with a theory of chronic slack in the economy, lacking faith in the capacity of private enterprise to generate full employment, anticipating a slow recovery, the Council has—quite logically—been urging a rapid expansion of Federal spending. My differences with the Council on the budgetary issue run deeper than the Council has indicated.

Let us note what is happening to Federal expenditures. Each official estimate of recent months has been a notch above the preceding one. The latest increase came on July 25, when the President announced that an additional appropriation of $3.5 billion would be requested of the Congress. Before this announcement, Federal cash payments to the public during the fiscal year 1962 were expected to be $7.8 billion higher than in fiscal 1961, when they in turn were $5 billion higher than in fiscal 1960. Again, just before July 25, the Federal cash deficit was expected to reach $4.8 billion this fiscal year. Allowing for upward revision of revenues, the deficit may now be estimated at $6.5 billion.

It may well be that the deficit will turn out to be still larger. Reversals of expenditure policy frequently result in overshooting the mark set by fiscal authorities. The present Congress seems reluctant to grant all the additional revenue the administration has requested. More serious still, as the international situation leads to new and perhaps much larger spending on national defense, it is by no means clear that governmental outlays on objects of lesser utility will be curbed. The Council has stated that "all governmental programs must meet the severe test of social priority relative to other public and private uses of the Nation's economic resources." It does not appear that this test is proving very severe. Just 1 day after the President made his momentous address on July 25, the House Labor Committee voted for a Youth Conservation Corps along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depressed 1930's. The climate for larger governmental spending is now good, and the Council has helped to provide a theoretical justification for it.

Whether or not my speculations turn out to be valid, it is clear that Federal finances—as was to be expected on account of the recession—have recently deteriorated. Allowing for seasonal factors, the Federal cash budget registered a surplus at an annual rate of about $5 billion in the third quarter of 1960. From January through May of this year, however, a deficit at an annual rate of nearly $7 billion has emerged. A sharp turnaround in Federal finances has therefore already occurred. And the deficit is not only growing, but for some months must continue to grow.

Meanwhile, the economy at large has been experiencing a revival since February. The recovery is widespread and is proceeding at a rather brisk rate. Total production already exceeds the prerecession peak, and total employment is not far behind. It appears, therefore, that the bulk of the new spending commitments by the Federal Government will come to fruition, not in a time of recession for which many of them were intended, but when recovery is well advanced and the economy is expanding of its own momentum—perhaps when it is already booming. New or additional governmental programs characteristically require only a modest expenditure at the start, then grow rapidly as the organization of the new activity is worked out. The full fiscal consequences of the new spending ventures lie, therefore, very much in the future.

But if governmental spending programs have a typical life history, so also has the business cycle. One of the normal features of business cycles is that the general price level tends to rise during expansions. Perhaps the present upswing will prove an exception,

[1] The Council reports that, between the first quarter of 1947 and the fourth quarter of 1953, real output grew at an annual rate of "nearly 4.5 percent" and that "this is a reasonable approximation to the rate of growth of potential during the early postwar years." Since the Council's appendix shows that "nearly 4.5 percent" means 4.3 percent, I have used the latter figure. I have spliced the 4.3 percent curve to the 3.5 percent curve in the first instead of the last quarter of 1953, because the Council's explicit estimates of potential output are already based on the 3.5 percent curve back to the first quarter.

but as yet I know of no evidence to support this supposition. With the private economy recovering, with Federal spending already rising swiftly, with expectations of inflation beginning to spread once again, I see a greater likelihood of an upward spurt in the price level during the coming year or two than does the Council. Under ordinary conditions, having become accustomed to creeping inflation, we might not worry about another limited rise of the price level. But the state of our international balance of payments has complicated matters. In view of its precarious condition, even a modest renewal of inflation could now prove very troublesome. If our export surplus should decline appreciably, while the government continued a policy of steadily filling calculated gaps in demand, insistent pressures may arise for factfinding boards to review planned increases of wages and prices—which would, of course, be a step toward reshaping our economy along lines of authoritarian control. Few people want such a change, certainly not the President or his Council of Economic Advisers, but economic and political forces released by our fiscal policies could move our Nation in this direction.

It is true, as the Council has pointed out, that the Federal deficit in sight for fiscal 1962 is considerably smaller than it was in fiscal 1959. But what concers me is that, in spite of the deterioration of our international financial position since 1958, the governmental approach to recession in 1960–61 has been so similar to the mistaken approach of 1957–58. Now as before, a quick reduction of taxes was talked about but never made. Now as before, the main emphasis of governmental policy has been on raising expenditures. Now as before, the spending stimulated by recession will outlast it. Now as before, programs to accelerate expeditures have proliferated—with more not only for defense, but also for public works, housing, education, research, unemployment compensation, and so on. Now as before, decisions to increase spending have not been taken all at once. Now as before, they have come in a long series, spread out over months, with few items of impressive magnitude taken by themselves. But when all the scheduled expenditures were finally added up in late 1958, they came to a much larger total than had been planned or advocated by our fiscal authorities. There is still hope that this will not happen when the accounts are struck late this year; but I cannot overlook the unexpected spurt of expenditures toward the end of fiscal 1961, or the fact that official estimates for fiscal 1962 have already had to be revised upward several times.

I have recalled the recession of 1957–58 because governmental policies for dealing with it have had consequences from which, in my judgment, our Nation is still suffering. In late 1958 the European financial community, discovering that our money supply was rising sharply and the Federal deficit piling up at a time when our export surplus was dwindling and gold flowing out, first began to whisper serious doubts about the future of the dollar. The need to quiet this concern and prevent a possible gold crisis was largely responsible for the highly restrictive fiscal and monetary policies put into effect in 1959. These policies inevitably involved a risk of slowing down our economic expansion to a point that could lead to recession. As events turned out, they, together with the steel strike did, in fact, lead to a mild and brief recession. The Council and I agree on this point. However, the Council also believes, if I have understood its thinking correctly, that the expansion could have continued to roll on during 1960 if only the Government had undertaken larger spending in 1959, instead of curbing outlays.

But would not such a policy have hastened the economic and political disaster that the Government sought to avert and, in fact, did avert? The heart of the problem of economic policy in early 1959 was that in the eyes of investors, particularly foreigners who do not need to continue holding billions of dollars here, our Government was already spending too much. It was the very fact that governmental spending kept climbing long after the recession had ended, with the cash deficit soaring to an annual rate of over $15 billion in the first quarter of 1959, which caused fears of inflation and of possible devaluation of the dollar to spread, thereby forcing an abrupt shift of policy. I fail to see how the Government could responsibly have followed any other course in 1959, although I do think that the shift need not have been so abrupt. It was not in 1959 that the fundamental mistake was made, but rather in 1958 when new governmental programs were piled up with little regard to their cost or future consequences.

The lessons of this recent episode should not be lost on us. It is precisely because the ways in which we fight recession have longer run consequences that we must not permit even compassion for the unemployed to lead us into actions which, while immediately beneficial, may seriously injure the entire population a little later. At a time such as this, when the possibility of a devaluation of the dollar is widely discussed in business and financial circles, I do not think it is prudent to continue enlarging Federal spending programs. Since defense outlays must go up, other programs should be cut. Since our economy is recovering and employment is again rising, we can with good conscience subdue our impatience for economic improvement. Past experience is a very imperfect guide to the future, but I think that it can serve us better than the Council's bleak forecast based on its projections of potential output. If the current expansion follows anything like the rule of postwar recoveries, and this assumption seems no less reasonable today than it did 3 months ago, our economy should come close to having full employment toward the end of next year.

PROBLEM OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

The time has come to stop fighting the recession, to say nothing of fighting it on the theory that it is superimposed on a chronic deficiency of demand. Let us concentrate economic thought instead on a real problem, that of increasing the average rate of our economic growth. The Council has rightly been devoting a good deal of attention to this longer range problem. Its call for a high investment economy, a high research economy, a high education economy makes good sense to me, although I am not entirely happy with the apparent implication that the only path to greater future efficiency is to spend more public or private money currently.

The prosperity of a nation depends basically on the energy and skill with which people apply themselves to production—in other words, on the amount of work that is done and the efficiency with which it is done. The Government can sometimes influence the outcome favorably by doing more and spending more, but it can sometimes also do so by spending less. The success of governmental policies to spur our economic growth will depend primarily on how effective they are in increasing confidence in the economic future, thereby stimulating people to use their brains, energy, money, and credit in building today for a better tomorrow.

To achieve a higher rate of economic growth, we need to give no less attention to the reduction of governmental obstacles to growth than we give to the devising of new governmental stimuli to growth. Whatever the defects of our public expenditure programs may be, whether on the quantitative or qualitative side, the Executive and the Congress at least go through the process of reexamining most of them every year. As far as the tax structure goes, there is much greater reluctance to rock the boat. Except for occasional and marginal adjustments, we have continued year after year a tax structure that practically every student knows is seriously defective. It is high time to carry out a thoroughgoing tax reform—a reform that, among other things, will serve to improve the economic climate for enterprise and investment at large, instead of on a curiously selective basis, as in the administration's recent proposal.

Of the many reforms that are needed, I think two are especially important. First, the tax rules governing depreciation need to be amended, so that they will take realistic account both of our technological revolution and of inflation. Second, the tax rates on personal income, which for some brackets of income are nearly confiscatory, need to be generally and gradually reduced, so that personal incentives to great effort will be strengthened and the energy now expended on tax avoidance schemes may be turned back into productive channels. It should be possible to carry out such reforms without impairing tax revenues beyond the initial year. But if this cannot be done, a low but broadly based excise tax will produce substantial revenue without blunting the incentive to enterprise.

I agree with the Council that we need to enlarge the national effort devoted to scientific research and basic education, but I feel that we need also to become far more efficient than we have been in conducting our educational enterprises. We need to hasten adaptation to changing technology by undertaking extensive training programs for unskilled workers in our individual communities, as well as retraining programs for industrial workers whose skills have become obsolete. It also would be constructive to stimulate the smaller firms, which are counted in the millions, to practice greater efficiency. With proper organization, our colleges of business administration should be able to render much the same kind of assistance to small businesses that our agricultural colleges have over many years rendered to farmers.

We need to become less tolerant of the wasteful practices that we have allowed to develop all around us. I am referring not only to restraints on efficiency imposed by trade unions in railroading, construction work, and other industries, but also to the featherbedding not infrequently practiced by business executives, and to the roadblocks to efficiency that have been put up by our Government, of which the farm program is only the most notorious example.

Since economic growth is bound to proceed unevenly, we must try to stiffen the resistance of our economy to occasional setbacks. In 1958 and again this year the Congress extended the duration of unemployment benefits, although it did so through tardy improvisations. Before the next recession strikes, as in time it probably will, our country should at least be armed with an unemployment insurance system that covers practically all wage-earners and automatically provides for extended benefits during periods of abnormally large unemployment. The President has wisely recommended legislation that would move our Nation in this direction.

Under present conditions of world competition, a reasonably stable price level would also help to promote the long-term growth of our economy. It would therefore be desirable to amend the Employment Act by specifying that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government to promote reasonable stability of the consumer price level as well as maximum production and employment. Such a declaration of moral purpose would help to assure everyone, both in our

country and abroad, that our Government has a proper concern for the future as well as the present.

These are some of the things that need to be done to enlarge and sustain prosperity. But as we work for a better future, let us not exaggerate the shortcomings of our economy or belittle the achievements of the past. In the postwar period our economy has extended, if not improved on, its historic rate of growth. It has demonstrated its great resilience by speedily filling the gap left by declining Federal expenditures when World War II ended and, a few years later, when the Korean hostilities came to a close. Perhaps the greatest economic triumph of our generation, although we too often show little appreciation of it, is the reduction of the swings of the business cycle and the blunting of their impact on the lives and fortunes of individuals. We should strive to do still better in the future, and I am hopeful that our efforts will be rewarded by success. But if it turns out that we fail to achieve all the improvement we seek during the 1960's, yet do no worse than in the 1950's, our accomplishment will still be very substantial and require neither remorse nor apology.

APPENDIX

I am appending the following notes for readers whose interest may center on technical points. They deal primarily with the gap estimates and with alternative methods of estimating when full employment may be reached. I have also added a few remarks on the theory of secular stagnation and recovery policies.

THE GAP ESTIMATES

The Council's gap estimates, starting in the first quarter of 1953, were derived by equating potential output to the actual output in mid-1955, then allowing the curve of potential output to ascend at an annual rate of 3.5 percent, and handling the period back of mid-1955 in similar fashion. The gap is simply the difference between actual and potential output.

In the appendix to its report of March 6, the Council spoke of its estimates of potential output, including the historical estimates, as being based on calculations that "are at best hazardous and uncertain." The text of the Council's report, however, did not heed the warning of the appendix, thus making my and other criticism inevitable. Now the Council makes a larger claim for its estimates of potential output—namely, that they are "reasonable," that they are "derived from careful quantitative studies," and that it therefore has "confidence in its trend projection."

On what quantitative studies, it is pertinent to inquire, did the Council base its estimate of an annual rate of growth of 3.5 percent in potential output? The Council gave a sketchy answer to this question in its original report and no information has been added by its reply. What, then, is the visible basis for the confidence which the Council now expresses in its historical estimates of potential output? The answer to this question consists of two parts.

First, the Council reports that these estimates imply "gaps which bear a close and reasonable relation to observed rates of unemployment in 1960 and previous years." This claim is excessive. According to the Council, an unemployment rate of 4 percent marks a period as having full employment. In mid-1955, when the unemployment rate was about 4 percent, the Council's estimate of potential output shows virtual equality with actual output, as it should. But when we move on, we find that the estimates of potential output soar above the figures of actual output throughout 1956 and throughout the first half of 1957, despite the fact that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in 11 of these 18 months was as low as or lower than in mid-1955 (when it was 4.1 percent). These oddities suggest that 3.5 percent overstates the annual growth of potential output, or than an exponential curve is a poor representative of potential output, or else that the concept of potential output itself requires modification. Even the Council's own equation, relating the unemployment rate to the gap, suggests that something is wrong. According to this equation, the gap vanishes at an unemployment rate of 3.7 percent, not—as it should by the Council's logic—at 4 percent.

The Council's report that its estimates imply "gaps which bear a close and reasonable relation to observed rates of unemployment" evidently means merely that the configuration of its gap estimates through time bears a general resemblance to the configuration of unemployment rates. But if this is what the Council means, no uniqueness attaches to its estimates; that is to say, several or many sets of historical estimates will meet this loose criterion equally well. For example, a curve of potential output ascending at an annual rate of only 3 percent, similarly pivoted in mid-1955, will certainly do so. I might add, for whatever it may be worth, that this 3-percent growth curve implies a gap of 5.3 percent in the fourth quarter of 1960, in contrast to the Council's reported gap of 8 percent.

Let us turn to the second part of the Council's visible evidence in support of its historical estimates of the gap. This consists of the finding that the several illustrative trends, which had figured in my criticism, yield gaps that do not bear a close and reasonable relation to rates of unemployment. The Council concludes that "this evidence strongly confirms" that its "choice of a trend line for potential output was not capricious." However, quite apart from the fact that none of my illustrative trends was suggested as a proper measure of potential output, a finding—whether well grounded or not—that these trends are faulty can tell us nothing at all about the statistical virtue of the Council's trend line for potential output.

The Council's own judgment in the appendix of its report of March 6 appears to be correct—namely, that its estimates of potential output "are at best hazardous and uncertain." It is difficult to see how estimates of this type could be anything but hazardous. Potential output, according to the Council, is "the output which could be achieved at reasonably full employment." Taken literally, this must mean that the potential output of a given period is the sum of (a) the actual output, (b) the additional output that could be achieved if the unemployment rate were 4 percent instead of, say, 6 percent, and (c) the further addition to output that could be achieved through greater efficiency of both labor and capital—apart from the which might be induced by (b). In this full sense, potential output is indefinitely larger than the sum of (a) and (b), this sum being what the Council has in mind by potential output. But even the latter quantity raises formidable difficulties. As far as (a) is concerned, we presumably know what it is. But how can we tell the magnitude of (b)? Not only is no answer given in official statistical publications, but no single true answer to this question is possible.

After all, the structure of a nation's output keeps changing. This is a particularly important feature of a free economy where people's demand may shift from automobiles to clothing to travel or whatnot. If the extra demand, which is implied by assuming that the unemployment rate comes down to 4 percent, were supplied by high-productivity industries, (b) would be one quantity. If the extra demand were concentrated on services supplied by low-productivity industries, (b) would be another and perhaps much smaller quantity. Nor is this the only theoretical difficulty. The magnitude of (a) in any specific period must depend, among other things on the relations among the prices of both final products and productive services during this and earlier periods. But once we assume that (b) emerges, the price relations that played their part in determining (a) will no longer be what they were. Hence, (a) itself cannot be treated as a datum. In short, unless we specify the precise assumptions concerning the economic processes involved in making total output something other than what it was or is, the magnitude of potential output is strictly indeterminate. And once we set out the assumptions of a working economic order, although a unique result becomes possible, it would still be necessary to assess the significance and relevance of the assumptions.

I have no illusions about the difficulties surrounding a theoretically valid approach to the problem of estimating potential output—even in the Council's restricted sense. I recognize that if the task of measurement is actually undertaken, some vigorous shortcuts such as the Council used are unavoidable. I do not rule out the possibility of getting dependable results by this approach. However, I have reason to believe that even an improvement on the Council's method—that is, a multiple correlation of output, time, and the unemployment rate—will yield gap estimates that have an uncomfortably large dispersion. This is certainly the case with the Council's method, as chart 5 of its report of March 6 indicates. If all this is true of descriptions of the past, it should be still more true of projections for the future. At any rate, the enormous differences in the estimates of potential output obtained by students who have concerned themselves with this problem shout warnings about the pitfalls that surround this field of measurement. I do not believe that the art of estimating potential output has reached a point that justifies the rewriting of the economic history of the postwar period, to say nothing of using such estimates as a basis for current policymaking.

As a matter of fact, in studying changes in economic conditions, it is necessary for experts to keep in mind the margins of error that attach even to measures of actual output—that is, the familiar statistics on the gross national product. Economists, no less than laymen, have gotten into the habit of assuming that there is only a single set of official estimates of the gross national product. In fact there are two estimates for every quarter, one arrived at from the expenditure side, the other from the income side. Since our statistics are imperfect, the two figures nearly always differ, sometimes by a disturbing margin. As far as expert knowledge exists on this subject, the figures derived from income data are neither better nor worse than the figures derived from expenditure data. Earlier publication and sheer convention, not science, have accorded the latter figures their practically exclusive sway. The Council's reply calls attention to the fact that its estimate of an 8-percent gap in the fourth quarter of 1960 was reached by more than one method. But no elaborate calculations are needed to show that this estimate may well be too high. For, even if the Council's figure of potential output for that quarter is taken as it comes, the mere substitution of the less familiar gross national product figure for the conventional one (as these annual rates are given in the June 1961 issue of Economic Indicators) would suffice to lower the estimate of the gap by $4.1 billion, or from 7.7 to 6.9 percent.

WHEN FULL EMPLOYMENT MAY BE REACHED

The Council observes that "the distance to full employment * * * is the true measure

of the magnitude of the recovery problem" and that "the percentage gap at the trough of the 1960–61 recession was greater than at the 1954 trough but about the same as at the 1958 trough." However, "the distance to full employment" is indicated better by the unemployment figures than by the gap estimates—which are, at best, cloudy images of the unemployment figures. The highest quarterly figure of unemployment associated with the recession of 1960–61 was 6.9 percent, with the previous recession 7.4 percent, with the one before that 5.9 percent, and with the 1948–49 recession, which the Council ignores, 7.1 percent.

The Council states that "current evidence suggests that it is highly improbable" that full employment will be reached by the last quarter of 1962. Apparently the Council reached this judgment by projecting its curve of potential output to the last quarter of 1962, then comparing the estimate so made with an estimate of actual output in the second quarter of this year. The result obtained can be no better than the Council's 3.5 percent growth curve of potential output. A projection of this curve yields a gross national product of $580.9 billion (annual rate, 1960 prices) for the last quarter of 1962. A projection of a similarly pivoted 3 percent curve, which meets every reasonable test as well as—if not better than—the 3.5 percent curve, yields a figure that is $20.4 billion lower.

I believe that earlier business-cycle expansions provide a better basis than conjectures concerning potential output for judging when, if the current recovery continues to flourish, unemployment may reach a 4 percent rate. The trough in the gross national product during the 1948–49 recession was reached in the second quarter of 1949. In the third quarter of 1949, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate averaged 6.6 percent. A year later, that is, in the third quarter of 1950, it was lower by 1.9 points. The drop in the unemployment rate over a corresponding interval of the business expansions starting in 1954 and 1958 was 1.8 points and 2.2 points, respectively. If, therefore, the current recovery follows approximately the course of the three preceding recoveries, the unemployment rate should be about 4.9 percent in the second quarter of 1962. Beyond this date, the three earlier expansions no longer give a useful clue. The first fails because of the outbreak of the Korean war, the second because full employment was already virtually reached, the third because of the outbreak of the steel strike. However, commonsense suggests, as does the behavior of unemployment rates during prewar expansions, that if the recovery continues with any vigor beyond the second quarter of 1962, unemployment may well reach or come close to 4 percent toward the end of 1962.

I have now set out the reasoning on which I based the statement concerning the prospects for full employment in the Chicago address. I should, however, add a word about structural unemployment. I have been inclined to agree with the Council's position that, as aggregate demand increases, what may now appear to be "an unyielding core of structural unemployment" will largely disappear. I still believe this to be true. Yet, some tabulations I have recently seen on the concentration of unskilled and semiskilled workers in the long-term unemployed group have made me wonder whether the Council and I may not be underestimating the difficulties posed by structural unemployment. I for one have not studied this question sufficiently.

THEORY OF SECULAR STAGNATION

The Council observes (a) that its economic views cannot be justly described as a secular stagnation theory; (b) that it has attributed the gap to deficiencies in total demand rather than to the deficiencies I had noted; (c) that it does not hold the view that the gap is "endemic" to the American economy; and (d) that one of its members had in fact informed the Joint Economic Committee that the Council "would not accept the idea that we have a chronic or growing longrun problem of unemployment but, rather, that we have a problem of unemployment that we can defeat."

As for (a), it may suffice to point out that theories of secular stagnation are distinguished by the fact that they characteristically posit a chronic failure of the economy (in contrast to a merely sporadic or cyclical failure) to produce all that it is capable of producing. That is precisely the way in which the Council repeatedly described our economy in its report of March 6.

As for (b), there is no sensible difference between my description of the Council's views (namely, that the basic reason for the alleged "growing gap" is the insufficiency, first, of investment in business plant and equipment, second, of public "investment"—that is, spending on education, health, research, and development of natural resources) and its own formulation, unless the Council believes that a deficiency of consumer spending is the basic reason for the gap.

There is no need to comment on (c), since the question whether the gap is "endemic" to the American economy is not involved in the present discussion.

I take it that the statement quoted in (d) refers to the future rather than to the past or present; for on any other interpretation the Council would be contradicting its own position (see the section on "The Chicago Address" in the text). I need hardly add that what is in question is the validity of the Council's theory that our economy has been suffering for years from a persistent, chronic, increasing slack—not whether such a condition, if it exists, can be corrected.

POLICIES FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

(a) The Council dissents from the view, which it attributes to me, that a particular increase of $724 million in Federal expenditures, recommended for fiscal 1962, would court inflation and a gold crisis. This view has nothing to do with what I have said or implied. What has concerned me is the extension of definite commitments for substantially larger expenditures, taken in the aggregate, not this or that recommendation, appropriation, or outlay.

(b) The Council notes that I have ignored the "latent surplus"—which, I take it, means the surplus that would emerge under conditions of full employment if both tax rates and expenditures remained unchanged. The truth is that, in view of the upsurge of Federal spending, I have taken it for granted that the "latent" or "implicit" surplus will rapidly dwindle, if not vanish. That seems to be the way in which things are working out. If present expenditure trends continue, whether or not my expectation that full employment will be approximated by the end of 1962 is borne out, it will prove very difficult to balance the budget in fiscal 1963.

(c) The Council appears to argue that, in the event it becomes clear that further stimulation of the economy would lead to inflation, monetary and fiscal brakes can be applied to prevent this from happening. I wish economic policies could be timed and executed with such nice precision. If experience is any guide, Federal expenditures are rarely reversible; they are apt to move sluggishly when they do happen to be reversed; and there is often a substantial lag between the time when monetary brakes are applied and the time they take hold. In the meantime, the economy may be damaged by inflation.

Testimony of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, Before the House Ways and Means Committee, August 10, 1961, on the Taxation of Mutuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. I commend to the attention of our colleague the following statement I presented on August 10, 1961, before the House Ways and Means Committee on proposed changes in the method of taxation of mutual thrift institutions:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning to testify against the proposed revision of the method of taxation of mutual thrift institutions.

This is a matter of great concern and one which—I know—all of us wish to see resolved in the fairest, most equitable manner.

For many years the commercial banks have been agitating for a change in the tax laws as they apply to mutual thrift institutions, on the pretense that they were seeking to correct a tax inequity. What they have been seeking to do, and what they seek the aid of this committee to do, is to create for themselves a competitive advantage—I dare say, an unfair competitive advantage.

Their principal gripe, even though they will not put it that way, is that savings banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions, operated as mutual cooperative endeavors, are permitted to and do pay a higher return as dividends and interest to their depositors and shareholders than commercial banks pay as interest on their savings and time accounts.

If the commercial bankers should succeed in this endeavor, as presently being considered by this committee, the higher tax that will be imposed upon these mutuals will require them to cut back the return to the mutuals' depositors, thus improving the competitive position of the commercials.

It is maintained by the proponents of these changes that mutual savings banks and savings and loan institutions enjoy an unfair tax advantage over commercial banks. Assuming that this inequity exists, I suggest that we eliminate it. Assuming that there is a different tax base for commercial banks than there is for mutual banks and associations, then if the commercial banks can make proof of their case, the tax base for each should be equalized with the other. The only inequality, however, that any commercial banker has thus far pointed out to me is that the amount of reserves a commercial bank may charge off, before computing its tax liability, is less than that permitted the mutuals. The simple way to remove that inequality is to permit the commercial bankers the larger reserve deduction if they are entitled to it. Thus far, they have been unable to establish to the satisfaction of the Internal Revenue Service that their reserve deduction is too low or that it should be increased. That requires no legislative action. The Internal Revenue Service can right that wrong, if there is one. That there is none is best proven by the fact that the commercials are not seeking any

such change. Mutual institutions, like every other individual or group of taxpayers will never be heard to complain about the reduction of taxes, if it is done fairly and without discrimination.

We must not overlook that bank reserves serve a twofold purpose—one to provide liquidity and the other to assure solvency. (I ignore at this time the manipulation of reserve requirements by the Federal Reserve System for credit purposes, because that does not enter into the tax problem.)

The power to tax is the power to destroy. This committee, however, and this Congress, I am certain will never use that power in that manner.

But you will come close to doing that if you increase the taxes on mutual thrift organizations. Their liquidity, their solvency, their usefulness, depend on their ability to build up their reserves.

I beg of you not to engage in a strictly banking function of determining what is or is not a proper reserve through the guise of a tax measure.

I am not raising the jurisdictional question that this is a proper subject for hearings by the Banking and Currency Committee. I am pointing out that this question is not as it has been made to appear, a simple tax problem. It is not. It has much greater implications. Before you have any right to change this tax formula you must determine that the reserves of these institutions are high enough for safe and sound operation and that such reserves must not be permitted to increase at the same rate as at present. I say all the proof is to the contrary.

In 1951, Mr. Chairman, the House and the Senate considered this same proposal—to impose a corporate income tax on the mutual savings banks. It was felt then that the Korean emergency demanded that such a tax be imposed. We determined then, however, as I think we must determine now, that the proper functioning of the mutuals requires that they be allowed to accumulate reserves, by deduction from gross income, to protect depositors against loss. The Congress at that time made specific provision in section 593 of the Internal Revenue Code to safeguard this very function of the mutuals. It is this provision of the Code that you are being asked to review and change.

I have carefully analyzed the arguments pro and con advanced on this subject by the financial institutions. I am convinced that the inequalities that the commercial bankers attempt to establish add up to a straw man. If there should be a tax on the mutuals before they pay the net earnings to their shareholders and depositors, then the interest which commercial bankers pay on their thrift and time accounts should not be a deductible expense before arriving at the taxable income of the commercials.

If the administration and the commercial bankers are serious in their contention for equality we should impose upon the commercial banks the same requirements we impose upon the mutuals by requiring that time and savings accounts in the commercials may be invested only in the same investments permitted to the mutuals. Let us further require that for those funds, the commercials must carry the same reserves as are required of the mutuals. It appears to me that this would remove the inequality that the commercial bankers insist is present. Let us not overlook a real inequality that exists: the mutuals are required to pay for the use of almost every dollar with which they operate (at least 93 percent thereof), while the commercials are permitted to use 70 percent of their resources (that is their demand deposits) free of cost.

The commercial bankers will dispute that statement by saying that they render a service to the owners of their demand accounts which costs the bank money. The fact is that, with rare exception, any demand account that does not pay its own way by service charges or otherwise is very quickly closed out by the bank.

Furthermore, the mutuals can use only their depositors' and shareholders' money for investment and can create no checkbook money.

Commercial banks are constantly creating, by their loans, new checkbook money, which after deducting a reserve, they can lend out all over again.

Under present tax law, both mutuals and commercials are subject to the same normal tax and surtax; both are subject to the same rate; both may deduct operating expenses; both may deduct taxes paid to State and local governments; both may deduct interest paid to depositors; both may deduct additions to reserves for bad debts; and both compute their reserve deduction differently than other taxpayers.

Mutual savings banks have a provision for reserve additions which takes account of their special needs. Except upon liquidation, these reserves can only be used for losses. As already indicated, the commercials can use their reserves as the basis for new loans and the creation of new checkbook money.

Commercial banks also have a unique formula that enables them to base their deduction on losses substained 30 years ago.

A heavier tax on savings banks, which would in turn reduce interest rates to depositors and thus reduce total savings, would reduce funds for home financing in the years ahead—one of the very things we must avoid if we are not to negate the gains made in this area by the passage of the Housing Act of 1961.

A heavier tax on mutuals would reduce the reward for savings by reducing the interest rate paid to millions of savers. This would first penalize the saver of modest means who prefers to save in a specialized mutual thrift institution.

Tax equality arguments of the commercial bankers are fallacious. Commercial bank income tax payments to the Treasury result mainly from their very profitable earnings from short-term commercial lending. They use their savings and time accounts in the same manner as their demand money.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that the need, the use and the amount of reserves should be judged on individual merit—there is every reason not to equalize these requirements between commercial banks and mutual and savings institutions. It is my conviction that to do so would result in serious consequences to our economic stability. A sound thrift system is as essential to national security as is immediate Treasury revenue.

I said earlier that 70 percent of the operating funds of the commercial banks is cost free to them. The figures are quite interesting. I use the year 1960 throughout.

Total assets of all commercial banks was in excess of $282,800 million. Of that their capital assets, including surplus, undivided profits and total reserves, were $41,800 million. Their deposits were $213 billion.

Bear in mind that they are prohibited by law from paying any interest on their demand accounts and the maximum interest most of them are permitted to pay on time and savings accounts is 3 percent. The mutuals must pay dividends on the full amount of all of their accounts. The commercials use in their income earning operations all of their deposit moneys less only the amount that they are required to carry as reserves pursuant to either the Federal Reserve Act, if they are members of the Federal Reserve System, or of State law if they are not in the System.

In 1960 they paid dividends to their stockholders of $832 million, an average of 7.4 percent of their income. In the same year they paid $1,785 million as interest on their time and savings accounts. All of that interest was tax deductible as an expense of operation before they paid any taxes. They paid out for salaries and wages 25 percent of their income as against only 7 percent paid by savings banks.

On the other hand, the mutual savings banks had total deposits of $36 billion and the savings and loan associations had total deposits of $58 billion. All of these moneys of course belong to the depositors. The savings banks earned and paid dividends to their owners of slightly more than $1 billion, or an average of 3.49 percent. Savings banks' total surplus and reserves were only $3,600 million. Savings and loan total surplus and reserves were about $4 billion.

Savings banks, out of total income of $1,600 million paid out 67 percent in dividends to their depositors for a total of $1,073 million, while adding to their surplus and reserve accounts $168 million, or 10.5 percent.

The savings and loan associations paid out 57 percent of their earnings to their depositors.

It should be borne in mind that the commercial banks can be required by the banking authorities to increase their capital when their financial condition requires it. The only way a mutual can improve its capital position is by increasing its surplus and reserve by additions thereto out of earnings.

I most respectfully direct your attention to the political impact of increasing the tax on mutual thrift institutions and thereby reducing the income or return to the depositors and shareholders in these fine organizations.

There are almost 37 million depositors in the mutual savings banks of the country. There are more than 27 million shareholders or depositors in the mutual savings and loan associations of the country. There are over 12 million depositors or shareholders in mutual credit unions. This makes a total of well over 76 million accounts that will be affected by what you do here.

Certainly you should not do anything until you hear from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as to what they think are required as proper reserves and at what rate those reserves must increase to keep our thrift system sound.

Bear in mind that FDIC today has total assets to insure its accounts of only $1.84 for every $100 of insured accounts and the FSLIC has only 67 cents for every $100 of insured accounts.

The one sure test of the sufficiency of the reserves of both the savings banks and the savings and loan associations is this:

Whenever the Congress can safely repeal the FDIC uncontrolled borrowing power from the Treasury of $3 billion and that of FSLIC of three-fourths of a billion dollars, the two systems will have built up sufficient reserves of their own to assure safety, soundness, and liquidity. Until then, we must not tamper with their reserves or the rate of growth thereof.

For those who might be inclined to feel sorry for the poor commercial banks, may I suggest they read the item in the American Banker of August 7, 1961, headlined "Bank Stocks Reach New High Level," which includes the prediction that an even better year is ahead for them, better than their best year thus far.

I urge you as strongly as I can, not to change the tax structure of these mutual thrift institutions at this time.

Cuban Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8689, which I introduced, calls for a complete embargo on goods to and from Cuba.

Earlier this year I called on President Kennedy to invoke a complete ban on Cuban imports and exports but to this day, Cuba is still doing business in many commodities with the United States. How ironic a situation, Mr. Speaker. How ridiculous, if it were not so tragic.

Ninety miles from our shores, Cuba, under the Castro regime, has become a Soviet satellite and its government has confiscated hundreds of millions of dollars worth of American property. Nevertheless, our Nation, acknowledged as the leader of the free world, continues to provide Dictator Castro with the cash which he desperately needs to maintain his antidemocratic, anti-U.S. regime. Time is long overdue for imposing and enforcing a firm embargo across the board to end this ridiculous and damaging contradiction.

In introducing this legislation I join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, PAUL ROGERS, who has provided superb leadership in this Congress to effectuate such an embargo. I am privileged to associate myself with him as cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill would effect such an embargo by banning all interstate shipment of goods imported into the United States from Cuba, and all goods destined for export to Cuba. It now seems necessary for Congress to take strong action and end the continuous flow of American dollars to the Castro regime. This bill would prevent the interstate transportation of goods to or from Cuba and would end the outflow of more than $1 million per month that Cuba still receives from this trade. This measure would further ban goods shipped from any third country through the United States to or from Cuba.

There is no excuse, no justification for the continuation of trade with Cuba. It is time to resolve the present paradox of our Cuban policy. We have, on the one hand, withdrawn diplomatic relations, branded Castro's government as Communist, supported free Cubans in their efforts for liberation, and cut the importation of sugar from Cuba into the United States. Yet, we still allow many other Cuban imports into this country in exchange for U.S. dollars, foodstuffs, and many other items whose exportation can only bolster the Castro regime.

Surely this policy cannot continue if we expect to advance freedom at full speed in Cuba. Positive action is necessary to hasten Castro's downfall. Mr. Speaker, I proudly join my colleagues who are fighting for this objective and call upon the Congress to enact a complete trade embargo which would help end this tyranny.

Klamath's Sheriff of Old West Practices Modern Penology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sheriff "Red" Britton of Klamath County, Oreg. has long been well known in our part of the country, both for the efficient administration of his office and for the unique museum and display maintained at the Klamath County Jail, which makes it a must for visitors to Klamath Falls. The Portland Reporter, in its August 7 edition, paid tribute to Sheriff Britton and it is a pleasure to call the article to my colleagues' attention:

KLAMATH'S SHERIFF OF OLD WEST PRACTICES MODERN PENOLOGY

(By Mary Ann Campbell)

KLAMATH FALLS.—Most law enforcement officers, in the tradition of the Royal Canadian Mounties, have to go out and get their man.

But Oregon has one sheriff whose job is greatly simplified because wanted men come to him.

This unusual sheriff who is sought out by criminals instead of the other way around is J. Murray "Red" Britton of Klamath County.

One such turned up at the sheriff's office on the second floor of the courthouse in Klamath Falls one day this spring and asked if Britton was looking for him.

"Heck, no," "Red" said, "What would I want with you?"

His visitor shrugged and left.

Twenty minutes later, Britton discovered he did indeed have a warrant for the man, on charges of contributing to the delinquency of a minor. City and State police began looking for the man, but "Red" assured them he'd be back.

He was right. The wanted man returned and again asked if the sheriff wasn't looking for him. This time, Britton told him he was indeed wanted and booked him.

Another man, charged with murder, drove his Thunderbird out to "Red's" house to give himself up. He arrived just as Red was sitting down to supper. Red invited him to join him, but the suspect had eaten, so he talked with the sheriff until the meal was finished. Then, the two men drove in their own cars to the county jail.

"Red" gets along well with his charges, both white men and Klamath Indians, because he encourages the men to work in their own trades or to develop trades while serving time in his jail.

Eddie Chiloquin, whose grandfather was the man the reservation town of Chiloquin was named after, has painted several pictures for the jail. His study of a buffalo hunt hangs in the jail office, his Indian horses are displayed over the piano in the small recreation room, and his religious paintings, copied from small Sunday school cards, hang in the hallways of each of the building's three floors.

A saddlemaker, Stephen Walcott, whose parole somehow got revoked this summer, spends his time in jail making saddles and repairing those used by the sheriff's mounted posse. He has made a magnificent black leather saddle with silver trimmings for use on special occasions and important parades. Financing for these projects largely comes out of "Red's" own pocket.

To provide the prisoners with reading material, "Red" has set up a small library of donated books, which contains such diverse titles as "Plutarch's Lives," "Chips Off the Old Benchley" and "Double Muscadine." There is a stack of back issues of the National Geographic, old school books and several Bibles, but more volumes would be welcomed.

Readers sit beside the bookshelf on a solid walnut bench made by "Red" in 1928 as a project for his eighth grade manual training class in Toppenish, Wash.

Because he believes the men in his care must keep some rights as human beings, "Red" has provided them with a television set in the recreation room and a subscription to the Klamath Falls Herald & News, the local daily. He also has a barber come in to give shaves and haircuts at prevailing union scale on certain days each week.

Britton is especially proud of the barber chair. It's 100 years old, and he found it in the town of Sprague River on the Klamath Reservation. Britton has had it restored, so it works as well as when it was brand new. He even has the original headrest with its paper roll to protect the customer's head.

In the evenings, he and such prisoners as have musical talent get together to play the violin, with "Red" providing terrific honky-tonk piano accompaniment. The piano is another item "off the reservation," as "Red" says. It's a four-pedal cabinet grand, made by Weser Bros., New York, and is probably close to the century mark also.

Outside the jail, "Red" and his charges maintain a little pioneer display, which originated during the Oregon Centennial in 1959. There are models of animals, an ox with marble eyes and a horse or two; a copy of an old-fashioned high-wheeled bicycle made by the prisoners, a model of a frontier fort and some old-style tombstones.

"Red" also has acquired the traces of the freight and passenger stagecoach that went between Klamath Falls and Lakeview many years ago. The garden is cared for by trusties, who are permitted to work outside without being under guard. Red believes in their word that they will not run away and can boast that he has never lost a prisoner since he took office on January 16, 1952.

His beliefs are also expressed in a sign hanging over the jail office.

"Our guests are human beings," it reads. "They are here as punishment, not for punishment."

This is a view prison organizations wish were held by more sheriffs throughout the country.

When a forest fire threatened large timber stands near Klamath Falls, Red took some of "my boys" out to help fight the blaze. During the firefighting some of the men were separated from the main group in the burning woods and made their way back to town on foot. State police picked one up on the road outside Klamath Falls and brought him to the sheriff's office, charging him with attempted escape.

"Red" hotly defended his prisoner.

"He wasn't escaping," he explained. "I let him out."

Odd though this statement sounds from a law enforcement officer, the system works. The man really was returning to the jail and "Red's" custody.

Temple University's Police Science and Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all Members

of Congress some new developments in police science and administration. A new curriculum in police science and administration was established at Temple University in September 1960, under the direction of Dean William A. Schrag, of the community college. The need for an organized program in this field was recognized by the Law Observance Committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association. A committee of local education and law enforcement officials, under the leadership of Harry D. Shargel, Esq., analyzed the needs and recommended a program of study which resulted in the curriculum in police science and administration.

The following courses are offered:

Police supervision and leadership; criminal investigation; criminal law and procedure; social aspects of police administration; police organization and administration; juvenile laws, crime, and delinquency; probation and parole administration; introduction to criminology; laboratory technique; evidence and court procedure; traffic engineering and control; personal property and sales.

Upon the completion of 16 credit hours of these courses a certificate is given to the student. If the student completes an additional 44 credit hours in the Community College of Temple University, he is awarded the degree of associate in science. Programs of this type go a long way in helping to make our police systems more efficient and the administration of law more effective. The program also points toward a solution of the problems of juvenile delinquency. I hope that all communities will take notice of this step forward and in some way follow this lead. I have included a copy of the professional program to show the details of the course:

A PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM IN POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION WITH THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE, COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION FACULTY

Edward J. Burke, B.S., M.S., Ph. D. in chemistry, police chemist, Philadelphia Police Department.

David L. Chomitz, B.S. in education, M.A., Ed. D., assistant professor of business and chairman of the business division, Temple University Community College.

Robert H. Coates, B.S., M.S. in Ed., director of school extension, School District of Philadelphia.

Harold E. Cox, B.A., M.A., Ph. D., assistant professor of social sciences, Temple University Community College.

John Freehafer, B.S. in education, M.S. in education, M.A., Ph. D., associate professor of English and chairman of the general arts division, Temple University Community College.

James W. Gaither, B.A., Ed. M., Ed. D., assistant professor of psychological studies and director of guidance, Temple University Community College.

Howard R. Leary, B.S., LL.B., deputy commissioner, Philadelphia Police Department.

James J. McNamee, staff inspector, Philadelphia Police Department.

Richard Overmyer, B.S., M.S. in C.E., deputy commissioner, department of streets, traffic engineering, city of Philadelphia.

John O. Reinemann, LL.B., LL.D., director of probation, municipal court, city of Philadelphia.

Ernest F. Roberts, B.A., LL.B., professor of law, Villanova University Law School.

Robert J. Selfridge, inspector, Philadelphia Police Department.

E. Preston Sharp, A.B., M.A., Ph. D., executive director, youth study center, city of Philadelphia.

Curtis Wright, Jr., B.S., J.D., LL.M., S.J.D., professor of law, Temple University Law School.

Charles P. Zerbe, B.S., LL.B., assistant district attorney, Montgomery County.

ESTABLISHED IN 1960

The curriculum in police science and administration, the first of its kind in the Delaware Valley area, was established at the Community College of Temple University in September 1960.

The need for an organized program in police science and administration was recognized at a law observance conference held by the Federal Bar Association. A committee of local education and law enforcement officials, under the leadership of Mr. Harry D. Shargel, analyzed the needs and recommended a program of study which resulted in the curriculum in police science and administration which offers the degree of associate in science from the Community College of Temple University.

The following sponsoring organizations and individuals jointly announced the establishment of the police science and administration program: Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president of Temple University; Dr. Allen H. Wetter, superintendent of schools; Mr. Albert N. Brown, Philadelphia police commissioner; Mr. Denis W. Gealer, past president of the Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Mr. G. A. McLaughlin, president of the Police Chiefs Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania and superintendent of police, Lower Merion Township; and Mr. Francis D. Deegan, superintendent, Fairmont Park Police.

The police science and administration advisory committee is composed of Mr. Albert N. Brown, Philadelphia police commissioner, chairman; Mr. Howard Leary, deputy commissioner, Philadelphia police, secretary; Lt. Col. Henry Bassetti, provost marshal, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot; Capt. Joseph Bonner, Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Inspector Philip J. Cella, Fairmount Park Police; Dr. Dalibor W. Kralovec, Philadelphia Board of Education; Staff Inspector James J. McNamee, Philadelphia police; Dr. William A. Schrag, dean, Community College and Technical Institute of Temple University; Staff Inspector Edwin S. Schriver, Philadelphia police; Mr. Henry D. Shargel, Federal Bar Association; Mr. Frank A. Sweeney, chief of police, Borough of Jenkintown and first vice president, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc.

POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATE IN SCIENCE

Elect eight courses (16 semester-hour credits):

Police science 1e: police supervision and leadership.

Police science 5e: criminal investigation.

Police science 9e–10e: criminal law and procedure.

Police science 11e: social aspects of police administration.

Police science 21e: police organization and administration.

Police science 25e: juvenile laws, crime and delinquency.

Police science 26e: probation and parole administration.

Police science 29e: introduction to criminology.

Police science 31e: laboratory techniques.

Police science 35e–36e: evidence and court procedure.

Police science 41e: traffic engineering and control.

Police science 43e: personal property and sales.

	Semester hour credits
Business 3e: personal finance	2
Business 4e: mathematics of business	2
Business 31e: law of business contracts	2
Business 32e: law of negotiable instruments	2
English 1e–2e: written communications	4
English 3e: public speaking	2
English 4e: advanced public speaking	2
English 12e: periodical literature	2
Psychology 1e: personal psychology	4
Psychology 2e: human relations in business	2
Secretarial 1e: elementary typing	2
Social Science 21e: American political institutions	2
Social Science 31e: contemporary social problems	2
Social Science 41e: contemporary political systems	2
Electives (any academic course offered by Community College)	12

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM—PROFESSIONAL COURSES LEADING TO A CERTIFICATE IN POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION

	Semester-hours credit
Police supervision and leadership	2
Criminal investigation	2
Criminal law and procedure	4
Social aspects of police administration	2
Police organization and administration	2
Juvenile laws, crime, and delinquency	2
Probation and parole administration	2
Introduction to criminology	2
Laboratory techniques	2
Evidence and court procedure	4
Traffic engineering and control	2
Personal property and sales	2

Upon the successful completion of 16 semester hours a certificate will be awarded. All law-enforcement personnel, attorneys, or individuals interested in professional police activities are eligible.

ASSOCIATE DEGREE

These 16 certificate credits may be used to satisfy part of the requirements for the associate degree in police science and administration.

To apply for degree status, you must file a Temple University application and take the Communist College aptitude test.

Advanced standing toward the associate degree may be requested for comparable degree courses taken at accredited colleges.

For class schedule and tuition, write to the Office of the Dean of the Community College, Cheltenham Avenue and Sedgwick Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Statement of Opposition to H.R. 207

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement I made in opposition to H.R. 207, a bill which would further limit the liability of shipowners in accident cases, before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on August 15, 1961:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 15, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for granting me this opportunity to present my views in opposition to H.R. 207.

H.R. 207 is a bill which would provide that claims arising under the admiralty or maritime law against any ship for personal injury or death (except members of the crew) shall be determined without respect to or based upon any warranty of seaworthiness or breach thereof.

On the surface, Mr. Chairman, this may sound like a fairly unimportant change in an obscure law. The effect of this change, however, is neither unimportant nor would it long remain obscure if the Congress passed this bill. This legislation would eliminate the protection of the shipowner's traditional warranty of seaworthiness from all except seamen.

The antiquated limitation of liability laws already prevent an adequate recovery by injured parties because of a limited fund made available to the victims of a marine disaster. The limiting language contained in the proverbial fine print on the back of a ticket further inhibits the right of recovery.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that commonsense dictates that the shipowner must stand behind the equipment used abroad a ship and—indeed—the ship itself. How can we say that he does not have to provide at least adequate safeguards in the operation of his business? What are we to do with those who suffer injuries as a result of the shipowner's laxness or ignorance? Leave them to find their own remedies? Surely the Congress cannot condone this kind of solution. Is it not more equitable that the loss sustained, when a person lawfully aboard a ship is injured by inadequate or defective equipment, should fall upon the shipowner than upon the injured party?

H.R. 207 would make an inadequate law more reprehensible in its application by encouraging shipowners and stevedoring companies to relax the high standards of care now imposed upon them by the doctrine of seaworthiness in port, and at sea.

It appears, Mr. Chairman, that a change in the law such as that advocated by H.R. 207 would benefit only the insurance companies by limiting the liability of the shipowners.

It seems clear that those who are termed "business invitees," longshoremen, railroad workers, etc., are in the same category as crewmembers. They run the same risks as crewmembers and sometimes greater risks. Passengers also are exposed to risks while aboard ship and the shipowners cannot justifiably escape responsibility for accidents which occur as a result of unseaworthiness.

The enactment of H.R. 207 would undercut the present responsibilities which shipowners must exercise with regard to those who are lawfully aboard their vessels, and I urge the committee to consider a revision of this whole antiquated body of law in the light of present maritime conditions and not take a step backward by reporting out H.R. 207.

LaGuardia Memory Lingers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several months ago, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke to the annual LaGuardia Memorial Association luncheon in New York City. His brief remarks were a fine portrait of one of the most remarkable political leaders of our time, Fiorello LaGuardia.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOUGLAS' eulogy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAGUARDIA: ST. GEORGE AND ST. VITUS

(By Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois)

The life of a politician is ordinarily written in water. He struts and frets his brief hour upon the stage and then, as ephemeral as the fruit fly, vanishes into the mists of time. Like the coral polyps, the more worthy of the species politician may indeed help to add their minute contribution to the rising island of civilization which slowly emerges from the sea, but rarely is this noticed for long. But compared with artists and authors, the politician is normally disparaged while alive and forgotten when dead.

It is quite otherwise, however, with Fiorello H. LaGuardia. He still seems vibrantly alive to the generation which knew him, and he is a living tradition to the youngsters who are pressing on behind us. Young men and women, and those not so young, remember his reading the funnies to them over the radio during a newspaper strike. Men still fancy they see the mayor riding firetrucks. He was a modern Haroun Al-Rashid exploring his Baghdad on the subway by night, slipping into flophouses to see how the down-and-outers fared, inspecting gutters to find out if they had been cleaned, and rushing into police stations to see if New York's finest were on the job.

Various sociological explanations have been advanced to explain Fiorello LaGuardia's success. He is said to have represented the eastern and urban outcroppings of American progressivism which had hitherto found its chief expression in the Midwest and the West, and previously to have been much stronger in the countryside than in the cities. He is heralded as the John the Baptist of the New Deal, but he, unlike John, did not lose his head even though various Salomes may have danced for it. He is also said to have embodied the revolt of the newer immigration from southern and eastern Europe, notably the Italian and Jewish Americans, against the older immigrant strains from northern Europe.

There is a great deal of truth in all of these explanations. I would even add another one. While most of the so-called native Americans were either holding themselves aloof from the rough and tumble of city politics in a sort of sterile disdain of the newer elements, LaGuardia followed an essentially integrating role in which he sought to make each and every group feel that it had an instrument to play in the orchestration of 20th century democracy.

LaGuardia was, in fact, a thoroughgoing progressive who believed that Government should be an instrument for human welfare. He believed in an investment in people. He fought for a greater equality of political and economic power so that all men and women might have enough power to be secure but not to have so much as to be able to oppress others. He was, therefore, a distributivist rather than a doctrinaire capitalist or Socialist.

But it is the warm, vivid, and admirable Fiorello that we love and not the sociological abstraction. LaGuardia was a chemical amalgam of many qualities. He was tenderheaterd and yet a hard-boiled political realist. He was implacably honest without the slightest touch of self-righteousness. He was brave as a lion with an effervescent energy that was tireless. He had a high sense of the dramatic and loved to act out his part on the center of the stage with the spotlight full upon him while his high-pitched voice squeaked out his political aria followed by an antiphonal in high chorus. He was indeed a cross between St. George and St. Vitus.

LaGuardia took on everyone, politicians, the tinhorns, the private utilities, even the newspapers. He was the living embodiment of God's angry man. And while his anger was sometimes misdirected, it generally went right straight to the mark. He gave to New York an administration which was honest, efficient, compassionate and completely unafraid.

The timid and ultragenteel continually criticized LaGuardia for his dramatic qualities which they said were unbecoming in a public official. Dramatic he certainly was. He loved the center of the stage and always wanted the spotlight focused fully upon him. This was partly due to his Latin temperament and his love of Verdi's operas, which caused his arch-rival Al Smith, with some show of justice, to refer to him always as "Rigoletto."

But this love for the exaggerated gesture and act was also the cunning tactic of an honest politician, who without firm political

or newspaper support, was trying to break through the sound barrier to the people of his beloved city and to convince them that there were great wrongs to right and that Fiorello H. LaGuardia was just the man to do it.

And so we revive ourselves in thinking about our tough political Sir Galahad. He gave us all a quickened sense of living—of a courageous living in noble causes, carried out, of course, with imperfections and with much circus hullabaloo, but with a relative success of intent and achievement. He showed us that a politician can be down to earth and realistic yet completely honest, devoted to the underdogs yet considerate of all. Vivid, dramatic, and unafraid, New York and the Nation will never be the same because of him, and the change is all to the good. God bless his memory.

TRIBUTE TO LAGUARDIA

As New York City enters upon a mayoralty-election year, we are pleased to be able to print a tribute to the late Fiorello H. LaGuardia by the distinguished U.S. Senator from Illinois, PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

A former member of Chicago's city council, Mr. DOUGLAS is familiar with big city government and the qualifications necessary for outstanding leadership in the executive branch of city government.

Senator DOUGLAS' tribute was delivered at the annual luncheon meeting of the LaGuardia Memorial Association, an organization formed by friends and governmental associates of the late mayor to perpetuate his ideals of honest, imaginative and responsive city government.

The Greatest Speech of Our Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Henry J. Taylor entitled "The Greatest Speech of the Century," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on August 9, 1961:

THE GREATEST SPEECH OF OUR CENTURY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Probably the greatest American speech of our century was Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur's address to Congress on his return from Korea.

Search all others, read this masterpiece again, and you will recall what I mean. Many men are full of good language and so are ghost writers, the playboys of the Webster world. But a truly great speech that requires not only superb language but great wisdom and great truth at a great moment from the heart of a great man. This is as far from ghost writing as $5 camera work is from Leonardo da Vinci.

General MacArthur wrote this speech flying in the *Bataan* from San Francisco to Washington to address the joint session the next day, and in longhand, much as Lincoln reportedly wrote the Gettysburg Address on an envelope aboard the train carrying him to immortality.

He could compose it because he understood it. He spoke the truth because he knew it. And when he had finished what he had to say—before the country's elected representatives—he sat down. He snorted proper contempt for the TV time, as if time had anything to do with intellect. He finished a half-hour early.

This speaker's great calling was liberty. Events full of terror and sorrow were at hand. Here was the needed reminder to his countrymen that the people who were in this war all the way were our men who ennobled the high, sharp Korean hills and lived on Heartbreak Ridge every day. And died.

Here was prophecy as revealing as a beacon light: the role of all southeast Asia in a predicted Soviet global plan to encircle Western Europe and the United States.

Here was hope: the dedication that we will live in a world where those of us who are Americans can be proud; where the statement "civis Americanus sum" will command respect everywhere and the conviction that we are worthy to do so.

Here was history tolling like an old and important bell: the mighty warning that mighty America, once having entered this major war, must not let it end in impasse because that would constitute defeat by the Sino-Soviet Communists and forever change the balance of power throughout the entire free world.

It was all spoken in less than 30 minutes and in 3,074 words.

All servile intellectuals who turn to political speechwriting are essentially library mice and phrasemakers at best, who do their adagio on demand. Can you conceive for one moment of a great man being a ghostwriter? And may I remind such captive intellectuals that when General MacArthur was graduated from West Point in 1903 his grades were then, and remain today, the highest ever given.

It is a roaring pity that General MacArthur ever was sucked into even the fringes of politics through the back door, the side door, or any other door by his admirers, for this was no place for him. His place was on the battlefield. With Lee, he was the greatest combat general ever born of our good earth, and indisputably the greatest field commander among all Allied or Axis belligerents.

No such scattered terrain, no such sweep of oceans, no comparable start on the heartbreaking pathway to victory, as was his from Pearl Harbor, ever faced a commander and his outnumbered forces since the first awful day of war in the history of the world.

The clever and the quick may come and go, the schemers and the plotters may come and go, those whose idea of life is to push and bite may come and go, and the self-seekers and opportunists may come and go; but this man will live forever in the imperishable memory of a grateful and free America.

Use of Telephone for Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Moscow Uses Phone To Embarrass Your Country," published in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, of which James Ward is the editor, on August 6, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MOSCOW USES PHONE TO EMBARRASS YOUR COUNTRY

One of the latest tricks of deception of the Communists is for a propagandist in Moscow to pick up the telephone and call someone in the United States. The conversation is taped, is translated with warped translation, and then the "doctored" conversation is broadcast as a "news" article.

At least three Mississippians have received such calls from a fellow named Sarkasov from Radio Moscow. They are Gov. Ross Barnett who was asked about jailing "freedom riders," Police Chief Murray Sills, of the Vicksburg Police Department, and the editor of the Jackson Daily News, both of whom were quizzed about the slanderous and erroneous propaganda issued by the NAACP that the Vicksburg trained police dogs were turned loose on women and children in Jackson during an attempted riotous demonstration in Jackson.

The Radio Moscow call to the police chief and the editor came on April 11 and the Governor's call a few weeks later.

Since that time calls have been put through to State Department and Pentagon officials in Washington, including Air Force Secretary Zuckert, says Insider's Newsletter.

Public officials and fellow members of the press are always happy to cooperate with a bona fide member of the press who seeks to reflect accurately the events of the day. But it should be remembered that when Moscow calls there is a propagandist on the other end of the line. His interest is against the United States.

The technique of using these telephone calls for propaganda purposes was recently revealed in testimony on the Communists' tactics of forging documents before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

A portion of the testimony by Richard Helms, Assistant Director, Central Intelligence Agency, might be helpful to citizens who might receive a call from Moscow.

The opening testimony by Mr. Helms dealt with "planted" articles in pro-Communist newspapers in Europe regarding the Algerian revolt. Obviously in an effort to capitalize on the political differences of the Challee revolt group and the Government of France to embarrass the United States, the accusation was made that certain American Government agencies, including the CIA and Defense Department, encouraged the revolt.

Continuing testimony on this subject, Mr. Helms said:

"On Sunday, April 30, Radio Moscow again broadcast the tale (of the Algerian-French dispute) to North America in English and to Latin America in Spanish, while Tass repeated it to Europe. In May the game continued, with Radio Moscow broadcasting the lie all over again to Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and this country, while Tass once more echoed the story to its European readers. Radio Moscow broadcast it to the Soviet Union, and Radio Sofia to listeners in Bulgaria.

"At this point the Soviets added a new twist to the act. During the past 2 months we have noted three calls directly from Radio Moscow to American newspapers and one to a U.S. police station. The alleged purpose is to check factual details picked by the Soviets from the American press. The real purpose is to record the conversation on tape. During the call the Soviet voice reads into the record a paragraph or two of selected propaganda. The edited tape, including the propaganda message and the preceding American comment, is then used in Radio Moscow broadcasts and Tass dispatches to make the propaganda sound like truth. This gambit was also used in support of the fraudulent claim that CIA supported Challe

and his colleagues. Radio Moscow recently telephoned the Washington Post and asked about a reference to the rumors in the Post's 'Letters to the Editor.' On the 5th of May an embellished version of the call was broadcast by Radio Moscow to Soviet listeners. The Soviets had perverted to their own purposes the standard Western practice of checking local sources."

Senator KEATING. Are you going into that more fully? I want to ask you a question or two about that.

Mr. HELMS. Yes.

Senator KEATING. In other words, the letter to the editor was presumably planted by Communist sources?

Mr. HELMS. It turned out, sir, in this case, that the letter apparently was a bona fide letter to the editor, but the caller simply took this letter, read it back over the telephone and added a couple of paragraphs of what the Soviets wanted to say about the letter.

Now the man on the other end of the line was talking at length, and when they got the whole conversation together on the tape, they had what they wanted. They could add their insertion while translating into Russian the American's quotation of the letter.

Senator KEATING. When they reproduced it, they put in their own additions as to what was in the letter in the Post and those additions were not in fact, in the letter?

Mr. HELMS. It wasn't quite that way, Senator.

As I understand it, this was a question of the correspondent for Radio Moscow calling someone at the Post.

Senator KEATING. Was it the local correspondent or did the call come from Moscow?

Mr. HELMS. It was a telephone call from Radio Moscow. This is as I understand it: They got hold of a man on the Post whose name is Gritz. He has to do with their world affairs section, and they simply said "Did this letter"—you know, they read it back—"appear in the Post?" The Post's man said, "Yes," and "What is this all about?" and they had a conversation. In the course of the conversation, the Radio Moscow man began to put in his propaganda twist, so that when this whole thing was recorded on a tape you had a fellow on the Post who was taken advantage of and he didn't know what the object of this exercise was.

Senator KEATING. He didn't know his conversation was being recorded?

Mr. HELMS. He didn't. And when actually they broadcast, they said his name was Green, whereas I am told it is Gritz. He was a perfectly decent fellow being made a fall guy.

Senator KEATING. Proceed Mr. Helms.

Mr. HELMS. The Challe slander shows four of the tricks used by the Soviets to nurse a little plant into a big lie. One is to print a local or planted rumor as a news article, using both bloc and free world papers as outlets. Another is to lend the tale a seeming authenticity by replaying through bloc media stories attributed to the Western press. A third device is the allegation that the current Soviet charges are proven by secret Western documents—documents that do not even exist as forgeries. The fourth trick is the tape-recorded telephone call.

The three Mississippians called by Radio Moscow didn't give the propagandist much elbow room for its tape recording. The Vicksburg chief told him where to go and hung up; the editor said he couldn't understand Sarkasov's language and the Governor answered only a few questions sketchily.

It is interesting to note that all three Mississippians were questioned about incidents created by both CORE and the NAACP, two outfits which are with knowledge or out of stupidity playing into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Having undergone this experience, we can suggest a few possibilities in case Moscow calls: 1. You can't understand; 2. Hang up on him (this will give the oversea operator fits, for the Russian will be persistent); 3. Tell him the latest Mickey Mouse episode you've seen and laugh in his face. (Mickey Mouse has been banned in Russia.)

Regardless of what you say, it will probably be used against the United States. He is calling for propaganda purposes, you know.

Preservation of Virginia Shoreline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleagues the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, have taken a leading role in an effort to prevent development from spoiling the beautiful shoreline immediately across from historic Mount Vernon in my northern Virginia district.

To both these fine friends I have personally expressed my deep appreciation and the appreciation of all those I have the honor to represent who share my pride in the home of the Father of our Country, George Washington.

Today I received a copy of a letter written by a lady living in Iowa, who expresses most eloquently the sentiments of thousands of our countrymen throughout the Nation. I believe this sentiment makes it incumbent upon the Members of this body to take the necessary legislation to preserve the shoreline there.

I deem it a pleasure to include Miss Anderson's letter in full so that all my colleagues may know her sentiments on this vital matter:

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
August 2, 1961.

THE MOUNT VERNON LADIES ASSOCIATION OF THE UNION,
Mount Vernon, Va.

DEAR LADIES OF THE MOUNT VERNON ASSOCIATION: Thank you for sending so promptly the postal card views of Mount Vernon recently ordered, and the inclusion of the copy of the 1861 sketch of the mansion, which I did not have and am pleased to add to my collection.

This acknowledgment is only incidental to what I am prompted to write. The information appearing in the news within the last week is very disturbing—to put it mildly—to those of us who have such deep feeling of interest and respect for the mansion of Mount Vernon, restored through the efforts of your association as a national shrine; its beautiful location, including the outlook across the Potomac River, the view that is in danger of being defaced and despoiled of its natural beauty by unsightly industry. I have reference to the proposed erection of a sewage plant on the Maryland shore directly opposite Mount Vernon, in sight of the mansion. We had heard nothing of this proposal until about a week ago, when we saw brief mention of it, and then, a detailed account, by Jack Wilson, of the Iowa Des Moines Register's Washington bureau, appearing in that newspaper's Sunday issue of July 30. And we cannot refrain from expressing our views on the matter.

When we think of the efforts through the years—from its beginning in Miss Ann Pamela Cunningham's determination to save the mansion from destruction, for posterity, and the continued efforts of all your loyal association members to carry on her work, and all the funds solicited and acquired to accomplish this purpose, expended in restoring to its present charm and delight the mansion that was the home of George and Martha Washington on the banks of their Potomac River, with its pleasing surroundings, including the tranquil scene across the river, appearing much as it was in the days of this owner—a patriotic shrine for all citizens to visit and enjoy, it stuns us to hear of this proposal to deface the landscape in this manner. Is there no spot of natural scenic beauty in these United States that is safe from the encroaching hands of modern progress? The "demon" progress, as one of my favorite travel-book authors terms it. Why does it happen that the Washington Suburban Sanitary District Commission should pick that particular spot on the entire length of the Potomac River for its unsightly project—with sinister purpose? It seems as though there is nothing of concern in the minds of many citizens—certainly not a patriotic thought—except monetary gain.

We notice in the newspaper account mention of an alternate site down the river which your association jointly with the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, and the National Park Service, are recommending, with your reasons stated for its being a more suitable location very much to the point. The location for this project can be changed. It is most certain the location of Mount Vernon cannot. Once the view is defaced, it is lost, irrevocably. Similar destruction in our own State makes us fully sympathetic.

We have enjoyed so much our visits to Mount Vernon, to see and admire the restored mansion—visualizing the home as George and Martha Washington lived in it, and we hope to see it again—with view unspoiled.

We are making our protests known to our Iowa Congressmen, and to the sponsors of the bills to declare the area opposite Mount Vernon on the Potomac a national park area, urging their utmost efforts to save it from despoilation, and we sincerely hope so many other citizens will take like action that there will be a landslide of protests in support of your efforts to save the view for Mount Vernon, resulting in success.

We trust this message may be brought to the attention of Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, Ohio vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, that she may know of our earnest interest. We note that she is also a Representative from Ohio, and the President of the Accokeek Foundation—the group of local residents that sponsored the initial fight to save the view.

Please pardon the length our our protest. We feel so strongly on the matter. I speak for my sisters and myself—three of us.

Very sincerely,

Miss DELVENA ANDERSON.

The Foreign Aid Program—Effect of Imports on American Industry—Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is this

week holding its 39th annual supreme convention at Miami Beach, Fla., where approximately 10,000 American Hellenes are gathering for the week-long meeting. Many of my constitutents of Hellenic tradition from Connecticut are attending. I wish them well at the convention and urge them to take effective action on civic, charitable, and public affairs programs which are a significant part of their work.

A few weeks ago, the Greek American Progressive Association held its 38th anniversary national convention in Philadelphia, Pa. Mr. Stavros Panagiotopoulos Pagios, district governor of GAPA for the 11th district which includes the State of Connecticut, submitted to me several resolutions passed at the convention which are noteworthy and of national importance, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-THIRD NATIONAL CONVENTION OF GREEK-AMERICAN PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION (GAPA) (A CIVIC, RELIGIOUS AND FRATERNAL ORGANIZATION OF GREEK-AMERICANS)

Whereas, the foreign aid program was formulated in 1947 with the principle purpose being to repair the ravages of World War II and to promote a swift recovery to Europe and other nations; and

Whereas as years passed, other purposes of foreign aid became evident such as raising the standard of living in certain areas of the world, and to halt the spread of communism and offset the drive by Communist Russia to make inroads in certain Asian and African countries by Communist aid to these certain countries; and

Whereas today, the many crises throughout the world, makes it more significant that the free nations of the world use every power in their command to hold firm and to give such aid to free and undeveloped nations as may be necessary to protect the position of the free world in its gigantic battle with the Communist nations, be it

Resolved, by the delegates to the National Convention of Greek-American Progressive Association on July 18, 1961, that the Congress of the United States enact a Foreign Aid bill in this session of Congress; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the leaders of both Houses of Congress.

TWENTY-THIRD NATIONAL CONVENTION OF GREEK-AMERICAN PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., RESOLUTION URGING SUPPORT OF STUDY OF IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON U.S. INDUSTRY AND LABOR

Whereas, approximately 30 industries are seriously affected by imports from foreign countries which have harmed said industries and the workers employed therein,

Whereas, said imports have affected industries and labor in many sections of the United States; and

Whereas there is pending in the U.S. Senate, Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 25) providing that the President appoint a commission to study the impact of imports on the economy of the United States of America, be it

Resolved by the delegates to the National convention of Greek-American Progressive Association duly assembled on the 18th day of July 1961, That both major political parties endorse Senate Joint Resolution 25 requiring said study of the impact of imports on the economy of the United States and that copies of the resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the leaders of both Houses of Congress.

RESOLUTION URGING A LIBERAL IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE LAW

Whereas, for many years both political parties have contained a plank in their platforms urging a more liberal immigration and refugee laws, and

Whereas a more concerted effort for enactment of such liberal laws must be made, be it

Resolved, by the delegates to the National convention of GAPA duly assembled, on the 18th day of July 1961, that the supreme lodge of GAPA prepare a concise and effective statement on why said immigration and refugee laws should be amended and liberalized consistent with the party platforms of both major political parties; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President and the leaders of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

America Must Not Fail Her Fighting Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, addressed to the gentlemen of the Congress of the United States, was forwarded to me by one of my constituents:

I find it necessary to attempt to bring to the attention of the Congress the disturbed feelings of men like myself, who may be asked to return to duty with the Armed Forces.

Our Nation has been advised by the President, that we must be prepared to answer the call of our country, to defend the principles for which our ancestors fought so hard to preserve. In the past, these calls have been unselfishly answered by Americans from all walks of life. In the past, however, our men could go to do battle in foreign lands, secure in the knowledge that the welfare of their loved ones was in capable and dedicated hands. No longer does this mutual reliance and trust exist.

A fighting man is being asked to face perils and hardships knowing that the Government officials are not waging the same war as that to which they send him.

A serviceman must read of the violations against the peace and safety of his fellow citizens within their own borders, when they find it necessary to board a commercial airliner.

He is asked to do battle with one country, while his Government is giving $460 million aid to an ally of that country through the United Nations.

He is asked to leave the protection of his family to an administartion which has in its ranks proponents of the idea to admit Red China to the U.N. and extend recognition to Outer Mongolia, one of the oldest Communist puppets.

He is told he must fight to stem the tide of communism, while the State Department and the Pentagon are discrediting or abolishing anti-Communist films and training programs for our citizens and servicemen.

He must be prepared to bear arms against a heavily armored foe while his government accepts gross violations against our sovereignty from the dictator of a small island off our coast.

He must be prepared to subject himself to attack by nuclear weapons of the enemy, which they may at this very moment be testing and improving, while his own government refuses to recognize the deceit of that enemy and the danger of continuing a nuclear test ban.

He is told by his statesmen that he must defend to the death our constitutional republican form of government, while a Socialist-dominated executive branch attempts every means possible to conduct business without consulting the elected representatives of the people.

He is called upon to sacrifice, while the Secretary of Commerce is issuing export licenses for the sale of farm products, which are subsidized by the American taxpayer, to Communist nations at 25 percent below the cost American users pay for them.

Are these the conditions under which the Members of Congress would send the young of our Nation off to war?

Never in the history of this Nation has America asked the young to risk their lives without giving them the peace of mind and pride of Nation, drawn from the realization that the people and the Congress had unity of purpose and trust in God and that they were taking every step and making every sacrifice to ensure the defeat of the enemy and his poisoned philosophies.

Gentlemen of the Congress, unless these situations are completely and undeniably rectified, and unless similar wrongs are avoided in the future, the morale and inspiration of the American fighting man will be greatly impaired. His courage and dedication to duty will lack the necessary foundation to bear the burden of the weight of battle.

The U.S. fighting man has never failed America. The Congress must take every step necessary to insure that America does not fail her fighting men.

You have your weapons, gentlemen. Do you have the stomach to use them? You're expecting our servicemen to use theirs!

JOHN A. HOULIHAN.
SANTA MARIA, CALIF.

"Third Giant" Vexing Soviet?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the progress of the West European nations for coordinating into an economic community, represents, from all signs, a forward step for the involved nations, individually and collectively. As well, it strengthens the free world effort to withstand the economic pressures of communism.

Obviously, Khrushchev recognized this fact. Consequently, the Communists are engaging in multipronged efforts to break up the Western community.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an article entitled "Third Giant Vexing Soviets?"

Reflecting the significance of greater unification of Western Europe as an economic bloc—not only for their own purposes, but also as a bulwark against the outspreading of communism—I ask

unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD GIANT VEXING SOVIETS?

WASHINGTON.—Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev was making another major speech in Moscow aimed at undermining the Western alliance at almost the moment that Secretary of State Dean Rusk was reporting to President Kennedy that he was encouraged about the unity and solidarity of the NATO alliance.

In his third speech in a week Premier Khrushchev pointedly warned that if the West unleashed a war the Soviets would deal crushing blows against Allied bases in Europe.

At this moment officials who had accompanied Secretary Rusk to his European conferences were reporting encouraging signs that the NATO forces in Western Europe could be built up to 30 divisions, that contingency planning on moves in a Berlin blockade was underway, and that France—previoulsy a holdout—had agreed that negotiations with Moscow would be useful later this year.

Premier Khrushchev added a new note in his latest speech—made at a Soviet-Rumanian frendship meeting in the Kremlin—when he seemed to stake Soviet prestige on the Berlin issue, declaring the German issue is "a question of the struggle for the acknowledgement of our greatness."

In a typical act, Premier Khrushchev emphasized his point by shaking his fist and shouting loudly to his audience.

Actually, many Washington officials believe that Premier Khrushchev, for all his bombast, is worried about the growing unity and prosperity of Western Europe. If Western Europe would find the will to match its current prosperity with equal military power, it would constitute a power base equal to that of the Soviet Union.

ON DEFENSIVE?

Mr. Khrushchev may believe that, with U.S. help, Western Europe will become this third giant in world power within 10 years. This may be why he is throwing his weight about and hurling threats now—to persuade the Western Powers to sign agreements over Berlin which will anchor and preserve Moscow's hold on that portion of Europe it now occupies.

In short, he may wish to nail down the "status quo" in the satellite (and East German) areas before the attraction and example of a prosperous Western Europe has its deteriorating impact on these areas.

BERLIN GUARANTEES

The Khrushchev speech, noted carefully by President Kennedy and his advisers, was a mixture of warnings and appeals but was not considered to represent any notable change in the Soviet position on the Berlin issue.

The Soviet Premier did seem, however, to spell out a little further the possible Soviet "guarantees" on Berlin, through the value to be placed on various phases remained problematical.

He recalled that he had specified earlier in the week that any Soviet-German peace treaty would include the West's access rights to West Berlin.

"The Soviet Union has rights to West Berlin.

"The Soviet Union has no intention to change the mode of life of West Berlin," Premier Khrushchev continued. "Nobody's prestige will suffer.

"We agree to recognize West Berlin as a free city and to provide it has free contact with the outside world. We want to protect it with sound international guarantees, and the four powers could be the guarantors."

NEGOTIATION SEEN

Meanwhile, at the White House Secretary Rusk, reporting to President Kennedy, told newsmen that "we can expect a negotiation" on Berlin. On the question of timing and the contents of the negotiation, however, Mr. Rusk said that British Foreign Secretary Lord Home had put it well when he said:

"When you are playing a game like this, you do not show your cards in advance."

The United States, it was made clear, hopes that the Berlin problem can be solved by normal peaceful procedures, but it realizes that Moscow's aims concerning Berlin are quite different from those of the West.

Some U.S. observers noted a contrast between the intentionally calm treatment given Berlin by President Kennedy at his weekly press conference and the tough talk by Premier Khrushchev. The Washington hope is that the observing world will draw its own conclusions as to who is being belligerent, the most dangerous, and, actually, the most irresponsible.

U.S. BASES FELT

Premier Khrushchev told his audience that when Italian Premier Amintori Fanfani had informed him that Italy had missiles hidden in orange groves, and when the Greek Ambassador to Moscow had said that surely the Soviets would never attack the Acropolis, he had replied: "Bombs cannot choose. If we are attacked, I will order an attack against all bases."

The Soviet Premier seemed concerned that the West was still wedded to the policy of "rolling back communism." The real reason the Western Powers opposed a German settlement, he said, is to be found in their ambition to take over East Germany and eventually destroy the Communist movement.

Perhaps his main worry concerning his satellite empire came to the surface here.

"The capitalist countries cannot impose their philosophy, their way of life on us, cannot force the Socialist countries to turn back," Mr. Khrushchev said.

Plight of the Glass Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry has always had a special significance for the portion of Maryland which I represent. In the 18th century some of the finest glassware ever made in America was produced by John Frederick Amelung at his New Bremen works near Frederick, Md. Examples of his art are preserved at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, at Mount Vernon, at the Maryland Historical Society and the Historical Society of Frederick County. For economic reasons, the Amelung enterprise did not survive into the 19th century.

It is not without significance that my distinguished predecessor, the late Frederick N. Zihlman had begun his career as a glassworker and a member of the glassworkers' union. His election to seven terms as a Republican Member of the House of Representatives reflect the high esteem in which his craft and his union have traditionally been held in the Sixth Congressional District.

Recently the Washington Post noted that one of our established glass factories, the Cumberland Glass Co., is closing its doors. The article which was printed in connection with the remarks of our colleague, Representative JOHN H. DENT of Pennsylvania, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27 stated:

The Cumberland Glass Co., Maryland's last producers of hand-made glass, will douse its white-hot fires for the last time.

For further comment on the plight of the glass industry I append an interesting letter that I have received from H. B. McCoy, president of the Trade Relations Council for the United States, Inc. While all of Mr. McCoy's opinions may not be universally shared, I feel that it is a candid and sincere comment of value in comprehending all the problems of the glass industry:

TRADE RELATIONS COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

Hon. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATHIAS: The closing down of the Cumberland Glass Co. has received a great deal of publicity in area newspapers. According to the Washington Post and Times Herald, the principal reason for the closing of this plant is the inability of the management to recruit an adequate staff of trained glassworkers. This is only part of the story.

During my career in the Department of Commerce, I had the opportunity to observe, in a detailed manner, the affairs of the handblown and pressed glassware industry. It has been a declining industry for over 20 years. The decline began in the late 1930's when U.S. import duties on these products were reduced substantially by a trade agreement. The lower tariff rates not only resulted in an increasing volume of imports (except during the war) but depressed domestic price levels to the point where domestic factories could not compete with the imports. As you know, plants making this type glassware folded up not only in Maryland but in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and elsewhere. I recall visiting some plants some years ago where, with the permission of the owners, the workers banded together in a cooperative to produce glassware on their own account. The worker groups borrowed money to finance their factory expenses, produced a quantity of glassware, and then offered their products at auction for whatever they would bring. The money received was used to pay off their debts and the balance was divided pro rata among the workers. A considerable number of glassworkers were able to earn a bare subsistence by this method for a period of time.

The closing of the Cumberland plant is attributable only incidentally in the newspaper account to imports and competition from machine-made glassware. As in many other consumer products, there is assumed to be direct competition between the custom or handmade products and so-called machine-made products. Actually this competition is more apparent than real. Those who buy mass-produced machine-made products, for one or more reasons, are generally not very interested in the handmade quality lines. If imports of handmade glassware had never interfered with the domestic market, it is probable that the domestic handblown products would have enjoyed a constant if not increased sale.

It is my guess that with the greatly increased per capita income in this country, the handmade glassware industry, without damaging foreign competition, would be in a relatively prosperous situation today. I believe it is a fact that as domestic produc-

tion has disappeared, the prices of imported handmade products in this market are increasing. This has been the situation in other products where imports have largely or completely displaced the domestic industry.

Those who have passionately supported the trade agreements program, and are now advocating an all-out free trade policy for this country, will point to the Cumberland Glass Co. as a victim, not of import competition, but of inability to find trained workers willing to work for the wages this industry can afford to pay. The argument is also advanced that an industry such as this is marginal, has not and probably cannot be further mechanized, is a high cost product, and an uneconomic utilization of resources. It is said that by abandoning the glassware market to imports, we advance the interest of our foreign policy, provide consumers with lower prices, and force both capital and labor into more desirable economic activities. The Cumberland region has long been a surplus labor area. If there were either existing or prospective other industrial and business activities in Cumberland that could in a reasonable time absorb the economic loss incurred through the closing of the Cumberland Glass Co., perhaps there would not be much concern, at least locally, about the sacrifice of domestic jobs to promote full employment abroad of handcraft workers. The older glassblowers at the Cumberland plant will probably retire anyway, but the younger workers will be on the street until they find other employment.

As an official of the National Production Authority during the Korean war, I was involved in the administration of an amendment to the Revenue Act which granted accelerated depreciation (5 years) for new production facilities designed to expand our national output in many industries. Another glass manufacturer was awarded accelerated depreciation for its plant in Cumberland. The economic and employment situation in Cumberland was one of the factors influencing the Government's decision to provide this tax incentive for location of the plant in Cumberland. You are aware, of course, that imports of flat glass have been substantially increasing during the past few years. In a recent decision, the U.S. Tariff Commission found that the domestic industry was injured by imports of sheet glass but divided on the question of injury with respect to another type of flat glass. As I recall, the Cumberland plant produces plate glass. This product is also, I believe, vulnerable to low-cost import competition, especially from European sources. Since 1934, through trade agreements, U.S. import duties on plate glass have been substantially reduced. The administration appears to disregard or bypass the safeguards for domestic industry in the Trade Agreements Act. In the event that imports of competitive plate glass should reach levels that would adversely affect the operations of the Cumberland plant, there is little hope that the Government would take any action either to reduce existing or to limit future imports.

The glassblowers and their union policies have, to some degree, contributed to the situation in this industry. The glassblowers union, one of the oldest craft unions in this country, has been generally successful year after year in bargaining for higher wages. When the industry began to lose ground against imports years ago, with employment decreasing in the factories, the skilled workers could not very well be blamed, if they did so, for restricting apprenticeship. Also, it is reasonable to suppose that young men would not be attracted to apprenticeship in this craft if they know anything at all about what was happening to the industry. I am not critical of the workers' desire for and success in obtaining the wage levels they enjoy. I wonder if the workers have been equally diligent and aggressive in actions to protect their jobs. In any event, it would hardly be expected that any American labor union would have been willing to accept wages which would make its industry competitive with plants abroad when the foreign wages are only a fraction of the domestic rate.

Although never admitted, I know for a fact that the officials in Government responsible for the trade agreement program have always considered the hand-blown glass industry, among others, as expendable "in the national interest." Government officials never had the courage of their convictions to warn both management and employees of this attitude toward their industry. Instead, the Government has consistently maintained that reductions of import duties under the Trade Agreements Act has not been responsible for the problems of this industry, but rather that these problems arise from a variety of internal factors in the domestic industry. The hand-blown glass industry will not entirely disappear from the American scene. Firms here and there will maintain production of high-quality, custom-made specialties either at a profit or purely for prestige reasons regardless of profit or loss. There is considerable production of glassware for technical uses which requires skilled glassworkers. Perhaps some of the workers in the Cumberland Glass Co. might find employment in these pursuits although they would probably have to leave Cumberland.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. McCoy, *President.*

Retraining: One Step in Answering Employment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday, August 12, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried an editorial commenting on the problems and possibilities of retraining as an answer to the unemployment situation we face in our society. This editorial covers one of the areas studied by the Republican policy committee's "Operation Employment," an investigation of the problems and successes that the dynamism of the American economy has brought to this country. The points which the editorial makes are sound; viewed in the broader context of situation as discussed in "Operation Employment," it makes a constructive addition to the thought that has been given to the question of employment and unemployment.

This editorial points out, as did an article which I inserted in the RECORD earlier—"The Hard Realities of Retraining," Fortune magazine, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 11366–11368, July 10, 1961—that the retraining road is not easy. They point out the hurdles which must be cleared before progress can be made in this phase of our efforts to overcome the employment problems which our dynamic economy has created. I should like to place this St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE USES OF RETRAINING

The administration's plan for retraining unemployed workers has received committee approval in both Houses of Congress and enjoys good prospects of passage at the current session. We look for constructive results if it is given a fair trial. And fairness, in turn, demands that it must be accepted for what it is: not a cheap instant panacea, but a form of education, which to acquire substance, requires money, time and patience.

Even before a federally backed retraining program for the jobless generally has been enacted, much less put into application, the idea is being disparaged in some quarters because it has not worked overnight miracles where those have been attempted. Armour & Co.'s retraining program at Oklahoma City and the Belgian Government's attempt to retrain displaced miners in the Borinage district have been cited as evidence that relatively little can be expected.

Whether or not these were fair tests may be judged in part from the fact that only $265 a man was invested in the Belgian experiment and $150 in the Armour program. Reeducation for productive work can hardly be expected to come that cheaply. The Armour effort suffered from the further faults that nearly two-thirds of the applicants were rejected as untrainable—a shockingly casual approach, in the view of the U.S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—and the relatively few who were given retraining were cast adrift on a distressed labor market without any attempt to find them new jobs.

Retraining will do little enough, indeed, if it begins with the defeatist attitude that most displaced workers are unretrainable and ends by doing nothing to put the retrained workers back into productive use. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation itself is a shining example of how much can be done, even under adverse circumstances.

It deals only with the physically or mentally handicapped, and resists regarding any worker as untrainable. It has retrained more than 1,200,000 workers in the past 41 years, and placed 3 out of every 4 in jobs. But it spends about $2,000 to counsel, train, and place one person, and works on the practical assumption that the kind of work it is attempting takes a lot of time. What this agency has done with the physically or mentally handicapped, surely other agencies may accomplish with workers not so handicapped.

Technological displacement of workers, principally by automation, is already a major national problem and shows every evidence of becoming a still larger one as time goes on. There are many ways of cushioning the shock but the one means of conserving these sinews of the labor force for continued and growing national productiveness is retraining.

Let us not expect too much too fast and become discouraged because it does not happen. Let us accept retraining for what it is. That should not be too hard to do in a Nation long committed to the ideal of universal education. The going will be slow and costly, there will be disappointments and setbacks—but what is achieved will be solid, and there is no acceptable alternative.

That Sinking Feeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the weekly newspapers in my district, the

Snohomish County Tribune, published an editorial in its July 27, 1961, issue that I believe will interest Members of Congress who feel, as I do, that the Government should not spend beyond its income.

The editorial follows:

SIX MONTHS—SIX BILLION

A fact that should give every taxpayer of slightly conservative stripe a sinking feeling in the pit of the stomach is that the Kennedy administration has managed, in the course of only 6 months, to run up a deficit of $6 billion dollars. At least, reliable administration officials are predicting that is how far in the hole we will be as a result of spending this year.

We are trying to spend our way out of a recession. At the same time we are trying to spend our way to peace in the world. We have our doubts that this is a wise or safe course. What if our billions fail to put our unemployed back to work or establish any more peaceful a condition in the world than we now have? Will it take a deficit of $8 billion next year; and $10 billion the next?

Can it be that the world will be plunged into war if our defense expenditure and foreign aid outlay are not increased by $2 or $3 billion? Will the country pitch back into a 1929 depression if our domestic spending isn't upped by a billion or so? We are yet to be convinced that there isn't enough waste in our $40 billion defense effort to lop off from unessential areas the money needed to keep our war machine up to date.

President Kennedy and his brilliant Harvard professors seem no more eager to tangle with entrenched Federal bureaucracy than was his predecessor—in fact, much less so. They seem oblivious of the danger of a resumption of runaway deficit spending.

Being scholars, they should know that throwing tomorrow's dollars around today can have no more effect on world conditions than yesterday's dollars did the day before. They should know that what we need is a greater outlay of grit and courage; a greater ration of brains and determination; more confidence and inspiration.

These are commodities we can spend to our heart's content. And until we begin using them, no amount of money is going to do any good.

The Peace Corps—Shaping a World Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, in response to the 1961 annual questionnaire sent by me to every fifth registered voter in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, 61.9 percent of those answering approved a Peace Corps for oversea service if volunteers are carefully selected and trained. Twenty-seven and one-tenth percent voted in the negative, and only 11 percent failed to express an opinion.

The hope inherent in the proposed Peace Corps and the enthusiastic response thereto is signalized in an editorial appearing in the Independent-Register of Libertyville, Ill., on June 29, 1961:

THE PEACE CORPS—SHAPING A WORLD REVOLUTION

(By James W. McCulla)

Housing, clothing, food and medical care provided. Chance for adventure in foreign lands. Pay $75 per month.

Sound like the Army?

It is.

But it also is the new Peace Corps (address Washington 25, D.C.).

There likely will be some marked differences between the Peace Corps and the Army, however.

WHEN IN ROME

When you join you are not guaranteed a barracks with indoor plumbing or meals which measure up even to American-oriented GI chow.

When in Rome, you know.

It is doubtful that dispensaries will be close at hand all the time and you won't be paid until your 2-year hitch is concluded.

And even if you like hard labor in some exotic land it is doubtful now that they will even let you re-up. The final kick in the teeth.

Obviously only dedicated people are candidates for an outfit like this.

And that, precisely, is what the Peace Corps wants—dedication.

"The Peace Corps' enemies are hunger, poverty, and ignorance," said Jim Gibson, acting director of public affairs for the Corps. He was in Highland Park over the weekend to address the annual convention of the American Legion's second Illinois division.

Mr. Gibson is somewhat typical of Peace Corps members. When top Corps officials, most of whom are in their early thirties, decided they needed someone on the staff a bit older they asked Mr. Gibson. In spite of the fact that he held a comfortable, secure position with the Department of Agriculture as assistant director of information and chief of the motion picture service, and has 26 years of Federal Government service under his belt, he jumped at the chance.

"It's an inspiration to work with these people," Gibson, who was a light colonel in the Army during the war, said. "They come to work at 9 but don't close shop until midnight. This is one outfit in Washington moving with genuine enthusiasm and spirit."

The Peace Corps is peopled chiefly by young folks. But membership is not necessarily limited to young people. The minimum age is 18, but there is no upper limit.

As soon as it became apparent that the Corps would come into being after John Kennedy's election, thousands upon thousands wrote to Washington asking for information about it. Names were filed and on May 27 and June tests were administered to volunteers. As of last Saturday there were 4,265 men and 2,069 women volunteers declared eligible for duty.

MOST VOLUNTEERS YOUNG

Of these 3,588 are in the 21 to 25 age group, The next group is 26 to 30, followed by 18 to 20, 31 to 35, and 36 to 40, in that order. Thirty-four volunteers are more than 66 years old.

Six thousand of the volunteers are single, the rest married.

There are 3,942 who have finished 4 years of college, of which 1,539 have done graduate work. There were 521 with high school educations.

Like the Army, lack of formal academic education is no barrier to Peace Corps membership. The cattle puncher who has never seen the inside of a school building, the plumber who learned it all from his father, the man who learned to cut trees in the Pacific Northwest as soon as he was out of the cradle are needed if the Corps feels they are capable of passing on their skills to a native in Tanganyika or a peasant in Colombia.

Doctors, dentists, nurses, educators, engineers, physicists, carpenters, dynamiters, bulldozer operators, high-wire men are welcome.

What's the point of it all?

REVOLUTION GOING ON

There is a revolution going on throughout the underprivileged and backward nations of the world, Mr. Gibson says. The people of these lands are emerging from ignorance. They have learned that there can be a better life. They see how the white man lives. They see pictures in magazines. They hear talk about other lands. They want the same things and they want it right now. Either we will show them how to get it or the Communists will show them because the Communists are aware of this revolution too. But when the Communists come, they bring more than material aid. They bring their own system of totalitarian government.

"If we can recognize this revolution and do something about it we'll help them and help ourselves," Gibson declares. "We want to see these nations become just that—nations—strong in their own right, free and independent, not satellites of Soviet Russia."

But, more important, pure humanity demands that we help these people. Gibson is quick to say and declare this is the Corps' prime motivation.

The idea of an organization of people transmitting their individual skills for the enlightenment of impoverished people is not new by any means. Organizations such as CARE, Medico, the major religious denominations, the International Volunteer Service, to name only a few, have been doing just that for years.

LIKE POINT 4

President Truman's point 4 program did exactly what the Peace Corps intends to do—send technical experts overseas at U.S. Government expense to teach the unskilled how to shape a better life. Point 4, by the way, was one of the least costly of American foreign aid ventures and one of the most effective.

Prior to formation of the Peace Corps, Minnesota Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced and saw passed a bill authorizing $10,000 to study the feasibility of establishing a point 4 Youth Corps. The University of Colorado got the job of making the study. But prior to the time the study was concluded John Kennedy was elected President and brought the Peace Corps into being by Executive order. The study later substantiated Kennedy's move.

The President used his powers under the Mutual Security Act to set up the organization and the Budget Bureau allowed $5 million to begin operations.

On May 31 Senator HUMPHREY introduced in President Kennedy's behalf a bill, which, if it passes, will provide the statutory authority the President feels is necessary to build a long-range Peace Corps program. The initial appropriation (covering 1 year) would be $40 million.

Until last Saturday the Corps had accepted four projects: to train young Tanganyikans to build feeder roads from agricultural areas into the main towns; to help build roads, schools, dig wells, stock fish ponds, raise farm animals, and set up recreation programs for children in Colombia; to serve as educational aids in Philippine elementary schools; and teach cultivation, horticulture, small animal husbandry, animal vaccination, carpentery, first aid, hygiene, child care, and similar things in Chile.

NEW PROJECT

Saturday, Gibson announced simultaneously with an announcement from Washington that the Corps has taken on its fifth project: to improve animal husbandry, develop feed mills, increase vegetable production through irrigation, teach soil conservation, encourage a newly organized 4–H club, assist in teacher training programs and home economic education on the Island of St. Lucia in the West Indies Federation. Only 12 volunteers will be sent to St. Lucia.

Sometimes Peace Corps people will be turned over to volunteer agencies such as CARE which already knows what is needed and has projects going. Sometimes the Corps will handle the project itself.

More than 50 nations have asked for Peace Corps aid but whether they get it or not will depend upon whether volunteer skills available make the goal of the particular project possible.

Why do people in the prime of life, many of whom are just out of school, willingly give 2 years to hard labor facing the possibility of being drafted into the Army for another 2 years when they leave the Corps?

It is very simple. "They want to do something for their country," Gibson says.

EVERYONE HAS STAKE

Everyone has a stake in the Peace Corps too, he says. "If you can't join you can get behind the Corps by spreading information about it to those who can join or who might be of aid to the Corps in the future." Included in the latter category, for example, would be an industrial executive who might be requested to grant a leave of absence to some skilled engineer or technician as the Corps' program advances.

Has the Corps had any critical press? "Not critical, but rather dubious," Gibson says. But the dubious press is strictly a minority voice. The majority of the press has applauded the establishment of the Corps.

It is not difficult to understand this enthusiasm. The Nation is involved in a mortal struggle with a great enemy—communism. Hundreds of thousands of people in this Nation want to do something to help their country, other than merely lending moral support. And now, at last, there comes an opportunity to get into the thick of the battle for freedom with both body and soul. Now when youth says "I want to do something" the Nation has something tangible for them to do.

Every Objection to Foreign Aid Can Be Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, all of us, who believe basically in offering assistance to other nations, have been exposed to all of the common objections to foreign aid. Seldom have I, however, seen them dealt with more effectively than in an editorial which appeared recently in the Longview, Wash., Daily News, and also an editorial from the Daily Chronicle in Centralia, Wash. It would make worthwhile reading for every member of Congress. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FOREIGN AID COSTLY BUT WE NEED IT

Since the Second World War, the United States has spent a total of $84 billion for foreign aid. In the 14 years from 1946 to 1960, that is, foreign aid has accounted for the equivalent of one full fiscal year's budget at the current high rate. Put another way, we could declare a moratorium on all taxes for 1 year with the money spent for foreign aid, even at the present high cost of the Federal Government.

These are some of the thoughts that run through the minds of Members of Congress as they face up to another foreign aid bill. This one involves $4.8 billion for the fiscal year begun July 1 and a $26 billion package over the next 5 years, to be spent on the authority of the President without the annual congressional review, for low-interest long-term loans that would enable the recipients to plan well ahead. It is an idea that had been put forward repeatedly by President Eisenhower and now by President Kennedy.

That foreign aid is unpopular with Congress has always been known. It has increased the productivity of foreign industry and made them a stronger competitor; as emerging nations are developed to self-sufficiency, they can reduce further American markets abroad, if not offer direct competition; and it increases the flow of American dollars and depresses the balance of payments.

However, there is no question about the fact that it would cost far more to finance the same amount of security in the American Military Establishment than the foreign aid funds now provide by strengthening the economies and military forces of our friends and allies. Despite such failures as Laos, foreign aid has helped hold back the aggressors around the world.

Thanks largely to the recent belligerence of the Moscow-Peiping axis—in Cuba, in Laos, in Africa, in Berlin—congressional opposition is giving way. The chances of passage of the foreign aid bill substantially as presented have improved with each saber-rattling speech and gesture. It is still our cheapest and best security insurance abroad.

EVERY OBJECTION TO FOREIGN AID CAN BE ANSWERED

President Kennedy is trying to push his foreign-aid program through Congress, and like other Presidents before him, he's finding rough going.

Foreign aid is such a complex thing, and so new, that even the experts cannot keep track of it all. It is no wonder then, that normally intelligent people dismiss the projects with a shrug and comment "charity begins at home." But the basic concepts, and the aims of foreign aid can be understood.

The motives are both moral and politic. Western civilization has reached the highest prosperity in the history of mankind. Yet two-thirds of the world's people are living little better than animals, not always sure they will have something to eat tomorrow. Therefore we should endeavor to use our abundance to some extent in helping others. There is no justification for being selfish.

Political motives for foreign aid are more pressing though no less important than the moral ones. The revolution in the West has seen common people, like ourselves, rise to heights undreamed of in underdeveloped countries. Undreamed of, that is, until recently. Now they see a better life for themselves is possible and they're impatient. They want advantages now, not later, for themselves. And the Communists emphasize the democracies took centuries to develop. But, they say, look at what has been accomplished in Russia and China in a few years. And the underprivileged blind themselves to the human suffering these advances cost.

We must get a line into these undeveloped countries and help them. Help them into our camp. Of course foreign aid cannot do it all, and only the program's critics say that is the intention of foreign aid. The aid has been criticized, often rightly so. Below are nine of the criticisms most often heard of foreign aid.

"It costs too much." Kennedy has asked for $4.8 billion—$27 each on a per capita basis. We spend $58 a year on alcohol. It is less than 1 percent of the gross national product which is growing by about 2 percent a year.

"Too much money is wasted." There is terrific waste, just as there is in the Armed Forces. But the good the money has done far outweighs the waste. The successful projects seldom make front page news.

"You cannot buy friendship." True, but many of us expect to buy admiration and envy. And friendship is not gained by refusing help either.

"It hurts American business." We have helped rebuild West European and Japanese economies, and their industries often compete with ours. Sometimes this hurts. But often forgotten are the 750,000 Americans whose jobs depend on foreign aid expenditures. Roughly 80 percent of foreign aid funds are spent here for things underdeveloped countries need. When they're on their feet they become out and out customers.

"The aid has not stopped communism." It wasn't intended to, but it does help. Europe, Japan, Turkey, and India are examples. In places like China and Laos we hoped aid alone would do the job, but it didn't.

"We aid nondemocratic governments." We have several times, notably in Latin America, with disastrous results. But democracy does not come easily. Even France and West Germany are uncertain democracies, so how can we expect countries with 80 percent illiteracy to develop pure democracies? We should aid only those countries which are encouraging social and economic reform, and use the aid as a lever to get the reforms. We need these people as customers.

"We are encouraging socialism." Socialism is the best thing in many countries with no capital. And besides, who is socialistic? Our Government dominates an estimated 20 percent of the economy, while in socialistic India only 10 percent is government dominated.

"The underdeveloped peoples aren't working hard enough." Their only aim, for centuries, was to earn a subsistence. They can be encouraged, and they are being encouraged by the Communists.

"We may fail." It would be naive to say success is certain. Only the results of doing nothing are certain.

It is well to note that no critics of foreign aid have come forward with an alternative. Perhaps the alternative is too horrible to contemplate.

Price of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the House this week considers President Kennedy's long-term foreign aid proposal, I think it fitting to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the Members to peruse, an editorial printed in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of Monday, August 14, 1961, entitled "For-

eign Aid Passes A Test," and an article by Columnist Bruce Biossat printed in the Springfield Union on Tuesday, August 15, 1961, entitled "Price of Liberty."

FOREIGN AID PASSES A TEST

Wisdom in politics would seem to dictate against staking one's personal prestige on issues where a cause is unclear and success uncertain. But that is what President Kennedy is doing with his foreign-aid program, and so far he is winning in an uphill battle.

The odds have been against him on two counts. First, foreign aid is poorly understood by the public, it has been weakly administered in many places, and, even where results are achieved, they are undramatic. Second, the recipients of foreign aid do not vote in America; the American voters get only the bill. These factors work on Congress to the jeopardy of the program, and their weight is increased when a major change is afoot such as the President's plan for long-term authority to borrow directly from the Treasury without annual appropriations by Congress.

This so-called back-door spending concept is not new. The dike was breached with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation plan in the early 1930's. The hole has been enlarged since by Congress authorizing of Government lending for a variety of domestic and foreign purposes. The most recent instance was the depressed areas bill approved last May.

But foreign development loans, designed mostly for shaky new nations, are a touchy issue in the light of proven waste and obvious failures to build stable economies and firm national friendships. Admittedly, one must think hard to decide whether America's world position would be worse today if aid had ceased after the Marshall plan's successful reconstruction of Europe. But hard thought produces only one conclusion: that aid has been a vital factor in resistance to international communism.

If this is a negative and defensive achievement, is there not a positive and aggressive course for the future? The President believes there is, and that it lies in a 5-year commitment of $8.8 billion for dollar-repayable loans to stimulate economic progress in underdeveloped countries. This is a businesslike approach. It recognizes that sound, long-range planning is essential; that such planning has not always existed before; and that it cannot exist if funds are voted, and results assessed, on a year-to-year basis.

Mr. Kennedy is committed to making development aid an arm of foreign policy. In effect, he is asking Congress to make it so by yielding much of the control to the executive branch where responsibility for foreign policy resides. The principle survived a major test Friday night when the Senate rejected a move to continue annual appropriations. By a compromise to be worked out this week, congressional committees would retain a review power over larger loans, much as Congress shares in other foreign policy by ratification and support of the Executive.

We hope the rest of the details can be worked out and adopted by the Senate and House. There is more at stake than the President's personal prestige before the cold war gallery. Nationhood in today's new world is still a void to be filled one way or another, and we can accept only the way of survival in independence and stability. It will not come easily even with our help, but without our help it is virtually impossible.

PRICE OF LIBERTY

(By Bruce Biossat)

WASHINGTON, August 14.—Across the space of 13 years, a general and an admiral spoke largely to the same point—that Americans must face up to the heavy burdens of peace if they would avoid the horrors of war.

AT LONGMEADOW

On Memorial Day, 1948, Gen. Omar Bradley, then Army Chief of Staff, rose on a village green at Longmeadow, Mass., to pay homage to a soldier, a Medal of Honor winner, killed near the close of the war in Europe. The general's words deserve full flow:

"We have suffered enough in two World Wars to know that noninvolvement in peace means certain involvement in war.

"Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience.

"If we (now) cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution, and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security.

"The American people must put their faith in stable, long-range policies—political, economic, and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

"The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship."

In midsummer of 1961, with the dilemma of Berlin hanging over this country and the world, Adm. Arleigh Burke, newly freed of his long responsibility as Chief of Naval Operations, spoke in like vein.

Delivering his maiden civilian speech in Washington, a long address covering many aspects of the world struggle, the admiral found a place for these words of challenge to the people:

"The pleasures of an easy summer and the comforts of a thriving economy can well obscure the seriousness of our times.

"We live in a free world, but we are confronted by a world of coercion, a world where men are disciplined by force, by terror, and intimidation.

"There is only one effective response to this challenge. We must provide our own form of discipline, the discipline that springs from within: self-discipline. This is the only discipline possible in a democracy.

"We must recognize that the very heart of any nation is its principles. Our principles must be the driving force behind our actions and the standard against which those actions are measured."

LET'S HOPE FOR OTHERS

No realistic leader predicts anything for us but continuing challenge in the decades ahead. Let us hope that in those years there will be other Burkes and Bradleys to call us sharply to the test.

Legislation Needed To Curb the Power of Hoffa and Other Labor Bosses

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune clearly illustrates how helpless the individual union member is against the organized power of a Hoffa. The only hope the working men and women of this country have to regain their freedom in running their own unions is through legislation. I am convinced abuses by labor bosses will not be corrected until union organizations are brought under antitrust law so that they will operate under the same rules as all of the rest of us must operate under. My bill, H.R. 8407, would, indeed, be a new Magna Carta for labor and a protection for the rest of us against oppressive practices of Hoffa and his ilk. I hope some action may be taken to bring about study of this legislation soon:

GOLDBERG KNOWS BETTER

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, in an interview that touched on the activities of James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters Union, said that the press had "exaggerated" Hoffa's power, and that "the good sense of the people who work" would restrain Hoffa if he "overreached himself."

Mr. Goldberg is an old pro in the AFL–CIO (from which Hoffa's teamsters were expelled for cause) and was Attorney General Robert Kennedy's counsel in a suit occasioned by some hard things the younger Kennedy said about Hoffa during last year's campaign. He is well aware of Hoffa's great and growing influence. For him to suggest that rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union can control their president is downright absurd.

Hoffa rules his union of 1.7 million members like an absolute monarch. This year's convention at Miami Beach tightened his grip and extended his grab.

Hoffa is a hard-working executive, who keeps a personal eye on the details of his vast empire. His union is now so rigged that most places as convention delegates are reserved for local and regional officials. By careful design, power flows from the top down. The union president, Hoffa, hires and fires organizers. He runs the pension plan. He slates the trustees—if they are loyal to Hoffa, no matter if they have been convicted of destroying subpenaed records, of perjury, even of defrauding the union.

Now Hoffa is authorized to create a new federation of unions, to compete with the AFL–CIO if it will not readmit Hoffa on his own terms. Already truckdrivers are a minority in the Teamsters Union, which is represented in funeral parlors, breweries, stores, filling stations, and numerous other businesses. Hoffa has well publicized plans for having all trucking contracts in the country expire on the same date, and for forming alliances with unions in all other fields of transportation.

What can rank-and-file workers, however sensible, do to restrain the president of so autocratic a union? Only exceptional circumstances enabled Chicago taxi drivers to give a rare beating to Hoffa's organization. Most of Hoffa's constituents are powerless before their union's president and his machine. The AFL–CIO has not been successful in its attempts to discipline Hoffa. It is doubtful if anything less than the Government of the United States can take his measure.

Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article concerning the

Attorney General's crime program, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, August 13, 1961. The article follows:

RACKETS IN UNITED STATES CALLED FAR WORSE THAN IN 1951—ROBERT KENNEDY CITES RACE WIRE DATA, STRESSES NEED FOR ANTI-CRIME BILLS

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said yesterday that organized crime in America today is far worse than it was at the time of the Kefauver hearings a decade ago.

He's got intelligence reports which he says prove it. More than half a dozen Federal agencies are now channeling information into the Justice Department on hundreds of known—but untouched—racketeers.

As a result of these reports, Mr. Kennedy gave this appraisal:

"I say the situation is worse than it was 10 years ago in terms of the financial power of the racketeers, the extent of their operations, the number of people involved and their political power. That power includes the corruption of some local police forces."

He disclosed that the Justice Department now has information on three major race wire networks serving the gambling world through telephone hookups.

"Our information is such that we now know the details of these race-wire setups. The gamblers can't operate without them," he said. "These are cases where it would appear we could move ahead with prosecutions if we had the legislation we need on the books."

DRIVE TOPS EXPECTATIONS

Mr. Kennedy also disclosed that the coordinated approach to organized crime that he mapped out soon after taking office has progressed further than he expected by this time.

He said the information coming from the FBI, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, Internal Revenue Service, Immigration Service, Alcohol Tax Unit, Customs Bureau, Food and Drug Administration, Labor Department, postal inspectors and others has provided the groundwork to proceed with prosecution if the necessary legislation were now available.

That's why he rates passage of his package of crime bills as his No. 1 objective right now. He is so concerned about House action on the Senate-passed bills that his first move on his return from Africa Friday was to confer with Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, which will handle most of the legislation.

He added he will make himself available all this week to discuss the crime legislation with Members of Congress.

"We really need it," he emphasized. "Of course, we're not saying that if we got this legislation, it would put an end to all organized crime. But it would open many doors. It would put a major crimp in the operations of the racketeers."

APPROVED BY SENATE

He pointed out that parts of the crime bill package have been discussed for the last 8 or 10 years and have been urged by both Republican and Democratic administrations. He added that extensive hearings were held before the Senate acted unanimously on all but one of the proposed measures.

"When we have come this far in getting congressional action, where we can see in practical terms what the legislation would accomplish, we are naturally anxious to get action before Congress goes home," the Attorney General said.

Mr. Kennedy emphasized that organized crime is bankrolled by gambling. That's why he is particularly anxious to get legislation that would curb the use of interstate facilities by gamblers and their henchmen.

One of the Senate-passed bills now pending before the House Judiciary Committee would make it a Federal crime to use interstate wire communications to transmit such gambling information as race results, odds, and bets.

The three major race wires cited by Mr. Kennedy are connected by interstate telephone hookups with frequently changing telephone numbers. Some of the Nation's leading racketeers are the operators of these services, without which large-scale gambling cannot operate.

One of these telephone hookups serves the east coast from Boston to Miami. A second connects the East with the Midwest. A third services a multistate area in the Midwest.

A gambling syndicate in one Midwest city accepts collect telephone calls from all over the county. In another Midwest city, a layoff man, who finances the big bets, protects bookies through telephoned bets from an eight-State area.

"We have set up the machinery to get the information on these operations," Mr. Kennedy commented. "What we lack are the enforcement tools to proceed against the racketeers directly."

The Justice Department is currently trying to make cases against the gamblers by such oblique approaches as prosecuting violations of the wagering tax law and income tax violations.

As the information comes in from the various Federal agencies, it is docketed and analyzed by Justice Department attorneys to determine what laws now on the books could be used for prosecution. A growing file, reading like a who's who of organized crime, details who is doing what to whom; who is possibly violating what law; their associates; their relatives and clues to their net worth.

"We can't make full use of the information we're getting at this time," Mr. Kennedy said regretfully.

BOX SCORE ON BILLS

Here's a box score on where the crime bills now stand:

The Senate-passed bill making it a crime to travel across State lines in aid of racketeering enterprises. Approved by the House Judiciary Committee in amended form.

The Senate-passed bill prohibiting the use of wire communication facilities to transmit gambling information across State lines or national borders. Approved by a House Judiciary subcommittee, awaiting full committee action.

The Senate-passed bill prohibiting obstruction of investigations or intimidating witnesses from giving information to Federal investigators. Approved in its original form, not in its Senate-passed form, by a House judiciary subcommittee, now pending before the Full House Judiciary Committee.

The Senate-passed bill forbidding interstate transportation of such wagering paraphernalia as number slips and books for betting on sports events. Substantially amended by a House judiciary subcommittee, now pending before the full committee.

The Senate-passed bill tightening the ban on interstate shipment of slot machines and similar gambling devices. Still pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The Senate-passed bill granting immunity from prosecution to certain witnesses in labor racketeering cases. Still pending before a House judiciary subcommittee.

The bill to broaden the Fugitive Felon Act: Pending before the House, not acted on by the Senate.

The Senate-passed bill to broaden the Federal Firearms Act: Pending before House Ways and Means Committee.

Testimony of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, Before the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, on Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1961, I was privileged to testify before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Banking and Currency Committee on proposals for amending the Small Business Investment Act. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the transcript of my remarks upon that occasion:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AUGUST 3, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. We have as our next witness one of our colleagues, the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who desires to testify. Mr. MULTER, we are glad to have you, sir.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is always a privilege to take this seat and submit myself to questions of the members of the committee.

I take the time of the committee this morning to urge a word of caution. When we first enacted this bill in 1958, we had great hopes for the small business investment companies that would be established under it. In the first 20 months of operation under the new law, only 95 companies qualified and received licenses. In the last 12 months, an additional 230 companies have qualified and been licensed as small business investment companies—giving us a total, up to about 3 weeks ago, of 325. There may have been more issued since. But those are the latest figures published by the Small Business Administration.

Of that number, some 28 are publicly owned. Obviously there hasn't been too much experience by the Small Business Administration in connection with the operation of these new companies. We still have great hopes for them. We still hope that they will be able to do the job that has not been heretofore done for small business by way of long-term equity investments that are so necessary for the operation of a small business.

At the same time, I think before we make any very substantial changes in the basic statute, we ought to await the experience that can be reported to us by those most closely concerned with the administration and supervision of these companies. We must learn a great deal more before we allocate or promise any very substantial new moneys or increased moneys to these companies.

My own view is that those companies, like the 28 that have gone public, some for as much as $20 million—a single public issue of $20 million was oversubscribed when it was offered to the public—when they are able to raise that kind of money for these projects by public subscription, I think they are demonstrating that they don't need Government money for those projects.

I would go even further than the Small Business Administrator [Mr. Horne] has gone on that score. Where the bill calls for lending up to $1 million—and obviously it is only

the big companies that could qualify for a $1 million loan from SBA for this purpose—while Mr. Horne suggests a lower limit and says, "Let's limit that only to $500,000," in my opinion it is only those big companies that qualify for that kind of money, and they don't need it.

If they can get as much as $10 million at a single underwriting or $20 million at a single underwriting, they ought not to come to the U.S. Government for any of this money at low interest rates.

In addition to that, I think we should have in mind that we limit any single loan by SBA to a small busines firm to $350,000. How are we going to justify limiting to $350,000 as the maximum we loan to a single small business concern and at the same time lend as much as $500,000 to a private enterprise at a low interest to relend at high interest rates, plus equity positions, to the small businessman who needs our help?

I want to see this program, as I am sure every other member of this committee does, succeed. I hope that we don't do anything that will cause it to get into trouble. We all remember only too well that the RFC was a good operation. But just a few scandalous incidents destroyed it and caused the Congress to repeal the RFC Act.

It took us a long time to try to get something to take its place. SBA takes its place to a small extent. The SBIC Act does it along a different line. I do hope that, as we make progress we will proceed cautiously.

Let us get a few—not a few, but a substantial number of—years of experience behind us. Certainly as to these 230 companies that are in business only a year or less, we have no real experience as to whether they are going to be profitable operations, whether they are going to do the job that is intended to be done by them or not.

As to the other 95, we have some fair experience over the last 3 years but certainly not enough. Before we give them additional powers and additional borrowing power, I think we ought to get a very detailed report on their operations.

I don't think it is necessary to remind the committee that when we said we would require a minimum capital of $150,000 for a small business investment company, we did that in order to give the companies in the smaller communities—where there wasn't the big money available which there is in the big municipalities and the big urban areas like New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago, even Dallas and Houston, where there are substantial sums of money available for this purpose—we put that minimum in so that the smaller community could build a small business or obtain a small business investment company that could do a job locally.

And bear in mind we wrote into the act that these companies were to indicate, as part of their license application, where they intended to operate—having in mind that we wanted them to operate locally to help the local people.

We never contemplated that most of these companies were going to organize by putting in merely the minimum of $150,000 capital and come down here and borrow another $150,000 and try to operate on $300,000.

During the course of the hearings and during the course of the debate, it was made perfectly clear that, for a big operation, for an operation that would have to service a large urban community, one would need a lot more than $300,000 because one couldn't earn enough on the $300,000 to pay the expense of a big operation.

But we also made it clear that that was to be the minimum; and in the larger communities we expected, as has happened, that some of them would organize for $1 million and some for much more.

That is what is needed in these larger communities. I don't think we ought to supplement what is required by way of capital investment for the small business investment companies in the big cities by letting them come down here and get from the Government, from SBA, the difference that they ought to be putting in in capital.

After some years of successful experience, after we see that they are doing a good job and that we can afford to risk lending them more money, perhaps we can amend the statute to give them a greater leverage.

But I think in the first instance we are doing enough for them now. I certainly would not like to see extended the maximum amount that may be lent to any of these small business investment companies beyond the amount that we now lend to a small business investment company directly.

We never intended these two operations should be competitive with one another. A small business investment company was to supplement the lending program of SBA by equity investment and long-term loans that SBA ought not to make directly. Having in mind that these people would then be investing their own money, we sought to give them some help.

But let's not now give them so much Government help that they will be doing the job with Government money. Let them make the maximum investment and the Government the minimum investment in these projects until such time as they really prove themselves as good, profitable, safe operations.

There is one thing that has not been touched upon in the bill that I would like to suggest again to the committee, which should require the most serious consideration. When we wrote the act originally, we put a provision into the act, section 301(d), setting forth 11 different items with reference to the organization of these corporations, their powers, what they could do, and the like.

Among other things, we said there that we required the incorporators of these companies in 301(a) to be not less than 10 persons, having in mind 10 individuals. I think the history of the legislation indicated that we wanted diversity of interest in the organization of these small business investment companies and we wanted individuals in them.

What we have seen happen is just as we did with some of the banks, where the statute specifically requires the incorporators to be individuals and that the directors be individuals who own stock as individuals in the banks. All sorts of strategems have been devised so as to evade that and avoid it. So, too, in the organization of many of these small business investment companies.

Instead of getting 10 individuals who were going to be interested in the company and operate the company and have their money in it, time after time we found that there were 10 dummies named. The applications were perfectly frank. They said, "This small business investment company is being formed by a bank or by an investment company"—or whoever it was who was doing the underwriting—and they indicated the 10 people or the 10 incorporators were representatives or dummies and they avoided and evaded that requirement of the law.

The way the act is written, section 301(d) is a dead letter. It applies only to federally chartered corporations. It expired by lapse of time and apparently there is no intention of extending it. In 1960, we repealed subdivision 9 of the section as unnecessary. We should now repeal the entire section, even though it is the only section in the act which sets forth any standards, powers, or restrictions.

That is not to say, however, that we should not set forth such standards and the like. The Federal Reserve Act, the National Bank Act, and every similar statute sets up minimum standards, powers, and restrictions.

We must write into this bill minimum standards, authorizations, and limitations which SBA must require of every licensee. They may be the same as in section 301(d) or they may be more or less stringent.

I think this committee should forthrightly and frankly meet the issue. If these criteria are to be used by the SBA in determining whether or not a State-chartered company qualifies for a license, we should say so—and let's make it clear that that is what we want them to do, as to all of the criteria set forth.

Let's indicate what these standards should be, then SBA, in taking applications from small business investment companies, will apply each of these criteria to the extent that we want them applied.

There are one or two other matters that I would like to review briefly with the committee with reference to the bill.

If section 2 is to remain in the bill by way of an amendment to 302(a), then I suggest that the language should be changed so that, instead of providing for the lesser of $1 million or whatever amount we agree upon—whether it be $350,000 or $500,000 as suggested by Mr. Horne—whatever that amount is, the section should not read "the lesser of" that amount, or "the amount of capital and surplus of a small business investment company from other sources."

I suggest that that language should be changed to read "or the amount of the paid-in cash capital and accumulated surplus of sound value of the small investment company."

Otherwise you are going to get a paper capital and surplus which is set up as a matter of bookkeeping and good accounting practice on the basis of which they will then be able to borrow the equivalent amount or 50 percent of that amount and easily get around what we intended there.

I think what we intend is that the Government should lend a certain percentage or a certain amount equal to what they have actually invested in cash or good securities, and not permit them to put in paper which may be stock in another company that has a book value of a lot less than the par value. The book value may actually be nil because the investment—while originally there may have been a cash investment of $500,000 or more, when they actually get to taking that paper into the small business investment company as part of its capital—it may actually have little or no value.

I am sure this committee doesn't want paper values to be taken as against sound values in determining how much of U.S. Government money should go into these organizations.

In each of these other provisions, if they should remain in the bill—for instance, in section 4 Mr. Horne has made some very good suggestions as to amending that language in each of those sections. I would go further and suggest that we give the Small Business Administration the right to approve in each of these subdivisions so that they can have complete control of the situation and we don't get into some of the situations that Mr. Horne indicated we might get into, which would be bad and give a black eye to the whole program and in some instances cause a loss of Government money as well as the original investors' money in the SBIC.

In other words, if we are going to bring in other than financial institutions, if we are going to let individuals participate in these investments that are made by the small business investment company to the small business concern, then go one step further than Mr. Horne has suggested and require that in each of those instances the SBA should review and approve or disapprove—as the case may be—such outside participation by individuals in order to avoid the possibility of self-dealing and even doubledealing.

In none of these things that I am saying to the committee am I trying to impugn the motives or good faith of any of the people who are in this program up to the present time or who may get into the program.

But I remember very well what happened in the 1920's and the 1930's. I think many of the members of this committee do, too. Most of the trouble that our financial institutions got into in those days, when the depression struck and people were demanding their money and the bottom fell out of the market, was caused by self-dealing.

We then found that banks and financial institutions, instead of making good loans in the institution at fair rates and at fair charges, were sending these people upstairs or across the street or around the corner to a finance company that was owned and controlled by officers of the financial institution. There they made the loans. At first they were sound loans, but they were sent in there to make them because—instead of at a fair interest rate and a fair service charge—they were able to charge bonuses and survey charges and appraisal fees and lawyers' fees and other exorbitant charges and high interest rates, too.

Then as business piled up, they began to get all the bad loans and the bad investments, borrowing from the bank and the financial institution at low interest rates and making the unsound loans at high interest rates.

Then when the crash came, the financial institutions and the banks went looking for their money from the finance company. The finance company couldn't pay back because it had a lot of bad loans and bad investments. Those things that couldn't be done by a regulated institution were done by the unregulated institution.

We want to be sure that the same kind of a situation doesn't happen here. Therefore I think we must lean over backward to make sure that we prohibit that kind of situation occurring again—and it can occur.

We have already given an incentive to that being done when we permit the bank to charge a fee to the small business investment company and we permit the small business investment company to charge a fee to the bank. That is already in the act. Now there is an attempt to enlarge that and go even further. Bear in mind that while banks are regulated and supervised carefully, SBA has not got that same power and authority to go in and supervise and regulate the complete operation of the SBIC. If the time comes when we give them the authority to send their examiners in regularly and look at what is being done from day to day, as the bank examiners do, maybe we can go a little further.

I don't think the time has yet come to do that.

I am in agreement, as I indicated yesterday, with the objections of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the amendments proposed here that would seek to amend the Securities and Exchange Commission Act. I think Mr. Horne also agrees that that should not be done. To the extent these companies are entitled to or will be entitled to exemptions, they can get it by regulation. They can get it by application to SEC.

Until we have more experience under our belt in the operation of these small business investment companies, let's not change the supervision that SEC now has and will have by vitrue of the applications for exemptions under this act. Let's not change that yet. The time may come when we may want to do it, but I doubt whether that time has arrived as yet.

Mr. Chairman, that is my presentation.

Mr. PATMAN. We appreciate your testimony, Mr. MULTER. We value your opinions, and they will certainly be considered.

I want to ask you two or three questions. One is, do you recommend $350,000 instead of $500,000 as the proper limit of SBA's capital investment in an SBIC?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. I think we would be safer not to go beyond $350,000 at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. In view of the fact that the SBA doesn't have the examining force to supervise these small business investment companies and cannot accomplish supervision at this time? That is your reasoning?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Did you make a comment on permitting the banks to increase the amount of their participation above the 1 percent that is now allowed by law?

Mr. MULTER. No; I did not, sir. I am glad you bring it to my attention, because I think we ought not to make that change either. I have received communications—as other Members have—urging that we increase it.

Originally I think this committee had in mind that the banks which up to that time wouldn't get into this kind of an operation—it is true in many States they didn't have the authority and the power under State law to do it; but they never sought a change in the State law so as to permit them to do it.

They didn't begin to get into this program until after the Federal Reserve Board and other agencies of Government had reported to the Congress that there was no facility for this kind of money.

We set up this program. We set it up with tax advantages to get people to come into it. We wanted the banks to get into it, too. We thought when we put in these—at least I did, and I think many of the other members did—when we put in a provision permitting the banks to invest up to 1 percent in these small business investment companies that they would be taking participations, not organizing and setting up these companies as subsidiaries and affiliates.

That may be a good thing. Maybe they have now found a way of doing this job that is necessary to be done. But before we let them go beyond the present 1 percent, let's find out whether they are going to be good operations. Let's find out if they are going to be used for self-dealing or for doubledealing in doing some of the things that we had to condemn in the twenties and the thirties.

Let's make sure they are good operations before we let them get into it to any greater extent.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you very kindly, sir.

Statistics on Employment by the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent House debate on the Agricultural Act of 1961, there was some discussion of the number of persons employed by the Department of Agriculture. I did not then have all the facts and figures readily available but now, at my request, Secretary Freeman has supplied the information in detail, including a table. In the interest of keeping the Members of the House informed fully on the activities of the Department of Agriculture, and with the consent of the House, I am placing this material from the Secretary in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The material follows:

During fiscal year 1960, average annual positions in the Department—81,585.

During fiscal year 1961, average annual positions in the Department—85,588.

The original budget submitted by President Eisenhower would have provided average annual positions for 87,609 people. The revised budget of President Kennedy provides for 89,710, or an increase of 4,122 above 1961. That increase was distributed as follows among the major agencies of the Department:

Agricultural Research Service	739
Federal Extension Service	5
Soil Conservation Service	590
Agricultural Marketing Service	399
Foreign Agricultural Service	64
Commodity Exchange Authority	2
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	−489
Farmers Crop Insurance Corporation	32
Rural Electrification Administration	−1
Farmers Home Administration	37
Office of General Counsel	3
Office of Secretary	3
Office of Information	9
Library	−1
Forest Service	2,732
Total	4,124
Less positions representing employment in other departments under allocation USDA funds	2
Total	4,122

You can see that of this increase, 2,732 or approximately 66 percent, is in the Forest Service, and the bulk of that is in Forest Land Management.

You will note that I have talked in terms of average annual positions so far. Total employment of the Department as of June 20, 1961, amounted to 102,557, an increase of 12,847 above the annual average position figure I've discussed above. This difference is due to the fact that the June 30 figure is a head count and the average annual positions is an average for the entire fiscal year. The 12,847 increase during the June period is accounted for primarily as the result of seasonal employment and part-time employment of the Department, and the bulk of this employment is distributed as follows:

Forest Service	6,373
Soil Conservation Service	881
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	1,098
Farmers Home Administration	4,414

The large increase in Farmers Home Administration was due to the fact that during the month of June, 4,908 State and county committeemen were required to work that month on approval of loan applications which increased substantially during that period.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Average annual positions in appropriations and other funds, fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962

[Based on 1962 budget estimates and adjusted for comparability with the 1962 appropriation structure. This table reflects the average annual positions under the appropriations and funds indicated, including those applicable to transfers, allocations, or allotments to organizations other than the agency receiving the appropriation]

	1960	1961 (estimated)	1962 (estimated)		Increase or decrease, 1962 revised budget compared with—	
			Original budget	Revised budget	1961	1962 original budget
Agricultural Research Service:						
Salaries and expenses:						
Research	7,184	7,956	8,546	8,619	+663	+73
Plant and animal disease and pest control	4,877	5,108	5,212	5,212	+104	
Meat inspection	3,172	3,194	3,273	3,273	+79	
Special fund	126	107			−107	
Total, salaries and expenses	15,359	16,365	17,031	17,104	+739	+73
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	2	5	6	6	+1	
State experiment stations	68	67	72	72	+5	
Total, annual appropriations	15,429	16,437	17,109	17,182	+745	+73
Other funds, including permanent appropriation	938	966	960	960	−6	
Total	16,367	17,403	18,069	18,142	739	+73
Extension Service:						
Federal Extension Service	224	231	235	235	+4	
Other funds	16	20	21	21	+1	
Total	240	251	256	256	+5	
Farmer Cooperative Service:						
Annual appropriation	66	66	66	66		
Other funds	45	44	44	44		
Total	111	110	110	110		
Soil Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	12,558	12,639	12,816	12,816	+177	
Watershed protection	1,877	2,176	2,318	2,617	+441	+299
Flood prevention	1,267	1,249	1,254	1,254	+5	
Great Plains conservation program	351	335	335	335		
Water conservation and utilization projects	6	1	1	1		
Total, annual appropriations	16,059	16,400	16,724	17,023	+623	+299
Other funds	239	280	247	247	−33	
Total	16,298	16,680	16,971	17,270	+590	+299
Agricultural Conservation Program Service	786	826	826	826		
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing research and service:						
Marketing research and agricultural estimates	1,696	1,878	1,972	1,972	+94	
Marketing services	3,670	4,129	4,152	4,152	+23	
Total	5,366	6,007	6,124	6,124	+117	
School lunch program	188	207	207	232	+25	+25
Total, annual appropriations	5,554	6,214	6,331	6,356	+142	+25
Other funds, including permanent appropriations	3,246	3,352	3,424	3,609	+257	+185
Total	8,800	9,566	9,755	9,965	+399	+210
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Salaries and expenses	703	724	741	784	+60	+43
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	18	17	17	17		
Other funds	109	113	117	117	+4	
Total	830	854	875	918	+64	+43
Commodity Exchange Authority: Annual appropriation	118	124	126	126	+2	
Commodity Stabilization Service:						
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	826	885	885	885		
Sugar Act program	177	187	187	187		
Conservation reserve	426	296	290	290	−6	
Total, annual appropriations	1,429	1,368	1,362	1,362	−6	
Commodity Credit Corporation (corporate administrative expense limitation)	5,208	5,491	5,009	5,009	−482	
Other funds, including permanent appropriation	480	557	556	556	−1	
Total	7,117	7,416	6,927	6,927	−489	
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Operating and administrative expenses	689	786	801	801	+15	
Capital and insurance fund	101	122	139	139	+17	
Other funds		1	1	1		
Total	790	909	941	941	+32	
Rural Electrification Administration:						
Annual appropriation	989	964	964	964		
Other funds	1	1			−1	
Total	990	965	964	964	−1	
Farmers Home Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	4,804	4,723	4,765	4,765	+42	
Other funds	406	466	461	461	−5	
Total	5,210	5,189	5,226	5,226	+37	
Office of the General Counsel: Annual appropriation	380	403	406	406	+3	

Average annual positions in appropriations and other funds, fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962—Continued

[Based on 1962 budget estimates and adjusted for comparability with the 1962 appropriation structure. This table reflects the average annual positions under the appropriations and funds indicated, including those applicable to transfers, allocations, or allotments to organizations other than the agency receiving the appropriation]

	1960	1961 (estimated)	1962 (estimated)		Increase or decrease, 1962 revised budget compared with—	
			Original budget	Revised budget	1961	1962 original budget
Office of the Secretary:						
Annual appropriation	310	319	322	322	+3	
Working capital fund	263	266	266	266		
Other funds	3	1	1	1		
Total	576	586	589	589	+3	
Office of Information:						
Annual appropriation	114	119	125	125	+6	
Other funds	9	11	11	11		
Total	123	130	136	136	+6	
Centennial observance of Agriculture			3	3	+3	
Library:						
Annual appropriation	123	130	143	143	+13	
Other funds	15	18	4	4	−14	
Total	138	148	147	147	−1	
Forest Service:						
Forest protection and utilization:						
Forest land management	12,086	11,730	12,701	13,972	+2,242	+1,271
Forest research	1,763	1,882	2,004	2,118	+236	+114
State and private forestry cooperation	139	142	158	158	+16	
Total	13,988	13,754	14,863	16,248	+2,494	+1,385
Forest roads and trails	3,878	4,367	4,367	4,458	+91	+91
Acquisition of lands for national forests	2	4	3	3	−1	
Total, annual appropriations	17,868	18,125	19,233	20,709	+2,584	+1,476
Other funds, including permanent appropriations	5,009	6,056	6,204	6,204	+148	
Total	22,877	24,181	25,437	26,913	+2,732	+1,476
Total, average annual positions under all funds available to U.S. Department of Agriculture	81,751	85,741	87,764	89,865	+4,124	+2,101
Deduct average annual positions included above representing employment in other departments under allocations from U.S. Department of Agriculture funds	166	153	155	155	+2	
Total, average annual positions for U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel	81,585	85,588	87,609	89,710	+4,122	+2,101
RECAPITULATION						
Included in U.S. Department of Agriculture chapter:						
Total annual appropriations	65,663	67,976	70,299	72,215	+4,239	+1,916
Corporate administrative expense limitation	5,208	5,491	5,009	5,009	−482	
Permanent appropriations	1,631	1,861	1,891	2,076	+215	+185
Other funds	9,028	10,157	10,295	10,295	+138	
Included in other chapters: Other funds	221	256	270	270	+14	
Total	81,751	85,741	87,764	89,865	+4,124	+2,101
Deduct average annual positions included above representing employment in other departments under allocations from U.S. Department of Agriculture funds	166	153	155	155	+2	
Total, average annual positions for U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel	81,585	85,588	87,609	89,710	+4,122	+2,101

City's Secondary Schools Win Maximum Accreditation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an item from the South Pasadena Review reporting on an action by the California Association of Secondary School Administrators Accreditation Commission in granting maximum term accreditation to both the South Pasadena High School and the South Pasadena Junior High School extended to June 30, 1966.

Of added interest in the article is the reference to the report that in January 1962 the Western Association of Schools and Colleges will be formed. The new association will be the agency for accrediting senior colleges, junior colleges, and all California high schools. It will adopt the Cassa program of evaluation, which is based not only on present status of the educational program but on the direction it is moving toward meeting educational needs in the future.

This action in my view is but one more indicator of the encouraging progress being made on the State and local level to forge ahead in the field of education. Such action I feel is significant to the current discussions in connection with proposals for Federal aid to education:

CITY'S SECONDARY SCHOOLS WIN MAXIMUM ACCREDITATION

Recognition for the program of education maintained in South Pasadena High School and South Pasadena Junior High School was evidenced by the recent action of the California Association of Secondary School Administrators Accreditation Commission in granting maximum term accreditation to both schools extending to June 30, 1966. The commission's action followed their careful study of the extensive evaluation reports prepared during the school year 1960–61 by staff members of the two schools assisted by student and community representatives. The commission also considered reports of the CASSA visiting committees which spent 3 days in observation and interviewing at each of the schools during the month of April.

Added significance will be given accreditation in January 1962 when the Western Association of Schools and Colleges will be formed. The new association, to be recognized by the U.S. Office of Education and the National Committee on Accrediting, will be the agency for accrediting senior colleges, junior colleges, and all California high schools. The CASSA program of evaluation recently completed by the South Pasadena secondary schools will be the one adopted by the new association. South Pasadena High School and South Pasadena Junior High School will become charter members of the new association, and the terms of accreditation recently granted by the CASSA State committee will apply.

The membership of the accreditation commission represents district administration, high school administration, the University of California, and the State department of education. The accreditation is based not only on the present status of the educational program but also on the direction it is moving in endeavoring to meet the educational needs of the community.

In Which We Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last month Kiwanis International had its annual convention in Toronto, Canada.

At the convention, President J. O. Tally, Jr., delivered a thought-provoking message entitled "In Which We Serve." Symbolizing thoughtful reflections upon the way in which Kiwanis are attempting to further improve their already splendid record of service to their fellowmen, I ask unanimous consent to have this message printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WHICH WE SERVE
(By J. O. Tally, Jr.)

I cannot say enough to you today in gratitude for the privilege and honor that have been mine to serve you in positions of high trust in Kiwanis. I came upon the Board of Kiwanis International after the Miami convention of 1954. These 7 years have been for me an opportunity for wide fellowship in the high calling of service to our fellowmen in an organization that I have come to love deeply.

If—as I believe—understanding is a fundamental part of love, I have tried constantly to gain an understanding of our heritage—the men and the events of our history—to whom and to which we owe so much. I have tried to learn the challenges to us in the present. And I have tried to discern the requirements and the duties of our future.

If—as I believe—deep concern is a fundamental part of love, I have been so concerned to assist in steering a course true to the past, safe and progressive for the present, bold and necessary and sound for the future.

A captain does not lightly make the command decision to call to emergency stations the officers and crew. But once his experience and his study have convinced him of imminent peril, he is no captain who does not sound that call.

The ship of Kiwanis is in mortal danger. I have sounded such call.

The engines of our energy and purpose are dying, and we are drifting near the fatal shoals of complacency, provincialism, depleted membership, and inactivity.

In each of the 7 years during which I have been charged with a part of the watch duty—and for years before that—we have called for increased revolutions of speed and progress with new members and new clubs. Yet at the end of each of those years, though we have founded new clubs (far fewer, by the way, than we could and should have founded), we have closed the year not with an increase but a decrease in membership in established clubs. Another way of saying this is: without the few new clubs we did establish each year, we should have steadily drifted backwards in numbers of Kiwanians.

I have seen this perilous trend continue while few scanned the horizon, and of those who did, most only hoped for some favorable wind that would bring us back upon course.

Unanalyzed statistics and carefully timed counts have been announced over the loudspeaker system giving an impression of progress. A glance over the rail at the set of the times will give a true condition.

While Canada and the United States have been experiencing a tremendous rate of population growth, we have, relative to that growth, not only stood still, but drifted astern. While some other civic club organizations have doubled their members by extending their frontiers, we have, too often, been content with those we had.

We have heard ambitious goals for certain high levels of membership by certain anniversary dates loudly announced only to be retracted in whispers.

As I have studied this fearsome drift, I have come to certain definite conclusions, which I now submit to you and which the evidence, I believe, will fully prove.

Our failure truly to grow has not been due to lack of fidelity and ability of our leaders at any level. From club officers through division and districts through international officers, board members, and committeemen over the years, we have had the benefit of the services of a group of devoted and distinguished men who have given without reserve of their minds, hearts, and energy in their tasks.

I concluded that what we lacked, in the first instance, at what I call the operational level, in the challenge of substantial growth, was a program so fundamental, so specific, and so comprehensive that it would involve Kiwanis leaders at all levels, both binding all in common effort and allotting unmistakable and important tasks to each.

I suggested what I felt to be such a program. It was devised in two parts—one to advance the pace in new club building, called the Five Most Likely Clubs, and one to increase individual membership, called the Ten Outstanding Men.

With the unanimous concurrence of the members of the international board these two projects were launched last August 1, so that they could run through the remainder of 1960 and all of 1961.

The Five Most Likely Clubs project requires each governor to require of each of his lieutenant governors the name of the community within the division of the lieutenant governor where the lieutenant governor thinks it most likely that a Kiwanis club can be built in his year. Using these reports of his lieutenant governors, the governor is required to report to International the five communities where he is most likely immediately to found Kiwanis clubs. Then, as a new club is founded from these prospects on the list, a new most likely community is added to the list, so that, under the scrutiny of Kiwanis officers at all levels, who bear the responsibility, there are constantly five most likely places in every district of Kiwanis where we don't but could have Kiwanis clubs.

A similar program, called the Ten Outstanding Men, seeks to increase individual membership. This project requires of every Kiwanis district governor that he require of each of his lieutenant governors that he require of each of his club presidents a written list compiled by the club president and his club board, of the 10 outstanding men in the club's community who are not civic club members, but who ought to be members of Kiwanis and who could contribute much if they were, and it further requires that such club actively seek, as rapidly as possible, to bring these 10 men into their membership.

Again, this fixes clear and inescapable responsibility. If a club does not want to grow, by increasing its own membership or founding a new club—let me say it flatly—that club does not deserve to be a Kiwanis club. If it does wish to grow, it can keep this list of 10 men by whose added membership it wants to grow in the best possible way.

And again, as members are recruited from these 10, the list is filled to 10 again so that every club can always have in view the additional men it would like to have as members.

I see no reason why these two programs should not become permanent procedure for founding new Kiwanis clubs and obtaining additional members. I am happy to report to you that these programs have already begun to prove themselves. We have had a significant increase in new club building, and we are beginning to move toward a net increase in membership in established clubs.

But I came to a second conclusion. You will never get good men or many good men to join anything for the sake of joining. The concept of a mere togetherness is sterile and stultifying. Men must join for a deep purpose; they must share a good fellowship in a great cause.

So my second conclusion was that we have denied Kiwanians the wide fellowship we need for a real sense of purpose. By inaction and timidity and lack of vision we have failed to offer Kiwanis to men in other countries who would give our fellowship the variety and the outlook and the strength that it needs to represent the best that is in men.

The evidence here is plain.

Those civic club organizaions in the past generation that have grown, even within the United States and Canada, have been those that have extended their organizations outside the United States and Canada. Those civic club organizations that have failed in the last generation to grow within the United States and Canada relative to population growth have been those, like Kiwanis, that have failed to be true to the vision and energy of their pioneer days by not extending their organizations into other lands.

The men we revere in Kiwanis have constantly warned us against this complacency and drift. The founding fathers who wrote our constitution and bylaws wrote them so that Kiwanis could extend anywhere in the world where men are free to think and believe and speak and worship and work unselfishly for their fellow men. So it was that we naturally grew from the United States into Canada within a short time of our being founded. So it was when our constitutional objects were adopted in Denver in 1924, they spoke in terms that could command the respect and permit the participation of freemen around the globe.

So it was that the several international board committees and special commissions appointed through the past generation to study whether Kiwanis should extend beyond Canada and the United States, while feeling unable to solve the problems of expansion at their respective times, have never recommended that we should betray the universal vision of Kiwanis and have always affirmed that our fellowship should be as broad as all the lands of freedom.

But while all these special committees and commissions, over a generation, could only affirm or recommend, our officials could act, and only they could give you, the delegates of Kiwanis International, an explicit invitation to urge such action. I regret that they have not, during this generation, acted or given you such explicit invitation to urge such action.

During this generation, other men's civic club organizations have so acted and have gone around the world in membership, in service, in the cause of freedom and peace. During this generation women's civic club organizations have so acted and have so gone around the world. During this generation, children's civic club organizations have so acted and have so gone around the world.

I say to you that what other men and women and children have proved can be done can also be done by Kiwanians.

Now the Board of Kiwanis International has given you an explicit invitation to urge upon us this action that we join the rest of the free world and that we invite it to join us.

You will have the opportunity to vote in this convention on the basic question:

"*Resolved*, We favor the establishment of Kiwanis clubs in other countries in addition to Canada and the United States, under due safeguards fixed by the Board of Trustees of Kiwanis International."

I want it crystal clear that, upon this question, I do not consider my function as president of this great organization to be that of a fence sitter. I want it known that I consider a "yes" vote to this view to be a "yes" vote for the salvation of Kiwanis.

I have no hesitation in predicting that if we vote "no," if we vote that we will pass the rest of the world by on the other side of the road, we shall lose our souls and be lost to history.

Certainly reasonable men may differ about the methods, the tempo, the procedures of our extending Kiwanis into countries other than Canada and the United States. Certainly we shall want the international board to provide due safeguards for such expansion. But I do not see how devoted Kiwanians can differ on the point that the heritage of Kiwanis would be helpful to men in other hemispheres. I do not see how unselfish men could withhold that help. I do not see how we can stop and stoop to count minor coins of cost when the world needs all the good neighborliness we can give. I do not see how religious and unselfish men can fail to extend the hand of fellowship to other men.

And when our beloved countries of Canada and the United States and the cause of freedom they champion are in mortal peril in psychological battlefronts all around the world, and when it has been made clear that they and the cause of freedom need the example of friendship, the way of community service, the human and spiritual rather than the material concern of men, the extension of organization and help to men struggling to remain free, to learn the ways of freedom, and yearning for the strength of other freemen to stand with them, I can't believe that Kiwanis will fail to volunteer in defense of these causes of our countries and the cause of freedom.

But I reached yet a third conclusion. It is not enough just to recruit more men here. It is not enough to join to them legions of men in other countries. All of this achieves a vast and virile fellowship. It collects a tremendous energy. But that fellowship must look to a great good; that energy must run and hum to a great purpose.

And that great purpose I would rediscover for you—rediscover, because it also comes from our rich past. It also has long since been revealed. But it has not always been revered.

A rereading of the objects of Kiwanis, shining ahead of us now these 37 years, since 1924, will reveal that the great aim of Kiwanis is citizenship, education, and service.

The phrases matched to this great conclusion roll one upon another—human and spiritual—the Golden Rule—higher standards—intelligent, serviceable citizenship—enduring friendship—altruistic service—building better communities—sound public opinion—high idealism—the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

These objects compose a charter of citizenship for country and world. How disillusioning that we have so often read it, at best, as a community improvement association advertisement.

Every man can be proud of all that we have done with boys' clubs and scout camps and tree plantings and dental care and scores of like projects. Every man knows that we will stand ready at any time to continue to help in any of these areas. But anyone who believes that social service and community charities form the first business of civic clubs in the second half of the 20th century is still living in the first half of it.

What our founders could foresee in 1924 we should be able in 1961 plainly to see to forestall an Orwellian 1984.

All that we have done has been good. But we have done so little of what we can do, and now must do.

The education of ourselves as exemplary citizens, the education of others for this end—this is our duty and our destiny.

Free representative government has run a terrible gantlet of war and disaster during this century. If we have learned any lesson from it, that lesson is that there must be full, informed, and active concern for the day-to-day course of free, representative government on the part of most citizens.

This concern cannot take the form of a sudden lash or a sudden slamming of brakes by means of a Presidential election or an angry town meeting. What is needed is steadiness of hand and purpose.

If we have an active citizenry, we can aim for a special achievement. This achievement is the momentous but entirely possible one of reconciling and harnessing the forces which threaten to tear fre society apart. These forces are rarely recognized for what they are: they are forces of pride and prejudice.

American audiences today have long since passed the day of naiveté when they watched and gullibly accepted the offering that the villain always wore a black handlebar mustache and carried a horsewhip. But the American public is still deluded that the only great villain of freedom wears a hammer and sickle and carries a red flag.

We should know this is false from the fact that, less than 20 years ago, the villain wore a swastika and carried the flag of the rising sun. Many times before that, in our history of freedom, this villain has worn other disguises.

Yes, the current disguise of tyranny—that of communism—is the great danger, but it is a danger to be met and forestalled on the international stage, not with hysteria but with adequate defenses for the free nations and the rule of law. Yet, it is a danger at home, but a danger to be met and forestalled not with hysteria but with positive education in the ways of freedom and the rule of law.

The true villain of today—as always—is ourselves, the pressure groups of despair, of hysteria, of selfishness that we form or allow to be formed and launched against one another.

Most of these groups—aggregations of opinions—formed originally out of indispensable pride to which we owe all our accomplishments. But a half turn given to them by men of ill will and an apathetic public of no will can change them into the cruel and cutting swords of prejudice.

We are so cutting and wounding one another today in America. The forces of conservatism and liberalism are today tearing at the very fabric threads of free government, in peril of forgetting that the pride of conservation and the pride of liberation can be debauched into the prejudices of dictatorship and anarchy.

Today we have a babel of spokesmen for every special interest or group, for every region, for the many tongues, but the monotonous tone of nationalism. But the result today is the same as it was in the Bible—utter confusion. Who speaks for man? Usually no one. But such spokesmen are precisely what we need.

Every great advance in human welfare has come from leadership and spokesmanship pitched above the low notes of partisanship, chauvinism, provincialism, and selfishness. When Washington measured the job to be done if we were to establish freedom and democratic rule, he said, "We must raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

This note was achieved exactly, and earlier, in our Declaration of Independence, now a part of the heritage of Canada and all the free world. Those honest and wise men who framed that imperishable document said it this way: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created free and equal." This call to men to claim their political inheritance was heard not only by American men, but by Englishmen who strongly protested the war of George III against the Colonies and who impeded the King's efforts and largely contributed to our success at Yorktown. It was heard by Frenchmen who came to us as allies and prevailed with us at Yorktown and who later, in their own Revolution, claimed their freedom.

It is the chief strength of the false and diabolical revolution of communism that it claims to speak, above national borders and national clamor, to men of all countries. If we are to meet and finally defeat this false and fatal revolution, we cannot do it by the use of bombs, even hydrogen bombs. We must have such bombs, certainly, to forestall any attack by their bombs. But we can defeat them only if we can oppose their false revolution with our true revolution, only if we meet their universal voice of slavery disguised as liberation with the true universal voice of freedom.

Lincoln was speaking to the world, and not to the disunited United States alone, when he called democracy the last best hope of the earth.

We are concerned not with the forms of government but with the substance of consent of the governed. Some societies may have a president and a congress, or they may have other forms of government. In economics they may display more or less government ownership of property and means of production.

We shall continue foundering upon, instead of leading away from, the rocks of international anarchy if we persist in trying to make the world over precisely in our political and economic image.

What we have had a phenomenal historic success in, and what can still give us a peaceful and stable world, is giving leadership and aid to other countries in achieving for themselves and within themselves the same spirit of respect for the rights of the individual and government by the uncoerced consent of the individual governed which we know here in North America.

We must recognize that the spirit of responsible democratic freedom is invincible propaganda in the world because it is, has been, and always will be invincible truth.

We did not invent it. It has evolved out of the long struggle for man's independence and security. But in our own American Revolution and the consequent histories of our Governments in the United States and Canada, we have given the first and most forceful expression to it in modern history.

We have here the great truth of human history, and it is truth that can make men free. It has toppled tyrannies everywhere. It will topple the Soviet tyranny and every other attempt by vicious men to play the devil over other men. It will succeed if we can give it clear expression and high fidelity of service. We must have the faith; we must perform the work.

In the popular psychology of our time we speak of the image of a thing or a man or a country. If Kiwanis is to survive and grow and serve in our world, it must have an image that commands the attention and the respect and the admiration of the world. If our highest function is to educate our-

selves to be worthy freemen to help the world to become fully free, we must have clearly before our eyes and firmly in our hearts the vision of such a truly freeman.

I spoke first of our beginning together in 1954. I wish to close by repeating now certain words that I spoke to you in Miami in 1954 about that freeman—words that seemed to me then to be true, and seem to me now to be true, and to which, I suggest, we must be true if we are to achieve our destiny:

THIS, KIWANIANS BELIEVE

Kiwanis believes in the freeman. The freeman is a free citizen.

He is free to think, to learn, to speak, to worship, to meet with other freemen, to elect his representatives, and to limit their power. He may be accused and tried only by the due and historic process of the law.

The freeman is responsible. As he prizes his own freedoms, he jealously guards them for his fellow citizens. He studies the issues of his day and his community. He decides them on merit. He utters and votes these decisions. He is loyal to his country. He is loyal to the ideal of freedom for men in all countries.

The freeman is a gentleman. He knows that democratic government operates by resolving controversies within the limits of law and mutual respect. He debates issues and not personalities. He respects the rights, customs, beliefs, and institutions of other men—requiring only the same of them.

The freeman is a spiritual man. He ascribes all wisdom to the Creator and not to men. He believes he can earn his spiritual way only by service to others. He seeks blessings for all, and not credits for himself.

He is the man we Kiwanians pledge ourselves to try to be. He is the man, who, one day, with God's help, will set our world firmly upon its spiritual axis. He is the freeman.

Will German People Expose Khrushchev as the Puppet Master of East German Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while we meet the Berlin crisis by sending mild notes of protest to which Krushchev pays absolutely no attention, it may be that the German people themselves will expose, for all the world to see, the Communist dictator as the puppet master who pulls the strings which make the East German officials dance. In this connection I call your attention to the thoughts developed in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

NOT WHOLLY WISHFUL THOUGHTS ON BERLIN

One of the news photographs shows a line of West Berlin civilians jeering at East Berlin police who are placing barbed wire entanglements along the border. Only a few yards separate the jeerers from the jeered. Other pictures show the West Berliners not jeering but scowling and shouting what, to judge from their expressions, must be imprecations and insults.

The dispatches tell of West Berliners tossing rocks at the despised East Berlin cops and the police and militiamen retaliating with tear gas volleys. A great concentration of East Germans and Russian forces in and around Berlin is reported. The people of West Berlin have been admonished by their authorities to remain well back of the dividing line lest some incident occur that would lead to bloodshed.

Trotsky from his own revolutionary experience has emphasized the obvious truth that when the organized forces of an unpopular government refuse to obey an order to fire on the mob, that government is on the verge of being overthrown. The East German Government is thoroughly unpopular and in the superheated atmosphere of Berlin the East Germans themselves might assert themselves as they did in street demonstrations 8 years ago. Likewise, the West Germans might surge over the border, testing the loyalty to the Communist cause of the police, the East German militia, and the rest of the East German forces which were set up to support the Ulbricht regime but may prove unreliable.

The task of repression might then fall directly upon the Russians and place them at a huge disadvantage before the world in any negotiations with the allies that may be impending. Khrushchev would find it not merely hard but impossible to pretend any longer that the East German Government had any respectable reason for existence or was anything but an invention of his own.

It would be instructive to know if the concentration of Ulbricht's forces in Berlin has greatly weakened him in other East German centers. If so, we should think it probable that there will be disorders in these provincial cities and towns and the repression by the Russians will start there rather than in Berlin itself.

Federal Assistance Necessary To Specially Train Teachers of the Deaf and Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 5360, a bill which would make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities, and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps. I was one of the sponsors of similar legislation in the 86th Congress.

The Special House Subcommittee on Education under the chairmanship of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, held hearings yesterday and today on this legislation. The Senate passed a similar bill on March 3. I sincerely hope that the House will have an opportunity to pass this vitally needed legislation in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include my testimony before Chairman GREEN's Special Subcommittee on Education, and an article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, which appeared in the New York Sunday Times of August 13, 1961, entitled "Loss of Hearing—Part 1: Six Million in Nation Suffer Impairments—Nature of Disabilities Is Little Known," with my remarks:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD P. BOLAND BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

AUGUST 16, 1961.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Education, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee, this morning, to make my views known on legislation to assist in educating and rehabilitating the handicapped.

As you know, my bill, H.R. 5360, is one of the pieces of legislation under consideration by this committee. My bill would make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

An identical Senate version, sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL (S. 336), was passed by the Senate on March 3. These bills are supported by the four professional organizations in this country which are primarily concerned with the education of deaf children: The Council on Education of the Deaf; the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf; and, the American Instructors of the Deaf.

There has been a critical nationwide shortage of trained classroom teachers of deaf children over the past years, and the shortage of the school year beginning next month, September 1961, will be critical indeed.

One of the outstanding schools specializing in this field is the Clarke School for the Deaf in Northampton, Mass., within my congressional district. Principal George T. Pratt of the Clarke School has told me that there will be a nationwide shortage of 454 qualified teachers of the deaf at the beginning of the 1961–62 school year, an increase of 85 over the shortage of the school year 1960–61. Mr. Pratt obtained these figures by an actual head count from 269 of the 400 schools and classes for deaf children in this country.

While only 177 teachers in this specialty were trained during the last year, there are over 30,000 deaf children of school age. These children will grow up to become useful productive citizens if they can obtain the proper special education. The States have no training facilities to provide properly trained teachers of the deaf. I believe that this must become a Federal responsibility to establish a program of grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions of higher education to cover the cost of courses and establishing fellowships for qualified persons.

I sincerely hope that the members of the subcommittee will report the bill favorably, so that this legislation can reach the floor of the House and be passed in this session of Congress.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

LOSS OF HEARING—I: SIX MILLION IN NATION SUFFER IMPAIRMENTS—NATURE OF DISABILITIES IS LITTLE KNOWN

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Of all types of disabling conditions, hearing loss, the Nation's leading cause of disability, is one of the least understood.

Most of us automatically think of the deaf when we think of hearing loss, for we are aware of their communcation problems. Of the nearly 6 million persons in the United States with impaired hearing, however, only 109,000, or less than 2 percent, are deaf.

The severe problems of the deaf are not to be minimized, and we are usually considerate and understanding of them in our social and business contacts.

Frequently, however, we consider the person with impaired hearing as either slow, inattentive, vague or overaggressive, because we fail to recognize that his behavior is the result of a communication disorder.

As Norton Canfield, M.D., points out in the new public affairs pamphlet, "You and Your Hearing," published earlier this month, the principal types of hearing disorders are conductive deafness and perceptive deafness.

TWO TYPES OF DEAFNESS

Conductive deafness results from interference with the passage of sound to the inner ear. It may be caused by increased stiffness of the tissues of the middle ear, mechanical obstructions, blocking of the Eustachian tubes, scar tissue or excessive bony formation.

Perceptive or nerve deafness involves the inner ear. It may be caused by infection, injury or traumatizing noise.

Other types of deafness are those which are psychogenic in nature or a mixed deafness involving both the conductive and perceptive deafness.

Unfortunately, there has been very little basic research in the cause of deafness until recently. One of the most hopeful approaches is the temporal bone bank program of the Deafness Research Foundation.

Under this program people, are being asked to will their temporal bones for medical research in a series of banks being established in leading medical schools. Such research is greatly needed because of the inaccessibility and minute size of the temporal bone, the smallest bone in the human body. Satisfactory research on the bone in living subjects is most difficult.

A SUPPLY DIFFICULTY

Another problem in research on deafness is the fact that it is very difficult to secure a sufficient supply of diseased ears through autopsy, because people do not die of deafness.

Although hearing problems are found among persons of all ages, there is a striking increase in incidence of hearing disorders around the age of 65.

Rates of impaired hearing per 1,000 persons in the United States are: under age 25, 7.9; ages 25–44, 20.6; ages 45–64, 52.2; ages 65–74, 129.2; and ages 75 and over, 256.4.

In one study of 100 patients in a home for the aged, about one-third were found to have normal hearing and only 7 percent showed severe hearing losses.

Hearing losses due to aging result primarily from arteriosclerotic and degenerative changes in the inner ear.

Studies indicate, however, that about half of the hearing impairments in persons over 50 result from the same causes as among persons under 50.

Because of higher accident rates among men and their greater exposure to noise in industry, the incidence of impaired hearing among men is about one-third higher than among women.

NOISE-INDUCED LOSS

Noise-induced hearing loss has become increasingly important with the expansion of industry and the development of high-speed machines.

Brief exposure, for example, to noise levels of 130 to 140 decibels, such as produced by a jet engine, does not result in damage. The danger comes from frequent and prolonged exposure to such noise.

Within recent years, the development of surgical techniques in the treatment of otosclerosis has resulted in greatly improved hearing for many persons.

One technique is that of fenestration in which a new opening is produced in the inner ear, permitting sound waves to bypass the diseased bone.

STAPES MOBILIZATION

The other technique is stapes mobilization in which the stapes bone is removed and replaced by tissue or part of a vein attached to a stainless steel wire or plastic tube.

Only about 20 percent, however, of all hearing impairments are caused by otosclerosis and permanent improvement results in only one-half of the cases treated. Results when successful are highly dramatic; persons who have been deaf for years frequently gain normal hearing.

Today, many hearing disorders can be improved through treatment. Through early detection of such losses and remedial measures such as hearing aids and lip reading, the damaging emotional, social and vocational sequelae can be prevented.

The most important aspect of hearing conservation is early detection of hearing loss.

Brooklyn's Famed Fighting 14th Regiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to Brooklyn's famed "Fighting 14th," that New York State Militia regiment which served so bravely during the Civil War. Mr. Bruce Catton, chairman of the New York State Civil War Centennial, has aptly said:

As untested and untried citizen soldiers, these men of Brooklyn stood up so valiantly to the heavy pounding at First Bull Run that they earned for their regiment forever, the motto—"Baptized by Fire." These red-legged devils who volunteered en masse for 3 years' service in the Civil War suffered almost incredible hardships and losses. With a toughness, a discipline, and an esprit de corps seldom equaled in our military history. Brooklyn's red-legged devils fought through from First Bull Run to Spotsylvania.

Brig. Gen. Charles G. Stevenson, the adjutant general of New York and vice chief of staff to the Governor, in an article entitled "Baptized by Fire" gives an account of the participation by the 14th Brooklyn Regiment in the First Battle of Bull Run written from military records. General Stevenson's article was published in the July supplement of the monthly bulletin published by the New York Civil War Centennial Commission. The article states:

One century ago on July 21, in a hot battle on a hill near a winding stream in northern Virginia, 825 men in red and blue earned the motto "Baptized by Fire" for their regiment which has lived ever since in the military history of Brooklyn and Long Island, N.Y. The battle was the First Battle of Bull Run or First Manassas on July 21, 1861. It was the initial large-scale contest of the Civil War.

The regiment was the 14th Brooklyn, New York State Militia, whose successor units in the New York Army National Guard today are: Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 187th Artillery Group; 1st Howitzer Battalion, 187th Artillery; 2d Gun Battalion, 187th Artillery, all of Brooklyn; and the 1st Medium Tank Battalion (Patton), 142d Armor of Freeport, Bay Shore, and Patchogue, Long Island.

The spirit of the Fighting 14th kindled during the tragic Civil War struggles, has continued as a torch of glowing tradition to these successor units in the New York Army National Guard.

The motto, "Baptized by Fire," was coined by the commander of the Union forces, Brig. Gen. Irvin McDowell. After the 14th had reassembled at Arlington, Va., following the battle, they learned that the number of the regiment had been changed by the State authorities to the 84th New York Volunteers. This aroused a storm of protest from officers and men. An appeal was made to General McDowell. His reply, which was upheld by the Secretary of War, was:

"You were mustered by me into the service of the United States as a part of the Militia of the State of New York known as the 14th. You have been baptized by fire under that number and as such you shall be recognized by the U.S. Government and by no other number."

The 14th Infantry, New York National Guard adopted the motto when that regiment was reestablished after World War I. It has been worn by the 14th and successor units to the present time. Today, it is the motto on the crest of one of the successor units.

The situation prior to the First Battle of Bull Run was this: The Confederates held a position northeast of Manassas, Va., stretching along the high ground west of Bull Run, from the Stone Bridge on the Centerville-Warrenton Pike on the left, to the woods at the Union Mills on the right. The bulk of the Confederate forces was in position at the fords in the center of their line, which was in front of Manassas, the focal point of the defense.

General McDowell, Union Commander in Chief, decided to envelop the enemy left. He entrusted the main effort to two of his four divisions—the 2d and 3d commanded by Cols. David Hunter and Samuel P. Heintzelman, respectively. Tyler's 1st Division was to threaten the center and left at the Stone Bridge and lower fords. Another division, under General Miles, was held in reserve at Centerville.

The operation opened at 2:30 a.m. in the morning of July 21, 1861, when Tyler, Hunter, and Heintzelman moved out of their bivouacs around Centerville, to which they had marched from Arlington, a few days before. After almost 3 hours delay caused by the slowness of the 1st Division in clearing camp, Hunter's 2d Division, composed of the brigades of Burnside and Porter, leading the envelopment, crossed Cub Run on the Warrenton Pike (now U.S. Route 29, Virginia Route 211). They turned north into a wood road a few miles west of Centerville and headed for the ford across Bull Runt at Sudley Springs about 3 miles to the north of the Pike.

Burnside's brigade splashed across the run, swung to the left pursuant to McDowell's plan and pushed down the Sudley Springs—Manassas road (now Virginia Route 234). Burnside, with the 71st New York State Militia as the 2d regiment in line, engaged the Confederates who had moved to Matthews Hill to meet him.

The 14th, in Porter's brigade following Burnside, arrived at the ford at about 10 a.m. Following a short rest, the 14th forded Bull Run, marched along an unused railroad grade and came under enemy artillery fire. Porter's brigade formed on the right of Burnside's. The 14th doubletimed southward towards the front, passed through a small woods and came out in a clearing. They saw Griffin's battery firing at a Confederate bat-

tery on Henry House Hill across the Warrenton Turnpike. The men dropped their blanket rolls in the clearing. Led by Lt. W. W. Averill of Colonel Porter's staff, they advanced past the west side of the J. Dogan House to the Pike. The 14th was followed by the 8th New York Militia. They turned east on the Pike and advanced to the Sudley-Manassas Road.

The purpose of this maneuver, as shown by Colonel Porter in his official report after the battle, dated July 25, 1861, was to cut off the retreat of the Confederates who were being beaten back from Matthews Hill by Burnside, assisted by Sykes' battalion of Regulars and by the 27th New York Volunteers of Porter's brigade. Porter said in his afteraction report:

"The rebels soon came flying from the woods toward the right, and the 27th completed their rout by charging directly upon their center in the face of a scorching fire, while the 14th and 8th New York Militia moved down the turnpike to cut off the retiring force, and to support the 27th, which had lost its galaint colonel (Slocum, who was wounded in the right thigh in this fight) but was standing the brunt of the action with its ranks thinning in the dreadful fire. Now the resistance of the enemy's left was so obstinate that the beaten right retired in safety * * * . The 14th, though it had broken, was soon rallied in rear of Griffin's battery * * *."

Lieutenant Colonel Fowler of the 14th described this first "baptism of fire" of the 14th in an account written in 1883 and published in 1911 in the regimental history. He said:

"On reaching the Sudley Ford Road, which crosses the pike well up the hill toward the Henry House, by some misunderstanding an order was sent to the head of the column to turn to the left in this road instead of to advance up the pike and charge the battery (on the Henry House Hill). From the woods on the far side of the road we received a severe and continuous fire of musketry from a force of the enemy in ambush, who could not be seen. The regiment returned the fire, then broke and reformed behind the fence on the road."

At this moment, as indicated by Colonel Porter's report, an officer of Griffin's battery requested the 14th to support the battery. The regiment changed position and placed itself in rear of the battery which then took position east of the J. Dogan house. The rebel fire was attracted to the red pants of the 14th—with resulting casualties to the artillerymen in front—so the regiment moved 100 yards in front of the battery. For a time, they received the enemy fire, which was high, with little loss. Then, the Confederates, finding that they could not hit the Red Legs any other way, began to ricochet their round shot—in other words, bounce them at the 14th—a hard thing to imagine in these days of high-powered weapons. The Rebel tactic made the position too hot and the regiment was marched a short distance to the Warrenton Pike.

The artillery batteries (Griffin's and Ricketts') were at this time called upon for more strenuous service. They were ordered by General McDowell through Maj. William F. Barry, his chief of artillery, to take position on the Henry House Hill supported by the marines of Porter's brigade and the 11th New York Volunteer Infantry (The Fire Zouaves) of Colonel Heintzelman's 3d Di--vision.

Then, two companies of Col. J. E. B. Stuart's 1st Virginia Cavalry charged the 11th. The Zouaves gave them a scattering fire which emptied a few saddles. A few minutes later a fatal mistake occurred. A Confederate infantry regiment clad in blue emerged from the woods on the right of the batteries. Major Barry advised Griffin that the advancing force was a Federal regiment sent by Heintzelman to support the batteries. The Confederates opened fire at not more than 60 to 70 yards distance and wiped out half of Griffin's and Ricketts' guncrews. The guns were captured.

The Rebel regiment was the 33d Virginia Infantry of the brigade made famous by the name "Stonewall" given to it and its commander, Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson, earlier in the battle by Brig. Gen. Barnard E. Bee of South Carolina.

At about this time, the 14th, according to Colonel Fowler, advanced up the hill "to a position near the woods on the right of the lost batteries."

Porter's after-action report stated:

"Griffin's and Ricketts' batteries were ordered by the commanding general to the top of the hill on our right, supporting them with the Fire Zouaves and Marines, while the 14th entered the skirt of woods on their right to protect that flank and a column composed of the 27th New York, 11th and 5th Massachusetts, 1st Minnesota, and 69th New York moved up toward the left flank of the batteries."

Porter then said the Zouaves broke and fled when fired on by some enemy infantry. Porter went on to say: "The Marines also, in spite of the exertions of their gallant officers, gave way in disorder; the 14th on the right and the column on the left hesitatingly retired, with the exception of the 69th and 38th New York who nobly stood and returned the fire of the enemy for 15 minutes."

In position, near the woods on the right of the lost batteries, Colonel Fowler said that before it was forced to withdraw, the 14th did terrible execution on Confederate reinforcements coming up in column in a ravine or water course.

According to Colonel Fowler, the fire of the Confederate reinforcements, from the front together with a crossfire from the bushes on the right and the shot and shell from the enemy batteries made the position so hot that the regiment was forced to fall back to the foot of the hill.

The Confederates opposing the 14th here were probably the 18th Virginia Infantry commanded by Col. R. E. Withers. In his afteraction report, Colonel Withers said:

"On approaching their [the Federal] position I found a pretty strong force posted in a thicket of pines, in some places almost impenetrable. With a cheer we dashed into the thicket and pushed forward, the enemy retiring as we advanced.

"They were composed principally of the 14th New York Chasseurs, and several of their number were killed and captured by the left wing of my regiment."

The 14th, repulsed after its first climb up the hill, rallied on the Sudley Ford road and advanced a second time to the summit.

On the second advance, the 14th was supported by the battalion of marines in its rear. Colonel Fowler stated that on reaching the top of the hill, his men dropped to the ground; the enemy's volley passed over them and "took effect on the Marines who notwithstanding the earnest efforts, in language more forcible than pious, of their commander, Major Reynolds, broke and ran to the rear, soon followed by the unsupported 14th."

This action by the 14th is substantiated by the after-action report of Maj. John Reynolds of the marines, dated July 24, 1861. He said that he was directed by Colonel Porter "to afford the necessary support of Griffin's battery." In taking this position, he said: "The battalion was exposed to a galling fire."

Then, he continued in his report:

"While holding it (the position in support of Griffin's battery), General McDowell ordered the battalion to cover or support the 14th New York Regiment, which was about to be engaged. The battalion, in consequence, took the position indicated by the general, but was unable to hold it, owing to the heavy fire which was opened upon them."

The 14th reformed on the Sudley Ford road for a third attack, but it had scarcely commenced when a fresh Confederate brigade appeared on its right rear and opened fire.

Colonel Fowler stated that: "On looking to the rear and left every regiment was seen in disordered flight from the field with Sykes' battalion of regulars drawn up in line beyond the turnpike as a rallying point. But everything drifted past them to the rear."

The 14th with the rest of the Union Army left the field generally by the route by which it came. It assembled again the next day—July 22—at the camp it had left in Arlington.

Col. Harry W. Michell who commanded the 14th after the war—from 1885 to 1898—was a private in Company C at Bull Run. He said: "I saw little of the panic at Bull Run of which so much has been written. The 14th kept a perfect formation and marched off the field in good order."

However, Colonel Fowler indicated that the retreat later degenerated into a stampede. He said: "The integrity of regiments and even companies was entirely lost and officers and men drifted to the rear, each on his own account." He expressed his opinion, however, that it was "providential that this defeat occurred. If we had won this battle we would have pushed on to Richmond and a compromise peace would have been arranged, leaving the great question of slavery to be settled at a future day at doubtless greater cost. This encounter did much to create an army, proved that the service was to be no holiday excursion or picnic, and those who came with such expectations found they had mistaken their vocations when brought face to face with the horrors of war and the resignations of officers and * * * desertions of enlisted men soon relieved the army of such useless material."

The regiment lost 2 officers and 21 enlisted men killed in the battle. Ten men died of wounds. Sixty-four men were wounded and 30 captured, including Colonel Wood.

At camp in Arlington, the 14th reorganized. Lieutenant Colonel Fowler said he worked "night and day to the end of making the regiment what it afterward became in the field—one of the most efficient, best drilled and disciplined in the service."

During this period, an interesting situation arose having to do with the regiment's red pants. Colonel Fowler wrote that: "They were worn out and the Army blue had to be substituted until other red pants could be supplied by contract and although the blue looked neat and comfortable, the men were not pleased with them as they would not be found dead without the red pants on. The Government soon supplied the distinctive uniform of the regiment and continued to furnish it during its term of service."

Few regiments wore their distinctive uniform throughout 3 years of active service, as did the 14th.

General Fowler commanded the 14th during the rest of its 3 years' service. He was seriously wounded at the Battle of Groveton, Va., in the Second Bull Run Campaign on August 29, 1862.

Mustered out of service on June 6, 1864, he was brevetted brigadier general for gallant and meritorious conduct. The entire city of Brooklyn paid tribute to him on his death, January 16, 1896. Some years later, a statue of General Fowler was erected. It stands in Fort Greene Park near DeKalb Avenue and Cumberland Street, Brooklyn.

On October 20, 1906, a monument erected by the State of New York was unveiled on a small hill just south of the Warrenton Turnpike (now U.S. Route 29, Virginia Route 211) at Groveton, Va. Although the 14th did not actually fight on this hill at Frst Bull Run it was heavily engaged there

on August 29, 1862, in the Battle of Groveton of the Second Bull Run Campaign.

Originally, the site was not within the limits of the Manassas National Battlefield Park. It became overgrown with weeds, bushes, and trees. In 1949, the New York Legislature appropriated funds to clean up the site, after which, pursuant to a 1950 act of the legislature, it was deeded to the Federal Government together with nearby monuments erected in honor of the 5th New York (Duryee's Zouaves) and 10th New York (National Zouaves) Volunteer regiments. In 1952, the legislature authorized the purchase of additional land surrounding the sites of the monuments and authorized the land to be deeded by the State to the Federal Government.

As a result of these acts, the monuments and their environs are now located within the confines of the park, which was not the case before. They are properly cared for by the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, this very cogent article is of special interest to me, not only because my brother Capt. Dennis J. Carey was a World War II member of the old 14th but by reason of their love of the unit in our borough.

On July 21, 1961, the 100th anniversary of the First Battle of Bull Run or First Manassas a group of over 50 members and friends of the 14th New York Infantry World War Veterans' Association of Brooklyn, N.Y., conducted a rededication of the 14th Brooklyn Monument at Groveton on the Second Bull Run Battlefield. The pilgrimage from Brooklyn to Bull Run was made by chartered bus.

The ceremonies included the presentation of a symbolic deed to some 126 acres on the battlefield from the State of New York to the United States. This land includes the sites of the Brooklyn 14th Monument and the sites of two other New York monuments, those of the 5th New York Volunteer Infantry (Duryee Zouaves) and 10th New York Volunteer Infantry (National Zouaves), together with the surrounding land necessary to incorporate the entire area around the three monuments into the Manassas National Battlefield Park. General Stevenson presented the symbolic deed to Mr. Elbert Cox, Regional Director, Region I of the National Park Service, Richmond, Va., who turned the "deed" over to Mr. Francis F. Wilshin, superintendent of the Manassas National Battlefield Park. The document will be displayed in the museum located in the park headquarters building.

General Stevenson was a prime mover in this project. His interest grew out of a visit he made to the site of the 14th Monument in 1944, and saw at that time the deplorable condition of the monument and its surroundings. General Stevenson lived in Brooklyn for 38 years and served over 13 years in the 14th Infantry, New York National Guard, prior to World War II.

Mr. James F. Evans, former director of New York State parks, was mainly responsible for procuring the passage of the 1950 and 1952 acts of the New York State Legislature under which the land and monuments were deeded to the Federal Government. He was ably assisted by Dr. Albert B. Corey, New York State historian. Dr. Corey and Mr. Evans spoke at the ceremonies on July 21, 1961 as representatives of the New York Civil War Centennial Commission.

The ceremonies were conducted under the auspices of the 14th New York Infantry World War Veterans Association of Brooklyn and the New York Civil War Centennial Commission. Speakers at the ceremonies besides General Stevenson, Dr. Corey, Mr. Evans, Mr. Cox and Mr. Wilshin, were Maj. Gen. Paul M. Booth, The Adjutant General of Virginia who extended greetings to the visitors from the Commonwealth of Virginia; Col. William J. Munday of Brooklyn, president of the 14th New York Infantry World War Veterans Association and Col. Theodore J. Krokus of Brooklyn, national commander of the 27th Division Association, who said in his rededication address:

Today we rededicate this monument to the men of our regiment, the old 14th, who, on this spot and in this vicinity fought in the cause of national unity and freedom. We honor too, the brave men of the South, who left this battlefield as victors.

Col. James J. Gambee of Lynbrook, Long Island, former colonel of the 14th Infantry, New York Guard, was chairman of the ceremonies.

Let's Curb Modern Piracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, if the stockworn phrase "there ought to be a law" ever needed to be speedily applied it is today when the Nation's airplane riders need protection against a wave of air piracy.

The Bay City (Mich.) Times, published in my hometown, appropriately cited the urgency of such legislation in an editorial a few days ago. Since it is so much to the point I submit that editorial for the attention of my colleagues.

It follows:

LET'S KEEP CRIME OUT OF THE SKY

National and international implications of the recent attempts to hijack multimillion-dollar U.S. passenger planes make the need for stiff Federal laws to halt future crimes of this nature most appallingly evident.

The claim is often made that Americans are overburdened with laws. It was therefore a most startling discovery to find that our civil aircraft and their passengers and crews were so poorly protected by the law against the depredations of hijackers and other criminals.

That Federal agencies and the Congress now are moving swiftly to close this gap only emphasizes past neglect.

All signs on Capitol Hill suggest we will soon have a tough law on the books. But recent plane hijack episodes in quick series had Federal Aviation Agency lawyers searching vainly for anything applicable to those fantastic developments.

Actually, aviation law is nearly blank on crimes committed while a plane is airborne. That law has had one main goal—aircraft safety.

When the Eastern Airlines Electra was hijacked and taken to Cuba, the Justice Department had to comb U.S. statutes to charge the culprit in absentia. It finally came up with kidnaping, stealing an aircraft in interstate commerce "and crime on the high seas."

Legislation being shaped in Congress plainly must cover not just these spectacular cases but a wide range of possible offenses committed in flight. As one aviation official put it wryly:

"Our planes have gotten big enough in the last few years to make room for the major vices."

Leaving hijacking aside for the moment. Suppose murder, arson, simple assault, molestation and such offenses are committed aloft. What law governs? What State takes jurisdiction?

In an age of high-speed, high-altitude jets, when borders are fuzzily seen and a small State is crossed in 8 or 10 minutes, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine in which State a crime has been committed aboard an airliner.

Most Americans will probably welcome, then, the lawmakers intent not only to equate hijacking with piracy (with mandatory life sentence or possible death penalty) but to cover many crimes with a stiff Federal law.

Yet any provisions, executive or legislative, calling either for arming a plane crew or installing armed guards aboard must be applied with extreme caution. Airborne gunfights could bring danger both to individual passengers and to the plane itself, since stray bullets might send the aircraft crashing in flames.

Since U.S. Chanceries in Foreign Capitals Are Located in Business Areas Foreign Nations Should, in the Interest of Comity, Locate Their Chanceries in Business Areas in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a House resolution declaring:

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that since the United States is generally required, in locating its chanceries abroad to observe the laws and zoning regulations applicable to business-type buildings in the capital cities of those nations with which diplomatic relations are maintained such foreign nations should, in the interest of comity, observe the laws and zoning regulations with regard to the location of business-type buildings in the District of Columbia and locate chanceries in business areas rather than in residential areas to the detriment of such residential areas.

I am pleased at the support which this resolution had evoked, and is evoking.

I include here for the information of my colleagues a letter I have received from Judge Russell E. Train, of the Tax Court of the United States, together with Judge Train's statement before the Board

of Zoning Adjustment on August 16, 1961.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: Please accept my heartfelt thanks for your very timely statements in regard to our local zoning problems concerning chanceries.

The Star article which you placed in the RECORD quoted at some length from my letter to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. I am testifying on the matter before the Board this morning and am passing along to you a copy of my statement.

Again many thanks. The residents of Washington badly need more friends like yourself.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN, *Judge.*

AUGUST 16, 1961.

STATEMENT OF JUDGE RUSSELL E. TRAIN BEFORE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT IN OPPOSITION TO APPEAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TO ESTABLISH A CHANCERY AT 29TH AND WOODLAND DRIVE, DOCKET NO. 6420

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, I am Judge Russell E. Train of the U.S. Tax Court. I own and reside at the property at 3101 Woodland Drive NW. I appear in opposition to the application of the Embassy of Panama to construct a chancery at 29th and Woodland Drive, two blocks from my home.

I have previously addressed a letter to the Board expressing my views on the matter and ask that that letter be made a part of the official record of these proceedings.

I also ask to have included in the record a statement on this same subject in the House of Representatives by the Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 1961, at pages A6323 and A6324. The statement includes the text of a House resolution which reads as follows:

"*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that since the United States is generally required, in locating its chanceries abroad to observe the laws and zoning regulations applicable to business-type buildings in the capital cities of those nations with which diplomatic relations are maintained such foreign nations should, in the interest of comity, observe the laws and zoning regulations with regard to the location of business-type buildings in the District of Columbia and locate chanceries in business areas rather than in residential areas to the detriment of such residential areas."

I also ask to have included in the record an article which appeared in last Sunday's Star on page one on this matter, likewise an article which appeared in the Evening Star of yesterday, August 15, at page B–1.

In my letter to the Board, I questioned the appropriateness of scheduling a hearing of this nature in mid-August when a large number of affected property owners are normally away. I wish to reiterate the point at this time. Every effort has been made to reach these people by long-distance telephone, by cable, and in two instances by radio at sea. Despite the short notice available, I believe many of them have been able to record their views with the Board, although hardly under circumstances which the importance of the situation warrants. In this conneciton, I would like to mention the following owners of Woodland Drive property who are away at this time, many of whom it has been impossible to contact: the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and Mrs. Edward Cushing, 3224 Woodland Drive; Mr. Marcella Dupont, 3200 Woodland Drive; Baron and Baroness Silvercruys, the former Netherlands Ambassador, 3201 Woodland Drive; Mrs. Frederick Gould, 3120 Woodland Drive; Mrs. Paul Bastedo, 3010 Woodland Drive; Mr. and Mrs. Ganson Purcell, 3000 Woodland Drive; Mr. and Mrs. Roger Neuhoff, 2919 Woodland Drive; Col. and Mrs. Albert Hoffman, 2910 Woodland Drive; Col. and Mrs. Albert Cox, 2875 Woodland Drive which is next door to the proposed construction; Mr. and Mrs. Garfield Kass, 2850 Woodland Drive; the Honorable Joseph Grew, former Under Secretary of State and distinguished Ambassador, 2840 Woodland Drive; and Mrs. Gilbert Hitchcock, 2817 Woodland Drive. These individuals represent almost one-third of the private owners of property along Woodland Drive, and not included are the many more who own closely adjacent and equally affected property.

My attorney, Mr. Samuel Spencer, has already called to your attention the several deficiencies in the application in question, any one of which will, I am certain, require rejection of the application.

Now, with your permission, I wish to address myself to the merits of the application, because I believe that it is on this basis that it must be rejected.

Woodland Drive is only six blocks long but it represents one of the finest residential areas remaining in the city of Washington—I use the word "remaining" advisedly because there are very few left. A city which once was the pride of the Nation and the admiration of foreign visitors is rapidly giving way to the urban blight which afflicts our time.

Woodland Drive is a winding street, a quiet street, a street of detached homes, a unique area which, while close to downtown Washington, is distinguished for its fine homes, its trees, its gardens, an area in the heart of the city where children and pets and all that add up to a decent family life can be maintained.

Obviously, the construction of an office building at 29th and Woodland Drive is going to aggravate the existing traffic problem on a narrow street. Obviously, such a chancery will result in substantial additional parking. I understand that the building plan calls for a small parking lot to hold about five cars which will be entirely inadequate. In itself, a parking lot in a residential neighborhood of this type is undesirable and unsightly. The very fact that provision is made for one indicates recognition of the increased parking problem which inevitably must follow. Moreover, we all know that diplomats are not subject to parking restrictions, will park double, and while other residents will be prohibited by law from using the Embassy spaces, the chancery employees will be under no such inhibition insofar as the spaces in front of private homes are concerned. Obviously, property values are going to be lowered. Obviously, tax revenues to the District government are going to decrease. Obviously, further impetus will be given to the existing flight of resident citizens to Virginia and Maryland.

All of these matters are, I am sure, of common knowledge to you gentlemen. I would like to address myself to more basic issues.

We all know that the issue here today is not whether the Embassy of Panama alone is to be permitted a variance from the zoning regulations. The real issue, the one which this Board cannot escape, is whether the finest residential area remaining in the city of Washington is going to be destroyed or whether the R–1A zoning of the area is going to be upheld against this and similar onslaughts.

There are at present on Woodland Drive 10 embassies. There are six more in the immediate Woodland Drive area. Only last week, I was called upon by two real estate agents who were seeking property for new embassies. Sixteen embassies today will be 20 tomorrow. I live at one corner of 31st and Woodland. Within the past 2 months, one of the other corners has been acquired as a residence Embassy by the Government of Nigeria, another by the Government of Senegal. To my knowledge, at least two of the present embassies are looking for chancery locations in the area.

There has been some suggestion that there are already chanceries on Woodland Drive. Let's get the record straight on this point. At the present time, the Embassies of Australia, El Salvador, Finland, Iraq, Uruguay, Senegal, and Nigeria—all located on Woodland Drive—all have their chanceries located elsewhere and, in most cases, at considerable distance. Of the remaining three, Panama has a small chancery in a pre-existing residence on McGill Terrace (not on Woodland Drive); while Saudi Arabia and Guatamala both house their small staffs within their Embassy residence structures. Not one single embassy has ever constructed a chancery building on the street or, to my knowledge, has applied for permission to do so, prior to this hearing. Of the six other embassies in the immediate vicinity—Canada on Rock Creek Drive, Ceylon on 30th Street, China on Woodley Road, Ghana on Benton Place, Latvia on Woodley Road, and Lebanon on McGill Terrace—not one has a chancery at the same location. Thus, the Embassy of Panama is seeking a variance which is not only incompatible with the general neighborhood but which is plainly not in accord with the established policy of almost all other diplomatic missions in the same area.

In this connection, I believe it fair to say that the Woodland Drive area has been sought as an embassy location by many nations for one reason and one reason only—because it provides the finest possible residential environment for their chiefs of mission and their families, carrying with it an opportunity for entertainment and the exercise of similar diplomatic functions in attractive and dignified surroundings. The approval of the pending application and of those which will inevitably follow can only serve to destroy the very advantages which have led so many embassies to locate themselves here in the first place. I state in all sincerity my conviction that among those who would be most adversely affected by approval of the application will be the 16 or so embassies now located on or near Woodland Drive.

We are all aware of the difficulties which foreign governments are reported to face in locating suitable embassy residences in high-grade residential areas. As I have already mentioned Woodland Drive has been chosen by several of these. I am glad to report that these—most recently Senega. and Nigeria—have been received in friendly, neighborly fashion. They have been received on the assumption that they will maintain the same high residential standards as do we who have lived in the area for many years. We ask no more; we expect no less. But, and this is a most important reservation, if the embassies which we have welcomed into our neighborhood and the others which are sure to come insist on privileges and exceptions to the law which we as American, tax-paying citizens are denied, then my attitude and that of the entire neighborhood is going to change very drastically. I have been quoted in the press and I have no hesitancy in repeating that our attitude "will change from one of friendly acceptance to one of hostility." I can think of no greater disservice to the cause of good international relations than the prosecution of this kind of application, and I hope that the State Department and my many good friends in the foreign diplomatic missions in this city will

take careful note of this point of view. Certainly, and at the very least, should this application be successful, the efforts of our State Department to find suitable residences for foreign diplomats will be made enormously more difficult.

I note in the article in last Sunday's Star that a State Department spokesman is quoted as saying on behalf of the Department:

"The District of Columbia was originally created not as a residential area but as the seat of the U.S. Government, with the thought in mind that foreign countries would send their diplomatic representatives here."

Of course, such a statement begs the question. Diplomatic representatives are welcome as such; their offices in residential areas are not so long as their are ample office facilities elsewhere in the city. I do not understand that the Embassy of Panama has been unable to find such office space or, indeed, has even sought any. The fact is that there is plenty of such space, as we all know, that would disturb no one and would probably be far more convenient and accessible to business visitors. What is sought here is simply the personal convenience and the personal accommodation of the Ambassador and a few of his staff. If the Panamanian and other Governments wish the residential advantages of the Woodland Drive and similar areas for their embassies then they should at the very least be willing to abide by the few local restrictions which exist for the protection and benefit of all.

I take strong exception with the State Department declaration just quoted to the extent that it suggests that residential values are to be ignored in this type of situation. If the Department's theory were correct, then we local property owners should have no local property tax liability. Of course, such a statement is so much poppycock. The District of Columbia is not a Federal Reservation. I do not believe it is going to be made such by State Department fiat. The District of Columbia is the seat of Federal Government. It is also the home of a large, although I am afraid diminishing, number of citizens. The people of the Woodland Drive area have no apology to make in this regard. I doubt whether any comparable area in the entire United States contains more individuals who are presently serving or who have served their community or their Nation in distinguished manner than the residents of this area, typically at great personal sacrifice. In return, we ask no favors; we ask no special privileges. We ask only this—that we be kept secure in our homes; that the law be enforced against others as we know it would be enforced against ourselves.

The standard which the law and regulations require in matters of this sort is that the proposed construction be compatible with the existing character and proposed development of the area in question. Tested by this standard, the pending application is totally defective. It is not only incompatible with but destructive of that neighborhood.

We are witnessing a creeping erosion of this city. Private residents, whether relative newcomers or persons whose families, like my own, are now in their sixth generation here, are unanimous in their feeling in this regard. We are sick of it. We are sick of being pushed around because of the supposed exigencies of the passing moment. The time has come to draw the line. The time has come for this Board to stand up for the private interests of the people of this city. If you will do so, we can have a National Capital in which our whole country can take pride; one which is not only the seat of government but which, at the same time, is a place of families and homes.

Is American Foreign Policy Being Shaped by Latin Americans Sympathetic to Communist States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, unless the United States has a strong and firm foreign policy, we face the grave danger of having our future decided by those who are not sympathetic to our form of government, but who are, indeed, partial to socialism and existing Communist states. Faced with a Soviet satellite within shooting distance of our own shores, and the stated objective of the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, to spread communism throughout the hemisphere, the United States is now in the humiliating position of being told by recipients of our aid in Latin America that we can do nothing to interfere with Cuba and her plans for aggression. Recent news items, and I include two with these remarks, tell the grim story of the meeting now going on in Punta del Este where our representatives are busy planning on how to give away more millions of the American taxpayers' money to countries who insist that nothing be done to embarrass the Castro regime or to hinder his activities as a part of the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time we speak up for the United States? Is it not past time that we demand some commitment from those we offer to help, a least to the extent that they support freedom? All that our representatives were asking in Punta del Este was for a resolution seeking free elections in Cuba, and our—friends?—insisted that such a demand upon Castro be eliminated. These are the countries which we hope, as members of the OAS, will halt the spread of Communism in this hemisphere. What a ridiculous situation. What fools we are to place the safety of our freedom on such a flimsy structure. Mr. Speaker, we must have a strong and firm foreign policy dedicated to our own self-interest. That policy should be to forbid the spending of any American money to help any country playing "footsie" with the Communists. That policy should demand that our help go only to those countries who are dedicated, as are we, to the freedom of mankind and for the right of the people of every nation to choose for themselves the kind of government they want. That policy should give us the right to take whatever action is necessary, with or without the cooperation of other countries of this hemisphere, to rid this part of the world of communism by freeing Cuba and giving her people the right to freely elect their own government. Until we do these things there will be no easing of the Berlin crisis, no halt in the steady march of communism, no hope of keeping the world free. If we are to be leaders, we must exert leadership, not accept humiliation at the hands of tiny despots like Castro, nor the dictation of Latin American governments who are trying to play both ends against the middle.

The articles to which I referred above, follow, one from the Chicago Daily Tribune and one from the New York Times:

[From the New York Tribune]

GIBE AT CUBA REMOVED FROM PROCLAMATION—LATIN AMERICAN FEUD SETTLED

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, August 15.—Latin American and U.S. delegates settled a hemispheric conference feud today by removing a political gibe at Prime Minister Fidel Castro from a conference proclamation.

Sources said the delegates to the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference agreed to throw out a reference to the necessity for "free and periodical elections" in the Americas contained in the original draft of the proclamation.

CALLED OUT OF PLACE

Some delegates believed that inclusion would merely give Cuban delegate Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Castro's economic boss, an excuse for another propaganda attack on the United States. Others argued that it was out of place in economic negotiations.

Informants said that with the concession all 21 of the nations except Cuba approved the final draft of the proclamation.

The 900-word proclamation outlines the spirit and aims of the Conference, called to put President Kennedy's $20 billion alliance-for-progress program in motion.

Delegates feared that the basic charter, running to 3,000 words, would be over the heads of most of Latin America's 200 million population. So they proposed a proclamation summarizing the charter.

MAY LAST EXTRA DAY

The Conference later bogged down in a maze of technicalities. There were indications it would drag on at least one additional day instead of adjourning tomorrow as expected, but most troubles appeared minor.

The United States took no official position in the behind-the-scenes squabble. But sources said U.S. delegates quietly agreed to the proclamation idea regardless of whether it contained the political reference.

Guevara has reiterated Castro's contention that Cubans have given their approval of the present government at big rallies and that Cuba thus does not need elections.

Brazil, backed by Argentina and Ecuador, led the fight against the free-election phrase.

A COMPROMISE VERSION

Anti-Castro delegates said such references would make it clear that any nation which did not hold free elections would not be permitted to share in the aid millions. The outcome was a compromise version which contained no harsh words and merely boiled down the bulky charter.

The big question was whether Guevara would sign the charter. The consensus was that he would not, since Cuba will get no U.S. aid. The charter pledges Latin American nations to carry out the sweeping aims of the program during the next 10 years in an effort to erase poverty and raise living standards.

The charter's 300-word preamble won a 20-to-1 vote and awaited only formal approval at a plenary session. It called for the nations to unite in a common effort and stressed that "the moment has arrived for a new impulse to our revolutionary vocation." Cuba voted "no."

LATIN DELEGATES SIDE WITH CUBA, OPPOSE A STATEMENT ON ELECTIONS

(By Edward C. Burks)

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, August 15.—An attempt to add a strong anti-Cuba political declaration to the alliance-for-progress charter apparently failed today.

The declaration, favored by Peru, would have put the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference on record in favor of honest and periodic elections.

Brazil led the opposition in informal huddles of delegates, to a political statement that would be unacceptable to Cuba. The delegates, including those of the United States, apparently have agreed to take the anti-Cuban sting out of the declaration.

Brazilian delegates said there was no reason for the conference to adopt a political line that would tend to isolate the Cubans. Up to tonight the declaration itself had not been formally put before the conference.

CONFERENCE BEHIND SCHEDULE

The work of the conference has been slowed by lengthy arguments over relatively minor amendments to the charter agreement. The meeting apparently will not end before Thursday instead of tomorrow as had previously been hoped.

In today's private huddles, the delegates killed a reference to honest and periodic elections in the Peruvian-supported political declaration. The Cubans had objected to the phrase.

The declaration also supported basic institutions of representative democracy. But it was generally agreed that the hard line of the declaration as originally drawn had been eliminated.

If the declaration is adopted, it will be separate from the Alliance for Progress charter.

The results today were another indication of the skill of Cuba's Finance Minister, Maj. Ernesto Guevara, in the political infighting that is taking place here. He has repeatedly said he would cooperate with the conference, and his attacks on the United States have been relatively moderate.

While arguing a point today with Douglas Dillon, head of U.S. delegation, during a meeting of a conference committee of the whole, Major Guevara said that Cuba respected the right of other peoples to promote private enterprise, but that his country opposed exploitation of men by men.

The committee of the whole since last night has been going over the 19-page charter draft sentence by sentence.

At one point this evening, the United States proposed adding to the preamble a general clause on reducing import restrictions. For a moment there was no second to the motion. Then Major Guevara announced that if no one else seconded the the motion, Cuba would. In the general laughter that followed the U.S. proposal was adopted.

There was a lengthy debate today as Bolivia and Paraguay, both landlocked nations, sought specific guarantees of free access to the sea for such countries. Peru, joined by the United States and others, argued successfully that a specific paragraph on that subject would open the door to a host of such specific statements.

SMALL NATIONS WIN POINT

Yesterday's session ran until 1 o'clock this morning. Just before adjournment the delegates approved an amendment to the charter sponsored by the small nations and opposed by the United States.

The amendment called for preferential treatment by the Inter-American Development Bank for countries that complete their development plans, as required by the charter, but still have difficulty obtaining loans from international agencies.

The amendment reflected a general fear among the small nations here that they might fall far behind their larger neighbors in obtaining development funds. The amendment was passed although Felipe Herrera, president of the Inter-American Bank, said that its charter barred favoritism, but that the Bank had been following the "spirit of the resolution" by granting the most aid to the least developed nations.

Irritants or Buffers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Sunday, July 30, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

President Kennedy's speech to the Nation deserves the support of all Americans insofar as its major point is concerned: That we will fight to maintain the freedom of West Berlin.

Beyond that, however, the speech raises more questions than it answers. At a time when it is of vital importance that the Soviets do not misunderstand our position, these questions deserve prompt, full answers.

At one point, President Kennedy indicated our readiness to remove what he called any actual "irritants" in West Berlin. Unless spelled out, this gives the Soviets a golden opportunity to haggle with us some more, extend their poised threats against Berlin and dull the edge of our otherwise strong position. The irritants of which the Soviets have complained include the floodtide of refugees that are escaping from East Germany. Does the President mean that we would take action to stop that tide? The Soviets have also complained of our propaganda barrages from West Berlin. Does the President suggest that we might shut off the sound of freedom's message? If we are prepared to remove irritants for the Soviets, what irritants are we going to demand that they eliminate? We have negotiated too long on the basis of what we will do to please the Soviets and too little on what we will demand that they do to please us.

More important, the President referred to Russia's historical concern about their security in central and eastern Europe. He said he believes that arrangements can be worked out which will help meet those concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area. At the moment, the Soviet is protecting its so-called security in Europe by holding in military captivity citizens of a dozen formerly independent nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, and so forth, not to mention East Germany.

Is there not grave danger that the Soviet could assume from his speech that we are now prepared to recognize that the freedom of those nations must be permanently sacrificed just to give Russia a feeling of security? That must be clarified for the world. We badly need to know where does America stand on this matter of the captive nations. We need to know: Is West Berlin's freedom the only freedom we will not negotiate away?

The President has made an inspiring pronouncement on Berlin but we still await his pronouncement on this larger question: Is our military buildup simply to hold the line, as in the past, or is it to give new hope to mankind that freedom is moving forward from the defensive, to the offensive—where freedom and America belong?

No Work, No Eat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine from Virginia Beach, Va., is concerned with the way some of his tax money is being spent. He resents that his hard-earned tax money is being used to support lazy, indolent parasites who refuse to work even though there are jobs available.

My friend points out that one of the earliest Virginians, Capt. John Smith laid down the rule "No work, no eat." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I enclose an article from the August 11, 1961, issue of the Virginian-Pilot, published at Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va. This item tells how convicts must be used to harvest crops because unemployed refuse to do farmwork:

VIRGINIA FARMERS PREFER CONVICTS

RICHMOND.—County farm agents in southwest Virginia defended Thursday the use of convict labor in harvest crops despite heavy unemployment in the area.

The agents of Giles, Bland, and Pulaski Counties said they felt the unemployed in their areas would not accept farmwork. And if they did, the agents agreed, their performance would be poor.

The question arose after the State board of welfare and institutions Tuesday said convicts at Bland Correctional Farm would be made available to harvest corn in the three counties this fall. At the same time, the State employment commission reported "substantial unemployment" in the three counties.

The final decision on using the convicts is up to Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr.

The three counties, however, are being considered as areas eligible for relief by the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration. Other counties in southwest Virginia already are accepted by the Federal Government as eligible.

Unemployment in the three-county area, according to the State Employment Commission, stands at 9.1 percent. In this category, it is high enough to qualify for Federal aid. Other categories in determining eligibility include median farm income and job opportunities.

The decision to use convict labor was made after the agents declared a farm labor emergency would exist this fall for the harvesting of corn.

Giles County Agent A. C. Holpp, said "most of the unemployed down here you couldn't get to work in a pie factory."

The farmers, Holpp said, have in the past tried to hire additional help, unsuccessfully.

"They (the unemployed) won't do agricultural work," he said. "It's the question

of willingness. I personally know people who have gone out and tried to hire people and couldn't."

In Giles County, he said, about 25 farms would use convict labor at an average of 10 acres of corn a farm.

In Pulaski County, convicts are expected to work, beginning probably in late September, on about 10 farms, each averaging 10 acres of corn.

Agent Roy A. Meek said using the unemployed would be difficult. "They're not that type of people," he said. "They're not used to that hard work—they're not hardened to it and it's a hard job. It would take forever to get the job done."

Using convicts, he said, a crew can be moved in and the job quickly finished in a day.

The unemployed, the factory people, he said, couldn't be used by the farmers.

"And," Meek said, "the Bland Correctional Farm needs the corn to feed its livestock."

In Richmond, a spokesman for the State department of welfare and institutions said the farm could get along without the corn. Under the plan the farm would get 30 percent of the ears harvested.

The farm "would be able to use the corn," the spokesman said. "However, the institution is not dependent on this corn for the successful operation of its farming program."

Medical Care for the Aged: A Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a recent excerpt from the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Telegram entitled "Spending for the Elderly Is Cut by States."

In view of the great attention which Congress has given to the problems of the elderly and to increase grants in aid in their behalf the contents of the article are, to say the least, disconcerting.

It would appear, according to the statement, that the effect of the Kerr-Mills bill which was designed to promote a deeper interest and more effective support for programs of medical care for the aged has actually produced the opposite result of reducing State spending on these programs.

As the House knows, the Kerr-Mills bill was designed to step up Federal matching grants for old-age assistance programs based on the assumption that the States would expand their medical services for the aged. The bill provides for unlimited Federal funds on a matching basis for new programs designed for the medically needy aged who are unable to qualify for old age assistance because of too high an income but without sufficient means to pay necessary medical costs. It was contemplated by the Congress, of course, that the bill would improve the medical programs for the aged and make more money available for that commendable purpose.

However, according to this article the net result has been to shift more of the cost of the burden from the States to the Federal Government. While 11 States had started new medical programs under the Kerr-Mills bill by July 1, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has listed 21 States as of that date as being not likely to establish such programs before 1963.

It would appear that only 6 of the medically needy programs, either proposed or in effect in 20 States as of April 1, offered comprehensive services since their programs restricted the number of days of paid hospital care, doctor's home and office calls and fees for prescription drug costs.

It appears further that only 10,229 medically needy persons received assistance in the first 6 months of the operation of the Kerr-Mills bill, although some 17,253 persons transferred from already operating old-age assistance programs in order presumably to secure the more favorable matching formulas established by the bill.

Moreover, there are apparent wide variations in the number of aged qualified by the several States to receive the benefits of these programs. For example, only about 10 percent of Michigan's aged population is eligible, while 80 percent might qualify in Massachusetts.

It would seem from reading this article and considering the contents of the Senate staff report and other available statistics and commentary that the medical care programs contemplated by the Congress are not being realized in the way that the Congress intended, and that immediate reappraisal and review of this situation is warranted to make sure that these worthy programs are promoted and not allowed to lag.

The goal of better medical care for the aged, and for the American people, is one that must be aggressively pursued by the Congress as a matter of enlightened national policy.

The article follows:

SPENDING FOR THE ELDERLY IS CUT BY STATES

(By Congressional Quarterly Service)

WASHINGTON.—The Kerr-Mills law, designed to encourage States to spend more on programs of medical care for the aged, actually has resulted in a net decrease in State spending on these programs.

In a study of State implementation of Kerr-Mills since its passage last year, Congressional Quarterly examined assistance payment figures compiled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) as well as a staff report of the Senate Committee on Aging. These were the results:

In the 6 months after Kerr-Mills went into effect last October 1, 32 States and Puerto Rico spent $27.7 million less of their own money on health and welfare programs for the aged than they spent in the comparable 6-month period a year earlier. Twenty-one other States and territories increased their spending by $5.3 million. The net decline for the period was $22.4 million.

At the same time, the Federal share of these programs increased by $44.5 million.

Thus, one result of Kerr-Mills so far has been to shift the cost burden for aid to the elderly from a number of States to the Federal Government—something never publicly predicted by supporters of the bill.

THE LAW'S PROVISIONS

The Kerr-Mills law was passed in the politically charged August 1960 special session of Congress. It affected programs of assistance for the aged in two ways:

1. It provided more favorable Federal matching grants for existing old-age assistance programs in the expectation that the States then would expand medical services under these programs.

2. It provided Federal funds, on a matching basis but unlimited in amount, for new programs designed for the medically needy aged—those persons whose incomes are too high to qualify them for old-age assistance but insufficient to cover their medical expenses.

The more favorable matching formulas under Kerr-Mills account for the shift in the assistance cost burden from the States to the Federal Government. The bill enables a State operating a reasonably extensive old-age assistance program to receive more Federal money and at the same time decrease its own expenditures without reducing overall program spending.

WASHINGTON PAYS

The HEW figures show that three of six States which established medically needy programs in the first 6 months of Kerr-Mills actually spent $6.4 million less on old-age assistance and medically needy programs combined than they had spent previously on old-age assistance alone in a comparable period. Although their overall programs were improved, the Federal Government more than picked up the additional tab.

Kerr-Mills has been described by the American Medical Association as superior to the social security approach, which it assails as "socialized medicine." The States are moving ahead with surprising swiftness in implementing Kerr-Mills, according to the AMA, and the Nation's physicians are at work in every State to put the new program into full effect. Kerr-Mills "must not be thrust aside without fair trial," the association says.

HEW listed 11 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands as having started new medically needy programs under Kerr-Mills by July 1. The Department also listed 21 States not considered likely to establish the programs before 1963.

The Senate committee staff report said only 6 of the medically needy programs either proposed or in effect in 20 States as of April 1 offered comprehensive services. Programs not considered comprehensive included such limitations as restrictions on the number of days of paid hospital care, on doctors' home and office calls, and on fees for prescription drug costs, the report said.

AID LOW INCOME AREAS

Moreover, the reports said, only 10,229 medically needy persons received assistance in the first 6 months of Kerr-Mills. A total of 27,482 individuals actually received care under medically needy programs, but 17,253 of them were persons transferred from already operating old-age assistance programs.

This transfer is explained by the more favorable matching formulas established by Kerr-Mills for medically needy programs than for old-age assistance. Under Kerr-Mills, the Government shares in the total cost, however great, of medically needy programs. The ratio of Federal sharing ranges from dollar for dollar up to $4 of Federal money for every $1 of State money in States with low per capita incomes. In old-age assistance programs, which include welfare grants as well as medical care, the Federal share ranges between 1 to 1 and 2 to 1, and Federal participation is limited to an average monthly grant not exceeding $8 per recipient. Obviously, it can be to a State's advantage to establish a medically needy program and transfer to it those patients whose primary need is for medical care.

All the medically needy recipients came from five States which established programs between October and April. (Kentucky, the only other State to start a medically needy

program before March 31, did not submit complete assistance figures to HEW.)

Twenty States plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, replying to a questionnaire prepared by HEW and the Senate committee staff, estimated that 3.3 million of their total over-65 population of 8.2 million would ultimately qualify for medically needy programs.

BAY STATE IS BEST

However, answers to the questionnaire showed that eligibility standards for medically needy programs vary greatly from State to State, as do the proportions of eligible aged to the total aged population. The maximum income allowed individuals in order to qualify ranges from $1,000 in Kentucky to $1,800 in Massachusetts. About 10 percent of Michigan's aged population is eligible, while 80 percent might qualify in Massachusetts.

Viewing all this, the Senate staff report concluded: "At the present time it appears doubtful that the large sums required to implement the full scope of the (medically needy) program will be made available by the States even with the Federal Government providing at least half the total costs" and that "the danger emerges therefore that the economic burden of the (medically needy) program will tend to restrict the scope of benefits and the aged population to be covered, and thus fail to meet the long-range legislative intent of the program."

Khrushchev's Opinion of Western Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems the extent of our action in answer to the challenge the Soviets have issued by creating the present crisis in Berlin, will be to send more protests to Khrushchev. The following letter written to the editor of the Wall Street Journal by Hubert W. Kregeloh of Springfield, Mass., shows what Khrushchev thinks of protests:

THE WEAK, THE LOST

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

It was with dismay that I read Professor Mietus' letter (July 18) criticising your editorial outcry against President Roosevelt's giving away to Stalin the East European countries now behind the Iron Curtain.

Professor Mietus seems to consider your accusation of F.D.R. unfair because—he notes, in absolution of what was done—"there were agreements entered into with the Russians * * * which called for free elections and self-determination" in the territories involved. Yet Stalin himself served notice that agreements with Communists are worthless when it appears expedient to break them. In this case, even limited intelligence should have compelled realization that it was not only expedient but absolutely imperative for the Soviets to break the agreements, because free elections and self-determination would have prevented communization of the East European countries.

Professor Mietus says that the Soviet breach of the agreements resulted in "strong protests by the Western powers, including the United States." And what, may one ask, did the protests of the West accomplish for the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians, taken over long before F.D.R. sold out all of East Europe, taken over in spite of agreements to respect the national integrity of the Baltic States?

Perhaps Professor Mietus doesn't know this but here is what Comrade Khrushchev, on the occasion of his last visit to the United States, had to say about protests during an impromptu press conference from the balcony of the building of the Soviet U.N. delegation in New York: "Protest," Khrushchev shouted, "is what a rat does when you step on it—what any weak thing does when it can do nothing else. Protest. Count them. They were made by the losers."

HUBERT W. KREGELOH.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Polka-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in recent weeks about America's television industry, with many people lamenting the fact that perhaps not enough is being done by the television industry to reflect our Nation's rich culture.

Television station WBKB, the American Broadcasting Co.'s affiliate in Chicago, for the past 5 years has conducted a colorful program called "Polka-Go-Round," which in part, at least, reflects the cultural contributions that television is indeed making to American viewers.

We in Chicago have viewed the Polka-Go-Round telecasts with a great deal of pleasure during the entire period that this program has been on the air.

Television station WBKB has earned the admiration and commendation of the entire Chicago community because through this weekly telecast this television station has helped the people of Chicago better understand and appreciate the fact that America's culture is made up of the best in the cultural activities of many countries throughout the world.

Chicago is a polyglot community which proudly boasts that it has people from practically every nation of the world. Chicago's great strength and progress stems from the fact that this great midwestern city has served as a crossroads where cultures from all over the world have met and worked in harmony.

Television station WBKB, in a most picturesque and stimulating manner, every week gives the people of Chicago a living example of the cultural contributions being made to America by the different ethnic groups whose immigrants have settled in this country.

The management of television station WBKB has very wisely arranged for this weekly telecast so that the people of the Midwest can enjoy the component parts of that homogeneous population and has given well-deserved recognition to the various countries and areas of origin from whence came the people who have made Chicago one of the world's great metropolises.

During the past 5 years, Polka-Go-Round has telecast the music and dances from various European nations and areas. Using local talent, this stimulating program has been able to bring out the very best in music, dances, and songs which have been brought to this country from all over the world.

Every week the program spotlights a visiting guest dance or singing group representing one of the many nations whose people have settled in America from foreign lands. More than 70 separate ethnic groups, representing 30 separate nations of the world whose people have settled in this country, have participated in these programs during the past 5 years. I am including at the conclusion of my remarks the list of these various groups so that we can all have a better idea of how faithfully the culture of the nations of the world is kept alive and is made part of our own American culture in Chicago.

Besides its extremely high entertainment value, this particular weekly program has a profound meaning for all Americans. I have often stated that the one factor which distinguishes America from all other social orders is that while most Americans come from some ethnic background which had its origin in Europe or some other corner of the world, we Americans have demonstrated a deep respect and affection for our fellow citizens regardless of their national origin.

The fact that we Americans can respect each other despite our different ethnic backgrounds is not only a source of great inspiration for people the world over, but also offers the world great hope that just as citizens of many nations can live in harmony in our country, some day all of the nations of the world will be able to live together as one family of nations, respectful of each other's ethnic background and culture.

By maintaining this very colorful program, WBKB has made a profound contribution toward a better understanding among all Americans and has fostered that sense of respect among people of different national origins for each other that makes America indeed the symbol of hope for the entire world.

I believe that those who would be quick to criticize the television industry will find that "Polka-Go-Round" stands out as an excellent exception. I am particularly pleased to note that this very fine program has made wide use of local talent in Chicago. This is a particularly noteworthy feature at a time when many artists express concern that the less known entertainers are not given sufficient opportunity to present their talents to mass audiences.

Mr. Speaker, this program is deserving of particular commendation because it has done such a tremendous job in helping Americans better understand and appreciate each other, and it has accomplished this in a most colorful and entertaining manner.

Mr. Speaker, the list of dancing and singing groups which have participated in the "Polka-Go-Round," whose excel-

lent and capable master of ceremonies is Mr. Robert Lewandowski, follows:

NAME OF GROUP AND COUNTRY

Edelweiss German Schouplattler, of Chicago, Germany.
Slovenian-American Club Folk Dancers of Chicago, Czechoslovakia.
"Sum" Ukrainian American Youth Association Dancers of Chicago, Ukraine.
Swedish-American Dancers of Chicago, Sweden.
Valdemaras Dzelme Latvian Dancers of Chicago, Latvia.
"Gruza" Serbian Folklore Dancers of Chicago, Serbia.
Leikkharrangen Heimhug Norwegian Dancers of Chicago, Norway.
Tara-Celtic Irish Dancers of Chicago, Ireland.
Federation of Moravian Societies Dancers of Chicago, Czechoslovakia.
Rumanian Radio Club Dancers of Gary, Ind., Rumania.
"Jolly Lumberjack" German Dancers of Chicago, Germany.
Philippine-American Dancers of Chicago, Phillipines.
McDonald Scottish Dancers of Chicago, Scotland.
Dela Rosa Spanish Dancers of Chicago, Spain.
Edelweiss Swiss Stars—Vocal Group of Wisconsin, Switzerland.
"Ateitis" Lithuanian Dancers of Chicago, Lithuania.
Teinauer Schwaben Dancers of Milwaukee, Wis., Germany.
Kinereth Israeli Dancers of Chicago, Israel.
Slovak National Sokol Dancers of Gary, Ind., Czechoslovakia.
Estonian Dancers of Indianapolis, Ind., Estonia.
Austrian Folk Dancers of Milwaukee, Wis., Austria.
Dushehubka Ukrainian American Dancers of Chicago, Ukraine.
"Kaukaz" Russian Dancers of Milwaukee, Wis., Russia.
Spokane Silver Spurs of Spokane, Wash., United States.
Tahitian Dancers "Pearls of the Pacific," Tahiti.
"Boyne" Ukrainian Chorus of Chicago, Ukraine.
Tamburitzan Yugoslav Dancers of Detroit, Mich., Yugoslavia.
Young Swiss Club Dancers of Chicago, Switzerland.
Harp & Shamrock Irish Dancers of Chicago, Ireland.
Yugoslav Balkan Dancers of Chicago, Yugoslavia.
Macedonian Patriotic Organization Dancers of Indianapolis, Ind., Greece.
"Zilvitis" Lithuanian Dancers of Cicero, Ill., Lithuania.
Japanese Youth Dancers of Chicago, Japan.
Donau Schwaben Dancers of Chicago, Germany.
Czechoslovak Sokol Dancers of Chicago, Czechoslovakia.
Daugava Latvian Singing Society of Chicago, Latvia.
Harmony Croatian Glee Club of Chicago, Greece.
Filareci-Dudsiaze Polish Singing Society, Poland.
St. Wladimir Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral, Singers of Chicago, Russia.
"Steierer" Austrian Ladies Chorus of Chicago, Austria.
Rumanian Dancers of Chicago, Rumania.
Charles Stephens Lithuanian Chorus of Chicago, Lithuania.
St. Francis of Assisi Polish Children Chorus of Chicago, Poland.
Polish Festival Dancers of Chicago, Poland.
Lake Forest Finnish Dancers, Lake Forest, Ill., Finland.
Arlington Heights Barbershop Singers, Arlington Heights, Ill., United States.
Senior German Youth Chorus of Chicago, Germany.
Echo Polish Ladies Chorus of Chicago, Poland.
St. Joseph Parish Ukrianian Youth Dancers of Chicago, Ukraine.
Sweet Adelines Girl Chorus of Chicago, United States.
Mexican-American Singers and Dancers of Chicago, Mexico.
"Trebleaires" Ladies Chorus of Chicago, United States.
Polish Roman Catholic Union, Youth Division Dancers of Chicago, Poland.
Schlesvig-Holstein Singers Bund of Chicago, Germany.
Polish National Alliance Children's Dancing Group of Gary, Ind., Poland.
Serbian "Kolo" Artists of Chicago, Serbia.
"Kok-Shila-Ska" Explorer Scout Post 691, American Boy Scouts of Chiacgo, United States.
Swedish Ring Dancer of Fox Valley, Ill., Sweden.
Twenty-sixth Street Polish American Dancers of Chicago, Poland.
Croatian Men's Chorus of Chicago, Greece.
Duquesne University Tramburitzans of Duquesne, United States.
International Windy City Dancers of Chicago, United States.
Steirer-Tyrolean Singers of Chicago, Austria.
Grecian Village Johnny Stamates Greek Group of Chicago, Greece.
"Metelycia" Ukrainian American Dancers of Chicago, Ukraine.
"Paderewski" Polish Singers of Chicago, Poland.
Stephens Lithuanian Girls Chorus, Lithuania.
Polish National Alliance Dancers of Chicago, Poland.
"Laget" National Swedish Dancers of Chicago, Sweden.
"Galil" Israeli Students Dancing Group of Chicago, Israel.
Estonian Folk Dancers of Crystal Lake, Wis., Estonia.

The National Lottery of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Guatemala. Guatemala, although a small nation, has the financial wisdom to recognize the worth of a national lottery—and Guatemala profits accordingly.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Guatemalan national lottery came to some $3 million. The total net income to the Government in that year came to close to $1 million. This income was not earmarked, but was rather put into the general fund.

There is really nothing special about the national lottery of Guatemala, for Guatemala is another of those countries where it is simply assumed that the government will have the intelligence to supervise gambling rather than disregard it. This wisdom, however, has not yet dawned upon the Government of our Nation.

Reds in Churches: Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last year the Air Force Manual carried a very unfortunate and inaccurate statement about the National Council of Churches. This statement clearly indicated that the people who authored this document were not adequately informed on the subject of religion in general and the program of the National Council of Churches in particular and were not adequately aware of the great dedication of its leaders to the noble and worthwhile ideals that they represent in their dedicated service to their God and country.

I took the floor at the time to explain the purpose and functioning of the National Council of Churches, a truly great and dedicated organization.

The Des Moines (Iowa) Register of Sunday, August 13, 1961, carried an editorial entitled "Reds in the Churches: Fact or Fancy?"

The editorial was basen on a report, "Communism and the Churches," which was financed by a grant from the Fund for the Republic.

The report states:

The number of clergymen who have been Communists, or persistent—and identifiable—fellow travelers, has been minute, in spite of continual efforts to involve clergymen in the Communist apparatus.

This report substantiates my contention that unwarranted attacks have been made on members of the clergy.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REDS IN THE CHURCHES: FACT OR FANCY?

(By Louis Cassels)

Two Episcopal laymen were having a troubled conversation at the headquarters of the Justice Department in Washington. One was a newspaperman; the other a high official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"I think," said the reporter, "that this thing is getting serious."

"So do I," said the FBI man. "It would certainly be ironic if a job which the Communists couldn't do for themselves should be done for them by the very people who profess to be their worst enemies."

The two men were talking about a campaign which threatens to weaken and demoralize America's churches by planting in the public mind the suspicion that they are overrun by Reds.

COMMUNISTS ARE PLEASED

This campaign is not being conducted by Communists. It is being carried on by men and organizations which claim to be militantly anti-Communist. But the FBI has evidence that the Communists are as delighted with the results as if they had planned the whole operation themselves.

Sapping the vitality of Christian churches has always been a major Communist objective. In free nations like the United States, Communists cannot attack Christianity directly. But they are constantly alert for opportunities to disrupt churches by more devious methods.

The obvious method is to infiltrate the churches by having disguised Communists work their way up to positions of leadership, particularly in the ranks of the clergy. The Communists undoubtedly have tried to do this. But as a practical matter, it is enormously difficult for a Communist to pose convincingly as a dedicated Christian even for the space of one conversation, let alone through the long years of seminary study and pulpit service which are required of any man who becomes an influential leader in U.S. church life.

Another method which the Communists have tried is duping well-meaning Christian clergymen into lending their names to Communist-front projects.

Dr. Ralph Lord Roy, a Methodist minister, has been conducting a study for the past 6 years, under a grant from the Fund for the Republic, to determine what success the Communists have had in this direction. His extensively documented research is reported in a book, "Communism and the Churches," recently published by Harcourt, Brace.

Dr. Roy sums up his findings in these words:

"Since 1930, there has been an estimated total of well over 500,000 ordained clergymen in the United States. Of these the proportion who have been affiliated with Communist efforts in any way whatever has been exceedingly small—perhaps slightly over 1 percent.

"The number who have been Communists, or persistent—and identifiable—fellow travelers, has been minute, in spite of continual efforts to involve clergymen in the Communist apparatus. Today, perhaps 25 of this number remain—or approximately seven one-thousandths of 1 percent of American ministers. And most of these are not serving pulpits."

WARNINGS FROM FBI

The FBI has not commented on Dr. Roy's specific figures. But it strongly agrees with his basic conviction—that the Communists have made very little headway in their 30-year effort to penetrate American churches.

In recent weeks, FBI Chief Inspector William C. Sullivan has delivered speeches in many parts of the Nation, warning Americans not to be taken in by charges that their churches are infested with hidden Reds.

These charges are "a patent falsehood," Sullivan says. "The truth of the matter is that the Communist Party has not achieved any substantial success in exerting domination, control, or influence over America's clergymen or religious institutions on a national scale.

"America's religious institutions are one of our most formidable bulwarks in the crusade against communism. There can be no question as to the loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the American clergy."

REDS LIKE VIGILANTES

The FBI has observed that the Communists are very unhappy about Sullivan's speeches.

"This should not surprise anyone," the high FBI official said. "The Communists are in favor of anything that will weaken America's churches and discredit their leaders."

The question that arises at this point is: Why are supposedly militant anti-Communists thus playing into the Communists' hands?

Evidence indicates that the charges of "communism in the churches" are being made by genuine, if extreme, conservatives, who are incensed at the social pronouncements of such Christian bodies as the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

In a recent letter to the clergymen of his diocese, Episcopal Bishop William Crittenden of Erie said church members must learn to "be on guard" against "unwarranted attacks on Christian clergymen of unquestioned repute, including Episcopalians, on the social action program of the churches and on the National Council of Churches."

"Let us fight communism to the utmost," the bishop said, "but let us do it by trying to correct the injustices upon which communism feeds, not by unfounded accusations or by twisting the truth to accommodate our point of view."

To Promote the General Welfare—An Article by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff, New York Times Magazine, July 9, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, from the July 9, 1961, issue of the New York Times magazine.

The subject of Secretary Ribicoff's article is, "To Promote the General Welfare."

I believe that Secretary Ribicoff's statement makes clear that President Kennedy's proposals for domestic legislation are in the best tradition of our American life and within the framework of our Constitution.

I commend Mr. Ribicoff's article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE—TO DO THIS—IN THE WORDS OF THE CONSTITUTION—IS EXACTLY WHAT THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS, ESPECIALLY FOR HEALTH AND EDUCATION, ARE DESIGNED TO ACCOMPLISH, SAYS RIBICOFF

(By Abraham Ribicoff)

In the current debate over two of President Kennedy's major domestic measures, aid to education and health insurance, I have been more surprised by the friends of these measures than by the critics. The simple fact is that the former spend more time apologizing for the measures than speaking positively of their merits. Here is legislation in the best American tradition—designed to "promote the general welfare"—yet its friends avoid professing openly and proudly that they are in favor of promoting the general welfare, as if this were somehow an unwise or shameful thing to do.

Worse still, the more defensive the friends of these measures become, the more America denies itself the right to speak a plain truth to the world: that under freedom we do more for the welfare of our people than the Communists could ever hope to do for theirs.

Why should this be so? The explanation is that the language of the critics has come to dominate both sides of the argument.

The critics themselves do not have ice water in their veins or a piece of flint where their hearts should be. Many of them are charitable people, generous to their neighbors in time of need, often leaders in community work. They are mostly serious-minded men and women, voicing their honest doubts in good faith. As such, they merit an answer.

But, in answering them, the friends of these education and health measures suffer self-inflicted wounds because they stop at the point where they have shown that the worst doubts the critics raise are groundless. In this way they make their own argument sound like an apology. What is more, they forfeit the solid case to be made for the specific good the measures will bring about.

The major doubts and fears the critics have about welfare legislation in general, and President Kennedy's program in particular, boil down to three main points:

They say, first, that if Washington does everything for the people, it will soon be in a position to do everything to the people. And when that happens history will say a long goodbye to the uniquely American idea of limited government, where all power rises from the people and where the primary purpose of government is to create a stable society in which the individual is free to pursue his own ends. In its stead, we will have a strong-arm central government with all its byproducts; bureaucracy, rigidity, humorlessness.

They say, second, that even if some welfare measures have merit, they must still be opposed. Why? Because they will inevitably lead to other measures so unwise, so all-embracing, so horrendous in ultimate consequences that we dare not take the first step.

Lastly, they say, welfare legislation has no basis in our Constitution. Nor does it square with any of the political traditions that have developed from the Constitution. All it represents is an import of foreign concepts and methods.

Now in all this, I recognize one underlying line of argument that goes as follows: Freedom of the individual is our most prized possession; welfare measures mean greater activity by government, often the Federal Government; therefore, the adoption of any such measures must entail a loss of freedom for the individual.

My answer is not just to protest the false logic of the argument; I believe that the general welfare legislation now before Congress adds to individual freedom by creating the opportunities in which freedom can be exercised.

What is the individual freedom we cherish? It is not an abstract principle, not a set of phrases to be chanted in hushed tones. It is the bundle of rights that are ours to enjoy—the right to live where we choose, to worship where we wish, to work at whatever trade or profession we prefer, to become educated wherever we please in schools and colleges we select, to decide for ourselves how we will enjoy our leisure time; in short, to live productive and creative lives to the limit of our capacities.

One must be free to do these things. But being free is no assurance that these things can be done.

With freedom there must be opportunity. And this is what we seek—the creation of opportunity to become educated, to find employment, to earn decent wages, to enjoy good health. With these opportunities established and strengthened, each individual can enjoy a free life and make his utmost contribution to our free society.

To make my point clear, let me recall what happened during the great depression of the 1930's. To fight that depression, the Federal Government was called on to do what no State or local government could do: to revive the national economy, and to establish standards of economic and social well-being below which no individual would be permitted to fall.

There were those who foresaw in such Government action the end of the American way of doing things. Whenever our Government attempts to enlarge the area of its social responsibility, fears of this sort are voiced. But what in fact happened? Measures like unemployment compensation and other features of the social security system then enacted represented a use of Federal power not to deny the individual his freedom but to strengthen his freedom by establishing his economic security. The States and local communities lost none of their powers.

In effect, all our traditional freedoms were reinforced because practical solutions to the urgent problems of the day were worked out within the four corners of the Constitution.

As for the second of these fears—that tolerable welfare measures will surely lead to others that are not tolerable—truly, what is one to make of it? What a shocking denial of rational judgment. What an abandonment of faith in free government.

This is our Government, not someone else's. Our citizens and their representatives in Government are capable of distinguishing between welfare legislation that is desirable and welfare legislation that goes too far. The right to make such distinctions is a crucial part of our freedom. Let us not abandon that right in the blind assumption that nothing is better than something.

Turn next to the fear that welfare legislation lacks a basis in the Constitution and is no part of our tradition.

The truth is entirely the other way. Such legislation is of the essence of the American tradition. Before the establishment of this Republic societies of men had been formed to promote the welfare of a group—an aristocracy, a military brotherhood, an economic class. But here was a people pledged from the start to promote the welfare of all of its members simply because they belonged to the same community. The pledge was revolutionary—something wholly new under the political sun—and the world has never been the same for it.

The concept of promoting the general welfare appears first in the Mayflower Compact in which the Pilgrims, en route to America, declared their intention to pursue "the common good" on new soil. The phrase itself first appears in the Articles of Confederation. It appears twice in the Constitution: in the preamble, and in the first article, by which Congress is empowered to impose and collect taxes for use, among other things, in promoting "the general welfare."

What did the phrase mean to the signers of the Constitution? That was the subject of a classic debate between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. As I hope to demonstrate, the debate bears on the current argument over President Kennedy's social program.

Jefferson held that under "the general welfare clause" Congress could lawfully appropriate money only for purposes specifically enumerated in the Constitution. (It is interesting to note that later, as President, Jefferson proposed the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, though the purchase of land was not included in the Constitution's list of specifics. President Jefferson warned his friends in Congress "not to entangle themselves in metaphysical subtleties but to approve an act that promised such enormous practical good to the Nation.")

It was Hamilton's view—and Hamilton had been a member of the committee on style at the 1787 Convention, which put the general welfare clause into the Constitution—that the phrase was "as comprehensive as any that could have been used" and embraced "a vast variety of particulars, which are susceptible of neither specification nor definition," including "whatever concerns the general interest of learning, of agriculture, of manufacturers, and of commerce."

Congress, he declared, was subject to only one limitation in levying taxes and spending money: the purpose must be general and not local.

But how was one to distinguish a general and a local purpose? Hamilton answered that the question "must be a matter of conscientious discretion, and the arguments for or against a measure in this light, must be arguments concerning expediency, not of constitutional right."

History, practical experience, and the weight of judicial opinion have been on Hamilton's side of the argument. Witness an eloquent restatement of his view in the opinion of Justice Cardozo rendered in *Helvering* v. *Davis*, a social security case decided in 1937:

"The line must be drawn," said Justice Cardozo, "between particular and general. Where this shall be placed cannot be known through a formula in advance of the event. There is a middle ground or certainly a pneumbra in which discretion is large. The discretion, however, is not confined to the courts. The discretion belongs to Congress, unless the choice is clearly wrong, a display of arbitrary power, not an exercise of judgment. This is now familiar law. * * * Nor is the concept of the general welfare static. Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times."

Applied to President Kennedy's program of aid to education and health care for the aged, the whole of the foregoing raises six questions.

First. Does the proposal for Federal aid to education rise from a nationwide need?

Answer. Yes. It is a simple fact that State and local governments, with their fairly rigid tax base, cannot, unaided, pay for the quantity and quality of education urgently required by our exploding population.

Second. Does the measure square with the traditional rule that the control of education must be a State and local matter?

Answer. Yes. It preserves that rule intact, just as did last year's Federal's aid-to-education program, which in all its forms totaled $2.7 billion, including millions for school construction and teachers' salaries. Indeed, not once in my 6 years as Governor of Connecticut did any mayor or school principal complain to me of a single instance of Federal interference. And I know of no such complaint to any other Governor elsewhere.

Third. Does the proposal to provide health care for the aged rise from a nationwide need?

Answer. Yes. That proposal is addressed to the fact that each year one out of five aged couples drawing social security benefits is hospitalized. Half of these people incur medical bills in excess of $700 a year—equivalent to a third of their income. Many do not obtain and cannot afford the care they need, nor are their children in any position to help them.

Fourth. Does the measure give the individual the absolute right to choose his own physician?

Answer. Yes. The services of private physicians are not even covered by the bill. Every person will choose his own doctor and hospital, and every doctor will treat his patient exactly as he wishes. The only thing that is new is that hospital and nursing home bills will be paid.

Fifth. Are these two proposals of a kind over which the Congress has a constitutional right to exercise its discretionary powers?

Answer. Yes. Since both problems have become a national concern, they fall squarely within the meaning of "the general welfare" clause.

Sixth. The constitutional right being granted, is it expedient or inexpedient for the Congress to enact the two measures?

Answer. I believe these proposal merit support precisely because they square with an American tradition that originates in the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution and are consistent with that tradition as it has been carefully tested and cautiously applied by generations of Americans. The educational proposal reserves to the States and local communities full control over the administration and content of public education. The health-care proposal reserves to the individual the right to seek his medical care wherever he will. The values of the past have been observed in meeting the needs of the present and future.

In conclusion, let me turn from the domestic scene to point out to critics of welfare legislation that in this revolutionary era people everywhere are striving to improve their own general welfare. The Communist nations offer themselves as the model to be followed in this effort. They work around the clock to deny the United States the moral right to offer itself as a proper model by portraying us as a selfish, self-centered people.

We know that what the Communists say about us is as false as what they say about themselves. Nevertheless, we give the color of truth to their falsehood. For when we propose a measure for the general welfare that will have real meaning for millions of our citizens, we talk around it, we play it down. And we take special care to cover up that word welfare. Would we have the world believe that we, of all people, are the enemy of the general welfare?

Let caution prevail in how and where we use the "general welfare" clause to meet the unprecedented challenges of our national life. But instead of being ashamed to speak the word welfare, let us recognize it for what it truly is—uniquely American. Let legislation to promote the general welfare be a source of pride to all Americans. We have promoted the general welfare more effectively than the Communists. This is our strength, a strength we must continue to demonstrate to the world.

Five Weeks in Russia's Backyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of our district's outstanding citizens, W. P. F. Brawner, president of W. P. Fuller & Co., recently spent 5 weeks behind the Iron Curtain in the Balkan countries.

He reported his experiences and observations before the World Affairs Council of Northern California and I am pleased to insert a copy of that address in the RECORD:

FIVE WEEKS IN RUSSIA'S BACKYARD

(An address by W. P. Fuller Brawner, president, W. P. Fuller & Co., delivered before the World Affairs Council of Northern California, St. Francis Hotel, August 3, 1961)

In recent years and particularly in recent months we have had a steady barrage of propaganda telling in one way or another of the superhuman accomplishments and the tremendous progress in science, industry and education going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Even though we know that publicity from that area is thoroughly censored and controlled, we begin to feel that where there's so much smoke there must be some fire—but with so many activities shrouded in secrecy, who could guess how great a fire was behind this smoke screen?

WANTED TO LEARN AT FIRST HAND

Being curious by nature, I have long been anxious to acquire firsthand knowledge by seeing and touching the wonders of nature and the creations of mankind, and so when the iron doors were recently pushed ajar a bit, I seized the opportunity. I wanted to find out whether we are justified in taking a strong, positive position in helping to make the world a better place to live in, or whether defensive stalling tactics were going to be necessary forever. If you are able to make a trip similar to the one I have just made, I urge you to do so and get your own firsthand information. If not, you may find my report interesting, thought provoking and even stimulating.

How many times have you heard a returned tourist talk as an expert on foreign affairs even though his visit to a country may have included only one big city for 2 or 3 days? I confess to being a member of this club more times than I care to mention. However, in defense of this group I must say there is at least some justification under certain circumstances—for example:

Having seen the Taj Mahal but once is enough to extol its architectural and artistic beauty—one visit to the Amazon will convince anyone of its tremendous power and size—a day in La Paz, Bolivia, is sufficient to describe how the highest city in the world looks and how it feels to live at such an altitude—the interesting customs and costumes in the Orient are obvious immediately—and so it goes for many of the more unusual sights and ways of the world. However, I must say at the outset of this report that I have never returned from a trip feeling less like an expert than after my 5 weeks behind the Iron Curtain—therefore, please bear in mind that I am merely putting together in this report some random comments and observations about things I personally saw and heard and my own reaction to them. If these comments have you somewhat confused, you will find yourself in my present condition.

STARTED IN MUNICH

The trip itself started in Munich—a most active city in a most prosperous and dynamic country—and went 6,000 kilometers (about 4,000 miles) by auto through Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary and ended 5 weeks later in the lovely, gay, cultural city of Vienna. It included a night or more in 20 different cities, a stopover for a couple of hours in another 15 cities, and much time spent in rural areas which rarely are visited by the average tourist. We had no special credentials and did our best to travel unofficially and inconspicuously (though the latter proved to be impossible).

The first reason for gaining so little precise information on current problems and activities in these areas is the language problem. Having traveled in more than 50 different countries, I'm sure I have never been confronted with quite such a difficulty—in most countries around the world it is possible to find people who speak English, French, German, or Spanish—but not in the Balkans. Even when we picked up a few words of their native tongue, we ran into trouble. For example, we learned to ask for cheta slivovic—four brandies—and once received four dishes of ice cream. When searching for the post office no one could understand us yet it was called posta. Again, in asking for simple directions when driving we would often be sent in the opposite direction.

EXTREME SECRECY

Secondly, the extreme secrecy precautions, the suspicious attitude of everyone, and the obvious instructions to talk only about the good points of their country and of their systems drilled into all tourist agency personnel, all government employees and many other individuals made it impossible to get correct factual information. Despite these precautions and restrictions, we were amazed to find ourselves completely free to do what we wanted and go where we pleased practically all of the time. We were also surprised and delighted to find so many friendly people willing and indeed anxious to go out of their way to assist us when we needed help. At times this kind of aid was invaluable. Imagine asking someone how to get to some hotel and have him say, "Follow me and I'll show you the way." Or our experience outside of Sarajevo (where Arch Duke Ferdinand was killed, causing the start of World War I) where on a rainy night our car broke down and, after we waited a bit for help, an ambulance going in the opposite direction turned around, picked us up with all our baggage, sent the wife of the ambulance driver and friend home on foot, drove us 25 miles to our hotel and refused to take a small tip—all of this without speaking a word of any language except Serbian which meant nothing to us. We finally persuaded the driver to let us make a small donation to his hospital. Can you beat that for a show of warmth and friendship to a foreigner in need?

TITO RESPECTED

Our first country was Yugoslavia, and what a hodge-podge that country is. Here six former individual countries: Slovania, Croatia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia have been put together under one government. The peoples of these countries are very different one from the other and to make the problem more difficult, there has been strong religious group feeling particularly amongst Catholics, Moslems and Orthodox. I must say my hat is off to Tito for the strong leadership he has given. He is undoubtedly respected and revered by larged numbers of people of all these countries and religious creeds. I should think it would be extremely difficult to find a successor, and without strong leadership it would not take much to rekindle the bitterness and enmity that formerly existed between these biased groups which already started one world war.

No sooner had we crossed the border into Yugoslavia than people began waving to us as we passed by them and this continued nearly all through the country. This was not particularly a gesture of friendship to America for, as a rule, they could not be sure who we were as we were riding in a big black Cadillac with a German license. It did, however, indicate their friendliness to foreigners and, as I have already illustrated, this was shown in many other ways.

CHAUFFEUR AN EX-POW

Our chauffeur was a German and he was probably the most interesting personality with whom we came in contact during the entire trip. He loathed Hitler under whose dictatorship he was brought up. Three of his four brothers were killed in the war, the fourth was blinded and he himself was drafted at the age of 14 and sent to the front. Mercifully for him he was captured almost immediately by the Americans and says that the 2 years he spent in this country as a prisoner of war were the happiest of his life.

Our second impression (and this also stayed with us all through the trip) was the scenic beauty of the Yugoslavian countryside. The rugged mountains and beautiful waterfalls, streams and lakes, particularly in the almost untouched, primitive back country of Yougoslavia, are positively magnificent, although I must say we soon found that it took a hardy traveler to find some of these scenic wonders for many of the roads were the worst we have ever traveled over.

A third impression was of the tremendous damage done to most of the big cities, particularly coastal cities, during World War II and the slowness of repairing the damage. In fact, in some cases, it appears that buildings will be abandoned and left to final destruction by the elements rather than to spend the time and effort necessary to repair or replace them. Unfortunately, this has been a characteristic of these people for centuries, as we could easily see by looking at ruins still standing from the days of Roman and Turkish occupation centuries ago. This laissez faire attitude is hard to understand for members of a family who helped to rebuild San Francisco after the fire.

A fourth and most important impression was of the lack of education which will take many years to overcome. This probably explains their lack of manners and complete indifference to maintenance of many new buildings recently completed. Indeed, their regular living conditions are about as filthy and backward as anything now existing in this world.

FAR TO GO

There is a slight ray of hope in that they are doing a lot of building and rebuilding and trying to make some educational and cultural improvements, and they do have a little freedom of action left—but they have so far to go it seems almost hopeless to the outsider.

Crossing the border into Bulgaria is positively startling, and incidentally, we were perfectly amazed to see how few people ever cross one of these borders from one Balkan country to another. The immediate improvement in education and mental alertness is noticeable. The roads change from terrible to very good, with handsome trees well taken care of lining each side. In a sense the change is frightening—one must wonder how successful the Communist system may become. The hotels were better but not up to our standard—the tourist agency was far more efficient, there was more and better food available—bigger farms and better looking factories—and the people were better satisfied; in fact, pleased with their Communist system and the progress it has made. Bulgaria, you may know, has had this system in operation for many years so that the younger generation knows no other system and has heard only about its good points. Large, colorful placards are all over, each one proclaiming the gains made in industry, agriculture, finance, etc.

OWNED BY THE PEOPLE

Now actually, while Bulgaria is ahead of Yugoslavia, they have a long way to go before reaching living standards familiar to all of us. Their stores have only the poorest kind of merchandise—so poor, in fact, that our wives could not find one gift to bring home to relatives and friends. Their best hotels compare with our poorer ones and their poorer hotels could not be found in most of our towns. They have accomplished equality by cutting off the top level of society—the elite. All business except a few little farms and very small stores is government owned and operated (as they say, "Owned by the people in this People's Republic."). Some incentives are given to the better workers by allowing them to pay lower rent or giving them special vacations in beautiful resort areas such as Varna on the Black Sea. The medium size farms and businesses were simply taken away from the

original owners and given to the people. In some respects good results have developed, for the large farming areas are better run and undoubtedly produce more, despite the fact that very little mechanical equipment is used (they claim this avoids unemployment but it looks to me as if they didn't know how to make this kind of equipment and couldn't afford to buy it). Their money is completely artificially controlled and practically worthless outside of Bulgaria. I was allowed to change dollars into levas but on leaving I could not change levas into dollars. Life is completely regimented and limitations, restrictions and government redtape are to be found everywhere.

KNOW NO OTHER SYSTEM

The people have lived under these rules so long that they know no other system and are perfectly content to fill out forms and wait in line for hours at a time to obtain some small favor or perhaps one of life's necessities. They are perfectly happy to get along without such luxuries as autos (there were none manufactured and very few in use) because no one else had one, and so they had no idea what they were missing (as a matter of fact, the gasoline was so poor there were times when we would have been better off without a car). They can't even learn about any other system because there is no freedom of the press—they never see Western publications of any sort and are fed only Communist news with the special Communist twist telling how much better off they are than the rest of the world. Now that these countries are relaxing their prohibition against tourists, this lack of news may change slowly, but it will take a long while to offset the brainwashing they have been getting for many years. Even we, who tried to learn what was going on in the rest of the world, went 5 weeks without a bit of information we could rely on.

Next we came to Rumania—a country just learning the Communist system and not being too sure whether it's good or bad. This condition is really a bit pathetic as shown by their great fear of doing something wrong and their fear of being caught in the act. They are suspicious of everyone and everything. What a way to live.

Here are a few specific examples to illustrate:

We were delayed on entering at the border because our driver did not have Giurgiu (the border town) listed on his itinerary and the officials were afraid to let us pass without checking with higher officials in Bucharest.

On leaving Rumania, a careful and thorough search of our baggage and car, including the engine, was made—this was the only baggage inspection made on the whole trip.

POLICE CHECK ALONG WAY

Going from town to town our time of leaving and arriving was always checked and in several instances we were stopped en route by police to check our license number and report our progress. Once we were met in the outskirts and escorted into the city.

Some mail never reached us and one letter I received had been opened.

We found a hidden mike in one of our rooms. Actually, it was the chauffeur's room. He found the mike concealed behind a picture on the wall and immediately sat in front of it for half an hour and sang nursery rhymes in German. I suppose our suspicious Rumanians are still trying to find some hidden meaning in them.

Our guide would not take a chance on obtaining tickets for us to a musical review that took a few cracks at the United States, but we went on our own anyway and had no trouble.

When we asked to take a look at a new apartment house the guide first said "Yes"; then learned from higher authority that this was not permitted and so, out of sheer embarrassment and fright, she disappeared and we never had her services again. We never did get inside one of these apartment houses. They look modern from the outside but from what we had seen of crumbling buildings in East Berlin, we became convinced that they were window dressing and that the authorities did not want us to get close enough to see the many defects.

Finally, when we asked for permission to leave the country 1 day early, the tourist agency office in Cluj (the second largest city in Rumania) had to phone to higher authority in Bucharest where the request was approved.

BILLBOARDS CLAIM PROGRESS

Conditions generally were worse in Rumania than in Bulgaria, though still somewhat better than in Yugoslavia, but despite all the glowing billboards telling about the great increases in output of everything, they still have to stand patiently in long lines waiting to buy a bit of meat. Again I say, "What a way to live."

Next came Hungary where the tight clamps applied by the Soviet Union have been tightened even more after the unsuccessful revolution of 1956. The country is surrounded by two and three strong, barbed-wire fences with landmines in between and with watchtowers every few hundred feet. I think this tells pretty graphically how much the Hungarians enjoy living in their native country under its new management. This is really an "iron curtain" with all exits closed tight. How would a free American find life under the restricted conditions?

The once beautiful city of Budapest is indeed a sad place to see. It was terribly damaged during the war and then hit hard again during the short-lived revolution. Rebuilding is slow and even the newest buildings are unattractive. It is hard to believe that it can ever come back particularly with individual initiative completely stamped out.

While we were in Budapest a large delegation of Red Chinese were in conference with the President of Hungary and other officials at our hotel. Wherever they went they were given a lot of special attention and high priority service. To us they appeared to be a mighty cocky and threatening gang. Outside of the President's room bodyguards were on duty 24 hours a day. I suppose to protect him from embittered Hungarians.

MONEY EXCHANGE PROBLEM

Here, as in Bulgaria and Rumania, the state owns everything, having taken factories, stores, hotels, etc., away from owners with little or no recompense. Here, again, were the same problems in exchanging our dollars into their worthless Florintz and being unable to reverse the process. Incidentally, no one in the country is allowed to accept foreign money in payment for goods or services, and this rule is so strict that to pay even as little as $1 required going to the state bank to get Florintz. Here, again, police were everywhere to enforce regulations, prevent group meetings, and so forth. No wonder Hungarians who once knew freedom will take any chance to escape.

Now to briefly review and summarize, here are four countries in Russia's backyard, all under the heavy thumb of the Communists but under slightly different circumstances.

Yugoslavia, the richest in natural beauty but the poorest in education, industrial development, general standard of living, and with a strong leader who has been able to straddle the fence pretty well and is still getting help from both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Bulgaria, where communism has been operating so long and effectively that people know of no other system and even here where the Communist system has reached its purest and most perfect form, their standard of living is far behind that of the free countries of Europe almost adjacent to it. Rumania, where fear and suspicion are everywhere except perhaps in the small country towns far away from the government controls in Bucharest.

And Hungary, where every native is a prisoner since their uprising a few years ago.

AMERICAN LIBRARY

In only one of these countries—Yugoslavia—are there any publications available in English. In Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, there is nothing at all printed in English. In Yugoslavia, there is an American library.

Most of the larger cities have considerable traffic with good bus service and rapid transit. In the rural areas, however, you see few private automobiles except those owned by people from other countries.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of all in this day of jet transportation, radio, television, and efficient telephone service, is that there is absolutely no communication between these countries at the people's level. They are completely and utterly isolated. Never at any time while crossing a border, did we see anyone else doing so, and on the highways, except for buses and trucks and military vehicles, we passed practically no other automobiles.

I should add that the visa procedure to enter these countries in Russia's backyard is quite complicated and involves a great deal of redtape. All trips must be arranged by the Government tourist bureau, which lays out your itinerary and then you are expected to keep to that itinerary and not to deviate by so much as a hair.

Which of these countries appeals to you as a spot for your future home?

RELIEF ON REACHING VIENNA

This just about concludes my brief report which I'm afraid does not begin to clear up the many points of confusion in my mind and probably in yours as well. Perhaps the best summary I can leave with you is to tell you, in a word or two, our feeling of happiness and relief when, after these 5 weeks behind the Iron Curtain, we found ourselves free again, surrounded by the free, busy, happy people of Vienna.

Here was a city as badly destroyed as any of the others we had seen and under the complete domination of the Soviet rulers immediately after the war, but once given their freedom, their recovery was almost miraculous. A similar condition exists in the comparison between East and West Berlin where the destruction was about the same but where great progress has been made in West Berlin while many parts of East Berlin are even worse than they were at the end of the war. Those of you who have seen pictures of East Berlin have seen how the famous Unter Den Linden (now Stalin Alley) has been quickly rebuilt with several blocks of large, somewhat uniform buildings, but behind this fancy front is rubble and trash; and furthermore, today, just a few years after this great demonstration of building power, even the showy fronts are absolutely falling apart. Could it be that these showy false fronts are a part of the Soviet's makeup? Is it possible that all this secrecy is to prevent the rest of the world from seeing what little there is to support their bravado? Can this possibly convince the world that the Communist system is superior? Surely the East-West Berlin situation and the comparison between this gay, prosperous, happy Vienna with hardly a sign of damage left versus any of those dirty, partially rebuilt, pathetic-looking towns we had been visiting is strong testimony in favor of the free enterprise system versus the strict regimentation of the Communist programs.

From what I personally saw, there is no possible reason to believe the exaggerated statements the Soviets are making about

great advances being made behind the Iron Curtain. In fact, there is every evidence that their industrial and building activities—their cultural and educational progress—their standard of living, etc., are still far behind the free people of the world living on our side of the Iron Curtain.

TAKE STRONG POSITION

The things I have seen only strengthen my feeling that the results of communism as a system have fallen far short of the progress made wherever we have had freedom of thought and action and so I am convinced that we should take strong, aggressive positions in international affairs now while we are ahead in so many important fields.

We should not allow ourselves to be bluffed by the Soviet Union as we have been so badly bluffed in the past.

I believe that they are pretending to deal from a position of strength when in reality their position is shot through with weakness.

They have troubles of their own. Their industrial output is still substantially behind ours. What I saw convinces me that, in the satellite countries at least, they are still far behind us in educating the masses.

To judge by their shops, they cannot, or at least do not, produce consumer goods of any appeal or in any great quantity.

There are modern appearing buildings all through the Iron Curtain countries, but they are not to be compared with our buildings for quality. Many in East Berlin are literally falling apart.

NO OVERCONFIDENCE, PLEASE

But please do not allow these remarks to give you any feeling of overconfidence for this trip behind the Iron Curtain made it only too clear to me that we are competing with a deadly serious, determined, relentless and completely unscrupulous organization that has absolute authority over millions of people occupying some of the most productive land in the world, and if we relax or let down our guard for a moment, they will seize the opportunity with all the vigor and vengeance at their command, and we could find ourselves with too little, too late.

William Sullivan: A Well-Merited Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a recent article from the celebrated Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, regarding the appointment of my friend and neighbor, Mr. William C. Sullivan, to be an Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in charge of the Domestic Intelligence Division.

Since the Item article sets forth in considerable detail the brilliant career and noteworthy achievements of this outstanding young man, I need not elaborate upon the magnificent record which he has made at a time when the Nation and the world are facing so many serious problems, arising from the existence of the worldwide Communist conspiracy directed against free institutions.

It is very reassuring to know that we have in a great, alert law enforcement agency, the FBI, highly qualified, dedicated leaders like Mr. Sullivan working diligently to protect the internal security of the Nation.

I am proud that a friend of mine and a distinguished resident of my congressional district has made, and is continuing to make, such a sterling contribution to the national welfare.

The selection of Mr. Sullivan is another of many instances of the wisdom, sound judgment and spirit of dedication of the great leader of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who by his long-continued, most able work for law, order and security has won the confidence and plaudits of the American people and the civilized world.

That this great American should express his confidence in Mr. Sullivan by naming him to such an important post in itself indicates the superlatively high qualifications Mr. Sullivan possesses—his sturdy integrity, his outstanding ability and his preeminent qualities of mind and heart.

All of us who have had the privilege of knowing Mr. Sullivan and watching his steady advancement in the Government service are very proud of the recent honor that has come to him in the form of this distinguished appointment.

We know how well deserved is the recognition he has received for his many years of unstinted, unselfish, and meritorious service.

In expressing my personal pride and that of my neighbors and constituents, I am immeasurably pleased to extend my heratiest congratulations to Bill Sullivan and his devoted family and to wish for him and for them many more years of success and happiness.

I have supreme confidence that Mr. Sullivan will not only continue his splendid work but that he will steadily advance and play an even more important and effective role in promoting the cause of law enforcement and national security, which is of such vital importance to the Nation.

The article follows:

BOLTON MAN NAMED ASSISTANT FBI CHIEF

William C. Sullivan, a native of Bolton, has recently been named by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as an Assistant Director of the FBI in charge of the Domestic Intelligence Division.

Formerly he was Chief Inspector.

The appointment comes in the same year Mr. Sullivan celebrates his 20th anniversary in the FBI.

He is the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. William Sullivan who were well known farmers in Bolton for 50 years. Mr. Sullivan attended the public grade schools in Bolton and was graduated from Hudson High School.

He next spent a year at the East Maine Conference Academy, Bucksport, Maine. Subsequent to this, he attended American University, Washington, D.C.; Clark University, Worcester, Mass.; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; State Teachers College Graduate School, Fitchburg; Boston College Graduate School, Newton; and George Washington Graduate School, Washington, D.C. He holds the degrees of bachelor of arts and master of education.

Prior to entering the FBI in August 1941, Mr. Sullivan had been in the field of education and also had served with the Internal Revenue Service. In the employ of the FBI, Mr. Sullivan has served in all sections of the United States.

NATIONAL AUTHORITY

Mr. Sullivan is among the better known representatives of the FBI throughout the country. He is a national authority on communism and espionage and has delivered innumerable lectures and speeches to inform the American people as to the true nature of Communist philosophy, tactics, strategy, and goals.

He has been a guest lecturer at the Army War College, National War College, Command and General Staff College, Naval College, Industrial War College, West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, the Department of State, the Inter-American Defense Board, intelligence conferences, seminars, and forums.

He has also lectured at such universities as Yale, Virginia, Princeton, Washington, Notre Dame, Stanford, Southern Methodist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Wisconsin, California, and many other similar educational institutions.

Mr. Sullivan is presently a member of the Washington Committee of the Institute for American Strategy and is a research associate of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, of Stanford University.

BOLTON SCHOOL CHAIRMAN

He will be recalled by residents of this community as a former chairman of the Bolton School Board, chairman of the Joint School Board of Bolton, Harvard, Stow, Carlisle, and Littleton, president of the Recreational Club, chairman of the Public Safety Committee, and principal of the Emerson School, Bolton.

In 1946 he established in recognition of his mother the Joann Sullivan Fund in Bolton to provide an award for outstanding scholarship and character to a member of the graduating class, Houghton Public School, Bolton. In his own student days, Mr. Sullivan was prominent scholastically and active in high school and college athletics, engaging in football, basketball, baseball, and wrestling. He was twice selected for membership on the All-Star Midland Baseball Team.

During the past year he spoke in Clinton before the Knights of Columbus, on the subject of communism.

Republicanism on the Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the Nation are becoming increasingly alarmed over the mad spending proposals consistently presented by the New Frontier. In their fear that fiscal irresponsibility threatens the very structure of our free way of life, the voters are turning to the Republican Party to lead them to sane, responsible government based on the solid foundation of the Constitution which protects all of us against a too-powerful, centralized bureaucracy. The following article from the Wall Street Journal depicts

what is happening in America in the field of politics:

FRESHENING POLITICAL WINDS

Some people assumed as a matter of course that the Republican Party would turn more "liberal" after losing the White House last November. After all, it was argued, that's what the people said they wanted, wasn't it?

But it isn't working out that way, so far at least. As Mr. Novak recently reported in this newspaper, the GOP is gradually turning more conservative. Senator GOLDWATER has achieved a remarkable prominence, but he is only the most dramatic example of the current conservative trend within the party and its representatives in Congress.

One explanation is simply that the Kennedy spending program is too much too soon; it was bound to generate opposition. The monstrous grab-bag housing bill, for example, was enough to prick the conscience not only of a conservative but of some liberal Republicans, who voted against it.

The far more significant explanation, though, is that the Members of Congress are feeling the heat from home. Local party workers tell of increasingly conservative voter sentiment, and the lawmakers also hear it directly from their constituents. As one party pro put it, "You go around the country and you hear two things from Republicans: They want a tough foreign policy and they want a cut in Government spending."

It should be noted in passing that a tough foreign policy is not necessarily conservative. Everyone, regardless of label, was appalled at the Cuban debacle, and almost everyone backs a tough stand on Berlin. It is, if anything, a matter of degree; as a generalization, conservatives, by the nature of their creed, are the stanchest opponents of communism, but that doesn't mean they want to go to war at the drop of every hat.

The domestic spending issue, at any rate, divides conservatives and liberals far more sharply. Indeed it must, for this issue is one of the outward signs of the clash of the rival political philosophies. On the one hand are the liberals, who believe the Central Government must do almost everything for the citizen, regardless of the cost in taxes, debt, inflation, and infringements on personal liberty. On the other are the conservatives, who believe the individual, and hence society, fares best in an atmosphere of maximum freedom consistent with order.

So it is a good thing that the spending issue is getting hot, for it serves to put the deeper rivalry in clearer focus. The Kennedy administration refuses to make any cuts in nonessential spending to offset its drastic increases in defense outlays, but instead seeks to spend more on more things. It thus has put the country on notice of its heavy bias toward centralized Government power.

The Republicans, in these circumstances, have an excellent opportunity to make the case for freedom, with next year's congressional elections as the first target. They could show concretely what a sharply lower level of Government spending would mean in terms of lower taxes, revived initiative, economic growth, and generally a fresher climate in the country.

This swelling of conservative opinion, even as it is, indicates that the voters might not be unresponsive to such a campaign. The people, after all, did not say last November that they wanted a Government of reckless spenders; half of them voted for the more conservative alternative.

And behind that result, we think, lies a restiveness growing over the years. People have been getting fed up with a point of political view which has no new ideas but only a compulsion to spend and control. The liberal approach, whether called New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier, is old and tired. The conservative case—or at any rate, the case for freedom—is by contrast young and vigorous.

Whether the Republicans will make use of their opportunity is another matter. They have missed other such bets in the past, and lost elections. But it is encouraging for the political vitality of this country that more and more Republicans at least acknowledge the existence of the opportunity.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Excerpts From Address of Hon. Antonio De Las Alas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a very informative address delivered by Hon. Antonio De Las Alas before the annual meeting of Philippine Mahogany Association, Inc., held at Boulder, Colo., July 16–20, 1961. I think it will be of of interest to many of our citizens.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF HON. ANTONIO DE LAS ALAS

An unexpected event about the end of the last century brought the United States to the Philippines. Having struggled for freedom from a colonizing country, we could not accept domination by any other nation so we resisted tenaciously America's design to occupy the Philippines. But the struggle was so unequal that after a brief skirmish we had to bow to American sovereignty. We soon understood the American motives and objectives. America did not mean to colonize the Philippines, but rather their policy was to prepare us for self-government with a view to eventually granting our independence. The Americans, with the hearty cooperation of the Filipinos, embarked in the complicated task of preparing our country and people for independent nationhood. We worked together in perfect harmony and understanding, and this developed a genuine, sincere relationship of respect, admiration, and love for one another. During the First World War the Philippines showed her support and adherence to the cause for which the United States was fighting by individual Filipinos enlisting with freedom armies in Europe and the Philippines, organizing and offering a complete army division to the United States.

In 1934 the Tydings-McDuffie law was approved by the Congress of the United States and this law expressly provided for the granting of independence to the Philippines. However, although politically speaking, the Philippines was prepared for a complete and absolute independent existence, it was believed by Filipino and American statesmen that there should be a transition period during which this country could build up its economy and at the same time free itself from too much dependence upon the U.S. market. The Commonwealth government was set up in 1936 and the law provided that, after 10 years, the Commonwealth would cease and the Philippine Republic must then be established and recognized. But in 1940 the Second World War broke out, resulting in the occupation of the Philippines by Japan during the years 1941 to 1944. In this Second World War the Filipinos played a very important role. Together with the American soldiers they fought against the Japanese invaders. They were able to hold the invaders for over 4 months in Bataan and Corregidor and this undoubtedly spoiled the timetable of the Japanese and enabled the Allied armies to organize and prepare for the counteroffensive. The successful Philippine-American resistance could be considered the turning point of the war in the Pacific. After the formal surrender of the American and Philippine Armies, the Filipinos engaged in guerrilla warfare which softened the resistance of the Japanese Army when the American Armed Forces returned to liberate the Philippines.

Since the economic preparation of the Philippines was interrupted by the war, the free trade between the two countries was continued but, by law and agreements like the Laurel-Langley agreement, a schedule of gradual liquidation of the free trade between the two countries was agreed upon.

In the meanwhile, aid in various forms was extended to the Philippines the most notable of which was the war damage payments. Up to now assistance is being given through American organizations like the International Cooperation Administration (ICA). So far we have not asked for any increase in the volume or amount of the aid, nor protested against any reduction, and much less resorted to a sort of extortion to get greater assistance like what some countries do.

Then there is that colossal struggle between communism and dictatorship on the one hand and democracy and freedom on the other. Again the Philippines joined the United States in this struggle. She demonstrated her unstinted support, not only in the diplomatic field—in the United Nations and international conferences—but even in the battlefields, the Philippines having participated in the Korean war. This struggle is even more dangerous as it may penetrate into the very heart of any nation in the form of internal subversion. The modus operandi is to cause discontentment and armed conflicts among the population and attain control of the country by encouraging and actually helping with arms and sometimes even with men the party or faction that embraces or favors the Communist ideology. Poverty and unemployment breed discontent and cause subversion which the Communists take advantage of to seize power and expand their sphere of influence or domination.

If the United States wishes the noble experiment she undertook when the Philippines was granted independence to be concluded successfully; if she intends to fulfill her obligation of rehabilitating the Philippines by repairing the losses and damages caused by the ravages of the last world war, and if she does not want the Philippines to be another hotbed of Communist propaganda and subversive activities and, on the contrary, she expects this country to be strong and in condition always to collaborate with her, she must make every endeavor to help the Philippines so that this country's economy will be sound and stable and the Filipino people happy and contended.

Barely 2 months ago the Filipino people was shocked by an unjust treatment perpetrated by the Department of Agriculture of the U.S. Government in connection with the allocation of sugar quota. Instead of describing this incident myself, let me quote a news item published in a Manila newspaper. It reads as follows:

"Oland D. Russell of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in an editorial in the New York World-Telegram of June 16, 1961 questioned the American decision to award additional sugar quotas to India and Brazil, affirmed neutral countries, because this was done at the expense of the Philippines, a stanch ally. Russell expressed the fear that even Brazil and India may not be impressed if they were to realize that friends like the Philippines are being taken for granted by the United States of America. These two neutrals, Russell said, would know that the moment they became 'friends' and not 'uncommitted,' they'd be treated as the Philippines is being treated now."

This hasty decision was later rectified by restoring to the Philippines its rightful share of 150,000 tons of additional quota. But the Philippine quota is still relatively small.

Notwithstanding regrettable failings on the part of America, not the least doubt should be entertained that the Philippines will always be a faithful and belligerent ally of America in so far as the fight for democracy and freedom as against communism and dictatorship is concerned. I am sure you have read the accounts of how warmly and sincerely our people welcomed General MacArthur during our Independence Day celebration on July 4. This, to my mind, demonstrates the continuing deep affection of the Filipinos toward the American people. But we hope and expect that no facts inimical to the economy of the Philippines will be committed.

With prosperity and contentment of the Filipinos and the Philippines enjoying a stable economy, America and the Philippines will continue marching together toward a world characterized by enjoyment of untrammeled freedom.

Another Administration Proposal That Hits Those of Moderate Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting that most of the administration proposals which are supposed to help the cherished common man of the New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier always end up hitting hardest at those of modest income? The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal emphasizes this point in treating how the recently passed bill to lower the customs allowance will work in actual practice:

LETTER TO AUNT BESSIE

Well, we suppose the only thing you can do now is to cut your trip short by a week or write home for more money.

The President of the United States and the Congress, duly assembled, have decided that after September 9 your customs allowance

will be only $100 instead of the $500 it was when you left. So unless you hurry the customs collector is going to charge you extra for the privilege of bringing home those keepsakes and gifts you've been saving for all those years. And the collector has already warned that he's going to give your luggage a good ransacking to be sure you aren't smuggling lace from Brussels and thus undermining the Republic.

The reason for all this is quite simple. True, American foreign trade has been running a nice surplus but it just hasn't been big enough to cover both your tourist purchases and the Government's own dollar payments abroad, including all the billions for foreign aid. So the United States is running a huge deficit in its total balance of payments with foreign countries—the Government estimates it will be about $1.5 billion this year alone, maybe more.

This means that somebody has got to cut down on oversea spending, and naturally the Government isn't. Of course if you and all the other tourists together don't bring back anything at all it still wouldn't make much of a dent in the balance of payments; in fact, if you take the $400 difference and spend it on that side trip to Scotland, the payments deficit won't be reduced by a nickel. But, as the President reminded us, these are trying times. And somebody has to make sacrifices, don't they?

It's all a bit futile, and we suppose it's bound to strike you as unfair. But that's the way it is. When a government has indulged in years of foolishness and has gotten things so snarled up that great sacrifices are demanded—well, it somehow always turns out that the sacrifices are never for statesmen but only for Aunt Bessie.

Justice Clark Bids Bar Group Act To Halt Antitrust Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, in a significant speech before the antitrust section of the American Bar Association, warned recently that stiff criminal penalties for aggravated violations of the antitrust laws would probably become commonplace.

He suggested that lawyers might best serve their clients and the national interest if they borrowed from the medical profession and adopted a policy of "preventive law," thus insuring more wholehearted compliance with the laws against monopoly and illegal competition.

Justice Clark declared that in 1961:

For the first time in Sherman law history reputable, top-level businessmen were sentenced and served a term in jail. One of the lawyers in addressing the court at the time of sentencing his client said: "Why punish these men? It's a way of life. Everybody's doing it."

In sum he concluded that no one would sentence a reputable businessman to jail with common crooks. Neither the National Association of Manufacturers nor the chamber of commerce ever reprimanded an indicted member company. In truth many saw nothing wrong in them.

But certainly every lawyer and every businessman knew that the conduct engaged in by these electrical manufacturers was a crime punishable by a jail sentence, by a fine, or both.

Lawyers, I believe, can have a large part in making sure it will not happen again. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who has developed a preventive medicine program for his patients. Lawyers must adopt the same principle of a preventive law program that will make certain that hard-core violations of the act will at least be eliminated.

If [they] do not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 4176, to provide additional punishment for corporate officers violating the antitrust laws, and to provide that such officers may be barred for not more than 1 year from serving in such corporate capacity.

I include, too, an article from the New York Times of August 9, 1961, and a letter I have received from the distinguished and indefatigable vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, George J. Burger, the ablest representative small business has ever had:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever is convicted of any violation of the antitrust laws may, in the discretion of the court, in addition to any other punishment provided by law, be barred for not more than one year from serving, directly or indirectly, in the capacity of officer, director, executive, legal counsel, or in any similar capacity with any corporation or corporations convicted in the same proceeding, and serving with any corporation engaged in interstate commerce, and from directly or indirectly receiving any compensation, remuneration, or other consideration therefor, or by way of indemnification for being so barred.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act the term "antitrust laws" has the meaning assigned to such term in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, and includes the Federal Trade Commission Act.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., August 9, 1961.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Early in the present Congress when I conferred with you as to the advisability of reintroducing legislation to amend the antitrust laws—such legislation was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress by you—I stated that the need for such legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws was even more necessary than ever before. That is, if we are to have respect and obeyance to the antitrust laws from all segments of our economy.

Bear in mind, my action in the first instance was confirmed by the nationwide membership of the national federation in the 50 States, now numbering 171,947, all independent business and professional men, all individual members.

You agreed with our request resulting in reintroduction of the bill in the present Congress, H.R. 4176. Your bill provides for removal of officers for violation of the antitrust laws.

From its inception the national federation has made its No. 1 objective to protect the free enterprise system and independent business, through vigorous consistent enforcement of the antitrust laws in all segments of our economy. Our action was confirmed in our public appearances before the respective platform committees of both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960. In fact that was the first recommendation, in each instance, that we made to the respective platform committees.

The importance of your legislative action as outlined in H.R. 4176 is most necessary when one stops to review the remarks of Mr. Justice Clark before the American Bar Association in annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., August 8, 1961, "Justice Clark Bids Bar Group Act To Halt Antitrust Violations."

Because of the importance of his remarks I am attaching herewith a clipping from the New York Times of August 9, and would it be possible to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD? I believe such action would furnish important information to many of your colleagues as to Justice Clark's views.

Finally, Congressman, we did not call the turn wrong when we advised the House Small Business Committee in 1948 that antitrust violations were more rampant both at the local and national level than ever in the history of our Nation.

Thanking you for your usual cooperation in behalf of small business.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

JUSTICE CLARK BIDS BAR GROUP ACT TO HALT ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS

(By Cabell Phillips)

ST. LOUIS, August 8.—Supreme Court Juctice Tom C. Clark warned today that stiff criminal penalties for aggravated violations of the antitrust laws would probably become commonplace.

He suggested that lawyers might best serve their clients and the national interest if they borrowed from the medical profession and adopted a policy of "preventive war." This, he said, would insure more wholehearted compliance with the laws against monopoly and illegal competition.

Justice Clark was the principal luncheon speaker at the antitrust section of the American Bar Association, whose annual convention entered its second day here today. The sessions will continue through Friday.

In other groups meetings today James M. Landis, special assistance to President Kennedy an organization of the regulatory agencies, pleaded for continued reform in the administration of these agencies. Postmaster General J. Edward Day stated the case for postal rate increases, Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland urged a cooperative attitude toward the work of the United Nations. And a panel on criminal law debated the probable efficacy of the Attorney General's new attack on organized crime racketeering.

FORTY-FIVE HUNDRED MEMBERS AT HAND

The convention has brought more than 11,000 visitors to this city, approximately 4,500 of whom are A.B.A. members. More than a dozen different sections and panels on specialized problems of the legal professions are in session at any given time during the morning and afternoon hours and hotel facilities separated by as much as 3 or 4 miles have been pressed into use.

In his address Justice Clark traced the slow evolution of antitrust enforcement from its earliest application under President Theodore Roosevelt when it scandalized many right-thinking people, including Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, through two decades of desuetude during the 1920's and 1930's to the present. In 1961, he said, there began a new record.

"For the first time in Sherman Law history," he went on, "reputable top-level busi-

nessmen were sentenced and served a term in jail. One of the lawyers in addressing the court at the time of sentencing his client said: 'Why punish these men? It's a way of life. Everybody's doing it.'"

"In sum he concluded that no one would sentence a reputable businessman to jail with common crooks. Neither the National Association of Manufacturers nor the chamber of commerce ever reprimanded an indicted member company. In truth many saw nothing wrong in them.

"But certainly," Justice Clark continued, "every lawyer and every businessman knew that the conduct engaged in by these electrical manufacturers was a crime punishable by a jail sentence, by a fine or both.

"Lawyers, I believe, can have a large part in making sure it will not happen again. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who had developed a preventive medicine program for his patients. Lawyers must adopt the same principle of a preventive law program that will make certain that hard core violations of the act will at least be eliminated.

"If [they] do not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail."

Justice Clark's talk was regarded as one of the "toughest" heard so far at the convention and there was considerable comment about it today among the delegates.

LOBBIES UNDER ATTACK

Mr. Landis, in his address to the section on administrative law, castigated lobbies and other special interest groups for seeking to cripple or defeat the plans for reorganizing the Federal regulatory agencies.

Such proposals on which he has worked as a special assistant to President Kennedy have gone to Congress in the form of proposed actions under the Reorganization Act of 1949. Two have been accepted in modified form and two have been rejected.

Referring specifically to the defeat of the proposal for reforms in procedures of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Landis said:

"An analysis of that event throws considerable light on the general problem of administrative reorganization. All the networks, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Federal Communications bar, opposed this reorganization plan.

"Their opposition stemmed not from a belief that the plan would not work but that it would work too well. Their fears related to the potentiality that the license renewal requirements might really be made workable.

Wisconsin Dairy Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in agriculture a difficult problem—in addition to the economic one—has been that of persuading young people to pursue farming as a career. In effect, it has been hard to keep them down on the farm.

We recognize, of course, that low income—in comparison with other vocations—is one of the influencing factors. To many people farming, however, is more than a vocation—it is a way of life.

Consequently, it is gratifying to see that despite the obstacles, a number of outstanding, promising youth are taking up farming as a career.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a number of articles reflecting the way in which young folks, for example, are participating in fair demonstrations—the culmination of year-round projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY YOUTHS ARE GIVING FAIR DEMONSTRATIONS

The mechanical head of a model Guernsey cow nodded, seemingly in agreement with the advice that two 17-year-old Buffalo County youths were giving a group of State fair visitors.

Delmar Plank of Alma, and David Putz of Fountain City, lecturing on the proper selection of foundation animals for a dairy herd, are among the 120 youths giving 360 demonstrations scheduled in the agriculture building during the fair.

The building comes alive early each morning as 4-H Club members, Future Farmers of America and Future Homemakers of America stream in to prepare their demonstration areas.

Using the model Guernsey and charts, Delmar and David demonstrated points they have picked up on cattle selection from their FFA project.

"When starting a herd look for an animal with a straight back," David told the audience as Delmar ran a pointer along the Guernsey's back to emphasize the remark.

Both youths moved cautiously through the presentation; besides the audience, there was a judge out front. He was there to make certain they had a sound knowledge of their subject and that it was presented clearly and in well organized manner.

Hoping to win a blue ribbon, the youths said they had been working on this particular project since February. Both have been meeting at the Cochrane-Fountain City High School Sundays and evenings, shaping the presentation and planning visual aids.

Like the other youths, they were selected to appear at the State fair after winning in competition in their home area.

Their work was rewarded when they won a blue ribbon for their presentation. It was a duplication of last year's feat, when the two teamed up to demonstrate how to clean and trim cows.

Typical of the girls demonstrating at the fair was Donna Newman, 16, Wisconsin Dells, who gave tips on traveling.

"Pack the things you need first—last. And the things you need last—first," she said.

"Always take a needle and thread. You never know when you'll rip a dress. Be prepared."

THREE ARE NAMED AS DAIRY WINNERS

The last three dairy champions of the State Fair's junior division were selected Monday with two of the titles going to girls.

Rhoda Sayre, 17, a 4-H Club girl from Edgerton, showed the champion milking shorthorn. Her winner, a pure white 3-year-old, was champion of the fair last year.

A pretty 19-year-old University of Wisconsin home economics major was the winner in the Jersey division. She is Barbara Howell of Waukesha, who won with her 6-year-old cow, How Blie. Miss Howell said this year would wind up her 4-H Club activities. She has shown the cow for 6 years.

The Ayrshire winner was John Dalton, 18, of Hartland.

CENTERS ON TWO FAMILIES

The milking shorthorn contest Monday boiled down mostly to representatives from two families. They were Kitchell Sayre's daughter, Rhoda, and four children of Leslie Gerner, Whitewater—Gayle, 13; Vicki, 15; Edwin, 17, and Nancy, 19.

Gayle got the Gerners off to a fast start, winning the junior heifer class. Nancy followed with the winner in the senior heifer class, defeating not only Miss Sayre but her own sister, Vicki.

But Rhoda came back to take the junior yearling heifer class and the aged cow title. Edwin Gerner won in 2-year-olds.

The showmen then squared off for the championships. Gayle Gerner won the junior award. Judge Elis Knutson, Oconomowoc, normally associated with Holsteins, liked the Gerner heifer. But with its immaturity he said he didn't want to stick his neck out. He gave the purple ribbon to Miss Sayre.

The Jersey showmen put on a classy display. They had their tidy animals brushed to perfection, with curved horns glistening. The Jerseys may be outnumbered by other breeds, but their sleek lines and alertness make them a favorite with spectators.

Jersey class winners were: Junior heifer calf, Carol Venoric, Kenosha; senior heifer calf, Miss Howell; junior yearling heifer, Oren Hammes, Jr., Edgerton; senior yearling heifer, Harlon Frost, Hudson; 2-year-old heifer, David McClurg, Gays Mills; 3-year-old cow, Hammes; aged cow, Miss Howell, and junior champion, McClurg.

Dalton's award climaxed 3 years of showing. His cow was State champion here in 1959 and first prize 2-year-old in 1960.

Other Ayrshire winners were; Junior heifer calf, Dalton; senior heifer calf, Steven Justman, Unity (Clark County); junior yearling heifer, Dalton; senior yearling heifer, Allan Benicke, Cedarburg; 2-year-old heifer, Kemp Wilson, Mukwonago; 3-year-old cow, Wilson, and aged cows, Dalton.

In bulls, James Thomey, Kenosha, had the winner on a senior calf. No Jersey or Ayrshire bulls were shown.

Miss Howell climaxed the day by winning a new class, for all-breed showmanship. Dalton was second.

To find the winner, the judge switched animals among the showmen. When Miss Howell was given a Holstein to lead, she did a better job than the others with unfamiliar animals.

The final decision was based on the fact that Miss Howell could stop her animal as if it were posed for a picture. That means having the right rear foot forward for a good view of the udder and keeping the back straight.

JEFFERSON COUNTY WINS

Jefferson County won the herdsmanship contest, given for the best job of displaying cattle in the barns. Sheboygan got an award among counties with less than 20 entries and Jefferson the prize for larger counties, then took the overall trophy for dairy cattle. Iowa County won in beef herdsmanship.

Into the rating go scores on general appearance and neatness of exhibits, conduct of exhibitors, attendant on duty, storage of feed and equipment, and type and quality of cattle.

Jefferson's stalls, even at the end of the junior fair, were squared off neatly, with deep, clean bedding in place. The youths had decorated the entire area with deep blue paper, lettered in white. Over each animal was hung the ribbon it had received.

Jefferson County also won the shepherd trophy for having the best decorated and cleanest sheep pens during the junior fair. Dunn County finished second, and Fond du Lac County third. Jefferson County also took the traveling award in 1959. With one more victory the trophy will be theirs to keep.

Flood Protection Preferable to Flood Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of flood control is of vital importance to many Members of Congress I am sure. I have for some time now been an advocate of effective flood control and protection devices that would prevent that type of flood damage that occurred in my own Eighth District of Indiana during the month of May. At that time, thousands of dollars of damage was suffered by communities and individuals living in southern Indiana, and in the general tristate area of southern Indiana, Illinois, and western Kentucky. I appeared before both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Works of the respective Appropriations Committees, strongly urging further starts and work on the various flood control projects on the Ohio, Wabash, and the White and Patoka River systems. A recent editorial appearing in the Evansville Courier, of Evansville, Ind., points out what I believe to be the only really wise solution to this problem of annual flooding and human suffering. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FLOOD PROTECTION PREFERABLE TO FLOOD RELIEF

President Kennedy has authorized the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to spend $950,000 in emergency flood relief for 43 Indiana counties, including all of southwestern Indiana.

That represents just a portion of the damage that was done to public facilities—roads, bridges, sewers, and the like—by torrential rains early this summer. For Vanderburgh County alone, there is an application for $104,000, mostly as a result of those spectacular downtown sewer cave-ins.

Private loss as a result of the floods was far greater. Some of it was paid for by private agencies, some by individual owners, and some by insurance companies.

Without detracting a bit from the need for this assistance, it should be noted that this is literally money down the drain. The Federal Government will spend close to a million dollars simply to get things back in some sort of normal order. None of the money will go for significant improvement of public facilities.

Nor is it likely that this will be the last expense of this type in southern Indiana. It could be next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now. But sooner or later there are bound to be more floods, and more emergency appropriations for flood damage.

The size of this year's bill helps to put the Federal Government's annual expenses for flood protection in context. A dollar spent in flood relief is gone forever. It has done nothing except replace something that already existed.

A dollar's worth of flood protection, on the other hand, can be expected to pay for itself time and time and time again. Sometimes a levee system can pay for itself by containing a single surge of high water. When the water recedes, the levees are still there, an investment in future protection.

The annual expenditures for flood control look immense when they've listed on a single-page summary of congressional appropriations. However, a little reflection is enough to convince most citizens that next to defense, the money is about as well spent as any in our Federal budget.

Dewey Hodges Johnson: His Faith in Future of South Carolina Will Live On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the praiseworthy and exceptional career of the late Dewey Hodges Johnson, of Greenwood, S.C.

Throughout his life, Dewey Johnson devoted his time and talents unselfishly and devotedly to civic, religious, humanitarian, and financial programs of our State. His achievements have contributed greatly to the public good and have earned him the respect, admiration, and gratitude of all South Carolinians. I join my fellow citizens in extending sympathy to his family, friends, and associates.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the August 15 issue of the Anderson Independent of Anderson, S.C., entitled "Dewey Hodges Johnson: His Faith in Future of South Carolina Will Live On," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY HODGES JOHNSON: HIS FAITH IN FUTURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA WILL LIVE ON

Summer days on Broad Street in Augusta generate a peculiar heat of their own. To move about at all is to sweat. To have been a bank runner back in the early 1900's called for pluck, energy, and plenty of perspiration.

Some youngsters in such jobs tossed in the towel, even as too many do today when the going gets a little rugged.

But Dewey Hodges Johnson, a native of Aiken who got a job as a bank runner in Augusta after he was graduated from high school in 1917, wasn't that kind.

His career, which came to an untimely end at the age of 62 when he died in Greenwood, is a model of the American story—from lowly bank runner to chairmanship of the board of the State Bank and Trust Co. with 19 thriving offices in South Carolina, the largest State bank in the State.

His first job as runner with the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Augusta was just the beginning of 24 years with that institution. He wasn't a runner for long. He was interested in banking and, especially, in the idea—strange idea it was not too many years ago—that the character of an individual was far more trustworthy than collateral.

He was the type of banker who was an acute judge of such character. Whether the applicant for a loan wore overalls or a top hat, the Dewey Johnson practice as it developed over the years was to judge the individual not by any "front" but upon his reputation for reliability, intent, and willingness to work.

The bank runner in time became vice president of the Augusta banking house, joined Auto Finance Co. of Charlotte, and then in 1943 took over control of the Bank of Greenwood, which name later was changed to State Bank and Trust Co. as new offices were opened first in smaller communities in Greenwood vicinity and then expanded to become truly a statewide banking service.

Increasingly, this banking service became a sparkplug in the financial dynamo, helping to produce new businesses and industrial plants in all parts of the State. All such enterprises—large or small—were encouraged and given full assistance, good times and bad, based on the same judgment—reliability and characters of owners and prospects for success, often in fields some lenders with less vision wouldn't have touched with a 10-foot pole.

Meanwhile, Mr. Johnson devoted much time and effort to civic and community affairs not only in his adopted home town of Greenwood but wherever his banking offices are located, since he believed in his business being a "good citizen" dedicated to upbuilding of State, town, and community.

It would require more space than available to detail the many good works this man performed during his career and typically, a great many of them were hidden under the bushel. Dewey Johnson was no seeker of publicity for himself.

Especially poignant to many Andersonians is that State Bank & Trust opened its most recent office in Anderson only a few months ago, fulfilling a longtime desire by Mr. Johnson to have his banking services established in this thriving Hartwell Dam area. It was a happy day for him and for Anderson, and will be long remembered.

As an able and astute banker, Mr. Johnson builded well, and his sons and other associates throughout the State may be depended upon to carry on in the progressive and friendly traditions he established so well.

As one longtime Greenwood friend said, "Dewey Johnson was one of those rare men—a real friend to everybody."

He will be keenly missed. Our sympathy goes out to his family, and to his friends and associates. They and all other South Carolinians may be both consoled and encouraged by remembering that Dewey Johnson demonstrated a deep faith in the future of South Carolina and its people which is a living force that will continue to have incalculable impact.

Tomorrow's Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in the face of all the problems which have confronted this Congress, it is refreshing for me to know that at the center for practical politics, Rollins College, in my district, a distinguished program is being carried on as a contribution to America's public leadership. Just let me mention a few of the young men who this summer have been engaged in strenuous internships to train their skills and test their capabilities.

Howell W. Van Gerbig, Jr., grandson of Ogden Mills, a former Secretary of the Treasury, is in Japan, studying the rela-

tionship of Japan's economic objectives to foreign policy. Mr. Van Gerbig, as you know, is himself a leading metropolitan golf amateur from Long Island and Palm Beach. Robert K. Brown, Springfield, Mass., has been working in the personnel offices of the New York Port Authority and is writing a manual on public personnel administration. Thomas Donnelly, Pittsburgh, Pa., is completing a study of the constitutions of the Americas and this fall will issue a collection of documents with organizational charts. Douglas Baxendale, Swansea, Mass., is engaged in making an economic study of Greater Fall River, looking forward to making contributions toward its industrial growth. Richard Rhodes, of Winter Park, Fla., is in personnel in the city of Orlando. And Rohn Lady, who was elected to the council of the town of Casselberry, Fla., at the age of 21, is serving as the administrative officer of the center for practical politics, coordinating studies which are in progress dealing with the central Florida region.

This kind of preparation of tomorrow's leaders by resultful internships is an encouraging sign of the times with a global reach.

Russians Conduct Economic Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, should there be any doubt about the totality of the Soviet offensive being directed against the West, the following article by Victor Riesel, describing the extent of Communist espionage in Europe, should bring us to our senses.

Can there be any doubt that similar spying operations are taking place daily within our shores? What Mr. Riesel's article also reveals is that the Russians, despite their claims of superiority, actually need the technological and mechanical information which they steal from western businessmen. Besides aiding the Reds in developing better machinery, basic information about our research and development progress gives them a good idea about our military strategy. The article follows:

RUSSIANS CONDUCT ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE

(By Victor Riesel)

MUNICH.—Plastic bombings in Frankfort and a midnight execution by revolver shots on a wooded roadside not far from Lisbon have been the trademarks of the Soviet counterintelligence operation in the last 2 weeks.

Today, all across Europe, but especially in Germany, the Communist underground is preparing for Der Tag. In a special room in a special headquarters of the German Republic's security forces there is a huge map with pins marking the concentration of Moscow's underground agents—and the pins in the map show the Russians have 16,000 special agents operating in West Germany.

Of these, some 4,000 are women. One of them, Rosalie Kunzé, was nabbed along with some 200 other agents "our side" picks up every day. She had all the equipment for the job: A false bottom purse, a hairbrush with a hollow handle for microfilms, undergarments into which she could slip edible tissue-paper reports.

Her first assignment was in a field the Soviet intelligence people give high priority—economic and industrial espionage. Her task was to contact and entertain, if possible, West German and French businessmen visiting the Soviet-zone Leipzig Fair. She was eventually arrested for soliciting—vital information which would give Russian analysts detailed knowledge of classified production this side of the line.

As the Landesamt fuer Verfassungsschutz (Office For Protection of the Constitution) put it recently in one of its reports: "Experience shows that the fight for technical progress, for markets in economic areas of influence, is playing an important role in the political battle for power." The "Verfassungsschutz" is the FBI of West Germany.

What the Russians want is all the information they can get on Western automatic machinery (the Soviets have virtually none compared with the West); developments in chemical industries; basic research in nuclear physics and electronics. These are the main targets. Also information concerning "secret construction plans, patented production procedures and individual models of items produced."

If the Soviet underground apparatus should succeed in gathering such data in Europe, it would lead the Moscow intelligence people directly to our own secret production installations, for we work closely with our allies.

So it isn't merely a cloak and dagger search for a death ray we may have closeted somewhere. If the enemy knows what we're making, or in what direction our secret basic research and development is going, they'll know what our basic strategy will be. And since so many firms back home are doing business with the bloc countries and are exchanging pleasant visits across the sea with bloc businessmen, I thought you folks back home would like to know what German intelligence has discovered:

All Czechoslovakian businessmen are given precise instructions in writing before they leave their country for Germany, France, or the United States, for that matter.

Each Soviet bloc buying agent, inspector, salesman, or trade commission member must file a travel report on his return. This goes into a vast global blackmail warehouse of personal dossiers.

Each itinerant Soviet bloc businessman must bring back with him detailed information on the type and volume of the production of the factories he visited. He must submit proposals for the evaluation of the information he obtained.

And, each of these visitors must describe his Western business contacts—this means their looks, peculiarities, and personal weaknesses.

Similar instructions are given to Soviet bloc inspectors of goods bought in the West, including the United States, and to all members of economic delegations. Frequently these inspectors, purchasing agents, and members of economic and trade delegations stay in Western countries for a month or more, perhaps several months.

Remember this, some of you folks back home, when you are dealing with a gracious, good humored bloc businessman. It's his life or your proclivities. He must report them. Remember that personal contacts are established not only with top executives, but with aids all the way down the line.

The German intelligence office says bluntly it has evidence that such contacts are used for espionage, including economic espionage. At all times bloc travelers are on the lookout for personnel who can be blackmailed into yielding industrial secrets, either because of personal habits or because of a relative behind the Iron Curtain.

Spying isn't always a microfilm and secret wireless operation. Beware the Russians and Czechs and all the rest of them who come bearing gifts in the form of orders. The dossier you build up may be your own.

Equalitarian Dogma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Equalitarian Dogma," by Henry E. Garrett, Ph. D. Dr. Garrett is one of the outstanding psychologists of our Nation and has served as president of the national association. Teaching at Columbia University from 1923 to 1941, he became head of the department of psychology there and continued in that position until 1956. Since that time, he has been a visiting professor at the University of California, the University of Southern California, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, the University of Florida, and is now a visiting professor of psychology at the University of Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Aug. 13, 1961]

EQUALITARIAN DOGMA RACIAL DIFFERENCES DISCUSSED

(By Henry E. Garrett, Ph.D.)

Up to World War I, it is probable that American scientists who gave the matter any thought at all believed the Negro race to be natively less gifted than the white. Thus, the Negro was generally considered to be less intelligent and more indolent than the white, and to be somewhat lacking in the fundamental traits of honesty and reliability. This judgment was concurred in by most white Americans.

Social scientists today do not often accept these onetime commonsense judgments. Instead, they hold that racial differences are skindeep: that, whereas the black African differs from the white European in the breadth and depth of his civilization, there are no genetic or native factors to account for these differences; that all races are potentially equal in ability and differ only in their opportunity to achieve. Usually, the social scientist will include motivation as a cause of racial differences, together with discrimination and prejudice.

This view that, except for environmental differences, all races are potentially equal has been called the equalitarian dogma. (Use of the word "equalitarian" in this paper is limited to the meaning indicated above. I do not intend the broader meaning: that of belief that all men should have equal political and social rights, a concept not debated here.)

It has spread through many of our colleges and universities and is widely accepted by sincere humanitarians, social reformers, crusaders, sentimentalists and—

ostensibly—politicians. Many ministers of religion, convinced that the concept of the "equality of man" is in keeping with the ideals of Christian brotherhood and democracy, have joined the social scientists. Last, but by no means least, the Communists vigorously defend the equalitarian dogma. Only the man in the street, uninstructed in social anthropology, remains puzzled and reluctant.

Equalitarianism—or egalitarianism, as it is sometimes called—finds its chief support from at least two clearly identifiable sources: the allegedly scientific groups who have proved equality, and the religious groups who accept this proof and, on the basis of it, assert that belief in racial differences implies superiority and inferiority and is unchristian, shameful and blameworthy.

Each camp supplements the other. The social scientists turn to moral denunciation when their evidence is feeble, and the religious fall back on science to bolster up their ethical preachments. From these two directions the American people have for more than 30 years been subjected to a barrage of propaganada unrivaled in its intensity and self-righteousness.

Today in many departments of psychology, anthropology, and even genetics, the equalitarian dogma has been installed as a major premise not to be questioned. Budding young scientists of independent mind jeopardize their careers by challenging the dogma and may be silenced by strong disapproval.

Many college students have been indoctrinated and parrot the equalitarian arguments without competent familiarity with the evidence, shifting from the scientific to the moralistic position as the occasion requires.

The northern press and many influential magazines, together with radio and TV programs, confidently proclaim equalitarianism.

How can we account for today's shift from a general belief in native racial differences to acceptance of the equalitarian dogma?

There are, I believe, five sources which have stimulated and directed the propaganda barrage mentioned above. Let us examine these in order:

INFLUENCE OF MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY

By far the most potent assault upon native racial differences from the scientific side has come from the work of Franz Boas, who may be thought of as the father of the equalitarian movement.

Boas came to this country from Germany in 1886 and for 37 years—1899–1936—was professor of anthropology at Columbia University. Boas and his followers actively and aggressively championed equalitarianism, discounting any evidence tending to show that Negro-white differences may not be environmentally determined. But the cultural anthropologists rarely use objective measures recognized as valid for judging the comparative abilities of racial groups. Hence their conclusions, though confidently announced, are often subjective and unconvincing.

The view presented here is that psychological tests offer the best—i.e., most valid—quantitative data for the determination of racial differences.

The best recent survey of the comparative standing of American Negroes and American whites on a number of mental tests may be found in "Testing of Negro Intelligence," a book written by A. M. Shuey, published in 1958. It is indicative of the power—and lack of tolerance—of the equalitarians that none of the university presses to which this book was submitted was willing to publish it. This book covers 44 years, from 1913 to 1957, and analyzes some 240 studies.

Negro-white comparisons are made of preschool children, grade and high school pupils, college students, gifted and retarded children, soldiers, delinquents, racial hybrids, and Negro migrants. A brief summary of the relative findings follows:

1. The IQ's of American Negroes are from 15 to 20 points, on the average, below those of American whites.

2. Negro overlap of white median IQ's ranges from 10 to 25 percent—equality would require 50 percent.

3. About six times as many whites as Negroes fall in the "gifted child" category.

4. About six times as many Negroes as whites fall below 70 IQ—that is, in the feebleminded group.

5. Negro-white differences in mean-test score occur in all types of mental tests, but the Negro lag is greatest in the tests of an abstract nature—for example, problems involving reasoning, deduction, comprehension. These are the functions called for in education above the lowest levels.

6. Differences between Negro and white children increase with chronological age, the gap in performance being the largest at the high school and college level.

7. Large and significant differences in favor of whites appear even when economic factors have been equated.

It seems clear that the evidence from psychometrics (intelligence testing) does not favor the equalitarian dogma; in fact, just the opposite.

HITLER AND THE NAZIS

Undoubtedly Hitler's unspeakable cruelties and absurd racial-superiority theories of the Nazis set up a favorable climate for the proponents of the equalitarian dogma.

It is easy for the equalitarian to argue the acceptance of the fact of racial differences is a forerunner of notions of racial superiority, discrimination, prejudice, and persecution.

The argument is fallacious. Recognition of differences in ability between men and women and between children and adults does not lead forthwith to prejudice and persecution; in fact, often the contrary is true. Recognition of the talents of many Negroes for sports and for various forms of entertainment has, if anything, improved the feelings of the white majority toward Negroes generally.

RISE OF AFRICAN NATIONALISM

The struggle for freedom and self-determination by the various peoples of Africa has aroused the sympathy of most of the people of the world and has undoubtedly strengthened the emotional appeal in the idea that all men are born equally endowed.

But emotionally founded belief can be deceptive. As is well known, the African Negro has been self-governing throughout most of his history, the colonial period being relatively short—only 80 years in the Belgian Congo.

In the several thousand years of recorded history, the black African has never constructed an alphabet, created a literature or a science, produced any great men, or built up a civilization.

Tonybee, the eminent British historian, has written that of the 21 great civilizations of the past, not one has been Negro.

To be sure, we are often reminded of the three kingdoms in West Africa which in the 12th century briefly attained a cultural level relatively high for that region. But these "magnificient civilizations," as the equalitarian anthropologists call them, were hardly on a par with the then flourishing civilizations of France, Italy, and the Near East.

Moreover, Timbuktu, with its allegedly great university, was Moslem and Arabic—not black African—and the university itself was little more than a large mosque with a few teachers.

SUPREME COURT DECISION, 1954

In May of 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision on desegregation of the schools. This decree was hailed by proponents of the equalitarian dogma, who rightly regarded it as a great victory for their cause. Many people, however, were—and are—still confused by the issue of legal and moral rights and their relation in biological and psychological differences.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

Undoubtedly the Communists—and their supporters—have aided in the spread and acceptance of the equalitarian dogma, although the extent and method of their aid is difficult to assess. Direct action as well as subversion are both in the Communist creed. Communists have used equalitarian dogma as a device to gain converts among underprivileged people, and also to foment trouble when possible. Many non-Communists hold the position that the free world must outdo the Communists in acceptance of this belief, and must reject any further inquiry into its validity.

It will be apparent that, in the writer's opinion, the weight of evidence is in favor of the proposition that racial differences in mental ability—and perhaps also in character—are innate and genetic. The story is not finished, and further inquiry is sorely needed.

Surely there are no scientific reasons why restrictions should be placed on further research. The equalitarian dogma, at best, represents a sincere if misguided effort to help the Negro by ignoring or even suppressing evidence of his mental and social immaturity. At worst, the equalitarian dogma is the scientific hoax of the century.

Grange Opposes S. 1123

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the summer months in my district, thousands of children are employed to help harvest strawberries, raspberries, beans, flower bulbs, and other crops of these types. This serves two purposes. First, it provides the children with a constructive way to spend their school holidays and at the same time pays them well. Also, it relieves the farmers of my district from having to import more harvesters from Canada and other areas.

I am one that believes that children should be protected and should not be allowed to work in occupations that might endanger their health or lives. But, also, I believe they should be given the chance to earn spending money in work that is healthful and useful.

There are others, Mr. Speaker, who agree. For example, the members of Ten Mile Grange have passed a resolution which sets forth the desirability of allowing children to harvest small fruits and row crops. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution:

A RESOLUTION BY TEN MILE GRANGE NO. 399 AGAINST SENATE BILL 1123

Whereas U.S. Senate bill 1123 seeks to prohibit children under 16 years of age from helping in the harvesting of crops and other useful, profitable, and harmless summertime work; and,

Whereas thousands of acres of small fruits and row crops planted each year, bring in millions of dollars to the economy of our Nation, and children are essential for this harvest; and,

Whereas the Justice Department decries the lack of occupation for children as a strong contributing factor toward a serious national juvenile delinquency problem; and

Whereas we are in support of Government regulations concerned with the protection of young children as regards dangerous and unhealthful occupations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Ten Mile Grange No. 399 go on record as opposing U.S. Senate bill 1123; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Washington State Grange, Whatcom County Pomona Grange, to Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON, to Representative WESTLAND, and to the State Grange News.

Adopted by Ten Mile Grange No. 399, July 28, 1961.

CARL G. ELSNER,
Master.
ARMIDA HOFFINGER,
Secretary.

Showdown in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an editorial from the August 15 edition of the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass. Titled "Showdown in Berlin," this is a penetrating analysis—in straight-forward terms—of the present crisis in Germany:

SHOWDOWN IN BERLIN

The present crisis in Germany, in which West Berlin has been shut off to East Berliners and East Germans, was not caused either by the East German Government or the nations of the Soviet bloc's Warsaw Pact, as Communist news sources suggest.

The decision was made by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

It violates the Four Power accord on free movement within Berlin which Russia signed with Britain, France, and the United States.

Why did Khrushchev do it, and particularly at this time?

He had come to the conclusion that the Western Powers would not join in any peace treaty that would recognize the division of Germany and that he must sign a separate agreement with the East Germans.

The knowledge that this treaty would be concluded about the end of the year produced Communist concern that the flight of East Germans into West Germany might reach dangerous and unmanageable proportions before the agreement was consummated.

It would be embarrassing to communism, to find itself possessed of a nation largely emptied of people who had cast their vote against Red rule "with their feet," by fleeing before it came to power.

Khrushchev has broken an international agreement.

He has perpetrated a cruel act upon the German people.

His action is threatening the peace of the world.

The Soviet Premier has dared anyone to question his right to do these things.

What he hopes is that the West will issue "vigorous protests," which he makes a habit of ignoring, and will eventually subside into acceptance.

Khrushchev hopes this because he wants to make other demands.

In the fall, he would like to negotiate with the Western Powers on their right of access to West Berlin.

In return for allowing them such access, which is not his to give or take away, he is expected to ask the Allied Nations to affirm the permanency of the present eastern frontier of East Germany, and to ban propaganda and similar activities in West Berlin that he contends are having a disruptive effect on East Germany.

If the West falters now, the results could be disastrous, not only for those Germans who ask the right to live under liberty, but for freemen the world over.

Chancellor Adenauer has assured Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain that Bonn, with its allies, will take the necessary measures to counter the sealing off of West Berlin.

Adenauer should be supported in the position by Washington, Paris, and London standing firm and united.

Political Spending and the Battle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able column written by Henry J. Taylor, entitled "We Are Burying Ourselves," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE BURYING OURSELVES

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When Khrushchev said he would bury us, this man was crazy as a fox. We have the shovel. We are burying ourselves. If Khrushchev has any brains he will just do a Rip van Winkle and let us do the rest.

We are not fighting communism. We are promoting it by political spending which punches hard at self-reliance, programs which aggressively make State dependents out of larger and larger parts of our population, tax laws which to a major degree nationalize property and wages, and by the veiled dive into welfare-state socialism which is, in fact, the overall objective.

It is a matter of intent. And this is the intent. It is also the chassis of totalitarianism by any name, and any government in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate for it whatever.

When you think of socialism think of the force content of the plan. That's the key. And socialism's only proven advantage is to the planners themselves. It is notorious as a politician's paradise. It guarantees the planners power by its bribes for votes; supports "the love of governing," as Voltaire defined political ambition; and suits its intellectual jockeys' cynical dream that they are the brains and we are the horses.

If we do not intend to create free and independent citizens, the United States has gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing. This is what the Constitution intended and we depend on everybody to recognize the worth.

Our Constitution was not written to limit the people. The people can always change the Constitution. It was written to limit the politicians. This is why they so often have trouble with it. And today we are witnessing every dodge and ball trick to circle this defense and in a mood, an intend of conquest. Thus, regardless of cause, the great oath of office becomes nothing more estimable than a ceremony.

The future comes one day at a time. There is absolutely no guarantee we can indefinitely withstand internal totalitarian encroachments. Totalitarianism means adherence to a single will, not necessarily a soldier or personal tyrant. Just one man. Democracies shatter themselves by blindness to this. The truth is the only hope: We are being deliberately manipulated further and further into such control. This is the eel under the rock and we had better see it. For the facts are indisputable and the truth can stop it if the public grasps the facts.

Back-door spending of billions in foreign aid without congressional control, sweeping Executive decrees having the effect of law without due process of law, multitudinous powerful Government agencies which report only to the President, attacks on the trinity of check and balances provided by the separation of Federal powers, the battle against the rights of the States; these are all symptoms of a deep malaise imposed on us.

Put into that malaise, as well, the systematic pressure for congressional votes by offers of public money for local projects, the juggling of judgeships and jobs, and nepotism, too, for that is being practiced, and the power-steering accessories are thus added to the totalitarian chassis.

None of these activities is needed by America. They are needed only by the men who perform them. And all are as inappropriate as if our Constitution's model had been Hinkey Dink and Bathhouse John in the river wards of Chicago.

Khrushchev flexes. We have a tough battle on our hands not only because the Red enemy is fierce and powerful but because the enemy is invisible and everywhere. The only proper test of men in public life today is whether they have courage enough to fight self-interest of all kinds, beginning with their own. There is some hope for this in Congress. But the immediate and decisive hope is in the President. "One man with courage makes a majority," said Andrew Jackson. The President can be that majority.

In the quiet accounting our President renders to himself, he can take stock at this perilous time, reverse his field, forget politics and 1964, and abandon the thrust toward welfare-state socialism, abandon partisan power plays and Government by indirect coercion, and see, as the fine patriot which he is, that these are intolerable now in the country he loves as much as any man alive.

The National Lottery of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Norway. In addition to the lottery, Norway also benefits from semiofficial football pools, which I would like to mention.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to $14 million. The Government is obliged to pay out about

two-thirds of the gross receipts in prizes, so that the Government's net profit in 1960 was close to $5 million.

Norway's football pools are controlled by the Government. They are operated by a semipublic company. The football pools are not an end in themselves but a means benefiting science and sport.

Interestingly enough, the football pools are supervised by the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Church Affairs. In Norway, it is recognized that the best way to control gambling is to admit its existence and seek to channel it. Are we too firmly in the clutches of hypocrites to escape the same realization?

Evolution of Nonviolence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article "Evolution of Nonviolence," by Carleton Mabee:

EVOLUTION OF NONVIOLENCE
(By Carleton Mabee)

The nonviolent movement for desegregation was born during World War II. The war created tensions which were sometimes transferred—often unconsciously—to hatred of minorities. At the same time, the Negroes' awareness of their second-class citizenship was heightened by the contrast between Jim Crow and the professed American war aim of opposition to the Nazi race theory. There was uneasiness in war plants, where white and colored often worked side by side for the first time.

In this situation, pacifists, once they had lost their effort to prevent U.S. entry into the war, decided to emphasize the development of nonviolent techniques to improve race relations. As they proceeded, they consciously learned from Gandhi, whose nonviolent movement for the independence of India was then reaching its climax.

As early as April, 1942, the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation's youth secretary, Bayard Rustin, a young Negro of compelling charm, was trying one-man sit-ins. He believed that American Negroes were peculiarly fitted to experiment with nonviolent action, he said, because they not only had a history of enduring suffering without bitterness, but also a rich religious heritage of which nonviolence was a part.

When Rustin went into a restaurant in a small midwestern town, the manager refused to serve him, because, she explained, if she did, "everybody would walk out." Rustin proposed that they try an experiment: he would sit at a table with a hamburger in front of him, and they both would watch for 10 minutes to see if anyone walked out because he was there. If anyone did, Rustin would also walk out. After some hesitation, the manager agreed to try the experiment. Rustin waited the 10 minutes without anyone's walking out, and then the manager served him a hot hamburger. Thereafter the restaurant continued to serve Negroes.

Rustin found other opportunities to refuse to cooperate with segregation. On a bus near Nashville, he sat up front with whites, was dragged out of the bus and kicked, but did not retaliate. Attending a Quaker conference at Cape May, N.J., he appeared with white friends one afternoon at a "whites only" section of a beach. When guards asked him to go elsewhere he expressed concern for the difficult position of the guards. He explained that it was against his principles to acquiesce in segregation and therefore he could not willingly leave, but suggested various humorous ways by which they could remove him. The guards were so taken aback that they left him alone; during the rest of the conference, Rustin and his friends continued to use the beach. When he arrived late one rainy night by train in Baltimore, Rustin found that the taxi drivers at the station refused to pick him up because of his color. He walked into the middle of the narrow taxi driveway alongside the station, and stood there, blocking all taxi traffic for 90 minutes, until he got a taxi.

During 1942 Rustin described his one-man sit-ins, ride-ins, swim-ins and stand-ins to many audiences, and thus prepared the way for the organized nonviolent movement.

In February 1942, James Farmer, the young race relations secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, proposed to the fellowship that it attempt to create an organization, composed of both pacifists and nonpacifists, committed to nonviolent action against racial discrimination. It was hoped that, after a period of 5 to 10 years of education and experiment, the organization would be ready to use on a large scale "relentless noncooperation, economic boycott, and civil disobedience." In April 1942, the fellowship's national council decided to endorse such a campaign, and authorized Farmer to work on it. The decision was soon to bear fruit.

Meanwhile, among the several Fellowship of Reconciliation cell groups in Chicago, one, composed largely of University of Chicago students, was devoted to race relations. One evening two members of this group—Farmer, who is colored, and James Robinson, white—went into Jack Spratt's a restaurant in their neighborhood. They were served reluctantly. Later, a larger interracial party from the same cell also went into the restaurant. They were also served reluctantly; and after they had eaten, their waiter refused to give them a bill. They left money in payment, but the waiter followed them into the street to throw the money after them.

By this time the group working on Jack Spratt's had grown to include several nonstudents and nonpacifists. The enlarged group deliberately planned a non-violent demonstration, patterned on a combination of Gandhian methods and the methods of the 1936–37 sitdown strikes in auto factories (the sitters first called their demonstrations sitdown strikes), in an attempt to change the restaurant's policy.

One day in May 1942, the group sent an all-white party into Jack Spratt's, and it was served; then a mixed party went in, and was seated; finally, an all-Negro party entered. The hostess told the all-Negro group it would not be seated except in the basement, but the group refused to leave. The hostess called the police who, upon finding only a quiet group of people waiting to be served, refused to arrest anyone. Patrons in the restaurant who were not part of the sit-in became curious about it and stayed on, occupying seats, thus in effect helping the cause. After two hours in which business in the restaurant was almost at a standstill, the management decided to change its policy, and the hostess personally served the waiting Negroes.

Deciding that they had found a technique that worked, the sitters led in forming, in June, 1942, the Chicago Committee on Racial Equality to experiment further with nonviolent direct action. The following year the committee, with the help of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, led in creating a national federation of groups devoted to nonviolent, direct action, called the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) which chose Farmer as its chairman. The major vehicle of the nonviolent movement of the 1940s had been created.

During most of the decade, CORE remained a loose federation of local groups, without a paid national staff. Its leaders were generally young, and among them were both colored and white. Aside from Farmer (a graduate of the School of Religion of Howard University, who later became program director of the NAACP, but who this year returned to CORE as national director), the leaders included George Houser, an ordained Methodist minister who later became executive secretary of the American Committee on Africa; and Bayard Rustin, who recently has been active in working with the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the War Resisters League.

In its early years, CORE's leaders—national and local—were generally pacifists, but this was not true of the rank and file. Some CORE leaders had been conscientious objectors during World War II. Officially, CORE was neutral on pacifism, but much of its nonviolent emphasis was nourished by the pacifists in its membership.

At first, CORE's national office was in a church in Chicago; from 1944 it shared offices with the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Cleveland; and from 1946 it shared the Fellowship's national office in New York. CORE's unpaid executive director, for most of the decade, was George Houser, whose paid occupation was that of a staff member of the Fellowship. There was some friction within CORE over whether the identification of CORE with the pacifist Fellowship scared nonpacifists away.

CORE was an interracial, urban movement, centered in the North, with only a few member groups south of the Mason-Dixon line at any time during the 1940's, and these all in the upper South—in Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis, and Bartlesville, Okla. (where, under pressure from "patriotic" societies, the leader of the CORE group was eventually forced from the library post which she had held for 35 years). The number of local groups affiliated with CORE was 10 in 1945, 13 in 1947, 15 in 1949, and 20 in 1950; and there was usually a number of cooperating nonaffiliated groups. Most of the affiliates tended to be unstable, flourishing briefly, dying down, then reforming. They were likely to be small, with perhaps 15 to 100 members, an exception being the affiliate in Columbus—the Vanguard League—which had 2,000 to 3,000 members.

Not all of the activities of CORE and CORE-related groups were carried out along strictly nonviolent, direct-action lines. Some activities followed conventional patterns, and in these CORE was often able to work with other organizations. CORE encouraged letterwriting campaigns to government officials or owners of businesses; petitions (as in Washington, D.C., to protest segregation in the public parks); and publicity by press releases. (In Denver, after a Negro was refused a room at a YMCA on Christmas Day with the explanation that there was no room available, a CORE press release drew a parallel with what happened, a long time ago, at another inn at Christmas time.)

Some activities were less conventional, and in these it was harder to find cooperating organizations. When the "Freedom Train" was circulating the country to exhibit copies of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, CORE groups picketed it with signs saying, "There is no freedom till all are free."

CORE groups conducted opinion surveys to find out if department store patrons objected to being served by Negro sales-

clerks (in Cleveland, where department stores employed only white saleselerks, 68 percent of patrons were willing to be served by Negroes); listed restaurants, outside of Negro sections, which had no racial bars (in Washington, sitters could recall when there were only 4 such restaurants; by 1950, there were still only 17 they could list); printed cards for CORE friends to leave on the tables of desegregated restaurants expressing appreciation of their policy; solicited business for newly desegregated enterprises; bought stock in companies which practiced segregation—like the Greyhound bus company—and then appeared at stockholders' meetings to protest company policy; distributed leaflets at Pennsylvania Station in New York and the interstate bus terminal in Washington, informing passengers that in interstate travel, despite custom, the Supreme Court had ruled in the *Morgan* case in 1946 that segregation was unconstitutional; and promoted a song that urged interstate travelers to sit where they liked:

> And if the driver-man says "Move,"
> And if the driver-man says "Move,"
> And if the driver-man says "Move,"
> Speak up polite,
> But sit there tight,
> You're in the right,
> You don't have to ride Jim Crow.

But it was in the more clearly nonviolent, direct-action projects that the CORE and CORE-related groups found their real metier. They adopted Gandhian methods imaginatively to the American scene, developing the techniques which sitters and freedom riders have made well known in the last few years.

Sitters in the 1940's, as now, found eating places their most convenient target. As early as 1944, the CORE group in Washington, D.C., decided that dime store lunch counters were excellent places to hold "sit-down strikes"—and for some of the same reasons that present-day sitters also find them so: "Because there is a good deal of Negro trade in these stores," they explained and "also because colored people are served at the present time standing up at the [lunch] counter." But they did not at that time discover that the dime stores were also a good choice because sympathy boycotts might spread against chain dime stores all over the Nation; that idea would not catch hold while the nonviolent movement remained small.

In the 1940's, CORE groups also held sit-ins at fancy restaurants, like the plush and hush restaurant in Los Angeles where a hundred persons at a time "sat-in." Sit-ins were held in a Negro-owned restaurant in Washington which discriminated against whites; at drugstore lunch counters and in department store restaurants.

In addition to eating places, there were also sit-ins in churches, as in Frankfort, Ky., and Bartlesville; in theaters, as in Yellow Springs, Ohio, and Baltimore; in swimming pools, as in Palisades Park, N.J., and Cleveland; in roller-skating rinks, as in Chicago; and in the religious services of prisons, as by the conscientious-objector inmates of the Federal prison in Ashland, Ky.

Other planned forms of nonviolent, direct action included stand-ins to buy tickets at discriminatory theaters, as in Washington, D.C., or at discriminatory swimming pools, as in Los Angeles, or to buy food at discriminatory cafeterias, as in Detroit; the picketing of segregated YMCAs, as in New York, and offices which promoted restrictive covenants for real estate, as in Chicago; small-scale boycotts, as of a tavern in Yellow Springs (it lost 60 percent of its business), or metropolitan-wide boycotts protesting discrimination against Negro employment, as of Carnation milk in San Francisco and Los Angeles, and of Wonder bread in Chicago (both these actions were successful in changing company policy); testing for hotel discrimination in Boston; hunger or work strikes against segregated dining in prisons, as by conscientious-objector inmates of the Federal prisons at Lewisburg, Pa., and Danville, Conn.; sitting desegregated on buses and trains, as on a long "Journey of Reconciliation" through Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky and Tennessee in 1947, for which Rustin and three others were sentenced to 30 days in a North Carolina road gang on the charge of disobeying State segregation laws. (Among the riders on this trip was Jim Peck, one of CORE's recent freedom riders, who was severely beaten in Alabama last May). CORE tested the interracial use of parks which by custom had become segregated, as in Chicago; and set up new enterprises, such as unsegregated barber shops in Oberlin, Ohio, and State College, Pennsylvania, interracial cooperative houses in Chicago and Detroit, and an interracial cooperative store in Detroit.

All this activity by CORE and its friends naturally stimulated opposition. According to the demonstrators' reports, if they were served food at all, they sometimes were served ants in their pie, sour cream for their coffee, or garbage in their sandwiches; sometimes they were charged higher prices; sometimes employees tried to break the polluted dishes from which they had eaten. Occasionally, when demonstrators arrived, managers would close their businesses; or, especially if their businesses were swimming pools or roller-skating rinks, would pretend they were running a private club. Sometimes employees or onlookers kicked demonstrators, pushed them out of line in front of theater ticket windows, shoved them against glass windows in swimming pools till the windows broke, hounded them with ammonia fumes, had them arrested, beat them, played fire hoses on them—or, as the demonstrators went limp, dragged them away.

The members and friends of CORE were likely to differ about its primary function. According to some, this was simply to stop discrimination against Negroes by non-violent means. When such was the purpose, sitters sometimes occupied all seats in a restaurant or encouraged boycotts to force a change in policy. But according to others, forcing a change in policy was not justified: the function of CORE was rather to stop discrimination by changing the attitudes of the persons responsible for it. As Chaplain Howard Thurman of Howard University put it, the purpose of nonviolent direct action was "to tear men free from the alinement to the evil way, to free them so that they may be given an immediate sense of acute insecurity and out of the depths of their insecurity to be forced to see their kinship with the weak and insecure." When such was the purpose, sitters were likely to occupy only some of the seats in a restaurant, with the object of appealing to the conscience of customers and managers. In practice, however, as Houser admitted, CORE activities sometimes brought desegregation without changing managers' attitudes.

There was continuous study of CORE methods. The executive committee admitted in 1945 that CORE suffered from immature leadership, and pointed out that the lack of a paid national staff reflected inadequate organization. Houser stated that many who participated in direct-action projects simply didn't have time to carry through with all the patient steps required for effectiveness. After the executive secretary had led an unsuccessful direct-action project to desegregate a roller-skating rink in Cleveland, during which patrons had bullied the CORE group, Houser decided that "a really tough racial situation cannot be handled by the tactics which we have used to date."

CORE leaders also frankly faced the problem posed by the participation in CORE activities of certain "undesirables"—including neurotics, leftists who were using the movement for their own not necessarily nonviolent ends, and those insufficiently disciplined to resist opportunity to retaliate with violence.

There was a barrage of criticism of CORE even from those who were foursquare for desegregation. Leftists blamed it for concentrating on racial injustice without recognizing that discrimination was merely part of an unjust social order. Activists said that CORE groups spent too much time investigating and negotiating, and too little in direct action. Purists complained that CORE sometimes succumbed to public prejudice by not permitting mixed colored-white couples to appear publicly on its behalf. Strategists condemned CORE for not doing much in the South, where the need was greatest.

Prof. Douglas Steere of Haverford College, a leading Quaker pacifist, answering a Fellowship of Reconciliation request that he sponsor a CORE project, wrote as follows:

"I have watched the CORE, groups function in a number of cities, and there have been a number of these that I should certainly not be prepared to sponsor, for they were simply 'expressing themselves' and gaining experience at the expense of those they worked on, and the ultimate result did not really advance the cause, in my way of thinking. Other CORE groups, however, who went about the process of thoroughly acquainting the persons they meant to seek to influence with what they were about, and at every point continuing this education, have seemed to me extremely useful instruments in the present situation. * * * There is still a strong element of the John Woolman approach to the slaveholders in my way of seeing the solution to these problems, and unless that is wedded to the direct-action techniques, and unless those who undertake them are exceptionally well-disciplined and mature, I do not see this kind of program resulting in one which the fellowship can helpfully sponsor. On the other hand, I realize the necessity of some action which will give us opportunities to see whether the Gandhi technique can function in the West."

Nevertheless, CORE-sponsored action was often successful, and strong claims were made on CORE's behalf. Educator John Dewey wrote that the direct-action method "is education in action through solving life problems, and its value can hardly be overestimated." Labor leader A. Philip Randolph declared that CORE's adaptation of Gandhi's methods "has resulted in a novel and successful technique for removing discriminatory practices." Unitarian minister Homer Jack, of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, said of a CORE summer project in Chicago: "A small interracial group of young people fought on more fronts and got more accomplished than most of the professional high-salaried race relations experts in Chicago."

The current nonviolent movement bears many marks of its origin in the movement of the 1940's. Today, as 20 years ago, the motivation of many of the participants has a religious basis; now, as then, there is an attempt to slough off extreme leftist or neurotic hangers-on; now, as then, the techniques are much the same: sit-ins, stand-ins, picketing, boycotts, and freedom rides. There are, however, significant ways in which the two movements differ. In the earlier movement, most of the participants were young adults; now most are students. In the 1940's, the major action took place in the North, in a generally friendly climate, with the law often in its favor; today, though there is supporting action in the North, the major projects are undertaken in the South,

in a generally hostile climate and more often than not in defiance of State and local law. In the earlier movement, the action was strongly interracial; now it is more nearly dominated by Negroes. The earlier movement was on a small scale, featuring action by fairly cohesive, more or less disciplined groups, chiefly under the sponsorship of a national organization, CORE, with support from the Fellowship of Reconciliation; today it has become a mass movement, with action often spontaneous, beyond the control of any one organization. In the 1940's, the movement lacked general support by either whites or colored, or even by pacifists; today it has the support of many of the major forces of the Nation, thus bearing witness to a striking reversal of public opinion.

DISASTER

What will happen, you may ask,
In a State where states rights are of more concern than human rights,
When the very last cell in the very last jail
Is full, and there is an SRO sign over the door?
What will happen when the very last key has turned in the very last lock,
And yet another busload of customers arrives,
And there is word that still another is on its way?
I can tell you what will happen:
The Governor will send an urgent message to Washington,
Asking that his State be declared a disaster area
And that Federal funds be sent immediately
To build more jails.—

RICHARD ARMOUR.

Envoy Warned United States and Got Squelched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate during this debate on foreign aid to look back over the conduct of our foreign policy in the past to review our mistakes.

During the recent wave of anger generated by the hijacking of another American airliner, we may have forgotten that Castro's publicity-happy henchmen were hijacking airliners 3 years ago. At that time we ignored the warnings voiced by our American Ambassador in Cuba. While our State Department stalled and refused to recognize that Castro was behind the hijackings, more planes were stolen and one crashed killing six Americans.

Lest we forget, I wish to insert the following article by Robert Jones from the Indianapolis Star into the RECORD:

ENVOY WARNED UNITED STATES AND GOT SQUELCHED

(By Robert Jones)

The one man who foresaw the continuing wave of aerial piracy was squelched almost 3 years ago by State Department order. He is Earl E. T. Smith, then U.S. Ambassador to Cuba.

Ambassador Smith fought for a strong U.S. stand when agents of Fidel Castro hijacked a Cuban airliner and crashed it, killing six American citizens. Smith warned then that U.S. prestige would suffer unless decisive action was taken. He also warned that American failure to respond would be an invitation to Castro, whom he described as publicity mad, to continue pirating planes.

The State Department's reaction was to smother the incident and smear Smith, a political appointee, in a flood of "leaks" to the press. Smith was accused of being a reactionary. It was even hinted that he had been paid off by Cuban President Batista. Castro shrilly echoed the charges.

If anything, however, Smith previously had demonstrated excessive restraint.

He had little to say in September 1958, when Castro was grabbing headlines by grabbing scores of U.S. citizens. In another publicity stunt Castro's guerrillas kidnaped 30 U.S. sailors and marines. A month later, Castro agents made off with three Americans when they hijacked an airliner en route to Santiago de Cuba.

A few days later, November 1, Smith exploded when Castro agents crashed a Viscount airliner en route from Miami to Havana. He rushed a team of Embassy investigators to the scene.

All over the Caribbean attention focused on the case. U.S. reaction to the killing of its citizens would set a precedent. The outcome would decide whether American citizens can be killed or kidnaped without effective U.S. reprisals.

A SUPPLY BASE

One possible U.S. action was obvious Washington was permitting Florida to be used as privileged sanctuary and supply base for Castro's rebels. A flood of contraband arms and munitions was flowing semiopenly from the United States to Castro's Sierra Maestra. Energetic Federal action easily could sever this illegal supply line.

But the State Department chose to be perplexed. Days passed. Eventually it was announced that the State Department was still not sure that the hijacking was the work of Cuban rebels.

Even while Washington stalled, Castro agents hijacked still another airliner, also with Americans aboard. State Department Spokesman Lincoln White closed the crashed-plane case, however, with the bland claim that the State Department "had no further information on the identity of the persons who commandeered the plane."

That was not true. Ambassador Smith and his aids easily had found conclusive proof that the 14 Cuban and American victims had been killed in a Castro conspiracy.

Smith's investigators had returned to Havana with rebel identification cards, armbands, Castro identification bracelets and similar paraphernalia stripped from the bodies of the two hijackers killed in the crash.

The hijackers were described as being in a state of frenzy. "This will be in all the newspapers of the world," they gibbered, capering up and down the aisle. Smith recognized the chilling future implications—planes could become targets for emotionally disturbed publicity seekers as well as political agents.

The Ambassador's report fixed the blame squarely on Fidel Castro. Realizing that his report to Washington would be buried, Smith also released his findings to the Havana press. This finished his diplomatic career. Smith was on his way out less than 2 months later. Oddly enough, several reporters for powerful New York and Chicago newspapers completely whitewashed Castro's role in the hijacking and bitterly assailed Ambassador Smith.

But more important was the fact that the State Department's response to piracy was an act of appeasement. All over the Caribbean it was recognized as such. Piracy had returned to the Caribbean.

Colonialism, Russian Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Soviet Union—highly proficient in propaganda—constantly barrages the world with "big gun bragging," on its accomplishments and its projective plans.

The great deficiency of U.S. policy is that too often it lets such bragging stand alone, uncorrected in the world mind.

Recently, for example, the Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., published a revealing editorial entitled "Colonialism, Russian Style."

The article reflects the way in which the Soviets—loud denouncers of colonialism—themselves represent the greatest colonial power of our times not only controlling, but milking dry the nations under their control.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONIALISM, RUSSIAN STYLE

What is it really like to be a friend of the Soviet Union?

Everybody knows the answer being given by East German refugees who, in President Kennedy's words, are voting with their feet. But what of the tens of millions in other satellites without an escape hatch?

They live in some of the world's most crowded cities, yet new housing in Eastern Europe is hardly 40 percent of that in the Soviet Union, itself troubled by shortages.

It is estimated another 15 years will be needed just to complete rehabilitation of war-damaged buildings and transportation.

Subsistence levels in food and clothing are being met, but faulty distribution yearly wastes thousands of tons of food, and warehouses are jammed with industrial rejects and shoddy, unsalable fabrics and footwear.

The whole satellite area has fewer telephones than our city of Baltimore. Total annual satellite automobile output—much of it exported—doesn't match the Cadillacs we sell in a year.

Hungary, once a rich breadbasket for Europe, has had to become a grain-importing nation.

All these lands should be reasonably prosperous, for they have rich resources and talented, industrious people. Still, they lag far behind the West, and the Soviet Union, in factory and farm output.

The answer is simple. To be a compulsory friend of Russia is to be milked dry, year after year.

The milking began after World War II when Russia carted off nearly $25 billion worth of capital equipment, even unto railroad tracks and telephone cables. It has continued ever since.

At first brashly but now more subtly the Kremlin has steadily overcharged satellite lands for its exports and underpaid them for its imports. In a 4-year span this thinly veiled theft was estimated at $2.4 billion—enforced foreign aid for Moscow's benefit.

Russia controls all satellite strategic resources and through alleged joint companies manages whole sectors of their economies. Before the war, when Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and the rest were free to chose,

they traded little with Moscow. Today more than half of Soviet trade is with these countries.

Furthermore, the Russians compel the satellites to bear the brunt of lavish low-interest trade credits to underdeveloped lands, and to aid Red-dominated Asian nations which in turn fatten Soviet coffers. The satellites rehabilitated war-torn North Korea.

Probably no colonial power in history has matched the squeeze the greedy Soviet Union has applied to its unhappy captive neighbors.

Less Waste, More Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been gratified by the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara has been willing to make the necessary hard decisions which will bring about greater economy and efficiency in the Defense Department. On a number of occasions he has utilized his existing authority, particularly the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. This authority permits him to study a given situation affecting common supplies and services and to decide how best to operate the function for the maximum benefit of the defense effort and the national economy. It is no secret that Secretary McNamara has initiated Project 100 in order to obtain the alternatives as to how best to operate the common supply functions in the Department of Defense. This is no small matter as it involves a stores inventory of $42 billion, a worldwide inventory of $120 billion and annual expenditures of $22 to $25 billion. A hard decision must be made soon.

An editorial from the Evening Star of August 17, 1961, entitled "Less Waste, More Weapons," gives significant praise to some of Secretary McNamara's recent efforts.

LESS WASTE, MORE WEAPONS

Defense Secretary McNamara surprised some Members of Congress by agreeing with the House that a 2-percent cut in Defense Department procurement appropriations was justified and could be absorbed by effecting certain economics. He had reference to the House Appropriations Committee's demands for elimination of overlapping and other wasteful practices in the purchase and distribution of military supplies. Mr. McNamara well merits the praise heaped on him at the Capitol for cracking down on inefficiency and waste of every kind at the Pentagon.

The 2-percent reduction made by the House was designed to force full compliance by military procurement officers with supply reforms recommended several years ago by the Hoover Commission. These called for consolidation of procurement activities by the three services and coordination of stockpiling and distribution systems. Steps in this direction have been taken by Defense officials, but much remains to be done.

When Secretary McNamara appeared before the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee he refused to accept the group's suggestion that he ask for restoration of the 2-percent cut. Instead, he said: "In a large program there are always potential savings open to one. I think that in the circumstances we are in today, when we are asking for $3 billion more, it makes even more important the saving of the 2 percent. We propose to live with it."

It has been a long time since a congressional committee has heard that kind of testimony from a victim of proposed economy. As a result the Senate applied the cut to the main appropriations, although exempting President Kennedy's emergency $1.8 billion supplemental request. However, the House conferees (Representatives MAHON, SHEPPARD, CANNON, FORD, and TABER) stood firm and the bill finally passed with the 2-percent cut applied to the entire procurement appropriation. This means a potential saving for the taxpayers of about $343 million—without impairing national defense in any way.

George E. Sokolsky Writes in Washington Post of Life and Death of Frank Buchman of Moral Re-Armament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on Wednesday, August 16, 1961, by Columnist George E. Sokolsky.

Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1961, I was pleased to make a few remarks on the floor of the House reporting the death of this world spiritual statesman, Frank Buchman, on August 7, 1961, in Europe. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, and all the other Members of this great legislative body realize the potent force of spiritual values in the preservation of individual freedoms and the American way of life, join with me in stating our appreciation to Columnist George E. Sokolsky for his timely comments hereinafter set forth:

FRANK BUCHMAN
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The death of Frank Buchman removed from the world a prophetic figure who adopted the idea that men change their personalities by free will. A clergyman, Frank Buchman, recognized that young people were not accepting orthodox forms of religion, even if they belonged to formal religious groups. He sought a method of solving personal problems by voluntarily changing one's personality, by personally accepting God's guidance in response to silence and prayer.

His movement started very small and I can recall when some of his followers came to my house in Sandisfield, sat on the grass under ancient maples to talk of life and personality. Frank, as he chose to be called, was then holding his house parties in Stockbridge, a suitable village for such a purpose, for it was in Stockbridge and the neighboring villages that the thought and art of America found its strongest expression during the 19th century.

More than 20 years ago I was impressed by the sincerity and profundity of Buchman's followers. What they represented in the current history of ancient religious movements was the enthusiasm of the Essenes, of whom John the Baptist was one, who believed that one could change from wickedness to virtue by baptism, by washing away the sins. So buchman answered man's willfulness by willing change. Not only was vice replaced by virtue, but futility by usefulness.

The young men and women who served in Moral Rearmament do not sit about and pray or sing hymns. They go out into the world to battle against social and political wrongs. Whereas the Salvation Army has battled against personal viciousness, such as drunkenness and poverty, Moral Rearmament moved toward the barricades where it fought communism as the evil of our day.

Buchman possessed no quality of bigotry. For him, there were many roads to God and each man had to choose his own. His movement had no priests or leaders; members united into groups of usefulness and spread themselves over the earth whenever they were most needed. They financed themselves as best they could and no great treasury was developed, but those who wanted to help did and those who wanted to give, gave. And the teams went forth to preach the doctrine of peace and human brotherhood.

I knew Frank Buchman well and admired him for his utter selflessness. What he had to give to humanity were his beliefs in the essential goodness and usefulness of man, and those who joined him were not abject followers but comrades in arms fighting for the better life.

Buchman was 83 when he died in a West German village. His movement assembled each year in Switzerland to discuss problems and then went to Mackinac in Michigan for other sessions. The great and the small came and many found in these assemblages the opportunity to open their hearts and expose their souls.

Is Moral Rearmament anarchic? The surprising characteristic of this movement is its orderliness. No one has ever been elected to be a president or a vice president, but somehow when a job had needed to be done, men and women fell into place, and the team functioned with extraordinary efficiency. Will it continue in this spirit and manner now that Frank Buchman is gone?

H.R. 7057—Bill To Provide Tax Depletion Rate for Clay Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, depletion bill, H.R. 7057, will be considered by this body on Monday, August 21, 1961, under suspension of rules.

This bill will provide an equitable tax depletion rate for the clay products industry.

I have made many appearances in recent months in support of this measure. My activities in behalf of H.R. 7057 have also included numerous meetings with interested individuals of the clay industry and conference with many of my colleagues here in the House to enlist their support for this much-needed legislation.

There can be no question of the urgent need for passage of H.R. 7057. Without equitable treatment regarding depletion allowances, it is feared the clay products industry faces financial ruin.

The industry is composed of small, independent businesses, which compete with each other under highly competitive conditions and, therefore, it is traditionally an industry that operates with a very small margin of profit.

Consequently, any factor that creates for one of these businesses a substantial disadvantage in comparison with its competitors may well prove disastrous to that business.

These small industries are scattered throughout the United States, with 653 plants owned by 511 taxpayer companies, located in 49 of the 50 States.

In Indiana alone we have 82 of these small clay products plants, which can be found in almost each of our 92 Hoosier counties.

Approximately 6,500 persons are employed by the clay industry in Indiana, and these residents face the specter of unemployment if the Congress does not grant their industry an opportunity to meet competition of related industries which are enjoying Federal tax advantages granted by the Internal Revenue Service.

In the Sixth Congressional District, which I represent in the House, we have approximately 1,000 persons gainfully employed by the clay industry.

I would like to list for the record the clay industry firms of my congressional district, which will benefit from equitable taxation allowances under H.R. 7057:

Montgomery County—American Vitrified Products Co., Crawfordsville; Hydraulic Press Brick Co., Crawfordsville.

Fountain County—Hydraulic Press Brick Co., Veedersburg; Chicago Fire Brick Corp., Attica; Rostone Corp., Riverside; Poston Herron Brick Co., Attica.

Parke County—Dee-Clay Products Co., Bloomingdale; Clay City Pipe, Rockville.

Vermillion County—Architect Ceramic Corp.; Cayuga Brick Co.

Vigo County—Terre Haute Vitrified Brick Works.

Members of the clay industry in Indiana have reported to me in recent months that several plants have been forced to close their doors and lay off their workers due to taxation inequities that restrict their ability to compete.

I am also informed by officials of this industry that there is actual bankruptcy facing more of these backbone firms if the terms of the Internal Revenue Service rulings are carried out.

Instead of closing their doors and releasing their workers, these Indiana clay industry firms would prefer, and in some instances have, to improve and enlarge their plant facilities, distribute accumulated earnings in the form of dividends to shareholders, hire more employees and keep the selling prices of their products as low as possible in order to try to meet the competition of newly developed building materials.

For example, since 1951 the price of steel has increased by 66 percent, the price of cement by 45 percent, but the price of brick and tile has increased only 27 percent.

In the face of constantly rising costs, the miners of brick and tile clay have been able to keep their selling prices relatively low only because they were relying on the Government's assurance that they would receive a depletion allowance equal to 5 percent of the selling price of their burned brick and tile.

However, regardless of whether the brick and tile clay miners have reduced their surplus funds to a minimum because of expenditures for plant expansion, or because of distributions of surplus in the form of dividends, or merely because they charged less for their burned clay products than they otherwise would have done, the result is the same.

They have reduced their surplus funds to a minimum, and they have established no large contingent reserves for taxes because the Internal Revenue Service promised depletion deductions.

Now economic chaos in the industry and insolvency is threatened under the Internal Revenue Service's recent decision to disallow depletion deductions.

In addition to these hardships, the depletion disallowance for the brick and tile clay industry only smacks of discrimination and unfairness to one of the oldest and most reliable industries.

I am certain that the House Members recognize the jeopardy that faces the clay products industry and will vote prompt approval of H.R. 7057.

David Lawrence Offers Possibilities for Action Against Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following column by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star. It may prompt some fruitful discussion of what we should be doing to answer the Communist challenge to freedom in Berlin.

ANSWERING THE REDS IN BERLIN—CLOSING OF ALLIED BORDERS IN CITY CALLED ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES

IN EUROPE.—"We will use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

The foregoing sentence is written in the Communist Party platform first proclaimed in 1919 by Lenin. This has never been withdrawn or revised. When Nikita Khrushchev recently restated the party platform and amended it in many particulars, he left standing the doctrine quoted above.

All Communist acts, therefore, must be judged by that blunt formula of deception, whether it be the violation in Berlin this week of the Four Power agreement signed in 1949 or of a disarmament "treaty" if one should be signed with the Soviets.

The Allies are building their hopes on a new agreement to be negotiated in the next few months to nail down their rights of access to West Berlin. But the Communist Party doctrine indicates that the Soviets would not hesitate to disregard these pledges whenever they decide it is expedient to do so. Indeed, Premier Khrushchev told the British Ambassador only a few days ago, in discussing the existing Allied treaty rights in Berlin granted in 1945 and 1949, that these were "unreal and irrelevant."

This is not surprising, coming as it does from a government that has no regard for morals or for the sanctity of a written pledge. But what are the Allies to do about it? Up to now, the procedure has been to make speeches, carry on conferences between foreign ministers and ambassadors of the West, and discuss privately a series of countermeasures—military, political, and economic.

While military preparations are important as a defensive precaution, neither side is likely to make a move in the direction of military action unless the other does—and it would have to be something more than a mere clash on a local basis to bring on anything so catastrophic as a nuclear war.

As for the political arena, this means an attempt through public statements and exchanges of notes to affect favorably the public opinion of the world, particularly in the so-called neutral countries where the Soviet Union has been making an intensive effort to win friends or to stir up trouble that would preoccupy Western forces.

What else can be done? The economic weapons of blockade now are being talked about openly. Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany has just said that trade agreements between the East and West would have to be reexamined. There are hints of a trade embargo. This naturally arouses anxiety in business circles, and already in London some authoritative British sources are saying that an economic ambargo is not practical and would mean that Western exports would suffer.

But if bombs begin falling on millions of people, there will be suffering, too. Hence, the world has to choose now between preventing policies of a drastic nature or a drifting policy that gives to the enemy an impression of irresoluteness and defeatism.

Back in the days of the Truman administration there was a word used widely to describe the then-existing American policy toward the Soviet Union. It was "containment." It meant that the Allies would draw a line around the Communist bloc and isolate it from the rest of the world. But the crisis never became sufficiently acute to make such a policy effective and gradually the proponents of exchange—whether in the educational, cultural, or commercial field—came to the fore.

The Soviets, however, have been getting the better of the bargain. They have been giving up little by way of information themselves through the exchange programs, but they have infiltrated nearly every large country and many of the smaller ones by increasing the staffs of their own embassies or legations—in many cases with several hundred persons—who enjoy diplomatic immunity. These diplomats are the clandestine link between the Kremlin and the small but influential group of agents and party members in the various countries who carry on the Moscow-directed intrigue, subversion, and espionage. They transmit the billions of rubles, converted into Western currencies, to finance the whole Communist apparatus.

The Soviet enterprises throughout the world would collapse if trade embargoes were applied and the whole system of converting Soviet money into other currencies were blocked off, so that the funds that flow to agents in Cuba or Mexico or South America or the Middle East or southeast Asia or Africa were in large part stopped.

There are plenty of countermeasures "short of war" which the West can take. The situation in Berlin affords a real oppor-

tunity. For, since the Soviets have ordered their puppet government in East Germany to seal off the borders, the allies could close their borders, too. A nonintercourse program could be gradually extended to apply to the other satellite countries. Certainly uprisings internally would occur in the Communist-dominated areas. But why should the West fear or timidly refrain from encouraging such outbreaks? Some failures will occur, but this is the price that has to be paid in the long struggle against Soviet tyranny.

Frustration Along the 49th Parallel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of Washington State, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation have a great stake in the development of water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Also vitally affected by such development are our neighbors, the people of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada.

Without appearing critical toward our friends to the north, Mr. Speaker, I want to include in the RECORD an editorial concerning economic and political activity in British Columbia which may have widespread effect upon the implementation of the Columbia River Treaty and the joint development of United States-Canadian water resources. This editorial by Callison Marks was published August 6, 1961, in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash.:

BRITISH COLUMBIA FRUSTRATES AMERICANS ALSO

There was a series of strange coincidences in Canada last week.

In Ottawa, frustrated leaders of the socialistic Canadian Commonwealth Federation, a political party, were combining with organized labor to form a new political party.

In Vancouver, funeral services were being held for a noted cultural leader and champion of free enterprise, A. E. Grauer, chief executive officer of the British Columbia Electric Co., one of the largest and most successful utilities on the continent.

In Victoria, British Columbia Premier W. A. C. Bennett, leader of the conservative-slanted Social Credit Party, announced to the provincial legislature that the government as of 2 p.m. Tuesday—had taken over the British Columbia Electric Co., something which the CCF socialists had been advocating for years.

In addition, Premier Bennett declared that the Peace River Power Development Co., a private-enterprise dam-promoting firm backed by famed Swedish industrialist Axel Wenner Gren, was also being expropriated.

The chairman of the Peace River company, Sir Andrew McTaggart, arrived from London with no inkling of the shocking news. He did learn that Bennett's British Columbia Energy Board had just determined that Peace River could be developed by the province at about the same rate as power from the proposed Canadian Columbia River projects.

Before the week was over, Bennett won legislative approval of his takeover plan. The Premier replaced the British Columbia Electric's board of directors with men of his own choice, headed by Dr. Gordon Shrum, chairman of the British Columbia Energy Board and former dean of graduate studies of the University of British Columbia.

Bennett, the onetime Conservative politician, then had a $100 million Provincial bond issue authorized for immediate payment for the shares of British Columbia Electric stock held by a parent corporation.

The total takeover price has been estimated at about $700 million. The "contingent liabilities" of the Province now to about $1.3 billion.

A little over a year ago Premier Bennett had told British Columbia voters that the Province was clear of public debt.

The Provincial takeover of the private power companies was justified, in part, by the Premier because the Canadian Federal Government handed back to Victoria only a small portion of the Federal taxes paid to Ottawa.

Provincial government operation of the British Columbia Electric deprives the Federal Government of the utility taxes. It also deprives many municipalities in the Province of the tax income formerly paid by the utility.

The total tax contribution of the company has been estimated at about $17 million annually—to Federal, Provincial and local governments. Some municipalities near Vancouver are already worried over the loss of tax income from the company and are threatening to curtail school and other public services.

The frustrations in Canada over this power takeover now involve the validity of the Columbia River treaty, signed by the United States and Canada last January and ratified by our Senate in March. No attempt has been made by the Canadian Federal Government to get the treaty ratified by the House of Commons at Ottawa.

The Bennett government in British Columbia has now, in effect, told the Ottawa Government that it must authorize the export of power (to come from Columbia and Peace River Dams) or the treaty will be kaput. Victoria holds one type of veto power and Ottawa holds another.

The hydropower which the British Columbians hope to develop is too expensive for marketing in the Pacific Northwest, even though the price may be acceptable in lower British Columbia—or in California.

The present British Columbia power situation is a source of frustrations on this side of the border, where there has been faith that eventually the leaders in Ottawa and Victoria would settle their differences and the Columbia Treaty benefits would become a reality.

The frustrations here are now complicated over the purely American questions of power development on the middle Snake River, the possibility of commercial power from the new Hanford atomic reactor, and the prospect for construction of the proposed Bonneville-California intertie.

The Snake River problem is now in the hands of the Federal Power Commission. The Hanford problem is now in the hands of Congress. The intertie problem is now in the hands of the Department of the Interior.

The present Canadian situation also concerns the backers of Libby Dam in western Montana, the last great Federal project now in the planning stage. Construction will be stymied as long as Canada holds up ratification of the treaty.

Premier Bennett is a masterful politician who is looking out for British Columbia interests. He has taken a big gamble in the Provincial takeover of private power in his ambitious plans for public power development of both the Columbia and Peace River projects. He has caused some frustrations north of the border.

Now he has many power-minded Americans worried over what may happen here because of the Columbia River uncertainties and because of the quick but legally permissible snatch of Canada's largest investor-owned public utility.

Continuing A-Test Ban Held Suicidal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the President's announced intention to remain firm in Berlin, and to build up our ground forces as a deterrent to Soviet threats, I think it is appropriate for us to finally recognize the futility of the continuation of our voluntary nuclear test ban.

As the following article so ably points out, the President has implied that the latest top-secret information reveals that we cannot doubt that Russia has been testing nuclear weapons right along. Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the luxury of a one-sided ban. No one is fool enough to believe that we could win an all-out war without the use of fully developed nuclear weapons. Yet we continue this self-restriction and allow the Communists to continue to test on the sly. The time has come for decisive action. Too much valuable time has already been lost. Let us resume nuclear testing immediately.

The article follows:

(By Michael Padev, Star foreign editor)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's statement on nuclear testing, made at his press conference yesterday, is highly disappointing.

Mr. Kennedy said, in effect, that he is prepared to continue the self-imposed American ban on nuclear testing, in spite of the fact that the Russians may well be testing secretly.

Here are Mr. Kennedy's exact words:

"I now have a report from the special panel on nuclear testing. This panel has examined a broad range of issues concerning our capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions. It has also gone into certain technical questions relating to nuclear weapons development.

"Although the report is made up of highly classified materials and cannot be released for that reason, I can say that as far as I am concerned this report has made me feel more urgently than ever that without an inspection system of the kind proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom at Geneva, no country in the world can ever be sure that a nation with a closed society is not conducting secret nuclear tests.

"In view of this report and in view of the deep longing of the people of the world for an effective end to nuclear testing, I am asking Ambassador Dean to return to Geneva on August 24, in an effort to ascertain whether the Soviet Union is now prepared to bring a safeguarded test ban agreement into being."

Stripped of the camouflage of diplomatic talk—and doubletalk—this Presidential statement reveals the following disturbing:

1. The special scientific and military panel on nuclear testing, appointed several weeks

ago by Mr. Kennedy, has now informed him that the United States has no way of knowing for sure whether or not the Russians are conducting secret tests.

2. This means that the United States has so far presumed—for nearly 3 years—that the Russians are not testing simply on the strength of Nikita Khrushchev's "word of honor" on the subject. For nearly 3 long years the United States has deprived itself of the possibility of perfecting its nuclear weapons, while the Communists—we can be sure of that—have been perfecting theirs.

3. In spite of this, Mr. Kennedy is prepared to go on with the nuclear test ban, presumably because of meaning of his reference to "world opinion." This is the "deep longing of the people of the world for an effective end to nuclear testing."

But who are "the people of the world" who supposedly long for the end of nuclear testing?

The American people are certainly not among them. The majority of Americans would never accept a nuclear test ban for the United States, while at the same time allowing the Communists to go on testing. Nor would any other free nation in the world—certainly not our allies—agree with such suicidal ideas.

The "people of the world" who supposedly "long" for the end of nuclear testing can be found mainly among the so-called neutralist states. And, of course, all Communist propagandists in the world have been shouting for years against nuclear testing—by the West. But they have never said a word against nuclear testing by Russia.

I should add here that U.S. military leaders want to resume underground nuclear tests. No dangerous fallout is involved here and no contamination of the atmosphere is possible. There are, in other words, no health hazards from such tests.

The idea of a voluntary American self-imposed nuclear test ban was first proposed seriously by Adlai Stevenson back in 1956 during the second Eisenhower-Stevenson Presidential campaign. The idea was not endorsed by the Democratic Party and, in any case, Stevenson was badly beaten at the election.

Former President Truman, who has a very shrewd knowledge of the Communist danger overseas, was against the idea, and only a few days ago he again told the press he would have never accepted the voluntary atom test ban.

President Eisenhower was originally against a one-sided (American) nuclear test ban as well. But under extreme pressure by some of his more "progressive" foreign policy advisers—and in spite of the strong opposition of all his military advisers—he agreed, toward the end of 1958, on the so-called 1 year moratorium plan.

Hopes were expressed that year the United States, Britain, and Russia would agree on a workable system of inspection. But the Communists did not ever think of discussing the problem seriously. They stalled all negotiations for 1 year, and then demanded another year for more talks. The West agreed.

At the beginning of the Kennedy administration, President Kennedy announced he would continue the ban with the hope of reaching an agreement with the Russians "within a reasonable time."

Seven months have passed since then. No agreement has been reached, and the Russians now don't want even to go on with the test ban talks. (They now want the matter referred to the United Nations)

It is indeed incredible to see how the Communists have been able to paralyze for nearly 3 years the production arm of the most important shield of American defense system.

It is also incredible that even now the U.S. Government is not able to see reason, to abandon the stupid farce of nuclear test negotiations with Moscow, and to resume underground nuclear testing for the protection of American national security.

Excerpts From Resolutions of the Third World Congress of the Communist International, Held in New York City in 1921

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have illustrated time and time again the vicious temper of the smear tactics being conducted against patriotic groups and individuals. The instigators of these vituperative attacks invariably attempt to justify their actions by stating that we cannot afford to let nationalism plunge us into war. But, we must face up to the fact that we cannot sit idly by while there are those who would destroy us from within.

The military leaders of this country have been severely criticized for their leadership in alerting our Armed Forces to the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy. The resulting furor over the gagging of the military has been far more harmful than any abuse of civilian control could ever be.

The Communist movement thrives on controversy and advocates the very result that has been achieved by a recent memorandum on the subject of military versus civilian control. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and the citizens of this country excerpts taken from resolutions of the Third World Congress of the Communist International, held in New York City in 1921:

EXTRACTS PAGES 91 AND 92 OF THESES AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE THIRD WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL—1921 (PUBLISHED BY THE CONTEMPORARY PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, 1921

The methods of propaganda in the armies and navies of capitalist states must be adapted to the peculiar conditions in each country. Antimilitarist agitation of a pacifist nature is extremely detrimental, and only assists the bourgeois in its efforts to disarm the proletariat. The proletariat rejects on principle and combats with the utmost energy, every kind of military institution of the bourgeois state, and of the bourgeois class in general. Nevertheless, it utilizes these institutions (army, rifle clubs, citizen guard organizations, etc.) for the purpose of giving the workers military training for the revolutionary battles to come. Intensive agitation must therefore be directed not against the military training of the youth and workers, but against the militaristic regime, and the domination of the officers. Every possibility of providing the workers with weapons should most eagerly be taken advantages of.

The class antagonisms, revealing themselves as they do in the materially favored positions of the officers as against the bad treatment and social insecurity of life of the common soldiers, must be made very clear to the soldiers. Besides, the agitation must bring home the fact to the rank-and-file that its future is inextricably bound up with the fate of the exploited classes. In a more advanced period of incipient revolutionary fermentation, agitation for the democratic election of all commanders by the privates and sailors and for the formation of soldiers' councils may prove very advantageous in undermining the foundations of capitalist rule.

The closest attention and the greatest care are always required when agitating against the picked troops used by the bourgeoisie in the class war, and especially against its armed volunteer bands.

Wherever the social composition and corrupt conduct of these troops and bands make it possible, every favorable moment for agitation should be made use of for creating disruption. Wherever it possesses a distinct bourgeois class character, as for example, in the officers corps, it must be unmasked before the entire population, and made so despicable and repulsive, that they will be disrupted from within by virtue of their very isolation.

A New Creativity Flexes Its Muscle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be possible for many of my colleagues to read the August issue of Television. I understand each Member has been furnished a copy. However, if for any reason any Member did not get a copy and will call my office I will see that he gets one.

Much has been written with reference to television in this last year. It has been pictured by some as a vast wasteland, by others as the chief villain in juvenile delinquency, and by others as for minds only in the lower intelligence quotients.

Unfortunately, very few people know all that is contained in the scope of television within the United States. Television magazine for August 1961 has printed a series of articles with pictures showing not only the scope but also the depth of television and its impact on the social and cultural life, not only through the networks but also through the programing in local communities, which are conceived "to serve a particular audience—an audience of many parts, many tastes, many desires, and many needs."

I am attaching herewith the introduction: "A New Creativity Flexes Its Muscle." This is followed by a series of eight articles which show what is being done in eight separate areas of programing. I am sorry that the rules of the House will not allow me to insert these articles in the series. I do, however, urge all of my colleagues to make a special effort to read them in order to see the full depth and scope of the creativity of television in its broadest sense:

MIDYEAR ANALYSIS OF LOCAL PROGRAMING: A NEW CREATIVITY FLEXES ITS MUSCLE

(By Richard K. Doan)

Like a fireman inured to heat, the U.S. telecaster has learned to take browbeating in stride. Nevertheless, at this juncture in his relatively brief career, he is obviously mindful of the recent public and official outcries over TV fare.

Local television in the United States, the product of over 500 commercial stations, is about to undergo some facelifting. It won't be so drastic as to produce a new look. But it should be more in line with the wishes of TV's critics, most apparent in a concerted trend to more news, public affairs, and educational programing.

Along with the networks, many a station management is taking stock. It is highly evident, on the basis of a questionnaire survey conducted by Television magazine this summer, that there will be a measurable increase in the coming months in local TV news, public affairs, live entertainment, and educational programing.

Significantly, any major overhauling in prospect will come more from the bottom than from the top. That is, those stations which have been making a substantial local effort right along are planning no decided step-up, while those which have been prone to take the film-network route begin to see the propriety, if not indeed license salvation, in more community interest.

The reason these innovations probably will not produce a decidedly new look is inherent: So much of TV's entertainment comes down the line from the networks that it's difficult for the individual station to make a strong dent in the public's overall impression—except as stations collectively might influence network taste in programing.

In his own bailiwick, the telecaster can make a choice between reliance on film product, which tends to bring him tempting profits, or local live productions, which are a lot more expensive but look good on his community and FCC records. Most stations quite naturally strike for some sort of balance between the two. One trouble is that the best local efforts, in themselves often highly creditable, bulk so small in the local TV panorama that they are lost to critical and general view.

Grassroots television at this instant presents no particular composite picture. It tends, among the network affiliates who constitute its overwhelming majority, to follow a popular pattern, but a breakdown of its programing elements discloses a diversity of approaches almost as numerous as the stations.

Of approximately 175 replying to this magazine's questionnaire—and representing a cross section of large and small markets across the country—some were far different from others:

In the surveyed week, May 7–13 (the week, incidentally, in which FCC Chairman Newton Minow made his now celebrated vast-wasteland speech), one station was on the air only 59 hours, another 142:26 hours.

One Texas ABC affiliate took only 30 hours of network programing; a three-network affiliate in the same State carried 103:50 hours of line-fed shows (some, presumably, on a delayed basis).

A few stations booked as few as 2 hours of syndicated film. Others carried up to 45 hours.

Three stations aired no movies at all (one of these said it would be starting them soon), while a west coast independent logged 98 of its 122 hours with feature films.

Four stations originated no more than 5 hours each of local live programing during the week. Four others offered more than 30 hours each, one of them 41 hours.

Five stations programed not more than 1 hour of local news each in the entire week, but nine others turned out more than 7 hours apiece.

Twenty-two stations had no children's programs whatever, whereas twenty-five reported 10 hours or more each of moppet fare, the most prolific a Nebraska station which devoted 34:30 hours to the kiddies.

Seventy-nine stations bypassed women's service entirely.

Sixty-four scheduled no variety-panel-music shows.

One hundred and thirty-nine eschewed audience participation formats of any kind.

Forty-three were without religious programing, and thirty-three offered no educational-cultural entries.

In all of these program categories, there were other stations which gave them substantial segments of time. A Virginia station, for example, ran 8 hours of religious shows. A California station went for 17:30 hours of audience participation. A New York station could claim 23:45 hours of educational-cultural programing.

Considerable disparity also turned up in local broadcasters' approaches to specials. Entertainment one-shots were distinctly not their dish in many cases. During the season from September 1, 1960, to June 1, 1961, 70 of the reporting stations undertook no such projects. On the other hand, many stations chanced a few, six programed over 20 hours each of such specials, and six others ran up over 30 hours each. One major independent in California claimed 129 hours of entertainment specials.

When it came to public-affairs specials, the spread was far more impressive. Only 16 stations reported they carried none at all. On the top side, 14 put together 30 hours or more each. A Florida station claimed 104 hours, a Maryland station 75 hours.

Editorializing is in a steep climb. About 45 percent of the reporting stations said they air editorials, although well over half of these are scheduled only on an occasional basis. Twenty-eight of the stations said they had started editorializing within the past year.

The trend of station thinking on programing for the immediate future was evident in responses to a question about planned changes in local shows for fall.

About half of the stations indicated either that they contemplated none or that it was too early to say. Several, playing it close to the vest, said they couldn't disclose their plans.

The other half implied by their answers that they were sensitive to the mood of recent TV onslaughts. In case after case, they expressed their intentions in phrases such as these:

"More public service, more news, more specials." "More live programing of all types." "Educational films, more children's time, more news." "Increased local public affairs specials." "Prime-time public affairs programing." "More local variety and public affairs; greater emphasis on live programing."

A number of stations stressed plans to schedule public affairs programs regularly in prime time. Mostly, these would be monthly preemptions of network periods.

Dozens of specific shows were listed as planned: a drama workshop, a weekly "focus on jazz," a weekly "great book analysis," a ranch party and square dance, a 30-minute news review, a capitol news conference, a teenage panel and talent show, several educational series in cooperation with universities, a "local musicians" program, several agricultural series, typing instructions, a Spanish language course, musical variety.

The emphasis of the hour was to be found in a tabulation of mentions of the types of programs in work: public affairs and information, 43 mentions; educational, 28; news, 17; live adult entertainment, 15; children's programs, 9; women's shows, 6; farm shows, 6; editorializing, 5; cultural shows, 5; syndicated series and sports, 3 each; special events, movies, exercise shows, and religion, 1 each.

Granted that these indicated plans are straws in the wind, the question of where grassroots TV goes from here is still difficult to answer.

Undeniably, the TV stations are prosperous. A major New York station representative disclosed in passing the other day that one of his stations, a moderate-size Middle Atlantic outlet, is realizing a 55 percent net before taxes.

A station-group executive noted last month: "Now's the time for creative people to get in their licks. The moment is ripe for those with programing ideas to put them forward. The management mood perhaps never was more receptive."

A station manager said he might put more quality programing on the air if his program people would come to him with strongly felt ideas—and sell me on them.

One of the paradoxes of the business is that broadcasters reap so little public and official recognition for the efforts they do make in the public interest. As one major executive put it recently: "I think one trouble is that the broadcasters haven't sold what they've done in public affairs." He didn't suggest how they might do it.

A widespread feeling among thoughtful observers is that stations aren't under fire so much for what they don't do in the realm of information and culture as they are for entertainment programing which offends tastes and sensibilities.

Most broadcasters can build an impressive documentation of what their stations have done in the community interest. The TV stations of the United States could literally inundate FCC Chairman Minow's office with evidence: brochures, presentations, photographs, trade ads, commendations and awards, and mountains of mail.

SNOWED UNDER IN AN AVALANCHE OF STEREOTYPES

The hitch seemingly is that much of the stations' do-good efforts escapes general notice. If it isn't half-lost by exposure in light viewing hours (i.e., Sunday afternoon or late night)—which, to be sure, is of the broadcaster's doing—it is lost in impressiveness because it occupies such a fractional part of the whole program spectrum. In short, a few public affairs specials, wonderful as they may be to critical audiences, are snowed under in the public mind by the avalanche of stereotyped offerings.

There have been recent efforts here and there both to counteract public disparagement and to invite community understanding of broadcasting's problems.

On June 27, the three stations of the Albany-Schenectady-Troy (N.Y.) area, WRGB, WTEN, and WAST, preempted 30 minutes of prime time for a simulcast titled "Status—Television Northeast" to tell how the stations have tried to meet their local obligations.

In Philadelphia, WCAU–TV is inviting community leaders to sit down before the cameras with General Manager John Schneider every third Sunday afternon for a 30-minute exchange of ideas and comments on TV programing.

In New York, a leading station rep, Blair-TV, has mounted a project to encourage stations to package more local factual programing and to sell the values and virtues of such programing on Madison Avenue (see "New Way To Sell in a Buyer's Market," p. 109).

The situation confronting the stations has typically, two sides: one says the industry is running out of film product and the stations must perforce turn to live productions; the other side says plenty of canned

stuff is around, and coming up, and what's all the crying about?

One says the squeeze is on for upgrading programing and that broadcasters cannot resist reform. The other says the shouting will pass, as it has before, and nothing drastic is called for.

The film's all-gone school of thought frequently states that only one (or not even one) new first-run syndicated package is available for fall. Actually, at least half a dozen new series are on the market.

The don't-get-excited school says that even if film is in shorter supply now, demand will create new product.

The syndicators themselves blame the stations for the current dearth on grounds that broadcasters have driven prices down to the point where studios can't afford continued production of quality features.

"It's no wonder the situation is worse today then ever," the president of a major syndicating operation observed. "While production costs have soared, the stations have gone on paying the same rates for film that they did 5 years ago."

Large chunks of station time are still plugged with syndicated product. The average among stations responding to Television magazine's survey was between 15 and 20 hours weekly, but some ran to as much as 38 and 45 hours. WPIX New York, probably the heaviest user, has had 56 half-hour-film features (including network reruns) in its weekly 7–11 p.m. time.

There is a particular concern about the network reruns, how worth buying will many of these be, the question goes, if the action-adventure cycle suddenly runs its course? Westerns already are over the hill, except for a handful of the best ones.

Another question: How well will the plethora of hour-long network entries fit into local schedules as reruns? Some quarters doubt their market will be good.

Movies are viewed as a continuing bulwark of profitable local TV. Few stations have yet abandoned their "late shows" in favor of attempting to buck NBC's durable Jack Paar with live local efforts, although several have decided to try it with the Westinghouse stations' new taped "PM East" and "PM West."

The average station, judged by those surveyed, still books close to 20 hours a week of feature films. Nineteen reported they programed less than 5 hours weekly, but another 11 aired more than 32 hours each.

While there has been evidence that TV movies pull less well than they once did, New York's WOR–TV amply demonstrated this summer that topgrade films still magnetize audiences. Ranked as the most film-happy operation of all (76 out of 81 hours in one June week), the RKO-General independent kicked off a big preview series of Seven Arts films with a June 20 showing of "The High and the Mighty." Running from 9 to 11:15 p.m., the show picked off a 24.2 Arbitron and topped all competition including Gary Moore.

A new film tack is underway at New York's Daily News independent. WIPX's general manager, Fred M. Thrower, believes that half-hour formula westerns and private-eyes have pretty well "had it." He has booked only three prime-time westerns for fall, adding "Wanted—Dead or Alive," and one of these may be dropped. Meantime, WPIX will gamble on building a trend for real-life adventure with nine prime-time half hours of this fare: "I Search for Adventure," "Bold Journey," "Wild Cargo," John Gunther's "High Road," "Seven League Boots," John Cameron Swayze's "It's a Wonderful World," "Adventure Theater," "Rendezvous With Adventure," and "Global Zobel." Some of these have been filmed especially for TV; others are compiled of film shot by explorers, adventure clubs, and others.

A GROWING NEW SOURCE OF FILM

Still another source of film programing has been noticeably growing in recent months: the stations themselves. Most of the product is of a nonfiction category, such as the "PM" series, Metropolitan Broadcasting's "Albert Burke," and "John Crosby Show," WNBC–TV New York's "Dr. Joyce Brothers" (through ABC films), WPIX's "Secret Life of Adolf Hitler," and other documentaries, WNTA–TV New York's "Play of the Week" and "Open End." The list grows steadily.

Recently, still more impetus to this trend came in the formation of a Trans-Lux subsidiary, Television Affiliates Corp. Backed by an advisory committee of prominent station executives, the firm is assembling a library of 100 odd station-produced programs of a cultural and informational nature to offer to other stations. This fall, TAC will attempt to sign up 100 or more stations as subscribers.

Straight program exchanges are underway, too, such as the international one set up by CBS's owned and operated outlets in which New York's WCBS–TV "American Musical Theater" has been swapped abroad for 12 hours of foreign programs for use as an international hour on the five o-and-o's. Similarily, the Westinghouse stations have cooperated with the National Educational Television & Radio Center to show and distribute documentaries on world affairs produced by International Television Federation.

In live programing, news and other informational shows undoubtedly received the most impetus in recent months. Some stations expanded their early evening "report" (including a quarter-hour from the network) into a full hour, with notable results. Last September KFSD–TV, San Diego, took this tack and doubled its 6–7 p.m. ratings. The bigger news package appeared to heighten audience interest: sets in use, from May 1960 to May 1961, jumped from 33 to 53.

In March WAGA–TV Atlanta went to a full hour "Panorama" of news at 6 p.m., including its "Waga Editorial" in a flexible format allowing for instant updating of dispatches breaking during the period.

In San Francisco, KRON–TV's 30-minute "Assignment Four" at 6:30 p.m., now in its second year, has picked up awards for its regular news-in-depth efforts. In another example of news alertness, KRON–TV aired President Kennedy's April 20 speech on the Cuban crisis three times that day, repeating it twice at 7 p.m. with a suggestion to viewers between the replays that they alert friends and neighbors to the rebroadcast.

When Hurricane Donna blew in, WTVJ Miami stayed on the air around the clock to report its progress. Films of Donna by WCKT Miami became part of a U.S. Weather Bureau special report on hurricanes.

Last fall WTVJ began programing a daily news show in Spanish, News en Español, for the benefit of 50,000 Cuban refugees in the Miami area.

Not all of the extended regular news coverage is in the customary evening slot. WBZ–TV Boston gives its News at Nine (a.m.) a half hour, injecting feature interviews. Incidentally, WBZ–TV's Starring the Editors, a news analysis moderated by Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, is in its 11th year.

Some news specials have inspired official action. A WOW–TV Omaha "TV News Conference" on the increase in crime in the Omaha area brought about passage of a crime-study resolution by the Nebraska Legislature.

Among the stations responding to Television magazine's questionnaire, by far the most give news from 2 to 4 hours weekly on a regular basis. About one-fifth of them, however, exceeded 5 hours weekly, with some reaching past 8 hours.

In children's programing, the cartoon and comedy strip-with-live-master of ceremonies formula has become so solidly entrenched and widespread that almost no other kind of kiddie show exists. Loaded with cans of "Laurel & Hardy," "The Three Stooges" and the like—and now "Dick Tracy"—the stations present the strips in bits and pieces spliced with smalltalk from studio clowns, cops, cowboys, and cuties (WISN–TV Milwaukee has a pair of girl puppeteers) to entertain peanut galleries of knee-high fans.

The formula generally works. In fact, where it works well, competing stations often just give up and shoot for whatever adults they can round up. More than 25 percent of the stations surveyed in June reported either no children's programing or less than 2 hours weekly.

On the other hand, a few go hot and heavy for the children, giving them 20 hours a week or more of juvenile fare. In the seven-station New York market, WPIX has corralled the kids with 3 hours daily (4–7 p.m.) of strip upon strip, hosted by a platoon of funnymen. It has been charged by competitors that WPIX has a sort of unfair advantage: with its daytime largely occupied by Regents-sponsored classroom TV, "if WPIX doesn't catch them in school, it gets them when they come home."

Some added interest in kiddie shows on the part of stations is foreseen in the wake of word out of Washington that the FCC plans to add this category of programing to the breakdown requested in license renewal forms.

As for live local daytime programing for the housewiffe, it is possibly less plentiful than formerly, but persists in many localities in many formats. Judging from questionnaire findings, well over a third of the stations carry no "women's service" shows and also as many air no variety-panel-music programs. Audience-participation shows are still fewer; fully two-thirds of the stations bypass them.

Religious programing occupies something less than 2 hours weekly on about 50 percent of the stations surveyed. Of the remainder, about half carry no religious shows at all.

Even Administration Spokesmen Admit From Time to Time That We Cannot Buy Loyalty

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to learn, from the report of a speech he made before the National Press Club, that Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles has finally come to the conclusion that the United States cannot buy friendship and loyalty. The New York Times account of Mr. Bowles' speech, which I include herein as a part of my remarks, makes most interesting reading in the light of some of the past statements of the gentleman, and in the impassioned pleas we have heard in the past few days from administration supporters for the need to increase foreign aid spending and to give the President even greater power to give away taxpayers' money. For years I have taken the floor of the House, when the mutual se-

curity bill has been before us, to point out that pouring money into foreign lands is not the answer to communism. The United States will maintain a position of leadership in the world and will command the respect and loyalty of other peoples only to the extent that we stand on principle, the principle that we are for freedom and the right of all men to choose their own system of government. When we demonstrate that we will support, with action as well as words, the right of self-determination for all nations, those who support the same principle will be with us regardless of whether they receive monetary aid or not. Those who are dedicated to the Communist philosophy will never be on our side, no matter how much we pay them. I am glad Mr. Bowles has learned this from his travels.

The New York Times account of Mr. Bowles' speech follows:

BOWLES FINDS UNITED STATES DOUBTED ABROAD—REPORTS SKEPTICISM IN NEW NATIONS ON ADHERENCE TO TRADITIONS OF FREEDOM

WASHINGTON, August 15.—Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles said today that he had found underdeveloped nations profoundly skeptical of the U.S. capacity to live up to its own revolutionary traditions.

Reporting at a National Press Club luncheon on his 20-day tour of Africa, Asia, and Europe, Mr. Bowles declared that "the enormous truth that comes home from this trip is that we can no longer coast on our revolutionary past."

"We may still sell an antique chair by boasting that Tom Paine once sat in it," Mr. Bowles said, "but we cannot persuade skeptical Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans that we believe in the rights for which Paine spoke so fervently unless our actions fit our words."

TRADITION NO LONGER SUFFICES

The Kennedy administration has taken the position that the revolutionary heritage of the United States has equipped it to provide leadership in the revolutionary world of the 1960's.

Mr. Bowles devoted a large part of his talk today to insist that the Jeffersonian traditions no longer sufficed at a time when "we Americans will be tested in the next few months as perhaps never before in our long history."

"Let us recognize bluntly that right now most Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans are profoundly skeptical of our capacity consistently to live up to our revolutionary tradition in support of self-determination and equality for all peoples," he said.

"Throughout the non-Communist world the tide of history is now running with flood force: for self-government, for economic justice, for racial equality," Mr. Bowles said. "These are the principles which we must support, morally, because they rest at the foundation of our own society and, realistically, becaus they represent the crucial force which is now shaping the institutions of our time."

BERLIN CRISIS DISCUSSED

Mr. Bowles told his audience that the Berlin crisis had loomed high in his talks with President Tito of Yugoslavia, the leaders of the world's unalined nations, including Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Premier Nu of Burma.

In all his meetings his trip, Mr. Bowles said, he had drummed home the fact that the fight of refugees from East Germany to the West was "a fantastic and extraordinary defeat for communism" and Premier Khrushchev.

"For several years now Mr. Khrushchev had been proposing what he describes as competitive coexistence between the Communist and non-Communist nations in the world," he said.

"So here in the very heart of Europe we have had the competition for which Khrushchev has been pleading and the results are clear: communism had failed," Mr. Bowles said. "It is also clear that Mr. Khrushchev is a poor loser."

Mr. Bowles said he had found "that when we speak of America's legal right to remain in Berlin few Asians and Africans are impressed. Nobody wants a nuclear war * * *," the United States legal rights."

FACES LIGHT UP

However, he said, "when we stress our role as defenders of the right of the West Berliners to make their own decisions, then faces light up and heads nod. For Asians and Africans know that self-determination is basic to their own independence."

In replying to questions following his speech, Mr. Bowles advocated what he called giving freedom of choice to uncommitted nations, instead of "nervously biting our fingernails" when leaders such as President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana or President Sékou Touré of Guinea visit Moscow.

Mr. Bowles also seemed unconcerned about continuing reports that President Kennedy was about to shift him to a new job in the administration. These reports have cited alleged dissatisfaction with Mr. Bowles' activities in the State Department, including his stream of policy ideas that sometimes are put forth without White House clearance.

Beaming, he told the overflow audience that the "reports of my death have been greatly exaggerated." He announced that he had just purchased a new house—"in Washington."

Then Mr. Bowles proceeded with the exposition of his ideas on what the U.S. policy should be in the underdeveloped world.

"We could," he said, "buy United Nations votes with aid. We could think that if people are full of rice they will support the status quo, but, then, we shall only have more muscular Communists."

The Delaware State News Compliments the President and Supports Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, our country grew to its present eminence in part as the result of the kind of independent and sturdy folk who edited and published our weekly newspapers.

Today, in our mass society these hardy souls must sometimes feel that our people are influenced only by the great television networks and the metropolitan newspapers and magazines of our greatest cities.

But, then, Members of the House themselves sometimes feel that the networks and the metropolitan newspapers and magazines are inclined to give undue weight to the Senate and its Members.

Today, I would like to call attention to an editorial and a letter published by Jack Smyth, editor and publisher of the Delaware State News.

It reflects the kind of keen mind without which any society, not ours alone, is almost powerless:

[From the Delaware State News, Aug. 14, 1961]

DEAR MISTER PRESIDENT

Along with other Americans I have been watching closely the actions of our new President. John F. Kennedy has given us some anxious moments—but I am greatly encouraged by the way he is now handling his very difficult task.

I am a firm believer in telling a person what I think. When any public official is doing a good job—it is only right to tell him so. And when he isn't—tell him that too. It is really the obligation of a citizen.

For these reasons I wrote this open letter to the President of the United States on Friday:

AUGUST 11, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the few months you have been in office I have, along with millions of your fellow Americans, have been observing the way you have been handling your many problems and tremendous responsibilities. I think you are doing a wonderful job. Keep it up and I feel confident you will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents.

Strangely enough, I formed this impression at the time of the Cuban invasion. Your courage in taking full responsibility, when you had just taken bad advice, proved to me that you are truly a man worthy of the high office you hold.

The stand you have taken on Berlin has been nothing less than magnificent. I am convinced that you have this Nation fully behind you—as well as our allies. And that you have Mr. K. bluffed—for a change.

I feel impelled, as the editor of a small daily newspaper, to write this letter supporting your foreign policy. (There are some aspects of your domestic program that I cannot agree with.) But I do want you to know I feel you are doing an outstanding job. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

JACK SMYTH,
Editor and Publisher.

Hitting the Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of my predecessors in this House, who now represents our State of Maryland in the Senate of the United States, the Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, has made some very timely remarks on a subject which is of concern to every Member of this House. The constitutional division of governmental power between the State and local governments on the one hand and the Federal Government on the other is a fundamental element of our political structure which is subjected to great pressures by the rapidly changing times in which we live. But the swift tide of national and world events is not

the only moving force behind the changes in the Federal nature of this country. I believe that a recent statement of the distinguished Senator from Maryland and the subsequent comment of the Catoctin Enterprise, a newspaper of Thurmont, Md., in the Sixth Congressional District, will shed a great deal of light on the decision which must be made regarding this problem.

Senator BEALL said:

SOCIALISM OR AMERICANISM?—WE MUST CHOOSE

When we demand Federal aid for virtually everything, we are refusing to take care of things which are our personal or local responsibility and are aiding the cause of socialism. We shall be moving for strength of character and constructive initiative, and away from creeping socialism, when we stop requesting nonessential new programs and Federal expenditures, when we revitalize our State and local governments, and when we assert the fundamental freedoms and independence which are our heritage.

The editorial inspired by this statement comments:

[From the Catoctin Enterprise, Aug. 11, 1961]

HITTING THE NAIL ON THE HEAD

The final paragraph of Senator BEALL'S "Senate Cloakroom" Letter, which appears on another page this week, is of such vital import that every citizen and taxpayer should read it. Not that the Senator's entire letter is uninteresting. Indeed far from it. But this last paragraph, headed "Socialism or Americanism? We Must Choose.", is of immense concern just now when the public is beginning to look to the Federal Government for help in almost every conceivable phase of local governmental operation.

Senator BEALL writes that "when we demand 'Federal aid' for virtually everything, we are refusing to take care of things which are our personal responsibility and are aiding the cause of socialism." There can be little doubt that he is right. Yet the difficulty seems to be in convincing the general taxpaying public that it is worth making sacrifices locally in order to avoid the socialistic trend. Federal aid to education is one example. We have stated repeatedly that we are opposed to Federal aid to education, but that we believe it to be inevitable. We believe it to be inevitable because experience in the educational field has convinced us that the people simply will not pay the taxes locally which are necessary in order to provide the types of schools and the brand of education necessary to the present age. They would rather have the Federal Government extract from them even more taxes than are necessary for this purpose, and return only a portion of the money, than pay out the necessary funds voluntarily themselves.

In other words, although they would perhaps not admit it, they would rather have a moderate form of socialism and be robbed blind by the Federal Government than step up boldly with their eyes open, and pay down what is necessary to secure the services they need. They will pay for these services, but only if they are forced to do so. What a sad commentary on the intelligence and good judgment of the American public.

Of course, all these funds cannot come from real estate taxes, and perhaps that is one of the underlying reasons for local feeling in this regard. If the counties and the State were permitted more tax powers by the Federal Government, then perhaps people would be more willing to raise whatever funds they need by means of these taxes. But it is doubtful that such permission will be granted easily by Washington, for Uncle Sam needs money too, and retaining a portion of each dollar that reaches him before he bestows his benefactions upon local governmental communities enables him to keep his own Treasury solvent.

Television Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission on July 28, 1961, issued a notice of proposed rulemaking under which it contemplates the substitution of ultrahigh frequency—UHF—channels for very high frequency—VHF—channels in eight additional areas in various parts of the country.

I deplore the Commission's action because it is discriminatory against those communities which the FCC would reduce to dependence upon the inferior type service provided through UHF channels.

Rural America, in particular, suffers from the deintermixture policy now being extended by the Commission. Many rural communities now getting good TV reception from VHF stations in medium size cities will not be reached by the shorter range UHF stations which the Commission plans to substitute.

As my colleagues know, I have fought hard over the last 4 years to reverse an earlier Commission decision which transferred a VHF channel from Springfield, Ill., to St. Louis, Mo. By order of the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, this case has twice been sent back to the Commission for review. Only last month the court of appeals told the FCC to make a "fresh start" on the matter.

The ink was hardly dry on the court's decision, however, when the Commission announced its deintermixture proposals for the Champaign-Urbana-Decatur area of central Illinois and for seven other areas in the country. As a sample of some of the protests which I have received against this proposal I include here a telegram from Mr. William J. Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, and a letter from the Honorable William E. LeCrone, mayor of the city of Shelbyville, Ill.:

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., *July 26, 1961.*

Representative PETER F. MACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Illinois Agricultural Association is disturbed to learn that plans are under consideration by the Federal Communications Commission which would curtail or extensively alter the television service to rural areas in the central and eastern portions of Illinois. We feel that deintermixture of the Champaign-Urbana-Decatur market to all-UHF service would be detrimental to television viewing in this area.

For the past 7½ years station WCIA on channel 3 from Champaign, Ill., has provided rural and smalltown residents in a large section of Illinois with high-quality programing and public services—much of it locally produced. We feel that any change in the status of WDIA could only result in a loss of service and quality of programing to many of our farmer-members.

To reduce the ability of this station to reach these rural and smalltown residents, many of whom are far from large television market centers, could only decrease the amount of television programing available to them. In addition, we feel that the division of WCIA's coverage area among a number of smaller stations would be simply replacing an able and established broadcast facility with smaller outlets incapable of supporting the staff and equipment necessary to produce the valuable local programing to which the viewers in this area have become accustomed.

We seriously urge the Commission to consider carefully the number of rural viewers who would suffer a quantitative and qualitative loss of television service as a result of the deintermixture plans. We hope you will bring these considerations to the attention of the Commission.

WILLIAM J. KUHFUSS,
President,
Illinois Agricultural Association.

CITY OF SHELBYVILLE,
Shelbyville, Ill., August 9, 1961.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the people of Shelbyville and the surrounding territory, I am asking your consideration and assistance in any way possible to avert the proposed change of WCIA channel 3 TV, near Champaign, Ill., to UHF frequency.

A change of this type would be a great loss to all television viewers in this area as we would be completely void of CBS reception.

Any assistance you can give us in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM E. LECRONE,
Mayor.

Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas and at Washington National Cathedral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the eloquent proclamation of Gov. John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, establishing this next Sunday, August 20, 1961, as Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas. This is in connection with Kansas Day services to be held this Sunday at our National Cathedral here in Washington:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF KANSAS, TOPEKA, KANS.

To the People of Kansas, Greetings:

Whereas Kansans should be ever mindful of their religious heritage stemming from the labors of the founders of the State who were men and women devoted to the establishment and perpetuation of Christian ethics and spiritual discipline; and

Whereas attention is hereby directed to the honors to be accorded this State by the special centennial prayer services for all Kansas citizens to be held at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., at the hours of 11 o'clock in the morning and 4 o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday, the 20th day of August 1961, and at which Kansas Day services the Kansas flag will be expressly honored in a ceremony in which Congressmen and Senators serving Kansas will participate; and

Whereas the purposes and objectives of those citizens of Kansas seeking to secure a Kansas bell for permanent installation in the tower of the Washington National Cathedral in the Capital are an honor to the religious heritage of the people of Kansas and a goal worthy of the prayers and support of all Kansans. Now, therefore, I, John Anderson, Jr., Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim Sunday, August 20, 1961, as Special Centennial Prayer and Thanksgiving Day in Kansas.

Done at the capitol in Topeka under the great seal of the State, this Friday, July 28, A.D., 1961.

By the Governor:

JOHN ANDERSON, Jr.,
PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.

"My Trip to Washington"—Prize Essays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the latter part of June a group of students of the Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., came to Washington on their summer school historical tour, and visited my office. These young people were very much alive to the responsibilities of citizenship and their enthusiasm and interest made a definite impression on me. I offered prizes for the best essays that they would write about their trip to Washington. The offer was accepted and I have received the selections made of the best essays that were written.

The first prize was won by Rachael Lemberg, the second prize by Joan Low, and the third prize by Sandra Blodgett. I am grateful for the opportunity to insert these essays in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Rachael Lemberg, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(First prize)

To me Washington is the hub of a giant wheel. The wheel is the United States; Washington is the center of it. It is in Washington that our laws are made, our guests from foreign nations stay, the world's greatest citizen protection agency is housed and culture is carried. In Washington people from all over our great country and other countries meet to talk, visit, and observe.

They talk in the Pan American Union Building about the future of our southern neighbors and the Communist threat to the security of their nations as well as ours.

But more important are the talks in the Capitol Building. These are discussions concerning the affairs at home.

They visit the monuments of America's great leaders, the monuments built and dedicated to men like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, men who strived for liberty, justice, and equality for all. These men and many others like them were not afraid to voice their convictions and live by them.

We, like many other visitors, came to Washington to visit and observe. We observed our Government in action in the Capitol Building, and we visited the world's largest protection agency.

One of the highlights of my trip was the personal visit to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, We were very fortunate to have met Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, for he is one of the most honored and busiest men in the House. Earlier that same day Mr. AUCHINCLOSS was in conference with the President. At this time I would like to personally thank Mr. AUCHINCLOSS for his time and trouble in trying to make our visit to Washington a more enjoyable one.

In the Capitol Building we saw the most beautiful artwork and architecture in the world. As we entered the great rotunda, I was overwhelmed by the grandeur of the dome and the walls. I am sure that we have the most beautiful Capitol Building in the world. Another room which fascinated me was the room used when John Adams was President. I call this the whisper room because even a whisper can be heard in any part of the room as clearly as a bell. Statuary Hall also impressed me with the beautiful statues of some of America's great men.

While we were in the Capitol Building we sat in on the Senate while they discussed 40-year mortgages. At first I didn't realize the importance of 40-year mortgages. Then, after thinking about it, I understood President Kennedy's way of thinking. Forty-year mortgages would enable men and women to purchase their own homes by spreading out the payments over 40 years. The President feels that if all Americans owned their own homes, communism wouldn't have a chance. It is hard to persuade a stockholder to sell his stock if it is gaining value by the day. In the same way, it is hard to persuade an American to "sell" his "stock" in America if it is gaining value by the day.

We also sat in on the House of Representatives. Here they discussed the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor to the position of the President's personal military adviser. This was quite a heated discussion. Many of the speakers thought that the President had too many advisers. Others thought that if he had several advisers who were capable, it would enable him to make decisions which would better the people of America and of the world.

In the FBI Building we saw all the devices used by the Bureau in tracking down and capturing criminals. In the lab we saw a woman gently scraping blood off a boot which would be examined later and used for evidence. In another room we saw how fingerprints were made and classified. This in itself is an extremely difficult and time-consuming job. What made it more interesting is that our guides were actual FBI agents who have had experience in handling dangerous cases similar to the ones they told about. These men know what they are doing and what they are looking for. With this in mind, I left with confidence in my law protection agency and in the men and women who make it what it is.

After visiting everything in the city we took a ride out to Arlington National Cemetery. There we saw the changing of the guard. I felt a pang of sadness in my heart, but I also felt proud. I though of the many, many men who died so we could continue to live in peace and freedom. At times I wonder if those men died in vain. Russia and communism are a threat to our security and peace. We have no peace and will not have peace until Russia and the United States can stop quarreling; until countries like Laos, Cuba, and Israel can settle their own disputes in a manner best fitting to them.

As we rode home I thought about Russia and her people. I wondered if they were happy. I came to the conclusion that they don't really know what happiness is. I feel that I am happy. Whatever the people of Russia may have, they don't have freedom—my most precious possession. To me freedom is to be able to speak, write, listen, pray, and visit as you choose. A visit to the Capital is proof of freedom in action.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Joan Low, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(Second prize)

After a long, fun- and song-filled bus trip from Rumson, N.J., we arrived in Washington, D.C. All 24 of us were in high spirits and eager to see the city.

Our first stop was the Capitol Building. We walked up the many steps and were met by our guide in a central part of the building. We were spectators in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. It was awe-inspiring to watch the men, whose thoughts and action help form the laws that affect the lives of several million people.

We met with Representative AUCHINCLOSS, a man for whom I have great respect. He was extremely nice to us, and I was impressed that he took time from his work and used it to speak to a group of students from his hometown.

The next point of interest was the wax museum where the likenesses of many of our famous heroes could be seen in true-to-life waxen figures. Their appearance is so real you almost want to walk up and talk to them. The Four Chaplains appealed the most to me. The rocking boat and the realistic figures were almost ghostly.

After a lunch break, we were off to the FBI headquarters. In touring the building we were told and shown the various methods and equipment used in tracking down some of the most notorious criminals. It gives you quite a feeling of admiration for the men who help to make this country a better place in which to live by apprehending dangerous men.

The Pan American Building was our next stop. This building is used for the meetings of the delegates of all the American countries, with the exception of Canada. The most impressive part was the tropical garden in a centralized court. Due to the tropical plants from South America and Central America you felt as if you were walking into a jungle when you entered.

Then we went to see the various monuments erected to the memory of our well-remembered heroes. The Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials are examples of classical Greek architecture. Contained in each of these buildings is a statue of the man to whom the structure was dedicated. When you stand before the Lincoln Memorial, you feel as if he is really alive and you can feel his greatness, which seems to come from his deep-set, compelling eyes.

The Washington Monument is the most magnificent shaft in existence. It stands as a tall spire piercing the sky and stands for the glory and power of George Washington whose height was reached when he became the first President of a young Nation.

Next we went to Mount Vernon, the magnificent home of George Washington. It is one of the best remaining examples of the gracious plantations of the Old South. In it I can see the smooth, comfortable life of a southern family in Virgina. I can also see the slaves—people who were bought and sold like pieces of furniture. Now, two hundred years later, we still have a problem. The Civil War freed the slaves but did little to really unite all of the people of our Nation. This segregation problem was the only disappointing portion of our trip.

This trip was the best I have ever taken, for I learned while greatly enjoying myself

in the company of my friends. I learned much about the city, things that you have to see yourself, not read or hear about.

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Sandra Blodgett, 10th grade, Rumson-Fair Haven Regional High School, Rumson, N.J., July 1961)

(Third prize)

Recently I was privileged to be one of 24 students who participated in a trip to and tours of Washington, D.C. The trip was made enjoyable by the enthusiasm of the students and the pleasurable accommodations which had been arranged for us. As well as having a great deal of fun, we were able to see our Nation's Capital in cross-section, and we were very much impressed by the city. Our group visited monuments and historic landmarks as well as agencies of the present Federal Government, so we were able to view a growth of the Government from the time of our forefathers to present day.

I feel that my trip was beneficial in several ways:

1. Seeing the workings of our Federal Government strengthened my faith in the democratic principles on which our Nation is based. As I toured the Capital, and viewed the different branches of Government in operation, my convictions as to the superiority of democracy over all opposing types of government were confirmed. An example of this was our visits to meetings of the Senate and House of Representatives. At these meetings we saw the actual debates of issues which are now affecting us all, either directly or indirectly. This impressed me a great deal.

2. The Capital stirred my national pride and partiotism by emphasizing the greatness and might of our country. My trips through the awe-inspiring buildings of Washington reaffirmed my feelings of dedication and responsibility to my native land, and I felt as if the future greatness of this Nation depended upon me as a young citizen of the democracy.

3. The trip gave me a greater knowledge of the Federal Government and its organization. As I saw agencies of our Government in action I was more clearly able to visualize the overall organization of our Federal system. The FBI tour, for example, gave me a greater understanding of this governmental agency.

4. By visiting monuments and historic landmarks, I began to appreciate more fully the background of our Nation as it was laid by our forefathers. The deeds of these great men added still further to the new-found national pride which such a trip helped me to obtain.

I am firmly convinced, as a result of my trip to Washington, that it would be of great value if every high-school student were able to visit the Capital. The pride and patriotism which such a visit inspires helps to insure our country of able leaders for the future and an active and dedicated youth for the present.

Communist Techniques To Protect the Government From Its People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in free societies police departments are organized to protect the people from any lawless element which may be loose in the community. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune reminds us that in Communist-dominated countries, police work consists mainly of protecting the government from its people.

A NEW WEAPON OF SUPPRESSION

Recent photographs from Berlin showed a group of anti-Communist demonstrators being sprayed from a machine that looks a little like an army tank, shoots water instead of bullets, and has a pillbox on top to protect the gunner—or maybe we should call him the pipe man, which is what the fire department calls the man assigned to hold the nozzle of a hose and aim the stream of water.

The Communists did not build this machine on the spur of the moment. It was designed and assembled to serve a purpose, and the marking on the truck in the picture—K51—suggests that there may be others like it.

The weapon doesn't seem to be designed for war, because it would be about as useless in battle as a child's water pistol and wouldn't last 5 minutes against modern artillery.

It isn't designed for legitimate police work, because a legitimate police department doesn't often have to use force to disperse mobs, and when it wants to spray them with water it can count on all the help it needs from the fire department. The need for a special armored water cannon has never occurred to American policemen, we are told. The Communist weapon can no doubt be adapted to shoot other liquids as well as water—burning kerosene, for instance, or possibly some kinds of acid.

The only plausible explanation for such an instrument is to combat mass uprisings such as the Communists have encountered in various places including East Germany and have good reason to expect there again.

This is police work in reverse. It is protecting the lawless minority from the people. Mr. Khrushchev may go on telling the world that the satellite countries are happy under his Red thumb and that the only troublemakers are a few imperialist agents. But an armored, mob-dispersing tank truck is an odd instrument to use against a few imperialist agents. His lies are drowned out by the roar of its water.

Neither Radical nor Reactionary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I recently mentioned to the Members of this body that I was disappointed in the number of my constituents who answered the questionnaire I sent out this year. I mailed about 104,500, but received back only 10 percent. This, of course, was my opinion. On the other hand, an editorial that appeared in the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald on July 30, 1961, said the number who answered the questionnaire "represents a high return for such surveys." Perhaps the Herald is correct.

Regardless of this point, the Herald aptly hit on the truth that the voters in my district are neither radical nor reactionary. They are people who have commonsense and who have a sense of public responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial which follows:

PUBLIC IS SMARTER THAN SOME PEOPLE IN WASHINGTON BELIEVE

The poll of constituents by Congressman JACK WESTLAND confirms some things we had suspected all along.

WESTLAND, who sends his questionnaires out annually, concedes that the questions are difficult to answer yes or no, but points out that this is the kind of choice Congressmen are faced with making on all national issues, the answers to many of which are anything but simple.

Anyway, back to those feelings we've had that the poll results, as reported in Wednesday's Herald, verify.

First, we think people are smarter than many politicians give them credit for. And more responsible, too. Most of the respondents felt that reduced Federal spending is the best way to handle the national debt. Failing that, more persons believed higher taxes are necessary to balance the budget. The smallest bloc consisted of those who thought increasing the Federal debt is okay. In this area, it would seem the administration is out of step with the public. The Federal debt has been rising with every new report and apparently President Kennedy's advisers are neither concerned about it nor see any need to apply the brakes.

On Federal aid to education, slightly more than half of the voters opposed Federal funds for school construction. And three-fourths said no to Federal support of teachers' salaries. Yet, because of the administration's insistence that help for federally impacted school districts—Blaine and Oak Harbor, for instance—be tied up in the overall bill pinned to Federal aid, there is danger that this needed support may be lost to those districts, in view of the lack of popular support for the overall Federal aid principle. Kitsap County districts, educating children of navy yard workers, figure to lose $400,000 on this political maneuver.

In other categories, Westland's constituents showed themselves to be well informed and politically moderate. The majority of the voters are neither radical nor reactionary, it seems to us. Rather they show a degree of commonsense that surpasses that of some of the people in Washington.

Of course, the 10,000 answers mailed to the Congressman may not duplicate in all respect the consensus in the Second Congressional District, though 10 percent does represent a high return for such surveys. The fact that they took the time and made the effort to answer the poll speaks well for their sense of public responsibility and thus they may be something of an "elite" group from that standpoint. It may be, to paraphrase an old Marine Corps expression, that this is the 10 percent that does get the word.

The Senate Accepts Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the August 16 issue of the Troy Record newspaper, Troy, N.Y., entitled "The Senate Accepts Uncle Sam."

As stated in the editorial, the Senate this week approved Troy's Uncle Sam Resolution. Through this action the recognition of Uncle Sam Wilson as the progenitor of America's national symbol is a step closer to reality. Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN and I have introduced concurrent resolutions in the House to accomplish this same objective and we hope that prompt and favorable action will be taken by the House during this session of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SENATE ACCEPTS UNCLE SAM

The hope that Troy's Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the Uncle Sam who is this country's national symbol, will receive official recognition is at its brightest. However, complacency should not be permitted to take over for the battle is not yet won.

Senate approval finally has come and by a margin which indicates that Troy's claim to the title is being generally accepted. But the House has yet to act. Sometime within the next 2 weeks when the House consideration is due, one of those unexpected pitfalls may develop which hinders progress.

This is the time publicly to support recognition for Uncle Sam's campaign. Sentiment, adequately expressed, can be important in swaying the decision of House members.

That Troy's Samuel Wilson has deserved this honor can hardly be contradicted. When the Senate debated the resolution, the sole objection came from Senator HART, of Michigan, and he failed to make known his reasons for opposing action.

Indiana, which has been the principal contender with Troy for the honor has virtually ceased to agitate. There has been tacit admission that the Samuel Wilson buried at Merriam, Ind., is not the man who led to the creation of a national symbol. There was a similarity of names but little else.

On the other hand, historical data substantiates every claim made concerning Samuel Wilson, born in Arlington, Mass., and a resident of Troy. Samuel Wilson was a patriot of the first order, he was a respected citizen and he was the meatpacker who marked his barrels of beef in the manner which led to the coining of the term "Uncle Sam."

Ever since the War of 1812, Troy has been accepted as the home of the original Uncle Sam. It was only when efforts were made to place this recognition on official basis that counterclaims arose.

As far as Trojans are concerned, this is the crucial period in the fight. The Senate has given its approval but the House still must act. There must be no let down in the effort to bring this campaign to successful fruition. The Samuel Wilson who made Troy his home unquestionably is the Uncle Sam who is part of history. Certainly the time is opportune to cease the quibbling and make it official.

News Accounts of Administration Policy in Dealing With Reds Are Disturbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following the President's address to the Nation in which he outlined the seriousness of the Berlin situation and alerted the country to possible Communist moves there, many were encouraged that he would take immediate and effective action should the Russians create new incidents. Now, from the news stories quoting administration spokesmen, we are disturbed to find that the bold action promised is merely another series of protests to which the Communists pay little heed. Mr. Speaker, apparently we have not yet convinced Khrushchev that we will really fight to protect the freedom of the people of Berlin, that we are prepared to got to war to halt any further Communist aggression anywhere in the world, and that we will use every weapon at our command to win any war they start. Such a statement of determined policy is the best guarantee we have that war will be prevented. The greatest danger that we will become involved in war is that Khrushchev, mistaking our hesitancy to act as a sign of weakness, will make the inevitable mistake that will lead to a hot war.

So that we may have at hand a ready reference of how the administration is handling the critical situation created by the Communists in Berlin, I include the following articles from the New York Times of August 15, 1961.

WEST PROTESTS TO SOVIET ON BERLIN BORDER CLOSING; UNITED STATES SEES PROPAGANDA GAIN—ALLIES ADAMANT—EAST GERMANS WARN OF NEW BLOCKADE IF TRADE IS STOPPED

(By Sydney Gruson)

BERLIN, August 15.—The United States, Britain, and France formally protested to the Soviet Union today against Communist East Germany's closing of the border between East and West Berlin.

The allied powers described the Communist action as "illegal" and the "most flagrant violation" of the four-power agreements on Berlin since the Soviet blockade of West Berlin in 1948.

The Communists had no immediate reaction to the protest, which they are expected to dismiss. However, a few hours after the protest note was delivered, the East German Government warned West Germany that another blockade of the overland route to West Berlin could result from any cancellation of the trade agreement between the two countries.

BATTLE OF WORDS RENEWS

This has been one of the countermeasures under consideration by Bonn in retaliation for the Communist's sealing off of East Berlin.

West German goods on which West Berlin's economic life is dependent would be barred from East German roads and railways if the agreement was canceled, the East German statement warned.

With the allies' protest and the East German declaration the situation here was returning to a battle of words.

None of the words, however, changed the fact that the intercity border had been effectively closed, that the flood of refugees from East Berlin and East Germany had been slowed to a trickle and that, to all intents and purposes, a state border had been created out of the intercity border.

BAN ON VEHICLES ENFORCED

The border itself was quiet and the Communists apparently felt confident it would remain so. They reduced their military strength at the border and took away about half of the 50 tanks they had stationed not far behind to deter resistance by the East Berliners to their harsh measures.

The latest of these measures, barring West Berlin vehicles from entering East Berlin without a special permit, was rigidly enforced.

The Brandenburg Gate, the main crossing point on the border where tension had been great for the last 2 days, remained closed. Barbed wire and concrete blocks were placed across the front of the huge monument during the night.

The Communists were allowing East Berliners to approach within 200 yards of the Brandenburg Gate today. This narrowed the no man's land for civilians created yesterday when trouble threatened to break out at the gate between West Berliners and Communist troops and policemen.

The West Berliners were still being kept about a half mile from the monument. In any case a heavy early morning downpour and intermittent showers during the day cut the crowds down, easing the task of the police on both sides. Taking no chances, however, the West Berlin Government put its entire police force of 13,000 men on a "maximum alert" around the clock.

CITY'S MOOD PESSIMISTIC

West Berlin's mood tonight, with Allied action confined so far to the protest, was one of pessimism and disappointment. The conviction was general that an important round had been lost to the Communists.

In East Berlin, only a few moments of conversation with Communist officials was sufficient to show how cocky they felt over the way the situation was developing.

"There are no more refugees to worry about, so why don't you agree now to our solution for West Berlin?" one of the officials said.

The leaders of the West Berlin trade union federation called on the allies not to confine themselves to formal protests but to undertake "economic sanctions."

A spokesman for the West Berlin Government said it could be assumed that the commandants' protest would not be the last word of the Allies.

REPRESSION IS CHARGED

The Allied protest said the East Germans' repressive measures had been taken because the people under their control, deeply perturbed by the threats on Berlin recently launched by Communist leaders, were fleeing in large numbers to the West.

In closing the border to the East Berliners and East Germans, the Allies said, East German military and paramilitary units had turned the Soviet sector of East Berlin into an armed camp.

The Allies noted that the agreement of June 20, 1949, formally ending the blockade had also been broken. In this agreement, they said, the Soviet Union pledged to facilitate movement within Berlin and between Berlin and the rest of Germany.

The protest took the form of a letter by the three Western commandants of Berlin—Maj. Gen. Alfred Watson 2d of the United States, Brig. Gen. Jean Lacomme of France, and Maj. Gen. Sir Rohan Delacombe of Britain. It was addressed to the Soviet commandant, Col. Andrei V. Solovyev, and delivered by hand to the Soviet Army's Berlin headquarters in the East Berlin district of Karlsborst.

ALLIED LINKS UNMENTIONED

The East German warning on trade said nothing specific about the Allies' communications with their garrisons in West Berlin.

However, when West Germany gave notice last year of its intention to cancel the trade agreement, the East Germans said the Allied communications to Berlin would be affected, as well as those of West Germany.

An annex of the trade agreement covers the payment by the West Germans for the use of the roads and railway lines from the West German border over East German territory to West Berlin—110 miles.

Last year's West German notice of cancellation, given then in retaliation for Communist restrictions on West German travel to East Germany and East Berlin, was eventually withdrawn and the agreement prolonged, although most of the restrictions remained.

ALLIES RUN TRAINS

The Allies operate 48 military passenger trains each week between West Berlin and West Germany and a number of freight trains to supply the garrisons. These are in addition to their traffic on the autobahn between Helmstedt on the West German frontier and West Berlin.

The trains are pulled by East German locomotives between the East German border and West Berlin and the annex sets out the payments for these services. West Germany has paid the costs of the Allied trains.

"Any attempts to talk to the German Democratic Republic from a position of strength and to exert economic pressure on it are doomed to failure," the Communist statement said. It was issued in the name of the Council of Ministers.

Cancellation of the trade agreement would automatically cancel the annex, the statement said, and would be a blow against West Berlin.

The statement said that West German leaders should learn that the German Democratic Republic is a sovereign state and that the use of its communications will only be tolerated on a contractural basis.

"This means," it added, "in complete agreement with the usual norms of international law."

The first reaction to the Communist warning came from the Free Democrats, one of West Germany's opposition parties. The Free Democrats conceded that the trade agreement and Berlin's communications were linked and said the Communists should not be given a pretext for blocking access.

The West Berlin city government, in a letter to the three Western commandants, proposed the establishment of a joint commission to examine possible countermeasures that could be taken here.

Possible steps included action to prevent 13,000 West Berliners from working in East Berlin and the assumption of responsibility for the elevated railway on West Berlin territory. This is now operated by the East Germans and, along with the subway, was cut by the border-closing decrees.

No one seemed sure, however, that something else would or even could be done. The travel documents East German officials need to go to the West were still being issued today. They were stopped last year as part of the counteraction against the restrictions imposed then on West German travel to East Germany.

The Communist border police were checking all West Berlin cars trying to enter the eastern sector today. The Communists set up two offices in East Berlin where West Berliners could apply for the special permits now needed to take their cars to the eastern sector.

The permits were not being granted easily. The car of Cardinal Julius Doepfner, former Bishop of Berlin and now Archbishop of Munich, was one of those refused permission to cross. The Cardinal, who still administers the Berlin diocese, crossed on foot.

At some of the border crossing points the identity of pedestrians from West Berlin was checked against lists by the Communist policemen. They apparently were looking for persons who had fled from East Berlin or East Germany.

The only potentially serious incident of the day occurred at the Friedrichstrasse crossing point, the main one, now that the Brandenburg Gate has been closed.

A crowd of West Berliners massed near the border there whistling and hooting at every East Berlin car returning to the Communist sector. The crowd, mainly of young people, threw some stones and once surged forward to get an East Berlin car. They rocked it until West Berlin policemen intervened and dispersed them.

REFUGEES SWIM CANALS

The exact figures on refugees filtering through the tight network was no longer being given. The few who were still getting over were mainly escaping by swimming canals and late today the Communists began building a six-foot wooden barrier along the canals.

One couple escaping over a canal drew revolver fire when spotted by the police, but got across safely.

There were two unexpected refugees during the day. One of the armed factory workers, the supposedly hard-core Communists who have been on guard duty since Saturday night, came across in his battle dress.

A policeman still carrying his submachine-gun also fled. He complained to the West Berlin police that he had been on duty 26 hours and had had only two plates of soup for meals all that time.

REDS HELD LOSING—WASHINGTON TO STRESS EAST GERMAN MOVE CONFESSES FAILURE

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—The Kennedy administration set out today to portray East Germany's closing of the border between East and West Berlin as a dramatic confession of Communist failure.

The highest officials here indicated that this would be the extent, for the time being, of the Allied response to Communist moves in Berlin. As long as Western rights of access to the divided city are respected, the officials said, protest and vigorous propaganda will be their primary form of retaliation.

At the same time, the administration continued to call attention to its plans for a steady military buildup. In what are likely to be daily progress reports on the partial mobilization, the administration hopes to convince the Soviet Union that it will be at peak strength for either conventional or nuclear warfare by the end of the year.

AIR FORCE TO KEEP MEN ON

The Air Force announced a program to keep 28,000 men on active duty past their normal terms. It will call for volunteers but will freeze other men in the Air Force for periods of up to 1 year under the authorization to increase its strength by as many as 65,000 men. The Air Force's present strength is about 822,000.

Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army, has scheduled a news conference for tomorrow afternoon. One report was that he would alert 111 Army Reserve units for possible call to active duty later this year. Pentagon officials have emphasized that they are trying to give all reservists the longest possible period to prepare for active duty.

Retaliation by economic sanctions against the Soviet bloc continued to be discussed among the allies. But Washington, at least, appeared convinced that an effective embargo would be extremely difficult to arrange and must in any case be held in reserve for future showdowns.

Despite pressures, especially from West Germany, for a harsher response to the closing of the Berlin border, the administration has decided to make a worldwide show of reasonableness while trying to make Moscow pay a heavy propaganda price for its action.

West Germany's Ambassador in Washington, Dr. Wilhelm Grewe, said a protest note on Berlin would probably be sent to Moscow "in the very near future." More than "theoretical" measures would be taken by the West against the new East Berlin refugee barriers, he predicted, but he did not elaborate.

One protest note was sent today by the United States, British, and French commandants in West Berlin to the Soviet commandant.

Dr. Grewe made his comments after a 2½-hour meeting of Big Four representatives at the State Department. He said the group had yet to finish its discussions of the Berlin situation and would resume talks tomorrow.

On hand for today's meeting were Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; Viscount Hood, Minister of the British Embassy, and Claude Lebel, Minister Counsellor of the French Embassy.

One of the leading members of the administration said the Communists had handed the West a ready-made and first-class story to tell.

The confession that East Germany could not hold its people against the attraction of a free West Berlin and West Germany, he contended, put the West in an excellent position to persuade the world of the need to preserve the status quo in the Western part of the city.

If this argument, buttressed by telling photographs of East Germans behind barbed wire, is effectively made, the official said, it may lead to pressures on Moscow for a peaceful settlement of the whole Berlin problem.

BOLDER APPROACH SEEN

There were indications here also that the administration would now be more bold in pressing its demands for an overall German settlement based on the self-determination of the German people.

At some point in the developing diplomatic struggle, it now appears likely, the West will take this demand and the entire Berlin problem to the United Nations.

Other high officials in Washington were making essentially the same point today. Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles gave a part of the argument in an address at the National Press Club.

"Here in the very heart of Europe, we have had the competition for which Khrushchev has been pleading, and the results are clear: communism has failed," he said.

Mr. Bowles declared that after the "pathetic failure" Premier Khrushchev had shown himself to be a "poor loser."

"Indeed," the Under Secretary added, "he is now asking us to bail him out of his failure by agreeing to abandon the free people of West Berlin to the same system which has brought such misery to the people of East Germany."

The plan to tax Moscow with the counter-demand for the self-determination of Germans has been discussed here for several weeks. The administration has shown some concern, however, that such a propaganda effort, aimed primarily at the independence-minded peoples of the uncommitted nations, might at the same time encourage a popular uprising in East Germany.

Such an uprising, it was feared, might have drawn West Germany and the United States into open conflict with the Soviet army. Now that Moscow can demonstrate an apparent ability to suppress the East German populace, however, the self-determination argument is to be pressed.

ENVOYS TO PRESS CASE

As a part of the propaganda effort, U.S. Ambassadors throughout the world have been instructed to call personally upon the heads of government to whom they are accredited to advise them of every Western action in the Berlin crisis and to answer their questions.

The U.S. Information Agency also has been alerted to prepare calm but dramatic presentations of the closing of the East German frontier, the reasons for it and the attendant violations of Four-Power agreements on Germany.

Most important, it is planned that the highest Government officials will refer to the situation in all public appearances so as to fuse policy and propaganda efforts.

In the continuing planning for the still expected East-West negotiations over Berlin, almost no thought is being given here to any kind of recognition of the East German regime, sources indicate. The Berlin demonstration of the instability of East German Communist rule, Washington believes, confirms the wisdom of this decision.

But the West will again, as in past negotiations over Berlin, show a willingness to be flexible on the question of who controls the check points along the access routes to West Berlin.

In other words, the West might consider allowing the Soviet Union to appoint East Germans as agents in supervising traffic as long as Western rights to station troops in Berlin and to supply them remained.

The general confidence of the administration and its sense of propaganda victory last week end was tempered, however, by a continuing fear of miscalculation by the Soviet leadership.

There is still concern also about the ability of the Western alliance to withstand the Soviet pressure and about the position later this year of the Leftist-leaning neutral nations.

George F. Kennan, the U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, conferred with President Kennedy this afternoon on this point and especially on plans to influence the meeting of twenty to thirty neutral heads of state in Belgrade starting September 1.

President Kennedy has been informed of all elements of the continuing consultations among the Western Allies. He scheduled a breakfast conference with Secretary of State Dean Rusk tomorrow, presumably for another review of the German issue.

Cuban Outrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Monday, July 31, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

CUBAN OUTRAGE

The latest outrage of Castro's Cuba, involving the kidnaping of Americans and the theft of a U.S. airliner, should be the straws to break the camel's back. If they do not, the world must conclude that once-mighty Uncle Sam is merely a strawman. Fidel Castro has mocked and humiliated everything we stand for. In the midst of our bold show of strength in Berlin, he makes of us an international laughing stock.

The list of Castro's outrages against the United States is too well known to enumerate. In addition, he has slaughtered thousands and enslaved the remainder of his own people.

The role of the United States in this is beyond belief. First we encouraged him and virtually installed him in power; then we gave him the benefit of every doubt in his Russian-style bloodbath; then we looked the other way when he looted over a billion dollars of American private property; then we helped him in his disgraceful attempt to extort ransom from us in the form of tractors for human beings.

The only time we showed any backbone was the halfhearted encouragement of the Cuban rebels into the Bay of Pigs invasion. But we chickened out just short of the air and sea support that would have made the invasion a success.

Now comes the final blow, and all we do is talk. The Eastern Electra incident is not even an act of piracy, for it occurred over American territory; it is a flagrant act of war. But our timidity knows no bounds. Our own Secretary of State excused giving Castro over a week to reply to our complaint on the incredible grounds that Castro might be too busy with his hate-America celebration of his Communist revolution. Now, believe it or not, the State Department has invited another slap in the face from the bearded bully by suggesting we might help him use the American courts to recover some Cuban aircraft impounded in this country for nonpayment of his debts.

A number of U.S. Senators, including Ohio's STEPHEN YOUNG, have demanded that we stop kidding around with this kill-crazy gangster and simply take back the stolen plane by whatever force is necessary. The American public is cheering such a move now.

President Kennedy has rallied the Nation in support of his firm stand in Berlin. He would have the same overwhelming support if he decided today to draw freedom's sword and drive this brutal, dangerous tyrant from the Western Hemisphere.

Mayors Do Not Want Federal Interference in Local Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to many people that Federal grants and loans to local governments are regarded more as a curse than as dollars from heaven. The fact is that as Federal assistance to local governments increases local autonomy decreases.

The mayors of the cities of Arcadia, Pomona, San Marino, and Whittier, which are located in my district, have sent me telegrams apprising me of their deep concern over the growing number of Federal advances into local affairs. Under unanimous consent, I include the telegrams in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Telegram from the Honorable Jess Balser, mayor, Arcadia, Calif.: "The city of Arcadia has expressed itself on numerous occasions as being opposed to municipalities receiving Federal grants-in-aid. We feel that our American communities are capable of carrying out their responsibilities without such programs. You are respectfully requested to present these views to the Congressional Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations."

Telegram from the Honorable James S. Baker, mayor, Pomona, Calif.: "Pomona believes periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments as proposed under H.R. 7802 to be desirable legislative control. However, we are concerned with growing number of Federal advances into local functions. Local governments should be expected and required to provide all necessary services. Believe vast majority of cities desire this. Only in cases where National interest clearly requires Federal action should U.S. Government become involved."

Telegram from the Honorable Harry W. Hitchcock, mayor, San Marino, Calif.: "I am generally opposed to grants-in-aid for purely local purposes. It is wasteful and extravagant. Local needs should be determined, controlled, and whenever possible financed locally. Communities will then determine what they require and can afford to spend. Activities financed by grants are thought by many to cost nothing, to be paid by others which is often true, or that the tax for such grants will be assessed regardless and every community should obtain as much as possible whether urgently needed or not."

Telegram from the Honorable Roy C. Morris, mayor, Whittier, Calif.: "Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee could serve the States and cities well in things like Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority on rapid transit problems or States on power and water financing this would benefit the small towns. Also, I think most of the small towns in this section are in good shape financially with their sales tax income."

Patuxent, Md., Test Center Mess Declared Navy's Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Sunday Sun of August 13, 1961, reporting the selection of the enlisted men's mess at the Naval Test Center in Patuxent River, Md., as the Navy's best.

We in the Fifth Maryland Congressional District are proud of the many defense establishments located in our area. We are glad to have defense personnel as our friends and neighbors. And when an unusual, but well deserved, accolade comes to one of these installations, we feel justified in sharing the feeling of pride which results.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, as the Representative in Congress in the district in which the Naval Test Center is located, and as an American, I want to extend my congratulations to the officers and men who operate the Patuxent River enlisted men's mess on being judged the best Navy mess in the world.

PATUXENT MESS RATED NAVY'S BEST—CLEANLINESS AND GOOD FOOD ACCLAIMED BY TEAM OF EXPERT INSPECTORS

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr., Sun staff correspondent)

PATUXENT RIVER, MD., August 12.—It is a fairly ordinary looking messhall. A little cleaner than most, perhaps; and there are curtains and artificial flowers at the windows.

Yet a visitor would observe nothing exceptional about this enlisted men's feeding place at the Naval Test Center here.

The Patuxent general mess, however, has one very noteworthy attribute: It is the best Navy mess in the world.

JUDGMENT OF INSPECTORS

The accolade is not an off-the-cuff commendation from a man who happened to get a good steak here but the considered judgment of a team of expert inspectors working under the auspices of the Secretary of the Navy.

Each year the Navy holds a worldwide contest to select the best mess. The judges are an officer of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, a medical officer, a line officer, and a civilian representative of the Food Service Executives Association, a business organization of hotelmen and caterers.

At 4 p.m., July 5, the Secretary of the Navy's office notified the Patuxent mess that in the opinion of these judges it was No. 1 in the world. The mess people here broke out the beer.

HAPPIER THAN EVER

"I have been in food service for 18 years, and I was happier then than I have ever been," said WO Gerald Barlow, assistant commissary officer. "The feeling was something you can't bring out in words."

What is so good about the Patuxent mess? Begin with a glance at one week's menu.

On Wednesday, for example, the Patuxent sailors could put on their mess trays: Roast beef and/or pork chops, parsley potatoes, beans, cauliflower au gratin, any one of seven salads from a special salad bar, devil's food cake, ice cream, rolls, several kinds of bread, milk and, as always in the Navy, plenty of strong coffee.

FRIED CHICKEN ON TUESDAY

Persons not fond of roast beef or pork chops might have enjoyed Tuesday's dinner which included fried chicken and baked ham. On Friday there was a choice of oyster stew, scallops, spiced shrimp and beef fricassee.

But a menu is only printed words on a piece of paper. How does the food taste?

This visitor, paying an unexpected call, found the food comparable to any good restaurant in Baltimore. Food on a tin tray will never look as appetizing as the same thing on expensive china under soft lights, but taste buds make these distinctions.

The man with the overall responsibility for Patuxent's mess is Lt. (jg.) James C. Owens, commissary officer. His job, briefly, is to make sure that three times a day the food is cooked, then served hot, on time and inexpensively.

"Saving Uncle Sam money is a definite factor in this program," Lieutenant Owens said. The Navy allows him $1.11 per man, per day. At the main meal (noon dinner in the Navy), Lieutenant Owens and his aides serve 3,000 sailors.

Like any successful restaurant man, the lieutenant aims to please.

Meats and vegetables at Patuxent are never cooked in great bulk; no more than 25 servings are brought out to the steamtables at any one time. Steaks are cooked on a grill as the chowline moves along, thus giving every man an opportunity to select a steak to order.

Ice cream is always available, but it is not served on the chowline.

"We put it in freezers around the messhall," Lieutenant Owens said. "We found that sailors sometimes left the ice cream because it melted on their trays before they got to it."

CRITICISM INVITED

Customer criticism is invited. Questionnaires are regularly handed out to the sailors by the messhall staff. Sample questions: "Is the menu variety satisfactory? "Does the cleanliness of the messhall meet with your approval?"

Cleanliness, a Navy tradition, was one of the major items in the messhall contest.

Lieutenant Owens and Mr. Barlow said the judges' inspection was so thorough that they even checked such things as the handles of spatulas for cracks that might harbor bacteria.

QUIZZED ON TEMPERATURES

One judge singled out a messman of minor rank, made him keep his eye directed toward the floor and ordered him to repeat from memory the temperatures at which food trays were to be washed and rinsed.

The lowly messman answered correctly, and played an unexpected part in Patuxent's triumph.

Sailors who had nothing to do with the mess were stopped on the streets of the base by the judges and asked their opinion of the food here. Opinions were duly noted.

The efficient operation of a mess was another big factor in the contest. Patuxent's efficiency even extends to the garbage, which is actually a source of income to the mess—it is sold to farmers for their livestock.

Flies, a perennial problem for many food dispensers, have been defeated at Patuxent. Large fans are placed in front of the screen doors of the messhall. The blast is so strong, from the point of view of the fly, that the insects simply cannot get in when a door opens and a human passes through.

All these things counted in Patuxent's selection as the best. Lieutenant Owens was asked what, in his opinion, really brought Patuxent the honor.

"I think it was the interest of mess personnel, which the judges must have seen," he replied. "They were anxious to please and eager to win."

South Bend Tribune Endorses Long-Range Planning Authority in Foreign-Aid Bill—President of Studebaker-Packard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in a State which is often regarded as isolationist, Indiana.

One of the most important newspapers in my State, the South Bend Tribune, which is also the largest newspaper in my congressional district, is a Republican newspaper which in the four campaigns that I have conducted for Congress has not once failed to endorse my Republican opponent.

The editor and publisher of the South Bend Tribune is one of the most distinguished citizens of Indiana, Mr. Franklin D. Schurz, who is not only very active in the civic affairs of our community but is also this year a member of the board of directors of the Associated Press. Mr. Schurz has also served as a delegate to both the Republican National Convention and the Republican State Convention of Indiana.

For these reasons, I believe that particular significance should be paid to the fact that this week, on August 15, 1961, the South Bend Tribune went on record as strongly endorsing the request of President Kennedy for long-term borrowing authority under the new foreign aid program.

Although I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that a number of editorials have been read this afternoon during the debate, I am nonetheless taking the liberty of reading into the RECORD, the South Bend Tribune editorial to which I have referred because I believe it of such significance. The fact that an Indiana Republican newspaper should support the President's earnest request for such authority is not only a tribute to the sense of national interest of the newspaper, but is, I believe, an indication that responsible leadership in the Midwest is deeply aware of our international responsibilities in the struggle against communism and is concerned to see us meet those responsibilities in an intelligent and businesslike way.

The editorial follows:

LONG-RANGE PLANNING BOOST

The defeat in the Senate of the foreign aid bill amendment that would have required the administration to go to Congress annually for appropriations to finance its $8.8 billion economic development loan fund was a clear cut victory for the Kennedy forces.

The greatest significance of the 56–39 vote against the amendment, though, lies in the fact that it is indicative of a change in thinking in Congress on the whole spectrum of foreign aid. For it reflects growing support for long-range planning as a basic element to the success of foreign aid as opposed to year-to-year arrangements which have obvious drawbacks.

In considering the matter, which has caused such a furor in Congress, it is essential to keep two important facts in mind.

Foreign aid is a fact of life so far as the United States and its people as individuals and taxpayers are concerned. It is going to be around for a long time.

Long-range economic development plans for the backward countries that we are trying to help cannot be managed efficiently on a year-to-year hand-to-mouth basis.

It is also well to remember that the so-called back-door authority sought by the administration in this case does not apply to all of the foreign aid program but only to the development loans repayable in dollars on a long-term basis.

It has been noted that the request does ask for a certain trust in the executive branch of the Government. It does. But Congress still can keep an eagle eye on what is going on and it should. It should hold administrators and the administration responsible by keeping close tabs on what is going on.

But the risks involved in what has been described at various times as stop-and-go planning in the handling of the foreign aid program also are apparent and the advantages in long-range planning outweigh the risks taken in long-term commitment.

It is time to introduce long-range planning to many phases of our foreign relief program. Applying it to the development loan fund is a good place to start.

TELEGRAM FROM SHERWOOD EGBERT

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to read into the RECORD a brief telegram I have received from another distinguished citizen of my district and State, Mr. Sherwood H. Egbert, president of the Studebaker-Packard Corp., in South Bend, endorsing the President's foreign aid program.

The telegram follows:

SOUTH BEND, IND.

The Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

As member of the Citizens Committee for International Development, I heartily endorse the sound position taken by you and your House colleagues who support the President's foreign assistance program. Every American taxpayer who recognizes the vital importance of strengthening the economies and defense of the underdeveloped nations will applaud your effort to assure that the aid program is conducted with maximum efficiency and effort.

SHERWOOD H. EGBERT.

Our Oversea Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and deserving editorial from the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes for August 17, 1961:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

To the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the eve of your 62d national encampment, which starts in Miami Beach on Sunday, we wish for you a most successful and constructive meeting.

We know that your organization and your ladies auxiliary will convene for your annual encampment in a spirit of service to the Nation, the security of which is threatened from without. We know, too, that by your actions you will demonstrate that your membership commands the respect of the entire Nation.

In the past you have taken a determined stand against the threat of communism and have been especially vigilant in alerting the Nation as to the dangers of this menace.

The U.S. Supreme Court in recent months has upheld two of the major objectives of your organization with respect to the Communist Party. The Court declared that Communist-front organizations must register with the Attorney General and another decision makes it a crime to be a member of a party advocating the violent overthrow of this Government. We know that this action on the part of the Supreme Court brings a keen sense of satisfaction as a reward for your patriotic efforts.

In Detroit last year your delegates sounded the call for a stepup in the defense posture of this Nation. Once again your efforts are bearing fruit as the Chief Executive takes decisive steps to bolster the might of our Armed Forces. Undoubtedly proposals will be set forth at your Miami Beach meeting which will recommend to the President and the Congress legislation which will help safeguard the security of this Nation.

Your organization has been a leader in pressing for liberalized legislation for the aging veterans of World War I. You have been forthright in your declaration that a separate and liberalized pension program is necessary to care for the needs of these veterans. For this courageous action we extend to your own sincere commendation.

Under the leadership of your present commander in chief, Ted C. Connell, you have gained stature and prestige in the eyes of the Nation.

The members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognize that duty is the first call of the Nation. They have answered that call once to meet the threat of America's enemies and now stand ready to again participate in the long, hard struggle to keep this Nation free.

We hope that you will enjoy the fun and horseplay that goes with every veteran convention, and we are confident that your actions will contribute materially to the future of our great country.

We wish you well.

Social Welfare Racket Has Become Vote-Getting Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, attempts to have the new welfare plan of the city of Newburgh, N.Y., declared illegal from the standpoint of State and Federal law make one thing clear: Social welfare has become a vote-getting device. George Todt discusses the Newburgh story in his column which appeared in the August 4, 1961, edition of the Los Angeles Herald Express. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BLOCKING WELFARE CHEATS

"To get into the best society nowadays, one has either to feed people, amuse people, or shock people."—Wilde, "A Woman of No Importance."

(By George Todt)

One of the most glaring deficiences of the social welfare state concept is that it makes so many crooks and chiselers out of people who otherwise might have amounted to something worthwhile.

What took place at Newburgh, N.Y., recently illustrates the point.

The city manager, the city council, and the vast majority of Newburgh citizens decided to have an end to the flagrant abuses of their welfare system. Accordingly they adopted a 13-point plan designed to cut down on fraudulent mooching and cheating by phonies.

What was the Newburgh plan? Why did it arouse so much consternation by the social welfare adepts? Why was it declared illegal by State and Federal law?

Judge this matter for yourselves. Here is the program:

"To Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

"From Citizens for Solvent Government.

WOULD YOU SAY

"We, the undersigned, do herewith execute the within petition in order to demonstrate our support for the underlying principles behind the action of the city manager and the Common Council of the City of Newburgh, Orange County, N.Y., in their adoption of a revised welfare plan. Following are 13 points of welfare relief changes to become effective in the city of Newburgh, N.Y., July 1, 1961.

"1. All cash payments which can be converted to food, clothing and rent vouchers and the like without basic harm to the intent of the aid shall be issued in voucher form henceforth.

"2. All able-bodied adult males on relief of any kind who are capable of working are to be assigned to the Chief of Building Maintenance for work assignment on a 40-hour week.

"3. All recipients physically capable of and available for private employment who are offered a job but refuse it, regardless of the type of employment involved, are to be denied relief.

"4. All mothers of illegitimate children are to be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief.

"THIS HERE PLAN

"5. All applicants for relief who have left a job voluntarily, i.e. who have not been fired or laid off, shall be denied relief.

"6. The allotment for any one family unit shall not exceed the take-home pay of the lowest paid city employee with a family of comparable size.

"7. No relief shall be granted to any family whose income is in excess of the latter figure.

"8. All applicants for relief who are new to the city must show evidence that their plans in coming to the city involved a concrete offer of employment similar to that required of foreign immigrants. All such persons shall be limited to 2 weeks of relief. Those who cannot show evidence shall be limited to 1 week of relief.

"9. Aid to persons except the aged, blind, and disabled, shall be limited to 3 months in any one year—this is a feature similar to the present policies in unemployment benefits.

"10. All recipients who are not disabled, or otherwise incapacitated, shall report to the Department of Public Welfare monthly for a conference regarding the status of their case.

"BLOCKED THE WAY

"11. Once the budget for the fiscal year is approved by the council, it shall not be exceeded by the welfare department unless approved by council by supplemental appropriation.

"12. There shall be a monthly expenditure limit on all categories of welfare aid. This monthly expenditure limit shall be established by the department of public welfare at the time of presenting the budget, and shall take into account seasonal variations.

FOR ANY MAN?

"13. Prior to certifying or continuing any more aid to dependent childern cases, a determination shall be made as to the home environment. If the home environment is not satisfactory, the children in that home shall be placed in foster care in lieu of welfare aid to the family adults."

Anything unreasonable here—except to bums, cheats and deadbeats?

Guess again. At a hearing before a special investigating committee of the New York State Welfare Board in July, the investigators refused even to listen to Newburgh City Manager Mitchell's reasons for instituting reform.

Frankly, the social welfare racket is largely a racket to get votes.

Let's curtail its abuses before it strangles our free enterprise system.

Let's Maintain Our Military Strength as We Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while world disarmament is an attractive ideal, the United States can make no move to weaken, in any way, our military

strength. We should, therefore, consider very carefully any new proposal that would create the impression that the United States will buy peace at any price. In this connection I call your attention to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: LAST THINGS FIRST

As the Communists throw a ring of steel around East Berlin, the last thing on the minds of most Americans, we imagine, is reducing U.S. military strength. Indeed, the multi-billion-dollar buildup of U.S. arms inspired by the threat to Berlin is in full swing.

And yet, in the midst of crisis and war fears, the best minds of the administration are turned to pleading for a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. Recurring cold war crises, says Secretary of State Rusk, should not sink the United States into a slough of despond and "prevent us from addressing ourselves to the kind of world we hope to see." The country must be prepared for "new opportunities" that may arise from "the ebb of tension as a particular crisis passes."

No one can argue with a U.S. policy of seizing every opportunity that arises to ease tensions. But the proposed "department of peace" could not manufacture opportunity nor bring closer the distant goal of disarmament. At best, it is irrelevant; at worst, it could hamper U.S. ability to fulfill its hopes in the world.

For one thing, consider the responsibility the administration would lay upon well-intentioned but humanly limited men. Conceivably, the 250-man bureaucracy and its near-cabinet rank director might resign themselves to seeing their labors come to the same frustrating dead end as earlier planners. But, being human, they might be tempted to pursue their declared objective singlemindedly, spurred by pressures arising from the administration's commitment to a "new approach." Since new possibilities could be exploited only as past assumptions about the Soviets were reconsidered, the planners might find themselves bound to make the risky assumptions necessary to perfect their blueprint in order to justify themselves.

But the fundamental flaw in the administration's scheme is the assumption that past U.S. efforts to achieve disarmament have failed for lack of sufficient expertise. Implicit in the proposed gathering of experts is the idea that arms control is basically a technical problem.

This is manifestly untrue. While weapons technology and hence disarmament planning grow more complex, no U.S. plan has ever been rejected by the Soviets on the ground of technical inadequacy. A case in point is the elusive atomic test-ban treaty. Negotiations, now nearly 3 years old, have failed because the Soviets insist that any inspection system be politically determined; a mountain of scientific data is summarily swept aside by Moscow.

The truth is, the Communists are interested only in disarming their intended victims. The most brazen imperialists in history ask "total and complete" disarmament first, and talk of safeguards later. So long as the Communists and their ambitions remain unchanged, so long must freemen keep their heads clear.

We Americans especially must beware of the easy, habitual optimism that sometimes lures us into supposing our wishes will be fulfilled if we can just hit upon the right institutional device. Before we begin creating agencies rooted in our wishes about the world, the world must become quite a different place. And wishful thinking in the meantime only weakens our power to make it so.

Immediate Action Required To Save Small Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years past the House Small Business Committee has been making extensive investigations into and studies of trade practices which are prevalent in the dairy industry and which are slowly but surely strangling all of the small dairymen who compete, in any way, with the large nationwide processors and distributors of dairy products.

Overwhelming evidence has been accumulated showing the appalling effect of price discrimination in the destruction of free competition and the creation of monopolies in the dairy industry. Investigations have disclosed that many of the dairy giants are selling milk and other dairy products at prices below cost, with resultant elimination of the small business competitors, at the same time that they are selling the same products at a much higher price in other areas of the country, thereby subsidizing their below-cost sales. Many small dairies have been forced out of business by such practices within a month or two after their inception. In some areas where nationwide distributors have gained monopoly control of prices, the public is paying more than it did for milk products before competition was eliminated.

One of my constituents, who is operating a small dairy in my district, has complained to the Small Business Committee with respect to these unfair trade practices. With leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, the following letter addressed by my constituent to the Small Business Committee and referred to me because of my known great interest in the welfare of all the small businessmen whom I represent:

EDWARDSVILLE CREAMERY CO.,
Edwardsville, Ill., July 31, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: The National Independent Dairies Association executive vice president, D. C. Daniel, has requested that the following information be furnished to you:

1. In our immediate sales area the following independent dairies are no longer in business:

(a) Community Dairy, Alton, Ill., sold out about 5 years ago to Prairie Farms Creamery, Carlinville, Ill., a farmer-owned cooperative.

(b) Walnut Grove Dairy, Alton, Ill., sold out in 1960 to Prairie Farms Creamery, Carlinville, Ill.

(c) Granite City Dairy, Granite City, Ill., sold out to Massey Dairy, Inc., Granite City, Ill., about 1959.

(d) Massey Dairy, Inc., Granite City, Ill., quit business in 1961.

Six years ago there were 10 operating dairies in this area. Now there are only 6.

2. I don't know the number of independent dairies presently in business in Illinois but in my judgment at least 35 percent of those in business 10 years ago have been forced out of business.

3. The unfair trade practices which have been chiefly responsible for the liquidation of these businesses are predatory pricing arrangements at lower prices in Illinois than they have in Missouri by St. Louis based dairies.

4. Our own business has been hurt through loss of profits by these predatory pricing practices. Our sales volume has not been reduced in number of units sold but our dollar sales amount is lower than it should be because in many cases we have had to reduce our prices to meet those of our out-of-State competitors.

At the present time the major St. Louis dairies sell one-half gallons of milk in St. Louis for 37 cents delivered to detail stores while just across the Mississippi River in East St. Louis and Belleville, Ill., these same dairies have set a price of 32¾ cents for the same product which they have continuously maintained. This amounts to 11½ percent below their St. Louis price.

5. We hope to continue in business with the help of our nonfluid-milk operations I don't believe that a dairy business could continue to operate in this area with only the processing of fluid milk products.

It is my sincere hope that your committee can help all independent business. We do not ask for special privileges but we do ask for elimination of unfair trade practices by the large dairy companies and by the small ones, too.

Yours very truly,

CLYDE W. FRUIT.

James A. Sheehan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the "Editor's Corner" of the National Tribune the Stars and Stripes on August 17, 1961:

JAMES A. SHEEHAN

James A. Sheehan, 68, died at Mount Alto Hospital in Washington, D.C., on August 9.

Jimmie, as he was known to his host of friends and well-wishers, retired as editor of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes in May of 1960.

He first came to the Tribune as a service officer in 1934 and brought with him an extensive knowledge of veterans laws and regulations gained through years of work with the American Legion and later as national claims director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

From the post of a claims officer with this newspaper he was later named as associate editor and served in this capacity until he was advanced to acting editor after the sudden death of Editor Edward K. Inman in 1956. A year later he was appointed editor of the National Tribune and remained at that post until his retirement due to failing eyesight.

For his fellow veterans, Editor Sheehan had a sincere understanding of their many problems. He devoted countless hours to alleviating some of the trials and tribulations of those less fortunate than himself.

As editorial writer for the Tribune, Sheehan received a number of commendations from patriotic organizations and veteran groups and his forthright style and clarity of expression was highly appreciated by Tribune readers.

Born in St. Louis, Mo., Sheehan moved to New York City at an early age, after which he came to Washington to fill a Government post. Enlisting in the Army in 1917, Sheehan was sent overseas almost immediately. As an accomplished stenographer, he soon gravitated to the headquarters of the First Army when he became confidential secretary to Maj. Gen. Hugh Drum. Here, Jimmie saw at firsthand all of the important Allied military figures of the First World War. After the Armistice, Sheehan worked for a few years as a reporter for the Chicago Tribune in Paris and later became secretary to the American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

Returning to the United States, Jimmie worked as a claims officer for the American Legion under the direction of the late Watson B. Miller. Later, he transferred to the VFW as head of their claims department and in 1934, began his long period of service with the National Tribune.

His untimely departure brings sorrow and regret from his thousands of friends throughout the Nation. We join with them in mourning the loss of a trusted and valued friend and colleague.

Sheehan leaves a widow, Gertrude, of Washington, D.C.

One of the Results of Foreign Aid Not Included in the Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we authorize additional billions for foreign aid or vote to increase the power of the President to give away money, let us pause and review some of the probable results of our generosity as outlined in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

ETERNAL TRIANGLE

For many years now, Uncle Sam has conducted his courtship of friendly and semi-friendly nations by reaching for his wallet whenever it appeared the country being wooed might be falling for the line of his rival. If this technique has not won him the impassioned affection of the recipients, it has at least—or so it is argued—kept most of the recipients from giving themselves to communism.

But because Washington is spending so much to keep so many countries happy, it runs the risk of jealousy popping up between states that are perfectly willing to accept American gifts but which get unhappy when each suspects the other of gaining special favor. For example, consider the mutual ire of India and Pakistan.

These countries, while living closer to each other than either prefers, have had a historic disagreement over the divided State of Kashmir, with each believing the other was about to make off with the whole. Pakistan's President recently visited the United States where he told us we must give his country more aid if the worst was to be avoided. America has already been sending Pakistan, among other things, squadrons of supersonic jet fighters.

India, however, which has also been getting U.S. aid, fears Pakistan may use the U.S.-built planes to enforce its designs on Kashmir. Thus, there are indications that India wants to use a big part of its American aid, not for boosting its troubled economy, but for a fleet of jet planes to counter the air power of Pakistan.

This puts us in a position that any suitor would find a mite disturbing: Two sought-after companions in danger of using their patron's beneficence to throttle each other.

It's bad enough that Uncle Sam would be the loser no matter what the outcome of such a scrap. But it would be bitter indeed if his own generosity triggered the trouble.

ADA Cooperation With Marxists and Socialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt's column in the August 7, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express describes the close relationship between the objectives of Americans for Democratic Action and Marxist or Socialist collectivism. I think the Members of Congress should have an opportunity to read Mr. Todt's column. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CVETIC TELLS ADA TIES

("Once ideologically trained and dedicated to the Communist revolution, the members of the Red's professional units are directed to infiltrate Government posts, trade unions, political parties, agricultural organizations, church groups, and civic organizations of all types."—Matt Cvetic, "The Big Decision," p. 49.)

Who are the shadowy Americans for Democratic Action? What is their mission in the United States? Where did they get started and why do we have so little information about them?

For answer to my questions, I looked up Matt Cvetic—former ace counterspy for the Federal Bureau of Investigation—who spent 9 heart-rending years as an FBI agent posing as a top worker inside the Communist Party in the United States.

Following is what my friend, Matt, told me:

"For the past decade the ADA—Americans for Democratic Action—has been in the forefront demanding recognition of Red China and a seat for this murderous Communist government in the United Nations.

THEY SAY YES

"The ADA should not be confused with the Democratic Party. True, members of the ADA have infiltrated many key posts in the Democratic Party, but they have also succeeded in infiltrating key posts in the Republican Party as well. The ADA is far from being an American innovation. It is a group of goldbricking intellectuals whose attitude toward the average American is the belief that he is too stupid to govern himself.

"And for some substantial salaries, they are willing to sacrifice themselves to do this job for Mr. Ignorant American.

"The ADA is the political action arm of the Fabian Socialist movement in the United States. This socialistic movement had its beginning in England in the late 19th century. Now, through duplicity and treachery, they intend to gain complete political control of the United States in order to promote their crackpot socialistic schemes. Naturally the American taxpayer is paying for—and will continue to pay for—this Utopian hayride.

"For example, back in the days of the ill-fated Communist-promoted Progressive Party—headed by Henry Wallace—many of the present-day Fabian Socialists worked hand-in-glove with the Reds in this Marxian political venture.

BUT MEAN NO

"During this honeymoon period between the Reds and Fabians, I was a member of the political commission of the Communist Party. One of my Red party assignments in those days (1947–48) was to meet with these starry-eyed ADA daydreamers in secret Progressive Party meetings to plan strategy.

"Talks with the ADAers convinced me that somehow they had the silly idea that they were using the Reds to help further their Fabian socialistic program in America.

"The Red agents with whom I worked—and who were familiar with this gullible attitude of the Fabian Socialists—laughed loud and long at these intellectual snobs. The Reds had only one ultimate plan for them. That plan called for the complete annihilation of these Utopian scatterbrains—if their coalition was successful in taking over the Government.

IT'S OUR GUESS

"Whether the Fabian Socialists who are beating the drums for the Kremlin line on Red China are aware of it or not, the Kremlin's plan still stands for them as it has for the past 44 years. And that is to hang them or stand them before a firing squad.

"The second part of this Kremlin directive in getting non-Communists to work for Kremlin objectives was never read to the naive and gullible fools:

"Comrades, after we take over the government with this united front, our next task will be to liquidate (murder) the rest of the coalition—and take over the government ourselves.

"These words right from the mouths of the Communist leaders certainly should serve as a warning to all ADA'ers, liberals, progressives, do-gooders, and all others who think that—by working for Red objectives—they can save their own skins in case the Reds ever take over.

"Far from saving themselves with this role of fence sitting and dual loyalty—by aiding the Kremlin and the Communist plot to take over our Nation—they are insuring their own ultimate destruction at the hands of the treacherous Red gangsters."

THEY GOTTA GO

The man you heard from today is one of the most knowledgeable concerning the machinations of the Communist Party in the United States.

Matt Cvetic sacrificed even the love of his family and those nearest and dearest to him in order to go underground to get the necessary facts for the FBI.

He deserves the thanks of a grateful nation.

His recent appearance on Ralph Storey's popular "Storey Line" on Hollywood Radio Station KNX brought him an avalanche of mail.

I wish Matt had a regular program of his own to give us the benefit of what he learned about the comrades as a counterspy for the FBI.

A Propaganda Gain for the United States on Test-Ban Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "United States Scores Propaganda Gain by Insisting on Test-Ban Talk," written by William R. Frye and published in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SCORES PROPAGANDA GAIN BY INSISTING ON TEST-BAN TALK

(By William R. Frye)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—For once, the United States has Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev over a propaganda barrel—and not on something trivial, but on a major issue which stirs the emotions of hundreds of people.

That issue is nuclear-weapons testing. People in Asia and Africa who couldn't possibly care less what happens to Berlin or Laos care very much indeed whether their air, their rivers and their food crops are poisoned by radioactive fallout.

And Khrushchev today stands as the roadblock to a ban on atomic testing. That fact, long apparent to Americans, can now be brought home to the uncommitted world with the impact of a piledriver.

The first step toward exploitation of this rare opportunity was taken this past week when Washington and London put atomic testing on the provisional agenda of the September U.N. General Assembly.

Western diplomats here hope the United States and Britain will follow through with imagination and skill, and really rip the hide off the Kremlin this time.

A whole year of patient effort has been invested here in Geneva by an incredibly long-suffering team of American and British officials to bring about this opportunity. Khrushchev lost interest in a test ban as early as May 1960, but the West had to keep trying in order to prove it to the world.

The West wants a test-ban treaty; Khrushchev does not want one.

The West wants a minimum amount of control; Khrushchev wants self-inspection and a three-way veto over that.

The West has made a series of dramatic concessions this year; Khrushchev has moved backward, welching on agreements previously reached.

The West is willing to sign a treaty outlawing tests and only tests; Khrushchev wants to bury the test ban in a maze of negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

It adds up to a case of Soviet sabotage so clear that no one from Stockholm to Jakarta or from Tokyo to Accra could possibly miss it once it is pointed out and documented.

If Khrushchev takes the licking he deserves on the test ban, he will be taking it in considerable part on behalf of the Chinese. Presumably it is because the Chinese Reds want to test, and because he does not want the world to know he cannot prevent it, that Khrushchev has reversed himself on the ban.

The more severe the propaganda licking, the more reason Khrushchev will have to resent Chinese policy. The more it hurts Khrushchev to have pulled China's chestnuts out of the first, the more angry he will be at having had to do so.

He might well put pressure—highly unwelcome pressure—on China to reverse its policy. The West, therefore, has an opportunity to intensify Sino-Soviet antagonism.

A smashing propaganda victory could serve the U.S. national interest in still another way. If it ultimately were to be decided that new American test programs would benefit American weapons technology more than new Soviet testing would benefit Soviet technology, then the resulting decision to resume testing would be less severely condemned by world opinion if it first were clearly established that Russia had sabotaged a treaty.

This fact, however, introduces a complication. If the United States seems to the world to have this motive, the purpose will be defeated.

Semyon K. Tsarapkin, Russia's man here, is screaming from the housetops that the United States wants a "propaganda cushion" for a test resumption. There is, it is privately acknowledged, a certain amount of truth to the charge, and until the United States ceases to be vulnerable to this counterattack, it will not be able to take full advantage of Khrushchev's position.

It is not now U.S. policy to bang, at least not first, and it is by no means clear that it ever will be. The prevailing judgment in nonmilitary circles, and even in some military circles, is that on balance, Russia would gain more than the United States from such resumption. If so, diplomats here believe President Kennedy should make the American policy of abstention unmistakably clear, and thus spike Tsarapkin's guns.

Query: Have the Russians been secretly testing? No one to whom I have spoken knows of any evidence that they have, and many doubt that they could gain any really significant advantage from doing so, given all the circumstances.

Query: Could the United States score a breakthrough in antimissile defense, or in development of the neutron bomb, by banging? Perhaps, but so might the Russians—and the United States is presumed to be ahead in this field now. Weaponeering goes on in the laboratory whether tests are conducted or not.

The conclusion here is that the United States should take a clear position against testing by anyone anywhere, and from this platform of virtue should have a field day in the U.N. General Assembly with Khrushchev's clear position on the other side of the tracks.

Let's Have Some Facts About Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable thought and discussion taking place today throughout the United States and the world with respect to the Peace Corps program.

The El Capitan Citizen, of Santee, Calif., which is located within my congressional district, published an editorial on August 10, 1961, entitled "Let's Have Some Facts About Peace Corps," which is significant to this issue, and under unanimous consent I include it herewith as a part of my remarks.

LET'S HAVE SOME FACTS ABOUT PEACE CORPS

A few months ago, R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, explained why he is working night and day to make a success of his job.

It may be trite, but he started out explaining these are urgent times. "In the world struggle we have relatively little time left," he said, and then continued to give an example:

"Just a few days ago, the former President of Costa Rica sat in the chair over there and told me there are 40 Moscow-trained agents of world revolution in Costa Rica alone. Red China, even though it is now under great economic stress, has invited all members of the Costa Rican legislature to visit Red China with all expenses paid. We have practically nobody taking that kind of interest in Costa Rica."

Shriver then drove home his point with the following quotation:

"Anybody who believes in the dignity of man and who has any kind of information on what is going on in the world just can't sit still today.

"Or look at it this way. Fourteen years from now my older boy will be 21 years old. Somewhere around then it will occur to him to ask his father: What were you doing in those crucial years of 1961 and 1962? What will I be able to say for myself? That I was a member of the XYZ country club and shot golf in the seventies?"

These are brave words by the leader of the Peace Corps, but what about his actions. Is he really following the current trend of stirring official words and not-so-stirring official acts?

"In Washington," says U.S. News & World Report, "concern is felt on Capitol Hill over a number of factors. Some Congressmen question whether a Peace Corps really is necessary, whether the massive expensive effort to put a handful of semi-skilled young people into the field is warranted."

"These Congressmen particularly question this in view of the fact that such services are being rendered by hundreds of older and more experienced organizations."

The Richmond (Va.) News Leader insists that the corps is a cropper and a flizzle because the basic idea of the Peace Corps has been altered and that many of the present problems should have been "forseen by R. Sargent Shriver when he did his task force report on the possibility of such a venture."

The newspaper continues to point out that, "private groups and organizations—missionaries, 4–H clubs, university programs, international charities, and others—are already doing much of the work that the Peace Corps mapped out for itself. These groups have put many more people into the world's needy areas than the Government's plan could ever do. These units have stability and a sense of purpose that is defined in each case."

"Already missionaries complain that they are expected to pay higher prices for many things they use or eat since the Peace Corps project was announced. The natives are anxious to cash in on anything financed by our fairy-godmother Government."

For instance, Peace Corps members going into Colombia this fall, will receive some $150 per month in living subsistence while living native. This is more than the average Colombian worker beside him will receive for a full year to support his family. In addition, the corpsman receives some $300 more per month in pay in other benefits, and this amount can be increased by Presidential fiat, whim or decree according to Senate bill 2000 or perhaps even without the Senate bill.

Shriver estimates it will cost $9,000 per year to keep one corpsman in the field. Of this he admits some $3,000 per year will go to administrators here in the States—many of which are tagged for $19,000 to $20,000 salaries.

A spokesman for the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society said a single man can be trained and maintained (as a Baptist missionary) for $3,500 for the first year, plus 20 percent overhead, and for only $2,000 the second year, plus the 20 percent overhead.

The Methodist Board of Missions trains and maintains a couple for 1 year for about $10,000. Overseas, full support amounts to $7,500 for a couple.

Senator ALEXANER WILEY says the Catholic Church is training and supporting volunteers in Colombia and other Latin American countries at a total cost of $2,860 for a 3-year hitch.

According to the U.S. News & World Report, Latin Americans are looking askance at the "idealistic amateurs" when they so badly need professional and technical help. Yet they would rather not be put on the spot of refusing "awkward but humanitarian" assistance offered by the American President.

Many people are asking why the corpsmen are given a mere 6 months training to go out against Communists with 20 or 30 years in the field. Others think the members should take a loyalty oath to the United States. Still others think that all members should at least complete their present college courses before dashing off to save another part of the world. But in the main, most Americans hope desperately that all these criticisms of the Corps are not true.

The Peace Corps has caught the imagination of the country. It is a public relations stunt par excellance. If there is any possibility that it can be out on a workable basis, few Americans are going to buck it. But all information coming out of Washington seems to indicate grave problems.

Perhaps, the worst part of all this is the extent to which future Americans will look to the Government to perform the charitable acts already now being performed by private agencies. We must never forget that churches, universities, 4–H groups, and privately financed groups are already providing technical assistance to backward countries, as well as maintaining hospitals, schools, orphanages, even technical training programs to help the natives help themselves. Why should the Government force the taxpayers to support something that private industry and private enterprise is already doing overseas?

Remember, whenever any of these private people goof up, it is only a reflection on that person or his sponsoring group. But when a corpsman pulls a boner, it is blamed on the Government of the United States. And even before they have been sent into the field, Tanganyika propogandists are denouncing the Peace Corps as spies.

How much better would it have been if President Kennedy had called in the leaders of all private groups working in foreign areas and given them high praise. His words sent out to all the Nation's news media would have been the catalyst that could have precipitated a new rush of volunteers to these organizations. These organizations do not take money out of taxpayers pockets. These groups screen their applicants. And most of all, these organizations are doing far more in other countries than can ever be accomplished by the semiskilled volunteers of the Peace Corps.

Only One More Bureau?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, if we could dispense with two worthless and inactive Government bureaus for every new one proposed, I think we would be progressing in the right direction.

The Poughkeepsie Journal, of the same address, very aptly summarizes one of the more recent proposals as an expensive and meddlesome measure, and I am glad to submit a copy of their editorial herewith:

ONE MORE BUREAU

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has decided that what the country needs is another bureau with almost a quarter of a billion deficit dollars to spend.

In his bill (S. 1212) Senator CLARK proposes to establish a Redevelopment Area Industrial Mortgage Corp. to create a market in the industrial mortgages of depressed area plants. All this is to take place in an independent bureau which has no connection with the Department of Commerce, and therefore no connection with the administration of the Depressed Areas Act already passed.

It is to be modeled after the Federal National Mortgage Association, which was supposed to do the same thing with home mortgages, but never was able to create much of a market. Fanny May (as it's known in financial circles) was never able to unload but about a fourth of all the mortgages it bought, and the revolving fund hardly turns over at all.

When many of the redevelopment areas are paying for advertising in business magazines to inform industries that "financing is available on very favorable terms," it is hard to see why the Federal Government should meddle further with capitalizing the free enterprise system.

There are other serious objections. The Depressed Areas Act has an antipiracy clause designed to prevent the use of U.S. funds for the purpose of moving existing plants from one community to another and thus relocating unemployment rather than creating jobs. The Clark bill has no such safeguard.

The bureau would be permanent, and so outlast any crisis it is supposed to deal with.

The RFC scandals demonstrated the dangers of favoritism, corruption, and influence-peddling inherent in making Federal funds available for such purposes.

Hearings on this little-known but expensive and meddlesome bill already have begun, and observers fear that in the flurries over spacemen and Berlin Congress may pass it absentmindedly with little discussion.

Minutemen Support House Joint Resolution 447 in War Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, each and every time this Nation has found itself in a perilous situation or actually in a war, it has always been the American citizen who has pulled this country up by the bootstraps and met the challenge head on.

On June 12, I introduced in the House, House Joint Resolution 447 calling for a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties of the world.

Almost immediately, thousands of ordinary citizens throughout the country offered their help in support of this resolution. Lt. Col. Frederick A. Kibbe, USAR, retired, and Mr. Douglas R. Voorhees, of Fort Lauderdale and Miami, Fla., respectively, are outstanding examples of the courageous attitude being taken by so many of our citizens in these perilous times. Colonel Kibbe and Mr. Voorhees, both members of the Florida Minutemen, organized a drive to have House Joint Resolution 447 printed in a number of Florida newspapers in order that other citizens might be made aware of the imminence of the Communist threat.

To date, the Florida Minutemen have been successful in having the resolution published in five Florida dailies with an aggregate circulation of over one-half million. In addition, the Minutemen have published and distributed more than 8,000 reprints of the House Joint Resolution 447 to various schools, groups, and individuals.

I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to these loyal Americans who are helping other citizens to transform their feelings, convictions, and patriotic desires into effective action.

Colonel Kibbe and Mr. Voorhees are to be highly commended for their unselfish devotion to the task of awakening the people of this Nation to the fact that we are at war with the international Communist conspiracy.

The Fulbright Fixation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, which appeared in the Washington Daily News. The article, entitled "The Fulbright Fixation" follows:

If we are to know what is happening to us we have to know that fixations do grip relatively unknown men whose influence on our country is enormous. Consider the idea that America must not defend herself any place on her own—which was at the root of the Cuban debacle. In short, our so-called collective security.

That fixation is typified by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and he is as wrong as a summer oyster. But ideas can get into men's mind and all circumstances and history does not seem able to blow them out. They just think something and that is all there is to it.

Because Senator FULBRIGHT is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he effects promotions within the State Department, its congressional relations and budget prospects and, thus, most importantly, America's policies not alone through the committee's statutory authority but merely on the basis of his own thinking.

We do not have collective security. We have collective insecurity. We are wise to be attached firmly to the principle. Often it is indispensable, as in NATO. But there is no NATO in Latin America, for example, and depending on collectivity wherever this involves numerous weak and shaky countries means we flounder into exactly what happened in Cuba.

Senator FULBRIGHT opposed any kind of intervention there unless we could waltz in

with a whole group of Latin American States, as if our Nation could order such a tidy state of affairs.

Many much more knowing, practical and tested observers than Senator FULBRIGHT find we are not blamed in Latin America for the intervention but, instead, for allowing the intervention to fail.

We got slight, if any, credit for our Government's self-defined morals in nonintervention, even within the Organization of American States. For all grows worse by our remedy. Everywhere southward most of our neighbors realized that both under the benefits to them of the Monroe Doctrine and because of Castro's relentless and psychopathic provocations an intervention was completely justified on moral or any other grounds. And is it, in truth, really moral not to intervene in a murder unless you can locate your cousins to walk with you? Or if you have no cousins, to turn your back?

There is widespread conviction the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba, not for a moral reason, but because our Government feared that this would provoke war between the powerful Soviet Union and the United States.

Countless millions throughout Latin America who love freedom would have welcomed U.S. intervention in Cuba (and still would) because they fear the expansion of Castroism into their homelands and doubt it will be stopped without intervention. These millions cannot dream in Senator FULBRIGHT'S office and telephone thunderbolts to the State Department. They have to live (or die) with what they get. Their only test of the intervention is that it succeed; and when it did not they are the victims in all the shame and despair of this sickening tragedy along with the entire free world.

How could America conceivably "lose more in other countries," in Latin America or anywhere, than we lost by the effect of this debacle on Khrushchev's estimate of the United States? Isn't Russia a country? The result there alone can mistakenly rationalize Russia into such pressure on us that, God forbid, there is a war. Meanwhile, our no-matter-what nonintervention policy frees Soviet strategy to pillage like a leopard turned from the cage.

Senator FULBRIGHT can sit frozen by his fixation and wrap a moral toga around himself if he prefers, but it does not fit. When the Cuban intervention design was allowed to be so disastrously frail to conform to our policy—and even then the dribble that was laid on for this was drawn back halfway our country suffered a disaster far, far greater than Pearl Harbor. We knew how to tighten our belts and, like Americans, fight our way back from that. But we do not know how to fight our way back from this.

Much Discussed Secret Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt, a columnist for the Los Angeles Herald Express, has always been willing to discuss basic issues confronting our country with refreshing candor. The much discussed secret memorandum sent to the Pentagon from Capitol Hill has, in the opinion of many, seriously curtailed the ability of many of our best Generals and others to train our troops to meet the challenges of psychological warfare. The idealogical battle that we face as a nation cannot be underestimated. In his column of August 14, 1961, Mr. Todt discusses this highly controversial memorandum with a sense of positive realism. Thinking that Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Todt's column, under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

("It is probably the view of most Members of Congress today that if foreign aid were laid before the people in a referendum, it would be defeated."—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, secret memorandum to the Pentagon.)

The highly controversial secret memorandum—that was quickly leaked out to concerned Senators on Capitol Hill—of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to the Pentagon is no longer secret.

After considerable prodding, and cognizant of the storm of controversy, even a national sense of outrage his antimilitary sentiments had evolved, FULBRIGHT revealed it to the Senate on August 2 despite earlier pleadings that he could not locate a copy.

Not only the erstwhile secret memorandum, but also FULBRIGHT'S thinking and supporting documents—in short, his case—is fully presented on pages 13436–13443 of the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Every patriotic American—in or out of the uniform of our country—ought to read the Fulbright memorandum.

WAY WE THINK

The Arkansas Senator, a former Rhodes scholar from Oxford, points up the real struggle in this Nation better than he may have guessed. It is not basically Republicans versus Democrats. Actually, our fight is ideological instead of political in nature, and it lies between the conservative Americans whose constitutional tenets spring from the Founding Fathers and our cherished War of Independence in 1776, and the radical liberals whose ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) philosophy is liberally sprinkled with British Fabian socialism and Russian menshevism—the minority section of the Social Revolutionary Party which escaped Lenin's clutches when his Bolsheviks took power in 1917.

None of these socialistic groups are Communist, but their end objectives tend to head in much the same Marxian direction.

Some day the American people are going to learn that the real, basic ideological war in the United States today lies fundamentally between those whose differing philosophies emanate from (1) the American Revolution (conservatives) and (2) the Marxist one (radical liberals).

CHARTS OUR LIFE

They are simply not two slightly differing chips off the same block.

We are going to have to stand up and be counted soon.

Maybe the forthcoming nationwide elections in 1962 will provide a new criterion for us.

If the American public, which lives in this great citadel of freedom, the United States, is not fit to be trusted with its own alerted thinking in the continuing battle against totalitarian, dictatorial communism—then perhaps Senator FULBRIGHT is right. Although I, for one, will not accept it.

In fairness to the Arkansas solon, I hope my readers will obtain the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read his words carefully for their own considered judgment. Here are a few random excerpts from his once-secret memorandum to whet your appetite:

TO FORGE A LINK

"The American people have never been tested in such a struggle (i.e., anticommunism). In the long run, it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos. Pride in victory, and frustration in restraint, during the Korean war, led to MacArthur's revolt and McCarthyism.

"If the military is infected with this virus of rightwing radicalism, the danger is worthy of attention. If it believes the public is, the danger is enhanced.

"There is little in the education, training, or experience of most military officers to equip them with the balance of judgment necessary to put their own ultimate solutions—those with which their education, training, and experience are concerned—into proper perspective in the President's total 'strategy for the nuclear age.'

"Fundamentally, it is believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

OF PEACE OR STRIFE

Actually, our military officers have been operating under a tough-minded 1958 directive of the National Security Council. It decreed that the military should be used to reinforce our cold war ideological effort.

A former U.S. Army general was behind that one: Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now FULBRIGHT—who helped nix the employment of our jets in the Cuban fiasco recently—wants to get into the act. Can he help us? Or hurt us?

Freshening Political Winds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of August 16, 1961, carried an editorial well worth reading and I recommend it to Republican and Democratic Members alike. Under unanimous consent, I insert the same in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRESHENING POLITICAL WINDS

Some people assumed as a matter of course that the Republican Party would turn more liberal after losing the White House last November. After all, it was argued, that's what the people said they wanted, wasn't it?

But it isn't working out that way, so far at least. As Mr. Novak recently reported in this newspaper, the GOP is gradually turning more conservative. Senator GOLDWATER has achieved a remarkable prominence, but he is only the most dramatic example of the current conservative trend within the party and its representatives in Congress.

One explanation is simply that the Kennedy spending program is too much too soon; it was bound to generate opposition. The monstrous grab-bag housing bill, for example, was enough to prick the conscience not only of a conservative but of some liberal Republicans, who voted against it.

The far more significant explanation, though, is that the Members of Congress are feeling the heat from home. Local party workers tell of increasingly conservative voter sentiment, and the lawmakers also

hear it directly from their constituents. As one party pro put it, "You go around the country and you hear two things from Republicans: They want a tough foreign policy and they want a cut in Government spending."

It should be noted in passing that a "tough foreign policy" is not necessarily "conservative." Everyone, regardless of label, was appalled at the Cuban debacle, and almost everyone backs a tough stand on Berlin. It is, if anything, a matter of degree; as a generalization, conservatives, by the nature of their creed, are the stanchest opponents of communism, but that doesn't mean they want to go to war at the drop of every hat.

The domestic spending issue, at any rate, divides conservatives and liberals far more sharply. Indeed it must, for this issue is one of the outward signs of the clash of the rival political philosophies. On the one hand are the liberals, who believe the central Government must do almost everything for the citizen, regardless of the cost in taxes, debt, inflation, and infringements on personal liberty. On the other are the conservatives, who believe the individual, and hence society, fares best in an atmosphere of maximum freedom consistent with order.

So it is a good thing that the spending issue is getting hot, for it serves to put the deeper rivalry in clearer focus. The Kennedy administration refuses to make any cuts in nonessential spending to offset its drastic increases in defense outlays, but instead seeks to spend more on more things. It thus has put the country on notice of its heavy bias toward centralized Government power.

The Republicans, in these circumstances, have an excellent opportunity to make the case for freedom, with next year's congressional elections as the first target. They could show concretely what a sharply lower level of Government spending would mean in terms of lower taxes, revived initiative, economic growth, and generally a fresher climate in the country.

This swelling of conservative opinion, even as it is, indicates that the voters might not be unresponsive to such a campaign. The people, after all, did not say last November that they wanted a Government of reckless spenders; half of them voted for the more conservative alternative.

And behind that result, we think, lies a restiveness growing over the years. People have been getting fed up with a point of political view which has no new ideas but only a compulsion to spend and control. The liberal approach, whether called New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier, is old and tired. The conservative case—or at any rate, the case for freedom—is by contrast young and vigorous.

Whether the Republicans will make use of their opportunity is another matter. They have missed other such bets in the past, and lost elections. But it is encouraging for the political vitality of this country that more and more Republicans at least acknowledge the existence of the opportunity.

New Frontier Policies Not Compatible With Private Business Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those businessmen who had fond hopes that the New Frontier might be friendlier to private enterprise than were the New Deal and the Fair Deal, have had those hopes shattered by the increasing demands of the administration for new welfare programs, greater Federal participation in business and ever-increasing Federal spending. The attitude of the administration toward business is pointed out in the following article from the Wall Street Journal. In my opinion, the best way to protect our free enterprise system and give private initiative the incentive to make its fullest contribution to our society is to enact legislation to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition to private enterprise. My resolution, House Resolution 138, would accomplish this purpose by making it unconstitutional for the Government to be in business in competition with its own citizens:

ANTIBUSINESS AURA—ADMINISTRATION ASSAULTS MEAN BRIEF HONEMOON IS OVER

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Soon after he took the oath as Chief Executive, President Kennedy was assuring an approving group of businessmen that Government and business were "necessary allies" rather than "natural enemies."

Now, just a scant 6 months later, the trend points more to enmity than alliance. As the evidence piles up, it is all but extinguishing early business hopes that here at last was a Democratic administration it could along with.

The strains are many:

Chairman Minow of the Federal Communications Commission blackened television programing as a "vast wasteland." This threat of even closer Government supervision so aroused the industry that it rose up to help stymie legislation that would have given the FCC chief more power.

The administration is pressing a proposal to add electrical generating facilities to a nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash., that sends currents of fear through private power proponents. The Hanford addition not only would deprive private utilities of business in the Northwest, they contend, but could signal the start of large-scale Federal public power projects using atomic energy. Shudders one opponent: It "could easily let down the flood-gates to a whole new round of Federal encroachment in the power field."

PLAYING MATCHMAKER

Chairman Boyd of the Civil Aeronautics Board makes no secret of his dismay at leaving airline mergers to what he calls the "vagaries of the marketplace." Instead, he wants the Board to play matchmaker. Already, Northeast and Eastern are nudged closer together, though neither airline has expressed any enthusiasm for marrying.

Attorney General Kennedy, pointing to the price-fixing scandals in the electrical equipment industry, accuses the business community of "moral laxity." His trustbusters not only track other price-fixing scents, but figuring the climate is right, aim at carving up corporate giants. General Motors, General Electric, and American Telephone & Telegraph all are in their sights.

Commerce Secretary Hodges, himself a former corporate official, talked up the national shock induced by the electrical price-fixing disclosures and put a group to work writing a federally sponsored business code of ethics—a plain implication that business can't be trusted to look after its own morality.

Chairman-designate Swidler of the Federal Power Commission promises that his agency, depicted as being industry-minded under the Eisenhower administration, now will become consumer-minded. And natural gas companies tremble at the thought of what this could mean. One omen: Mr. Swidler says the agency will break new ground by reducing rates it thinks too high, even though there's no complaint.

Even Mr. Kennedy, despite his proffers of friendship, has joined in the stone-throwing. Proposing a code of improved conduct for Government employees, the President blamed "widespread business conspiracies to fix prices" and "cheating on expense accounts" for debasing the Nation's morals.

To be sure, the trend is not all one way. The administration is making a special effort to hand development of a communications satellite system to private industry, instead of marking it off as another area of Government monopoly. But clear notice has been given that this concession will be protected "in the public interest" by strict Federal regulation.

It's also true that the administration offered its first tax cut to business. But the form, an investment credit plan, provoked vigorous protest from businessmen who argue that a more rapid depreciation allowance is a much more feasible way to handle the tax relief. Too, Mr. Kennedy coupled his proposal with various others to spank business for what he described as abusing the tax laws. Example of the Kennedy chastisement: "It's deductible" is a business slogan that must be erased from the language.

COOLER CLIMATE

In sum, then, it takes no unusually sensitive thermometer to determine that as the sticky midsummer heat settles on Washington the political climate for business has turned noticeably cooler. One business lobbyist on Capitol Hill, whose job it is to detect which way the political winds are blowing, confides: "I'm telling my clients to look carefully over legislation they don't like, decide what they can live with—and accept that."

Why the change from handshake to fist? Certainly the administration will deny there has been a change. Far from being "antibusiness," officials will insist they would like nothing better than to forge an alliance. They will defend each and every one of their programs as being dedicated to promoting the "public interest"—pure and simple. And, if one accepts their logic, this dedication may seem entirely genuine.

There's little doubt that some of the areas now receiving closer Government scrutiny deserve it. Mr. Minow's criticism of the television industry surely is welcomed by many viewers. Nor can it be argued that the laws against price-fixing and monopoly shouldn't be enforced to protect the public. And no one supposes that business morality is lily-white in every instance.

But the glittering nobility of each of these causes can easily blind the casual observer to an even greater cause that must be considered: The Nation's still-strong conservative bent remains a chief bar to Mr. Kennedy's ability to move the country in the liberal direction he desires; and the corporate world stands as the major exponent of this conservatism.

The closeness of the 1960 election, the President's caution in pushing liberal legislation, and Mr. Kennedy's lip service, if nothing more yet, to fiscal responsibility—these indicate clearly the existence of a powerful conservative influence which administration planners are taking special care to erode rather than arouse; for much of what the administration wants to do, the argument is made that the country "is not yet ready."

The fact that business is not entirely ready for Mr. Kennedy is clear after only a quick glance at what's been happening on Capitol Hill. Business groups spent more than a month battering the President's first attempt at tax reform and can be expected

to put even more vigor into the fight against some aspects of his proposed broader tax revision program next year. Business groups are giving strong backing to efforts to beat down the administration's expanded foreign aid program. They are in the forefront of critics of Mr. Kennedy's aid to education proposal. And business has become increasingly vocal as each new plan for Federal spending is unveiled before Congress.

It thus makes sense for Mr. Kennedy to seek a way to neutralize the conservative political influence business is bringing to bear against his program. To shrink business' political influence, the Kennedy team found ready for exploitation events that already had damaged business' public prestige, chiefly the electrical equipment industry price-fixing scandals. Now, in the name of the "public interest," that prestige is taking a further battering.

GROWING ESTRANGEMENT

In part, this growing estrangement between business and the Kennedy Democrats might be attributed to unfamiliarity. The New Frontier is populated with young men whose meteoric careers have brought them in contact with little else but the academic and governmental. Certainly Mr. Kennedy does not regard the predominantly Republican business community as fertile territory for the "idea men" he seeks to collect around him.

But, whether by design or inexperience, the fact remains that the administration has done far more to alienate than to understand business. Perhaps the most dramatic proof is the complete rupture between the administration and the Business Advisory Council, which not only had advised the Commerce Department since New Deal days but had served as a talent reservoir for many administrations. And, there were no tears at the parting—either by the Kennedy team or the blue-ribbon group of corporate executives.

And relations between business and the administration threaten to become even more difficult. For though the Kennedy Democrats show little enthusiasm for the business viewpoint on governmental affairs, the administration's eagerness to influence the affairs of business remains unabated.

Take Mr. Kennedy's Labor-Management Council, for example. It is freely feared by corporate executives and others that the Council is intended to be nothing more than a device for the Federal Government to establish wage and price policies for industry to follow. Labor Secretary Goldberg has strongly indicated that the Government will force, if necessary, an auto industry settlement to avoid a strike; such as a walkout, Mr. Goldberg has declared, would not be "in the national interest."

Anticipating a possible autumn increase in steel prices, Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers is peering at the industry with skeptical eyes; it is probable that, with the administration's desire to "hold the price line," a price increase on this basic commodity would push the steel companies into a difficult public relations position.

True, the administration does not yet have any legal mechanism to prevent unions from striking, or steel companies from boosting prices. But the pressure of administration censure, coming at a time when business prestige has been kept in low estate, would make it extremely difficult for industry to hold to a firm position.

Just after Mr. Kennedy uttered his friendly postinaugural words, a top businessman commented that "we liked what we heard," and the proposed alliance seemed entirely feasible. But in the wake of developing events, businessmen may wonder if they can expect even a peaceful coexistence.

A Few of the Dangers of Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt's column in the August 11, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express reviews some of the dangers of free trade to our domestic industries. I think every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read the column. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TIDDLYWINK WAR

(By George Todt)

"Commerce is the equalizer of the wealth of nations."—GLADSTONE.

International free trade can be made to sound by its exponents like a panacea for many of the ills which now plague the world—but how can our U.S. industries compete on a reasonable or fair basis with foreign competitors which utilize cheap labor paid near-starvation wages?

I asked this question of affable Terry Sanford, the new Democratic Governor of North Carolina—who succeeded Luther Hodges, presently Secretary of Commerce in the Kennedy administration—as we toured the Warner Brothers movie lot together in Burbank recently.

Terry is 43, one of the youngest Governors in the Nation, a former paratroop officer in the European theater during World War II. He received a battlefield promotion to first lieutenant during the Battle of the Bulge. Fought in five campaigns. Has a good head on his shoulders. Strictly regular.

WHAT IS RIGHT

The Governor answered by question thusly:

"The problem of free trade is a very difficult and controversial one. There is no easy answer to the long haul effect of it. Things become quite complicated when you go beneath the surface. Let's kick the ball around a bit.

"For example, consider our ally Japan. If the Japanese textile industry cannot sell its surplus goods here in the United States—then perhaps it would, of necessity, be forced to trade with Red China instead.

"So we provide markets here for the Japanese to sell their goods—and it hurts considerably our own textile industries in the United States. The foreign workers are paid such substandard wages in comparison to ours that their costs are often much lower than ours, even allowing for additional oversea transportation charges.

"Wisely, the Japanese have imposed on themselves a voluntary quota of textile goods to be sent here to the United States. It may be that we will have to resort to a system of quotas in the future on many other items, too."

CAN'T BE WRONG

Afterward we got into question of trade with Red China—accomplished surreptitiously through the British port of Hong Kong.

This is a horse of a different color to Terry and me.

It does not make sense to be engaged in an intolerably expensive global cold war—or a recent hot one in Korea—with Red China and supply some of her critical needs through the back door of Hong Kong trade and commerce.

"Hong Kong cotton goods, undoubtedly using Red Chinese textiles—produced with slave labor by undemocratic Communist despots—are now undercutting our own American made textiles in the domestic market," Terry Sanford told me. "We pay labor 10 times the rate prevalent in Hong Kong. While we think competition is a good thing ordinarily and within reason, it cannot remain unlimited without damaging extensively our own industries."

DAY OR NIGHT

Actually, I think it is time for us to get down to brass tacks with our British cousins. Undoubtedly, they have a trade problem—and we all wish them the best in their efforts to increase their commerce.

However, we are going to have to stop aiding and abetting our mutual Communist enemy in trading under any circumstances. Cold war strategy demands it. It is patently ridiculous for us to spend hundreds of billions of our dollars to bring pressure to bear on the Red enemy—only to have our allies supply his needs when the pressure gets critical.

Either we are in a war, or we are not. If we are, we ought to try to win it. We cannot win by bailing out the enemy when he begins to hurt.

Is it not time to stop playing tiddlywink?

After exploring some of the serious problems of our world with Terry, he also let me in on the reason he came to California.

THAT'S OUR SONG

Seems North Carolina has great plans for a giant 9-day trade fair to be held in Charlotte, N.C., commencing October 12, which is Columbus Day.

The fair will be inaugurated by President John F. Kennedy, himself.

Besides extending a cordial invitation to California industries to send their exhibits to the North Carolina trade fair—Terry also let it be known that his productive State will welcome any California industry which might like to locate another branch or factory elsewhere. A real live wire.

Kennedy Has Fingers in Too Many Pies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will be interested in the remarks found in an article by Mr. Richard Starnes, which appeared in the Washington Daily News. The article entitled "Kennedy Has Fingers in Too Many Pies," is as follows:

The blowzy near technicians who practice the black arts of image making are doing a major disservice to the President.

The Chief Executive of the United States is not a policeman, nor a labor mediator, nor a news agency, nor any other Jack-Kennedy-of-all-trades. Yet, in the frenetic battle to keep his "image" in the forefront of public consciousness, the President has been repeatedly cast in these roles.

In New York, for example, the Metropolitan Opera recently endured another of its perennial labor crises.

The opera company using techniques that would have drawn howls of outrage if they had been employed by an industrial concern, simply told its musicians it would close down rather than accede to their wage demands.

In industry an employer can be forbidden by law from closing his business to avoid negotiating legitimate union demands, and it is my conviction that it is an ill woodwind player who does not deserve the same protection.

But, apart from the merits of the dispute, whether the Met runs next season or not is of limited importance.

Certainly it should not compete, even momentarily, for the attention of the one man upon whom the destiny of Western civilization may depend. Yet that is exactly what happened.

NOT HIS BUSINESS

Mr. Kennedy intervened in the dispute, to an extent unknown here but doubtless in a superficial manner. But however brief his participation in this tempest in a cultural teapot, he did spend a measureable fraction of his time and energy delving into a concern that was none of his business.

There are other examples of the President's preoccupation with being Johnny-on-the-spot. The disgraceful episode of airplane hijacking provided an unexampled opportunity for the White House imagemakers to get their principal into the limelight.

Has anyone thought to ask why it was necessary to shoot up the hijacked jet in El Paso, when a truck parked across its bow would have effectively—and safely—prevented a takeoff attempt?

The business about the President being in charge was mostly public relations happy talk, of course, but suppose the airplane had exploded when the lawmen were cheerfully shooting out its tires and one engine?

Any President is always a politician, and none can dispute his right to take reasonable measures to insure his reelection.

But there is a line where ordinary political corn shucking becomes compulsive attention to minutiae and, guided by his clamorous imagemakers, the President has crossed it.

She's the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a woman who has devoted much time in her life to easing the sufferings of others, although she herself has been handicapped since infancy, will be honored on Saturday with the designation as "Catholic Woman of Year."

She will be so designated by the National Catholic War Veterans at their annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J.

The recipient of this honor is Mrs. Mary Cassidy Varick, of 241 Pacific Avenue, Jersey City, a constituent of mine. The inspiring story of Mrs. Varick has been published in the August 14 issue of the Jersey Journal and I would like to include this excellent article as part of my remarks along with my congratulations and best wishes:

SHE'S THE NEWS: HER CRUSH ON LIFE CONQUERS CRUSHING BLOWS

Mrs. Mary Varick found out early in life that suffering and sickness may be a condition of being human but that acceptance and unselfishness partook of the divine.

At 18 months she was stricken with polio and faced the life of a cripple. Her mother, however, would not let bitterness become part of the growing girl's outlook. "God loves you more than the others," was her mother's words. "He made you special. God saved the world by suffering so suffering can be the most important thing in the world."

The young child took the words to heart and built a philosophy of life upon it. Next week, Mrs. Varick, the mother of four, will be honored as Catholic Woman of the Year in Atlantic City at the convention of the Catholic War Veterans.

Mrs. Varick was chosen for the honor for her activities as a mother, founder of the First Saturday Club, and the initiator of a series of pilgrimages to the shrine of St. Anne deBeaupre in Quebec.

Mrs. Varick began the First Saturday Club for the spiritual and recreational benefit of crippled people. On the first Saturday of each month, the club attends mass in a group and devotes the rest of the day to recreation.

She first journeyed to the Canadian shrine in 1951 when she was suffering from cancer of the bone. Doctors were pessimistic about her chances of survival. But Mrs. Varick was convinced that her prayers would be answered. The disease was cured.

Mrs. Varick and her husband then determined to aid other cripples to visit the shrine. They organized bus trips for the cripples. Her husband, William, a busdriver for Public Service Co., drove the bus and also donated his salary to make up the deficits.

This year the two organized two tourist bus pilgrimages to the shrine to raise funds for a charter plane pilgrimage for cripples. Last Sunday they returned from the shrine. Fifty-four cripples had made the trip on the special plane and a total of 71 cripples assembled at the shrine.

Another tourist bus ride to the shrine leaves on August 19. The proceeds from this trip will go to make up the deficit that the plane pilgrimage encountered. Space on his bus is still available.

"I'm the crazy dreamer but my husband is the real worker," Mrs. Varick says. "The work we do is a work of love. The one thing that you can't give away is happiness. The more you share your own joy, the more comes to you."

Mr. Varick believes that pain is wealth and that wealth should not be squandered. "Pain changes a person's life. Only if you accept it can the cross be borne cheerfully. Some of the cripples I know are the most joyous people. They know that they haven't been abandoned by God but chosen by Him for special happiness."

It is this type of faith that enables Mrs. Varick to face the future knowing that a disease of the cornea will cause her to become totally blind.

She faces this future with the calm acceptance that has accompanied her in all her difficulties. Right now she looks forward to next week and the convention in Atlantic City with veterans who have also witnessed suffering. "It will be the chance for one veteran like myself to talk with the other veterans. Many of us have things in common."

Answers to Tannenwald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of my remarks on the floor today regarding the gratuitous insult to Members of the House offered this morning on NBC's "Today" television show by Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., special assistant to the Secretary of State, my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD] directed attention to still another officious lobbying effort on the part of this special assistant.

In this earlier venture, Mr. Tannenwald took on the eminent columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, in a letter published in the New York Times. His effort has prompted the apt and tart comment by Mr. Krock that this "subordinate official on the heavily populated assistant level considers it within his function and responsibility to act as high policy spokesman and debater in the public press."

Under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter from Congressman FORD published in today's New York Times in response to Mr. Tannenwald's brash contradiction of testimony by two Cabinet officers. I also enclose Mr. Krock's comments today on the same matter:

FUNDS FOR FOREIGN AID—ISSUE TAKEN WITH TANNENWALD ON BORROWING AUTHORITY PROVISO

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is appalling that a high official of the administration such as Theodore Tannenwald, special assistant to the Secretary of State, would make some of the statements he does in his August 9 letter to you denouncing Arthur Krock's August 4 column as "omitting a number of pertinent facts and not stating accurately other facts," about the 5-year back-door borrowing provision in the administration's foreign-aid bill.

Mr. Tannenwald is in some respects guilty of what he deplores. He even put himself in direct opposition to testimony of his superiors. And he hangs on legalisms and indulges in technicalities.

Mr. Tannenwald correctly notes that, as now written, the legislation requires the President annually to submit a budget to Congress under the Corporation Control Act showing how the funds are to be used, etc. Then he says:

"The President will not be able to obligate or spend these funds until Congress has enacted an authorization in an appropriation bill for the use of the funds."

SECRETARY DILLON'S TESTIMONY

Many Members of Congress regard this as opposite to what Treasury Secretary Dillon told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the following exchange:

"Senator WILLIAMS. As I understand it, and I think we ought to get this clear, you come back each year and report to Congress, but you do not need any additional action on the part of the Congress to get the money if we approve this bill as it is written; is that correct?" "Secretary Dillon: That is correct."

I fail to see how both Secretary Dillon and Mr. Tannenwald can be right.

Mr. Tannenwald indulges the obvious when he asserts that Congress would have full legal power to limit the use of these funds. Of course it would. It is a rare occasion when the Congress is without raw legal power—note the word "legal"—to change its mind and amend a law in practically any way it deems appropriate. But hanging on legalisms here substantially begs the question—certainly where delicate and far-reaching arrangements with sovereign foreign nations are involved.

His superior, Secretary Rusk, told the House Committee on Appropriations that: "As a matter of the law and the Constitution, it [Congress] would have the same

control. However, I would be less than candid if I did not say that the exercise of that control by the Congress on an annual basis would be a more serious step in terms of our commitments and relations with other governments than would be true under the present arrangement."

LIMITING EXPENDITURES

This question of control by Congress is so crucial to the understanding and consideration of the proposition that I again quote from Secretary Dillon. He was asked what would be the situation if Congress decided to cut a part of the $8.8 billion but in the meantime under long-range programing, commitments had been made with foreign countries. Could Congress then limit expenditures below what had been committed? Dillon said:

"I would like to be perfectly clear on that, Senator. Congress does have the authority to limit it, and could limit it, but it would have the effect of the United States not living up to its commitments. So I believe there would be very strong pressure on Congress not to have the United States default on a commitment which it had legally made."

In the face of that statement, Mr. Tannenwald says Mr. Krock was incorrect when he suggested that if Congress were to limit or terminate the previously granted borrowing authority the United States would be in default in its foreign aid commitments. Then hanging on technicalities, he concludes that "there could be no question of a default." Secretaries Rusk and Dillon say otherwise.

Mr. Tannenwald insists it is not true, as Mr. Krock states, that:

"Since technically the executive could commit in 1 fiscal year the entire $8.8 billion Congress had given it for 5 years, there conceivably could be no money left for Congress to recapture."

Once again, let's see what Secretary Dillon says: "Mr. Passman: In effect, the executive branch could if it should so determine, commit the entire $8.8 billion during fiscal year 1962 on a conditional basis?" "Secretary Dillon: They could commit $1,187 million firmly, and they could commit the rest of it conditionally." "Mr. Passman. It could be committed, nevertheless?" "Secretary Dillon. Conditionally, it could be."

In conclusion, this long-term financing proposition, and some others similar to it and now rather commonly known as backdoor financing, raises questions vital to the orderly processes of representative Government. The Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, has but one certain way effectively to control the Government. That is the power of the purse.

So when such a proposition as the pending $8.8 billion, 5-year borrowing authority is submitted above all things we must know its full dimensions and characteristics before we finally vote. Do what we will—but know what we are doing.

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Representative, Fifth District, Michigan.

WASHINGTON, *August 10, 1961.*

IN THE NATION—MIXED SIGNALS AND DUTIES ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Arthur Krock)

Whatever may be the final form of the administration's foreign-aid bill, the determined efforts in the Senate and House to retain more committee control over, and reduce, the expenditure of the $8.8 billion the President wants to finance long-term development loans reveal the depth of the disbelief in Congress that the effects of the proposal merely would be to institute sound business practices in the program. The questioning of high officials by congressional committee members inevitably discloses the potential apparatus of a 5-year legislative loss of control of the loaning activity that could be regained only at the default of commitments already made in the name and on the honor of the United States.

Perhaps Congress ultimately will agree, as in other instances it has, to this fundamental self-limitation on its constitutional power of the purse over annual Government spending and commitments of future spending. But, if so, in this case that will not be because of the lawyers' quibbles and bureaucratic technicalities by which administrative agents and floor spokesmen in Congress have sought to obscure this inevitable consequence. Substantial approval will have been given dispite these attempts to gloss over the realities.

The causes will be three in particular: (1) The President's total involvement of his political fortunes and his personal prestige with the fate of his loans plan; (2) its intrinsic merit as sound administrative procedure; (3) the new and recurring international crises which require that his national leadership shall not be cast in the serious doubt he deliberately risked by almost equating congressional action on his development loan program with a vote of personal and official confidence in his conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

THE BOWERY ARGUMENT

The strategy of this final pressure on Congress has been organized to the point where every event abroad, every vote in Congress on the foreign aid program, is cited by members of his Cabinet as a reason why Congress should authorize a 5-year Treasury fund for development loan projects on which the President can draw without further legislative action. This tactic, and the personal and patronage politics the President has played to get the votes of Members who doubt or oppose his plan, are wholly legitimate, and no invention of the Kennedy administration. Alfred E. Smith approvingly described these pressures as the Bowery argument which the American political system often makes it necessary for men in office to employ for high purposes.

Evasion or concealment of the actual meaning and effects of actions urged on Congress by the President also represent no innovation of the Kennedy administration. Therefore the letter typical of such an endeavor, which was published on this page last week from Theodore C. Tannenwald, Jr., a special assistant to Secretary of State Rusk, was traditional. In attacking as ignorant and uninformed an analysis of the President's long-term loan proposal that appeared in this space on August 4, Tannenwald was merely resorting to the bureaucratic device of asserting that plainly labeled interpretation and estimate had been represented as accomplished mathematical facts.

A response to this letter from Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan, published on this page today, sufficiently exposes the basic flaws in its construction. And FORD, an undeviating Republican supporter of foreign aid, demonstrates by documentation that the analysis of the loan proposal's effects made by Secretary Rusk's special assistant conflicts head on with testimony by his chief and Secretary Dillon before congressional committees.

But the Tannenwald letter was an innovation in another important respect. It reveals that the profusion and duplication of top authority grants by President Kennedy make this the first administration in which a subordinate official on the heavily populated special assistant level considers it within his function and responsibility to act also as high policy spokesman and debater in the public press. This is an expansion for him of an assignment to lobby for the foreign aid bill at the Capitol.

That is a risky combination of duties, assigned or assumed, particularly when its byproduct is a public denial of legislative effects which have been conceded by Government superiors. Possibly that is why it has not previously been undertaken.

Newburgh Policy on Welfare Payments Helps Solve Many Community Problems

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those who are interested in cutting the rising crime rate in many of our communities, and to generally improve community life, should find some interesting facts in the following article from the Wall Street Journal on the effect of the new welfare code adopted by Newburgh, N.Y.

THE NEW NEWBURGH: WELFARE PSYCHOLOGY, CIVIC REFORMS CHANGE CITY'S LOOK

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

NEWBURGH, N.Y.—While much attention has been fixed in recent weeks on this city's progress in enacting a more rigid welfare code, the controversial code itself and the publicity it has fomented have resulted in a variety of interesting secondary results. For although the new regulations have not yet of themselves directly affected the city's welfare load, they have indirectly helped to alleviate several historic community problems.

Since the 13-point program went into effect on July 15, for instance, the crime rate in Newburgh's Water Street slum area has fallen markedly. For the first time in many months, nobody from the Water Street district was a defendant at a session of municipal court. This in itself is extraordinary because in the past few years that district has been far and away the biggest headache for the police department.

A visitor quickly senses the changed atmosphere on an after-dark tour of the Water Street area. The streets are quiet and almost empty, except for small groups of children here and there playing hopscotch or hide-and-seek under a street light. The bars are doing business as usual but they are doing it quietly. Just 6 weeks ago it was common for a sidewalk stroller to have to step off the curb to get around a couple of men (or women) preparing to settle a dispute in direct fashion. Also, during the wee hours, one was likely to see a crowd of 50 or 60 men and women gathered in front of a tavern, chattering excitedly and drunkenly shoving each other about.

City officials view the changed atmosphere with satisfaction, and they contend that the new welfare psychology is responsible for the change.

BROAD APPROACH

"What most people outside of Newburgh fail to realize," says City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell, "is that our new welfare code is just one part of a broad approach to community problems. We are now working hard to improve zoning laws, eliminate the many fire hazards in some parts of town, remedy unsanitary conditions in poorer neighborhoods, press forward with our urban renewal projects, provide additional offstreet parking in the downtown area, and we're trying by various means to boost the local economy."

The most noticeable result of the tougher city attitude is that residents seem to be gaining a new respect for city hall. This is partly due to reawakened civic pride but probably more to the stringent measures the city is using in its broad attack on local problems. And adoption of the welfare code served to convince many doubters that the city meant business.

Newburgh, to illustrate the community's new approach, has had a long-time garbage problem. Residents had over the years put out their garbage with little care for neatness. Refuse cans often had no covers and sometimes great piles of trash were simply set out with no container at all—and the wind and dogs could be counted on to scatter garbage on lawns and in streets. But today Newburgh's garbage problem no longer exists. An offender first gets a warning, but on the second offense he is pulled into court and, if found guilty, is liable to a stiff fine.

One of the dilemmas that prompted the new welfare code, aside from rising public relief costs that threatened to force a real estate tax boost of 30 percent, was the deterioration of the Water Street area. Newburgh now has an inspection team composed of fire, sanitation, housing, building, and plumbing inspectors who jointly give a dwelling a thorough once over.

CONVERSION OF DWELLINGS

The Water Street area is populated almost exclusively by Negroes, and many of these are migrant workers from the South who drifted into town when the picking season on surrounding farms was over. They were able to find space to live because for years the city looked the other way when half a dozen families crowded into one-family houses. Now Newburgh has a law which prohibits the conversion of a one-family dwelling into more than three separate units. And, while no statistics are available, city officials believe the influx of migrants has been slowed and that many of these newcomers are leaving town.

City Manager Mitchell contends it is still too early to judge the effect of the new welfare code on the city's welfare costs. Newburgh is moving slowly, he says, out of common prudence and because Peter Z. Petrillo, the new welfare commissioner, needs time to become acquainted with individual cases. Mr. Petrillo, a former school teacher with no welfare experience, recently replaced John J. O'Donnell, who resigned because he disagreed with the new code.

But if enforcement of the code is going slowly, the atmosphere the code has engendered is already causing a drop in public assistance costs. Since January, for instance, when new welfare rules were being actively considered, until July, when those rules were adopted, the number of home relief and aid to dependent children cases dropped from 266 to 135. At an annual rate, this amounts to a cost reduction of $163,860. The city had been spending about $1 million yearly on welfare, about half of which was paid by local taxpayers with the other half coming from the State and Federal Government.

The 13-point program, aimed at weeding out the undeserving from the welfare rolls, includes such items as ending aid to unwed mothers who continue to have children, putting able-bodied reliefers to work for the city, and cutting off assistance to recipients who have been on the rolls for more than 3 months—except in cases involving the elderly and the disabled.

And there are about a dozen more regulations to come. Mr. Mitchell isn't saying what these additional restrictions will be, but it is known that the city is seriously considering a law which will force relatives of needy persons to assume responsibility for their support. The city council believes, for instance, that many elderly people, now living in the local old people's home, are a public burden because their families, living nearby, refuse to care for them.

New York State welfare officials, incensed by Newburgh's do-it-yourself revamping of its welfare system, is seeking a court injunction prohibiting the city from carrying out its program. Supreme Court Justice John P. Donohue is expected to rule on the State's request shortly.

Aside from the politically volatile nature of the case, State officials are alarmed because they fear that Newburgh's action might deprive the whole State of Federal welfare aid. The Federal Government requires that a State, to be eligible for welfare funds from Washington, must administer its welfare program in a uniform manner. And Newburgh's new code is far stricter than those of other municipalities in the State.

PATCHWORK JOB

Meantime, Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is considering a major overhaul of Federal welfare laws. Thus far, Mr. Ribicoff has not commented directly on the Newburgh case, but he has termed the entire system of Federal welfare aid a patchwork job.

Liberal charges that Newburgh is following a reactionary style of municipal government are denied by city officials who contend the city is aggressively, and progressively, working to improve the general welfare. The city, for instance, will soon announce a $500,000 outlay to improve parking and traffic conditions in the shopping district. It has urged establishment of a major jet airport at a site 30 miles from the city—this at a time when most municipalities are doing their best to keep the jet airliners away from their doors.

Newburgh is also in the process of clearing a blighted area for a third public housing project, even though a previous project—the Bourne Apartments in the Water Street section—became a civic menace when the occupants created every manner of nuisance.

Mrs. Hattie Howard, walking her dog along the Broadway shopping area, reflected for a moment "on all the excitement around here" and declared: "I don't know what will come of the new welfare code, and I'm not even sure it's fair to everybody. But I'll tell you this. Newburgh is becoming a better place to live because more people are interested in what's going on. And I think we're all pretty proud of our little city."

United States Buys Russian Jeeps for Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of concern exists among many of our colleagues with respect to our foreign aid program and the fact that at times the United States is forced to participate in programs which benefit the Soviets.

One of our California colleagues has an extensive study underway on this very question. The Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, who is a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has made some findings that are significant, especially today when we are considering the foreign aid legislation.

Under unanimous consent I include herewith an article that appeared in the Washington Daily News on August 15, 1961, by Mr. Charles Keely of the Copley News Service. It reveals the sad fact that the United States is now buying Russian jeeps for the use of Fidel Castro agents.

IT'S UNCLE WHO PAHO'S BILL

(By Charles Keely)

U.S. taxpayers are buying Russian jeeps for Fidel Castro.

Thirty-two of the vehicles have been furnished Cuba, allegedly for purposes of malaria eradication.

These charges were made by a ranking members of the House Appropriations Committee who says he will present the matter to the full committee when it considers the foreign aid appropriations bill later this month.

Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, says the jeeps were given Cuba by the World Health Organization (WHO) working in conjunction with the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).

DUAL ROLE

PAHO serves a dual role; it is the regional agency of WHO and also a branch of the Organization of American States (OAS).

The United States pays most of the bills; it picks up 33 percent of the annual WHO tab and 66 percent of PAHO's.

The Russian jeeps are part of the Soviet Union's contribution in kind to the WHO fund. The United States contributes dollars. In 1951 U.S. participation amounted to 66 percent of the combined PAHO/WHO fund of $7,665,181.

Representative LIPSCOMB claims, however, that the U.S. contribution is even greater because of the large amount of unpaid quotas by other countries.

Cuba, for instance, hasn't paid since Castro took power. Castro owes $224,010.

"It makes no difference whether Russia contributes in kind or cash," LIPSCOMB says. "The U.S. taxpayer has a major investment in whatever goes out of the fund. In this case it's 32 Soviet jeeps worth $1,820.75 each."

HIS CLAIM

Representative LIPSCOMB claims the most jeeps any other nation has been furnished under the malaria eradication program is six. Why six jeeps from the rest of the world to cure Cuban malaria, but 26 from Moscow?

He says the situation is even more incredible in light of statistics which show malaria presents no real danger in Cuba.

"There were only 2.2 cases per 100,000 people in 1959," the lawmaker claims.

Nevertheless, he says, the malaria program's budget had been increased from $3,521 (when Dictator Fulgencio Batista was in power) in 1958 to $31,471 in 1959 under Fidel Castro.

"Something's unhealthy about the whole PAHO operation," the Congressman claims. "But I haven't been able to get a diagnosis from either the State Department or OAS."

The jeep situation was only one of several charges LIPSCOMB made against PAHO.

For instance, he says he can not understand why the program's budget for Cuba has increased from $37,045 in 1958 to $213,708 this year with next year's budget calling for $219,513. Particularly when Cuba isn't paying its share.

Representative LIPSCOMB says a State Department explanation that it was due to the larger number of Cubans who were traveling today to Russia and Red China where they might pick up diseases was "incredible and fantastic."

KEPT BY CUBANS

The Congressman charges also that the jeeps were not designed for malaria eradication at all but "the Cubans kept them anyway."

He said he has information leading him to believe Cuban nationals, working under the guise of the PAHO are actually Castro agents who use the health pretext to enter homes to look for clandestine meetings and counter-revolutionaries, presumably riding around in jeeps supposed to be used to fight malaria.

He also charges that instead of curing disease, the PAHO fellowship programs are affording Cubans a chance to spread Castro propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

The Congressman says he is hopeful he can persuade the full Appropriations Committee to write language into the foreign-aid bill that will allow Congress to express its objections to contributing U.S. funds to international organizations which give direct help to Communist-controlled nations in this hemisphere.

He says that before such funds could actually be denied the House Foreign Affairs Committee would have to write legislation forbidding grants to such organizations.

Pennsylvania AFL–CIO Opposes Proposed Railroad Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, at its second constitutional convention, held at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia, the Pennsylvania AFL–CIO adopted a resolution on "Railroad Mergers and the Public Interest" commending the Railway Labor Executives' Association and the Standard Railroad Labor Organizations for their courageous campaign against the current effort of railroad managements to gain quick profits from mergers, and calling upon all members to counteract the distortions in the charges of featherbedding which have been leveled against railroad employees.

At the convention a delegate spoke emphasizing the importance of this resolution as it affects the railroad people in the United States. He reminded the delegates that the railroad industry has lost 400,000 workers in the last 5 years.

In the belief that the views of the Pennsylvania AFL–CIO on this subject will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, I , under unanimous consent, include the full text of this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 66—RAILROAD MERGERS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Railroad mergers and consolidations, now becoming more widespread, offer a serious threat to more than the 700,000 workers still on the job and the 400,000 other Americans who have been eliminated from their positions in the last 5 years. Rail employment has declined persistently since World War II ended, the total work force falling from 1,359,000 in 1946 to 708,778 at the end of 1960.

Technological changes and automation have not provided the entire reason for this alarming reduction in the force of railworkers. Able and well-informed spokesmen for the 23 standard railroad labor organizations have presented well-documented cases in recent months before Congressman ELMER HOLLAND'S special committee and directly to President John F. Kennedy at Washington to make this fact evident.

It is significant that railroad workers through their organizations have not blindly opposed technological changes over the years. Rail managements, however, blinded by desire for immediate profits, have resisted attempts at adequate planning and consideration for the human elements in instituting these changes.

Result is that, while 600,000 workers have been eliminated in 14 years, American railroads are transporting as much tonnage as was hauled in the 1920's, 1930's and in 1946, with about half the number of men. Loss of business has not brought about the decline in jobs. Management policies have been responsible for a great deal of it.

While going on a merger binge, rail management spends over a million in propaganda under the phony slogan of featherbedding, seeking to add another 200,000 or more operating and nonoperating employees to the list of jobless; reduces its services under retrenchment programs; farms out its work to the detriment of safe and efficient operations and abandons service to the public in cold-blooded fashion.

Carriers have already told the Presidential Study Commission in recent weeks they want to eliminate 35,000 firemen who insure safety on engines, and 20,500 road trainmen and yard helpers.

President Kennedy hearkened to the appeal of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to do something to solve the problem of rising unemployment in the railroad industry as related to the rash of merger programs. He has asked Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg to investigate and submit recommendations for action.

As with automation and technological changes, the railroad labor organization informed the President the workers do not oppose any and all consolidations or mergers of corporations in the industry. Some, they say, under certain circumstances not now being provided will promote a dynamic and expanding economy and are in the public interest.

Railroad labor opposes the current trend of the mad rush of roads to merge. Weaker and financially unsound roads are not the lines to be absorbed, as Congress recommended in the Transportation Act of 1920. On the contrary it is pointed out to the President, a dominating factor in rail merger proposals has been the profit motive, with little attention being paid by the carriers or the ICC to the protection of the public interest.

Railway labor executives point out that the Commission policy in recent years has shown an absence of restraint on railroads in any form; that five major mergers were approved between 1955 and 1960 and none disapproved. More than a score of other carriers are currently involved in merger steps and practically every large railroad in the country is exploring the possibility. Absence from the Transportation Act of 1940 of restrictions and standards such as were in the 1920 act, encourages the ICC present policy. It is worth noting that in the prosperous 15 years following the act of 1940, there was no major railroad merger or consolidation.

Finally, the American people should remember that the public interest is not being served by the present rash of mergers for two principal reasons—

1. Mergers and consolidations of carriers threaten our current struggle to recover from depression and threaten our future economic progress, dislocating railroad communities in all parts of the Nation.

2. In the event of a national emergency, threat of which is ever present, rail mergers will permit and encourage the disintegration of an essential facility of transportation which cannot be replaced and will weaken our national defense potential: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania AFL–CIO at its second convention commends the Railway Labor Executives' Association and the 23 standard railroad labor organizations for the courageous and convincing campaign being waged to acquaint the people with the frightening facts of threats to the Nation's present and future well-being and safety represented by the current effort of railroad managements to gain quick profits by mergers; and be it further

Resolved, That officers and members of all affiliates are strongly urged to lend every assistance to fellow workers in the railroad unions to deny and counteract the distortions being promulgated by the railroads' current costly propaganda campaign built around the big-lie technique of using the unfounded charge of featherbedding.

Urban Renewal in the District of Columbia Can Be Made More Humane and Vastly Improved and Strengthened by Providing Tax Abatement, and by Protecting Good Structures and Those That Can Be Salvaged as Was Done So Ably in the Georgetown Section of the Nation's Capital, and Millions of Dollars in Taxes Can Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, once again I am compelled to voice my concern for the needless destruction of buildings and sites of local or national historical or architectural interest and the disruption of balanced neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. This is not offered as an overall criticism of the urban renewal program in the District of Columbia. Instead, I want to focus attention on the need for less emphasis on demolition and complete clearance and greater effort toward rehabilitation and conservation of neighborhoods which perform positive functions for their inhabitants. There is documentation to support the contention that too little attention has been given to the human side of urban renewal; and that historically significant areas, such as the one destroyed by the southwest urban renewal project in the District of Columbia have been swallowed up by inappropriate development. It is my belief that this documentation should serve as a warning to us and as an inducement to review the policies and regulations which have permitted this perversion of so essential and vast a program as urban renewal.

In an attempt to increase emphasis on rehabilitation and conservation we are first in need of a better definition of a slum. An editorial in the July 22, 1961, Saturday Evening Post alleges:

> In cities from coast to coast, areas of historic interest, pleasing architecture and gracious living are being condemned as substandard, blighted, deteriorating or plain slum. * * *
>
> Something of the sort is threatened for the West Greenwich Village area in New York City. Fourteen blocks in the most charming part of the city have been designated as a "blighted area," although the people who live there include normal middle-class families with better-than-average incomes, artists, small-business operators, working people of many races—the kind of people you find in any American community which has had a long and natural development. The delinquency rate is low; real estate valuations and taxes have been steadily rising—a uniquely blighted area.

I can cite an example even closer to home. I have reference to the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project. This is a project which is worthy of note, for it truly exemplifies citizen interest in renewal, upgrading, and preservation of a stable community. Nevertheless, there are some features of which I am critical, and I have tried to assist the Kalorama Citizens Association in its efforts to have these features corrected. A part of the plan for the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project is to demolish one side of Lanier Place NW., for the purpose of erecting a parking lot. Lanier Place is an attractive residential street which contains predominantly substantial houses, some of which are valued as high as $75,000. Surely this does not constitute a slum area which must be removed to be replaced by a parking lot.

In spite of citizen dissatisfaction and the fact that the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project is the first urban renewal project in the District which emphasizes conservation and rehabilitation of existing properties, officials have refused to change the plan for clearing Lanier Place to establish this parking area. The HHFA has already approved an application for Federal planning advance funds, and has made a capital grant of more than $460,000. Here again is an example of the inappropriate use of some of the funds made available for urban renewal.

The West Greenwich Village area referred to by the Saturday Evening Post parallels on a smaller scale the kind of restoration we have witnessed in old Georgetown. Many of the West Greenwich Village residents have invested heavily in the repair and modernization of fine old brownstones, contributing to the creation of a stable, attractive neighborhood. Clearly, this is the kind of citizen action and interest which is basic to urban renewal. It should be encouraged. It should not be ignored in deference to the bulldozer approach of complete demolition and rebuilding. The taxpayers should not be required to underwrite this kind of social injustice and economic waste.

One city planner who has conducted on-site studies of the effects of urban renewal operations on site tenants, concludes that while urban renewal and rehousing of slum dwellers are necessary and desirable objectives, the means for achieving them are often ill chosen in relation to these objectives:

> Redevelopment should be pursued primarily for the benefit of the community as a whole and of the people who live in the slum area, and not for that of the redeveloper or his eventual tenants.
>
> For example, objectives such as attracting middle- and upper-income citizens back from the suburbs, contributing potential shoppers to a declining central retail area, creating symbols of community revival; or providing more statusful surroundings (and parking lots for powerful community institutions (are extraneous objectives).[1]

I am in wholehearted agreement with the attitude stated by this city planner, and I sincerely regret the fact that so few of the members of his profession share this humane and sensible point of view. I can only hope that in the not too distant future more city planners, urban renewal agency executives, and other Government officials will see the wisdom of achieving the true objectives of urban renewal—the rehousing of slum dwellers and the upgrading of neighborhoods, through conservation and rehabilitation.

In an appearance before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I submitted a statement in support of a proposed revision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, the statute under which the urban renewal operations of the District of Columbia are conducted. At that time I proposed the following change in language in the Redevelopment Act of 1945:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this act (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provide for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate, and shall dispose of such housing within a reasonable time on such terms as it may consider to be reasonable and in the public interest.

Briefly, my proposal has as its objective the preservation of all sound structures—residential or other—and the avoidance of depredation of buildings or sites possessing local or national historical or architectural interest which should be preserved as a part of our country's history. I also proposed that the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, likewise be revised to include this language. A similar proposal was among the recommendations of the 1960 tax policy study undertaken by the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York. This group also suggested that code enforcement be used as a tool for reducing the cost of urban renewal, and the council proposed that once a firm decision has been made to acquire a specific area for urban renewal, owners of substandard properties be given the choice between prompt rehabilitation or equally prompt demolition.

The Housing Act of 1961 contains several tools for use in conserving and rehabilitating basically sound housing. It is my hope that these instruments will be used to the greatest possible extent. Properly used, and conscientiously administered, the new home improvement loan program and the liberalized FHA insurance provisions can help stem the spread of blight; rehouse low- and middle-income families in housing which they can afford; and prevent the needless demolition of homes and other buildings, and the disruption of neighborhood ties and associations. However, it does not provide for the retention of all sound structures in urban renewal project areas, as does my proposal.

Studies conducted by ACTION American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods—and other groups—both private and public—have documented the fact that rehabilitation of sound structures is usually less costly than new construction on the same site. Thus, there is a distinct cost advantage in rehabilitation.

In view of our anticipated population growth and the estimate of experts that from 4 to 6 million dwelling units sink below acceptable standards or are demolished every decade, positive steps are required now to prevent a reduction in our overall housing supply. William L. C. Wheaton, a well-known city planner, has estimated that, through rehabilitation, some 400,000 existing dwelling units may be saved from destruction or dilapidation every year. This constitutes another concrete advantage to be gained by a step up in rehabilitation efforts.

The two advantages mentioned—reduction of the cost of urban renewal and saving housing units—are economic gains which could be achieved through rehabilitation. There is also a social benefit of major significance which could be derived from an emphasis on conservation and rehabilitation of slum areas—I have reference to the preservation of established, balanced neighborhoods.

I would like to call the attention of this body to the philosophy of an editorial which appeared in the July 21, 1961, issue of Life magazine; it may provide some food for thought. The editorial was a commentary on a recent brochure published for the Citizens' Housing and Planning Council of New York, written by that eminent housing expert, Miss Elizabeth Wood. Miss Wood recommended that public housing develop-

[1] Herbert J. Gans, "The Human Implications of Current Redevelopment and Relocation Planning" (February 1959, Journal of American Institute of Planners).

ments be designed to help the lower income people to learn to be self-policing via "community morale." Life magazine observes that Miss Wood "urges that public housing projects be adorned with pubs, candy stores, loitering places, and other amenities of community life. Instead of strict rules and keep-off-the-grass signs, she would provide places for the teenagers to drink pop and play records while their parents drink beer and play boccie nearby. A concierge would be at their service in the lobby."

The magazine editorial concludes:

Here surely is a reason to stop and think before we let the bulldozers loose on our remaining slums. Many salvageable slums are already well equipped with saloons, candy stores, loitering places, and a humming community life. * * *

The housing problem requires many different solutions; but the roles of the bulldozer, the big project, and the professional housers have long been overdone. If some rents have to be subsidized, it can surely be done without creating economic ghettos which, whether bleak or pretty, are no more democratic than the other kind. Tax reforms, better incentives, for private landlords, easier credit for rehabilitation—there are many ways we can stop slums from developing, and so nourish the living communities of real people that make our great cities worth saving.

During this session of the Congress I introduced a bill in the House which sought to allow homeowners to deduct from their income tax payments the expenses incurred in modernization and rehabilitation of their homes, and to permit an accelerated rate of amortization of the costs of such repairs and improvements. It is my contention that this incentive to homeowners is a step which the Congress and the Internal Revenue Bureau should not hesitate to take. There are others who share this view.

For example testimony before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee this year revealed the deep concern of mayors and housing officials over the continuation of tax practices which tend to perpetuate the slums rather than eliminate them. Richard L. Strout, reporting on these hearings in the May 11, 1961 Christian Science Monitor stated that planning authorities charged "that today's municipal taxes harness the profit motive backward."

The slumlord who buys property and lets it deteriorate, they charge, is benefited by taking a depreciation allowance. If he sells for less than he paid he gets a tax rebate. If the same man tried to improve his slum dwelling by painting or renovating it, he would be taxed higher on the higher value.

Similarly a University of Wisconsin law professor, Arthur D. Sporn, has concluded that "within our legal system the depreciation allowance provisions of Federal and State income tax laws, as they apply to rental housing may be promoting the persistence and spread of slums."

Professor Sporn based his conclusion upon a thorough study of the depreciation provisions of the Federal income tax law and legislation and other activity aimed at slum clearance in the United States. His study revealed that depreciation rules encourage irresponsible and deleterious operation of rental housing; discourage investment in new housing; and contribute to the shortage of building sites for new housing.

I was particularly interested in Mr. Sporn's analysis of the consequences of our failure to revise our tax regulations. Says Mr. Sporn:

In the case of slum housing the public subsidy that contributes to the maintenance of values, and hence to the level of capital investment being recovered through depreciation, comes from at least three separate sources: from the relief and other welfare payments made to tenants by welfare and other public agencies, part of which goes toward payment of rent; from the furnishing of municipal services at excessive costs; and from purchases made in condemnation proceedings.[1]

Surely a dynamically progressive country such as ours, built upon honesty, integrity, and individual enterprise, and having as one of its motivating principles "the greatest good for the greatest number," cannot afford the continuation of practices which thwart progress, and benefit the few at the expense of the many.

In taking the actions which I have proposed in my two bills, we would not be setting an uncharted course. Washington's Georgetown, Boston's Beacon Hill, New York's Sutton Place—all are living proof that renewal through rehabilitation can be successful. Australia's and New Zealand's experiences with land value taxation has proved that tax abatement on building improvements can be effective.

If slum clearance and rehousing of slum dwellers are worthy objectives—and I am convinced that they are—they must be encouraged. This we can do by not penalizing those who improve their property by levying taxes on these improvements, and by promoting continuous urban renewal through tax abatement, emphasis on rehabilitation procedures as opposed to complete demolition and clearance of slum areas. Last, but by no means least, we can prevent the destruction of historic sites and the disruption of community life which has had so detrimental an impact on thousands of families.

I ask that you join me in urging this administration to do everything possible to improve the housing for all American families, to preserve the symbols of our country's history, and to promote neighborhood improvement and stability through rehabilitation of existing housing and the provision of adequate community facilities.

I have today introduced a House joint resolution which provides tax abatement for the improvement of residential property, and, at the same time, protects good housing as well as housing which can be salvaged.

This measure will literally save tens of millions of dollars. If it had been in effect it would have made unnecessary the expenditure of the major part of the $90 million which is the expected final cost of the Southwest urban renewal project, and it would have made unnecessary the loss of taxes from business and residential property in the Southwest urban renewal project which is another major and hidden cost of the present type of urban renewal programs being carried on in the District of Columbia.

Third, it would have been much more humane, had it been in effect, and would not have contributed to the spreading of slums throughout the District of Columbia as the present program has. Here is the second major hidden cost of the present type of urban renewal program.

[1] Sporn, Arthur D.: "Some Contributions of the Income Tax Law to the Growth and Prevalence of Slums." Columbia Law Review, vol. 59, Nov. 1959: 1026–1036.

The Destructive Nature of Our Present Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt's column in the August 10, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express points to the fallacies of our present foreign aid program. It is most timely and would, I am sure, be of interest to every Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I insert the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BOLSTERING THE U.S. $$$

(Unfortunately, the President's foreign aid program is wasting two of our most precious assets: The stability of the dollar and the competitive power of U.S. industry.—Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1961.)

"The most important issue today is the restoration of international confidence in the dollar," according to London's Samuel Montagu & Co., leading bullion dealers.

The noted French economist, Jacques Rueff, puts it this way:

"A grave peril hangs over the economy of the West. Every day its situation more and more resembles the one that turned the 1929 recession into the great depression. The instability in our monetary system is such that a minor international incident or a small economic or financial disturbance could set off worldwide disaster."

The collapse of the American dollar would mean a collapse of the entire free world economy.

TIME HAS COME

Now the important thing for us to bear in mind is that the strength of our dollar has been continuously drained away by constant erosion of our gold reserve—perhaps the word "hemorrhage" would be more appropriate here—and we lost over $5 billion in the period 1958–60, alone. How long can this go on at Fort Knox?

"The real significance of the drain on our gold supply," said the influential Senate Committee on Rules and Administration recently, "is that it is a symptom of a basic and potentially disastrous weakness in our economy. This weakness is the deteriorating position of the United States as a supplier of industrial products in world markets."

TO REALLY SEE

One of the basic reasons for this unpleasant factor lies in the fact that the economies of Western Europe and Japan have become

important competitors in world markets. Their brandnew factories and competent mass production techniques compare favorably with ours—and have been largely financed in the past with American taxpayer giveaways.

Utilizing much cheaper labor available in foreign countries, our friends and allies—as well as our enemies on the other side of the Iron Curtain—are underselling and undercutting us all around the globe.

World consumers are not interested in the argument that America has been their great friend in the past. They ask the age-old question:

"What have you done for me recently?"

Then they buy goods from the supplier who gives them the best price. This is natural. But the point is that we are up against what amounts to a self-defeating argument: We are paying for our own ultimate economic destruction. Our high-cost-of-labor merchandise will increasingly suffer in competition with the foreign low-cost-of-labor output. What about the future?

It seems to this writer that our allies are going to have to face up to the facts of life, however unpleasant for them. We simply cannot go on carrying the lion's share of the load and getting only the donkey's share in return (see Aesop's Fables).

The controversial U.S. foreign aid program is the difference between solvency and the multibillion dollar annual drain on our threatened gold reserves.

OUR RUIN IS NEAR

Let our friends—if they are indeed our friends—carry their fair share of the load between us. What are they doing now? Why not have a long overdue accounting and find out exactly what has been done by all of us?

The sorry truth is that our allies have milked us for all they can get—and now some of them think we owe them a living.

The recent effrontery of the head of a foreign government telling the U.S. Senate that, like it or not, we were stuck with foreign aid from here on out—and that we had better accept it, or else—left a bad taste in the mouths of most of us. Even though it was obviously a badly staged "spontaneous" effort by the administration to stampede Capitol Hill support in behalf of foreign aid.

BY AID FALLACY

The currently ill-advised plea of giving the administration long-term foreign aid moneys without congressional strings attached could open up a Pandora's box of evils.

If congressional scrutiny has not caused our expensive military structure to collapse because of lack of long-range planning—then what is there to wring our hands about similar year-by-year plans for underdeveloped Afro-Asian nations?

Congress should not abdicate its historical control of the purse.

Once this happens, the international results thereafter could become increasingly weird for us.

Ever hear of the planned $200 billion boondoggle over a 10-year period by the code name of SUNFED? Ask Representative GLEN LIPSCOMB of Los Angeles.

J.F.K. Aids Far, Far Over Their Heads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal recently carried an extremely interesting article by Henry J. Taylor in which he hits the nail right on the head in regard to the great amount of activity at the White House which results in little positive action. I commend it to the reading of the Members of the House:

NO POLITICS PLEASE—J.F.K.'S AIDS FAR, FAR OVER THEIR HEADS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

On ending his report to the Nation about Berlin, President Kennedy said he had found the burdens of the Presidency even greater than he thought when he ran for office. He asked for suggestions and for the public to help him.

The humbleness in this plea is enormously appealing and the sincerity unquestionable. "To know," the Bible calls it; a profoundly meaningful word.

Progressively fighting for the right, as the President is, is the noblest effort the world affords, and I do not like to put things too strongly but I believe that the greatest help the President, and therefore our Nation, can receive is within his own grasp and at his command.

Surely it must begin with the abandonment of inexperienced and immature young associates who are his closest official advisers in the White House. They are intellectuals, fresh from college faculties, but not one has had any experience in government or equally large affairs or been tested in anything like the burdens to which the President himself refers.

The President simply brought with him into places of highest authority the same group who had the highest authority in his election campaign. They are far, far over their heads. The correction is entirely in the President's own hands, as it is elsewhere among advisers where incompetence is evident in the record.

Next, great help will flow to him when, in so properly calling for sacrifices, he himself takes this flag out front. The basic sacrifice any official can make—and it is soon recognized by the public—is not to play politics—with the people's money, with policies, with decisions, with appointments or anything else, and to forget the next election. Yet it is clear that politics as usual, political spending as usual, and all the casting about for reelection is in practice from the White House on down.

No President can control congressional behavior in this respect, but he can control his own. The survival of the United States is not a partisan matter, and partisan affairs are too much for a President or our Nation to bear at a time like this.

Next, failing to be strong, we invite aggression; failing to be solvent, we defeat ourselves. The weapons we are building are the world's best peace insurance. But they are costly beyond comprehension, and every dollar in personal income taxes Washington levies, and more, is already consumed by defense bills alone.

Great help would come to the President's hallowed task by postponing or abandoning other programs which, while desirable or popular, are not essential. Yet, instead, added programs are being sponsored without apparent heed to the cost of it all or how we are to pay for the total load, except through a deficit without tears.

The weapon Russia wants most is an inflated and unstable America. And little separates the Russian sword from our throat. We are faced by a problem of priorities in spending. We need an immediate decision on where to proceed and where to hold back. Not a better life, but humanity in its vastest meaning, is at stake.

Lastly, the Greeks and Romans went into battle under the influence of oratory. But as new weapons became more deadly the tongue lost much of its force. For false promises, unattainable promises, broken promises—these three things are the curse of men and nations. Knowing this, Prime Minister Winston Churchill was careful with his words, for, as he said:

"The people can face peril or misfortune with fortitude and buoyancy, but they bitterly resent being deceived or finding that those responsible for their affairs are themselves dwelling in a house of artifact. There is no worse mistake in public leadership."

It will be profoundly helpful to the President if he attempts to redeem to the American people the promises made and then contradicted or not kept, and at the same time he speaks no word that exceeds our Government's willingness and capacity to act, as in the tragedy of the unsupported warnings to Russia regarding Cuba and Laos. Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world, and therefore to peace, as eloquence without performance.

Thus a mass of uneasy thoughts burst in today. But the American people would recognize a change in course very fast and respond with a roar of approval, support and allegiance. Otherwise, any President must face a division between those who believe with their ears and those who believe with their eyes. And to force that unwanted division on us would be unworthy of this hour.

In many lands, across many a sea, so far from home, American youth in their sad dust must search our souls. They hail this land, forever, for eternity. So do we.

Our Spending Policies Are a Greater Threat Than Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest articles it has been my privilege to read is the following column written by Henry J. Taylor on where the United States is headed if we continue to adopt socialistic programs in an effort to defeat socialism:

THE EEL UNDER THE ROCK

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When Khrushchev said he would bury us, this man was crazy as a fox. We have the shovel. We are burying ourselves. If Khrushchev has any brains he will just do a Rip Van Winkle and let us do the rest.

We are not fighting communism. We are promoting it; by political spending which punches hard at self-reliance, programs which aggressively make State dependents out of larger and larger parts of our population, tax laws which to a major degree nationalize property and wages, and by the veiled dive into welfare-state socialism which is, in fact, the overall objective.

It is a matter of intent. And this is the intent. It is also the chassis of totalitarianism by any name, and any government in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate for it whatever.

When you think of socialism, think of the force-content of the plan. That's the key. And socialism's only proven advantage is to the planners themselves. It is notorious as a politician's paradise. It guarantees the planners power by its bribes for votes; supports "the love of governing," as Voltaire defined political ambition; and suits

its intellectual jockeys' cynical dream that they are the brains and we are the horses.

If we do not intend to create free and independent citizens the United States has gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing. This is what the Constitution intended and we depend on everybody to recognize the worth.

Our Constitution was not written to limit the people. The people can always change the Constitution. It was written to limit the politicians. This is why they so often have trouble with it. And today we are witnessing every dodge and ball trick to circle this defense and in a mood, an intent, of conquest. Thus, regardless of cause, the great oath of office becomes nothing more estimable than a ceremony.

The future comes 1 day at a time. There is absolutely no guarantee we can indefinitely withstand totalitarian encroachments. Totalitarianism means adherence to a single will, not necessarily a soldier or personal tyrant. Just one man.

Democracies shatter themselves by blindness to this. The truth is the only hope: We are being deliberately manipulated further and further into such control. This is the eel under the rock and we had better see it. For the facts are undisputable and the truth can stop it if the public grasps the facts.

Back-door spending of billions in foreign aid without congressional control, sweeping Executive decrees having the effect of law without due process of law, multitudinous powerful Government agencies which report only to the President, attacks on the trinity of checks and balances provided by the separation of Federal powers, the battle against the rights of the States—these are all symptoms of a deep malaise imposed on us.

In the quiet accounting our President renders to himself he can take stock at this perilous time, reverse his field, forget politics and 1964, and abandon the thrust toward welfare state socialism—abandon partisan powerplays and Government by indirect coercion and see as the fine patriot which he is that these are intolerable now in the country he loves as much as any man alive.

Defensive Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to an editorial that appeared in the August 7 edition of Aviation Week magazine. This contains an admonishment to each of us here in the Congress, to the President and most directly to the Secretary of Defense. This critically analyzes the current and future status of the Air Defense posture of the United States in the light of the three new supersonic strategic bombers exhibited in sufficient quantities to guarantee volume production by the Soviets on July 9, and each armed and equipped with air-to-surface missiles of such ranges as to render our perimeter defenses, totally ineffective.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial to be entered into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, offensive and defensive weapons are inescapably tied together, they are interrelated and they are inseparable. Because of leadtimes, and other technical considerations it is constantly essential that we maintain a family of offensive weapons in the various stages of their life cycle. By the same token it is equally essential that we have a similar family of defense weapons in the same stages. Our inventory aircraft, in this dynamic field of technological advancement, must at all times be of sufficient superiority over those of our potential foe to insure success. In other words, our offensive weapons must exceed the capabilities of his defensive weapons and, at the same time, our defensive weapons must exceed the capabilities of his offensive weapons. Our failure to do this is an open invitation to aggression and in the days of thermonuclear bombs to total annihilation.

Where do we stand in the light of these truisms? What hypothetical study, what abstract analysis, what intuitive hunch has led us to our present status—a state of affairs that violates every principle of warfare that have been proven in every battle since Alexander the Great? Beginning at the end of June 1961 our air defense began a decline in both quality and quantity that is as inevitable as the passage of time and as inescapable as taxes. On that day the last all-weather interceptor was delivered to the U.S. Air Force. From that day on, Mr. Speaker the erosion has begun. Mr. Holtz calls it a combination of faulty intelligence and wishful thinking, I call it criminal negligence.

The conferees of both Houses provided $100 million in the fiscal year 1961 defense appropriations bill for the contained procurement of F–106 all-weather interceptors. This money was not used. There are no moneys requested in the fiscal year 1962 Defense Department budget request for this purpose. We now find ourselves confronted with a possible air offensive from the south—a direction that has been totally neglected. The implications of the supersonic buildup in the Soviet supersonic strategic air force are explicit. The standoff capabilities represented by their air-to-surface missiles is explicit. The implications of the appropriations request to provide $207 million for American citizens to dig holes in the ground are explicit. The implications of the tone and content of Mr. Khrushchev's fireside chat are explicit.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

The Secretary of Defense gives every evidence that he will recommend against the use of the funds unanimously appropriated by the Congress for the continued production of manned strategic bombers. Our only supersonic long-range manned bomber, the B–58, will be allowed to wither and blow away. The development of the B–70 will be slowed down. Our deterrent capability offensively begins its decline when this decision is made. This makes it all the more mandatory that we take every conceivable means to enhance the caliber and quantity of our air defense system. Unfortunately we canceled the development of the F–108 long-range interceptor. We cannot reinitiate this program without chaos. We can, however, if we act with dispatch, restart the production of our most advanced all-weather interceptor, the F–106. We can order improved versions with increased speed and range and improved fire-control systems and improved missiles which are capable of meeting the threat. These can begin to be delivered years before a newly designed fighter could be available. The interceptors procured in the interim to insure production continuity can be used to replace much needed attrition losses, to provide for all-weather defensive capability along our southern border and to provide for greater defense in depth. We can enhance the all-weather defensive capabilities of our NATO allies and our allies in SEATO nations to contain the ever increasing threat of the Soviet SAC, the Communist China SAC, and the budding Indonesian SAC.

I have pointed out these things before, Mr. Speaker. I have predicted the state of affairs which now confronts us. We must insist, in deference to our responsibilities to provide for the common defense,, in deference to our wives and children, in deference to our responsibilities to the people of the United States and the free world, that the executive department act with dispatch to insure our existence in the future.

DEFENSIVE PROBLEMS

(By Robert Hotz)

The problem of using offensive military weapons offers a wide choice of possibilities that can be tailored in many fashions to suit the varying national policies and purposes of the countries concerned.

For example, the fact that the Soviets are building a second generation of supersonic long-range bombers does not necessarily mean that the best U.S. policy lies in pursuing a similar course. It may be prudent to continue to bolster B–52 and B–58 strength for the immediate future to insure that there is no possibility of a deterrent gap before large numbers of solid-fueled missiles can take over the major portion of that role. But it is becoming increasingly obvious that the development of the mach 3 B–70 bomber offers only marginal possibilities for major military advantage for the time period into which it has now slipped.

Although the Air Force is clinging to the B–70 project with emotional fervor, many people are raising the question whether the substantial funding now being poured into the B–70 program could not be invested with more profit to the defense posture in some other, considerably more advanced methods of waging long-range offensive warfare. This is a debate that is likely to grow in intensity as the inexorable technical logic of this situation backs the blue-suited emotions into a tight corner.

When it comes to the problems of defense, however, there is no choice available except to counter the enemy's weapons. The kind of defense that this country builds is of necessity determined by the kind of weapons the Soviets develop to wage offensive warfare. Among the prime requisites in building adequate defensive forces yesterday to beat the enemy's offensive capability of today are accurate intelligence and intelligent foresight. It is always too late to research, develop, produce and deploy a defensive system if you wait until the enemy reveals his new offensive equipment, even in prototype form.

Thus, it is obvious that we should have been working on a defensive system against Soviet ICBM's even before we got the first intelligence confirmation that they had indeed embarked on the development of this type of weapon. Unfortunately, our ICBM defense effort has been confined to the single channel of the Nike-Zeus approach, plus a rather thinly funded broad research study sponsored by ARPA. It is impossible to determine at this point in technology whether a successful defense can be developed against the ICBM. But history records that no "invulnerable"weapon has ever been developed and that an effective counter always appears, with its appearance timed in direct ratio to the amount of effort devoted to its development.

The current scale of our ICBM defense effort suggests that it should be increased in intensity and expanded in scope. For an effective ICBM defense offers the strong possibility of achieving strategic checkmate in a single move. The country that first develops and demonstrates an effective defense against ICBM's can rule the international roost for that period in the foreseeable future until new types of offensive weapons emerge to make the ICBM obsolete.

Although we get only faint sniffs of the Soviet effort at developing an anti-ICBM system, it would be foolish to assume that they are not pushing this program to the limit of their available technical resources. As a nation of chess players, the significance of this move could hardly be lost on the Soviet leaders.

In the same vein, we should be devoting considerable effort today to developing defensive capability against weapons that may eventually be deployed through space, even though it is not yet clear exactly in what form the space offense will emerge as a genuine threat some years hence. Such projects as the Air Force Saint (satellite interceptor) represent a sound forward step toward solving the defensive problems of tomorrow, even though its details sound like science fiction to the taxpayer today.

But one area in which we find ourselves in serious defensive difficulty is the old-fashioned business of air defense against manned bombers. Based on a combination of faulty intelligence and wishful thinking, our national leaders of some years ago convinced themselves that the Soviets had abandoned manned bomber development and that it was safe to let our air defense system deteriorate into eventual obsolescence.

There is still some effort at the top level in the Pentagon to dismiss the Soviet supersonic bomber and tanker developments with the hackneyed Detroit-manufactured sneers of "The Russians aren't 10 feet tall," and "How do we know these new Russian bombers aren't just prototypes built to fool us into going in the wrong direction?" This was the same sort of malarkey pedaled by the Central Intelligence Agency after the 1956 Tushino air show. Despite the protestations of Messrs. Dulles and Khrushchev, the Soviets have continued development of manned flying machines across the entire technical spectrum from supersonic bombers to helicopters and convertiplanes.

It is against the threat of the new Soviet supersonic bombers with their high-speed jet tanker support, combined with the old Bear and Badger bomber fleet equipped with standoff missiles of sufficient range to avoid Nike-Hercules and make the Bomarc B and the F–106 systems of marginal effectiveness, that our defenses are critically weak. We once had adequate military plans to counter this future threat with the long-range F–108 mach 3 interceptor and a modernized SAGE and DEW-line system. But all of these plans were scrapped on the ground that no such future threat would exist.

In our current preoccupation with the development of a variety of technically sound new offensive weapons, we should not neglect a more intensive and intelligent evaluation of our future defensive requirements than we have devoted to this area in the past.

The Ideological Battle of Constitutional Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the current attack on constitutional conservatism is discussed in a column by George Todt which appeared in the August 2, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express. Thinking that Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Todt's column, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"GIVE ME LIBERTY OR"

"In much of your talking, thinking is half murdered".—KAHLIL GIBRAN, the prophet.

(By George Todt)

Seen from the ideological viewpoint of constitutional conservatives, the most dangerous man in America may well be Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas. He is chairman of the influential Foreign Relations Committee, former Rhodes scholar to England's Oxford University and a power in the controversial Bilderburg Group.

The latter is particularly adverse to publicity, but has been pretty well established as a form of "Atlantic Union" type of fellowship dedicated to erosion or loss of U.S. sovereignty.

Consider these recent words of FULBRIGHT as he addressed the 1961 Cuberly Conference on Education at Stanford University.

MANY YEARS AGO

"The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society, far removed from the centers of world power.

"It is imperative that we break out of the intellectual confines of cherished and traditional beliefs and open our minds to the responsibility that basic changes in our system may be essential to meet the requirements of the 20th century * * *

"I do not know whether the American people can be aroused in time from their current apathy and indifference and educated to the necessity for challenging tasks and policies that break sharply with the traditions of the past.

"I do feel certain that if a consensus for dynamic and imaginative action is to be formed, it is the President who must shape it."

BRAVE MEN SPOKE

FULBRIGHT's apparent scorn for our "constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society, far removed from the centers of world power" is not shared by those who study and understand history.

Our ingenious Founding Fathers rejected all notions of a government with dictatorial and tyrannical powers, accordingly instituted our famed system of checks and balances between our executive, legislative and judiciary sections. None can gain complete ascendancy over the others.

Now this does not make for governmental streamlining and quick decisions overnight—but we have never had a Hitler, Stalin or even King George III.

Which is better? What is wrong with making the American system of government free from tyranny? Who wants a dictator in the United States?

I think we are well off today, Senator FULBRIGHT to the contrary, and we all ought to take a long second look at any siren call for changes in our constitutional system. Although designed for an 18th century agrarian society at the outset, it was also much more than that alone.

NOW WE KNOW

The American constitutional system has stood the test of time. In 185 years it has taken us from the position of a small agrarian society to that of the most powerful nation in history.

The British parliamentary system, which Senator FULBRIGHT admires so much, is now presiding over the breakup of the largest empire in modern times. What is the incentive here to make a change?

Who wants a dictatorship? All dictatorled nations throughout the world as of right now, including Russia, have less than one-third of our celebrated standard of living. Why should we complain?

Senator FULBRIGHT is a man who will require considerable watching by American conservatives—neither apathetic nor indifferent—in the unpredictable days ahead. Who is he?

The former Rhodes scholar received his education at Oxford, hotbed of British Fabian Socialists. The latter are closely akin to our homegrown variety of socialistic Americans for Democratic Action. If they could have their way, leaders of the ADA would take us into Fabian socialism without delay. FULBRIGHT is one of their pampered darlings.

IT WAS NO JOKE

The Arkansas Senator first made the headlines as a result of now-deceased Senator Joseph McCarthy labeling him "Senator Half-Bright" in his war against fifth column subversion.

I have always considered it a grave tactical error to be insulting toward an ideological opponent. In truth, I think FULBRIGHT gained much from McCarthy's diatribes against him. He took on the mantle of a martyr.

Throughout the years, FULBRIGHT has lent much support to the radical concept of Atlantic union—a concept which, incidentally, would benefit Great Britain much more than the United States. Why should we be the tail on the kite?

Not long ago FULBRIGHT was taken sharply to task in the Senate by Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, a stauch Democrat conservative.

THURMOND, also a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve, spoke out strongly against FULBRIGHT's recent secret memorandum to the Pentagon—which got leaked, incidentally—against officers of the armed services appearing on anti-Communist platforms in public. What gives?

Brooklyn: The Borough of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few communities of the world can claim as familiar an identification all over the world

as the great Borough of Brooklyn. I have no knowledge yet as to whether this great community has been heard of spatially but when we are I am sure we will be described in words connoting progress, true brotherhood, and social responsibility. I would direct the attention of my colleagues to a recent article complimentary in tone which reflects to the Borough of Brooklyn:

BROOKLYN PROGRESS

Borough President John Cashmore did not live to see the 1960–61 edition of Brooklyn Progress, the title of his annual reports year after year. Mr. Cashmore died on May 7, but, because most the work was done under his direction, the 44-page brochure has been issued in his name and forwarded to Mayor Wagner by Borough President Hayes.

Like the preceding reports, the 1960–61 volume goes far beyond the scope of the borough president's immediate responsibilities and surveys Brooklyn generally. For many years the downtown Brooklyn civic center has been taking shape; now we learn that the center has stimulated public and privately financed improvements in the area worth $258,860,000. These include housing projects, office structures, and banks, to name a few.

Brooklyn resisted the effects of the 1960–61 economic recession "far better than most large industrial and business communities"; Brooklyn manufacturers turn out, each year, products valued at $1,750 million in 7,500 local manufacturing plants, and the volume of Brooklyn's retail sales business for 1960 was $2,313 million or $80 million higher than in 1959. The report cites these facts in making a case for the borough as being both stable and dynamic.

Big Push in Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post features an article entitled "Big Push in Soviet Propaganda," written by the authors of "The Ugly American," Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer. It is pertinent to the provisions and objectives of H.R. 8400 now before the House and due to be voted upon this week.

It is strong support for those who recognize the seriousness of the worldwide struggle now confronting all free nations and who think, as do I, that the Mutual Security Act proposals are ill advised, costly, and wasteful, and would turn over to the Executive powers and responsibilities which under our Constitution belong to and must be retained by Congress. The authors of the article, which I present here for the RECORD, make a valuable contribution to straight thinking:

BIG PUSH IN SOVIET PROPAGANDA: TO PRESENT A BROTHERLY AND BENEFICENT IMAGE, RUSSIA BACKS A GLOBAL ORGANIZATION WITH TREMENDOUS POWER AND BIG MONEY—A REPORT BY THE AUTHORS OF "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

(By Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer)

In Manila a young Filipino writer opens an envelope, finds a check for 750 pesos—the largest sum he has ever received for an article. Twenty-eight hundred miles to the southwest, at the airport in Ceylon, an anxious mother and her paralyzed son are carefully placed in a plane and before the plane has made altitude a doctor is examining the boy. Five thousand miles to the northwest, in a sunny Russian schoolroom, 60 8-year-old children expectantly face the door, waiting for a distinguished dark-skinned visitor. When he enters, they sing a song of welcome in Hindi, his native language.

Three rather touching scenes—but they all bear the mark made in Moscow. These three episodes are typical of thousands that occur around the world as a part of a comprehensive Communist propaganda program. Only recently have Western scholars been able to put together the fragments of this massive Soviet propaganda apparatus and make educated estimates of its range.

Americans, used to the bluster of Khrushchev and the blatancy of May Day parades in Red Square, will be surprised at the delicacy with which this devastating, yet invisible structure operates.

In the opinion of many experts this propaganda machine is more dangerous than nuclear-armed ICBM's. The Soviet effort costs $2 billion a year directly and probably twice that much indirectly. By contrast the United States spends about one twentieth as much in money and one one-hundredth as much in effort and intellectual skill.

The Soviet effort is not merely massive. To a startling degree it can pinpoint small targets. Take the three examples mentioned. The Filipino writer had received his check from the Foreign Language Publishing House in Moscow. Although he is a professed "Philippine nationalist," he is now receiving over half of his income from Soviet royalties. The anxious Ceylonese mother with the paralyzed son was flown to Moscow, where her son was given treatment at a polio institute and returned home much improved. The mother, in addition to being an influential journalist, is related to the secretary of a powerful Ceylonese politician. The class of Hindi-singing children were Russian students at a public school in Moscow and their guest was a prominent Hindi-speaking Indian intellectual. When he returned to India, he praised the Soviet Union's "brotherly interest in India and its culture."

The painstaking details of the Soviet effort are stunning. Grassroots indoctrination begins in the Soviet schools. All Soviet pupils start serious study of a foreign language in the third grade. By the time they have finished high school they have had at least 6 years' training in a foreign language. They do not confine their language training to English, French, Spanish and German, but also have thousands of students studying the so-called "exotic languages" of Africa and Asia. In Singhalese and Bengali, the Russians have a small army of fluent linguists. Our Department of State's Foreign Service does not have a single qualified person—although these languages are spoken by almost 100 million people living in important sensitive areas.

Language is not the whole of propaganda, as we shall see, but it is the vital first step. John Foster Dulles put it this way: "Interpreters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language, and without understanding their language, it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

Soviet language training is so sweeping that Moscow can, if the occasion calls for it, produce tomorrow a skilled plumber who speaks Hindi and is also familiar with the great figures of Hindi literature. As long ago as 1957 Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, said that he had never met a Russian in that country who was not working hard at Hindi, or already reasonably fluent in the language. American officials who are fluent in Hindi could comfortably meet in the living room of an average American home.

What are the results? When Moscow contracted to build the Bhilai steel mill for India, a great many of the Russians, from steel muddlers to top engineers, could speak to Indians in their own language. The Indians were so pleased that they did not object when Russian workers taught Russian and Marxist doctrine to Indian workers during the lunch hour.

In Swahili, Nepali, Telugu, Annamese, Amharic—languages spoken by 86 million people—the pattern is the same. The Soviets have platoons of people trained in all these languages. Most Russians will not see duty overseas, but if the need arises, the Soviet propaganda apparatus can call upon an immense reservoir of language competence. By contrast, consider that this year only four of our foreign service officers are studying southeast Asian languages.

But the real cutting edge of the Soviet propaganda apparatus is the full-time, highly trained expert who skillfully directs his army of assistants. When he goes to work, overseas or in Moscow, he will have survived one of the world's most rigorous indoctrination and screening programs. He is a professional who has been schooled more extensively than a physician. Take, as a composite example, the case of a fellow we'll call Serge Rasonilkov.

Serge was graduated at the top of his class from a high school in Minsk. He was assigned to one of the numerous institutes that exist throughout Russia for specialized training in language and area studies. For the first year the average workday was 16 to 18 hours. Serge was 1 of 25 students making up a class in Twi, a little-known language which is spoken by 2 million people in the northern part of Africa's gold coast region. Language made up one-half of the institute's program, and it was taught by an African Communist, specially recruited. The other half of the curriculum consisted of an intensive course in the anthropology, religion, politics, and geography of Africa.

At the end of the first year the 25 students were told where each ranked in the class. The bottom five students were dropped from the institute.

For 36 more months the work continued. When the class finally was graduated, it consisted only of five superior professionals. The Russians' estimates of their need for experts in Twi were five per year. Two of the students had been discharged from the institute for "marriage without official permission." The rest were casualties of the competitive system. In addition to scholastic brilliance, other criteria were taken into consideration in grading students—physical stamina, ability to make decisions and boldness.

Serge was one of those who survived. Serge had acquired not only the ability to speak Twi fluently but also knowledge of the Twi folk myths. In addition he knew the names of contemporary political leaders in the areas where Twi was spoken, their backgrounds, their weaknesses.

A few months before being graduated from the institute Serge and the four other surviving students were each assigned a secret topic on which to write a master's thesis. Unbeknownst to any of the five the topics were identical—"A Marxist-Leninist Strategy for Twi-speaking Cultures: The Next 10 Years." Near the end of the term each student was presented with a copy of the other four theses and asked to defend his own publicly in the light of what the other stated. To Western educators such a technique would be not only unethical but extremely cruel. In the Soviet view it produces a potential diplomat-propagandist who is suspicious, tough minded and highly flexible in his application of Communist ideology.

The institute decided that Serge was their most outstanding graduate. The four other graduates were at once ordered to Twi-speaking areas of Africa where they took jobs in the Russian Embassy or consulates as chauffeurs, kitchen helpers, and messengers. They were given these jobs to permit extensive contact with the natives. Later they would move into propaganda jobs.

Serge remained in Moscow and was sent to the Diplomatic School for an additional 2 years. The U.S.S.R. Diplomatic School is top secret. No American, to our knowledge, has ever visited there. A few foreign Communists have briefly attended the school and after defecting from the party have described what takes place in that highly guarded institution.

The first task of the school is to instill in every student an identical notion of the grand sweep of Soviet strategy and tactical flexibility. The aim of that strategy is to assure the world domination of socialism. Tactical flexibility means that in each country, at some time in history, the ever-changing problems will be different and must be handled differently. In some countries it will be possible to move quickly—to give history a push. In others it will be necessary to go more slowly, to mask Soviet intentions, to work in feigned sympathy with unsatisfactory local movements.

Serge also was taught such practical skills as the art of "spontaneous demonstration." The antiriot procedures of police all over the world were carefully studied so that they could be circumvented. Serge personally will never participate in such a demonstration. But he will give the triggering order to the local Communist leaders. The Communists, for example, carefully controlled the pitch and tempo of the Zengakuren student demonstration against the Japanese visit of President Eisenhower. The Communists in Tokyo, vastly outnumbered in the Zengakuren organization by moderates and conservatives, maneuvered the others during the last 3 days before the President's scheduled visit. The result of this tactic was a stunning historical cataclysm. The sovereign head of the world's most powerful Nation was prevented from visiting another head of state. To this day most of the members of the Zengakuren who howled in the streets during those days, are not anti-American and are not quite sure how they were manipulated. For Serge, such a performance is a routine technique.

A former Communist once told us, we thought jokingly, that one of the things taught at the Diplomatic School was "the moment for producing the proletarian corpse." By this the ex-Communist meant the technique of mysteriously killing or wounding a well-known native leader—especially one in revolt against white officials. The result of the murder usually is a violent flareup of native rage against those in authority. To succeed in such a political maneuver requires great skill. One of the problems of the propagandist is to calculate accurately when the moment for the murder has arrived—and how to have the corpse "discovered" most effectively.

In recent years we are not so certain that our ex-Communist friend was joking. With an eerie consistency, political deaths around the world inflame insurrections and benefit the Communists. From Laos to Vietnam to the Congo there is a thin, red, bloody strand that is almost surely not accidental.

Upon completion of his studies at the Diplomatic School, Serge was ordered to a Soviet embassy in Africa, where he at once had a consultation with the Russian political boss. In most Soviet embassies the ambassador is not the "No. 1 man" but is only a figurehead. He is the one charged with the energy-consuming task of showing up at social functions. If the ambassador absorbs a staggering number of vodka toasts and a huge amount of caviar at such functions, he can spend the next day recovering. The important political work is done by others who have time to think and study. Usually the real leader of the embassy will occupy what is officially the third or fourth position.

Serge was given almost a completely free hand. The camouflaged "No. 1" said he would issue specific orders only when a change in tactics or strategy came down from Moscow.

At first Serge concentrated on influencing strategically placed persons. Serge also saw that Twi poets, writers and intellectuals had their work translated and reviewed by Tass and in Pravada, or in one of the many specialized journals within Russia. The reviews invariably glowed with praise. Serge made certain that the local intellectual received a Twi translation of the review—as well as substantial royalties.

In the second phase Serge generated an impression of great Soviet admiration for the folk culture of the host country. The Soviet press published editorials insisting that selected native intellectuals be invited to Russia as state guests. Such visits were lavishly prepared and widely reported.

In Russia the surprised Africans found themselves surrounded by people who were not only friendly but apparently genuinely well informed and deeply interested in the culture of their own country. Writers who had barely been making a living suddenly began to receive handsome checks from Moscow for work that was translated into Russian. Musicians and artists received the same heady attention.

We once asked a group of Asian intellectuals, all of whom had received royalty payments from Moscow, if they knew that no American or British writer was able to receive royalties for works published in Russia. There was an embarrassing silence. We asked, half jokingly, how many of them would be willing to return their royalty checks to Moscow as a gesture of solidarity with their American literary colleagues.

One of the Asians, more candid than the others, stated, "It is impossible. I am now dependent for approximately 50 percent of my income on Soviet royalties. I could not afford to do as you ask, and I am ashamed of that fact." Most of the writers professed to be unaffected politically by their Soviet incomes.

But a young Indonesian writer told us, "It is difficult to avoid unconscious seduction. The first few articles I wrote for the Communists were fair and objective, and they printed them precisely as I wrote them. Each time they paid me more than I had received before. After a few months, however, they began to suggest slight editorial changes: Would I object to the placing of the word 'imperialistic' before 'American;' would it not be accurate to describe Eisenhower, a former general, as a militarist? If I balked they quietly went along, but they kept the pressure on—partly by raising the payments. One day I finished an article and on rereading realized that it was straight Communist doctrine. I tore it up and have not written for the Communists since."

He is a rare exception. But let us return to Serge.

Serge's next step was an intensive program of cultural exchange. Here Serge took Japan as an example. In 1957 a distinguished Russian pianist, Gilels, made a Japanese tour. This was quickly followed by a tour of the singer, Alla Glenkova. In 1958 the Russians invited the Japanese puppet theater Avidzi to Russia, where it received wildly enthusiastic reviews. The Russians also made it known, pointedly, that this was the first trip that the puppeteers had made outside of Japan's borders. Scholars, scientists and famous Russian artists too numerous to mention all visited Japan. In return, numerous groups of Japanese were invited to visit Russia.

Japan is a fully developed society, and Japanese are likely to recognize propaganda techniques when they see them. Even so, the Russians have made a serious propaganda penetration and are constantly working hard to enlarge it.

In the primitive and emerging nations the Soviet effort is proportionately much higher. Communist entertainers and artists and journalists flood to countries like Liberia, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Iran, Lebanon, and all the Arab countries.

In Burma, Russian circuses and Chinese entertainers went to tiny upcountry hamlets where the people had never before seen a foreigner. In some cases the Russian circus staff was larger than the village population.

Serge followed the established propaganda pattern closely. Once key people are cultivated and a mask of friendliness exhibited to the masses, the propaganda dagger is aimed at other victims. The next target group is students. They are invited to fairs, youth festivals, cultural meetings, and universities—all in Russia. Preparations are carefully made. For example, student delegations arriving in Russia from France and Great Britain and the United States, who have some knowledge of Communist techniques and are therefore likely to be suspicious, are housed in drab, ordinary dormitories. But the delegations from Africa, the Arab countries, and southeast Asia are housed and fed in plush luxury—candlelighted tables, a menu meticulously put together with careful attention to religious requirements and native food tastes, and cheerful waiters.

Perhaps the high point in the propagandizing of students took place in 1960 when Khrushchev, while visiting in Indonesia, announced that the Soviet Union had established a University of Friendship of the Peoples. This university is designed to train engineers, physicians, teachers, and technical experts from all over the world. If successful, it might make it possible for communism to capture the intellectual elite of most of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Fortunately the first few classes did not go well. But the Russians are experimenting; the curriculum of the Friendship University has just been changed.

The countless festivals and youth congresses in the Soviet Union are carefully and generously subsidized. Students from the poor nations pay little or nothing. But the Soviet aid is always carefully presented as a fellowship or as a reward for winning a contest or some such face-saving device.

Once an atmosphere of friendliness is established with the intellectual elite and the organization of students in underdeveloped countries is underway, the next step is a careful wooing of the leaders. With a shrewd eye for protocol, the Russians first send a high-ranking diplomat to call on leaders such as Sukarno, Haile Selassie, Nehru, or the Shah of Iran. The foreign head of government is then invited to the Soviet Union. There is no limit to costs.

Take the visit of Nasser, the ruler of Egypt, to Russia. He was flown in a luxuriously equipped Soviet jetliner, the TU–104. When he arrived in Moscow, he was greeted by orderly files of people cheering as he drove down the street. Scrubbed schoolchildren threw flowers at him wherever he went. At small, intimate parties Nasser was shown examples of Egyptian and Arabic works translated into Russian, some of them consisting of his own speeches, which had been catalogued as "masterpieces." He met Soviet Moslems who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While traveling in Russia he was shown factories making the most sophisticated military equipment, parts for guided missiles and earth-moving equipment. The

implication was clear: The Soviet Union was not only powerful in war but able to supply the kind of equipment needed to build the Aswan Dam; and she could supply seed and farm machinery for the lands to be irrigated by that dam.

At a splendid state dinner Khrushchev assured Nasser of the support of "the whole Socialist world" in his "struggle for independence." Nasser was also informed that the Soviets had just established a Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With the Countries of the Arab East.

The usual concluding flourish to such a trip is making a gift of the jet plane in which the foreign leader has traveled. Haile Selassie, the Shah of Iran and Sukarno have received such gifts. U Nu of Burma flies in a plane presented by the Russians. The Russians pay special attention to local customs. They know, for example, that Indonesians prefer lengthy movies. The longer the show, the more the Indonesians like it. It is no accident that President Sukarno exhibited the 3-hour motion picture of his trip to Russia in preference to the 30-minute movie documentation of his visit to America made by our U.S. Information Agency.

The foreign leader, thus manipulated, sometimes leaves the Soviet Union with the impression not only that the Russians are deeply interested in his country, but that Russia is the coming economic and military power. No one lectured him on the "inevitability of world communism." He has met the real leaders of Russia and may have the impression that he can "do business with the Russians" without compromising his position.

The results are alarming. Today in Egypt there are thousands of Soviet technicians, military advisers and engineers. Instruction in the Russian language has begun in secondary schools of the United Arab Republic. Three hundred of her best students are being sent annually to Russia to study.

Now Russia is ready for the last stage of propaganda: "the socialization of the masses." This means a penetrating and widespread propagandization of the citizens of a foreign counrty. The blueprint of action is clear. In most of the emerging countries where Serge—and a thousand others like him—serves, the public communication system is either primitive or nonexistent. One of Serge's first steps in socializing the masses will be to see that small radios are distributed to the outlying villages by the native Communist Party. These radios have one peculiarity: They receive only one station—Radio Moscow or Radio Peiping. Powerful broadcasting stations in Russia and China fill the air with programs in Amoy, Tonkinese, Tibetan, Pashto, Bengali, Berber and hundreds of other languages. In deserts, deltas, and farm areas the entire population of tiny hamlets will squat around the radio in the evening hours. As the young people crank the hand generator, the village listens to Bing Crosby, the Red Army Chorus, classical music, folk music of their own land—and a carefully edited version of world news. American press reports are rewritten to make us look as bad and unhappy as possible.

The Communists also realize that intense "literacy drives" among the emerging nations creates a new market for books, magazines and newspapers. Today the Russians and Chinese are the biggest publishers of books in the world. Between them they produce more than 2 billion books a year, which surpasses the entire output of all other nations. A large fraction of these volumes are published in foreign languages, ranging from obscure African languages, like Fang-Bulu and Kabyle, to Japanese and German. Children's books which successfully convert Cinderella and Little Red Riding Hood into Communist heroes are put out in fine editions, beautifully illustrated. Millions of magazines are distributed throughout the world, each of them aimed at a specific audience: the peasant, the trade union member, the city worker, the disgruntled intellectual.

Today the world's best-selling author is Joseph Stalin. His books are followed by the Bible, but the next three most widely read authors are Communists. A bookseller in Cairo or Djakarta or Bangkok or Singapore finds it financially attractive to stock Communist literature. First, he pays for the books in the local currency, directly to the Russian or Chinese Embassy. Second, their cost is low and the profit is high.

The accumulated local currency resulting from local payments is used by officials like Serge to establish native newspapers and journals. Normally there will be an overt Communist newspaper, which concentrates on lengthy analyses of Marxist theory. It is usually turgid and has a small circulation. But Communist money also flows to the covert newspapers. They carry neutral titles such as the Star, or the Chronicle and are jammed with popular features attracting a mass circulation. With no visible Communist connections, these papers carry on bitter campaigns against white colonialism and the presence of American troops overseas.

Hand in hand with books and newspapers, the Communists have been engaged since 1955 in a stepped-up production of motion pictures. Among other advantages, use of this medium assures that illiterates are not overlooked. In 5 years the number of Communist propaganda films has quadrupled.

Serge is familiar with all these techniques. He has the personnel and assets to use instantly whatever method he judges most effective. Serge can order any Russian in the area to take on a propaganda project; and each receives a specific assignment in addition to his normal job. Whatever money or equipment is needed Serge can get quickly from Moscow. Films, money, printing presses, newsprint, books, a grand ballet—these will be flown in at his request. The Russian Government is organized for this kind of operation. The propaganda agency in the U.S.S.R. has a status equal to that of the Foreign Service or Department of Defense.

There is only one thing Serge may not do: He may not fail. If he makes one major mistake, he is ruined. He will be recalled and placed in a minor post for life. The same applies to everyone involved in Russian strategy and tactics.

Compared with the Communist effort the American venture into propaganda is anemic. Not only is the USIA budget severely limited, but so is its statutory function. It can only project the American image abroad. It is paradoxical that America, where the communications arts are most highly developed and where the technical skills are so far advanced, should be such a slow starter.

Our USIA people are on the whole as intelligent and perceptive as their Russian counterparts. But they are paralyzed by inadequate funds, too frequent shifts in posts, and sketchy training in the language and customs of the area they serve.

The Communists are not infallible. They have made great mistakes. Their ruthless suppression of the Hungarians, the inhumanity of the collective farms in China, and other events have nullified many of their propaganda drives. Then, too, the Soviet Friendship University is by all accounts a dismal place that offends many students. Yet few Asians or Africans are aware of these facts. All in all, the Russians make more mistakes than Americans do. But the Communists have the funds, trained personnel, and organization to take advantage of—or create—American fumbles. We are slow to act.

There is nothing at this moment to prevent Americans from creating the intellectual and technical weapons required to win the great battle for exposing the minds of men to the truth. The Communists already have a formidable machine at work telling lies. Americans can overcome it. All that is lacking at the moment is an awareness of the danger and a determination to do something about it.

Centennial of Masonry in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 2 Colorado Masonry held meetings throughout the State commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the fraternity within the State. This great fraternity has rendered outstanding and effective service to mankind. This has been particularly so as it has grown in the United States, with its lodges coming into existence and flourishing throughout this great land of ours.

In Colorado some of our great public servants and leaders have been members of this fraternal organization, and at all times its members have endeavored, and have succeeded, in building constructively for the good of the State and its people.

On August 2, in Grand Junction, Colo., members of the two Masonic lodges of that community met to celebrate this anniversary. On that occasion my personal friend and Masonic brother of many years, James K. Groves, gave a splendid address. I take pleasure in having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that its historic and educational values may be preserved:

CENTENNIAL OF MASONRY IN COLORADO—MESA NO. 55, A.F. & A.M., AUGUST 2, 1961

(An address by James K. Groves)

Worshipful master and brothers, some time ago our competent and efficient secretary handed me an address, which I presume was issued by the grand lodge, designed to be given on this occasion. I was told that I could read it as it is, modify it, or throw it away and give one of my own composition. It is a good address but, with my stubbornness and independence, what follows are portions of it and materials that I have inserted. Therefore, you will know that in these remarks, when I am saying something that is meaningful or of interest, it comes from the grand lodge address, and when dull and inappropriate, it has resulted from my own peregrinations.

We meet here this evening with the other 166 lodges of this grand lodge, united in one common purpose—the celebration of the formation 100 years ago tonight in Golden City, Colorado Territory, of the Grand Lodge, A.F. & A.M., Colorado, attended by 67 members of the three lodges there represented.

Each of us, I believe, has or has had a copy of George B. Clark's book, "Our Masonic Heritage." On an occasion such as this it should not be inappropriate to trace from it the Masonic genealogy which lead to that meeting on August 2, 1861. Near the beginning of Masonry in the Americas, there were the Grand Lodges of Virginia and North

Carolina. The first local lodge was established in Virginia, December 22, 1733, and lodges there were organized subsequently under the jurisdiction of the Premier Grand Lodge of England, the Grand Lodge of Scotland, the Kelwinning Lodge of Edinburgh, Scotland, and the Provincial Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania. It was the latter which issued the charter to Alexandria Lodge No. 22 which selected George Washington as its first master. On October 13, 1778, these lodges of Virginia duly proclaimed the Grand Lodge of Virginia. During approximately the same period lodges were being organized in the Colony of North Carolina, under the authority of the Premier Grand Lodge of England. On St. John's Day, December 27, 1787, the nine lodges of the Colony of North Carolina organized the Grand Lodge of North Carolina. Without relating dates and details, these two grand lodges issued charters in other areas from which grand lodges were formed, which new grand lodges repeated the operation and, as a result, there flowed from the Grand Lodges of Virginia and North Carolina the authority for the Grand Lodges of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, the last of which was organized, the latest, on September 23, 1857.

The three lodges in the territory of Colorado, which shortly prior thereto was Jefferson Territory, being the lodges at Golden City, Parkville, and Gold Hill, had been chartered, one from Kansas and two from Nebraska. Thus it can be seen that our Colorado Grand Lodge and, in turn, we of this lodge, have gained our heritage from the roots of this Nation.

Let us back up just a little beyond 100 years ago tonight and look at the area involved. Prior to August 2, 1861, this land we now term colorful Colorado had belonged in turn to the Indians, Spain, Louisiana, Missouri, Republic of Texas, Mexico, New Mexico, Utah, Nebraska, and Kansas. Earlier in the year 1861 it was Jefferson Territory, a unit without any local or territorial government and subject entirely to the orders and appointees from Washington.

Ten years following the discovery of gold in California in 1848, which gave rise to the 49'ers, and in 1858, gold was discovered in the Rockies of Jefferson Territory and the cry of "Pike's Peak or Bust" was in the air, as well as on many occasions the subsequent, plaintive sign "Busted, by God." By the fall of 1858 the vanguard of prospectors and miners had reached Cherry Creek. On November 4, 1858, seven Masons gathered in the tent of Henry Allen and, while they did not have a formal meeting, they discussed Masonry and contemplated the application for charter. This was in the new town called Auraria. Not too far away was Denver City, a city with a population of 300, all living in tents except that there was one cabin. In his four-volume "History of Colorado and Its People," LeRoy R. Hafen records that a couple of weeks prior to this first informal Masonic meeting in Denver City, there met in this one cabin the organizers of the Denver Town Co. The cabin belonged to Wm. McGaa. He was most hospitable, serving a kettleful of hot punch which was brewed from Mexican whisky known at that time as Taos lightning. A man named Frank Hall kept the minutes of the meeting and the minutes record that after considerable discussion and hospitality, "It is proper to draw a veil over the final deliberations of the meeting." Apparently the organizers met on another day, soberly, and completed the organization of the townsite of Denver City.

It was a rough country between 1858 and 1861. Indians would become drunk and commit many massacres and other depredations. The historians record that a majority of the bloody murders of the period which were blamed on Indians were really committed by white men. They further record that what sane local government there was, was at the instigation primarily of the minority of Masons in the various mining camps. Prices were a bit strange. A whole venison sold dressed for $1.25, and yet 100 pounds of flour cost $40. Some of the early issues of the Rocky Mountain News carried the barbershop ad: "Come and get your hair and beard mowed." And as one entered the shop, he would see a card with the following message:

"Since man to man will be unjust,
You may bet your pile we never trust."

The currency of the period consisted of $10 and $20 gold pieces, minted by Clark, Gruber & Co. They were soft and disintegrated rapidly, being of nearly pure gold and having no alloy. A carpenter's union was formed in one of the camps and established an unheard of wage for the time of $3 a day plus board. A. O. McGrew, known as the wheelbarrow man because he came in the "Pikes Peak or Bust" rush wheeling a wheelbarrow, plastered the region with reams of his verse. Here is a fair sample:

"Way out upon the Platte, near Pikes Peak
we were told,
There, by a little digging, we could get a
pile of gold.
So we bundled up our duds, resolved at
least to try
And tempt old Madame Fortune, root hog,
or die.
Speculation is the fashion even at this
early stage,
And corner lots and boom talk appear to
be the rage.
The emigration's bound to come; to greet
them we will try,
Big pig, little pig, root hog or die."

In April 1861 the Southern States announced their secession and on April 12 that year their occurred the firing on Fort Sumter which precipitated the Civil War. Immediately prior to that time the formation of the territory of Colorado had been announced with its first capital at Colorado City, described as being northeast of Canyon City and which, as you know, comprised a part of what is now Colorado Springs. President Lincoln had appointed Maj. William Gilpin of Missouri as the first Governor of the Colorado Territory. On April 24, 1861, word reached Denver City of the Civil War and Confederate flags were unfurled in the streets and upon the buildings, but were quickly torn down with considerable fighting. The next day in Denver City a huge bonfire was lighted and a mass meeting called, whereupon the following resolutions were adopted by this wild and wooly community:

"Whereas, in all times past it hath been the privilege of a free people peaceably to assemble and freely express themselves on public matters; and whereas this people, though far removed from the strong arm of our National Government, yet feeling a deep interest and love for their distracted country, and fearing lest they, by silence, might be misunderstood, would therefor, irrespective of past political predilections: Firmly

"Resolved, That, as for Colorado, she, with willing hearts and ready feet, will follow the flag and keep step to the music of the Union;

"Resolved, That the Government of Washington is good enough for us—that it is the best Government the world ever saw—that we will ever sustain it;

"Resolved, That the rich inheritance of constitutional liberty—our forefathers, living, fought for and secured, and dying, blessed—we, their sons, should maintain at any hazard—even unto death;

"Resolved, That the flag of the Colorado Territory is the Star Spangled Banner;

"Resolved, That we desire peace in our midst, and that each one of us will exert himself to preserve peace and harmony in this Territory, among our fellow citizens, because we love peace, and lest we may have need of all for common defense against the Indian tribes around us."

Colorado was on the Union side, but bear in mind for whatever it may be worth that the grand lodge to be formed that same fall had its roots in two of the Confederate States.

On May 27, 1861, Governor Gilpin arrived in Denver. There is a long article in the issue of the Rocky Mountain News of May 28, 1861, of the welcome accorded him and the many speeches made. I chuckled at one paragraph:

"Hon. H .P. Bennet [who was to become the first delegate to Congress from Colorado Territory] came forward and introduced Governor Gilpin to the assemblage, prefacing with a polished and patriotic little speech. * * * Governor Gilpin responded in a somewhat lengthy speech, and in a style and manner which seemed to suit and satisfy all parties present. His remarks were clearly and cautiously composed, not committing himself on anything, yet assuring and inspiring the hearers with the feeling of being interested and impartially devoted toward all the sections and the citizens of our Territory; and of being loyal and sound toward the Union and the Constitution."

In June 1861, there assembled the first Territorial Legislature of Colorado and the first Supreme Court which Court handed down decisions in that raw and rugged time which are still precedents in our life here in Colorado today.

As previously mentioned, on August 2 of that year 67 members of 3 lodges met in Golden City.

There were not automobiles, in fact there were no roads. There was no television, no radio, no telephones, no telegraph communication. That man could ever fly through the air seemed but an idle dream. This was the year of the pony express, that rapid form of mail service which promised to revolutionize our communications, but the pony express lasted only a short while and only touched the territory of Colorado at the extreme northeast corner near Julesburg. In 1861, although man had trod the earth for untold centuries, he still moved across the land at a pace no more rapid than a Caesar or an ancient Pharaoh. In 1861 when Masons went to lodge they guided their steps by kerosene lanterns. The hall was lighted by candles or oil-burning lamps just as they had been for centuries past. It is interesting to note that the price of a gallon of kerosene in those days often exceeded that of a gallon of whisky.

At each side of the entrance to the massive Archives Building in our Nation's Capital is an inscription. One has these words: "Study the past" and the other "The past is prologue." As we meet here this evening in the midst of all that makes life comfortable and as we stand upon the threshold of a brandnew age—the atomic age—we can say in the words of the taxi driver who was explaining these inscriptions to his passenger: "Mister, that means you ain't seen nothin' yet."

This brings to mind the story of the man from Cape Canaveral who went to Washington, D.C., for the first time and, when standing awe-struck before the Washington Monument, was heard to mutter "By gosh, they'll never get it off the ground"

As we meet here this evening there are U.S. B–52's flying on alert in various parts of the country and the world, each one of which on the average carries 12 times as much explosive power as all the bombs dropped in World War II, including atomic bombs. Tonight enough nuclear weapons now exist in American stockpiles to exterminate every man, woman and child on earth, and the Soviet Union has almost as many.

Each nation is spending billions on means of delivering these weapons. If the United States and the Soviet Union should engage in a nuclear war, within a few weeks—in the so-called first and second strikes—between 60 and 90 percent of the population of both countries would be killed, and the survivors would have been spared to see horrors even more unimaginable than this quick killing of hundreds of millions of people.

Many are the new tools which the hands of man have grasped in recent years. So great has been the demonstration of his ability to bring into being the products of his imagination and dreams that it is difficult for us to realize that so many of these miraculous developments have occurred within the lifetime of those present here this evening. When we turn, however, from the tangible to the intangible, from the material to the spiritual side of the life of man, we find that thoughtful men are disturbed over the fact that our civilization is lagging in spiritual progress. It is true that our present-day civilization can cite many instances of great spiritual growth but it sometimes seems that for every claim of progress there exists an opposing condition to counteract and nullify our claims. We profess a belief in the dignity of the individual man—that we are all children of one common father—and yet intolerance of one race for another is rampant in our land. It brings to mind the story that went the rounds not too long ago about the fellow here in a bar in Grand Junction who, upon becoming rather exuberant, pounded the bar and said, "There are two things I hate—intolerance and niggers."

Men no longer rot in filthy dungeons as in days of yore, our penal institutions are vastly improved, but we are a long way from solving the problem of rehabilitation of our social outcasts.

New and larger churches are springing up everywhere. People are attending churches as never before, but our rate of crime is increasing steadily.

We go to great expense in educating our youth. As Masons we take great pride in our allied groups of young men and women, but accounts of juvenile delinquency continue to be discouraging and disheartening.

We loudly proclaim the right of man to the freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution for these United States of America, but seem always willing to trade that freedom piece by piece for something we call security.

We believe implicitly in our American and Masonic way of life, but are indifferent to the affairs of our own Government and apathetic toward those great insidious forces which would destroy us. About 2 months ago, along with some of you, I listened at a noon luncheon club to a talk by Bernard Teets, the head of the State Employment Department. He told of an act of Congress passed a month before which causes to be spent over a billion dollars in additional unemployment benefits to those receiving them from the States, without regard to the situation or need of the recipients. He asked that those who had heard of this legislation, which admittedly is of some importance, to hold up their hands. Out of over 100 business and professional men present, 3 held up their hands.

During the past century men have universally accepted the maxim of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but have exemplified it by fighting no less than 22 wars.

We stand indicted by instances of man's inhumanity to man and are compelled to ask ourselves as we face the second century of our existence: Does Freemasonry have anything to offer to society in a rapidly shrinking world? Can it be of assistance facing the problems confronting him in a rapidly changing world? We believe that it does and can. We believe that values and ideals have not become obsolete because of material progress or exterminated by crime or devastation of war. We are persuaded that the great principles promulgated by our ancient craft, having stood the test in the crucible of time, will be just as essential in the century ahead as they have for centuries past.

Freemasonry today as never before speaks to the world a message of universality. It has been the one great force in which has been found a common ground whereon men may meet religiously, socially, and morally; thus it can offer to civilization in the century that lies ahead, that pattern of human conduct which is the one great hope of man.

And so, my brethren, we may rest assured that as we stand upon the threshold of a new century of Masonry in Colorado there is still a great work for our ancient craft which has ever sought to promote the dignity of the individual man; which is now, as it always has been, the unalterable foe of any creed or ideology which seeks to enslave the minds of men and which clings fast to the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. For in the words of Edwin C. Markham:

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man."

It would seem entirely fitting and proper that any discourse upon this occasion should conclude with a tribute to those great men who were the pioneers of Masonry in this raw, new land 100 years ago today. They came, most of them, in the slow, monotonous covered wagon. Through midday heat and wintry winds they wended their way for months from far-off places. They brought with them materials for their Masonic altars and set them in the wilderness. Upon them they placed the Holy Bible, symbol of man's faith; upon the book they placed the square, symbol of equality before the law, and the compasses, emblematical of that due restraint upon personal liberty necessary for the protection of the rights of others.

They worked with rough hands and stout hearts to bring order out of chaos and from the woof of time wove the lasting fabric of justice and good government. They labored long and diligently to lay the foundation upon which the elegant superstructure of Colorado Masonry has been erected. May we so live and work that their labors will not have been in vain. The torch they bore has been handed to us. It is our duty to hold it high; that Freemasonry may continue to shed its beneficent influence upon mankind, that it may continue to be a great force for good in the lives and in the hearts of men.

"And so I say a sacred trust
Is yours to share, is yours to keep;
I hear the voice of men of dust;
I hear the step of men asleep;
And down the endless future, too,
Your own shall echo after you."

State Taxation on the Income of Non-Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of State taxation of the income of nonresidents is plaguing the residents of Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York. The problem is not local and affects many other States. A treatise on the subject which was lucid, informative and exhaustive, recently came to my attention. It was so detailed and covered the problem so well that I believe the readers would appreciate reading this paper written by Lawrence R. Caruso of Princeton University, which was published in a recent issue of the Rutgers Law Review. The treatise follows:

STATE TAXATION OF THE INCOME OF NONRESIDENTS: A NEW JERSEY DILEMMA

(By Lawrence R. Caruso)

I. THE PROBLEM

This article covers one aspect of the overall problem of conflicting or multiple taxation. For purposes of study, the problem may be limited in two ways. First, it may be limited with respect to the type of taxing jurisdictions which impose the conflicting taxes. The most common conflicts involve: (1) the Federal Government and a foreign government, (2) the Federal Government and the States, (3) two or more States, and (4) increasingly, a local government and a State government or other local governments. Secondly, the problem may be limited with respect to the kind of tax involved. In earlier days it frequently involved death taxes, or tangible and intangible personal property taxes. More recently attention has tended to focus on income taxes, both on corporations and on individuals. This article is limited to the single aspect of the problem as it involves conflicting individual or personal income taxes where two or more States are involved.

II. THE BASIC ISSUES

At the turn of the century a number of States still carried on their statute books the personal income tax laws enacted during and following the Civil War. These were flat-rate taxes administered by local property tax officials. A new era of income taxation began in 1911, when Wisconsin adopted an income tax on individuals and corporations and vested responsibility for its administration in a State tax commission. This income tax provided for personal exemptions and graduated rates and was quickly copied by a number of other States.

At present, 32 States and the District of Columbia impose individual income taxes. They were adopted by the States and the District of Columbia as follows: Wisconsin, 1911; Mississippi, 1912; Oklahoma, 1915; Massachusetts, 1916; Virginia, 1916; Delaware, 1917; Missouri, 1917; New York, 1919; North Dakota, 1919; North Carolina, 1921; South Carolina, 1922; New Hampshire, 1923; Arkansas, 1929; Georgia, 1929; Tennessee, 1929; Idaho, 1931; Oregon, 1931; Utah, 1931; Vermont, 1931; Alabama, 1933; Arizona, 1933; Kansas, 1933; Minnesota, 1933; Montana, 1933; New Mexico, 1933; Iowa, 1934; Louisiana, 1934; California, 1935; Kentucky, 1936; Colorado, 1937; Maryland, 1937; District of Columbia, 1939; and Alaska, 1958. An increasing number of States have patterned their methods of income tax computation after the methods used by the Federal Government subsequent to the adoption of a tax simplification program in 1944.

Income taxes provide about one-sixth of State tax revenues. In 1953, nine States derived 25 percent or more of their total tax revenues from individual and corporation income taxes. By 1959, the latest year for which figures currently are available, 13 States derived 25 percent or more of their total tax revenues from individual and corporation income taxes. Obviously, then, despite the fact that no State has established an individual income tax in more than 20 years, except Alaska, which became a State

on June 30, 1958, the income tax (both on individuals and corporations) is continuing to grow in importance in those States which do use it.

The three States which in the past relied most heavily on income taxes were New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin, which in 1953 obtained from individual and corporation income taxes 50 percent, 48 percent, and 46 percent, respectively, of their total tax revenues. Six years later, although the ranking had changed, it still was the same three States and Delaware which placed the most reliance on the income tax. In 1959 Oregon, New York, Delaware, and Wisconsin obtained from individual and corporation income taxes 53 percent, 52 percent, 47 percent, and 44 percent, respectively, of their total tax revenues. These same four States, and Alaska and Massachusetts, secure more than 30 percent of their total tax revenues from the individual income tax alone. In all, a total of 12 States derive more than 20 percent of their total tax revenues from the individual or personal income tax. Thus, the income tax, and especially the individual income tax, is a matter of major importance in the government and administration of many States.

Legislatures often are faced with the situation in which large numbers of nonresidents work in a State or a particular part of a State or, conversely, where large numbers of residents work outside the State. Obviously each group receives benefits from the State. Thus, it is plainly unfair to others who are taxpayers in the State to allow these groups to escape all tax obligations to the State. Two 1920 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States clarified the jurisdictional bases upon which a State may tax the income of a nonresident. Before that time it had been held that the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution denies general tax jurisdiction over subjects not regarded as within a State's boundaries. In *Shaffer* v. *Carter* the Supreme Court sustained the Oklahoma income tax imposed upon the income of an Illinois resident derived from an oil business and the operation of oil and gas mining leases in Oklahoma. In *Travis* v. *Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.*, in a decision announced the same day as the Shaffer decision, the Supreme Court recognized the jurisdiction of New York to impose an income tax upon the salaries and wages earned in New York by residents of Connecticut and New Jersey. The shift in doctrine relating to State taxation problems, manifested by the Supreme Court as a tribunal of final resort, is toward an expanding recognition of freedom on the part of the States in the imposition and collection of taxes.

Quite a few States clearly exhibit the desire to extend their taxing jurisdiction as far as the Supreme Court will allow and to tax everything the Supreme Court will allow. The continuing search for more revenue thus is steadily increasing the extent of tax overlapping. Tax overlapping or multiple or conflicting taxation occurs where two or more jurisdictions tax the same object, as where the State of one's residence and the State of one's employment (if different) both tax one's income. The problem of conflicting taxation began to receive serious attention as early as the mid-1930's. At that time, however, attention tended to be focused on taxes other than the income tax. In an excellent article on multiple State taxation, published as recently as 17 years ago, for example, the personal or individual income tax was not even mentioned. The situation has changed. Today a substantial share of the attention paid to the entire problem relates to the income tax. The ill effects of excessive duplication and overlapping in taxes may be summarized as follows:

1. They may result in undue concentration of tax charges on a narrow range of economic activity. This may distort the whole pattern of investment and employment.

2. They limit the degree to which State governments have freedom in securing revenue sources to meet their needs.

3. They increase the cost of administration of collecting the taxes.

4. They irritate and annoy the taxpayer who is already heavily burdened by the obligation to pay. He has to face double or triple tax-reporting systems.

5. They reduce efficiency in the operation of State government due to a duplication of administration and responsibility.

III. DEDUCTIBILITY AND CREDITS

To be taxable, income of nonresidents derived from professional and personal services must definitely be attributable to activity within the taxing state. If income is derived partly from services rendered outside the State, income from outside source may may not be included in the income subject to tax. Some States make some effort to relieve the nonresident taxpayer of the burden of multiple State taxation of the same income. Although there is hardly a tax coordination devise ever thought of that has not been used somewhere or other, help for victims of multiple taxation usually takes the form of tax deductibility or tax credits.

Tax deductibility may be defined as the practice of one jurisdiction in permitting the deduction from the tax base of taxes levied by other jurisdictions; for example, the Federal Government allows the deduction from gross income of State individual and corporate income taxes in determining net income for Federal tax purposes, and some of the States permit similar deduction of Federal taxes. Deductibility has not found much use where the overlapping involves income tax and is between or among States.

Tax credits may be defined as an arrangement under which taxpayers are allowed to claim taxes paid to one jurisdiction as a partial credit against tax liability to another jurisdiction. This devise has been used, for example, by the Federal Government with respect to taxes paid to the States in the field of transfer taxes at death and the unemployment insurance tax. It is much favored when the overlapping involves the income tax of two or more States. Credit often is dependent, however, upon the existence of substantially similar reciprocal legislation in the other State involved in the overlapping. Examples of this type of reciprocal credit are found in such widely separated parts of the country as California, North Carolina, and New York.

Eighteen of the States which levy net income taxes on individuals grant a tax credit for personal income taxes paid to other States. Some of these 18 States allow the credit to residents only, some to nonresidents only, and some to both; so that, in all, 14 States grant such credit to their own residents for taxes paid to other States, and 12 allow credit to nonresidents. No possibility of a double credit exists since, in all States which allow credits, only taxes already paid or at least unconditionally payable may be credited. With regard to credit allowance to nonresidents, all States which grant such credit do so subject to the condition that the tax for which credit is requested has been paid to the taxpayer's State of residence, and not to another State of nonresidence. The legal principle requiring a tax law to be construed against the taxing power and all doubts to be resolved in favor of the taxpayer has no application to the reciprocity provision of a State income tax law granting an exemption from the payment of an income tax. A taxpayer claiming such exemption must show that he comes clearly within its grant.

IV. THE NEW JERSEY DILEMMA

It has been said that there is no comparable industrial State that has so many undeveloped tax bases as New Jersey. Sales taxes and individual income taxes are the largest sources of general tax revenues used in other States but these are not presently included within the New Jersey system of taxes. Although a majority of the States impose individual net income taxes, some of the most populous and highly industrialized States, including New Jersey and Connecticut, have no individual income taxes. During the fiscal year ending March 31, 1957, the State of New York, on the other hand, collected $476,300,000 in personal income taxes. A substantial part of this sum was collected from 180,000 nonresident taxpayers, 172,000 of whom resided in either New Jersey or Connecticut, 155,000 New Jersey residents paid $20 million to New York, while 17,000 Connecticut; 155,000 New Jersey residents paid also was a comparatively small number of persons from other States, particularly Pennsylvanians, who earned all or part of their income in New York State and paid the nonresident income tax to New York. Subsequently, a sample study of returns filed for income earned during the calendar year 1957 indicated that there were 201,252 nonresident New York taxpayers, 148,720 of whom were residents of New Jersey. These nonresidents were subject to a total tax of $38,506,000, with $24,262,000 coming from New Jersey residents.

The basic reason for difficulty stems from the fact that neither New Jersey nor Connecticut imposes an individual income tax. If they did and if the rates approximated the New York rates, New Jersey and Connecticut residents would pay no or very little New York tax. Because New Jersey and Connecticut do not impose a tax on personal income, or measured by personal income, residents of those States may not take advantage of the reciprocal provisions of the New York tax law. Thus, when they are liable for the New York income tax on personal income which has its source in New York, they may not take any credits for taxes paid to their State of residence. Consequently, they find themselves in the unpleasant position of paying the full measure of taxes to their State of residence, and, because that does not include an individual income tax, also paying the full income tax, without credits, to New York. This hardly seems equitable.

In general, the New York personal income tax law follows the Federal income tax law. There are two important ways, however, in which the New Jersey resident subject to the New York personal income tax finds it even more onerous than does the New York resident. First, a New York resident is permitted to deduct all applicable allowable deductions, but a nonresident is not permitted any of these deductions except to the extent that they are related to the production of income in New York. Secondly, when nonresidents are entitled to refunds with respect to personal income tax paid to New York by way of payroll withholding, 2 to 3 years sometimes elapse before these refunds are made. Also, until very recently, in New York only the nonresident had his New York State personal income tax withheld at the source, by payroll deductions by his employer, while the New York resident did not. As if this were not enough, in 1959 the New York personal income tax law underwent some significant changes. These changes included both a reduction in exemptions and an increase in the upper limit of the rate scale. Both of these changes will tend to increase the burden on nonresident taxpayers.

New Jersey and Connecticut, however, are not alone in their tax dilemma. The Florida "winter resident," for example, frequently finds himself with multistate tax problems. This often occurs in those cases

where he has taken no steps to establish a definite, provable domicile in Florida or to retain a domicile in the State in which he formerly resided. His tax problems more often than not involve taxes other than personal income taxes. And when they do involve personal income taxes the issue usually is the question of what State is his legal residence. This is in marked contrast to the problem of the New Jersey resident working in New York or Philadelphia who knows full well where his residence is, but whose tax problems only begin, not end, at that point.

V. SOME PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE GENERAL PROBLEM

Few would deny that both residents of a State and those nonresidents receiving income from sources within a State have a tax obligation to that State. Differences of opinion arise primarily over the question of the proper way for these two obligations to be discharged.

Those who design the revenue system of a State must always be aware of the relative mobility of persons and property among States. It is this mobility which places the States in a position of actual competition among themselves to provide relatively favorable tax structures. The tax systems of the various States vary so greatly that, as a practical matter, legislators in writing an income tax law must do so in the way which seems to promote best the interests of the State and its people and the demands of equity for them, with little reference to the tax systems of other States. As might be expected, therefore, there is considerable variation among the several State provisions for mitigating interstate double taxation. Mr. Tully, for one, believes that it would be desirable to standardize these provisions by securing in some way the adoption of a uniform rule to be applied by all States. In this direction, the Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act was approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association during their annual meetings in July 1957. The uniform act deals with the allocation and apportionment of income of multistate businesses. I am not aware of any such action on any similar proposal with respect to personal or individual State income taxes. Except for the adoption of reciprocal credits, little progress has been made in developing uniform jurisdictional rules in the individual income tax field. This has been due to the large number of jurisdictions involved, the great diversity in treatment among the States, and the lack of any coordinating group to bring the various jurisdictions together.

Reciprocal credits, moreover, have not universally been looked upon as an unmixed blessing. One of the arguments against the use of the tax credit to solve problems in the area of intergovernmental fiscal relations is that the credit does not eliminate the wastes of duplicate administration and duplicate costs of compliance. A major weakness in the crediting systems which usually are utilized or proposed as a means of eliminating the double taxation resulting from dual jurisdictional claims where the taxpayer lives in one State and all or part of his income comes from sources in another State is that the impact of the systems is such that the taxpayer always is taxed at the rate imposed by the State having the higher tax rate and that no relief at all is provided if the State of residence does not impose an income tax. This latter, of course, is the unhappy posture of the New Jersey resident employed in New York or Philadelphia.

Mr. Tully, nevertheless, is a strong proponent of tax credits. He says that despite its shortcomings and disadvantages, the crediting device should not be discarded merely because it is not in itself a complete solution for every aspect of intergovernmental fiscal problems. He is correct, of course, in the sense that the tax crediting device is better than no solution at all. It would be a serious blunder, however, if we permitted the existence, or the possibility, of tax credits to blind us to the possibility of better solutions. Half a loaf may be better than none—or perhaps worse than none if it causes us to falter in our pursuit of the full loaf. Most of the plans proposed for the elimination of double State taxation on incomes would achieve this result at the expense of different groups in the country according to which method was adopted. Furthermore, most of the various proposed plans, as well as the existing plans, provide no relief at all for the individual who receives all or part of his income from sources within a State in which he is not resident, if the State in which he is resident chooses to raise its tax revenues by means other than a personal income tax.

Is it possible that one solution to the problem could be to have incomes fixed inclusively by the Federal Government and the revenues shared with the States on the basis of some equitable formula? Despite a certain surface charm, this idea really is not worth serious consideration. If past experience in Federal-State relationships is any valid criterion, this "solution" would raise more problems than it would solve.

A far better solution comes from Professor Fisher, who suggests a novel dual-tax theory which would treat the income tax as a dual tax, one part of which is levied by the State of residence as a personal tax and the other part of which is levied by the State where the income has its source as a tax upon the process of income creation. This, he believes, would provide a relatively simple, fair solution to the problem of the rights of both the State of residence and the State of origin of the income. He says: "The legitimate claims of both States would be recognized, complicated credit provisions would be eliminated, and no taxpayer would be penalized because his residence and income-producing activities are not confined to one State."

VI. SOME PROPOSED SOLUTIONS TO THE NEW JERSEY PROBLEM

From time to time various proposals are advanced to mitigate the plight of the New Jersey resident who earns his living in New York or Philadelphia. Recently, on April 11, 1960, a joint resolution was introduced into the General Assembly of the New Jersey Legislature to make application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to provide that no State or political subdivision thereof shall have the power to impose any tax on the income of nonresidents. There would seem to be little hope for the success of this approach, since 32 States now impose an income tax on nonresidents—far more than enough to block any constitutional amendment. Indeed, no significant action was taken on this joint resolution by the 1960 New Jersey Legislature, and no similar legislation has thus far been introduced into the 1961 legislature.

On February 6, 1961, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, introduced into the U.S. Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with reference to income taxes on nonresidents. This resolution is the same as one which Senator DODD previously had introduced into the 86th Congress. It would not ban taxation of income of nonresidents, but, rather it would empower Congress to eliminate the inequities in such taxation. There would not seem to be much greater practical hope for the successful enactment of such an amendment than for one resulting in complete prohibition. Indeed, to date, the Committee on the Judiciary, to which it was referred, has not taken any action.

The State of New Jersey Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents was established by the New Jersey Legislature in 1958 to consider the complaints of New Jersey residents against discriminatory treatment under the income tax law of the State of New York and with respect to the municipal wage taxes in the State of Pennsylvania. It is too soon to tell what the total impact of that Commission will be.

Late in 1959 the problem received a great deal of serious attention. On December 29, 1959, Governor Rockefeller of New York met with Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Ribicoff of Connecticut to discuss various proposals to provide some relief for New York's nonresident taxpayers. Unfortunately, no concrete result satisfactory to all three States came out of that meeting.

New York officials frequently take the position that New York will consider some relief for nonresident taxpayers only if their State of residence enters into an interstate compact to permit employers within such State to withhold income taxes from New York residents employed in those States and to authorize each party State to bring suit in the other State to enforce collection of taxes. Fortunately, Governor Rockefeller has not taken that position. Although there may be much merit in the proposal that New Jersey and Connecticut so cooperate with New York, it is unreasonable to make such cooperation the quid pro quo for legitimate relief for New York's nonresident taxpayers.

Nearly every article on the impact on nonresidents of the New York personal income tax concerns itself in very large measure with the issue of deductions. There is a great deal of discussion of the inequities involved in not permitting nonresidents to itemize and take as deductions many items of a kind which residents may itemize as deductions. But much of this discussion seems to be at the expense of the more basic issues. While the New Jersey resident does not pay an income tax on his income earned in New York or elsewhere to the State of New Jersey, he does pay a variety of other taxes, particularly property taxes, which are required to support all levels of government in his home State. If New York were to allow a New Jersey taxpayer the full benefit of itemizing deductions, it would still be far less than the credit New York now allows residents of States levying income taxes, which is a full tax credit to the extent that the resident of another State pays income taxes equal to those he might pay in New York State. Thus, it follows that this is a problem more worthy of attention than the lesser, but more obvious, issue of unequal treatment on deductions.

An interstate compact has been advanced by some as the preferred solution to the income tax problems besetting New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Others have suggested either an interstate compact or reciprocal legislation. Still others see a solution to the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut problem and similar problems in a "massive research project." Finally, one occasionally hears the idea advanced—sometimes in jest, sometimes seriously—that New Jersey adopt an income tax, or a tax measured by income, to be imposed only upon nonresidents who have sources of income in New Jersey. Whatever might be said in justification of such a retaliatory provision, it would not be valid, under the U.S. Constitution, for New Jersey to impose a personal income tax on nonresidents in the absence of a similar impost of its own citizens.

VII. THE PROPOSED EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION TAX ACT

An entirely new approach to New Jersey's problem was unveiled on May 2, 1960, when,

with Governor Meyner's support, a bill was introduced into the general assembly of the New Jersey Legislature for the imposition, for a limited period, of an emergency tax for transportation purposes, measured by income derived by residents of New Jersey from sources within another State with respect to which there is a critical transportation problem interstate and by residents of such other State from sources within New Jersey.

The act would provide for withholding of taxes by every employer in New Jersey of a taxpayer subject to the State tax on income derived from sources within New Jersey. This would apply even though the taxpayer is a resident of some State other than New Jersey. The real key to the act is the provision that a person otherwise subject to the tax and to the withholding requirement may be relieved of tax liability to New Jersey if he is resident in a State which allows reciprocity credits and such State withholds taxes with respect to New Jersey residents whose source of income is in such State, and makes payment of such sum to New Jersey. The effect of the act, therefore, would be that a person subject to the act would pay a personal income tax only to the State of his residence, and he would receive a credit from a State in which his income had its source but in which he was nonresident. Of course, as a practical matter the latter State would require his employer to withhold appropriate sums from his salary or wages, and such sums then would be paid to the State of his residence.

The Sunday following the introduction of the bill Governor Meyner admitted frankly that the measure is a matter of expediency. He described it as the "Commuter Benefit Tax." Its purpose, he said, is to help transportation. It would be temporary in nature, expiring by its own terms in 1970. He believes that the people who commute across a State line (e.g., those who live in New Jersey and work in New York, and those who live in New York and work in New Jersey) constitute a taxable class. This, as might be expected, is the single aspect of the bill which has received the greatest attention. It cannot be denied that, on this point, there is a serious question as to the validity of the tax.

If the bill should be enacted into law we can expect to see litigation to test its validity. To be valid, a tax measure need not tax everyone. Various classes can be exempted, or conversely a tax measure can impose its burden only on a limited class or group of classes. In either case, however, the classes established may not be unreasonably discriminatory. It is manifest that the drafters of the bill have attempted to avoid this pitfall. The bill would raise revenues earmarked for particular purposes. The revenues would be raised by a tax imposed upon a class, including both residents and nonresidents, which would especially benefit from the purposes for which the revenues are earmarked. Nonresidents who fall within the class (i.e., interstate commuters) would be treated no worse than residents who fall within the same class. If the bill is enacted into law, we can expect that it will not be long before its validity is tested in the courts. Even if, based upon the above and other factors, the validity of the tax should be sustained, it would not be entirely unexpected if New York were to take the position that it is not an "income" tax and thus does not qualify as the basis for reciprocal credits under the New York law. If this issue were raised we can anticipate seeing it, too, finally decided only in the courts. Governor Meyner says he expects the tax to produce for New Jersey revenues of at least $25 million a year, and perhaps as much as $38 million a year, now going to New York. No matter how compelling, in equity and justice, New Jersey's claim to this money may be, it is not likely that New York will give it up without a struggle.

If all else fails, it is not inconceivable that New York would give serious consideration to repealing the reciprocal credits provisions of its tax law. It is unlikely, however, that New York actually would go through with this, because, if it did, the 50,000 to 70,000 New Yorkers who work in New Jersey automatically would lose their rights to credits under the New Jersey law, because those credits are bottomed on reciprocity. Those New Yorkers then would find themselves paying taxes to two States—ironically, the same position New Jersey residents working in New York have been in for 42 years. Therefore, these New Yorkers could be expected to be a potent force on their legislature to keep this from happening. Consequently, while it is possible that New York will repeal its reciprocal credits provision, it is not probable.

VIII. CONCLUSION

New Jersey never has imposed a general personal income tax. For reasons not within the scope of this article, it seems unlikely that it will impose such a tax in the foreseeable future. Thus, other solutions must be sought to the New Jersey tax dilemma.

The Proposed Emergency Transportation Tax Act is a bold step in that direction. Without a doubt, however, it has a rocky road ahead of it. As this is written, it has not yet been passed by the New Jersey Legislature, and opposition to it quickly developed in the Senate of that body. If the measure gets over that hurdle, it seems assured of the present Governor's signature. But then we can look forward to seeing it in the courts for several years. If it survives the courts, there remains the possibility of retaliatory measures by the New York lawmakers.

One thing must not be forgotten: If the proposed law should survive all of these threats to its existence, validity, and vitality, it still would not provide any direct personal relief to the New Jersey resident who now pays an income tax to New York. As far as he is concerned the only change would be that, in addition to all his other taxes, he would be paying an income tax to New Jersey, instead of to New York.

It may be that we never will see the Emergency Transportation Tax Act in force, but the very proposal may help to narrow and sharpen the issues and thus hasten the day when New Jersey finally will find its way out of its tax dilemma.

Heartless Firing of Government Workers for Political Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we on our side of the aisle are, of course, very much aware of the way the Kennedy administration plays politics. They are especially skilled in the art of patronage, as evidenced by the heartless firings of thousands of Government workers for political reasons.

But when the Post Office Department without turning a hair tosses out a 100 percent disabled war veteran who has done an outstanding job as acting postmaster, I think all of us should rise up and protest.

What price must a man pay to receive fair and reasonable treatment from his country? Do we as Americans owe a debt of gratitude to a man who was presented the Bronze Star Medal by the President of the United States for taking command of a unit in the invasion of Saipan, who alone in the face of enemy fire strung communication lines on the battle front, who as a result of his bravery was struck by a 9-millimeter Japanese shell and was so mortally wounded that his fellow marines left him for dead on the beach of Saipan for 5 days?

This man, Mr. Speaker, is Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster of El Cajon, Calif. As a result of his wounds, this former marine is today a 100-percent disabled veteran. He is partially paralyzed on his left side, but this paralysis is relatively unnoticed and has not interfered with the performance of his duties.

Since returning to civilian life, Tom Smith has distinguished himself with unselfish devotion to community activities of every nature. His interest in public service was climaxed early in 1960 when the postmaster of El Cajon, Calif., retired and Tom Smith was appointed as acting postmaster.

Although he wears many medals, including the Purple Heart, are we to conclude that he cannot serve because he did not wear a Kennedy button?

I can well appreciate that it is not enough that a man be a war hero nor that he have a desire to serve his country in war and in peace, but there must be other elements necessary, particularly in a position as important as that of postmaster. In this instance, I speak of the executive capabilities required, and I am pleased to report that Mr. Smith has been exemplary in the discharge of his responsibilities during his term of office and has received the commendations of not only his supervisors in the Post Office Department, but his employees as well.

The support for Mr. Smith is not of a partisan nature. Republican and Democrats alike have contacted me, expressing their indignation at this grossly unfair treatment of this 100 percent disabled American veteran. The veterans community of the city of El Cajon and the county of San Diego are seriously concerned with this dismissal of Mr. Smith. This whole problem is further compounded by the fact that the San Diego County Democrat Central Committee has selected a nonveteran as their patronage choice to replace Mr. Smith in this political maneuver.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include at this point some of the letters and telegrams I have received from veterans organizations, plus high ranking civic leaders in the area. The civic leaders include the mayor of El Cajon, who forwarded a copy of his telegram of August 4, 1961, to President Kennedy. His letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF EL CAJON,
El Cajon, Calif., August 9, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Following is the text of a telegram sent on August 4, 1961, by me to President Kennedy:

"The President, Washington, D.C. Please retain Mr. Tom Smith as postmaster of El Cajon postal department. During the past year Mr. Smith's performance in this capacity has been excellent, reflecting an intense interest in furthering postal services extended to the citizens of El Cajon, Calif. This fine quality creates good public relations both from the city's standpoint and that of the Federal Government. Mr. Smith has served his country in the armed services prior to becoming postmaster and is a disabled war veteran. It seems only logical that men of his experience performing credible duties in a Federal agency as important as the U.S. Postal Department should certainly be retained. Your serious consideration of Mr. Smith for the appointment of postmaster for the city of El Cajon and valley is respectfully requested."

Your assistance in Congress helping our city retain the services of Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., as postmaster because of his outstanding service to his country and our community will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

KARL R. TUTTLE, *Mayor.*

Mr. Speaker, also, I have a letter from the mayor of Coronado, Calif., Robin Goodenough, which reads, as follows:

CITY OF CORONADO, CALIF.,
August 9, 1961.

Congressman BOB WILSON,
30th Congressional District, State of California.

DEAR BOB: By this time you are undoubtedly familiar with the case of Tom C. Smith, Jr. Your appointment of this disabled veteran was a wonderful service to both the Government and to the man.

Certainly the continuation of this man in his position as postmaster is far above the issue of party and patronage. He has served his country far above and beyond the vast majority of Federal appointees. As a result of his war service he has a severe handicap in getting any sort of reasonable employment. He is well qualified in his present position. His removal would cast a severe shadow over our present administration.

There is a strong wave of bipartisan sentiment sweeping across the county in support of this veteran's plight. I'm certain you can ascertain this readily and will communicate the same to your fellow Members of Congress. In any event, we know we can count on you to do every possible thing to help this veteran who has given so much, and at the same time to avoid a tragic mistake on the part of the Federal Government.

Cordially yours,

ROBIN GOODENOUGH,
Mayor.

Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully, under unanimous consent, include at the conclusion of these remarks the following communications in behalf of Mr. Smith:

Copy of the citation for Bronze Star Medal.

Military Order of World Wars, La Jolla Chapter, by Comdr. Alfred A. Gregory.

American Legion, 22d district of California, by Comdr. C. M. Meech.

Disabled American Veterans, San Diego Chapter No. 2, by R. J. Cosgriff, adjutant.

Regular Veterans Association of the United States of America, by Rev. Frank B. Gigliotti, past national commander.

Military Order of the Purple Heart, San Diego Chapter No. 49, by Comdr. Alex Zauri.

Also, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herewith an article that appeared in the July 29, 1961, issue of the San Diego Evening Tribune and an article that appeared in the August 6, 1961, issue of the San Diego Union.

Also, examples of the indignation expressed by the citizens of San Diego, copies of telegrams and letters directed to the President, as well as letters and telegrams I have received from private citizens in Mr. Smith's behalf:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Bronze Star Medal to 2d Lt. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic achievement as assistant commander of the 81-mm. Platoon, 2d Battalion, 8th Marines, 2d Marine Division, during operations against enemy Japanese forces on Saipan, Marianas Islands, on June 15, 1944. Occupying an amphibious tractor which was guiding three others into the beach when the tractor commander became a casualty, Second Lieutenant Smith immediately assumed command and fearlessly exposed himself to heavy enemy fire in order to guide the vehicles to the beach during the initial landing on the enemy-held island. With his platoon completely isolated from the remainder of the battalion, he skillfully reorganized his men and directed them to fighting positions. Braving intense hostile small-arms, artillery, and mortar fire, he personally laid communications wire from his exposed position to the battalion headquarters although painfully wounded twice en route. While at battalion headquarters, he pointed out the positions of enemy guns, which were firing on his unit. Returning to his platoon, he sustained critical wounds and was subsequently evacuated. By his courageous leadership, aggressive fighting spirit and unwavering devotion to duty, Second Lieutenant Smith served to inspire all who observed him and upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service."

Second Lieutenant Smith is authorized to wear the Combat "V."

For the President:

———— ————,
Secretary of the Navy.

AUGUST 13, 1961.

To advise that staff of the Military Order of World Wars is urging retention of Capt. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps (retired), as postmaster, El Cajon, Calif., who not only has done a commendable job as incumbent but in recognition of his valiant battlefield service in behalf of our country. Letter follows.

Comdr. ALFRED A. GREGORY,
U.S. Navy, Retired, Commander of La Jolla Chapter of Military Order of World Wars.

AUGUST 10, 1961.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, chapter 49, and the department of California at a regular meeting March 7, 1961, and the annual State department meeting February 18, 1961, unanimously endorsed and recommended by resolution the retention of Comrade Patriot Thomas C. Smith, Jr., combat disabled Marine Corps hero, for postmaster in El Cajon, Calif.

Therefore, this chapter 49, Military Order of the Purple Heart of San Diego, and all other chapters, department of California, respectfully request you, the duly elected representative of the people, place a request before Congress of the United States of America for approval.

ALEX ZAURI,
Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Chapter 49.

AUGUST 8, 1961.

San Diego Chapter 2, Disabled American Veterans, at a regular meeting in April 1961, unanimously endorsed Tom C. Smith for appointment to postmaster at El Cajon, Calif. Tom, a member of this chapter, is a World War II combat disabled veteran and recipient of the Bronze Star for saving 42 lives at Saipan. We the members of chapter 2 hereby reaffirm our previous endorsement of Tom and urge the appointment of this World War II disabled veteran to the postmastership of El Cajon, Calif.

R. J. COSGRIFF,
Adjutant, San Diego Chapter 2, Disabled Veterans.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion is strongly opposed to the replacement of a disabled veteran as postmaster of El Cajon by a nonveteran and request your assistance in preventing this replacement.

C. M. MEECH,
Commander, 22d District, American Legion, Department of California.

REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 8, 1961.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am amazed and somewhat disappointed in the fact that so much undue pressure has been brought upon one of the outstanding heroes of our country's struggle for freedom, Acting Postmaster Tom Smith of El Cajon, who is an outstanding citizen as well as having given of himself to our country in time of battle so that he has been classified by our Government as totally and permanently disabled. If we are to treat men who devote and dedicate themselves to our country's welfare in time of war as some folks are attempting to treat Captain Smith, then there will be a question in the minds of those of future generations whether it will be worthwhile to sacrifice life, limb, and oneself for the preservation of our institutions and our altars.

Making political footballs of devoted servants of our country is not in keeping with the best spirit that makes it possible for a democracy to live. I hope that you can take Tom's case to the floor of Congress, and see to it that Captain Smith is given justice, and that he remains as postmaster of El Cajon, where he has done an excellent job.

With devotion to the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy, I remain.

Your friend,

FRANK B. GIGLIOTTI, D.D.,
Past National Commander, Regular Veterans Association.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, July 29, 1961]

ACTING POSTMASTER OUSTED IN EL CAJON

EL CAJON.—Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster here for the last year, said today he has been dismissed from his job.

"I am a Republican," Smith said. "I guess I just belong to the wrong party."

Smith, who was appointed by President Eisenhower, through Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, San Diego, said he received a letter from Frederick Belen, assistant postmaster general, saying Smith's services would no longer be required.

"In effect it gave me 2 weeks' notice," Smith said.

Smith is 100 percent disabled but gets around without a wheelchair or crutches. We was wounded in World War II.

He was a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps and went ashore in the second wave of Marines at Saipan in a tank, he said.

"I got fragments of a 90-millimeter shell in my head and laid on the beach for dead 5 days," he said. "Finally, someone noticed signs of life and salvaged me."

Smith is partially paralyzed in the left arm and leg and lost the use of his left hand. This has not interfered with his duties, he said.

PROMOTED TO CAPTAIN

Smith was promoted to captain when he left the service and has received the Purple Heart and Bronze Star in lieu of a Navy Cross. Before Saipan, he had served in Iceland and Africa.

Recommendations that he be retained as postmaster have been sent by city and county officials from El Cajon and San Diego and from leading citizens throughout the State.

One of his last official acts was to recommend a new post office building for El Cajon.

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 6, 1961]

POSTMASTER BEING REPLACED NOTES ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By Nick Williams)

EL CAJON.—Tom Smith, Jr., will step down as acting postmaster of El Cajon within a week—leaving, he hopes, the seed of a quadrupled post office here.

The Post Office Department last week notified Smith he would be replaced within 2 weeks ending a 1-year term as acting postmaster. Congress has yet to confirm a replacement for Smith.

Smith, a much-decorated World War II veteran, yesterday said he hopes to leave office with plans for a new post office underway.

"I saw the need for a new facility as soon as I took office," Smith said. "It is tremendously difficult to work in the cramped (7,000 square feet) space of the present post office.

"On my recommendation, the Department made a study for a new facility. I think the postmaster will accept it readily."

Smith said the proposed 28,000-square-foot post office, if accepted, will be completed within 2 years. He said it will allow postal workers to operate efficiently for at least 10 years.

HIGH SCHOOL COURSE

Smith, of 1790 Garrison Way, also cited a post office personnel administration course he formed for operation in the fall semester at Granite Hills High School. Twenty 2-hour courses will be conducted by post office instructors in the adult education division. Regular and prospective post office employees are expected to attend.

During his term, the post office also was raised from grade 11 to grade 12, the second highest grade post office in the county. Grade increases, Smith said, are measured by efficiency, number of employees, and Government vehicles and total receipts.

Smith said he had made no plans for the immediate future.

The acting postmaster still suffers partial paralysis on the left side from wounds suffered in World War II during the landing of the 2d Marine Division on Saipan.

SERVED IN ICELAND

He entered the Corps as a second lieutenant and served with a combat unit in Iceland in 1941 and early 1942. In the spring of 1942 he was intelligence officer of the staff of the admiral of the Atlantic Fleet during landings in North Africa where he later went ashore and endured the shellings at Casablanca, Rabat, and Dakar.

He returned to the States for training at Camp Elliott and shipped to New Zealand to join the 8th Marine Regiment.

By then a first lieutenant and infantry company commander, Smith took part in the bloody landing on Tarawa.

In June 1944 he was assistant commander when his mortar unit streamed toward the Saipan beaches in amphibious trucks. His commanding officer was killed before he reached the beach and Smith took command and brought the trucks to the beach where he reorganized the unit in an isolated area.

He led a wire team through enemy lines to link communication with his battalion headquarters where he briefed commanders on Japanese positions. He was struck in the left leg by small arms fire during this action.

Returning through the lines to command his unit, Smith was felled by a Japanese mortar shell which sent shrapnel into his arms, legs, shoulders, and the back of the head.

The Smiths have two children, William, 11, and Melinda, 9.

NATIONAL CITY, CALIF., *August 7, 1961.*

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: As soon as I saw in the newspapers the news of the action of the Post Office Department in relieving Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., acting postmaster in El Cajon, Calif., I sent a protest of this action to that Department in Washington. It seemed to me to be a rather summary action against a wounded veteran of World War II who almost died on the beaches of Saipan in the service of this Nation.

The mail today brought the enclosed reply which does not seem satisfactory to me. The whole thing smacked to me of politics. If anything can yet be done for this man I think it should be done.

Gratefully yours,

W. R. VAIDEN.

EL CAJON, CALIF.

MR. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is a generally accepted practice for political appointees to be replaced when a new administration is inaugurated. However, in some cases this serves no useful purpose and in the case to which this letter refers, perpatrates a grave injustice.

Thomas Smith, of El Cajon, Calif., was appointed acting postmaster. He has done a very creditable job of improving the efficiency of the local post office and has earned the respect of his fellow workers and of the townspeople.

Mr. Smith has a war record almost equal to that of Mr. President but he is now being replaced by the former assistant postmaster who, so far as this writer knows, has had no organizational or executive experience except that gained in his present job and when he operated a small gas station with a partner.

We all have reason to be grateful for our partisan type of government. This writer is a Republican but a stanch supporter of Mr. Kennedy in his high office as the President of the United States because the majority of our citizens elected him to that office.

Now then, could Mr. President not delegate someone to correct this unhappy situation and hold Mr. Smith as postmaster of El Cajon, Calif.?

Respectfully,

LEAH MCMAHON.

EL CAJON, CALIF.,
August 8, 1961.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hoping you will put up a good fight in Washington for our El Cajon Postmaster Tom Smith; 100-percent disabled American war veteran with an outstanding record in the service of his country; an outstanding record in the service of his community; and an outstanding record in the service of his job. And let's not forget the fellow countrymen who gave their blood to keep us free.

RUSS CRANE.
FRANK FOX.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Congressman BOB WILSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: I read in the San Diego newspapers about Thomas Smith, postmaster of El Cajon, losing his position and I think that this is terrible. A man who had defended his country as this man has should certainly be retained.

I am a registered Democrat and I believe that in this man's case that party affiliations should not be considered, just because he is a Republican is not enough reason to replace him. Republicans are Americans too.

I am for America and all good Americans regardless of party.

I hope that the Democratic administration will be fair in this man's case.

Respectfully yours,

ARLA MCCLURE.

AUGUST 9, 1961.

Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Better Government Association of San Diego wish to go on record for the retention of Mr. Thomas C. Smith, Jr., as postmaster of El Cajon, Calif.

Mr. Smith served his country with honor in time of war, and we believe that it is time to forget party politics and let him know that America is proud of the sacrifice he made for our country.

Yours truly,

WILLARD B. STEELMAN,
President, Better Government Association, San Diego, Calif.

AUGUST 9, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tom Smith, our local postmaster for the city of El Cajon, has been notified of his discharge from the service.

To my personal knowledge, Mr. Smith is an outstanding administrator, excellent in public relations, and an all around fine individual. We feel that Mr. Smith has served his country well. He has suffered for his service strong physical discomfort and as such, we feel that this is a poor reward for what he has been through.

I, therefore, respectfully request that additional consideration be given to the action of his discharge, and that he be restored to his former office.

Very truly yours,

J. C. O'CONNOR,
Chief of Police, City of El Cajon.

The Vicious Attack by Fabian Socialists on Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Fabian Socialists are today making a concerted effort to destroy those of us who

oppose their collectivist goals. Patriots who openly confess their belief in the principles of free enterprise and individual freedom are being subjected to the most vicious kind of character assassination. Writing in the August 8, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express, George Todt reviews the pitfalls of being pro-American. Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Todt's column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

VICIOUS ATTACKS ON UNITED STATES

"Let none except Americans be on guard tonight."—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

It is time the American people fully understood that there is presently a concerted attack under way against the anti-Communist indoctrination of the public and our troops in uniform—and particularly against participation in this effort by our military officers.

Part of this vicious onslaught has come from the Communist Party in the United States and its unreliable news rag—the Worker—the successor to the former Daily Worker, official Red organ.

But an even greater portion—and considerably more effective role—of the dastardly attempt to muzzle our military leaders in fighting against the Reds has come from misguided radical liberals of the Fabian Socialist school of thinking and its counterpart in the United States, the Americans for Democratic Action.

IF WE ARE

Unfortunately, key figures in the ADA occupy important positions on the New Forntier and have the ear of the President and his Secretary of Defense upon occasion. This seems to be one of them.

Every concerned and patriotic American owes it to himself and our country to brush up on some prerequisite reading about this matter.

It is contained in two magnificent speeches on this subject in the Senate by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 26 (pp. 12607–12637) and again on July 29 (pp. 12997–13013), entitled "Military Anti-Communist Seminars and Statements."

Strongly supporting Senator THURMOND throughout his thoroughly American stand on this vital issue today were such senatorial stalwarts as STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire; KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota; RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona; CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, and JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa.

WHAT WE SAY

On pages 13011–13013 is contained a tremendous address made by GOLDWATER to the Texas State convention of the American Legion at Houston on July 28. It tells a story which would seem incredible except for one thing: It is 100 percent true. Fantastic—but eminently correct.

GOLDWATER has put this matter of censorship of the military by our homegrown radical liberals exactly on the line—and it ought to become priority No. 1 reading for all concerned Americans.

Patriotic organizations would be well-advised to circulate this address by GOLDWATER, in particular, to all corners of the land.

For some strange reason, known only perhaps to those behind the scenes, the mass communications media of the Nation has been shy about reporting GOLDWATER or THURMOND regarding military censorship.

And yet both are eminently qualified to speak out. The former Senator is a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve, the latter a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve. Their thinking on military subjects is top-flight.

LET'S NOT BAR

"It is now becoming popular in the National Government," said the Arizonian to the Texas Legionnaires at Houston, "to investigate and censure military men who have any words of warning to say about Communist influences in American life. You men who have fought in wars must wonder what kind of struggle we are waging when it becomes a censurable offense to discuss the tactics of the enemy.

"Regardless of what the official policy might be, there can be no denying that communism is our enemy. Communism is our sworn enemy. It strives to take over and enslave the United States of America as well as the entire world. And against this backdrop it becomes not merely an arguable question of military etiquette whether we are to know every possible facet of the enemy's operation. It becomes a question of our national survival."

AMERICAN WAY

At the bottom of the woodpile is the supposedly secret Pentagon memorandum-that-got-leaked of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a former Rhodes scholar at Oxford University, England.

Senator THURMOND has described it as a dastardly attempt to intimidate the commanders of U.S. Armed Forces and prevent those commanders from teaching their troops the nature of the menace of world communism.

Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, wanted to know what right the Senate Foreign Relations chairman—in this case, FULBRIGHT—had in sticking his nose in Pentagon affairs in the first place.

Then the question arose: Actually, just who was behind FULBRIGHT in his highly controversial action?

Read it for yourself in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is usually available in the public library. Then write your views to Washington.

"The way to fight communism," says reliable J. Edgar Hoover, "is to study it, understand it and discover what can be done about it."

That applies to our military men, too.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Secretary of Defense's Reply to Question Raised by Hon. Steven B. Derounian, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I received from the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara.

On July 31, 1961, during the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 120, the resolution to authorize the President to order Ready reservists to active duty, I engaged in the following colloquy with the gentleman from New York, Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN:

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I am disturbed over the recent charge by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor that according to his investigator there is some discrimination in the armed services of the United States because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Would the gentleman assure me that he will look into this on his own responsibility to make sure that this is not happening, or if it is, that immediate corrective measures will be taken through the President of the United States to assure equal status and equal treatment for all members of the armed services?

Mr. VINSON. In view of the question the distinguished gentleman from New York has propounded to me, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I will advise you and advise the Members of the House and the public that I shall on tomorrow morning address a communication to the Secretary of Defense requesting information along the line of the gentleman's question to me and I will be delighted to give it to the public and I will be happy to send the gentleman a copy of the letter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman.

Accordingly, I wrote to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, on August 1, 1961, requesting that he furnish me a full reply to the question raised by the gentleman from New York. That reply has been received and is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, August 5, 1961.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to your letter to me of August 1, 1961, in which you included a colloquy between yourself and Congressman DEROUNIAN with respect to alleged discrimination in the armed services of the United States because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Mr. DEROUNIAN's statement is in broad terms and we have been unable to identify any specific charge by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor on this subject which would pertain to the Department of Defense as a whole. From time to time, Mr. POWELL has forwarded to the military departments complaints that have been made to him by individuals alleging discrimination. Each of these complaints has been promptly investigated and replies made to Congressman POWELL advising him as to our findings and corrective action taken if such was called for.

The policy of the Department of Defense is that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. This policy stems from Executive Order No. 9981, signed by President Truman on July 26, 1948, and we are happy to report that this policy has been fully implemented in the Active Establishment.

There have been suggestions that this policy should be enforced with respect to the National Guard. It is a fact that there are several States, in which State laws, practices, and customs result in segregation of Negroes in the National Guard and preclude equality of treatment because of race. Since World War II, however, there has been significant advance in the integration of Negroes into formerly all white National Guard units. This has been accomplished by the modification of both statutes and practices which formerly precluded integration in several States.

With respect to those States where progress as yet has not been made the problem admittedly is complicated. When the National Guard is in an inactive status or as the language of the Constitution provides when not "called into the actual service of the United States," there are constitutional and statutory provisions which make the attainment of racial integration much more difficult than in the Active Forces where the Federal authorities have the direct exclusive authority to require integration. The National Guard, in an inactive status, is composed of State forces serving under the command of the several Governors. In the event that the threat to the security of the United States should require the necessary action to call any or all the National Guard units into active service, the policy of integration which presently obtains for the active service would, of course, apply also to the National Guard units on active duty.

It is possible that the remark by Mr. DEROUNIAN pertains to the considerations mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs. There has also been a complaint that there is discrimination within the National Guard Bureau. This allegation is currently under careful scrutiny by the Department of Defense and I assure you that such corrective action as may be called for will be taken. Although Mr. POWELL has not written to me on this matter, I am advised that members of his office staff have discussed the allegation with representatives of the National Guard Bureau and members of my staff.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, may I assure you that the Department of Defense wholeheartedly supports the national policy with respect to equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services. Each instance of alleged discrimination is promptly investigated and, if appropriate, corrective action is taken within the authority at my disposal.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and it is a pleasure to be able to provide you with this information.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

NSA Congress To Convene in Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the National Student Association Congress will convene August 20 for 10 days in the capital of my State, Madison, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent to have a brief history of the National Student Association printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brief history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

The U.S. National Student Association (USNSA) is a confederation of student governments in colleges and universities throughout the United States. Its programs, policy and national leadership—this year as in previous years—is determined by the National Student Congress, the largest and most significant single meeting of college students in the Nation, comprised of delegates elected by the students of the member schools of the USNSA.

This year the National Student Congress will be held August 20 through 30 at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, marking a return to the site of the USNSA's constitutional convention for the 14th anniversary of this nationwide organization of American students.

The USNSA's 14-year history dates back to 1946, when the student scene mirrored clearly the hustling phases of the world. In that year, postwar world meetings of all kinds were taking place, and the World Student Congress opened in Prague that summer.

Twenty-five Americans attended the World Student Congress, representing 10 universities and 9 student and youth organizations. They had not been named official delegates of any American student organization, for no such organization existed after previous efforts to form a national student group had lapsed into futility when overshadowed by the war or swallowed up by the partisans of left or right.

The 25 Americans were conscious of the handicaps they suffered as unofficial delegates. Still they could not be other than impressed by the reputations, programs, and traditions of the representative student unions of other countries, some of which had been in existence for more than half a century. These young Americans were determined to form an organization in the

United States, capable of encompassing wide-ranging opinion and pressures so that it might become the spokesman of the American student community while at the same time providing valuable services to American students locally, regionally, and nationally.

Their efforts culminated in August of 1947, when the University of Wisconsin campus was thronged with 750 delegates from 356 schools who wrote the constitution for the USNSA, chose its name and decided the basis of its representation. Determined to assure the association's continued maintenance of a large and representative constituency, they limited membership to the student bodies of all accredited institutions of higher education through their democratically elected student governments. Thus the USNSA did not become an individual-member organization where the individuals are responsible only to themselves, nor did it become solely a coordinating body for existing partisan or sectarian student groups. Reflecting the feelings of students on member campuses, USNSA's structure provides a representative organ for American students within the heterogeneous framework of the Nation's system of higher education.

Today, USNSA's membership includes the student bodies of 400 major American colleges and universities. While this constitutes only one-fifth of the total number of institutions on higher education in the United States according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and one-third of the accredited colleges and universities, the enrollment of these 400 USNSA member schools encompasses well over one-half of the total college enrollment in the country.

Represented within the USNSA are colleges and universities of the 4-year and 2-year variety, large State-supported universities and small public colleges, private colleges of every denomination and large privately-endowed institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. USNSA member colleges and universities are located in all but 4 of the 50 States including the District of Columbia, providing the USNSA with a true cross-section of American college students.

The annual National Student Congress is the supreme legislative body of the USNSA, establishing the policies and programs of the association and electing national officers for the coming year. Each student of a USNSA member school has the opportunity to be represented at this meeting through his democratically selected delegates. In this manner, the representative form of government of the United States is reproduced at the college level, providing for the student an unusual exercise in democracy through which he may develop his citizenship and leadership skills through actual participation in self-government, where he finds himself both the governing and the governed.

In the intensely political, but nonpartisan, atmosphere of the National Student Congress, delegates are forced to realize, some for the first time, the importance of their vote in the democratic process through which the future activities of their organization are established. At a time in history when totalitarian methods become more and more evident, this experience in democracy gives the American student a true understanding and appreciation of democratic institutions.

This training in democracy and self-government has been further utilized by USNSA student leaders as they move from the college scene into positions of national prominence. Among the former USNSA officers now serving in positions of national leadership are William Welsh, USNSA president in 1947–48, now assistant to Senator HART, of Michigan; Ralph Dungan, USNSA national affairs vice president in 1947–48, now assistant to the President; James T. Harris, USNSA president in 1948–49, now director of the Ford Foundation's Institute of Law and Public Administration of the Congo (Leopoldville); Peter Jones, author of a USNSA publication on the early international student scene who is now assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration; William Dentzer, USNSA president in 1951–52, now with the International Cooperation Administration; Richard J. Murphy, USNSA president in 1952–53, now Assistant Postmaster General. Other USNSA alumni fill positions of leadership in the community, industry, and non-governmental organizations.

In addition to its leadership training aspects, USNSA's flexible, yet sturdy structure has contributed to the continued growth of a 14-year program of service, education, and action. USNSA works both domestically and internationally in creating an awareness of the student's local, national, and international responsibilities. Emphasis upon responsibility, as well as rights, has secured for USNSA the recognition and permanent esteem of educational organizations and national leaders.

The work of the USNSA in the international student community was recognized in a statement of evaluation adopted by the three major deans' organizations in the United States—the National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators—declaring that the USNSA has "spearheaded and led the mobilization of the unions of students of the free world in combating the partisan propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the Communist-led International Union of Students."

Internationally, the USNSA was actively involved in the formation of the International Student Conference and its Coordinating Secretariat, an international meeting and coordinating agency for the activities of 77 representative national unions of students of the free world. USNSA sent five representatives to the most recent International Student Conference meeting in August 1961, in Klosters, Switzerland, and will represent the American student community at the next meeting.

Good will delegations of American students have traveled to other countries under the sponsorship of the USNSA while the USNSA has hosted numerous delegations of foreign students in this country. This year the USNSA acted as host to delegations of student leaders from Korea, Paraguay, the Congo, Chile, French West Africa, and the Federation of Black African Students in France. The association also hosted an international student team interested in studying the problems of racial discrimination in the southern United States.

At a time when the foreign student leaders of today are also the national leaders of today—particularly in countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East—the USNSA international program has been an important factor in establishing good will with the leaders of these countries and helping them to understand our system of democratic government and political freedom.

The USNSA has long been an advocate of international educational exchange programs and for the past 6 years, has been active in providing scholarships to outstanding student leaders from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East for academic study in the United States. Through the association's foreign student leadership project, 15 special scholarships are awarded annually to students from these four areas of the world for a full academic year on selected American campuses, with reduced study loads allowing them to participate actively in the student organizations and activities on American campuses, especially the democratic student self-governments. Twenty-eight academic scholarships have also been made available for Algerian refugee student leaders to study in colleges and universities throughout the country.

The USNSA recently completed negotiations for a long-term academic exchange program with the Soviet Union. Under the terms of the agreement, two American students will study for 1 full year in the Soviet Union and two Russian students will come to the United States. A special section of the agreement guarantees to participants of the exchange complete access to all necessary records in both countries.

For the past 2 years, USNSA has conducted an academic exchange program negotiated by representatives of USNSA and the Polish National Union of Students, under which two American students study in Polish universities and two Polish students spend an academic year in the United States.

A program of travel in Latin America has been established by the association to ascertain the needs of student communities there in order to develop programs through which some of these needs may be alleviated. In this connection, USNSA cooperated with the National Union of Students of Chile during the past year in bringing five Chilean student leaders to the United States to study the American student cooperative system for adaptation to the Chilean environment.

Convinced that the American student can contribute immensely in the field of international relations while he is still a student, the USNSA, for the past 9 years, has conducted an international student relations seminar, providing the annual opportunity for 15 American student leaders to spend 9 weeks in an intensive workshop on international relations and the international student community, preparing the student to work effectively on the international student scene. The ninth seminar is now in progress in Philadelphia, Pa. In order to expand the benefits of the program, USNSA conducts regional international student relations seminars of a shorter duration throughout the country during the academic year.

USNSA's International Commission has concentrated this year on efforts to aid in the establishment of the Peace Corps. An active supporter of the Peace Corps idea since the proposal was first introduced as congressional legislation under the name of the point 4 Youth Corps, the USNSA has worked closely with its member student bodies in providing them with information and urging students to study the Peace Corps proposal. The USNSA prepared the student section of the original study on the feasibility of a Peace Corps conducted by the Colorado State University Research Center.

The association has been active in the field of civil rights and human relations on the student level. Last year the association sponsored a National Student Conference on the sit-in movement in Washington, D.C., which brought together student body presidents from colleges and universities throughout the Nation to learn about and discuss the Southern student protest movement. USNSA has continued its close cooperation with the Southern Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and its sponsoring a conference on the problems of desegregation in the South this summer for student leaders from the various communities where sit-in protests have occurred. USNSA published a Civil Rights Newsletter during this academic year which serves as a means of channeling information from the Southern students to the students at USNSA member institutions and other interested persons.

USNSA was one of nine organizations selected this year to cooperate in a nationwide inquiry to determine what substantial groups of Americans think our national pur-

pose is and ought to be. The inquiry is being conducted by the National Recreation Association.

USNSA is built on the belief that education is the keystone of democracy and that a free university is essential to a free society. For this reason, the association annually sponsors Academic Freedom Week on its member campuses to emphasize the importance of the freedoms to teach and to learn in building and maintaining a free society.

As one of its most important service functions, the association provides low-cost student tours of Europe through its travel subsidiary, Educational Travel, Inc., with offices in New York City and Berkeley, Calif. USNSA student tours are educational in content and provide the student travelers from the United States with an opportunity to meet with and get to know students from the countries which they visit.

Recognition of the work of USNSA was made in a message to the delegates of the 13th National Student Congress last summer by President John F. Kennedy, then Senator, who stated:

"The National Student Association has splendidly articulated our national ideals and reflected the vigor of our college and university young people. The NSA has behind it years of useful activity and experience. It has made generous and effective contributions in many areas of public policy—foreign affairs, civil rights, academic freedom and international student exchange."

A New Kind of Warfare—House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, the Frontier Herald, a very fine local newspaper, published in Hamburg, N.Y., ran what I consider to be an extremely worthwhile article. The article was prepared by Dr. George S. Benson, president of the national education program.

The Frontier Herald and Dr. Benson are to be commended for their active support of a program which would initiate an offensive campaign against the international Communist conspiracy. The text of Dr. Benson's article follows:

A NEW KIND OF WARFARE

(By Dr. George S. Benson)

Scholars who know communism have tried to teach us, and largely failed, that the Communists keep a jump ahead in the battle for the world because they play the grim game entirely according to rules of their own making, not according to our rules. We have long known that they read history in their own peculiar way according to the Marxian dialectic, but we have too long refused to face the unpleasant fact that they play at politics without subscribing to the customs, ethics, and morals that are generally observed by the Western World.

These rules of centuries past are usually not of any use to them in their nefarious schemes. Perhaps it could best be said that there are no rules in this program of world conquest. But the distinctive feature of communism that we have ignored is that it is an international conspiracy that knows no boundaries, no allegiances, and no commitment except to its oft-stated objectives of world conquest and to its own evil devices.

LEADING THE FREE WORLD

Representative PILLION of New York has an idea for making this understood, both at home and abroad. He would do this by means of a joint congressional resolution which would amount to a declaration of war upon the source of most of the conflict in today's world, not against any government, but against the actual enemy, the alliance of Communist Parties of the world. This is something new. It meets the challenge where it has been made. Besides standing firm to meet the Communist advance, we might well rally the free world to get off the defensive and carry the battle to the enemy.

Although many of President Kennedy's recent public statements reveal that he himself understands clearly the nature of the war we are fighting, there seems to be a continuing need for this realization on the part of other leaders in the Government and in Congress. This resolution would do much to unify us all and to inform the world where we stand. It would be a splendid start toward assuming the real leadership of the free world that has been thrust upon us.

BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

This resolution, or at least the kind of thinking that is revealed in it, ought to undergird our own foreign policy. Although the idea of declaring war on a political movement is a unique concept, it is a recognition of the realities of today. It is an answer to the aggression of Marxian geopolitics and to the Russians who steer and coordinate the whole movement. This resolution could be the beginning of a new approach to international relations.

Representative PILLION is aware of all this. Here are some of the practical results he sees if his resolution is adopted:

"First, by identifying the enemy, by recognizing the war which the Communists have been waging against us, we shall have a basis for shaping our policies to prosecute the war. How can we formulate effective programs to defeat an enemy if we neither specify who he is, nor acknowledge that we are at war with him?

HOPE OF MILLIONS

"Second, we shall raise a standard to which freemen everywhere can rally. The enemy is not just our enemy, but of all who love freedom. We shall by raising this standard, assert our rightful place as leaders of the yet free world. We shall give renewed hope to the millions whom the Communists hold in bondage.

"Third, we shall have a guide for our domestic policies which must be consistent with the demands of the life and death struggle in which we are engaged.

"Finally, we shall have a justifiable hope that by accepting the challenge which the enemy poses to civilization itself, we can someday usher in an era of genuine peace, and the fulfillment of the highest aspirations of mankind."

This clarion call resembles in every essential respect the stirring messages of Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry in 1775. Patriots then were aware that the world was watching to see whether tyranny could be challenged successfully. Have we not, today, an even greater obligation to the free world to lead against an even darker enslavement?

The Muzzling of U.S. Military Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, second only to the issues involved in the foreign aid bill, I believe there has been more debate on the Senate floor the past 90 days on the growing censorship by politicians in the executive department of Government than on any other important public issue. Great credit should go to the hard-hitting, outspoken courageous and independent junior Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, for his diligence and industry in ferreting out the facts and bringing this new censorship activity of the Pentagon to public attention.

Interestingly enough, that vast segment of the American press which is not "in the bag" of the administration and which still exercises independent judgment on public affairs rather than merely echoing and endorsing White House pronouncements, has come to life in a big way by criticizing this new peacetime censorship. A case in point is an editorial from the Fort Worth, Tex., Star Telegram which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MUZZLING OF U.S. MILITARY LEADERS

The answer to a current question in the Nation's Capital could have important bearing on the cold war and the future of the United States. The question is whether the country's military leaders should be muzzled and, if so, to what extent.

At the moment the administration apparently is persuaded that the muzzle should be applied. It was put on, actually, in the early days of the Kennedy regime. Successive directives have tightened it. The latest of these orders, imposing new controls and "guidance" on speeches by military officers, came after a complaint to Secretary of Defense McNamara from Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT. Certain members of the military, the Senator is said to have complained, were making "extremist speeches" and promoting "radical rightwing views."

The subsequent order for new restrictions brought an expression of the opposing point of view from Senators STROM THURMOND of South Carolina and FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio, however. Senator THURMOND charged that "a dastardly attempt to intimidate the commanders of the U.S. Armed Forces" was being made. Senator LAUSCHE asserted that the muzzle was being tightened to the extent that military leaders "are afraid to speak about the benefits of our system and the evils of communism."

In a democracy such as ours there sometimes is a threat to freedom from the "radical rightwing." It often manifests itself in the military and it usually is strongest when there is also a threat from the leftwing.

At this juncture, however, the overriding threat to American freedom is from the leftwing, the Communists. Military commanders are acutely conscious of this peril and perhaps a bit impatient with the slowness of civilian leaders to recognize the danger

and prepare the Nation and the people to meet it. But there is nothing to warrant a feeling that they are so alarmed or impatient as to be themselves a threat to democracy.

There is, on the other hand, plenty of evidence that the American people, and even members of the Armed Forces, could stand to hear more about the benefits of our system, the evils of communism and what the Reds are doing in an effort to impose their evil system upon us. For the moment, then, the answer to the question of whether the military should be muzzled would seem definitely to be no. And for that matter, the very idea of the Federal Government muzzling those who have something to say to the American people seems hardly to coincide with the spirit of the Constitution.

Senecas Can Take United States Off the Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on August 14, 1961. This editorial bears out my thoughts, as I have been very much opposed to the construction of the Kinzua Dam. Here we are in this great country breaking a treaty of 1794. The editorial follows:

SENECAS CAN TAKE UNITED STATES OFF THE HOOK

Whether the United States can be purged of the moral stain of having broken a 1794 treaty with the Indians without the consent of the Seneca Nation which owns tribal lands along the Allegheny River is a question that perhaps the Senecas can answer in responding to President Kennedy's offer of compensation in "every proper way" for their loss of land to the Kinzua Reservoir.

The President presented the Senecas with a fait accompli in notifying them by letter that he is satisfied that construction of the reservoir should not be halted. He said in effect that, treaty or no treaty, the material interests of the country of which the Indians are in a sense impressed citizens transcend in importance its moral obligation to live up to a treaty made 167 years ago.

It should be some comfort to the Senecas that President Kennedy made a direct reply to their chief, Seneca President Basil Williams. The letter indicates that the Office of the President of the United States—the Great White Father to those who dote on movie scripts—acknowledges that the treaty itself is no mere scrap of paper to be ignored at the White House.

Moreover, the President held forth the promise of material rewards to the Seneca Nation of perhaps a special nature if that can be arranged. It well may be that the Indians will be better off materially because of the treaty's unilateral abrogation, and we certainly hope so because if a settlement is to be pitched at that level, the sky ought to be the limit on the help proffered the Senecas.

A splendid opportunity is presented to the Seneca Nation to dramatize its people's loyalty and forbearance in this matter. It was no dog-in-the-manger position they took, for they said they would relinquish their lands if it were shown that an alternative to the Kinzua Dam would not solve the flood-control problem of the lower Allegheny. The alternative plan was not examined as it might have been.

Now, we suggest, confronted with the fait accompli bearing the presidential imprimatur, the Seneca Nation might cap this sorrowful incident with a grand gesture: Formal annulment of the treaty of 1794 at ceremonies in the hills of Pennsylvania to which the appropriate representative of the U.S. Government would be a party.

Probably it would be best for the Senecas to carry it off in the spirit of the times: In the front of the TV cameras after they have nicked the United States for all the traffic will bear in material awards.

The Price of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a thought-provoking editorial, entitled "The Price of Liberty Is Spelled Out by a General and an Admiral."

The oft-quoted statement, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance," needs to be updated to include not just vigilance, but action, sacrifice, and dedication.

In these challenging times, we need crystallization of the goals, give the necessary direction, and muster the patriotic spirit to win against threats to our freedom.

Reflecting such goals, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF LIBERTY IS SPELLED OUT BY A GENERAL AND AN ADMIRAL

Across the space of 13 years, a general and an admiral spoke largely to the same point—that Americans must face up to the heavy burdens of peace if they would avoid the horrors of war.

On Memorial Day, 1948, Gen. Omar Bradley, then Army Chief of Staff, rose on a village green at Longmeadow, Mass., to pay homage to a soldier, a Medal of Honor winner, killed near the close of the war in Europe. The general's words deserve full flow:

"We have suffered enough in two World Wars to know that noninvolvement in peace means certain involvement in war.

"Secure in distant and peaceful towns like these, clinging to comforts, refusing risks, seeking safety in refuge and refuge in words, we recanted power and conscience.

"If we [now] cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly with principle, resolution and strength, then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the Nation with an illusion of security.

"The American people must put their faith in stable long-range policies—political, economic and military—programs that will not be heated and cooled with the brightening and waning of tension.

"The United States has matured to world leadership; it is time we steered by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship."

In midsummer of 1961, with the dilemma of Berlin hanging over this country and the world, Adm. Arleigh Burke, newly freed of his long responsibility as Chief of Naval Operations, spoke in like vein.

Delivering his maiden civilian speech in Washington, a long address covering many aspects of the world struggle, the admiral found a place for these words of challenge to the people:

"The pleasures of an easy summer and the comforts of a thriving economy can well obscure the seriousness of our times.

"We live in a free world, but we are confronted by a world of coercion, a world where men are disciplined by force, by terror and intimidation.

"There is only one effective response to this challenge. We must provide our own form of discipline, the discipline that springs from within: self-discipline. This is the only discipline possible in a democracy.

"We must recognize that the very heart of any nation is its principles. Our principles must be the driving force behind our actions and the standard against which those actions are measured."

No realistic leader predicts anything for us but continuing challenge in the decades ahead. Let us hope that in those years there will be other Burkes and Bradleys to call us sharply to the test.

Governor Rockefeller's Telegram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from one of the best-known individuals in the Nation today, Nelson A. Rockefeller, urging me to vote to reverse adoption of the Saund amendment. That I will not do.

First, Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman from California is a member of the majority where I am a member of the minority, I believe his amendment expresses the thinking of the Republican Party and expresses the thinking of the people of my district and the Nation.

I believe in the concept of long-range planning, Mr. Speaker; however, I can see no reason why it is necessary to give the administration or any other agency the authority to borrow from the Treasury in the manner the administration proposes and in the manner Mr. Rockefeller supports.

I firmly believe we can have long-range planning and still finance the program by the traditional method of annual appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the telegram I received refers to bipartisan endorsement of this legislation. This endorsement, Mr. Rockefeller implies, has existed for some time. I believe Mr. Rockefeller doesn't know what he is talking about. I have never heard of any bipartisan support of back-door spending.

I agree with Mr. Rockefeller that if freedom is to live the long and relent-

less struggles with communism must continue. But, the outcome of this struggle depends to a great extent upon the wisdom expressed by this body.

Certainly, Mr. Rockefeller can judge the issues from his chair in Albany by reading and listening to reports of the various media, but I doubt that his conclusions can be as valid as those reached here in the House of Representatives where firsthand facts and the pros and cons have been discussed and weighed.

President Kennedy's Orders Permit Red Propaganda Flood Into United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, because President Kennedy has ordered cessation of inspection of suspect mail by postal authorities, tons of Communist propaganda are being delivered to U.S. homes, institutions, and businesses. This was accomplished on April 6, 1961 by official Order No. 20247.

The subject is discussed in quantities of tons in the following article recently appearing in the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram:

MASSIVE QUANTITIES DELIVERED TO AMERICANS, POSTAL AID CONFIRMS: RED LITERATURE POURS INTO UNITED STATES AT HARBORS

A local postal spokesman has confirmed a House Un-American Activities Committee report that massive quantities of Communist literature and political propaganda are being landed at the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles and other U.S. harbors.

And the Red periodicals and pamphlets, arriving in astronomical numbers aboard foreign ships, are being delivered free-of-charge by the Post Office Department.

The Government, Congress, the postal service and Federal customs are aware of the problem, but can do nothing about it officials claim, because:

1. The United States is obligated under international postal agreement to deliver or transship all foreign postage mail arriving at its sea and air terminals.

2. Constitutional law and the so-called "sanctity of the mails" prohibits opening much of this mail or stopping its delivery unless requested by the addressee.

3. The last remaining check on the flow of these anti-American materials, a policy in which suspect mail was forwarded to an inspection investigation division to determine if it is subversive, was abolished by the Kennedy administration in an official order (No. 20247) on April 6, 1961.

Los Angeles is one of 9 U.S. cities designated as an official foreign exchange postal station and picks up between 5,000 and 10,000 bags of mail each month from ships arriving at the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles.

Local postal authorities declined to estimate the exact amount of Communist mail involved here "because we have no way of knowing" and stated they have had no official order to check the incoming mail for anti-American or pro-Soviet bloc materials.

"We can't refuse to pick up mail. We must accept all mail offered by ships that call here and deliver it if it is deliverable," a San Pedro postal station officer said.

Another Los Angeles postal official who worked in the special subversive mails division before it was abolished, verified that a "large quantity (of Communist tracts and propaganda) comes in here," but also could not make a (factual) estimate.

The postal official said he could not detail to whom and where the mail was sent "because we were more interested in the text than the destination."

The House Un-American Activities Committee, in a report last year, estimated that virtually every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist publications.

A check of area colleges, however, indicated very little literature from Communist countries had been received through the mails within recent months.

Most librarians checked said no such materials had been received to their knowledge.

A librarian at State College said only one or two items that could be classified as Communist propaganda have been received there in the last year.

One official at El Camino College told reporters she recalled two periodicals coming in early this year from either Poland or Yugoslavia. She said the magazines were thrown away.

The material, numbering about 40 different publications, is mailed to a master list of American students compiled by international youth organizations with headquarters in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and London, according to the House committee.

Other sources claim:

A 12-month U.S. Customs check of the port of New Orleans revealed 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined for U.S. school students was landed there.

Seven million pieces of Communist literature cleared the port of New York in a year's period and in 1 week during 1960 the San Francisco Post Office processed 17½ tons of Red propaganda to American addresses.

Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has suggested that the U.S. Post Office Department refuse to deliver any pro-Communist materials.

However, postal officials point out that present law and court decisions make delivery of mail mandatory unless the addressee (recipient) complains or refuses to accept it.

Most of the Red materials are unsolicited. "Patrons would get such mail here," said Long Beach Postmaster George McMillin, "and we wouldn't know about it unless they protest. Then it is sent on to the inspector's office."

Local inspectors said they were not in a position to evaluate it here. Most of it does not show.

The inspector said there have been a few instances of addresses protesting receipt of Communist propaganda "but we're not at liberty to divulge information about these."

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article dealing with the Berlin crisis, written by William S. White and published in a recent newspaper column.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—It now looks like the Berlin crisis is going to be manageable—but only if all concerned will keep their shirts on and if self-nominated world statesmen will stop interfering with the responsible Western leaders.

President Kennedy is having almost as much trouble with volunteer advisers as with Nikita Khrushchev. There is, by the way, excellent authority for saying that one of those holding the liveliest of sympathy for Mr. Kennedy is former President Dwight Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower, in every crisis in his own time, had the same difficulty.

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany is being bedeviled by the man who seeks his job in the German elections of September 17, Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin.

On top of all this, some people in this country and in West Berlin are howling for the Allies to "do something" about Russia's closing of the border between East and West Berlin. Most of these people don't know which "something" it is that they want to be done.

Finally, any "something" that could be done would likely only bring a kind of civil war in Germany. This would benefit nobody but the Soviet Union; and would kill many Berliners—including those now clamoring for "something to be done."

What many will not grasp is that the closing of the border between the two Berlins is no kind of Soviet "victory," and that the incident is all but irrelevant to the true contest. The true contest is only now opening; and it is not over the city border. It is over two vital points, and two only: Continued Allied right to keep troops in Berlin; continued Allied right to free access to Berlin.

These rights have not yet been cut in any way. If and when they are, the West will "do something." In the meantime, there is no commonsense justification for risking civil war in Germany and a worldwide nuclear war over the unpleasant but not very important fact that the Russians have sealed the city borders.

There is also the not exactly trivial fact that they have thereby created for East Berlin—and for themselves—an intolerable situation for the long run.

All this shouting from ordinary people, though damaging, is understandable. Not at all understandable are the deeply harmful and irresponsible actions of high public officials in both countries.

An American Under Secretary of State, Chester Bowles, undercuts his own administration's basic—and profoundly right—case by suggesting that few in neutralist countries are impressed by the West's legal rights to remain in Berlin. Their faces light up, he says, only because of our resolve to defend self-determination for the Berliners.

No one doubts Bowles' desire to assist his country. But this episode will speed his already foredoomed departure from his present post. People within the administration itself are appalled. But the damage has been done.

Mayor Brandt, for his part, is shamelessly using a world crisis to promote his campaign to unseat Chancellor Adenauer. It is easy for demagogs to whip up excited crowds, as Brandt is doing, to pour scorn on the West for inaction. The old Chancellor is bravely resisting public clamor, faithful to his responsibility. He is actively defending proper Western caution, while Brandt, from a mere

mayor's post, tries to take over the foreign policy of all the West by addressing personal notes to the President of the United States.

How many divisions would Brandt or Bowles—or some of our most vocal liberal Democratic Senators—be able to put into the field if their own private and often contradictory foreign policies should prevail?

The Great Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article on the great unsolved farm problem was written by Mr. James Lane, Jr., of Delaware County, in my district.

Mr. Lane is a working farmer, and he takes a very, to me, new approach in trying to solve this overwhelming problem.

I agree wholeheartedly with his statement: In summary, it is my opinion that the farm problem is not a separate problem in itself, but part of a bigger problem—national unemployment. Yes, indeed, national unemployment is the real problem, and it is increasing slowly but surely:

THE GREAT FARM PROBLEM

For a period of approximately 40 years with the exception of war years a condition has existed in agricultural economics that has come to be known as "the great farm problem."

It could be summarized by saying that it consists of too many farmers producing too much produce for what the market will absorb at prices that farmers consider satisfactory.

To be sure not all farmers are dissatisfied and some would be dissatisfied if prices were twice as high, but the fact remains that agriculture has lagged behind the rest of the economy in per capita income and farmers have seen the lions share of their gains in productivity go toward subsidizing consumers or into the middleman's profits, or else swallowed up by government taxes.

The solution to this problem seems ridiculously simple, merely limit production to the amount that will be absorbed at satisfactory prices. It would work too if farmers were given to group action like ants or honeybees, but unfortunately or fortunately whichever way you want to look at it, farmers are individualists and are apt to regard production controls as a challenge to their ingenuity like drought, floods or the boll weevil. The record will show how well they have succeeded in circumventing the intent of production controls. Laws with teeth in them that would make production controls workable have been lacking, due to the fact that legislators haven't figured out a way to pass these kinds of laws and still retain enough popularity to get elected again. Moreover many advocates of production controls would quickly lose their desire for controls if these laws were passed.

Ezra Benson in his ordeal as Secretary of Agriculture correctly analyzed the problem when he decided that the cause of the surplus problem was the farmer himself. He reasoned that the way to eliminate the surplus was to eliminate the farmer. While this statement may sound somewhat crude and unfair it is basically true.

In a recent survey it was found that agriculture was comprised of 3,700,000 farm families. Of this total it was found that about 2,400,000 families were producing 95 percent of the stuff. It doesn't take much of a mathematician to figure out that probably a million farmers are doing little more than add to the surplus and would not be able to make a satisfactory income for themselves even at 150 percent of parity. The reason why they persist in pursuing farming as an occupation is not necessarily because they have such an intense desire for the home farm and the simple life but rather because of a lack of alternative. I am convinced that farmers will leave the farms in droves if and when they have the opportunity of taking jobs off the farm that will offer them a better income or better working conditions than the farm they are now operating. This was aptly demonstrated during World War II when countless numbers of farmers left their farms as a source of income to work in defense plants.

In summary, it is my opinion that the farm problem is not a separate problem in itself, but part of a bigger problem—national unemployment.

While there are certain things that farmers can do and must do to improve the situation such as a better promotion and merchandising and constant upgrading of the consumers diet through quality control and increased use of animal agriculture, nevertheless I am convinced that the problem is destined to not only continue but to grow worse until we have an economic climate which will encourage farmers through voluntary individual decisions to seek some other occupation as a means of livelihood. Until such time, farmers will continue to follow the only course they know to meet the double challenge of the high cost of living and the cost of high living by producing more and more for which they receive less and less. It's very much like a dog chasing its tail.

Telegram From Governor Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose the text of a telegram I have today received from the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York, and my reply thereto:

NEW YORK., N.Y., *August 17, 1961.*

Hon. AUGUST JOHANSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I am taking the liberty of sending you this wire because I deeply believe that this Nation's program of assistance in strengthening the forces of democracy is vital to the survival of freedom. I consider it is essential, in terms of our own interests that our aid program be placed on a basis permitting long-range planning, which has had bipartisan endorsement. This will not only enable us to assist more effectively in orderly economic growth of developing nations to the end that they may remain free, but will also assure maximum usefulness of the U.S. contribution to the developing multilateral aid program of the free world. We must face the reality of our responsibilities as leader of the free world. The long and relentless struggle with communism must be sustained if freedom is to live. In light of the above, I urge you to vote to reverse yesterdays adoption of the crippling Saund amendment.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

AUGUST *18, 1961.*

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of New York,
Albany, N.Y.

In my judgment your telegram of this date is tragically ill-advised. The only thing the Saund amendment cripples is the bureaucracy's campaign to pressure Congress into abdicating its constitutional responsibility and authority. I deeply regret that you associate yourself with this campaign. I shall vote to support the Saund amendment.

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

Tribute to the Late Louis Salzarulo, Richmond, Ind., Councilman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Indiana and the United States recently lost one of their finest citizens, Mr. Louis Salzarulo. Mr. Salzarulo came to America from Italy in 1904, and settled at Richmond, Ind., where he made his home for the rest of his life.

The story of "Louie" Salzarulo, as he was known to many, is unusual. Because of this, and because he, as an immigrant, became a shining example of how one can rise to success in a free country, I ask unanimous consent to have the obituary of Mr. Salzarulo, as it appeared in the Monday, August 14, 1961, edition of the Richmond Palladium-Item, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUIS SALZARULO, 77, COUNCILMAN, DIES

Louis Salzarulo, 77-year-old veteran city councilman, died Monday afternoon about 2 o'clock. He lived at 121 North 15th Street.

Salzarulo, who had been in failing health in recent years, and who had been hospitalized on former occasions, was taken to Reid Memorial Hospital on Wednesday, August 9.

His condition became critical Sunday night, members of his family said, although he had entered the hospital principally for examination.

SICK YEAR AGO

Salzarulo had suffered a serious heart attack a year ago, but had recovered and had taken his place as usual at common council meetings.

A former president of council, Salzarulo served as chairman of its committee on public utilities and was a member of the public property, sewers, streets and alleys committee.

"Louie" Salzarulo came to Richmond, an immigrant from Italy, in 1904, only a few months after he had landed in New York City. He made this city his home the rest of his life.

The story of "Louie" Salzarulo, as he was known to many, is unusual. He rose from a self-educated section hand to foreman of the Pennsylvania freight house, a job he held many years until his retirement in 1949.

He became interested in city government and first was elected a councilman in 1921. He was elected again in 1951 and served his third district continuously since that time, one term as president.

"Louie" was a hard worker who learned the hard way.

His ambition and willingness to work took him from the rough and tough section gangs to the better quarters and work of the railroad freight house.

LIKED HIS JOB

He liked his job. He was an honest and conscientious councilman. But by far his most intense interests were in his family, and in his church. He was a devout member of the Catholic faith.

When he retired from the railroad in 1949, he was more interested in showing a newspaperman photos of his six sons, all of whom served in World War II, than he was in talking about himself.

One son, Maj. Raymond Salzarulo, was killed. Another, Maj. Robert Salzarulo, was a prisoner of war in Germany.

Louie Salzarulo knew what it was to come to a strange country from a foreign land. Accordingly, he was helpful in many ways to numerous others who in later years left their native country, principally Italy, and made an adopted home here. Louie Salzarulo was the one to whom they turned.

Back in 1944, the year before the allies finally crushed Germany and then Japan to bring World War II to an end, the Richmond Rotary Club in an unusual program chose to honor Mr. and Mrs. Louis Salzarulo at one of its weekly luncheon meetings. The date was June 20, 1944.

The late Clarence M. Brown, Richmond attorney, told the club the story of that couple, of Louie's birth in Italy, how he came to this country to find freedom and opportunity, how he returned later to marry his childhood sweetheart and bring her, too, to America.

Brown told of the family they reared, six sons and two daughters. A third daughter died in infancy. Brown described the Salzarulo family story as stranger than most fiction but an inspiration to every American who knows it.

Mr. and Mrs. Salzarulo returned to Italy for a visit in 1949. Mr. Salzarulo said after his return it helped him to a keener appreciation of his adopted land, the United States.

DONATED BELL

A few years later, Mr. Salzarulo announced plans for an unusual gift. He wanted to present a new church bell to a little congregation in his native Bisaccia, as a memorial to his son, Raymond.

It made a touching human interest news story. Mrs. Salzarulo was unable to go due to ill health. But "Louie" went and the story rated press, radio, and television coverage over a wide area. That was in June of 1953.

To compensate for Mrs. Salzarulo's inability to make the trip, the Palladium-Item arranged for a recording of the affair and presented it to her one afternoon in July before her husband had returned.

Richmond's council took a hand in the proceedings by presenting Salzarulo with a plaque he was to take with him.

It said, "From Members of City Council, Richmond, Ind., United States of America, to the people of Bisaccia, Italy, 1953, in recognition of the high esteem in which we hold your native son and our fellow citizen and councilman, Louis Salzarulo."

There was a strange aftermath to the story. It brought to Salzarulo literally hundreds of requests for help from Italians in many walks of life. One was from a prisoner. Another was from a young Italian who thought maybe "Louie" could finance his marriage to the young woman of his choice.

"Louie" said he would liked to have helped them all. But he regretfully concluded that one gift would only bring a request for another.

WIFE DIED IN 1954

Mrs. Salzarulo died in March of 1954, the year following the "Bell for Bisaccia" project, as it was popularly known. But, as others have done in similar circumstances, "Louie" kept going.

High honor came to him in August of 1954 when Pope Pius XII named him a Knight of St. Sylvester, the oldest of six papal orders, established in the fourth century. It was for "outstanding service by a Catholic layman."

With State Catholic dignitaries participating, the honor was bestowed upon Salzarulo in ceremonies in St. Mary's Church October 31, 1954.

Later that year, in December, a national magazine led off a story about "The Italians Among Us" by recounting Salzarulo's unusual church bell project.

In April of 1956, Salzarulo played a leading part in a local dinner party in honor of Rev. Michele Lattarulo, from Salbarulo's native Bisaccia, who was visiting in this country.

As a member of common council, Salzarulo was named president for 1957.

One of Salzarulo's firm convictions was that park land be retained for that purpose, and not be turned over to schools.

PROTECTED EARNINGS

He also was one of the advocates of the present practice of returning a portion of municipal light plant earnings to the taxpayers in the form of an annual dividend toward the expenses of operating the city government.

One of Salzarulo's proudest moments came in June 1960, when he saw his grandson, whose father was killed early in World War II, graduate from a military school preparatory to entering the Air Force Academy.

One of his saddest tasks was to attend the funeral services for Joseph M. Waltermann, former Richmond mayor and also a former veteran councilman, who died May 31, 1960.

Salzarulo was a member of the Italian club, the Holy Name Society, the Knights of Columbus, Knights of St. John, and St. Joseph Society. He was a member of St. Mary's Catholic Church.

Survivors include five sons, William of Richmond, Frank of Indianapolis, Albert of Indianapolis, Mark of Fullerton, Calif., and Robert, an Air Force colonel, of Dayton; two daughters, Mrs. John Dunkle and Mrs. L. L. Godsey, both of Richmond; and 14 grandchildren.

The National Lottery of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about the national lotteries of Italy. The Italian Government operates several lotteries and thus realizes important revenues.

In 1960, the lotteries brought in a total of $72 million. The profit of the Government amounted to close to $40 million. These revenues are not earmarked for any specific purposes, but are rather directed to the Italian treasury.

Italy's profitable lottery is another of the many lotteries bringing very real benefits to the nation in question—benefits made possible by the wisdom of governments refusing to let hyprocrites stifle and smother needed advances.

Can America Regain the Initiative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, out of the tremendous volume of letters which all of us receive, there are many which show the courage and resolve of the American people. I recently received just such a letter from a young Minneapolis man, and with the unanimous consent of the House I should like to share it with my colleagues:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MACGREGOR: To my knowledge, a satisfactory compromise is usually worked out when both sides make demands and then compromise them. In that case, how can a compromise be worked out over Berlin? Russia is making all the demands. The United States has left itself no room for compromise—only surrender.

Is Berlin to be another small step backward for the United States? These, I fear, are rapidly becoming miles.

Representative, I know that I speak the sentiments of the youth of the free world. Having recently graduated from the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, and now touring Europe on $400, I feel that I know both American and European student thought.

The world is ours, Representative. What happens now will affect our generation. But our world will never be safe in view of Soviet advances. I fear that in 30 years the United States will have no more to compromise but herself.

If we are going to win, we must take the offensive away from the Russians. We must be bold, brash, and imaginative. By making demands, Russia has gotten her way, without force, since 1945. If we do the same, our retreat will become an advance.

Therefore, I propose that we counterdemand the Russians. I propose that the United States order free elections in all Germany, in accordance with the treaty signed after World War II. And we must back this demand with diplomatic and military force.

This may be our last chance to assume the initiative. With the treaty rights to elections, how can our action be condemned? Also, this is Konrad Adenauer's dream, which he will fight for; his successor may not be so inclined.

We know the Russians won't fight. They won't fight the United States, are afraid of the West German army, and can't trust their satellite armies.

We must turn the tables in our favor. Khrushchev has now given us the perfect opportunity. We must act quickly and decisively, and seize the offensive.

At the very least, this action will give us, for one of those rare occasions since 1945, something with which to bargain.

America's youth is ready to fight for its future. We know the stakes and the threat; we realize the possibility of death; but we also know our principles; Russia must be stopped.

Now is our chance. Young America must be bold, brash, and imaginative. Our existence depends on it.

Sincerely,

FRED HARWOOD III.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Newburgh Case: A Need To Reappraise Welfare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, self-government and the right of self-determination dies stubbornly in the United States even though compelled to resist the great power of the Federal Government.

The Newburgh case is an example in point. Citizens of Newburgh retain the early American notion that they should have the right to spend their local tax dollars according to the majority wishes of the people of Newburgh. However, the Federal Government and, apparently, certain high State officials in New York State have become greatly disturbed by this unexpected revival of the spirit of American independence. Hence, Newburghers are forced to demonstrate in court that they can still control their own destinies.

Roscoe Drummond comments informatively on this strange paradox in this modernized version of the New Frontier. I ask that the article by Mr. Drummond be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Congress and the country. Perhaps the day will come again when it will not be considered illegal to let freedom ring.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBURGH CASE: THE NEED FOR FACTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Joseph Mitchell, city manager of Newburgh, N.Y., have one thing in common: they both believe that our whole social welfare setup should be reexamined. But their approach is radically different.

Mr. Ribicoff is setting out to get the facts before reaching his conclusions.

Mr. Mitchell has been setting out his conclusions before getting the facts.

There is no doubt that Mr. Mitchell struck a responsive chord all across the country when he made his first appeal for welfare reform. He said he was determined to free the Newburgh budget from able-bodied reliefers who should be put to work, from "undesirable outsiders" who were placing an inordinate burden upon his community, and from "frauds and chiselers."

That's just what many other cities and towns wanted, but now that the facts concerning the actual relief situation in Newburgh have finally come out, it developed that there was only one unemployed person who was found able to work for the city, that in the entire year of 1960 Newburgh paid only $205 to "newcomers," and this amount was reimbursed by the State, and that no single case of fraud was uncovered.

As Eve Edstrom, a reliable digger of facts, has pointed out in the Washington Post, the percentage of Newburgh's population on relief in 1960 was the lowest of five comparable cities in New York State and below the statewide average.

The weakness of Mr. Mitchell's emotional crusade for welfare reform is that the furor he stimulates dies down when facts do not support his claims.

But even if Newburgh itself has not produced the facts which justify its own impatience, a strong case can be made for a thorough reexamination of all welfare. It is all to the good that Secretary Ribicoff is undertaking it.

It may well develop that there is wide abuse and inefficiency in the administration of relief on the Federal, State, and local levels. But the need at this stage is to get at the facts objectively and then to fit the reforms to the facts.

That is what Mr. Ribicoff is seeking to do. As Governor of Connecticut for the past 6 years and as one never disposed to throw pie in the sky, Mr. Ribicoff frankly says that we have just been drifting in the field of welfare and that he is determined to carry through a new look across the board.

These studies were begun at Mr. Ribicoff's direction before Newburgh hit the headlines and will be completed in the next few months. They do not rest on the assumption that our welfare system is wrong, but that some parts of it may no longer be applicable to present-day circumstances since the system was created nearly 30 years ago and has never been thoroughly reexamined. Mr. Ribicoff's findings and recommendations will be ready for Congress next year.

I am not suggesting that City Manager Mitchell is all wrong by any means. He has simply gone about it the wrong way.

Mr. Mitchell protests against the uniform relief code imposed by the Federal and State Governments in providing funds for local use. But without that uniformity more migrant reliefers would be seeking out the community that will do best by them, thus imposing an unjust and inordinate burden on such communities.

Mr. Mitchell asks why able-bodied persons on relief shouldn't work for the city. Why not, indeed? No Federal or State law prevents that. But if persons on relief do work for the city government, they must be paid by the city government—otherwise the Federal Government will be taking over part of every municipal payroll.

That is certainly part of an answer but it does not seem to me adequate. Able-bodied persons on relief ought to serve the community, and the welfare system ought to find proper ways to make it possible.

Subsidized Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 I called the attention of the House to the now famous June 22 decision of the Department of Commerce to permit sales of subsidized farm products to be made to Communist-bloc nations. Since that time much has been said in this Chamber, in the public press, and by officials of the executive branch on this subject. For the information of Members of the House, I am submitting a letter which I received from the Honorable Edward Gudeman in response to my remarks on the floor on this subject and my response to his letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1961.

Hon. EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Acting Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to acknowledge your letters of July 21 and 27 in reference to the sale of subsidized surplus agricultural products to Russia.

None of the reasons that you advanced for the sale of these products touches upon the principle objection to them; that is, our foreign policy with respect to the international Communist conspiracy. There are increasing indications that the cold war will continue on the economic front for many years and this does not seem to me to be the way to employ a major economic weapon. In my opinion it does much to reduce our chances of eventual victory in this area.

There should be a distinction made between ordinary trade with Communist countries and the sale of subsidized products. Whatever arguments may be made in support of ordinary trade do not pertain to subsidized sales which have the effect of a grant of American tax dollars to the purchaser.

The argument that these commodities are readily available from other countries is not convincing. By the same logic you could be offering to sell jet bombers to Red China.

I accept with thanks your offer to supply me with the full details of export licenses issued for sale of these commodities to Communist countries and acknowledge receipt of the reports to date. In accordance with your letter of July 27, I assume that you will note the classification placed upon such information. I reserve the right, in the public interest, to reopen the question of executive privilege in assigning such classifications should it become necessary.

Sincerely,

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1961.

Hon. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATHIAS: Your comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, has just been called to my attention. Unfortunately, my letter of July 21 has caused a misunderstanding on the question of disclosing names and addresses of exporters of subsidized surplus agricultural products to the Soviet bloc. Upon rereading, I can see how this occurred, given the juxtaposition of a sentence repeating your request and the subsequent sentences concerning our willingness to supply certain data to you.

After careful consideration and discussion with Congressman Moss, it was decided that it would not be in the national interest to disclose the names of exporters receiving licenses. A copy of the Secretary's letter to Congressman Moss is enclosed for your convenience. As stated in that letter, the Department is now making daily reports on export licenses issued, giving the commodity involved, the value or volume of the intended shipment, and the country of destination.

I am sure you recognize that there are conflicting interests concerning the publication of names of licensees, and it would be easy to justify either disclosure or nondisclosure through broad generalities. The specifics of the problem are more difficult to handle, yet it is with these that the Secretary must deal. It must be kept in mind that only a small percentage of total U.S. exports are now subject to our licensing controls and that

there is no publication of the names of exporters involved in regular unlicensed commercial export trade. The Secretary's decision to withhold the names of licensees was based on the facts that the names of exporters of nonlicensed items are not publicly available and that disclosure would provide competitors (both United States and foreign) with information which they could not otherwise obtain. To give names would be discriminatory, and to give out names of only licensees exporting to the Soviet bloc would be even more arbitrary and discriminatory. These facts had to be balanced against the general desirability of providing the public with information about Government actions. We think that the procedure of providing the important information of commodity, value, and destination on a daily basis appropriately satisfies both considerations.

In view of your interest, I am placing your name on the mailing list for the daily reports. Any shipment of surplus agricultural commodity would, of course, be included as items in the daily reports. But, to date, we have not received any application for a license to export subsidized commodities.

We have been concerned to make certain that the procedures under which licenses are granted insure a careful consideration of applications for export to the bloc. This Department relies upon the advice and consultation of several departments member to an interagency committee. This change in policy on subsidized agricultural commodities was not "made at the instigation of certain unnamed exporters" as you state was reported in the press. The decision to permit the sale of these commodities to the Eastern European Soviet bloc was made after careful consideration of all factors involved, and certain conditions were imposed on the sales:

1. The sale of such commodities would be at prevailing world market prices.

2. The sale of such commodities to the Eastern European countries would be authorized only on condition the purchasers would pay in convertible currency or in dollars.

3. Exporters would be required to obtain commitments from the importers in the bloc countries to the effect that the commodities would not be reexported to another country.

Given these conditions, purchasers in Eastern European countries would not obtain any advantage pricewise because the commodities would be authorized for export only at prevailing world market prices. And, it is clearly evident that the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to Eastern European countries grants to those countries no greater advantage in military terms than they have received and would receive from the sale of unsubsidized agricultural products (and concerning the latter category there are not and have not been, as you know, any export restrictions). Further, these same commodities are readily available from other producing countries. From the standpoint of the United States, we could anticipate advantage to this country in terms of a potentially larger market for disposal of surplus agricultural products, and as everyone knows the United States still has very grave and serious problems in handling—marketwise and otherwise—agricultural products which we produce and which cannot be sold in the domestic market.

We recognize there are differences of opinion as to whether there should be any trade whatever between the United States and Soviet bloc countries. Some people undoubtedly hold the view that there should be absolutely no trade whatever with the Soviet bloc. For those with this basic opinion any decision to export commodities or items to the Soviet Union is always suspect regardless of the specific factors involved.

I should like to conclude by stressing that the Secretary has previously made clear to Members of Congress that any time a committee or Congressman in the exercise of his official duties wants to have the full and complete details on any export license application or action by the Department, this will be made available to the committee or Congressman on a confidential basis—that is, with the understanding that the same standard of confidentiality which the Department applies to itself would also be followed by the committee or Member of Congress. I wanted to mention this so as to make clear that Secretary Hodges is doing everything possible to insure that the public is informed as to the basic action taken by the Department of Commerce—but without interfering unduly with private business activity; and further, that any Member of Congress has available to him any information that he needs or desires for official purposes concerning the Department of Commerce.

I am extremely sorry that my letter misled you and will be glad to reply to any further questions.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Turning Atomic Waste Into Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Stockton Daily Record, Stockton, Calif., concerning the Hanford plutonium reactor.

The Stockton Record, with a circulation of over 58,000, is one of the largest independent newspapers in the central part of California.

I believe the editorial accurately reflects the thinking of the people of this area on this proposal.

I hope that the House will have another opportunity this year to vote on this important issue, and I would anticipate that the bringing of the issue into the open as the Stockton Record and other newspapers have done so well, will assist us in reversing the earlier unfavorable decision. This project should be allowed to proceed to give the world a tremendous example of American dedication to the peaceful use of the atom.

Following is the text of the editorial:

TURNING ATOMIC WASTE INTO POWER

At Hanford, Wash., a billion-dollar Government plant manufactures plutonium for nuclear weapons. It uses water of the Columbia River for cooling, returning the water to the river. Next year an addition to the plant will require more water and will raise the river temperature to a point where it will be injurious to fish, including salmon.

Use of this heat to produce steam to turn electrical generators has been proposed. Power production would be 700,000 to 800,000 kilowatts, or 1½ times the output of gigantic Bonneville Dam. This energy is needed in the Northwest power pool, and it could be utilized further in the proposed tie of Northwest and California power resources.

Use of atomic heat that now is wasted has the blessing of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and of both California Senators. An appropriation to build the $95 million generating plant is in the atomic energy bill approved by the Senate, but the Hanford project has been defeated in the House. Representative CHARLES HALLECK, the GOP leader, is maneuvering to prevent an agreement on the issue in a House-Senate conference committee.

The scare word "socialism" has been invoked to perpetuate this wastefulness at Hanford that could be transformed into a landmark in the peaceful use of atomic energy. No nuclear-fueled generating plant anywhere would compare with this proposed installation. It would present to the world a tremendous example of American dedication to the peaceful use of the atom.

To muff this opportunity of conservation and Western development would be a national shame. We hope Mr. HALLECK does not succeed in killing in the Rules Committee all hope for an agreement between House and Senate.

Common Market Dangers to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the United States exports almost $5 billion worth of farm commodities annually. This is tremendously important to our internal economy and to our balance-of-payments position with other nations. A threat now is posed to our export markets for farm products by Britain's plan to join the European Common Market. The nature of this danger was concisely and forcefully presented by the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in an article published last Sunday by the Washington Star and by the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer. This penetrating discussion, by such an authority as Chairman COOLEY, should have the widest possible circulation and attention. Therefore, with the consent of the House, I am inserting this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

COMMON MARKET DANGERS TO UNITED STATES

(By Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina)

American agriculture is watching with mixed emotions recent Common Market developments in Europe. U.S. farmers, like most people in this country, feel that the free world would be strengthened by close economic and political ties among all the Western European countries. At the same time they fear, with some reason, that U.S. agricultural exports to Western Europe will be greatly reduced if present Common Market trade proposals become effective.

For American farmers the stakes are big.

In 1960, U.S. farm product exports to the six Common Market countries—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—had a value of $1.1 billion.

Now there is possibility of a merger between the Common Market and members of the rival Outer Seven group—the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal. Our farm product exports to these seven countries in 1960 amounted to $700 million.

EXPORTS TO MARKET AREAS

Altogether, then, exports to the Common Market-Outer Seven countries last year amounted to $1.8 billion, or about 40 percent of our total agricultural shipments. These prosperous countries provide an outlet for the bulk of our commercial agricultural exports for dollars. Many important commodities are involved, including cotton, tobacco, wheat, feed grains, fats and oils, poultry products, and fruits.

A few days ago Prime Minister Macmillan announced the decision of the British government to seek full membership in the Common Market. At the same time it was announced in Geneva that other members of the Outer Seven group would also seek membership or association with the Common Market.

Mr. Macmillan referred to negotiations which must take place before merger can be effected. He noted that the negotiations must recognize the needs of British agriculture, the Commonwealth, and other members of the Outer Seven.

Unless present protectionist proposals with respect to farm products are modified, membership of the United Kingdom in the Common Market would have further serious implications for American agriculture.

EXAMPLE OF WHEAT

For example, wheat now enters the United Kingdom duty free. But United Kingdom membership in the Common Market would mean the imposition by the United Kingdom of an unlimited variable import levy on wheat. France, of course, as a wheat producer and Common Market partner, would get first crack at the British wheat business. France would export wheat to Britain on a duty-free basis, but the United States would not. And depending upon the way membership negotiations go, there is a possibility that the Commonwealth wheat producers, particularly Canada and Australia, would also gain a preference or advantage over the United States wheat in the British market.

This valuable export outlet for American food and fiber can be maintained and even expanded if there is adherence to the letter and the spirit of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. These Common Market Outer Seven countries, like the United States, are signatories to the agreement, generally referred to as GATT. This agreement, entered into freely and willingly by all signatories, spells out a liberal policy. It is aimed at expanded world trade on a multilateral nondiscriminatory basis, as moderate levels of tariffs, not only for individual countries, but also for customs unions, such as the Common Market. It provides that in the formation of a customs union the overall level of protection shall not be any higher than it was in the member countries prior to the formation of the union.

However, under current Common Market proposals, a number of important United States farm products would be subject to protective devices of one type or another. For example, proposed unlimited variable import levies on grains, pork, poultry, and eggs would make it impossible for fixed levels of protection to be negotiated. In the case of some commodities for which fixed tariffs are proposed, special market regulations, preferences for overseas or associated territories, and quantitative emergency restrictions are planned. Fixed tariffs on some other products would be set at unduly high levels. These plans can only be described as trade restrictive rather than trade expansive.

U.S. tobacco producers are deeply involved in the effects of these plans.

TOBACCO IS INVOLVED

Under Common Market rates now proposed, the duty on practically all imports of U.S. leaf tobacco, because of higher quality and prices, would be at the maximum level—equivalent to 19.1 cents a pound. But most tobacco imports from other competing areas would be assessed the minimum rate—13.2 cents. This is a difference of about 6 cents in favor of competing leaf. This differential, plus the fact that tobacco from associated oversea territories can enter duty free, could cause the United States to lose as much as 50 percent of its sales to Common Market countries. It is important to remember in this connection that in 1960 the Common Market countries bought 136 million pounds of U.S. tobacco equal to 27 percent of total U.S. tobacco exports.

British membership could mean increased competition for other commodities exported by the United States. Tobacco is one of those commodities. British membership could well mean the gaining of Common Market preference for the flue-cured tobacco produced by Rhodesia, Canada, and India—the three largest flue-cured competitors of this country. Preferential treatment to the Commonwealth also would sharply reduce U.S. fruit exports.

The United Kingdom is our largest single oversea market for farm products. But the other six countries of the outer seven group are, in the aggregate, important to us as customers. Their membership or association in the Common Market—under present agricultural protection plans—would mean more problems for U.S. farmers.

THE U.S. AIMS

The American Government is seeking actively to protect the legitimate interests of U.S. farmers. Representations have been made repeatedly to emphasize our position in the case of tobacco, feed grains, poultry, fruit, and other commodities. We have taken advantage of every opportunity to drive home the importance of the export market to our agricultural economy.

The United States has not been unreasonable in its requests for fair play from the Common Market. We want to be able to support the Common Market wholeheartedly. It has a great potential for good. To the extent that the Common Market promotes increased levels of economic activity in Western Europe, a higher standard of living will result. With that improved living standard will come increased demands for farm products. What we as an exporting Nation seek—and have a right to expect—is access to and a share of the expanding market. That is in accord with the spirit of the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

Pulaski Foundation Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editor from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, August 12, 1961, which comments upon the election of Mr. Joseph Lester, Kingston, Pa., businessman and civic leader, to the presidency of the Pulaski Foundation with main headquarters in New York City.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Aug. 12, 1961]

PULASKI FOUNDATION HEAD

Luzerne County's reputation for providing organizations and government with leadership was enhanced this week with the announcement that Joseph Lester, Kingston automobile dealer and civic leader, had been elected president of the Pulaski Foundation which maintains headquarters in New York.

The Pulaski Foundation, which bears the name of the Polish nobleman and officer who gave his life for U.S. independence in the Revolution, was established not only to perpetuate his memory, but to promote friendship and cultural ties between the United States and Poland.

Mr. Lester, a native of Poland, is eminently qualified for the new post to which he has been elevated. His local activities, including tours of duty as president of a number of organizations, have demonstrated his capacity. His support of worthy causes, with emphasis on cultural groups, including the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs, whose convention in Youngstown, Ohio, next week he will attend, attests to his idealism as well as his generosity.

As a charter member and first vice president of the Pulaski Foundation, Mr. Lester has played a leading role in its development. Last year, he was selected to go on a mission to Poland to iron out details of the $14 million medical center that is being erected at Krakow with U.S. counterpart funds and to discuss with the Polish Government plans for the restoration of the birthplace of General Pulaski, including the rebuilding of the manor and museum, destroyed during the Second World War. He also took up other projects to provide aid. Upon his return, he reported the Polish people have great faith in America.

With his impressive background of service and contribution to the foundation's success, his advancement to the presidency was a logical step, constituting, as it does, national recognition and a challenging opportunity.

PERT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the amazing mental breakthroughs of our time has been announced. With little fanfare, with casual account, the Wall Street Journal carried a story of this amazing discovery on August 16, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of PERT. This is a name assigned to the mental makeup of which it is composed. Mr. Speaker, PERT is a brainchild of Mr. Polaris—Vice Adm. W. F. Raborn—the father of the Polaris. To him and his group of scientific giants must be assigned the major credit for this achievement.

To us laymen, PERT is a device whereby development of a product may be accurately calculated. IBM and other machines of similar composition are needed—practically all bottlenecks can be estimated. Pitfalls—long the char-

acteristic plague of development may be avoided. Slowdowns, due to nonperformance of contractors with resultant overruns—in the main—may be relieved.

Admiral Raborn never believed—nor does he now believe—that manpower and brainpower should be wasted by planning for production and then running headlong into insurmountable walls of delay due to the failure to take into account the forces long the nemesis of management.

He was determined that his one dream to save the Nation—the Polaris missile—should meet her commitment with destiny.

Because of PERT, his invention, Polaris did exactly that. Today, his Navy, other branches of the military, other government agencies and industry alike are beginning to utilize this achievement. Mr. Speaker, today management hails this historic breakthrough, because the development program of almost anything can be PERT'ed with amazing efficiency.

Drs. Cherrington and Livingston, of Harvard Business School, have stated that PERT ranks as one of the most significant advancements in management techniques developed in decades .

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article referred to above in the Wall Street Journal of August 16, 1961. In addition to this, I enclose an article by Fred Hamlin taken from the July 1959 issue of Armed Forces Management titled "How PERT Predicts for the Navy." I think the Congress of this Nation should know that contained within the brainpower of America, giants walk among us. One of these giants wears the uniform of his country—the U.S. Navy—Vice Adm. W. F. Raborn.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 16, 1961]

PERT SYSTEM SPEEDS WORK ON POLARIS; BUILDER USES SIMILAR PLAN FOR BRIDGES

(By Norman C. Miller, Jr.)

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.—A novel system of management, designed to aid executives in keeping tabs on complex projects, is being put to use by an increasing number of companies.

It is known by two names: PERT (program evaluation and review technique) in defense work and the critical path method in nondefense fields. Both are designed to pinpoint the key jobs in a multistage industrial operation and to point up possible solutions when trouble looms.

For a look at how PERT works, visit Lockheed Aircraft Corp.'s missile and space division here, where, in a guarded room, managers scan the complex charts covering the walls. This is a management information center, patterned after a military command post, where Lockheed, prime contractor for the Polaris missile, plots development progress on bigger and better versions of the submarine-based missile.

To the unaccustomed eye, the charts are bewildering. In seemingly haphazard fashion each chart is splattered with hundreds of colored circles, connected by a maze of crisscrossing arrows. But to the Lockheed managers the story the charts portray is clear. Each circle is a step in building the advanced Polaris. White circles are steps on schedule; orange ones are in danger of falling behind schedule; red ones are behind schedule. Each arrow connects steps that depend on others. Together the charts form a sort of map for managers which shows all segments of Polaris progress and indicates what jobs need priority attention.

A MANAGEMENT BREAKTHROUGH

"This is the first real breakthrough in management science in the last 10 years," says John T. Pettit, director of industrial dynamics at Hughes Aircraft Co. "All major defense contractors are or soon will be involved in PERT."

PERT was developed by the Navy in 1958 for management of its highly successful Polaris program. The system is credited with a major role in placing the 1,200-mile-range Polaris I missiles in submarines more than 2 years ahead of the original 1963 target date. The sea service is now extending PERT into its other weapon development programs. Eying the Navy's results, the Air Force currently is installing PERT for management of its Titan, Atlas, and Minuteman missile programs and for space satellite projects such as Midas. The Army is using PERT for its Nike-Zeus antimissile program.

Concurrent with the spread of PERT for defense programs, a growing number of companies are using the Critical Path method, which is essentially the same thing, for other complex projects—bridge building in Canada, installing computers, development of new electronics products.

TRAINING COURSES AND FILMS

International Business Machines Corp., which is promoting the technique because computers are usually used with it, says more than 150 companies have asked for sample PERT computer programs within the last year to try out the system. A training film about PERT has been sold to more than 160 companies since last September at $167.50 a print, says the film's producer. Mauchly Associates, a management consulting firm specializing in Critical Path applications, counts more than 90 companies among its clients. And since last April, more than 350 corporate officials have paid $130 each to take a 5-day PERT training course in Washington and Santa Monica, Calif., under the auspices of Operations Research, Inc., one of several management consulting firms offering such courses.

It is easy to see why the new management method is taking hold. In the Polaris program alone 8 major contractors and some 6,000 other firms are involved. In the past, complicated projects like this often were delayed simply because of the difficulty of keeping abreast of progress in all parts of the program. Neat bar-charts and graphs, traditionally used to depict progress, have one major flaw, say managers: They don't point up the cause of delays.

One major Navy contractor tells how PERT revealed at an early date that a seemingly unimportant item—delivery of special cable connectors—was becoming critical for development tests in a missile program. The company which was to supply the connectors said it couldn't meet its delivery deadline and wasn't interested in expediting such a small item. Armed with a PERT analysis, the contractor was able to persuade high Navy officials and the Small Business Administration to press successfully for timely delivery of the connectors. Without PERT, the potential delay probably wouldn't have come to the attention of top officials until it was too late to remedy it, says a Navy official.

REVEAL TIMING CONFLICTS

Frequently it's discovered that previous plans didn't show timing conflicts among parts of a multistage project. A construction company analyzed an office building plan, using the critical path method, and found that under its first plan a cafeteria was scheduled for completion while construction hoists were still passing through it.

Managers also are intrigued by the way the effects of decisions can be simulated in advance within the framework of the new system. This is done by feeding data from the integrated plan into a computer; when it is decided a change in the plan is needed, the computer evaluates the effect of the proposed change on all other parts of the project and reports its analysis to a manager.

For example, at Aerojet-General Corp. development work on the Polaris II missile was being slowed because fibrous glass motor casings weren't ready. The Polaris I, which then was in final development, uses heavier steel motor casings. On a computer, Aerojet simulated the effect of taking some steel casings from the first Polaris program to use them for experimental firings of the second missile while awaiting delivery of fibrous glass casings. The computer accurately predicted the switch wouldn't affect Polaris I development and would speed up work on Polaris II by 3 months, says C. K. Simon, Aerojet's PERT program manager.

BUILDING A CHEMICAL PLANT

The principles of PERT and critical path method are simple, although implementing the systems can get highly involved. Consider a typical critical path method outline used in building a chemical plant, involving five production units and a pump station. Six charts were drawn up, one for each project; then the charts were linked together as a composite picture of the total plant. At this point it was necessary to rearrange some of the work because conflicts became evident where work was scheduled to go on in two adjacent areas at the same time.

When all the kinks in the composite chart were ironed out, it was seen that the project divided into 180 jobs, represented as circles scattered over the chart, with relationships between jobs indicated by 267 arrows. To figure the length of the project, time estimates were assigned to each of the arrows linking the circles. Then the time of the longest sequence of arrows was added up to arrive at the estimated project completion time. The longest sequence is called the critical path because a delay in the jobs along this path necessarily would delay completion of the entire project. All other jobs, about 90 percent of the total, could be delayed for varying amounts of time without slowing down the entire project.

Says Gordon Morris, manager of Perini Pacific, Ltd., one of Perini Corp.'s many construction subsidiaries: "Normally, if you get into trouble on a construction job you start expediting everything. Actually, it's usually necessary to expedite only 1 thing out of 10. The critical path shows up the important things." Mr. Morris predicts, "Within another 10 years all construction companies will be using the critical-path method."

PERT works the same way as the critical path except in the way time estimates are determined. Because PERT is used mainly in development work where time schedules are less certain, technicians make three estimates instead of one for completion of their work: Optimistic, mostly likely, and pessimistic. These three estimates are statistically related to derive the most probable estimate for specific jobs.

In the tremendously complex programs PERT is normally applied to, it would be easy for the manager's map to get so unwieldly that it would be almost useless. In the Minuteman program, the Air Force estimates it will be necessary to keep tabs on at least 10,000 jobs, which if depicted by circles about 1 inch in diameter would require a single chart some 16 feet high and 75 feet long. To keep from getting lost in such a maze, PERT charts are constructed in several levels of detail. Behind each step on major charts are subcharts, diagraming key elements of that step and its relation to others. Managers along the line consult lower level charts to decide how to cor-

rect problems only when reports to them make it apparent that elements of major steps are in trouble or are heading that way.

How PERT Predicts for the Navy

(By Fred Hamlin)

When the men in Navy's Special Projects were some 9 months down the road on developing their Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT) project, they were visited by a team of top-level executives from one of the Nation's most respected industrial research organizations.

After a preliminary rundown on the PERT system, the industry consultants were shaking their heads sadly. The reason, in their own words: "You people have done here something that we've been trying to do for nearly 4 years. Needless to say, we feel you have a pretty fine program."

What PERT does: (1) States the sequence of progress benchmarks in a given program as they must occur under current planning to achieve success; (2) measures the relative uncertainty—based on technicians' estimates—of meeting these benchmarks, and as a result, of program completion; (3) combines network and time data to show their joint impact on program completion; (4) reveals critical areas and slack areas—those which are either ahead or behind schedule, or those which are likely to be; (5) computes current probability of meeting all completion dates by comparing probabilities and deadlines; (6) tailors outputs to all appropriate levels of management technical responsibility; (7) simulates time impact of proposals for change and optional courses for remedial decision on the outlook of final deadlines.

Willard Fazar, one of the originators of PERT, and presently in charge of PERT at special projects, adds one other advantage, and a bit of prediction: "Perhaps most important, PERT forces customer and contractor to maintain the sort of communications that everybody always assumed to be there. Beyond that, we haven't yet begun to imagine all of the advantages that PERT will eventually offer."

In short, PERT analyzes the current validity of approved plans and schedules, the progress to date against program objectives, and the outlook for meeting ultimate objectives on time—without further executive action.

According to Willard Fazar, "PERT is a management control tool for defining and integrating what must be done to accomplish program objectives on time. PERT is a statistical technique—diagnostic and prognostic—for quantifying knowledge about the uncertainties faced in completing intellectual and physical activities needed for timely achievement of program deadlines. It is a technique for focusing management attention on danger signals that require remedial decisions and on areas of effort for which tradeoffs in time, resources, or technical performance might improve capacity to meet major program deadlines."

Put simply, PERT is a consolation of probabilities to evaluate past performance. It can be used on this basis to predict future success. Its major use is necessarily with a program with a size approaching that of the Polaris fleet ballistic missile. That is, a program that is too complex to be evaluated by ordinary means. Using a medium-to-large digital computer (IBM 650/705), PERT consolidates all of the information funneled into special projects on Polaris progress, puts it in perspective and context, and comes up with what amounts to a highly educated guess—based on statistical probabilities—on exactly who in the program is behind, ahead of, or on schedule. The obvious corollary is PERT's ability to show management where it can best manage by exception. Trouble areas are neatly spotted, and those areas ahead of schedule can be left to go their own way. At the same time management is given the option of transferring funds or manpower from parts of the total that are ahead to those behind.

Oversimplified, PERT reports by showing about the same thing on its flow charts as a tournament sheet in a golf match, displaying the various flights as they narrow down to the finals. Those golfers who draw byes spend less time playing golf, and those scheduled for every flight will have to spend more time on the course. The difference here is that PERT is not concerned with who wins the tournament—what PERT wants to know is how soon the tournament will be completed, and how, by readjusting the byes they can get it over with sooner.

The common denominator is time. Formerly, attempts at this sort of system were set up in terms of funding or technical performance. But in the Polaris program, it has been accepted that money will be spent to buy time. Because money is not as tight here as it is in some areas, it follows that technical performance can be brought in more or less as needed. Money and performance then, are the variables, and are only important—for PERT's purposes—insofar as they contribute to the time factor.

As an important sidelight, the PERT system allows any contractor—or the Navy—to run test cases on alternatives to an existing program, again with the aim of cutting the time needed to complete a project or a major subpart of the project. By using this technique, one Polaris contractor who had found himself lagging considerably behind schedule was able to find where the trouble was, and eliminated two-thirds of the time beyond deadline he had thought he needed. Footnote: the same contractor is still working with PERT to get himself all the way back on schedule.

This is how PERT works. First, the PERT office at special projects set up a sequence of events, or milestones, which will lead to the completion of a given system or subsystem. This is drawn up in reverse order, moving from end product to the present status of the given project. This chart is then farmed out to the contractors or agencies working on the various parts of the whole, and the scientists and engineers in charge return the charts with their time estimate on completion dates. They give special projects three estimates: (1) most likely completion date, (2) most optimistic date, given an unexpected breakthrough in state-of-the-art or similar step up, and (3) most pessimistic date, assuming practically nothing goes right.

These figures are edited for reasonableness at special projects, and then programed into Navy's NORC computer at Dahlgren, Va. The computer averages out the figures, and gives a printout that is used to formulate the PERT flow charts. The charts are the end product of PERT. They show not only the relation between the various parts of the whole in point of time, but how long it will probably take from each milestone to the next.

Given this much, the charts also show which of the flow lines is most critical—that is, which is most likely to take the longest time to be completed. It is the old story of the chain being as strong as its weakest link. If, for instance, the most critical line is some 3 months longer than its nearest competitor, Navy immediately knows that it can shorten the entire program by 3 months, simply through attacking that one area. Further, if one milestone in that line is 3 months beyond the one before it, Navy knows that it can gain most of its time back by going after that one part of the line.

And once Navy has eliminated the one problem area, the PERT chart still shows the next most critical line, giving Navy its next area of operations for further cutting the time needed to complete the project.

One of the criticisms most frequently leveled at PERT points up the basic theory behind the system. Say PERT critics, "If you put garbage in a computer, you get garbage back. The PERT system relies on an engineer's guess about when his part of a project will be done. Because you are dealing at the edge of present technology, it is nearly impossible to make an accurate guess on progress. Inaccurate guesses mean inaccurate results, and so about all you get is unreliable information compounded."

Not so, say the people who work with PERT. The theory behind the system is roughly the same as that used by social scientists—that of statistical probabilities. Oversimplified, this theory states that a large number of educated guesses on a given subject will average out to an answer that is close to being entirely accurate. Perhaps more important, when all such figures are averaged out, they will point up a trend that can be largely relied upon.

From management's standpoint, this trend is extremely valuable. Without it, they are literally shooting in the dark, with nothing but occasional blind stabs to guide them. Besides this, the man who screams the loudest may not always have the biggest problem—one of the most important functions of PERT is to make progress analysis as objective as possible, thereby putting all of the many factors to be considered in context and perspective.

Considering the job that is handled by PERT, the amount of time and money that has gone into it has been almost negligible. Aside from the initial study contract, the returns on PERT have far overbalanced the investment. Once the theory was set up, it took PERT managers only about half a day at each of the various Navy and contractor offices to indoctrinate personnel concerned. As for the time needed to feed information to PERT.

"The engineers and scientists that I've talked to feel that the time they spend on this is profitable time. I suppose this is probably because it gives them a chance to evaluate their own position fully, and take a good look at where they stand."

The cost is low

With the system now in operation, there are only five professional people at Special Projects working full time on PERT. Computer time runs less than an hour a week, and costs less than $200 per hour. It takes between 15 and 20 minutes for a PERT network to be run through the NORC computer once it is programed.

Actual computer sequence on the information is as follows: (1) input conversion, about an hour; (2) mean and varience computation, about 1 minute, using NORC; (3) sort and merge runs, about 5 minutes using NORC; (4) file updating, about 3 minutes, using NORC; (5) sequencing, about 5 minutes, using NORC; (6) computation, about 3 minutes, using NORC; and (7) edit and printout, about 36 minutes.

From the printout, the information must be interpreted by PERT technicians and transposed to the flow charts that are used to present the finished product. To date, PERT has set up the flow charts on at least half of the Fleet Ballistic Missile program.

PERT's most important job at the present time is to answer one question, as it is posed each Monday morning by Special Projects Chief Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn: "What are my problems?" All of the information that is turned into PERT eventually ends up on the PERT flow charts, which are given to Rear Admiral Raborn biweekly. They answer the question.

Besides this, PERT can be used equally well by all levels of management. While Admiral Raborn is most interested in the

overall Fleet Ballistic Missile program, each of the major contractors can draw on PERT to fit their specific evaluation needs. Using the system in the same way, contractors and even important subcontractors are using the PERT method to find out where they stand—and to find out where they can most profitably make improvements in their own operation. Flow charts on major subsystems can be as large as the wall of a room, and the sizes—and the material contained—can be tailored to fit just about everybody's needs.

Another measure of the success of the system is related by Willard Fazar: "There is one other thing about this that makes the scientists extremely happy—it is just about the first time that management has acknowledged the uncertainty of research and development work. Before this, management was perhaps too prone to set a deadline, and say 'You have 3 months to invent something—get to work.' PERT was developed on the assumption that research is a pretty uncertain business. What we try to do is to balance out all of the factors—from hurricanes to breakthroughs—and come up with a reasonable expectation."

Although PERT to date has not been highly publicized, a measure of its worth is the amount of interest that has been generated already. Flowing into the special projects office have been a list of requests that covers six typewritten pages—and already, PERT officers are penciling other names in between the lines. The requests have come from all three services, all manner of industries, foreign and local State governments, and even such improbable sources as State census bureaus.

These queries are not idle curiosity—many of the organizations have already begun to apply the theories of PERT to their own operations, and still more have enthusiastically endorsed the program. What it means is that Navy's special projects office has hit a good thing, and something is needed in many places. It is as simple as this: Everybody wants to know what is going on in their own operation, and PERT appears to offer one of the best methods to date to keep close touch.

Historical Sketch Tells Story—Bloody Tarleton's Quarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 14, 1961:

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News, Aug. 14, 1961]

HISTORICAL SKETCH TELLS STORY—BLOODY TARLETON'S QUARTERS

One of the bloodiest battles of the Revolutionary War took place about 9 miles north of the present Lancaster Courthouse on May 29, 1780. The following account of this battle was taken from a historical sketch by G. W. Malone, published in 1900 in Lancaster:

"About 9 miles north of the present Lancaster Courthouse, and between 20 and 23 miles above Hanging Rock, upon the Waxhaw Creek, the regiment of Col. Abraham Buford was massacred by Tarleton, on May 29, 1870. Sir Henry Clinton took possession of Charleston on the 12th, and immediately commenced measures for securing the homage of the whole State.

"He sent out three large detachments of his army. The first, and largest, under Cornwallis, was ordered toward the frontiers of North Carolina; the second, under Lieutenant Colonel Cruger, was directed to pass the Saluda to Ninety-six; and the third, under Lieutenant Colonel Brown, was ordered up the Savannah to Augusta.

"Soon after he had passed the Santee, Cornwallis was informed that parties of Americans, who had come into South Carolina, were as hastily retreating. Among these was Colonel Buford. His force consisted of nearly 400 continental infantry, a small detachment of Washington's cavalry, and two field pieces. He had evacuated Camden, and in fancied security, was retreating leisurely toward Charlotte in North Carolina.

"Cornwallis resolved to strike Buford, if possible, and for that purpose he dispatched Tarleton, with 700 men, consisting of his cavalry and mounted infantry. That officer marched 104 miles in 54 hours and came up with Buford upon the Waxhaw.

"Impatient of delay, he had left his mounted infantry behind, and with only his cavalry he almost surrounded Buford before that officer was aware of his danger. Tarleton demanded an immediate surrender upon the terms granted to the Americans at Charleston. These terms were very humiliating Buford refused compliance.

"While the flags for the conference were passing and repassing, Tarleton, contrary to military rules, was making preparation for an assault, and the instant he received Buford's reply, his cavalry made a famous charge on the American ranks."

MASSACRE

"Having received no orders to defend themselves, and supposing the negotiations were yet pending the continentals were utterly dismayed by this charge. All was confusion and while some fired upon their assailants, others threw down their arms and begged for quarters. None was given and men without arms were hewn to pieces by Tarleton's cavalry.

"One hundred and thirteen were slain; 150 were so maimed as to be unable to travel; and 50 were made prisoners, to grace the triumphal entry of the conqueror into Camden. The whole of Buford's artillery, ammunition, and baggage fell into the hands of the enemy.

"For this savage feat, Cornwallis eulogized Tarleton and commended him to the ministry as worthy of special favor. It was nothing less than a cold-blooded massacre and Tarleton's quarter became proverbial as a synonym to cruelty. The liberal press, and all right-minded men in England cried 'shame.'

"After the battle, a large number of the wounded were taken to the log meeting house of the Waxhaw Presbyterian congregation, where they were tenderly nursed by a few who had the boldness to remain.

"With the defeat of Buford, every semblance of a Continental Army in South Carolina was effaced. This terrible blow spread consternation over that region, and women and children were seen flying from their homes to seek refuge from British cruelty in more distant settlements."

ANDREW JACKSON

"Among the fugitives was the widowed mother of Andrew Jackson (seventh President of the United States), who, with her two sons, Robert and Andrew, took refuge in the Sugar Creek congregation at the house of the widow of the Reverend J. M. Wilson near Charlotte. This was the first practical lesson of hatred to tyranny which young Jackson learned, and it doubtless had an abiding influence upon his future life."

MONUMENT

"Some time about 1955 or 1956, the citizens of Lancaster erected a granite monument to Buford and his brave men, just below where the Chesterfield Road crosses the Rocky River Road, the spot where the massacre occurred; and this monument now stands there, with suitable inscription to commemorate the patriotism and courage of this unfortunate command. After Colonel Buford the township has been named.

"The monument has the following inscriptions: On one side are these words, 'Erected to the memory and in honor of the brave and patriotic American soldiers who fell in the battle which occurred at this place, on the 29th of May 1780, between Col. Abraham Buford, who commanded a regiment of 350 Virginians and Colonel Tarleton of the British Army, with 350 cavalry and a like number of infantry.' "

"On another side are these words: 'Nearly the entire command of Colonel Buford was either killed or wounded. Eighty-four gallant soldiers are buried in this grave. They left their homes for the relief of Charleston, but hearing at Camden of the surrender of that city, were returning. Here their lives were ended in the service of their country.' "

"On the third side you will read, 'The cruelty and barbarous massacre, committed on this occasion, by Tarleton and his command, after the surrender of Colonel Buford and his regiment, originated the American war cry, 'Remember Tarleton's quarters'."

"The other side has no inscription. A move is being made by Mr. Amos of Lancaster, who is himself a Virginian, to have the ground properly enclosed and to have the inscription on the monument made more legible. It is to be hoped that he will succeed, as it is very much in need of proper attention and should be perpetuated as a historic and sacred memento."

When Castro Raised the Ante

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, regardless of how an individual viewed the recent tractors-for-prisoners negotiations, there is one aspect of the issue which deserves our special concern.

What has happened to our free and objective press? The handling of the tractors-for-prisoners issue was a black mark on responsible journalism. I do not presume to know the reasons why this matter was handled so clumsily and inaccurately. Perhaps it was a simple example of slipshod performance. If so, it deserves our attention and disapproval.

I hope and trust that news reporting errors on this issue were not caused by a slanted approach. It is just possible that the serious inaccuracies were motivated by a desire to let important people get off the hook. If so, the mishandling deserves more than just our attention and disapproval. It deserves the righteous indignation of every American who is concerned about the preservation of a free and responsible press.

Elmo Roper has done a service in documenting this indictment of the news reporting of the tractors-for-prisoners negotiations. I commend to the attention of my colleagues his splendid article which appeared in the Saturday Review of August 12, 1961, and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

WHEN CASTRO RAISED THE ANTE—THE U.S. PRESS AND THE TRACTOR DEAL

(By Elmo Roper)

For a time after Fidel Castro put forth his tractors-for-prisoners demand, it looked as if the exchange would go through. An eminent committee, consisting of Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther, was formed. They had the quiet, but by no means secret, backing of President Kennedy, and they secured thousands of contributions. But then, at the last minute, Fidel Castro sharply and unreasonably raised his demands, and the committee refused to go along with these new demands.

If that is your understanding of approximately what happened on the lamented tractors-for-prisoners exchange, it is very much like the impression of nearly everyone with whom I have talked. (The opinion-research firm with which I am associated has not done a survey on the matter.)

The fact of the matter is that this is not what happened at all on the tractors-for-prisoners exchange. Fidel Castro, while he can be criticized for many things, including making the demand in the first place, cannot be criticized for raising his demands. A review of the New York Times stories, and, it should be added, a careful review of them, will show what actually happened.

The New York Times printed an AP story, datelined May 17, which said that Premier Castro offered to "exchange his prisoners for 500 bulldozers from the United States." The same story quoted Fidel Castro as saying, "If President Kennedy says they are his friends and he loves them so much, let him send 500 bulldozers and we will send them back." The subheadline said, "Will exchange invaders for 500 bulldozers, he says." Note that the word was "bulldozers," not "tractors."

On May 22 the New York Times stated that the newly formed committee hoped to "raise almost $2 million through volunteered contributions to purchase the tractors." Note that here the word is "tractors," but note also that it is not Castro's word. A second story in the New York Times on the same day said, "No one here was willing to set a figure on the total cost of the operation." The antecedent of "no one" was "Cuban and American sources," and the story was datelined Miami Beach.

On May 22 the committee met with the Cuban prisoner delegation sent to the United States to negotiate the exchange The New York Times story which referred to this meeting spoke of Castro's demand for 500 "D–8 Super" Caterpillar tractors or equivalent models made by several other firms. The Times said, "This is the next-to-largest tractor made by Caterpillar and is used as a construction bulldozer rather than as a farm tractor. Caterpillar, which estimated it could fill the order for 500 tractors in 4 to 6 weeks, placed the cost of one tractor at about $40,000." In this latter sentence the Times used the word "tractor" to mean "bulldozer." At the price quoted by Caterpillar, the 500 bulldozers would have a value of $20 million, which is substantially more than the $2 million the committee hoped to raise. In the same story the Times also related the surprise of the committee at "the insistence on this type of tractor, since it seemed more adapted for heavy construction projects than for agricultural work." But it also reported that Mr. Reuther "made clear, however, that the committee felt obligated to ship the larger-type tractors if they were the ones wanted by the Castro government." To this point in the proceedings, the only mention that had been made of tractors for agricultural purposes was made by Americans. Castro never said he wanted agricultural tractors. The word he originally used was "bulldozers," and what he subsequently specified was "D–8 Supers." The Times commented, "The exact amount the group will have to raise has not been determined. It could run as high as $20 million if Premier Castro insists upon receiving the extremely large, track type of bulldozer suggested in his original proposal." Note the words, "track type of bulldozer suggested in his original proposal," and particularly the words, "his original proposal."

On May 24 the Times reported, "The prisoners brought with them vague specifications calling for 200 Caterpillar Tractor Co. D–8–Super tractors equipped with disks for plowing, and 300 tractors of the same type equipped with bulldozer blades, presumably for other types of farm work. These specifications, conflicting with earlier reports that Cuba wanted road building equipment, left the committee confused as to what was actually required." Note here that the original demand was purported to be for road building equipment, not farm purposes.

The negotiations steamed along, as did the newspaper reports of them, until on June 9 the Times said, "The message to Dr. Castro made it clear that the committee proposed to ship only agricultural type tractors rather than the heavy-tracked tread tractors suitable for earth moving and construction work sought by the Cuban leader had said he wanted [sic]." And later in the same story, "Spokesmen for the committee here estimated that the total cost of the agricultural tractors would be between $2 million and $3 million. The cost of supplying the heavy-duty tractors would amount to something above $20 million, they said."

The whole proceeding finally came to a boil on June 14. The following day the Times, in a story headlined, "Castro Revises Tractor Demand," pointed out that the committee had "refused to provide the heavy bulldozers originally requested." Further on it said, "Dr. Castro said he estimated the value of the 500 bulldozers at $28 million. He then explained that he would accept $28 million worth of the smaller machines"—the smaller machines being the type of agricultural tractor the committee had proposed to substitute for the bulldozers Castro had demanded.

On June 16 in a story headlined, "Tractor Experts Return with Castro's New Demands," the Times said, "Yesterday he (Castro) said he would go along with the committee's offer to supply small farming tractors, but he added a costly provision: the small tractors, not including transportation expenses, would have to cost $28 million, the figure he assigned to the bulldozers." At this point the only discrepancy in dollar figures was that Castro placed a $28 million valuation on the 500 bulldozers; whereas the manufacturers of those bulldozers placed a $20 million valuation on them. The Times reported, "when asked about the $28 million estimated cost of the tractors, Ulises Carbo, leader of the prisoner delegation, replied: 'The tractors are worth $28 million in Cuba; they are much cheaper here.'"

The "new demands" which the Times headlined actually constituted acceptance by Castro of the tractor committee's condition that they would not send bulldozers which could be used for military purposes, but would only send agricultural tractors. Castro did not accede to the committee's proposal of 500 such tractors, but rather stuck with the dollar valuation he placed on his original demand, which when converted to smaller agricultural tractors meant significantly more than 500. This the New York Times labeled, "new demands." But their treatment of it was mild as compared with what others did. Specifically, the New York Herald Tribune put in its headlines, "Fidel Ups 'Ransom' Tenfold." Life magazine said, "Castro also upped his ransom for 1,173 captured rebels. A U.S. team for the Tractors for Freedom Committee had come with a promise of $2.5 million worth of tractors. Castro gleefully sent them home with a fresh demand for $28 million worth."

If you were like the many people with whom I have talked who genuinely thought that Castro reneged on his own proposal and raised his demands, it is easy to see how you arrived at that conclusion in light of such reporting of the happenings. The handling of the tractor exchange by a large segment of the Nation's press (the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and Life are not alone) was at least loose and misleading, if not actually irresponsible. The fact that Americans are always receptive to liking the good guys and booing the bad guys and that Castro is a bad guy does not excuse the press for distorting what actually happened. In fact the press might well consider it a special responsibility to present the facts all the more clearly when the bad guy is not at fault. Obviously I don't mean that Castro was not at fault in making his original demand. I merely mean that he did not change his terms. It is comforting to Americans to think that we are right and our adversaries are wrong, and the press can find a ready market for such stories. But in a democracy such as ours, which depends for its ultimate success on a well-informed electorate, it is essential that the free press of which we boast be also an objective press that reports the facts honestly. Castro is difficult enough to deal with when he is clearly understood. He will be impossible to deal with if he is misunderstood as a result of the way our press reports the facts.

In and of itself the impression created by the press reports of the tractor incident may not be particularly harmful. But it is an example of the power the press has both to inform and to misinform, and hence it underlines the tremendous responsibility the press must bear for seeing that the facts, both pleasant and unpleasant, are fairly and objectively presented to the public.

Father Baker, Padre of the Poor, Lackawanna, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 15, the city of Lackawanna, joined with the Buffalo area in paying honor to the memory of a great humanitarian, Father Baker.

The occasion was the dedication of the Father Baker Bridge, in commemoration of the "Padre of the Poor" who died 25 years ago.

Father Baker was a great man with a magnificent spirit. He had a deep understanding and sympathy for the ill, the unfortunate, and the forgotten man.

Speaking at the dedication ceremony were the Most Reverend Joseph A. Burke,

Bishop of Buffalo, and the Right Reverend Monsignor Joseph A. Maguire, pastor of Our Lady of Victory Basilica, Lackawanna.

The full texts of their remarks follow:

BISHOP BURKE

"Builders of bridges are benefactors of human society. Among these builders one numbers those who recognized the need to surmount a barrier that impeded both travel and commerce.

"We are grateful, then, to those who planned, to those who constructed, and to those many citizens of our area and of the State of New York who, in any capacity, have made possible this newest bridge on the Niagara Frontier.

"Both travel and commerce have been accelerated by this impressive structure.

"We are particularly appreciative that this bridge has been named in honor of Father Baker, for he, too, was a bridgebuilder. For many years he built a bridge that surmounted the barrier of human needs.

"There are hundreds of thousands who recall his selfless benefactions. He counseled the troubled; he sheltered and fed and clothed and educated the abandoned, the orphaned, and the handicapped. No one who was worthy of his aid was ever denied his kindly assistance.

"We fervently thank almighty God for His divine gift to us of one who will long be remembered for his sympathetic and tireless consideration for the welfare of his fellow men.

"We pray today that this selfless spirit of humanitarianism and of charity may prove a powerful incentive for this area and for all who pass this way.

"May this enlightened philosophy of sincere concern for the welfare of those of every color, creed, and clime spread throughout our country—yes, even throughout the nations of the world.

"It should be our most fervent and daily prayer that, before it is too late, those who are responsible for the fate of nations will quickly accept his powerful and efficacious remedy for the problems that face the nations of the earth; for only unselfish concern for the handicapped, the needy, and the oppressed of the world can forestall a catastrophe that threatens civilization and can bring peace and a modest, widespread measure of prosperity to all the inhabitants of the world."

MONSIGNOR MAGUIRE

"It is wonderful of you people, gathered from every walk of life, to come here to honor the memory of one who was a great and exceptional priest of God, a great citizen and a great American—our own beloved Father Baker.

"It would not be presumptuous of me to say that there was no man who so ingratiated himself in the hearts of all people as did he. His name was a veritable household word.

"Not only is his memory revered by those of our own faith, but by those of other faiths as well, for he was looked upon as a friend of all, regardless of race, creed, or color.

"It is not necessary for me to enumerate for you his many and glorious achievements, particularly in the field of religion. These, for the most part, are known to all of you.

"That he was a man of prayer there can be no doubt, for he spent many hours in the silence of the night communicating with his God, under the flickering light of the sanctuary lamp.

"His confidence and trust in Our Lady of Victory knew no bounds. He was often wont to say that she was his mother and whatever he asked she never refused.

"He took no credit to himself for anything that was accomplished, since he considered himself but an instrument in the hands of Our Lady.

"He was great in his simplicity, rich in his poverty, because he was humble.

"His love for the poor, the orphan, and the wayward could not be adequately evaluated by any mere words of mine.

"He was never known to have refused admittance to anyone who sought his help. He saw in everyone the image of the Master and realized that in giving to them he was giving to Christ himself.

"His life was an inspiration to all of us. His spirit lives.

"May his memory ever remain in our hearts as fresh as in the days he walked amongst us."

Answering the Reds in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. David Lawrence from Europe that appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, August 16, 1961.

The column follows:

ANSWERING THE REDS IN BERLIN—CLOSING OF ALLIED BORDERS IN CITY CALLED ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—"We will use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

The foregoing sentence is written in the Communist Party platform, first proclaimed in 1919 by Lenin. This has never been withdrawn or revised. When Nikita Khrushchev recently restated the party platform and amended it in many particulars, he left standing the doctrine quoted above.

All Communist acts, therefore, must be judged by that blunt formula of deception, whether it be the violation in Berlin this week of the four-power agreement signed in 1949 or of a disarmament "treaty" if one should be signed with the Soviets.

The Allies are building their hopes on a new agreement to be negotiated in the next few months to nail down their rights of access to West Berlin. But the Communist Party doctrine indicates that the Soviets would not hesitate to disregard these pledges whenever they decide it is expedient to do so. Indeed, Premier Khrushchev told the British Ambassador, only a few days ago, in discussing the existing allied treaty rights in Berlin granted in 1945 and 1949, that these were "unreal and irrelevant."

This is not surprising, coming as it does from a government that has no regard for morals or for the sanctity of a written pledge. But what are the Allies to do about it? Up to now, the procedure has been to make speeches, carry on conferences between foreign ministers and ambassadors of the West, and discuss privately a series of countermeasures—military, political, and economic.

While military preparations are important as a defensive precaution, neither side is likely to make a move in the direction of military action unless the other does—and it would have to be something more than a mere clash on a local basis to bring on anything so catastrophic as a nuclear war.

As for the political arena, this means an attempt through public statements and exchanges of notes to affect favorably the public opinion of the world, particularly in the so-called neutral countries where the Soviet Union has been making an intensive effort to win friends or to stir up trouble that would preoccupy Western forces.

What else can be done? The economic weapons of blockade now are being talked about openly. Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany has just said that trade agreements between the East and West would have to be "reexamined." There are hints of a trade embargo. This naturally arouses anxiety in business circles, and already in London some authoritative British sources are saying that an economic embargo is not practical and would mean that Western exports would suffer.

But if bombs begin falling on millions of people, there will be suffering too. Hence, the world has to choose now between preventive policies of a drastic nature or a drifting policy that gives to the enemy an impression of irresoluteness and deafeatism.

Back in the days of the Truman administration there was a word used widely to describe the then-existing American policy toward the Soviet Union. It was "containment." It meant that the Allies would draw a line around the Communist bloc and isolate it from the rest of the world. But the crisis never became sufficiently acute to make such a policy effective, and gradually the proponents of "exchange"—whether in the educational, cultural, or commercial field—came to the fore.

The Soviets, however, have been getting the better of the bargain. They have been giving up little by way of information themselves through the exchange programs, but they have infiltrated nearly every large country and many of the smaller ones by increasing the staffs of their own embassies or legations—in many cases with several hundred persons—who enjoy diplomatic immunity. These "diplomats" are the clandestine link between the Kremlin and the small but influential group of agents and party members in the various countries who carry on the Moscow-directed intrigue, subversion, and espionage. They transmit the billions of rubles, converted into Western currencies, to finance the whole Communist apparatus.

The Soviet enterprises throughout the world would collapse if trade embargoes were applied and the whole system of converting Soviet money into other currencies were blocked off, so that the funds that flow to agents in Cuba or Mexico or South America or the Middle East or southeast Asia or Africa were in large part stopped.

There are plenty of countermeasures short of war which the West can take. The situation in Berlin affords a real opportunity. For since the Soviets have ordered their puppet government in East Germany to seal off the borders the Allies could close their borders, too. A nonintercourse program could be gradually extended to apply to the other satellite countries. Certainly uprisings internally would occur in the Communist-dominated areas. But why should the West fear or timidly refrain from encouraging such outbreaks? Some failures will occur, but this is the price that has to be paid in the long struggle against Soviet tyranny.

Choralaires Sing on Swing Around Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Twin Cities area of Minnesota is exceptionally proud of a group of young people who have distinguished themselves at song festivals in Europe. The group is the Choralaires, founded and conducted

by Mr. Robert Mantzke. Their travels provide the best kind of cultural exchange for our country. They are the finest types of good-will ambassadors we could send anywhere. I would like here to bring to the attention of Congress an article about the Choralaires appearing in the Minneapolis Star for July 28, 1961:

CHORALAIRES SING ON SWING AROUND EUROPE

(By Everett Helm)

BADEN-BADEN, GERMANY.—Approaching the Hotel Terminus in this Black Forest city, I heard the sound of many voices in song.

Following my ears, I reached the dining room. And there they were, 36 strong, the Minneapolis Choralaires, seated at a dozen tables and indulging in a round of lusty after-dinner singing.

In the center of the room stood a stocky, energetic young man who beamed as he led the four numbers that constituted the evening's program. Obviously this was Bob Mantzke, the Choralaires' founder and permanent conductor.

The choristers were in as good spirits as were their leader and the other hotel guests who applauded warmly for this impromptu concert. Well might they be, for scarcely a week earlier this remarkable "group of amaterus with professional standards," as Mantzke described them, had won the first prize at the famous Eistedfod in Wales—a competition in which choruses from 33 countries participated.

After the Choralaires had sung their last piece, Mantzke showed me the 6- by 6-inch bronze medal they won at the Eistedfod. I mention this particularly in case some pedant may question my spelling of Eistedfod with one "d" at the end instead of the frequently seen two. That's the way it is on the medal, and, after all, the Welsh ought to know how to spell their own word (which, by the way, means a session).

MUSICAL GREETING

Mantzke also told me something about the Choralaires' trip to date. They flew from Minneapolis to London, had 2 days of sightseeing there, then proceeded to Llangollen, where the Eistedfod is held annually. Since this small city cannot house all the visiting choruses, they are put up in the surrounding villages. The Choralaires were assigned to Penycae, a few miles distant.

As their bus approached the center of town, driving between the long rows of red brick cottages, the Choralaires heard the voices of children. In the main square they discovered 300 youngsters greeting them in song.

The Choralaires reciprocated with several numbers of their own. Then the children sang again.

In the same village a Swedish chorus, the Kariskoga Kammarkor, was lodged and one evening the two choruses gave an impromptu concert for the townspeople. A few days later, this joint concert was repeated in London's White Bear Inn.

In London, the winners of the Eistedfod competition also made three appearances on BBC television and gave a concert at the Hindes Street Methodist Church, where they were introduced by a Minneapolitan.

Dr. Chester Pennington, pastor of Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church, had just arrived in London in an exchange of pulpits with the London pastor.

ON THE CONTINENT

From London the group went to Holland for a few days, then to Bonn (where they saw Chancellor Andenauer of Germany and President de Gaulle of France in a parade) and thence to Baden-Baden for a single concert before moving on to Munich, Salzberg, Rome, Geneva, and Paris.

After Baden-Baden, the Choralaires have most of the time free for sightseeing. It is a case not of singing for their supper but rather, of singing for their trip to Europe.

During the past 12 months the Choralaires gave 63 concerts of sacred and secular music in and around the Twin Cities to raise part of the $30,000 needed for the trip. They also held rummage sales, washed cars, and did babysitting.

The result of this is that each member of the group pays only one-third of his own expenses.

The average age of the Choralaires is 25. For many, this was the first trip abroad—the group has been in England before, but with different personnel. At home, they do various things, chiefly nonmusical. Six are teachers—one of music and five of history, economics, etc.—the rest are secretaries, office workers, and students.

FOUNDED IN 1944

The chorus was founded in 1944 after 30 Washburn high school students heard the Robert Shaw Chorale. Under Mantzke's leadership the Choralaires won local and national contests, including the Chicagoland competition in 1948, 1950, and 1952. They took an active part in nine aquatennials and have appeared at three twilight concerts with the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra.

Their repertoire is predominantly American, featuring show-tune medleys, Civil War and other patriotic songs in the secular programs and spirituals as well as compositions by Americans in their sacred programs.

But they sing the music of other nations, too—from Palestrina motets and English madrigals to folksongs of many peoples.

Listening to them is a pleasure not only because they do it well, but also because they do it with such enthusiasm. Wherever they go they sing—in hotels, in restaurants, and, of course, in the bus that is taking them around the continent. In so doing, they not only have a wonderful time but also make many friends—for themselves and for America.

(Minneapolis-born Everett Helm is a composer, conductor, and music journalist who has been living in Germany since World War II.)

The Wilderness Area in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and its magnificent Chinese Wall, which appeared in the August 13 issue of the Great Falls Tribune.

The author, Ken Payton, has captured the breathtaking serenity of this world-famous wilderness area in Montana.

The greatest threat to wilderness is man and the march of civilization—

Concludes Payton.

Montana has a great asset in its wilderness areas, areas that to offer their great gifts must be left in their natural State.

To appreciate wilderness fully, one must travel it. To those who cannot—to those who would, I commend this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKPACK TRIP TO CHINESE WALL AWE INSPIRING

(By Ken Payton)

The magnificent Chinese Wall in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, one of the great mountain attractions of Montana, is like nothing else in the State. The harsh beauty of sheer cliffs shining white in the bright sunlight and stretching for miles through the heart of wilderness makes the wall unlike any other mountain or massive rock formation.

Seeing it offers solitude, relief from man's artificiality, personal contact with one of Montana's most famous attractions.

That one of nature's awe-inspiring creations should be in a wilderness area set aside to forever remain in its natural state seems in keeping with the spiritual lift that goes with seeing it. One gets the feeling that if the area is ever subjected to modern civilization it would be sacrilege.

The Chinese Wall means wilderness, almost a million acres of it in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. It should be seen and enjoyed by Montanans, but only on horseback or on foot.

It's an unforgettable experience to walk into the wilderness for the sheer joy of walking, to feel packboard straps pull at your shoulders and your legs tighten as they carry you up, always up, and then to know the pleasure at the end of the trail when you pull off your pack and reflect that you reached your destination through your own efforts entirely.

Wilderness itself offers beauty to the beholder, but like all the pursuits in which man comes in contact with natural forces and closer to God, wilderness also offers peace from the mad scramble for home at 5:30 every afternoon. It can renew faith in people who after all these years still have not learned how to get along with themselves. Far away from pushbuttons, exhaust fumes, lawnmowers, and pricelists, wilderness can mean adventure, for which every man yearns and of which there is precious little left to the man of modest means.

One has a great feeling of accomplishment and overwhelming appreciation for the things that made the preservation of wilderness areas possible when crossing an alpine meadow at 7,000 feet.

My companion and I felt these things June 26, high in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. Before us was the Chinese Wall, winding 15 miles through the area, towering a thousand feet high like a gigantic backbone and reminding us that, after all, the works of man are puny in comparison. Three hundred yards ahead was the Wall Trail; 23 miles behind stretched the trail of Klick's Resort at the head of Gibson Lake where we had started little more than 2 days previously.

The two men who had never seen the Chinese Wall and who spend most of the year sitting before a typewriter or a linotype machine, the last 300 yards was like attaining the summit of Mount Everest, I suppose.

It was a particularly fine moment for John Polston, 42-year-old Tribune linotype operator. In the first place, for his first major back-packing trip into deep Montana wilderness, he had chosen a trip that required about 45 miles of hiking trails to elevations of about 7,800 feet while carrying about 35 pounds on his back.

Most important is that Polston made the trip with a left leg from which polio had taken much of the strength when he was 14. He always walks with a limp. Near the end

of the trip Polston's left boot weakened after crossing the West Fork of the Sun River several times and hiking through snow water-soaked alpine meadows alive with millions of tiny yellow flowers. The boot forced Polston to walk on the inside of his left ankle.

Sitting in the later afternoon shadows of the wall at our campsite, set up on a green carpeted bench overlooking the Moose Creek Valley up which we had come, we spotted a herd of about 30 elk on a mountainside half a mile away. Marmots whistled at each other and birds nesting in the cliffs chased away a hawk, which without once moving its wings rode air current to the top of the divide.

Cold wars, atomic bombs, and Minute Mans are forgotten 35 miles by trail from any known road, or 65 miles from any paved road or town. One can think only of what is around him or of the too seldom-used muscle power that took him there. From late in the afternoon until 8 the next morning we renewed ourselves spiritually for our battles with civilization during the coming year.

"I've been thinking about those days when I was 14," Polston said sometime during that period. "I keep realizing that here I am. If I can do it anyone can. If you write anything about our trip mention my game leg. It might encourage others with the same handicap to see this country."

Forest rangers at Augusta said we were the first persons into the area this year. Until half a mile from Benchmark, the end of the trip, there was no evidence to contradict them. At trip's end we met a man and his wife from Helena backpacking into the same area. The man had a .308 Winchester over his shoulder.

"We've been told that if we see a grizzly and have to shoot, we'd better have something that will kill it," he said. Our .45 Colt automatic looked awfully small beside the rifle, but then our trip was behind us. It is hoped that he did not have to shoot.

We saw huge bear tracks 6 inches across, but no grizzlies. Our one brush with a bear left us red faced.

It was June 28 at Indian Point on the West Fork of the Sun River, a day for soaking up sunshine, nursing blisters and shaking pine needles out of sleeping bags. Rain came that evening and the thunder echoed from mountainside to mountainside like the end of the world was coming. The bear came creeping through lodgepole pine a few yards downhill from Indian Point Ranger Station where we had put sleeping bags on the porch to escape the rain.

John decided to head under the cabin if the bear got too close. I decided to climb on the roof if I had to. The bear circled the cabin, pawed through a garbage dump, investigated the outhouse, and then came our way. John nervously pulled the .45.

Fifty feet away Bruin, who had turned into a small nearsighted brown bear, turned tail and bounded up the hill while we barked like dogs and pounded on tin pans. He stayed another half an hour but was encouraged to go elsewhere in search of food.

The trip began at Klick's after a boat ride from Gibson Dam. The trail followed the North Fork of the Sun to Moose Creek, up Moose Creek to the Chinese Wall, down the West Fork of the Sun to the South Fork and finally to Benchmark.

It was a trip that anyone with enough ambition can make. We ate dehydrated food. Anyone who can boil water and read directions can cook it. Aside from the feeling of well-being and intimacy with the woods one gets from backpacking, there is also the economy one enjoys. The whole trip cost each of us about $30. Backpacking is the answer when you can't afford horses.

But one must never go alone. Two is all right, but three or four in a party is about perfect.

We started up the east side of the north fork at about 1 p.m., June 24 after a boat ride from Gibson Dam. The river was fast and wide, still high from the spring runoff and dangerous for two men to ford. We decided not to go to Cabin Creek where the trail fords the river, but to stop at Circle Creek and try to find an old wire bridge, cross it to the west side trail to the Moose-Furman Trail and hike another couple of miles to Moose Creek.

The wilderness boundary is about a mile from Klick's Resort. We were envious of cabins perched on gentle knolls, nestled among fir and pine, or overlooking the north fork.

Our first impression of the wire bridge was one of horror. Who, we thought, can cross that?

It stretched across the river from one tree to another and was supported by guy wires at two points on both sides of the stream. But it was in a terrible state of disrepair. The wire was bare of wood on which to walk. Wire side rails had long ago collapsed and wooden supports at intervals wobbled or swung loose.

John led the way. The next morning while I put ropes on my pack John slipped away to the bridge. A moment later I looked over and John was sitting on the bridge in midstream. He had his pack on his back minus sleeping bag and was scooting a foot at a time across the swirling river.

Although it wobbled, the bridge was well anchored and by sitting low we inched our gear across in two trips apiece. The operation took an hour. It was a small thing but something a person does not do every day, something that stands out as a high point on a wilderness tour.

That evening, June 25, put us about 8 miles from the Chinese Wall. Our own small stream gurgled 10 feet from our campsite and we got our water as it cascaded crystal clear over a waterlogged sapling.

The trail up is a gradual climb through meadows and heavy timbered areas with no great number of huge trees but many medium size fir and pine. Sometimes the trail goes below rocky points and gives the hiker a chance to look for goats or sheep. Other times the trail climbs over rocky points and one can look behind him and marvel at how far he has come and how far he has to go. Wild flowers are everywhere.

The area through which we walked is a game preserve and wildlife does not know what it is to be shot at by human beings. One mule deer doe followed us half a mile before her curiosity was satisfied. Another with two fawns at her side took one look at us and was gone with her family.

A small section of the Continental Divide can be seen from about 5 or 6 miles down the Moose Creek Valley. We saw it at midmorning of the 26th.

Blooming bear grass covered the meadows on both sides of the trail. It was present until the last steep climb up to the foot of the wall, where it was still too cool for it to bloom. At the foot of the wall bear grass foliage covered the ground as thick as Kentucky bluegrass in front of a suburban home.

The nearer one gets to the divide the thinner the timber grows and the harder the wind blows. A last climb up a bench puts you in wide-open country typical of that at the foot of the wall.

The last 2 or 3 miles is through rocky country stripped of timber years ago by fire. Black snags, rocks, beargrass, scrubby second-growth timber, brush, and wild flowers cover the mountainsides. The closer one gets the steeper the trail gets.

At the head of Moose Creek Valley half a dozen streams rush down to form the main stream. The trail is over spongy green velvet, still wet in June from the spring runoff. A switchback leads the hiker above the valley headwall, along a ridge, and up to the foot of the divide.

We were at the base of the divide at 4:30 p.m. The highest point of the trip was reached next morning at 10:30 after a final climb of about 800 feet past Cliff Mountain and over into the West Fork drainage.

At the base of the wall one can drink snow water after it has run 100 yards, wash pots and pans under a snow bank and from the front porch of a campsite have a 25-mile view.

The hike to Cliff Mountain was the toughest of the trip. It is steep climbing for 800 feet with no real switchbacks. Some of the trail follows rocky streambeds that had dried up already. Sections of it would be touch and go for a horse. But behind the hiker every time he rests is the gigantic wall.

At the foot of Cliff Mountain, after an hour of hiking, it doesn't seem possible that the top of the wall is still a thousand feet above. At Cliff Mountain it's like the top of the world. The trail goes through a saddle. Cliff Mountain towers on one side and the south ridge above Moose Creek stretches up on the other.

I could imagine all my troubles falling away before me, carried away to the sea in foamy Moose Creek more than a thousand feet below. My tribulations were as insignificant as the marmots below, merrily whistling to each other.

It was downhill the rest of the way. At 6 p.m. on the 27th we made camp at Indian Point after the long walk down the steep West Fork trail. We stayed there all day the 28th. On the 29th we stopped 3 miles from Benchmark and on the 30th at midmorning walked out.

Twice we ate cutthroat and rainbow trout after they were pulled from the South Fork of the Sun.

The famous Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is composed of almost a million acres of superb mountain country lying on both sides of the Continental Divide in the Lewis and Clark, Flathead, and Lolo National Forests. It is one of 83 wilderness areas, wild areas, primitive areas, and roadless areas in America's national forests. There are 14½ million acres in these areas, all the wilderness left in America outside of Alaska. They are something that once lost can never be regained.

National forests last year had 92½ million visits. When this year's season began it was predicted that the total would reach 100 million. This is a time when we should be making every effort to preserve our wilderness areas for their recreational, scientific, educational, and historical values.

If you're lucky, like John Polston and I were, you can cook meals, wash clothes, air your sleeping bags, and sunbathe while a deer grazes unafraid 25 feet away.

Ugly black snags left by fire years ago remind one that these areas must be protected. But fire, the natural kind that some experts say is one way that nature keeps the forest in balance, or the useless kind caused by carelessly discarded cigarette butts or campfires left smoldering, is not the greatest threat to wilderness.

The greatest threat to wilderness is man and the march of civilization. Montana has a great asset in its wilderness areas, areas that to offer their great gifts must be left in their natural state. They must be as free as possible from any evidence of man.

A Generation Too Long To Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, as President Kennedy told the Congress early this year:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. * * * The human mind is our fundamental resource.

This progress in education cannot come when classrooms are overcrowded, when teachers are underpaid, when they do not have adequate tools with which to teach.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a statement from one of our dedicated southern Idaho teachers, Mrs. Gladys R. Messex, reporting some of the frustrations she has encountered as a classroom instructor which decries the argument that State and local communities are fully able to meet their educational responsibilities and that no Federal aid is necessary.

Mrs. Messex, who is president of the Idaho Federation of Teachers, is also well known in the State as a weekly newspaper columnist:

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *July 25, 1961.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMAN: Monday morning as I listened to debate on the house floor relative to the needs of the Nation's schools I wondered whether some of those taking part had ever visited some of our less show-worthy buildings and systems to see conditions for themselves and talk with the teachers there. If they'd do so I've a feeling that the talk would be less concerned with policy statements, statistics which purport to prove that all we really need to do to solve our problems is to keep on doing what we've been doing since World War II, and somewhat coldblooded calculating concerned with how little we can pay for teachers and still provide enough classroom supervision to at least keep the kids from killing each other—which is about all you should expect of those who have 50 or more in a room. (But one representative complained about the fact that standards keep coming up.)

You begin to see schools only after you enter the classrooms and talk with the teachers as distinct from principals, supervisors, superintendents and trustees. I found that out after I decided that a country worth dying for was worth educating citizens for, because democracy demands an educated electorate for its survival. Besides my own sons were suffering from the war-induced teacher shortage.

So I sold my furniture and an equity in a modest home to go back to my university for a teaching certificate and a master's degree. But our investment seemed entirely justified what with all the authorities saying that salaries were on the way up and conditions getting better all the time.

That was about 16 years ago, and since that time I've taught in high schools in Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Idaho to learn from bitter experience the uniform cynicism of those who promise significant improvements to recruits to the profession or a better day to the youngsters. (I'm not talking about those districts which skim off the cream and give them superior opportunities at the expense of the rest. I'm talking about the ordinary class of ordinary kids.)

Businessmen who've been my school trustees uniformly desire winning athletic teams and showy bands, and they pay for these. But they hold down investments in shower curtains for the girls' gym, maps, globes, shop tools, adequate heat and light and janitor service as well as microscopes and libraries and textbooks. And teachers. The form of schooling indeed is there. Only the substance is lacking. But of course the children know no better—nor do most of their parents.

So increasingly I've come to realize that the one real hope for our Nation's children lies in the national Government rather than the more easily managed State legislatures where blocks of tax-conscious interests so often crush any attempt to appropriate adequate State funds to plug the gap left after the local property owners shoulder 80 percent of school costs. This though all accepted measures of our national ability to pay for anything else are based on the gross national product—our income—rather than real estate.

Resulting quality of education based on State and local financing is uneven—most of it far from adequate to meet today's needs—or the demands of the tomorrows where college entrance is increasingly competitive. And yet we've found from experiments in New York and New Mexico that a little more money and a little more individual attention to supplement poor cultural backgrounds can salvage surprising numbers of those previously judged to be unfit. But let's look at a typical high school in a pretty average community. The one where I teach is Pocatello High.

Last year I attempted to instruct 193 students a day. They came to me in sections all day long—six in all. And for these I had just 73 textbooks—of an issue printed in 1952. Sociology changes so rapidly that they were completely out of date for the study of crime, of marriage and divorce, of prehistoric man, but I lectured to update that material. Films which might have speeded learning are preferably ordered from the local college library to save shipping costs, and so they'd all been seen by my students in other courses from junior high on. Besides we had only six projectors to use on our nearly 2,000 youngsters and about five tape recorders and a like number of record players. But all our wing rooms have a bad echo—too expensive to insulate out—so these mechanical tools are only partly successful at best. Paper and dittos for tests are yearly in such short supply that we most frequently read the questions of our true-false tests to students in order to save money. They read our faces, of course, and most guess right a lot of the time. The only map I had was one I provided, pictures—anything adding beauty to my room—these are mine.

Two years ago I had to put out the school newspaper with a journalism class of 10 assigned to a converted janitor's cupboard. My claustrophobic reaction was to request a change of assignment last year although I was one of two journalism majors teaching in Idaho. Yet that cupboard is statistically a classroom. So are the 12 by 12 former activity rooms that now house up to 35 for study halls or shorthand classes sardined together so tightly that tests become a farce. Statistically these are rooms, too.

Four years ago I joined our English teachers in requesting that that department be granted classroom sets—one per desk—of dictionaries. Theory is the books stay in the room, but like my sociology texts, they're stolen by students who care enough to want to study at home. Some come back—but isn't it too bad that they must learn to steal in order to earn the grades they must have for success in life? We didn't get the dictionaries, were told "maybe in 10 years you can have them."

And did you ever attend a health class in a closed men's lavatory? A girl's group had to meet in one of ours 3 years ago. Quite educational when one considers all the aspects—and that, also was statistically a room.

No relief is in sight for our district, which, like so many others, is bonded up to its legal limit now. And as our war babies marry and their children enter the schools, results of an explosion are going to be felt right across our land. But we won't be ready. We weren't ready for their parents or the post-war wave either.

I feel deeply enough about these matters to have paid my own expenses to come to Washington. In addition to teaching thousands of attractive American young people in the past 14 years, I've brought up two sons who unfortunately had to battle their ways through our then temporarily overcrowded and understaffed schools in the care of a good many emergency (substandard and cheaper) teachers. And now in Bay County, Fla., my three grandchildren are in their turn being subjected to temporary overcrowding, teachers without degrees, and mass produced regimentation which is all such schools can offer. Last year they made far less progress than they'd made the year before in the federally financed, controlled, and operated Air Force school they attended in the Tokyo area. But that school's operation was based on income taxes—a more nearly adequate base.

That explains this long letter. I submit, gentlemen, that a whole generation is too long to wait for the quality of education to get back up to that which I enjoyed in Colorado public schools when I was a child. My sons were short changed. My grandchildren at least should enjoy the equipment, teachers, and classrooms that will make meaningful the time they must spend in classes. Yet in reading the Jacksonville, Fla., paper this month I noted that that area won't have any money for printing diplomas, for substitute teachers after the first of the year, or for adequate heat. The diplomas don't matter—they're worthless unless they are given by schools that have the teachers and plant to give them significance. The other things are serious.

So much for some of the facts I thought about as the gentleman talked of statistics. Now let's look at the teaching shortage. No wonder it exists. Many conscientious teachers cannot recommend the schools to their bright students, for only two professions requiring similar preparation are financially less rewarding—nursing and that of the Protestant clergy. But the clergy at least aim at collecting part of their rewards in heaven. And while, in dollars, salaries have risen quite impressively, in buying power the change is quite unimpressive. Besides, it is hard to tell what the real average of classroom pay is—too often the figure is distorted by inclusion of higher priced supervisors, principals, and superintendents as teaching staff. But I do know that a biology teacher at Pocatello who retired this year after 40 years of master of science degree teaching was receiving exactly the same pay in buying power as he did the first year he taught. This, gentlemen, is a dead-end occupation.

My own experience might interest you. With assets of $8,000 and two sons who each receive $50 a month during their minorities, I returned to college in 1946 for teaching credits. I lived at my mother's home or I'd not have attempted it, and the rest of the time during those next 12 years we had to

use what sociologists call substandard housing—slightly remodeled two-room attics, an unheatable Nebraska house—things like that. Our cars were never less than second hand. We ate lots of hamburger, and after the elder had 2 years of university and the younger a 3 years electronics course at Idaho State, my bank balance was down to less than $1,000. The boys would have liked more college but saw I couldn't help any more. The younger needed braces on his teeth and couldn't have them. This behind your statistics.

But in the last 3 years I've been alone. I've lived as a semicompanion to an elderly widow and that cut my costs way down. My beaten bank balance is reviving and I have nearly $3,000 and a 1953 Studebaker champion all paid for. Since I'm now a 14-year teacher with a master's degree I'm on the upper side of our salary schedule and so long as I continue to wear dresses I make myself, wear my good cloth coat, keep well, and keep my mind on the higher (less expensive) things of life I'll be all right. I doubt though that I'll ever see Hong Kong or the Taj Mahal.

But teaching's a virus that runs deep in my family. Now my 8-year-old granddaughter dreams of following in my steps. (A niece in college does the same.) But if they or any of my students do this thing it will be against my serious objections unless this wealthy land stops its stalling and conditions in the school improve dramatically. I've given one life to my country in exchange for little more than room and board. I dont' want them to make the same optimistice error. Besides, no one appreciates that which costs very little.

Your teacher presently in the classroom have already made their investments of time and money in the schools, however—and they continue paying for the privilege of teaching every summer as hundreds of thousands return to college campuses. We'd like very much to have the space we need, the books and maps and microscopes, the visual aids. (We know we don't do what people would like done for many of our children. We cannot. They need more individual attention than we can give.) We'd like enough money in return for our teaching so that we could give up those moonlighting jobs we take to balance the books—and instead have the evenings for leisure, reading, study, and recreation we need to make us better, more interesting teachers the next day. And, yes, we'd like steaks now and then for "pep" and energy. No matter how you cook it, hamburger does get tiresome.

All this really isn't much when you consider that the Federal Government doesn't even accept tax money from the oil industry until they've had a $27.5 depletion allowance even on foreign wells, and the clamshell boys get 5 percent. And across our Middle West there are Butler bins that look like cities of Congo huts filled with stored grain that farmers grew that no one wants but they were paid for that and paid again to store it, are paid sometimes just to give up the practice. Southern Airways which I rode last week rates six fares every time it leaves the ground even if those seats are resold to private customers, and the list is endless.

So what's wrong with investing Federal funds in our most precious national asset? For those "kids" in the schools are national assets or liabilities in this day when the average American increasingly moves from State to State, and the children are most properly a matter for national concern. That child in that distant State who is getting an impoverished, substandard schooling—or even none at all—won't necessarily stay there where his State can suffer for its own neglect. On the contrary, he may very well move into your district where his vote will cancel out that of your most erudite college professor or scientist.

Sincerely,

GLADYS R. MESSEX,
President, Idaho Federation of Teachers.

Triumph of the Spirit at St. Joseph's Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, despite terrible odds, a truly inspiring story has unfolded at St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church at Port Griffith, Pa., in my congressional district. Following a mine subsidence disaster of staggering proportions and a fire, the pastor of the parish, Rev. Walter F. Skurski, and the parishioners, went to work and raised an impressive sum of money in an economically depressed area and have now reached the stage where plans have been drawn and contracts will soon be invited for construction of a new edifice of special design to protect it against possible damage from any future subsidences. I wish to warmly congratulate Reverend Skurski and his congregation for the wonderful manner in which they overcame extremely adverse conditions. Their story is a remarkable example of faith and an equally fine example of what hard work and diligent application to duty can attain.

The Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, August 16, 1961, published a fine editorial on the accomplishments at St. Joseph's Parish and I include it as part of my remarks today:

TRIUMPH OF THE SPIRIT AT ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH

The announcement that plans have been drawn and contracts soon will be let for the construction of a new edifice for St. Joseph's Roman Catholic parish at Port Griffith provides the community with a stirring example of faith, courage and initiative in these trying times through which it is passing.

Even before the Knox tragedy, which dealt the town a staggering blow, St. Joseph's had suffered from fire and mine subsidence. When the church was wrecked, a hall was converted into a chapel, so the 140 families comprising its modest congregation might have a place to worship.

It was at this crucial juncture in the history of the parish that the Most Reverend Jerome D. Hannan, bishop of Scranton, assigned the Reverend Walter F. Skurski to the pastorage—his first, incidentally. A Glen Lyon native, who had served in Plains, Wilkes-Barre, Nanticoke and Lake Ariel, he accepted the challenge in line of duty.

To complicate the situation, Greater Pittston, like its neighbors in Wyoming Valley, was not the most prosperous place on earth. A little more than a year after Reverend Father Skurski's arrival, the river was to break into a mine and claim the lives of 12 workers and throw others idle.

A zealous priest, the Reverend Father Skurski was to prove himself an outstanding administrator within the year. When friends and acquaintances came to extend sympathy, he told them frankly:

"Don't feel sorry for me; help me."

He breathed new life into the congregation. Benefits were arranged which in previous years had produced a few hundred dollars in revenue. Under his leadership, receipts were in four and, on occasion, in five figures. Members of the congregation increased personal contributions.

Since he was forced to start from scratch, these measures, while rewarding, were not enough. So he launched a campaign to collect 5 million pennies—$50,000. At this writing, he has collected 3 million—and legal tender of larger denominations.

If the recent pace is maintained, and those who know the resourceful pastor and his loyal congregation have no doubts about that, there is reason to believe the new church will be built and paid for in 5 years, a record in the diocese.

The modern edifice that is contemplated will take into consideration special construction problems because of surface conditions and also the future needs of the parish. It is a tremendous achievement for pastor and flock in the face of monumental difficulties and constitutes an impressive tribute to the revered patron whose name it bears—the foster father of the Lord and a humble carpenter who knew the meaning of poverty and struggle.

Home Study Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an historic milestone in the field of home study has just been passed with the enrollment by International Correspondent Schools of Scranton, Pa., of its 7,000,000th student—Mr. Herbert Eggleston of Chesterland, Ohio.

In recognition of this unique achievement by ICS, oldest and largest home study institute in the Nation, and of the continuing contribution that accredited correspondence school instruction makes to the upgrading of job skills for millions of Americans, the week of August 14 has been proclaimed as "Home Study Week."

Many nationally famous leaders in Government, business, and labor once studied with ICS including the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Symington; Commerce Secretary Hodges; the late Philip Murray; and Charles E. Wilson, former president of General Electric. And since it was founded some 70 years ago in Scranton, ICS has been the leader in an important field of education which today, according to the National Home Study Council, is utilized by some 2 to 3 million men and women in this country.

Home study is recognized as both a popular and a practical educational tool by some 85 percent of the ICS student body of 125,000 active students who are studying material directly related to their present jobs. ICS's 7,000,000th student is typical of many in the Nation's work force who want to better their

own standard of living by qualifying for jobs requiring technical skills in growing demand by U.S. industry. A machinist trainee today, "Mr. Seven Million" is studying to become an engineer, His determination to improve himself through a course of self-instruction led him to enroll with ICS and thus become symbolic of so many of our workers, regardless of age, who have the initiative and ambition to train themselves so that as they get ahead, they will be playing a more meaningful role in our Nation's technological march of progress. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to insert the Home Study Week proclamation in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION: HOME STUDY WEEK

Whereas the continuing emphasis on education in all its aspects is vital to the national economy and the development and the future of this country and its citizens; and

Whereas an increasing number of Americans of all ages seek to further their educational preparation and thereby achieve greater value as citizens through home study; and

Whereas correspondence courses have proved to be a vital branch of learning, enabling millions of people to realize their ambitions; and

Whereas International Correspondence Schools has just enrolled its 7,000,000th student, who personifies the vast number of resourceful people who have taken the initiative to increase their knowledge through home study;

Therefore, I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim the week of August 14, 1961, as Home Study Week in recognition of the contribution of International Correspondence Schools to the public welfare.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Pennsylvania at the city of Harrisburg, August 15, 1961.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

Viehman Was One of Era's Most Forceful Political Personalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the State of Minnesota has lost one of its most effective and selfless citizens. George Edwin Viehman, Jr., died Monday at the age of 39, after devoting himself wholeheartedly to his strong political and religious convictions. He was an inspiration to thousands. In honor of his memory I wish to share with my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star Tuesday, August 15:

(By Wallace Mitchell, Minneapolis Star staff writer)

The death of Ed Viehman, former Republican State chairman, has removed one of the most forceful personalities from recent Minnesota political history.

He died Monday at St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester at 39 of the cancer he had battled stubbornly for 10 months. Funeral services are set for 10 a.m. Thursday in St. Joseph's Catholic Church at Owatonna, where he had lived for the past 5 years.

A wake will be held at the Viehman home in Owatonna at 1 p.m. Wednesday.

CHARGED INTO POLITICS

He charged onto the Minnesota political scene in 1958 with a verve and bounce that defied anyone to call him anything but Ed. Few persons knew that his full name was George Edwin Viehman, Jr.

It was in 1958 that he drew his first statewide recognition within both Republican and DFL Parties by his piloting of the special election victory for ALBERT H. QUIE to fill the First Congressional District post left vacant by the death of Representative August Andresen.

In 1959 he was elected Republican State chairman. In that post he combined the full spectrum of his talents.

Ed turned loose the organizational drive he'd first shown after World War II in beefing up membership of his Richfield American Legion post to win national recognition. He unleashed all his experience as a showman in radio, television, and the stage.

For 12 years he held a variety of positions with radio station WCCO before joining Josten's, Inc., of Owatonna, as sales promotion manager in February 1956.

Near the tumultuous close of the 1960 Republican State convention, the ranks-splitting scrap over endorsement for Governor and for the U.S. Senate had Ed frustrated and disappointed in his failure to work out a compromise.

At the luncheon recess before the final convention session he went to his Leamington Hotel suite. He paced the floor briefly.

"Well," he said, "I've done all that I can. And all my life, when I've come to spots like this I have one retreat—I simply say that the rest is in the hands of the Lord."

FAITH AND POLITICS

He had strong convictions and fought for them. His life then was politics. There was nothing sacreligious in Ed's linking this faith to the life he was leading in politics.

He fought his fatal illness the same way and refused to admit even a chance that cancer could lick him. Six weeks ago he exploded when a friend suggested for a round on the Owatonna Country Club golf course they ride an electric cart.

The day before his final hospital entrance, August 3, he worked a full 10 hours and received a company award for his contribution to the firm's annual sales school that was concluding.

RETIREMENT FROM POST

This massive battling flame was what Minnesota Republicans missed most when last winter he said he would not accept another term as chairman. He said he would devote his time to whipping the cancer that had been detected in October.

He continued to be called on for advice and party help and last June was emcee at the banquet that concluded the annual nation convention of Young Republicans in Minneapolis.

Before he moved to Owatonna he was a well-known personality in Minneapolis, where he had grown up and graduated from De La Salle High School. He had started studies for the priesthood at Nazareth Hall Seminary, St. Paul, when World War II erupted and he joined the Navy.

He returned to Minneapolis with his wife, Marjorie, headed Legion Post 435 in Richfield, became active in Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and aquatennial work, ran unsuccessfully in 1951 for the school board and organized the State branch of We, the People.

Even after leaving radio, one of his continuing personal satisfactions was his annual broadcast of the midnight mass on Christmas Eve at St. Olaf's Catholic Church. He did it again last Christmas.

In addition to his wife he is survived by a daughter, Gayle, 16; and sons, Edwin, 11; Thomas, 9; John, 7; Michael, 5, and Daniel, 2, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. George E. Viehman, 2524 Pillsbury Avenue.

A Viehman memorial fund is being established by a group of Owatonna residents to assure the education of his children.

Science Advanced by A.T. & T. With Senator Humphrey's Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has recently developed an electronic larynx for those who have lost their ability to speak by virtue of a laryngectomy.

Since that development, the A.T. & T. has had thousands of letters from 57 foreign countries, all seeking access to this sensational device.

In the company's quandry to make it available to anyone, anywhere in the world at cost, they asked and received an assist from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator HUMPHREY presented this problem to the World Health Organization, whereupon they now buy the device and distribute it worldwide at actual cost. I compliment a great and a very busy Senator for taking valuable time from his many duties in seeing to it that this ingenious device is now available to every living person laryngectomized. I congratulate a great American company, who in this instance seeks not a cent of profit, but chooses to do good for mankind all over the world. An article properly explaining the artificial larynx follows as it appeared in the New York Times of August 6, 1961:

THE ARTIFICIAL LARYNX—A.T. & T. DISTRIBUTES ELECTRONIC VOICE ON NONPROFIT BASIS TO 4,000 A YEAR

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Today as a result of electronic developments and the emphasis placed on service by one of the Nation's laregst corporations, thousands of persons throughout the world who were once speechless can communicate again.

The ability to speak is brought to them by the Bell System of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. through its new, low-cost transistorized electronic artificial larynx, which is distributed by the corporation on a nonprofit basis. The medical staff of the National Hospital for Speech Disorders in New York cooperated in the development of the artificial larynx and tested it clinically.

It is reliably estimated that more than 25,000 persons in the United States have had the entire larynx removed, and a lesser number who have had partial removal.

By far the most common reason for this surgery is cancer. Laryngectomy is required about 10 to 12 times more frequently in men

than in women, but the cause for this wide variation is not understood.

A much less frequent cause of aphonia (loss of voice) is paralysis of the vocal cords, due to certain neurological conditions.

SETS UP VIBRATIONS

The larynx, commonly called the voice box or adam's apple, terminates at the upper end of the trachea, or windpipe. As air is exhaled from the lungs, it sets up vibrations in the vocal cords, creating sound that is articulated into speech by the tongue, teeth, lips, and cheeks. The opening into the larynx is controlled by the epiglottis, a flap-like, cartilagenous trapdoor that opens automatically to permit passage of air and closes automatically to prevent the aspiration of food or liquid.

Esophogeal speech is recognized as the method of choice in the rehabilitation of persons who have had their larynx removed. This is accomplished by swallowing air into the esophagus which in turn is regurgitated voluntarily, creating a column of air which is set in vibration and which can then be articulated into speech.

Many persons become extremely proficient in this. The writer has personally known a number of such cases, one a midwestern industrialist who had a laryngectomy more than 10 years ago, but who has continued to function just as effectively in his business and social life as he did before the operation.

DEVICE HAS LONG STORY

Unfortunately, only about the two-thirds of laryngectomized patients can develop adequate esophogeal speech, even with sufficient instruction. This is true for a variety of reasons, most important of which are psychological.

This difficulty is quite understandable, for the loss of verbal ability is an ominous threat to any individual in his relations with family, friends, business associates.

The development of the artificial larynx is a long story. As far back as 1925, the Bell Telephone Co. became interested in developing an artificial larynx.

Prior to that time a number of laryngeal prostheses had been developed. All were based on the work of a Viennese physician named Czermak who described the principles of an artificial larynx in 1859, many years before the first attempts at surgical laryngectomy.

Although the Bell System constantly improved the artificial larynx brought out in 1925, it was still dissatisfied with the results.

In 1956 after consultations with leading surgeons and speech specialists it started an all-out research and development program that culminated in the new instrument.

The new artificial larynx is hygienic, estheically acceptable, easy to maintain, and sells for its actual cost, $45.

WEIGHS 7 OUNCES

It weighs only 7 ounces and is entirely self-contained and battery operated. Two models are available; one simulates a man's voice and the other a woman's.

When the patient holds the artificial larynx against his throat, it transmits vibrations into his throat cavity; the vibrations can then be articulated into words. Power is turned on and off and pitch varied by a simple thumb-operated switch.

Among many others who make very effective use of the electronic larynx is a distinguished former professor of medicine and medical dean, who now does medical consultating and editorial work.

Although information about the device can be obtained through any of their local offices, the Bell Telephone System was extremely careful to introduce it professionally through the journals of the medical and speech professions.

Currently, Bell officials are working on an international distribution system, with the hope that the artificial larynx can be made available throughout the world on a cost basis.

Critics of the free enterprise system frequently charge that American corporations are interested solely in profits. Such critics are not familiar with the tremendous amount of research, philanthropic, and public service contributed by many large corporations.

The new electronic artificial larynx is an example. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s 2 million stockholders have thrown their vast resources into a successful project to benefit about 4,000 persons a year. Its importance for those who benefit cannot be underestimated. For them it means not just the ability to speak again; it is release from the prison of silence to a renewed life of communication with their fellows.

Despite Surgery, Bill Drevlow Won't Be Counted Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, William E. Drevlow, the Lieutenant Governor of my State, has always enjoyed the respect of Idahoans of all political beliefs. On reason he has this great respect is that he possesses great quantities of optimism and fortitude. These qualities have been demonstrated at all times in Bill Drevlow's life, and have been demonstrated once again in a time of severe personal crisis.

Bill has recently had to undergo the amputation of his right leg. This is a difficult thing for any man to do, and it is especially difficult for a man of 71 years. But, despite these difficulties, Bill Drevlow has retained his good spirits and healthy outlook on life. This is pointed out in a fine article in the August 13 issue of the Lewiston Morning Tribune, one of America's best newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESPITE SURGERY DREVLOW WON'T BE COUNTED OUT

CRAIGMONT.—Loss of his right leg as the result of a blood clot last month apparently hasn't changed the outlook of W. E. "Bill" Drevlow, Idaho's Lieutenant Governor.

Except that he will be walking on crutches until about October 1 when he gets an artificial limb, the Lewis County Democrat doesn't look for any major changes in his life.

He noted Saturday that when possible gubernatorial candidates were being discussed at Lewiston earlier this year, he stated: "Don't count me out." Despite the fact he was close to death and came home minus part of a leg, he hasn't counted himself out in any respect.

LOST 33 POUNDS

Drevlow lost about 33 pounds during the ordeal. He was stricken during the annual State land board tour of north central Idaho forests and was flown first to Lewiston, then to Spokane's Sacred Heart Hospital. He's pale now and still a bit weak. But there apparently has been no change in spirit.

He'd go to Boise now to serve as chief executive if there were a need for him, he said. But he'd prefer to have a week to 10 days rest at home first. Drevlow and his wife returned home from the hospital Thursday night.

What about continuing in politics?

"I haven't anything in mind but to finish out my term," he said. "But I haven't changed my mind about politics. This isn't so big it can't be lived down," he said, indicating his abbreviated right leg.

Should the Governor leave the State for only a couple of days, he said, he could fill the breach from his home. "I haven't written yet (to the Governor) but I will that if he is willing to send a car for me I can fill in as Governor in the very near future. I need a little more strength in my arms to walk on crutches. I still haven't got stamina enough to carry on long on crutches."

Discussing politics, he stated: "I had said before, 'Don't count me out' and right now I couldn't say that my mind is much changed. I haven't made any soul-searching decision. I will try to continue until my term is finished in 1963. As for running for another office, I haven't thought much about it.

"I haven't counted myself out and I haven't counted myself in. There will be time to answer that. Since the operation I haven't given it any consideration. Right now I don't see why I should give up hope of living a normal life. I have to see what the good Lord has in store for me at the first of the year."

FIRST INACTIVITY

Right now Drevlow is learning about inactivity for the first time in his life. Born February 17, 1890, at Round Prairie, Minn., he worked as a youth as a helper in a creamery, went to the University of Minnesota for an extension course in buttermaking and at 17 became manager of a creamery at Eldred, Minn. The dampness affected his throat, and after 2 years he headed west to enter drawings for land being opened on Indian reservations.

His number never came up so he joined a crew building the Milwaukee Railroad across the Northwest. He did all kinds of rail construction work from Missoula to Spokane. "I was at Taft, Mont., when it was considered the toughest place in the world." One spring, he recalled, when the snow melted, 20 bodies were found. "They were victims of the black bottle"—a drink roughly comparable to strychnine—and other forms of foul play which separated them from their money and lives.

It was at Missoula, on January 17, 1913, that Drevlow married the former Phenia Heinrich, "a wonderful companion" who has made the last few weeks easier for him. Their first home was a 10-by-14-foot construction shack on a railroad project. "It was on a sidehill summit between Helena and Butte on a tunnel job," the Lieutenant Governor recalled. "On Easter morning a late Montana blizzard piled 1½ feet of snow from the bed to the door. It came in through the cracks." The Drevlows, who have two sons, Maurice, Craigmont postmaster, and Raymond, a Potlatch Forests, Inc., sales executive at Kansas City, now have a comfortable two-story house at Craigmont.

After leaving railroad construction, Drevlow worked on the Thompson Falls, Mont.,

dam and on a dam at Holden, Mont. Toward the end of World War I he worked on a building project at Portland. "I worked mostly on steam engines and had charge of several fairly large jobs," he said. "I was rigging foreman when the first concrete was poured for the Monroe Street Bridge at Spokane."

When his sons were at school age he wanted to stop moving. The family went to Tekoa, where he farmed 5 years. Then work started on what is now the Clearwater unit of PFI and Dreviow went back to construction.

SENIOR IN SERVICE

"I was about the seventh man to start on the construction and I was the senior man, in terms of years of service, in 1943," he noted, when he resigned to move to Craigmont. The Dreviows bought their first 160-acre ranch near here in 1934 and from 1935 until 1941 they farmed it on weekends or at any time they could. In 1941 they bought a second 160-acre tract and continued as weekend farmers. Two years later they had the land paid for and decided to move to Craigmont and do nothing but farm. "That was a pretty rugged life," he said. "There were no picnics. We were always up here working."

Dreviow's first public office was on the Craigmont City Council, starting in 1944. He headed a committee which, with Federal aid, had a $60,000 airport constructed. A former master of the Craigmont Grange and area lieutenant governor of Toastmasters International, he served 13 years on the board of the Union Warehouse & Mercantile Co., at Craigmont, the last 8 as chairman.

He first ran for the legislature in 1946, winning in the primary by 19 votes but by a substantial margin in the general election. A member of the house, he was defeated in 1948 after he found he had devoted too much time to other activities and too little to campaigning.

"I learned a lesson," he said. If a man runs, he must get out and work hard, so in 1950 I really went out and campaigned." Dreviow hasn't lost an election since.

SUCCEEDED COSTLY

When the late State Senator William Costly had to retire for reasons of health, he suggested Dreviow seek his seat. Dreviow was State senator until elected Lieutenant Governor in 1959.

When he became Lieutenant Governor, it ceased being a mere title and became an office. When the Governor is out of the State, Dreviow takes over. "I've had the good fortune of having a lot of experience in the Governor's office," he said. "I've served 190 days as Governor and I've still got the balance of my term to go."

Of his future in general, Dreviow observed: "I don't see many obstacles facing me now."

Preparing for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President's bill to create a U.S. Disarmanent Agency for World Peace and Security is receiving very widespread support. It seems to me that our present task is to turn this support into an active drive to pass this bill in this session of Congress before the disarmament debates at the U.N. in the fall.

Though many have now concluded that we must prepare for peace even during a period of great tension, I think that the House may find the following editorial from the August 15 Milwaukee Journal a concise and well-reasoned expression of this growing and hopeful opinion:

PREPARING FOR PEACE

It may seem ironic that after adopting a record peacetime military budget of $46.7 billion Congress should turn to President Kennedy's proposal to create a full-time U.S. Disarmament Agency.

Actually, there is nothing contradictory about it. As Secretary of State Rusk said in supporting the measure before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the military buildup and now the Berlin crisis make it all the more urgent that we have an Agency to pursue "strong, patient, and sincere efforts" in behalf of disarmament.

"We must provide ourselves and our children with an alternative to the threat of massive thermonuclear destruction," said the Secretary.

From former President Eisenhower came welcome support, contained in a letter read by Disarmament Adviser John McCloy. Under Eisenhower disarmament studies were expanded, but the new organization would be still more extensive.

The Agency would be similar to the national Peace Agency that has been urged by Representative KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Watertown. It would carry on research in disarmament and arms control, develop plans, and provide our negotiators with expertness in an extremely complicated field. It would prepare America to take advantage of a break in the cold war, just as the military buildup prepares the Nation against a hot war flareup.

To assure peace, the United States must be militarily strong. But it must simultaneously seek ways to end the costly and perilous arms race and to settle international differences under law.

Looking at the Moon and Seeing Yuri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, too often we do our thinking in a fit of hysteria based on a momentary aura of crisis.

Most often the solution to a problem is found when we are leaning back in our chairs, relaxed and at ease.

Invariably the most reliable conclusion is reached when we look at all phases of the situation at hand and evaluate all aspects of it.

This editorial in the Ransom County Gazette, a weekly newspaper at Lisbon, N. Dak., was written by Mr. Ferd Froeschle, a former member of my staff here in Washington, on August 10, 1961. It clearly expresses the points that I have made here, and I think the other Members of Congress should have the opportunity to read it.

LOOKING AT THE MOON AND SEEING YURI

Now that the Russians have come up with another spectacular space achievement, we are being treated to the customary flap into which American officialdom automatically goes whenever we are shown trailing in astronautics. And let's face it, we've been trailing pretty steadily.

There are basically two official attitudes. One is the "my dad can lick your dad" approach which consists of pointing out that we still have better refrigerators than the Russians. The other might be called the "my boys can lick your boys" approach, consisting mainly of the suggestion that some other American be sent into space right away.

On inspection, the first approach is more realistic because it accepts the fact that we have set up the conditions for the race with the Russians.

By insisting that we must lead the Russians in all fields we have created a situation in which it becomes intolerable for us to be bested by the Russians in any field.

And so all the Russians need to do is concentrate on a single field of endeavor with the natural result that they will eventually outdo us in that field.

We have further aggravated the situation by carefully outlining our step-by-step plans for space conquest, letting the whole world know just what to expect next from our space people and when to expect it.

And this is as it should be because it emphasizes the peaceful intent of our space pursuits. Russian secrecy, on the other hand, has had the predictable effect of surrounding Soviet efforts with the suspicion which the world has learned to view their achievements and claims of achievements.

We continue to believe that if the United States had dedicated itself to space conquest with the same zeal as the Russians have shown, we would have equalled their achievements, and possibly because of the broader scope of our scientific interests, we might have led them.

But as Americans, we deliberately choose the course we have taken, devoting our efforts to all facets of science and living rather than to a single field.

Perhaps as a result we shall have to be content with looking at the moon while following peaceful pursuits on earth, but we regard it a more laudable goal than conquering the moon before learning to live on earth.

Return of the Hijacked DC–8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, although the State Department has finally negotiated a return of the first hijacked airliner from the Cuban Government, by means of a trade for one of their gunboats impounded for bad debts, the editorial which I am including in the RECORD is still very timely and appropriate.

This editorial appeared in the August 10 edition of the Seattle Times, a newspaper published in Seattle, Wash., which is a part of the district I am privileged to serve.

In view of the many recent blunders in U.S. foreign policy, the State Department might well take note of the suggestions contained in this article, at least to the extent of consulting with such organizations as Pan American World Airways on matters of state involving situations such as this:

ANOTHER ROUND TO CASTRO

No doubt it was with tongue in cheek that a group, while discussing the baffling state of the Nation's foreign policy, suggested that it might be well to turn the administration of our diplomatic affairs over to Pan American World Airways.

This worldwide airline—with more than fourscore of years of experience in foreign capitals—seems to have a notable record of getting things done with remarkably few hitches.

Anyway, whatever may have been the other factors at work yesterday, Pan American recovered its hijacked DC–8 jetliner at Havana and returned all but one (the hijacker) of its occupants safely to American soil without undue delay.

This was more than the whole influence of the American Government has been able to do about a turboprop airliner of another company hijacked earlier and flown to Cuba.

It was well that the DC–8 was returned promptly—because the temper of the American public yesterday was to demand that there be no further shilly-shallying with Fidel Castro, including sentiment that if necessary Cuba be ringed with American warships, or Armed Forces landed, to recover both planes and show the world that Uncle Sam's whiskers had been jerked just once too often.

As it turned out, Castro once again was able to make Uncle Sam—especially some of our Congressmen—look quite ridiculous by his release of the DC–8 and its crew and passengers.

This was one time when it was evident that assumptions were made before all of the facts were available for a valid assessment.

Yet the Cuban dictator had, through utterances earlier, spread the word that pirated airliners would be welcomed in Cuba. So he is not entirely blameless. But he must have won this round in foreign public opinion.

This time the hijacking was by a French Algerian, who like too many other persons throughout the world, blames the United States for troubles not of our making. It would have been more to the point, although still intolerable piracy, if he had seized a French airliner.

The fact that another big American airliner could be seized by a lone gunman demonstrates that the precautionary steps taken after the Texas incident were inadequate. It begins to appear that seizure of American airliners has become international practice.

One step which could help put an end to the piracy would be an international agreement declaring that nowhere would there be a welcoming haven for hijacked planes, with drastic punishment to the hijackers.

And meanwhile, a lesson should have been learned. Full information should be awaited before blame is assessed.

Walter E. Monagan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week the city of Waterbury in the State of Connecticut lost one of its outstanding citizens in the death of Walter E. Monagan.

Throughout his life, Mr. Monagan contributed much to the city and State in public service, in work for his church, and in the activities of fraternal and civic organizations. In addition, he was the father of a fine family of seven children who survived. Professionally, Mr. Monagan ranked at the top of the Connecticut bar which he adorned for more than 50 years. The frequency with which his name appears in the reports of the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut attests to the scope and depth of his legal knowledge.

Above all, Walter Monagan was an intellectual with a love of knowledge and appreciation of beauty and literature and of character in life.

An editorial in the Waterbury-American of August 9, 1961, characterizes Mr. Monagan so aptly that I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER E. MONAGAN

The unvarnished facts concerning the late Attorney Walter E. Monagan were published in yesterday's afternoon paper.

Dutifully recorded was the fact that he had died after an illness of 3 weeks; that he had been born in Bristol; that he had graduated from Waterbury High School, Holy Cross College and Yale Law School; that he had practiced law in this city for more than 50 years; that he had been active in civic, fraternal, and religious circles and had held many positions of prominence; that he had served as a member of the general assembly and in the Connecticut National Guard.

An impressive recitation of facts, to be sure.

But unfortunately it did not capture the essence of the man. For Walter E. Monagan was, above and before all else, a gentleman and a scholar of what is referred to today in all too often deprecatory tones as "the old school."

Walter Monagan loved Waterbury. He loved its people. And in his associations with the people of the city, whether it was in legal circles or elsewhere, he maintained a very warm and human manner. He thoroughly enjoyed a good argument, purely for the sake of argument. He was never happier than when he had an opportuity to stimulate the thinking of younger and less experienced men. He could—and did take both victory and defeat with good grace. He was a man utterly without malice, a man of wit and humor, a man of sympathy and broad understanding.

His passing leaves a void not easily filled.

Arming To Disarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, there are now almost 60 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle for the President's bill to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

These people have been joined by an impressive list of distinguished people who have supported the bill. Heading the list is President Eisenhower and it includes most of the people connected with disarmament negotiations since the Second World War. Equally important is the fact that leaders of the Defense Department from the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations have given solid backing to this Disarmament Agency bill.

There is a great need to pass the bill to set up this new Agency this fall before the coming debates on disarmament. Although some have questioned the wisdom of planning for disarmament now during the Berlin crisis, I think the following editorial from the August 17 New York Times makes it perfectly clear why we must now arm to disarm:

ARMING TO DISARM

Despite the new armament race precipitated by the Moscow-made Berlin crisis, the Kennedy administration urges Congress, with wide bipartisan support, to create a new Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. If that seems ironic at this moment, the irony lies not in the goals enumerated in the agency's very name—that is, to state them in a different order, world peace, security, disarmament. These goals are now questions of life or death for all mankind.

The irony is rather that this new project must be launched in the face, even because of, the new menace emanating from Moscow, where a dictator hurls boastful threats of atomic annihilation against all standing in his way. This menace must be and is being met by increased Western armament designed not to wage war if we can help it but to maintain a balance of power adequate to deter reckless Soviet adventures and prepare the ground for disarmament.

For this menace cannot alter our basic policies and principles which aim, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war." The Berlin crisis can only give new impetus to our longstanding efforts to reach that goal, and the new agency would be both a new proof of our sincerity and a valuable instrument.

Its purpose is to make broad-gaged studies of the complex political, technical, and scientific problems involved in the three goals mentioned, to prepare new disarmament plans and to conduct disarmament negotiations with other nations. It is to be a semi-autonomous body of experts whose director would work under the overall direction of the President and, in matters of foreign policy, under the direction of the Secretary of State.

A good foundation for the agency's work is already being prepared by John J. McCloy, the President's disarmament adviser, in the shape of a new "far-reaching and comprehensive" disarmament plan. But the first task of the agency would be, as it is of the Government now, to break the deadlock on a nuclear test ban and general disarmament, on both of which the Soviets still seek to dictate their own terms in order to escape the first condition of any disarmament with security—namely, effective control.

But the Berlin crisis has again demonstrated that disarmament cannot be accomplished in a vacuum, that before it can even begin there must be at least a lessening of international tensions, and that after this it must go hand in hand with a peaceful solution of the world's major political problems. Disarmament is possible only in a world where peace prevails on the basis of just peace settlements, where the sanctity of international agreements, treaties and laws is respected, and where an international police force exists adequate to check any aggressor. That goal is still distant but not so distant as to warrant lack of effort to reach it.

Let's Get Serious About Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, our civil defense efforts have been allowed to putter along for a dangerously long time. This has been reflected not only in public apathy, but also in the half-hearted attempts which have been made in planning and preparation in many areas. Capitol Hill, itself, is a clear example of the present program's inadequacy. For although we have very loud civil defense sirens to warn us of an attack, we have only poorly marked, temporary shelters with no provisions for food, communications, or first aid. With the Capitol Building itself so ill prepared, we cannot but question the ability of the Nation to survive a nuclear attack. The Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, in an editorial dated August 13, 1961, offers opinions which are encouraging in their awareness of the situation and in their desire to see something done about it. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. Civil defense, perhaps more than ever before, demands as much of our attention as does any other part of our overall defense considerations.

The editorial follows:

LET'S GET SERIOUS ABOUT CIVIL DEFENSE

The Berlin crisis and Premier Khrushchev's boast that Russia can produce a nuclear bomb of 100 megatons that could be dropped with accuracy by intercontinental ballistic missiles on virtually any spot in the world, have sharply accelerated American interest in civil defense.

For years following World War II, the Federal Government, States, and local units of government have maintained some semblance of civil defense organizations but public apathy made the civil defense task quite futile.

This indifference stemmed from a number of factors. First and foremost was the general attitude that the danger of nuclear warfare was virtually nil. Then there was the belief of many that if nuclear warfare did come, millions of Americans in the impact areas would be wiped out anyway, no matter what civil defense precautions they might have taken. And finally, the Office of Civil Defense compounded the confusion by determining that only massive evacuation in metropolitan areas could serve any useful civil defense purpose.

This determination virtually negated the effectiveness of the Office of Civil Defense because Americans generally recognized that it would be impossible for hundreds of thousands, even millions, of persons to evacuate a metropolitan area within the very few minutes of warning time possible in the event of an approaching nuclear attack. The Office of Civil Defense plan was so ludicrous that it had residents of one metropolitan area headed for a second community while the residents of the second community were headed for the first. After that bungle almost everything that the Office of Civil Defense said or did was completely discounted by the American public.

But now the problem is becoming more real. The danger of nuclear attack mounts with the increased tension in the Berlin crisis.

Russia is not lackadaisical about civil defense. The Soviets, in fact, have trained millions of citizens in civil defense techniques and the Kremlin has constructed vast underground shelters to protect millions of its people from nuclear destruction. It is quite evident that Russia regards seriously the possibility of nuclear war. This should be of extreme significance to Americans because we know—and presumably the Communists also know—that there will be no nuclear attack unless they start it.

Just as a strong defense system serves as a deterrent to war, establishment of a strong civil defense system in this country likewise can serve as a deterrent to nuclear attack.

There are many problems in civil defense to which little thought has been given in this country. Communications facilities, for instance. Overhead telephone and power lines would be wiped out in a nuclear blast. But underground facilities probably could be maintained intact.

Survival shelters in every home are urged by the Office of Civil Defense but it might be far more practical, from a humanitarian and morale standpoint, if neighborhood shelters were created. If a nuclear attack occured at a time when families were separated, a housewife at home alone would not be likely to remain in a survival shelter for several weeks wondering what had happened to her husband and children. This is a time when companionship is as important as food. Neighborhood shelters perhaps could be provided with communication facilities to a central information headquarters that would serve to alleviate this problem.

In any case, there are definite indications that the public complacency in civil defense is dissipating. Once the American people take civil defense seriously enough, a big step forward will have been taken in the grim business of assuring human survival in this nuclear age.

Brief Notes on the B-70 Bomber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the B–70 is a large airplane in the range of a 707 or DC–8 airliner. It is designed to replace the slower, lower-flying B–52 as the basic backbone of the Strategic Air Command—SAC.

Its function is to deliver nuclear or thermonuclear bombs over any Russian city or other military target as a retaliatory or offensive measure. The size of the bomb bay permits the use of conventional bombs.

Its range is intercontinental. It can take off from the United States and fly nonstop to any Russian target. Current policy of SAC, of course, is to have loaded bombers in the air at all times—refuelling at the SAC bases surrounding Russia. Its speed will be 2,000 miles per hour. This speed is faster than the speed of a high-powered rifle bullet. The flying time from Los Angeles to New York would be 1 hour and 40 minutes. It would fly at 70,000-feet altitude which places it above the capabilities of conventional weapons. It is powered by six new-type high-thrust jet engines. It has a crew of four—pilot, copilot, bombardier, navigator and defense operator. The crew cabin is pressurized and no protective clothing is required of the crew. It has a highly sophisticated bombing and navigation system which utilizes star tracking for position and search radar for identifying the target.

Methods are employed to jam or confuse enemy radar seeking to locate the plane. It will employ decoys to lead antiaircraft missiles away from the bomber. The bomber does not depend on any fighter support. Defensive measures are effective for a single aircraft—effectiveness increases with the number of aircraft. Speed alone is defensive—if it takes 2 minutes to identify and locate the bomber, it is 60 miles closer to target before a weapon is fired.

A manned bomber has the following advantages over intercontinental ballistic missiles:

First. Better accuracy as man can sight directly on target and correct all accumulated navigation errors.

Second. It can be recalled after starting the mission.

Third. With SAC planes airborne at all times, it will be impossible to destroy a sizable portion of the planes "on the ground" in an initial attack.

Fourth. Certain operational failures can be corrected by the crew in flight.

Fifth. Flexibility in route selection and speed, tactics, maneuverability, altitude and use of defensive measures all enhance the probability of a successful bombing on target.

Sixth. Bombers could be a very effective "show-of-force" in the event of extremely critical situations. B–70's could be circling targets within 3 hours of notification.

Seventh. Manned aircraft have reconnaissance and surveillance capability.

STATUS

The current contract calls for the building of three planes without many of the electronic systems such as the bomb-nav and defense systems.

The parts for the first ship are now being built and the assembly departments have been set up and are operating.

Incidentally, the B–70 is currently the only new plane under development by the USAF at this time.

FUTURE

First. The B–70 configuration could easily grow into a mach 3—2,000 miles per hour—commercial passenger transport.

Second. Nuclear engines could be added when available to increase the range and length of sustained flight of the B–70.

Third. The B–70 could be used as a recoverable booster for space launches.

The Loyal Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are considering the au-

thorization for the Agency for International Development and charges and counter-charges are made as to political positions, it seems to me that we might well consider the advice of Stephen R. Graubard, of Harvard's History Department, which was issued on November 18, 1960, defining the position of "The Loyal Opposition":

THE LOYAL OPPOSITION—ITS DUTY IS TO CRITICIZE, AND NO PLEA OF STATE INTEREST CAN RELIEVE IT OF ITS FIRST OBLIGATION

(By Stephen R. Graubard)

In December 1945 Winston Churchill rose in the House of Commons to move a vote of censure against the Labor Government. It was with no rancor, but with a sense of fulfilling an obligation, that he said: "The Government reproach us with making their task more difficult, but what do they expect? Can we, with our convictions, as honorable men, as a great party in the state, afford, for the sake of appearances of unity, to acquiesce in a destructive downward trend in all our affairs at home and abroad? Are we not bound in honor to give our warnings in good time about the future, and to record our censure on the present? Would we not be blameworthy before history if we sat supine and silent, while one folly and neglect is piled on top of another, and much that we fought for together is lost or frittered away? The only excuse for silence and inaction would be despair, and despair is not to be tolerated among Britons."

Is one being unfair to American politicians if one suggests that our principal lack in the last 15 years has been a voice of comparable wisdom? We are all painfully aware that there has been no Churchill among us, that we have heard little in ghost-written speeches to compare with the dignity of his "bound in honor to give our warnings in good time about the future." What is less apparent, however, is that our political leaders, provided with many of the same opportunities that Churchill enjoyed in opposition, have scarcely known what to do with their power. Churchill's words are significant—the opposition's duty is to oppose, to criticize, to warn, and no plea of state interest can relieve it of its obligation. Honor is more important than appearance, and the bar of history may be expected to pronounce judgment when yesterday's newspapers are moldering in dark cellars. Churchill has nothing to say for bipartisanship, that famous American remedy, which is offered as a political elixir, providing strength, but which too frequently acts as a soporific, inducing sleep.

Those who would defend the American achievement in the last 15 years will reply that the British experience has no relevance to our situation, and that what is possible in the House of Commons, with an institutionalized loyal opposition and a Cabinet system, has little import for us. To assert this is to miss the whole point of Churchill's argument. Opposition came naturally to him, not because he was contentious, but because he believed the Conservative Party would one day soon again hold power, and he had no intention of entering upon a reduced inheritance. He took it for granted that when the Government acted rightly (by his own lights), he would offer his congratulations, but this implied that a wrong or insufficient act would call forth the opposite response—a stern rebuke. Churchill cared not at all what others might think or say; a government which was left uncriticized would grow soft and, in time, betray those higher interests which it was commissioned to serve. Opposition was not a luxury, to be occasionally indulged in, but a necessity—it was the one incontestable advantage which free government offered proud, independent, and responsible men.

In the United States, since 1945, the Democrats and the Republicans have been out of power for almost precisely equal periods of time. What can be said of the record of either party in opposition? Which Republican, from 1945 to 1952, in the Senate, on the radio, in the press, ever made a speech of such prescience that we feel he speaks to our situation today? Who in the opposition corrected the President and provided guidance for an alternative policy? Where was the mind which soared over the cliche, avoided the obvious, and gave direction, let alone information? Is one being unkind when, in reading the encomia awarded Senator Vandenberg for his brilliant statesmanship, one stops to ask what all the excitement was about? Even Robert Taft's enemies remarked on his intelligence, but to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this period is to wonder whether the senior Senator from Ohio understood the dangers that were abroad in the world when Stalin sat in the Kremlin.

The Democratic Party's achievements in opposition—between 1952 and 1960—are no more impressive. For all of the criticism of John Foster Dulles, there was not a single Democrat who succeeded in developing, asserting, and communicating a coherent foreign policy different from his. As for understanding the significance of Russia's atomic achievements, the East Berlin rising, the Suez fiasco, the Hungarian Revolution, not to speak of developments in Japan, China, Egypt, Cuba, and the Congo, there was not much to choose between Democratic policy and that of the Eisenhower administration. Attacking the "brinkmanship" of Dulles or the vacuous staff-produced speeches of his Chief was really no substitute for the effort which might have been made. Television—in common with all the other mass media—stood ready to report whatever the Democrats invented, but the image, if it appeared at all, was hopelessly blurred.

In this 1960 election campaign, both candidates were pledged to a debate on foreign policy issues. But how can such a discussion be initiated before klieg lights when for 15 years the voices on both sides have been confused and inaudible? Who could recall in October 1960 the great debate of 1957, let alone 1954? Like last year's advertising copy, they were irretrievably lost. What could Mr. Nixon do but maintain the Eisenhower myth that all went well with the Nation, that our alliances were strong, our defenses impregnable, and our future secure? What could Mr. Kennedy say but that the Republicans, in their pennypinching penury, have starved our defenses and denied aid to those who remain uncommitted, and who might otherwise be our friends? As if money—in any amount—could have solved our problems and obliterated the fact that we were impregnable in 1945, that such is no longer our situation, that our stock in the world is declining, and that it is not only Communist propaganda that accounts for our losses. The debate could not be on the issues, for we scarcely knew what they were. We had been left uninstructed; our citizens in New York were no more sensitive to the currents that pass through the world than those living in Sioux City.

A new President will be installed in the White House on January 20. Youth will then take over from age, and editorials will herald the day as the start of a new epoch (in the 20th century, there is a new epoch every 8 years). That the new Chief Executive will be energetic there is every reason to believe. But what about the loser—or, more precisely, the losers? What will they do? Simply wait, with confidence or without it, for 1964? Is time so cheap that its patience can never be tried? Or will somebody among the defeated, dimly aware of the hazards of our time, seize the opportunity to form what we have lacked for so long—an effective and articulate opposition? If a model is required, let it be sought in the career of that Englishman, who, having served his country in war for 5 years and 3 months, was, in August 1945, in his own words, "immediately dismissed by the British electorate from all further conduct of their affairs."

A study of Churchill in opposition cannot fail to be instructive to anyone contemplating an analogous (and, hopefully, equally temporary) career for himself. If ever there was a man who might have been forgiven for recalling his warnings of the past, and dwelling on them, it was Churchill in 1945, but he disdained so easy a role. Perhaps recalling Edmund Burke's contempt for "retrospective wisdom," he scorned the crutch that lay at hand, and addressed himself to the problems of the moment.

The American who leads the opposition in 1961 would do well to forget 1945–60. To know today what one should have done 5 years ago is relatively easy, and this is not a road which a responsible man travels. It is not important that the opposition have many ideas—a great mind or a great party is seldom burdened with many—but it is essential that it have some, that these be persisted in, and that they be communicated. These ideas cannot be the ideas of the crowd; keeping one's ear to the ground is insurance for hearing nothing.

Nor should the opposition look to others to define the issues; that is its own responsibility. Churchill's ideas were not invented by the Times or by the Observer; even less were they the work of experts called in at a moment of crisis. The opposition must not imagine that being denied "secret Government data" is an impediment; Churchill, in October 1945, spoke of no longer having "the power to 'press the button' and obtain the exact information on any point," but he stated this as a fact, not as an excuse. The opposition must learn how to give warning, not in order to frighten, but to instruct. Free from the daily housekeeping responsibilities of government, it enjoys precisely the distance necessary to accurate observation. Since much of what it will say will be new, it expects to be outrageously treated. Few newspapers and fewer statesmen congratulated Churchill in 1946 for his Fulton, Mo., speech. Churchill recited facts known to informed people, but the notion that an Iron Curtain had descended across the Continent proved unpalatable to many who believed that Stalin's only interest was to protect Europe against a revived Germany. Churchill did not think the Russians wanted war; they simply wanted "the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines." These words seem scarcely excessive in 1960; in 1946 they were sufficient to cause certain journalists to recall Churchill's "warmongering past" and to cite for their readers his reputation for "Russophobia."

Churchill knew in 1946 that the Russian power was at its nadir, but he did not long expect it to remain so. It was for this reason that he recommended an immediate peace with the Soviets. "What is needed," he said at Westminster College, "is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become." The Russians, admiring strength, would not long suffer their military inferiority; when their situation improved, they would be even less amenable to persuasion. Why should Churchill have been able to see this when so many "experts" argued differently?

The answer, in part, is contained in a speech which Churchill gave at the University of Miami in February 1946 where he said: "Expert knowledge, however indispensable, is no substitute for a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story with all its sadness and with all

its unquenchable hope." Churchill's understanding came not from years of experience in British Cabinets; a dozen other politicians might have claimed the same distinction. Nor did it come from his being a foreign affairs or a military affairs specialist. It derived from his study of history, his constant reflection about the world in which he lived, and his willingness to be moved and angered by it. Churchill's realism reflected neither hardness nor coolness but a deeply felt sympathy. It was he who urged "magnanimity" on the victors, and spoke with shock of what the Poles were doing in Germany, where millions of Germans were expelled "on a scale grievous and unheard of." These were facts available to any American or European who chose to inform himself. Indifference, even more than fear, suggested that they be ignored.

If the opposition that forms in 1961 is to be effective, it must look not only to the present but also to the future. In a revolutionary age, when change is in the saddle, men are often disposed to wait and see. Such is a fatal tactic, for it can only lead to perpetual surprise. Today, as in the past, the great man seeks to preserve that which is worth maintaining, and to reform that which will no longer serve. It is not self-evident which institutions and forms fall into either category, but decision on such matters is essential.

Churchill, speaking in Zurich to a university audience, said in 1946: "I am now going to say something that will astonish you. The first step in the re-creation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany. There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany." At a moment when German factories were being dismantled and war criminals hanged, Churchill looked to the day when both would end and a new Europe arise. What American, in opposition, has ever spoken with equal prescience? Is this a standard which we cannot hope to attain? Or is it possible that in 1961 someone will emerge capable of speaking as much to our problems as Churchill did to those of his day when he said: "At present there is a breathing space. In these present days we dwell strangely and precariously under the shield and protection of the atomic bomb. The atomic bomb is still only in the hands of a state and nation which we know will never use it except in the cause of right and freedom. But it may well be that in a few years this awful agency of destruction will be widespread and the catastrophe following from its use by several warring nations will not only bring to an end all that we call civilization, but may possibly disintegrate the globe itself."

The task which confronts the opposition in 1961 is clear—to give instruction to a society which feels itself imperilled. If the United States is to survive, and check those who would destroy it, the world must be presented as it is, and not as our romantic or parochial intelligence would wish it to be. To grasp facts—however unpalatable—and to make the sacrifice they indicate is a first requirement. Sacrifice, however, must be thought of in other than dollar terms, or the world will take the United States for what the Russians claim it to be.

The importance of time—of the moment—must be recognized. Tomorrow is too late for most things. The mistakes of 1945–60 cannot be undone in many instances, but new ones, of comparable gravity, need not be made. Some attempt must be made at prophecy, since to live only in the present is to live as no wise man does, and as no nation can. History must form part of the American education or sight will be lost of that tragic component in life without which no sense of urgency is possible. The opposition must press for actions that are humane and generous, while understanding that sentimentality is a snare and weakness a sin. Pride should be encouraged in those things which do us honor, but no effort should be spared in correcting those things which we know to be wrong. The United States must be just, to itself, to its friends, but also to its enemies. It must seek the respect of other nations, understanding it to be the basis of enduring friendship; it can never be taken for granted. There must be no patronizing of others, lest we be guilty of the worst sin of all, which is self-delusion.

Any man able to form an opposition dedicated to these ends may not be President in 1964, but of him, a future historian may wish to say: "He deserved well of the Republic."

The Castro Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, while our attention is focused on Berlin, we cannot allow our vision to become blurred about what is on our doorstep. The Lansing (Mich.) State Journal in an editorial on August 12, 1961, reminds us of some aspects that need to be considered with regard to Castro which, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make available to my colleagues as I feel it contains views which are both timely and pertinent.

The editorial follows:

THE CASTRO CANCER

Many Americans have long suspected that the billions of dollars this country has poured into foreign aid in the postwar era failed miserably to buy substantial friendship for this country.

These suspicions are confirmed by a former vice president of the Cuban federal reserve system, Alberto Gandero, who told Lansing service club members this week that "the United States is throwing away billions of dollars and not gaining a friend."

Moreover, according to Gandero, more Latin American countries are certain to turn to communism unless the United States assumes leadership in driving Fidel Castro out of power in Cuba, no matter how much money the United States gives to Latin American countries in foreign aid.

It is understandable that a man who lost his personal possessions in Cuba to the Castro regime would be bitter about the whole deal. This may account, in part, for his placing most of the blame on the United States for the Castro revolution.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Government obviously did misjudge Castro and failed to recognize his Communist connections, despite the fact that official governmental dossiers on Castro contained rather convincing evidence that the bearded Cuban revolutionary leader was, in fact, a tool of the Communist international conspiracy.

Gandero says that he personally knew Castro before the overthrow of the Batista government and that he also knew Castro was a Communist. Further, he said, this information was given to the U.S. State Department which refused to heed the warnings. He made serious and specific charges against a State Department official in charge of Caribbean affairs at the time of the Castro revolution.

Recriminations, however, are of no value now. Castro is in the saddle. He is a threat to the United States and he is fomenting Communist revolts in other Latin American countries.

Cuba's powerful radio stations, beamed to Latin American countries, are pouring out scurrilous attacks upon the United States. The United States is meeting this vicious propaganda barrage with a part-time punch-pulling effort.

The "Voice of America" programs beamed to Latin America are operating on only a 4-hour basis, in contrast to the unceasing round-the-clock radio campaign conducted by Castro.

Congress has failed so far, Gandero emphasized, to appropriate the extra $2 million required to double our radio broadcasts to Latin America. The $2 million undoubtedly would be far more important to the United States than some of the hundreds of millions the United States is prepared to commit in direct foreign aid to Latin American governments.

And the commitment of additional funds for effective programs aimed at the elimination of the Castro cancer in the Western Hemisphere will be of greater benefit than direct handouts, not only to the Latin American countries but to the entire free world as well.

Project Apollo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Monday I visited the headquarters of Project Mercury at Langley Field, Va., which was the management center for this Nation's first ventures into manned space flight—the historic suborbital journeys of Commander Shepard and Captain Grissom.

My interest in operations at Langley was stimulated by two newspaper articles which appeared over the weekend. The first, in Saturday's Boston Herald, called attention to the fact that the city of Fall River and town of Hingham, both in my district, are among several locations in Massachusetts under consideration by the Massachusetts Citizens Committee for the location of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Project Apollo research and development command center, a proposed $60 million installation. It has been brought to my attention more recently that the port city of New Bedford is also qualified and interested in consideration as a site for the space project. The second article, on the front page of the New York Times the following day, was a somewhat critical account of developments in our space program during the 3 months that have elapsed since the President issued his dramatic call for a race to the moon. It was titled, "Capital Worried by Lags in Plans on Race to Moon."

My trip to Langley was necessarily brief, but worthwhile, as I can report that I am satisfied Project Apollo is moving ahead rapidly and without unnecessary delay. I was tremendously impressed with what I saw at Langley Field and with the director of the Space

Task Group, Robert Gilruth, and other project officials I met there. The public should be assured we are making real progress in the space race.

As an example, I learned that bids have already been invited on the moonshot's multimanned spacecraft, the highly advanced vehicle that will carry three men to the moon, land them and return them safely to earth. Specifications are the result of 18 months of painstaking research and hard study within the NASA family.

The advanced planning for this massive national adventure was carried out, I might add, during a period when NASA—still less than 3 years old—was conducting experiments with earth satellites, space probes, sounding rockets and, of course, the two successful Mercury-Redstone firings. Thus far during the calendar year 1961, NASA has recorded an average of one major experiment a month in its manned-flight program.

Before Project Apollo can move into its next phase, however, it is necessary that the site for its command post be selected. Special NASA study groups are now preparing final basic site criteria. From available preliminary information, it is obvious that several communities in Massachusetts are superbly suited to serve and house such a headquarters.

It is important that we realize this national goal of putting an American manned space vehicle on the moon will not only require the talents and technical know-how of thousands of scientists and engineers, but the aggregate resources of our industrial and academic communities. Massachusetts is proud of the role that its industrial, technical and educational institutions have played and are now playing in this country's space program and in particular Projects Mercury and Apollo. Much of the navigational and guidance systems, for the lunar project, for example, will be developed at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, while study contracts for portions of Project Apollo have been awarded to Lincoln Laboratories in Massachusetts.

Because of its complex of specialized electronics and other highly technical industries, its outstanding educational facilities and availability of skilled manpower, plus an elaborate rail, air and sea transportation network, Massachusetts is equipped to contribute to an extraordinary degree to the success of our race to the moon.

Blockade of Cuba Advocated by National Commander of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Blockade Cuban, Legion Chief Says," published in the Roanoke (Va.) Times of Sunday, August 13, 1961. The article contains an account of a speech delivered by William R. Burke, National Commander of the American Legion, in which he discussed action which should be taken with respect to Cuba.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCKADE CUBA, LEGION CHIEF SAYS

(By Robert B. Sears, Times staff writer)

The United States should apply more rigid economic sanctions against Cuba and institute a military blockade of the island, William R. Burke, national commander of the American Legion, said in an interview in Roanoke Saturday.

Burke, a Los Angeles public relations man, flew into Roanoke to address the Virginia American Legion at its 43d annual convention at Hotel Roanoke. He will speak Sunday morning at 10 on the final day of the convention.

Trade with Cuba still amounts to $40 million a year, Burke said, and it should be drastically cut.

The United States, Burke said, has "every military and legal right to institute a naval and air blockade to make sure arms and munitions of war do not funnel into South America through Cuba."

There is no way Russia could effectively support Cuba in military action against the United States, short of pushing the button for all-out nuclear war, Burke said.

"I don't think Khrushchev is going to go to nuclear war to save Cuba," he added.

But Russia would not hesitate to start a nuclear war, Burke said, if and when she is convinced she can win.

Russia would do this, he continued, even at the risk of suffering great losses herself.

He said that in his opinion, Russia would be perfectly willing to take a loss of 2 million Russians killed, if at the same time she could destroy 60 million Americans.

Russia suffered 25 million casualties in World War II, he noted, and did not hesitate to destroy 16 to 20 million of her own people in establishing the present Soviet regime.

Russia has also prepared herself for nuclear war in a way the United States has not, Burke said, by instructing Russians how to protect themselves against blast and fallout.

On the issue of Berlin's independence, Burke is convinced the 15 nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will stand firm against Russia.

But, he added, "to a varying degree."

France, he pointed out, is taking a firm position, feeling that nothing can be gained by negotiation.

Britain, he added, is more inclined to negotiate, but will probably stand firm in any showdown.

Burke said the two U.S. battle groups in Berlin are determined to stand up to Russia, as, indeed, are most West Germans.

The Soviet Union and other Communist nations in the Warsaw Pact, in a directive issued to East Germany early Sunday, demanded a "reliable watch and an effective control" around West Berlin—including the border between East and West Berlin. The directive was published by the East German news agency ADN.

The closing of the border at Brandenburg Gate was the first action in response to the Warsaw Pact statement.

The East Germans, through propaganda measures and augmented police controls on refugee routes leading to Berlin, have been trying for weeks to stem the high tide of East German refugees reaching West Berlin.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev's drumfire of demands apparently has stimulated fear among the people that the Berlin escape hatch would be closed.

But the Communists for some reason have been reluctant to apply iron controls to seal West Berlin's borders, and the refugee flow Saturday may have reached the 3,000 mark—the biggest in any single day since the 1953 revolt.

The Warsaw Pact statement finally calling for the border closing, said the control measures should not affect traffic arrangements between West Berlin and West Germany.

Such traffic is now controlled largely by the East German Communists. United States, British, and French military traffic, and civilian air traffic, is under control of those three powers and the Soviet Union, however.

The Communist appeal to throw a ring around West Berlin came after a flow of refugees into the divided city that may have hit the 3,000 mark, the biggest single day in 8 years.

It's Time for United States To Seize Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Edith Kermit Roosevelt which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger of Sunday, August 13, 1961.

The indicated column follows:

IT'S TIME FOR UNITED STATES TO SEIZE INITIATIVE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

The Communists have conditioned the free world to accept certain quaint ground rules for fighting the cold war. They have split the world into war and peace zones. Under the Communist rules, Soviet allies and captive nations lie in the "peace" zone and the Reds forbid any forays onto their own territory. At the same time, all non-Communist territory is labeled the "war zone" where Communists have full right to indulge in propaganda, demonstrations, economic sabotage, spying, political murder, and finally "wars of liberation" supported by Communist-armed technicians and volunteers. Examples are Laos, South Vietnam, the Congo and now Latin America.

Surely, the time has come to halt this double standard which has allowed the Reds to increase control over from 3 to 33 percent of the world's population since World War II.

This could be done if President Kennedy were to declare the entire Western Hemisphere to be a "peace zone" with all Communist war material, including fuel, declared contraband.

As part of this declaration, it could be made clear that the United States will not tolerate guerrilla invasions and power seizures of other Latin American countries by Cuban or other Communist forces.

At the same time, the United States should actively support anti-Castro political groups and beam effective "truth programs" to Cuba.

A report issued August 9 by the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council analyzes the contraband proposal as follows:

"A patrol aircraft would spot an Iron Curtain ship headed for Cuba and a U.S. destroyer would be dispatched for a search. If contraband were found the ship would be warned to turn around. If she refused or tried to proceed the destroyer would either board her and jettison the contraband or bring her into a U.S. port to have confiscation adjudged."

The advantage of this enforcement procedure is that it would be entirely peaceful because legitimate peaceful trade would not be blocked.

Would we risk war by a declaration of contraband?

Soviet Russia would be forcing Iron Curtain arms and munitions of war into peaceful waters of the Western Hemisphere, a move unjustified from a propaganda standpoint and not easly defended by force.

U.S. seapower in effect encircles Cuba already. Soviet Russia's nearest naval base is 4,968 nautical miles from Cuba—and all other Polish, East German and Albanian ports which could be used for bases are equally distant.

The advantage of a "declaration of contraband" over the more warlike concept of "blockade" is that only a few destroyer and patrol aircraft would be needed to halt further shipment of Iron Curtain arms to Cuba and transport of thousands of tons of arms already there to other Latin nations.

Such a declaration is far removed from the character of armed intervention or invasion since it does not try to operate inside the sovereign territory of any country nor to interfere in the internal affairs of any Latin American nation.

The policy would merely continue the most durable tradition in American diplomacy—the Monroe Doctrine.

Only one technicality stands in the way, according to Loyd Wright, chairman of the National Strategy Committee and president of the International Bar Association.

"In ages past, declarations of contraband, with the attendant right of visit and search of vessels for enforcement, were recognized only if a state of 'belligerency' existed."

But this technicality could be met by a realistic recognition of the present de facto state of belligerency.

The Communists have forced us into their new type of war called peace.

The Moscow Communist manifesto of November-December 1960 and Soviet Premier Khrushchev's speech of January 6 amount to a creation of a state of belligerency aimed at the destruction of all non-Communist governments as well as those in the Americas.

To avoid a missile war, we must seize the initiative in the peace war before it is too late.

Progress at Cape Canaveral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Progress at Cape Canaveral," published in the Orlando Sentinel of Thursday, August 3, 1961. I commend a reading of the editorial to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS AT CAPE CANAVERAL

With the disclosures of the McClellan Senate investigating committee still ringing in our ears, some of us may have the feeling that in a missile showdown with Russia we'd come out second best, if we'd come out at all.

After a minute inspection of the Air Force Missile Test Center at Cape Canaveral, we'd say the U.S. missile program is ahead of Russia's in many respects, and catching up fast in others.

NASA is almost ready to orbit first a monkey, then a man; it will be ready within a couple of months to fire the Saturn, a 350 foot behemoth with which we hope to be able to hit the moon.

We're almost ready to put a stationary platform in space; we will soon launch some stationary satellites to be used for worldwide telphonic and TV communication; and militarily we're equal to Russia today.

Our shining Atlas can be fired with such precision it could hit Mr. Khrushchev's house in Moscow if it were so aimed.

EXPANSION DUE

The United States has $1 billion invested in the sand and palmetto neck of land which for more than a century has been known as Cape Canaveral.

Under the President's stepped-up defense program the cape will be expanded even more.

The biggest mission confronting U.S. space technologists today is that trip to the moon which it is estimated will cost $20 to $40 billion and require a preparation of possibly 10 years.

There is some question now whether this attempt will be made from the cape or one of the other missile bases. The cape is ready to do the job and is more favorably located—being on the Atlantic Ocean, the boxcar size boosters needed for the moon trip would fall harmlessly into water instead of on land, as might be the case if the huge missile were fired from California or New Mexico.

All bases would like the opportunity to handle this important assignment, of course, but since the cape is the logical site, if there is any concerted move to deprive us of this opportunity we think our Florida delegation in Washington should speak up.

WORKERS COOPERATE

Labor problems, subject of the recent McClellan hearings, appear to have been solved at the cape for the present. Workers have agreed to a no-strike, no-lockout pledge.

The official view, as expressed by Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, who was at the cape this week, is that the pledge is working well.

As a newspaper interested in the welfare of this country, the Sentinel has been highly critical of work stoppages, strikes, and lockouts at the cape. But now that they have apparently ceased we want to be just as complimentary to the 20,000 or so dedicated civilian workers whose contribution to our struggle with Russia will be to stay on the job.

Cape commanders today have not only the facilities of the Labor Department to deal with unauthorized work stoppages, but also those of the State of Florida. Gov. Farris Bryant conferred with cape commander, Gen. L. I. Davis, recently and pledged the resources of his office, if needed.

Governor Bryant was undoubtedly talking about Florida's historic right-to-work law which provides that a worker may or may not join a union, but that union membership is not necessary for him to hold a job in Florida.

SECURITY OK

The matter of security at the cape also came up at the McClellan hearings. One Senator said he would not make the charge there are Communists at the cape, but he said security is so lax he would not be surprised at some infiltration.

Information supplied us by Gen. Harry J. Sands, Jr., vice commander of the cape, is that some security clearance is necessary even for ditchdiggers.

The only people who need no clearance are the occasional visitors and they're not allowed to travel far, or see much on the cape.

Multiple clearance is required for many workers. That is, a worker on the Atlas complex, for example, cannot enter the Polaris complex and so on. Some workers are cleared for all areas but in general an employee must stay within his assigned bailiwick. Armed guards see to that.

Mutual Security: H.R. 8400

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against H.R. 8400 for several reasons.

First, according to the uncontroverted figures the Department now has over $5½ billion unexpended, a large part of which is unallocated. At a time when defense and domestic spending is at an all-time high, this is enough to provide necessary assistance to friendly needy countries.

Second, this bill gives to the President power, authority, and control that no head of any free nation should be given. It was demonstrated this week that long-term authority is not needed. Without this authority Secretary Dillon signed a 10-year contract in South America.

Third, it has been admitted on the floor of this House a dozen times that foreign aid dare not be stopped because 80 percent of it will be spent in the United States creating jobs and business opportunities and preventing unemployment. If it is intended as depressed-area legislation let us name it "depressed-area legislation" and not attempt to give the idea that it is a program to assist friendly foreign countries.

Fourth, the program to date has not been a success. No one denies the wanton waste, mismanagement and failures occasioned by bureaucrats who many times are more interested in making a record than in making a friend.

Fifth, How can the United States hope to make friends by attempting to force its so-called democratic form of government on other peoples when those same peoples can see that our form of government is no longer democratic but socialistic and those people do not want that any more than they want communism?

Sixth, I believe it is time that we quit apologizing for being a capitalist nation. Offer capitalism an opportunity in these low-income countries not through Government doles, but through guarantees that the might of the United States will protect their properties from confisca-

tion. It is capitalism that built this Nation and will continue to build it if it is not plowed under by the spenders, wasters, and "welfare staters."

Our money doled out through local governments, which simply build strong centralized governments stronger, will not raise the standard of living in these countries any more than this same program has raised the standard of living on the Indian reservations of this country. Both follow the same pattern of sordid failure.

When we start backing up our capitalistic form of government in other countries, with the same enthusiasm the Communists back up their system, then we will begin to have a foreign policy which means something and which will accomplish the purpose this dole program is supposed to accomplish.

I am just as proud of what our industry has done for these countries and what it can do, if it is not fenced in, as any Russian is of what he has done for these countries, yet we do not seem to support these advances by Government activities and protection.

Do we really believe in capitalism or do we just tolerate it so we can milk it and pour the cream down the Socialist rat holes of the world?

The Civilized Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the reaction to recent hijacking events has done much to illuminate the frayed nerves of the Nation and the Congress. Sharply contrasting with this, the President has set a standard of prudence and thoughtfulness which should be looked up to by every American.

Both Houses of Congress have demonstrated a strange view of the way civilized nations should act under adversity. In the House, a number of Members have called for speedy and—as circumstances have shown—rash military action against Cuba. On the Senate side, a bill has now been passed which provides the death penalty for airplane hijackers.

I would like to suggest that the President's example of carefulness is a direct criticism of our own hasty acts. In the same vein, many States have already implicity criticized the Senate's action. Wisconsin and other States long ago concluded that the death penalty is no longer a useful or just weapon of the State. To institute it on the national level for the theft of airplanes in flight seems to me a great national step backward.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an editorial from the August 11, 1961, Capital Times. This editorial, critical as it is of the Congress, suggests that a civilized nation should think twice before taking hasty action internationally. I would extend its message to suggest that the Congress should think at least once again before increasing the number of legal killings. In a world in which we are trying to uphold the rule of law, we would do well to uphold the fundamental assumptions of the civilized approach to law: attention to facts, prudence, and thoughtful action.

The editorial follows:

HOTHEADED CONGRESS MEMBERS AGAIN MAKE CASTRO LOOK GOOD

Congress behaved characteristically over the most recent airplane hijacking, illustrating again that if there is anything more dangerous abroad today than the unbalanced hijackers it is trigger-happy Members of the U.S. Congress.

Even while the Pan American plane was winging its way back to Miami on Castro's orders, Members of Congress were elbowing each other out of the way in their boiling frenzy to call for military action against Cuba.

Fortunately, President Kennedy has kept his head and insisted on getting the facts. One would think that the short-fused Members of Congress would do the same, particularly after the embarrassment of last week's popping off over the hijacking of another airliner.

Some of the editorial writers who put on their war paint last week have been trying to save face all week by lame rationalization that Castro should be blamed anyway because he started this whole hijacking business.

Four of our planes have been hijacked, of which three have been returned. Twenty-four Cuban planes have been hijacked of which 14 have been returned and 10 retained.

Does this look like Castro is to blame for this whole idiotic business?

Castro has done his share of reprehensible things. He has been well on his way toward discrediting himself with his public hysterics. But he is being made to look like a model of calm, thoughtful statesmanship by the hysterical Members of our Congress, who apparently are ignorant of the fact that anytime he wants to seize a Pan American plane he can do so by sending his police out to the Havana Airport where Pan American is maintaining regularly scheduled flights.

"Carousel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, one of my neighbors when I was living in Beverly Hills was Jan Clayton who, on Monday, will open at the Carter Barron Amphitheater in the Rogers and Hammerstein musical "Carousel."

Miss Clayton and her leading man, John Raitt, were the original stars in this musical comedy when it was first presented on Broadway some 17 years ago.

Certainly it must mean a great deal to anyone connected with the theater to be indentified with a production which almost from the time of its opening became a show business legend. But to have contributed so importantly to the making of that lengend, as Jan Clayton and John Raitt have done, is to move into that select circle of great men and women of the stage whose enduring contributions to the theater will always be remembered.

So it is that we can look forward to the Carter Barron production next week not as an opportunity for an evening of pleasant nostalgia, but rather as a wonderful opportunity to see "Carousel" as presented by two stars who have come to show us what it was like on that magic evening when this show became part of Americana.

Let's Put Our Best Foot Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the chill of the cold war cuts deeper and it is now quite clear that the United States must devote considerable thought and energy to projecting its basic concepts for friends, foes, and neutrals to see and believe. President Kennedy, from his inaugural address onward, has fervently sought to reaffirm the vitality of America; the President is determined to meet the challenge of the times with a confidence that ultimate success will obtain for our Nation and other nations of the free world.

It is ironic and tragic at this critical time in our world relations to find President Kennedy's act for international development subjected to immoderate harangues and political broadsides which are aimed to dispose with a vengeance the sound modifications in our foreign aid mechanisms thereby depriving the President and the United States of an effective weapon in the successful exercise of foreign policy. As the lead editorial in the Washington Post of August 18, 1961, reflects upon the negative action taken in the House on the foreign aid program several days ago, we are only "frustrating ourselves."

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial cited hereinabove; in addition, I include an editorial from the New York Times of July 11, 1961, and a letter by Chairman Harry J. Carman, of the American Liberal Association, which appeared in the Washington Post this date:

FRUSTRATING OURSELVES

Members of the House who voted to deny long-range foreign aid financing would be quick to rebuff the suggestion that they were handicapping the United States in the battle to safeguard and encourage free institutions. Yet, with the most patriotic motives on the part of the Members, that is he unhappy effect of the move to reject a 5-year borrowing authorization.

Since President Kennedy has invested his own prestige in an issue he considers to be of the highest importance, a sustained defeat would be the most serious political

blow the administration has suffered so far. That is a less significant consideration, however, than the effect upon the country's position in the all-encompassing struggle abroad. A defeat would undercut the President of the United States at a time when he needs every weapon he can muster in a contest that goes far, far beyond the immediate Berlin crisis.

It may be said that the tentative House vote insisting upon a 1-year authorization would not end foreign economic aid, and this is true. But the action, if sustained, would doom the program to inevitable inefficiency. It would deprive the effort of the tools it needs to make the aid really effective and to crack down upon waste and diversion.

Why did the House do what it did? No simple answer would suffice. A long congressional session is nearing the end, and tempers are frayed. Foreign aid has not been a popular issue in the lower chamber. There are many vexing frustrations—the length of the cold war, taxes, Berlin, Cuba. There are some genuine apprehensions about the misuse of aid money. Administration supporters patently underestimated the appeal of the Saund amendment. The Republican leadership seized an opportunity to capitalize upon the frustrations and embarrass the administration.

Irrespective of the reasons for the predicament that has caused so much anguish and uncertainty, the inconsistencies of the House position ought to become plain. Here is a legislative body which expresses great interest in prevention of waste rejecting the one system of fund commitment that gives promise of more leverage in eliminating waste. Opponents have been misled by a slogan—"back-door spending"—in disregard of the many successful precedents of long-range financing by borrowing from the Treasury.

Foreign aid may not be popular, but it is an altogether necessary part of this country's effort to make freedom more meaningful. The task of Members of Congress who appreciate the complexities of the crucial times in which we are living is not to judge the issue by its popularity; it is to help explain the necessity for shouldering this load along with taxes for defense. Indeed, despite the durable fictions about the great burden of foreign aid, the fact is that many of the dollars spent come back to the United States in the form of purchases, subsidies to shipping and the like.

It is paradoxical that the House will vote billions in increased military appropriations, including military aid to other countries, without a quibble. This is an area in which the likelihood of waste is at least equal to that in economic aid. Yet when legislators are asked to invest, say, a tenth of the sum spent on military defense in efforts to help others to help themselves and to create more nearly the kind of world we should like to see, many of them balk. It simply does not make sense.

Added to all of this is the political factor. It is said that the House action was the product of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition. For men in either faction acting out of conviction there can be no reproach despite the disagreement. But to the extent that the vote may have been intended to embarrass the President and the administration, it could be a boomerang.

One of the great assets of the foreign aid program is that, like most aspects of foreign policy, it has been a bipartisan effort going back to the days of the Marshall plan and Senator Vandenburg. Some 30 Republicans in the Senate supported President Eisenhower's request for long-range authority (which this newspaper also supported) in 1957. A rejection of this view now in the House would be passing strange. It would seem to put politics above the national interest, with the country's world positon the victim.

Despite some Senate cuts in the authorization and the perennial possibility of an upset, the indications are that what will emerge from the upper chamber will be a good bill, thanks to the teamwork of persons in both parties. Members of the House who may have voted in haste could well heed the reasoning put forth in the Senate. If a workable bill is to become law, at the minimum the House ought to reconsider its tentative action and provide the basis for long-range financing. Plenty of acceptable methods are available whereby Congress can insure itself of a check upon expenditures.

There are no panaceas or easy answers in the fight for freedom that extends from Berlin to the belly of the hungry child in India. Foreign aid should not be oversold as a cureall. But a move to gut the aid program with restrictions would be no more logical than a move to abandon this country's allies or cut the military budget and then get tough with Khrushchev. In their hearts Members of the House surely know this. The ultimate reason for an adequate economic aid program has nothing to do with politics. It is that the President of the United States, who is the commander in chief in the desperate long-term struggle in which the country is inevitably involved, views such aid as an imperative tool.

The Policy of Foreign Aid

Premier Khrushchev gave a new twist yesterday to a mounting crisis that goes far beyond Berlin. Congress is still dawdling, weeks behind schedule, over one of the most vital measures of our foreign and defense policies—the foreign aid bill. It sent such a measure to the White House last year by May 12. Now, with the new fiscal year already underway, the authorization bill for this year's program is still in committee in both Senate and House. When Congress will finish its debate is still in the hands of the congressional powers that be and, it seems, the formidable opposition lobbies.

As a result, while there is still money in the pipelines, the program is already at a standstill as far as new commitments and projects are concerned. This puts the recipient countries, whose military and economic policies are geared to our aid, in a serious predicament. It certainly does not present an inspiring picture of our zeal and determination in the defense of freedom.

The size of the Kennedy program, which involves not only $4.8 billion for this fiscal year but a $26 billion package over the next 5 years, demands careful scrutiny. But the urgent need for the program has already been presented publicly and privately by President Kennedy and civil and military aides. For the benefit of the unconvinced, it is pertinent to summarize the arguments:

1. Foreign aid in the amounts and with the flexibility now called for is essential for both our own survival and that of the free world in the tridimensional war waged by Soviet imperialism. It is essential to enable some of the aided countries to maintain military defenses that may be beyond their own resources but that serve them and us at a fraction of the cost of similar defenses here at home. It is equally essential in this revolutionary age to maintain the frontiers of freedom by enabling underdeveloped countries to stay free, to fight misery and poverty with the principles of the American, not the Communist, revolution. It is essential to counter the stepped-up Communist "aid" programs for political penetration, now passing $1 billion a year.

2. Quite apart from the Communist menace, foreign aid is an expression of our own ethos that imposes on us moral and political responsibilities and obligations as good neighbors to help those less well off. This responsibility rests especially heavily on the rich United States; but it also rests on all industrialized countries which must share the burden.

3. The United States is fortunate that its ideals serve its own best interests. We must not only deter military aggression; we must also keep free, develop and enlarge the free markets of the world to maintain our own growing economy. An investment of about 1 percent of our gross national product is thus a good investment in the future, especially since most of the expenditures mean employment for our factories, farms, and workers.

4. As is inevitable in so vast an undertaking, there have been waste and mistakes. But much of any present waste is due primarily to congressional insistence on annual appropriations that hamstring all long-range planning. No business could be run on that basis. That is why President Kennedy today, as President Eisenhower yesterday, asks for a revolving development loan fund calling for $7.3 billion over the next 5 years to extend low-interest but repayable loans for long-term projects. If that be "back-door borrowing" Congress has already authorized it for a score of agencies; and Congress' present delay is the best argument for it in foreign aid.

Of course, we can help only those willing to help themselves, and the biggest development aid must come from private investments. But without the foreign aid program there will be little development of any kind; and the Communist imperialism could win the world by reason of our default.

Unity for Collective Security

Freedom throughout the world is today facing the greatest threat ever from communism. The United States, the most powerful nation among the free peoples, must assume aggressive leadership in the conflict with the Communist bloc.

As Santayana has wisely said, those who forget the mistakes of the past are condemned to repeat them. Although Hitler had told in "Mein Kampf" exactly what he planned to do to gain control of the world, the British continued to disarm while Germany was rearming, and they engaged in wishfully thinking that there would be peace in their time. The words of Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have revealed the Communist aim so clearly and specifically that the free peoples should have long ago been warned to take adequate and effective countermeasures.

The free peoples are today facing an enemy who initiates moves to which they merely react. The initiative should be made to pass from the Communist bloc to the free peoples—we should act, not only react. The free peoples must take measures to seize the initiative so that the Communist bloc may be made aware of their firm determination to maintain their freedom, and the uncommitted nations may understand that freedom, not communism, is the wave of the future.

First, to face the relatively monolithic Communist bloc, the free peoples, presently far less united, should mobilize their total political, military, economic and scientific resources in the interest of their collective security. There should therefore be created an effective working association among all nations allied in regional groups for the common defense of the free world.

These are the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Central Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, and the Australia-New England-United States Pact who should join in signing a Declaration of Interdependence, to

which it is hoped the uncommitted peoples will adhere.

Second, both the defensive armament and the deterrent power of this country and the other free peoples should be built up to a superiority over the Communist bloc.

Third, the specific benefits of democracy and the manifest evils of communism should be made crystal clear both to the peoples in the uncommitted countries and, when possible, to those behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains.

Fourth, the enlightenment of those who are so softhearted that they are softheaded, it should be stressed that what the Communist bloc means by peaceful coexistence, democracy, and similar cliches is far different from the understanding of the free peoples.

Fifth, it should be emphasized both to the Communist bloc and to the uncommitted nations that the free peoples are determined to defend their freedom with an iron will and, if necessary, an iron fist, against Communist attack, whether it comes from the use of propaganda, of infiltration, of subversion, or even ultimately of force.

And last, the spiritual strength of the free peoples should be mobilized at whatever cost of austerity and sacrifice so that the Communist countries clearly understand that they face a powerful opponent determined to defend its freedom at any price and any risk.

HARRY J. CARMAN,
Chairman, American Liberal Association.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

Clear and Understandable Policy Needed on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the best chance we have to avoid a shooting war over the crisis created in Berlin by the Communists is to announce at once a clear and understandable policy so that both the Communists and the free people of Europe know exactly where we stand. At the moment, it is not clear at just what point we will fight. We have not convinced Khrushchev that we will take a firm stand in Berlin. We announced that our policy will be one of firmness and then we indicate a weakening of our resolve by telling the Communists we will negotiate. The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, suggests such a clear and understandable course which the West should take now:

COMPASS TO STEER BERLIN COURSE: ABSTRACT ISSUES BELIEVED ENTANGLING WEST'S BASIC LEGAL RIGHT OF ACCESS

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—Anxiety and apprehension over the Berlin problem seem more pronounced in America, judging by press reports, than here in Europe.

Maybe they're accustomed over here to the behavior of dictators and to the bluffing tactics that surround an artificially created crisis. But in a period of economic prosperity, the natural tendency also is to indulge in some wishful thinking and to hope the storm clouds will blow over.

The governments themselves, however, are worried. Foreign ministers and ambassadors in all the capitals are busy talking a lot to each other, and the telephone lines are crowded with official business.

But notwithstanding all the news articles about "timetables" and "contingency planning" in the official conferences, there seems to be as yet a lack of coordinated policy among the Western Powers. It's a sort of wait-and-see kind of approach. It isn't even clear just what is the issue on which the West will risk everything, including war.

For several weeks now the United States has endeavored to impress upon Nikita Khrushchev that there is a point beyond which we will not hesitate to fight for our rights. But, at the same time, this has been coupled with a well-publicized determination to seek negotiations.

Legal rights of access to Berlin have become entangled, therefore, in all sorts of abstract issues. The Soviet Premier may think he can rely on the strategy of confusion to attain his objectives while the Western allies debate among themselves what "concessions" to make.

Broadly speaking, what is absent is a spirit of idealism and a willingness to fight, if necessary, for those ideals. There seems to be no compass to steer by—no principle that has been given paramountcy. Instead, the word goes out, for instance, that the Western allies are so afraid of possible revolutions in East Germany that the people there have been asked through official American radio broadcasts to keep calm and avoid any disturbances which could lead to the use of force. Observers in West Germany, moreover, are dismayed by an editorial in the New York Times which was carried on the press association wires to European newspapers yesterday and which reads in part as follows:

"While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil, even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citidals of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

This is but another way of saying that the United States must avoid encouragement of a revolutionary spirit inside the Communist-dominated countries for fear of distasteful complications. It implies that the West is really afraid to use the most powerful weapon that can be mobilized at present—the public opinion of the afflicted countries whose citizens look to the United States for inspiration at least, if not direct military help.

The Western Powers keep haggling among themselves about legal rights in Berlin when the basic issue is the continued enslavement of 16 million human beings in East Germany. There is nowadays a lot in the press about the need for self-determination of half-civilized peoples in Africa, but there seems to be a temerity about proclaiming such a goal for the civilized peoples of Eastern Europe. Already resentment is rising in West Germany, whose people are beginning to feel they are being forsaken by the West.

The true issue is whether the West is going to adopt an attitude of craven acquiescence which will help the Soviet Union "stabilize tottering Communist regimes," and whether the peoples of East Germany and of the other countries behind the Iron Curtain are to be condemned to "slow death by strangulation."

It seems tragic that, at a time when President Kennedy has been speaking some brave and courageous words, there should arise hints from some administrative officials in Washington—also reported in the press of Europe—urging the East Germans to be careful not to offend their Communist masters.

Revolutions are unpredictable, and so are their originating causes. But they come about spontaneously when whole nations become desperate and rise up against their tyrannical rulers. Then even foreign armies sometimes refuse to shoot down the revolutionaries and, instead, join the revolt.

Above all else, it is risky for the West to appear to cringe before the Communists and to be giving the world the impression that it is afraid to speak up for basic ideals lest captive peoples derive therefrom some hope of liberation. America has rarely failed in the past forthrightly to speak its words of encouragement to peoples anywhere in the world who may be struggling for freedom.

Nebraska Farmers Respond to Legislation From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, quite frequently Members of Congress have worked long and hard to produce a program which, they hope sincerely, will benefit the people of the United States or some particularly hard-hit segment of our economy. This is particularly true of the committees and committee chairmen and ranking minority members who must bear the burden of actually working out acceptable language and proposals.

All too frequently the work done by these people and the spirit of cooperation which more often than not exists between the executive and legislative—regardless of which political party controls either branch of the Government—go unnoticed. At best, many times, committees, their staffs and their consultants can expect nothing but a barrage of criticism.

It is, therefore, with a great deal of pleasure that I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by a group of farmers in the First Congressional District of Nebraska who met at Holdredge, Nebr., on August 1, 1961. I should particularly like to call it to the attention of my friends and colleagues who worked so long and hard during the spring and early summer to perfect the emergency feed grain program and the omnibus farm bill. It should be heartening to them to know that this group does appreciate their efforts and has some constructive suggestions to make.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NEBRASKA FARMERS

Resolved, That—

1. Farmers of south central Nebraska desire to express to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Members of the National Congress their appreciation of the benefits deriving from the 1961 feed grain program and to commend the above mentioned individuals for promptness with which this program was made available and for the effectiveness with which it has been administered.

2. This group desires to commend members of the agricultural committees of the House and Senate, administrative personnel

and other officials for the prompt and effective job recently done in reworking the Agricultural Act of 1961 in such a way as to provide wheat and feed grain programs for 1962 together with other constructive programs for agriculture.

3. The following suggestions be considered in formulating administrative rulings and legislation for 1962, 1963 and other farm programs:

(1) That in operation of the 1962 feed grain program the Secretary fix the support price for corn at or about 80 percent of parity and other feed grains in proportion thereto.

(2) That consideration be given to adjustments in allotted acreages and yields in hardship cases resulting from such disaster factors as hail, flood, heavy insect damage and others.

(3) That study be made of the possibility of an overall land retirement program in which each farmer would retire a stated percentage of his total crop acreage and use the remainder of his land for any purpose desired, except for specific allotments in the case of certain crops such as wheat, tobacco, cotton and others.

(4) That the bushel management program developed by the National Association of Wheat Growers in cooperation with several other farm organizations, be adopted for operation beginning with the 1963 crop.

4. That Secretary Freeman and the members of his staff be commended for the outstanding job done to date on a public relations program for agriculture and recommend that this program be expanded and continued permanently with the objective of informing people everywhere, urban and rural alike, concerning the economic facts pertaining to agriculture and the important relationships to the rest of the economy.

P. L. MILLER.
OXFORD, NEBR.

DAN O'CONNELL.
HOLDREDGE, NEBR.

HOLLY HODGE, Jr.
HOLDREDGE, NEBR.

RAY E. WEBER.
FUNK, NEBR.

RHODELL JAMESON.
MINDEN, NEBR.

DONAL FRISELL.

H.R. 8305

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and to recommended passage of bill H.R. 8305:

COMMONWEALTH BANK
& TRUST CO.
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 8, 1961.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you in behalf of and to recommend the passage of the bill, H.R. 8305, introduced on or about July 24, 1961, by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.

Justus Mulert, a citizen of the United States and a resident of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., died January 18, 1932, and under the terms of his will he created a trust fund of $125,000 and named the undersigned Carl J. Mulert and Commonwealth Trust Co. of Pittsburgh, now Commonwealth Bank & Trust Co., as trustees. The will provided that the trustees shall pay the income of this trust fund to relatives of the testator who resided in Germany. There were seven families of income beneficiaries and following the death of the testator the trustees paid such income to them until, following the declaration of war between the United States and Germany, the Alien Property Custodian issued Vesting Order No. 1122 dated March 23, 1943, wherein he seized the income from the trust fund which would otherwise be paid to the beneficiaries of the will who resided in Germany. This vesting order did not cover the principal of the trust fund, which continued in the possession of the trustee and which has been administered and invested and reinvested from the date of the vesting order until the present time.

Of the seven families of beneficiaries of this trust who resided in Germany, four have died and members of only three families are still living. These three are Dr. Joseph Remele, presently residing in Osnabruck, West Germany; Dr. Botho Mulert, presently residing in Bad Soden, West Germany; and Charlotte Simmgen, who now resides with her husband, Rolf Simmgen, and children in Allegheny County, Pa., with intentions to establish permanent residence there. The Simmgen family is a refugee family, having fled East Germany in 1953.

The treaty of peace with Germany was signed in October 1951, and although since that date the income beneficiaries of this trust are allies and friends, the trust income due them has nevertheless continued to be claimed by the Alien Property Custodian. Although the act related only to trading with the enemy, nevertheless, the trustees since the treaty of peace have been obliged to pay a total in excess of $14,000 to the Alien Property Custodian.

This indefensible situation is in effect the same as if Congress now passed new legislation to take and appropriate existing private property of German citizens.

We urgently recommend passage of the Cunningham bill, and we ask that this letter be put in the RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

CARL J. MULERT.

California Protects the People's Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 5 years the State of California has led the way in adopting legislation requiring that meetings of its governing bodies at all levels be open to the public. In addition, the State has established clearly that the documents and records of government belong to the people by whom all government is authorized and established.

A columnist for the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, Bob Wells, provided a clear explanation of the significance of these enactments in an article appearing in that newspaper on August 4, 1961. Because of the excellence of the article and the significance to all citizens of the subject it discusses, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the column in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO INFORMATION BEST PROTECTED IN CALIFORNIA

(By Bob Wells)

Assemblyman Ralph M. Brown of Modesto, speaker of the State assembly, is expected to accept a judgeship soon and to retire from the State legislature. He has held the speaker's post since the Democrats regained control of the legislature in 1958 and the bipartisan consensus is that he has done an able job.

However, when Brown leaves the legislature his place in history will be assured not by his service as speaker but by a series of bills introduced or coauthored by him prohibiting secrecy in local government.

It was 5 years ago that Brown introduced the original antisecrecy measure. Since that time he and other legislators have amended and expanded it. The last session of the legislature passed assembly bill 663, introduced by Gordon Winton, provides that the legislation shall officially bear the title it has long unofficially been accorded by officials and newsmen—the Ralph M. Brown Act.

The Brown Act provides that all meetings of State boards and commissions and all local governmental bodies shall be open to the press and the public and shall be announced in advance. The only exception made is for the personnel matters—public officials may meet in secret to discuss the hiring or firing of a governmental employee.

Under an amendment introduced by Assemblyman John A. Busterud, Republican, of San Francisco, and passed by the last session of the legislature, the act has been extended to include the meetings of any body organized and operated by a private organization if the membership of the body is composed in part of public officers and the activities of the body are supported in whole or in part by public funds.

Locally this would apply to meetings of the board of directors and certain other committees of Memorial Hospital, Community Hospital, and similar institutions.

The preamble to the Brown Act declares that in delegating authority to properly chosen representatives, citizens do not give up their right to know what use the representatives are making of this delegated authority.

The antisecrecy measures have been widely hailed by most of the press as a bulwark of freedom. They have been received somewhat more coolly by many public officials—not because the officials necessarily are misbehaving but because the law undoubtedly complicates their jobs.

There are many times when an official would like to sound out his colleagues on what he considers a necessary but unpopular course of action. He would like to discuss the problem and get the benefit of his colleague's ideas without having to defend his statements in the newspapers.

There are other times when a particular jurisdiction will find itself dealing with another jurisdiction which may have different objectives. One body may want to discuss its strategy without tipping its hand to the other body. This is somewhat difficult to do in an open, public meeting.

There are problems of determining sites and rights-of-way and acquiring property. Open, preliminary discussion of eventual property needs may serve to increase prices by the time the jurisdiction finally gets around to acquiring the needed property.

Brown admits that the antisecrecy law may cause some problems for the public official and for public bodies. However, he denies that these problems are as big as some have claimed, and, in any event, he believes they are more than compensated by the added protection provided to the public in-

terest and public money by protecting the public's right to know.

Thanks to the Brown Act, nowhere in the Nation is the public's right to know so well protected as in California.

Southwestern Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the nationally circulated and celebrated magazine, Arizona Highways, in its September edition, contains a splendid testimonial to southwestern Colorado, known widely as the Switzerland of America. This neighborly salute, written by Esther Henderson, is in four related sections in the same issue of the magazine.

Two of these sections are concerned primarily with the colorful history and magnificent scenery and recreation to be found in and around the town of Ouray. Even in a State renowned for its natural wonders and beautiful spots, the mere mention of Ouray frequently evokes a wistful sigh.

The third section briefs the story of gold exploration and development in Colorado, a truly fabulous tale.

The fourth section concerns the famous Silverton-to-Durango narrow gage railway, still in operation during the summers and patronized by people from all 50 States. A great feat of engineering, this train affords one of the most scenic and exciting rides in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that these items from Arizona Highways about southwestern Colorado be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OURAY, GEM CITY

(By Esther Henderson)

Like a droplet of green in the palm of the mountains' massive hand—this is Ouray, Colo., known as the Gem City of the Rockies in the Switzerland of America.

It is a gem all right, but not a city which conjures up thoughts of all the sights and sounds and smells of urban America. Ouray is a village—an honest-to-goodness village that existed everywhere in the America of 50 years ago but is today found only in rather isolated sections of our country. It is a village not only in the fondest sense of the word, but also in the practical sense: good accommodations, hospital, medical and dental services, churches, schools, markets, shops, movies.

This little village of tree-lined streets, checkered with houses of many colors, will stir some long-stilled filaments of memory if you are somewhere around the half-century mark. If you have children who never have seen mansard roofs and dormer windows (Beaumont Hotel), isn't it a warming thought to know that such things have not passed completely from the American scene but can be introduced to our progeny as something almost as antiquated as the pyramids?

The kids get a bang out of it and you get a sort of special pleasure in knowing that right here in Ouray, you are able to turn back the years to a time, as far removed from the experience of this generation, as if you had lifted the curtain to reveal the ruins of Rome. Few of us may visit Rome, but here we can glimpse that slice of American life that is as recent as Mark Twain, as opulent as ante-bellum days, as gay as fiesta time, as naughty as the Barbary Coast, as wild as the rawest frontier and, at the same time, as quaint, quiet, and personal as everyman's home town.

Ouray is a landmark of the gold-rush years; that blink of historic time that came, flourished and finished almost within one generation; an incredible era of flamboyance, elegance, extravagance, luxury, poverty, elation and despair, adventure, cowardice, avarice, courage and * * * unimaginably fabulous luck—good and bad. Throughout all history, cities and areas have flourished and fallen, but where and when has so much happened, so colorfully, to so few, so fast?

The gold, and we should add, the silver years, were an epic time, peculiar to America and the West, never to come again with the color of the old frontier days. These were the times when, in some areas, whisky was cheaper than water; when potatoes were a dollar each and a pint of whisky was given away free with each potato sold. These were the places where you could get oysters, champagne and fresh roses but no milk, calico or safety pins. Gone are those times but so recently gone that the buildings and streets you pass today were witnesses to that frantic period.

To stroll up main street of an evening and watch the alpenglow on the mountains surrounding the town; and to hear the far-off sounds—sights and sounds that pluck at thoughts long sleeping, is an experience personal to each heart alone; a moment of time that one can catch and hold, each to his own memory.

Ouray, named for the great Ute Indian chief of that area, was founded in 1875 with the discovery of rich silver lodes in the vicinity, boomed through the eighties, languished for a time, then boomed again in the true rise-and-fall-and-rise-again tradition of western mining when Irish immigrant Tom Walsh, discovered gold there in 1896.

If you like statistics, here are some wowzers for you: Ouray is a valley town pocketed in a bowl at 7,800 feet elevation and surrounded by 71 mountain peaks within a radius of 15 miles. Eight of them are in the 12,000- to 13,000-foot range; 9 are in the 13,000- to 14,000-foot range; and 7 are in the over 14,000-foot range. What other valley village can make such claims?

When the bounty of summer fills the mountain meadows with acres of wild flowers, you feel you have never had such an experience until—you look up one day to see the hand of winter has lightly dusted the mountaintops with the first capping of snow and hung the aspens with shining pennies. Then you feel, this is the incomparable time. But wait.

When the snowpack up on the pass is 5 to 10 feet deep and the snowplow comes chugging up the grade spewing a horizontal waterfall of snow; when the sun turns each crystalline flake into a diamond so that all the rills are one undulating sheet of sparkle; when every angle and elbow in nature has become a rounded, mounded mass of glittering white, softly laced with periwinkle shadows, then you will be truly hard put to it to decide which was the most rewarding time of all.

Yes, whatever the season, this scalloped, lofty landscape isn't only for the eagle; it's for you.

JEEPERS

That's what they call these folks in the stub-nose cars and that's what the folks in the stub-nose cars exclaim when they reach the 13,000-foot level (a misnomer if ever there was one—what's level at 13,000 feet?—with one wheel on the side of the mountain and the other wheel treading clouds.

For a jeep is a sort of swollen-out vehicle. When you are in one and peer out, and down, there are times and places around Ouray when you think the outside wheel is on dry land but you can't be sure. To worriers like this we say, "Whatsa matter, you nervous or something? Watcha nervous about? We got four wheels and all three of them are right smack dab in the middle of the road." Well—that's when they say, "Jeepers."

Ouray is jeep capital of America with more than 300 miles of jeep roads through the surrounding country. Every year, jeepsters congregate in Ouray for a weekend of jeep-cavalcading, a unique sport made possible by the nature of the terrain and the mining that has taken place there.

Exciting roads that lead to mountaintops and back country are usually made by loggers; they are private roads, hazardous at all times, closed to ordinary traffic most of the time. Permission to use must be obtained before travel and after obtaining, roads are one way at timed intervals and traffic is heavy in weight, bulk, and quantity. Anyone who has ever met a loaded logging truck on a mountain road will understand the picture.

Not so in Ouray, the jeep roads of today were originally pack-train roads to many long-gone mines. The mines, now mostly closed, leave the roads accessible and traffic-free; just right for the jeepers.

In these elevations the climate is likely to be moist thus rendering a logging road impassable at times. But the Rockies are aptly named. You may be obstructed by a snowbank, a landslide, a washout, but stuck in the mud you'll never be.

What is it like, this jeeping along in the clouds? It's a new experience and quite incomparable to travel of any other kind; a sort of composite voyage made up of one-fourth horse jog, one-fourth wind in the face, one-fourth sailboating in the sky, one-fourth looking down on a pygmytized landscape wherein, contrary to reality, you are the kingpin and even the tallest tree becomes a blade of grass. If you are a frequent air traveler you may be thinking you've been that high up lots of times. True, but in air travel you are so high up that you have lost contact and detail of the terrain.

What difference does that make you may ask and the answer: all the difference in the world. For nowadays it's commonplace to soar to unbelievable heights in pressurized compartments; to partake of steak and champagne 2 miles up and a thousand miles from land. What is not commonplace is to tie a bandana around your hair and joggle up from Main Street to where the eagles soar; to breathe the winds that skim the loftiest peaks of the Rockies, to have at one and the same time, your head in the clouds and your feet on the ground.

Only by jeep trip are you in intimate contact with flower-filled mountain meadows where acres of wild columbine cast a lavender glow over the timberline slopes; where alpine tarns in the high, cold rock escarpments meet summer but a few short weeks removed from returning winter.

Before time and events and circumstances made possible both the jeep and the roads, these wonderful regions were closed to all but the young, the hardy, and the adventuresome. You might be as adventurous as all getout in spirit but unless you are at least moderately young and in condition, a mountain-climbing expedition could be uncomfortable and hazardous. The jeep trips are

made to order for the old, the young, the hasty (or the unhurried), for city- and country-dweller alike. In fact, for all those who hear the call of faraway places, who want to smell mountain winds across tundra, who want to hear the turbulent splash of alpine freshets, to feel the good earth of which we are deprived so much of the time in our business-of-living existence. To all those we say—come with us. Experiencing is believing.

ACCENT ON GOLD

When Otto Mears, onetime president of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad and pioneer roadbuilder in Colorado, engineered his toll road out of Ouray across Red Mountain Pass, little did he suppose that a future highway (550) following his road would, in part, be surfaced with gold-bearing gravels worth a million dollars before the mistake was discovered. That was the mistake that gave the million dollar highway its name. Although it cost many millions to build, the million that went into the unsuspected surface is the one that tickles our fancy today. It could happen only in Colorado.

The dust from the trail of the 49'ers had been settling for some 10 years when word spread that somewhere within the shadows of the front range of the Rockies there was gold for the scooping. While a few prospectors had raised color along Cherry Creek (within the present city limits of Denver) the good news was so embellished that immediately hundreds of otherwise prudent people dropped their quills and ledgers, plows and bellows, needles, lasts, saws, soup kettles or whatever had been the tools of their trades, and set out for the Colorado goldfields under the slogan "Pike's Peak or Bust."

About this same time the market for guidebooks on Colorado was a fairly rich field in itself and an author was as willing as the next fellow to accept the maxim "gold is where you find it." The fact that he hadn't been to the region in which he was guiding was no handicap to any guidebook writer of that day. It was an asset because he could exercise a clear imagination (unhampered by reality) and then, to keep his conscience likewise unclouded, he could and did ring in that old friend who is with us to this day: that usually reliable source who was described in 1959 as "A western gentleman of reliable veracity."

This veracious gentleman, then, is the one who presumably said, "Gold can be found anywhere in Colorado; on the plains, in the mountains, and by the streams; in fact, one area of 12,000 square miles at the headwaters of the Arkansas River is almost solidly plated with the precious yellow meal." Hot darn! It's easy to see how such information quickly greased the wheels westward of every pop-eyed reader who obtained a guidebook.

This, then, was the stage setting in 1859 before the proscenium of the magnificent Rockies; a lot of drama took place off stage, on stage, backstage, and in the wings before the slogan was changed to "Pike's Peak and bust." Hundreds of ill-provisioned gold seekers, wintering under pine bought leantos, found it almost as hard to come across a pot of beans as a pot of gold. Many of the disillusioned stampeded back to the States but always there were some who pushed on and when the gold ran out in the front range, there were always the middle and back ranges to explore.

There was Tom Walsh for one, Ouray's most famous citizen, who had already lost a fortune when he discovered that the low grade lead and zinc sulphides for which the Camp Bird mine was being worked contained tellurium compounds, rich in gold. The Camp Bird soon became the second-richest gold property in the State. Tom went to Washington, where he floated his daughter Evelyn into capital society on a stream of gold. Evelyn, we might add, was something of a successful prospector in her own right in that she located a husband whose idea of a nice present to give his wife was the Hope diamond.

Up in Leadville, H. A. W. Tabor purchased a property for $117,000 which netted him $10 million, sometimes at the rate of $10,000 monthly. A single shipment of ore that Tabor's contemporaries had dismissed as worthless assayed 10,000 ounces of silver to the ton.

Next to Tabor's claim was another bought by one Jim Baxter who sank a 100-foot shaft, found no ore, and sold the claim for $30,000. A lot of money for a hole in the ground. The following morning the new owners put in a single shot of dynamite that exposed a vein of almost pure silver which yielded a half-million dollars within 3 months. In one 24-hour period, $118,000 was mined, and one operator offered the owners $10,000 if they would allow him to work one 4-foot-square area for 1 hour.

Those were the days! You didn't need to know arithmetic; all you had to do was count up to ten and then multiply by the thousand. A pinch of gold dust was reckoned at 25 cents so you didn't have to count your small change either—just pinch it frequently. All you really needed was a pick and a rabbit's foot and if the rabbit's foot was a good one you could even throw the pick away.

Well—that's how it was, and whatever it was, it was always the tallest, the richest, the biggest and the most in this southwestern Colorado country. Flowers come by the acre, water by the damful, peaks by the dozen, history by the pound. Man has been coming and going through this part of the world for countless centuries and still—the land is so vast, so high, so wide, so deep, so varied in all its aspects, that no man has as yet seen it all.

TOOT! TOOT!

Clang goes the bell, toot goes the whistle, puff goes the ball of black smoke and out of the windows pop some 375 tourist heads, 3 days a week during the summer months as the last passenger-carrying narrow-gage railroad train in the U.S. chuffs up the Animas River Canyon from Durango to Silverton and return.

In this day of space achievements, why should a little jerkwater trip on a baby-carriage train to a remote little town in a pocket of mountain hold such delight and fascination? Because it's the last of its kind for you and me and the first of its kind to most of the youngsters who know all about rockets but little about railroads; or perhaps whose railroad acquaintance has been limited to thundering diesel fliers that streak across the country, a silver sliver by day, a segmented glowworm by night.

Open platforms, wiry-iron railings, windows that open, painted yellow wooden coaches, wood seats with iron chair arms—how unusual and interesting! A smokestack belching real smoke, the swinging motion of 20-mile-per-hour progress—how new and exciting! To see the passengers literally bulging from all windows in the gaiety of vacation and the colors of summer reminds you of train scenes from the film "Around the World in 80 Days" and not without reason. The D. & R. G. Cannonball was the one used in the picture and the scenes were shot in this location.

When they laid the first railroad across the plains into Colorado from the East it was a big and dangerous job but at least it was a horizontal one. Later, when the railroads pierced the mountains and canyons of the back country, the job was equally hazardous but added to that it was now vertical as well!

The Denver & Rio Grande, first to employ the narrow gage (light rails laid 3 feet apart) was dubbed the "baby railroad" but its stout little locomotives with proportionately sized freight and passenger cars were soon winding up the narrow canyons to almost inaccessible districts. These narrow-gage lines could just about "curve on the brim of a sombrero" and today, though all trunk lines have long since been converted to standard gage, there are still many miles of baby railroads rusty and weed grown in remote parts of the State.

Silverton, seat of San Juan County, was originally called Baker's Park after an early prospector but when a local mining operator claimed "We may not have gold here but we have silver by the ton" the name was changed to Silverton. San Juan County lays its own claim to fame: it is the up-and-downest county in the country that can boast, "Not a single acre of arable land."

The train winds up the Animas River canyon to Silverton in time for lunch and sightseeing around the town. For a number of years it was said that not a new house had been built there in 40 years; when you get there, you'll believe it. However, many of the old houses and buildings have been refurbished in the original style and no one should miss a visit to this unusually situated town.

Durango, seat of La Plata County, was founded in 1880 by the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad to profit from the business created by building the road. It was the usual roistering frontier town and a streetcar line ran less than a year because "the crews were abusive and insulting to the patrons and the cars invariably pulled away from the station before all the incoming passengers could get aboard."

At another time the local newspaper reported that a group of men had left for La Boca, N. Mex. to "dig up Aztecs." For this bit of archaeological research the party was outfitted as follows: 30 horses and 15 burros, 5 cases of chewing tobacco, 3 cases of beer, 10 gallons of heavy liquids (hotcake syrup?) 7 reels of fuse, 2 boxes of cigars, a fishline, 20 pairs of rubber boots, 1 can lard, 200 loaves of bread, 1 pound bacon, (That last for flavoring?)

Sometimes on the Durango-Silverton run, one can see the little yellow mighty midget rocking up the canyon while high overhead remains the trail of a jet airplane long since beyond the horizon; quite a span between the two.

Scenery through Animas Canyon is spectacular and inaccessible except by train. Highway 550 parallels the railroad for a short distance north of Durango, then the roads separate. The highway traverses another route over the pass and the little train that could and still can, tootles off into the yawning gorges of the San Juan Range.

A. L. Valencia Reviews 15 Years of Democracy in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the notice of our colleagues a splendid review of the success story of the growth of a democratic nation that is related in Mr. A. L. Valencia's article entitled, "The Philippines: A Successful Democracy at Work."

Mr. Valencia, a well-known writer and commentator on world affairs, asks a

question which I believe is considered by many Filipino's when he states:

They [the Filipino people] wonder why the United States has not made more of the success story of the Philippine independence in the current struggle for men's minds and hearts?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that question is well worth answering to the peoples of the world, and in particular to those countries which have recently attained their independence. In answer to that query one will review the steps taken by the U.S. Government in developing the educational system of the Philippines, in providing adequate health services and sanitation facilities; in setting up the machinery for a vigorous civil service system and encouraging Filipino participation in local and national government offices—all needed and consistent spadework for the establishment of a democratic nation.

The devotion and affection expended by the scores of U.S. teachers, engineers, officers, and public health workers has been matched by the efforts of other great Americans including John J. Pershing, William Howard Taft, Leonard Wood, Henry L. Stimson, Frank Murphy, and Douglas MacArthur. The work of these Americans coupled with the cooperation and assistance of the Filipinos was the needed groundwork for the Filipino Government to take over the reins of government. Thus it was that after some 40 years of American tutelege the American flag was lowered and the Philippines became an independent nation at last. I believe Mr. Valencia summarized the feelings of millions of Filipinos toward the United States on their first independence day when he wrote:

If I could speak for all my countrymen, I would say to you good people across the Pacific, "God bless you; we will never forget."

Mr. Speaker, since that first independence day I have visited the Philippines and in many conversations with numerous Filipinos of various backgrounds I have heard and seen Mr. Valencia's prediction affirmed. I found in the Philippines a government which effectively met the challenges and responsibilities in building a new government of their own into a working and viable democracy. As Americans we should be heartened by our efforts in helping the Philippines attain its freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and good friend of so many Americans, Carlos P. Romulo has eloquently summarized this in a recent article appearing in Current History wherein he states:

We have made our choice and we do not believe in twilight zones. We cannot subscribe to a monolithic and ruthless ideology which reduces everything to materialistic dialectics. As we start as an independent country, history tells us that for 50 centuries men have had to choose either the hard sinews of freedom, integrity, dignity—or a gutless peace and degradation of slavery. Freemen are free to choose and we have chosen.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of the United States should be proud of our efforts to have worked with the Filipino people in making this choice. Our working hand in hand with the Filipino people in attaining the freedom and democracy they enjoy answers curtly Communist charges of selfish American capitalism. As an American I am proud of our record there and such an article as this written by Mr. Valencia, appended to these remarks, is a timely review of U.S. efforts and determination to assist in building healthy and democratic nations throughout the world. This article is solid food for reflection—on the part of Americans and other peoples of the world—as to the desire and hope of the United States to see men throughout the world living as free citizens:

THE PHILIPPINES: A SUCCESSFUL DEMOCRACY AT WORK

(By A. L. Valencia)

Fifteen years ago next Tuesday, as a young reporter on the Associated Press in Manila, I was assigned to cover my country's first Fourth of July.

After nearly four centuries of Spanish rule, more than 40 years of American tutelage, and 3 years of Japanese occupation, the Philippines was a nation at last.

My heart was full and this is what I wrote:

"They lowered the American flag today. A friend has said goodby. A part of me is gone.

"The Filipino flag stands alone. It is one of the proudest moments of my life. But I cannot help feeling a sadness. I was born under the American flag; so were millions of my fellow countrymen, those alive today and those who died in the thousands on Bataan and Corregidor. What does the future hold? What does the lowering of the American flag mean?

"I saw the American flag come down once before. That was a black day in January 1942. I saw the flag of the Japanese invader fluttering in the bright sunshine in almost the same spot where we Filipinos and Americans assembled today. There followed 3 grim and ghastly years.

"Then the American flag came back, only to be lowered once more.

"To me and my fellow countrymen, the American flag has meant so many good things. And now, as it goes down, this jubilation, the gun salute, the applause, and High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt saying, 'A nation is born. Long live the Republic of the Philippines. May God bless and prosper the Filipino people and keep them safe and free.'

"If I could speak for all my countrymen, I would say to you good people across the Pacific, 'God bless you; we will never forget.' "

THE MESSAGE TODAY

Why do I recall this day so long ago? Why do I go back to a faded newspaper clipping to see what I wrote?

I do so because I believe it has a message for the American people in what President Kennedy describes as this "decade of danger."

Wherever the young President of the United States looks today, he sees the ruins of past American policies—and a host of new problems in the making. There is trouble in Laos, Vietnam, the Congo, Cuba, and in NATO. The cry of "Yankee go home" even echoes from Holy Loch in Scotland, a peaceful little holiday resort never associated with the international scene.

President Kennedy and his follow citizens might be excused for asking: "Has America ever done anything right?" as they face the barrage of world doubt and criticism.

Yet there is one direction in which Americans can look and see an inspiring success story—a living, positive, and enduring proof that there are people in the world who love and admire the United States and the American way of life and who are ready to die to defend it. Because it's their way of life, too.

In fact these people have done so once before and are willing to do so again should the chips ever go down.

SAME INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is no accident that the Philippines and the United States celebrate their independence on the same day. It was planned that way, to emphasize their common devotion to democracy.

Philippine national life is modeled entirely on that of the United States. It has the same political structure, with the same system of checks and balances (elected legislature, elected executive, and established judiciary) and the same burning determination to preserve that structure.

On the rim of the Orient, 8,000 miles from California, 28 million people of many races and many tongues, living on more than 7,000 islands have found unity and are providing proof that the American way of life can be transplanted and appreciated with glowing fervor.

And this strange flower, mixture of the exotic East and the bustling West, has come to sturdy bloom in little more than half a century.

Communist clamor about the evils of colonialism find little or no response in Filipino ears.

For after centuries of colonialism, the Philippines found their way to freedom through that form of government exercised with superb skill and sympathy by the United States, itself a former colony.

It was in 1521 that Spain set its mailed foot on the neck of the Filipino people and kept it there for nearly four centuries. Then came the Spanish-American War of 1898, and Admiral Dewey's victory over the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay.

COLONIAL POLICY

No one was more surprised at this sudden acquisition of a new territory than President McKinley but in a moment of inspiration he announced the basis of the policy that was to govern relations between the United States and the Philippines from then on. It was simply: "The Philippines for the Filipinos."

Modern Filipinos like to say: "America's greatest export to our country was the Thomasites." They were 600 young American men and women—teachers, engineers, constabulary officers, and public health workers—got their name from the U.S. Army Transport *Thomas* which brought them to Manila. It is no exaggeration to say that these 600 young people laid the foundations of the modern Philippine Republic.

Politically, Spanish rule had been of the worst, but not all its legacy was evil. The vast majority of Filipinos had become Christians and had adopted the moral standards of the West. The groundwork for a new relationship with another and more progressive Western people had already been done.

When the Thomasites began to build on this groundwork, working alongside the people, as the new Peace Corps now proposes to do, they were welcomed with enthusiasm.

Schools were opened: at first in shacks rudely built of bamboo and palm leaves. Many of the first teachers were American soldiers who had fallen in love with the Philippines and decided to take their discharge and stay on. Some of these men could do little more than teach the A B C's, but the English language began to spread.

Today the Philippines is the third biggest English-speaking nation in the world.

ENCOURAGED IN POLITICS

After education and health, came politics. Instead of being rigorously excluded. Fili-

pinos were encouraged to take part in government and aspire to office, first on the municipal level and later on a national level.

A whole crop of Filipino leaders sprang up. And as education became more widespread, that crop doubled, trebled, and quadrupled. Within 20 years, although American officials still held many of the top jobs, an experienced Filipino civil service had been developed, and Filipinos sat in the Governor General's Cabinet.

When in 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt pledged full independence for the Philippines in 10 years, there were no doubts either in Washington or Manila about Filipino capacity for self-rule.

Those were happy, exciting days. The work of those great Americans—the humble Thomasites, John J. Pershing, William Howard Taft, Leonard Wood, Henry L. Stimson, Frank Murphy—was paying off abundantly.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur arrived to train the new Philippine national army. How well he did his work was to be proved in five years' time—at Bataan and Corregidor. One of MacArthur's assistants was a Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Government was now entirely in Filipino hands. Washington held only the loosest of reins through a High Commissioner; and this rein applied only to foreign affairs. For the rest, the Filipinos were ruling themselves.

This was to go on for the stipulated 10 years of training and transition to full independence.

THE WAR YEARS

Then, in 1941, the gathering war clouds let loose their deluge. America's enforced retreat from the Philippines in the face of Japanese might could have strained Filipino loyalty. Instead it hardened it.

Filipino underground resistance to the Japanese occupation was tougher than that of any other country in Asia.

The Japanese set out to break the Filipino spirit of freedom and devotion to democracy. The first weapons were cold steel and hot lead. They did not work. The next weapon was starvation; then came terrorism and torture. These failed, too. Finally, came the seductive temptation "Asia for the Asians; throw the white man out."

The Filipinos preferred to throw out the Japanese, and clung on grimly for the American rescue they knew would surely come.

After 3½ years of bloody war and brutal destruction, Washington might well have reconsidered its promise of independence for the Philippines. Not out of an ulterior motive, but simply from a feeling that the chaos of the war should first be restored.

But political wisdom won over paternalism. Independence was granted to the very day. And as the Stars and Stripes came down from the bombed-out House of Congress to be replaced by the flag of the Philippines, Filipinos wept openly. They were happy and proud of their new status, but it was a little like leaving home.

COMPENSATION FROM UNITED STATES

To repair war damage in the Philippines, the United States, for the first time in its history, provided war damage compensation of some $600 million. About $1 million small claimants were paid in full.

The shock of war to the Philippine economy was a savage one. But the newly born nation attacked the work of restoration with vigor, and with equal vigor proceeded to pursue its new political life.

Since then 15 years have passed. Contrast the political stability of the Philippines today with the records of some of the other new nations that have come into existence since the war.

The Communist-dominated Hukbalahap movement sought to take over by force—and was defeat. Four Presidents have been elected by democratic process, and in this year of Asian crisis a fifth President will seek the approval of the polls.

In November, some 6 million Filipinos will go to the polls; and the percentage of those casting ballots is higher than in many States of the United States.

Every succeeding administration has striven for cleaner government and elections. It must be remembered—and this makes the record of the new Philippine nation all the more admirable—that some of the political corruption habits acquired during the Japanese occupation were hard to lose. The country was full of small arms which had been employed in regaining freedom; men were used to living dangerously; the black market and bribery had become a way of survival.

THEY PREFER THE BALLOT

Yet despite this, the Filipino people have continued to prefer the ballot box as their means of changing a government. It is a fine tribute to their political maturity.

This year's election will be between President Garcia, running for his second term, and Diosdado Macapagal, current Vice President, who belongs to the opposition Liberal Party.

The election will be fought entirely on domestic issues, because in the realm of foreign affairs both men think alike. Both are stanchly pro-American. Both are stanchly anti-Communist.

President Garcia outlawed the Communist Party. He has declared that even though America, under European pressure, may be forced to recognize Red China and go along with its admittance to the United Nations, he himself will never do so.

Macapagal accuses Garcia of being "soft on communism."

The Philippines was among the first of America's friends to send troops to Korea. The Philippines was the first to stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States when it became clear that Russia's Khrushchev was determined to make Laos a crucial test in his new war of nerves with President Kennedy. Britain and France wavered. The Philippines stood firm—and still is prepared to fight if the need arises.

Of course the two nations have their points of friction. Filipinos feel the United States tends to take them and their friendship for granted. They feel like the little brother whom a big brother ignores. They wonder why the United States has not made more of the success story of Philippine independence in the current struggle for men's minds and hearts.

Americans have too often been preoccupied with the fumblings and shortcomings of this new republic, modeled so exactly after their own. They have not seen it—as it should be seen—as one of the world's finest monuments, because it is a living monument to the American ideal of total freedom against total tyranny.

A Special Report on Juvenile Delinquency, WMCA Radio, New York, August 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, too seldom, perhaps, are Members of Congress confronted with the human aspects of the problems with which they are called upon to deal in legislation. A few weekends ago, members of the Subcommittee on Special Education, the chairman of which is the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon, [Mrs. GREEN], traveled to New York City to see for ourselves conditions in some of the high crime neighborhoods of the city.

Our subcommittee had been holding hearings on H.R. 8028, a bill that both Mrs. GREEN and I have introduced for the purpose of helping combat juvenile delinquency and on which the House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on Monday, August 21.

I feel sure I speak for my colleagues who made the trip when I say that my awareness of the seriousness of juvenile delinquency and my concern that we undertake effective countermeasures were both sharpened by the experience of the trip. We talked on the streets with young people and also with staff members of the New York City Youth Board who work with them.

On one night of the visit, newsmen of radio station WMCA accompanied the Members of Congress and the New York Youth Board staff persons who served as our guides and taped a documentary broadcast entitled "A Special Report on Juvenile Delinquency." Because this program seems to me to be an outstanding example of radio journalism in the public service and because it deals with such an important subject, I believe that Members of Congress will be interested to read excerpts from the transcript of that documentary broadcast.

Although the printed record cannot evoke the sights and sounds of the tension we saw, the words of these young people on the streets of New York City are harshly eloquent testimony of an increasingly serious problem in American life.

The transcript follows:

A SPECIAL REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, PRESENTED BY WMCA, THE VOICE OF NEW YORK, BROADCAST FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1961

ANNOUNCER. Last month a special subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives toured some of the worst slum neighborhoods in New York City. The committee's mission: to observe youth gang behavior here as a guide in preparing a Federal law to curb juvenile delinquency. Next week the full Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives will consider this legislation, which was cosponsored by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, chairman of the subcommittee which visited New York, and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana.

WMCA accompanied Mrs. GREEN on her tour 2 weeks ago and recorded her recent speech in Washington on the need for the new law. The subcommittee's experience on the sidewalks of New York, and that speech, constitute a powerful story of juvenile delinquency as it exists in New York and a hopeful plan for both the Nation and New York to stem the alarming growth of youthful violence, crime and human waste.

Here then is that story and, following it, the plan proposed in Congress by Representatives EDITH GREEN and JOHN BRADEMAS.

NARRATOR. Friday, the 21st of July, had been the hottest day of the year in New York. In the Williamsburgh section of Brooklyn, angry challenges to battle had been passing back and forth all day long between two of the roughest juvenile gangs in town: the Black Diamonds and the Quintos. The corner of White and Segal Streets was Quinto territory, and shortly after 9 o'clock in the evening the Quintos had beaten off the enemy in their first skirmish of the night. There were to be more.

It was during this lull in the battle that Congresswomen EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, and

Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, arrived at White and Segal Streets. Mrs. GREEN was chairman of a subcommittee charged with reporting on an administration bill aimed at curbing juvenile delinquency. BRADEMAS was a fellow member of the same subcommittee. They had come to inspect juvenile gang behavior in a neighborhood so notoriously depressed that even the people who live there call it "The Bottom." The Quintos quickly sensed that they were on display, and their hostility was obvious. As they clustered around the corner lamppost, Mrs. GREEN tried to find out what made them tick:

Mrs. GREEN. What do you do in the summertime when you're not in school?

KID I. Hang around the block—there ain't nothing else to do.

Mrs. GREEN. How about you?

KID II. Who, me?

Mrs. GREEN. I talked to you before.

KID II. No; you ain't talked to me—you talked to my brother.

Mrs. GREEN. Your brother?

KID II. Yeah.

Mrs. GREEN. Are you at school now?

KID II. No.

Mrs. GREEN. Have you finished?

KID II. No.

[Many kids' voices in background.]

Mrs. GREEN. How far did you go?

KID II. Eleventh—there were too many girls in that school, man—I was a boy-lover.

[Laughs and jeers from other kids.]

KID II. Hey, get off my back, baby.

KID III. Only thing I need is a bunch of girls and I'll be happy in a job and I'll be straight for the rest of my life.

KID II. You're already straight.

KID III. That's all I need. My name is James Fennimore Cooper, the famous writer, you know.

KID II. And my name is David Taylor, better known as "Teach."

[Again, many kids' voices in background.]

Mrs. GREEN. Let me talk to this boy. How old are you?

KID IV. Thirteen.

Mrs. GREEN. Thirteen, and you are in school?

KID IV. Uh huh.

Mrs. GREEN. You're in the what grade, the eighth grade?

KID IV. Ninth.

Mrs. GREEN. The ninth grade—what do you do in the summertime?

KID IV. Hang around the block, like everybody else.

NARRATOR. Congressman BRADEMAS was talking meanwhile to another group of Quintos at a nearby corner when he and some of the people in his party heard a chorus of angry voices from the surrounding windows and fire escapes. He told WMCA's Dan Meenan, the only reporter who'd gone along on this tour:

Mr. BRADEMAS. There was real tension in the air. I remember a young lady in our group was standing there talking to me when suddenly a pop bottle came down and hit her on the head. And I understand that as Mrs. GREEN was about ready to get into a car, the Congresswoman who is chairman of our subcommittee, when a group of youngsters from another gang came marching down the street looking for a fight with some of the Quintos, and they were headed off only by the quick thinking of the youth board street gang worker who saw them and went over and talked to them and calmed them down.

NARRATOR. The gang members who had descended on Mrs. GREEN and those with her just as she'd been about to leave White and Segal Streets were members of the Black Diamonds, heading for their second rumble of the evening with the Quintos. The city youth board worker who headed off the Black Diamonds, sent them back to their own territory and conceivably saved Mrs. GREEN and her party from being mobbed, was a 21-year-old graduate student at New York University, working full time with the New York City Youth Board. He had grown up himself in exactly this environment. Lawyer Fields, youth board worker, told WMCA's Meenan:

Mr. FIELDS. The situation in the area now is rather tense because the groups have begun to more more freely from one area to the other, and whenever groups begin to move from one area to the other, it automatically makes every area a tense area because you never know when another group will come into the area.

DAN MEENAN. You've had two killings in your neighborhood since the first of the year, right?

Mr. FIELDS. Right.

DAN MEENAN. What gangs were involved in those two?

Mr. FIELDS. The Black Diamonds and the Quintos.

NARRATOR. These were the gangs onto whose already bloody battlefield the Congressmen had ventured this hot and troubled night in Williamsburgh. As Mrs. GREEN and BRADEMAS watched, WMCA's Meenan talked to Quintos. What exactly, he said, was their quarrel with the Black Diamonds about?

QUINTOS. They wanted to get a big rep or something like that. They want the whole neighborhood. They want everything, you know, around here. They want this to be their territory, you know? That's what they want.

NARRATOR. It was apparent, however, that the aggression had not been entirely one-sided. Tonight's battle in fact had apparently stemmed from a Quinto's having taken away the girl friend of a high-ranking member of the Black Diamonds.. And all of the Quintos were taking pride in that conquest.

QUINTOS II. We take all their girls and what-not, you know, and they don't go for it. [Laughing.] They don't like the name, Quintos. That's all there is to it.

Mr. MEENAN. How many members do the Black Diamonds have?

QUINTOS. Oh, they have about 50 or 60.

Mr. MEENAN. And how many do you have?

QUINTOS. Uh, we have about 300 or so.

Mr. MEENAN. You're one of the better known gangs in Brooklyn.

QUINTOS. That's right.

[Cheers from background—Yea. Quintos.]

NARRATOR. Hostility was the hallmark of the Quintos. Hostility not just toward their rivals, the Black Diamond, but toward the entire world that wasn't Quinto. Hostility toward the Congressmen. Hostility in fact toward all adults and especially toward the police. The Quintos obviously felt deeply injured by all of those in authority around them.

QUINTOS. You know what? A boy got stabbed up in school and a cop was looking right at him and they ain't said nothing. And they just watch. And after the fight is over, they come around and ask us what's happening. And then they make us—they get us against the wall and search us.

NARRATOR. One of the favorite boasts of the gang member is that a cop stood him up against a wall, searched him, and found him, as the gang members put it, clean. No weapons, no narcotics, in his pockets. Juvenile gang members rarely have either of these in their possession except when they're about to use them. The weapons and narcotics carriers for the gangs are usually their girl auxiliaries, and the girls are valuable in this respect because all of the youths know that policemen are not permitted to search girls.

At White and Segal Streets when the Congressmen were there, the girls of the Quintos kept in the background and would not talk to anyone. A former member of a girl's gang auxiliary however did speak to the Congressmen. Eighteen years old today, employed as a switchboard operator with an insurance firm, she had already made her break with the gangs but she understood them well:

FIRST GANG GIRL. I know a few cases of girls that do carry weapons for the boys, and some of them—but, the girls that I hang out with, they don't go as far as prostitution, and they don't use narcotics. But, they will conceal weapons for the boys. They'd rather hold them and endanger their own reputations and their own moral standings, than rather see the boys get in trouble.

NARRATOR. WMCA's Meenan asked whether the gang girls in this neighborhood often become pregnant:

FIRST GANG GIRL. Yes, they do. Very frequently.

Mr. MEENAN. Well, how frequently? How many in your area?

FIRST GANG GIRL. Well, to this day, I'd say five girls, so far.

NARRATOR. Another former gang girl from another neighborhood talked of the boys who not only use but push narcotics.

SECOND GANG GIRL. There are young fellows who sell the stuff and, they seem to influence the other young fellows too, because the money they make, they make sometimes $500 a week just selling the stuff, and they waste all that money on themselves. Of course, they dress and they give this example to the other young fellows, and they make it seem so easy to have all this, you know, just by selling the stuff, you know, so that every day, you know, more fellows come in contact with them, and if they can convince them, they'll be selling it too.

NARRATOR. This girl, once a member of a gang auxiliary, had also made her break and is a clerk today in a business firm. She still lives, however, in the neighborhood she described to Meenan as——

SECOND GANG GIRL. Junkie Paradise. That's what they call it where I live—Junkie Paradise. You just walk down the streets and they're all over the place—all over.

Mr. MEENAN. What do they look like when they're on the streets and they're high? What do they do?

SECOND GANG GIRL. Oh, they're a little sleeplike [laugh] and their eyes are bloodshot, and they stand up like holding up the building—so they sit around waiting for the guy who's going to give them the stuff. Or, they're usually eating candy. They go to the bakery all the time. They hang out in front of the grocery store. I don't know—they look like people who are very sick.

NARRATOR. Girls like these who'd fought their way out of the social trap, created by the street gangs, for so large a part of the youth in neighborhoods like "The Bottom" are the pride of the city's youth workers. A 19-year-old boy, tough as nails, who just a few years ago had been a gang leader in Williamsburgh, was home for the summer from a college in North Carolina to which Youth Board Worker Fields had helped him win a scholarship. They boy told Meenan:

REFORMED GANG KID. None of my friends carry anything in their pockets at all.

Mr. MEENAN. Why is this, because the police bust them so often?

REFORMED GANG KID. No, it's not that. It's just that the boys that I stay with have grown out of this thing. They have no need for it because they don't go looking for any trouble. And if trouble comes their way, they can handle theirselves with their hands. I think that's the best way to handle yourself, anyway, if you have to get into any trouble—use your hands.

NARRATOR. To the surprise of the visiting Congressmen the boy said flatly that gang warfare in Williamsburgh used to be worse.

REFORMED GANG KID. When I was about 12 years old, it was very bad—very, very bad. In fact, it was much badder than it was now—than it is right now, at the present. It's getting worse. It's starting to go right back to it now. It would—it would go right back to it now, if they didn't have the supervisors, the different supervisors for the different people that, you know, help the kids.

NARRATOR. The chief rival of "The Bottom" for the title of the worst slum in Brooklyn, is the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, and this was the next stop on the schedule of Mrs. Green, Brademas, and Meenan. In the courtyard of Junior High School 57, they met Ed Allen, youth board supervisor for the Bedford-Stuyvesant area. Only a few hours earlier, right where they were standing, a boy had been killed. Allen told them how it happened:

Mr. ALLEN. At approximately, I believe, about 6:30 p.m., several members of a loosely knit group called the Imperial Lords were sitting down in the park at Public School 57. They were watching some kids play handball. At this point, they approached one of the kids that was playing handball, and asked him for a dime. The kid refused them a dime. At this point, a friend of the fellow who refused him a dime, tried to intervene and asked what was going on and they asked him what pitch did he have involved in this incident, and they jumped on this fellow because he asked and they beat him to death—they stomped him to death—with their feet.

NARRATOR. Mrs. GREEN was shocked by the story. Allen, though by no means insensitive, had obviously grown accustomed to events like this:

Mr. ALLEN. Unfortunately, killings around here are not unique. They don't seem to care too much about it.

Mrs. GREEN. How long have you worked in this area?

Mr. ALLEN. I've worked in this area for 1 year.

Mrs. GREEN. How many killings have you been aware of, or know that have happened?

Mr. ALLEN. I've experienced—in Bedford-Stuyvesant—I'm not speaking for the entire Borough of Brooklyn—since I've been here, there have been six to seven killings.

NARRATOR. The former girl gang member reacted pretty much as Allen did.

FORMER GIRL GANG MEMBER. Seems that they just don't care about anybody else but themselves—that to take another's life is not very important.

Mr. MEENAN. There were other boys and girls in the schoolyard when this happened. Why didn't they pitch in and try and prevent it?

FORMER GIRL GANG MEMBER. Well, they were afraid that if the ones that lived in that section—they were afraid that the boys would get them or tell somebody to come after them if they had tried to prevent this killing.

NARRATOR. Earlier, in talking to the Quintos, Meenan had found the same matter-of-fact feeling about homicide when he asked one of the leaders if any of his pals had been killed lately.

QUINTO IV. Yeah. Two.

Mr. MEENAN. When?

QUINTO IV. I think 2 months ago—a couple of months ago. Something like that. And—around four of them shot—in the leg, or something like that, or arm.

Mr. MEENAN. Were they bushwhacked or was this in a gang fight?

QUINTO IV. A gang fight.

NARRATOR. After talking to some of the boys and even the adults hanging around Junior High School 57, Congressman BRADEMAS told Meenan.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Talking to some of these kids about that murder, they were a little bit cocky and a little bit arrogant about it, as if, well that's the way it is—you take a few chances here—if somebody gets killed, so what?

NARRATOR. For the gentleman from Indiana at the end of the evening's tour, this had obviously been an eye-opening experience.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We have juvenile delinquency in Indiana, I know. But, it's a far different situation from what it is here in New York, when it really is like seeing dynamite lying there on every street corner that you go by. It's like going out onto a battlefield, when we walked around, because we expected a real war to break out anywhere we went.

NARRATOR. For Congresswoman GREEN, there'd been something even more shocking than the youth violence she'd been confronted with that evening.

Mrs. GREEN. I was, of course, shocked by the killing of this boy over 10 cents. But, I am more concerned and more shocked by what seems to me almost a hopelessness on the part of the hundreds of young people to whom we talked, whom we saw, and I suppose this could be multiplied by the thousands, who were unemployed, who had not finished high school and therefore, could not expect to get jobs in a society that is demanding more and more skills—lack of recreational areas, youngster after youngster who said, "Nothing to do except stand around on the street corners."

NARRATOR. The same note of primary concern, not so much about violence as about indolence, was sounded by a member of the Youth Board who'd accompanied the Congressmen. He was Robert Cooper, director of the board's street gang projects for the Borough of Brooklyn. Said Cooper:

Mr. COOPER. A teenage homicide makes headlines and this is what stays in people's minds. I rather think of the thousands of teenagers whom I know whose lives are empty, dull, pointless—kids without much hope, kids who never find any real satisfaction, youngsters who are just drifting aimlessly, having no place to go. This to me is just as tragic as a few youngsters being killed.

NARRATOR. In a country where nearly 5 million adults are unemployed, just what can Government do to help underprivileged and undertrained youths to get a foothold among the usefully employed? Speaking for New York City, Cooper could point to a number of experimental programs which embody hope:

COOPER II. The Youth Board, for example, spent a good part of this spring trying to involve business and industry in specific programs to provide more jobs for teenagers this summer. This is a fairly new program and it hasn't actually caught hold yet, but you have to have a beginning, and the beginning in this direction has been made.

NARRATOR. Congresswoman GREEN and Youth Board Member Cooper were obviously thinking along similar lines. To both of them, it was the lack of opportunity for useful work which condemned so much of the youth of areas like Bedford-Stuyvesant and "The Bottom" to hang around uselessly once they'd finished school, or once school was out for the summer, and eventually drift into gang activities for want of anything better to do. Of the administration bill which her subcommittee was planning to submit to Congress, Mrs. GREEN said.

* * * * *

Mrs. GREEN. This legislation, first of all, provides for the training of more personnel, probation officers, juvenile court judges, social workers such as these dedicated people with whom we've talked—ones working out on the streets with the gangs of New York, and other cities. There simply are not enough trained workers in many fields.

And, secondly, the bill provides for research and demonstration projects. There has been much discussion on the need for a study, for example, of school dropouts and what effect this has on the increase of juvenile delinquency.

I think that a study needs to be made of the laws in the various States in regard to the employment of young people. I'd like to see a work-study program for these school dropouts—young people who have no skills and who often are prevented from working by law, or, who because they have no skills, simply cannot find a job. What effect does this have on delinquency?

More research needs to be done, I think, on the possible early identification of the potential juvenile delinquent. Is it possible to identify this delinquent at, say, the kindergarten or the first grade level?

We simply do not know the answers to a lot of these questions. We hope also to provide Federal leadership in the comprehensive mobilization of community resources, and at the same time have a highly coordinated effort on the part of all departments and agencies of the Federal Government that are concerned with this. However, I would mention one word of caution and that is that no one should be misled that the Federal Government alone can take on its shoulders the responsibility for the million and more young people who come to the attention of the police and the courts each year. It cannot do the job of the community, the agencies, the schools, and even more important, the job that needs to be done by the church and the parents. It can offer leadership, but it cannot supplant the multitude of independent efforts which must go into any successful attack on juvenile delinquency.

No less than the combined efforts of all is required if we are going to cope with a problem that has grown to national dimensions, but is still best understood in terms of the single unloved, poorly educated, unemployed youngster, who has nothing to do and just no place to go.

NARRATOR. From Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, you have heard a proposal for Federal support to the campaign against juvenile delinquency. This measure, which has the support of the Kennedy administration as well as broad backing from members of both political parties, is only a very modest beginning to a program which deserves the attention of government at every level, from the Halls of Congress down to every city hall in the land.

As you have heard on this program, a careful study of the specific requirements of New York City was part of the preparation for presenting this bill. It is a bill aimed at making useful and happy Americans out of boys and girls who are currently headed toward lives of frustration, violence and in some cases, serious crime.

As Mrs. GREEN has said repeatedly, the authors of the bill do not have all the answer to juvenile delinquency. The plain fact is that nobody does. Mayor Wagner doesn't. The youth board doesn't. Police Commissioner Murphy doesn't. Certainly the gang members themselves don't, but in their conversations with Congressmen GREEN and BRADEMAS just a few weeks ago, they gave—however raucously—an important clue. Most of them, offered a job and the prestige, the sense of being useful, the having something constructive to do and the money that goes with it, would jump at the opportunity. In America today, those opportunities come only to those who are trained for them, and even so they are often hard to come by.

The aim of the administration bill on juvenile delinquency is to find ways of preventing potential delinquents from getting into trouble, ways of training them for jobs in our society and of helping them to get such jobs.

WMCA believes that no domestic program of the U.S. Government is more important than this. If you agree, write to your Congressman and urge him to support House bill 8028 when it comes to a vote on the floor. It's a bill aimed at helping the underprivileged youth of all America, and no community will profit more under it than will our own city of New York. The bill again is House bill 8028. Write your Congressman and let him know that you want it passed. This is Cameron Cornell speaking.

Appendix

Protecting Quality Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Barre (Vt.) Times-Argus, entitled "Protecting Quality Milk."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTING QUALITY MILK

Commissioner of Agriculture Elmer Towne testified at a congressional hearing in Washington this month against H.R. 50, which would lower the standards of milk sanitation for New England markets and let in a flood of milk from the Midwestern States.

Towne represented the Northeastern Association of State Departments of Agriculture before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The association had opposed similar measures in 1959 and 1960. The 1960 resolution, passed at Booth Bay Harbor, Maine, noted that State and Federal departments of agriculture, due to special knowledge, skill, and close contact with the local industry, are best able to efficiently and at low cost, protect the public interest.

H.R. 50 would bring milk sanitation under the Department of Health and Public Welfare and would permit midwestern milk to be sold in New England.

Towne noted the association he represented "does not support State or local regulations that are designed to be trade barriers in interstate trade or which result in a monopoly by local interests." He said "There is a very widespread, high volume traffic across State lines of high quality fluild milk in this northeastern area * * * the program which we have developed of State control in this northeastern area, has resulted in the highest quality of milk at the lowest consumer price of any comparable area in the country.

"We fail to see how the Federal Government through action by the Surgeon General could appreciably improve our program or reduce prices to consumers in our area.

"Our northeastern standards emphasize some quality standards that are entirely absent or are at a lower level in the national code. Specifically, in New England, we require that milk contain not more than 10 colonies standard plate count of bacillus coli per cubic centimeter. Farm bulk tank milk must be cooled to below 40° F. at the farm. We require a standard plate count both raw and pasteurized monthly on each farmer's milk. The tests are to be performed in an approved laboratory and the results reported to control officials routinely. High count results in a warning. Checks are run in 10 days which, if still over the standard, result in excluding the dairy from the market until the condition is corrected.

"Many of our States grade milk for flavor and carry out corrective procedures for poor flavored milk. Conversely the national code emphasizes equipment and facilities, in some cases at a higher level than is common in our area. Our northeastern concept in general is that improved methods and frequent routine quality checks of the product better serve the public interest than extreme emphasis on facilities and equipment."

"If the Congress decides to enact Federal control of dairy sanitation, we respectfully urge that the present legislation be amended in such a way as to accomplish the following results:

"1. The U.S. Department of Agriculture should have the responsibility and authority for establishing dairy sanitation standards and the required enforcement. The Department of Agriculture has the close contacts with all branches of the industry, the responsibility for livestock disease control, the testing and recommendations concerning pesticides and expert knowledge of the economics involved. This knowledge, skill, and experience would enable them to best serve the public interest efficiently, at low cost.

"2. A Federal dairy sanitation program, if enacted, should cover all dairy products. In my opinion, there is no longer any place for a double standard in the dairy industry. Milk for manufacturing should also be of high quality. The small percentage of low grade butter and cheese on the market now, in addition to being a minor health hazard, is detrimental to the consumer interests and disastrous price wise to the dairy industry.

"3. Each State should have the right to impose additional standards above the Federal minimum for fluid milk sold inside their State. As long as these standards are actual quality standards which actually and factually improve the quality of milk and are not gimmicks in restraint of interstate trade.

"In summary, the Association of State Departments of Agriculture of the 11 northeastern States, after careful consideration over the past 3 years, is opposed to H.R. 50. I have stated some of the reasons on which this decision is based. If the Congress should impose national dairy sanitation standards, the present proposed legislation should, we believe, be changed as indicated in this statement."

Mutual Security Act of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH J. SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8400) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting people of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting President Kennedy's foreign-aid program in the form he has requested. And if and when we come to the consideration of a House-Senate conference report on this legislation, I shall support it.

In the months since it took office, the Kennedy administration has sought the advice of technical experts, business leaders and able people of long experience in world affairs in analyzing our foreign-aid program. It has taken a new look at every aspect of our past programs and the situations with which we are confronted in various parts of the world.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has also worked for months in reappraising this program. And the present bill, referred to as the Mutual Security Act of 1961, is the result of these intensive studies. The conclusions of these experienced observers are entitled to our thoughtful and most respectful consideration.

It should be noted that the 1961 act is practically a complete revision and rewrite of the former Mutual Security Act and undertakes to provide for the correction of many indicated defects in previous acts.

I am convinced that President Kennedy is determined to make our foreign-aid program more realistic and effective as a means of supporting and promoting the cause of freedom throughout the world and particularly in those countries receiving aid. Whether we like the principle of foreign aid or not, we must face the fact that aid to more than 70 foreign countries over a period of several years has become symbolic of the desire and will of the United States to support and promote the cause of freedom throughout the world.

As a matter of principle, under normal circumstances I am strongly inclined to be conservative.

Under normal conditions, the people of my congressional district, I believe, expect me to be cautious in voting for huge appropriations of public funds and to be reluctant to vote for the surrender of any prerogatives reserved by the Constitution to the people or to the Congress.

At the present time, however, normal circumstances and conditions do not prevail in the world. It is my conviction that we are now in a period of crisis which contains all of the ingredients of worldwide catastrophe.

We are living in an emergency of almost inconceivable proportions and seriousness. When faced by emergencies in our private affairs we often find it necessary to take actions that we would not take under normal conditions. Over and over again, experience has demonstrated that emergencies require emergency action.

In supporting the President's foreign-aid program as submitted to Congress, I am not abandoning my conservative

principles but am recognizing the state of emergency in which we live and indicating my sincere belief that the President should have every weapon he thinks will be helpful to him in the fight against world communism.

I do not like our foreign-aid program as it has been administered in previous years, and have never supported it because I have not considered it conducive to the defense or best interests of our country.

Neither do I like the fact that today "a sense of impending disaster pervades the world."

I do not want to ever feel that I have failed to support any measure that might in any degree have contributed to our country's defense and security.

Feeling that the pending Mutual Security Act or foreign-aid program holds a measurable promise of added strength to our position in a restless and troubled world, I am supporting it in the form requested by the President or in whatever final form in which it may be presented to us.

Being faced by a critical emergency and dangers of incalculable proportions directly affecting our national survival, it is the height of folly to simply do nothing until it can be definitely ascertained that a given course of action will solve our problem.

We cannt afford to demand complete assurance that the President's new foreign-aid program will be 100 percent successful. I am satisfied that it will not. But it must be considered worth the price if it makes only an appreciable contribution to our country's defense and security.

It should be noted that President Kennedy's program differs in many important respects from previous foreign-aid programs:

Instead of a scattergun or haphazard plan, the administration proposes to give assistance only tho those countries having self-help programs for social and economic reform—to those which have plans that appear to be reasonably workable—and which are themselves willing to make some sacrifices to achieve stabilized social and economic systems.

We now have the benefit of hindsight and can correct some of the mistakes made in the past in the administration of this program.

President Kennedy and his administration are pledged to first, seek higher caliber officials to staff and manage the program; second, tighter screening of projects with the view of restricting aid to those giving reasonable promise of success; third, examination of future projects by type in the light of past experience in specific areas; fourth, insistence upon planned programs before money is loaned—loans to be repayable in dollars rather than local currencies; fifth, insistence that recipient countries make genuine efforts to help themselves; sixth, attention to priorities; that, giving first attention to mass or grassroot needs; seventh, closer coordination of our assistance with any that may be furnished by other countries; and to insist that other countries contribute a reasonable amount according to their means; eighth, emphasis upon development rather than support; ninth, better procurement and auditing practices to minimize waste and inefficiency; tenth, increased efforts to encourage private enterprise in underdeveloped nations; eleventh, more businesslike planning and supervision of projects; twelfth, more specific and better defined authority and responsibility for projects; thirteenth, improved standards and procedures for the award and administration of contracts.

I do not believe that Khrushchev will back down on his threat to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, thus aggravating an already explosive situation. The concrete wall he has thrown up between East and West Berlin to contain any who may seek freedom is symbolic of the slavery he would impose upon all mankind. His threat to bury us and his prediction that our grandchildren will live under communism daily takes on more significance. I dare not discount these threats or to minimize Russian capability of carrying them out.

It must be remembered, too, that the Berlin crisis is only one of many trouble spots in the world today, any one or more of which at any time become acutely critical.

The debate on this bill has been long; some of the speakers have been positive and prescient in their arguments pro and con; both sides of the debate have in some instances resorted to exaggeration for effect, a perfectly legitimate and ethical tactic. But however strongly individuals may cling to their personal views, it is certain that there is not one Member of the Congress who knows whether the President's foreign-aid program, if enacted, will or will not be worth its price.

My record in Congress is generally conservative. I have been seriously concerned about our huge and increasing national debt, on which nothing is being paid, and have opposed extravagant Federal spending.

We cannot afford to appropriate public funds for extravagant and unnecessary purposes. But we can well afford to appropriate billions of dollars for a program that promises only partial success when our national safety is involved. I do not say that it will, but this program may contribute heavily to our national defense and security; it may make only a small contribution; it may or may not be a factor in saving the lives of thousands and even millions of people. I do not know; you do not know. If we win the cold war our victory and winnings will be immeasurable; if we lose the cold war our dollars will be worthless anyway.

For these and other reasons the Mutual Security Act of 1961 has given me more genuine concern than any piece of legislation the Congress has considered during my brief service here. My decision to support it is my own, free of influence or pressure from any source, and reflects my conviction that the people of my district desire, and that the best interests of our country require and fully justify, a departure from precedents and procedures followed under normal circumstances.

I am convinced that this is the most critical and dangerous period in the history of mankind and that we will have to make many, many sacrifices in the years just ahead in order to preserve our system of government and our way of life. We certainly cannot nonchalantly go on doing "business as usual" and simply wish communism away. The proposed foreign-aid program is expensive, and it may not do all that we hope it will. But if it will help a little it will be worth while.

All that we can do, all that we have, is not too great a price to pay for security against world communism.

Needed: World Pressure Against War Over West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, day by day, the East and West positions in Berlin are becoming more crystallized and hardened.

The United States has reassured West Berliners by reinforcing our garrison there, as well as by the firm statements by Vice President JOHNSON that we fully live up to our commitments.

In all probability, we will now experience tactics of harassment—rather than massive attack. Recognizing that the heightening of tensions—already at a high level—increases the possibility of war, I believe that it is incumbent upon the Soviet Union and the United States to try to seek workable alternatives. At the same time, nations around the globe—who also have a great stake in prevention of a nuclear war—have an interest and responsibility in this crisis.

Having commented on this in a recent address over radio station WGN in Chicago, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet-created crisis in Berlin represents—in my judgment—one of the gravest post-World War II threats to peace.

As things stand now, the East and West are deadlocked—with no visible solution on the horizon. Dangerously, the battle lines are forming—troops are mobilized—guns are cocked—targets are zeroed in.

Day by day, tensions are heightening. Slamming down the Iron Curtain between the East West Zones in Berlin, for example, is a direct violation of post-World War II agreements.

The Communist aim, of course, is to snuff out the light of freedom in West Berlin. Why? Because the free zone has been a great embarassment to the Kremlin:

As a showcase of Western progress—far outstripping the Eastern Zone; and

As a mecca of freedom for millions of individuals fleeing communism.

While stirring up trouble, Khrushchev at the same time (1) extends the hand of negotiation to the West (without, however, any real constructive proposals); (2) attempts to blame the West for the Soviet-created crisis; and (3) menacingly brandishes rockets and missiles in a coercive effort at power politics.

Now, what can be done? At this stage the West has a threefold responsibility. Fundamentally, this involves: creation of alternatives to a military showdown on Berlin; maintaining an adequate defense force to protect Western rights and obligations; and conduct a diplomatic offensive—to prevent the situation from being determined by Khrushchev alone; but rather to present the Western case to the court of world opinion.

In this respect, I believe the nations—not directly involved in the crisis—also have an obligation. How? The stakes in Berlin are higher than just the freedom or enslavement of the West Berliners—or the triumph of defeat of the Western alliance, or the Soviet Union. Rather, the alternatives in this dangerous tempest are nuclear-missile war or nonwar. If a war occurred, the whole world would suffer grave consequences.

For this reason, I believe that prior to a showdown—prior to the end-of-year deadlines set by the Soviet Union for signing a separate treaty with East Germany—the noninvolved nations should carefully consider taking the following actions:

1. A majority of the nations could endorse U.N. intervention and settlement of the issues—in accordance with the principles of the U.N. Charter, including the right for self-determination for the German people.

2. Creation of other ideas or alternatives for solving the crisis; and

3. Obtaining an endorsement by a majority of nations against war—or provocative acts that could lead to war—thus creating a psychological barrier to further threats of war.

If these things were done, I believe it would have a positive influence on the situation. Also, it would help to block the Communists to doggedly pursue their aggressive tactics, irrespective of its effects on the people of Berlin and Germany; or on world peace.

Use of Public Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I include as part of my remarks a speech by Harold R. Hochmuth, Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management at a meeting of the Range Resources Committee of the Western Agriculture Economics Resources Council held at Fort Collins, Colo., this past Friday outlining the background and current thinking of the Department concerning grazing on public lands.

This is a vexing problem in the West at this time and I do not by any means submit that the answers have all been found. However, I am extremely hopeful that Secretary of the Interior Udall and Bureau of Land Management Director Landstrom will cooperate in the adjustments necessary to balance all usages. I commend to the Members the speech which follows for its background and clarity of development of the problems involved:

THE NATIONAL LAND RESERVE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE RANGE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

It is a great pleasure for me to meet with you here today in this, my home State of Colorado. It was in this State many years ago that I began my career with the Grazing Service, one of the predecessors of the Bureau of Land Management.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Bureau of Land Management Director Karl S. Landstrom send their greetings to you today, to which I add my own.

Science has ushered in a great new era in our generation, the atomic and space age. Man has made his first ventures into the mysteries of space and returned safely to earth. We have great confidence in reaching the moon in the near future. But with all our space-age aspirations and planing, we are still tied to the land. From the land comes our livelihood—living space, food, clothing, and shelter.

It is the land, and the resources it contains, that have built this great Nation and made our vast scientific achievements possible. As President Kennedy said in opening his special message on natural resources to Congress "* * * every nation's basic wealth and progress has stemmed in large measures from its natural resources * * *. How we use these resources influences our health, security, economy, and well-being."

But man is at odds with his environment today. We are tied to a limited resource base. And as our population and society expand we find that greater pressures are being placed on the land—it must provide and produce more, and we must use it in new ways.

For 175 years, America's public domain has been furnishing land and natural resources to help meet the needs of a nation that has grown from less than 4 million people in 13 States to 180 million people across 50 States.

Over half of the original public domain has been taken by private citizens to settle, develop, and use. Not too long ago most people considered the remaining lands of little value—just what was left over.

I know that I'm speaking to Westerners who have an intimate acquaintance with the vast acreage that was known as the public domain. We know the history of its use and abuse. We know its value as part of the agricultural economy of the Western States. We know it as space, as watersheds, mountain ranges and desert valleys.

But the role of the public domain is changing as our population grows and spreads westward. President Kennedy gave recognition to this changing role in his special message on natural resources. He said, "The Federal Government owns nearly 770 million acres of public land, most of it devoted to a variety of essential uses. But equally important are the vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public domain lands, amounting to some 477 million acres—a vital national reserve that should be devoted to productive use now and maintained for future generations."

In view of this new outlook by the President and the people, we now refer to the lands administered by BLM as the "national land reserve."

As a result of uncontrolled use and a lack of proper management, most of our public lands are in a deteriorated condition. Nearly one-third of the land in Federal grazing districts is in poor or bad condition. Because of this, the President directed the Secretary of the Interior to make an inventory and evaluation of the national land reserve, and take immediate corrective measures to reverse the downward trend in conservation. In addition, recently the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in Committee Report No. 294, stated:

"The committee directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, based upon knowledge, techniques, and data available, to initiate a trial program of range appraisal within the existing resources available to the respective Departments."

The President also directed the Departments to develop a program of balanced usage designed to reconcile the conflicting uses—grazing, forestry, recreation, wildlife, urban development, and minerals.

Why are these uses in conflict? Is our resource base becoming limited on these wide-open spaces? We have reached deep down into our barrel of lands and resources and we are getting occasional glimpses of the bottom. This makes us look around at what we have done with the lands and resources already removed from the barrel. And what do we see? Rivers and lakes polluted from the products of man's economic activity and from his abuse of the soil mantle. Disappearing open space. Overcrowded parks. A vanishing shoreline. The displacement of migratory waterfowl. Dwindling opportunities for outdoor recreation. And sprawling subdivisions eating into our open spaces at an alarming rate. Those of us who are actively engaged in the planning and conservation of our lands and resources are concerned. As Director Landstrom has said "Programs for the public lands must be adjusted to meet the growing land and resource needs of the Nation. This may require some rethinking."

The great bulk of the national land reserve has been, and still is today, used for the grazing of domestic livestock. For more than a century, the primary economic use of the surface has been forage production. But increasingly, other interests are demanding attention and recognition. As stewards of that which belongs to all citizens, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management are obligated to give attention and recognition to all legitimate interests in public lands.

Those uses which have held the spotlight in the past must move over and make room for other uses. Ours is an ever-changing society and economy—there can be no status quo in the broad, overall management of lands and resources. L. A. Stoddard, head of the department of range management at Utah State University, said in a recent issue of the American Cattle Producer:

"To maintain their position on the land, stockmen must work with watershed and recreation interests and avoid uses of the land that will increase conflicts with these interests. There can be no question that these interests have a place on the land, so the stockmen can at best hope only to maintain a reasonable place in the land-use picture. There is real hope in avoiding a too narrow concept of the place of grazing in multiple use of land."

In making land use adjustments on the national land reserve and in providing for all legitimate uses, we must look to the statutory base which provides for the administration of these lands. Although there are many acts of Congress applicable to the public lands, the basic conservation measure is the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934.

In brief, the act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to:

1. Promote the highest use of the public lands, and to place those lands chiefly valuable for grazing in grazing districts, provided however that this does not diminish, restrict, or impair any right previously or subsequently initiated under any existing law.

2. Provide for access to the public land by the public.

3. Provide for the determination of reasonable grazing fees taking into account the extent to which public lands yield public benefits over and above those accruing to the users of the forage resources for livestock purposes.

4. Provide for the classification of public land determined to be more valuable or suitable for uses other than grazing.

5. Provide for land use adjustments by exchange, sale, or selection of lands.

6. Provide for cooperation with stockmen and State agencies concerned with wildlife and conservation.

7. Provide for district advisory boards of local stockmen and one wildlife representative.

There are other requirements of the act but not being directly germane to our subject, I have eliminated them in the interest of time.

What can the Government show for its more than 25 years of stewardship of the public lands? Let me present briefly to you the debit and credit side.

The debit side: More than 50 percent of 170 million acres have not been improved or have deteriorated. Accelerated soil erosion continues. Poisonous plants and noxious weeds continue to invade. Grazing capacity continues to decline on many sites. And, in respect to decline in grazing capacity in some areas, we must not ascribe all of this to overstocking by domestic animals. Failure by States to control big game numbers is a substantial contributing factor.

In addition, only a little more than half of the range area has been adjudicated and stocking adjusted to grazing capacity. The land tenure pattern in many areas has not been improved causing difficulty of administration by the Government and difficulty in grazing management by the user.

The credit side: The Taylor Grazing Act. Some management is better than no management. About 60 percent of the range has been adjudicated and reduced to capacity and vegetal improvement is noticeable. About 2,400,000 acres have been reseeded and some 1,500,000 acres have been treated for brush control. Better access has been provided. Initial steps have been taken to provide balanced use of all of the rsources.

The preamble to the Taylor Grazing Act uses the phrase "to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range." This phrase, probably more than any other, has been the means by which the livestock industry has maintained its use of the public lands administered under the act. But let's take a look at that phrase—it's very broad and liberal.

How through the statute does one stabilize an industry? Obviously, the Congress in enacting the statute was thinking in terms of stabilizing the range resource upon which the industry is dependent. The word stabilize means to "maintain at a given or unfluctuating level or quantity." But the question is when and where do you stabilize the livestock industry. Should we have stabilized it as it was in 1934, or 1940, or 1945, or 1961? Was there ever a point in our history where the range livestock industry was stable? If not, can anyone predict when we will reach that point? These questions may sound facetious, but they are not meant to be. They are valid questions which must be considered and, if possible, answered by public land administrators. When do you maintain the status quo? Do you maintain it for all time? I think not. Then, how long do you maintain it? A year? A decade?

I have had occasion to view a number of grazing allotments in the Western States in the past few months. Those allotments in which grazing capacity has been set at realistic rates have shown remarkable recovery. However, nature has not done it all. Reseeding and brush control have contributed and some areas are now producing two to four times the AUM's of forage previously produced. Climatic conditions have been average to somewhat unfavorable during the recovery period. To me, this is stabilizing at least one aspect of the range livestock industry.

These needed adjustments have not been made without some controversy and objections from the users. Director Landstrom recently told the Colorado Cattlemen's Association in Grand Junction that "* * * much unnecessary controversy could be avoided if all of us thoroughly understood the meaning and effect of the laws governing grazing on public lands and the relationship of grazing use to the conservation of the lands and other uses.

"Let's take an example: There is nothing in the Taylor Grazing Act that requires that a needed adjustment in grazing use be withheld merely because the adjustment would adversely affect the income from private ranching operations. Nor can the adverse effect on a rancher's private operations be made the basis for modification of a district manager's decision determining the rate of use to be permitted on the Federal range; *Charles H. McChesney et al.*, 65 I.D. 231."

Although the Taylor Grazing Act is a basic conservation law, the Bureau of Land Management must provide for a balanced usage of all of the resources on the national land reserve. To name a few: minerals exploration and development, forest and woodland management, soil and water conservation, outdoor recreation and wildlife, and a host of new uses and demands not envisaged 25 years ago. Secretary Udall has interpreted the President's term "balanced usage" as meaning usage that will be best for all of the people, taking into account conservation of resources. A balance of uses from the standpoint of the entire system—not necessarily the presence of every use on every tract or acre of land.

In a bill to establish the King Range National Conservation Area, California Representative CLEM MILLER has defined balanced use as "utilization of an area of lands in such a manner as to satisfy all legitimate requirements for the available resources as fully as possible without undue denial of any of such requirements and without undue impairment of any of the resources, taking into consideration total requirements and total availability of resources, irrespective of ownership or location."

The idea of balanced use as we are applying it to the national land reserve is very similar to the concept of multiple use under which the Forest Service has been administering national forests for many years. Unfortunately, as Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources, has pointed out, "multiple use" is too often looked upon as a panacea and a guarantee of virtue. The phrase has meant many things to many people. To some, it has meant "my use, anywhere, at any time." In developing a program of balanced use for public lands, we in the Department of the Interior are trying to avoid such misconceptions.

An example of the Department's efforts to balance uses is the recently established Caliente National Land and Wildlife Management Area in San Luis Obispo County, Calif. Consisting of nearly 59,000 acres of public lands, Caliente is the first Federal-State land and wildlife management area of its type. Through a cooperative program, the Department of the Interior will manage the land for grazing, wildlife, recreation, minerals, and other natural resources.

In setting up the Caliente project, the Department withdrew the lands from the filing of applications under the nonmineral public land laws and dedicated them to public use. There will be no dispositions under the homestead, desert land, or scrip selection laws. The lands, however, remain available for mining and other uses such as mineral leasing and grazing. Compatability of uses will not be sought for every acre, but a balance of uses will be identified within the area.

We hope that this progressive step in public resource management will pave the way for similar progress throughout the West.

OUTLOOK AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

As all of you probably know, one of Secretary Udall's first acts on taking office was to announce an 18-month moratorium on the filing of most types of nonmineral applications for public lands. The Secretary did this so that the BLM would have an opportunity to overcome an inherited work backlog, and launch the public land inventory and study President Kennedy directed be made. I'm happy to say that the inventory is well underway. Already it has identified and opened large areas of land to additional uses.

A permanent inventory and classification program for public lands will offer large benefits to the Nation. It will provide units for long-term management of land, outdoor recreation, wildlife, minerals, soil, water, forests, and grass. It will provide strategically located public land to meet the mounting needs for outdoor recreation. It will provide land for the expanding economy of Western States and cities. The return to the Nation in direct and indirect benefits will far exceed cost.

As the Department moves along in the inventory process, established programs and procedures are being carefully scrutinized, as well as the laws and regulations under which public lands and resources are administered. In some cases, new legislation will be needed to support new demands for the balanced use of public lands.

As the first step in this direction, the administration recently sent to Congress a proposal to update and modernize the public land laws. One new land sale law would replace all or parts of some 30 old laws, dating back as far as 1877.

We also are giving the homestead and related agricultural land laws close scrutiny. Preliminary information casts doubt on the desirability of continuing to break out additional land for dry farm homesteads, or developing land by mining water out of already depleted aquifers. Continuation of such activity would seem to run counter to national agricultural policy, where the Nation is retiring similar submarginal land.

The Department is also giving close attention to the application of user charges for public lands and resources. This is a field in which the President is especially interested. He has noted that fees and user charges wholly inconsistent with each other, with value received, and with public policy have been imposed at some Federal developments. It is our goal to bring user fees and charges more in line with values received.

In respect to grazing fees, I believe you are aware of the present studies being made in this field by several colleges and universities in the West, in cooperation with the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This study was requested and supported by the BLM. It is designed to show the effect of various levels of grazing fees on several types of ranches using public lands.

This study has an important bearing on what action the Bureau might take in response to the President's directive to determine fair user charges. You might ask why don't we just go out and determine fair market value of forage. The Taylor Grazing Act provides not for payment of fair market value for forage but payment of reasonable fees for use of the forage. I might ask you these questions. Is a

reasonable fee what the market will bear, after deducting the public values and benefits, or is a reasonable fee just the cost of administration, or is a reasonable fee a fee that can be related to the profit taking in the industry?

The national land reserve belongs to all Americans. Their taxes pay for its administration and management, it is only fair that they receive full value for the use, lease or sale of their lands and resources. In many instances, fees and user charges have been calculated to accommodate the user—it is time to put this whole field in its proper perspective. Fees and user charges for public lands and resources should reflect the broad public interest.

But while fees should reflect the value received, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect, and if possible, increase the value received. As mentioned earlier, large areas of Federal grazing lands are in poor to bad condition. Substantial capital investments in soil and water conservation and range improvement practices are needed. Land that is now producing some 17 million animal unit months of forage can, with the help of applied conservation technology, produce an estimated 46 million animal unit months of forage within a few decades.

Revegetation efforts have been far short of replacing the annual loss of forage on deteriorated ranges. Where forage has been lost poisonous and nuisance plants often intrude, or the land is exposed to the mercy of cutting wind and rain. Some 45 million acres of public lands need revegetation, to restore soil-holding plant life and build the productivity of the land.

Under the leadership of Secretary Udall, I am confident that proper action will be taken.

We have discussed the statutory base from which flows the institutions that affect land and resource use. We have also discussed some of the competing demands for public lands and resources and new plans and programs being put into effect. Now perhaps we should look to the future; the past is prologue. What will be the situation on the national land reserve a decade from now? How will developing demands, uses, and programs affect present users—mainly the livestock industry? Let me quote from one authority, "Federal Land Use and Management," by Clawson and Held:

"The outlook is for a continuation of the trend toward heavier use of the Federal lands, which has so dominated the Federal land use picture of the past two or three decades. The amount of recreation use of the Federal lands (here speaking of all Federal lands) will increase by leaps and bounds, until it may perhaps come to dominate the whole Federal land management picture—surely it will do so for many years.

"It has been assumed that the scale of ownership of land by the Federal Government will continue, in essentially its present extent, indefinitely into the future. While the grazing districts and other public domain do not have quite the same kind of strong emotional and political support, there is a general feeling that these lands will be better used, and their values better protected, if they are in the public ownership than if they were in private ownership. 'One of the major tasks of Federal land management is to decide which tracts are not suited to Federal ownership and management, and to arrange for their disposal.'

"Federal land management seems to be just entering into a new major era of its history—an era which can be characterized as one of intensive management.

"The administrative agencies themselves, although they are doing a good job, might well do an even better one. In particular, they might give more thought and attention to the long-range problems and possibilities of the lands they administer. They might think more in terms of the relationship between the resources they administer and those existing under other ownership or management, and the needs of the public."

These are general statements of principles and broad programs with which I cannot find fault. In the national land reserve, future programs must be applied in detail, area by area, to obtain balanced use of all of the resources and to meet the spatial demands for our increasing population. We expect that the acreage devoted to primary use by domestic livestock will shrink. However, we believe that the total AUM's of forage produced on this lesser area, will be larger than that produced presently on the total area. Our big hope and a really bright spot on the picture is that we know how to increase both the quality and quantity of the forage resources.

This is a must so that the range livestock industry can adjust to competing and in some instances more compelling uses of the public lands, and maintain, and in fact increase, the net production of meat and associated products from this resource.

Productive Aviation Seminar Held in Elkins, W.Va.—First in Series Addressed by Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman Alan S. Boyd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on August 19, the day established 22 years ago as National Aviation Day, there was held in Elkins, W. Va., the first in what promises to be a productive series of aviation seminars. Among the 90 persons attending were Senator Robert C. Byrd, Representative Harley O. Staggers, the Commissioner of the West Virginia Department of Commerce, Hulett C. Smith, and Walter L. Hart, editor of the Dominion-News, a former aviation consultant to the late Gov. M. M. Neely, and one of our State's most active leaders in the development of better air transportation.

Representing the State authority in the field of aviation regulation were Lt. Col. James A. Downs, aeronautics director, and State Aeronautics Board Chairman Swisher as well as other members of the board.

Also represented were five of the six airlines operating in West Virginia, including Lake Central, the most recent air carrier to initiate service in our State, through its president, Gwin Hicks.

The significance of the meeting in my home city was acknowledged in President Kennedy's message of greeting and his expression of regard that "Governor Barron and other West Virginia officials have seen fit to mark the anniversary of Orville Wright's birth in this way."

In a thoughtful and informative address on Federal-State relations in regulating aviation Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman Boyd stated that:

We would like your affirmative support. We need good economic statistics and other material from all over the country. We need good analyses of potential traffic. We need information on highway and airport planning. The more accurate and comprehensive the record in proceedings before us, the better our findings.

The success of this initial seminar is attested to by plans already well advanced for another such gathering in a few weeks at Bluefield or Beckley and for a third at Parkersburg or Wheeling, by the end of this year or in early 1962.

Richard Benson, of the Elkins-Randolph County Airport Authority, Mrs. Rose Martin, another member of that body, as well as John Harris, president of the local chamber of commerce, and members of the organization's aviation committee were helpful with planning the event. Other citizens who were active in the program were Dr. Ben I. Golden, Clay Whetsell, and O. H. Taylor.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Hon. Alan S. Boyd, delivered at the Elkins Aviation Seminar, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ALAN S. BOYD, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA AVIATION SEMINAR, ELKINS, W. VA., AUGUST 19, 1961

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States reads that the Congress shall have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;". It is by authority of this clause, known as the commerce clause of the Constitution, that Congress regulates interstate air transportation, among many other activities. The economic and certain other phases of this regulatory function have been delegated to the Civil Aeronautics Board by statute. The Board is vested with congressional authority and responsibility in this area under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as it was under predecessor legislation. Therein standards are laid down to guide the Board in its work.

Naturally the several States, now 50, take individual interest in this activity, at once so vital to our commerce, postal service, and defense, and therefore of such concern to the public. This seminar is a West Virginian manifestation of that interest. The Board welcomes such expressions of concern from public, civic, and private bodies. Occasions of this kind are instructive to us, and at the same time give us the opportunity to state our views and positions, of which we have many. Too many to cover here today. So I shall be selective, and treat with only a few pressing economic matters in interstate air transportation.

The development of air transportation has been such that it no longer knows physical boundaries within its element, the air. There are no mountains or waters which cannot be crossed by aircraft. The nature of air transportation is such that it would like not to know of political boundaries which may hamper system integration. It happens that mountains and bodies of water cannot talk back, however offended they may feel to find their precincts invaded or avoided by aircraft. The same is not to be said of political units, be they States of these United States, counties, cities, or smaller communities. They all talk back when they feel offended by invasion or avoidance on the part of airline companies. The Board has the duty to hear many of these complaints and to resolve the disputes which arise from them.

This must be a centralized function which only the Federal Government can

perform. Individually the States cannot solve problems touching on or affecting other States. It is for this reason, of course, that we have a Federal Government, and for this reason that the several States surrendered part of their sovereignty to the Central Government in ratifying the Constitution, the commerce clause of which is representative of such a transfer of authority. It is not simply because aviation problems are common to all the States that authority over them is centered in Washington, D.C. Real property problems are common to all the States, but they are handled by each State under its own law. The difference between aviation and real property in this connection rests in effects. How one State governs recordation of property transfers has little or no effect on another State, whereas how one State might govern air transportation could have serious effects beyond that State's borders, when air transportation is largely an integrated, interstate activity by nature.

Regulation of the navigational side of this activity has been completely preempted by the Federal Government under the commerce clause as a safety measure. The same is not the case on the economic side, where regulation of purely intrastate aviation is left to the individual States. I suppose that it will continue to be left there unless it were demonstrated that the practice is burdensome to interstate air transportation, whereupon I have no doubt that that Federal authority would be asserted to protect our interstate commerce in accordance with the law of the land, and to protect the legitimate interests of one or more States against harmful acts on the part of another. I must tell you honestly, because I would be remiss in my duties or deceptive by omission if I did not, that the present and prospective State of commercial air transportation is such that few opportunities for State governance present themselves without the possibility of undesirable effects being felt outside the State. This is due to the highly integrated nature of the airline business throughout the country. Fare and rate levels and route alinements are delicately balanced. There is a national web which has been carefully constructed to meet the demonstrated needs of all the people. To delete or add a strand, even within a State, could result in ill effects far distant from that State's borders. To strike at or weaken the economy of a carrier within one State, is to reduce that carrier's efficiency outside of it. Largely this is because the economy of our air carriers is so marginal.

The marginal economies of the carriers result not only from the high cost of doing business as an airline, and the need for price competition with surface carriers, but also from the fact that the Board requires them to serve points which are not profitable to the carriers. This the Board does in the public convenience and necessity. We have available to us complete systemwide financial reports regularly submitted by each carrier. We know what they can bear and what they cannot bear. In the case of subsidized airlines, the local service carriers, we know what funds are available for them and how far we can go to assist them. This information the State governments do not have. Often they are not aware of the repercussive effects of their decisions in matters pertaining to airline companies. For that reason we are hopeful that the State governments will not take action which may be contrary to that taken by Federal Government through the Civil Aeronautics Board. We see the overall picture, and at the same time have the duty to see to it that service is rendered to the communities of every State consonant with the public interest.

Subsidy is one of the most intricate questions with which we have to treat. The Board has assured the Congress that the airline subsidy bill will go down in the next few years. This is part of the greater effort to bring taxes down, or at least to keep them from rising. Certainly the objective is to have our airlines operating on a self-sufficient basis as soon as possible. Disruptions in this program caused by conflicts created by State authorities could set us back seriously. In the long run we believe that it is in the interest of each State to accept leadership from the Federal Government in this area. There may be some rocky moments, but we ask to be heard on those occasions and believe that we can give satisfactory answers.

I am not for a moment suggesting that the States should disband their aviation commissions and rely entirely on the agencies of the Central Government to protect their aviation interests. To the contrary, I welcome the active role that State aviation commissions play and solicit thier further help. All is not negative in Federal-State aviation relationships. You are not asked only to desist from upsetting our determinations. That would be to ask too little of you. We would like your affirmative support. We need good economic statistics and other material from all over the country. We need good analyses of potential traffic. We need information on highway and airport planning. The more accurate and comprehensive the record in proceedings before us, the better our findings.

This matter of formal proceedings can be most time consuming. Here is an area in which the State aviation commissions can be of tremendous assistance to the Board. I am thinking in terms of consolidated presentation concerning air services for any single community. Oftentimes we have arguments and/or briefs from the State, a county or city or town, civic groups and others all concerning air services at a single point. These tend to be repetitious. If it were possible to consolidate like petitions or arguments into a single oral or written presentation, much time and work can be saved. I know of no better or more qualified group to undertake to consolidate such views than the State aviation commissions. It is in the public interest to move on aviation matters with expedition and all that you can do to help us will be appreciated.

There are many aviation questions of mutual interest and concern to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the State boards or agencies. But probably the most important questions turn on local service carriers. I do not know whether you may have seen the article entitled "The Development and Progress of the Local Service Airline Industry," which appeared in volume 6 of the South Dakota Law Review in spring 1961. It was written by my distinguished colleague on the Board, the Honorable Chan Gurney. I strongly recommend it to you and to State officials throughout the country. I do so because I think everyone concerned with domestic aviation ought to be familiar with the role the Federal Government has played in bringing local service about. Without Federal aid in the way of subsidy and guaranteed loans for carriers' equipment purchases, there would be no service even remotely similar to that which communities enjoy throughout the Nation today. To a great extent the Federal Government is footing the bill with the taxpayers' money. There was no other way to get local service going on a grand scale. Now that we have it going, it is incumbent upon us to regulate the industry carefully with a view to getting it off subsidy eventually.

In order to accomplish this end, we must rigorously pursue our use-it-or-lose-it policy, our class rate subsidy scheme and other policies designed to insure economical operation on the part of the local service carriers, such as strengthening them by permitting trunk carriers to abandon certain points in favor of the locals, where service in the public convenience and necessity is still provided, even though some single-carrier or single-plane or nonstop service may be lost to some communities. The fact of the matter is that ideal service, which would be single-carrier, single-plane, nonstop service more or less around the clock, would be prohibitively costly and impracticable. We have the task of balancing public requirement against carrier capability and coming up with solutions which provide adequate service at reasonable cost to users and taxpayers on an economical basis to carriers. This is the delicate balance I referred to earlier.

It is our earnest hope that State and local authorities will assist us to maintain this balance and not require interstate carriers to provide intrastate services which will be destructive of carrier economies and our national program, or to require trunk carriers to serve points more appropriately and economically served by local service carriers due to flight equipment changes in recent years. Along the same lines, we would hope that fare and rate levels of intrastate carriers would be set in a fashion which will not disrupt the levels established for interstate carriers competing on intrastate sectors. Otherwise through tariffs are undermined to the detriment of carriers serving the public of a large area. We further hope that the States will exercise their taxing and licensing powers with restraint in the interests of a healthy national air transportation system designed to meet national and local needs, remembering that we are dealing with companies whose economies in some instances are nearly precarious.

It is a large order to expect 50 State governments and the central government to cooperate effectively in the development of an industry. I believe that it can be done, however. Indeed we are fairly well on the way. Still we have some distance to go and many problems to overcome. A full appreciation of these problems should help to bring about the necessary measure of cooperation. It is in the interest of all to promote the air transportation industry in this country, and it is toward that end that I have addressed you today. I am hopeful that by exposing some problems in Federal-State relationships in civil aviation, we may overcome them to our mutual benefit. I have not meant to suggest that these relationships are bad. They are not. Instead I have intended to show how they can be improved, which they can. May we now proceed to do so.

The Berlin Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, if we are to achieve any worthwhile solution to the Berlin problem, it is essential that we ask the right questions about it. If we are to negotiate at all, it is vital that we negotiate about the real basis of the problem.

In this connection, I believe the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of August 15, 1961, is of interest:

THEY WANT OUT OF PARADISE

By moving so drastically to throttle the flow of refugees from East Germany, the Communists have played into the hands of the West.

The question of who makes the first move to negotiate on the German problem is important only in relation to the question of what is to be negotiated. It is the subject which is vital.

The sealing of the border is a tailormade issue for negotiation which can be advantageous to the West. Its propaganda possibilities are tremendous. And it strikes to the heart of the real Soviet problem not only in Germany but in all of Eastern Europe. Indeed it is a problem even in Russia's own backyard.

The big problem—the one that keeps every Communist ruler on edge—is the seething discontent of the people who live under the bleak and oppressive tyranny of Communist rule.

We of the West will be on very solid ground if we will demand, loudly and insistently, that the Soviet Union negotiate about the sealing of the border in Berlin. We should demand that the Soviets negotiate about the opening of the whole zonal border between East and West Germany.

This is the matter which better than any other can dramatize to the uncommitted peoples and to all the world the fact that the glowing propaganda of the Communists is full of lies and fraud. The streams of refugees are living evidence of the fact that people who experience life under communism become willing to sacrifice everything and take all kinds of risk in order to get away from it. The harshly guarded barriers around every Communist nation are incontrovertible proof that a Communist land is not a paradise but a prison. They prove that the term "volunteer," which the Communists are so fond of using, is a lie every time they use it. People do not volunteer to live and work in the Utopia the Reds describe so glibly; people have to be kept in by barbed wire and force.

We of the West should challenge the Reds again and again and again to talk about this. We should exploit in every possible way this thing which shows the true nature of communism, so that people everywhere in the world will hear about it and hear about it and hear about it some more.

A demand for negotiation about the borders in Berlin and elsewhere in Germany is an ideal vehicle for this challenge. This is where the world's attention is now centered. This is the way to press the position to which the United States should stanchly cling—that the Germans should have freedom of choice about governing their country. This is the move that can put the West on top and the Russians on the defensive in the German situation.

The National Lottery of Honduras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Honduras. This small Latin American nation, like all of our southern neighbors, realizes considerable benefits from its national lottery.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to over $15 million. The net income in that year amounted to close to $2 million. The Government does not receive the income produced by the lottery, for the profits are controlled and distributed by the Council for Infant Charity. Most of the money was spent for public health and hospital facilities.

Honduras is a small nation, yet its lottery is quite productive. If the United States had a lottery that accounted for a similar percentage of the national income, such a lottery would be tremendous indeed. The profit to the Government would be exceedingly valuable in the relief it might offer to our hard-pressed taxpayers.

Urban Renewal—A Local Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, much of the attention on urban renewal programs has been focused on our larger cities and metropolitan complexes. Sometimes we forget the importance of this cooperative endeavor to our smaller communities.

My own hometown of Waterville, Maine, with a population of 18,695, has embarked on an urban renewal program which should have a great impact on the future life of the city. I have been pleased at the interest and the energy shown by this community in restoring the business section of the city as a contribution to better living and economic growth.

A recent editorial in the Waterville Morning Sentinel presents a realistic appraisal of the urban renewal program and its importance to smaller communities. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY URBAN RENEWAL?

What is urban renewal?

Is it a socialistic boondoggle?

Is it a scheme designed to fatten the purses of real estate operators?

Like any Government operation there is undoubtedly some waste involved in an urban renewal program. But it isn't a socialistic boondoggle. Nor is it a scheme to make real estate operators rich.

Urban renewal is an idea—now 10 years old—to save the Nation's cities which are being strangled by the automobile and choked by substandard buildings.

The New England Business Review defines it this way:

"The Federal urban renewal program is designed to salvage the American city by arresting its physical decay and making the city again a vital economic and social unit. The program is of particular importance to New England, the oldest industrial area of the country."

It's as important to Waterville as it is to Boston, despite the difference in the sizes of the two cities.

Waterville now has an urban renewal program going designed to revitalize the downtown area.

Its scope is broad for a small, conservative city like Waterville and if it is carried through to its ultimate, planned conclusion will mean that the taxpayers of Waterville will have to commit themselves to a substantial (for Waterville) amount of money.

Willard B. Arnold, a Waterville businessman who is a member of the Urban Renewal Authority, says that it could mean that Waterville would commit itself upwards to $415,000.

With the city already involved in an expensive new school and other projects the first reaction of any taxpayer, concerned about making both ends meet, is that this is foolish and it shouldn't be allowed to happen.

If that were all there were to it, we would say "amen" and tell the urban renewal boys to fold up their tents and slip silently into the night.

But that isn't all there is to it.

In the first place, doubting Thomases who have dug into the proposal, sought out all the angles and the probabilities and the possibilities are convinced that the plan will amortize itself in a period of 16 to 18 years. In other words, through land resale and metered parking revenue that will result, the plan will pay for itself.

But that's not all. Consider the alternative if nothing is done.

The tax records of the city of Waterville show that the downtown area which would be revitalized by a sound urban renewal program now pays about one-third of all of the city's taxes.

And, because of parking problems and traffic congestion that urban renewal would correct, downtown business is beginning to hurt. If the problems continue and business goes into outlying areas, that are easier to get at, downtown business is going to hurt more.

If it hurts enough eventually a substantial portion of that one-third of the tax revenue will have to be paid by someone else. That someone else obviously would be the homeowner, who is already paying just about all he can stand.

This is why urban renewal is a citywide problem that deeply concerns every taxpayer.

That is what prompted the president of the New England Council to say this:

"Those cities which do not soon begin such programs face an unpleasant future. They will find stores from the downtown areas moving into suburban shopping centers. Homes and apartments surrounding these areas will continue to deteriorate. The net result will be a decline in taxes collected, which in turn, will decrease still further the ability of the city to provide schools and other facilities so important in today's community life."

Tragic Truth About West Berlin: K., Heedless of Risk, Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted and as a companion piece to the editorial from the New York Daily News appearing earlier in this RECORD, I am glad to present the dispatch printed in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, under the signature of Roscoe Drummond:

TRAGIC TRUTH ABOUT WEST BERLIN: K., HEEDLESS OF RISK, WINNING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN, August 20.—Though Western diplomats would like to put a more agreeable face on it, the tragic truth is that Nikita S. Khrushchev, ruthless, wily, and unafraid

to risk war, is winning some of his main objectives in the battle for Berlin.

Mr. K.'s victory will not be readily conceded by the Germans, or by the British, or by American officials. But it is grimly in the making. It is visible in fact in event and in atmosphere the minute you come within sighting distance of the desolate Brandenburg Gate, through which so many thousands of East Germans fled to freedom.

I am not referring only to the Red militia, who have turned their guns on their own people to halt the refugees. I am not referring only to the tanks, and tear gas and water hoses, or the 6-foot wall of concrete with which East Germany's Herr Ulbricht is now lining the whole 25-mile border, so that East Berlin will be as hard to escape from as Alcatraz.

These massive and violent acts of repression—all in bald violation of the four-power agreements to permit free travel between East and West Berlin—have been permanently in the headlines.

But the truth, the symbol, the forecast of the shape of things to come are contained in the less publicized fact that the three Western Powers took the most "tactful" elaborate, let's-not-provoke-anybody precautions at the Brandenburg pass to make sure that the West Berliners did not gather to hurl even an unkind word at the Communist troops, or even an encouraging cheer to an East German who might still break through to freedom.

Now, the new Chinese wall is sealing off the borders so that it can be neither scaled nor pierced. Not only has the flow of refugees been brought to a standstill but hope of escape has been snuffed out.

The fact is, the Berlin crisis is entering a new phase and, from the standpoint of the West, a deteriorating phase. I say this because the known—but not always admitted—position of the West is to accept these events with reluctancy, yes, even with anguish, but also with a kind of relief.

I do not contend that these events could have been averted, or altered, except by the use of force which would have made war over Berlin probable. It was always within the power of the Soviet to jail the whole East German population within the Communist zone, ruled by the ugly, iron-willed, and resourceful Herr Ulbricht. We have the Soviet word on the dotted line, but it would have taken American, British, and French troops, thrown behind the Iron Curtain, to attempt to force the Russians to honor their word.

We did not have the will to do so. We did not have the nonnuclear power to do so. Chancellor Adenauer did not have the wish to do so. It is doubtful that even Mayor Willy Brandt would have recommended that we do so.

We have, therefore, acquiesced—after making the proper protest.

My purpose in saying this is not to suggest that special blame rests with Washington or London or Paris. I say it because it is imperative that we see candidly what has happened so that we understand what lies ahead. And do our best to make the most of it.

What lies ahead is this:

Mr. Khrushchev is not through.

Having seized the border by force of arms, having made it impossible for West Berlin to be a show window of freedom and prosperity to any but the convinced, his next step will be to attempt to terrorize, intimidate, and so depress the people of West Berlin that this once vibrant city will in time shrink and shrivel.

It is probable that the greatest danger of war has now passed:

1. Because Mr. Khrushchev and the East German Communists have already attained a psychologically reduced West Berlin, and this is sufficient for the present.

2. Because the Soviet know that new encroachments upon the visible freedom of West Berlin would be resisted by force by the West.

This means that the Soviet, while preparing to give sovereignty to East Germany may reserve Western rights in West Berlin from the proposed treaty and will not soon threaten these rights overtly.

West Berlin will remain a free city for some time to come. Whether it can escape becoming a lonely, hopeless, declining city is very much in doubt.

Forest Land Owners Meet at Eagle River, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the adoption of more efficient utilization and reforestation programs is absolutely esential—if we are to meet the requirements of the future.

According to experts, these requirements will be doubled in the next 40 years.

The development of more efficient utilization and replenishment practices, of course, will depend not only upon sound, forward-looking programs by local, State, and Federal Governments but also by private interests.

For this reason, I welcome the opportunity to call attention to one such effort in Wisconsin—a State in which timber is a most valuable resource. Recently, a group of forest land owners convened at Eagle River to promote better management practices for our forest lands. The conference, I believe, represents the kind of private-initiative effort—which we need more of—to assure ample resources for the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Green Bay Press-Gazette, by Katherine Andrews, outlining the program and its objectives, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST LAND OWNERS MEET AT EAGLE RIVER—MANAGEMENT CLINIC ATTENDED BY 125 FROM 14 COUNTIES

(By Katherine Andrews)

EAGLE RIVER.—An enthusiastic group of forest land owners met at the Trees for Tomorrow camp here Thursday for the Sixth Annual Forest Owners Management Clinic.

Over 125 persons coming from 14 Wisconsin counties and one from Iron County in Michigan were the forest landowners who have management plans prepared for them by Trees for Tomorrow.

One of the highlights of this year's gathering was the opportunity given to each participant to meet and talk with the forester who prepared his management plan.

Another feature was the provision made for specific study according to the personal interest of each forest owner in attendance.

GREETED BY TAYLOR

Eager anticipation and the feeling of fellowship prevailed as the forest owners registered early Thursday at the campgrounds and enjoyed coffee.

After a greeting by M. M. Taylor, executive director of Trees for Tommorow, chief forester, W. A. Sylvester, outlined the tour procedures and gave directions and a short briefing on the subject matter to be covered by each of five groups.

Doctor James E. Kuntz, associate professor of the department of plant pathology, University of Wisconsin, led a group in a discussion and demonstration of the use of herbicides in forest plantations.

Since many landowners are confronted with controlling grass and brush, a demonstration was given which provided information on chemicals, methods of application and cost. Several types of spraying equipment were also shown in the experimental forest on the Trees for Tomorrow campground.

CONTROL OF INSECTS SUBJECT OF TALKS

Control of insect pests on forest plantations was the subject of an illustrated slide talk and field trip under the direction of Dr. D. M. Benjamin, associate professor of forest entomology, University of Wisconsin. The objective of his demonstration was to show the forest owners when, where, and how to look for insect pests before epidemic sets in.

"One of the most important things to keep in mind when trying to eliminate forest pests," said Dr. Benjamin, "is when we can and when we cannot do so. Therefore, we must evaluate the importance of the crop against other factors such as detrimental effects on wildlife, bird population and all of the other things, which make up the forest community."

Dr. Benjamin's illustrated talk was followed by a field trip in private cars to a privately owned tract of land 2 miles from Eagle River. Here the group was shown many of the insects that had been viewed on the screen.

SECOND GROWTH MANAGEMENT

Managing second growth hardwood through timber stand improvement was explained by Walter Nicewander, manager, Trees for Tomorrow camp. It was stressed that commercial and noncommercial timber stand improvement has become increasingly important. Cut and leave exercises were conducted on the Wisconsin Press Association Forest, 3 miles from Eagle River, with each participant taking part in the activity.

A tour of a forest trail on the demonstration forest within Trees for Tomorrow Campgrounds was conducted by Robert Engelhard, forester Trees for Tomorrow to show how a forest lives and grows.

Engelhard pointed out that creating of a forest condition was the most important part of rebuilding our woodland.

MUST CONSIDER ALL WOODLAND ASPECTS

"When you have a forest already growing and in transition don't disturb things by doing a lot of planting. Take care of what nature has put there and give it a chance to grow and develop as it was intended to do," Engelhard said.

At noon the groups convened on the camp ground for a chuckwagon lunch. Around the lunch tables outdoors alongside Eagle River, forest landowners engaged in conversation about their respective ventures in forestry.

Following the luncheon, a talk on the recent trend in wood utilization was given by N. S. Stone, secretary and treasurer of Trees for Tomorrow Incorporated and president of Mosine Paper Mills Co.

Stressing the importance of the place of the private forest landowners in Wisconsin, Stone told of his long heritage in the logging and paper industry. Pointing up in his talk the fact that the developments in the broadening of wood utilization and papermaking had increased by leaps and bounds due to the use of suphate, Stone

assured the forest landowners that their place in the total picture of reforestation of Wisconsin woodlands is one of vast importance in our economy.

As a conclusion to his remarks, Stone quoted chief forester McCardle of the U.S. Forest Service when he said in 1960 that the forest land available would not keep up with demands and that unless production is stepped up we will run out of marketable timber by the year 2000.

During the afternoon the group leaders repeated their morning demonstration. In this way each forest owner was able to attend at least two aspects of forest management.

Attack on Military Leaders Helps Anti-Anti-Communist Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from the Washington Evening Star, quoting our distinguished colleague, Senator STROM THURMOND, is of vital concern to all of us. Senator THURMOND is doing his country an invaluable service in exposing the attacks on our military leaders, and the attempts to muzzle them when they speak out against the Communist conspiracy which is threatening to destroy us. Our military men, who are in the best possible position to know the real extent of Communist subversion, must not be denied the first principle of our free society, the freedom of speech. The people are clamoring for the right to know so that they may be in a position to help battle subversion and we cannot deny the people all available information. I must agree with Senator THURMOND that the muzzling of our military men can only make the job of the anti-anti-Communists easier.

THURMOND TIES REDS TO ANTIMILITARY DRIVE

(By the Associated Press)

Senator THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, said today that Communists originated an "anti-anti-Communist campaign subtly concealed behind a nonexistent conflict between civil authority and military leadership."

The campaign, he said in a speech prepared for Senate delivery, is focused principally "in an attack on our military leaders."

"There is specific evidence that attempts to create the impression that this administration wants anticommunism soft pedaled have borne fruit," said Senator THURMOND.

"I do not believe for 1 second that the President or responsible officials in the administration want anticommunism soft pedaled," he said and added:

"However, when the impression is spread that the administration wants anticommunism soft pedaled, the result is as disastrous as it would be were the administration, in fact, to have contributed to that impression."

Referring to censorship of military men's speeches, Senator THURMOND said, "This censorship pattern spills over to the point where it allows no criticism of any Marxist-Socialist-Communist theories or practices."

He said the "effect of this insidious campaign within our Military Establishment is two pronged. The outward manifestation of the effectiveness of the anti-anti-Communist campaign is illustrated by official changes in policy and directives in the Defense Department. The sub rosa effects * * * are manifest primarily by an unrevealed, as yet, pattern of censorship."

Implications of Draft Increase Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recent step-up in the military draft has raised many questions as to the impact of these changes on the plans of men eligible for the draft. Many factors influence an individual's elibigility, and it is understandably difficult to keep all these in mind.

The New York Times, in an article on August 13 entitled "Step-up in Draft Is First Since 1953," has provided a real carefully researched analysis of the current standards for military induction. I want to call this article to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1961]

STEP-UP IN DRAFT IS FIRST SINCE 1953, BUT RULES ON DEFERMENT ARE LIKELY TO BE UNCHANGED

"President of the United States to _____

_____.

"GREETING: You are hereby ordered for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States, and to report at _____ at _____ on the _____ day of _____, 19____, for forwarding to an Armed Forces induction station."

It has been 8 years this month (the Korean armistice went into effect July 27, 1953) since this Presidential greeting stirred much of the male population. Now it is again going to be a more familiar salutation.

The Army has been the only service taking draftees since the Korean conflict. It has been inducting at the leisurely rate of 90,000 to 100,000 men a year. The Army's quota in July, for example, was 6,000 men. There was no manpower levy all in May or June. The April call was for only 1,500 men.

In August, however, as a result of President Kennedy's decision to begin a limited national mobilization, the draft call will be for 13,000 men. Until July 25, the day after the President's televised address, the August quota had been set by the Defense Department at 8,000 men. The belated decision to increase it to 13,000 men will produce the biggest Selective Service call since May 1958.

In his speech the President forecast a doubling or tripling of the monthly total. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara set the September quota this week at 25,000 men. In the Korean conflict the monthly quota went as high as 80,000.

COLLEGE STUDENTS AFFECTED

At the rate of 25,000 a month—300,000 men a year or more—the draft will begin again to impinge significantly on the thinking and plans of the country's youth.

Selective Service officials have announced that they expect no severe tightening of deferment regulations unless the monthly manpower demands of the Defense Department increase markedly. Deferments are given for educational, occupational, and hardship reasons.

A spokesman said that any student doing satisfactory work in college, for example, would continue to have a good chance of being temporarily excused from military service if he applied for a 2–S classification.

But in practice may college students have deliberately refrained from seeking an educational deferment. The reasoning, apparently, has been this:

All young men are required to register with local draft boards on their 18th birthday. They remain eligible for compulsory military service, under present regulations, until their 26th birthday. But those who apply for and receive an educational or other temporary deferment, including 4–F deferment for physical or mental defects, are automatically eligible until they are 35. The extension of liability to age 35 applies to all registrants classified lower than 1–A.

EFFECTS OF MARRIAGE

Since the average age of inductees in recent years has been between 23 and 24 (selections have been made from among the older eligibles first) educational deferment has seemed a dubious benefit to many younger students. They have gambled, in effect, on completing college without being drafted, and on doing so without extending their service liability to age 35 through deferment.

Selective Service officials insist that the chance of a student's gambling himself completely free of his military obligation by avoiding the draft until he is past the induction age is extremely slim. That is, unless the prospective draftee marries and has children. That move, although reducing immediately liability, also extends the age ceiling from 26 to 35. Married men with children are classified 3–A.

A Defense Department report last fall disclosed that, with rare exceptions, no fathers had been drafted since 1955. For the childless man, on the other hand, the report predicted that only 5,000 of the 1,150,000 draft-eligible men who would reach the age of 26 by mid-1963 would escape military service. That is 1 in 230.

To counter complaints that many registrants had been able to obtain what amounted to double deferment, first to complete their education, and later due to marriage and fatherhood, President Eisenhower in 1953 ordered a change in the regulations. This provided that evidence of fatherhood presented after August 25, 1953, would not be accepted as a ground for deferment.

But draft quotas have been so small in recent years that the Selective Service System's instructions to local boards on priority of induction have had the effect of virtually exempting fathers. There are no indications yet that this will be changed.

ORDER OF SELECTION

Registrants are selected for induction in the following order:

(1) Those who are delinquent in registering or in following regulations, or who are 19 and older in order of date of birth, oldest first; (2) volunteers for induction under 26, in order of volunteering; (3) registrants 19 to 26 who are childless, oldest first; (4) registrants 19 to 26 who have a child or children with whom they maintain a home, oldest first; (5) registrants over 26 but still eligible due to prior deferment, youngest first, and (6) registrants 17½ to 19, oldest first.

Volunteers appear at draft boards because the term of service under a Selective Service induction is shorter (2 years as against

3 or 4) than under the enlistment plans of most of the armed services. The Army is required by law to offer a 2-year enlistment, but its use is unofficially discouraged by recruiting officials.

Another course offering minimum disruption of civilian pursuits is enlistment in the National Guard or Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard. Under variations of this plan offered by the services, after an active duty period of 6 months for training a recruit is assigned to a Reserve unit near his home. Participation in evening drills, usually weekly, and in 2 week periods of active duty, usually during the summer, is sufficient to maintain a classification of 1–D.

Barring obvious justifications for a lower classification, such as a crippling disability, Selective Service registrants are placed first in the 1–A classification, available for military service.

ORDER OF CLASSIFICATION

Physical examinations and deferments on other grounds have recently resulted in removing more than 50 percent from the 1–A group. The lower classifications are as follows:

1–A–O: Conscientious objector, available for noncombatant military service.

1–C: Member of the Armed Forces, the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Public Health Service.

1–D: Member of a Reserve or National Guard component, or a student taking military training.

1–O: Conscientious objector, available for civilian work contributing to the national health or safety.

2–A: Deferred due to critical civilian occupation, except agricultural occupation.

2–C: Deferred due to agricultural occupation.

2–S: Deferred to complete education.

3–A: Registrants with a child or children, or deferred by reason of extreme hardship to dependents.

4–A: Registrants who have completed military service, or who are sole surviving sons.

4–B: Officials deferred by law; the Vice President of the United States, Governors of States and territories, members of Congress, judges, and others.

4–C: Aliens.

4–D: Ministers and divinity students.

4–F: The physically, mentally or morally unfit.

5–A: Those over the age of liability for military service.

In addition, the Selective Service System has proposed a new classification—1–Y—for registrants now classified 4–F but who could qualify for military service in a national emergency. The change has yet to be approved by the President, but local draft boards were instructed a year ago to stop classifying as 4–F men who could qualify if Selective Service standards were lowered to meet urgent manpower needs.

Is Help, at Long Last, Coming to Our Rural Citizens?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Rowan County News, Morehead, Ky., on August 17, 1961.

As a preface to the editorial I would like to answer the question it raises by saying that the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has demonstrated a keen insight and sympathy for the problems of our small rural farm areas. I have confidence that under his able leadership great progress will be made in restoring economic vitality to these areas:

IS HELP, AT LONG LAST, COMING TO OUR RURAL CITIZENS?

We hope—and pray—that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman is sincere, and knows what he was talking about, when he said this week, "We are launching a full scale campaign to end rural poverty by stimulating economic growth in rural counties * * * particularly depressed areas."

Quoting from a previous editorial in this newspaper "The plight of eastern Kentucky is like Mark Twain's weather—everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it."

Secretary Freeman said the rural development program has reached the operational scale. This means, in our language, the dilly-dallying and redtape is over. Mr. Secretary, we, the people of this county, and of all eastern Kentucky, accept your statement at face value * * * we are expecting some results. We've had enough lip service from Washington while our rural citizens have a harder time barely existing than most of the people of the nations in which we are pouring millions—yes, billions—of dollars in foreign aid.

We believe that charity begins at home and certainly there is no place in this vast United States needing Federal assistance more than the people in our county, and area.

Secretary Freeman listed the following tools which the Department is ready to use.

Financial assistance to 460 rural counties designated as eligible for loans and grants under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mobilization to Extension Service and Farmers Home Administration personnel to begin organizing economic development programs in counties throughout rural America.

Appointment of five area fieldmen.

Local support from over 2,000 Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives in developing industrial opportunities and administering county and regional economic development programs.

Establishment of a departmentwide Rural Areas Development Board, representing 12 USDA agencies, including the Kentucky ASCS State and county ASCS offices, to coordinate all departmental resources which will be used in the rural areas development program.

Appointment of special rural areas development staffs in each USDA agency assigned to give top priority support to the RAD program.

Secretary Freeman noted that the recent announcement by the U.S. Department of Commerce of the counties which are eligible for grants and loans under the ARA program clears the way for swift action in these localities, which includes this and area counties.

"USDA's rural areas development program seeks to eliminate low income and underemployment in agriculture by bringing to bear all the resources of the Department plus the ingenuity and drive of economic leaders in the States," Secretary Freeman said. He added:

"One of the tools that USDA is now putting to use in its program is loans and grants by the Commerce Department's Area Redevelopment Agency to the Nation's lowest income counties for industrial and public facilities development.

"The economic development program sets as goals better community facilities and services, development of recreation potentials, introduction of new industries, and expansion of the agricultural economy."

Secretary Freeman, we hopefully await results. But, our hopes of today, as this is written, are clouded by doubts because our people have been promised help so many times—which never materialized—that they are beginning to have the same feeling toward our Government as the people of Poland who turned against us in hatred because Roosevelt and Churchill failed to send the promised help when their country was overrun by Hitler and eventually became communistic under Russia.

Repeating the first part of this editorial—we hope, and we are praying.

The Nature of the Enemy—3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to bring to the attention of Congress and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Daily News and the dispatch sent by Roscoe Drummond from Berlin, which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune. There is much in each which supports the other. They both emphasize the failures of Khrushchev to improve the lot of the people who have fallen under his rule and the increasingly serious dangers facing the free world.

Under the rules as to length, I present these articles separately. The Daily News editorial follows at this point and the Roscoe Drummond article will be a separate insertion:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—3

Herewith, the third in a series of Monday editorials on N. S. Khrushchev's recently issued 50,000-word program for the world Communist conspiracy.

The first two editorials in the series discussed the new Communist Manifesto's introduction and first section.

Its second, concluding section, is by far the longest of the three parts and the most heavily loaded with claptrap. The claptrap consists mainly in promises of what the Reds are going to do for their slaves behind the Iron Curtain in the next 20 years.

They've been promising many of these things for the last 44 years, and the promises have never yet come true. That, we'd say, is a testimonial to two things: The brilliance of Red propaganda, and the "suckerishness" of a lot of Russians.

When you boil down all these promises, you find that the Communist objective is to turn the Communist nations into carbon copies of the United States of America, as regards living standards and other material advantages.

Suffer along under our horny thumbs for two more decades, Khrushchev & Co. tell their slaves, and you'll get comfortable apartments for every family, "including newlyweds," steadily rising incomes for peasants and workers, innumerable electrical appliances to make life easier, better food than the nasty Americans ever ate in their lives, and no more street cleaning and snow shoveling done by women.

PROMISES, PROMISES

Nor is that all. In the next 20 years, the Reds say, they will abolish taxes; cut the workday to 6 hours with 1 day off per week or 7 hours with 2 days off; bring culture and free shows to the farmers; extend free medical service of all kinds to the whole population; educate everybody at no charge; provide comfortable homes for old people and invalids; and—hold your hats, now—make life one grand, sweet song for unmarried mothers.

These promises are interesting enough, because they show you what the Russian people do not have now, and want, and are demanding more and more loudly from their Red masters.

But the—political promises—in this pie-in-the-sky paper are even more significant and interesting than the bread-and-circuses promises.

The Communists have said off and on for generations that the state will wither away when pure communism is achieved. They have soft-pedaled that promise in recent years, but evidently the Russian people haven't forgotten it.

WITHERING AWAY WITH A DIFFERENCE

So this document again promises a withering away of the state, but with a difference. The Communist Party, with its giant bureaucracy, will not wither away.

Rather, the party is to increase in usefulness to the people, and expand its services to them.

The people are to have more voice in electing some minor public officials than they have now. But they aren't to have a shred of power to vote the Communist Party out of control of government, and elections will be rigged so that whoever runs the Kremlin will run the Red slave empire.

As for opposition parties, they will not be tolerated by the Reds, who feel that they know everything already and therefore can see no reason for opposition parties.

In short, this document shows on every page that—the longing for freedom—and a decent life for the ordinary citizen is as strong in Russia as it ever was.

It probably is stronger than ever before, considering that Khrushchev felt compelled to put out this fantastic hatful of promises in the hope of keeping the slaves quiet at least until Khrushchev is dead and unreachable by the bloody hand of revolution.

TIPS FOR OUR SIDE

All of which should give the Western Allies some priceless tips on how best to combat the criminal Communist conspiracy to extend Red slavery to the entire human race—assuming the Western Allies have sense and courage enough to spot and act on those tips.

That may be a big assumption, in view of the Allied shilly-shallying about West Berlin. But we expect to wind up this series next Monday by listing some of the aces, trumps and face cards which we think the West holds.

Foreign Aid

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8400) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting people of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the proponents of the administration who claim that unless our system of annually appropriating funds, as provided by the Constitution, is changed this year, neither the United States nor nations we intend to help can plan or carry out their projects effectively.

Now why the sudden switch? No case has been cited where a program or a project started has been interrupted because of a lack of funds. We have been carrying on long-range planning for years under our present foreign aid program without back-door financing. In Greece, for example, 21 of 45 projects were from 2 to 5 years. In Ethiopia, 42 of 45 projects were for 2 to 15 years, it has been reported.

On the other hand, many of us are concerned over reports that the administration in contemplating stepped-up aid to Communist nations. Poland is as closely alined to Moscow as ever and yet scheduled to receive one of the biggest chunks of the new aid program. And what do they do with it—the Poles are reported to have recently sent $13 million in aid to Castro's Cuba, and have pledged more if needed. There is also talk of additional aid to the Czechs, notwithstanding the fact that this country has sent millions of dollars worth of military equipment to Cuba. I need not dwell on the sorry spectacle of our long and expensive attempts to aid the latter, here almost in sight of our own mainland.

I am heartily in favor of assisting the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world in such things as medicine, sanitation, and education, which I feel should be our primary objectives. The notion that the main weapon against communism is a higher living standard, and that we can pour fantastic sums into these areas in order to prevent them from turning Red, is utter nonsense. Long experience has certainly established that fact to the satisfaction of any fair and disinterested mind. Each year, we have been assured that there will be a house cleaning in the administration of foreign aid, and that only sensible and feasible projects will be undertaken henceforth. Unless, and until, foreign aid is placed under a firm and businesslike administration, I shall continue to vote against it. I am sure that its defeat, in view of the substantial carryover funds at this time would not be as world shattering as our liberal friends would have us believe.

In the face of the Berlin crisis, prompting billions in new defense expenditures, there is a feeling that the administration is attempting to move too fast, too far, and too soon on too many projects. And that too little attention has been paid to policing up areas where obvious mistakes have been made in the past.

Even under the Saund amendment, President Kennedy is offered $1.2 billion in appropriated development loan money for this year, which is all he asked. In my opinion, he should settle for that and be pleased that so much is offered, even if there is a chance that broader authority might be forced through a reluctant Congress in the final compromise version of the bill. If he comes back next year with a plain record of reform and progress, he need not worry about future financial support.

K. Is Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in today's Washington Post. It is written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond and shows his cool-headed appraisal of Khrushchev's progress.

Of course it is fine to have parades in West Berlin and to watch 1,500 American GI's roll down the autobahn. But Mr. Khrushchev has 20 divisions scattered over East Berlin and East Germany, and all West Germans know it.

After looking at the pictures in the daily papers and noting the expression on Chancellor Adenauer's face I hardly think he is greatly exhilarated by this exercise.

K. IS WINNING: SOME OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN, August 20.—Though Western diplomats would like to put a more agreeable face on it, the tragic truth is that Nikita S. Khrushchev, ruthless, wily and unafraid to risk war, is winning some of his main objectives in the battle for Berlin.

Mr. K.'s victory will not be readily conceded by the Germans, or by the British, or by American officials. But it is grimly in the making.

I am not referring only to the Red militia, who have turned their guns on their own people to halt the refugees. I am not referring only to the tanks, and tear gas and water hoses, or the 6-foot wall of concrete, with which East Germany's Herr Ulbricht is now lining the whole 25-mile border, so that East Berlin will be as hard to escape from as Alcatraz.

But the true, the symbol, the forecast of the shape of things to come are contained in the less publicized fact that the three Western powers took the most tactful elaborate, let's-not-provoke-anybody precautions at the Brandenburg pass to make sure that the West Berliners did not gather to hurl even an unkind word at the Communist troops, or even an encouraging cheer to an East German who might still break through to freedom.

Now the new Chinese wall is sealing off the borders so that it can be neither scaled nor pierced.

The fact is, the Berlin crisis is entering a new phase and, from the standpoint of the West, a deteriorating phase. I say this because the known—but not always admitted—position of the West is to accept these events with reluctancy, yes, even with anguish, but also with a kind of relief.

I do not contend that these events could have been averted, or altered, except by the use of force which would have made war over Berlin probable. It was always within the power of the Soviet to jail the whole East German population within the Communist zone, ruled by the ugly, iron-willed, and resourceful Herr Ulbricht. We have Soviet word on the dotted line, but it would have taken American, British, and French troops, thrown behind the Iron Curtain, to attempt to force the Russians to honor their word.

We did not have the will to do so. We did not have the nonnuclear power to do so. Chancellor Adenauer did not have the wish to do so. It is doubtful that even Mayor Willy Brandt would have recommended that we do so.

We have, therefore, acquiesced—after making the proper protest.

Mr. Khrushchev is not through.

Having seized the border by force of arms, having made it impossible for West Berlin to be a show window of freedom and prosperity to any but the convinced, his next step will be to attempt to terrorize, intimidate and so depress the people of West Berlin that this once vibrant city will in time shrink and shrivel.

It is probable that the greatest danger of war has now passed:

1. Because Mr. Khrushchev and the East German Communists have already attained a phychologically reduced West Berlin, and this is sufficient for the present.

2. Because the Soviets know that new encroachments upon the visible freedom of West Berlin would be resisted by force by the West.

This means that the Soviet, while preparing to give sovereignty to East Germany may reserve Western rights in West Berlin from the proposed treaty and will not soon threaten these rights overtly.

West Berlin will remain a free city for some time to come. Whether it can escape becoming a lonely, hopeless, declining city is very much in doubt.

Don't Be Self-Deceived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Community Citizen, published semimonthly at New Albany, Miss. The editor of the Community Citizen is J. W. Jones, a respected Negro citizen of Mississippi. His editorial offers some sound advice to his fellow Negro citizens. It follows:

DON'T BE SELF-DECEIVED

We read of two Bible characters who were self-deceived, yet they were warned of their inavoidable destiny should they follow out their plans. One of those characters was Judas Iscariot, deceitful disciple of Christ. The other character was Haman, a Persian official who sought the destruction of the Jews but was hanged from his own gallows (Esther, 7th chapter).

Every dime we put in the NAACP, we are following the same steps of Judas Iscariot and Haman, the Persian officer. The NAACP was organized by two multimillionaires (Joel and Arthur Spingarn). Joel took over and was NAACP president until his death in 1939. Arthur Spingarn then took over and has been NAACP president ever since.

The late Mr. Joel died a Communist, and his brother, Mr. Arthur, is still a Communist.

The NAACP heads know that we are a minority. They know that we have made outstanding progress in this Southland. They want us to believe that we are objects of their pity.

Every dollar we put in the NAACP is a dollar we have placed in a program which is designed to overthrow our privilege.

Communists are at the head of the whole program. What is communism? "A system by which one small group seeks to rule the world."

There are several questions which we should ask ourselves. Why is the NAACP not trying to help the Indians? They know that the Indians will not bite their bait.

What are some of the privileges which we have here in the South? We have access to any type of education available to any group. We have access to 3,443 modern school buildings in our State (Mississippi). These schools are equipped with cafeterias, gymnasiums, and auditoriums. Every child who lives more than a mile from school has access to a well-equipped schoolbus to transport him to and from school. All schoolteachers with the same types of certificates, regardless of their color, receive the same amount of pay.

History, as well as tradition, shows that with a minority in power ruin is the final result. Rome and Germany are typical examples. The following is an extract taken from the "Cross and the Flag," as reported by the Citizens Congressional Committee:

Titled, "A Tragic Fact": "It is a shock to visit Washington, D.C., today, even to those who have made frequent trips to the Nation's Capitol. A new play might well be written 'Exodus of the White Ban.' Beautiful Washington has become a black ghetto. Nearly 80 percent of the schoolchildren in Washington are now Negroes. Over 60 percent of the population is black. Property values have been destroyed. Taxable property is no longer worth the taxes in many areas, and practically every white person with a residence is offering that residence for sale in order that they may escape to Virginia, or Maryland, or some other State where segregation is being bootlegged."

White leadership has made this country what it is. They were a God-fearing people. They wrote a Constitution which has never had a substitute to take its place. Men have tried to change the meanings of the Constitution, but its spirit remains the same.

President Kennedy is a shrewd politician. In his platform, he preached to Negroes as well as to whites, and put himself in office. Last week a delegation from the NAACP headquarters called on him to remind him of some of the promises made in his campaign speeches. So far as we know, none of his answers have been published. The President, when sworn in office, pledged himself to support the Constitution of the United States. That was his promise under an oath which takes precedence regardless of his campaign promises.

Ever since the Negro was brought to this country as slaves, politicians have used him as a tool in win office. It appears that the more enlightened we portray ourselves to be, the better opportunity is created for politicians to use us.

As soon as a politician finds a so-called leader among our group, he sugarcoats him or her with some promises or a few dimes. The politician who can offer the largest amount of sugar is the one who will eat the pie.

No one can deny the above facts. It was a margin of Negro votes which gave Mr. Kennedy the lead over Mr. Nixon. If Mr. Kennedy can succeed in keeping our so-called leaders hoodwinked during this term of office, he will win another term.

No race or nation is fit for self-government as long as it places selfishness above a general principle.

"In vain do they talk of happiness who never subdued an impulse in obedience to a principle—He who never sacrificed a present to a future good, or a personal to a general one, can speak of happiness only as the blind speak of color."—Horace Mann.

"Of all sorts of earthly good the price is self-denial. The lower must be sacrificed for the greater; the coarser give place to the finer. Every step of our progress toward success is a sacrifice. We gain by losing; grow by dwindling; live by dying."—R. D. Hitchcock.

We will never be permitted to a standard society until we are willing to make the necessary sacrifice of requirement. High society has for its basis a moral, academic, and a scientific principle.

Red Trade Booms Under New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal for Monday, August 21, 1961, reports the dollar volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries increased by more than 800 percent in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin over the preceding 3 weeks. Included in the articles licensed for shipment are many items of military significance such as railroad equipment, synthetic rubber, and chemicals. The administration reaction to this stepped-up exports to Communist-controlled countries is that we must keep "flexible," meaning apparently that we will abandon principle in favor of expediency. It is noted that Mr. Hodges admonished the members of the press that they should "treat the subject with care." It is my view that administration officials are the people who should be treating this matter with care and take appropriate steps to bar the shipment of strategic goods to Communist countries.

One thing America should not do is to help Mr. Khrushchev obtain the industrial capability of making good on his belligerence. Just as there was no sense in selling metal scrap to Japan on the eve of World War II, there is certainly no sense in trading with the Kremlin warlords and their Communist puppet governments behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I will include the article from the Wall Street Journal:

GOODS U.S. LICENSED FOR RED BLOC EXPORT ROSE 800 PERCENT SINCE KENNEDY SPEECH ON BERLIN

WASHINGTON.—The dollar volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries increased by more than 800 percent in the 3 weeks after President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin from the 3 preceding weeks.

This has been a cause of concern and embarrassment to high administration officials aware of the statistics, which have received scant public attention.

Steps have been taken to reverse the upward trend, although no formal change in export control regulations has been made.

An Associated Press tabulation of daily export licensing reports, made available by the Commerce Department, showed that:

In the 3 weeks preceding Mr. Kennedy's July 25 television-radio address on the Berlin crisis the Department authorized the shipment of $750,196 in American goods to the Soviet Union and its European satellites.

In the 3 succeeding weeks the licensing total soared to $6,278,566.

RAIL EQUIPMENT, RUBBER INCLUDED

Included in the later period were $2,500,000 of rail equipment for Bulgaria; $1,700,000 of synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; $95,000 of coal tar products for Hungary and Czechoslovakia; $38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia; $35,000 of industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany; and $23,000 of pipe valves for Russia and Poland.

The Department ruled that none of these proposed shipments would endanger national security. Export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their warmaking potential.

The licensing officials apparently continued to take a business-as-usual attitude after Mr. Kennedy's talk, thus running counter to public opinion as assessed by their chief, Commerce Secretary Hodges. The Secretary told a news conference August 8:

"I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 or 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

Mr. Hodges said new restrictions on such trade were possible but suggested that newsmen treat the subject with care.

HARDER LOOK SOUGHT

"We must keep flexible the whole question of relationships," he said. The Commerce Secretary has met several times this month with Secretary of State Rusk to discuss trade with the Communist bloc. The two Cabinet members also met last week with a group of House Members who favor new trade curbs because of the Berlin crisis.

As a result of these meetings, licensing officials have been told to take a harder look at proposed exports to Iron Curtain countries. The effect can already be seen in the daily trend of licensing.

August 9, $1,600,000; August 10, $98,859; August 11, $73,185; August 14 (a weekend intervened), $53; August 15, $10; August 16, $5,317; and August 17, none.

Some Congress Members favor legislation to put a crimp in East-West trade. Mr. Rusk and Mr. Hodges believe the same objective can be achieved through administrative discretion, thus avoiding a statement of national policy that might make Berlin negotiations more difficult.

Since July 1 the Department has licensed shipments totaling $9,603,511. Included was $2,574,749 of Mexican-grown cotton, which required licensing because it passed through an American port en route to Eastern Europe.

The granting of a license does not mean that goods will be shipped. "Historically," Mr. Hodges says, "there is a heavy attrition between licensing and actual exports."

Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address given by Iowa Department Commander Ed te Veltrup, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., at the Department Convention of the American Legion at Sioux City, Iowa, on August 7, 1961:

Mr. Commander Chairman, honored guests, fellow Legionnaires, by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. Iowa Department, I am authorized as commander to bring you greetings, warm regards, and the wish that you may enjoy an informative, successful, and happy convention.

We who have been Legionnaires for more than 40 years, who laid the foundation and built the structure, love the American Legion and are proud to hold membership in this great organization.

When the survivors of World War II returned home after brilliantly winning a war, they were invited by us to join our ranks. Many did. We adopted them—six lusty sons for every one of us; we endowed them with all our organization possessions and hard-won legislation, including the GI bill of rights. They became the beneficiaries of all this without realizing fully the dedication, desperate effort, and work required to bring all this about.

Seventeen years have passed and now we old veterans are experiencing a new appreciation. Our ears are hearing some nice words from the younger veterans. In the last 60 days we were privileged to listen to words of praise from the Legion's top Iowa leadership—and we don't mind admitting—it gave us a pleasant glow.

To the Department Convention of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. at Waterloo, you sent a vice commander, an able speaker and a fine, friendly person. He ended his talk with a frank appeal for assistance and advice, which we assured him was at his disposal. We intend to be equally frank today. We will come to the point at once.

We invite you to make a serious study of the problems of surviving veterans of World War I. We can't emphasize too strongly taking this step, because in a few years identical problems will be facing you.

In terms of needed medicine, doctor's care, operations necessary, and the means to meet the higher cost of living, the vast majority of the veterans of World War I are without sufficient income.

At retirement age you will discover that your situation will closely parallel ours of today. The pattern is clear. The thinking projected by greedy, ruthless segments of our society, in and out of Government, wasters of the taxpayer's money in irresponsible spending, seek to draw attention away from their operations by attacking the veterans with such articles as appeared in one of New York's papers, "Veterans, Get Off Our Back."

We don't have to point out that your backs and our backs carried the Nation's honor, the Nation's survival, the Nation's victory, the Nation's glory.

Can the Nation repay us for these sacrifices? This debt can never be erased. Only partial retribution can be made. An adequate pension should be granted to make the old veteran comfortable in his retirement years. Will this be granted? Not without a struggle. There is only one solution. Fight. Fight and protect legislation in your behalf, in our behalf, now on the statute books.

The veterans of World War I are seeking an adequate pension. We resent the pauper's oath. We reject the hue and cry, "It will cost too much." Frankly, we evaluate that argument as a phony. The President recently asked for $3½ billion for foreign aid. Congress gave him $4½ billion. To insure success, our scientists are all set to spend $100 billion on a moon shot, and our Legislature will approve it.

One of the great veterans' organizations represented on this platform has already pledged its support on the national level for our project.

In conclusion:

We are testing today for compassion and understanding. Will we find it within the ranks of the Iowa Department of the American Legion?

Shall we "sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness"?

Minerals Policy Leaves a Ghost Town at Cobalt, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the New York Times a brilliantly written article by the distinguished Idaho journalist, Mr. Gideon Oppenheimer, describing the effect the lack of an overall continuing minerals policy has had on one Idaho mining town.

Cobalt, Idaho, grew up and prospered as it contributed to our war and defense efforts. It can and will, if need be, do so again. But in the meantime the country has turned its back on this area and caused the complete shutdown, not only of the mine but of the town itself.

The cooperative spirit of the people is reflected in the article as is the beauty of the area. I think it is significant that the article appeared in the travel section of the paper for, in addition to reading this history, I am certain that all Americans will enjoy seeing Cobalt if they have an opportunity to do so. The article follows:

INFANT IDAHO GHOST TOWN—COBALT ACHIEVES STATUS IN 2 YEARS AS UNITED STATES PULLS UP STAKES

(By Gideon Oppenheimer)

SALMON, IDAHO.—Forty miles west of here lies Cobalt, a community that has become a ghost town in 2 years' time, and presently will hardly even be that. The reason is that the Federal Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization decided in 1959 that the Nation's stockpile of the metal for which the place was named—cobalt—was sufficiently large to meet all foreseeable mobilization requirements for it even if there were no imports or domestic production.

So the Government's contract for the Idaho cobalt was not renewed, and installations such as dormitories for the unmarried miners were toted away to other places. Now, not only has the 1959 population of 1,500 dwindled to 20, but the town itself is vanishing. Presently, its site is likely to be given back to the forest, the deer, and the hawk.

TURBULENT CREEK

Cobalt lies on turbulent Panther Creek among the hills of the almost primeval Salmon National Forest. No main road borders its neat rows of white homes among the ponderosa pines, but a good road was built through the rocky crags of the Challis Range into the Panther Creek Valley to accommodate the ore trucks. It remains a better road than the average in sparsely settled central Idaho. The nearest big city is Missoula, Mont., about 100 miles north of Salmon on north-south running U.S. 93.

Cobalt's Blackbird Mine a few years ago had a payroll of over $2 million a year. It produced the only usable cobalt on the American Continent. The silvery, lustrous mineral is used in steel alloys for jet engines and for other high-stress and high-heat applications.

Cobalt also has a new use in medicine. It holds acquired radioactivity longer than any other metal save uranium, and so is an important tool in the fight against cancer.

As a town, Cobalt was divided in three parts. Nearby, Panther Creek was muddy with tailings from the mine, but above and below the settlement the flow was clear and the home of many rainbow trout.

From its downstream limits to the central recreation hall, Cobalt was a company town of clapboard homes. From the recreation hall to the grade school, about a quarter of the town's area, were the the private homes of foremen, managers, store owners and other leading citizens. From the grade school upriver were Government buildings, mostly the dormitories for bachelor miners.

Cobalt's good road now makes possible the town's final indignity—the removal of its homes. Wrecking crews from a Salt Lake City company specializing in dismantling abandoned mines are moving out the wooden houses. They are finding new foundations and new inhabitants in other, more fortunate, Idaho places. These include Burley, where the potato-processing industry is flourishing; Mountain Home, where a Titan missile base is under construction; and Montpelier, where phosphate utilization is being expanded.

HOPE FOR REVIVAL

The few of Cobalt's residents who remain hope against all evidence that mining will revive. Rumors serve to delay some departures. One such rumor was that another mining company would reopen the Blackbird for its copper rather than its cobalt. Engineers did actually inspect the Blackbird, but the dismantling has continued.

The first cut in the Blackbird payroll occurred in January 1959. At that time there were 450 employees. By the time all operations ceased, June 1, 1960, only 30 were left.

One remaining resident is the owner of the town's only grocery store, open after noon 6 days a week and doubling as the post office. The store serves U.S. Forest Service employees, hunters and fishermen, and individual miners from nearby diggings at Leesburg, Yellowjacket, Copper Creek, and Black Pine.

These hills abound with mining operations of solo diehards who hold to their belief that a big strike will be made again. Some of them will be forced to leave, as their one-time grubstake employment, the Blackbird, is no more.

Cobalt had its own grade school, but its high school children had to come here to Salmon. The practice was to board out the youngsters during the school year.

The center of Cobalt's nightlife was the company-owned recreation hall. It had pool tables, four bowling alleys, a library and a bar. It will remain, as it is too big to move. The community club, the town's only civic organization, built a booster station to permit reception of television programs from Idaho Falls, but once current funds for operating it are used up, TV also will be gone from there.

Cobalt's water and sewage systems were company-owned. Power was delivered by the Idaho Power Co. The utilities remain, but in all likelihood a future breakdown will go unrepaired. The town's only gas station closed soon after the mine, and the pumps were dismantled. The remaining residents can buy gasoline at the Panther Creek Inn, a summer tourist station 3 miles away.

The 75 units of Federal housing were bought by a private contractor. He left 25 units "on a gamble," but they too will be moved out soon.

DEER MOVE IN

With the inhabitants' departure, the game population begins to venture closer to town. Near one remaining home, alkaline earth furnishes a natural deer lick. Long out of use, it once again attracts deer, elk, and even some mountain sheep.

A company watchman keeps the sprinklers going in the summer dry season. A 10-year-old drives a pickup truck. There no longer is a policeman to enforce driving regulations.

Moss, weeds and sprouting bushes begin to crowd into the open cavities that were the basements of the buildings that have been removed. Human habitancy thus gives way to nature. Soon Cobalt will be less than a ghost town, only a memory of those who worked and lived there.

The Tax Bite in the Paycheck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Bob Taylor, of the U.S. Press Association, with headquarters at McLean, Va., has just sent to the thousands of editors whom he serves two little tax stories that should be given wide publicity and wider emulation. Withholding has now been in effect for so long that I am sure very few wage and salary earners are conscious of what Mr. Taylor calls "the gluttonous bite Uncle Sam is taking out of their pay envelopes." Two ways of calling attention are suggested; either one gets my grade of 100 percent:

Early in the year we applauded the efforts of Editor and Publisher D. R. Peterson of the Truman (Minn.) Tribune to impress his staff with the gluttonous bite Uncle Sam is taking out of their pay envelopes. What he did was to hand out full pay—with no withholding—for 4 weeks in a row and then take out the works on the fourth week. In some cases this fourth payday provided eating, tobacco, and gasoline in moderation.

Reporting on his experiment 2 months later, Mr. Peterson wrote us that his employees were still with him and that after 16 years of fruitless efforts on his part, they now comprehend when I tell them they are working from 3 months on up for the Federal Government each year.

Here's another successful effort in the same direction, reported to us by Ben Fairchild, export advertising manager of International Latex:

"President Edward F. Gallagher of the Goodwill Publishing Co., of Gastonia, N.C. (he publishes Bibles rather than a newspaper), pays off his 29 hourly rate employees in cash and in full every other Friday. For 2 hours (approximately) they have the privilege of gloating over all this money. Then the paymaster comes along and collects the tax bite—State and Federal income tax withholding and social security.

"This procedure costs more, says Mr. Gallagher, than removing these items in advance of payment, but he says it gets results. It not only impresses the workers with how much government is costing them. but it also makes them realize how much the firm is actually paying them. As for the help, they admit it's a good idea but they also confess that it's tough to give up the money after they've had it in their pockets for a couple of hours."

Whatever plan is adopted, we hope to hear that more and more employers are seeing to it that their toilers are impressed every payday with the outsize cost of government. If enough business heads will make the effort, the cries of anguish will reach sufficient volume to be heard in Washington and the Federal Establishment may be persuaded to make some of those sacrifices the President has urged on the rest of us. In fact, we see no other way to check the cancerlike growth of bureaucracy.

Representative Carl Vinson Urges Larger Active Duty Fighting Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the best informed member on all matters with reference to the Military Establishment and national defense. I am sure all will be interested in an interview he recently granted to the Army-Navy-Air Force Register as it appears in the issue of August 26, 1961. I include the same as follows:

URGES LARGER ACTIVE DUTY FIGHTING FORCE

The United States has launched a stepped-up program to counter the Soviet threat to peace. One of the men who, over the years, has played a major role in shaping legislation governing the Armed Forces has been Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The Register's Associate Editor Bill Immen interviewed the chairman to obtain his views on the buildup. In addition, VINSON outlined his views on the conflict-of-interest problem, the $10,000 limitation on salaries of retired officers, the contributory retirement plan, and the B–70 program.

Question. Mr. Chairman, the President has made the decision to beef-up our Armed Forces by calling up Reservists. Do you believe that the planned strength jump of 250,000 is adequate to accomplish the job at hand?

Answer. The objective of the current increase in military manpower is to bring our current active duty force up to full combat strength. Certainly this is a step in the right direction, but future events will determine whether or not this limited strength increase is sufficient.

Question. If the tension in Berlin eases, will the plan to strengthen our forces remain in effect? In other words, is this simply a stopgap program, or will these increased forces be held on active duty even if the Berlin threat ends?

Answer. I have consistently urged that we should have a larger active duty force and that we should adopt a "stable-force" concept. It is certainly my hope that once we attain full combat strength that we will maintain it, even if the Berlin threat subsides.

Berlin is only the most obvious evidence of the greater Communist threat which is worldwide. We must be militarily ready and

nationally willing to meet this Communist threat wherever it may appear. Unless we are willing to maintain this posture for an indeterminate period of time, the current increase will be rather meaningless.

Question. Will the action of increasing our armed strength mean more expenditures for military hardware—ships, planes, guns? To what extent?

Answer. Increasing our armed strength will require greater expenditure for military hardware. As a matter of fact, it has already produced a request for an increased appropriation of $1.8 billion. Of this amount, an authorization of $958 million was necessary. The authorization has already been approved by both the House and the Senate and I have no doubt that the full appropriation will be approved by both bodies in the immediate future. I would anticipate that the fiscal 1963 budget will reflect increased expenditures to accommodate the increase in strength, as well as the modernization of weapons already in the hands of the current active duty force.

Question. Are you satisfied that our allies are doing their fair part in meeting the Communist threat?

Answer. It is obvious that our Allies have their own problems. Since I do not have all the details as to the gravity of those problems, I would be most reluctant to criticize. On the other hand, the fight against communism is a problem common to all of us. By the same token, our efforts must be both mutual and substantial.

Question. Secretary McNamara has testified that he hopes, in part, to fulfill strength requirements by encouraging voluntray reenlistments and voluntary extensions of enlistments. Do you feel that this approach will work? Or, will the draft be the chief means of obtaining additional manpower?

Answer. Historically, any substantial increase in draft calls has produced a concurrent increase in voluntary enlistments and voluntary extension of enlistments. One service has already reported a 30 percent increase in the rate of voluntary enlistments. Since the draft is to be not only doubled, but tripled, we will undoubtedly experience a very substantial increase in enlistments and voluntray extension of enlistments. In the current situation, only the Army will rely upon the draft for additional manpower. But even the Army can expect a very substantial part of this manpower requirement to be met on a voluntary basis.

Question. Will men called to active duty be assured that they will have the same job reemployment rights as those who served during World War II and the Korean war?

Answer. Current law insures the protection of job reemployment rights for those ordered to active duty.

Question. In recent days on the Hill there has been a renewed move to limit retired officers from holding jobs with organizations doing business with the Government. Do you feel that retired officers should be restricted in this way?

Answer. I have the continuing feeling that it is proper to restrict retired officers who obtain employment with defense contractors, insofar as their contacts with Government in a selling capacity are concerned.

The greater difficulty lies in defining the word "selling." On the other hand, many retired officers have acquired substantial skills in military weapons and I do not feel that the Nation should be denied these talents by barring the employment of retired officers in defense industries. It is simply a question of finding the proper dividing line between improper influence, as a result of a former service connection, and a desirable technical ability.

Question. Do you believe that there should be a $10,000 limitation on the salaries of retired officers as is now enforced under the Dual Compensation Law?

Answer. For many years the total salary limitation under the Dual Compensation Act was $3,000. As the cost of living index increased over the years, it became obvious that the $3,000 limitation was wholly unrealistic. As a consequence, the Congress increased the minimum to $10,000. It may be true that a further upward revision would now be appropriate, but that is a subject which is not within the primary jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Question. There has been considerable concern lately over the rising cost of military retirements. It has been suggested by some that a possible solution might be a contributory retirement system. Would you favor this as a solution?

Answer. The cost of military retirement is simply another phase of the total cost of defense. While some have urged a contributory retirement system, I have consistently supported the current system. It is interesting to note that the recent study conducted by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, by contract with the Univeristy of Michigan, has reached the same conclusion.

Question. Some aviation spokesman have called for additional funds for production of the B–70 bomber. Do you go along with this, or do you feel that we should continue with our limited program?

Answer. I originally supported the development of the B–70 as a weapons system, not as a flying prototype. During this session of the Congress, it was the position of Secretary McNamara that the B–70 program should be restricted to the development of a flying prototype, without accompanying weapons systems. I reluctantly supported the Secretary in that decision.

However, it is my conviction that my original judgment was correct. As a consequence, and notwithstanding the position of Secretary McNamara, I fully support the prompt development of the B–70 as a weapons system. I publicly stated that position during the debate on the floor of the House on August 2, 1961, when I endorsed the action of the Senate in adding additional funds for this purpose. I am not only impressed with the added capability and flexibility which the B–70 would give us, but the great problems which it will create for our potential enemies.

In Spite of Unexpected Problems President Kennedy Gets Action on Domestic Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, I feel that we in the Congress can be proud of the results achieved during these first 7 months of the new Kennedy administration. President Kennedy inherited many problems from the outgoing Eisenhower administration, both domestic and foreign. I personally feel that he has handled them with firmness and intelligence. As an indication of the editorial comment on the first 7 months of this new administration, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the Corydon Democrat, Corydon, Ind., of August 16 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

IN SPITE OF UNEXPECTED PROBLEMS PRESIDENT KENNEDY GETS ACTION ON DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

In spite of a number of extremely difficult international problems which have required the President's attention and have worried Members of the Congress, the administration of President Kennedy has within 6 months received the cooperation of legislators and administrators in putting into effect quite a number of measures they seem to feel is good for the United States domestically.

Senator VANCE HARTKE and Congressman WINFIELD DENTON have been key figures in much of the effort and much of the accomplishment.

A number of Government reorganization measures have been passed with resulting streamlining of action and cutting of red-tape. The trend toward recession definitely has been curbed; all indications are for prosperous times ahead. The gold outflow was stopped within 6 weeks after the President took office and $178 million has been added to gold reserves.

The depressed areas and redevelopment bills were passed and put into effect.

Housing, stream pollution and health bills were passed.

Highway and airport legislation and expediting stepped up.

U.S. Travel Service was established to promote travel in this country. The feed grain bill, while not getting full approval of all farm leaders, has seemed to accomplish a part of its purpose in reducing the trend of surpluses and stabilizing agriculture economics. The bill, long pending during the Eisenhower administration and tied up in politics for new Federal judgeships was enacted. These and other measures such as extending unemployment coverage, improvement of social security laws and more realistic welfare legislation and administration are pointed to by supporters of President Kennedy, and we also find by independents who were not so sure they wanted to vote for him last fall, as important accomplishments which likely will be lauded and approved by more and more voters as they see the improvement which they will bring for a majority of the people of the United States.

Our National Emblem: Eagle or Oyster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, for 5 days last week countless words were spoken in this House. Some were sincere and meaningful, others completely irrelevant and meaningless.

The discussion, as all know, centered around the foreign aid or the more ear appealing title, Mutual Security Bill. Few will deny some foreign aid is essential. Many deny the advisability of attempting to play Santa Claus to the entire world—friend and foe alike.

If we are to survive as a nation, we must not only remain strong financially and economically, but morally, physically, and spiritually as well.

The sermon which follows, delivered in the Trinity Lutheran Church of Camp Hill, Pa., might well be required reading for every Member of this Congress.

THE SOFT AMERICAN

(By the Reverend Matthew L. Winters, July 2, 1961)

Grace be onto you and peace from God the Father and our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The sixth chapter of the book of Ephesians: "Therefore, take up God's armor, then you will be able able to stand your ground when things are at their worse, to complete every task, and still to stand." Stand firm, I say.

When was the last time that you as an individual read the account of what happened on July 4, 1776? This is a loaded question—because this past week I did so for the first time in a long time. I sat down and read the account of the little group of men who came together in the city of Philadelphia to study what the future would be for this new land that they had come to and I must confess that as I read the words, tears came to my eyes, especially those old familiar words "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

I thought of the 13 Colonies doing the impossible—going out from that first July 4 to oppose the mightiest nation in the world; going out to fight the strongest military force that existed on the earth at that day and age; going out to flaunt themselves in front of one of the most powerful navies to ever sail the seven seas. I thought of the little group of men and women who made up the original colonies going out and doing the impossible with great personal sacrifice. There were very few families who did not know what it meant to see their life blood run into the new soil of their chosen home. There were very few families who did not share their wealth in promoting this struggle for freedom. There were few families who did not even give the dishes from off their shelves so that those pewter plates and saucers could be melted into bullets to win the conflict—something that disturbs all antique collectors today in the realm of beauty. They took their household goods and gave it to a cause. They gave of everything that they possessed because they sincerely believed that no sacrifice was too great for the cause of liberty and freedom that they were prepared to fight for.

And then I thought of my America today in one of its darkest hours of history. It seems like it runs in a sort of cycle. Almost 100 years from 1776 to the outbreak of the Civil War here in America when we were tested whether this Nation under God would remain one and indivisible. And now since the Civil War, almost 100 years later, we find ourselves confronted by a new conflict—because whether we want to admit it or not, we are at war and there is no sense kidding ourselves that we are in a state of peace today. We are fighting and our very existence is at stake. We are fighting not just another nation. We are fighting, as St. Paul said, "not against flesh and blood but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rules of this present darkness, against the spiritual host of wickedness in the heavenly places" because our enemy today is not just another nation, another people. We are fighting a system, a religion, a way of life, a force of darkness that is out to envelope the earth. This is America's greatest challenge, for we are confronted today by a godless Marxism that is out to literally destroy America as we know it, democracy as we love it, Christianity as we practice it, and to destroy you and others like you as responsible individuals. The thing that made America great in those early days, the thing that helped it grow to one of the powerful nations upon the earth was the fact of its strength—physical strength, moral strength, spiritual strength.

And the distressing thing to me today is this, that in too many cases we see the evidence that America and Americans are growing soft, growing soft physically. We are a nation that is becoming enamored of comfort and ease and soft living. We as a nation are looking more and more to our own leisure, to our own enjoyment, then to the essential things that we should be giving our attention to. More and more we deny our interests, our gifts to those necessary elements of our community, our schools, hospitals, our Christian missions here and abroad, public housing, and aid and help to underprivileged areas of the world. Too often we begrudge what we give to those things and would want to spend our money on the luxuries of life, on our soft living and easy-going way. Too often in America today the cult of soft living has substituted for the pioneer psychology. This is of distress to me as an American.

Not too many weeks ago, at a service club meeting, I heard a U.S. Army officer talk about the Korean conflict, and the prisoners of war in that conflict. And what he said distressed me. He talked about how this was the first war that our American boys seemingly, after they were made prisoners, gave up hope. This was the first war in which there was not a major attempt to escape after they had been captured. This was the first war that any American boy ever decided to remain with the enemy. And then he said, do you know that one of the greatest causes of death among our prisoners of war was not disease, not atrocities, but give-up-itis; where a boy would go over into a corner, would pull his blanket up over his head and give up—and 24 hours later they would carry him out. This is the thing that disturbed him and disturbed those of us who heard it. Is this America? Is this the type of fighting man that we show to the world? Is this evidence of the best of our young men and women today?

He compared our American reaction to the enemy to the Turkish soldiers and they were head and shoulders above us in every respect. And what did they have to fight for compared to what we have? Is it not true that our young men and our young women, as well as the older persons of our community, have become disinterested in patriotism, distinterested in the basic things of America that must be held fast or it shall go as every other empire before it.

In that well read book, "The Ugly American," many persons were disturbed and I would not agree with everything that was written in that book, but one thing that it validly exposed from beginning to end was a plea—a plea for dedicated men and women, who were willing to risk their creature comfort and even their health for their nation and everything that was good and true. And this is a plea that should be given to each man and woman and child in America today.

I love that true story about a little Latvian boy refugee whose foster father here in America took him down to one of those marvels for a small child—the five and dime store. He took him in there and showed him all the various things that attract a little boy's eye and then he went outside and said, "Son, here's a dollar. Go in and buy anything you want." Do you know what that little Latvian boy came out with? A flag—a flag of the United States of America. This symbolized to him everything that was good. This symbolized his new life. He was willing to spend that wonderful dollar he had—spend it all not for candy and toys, but for the symbol of his new love. Are we willing to sacrifice that much?

Do you realize that every 3 minutes, right now while we are here worshiping, a refugee leaves East Germany and goes into West Berlin? Every 3 minutes a refugee leaving behind them their homes, their clothing, their savings, everything they have worked for, leaving everything behind them but the clothes on their back. For what? For freedom! For freedom and liberty and the opportunity to worship God as they want. They are willing to give up all of that for freedom. What are we willing to give up to preserve our freedom?

But it is not only physically that we are weak. We are a nation that is weak morally. Now I am not going to paint the past in lily-white colors and paint the present in dark and somber tones because sometimes in the past our American morals were not all that they should be. But I need not go into great lengths to point out to you today that the situation of morality in America is in bad condition. Too often we are controlled by the philosophy of David Harum, who siad "Do unto your neighbor as he would do unto you, only do it first." This is seemingly the American attitude today to get ahead at the cost of my neighbor, to be concerned about "yours truly." We have gotten to the place that we are not even appalled by television scandals, by fraudulent practices in our businesses and corporations. We are not disturbed at all about corruption in political life whether it is on a national or a local level. We take it for granted today. We hardly even notice the still high divorce rate of this nation. We have become almost unconcerned when we see vice and immorality reaching down even into our high schools. We just sort of pass it off as the day and age in which we live. Morality is at an all time low in America. Thank goodness there are hundreds and thousands of Americans to whom integrity and truth and righteousness are still guides. But there is enough of the other kind that it is like a cancer eating away at the vitals of America. And it goes on, this great nation will rot from within and will collapse like an overripe apple from the tree. This is the thing that concerns me; that you and I as responsible Christians and Americans should do something about the moral climate of America today.

Paul, in a letter to the Ephesians, after telling them to put on God's armor, tells them "buckle on the belt of truth and for chest plate armor, put on integrity." We need a sense of moral direction in America today. We need to have a moral atmosphere in our dealings, whether it is with conditions in our own country, race relations, or our neighbors, or things of political concern, or whether it is in our commitment to places like Berlin and South Vietnam. We must be a nation of truth, of integrity, and forthrightness. Without a culture which has values superior to money, without a robust moral sense, no nation can ever be strong—and our morals are weak today.

And that leads very naturally to a place which should be the springboard for morals—and that is our spiritual life. We are a weak nation spiritually. Oh, I know we have growing church budgets, building programs continue with churches, but we are spiritually a soft nation. A nation who proclaims "in God we trust" hardly knows the God that they trust in. A nation that was built on the basic Protestant principles of dedication to God is today a nation of spiritual illiterates. Too often our Bible grows dusty, our knees creak from not using them enough when we bow in prayer. Our worship is haphazard and our gifts to our church are less, quite often, than we would tip a waitress who serves us in a restaurant.

Fifteen million for cigarettes and for alcohol—four million for our churches and welfare organizations. Where does America's heart lie? That says something. Religion for too many people today is an umbrella to keep the rain off. We feel that God exists to serve us when the true fact is that we exist to serve God. Too often religion has become an escape, something that we expect God to come down, protect us, and give us the good life rather than going out and sacrificing for Him. We shoulder no cross, we carry no banners, we shun commitments and causes, we conform to the world and its way. Spiritually, we are soft. How does that add up to the words of the New Testament? Listen to Paul and to Jesus: "Endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ." "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." "Enter in at the strait gate."

These are the things that are set before you. Our symbol is a cross and our commitment is as rigorous as a marine on combat duty. We have a cause to fight for. I am fed up and sick unto death of persons who go around and say, it doesn't matter what you believe as long as you have some sort of faith. There is only one faith for America today, only one faith that will give it moral direction and purpose and strength, and that is, faith in Jesus Christ and His cross and dedication to that way. I do not believe that one faith is as good as another. I believe that America is the best form of government in the world and I believe that Jesus Christ and His cross is the only religion.

The soft American—but thank goodness there are hopeful signs today. Men and women, Christians all over this great land of ours, are waking up—they are beginning to realize the peril we are in and they are beginning to prepare for the hard struggle and basically I am optimistic because I believe that God has a purpose for America. I believe that God has a destiny for this Nation of mine. I believe that the future belongs to your children and their children and my children. I believe that we are the direct heirs to the 12 of Galilee and the 13 of 1776. I believe that we are the future and that God has entrusted it to us.

As St. Paul says in the 11th chapter of Hebrews: "With all these witnesses to faith around us like a cloud, we must throw off every encumbrance and run the race set before us."

I believe that from heaven's portals Christians of time past are cheering you and me on today. And I believe that from those same portals our forefathers in this Nation are urging us on for the test of the 20th century.

The oyster was given absolute economic and social security. God, when he created the oyster, placed it in a shell to protect it from its enemies. All it had to do was to open its shell and food floated in. But when God created the eagle, He set him out in the wild blue and said, go out and find your own home, and the eagle found its home on the crag of a mountain peak in the most dangerous spot it could find, and sometimes had to fly over a thousand miles through rain and storm for its food.

When our forefathers decided to pick an emblem to symbolize America, they did not pick the oyster. They picked the eagle. They chose not the protected way but the valiant way, the way of adventure, the way of courage, the way of thrilling adventuresomeness. The cross and the eagle are symbols as Christian Americans. Symbols to live up to. As He died to make men holy and as our forefathers died to make men free, let each of us live not for glory but for our Nation and the Master from Galilee. Stand firm, stand strong; stand up, America. Amen.

The Conservative Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 15, 1961]

THE CONSERVATIVE TIDE

A misnamed modernism which has afflicted the Republican Party for the last decade seems to be breathing its last. Where once the GOP contented itself with mimicking its Democratic opposition, with dim carbons of liberal proposals for spending and statism, it has now adopted a stance of principled conservatism.

This turn to the right can be sensed in the mood of Republicans at the grassroots, demanding a cutback in wasteful Government spending, and a militant policy against Communist imperialism. And it is being made explicit in the speeches and actions of Republicans in the national hierarchy and in the Halls of Congress. In a recent survey for the Wall Street Journal, Washington Correspondent Robert D. Novak concludes: "Slowly but surely, the face of the Republican Party is taking on a more conservative cast."

The ascension of Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER to the national chairmanship, Novak says, has been a key development in this trend. MILLER is an outspoken Conservative and a knowledgeable political tactician who "can be counted on to build a campaign around accusations that President Kennedy has been simultaneously temporizing with communism and spending the Nation into bankruptcy."

Even more crucial has been the rise of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as the principal spokesman for the Republican Party. GOLDWATER has proved his philosophy can be sold in once solidly Democratic areas: His own election suggested that fact, as did the victory of Senator JOHN TOWER in Texas. Now the election of Goldwater Republican Charles E. Boineau to the South Carolina Legislature nails it down beyond any peradventure of doubt.

The conservative surge, Novak emphasizes, comes from the grassroots. "Among local Republican groups," he reports, "there's an overwhelming demand for speaking appearances by conservative leader Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, with Senator JOHN TOWER running him a close second. In contrast, demands are few for appearances of liberal Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, whose lack of political appeal among party-workers outside the eastern seaboard is worrying his political handlers."

Finally, Novak concludes, the conservative uprising is being sparked by young people. "Young Republican leaders now tend to be among the most militant conservatives in the GOP. The Young Republicans, a stronghold of Republican liberalism two decades ago, now stand on the party's extreme right-wing. The most politically promising and appealing figures in the party tend to be young conservatives."

Among the young congressmen named by Novak as comers in the party are Marion County's own Congressman DONALD BRUCE and Noblesville's RICHARD ROUDEBUSH. PETER DOMINICK of Colorado, RALPH BEERMANN of Nebraska, and JOHN ROUSSELOT of California are others giving expression to the rising conservatism of the GOP.

All of this suggests a deep conservative tide is running in the country, which could well decide the fate of the Republican Party. If GOP leaders fail to take heed, and once more revert to modernism in 1964, they will have only themselves to blame if they once more tumble to defeat. In the tradition of the GOP, conservatism spells principle; as Goldwater, Tower, and Boineau have demonstrated, it can also spell victory.

School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune Raymond Moley suggests a sensible approach to genuine aid to education, minus shackling controls and loss of freedom to agrarian reformers abounding around the White House these days.

TAPS FOR SCHOOL AID

(By Raymond Moley)

At the summit of Rembrandt van Rijn's career he found himself possessed of a large mansion, a vast collection of objects of art, and numerous creditors. Hard times in the Netherlands made money tight; new commissions for paintings were scarce, and the master had many enemies. As the net tightened around him, Rembrandt ignored the sensible course of selling a Rubens or a piece of rare porcelain or jewelry, but held tenaciously to everything he had. The result was legal action which lost him everything but his family and what he could wear and carry with him to a miserable inn.

The Kennedy strategy on aid to education was based upon a package of projects which he believed would enlist the support of so many interests that nothing could fail. But there proved to be more and varied points of opposition than there were favorable interests. And so the whole thing has apparently foundered, good things and bad in one total disaster.

No doubt, the religious issue was a determining factor in the defeat. But beneath that there were grave doubts in the minds of many Members of the House—doubts rooted in distrust of the claimed need for most of the items in the omnibus proposal and in the figures in support compiled by the Office of Education. They also question whether Federal aid would not mean Federal control.

There is also a rising tide of conservatism among Republicans in the House, stimulated by letters from home. When there was a Republican President who wanted school aid, these Members felt an obligation to support him. But now they are free to follow their own inclinations. And there is the practical motive of an opposition to the wishes of a Democratic President in matters not involving national defense. They don't want President Kennedy to succeed in passing aid which President Eisenhower failed to secure.

Now that there is a breathing spell, there is time for a more rational approach, free of politics and emotionalism. Surely in the two Houses of Congress there are enough intelligence and imagination to contrive a means by which aid can be supplied to meet

genuinely demonstrated need without the Federal control which both parties, sincerely or not, loudly oppose.

The Federal Government can take certain steps to provide more money for education without any danger of control. There can be tax credits for those who pay local taxes for schools. The Federal tax can be removed on certain sources which could then be used by the States and local governments. Parents with children of college age can be permitted a credit on their Federal income tax to help their own children continue their education.

Since the Office of Education has been proved wrong over and over in its estimates of need, Congress can provide some more reliable means of getting at the truth. School administrators can bring some administrative talent and imagination to bear in lengthening the school year and thus providing a more efficient use of facilities and more pay for teachers. They can also excise a lot of frills from their curriculum and their building plans. Colleges can, according to many enlightened college and university presidents, reduce the traditional and unnecessary 4 years to 3. There can be an elimination of unnecessary courses. State and local governments can and now must forget about the cuts they were planning if Uncle Sam comes in with help in their appropriations for education. The Federal Government can help impacted areas by paying taxes at the local going rate on the vast areas they have taken off local tax rolls.

I simply do not believe that there are as many young men and women who want to go to college and have not the means as are claimed by the President and HEW Secretary Ribicoff. Many colleges have scholarships for gifted applicants—funds which are going begging. Private philanthropy, especially the big foundations, can supply thousands of scholarships if they eliminate some of the nonsense which they are now supporting.

There is enough money in the United States for education. But it need not be channeled and controlled by a Federal bureaucracy. Let us now have a reasonable approach to the whole subject.

Lyndon Johnson Accepts Painting for U.S. Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently I presented, on behalf of the city of Durant, Okla., a copy of Warner Sallman's famous "Head of Christ" portrait to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD the account of the presentation ceremony as syndicated by the Religious News Service:

LYNDON JOHNSON ACCEPTS PAINTING FOR U.S. OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON accepted a copy of Sallman's "Head of Christ" for his office here as a gift from the city of Durant, Okla.

Representative CARL ALBERT, Democrat of Oklahoma, presented the portrait which carried a personal inscription by Warner Sallman of Chicago, creator of the famous painting.

The presentation is part of a campaign by Ora O'Riley, of Durant, to have a picture of Christ in every public building in the United States. She has enlisted the support of her townsmen in this effort and in a campaign to place plaques bearing the national motto, "In God We Trust," on public buildings.

Plaques have recently been installed in the office buildings of the Senate and House of Representatives here and one has been presented to President Kennedy for the White House.

What the Constitution Means to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1789, the 39th signature out of the 65 who qualified was affixed to the Constitution of the United States. Thus the greatest and most important document in the history of the governments of the world came into being. It has served as a guiding light to the freedom loving peoples of the world for 172 years.

Many very important and vital privileges, freedoms, and opportunities are provided for each of us in the United States, Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution of the United States. All too frequently, however, Mr. Speaker, all of these precious freedoms and privileges are taken for granted and thus our great heritage and our American way of life are endangered. It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that we need be constantly reminded about our Constitution and that it should be studied and emphasized in all our schools throughout our great Nation. Just a year, ago, the Times, a weekly newspaper published in Worthington, Ind., published an editorial listing 31 points on "What the Constitution Means to You" and I, under unanimous consent, include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

It establishes for you a stable and responsive government.

It makes you a citizen of the United States, if native born.

It gives you citizenship, if foreign born, on complying with liberal naturalization laws.

It allows you a voice in the Government through the officials whom you help to elect.

It guarantees you life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It defends your rights even against the Government itself.

It makes you equal with all men before the law.

It confirms your religious freedom, and liberty of conscience.

It accords you free, lawful speech.

It guarantees you together with all people the right of peaceable assembly.

It permits you to petition the Government to right your wrongs.

It guards your property rights.

It prohibits the Government from taking your property without due process of law.

It lets you hold any office in the gift of the Nation for which you are qualified.

It enables you to become a citizen of any State.

It prevents you from being held to answer to a complaint unless you have been lawfully accused.

It insures your right of trial by jury of your fellow men.

It grants you the right of habeas corpus, that is, the right to know why you are held a prisoner.

It assures you a speedy trial.

It permits your having counsel for defense.

It prevents your being tried again if once acquitted.

It permits you to have a trial in the State and district in which you may be charged with an offense against the laws.

It lends you the power of Government to compel witnesses to appear in your behalf.

It relieves you from compulsion to testify against yourself.

It forbids excessive bail.

It protects you from slavery in any form.

It keeps any State from depriving you of your constitutional rights.

It sanctions your bearing arms for the protection of your life and home.

It secures your home from search except by lawful warrant.

It guarantees you that the legal obligation of contracts shall not be impaired.

It permits you to participate in amendment of the Constitution from time to time.

The War and Peace Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE WAR AND PEACE ISSUE

Many years ago, when we were younger and smarter, an old man brought us up sharp with the quiet remark, "It is easy to be smart. It is very difficult to be wise."

This haunting phase is very much with us this morning as we watch our country and its allies struggle with the oppressive question of how to react to the latest Communist moves at Berlin. And we should confess at the outset that we have no simple answers to contribute.

We can only hope that they will resist the temptation to be smart and that they will not lose sight of what is the central issue in this struggle, the issue that abides regardless of what Mr. Khrushchev said or did in the past hour, or in the next one.

That issue is not—though we might wish it could be—the fate of the millions who already live behind the Iron Curtain. If it were, if it were our duty to free the people of Hungary or Poland or Russia itself at no matter what cost, then that duty would not require any particular crisis at Berlin to bring it into being. In that case we should have long since launched an atomic war to play our goldlike role in freeing those millions from the Communist system.

Yet no wise man would advocate such a course, for no man is so wise as to be sure that the consequences of a thermonuclear war would make the world a better place for men to live in. The issue that divides war and peace, the issue for which even wise men will accept the risks of war, lies elsewhere.

That issue, put simply, is that the bastion of the free world shall not itself fall under the yoke of communism. What is at stake is the safety of all Western Europe and therefore of our own chances of survival in a world in which we would be surrounded. For that, wise men should be willing to fight upon the beaches, to fight even amid to rubble of atomic bombs. That is the

only issue that today makes Berlin the focus of the world.

We do not stand at Berlin to save a little piece of land. Or simply to enforce some legal rights. Or even, for themselves alone, to save the West Berliners. Certainly not to undo all the past follies of the world, to save Russians, Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, or East Germans. And the problem is not to lose sight of what is the true war-and-peace issue.

When Mr. Khrushchev clamps down his own people, barring with tanks their exits to freedom, it is a tremendous temptation to react to this brutal move with a move of equal force. Surely, we ask ourselves, our statesmen should be able to think of some smart action, some clever scheme which would teach Mr. Khrushchev a thing or two. Or, as Berlin's Mayor Brandt urges, we can't let the Communists get away with that.

Now one difficulty with this reaction of anger is that it may keep us from seeing what is truly happening around Berlin. That the Communists have shut up their own people is not necessarily a sign of strength; it is more likely a mark of weakness. Far from acting boldly, Mr. Khrushchev may be acting desperately. And so, all unknown to us, this move may signal that already we have won a victory at Berlin.

But the greater danger in blind passion is that the rush to be smart may sweep us into new folly. The world has come to its present state largely because of the cleverness of statesmen, because men at such places as Yalta and Potsdam were too impatient with the search for wisdom and did what seemed to them at the time the smart thing. Few decisions are more treacherous than those made in passionate haste.

President Kennedy has clearly stated the war-and-peace issue at Berlin. It is that we will not surrender there, simply because to surrender there will surrender more than we can yield in safety. And there is enough in this to challenge the wisdom of statesmen without their risking the peace merely to show how smart they are in jousting with the Communists.

Wheat Plan Dubious but Interesting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like included the attached editorial from the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Wheat Plan Dubious but Interesting":

WHEAT PLAN DUBIOUS BUT INTERESTING

On the surface, the plan for stockpiling wheat for use in case of war—which the Government says it will do in Peoria and 190 other metropolitan centers, is about as hard to oppose as virtue and motherhood, but certainly it is a subject worthy of rumination.

Practically the plan raises as many questions as it answers.

It's well and good to have a stockpile of wheat here in case of a nuclear attack. But would the wheat be around when the bombs stopped falling?

And, if it were, would it be fit to eat? Or would it be contaminated from radioactive fallout?

If the people and the wheat both survived, precisely how are the people—who are warned to remain in shelter until danger of fallout is past—to obtain the wheat?

Perhaps time will provide answers to these questions, too. For now, the primary fruit of the Government's plan seems to have been to spotlight the usefulness of wheat.

And it is a noble grain. From it comes bread, the staff of life.

Moreover, in this age of refined and fancy foods, it is good to be reminded that wheat doesn't even have to be ground and made into bread to be nourishing and good.

As Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman points out, you can simply pick up a handful of wheat and eat it.

Indeed, we're tempted to advocate this as the best way to eat wheat anyway. Nothing matches our memories of childhood years in our Nation's great Wheat Belt, standing beside a combine on a warm summer harvest afternoon watching the golden flood cascade from the combine's bin into the waiting truck. And reaching over to take a handful of the fresh grain and pop it into the mouth.

Certainly it is nourishing in this way. Nothing is lost in the grinding and refining process. And when partaken of this way, it rather nourishes the spirit too. A chew of wheat, stuffed into the cheek to soften, from when your tongue can separate a kernel at a time for munching, serves somewhat the same purpose as a chew of tobacco. It tranquilizes and invites rumination.

We're supported in our view of wheat by our own Dr. William Brady, whose health column runs daily on the evening Journal Star's editorial page. He thinks eating wheat any way except in its raw form or freshly ground is unhealthy—and sacrilegious. Dr. Brady offers a free pamphlet, incidentally, called "Wheat To Eat," which readers can obtain in return for a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

If Secretary Freeman's plan accomplishes nothing more than popularizing wheat, it will perhaps be worthwhile.

And the Government's choice of wheat as the sustaining food in case of war is psychologically not bad, too. Wheat is symbolic. As William Jennings Bryan, himself an Illinoisan, once said, "If this invisible germ of life in the grain of wheat can thus pass unimpaired through 3,000 resurrections, I shall not doubt that my soul has power to clothe itself with a new body, suited to its new existence, when this early frame has crumbled into dust."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of August 19, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Foreign aid occupied both the House and the Senate this week. Hottest debate revolved around the President's demand for 5-year authority to borrow directly from the Treasury (back door spending, bypassing Congress constitutional responsibility), and continuing aid to Communist countries. I took the floor on 3 days to (1) object to the entire bill, (2) object especially to giving aid to Communist and Socialist countries, as well as neutral countries.

In opposition to the entire mutual security bill, I stated on Wednesday (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14969) "In my opinion it is absolutely essential that we take a long hard look at the whole foreign aid program so that it may be revised to meet United States self-interest rather than to continue as a gigantic worldwide welfare scheme paid for by American taxpayers and which is not achieving the goal of stopping the spread of communism." Reasons for opposition to the bill: (1) Poor administration. The bill will not provide improved administration, better recruitment in the personnel, the result being increased ineffectiveness, greater and more widespread scandals. (2) Back-door financing is wrong. The 5-year loan authority totaling $7.3 billion represents a loss of congressional control and a loss of congressional scrutiny of the programs annually. (3) What is really needed is a complete review and revision of foreign aid legislation based on a self-interest statement of the United States. (4) Dollar diplomacy (throwing money at problems in an attempt to solve them) creates more problems in attempting to force our culture and our standard of living and social reforms on people and governments who take our money but do not want a different way of life than they now have. (5) The bill is not fiscally responsible. The bill and the report show no one knows the total cost; $30 billion over the next 5 years in the report, $36.6 billion according to Senator BYRD. (6) No terms or conditions on loans totaling $7.3 billion in the next 5 years. It will be possible for the Executive to make low or no interest bearing loans as long as 50 years with no principal payments in the first 10 years. According to Senator BYRD (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD p. 14478) "interest on Federal debt, as it would be created by this bill (Senator BYRD figures the loan cost will be $8.8 billion in the next 5 years) for the loan program alone, computed at 3 percent, compounded annually for 50 years would total $29.7 billion. This would be nearly three and a half times the principal. That is to say that inasmuch as all of the money, which would not be appropriated in the regular course must be borrowed at about 3 percent interest, if no interest is received from the countries to whom the loans are granted, the compounded interest on the loans made by our Government will be $29.7 billion." (7) Danger in tremendous increase in Executive power and control of spending. I oppose Congress delegating its authority as a violation of the oath we take to support the Constitution. (8) Too many ambiguities of the provisions within the bill which make it a legislative monstrosity. (9) Foreign aid is failing to achieve its objective—witness the growth of communism during our huge outpouring of money. It is self-defeating, causing us to lose, not win, the struggle with communism. (10) We are wrong in committing future Congresses to appropriations, a violation of congressional procedures and could be unconstitutional. (11) It further increases the pressure on our balance of payments. We continue to give away dollars which can be redeemed in gold when foreign nations already hold approximately the same dollar volume as we have gold. Any "run on the bank" would deplete our gold supply. (12) The foreign aid program is being sold as a subsidy for U.S. industry. This philosophy is wrong and endangers our economy. It will return to haunt us.

On Thursday and Friday I spoke against giving aid to our enemies. When we give aid to Communist Tito, to Poland, and other Communists, indeed, to Socialists like Nehru and those of India, we are giving aid to our

enemies. When we give money to the Communist and Socialist governments, we are aiding the philosophies and governments that are determined to destroy us. We will either win the fight or we will lose the fight. There will not be peaceful coexistence, which is a Communist line.

I stand with the American taxpayer who is footing the bill in saying we are sick of pouring out money to a dedicated enemy. Let us gird ourselves and not give a penny to any government that does not guarantee its people certain freedoms, freedom of election, freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. We must make this agonizing reappraisal—to stop subsidizing an alien philosophy. Let us say that we will aid only dedicated friends, not our enemies, not the neutrals.

A bitter disappointment was the defeat of an amendment by Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of Mississippi which would have prohibited aid to any country which voted in the United Nations to seat Red China. (The vote 212 to 102)

The mutual security bill passed the House late Friday evening, 287 to 140. It is an unfortunate truth that the few conservative victories limiting the bill (including reducing the 5-year authority of the President to yearly scrutiny by Congress) will be deleted in the conference with the Senate version and thus probably will not be in the final bill.

Coal Vital to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt in anyone's mind that the coal industry would be called on to greatly expand its production in a time of national emergency. This was the case during World War I, and World War II, when annual production had to be stepped up more than 200 million tons a year by the 4th year of hostilities.

In the event of a third world war, even greater increases in production would be called for.

The only real question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the coal industry is, and will be, in a position to meet these demands, whether it would be in a position to supply all of the fuel needed to keep our factories and businesses going.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the coal industry is dangerously close to the point where it could not meet these demands. Production in 1960 amounted only to 413 million tons, the bare minimum at which it can operate profitably, and the figures so far this year indicate that production will fall to a 23-year low of 385 million tons. Actually, total production for the first 6 months of this year was only 155 million tons, a 27 million ton drop from a year ago.

When production falls off mines must be closed and, once they are closed, it is difficult, in many cases impossible, to reopen them. They are subject to flooding, contamination by gas, cave-ins, and other dangers and it is more practical and economical to open new mines.

But I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the opening of a new mine is in itself a time-consuming and costly operation. It has been estimated that the initial investment to open a new mine is approximately $20 for every ton of annual production capacity, and this estimate is probably low when you consider the tremendous cost of the equipment needed to operate today's highly mechanized mines.

If cost were the only problem, it could, of course, be overcome if the need were great enough. But there are also the elements of time and of skilled manpower to operate the mines.

Today's miner is a highly skilled technician, and needs a great deal of training before he can perform his job. At the present level of employment in the mines, more and more of the trained, highly skilled miners are seeking employment in other industries, many in areas far removed from the coal fields, and they would not be readily available when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, the mines of West Virginia are the most productive in the world, and a great percentage of our production goes to the east coast where so much of our industrial might is concentrated. It is in this very area, whose needs we have served so long, that coal is losing out to the imports of foreign residual oil. If that supply of oil should be cut off, as it surely would be in time of emergency, we would be sorely pressed to meet the immediate demands that would be made upon us.

The only logical answer, Mr. Speaker, is to keep imports of residual oil at a practical level, a level which will permit the coal industry to maintain production at a rate which will let us expand when the demand is made upon us.

Card-Carrying Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, in the column "Offbeat Europe," by the Herald Tribune foreign staff, the following item was printed. It concerns the foray of our Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, to Africa, recently, on some foreign policy mission.

OFFBEAT EUROPE

On his way back from the Ivory Coast where he represented the President at Independence Day celebrations, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy fell into conversation with a newsman in Paris. The name of Ghana President Kwame Nkrumah came up.

"We're against him," said Kennedy flatly.

"No, Bob, we're not," said the newsman. "Why your brother had him on a state visit in Washington."

"Well I think we're against him, but I'll check," said the Attorney General. He went to his hotel room, came back about 10 minutes later and said:

"Yeah, you're right. I looked him up on the cards and we're for him."

First. If what is reported is true, the American people should have great misgivings as to this administration's understanding of a knowledgeable foreign policy. I do not think it very sensible to send a Cabinet Member who is unacquainted with foreign policy to a foreign land, just because he happens to be a relative of the President. He should stay home and tend to his homework as Attorney General and leave the very factinating trips overseas to those who know more about the subject.

Second. Already here at home we see Government by credit card—charging to our children and grandchildren our profligacy today. Now we see foreign policy by a card-carrying Attorney General.

Third. I say it's time this administration started putting its real cards on the table—abroad, as well as at home.

Tribute to Mrs. Katie Louchheim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the best known and most admired women in American politics is Mrs. Katie Louchheim. As vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee and chairman of the Women's Division she traveled into every State of the Union and made friends everywhere she went. Now the same talents that she demonstrated here at home in working for the Democratic Party have been put to work making friends for America all over the world. An article from the Christian Science Monitor tells the story of the fine work Mrs. Louchheim is doing in her new field.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

(By Josephine Ripley)

When Mrs. Katie Louchheim was appointed as consultant to the Department of State on women's activities, she started out with a clear slate—in fact, a blank slate.

The job itself was new. But adaptable Katie plunged from politics (as vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee and director of its women's division) into diplomacy without difficulty. That is except for one thing. She is still trying to break herself of saying "Hi."

Basic training in her new job has taken her around the world, across the country, and brought her in touch with women's groups in many nations. Just back now from a trip to India and Cyprus, she will soon be off to Africa. She is flooded with invitations from all over the globe.

It's not just a question of personal popularity, although that helps, it's just that Katie is fast becoming the women to whom women everywhere are turning for help, particularly the women of the newly independent nations.

There has been some disappointment among Democratic women that President Kennedy has not appointed more women to top jobs in the administration. But there is probably no more potentially influential position in the Government today than that which Mrs. Louchheim holds.

Women of many nations in the world are just emerging from obscurity into public life. How does a woman learn to participate in community affairs, raise money for schoolbooks, organize women's clubs? The U.S. Government feels it is important that help be offered.

Wives of ambassadors and of Foreign Service officers are encouraged to lend a guiding hand—to show how American women, in their communities, go about these things.

Mrs. Louchheim found that in Afghanistan many wives of American officials are teaching English in schools, or teaching the women how to make clothes for themselves and their children.

In Nepal, the American Women's Organization provides nursing scholarships, supplies simple household utensils, assists adults in literacy courses, provides toys for the youngsters.

In Pakistan, wives of Americans stationed there are active in refugee work.

In Thai, Army officers recently inaugurated what they call Operation Mitrapaf, meaning "friendship" in a remote area. Their first objective is to get a new school built and equipped. Wives are helping to raise money for the project.

In Yemen, the wife of the American chargé d'affaires teaches and runs a school in which half of the children are Yemenese and half are children of members of the diplomatic corps.

When Mrs. Louchheim returned from this "reconnaissance trip," she had a notebook full of reminders: "In Thailand children need paper and pencils and children's books. In India, need for clothes for farmworkers; same in Malaya; in Pakistan they need plastic bottles and ordinary wrapping paper." There is such a dearth of wrapping paper in Pakistan, Mrs. Louchheim reported, purchases are sometimes tied up in cast-off cigarette wrappings.

The President sees it as important—as a kind of people-to-people program taking in millions of women in many nations.

Mrs. Louchheim's responsibilities are far-ranging, from helping to coordinate the reception of oversea neighbors coming to Washington, to pulling together all kinds of government programs—as well as those of private women's organizations—as they relate to the expanding role of women.

She feels there is a great need today to increase the participation of women in exchange programs. She recently initiated the first multinational exchange program of social workers in Latin and Central America—a project so successful that special funds have now been set aside for more of the same.

She plans a series of meetings with women's groups of all kinds interested in working with similar groups in other lands, and who want to underwrite a village project or adopt a school.

She believes it would be helpful if wives of Ambassadors and Foreign Service officers going overseas could be given more of an opportunity to participate with their husbands in language and orientation courses before departure.

The new world which is emerging is a world in which women are bound to have a greater part, whether they want it that way or not, and the President has wisely recognized this fact in his appointment of a woman to this new and unusual job in his Department of State.

The West Virginia Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is with sheer gratitude and pleasure that I read "The West Virginia Story," by Gordon L. Palmer, in Dodge News Magazine's August issue, for the author has captured the flavor of my State in both its history and scenic grandeur.

But Dodge News Magazine has done still another good turn for the people of my State, as well as the people of the United States, by also including an article, in the same issue, by Eloise Engle, entitled "And This Is Harper's Ferry." Miss Engle's article, so carefully turned and rounded, together with Mr. Palmer's article, deserves universal attention, if more Americans, and foreign visitors to our shores, are to learn of the many pleasures which await them on a visit to West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST VIRGINIA STORY
(By Gordon L. Palmer)

West Virginia offers spectacular scenery, famous historic landmarks and outstanding recreational facilities. And by virtue of its varied attractions it has often been proclaimed the Little Switzerland of America.

The majestic Mountain State is nestled between the Appalachians and the Ohio River Valley where more than half of the population of the Nation is located within 500 miles of its geographic center, making it the outdoor playground of the East.

Much of America's early history was fashioned in large part by the Alleghenies as the way southward for confident settlers and the Ohio River as the main artery to the West. Thomas Jefferson and George Washington were frequent visitors to West Virginia and it was on one of Jefferson's trips to these highlands that he remarked, after viewing for the first time the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers: "In the moment of their junction, they rush together against the mountain, rend it asunder, and pass off to the sea. The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

From the recorded pages of history and the palette of nature which has created a masterpiece of scenic grandeur the adventurer can enjoy the tranquility of a cool mountain retreat; capture the scent of hemlock, oak, pine or cedar while motoring along forested hills, valleys, streams and waterfalls where rushing waters have formed rugged gaps and towering canyons.

With an average altitude of 1,500 feet West Virginia is a woodland paradise with primitive scenery. The State offers among its many outstanding facets 20 beautifully developed State parks and nine State forests. Lodgings and their neighboring facilities are unparalleled where vacationing guarantees relaxation and contentment. Vigorous activities such as hiking, swimming, golfing, nature study, boating, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, spelunking, and tent camping are available.

Looming above the Charleston skyline on the banks of the Kanawha River, located in what is often called the Ruhr Valley of America, is West Virginia's gold-domed capitol, one of the world's superb examples of Italian Renaissance architecture.

A parkland panorama and rendezvous with nature awaits the motoring tourist as he travels east on U.S. 60. Within an hour's drive of the State Capitol is Hawk's Nest State Park where a spectacular view of New River Canyon is seen by a half million people annually. Andrew Jackson said, "It's worth a month's journey to behold."

In historic Lewisburg just west of world-famous White Sulphur Springs the park tour turns north on U.S. 219 for Watoga State Park near Marlinton, one of the Mountain State's most popular parks. In addition to cabins and Watoga Lake, Brooks Memorial Arboretum provides a place for those interested in trees, shrubs, ferns, mosses and wild flowers.

South of Marlinton at the town of Hillsboro is Droop Mountain Battlefield State Park, the site where one important Civil War engagement in the State took place. The same hamlet is the girlhood home of Pearl S. Buck, world-famous novelist, who has contributed much to American literature, and only one of the many West Virginians who have distinguished themselves by enriching a part of the American way of life.

Thirty miles north of Marlinton on State Route 28 at Green Bank a National Radio Astronomy Observatory is already in operation, listening to the sounds of the universe. The observatory is a national center for radio astronomical research, and 60 percent of its program is conducted by visiting astronomers and scientists. A guided tour of the site is conducted for visitors at 2 p.m. daily, except Monday and Tuesday. The observatory's 85-foot radio-telescope is operated for National Science Foundation by Associated Universities, searching the skies for radio signals from outer space.

Less than 100 miles from Washington, D.C., and 41 miles north of Harpers Ferry, a most impressive sight greets the motorist as he approaches Cacapon Lodge, one of the State's three year-round vacation lodges. This modern living lodge with a mountain setting in Cacapon State Park on U.S. 522, 10 miles south of Berkeley Springs, and 47 miles south of the Breezewood interchange on the Pennsylvania Turnpike was known to early Americans as Bath. Add to 30 completely equipped vacation cabins the lodge's 50 guestrooms, a spacious air-conditioned dining room, the park's diversity of recreational facilities, and the traveler has everything for a complete vacation.

Traveling southward from Cacapon along U.S. 50 and then on U.S. 220 at Romney, one cannot help but admire the countryside and bluish peaks of the Allegheny front whose mountains produce a thousand rippling brooks that flow eastward to form the great Potomac, Cacapon, and other historic rivers.

Turning left at Moorefield on State route 55 the next stop is Lost River State Park, named for the river which disappears into the nearby mountains only to appear on the other side of the mountain as Capon River, awards for a journey's pause or stay, cabins and a multitude of recreational opportunities. In driving distance of the park are areas for good deer hunting and streams for excellent bass and trout fishing. Horseback riding over scenic trails is one of Lost River's most popular activities.

Twelve miles south of Moorefield at Petersburg U.S. 220 joins State route 28 then U.S. 33 at Mouth of Seneca. Well-marked highways guide your every mile as you pass through open meadows, broad valleys covered with world-famous orchards, en route to the mecca of the Mountain State park system and another in West Virginia's chain of fabulous lodges.

Approaching the vicinity of Elkins in Randolph County on U.S. 33, the home of the Mountain State Forest Festival for the past 24 years, the sojourner turns north on U.S. 219, the Seneca Trail, and sets his sights toward Blackwater Falls State Park.

Named for the beautiful falls of Blackwater River this park has become a popular year-round vacation resort. Swimming, boating, hiking, and horseback riding are available for the outdoor-minded tourist. A recreation leader-naturalist is on duty during the summer months supervising a well-planned program.

In the winter months the Blackwater section is the most populous ski resort south of the Mason-Dixon Line, and the Washington Ski Club holds its annual winter carnival here each year. For summer or winter pleasure the Blackwater country, high in the picturesque Tucker County mountains, bestows unlimited outdoor adventure and beauty upon vacationers.

Descending from the high elevations heading northwest from Blackwater just 60 miles away near Morgantown, home of West Virginia University, and overlooking the beautiful Cheat Lake, is Mont Chateau State Park. Its main feature is the Mont Chateau Lodge, West Virginia's newest State park lodge with 55 guestrooms each representing one of the State's 55 counties.

This is only a part of the West Virginia story. In 1963 the Mountain State will pause in the midst of a rapidly changing world to recognize its honored past and promising future by celebrating the 100th anniversary of its statehood.

AND THIS IS HARPER'S FERRY

(By Eloise Engle)

It's hard to believe as you stroll down the quiet deserted main street of Harpers Ferry that this town had ever seen history shaped upon her river shores, or that she had witnessed life and death struggles between men destined to be national heroes. Traveling up the winding steep High Street to Hilltop House, the town's one hotel, and seeing the view of two rivers and three States with a backdrop of the Blue Ridge Mountains you swear that war and bloodshed had never touched this tranquil scene. Later as you climb the solid rock steps carved in 1810 to see the Robert Harper house, and then continue on to Jefferson's Rock you know that time has not dulled nature's wonders here.

Looking down from this same spot 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson was awed by the beauty of it. On your right comes up the Shenandoah, having ranged along the foot of the mountain a hundred miles to seek a vent. On your left approaches the Patawmac, in quest of a passage also. In the moment of their junction, they rush together against the mountain, rend it asunder, and pass off to the sea, this scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic.

Yes, nature was kind to Harpers Ferry, situating her between two rivers on a rocky wedge where waterpower, iron, hardwood forests and a watercourse to carry products to Washington made an ideal spot for Robert Harper to establish a mill and a ferry in 1747, and for the Government to establish a Federal armory in 1796. By 1821 Hall's Rifle Works was producing 1,000 rifles and muskets a month. By the 1850's, the canal had connected Harpers Ferry to Washington and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad linked her to Baltimore. The 1,800 inhabitants were peaceful, industrious and prosperous. The town was growing, flourishing and feeling its importance. There was the uncomfortable undercurrent of the 1850's, but Harpers Ferry was no more, or no less torn by talk of slavery, abolition and secession than other towns.

No one suspected the gaunt stranger from Connecticut who moved into the Kennedy farm 5 miles out of town to be anything but a "land and cattle buyer," yet secretly he was collecting men, guns and supplies. On Sunday night, October 16, 1859, John Brown, religious fanatic, slave-freeing abolitionist leader of bloody raids into Kansas and Missouri, struck at Harpers Ferry. His plan to set up a free-Negro stronghold in the mountains began with his 18 men seizing the Government arsenal and imprisoning the armory guards. Telegraph wires were cut and parties sent out to bring in slaves and hostages. For some unknown reason Brown allowed an eastbound train to cross the bridge the following morning, and it was the engineer who later telegraphed the alarm.

Meanwhile the fierce battle between the townspeople and Brown's party raged on. His hopelessly inadequate plan failed once the people realized the insurgents were small in number, though large in noise. In desperation Brown and his hostages barricaded themselves in the Government arsenal. The militia arrived from Charlestown 8 miles away, and secured the bridge across the Potomac. By nightfall the survivors of Brown's party and their hostages and slaves had all taken refuge in the fire engine house of the armory. Only five of Brown's men remained unwounded. Two of his sons were badly wounded; one died during the night, the other later.

That night Col. Robert E. Lee and Lt. "Jeb" Stuart arrived from Washington with 90 marines. On October 18, they attacked the firehouse. Of Brown's party 10 had been killed, 5 captured, 4 escaped. On the other side there were four citizens, a free Negro and one marine dead.

It's hard to say what the results of the famous raid would have been if John Brown had been killed instead of just wounded. As it was John Brown was brought to trial in nearby Charlestown. Refusing a plea of insanity he was convicted of treason against Virginia, and for conspiring with slaves to commit treason and murder. For 6 weeks, between his capture and execution, he spoke and wrote so skilfully that northern sentiment actually exalted him. Louisa May Alcott called him St. John the Just, and Ralph Waldo Emerson said that Brown "would make the gallows like a cross." The southerners saw him as a frightening omen. Smoldering tempers on both sides exploded with the events at Harpers Ferry. Before long, armed soldiers were marching to the tune of "John Brown's body lies amoulderin' in the grave."

The town itself became a no-man's land. Southern forces held it for a while in 1861. General "Stonewall" Jackson whipped his troops into action, and before making their strategic withdrawal wrecked the B. & O. covered bridge leaving only the stone piers. The Virginia militia had already destroyed the gun factory and the 4,300 rifles and muskets. At one point General Jackson managed to seize 56 locomotives and more than 300 cars on the B. & O. railway. Later multihorse teams hauled 14 of the locomotives to Strasburg. When Union troops removed a large supply of wheat from the mill the Confederates raided the town and burned the mill. A few months later a sniper firing from a building in town killed a Union scout, and in retaliation Union troops burned the entire point section of the waterfront.

When Lee invaded the north a second time in the 1863 campaign that led to Gettysburg the Union garrison evacuated Harpers Ferry but held their fortifications on Maryland Heights. The Confederates held the town briefly for the last time in the course of Lt. Gen. Jubal Early's raid against Washington in the summer of 1864.

At the end of the war Harpers Ferry lay in ruins. The bridge across the Potomac had been destroyed and rebuilt repeatedly. The enginehouse, John Brown's fortress, stood alone among the leveled arsenal buildings. Hall's rifle works were no more. Federal headquarters on Camp Hill were donated to a school for Negroes. Storer College establish in 1867 remained active until 1955 when it was closed for lack of funds. The town never recovered. Its industries never resumed. People moved away. Now there are only about 820 residents here.

Yes, nature was kind to Harpers Ferry, but its a sad kind of beauty she has today a century later. The deserted buildings are crumbling with decay. Empty, dark shells with yarning, ghostlike windows stand forlorn waiting to crumble or be swept away by floods. Vines creep precariously over the fallen, rotting rafters. Wrought-iron balconies sag and groan with weakness and age.

The Federal Government's Mission 66 project is to restore the crumbling buildings. Established in 1944 by Congress, the national Monument consists of 515 acres centered on Shenandoah Street where history was made. The visitor's center, built in 1858 for a master armorer, is operated by the National Park Service.

Visitors come in increasing numbers. Last year, the centennial of John Brown's raid brought 100,000 to the spot where it all happened so long, long ago.

Spahn Passes 300 Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in these times of world crisis and pressing problems, it is good, occasionally, to turn our attention to more pleasant events. Our national pastime, baseball, offers an enjoyment and excitement to millions unequaled by any other sport. Recently, Oklahomans, and my friends of the Third Congressional District in particular, had the occasion to take special note of a spectacular achievement in the baseball world.

On Saturday, August 12, 1961, Warren Spahn joined the select group of baseball's immortals as he posted his 300th victory. To date, he has added two more victories to this season's record and appears to be well on his way both to a 20-game season and breaking the all-time record of 325 wins by a left-handed pitcher.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD two articles paying tribute to Warren Spahn. One carries the account of his career and the second contains the comments of his neighbors in our home county. As one of those neighbors, it is a pleasure to add my personal congratulations to Warren Spahn together with best wishes for many more years of making baseball

history while serving as an example of the best in American sportsmanship.

The articles follow:

SPAHN SAYS NO. 300 MORE EXCITING THAN NO-HITTER

MILWAUKEE.—Milwaukee southpaw Warren Spahn, whose brilliant career includes world series, all-star game and no-hit pitching heroics, Saturday called victory No. 300 his most thrilling moment.

Weary but relaxed after becoming the 13th pitcher in major league history to reach the charmed 300-victory mark, Spahn still is amazed by his excitement in a 2 to 1 decision over the Chicago Cubs Friday night.

"It was fantastic," said the 40-year-old wonder from Hartshorne, Okla. "That game was the most exciting I've ever pitched—more exciting than the world's series or my two no-hitters. Maybe it was just built up in my mind. I really don't know but, believe me, it was something."

Spahn explained that he wasn't too excited about reaching his 300th goal, figuring it would come along eventually, until a few hours before he took the mound against the Cubs. Then the pressure mounted.

"About 6 o'clock I was wishing we could start the game right then and there," he said. "I wanted to get it over with. Now I'm greatly relieved and thankful I don't have to go through it again."

Spahn became the first pitcher to reach 300 since Bob "Lefty" Grove struggled to that milestone with the Boston Red Sox in 1941. Grove never won another game.

Grove, Spahn, and Eddie Plank are the only lefthanders in the select 300 club. Plank won 325 and Spahn's next major goal is to catch him.

"Just say I'm shooting for 400 but won't be unhappy if I fall 75 short," Warren said. "First though I'm still going to try for 20 victories this year—and that's going to be tough with only 12 so far. But I'll be back next year.

"I feel good and will keep pitching as long as I do—and can win. I'm not even thinking about the time I'll have to quit."

A physical marvel, Spahn came up to the Braves, then in Boston, in 1942, appearing in only four games without a decision. Then he spent 3 years in the Army, serving in Europe, where he was wounded, decorated for bravery, and awarded a battlefield commission.

He returned to the Braves in 1946, posting an 8–5 record. He lost his first decision, against the Brooklyn Dodgers, and then scored the first of his 300 triumphs.

"That first one was in Pittsburgh against the Pirates," Spahn recalled. "I think we beat them 6 to 1. I had a shutout going until Frankie Gustine hit a homer in the eighth inning. I don't forget victories—nor home runs."

SPAHN JOINS 300 CIRCLE—HARTSHORNE PROUD OF THEIR FAMED FRIEND

HARTSHORNE.—"We were very proud of him," remarked Mrs. Talton Bruton.

Her words expressed the sentiments of this entire area in regard to their neighbor and friend, Warren Spahn, in his garnering major league victory No. 300 last night when he halted the Cubs, 2 to 1.

The ace Milwaukee Brave lefthander lives on his ranch in the Arch community near here in the off season, along with his wife and 12-year-old son Greg. Mrs. Bruton's husband is manager of the ranch.

Other Hartshorne residents had this to say about their town's most famous personality:

Gene James, president of the chamber of commerce: "People of this community have looked forward with pride to Warren's attaining this goal. He is a great competitor and we never had a doubt about him reaching the 300 mark."

Bill Morgan, postmaster: "A great desire to win, plus near-perfect physical condition have allowed Warren to achieve the coveted goal of 300 games. People of this entire area are very proud of him."

Dr. W. P. Lerblance, Jr.: "Warren is to be congratulated on another milestone in the brilliant career. We wish him continued success and more records."

Lecil Bruton: "We were pulling for Warren all the way and knew that he could do it."

Spahn became the 13th pitcher and only the third lefthander to win 300 games in his major league career. Five of the 13 finished their careers before 1900. Spahn was the first National League lefty to reach the mark.

THE MAJORS AND TOTAL VICTORIES

Cy Young, 1890–1911	511
Walter Johnson, 1907–27	416
Christy Mathewson, 1900–1916	373
Grover Alexander, 1911–30	373
Charles (Kid) Nichols, 1890–1906	360
Jim Galvin, 1879–92	355
Tim Keefe, 1880–93	345
John Clarkson, 1884–94	328
Eddie Plank, 1901–17	325
Mickey Welch, 1880–1892	316
Charles (Hoss) Radbourne, 1881–91	308
Lefty Grove, 1925–41	300
Warren Spahn, 1942–	300

SPAHN'S MAJOR LEAGUE RECORD

	Games	Won	Lost
1942	4	0	9
1943–45 Army			
1946	24	8	5
1947	40	21	10
1948	36	15	12
1949	38	21	14
1950	41	21	17
1951	39	22	14
1952	40	14	19
1953	35	23	7
1954	39	21	12
1955	39	17	14
1956	39	20	11
1957	39	21	11
1958	38	22	11
1959	40	21	15
1960	40	21	10
1961	27	12	12
Total	598	300	194

Wichita Youth Wins Soap Box Derby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most appropriate and timely during this debate on legislation which would assist in preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency to inform the House of an achievement yesterday of a 13-year-old Wichita, Kans., boy which has been acclaimed by the citizens of my district, the State, and Nation.

It is with considerable pride that I note the victory of Richard T. Dawson, of Wichita, in the finals of the 24th All-American Soap Box Derby held at Akron, Ohio, on Sunday. Dick is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard W. Dawson and he represented the Wichita Eagle and Beacon in the national competition.

Dick Dawson is representative of 50,000 young American boys in our Nation who each year devote their time and energies to building soap box racers and compete for the right to race in the national classic at Akron.

Dick had spent a year working on the planning and building of his winning racer. He had the valuable counsel and assistance of his father. Yesterday's national championship won by him over 153 other local champions represented the successful culmination of three years of Soap Box Derby competition. Dick had tried twice before in the Wichita contest but was unable to qualify for the Akron race.

I want to commend the sponsors of the Soap Box Derbies across the land along with the many newspapers who assist young boys to compete in the local and national classics. Parents are to be congratulated, too, for their vital role of lending encouragement and advice to their sons in this program.

I believe that this is one of the many constructive programs promoted by private firms and industries which is an important force in providing American communities with valuable young citizens. Such youth programs also help stem the rise of juvenile delinquency.

Don't Let Time Run Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a thoughtful address by a leading citizen of Nebraska, Mr. Neil B. Danberg, regional director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Mr. Danberg gave this address to a group at Doane College, in Nebraska, recently, and it was well received. I commend it to the readers of the RECORD:

DON'T LET TIME RUN OUT

(By Dr. Neil B. Danberg, regional director, National Conference of Christians and Jews)

The overreaching problem of our time is how to avert war. The continuing crises between East and West overshadows all else. The question is: how will the conflict be resolved?

There is a narrowing-down process in conflict. Each unresolved problem tends to restrict more and more the avenues of possible solution. Such problems tend to pyramid, leaving a smaller and smaller area of possible agreement. The question becomes, what margin is left for negotiation? Then when the margin itself is in doubt, armaments becomes the language used between conflicting powers. The differences between the free world and the communist bloc have deteriorated as no major problem has been resolved. This points up the significant role of negotiation itself. Negotiation depends upon not only the margin left but the willingness to try to reach a solution. The host of unresolved problems, and some that have become a constant source of danger, are a result of this pyramiding of disagreements and issues. At best we have had a conversation that has acted upon certain areas of conflict. When people are talking together they do not fight each other. The vital role

of negotiation has been missing, such as the elimination of problems, bringing a just peace to areas of conflict, the building of bridges of increased understanding, and cooperative undertakings. The past decade is marked by a host of conversation-type arrangements. The future holds the possible remedial effect of time.

Time offers hope in that it projects over a greater period, making conditions more malleable, more negotiable and brings into being other problems and forces. If the present tensions and problems are prolonged then time may serve as a factor of balance.

The role of time in solving some of the insolubles can be seen in the area of religion. The ecumenial movement is one of the great factors in modern Christianity. Born out of the changing age, in an atmosphere tempered by time, the asperities are reduced. What was considered intransigent and insoluble, today many of these areas are being considered, a greater dialog between various faiths is taking place, new opportunities for unity and understanding are presenting themselves. Time has brought a historic transition. They have discovered a growing unity that is greater than their former perspectives.

We must not rely on time alone in our world so filled with tensions. Khrushchev has repeatedly said that time was on "their side." It is the use we make of our time, not time itself. Elements may turn time as a liability for the Soviets. We must not make the fatal assumption that we can disregard the opportunities and challenges of today and that tomorrow will somehow work things out. Responsibilities are tied to present situations; the failure to act leads to misinterpretation of one's intent and forecloses opportunities in the future. Peace itself is not a sitting back process allowing events to take their course, it is a dynamic meeting of present needs. It is a positive process bringing increased justice, opportunity and progress. It is not just the absence of war, an uneasy truce, or negative control. Today, we strive for peace, we begin with the realities of our present world.

Never before in history has the world been so filled with tensions as it is today, tensions between rich and poor nations, light- and dark-skinned people, between free nations and Communist nations. Some tensions are a stimulus to progress, others produce changes, others if not resolved or controlled can bring about disaster. The Communist pattern is one of seeking to negotiate after threatening, of insisting on their right to veto, and of pursuing without compromise their "solution." This accounts for the impasses and the familiar use of the term "potentially dangerous situation." Each of these situations tests the determination, strength, will and intelligence of both sides. Always there exists the minimal in communication in areas left for discussion, the time factor is lengthened when deadlines are passed by, and decisions effecting the solution are postponed. This may be the pattern for a good many years. If so, we will have to learn how to live with anxieties and the fear of war. In this sense time remains for many constructive programs and the door is kept open for negotiation. The failure to find the means of assuring peace has led to our largest armed force in peacetime history and a disillusionment about progress.

The fear of war and Communist subversion has led to those who would oppose such a threat by adopting their methods. There is a feeling of immobilization toward the problem which gives rise to smear charges, this places the enemy within striking distance. One of the lessons of history is that we cannot give ground to the forces that would divide us. We must always be alert to the latent hatred, suspicion and fear that is lurking below the surface. Hitler made the Communists a useful enemy then turned around and signed an agreement with them. The modern social disorganization brings discontent, instability and distorts relationships. Out of its confusion we must be sure that our leadership is worthy, that our basic values do not become distorted.

One of our basic values is the dignity and worth and equality of all of our citizens. Some distort the value to bring a Red smear on those who are defending this freedom in our democracy. The principle of self-determination is lacking in the Soviet-dominated states. It is inimicable to our free society. Men are manipulated in communism; in democracy there is a freedom of choice. Ethics demands that men be free agents so that in their choices they partly determine their destiny.

Where we have denied freedom to our citizens it has hurt our national image as a free nation. Where men's rights are denied we witness the Federal Government trying to secure these rights which is the opposite of communism. The equality of our citizens was an outgrowth of our concept of freedom. It was not an outright gift. It was a goal for a free society. The added freedoms that citizens are given brings us closer to a free and just society. Justice itself depends upon, to some degree, the individual's freedom. Injustices in our society continue to weaken our moral strength and reduces our influence in the family of nations. Our national race relation tensions are tied to the worldwide problem of race relations and is a source of worldwide tensions.

Our work in NCCJ is committed to the educational realm. Education is a powerful force. Education, considered broadly, is any change in the mind and spirit of man. The struggle in the world is for the hearts and minds of men. The ultimate destiny of mankind will ultimately be reduced to human values; persons, not things, are what really matter. The task of education is not only to train enough scientists or reduce illiteracy but to have a well-trained citizenry that is committed to the democratic traditions and values—citizens who through their education can contribute in a variety of ways toward the strengthening of our Nation; leaders who are equal to the challenges of these areas. Through education we must underline our moral strength, through those who have moral courage, a concern for others and are devoted to greater freedom and justice. Intolerance, ignorant mass fears, suspicions and rumors have always threatened to possess us. Education can awaken us from our complacency. It can challenge us with new ideas and train us to take part in vital discussions. The basic means to solve our problems begins in our educational system. Education is necessary to discover the common ground for mutual understanding. The nature and scope of the present crisis demands that it be given serious study and discussion on how to cope with it. Freedom itself demands that channels of communication be kept open. It is not enough to detour around any controversial question or to avoid our differences. We need to find common ground for mutual understanding. How can we who cherish freedom most find ways to subordinate our conflicts of interest to areas of common concern. We must try to understand the world we live in, a world that is changing too fast for many of our ideas.

Change is a safety valve in society. Without an evolving pattern of change, the stultifying effect of repression leads to a decadent society, a society where change comes about through revolution and not by a peaceful process. Although changes are often resisted, today we are living in the greatest age of change in all of the world's history. The built-in systems of prejudice resist change and we have heard of the massive wall of resistance. Here the changes usually take place over a period of years as social customs are involved, as well as traditions. But, even in this area where some changes are often thwarted, other changes are taking place in various areas. Society itself is not a fixed bloc but a changing entity filled with frustrations, fears, anxieties, and hatreds. Democracy adds another dimension to society and that is that men can reason together and confront each other in discussion of issues. That each of us has a responsibility to the common good and to the injustice of our fellow man.

No amount of good will is a substitute for the social and economic mechanisms of control. Justice depends upon the equalization of social power and adequate restraint of competing interests. Although good will may perfect and purify, it cannot overcome a basic power void in the social structure. Politics is the achievement of equalizing power to effect justice. There is tension between a balance of power. Where there is tension there is potential conflict. When there is a minimum of contact and channels of communication are clogged, then peace or war does not depend on what their stated positions are, not what either side says, but what both sides do.

Yet the possibility of negotiation remains, however tragically limited. There is the desire by both antagonists to survive this in their own interest. The place of confrontation of basic issues by both powers is necessary because conflicts resolved themselves eventually either in peaceful ways or violence. The task of negotiating is often frustrating and agonizing, it often appears futile, but if we desire peace we must somehow find a modus vivendi with the Soviets. We will also recognize that we have unfinished business in our own democracy closely related to the peace of the world. Our own race relations issues, our education problems, a working democracy itself. We will recognize and use a positive process unique in our democracy which is the capacity for peaceful change and civilized discussions of basic issues, as well as, the right of the free people to determine their leadership, programs, and in part, their destiny.

T. S. Eliot once wrote, "Only through time, time is conquered." Time offers hope, given enough time negotiations may take place that bring about results. Today, the positive, dynamic side of peace itself must become our task. Many tensions, if left unchecked, could lead to disaster but if properly channeled could bring about progress for a better world. The positive steps must be taken while time remains.

World Peace Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, at the convention of the Alabama Bar Association, whose president is the distinguished Alabama lawyer, Mr. Clopper Almon, the Honorable Brooks Hays, Assistant Secretary of State, addressed the Alabama bar in Birmingham. His subject was "World Peace Through World Law."

It is my information that our former colleague, Brooks Hays, received a warm ovation at the close of his great address.

I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will take the opportunity to read

this very outstanding speech by Secretary Hays:

WORLD PEACE THROUGH WORLD LAW

It has been almost 40 years since I graduated from law school and nearly 30 years since I left the active practice to enter public service. My law practice included an exciting 2 years as assistant attorney general for the State of Arkansas, and the years devoted to legal activities, all of them in my home State, were divided between practice in a county seat and the capital of the State. I have been so absorbed in political responsibilities since those days that I hardly dare speak as a lawyer. Nevertheless, this is my profession, and my political course certainly bears some impress of my experience in the profession. I came to have, as all of you do, an appreciation of the meaning of a rich phrase "the due process of law" that so often appears in our documents. As a Member of Congress I developed some convictions regarding another standard, seldom phrased but having reality in our system of government; namely, "the due process of lawmaking." Furthermore, my interest in association with others in ridding our electoral system of every taint of irregularity and manipulation led me to create a phrase for my own use and I trust you will agree with me that it might well challenge the entire bar: "the due process of selecting lawmakers." These three phrases encompass the interest of the technician and cover the whole range of law and government.

My work with the State Department naturally accentuates my interest in seeing our standards and ideals projected into the world scene so that conflicts between nations may be resolved without resort to arms but through the application of judicial principles in the same fashion that individuals and groups have learned under our judicial system to settle their differences without violence. While I have great pride in the Department I serve, I am aware that it does not enjoy the political advantages of departments with projects to award and money to distribute. Nevertheless, I think there is growing appreciation for the fact that those who serve you in the Department are in reality soldiers of peace. In our efforts to develop through diplomatic, economic and educational means effective instruments for peace, we are alined with the Defense Department in protecting the security of our Nation.

I have reached the conclusion that not all peace-making is under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. Under the aegis of the American Bar Association significant advancement in promoting the idea of world law is being made. This is the most timely subject that can engage lawyers and I trust these exertions of the American bar will receive your support. One of the most eloquent spokesmen for cooperation between the nations in developing a world judicial system is the incoming president of the American bar, Hon. John Satterfield, of Mississippi. The first of a series of meetings sponsored by the bar of our country and our sister Republics of this hemisphere has just been concluded in San Jose, Costa Rica. Perceptible progress is being made.

Maintenance of the world's peace, even the tenuous and unsatisfactory peace we now enjoy, has become the major function of the Federal Government. The two Departments, Defense and State, in reality work toward the same goals. If the weapons placed in the hands of members of our armed services have to be used, the primary purpose for which they were forged has not been realized. Our Military Establishment is a deterrent, as the world is so often assured.

The lawyer occupies a special place in the struggle for peace. He must supply the imagination and the intellectual sinews for the structure for world peace and the judicial system that will assure at the world level both justice and peace. We believe that both are attainable. The burden of leadership that has been put upon our country tends to overwhelm us but our resources are impressive and our own regional tradition is in line with sound internationalism, for the South has successfully fended off the allurements of isolation from world conflicts. The careers of distinguished southerners like Cordell Hull and Walter George should inspire us.

We of the South in determining how best to contribute to the stabilizing of governments and strengthening of free institutions in the world should have a two directional look. An examination of our own history and resources would help us.

The experience of a hundred years which have brought us to this position of relative strength and prosperity were fraught with considerable suffering and with many social and economic tensions particularly in our relations with the Nation. The struggle for justice should have sensitized us to the claims of other basically rural populations and to a large degree it has. We are familiar with all of the ills that have created the restlessness upon which the forces of dictatorship feed. We know about the poverty that comes with lack of technical knowledge of agricultural production and marketing. We know about the ravages of disease that attack on a wide scale. We know about the problems of low wages and industrial lag. And one problem we know about certainly affects foreign policy problems. I refer, of course, to the unfinished job faced by two races who must learn to achieve full justice and great happiness for all as the aspirations of the minority are voiced. There are other phases of foreign policy that are of special interest to the South. Many social and economic measures for amelioration of conditions surrounding disadvantaged people have originated in our section. A great Alabamian, Gen. William Gorgas, inaugurated one of the greatest campaigns against disease ever undertaken.

Another citizen of your State, Hon. Will Bankhead, was one of my heroes. I worked with him in the farm security days in endeavors to improve land tenure practices by opening doors of opportunity on the land to both white and Negro farmers. Identified with this campaign a generation ago was Dr. Charles Johnson, a dedicated schoolman and Negro leader. I often consulted him for expert information on farm problems and found him interested not only in Negro people but in all people. We attacked evils with a concern for our whole population not stressing racial but rather cultural and economic aspects of the problem.

Having had committed to us the training of a multitude of young people from other nations it is also our responsibility to stand by the ideal of democratic rule and to develop that patience with popular misrule that preserves the system against contemporary cynicism. This tradition "regnant populus" is something to share with the younger republics making sure that we ourselves are faithful to it in intellectually and spiritually. It calls for intensified devotion to the public school system for as James Madison wisely said "popular government without popular education will be either a farce or a tragedy, perhaps both."

Lawyers, being conservative, are not likely to forget our indebtedness to the past. This sense of history's continuity must be accompanied however with a sensitivity to change so that the goals of justice may be efficiently pursued in an age that finds new aspirations being vigorously expressed. We live in a changed world environment and we must not forget it.

New nations emerging from colonialism are making it difficult for the older powers to preserve the world stability that belonged to a quieter age. One-fourth of the earth's population is in nations that have enjoyed independence less than 15 years. The strains thus produced are a part of civilization's growth and need not frighten us. Some theologians believe that they are providential—that the tensions in Latin America and elsewhere are God's plan of sharing with the human race the divine quest for perfect justice. God's own restlessness is reflected in our awareness that intellectual and moral exertions are necessary. "God will not rest," said Isaiah, "until He establishes justice in the earth."

The legal profession must carry a substantial share in the processes for international justice. The lawyer knows when others may not that we cannot live in a power vacuum in the world. Humanity demands order as well as justice. The most precious tradition of our judicial and political system is that both are essential and both are attainable. Full participation in the United Nations and other international organizations is not inconsistent with our policy of bold unilateral action. And while the building of an effective judicial system to adjust conflict on the basis of law rather than military might is proceeding, we must see to it that our own national responsibility for defending justice and freedom and the values that are threatened is fully met.

There is scarcely a community in the South where the legal profession is not looked to for leadership in civic righteousness. You are more than technicians. You are moral leaders and your devotion to the rule of law grows out of belief that cherished values are made secure by the system itself. When our forefathers repudiated force in the settlement of conflicts they set us in the right direction. The constitutional system which we revere represents the flowering of this ideal.

My experience in the State Department has convinced me that the new nations of Africa and Asia are proceeding with faith in us to supply leadership in this field and to set inspiring examples in their pursuit of democratic ideals and governmental stability. They look to the Nation, not to any one region, but you and I know that without the South's resources and its full participation in efforts to ease race tension the example cannot be set. The lawyer has a profound contribution to make to this movement. The disciplines of the law have been well preserved in the Southland. Strong moral foundations for a judicial system that protects human dignity and human rights are here. But the southern lawyer cannot provide the patient counseling and enlightened guidance that the times require for easing race tensions if political pressures force him to retreat into conventional thinking. Imagination and compassion are imperative.

My own hope is that we will cheerfully continue, as it seems to me in recent months with some exceptions we have been doing, to show that there is a sense of brotherhood and a love of justice in the region that both the minority race and the people of the world may rely on.

Attack on Chief Justice Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, misguided effort to combat Communist influence sometimes achieves results ex-

actly the opposite of those desired. An example is the unfortunate essay contest on "grounds for the impeachment" of Chief Justice Earl Warren. I invite attention to this thoughtful analysis by Roscoe Drummond, as printed in the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, August 15, 1961:

CRITICIZES BIRCH SOCIETY FOR ATTACKING WARREN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—The attack by the John Birch Society on the U.S. Supreme Court and effort to vilify Chief Justice Earl Warren may well impair the John Birch Society more than it does the Court.

The Birch Society claims to be a thoroughly and sincerely conservative organization seeking to alert the country to the dangers of communism. That is a useful and proper thing to do.

But when the leader of his organization resorts to extreme, radical, and reckless methods, which have the effect of harming those very institutions he says he wants to secure, then the Birch Society is throwing away its credentials.

Its latest action, announced by Robert H. Welch, Jr., is to invite college students to compete for $2,300 by writing essays "on grounds for the impeachment" of Chief Justice Warren.

Obviously every decision by every Justice of the Court is subject to the most searching debate and dissent by anybody. But when the Birch Society proceeds to the proposition that, if we don't like the decisions of a member of the Court, he should be removed, this is not suporting a government of law, that is throwing it away.

I doubt if the American people have so soon forgotten F. D. R.'s ill conceived and similar "court-packing plan" of 1937. Mr. Roosevelt, too, didn't like some of the decisions of the Court in the midthirties and he proposed to add nine more Justices to the high bench in order to outvote those who were making what to him were the wrong decisions. Even President Roosevelt, powerful and popular as he was, did not dare to suggest the impeachment of the Chief Justice or other members of the Court. He just proposed to outnumber them. His proposal was roundly defeated by the Senate.

The president of the American Bar Association, Whitney N. Seymour, has described the Birch Society bid to get young students to write essays on why the Chief Justice should be impeached as "not legitimate criticism of decisions."

"No responsible person will encourage it," he said. "The ignorant, by such false implications of misconduct, are led into disrespect for our institutions which maintain liberty under law, and thus for all law. Let us leave such attacks to the Communists who hate our institutions. Our duty is to uphold and defend liberty and the independent courts which are essential to maintain it."

The head of the Birch Society says that the purpose of the essay contest against Justice Warren is "to stir up a great deal of interest among conservatives on the campuses on the dangers that face this country."

You will note that Mr. Welch does not invite the college students to examine the grounds "for and against" impeachment. He asks them to examine only the grounds "for" impeachment and write their essays to that end.

I wonder if this kind of one-sided research and "be sure to come up with the right opinion" will appeal to many students of law and government. I wonder if there may not be students who will enter the contest with essays suggesting that there are no grounds for the impeachment of the chief justice. There will certainly be those who will conclude that packing the court because you don't like some of its decisions is not government by law but nullification of law itself.

Mr. Welch is subtle. He doesn't exactly and openly say that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower is pro-Communist. He just circulates a letter which suggests that he has aided the Communists and invites your opinion. Mr. Welch doesn't say that the Chief Justice should be impeached or, that there are grounds for his impeachment. He invites others to do so and offers $2,300 in prizes to those who do it best.

This does not seem to me to be either an honest or an honorable thing to do. It is this kind of thing which is hurting anticommunism, rather than helping it.

Khrushchev Winning the Cold War by Creating Issues Which Entrap Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the politicians who creates issues upon which to campaign, then supplies the answers and sells the people on the necessity of electing him in order to solve the problems. Again, we are familiar with the type of politician who vigorously rocks the boat and then convinces his constituents a great storm is in progress.

This is the way Khrushchev has been able to create false issues, upon which he will then agree to negotiate and whatever the outcome of the negotiations, he has made a forward step. We cannot allow him any more victories, in Berlin, in Cuba, in Laos, or anywhere else. There is a far greater danger of war if we continue to give in to his unreasonable demands than if we take a firm and strong position now, backed up by our willingness to fight, if necessary. Victory in Berlin will not mean the end of Communist demands for piecemeal surrender, it will merely increase the pressure on the West by additional demands.

The columnist, Roscoe Drummond, sets forth Khrushchev's tactics in the following column from the Washington Post:

K. IS WINNING—MAKES ISSUE THEN BARGAINS—SOME OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN, August 20.—Though Western diplomats would like to put a more agreeable face on it, the tragic truth is that Nikita S. Khrushchev, ruthless, wily and unafraid to risk war, is winning some of his main objectives in the battle for Berlin.

Mr. K.'s victory will not be readily conceded by the Germans, or by the British, or by American officials. But it is grimly in the making.

I am not referring only to the Red militia, who have turned their guns on their own people to halt the refugees. I am not referring only to the tanks, and tear gas and water hoses, or the 6-foot wall of concrete, with which East German's Herr Ulbricht is now lining the whole 25-mile border, so that East Berlin will be as hard to escape from as Alcatraz.

But the true, the symbol, the forecast of the shape of things to come are contained in the less publicized fact that the three Western powers took the most tactful, elaborate, let's-not-provoke-anybody precautions at the Brandenburg Gate to make sure that the West Berliners did not gather to hurl even an unkind word at the Communist troops, or even an encouraging cheer to an East German who might still break through to freedom.

Now the new Chinese wall is sealing off the borders so that it can be neither scaled nor pierced.

The fact is, the Berlin crisis is entering a new phase and, from the standpoint of the West, a deteriorating phase. I say this because the known—but not always admitted—position of the West is to accept these events with reluctancy, yes, even with anguish, but also with a kind of relief.

I do not contend that these events could have been averted, or altered, except by the use of force which would have made war over Berlin probable. It was always within the power of the Soviet to jail the whole East German population within the Communist zone, ruled by the ugly, iron-willed and resourceful Herr Ulbricht. We have Soviet word on the dotted line, but it would have taken American, British and French troops thrown behind the Iron Curtain to attempt to force the Russians to honor their word.

We did not have the will to do so. We did not have the nonnuclear power to do so. Chancellor Adenauer did not have the wish to do so. It is doubtful that even Mayor Willy Brandt would have recommended that we do so.

We have, therefore, acquiesced—after making the proper protest.

Mr. Krushchev is not through.

Having seized the border by force of arms, having made it impossible for West Berlin to be a show window of freedom and prosperity to any but the convinced, his next step will be to attempt to terrorize, intimidate and so depress the people of West Berlin that this once vibrant city will in time shrink and shrivel.

It is probable that the greatest danger of war has now passed:

1. Because Mr. Khrushchev and the East German Communists have already attained a psychologically reduced West Berlin, and this is sufficient for the present.

2. Because the Soviets know that new encroachments upon the visible freedom of West Berlin would be resisted by force by the West.

This means that the Soviet, while preparing to give sovereignty to East Germany may reserve Western rights in West Berlin from the proposed treaty and will not soon threaten these rights overtly.

West Berlin will remain a free city for some time to come. Whether it can escape becoming a lonely, hopeless, declining city is very much in doubt.

Communists Tell Followers in United States How To Back Khrushchev's Berlin Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit a fine article by Carl DeBloom, of the Washington bureau of the Colum-

bus Dispatch, relative to Communist Party leaders dictating through their members on how they should back Khrushchev's stand in Berlin. This thought-provoking article is being submitted in the RECORD in order that all Members may have the benefit of this revealing material:

COMMUNISTS TELL FOLLOWERS IN UNITED STATES HOW TO BACK KHRUSHCHEV'S BERLIN STAND

(By Carl DeBloom)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—The national Communist Party in this country is mobilizing its forces to enlist the aid of non-Red organizations to support Premier Khrushchev's stand on Berlin.

This is made clear in a secret communique or directive that has gone out from the national board of the Communist Party to all party district leaders.

The communication points out that the national board "decided to call the attention of all party organizations to the central importance of this matter (Germany) which will be in the forefront of international affairs for some time to come."

Written in three sections, the lengthy communication gives party members a complete blueprint of what they should do, what arguments to use, and what groups to contact.

In the first section the board says:

"It is essential that all clubs discuss the Berlin issue, and that the party take steps to clarify public opinion on its significance and to mobilize the people—of the United States—in favor of a peaceful solution of the question."

Then the communique proceeds to give the "essential facts" so far as the Soviet Union is concerned. These facts are designed to give Communists their talking points in dealing with groups and individuals.

Some of the highlights of the facts are these:

"The Soviet Union has stated that it is demanding a peace treaty as a matter of necessity in order to settle the terms of peace and establish new peaceful relations. This has become imperative because West Germany (the free sector) increasingly constitutes a war threat.

"This is because it is headed by a revanchist government, which has built a vast army, headed by former Hitler generals, has an atomic and rocket industry and has been promised 100 Polaris missiles through NATO. West Berlin, which is deep in East Berlin territory, is a hotbed of provocation and war.

"The Soviet Union has proposed a peace treaty with both West and East Germany, to be negotiated jointly by the four major powers, the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

"On the basis of the Potsdam Agreement, a peace treaty would help demilitarize, denazify, and neutralize West Germany and would solve the West Berlin problem which the Soviet Union proposes to be solved on the basis of establishing it as an independent free city to which the West would have access.

"The U.S. imperialists oppose a peace treaty because they wish to use West Germany as a mercenary force against the Soviet Union and also economically against Britain and France in its own interests.

"There are differences between the United States, Britain, and France on West Germany, because of conflicting interests, but they are allied thorugh NATO against the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries."

Commenting on President Kennedy's agreement of further negotiations, the communique advises that: "Negotiations are good and essential."

Then it warns party leaders that: "The proposal for self-determination cannot be real since the West German Government has outlawed the Communist Party."

In the essential facts the party is told that U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD'S (majority leader) proposal to make West and East Berlin together a free city has the merit of a proposal to negotiate, though it is hard to see how it could be carried out, since East Berlin is Socialist and it would mean changing its economy.

Listed under essential things to point out to the American people are such statements:

"The German issue and particularly the status of Berlin presents a war danger. The prowar press is deliberately distorting the situation.

"A peace treaty is in the interest of the United States. Our soldiers have twice been in war started by the German general staff.

"A peace treaty would help remove a source of war in Europe and the world and would cause a heavy thaw in the cold war and would further disarmament, thus greatly helping the American people in terms of peace, taxes, jobs, etc.

"A peace treaty would help the fight for democracy and equal rights and against antisemitism.

"It is necessary to criticize the extreme proimperialist position of the executive council of the AFL–CIO which reflects the Adenauer stated and those of most reactionary elements in the United States."

Finally under the heading of "actions" the communique says:

"It is important to stimulate peace organizations to take up the issue in the interest of peace.

"The many national groups in our country can be mobilized to take a stand in favor of a peace treaty, particularly those who have suffered from German occupation and brutality (Jews, Ukranians, Czechoslovaks, Yugoslovaks, Russians, Armenians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Finnish, Hungarians, Italians, etc.).

"Negro people's organizations and leaders could be gotten to speak out since present day West Germany is a vicious center of racist ideas.

"It is important to hold meetings, forums, to have speakers at camps and other places."

Party members are also advised to speak against certain Supreme Court decisions restricting Communist activities, pointing out these actions "only severely hurt and curb all democratic and peace movements."

The communication ends by listing literature that should be read including a pamphlet on the Eichmann trial which will be published later.

The National Tropical Botanic Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1961, I introduced H.R. 5628 to authorize the President of the United States to order a complete study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden in the State of Hawaii. The National Tropical Botanic Garden would be established for the purposes of research and education concerning tropical flora. The bill would authorize an appropriation of $5,000 to conduct this feasibility study. A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the last session of Congress, but due to lack of time, it was not considered by the House.

A National Tropical Botanic Garden is of paramount interest not only to the people of Hawaii but to people everywhere interested in plants. The idea of a living museum of tropical plants for basic and applied research in tropical botany is not new. For many years a group of Hawaiian citizens has worked steadily for a tropical botanic garden in Hawaii. Recently hundreds of interested people have organized to form the Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation. State and city planning officials have zoned a 5,000-acre valley for such purposes.

It is not the intent of the bill to have the Federal Government subsidize the National Tropical Botanic Garden. It is hoped that such a garden can be privately endowed. However, at the present time, because of limited facilities and, more important, because such a study can be made with relative ease by experts in existing Government agencies, the bill asks the President to designate the proper agency to conduct the study.

Tropical plants are woven into some of history's most colorful tales. In 1793, Captain Bligh successfully transplanted breadfruit trees from the South Pacific to the West Indies—after being interrupted by a mutiny on the *Bounty*. The British West Indies plantation owners wanted breadfruit trees to produce abundant, starchy, highly nutritious and yet extremely cheap food for their slaves.

Quinine, once the exclusive and profitable trade commodity of Peru and Ecuador is more readily available in all parts of the world due to the cunning of the British and the Dutch. When they were refused permission to transplant quinine seedlings to their colonies, the British and the Dutch resorted to smuggling in 1850. Today Java is the principal source for quinine. During the war when that source was cutoff, the Federal Government gardens in Beltsville devoted its energies to the production of quinine seedlings which were airshipped to South America where they were cultivated. This made the Western Hemisphere independent of other areas of the world for the source of quinine.

The establishment of a National Tropical Botanic Garden in Hawaii would benefit the entire Nation and would further international understanding. Scientists from mainland universities as well as the rest of the world would conduct research on any botanical problem of interest concerning tropical plants.

The Hawaiian climate during all seasons of the year allows for continuous growth and gives many generations of annuals each year for research in plant genetics. The mean annual temperature is 74° and the average temperature during the coldest month differs only 6° from the average temperature during the hottest month.

More than 90 percent of the flowering plants in Hawaii are found nowhere else

in the world. Many of them lack close relatives. Hawaii is so unusually gifted in its flora that it has 30 species of palm, and no specie is found on more than one island. Oahu alone has nine species, each one found in a separate valley in single or multiple groves. The number of plants unique to Hawaii is due to its prolonged isolation by vast spans of ocean, its mountains, and to the age of its land.

Within the Hawaiian Archipelago, there is a vast difference in the age of the islands. Kauai, the westernmost island is oftentimes called the Garden Isle. It is the oldest and the most abundant in flora. The wettest spot on earth is located on this island. The rainfall measures over 400 inches a year.

The island of Hawaii, the southernmost tip of the United States lies to the east and is still in the process of formation as is graphically seen by the present volcano eruptions there. It has desert areas and rain forests. The rainfall on this island varies from 145 inches a year in Hilo to a few inches in Kawaihae.

In many ways, Hawaii is a botanical garden in itself. The purpose of establishing a National Tropical Botanic Garden is first, to preserve the plants which are fast being destroyed everywhere in the tropics; second, to provide a living herbarium for taxonomists; third, to educate the present and future generations in the appreciation of the beauties of nature; and, fourth, to establish a research institute in connection with this living museum of tropical plants which would be open to scientists of all countries to carry on their studies.

Not just the whole South Pacific area but the whole southern half of the globe would profit directly from such an arboretum.

New Frontier Sees an Indian Bite the Dust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the following news story from the Kansas City Times of August 9, 1961, tells a very great deal about the so-called New Frontier. It speaks for itself:

NEW FRONTIER SEES AN INDIAN BITE THE DUST
(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON.—When the New Frontier trip took off, it was announced with resounding fanfare that at long last a real Indian had been appointed by President Kennedy to head the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

He has just been booted out so that the $18,500 job can go to a Democratic politician whose closest link with the red men is that he once grew red cranberries in Wisconsin.

Chosen as Acting Indian Commissioner early in the new administration was John O. Crow, born in Missouri and a graduate of Haskell Institute, at Lawrence, Kans. The strapping Crow played on the Haskell football team and later in professional football. In the Indian Bureau he worked his way up from the bottom. He was and is considered highly qualified for the job to which he was appointed.

There is nothing in the surprise announcement to reveal why Crow is being pushed back to Assistant Commissioner in favor of a party wheelhorse who has been knocking around on political payrolls a number of years. The new Commissioner nominated by Kennedy, Philleo Nash, 51, had a job at the White House under former President Truman. When Nash ran for Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin he was pictured on the party pamphlets as the "cranberry king." He was elected his first race.

Nash, a follower of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, backed HUMPHREY'S unsuccessful fight to capture Wisconsin delegates in the 1960 primary. Kennedy all but knocked HUMPHREY out of the race on the basis of the Kennedy Wisconsin victory. Nash also supported HUMPHREY in his last stand in West Virginia.

Apparently to pave the way for his appointment to the well-paying job, Nash was named by Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to a three-man group to report on Indian affairs. The submission of the report was followed by the appointment. There was nothing of note in the report, but it did provide a springboard for Nash to get back on a payroll.

Crow is a career employee. He was born on a farm near Salem, Mo., when his parents stopped there to farm a while on a trip west from the Southeast. He was raised at Commerce, Okla.

A friend of Nash said the former Wisconsin Lieutenant Governor had done some excavation work on Indian mounds near La Crosse several years ago.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Wayne, Mich., Community School District, I am submitting for the RECORD two communications I have received from the board of education of the district.

I believe that any Federal aid in this field should be based upon need and effort of the school district.

The communications are as follows:

WAYNE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Wayne, Mich., July 14, 1961.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Representative, 16th District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that at a recent meeting of the board of education of the Wayne Community School District a motion was passed as follows:

"Moved by Ryan, seconded by Stockmeyer, that JOHN LESINSKI, Member of the House of Representatives, be advised that the board of education of the Wayne Community School District favors Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, and that assistance be given in direct proportion to local effort."

We trust the above information will be helpful to you and that our resolution will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

P. D. GRAHAM,
Superintendent of Schools.

WAYNE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Wayne, Mich., June 7, 1961.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Representative 16th District, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

At a regular meeting of the board of education of the Wayne Community School District held Monday evening, April 24, 1961, the following resolution was passed:

"Whereas school enrollments have been increasing at an average rate in excess of 600 per year for the past 10 years with current enrollment increases averaging 1,000 pupils, and

"Whereas the community has consistently demonstrated its willingness to be taxed at high rates to furnish adequate money for the Operating and Debt Service Funds, and

"Whereas $12,638,003.48 has been expended for construction cost only of new school buildings from 1950 to 1960, and

"Whereas the school census, 0–19 years, has increased from 12,504 in 1950 to 23,830 in 1960, and is expected to exceed 26,000 in 1961, with preschool children and below the age of 5 approaching 2,000 per age group, and

"Whereas increased taxes will be needed to maintain adequate building and instructional standards: No, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the board of education of the Wayne Community School District, Wayne, Mich., go on record favoring Federal aid for education."

The board of education of the Wayne Community School District respectfully requests that this resolution be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Wayne Community School District is one of the fourth largest in Wayne County, comprising some 30 square miles, with a school membership of approximately 13,000. Explosive growth of this district, including currently some 6,000 homes that are coming over us, creates pressing problems of financial support. This district has consistently approved mileage for debt, to construct schools. This has permitted us to build on the average of 37 classrooms a year over the last 10 years. We are just now finishing off a building program representing some $9 million in appropriations for schools.

The total millage for schools in this district is 28.65 mills. Of this millage 21.90 is for operations.

We have repeatedly been obligated to borrow sizable amounts of money to meet payroll. The accompanying interest on these moneys cannot be recovered and represents an additional loss which must come from our operating budget. This board was compelled to borrow, only recently, another $500,000 to meet this contingency. Obviously, this story could be repeated by the many units of government which operate under the allocations of State funds.

It is for these reasons that we are directing the above resolution to your attention.

Sincerely,

P. D. GRAHAM,
Superintendent of Schools.

Nancy Gallman: A Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an editorial which appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., pointing out educational work of the Rotary

Club. The sincere feeling of members of the club is that anyone who is ambitious and worthy should have a chance to succeed and deserves assistance.

The editorial follows:

NANCY GALLMAN: A SUCCESS STORY

For more than 10 years the Greenville Rotary Club has carried on a program intended to further the cause of education and international understanding. It has paid at least a part of the expenses of a number of foreign students studying in the United States.

A few weeks ago the Club's directors made an important decision. They agreed to pay the costs of transportation and the living expenses of a Greenville girl who had won a scholarship for a year's study in a French university. The recipient is one of the most deserving young persons we have heard about in a long time.

She made an outstanding record in high school and through her junior year in a South Carolina college. She comes from a family which has known hardship and even poverty. She is ambitious and intelligent.

The Rotary Club departed from policy in this instance. Its previous efforts have been aimed at importing foreign students. This time, Rotary is exporting a student.

But there is more to it than that. The recipient of the assistance, Miss Nancy Carolyn Gallman, is a Negro. A desire to help a deserving member of her race may have had a part in the action of the Rotary Club. But the decision was based mainly on a sincere belief in her ability, her ambition, and her capabilities as a representative of the United States and of Greenville, S.C., in a foreign country.

Miss Gallman has an opportunity to further her education. She also has an opportunity to help foreigners to understand better her own country and her native State.

We commend her for her achievements and wish her well in her studies and in the teaching career she plans for herself.

What she has done for herself and what the Rotary Club is doing for her should be an example to the Nation and the world. We hope the obvious morals will not be lost on the freedom riders and the directors of Mr. Kennedy's Peace Corps.

If there were more Nancy Gallmans and more men like the Rotarians to encourage them and give them the help they deserve, a lot of problems would be greatly simplified.

There really is no such thing as "equality of opportunity" except that which people make for themselves. Miss Gallman earned hers, and we've an idea her benefactors someday will be proud of her.

Do They Want To Liquidate Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a certain article in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 20, 1961, is entitled "Kennedy Aids Frustrated by Ill-Informed Congress." The article was written by a staff reporter, one Julius Ducha, who quite obviously should have done some "homework" before writing this article.

Mr. Ducha says that the lack of information on the part of Members of Congress is frustrating eager Kennedy administration officials. Eager for what, may I ask? I assume Mr. Ducha means that these officials are eager to put over the Kennedy legislative program exactly as it comes down from the White House and that they resent any and all attempts on the part of Congress to revise or amend such legislation. Or does Mr. Ducha mean to convey the idea that these administration officials are eager to make the Congress ineffective and impotent so as to put it entirely out of business?

Mr. Ducha says:

Cabinet members and other top administration officials have come out from their baptism of hearings with the conviction that there must be a better way.

What does Mr. Ducha mean by a better way? He gives no constructive suggestions as to what he means by a "better way." Does he mean that such a better way is to do away with committee hearings entirely? If he had suggested that Members of Congress should be provided with a special legislative assistant, he would have, at least, offered something constructive.

Mr. Ducha says that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman spent hours before the Agriculture Committee talking about the intricacies of such programs as honey and tung oil for the edification of Members of Congress with a special interest in, but little knowledge of, such minor farm programs. I attended all of the hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture on the administration omnibus farm bill and heard every word spoken by Secretary Freeman. To my knowledge the Secretary did not even mention honey or tung oil, and if he did, he most certainly did not spend hours discussing such minor agricultural commodities. Press statements such as these only serve to belittle and ridicule Members of Congress. They serve no useful purpose whatsoever unless they are a part of an overall scheme to make the Congress look ridiculous in the eyes of the public.

It is becoming more apparent each day that a concerted movement is on foot to make the Congress of the United States impotent and ineffective. The original administration omnibus farm bill, for instance, sought to deprive the Congress of its constitutional right to legislate in farm matters. Fortunately, such requested authority, which would have permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to usurp the right of the Congress to legislate, was entirely eliminated from the omnibus farm bill recently enacted into law. More recently, the administration tried to deny the Congress its constitutional right to make annual appropriations in the field of foreign aid. These two glaring examples indicate that gradually but surely every effort is being made to restrict the Congress in performing its constitutional duties. Unless this trend is stopped, the net result will be a bigger and stronger centralized Federal Government with the Congress of the United States relegated to the background. Perhaps this is what is meant by a better way. If this is brought about, administration officials need no longer be frustrated when they appear at hearings before congressional committees.

Local Union Members Need Protection of Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following article and editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune dealing with the efforts of local teamsters there to break the hold of the Hoffa dictatorship over their union and their lives. These two pieces clearly show that there is a desire on the part of local union members to throw off the rule of labor bosses. The Teamster members in Chicago, and other American working men and women, throughout the Nation, need help so that they may be able to run their own unions, free from outside dictation and interference. This can be accomplished by action upon a bill I have introduced, H.R. 8407, which would bring labor unions under antitrust law and return control of local unions to local members.

UNION REBELS COMPLAIN OF ITS PAYROLL

(By George Bliss)

A group of rebel Teamster Union members charged Friday that officials of Local 710, Meat Drivers & Helpers Union, refused them permission to examine union financial reports in violation of the Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Act.

The rebel truckdrivers, who went to the union office at 4217 South Halsted Street, said they would file complaints with the U.S. Department of Labor that, under a law passed in 1959, financial reports must be made available to union members.

NOBODY'S BUSINESS

William J. Burns, who heads the rebel group, said he was told that the reports "are none of your business."

Burns said he wants to find out why officers of the local are what he called the highest paid union officials in the country and what justification they have to pay business agents $27,000 a year plus new automobiles and expense accounts.

In a study of Government reports, Burns charged, he has found that John T. (Sandy) O'Brien, secretary-treasurer of local 710 and a vice president of the international union, receives a total salary of more than $100,000 a year. He said this tops the salaries paid to James R. Hoffa, Teamster president, who is paid $75,000 a year.

A BIG PAYROLL

The local now has a total payroll of more than $500,000 a year for elected officials and appointed business agents, Burns added. He said that Frank C. Schmitt, local 710 president, was paid $62,827.42 in 1959 and $61,389.53 in 1960, and received large expense accounts besides his salary.

There were other local officers who received salaries that ran over $40,000 for the year, Burns said.

Burns said that Thomas H. Keegan, a business agent, was paid $27,924 in 1960 and there were at least four other business agents in the union who were paid more than $20,000 for the year.

Local 710, already under investigation by a Federal grand jury on complaints of arranging "sweetheart" deals with favored trucking companies, has about 15,000 members.

INFECTIOUS HOFFA-PHOBIA

The Chicago taxicab drivers' rebellion against Jimmy Hoffa and his henchmen is spreading to other cities.

About 225 cabdrivers in the St. Louis area have decided to pull out of Teamster Local 405 and form an independent union of their own. They represent about one-quarter of the membership of local 405, which has been dominated by Teamster Boss Harold Gibbons much as Chicago's union has been dominated by Joey Glimco. Other members of local 405 are believed ready to join the 225, and will vote in a supervised election next Friday.

In Cincinnati, cabdrivers local 954 voted 241 to 15 to separate from the Teamsters union. Several thousand members of three other Teamster locals—representing dairy drivers, soft drink drivers, and livery drivers—had already done so. Hoffa ordered Gibbons to take over the funds of these unions, but the rebel unions are said to have refused to turn them over to him. No doubt they are encouraged by the assurance of the NLRB, in the Chicago case, that the money belongs to the members of the union and not to the management of the union.

The Cincinnati drivers hope to affiliate with the AFL-CIO, which ousted the Teamsters for corruption in 1957.

The drivers in Chicago, Cincinnati, and St. Louis have shown that when the members of a union run by crooks are offered an honest choice, free from the threat of reprisals, they are usually eager to throw out the crooks and restore the good name of their union.

Their example should encourage other Teamster locals whose members are tired of living in Jimmy Hoffa's murky shadow. It should also teach a lesson to those politicians who, playing footsie with the union bosses, try to tell us that what the bosses want is always best for the union members.

Judge Learned Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 18, Judge Learned Hand died at the age of 89.

Judge Hand's passing marks the end of one of the noblest careers in the history of Anglo-American jurisprudence. To some, Judge Hand was the greatest judge that this country has produced. To a great many more he was the greatest American jurist of his time. The country mourns his passing and extends its sympathy, and its gratitude, to his widow and his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Saturday, August 19, published an obituary which is a remarkable piece of writing. It tells a great deal about this great judge, who combined wisdom and humor and experience to bring strength and luster to the law:

JUDGE LEARNED HAND DIES; ON U.S. BENCH 52 YEARS—A DEFENDER OF FREEDOM AGAINST EXTREMISTS OF LEFT AND RIGHT

Judge Learned Hand, once called the greatest jurist of his time, died yesterday at the age of 89.

Judge Hand spent 52 years on the bench. He retired in 1951 as judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, but retained his office to sit as judge on special assignments.

Judge Hand died in St. Luke's Hospital of heart failure. He had been admitted to the hospital August 5.

During his time on the bench Judge Hand wrote more than 2,000 opinions. Many became standards for law schools. They gave him a reputation as an outstanding liberal, even when the Federal courts were dominated by conservative judges. They also made him widely known as a master of the English language.

His incisive opinions, couched in terms of clarity and eloquence contributed much to the country's law heritage, in the opinion of many. In 1952 a book containing his papers and his speeches was published. It was called "The Spirit of Liberty," and its title embodies the spirit of the man himself.

The book, which showed him to have in the opinion of a reviewer a "poetic vision," made clear his life's philosophy: the defense of freedom against extremists, whether from the left or right.

Associate Justice Benjamin Cardozo of the Supreme Court called Judge Hand "the greatest living American jurist," and Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter of that Court lamented as one of the "caprices of fortune" the fact that Judge Hand had not been named to the Court.

But to most American jurists, and to the legal profession that over the years expressed amazement that he had never thus been rewarded. Judge Hand remained "the 10th Justice of the Supreme Court."

And the court itself quoted his opinions more often than those of any other jurist in the United States.

That he was never elevated to the Supreme Court, the crowning achievement for an American jurist, remained unexplained at his death. Many in the legal profession over a period of years expressed amazement that his illustrious career had never thus been rewarded.

Whether it was consideration of geographical appointment or religious requirement in a balanced high court or a dozen more reasons explored, debated and speculated upon over the years has never been determined. Even the conjecture by some that the unpredictable "turn of the wheel of fortune" had played a part remained only an explanation.

He won the country's admiration as one of its most respected judges in the 52 years he spent on the bench. He retired from regular active service in 1951 but retained his office in the U.S. Court House in Foley Square, continuing to sit as a judge on special assignments.

WAS HONORED IN 1959

One of the greatest tributes ever paid to any jurist was accorded Judge Hand on April 10, 1959, on the occasion of his 50th year on the bench. Chief Justice Earl Warren and other Justices of the Supreme Court were among the throng of Government officials, lawyers, and judges from all over the country who gathered in the Federal Court House here to honor Judge Hand.

There were several orations and a letter of commendation from President Dwight D. Eisenhower was read, but what seemed to move Judge Hand the most were the remarks of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter of the Supreme Court, who quoted Judge Hand as having said his life was "uneventful, unadventurous, easy, safe, and pleasant." Justice Frankfurter termed the five adjectives "inadequate and inaccurate," and proposed, instead, "daring, romantic, antediluvian, sophisticated, and lucky."

Other associates praised Judge Hand for his mastery of profanity as well as his eminence in the law.

Judge Hand responded to the tributes with jokes about himself and his court, then spoke seriously about the qualifications to be a judge. He mentioned detachment first and then imagination—for after all, he said, the work of a judge, like a poet's or a sculptor's, is an art. He concluded by reading Shakespeare's 123d sonnet, which is addressed to Time and ends with this couplet:

This I do vow, and this shall ever be,
I will be true despite thy scythe and thee.

His public speeches, as well, contained gems of logic, perfection of expression and persuasion. Of the meaning to man of liberty he once said:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right * * * the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interest alongside its own, without bias. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson that it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

In his prime he was a robust, stocky man with heavy eyebrows and a voice marked with authority. He had a quick wit. Lawyers who came before him unprepared to argue their cases, or disposed to wordiness, often felt his sharp tongue. Off the bench, however, he was the soul of gentleness.

Among his friends Judge Hand was a boon companion, much in demand as a singer and mimic at parties. He particularly enjoyed Gilbert and Sullivan lyrics and American folk music.

Once he made Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes of the U.S. Supreme Court double up with laughter at a collection of salty sea ditties. His ballad singing was so popular that he was induced to make a record album of folksongs.

Judge Hand attributed the fitness that enabled him to carry on his work so long and vigorously to walking and diet. For many years he walked 4 miles daily from the three-story brownstone house he owned on the upper East Side of Manhattan to his chambers downtown.

He was a cousin of Judge Augustus N. Hand, who retired from regular active service in 1953 and died in 1954 at the age of 85. Both Judges Hand served at the same time on the U.S. Court of Appeals, second circuit, at Foley Square, and were sometimes referred to by other judges there as "the right hand and the left hand." Judges and lawyers alike respected and admired them both as men of strong character, wide knowledge and utmost integrity.

It was fitting that in his last year of active service, Judge Learned Hand should be called upon to rule in one of the most important cases of the postwar period. On August 1, 1950, in an opinion written by Judge Hand, the court of appeals unanimously affirmed the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders and upheld the constitutionality of the Smith Act under which they had been convicted.

In the main opinion—a 66-page document of 20,000 words—Judge Hand found abundant evidence to sustain the conviction. He held that the only question was "how long a government, having discovered such a conspiracy, must wait, before finding that a clear and present danger to its institutions exists."

In upholding the convictions, Judge Hand wrote:

"The American Communist Party, of which the defendants are the controlling spirits, is a highly articulated, well contrived, far spread organization numbering thousands of

adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate utopian faith that is to redeem mankind.

"Our democracy, like any other, must meet that creed and that faith on the merit or it will perish; and we must not flinch at the challenge. Nevertheless, we may insist that the rules of the game be observed, and the rules confine the conflict to weapons drawn from the rules of disclosure * * *."

The danger was now a clear and present one, he ruled, and was so in the summer of 1948 when the defendants were indicted. The Supreme Court of the United States in a 6 to 2 decision on June 4, 1951, sustained the conviction.

APPOINTED BY TAFT IN 1909

Judge Hand's career began with an appoint by President William Howard Taft in 1909 as a district court judge for the Southern District of New York. It spanned an era that brought a great social change to the American scene.

Born in Albany on January 27, 1872, the future judge was named Billings Learned. He dropped the Billings later. Learned was his mother's maiden name. His father, Samuel Hand, served for a time on the court of appeals, highest court of New York State. An earlier forebear, John Hand, had come to this country from Kent, England.

Judge Hand was graduated in 1895 from the Harvard Law School, where he was editor of the Law Review. In 1902 he married Miss Frances Fincke of Utica, a graduate of Bryn Mawr College. They had three daughters, Mary Deshon, Frances L. and Constance Hand.

Moving to New York in 1902, he became a partner in the law firm of Gould & Willkie in 1903. His appointment to the Federal bench in New York came in May 1909, when he was 37 years old. His sole venture into politics occurred when he ran for chief judge of the court of appeals on the Progressive Party ticket in 1912. After the Progressive movement collapsed, he said he did not consider himself member of any political party.

After serving for 15 years as a Federal district judge, Judge Hand was nominated in 1924 by President Calvin Coolidge as a judge of the circuit court of appeals.

In 1946 he withdrew from the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. He was joined by Harold L. Ickes, Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts and William L. Batt, former vice president of the War Production Board.

In October 1947, Judge Hand received a Distinguished Service Medal from the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, sharing that honor with Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Jeremiah Malbank, philanthropist and industrialist, and Arthur Hays Sulzberger, then publisher of the New York Times.

ACTIVE IN RETIREMENT

After his retirement from regular active service on the bench, Judge Hand devoted considerable time to speaking and writing on legal and constitutional problems.

In a speech before the board of regents of the University of the State of New York in 1952, he appealed to Americans to continue their traditional reliance on free discussion despite the current fear of communism. He warned that American democracy would be threatened by suppression of freedom to dissent, by the making of denunciations without evidence and by loss of faith in the eventual supremacy of reason.

"Risk for risk," he said in a widely quoted statement, "for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry."

In his book, "The Spirit of Liberty," Judge Hand wrote that the qualities that "clear the path to truth" are "skepticism, tolerance, discrimination, urbanity, some—but not too much—reserve toward change, insistence upon proportion and, above all, humility before the vast unknown."

Judge Hand delivered a speech entitled "A Fanfare for Prometheus" at a dinner of the American Jewish Committee here in 1955, strongly endorsing the right of dissent. Only in a society that has learned to tolerate dissent, he asserted, could human rights and civil liberties be safe.

At this dinner he received an award for "exceptional advancement of the principle of human liberty." He received an award from the Freedom Foundation in 1956 for his contributions to a better understanding of the American way of life.

Judge Hand delivered three lectures in the Oliver Wendell Holmes series at the Harvard Law School in February, 1958. From them a book was derived and published under the title, "The Bill of Rights," dealing with the Federal judiciary in an America committed to majority rule. The lectures summed up his philosophy of the law, especially on the proper role of the courts in enforcing the Bill of Rights.

In these lectures Judge Hand said the power of the courts as final interpreters of the Constitution had been essential to the American system of government. Without an assumption of authority by the Supreme Court to keep the States, Congress and the President within their prescribed powers, he said, this Nation's form of government would almost certainly have foundered.

ATTRACTED WIDE ATTENTION

These statements attracted wide attention because Judge Hand for many years had been a leading spokesman for the position that judicial review—the power of the courts to declare statutes unconstitutional—should be exercised with great self-restraint, on the rarest of occasions.

He held to his traditional position in the Harvard lectures, criticizing the Supreme Court for exercising what he regarded as too broad a supervision over legislative desions, functioning in effect as a third legislative chamber. For the courts to pass on the merits of legislation, he asserted, is a patent usurpation of power.

Judge Hand cited the Supreme Court's 1954 decision outlawing school segregation as an apparent example of the approach to judicial review that he opposed.

President Eisenhower appointed Judge Hand early in 1960 to the President's Commission on National Goals. Judge Hand participated in the early meetings, which set the policies and procedures of the Commission. Failing health forced him to withdraw from active participation before the Commission's report was drafted. The Commission, with Dr. Henry M. Wriston as Chairman, noted in its letter of transmittal of the report in November 1960, that Judge Hand's "wisdom and cooperative temper made his participation extremely valuable."

CONTINUED TO WORK

Despite advanced years and delicate health Judge Hand continued to handle judicial assignments. He came to his office in the courthouse regularly in 1961. He wrote the decision in which the U.S. court of appeals held unanimously that ignoring parking tickets was not a serious enough offense to bar a man from citizenship.

His opinions were not always fraught with immeasurable consequence. In reversing a lower court's refusal to grant citizenship to a woman because of contentions of bad moral character, he ruled:

"A continued illicit relationship is not inevitably an index of bad moral character. A person may have good moral character even though he has been delinquent upon occasion in the past; it is enough if he shows that he does not transgress the accepted moral canons more often than usual."

Judge Hand wrote: "A person may have a good moral character though he has been delinquent upon occasions in the past; it is enough if he shows that he does not transgress the accepted canons more often than is usual."

Judge Hand received many honors through the years. In 1960 he received the State bar association's gold medal for distinguished service in the law and a distinguished service award from the council of Harvard Law School Association. The same year he was among the five recipients of the Great Living American award of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

He is survived by his widow, the former Frances Fincke, and three daughters, Mrs. Norris Darrell, Mrs. Robert M. Ferguson, and Mrs. Newbold Morris, the wife of the commissioner of parks of New York City.

The funeral service and burial will be private.

West Virginia and Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Jack Davis, of the Associated Press, recently wrote an article which analyzes the problem created by imports for several industries important to West Virginia's economy. The problem is presented in clear, concise terms.

The Associated Press is noted for the objectivity with which it approaches public issues. Therefore, it seems to me the article by Mr. Davis is particularly pertinent at the present time when Government policies on import restrictions are under discussion and review. Even though I cannot agree with certain criticisms of Secretary of the Interior Udall, I believe the article provides a helpful analysis.

I ask permission to include the article by Mr. Davis which appeared in one of our Huntington, W. Va., newspapers:

STEPPED-UP OVERSEA IMPORTS HURT WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMY

(By Jack Davis)

CHARLESTON.—West Virginia's skilled labor is among the highest paid in the world.

The coal miner. The glass and pottery worker.

But these employees can't earn a dime if their bosses cannot find a market for their products.

The market is there. The great industries of the East are consuming more fuel than ever before. And glass consumption is high.

But fuel and glass brought in from overseas is so much cheaper that the market for West Virginia coal and glass continues to shrink.

Two years ago, President Eisenhower became so concerned about the amount of foreign oil shipped into the United States that he ordered a limit placed on these imports. As a gage, he used the amount of oil that was imported in 1957.

LIMIT NOT HELD

For one reason or another, that limitation was not held.

The Government said, in effect, that 128 million barrels of oil could be imported each year.

But the figure has slipped upwards. In 1960 the figure was hiked to 155 million barrels, and this year it will run about 168 million barrels.

One million barrels of residual oil is equal, in heating value, to about 240,000 tons of coal.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, last month gave a House subcommittee this picture:

Based on 1959 figures, coal at the mouth of a West Virginia mine was worth $5.12 a ton. Since the average production for the West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and east Kentucky area is 10.63 tons per man a day, this would mean that—in the value of the coal alone—each million barrels of residual oil replacing coal would mean a loss of $1,229,000 at the mines.

LOSE 22,580 DAYS

The number of man-days lost would be 22,580. That would mean a pay loss of $587,000 to the miners. Supervisory, clerical, and other employees would lose another $96,000.

Since local and State taxes average about 15 cents a ton, that would represent a loss of $36,000 in tax moneys.

The United Mine Workers Welfare Fund, which gets 40 cents a ton royalty, would lose $96,000.

Mining concerns spend about $1.50 a ton for mine supplies, power, rental and depreciation. That would be another $360,000.

Virtually all coal moves to the eastern markets by rail. The railroads get an average of $4 a ton for shipping costs. The rail revenue loss would be $960,000.

When all of these figures—and others—are put together, Moody told the Congressmen, the total loss for every million barrels of imported residual fuel which takes the place of coal runs to more than $4,400,000.

LOSE MILLION WAGES

"Imports in 1961 are expected to be about 77 million barrels greater than they were in the 1957 base year," Moody said. "When we multiply the loss of $4,400,000 per 1 million barrels by 77, I think everyone can begin to comprehend just how serious the total cumulative effect of excessive residual fuel oil can be to the economy of a substantial part of the Nation.

"Wage loss alone in the mining areas for mineworkers, employees of suppliers and railroad employees, for every million barrels of residual fuel oil which displaced coal is equal to more than a $1 million."

President Kennedy's new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, has come in for considerable criticism among coal interests for hiking the quota limitations on foreign oil.

Walter R. Thurmond, of Charleston, retired secretary of the Southern Coal Producers Association, criticized President Kennedy for choosing an obscure Congressman from a section far removed from coal for Secretary of the Interior.

Last week the glass and pottery industries joined the coal interests in telling their troubles to a traveling congressional subcommittee.

President Robert Hannum of the Fostoria Glass Co. at Moundsville told the subcommittee at a hearing in Wheeling that the industry cannot continue paying high wages and compete with "low wages and lower standards of living in competing foreign countries."

THIRTEEN QUIT BUSINESS

And a union spokesman testified that 13 glass companies in the Wheeling area have gone out of business in the last 10 years.

W. A. Harris, Jr., president of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co. of Newell, W. Va., told the Congressmen "the American Government owes our industry a fair break by restricting the volume of dinnerware imported by establishing quotas."

Hannum said he pays an average weekly wage of $91.39 in his Moundsville plant. And he's competing with weekly wages of $20.61 in Germany, $13.98 in Japan, $13.98 in Italy and $17.20 in France.

The congressional subcommittee is to make a formal report to the full House Labor Committee.

What will come out of it is anybody's guess.

With the world situation as it is, Congress probably will be reluctant to risk antagonizing other countries by imposing restrictive tariffs.

Still it is faced with coming up with some sort of salvation for home industries who must go out of besiness because they cannot compete against the lower foreign prices.

It's one of the toughest problems facing Capitol Hill today. And one of considerable importance to West Virginians.

Continued Subsidies Will Not Solve Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune calls attention to a side of the farm problem which needs serious attention—with ever-greater technological advancement, fewer farms will produce all the food and fiber we can possibly use. More attention must be given to creating an economy which will absorb greater numbers of people from rural areas and expand training facilities in nonfarm occupations. The alternative is to continue subsidizing unprofitable farm operations until we have put most of our rural population on little more than a dole:

SURPLUS OF FARMERS

D. Gale Johnson, dean of the division of social sciences and professor of economics at the University of Chicago, says the farm income problem could be solved in 5 to 10 years if "positive measures" were taken to help people move out of agriculture.

"The problem of low farm incomes will not be solved until our political process recognizes that we have too many farms," Mr. Johnson told a seminar on economic developments. "Such recognition, however, is not enough. Positive measures must be adopted that will make it easier for farm people to find satisfactory nonfarm jobs.

"If we were willing to spend the same amount of money to help farmers find nonfarm jobs—and, if necessary, to create the nonfarm jobs—as we now spend to support farm prices, we could solve the farm problem in the next 5 or 10 years."

We do not agree that it is the Government's responsibility to spend billions of dollars to find or create jobs for farmers or anyone else who is dissatisfied with the income from his present occupation. Mr. Johnson is right, however, when he points out that the basic problem in agriculture is an oversupply of labor and management.

Two decades ago, 1 farmer produced enough food and fiber for himself and 10 others. Now 1 farmer produces enough for himself and 24 others, and the ratio undoubtedly will continue to expand in succeeding years. The great advances in farm technology and mechanization in recent years mean that fewer farmers are needed to supply the Nation's food and fiber. An oversupply of farmers depresses income per farmer, just as a surplus of farm commodities depresses prices.

Census figures show that the farm population has been declining for more than four decades, indicating that economic pressures are forcing farmers to seek more remunerative work off the farm. From a record high of 32 million persons in 1916, the farm population is down to 15,635,000, and the 3.7 million farms estimated by the 1959 census is the smallest number in the last 90 years.

One of the encouraging trends disclosed by the census was the substantial decrease in the number of marginal farms and a healthy growth in the number of larger units, indicating that family farms are adjusting to the size needed for profitable operations. The census showed there were 1 million fewer farms in 1959 than in 1954, and that 96.5 percent of the decrease was in units too small to yield a decent income or in units no longer called farms by a change of definition. Most of the eliminated marginal units were absorbed by other farmers to increase the size and efficiency of their operations.

On the other hand, the census listed 211,000 more farms (an increase of 36 percent) with $10,000 or more of annual sales. Farms in this category now comprise a fifth of all farms, whereas in 1954 they made up only 12 percent of the total.

Experience yields little hope that the "political process" will recognize the problem, nor does the policy of the Kennedy administration offer hope. The administration's policy is to dole out more subsidies to keep 'em down on the farm, regardless of how unproductive or inefficiently they may be, apparently in the hope that the payoff will come at election time.

Address of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in Honor of Charles J. Bonaparte, June 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 22, 1961, a commemorative ceremony in honor of Charles J. Bonaparte, the founder of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, took place in the Great Hall of the Department of Justice. The many distinguished guests present on that occasion witnessed the unveiling and presentation of a granite memorial to this dedicated and imaginative man who originally foresaw the necessity of a permanent investigative force in our Government. The ceremony, which also marked the 91st anniversary of the Department of Justice, was jointly sponsored by the Italian Historical Society of America and the Maryland Historical Society; the memorial was presented by Mr. John N. LaCorte, director of the Italian Historical Society, and was accepted by Attorney General Robert F.

Kennedy on behalf of the Department of Justice.

The speakers of the day were the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, U.S. Attorney General, Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Mr. John N. LaCorte, director of the Italian Historical Society of America, and the Honorable George L. Radcliffe, president of the Maryland Historical Society.

Dr. Re's address, entitled "The Ideal to Which America Is Committed," is particularly timely for all Americans. It calls the attention of all of us to the invaluable contributions of the FBI in preserving the American ideal of right and liberty for which it founder, Bonaparte, worked.

Dr. Re, as chairman of a commission dedicated to the protection of these American rights abroad, speaks with clarity and conviction. Prior to his appointment by President Kennedy, he was for 14 years a professor of law at St. John's University School of Law in New York. He is a member of the Board of Higher Education of the city of New York, and has served as a special hearing officer for the Department of Justice. A recognized authority in international law, he is divisional vice chairman of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association.

Dr. Re's address follows:

THE IDEAL TO WHICH AMERICA IS COMMITTED

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, on the occasion of the ceremony in honor of Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte, founder of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, June 22, 1961, in the great hall of the Department of Justice)

Mr. Attorney General, distinguished members of the judiciary and public officials, guests, and my fellow Americans:

We have assembled here today in order to pay tribute to a great American and to the remarkable institution that was the handiwork of his vision and labor. As patriotic Americans, proud of our common heritage and ideals, we welcome the opportunity to honor Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte for his example of devoted service to our country and for his invaluable contribution to the American cause of freedom and the American way of life.

The biography of Charles J. Bonaparte reveals a man of great ability, profound perception, and unparalleled courage. Charles J. Bonaparte was born in Baltimore, Md., on June 9, 1851. He entered the Harvard Law School in 1872, graduating with high honors 2 years later. His absolute integrity in the practice of law and his unbending dedication to the cause of justice soon earned for him a nationwide reputation as a brilliant attorney.

No cause was too small, no client too poor, for Charles J. Bonaparte. He served them all with identical zeal and inexhaustible energy. However, in his heart he was always primarily concerned with the public interest and public causes. He campaigned against political corruption and was one of the founders of the Baltimore Reform League and the National Civil Service Reform League. This great interest in civil service reform brought him into contact with Theodore Roosevelt, who was then Civil Service Commissioner. When Theodore Roosevelt became President, he repeatedly sought the services of Charles J. Bonaparte, and in 1905 appointed him Secretary of the Navy.

The following year he was appointed Attorney General, and soon saw the necessity for a permanent investigative arm within the Department of Justice. It was in 1908 that he succeeded in establishing the Bureau of Investigation within the jurisdictional framework of the Department of Justice.

Our ceremony today assumes even greater significance because it also commemorates the 91st anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Justice by Congress on June 22, 1870. However, it is well to remember that in honoring Charles J. Bonaparte, the founder of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we simultaneously honor the Bureau itself, as a great American institution that has come to play a major role in the maintenance of our security and our cherished liberties. In investigating violations of law of the United States, and in protecting our Nation from subversion, the Bureau has performed a service of incomparable value to the safety and security of America. For these patriotic services, the men of the Bureau and its distinguished Director, J. Edgar Hoover, have earned the undying gratitude of all Americans.

It has been said that it is a sacred duty of every American to perpetuate our civil institutions and to avert the dangers which may threaten them. By these standards, Charles J. Bonaparte has truly earned our lasting tribute, as well as this memorial in his honor. Through the Bureau that he founded and nurtured, he helped America achieve the ideals to which we as a Nation are steadfastly committed. These ideals were enunciated clearly and beautifully at the very founding of our Nation. They are beautifully enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, which proclaims to the world for all time the truths and convictions which form the cornerstone of our national purpose. That great charter, with eloquent simplicity and dignity, proclaims our belief in the Creator and the equality of man.

The ideals and national goals to which we have always been dedicated are set forth within the framework of our original plan of government. They are designed to guard the rights of all persons, to insure man's full development, and to guarantee equality of opportunity. These principles constitute the great American dream:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It is most significant to note that the very purpose of government is stated to be the securing of these rights.

Although this was only the statement of an ideal in 1776, its achievement or realization has constantly been our national goal. And although we cannot say that we have fully realized that great ambition, we can justifiably affirm that with every generation we have indeed come closer to its complete achievement. In this process of growth, this striving for perfection, all Americans should be made aware of the role the Federal Bureau of Investigation has played in securing these cherished rights and liberties, and guaranteeing their complete enjoyment by all Americans, regardless of race, color, creed or previous national origin.

Therefore, in paying tribute to the spirit of Charles J. Bonaparte, we are honoring not only the man, but the principles for which he stood and fought. And perhaps no greater homage can be paid than our realization that these very principles have been handed down and carried on by the valiant men of the Bureau who have followed in his historic path; those men who presently wage the difficult and dangerous battle to protect our rights and liberties—the rights and liberties of all Americans. These men today constitute a living and growing tribute to his memory. It is through their work that we have been brought closer to the realization and fruition of the great ideals adopted by the founders of this country—and expressed for all mankind in the Declaration of Independence. It is to them, too, that we must pay tribute.

It is also well to remember that it is by our ideals, and the genuineness of our efforts to attain them, that we are to be judged as a nation, and not by scientific and technological achievements alone. Indeed, the advances of science cannot be regarded as true progress unless they are used to achieve our great national purpose. This purpose scorns both cynicism and despair. It reawakens all Americans to a realization of the spirituality of man and exhorts us to extend to all others those rights and privileges which we ourselves take so easily for granted.

It summons each of us to extraordinary personal responsibility and sustained effort in the national interest. It inspires us in our struggle against injustice.

On this occasion we wish to express our gratitude to the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, for his leadership, and to the Italian Historical Society of America, for its sponsorship of this ceremony. We are grateful for this opportunity to salute the Federal Bureau of Investigation for having given vitality to the philosophical principle and spiritual ideal which forms the backbone of this Nation.

And so, my fellow Americans, we have turned to the pages of our glorious past for the inspiration to rise to meet the challenges of our troubled age. And as we constantly bear in mind that the greatness of our Nation was made possible by the united wisdom and valor of people from all lands, let us on this solemn occasion rededicate ourselves to that lofty national goal that inspired the founding of our country and enabled it to meet the trials of nationhood and greatness. With patriotic zeal in the tradition of Charles J. Bonaparte and the men of the Bureau that he founded, let us strive today to do all within our power as private citizens, as leaders of our community, and as public servants to accelerate the day when the American ideal will be a total reality, not only for all Americans, but also for all the peoples of the world.

Florida Chamber of Commerce Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, two resolutions received by me which I feel accurately reflect the thinking of my constituents of the Fourth District of Florida.

I do not think it would be inaccurate to say these resolutions mirror the feelings of most of us as far as the significance of the Communist-controlled Government of Cuba is concerned or as far as the necessity for a complete embargo on all trade with that country is concerned.

I have been seeking such an embargo for more than 18 months; it was gratifying to me to have my amendment to accomplish this, passed by an overwhelming vote in the House last week.

I introduced into the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce on August 3, 1961, and the resolution adopted by the Key West Junior Chamber of Commerce during its summer conference from August 17 to 20, 1961:

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

Whereas the establishment and continued existence of a de facto communistic regime in Cuba constitutes a threat to the security of the people of these United States of America, as well as the peoples of the other American Republics; and

Whereas the activities of that regime have violated and continue to violate the terms of existing inter-American treaties, as well as the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas these undeniable facts are known to all the peoples and governments that form part of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America should and has followed the required procedures in seeking joint action in accordance with inter-American agreements of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the Organization of American States has failed to react to this threat from Cuba with the vigor, determination, and action required to adequately protect the principles and agreements that bind its member states together; and

Whereas agreement with other countries for joint action in the defense of common principles and interest does not relieve the Government of the United States, or any other government, from its responsibility to its citizens to act individually when those principles and interests are, in its judgment, theatened: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce recommend to the Congress and the President of the United States, recognition and acceptance of these facts:

1. That the Communist-controlled Castro regime of Cuba constitutes an intolerable threat to the national security of the United States and all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

2. That our national security, the preservation of individual liberty and national sovereignty require and demand that the Cuban threat be considered as equal, if not greater, in importance than those that exist in Europe, the Far East, and other regions of the world; and be it further

Resolved, to recommend and urge the U.S. Government act promptly and with determination, in accord with other nations if possible, but alone if necessary to remove the Communist threat from Cuba, by whatever means are necessary; be it also

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, the Florida congressional delegation, members of the appropriate congressional committees, other pertinent governmental officials, and the ambassadors of the American Republics to the Organization of American States; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce seek endorsement of this resolution by other chambers of commerce and civic organizations throughout the United States.

Unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce on August 3, 1961.

WILLIAM P. SIMMONS, Jr.,
President, Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce.

Attested:

ALFRED CANEL,
Executive Vice President.

KEY WEST JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

Whereas communism is at work steadily and patiently undermining country after country; and

Whereas communism has now launched its attack on the Western Hemisphere and has won its first beachhead in Cuba; and

Whereas Cuba is an island country located approximately 90 miles from the shores of the United States, and is one of the main crossroads to Latin America; and

Whereas Western Hemispheric security and sovereignty is particularly threatened by the intervention of communism in Cuba; and

Whereas the Cuban Government has illegally confiscated American-owned property in Cuba worth approximately $861 million; and

Whereas Dictator Fidel Castro, acting as the Prime Minister of Cuba, recently attempted to blackmail the United States into exchanging farm tractors for prisoners; and

Whereas American commercial airplanes have been hijacked and illegally diverted to Cuba in such numbers and in such a piratical manner as to indicate that a conspiracy exists; and

Whereas because of the Cuban Government's actions, Cuba must now be considered a member of the Communist bloc; and

Whereas the Castro self-proclaimed Red dictatorship does not in fact comply with the requirements and principles of a properly constituted government of the Cuban people; and

Whereas the further spread of communism in the Western Hemisphere must be stopped, and that which exists must be destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Key West, Fla., and the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, ask the President and the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps to place into effect a complete trade embargo with the Island of Cuba in order to deprive the Communist leaders of that country of the economic assistance derived from trade with the United States; that, in addition, the United States withdraw its official recognition of the Castro Government and recognize in its place an exile government more representative of the Cuban people; be it further

Resolved, That the Key West Junior Chamber of Commerce does hereby submit the above resolution for consideration of the board of directors of the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce at its summer conference meeting at Cocoa Beach, Fla., August 17–20, 1961.

Shortage of Teachers of Deaf in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the eminent medical columnist for the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, pointed out in his Sunday article yesterday "Loss of Hearing—Part II" that we in the United States, unfortunately, are not producing enough trained teachers of the deaf to staff our current program for the deaf, let alone expand it.

Authorities estimate, Dr. Rusk wrote, that during the coming academic year some 365 special schools and classes for 26,500 deaf children enrolled will need 653 new teachers, but there will be a deficit of 454 teachers, because only 199 new teachers finished their training this spring.

Mr. Speaker, the rescheduled hearings of the Special House Subcommittee on Education will open tomorrow on my bill, H.R. 5360, and similar legislation, to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities, and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

In view of the fact that Chairman EDITH GREEN and members of her subcommittee will be conducting hearings for the next 2 days on this subject, I think it timely to call to the attention of my colleagues the importance of this legislation, which should be enacted in this session by the House. The Senate passed a similar bill on March 3. I also ask permission to have Dr. Rusk's full article included with my remarks for my colleagues to peruse.

LOSS OF HEARING—II: MOST OF DEAF NEED A MECHANICAL AID, BUT COMPETENT DOCTOR MUST PRESCRIBE

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

As pointed out in this column last Sunday, hearing impairments in some instances may be cured or substantially alleviated through surgery.

For the great majority of persons with hearing problems, however, a hearing aid is the best answer.

Success with a hearing aid depends not only on the choice of aid and its fitting. There are many psychological factors involved such as vanity, pride, and other types of sensitivity.

Boys, for example, generally prefer the eyeglass type of hearing aid even if they do not need to wear glasses. On the other hand, even girls who wear glasses generally prefer the over-ear type of aid, because they can cover it with their hair.

In no case should a person who suspects he has a hearing loss wear a hearing aid, unless it is recommended by a physician who has had special training in audiology.

This is emphasized in a recent booklet, "You and Your Hearing" by Norton Canfield, M.D., published by Public Affairs Pamphlets, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N.Y. (25 cents).

Dr. Canfield of Yale University School of Medicine points out that there are some persons who cannot wear an aid satisfactorily because of the severity of their hearing loss.

A hearing aid makes speech louder, but it does not always make it clear enough for the deaf person to understand what is said. Auditory training and speech reading (lip reading) may also be necessary to make the new hearing aid effective.

Dr. Canfield urges that all persons with hearing impairments join the American Hearing Society, 919 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

This is good advice, as a variety of important services are available through local affiliates of the society, which operates more than 150 facilities throughout the Nation to assist the hard of hearing.

One of the most important aspects of hearing conservation is detection of hearing loss as early as possible, preferably before 2 years of age. Special testing devices are available for preschool children and even infants as young as 3 weeks can be tested for response to sound stimuli.

One of the most unusual and most valuable services in the field of hearing are the correspondence courses for parents of deaf children, developed by the John Tracy Clinic, 806 West Adams Boulevard, Los Angeles 7, Calif.

Through these courses, published originally in English and Spanish and since translated into many languages, parents learn to help their children in lipreading, language, sensory training, acoustic training, and speech preparation.

Next week in the House of Representatives hearings will begin on legislation which would help solve the greatest single obstacle to improved services for the deaf and hard of hearing—the acute shortage of qualified personnel to provide these services.

Currently there are approximately 26,500 children enrolled in 365 special schools and classes for deaf children.

Far more such schools and classes are needed but, unfortunately we are not producing enough trained teachers of the deaf to staff even our current program, let alone expand it.

Authorities estimate that during the coming academic year these schools and classes will need 653 new teachers. Since only 199 new teachers finished their training this spring, the deficit will be 454.

The number of centers training such teachers has increased from 25 to 30 in the last 3 years, but most of these centers are not being used to capacity, and five report they expect to have no students in teacher training during the coming year.

There are an estimated 8 million to 9 million persons with speech and hearing problems of sufficient severity to require special services.

To meet their needs would require the services of 27,300 professional personnel competent in speech pathology and audiology. Such personnel currently number only 7,000 and less than half this group have adequate professional training. Currently less than 400 such personnel are being trained each year.

The legislation to be discussed in the House of Representatives would remedy this situation by establishing a system of training grants to institutions to strengthen and expand their training programs for teachers of the deaf, speech pathologists, and audiologists.

The bill has already passed the Senate.

This legislation may not seem of major importance when compared to some of the major issues of national security, health care for the aged, and Federal aid to education now before the Congress.

To some 8 million to 9 million persons with speech and hearing problems, however, it means the only hope of realizing the prophecy in Isaiah 35: 5–6 that "* * * the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped * * * and the tongue of the dumb sing."

Administration Wants To Get a Foot in the Door on the Principle of Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the social planners and the proponents of Federal control never give up. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points up the maneuvering by administration officials to get any kind of aid to education bill through Congress in order to "establish the principle." Once that has been accomplished, it is not much of a trick to expand the program and the appropriations in order to fulfill the whole program. If the compromise now being worked out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare fails, then look for an effort to expand aid through the National Defense Education Act, or by increasing the number of impacted areas in which Federal aid is given. Accepting the principle in any degree is just like jumping off a building, you can not go just part way down, once the principle is accepted, we go all the way. The best way to avoid Federal aid is to keep from accepting any part of it:

HALF A LOAF

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is busy trying to salvage just enough of the Kennedy administration's bill proposing Federal aid to education to establish the principle of the thing. If he can get Congress to accept a small dose this time, never fear but that the administration will be back next time to try to get the full dose down.

Mr. Kennedy started out seeking a $6 billion program to build schools, pay teacher salaries, build college structures, provide scholarships, and authorize loans for parochial and private school construction. The House Rules Committee tabled the legislation July 18 on a vote of 8 to 7.

Now Mr. Ribicoff is back with a deal scaled down to $1,126 million. Grants of $325 million for public school construction would be limited to 1 year. School districts would have to meet specified Federal criteria of need—which is just an illustration of the principle that Federal control goes with Federal aid. They would also have to match every $40 of Federal money with $60 of their own, which strips the Washington handout of a good part of its appeal.

There would be no money for teacher pay or for construction of parochial and private schools. This has prompted objections from some Catholic legislators, among them Representative MCCORMACK, the House majority leader. He says the new legislation "would not please anybody."

Other proposals in the new stripped-down package would extend for 1 year scholarship loans now provided in the so-called defense education act; would provide a small amount for college classroom construction; and would extend for 1 year aid to areas where a high proportion of Federal employees work on tax-exempt property.

The principal objections to Federal aid for school construction are untouched by Ribicoff's changes. Federal control is still there, and the administration has yet to demonstrate any need for Federal intervention. The figures show that the classrooms are being built without Washington handouts.

It is obvious that President Kennedy and Secretary Ribicoff seek this legislation to get a precedent established that Federal aid is acceptable. They will take half a loaf now in the hope of getting a baker's dozen later.

Immediate Action Required To Save Small Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, for several years past the House Small Business Committee has been making extensive investigations into and studies of trade practices which are prevalent in the dairy industry and which are slowly but surely strangling all of the small dairymen who compete, in any way, with the large nationwide processors and distributors of dairy products.

Overwhelming evidence has been accumulated showing the appalling effect of price discrimination in the destruction of free competition and the creation of monopolies in the dairy industry. Investigations have disclosed that many of the dairy giants are selling milk and other dairy products at prices below cost, with resultant elimination of the small business competitors, at the same time that they are selling the same products at a much higher price in other areas of the country, thereby subsidizing their below cost sales. Many small dairies have been forced out of business by such practices within a month or two after their inception. In some areas where nationwide distributors have gained monopoly control of prices, the public is paying more than it did for milk products before competition was eliminated.

Small businessmen operating independent dairies have complained to the Small Business Committee with respect to these unfair trade practices. With leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, the following letters addressed to the Small Business Committee and referred to me because of my known great interest in the welfare of all small businessmen:

MARTIN CENTURY FARMS, INC.,
Lansdale, Pa., August 9, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: It was indeed a great pleasure to meet with you at the recent convention of the National Independent Dairy Association. I certainly appreciated the fact that you took time from your busy schedule to meet with us. I recently received

a questionnaire from Scott Daniel requesting that I send you the following information.

In 1952 there were 986 dairies in Pennsylvania; in 1961 there are 626. This indicates that there are 360 dairies less at the present time in Pennsylvania than there were in operation in 1952. This figure includes all the dairy operations in the State of Pennsylvania, which are retail and wholesale milk dealers, manufacturing plants and subdealers. Pennsylvania is primarily a fluid market, therefore, there are very few, and mostly small, manufacturing plants. The reduction of 360 milk dealers is mainly fluid milk businesses. In Pennsylvania we have only five large chain operations, therefore, most of the businesses are independents. The milk dealers who went out of business were practically all, if not all, independents. I reviewed the questionnaire with the Pennsylvania Milk Control Commission and they stated that since 1952, they knew of no dairies that went bankrupt. Most of these dairies were small dealers who sold out to larger dairies. They sold out for one or more of the following reasons:

1. Buildings and/or equipment became old and obsolete. When this equipment had to be replaced, either they did not have the money to remodel, or did not wish to invest the money to remodel.

2. There is a ready market to sell a small business. Therefore, the small dealer feels it is to his advantage to sell while he still has a running business.

3. Many of these small businesses were individually owned. The owner is now at or near the retirement age and has found that his son, or sons, are not interested in a small milk business and therefore, makes the decision to dispose of his operation.

4. Some of these businesses are so small that under present operating costs, they do not receive a large enough return to continue.

In Pennsylvania, we have a very interesting story due to our milk control commission. It is the oldest and, I believe, the best operated commission in the country. In 1933 in the midst of the depression, farmers and milk dealers were going out of business in Pennsylvania, due to bankruptcy, at about the same rate. The rate was alarming. Our Governor realized that something had to be done or there would not be enough milk produced or distributed in the State to maintain the health of the people of Pennsylvania. Therefore, he inaugurated a milk control commission as a health measure. The State legislature set up the rules and regulations for the milk control commission. It was given three charges:

1. To return to the farmer the cost of producing the milk, plus a reasonable profit.

2. To set the price of milk, home delivered, at a price high enough so that the milk dealer receives the cost of operation, plus a reasonable profit.

3. To always bear in mind that the milk sold to the consumer must be set at a level so that the consumer can afford to buy an adequate amount of milk to maintain the health of her family.

Our milk control commission has been set on a sound basis and as a result has operated continuously since it was inaugurated in 1934. As a result, the farmers are producing more than enough milk to meet the requirements of the State. The milk dealers have received cost of production plus, and the retail price of milk has been at a level so that the consumer can afford to buy it. If the price of milk is set to return a fair profit to the average, normally efficient milk dealer; it will not return a sufficient profit to an inefficient milk dealer or to a dealer who is too small to operate under today's mechanized system. Therefore, this dealer cannot, and probably should not, continue in business. The dealers in our State, under the regulations of the Pennsylvania Milk Control Commission, may operate differently than dealers who operate without a milk control commission, or with a milk control commission that has only a partial and not complete operation.

If you have any additional questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

MARTIN CENTURY FARMS, INC.,
C. H. GODSHALL, *Secretary.*

PASCHAL'S DAIRY,
Enterprise, Ala., August 1, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As to the information requested by Mr. D. C. Daniel about unfair trade practices in the milk industry, I am listing a few of the things that confront us from day to day. Since Foremost is our keenest competition I will confine my accusations toward them.

1. Buying accounts with refrigeration.
2. Giving rebates.
3. Bribing accounts. One instance—purchasing two pairs of trousers for a customer, stating that it was in appreciation of the business from his store.
4. Buying space in cooler. In one chainstore we were the only one putting milk in. Foremost came along and promised to pay rental on space.
5. On school accounts they offer a percentage back to the lunchrooms. In this way, the lunchrooms can save enough to buy a big piece of equipment in a year. (One lunchroom in my area bought a deep freeze.)

V. W. PASCHAL.

REISS DAIRY, INC.,
Sikeston, Mo., August 4, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: In response to an inquiry from Mr. D. C. Daniel, executive vice president of National Independent Dairies Association, I am attempting to answer the six questions he posed:

Question 1. Number of independent dairymen in Missouri who have failed or sold out to a competitor in the last 10 years—about 50.

Question 2. Names and locations of those listed in question 1.

Atteberry Dairy, Charleston, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

Crenshaw Dairy, Charleston, Mo. Quit.

Lawson Dairy, Caruthersville, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

Oldfield Dairy, Cape Girardeau, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

O'Laughlin Dairy, Jackson, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

Murphy Dairy, Arcadia-Ironton, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

Vaughn Dairy, De Soto, Mo. Now distributor for Sealtest.

Creole Dairy, Ste. Genevieve, Mo. Sold to Dairy Brand.

Purity Dairy, Bonne Terre, Mo. Sold to Tucker Dairy.

Schonhoff Dairy, Cape Girardeau, Mo. Quit.

Woods Dairy, Sikeston, Mo. Now distributor for Edwardsville Creamery, Edwardsville, Ill.

Central Dairy, Columbia, Mo. Sold to Beatrice.

Casey Dairy, Potosi, Mo. Quit.

Merchants Dairy, Desloge, Mo. Sold to Foremost.

Producers Dairy, Poplar Bluff-Lutesville, Mo. Quit.

Country Club Dairy, Kansas City, Mo. Sold to Fairmont.

Quality Dairy, Hannibal, Mo. Sold to Beatrice.

Watson-Weber Dairy, Malden, Mo. Quit.

Weber Dairy, Hannibal, Mo. Sold to Quality Dairy, Hannibal.

Cloverleaf Dairy, Springfield, Mo. Sold to Adams Dairy Co.

Beverly Farms Dairy, Lee Summit, Mo. Now a distributor.

Audrain County Dairy, Mexico, Mo. Sealtest.

Cole Dairy, West Plains, Mo. Now distributor Sealtest.

Question 3. Independents who aren't in business now who were in business 10 years ago—about 30.

Question 4. Unfair trade practices at present:

1. Below cost selling.
2. Discriminatory pricing.
3. Unlawful discounts.
4. Free merchandise, equipment, and facilities.

Question 5. How have unfair practices affected our growth? We have had no growth for 5 years. Profits have decreased about 40 percent. Our volume has decreased about 10 percent.

Question 6. Chances of survival. Present trends are such that our only hope for survival is better law enforcement and "below cost" legislation.

It is difficult for one person to be acquainted with all areas of the State of Missouri. There is no longer any independent dairy in Kansas City, and in the entire area of Missouri, north of the Missouri River, there are only three independently owned dairies. Southeast Missouri, where we are located, has 5 dairies, where about 20 dairies operated in the area 10 years ago.

We have experienced about every conceivable gimmick by our competition—how we have managed to survive amazes me. We have seen chainstores and a favored dairy apparently conspire to take over the dairy business in Missouri, and they have almost got the job done. When these practices are prevalent in an area, the other dairy giants jump on the bandwagon and pick up what is left. As you will note, many small dairies have become distributors for national dairy concerns—I believe there are about 50 distributors for Sealtest in Missouri—and are so limited in the territories that they can make a living but never become a big problem for Sealtest. A lot of these fellows used to be the ones we competed against, yet the competition was not illegal or unfair. In many cases, they were our friends and neighbors. If the present trend continues as it has, in another 10 years, the milk business of our country will be operated from New York or Chicago.

We operate in a modern dairy plant. None of our equipment is over 12 years old. Our plant, delivery, and office costs are below average. Yet we made a profit on sales in 1960 of less than 3 percent. That margin of profit gives us little opportunity to keep our plant and methods modern. Even now, we feel that we can compete with any dairy serving this area—and make a profit—if they will sell their products at cost or above cost. We have cost accounting and we have a pretty good idea what costs are.

Very truly yours,

L. M. STANDLEY, *President.*

OWEN'S DAIRY,
Englewood, Colo., August 1, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Concerning the request of Mr. D. C. Daniel regarding the number of independent dairies in our State, here is the information to the best of my ability.

In 1956 there were approximately 144 independent dairies in Colorado. We now have approximately 81 independent dairies, or a

decrease of 63 companies. Approximately 19 of the 63 companies in question were sold to national chain dairies. Of this group an additional six have become distributors for the large concerns. Of the remaining number, 13 have merged with other independents, the rest have gone out of business for reasons unknown to me.

Undoubtedly, some of the business failures were due to mismanagement, however, I am confident that some failures were due to the unfair trade practices constantly in use by the chains.

The national companies involved in this State are as follows: Beatrice Foods, Borden's, Fairmont, Carnation, Sealtest.

If these giants are allowed to continue their immoral and illegal methods of doing business, it is questionable how long our company, as well as many other independents, will remain in the marketplace. Were it not for men such as yourself, we would have given up the ship 2 years ago.

I trust this information will be of some value to you in your fight against monopoly. If I can be of further service, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,

PAUL R. MILLER.

THE GARDINER DAIRY
& ICE CREAM CO.

Garden City, Kans., August 12, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: We operate in 25 counties in southwest Kansas, which I realize is 25 percent of the territory in Kansas but it is in the sparsely settled area and it only represents 5 percent of the population. Since 1954, 11 independent dairy plants in this area have gone out of business leaving only 6 and one of them is a major plant of the Fairmont Food Co. located in Dodge City, Kans. It is my estimate that they have 65 percent of the business in the entire territory. So the rest of the 5 independents have only 35 percent of the business. In this area the other majors, namely National Dairy Products, Borden Co., Carnation Co., Beatrice Foods Co. all have plants outside this trade area but do have a good deal of business.

The reason we, and the other independents, have trouble staying in business is that these major companies are furnishing equipment, financing the businesses, supplying large signs, renting the sides of the buildings for the placement of large billboards, issuing secret rebates or using tie-in sales and running specials at prices below cost. Some of the major grocery organizations have sponsored agreements to price with their competitors to price our products higher than other brands and running specials for the weekend on their private label below cost. This has caused us to lose, in some towns where we were strong, 80 percent of our business in the past 20 months. We operate 12 wholesale routes and one of these routes is off 40 percent, another 24 percent, another 19 percent, and another 14 percent during this past 20 months when the strive is on apparently to put us independents out of business. It has caused the sales to drop 11 percent in this area which means the production from 500 cows. If something isn't done to correct these unfair trade practices there will not be many of the five independents left at the end of 3 years. The way the majors are operating now they can move in on us further any time and have us broke in 90 days time.

No doubt you are familiar with the price of ice cream in Whichita, Kans., which today is far below cost. It is my understanding the Small Business Committee and the Federal Trade Commission are moving in to conduct an investigation in that area and those same prices are being put into effect in this area this weekend. If we do not meet the prices we lose the business and if we do meet the prices we lose money. Either way we go, our chances of survival are very slim.

Please do what you can to help us at the earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

RALPH T. GARDINER.

Vice President's Promises to West Berlin Demand Enunciation of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following news stories, concerning the weekend trip of the Vice President to Berlin, carry the stirring speeches he made to the West Berliners. There are few who will disagree with the Vice President's promises that we will defend our commitments with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." But some may be confused as to just what policy these stirring words back up. Such a declaration of action must be supported by a firm declaration of purpose. We, and the Communists, must know without question what objective we expect to support with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." To date the administration has not spelled out a firm foreign policy upon which we stand and such a declaration must be forthcoming now. The best way for us to prevent World War III is to state clearly and without qualification that the United States will not submit to any further Communist aggression, that we will defend freedom wherever it is threatened, and we will use every weapon at our command to win any war the Communists start, either deliberately or through miscalculation. The best guarantee of peace at this moment is to back up the words of the Vice President in Berlin with a firm declaration which will serve notice on Khrushchev that, if he is so foolhardy as to plunge the world into war, he and his country will lose.

The articles from the New York Times and the Chicago Daily Tribune follow:

[From the New York Times]

JOHNSON'S JOURNEY ASSAILED BY SOVIET

Moscow, August 20.—Pravda today described Vice President JOHNSON'S trip to Bonn and West Berlin as a "provocative journey."

The Soviet Communist Party newspaper thus headlined a dispatch from its Bonn correspondent depicting Mr. JOHNSON'S arrival yesterday in the West German capital. The Vice President later visited West Berlin.

The dispatch said Mr. JOHNSON'S drive of several hours from the Cologne airport to Bonn had been conceived as a "demonstration of solidarity" with West German quarters that "seek to raise a provocation clamor" over East Germany's border restrictions in Berlin.

Moscow newspapers published today the text of a Soviet note to the United States, Britain, and France charging that the three powers had invalidated agreements that guaranteed Western rights in Berlin. The Communists have sought to justify the closing of the border between East and West Berlin on the ground that the West had been using West Berlin as a base for subversion and espionage.

Izvestia, the Soviet Government organ, also printed the text of an earlier U.S. protest to the Soviet Union regarding the border closing.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

JOHNSON VOWS FREE BERLIN—100,000 HEAR PLEDGE TO GIVE U.S. LIVES

BERLIN, August 19.—More than 100,000 West Berliners stood in a drizzling rain tonight to hear Vice President JOHNSON assert Americans have pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor" to the survival of West Berlin.

JOHNSON addressed the West Berlin city parliament and his words were relayed over loudspeakers to the crowd outside.

REPEATS KENNEDY HOPE

Repeating President Kennedy's July 25 statement on Berlin that "This crisis could be surmounted," JOHNSON told West Berliners to be confident.

"Freedom can prevail, peace can endure," he said.

"This is a time then, for confidence, for poise, and for faith—for faith in yourselves."

President Kennedy wants West Berliners to know that the pledge he has given for the freedom of West Berlin and the rights of Western access to Berlin is firm," JOHNSON said.

PLEDGES U.S. LIVES

"Our lives, our fortunes, and sacred honor," he said, quoting the American Declaration of Independence, are pledged to the people of West Berlin.

JOHNSON gave similar assurances in speeches to the crowd from the city hall balcony and to a crowd of welcomers earlier at Templehof airport.

JOHNSON arrived here from Bonn, where he held lunchtime talks with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenaur. In a speech in Bonn he said: "The American people have no genius for retreat and we do not intend to retreat now."

GREETED BY APPLAUSE

He told the airport crowd that the United States will "never, never forget their obligations to you."

A great burst of applause greeted the Vice President as his car swung through the massive crowd outside West Berlin's city hall.

An even greater roar greeted him when he appeared on the balcony with Mayor Willy Brandt and Gen. Lucius Clay, retired, former U.S. commander in Germany during the 1948–48 Berlin blockade.

JOHNSON told the crowd from the balcony: "Do not lose courage, for if tyranny may seem for the moment to prevail, its days are numbered."

TIME OF DANGER

In his speech to Parliament, the Vice President said:

"I come here at a moment of tension and danger—in your lives, the lives of my countrymen, and the common life of the free world.

JOHNSON referred to the troop-guarded barbed wire, concrete walls, and planking that the Communists have installed on East Berlin's border since last Sunday to stem the westward flow of East German refugees.

"Lift your eyes from these barriers," he urged, "and ask yourselves: Who can really believe that history will deny Germany and Berlin their natural unity? Who can really believe that the German people will choose communism after what they have seen on German soil?"

ADENAUER IS SATISFIED

In Bonn, JOHNSON directed a warning to East German Communists and Russian leaders alike that "humanity's retribution will be swift and emphatic" for a crime against peace.

"I am very satisfied," Adenauer said after his talk with JOHNSON. "I am flying to Berlin myself in the course of next week."

In his speech here, JOHNSON said he understood the Berliners' anger against the Communist authorities who congratulate themselves on having stopped the flow of refugees to the west.

REDS PROVE FAILURE

"What a victory they claim," he said. "What a failure they prove. I tell you the Communists congratulate themselves too soon."

The Vice President congratulated West Germans on their economic progress since World War II and on their building of a vital, democratic life. He said there has been a tragic failure in Communist East Germany.

"In the short run," he said, "the barbed wire is there and it will not go away by a wave of the hand."

JOHNSON told West Berliners:

"This island does not stand alone. You are a vital part of the whole community of freemen. Your lives are linked not merely to those in Hamburg, Bonn, and Frankfurt. They are also linked with those who live in every town of Western Europe, Canada, and the United States, and with those of every continent who live in freedom and are prepared to fight for it."

ACCEPTED AS SYMBOL

JOHNSON said that by closing the border the Communists have shown that they "have not been able to create a life in which men and women can commit their talents, their faith, and the future of their children."

There was never quite anyting like it in Berlin as JOHNSON's motorcade procession wound its way through the picturesque streets of a city that accepted him as the symbol of the West's warranty that communism will not be permitted to swallow its citizenry.

Men, women, and children cried greeting and waved their handkerchiefs, some smiling and some openly weeping. A half-mile from the airport JOHNSON halted his car, flung open the door and stepped, hands outstretched, into the crowd.

Berliners surged about him and police were hard put to keep him from being swept off his feet. Grinning broadly, JOHNSON shook hundreds of hands, stopped to kiss babies, and even petted a dog as he made his way on foot for about five blocks.

Lawrence, Kans., Girl—Clarice Richardson—All Around 1961 Champion Cowgirl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Kansas City Star, August 13, 1961.

Lawrence, Kans., Mr. Speaker, is noted for many things—not the least among which is an abundance of talent and ability among her youth. Miss Clarice Richardson is representative of the fine and wholesome competitive spirit of Kansas youth, and I am pleased to call her success story to the attention of my colleagues:

TOP HIGH SCHOOL COWGIRL IS A DEMURE KANSAN, 16

(By Eldon Miller)

LAWRENCE, KANS., August 12.—A 16-year-old girl from a 10-acre farm near Lawrence has ridden her way to the title of all-round high school cowgirl in national competition at Douglas, Wyo.

Clarice Richardson, a small and pretty brunette who is a cheerleader at Lawrence High School as well as a good horsewoman, became the first Kansan to win such a title.

She rode in three events to win over the defending champion, competing against girls reared on ranches and riding horses valued at up to $10,000. Clarice rode an unregistered mount in her specialty, barrel racing, and topped 96 other teenagers to boost herself to the championship.

Barrel racing is a timed event in which each contestant must ride in a cloverleaf pattern around three barrels.

"This is my year," Clarice said. But actually there have been other good years.

She started competing in horse shows when she was 8 and has won many prizes for her horsemanship. Last year was her first in barrel racing and she likes it better than the earlier competition.

"It's not rush, rush, rush like the horse shows," she said. "Now I usually have just one event to compete in."

Last year Clarice was the State champion in barrel racing and placed fifth in the national contest at Hot Springs, S. Dak.

There were extra events, however, when she won the Kansas cowgirl title at Topeka in June of this year and then the national championship last month.

WINNER AT TOPEKA

As well as being tops in barrel racing at Topeka, Clarice won the pole-bending event, another timed ride in which each rider weaves around a series of poles, and was third in the cutting horse contest, where a horse and rider must keep a calf away from a herd of stock for a certain length of time.

At Topeka, Clarice received a $150 scholarship and a $150 saddle as prizes. At Douglas, where she also placed in pole bending and breakaway calf roping, she was given a $300 saddle and two sterling silver belt buckles.

But at most of the other rodeos, barrel racing has been her only event. She plans to compete this weekend at Concordia, Kans.

Sixteen only a week ago Tuesday, Clarice also will be entered in the American Royal barrel racing in October. It will be her fourth year against the professional contestants here. When she was 13, she placed fourth, and she also has finished near the top since then.

Clarice proudly admits to being nervous before each event.

"If you don't get nervous you have too much confidence in yourself and you foul up," she said.

"But her father is much more nervous than she is," her mother added.

Clarice's activity is part of a family project. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Delbert Richardson, purchased a Shetland pony for their children in 1949. This led to a family hobby which at one time saw all four of the Richardson children competing in horse shows.

At present, the Richardsons own six horses. Another daughter, 7-year-old Denise, still appears in horse shows. The two Richardson boys no longer compete.

"It's not really an expensive pastime," Richardson, an insurance agent, said. "We meet so many interesting people. As a family, we meet other families."

"We use the time we travel as our vacation," Mrs. Richardson added.

LISTS 10 RODEOS

Clarice has competed in more than 10 rodeos this season. Last week she appeared in Lee's Summit as a barrel racer. The first night she fell from her horse and was disqualified, but the next night she won the event.

Clarice and her horse also fell last year at Topeka in a muddy arena. The horse kicked her on the head and she suffered a slight concussion. This year, while practicing at Douglas she again fell from her mount.

"It was embarrassing," Clarice said.

"She's not scared of horses," her father said. "She's a natural on a horse."

The animal Clarice rides in barrel racing is Zip, a 10-year-old purchased 2 years ago for considerably less than the $5,000 at which Richardson values it now.

Zip is not a registered quarter horse, but it has excellent speed for the event. Clarice is the only person who rides Zip.

LIKES CHEERLEADING, TOO

Clarice, who will be a junior at Lawrence, also will be in her second year as a high school cheerleader. Just before she won the national cowgirl title, she was part of the Lawrence group which took first place at the cheerleaders' short course at Oklahoma University in Norman.

Clarice is not sure how long she will continue to compete on horseback after finishing her education.

"That's quite a while away," she said.

Meanwhile, Clarice practices at least an hour a day, weather permitting, in the arena at the Richardson farm.

"You've got to have a good horse and a good rider to win," Mrs. Richardson said. "And good luck," Clarice added.

Dallas Industrialist Scores Attempts To Buy Friendship Through Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Texas have some pretty definite ideas about spending billions of the American taxpayers' money on foreign-aid programs that do not accomplish the purpose of stopping the spread of communism. We, in Texas, feel pretty sure that you cannot buy lasting friendships, nor even loyalty. We believe foreign-aid programs should be in the self-interest of the United States. In this connection I would like to include the following telegram I received from Mr. E. B. Germany, prominent industrialist of Dallas, who reflects the thinking of the majority of the people of Texas in this regard:

Congressman BRUCE ALGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The majority of Texans continue in their fundamental belief that lasting friendships cannot be purchased with any amount of money. Doubtful repayment is attached to the attempts to buy foreign or domestic

friendship with gifts or loans. Instead we must establish in the minds of our neighbors at home and abroad that freedom and free will of choice is the inherent right of every individual. This country needs a program of courageous positive action. Your vote on the foreign-aid bill now being discussed should reflect the knowledge and desires of Texans.

E. B. GERMANY.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that I believe my vote on the foreign-aid bill did reflect the thinking of the great majority of the people it is my privilege to represent.

Subsidized Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 and again on July 24 I called the attention of the House to the recent decision of the Department of Commerce to permit sales of subsidized farm products to be made to Russia and her satellite nations. For the information of Members of the House, I am now submitting two recent news releases that offer further illumination to this growing issue of controversy:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 19, 1961]

NINE MILLION DOLLARS IN U.S. SALES TO RED BLOC APPROVED

American businessmen have obtained Government permission to export almost $9 million worth of materials to Soviet-bloc nations in the last 5 weeks.

In addition, more than $2.5 million worth of goods was approved for shipment to Yugoslavia in the same period.

Both private trade and the recent decision to allow the shipment of Government farm surpluses were discussed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges at a meeting with about 20 critical House Members Thursday.

House sources said Rusk and Hodges left the impression the administration would not be pleased with any congressional action in regard to either Government or non-Government trading behind the Iron Curtain.

But the sources said the House Rules Committee is expected to consider a resolution next week that would form a select committee to examine the question.

The value of goods—including locomotive engines, oil drilling equipment and laboratory supplies—that the Government granted businessmen permission to export to the Communists in the last 5 weeks was computed by the United Press International.

The figures were taken from daily export license lists that the Commerce Department began making public on July 3.

According to these lists, licenses to export $8,810,290 worth of goods to the Soviet-bloc countries were granted between July 3 and August 11. Of this total, $1,741,772 was earmarked for the Soviet Union.

In the same period, permission to export $2,559,260 worth of materials to Yugoslavia also was approved.

A spokesman for the Commerce Department told a reporter that the amount of supplies and equipment actually shipped was considerably lower than the value indicated by the license lists.

The State Department includes the U.S.S.R., Poland, Czechslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania in its official list of Soviet-bloc countries. Also included, though not officially recognized are East Germany, North Vietnam, North Korea and Communist China.

Among the items approved for shipment to the Soviet Union in the past 5 weeks were $31,221 worth of surgical instruments, $572 worth of detergents, $5,523 worth of recording equipment, $51,337 worth of industrial equipment and parts, and $1,455,036 worth of synthetic rubber.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Monday, Aug. 21, 1961]

U.S. PERMITS ON RED BLOC TRADE SOAR—800 PERCENT INCREASE IN 3 WEEKS AFTER KENNEDY SPEECH

WASHINGTON, August 20.—The volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries increased by more than 800 percent in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin.

This has been a cause of both concern and embarrassment to high administration officials aware of the statistics, which have received scant public attention.

Steps already have been taken to reverse the upward trend, although there has been no formal change in export control regulations.

RAIL EQUIPMENT INCLUDED

An Associated Press tabulation of daily export licensing reports, made available by the Commerce Department, showed that:

In the 3 weeks preceding Mr. Kennedy's July 25 television-radio address on the Berlin crisis, the Department authorized the shipment of $750,196 in American goods to the Soviet Union and its European satellites.

In the 3 succeeding weeks, the licensing total soared to $6,276,866.

Included in the upswing were $1,500,000 of rail equipment for Bulgaria; $1,700,000 of synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; $107,600 of industrial instruments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; $95,000 of coal tar products for Hungary and Czechoslovakia; $38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia; $35,000 of industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany, and $23,000 of pipe valves for Russia and Poland.

HODGES QUOTED

The Department ruled that none of these proposed shipments would endanger national security. Export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their warmaking potential.

The licensing officials apparently continued to take a business-as-usual attitude after Mr. Kennedy's talk, thus running counter to public opinion as assessed by their superior Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary told an August 8 news conference:

"I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 or 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

FLEXIBILITY CALL

Hodges said new restrictions on such trade were possible but suggested that newsmen treat the subject with care.

"We must keep flexible the whole question of relationships," he said.

The Commerce Chief has met several times this month with the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to discuss trade with the Communist bloc. The two Cabinet members also met last week with a group of House Members who favor new trade curbs because of the Berlin crisis.

As a result of these meetings, licensing officials have been told to take a harder look at proposed exports to Iron Curtain countries. The effect can be seen already in the dairy trend of licensing:

August 9, $1,600,000; August 10, $98,859; August 11, $73,185; August 14 (a weekend intervened), $53; August 15, $10; August 16, $5,317, and August 17, none.

Some Congress Members favor legislation to put a crimp in East-West trade. Rusk and Hodges believe the same objective can be achieved through administrative discretion, thus avoiding a statement of national policy that might make Berlin negotiations more difficult.

HEAVY ATTRITION

Since July 1, the Department has licensed shipments totaling $9,603,511. Included was $2,574,749 of Mexican-grown cotton which required licensing only because it passed through an American port en route to Eastern Europe.

The granting of a license does not mean that goods will be shipped.

"Historically," the Commerce Department says, "there is a heavy attrition between licensing and actual exports."

Licensing so far in the July–September quarter is approaching the total for the preceding 3 months.

Hodges today issued a report which said $12,948,090 in goods were licensed in the April–June quarter. Rejected license applications totaled $2,786,377 during the 3 months.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT FOR SOVIET UNION

This compared with first-quarter licenses of $23,824,754 and rejections of $24,916,528.

Of the approved April-June licenses, nearly 75 percent, or $8,254,173, involved the Soviet Union.

The principal commodities involved were:

Agricultural and forest products, $1,193,427, principally to Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and Hungary; chemicals and plastics, $4,933,492, of which $2,425,502 was synthetic rubber to Russia; metals and minerals, $1,241,194, of which $726,491 was carbon steel condenser tubing to Russia, and manmade fibers, $1,908,497 to Russia.

Among the licensing applications rejected were some covering gas compressors, farm tractors, synthetic rubber, magnesium alloy ingots, copper scrap, and boric acid.

Our Nation's Pharmacists Engaged in Fight for Survival Against Doctor- and Hospital-Owned Pharmacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER L. McVEY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, if a person is run over and killed by an automobile, does it really matter whether or not that automobile was driven by a friend or a foe? By the same token, does it matter to one engaged in private enterprise that his business is destroyed by socialism or private enterprise? In either case, the result is the same.

Today our Nation's pharmacists engaged in private enterprise find themselves in a fight for survival, and strangely enough among their adversaries are medical doctors, whom they consider to be their best friends. In Kansas, as in other States, these pharmacists face both professional and economic destruction

from some of the greatest advocates of private enterprise—the medical doctors. The instruments of destruction are the doctor-owned pharmacies, the hospital pharmacies serving out-patients, and also the clinic hospital pharmacies. It takes little imagination to guess where a prescription will be filled if it is prescribed by a medical doctor who owns his own pharmacy. Similarly, it is impossible to match the convenience afforded by purchasing drugs in a hospital where one is a patient.

Is it any wonder that some pharmacists have had to give up youthful dreams of owning and operating a "pure" pharmacy or drugstore, to sell shrubbery, hardware, clothing and other sundry items in a general store with a pharmaceutical counter?

By no means are the pharmacists opposed to medical doctors, but they cannot stand idly by and suffer destruction by anyone, friend or foe. It is shocking that some of the greatest exponents of free enterprise, medical doctors, actually threaten to destroy a vertebra in the backbone of our economy—the corner drugstore—by selling drugs from their own pharmacies.

Just as great a threat to the pharmacists are the municipally owned hospitals, or charitable institutions that engage in the device of pharmaceutical sales to bolster their sagging revenues under the representation that their actions are in the best interests of the public.

Several years ago, Congress enacted a law restricting druggists from selling, dispensing, distributing, or even consuming their own drugs without a prescription from a medical doctor. Druggists realized this action was for the protection of the public, but it did leave them somewhat at the mercy of prescribing physicians upon whom they depend for a large portion of their business.

Now that medical doctors are entering the field of pharmacy, is there any reciprocity for druggists? Do the druggists even dare to complain?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to let the RECORD show by submitting the following letter from Miss Clara Miller, executive secretary to the Kansas Pharmaceutical Association in Topeka, Kans.:

THE KANSAS PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., August 1 1961.

Congressman WALTER L. MCVEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCVEY: We are getting a little support from some Kansas physicians on the unfairness of the doctor-owned pharmacy and its successor, the hospital pharmacy now serving outpatients, and the even later creation, the clinic-hospital pharmacy.

The doctor diagnoses and treats the patient. He prescribed the medication. He administers drugs or directs a nurse to administer drugs as a part of her profession. Up to this point, the doctor is operating under the Medical Practice Act rightly.

When, however, the doctor leaves the area of the practice of medicine and enters into the practice of pharmacy, he violates the very ethics he so loudly proclaims as regards freedom of choice, free and open competition, equal opportunity to all, the profit system—all the very basics of the American way of life. He also violates State and National laws which govern the pharmacist.

A new type of pharmacy is now appearing in Kansas and elsewhere. It is the pharmacy owned and operated by a tax-built and tax-supported hospital while at the same time it is servicing outpatients. An even later creation is the clinic-hospital combination. A doctor-owned clinic puts in three beds—whether used or not—and now becomes a hospital eligible for Hill-Burton moneys for expansion. Yes, a pharmacy is built in here, also. It services outpatients.

Will something be done about this or not? I hope so.

Sincerely,

CLARA MILLER.

Are We Sure Latin-American Aid Isn't Being Used To Aid Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the administration belief that any problem may be solved by the use of money, and in the haste to give away the dollars of the American taxpayers, care must be taken that we are not actually helping the cause of communism in countries receiving our aid. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal indicates some of the so-called reforms our money is supposed to bring about in Latin America. Too many of these reforms come too close to socialism and communism to make it pure happenstance. I commend this editorial to you before we vote the billions asked for in the upcoming mutual security appropriation bill.

BILLIONS FOR PROMISES

The administration has pronounced the beginning of its multibillion-dollar Latin American aid program a "success." But it should be clear the "Alliance for Progress" conference in Uruguay made a beginning only, and may well have produced the last easy success.

The task of the delegates was to describe what they hope to achieve in the next decade. Outlined in the Declaration to the Peoples of America are goals on which everyone can agree: "A substantial and steady increase in average income as quickly as possible." "Decent homes for the American peoples." "An equitable system of property." "Primary education [for] all Latin Americans." "Fair wages and satisfactory working conditions"—in a word, a better life for a whole region embracing upwards of 200 million people in all stages of development, ruled well, badly, and indifferently.

The delegates also were bound to state their choice of means to this desired end. For its part, the United States firmly promises "a major part of the $20 billion • • • which Latin America will require in the next 10 years." For their part, the Latin American countries "agree to devote a rapidly increasing share of their resources to economic and social development, and to make the reforms necessary to assure that all share fully in the fruits of the alliance." They plan to do so by adopting "comprehensive and well-conceived national programs."

Among the aims of these programs are tax reform, abandonment of outmoded systems of land tenure, and adoption of fiscal and monetary policies which, "while avoiding the intoxication of inflation or the mire of depression, will protect the purchasing power of the many, guarantee where possible price stability, and form an adequate basis for economic development."

But the ease of stating goals that have proved so elusive should not intoxicate anyone. All that has happened so far, really, is that the United States has exchanged a pledge of billions of dollars for the commitment of Latin Americans to spend our money and as much of their own as they can scrape up. If there is to be any success for the alliance, it all depends on the future will and wisdom of the partners.

And on that score, some skepticism is in order. For example, a parallel is often drawn between aiding Latin America and the postwar Marshall plan in Western Europe. True, the alliance is loosely modeled after the latter plan, but there are huge differences—Latin America's widespread illiteracy, its historic economic and political instability, its lack of experience with industrialization and the disciplines of modern society.

Moreover, much remains undefined. For Castro and others in Latin America, land reform means land grabbing. And who shall decide the equity of property, and on what basis?

Then, too, those "comprehensive and well-conceived" development plans of Latin American countries are yet to be drawn up. They could easily turn out to be misconceived and unrealistic. The United States could also find itself encouraging stagnant, planned Socialist economies, incapable of growth.

Clearly, the background against which the alliance begins is unpromising, to say the least. Almost all the reforms to which the Latin Americans now agree have been within their grasp for years, and have been left undone. Modern tax and land reform laws are already on the books of some countries, but go unenforced. Can a declaration in favor of progress—a decision to move against the weight of accumulated neglect and indifference—really make progress a fact?

The security of the United States, more than good neighborliness, justifies our interest in the possibility of building a free, prosperous Latin America. But billions alone, in whatever amount, won't buy it. Nor will promises by the recipients. And right now that's all the alliance for progress is—U.S. billions for uncertain promises.

Even more suspicious is the thought raised by the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune which makes the startling exposure that our aid to Columbia will be handled by Lauchlin Currie, who was clearly identified as a Communist agent and has been stripped of his American citizenship. Is it not time we use more care in sending our money abroad? Is it not just commonsense to make sure we are not aiding the Communist cause before we spend more billions contributed by the already overburdened American taxpayer? I, for one, will continue to urge that we do not give 1 penny to our enemies, or to those who play ball with our enemies. Certainly, it cannot be in the best interest of the United States to pour money into a country and have that money programed by one who has already been exposed for his Communist leanings.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

DISBURSING AGENT

President Kennedy has launched a scheme to blow about $20 billion in foreign aid to Latin America under the imposing label at an alliance for progress. Almost at once it turns out that the gentleman who is to plan the spending of Colombia's share of these American dollars is an old Franklin Roosevelt White House hand who was stripped of his American citizenship after being branded an informant of Soviet espionage agents.

This person, Lauchlin Currie, a Canadian by birth, was a naturalized American citizen when he was serving Roosevelt as administrative assistant for foreign affairs. In 1948, Elizabeth Bentley, a repentant Soviet espionage agent, stated he had been helpful to her in her work. Five years later the FBI listed Currie as one who had supplied U.S. documents to a Russian spy ring.

In the interim, he took himself off to Colombia and has holed up there since. His interest in returning to the United States vanished in 1951 when a Senate committee wanted to question him. In 1956 his citizenship was revoked because he had remained outside the country longer than the 5 years permitted naturalized citizens.

Louis Budenz, who quit the Communist Party after having risen to become managing editor of the Worker, the party organ, testified about the time Currie chose to make himself scarce that the Communists set out in 1942 to smear hostile officials in the State Department. Propaganda was worked up to be published in the party press.

Budenz related that Earl Browder, the party boss, showed his material to him with the explanation that it had been "worked out by arrangement with Lauchlin Currie." After the blast was printed, Browder and another party functionary, Robert Miner, went to Washington to beard Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles in his own office.

Welles received them as if they had been the official emissaries of a foreign state—which, in fact, they were, for they were on Russia's business—and gave them a promise that the State Department hereafter would make "no distinction between the Communists and Chiang" in its dealings with China. At the time Chiang Kai-shek was the head of the legitimate Government of China which was the wartime ally of the United States, while the Communists were only a rump movement confined to the Yenan area. They took the country away from Chiang a few years later, after the anti-Communists had been cleaned out of the State Department and Currie had provided a convenient assist.

Russia entered the war against Japan at the last minute and the Soviet forces disarmed the Japanese army in Manchuria after Japan's surrender. Huge stocks of arms were turned over to the Chinese Communists. The Germans, who surrendered a few months earlier, had originally trained Chiang's Nationalist army, whose standard rifle ammunition was the same as the German 7.92 mm. Shipment of the vast quantity of captured German small arms and ammunition to Chiang was authorized by the joint chiefs of staff, but the first cargo had barely got out of a German port when it was stopped en route by an order signed by Currie on White House stationery.

This is the man who is planning how the dollars provided by a country which has stripped him of citizenship are to be employed in Colombia. It will be surprising if President Kennedy doesn't find out he has made an alliance for Communist progress in that country.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

A Brilliant and Promising Experiment in Improving the Quality of Our Education: Carpeting Eliminates Noise and Distraction in Amsterdam Junior and Senior High Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have long urged the emphasis, on carpets as the ideal type of floor covering in our hectic and often overwrought civilization. Not too long ago, in fact, I urged serious consideration of the proposal that the floors of more of our public buildings in Washington be carpeted so as to ease the strains on the millions of weary tourists who walk through them each year. By dimming the noise and easing the pressure underfoot, carpets can do much to restore the kind of calm and sober equanimity this Nation needs to confront and to surmount the manifold obstacles that lie ahead of us in the world struggle against communism.

Only the other day, Mr. Chairman, I had the rare privilege of conferring with the President of the United States in his White House office. One of the things that impressed me most as a result of that conference was the calm, confident, quiet, and self-assured air of our great President, Mr. Kennedy, on a day when he had on his heart and mind the difficult decision relating to Berlin. Mr. Speaker, I could not help wondering as I came away from that meeting with President Kennedy, whether something of the quiet and calm air of assurance which has characterized his handling of the delicate world situation may not have been imparted as a result of the similarly calm and quiet atmosphere of his beautiful office, carpeted of course in the modern manner, wall to wall.

Mr. Speaker, if carpeting can help to create an atmosphere here in Washington where the great decisions of the day can be met with deliberateness and sober reason, then surely it can also be of value in our educational institutions as well, and serve to cut down the clatter and clamor that no doubt play such a major part in impairing the effectiveness of classroom instruction or study hall meditation.

And so I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to be able to report to this House that back in my district in Amsterdam, N.Y., home of one of the great leaders in our American carpet industry, Mohasco Industries, Inc., the officials of this great concern have now undertaken to underwrite the expenses of an experiment designed to demonstrate what carpeting can do by way of improving the educational environment of our secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident the experiment will succeed. I congratulate the officers of Mohasco Industries for their leadership in this field. Indeed if this Congress should in the remaining days that lie ahead get around to enacting, as some have suggested, a compromise classroom construction bill, I do hope that these new classrooms, building on the results of this new educational experiment now going on in Amsterdam, will have their floors covered with carpeting manufactured in American plants by American working men and women.

Upon leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which sets forth in more detail the scope of the Amsterdam experiment which appeared in the Amsterdam Evening Recorder for August 18, 1961.

The editorial follows:

COMMUNITY EXPERIMENT

Prior to the opening of school in September, areas of the Lynch High and Woodrow Wilson Schools will receive a new look in floor coverings. This could mean a great deal not only to our educational system but to the future economy of Amsterdam.

Carpeting is being contributed by Mohasco Industries, Inc., as part of an experimental program designed to illustrate the benefits deriving from this type of floor covering in educational institutions.

If findings in an earlier experiment prove true here, local schools will benefit through lower maintenance costs, better classroom performance due to elimination of distracting noise, and more comfortable and visually pleasing rooms and offices.

Local industry also stands to benefit through increased sales to representatives of the educational field, a relatively new area of operation for the American carpet industry. Increased production would mean more jobs in Amsterdam.

What the current industrial experiment illustrates, perhaps best of all, is the spirit of cooperation which in recent years has swept like a refreshing breeze over the local scene. This has meant a great deal to all of us and it will mean even more in the years to come.

The manner in which Mohasco Industries, Inc., and the local school system have worked together in this project provides another example of how progress through cooperation at all levels can become a community's most important product.

Civil Defense Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, often overlooked are the important duties which civil defense performs in emergencies of a nondefense nature. Just recently, the civil defense unit in Gary, Ind., was instrumental in saving the lives of two boys who were stranded for 6 hours on Lake Michigan during a storm.

An Indiana State police plane, piloted by Sgt. Gilbert S. Holt, located the raft on which the two boys were stranded and the rescue was effected by the Gary civil defense unit's amphibious "duck" manned by Bill and Al Kuzma and Dick Meyer.

Mr. President, the action of the Gary civil defense team and all others who participated in this dramatic rescue should be commended. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the story of this rescue as it was printed in the Indiana Civil Defender.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARY CIVIL DEFENSE CREW RESCUE BOYS ON ROUGH LAKE—BOAT DIRECTED BY STATE POLICE PLANE

The dramatic water rescue of two boys who were stranded for 6 hours on turbulent Lake Michigan waters recently graphically illustrates the role of civil defense and its coordination with other agencies in the Gary area.

Two Portage youths, Elliot Tecsi, 14, and Johnny DeFauw, 12, were set adrift in their homemade craft while it was anchored to a log along the lake at the Wells Street Beach on March 27.

At about 10 a.m. the rope broke and they began drifting into the lake, pushed by 25-to-30-mile-per-hour winds.

Elliot's sister was sent to the lake by her mother to tell her brother to get out of the boat and come home.

She and a playmate found the boat was drifting and the boys were shouting for help.

Gary police put an extensive rescue operation into action which was headed by traffic captain, Ray Hahn.

Gary's civil defense unit put its amphibious "duck" into action manned by Bill and Al Kuzma, brothers, and Dick Meyer.

State police sent an observation plane from Indianapolis which was piloted by Sgt. Gilbert Holt.

The U.S. Coast Guard from South Chicago was called into the search and Delta Airlines sent a twin-engine C–46 from Midway Airport.

Shortly before noon, Holt in the small single-engine observation plane spotted the two boys. They were about 5 miles north of where they were set adrift.

Meanwhile, several private boats from various docking areas converged on the scene, but were driven back to shore by waves 8 to 14 feet high.

All sight of the boat was lost from the shore. The civil defense "duck" was attracted to the skiff 5 miles out in the lake by the circling planes.

The Gary civil defense unit, chugging along in the perilous waters, kept an eye on the circling planes and arrived only seconds before the Coast Guard unit.

The "duck" pilot pulled alongside the wooden boat and the two Gary men reached down and yanked the boys to safety.

Both boys were taken to a Gary hospital where they were treated and later released to return to their homes.

Sergeant Holt, who was instrumental in directing the civil defense "duck" to the site of the rescue, later wrote the following letter to the Indiana Department of Civil Defense:

"On March 27, 1961, I was the pilot of the Indiana State Police airplane which located two boys adrift in the rough waters of Lake Michigan in a small rowboat. The distress craft was approximately 10 miles offshore from Gary, Ind., and I directed two rescue boats to it from the airplane.

"I have learned since that the boat which was finally able to effect the rescue was a civil defense boat, and I feel that its crew should be commended for a job well done. I need not elaborate on the difficulty of the pickup caused by the extremely rough waters.

"I do not know the crew of that boat, but I wish that you would convey to them my personal thanks and the appreciation of the entire Indiana State Police Department for a display of fine seamanship under very hazardous conditions. Your organization is to be commended for having the capability to cope with such an emergency.

"Best regards,

"GILBERT S. HOLT,

"Sergeant, Indiana State Police Department Traffic and Uniform Division."

New Chief of Naval Operations; Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of a new Chief of Naval Operations in the Navy Department is always one of significance. As the senior line officer of the Navy his position is one of momentous responsibility.

The selection of Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., is most appropriate for his high order of ability and broad background of experience combine to qualify him eminently for the post.

A biographical sketch of Admiral Anderson published in the August 1961 issue of Shipmate, magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, will be of interest to the Congress and the Nation at large.

The indicated sketch follows:

OUR NEW CNO, ADM. GEORGE W. ANDERSON, JR., U.S. NAVY

George Whelan Anderson, Jr., was born on December 15, 1906, in Brooklyn, N.Y., son of George W. and Clara (Green) Anderson. He attended Brooklyn Preparatory School, and entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., from his native State in 1923. Graduated and commissioned ensign on June 2, 1927, he subsequently advanced in rank to that of rear admiral, to date from August 1, 1954. He served in the rank of vice admiral, from May 1, 1957, until January 18, 1958, and on September 14, 1959, he again assumed the rank of vice admiral. On August 1, 1961, he took over as CNO with the rank of admiral.

Following graduation from the Naval Academy in 1927, he remained there for the short course in aviation, before joining the U.S.S. *Chaumont*, for transportation to the U.S.S. *Cincinnati*, in which he served as a junior officer until 1930. He was then ordered to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training and, designated naval aviator in October of that year, was ordered to the Atlantic fleet for duty in the aviation units of the U.S.S. *Concord* and U.S.S. *Raleigh*, successively.

Between 1933 and 1935 he was assigned to the Flight Test Division of the Naval Air Station, NOB, Norfolk, Va., after which he had duty afloat with Fighting Squadron 2, based on the U.S.S. *Lexington*. He was detached from that squadron with orders to the Newport News (Va.) Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., where the U.S.S. *Yorktown* was building, and joined that aircraft carrier on her commissioning on September 30, 1937. From the fall of 1939 until early 1940 he was attached to Patrol Squadron 44, Patrol Wing 4 based at Seattle, Wash.

He was next assigned to the Plans Division, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., and while there participated in the formulation of the American aircraft program for World War II. This included association with wartime agencies charged with production and allocation of all U.S. aircraft, and planning the aircraft aspects of the expansion of naval aviation. For his liaison work with the Army Air Force while in that assignment, he received a letter of commendation from the War Department, with authorization to wear the Army Commendation Ribbon.

In March 1943 he again reported to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., this time to assist in fitting out the new U.S.S. *Yorktown* (CV–10), and became navigator and tactical officer when she was commissioned on April 15, 1943. He was aboard that aircraft carrier during her early action in the Pacific, and received a letter of commendation, with authority to wear the commendation ribbon, from the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for outstanding services from August 15 to November 1, 1943, while attached to the U.S.S. *Yorktown*.

He is also entitled to the ribbon and a facsimile of the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the U.S.S. *Yorktown* for "extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese forces in the air, at sea, and on shore in the Pacific war area from August 31, 1943, to August 15, 1945. Daring and dependable in combat, the *Yorktown* with her gallant officers and men rendered loyal service in achieving the ultimate defeat of the Japanese Empire."

He next had duty as plans officer on the staff of Commander Aircraft, U.S. Pacific Fleet, and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as head of the plans division of the staff of Commander Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet during the period from November 1943 to March 1944," he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

On March 28, 1944, he reported as Assistant to the Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for "meritorious achievement (in that capacity) * * * during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, from March 28, 1944, to April 16, 1945."

In June 1945 he became aviation officer in the strategic plans sections on the staff of the commander in chief, U.S. Fleet, with headquarters at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C. As such he also had duty as deputy navy planner on the joint planning staff. Ordered to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, he was appointed a member of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense (Canada-United States) in November 1946; was also one of the Navy members of the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission and served with the joint war plans committee of the joint staff.

In July 1948 he returned to sea as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Mindoro*, and when detached from that antisubmarine carrier in August 1948 reported for instruction at the National War College, Washington, D.C. Completing the course there in July 1950, he joined the staff of the commander 6th Fleet as fleet operations officer. In December 1950 he transferred to the staff of the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SHAPE), and remained there until July 1952 as the senior U.S. officer in plans and operations. He served as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* for a year, and when detached from command of that aircraft carrier in June 1953 reported for duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

In July 1953 he became Special Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C., continuing to serve in that capacity until July 1955. On August 3 that year, he assumed command of the Formosa patrol force with additional duty as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1 (his title was changed late in 1955 to Commander, U.S. Taiwan patrol force). He was Chief of Staff, Joint Staff, commander in chief, Pacific, from July 1956 until May 1957 when he reported in the rank of vice admiral as chief of staff and aide to the commander in chief, Pacific. He was Commander Carrier Division 6 from July 1958 until September 14, 1959, when he became commander 6th Fleet and commander Naval Striking and Support Forces, Southern Europe, with the accompanying rank of vice admiral.

In addition to the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon (Navy), the Commendation Ribbon (Army), and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with one star, Admiral Anderson has the American Defense Service Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two stars; the World War II Victory Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal. He has also been awarded the Order of the British Empire, rank of Honorary Officer, from the Government of Great Britain.

Freedom's Foundation Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, Secretary of the Board of Trustees of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., before the Kiwanis Club of Houston.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION OBJECTIVE

(An address by George E. Stringfellow of East Orange, N.J., former daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison and secretary of the Board of Trustees of Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., before the Kiwanis Club of Houston, Tex., May 10, 1961)

The objective of Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge is:

1. To create a better understanding of the spirit and philosophy of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

2. To inspire love of country and respect for freedom.

3. To support the spiritual unity borne of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker.

Freedom's Foundation stimulates individuals and organizations to assume their patriotic obligations. Those who make significant contributions to a better understanding of the American way of life are honored through awards.

Thousands of nominations for awards come to Valley Forge each year from all parts of the Nation representing the work of people and groups who are "speaking up for freedom."

Our former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "By encouraging Americans to study the basis of our free way of life and to voice their beliefs and thoughts about the enduring values set forth in the American credo, Freedom's Foundation is helping to create the all-important understanding necessary to keep our Nation (a) morally strong, and (b) politically free."

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "Our weakness is not the military front, but on the psychological and propaganda front. In this area we have fallen behind in the battle for the hearts and minds of men, and it is in this area that America must step up its offensive or lose the struggle."

J. Edgar Hoover said, "Freedom's Foundation stands as a sentinel, as did our revolutionary freedom fighters at Valley Forge."

The Honorable Robert O. Simmons, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska said, "Freedom's Foundation's program is above partisanship in all respects and needs the fullest attention of Americans everywhere, for it is the most important message in America today."

Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and U.S. Senator from New Jersey said, "I know of no other organization that works more effectively than Freedom's Foundation in promoting our way of life."

I received a letter recently from the principal of a high school to which I had presented an award from which I quote: "One of the most rewarding results is the editorial which won the award has set many of our underclassmen thinking through the significance of their freedom and our blessings of their American heritage. We are glad to see that the Freedoms Foundation is accomplishing its objectives. It is a privilege just to be part of Freedoms Foundation program." The question is often asked, "What makes America great?" Other nations are richly endowed with natural resources and their people possess equal ingenuity, why then has the United States made more progress than other nations? What does America have that other nations do not possess?

First, it has a form and philosophy of government that provides the maximum liberty for its citizens.

Second, ours is a system which provides investors, producers and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity.

Third, ours is a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of the government.

Fourth, ours is a system that recognizes the dignity of the individual.

Fifth, encourages high moral and ethical standards.

Sixth, gives its citizens an incentive to do their best and rewards them according to their production.

The men who gave us our way of life did not subscribe to the philosophy that the government owes everyone a living, they gave us a way of life that provides an opportunity for everyone willing to work to make the most of what he has. Our Founding Fathers worked like Trojans to build America, and they roared like lions to preserve our liberty and so must we. They were endowed with strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing minds. If we are worthy of our heritage, we will emulate them and thus keep the lamp of liberty casting its ray of hope over the universe. Such is the objective of Freedoms Foundation.

Our liberty is in great peril today. World communism is attacking the principles, faith, freedoms, and the liberties our forefathers won for us.

Since 1919, when the Communist Party was formed in the United States, even when we were helping the Communist defeat Hitler, our country has been the target of a continuous, systematic program of espionage, infiltration, sabotage, and propaganda—the aim is the destruction of our American way.

In 1920 Lenin said, "As long as capitalism and socialism exists, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph."

In 1960 Khrushchev said, "The children of the present day America will live in a Communist society," and that communism will "bury us." The objectives of the Communists never change. To keep their adversaries confused they blow hot and cold on all issues, but their objective as Mr. Hoover said "is world conquest." That objective never changes those who dilude themselves into believing that we can do business with the Communist are making the same mistake that others made when Hitler proclaimed his intention to conquer the world. Leaders of that day asserted, "Hitler is saying that for home consumption—he does not mean it."

The Communists tell us that capitalism and communism cannot exist in the same world. They are not saying it for home consumption. They mean it.

One-third of the land surface and one-third of the people of the world today are controlled by the Communist bloc.

In 1920 the Communist Party had only 80,000 members. Its world membership today is 33 million with active party units in 83 nations.

J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI reported recently that Communist infiltration in our country is today at its alltime peak. "Such an intensive operation proves that despite their propaganda on peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, the Communists have not abandoned their revolutionary tactics. Their goal is world conquest. Said Mr. Hoover, underlying the thinking of Khrushchev and his Communist allies are words of a Chinese militarist who 500 years before Christ wrote, "To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence: supreme excellence consists of breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." To the end that countries we are trying to save from communism do not have the will to fight to save or to establish their own freedom, the Communists have done a pretty good job in "breaking the enemy's resistance." This they have done by infiltration, intimidation, and duplicity.

The enemy we face is real—and grim. Our Government can do only a part of the job in combating it. Public-spirited citizens loyal to our way of life must do the rest if we are to remain free. The only power on earth that can destroy our Nation is complacancy. While we have been eminently successful as a nation, I would remind you nothing fails like success—when success leads to complacancy. Today we are too complacent. Seventy-five years ago someone asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will the American way of life endure?" The wise statesman and poet replied, only so long as the ideals and philosophy of the men who made it continue dominant in the minds and hearts of each succeeding generation.

Calm Search for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, in this confused and hectic period of our Nation's history and when so many of our people are urging saber-rattling tactics on the part of our President and the Congress, I was most happy to have an opportunity to read a recent editorial in the Central California Register published in my hometown of Fresno, Calif. This newspaper is the official organ of the Monterey-Fresno Diocese and its editorial columns command great respect throughout central California.

I feel that the managing editor, Mr. Gerard E. Sherry, has caught the true significance of the President's calm courage in meeting the bluster and distortions of Mr. Khrushchev. I agree completely with Mr. Sherry's statement that it takes a great deal more courage on the part of President Kennedy to remain calm and yet, at the same time, forcefully state our position than policies advocated by some of our more hysterical spokesmen:

CALM SEARCH FOR PEACE

(By Gerard E. Sherry)

Whatever one's political point of view it was heartening to watch President Kennedy perform a national service at his press conference last week.

Some 450 newspaper reporters from all over the world attended the conference and expected startling statements in answer to the recent bluster and threats of Nikita Khrushchev over Berlin.

These reporters, instead, witnessed the great game of diplomacy played at its best. Mr. Kennedy spurned Mr. K.'s ranting and raving and, instead, reiterated the desires of the U.S. Government to seek every peaceful means to a solution of the Berlin question. The President pledged that the United States would go "to the brink" in the search for peace and justice.

Whereas Mr. Khrushchev was taking an exercise in military mathematics, Mr. Kennedy took the road of calm reasoning. The Russian leader had informed us that he was building a bigger and better bomb. The "better" here referred to a greater power of obliteration. He noted 21 nuclear bombs would take care of Britain; 6 or 7 for France, and an equal number for Italy. And Mr. Khrushchev reminded us here in America that we would not be immune to his wrath if we did not go along with his scheme to annex Berlin for the Communist empire.

We've had these threats before. I suppose they should be taken seriously. We have no doubt that Russia has the military capability to destroy Western Europe and to inflict heavy damage on these United States. But the converse is also true.

Mr. Kennedy could have reminded Mr. Khrushchev that America, on its own, has enough military might to destroy the whole of Russia. The number of atomic bombs it would take is beside the point. The fact remains that America has this capability. No one knows this better than Mr. Khrushchev.

There were some, in and out of Congress, who expected Mr. Kennedy to use the press

conference to answer Khrushchev in violent terms. Yet, our President chose the better way. He spoke of peace with the confidence of a leader who had the strength to face the issue of war if need be. Our President rattled no sabers; made no threats; nor gave any ultimatums. He spoke of our desire for peace.

But behind this peaceful facade the preparations for the ultimate showdown were going on. Mr. Kennedy was speaking, and all the time was making sure that the big stick would be available as and when it is needed. Some people saw his failure to reply to Mr. Khrushchev's threats with counter-threats as a sign of weakness. To me, however, this is a sign of the President's strength.

Mr. Kennedy was not panicked by Russian bluster. He does not want a war hysteria creeping over these United States. He would much prefer to see our people engaged in peaceful pursuits, and production for peace and security. Hence, even though the war shadows loom across our horizon, the United States continues to promote other projects.

The Peace Corps program is underway, aid for Latin America is becoming a reality; aid for the rest of the world's needy is underway. And most important, we pursue with patience for a controlled world disarmament plan.

To me, our President has given an example of constructive leadership, which has been missing in high places in Government for many a year. It can't help but impress not only our own people but the peoples of all the world.

Mr. Khrushchev's methods are aimed at instilling fear in the free peoples of Western Europe, and in this country. His bluster is meant to cower us in surrender before a shot is fired. He can succeed only if we lost faith in our leaders and the high ideals of this democracy.

If we panic into the fear of saber rattling there may be no other way but the sword. However, if we speak softly, facing the enemy with courage and resolution the battle will be won. There will be time to let the enemy see that in the holocaust of modern war nobody wins; least of all Mr. Khrushchev.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a strife-torn world we as a nation face the dual task: that of safeguarding our security against dangers from without and of further strengthening the Nation domestically.

Last weekend I was privileged to comment on aspects of the dual responsibility in an address over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS, WEEKEND OF AUGUST 20, 1961

Today the Nation—despite facing great, far-reaching challenges around the globe—must also keep its domestic "house in order."

Among other things, this includes assuring economic health for major—in fact, all segments of the economy.

At this time, I would like to discuss with you one significant field—agriculture.

How important to the economy is farming?

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the farming industry employs about 7.1 million workers and creates jobs for 16 million more in nonfarm industries. The total investment in American agriculture is nearly $200 billion—equal to three-quarters of the value of current assets of all corporations in the country.

In Wisconsin, of course, dairying is of special significance. The annual income for Wisconsin farmers amounts to $600 million.

In recent years, unfortunately, the dairy industry has been handicapped by a supply-demand imbalance of milk. As a result, the farmer has suffered from too-low prices.

Now, what can be done?

Over the years, a wide variety of programs have been inaugurated to improve the economic outlook. Of some help; these have not yet, however, provided the ultimate solution.

Consequently, we must continue to explore for new ways and means for brightening the economic future of the American farmer.

As a further effort to help solve the supply-demand imbalance surplus problem in dairy products, I introduced in the Senate this week a bill to establish a Dairy Research Center at Madison, Wis.

The purpose would be to find new ways to utilize dairy products for commercial-industrial uses.

In dairying—as in other fields—creative research is the key to progress.

Over the years, the dairy industry, State and Federal departments of agriculture, colleges and universities, and other institutions, have discovered a wide variety of ways to utilize dairy products for human consumption, including milk, cheese, butter, ice cream, powdered milk, and other foods.

In this exploratory age, however, we need new Columbus-type researchers to seek out and find industrial and commercial uses for our milk, cheese, butter, and other dairy items.

Out of such research could well come uses that could revolutionize the dairy industry and further benefit our people.

For 1961, the annual national milk production is estimated to exceed 124 billion pounds, including 18 billion pounds produced in my home State of Wisconsin—the number one producer.

The present supply exceeds the demand. As a result, Wisconsin producers get only one-half the price for their milk that producers in Eastern markets get for their milk.

The utilization of the surplus for industrial purposes would be of tremendous benefit, not only to the dairy industry, but also to the whole economy.

BERLIN CRISES

Now, let's look briefly at the global scene:

Today, the world is teetering dangerously on the brink of war.

In Berlin, particularly, the Soviet-created crises threatens to result in a showdown of force between the Western Alliance and the Communist world.

In the minds of millions of people, the question is now being asked: can a nuclear-missile war be avoided?

For reasonable people—concerned with peace, rather than power-seeking—the answer is obvious: Yes, we must avoid a war!

However, it is difficult to predict tactics or strategy of Communist thinking.

Because of the grave risk of a third world war, even the Communist leaders—we hope and pray—will realize it would be suicidal.

Although adhering to a "tough" policy, Krushchev has indicated that he is willing to further confer on the issues of Berlin and Germany. OK, let's talk to him. But let's not go empty handed to a conference.

What should be the foundation of Western policy? Among other things, the following:

1. Mobilization of adequate military forces to demonstrate to Khrushchev that the West intends to protect its rights, live up to its obligations and commitments, and not make any one-sided concessions;

2. Educate world opinion—a growing influence in determining disputes—to the real factors behind the Communist guilt for the Berlin crisis—not allow judgments to be formed on distortions by Communist propaganda;

3. Propose alternatives to a showdown of force over Berlin, including: (a) U.N. participation in a settlement of the issues, (b) a voice by the German people—by secret ballot—in determining their future, or (c) agreement to accept the nonwar status quo—until progress can be made toward resolving the differences between East and West in both the cases of Berlin and Germany itself.

As for Communist policy, Khrushchev continues to threaten to sign a separate treaty with East Germany. What would be the significance of such a treaty?

Realistically this would be a mock gesture. The East German Government continues to be a puppet—with Moscow pulling the strings. The omnipresence of 450,000 Soviet troops in East Germany assures that this puppet doesn't act by itself. Presumably the signing of a separate treaty then could only have one real objective: Provide a false-front effort to shift blame for troublemaking over Berlin from Moscow to the Red overlords of East Germany.

Because of the Communist-created crises—in Berlin and elsewhere around the world—we and our allies need to put more muscle into our defense.

For this reason, Congress has increased the total defense budget for 1962 to about $47 billion.

The budget will enable us to strengthen our "free-world guard."

According to the Defense Department, this will be done in the following ways:

First, reinforce our forces in Europe by bringing 7th Army and other U.S. units committed to NATO to full strength.

Second, add combat, combat support and logistical units to meet the requirements of the U.S. Army in Europe for a fully combat-ready posture.

Third, double the number of combat-ready divisions in our Strategic Reserve, giving us six divisions in the United States, instead of the present three, and providing the additional nondivisional units necessary for a balanced force capable of immediate deployment.

Fourth, add to the training and logistics base to support the larger Army and provide substantial reinforcements and replacements, if needed, in the event of hostilities. If the latter are not needed for this purpose, our plans for their utilization will be announced in due time.

Fifth, more than double the size of the special forces, which as you know are specially trained for counter-guerrilla and other forms of sublimited warfare.

Because of the high cost of defense, however, it will be absolutely necessary for Congress to adopt "watch-dog practices" on other types of spending. With the burden extremely heavy on the American taxpayer, it is important (a) that we don't waste money; and (b) that we establish a realistic priority for the programs necessary to maintain a good pace of domestic progress in the country.

These steps are not merely crash measures designed to meet the Berlin crisis, but are a part of the buildup in our military strength to meet the worldwide threat.

Let's face it: The Reds greatly outnumber us—if we include in strategic estimates, the Soviet-controlled bloc and Red Chinese forces. In battle, the Communists—inconsiderate of human life—do not hesitate to sacrifice manpower as cannon fodder. This is abhorrent to our system where the dignity of man is supreme.

For an effective balance, then, we will need to continue and, as necessary, expand efforts to increase the firepower of our weapons—to offset the weightiness of manpower of the enemy.

To accomplish this, we must maintain and further improve a strong, up-to-date modernized defense force; the manpower; the intelligence and knowledge; the weapons; the supporting industrial and agricultural strength; and the spirit of patriotic people to preserve and perpetuate liberty.

Overall, the cold war covers military, economic, ideological, social, and cultural fronts.

To win, we need to buy the time, by having a strong military shield to prevent attack—in which freedom can prove its superiority over the Communist system.

For this reason, we must assure that our Armed Forces have the necessary money, manpower, equipment, to do the job.

This, then, is a brief review of some of the major problems confronting us.

Once again, I want to say thanks very much for listening.

Now, this is your senior Senator, ALEC WILEY, signing off.

Appeasement of Communists Weakens Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, 17 million, intelligent, well educated and self-sufficient people have been imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain and there has been no outcry from the so-called neutral nations, no demand that the United Nations take action, no serious move by the free world to take effective action. The result is another victory for communism and another step in the loss of freedom for all men. This is the crux of the Berlin situation. It is the pattern the Communists have been weaving and by which they are slowly, but surely, winning their objective of world domination. Unless the trend is reversed, unless the free world is ready to stand up to communism, unless the United States takes effective leadership in halting Communist aggression here and now, the ultimate result will be slavery for all men under the Communist dictatorship of the Kremlin.

There is an alternative, firm resolution that we stand against the Communists now. A firm and determined policy in Berlin, in Cuba, may lead to war, it is true, but unless we take a firm stand now, war is certain because somewhere down the line we will be forced to fight and that time may not be of our choosing and we may not be as strong as we are today with the result that the Communist-inspired war will be a bloodbath for those who believe in freedom.

The best guarantee we have for peace is let the Communists know that we are prepared to fight and to use every weapon in our arsenal to assure victory. Any lesser position invites continued Communist aggression and the chance of war.

David Lawrence, in the following editorial from the U.S. News & World Report, states the case clearly:

THE BIG PRISON

(By David Lawrence, by cable from Europe)

More than 17 million persons were imprisoned a few days ago in East Germany.

They have committed no crime. They have not trespassed upon any other people's territory. They are nevertheless confined within borders prescribed by their Communist masters. Armed guards patrol the barbed wire and concrete barriers erected to prevent their leaving the big prison.

Across a line through the city of Berlin are many relatives and friends whom they are forbidden to visit.

Alone and unbefriended by any other nation, the East German people suffer in silence—unable to express their will and bound by the mandate of their oppressors not to dare to depart to other countries or even to other parts of their own German homeland.

The world has not often witnessed in our times such a colosal act of cruelty.

In these days when self-determination is the rallying cry of millions of persons in Africa, many of them not yet fit for self-government, the majority of nations have given more than lip service to the idea that colonialism should be abolished and independence granted.

But where are the champions of the imprisoned millions in East Germany? Do the Afro-Asian members of the United Nations lift their voices in protest or demand special meetings of the General Assembly to seek justice for the 17 million prisoners—educated human beings who obviously deserve a chance to govern themselves? And what do we in America or our friends in Western Europe do about it?

Timidly and with a mistaken belief that it is important not to offend Nikita Khrushchev, the American Government's broadcasts to East Germany tell the people there to be calm and to do nothing to bring about disturbances of any kind. This is advice based on our own alleged self-interest. But it is really a form of appeasement reminiscent of the days of Munich.

Here, for instance, is an extract from an editorial published in the New York Times of August 16 and transmitted by the various press services to the newspapers of Europe:

"While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Does this expression by one of the leading newspapers of the United States represent the thinking of the American people today? Have we forgotten the ideals of yesteryears—the many words of sympathy we have written into the platforms of both of our political parties in decades past as we openly took our stand by the side of oppressed peoples?

Do we really mean to remain passive now lest we offend the Communists? Will this not embolden them to take further steps—perhaps the next time to imprison the people of West Berlin, too?

For if we are obsessed with fears and afflicted with a defeatism which makes us afraid even to encourage other peoples to seek their freedom, then the Soviet Union need have no concern about trespassing further on human rights.

The West Germans are plainly disappointed that their Western allies have indicated their aloofness toward the problem of the East German people. Small wonder that it was deemed necessary by President Kennedy to send Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Berlin to help bolster the morale of the people there.

True enough, nobody wants to see any incitement to war. But wars come from timorousness, and not from resoluteness.

The Soviet Union has committed a major crime in imprisoning the people of East Germany. Will the people of the West fail to speak up against this act of inhumanity?

Diplomatic notes of protest are not enough. Throughout the United States and other Western countries days of mourning should be proclaimed as millions of free men go to their churches to pray to God to give the East German people the strength to rise up against their captors and emerge from their enslavement.

Demonstrations in all parts of the world should be held immediately so that there can be recorded the protest of a shocked humanity.

For communism, which boasts of its prowess in science and pledges great achievements in economic fields, reveals its true character as it denies human beings their freedom and their individual liberties.

The verdict of the world must be registered, and the United States should take the lead in denouncing the unjustified imprisonment of 17 million human beings behind the walls of imperialistic communism.

Judge Learned Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Nation, indeed the whole world, has lost a great friend and teacher with the passing of the distinguished judge, Learned Hand. He was truly one of the great minds of the century. I would like to send my personal condolences to his family and many friends in their moments of sorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Judge Hand Won Praise for Words, Opinions," published in the Washington Post, issue of August 19, 1961, and an editorial entitled "Learned Hand," published in the same newspaper, issue of August 20, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE HAND WON PRAISE FOR WORDS, OPINIONS

Judge Learned Hand, who died yesterday, once was referred to by Justice Benjamin Cardozo of the Supreme Court as "the most distinguished living English-speaking jurist." Another description of him was a "judge's judge." His opinions—he wrote some 2,000 during 42 years on the Federal bench—have been acclaimed by literary critics.

"There is a lovely tune in his head and sometimes he translates it into words," a colleague said. One of the many examples that this colleague might have cited was this definition of "the spirit of liberty" that he gave in a public adress:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias.

"The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

COMMENTS MAKE MUSIC

The citation accompanying the 1947 award of a Theodore Roosevelt Distinguished Service Medal said that some of Judge Hand's comments on America, love of country and liberty "make music that is likely to thrill American thoughts for generations to come."

From a brilliant career at Harvard, Judge Hand went into a law office in his native Albany, N.Y., and soon became a partner in the firm. Several years later he moved to New York City and was established as a successful lawyer.

His abilities came to the attention of President William Howard Taft, who in 1909 appointed him to the Federal bench for the southern district of New York.

When President Taft ran for reelection in 1912, Judge Hand supported the Progressive (Bull Moose) candidacy of Theodore Roosevelt. The next year he himself made a political race—his first and only one—when he sought election on the Progressive ticket as chief justice of the New York Court of Appeals. He was defeated.

ELEVATED BY COOLIDGE

President Calvin Coolidge elevated Judge Hand to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, which has jurisdiction over Vermont, Connecticut, and New York, in 1924.

He became senior judge of that court in 1939. In 1951, at the age of 79, he retired, but made himself available for assignment as a judge whenever needed. He had served on the Federal bench longer than any other judge.

Judge Hand was rated as one of the country's deepest students of law. He has been compared with Oliver Wendell Holmes, Louis Brandeis, and Benjamin Cardozo. His name figured many times in speculation when a Supreme Court appointment was to be made. But the call never came to him.

A stocky, broad-shouldered man with brilliant eyes and iron-gray hair, Judge Hand had an aloof bearing that clothed him in privacy on the bench. He was reserved almost to the point of hauteur. He spoke with the voice of authority.

He had no patience with lawyers who wandered away from their subject or with those who obviously came unprepared to argue. In such cases he was likely to make some very barbed remarks.

But off the bench his austerity left him. Friends found him a witty companion. He was an accomplished mimic, a gifted entertainer when with close friends.

Back in the days of prohibition, Judge Hand held that the 18th amendment and its enforcement act applied to American ships on the high seas and to foreign vessels that came within the U.S. 3-mile limit.

"Naturally, I have nothing to say about the wisdom of the amendment or the law, but, wise or not, one thing is clear, that a drink of whisky is as hurtful to health and morals outside as inside Ambrose Light."

UPHELD CONVICTION OF REDS

Judge Hand wrote the 1950 opinion of the Court of Appeals that affirmed the conviction of 11 top Communist leaders in the United States. The constitutionality of the act under which they had been convicted was affirmed at the same time.

As members of the national board of the Communist Party, the group had been convicted of criminal conspiracy to teach and advocate overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

Judge Hand's 20,000-word opinion contained these conclusions:

"The American Communist Party, of which the defendants are the controlling spirits, is a highly articulated, well contrived, far-spread organization, numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate Utopian faith that is to redeem mankind.

"The violent capture of all existing governments is one article of the creed of that faith, which abjures the possibility of success by lawful means * * *.

"Our democracy, like any other, must meet that faith and that creed on the merits, or it will perish; and we must not flinch at the challenge."

OTHER DECISIONS

Other decisions by Judge Hand:

[In 1934 he concurred in a decision that James Joyce's novel "Ulysses" could not be barred from this country as immoral because of its sincerity and the absence of "the effect of promoting lust," even though "it justly may offend many."

[In 1935 he concurred in the Schecter poultry case which broke the NRA wage and hour provision.

[He wrote the opinion in 1951 upsetting the espionage conviction of Judith Coplon, Government employee, on the ground that the evidence, while pointing to guilt, was obtained in part through illegal wiretapping.

[After his retirement, when he sat in nationally known cases, he dissented in 1953 in a ruling that upheld the conviction of William W. Remington, a Government economist, on charges he committed perjury in denying he ever had been a member of the Communist Party.

[In 1955 he wrote the principal opinion upholding Frank Costello's conviction for income tax evasion.

[In later years, he served as a member of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals. In 1960 he was one of a number of eminent world figures who signed a statement warning about the dangers of overpopulation, presented to the United Nations.]

His full name was Billings Learned Hand He dropped his first name in young manhood in favor of Learned, which was his mother's maiden name. The Hands are of colonial stock, the first of the family having come from England in 1644.

Judge Hand graduated summa cum laude from Harvard in 1893. He took his master's degree the next year and then entered the Harvard Law School, which he finished with honors. In 1902 he married Frances Fincke. They were the parents of three daughters.

LEARNED HAND

For all his extraordinary eminence and authority as a jurist, Learned Hand's richest legacy may well lie in the more generalized expressions of his views as a political philosopher. Warmth and tolerance, sensibility and wisdom were miraculously fused in him.

He was, by every standard, a great judge—in his exceptional capacity to discern the core of complex legal issues, in the vast legal learning that informed his judgments, in the exquisite craftsmanship and clarity with which he wrote his incisive legal opinions. In some 2,000 cases that came before him in more than 40 years on the Federal bench he dealt with a tremendous range of judicial problems; and because the court of appeals for the second circuit, on which he sat so long, handled an immense volume of corporation and commercial litigation, he left an indelible stamp upon the business law of the country.

He left a significant stamp as well on the area of individual liberty in relation to the authority of the State. In this area his thinking was dominated by devotion to high standards of procedural fairness—as, for example, when he upset the conviction of Judith Coplon because a trial judge had refused to disclose to the defendant evidence obtained by wiretapping, on the ground that the disclosure might be dangerous to national security. He was, however, a judge who accorded great deference to legislative judgments; and this deference led him occasionally, as perhaps in the Dennis case testing the constitutionality of the Smith Act, to decisions which may have been profoundly unsympathetic to his own preferences and convictions.

No comment on Judge Hand can hope to express with anything like his own eloquence the ideas that animated him. Perhaps nothing ought to be written about him save in quotation. Here, one quotation must suffice to suggest the quality of tolerance, his humanity and his faith in individual freedom:

"Our dangers, as it seems to me, are not from the outrageous but from the conforming; not from those who rarely and under the lurid glare of obloquy upset our moral complaisance, or shock us with unaccustomed conduct, but from those, the mass of us, who take their virtues and their tastes, like their shirts and their furniture, from the limited patterns which the market offers."

Keep Channel 3 in Hartford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1961, the Federal Communications Commission initiated a formal rulemaking proceeding looking toward the deletion of television channel 3 from its present use at Hartford, Conn. The Commission's proposal, subject to further consideration, is that channel 3 would be replaced by channel 76, a channel at the top of the UHF band.

This proposal has created a great deal of distress and opposition among television viewers in Connecticut and in the Fifth Congressional District which I represent. Gov. John Dempsey has taken the leadership in the organization of a plan of action to oppose the Commission's proposal and he has enlisted the aid and support of the Connecticut congressional delegation to make strong representations to the Commission with the objective of retaining VHF channel 3 in Connecticut at Hartford.

With unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an editorial "Keep Channel 3 in Hartford," which appeared in the Friday, August 18 edition of the Naugatuck (Conn.) News:

KEEP CHANNEL 3 IN HARTFORD

"There is no question of the need for channel 3 at Hartford and we are going to fight for it," said Gov. John Dempsey this week.

The Federal Communications Commission has proposed that channel 3 (WTIC–TV), a very high frequency station, be eliminated from the city of Hartford and the State of Connecticut, and be replaced by channel 76, an ultra high frequency station.

Many thousands of people throughout Connecticut would be affected by the proposed move. It would eliminate for them all clear television reception whatsoever. Many others would be cut to only one clear television channel, from the two they now enjoy, 8 and 3.

Many Connecticut residents do not have adapters for UHF which would be needed to pick up channel 76, if they could pick up channel 76 at all. Waterbury's channel 53 has been in operation for quite some time, but many area residents cannot receive the channel, even with a UHF adapter.

During the years which channel 3 has been in operation, it has been steadily improving its programing schedule. It is now at a point where the station presents top-notch entertainment that compares with the best offered by any television station in the Nation.

The educational programs and news reports, covering State, local, and national subjects are excellent. It would be an injustice to the people of Connecticut if the FCC removes channel 3 from Hartford.

We call upon our Congressmen and Senators to make it known to the Federal Communications Commission that there is a need for channel 3 in Connecticut and that we won't settle for a UHF replacement.

Television has become an intricate part of the everyday life of American citizens. Why should Connecticut viewers have their enjoyment cut in half because the FCC wants to experiment?

Certainly, television is a commercial venture and channel 3 is in business to make a profit. And, we might add, television is, more or less, in competition with newspapers. But, television does provide a very much used service to the people of Connecticut and we do not intend to sit by and watch the men in Washington take away services we now enjoy—rather than reducing the services, they should be attempting to increase them.

The individual television viewer can do something about it. You can write to your Congressmen and you can write to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, D.C., protesting the present plans by the FCC to remove channel 3.

Washington State Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in times as precarious and unpredictable as these in which we live today, there is great need to further acquaint citizens of this country with the importance of an adequate civil defense program. President Kennedy has outlined the great need for a heightened program that could lead to the preservation of millions of lives in case of nuclear war. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has announced a plan for stockpiling of wheat for survivors of target areas. On August 11 in Wenatchee, Wash., the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, spoke before the State American Legion convention on the subject of "Civil Defense" and the steps he will take to see that the responsibility of civilian defense is carried out at all levels in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Rosellini's statement of August 11 be printed in the RECORD so that all Members of the Senate may be informed of the civil defense program being initiated in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALBERT D. ROSELLINI, AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, WENATCHEE, WASH., FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1961

There is one factor, beyond all others, which links you men of the American Legion. It is the same factor which binds together those who belong to the other, major veterans' organizations—as, indeed, it touches most veterans of the armed services who have not chosen to affiliate themselves. The common factor is that you all have seen the terrible face of war, or at least have been closer to it than the remainder of the populace.

This shared knowledge would make you respond automatically to the spirit which pervaded President Kennedy's recent, momentous speech on the Berlin crisis. It was a spirit which sent a message to any potential armed aggressor, or defiler of human rights: "We wish to negotiate in honor but make no mistake; do not underestimate us; we are building the strength we need against that horrible day when aggression may come. We parlay, but from strength, not weakness."

For those of you who have known something of war, albeit only "old-fashioned," non-nuclear war, there is another self-evident truth. This is that there is no waste of human life so grievous as when attack comes upon the unprepared.

It was in this sense, I believe, that the President made a major and telling point in his speech on Berlin. He said "To recognize the possibilities (the possibilities) of nuclear war in the missile age, without our citizens knowing what they should do and where they would go if bombs began to fall, would be a failure of responsibility."

For this State of Washington, I submit to you, it is even more than a failure of responsibility. Here, it is a matter of absolute, unquestioned necessity.

Do you know where you should go, and what you should do? Do your families? How many Washingtonians know?

Are these alarmist questions? I do not think they are. They are, in the most literal sense, life insurance questions.

There are those who shrug fatalistically—those who say if the world comes to the horror of a nuclear attack, it is the end anyway. But such persons let themselves be tragically ignorant of certain known facts of the atomic age.

Just one of these facts comes from what is known of the deadly radioactive fallout which would follow any atomic bombing and which could drift 200 miles downwind from any blast—and "downwind" means in whatever direction it's blowing that day. Such a drifting cloud would kill 25 percent of the entire population of any area over which it hangs or moves. But—and mark this well—if every existing building with a fallout-shelter capacity could be surveyed and marked, and the populace made knowledgeable about their use in the event of emergency, the saving of life would be immense. In the case of the Nation as a whole, this step alone could mean the saving of as many as 40 to 50 million American lives. Think of it: 40 to 50 million Americans alive instead of dead.

Were the unbelievable day to come—were a 20-megaton bomb to be dropped without much advance warning in the vicinity of the Boeing Airplane Co. plant in Seattle, 721,000 could die of the heat and blast, but 670,000 more Washingtonians downwind could also die, of fallout. But have merely a system of identified fallout shelters, in no more than the existing buildings found so qualified and then properly stocked with materials for survival, and have adequate home shelters, 800,000 of the 1,391,000 would live.

Yes, I am talking civil defense. I am saying that we can no longer afford the drift, the indifference and the lethargy which despite valiant efforts in some quarters have kept preparedness against nuclear death only a little short of being a mockery and a farce.

I am calling attention to the fact that the Soviet Union installs blast protection in their underground subways, places fallout shelter facilities in all new apartment buildings, puts the must-do stamp on civilian defense education.

I am directing your attention to the President's conclusion that civilian defense in these United States is, to all practical purposes, tragically inadequate.

As chief executive of this State, I am pointing out that the situation here in Washington is no exception to the national rule. The average, annual county appropriation, for implementing at the local level the civil defense plans developed by our State civil defense agency, is only $9,000. Nine thousand dollars a year. There is, so far as I can tell, no awareness in, let us say, counties east of the Cascades that an atomic attack anywhere in this State could mean death—if there is no adequate preparedness—to hundreds of thousands who live far from our cities. There is no concerted shelter program in the marking of qualified public or private buildings, nor is there any broad-scale awareness among private citizens of the cheapness or simplicity of home shelters. We have a dedicated civil defense agency in my administration, but its efforts have been seriously limited by apathy at all levels, and often negated by popular indifference.

We in Washington are the closest mainland State of all, by way of Alaska, from Soviet missile bases. With the Boeing Airplane Co., the Hanford plutonium plant, and the Grand Coulee Dam, certainly we stand as one of any aggressor's highest priority targets. Accordingly, as chief executive, I raise the question: Can we afford to drift, in any program by which the lives of our citizens may be safeguarded, and through which they, themselves, may prepare against a day we pray never comes but, God forbid, could come?

Surely, there is but one answer. Surely we cannot go on planning to commit deliberate suicide.

As Governor, I am authorized by law to take all possible steps to see that the responsibilities of civilian defense are carried out at all levels.

Accordingly, I wish to announce certain steps which I intend to take.

I shall shortly summon for a conference with me not only the heads of all existing civilian defense organizations at the county level but, with them, all county commissioners and the mayors of certain cities.

At that time, it is my intention to direct that a survey of the fallout shelter capacities of all existing office, warehouse, and similar buildings shall be made, and that thereafter there shall be a directive timetable for

the proper marking of such shelters, and for their stocking with food, medicines, and sanitation facilities. I shall separately order such a survey and handling of all State buildings.

In advance of such a conference, I am this day communicating with the Federal Government to seek the designation of Washington State as a pilot area, for the implementation of the shelter program now being launched at President Kennedy's direction. Certain funds for this purpose are being voted on in the Congress; it is my intention to cite our primary-target status, as a basis for primary receipt of a proper share of such funds. These will be of help in the program which I shall ask of counties and cities. Federal funds for the marking of mass shelters already are available on a matching basis. I am determined that the State, too, shall play its proper role. But it is not my purpose to permit the low degree of existing county and city civil defense appropriations to absolve officialdom at any level of their responsibility for prompt action.

With this in mind, I shall call attention to the fact that county and municipal budgets, now being prepared, must provide for adequate funds to carry out this program on a continuous and effective basis. If necessary, these appropriations will have to be made at the expense of other needed services for I shall not tolerate lack of preparedness on the part of governmental agencies—nor lack of complete preparation and understanding by our citizens when lives—lives—can be saved.

Subsequent to the conference of city and county authorities, I shall call a conference of representatives of radio, television and the newspapers. Before them I shall lay the challenge of assisting us all to do a better job, in relaying to the people of the State the surprisingly simple but tragically uncommunicated facts of individual preparedness. Also, the inexpensive steps and the existing financial aids for the creation of fallout shelters in the home.

Our national specialists in civilian defense tell us it is possible that, in the event of attack, prevailing winds would not be strong enough to bring radioactive fallout into certain areas so quickly that some people could not safely evacuate metropolitan areas. There is also the possibility of enough advance warning to allow for such partial evacuation.

However, the protection of every area with fallout shelters is counted by the President as the first order of business. It shall be ours.

But thereafter, public knowledge of, and experience with evacuation planning becomes another must. A related necessity is the readiness of small counties to receive such a mass influx of people. Accordingly, I shall consider at that time the staging of a mass evacuation drill during which it is my firm determination to require the participation of all citizens save only emergency crews and other exempted personnel. If necessary to enforce such mass participation, I shall ask the legislature for a statute making refusal to participate a violation of the penal code. Such a law already is on the books in New York State; it is no more than the application, to citizens not wise enough to know their own welfare, of those same rules which require every child to participate in a safety drill in our schools.

Legionnaires—if I may presume on the privilege of this platform to speak directly to every man, woman, and child in our great State—permit me this sober moment of realization.

We are a beautiful State in a beautiful time.

Our future is unlimited.

Let us live for it. But if the holocaust should actually occur let us not die for it wastefully.

While our leaders pursue every avenue for the peaceful best we must have the courage to prepare for the works of ungodliness.

It is my purpose to see that we shall so prepare.

U.S. Fleet in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating article of historical interest by Capt. D. E. Cummings, U.S. Navy, retired, dealing with the evolution of the U.S. Fleet since 1902, was published in the August 1961 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote the indicated article:

U.S. FLEET IN TRANSITION

(By Capt. D. E. Cummings, U.S. Navy, retired, 1907)

The Armed Forces in 1961 are in a state of transition involving extensive changes in strategy and tactics. For the Navy this is no novelty. Since the establishment of the fleet in 1902, fleet general orders have repeatedly opened with the statement that the fleet is in transition. And this is quite natural; the world is changing and the U.S. fleet changes with it.

The Navy of 1902 was itself the product of two decades of revolutionary development. In 1885 when the North Atlantic Squadron visited Newport Harbor to be inspected by the President, Chester A. Arthur, it was obsolete. It was wooden, its guns muzzle-loading, smoothbores.

At this time the flagship of the British Squadron also paid a visit to Newport. This flagship alone was as powerful as the combined North Atlantic Squadron. A modern steel vessel with breech-loading rifles, it could have stood off, chosen its range and sunk the North Atlantic Squadron with impunity. But reformation was underway. Chief Engineer King, was sent abroad to report on the condition of foreign navies. Admiral Luce founded the Naval War College to study conduct of war. The North Atlantic Squadron engaged in a period of tactical maneuvering which, its commander reported, greatly increased effectiveness.

The country which had concentrated on the western march of Empire now began to pay some regard to the Navy, and Congress became more responsive. In the next 20 years materiel (ships, engines, guns, and the like) as well as personnel and, most important, ideas, underwent close scrutiny. The Navy began to look toward offshore operations, instead of a relatively passive coastal defense. Near the end of this transition period came the Spanish-American War. It was fought with ships of modern construction with modern guns but not with modern ideas of what could be expected from those guns. The accepted opening range for battle was 2,000 yards, effective fighting range 1,500 yards.

After victory the Navy reverted to its prewar pattern of dispersing around the world to protect American interests. Ships had sound administrative command but lacked fleet tactical commanders. In war selected officers had been placed in command of the North Atlantic Squadron and the Asiatic Squadron and in the Navy Department the Secretary had formed a professional council to assist him in determining what to do and how to do it. After the war, command reverted to usual seniority standards and the professional council in the Department dissolved.

However, the floodgates had been opened to change and strong men were on hand to guide it. Theodore Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Coming to the Department in 1897 he leaned heavily on his idea man, Lt. Comdr. Richard Wainwright, in making drastic moves.

The Atlantic, North Atlantic, Coastal, Caribbean, South Atlantic, Mediterranean, and European Squadrons were concentrated in November 1902 in the Caribbean. This was an unprecedented thing in itself; equally unprecedented was the command structure. Admiral Dewey went to command the combined force. For chief of staff he took from the Department Admiral Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation.

The combined squadrons were tactically untrained. Yet, before they dispersed they were formally established into the U.S. Fleet with the commander of the North Atlantic Squadron given overall command. Furthermore their mission changed. No longer was it simply for individual ships to protect American interests here and there, but squadrons and divisions were required to attain tactical proficiency.

This was a radical change of front. Numerous other changes also took place, including major steps forward in gunnery as spurred by W. S. Sims. Together they constituted a revolution in the concept of the U.S. fleet and even in the existence of the fleet.

Having thus been established, the fleet proceeded with energy to develop as such, going through periods of transition as its evolution demanded. It is convenient to consider the decade to December 1911 as one of consolidation. During this period progress was in the direction of fighting efficiency, ability to operate away from home yards, and development of command. To facilitate distant operations it was necessary to change the system whereby ships going into yards for repairs were decommissioned—following overhaul, they did not become efficient for some time until the new crews had undergone extensive shakedowns. Ships now remained in commission, except for prolonged major overhaul, and the captain became responsible for the condition of readiness with which the ship quit the yard.

Fighting efficiency was further improved by fleet organization changes. Battleships, for example, were assigned to divisions of five ships in which four were always in the fleet and the fifth in the yard. By rotation on a regular schedule the fleet at sea was maintained at strength.

Trained personnel also had to be kept at strength. An important contribution to this end was the development of the naval reserve, ready to be called when needed. The ability to operate effectively far from home was increased by line officers being made responsible for maintaining engines and machinery, aided by auxiliary vessels during limited periods of availability at anchor.

Another long step toward fighting efficiency was the world cruise. In 1906 the fleet began its celebrated 14 months' cruise around the world. Many thought the ships couldn't make it. Yet the fleet ended this epochal cruise in as good shape as at the start. Ships' companies had done most of the maintenance.

Readiness for battle was developed by rapid strides in gunnery, by developing radio communications (the U.S. Navy took the lead in America), by making submarine squadrons a unit of the fleet, by employing aviation on an experimental basis, by constant battle drill, and by annual combined maneuvers and test exercises with parts of the fleet pitted against each other to test tactical ideas and plans.

The Secretary of the Navy fostered development of higher command (besides that inherent in the exercise and operation of the fleet), by creating for the first time, in the Navy Department, a division of operations of the fleet. An "Aide of Operations" provided the Secretary with professional guidance in the preparation, readiness and conduct of the fleet. The Aide for Operations was a step toward the later statutory creation of the Chief of Naval Operations.

The peak of this period of tremendous improvement in fleet efficiency came in December 1911, when the fleets conducted practice mobilizations. The Atlantic Fleet was strengthened by reserve vessels placed in commission with reserve crews commanded by Regular officers. Thus a full fleet steamed in review before the President in the North River. The fleet the American public saw, at the opening of this critical decade in history, was a well-organized well-commanded, competent force, skilled in tactics, engineering, and gunnery. It was a potent fighting organization—ready for trial by war.

A change in the national administration brought a pacifist Secretary so that the Navy approached World War I short of men and less ready than in 1911. However, because of the sound foundation laid in the preceding decade, and with the assistance of another Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, when war came it acted effectively.

It is not necessary to tell the naval history of World War I for the purposes of this study. The war demonstrated that the Navy had produced excellent ships. Its officers and men had trained well so that when charged with combat missions they carried them out with great efficiency.

These missions varied widely. High among them was the conquest of the German submarine.

Admiral Sims, representing the U.S. Navy, induced the Royal Navy to undertake the convoy system which saved Britain from economic strangulation and collapse. Destroyers proceeded to Queenstown and, under British comand, assisted effectively in convoys, British aircraft manned by the U.S. Navy operated in antisubmarine patrol with the British over the North Sea. The U.S. Navy counted as one of its greatest achievements the fast development and production of a mine with which a curtain against submarines was laid across the North Sea from the Orkneys to Norway.

The Navy escorted a vast army overseas without loss, supplied it and supported it with heavy naval guns mounted on railroad cars—just as naval gunfire has supported Army operations throughout our history. The Marine Corps acted with the Army on the Western Front and made a fine reputation. The ability to operate at long distances, with tactical effectiveness and to stand up well with other navies in the matter of ship design were well demonstrated.

At the war's outset worldwide communication had to pass through British hands. By war's end the Navy had a worldwide communication network under American control. To preserve this vital communication network for the future an American company, the Radio Corp. of America, was formed. Radio, which the Navy had fostered for years, now developed rapidly and the Navy continued to set the pace.

American planes operating in Europe had to be carried there by ship, since they lacked the flying range to cross the Atlantic. To overcome this deficiency the Navy designed the NC flying boats. They did not get across before the armistice, but shortly afterward a pioneer attempt was made. Out of four flying boats that started, one reached Lisbon, Portugal—the first trans-Atlantic airplane flight in history.

Th U.S. Navy in 1900 ranked low among the navies of the world, far behind Britain. Now through British war losses and American crash building the United States had an armada of powerful ships present or in prospect as the first Navy of the world—as indeed the first nation of the world needed.

Thereafter the United States took second place to none. However when peace came, like the courtiers of King Canute of old, the Navy Department thought it could proceed about its business without demobilization hysteria. King Canute's courtiers, it will be recalled, had insisted that the tides would not rise if the King commanded to the contrary. But the tides did not hear the command.

The Office of Naval Operations, now a well-functioning organization, decided that the training of the fleet should continue without break; immediate demobilization would not take place, officers and men in for the war should await replacement before being released. Accordingly a winter maneuver period at Guantanamo was scheduled.

The fleet, with the aircraft, carried out a busy schedule of winter exercises, including an elaborate spotting practice to determine which spotters were best qualified to bring shots on the target. For this purpose, the spotters were assembled on one firing ship. Spotters were required to record estimates of where the shots fell with reference to the target and were graded on estimates. Aerial spotting was now initiated. Some pilots had never before seen a big gun fired. Yet when their estimates were scored it was found that the pilots were closer than ship spotters. This made a profound impression, and was one of the elements which resulted in aircraft being promptly placed on board as many ships as possible and of installing radios in naval aircraft.

At this time the wise and far-reaching decision was made to develop carrier aviation as a principal arm of the fleet. The Navy also made a determined effort to develop lighter-than-air rigid airships for war use, but with disastrous results, so they were abandoned. Nonrigid airships continued.

Like King Canute's tide, the tide of American desire to get the boys home rose to such a point that demobilization did have to take place. Thus in the middle of exercises the fleet was largely stripped of men. The American public turned its back on war, listened avidly to pacifists and other propagandists. Delusion of permanent peace made many reluctant to put money into a large Navy. A new administration soon put an end to a mighty fleet in being and building. Instead, the Washington treaties limited the number and the size of ships. We gave up ships, other nations mostly plans.

The Office of Naval Operations, however, seeing great problems for the United States in the future, proceeded with its business of making plans for wars that might be forced on us. The most likely place was in Asia, not Europe, and accordingly the fleet shifted to the Pacific. Studies and plans were prepared for conduct of war, largely amphibious, in that area. As part of the Navy's overall amphibious planning and exercises, the Marine Corps concentrated on preparation for amphibious landings.

As war plans emerged the means for carrying them out were also developed so far as funds could be obtained. Plans were kept in readiness to supplement construction on the certainty that crisis would shock the public awake and insure the necessary appropriations.

The Washington and London Treaties limited the size of cruisers and therefore the objective became to make cruisers within the limits as potent as possible. Included were double-purpose guns. As aircraft developed, means for defending ships against them were sought with great success in the 5''/38 battery, the best in the world, but with limited success in close-range weapons.

During this period the fleet was organized in two major forces: the Battle Fleet, normally stationed in the Pacific, and the Scouting Fleet, normally in the Atlantic. Occasionally one fleet would transit the Panama Canal, which had been built originally not without thought of using it as a means of making ours a two-ocean fleet. The two fleets pitted against each other in war exercises to try out the various plans which each devised and to determine the effectiveness of plans and tactics in conditions simulating war, as closely as possible.

The Navy had led in science and technology for a hundred years. Now in the swiftly changing 20th century it expanded its efforts. By its own resources it was a highly technological service. But supplementing its own resources, it enlisted even more than in the past commercial companies that specialized in technological advances useful to the Navy. Rapid progress resulted. For example, gyroscopic compasses became general throughout the service, replacing magnetic compasses, and they became useful in a multitude of other ways for which magnetic compasses were unsuited. Various companies developed ways, including use of the gyro, of providing automation in the conduct of gunnery, fire control, torpedo control, and other operations of the fleet. More and more it became possible to do mechanically most of the things that had previously been done by men, thus leaving the men free to do in a minimum of time the duties that could be done only by them. As we sped into the scientific age, and the wonders of the nuclear-space age soon to dawn, the Naval Research Laboratory began to function and make scientific breakthroughs that gave promise of far greater developments. Among these were the vital ones of radar and nuclear energy.

When Japan repudiated the Washington Treaty and dictators rampaged in Europe, another Navy-minded Roosevelt in the White House saw the storm warnings and wisely resumed naval construction. After war started in Europe, the Navy took on duties that brought ships closer and closer to actual war before Pearl Harbor thrust us headlong into it. By this time, fortunately, new construction had advanced so that another fleet was coming off the ways. In time, spearheaded by aircraft, submarines, and amphibious assault, it would stem the tide of Japanese expansion in the Pacific, destroy the Japanese Navy and bring total U.S. strength to the shores of Japan.

A prime element in this magnificent achievement was the submarine force. It played a major role in destroying the Japanese Merchant Marine and Navy thereby cutting off supplies of oil and other essentials without which Japan could neither subsist nor wage war.

Carriers became the basic power element of fleet operations and amphibious landings became the method of permanent advance.

In the Atlantic defeat of the submarines was the first need and absorbed vast effort. Giant amphibious assaults swept from the sea into Africa, Italy, and Normandy where under the power of the fleet large American armies surged ashore.

Science made possible the final act of the war in the Pacific—the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima. This was an act in which the Navy had a large part, including the ordnance elements of the bomb. Capt. W. S. Parsons, U.S. Navy, was the bombardier in this world-shattering flight.

The Navy's World War II personnel effort included not only the employment of large numbers of scientists and the commissioning of tens of thousands of reserve officers, but also the training of the host of junior officers needed in existing and expanded college facilities. Many capable officers were thus developed, some of whom made the Navy a career. When peace came, many of these training establishments were transformed into ROTC units. Now in peacetime as well as in war the Navy would have a large inflow of officers other than from the Naval Academy.

The close of the war again brought quick demobilization. The bomb dropped on Hiroshima added a new more powerful weapon to the arsenal of the Nation and of the Navy. Atomic weapons opened vistas of huge power. Combined with the German rocket bombing of Britain, it pointed the way to a heretofore undreamt of era of distant delivery and power.

The postwar period has seen large developments of weapon systems to exploit this new force. Controlled atomic energy proved a turning point not only for weapons but for ship propulsion. The combination of nuclear powered submarine with nuclear missiles like Polaris offers a weapon of unprecedented range and capabilities. Significant as the advances have been, the Navy is just on the threshold of this staggering technological revolution.

The relative merits of one weapon or weapons system had always excited controversy; now the whole world of science and national politics became involved. Sometimes individuals argued from special knowledge and sometimes not.

Among means employed in effort to obtain unity of viewpoint in regard to weapon development and other matters, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which had worked well during the war, were continued as a permanent body. The Department of Defense was erected over the military-naval establishment theoretically as a small coordinating policy unit.

Not long after World War II the aggressive nature of international communism disturbed both Western Europe and the Far East. War again reversed demobilization. The Navy was brought up to strength, performed brilliantly in the Korean war and has since been maintained at a high state of readiness and efficiency. Naval gunfire, naval aviation, naval amphibious tactics and seaborne logistic support played dominant roles in the Korean conflict. The Navy has been employed in the Far East as an effective deterrent to aggression ever since.

In Europe, the NATO organization was formed to meet Communist aggression. An American officer has commanded the combined NATO naval forces. The powerful U.S. Sixth Fleet keeps the peace in the Mediterranean and the U.S. naval forces operate in Western European waters in collaboration with allies. Thus the doctrine of 1902 that the Navy should be prepared to fight where needed, and to maintain itself at a distance in order to do so, has demonstrated its soundness throughout the world.

The doctrines that governed the newly established fleet in 1902 included ability to operate at great distances for long periods of time and to maintain ships without frequent recourse to home yards. They included the adoption and exploitation of the most powerful and the longest range weapons available. They included the employment of the vessels best suited to carry those weapons.

In the evolution of material in these 60 years the Navy has been in a constant state of transition, due to changes in one or another of the many elements that make up its power. Constant evolution in all its elements and in its ability to employ them to the fullest advantage has been the prime requisite for the progress which the Navy has consistently made. Transition has been the fleet's normal condition.

If the fleet is today undergoing a major period of transition, involving widespread changes in strategy and tactics, as the development of new weapons and new types of vessels to carry them suggest, this is but a continuation of a long historic process with which the Navy is in the habit of coping successfully.

The Navy will weather the troubled seas of change. Admiral Burke and the dedicated officers now controlling the destinies of the fleet are of the same cut as the men who commanded when the fleet was formed. The only novelties that they find now are those which arise from the increased complexity imposed by rapid development of new weapons, the entry into space, and the global commitments to the free world. The Navy has never failed to meet its commitments—it never will.

Wisconsin Celebrates Two Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this year the great State of Wisconsin celebrates two anniversaries: First, the 50th anniversary of Wisconsin's Workman's compensation law—the first effective program of its kind in the Nation; and second, the 25th anniversary of the 1st unemployment benefit check ever issued in the country under a State law.

Overall, these two events reflect the kind of forward-looking leadership that has marked progress in our State throughout the years.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial entitled "Two Anniversaries in Which State Can Take Great Pride," reflecting upon the significance of these programs, not only to Wisconsin but also to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO ANNIVERSARIES IN WHICH STATE CAN TAKE GREAT PRIDE

Today at Madison, ceremonies mark payment by Wisconsin exactly 25 years ago of the first unemployment benefit check ever issued in this country under a State law.

In Milwaukee on Labor Day, the post office will issue a stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of Wisconsin's workmen's compensation law, the first modern act of its kind in the Nation to go into operation. Other ceremonies were held in Madison in May, the month of the enactment.

It is hard to imagine our industrial society without unemployment and workmen's compensation systems. But there was a time when unemployment was considered a private vice and injury at the work place a private misfortune.

Now, these major social insurance programs have spread to all the States and afford workers a substantial measure of protection against two of the greatest hazards of their lives—injury on the job and loss of employment.

The unemployment compensation system also is one of the Nation's main bulwarks against recession—an automatic stabilizer that partially maintains incomes when production is being cut back and workers laid off.

In the 25 years since the first unemployment compensation check was issued, payments under the law to jobless Wisconsin workers have totaled more than $436 million. And in its 50 years about $300 million has been paid to workers and their survivors under the State's workmen's compensation act.

The real significance of the laws, however, is not in the size of those figures, but in the distress averted, the families held together, the pain and sorrow eased, the human dignity maintained, the pride restored, the rehabilitation aided and both the unemployment and injuries avoided because of awareness engendered and costs assessed by the laws.

In addition to the pioneers who fought for the legislation, the State also can thank the men and women who have given efficient and honest administration of both laws. Without that, for all their theoretical value, the laws would not have worked nearly so well.

Moreover, the process through which the acts have been improved over the years has been a useful lesson. Amendments are suggested by advisory committees composed of those affected—labor and employers in the case of the unemployment compensation act and those plus insurance companies in the case of the workmen's compensation law.

The advisory committees have a remarkable record of agreement and of success in getting their suggestions enacted by legislatures. Their work has been a salutary demonstration of mature acceptance of responsibility for policy by those most affected by it. They have kept these important social insurance system from being mangled in the partisan political struggle.

New Asian Agreement Will Help Stop Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer on the new Asian agreement:

NEW ASIAN AGREEMENT WILL HELP STOP REDS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The birth of ASA (Association of Southeast Asia) could, in my judgment, mark the turning point in the successful defense of the Far East against further Communist advance there. When the representatives of the Philippines, Thailand, and the Federation of Malaya signed their nonmilitary agreement (which they chose to call the

Bangkok Declaration) on July 31, 1961, they may well have started something of immense importance.

They may have taken another first vital step toward the consolidation of all the defense arrangements of the Far East, from Japan to New Zealand, into a single sort of Pacific NATO, able to concert its defense efforts effectively. Such a consolidation could be the greatest victory for freedom since the creation of NATO back in 1949.

The reason is quite simple. I happen to believe that, while communism's chief goal, short of the United States, is rich, industrially, and scientifically developed West Europe, Moscow does not expect to take this by frontal attack. The Soviet claim at West Berlin, therefore, is for me a defensive action forced upon the U.S.S.R. by the need to stop the refugee and information hemorrhage through that city from the east.

PART OF OFFENSIVE

Moscow, with Peiping, is in my judgment, still following Lenin's advice that the way to Paris (later to New York) lies through Peiping and New Delhi. Thus, unlike the Berlin demand, the Communist attempt to seize Laos and subsequently South Vietnam and neighboring countries is part of the main offensive.

That is why ASA—harmless as it looks—could be so important. For ASA is a first link between the Philippines, bilaterally linked to the United States, Thailand (part of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO)) and the Malayan Federation, which has no links to the United States.

If this link should grow into an impregnable chain, the credit would go to the Philippines. For back in 1950, I am informed, in holding the Baguio Conference, President Quirino hoped to plant the seed of some sort of 10-country defense pact. And at that time both India and Indonesia, later to go vehemently nonalined, would have considered signing such a pact.

LEARNED MISTAKE

The plan fizzled because of the indifference, even the hostility, of the United States. Not only the Truman administration, not yet awake to the importance of the Far East and soon to learn in Korea, but Republican John Foster Dulles saw no virtue in the Quirino plan—as Dulles ruefully admitted when, in 1954, he himself started pushing the pieces of east Asia into some sort of defense pattern.

The result is clear: the United States today has (a) a defense pact with Japan; (b) a defense pact with South Korea; (c) a defense pact with National China; (d) a full-fledged alliance with the Philippines; (e) the eight-power SEATO, three of whose members are non-Asian; (f) bilateral arrangements with Australia and New Zealand.

There is no single coherent political or military coordinating board. The weakness of the SEATO type organization became painfully evident in the (probable) loss of Laos.

COULD BECOME NUCLEUS

But that catastrophe has had one good effect. It is causing worried leaders in Asia and the United States to talk of a Northeast Asia Treaty Organization (NEATO)—and the mere talk is sending Red China into fits. NEATO, one must suppose, would link Japan, South Korea, National China, and the Philippines into one front backed by the United States.

And so far so good. This is where ASA could come in. Just as Turkey is the vital link between NATO and the Central Treaty Organization of South Asia, and Pakistan is the vital link between the Central Treaty countries and SEATO, so ASA could become the nucleus of an effective Far Eastern defense organization stretching a quarter of the way around the globe.

I believe some such group is going to be increasingly needed. Should it happen, the credit should go to the three governments that, in their frustration over the nondefense of Laos by the Western countries, took a first step toward real cooperation by establishing ASA.

Cooperative Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Dwight D. Townsend, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., noting the recognition given Father Al Simon, pastor of Our Lady of Consolation Church at Alexander, N. Dak., and his father, Al Simon, Sr., of Bismarck, N. Dak., for their work in cooperative housing. The certificate of recognition was presented by Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A.,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1961.

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The Marian Park Housing Project in Bismarck, N. Dak., has been honored with a certificate of recognition presented to Father Al Simon, pastor of Our Lady of Consolation Church at Alexander, and his father, Al Simon, Sr., of Bismarck, by Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The certificate recognizes their work on the Marian Park Mutual Aid Corporation, which is a cooperative with 61 family members. An FHA insured mortgage made the project possible which cost $830,000.

Organized in 1954, the New Marian Homes Corporation was formed when Father Simon was an assistant at St. Mary's Parish in Bismarck. Many members of the parish needed homes. This need was not being met and Father Simon organized the cooperative and named it "Marian Park Mutual Aid Corporation." This name was selected because 1954 was the Catholic Marian Year, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1854 declaration of the immaculate conception as Catholic dogma.

I attended the groundbreaking ceremonies in 1957 at which time I referred to it as "the purest co-op in the United States." The planning, the initial capital and much of the original work came through the organized effort of the 61 families who now live there, where there are no restrictions as to race or creed.

In 1960, David Webb, personnel and training office of HFHA, conducted tours of visitors from Chile and Pakistan to the cooperative community. Swedish visitors, too, have expressed interest in the development because it parallels so nearly the housing program in their own country.

Members of the original board were Al P. Simon, Sr., Joseph E. Wolf, Herman Slag, Leo Kreitinger, Bernard Slag and Wendlin Fisher, all of Bismarck. Fred Hoesley, chief underwriter of the FHA in Fargo, gave competent guidance to the group during the formative period in order to make it possible.

Father Simon suggested to me that a project of this kind could be utilized by those patriots who want to contribute to President Kennedy's Peace Corps program, but who are unable to leave their country.

Perhaps the idea merits your consideration.

Sincerely,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
DWIGHT D. TOWNSEND,
Director, Washington Office.

United States Applying Brakes to Red Bloc Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, continuing the analysis of the Commerce Department's recent decision to sell U.S. surplus agricultural products at subsidized prices to Communist nations, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Washington Star of August 21 on this very questionable reversal of American policy:

UNITED STATES APPLYING BRAKES TO RED BLOC TRADE

U.S. officials have been instructed to take a harder look at proposed exports to Iron Curtain countries.

The new orders came after the volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries increased more than 800 percent in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin.

This increase caused concern and embarrassment to the administration.

Without any formal change in export control regulations, the administration already has forced a slowdown in trade with Communist bloc nations.

In the 3 weeks before Mr. Kennedy's July 25 radio-TV speech on the Berlin crisis, the Commerce Department authorized shipment of $750,196 in American goods to the Soviet Union and her satellites.

With Department officials apparently continuing to take a business-as-usual attitude after the Kennedy talk, the licensing total soared to $6,278,566 in the next 3 weeks.

This increase came despite the attitude of their boss, Secretary of Commerce Hodges expressed in an August 8 news conference:

"I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 to 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

As a result of several meetings this month between Mr. Hodges and Secretary of State Rusk, there already has been a dip in licenses issued.

Mr. Rusk and Mr. Hodges, however, do not favor any new legislation to curtail trade with Iron Curtain nations. They believe it can be controlled effectively by administrative discretion. This would avoid a statement of policy that might make Berlin negotiations more difficult.

Included in the upswing were $2.5 million of rail equipment for Bulgaria; $1.7 million of synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; $107,000 of industrial in-

struments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; $95,000 of coaltar products Hungary and Czechoslovakia; $38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia; $35,000 of industrial and speciality chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany; and $23,000 of pipe valves for Russia and Poland.

The Department ruled that none of these proposed shipments would endanger national security. Export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their warmaking potential.

Exports to Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, is it not ridiculous to tax the American taxpayer billions of dollars to build up our military might to ward off a Communist threat and at the same time make it possible for the Communist to purchase material through which they can build their military strength? This is the same foolish policy we followed before Pearl Harbor when the scrap we sent to Japan was returned to us in the form of guns and ships and the mutilated bodies of thousands of American boys. The following news story from the Washington Post is a shocking revelation of how we are increasing exports to Communist countries. While any kind of export helps them, it is even more foolhardy to ship such things as railroad equipment, certainly valuable as a military buildup, and synthetic rubber to the Soviet Union. Just whose interest are we protecting? I think the only sensible course is to enact a complete trade blockade with any Communist country. At least we will not then be contributing to our own murder:

EXPORTS TO REDS SHOW SHARP RISE SINCE JULY

Government authorization for the shipment of American goods to Communist countries have increased sharply in recent weeks after declining earlier this year.

An Associated Press tabulation of daily export licensing reports showed yesterday that the Commerce Department authorized the shipment of goods worth $750,196 in the 3 weeks preceding President Kennedy's July 25 radio-television speech on the Berlin crisis.

In the first 3 weeks following the address the authorizations totaled $6,278,566, an increase of more than 800 percent over the previous 3-week period.

Among shipments approved in the 3-week period from July 25 to August 15 were $2.5 million in railroad equipment for Bulgaria and $1.7 million worth of synthetic rubber for the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania.

Another Commerce Department report showed that shipments of American goods to Communist countries totaled $41.1 million in April, May, and June compared with $59.4 million in the first 3 months of 1961 and $74.5 million in the last quarter of 1960, when the shipments reached an alltime high.

In the second quarter of this year applications for export licenses authorizing shipments to Communist countries were filed for goods worth $15.7 million. Licenses were granted for $12.9 million worth of goods. In the first 3 months of the year applications amounted to $48.7 million, of which only $23.8 million were granted.

Nearly three-fourths of the value of the shipments approved in the second quarter were destined for the Soviet Union. A reduction in the sales of surplus wheat and cotton to Poland was chiefly responsible for the sharp decline in the second-quarter figures.

The Associated Press said that high administration officials were concerned and embarrassed by the increase in license applications since the President's July 25 speech. The officials were not named.

The AP also said that steps had been taken to reverse the trend but that there had been no formal change in export control regulations.

Chautauqua: The Most American Thing in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the famed Chautauqua Institution is now completing its 88th year of enlightened activity. The institution is located in western New York on the shores of beautiful Lake Chautauqua. This is the original Chautauqua, not to be confused with the itinerant companies which for some time flourished in many parts of the country.

Chautauqua was formed as a summer colony where recreation, culture, and education could go hand in hand. Today it offers daily programs of concerts, operas, plays, lectures, and university extension courses throughout the months of July and August. Golf, tennis, swimming, boating, fishing, and many other activities are part of the Chautauqua program. Last year 50,000 people enjoyed its benefits.

On August 15, 1961, the Buffalo Evening News editorialized in tribute to Chautauqua. We are proud of Chautauqua's great traditions and its inspiring contribution not only to western New York, but to our entire Nation. It gives me great pleasure to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the Buffalo Evening News editorial:

CHAUTAUQUA IN SUMMER

In a noisy and ever-changing world the enduring charms of the Chautauqua Institution are cause for some wonder and much satisfaction. Now in its 88th season, this distinguished cultural center in the peaceful hills of southwestern New York beckons each summer to tens of thousands of visitors in quest of education, recreation and renewed inspiration.

Theodore Roosevelt—one of seven Presidents who have spoken in its famous amphitheater—once called Chautauqua the most American thing in America. Here were founded the country's first summer schools and adult education movements. Merely to stroll through its tree-shaded streets, past its Victorian houses, is to experience a serenity and leisurely pace unknown to most present-day Americans.

But Chautauqua is no museum piece. It is alive and busy with vacationers of all ages combining water sports on Chautauqua Lake with the study and enjoyment of music, art, drama and literature. There are concerts, operas, Broadway musicals and lectures by outstanding figures in every field. It is at once a secluded place of summer play and rest and a stimulating center of culture and religion—a gift from 19th century America to a 20th century America that needs it even more.

Sesquicentennial of Battle of Tippecanoe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this past week the citizens in and around Tippecanoe County, Ind., have been celebrating and observing the sesquicentennial of the Battle of Tippecanoe.

Because of this battle a new frontier was opened for this great Nation of ours. One of Indiana's leading newspapers, the Lafayette Journal & Courier, in a recent editorial entitled "They Opened a Frontier," eloquently explains the need for remembering those frontiersmen of yesteryear. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY OPENED A FRONTIER

Observance this week of the sesquicentennial of the Battle of Tippecanoe constitutes a commemoration and tribute, as well as an act of solemn remembrance. As such it is completely appropriate and should attract wide public interest, support and participation.

The formal observance begins Thursday and runs through Sunday, centering largely on the battlefield, some 7 miles north of Lafayette and at the south edge of the Tippecanoe County town of Battle Ground.

The battle, although certainly not of major magnitude, still left a permanent imprint upon the history of the State and of the Nation. It opened a vastly rich new frontier empire to settlement. Names of heroes of the battle and events leading up to it, notably the two principal characters—Gen. William Henry Harrison and the Indian Chief Tecumseh—have been memorialized in the State and over the Nation.

General Harrison became President of the United States less than 30 years later, largely on the strength of prestige gained at Tippecanoe. Chief Tecumseh has gone down in history as one of the ablest statesmen, warriors and leaders of all time among American Indians, also as one of the most humanitarian.

Controversy still rages as to the significance of Tippecanoe. Admittedly it does not rank with Waterloo or Normandy. In numbers of combatants, with the band of armed white settlers on one hand and Indians on the other, it was small. But a white army ventured more than 100 miles from its base into a trackless Midwest wilderness, entirely on its own resources, poorly armed and equipped, walking out to meet a wily, bitter and relentless Indian foe.

Here was another clash of races, each intent upon preserving itself and its way of life. The Indian chapter in American history is among its blackest. The coming of the white European to these shores spelled the doom of the American Indian, who was here first. Often the white man took what he wanted.

The two races could not live together. The Indian was a nomad. The white man looked to settlement of the land, cultivation of its acres and processing of their products, with establishing of towns and cities. The two were not compatible. There were negotiations and treaties, which not all Indians recognized, notably Tecumseh. The red man was steadily pushed back as the white advanced. Tecumseh sought to reverse this situation.

Conflict was inevitable. The land had been drenched with blood for years. More was to flow at Tippecanoe as the red man took what amounted virtually to a last stand in the Midwest and the white man fought to make life safe for himself and those who were to follow, soon in a great floodstream.

With the defeat of the red savages at Tippecanoe, the door was opened to the settlement of this vast and promising area. The Indians were not finally and completely vanquished, but their spirit was broken and their dreams punctured. Their depredations ceased.

Tecumseh's efforts to unite many Indian tribes into a federation strong enough to resist and repel the whites had to be abandoned. The result hastened the realization by Indians of their inability to cooperate among themselves—and alone they were doomed. Tecumseh's plans in this respect were ruined. The influence of his brother, the Prophet, was destroyed.

The battle furnished a new leader in General Harrison, who went on to win new laurels in Canada in the War of 1812, where Tecumseh, who had joined the British, met his death in battle.

The Battle of Tippecanoe was in fact a prelude to the War of 1812. It may be said that some of its first shots were fired at Tippecanoe. The second phase of the Revolutionary War, from Tippecanoe to 1814, clinched the victory of 1776–82.

Tippecanoe not only made the Northwest increasingly safe for settlement, but also gave new life, strength, and courage to a young nation which, even in the flush of earlier victory, remained in a precarious position.

Settlers streamed in soon after Tippecanoe. Farms were established and towns founded. Churches, schools, factories and other signs of civilization came into being.

A showdown had become necessary. It had to come somewhere, sometime. It remained for Tippecanoe to provide the time and setting.

Observance of the sesquicentennial recalls and emphasizes all these factors. It is not a glorification of war and death. It is an occasion to honor the memories of those who fought and died at Tippecanoe and through renewed expressions of gratitude add another payment on a debt which never can be fully paid.

A dignified observance, with numerous and varied features making up its program, has been arranged. High public officials will take part. Many persons have worked hard and long to bring plans to reality. They are to be commended for their devotion, initiative, imagination, and enterprise. Because of them, the story of the gallant deeds at Tippecanoe will come alive again; appreciation of their meaning takes on new significance and is projected afresh into the future for generations yet unborn.

Heroes of the battle still sleep on the battlefield. As their spirits hover above the scarred oaks, they must find satisfaction in the knowledge that their posterity still remembers. Because of the observance, younger generations especially will be given a new appreciation and understanding of the sacrifices required to make possible the free institutions which are their heritage.

Such remembering should make for better Americans and for a better America.

Is a New Farm Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, CHARLES B. HOEVEN is serving his 10th term as a Member of the House. He has demonstrated his complete desire and ability to serve the agricultural economy of our Nation.

A recent recognition of his contribution is included in the following editorial from the Spokesman, publication of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

IS A NEW FARM LAW

Congress had its say about the Agricultural Act of 1961 and it has turned out a fairly good bill. Congress tossed out many of the bad features which would have placed real earning power of farmers in jeopardy in the future.

The new legislation will increase farm income over the short run but the legislation will be expensive and will come under criticism because of its cost. It does take more land out of production which we feel is basic to good farm legislation but farmers are going to have to defend this point. Criticism will come on the grounds that "Government is paying farmers for doing nothing."

The bill contains many of the features Farm Bureau members urged in adopted resolutions. It falls short in not being a long range plan for agriculture. We feel it is a better bill than when originally introduced because Farm Bureau members and other groups opposed the original Cochrane-Freeman plan to control individual commodities.

It is a farmers' victory but farmers got the victory by working with their elected representatives in Congress. Leaving the final decision to Congressmen was one of the key points in the battle. The original bill would have taken the right to decide away from Congress and place it in the hands of the executive branch. Farm Bureau worked to keep this power in the hands of the legislative branch of government. It remains in the hands of the legislative branch and a better Agricultural Act of 1961 is the result.

We also feel that bipartisan support for the act adopted can be seen in the vote in the House and Senate. Men from both parties teamed up to defeat the bad portions of title I. They teamed up again to pass the good features.

We should recognize the effort of Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa, who worked to keep the final decisions on farming in the hands of farmers. In his key position as ranking member of the minority party on the House Agricultural Committee, he expressed strong opinions against the original bill and title I because it was bad for Iowa agriculture.

Representative HOEVEN received strong support from Iowa Republicans in efforts to defeat measures that would have brought Iowa farmers down to the national average. Democratic support for Representative HOEVEN's point of view came from various parts of the country but notably from the South. There was also bipartisan support in the Senate which again points out the value of Congress making the final decision because it is in the Congress where all interests of the Nation are represented.

We do recall that many said "all was lost" when the original bill was defeated. Many said there would be no farm legislation unless the administration's bill was accepted. It was due to the strong demand by farmers working together in Farm Bureau that the farm bill was revived. It was due to the efforts of farmers working together that the Agricultural Act of 1961 contains the good features without the bad.

Support for President Kennedy's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, recently the Democratic National Committee has organized "Operation Support" to gain grassroots backing for important parts of President Kennedy's legislative program. In my own State of Massachusetts, Democratic women have been working hard phoning, writing, and even wiring at their own expense to arouse public support for this vital piece of legislation.

They have received support for their program from voters of both parties and nonpartisan groups such as the League of Women Voters. This shows, I feel, how widespread the concern for the President's foreign-aid program is and how important it is that the Congress pass a strong foreign aid bill this year.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the fine description of the work of this group which was published in the Boston Globe of Sunday, August 20.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL WOMEN HELP KENNEDY AID BILL

(By Mary Sarah King)

There is a nonpartisan aspect to the Democratic women's Operation Support which is fast gaining backing in the Bay State.

One Harvard professor, a Republican, when appraised of the program said that he would be glad to write his Congressman, and happy to speak on President Kennedy's foreign-aid bill.

And the Massachusetts League of Women Voters, which has no party affiliation, when approached by Mrs. Edward L. Schwartz, of Newton, Mass., chairman for Operation Support, pledged their assistance to the foreign-aid bill.

"They were most willing to work in alerting legislators and voters alike," she said.

Both the written and the spoken word are to be key factors in this campaign,

through letters to be sent directly to the peoples' representatives, and through a speaker's bureau which will supply top level persons interested in addressing clubs and organizations throughout the State.

"We feel that this is a great force in educating women, as well as men, on political issues," said Senator Elizabeth Stanton, Democratic National Committeewoman.

"By keeping the public informed of current measures, we know we are performing a service to our Nation and to the world," she added.

Operation Support was instituted by the Democratic National Committee to secure grassroots support for the major parts of President Kennedy's program. They send along background material on all important issues to the State committee which operates locally in distributing information to key women throughout the State.

"It is our function to contact men and women of all parties, and organizations with an educational program, to acquaint them with the President's proposals," Mrs. Schwartz brought out.

"Right now we are concerned with gaining support of his foreign-aid bill," she said, adding that the committee is alerting public opinion in favor of the health cost program for the aged which is expected to be a major issue in 1962.

"Our women working on Operation Support are phoning, writing, even wiring—and paying their own expenses—to promote the project," joined in Mrs. Stanton. "The wonderful thing about this, is that the women are putting teeth into their efforts because of the urgency of the times."

Flood Protection Preferable to Flood Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, time and time again the problem of protecting human lives and property from devastating floods has come before the Congress of the United States.

On Tuesday, August 15, 1961, the Evansville, Ind., Courier, printed an editorial headlined "Flood Protection Preferable to Flood Relief." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD since it so excellently points out the need for flood control, not only in Indiana, but in the entire Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD PROTECTION PREFERABLE TO FLOOD RELIEF

President Kennedy has authorized the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to spend $950,000 in emergency flood relief for 43 Indiana counties, including all of southwestern Indiana.

That represents just a portion of the damage that was done to public facilities—roads, bridges, sewers and the like—by torrential rains early this summer. For Vanderburgh County alone, there is an application for $104,000, mostly as a result of those spectacular downtown sewer cave-ins.

Private loss as a result of the floods was far greater. Some of it was paid for by private agencies, some by individual owners, and some by insurance companies.

Without detracting a bit from the need for this assistance, it should be noted that this is literally money down the drain. The Federal Government will spend close to a million dollars simply to get things back in some sort of normal order. None of the money will go for significant improvement of public facilities.

Nor is it likely that this will be the last expense of this type in southern Indiana. It could be next year, or 5 years from now, or 10 years from now. But sooner or later there are bound to be more floods, and more emergency appropriations for flood damage.

The size of this year's bill helps to put the Federal Government's annual expenses for flood protection in context. A dollar spent in flood relief is gone forever. It has done nothing except replace something that already existed.

A dollar's worth of flood protection, on the other hand, can be expected to pay for itself time and time and time again. Sometimes a levee system can pay for itself by containing a single surge of high water. When the water recedes, the levees are still there, an investment in future protection.

The annual expenditures for flood control look immense when they're listed on a single-page summary of congressional appropriations. However, a little reflection is enough to convince most citizens that next to defense, the money is about as well spent as any in our Federal budget.

Thirty-nine Tons of Congressmen, Kilotons of Boards, and Megatons of Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, weighing in at an average of 180 pounds, much less, of course for our lady colleagues, we have about 39 tons of Congressmen here in the House. Over in the other body, and assuming the same body weight, there are about 9 tons of Senators.

On this basis it takes a little over 19½ tons of Congressmen and a little over 4½ tons of Senators to get a law passed, 24 tons, plus, in all, of legislative weight.

Likewise, in our 39-ton body, a little over 19½ tons of us can get a bill out of committee via the discharge petition route and passed over to the 9-ton body where an affirmative 4½ tons, plus, can send it on down to the President's desk. I do not know how much his desk weighs and Dr. Travell has not held a press conference to supply what, obviously, would be the next vital statistic.

Now, a weighty question bothering kilotons of school boards in over 300 congressional districts, is whether the impacted school area statutes are going to be extended before Washington becomes 48 tons lighter by the adjournment exodus of Congressmen and Senators, which will occur in less than 1 month. If 19½ tons of us, plus 180 pounds more, will sign the petition to discharge H.R. 5349 extending these impaction statutes, then the kilotons of school boards will be relieved of the pressing weight of impending financial chaos and the scales will tip in favor of financing needed education for the megatons of American public schoolchildren residing in impacted school areas.

Congress Still May Act To Maintain Its Constitutional Responsibility in Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is still not too late for Congress to act to maintain its constitutional authority over appropriations by insisting on a conference report on the mutual security bill which embodies annual appropriations. The claim that the administration must be given 5-year authority to bypass Congress in order to keep the program operative is a false one. Congress has never failed to appropriate whatever is necessary, and in my opinion, beyond what is necessary. I hope the people can be aroused to make themselves heard before the final vote is cast on the mutual security bill. Perhaps the following summation of the provisions of the bill and the points of view involved will be helpful, not only to Members of Congress, but to those constituents who may read this RECORD. The article appeared in the Wall Street Journal:

KENNEDY LIKELY TO FIND FOREIGN AID PLAN OF CONFEREES ACCEPTABLE; HOUSE MAY NOT

WASHINGTON.—House and Senate conferees are expected to draft a compromise foreign aid bill this week that probably will be acceptable to the Kennedy administration but may not be accepted by Congress.

The measure seems likely to include the administration-backed provision to obtain funds directly from the Treasury, rather than by way of yearly congressional appropriations, for long-term economic loans to underdeveloped nations. Similarly, it probably won't contain several administration-opposed amendments included in separate bills passed by the House and the Senate on Friday.

While the compromise product is likely to gain Senate approval, it certainly will encounter stiff opposition in the more conservative House. Democratic leaders have informed President Kennedy they doubt the House can be induced to accept a proposal for direct borrowing from the Treasury for economic loans. Mr. Kennedy's request for 5-year authority to borrow $8.8 billion from the Treasury was rejected, 197 to 185, by the House last Wednesday despite Presidential pleas in behalf of the controversial proposal. The Senate previously had accepted the plan, 56 to 39, and last week beat back attempts to weaken it, although the $8.8 billion figure was reduced to $8 billion.

Regardless of the outcome of the financing fight, the bill that ultimately goes to the White House is expected to give the administration some type of authority to make loan commitments over a span of several years—even if the aid planners are required to come to Congress for appropriations annually. At

present, all aid funds are provided by Congress yearly, but the new arrangement, however it is worked out, would impose at least a moral obligation on the lawmakers to continue the flow of foreign-aid money year after year.

ADMINISTRATION CONTINUES EFFORTS

The administration has not abandoned its effort to free the foreign-aid program from the annual appropriations ordeal. The strategy in the Senate-House conference will be to fashion a modified version of the 5-year plan in the hope of gaining House acceptance when the compromise bill is sent back to each Chamber. Thus, the outlook points toward conference agreement on a 3-year plan permitting loan commitments up to some $5 billion. Also, the bill seems certain to retain the Senate-approved amendment that gives Congress a veto power over nearly all loan commitments when both Chambers pass resolutions of dissent within 30 days after proposed loans are submitted for congressional review.

Although the obstacles are much greater, the administration obviously hopes to duplicate the comeback performance it made in the minimum wage struggle some months ago. In that fray, the Kennedy-backed bill was defeated on the House floor, but a later Senate-House compromise, acceptable to the administration, passed the House by 34 votes.

But several factors weigh heavily against the administration in the foreign-aid fight. Foremost is the opposition of many House Members to the principle of borrowing directly from the Treasury, described as "backdoor spending" by its foes. Conservatives have been opposed from the start; and, significantly, many liberals are giving the idea only halfhearted support. There is a strong undercurrent of opinion that the administration, for all of its lobbying, has not justified the need for direct Treasury financing.

Administration officials contend that only by having ready access to a sizable amount of funds can they efficiently prepare long-range plans to help backward countries in South America, Asia, and Africa. The appropriations process, they argue, leaves the continued supply of funds in doubt. Foes label this argument specious, declaring Congress had always provided sufficient aid money and will continue to do so. Moreover, they allege the administration's financing plan represents one more attempt by the executive branch to usurp congressional authority over the purse strings.

Aside from the philosophical dispute over direct Treasury financing, there is some reason to believe the administration's foreign aid cause suffered in the House because bill managers refused to compromise until the last minute. Had they shown more willingness to find some middle ground, it's possible the President would have had the support of more than 6 of the 174 Republicans. As it was, the no-compromise stand helped harden the opposition and, for this fight, revived a conservative coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

Another factor that handicapped the administration was the growing unpopularity of foreign aid in some areas, which caused some loyal Democrats to desert the administration for the first time this year. This persuaded House leaders to forgo an attempt at reversing the House decision to kill the direct Treasury financing plan. They feared the administration would suffer an even more devastating defeat, thus harming the chances for a conference compromise.

MAXIMUM EFFORT EXPECTED

Mr. Kennedy and State Department lobbyists can be expected to exert the maximum effort to reverse the first round defeat. The President already has laid his prestige heavily on the line with numerous phone calls and personal conversations with lawmakers visiting the White House. The administration is pinning its hopes primarily on a bloc of some 25 Eastern internationalist-minded Republicans. Nearly all this group last week supported the amendment that killed the direct Treasury financing plan. But, to most, the vote came as a surprise and caused second thoughts; the amendment gives the administration only $1.2 billion in economic loans for the current year through the regular appropriations process and makes no provision for long-range planning. Republican leaders have announced their willingness to accept the principle of long-range planning with authority to spend specified sums over a period of years so long as the money is provided by yearly congressional appropriations. Administration strategists hope the Eastern bloc of Republicans, faced with the limited House bill, will support a compromise that enables some long-term planning and includes some authority for Treasury financing.

The monetary differences in the House and Senate bills won't pose any great problem for the conferees. For the first time in memory, the House bill would authorize more in aid outlays than the Senate measure. The prospect is for concurrence on a figure closer to the $4.3 billion specified in the House measure (the $1.2 billion for economic loans plus money for military and economic grants and other forms of assistance) than the $4 billion allotted in the Senate bill; the administration requested $4.8 billion for the current fiscal year.

In the closing hours of debate, both chambers tied new strings to the aid program. The Senate adopted an amendment by Senator GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, that would prohibit any country receiving U.S. funds from lending any of the money to its people at more than 5 percent above the interest rate paid Uncle Sam. The amendment is aimed chiefly at Latin America where local lending rates sometimes have ranged up to 10 percent or higher.

The House adopted an amendment barring U.S. assistance to Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, and other countries labeled as under the Soviet influence. Another House amendment would authorize the President to cut off aid to any government extending aid to Cuba. But the chamber rejected an amendment that would have denied aid to any country voting to seat Red China in the United Nations. On final passage, the House approved the bill 287 to 140, and the Senate voted 66 to 24.

Resolution Commending Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee - Mississippi Sheriff's and Peace Officers Association in convention at Jackson, Miss., on the 7th day of August 1961, passed a resolution commending the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Tennessee-Mississippi Sheriff's and Peace Officers Association is a very outstanding organization. I feel that the membership of this body would like to read this resolution:

Whereas crime in the United States has increased 98 percent in the past decade, with a 14-percent increase in 1960 over 1959, with a total of 1,861,300 serious offenses committed in 1960; and

Whereas crime has continued to increase four times as fast as the spiralling population increase; and

Whereas Mississippi and Tennessee, as well as the entire Nation, face the gravest crisis of all times in view of the startling increase in crime and lawlessness; and

Whereas law enforcement is meeting the challenge as evidenced by the fact that 71 percent more cases were cleared by arrests, 65 percent more persons were arrested and court convictions increased 42 percent in 1960 as compared to 1950; and

Whereas the increased efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement are directly attributable to the continued professionalization of law enforcement through higher caliber personnel, more efficient equipment, continued intensified training and increased recognition and support of the citizens; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for over 37 years has dedicated himself and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the ever continuing increased professionalization of law enforcement and the recognition of law enforcement as a respected profession by the citizens of America, and has made available completely the facilities of the FBI to law enforcement officers in furtherance of the struggle against lawlessness and crime: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Tennessee-Mississippi Sheriff's and Peace Officers Association in convention at Jackson, Miss., on this the 7th day of August 1961, express to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI the sincere appreciation of the members of this association.

Foreign Aid With Congressional Checks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, there are some among us who contend that foreign aid, the spending of taxpayers' funds for other than that which directly affects the well-being of the American people, is unconstitutional. While I have always inclined somewhat to that viewpoint, I have, nevertheless, salved my conscience by the belief that what we spend on oversea aid, providing it strengthens our allies and ties them closer to our philosophy of freedom, will result in direct benefit to our citizens.

In any event, the RECORD will reveal that I have supported mutual security with fair consistency despite the fact that I have some doubts that it has been a popular program with my constituents. In the consideration of the bill just passed by this House, the administration insisted that it be given authority to make long-range commitments, and with that position I have had no serious quarrel since, for all practical purposes, foreign aid has never foundered due to the failure of Congress to allow multiyear planning or provide adequate funds. It might also be noted, in passing, that in entering into its alliance for progress with our sister republics in this hemisphere, to run for the next 10 years, the administration evidently felt that it has adequate authority under existing law for such extended planning.

Be all of that as it may, when the White House asked for the right to fi-

nance the program with borrowed money—to resort to back-door spending, I joined with the majority of my colleagues in support of the measure that was finally passed, whereby the executive branch will have broad powers to promote mutual security while, at the same time, the Congress retains to itself the right to pass upon the amount of money to be spent through annual appropriations.

It is always encouraging when the position I have taken on a given issue receives editorial support, particularly when such support comes from a leading daily in my home county. I am, therefore, gratified to be able to include with and make a part of these remarks the splendid editorial from the pen of my good friend, Henry Brinton, the editor of the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., as it appeared in the August 18 issue of that fine paper:

CAN CONGRESS RESIST PRESSURE IN FOREIGN AID SHOWDOWN?

The battle lines are drawn on the pending showdown over the Kennedy administration's multibillion dollar foreign aid program.

United Press International news dispatches which reached us early today indicate that the outcome of the controversial issue will depend not so much on the fight in Congress, but whether or not certain elements in Congress can resist the mounting pressure which is being put on them by the White House.

It is an established fact now that President Kennedy is tremendously worried over the outlook for his foreign aid bill which only a few days ago seemed to be well on its way. The hot spot in the explosive issue has to do with the method of financing the billions upon billions which will be poured into foreign countries in the next 5 years.

Fortunately there is a group within the House which is determined that all aid money be made available by the approval of Congress. That is the constitutional way and the only way such funds have been furnished in the past.

The other way is through borrowing from the Treasury without the annual scrutiny and sanction of the Congress. Because of its questionable methods, it has been dubbed "back-door spending." Huge sums have been spent in this way in recent years, but never for foreign aid. Now the administration would make such spending easier by having aid to other countries financed in the same way. This, at the moment, appears to be the chief bone of contention, and well it should be for it involves billions in American tax money.

This explains why the White House wires are hot and why Mr. Kennedy is seizing every straw he can grasp in order to save this program and the method of financing which he favors.

This does not mean that the Congress is opposed to foreign aid. Not by any means. When the fight is over and the dust settles it will probably show that the President received all the money he asked for. But if the constitutionally minded element in Congress has its way, it will be necessary for the President to ask the legislators for funds every year rather than merely direct the Treasury to make the money available. And that is the way it should be.

Whom does Congress represent? Is it the President or the people? The answer is obvious. If Congress turns over to the executive branch the power to spend funds for projects of which it has little or no knowledge, it is, in effect, surrendering its sanctioning authority and the people, in turn, lose their contact in the important field of foreign aid. That, in brief, is what will happen if Congress fails to stand on its constitutional rights regarding the appropriation of public funds.

Since the close of World War II, the United States has poured more than $80 billion into an oversea program with varying degrees of success. Billions of it accomplished a lot of good, while other billions would have been just as effective had they been poured down the drain.

Today as Congress battles the fate of foreign aid yet to be it must be plain to every American citizen that it should be administered under the watchful eye of Congress. The funds should be voted by Congress rather than handed out through the Treasury's back-door spending method.

Congressional approval of all such funds is a must in these critical times. It is the only constitutional way of doing business and we see no reason for doing it any other way despite pressure from the White House.

Crusade for Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in a time when many people and many groups are trying to find a way to combat Communist subversion, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to what the folks in my hometown of Glendale, Calif., are doing. I am sure all will agree after reading the following article by James Bassett in the Sunday, August 20 Los Angeles Times that this is indeed a commendable approach and worthy of emulation.

GLENDALE SHOWS HOW TO TACKLE COMMUNISM

(By James Bassett, Times political analyst)

This is the story of one community's effort to find a workable approach to a problem that has baffled Americans for the past 15 years—how the average citizen can help his Government meet the Communist challenge.

Deeply concerned by what they'd read about the progress of the cold war, the heads of 16 service clubs in the quiet, conservative, suburban city of Glendale (population: 120,000) met 2 months ago to ponder the question.

Like other good Americans, they'd paid their taxes, voted, exhorted their legislators on occasion, and sought to keep informed about the situation at home and abroad.

Yet they were dissatisfied. They felt there must be more that a thinking citizen could do.

They wanted to get into the fight.

Having observed the divisive efforts of the radical rightwing John Birch Society, however, they concluded this wasn't the way to assist their town and their Government in the global struggle.

By the time they held their second informal session in July, these earnest civic leaders were ready with a "declaration of purpose":

1. To conduct an educational program in the nature and menace of communism.

2. To inform the community about the principles of American freedom and liberty, and show how they can be strengthened.

3. To bolster "the will of this community to stand actively and intelligently behind their government in its struggle against the dangers of international communism."

As businessman Ben Roth puts it, "The idea spread like wildfire."

Veterans' groups and women's organizations joined up, and now Glendale's bipartisan, nonpolitical "Crusade for Americanism" boasts more than 100 member clubs. Next week the clergy of this city of 120,000 will consider participation in the movement.

Lewis Gough, former national commander of the American Legion, is chairman. Roth heads the executive committee. Dr. William Steuart McBirnie, lecturer and church pastor, is the moderator.

"There will be no witch-hunting in our program," McBirnie promises. "What we're aiming toward is the mobilization of an entire community to do its part in the cold war."

According to their policy statement, "the crusade shall follow the suggestions for education and action as set forth in the writings and releases of J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Committees are being formed from the various supporting organizations—each of which has a member on the executive board—to direct special projects: such as distributing approved literature, creating a speakers' bureau, handling publicity and planning an autumn rally.

"This climactic meeting will be a serious affair," McBirnie said, "enlisting authoritative speakers from the highest level of government, and civil life."

In Gough himself, the Glendale program has a man of national stature and international experience: he served as cochairman of former President Eisenhower's People-to-People Committee, undertook a special Navy mission to Korea and holds the Crusade for Freedom citation for his work in Europe in 1957.

Quite candidly, he and McBirnie acknowledge the difficulty of steering their new crusade along a sane, effective course that will avoid ultraconservative extremes.

It won't, according to their basic memorandum, "adopt the doctrinaire viewpoint of any organization."

Education is the keynote. They contend that the U.S. people want "determined leadership" from Washington, and wish to have our national purpose more clearly defined. Toward this end they hope to secure informed speakers who can clarify citizen duties in the cold war that's being waged on the economic, political, propaganda, scientific, and intelligence fronts, as well as on territorial borders.

An aroused and informed citizenry, they believe, is a prerequisite in our fight against world communism, particularly if we are to go on the offensive against communism rather than continue merely to react against Red thrusts.

"We've got to realize," McBirnie said, "that we're in a war—right now—even if it doesn't involve shooting."

On many occasions the American people outpace their Washington representatives in a desire for positive action during critical times. Unhampered by political considerations, the people often display a greater degree of determination than their government, and their courage in the face of potential danger is apt to be underrated by the decisionmakers.

Meanwhile, the people themselves yearn to do something constructive.

If this fledgling crusade, which has the support of the Glendale News-Press (a paper that vigorously opposed the Birchers' methods) and the backing of the city fathers, emerges as a program of intelligent education and genuine inspiration, it will indeed be worth emulating.

Statement Submitted to Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment by Irving R. Glass, Executive Vice President Tanners' Council of America, Inc., August 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, numerous long-established industries located in the congressional district, which I represent, are experiencing increasing difficulty in competing with foreign imports produced by cheap foreign labor. At an alarming rate they are losing their American markets and can look for no relief under our existing Reciprocal Trade Agreements. The outlook grows bleaker as the present administration continues to move toward lower protective tariffs and eventual free trade.

One such industry is the tanning industry. The growing plight of this industry was pointed up in a statement submitted on August 21, 1961 to the House Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment by Mr. Irving R. Glass, Executive Vice President Tanners' Council of America, Inc. Mr. Speaker at this point I request permission to insert Mr. Glass' statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPACT OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS ON AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT BY IRVING R. GLASS, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, TANNERS' COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC., AUGUST 21, 1961

The Tanners' Council of America is the national trade association of the tanning industry of the United States. Its membership represents virtually all the leather produced in this country. Since the Tanners' Council collects and publishes data covering the production and consumption of all types of leather, it is thoroughly qualified to describe the industrial trends directly which are attributable to foreign trade in leather and leather products.

During the past 6 years employment in tanning and related industries has declined sharply. The major responsible factor has been the tremendous growth in the volume of imports of leather and leather products entering the U.S. market. Prior to World War II, the United States was a substantial net exporter of both leather and finished leather products. During recent years this trade relationship has been completely reversed and the growth in imports of leather and leather products has accelerated at a rate which threatens to destroy the industry and eliminate many thousands of jobs.

THE FACTS

The foregoing statements are not based upon supposition, hearsay or vague apprehension. They are based upon the unambiguous statistics prepared by the U.S. Government itself. Tables I through IV present the salient facts. The question raised by these facts can no longer be ignored because it involves the future of U.S. leather and leather products industries and the future of employment in these industries.

Table I compares U.S. leather imports and exports and indicates the tremendous gain in the volume of foreign leather reaching the United States. Table II demonstrates the similar trend which has taken place in U.S. imports of foreign shoes. Table III provides a composite tabulation of imports of all leather manufactures, including gloves, handbags, sporting equipment, and miscellaneous leather products. It will be noted that in 1960 the composite value of leather manufactures imported into the United States was almost $80 million greater than U.S. exports.

In the light of the great tide of imports revealed by Government statistics, it is not surprising that the Bureau of Labor Statistics totals on employment in the tanning industry should show the trend indicated by table IV. The loss of employment in the U.S. leather industry is paralleled by trends in leather-consuming industries such as shoes, gloves, handbags and sporting equipment.

CAUSES

The present situation can no longer be glossed over or dismissed. It is the consequence of a number of causes which are still operating and of which the end result can only be further injury to domestic industry and therefore loss of employment. Principal causes have undoubtedly been indicated to the subcommittee by numerous industry witnesses. However, it may be pertinent to describe the specific form and bearing of these causes on leather and leather products.

1. Iack of reciprocity in foreign trade—U.S. markets are completely free and open. There are no artificial restrictions or barriers to our markets such as quota schemes, embargoes, barter agreements, subsidies, or similar artificial impediments. The United States has consistently adhered to the principles of the GATT Convention. Unfortunately other nations have all too frequently merely given lip service to the principle of reciprocity and have violated it in practice. The import of U.S. leather and leather products has been, and continues to be, discriminated against in all too many countries. Immediately after World War II, such discrimination was theoretically justified by the so-called dollar shortage. That stock excuse, however, has long since vanished. Nevertheless, restrictions or discriminations of various kinds are still utilized abroad to bar competition of U.S. leather and to give artificial protection to foreign industry. For example, West Germany, which enjoys a very favorable balance of trade with the United States, still maintains an import quota system which effectively prevents West German purchases of U.S. bovine leathers. There is no excuse whatsoever for this quota system other than providing artificial and unwarranted protection for German industry. Lack of reciprocity abroad has protected monopolistic foreign industry at home and enhanced the ability of foreign producers to dump products on the American market.

2. Wage costs—Wages are a major element of cost in the production of leather and leather products. The differential between U.S. wages and wages abroad ranges from 300 percent in Western Europe to 800 percent in Japan. Since U.S. aid has contributed toward raising foreign plant equipment and efficiency to levels comparable with the United States, the huge difference in wage costs has placed American industry in an utterly adverse situation. For example, Japan buys U.S. rawhides, transports these hides across the Pacific, tans them into baseball glove leather, fabricates baseball gloves, and ships these gloves to the United States to retail at prices less than U.S. cost of production. Japan is now the largest supplier of baseball gloves in the U.S. market. In proceedings before the U.S. Tariff Commission it has been pointed out that fully 50 percent of the baseball gloves sold in the United States originate in Japan, a situation which has developed entirely within the past 6 years.

3. Inadequate U.S. protection—U.S. tariff rates have been cut progressively under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Elimination of tariff protection has clearly coincided with the development of technology and plant capacity abroad. No steps have been taken to mitigate the impact of world competition on U.S. markets or to equalize the tremendous differential in wage costs in the United States and abroad. U.S. duties now provide practically no protection against lower foreign costs. In the absence of any general policy or plan to meet unprecedented modern conditions, the danger of irreparable injury to U.S. industry and to U.S. jobs has steadily increased.

4. Long range consequences—The present trend is unmistakeable in leather and leather products: Foreign merchandise is supplanting U.S. production. Unless this trend is stopped and reversed, U.S. output of leather and leather products will continue to shrink; employment in these industries will diminish; the skills and the capital investment which are vital to many small communities in the country will disappear.

There is a further consequence implicit in the present trend of foreign trade. The United States is now exporting a substantial proportion of its hide and skin supply, whereas in the past the United States was a raw material importing nation. In alarming degree, therefore, the status of this country has changed from being an industrial leader to becoming a producer of raw material for other countries to fabricate. It is by no means inconceivable, if present trends are projected, that in at least one major industrial product area the United States will become an undeveloped agricultural producer. That result could certainly have never been contemplated a generation ago when the industrial ascendency and technological leadership of the United States were undisputed. Skeptics who feel that the foregoing statements are alarmist and exaggerated should refer to table V and note the percentage of U.S. cattlehides and calfskins exported in the past 3 years. Needless to say, a very large proportion of the raw material leaving the United States returns to this country as finished leather or leather products.

The facts reviewed in the present statement are familiar to various departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Intensive consideration and remedial action have been conspicuous by their absence. It is imperative that Congress become aware of the facts and their implications and that Congress galvanize Government into action.

Impacted School Areas: Now is the Time To Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a discharge petition is at the Clerk's desk on H.R. 5349, a simple extension of the impacted school areas statutes. If this session adjourns without extending these statutes school districts in over 300 congressional districts will suffer moderate to catastrophic financial crises. Signa-

tures on this petition will speed necessary legislation. It must be speeded to be enacted during the next 3 to 4 weeks, before Congress adjourns. Now is the time to help.

Foreign-Aid Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a splendid article by Henry Hazlitt, one of the contributing editors to Newsweek, which appears in the August 28, 1961, issue of Newsweek, just off the press. Mr. Hazlitt is to be commended for his forthright analysis of the foreign-aid program.

FOREIGN-AID FALLACIES

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration's foreign-aid program disregards nearly every sound principle of constitutional balance, foreign policy, or economics.

Even if we were to grant that a foreign-aid program of the present dimensions is economically necessary or desirable, the request of the President for authority to borrow $8.8 billion from the Treasury over the next 5 years to finance long-term "development" loans violates sound democratic and constitutional procedure. Congress is asked to give up, to that extent, its essential annual control of Federal expenditures. It is asked, in other words, to vote a lack of confidence in its future self. It is asked to prevent itself from reconsidering the program next year on its merits, and deciding the question in accordance with its judgment of the situation as it exists at that time.

It is also asked, in effect, to limit the freedom of action of the next Congress. If the voters were to return a conservative or a Republican House to power in November 1962, for example, and the new Members felt that part of their mandate was to cut down or halt foreign aid, they would be prevented from doing so by an unwarranted "moral commitment" made by the present Congress. This is a denial of democratic principle.

FIVE-YEAR PLANS

The President's request rests, in addition, on unsound economic assumptions. The Rusk-Dillon plea declared: "It will be necessary to free our development lending program from the difficulities of working under the uncertainties inherent in annual requests for funds." Why can't foreign governments operate under the same "uncertainties" as our own Government departments do? The administration's argument apparently assumes that the key to prosperity and economic growth is not free enterprise, but government planning, as typified by the 5-year plans that India and other nations have aped from Russia.

President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon have promised huge sums to Latin American countries in our Alliance for Progress on condition that they institute "reforms." These reforms are not in the direction of encouraging free enterprise, removing vexatious controls, safeguarding private property, reducing onerous taxation and Government extravagance, balancing their budgets, and halting inflation. The money has been offered, on the contrary, on the condition that the Latin American countries will undertake "national [i.e., governmental] planning," "land reform," and socialized housing—in brief, if they will move still further toward socialism and the welfare state. So-called "land reform" abroad has usually meant a grave infringement of private-property rights. It has more often resulted in a reduction rather than an increase of agricultural output.

WHAT PRICE COFFEE?

Secretary Dillon has promised the Latin American countries "at least $20 billion" in return for such socialistic measures. In addition, he has promised help in pushing up the price of coffe and tin, for example, against American consumers. He has not only endorsed export quotas of these products from Latin American producers, but recommended policing imports into the United States. He ignores the collapse of all the old Brazilian coffee valorization plans and similar "stabilization" schemes, and the expensive fiasco of our own crop-support programs.

In brief, the administration does not trust or understand the function of free prices and free markets in adjusting production to consumption and supply to demand. The whole folly of Government price control and production control is to be launched on a new and international scale.

The result can only be to encourage and prolong all the unsound economic policies of South American governments, and to slow down rather than accelerate sound and continuous South American economic growth.

All this is apart from the economic harm that the foreign-aid program is now doing to the United States itself, in unbalancing our budget, threatening greater inflation and a still greater increase in the tax burden on productive enterprise, increasing the deficit in our balance of payments, and undermining the dollar just when it is most essential for our own stability and world stability to strengthen it.

The Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Vincennes Sun-Commercial recently published a thought-provoking editorial entitled "This We Can Afford." Much has been written and said about foreign aid, but this brief editorial in a few words says much. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS WE CAN AFFORD

There is always a lot of congressional unhappiness over foreign aid offered in loans and grants. But shipments abroad under our "food for peace" program can warm many a lawmaker's heart.

These can be of immense value to needy nations. At the same time, they slice into our farm surpluses, easing that groaning burden a little, particularly as to storage costs.

Food for peace shipments are rising markedly. Last year just 43,763 tons went into development programs, with nearly 400,000 additional tons going for famine and disaster relief. This year, with months yet to go, development areas already have received 264,000 tons of food out of a total of 727,000 shipped.

That this is, relatively, our most painless foreign aid does not in any way impair its great usefulness.

We Should Set the Terms of Any Negotiations as a Result of the Berlin Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Wall Street Journal should give the West cause for concern. Here we learn of an attitude on the part of the West Berliners which has not been publicized in the glowing reports following the Vice President's visit to Germany over the week end. We have been led to believe the West Berliners would stand firm in the face of any discouragement, that regardless of what the free world did, they would not back down in the face of Communist aggression. It is foolhardy to expect that much of any people and the Berliners are beginning to react as any people would who lose confidence in those from whom they expect support. This could be the end result of the current Communist moves in East Berlin, the complete isolation of the Western part of the city and its gradual strangulation until it, too, silently is enclosed by a barbed wire fence and a brick wall.

Action is needed to prevent any such result. Mere words, no matter how high sounding and dramatic will not halt the spread of communism. Action will. What action can we take in Berlin now, short of war? We can tell the Communists upon what terms we will negotiate. We can stop dancing to Khrushchev's tunes. We can make it clear to him that existing treaties in Berlin are not subject to negotiation, but now that he has broken those treaties, has defied the agreements, that there is only one issue to be negotiated, the unification of Germany. Such a bold and definite position on our part will give new hope, not only to the German people on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but to all those who are looking to the United States for bold leadership. It will stop the flight of the West Berliners. It will enlist the support of all those who believe in freedom and justice.

The article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

EMBATTLED BERLINERS—THEY BEGIN TO SHOW NERVOUSNESS UNITED STATES HAD NOT EXPECTED

(By Dan Cordtz)

BERLIN.—The amazingly tough burghers who live in the encapsulated Western sector of this city have for the first time been developing a case of nerves. And that is what

Vice President JOHNSON's trip and the reinforcement of the U.S. garrison here is really all about.

Through one crisis after another in the past 15 years, West Berliners have displayed a calm optimism and an undaunted sense of humor that have been the wonder of outsiders who have witnessed it. But today, although their sense of humor remains and is reflected in persistent wry joking about their current plight, even an occasional visitor can sense a slight deterioration in the determined air of confidence.

"Are you going west?" the West Berliners are asking each other more frequently, and more openly. There was a time, and not so long ago, when even asking that question was regarded as a sign of weakness.

Those who went—and of course there were always a fair number going to the Federal Republic to escape the Soviet squeeze—went silently. Now the enquiry is made frequently among friends here, and no special stigma is attached to a confession one is considering the move.

West Berlin officials insist there has been no rise in the normal flow of persons to West Germany since the latest crisis arose. Planes are crowded, they explain, with the backlog of East German refugees who managed to escape before the last gap in the Iron Curtain slammed shut. But some Allied officials here are not so sure. "It would be strange," says one, "if all the talk didn't also result in more people running out."

Typical of those at last making the move is 48-year-old Otto Schade, a machinist waiting with his family and belongings for a plane that will take them to Frankfurt. Mr. Schade displays the same apologetic manner of most West Berliners reluctantly abandoning their city, but points to his two teenage daughters as the reason.

FOOD AND AMERICANS

Some of the signs of nervousness are obvious, some more subtle. In spite of the disapproval of their neighbors, for example, many housewives have started stocking up heavily on canned goods, flour, sugar and other staples. Although city officials declare there is plenty of food in warehouses around the Western sector to feed its 2.2 million mouths for 9 months at least, last week's hoarding was serious enough to strip shelves in some stores. One well-to-do hausfrau purchased $750 worth of food from a large downtown department store. "We really just laughed at her," claims a store executive.

Anxiety shows in the faces of the little bands who gather around newsstands to read the headlines—some of them shouting such conclusions as: "The West is doing nothing." Serious expressions were also the rule among the 250,000 who gathered Wednesday to hear Mayor Willie Brandt demand something more than words from the United States and while there was enthusiasm for Vice President JOHNSON's visit, it is by no means sure to be enough.

Quite significantly, perhaps, for the first time in recent years an American finds himself something less than the object of complete admiration and friendship. Yet no real hostility is evident and, indeed, some of the newly arrived U.S. soldiers have been greeted almost as liberating heroes.

One interesting sign of the effect of the Soviet squeeze is the increasingly grim twist West Berlin humor is taking. The owner of a small downtown bookshop promised his staff he will soon issue them water pistols "because I guess that's all we'll have on our side." A current joke being passed around holds that the Red invasion will come on a Sunday afternoon—when all the American troops are watching a football game or sleeping off Saturday night. On the lighter side, a newspaper cartoon depicts a scene in an East Berlin butcher shop where the man behind the counter is telling the customers: "Sorry, no wurst, but I can let you have 3 meters of barber wire."

The most serious sign of nervousness, though, is a change in the once-dogged stubbornness about not being forced out of this island city.

"What kind of normal life can children ever have here?" a man who is leaving with his family asks. "For myself, I would stay and fight—but the children deserve better than that. It's just too uncertain."

Erection of "Ulbricht's Chinese Wall" between the two segments of the city has brought special problems with it to some Berliners—and they, too, must now seriously consider leaving for West Germany.

An example is Hans Preuss, a middleaged shopkeeper whose small delicatessen stands near a stop on the S-bahn not far from the now sealed off border. Mr. Preuss counted among his regular customers many of the 53,000 Grenzgaenger-East Berlin residents working in West Berlin. Now this business is gone, probably for good. "Of course, I could see the effect right away," he says unhappily. "Last week I made no money at all. The only thing to do is either to find a new location here or move out altogether." Asked what his choice will probably be, he looks at the floor and replies softly that "I just don't know." But his defeated air suggests he too may "go west."

More important, perhaps, is the reaction of the West Berlin youth. To a distressing degree it has already decided that the future can hold little for it here.

VIEW FROM A BEER HALL

Visit a few of the small beer halls near the downtown campus of Berlin Technical University and you quickly sense the feeling among many young people that it is best to leave Berlin. Speaking in slow, careful English, a handsome young engineering student, now working in a Berlin factory during his summer vacation, explains his firm determination to go west after he takes his degree in another year.

"We must be realistic," he says. "No matter what the Allies do, Germany is not going to be united and Berlin is not going to be a normal place to live and work for many years. I myself believe it will not be in my lifetime. Therefore the opportunities will not be here. I stay here now because I believe I can learn more here than anywhere else in Germany. But when I have finished, I will go to West Germany because then I can do more with what I have learned."

A companion, listening in obvious sympathy and agreement, was nonetheless one of the thousands of West Berliners who gathered at the Brandenburg Gate on the day the border was sealed to shout insults at the Communists and demand action by the West. How to reconcile his words and actions? He shrugs. "That's different. Sometimes you have to protest even if it does no good."

The long-term exodus of young men like these—who take with them the priceless technical training and education that would enable them to replace the community's aging leaders—is already West Berlin's most acute problem. The current crisis cannot help but aggravate it. Officials of the two universities say they have seen no wave of registration cancellations for this fall as a result yet, but concede the new trouble could show up when classes actually begin.

Already nearly a quarter of West Berlin's population is made up of persons in the 65 and older age bracket, and that segment is growing yearly. One man almost of that age, who is manager of one of the city's large industrial plants, says he cannot blame his younger colleagues when they leave. "I always point to all the advantages of living in an exciting, intellectually stimulating atmosphere like this when I'm trying to keep a good young executive," he says, "but I can't bring myself to reproach them when they ignore me."

HERR HAASE SCOFFS

It would be a serious mistake, of course, to bring away the impression that the current nervousness implies a majority of West Berliners are now thinking in terms of flight. Most continue to share the views expressed by Friedrich Haase, a foundry engineer, one of whose three daughters left the city this year for Los Angeles. "We still think West Berlin will remain free," he declares with a smile. "We know that this is not a fight between the Communists and the West Berliners, or even the West Germans. If that were the case then there would be nothing we could do. But we know it is between the East and West—between Russia and the United States finally. So we are sure you will stand behind us."

Has he not pondered leaving? "No," Mr. Haase scoffs. "What sense would it make to run to West Germany? If the Russians come here, they will soon go there, too—then all over Europe. Your leaders know this as well as we."

Western officials, whether or not they agree with all Mr. Haase's assessment, make it clear they regard his brand of confidence as the most essential element of strength in the Allied position today.

Hence the Vice President's trip. "Some of us, I'm afraid, had started to take the Berliners' courage for granted," says one Western official. Even it has to be bolstered now and then. "But," he adds hopefully, "I'm sure they'll meet the test."

Has Job, Will Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 22, 1961:

HAS JOB, WILL TRAVEL

Mr. Kennedy's tribute to LYNDON JOHNSON's "remarkably successful and important trip" to West Germany and West Berlin was fully deserved.

The success of the trip, of course, was not due primarily to anything Mr. JOHNSON did or said in Germany. It is attributable, rather to the fact that his presence there, at the President's direction, plus the modest reinforcement of our small Berlin garrison, was properly interpreted by the Germans as a manifestation of American resolve not to be pushed out of the beleaguered city. Mr. Kennedy underscored this when he said we are going to pass through difficult weeks and months in maintaining the freedom of West Berlin, but "maintain it we will."

This is not the first trip the Vice President has made to assert the American presence in troubled areas of the world. Nor is it likely to be the last. But he can be depended upon to do what needs to be done. We do not imagine that LYNDON JOHNSON has found it easy to assume the role of presidential emissary. As majority leader of the Senate, he had been accustomed to lead, not to follow. And his willingness to play ball as a team member has been something of a surprise to many. When he accepted

the vice-presidential nomination after his bid for the first prize had failed, however, he made up his mind to take the assignments that came his way and to make the most of his opportunities. The "remarkably successful" trip to Germany is but one chapter in that story.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on July 14 the Wall Street Journal had an editorial entitled "Flunking the Test" in which the writer suggested that some of the arguments presented for Federal aid to education were so weak that they "flunked the test." The editorial was especially directed at an article previously published in the New Republic. The August 21, 1961, issue of the New Republic contains an answer to the editorial which speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T.R.B. FROM WASHINGTON

One of the mysteries of journalism is that editorial writers never read their own paper. Here will be a news story that Mr. Black says this, but on the editorial page Mr. Black will invariably say that. The gap is only a few pages apart but it is too wide ever to be bridged. The estimable Wall Street Journal, July 14, accused us of alarmist views on school shortages because we said galloping State-local indebtedness requires Federal aid. Nonsense, localities are doing all right, says the paper in rebuttal.

By a quaint coincidence we had based our alarmist reflections on a lead story in a prominent New York newspaper with this headline last June 2: "Troubled Cities: Their Deficits Grow as They Try To Meet Demands for Services—Oak Park, Mich., Policemen Fight Fires—Boston Frets Over its Downtown Needs—More Help From Uncle Sam?" The carefully documented article was signed "Mitchell Gordon, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal."

Which paper d'ya read?

It is informative, perhaps, to excerpt the Wall Street Journal's debate with itself:

"We didn't realize how tough things were until we came across this last-ditch plea in the New Republic." (Wall Street Journal editorial, July 14.)

"In major metropolises and crossroad hamlets around the country, municipal taxes are going up these days—but not fast enough to keep deficits from rising, too." (Wall Street Journal news article, June 8.)

"Some States have hardly any official indebtedness. Altogether, State and local debt totals some $64 billion; that of the Federal Government, which has gone up only 8 percent since the war, is $289 billion." (Wall Street Journal editorial, July 14.)

"Nearly all city finance men contend that State and Federal Governments are going to have to step in increasingly to help ease the cities' worsening predicament." (Wall Street Journal news article, June 8.)

"The States and localities have gone ahead in recent years building classrooms at a pace that could result in a classroom surplus by the end of the decade rather than the lamented 'shortage.'" (Wall Street Journal editorial, July 14.)

"Education's financial demands on the cities are great. New York City, for example, is spending nearly 20 percent of its current budget on education. In Birmingham, Ala., City Controller Sidney Grady Fullerton, Jr., calls schools 'the real problem with us.'" (Wall Street Journal news article, June 8.)

"In 1960, the volume and approval rate of school bonds set new records at elections." (Wall Street Journal editorial, July 14.)

"Municipal officials complain the education burden is getting to be more of a problem for them because taxpayers are growing increasingly antagonistic toward bond issues for new schools." (Wall Street Journal news article, June 8.)

The Wall Street Journal editorial makes these statements:

"Some States have hardly any official indebtedness."

(True of about six States which have passed debt on to cities. But since the war Federal debt has increased only about 8 percent; State and local debt 400 percent.)

"Only one-half of 1 percent of all school districts in the United States have reached the limit of their available bonded indebtedness for school construction."

(If a school district spends $10 million but is still $5 under its legal limit it comes under the generalization above, vague and largely meaningless.)

"In 1960, the volume approval rate of school bonds set new records at elections."

(There were also about 1.5 million more children. Sale of school bonds isn't keeping up with population increase.)

"No State legislature has ever asked the Federal Government for school aid." (Incorrect. Better research it again Wall Street Journal.)

"Nor has a local school board official ever testified in favor of a Federal aid bill."

(So many petitions have been received by Congress from local school board officials that they aren't even counted.)

Well, that's the story. Moscow has beaten us in science again, and once more at home American kids have been smugly gypped on school aid.

Crimes Aboard Aircraft in Air Commerce

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend our subcommittee chairman, Mr. WILLIAMS, not only for the very prompt action he took on this bill but in the very meticulous manner in which the legislation was formulated. And, I might say that I think this certainly fills a vacuum in the jurisdiction, enforcement, and punishment of those crimes aboard aircraft that is highly essential, and might also have a definite retarding effect, so to speak, on the number of so-called crackpot cases of this nature that always spring up just as they did in the epidemic of aircraft bombings a couple of years ago.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Johnson Does Masterful Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln:

JOHNSON DOES MASTERFUL JOB

(By Gould Lincoln)

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON did the job he was sent to do in West Berlin—and he did it well. His mission was the most important ever assigned to a Vice President of the United States, in view of the tension which had built up over the Berlin situation. It was touch and go whether the effort of the Kremlin leaders to convince the West Berliners, the countries of the free world and the so-called neutralist nations that the United States was indeed a "paper tiger" would succeed. The Vice President's visit to reassure the West Berliners this country was prepared to stand firm in their defense, plus the immediate strengthening of the American military forces in West Berlin, has been of great value. In the first place, it has restored the morale of the West Berliners, which had been sadly strained by the slow approach to the situation caused by the Communist East German blockage of the border between East and West Berlin. In the second place it has, or should have, convinced the Kremlin that President Kennedy was not speaking idly when he told the American people and the peoples of the world that this country would not be forced or bullied out of its rights in West Berlin. And third, it has placed the cause of the present crisis right where it should be placed—in the lap of the Communists, for all the world to see and understand.

The reaction of the Kremlin and its satellites and Red China has been just what would have been expected. They have attempted to picture the JOHNSON visit, the Vice President's firm statements, and the assignment of added military forces to the area as attempts of this country to increase tension between the East and the West almost to the brink of war. The fact is that the tension already had been increased by the Russians and their puppet government in East Germany. This should not be difficult for the Allied free nations and the neutralists to grasp.

CONFERENCES EXPECTED

The JOHNSON visit has been salutary, but it still leaves the Berlin problem where it was before, and has been for the last 16 years. Unless the Reds intend to force us to military action, the next step seems to be diplomatic conferences. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said Sunday in a televised broadcast ("Meet the Press") that he did not believe the Soviet Government wished war over Berlin. He also said he believed the Berlin issue would be discussed by the interested powers, though he did not undertake in any way to be specific as to time, place or character of the expected conference. Russian Premier Khrushchev, meanwhile, has not backed away at all from his declared purpose to sign a peace treaty with his puppet East German government. Also he has now suggested that whatever rights the United States, Britain and France claim they have as a result of agreements at the time of the cessation of hostilities—the end of World War II—are no longer existent.

REDS BLOCK SOLUTION

The West has made frequent suggestions to the Soviet Government for a solution of the Berlin and the divided Germany problems. In every case they have been rejected. What is clear is that the Kremlin has been stalling any adjustment, believing that in the end they will be able to take over all Berlin. They have been putting the pressure on now and again, while building up their military strength. They have believed that finally they could scare the United States and its allies into making concessions which could lead to the engulfment of the 2.5 million West Berliners in the Communist state of East Berlin. It will be interesting to see what further lines of pressure the Kremlin exerts before they go to the conference table.

Vice President JOHNSON, who was accompanied to West Berlin by Gen. Lucius Clay, the commander of U.S. forces in that area in 1948 when the Communist attempted a blockade of West Berlin and failed because of our successful airlift, has reported to President Kennedy what he found in Berlin, as well as the result of his talk with West German Chancellor Adenauer.

The Kennedy administration has been engaged in conferences with the British, French, and the West German Governments and NATO regarding the course to be followed over Soviet attempts to take over the West Berliners. So far, there has been solidarity of purpose on the part of the Western Allies. The Reds have tried and will try again to break this solidarity. They are clever maneuverers. They will do what they can to obtain their goals without war. There remains the question whether they will use armed force finally. That is the problem the Kennedy administration faces, and will continue to face unless the Kremlin has a change of heart.

Vice President JOHNSON, said, indeed, no more than President Kennedy, himself, had said earlier—that we would never give up on West Berlin. His appearance on the scene of the crisis at this particular time, however, was more effective. He brought with him a promise of action that changed the atmosphere.

Government Support of Business Has No Place in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system has proven to be the best system devised for the progress and development of the individual. Any Government interference with the processes of the free enterprise system weakens the entire structure. In other words, we cannot have a little bit of socialism. Once we start down that road, through Government efforts to support or control any line of business, it will be difficult to halt the direction.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News makes an important point that too many of us have forgotten.

RIGHT TO GO BROKE

Dale Witham, in Clark News (house organ of Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich.), presents the idea that the right to go broke is essential to the development of free enterprise.

A business has the right to propose a new article, a new service or a new price to the trade, he argues. And the trade has a right to go somewhere else for what it wants. In the competition between one business and another, one survives and another doesn't. The customers decide who wins and who loses.

Every time Government steps in to protect a losing business from going under, Mr. Witham argues, tax money is poured in—and things are no better than they were before. He points to the effort of Congress to make it illegal for a farmer to fail. But if the farmer grows too much, the consuming public has the right to stop buying when it has had enough. And piling the surplus up under Government subsidy still leaves farming as a failure to gear output to demand.

Of course, if nobody fails and nobody can fail, there is an end to competition and an end to keen incentive to improve methods, service and product.

Federal Aid to Education and Other Socialistic Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Mr. Alan L. Barrett, 1127 South Bristol Street, Santa Ana, Calif. This letter portrays the feelings of Alan and his friends toward the proposed Federal aid to education program, as well as other socialistic legislation:

AUGUST 14, 1961.

Mr. JAMES B. UTT,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UTT: In April of this year I wrote to you concerning Federal aid to education, more specifically, that portion related to veterans. At that time I wished to inform you that I favored Federal aid to all veterans, not just to those who were in active service during wartime. Since April I have furthered my education by taking a course in political science at Santa Ana College. What I have learned in that particular class and what I have assimilated through supplementary reading is that most programs for Federal aid to education are superficial, wasteful, inequitable, and unnecessary. I am now concerned with the fact that extension of veteran's benefits is a socialistic move at best, and therefore wish to reverse my stand by opposing such benefits.

You inquired in your reply of May 4 as to whether or not I was a former cadet at the Military Academy as indicated by your records. Yes, I was appointed by yourself in July of 1956. I attended until January of 1959 at which time I was dismissed for deficiency in mathematics. I have always appreciated your selecting me for the appointment, however, and am very greateful for the experience gained there in attending as long as I did. I wish to pursue my education to finality as I am doing now however, and I am thoroughly convinced I can do it on my own without Federal aid. I think the words of Mr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College in Illinois, are especially applicable here. He said, as regards to accepting Federal aid to a proposed building program at his college, "I feel that the dependence on National Government to solve all problems weakens the moral fiber of its citizens. Man's human stature rises as he is self-sufficient, and declines as he is dependent." I heartily agree with the view expressed here.

I wish to expand my position even further by stating that I and those friends of mine whom I consider intelligent, are growing more and more opposed to socialistic legislation in any form and are behind you to the limit in the work you are trying to do in Congress along these lines.

I have heard many people talk of your proposed "liberty amendment" but confess I am not qualified to discuss it simply because I have not read it. Would you please send me a copy so I can familiarize myself with it? I assure you that I will communicate with you on my views, and those of my family and friends in the near future. Until then you have our best wishes.

Very sincerely,

ALAN L. BARRETT.

One at a Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

ONE AT A TIME

Many of our freedoms are being lost while we seem not to notice. Year after year, there are fewer and fewer areas into which Federal regulation has not encroached.

Government bureaus exist to regulate farming, jobs, relations between employer and employee, and other broad areas of business operation. Excessively heavy taxes make it more and more difficult for an American citizen to accumulate sufficient savings to take care of himself in his old age. The length of the so-called normal workweek is set by a Government agency.

All of these things have been done at a time.

Each advance along the road that leads directly away from freedom probably seems a small movement, a hardly noticeable movement. Most often each step away from freedom was made possible by a promise of something for nothing. A far-reaching system of grants, subsidies, rewards, and penalties has been set up to finance the flight from freedom.

And the end is not yet. Every year additions to the regulatory system are proposed. Each of these offers something to somebody. Each one demands the surrender of a little more of the freedom of the individual American citizen and the handing over to the Government of more power over more people.

Those who give up their right to decide their own affairs for themselves may find it temporarily profitable. Those who protest or rebel find it costly. In the end, both groups—all Americans—suffer great harm. For freedom once lost is more difficult to regain.

We can do something more than wring our hands over this state of affairs. First of all, we can—each of us individually, all of us

together—make a clear and conscious choice in favor of freedom.

We can make our choice and then we can actively seek out others who also choose freedom. This is a time for patriotism in America. This is a time for us to be proud of the fact that we are patriots, and to let our fellow Americans know that we stand up for freedom.

The Communists and their fellow travelers are always at work against freedom. We can meet their challenge only by our own unceasing vigilance, our own equally constant efforts to uphold freedom, and our own continuing reliance on the right of free men under God to work out their own destinies.

The Farm Program and the Price of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Sunday News of August 20 contains a brief editorial which points up very effectively the dilemma which confronts American consumers in the form of agricultural price support legislation.

The news that the price of bread is expected to rise will come as a particularly distasteful shock to every American housewife and every American taxpayer.

Each year we are asked to pay billions of dollars to support the prices farmers receive for so-called basic farm commodities, and each year we are told that farmers' income is inadequate.

Each year we are asked to pay additional billions to store the surplus crops which American consumers cannot consume and which foreign consumers often cannot afford to buy.

For all their billions, American taxpayers might be pardoned for expecting that the price they pay for food would reflect, in lower prices, the subsidy they pay to producers. Yet, almost as regularly as taxes come due, we read the bitter news that the price of bread or some other commodity affected by the price support program is about to go up. Where will it stop?

The editorial follows:

MORE FOR BREAD

The price of bread is about to rise and as proprietors of the biggest piles of surplus grain in history, the American public is entitled to some curiosity about it. The answer is as simple as the Government farm program. This summer's drought hit hardest at the high-protein wheat bakers want, and that's the kind of wheat we have the least of in surplus storage.

Of the 1.4 billion bushels of surplus wheat, most of it stored at taxpayer expense, only 235 million bushels are suitable for bakery use. Even this seems a generous offset against the crop dent made by the drought, but that's where the Government's genius in such matters becomes a factor.

The Government is about to raise the wheat support price from $1.79 to $2 a bushel for 1962. Shrewd farmers, who have learned to watch Washington instead of the weather, are understandably reluctant to market their crops now when by marking time they'll get more for it.

Already this combination of drought and Government has driven the price of Hard Winter flour at New York from $6.20 per 100 pounds to $6.55. Thus the consumer's reward for shoveling $6 billion this year into the "big brother" farm program is the added privilege of paying more for his bread.

The Doom and Renewal of Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago I offered for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by a very distinguished world statesman, Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon.

Dr. Malik is in this country now. He is a professor at American University. He delivered the commencement address at American University on June 11 of this year. It was a remarkable address, one which brings some hope and encouragement despite the present terrible, troublesome world conditions.

At that time I asked unanimous consent that Dr. Malik's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address has been returned to me by the Government Printing Office with the statement that it exceeds by one-quarter of a page the amount which is authorized for printing under the rule. The total cost of printing the entire address is estimated at $182.25.

In accordance with the Rules of the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding its excess length, the address by Dr. Malik be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I believe a reading of the speech now would be most interesting because it is most timely. Dr. Malik began his address as follows:

Nothing is easier today than to dwell pathetically on the elements of doom and disaster. The grounds of discouragement are so numerous that it takes at times a violent wrenching of the spirit to wake up to the real elements of hope and renewal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOOM AND RENEWAL OF CIVILIZATION

(Commencement address by Dr. Charles Malik, university professor at the American University in Washington, D.C.; professor of philosophy at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon; former president of the General Assembly of the United Nations; former Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lebanon; former Ambassador of Lebanon in Washington, D.C.)

I

Nothing is easier today than to dwell pathetically on the elements of doom and disaster. The grounds of discouragement are so numerous that it takes at times a violent wrenching of the spirit to wake up to the real elements of hope and renewal. It is good to analyze and criticize and face the ugly facts, and not to face them in truth and honesty would be a terrible sin. But analysis would also become a terrible sin if it landed us in despair while we still believed in the creative powers of man and God. And the facts, especially if taken in their totality and seen in the right perspective, are not as ugly as some gloomy minds are in the habit of painting them. Far from disaster being the inevitable issue of the present trend of things, it is altogether possible that humanity is on the verge of a new age, as wonderful in its brilliance as completely unknown as yet in its character. The present moment therefore tests at once our ability to see the obvious truth without blinking and our ability to see the deeper truth of faith without doubting.

II

Who is not troubled today by the great strain which the family is undergoing under the complex conditions of modern life—parents often pulled in different directions; parents not having enough time to see and love and play with their children?

Who has not wondered at the inordinate spread of juvenile delinquency in modern society?

Who has not noticed or suffered from the general collapse of morals in the world—standards of integrity, honesty, purity, truth, no longer holding, the soul being ready, not only to yield to temptation without resisting, but at times even actively to seek occasions of temptation itself?

Who has not made telling observations on the effect of the machine on the human mind and on the whole tone and character of contemporary civilization?

Who has not lamented the dullness, drabness, mechanicalness, and unnaturalness of urban existence—this existence which is spreading all over the world at a terrific rate—and who has not time and again longed to return to the simple life of nature?

Who is not infected by the general malaise of nervousness, hecticness, movement, meaninglessness, absence of peace and grace and rest for the poor and tormented human soul?

In the social sphere, who is not upset by the disregard for human rights and fundamental freedoms and by the consequent eruption of unreason and violence to assert these rights?

Who is not profoundly disturbed by the phenomenal spread of communism in recent decades—by its holding in its iron grip one-third of mankind today and its softening, infiltrating, and intimidating in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds?

Who is not perplexed by the apparent impotence of the free world to push back or even at times to resist this incredible Communist onslaught?

Who has not perceived in his own life and in the life of society an increasing emphasis on materialism, secularism and relativism—an emphasis serving as the ideal spiritual preparation for an eventual Communist takeover?

Who is not dismayed by the constant shrinkage of the domain of freedom—the mind of man being more and more subjected to arbitrary and tyrannical systems?

Who is not frustrated by the recent political and military reverses, and by the apparently insufficient progress in certain sectors of economics and technology?

Who does not live in fear of war—the unimaginable holocaust of the atom?

Who is not paralyzed in his planning—the future being so uncertain, so mysterious, so inscrutable?

And as a result of all this, who is not entertaining some doubt at least as to whether Western civilization can much longer endure—with communism attacking it at every point from without, with fear, softness and uncertainty undermining it from within, and with the neutralist world at least indifferent to its fate?

III

There is no dearth therefore of grounds for discouragement and frustration.

He must conclude that civilization is doomed who dwells only on these things and what they imply. The company of the Spenglers and Toynbees has lately increased, I mean those who affect the knowledge of a law of growth and decay according to which civilizations develop and decline. These people for the most part live in their ideas and not in the world. According to these theories, civilizations, like individuals, age, and when the end comes, they must die and fresh civilizations will arise on their debris. This impersonal, cyclic determinism goes back to pagan thought, both Greek and Oriental. It antedates and lies outside the heart of the Christian message, the message which insists that nature, decay, corruption and death can never be the last word. Marxism essentially belongs to the same type of impersonal, non-Christian thought. Theories of the most ingenious character are devised by these outlooks to prove that Western civilization has exhausted itself, that immanent in its development has been an inexorable law of decay, that this law operates completely independently of the human will, and that the end is not far off when, fatigued and unable to revive itself, Western civilization lays down its burden and other youthful shoulders carry on the torch. These theories, suggestive and erudite as they may be, nevertheless forget two decisive things: the freedom of man and the mystery of God. Through his freedom there is no impersonal law of history that man cannot rise above and alter, and through His mystery there is no law of death that God, in His freedom, cannot overcome.

I shall therefore indicate, in the briefest possible terms, the main lines of thought which, in my opinion, constitute the real grounds of hope, and which will, when fully developed, demonstrate that, far from doom being the fate of civilization, it is probably renewal that is just around the corner.

IV

The West contains the greatest concentration, by far, of science, technology, and industry in the world. These things are rooted in a cumulative tradition that extends for thousands of years. They are also self-perpetuating. They represent much more than mere mechanical technique: they represent a fundamental, theoretical attitude of a whole culture toward nature, man, and history—an attitude that canont be transplanted to other cultures overnight. With Germany and Japan securely on the Western side, and with science and technology developing as they are in the West, there is no reason to believe that any comparable concentration will arise anywhere else in the world for at least another century. In the space of a century of scientific and technological superiority, in which the mind is truly alerted to the ultimate issues of destiny, much indeed can be assured.

This is so far as science and nature and the harnessing of nature's forces are concerned. What about man and culture and history? The dimension of history is now more fully disclosed to the inquiring mind than ever before. And, incidentally, it is the canons of Western scholarship itself that have opened this majestic dimension of the past—not only of the Western past, but of every past. It is almost literally true that the past, in its fundamental structures, is now a completely open book. One need not fear that there is anything important still hidden that will, when uncovered one day, truly astound the world. There will be endless refinements, but the basic contributions are all known. Let every living culture, therefore, display its full achievements. In the total array of cultures and civilizations that can thus be fathomed, Western civilization, rooted as it is in Greece, Rome, the Near East, the Mediterranean, and Western Europe, stands out as something quite unique. In its unbroken continuity 4,000 years or more, in the creative principles of thought and feeling it established, in the patient disclosure of the mystery of God which it has inherited and which it can never disown, in the incomparable products of beauty and reflection and worship and political wisdom and collective endeavor which it has deposited, it need not feel any sense of inferiority with respect to any other civilization whatsoever. In fact all other civilizations have learned and continue to learn from it, far more than it has any need to learn from them. This is its distinctive universal and humane character; namely, its preoccupation with truth, the truth that is valid for all; and its concentration upon man as the origin, center, and end of everything. He who, placing himself above any silly political or diplomatic considerations in order to see the truth in itself and for its own sake, penetrates to the depths of achievement of Western civilization, has no doubt whatever about its infinite sources of strength. The only question is whether those of its children who have been initiated into its deepest mysteries are going to prove worthy of what they have received and known.

The total forces of the West have not been fully committed. This is most important. Should the occasion arise for the total commitment of these forces, who can predict the outcome? Every time this happened in the past, the West came out in the end victorious. Let the West as a whole really feel the pinch, and then I doubt whether anything can stand in its way. Having regard to its infinite potentialities of mind, morals, and material, and to the creative potency of freedom, I do not have the slightest doubt that the enemies of God, man, and freedom will not have the last word—no matter how much suffering the resistance and destruction of them will entail.

There is a remarkable awakening in America as to the issues and dangers involved. This has never happened before in peacetime. People seem to me to be ready for any eventuality: they only ask to be told what is expected of them. It is quite possible that in many respects the people are ahead of their leaders. I feel that in a matter of days, if not hours, they could be galvanized into the most heroic action. A civilization that is thus alert and ready cannot be said to be nearing its end.

This raises the question of coordination. The greatest danger is uncoordinated individualism, the frittering away of effort, the nonconvergence of energy and interest onto a single point, onto a unitary outcome. People are excited; they sense the danger; they want to join in some common effort; they crave to know what that common effort is; but so far nobody has told them, nobody has summoned them to a supreme effort for the common good. A man demanding that he be shown the way, yet appearing to wait indefinitely without anybody showing him the way, soon develops a terrible inner frustration. If Western civilization goes down, it will be only because its leadership has failed to show it the way. There is no impersonal law of growth and decay here at work whatsoever. There is the very personal moral failure of the leaders to show the way. And a real way out most certainly there is. The actual, ready potentialities of this civilization, in every sphere, are so tremendous, so overpowering, that with the proper coordination and the right voice of leadership it can rise to any challenge. The greatest danger today is that either this leadership is not forthcoming or its voice will come too late.

V

The fervor and dedication with which the great peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are renewing their life are matters of the greatest satisfaction. Only good can come out of this peaceful renewal. They are fully entitled to the opportunity of enjoying the natural right to be themselves in freedom; namely, to fall back upon themselves, to search their own souls, to discover the grounds of their native dignity, and thus to enter anew into the dynamics and responsibilities of history. An order of equality and mutual respect and appreciation should prevail. It is far better and healthier to be dealing with moral equals than with inferiors or superiors; because that is the order of freedom in which nothing can be taken for granted and you should always be on the alert. That is why I regard the rise of the East as being, not cause for alarm and doom of the West, but ground for its renewal. You can really be at your best only in the company of moral equals. There is no relaxation any more with the East questioning and challenging the West at its deepest. A genuine renewal is not when you renew yourself while the rest of the world remains snoring; a genuine renewal can only be an organic part of the total renewal of all.

I do not despair of Russia and the West reaching some kind of an agreement. Of course this will not happen while communism, which as a total world outlook contradicts all the fundamental values of the West, rules the Russians. I am not at all thinking of communism versus capitalism here; I am thinking of communism as a religion—as an absolute materialistic-atheistic interpretation of man, society, history, and the final things. But I trust the Russian people, on the basis of their own creative background, to see in their own day the sham and falsehood of this outlook, and thus to rid themselves of its yoke. I have a great faith in the Russian spirit performing this miracle one day. This can come about only if the West does not let the Russian people down, either by hating them, or by identifying them with the Communist Party, or by ceasing to commune with them on every possible level, or by failing to appreciate their great spiritual genius, or by itself turning materialistic and forgetting about its great spiritual heritage. But should the Russians rid themselves of communism and return to their wonderful original spirituality (and no return can ever be to the same position), and should they then live in full spiritual and temporal peace with the rest of the world, then I should like to see the despairing spirits who prophesy the doom of Western civilization. These spirits seem to me to be praying that such a fundamental understanding does not take place. But a genuine reconciliation between Russia and the West, certainly not on the basis of communism, but on the basis of a renewed Russia that has purged herself of communism, could bring about the greatest renewal of Western civilization in its history. A whole new epoch for the whole of humanity, absolutely wonderful in its promise, will then dawn. Such a thing is not impossible, and its mere possibility disproves any silly determinism with respect to the fate of Western civilization.

VI

One must never underestimate the power of freedom. It is most significant that the great expression of the freedom of man which we find in Dr. Zhivago scared the Communists out of their wits all over the world. One must keep the torch of freedom burning—in his soul, in his country, before the world. The children of freedom little know what a world-shaking and world-transforming weapon they can wield. Only they must not let material values overwhelm the wonderful spiritual values of freedom. It is original freedom that creates all economic and material values, and these can never by themselves create freedom. The fate of the world hangs on the extent to which the

West shall remain actively faithful to the creative freedom which is at the base of all that is true and good and beautiful and graceful and holy in all civilization.

I am encouraged by the diverse movements for church unity. The Protestants appear to be getting closer together, and I consider the decision of the Presbyterians last month to seek unity with three other Protestant groups an historic decision. A major theme of the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches next November in New Delhi is going to be this question of unity. The Ecumenical Council which the Pope called on the subject of unity testifies to a new spirit animating Rome today. The Orthodox all over thirst for unity and communion, and the Russian Orthodox Church's recent decision to join the World Council of Churches must be interpreated as a sincere expression of this thirst. What is most encouraging in all these gropings, from my point of view, is that the principle sought is not a watering down of faith and doctrine, but a decided return to a new orthodoxy. The problems are still insuperable, but we are dealing here, not with what is impossible with man, but with what is possible to God. Let the Christians really constitute One Body, or at least let them, in perfect charity, come appreciably closer together, and you do not then need to worry at all about the fate of civilization. The Christians cannot sit back and carp at their political leaders; they are even more responsible than these leaders for the fate of their civilization; they, even more than the politicians, must assume full responsibility for what the future holds in store.

The new spiritual leavening is further evidenced by the widespread intense interest in the Bible, in the Liturgy, in the Sacraments, in fundamental theology, and in the original tradition. If you compare what the seminaries now teach and produce with the silly and superficial rationalism and liberalism and humanism and psychologism which dominated them only a generation ago, you think you are dealing with two different ages altogether. The unfathomable mystery of God is again impinging on the dull mind of man, with incalculable consequences precisely for the fate of civilization itself.

VII

Civilization is the joint creation of God and man: it is a human-divine artifact. The very essence of God is freedom, and man, insofar as he is human, participates in the divine essence. Therefore it is nonsense, on strict metaphysical grounds, to speak of civilization subject to the iron laws of fate. Through the free action of God and man every decay can be arrested and every civilization can be redeemed. Those who talk of the doom of civilization may not have known the renewing power of God in their own lives. And those who know this power know also that one man thus renewed may save the whole world.

In addressing civilized and learned audiences one is not supposed to mention Jesus Christ. Such a mention shocks and disturbs. Rather one is supposed to dissolve Christ into generalities, ideas, principles. And so one had better talk of "spiritual values" or "religious principles" or at most "Christian truths." But the greatest thing about any civilization is the human person, and the greatest thing about this person is the possibility of his encounter with the Person of Jesus Christ. With your permission therefore I shall not dissolve Christ into principles and generalities.

When we speak of a thing we mean primarily its essence. Certainly Jesus Christ, the church, the cross, belong to the essence of Western civilization. Whatever is doomed, these are not doomed: on the contrary, they doom everything else. The renewal of Western civilization is guaranteed so long as Jesus Christ remains at its heart. Let it forsake Him, and forthwith it dooms itself. And to the extent it has forsaken Him and He is no longer at its heart, it has doomed itself.

He who is living—and living here means the life of responsibility and decision, the life in which you cannot have everything but you must decide in favor only of one alternative and ruthlessly and responsibly destroy a number of alternatives—and not only thinking and philosophizing in this age certainly must feel that things are passionately straining toward an event to come. This is a preeminently eschatological age, There is a sense in which everything is now groaning, travailing, waiting, expecting—something to come. If you do not feel this in your bones, you are not living in this age. In the end an act of divine intervention is necessary to precipitate and crystallize the whole thing. A day of judgment, I assure you, is at hand. We should never expect anything less than the face of God Himself, renewing and replenishing the face of the earth.

An intense personal existence, like that of David, in which the struggle against the Devil and his forces is carried to the *n*th degree in the presence of God; an existence therefore whose personal suffering is not wasted, but is wonderfully redeemed by the Cross; an existence which is never passive, but is most active in its waiting on the Lord; an existence which, because it knows God, believes in miracles—real, not imaginary, not sentimental, miracles—and expects them; an existence which is straining every nerve toward a fundamental spiritual breakthrough: a breakthrough, not only of man to God, but above all of God to man—this kind of existence, still perfectly possible to those who will be born anew, regardless of their rigidity and regardless of their age, will be rewarded, by the freedom and mercy of God, with a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit which will transform the face of the earth—this earth of sorrow and tears, this earth of suffering and estrangement, this earth of misunderstanding and pain, this earth of narrowness and greed, this earth of loneliness and rebellion, this earth which has willfully separated itself from God.

To you who are going out of these halls of learning into this intensely charged and expectant world, let me assure you that every generation from the beginning of time is envying you. It is the greatest honour to be living today. You may be destined to play a decisive role in the certain coming renewal of civilization.

Therefore face your historic task with the utmost expectancy. Trust in the living God. Remember that He is pleased only with the humble. Believe in freedom. Wish it and work for it for all. Be strong in the right. Love your fellow men. Never weary in serving them. Never betray the deepest in your heritage. Never turn to strange, new gods. Treat yourselves always with a sense of humour. And so live and suffer as to be always ready to face your Maker, always asking His forgiveness and always thanking Him from the bottom of your heart.

National Lottery of Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Bolivia. This lottery is operated solely for the benefit of health and welfare agencies in the country.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Bolivian lottery came to about $1 million. The profits in that year amounted to some $400,000. This income was not retained by the Government but was distributed to several welfare and charitable organizations. Half of the money went to the Bolivian Red Cross.

Bolivia is not a rich country by any means, and a national lottery offers needed revenues. These moneys are well used. America, with all its affluence, could derive tremendous financial benefits from a lottery. Why are we holding back?

"The Rule of Reason in Antitrust Law"—An Address by Hon. Lee Loevinger Before the American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law, August 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of the Honorable Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Departmento f Justice..

Judge Loevinger's remarks center heavily on the "rule of reason." The application of this rule in antitrust law is of particular interest in connection with bank mergers and the increasing activities of bank holding companies.

Judge Loevinger's remarks follow:

THE RULE OF REASON IN ANTITRUST LAW

(Address by Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, before the American Bar Association Section of Antitrust Law, St. Louis, Mo., August 7, 1961)

Running through the history of antitrust law are two contrapuntal themes: A prohibition of restraint of trade and a principle lately called the "rule of reason" which limits the prohibition. The legal rule against restraint of trade began in the 15th century in cases holding that a contract by which a man agreed not to practice his trade or profession was illegal.[1] However, in the course of development of the common law, it became established that agreements which were ancillary to the sale or transfer of a trade or business and which were limited so as to impose a restriction no greater than reasonably necessary to protect the purchaser's interest were legal.[2]

Thus, when the Sherman Act, by adopting the concept of restraint of trade incorporated the common-law principles on this subject into the Federal statutory law[3] it presumably imported both the principle that restrictions on competition are illegal and also the principle that in some circumstances a showing of reasonableness will legalize some restrictions on competition. Nevertheless, when the question was first presented

Footnotes at end of speech.

to the U.S. Supreme Court under the Sherman Act, it was clearly held (despite later disavowals) that no justification of reasonableness was available as a defense to a combination which had the effect of restraining trade.[4] Indeed, it was intimated that no question of reasonableness was open to the courts with reference to such an issue at common law.[5] However, when the Court came to review the matter in the first Standard Oil case [6] the Court said in fairly explicit terms both that the Sherman Act prohibited only contracts or acts which were unreasonably restrictive of competition and also that the standard of reasonableness had been applied to all restraints of trade at the common law. The Court's assertion is somewhat weakened by the fact that it construes the rule of reason, not as applying a standard for judging the character or consequences of the challenged conduct, but as a technique involving the application of human intelligence, or reason, to the problem of arriving at a judgment.

The holding of the Court in the Standard Oil case has established rules for the interpretation and application of the Sherman Act that have guided antitrust enforcement since 1911. However, the analysis by which the opir'on arrived at its conclusions leaves somethings to be desired in terms of semantic lucidity. But even in that opinion the Court was at some pains to state that where the character or necessary effect of assailed acts was to restrain trade, they could not be taken out of the scope of the statute by general reasoning as to their expediency or nonexpediency. This point was elucidated in the first tobacco company case which followed shortly thereafter.[7]

In this opinion, the Court stated that the antitrust law embraced acts which, because of their inherent nature, effect or purpose, restrained trade or restricted competition. It said that the statute did not forbid normal and usual contracts to further trade by resorting to all normal business methods. The Court said that the rule of reason was not that acts which the statute prohibited could be removed from its prohibitions by a showing that they were reasonable, but that the duty to interpret the term "restraint of trade" required a reasonable meaning which would not destroy the individual right to contract and carry on trade.

As might be expected, the promulgation of this rule of reason resulted in an attempt by defendants to justify every restrictive combination that was attacked on the grounds that, in the light of all the economic facts and conditions, the particular practice assailed is reasonable. The courts have responded to this by developing a doctrine of so-called "per se" violations which are held to be prohibited by the antitrust laws regardless of any asserted justification or alleged reasonableness. Such category of violations are sometimes referred to as "unlawful per se" [8] and it is sometimes said that such acts are illegal per se regardless of their reasonableness.[9] However, such a view suggests an arbitrary holding which, in my opinion, is not justified by an analysis of the cases themselves. Rather, I think the correct analysis is indicated by the statement of the Court in the Socony-Vacuum case that "Agreements for price maintenance * * * are, without more, unreasonable restraints within the meaning of the Sherman Act because they eliminate competition * * *" [10] and by the statement in certain later cases that tie-in agreements and similar arrangements are "unreasonable per se." [11] This view seems to be that which the Court itself is now taking as indicated by the statement in the Northern Pacific decision that "There are certain agreements or practices which because of their pernicious effect on competition and lack of any redeeming virtue are conclusively presumed to be unreasonable and, therefore, illegal without elaborate inquiry as to the precise harm they have caused or the business excuse for their use." [12] In the apt phrase of a recent decision, such practices are "intrinsically unreasonable." [13]

In this view, the distinction to be made between the categories of acts which are prohibited by the antitrust laws is between those which are intrinsically and those which are extrinsically unreasonable. Acts which are intrinsically unreasonable violate the antitrust laws because their inherent character is so restrictive of competition that the courts will not undertake an elaborate economic inquiry into their purposes, tendencies or effects, or into the circumstances giving rise to their adoption and use.

Over the years a number of specific practices have been found to be thus intrinsically unreasonable and, therefore, illegal under the antitrust laws.

First, of course, are the traditional agreements not to compete which are not ancillary to a legitimate contract. Such nonancillary covenants against competition are clearly illegal.[14]

A second category of conduct which is intrinsically unreasonable and, therefore, illegal is that of collusive price fixing. As has been established in many cases, price-fixing combinations are illegal whether they are horizontal [15] or vertical.[16]

Third, as was recognized by the Attorney General's committee, there is little doubt, either as a matter of principle or of precedent,, that agreements among competitors for market division, should be and are treated like price-control arrangements.[17] As recent cases have illustrated, a division of the market between competitors is intrinsically unreasonable, and therefore illegal, whether it occurs by way of allocation of territories or of customers.[18]

A fourth class of intrinsically unreasonable activities is that composed of group boycotts of any character. These are intrinsically unreasonable, and therefore illegal, whether they are purely commercial in nature [19] or purportedly based upon some broader or more elaborate general justification.[20]

The fifth category of intrinsically unreasonable combinations is that which forecloses competitors from any substantial market by tie-in agreements.[21] The variations of such agreements and the qualifications of the rule suggested by recent cases make this category somewhat less distinct in its scope than those that have been mentioned. Perhaps the category itself is still in the process of judicial demarcation. But there seems little doubt that there is a class of intrinsically unreasonable tie-in agreements.

Finally, it seems fairly clear that agreements involving the pooling of profits and losses by competitors are intrinsically unreasonable and therefore illegally restrictive of competition.[22] It is likely that there are other practices which may, when the issue is squarely presented, be held to be intrinsically unreasonable. Thus, there is some suggestion that an agreement among competitors to limit the supply of a commodity may be intrinsically unreasonable and illegal.[23] Undoubtedly there are others that I have failed to note.

The infinite variety of practices that may be attacked as restraints of trade and that are not intrinsically unreasonable are those which may be found to be unreasonable because of extrinsic or circumstantial elements. These may be found unreasonable in any case because of their purpose, their tendency, or their effect.[24] In any event, the inquiry is not whether the acts complained of are expedient, but whether, because of the circumstances in which they occur, they are restrictive of competition by reason of their purpose, their tendency or their actual effect.

In the common mode of talking about these classes of cases, it is said that as to the first category, those which are intrinsically unreasonable, they are illegal per se; and that as to the second category, those which are extrinsically unreasonable, they are subject to the so-called "rule of reason". It seems to me that such terminology is essentially misleading and tends to be confusing of clear thought on the subject. The implication seems to be that, except for certain exceptional practices which are per se illegal, any restraint of trade may be justified by showing its expediency or utility to those involved. Such language suggests that reasonableness is irrelevant as to the so-called per se violations and that, as to all other violations, they are illegal only if such as would not be undertaken by a reasonable man.

A far more realistic approach is that the antitrust law is always concerned with a pragmatic judgment as to the reasonableness of trade practices from the social viewpoint. The difference between the categories of violation is between those which are instrinsically or inherently contrary to the social interest in competition by virtue of the nature of the acts involved, and those which are unreasonable only because of extrinsic conditions or circumstantial evidence. As to the latter category, the purpose, the tendency, and the effect of the acts upon competition must be established by evidence. As to those which are intrinsically or inherently unreasonable, their character is such that their economic tendency and effect is judicially known.

This is essentially the view now taken by the Supreme Court which has said, "This principle of per se unreasonableness not only makes the type of restraints which are proscribed by the Sherman Act more certain to the benefit of everyone concerned, but it also avoids the necessity for an incredibly complicated and prolonged economic investigation into the entire history of the industry involved, as well as related industries, in an effort to determine at large whether a particular restraint has been unreasonable—an inquiry so often wholly fruitless when undertaken." [25]

It is implicit in this approach to the subject that, whether the legal judgment is based upon intrinsic or extrinsic evidence, it is always intended to be both a pragmatic and a reasonable one. The law proscribes only practices which reasonable men have judged socially incompatible with the maintenance of a free competitive economy. The only difference between the categories of proscribed acts is whether evidence to establish the conclusion that they are unreasonable is inherent in the character of the acts or must be sought in the circumstantial setting. In any case, the rule of reason is implicit in every determination that any conduct is illegal as restraint of trade.

Such a view of the antitrust laws inevitably has consequences for an enforcement program. To begin with, as to practices which are intrinsically unreasonable—such as price fixing—these must be treated as equally forbidden to all business—whether it is big or small, either in assets or in market power. As to such practices, the relative or absolute size of a business has significance only as it may relate to the substantiality of the impact of the practices upon interstate commerce.

On the other hand, as to the far wider range of practices which are prohibited only as they may appear to be unreasonable in the setting of economic circumstances in which they occur, both the relative and the absolute size of the enterprises involved is significant. To pose only one obvious example: an acquisition or merger by a company that is already very large is far more likely

Footnotes at end of speech.

substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in contravention of the antitrust laws than a similar transaction by a company that is small in relation to its market. The intention of those who wrote the antitrust laws, the purpose that speaks from the laws themselves, and the spirit in which they have been construed, all combine to make manifest that a principal objective of the laws is to set a limit to the aggrandizement of economic power.

Unfortunately an antitrust enforcement program based upon such premises will set no statistical records. An increase in the number of cases filed is to be achieved only by increasing the number of defendants, which, since the number of big and powerful businesses is limited, is most likely to mean extending the scope of antitrust attack to the activities of enterprises that are successively smaller and weaker in their respective markets.

Since the resources of both the Antitrust Division and the courts are limited, this, in turn, has at least a tendency to result in diverting attention from the principal objectives of the laws. The effectiveness of antitrust enforcement cannot be measured by statistics as to numbers of cases started. Were the program of enforcement perfectly effective, there would be universal voluntary compliance, so that litigation would be confined entirely to the borderline cases in which the application of antitrust principles cannot be known without full judicial inquiry and determination. No such utopian condition seems imminent—or even ultimately prospective. However, such a hypothesis gives emphasis to the point that is significant. This is that the statistical measures of antitrust enforcement are misleading and deceptive. One antitrust case is not necessarily equal to all others. A large number of cases may have relative little economic impact, whereas a single case may have far-reaching consequences. Antitrust cases are also most unequal in the manpower, effort and resources required for prosecution, as they are in the results that may be achieved.

The purpose of antitrust enforcement is not to bring as many businesses as possible into court; it is not to put people in jail or to impose large fines; it is not to secure the entry of numerous injunctive decrees. The purpose of antitrust enforcement is to secure as free and competitive conditions as possible in the American economy. This is the principle by which we will seek to guide our enforcement efforts. Although the consequences for purposes of statistical comparison may be unfavorable, we believe that this is the most effective program to promote antitrust principles and achieve antitrust objectives.

---

[1] Loevinger, The Law of Free Enterprise (1949) p. 8 et seq.

[2] *Mitchell* v. *Reynolds* (1711) 1 P. Wms. 181, 24 Eng. Rep. 347; *Nordenfelt* v. *Maxim Nordenfelt G. A. Co. Ltd.* (1894) App. cases, 535; Cincinnati, etc. *Packet Co.* v. *Bay* (1906), 200 U.S. 179.

[3] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (1911) 221 U.S. 1.

[4] *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association* (1897), 166 U.S. 290; *United States* v. *Joint-Traffic Association* (1898), 171 U.S. 505.

[5] *Addyston Pipe and Steel Co.* v. *United States* (1899), 175 U.S. 211, at pp. 237–238.

[6] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (1911), 221 U.S. 1.

[7] *United States* v. *American Tobacco Company* (1911), 221 U.S. 106.

[8] *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (1940), 310 U.S. 150 at p. 218.

[9] *Las Vegas Merchant Plumbers' Association* v. *United States* (C.A. Nev., 1954), 210 Fed. 2d 732, cert. den. 348 U.S. 817, rehearing den. 348 U.S. 889.

[10] *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (1940), 310 U.S. 150, at p. 218 et seq.

[11] *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (1947), 332 U.S. 392; *Times-Picayune* v. *United States* (1953), 345 U.S. 594.

[12] *Northern Pacific Railroad* v. *United States* (1958), 356 U.S. 1, at p. 5.

[13] *Silver* v. *New York Stock Exchange* (U.S. D.C. S.D.N.Y., June 16, 1961).

[14] *Johnson* v. *J. Schlitz Brewing Co.* (1940), 33 Fed. Supp. 176; also see *United States* v. *Joint-Traffic Association* (1898), 171 U.S. 505; *Northern Securities Company* v. *United States* (1904), 193 U.S. 197; *Shawnee Compress Company* v. *Anderson* (1908), 209 U.S. 301; *United States* v. *Reading Co.* (1912), 226 U.S. 324; *United States* v. *Sisal Sales Corp.* (1927), 274 U.S. 268; *Morton Salt Co.* v. *Suppiger Co.* (1942), 314 U.S. 488; *Hartford-Empire Co.* v. *United States* (1945), 323 U.S. 386.

[15] *United States* v. *Trenton Potteries* (1927), 273 U.S. 392; *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (1940), 310 U.S. 150.

[16] *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.* (1911), 220 U.S. 373; *United States* v. *Univis Lens Co.* (1942), 316 U.S. 241; *United States.* v. *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* (1944), 321 U.S. 707; cf. *United States* v. *Colgate & Co.* (1919), 250 U.S. 300; *United States* v. *Parke, Davis & Co.* (1960), 362 U.S. 29.

[17] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws (1955), p. 26.

[18] *United States* v. *Consolidated Laundries Corp.* (C.A. 2d, May 31, 1961); *United States* v. *White Motor Company* (U.S.D.C. N.D. Ohio, 1961).

[19] *Klor's* v. *Broadway-Hale Stores* (1959), 359 U.S. 207 *Radiant Burners* v. *Peoples Gas Co.* (1961), 364 U.S. 656.

[20] *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (1941), 312 U.S. 457; *Silver* v. *New York Stock Exchange* (U.S.D.C. S.D.N.Y., June 16, 1961); W. Wallace Kirkpatrick, Commercial Boycotts as per se violations of the Sherman Act, 10 Geo. Washington, L.R., 302, 387 (January, February 1942).

[21] *International Salt Co.* v. *United States* (1947), 332 U.S. 392; *Times-Picayune* v. *United States* (1953), 345 U.S. 594; *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures Inc.* (1948), 334 U.S. 131; *Northern Pacific Railroad* v. *United States* (1958), 356 U.S. 1; but cf. *United States* v. *Jerrold Electronics Corp.* (1960) 187 F. Supp. 545, aff'd 365 U.S. 567; and *Dehydrating Process Co.* v. *A. O. Smith Corp.* (1 C.A. 1961) 1 ATRR X–9.

[22] *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc.* (1948), 334 U.S. 131.

[23] *Standard Oil Company* v. *United States* (1931), 283 U.S. 163; *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (1940), 310 U.S. 150.

[24] *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (1941), 312 U.S. 457; *United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.* (1948), 334 U.S. 495.

[25] *Northern Pacific Railroad* v. *United States* (1958), 356 U.S. 1, at p. 5.

Impacted School Areas: Crises Can Be Avoided by Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the education of millions of America's public schoolchildren will be impaired, in some cases very seriously, unless the impacted school area statutes are extended before Congress adjourns in less than 1 month. The signatures of Members of this body on a petition now at the Clerk's desk to discharge H.R. 5349 extending these statutes will help avoid the crises. I invite Members who have not already done so to add their signatures to this petition.

Congressman John Lindsay Reports on Millions Who Are Still Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] undertook a trip around the world, during the course of which he made a first-hand inspection of the refugee situation facing the nations and peoples of the world. In the light of this experience, Mr. LINDSAY continued his research into the refugee problem and prepared and introduced the Lindsay immigration bill. In order to report on his experiences and to stimulate discussion on the important refugee problem, Congressman LINDSAY has written an interesting and constructive article entitled "Still Millions of Refugees," which appears in the New York Times Sunday magazine of August 13. This report, guided toward finding a constructive solution for the refugee problem, merits the serious consideration of Mr. LINDSAY's colleagues and discussion by all Americans. I should like to place Congressman LINDSAY's article, "Still Millions of Refugees," in the RECORD:

STILL MILLIONS OF REFUGEES—WHEREVER AN UNSOLVED REFUGEE PROBLEM EXISTS, THERE IS POLITICAL DANGER TO MATCH THE MISERY

(By JOHN V. LINDSAY)

WASHINGTON.—Refugees are living history. I have often been reminded of the mammoth chessboards of old, on which kings and emperors used living people to play the game. Wherever there is an unsolved refugee problem a deadly chess match is underway. Its terms are human misery; its consequences, festering tensions, and political or military conflict.

According to the most reliable statistics available, there are now some 10 to 15 million unsettled refugees outside the Iron Curtain. The bulk of these are in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. (In Europe, where vast migrations of populations took place in the wake of World War II, only about 100,000 unsettled refugees remain, not including the very different refugee problem of a divided Germany. There the refugees who have been fleeing from East to West are, by and large, accepted as citizens and quickly integrated into the society of the Federal Republic.)

Not long ago I studied the living history of three significant concentrations of refugees: The Arab refugees in the lands around Israel, the Tibetans in India, and the Chinese in Hong Kong.

The greatest problem is that of the 1 million Palestinian Arabs surviving in bitterness and deprivation, mostly in wretched camps, in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt. Here I saw thousands of children and adults living without hope, without the barest material comforts and, above all, without the conditions of human dignity that we Americans have come to accept as our birthright.

It is the children who suffer most. Try to look at a ration card belonging to a wide-eyed, 10-year-old girl waiting in line for her "supplemental" feeding in a refugee camp in the Jordan Valley. She has learned to accept the loss of her home (the hut in which her family lived was washed away in a flood); she still clings to the doll she carefully pieced together with rags and bits of cloth, but she can survive the loss of this, too. But reach for that grimy, half-torn ration card, and the panic-stricken expression that spreads over her pinched but lovely dark face is one that you will not soon forget.

The prevailing view among American officials and those of other interested countries is that no settlement of the Arab refugee problem can be achieved without a final political settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors. The interrelatedness of the political and the human aspects is thus cited as the basis for a policy—or nonpolicy—of resigned inaction.

My own view is that positive measures should be taken in both of these areas. A political settlement, it is true, is the key to final solution of the problem. But it is also true that any measures that alleviate the suffering of the refugees will significantly ease political unrest and help to create an atmosphere congenial to serious negotiations.

The main international agency that is directly concerned with the Arab problem is the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA). Within its financial limitations UNRWA ably performs its assigned tasks of providing food, shelter, health and welfare services, education and vocational training. In addition, while it necessarily and wisely avoids any involvement in the politics of the refugee issue, it makes an extremely useful, but indirect, political contribution. It does this by maintaining the U.N. "presence" in an explosive area and, through its relief operations, by sustaining a barely tolerable status quo.

The most troublesome single problem that has plagued the operations of this agency in recent years is that of falsification of ration cards. The refugees have consistently concealed the occurrence of deaths, thereby gaining extra rations for survivors. It is not uncommon for a family to receive the food and kerosene allotment for a relative who has been dead for 3 years.

Under pressures generated by American Congressmen who inspected the refugee camps, Henry R. Labouisse, formerly the director of UNRWA and currently the director of the International Cooperation Administration, undertook to control the situation by freezing it. That is, to compensate for the deceased who remained on the ration rolls, Labouisse decreed that no new ration cards would be issued for new births until an accurate census or other information could be obtained for purposes of "rectification of the rolls."

The freeze, admittedly inequitable, was necessitated by an uncontrollable situation. In fact, the refugees have undoubtedly lost far more than they have gained, for the birth rate is substantially in excess of the death rate.

In the camps, "rectification" has now become as explosive a word as "resettlement." Arab politicians have played on the refugees' fear that rations would be lost and there have been many threats of revolt. Thus, although it is estimated that as many as 20 percent of the ration cards now held are fraudulent, it is very questionable whether an enforced revision of the rolls would be worth the turbulence it might very well set off. Indeed, the very system of ration cards in isolated camp areas is of dubious value.

While present efforts have been more or less successful in keeping the lid on a boiling cauldron, the seeds of long-range catastrophe have been planted and are flourishing in these teeming camps. The Arabs, who are great legend builders, have glorified their memories of their former homes in Palestine into an idyllic dream of paradise lost. About 50 percent of the refugees are youngsters of 16 and under and the ratio of young to old is constantly mounting. It is these embittered youths who pose the greatest danger for the future.

In every camp that I visited in company with UNRWA personnel, we met with the Arab elders to listen to their complaints and suggestions. In Lebanon my companion was John Reddaway, an Englishman with vast knowledge and experience in refugee work, who is deputy director of the agency. On each occasion when we received the Arab spokesmen, we were belabored with impassioned criticisms of our countries for having brought the refugees to their present plight by fostering the establishment of Israel.

And we were admonished not to believe that the passing of the present generation of displaced Arabs would cause the problem to disappear. "Tell your Governments," they would say, "that we are teaching our children that the injustice is permanent and that their right to Palestine is the only legacy which their fathers will leave them."

The key state in the Arab refugee complex is the economically nonviable Kingdom of Jordan, where over half of the refugees have taken asylum. They constitute more than one-third of the total population and have become a powerful force in Jordanian politics. An internal convulsion in Jordan would very possibly invite intervention by the United Arab Republic, which, in turn, would almost certainly trigger an Israeli military move to occupy Palestine to the west bank of the Jordan River.

For the short-range future, therefore, our policy toward the Arab refugee problem should focus on sustaining and expanding the work of UNRWA and on maintaining and strengthening Jordan's Government.

There are three possible solutions to any refugee problem: repatriation in the country of origin, integration in the country of asylum, or resettlement elsewhere. The solution to the Arab problem would seem to lie in some combination of integration, resettlement, and a measure of repatriation in Israel. Such a program should be mounted principally through the United Nations but also through unilateral and cooperative action by the free nations, with the United States playing a leading role.

In Syria, Iraq, and the Sinai Peninsula, the possibilities for establishing new homes and jobs for the refugees are reasonably good. The plan should include the exploration of possibilities for immigration in such underpopulated areas as Canada, Australia, and certain countries of Latin America. It should also include a loan program to help the resettling countries pay the cost, as was originally suggested by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

The United States and other Western nations can scarcely press such a program without offering to accept some of the refugees themselves. I do not suggest that we must open our doors to massive immigration. But I do maintain that we are under an obligation, in advancing an overall resettlement plan, to offer homes within our own country to at least a reasonable number of refugees.

Of course, permanent solution will come only when the Arab States accept the fact of Israel as a nation, when Israel makes serious efforts to conciliate her neighbors, and when both sides cease to use the refugees as pawns of power politics. In the meantime, it is the duty of the entire world community to do what it can to assuage the misery and hopelessness that blights a million lives.

My journey took me from the Middle East to India. In the remote village of Darmshala, in the Himalayan foothills of northeastern India, I was received with cordiality and graciousness by His Holiness, the Dalai Lama, god-king in exile of the Tibetan people. I found him an intelligent and engaging young man of 25 who is deeply concerned with the welfare of his people both within and outside Tibet. He is especially preoccupied with the future of the Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal, of whom, he says, there are some 57,000. He is doing all in his power to maintain close contact with his exiled countrymen, who he fears will be broken up and dispersed with a resulting dissipation of Tibetan culture. While he entertains little hope of returning to Tibet in the foreseeable future, he is profoundly anxious to preserve his people's culture and traditions.

The Tibetan refugees are divided into three groups—approximately one-third are agricultural, one-third are potentially able to move into skilled occupations, and one-third are monastics. The Dalai Lama hopes to move the agricultural segment into suitable areas where they can work the soil, and to employ the monastics in conducting an educational program designed to preserve the integrity of Tibetan culture. He proposes to keep the youngsters below the age of 16 under the tutelage of monks who would supplement their secular education with training in Tibetan and Buddhist customs and values. He hopes that many of those over 16 will be sent to educational institutions in various free countries around the world.

His Holiness asked if the United States would be willing to accept additional young Tibetans for training in our country. A commendable start in this direction has been undertaken by the Rockefeller Foundation, which has recently arranged to place a group of Tibetans in universities in the United States and other countries. The numbers involved are very small, however, and our Government, as well as private foundations, should undertake a greatly augmented program of assistance.

The Tibetan refugee problem, like that of the Arabs, involves both tragic human hardship and a difficult situation for the asylum state, for it greatly exacerbates the already tense relations between India and Communist China. Here, as in all refugee situations, the problem must be regarded as one in which the United Nations as a world organ, and the free nations in particular, must lend all possible aid.

On my way home from India, I visited the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, where approximately a million refugees from Communist China have found asylum. The British Government's Hong Kong refugee program is conducted with virtually no help from outside national or international bodies.

One such organization that makes some contribution, however, is the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration (ICEM), an international transportation agency that has done excellent work with European migration problems. This agency has undertaken to transport about 500 European refugees from China to other countries. But in terms of the total problem this action has been negligible.

The problem of the Chinese refugees is vastly greater in scope and in dangerous political potential than that of the handful of Europeans, and it may well be asked whether international assistance could not be provided on a large scale. It would be both feasible and advisable to broaden the ICEM effort to include a substantial number of the Chinese refugees who have made Hong

Kong one of the most densely populated areas on earth. As it is, the international community has taken little more than token cognizance of this immense problem.

Remarkable work has also been done by various voluntary agencies, which have been responsible for the effective distribution of over $21 million worth of food and supplies in Hong Kong between 1955 and 1960. And the British Crown Colony Government has undertaken an impressive, large-scale housing program.

The facts remain, however, that available land and resources in the tiny colony have reached the saturation point and, by one means or another, refugees continue to enter. Unless we are prepared to see these people turned back into Communist China, the United States and other countries will have to lend substantial assistance in the future.

Whenever refugees take flight across an international frontier, the issue immediately becomes an international problem. This is true for two reasons. First, the human plight is one to which the civilized international community cannot in conscience turn its back. And no country of asylum can, in justice, be expected to bear the burden by itself. Secondly, because a refugee situation is usually the product and, in turn, the source of international tensions or conflict, the world community is bound to concern itself with the political issues involved.

The United Nations took a significant step toward full acknowledgment of refugee problems as a matter of international responsibility on December 5, 1958. On that date, the General Assembly adopted a resolution proclaiming a World Refugee Year for purposes of advancing a "worldwide effort to help resolve the world refugee problem." The stated aims of the World Refugee Year, which began in June 1959, were to encourage financial contributions and opportunities for repatriation, resettlement and integration.

The principle thus adopted is admirable. But, having acceded to this worthy declaration of purpose, the member nations paid little heed to the conditions to which it referred. Although the United States contributed an extra $5 million for special projects, its efforts and those of other nations were small in relation to worldwide needs.

We can and must act now to alleviate the world refugee problem through two broad lines of action. First, we should take the leadership in encouraging a worldwide coordinated program of relief and rehabilitation under the auspices of the United Nations. Such a plan might be modeled, in part, on the surplus-food-distribution program of the United States, under which an estimated 3,500,000 refugees in various parts of the world were among the 50 million persons who received American food in 1960.

Specifically, I would recommend that the machinery and resources of the ICEM and of the UNRWA effort in the Middle East be brought within the scope of, or coordinated closely with, the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. The Office of the High Commissioner is ostensibly an organ of worldwide responsibility. However, under its mandate it is largely confined to European refugee problems, as is the ICEM. Thus, I would also recommend the expansion of the mandate of the Office of the High Commissioner to encompass all world refugee problems and not merely the waning refugee problems of Europe. By the same token, the ICEM should be given worldwide responsibility.

But, while important, these measures of reorganization will be of little value unless accompanied by a far more intensive and costly program than is now operated or contemplated by the U.N.

The second broad line of necessary action is in the area of national immigration policies. Here, substantial measures of liberalization should be adopted by free nations, especially the underpopulated countries which now maintain policies of rigorous exclusion.

Our own refugee laws as they now stand are restrictive. The Refugee Relief Act, which expired at the end of 1957, has been replaced only by the very limited U.S. escapee program, enacted in 1960. This program is confined almost entirely to Europe and to Europeans, excluding the Middle and Far East from any direct participation. Under it, about 5,000 persons, most of them from asylum in Austria and Germany, have been accepted for admittance to the United States. (Of these, 407 had arrived by the end of 1960.) But only a very few more can be accepted under the restrictive provisions of the 1960 act.

To meet the pressing need for a liberal and nondiscriminatory policy toward refugee resettlement, I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives that takes an approach entirely different from the piecemeal and ad hoc approaches of the past. My bill would grant broad, new authority to the President for an indefinite period. Under it, he could admit up to 10,000 refugees a year, or, in the event of an overriding emergency, an unlimited number. There would be no restrictions as to geographic or ethnic origin. In addition, to meet specific unfulfilled goals of the World Refugee Year, a special number of 20,000 would be admitted in the first 2 years.

The President would thus be given flexible authority to accept refugees, year by year, from the areas of most pressing need. For purposes of maintaining ultimate legislative authority, the bill would allow the Congress, by joint resolution, to veto the admission of any individual or group proposed by the President.

Such a program would represent a significant effort by the United States to accept its fair share of responsibility for the world refugee problem. Legislation of this nature, moreover, would provide a sincere and concrete example that would make it possible for this Nation to exercise persuasive influence on other free nations to accept a share of the responsibility.

In each of the two broad lines of action—the enhancement of efforts by the United Nations and the liberalization of national immigration policies—it is incumbent on the United States to take the lead. We are the leader of the community of free nations. In the problem of refugees, as in all world problems, it is our responsibility, by example and by persuasion, to point the way toward workable solutions.

Neither individuals nor nations are disposed to act on problems, however critical, that do not present themselves with tangible and dramatic urgency. It is all too easy to dismiss the millions of unseen and muted refugees around the world as a distant and vague abstraction. For my own part, I need only recall the frightened little Arab girl, clutching desperately at her ration card, to see the plight of the world's refugees for what it is: an urgent problem of human suffering in which the seeds of political tension and conflict find fertile soil.

Seen in this way, the need for prompt and effective action appeals most urgently to our wisdom and our consciences.

Red Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Wednesday, August 2, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

RED TRADE

When you get into a knock down drag-'em-out battle with a tough, wily opponent, you know you can't afford to let down your guard an instant or you'll wind up wondering what hit you. As with fighters, so with nations, or at least so it should be.

That's why we find completely incomprehensible a recent decision by our Commerce Department affecting trade with the Soviet Union and her Red satellites.

At a time when the administration has called upon the American people to make real sacrifices to meet the threat in Berlin, the Commerce Department has set about to give help to the enemy. The defense budget is to be hiked almost three and a half billion dollars, draft calls are being doubled and tripled and a number of reserve units are being ordered to active duty. All these measures are designed to show that we mean business in our showdown with the Reds. But how impressed can the Communists be with our determination to oppose them when we, at the same time, hasten to bolster their economy.

It is incredible but that is what we are doing. The Commerce Department quietly announced a change in our export licensing policy to permit the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries. We will be shipping Russia, which has been hard hit by crop failures, wheat, flour, rice, and other farm products at prices subsidized by American taxpayers.

Why are we doing this? Why to lessen tensions, of course. This is and always has been a one-way street. We try to reduce tensions by giving help to the Communists, who, because of our aid, are strengthened to apply new tensions.

Ohio Congressman WILLIAM HARSHA, one of the loud voices of opposition to the Commerce Department deal, has succinctly summed up what it means: "The American taxpayer will in effect be subsidizing the Communist conspiracy so it can successfully carry out its avowed purpose to destroy us."

No wonder why at times we are the laughingstock of the world.

Impacted School Areas: Move To Get Extension Off Dead Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, school boards of thousands of the Nation's school districts in over 300 congressional districts are facing crises in financing the education of America's young. This is because the impacted school area statutes have not been extended during this session of Congress. This session is scheduled to adjourn in less than 1 month. Yet extension of these statutes is still on dead center. Members of this body may help move it ahead by signing the petition now at the Clerk's desk to discharge H.R. 5349, a simple extension of these statutes.

The Cosmic God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President in this age of missiles, earth satellites and men in space, we tend to be too much concerned with man's conquest of nature and too little with the meaning of nature itself. Instead of concentrating on our manmade stars, we might well ponder the message of the star which brought the whole world to Bethlehem.

Rev. Edward E. Frost, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Malad, Idaho, gave a sermon on August 6 entitled "The Cosmic God," which reminds us of what should be our answer to the question, "What do you feel when you look at the stars?"

Reverend Frost is pastor of a church which was the first Protestant Church in the area. The First Presbyterian Church of Malad was founded in 1884. In 1878 a Presbyterian missionary started an elementary school in a little one-room, dirt-floored log cabin. Attendance grew, among Presbyterians and non-Presbyterians alike, and the school was progressively moved to larger quarters. This school added much to the educational development of Malad until it ceased operation in the early years of this century.

I ask unanimous consent to have this fine sermon given by the pastor of one of Idaho's most historic churches included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COSMIC GOD

(Psalm 8; Isaiah, 51: 4–6; 55: 6–13; Matthew, 2: 9–11)

"Lift up your eyes to the heavens," wrote Isaiah. Someone else, one of the psalmists, took Isaiah's advice, and looked, and recorded his reaction: 'When I look at Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast established; what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou dost care for him?"

It used to be that stargazing was pretty much limited to scientists peering through their telescopes, sailors plotting a course across the trackless seas, and springtime lovers making wishes, dreaming the timeless dreams of the young and optimistic. However, there seems to have been a sudden flurry of stargazing about 2,000 years ago—when, according to reports, a strange, compelling star appeared new in the heavens; and when, as we know, a baby was born in a tiny stable in a far-off corner of the world.

This baby grew, as the scripture tells us, in wisdom and in stature and in favor with man and God. Then, even before he had reached what most people would call full maturity, his life was snuffed out. Once again stargazing became something mostly for scientists, sailors, and young lovers.

Today, however, the world is scanning the heavens as in the days of old. No, no, not quite as in the days of old. There is a significant difference. True, we are obeying literally Isaiah's command "Lift up your eyes to the heavens." But at what are we looking? The psalmist was looking at "Thy heavens, O Lord, the work of Thy fingers, the Moon and the stars which Thou hast established." But we? * * * we are looking at earth satellites, at gigantic weather balloons, missiles, astronaut capsules. We are looking at the work of our fingers.

We look at the Moon and think of 1970, the target date for our putting a man on the moon. Probably not too long after that it will be the planet Mars, to see if there is any form of life there; then Venus, then the other planets in our solar system; and then—and then the stars. Oh, yes, we'll get out there—hundreds, thousands of light-years away. By the work of our hands, and our brains, we'll be there some day. Our destination is the stars.

For a moment, though, let's forget our plans, our technological advances, the work of our fingers. For a moment let's go back to the old preastronaut, presatellite days. This shouldn't be too difficult. Science has rapidly outdistanced our ability to keep up with it anyway, so, for now, let's just forget science and consider simply * * * the heavens.

When you life your eyes to the heavens, when you look at the stars, what happens inside you? What do you feel? This is the central question of today's sermon. What do you feel when you look at the stars?

Let's assume that you are alone, and that you are in a contemplative mood, and that you don't have to jump up in the next minute to go be "busy." What happens when you look at the stars?

Each of us, being different from one another, will have different reactions. However, it is quite likely that most of our reactions will be variations one or another, or both, of two basic themes.

The first can be called cosmic loneliness. It's the fearful feeling of being overpowered by the silent, uncaring vastness of the universe. It's the feeling of our own microscopic smallness and our own lonely unimportance in the presence of all this vastness.

For the universe is vast—it is vast in space and vast in time. Every now and then when I look up at night I am startled all over again to realize that the pinpoint of light we see, and call a star, has been traveling for so long a time that the star may no longer be there.

Most of the starlight we see began its journey across space long before we were ever born. So great are the distances in space that it takes hundreds, even thousands of years for the light from some of the stars to reach our little planet. As we lift our eyes to the heavens we are literally looking centuries upon centuries back into history. Such distances reduce man to microscopic smallness.

In a similar manner the age of the universe makes our own lifespan appear to be utterly inconsequential. Consider, for instance, only the earth. A Professor Dorn has written: "Let us assume that the earth is 2,850 million years old" (a very conservative estimate, I might add. Most scientists place the earth's age at between 4 and 5 billion years). "If we consider this as a day of 24 hours, from midnight to-midnight, then the (beginning) of organic life on our planet does not occur until 10:51 p.m., the appearance of man only at 22 seconds before midnight, and the whole of what is called world history, including all the establishments of states, the wars between nations, the ideological struggles, the conflicts of the faiths and the foundation of religions (all this) takes place in the last three-tenths of a second."

Most of us who live in the mid-20th century are uncomfortably aware that we are but minute specks in a universe that is millions of light years in diameter. We also know that our lives cover only a few trivial years on a planet that is millions of centuries old. Deep inside us, perhaps locked tightly in our unconscious, is the haunting fear that we are only microscopic specks of dust occupying only the very briefest flicker of time in something so vast and so old as to make our lives of absolutely no consequence in the overall scheme of things.

Lift up our eyes to the heavens? No, no, a part of us cries; for to do so makes us feel terribly tiny, and lost, and afraid. The bone-chilling winds of cosmic loneliness sweep over us.

But is this the story we Christians have to tell to the nations? Is this the message of light about the Lord "who reigneth above"? No. Cosmic loneliness is not the only reaction around which our feelings circle as we lift our eyes to the heavens. There is a second basic reaction. It embodies the first, but carries the first one important step further. It is the reaction of faith, or, as it might be called, of cosmic companionship.

Let us turn again to the eighth Psalm: "O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Thy name in all the earth. When I look at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast established; what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou dost care for Him?"

Here we stumble onto one of those passages in the Bible which, as we move into the latter half of the 20th century, suddenly takes on new meaning and almost shouts its message at us.

God himself is cosmic—even more than cosmic if it is possible for us to think of such a thing. The heavens?—they are God's, the work of His fingers; the Moon and the stars?—God has established them. There is no distance in the universe which is greater than God. Time, too, cannot make small our God; for in the beginning God already was, and He is now, and ever shall be, for ever and ever and ever. If to think of the vastness of the universe makes us feel minute, then to think of God ought to reduce us to nothing.

The writer of Psalm 8 felt this. To paraphrase him: "When I look at thy heavens, at the Moon and the stars, when I look at all this gigantic vastness, what is man? So tiny, so frail, so fleeting." This is cosmic loneliness.

But notice. The psalmist moves on one step beyond cosmic loneliness.

He goes on to a greater truth. "What is man that Thou art mindful of him, that Thou dost care for him?" The cosmic God is also the God who is concerned, who cares, who is mindful of the creature called man on the planet earth.

How do we know this? How can we believe this other than the fact that it says so in Psalm 8? For our sake the one great God of the universe has in His greatness made Himself small enough for us to begin to understand Him and for us to begin to know, to sense, to feel the companionship He offers. "God so loved the world" (or, as John 3: 16 can also be translated: "God so loved the cosmos") that He gave His only begotten Son."

I think it is no accident that we associate a star with the birth of Christ. The star, which symbolizes all the mystery of the vastness of the universe; and Jesus Christ, who contains within Himself all the mystery of the cosmic God come to earth as a man—these two belong together.

Our true pathway to the stars lies through Jesus Christ. It is He who changes the death-giving sense of cosmic loneliness into the life-giving certainty of cosmic companionship. Not only does Jesus Christ bring the infinite and the eternal down to us; He

also makes us big enough to share in the on-marching work of the cosmic God.

No person is so great that he does not need the whispered word of companionship. No person is so small that Christ does not seek him out. No person is so lost that he cannot be found. In Christ we are all one with each other and with the one, cosmic God.

"And lo, the star which they had seen in the East went before them, till it came to rest over the place where the Child was. When they saw the star, they rejoiced exceedingly with great joy; and going into the house they saw the Child with Mary His mother, and they fell down and worshiped Him."

Tragic Splintering of New York Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by William S. White which appeared in the Washington Star of August 21, 1961.

The disastrous consequence of opposition for the sake of opposition is compellingly illustrated by the present primary contest in New York. The national consequences will not be nearly as bad as the destruction of a functioning political party in the city of New York.

The article follows:

NEW YORK POLITICAL CRISIS BOILING—STRONG CONTEST FOR MAYORAL OFFICE IS CAUSING NATIONAL POLITICAL CONCERN

(By William S. White)

A New York domestic political crisis, as well as a Berlin foreign crisis, is boiling ever higher for President Kennedy. And he con do considerably less about the one than about the other.

Incredible is the word even to tough national politicians for the savage mayoralty fight now going on in a city which is more than a city—is, indeed, more important politically than any half-dozen of the smaller States.

The national Democratic Party, and also all 1964 Republican presidential aspirants except Governor Rockefeller of New York, have much to lose and nothing to gain. For if the outcome is capture of city hall by the Republicans through their mayoral candidate, Louis Lefkowitz, Rockefeller will go into the 1964 Republican National Convention with immensely added strength.

He would be a far more formidable challenger to his two rivals for the presidential nomination, Richard Nixon and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, than today. A victory for Lefkowitz would be, nationally, simply a victory for Rockfeller. He would be in the proud and powerful position of having beaten the biggest center of urban Democratic strength in the country.

On the other hand, an ultimate victory in the mayoralty race for any Democrat would by no means strengthen the Democratic Party nationally—or President Kennedy, either. If this victor should be the organization Democrat, Arthur Levitt, this would only add yet more venom to an already ferocious Democratic in-fighting which has produced one of the most irresponsible political campaigns in memory.

Levitt would never be accepted by the reform Democrats. These, headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, very likely would be able to destroy him in the end anyhow.

And if the victor should be the present mayor, Robert Wagner, the regular Democrats would owe him less than nothing and would give him even less. Whichever way it went, as between Levitt and Wagner, the Democrat Party as an organized and responsible entity in New York would lie in something close to sulking ruins.

And, for the crucial point, the National Democratic Party has always found it hard to survive national elections without a strong base—a money-in-the-bank kind of thing—in New York.

What has brought the Democrats to this pass is an increasing Balkanization, an increasing erection of splinter groups, due to the rule-or-ruin self-righteousness of the ultraliberal reform element.

These people opened long ago a melodramatic crusade against the so-called boss of New York, Carmine De Sapio of Tammany Hall. They had managed in the past to get along with him; his real sin seems to have been that they found they could not direct him. Next, they forced a break with the genuine Democratic bosses, headed by Representative CHARLES BUCKLEY, of the Bronx.

The forced Wagner to abandon these real bosses, who had made him in the first place. Then their vague cries of "corruption" against De Sapio, who holds no public office anyhow, inevitably boomeranged. The voters needed no degree in political science to know that if there really was such corruption in New York as the reformers said there was, the reformers' man, Wagner, for years had been the responsible head of the city.

Now, the unfortunate Wagner has been compelled to detach himself from another set of old friends. He is trying to force out of office the very same unpaid city school board he himself appointed, abandoning them—and incidentally smearing them—as he had abandoned the real bosses.

This absurd and tasteless episode has put the very public schools of New York into politics, and nasty politics, at that. The Republicans, naturally, are exploiting this mess.

What it all proves is that the ultraliberals have not grasped the first reality of American politics. This is that ours is a two-party system or it is only a howling, squabbling farce. Only frantic disorder and futility will reward those politicians who try to set themselves up as the only right and righteous men by creating splinter movements.

Expanding the Saline Water Conversion Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Although those of us in the East may not now feel the same degree of pressure of need for water as some other parts of the country do, we may in the near future. I believe that this is the sort of forward-looking legislation that the entire country may be thankful for too, in time. Perhaps, even the greater metropolitan area of Washington may someday have to be supplied with water provided by means available as a result of legislation of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this legislation.

Pennsylvania's 22d District Offers Outstanding Opportunities for Industrial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an important meeting took place in Johnstown, Pa., on July 27. At the instance of the Greater Johnstown Chamber of Commerce, a group of business and civic leaders heard Dr. Myles E. Robinson, director of the National Coal Association's Department of Economics and Transportation, present a pilot study on Cambria County's advantages as the locale for certain types of industrial endeavor.

Because Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District offers excellent opportunities that need to be brought to the attention of all businessmen planning new or expanded industrial activity, I invite my colleagues to take especial note of the analysis and appraisal submitted by Dr. Robinson. He said that his study of the county demonstrated economic availability of substantial supplies of coal and other natural resources, including clay, iron ore, limestone, sandstone, and surface water of standard chemical purity. He also pointed out that blast furnace and byproduct coke operations provide aluminum sulphate, blast furnace gas, coke, coke oven gas, light oils, tar, and other byproduct materials.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an era of a sharp rise in population and dramatic industrial development. This is the age of power. It is reflected conclusively in the growth of the electric utility industry, where installed capacity increased by more than 120 percent in the past decade and will more than double again in the coming 10 years.

Every business entrepreneur should carefully consider fuel costs and fuel availability before making a decision on where to locate a new plant or factory. The chambers of comerce and industrial development groups of our district invite inquiries from businessmen seeking the most advantageous areas for their industries. As Dr. Robinson's study has portrayed, we have enough mineable coal reserves to last far into the future. We have the manpower—willing and able men whose forebears helped to forge America's mighty industrial framework. We have adequate water and other natural resources. Our railroads will carry finished products into every market center.

The National Coal Association is to be congratulated for its thorough study and analytical report. It has been approximately 1 year since Stephen F. Dunn, NCA president, announced that his organization would undertake to work with coal State leaders in attracting new industry to mining regions. I have followed the program closely and am convinced that continued close cooperation between National Coal executives and interested coal area groups will result in better industrial opportunities. When Dr. William J. Hargreaves, president of the Cambria County Chamber of Commerce, introduced Dr. Robinson and Victor V. Lehtoranto, NCA staff economist, at the Johnstown meeting, he made this comment:

In the long run, the survey will be of more value in seeking new industry than anything we have done to date since we had our development fund drive.

I should like to notify my colleagues that information developed by this study can be obtained through Dr. Hargreaves or at my office.

SS "Hope" in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the speech made by Mark S. Beaubien, M.D., on the occasion of ceremonies attendant to the departure of the SS *Hope* from Djakarta, Indonesia.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleagues recognize that one of the lasting benefits of a people-to-people program such as Project Hope is the opportunity afforded the participants of the countries involved to meet and know each other. From intimate associations such as those developed by Project Hope, our Nation can gain appreciation and understanding among the citizens of foreign countries, whom it would be impossible to reach in any other way.

Dr. Beaubien, who formerly practiced medicine in Lansing, Mich., is now vice president and chief of mission for Project Hope in Indonesia. His remarks at a reception of the Minister of Health, Djakarta, on May 30, 1961, follow:

It is an honor for me to receive this very beautiful and dignified silver award on behalf of Dr. Walsh and the members of the Project Hope. I am sorry that illness has prevented him from being here to accept this honor which he so rightfully deserves, since it is his personal energy and inspiration which have initiated this project, but I am pleased that the staff of the SS *Hope*, who have brought his plans to realization, are present here tonight to join with me in this ceremony.

I would like to say a few words, if I may, knowing that they cannot be expressed as eloquently as Dr. Walsh would do so but which I hope might convey some of the things that I am sure he would wish said.

This has been a medical project and we want its achievements and merits to be weighed with that in mind primarily. Friendship and understanding can be expected to follow when we have a common meeting ground, whether it be in medicine, the arts, or athletics, especially between peoples who are fundamentally as warm and hospitable as Indonesians and Americans. During the past few days we have begun to look back on our total experience in Indonesia and to express some of our impressions to our Indonesian colleagues. Likewise we have gathered some of their impressions of us. But it will be some weeks to come before much of the results can be properly evaluated. Even then, statistics will never measure what has always been in medicine the significant and effective tool for advancement, the personal interchange of ideas and experiences. This being true, I have no doubt about the success of the project from our viewpoint.

Much has been said in previous weeks to the medical and administrative leaders in the various communities in which we have visited with regard to the excellent cooperation, hard work, and hospitality which they have all shown. This can never be praised enough and was true wherever we went. But I think this is the proper time and place to bring out a point which has probably not been sufficiently emphasized, and I hope you will pardon me for being a bit personal. I am referring to General Satrio. How many persons in high and responsible positions anywhere in the world could be found who would take the risk of welcoming a project of this type—a project which had never been tested before, a project which was not just a charity or giveaway program but one which would, in fact, require money from both sides that could well be used in many other direct ways? This I think takes a special brand of courage and farsightedness, which few others have ever had. I think he shares this kind of courage with Dr. Walsh. With such leaders as General Satrio, who are willing to sacrifice for certain ideals and goals and resist the pressures of immediate but lesser objectives, Indonesia will have its rightful place as a just and prosperous society.

General Satrio has thereby placed on us a heavy responsibility and I hope we have not misplaced his confidence in us. It has been a privilege and honor for us as representatives of the American people to have shared with him, with Col. Sjarif Thajeb, with many other warm friends, and with Indonesia this first Project Hope. May this open the way for further efforts in our mutual search for a happier, peaceful, and more meaningful life.

MARK S. BEAUBIEN, M.D.

Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Miss Joyce Teitz of Walnut Hills High School has written an excellent and thought-provoking article on "Thrift." It was once a well-known and practiced virtue in this country. It has completely vanished from the Washington scene.

Perhaps Miss Teitz' admonitions will cause us to pause and reflect in our mad rush toward national insolvency and bankruptcy.

THRIFT

Thrift is a tool of nature. In all she does, nature is conserving. She tolerates no waste. All excess arising from the life processes of her creatures is stored and later put to use by other living things.

Through the instinctive thrift of the bee, honey and wax are conserved. Out of the thrift of the wasp comes paper. All green plants are conservers of sugar and great storehouses of potential energy for other living things. All forms of life are part of a vital cycle of creation, conservation, and utilization.

In all he does, man soon learns to imitate nature. As he seeks improvement, he discovers that basic fundamentals in nature are universal laws. Typically, he has emulated nature in her thrift. He has devised a system whereby he may exchange his labor for capital, and, through his thrift, he may conserve part of this capital, and turn it toward the next day's need.

The wise man has learned to take the superfluities of his labor and make them sources of service for other men. He has created a system of financial institutions to promote him in this practice. Here, he may temporarily deposit his excess capital.

Once deposited, this capital becomes a cogent force. It may help another man to make a start in life. It may create employment for the jobless. At the same time, it confers returns upon its investor. Thus, man treats excess just as nature does, by putting it to work for himself and for his fellow men.

In addition, man's thrift provides him with a constant source of supply. The excess of one day's living may be the substance which satisfies the next day's need.

A man's thrift makes him free. The thrifty man is his own master. He may depend upon his own resources in time of need. The poorest individual becomes more wealthy through his practice of thrift. As the amounts which he sets aside accumulate, they develop the power to serve him.

America has grown upon thrift. Its patriarchs were frugal with all they possessed so that they could expend it, in part, for the building of the country they loved.

Man's savings—the product of his thrift—are the basis, en masse, of national economies. Therefore, the financial institutions, as storehouses of these products, are vital. Months have been spent in debate on legal issues concerning them. Upon their fluctuations, the fates of governments have rested. Their failure has often spelled disaster.

The ideal citizen is a source of supply. He provides capital for investment. He creates employment. Collectively, he bolsters national economies. He stands firm as a self-sufficient, contributing member of society. His thrift makes him so.

Death Penalty for Hijackers an Incentive to Violence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 8384, a bill providing for the imposition of the death penalty for those persons convicted of

hijacking aircraft. During the debate I recorded my sympathy and wholehearted support of H.R. 8384 if the death penalty proviso was removed. This was not done and I was accordingly recorded against the bill.

This morning the Washington Post published a letter written by Alan M. Dershowitz, editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal, on the subject of man's desire to impose death upon his fellow man, with particular reference to the hijacking bill. As Mr. Dershowitz points out:

It is criminal to legislate the death of guilty men when such legislation may foster rather than prevent the death of innocent men.

Mr. Dershowitz' letter follows:

DEATH FOR HIJACKERS?

Freud, in his brilliant exchange with Einstein on the causes of war, explained man's constant desire to inflict death upon his fellow man. He indicated how the human animal ingeniously contrives causes and myths to rationalize the continuation of institutionalized death. The recent congressional clamor for the death penalty for air hijacking is apparently a case in point.

Forgetting for a moment the substantial arsenal of arguments which can be marshaled in support of total abolition of the death penalty, it is likely that in the case of air hijacking the death penalty will increase the very danger it seeks to prevent.

Arguably, the fear of judicially imposed death would deter some individuals contemplating hijacking from implementing their schemes to a greater degree than would fear of a long prison term. But undoubtedly there would still be those rash enough to attempt the crime even in the face of possible death.

Once the hijacking has commenced, the very existence of the death penalty will multiply the danger to the crew and passengers. A hijacker, facing death if he returns, will be motivated to act in a hazardous fashion (e.g., to attempt dangerous landings and even to kill hostages to show that he isn't bluffing) if he knows that his only chance of survival lies in the successful completion of his crime and the political asylum awaiting him in the country of his destination.

It is always a serious matter to legislate the death of guilty men; it is criminal to legislate the death of guilty men when such legislation may foster rather than prevent the death of innocent men.

ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ.

Meeting the Educational Challenge of the "Exceptional" Child—Testimony by Congresswoman Sullivan on H.R. 15—Exceptional Children Educational Assistance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago this month, in the final hours of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, after almost a year of study and consultations with education experts, and after a comprehensive research project done for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I introduced the exceptional children educational assistance bill. Its purpose was, and is, to establish a 7-year program of Federal fellowships and scholarships, along with grants to colleges and universities, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for gifted children and also for physically handicapped children—children who need in either case the help of specially trained teachers in order to achieve their full educational potential.

DO NOT ALWAYS NEED SPECIAL CLASSES BUT DO NEED SPECIALIZED TEACHING

Running through all of the research material I have seen on the problem of meeting the educational challenge of the Nation's estimated 6 million exceptional children of school age is the theme that while these children do not in all cases need special classes or separate classrooms, they do require special teaching techniques. My bill is intended to encourage experienced classroom teachers to go back to college for graduate work in this field, and thus qualify either to teach exceptional children or to train or supervise other classroom teachers in this important and long-neglected field.

In the 2d session of the 85th Congress, I was urged by some of the parent groups and professional groups vitally interested in my bill to defer seeking action on it until a bill then pending directed at establishing a fellowship program for teachers of retarded children, could be enacted. It was feared that hearings on a bill covering all exceptional children might delay or interfere with final congressional action on the retarded children bill, which had already passed the Senate. And so I did defer to that position, and consequently we did pass the retarded children bill in 1958.

In the 86th Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor was so tied up in so many bitter legislative controversies that I could not obtain a hearing on the exceptional children bill. I am extremely pleased that today, thanks to Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, I was finally able to have my first opportunity to present testimony before an appropriate legislative subcommittee on my 4-year-old bill—H.R. 15 in this Congress. The hearing was conducted this morning before Mrs. GREEN's Subcommittee on Special Education.

Because of widespread interest among Members of Congress, among educators, parents, and the various groups interested in the particular problems of exceptional children, I am submitting for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my testimony this morning before Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ST. LOUIS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON H.R. 15, A BILL BY MRS. SULLIVAN, "THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT," TUESDAY MORNING, AUGUST 22, 1961

I am grateful for this opportunity to testify on H.R. 15, the Exceptional Children Educational Assistance bill, to establish a 7-year program of Federal fellowships and scholarships to train more teachers for America's 6 million exceptional children—those with specialized learning needs and problems.

Because of the extraordinarily heavy schedule of controversial legislation on the calendar of the Committee on Education and Labor I was not able to arrange hearings on this bill in either the 85th or 86th Congress, so I am particularly grateful to Congresswoman GREEN, the chairman of this subcommittee, for calling up the bill for hearings this week.

During the 4 years since I originally introduced the legislation, we have made a few piecemeal approaches to the educational problems of exceptional children—chiefly the mentally retarded—but little or nothing has been done for the others. Consequently, it was not surprising to me this past weekend when Secretary Ribicoff reported that an estimated 4½ million handicapped children of school age are not attending school at all. A major reason for that is that most of our school systems lack the specially trained teachers needed to make school a meaningful experience for these youngsters.

The Federal Government, of course, cannot be and should not be expected to finance the training of all of the classroom teachers we need, and the college faculty people we need, in this field of educating exceptional children. The most a Federal program should be expected to do is to provide a starting motor—a mechanism to initiate action in a neglected but vitally important area of education.

As long as we recognize it as only a starter—as long as we are aware that the biggest effort here is going to have to be by the States and localities, as it should be—then H.R. 15 represents one of the best investments the people of the United States could make, as Federal taxpayers, in the development of human resources, which constitute the greatest of all of our national resources.

THE PROBLEM FACED BY THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD IN SCHOOL

While all of us are endowed with individual qualities and characteristics which distinguish us from each other most of us are blessed with a kind of normal averageness, if that is the word, of physical appearance and mental capacity which enables us from childhood on to submerge comfortably in the group—in the crowd—if we so desire and travel life's road at a comparatively easy pace. Most of the institutions with which we come in contact, the tools we must use, the clothes we wear, the homes in which we live, the specifications for most jobs, and the schools in which we learn, particularly the schools, are geared or tailored pretty much to the norm. I said we are blessed with the averageness because certainly as children we shrink at the idea of being visibly or demonstrably different.

But while most children seem to fit a comfortable pattern, others, a very select few, are touched by God with such great gifts of mind and perception, as to stand out for their brilliance; and still others, millions of others, are chosen for reasons known only to God for the special testing and trial of another form of differentness, that is, in having to shoulder physical, mental, or emotional handicaps or disabilities.

To romanticize this situation, it is easy to think that the gifted child has everything in his favor with the world as his oyster and the handicapped child inevitably has some inner fire and drive to enable him to overcome his physical limitations and achieve the greatness which has come to so many in similar circumstances, great poets, musicians, teachers, physicians, and so on, who were handicapped and who nevertheless achieved great things in spite of, if not because of, those physical handicaps.

But let us not forget that children do not suck knowledge out of their thumbs. They must be taught and often it is a painstakingly difficult—incredibly difficult—and skilled task to teach some unfortunate children anything, to teach others the minimum of those things they must learn and know in order to live useful lives, and to teach still others all they can learn profitably.

WASTAGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

In this respect, the greatly gifted child and the handicapped child share some common and often serious problems in the educational process and thus are placed together by educators under the heading of exceptional. For the procedures set up to teach the so-called normal or average child do not begin to reach the educational needs of the difficult child—the exceptional one. As a consequence, the exceptional child—gifted or handicapped—is robbed of some of his educational birthright.

Some millions of children of school age are not in any school at all because of the existence of this problem. Some of these receive some help from the school system, but the problem is enormous, and the needs generally are not being met.

In addition, many others attend schools but find it often a frustrating experience, a place of confusion and torment, because they are just not geared for the classroom routine. They need classroom work specially planned for their abilities or handicaps. A capable youngster with a serious speech or hearing or visual defect can be made to feel dumb; an emotionally disturbed youngster can be a distracting influence on an entire class; a gifted youngster can sit and vegetate in pure boredom in a class which he tends to find a prison for his imagination or feel out of it in a class of older children who are nearer his mental capacity.

This is the problem faced by the exceptional child, and by his parents, and by all of us. Because the specialized equipment or the special techniques—or, most important, the specially trained teachers—are not available, the exceptional child suffers from unrealized educational opportunities, and his family is often caught in an agonizing situation. I think all of us know of such families and the problems they face. And lastly, we as a nation suffer in terms of a tragic wastage of human resources, of skills and abilities we cannot afford to waste.

I am not going to put this in terms of cold war or West versus East or the fact that the Soviet Union is outstripping us in the education of scientists and engineers and technicians. True, a gifted child whose talents are wasted because he is not stimulated to learn to his full capacity might otherwise become a great inventor or scientist whose discoveries could bolster our defenses, but that is not the point I wish to make. I should like to present this problem not in terms of national defense but in terms of what is right and fair to American children and to our society, which could be enriched by the contributions of all of these exceptional children if given the opportunity to learn and contribute to their full capabilities.

INCIDENCE OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Who are these children? And how many are there?

H.R. 15 defines the term "exceptional children" to include those who are unusually intelligent or gifted; the mentally retarded; the deaf or hard of hearing; the blind or those with serious visual impairments; children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; children with speech impediments; and those who are crippled, including those who have cerebral palsy; and, finally, children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent.

There is no exact count available on the number of children in each category. However, spot studies made in 1952 showed that except for the category of blind children or those with serious visual impairments, numbering at that time less than 100,000, each of the other seven categories was estimated to number at least—or substantially more than—500,000.

In 1954, the Office of Education held a conference on qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children, and in the course of the conference a proposed creed for exceptional children was presented by Leonard Mayo, director of the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, and was accepted by the conference and by the Office of Education, which has since published it. I would like to quote a few passages from it.

This document states:

We believe in the American promise of equality of opportunity, regardless of nationality, cultural background, race, or religion.

"We believe in the American promise of every child within the borders of our country no matter what his gifts, his capacity, or his handicaps.

"We believe that the Nation as a whole, every State and county, every city and hamlet, and every citizen has an obligation to help in bringing to fruition in this generation the ideal of a full and useful life for every exceptional child in accordance with his capacity: the child who is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight, or of hearing, the child whose life may be adversely influenced by a crippling disease or condition, the child whose adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, and the child who is endowed with special gifts of mind and spirit."

TRAINED MIND AND WARM HEART

The final paragraph of this document states:

"Above all, we believe in the exceptional child himself; in his capacity for development so frequently retarded by the limits of present knowledge; in his right to a full life too often denied him through lack of imagination and ingenuity on the part of his elders; in his passion for freedom and independence that can be his only when those who guide and teach him have learned the lessons of humility, and in which there resides an effective confluence of the trained mind and the warm heart."

I have quoted only portions of the document, the creed for exceptional children. I prize a framed copy of it in my office, and I will readily acknowledge that I have borrowed very heavily from it, deliberately, for the language of the preamble of my bill.

I think those few passages I quoted sum up a philosophy with which we must agree wholeheartedly if we truly mean to see to it that each child in this great country shares equally in the opportunity to learn. We know that each cannot learn at the same speed or to the same degree. But for those who can absorb knowledge and skills, we must make sure the opportunity exists for the child to benefit to the full extent possible.

We do that now for adults, and for children reaching maturity, in connection with vocational training and vocational rehabilitation. We provide the means by which men and women and young men and young women, with physical handicaps can be helped and taught to qualify for skilled employment. Wonders are being performed under this program.

But why must we wait until the handicapped child is almost grown and ready for employment to begin thinking of his need in this respect? If we can perform wonders now in the rehabilitation process—and we can—then think how much more we could accomplish with that same individual if we began his specialized education as a youngster and geared it to his capabilities just as we later gear the vocational rehabilitation program to the physical capabilities of the individual.

SPECIALIZED TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Special educational techniques for the exceptional child would eliminate a tremendous amount of emotional stress for many of these children in the growing-up stage and thus help make better citizens of them and better communities for all of us.

Special education does not always and invariably involve special classes, but it does involve specialized teaching. In this connection, I think one of the best statements of the problem which I have seen was made in the annual report of the Ames, Iowa, public schools for 1954–55, in which Walter L. Hetzel stated:

"It must always be remembered that the education of exceptional children has basic concepts and goals in common with the education of all children. The same principles of child development prevail. A deaf child is a child with a hearing handicap. As a child, he has all the needs, desires, and physical energy of children in general. Basically, the only way in which he differs from an average child is his inability to hear; and because of this hearing handicap, he is unable to speak.

"This difference makes it necessary to plan his education with special consideration for his disabilities. The mentally retarded child, the child with visual impairment, the crippled child, and every other exceptional child has fundamental motives and drives common to children in general; but along with those common characteristics, there is in each case a specific handicap or exceptional condition that requires an adjustment or special service in his educational program.

"That program should be designed with full recognition of (a) his likeness to normal children, and (b) his special needs. This, in brief, constitutes the modern approach to the education of exceptional children."

EDUCATORS AWARE OF AND DISTURBED BY PROBLEM

Every family which has an exceptional child knows of the existence of this problem. So does every teacher who struggles with the task of trying to accommodate such a child in a group of 35 or 40 or more other youngsters, when there is insufficient space and not enough teaching hours in the day to cope with such tremendous classes. Our school administrators know of the problem, and so does the Office of Education, which has published much on it.

Many schools and many school systems are trying determinedly to meet the challenge which this problem presents. I was amazed at the number of Catholic schools, for example, set up specifically to meet the needs of exceptional children. I was also deeply impressed by the tremendous amount of literature on this problem.

TEACHER SHORTAGE AS BASIC FACTOR

One theme runs through all of this material, and is voiced again and again by Federal officials, State and local school administrators, and all of the experts in this field. It is this:

The problem is serious not because there is a lack of techniques or knowledge for helping these children, but because of a lack of trained teachers specially qualified to use these techniques and skills.

According to the research material prepared for me by the Library of Congress, there were in 1957 perhaps 25,000 specially trained schoolteachers equipped or certified to provide the specialized teaching required for various types of exceptional children. Some of the States have gone into the leadership on this in setting up certification standards for teaching exceptional children and many have established on a mandatory

basis classes for certain physically handicapped and mentally retarded children.

Furthermore, at least 125 colleges and universities were then presenting sequences of courses leading to degrees for teachers or supervisors or researchers in various areas of exceptionality, and the increase in interest in this work on the part of the colleges and universities in recent years has been extremely gratifying.

Nevertheless, the number of teachers specially trained in these fields is so small compared with the magnitude of the need that any program to help in the education of exceptional children must start—and must concentrate on—assuring the training of many more teachers, and men and women to teach such teachers.

I am informed that a conservative guess on the number of elementary and secondary schoolteachers needed in this field would be 100,000—4 times the 25,000 teachers reported to have these specialized skills. And even that number, I am told, would not assure a desirable or practical ratio of teachers to students needing this specialized help.

PURPOSE OF PROPOSED BILL

The purpose of my bill is not to have the Federal Government proceed to do the job, but just lead the way, to provide a limited number of scholarships and fellowships to teachers and prospective teachers to encourage them to go into this field where they are so desperately needed; to provide some assistance to the colleges and universities pioneering in this work to enlarge facilities or obtain specialized equipment; and, above all, to stimulate the States and the localities not only to recognize their obligations—most of them do now—but rather to see the way to setting up the specialized classes or programs which are so necessary, knowing that under this bill more and more qualified teachers will be coming out of the advanced training courses prepared to take over such programs and build their effectiveness.

The Sullivan bill would work in this fashion:

AWARDS TO INDIVIDUALS

Beginning in this present fiscal year, and extending over 7 years, the Office of Education could award a total of $18,500,000 to teachers and prospective teachers for specialized training, primarily at the graduate level, in the field of education of exceptional children. The appropriations authorized for this purpose would be limited to $500,000 for the current fiscal year ending next June 30, increasing each fiscal year thereafter by $1 million until a maximum of $3,500,000 a year was reached in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. This amount would continue each year, then, until the end of the fiscal year 1968. These grants would carry such stipends as the Commissioner of Education would determine, but the basic idea is that, by providing for living expenses as well as tuition or other expenses, they particularly enable men and women already engaged in the teaching profession to feel that they can afford to go back to school for this specialized advanced training.

UNDERGRADUATES COULD BE INCLUDED

The money would be allocated on a strict ratio among the States, based on the school populations of the respective States. If there were not enough successful applicants from any State to use up the State's full allocation in any one year, the remaining amount would revert to the Treasury. It could not be reallocated among other States.

Although the program is intended primarily to attract teachers with degrees for advanced training at the graduate level, there is a special provision in the bill to permit the Commissioner, when he deems it advisable, to make awards also for study at the undergraduate level. Thus, if there should be a limited number of graduate teachers in a particular State who were interested in going into this field, there would still be opportunity for the Commissioner to make awards to teachers who have not yet earned degrees or to residents of the State who have never taught professionally but who want to enter this field of teaching the exceptional child. But the primary emphasis of the bill, as I said, is on work at the graduate level.

The awards of scholarships and fellowships would be made directly to the individual recipient, not to the colleges or universities offering specialized courses. Since more institutions of higher learning are entering this field year by year, the recipient would thus have a free choice of institutions, providing, of course, that the recipient attended an accredited institution which offered appropriate courses in this field.

AWARDS TO INSTITUTIONS

An additional total amount of $2,500,000 would be authorized for appropriation during the 7-year program for grants to colleges and universities, primarily for installation of specialized equipment or facilities for training teachers in the fields of exceptional children. This particular item is not allocated on a State-by-State basis, nor is there a limitation of how much of the $2,500,000 could be appropriated in any one fiscal year. The basic idea in connection with this phase of the bill is to give the Commissioner of Education an opportunity to help schools actively engaged in teacher-training work to expand facilities, to put in necessary laboratories, and so on.

The Commissioner would be free to use some of this money in order to help an institution of higher education expand its faculty to establish courses in teacher training in the exceptionality categories. But I repeat, the emphasis intended on the use of this money is for things, rather than personnel. The amount of money involved is really so small that it could be used up quickly and to little overall effect if much of it were to go to schools to hire personnel, but I would not want to tie the Commissioner's hands too tightly if it should be determined by those best in a position to know the facts, that substantial portions of the awards to institutions should be made for that purpose.

Conceivably the best use to which this $2,500,000 might be put could even be for the purpose of setting up summer workshops or institutes at a number of centrally located colleges and universities. I just throw that out as a possibility, knowing that the summer institute idea has been used with very great success in the National Science Foundation and NDEA programs for high school teachers of science and mathematics.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Rather than try to spell out in every detail how these funds would have to be used to achieve the greatest effectiveness, I have provided in the bill for the creation of an advisory committee to assist the Commissioner in determining the areas and priorities of need in the award of grants to individuals and institutions, and in setting the standards for making the awards.

The advisory committee would be composed of people conversant with the overall educational needs of exceptional children, which is broad enough in phraseology, I hope, so that it could include outstanding lay people and other professionals, not just professional educators. To assure full participation by the professional educators now engaged in this work, I suggest in the bill the establishment of advisory panels of specialists in special education for each of the various categories of exceptional children, who could advise the Commissioner on particular problems and needs in their respective fields.

COOPERATION WITH THE STATES

There is one other provision of the bill which I believe warrants mention at this time, a provision calling for close and continuing and affirmative cooperation with the various State educational agencies to keep them fully informed of all developments under this program.

In this connection, the Commissioner of Education is instructed to notify the appropriate State officials of the names and home addresses of each resident of their State who is studying under a scholarship or fellowship grant under this program, and the field of study each is pursuing, so that the States can then bring up whatever ammunition they can to attract these teachers to positions back in their home States.

Of course, no teacher receiving a grant would or could be required to promise to teach in a particular State as a condition to receiving the award; so they will be free agents in that respect. But the States should be encouraged to try to get these people to come back to the home State so that the schools there can benefit, and the children can benefit, from the skills which these teachers will have acquired with Federal help.

The theory behind this section on cooperation with the States is that if the State agencies are keyed into the program, and are kept fully informed of all developments under it, and are consulted on the needs for specialized teachers in their States, they in turn will develop a greater awareness of those needs and the potentials of educating their exceptional children more effectively. They will thus also be encouraged, I believe, to develop more statewide programs and stimulate the local communities to set up special classes in these areas of specialized need.

PARTIAL SOLUTIONS FOR A MUCH BROADER PROBLEM

At the national level, Congress has not by any means been insensitive to this problem. Thanks to Congressman FOGARTY, we have appropriated substantial sums for research into the problems of teaching mentally retarded children and in 1958—a year after what is now H.R. 15 was originally introduced—we passed the bill to authorize a $1-million-a-year program to finance some fellowships for specialized work in teaching the mentally retarded. I was glad to support that bill, but as I said at the time it was passed, it was only a partial solution to a much broader problem.

Now the Senate has this year suggested a further partial solution by passing S. 336, which would provide grants for the training of teachers of the deaf, and for the training of speech pathologists and audiologists.

But is there any legitimate reason why we have to approach this problem in piecemeal fashion, enacting something for the mentally retarded children in 1958, something for the children with speech and hearing defects in 1961 or 1962, something for the crippled and cerebral-palsied in, say, 1963 or 1964, leaving out the emotionally and socially maladjusted or the children with debilitating conditions unless and until their parents can form a big enough lobby and become articulate enough to command equal attention from the Congress?

I have heard it said by some legislative strategists that it is always so hard to get through any broad type of Federal aid to education, that it is simpler just to handle all of these problems in piecemeal fashion, solving one problem one year in the name of national defense, then tackling the mentally retarded problem separately because no one can conscientiously oppose aid for mentally retarded children, and so on. Of course your experience on education issues in the Congress might bear that out. But I think, if we are doing anything significant and substantial in the field of training teachers for one group of exceptional children fairness dictates that we include them all in the same program and that it be the most effective type of program we can devise.

In connection with the needs of gifted children, your committee provided a good start in 1958 by including in the National Defense Education Act funds for testing and surveys to uncover the incidence of such youngsters in our schools. Presumably, then, we are singling them out for particular emphasis in the national defense-related subjects such as languages, mathematics, and the sciences. In the same act you set up a fellowship program for teachers in these specialized fields of knowledge. The National Science Foundation also devotes substantial funds for seminars and institutes for teachers in the secondary schools. So this problem is not entirely ignored. But we also need teachers in the elementary schools and in high school, too, who are able to work with the unusually intelligent child, not only in the teaching of a particular subject related to the national defense but in helping the child to achieve his full educational potential in all the fields of learning.

DOLLAR AUTHORIZATIONS PROBABLY TOO LOW

The $21 million which would be authorized over a 7-year period by H.R. 15—$18,500,000 in grants to individuals and $2,500,000 in grants to institutions—is an extremely modest amount compared to the need and the challenge. It is a figure based on recommendations made 4 years ago, and is probably too low in relation to today's costs, prices and needs. I would be delighted—and I invite you to do it—to see the subcommittee double or triple that amount. I was groping somewhat in the dark in trying to arrive at a reasonable figure. As some of you may know, and as the material I intend to submit for your record will show, I originally invited the Commissioner of Education in 1957—Dr. Derthick—to recommend to me the kind of legislation which would best help meet the need for teachers of exceptional children as he himself had described the need in testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. His office declined to make any official policy recommendations and, I would say, appeared quite lukewarm about the whole matter. I will let our exchange of correspondence at that time speak for itself.

I have not discussed the bill with the new Commissioner of Education because, frankly, I know he's had his hands full, since taking office, with issues and controversies with which all of you are quite familiar. But I hope this subcommittee, if it seriously plans to go ahead with H.R. 15, will discuss with the Commissioner and recognized experts in this field the proper dollar amount which should be authorized overall. I leave that to your good judgment.

CONCLUSION

Madam Chairman, there are two technical amendments which must be made in H.R. 15. On page 3, line 7, the word "Hawaii" should be deleted since Hawaii is now, of course, a State by right and by law and not merely by convenient definition in this measure.

On page 4, section 4, beginning at line 17, the $500,000 which would be authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, is no longer appropriate. I would suggest, therefore, that each of the fiscal year authorizations be moved back 1 year, so that the program would continue through fiscal year 1968 rather than 1967.

I am submitting for your record the background material which I prepared at the time this bill was originally introduced. I hope you will include it in the printed transcript. It gives the origin of what is now H.R. 15. It details the actual development of the various provisions of the bill. It shows the factors which were taken into consideration. It lists the people who had a hand in developing the provisions. Most importantly, it gives what I believe is an outstanding research report from the Legislative Reference Service on this whole program. And this research material, in turn, explains the bases on which I had to make the final decisions from among various alternatives for what was, and still is, a pioneering legislative effort to help extend the American promise of equality of opportunity, as the preamble of the bill states, "to every child within our country, no matter what his gifts, his capacity or his handicaps, whether he is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight or of hearing, or crippling disease or condition, whether his adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, or whether, on the other hand, he is endowed with outstandingly brilliant gifts of mind and of spirit."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the statement above lists the distinctive features of H.R. 15. I think it would help in an understanding of those features if the text of H.R. 15 were printed at this point in the RECORD in full, as follows:

H.R. 15

[87th Congress, 1st session, in the House of Representatives, January 3, 1961]

Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"A bill to provide for the establishment of a special $18,500,000 seven-year program of Federal scholarship and fellowship grants to individuals, and a $2,500,000 program of grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for the education of exceptional children

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"This Act may be cited as the 'Exceptional Children Educational Assistance Act'.

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE OF ACT

"SEC. 2. The Congress believes that the American promise of equality of opportunity extends to every child within our country, no matter what his gifts, his capacity or his handicaps, whether he is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight or of hearing, or crippling disease or condition, whether his adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, or whether, on the other hand, he is endowed with outstandingly brilliant gifts of mind and of spirit. All such exceptional children require special educational guidance for development of their total educational potential.

"The Congress finds that the educational problems presented by such exceptional children are of national concern, and that there is an acute national shortage of, and urgent national need for, individuals professionally qualified to teach such children, to supervise the teachers of such children, to train such teachers and supervisors, and to conduct research into the problems relating to the education of exceptional children.

"While the Congress recognizes that the primary responsibility for meeting these problems lies with the States and local communities, national interest in the training of self-reliant and useful citizens demands that the Federal Government assist and encourage and stimulate the initiation of adequate programs in the States to meet these problems.

"Therefore, this Act provides, on a temporary, seven-year basis, a program to further the training of teachers, supervisors of teachers, and researchers in special education for exceptional children, and to encourage and assist public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to expand their training work in these fields.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'State' means a State, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

"(2) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education;

"(3) The term 'school-age population' means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce;

"(4) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in a State, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the Governor or by State law;

"(5) The term 'nonprofit institution' means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(6) The term 'exceptional children' means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy); and (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; for grants to individuals for scholarships and fellowships in accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of this Act.

"(b) There is also authorized the sum of $2,500,000 to be expended during the existence of this program in the form of grants to public and nonprofit institutions in accordance with the provisions of section 5(b) of this Act.

"GRANTS BY THE COMMISSIONER

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships, with such stipends as he may determine, to individuals for the purpose of taking advanced training, at institutions selected by the recipients, for stated periods of time, in order to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train or supervise teachers in this field, or engage in research in the teaching of exceptional children: *Provided*, That, in his discretion, the Commissioner, in order to accomplish the objectives of this Act, may also make these awards for study at the undergraduate level.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to construct, install, improve, or expand specialized facilities and equipment in connection with courses of instruction for persons preparing to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional

children, or to train such teachers, or to supervise such teachers, or to engage in research in special education for exceptional children: *Provided*, That the Commissioner, in his discretion, may also make grants to establish specialized courses in this field in such institutions.

"(c) The amount of scholarships and fellowship grants made in any fiscal year to residents of a State under section 5(a) shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds appropriated under authority of section 4(a) for such fiscal year as the school age population of such State bears to the total school age population of all the States.

"(d) Payments of grants pursuant to this Act may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine, including conditions requiring public and other nonprofit institutions to make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and conditions requiring compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(e) The Commissioner shall consult with an advisory committee as described in section 6(a) which shall assist him in determining the areas and priorities of need in the award of these grants, and in setting the standards for the granting of such fellowships, scholarships, and grants.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY PANELS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall appoint an advisory committee of not more than eight persons who shall be conversant with the overall educational needs of exceptional children and who shall assist the Commissioner in developing general policies under this Act. The Commissioner shall be ex officio a member of this committee and shall act as chairman thereof.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized from time to time to establish advisory panels of specialists in special education for any of the categories of exceptional children enumerated in this Act. Each such panel shall consist of not less than five persons, who shall meet at the call of the Commissioner.

"DELEGATIONS OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 7. The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this Act except the making of regulations.

"PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS

"SEC. 8. The Commissioner shall take such steps as are practicable to publicize to the fullest extent possible the availability of fellowships, scholarships, and grants under this Act among teachers and prospective teachers, and among all colleges and universities offering accredited courses of study leading to advanced degrees in nursery, kindergarten, elementary, or secondary education.

"COOPERATION WITH STATES

"SEC. 9. In the administration of this Act, the Commissioner shall consult and advise with the various State educational agencies to determine the extent of need for teachers of exceptional children in the respective States and to keep the State educational agencies fully informed of all developments under this program in order to encourage them to establish special programs or special classes for exceptional children. In this connection, the Commissioner shall advise the State educational agencies of the names and home addresses of all individuals from their respective States who have received fellowships, scholarships, or grants for training in the field of education of exceptional children, and the particular field of study each is pursuing, so that the respective State educational agencies can then take appropriate steps to seek to attract such persons to positions in their home States in order to utilize the advanced education and skills which they have acquired under this program: *Provided*, That no individual receiving a scholarship, fellowship, or grant for advanced study under this Act shall be required, as a condition of such scholarship or fellowship or grant, to promise to take employement subsequently in any State."

Has the President Told the People the Whole Truth About the Berlin Situation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, are the people being fully informed by the administration regarding the current situation in Berlin? It seems that in his report to the Nation on July 25 and in subsequent statements from the White House, the President may have been holding something back. He has not told us how the situation is different today in Berlin than it was in 1958 when Khrushchev gave us 6 months to get out of the city. President Eisenhower ignored the threat, there was no big rush about increasing our military forces, no demand for new billions of appropriations to put us on a war footing, simply a firm, straightforward statement that we had certain commitments in Berlin which we intended to honor. The Khrushchev threat evaporated. How did that situation differ from this? What made this ultimatum so much more serious that it demanded mobilization of men and resources? The American people are due an explanation, they should be told the whole truth if there is any reason to be more concerned now then there was then.

It seems to me a policy of strength and firmness in 1958 was sufficient to keep the peace. It is doubtful that our policy of a hot exchange of words will do the same now. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points out the danger of two powerful nations trying to outgoad one another. We may reach a point of no return and a hot war will be inevitable. I am convinced that the true path to peace lies in the judicious use of the tried and true philosophy of speaking softly and carrying a big stick. Our nuclear power is the big stick which will deter any plans for Communist aggression and we should make it known that this will be the power that Khrushchev will unleash on his homeland, if he is so foolish as to start a war he cannot win.

The editorial follows:

THE PING-PONG EFFECT

One of the mysteries in the Berlin situation is why the 1961 dispute is developing so much more ominously than the 1958–59 dispute.

Then, as now, Khrushchev threatened to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, a pact he said would end Allied rights in Berlin. Then, as now, he set a 6-month time limit. Yet as the months rolled by, that crisis faded away, whereas this one has sometimes seemed hell-bent for war.

There are certain possible explanations for the difference. One is that it is really the same continuing crisis, which Khrushchev merely shelved for a time and then resumed in more aggravated form. Another is that conditions in East Germany, while bad in late 1958, were not nearly so bad as this year, when the place had become an economic and political shambles, in danger of disintegration from the vast outpouring of refugees.

Still another possible reason may be simply that Khrushchev is that much older now, getting on toward 70, and he may be obsessed with the need to consolidate his position in Eastern Europe before he dies. then, too, there is always the chance of obscure internal and Red Chinese pressures pushing him toward greater belligerence.

Some or all of these theories could account for the far more dangerous face the crisis has worn this time. But it is also true that the U.S. response has been very different this time, and this may not be unconnected with the way things have developed in 1961.

After the 1958 ultimatum, President Eisenhower said in effect that, though we were willing to discuss the matter, as we eventually did at a fruitless foreign ministers' conference, we were not going to be pushed out of Berlin. The United States, however, undertook no big new military buildup, and indeed seemed to try to avoid encouraging a war psychology. This time, of course, both the buildup and the psychology have come about.

Now if the intrinsic situation is in fact much graver—if Khrushchev's intentions are much more menacing than in 1958—then the massive U.S. reaction is justified. For in that case, it is incumbent on this country to make unmistakably clear to Khrushchev that we will fight, if necessary, to preserve the Western position and keep our commitments to West Berlin.

The ordinary American unfortunately has no way of knowing whether that is the actual situation. Certainly no administration official has ever explained to us in what way, if in any way, the Berlin crisis of 1961 is more dangerous than the Berlin crisis of 1958. One can only speculate, and among the speculation must be the question whether all the new billions for arms, the calling up of Reserves and all the rest are the wisest methods of dealing with the problem.

And if not, there is a certain danger of aggravating the crisis by such moves. Khrushchev goads us, we goad him back and you may get what might be called the ping-pong effect, with the smacks getting successively harder as the antagonists get more aroused. Matters can get out of hand in such a game.

In a perhaps minor way, this process can be seen right now in West Germany. Chancellor Adenauer and West Berlin Mayor Brandt, fighting each other in an election campaign, seem to be trying to outdo each other in toughness regarding the Communist closing of the internal Berlin border. You can't blame them for behaving like politicians, but it is not difficult to see, for example, how a West Berlin population, understandably infuriated by the Red move, could be whipped up to the point of violent action, which could drag us in.

For all we know, the back of the Berlin crisis may already have been broken—by the sealing off of East Berlin and by our firm stand. If our arms brandishing is necessary to convince Khrushchev of our firmness, then it is necessary.

We would only like to note that if a country intends to carry a big stick and speak softly, both parts of the proposition are important. That was what the United States did after the 1958 ultimatum, and, whatever happens now, it worked then.

Soil and Water Conservation: Our Capital Investment in America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech given by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. James T. Ralph, at the meeting of National Association of Soil Conservation District:

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION: OUR CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to have this opportunity to talk with you today about one of our Nation's most pressing needs—soil and water conservation.

There are many things I could talk with you about which would not be inappropriate on this occasion.

I could review for you many statistics of soil and water conservation—something that is commonly done, but you can find statisticians who know these figures better than I.

I could talk to you about the Kennedy administration's agricultural record in the first 8 months—the first Executive order signed by the President was the move to distribute our abundance to the needy—the first major piece of legislation was the feed grain bill—and the first long-range plans submitted to the Congress (the enabling portion of the Agricultural Act of 1961) were all agricultural measures. Agriculture is in the forefront of the Kennedy administration.

I could talk to you about the tremendous team that President Kennedy has put together in your Department of Agriculture. Orville Freeman of Minnesota, a man whose dedication is surpassed only by his energy. A man determined to correct the misdirection that has been given to thinking on agriculture in recent years. A man who would lead us to think of our capacity to produce in terms of an asset rather than a liability.

Charles Murphy, of North Carolina, a distinguished lawyer skilled in the ways of Government.

John Duncan, former president of one of the finest farm organizations in America—the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation—although a relatively large farmer himself—completely devoted to the cause of assisting smaller farmers to share in America's abundance.

Frank Welch dean of two agricultural colleges in his time and probably the outstanding man of the land-grant college system of America.

I could talk to you about our distinguished corps of career people in the Department; many of them you know better than I. We have the finest staff of any department in Government, not just because of their intelligence and ability but more so their dedication, their pride in the industry they serve and their loyalty to the cause of American agriculture. Many of them stay in Agriculture because of that loyalty and pride when their training and ability would get them better positions in other departments.

But I would prefer talking to you about our great conservation effort to make our land more fruitful for this and future generations. As supervisors of soil and water conservation districts, you have a key role in this highly important program.

In my association with agriculture and farm people I have come to have the highest regard for the work you do. Serving out of a genuine desire to conserve resources for our future citizens, you deserve high praise and commendation for the success of the program you push forward so vigorously. The soil and water conservation program is a dynamic and moving force because of the direction you give it.

We are challenged to accelerate the program. Soil, once it is lost to erosion, is not easily replaced or rebuilt. Our soil conservation authorities estimate we are losing the equivalent of 2,000 average sized farms every year. About two-thirds of the landowners and farm operators in this country have not yet adopted basic conservation plans. A tremendous job remains to be done.

This gigantic undertaking to stop the waste of precious topsoil, prevent floods, and make better use of water resources is strongly undergirded by the Department of Agriculture.

The fact that the work is progressing steadily and surely is a tribute to the ability of Administrator Don Williams. As a veteran of more than 25 years of service in conservation work, he knows the soil and water conservation program from the ground up. I am impressed not only with his technical knowledge but with his administrative skills as well. A native of South Dakota, he knows the problems that concern you here in the Great Plains, not only as district supervisors but as landowners and operators too. We look forward to continuing progress under the vigorous leadership that he and his field representative for the Great Plains, Gary Bobst, are giving to the program.

I note with pleasure the Great Plains program is making substantial headway. Almost 7,000 basic conservation plans and contracts have been written in 361 counties, covering about 18¼ million acres, during the 3½ years of operation of the Great Plains conservation program. These plans obligate nearly $31,358,000 of Federal funds. Further, we have a backlog of 2,600 applications.

In Nebraska, for example, 58 of 60 eligible counties are in the Great Plains program. Up to the first of July, 1,050 contracts had been signed with farmers and ranchers on 1¼ million acres of land. Those contracts call for $3,867,000 of Federal money; 3,020 additional farmers have applied.

The Great Plains conservation program will add strength and stability to agriculture in this area: (1) by installing permanent conservation practices; (2) by making the changes in land use that conservation authorities consider necessary; (3) by seeding land less suited for crops to permanent grass; and (4) by developing water facilities. Already about 1 acre in 3 of the land under contract here in the Great Plains has been changed from cultivated crop use to permanent vegetation.

We hope this will encourage even more practices known to improve land use in this area. Let me congratulate you again for your part in helping to bring about these achievements.

But, however must we bend our efforts and energies toward wise use of our land and water resources, they take on real meaning only when we keep in mind that those efforts have one basic purpose. That purpose is to serve people—you, me, our fellow men in this generation and in generations to come. There are 8,200 more of us each morning and the ratio of acres to people narrows with each passing day.

Our population numbers about 184 million. By 1975 we may have 230 million. By the year 2010, we could have twice our present number, or 370 million people.

Pressure on the land will increase. We must apply soil and water saving know-how faster if our children are to live as well then as we do now.

Our Agricultural Research Service estimates we will need 400 million additional acres just 50 years from now.

Some may ask, "What about now—the present—when the emphasis is on cutting down on production to bring crop supplies in better balance with demand? Is soil and water conservation so urgent at a time when we have larger surpluses of feed?"

The answer is clear and unequivocal yes.

Only a third of the land in this country is now safeguarded against wind and water erosion. No competent general would think of demobilizing his troops before the enemy has been licked. Our soil and water conservation program must not be abandoned when it is only well started. The work must continue at ever-increasing speed.

Wind and water erosion are ruining 400,000 acres each year. Production on another 120 million acres is seriously endangered. We cannot afford this resource waste.

Nearly one-fourth of our people are confronted by water shortage, poor water, or both. The amount of sediment dredged each year from rivers and harbors is greater than the volume of earth dug from the Panama Canal.

Soil and water conservation pays its way regardless of the price and demand situation. By improving productivity, by conserving rainfall, by keeping seeds and fertilizer from washing or blowing—conservation farming enables growers to produce more efficiently.

Soil and water conservation are as important in farming as improved machinery, high-quality seed, weed and pest control, or skilled management.

Soil and water conservation help maintain a firm tax base and reduces risks that banks and other lending agencies assume.

It is the essential first step in watershed protection and flood prevention. Rainfall soaks more readily in land under conservation treatment.

Soil and water conservation has contributed to the low cost of food the American people enjoy. This alone would be enough to justify your work.

Contouring, contour stripcropping, terracing, grassed waterways, new ponds, and healed gullies add greatly to the beauty of our countryside. To a man passing by they dramatically illustrate the American farmer's love for his soil.

Newly established plantings of grass on millions of acres once bare to the ravages of erosion create conditions that favor growth and reproduction of wildlife and the development of recreation sites. As a result there are more kinds and a greater number of game birds, fish, and fur-bearing animals in the United States today than when white men first came to this country.

The value of the conservation effort extends far beyond its physical effect upon the land. It contributes to the well-being of all our people—the tourist, the sportsman, and the city dweller. The cost of conservation is a capital investment on the part of our whole people.

While it is true that a great conservation job is being done, there is still much room for improvement.

As you meet here to review your accomplishments and plan programs for the future, you should also take a serious look at your operations.

Our country was rapidly developed. In our era of greatest agricultural expansion we enjoyed the luxury of virtually unlimited land resources. Today, our land resources are committed. There is little left in the way of virgin land.

In the process of national expansion we have been wasteful of resources, and that is why we must now retrace our steps and correct some of the early errors. These are some of the questions I suggest for your consideration.

Have we been fully effective in our efforts to acquaint the public with the district program? This is a tremendous story of local people organizing to do a necessary job. It is a story of self-help on the part of farm people in direct contrast to the action programs of Federal and State Governments. How long will local people continue to participate and assert the kind of initiative, intelligence, and leadership required without a full measure of public support?

Failure of 15 States to provide funds this year for districts which are instrumentalities of the States should be cause for serious reflection. Advocates of States rights and local self-determination should be asked to take another look at this program from their viewpoint.

Then there are long-range questions looking to the future. What needs to be done now to protect our limited areas of class I farm land. We have less than 75 million acres of such land, counting that still in grass and trees. We are losing a million acres a year to shopping centers, highways, airports, housing developments, factories, and other urban expansion. Our best land is the most attractive to the highway engineer and other builders, but how much of this good land can the Nation afford to divert to asphalt, brick, and concrete?

All of us need to look closely at some of the contradictions of farm programing. Are farmers who make desirable land-use adjustments to risk economic penalties by the development of production adjustment programs. If the investment in conservation is to be profitable, economic benefits should accrue to the conservation farmer participating in adjustment programs.

In our Department alone we are spending over a third of a billion dollars annually for soil and water conservation. Public and private investment in agricultural soil and water conservation totals at least a billion dollars a year. We must all work together in our planning and administration of farm programs to avoid economic inequities which might nullify the rewards conservation farmers have every right to expect.

Conservation farming should always mean lower costs of production and better income prospects for the farmer. This, in turn, provides consumers additional assurances of abundant supply at a fair price.

We believe strongly in the American system of widespread ownership of wealth and private enterprise with competition. But we are concerned about its future because farmers and ranchers, the people who have made the greatest contribution toward our economic progress, are not sharing equitably in the bounty they have helped to create.

I am speaking of people like you—the efficient, commercial family farmers of America.

Through their hard work, their thrift, their investment and their productiveness, farmers and ranchers have made an almost incalculable contribution toward the economic progress we enjoy. As a result of their efficiency they have released labor and other resources to other industries to produce the fruits of invention.

In other industries both producers and consumers alike benefit. But, in agriculture a major portion of the benefits have accrued to the consumer.

This is the story of American agriculture that Secretary Freeman and those of us in the Department of Agriculture urgently feel needs telling and retelling until it is understood by the people of this country, in towns and cities, by leaders of thought, by editorial writers, by commentators, and speakers who influence public opinion. You can help too, by telling the facts about this great production success story whenever and wherever you have an opportunity.

You can point out that farmers and ranchers through their purchases of farm equipment, seed, feed, fertilizer and a long, long list of supplies of all kinds play a big part in keeping the wheels of American industry turning and providing jobs for millions of people.

Farming and ranching and the businesses associated with agriculture account for about $4 out of every $10 of business volume in the United States. This is truly tremendous and it needs to be much more widely known and understood.

You can point out that the bountiful abundance that American farmers and ranchers turn out each year is an instrument of massive strength in support of this Nation's foreign policy and that American agriculture's capacity to produce is a reassurance that hunger can be conquered—that food is truly a weapon that serves mightily in both war and peace.

You can point out too, that efficient producers in agriculture are not receiving a return on their capital, their labor, and their investment equal to the returns earned by efficient producers in other industries.

This problem of lack of bargaining power by farmers and ranchers has been recognized for a long time, but it is only recently that attempts have been made to do something about it.

The first Government action program came along in 1929 with creation of the Federal Farm Board.

Since 1933 the Government has tried various stabilization programs to strengthen farmers' bargaining power.

We believe these programs are justified. We believe efficient producers in agriculture are entitled to as good a return on their investment, their managerial ability, and their labor as efficient producers in other necessary industries; and we believe the Government is justified in helping farmers get their fair share of the abundance they help create.

The present administration's programs are aimed at achieving this goal. Efficient private enterprise cannot exist unless the most efficient private entrepreneurs make a profit. We must continue in business as many individual private enterprises in agriculture as are consistent with economic efficiency. The great danger to our system is to have too few people performing the ownership or risk-taking function.

By giving our independent farmers and handlers in agriculture the bargaining strength to maintain themselves in business, we are insuring a greater number of people engaged in private enterprise.

Of the countries of the world that have succumbed to socialism or communism in the past few years, none had the system of family farms that we have here in America; and yet all were agricultural countries.

In all of those countries concentrated ownership of land and other resources was the usual case. The great mass of the people in those countries had no connection with the private enterprise system.

By giving so freely of your time, thought, and energy to the direction of the activities of your soil and water conservation districts, you are contributing greatly to the preservation of private enterprise in our Nation. In like measure, you are helping guarantee freedom of opportunity in our land and throughout the world.

Your contribution to agriculture has been tremendous, but more is needed. A fully successful conservation program must include three fundamentals—people, economic value, and technology. We must look at the problems of land use and resource conservation in human as well as economic and technical terms. What we call the farm problem is part and parcel of the conservation problem. Until we have dealt adequately with the human and economic, we shall not effectively deal with the other.

As stewards of our soil and water resources, I ask you to support in full measure the studied efforts of this administration to bring economic equity to agriculture. In so doing, you will ultimately serve the cause of conservation.

You know that proper land use pays off. We also know that it costs money. If we are to attain the goals we set for ourselves, we must begin now the development of necessary programs and opportunities for farm people to share more equitably in the bounty they produce.

This is the cornerstone on which the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is being built.

The administration's long-range farm program was passed by Congress and signed by President Kennedy. Some have the impression that this program was pretty well taken apart. We did not get all that was asked. But we got most of it. This is a tremendously important piece of legislation. It will lead to more effective action to promote and protect American agriculture. Provisions of the Farmers' Home Administration Credit program were liberalized. The school milk program was continued, Public Law 480 was extended, and two highly significant commodity programs were enacted. Our feed grain program with minor changes was extended, and a similar program was adopted for wheat.

We achieved a breakthrough on the long-range stabilization plan proposed for agriculture. That long-range plan for farmers to set up and operate their own economic stabilization. The form was amendments to the Marketing Agreements Act of 1937. This act had not had major amendment since it's passage 24 years ago. This act was amended in two major respects. First, promotion and research were added as economic tools available to the industries affected. Second, several commodities not heretofore eligible for self-help stabilization programs were added in this bill. Cherries, apples, turkeys, peanuts, and cranberries among others.

The Kennedy-Freeman proposal that farmers be afforded an opportunity to copy the time-tested techniques of other industries by the development of self-help programs will open up New Frontiers of economic opportunity for farm people.

The bill of rights we propose for farm people is not a panacea to cure all ills. It is not pork barrel legislation to make farmers wards of the government. It does provide farmers a license for hard work. The hard work of designing, initiating, securing approval, voting in, administering and paying for their own economic stabilization.

We believe this is a practical program. We believe it easier to give farmers who are 9 percent of our people the power to copy other industries than to attempt to reform the other 91 percent of our economy.

The task of changing 91 percent of our economy staggers the imagination.

To think of reforming the other 91 percent of our economy is impractical. The self-regulation they have is sensible and workable. We have no criticism of other industries. They have designed a workable system of self-regulation. We believe the best approach to stabilization in agriculture is to give farmers the legal power to join the mainstream of the American economy by acting as other industries act.

I submit to you that anyone who is in favor of more economics and less politics in agricultural stabilization; anyone who believes in representative democracy in agriculture; anyone who has faith that farmers can run their own business if given the legal

tools to do so should be in favor of this program.

Our system of private enterprise with widespread ownership has proven its worth. The wisdom of our forefathers has been demonstrated. The need for preserving this system is self-evident.

Our farmers have achieved for us the dream that man has sought throughout the centuries. To be able to produce more food than is needed. American farmers produce not only enough food and fiber for our own needs but also vast quantities to help supply the needs of millions throughout the world. This is an achievement of far greater consequence than putting a man in space. Meat, milk, poultry, fruits, and vegetables in the hand are far closer to man's basic needs than a star in the sky. There is no better propaganda in all the world than the success story of American agriculture.

I suggest to you that our greatest defense against communism or socialism is to preserve, to protect, to promote this wonderful system of efficient commercial family farms we have in America. This system is the strongest thread in the fabric of our society. The Agricultural Act of 1961, by giving farmers the tools to obtain equal bargaining strength with other segments in our society, is a long step forward in preserving our system.

Sawmill: Nix to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Sunday, August 6, 1961, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

SAWMILL: NIX TO RUSSIA

In a recent editorial we opposed the easing of restrictions against trade with Russia. We felt then, as now, that trade with the Soviets can only serve to bolster their ability to wage war against us—as in the shipping of scrap metal to Japan in the thirties. Now, there is a refreshing example of what businessmen can do above and beyond Government positions on the matter.

In Seattle, Wash., recently, the Republic Electric & Development Co. received an order for a very advanced lumber sorting machine to be used in a Russian sawmill. The sawmill, it was learned, would be the largest in the world.

To Republic Electric the order was a big one, representing about 10 percent of its annual volume of business. But, it also represented something else, as Republic's headman, M. E. Hillman, soon made clear. He turned the order down. His explanation, costly as it was in terms of his company's earnings, should be studied carefully by every other businessman in the Nation.

"The Russian Government," Mr. Hillman wrote in part, "has vowed innumerable times to achieve the ultimate destruction and elimination of democracy, either by all-out warfare or by economic warfare. The result would be the same.

"The one advantage we in North America have over the Communist bloc is our production know-how, and it was that single ability more than any one factor which brought about victory in World War I and World War II and, at the moment, still insures our victory in world war III. To knowingly give away the tiniest portion of that production superiority represented by the excellence of Republic's Magnestat Control System would represent us admitting the inevitability of world domination by communism.

"On his recent visit to Moscow, your representative was told by the Russian purchasing committee that they could not train enough technical people in the next 20 years to achieve the building of this tremendous lumber mill and were therefore purchasing North American technical know-how to close the gap from 20 years to 2 years.

"Redco will have no part in handing this advantage to our sworn enemy."

Mr. Hillman's inspiring reply reminds us that there is an old Soviet saying that when the day comes to hang all capitalists, they will knock one another down in the rush to sell communism the rope.

Mr. Hillman has given that the lie. He has said very simply and unmistakably that his country comes first, even ahead of his company.

Freedom Is Not Negotiable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Freedom Is Not Negotiable," which appeared in the Greenfield Daily Reporter of August 14, 1961:

FREEDOM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

For the first time, perhaps, since the great days of Winston Churchill, we can applaud the words of a British leader and hope that his allies on this side of the water absorb something of his candor and courage.

Her Majesty's Foreign Secretary, Lord Home, in answering Khrushchev's peaceful speech of August 7 (not his 100-megaton bomb threat of the 9th) is reported to have stunned his appeasement-inclined countrymen with the suggestion that negotiations is not a magic word that will cause the Berlin crisis to evaporate.

In commenting on the Khrushchev speech that bracketed a warning that he may have to call out reserves and "beef up" Soviet divisions on East Germany's western front with a plea to the West to "sit down around a table and negotiate in an honorable way," Lord Home said:

"So far, and this point has been made time and time again, notably by Mr. Kennedy, the Russian attitude is that what is mine is mine and what is yours is negotiable.

"If from the start there is no real hope of getting an agreement this is worse than no negotiation at all."

Within hours, President Kennedy was telling his press conference in Washington that there was nothing in the latest Khrushchev speeches that he hadn't heard in Vienna. Yet, the emphasis he placed on his intention to use "every device available to us" for the peaceful solution of the Berlin crisis strongly suggested the "negotiations" of which the British Foreign Secretary warns.

Caught as we are between the frustrations of further discussions with the faithless and the perils of war, we should all—including the President himself—remember these words of Mr. Kennedy to the Nation on the night of July 25:

"The solemn vow we (of the Atlantic community) each gave to Berlin in time of peace will not be broken in time of danger. If we do not meet our commitments to Berlin, where will we later stand? And if there is one path above all others to war, it is the path of weakness and disunity."

Tower of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Phil Bladine in the McMinnville (Oreg.) News-Register:

TOWER OF AMERICANISM

Highly acclaimed visits by Texas' new Republican Senator JOHN TOWER at Republican Party gatherings throughout Oregon several weeks ago spotlights the growth of conservative and constructive thought in the ranks of American voters.

First Republican Senator to be elected from one of the Confederate States, Senator TOWER was received with enthusiasm by Oregonians, who flocked to fund dinners, party picnics, and group sessions. They liked what they heard him say about conservative thinking in regard to foreign relations, domestic spending by the Federal Government and reduced Federal encroachment on State and individual rights.

Many people in Oregon, of course, were keenly interested in this man because the was helped so greatly by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona's Republican leader who has skyrocketed into the national political arena as a dynamic, effective spokesman for millions of Americans.

Karl E. Meyer, editorial writer for the Washington Post, recently wrote: "We who disagree with Senator GOLDWATER may soon be glad that he is around. No one could seriously maintain that GOLDWATER is a seditionist or a malevolent demogog. On the contrary, he is a decent, upright, and thoroughly attractive politician. The groups he speaks for deserve a spokesman, and a good one. They could do far worse than BARRY GOLDWATER."

Now, Americans of this school have another sound, colorful, decent spokesman for their cause.

We long have felt, as Meyer expressed it, that conservative Americans deserved leadership able and willing to espouse their cause. Appearance of men like GOLDWATER and TOWER has brought millions from every section of the Nation rallying to a program seeking preservation of the Republic.

Happily and for the first time in decades, we are seeing the youth of America embracing daring new leaders and the precepts they present. For the first time since 1932 conservatives—who view themselves as the real liberals seeking to preserve individual freedom in America—see rays of hope that the rush to the welfare state may be stemmed. They want to preserve a Nation standing before the world as a strong, dynamic symbol of the heights mankind can achieve in a progressive society under capitalistic freedoms. They believe a free America we have boasted about—but which we have undercut by so-called liberal inroads on the Nation's

individualism—can successfully put the lie to Communist propaganda if only it is allowed to flourish.

It was refreshing to have Senator JOHN TOWER visit and present his philosophies in Oregon. We think that he, Senator GOLDWATER and other like-thinking Americans will find they have strong backing in our State.

Your Stake in the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today is the official opening of the Montgomery County Fair at Gaithersburg, Md. Last night I was privileged to attend the premier showing of the new educational exhibit of the Atomic Energy Commission "Your Stake in the Atom." This exhibit is housed in its own 50-foot diameter "Exhibidome." Inside this modern dome are exhibits demonstrating the various uses of atomic energy. A film on atomic research and development and a short demonstration on radioactivity and its uses is presented several times daily.

This exhibit is 1 of 24 traveling exhibits of the Atomic Energy Commission. Last year over 9 million persons visited similar exhibits. The Atomic Energy Commission is to be congratulated on its newest achievement, "Your Stake in the Atom."

A description of this exhibit follows:

YOUR STAKE IN THE ATOM

(Atomic energy is playing a vital role in the life of every man, woman, and child in the United States today. It is essential that all Americans have some understanding of this vital force if they are to discharge thoughtfully their responsibilities as citizens. The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission presents this exhibit to help you achieve such understanding of atomic energy and the contributions it is making to our national welfare and security.—Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.)

1. INTRODUCTION

Our atomic age was born at Chicago on December 2, 1942, when our scientists first released energy from the uranium atom, in a controlled reactor ("atomic furnace"). Only 2½ years later, on July 16, 1945, in the New Mexico desert, we successfully tested the terrific explosive power of the atom. Since then we have harnessed the energy of the atom for many uses, with many still to come.

2. ENERGY: KEY TO PROGRESS

The development of civilization is the story of man's discovery and use of nature's power. The use of energy and radiation released from the center of the atom is our latest conquest of nature.

3. ENERGY FROM THE ATOM

We control the amount of energy released from uranium atoms in the nuclear furnace. The two products of the nuclear furnace are heat and radioactive materials.

4. ATOMIC MESSENGERS

Radioactive materials send out constant signals. By using a Geiger counter to detect these signals, we can trace the radioactive atoms wherever they go. The tracer atoms which we use in medicine, agriculture, and industry do jobs better, faster, and with greater accuracy. Some of these jobs can be done in no other way.

5. RADIATION AT WORK

We cannot live without radiation. The sun's rays, television, radio, and X-rays are forms of radiation at work. Nuclear radiation from radioactive material is used as a production tool in industry, a healer in medicine, a versatile aid in agriculture.

6. POWER FOR PEACE

By 1980 our American power needs may double. Coal and oil will continue to furnish most of this power, but much will be from atomic energy. The heat energy released from atoms in the nuclear furnace is used to make steam which turns a turbine-generator to produce electricity. We now have a number of nuclear powerplants in the United States producing more than 600,000 kilowatts of electricity for our own use.

7. ATOMS ON THE MOVE

The nuclear ship *Savannah*, our first powered merchant ship, is designed to cruise 300,000 miles without refueling. Other portable nuclear powerplants have been developed. These compact units can provide heat and power at remote locations throughout the world.

8. PARTNERS IN DEFENSE

Nuclear energy, as a fuel and as a weapon, is a vital part of our defensive force. Our Armed Forces have a variety of nuclear weapons and nuclear-powered ships for the protection of the free world.

9. LIVING WITH RADIATION

We use radiation every day. In whatever form we use it—sun rays, X-rays, or nuclear rays—we must protect ourselves from overexposure. The three safety factors we must consider when using radiation are: (1) time of exposure, (2) distance from the source of radiation, and (3) shielding from the rays.

10. ATOMIC HORIZONS

New uses of atomic energy are being developed each year. The limits of our nuclear age are nowhere in sight. Both on earth and in space, nuclear energy is the answer to man's dream of an unlimited source of power.

11. YOUR STAKE IN THE ATOM

You are already receiving benefits from atomic energy. Every day you use products which have been improved or tested with radioactive materials. Some of you are already using atomic produced electricity in your homes. As you look about your State, your community, and your home, you can find many ways atomic energy is contributing to the progress of our Nation.

12. MOTION PICTURE AND DEMONSTRATION

The feature attraction of the exhibit is a short, unique, three-screen motion picture on atomic energy.

Some of the uses of atomic energy are demonstrated by the manager of the exhibit who will also answer any questions you may have about this interesting and important subject.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, juvenile delinquency is one of the most difficult, long-term problems which this country faces. It is one that must be met on the community level through a concerted effort of all those who are concerned with the welfare of our children—parents, teachers, law enforcement officers, and social workers.

It is a problem that must also be met on the national level by a similar effort among the Federal agencies such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Justice with the Congress to coordinate their work in this field.

President Kennedy has set up a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency in the Justice Department headed by David Hackett, of Needham, Mass., to do this job. It represents the first large-scale attempt ever made by the Federal Government to deal with this problem and will be, I hope, the first step in an all-out attempt at all levels of the country to halt the spread of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 20, 1961]

MILTON ACADEMY GRADUATE WARS ON DELINQUENCY

WASHINGTON, August 19.—It is a long way from Milton Academy to the Nation's slum areas and spawning grounds for juvenile delinquency.

Yet this is the path that the New Frontier has chosen for David Hackett, 33-year-old graduate of Milton Academy and McGill University, in a bid to come up with the formula for solving the Nation's juvenile delinquency problem.

Early in his administration, President Kennedy set up a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. It marked the Federal Government's first venture into the problem on a major scale.

Hackett—a close friend of Attorney General Robert Kennedy—was picked to represent the Attorney General's department on the committee.

Now he is considered by the New Frontiers men here to be the prime mover behind the committee.

Hackett—wearing a blue shirt with button-down collar and looking much like a graduate student from Cambridge—sees no easy solution to the problem but is convinced that the approach must be through preventive rather than corrective action at this time.

Although he frankly admits that the committee's blueprint for action is still far from complete, he believes that first the committee must help make local communities realize two major contributing factors to juvenile delinquency:

1. Lack of employment opportunities for youth.

* * * * *

school dropouts.

And with the Nation's increasing population facing problems of automation and technological advances, Hackett is convinced this problem of lack of job opportunities for youth is just beginning.

For the past 7 months the committee—it has a representative from the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare as well as * * * and searching in large cities through the Nation.

Even the FBI—associated in the public mind with the tracking down of criminals—has been put to work on the preventive phase of juvenile delinquency.

By studying the endless statistics kept by the FBI, potential trouble spots throughout the Nation can be found by the flip of an IBM card.

Perhaps the most difficult task facing those who hope to solve this problem is acquiring firsthand information of what makes a juvenile delinquent tick.

To find out, Hackett hopes to set up trained task forces.

How to train them?

One method being pursued is to have future teachers actual part of present juvenile gangs.

In effect the future teacher is an undercover agent, acquiring understanding that isn't taught at any college.

In addition to these teachers the task forces will be composed of educators, doctors, social workers, and the best brains that can be acquired.

Their findings convince them that in many slum areas the combination of school dropouts and lack of jobs results in gangs (in some cases, armies) of juvenile delinquents.

Lack of jobs is cause for * * * ployment, lack of skips by youngsters, and prejudice sometimes on the part of employers and sometimes on the part of labor unions.

In some areas, Hackett says the committee has come to realize that an educating job has to be done on some youths just to get them to "want to work."

In other cases, hope has to be instilled in youngsters who early in life despair of ever getting anywhere in life and therefore join a "gang" where they are accepted.

Currently the committee has teams operating in various cities in the Nation scrutinizing successful approaches to the problem.

By assembling this data it hopes in the near future to make it available to other cities that can adapt to these formulas.

"We know the solution accepted by some people of lockup the offenders won't work. There just isn't that much money or jails," Hackett claims.

"But by trying to do something with youngsters before they become delinquents, by seeing if we can't give them some hope and opportunities through education and jobs, we hope to take the first steps toward solution of the overall problem," Hackett says.

Hackett also emphasizes that in some school systems in some cities while top students get a great deal of attention, too little attention is paid by the school system to the average student. And particularly the below average student, he says, is very likely to become the juvenile delinquent of tomorrow if some attention isn't paid to him.

Hackett served with the Army paratroopers and before coming to Washington helped found two magazines in Canada.

Resolutions of Dairyland Power Co-op

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we in Wisconsin have good reason to be proud of Dairyland Power Cooperative of La Crosse, Wis., which is the largest generation and transmission co-op in the world. At Dairyland's 20th annual meeting this year, delegates passed a series of resolutions that represent the thinking of its 27-member systems' 100,000 members. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include some of those resolutions in the RECORD:

REA GUIDING PRINCIPLES ANNOUNCED BY SECRETARY FREEMAN

Whereas the nine guiding principles for the administration of the Rural Electrification Act announced by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman in his letter of February 3, 1961, to the employees of REA, are principles for which rural electric cooperatives the country over and their members have worked for many years; and

Whereas the application of these principles will give tremendous impetus to the program of cooperative rural electrification, and will admirably serve the best interests of not only the millions of rural peoples who are the direct beneficiaries of cooperative rural electric service but the economic health and social development of the general public:

Now, therefore, we the delegates to the 20th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative, do hereby express our appreciation to Secretary Freeman and the administration he represents for his succinct and understanding statement of those principles and we do hereby pledge our wholehearted support to the application of those principles in the administration of the Rural Electrification Act.

REA ADMINISTRATOR, NORMAN M. CLAPP

Whereas in February of 1961, President John F. Kennedy appointed Norman Clapp of our Dairyland area as Administrator of REA; and

Whereas by his prior work as Administrative Assistant to the late U.S. Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and his later work as an outstanding rural newspaper publisher, editor, and journalist, Norman Clapp displayed a fine understanding of the problems of cooperative rural electrification and an undeviating support of the principles essential to its success; and

Whereas since assuming the duties of Administrator, Norman Clapp has demonstrated by word and act that he will dedicate himself to carrying out in administrative practice the fine principles for administration of REA so admirably set forth by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman; and

Whereas Administrator Norman Clapp has further demonstrated a keen understanding of the present and future problems of REA and a determination and ability to solve them in a manner which will promote the best interests of cooperative rural electrification; and

Whereas Administrator Norman Clapp has particularly demonstrated a sympathetic understanding of the role that generation and a continuation of low REA interest rates must play in the future development of the REA program.

Now, therefore, we, the delegates to the 20th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative do hereby express our appreciation to President Kennedy for his appointment of Norman Clapp as Administrator of REA and we do further commend and congratulate Administrator Clapp for his auspicious start in discharging the duties of his important office, and we commend him for his courageous and understanding determination to carry into administrative practice those principles which we wholeheartedly support.

AGRICULTURAL ELECTRICAL RESEARCH

Whereas contemporaneous with the advance of rural electrification since the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, life in America has become richer and better through a manifold increase in the use of electric energy; and

Whereas advancing scientific know-how in the field of electronics promises to further revolutionize our traditional methods of production on the farm and in industry and commerce and to better solve many of our problems of health and of economic well being; and

Whereas progress in the application of new discoveries in the field of electronics to agriculture has been delayed because of lack of research and research facilities devoted to the specific problems of agricultural production; and

Whereas Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota has introduced in the U.S. Senate bill S. 859, and Representative MERWIN COAD of Iowa has introduced in the U.S. House H.R. 7005 to provide for the establishment of a farm electrification research laboratory; and

Whereas the passage of bills S. 859 and H.R. 7005, and the establishment of such a laboratory should substantially advance the application of new discoveries in the fields of electricity and electronics to the pressing problems of agriculture and immeasurably enrich and advance our agricultural and general economy.

Now, therefore, we, the delegates to the 20th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative urge the passage of companion bills S. 859 and H.R. 7005, and request that all Senators and Congressmen from the Dairyland service area give these bills their full support.

ASSISTANCE IN RURAL AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Whereas the enactment into law of the Area Redevelopment bill (S. 1), imposes a responsibility and presents an opportunity to the members of rural electric cooperatives because much of the rural phases of the program of area redevelopment to relieve unemployment and create job opportunities will be financed by direct Treasury loans and will be administered by the Department of Agriculture with the likelihood the REA will be asked to assist in important parts of said program; and

Whereas the experience gained by REA personnel and by the personnel and members of REA cooperative borrowers in the rural electrification loan program should be of real assistance in the development of sound rural area development projects; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the delegates to the 20th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative, That Dairyland Power Cooperative, its personnel, directors and members be urged to assist in the planning and promotion of rural area redevelopment projects in the Dairyland service area and to provide leadership in the program in cooperation with responsible agencies of the Federal Government to the end that the rural area redevelopment program can achieve its objective in materially improving the economic health of depressed rural areas.

GENERAL MANAGER JOHN P. MADGETT

Whereas John P. Madgett, as general manager, has been chief executive officer of Dairyland Power Cooperative since 1947, and has led Dairyland through its great construction program in generation, transmission and distribution, and has succeeded with the help of his associates, in bringing an improved electrical service at lowercost to the entire Dairyland membership; and

Whereas through his forthright and aggressive leadership, he has entered boldly into new fields such as barge operations, tion program in generation, transmission and interconnections, pooling arrangements and atomic energy plant procurement, which bring increased benefits to the Dairyland membership; and

Whereas the influence of his leadership has been felt throughout the Nation in the cooperative rural electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates here assembled take this opportunity of commending our General Manager John P. Madgett for his untiring efforts in behalf of rural people throughout the Dairyland service area and the Nation.

Appendix

United States Against E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to support my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the tax treatment of stock of the General Motors Corp. to be distributed pursuant to an antitrust divestiture decree arising from United States against E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

It is my deep and sincere conviction that my bill, H.R. 8868, will help resolve the problems facing the Du Pont stockholders who are immediately affected by a recent decision of the Supreme Court which requires that E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. dispose of all of its stock in the General Motors Corp.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7348, which was identical to a legislative measure on the Du Pont problem approved by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1959.

Upon the introduction of H.R. 7348, I said that:

> It is entirely possible that further action of the Ways and Means Committee, working with officials of the new Democratic administration in Washington, may be necessary to further perfect legislation dealing with the divestiture ordered by the Supreme Court.

I am convinced that it is neither necessary nor wise to try to solve all of the problems which may arise in all of the antitrust divestiture cases in the future before we provide a fair solution for those involved in the Du Pont case. It must not be allowed to drag on and on until everyone concerned loses hope of a just solution. This case must be concluded promptly and fairly. Substantial sums of money and a considerable segment of our population are involved so that I believe it would be in the public interest for Congress to devise the appropriate means of solution. Accordingly, my proposal will by its terms apply to the Du Pont decision and the particular Du Pont stockholders immediately and directly affected by the Supreme Court decision. In order to get the case disposed of promptly, my proposal will apply only if all of such divestiture is completed on or before January 1, 1964.

My proposal would provide for individual stockholders the same tax that would be paid under the bill, H.R. 8190, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman MASON. In general, an individual, for instance, who bought or inherited his Du Pont stock since 1949 would not pay any tax on the General Motors stock distributed to him because his basis in the Du Pont stock will be greater than the value of the General Motors stock he receives. Likewise, an individual who bought or inherited his Du Pont stock before 1949 would pay some tax at capital gain rates, the amount of the tax depending on how much the value of the General Motors stock exceeded the basis of his Du Pont stock.

Moreover, under H.R. 8868, the distribution of General Motors shares to individuals would reduce the basis of the Du Pont shares in an amount equal to the fair market value of the General Motors shares and any excess of the value of the General Motors shares over the basis of the Du Pont stock would be taxed at capital gains rates. Thus, assuming that the value of the General Motors shares distributed with respect to each share of Du Pont was $60, any shareholder with a basis of $60 or more in his Du Pont stock would receive the General Motors shares without paying any tax. The shareholder's basis in the Du Pont stock would be reduced $60. Any shareholder whose basis in his Du Pont stock was less than $60 would pay capital gains tax on the excess of the $60 value of the General Motors shares distributed over his basis. His basis in the Du Pont stock would be zero and his basis in the General Motors stock would be its fair market value.

I have been disturbed by the application in the instant case of the provisions of existing law which permits a corporate shareholder receiving a distribution in property other than money to get the double benefit of the 85-percent dividends received deduction and permission to treat as gross income less than the fair market value of property received.

In the Mason bill, H.R. 8190, this problem is dealt with by introducing a change in permanent law embracing all dividends received in the form of property other than money by a corporation. This will have far-reaching implications. Using the instant situation to change long-standing rules of present law in unrelated situations can only result in slowing down legislative action on the immediate problem which is the relief of hundreds of thousands of innocent Du Pont and General Motors shareholders from an undeserved penalty.

My bill would provide relief to persons who receive General Motors stock from a corporation, such as Christiana Securities, for example, which holds Du Pont stock only if two conditions are met: First, the intermediate holding company must be required under the court decree to divest itself of such General Motors stock as it received from Du Pont; and second, the intermediate corporation must have elected to pay the higher tax under the special corporate provision which is similar in effect to section 2 of H.R. 8190.

The Mason bill changes the tax treatment of a corporation receiving as a dividend property other than cash in all cases whether or not there is any connection with an antitrust suit.

The McDowell bill says this treatment will apply only to a corporation affected by the Du Pont decision if the corporation elects this treatment in order that its own shareholders may qualify for the return of capital provided in this bill.

Under present law, General Motors stock that is distributed to Christiana Securities, for example, would be taxed at about 16 cents a share. And if the court requires them to distribute this to their own shareholders the value of such stock would be taxed like a dividend to the Christiana shareholders.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 8868, to provide for the tax treatment of stock of the General Motors Corp. distributed pursuant to an antitrust divestiture decree arising from United States against E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.:

H.R. 8868

To provide for the tax treatment of stock of the General Motors Corporation distributed pursuant to an antitrust divestiture decree arising from United States against E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any provisions of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, if a shareholder receives a distribution, before January 1, 1964, from a corporation pursuant to an order entered by the United States district court under the mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States in United States against E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, (366 U.S. 316), and if—

(1) such distribution consists solely of stock (including rights to fractional shares) of General Motors Corporation,

(2) section 301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 would (but for this Act) apply to such distribution, and

(3) such distribution is part of a divestiture of such holdings of the General Motors Corporation stock required to be divested pursuant to such order,

then for purposes of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, such distribution shall be treated as provided in section 2.

SEC. 2. (a) INDIVIDUAL SHAREHOLDERS.—In the case of an individual shareholder—

(1) the fair market value of the distributed stock shall be applied against and reduce the adjusted basis of the Du Pont stock with respect to which the distribution is made. That portion, if any, of the fair market value of the distribution which exceeds such adjusted basis shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property;

(2) the basis of the stock received shall, in the distributee's hands, be its fair market value at the time of the distribution;

(3) the basis of the Du Pont stock with respect to which such distribution was made

shall be its adjusted basis immediately before such distribution, reduced (but not below zero) by such fair market value; and

(4) the earnings and profits of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company shall not be reduced by reason of such distribution. An individual who receives stock described in the first section of this Act on the basis of his holding of stock in a corporation other than E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company shall apply paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as though his holding was in such company but only if the distributor has elected to have subsection (b) apply.

(b) CORPORATE SHAREHOLDERS.—In the case of a corporate shareholder electing to have this treatment apply, the distribution shall be treated as provided by section 301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that—

(1) the amount of the distribution shall be the fair market value of the stock received,

(2) the basis of the stock received shall, in the hands of the distributee corporation, be the fair market value of the property distributed, minus the deduction for dividends received, as provided for in sections 243, 244, 245, and 246, attributable to the distribution as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

Support for 2 Days for Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, on April 27, 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 1749) to provide that elections be held for 2 days. In introducing this measure, I indicated that there would have to be considerable study and discussion before this legislation was enacted. Such consideration is extremely important. I believe we must take every possible step to increase voter turnout to better our present record of about 60 percent of persons over 21 voting for President and Vice President.

I am pleased that my bill has resulted in a good deal of debate on the relative advantages and disadvantages of holding presidential elections for 2 days. This is certainly healthy.

Madam President, I am pleased to call attention today to several recent editorial comments on this proposal. One from the San Francisco Examiner strongly endorses the bill which I have introduced and which my colleague, Mr. HALPERN, has introduced in the other body to have elections held for 2 days. In addition, I should like to call attention to two comments from the New York Journal American, an editorial supporting our bill and a news account of the statement which I made in introducing this measure.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner, June 14, 1961]

THE WAY TO BETTER ELECTION TURNOUTS

Congress should act without stalling on the companion bills introduced by Senator KEATING and Representative HALPERN, both Republicans, of New York, to give Americans 2 days for voting in presidential elections.

Since 1952, the Examiner and other Hearst newspapers have sought such legislation as a vitally needed reform to widen exercise of the voting franchise. Even in presidential elections, which bring out nearly double the number of off year voters, the best polling record the United States can show is less than 63 percent of the qualified electorate. More than a dozen nations are far ahead of us, with voting records running up to 90 percent.

It is generally recognized that allowing 2 days for voting would bring out many stay-at-homes who are deterred by circumstances beyond their control. It is also recognized that elections have been won and lost by margins far smaller than the number who failed to vote.

The Keating-Halpern legislation deserves the support of every one who believes in giving the most people the maximum chance to choose their government.

[From the New York Journal American, July 28, 1961]

VOTING TIME

Congress should act without stalling on the companion bills introduced by Senator KEATING, Republican of New York, and Representative HALPERN, Republican of New York, to give Americans 2 days for voting in presidential elections.

Since 1952, the Hearst newspapers have sought such legislation as a vitally needed reform to widen exercise of the voting franchise. Even in presidential elections, which bring out nearly double the number of off-year voters, the best polling record the United States can show is less than 63 percent of the qualified electorate. More than a dozen nations are far ahead of us, with voting records running up to 90 percent.

The Keating-Halpern legislation deserves the support of everyone who believes in giving the most people the maximum chance to choose their government.

[From the New York Journal American, May 8, 1961]

KEATING WANTS 2-DAY ELECTIONS

WASHINGTON.—Senator KEATING, Republican of New York, has proposed presidential elections be held on 2 days.

Extending the election period, according to Senator KEATING, would enable more people to vote and might cut down on election corruption.

"The number of people who do not go to the polls is, more often than not, greater than the margin between the two major candidates," Mr. KEATING said.

He pointed out in the 1960 election, 5 million people were unable to vote because they were ill or hospitalized.

Many of these people, the Senator claimed, "might have been able to leave their places of confinement had there been another 1 or 2 days available for voting."

Many travelers who were unable to obtain absentee ballots probably could have returned home to vote on a second election day.

Senator KEATING maintained that voting on 2 days would not make a significant difference in the opportunities for voting fraud and corrupt election practices.

"In fact, by avoiding crowded polling places and hectic voting deadlines, we might even cut down on opportunities for vote frauds and corrupt election practices," he said.

Other reforms Mr. KEATING recommended are liberalizing residency requirements, broadening absentee ballot rules, revising literacy tests, simplifying the ballots and modernizing registration systems.

The Connally Reservation to the Jurisdiction of the World Court—A Necessary Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, a persuasive editorial in support of retention of the Connally reservation to the jurisdiction of the World Court was featured by the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle-Herald in its edition of Sunday, August 20, 1961. Entitled "A Necessary Amendment," it sets forth in the space of one short presentation the compelling reasons why the American people must not allow specious contentions to confuse the urgent necessity for retaining this vital safeguard of our Nation's sovereignty. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NECESSARY AMENDMENT

When the United States adopted a resolution formally recognizing the jurisdiction of the World Court in 1946, the late Senator Tom Connally of Texas wisely—and successfully—campaigned for an amendment to the resolution. His amendment, which has since become the object of widespread controversy, reserves this Nation's right to determine which issues are domestic and, therefore, not properly within the jurisdiction of the World Court.

From its inception, the Connally amendment has been under heavy fire from those in this Nation and abroad who would have the United States submit itself completely to the international tribunal, a court of predominantly foreign judges which already includes 2 Communist and only 1 American among its 15 members. These opponents of the Connally reservation claim that acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court is the way to world peace through law.

The Connally repeal movement, unfortunately, has gained wide support, and it was given a new push a few weeks ago by the Continental Conference on World Peace and Law in San Jose, Costa Rica. This meeting was attended by lawyer-delegates of all 23 nations of the Americas, and one of the principal members was Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., chairman of the American Bar Association Special Committee on World Peace Through Law. Rhyne is on record as favoring repeal of the Connally amendment.

The San Jose meeting is one of a series planned to propagandize all nations into accepting the World Court's jurisdiction without a restrictive amendment.

But a countermovement also is underway, the Chronicle-Herald was pleased to learn recently. A letter from the Committee for Connally Amendment announced formation of that group and pledged its efforts toward encouraging Americans to oppose repeal of the vital amendment.

The committee pointed out that claims of international peace through international law fail to meet critical examination for several reasons:

"1. There is no international law. A court, per se, has no meaning unless there is some body of law on the basis of which it may act. Law comes first, not a court. This court can, as presently set up, do anything that comes into its collective head.

"2. The judges are selected by concurrent action of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The General Assembly is being overrun by a flood of adolescent nations who, if not Red, are more often neutralist or pro-Red.

"3. When we speak of peace through law, we fail to name the international source of unrest, or war, and of general trouble making. The fountainhead is Soviet Russia. Are we going to be foolish enough to suppose that Russia will accept the jurisdiction of this court? If she will not, then all this peace through law is simply nonsense. It can, in the long run, only serve the cause of Russia herself.

"4. Our national sovereignty is the only thing that protects our freedoms."

This is the heart of the case for the Connally amendment. In our opinion, it more than justifies the retention of this reservation in America's relation to a World Court that is of dubious makeup and questionable value.

Statement in Support of H.R. 4222

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means by the Governor of my State of Michigan, the Honorable John B. Swainson, on his own behalf and on the behalf of the Governors of the States of Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana.

As Governor Swainson so aptly points out, the need of passage of H.R. 4222 is clear and immediate, because existing programs simply have not done the job, and "medical care delayed is medical care denied."

It is my hope that the Members of this Congress will give their serious consideration to this statement:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4222 SUBMITTED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS BY GOV. JOHN B. SWAINSON, OF MICHIGAN, IN BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND GOV. MICHAEL V. DISALLE, OF OHIO, GOV. OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS, GOV. GAYLORD A. NELSON, OF WISCONSIN, AND GOV. MATTHEW E. WELSH, OF INDIANA

This statement in support of H.R. 4222 is presented in behalf of the Governors of the five Great Lakes States—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. In these five States represented by the Governors who join in this statement live one-fifth of the Nation's citizens aged 65 and over. In these States, approximately one out of every six adults is a senior citizen, facing the hazardous risks of greater incidence of need for health care, at greater and greater costs to them, at a time when their retirement income is inadequate to meet such costs on a continuing basis.

We repeat the urgent request in the resolution passed by the majority of the 1960 Governors' conference for congressional passage of the necessary machinery to provide for the rational and dignified payment of basic health care for the aged through the social security system. Existing efforts to meet this growing problem of senior citizens and their families—such as old age assistance programs, medical assistance for the aged, and private health insurance—simply do not provide the answer.

While some sincere advocates of these three piece-meal approaches argue that we should be patient and "give them a chance," we are forced to proclaim that medical care delayed is medical care denied. Moreover, such programs are not and cannot be adequately financed, through already near-exhausted State tax sources or through premium payments by aged individuals.

Instead, we firmly believe in the system of meeting the hazards of old age through systematic contributions by employee and employer while the employee is in the labor force—not after he is retired. This is the workable and efficient machinery accepted by American society over the past quarter of a century. We deplore the destructive attacks on the social security system, by some powerful groups in their irrational opposition to utilizing the system for the purpose of financing adequate health care for the growing population of older men and women.

There are three alternatives to dealing with the problem of medical aid to the aged. One is to establish an aid program through social security. The second is for a Federal-State program under old age assistance and medical aid to the aged (Kerr-Mills). The third is for Government to do nothing under the assumption that private insurance will solve the problems.

To determine which alternative is the most appropriate, four factors must be considered: the special health problems of the aged, their income maintenance problems, the fiscal problems of the States, and the role of private health insurance.

SPECIAL HEALTH PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

Aged people go to the hospital more often and stay longer than those at younger ages. At the same time these aged people have substantially less income to meet these increased costs.

1. In 1957, nearly 8 out of 10 noninstitutionalized aged persons, over 11 million, had one or more chronic ailments. A large part of such ailments consisted of heart trouble, arthritis, diabetes, and kidney disease.

2. While only 3 percent of the total population have limitations in mobility, 18 percent of the aged have trouble getting around alone, cannot get around alone, or are confined to the house.

3. The aged suffer mostly from long-term chronic conditions, not from short-term acute ones (to which most health insurance programs are geared). They stay in hospitals two to three times longer than the younger age groups, and use physician services more frequently. But the aged with lowest incomes use such services less often.

Many of the handicaps developed by these older people could have been prevented if the disease or injury had been treated properly from the beginning. That is, if they had had preventive health care.

Neither the Kerr-Mills approach nor private insurance emphasize preventive health care for our older citizens.

INCOME MAINTENANCE PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

Income is the overwhelming determinant of the ability to get needed medical care and income is inversely correlated with age. The older the person, the less his income.

1. Census Bureau data for 1959 shows that 55 percent of those over 65 had annual incomes of less than $1,000 and 23 percent had between $1,000 and $2,000.

2. Of the nearly 17 million persons over 65, more than three-fifths receive social security benefits.

3. At least 7.6 million elderly persons have liquid assets of less than $500.

4. Per capita, private expenditures for health needs for persons 65 or over in 1957–58 were a total of $177, of which $55 was for physicians; $49 for hospitals; $42 for drugs; $10 for dentists; and $21 for other medical costs. The 1960 costs have been estimated at $265 per aged person.

5. For half of the OASDI couples with a hospitalized illness the total medical bills incurred amounted to over $700, as of 1957. Some 28 percent had bills over $1,000.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE

Voluntary group prepayment plans are not geared to the special needs of older people because their illnesses are characteristically chronic and their income is usually marginal.

1. Only 14 percent of all social security beneficiary couples had some of their medical costs covered by insurance in 1957.

2. And among hospitalized insured couples, 73 percent had zero to one-half of their medical costs met by insurance, while only 27 percent had more than one-half of their costs met by insurance.

3. As of 1958–59, only 46 percent of all aged Americans had hospital insurance, nearly all of the policies providing inadequate benefits.

4. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has projected increased coverage by all voluntary insurance plans to include 56 percent of the aged by 1965. Therefore, as of 1965, at least 8 million would not have any insurance coverage whatever.

Relieving current private health insurance programs from the burden of trying to insure the aged would contribute greatly to their stability and even expansion, and to their ability to insure the rest of the population at a more reasonable cost. The history of private pension progress, built on the floor of social security benefits, is a sound parallel.

THE FISCAL PROBLEMS OF THE STATES

Because of the special health needs of the aged, their income problems, and the inability of private insurance to cover adequately the high costs of medical service, either State welfare programs, Federal-State programs, or Federal programs must be utilized to aid the aged.

In terms of numbers, this is what the five Great Lakes States face:

State	Over 65 population	OAA medicare recipients	MAA eligibles
Illinois	974,900	74,500	(1)
Indiana	445,500	(1)	26,650
Michigan	638,200	13,365	2 60,000
Ohio	897,100	75,000	(1)
Wisconsin	402,700	22,400	(1)

1 Unknown.
2 Estimated.

Under the proposed social security approach, the older citizens in the five States would receive the following in medical benefit payments (based on benefits as provided

under the King-Anderson bill endorsed by President Kennedy): Illinois, $66.8 million; Indiana, $29.6 million; Michigan, $51.5 million; Ohio, $61.3 million; Wisconsin, $24.9 million.

To provide the same amount of medical care for the same number of individuals who would receive aid through the social security approach using Kerr-Mills, the States would have to appropriate: Illinois, $33.4 million; Indiana, $14.8 million; Michigan, $25.75 million; Ohio, $30.65 million; Wisconsin, $12.45 million.

Even if the States limit the number of eligibles under an MAA program, it will be just a matter of time until this number of eligibles soars to a much greater number of older persons in a State. This is true because as the ineligible exhaust their own resources and income in making medical payments, they will be reduced to the income level of eligibility for benefits under MAA.

Under the Kerr-Mills program (including OAA and MAA recipients), about 50 percent of the aged are ostensibly eligible in the States now with a program or proposed programs. But few States are able to afford a comprehensive program.

Therefore we urge that Congress take immediate action to pass the King-Anderson proposal, which has been endorsed by the President and which would provide needed health care on a dignified and orderly basis for our Nation's senior citizens.

Bias in South Exaggerated, Africans Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article "Bias in South Exaggerated, Africans Say," which appeared in the Evening Star on Tuesday, August 22, 1961. This interview, which bears the dateline of my hometown, Greensboro, N.C., reflects the change of opinion of several African students who lived in the South during their period of studying in the United States under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration. These students found that their previously held impressions of race relations in the South were the result of misinformation and exaggeration which they attributed to some of the newspapers and news magazines published in the United States.

That these men will leave the United States with this better understanding of one of our society's most difficult problems is, in my opinion, indicative of the very great value of this sort of cultural exchange program in that it shows the gain in understanding that comes about through personal experience.

At the same time it is indeed sad that the misinformation and exaggerations are eradicated in many instances only by personal observation, and it should serve as an admonition to our press that its publications do not always reflect an accurate picture of American life to the peoples of other countries. The battle for the minds of men is being waged between the free world and the Communist bloc and in this all-important struggle the press has a tremendous responsibility to represent to the world the true image of America.

The article follows:

BIAS IN SOUTH EXAGGERATED, AFRICANS SAY

GREENSBORO, N.C., August 22.—Bekele Gared, a young Ethiopian agricultural official, says he is convinced the South's racial troubles have been exaggerated.

Mr. Gared, who has lived in Texas and North Carolina for 5 months, says the people who exaggerated these troubles to him were not Russians, but "mostly Americans."

Mr. Gared is one of 18 Africans currently studying agricultural extension work in the United States. A number of them have lived with farm families in central and eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Gared and others of the group were interviewed by a representative of the Department of Agriculture Information, of North Carolina State College's School of Agriculture.

"When I came to the United States, a chose to go to the North," Mr. Gared said, "because of what I had read about the South."

Mr. Gared said most of the things he had read about the South had appeared in weekly news magazines and Negro newspapers published in America.

Officials of the International Cooperation Administration granted Mr. Gared his wish. They sent him to Michigan State University.

"Later, when they told me they were going to send me to Texas, I protested," Mr. Gared said. "And when I told people at Michigan States that I was going to be sent to the South, they were most sympathetic."

He said he finally agreed to go to Texas "when I found I had no alternative."

The headquarters of his Texas visit was Prairie View A. & M. College, a State-supported Negro college. In early July, he and his group moved on to North Carolina.

EXPERIENCE OPENS EYES

Since then, they have visited State institutions, businesses, and for about 2 weeks, various members of the group lived with farm families in Wilson, Greene, Wayne, Franklin, Vance, Warren, Granville, Durham, Rockingham, and Caswell Counties.

As a result of his extensive visit, Mr. Gared said his attitude about race relations in the South was entirely changed.

"If you don't look for embarrassing things, you won't find them," he said.

Members of Mr. Gared's party were interviewed at North Carolina A. & T. College here, where they spent several days evaluating their North Carolina study. There was general agreement with Mr. Gared's observation about racial conditions in Texas and North Carolina.

KENYA OFFICIAL AGREES

"You see a good deal of what you are looking for," said a Ministry of Agriculture official from Kenya.

This official, incidentally, said he tried to eat at a white restaurant in Greensboro and was refused service.

"But I didn't get upset," he said, "because I realized that in my own country a white man may have had the same trouble in many places."

"Racial problems are worldwide," he continued in a distinct British accent, result of 3 years of study at Cambridge University.

"But perhaps you in America have done more about these problems than many places in the world," he added.

INDIANA NOT MUCH DIFFERENT

A 36-year-old superintendent for the Ministry of Agriculture in Nigeria, Agorinda Alawode, felt that he had an objective view of America's race problems before he came to this country.

"The American Ambassador explained the situation at a lecture I attended," he said.

Mr. Alawode, whose face is marked by tribal tattoos, has attended Indiana University for 9 months.

"And I don't see much difference in race relations in Indiana and other places I have been," he commented. "I could get myself into trouble any place," he added, "whether it's in America or my own country."

A Tanganyikan official, Ally Mondoma, said he remembered reading about that "Rock place" (Little Rock). "But when I got here," he added, "I saw the races were getting along in all phases of life."

One visitor said: "Any time people are indifferent to you, you are segregated. And here I found people very sympathetic."

Anonymous Group of Six Laymen Give Reality to Ideal of Brotherhood in Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Charleston, W. Va., has long been acknowledged by those who have lived and visited there as a community of friendly and tolerant people who are remarkably free of the religious and racial prejudices which sometimes detract from the full realization of American ideals. The mayor's commission on human relations, established almost 4 years ago, has worked effectively further to eliminate barriers to understanding between different racial and religious groups in that city.

In addition to such official and public organizations, however, there is a most unique group of private and anonymous men, known as the Six Laymen, whose sole purpose of existence is to apply in daily practice the ideals of brotherhood and good will. Organized in 1952 to honor the famous four chaplains who gave their lives in the sinking of the troop ship *Dorchester*, the Six Laymen took as their motto: "If men can die together, surely men can live together."

The work of this exceptional group is related in an article in Parade magazine, July 30, and I ask unanimous consent that this inspiring article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Parade magazine, July 30, 1961]

CHARLESTON HAS A SECRET: THE GOOD DEEDS DONE BY SIX KIND MEN

(By Sid Ross)

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—When an act of kindness is performed here, someone usually comments: "That must be the work of the Six Laymen." For, quietly and anonymously, members of this unique organization go around Charleston doing good deeds. No one knows who the laymen are, when they may appear, or what generous thing they will do next. But everyone in town knows their admirable goal: brotherhood through simple kindness.

Now in its ninth year, the group operates without officers, dues or bylaws. Only two of its activities are publicly acknowledged. One is a semiannual civic luncheon for newly naturalized U.S. citizens—usually held in a downtown hotel and attended by many of Charleston's leading citizens. Gifts are presented, speeches of welcome made, and then the proud new Americans are introduced individually to the audience. The laymen also send certificates of recognition to persons who perform selfless acts. One recent awardee was a man who had nursed a boy through sleeping sickness.

One of the town's favorite games is guessing the laymen's membership. Actually the Six Laymen now number 12, and go to great lengths to preserve their anonymity. A front man is chosen annually to arrange the luncheon, mail certificates and collect contributions, if any. Even he does not know all 12.

Anonymity has been an integral part of the organization since its beginning in 1952. Originally the group was founded by two Protestants, two Jews and two Catholics as a simple way of honoring the famous Four Chaplains—the clergymen who gave their lifejackets to four soldiers when the U.S. troopship *Dorchester* was torpedoed in 1943. The group took as their motto: "If men can die together, surely men can live together." They concluded that the route to brotherhood was through simple kindness, good acts and good will toward each other.

However, the Laymen is not a religious group. None of the members are clergymen. "Progress and understanding in getting along with each other has to come from average people," one layman says. "We do not ask for agreement, but for good will."

Acts like welcoming new citizens to the country are one way to bridge the gap between religion and religion, nation and nation and man and man, in the laymen's view. "How I wish that nations and governments could have some such philosophy of good will and understanding," one layman has sighed.

But the laymen are not out to change the world. "We don't have any great aims like that," says a Catholic member. "All we do is what we think is good—the modest, natural things that will help people, and help us in our inner selves."

The Threat and the Hope Before Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, we are living in a period in which no one knows what is around the corner. We do not know what is on the horizon. However, we should express a word of caution. We remember that there was once a man named Chamberlain, who had a great deal of blind faith in a man named Hitler. Chamberlain came from a good breed—the English. The English keep faith, and through the centuries have demonstrated that the thing that counts is the contract involving obligations on both sides. But Chamberlain was really "taken for a ride." The result was Munich and the Second World War.

Today we must guard against putting ourselves in the same position. Though our President and his advisers do not need a word of caution, should one be given, it would be that they should bear in mind Munich. Throughout history we know that the creation of new weapons of warfare, from time to time, has threatened the existence of mankind. The invention of gunpowder, the utilization of planes for bombing, and nuclear weapons—each in its time—posed for humanity a new—and it was thought total—threat of destruction.

Currently, thermonuclear-missile war, if unleashed upon the earth, for example, could, we believe, destroy all human and animal life.

Despite such dangers, however, we must go forward on the assumption that man is not yet insane enough to destroy himself; that, though there are strong, conflicting ideologies, adequate self-control will be exercised to prevent total destruction. At the same time, we need to expand efforts to find peaceful ways to settle differences among nations.

Recently, Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, made an address, putting into historical perspective the advent of successive threats to human existence, including the problems now confronting the world. Reflecting upon the need to work for the elimination of conflict, while attempting to avoid a world-destroying war, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address, recently published in the Milwaukee Journal, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT AND THE HOPE BEFORE US—ALTHOUGH THE LAST TWO DECADES HAVE BEEN AS VIOLENT AS ANY IN HUMAN HISTORY, MORE THAN EVER BEFORE HAS BEEN DONE TO CREATE A PEACEFUL WORLD

(From a recent address by Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University)

I remember very well an island in the middle of the Connecticut River where, my grandfather told me, the members of an apocalyptic sect had gathered to await the end in the 1870's.

Their view of the Kingdom of Heaven must have been a strange one, for they sold their land and their property and took their money with them to the island. Not far from that island, the Shakers built one of their dreary utopias.

In the days just before the Second World War, again there was a recurrence of belief in the apocalypse and also of hope for utopia. People exaggerated the potentialities of air warfare, which we now call conventional warfare, and assumed urban society would be destroyed—as indeed it almost was. On the other hand, some believed that a perfect society could be created on earth.

We are now again, in the midst of a period of fear of destruction—this time of human life—and, again, as a result of a technological change in warfare.

The development of the warhorse in ancient and medieval society created a social class which based its position on the superiority that the warhorse gave it. Gunpowder destroyed this class in early modern times. In the 20th century the airplane involved the whole population in war, and now the missile and the thermonuclear bomb have made it clear that war will be either impossible or final. All mankind knows this and, as usual, men react differently in the face of the threat.

An interesting manifestation is Nevil Shute's novel, "On the Beach." A war started accidentally and involved the great powers accidentally, and thermonuclear devastation destroyed the armaments and cities of the northern hemisphere. Then radioactivity destroyed the population of the northern hemisphere and gradually spread south.

The book ends with the destruction by radioactive disease of the last inhabitants of southern Australia and is devoted to a description of their activities during their last months.

There is an air of hopeless resignation when nothing can be done. Some met this by debauchery; others by virtue. Some created a fantasy of the future and went about preparing for the next year as if it would occur for them.

A POLITICAL PARALLEL, TOO

At the end, one is faced with the irony of an earth uninhabitable at the moment, but which, through dissipation of the radiation, would become habitable in 20 years or so, but there would be no human or animal inhabitants.

This is a literary expression of one of the possibilities that lie before us. There is a political parallel, best expressed by the neutralists who would avoid participation in international affairs in the hope that, if enough nations do not become involved in the power struggle, the danger will go away.

We have a parallel to the neutralists in this country in those who advocate unilateral disarmament in what I suppose is a real belief that, if one of the great powers disarms, war will not result. And there is the corollary that it is better to take the consequences of political subjugation than to accept destruction.

When it is pointed out to the unilateral disarmists that the inevitable result of this will be the domination of the world by an authoritarian and evil society, they reply, "better Red than dead." Here, again, we have the irony that, through the excessive use of democratic freedoms and adherence to ideals, the society that permits and produces such beliefs and activities will inevitably be destroyed.

Another currently popular book, which expresses the other stream of thought, is Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World." This, of course, is a much older book and was written in fear of World War II.

Huxley was not conscious of the threat of the destruction of humanity by thermonuclear warfare, but he feared the destruction of society by conventional warfare. He speculated that, in the face of this threat, men would create a super world state, and that it would produce a Utopia which would produce international order and, by its very strength, would control every act of human life.

Life in the "Brave New World" is completely controlled even to the extent of the elimination of natural conception and birth. Children and adults are conditioned to be happy and to behave themselves. Their normal impulses are replaced by a meaningless sensualism and speculation by the recitation of slogans. All intellectual life is destroyed except the application of science.

The picture, taken as a whole, is a picture of a society that is unrecognizable as human. Here we have a metaphoric apocalypse, and Huxley makes it clear that men have as much to fear from Utopia as from Armageddon.

Again, today, there is a political manifestation of this possibility. We have in many countries a controlled society, and in all societies there is a development toward socialism and toward control of various aspects of life.

There is a difference in the controlled societies, however, for some are controlled for the benefit of the state and others for the benefit of the individual. There is advocacy of a superstate and the beginnings of international government. There is an effort toward universal disarmament and there is a

good deal of utopianism, although even the advocates of Utopia are pessimistic of its achievement.

All the ingredients exist to put us "On the Beach," all the ingredients to produce the "Brave New World." If these are the only alternatives, mankind is in a race between Armageddon and Utopia, one of which will destroy our lives and the other all that gives meaning to them.

There is another possibility, expressed by the old slogan:

"Give me liberty or give me death." It is considered corny to utter this slogan in these times, but I must confess that I myself would prefer death to the kind of society that would result either from unilateral disarmament or from a world state that was authoritarian in its control.

There is a second alternative: To work within the framework of our own society for the best use of its opportunities and to work within the less clear framework of international society for the control and eventual elimination of armaments and conflict; to provide workable means for the solution of conflicts; to provide means for cooperation between peoples and for the mutual use of one another's resources, and to do all these things with individual liberty consciously in mind and with the determination to strengthen rather than weaken individual liberty.

MUCH HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

It may seem foolish to utter such words as these in the face of the gloomy news we receive every day and the dreadful threat that hangs above us and which is apparent even to the most primitive peoples.

Yet, despite this threat or perhaps because of it, more has been accomplished in these last times than in all the centuries before to bring about an orderly and peaceful world, althought the last two decades have been as violent as any in human history.

We have now international exchange of information through UNESCO, through international conferences and through the relatively free flow of publications. We have actually settled some international disputes without war through multilateral conference; we have not settled some others, but no general war has occurred as a result.

We are in the midst of long and painful negotiations for disarmament. We have already suspended the testing of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. Most miraculous of all, both sides have restrained themselves from the use of the ultimate weapon. So there is some accomplishment, and there is some hope.

If these efforts fail, you will be present at the apocalypse; if they succeed and produce a collective world-state, you will live in the "Brave New World." But if we are alert enough and strong enough to preserve our liberty while saving our hides, we may produce a world that is at once better and more durable, and historians a thousand years from now may wonder that we believed that these were the last times.

What Price Business as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the leftwing press and some of the Nation's political leaders are providing communism with distorted propaganda to use against us in the grave struggle to preserve democracy.

They are creating dissension at home and doubts abroad by their incessant attacks on the South, and by shedding crocodile tears for the Negro.

Those who pander to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Congress for Racial Equality do not acknowledge that the Negro in America is living in a paradise, that the lot of even the poorest American is far better than the fate of those who live under Communist domination.

This point was expressed in a very excellent editorial in the August issue of Southern Advertising and Publishing, a magazine that is published in Atlanta, Ga.

The editorial follows:

WHAT PRICE BUSINESS AS USUAL

According to news report, Dictator Khrushchev was considerably riled by President Kennedy's having the audacity to call the American people to more vigorous defense of our way of life, our world, our concepts, religious and social and economic. It is reported that after Dictator K. finished his long harangue to his people, they volunteered to work an extra hour without pay to hasten their march to catch up with America. Comes to mind at this point, the strikes that hampered our defense work at Canaveral. It's something for us to think about.

Our economic way of life—which includes our world of advertising and marketing—is so far ahead of the Communists' that we give them a big target. However, the day is long past when we can continue to play peanut politics when the balanced meals of modern civilization are at stake. It is full time that we got off the defensive and stated the full American way of life to the world. Our propagandists, instead of trying to cram racial equality down the throats of the white South, should tell the world in true and full terms that the colored races in America are living in paradise compared to the lot of those in the Communist world.

The facts are there—why keep the South under blackmail pressure by the outside press?—as pointed out by no less a respected figure than Herbert Hoover sometime ago when he said "that the Negroes in the United States own more automobiles than all the Negroes of Africa plus the entire population of Russia." Does our State Department, or our Office of Information, ever point that out? Does anyone in authority nationally ever point to the good things the Negroes in America enjoy? Why is this? Is it more fun to send "freedom riders" to antagonize the white South than to face the outside world that is being stirred up by the Communists in the first place?

And imagine the NAACP protesting against the Civil War Centennial on grounds that it is getting too favorable an image for the South. When are our politicians and editors going to realize that we are all part of the Nation and to sick the NAACP on the South is to aid and abet the Communists? Or are we as stupid as Dictator K. and his stooge Dictator Castro paint us?—G. B. P.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the Administrative Committee of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin recently adopted a resolution supporting President Kennedy's Peace Corps. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED ON AUGUST 12, 1961, BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF WISCONSIN SUPPORTING PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PEACE CORPS

Whereas President John F. Kennedy has strongly urged the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas our own freedom, and the future of freedom in the world, depend on the ability of underdeveloped and newly developed nations to build a stable society where men can live in dignity; and

Whereas one of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of this goal by these nations is the lack of trained men and women with the skill to teach the young and assist in the operation of development projects; and

Whereas the Peace Corps represents an opportunity for skilled American citizens to work directly with people of other countries to provide economic, social, and educational assistance and to further the cause of peace through personal relationships and mutual understanding: Now let it hereby be

Resolved, That the Administrative Committee of the Democratic Party of the State of Wisconsin strongly support the formation of a permanent Peace Corps; and let it be further

Resolved, That Senator PROXMIRE and Wisconsin Congressmen ZABLOCKI, JOHNSON, REUSS, and KASTENMEIER be urged to support and take a leading role in securing congressional approval of President Kennedy's Peace Corps.

Memories of the Critical Fuel Oil Crisis in World War II Should Serve as a Grim Reminder That the Distressing Situation Is Certain To Be Repeated in the Event of Another National Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert the following paragraph from a newspaper story:

The Manufacturer's Building at 7 Beverly Street, which houses 30 small firms, many engaged in war work, will be closed today for lack of fuel oil, Miss Anna Bowman, superintendent, said yesterday.

For anyone who is not familiar with the critical fuel oil shortage that enveloped New England during World War II, I invite him to request the Library of Congress to provide copies of newspapers from Boston, Providence, New York, or other areas along the upper east coast for 1942 and/or the early months of 1943. He would find many items akin to that which I have just read from a February 1, 1943, edition. Here are just a few headlines:

"Lack of Oil Shuts Down Many Mills: War Work Halted as Thousands Lose Their Jobs," February 3, 1943.

"Hospital Is Ordered Closed by City To Save on Fuel Oil: Patients at Neponset Beach Institution for Children at Rockaway To Be Moved Today," January 4, 1943.

"End of Many Activities Held Imminent Under Cut in Oil: Churches, Schools, and Theaters Face Closing Unless Coal Users—Officials Expect No Early Relief," January 7, 1943.

"Bunker C Imports Into Rhode Island Short by 14,000 Barrels Daily," February 26, 1943.

"Exodus of Labor Threatens Mills in Fuel Oil Crisis"—February 5, 1943.

Those are but a few of the headlines that you will see if you ask for the early 1943 issues. Go back a year, from the time that our tanker traffic from the Gulf of Mexico to the east coast first began to fall prey to enemy submarines and you will realize that the long fuel oil deficit was inevitable. You would not have to be many yards east of the beaches to read those headlines at night by the lights of the tragic fires that flamed into the skies as ship after ship exploded. Here is a May 27, 1942, headline:

"New England Told Not To Expect Oil: Ickes Says Worse Situation Is Coming and Asks Conversion to Using Coal."

June 5, 1942: "Hardship for Fuel Oil Users Protected by Fuel Industry Council."

Incidentally, the Council referred to was the Petroleum Industry War Council, and I dare say that anyone who advocates free access to American markets for foreign oil might do himself and his country a favor if he would review some of the Council's records for the World War II period. Better yet, place the front pages of this week's newspapers alongside those of 18 and 19 years ago, and then ask yourself this question: In view of the current crisis over Berlin, can a single American plant, factory, or generating station that would contribute in any way to a war effort be permitted to rely on a foreign source of energy?

The matter of the American coal industry's interest in restricting imports of residual oil has been in discussion for at least 12 years. I appealed to Congress as far back as 1950 to enact a quota restriction as a medium of protecting the jobs or our miners and railroaders. My friends from New England have made similar appeals on behalf of textile workers, fishermen, and miscellaneous other labor groups whose unemployment is directly attributable to excesses of imports.

It would be difficult for any human being to visit an area of chronic surplus labor and refrain from attacking the major causative of this condition. There is no question about why so many of our mines are closed, why so many of our railroad cars are idle on sidings. Many markets that once provided outlets for coal supply have simply turned their backs to our coal producers and opened the doors of their boilerrooms to tanker-borne fuel. The price differential is usually not pronounced, but it is always used as a lure. When a shipper of foreign oil agrees to sell his product at whatever level is necessary to get below the cost of coal, the consumer does not have to rely upon his calculating machine—whether it be Remington Rand, Olympia, or Olivetti—to determine which fuel is cheaper.

Eventually, of course, the company which chooses foreign oil is going to find that it has not taken the more economical course. When there are enough plants unable to convert back to coal, and when enough railroad tracks into others have been abandoned, the international oil crowd will be able to charge what it pleases. Historically, it is the practice of a monopoly to destroy competition and then boost prices at will.

These entreaties from the standpoint of the economy of coal regions have gone unanswered. Perhaps next year, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act expires, some consideration will be demonstrated toward this problem, for it is evident that a growing number of industries and areas are suffering progressively more as a consequence of the Nation's illogical trade policy.

Of late my colleagues from Massachusetts have presented in the RECORD a large number of editorials on residual oil imports. It is my intention to attempt some measure of reciprocation by providing, from time to time, relevant material from earlier editions of newspapers from that section of the country. In deference to my friends who do not remember developments on the fuel front in the early war years, I shall request that complete news stories, rather than mere headlines such as I have inserted today, be included in the RECORD. Perhaps my friends from New England will wish to discuss further those dark days of 1942–43 as this material appears in the RECORD. I shall welcome their expressions.

Meanwhile the country must depend upon the mandatory oil import program for protecting domestic fuel industries from the destructive effects of unfair competition from foreign oil. The program is obviously far from satisfactory. Last year's record high volume of 230 million barrels of residual oil will easily be surpassed in 1961 unless the current crisis jolts the Department of Interior into reducing substantially the quota allocations. As of August 4, imports for this year were running at almost 6 million tons higher than for the equivalent period in 1960.

If the Secretary of Interior would take note of the headlines which I have presented here today, then check with the White House or Department of Defense on the world crisis, it is inconceivable that he will not order an immediate adjustment in allocations. Somewhere along the line communications between the departments have apparently broken down. On the one hand the President soberly warns the Nation of the gravity of Khrushchev's threats. Congress is asked to provide astronomical increases in the defense budget. The draft pace is quickened. National Guardsmen are alerted. Civil defense alarms scream for shelters to guard civilians against fallout.

On the other hand, the Department of Interior goes blithely along its peaceful way, the Secretary so inspired with the beauty and magnificence of parks and monuments and rivers and dams and public power that he is unable to grasp the somber significance of barbed wire and armor that have encompassed Berlin and cast grim shadows over the entire world. Having arbitrarily increased residual oil imports by 100,000 barrels a day shortly after he took office, then in May having recklessly ordered an increase of another 44,000 barrels a day for the following 12 months, the Secretary has exhibited no signs of attempting to get in step with other Cabinet members who foresee the need for mobilization preparations.

I would suggest that the Secretary of Interior make a study of the problems that confronted his predecessor in 1942 and 1943. I would remind him that the tankers which now lie at the ocean floor off the beaches from Miami to Cape Hatteras to Atlantic City and points beyond were in coastwise traffic and not exposed to the added dangers to which ships from Venezuela and the Middle East would be subjected.

If we are ready to call the Kremlin's hand, it is folly to invite an energy gap by relying upon a foreign source of fuel for a war production effort. There can be no further delay in determining which industries necessary to the national defense now using foreign oil would be forced to terminate operations in the event that ocean traffic is disrupted. This information should be obtained as quickly as possible and oil import quotas be revised accordingly.

Congressional Reapportionment Proposals in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a résumé of editorial opinion on congressional reapportionment proposals in Pennsylvania, contained in an article entitled "Reapportionment—A Long Way Off," written by Bern Sharfman and published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, of August 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA EDITORS AGREE: REAPPORTIONMENT—A LONG WAY OFF

(By Bern Sharfman)

Pennsylvania newspaper editors have looked at the Democratic program for reapportioning the Commonwealth's congressional seats and have found it sadly wanting.

An extensive sampling of newspaper opinion throughout the State shows reactions ranging from "arrant gerrymandering" to "political fumble."

Core of the resentment centers about Philadelphia Representative WILLIAM GREEN, a big Democratic power in Pennsylvania, and

his scheme to keep six seats for Philadelphia by chipping pieces off neighboring Republican counties and adding them to the City of Brotherly Love. Philadelphia's population losses warrant the elimination of one of its current seats.

But there's equal feeling around the State that the entire Democratic plan generally favors Democrats and shifts districts so that rural, suburban, and urban interests are all mixed up.

Here's what the editors are saying:

"The overall arrangement would guarantee that while Pennsylvania loses three seats in the House of Representatives, as ordained by this State's relative lack of growth in the past decade, none of the loss will come out of Philadelphia," says the Philadelphia Bulletin. "To call such an arrangement unfair is understatement. It is political larceny, deserving of all-out resistance from citizens of any party who believe that Congress ought to be a representative body."

Referring to the proposal as a "Greenmander" and "pure politics," the Pittsburgh Press suggests an oft-repeated way out of a "nightmare at-large election."

"Before things get too far out of hand, why don't the Representatives of both parties sit down and work out an apportionment to which both can agree?" this editor asks. "It would be too much to expect that they would draft a plan devoid of politics and based solely on the public's right to fair apportionment. But even a political compromise would be preferable to the one-sided proposals thus far advanced."

The Sunbury Daily Item attacks "crafty WILLIE" GREEN for trying to "preserve his home base" and extend his power. It says: "The possibility that GREEN is playing a deliberate game of frustration to block reapportionment merits serious consideration. Failure to redistrict the State would mean that in 1962 Pennsylvania would elect 27 Congressmen at Large. In other words, it would thus be possible for Boss GREEN to personally select the majority, if not all of the Members of the House delegation. In short, the people of Pennsylvania would be at the mercy of GREEN in national affairs, even as they now are in matters of State government.

"What the Democratic Party offered to the State * * * was a holdup, pure and simple," the Altoona Mirror says. "So as of now, there's no agreement on reapportionment, only arguments. The item will remain as an excuse to keep the legislature in session the rest of the year."

The New Castle News observes that Philadelphia always has held itself apart from the rest of the State, as Pennsylvania's only first-class city, and adds: "Philadelphia is entitled to its proportionate share of Congressmen but certainly no more. The endeavor to grab off chunks of Bucks and Delaware in order to make a case for Philadelphia is gerrymandering in its most glaring form. If GREEN would agree to what is obviously fair, drop one Congressman from his delegation of six, a compromise could undoubtedly be worked out."

To the Bethlehem Globe-Times it is "another political rocket" in GREEN's "thinly veiled plan to entrench his party in Harrisburg—for many years to come." The paper applauds State Senator Fred B. Rooney, Bethlehem Democrat, for his suggestion that both parties sit down and work out "a just and equitable" plan, an approach the editor believes "has the wholehearted support of thinking citizens throughout the Commonwealth."

The Sayre Evening Times notes: "An additional measure of unfairness is injected into the plan by the fact that every one of Philadelphia's six districts will be smaller than the statewide average—and one of them will be the smallest in the entire State. It was, of course, to be expected that the Democratic program would be drafted to further its own fortunes; any party will seek to do that. But the plan is so blatant a case of gerrymandering that it cannot but come as a shock."

"It is a blueprint to deprive the central Pennsylvania counties of effective representation in the National House of Representatives for years to come," comments the Lock Haven Express. As long as the State is divided into counties, county units should make up the congressional district, even if it throws off the mathematical uniformity of the districts. Although county lines may not always represent the exact division of interests and needs of the people, they have existed so long that a practical accommodation has been made. This is not redistricting; it is political mayhem."

For the Oil City Derrick, the plan is "high-handed political chicanery."

"It would almost certainly reduce the number of Republican Congressmen chosen by the people of their districts by realinement of the areas to serve political ends," this editor explains. All in all, the Democratic blueprint is a sham. It aims at further strengthening a scandal-ridden big city machine at the expense of the rights and privileges of other areas of the Commonwealth. It should be clobbered, not only in the legislature, but by all citizens who believe in a fair and just congressional representation."

The Allentown Chronicle calls it a "special form of job insurance" and adds: "In order to keep congressional districts in some semblance of population balance, it might be necessary to divide some counties * * * but when this is done, it should be on the basis of trying to bring together counties and parts of counties with common interests. The fact there is some strong Democratic opposition to GREEN's plan shows how unpalatable it really is. It makes the issue not so much one of reapportioning the State as one of who is to dictate the terms."

"It serves urban concentrations at the expense of rural Pennsylvania and in this respect is grossly unfair to the broad interests of the Commonwealth," says the Williamsport Sun-Gazette. "While we know the proposal as outlined by Democratic Majority Leader Stephan McCann is not yet in its final form, we are nevertheless alarmed by this disclosure of the Lawrence administration intent."

The Washington Observer believes the plan eventually may boomerang on Democrats, causing voters to rebel, and observes: "It tends to destroy the real democratic processes of government by reducing the power of the minority party, perhaps toward a point of elimination. There may be a real question as to whether that is the real intent of the Constitution and the law."

A plan for redistricting counties around Philadelphia to keep people of similar interests together is outlined by the Somerset Daily American, which then offers this challenge: "We wonder how Representative GREEN would react to such a proposal? His response would determine whether he is interested in representation of the people or whether it is his desire to hold six seats in Philadelphia which causes him to defend the Democratic plan."

"The proposal studiedly separated and merged districts so as to strengthen Democratic congressional districts, considering the State as a political whole," charges the Easton Express. "With the State senate balanced on a 25–25 party representation basis, and partisan considerations wholly governing this issue, Republicans are in a position to demand concessions."

The Warren Times-Mirror sums it up this way: "The Democratic plan for reapportionment in the State of Pennsylvania was unveiled with a fanfare of political trumpets * * * and promptly fell flat on its face. We suggest the Democrats take their 3-minute egg back to the nest and hatch it a while longer. This one didn't come out too good."

"It is too much to suppose that these leaders (of both parties) would give the rights of the people even the ghost of a thought were they to sit down to carve the State into new districts," says the Valley Daily News. But the paper believes they have an obligation to avoid an at-large election. It sees "nothing fair and honest" about the Democratic plan.

Some State papers took a broader view and concentrated on the inadequacy of the programs advanced by both parties.

"No one is happy," claims The Latrobe Bulletin. "It is naive and fatuous to think that there isn't any political maneuvering in back of both the Democratic and Republican plans. Each is trying, with its own plan, to strengthen its political lot. The leaders of both parties must sit down at the conference table and forge a plan which will be acceptable to the majority of members of both parties. This appears to be an almost hopeless development, but it can be done if there is a determination to give and take a little."

The Lancaster New Era says the Republican plan "had no chance of acceptance" and the Democratic plan "is ridiculous." It adds: "Maybe now is a good time for the legislature to adjourn. Both sides could go home and then sit down together later and work out a reasonable plan for redistricting."

That view is echoed by The Scranton Times, which claims the Democratic plan has "as little chance of being approved as the previously announced Republican plan and for the very same reason—they change the status quo."

This editor adds: "It is to be expected that the two parties will battle to the utmost to protect their respective interests in the revamping of the State's congressional districts, but politics may have to be set aside if an agreement is to be reached in time to prevent the election of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation on a statewide basis.

"Neither fully meets the need for fair and equitable representation," the Meadville Tribune notes. "Each party's plan is unacceptable to the other and, since close partisan division in the legislature probably would obstruct adoption of either one, a compromise clearly is necessary. The fairest compromise also would be the simplest—division of the Commonwealth into 27 districts as nearly equal in population as possible."

The Greensburg Tribune-Review takes a dim view: "At the moment we cannot see much basis for compromise between the two programs. And if no such compromise can be reached in the legislative term, then the entire congressional election would be forced into a statewide race for each candidate of each party * * * a Pandora's box if there ever was one."

"The Democratic reapportionment plan will not please the Republicans any more than the earlier Republican plan pleased the Democrats," notes the Chambersburg Public Opinion. "This is to be expected. One of the difficulties presented by reapportionment is that what makes sense geographically often does not make sense politically."

The Lancaster Intelligencer-Journal feels neither party will risk the chaos of an at-large election, then reminds us of another redistricting headache:

"Despite a constitutional requirement for such action, the (State) senate has not been redistricted since 1922, when minor changes were made. The house was redistricted in 1953, but the changes were minor. There is unfortunately no urgency about the State assembly reapportionment. The State's constitution says it should be done, but so long

as it isn't, the election of the State's legislators continues on the same basis as present. Leaders of the assembly have been attempting to show that this session of the legislature has been one of accomplishment. They would go a long way to proving such an assertion by hammering out just and fair reapportionments not only for Congress but for the State assembly, before adjournment."

Brig. Gen. Barnard E. Bee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute to Confederate Gen. Barnard E. Bee, of Pendleton, S.C., by Union Maj. Gen. William Farrar Smith, of Vermont, is one of the most moving in all of the annals of war.

This article by George Kennedy appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Sunday, July 16:

LETTER REVEALS TRIBUTE TO BEE BY UNION GENERAL

(By George Kennedy)

Among the wealth of interesting letters, dairies and personal memoirs which the Civil War Centeninial has brought to light, is a moving tribute paid by a Union general to his classmate and friend, a Confederate general, who fell in the first major battle.

Ours was a small army in the 1840's and 1850's. The officer corps was, for the most part, from a small school, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. All the cadets knew each other. Friendships were often strengthened by the intimacy of subsequent service in our frontier posts.

The Confederate was Brig. Gen. Barnard E. Bee, of South Carolina. In the first battle of Bull Run, 100 years ago this Friday, General Bee rallied his men by shouting:

"Look at Jackson, standing there like a stone wall."

The accolade stuck.

General Bee then led his men in an advance that helped upset the Union plan of battle. He was mortally wounded.

After the war Maj. Gen. William Farrar Smith, of Vermont, a fellow member of the class of 1845, wrote this hitherto unpublished tribute to his friend, uncovered recently and scheduled to be presented, along with other Smith papers, to the Library of Congress:

"The recollections of the intimate friendships which I formed in my military life, now that most all of my contemporaries have gone to the other world, are as dear to me as when they were in active existence. Of some of these I must speak individually.

The first and dearest one of my life was a classmate of mine, Barnard E. Bee, of South Carolina. Between us, from our life at West Point to the day of his death, there was ever a perfect confidence and faith in every question that ever rose, up to the breaking out of the Civil War.

There was never any hesitation on the part of either as to supporting the other without asking as to the merits of the cause. He was a noted man among all his associates; possessed of the finest moral and physical courage of any man with whom I was ever thrown."

CAPTURED DESPERADO

"He belonged to the 3d Infantry of the U.S. Army, which was stationed in San Antonio, Tex., 1848, where I, a young engineer officer, was on duty with the headquarters of the army stationed there.

"A noted desperado named Glanton, had wantonly killed a soldier of the 3d Infantry and the civil authorities of the town were afraid to arrest Glanton for murder. Bee went to the sheriff and told him that if he would make him a deputy that he would make the arrest and bring the prisoner before him.

"The sheriff acceded to his request, and he went and unarmed, by his exhibition of moral power took Glanton and delivered him up to the sheriff. The man was tried, and of course, by jury convened in those days was acquitted. This, however, did not detract from the merit of the act of Bee."

FOUGHT AT BULL RUN

"Shortly before the Civil War broke out Bee, who was stationed in Utah, wrote a letter to me in which he stated that a civil war was being brought on by the politicians on both sides, that they were looking forward to the help of the graduates of West Point to pull their chestnuts out of the fire, that in the question we had no interest, that we should both leave the service and go to Texas where his brother had a million [of] acres of land, from which we could select a large cattle ranch, and as we were both accustomed to roughing it we could manage to earn a living."

"To this I replied 'that when the separation came he would be obliged to go with his friends and relatives, and that I must stick by the flag.'

"He had served during the Mexican War with his regiment, then second to none in the army, and had won high praise from his brother officers for his gallantry in battle. I, who knew him so well, felt that with his qualities he would make a most distinguished adherent to the Southern cause, and the most dangerous adversary to ours.

"When the time came he resigned his commission and went to South Carolina and appeared at the Battle of Bull Run a brigadier general in command of a brigade.

"(I have forgotten to state that his reputation was so well established that when the Regular Army was increased by the addition of the [sic] regiments of Infantry, he was given a captaincy in one of these new regiments.)

"As I had expected, his action at the first Battle of Bull Run, by ordering at a crisis a charge of the brigade, changed the fate of the day and brought upon us a serious defeat.

"When the details of the battle came to me at Brattleboro, in Vermont, where I was on sick leave, I recollect that on seeing the notice of his having been killed in this charge, while the tears ran down my cheeks for his loss, I was glad in my heart that so complete a soldier had been taken from the list of our enemies. I never knew a nobler man."

The Issue at the Metropolitan Opera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the concern which has been aroused throughout the country over the announced cancellation of the 1961–62 season of the Metropolitan Opera Association is based in large part on a growing realization of the grave financial crises faced by the musical performing arts throughout the country. Costs are rising at a rate too rapid even for private foundations and philanthropists to match, and the resultant financial squeeze threatens the life not only of the Metropolitan Opera, but of the Nation's symphony orchestras and ballets as well. Legislation such as my proposal for a U.S. Arts Foundation is urgently needed to provide the backing which will enable these major institutions of our national cultural development to continue and to flourish.

An article entitled "Musicmakers Sing the Blues Over Money," offers some facts and figures that demonstrate the extent of the crisis. I ask unanimous consent that this article which appears in Bsuiness Week, August 19, be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSICMAKERS SING THE BLUES OVER MONEY—LABOR DISPUTE AT METROPOLITAN OPERA UNDERSCORES FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF LONG-HAIR MUSICIANS AND THE ORCHESTRAS THEY WORK FOR: SPECIAL SUBSIDIES MAY BE AN ANSWER TO DILEMMA

A few days ago, Herman D. Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians, said regretfully that "the musical performing arts can't survive in today's marketplace."

The warning was given before AFM's contract talks with the Metropolitan Opera Association in New York had developed into the most serious crisis the Met has faced in recent years. Early this week, that crisis still threatened the Met's 1961–62 season, despite negotiations seeking to salvage it (Business Week, Aug. 12, 1961, p. 86).

The Metropolitan's labor troubles sharply focused attention on the plight of serious music in this country—and on the plight of the serious musicians, employed by opera companies, ballets, and symphonies (picture).

MONEY PROBLEMS

The musical organizations have serious money problems. The musicians, too, contend that they are facing financial troubles. They are caught in "an intolerable bread-and-butter squeeze" largely because of underemployment. Most say they work regularly for less than half of each year.

The problems on both sides are the basis of a running conflict between unions demanding more money and enlarged benefits, and sponsors of serious music who are trying desperately to hold down deficits.

AFM argues that this unhappy situation means, inevitably, that there must be public assistance for the arts, through subsidies. Whether they like the idea or not, many sponsors of musical arts are coming to a similar conclusion.

ORCHESTRA DEFICITS

Few opera companies, ballets, orchestras, or other organizations that provide serious music can break even for a season. They wind up their programs in the red (the Met last season was $840,000 in the hole) and have to worry about raising money.

This is harder to do each year. Wealthy patrons can't be counted on to write generous checks to balance the books, as they once did. Deaths and taxes have taken big tolls in their ranks. Public solicitations haven't worked. Industrial donors and foundations haven't helped enough.

According to one survey, only about eight major symphonies are sponsored by foundations, corporations, or philanthropists. The

others must survive pretty much hand to mouth.

MUSICIANS' NEEDS

The musicians' AFM recognizes that union demands for more money and greater pension and hospitalization benefits create serious problems for those who must find the necessary financing for musical organizations. But the union says that many musicians who are tops in their profession make less today than a truck driver or industrial worker does each year.

The AFM wants "a complete reappraisal of the serious musician's position and status as an artist and of his financial prospects in today's economy."

The labor dispute at the Met involved this demand. AFM is asking big enough weekly salaries during short seasons to give musicians a substantially higher annual income.

Backers of major symphonies in several cities said last week that similar demands for exorbitant wage increases could kill serious music in their cities. They aren't accepting—yet—AFM's implicit proposals that sponsors of serious music join the union in seeking Government subsidies as the way out of the financial squeeze.

AFM SURVEY

During the Metropolian Opera negotiations last week, a union spokesman complained that criticism of AFM's demands overlooks these points:

Met musicians had an annual income last year of $7,600 from opera work—including their payments on opera records. Striking concrete drivers in New York City can expect more than that, over 12 months, at an offered (and so far rejected) new rate of $3.75 an hour.

Most serious musicians employed by the Met or other organizations actually are paid for seasons of only 27 weeks or less, from late fall through early spring. The union contends they are seasonal workers with not much hope of off-season work in the field of serious music outside New York, Boston, and perhaps one or two other cities.

The musicians do not qualify for most of the basic welfare program benefits included in labor agreements covering industrial workers who make more money per year.

AFM cited a recent union-made survey to back its arguments.

WHAT THEY EARN

AFM checked musicians employed by 26 major symphonies, which employ some 2,300 artists. It eliminated 150 "secondary orchestras" that give only a few concerts a year an employ musicians on a per concert basis, and others that pay on a weekly basis for seasons shorter than 20 weeks a year.

According to the suurvey, some 500 musicians in the "big five" orchestra cities—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Cleveland—averaged $167 a week in the 1960–61 season. The other 1,800 in the major orchestra group averaged $98.20. The overall average of the 2,300 was $117 a week.

Only nine of the orchestras offered regular season employment for 30 weeks or more. The New York Philharmonic paid for the longest season, 38 weeks; seasons of 17 of the group ranged from 20 to 28 weeks.

Eleven of the twenty-six supplemented regular seasons with summer programs averaging about 7½ weeks, but with reduced pay and fewer musicians.

AFM said the musicians in only 12 of the 26 major symphonies are eligible for unemployment insurance in off-seasons. Only 4 of the 26 provided hospitalization during the 1960–61 season. Only 10 had pensions.

According to AFM, the 2,300 musicians in the 26 top orchestras averaged less than $4,000 from their regular employment during the year—including "a generous approximation for summer season employment and postseason tours."

FEWER FINDING JOBS

According to Kenin, fewer musicians every year are able to earn their bread solely by musical performances or teaching. Livelihood through musical talents is becoming increasingly precarious, he says, because "canned" music (sound on films, long-playing records, and now tapes) has cut deeply into live music opportunities.

AFM reports show only 35 of 537 local radio and television stations outside New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles (network centers) employed musicians in 1960. The motion picture industry employed 303 on a yearly contract basis in 1957, last year for which AFM has figures, and "perhaps 1,000" on casual, sporadic schedules.

Other performing opportunities are dropping, too. Fewer musicians are getting wedding, ball, and other engagements, once common in high society and lucrative for serious musicians.

PART-TIME WORKERS

Nevertheless, the union survey found that 70 percent of the orchestra members by scrounging still are able to rely on musical activities for their entire livelihood. Of those responding, 23 percent said they were able to supplement their income sufficiently by performances in addition to their regular symphony engagements, while 47 percent said they made ends meet by teaching and other work related to music.

The remaining 30 percent, mostly outside the big five cities, said they supplemented their income through part-time nonmusical work.

They listed some 100 different nonmusical jobs—including work as aerial surveyors, gardeners and park guides, language teachers (a popular sideline), mental hospital therapists, bus and taxi drivers, a racetrack parimutuel official, a liquor store manager, and, Kenin reported, one who confessed to the mysterious vocation of bottle selector.

TOO BLACK A PICTURE

Employers of long-hair musicians say the union is painting too black a picture. They agree that seasonal earnings of orchestra members from opera, ballet, or symphony work may average what the union says it does. But they contend that most musicians do a lot better than AFM says they do.

But, most of all, they say that even if the picture AFM paints is really a true one, there is little the orchestras can do to improve conditions as things stand today, there isn't the money for bigger music budgets.

AFM spokesmen deny that pressures on the Met are part of a campaign for the bill—but one conceded this fuss might help everybody.

Summary of Various Benefits to Which Members Who Are Involuntarily Ordered to Active Duty With the Armed Forces Will Be Entitled

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, after the enactment of August 1, 1961, of Public Law 87–117, a request was made to the Department of Defense for a summary of the various benefits to which members who are involuntarily ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces under that act will be entitled.

The information in the following letter from Mr. Frank A. Bartimo, Assistant General Counsel of the Department of Defense, together with the summary of benefits, should prove interesting and informative in view of the thousands to be affected by Public Law 87–117.

The letter and summary follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1961.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: This is in reply to your request of August 12 for a summary of the various benefits to which members who are involuntarily ordered to active duty under the act of August 1, 1961, Public Law 87–117 (75 Stat. 242), will be entitled.

Members ordered to active duty under the act of August 1, 1961, will be entitled to the same benefits as other members serving on active duty. The benefits referred to here include basic pay, allowances, leave, commissary and post-exchange privileges, transportation for himself and his dependents and his household goods and effects, medical care, specialized training in various fields, career opportunities, promotion, extensive travel at Government expense both here in this country and abroad, the chance to meet far more individuals than normally encountered in civilian life, guarantee of premiums on commercial life insurance not exceeding $10,000 in any individual case and 6 months death gratuity.

In some instances, the extent of the benefit may depend on the period for which the member is ordered to active duty; for example, a member who is ordered to active duty for 30 days or less would not be entitled to medical care for his dependents. However, his dependents would be entitled to medical care if he is ordered to active duty for more than 30 days—10 U.S.C. 1076. Similarly, a member who is ordered to active duty for 30 days or less is entitled to physical disability benefits (severance pay or retirement, depending on the circumstances) if he incurs a disability resulting from an injury—10 U.S.C 1204, 1206. On the other hand, a member who is ordered to active duty for more than 30 days is entitled to physical disability benefits if he incurs a disability resulting from an injury or disease—10 U.S.C. 1201, 1203.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.), affords a different type of benefit in that it relieves members of the military service from worry over their inability to meet their civil obligations by temporarily suspending enforcement of certain of their civil liabilities if their ability to meet their obligations has been impaired by reason of their military service. The act does not free a serviceman from his obligations or impose any automatic moratorium thereon. It does, however, contain provisions designed to afford protection to those in military service with regard, among other things, to debts, leases, evictions, interest rates, income taxes, personal property taxes, real estate taxes, installment purchases, conditional sales, repossessions, foreclosures, mortgages, suits, judgments, attachments, executions, garnishments, penalties, and statutes of limitations. Protection is also provided under certain circumstances and in certain cases for dependents, sureties, endorsers, and persons jointly obligated with servicemen.

With respect to the extensive benefits to which a member may be entitled upon his release from active duty, or as an incident of that release, I am enclosing a comprehensive chart, listing those benefits, that was

prepared by the Military Affairs Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army. This chart will serve to identify the various benefits to which members may be entitled depending, of course, on the circumstances of their particular cases.

In summary, there are many and varying benefits, both present and prospective, for the young men who will soon enter the Armed Forces. But perhaps even more important than these practical considerations is the fact that military service can be a rich and rewarding experience generally for the individual who will make it such.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. BARTIMO,
Assistant General Counsel (Manpower).

Incidents of discharge

	Honorable	General	Undesirable [1]	Discharge [2] (under other than honorable conditions)	Bad-conduct discharge		Dishonorable	Resignation for the good of the service AR 635-89 (officers), homosexuality in lieu of courts-martial	Authorization for benefit
Authority for discharge	AR 635-200 (e.m.), AR 635-5 (officers)	AR 635-200 (e.m.), AR 635-5 (officers)	AR 635-200 (e.m.)	AR 635-5 (officers)	Sentence of a special court-martial	Sentence of a general court-martial	Sentence of a general court-martial (Dismissal by sentence of general court-martial is equivalent to dishonorable discharge)	AR 635-120 (officers) AR 635-5 (officers) (the provisions of AR 635-5 apply to all officers of the Army; AR 140-175 provide that Reserve officers being separated will be furnished discharge certificates in accordance with AR 635-5)	
Conditions under which issued.	Convenience of the Government; expiration of enlistment; minority; resignation; dependency or hardship; disability; revocation or termination of appointment; discharge to accept appointment	Convenience of the Government; disability, disloyal or subversive; expiration of enlistment; minority; resignation, unsuitability; homosexuality	Misconduct; homosexuality; qualified resignation, unfitness; disloyal and subversive; a.w.o.l. or desertion	Conviction of felony by civil authorities; security violation					
BENEFITS ADMINISTERED BY THE ARMY [3]									
Death gratuity	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	10 U.S.C. 1475 et seq.
Headstone marker	do	do	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	do	do	do	Sec. 1, act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1215), as amended (24 U.S.C. 279a).
Mustering-out payments	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.
Payment for accrued leave	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 963), as amended (37 U.S.C. 32 et seq.).
Retirement pay for non-Regular service.	do	do	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	10 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.
Transportation allowance for dependents and shipment of household goods.	do	do	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Pars. 7011-5, 8009-4, Joint Travel Regulations.
Transportation in kind	do	do	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Par. 5300 et seq., Joint Travel Regulations.
Burial in national cemetery	do	do	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Not eligible.	Sec. 1, act of May 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 234; 24 U.S.C. 281).
Use of wartime title; wear of uniform of wartime grade when authorized by Presidential regulations.	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	10 U.S.C. 772(e).
Admission to Soldiers' Home. [5]									
BENEFITS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION [6]									
Dependency and indemnity compensation.	do	do	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 410 et seq.
Pension for service-connected disability.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 301 et seq.
Pension for non-service-connected disability.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 501 et seq.
Vocational rehabilitation	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.
Education and training	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.
Loans	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.
Unemployment compensation.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.
Special housing	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 801 et seq.
Hospitalization	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 601 et seq.
Domiciliary care	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 601 et seq.
Out-patient medical treatment.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 601 et seq.
Out-patient dental treatment.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 601 et seq.
Prosthetic appliances	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 613.
Seeing-eye dogs and mechanical electronic equipment.	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 614.
Automobiles	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.
Compensation for service-connected death.	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.
Compensation for non-service-connected death.	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 501 et seq.
Burial expenses	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 902 et seq.
Burial flags	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 901.

Footnotes at end of table.

Incidents of discharge—Continued

	Honorable	General	Undesirable [1]	Discharge [2] (under other than honorable conditions)	Bad-conduct discharge		Dishonorable	Resignation for the good of the service AR 635-89 (officers), homosexuality in lieu of courts-martial	Authorization for benefit
					Sentence of a special court-martial	Sentence of a general court-martial			
Authority for discharge	AR 635-200 (e.m.), AR 635-5 (officers)	AR 635-200 (e.m.), AR 635-5 (officers)	AR 635-200 (e.m.)	AR 635-5 (officers)			Sentence of a general court-martial (Dismissal by sentence of general court-martial is equivalent to dishonorable discharge)	AR 635-120 (officers) AR 635-5 (officers) (the provisions of AR 635-5 apply to all officers of the Army; AR 140-175 provide that Reserve officers being separated will be furnished discharge certificates in accordance with AR 635-5)	
Conditions under which issued.	Convenience of the Government; expiration of enlistment; minority; resignation; dependency or hardship; disability; revocation or termination of appointment; discharge to accept appointment	Convenience of the Government; disability, disloyal or subversive; expiration of enlistment; minority; resignation, unsuitability; homosexuality	Misconduct; homosexuality; qualified resignation, unfitness; disloyal and subversive; a.w.o.l. or desertion	Conviction of felony by civil authorities; security violation					
BENEFITS ADMINISTERED BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES									
Farm loans and preference for such loans (Department of Agriculture).	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible	Not eligible	Eligible	Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 522), as amended (7 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).
Preference for farm housing loans (Department of Agriculture).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Sec. 507, Housing Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 436), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1477).
Homestead preference (Department of Interior).	do	do	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	do	Not eligible	Sec. 1, act of Mar. 1, 1921 (41 Stat. 1202), as amended (43 U.S.C. 238); sec. 1, act of Sept. 27, 1944 (c. 421, 58 Stat. 747), as amended (43 U.S.C. 279).
Desert land preference (Department of Interior).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Sec. 1, act of Mar. 1, 1921 (41 Stat. 1202), as amended (43 U.S.C. 238); sec. 2, act of Dec. 15, 1921 (42 Stat. 348; 43 U.S.C. 331)
Civil service preference (Civil Service Commission).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Sec. 2, Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended (5 U.S.C. 851).
Reemployment benefits, Federal or private (Civil Service Commission or Department of Labor).	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	do	Sec. 9, Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 614), as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 459); pt. 35, Civil Service Commission Regulations.
Job counseling and employment placement (Department of Labor).	do	do	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 2010 et seq.
Unemployment compensation, veterans of service after June 26, 1950 (Department of Labor).	do	do	do [4]	do [4]	do [4]	do	do	do	38 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.
Naturalization benefits (Department of Justice).	do	do	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible	do	do	do	Sec. 329, Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 250), as amended (8 U.S.C. 1440).
Social security (Social Security Administration).	do	do	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	Eligible [4]	do	do	do	Sec. 217, Social Security Act, as added by sec. 105, Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 (64 Stat. 512) as amended (42 U.S.C. 417); title IV, act of Aug. 1, 1956 (Public Law 881, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 869 et seq.).

[1] Title 10, United States Code, secs. 1161 and 6408, provides for the dropping from the rolls of an officer absent without leave more than 3 months or who has been convicted by civilian authorities and sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution. This office has previously stated that such separation will usually be characterized as under other than honorable conditions.

[2] Resignations for the good of the service are normally accepted as under other than honorable conditions and a discharge (under other than honorable conditions) is issued. Subparagraph 4d, Army Regulations 635-120, dated Nov. 25, 1955, provides however, that if the Department of the Army determines that the resignation be accepted under honorable conditions, an honorable or general discharge may be be furnished. As a matter of policy if it is determined that the resignation is under honorable conditions it is no longer considered a resignation for the good of the service but as a resignation under honorable conditions.

[3] Paid by the Army; determination of conditions of discharge by the Veterans' Administration.

[4] Subject to a review of the facts surrounding the discharge by the agency administering the benefit except in the case of death gratuities by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

[5] Sec. 4821, Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 49) provides that certain soldiers with service in the Army of the United States are eligible for admission to the Soldiers' Home. Sec. 4822, Revised Statutes (24 U.S.C. 50) provides "the benefits of the Soldiers' Home shall not be extended to any soldier in the Regular or volunteer service, convicted of felony or other disgraceful or infamous crimes of a civil nature after his admission into the service of the United States; nor shall anyone who has been a deserter, mutineer, or habitual drunkard be received without such evidence of subsequent service, good conduct, and reformation of character as is satisfactory to the commissioners."

[6] 38 U.S.C. 3103 provides in substance that discharge or dismissal by reason of sentence of GCM and other discharges and dismissals specified, shall bar all rights based upon the period of service from which discharged or dismissed, under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

[7] Eligibility dependent upon entitlement to disability compensation.

[8] Eligibility dependent upon entitlement to disability compensation for 1 of specified disabilities.

NOTE.—State benefits: The States provide a varying number of veterans' benefits which include bonuses, burial rights, employment preferences, and tax benefits. No general rule can be stated as to eligibility requirements for such benefits. Some States require an honorable discharge; others require discharge under conditions other than dishonorable, service with honor, or satisfactory service.

Source: Prepared in the Military Affairs Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Army (revised Oct. 1 1960).

The New Newburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, further evidence that there can be no Federal aid without Federal control is dramatically underlined by bureaucratic meddling and opposition to the efforts of Newburgh, N.Y., to purge its relief rolls of welfare chiselers.

One of the finest editorials that I have seen on the Newburgh case appeared in the August 16 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I think this editorial should be read and studied by every American.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW NEWBURGH—WELFARE PSYCHOLOGY, CIVIC REFORMS CHANGE CITY'S LOOK

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

NEWBURGH, N.Y.—While much attention has been fixed in recent weeks on this city's progress in enacting a more rigid welfare code, the controversial code itself and the publicity it has fomented have resulted in a variety of interesting secondary results. For although the new regulations have not yet of themselves directly affected the city's welfare load, they have indirectly helped to alleviate several historic community problems.

Since the 13-point program went into effect on July 15, for instance, the crime rate in Newburgh's Water Street slum area has fallen markedly. For the first time in many months, nobody from the Water Street district was a defendant at a session of municipal court. This in itself is extraordinary because in the past few years that district has been far and away the biggest headache for the police department.

A visitor quickly senses the changed atmosphere on an after-dark tour of the Water Street area. The streets are quiet and almost empty, except for small groups of children here and there playing hopscotch or hide-and-seek under a street light. The bars are doing business as usual but they are doing it quietly. Just 6 weeks ago it was common for a sidewalk stroller to have to step off the curb to get around a couple of men (or women) preparing to settle a dispute in direct fashion. Also, during the wee hours, one was likely to see a crowd of 50 or 60 men and women gathered in front of a tavern, chattering excitedly and drunkenly shoving each other about.

City officials view the changed atmosphere with satisfaction, and they contend that the new welfare psychology is responsible for the change.

BROAD APPROACH

"What most people outside of Newburgh fail to realize," says City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell, "is that our new welfare code is just one part of a broad approach to community problems. We are now working hard to improve zoning laws, eliminate the many fire hazards in some parts of town, remedy unsanitary conditions in poorer neighborhoods, press forward with our urban renewal projects, provide additional off-street parking in the downtown area, and we're trying by various means to boost the local economy."

The most noticeable result of the tougher city attitude is that residents seem to be gaining a new respect for city hall. This is partly due to reawakened civic pride but probably more to the stringent measures the city is using in its broad attack on local problems. And adoption of the welfare code served to convince many doubters that the city meant business.

Newburgh, to illustrate the community's new approach, has had a long-time garbage problem. Residents had over the years put out their garbage with little care for neatness. Refuse cans often had no covers and sometimes great piles of trash were simply set out with no container at all—and the wind and dogs could be counted on to scatter garbage on lawns and in streets. But today Newburgh's garbage problem no longer exists. An offender first gets a warning, but on the second offense he is pulled into court and, if found guilty, is liable to a stiff fine.

One of the dilemmas that prompted the new welfare code, aside from rising public relief costs that threatened to force a real estate tax boost of 30 percent, was the deterioration of the Water Street area. Newburgh now has an inspection team composed of fire, sanitation, housing, building and plumbing inspectors who jointly give a dwelling a thorough once-over.

CONVERSION OF DWELLINGS

The Water Street area is populated almost exclusively by Negroes, and many of these are migrant workers from the South who drifted into town when the picking season on surrounding farms was over. They were able to find space to live because for years the city looked the other way when half a dozen families crowded into one-family houses. Now Newburgh has a law which prohibits the conversion of a one-family dwelling into more than three separate units. And, while no statistics are available, city officials believe the influx of migrants has been slowed and that many of these newcomers are leaving town.

City Manager Mitchell contends it is still too early to judge the effect of the new welfare code on the city's welfare costs. Newburgh is moving slowly, he says, out of common prudence and because Peter Z. Petrillo, the new welfare commissioner, needs time to become acquainted with individual cases. Mr. Petrillo, a former schoolteacher with no welfare experience, recently replaced John J. O'Donnell, who resigned because he disagreed with the new code.

But if enforcement of the code is going slowly, the atmosphere the code has engendered is already causing a drop in public assistance costs. Since January, for instance, when new welfare rules were being actively considered, until July, when those rules were adopted, the number of home relief and aid to dependent children cases dropped from 266 to 135. At an annual rate, this amounts to a cost reduction of $163,860. The city had been spending about $1 million yearly on welfare, about half of which was paid by local taxpayers with the other half coming from the State and Federal Governments.

The 13-point program, aimed at weeding out the undeserving from the welfare rolls, includes such items as ending aid to unwed mothers who continue to have children, putting able-bodied reliefers to work for the city, and cutting off assistance to recipients who have been on the rolls for more than 3 months—except in cases involving the elderly and the disabled.

And there are about a dozen more regulations to come. Mr. Mitchell isn't saying what these additional restrictions will be, but it is known that the city is seriously considering a law which will force relatives of needy persons to assume responsibility for their support. The city council believes, for instance, that many elderly people, now living in the local old people's home, are a public burden because their families, living nearby, refuse to care for them.

New York State welfare officials, incensed by Newburgh's do-it-yourself revamping of its welfare system, is seeking a court injunction prohibiting the city from carrying out its program. Supreme Court Justice John P. Donohue is expected to rule on the State's request shortly.

Aside from the politically volatile nature of the case, State officials are alarmed because they fear that Newburgh's action might deprive the whole State of Federal welfare aid. The Federal Government requires that a State, to be eligible for welfare funds from Washington, must administer its welfare program in a uniform manner. And Newburgh's new code is far stricter than those of other municipalities in the State.

PATCHWORK JOB

Meanwhile, Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is considering a major overhaul of Federal welfare laws. Thus far, Mr. Ribicoff has not commented directly on the Newburgh case, but he has termed the entire system of Federal welfare aid a "patchwork" job.

Liberal charges that Newburgh is following a reactionary style of municipal government are denied by city officials who contend the city is aggressively, and progressively, working to improve the general welfare. The city, for instance, will soon announce a $500,000 outlay to improve parking and traffic conditions in the shopping district. It has urged establishment of a major jet airport at a site 30 miles from the city—this at a time when most municipalities are doing their best to keep the jet airliners away from their doors.

Newburgh is also in the process of clearing a blighted area for a third public housing project, even though a previous project—the Bourne Apartments in the Water Street section—became a civic menace when the occupants created every manner of nuisance.

Mrs. Hattie Howard, walking her dog along the Broadway shopping area, reflected for a moment "on all the excitement around here" and declared: "I don't know what will come of the new welfare code, and I'm not even sure it's fair to everybody. But I'll tell you this. Newburgh is becoming a better place to live because more people are interested in what's going on. And I think we're all pretty proud of our little city."

Medical Assistance for the Aged Enacted by Georgia's General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with justifiable pride that I call the attention of the membership of this body to the fact that the sovereign State of Georgia has taken significant steps to fulfill its responsibility toward the medical needs of Georgia's older citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from my good friend, Dr. Fred H. Simonton, president of the Medical Association of Georgia, to the Honorable S. Ernest Vandiver, Governor of Georgia, which evinces the forward-looking and responsible attitude of the medical profession of Georgia:

Hon. S. ERNEST VANDIVER,
Governor, State of Georgia, State Capital Building, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR GOVERNOR VANDIVER: I wish to take this opportunity, in behalf of the Medical Association of Georgia to commend you and your administration on your decisive action to implement the medical assistance for the

aged program as enacted by the Georgia General Assembly. Your leadership in establishing the Governor's commission on aging; the Governor's study committee on aging; and your support of the enabling legislation which allowed Georgia to implement the Federal Kerr-Mills law in the State legislature, give ample evidence of your strong desire to provide better health care for Georgia's senior citizens.

As physicians, dedicated to promote the science and art of medicine and the betterment of public health, we share your concern for health care needs of the people of Georgia. It then is only right and proper that we doctors praise and endorse your announcement of the activiation of a $7,200,000 medical assistance program for the aged.

Traditionally, the medical profession has and will continue to treat and administer to all patients irrespective of their ability to pay for such care. Our association, comprised of 3,000 doctors of medicine, pledges cooperation with your medical assistance to the aged program. We wish to assure you that we join with you in this program to provide medical care for Georgia's needy elder citizens.

Again, may we commend you for this forward step in meeting the health care needs of Georgians—by providing care for those who need care. As Governor, you have met the challenge of medical care for the aged and have again served all the people of this great State.

Respectfully,

FRED H. SIMONTON, M.D.,
President, Medical Association of Georgia.

Address by Hon. John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island, to the Rhode Island Optometric Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me at the annual banquet of the Rhode Island Optometric Association:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE RHODE ISLAND OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION AT LINDSEY'S, LINCOLN, R.I., ON SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1961

It is a great pleasure to be with you tonight and to have this opportunity to talk to you about eyes, aging, and our Nation's most important resource—healthy population.

I have long been impressed with the important supportive role played by the optometrist in the early detection of diseases of the eye. Into your offices come people with all kinds of visual defects, and you thus are key personnel in advising the patient when disease requires further treatment. This is a tremendous responsibility you have. There are only about 20,000 optometrists in the United States, and it has been estimated that almost 40 percent of the population has eye defects.

I am aware of your code of ethics which binds you to advise the patient whenever other professional care seems advisable, and of the fine work you have done through the "Optometry Annual," which for years has stimulated interest in the early detection of glaucoma by competent refraction of the eye. The discipline of optometry has earned the gratitude of all of us for its use of preventive and corrective measures to insure maximum vision and comfort for a considerable part of our population.

Spectacles have been in use since the 14th century, but the discipline of optometry is relatively new. Right here in New England, just 27 miles from Boston, Dr. Augustus Klein set up the Klein School of Optics, in 1896, where he delivered lectures in a pine grove on his estate. The following year the American Optometric Association was founded. While Dr. Klein was not one of its founders, clearly it is the pioneering work of men such as he that established the roots that have become the discipline of optometry.

Still, I am impressed by the small numbers of optometrists we have who have such an important role in dealing with eye conditions in our population, especially in that nearly 10 percent of our population age 65 or older.

You may be asking yourselves at this point—how do I qualify to speak to you on the subject of aging in the field of optometry, or aging in any field, for that matter? My answer is simply that in the course of my 20 years in Congress I have become deeply interested in and active on the Health Subcommittee on Appropriations. As chairman of that subcommittee for 9 years I have been privileged to take a leading part in the establishment of a broad forward-looking program of research in the medical and biological sciences. To keep abreast of developments it was necessary for me to learn as much as possible about these fields to qualify as a well-informed layman, while at the same time serving as your Representative, and, of course, as a citizen who has the same stake in medical progress as any other citizen.

Early this year the White House Conference on Aging was held in Washington. As some of you may be aware, I have a deep personal and official interest in the results of this, the first White House Conference on Aging. I am proud to have introduced H.R. 9822 calling on the President to hold such a conference. Officially, in my opinion, I performed no more important task while chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

The importance of your profession's contribution to this conference was recognized when Dr. Ralph Wick, chairman of the Committee on Vision Care of the American Optometric Association was named to its National Advisory Committee.

In addition to Dr. Wick, two other representatives from the association served as delegates as well as delegates from the American Optometric Foundation and the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness.

It was interesting to me to note in the conference recommendations, the number of references to "optometry" and its significance in the total approach to meeting the challenge of aging.

I must share with you my deep concern about the results of the White House Conference. If you heard or read any of the many speeches I made preceding the Conference, and at the meeting itself, you know what stress I placed on action. The conference was not intended to be the goal—but a beginning along the lines that 2,565 voting delegates decided in workshops and general sessions.

During the recent hearings on the appropriations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I was very critical of the report of the Conference because it was not the blueprint for action that had been promised. I ventured to add that this might well be the most expensive and least productive of the national conferences and could be a cruel hoax against our senior citizens who prayerfully waited patiently for positive action after the hundreds of gatherings that were held in preparation for the Washington meeting.

More than ever, I believe that favorable action should be taken on the bill I introduced in Congress on the opening day of the White House Conference. It calls for the creation of a Federal Commission on Aging that will provide the mechanism, prestige, and independence needed to keep the national program on aging vital and meaningful and not a leftover function or second best activity of any one department.

I have just heard of the formation of the Vision Institute of America and some of the plans for pilot projects in the field of aging. This is a most important development in the field of aging and its potential for the field of optometry is equally significant. We shall all be watching and encouraging you in this endeavor. It is almost the prophesy on the cover of "Vision of the Aging Patient" come true. It says "Old age can well be the golden years of a human life. The optometric profession can help to make it that by the proper care of the most vital of the senses—vision."

It is my hope that Rhode Island will take a leadership role in this entire field of meeting the needs of the aging on all fronts. There are several unique factors affecting our State which are the basis for my expressing this objective.

At the present time, our older persons covered by medical insurance far exceed the national average.

Rhode Island welfare and medical programs are somewhat more liberal than in many other States. Only 8 percent of our population receives old age assistance benefits, ranking 41st among the other States.

A State analysis shows 27 percent of the aged in Rhode Island to be handicapped by serious defects in vision, hearing, or mobility.

It is most encouraging to have Brown University included among the distinguished universities undertaking a part of the national research program.

At Brown, initially, the socioeconomic factors associated with aging will be studied and the relationship between these factors and the medical and biological aspects of aging and old age will be assessed. Five of the departments of the university will contribute to the project and the Rhode Island Hospital and community facilities will be used for clinical research purposes.

Other aging studies at Brown University are being supported by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, and the Ford Foundation.

Arrangements are underway to hold the second of the nine regional conferences—sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education with seven other educational groups at the University of Rhode Island in August. Again our State will play host to leaders from all of the New England States to develop the place of education in meeting the needs and desires of our elderly for lifelong learning and meaningful retirement.

It is my hope that the University of Rhode Island may become one of the Nation's centers on aging and preliminary steps have been taken toward that goal.

This is my concept of action. It has meaning for each of us in the job we are performing in our chosen fields and as citizens of the State and Nation.

To you, as optometrists numbering approximately 20,000 nationally and 150 within Rhode Island, there is a tremendous opportunity.

A few figures tell us of the task before you. Approximately 70 million Americans have eye ailments and need glasses; about 1 million persons have glaucoma without knowing they have it; 350,000 persons are considered legally blind, half of these are individuals 65 years of age or older.

It costs the United States approximately $500 million annually for the special benefits for the blind. There is no way to measure the cost to the individual, his family, friends, or the community.

Of this I am sure, that with the devotion to your profession that has been reflected in your growth and achievements, there is a brighter tomorrow for our Nation and for our senior adults who have had cause to doubt the value of their added years.

Now they can look forward to useful, healthful years lived with dignity and independence.

Much of this will be realized because you have kept faith with your own optometry's pledge:

"Next to life itself, God's most gracious gift is sight, and to the service of this great gift of sight we optometrists sincerely and faithfully dedicate our ministry."

Address of Luther L. Terry, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Before the Alabama State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to place in the RECORD, an address given before the Alabama State Legislature on July 18, 1961, by Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Terry, a distinguished Alabaman, in his address, honors our beloved senior Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL who has, throughout his long and honored career constantly strived to improve the medical facilities and the field of medicine. Senator HILL, known as Mr. Health, while not following in the footsteps of his father, a distinguished surgeon, has throughout his political career served the medical profession and the health of the Nation with devotion and leadership that cannot and will not go unnoticed in the years ahead.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY LUTHER L. TERRY, M.D., SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE JOINT SESSION OF THE ALABAMA LEGISLATURE, MONTGOMERY, ALA., JULY 18, 1961

At the outset, I wish to say that I appreciate the honor of addressing a joint session of the Alabama Legislature. Also I want to thank the members of the senate and the house of representaitves for the sentiments expressed in their joint resolution. I will endeavor to deserve their praise and good wishes.

I would also like to pay tribute to Alabama's delegation in the U.S. Congress. Senators HILL and SPARKMAN have won the admiration of the entire Nation as two of America's finest statesmen. They and our Congressmen comprise one of the ablest and hardest working groups in the Capitol.

I have known Senator HILL all my life. Some years ago, I was distressed when he decided to go into politics instead of medicine. I thought the country would be wasting a good physician. I have changed my mind, for there's no doubt he has done more for the health of mankind as a statesman than any one physician could possibly do. In the United States—and a number of other countries—Alabama's senior Senator is "Mr. Health."

It is not often that an official of the U.S. Government has an opportunity to discuss his responsibilities with the legislators and executive officers of his native State. I welcome this opportunity. Until a few months ago, my chief concern was with medical research and training, principally in the field of cardiovascular disease. When I was appointed Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, my responsibilities were broadened to encompass the health of the Nation.

National health is nothing more nor less than the health of every State, every community, every individual. As I view the scene, all of us share the responsibility for three major health problems.

The first is the changing pattern of disease in our growing population. During the past two decades, the American people have witnessed the virtual conquest of bacterial diseases. In that period, chronic diseases have continually risen in prominence as causes of death, and even more so as causes of prolonged disability. This problem is closely associated with the medical needs of the aged, since cardiovascular disease, cancer, and metabolic diseases strike most severely in the later years of life. But I must point out that chronic conditions inflict the highest disability rates in all age groups, from early infancy through the most productive years of adulthood.

The second problem is corollary of the first; namely, the provision of comprehensive health care for 180 million people. The core of this problem is our lack of facilities, personnel, and effective organizations for the application of medical science to human needs. A part of this problem is our need for more efficient systems of financing medical care for the aged and dependent groups. Modern medicine has a vast array of preventive, curative, and restorative techniques. If these were readily available to all segments of the population in all communities, we could anticipate a substantial reduction in costly long-term disability.

The third problem is the emergence of new environmental threats of life and health. These include ionizing radiations, chemical wastes in the atmosphere and water resources, and the use of new chemicals in foods and domestic products. Both rural and urban populations are confronted with increased exposures to these hazards.

Our hopes for ultimate success in solving these major problems depend upon one common factor—continued progress in the health sciences. During the past 15 years, our national health policy has given highest priority to the expansion of medical research. The result has been greater advances in scientific medicine than in any prior period.

We can anticipate further medical advances under that policy. But many problems in the life sciences remain unsolved. Many research areas affecting human health are little explored. Notable among these are the environmental sciences, the behavioral sciences, and administrative research. Of critical concern also is the fact that the health professions in many parts of our country lack the essential support of strong research programs.

I would like now to give you a closer view of the three major health problems as they affect the nation and the State of Alabama. In doing so, I shall discuss briefly our national programs in these areas and some proposals for the future.

CHRONIC ILLNESS AND THE AGED

In considering the problem of chronic illness, we need to bear in mind, the great population changes that are taking place. I know that this is a matter of primary political concern. It also has significant implications for national health.

The Nation's population totaled 180 million in 1960. This represented an increase of 18.5 percent over 1950. The two groups with the highest rates of growth were the children and the aged. The child population under 18 years of age increased 37.6 percent and the aged over 65 increased nearly 35 percent. These trends will continue for the next few decades, with a predicted total population of 214 million in 1970.

In States like Alabama, where population growth is slow, the proportional increase of the aged population may be much higher. For the Nation as a whole, the aged increased at a rate almost twice that of the total population in the past decade. Alabama's aged population increased by 31.5 percent, a rate more than four times that of the State as a whole (6.7 percent).

There are ample data to document the special health problems of the aged. At least 77 percent of persons 65 years of age and over have one or more chronic ailments. These conditions do not always disable; but more than 6 million older people who are not in institutions report some limitation of their usual activities as a result of chronic conditions. About 2 million in that group are invalids, in the commonly accepted sense of the term. That is, they are in chronic ill health and disabled for active life.

Approximately half a million older people are in nursing homes and similar institutions and another quarter million or more in mental hospitals. From past experience, we know that in most of these institutions, the elderly patients are very old, very sick, and are receiving inferior service and very little medical care.

The high prevalence of chronic illness in the aged has stimulated national concern to find a satisfactory system for financing their medical expenses. As you know, President Kennedy has proposed the extension of our social security system to provide health insurance for aged beneficiaries. In my opinion, that is the logical, the most satisfactory approach. Our experience with other approaches indicates that for the majority of old people, action is too little and too late. Whatever the Nation's decision is in this matter, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that we must be prepared to provide more and better medical services for increasing numbers of older people.

The chronic diseases, which cause the largest volume of prolonged disability, may have their onset at any time of life. There are about 70 million persons in the United States with one or more chronic conditions. Less than half of these (32,147,000) are 45 years of age and over. In these groups, however, the rate of chronic illness as well as its severity increases sharply with age. Among persons 45 to 64 years old, 56 percent have chronic ailments and that rate increases to 83 percent at age 75 and older. The percentage of persons with partial or major limitations due to chronic illness increases progressively from 13 percent in the younger group (45–64) to 55 percent in the oldest.

The health professions have long recognized that the best hope for coping with

chronic disease is a preventive approach. In 1947, four major professional organizations[1] issued this joint statement:

"The basic approach to chronic disease must be preventive. Otherwise the problems created by chronic diseases will grow larger with time, and the hope of any substantial decline in their incidence and severity will be postponed for many years."

The earlier a chronic disease is diagnosed, the better the prognosis. If appropriate treatment is instituted promptly and medical supervision is maintained, the patient may live a long, active life with relatively little residual disability. This has been my experience as a clinician in the management of many cardiovascular patients.

It is true that a vast amount of basic and clinical research must be done before we have sure cures or simple preventive measures for most of the chronic diseases. In fact, as medical science advances, the more complex the causation of disease appears. But medicine has accumulated a battery of remarkably effective preventive weapons against chronic conditions in the past 15 years. To mention only a few: the prophylactic use of antibiotics has sharply reduced the incidence and mortality of rheumatic heart disease and subacute bacterial endocarditis. Anticoagulants have given a new lease on life to patients who survive their first coronary attack. The use of steroid compounds to suppress rheumatoid inflammation has prevented severe crippling in many arthritic patients. Exchange transfusions for Rh negative infants has virtually eliminated one form of cerebral palsy.

In addition, advances in diagnostic techniques have greatly increased efficiency in discovering serious chronic disease at a time when the chances of cure are best. Among these, I would mention improvements in the electrocardiograph and the electroencephalograph; the use of the tonometer to detect glaucoma; and the cytologic test for cancer of the uterus.

In sum, the prognosis for a national attack on chronic disease is far better than it ever has been in the past. We need to continue and expand our research effort. This we will do. But we must begin now to apply throughout the country all the gains we have made in scientific knowledge and medical skill.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE

This brings me to the second major health problem that confronts this Nation; the provision of comprehensive health care.

President Kennedy recognized the importance of this national problem in his first health message and has emphasized it in subsequent special messages. In his recommendations for community health facilities and services, the President stated that the ability of families and individuals to purchase health care is of no avail—if their communities do not have the necessary facilities and services.

The concept of comprehensive health care has emerged within the past decade as scientific progress has taught the health professions that there can be no separation of their basic responsibilities: prevention, care, and restoration.

In the distant past, it was possible to separate our very few preventive measures from the treatment of acutely ill people. Later on, a few surgeons seized the opportunities offered by the care of severely wounded soldiers to develop rehabilitative, or restorative, medicine.

This was extended first to the industrially injured and subsequently to a larger group of handicapped persons in our national programs for crippled children and vocational rehabilitation.

The goal now is to make sure that preventive, curative, and restorative services are available for all persons who need them, at the times they are needed, and wherever they are needed.

As I said earlier, the core of this problem is facilities and personnel. And it is inextricably linked with the costs of health services. We need to recall that medical care prices have risen more than 40 percent in the past decade. That is twice the rate of increase in the average price of all consumer goods and services for the same period. There is no indication that this trend will halt. There has been no corresponding improvement in the income status of the aged in the same decade. Moreover, private carriers of health insurance, with few exceptions, have not offered to the aged the same coverage and benefits offered to younger groups.

I am under no illusions that the improvement of community health facilities and services will reduce the Nation's annual medical bill of $25 billion. In fact, if all our medical knowledge were applied wherever and whenever it is needed, that bill for a growing population would be substantially higher. The American people, however, want the best that medicine can provide. They have financed the scientific research that makes the advances. They will, I feel sure, find ways to pay the price of better care.

As a Nation, we have made substantial progress under the Hill-Burton program in reducing the deficit of general hospital beds, particularly in rural areas. In 1948, when construction began under the program, only 59 percent of the needed general hospital beds were in existence. By 1960, the States reported that 80 percent of the national need had been met. I regret that Alabama's record is below that of the Nation as a whole. Our ratio of general beds to population is about 3 per 1,000, as contrasted with the estimated need for 5 per 1,000.

It should be noted that a growing and mobile population has sharply increased the need for general hospitals in suburban areas. Also many of our oldest and most famous hospitals in central cities urgently need new facilities. Of special importance is the development of adequate teaching, research, and service facilities for the Nation's medical centers. I refer to such institutions as our University of Alabama Medical Center in Birmingham.

The most serious deficits in service facilities are in nursing homes, in new types of facilities for the intensive treatment of mental patients, and in rehabilitation facilities. As of January 1, 1960, the national deficit in nursing home and chronic disease beds was reported as more than 500,000. Both types of facility provide long-term care, chiefly for the aged. Legislation now before the Congress would authorize an additional $10 million in Hill-Burton grants for the construction of nursing homes. If this increase is provided, the combined funds for chronic disease hospitals and nursing homes would total $40 million a year in grants. If the States and communities utilize these grants, it will be possible to add about 10,000 nonprofit beds for long-term care each year. It can be expected that commercial nursing home facilities will continue to increase, probably at a faster rate under the expanded Federal-State programs for medical care of the aged.

Alabama has worked hard to meet her nursing home shortage, as well as to improve services in the homes. I was very proud about 2 months ago to learn that the one-thousandth Hill-Burton project to be completed in this part of the country was the Sylacauga Nursing Home at Sylacauge, Ala. What's more, this region is the first in the country to complete 1,000 Hill-Burton projects. I was gratified to observe, too, that the Sylacauga Nursing Home is administered by the community hospital. This insures skilled nursing care and proper medical supervision—two of the basic requirements for improsing nursing home services.

Our State still has a long way to go in this nursing home field. More construction is needed. Also the Alabama Health Department will have to have increased support for personnel who can work with nursing home operators for better standards of care.

I have not touched upon the Nation's needs for teaching and research facilities in the health field. These are intimately associated with our shortages of professional personnel which I shall now discuss.

President Kennedy's recommendations for health profession's educational assistance would authorize a 10-year program of matching construction grants for medical, dental, and public health schools, at a rate of $60 million a year. New schools or major expansions of existing schools would receive up to 60 percent of costs in Federal grants, while the ratio for renovation would be 50–50. The proposal would also extend our Public Health Service construction grant program for research facilities for 3 years, increasing the authorization to $50 million a year.

The educational provisions would make available scholarship grants to medical and dental schools for aid to students requiring financial assistance. The schools would also receive instructional grants equivalent to $1,000 per Federal scholarship holder.

These proposals have had wide approval from the professions and the public. They would make a start toward meeting the long-standing deficits in professional health personnel.

We need to strengthen and expand our existing schools; and we need to build new ones. We need to recruit our best young men and women to careers in the health professions.

The shortage of physicians and dentists has been a never-ceasing problem for the past two decades. The national ratio of physicians to population has been about the same—132 per 100,000—in a period of great and rapid population growth. Many parts of the country are not as well off as they were in 1940. Alabama, for example, had a ratio of 89 per 100,000 at that time. At present, the figure is about 72 physicians per 100,000 people. Only two States have a more severe shortage: South Dakota with 68 and South Carolina with 71 per 100,000.

This State, like many others with severe economic problems, has made heroic efforts since World War II to strengthen its educational and health programs. These problems are complex; they are difficult to solve and their solution is costly. I believe, however, that State governments face a broader responsibility in relation to health than ever before. Federal aid in various fields—notably medical research, hospital construction, and public health programs—has been substantial over the past decade. I believe that it will increase and extend into new areas. But the Federal Government cannot carry the entire burden of public responsibility for growing health needs.

I believe that the next decade will see a tremendous increase in service occupations as a source of economic development. Automation in industry will create many new jobs requiring higher levels of education and training. So, also, in health services, advances in science and technology will create new opportunities demanding special skills. The kinds of specialists and technicians employed in comprehensive health services already have increased. Today, there are four professional health workers for every physician. These additional workers provide

[1] The American Hospital Association, American Medical Association, American Public Health Association, and American Public Welfare Association.

the nursing care, the laboratory and pharmacy services, and many of the special treatments—such as physical therapy—which the physician requires in the management of his patients. He is responsible for making the diagnosis and prescribing the treatment; but an army of professional and technical personnel carry out his instructions.

Most of these services are available in the modern hospital. But if we are to provide comprehensive health care for 180 million people we must find ways to bring more of these services to the people—in their own homes, nursing homes, and facilities for ambulatory care. It is wasteful of professional personnel and funds to keep patients in hospitals beyond the time when the full battery of specialized hospital equipment and service is needed.

Organized community services to provide comprehensive health care outside the hospital are available in only a few parts of the country. Yet where even partial programs are in operation, their values in improving the health of the people and reducing the costs of care have been demonstrated.

Let me illustrate. Simple exercises and other measures in care of the patient can have people who survive stroke walking within 2 months of the attack. The longer the time before these measures are instituted, the longer the patient is flat on his back, and the harder it is to restore function. But even severely paralyzed patients—after lying in bed for years—have recovered function—enough to take care of their daily personal needs.

Mind you, this particular method of carrying out the restorative phase of comprehensive health care is probably the least expensive technique in the entire medical armamentarium. Properly instructed, any intelligent adult can do for the patient what is needed; and the patient himself very soon is exercising himself.

Now you may ask, if this is known, why are so many victims of stroke permanently and totally disabled? It would take me an hour or more to go into the basic reasons. They are related to education of the health professions, traditional ideas of what severely ill patients can and cannot do, and the tendency in nursing homes to keep patients in bed and docile. Let me tell you instead that medical schools and health departments all over the country are jumping at the chance to put these measures into operation. The State Health Department of Georgia and Emory Medical School have teamed up, for example, with help from the Public Health Service. They are providing community services to institute this restorative technique in nursing homes and the homes of stroke patients.

It does require some personnel to start such a program and keep it going. But I am sure that your State health officer, Dr. Gill, and his staff will tell you that new community services of that sort would go far in stretching dollars and providing better care for the aged.

President Kennedy's proposal for strengthening community health facilities and services would increase Public Health Service grants to the States for these purposes. It would expand efforts to improve the quality of care in nursing homes, as well as programs for chronic disease control. It would encourage the development of comprehensive health care programs in local communities. And it would provide supports for special projects in public and private organizations designed to develop new and better methods of delivering comprehensive services.

Governor Patterson is 1 of 31 Governors who replied to the request for comments on these proposals by the congressional subcommittee considering the legislation. Governor Patterson wrote, in part, that "this bill, if enacted, could have a profound effect on the health of this Nation. I believe the need is great and the approach of this legislation is sound." I scarcely need add that Secretary Ribicoff and I agree with the Governor.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

The third major problem—new environmental hazards—has been advancing upon us for 20 years. The principal areas of concern are water and air pollution, the use of new chemicals and of ionizing radiation. Within these broad fields there are the specialized problems of industrial workers exposed to new processes and the concentration of environmental problems in metropolitan areas.

In the main, these problems are by-products of technologic progress. They are accompanied and exacerbated by population growth and increased urbanization. So the American people are confronted with a dilemma. How can we create a healthful environment, conserve our natural resources, and at the same time retain the benefits of industrial technology? Those benefits have added immeasurably to the convenience and healthfulness of daily living. But they have imposed heavy hidden costs on the economy and on human health.

Water pollution has driven up the costs of industrial production and of municipal water supplies. It has seriously depleted the Nation's fish and wildlife and its recreational areas. It has had adverse effects on animal industry and agriculture. And it is a very real and present danger to human beings.

Last February, there was an outbreak of infectious hepatitis in Pascagoula, Miss., which eventually involved 80 cases in Pascagoula and Jackson County, Miss., in Troy and Mobile, Ala. Epidemiologic studies by the Public Health Service traced the source to raw sewage discharged into the Pascagoula River and eventually infecting oysters which the victims had eaten. The shellfish were harvested from presumably safe reefs in the coastal area.

In investigating this puzzling outbreak and halting its spread, the Public Health Service had wonderful cooperation from both State health departments, as well as from the Mississippi Marine Conservation Commission. Later this year water pollution was the source of another outbreak of infectious hepatitis in New Jersey and New York. It was traced to clams taken from Raritan Bay. I cite these two instances to emphasize that water pollution knows no political boundaries; and that it affects both fresh and salt water resources, long distances from the point of waste discharge.

Air pollution from industrial and domestic sources and automotive traffic is a recognized problem in all metropolitan areas, and a serious one in many. The production and use of chemicals and ionizing radiation have added enormous dimensions to the environmental problem. It is further complicated by the lack of uniform laws and regulations in this great national complex of State and local jurisdictions.

What can we do about it? The first need is for a greatly expanded national research, training, and development effort in the environmental sciences, comparable with our efforts in medical science, aeronautics and space research. Lack of scientific knowledge and efficient control equipment is the chief handicap which deters governmental agencies at all levels in their efforts to protect natural resources and human health.

Insofar as health is concerned, the great unknown is the biological effects of small, intermittent doses of radiation and new chemicals over long periods of time.

A second major need is for funds and a coordinating mechanism to bring together specialists in a wide variety of fields—at National, State, and municipal levels. The objective would be to apply interdisciplinary analysis, planning, and logistics to specific problems, as well as to the total environment of different regions or metropolitan areas.

The Public Health Service has had responsibilities, including some regulatory duties, in environmental fields since early in this century. It acquired additional responsibilities, particularly in water and air pollution control and radiological health, during the 1950's.

One of our goals now is to speed water pollution control, especially through increased research, training, and financial grants to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment facilities.

We expect also to expand research, training, and technical assistance in all environmental fields. President Kennedy has requested funds for site acquisition, planning, and design of a National Environmental Research Center located near the National Institutes of Health and the central facilities of other Federal research agencies such as the Bureau of Standards, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Various field centers, some of which are already in being, will be developed to conduct field investigations and provide technical assistance to adjacent regions.

THE ROLE OF GOVERMENT IN MEETING HEALTH NEEDS

The problems and programs I have mentioned represent only a sample of the nation's health needs and resources. In all these areas and others, public and private resources have poured into the breach to meet urgent needs. If this were not so, American medicine and public health would not have attained their present high levels of proficiency. Without public and private action, we would not have our universities, hospitals, health departments, voluntary agencies, pharmaceutical and instrumentation industries.

In certain areas, joint planning and action by public and private organizations has brough about sustained progress over the past two decades. Usually, the beginnings have been small; but in some instances the results have been spectacular. Two notable examples are the national medical research effort and the national hospital and medical facilities program. Both have gone from strength to strength largely as a result of the active involvement of professions, governments, industries, non-profit institutions, and voluntary associations. This great complex of private and public resources is now called upon for similar involvement in different—but closely related—areas. Concerted action has made possible every significant advance in the nation's health services. The contemporary problems are certainly more complicated than those of the past. But they are no more difficult of solution—if there is a will to solve them in the public interest.

Future progress in comprehensive health care, in education of the health professions, in environmental health will depend in large measure on clear understanding by public and private groups of their respective responsibilities. I mention these relationships because health needs in a nation of high material prosperity sometimes have a "low visibility," in comparison with other more obvious demands. Health needs are continuous. In a growing population they cannot be met by single actions expected to fill the bill for a generation.

In our country, governmental agencies and intsitutions derive responsibilities and funds from the representatives of the people in Federal and State Legislatures. Over the past quarter century, our national policy for community health facilities and services has been to provide Federal grants to the States, accompanied in some instances by other forms of assistance. Further, the in-

tent of the U.S. Congress has been to provide proportionally larger financial aid to the jurisdictions with low per capita income. This policy has been pursued consistently in Federal-State programs operated by the Public Health Service, the Social Security Administration, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The pattern of Public Health Service grants for health research, training, and research facilities construction has been different. Here the aim has been to build up the Nation's scientific potential through support of institutions and individual scientists. The same pattern has been applied in our programs for the advanced training of public health specialists and nurses.

In both these programs, research and training institutions in all parts of the country have benefited, whether operated under public or private auspices. For example, our National Institutes of Health programs have increased support of instiutions in Alabama progressively over the past 12 years. In all, over $10.5 million in NIH grants have been awarded to Alabama's research and training institutions.

A second goal of these programs, aided by the Hill-Burton program, is to strengthen the Nation's medical centers. These are at present the source of medical leadership in teaching, research, and clinical service—and the hope of the future. As a reflection of this policy, let me point out that the University of Alabama has received 80 percent of the National Institutes of Health grant funds awarded in this State—a total of $8.4 million.

Alabama has also benefited by the Federal-State health programs now in existence. For example, in the 10-year period, 1951–60, the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau awarded a total of about $63 million in grants to this State. The bulk of that support (about $37 million) was for the construction of hospitals and medical facilities under the Hill-Burton program. Another $5 million was in aid to the construction of waste treatment works. The remainder was in support of other public health programs, including disease control, maternal and child health, and crippled childrens' services.

Of course, the Federal share in all these health activities has been less than that of State and local resources, both public and private. For example, the total cost of the 162 Hill-Burton projects approved in Alabama since 1948 will be over $103 million when completed, the Federal share of which is about $51 million. Private nonprofit institutions, as well as local governments, are responsible for the bulk of remaining costs.

State and local governments traditionally have borne the major burden for public health services. In the past decade, the proportional contribution of the Federal Government in those fields has declined, while that of State and local governments has increased sharply. This change has occurred even in States with relatively meager economic resources. In Alabama and the five neighboring States comprising Region IV of the DHEW, State appropriations for public health increased 155 percent between 1951 and 1960, as contrasted with a national average of 145 percent. The corresponding figures for local appropriations were 98 percent for Region IV local jurisdictions and 94 percent for the Nation as a whole.

Alabama has neither the best nor the worst record in this transition. Among Region IV States, Florida and Georgia Legislatures have increased State provisions for public health by 185 and 233 percent, respectively. South Carolina and Tennessee managed increases of 122 and 144 percent, while Alabama and Mississippi State appropriations have increased by only 91 and 51 percent, respectively.

State and local governments are being called upon to play a larger role in types of health activity new to most of them. I refer particularly to health research, education of the health professions, construction of community facilities, and administration of medical care programs covering larger segments of the population than previously came within their purview. The prominent role that private institutions have played in these areas will not—must not—diminish. On the contrary, it must increase.

The fact is that we cannot sustain progress in national health without substantial expansion of support from all sources. The stress of competition with other large national demands already has had an adverse impact on the Nation's health institutions and agencies.

I am anything but an expert in economics and politics. But as a medical administrator, I know that high quality research, teaching, and service in my field cannot be performed without adequate support for personnel, facilities, and administration. In health fields, nothing less than high quality will suffice, for these activities touch people—in the most poignant experiences of their lives.

If expenditures lag too far behind increasing costs, increasing demands, the quality of health activities will deteriorate in the long run. If pressing demands for other civic needs are allowed to crowd out health needs, the effect on the economy of a state or of a nation can only be disastrous. In practical terms, achievements in those fields depend ultimately on a healthy, productive population. Parallel development of health resources must keep pace with action in these other fields.

My contacts with other medical administrators in private and public organizations lead me to believe that this crowding out of health needs is occurring in many States. In others, there is a slowing up of support for new activities launched with enthusiasm only a few years ago.

The struggle of the University of Alabama Medical Center to build the research, teaching, and service potential of this State is a case in point. My colleagues and I in the Public Health Service, as well as eminent scientists on our advisory councils, have been impressed by the quality of work at the Alabama Medical Center. The valiant efforts of Dr. Berson and his staffs in the component schools and the university hospital can only command the greatest respect. For these dedicated men and women are trying to carry out their mission to the people of this State under the handicap of inadequate facilities and insufficient professional personnel.

As I see it, the mission of a modern medical center is to develop high standards of research, teaching, and service and to radiate its influence throughout the communities of the area it serves. The basic responsibility of medical, dental, and nursing schools is to educate professional personnel. But this cannot be done without the inseparable functions of research and clinical care. The mission of our medical center thus transcends its educational function. It is intimately associated with the quantity and quality of health care available to the people of Alabama.

Of course, I am not prepared to discuss the specific problems of the medical center nor to suggest solutions. In institutions where tax funds are the principal source of support, the problems may involve capital investment, budget structure, relationships of State and local agencies—any number of basic issues associated with public administration in all areas. More often than not, however, appropriating bodies underestimate operating expenses and do not plan far enough in advance for essential expansion of facilities and staff.

It is gratifying that the Alabama Legislature and the voters of this State have repeatedly increased capital investments in their medical center over the past decade. And I am proud that the Public Health Service has had a share in its expansion, both through Hill-Burton and research facilities grants. The most recent provisions for the University Hospital School of Nursing and a psychiatric unit will greatly extend the center's usefulness. The generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Spain also has provided the stimulus for the creation of a rehabilitation unit which will broaden the center's mission to encompass the restorative phase of comprehensive health care.

Facilities, however, are only the beginning. I would urge the legislature to scrutinize closely the personnel and operating needs of all State health facilities and programs. Professional personnel in all categories are in short supply. The Public Health Service, even with generous congressional support for its own operations, is feeling the competition for highly qualified personnel.

The relatively low cost of living in some States does not offer a sufficient incentive to attract and hold qualified professional health workers on salaries substantially lower than they can command elsewhere. This harsh fact is reflected in the staffing difficulties of Alabama's medical center and her health departments—State and local.

I do know that its salary program is not only low on the national scale, but also substantially below that of similar institutions in nearby States. Further, Alabama—with a slowly growing population—has not improved the professional and technical staffing of her health departments over the past 10 years. Between 1951 and 1960, the ratio of health department staffs to population increased from 18 to 21 per 100,000 for the Nation as a whole. Other States in this region went ahead to a rate of 24 per 100,000, whereas Alabama remained at the 1951 level of 18.

I have mentioned earlier Alabama's low physician-population ratio. The State is not much better off in her supply of dentists and the shortage of professional nurses is well-nigh desperate. A month or two ago, I appointed a special advisory committee to analyze the nationwide situation in nursing so that we may report the educational needs in that field to President Kennedy.

I realize that Alabama is facing problems of great magnitude in all fields of public responsibility—health, education, welfare, agriculture, industrial development, and others. The State's economy is sound, however, and I would bespeak the legislature's earnest consideration of the health problems and needs I have discussed.

The Nation's medical centers, hospitals, and health departments cannot carry out the missions for which they were created without solid, sustained support. Nor can governments and private organizations afford the wastefulness of inadequate health resources and mounting disability.

These challenges confront the entire Nation. We need to move forward now—in a concerted effort to increase national health resources. Buttressed by an expanding research effort in all fields, our facilities, personnel, and organizations should be able to provide for the American people all the comprehensive health care, all the protection against environmental hazards that science affords.

I am confident that America's health needs will be met. But it is up to the Nation's leaders at all levels of government to pick up the challenge wherever public responsibility is a factor in meeting the needs. The health professions can identify the needs. They can point out the great oppor-

tunities for health progress. They can deliver the services. They can suggest ways to improve efficiency. But they cannot provide the means. For the decisive actions, the people depend upon the wisdom and vision of their elected representatives in their legislative bodies. Let it not be said that the world's richest Nation in all history failed to meet the people's health needs.

Progress on California's State Water Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in California, construction in earnest is getting underway on the State water project. Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown has thrown the full weight of his leadship behind this great undertaking, a unified project costing $1.75 billion, to bring excess waters from northern streams into parched, growing southern California. Governor Brown has correctly described this project as a unifying force, and as such in the years to come the project may have as notable an influence on the political development of California as it certainly will have on the State's economic growth.

Water users from the Last Chance Creek Water District in Sierra Valley of Plumas County in the upper Feather River vastnesses to those of the Helix Irrigation District of southern San Diego County will have parallel interests in operations of this farflung project. These two and many others are expected to be served by features of the project. Small agencies and the great Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will similarly be drawn together in a common activity. These common activities and concerns are certain to provide a community of interest now lacking and will help offset regional suspicions and jealousies within the State.

At Governor Brown's suggestion, Director William E. Warne, of the California Department of Water Resources, which is building the California water project, recently organized the State water project service agency council. This council is made up of representatives of agencies that have contracted for services from the California water project and it will meet once each month. At the first meeting only two agencies were represented, the Metropolitan Water District and the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, the two with which water contracts have so far been completed. Mr. Warne reports that negotiations are advancing with many other agencies, and each of these will be admitted to this council as the contracts are signed.

The council will receive progress and other reports from the department of water resources and advise with the department. The contractors will repay the full costs of the project and, therefore, Governor Brown has said, have a current and continuing interest in the progress of the work.

Director Warne has prepared a series of articles now appearing in California newspapers on California water problems and programs.

I should like to call attention to the one dealing with "The State Water Project."

It follows:

THE STATE WATER PROJECT

(By William E. Warne director, department of water resources, Sacramento, Calif.)

The voters of California adopted the State Water Project and authorized issuance of $1,750 million bonds to finance its construction at the election on November 8, 1960.

This was the action that in the future will be hailed as marking the crucial change in the course of the State, for it opened an era in which California, herself, attacked her own essential problems, not leaving the development of water supplies needed for growth to scrambling local agencies or Federal agencies oriented to specialized programs, such as flood control or reclamation.

The State water project is the initial stage of construction adopted from the California Water Plan. As presented by Gov. Edmund G. Brown last fall to the voters, it covers the whole State. It is designed to meet the needs of growing California until 1990. Beyond that date 30 years from now another project will have to be provided.

The State water project consists of:

Big Oroville: When constructed it will be the world's highest dam. Its huge reservoir will impound surplus Feather River water for power, flood control, and for conveyance to semiarid central and southern California. It will provide an additional 275,000 acre-feet of water annually for irrigation in the Feather River service area. Waters from this reservoir, released to the Delta in periods of low San Joaquin-Sacramento River runoff will also help prevent saline water intrusion in the Delta.

Five upstream dams in the Feather River drainage area—Antelope Valley Dam, construction of which will get underway soon, and the Dixie Refuge and Abbey Bridge Dams, are in the Indian Creek recreation project. These reservoirs are primarily for recreation purposes. They will also aid stream flow maintenance. The Frenchman Dam, to be completed this year, and the Grizzley Valley Dam will also provide stream flow maintenance and recreation. They will irrigate the Sierra Valley.

Delta project: A key works of the statewide water development program, it will repel sea water and will salvage from loss to the sea 2 million acre-feet of fresh water annually, which can be transported to semiarid regions. Recreational, agricultural, and industrial development benefits will also accrue to the area.

California aqueduct: One of the most spectacular features of the State water project will be this conveyance system to move surplus northern waters through the central valley and over the Tehachapis to the Southern Coastal Plains, providing new water supplies to areas of need en route, including Kern County farmlands.

North Bay aqueduct: Another authorized State project, this 60-mile aqueduct will move surplus Delta waters through Napa and Sonoma Valleys to Marin County, providing for irrigation, domestic, and industrial needs along the way.

South Bay aqueduct: This project is under construction, and is designed to transport surplus Delta waters to Alameda, Contra Costa and northern Santa Clara Counties. It is expected to deliver water to Livermore Valley next year.

Coastal aqueduct: This 131-mile aqueduct will carry water from the California aqueduct at Avenal Gap across the Salinas Valley and terminate in the Santa Maria Valley, providing irrigation, domestic, and other needs in the central coastal area. A feature of this project will be the pumping lifts to carry the water through the coastal range.

San Joaquin master drain: This facility will carry brackish drainage waters from the valley to prevent pollution of valuable ground water basins.

Upstream and small projects disassociated from the central facilities in the amount of $130 million: These are projects of the type that are authorized in the so-called Davis-Grunsky Act. They provide the protection needed to assure that emergent needs of less developed areas will not be overlooked.

Much has been said of the State water project. Governor Brown has rightfully described it as a unifying force, one project for one State, a tonic for California, torn by regional differences. There is hope that operation of the roject will prove helpful in healing old scars of the 20 years of controversy that preceded it.

Opponents of the Burns-Porter Bond Authorization Act charged that the project would cost more than the estimate, that the general treasury would have to be called upon to supplement the funds, that the south would benefit at the expense of the north.

One thing is certain. California must have the project. It is already late, and the needs likely will become urgent before the project is completed, even should it be possible to adhere to the extremely tight construction schedule that is expected to put water in Perris Reservoir in Riverside County in 1972.

Every great project that I have been connected with or observed closely, the Central Valley project in California; the Columbia Basin project in Washington State; the Tennessee Valley Authority; even the Boulder Canyon project on the Colorado River, has been highly controversial at the outset. Passions have run high over the contentions made concerning them. As such projects move on through the construction stage they capture the imagination of the public. The sight of truly great works underway inspires people and doubts fall away. In the operation stages such projects gain complete approval, and old controversies are replaced by new loyalties. Such projects become a part of the fabric of our lives and to the new generation it seems unthinkable that they were ever opposed.

I predict that it will be so also with the State water project. In 1990, when a controversy will be rising over a new project to follow this one, it will be impossible to persuade most Californians that the original State water project ever excited hot words and opposition. By then this project will have become indispensible to a new and better way of life. The next new project proposed at that time will be unfavorably compared by its opponents with the State water project.

But the next new project by then also will be essential and cannot be postponed.

So let us build the State water project in good spirit now.

Dead Wrong in 1951 and Still Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, since the Dr. Walter W. Heller referred to in the

following article is Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers and is, as the author states, "probably the Government's top economic strategist," the article takes on added significance. It should be read by every Member of Congress and for this reason I include it as a part of my remarks. This article was written by William H. Peterson, Ph. D., associate professor of economics, New York University, and appeared in the July 18, 1961, issue of Christian Economics, under the title "Dead Wrong in 1951 and Still Wrong":

DEAD WRONG IN 1951 AND STILL WRONG

(By William H. Peterson, Ph. D., associate professor of economics, New York University)

It hardly seems reasonable that an American professor of economics who was dead wrong in his prescription for the future of West Germany 10 years ago should now be permitted to prescribe for the United States in 1961 the same wrong medicine which he prescribed for Germany in 1951 and which was then summarily and most fortunately refused.

This strange story, based on a report kept under wraps these many years until at last broken open by Lawrence Fertig, economic and financial writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, concerns the recommendations made to the West German Government in 1951 by a team of American economists, one of whom was Dr. Walter W. Heller, presently Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers and probably the Government's top economic strategist.

The chairman of this economic team sent to Germany in 1951 by the State Department was Alvin H. Hansen, now professor of economics emeritus of Harvard and head of the Keynesian school of thought in America, and who, in the 1930's proclaimed the stagnation thesis that the American economy had come pretty much to the end of the road, to which the major answer was massive Government spending and deficit financing and which utterly failed to break the grip of the great depression. He, incidentally, is also the man who taught two other members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers: Dr. James Tobin and Dr. Kermit Gordon.

So, armed with all the ill-designed, forever-misfiring weapons of Keynesian interventionism, the Hansen-Heller team in 1951 tried to tell Dr. Erhard and Chancellor Adenauer how to run the West Germany economy—in a 400-page report.

This report expressed the opinion that the German economic machine, still rocketing upward in 1961, had bogged down in 1951 on a kind of low-level plateau and that "proper measures must be taken if the possibilities—of economic growth—are to be realized."

The bizarre report said that West Germany would never hit a high rate of industrial expansion if it was forever preoccupied with worries over inflation. The Hansen-Heller team told the West Germans that they should not "confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit," that they should not manifest an "excessive concern for price stability;" and that they had been "overly timid" in creating new credit.

The report specifically called for an easy money policy, arguing that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." The West Germans nonetheless clung to one of the highest interest rates in all of Europe.

The State Department team further told the West German Government that tax concessions granted to industry, such as accelerated depreciation allowances, were being abused and that in any case they amounted to only "an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the Government."

Accordingly, the Hansen-Heller team recommended a "compulsory investment program, under which the Government was to assess all industries for a special investment fund which the Government was to distribute where there was a "crying need for expansion." (The possibilities for graft and pork-barreling for votes under this scheme are staggering.)

The report also made the obiter dictum, completely disproved by events, that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will.

Such was the Keynesian philosophy and recommendations thrust on the West Germans in 1951, and earlier during the Allied Occupation from 1945 to 1948. Up to 1948, American economists, under General Lucius Clay, counseled the Germans to inflate their way out of the postwar depression that gripped war-torn West Germany. At one point, Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard threatened to resign if this view was to be forced on him and the German people. The Americans backed down, and Dr. Erhard took precisely the opposite course: the institution of a rock-hard currency, a strictly balanced budget, the stripping away of price and wage controls, the encouragement of private business (including the eventual denationalization of such Government enterprises as Volkswagen), the stimulation of private incentives to individuals and corporations to save and invest, the provisioning of acceleration allowances to induce the upgrading of West German plant and equipment, and an end to Government planning.

Erhard's prescription worked like a charm. History records the feat of Germany in emerging from the ruins and ashes of 1948 to become the strongest economy in Western Europe, despite the fact that it had to absorb millions of refugees fleeing communism, had to be dismembered into East and West, and had to be occupied by Four Powers. Yet West Germany surged past Great Britain which, under the Labor Party, had chosen a Keynesian-socialistic solution to postwar growth.

Lucky, too, for the West German people that the Hansen-Heller report was in effect consigned to the circular file. For nothing could be farther from sound government economic policy than the economic pronouncements of the Hansen-Heller team sent by the State Department to West Germany in 1951. Time and events have condemned those pronouncements and fully justified Dr. Erhard in refusing to accept them.

The West German capital market has been the talk of the financial world. Thanks to one of the highest interest rates in the world, savings and investment zoomed. Funds from all over the world have been attracted to West Germany. The West German trade surplus is substantial, the West German reichmark is rock-hard, the West German reserves amount to around $80 billion, and West German unemployment is practically nil, and has been ever since the currency reform of 1948.

The dazzling story of the West German recovery as a result of turning his back on the Keynesian-socialistic report of the Hansen-Heller team is epitomized in this statement by the architect of the recovery—Dr. Erhard:

"The successful rehabilitation of my country must serve as clear documentary evidence to put before the still vacillating and doubting people of the world, of the fact that only by firmly rejecting Socialist dogmas, of whatever complexion, and by affirming a free economic order can mounting prosperity and genuine security be achieved. In a Europe which allowed the life of the individual to be dragooned into ever more regimented collectives, the intellectual and spiritual powers would atrophy—powers that are vitally necessary in order to combat the infiltration, and also the many enticements, of the East."

So here are the philosophical choices in an industrial sense for America—the economics of Ludwig Erhard, the same economics which achieved the great economic growth for America since its founding, or the economics of Keynes, Hansen and Heller, the economics to be found in the 1951 State Department report which was rejected out of hand by the Adenauer-Erhard regime.

But the irony of this situation is that we are having thrust upon us now the Keynesian economics of the repudiated Hansen-Heller report, and by none other than a key member of the 1951 economic mission to West Germany, Walter W. Heller, the chief economic adviser to the President.

Statistics of Questionnaire Sent to New Jersey Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed a lengthy questionnaire to 60,000 constituents eliciting their views on important issues.

The response of over 12,000—over 20 percent—was remarkable, as it is well known that a 10-percent figure is a usual return.

On most questions asked, the views expressed were clear cut, the percentages weighing heavily in favor of or against a proposal. On a few the majorities in one column were less persuasive, but equally interesting.

The district which I have had the privilege of representing in the House of Representatives since 1950 offers a healthy cross section of American life, with rural, industrial, farm, and suburban areas, moderately large cities and tiny hamlets, regions of considerable wealth and low-income areas.

Because the Seventh District of New Jersey is so representative of the country as a whole in the backgrounds and occupations of its residents, I feel readers of the RECORD will find considerable interest in the statistics of this poll reproduced below:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe Communist China should be recognized by the United States?	20	76.25	3.75
2. Do you believe the competition of low cost Chinese made goods would provide jobs for Americans?	7.5	85	7.5
3. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to assist school construction?	61.5	37.5	1
Should such aid be based on need? (Of those favoring aid for construction, 94 percent favor basing aid on need.)	57.5	15	27.5
4. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States for teachers' salaries?	25	73.5	1.5
5. Should there be Federal aid to parochial schools?	20.74	78.20	1
6. The hourly minimum wage is $1. Do you favor an increase, and if so, which do you favor?			
	Percent		
$1.15	25.0		
$1.25	42.5		
Other	15.0		
No increase	17.5		
7. Do you favor trading butter and other surplus products to the Soviet bloc for strategic materials?	50	46.25	3.75
8. Do you favor continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee?	81.25	15	3.75
9. Do you favor an increase in 1st-class postage rates?	42.5	55.75	1.75
10. Do you favor an increase in 2d- and 3d-class postage rates?	70	28.25	1.75
11. Should we give the President the right to accept or veto specific items in appropriation bills so that he might disapprove specific appropriations? (Now he has to accept all or nothing.)	67.5	27.5	5
12. Do you favor a Federal program of medical aid for the elderly?	72.5	21.25	6.25
Through Federal aid to States, each State to administer the program on the basis of need?	50.5	49.5	------
Through social security?	62.5	37.5	------
13. Should the United States establish a West Point type academy for diplomats?	77.75	20	2.25
14. Do you favor enactment of a Federal so-called "fair trade" law permitting manufacturers to set minimum prices throughout the country?	25	72.5	2.5
15. Do you believe we should agree to further land concessions to the Communist Chinese in the Straits of Formosa (Quemoy, Matsu)?	7.5	87.5	5
16. Do you favor competitive development of atomic energy by private enterprise for commercial purposes?	86.25	10	3.75
17. Should we continue the mutual security program of military and economic assistance to friendly nations?	81.25	15	3.75
18. Do you favor retaining the Connally amendment of 1946 (U.S. right to determine which issues are rightly the province of this country to settle and not subject therefore to the jurisdictions of the International Court)?	70	12.5	17.5
19. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?	23.25	75	1.75
20. Do you favor a peacetime veterans educational benefits program, similar to the postwar GI bill of rights?	41.25	57.5	1.25
21. Do you favor elimination of crop restrictions to permit a farmer to grow sufficient foodstuffs on his own farm for consumption by livestock being raised on the same farm?	87.5	6	6.5
Should feed grain be subsidized?	12	75	13
22. Should there be a reduction of Federal Government competition with privately owned business and industry?	77.5	18.75	3.75
23. Should we abolish the affidavit of nonmembership in subversive organizations (loyalty oath) from the National Defense Education Act?	12.5	82.5	5
24. Do you favor Federal aid to depressed areas?	85	12.5	2.5
	Percent		
(a) By loans	67.5		15
By grants	17.5		
(b) To industrial areas?	73	10	17
(c) To rural areas?	71.25	10	18.75
25. Do you favor raising the $1,200 limit on earnings in order for one to be eligible for social security benefits?			
	Percent		
To $1,800	25		
To $2,400	35		
No change	13.75		
Unlimited	8.75		
Others	17.5		
26. Should the public housing program be continued and enlarged?	50	43.5	6.5
27. Do you believe in the proposed Peace Corps program?	55	37.5	7.5

Echo's Birthday Emphasizes Value of Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Calif., of August 11, 1961:

ECHO'S BIRTHDAY EMPHASIZES VALUE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Echo I, the U.S. earth satellite balloon, will mark its fist year in space tomorrow morning—4,480 orbits and 138,136,000 miles after its launching last August 12 by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This birthday emphasizes the importance of America's vast private enterprise communications system.

The Echo project was the brainchild of Dr. John Robinson Pierce, a 51-year-old research director at Bell Telephone Laboratories.

The 100-foot balloon, still visible at times in the evening sky over San Diego, demonstrated the practical possibilities of satellite communications. Although originally expected to remain aloft only a few weeks, it is still capable of bouncing back radio and television waves to earth.

This is just one of many communications advances made by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its associated companies in the Bell System.

This system of private enterprise research and development made a major breakthrough with transistors in 1948. The application of this discovery is a prime factor in America's superiority in missile and satellite instrumentation, miniaturization, and reliability.

For the public, transistors have brought an array of useful products from pocket radios to lightweight hearing aids.

Bell pioneered another significant development with the solar battery in 1955. This invention converts sunlight to electrical energy. It is being used in space, and experimentally for phone service in remote areas of the earth.

Western Electric, manufacturing and supply unit of the Bell System, coordinates management services on SAGE (Semi-Automatic Ground Environment) construction—part of our vast air defense system.

Our Distant Early Warning system—the DEW line—is another example of America's private communications systems working with the military for national defense.

Bell Laboratories is developing the Nike-Zeus system for defense against long-range missiles.

All of this has been going on apace with the expansion of domestic communications services. At the end of 1945, the Bell System included, exclusive of private line telephones, 22.4 million phones. As of December 31, 1960, this number was 60.7 million phones.

We talkative Americans carried on an average of 90.5 million telephone conversations daily in 1945. Last year, the average of daily conversations was 219 million.

In addition, we have extended and improved our oversea communications for defense, commerce, and personal convenience far beyond anything that was comprehended 20 or 25 years ago.

These are merely highlights of communications progress touched off by old Echo's birthday tomorrow, 1,000 miles or so out in space.

But one can wonder where our defense effort, our scientific explorations, our national growth, would have been without the investments, the initiative and the imagination of our private enterprise communications industry.

We could not have found the answers in fragmented firms and centralized government control.

Dedication of the U.S. Merchant Marine Chapel, King's Point, Long Island, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

by John S. Stillman, Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, at the dedication of the U.S. Merchant Marine Chapel, at King's Point, Long Island, N.Y., May 1, 1961:

REMARKS OF JOHN S. STILLMAN, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE CHAPEL, AT KING'S POINT, LONG ISLAND, N.Y., MAY 1, 1961

Reverend clergy, Admiral McLintock, Congressmen, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul General, visiting officers, distinguished guests, cadets, faculty, alumni, and friends of King's Point, I deeply appreciate the honor of participating in this dedication of the U.S. Merchant Marine Memorial Chapel. I do feel somewhat outranked as an inactive naval reserve lieutenant commander, but I am here not as an individual but as a representative of the Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, and of the President.

I am particularly pleased at the presence today of a number of interested Members of Congress. Congressman GARMATZ, of Maryland, is representing the House Merchant Marine Committee and its chairman, Congressman BONNER. I wish to speak particularly, however, of Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, of Brooklyn, who served many years on this committee and was a member of the Academy's Board of Visitors.

We are here today to honor the bravery of the men of the Merchant Marine who have given their lives for their country in the cause of freedom. Appropriately, today, May 1, is also "Law Day," and has been especially set aside as a time to reflect on the true meaning of our constitutional form of government and great legal system—another bulwark of our Nation's freedom.

There is little we could do or say here that would in any manner add to the glory of the gallant dead of the American Merchant Marine who "gave their last full measure of devotion" to the service of their country. Religion and faith are strong in most who follow the sea. I know from personal experience; at no time in my life have I attended church services as regularly as during the 3 years I served on a cruiser in the Pacific in World War II. There is no better time for prayer than when alone with the stars on a long midwatch, or watching the delicate colors of a new day dawning on the 4 to 8. I know what it meant to the 1,300 men of the ship on which I served when a beautiful triptych alter painting was received on board.

This chapel will provide a place for all those who seek divine guidance in carrying through their appointed tasks.

This memorial, in lasting stone, brick, and mortar, symbolizes, in some small measure, the permanence of our debt to those men of all faiths, all races, all religions—yes, of no religions, as well—who sailed the seas in an hour of our country's peril, never to return.

No member of the military services exceeded in bravery the merchant seamen who manned the privateers of our early days as a nation, or the brave men who served on the Murmansk convoys, who braved Stukka attacks at the Anzio beachhead, who were hit by Bettys, Vals, and Zeros off Guadalcanal, or by Kamikazes off Okinawa. Any of those who lost their lives in these engagements deserve equal honor with the Unknown Soldier—or any of the other honored dead at Arlington or our other great national cemeteries.

Let this chapel in some measure symbolize to the Merchant Marine what Arlington does to the armed services. As so many of them were lost at sea, or received a sailor's burial in the deep, they have no headstone or cemetery memorial.

Those we honor here today have been properly described as men whom "Fate could not defy, nor death dismay."

Never has that old cliche about the change from "wooden ships and iron men" to "iron ships" and something else, been less appropriate.

Our men are now expected to be more than men of iron. In this age of automation and mechanization, which is desirable as well as inevitable, we expect men of tempered steel who are ready to assume added burdens and responsibility and will do their utmost for the national welfare. Your Federal Government and the Commerce Department in particular, is vitally interested in a healthy merchant marine and superior morale on the part of crew, officers, and management.

The men of our merchant marine were pioneers in the constant and continuing struggle for freedom in the world. The bodies of those we honor today rest in the peaceful deep of many seas, but their spirit lives on here in this chapel, admonishing us that to remain free we must stay alert and we must stay strong.

The words of Abraham Lincoln, spoken at another dedication 100 years ago, come to mind on this occasion—"It is for us, the living, here to dedicate ourselves to the proposition that these hallowed dead shall not have died in vain."

We must here dedicate ourselves to the proposition that we, too, will, if need be, give that last full measure of devotion, to assure that under God mankind shall have the opportunity to live in peace and freedom. Let this chapel stand as a symbol of the supreme sacrifice of these brave men in the cause of freedom—and let us dedicate it to the memory of their fortitude and valor.

President Kennedy probably came as close to death at sea as anyone here, when the PT boat he commanded was rammed and sunk in Blackett Strait by a Japanese destroyer. Thus it is uniquely appropriate that he should personally send us a message on this occasion of such deep significance:

I quote the President:

"It is fitting that the Inter-Faith Chapel in memory of the American seamen of all faiths who gave their lives at sea be established at King's Point.

"Erected to the glory of God, this edifice commemorating the memory of these men will stand as a national monument on the grounds of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy where young Americans prepare to serve their country in the American Merchant Marine.

"Our Nation has ever sought divine guidance in its hours of thanksgiving and its moments of peril.

"On the high seas, between heaven and the deep, men of all faiths feel a sense of brotherhood with the infinite.

"May this chapel ever inspire those who pause here to dedicate themselves to the service of their fellow men."

Officeseekers Frightened by Minority Blocs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members of this body an editorial which appeared in the August 6 issue of the Metropolitan Herald, a very fine community weekly newspaper that is published in Atlanta.

The editorial, which is entitled "Officeseekers Frightened by Minority Blocs," speaks for itself:

OFFICESEEKERS FRIGHTENED BY MINORITY BLOCS

There was a time when parents threatened unruly offspring with the possibility of the "bogy man getting you," or "we'll tell the police on you if you don't be good," or "Santa Claus won't leave you anything if you aren't a good little boy."

These are changing times in America. While children have apparently gotten smarter, politicians seemingly are becoming frightened. Today, all you have to do to scare an officeseeker right out of his skin is to threaten him with the NAACP, CORE or some other colored pressure group.

Never before have minority groups in America used their threats to obtain as much undeserved political influence as have the agitators who carefully manipulate and publicize the rowdy, loud-mouthed activities of the current day race-pressure groups.

The fear of reprisals has become so great until there is serious possibility of law and order being completely broken down in some sections of this country.

In New York, for instance, city police officers walk their beats in constant fear of being set upon by cowardly, but highly dangerous roving street gangs and ruthless mobs, the large percentage of which are composed of Negro rowdies, hopped up by narcotics, alcohol, or other artificial stimulants.

This situation has high police officers badly worried. The attempts of the officers to protect themselves and maintain law and order by use of equal physical force brings out loud, united, highly organized and well publicized threats by NAACP and other racial-agitation groups, demanding cessation of police brutality and that punishment be meted out to the offending officers.

This is probably the silliest of the lines being followed by the closely knit, closely allied agitation groups in their apparent efforts to cause a complete breakdown of law and order in America. It reminds us of the Communist tactic of demanding rights under our Constitution, every time their shrewdly laid plans are upset by true Americanism and then hiding behind their constitutional rights every time they are cornered and brought before the bar of justice.

These tactics have paid, and are still paying, big dividends to the brains behind the scheme, dividends received in the way of political favors and power.

When you consider the fact that there are almost 10 white people to every colored person in these United States (last census, white—157,290,000 to colored—19,813,000) it becomes most apparent that this country is, just as has been the case in past history, being controlled by a well organized, highly efficient, small group of propagandists. It furnishes food for serious thought.

History will reveal the fact that in every case where the minority of the population took over and ruled the majority, it was the real beginning of the end for that country as a world power.

That was true in ancient Rome, when the rulers became fat and "drunk with power." To a degree it worked out to that end in the South, when the minority, the plantation owners were forced to fight the majority, and the results were disastrous to the Confederacy.

It could be in the making for Communist Russia, when a small minority are actually strict followers of the party line. It could be a possibility this country faces unless we awaken to the cold facts that the majority is being taken for a ride as constant attacks are made on established law and order and rules and regulations, designed to govern all the people.

Berlin, Violation of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the bold, brave words of President Kennedy and his administration, I have the feeling that we are retreating in Berlin.

Secretary of State Rusk constantly talks about the necessity of negotiations. Mr. Nehru, who has just come out for the Soviet position on the Berlin matter, was recently visited by our Assistant Secretary of State Bowles with the avowed purpose of winning him over to our side. Obviously, Mr. Bowles has met with his usual degree of success on this subject.

Are we, in the United States of America, set to appease again?

What about our principles of freedom and liberty, upon which this Nation was founded, and for which we have fought?

In today's New York Herald Tribune, David Lawrence tells us of the flight of 17 million human beings in East Germany who are about to be abandoned by the West, if the attitude of this administration of "we don't want to hurt the feelings of the Soviet Union" prevails:

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS: BOTH WEST AND U.N. SEEN FLOUNDERING IN EAST GERMANY

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE, August 22.—Western diplomacy is floundering. It hasn't come up with a solution as to the policy it should pursue. But the simple fact is that more than 17 million human beings in East Germany have just been imprisoned in a huge concentration camp by order of the Soviet Government. They cannot see their relatives or friends who happen to live even just across the streets of the same city. They are sent to jail for looking at a bulletin board giving news of the world.

Meanwhile, the great organization known as the United Nations is floundering, too. It is supposed to be interested in violations of human rights. It is supposed to be concerned when there is a threat to world peace. The U.N. has special meetings when there is a crisis, but it is doing nothing about the Berlin problem. It is strangely silent as the many erstwhile champions of freedom and human liberty hesitate to use the forum to expose to the world the hypocrisies of Soviet colonialism.

JUST ONE NEWS ITEM

There is no question about the violation of human rights. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON went to Berlin to tell the people there of America's moral support. President Kennedy, in a message to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, said the closing of East Berlin border restricting the movement of refugees underlined the struggle "for the protection of freedom, for human rights and for the principle of the self-determinaiton of peoples." But here is a Reuters News Service item of Monday of this week:

"An East Berlin court jailed five men for terms ranging from 3½ years' hard labor to 8 months' imprisonment. They were arrested August 13 and 14 when demonstrating near the sector border against the East German border controls."

When an electric sign was erected in West Berlin a few days ago to carry in big letters the news of the world, persons in East Berlin who tried to read it from a distance were arrested for demonstrating. East Berlin police have started, moreover, to move families out of houses which look out on West Berlin streets.

The instances cited are but a few of the many evidences of cruelty and inhumanity imposed on the East German people. If they had been "freedom riders" they might have gotten sympathy in certain parts of the world. If they had been Tunisians in North Africa, they would have been applauded for exercising their right to self-determination. Indeed, Tunisia is a member of the U.N. and states her case, but the West German Republic isn't. The Soviet Union keeps out the West Germans.

There is beginning to develop in different parts of Europe an impression now that the Western governments fear the Moscow Government's power and influence and that they feel it is risky even to debate the Berlin problem in the United Nations, where the Communists have lined up a sizable bloc in the last few years.

Brave words are uttered in the press about the sympathy of the U.S. Government for the East German people, but there are no signs that the Western governments are ready to make an issue of the flagrant violation of human rights in East Germany. It is vaguely hinted that the legalisms of the wartime agreements about Berlin some day will be negotiated or brought to the United Nations for debate, but the obvious issue—the human rights question—seems to have been sidetracked altogether as a basis for action in either the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or both.

The two major political parties in West Germany have called for a U.N. debate on the Berlin issue. Mayor Brandt of West Berlin appealed personally by letter to President Kennedy to ask for action by the United Nations. Chancellor Adenauer said to the West German Parliament a few days ago:

"He who tramples the right of self-determination with his feet must count on the deep contempt of all the people in the world who respect the Charter of the United Nations. There is only one possibility in placing Soviet-German relations on a new basis: the German people must be given the right to form a free and independent government that can speak and act for the whole German nation."

What cause could be more pertinent to world progress and world peace than the right of 17 million human beings to decide for themselves by whom and how they shall be governed? One wonders why the Western governments are shying away from the basic issue. By so doing, they may lose the prestige they have always enjoyed as champions of human liberty and freedom.

It's Time We Do Something About Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News makes a pertinent point about our Federal debt. We owe a lot more than we admit and it is time something is done to cut down our spending. I commend this editorial for your serious consideration:

WE OWE MORE THAN WE KNOW

The military budget of the United States now is $46 billion. That is about $6 billion more than the total national debt accumulated and unpaid up to 1930. Granting that we must spend whatever is needed to defend the Nation, such record costs call for review of the overall financial situation.

When the Federal debt reached $40 billion in the 1930's, a New Dealer, the late Jerome Frank, remarked that there was no cause for worry. The time to worry, he added, would be when the Nation owed $300 billion. That time has come.

Even this large national debt is only part of the total taxpayers owe. Tax Foundation, Inc., says that States owe about $18 billion more and local governments $51 billion. The total governmental debt of over $355 billion (figuring the U.S. debt at only $286 billion) increased $7 billion from 1959 to 1960. Four billion dollars of this was in local government debts.

This amounts to about $6,400 owed per family in the United States, and that is not all.

The Federal Government has vast financial commitments and guarantees not included in the national debt. Uncle Sam has promised to pay you social security. He has guaranteed your FHA or Veteran's Administration mortgage on the house. He insured your bank account. These are financial obligations, as are many other guarantees and loans in agriculture, business, and other fields.

No one can foretell how much Uncle Sam will have to pay, but the Magazine of Wall Street recently estimated that these obligations, in addition to the national debt, may total almost $150 billion.

These obligations are increasing, not diminishing. For one example, Federal Housing Administration guarantees total about $41 billion for the 1962 budget. If they continue to rise as they have recently, they will exceed $100 billion by 1970.

Interest, alone, on the national debt now is about $9 billion yearly. As debts rise, or inflation forces higher rates, interest obviously must rise.

Now is the time to worry, and to do something about it.

Remember This Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ramona Sentinal of August 17, 1961:

REMEMBER THIS INCIDENT

Every American has a political philosophy, no matter how vigorous or how bland. I have my philosophy too, and, such as it is, it has evolved from observation and reason, not from practical experience. I would be the first to admit that I know nothing at all about pure politics—its theory and practice. However, I am a willing pupil and will en-

deavor to comprehend the subject whenever someone will expend the effort to teach me.

Last Wednesday I had the distinction and opportunity to become more informed on the subject from a ranking official in the Democratic Council for the County of San Diego. In my opinion, a more capable teacher would be difficult to find. I can say, without false modesty, that I now know infinitely more about party politics than ever before. I would like to share something of what I learned with the readers of this column. Perhaps they will find the information of value.

First, the gentleman informed me that Mr. Drown, our acting postmaster, is being let out—definitely—and Mr. Drowns received word the same day from the kind gentleman. It seems that our postmaster is a registered Republican and, of course, the county Democrats can't have that. This writer knows for certain that Mr. Drown voted for State Senator CLAIR ENGLE (Democrat) when he ran for office—in fact, I recall that he asked others to vote for ENGLE at that time. Senator ENGLE will not confirm Drown's appointment. Lesson No. 1—Democratic State Senators are not concerned with the needs of the people who voted for them, but only what best serves the Democratic Party. This is called devotion to duty.

A Ramona Democrat approached the county democratic committee a month ago to plead Mr. Drown's cause. She was asked, "If Ramona people want to retail Mr. Drown why don't they speak out for him? We haven't heard a word in his favor." Since that time a volume of mail from both Republican and Democratic ranks have been received by the committee office. I brought this fact to my visitor's attention. He replied that he was aware of the situation and said, "That's the trouble; Mr. Drown's friends have hurt him more than they have helped him. So much has been said, it has become a political issue, so we can't possibly appoint him now." Lesson No. 2—adopt a new argument for every situation—don't back down. This process is termed "singleness of purpose."

Further discussion with my Democratic friend revealed that he was in Ramona that day to feel out the community on the subject of Mr. Drown's appointment to permanent postmaster. In the same conversation he informed me that his superiors thought that a Democratic postmaster in Ramona would help the party gain strength in a conservative stronghold. And furthermore, the Democratic Congress would never accept Mr. Drown anyway. Lesson No. 3—create the impression that you are concerned with the ideas and desires of a group of people, having already set a plan in motion. This pure sham is all in fun, of course, and necessary in public relations. Also, whenever you feel it is appropriate, speak of your party as the one which champions the desires of the little people; or better still, call it the voice of the people.

My lesson served to prove that politics in practice are quite different from politics in theory—that the high ideals voiced on campaign platforms sometimes are different from what actually happens at the back door.

In cold perspective, here is the situation. By his own admission the representative from the County Democratic Council agrees that that move to deny Mr. Drown his justly earned position as postmaster is purely and simply political. The fact that Mr. Drown deserves the position after 24 years of faithful service to the Post Office Department, and by the demonstration of his ability to handle the position with competency, counts not at all. Neither does the fact that the community rose in response to the cause of Mr. Drown hold any importance to the Democratic Party.

In truth, the county committee is interested in one thing only—the placing of a Democratic postmaster to strengthen the party machine in Ramona—not greater efficiency, not faster service, not saving money, only a strong local machine is important. Is this the political party for Ramonans to support—one who ignores the wishes and feelings of the people they claim to represent? Remember this calculated, heartless, political maneuver. Remember what happened to Mr. Drown. Remember the party that took from him what was justly his—that is the Democratic Party, the party of ENGLE and Pat Brown. When Ramonans vote next year, it might be well for them to pause before casting their ballots to ask themselves if the Democratic Party is consistent with their ideals of government and justice.

Pause, and remember what happened to our Mr. Drown.

National Lottery of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint the Members of this House with the national lottery of Israel. The Israeli lottery operation is not particularly extensive, but it is nevertheless a quite significant achievement.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Israeli national lottery came to some $14 million. The net income to the Government, earmarked solely for the construction of hospitals, policlinics and schools, exceeded $4 million.

The struggle to establish a national lottery in Israel was not easily won—the United States does not have a monopoly on hypocrites. We might perhaps learn a lesson from the words of the director of the Israeli lottery—from his comments on the fight for an Israeli lottery.

"The Israeli lottery exists somewhat less than 9 years. During the period between the two World Wars, it was the Jewish population in Europe which, due to its insecure economic position, was the major buyer of lottery tickets there. In spite of this fact, it took a few years after the declaration of the State of Israel, before tse Government and public circles consented to the organization of a lottery in Israel. This reluctance was probably due to the fact that the British, who were the mandatory power in the country for 30 years, considered any lottery as being uneducational. Incidentally, it is worth remarking that even the British are now beginning to abandon these principles, this quite apart from horseracing and betting which have always been considered acceptable by the English. The latter institutions are certainly no more ethical than lotteries under government control, whether or not part of normal government activity."

With these words, spoken before the Third International Congress of National Lotteries held in Tel-Aviv in 1960, Israel's lottery director hit the nail on the head. Israel, like Britain and other nations, has overwhelmed the hypocrites, bluenoses and moralists. Is it not about time that we did the same—America needs a national lottery.

Shelter Plan Could Use Redi-Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture announced last week that the Department of Agriculture has begun the development of a national defense food policy to enable the farmer to feed the American people in case of a nuclear war.

The first step taken by the Department is the proposal for a nationwide strategic reserve program to locate supplies of wheat in 191 metropoliton areas of 100,000 persons and over which are assumed by civil defense authorities to be target areas.

Under this plan the Department of Agriculture would move some 160 million bushels of wheat, along with temporary storage bins, into the target areas. The cost of this wheat relocation program would be approximately $47.2 million.

While I favor immediate steps for the development of an effective national defense food program which will assure edible food supplies and water for the population, in case of war or disaster, I seriously question that aspect of the plan which would merely move raw wheat into metropolitan areas.

There has been considerable research by Department of Agriculture officials and by those associated with our food-for-peace program with processed wheat products. In my own State and particularly in my district, consumer tests have been conducted with a processed wheat product known as Redi-Wheat.

I understand that the food-for-peace program is sending a processed wheat product to Asia and Latin America because of its nutritive value and because it is easy to use. I suggest we demonstrate similar consideration for American citizens and consider the stockpiling of a processed wheat product—such as Redi-Wheat—rather than undertake an expensive program of moving raw wheat stores into target areas. If disaster should strike, it would be easier to distribute a product ready to use rather than depend upon mills which are likely to be destroyed, or upon the pains of hunger which would force the populace to use primitive methods of making raw wheat edible.

Another argument which should be advanced against the Secretary's proposal is that raw wheat is a highly perishable commodity. Wheat is prey to every form of rodent and quantities of species of bugs, to say nothing of heating, mildew and mold. It requires around-the-clock scrutiny with intricate machinery and trained personnel.

I agree with the Secretary that this is a "grim and humorless business" but one which requires more consideration before it is implemented.

Following is a pertinent editorial from the Wichita Evening Eagle and Beacon of August 19, 1961, and a copy of a letter from W. W. Graber, administrator of the Kansas Wheat Commission, to Secretary of Agriculture Orville J. Freeman, dated August 18, 1961, which discuss the possibility of utilizing processed wheat in the strategic reserve program:

SHELTER PLAN COULD USE REDI-WHEAT

In relation to the Kennedy administration's plan to store wheat in nearly 200 metropolitan areas as a safeguard against hunger in event of a nuclear war, Representative GARNER SHRIVER takes the sensible attitude that the program would be tragically short of civil defense needs unless the grain is processed.

Supporting the development of an effective national defense food policy, SHRIVER says our people are entitled to at least as much consideration as the peoples of Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere. We are providing hungry lands with processed or semi-processed cereal so it will be more attractive to them. That brings wheat into favor among peoples who have not used it.

As for our civil defense program, raw grain will be of little use unless each shelter was provided with a grinding apparatus of some sort. Even then the problem of provisioning the sheltered would be difficult.

"I believe," says SHRIVER, "the Agriculture and Defense Departments should consider the stockpiling of a processed wheat product such as 'Redi-Wheat' which has been developed by the Kansas Wheat Growers Association and the Kansas Wheat Commission."

Provisioning shelters with such a product, which has won considerable favor in American communities where consumers have tested it, would certainly go far toward keeping sheltered survivors fed while awaiting for the passing of the fallout menace.

Processing wheat on that scale, too, might well lead to an accumulation permitting export of surpluses to regions which are still to get acquainted with the cereal. The real potential of Redi-Wheat has not yet been tested in this country or in any other.

KANSAS WHEAT COMMISSION,
Hutchinson, Kans., August 18, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE J. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FREEMAN: I am writing you concerning the possibilities of stockpiling Redi-Wheat as survival food in strategic areas. Redi-Wheat was developed by the Federal Research Laboratory in Albany, Calif. The Kansas Wheat Commission and the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers are producing and distributing the product at this time. It has been market tested by Agricultural Marketing Service and has proven very acceptable. Mr. Haven Umstott with AMS in Washington, D.C., was in charge of vacuum, is very palatable, and has indefi- give you information concerning its acceptability. Various other U.S. Government agencies have conducted tests concerning its nutritive vlaue with very favorable reports.

This is a debranned, cooked, canned whole wheat product. It is canned under 26 inches of vacuum, is very palatable, and has indefinite shelf life. It is produced from Hard Red Winter wheat. A good defense food should be immediately usable, available, nonperishable, and palatable. Redi-Wheat fills these requirements. If CCC stocks of wheat were made available, this would become a very reasonably priced as well as convenient item to stockpile.

The stockpiling of wheat in strategic areas has merit, but an additional or supplemental stockpile of canned Redi-Wheat would greatly strengthen the position of the survivors because this food would be usable immediately and without processing. Processing facilities would more than likely become unusable in the event of an attack. Mr. Martin Garber, head of the school lunch program, Mr. James A. Hutchins, Jr., chief of direct distribution branch, Mr. Frank LaRoux, and Dr. James Ralph are acquainted with the product.

The Kansas Wheat Commission and the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, as well as Great Plains Wheat, Inc. encourage you to seriously consider the possibilities of stockpiling Redi-Wheat for civilian defense. I am sending you some cans of Redi-Wheat, in the seasoned and unseasoned forms, to try.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. GRABER,
Administrator.

Attempts To Discredit Anti-Communist Movement in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the collectivist trend in this country is alarming many people. In southern California, wherein my district lies, many anti-Communist groups are doing a fine job of alerting freedom-loving Americans to the dangers of collectivism. Efforts to discredit these groups are discussed by Jack Moffit in his column "The Cracker Barrel" which appeared in the August 4, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express. I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE CRACKER BARREL

EAGLE ROCK, August 4.—On July 21, 1961, Temple Wanamaker, director of the State Department Office of Public Service, said in San Francisco that anti-Communist letter writers (in southern California) do what hundreds of Communist agents could not do in planting division and suspicions in the minds of Americans. Maybe that's good. Anti-Communists are suspicious of anyone who apologizes for the rape of women and girls, the liquidation of the clergy, and the enforced transportation of millions to Siberian slave labor camps that occurred when Russia took over the Baltic countries. They are suspicious of anyone who defends the sellout of China and Cuba. They are suspicious of the U.N.'s liquidation of the anti-Communist government of Croatia. They are suspicious of the transportation of 300 women of Tibet to Red China, a first step in genocide to absorb and eliminate the Tibetan people. Communist agents are for that. If they find anti-Communists at cross purposes with them, we are proud. It is too bad that southern Californians can do no more than write letters condemning these practices. But every such letter is a blow for human decency and southern Californians will keep on writing them even though Wanamaker doesn't like to be bothered.

JACK MOFFITT.

Neighbors Reaching for Bootstraps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks the press has been carrying many stories about the recent action of the United States, as represented by the Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon, at Punta del Este, Uruguay, which resulted in the United States and 19 Latin American countries signing an 8,000-word document to begin to implement President Kennedy's alliance for progress, designed to assist our southern neighbors in helping themselves.

The following editorial from the Geneva Free Press, Geneva, Ohio, states the case very well for the need for such action. As indicated in the editorial, what these Latin American countries need is capital equipment to get going in a vast program of education and to give them means to make the most of what they have. This is the object of alliance for progress:

NEIGHBORS REACHING FOR BOOTSTRAPS

A prime characteristic of the emerging people in the underdeveloped lands of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is impatience.

Trained for it or not, they want and are getting independence. And with it they want, in the fastest way possible, levels of living that will take them out of mass misery.

The task is monumental. It is being compounded by racing population gains that will add some 350 million to the underdeveloped countries by 1970, and many hundreds of millions more by year 2000.

Right now nearly half the globe's population is in the low-income category. The experts say the gap between these people and the "have" nations grow wider instead of narrower.

How much of the gap can be closed in the next years?

For Asia to compensate for its projected stupendous population growth and lift its poverty-ridden peoples just to European living standards ($380 per capita per year), it would have to increase its aggregate income to 21 times its 1950 level.

For Latin America to achieve a similar living plane, it would have to boost its 1950 income eight times by 2000.

Nothwithstanding the impatient dreams of these peoples, no sober realist imagines the gains will be anywhere near so great.

Paul Hoffman, head of the United Nations Special Fund, estimates that 90 of the 100 low income countries have sufficient resources to give themselves decent living standards.

Their difficulty is lack of nonhuman power and of technological competence.

We think of many of the backward lands as "agricultural." Yet the North American Continent, with far less population per square mile, produces a per-person farm output that averages 10 times as high as Asia's and 20 times higher than Africa's. These peoples suffer in the midst of potential plenty.

What they need above all is the capital equipment to get going and a vast program of education and technical training to give them the means to make the most of what they have.

Hoffman thinks that conservatively the underdeveloped nations need to train a million people as quickly as possible for top level government and business posts, middle range technical tasks, health services, teaching, and the like.

The task of human uplift is one for all the world. Even the Communists have a stake in seeing it succeed. If it were to fail, then the broad conquest they dream of would find them presiding over human misery almost beyond imagining.

Nation's First Private Bomb Shelter?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in Shippensburg, Pa., a visitor will see a very unusual home. Built on the exact site of Fort Morris of Revolutionary fame, a greater deal of history surrounds the area.

The construction is unusual in that the design is a perfect octagonal. The description of the bomb shelter in the accompanying article should be of interest.

While I am not authorized to say this, I am certain any Member of Congress visiting that area in Pennsylvania, would be most cordially received by Mr. and Mrs. Goodhart and would be intrigued, as I was, with this home.

The article follows:

GOODHART HOME ON BULLS EYE THOUGHT TO BE NATION'S FIRST SHELTER HOUSE

The Wilber E. Goodhart home atop historic Bulls Eye in Shippensburg is thought to contain the first bomb shelter provision in the Nation.

This statement is made in view of more recent claims that other communities have such "firsts." In June of this year, the Pittsburgh Press announced in an advertisement by the builder that new homes were being built in the Pleasant Hills section of that city which were called by the builder as "the Nation's first home to be constructed with a built-in shelter for protection in the event of nuclear attack."

The Goodhart home pre dates the Pittsburgh homes by almost 5 years. It was started April 5, 1954—just 200 years to the day when Fort Morris was started.

DESIGN OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

The designing of the home to be erected on the historic site went on over a period of 5 years previous to the 1954 date. The designers were Wilber E. Goodhart, his wife, Mildred, and son, W. Edward. The home was built over a 3½-year period.

The home contains many innovations. To begin with it is an eight-sided home with a specially designed floor for heating and air conditioning. No windows open to the outside, all being thermopane which with the special insulations and conditioning keeps the house at 72° the year round.

The bomb shelter for the home was built first. It contains over 30 tons of 105-pound railroad rail, 30 cubic yards of concrete and 14 yards of filler stone. The railroad rail is welded with stainless steel all in one pad.

The entire home structure contains over 60 tons of steel. The bomb shelter has approximately 5,000 cubic feet of free space and is equipped for toilet facilities and emergency light and power.

CONNECTED WITH CAVE

The shelter is connected to a limestone cave with 24-inch walls which has about 1,000 cubic feet of storage space for food and produce storage.

Mr. Goodhart says the bomb shelter part of the home was one of the original ideas when the home planning began in 1949, not too long after the conclusion of World War II.

"The planning period stretched out over 5 years because we kept getting newer and better ideas and revised earlier plans," Mr. Goodhart explains.

The home has three bedrooms, all keystone shaped, a spacious kitchen, a utility room and a 52- by 20-foot living room.

Some of the design for the home comes from Mr. Goodhart's reading concerning the old blockhouse built on the site by the early settlers and soldiers.

SEVERAL ORIGINS

The Bulls Eye name is attached to various origins. Some say it was the window in the garrison house built on the place by Col. James Burd's men. Others say it refers to the crack marksmen who were stationed there and never missed the bull's eye.

The Bulls Eye garrison house was started in 1775 as protection against the Indians. Col. James Burd wrote in 1775 "We have 100 men working at Fort Morris with heart and hand every day. The town is full of people; five or six families in a house in great want of arms and ammunition, but with what we have we are determined to give the enemy as warm a reception as we can. Some of our people have been taken prisoner, but have made their escape * * *."

A News-Chronicle editorial of some years ago makes this comment concerning the site where the home is located: "From the Bulls Eye of Fort Morris the embattled settlers made, against overwhelming odds, a defense that saved Edward Shippen's settlement from extermination—made it possible, therefore, for people to live here today in quiet homes and at gainful pursuits."

STONE FROM LOG HOUSE

A large stone on which the cornerstone of the new home rests was taken from the old log house which once stood on the lot along Route 11, once known as the Great Virginia Road. This home was reportedly used as headquarters station for both armies during the Civil War period.

A threshold stone was obtained from the base of a 21-foot wall which was found at the back of the lot, about 41 feet from Martin Alley to the rear. This is thought to be the wall of the original garrison house of Fort Morris.

Mr. Goodhart is a veteran of World War I. He met his wife while he was stationed in England during that war. She is the former Isabella Mildred Kimpton of Chester, England. They have three children, Mrs. Winnifred Mills of Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., Mrs. Ursula Joan Crisswell of Chambersburg and W. Edward at home.

San Diego: The Boston of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been written through the years on San Diego, Calif. There recently appeared in the July 1961, issue of Fortune magazine, an advertisement entitled "The Southern California Story," by Frank McCulloch, one of the managing editors of the Los Angeles Times. The objective on the "Southern California Story" is to create awareness of the economic, climatic and cultural advantages of southern California as an area in which to locate a business or industry.

Included in this story is a section about San Diego, Calif., which is within my congressional district.

It gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress this article which depicts San Diego as "The Boston of the West" and describes well our people at work and at play.

I would commend the complete "Southern California Story" to the attention of everyone, but in particular I wish to insert herewith the section dealing with San Diego:

DOWN TO THE SEA

From the rich land on both sides of the border, thousands upon thousands of bales of high-quality cotton move into international commerce through one of the west coast's three natural deepwater ports. This is at San Diego, 120 miles to the west of the Imperial. Long the home of hundreds of the ships of the Pacific fleet and headquarters of the 11th Naval District, San Diego is now making a serious bid for west coast leadership in commercial shipping as well. If its newest waterfront improvement plans are carried out, the harbor will run from Point Loma to the Mexican border and its two deepwater entrances will lead ships of the world out onto 22 square miles of protected bay-water.

This deep bow to the sea is rooted in the history and traditions of San Diego, which, with considerable validity, is often called the Boston of the West. Like Boston, it has always had strong ties with the sea; like Boston, its intellectual capacity is enormous. Like Boston, its roots run far back into American history, for Juan Cabrillo sailed into San Diego Bay on September 28, 1542, only 50 years after Columbus discovered America. Like Boston, it is proud both of its history and of its cultural heritage. And like Boston, its space age and missile scientists represent one of the Nation's most important resources.

But unlike Boston, San Diego is a clean-scrubbed and gleaming white city, climbing gracefully up the gentle hills which roll back from its harbor. Unlike Boston, it basks the year-around in a climate that seldom sees the temperature depart from more than 10 degrees in either direction from 72. And unlike Boston, it is growing explosively.

YOUNG BUT WELL PAID

It is still a source of some astonishment to sociologists and economists that the median age of metropolitan San Diego's 1 million-plus residents is only 27.7 and that their per capita income is a healthy $2,550. This is accounted for largely by the fact that a high percentage of them are scientists, technologists or otherwise highly skilled and trained personnel.

A very partial list of the companies for which they labor and the hardware they manufacture helps make clear why this is so. At the glittering $30-million General Dynamics Astronautics (formerly Convair Astronautics) plant, they conceived built, tested and now turn out in assembly-line numbers this Nation's first operational in-

tercontinental ballistic missile and workhorse of the space program, the Atlas. At Ryan Aircraft, "The Spirit of St. Louis" was assembled for Charles Lindbergh in the not so very long ago and modern products have ranged from fighter planes that take off and land vertically to rockets and electronic equipment of the most advanced nature.

Rohr Aircraft is the Nation's biggest builder of powerbacks (engines) for aircraft and Solar Aircraft manufactures thousands of items for just about everything that flies, at least without feathers. Atomic reactors are built at General Dynamics' hub-of-the-wheel-shaped General Atomics plant, and General Dynamics Electronics, formerly Stromberg-Carlson, is a major producer of electronic goods and systems.

San Diego has been concerned with manned flight since one John J. Montgomery took the first ride (Austrian claims to the contrary notwithstanding) in a glider at nearby Otay away back in 1883. Yet for all the emphasis on avionics, San Diego is also the home of such down-to-earth enterprises as National Steel & Shipbuilding, the last important tuna fleet and cannery in the United States, and the San Diego Chargers of the American Football League, recently moved from Los Angeles.

THE THINK PALACES

San Diego's climate, natural and otherwise, has also encouraged a proliferation of what southern Californians unromantically have come to call "think factories" or "think palaces." These are research and development centers, looking for all the world like ultramodern college campuses and dedicated to the production not of hardware but of ideas. The John Jay Hopkins Laboratory, an adjunct of the General Atomic lab, is one such. So is the biological research center that Dr. Jonas Salk, discoverer of the polio vaccine bearing his name, will soon establish at San Diego. Biggest and oldest of all of them is the Naval Electronic Laboratory on Point Loma, where 1,300 scientists and technicians study and experiment in sonar, radar, and human behavioral characteristics. NEL scientists were the guiding geniuses of such recent triumphs as the 35,800-foot dive of the bathyscaph *Trieste* (which belongs to NEL) near Guam last year, and the underice polar cruises of the atomic submarines *Nautilus* and *Skate*.

Equally prominent in the field are the scientists and faculty members of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, whose buildings stretch along the Pacific surf in the rich and beautiful San Diego suburb of La Jolla. Scripps is now in the process of becoming a full-fledged campus of the farflung University of California, and 20,000 of the area's top scholars and researchers soon will work and study there. Perhaps twice that many more will study each year on such other campuses as San Diego State College and the University of San Diego.

ASPIRING TO CULTURE

The new University of California campus will be an integrated part of what is becoming an increasingly familar hallmark of southern California development: the from-the-ground-up new city. University City, under the direction of a lawyer-turned-builder named Irvin J. Kahn and his associates, will house 100,000 people by 1970. And no resident need leave it, save possibly to go to work, whether for aspirin tablets or culture. Importance of University City was pointed out recently with its merger with MSL Industries, Inc., formerly the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railway.

Nonetheless, Kahn is also helping lead a project to revitalize downtown San Diego. His 24-story office building, now under construction in the business district, is more evidence that southern California at long last, has begun to push upward as well as outward. That the outward push still has momentum, however, is demonstrated by such in-progress programs as Sunset International Petroleum Co.'s planned construction of 8,000 homes across 4,000 acres of San Diego's San Carlos district.

Many a San Diegan will tell you that if he were forced to narrow a list of his city's attractions to one, he would settle on the zoo. For the San Diego zoo is truly one of the world's greatest, as charming and informative for adults as for kids and, in the best European tradition, as productive for scientific researchers as it is attractive for the kids. It is an important dish in a cultural-recreational smorgasboard which includes such varied items as a summer-long Shakespearean festival in an authentic Old Globe Theater, Equity player productions at the La Jolla Playhouse and new Circle Arts Theater, concerts under the stars in Balboa Bowl by the San Diego Symphony and Civic Light Opera, excellent skin diving and surfing, and one of the most beautiful of all metropolitan green belts, the 1,280-acre Balboa Park, in the heart of the city. Always farsighted San Diego plans to pour $75 million into the development of another 4,500-acre park and recreational area on the shores of Mission Bay. Its marina alone will be three times the size of Newport Harbor, officials claim.

One of the city's most prominent scientists, Frederic de Hoffman, boss of General Atomics, summed up the situation this way: "In an environment such as this, it is not surprising that in 5 years we have lost only four or five of our top people. And of those, all but one simply moved a little farther up the California coast."

BACK, BACK, BACK

But San Diego County, or, more accurately, scientists in San Diego County, also know how to look back—back beyond the understandable, back so far man's mind boggles at the concept. They do this at the great Palomar Observatory, high up in the Cleveland National Forest, near the northern edge of the county. There, 2 years ago, California Institute of Technology astronomers discovered a galaxy three times more distant from earth than any other ever before known to man. At 186,000 miles a second, light from it takes 6 billion years to reach the earth. Among other things, the astronomers calmly tell the reeling visitor, this discovery established that the universe is 27 times larger than had previously been thought.

Magnificent Mitchell Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press of August 22, 1961, on the plan to convert Mitchel Field into a cultural, educational and civic center.

In giving credit to all the individuals who made this accomplishment possible, the Long Island Daily Press and Long Island Star-Journal modestly omitted any mention of the very substantial part that these Newhouse newspapers played not only in spotlighting the problem, but in crusading for the results achieved.

This is far from the first time that these papers have spotlighted problems in and about our community, resulting in the very best accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, this was, as you know, an excellent demonstration of the bipartisan efforts of the members of the Queens and Long Island delegation in Congress, and they certainly deserve the utmost credit.

The editorial follows:

MAGNIFICENT MITCHELL PLAN

The plan unveiled yesterday to convert Mitchel Field into a cultural, educational and civic center is magnificent.

It deserves the wholehearted, enthusiastic support of every Long Island citizen who is interested in the proper development of his community.

And the proper development of Mitchel Field is, as Robert Moses put it yesterday, "an almost-miraculous opportunity for sensible community development based upon forethought, experience, common sense and cooperation.

The Mitchel Field development committee has made splendid recommendations.

More than a third of the field's 1,168 acres goes to education, 235 acres for Nassau Community College, 150 acres for Hofstra College, and 55 acres for public schools.

Two hundred acres are set aside for a civic and cultural center. The planners wisely refrained from blueprinting the exact components of this civic center. There are still more question marks. The State is interested in putting a medical college there. The Veterans Administration is talking about a general hospital.

But this much is known: the county civic center will have a large auditorium for concerts and shows, a reference library, a convention hall, possibly a music shell for outdoor concerts.

In addition, reasonable acreage is set aside for light industry, and a small section for housing and business.

The committee rejects the idea of another airport on the site of one abandoned by the Air Force as unsuitable. It is entirely justified. An airport there would be a blight. A cultural-civic-educational center will be a blessing, not only for the immediate community but for all Long Island.

The development committee's report is a major achievement. We congratulate every member. We also congratulate Nassau's elected officials, led by County Executive A. Holly Patterson, the Long Island congressional delegation, our U.S. Senators, and others of vision who recognized this "almost-miraculous opportunity," and who have worked so well to achieve it.

Newburgh Loses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that I am completely in favor of Federal controls for projects which are financed by Federal funds.

It is only commonsense for us, as Representatives of the taxpayers, to impose controls on the way Federal funds may be expended.

This is precisely why I have opposed the unlimited and wasteful spending of Federal funds for functions which are

better and more efficiently handled at the State and local community level. This includes funds for aid to education and for welfare services. The control of both of these functions should remain close to the local administrators in the communities, those who are more familiar with the needs and problems of that community.

The case of the courageous city council in Newburgh, N.Y., which attempted to put teeth into its welfare laws, is a perfect example of the danger inherent in Federal grants to States and communities. Since Newburgh received aid from the State of New York and from the Federal Government for its welfare services, it had to abide by the rules laid down by those bureaucrats in Albany and in Washington who think they know better how to handle Newburgh's problems. This is so even though Newburgh residents pay both State and Federal taxes and therefore are hampered by their own lawmakers.

I believe that this is stated succinctly by the editorial entitled "Newburgh Loses" which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 22. I wish to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

NEWBURGH LOSES

As everyone expected, the sovereign State of New York has been granted its petition for a court injunction prohibiting the small city of Newburgh from enforcing a set of rules proposed for its welfare handouts.

The rules were drawn up when city officials became alarmed at the rapid increase in their relief load, even though about half the funds were coming from State and Federal treasuries. In gist, the effort was aimed at chiselers and questionable cases.

But, whatever its motives, Newburgh is powerless to act. That's what the judge holds. The rules are made by those who hand out the money, and no matter if the money comes from the same taxpayers who put up Newburgh's share.

"It is the law!" said the judge, as a judge must.

This is the whole core of the issue.

The more the State "helps" local communities, the more the State will tell local communities how to run their affairs. The more Washington spreads "aid" among the States, the more Washington will run the show. It is happening more and more as the Federal Government does more of what cities and towns once did for themselves.

As sure as daylight, this is the pattern which will follow increased Federal "aid" to education, loans and grants for sewers and parks, assistance for mass transportation and all the other things Washington is setting out to do for the "people back home."

When the Government doles out the dollars, the Government writes the rules, and there is no appeal. When the people back home raise their own funds for their own needs, they can write their own rules. Newburgh is not the first town to learn this the hard way. It will not be the last.

Resumption of Nuclear Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert into the RECORD a letter that I have received from Mr. E. Eric Robison, Buffalo, N.Y. Mr. Robison was connected with the Manhattan project during the last war. His letter follows:

Subject: Resumption of nuclear testing.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: I am writing on the above subject with the hopes that my letter might be classified as the straw that broke the camel's back. I would greatly appreciate your sincere efforts in bringing about, as quickly as possible, the resumption of nuclear testing in the United States. I feel, after doing a great deal of reading on this matter, and especially an article written by Ernest K. Lindley, appearing on page 39 of the April 17 Newsweek, that we must not delay any longer in this most important field of defense.

I had the great privilege of being affiliated in a small way with the Manhattan project during the last war, and I sincerely believe that if we don't do something in regard to this problem, history will record our continued moratorium on nuclear testing as one of the greatest mistakes ever made by the U.S. Government.

Allow me to thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,
KENSINGTON REALTY, INC.,
E. ERIC ROBISON, *President*.

Action, Not Words, Will Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration need not take a back seat to Khrushchev or anyone else when it comes to indulging in talk. This is the talkingest administration in recent history. Unfortunately, the Communists do not pay much attention to what we are saying and, I am afraid, something more than a glib tongue will be needed to halt the spread of communism. There are alternatives to talk which, it is true, could lead to war, but a strong stand by us and less talk, or a return to the Teddy Roosevelt era of "soft talk and a big stick" will do more to insure the peace than anything so far attempted. In this connection I would like to call your attention to the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

ONE WEAPON WE SHOOT OFF

"My tongue," said the garrulous Khrushchev not long ago, "is my secret weapon." Well, we want to inform Mr. Bigmouth that the Kennedy administration refuses to yield in this department. The one weapon Washington constantly shoots off is the mouth. It is the unsecret weapon of the Kennedy phalanx.

Speak softly and carry a big stick, said the earlier Roosevelt. Speak loudly, call up the guard and Reserves, step up conscription, appropriate some more billions, add 10,000 more paperwork warriors to the bureaucracy, and recommission 82 tank landing ships, presumably to disgorge a landing force at landlocked Berlin—that is the Kennedy response.

And, if Laos or Cuba offer any instruction, then expect the administration to run out when the chips are down.

The mimeograph machines are running overtime keeping up with the statements. In rapid sequence we have heard from Adlai Stevenson, Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of the Army Stahr, Vice President Johnson, and Mr. Kennedy himself.

Stevenson announced that he does not think war will result from the Berlin crisis. "If we go to war over Berlin," he said, "it will be an unparalleled failure of statesmanship on both sides."

Khrushchev's statesmanship has consisted of a series of threats over what he would do if he doesn't have his way in Berlin. What does Stevenson's fear of a failure of statesmanship amount to? A fear that we won't be statesmen enough to cave in at the right moment?

Mr. Rusk took to television and promised to negotiate with the Communists. He didn't promise to stand firm on the principle that neither Western rights nor the West Berliners' freedom are negotiable. He took the familiar line that war is unthinkable. Neither war nor surrender, he said, is the answer to Berlin. "One of the problems of diplomacy is to protect our interests without war." And, if diplomacy isn't enough—what then?

Secretary Stahr popped up in Miami Beach with the announcement, "I do not envision war over West Berlin as the situation is today." In the Secretary's view, "if there were to be war over West Berlin it would have started yesterday," when a feeble column of 1,500 additional American troops was passed through the Soviet Zone into Berlin. Reinforcements on that scale will hardly occasion enough alarm among Communists to cause the missiles to start popping.

Then Vice President JOHNSON, after orating around Berlin, flew home to exchange congratulations with President Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy saw "difficult weeks and months ahead." Mr. JOHNSON reported a heart-warming reception for the newly arrived troops. He spoke of marching "shoulder to shoulder" with the German people "to the end that freedom is preserved in the world."

Maybe so, but if the administration wanted to show Khrushchev it meant business, it could do it in many ways—by a massive Allied confrontation of Communist forces on the border of Soviet East Germany; by cutting off steel and electronic components without which East German industry could not even continue going through the motions, and by a disciplined silence that would put it up to Khrushchev in terms of "your move."

For Khrushchev has bellowed and turned the panic off and on at Berlin for 33 months. He knows as well as the next one that, if the West stands fast, he can grab Berlin only at the price of a nuclear war which would destroy communism. Short of that, he can have it only if we give it to him. So he must congratulate himself as American gabsters worry out loud about the unthinkability of war and possible "failures of statesmanship." We shouldn't doubt that he is convinced that they are going to worry themselves into giving him everything he wants on a silver platter.

Pittsburgh Contributions to Sports Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, two Pittsburghers have

made particularly great contributions to the field of sports in America. They are Arthur J. Rooney, president of the Pittsburgh Steelers Football Club and Al Abrams, sports editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. The Pittsburgh Steelers' home field is located in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Pittsburgh want the Steelers to continue to play football in Pittsburgh. Mr. Rooney has written me in support of the Celler bill, H.R. 8757, stating that "without it, professional sports as we know them, will not continue to exist." Al Abrams has written an excellent column in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in which he concludes that if this legislation is not enacted, "it could mean the collapse of many sports organizations." I call Mr. Rooney's letter and Mr. Abrams' column to the attention of all of my sports-loving colleagues:

PITTSBURGH STEELERS FOOTBALL CLUB,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 21, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: The other day I sent you a wire asking you to support a bill now before the House which will allow all professional sports to operate on a single television network. The bill was introduced by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER last Thursday, August 17, 1961. I cannot tell you how interested I am in this bill. I feel very strongly that without it, professional sports as we know them, will not continue to exist.

Recently Al Abrams, the sports editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, devoted his entire column to this matter. He explained the situation very well and I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of his column. As you will note in the column, the sports fan will continue to get as much sports on television as in the past. The major problem here is that if we continue to operate as we have been, in the next couple of years, our sponsors have indicated they will no longer pay the freight. If that happens, the sports fan will be the loser.

If you can help in any way, I would be most appreciative. Thanks for your interest.

Warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR J. ROONEY,
President.

TV SPORTS AND COURTS

(By Al Abrams)

When Judge Allan Grim, of the Federal District Court of Philadelphia, invalidated a television contract between the National Football League and the Columbia Broadcasting System as a violation of the antitrust laws he dealt a body blow to not only the progrid sport but all others with the exception of baseball.

Baseball, as you know, is the only sport not restricted by the Sherman Antitrust Act. Just why, we don't know. Neither do most of the brains in sports and some in the legal profession. The few (lawyers and judges) I have asked profess ignorance, too, and come up with legal mumbo-jumbo which throws me completely off the trolley.

This is neither here nor there. What we do know is this. Television revenue has become a vital part of every sports team budget—baseball, football, basketball. Without this outside revenue, very few teams, if any could issue a statement showing a profit.

A telephone call to Art Rooney confirmed this. "Without our television income," he told me, "I estimate we would have lost, roughly, a quarter of a million dollars annually."

Rooney went on to explain that this year the league decided to sign all the clubs to a contract with a single network. The league chose CBS because it already had working options with 9 of its 13 clubs last year. The league has since expanded to 14 clubs.

SPONSORS WANTED CHANGE

As I got the story from Rooney, three different networks carried the games in the past. This meant the same towns were getting three different games—but basically the same product—on three different stations.

This caused the sponsors to become disenchanted. Instead of having exclusive rights to a product, the sponsor found he had to compete against his own product in many towns across the Nation. Most of them thought three games in three stations in the same town at the same time divided the audience to such a point it made the game an unrealistic buy.

One major sponsor, who spent nearly $12 million yearly bringing National Football League games to fans throughout the country, said it planned to cancel its contract if exclusivity to games was not possible.

Under the new package deal with CBS, television would still be widespread and the fans still would see as much NFL football as ever. The only difference is that one station—not two or three—would carry the games. Such restraint is well in order and reasonable.

Some people, including Judge Grim, I presume, are of the opinion the one-station deal would restrict the exposure of football to fans.

Such is not the case at all. It would be the continuation of television of all major sports—in this case pro football—primarily in the best interest of the common good.

That is why football men and those in other sports are asking Congress to support sports bill 1856 which comes up soon. If it isn't, it could mean the collapse of many sports organizations.

The Personal Practice of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Congress are approached almost daily by friends and constituents who tell us of their concern about the world and domestic situation and they ask simply, "What can I do about it?"

I have had the privilege of recently reading a speech that sets forth the personal formula of a good American. I am hopeful that by including this speech herewith in my remarks that it will serve as a guide to many other Americans who often ask this question. It gives me real pleasure to request that a speech given by Mr. Ed Lipscomb, of the National Cotton Council, which was given to the Railroad Public Relations Society in Chicago on June 22, 1961, be included herewith in my remarks:

THE PERSONAL PRACTICE OF PATRIOTISM

When most of us read an article or hear a speech about America and its future, we find ourselves with one big question left dangling.

It is the simple, logical, and very human question, What can I do about it?

Instead of stopping at the point where that question arises, we want to start with it, and to devote these pages to three simple steps which must be taken by any man who truly wants to find his answer.

Developments of the present and the recent past give distressing assurance that we are moving clearly and rapidly in the exact direction our mortal enemies have prophesied, again and again, would lead to our total defeat. You know the story—a trend toward national insolvency which already has destroyed more than half the purchasing power of our money and created a public debt larger than the debts of all other nations of the earth combined, a Federal tax system patterned directly on Marxian principles and carried to extremes which not even the most socialistic country of Western Europe has undertaken to impose, the usurpation of more and more power by a bigger and bigger central government; the gradual destruction of personal incentive and the increasing frustration of those who would create new wealth and new jobs; the complete or partial dependence of half of our population on checks from the national treasury; the decline of individual patriotism and public morality to a point where cynical union monopolists can force the weekly wages of missile base workers to levels higher than the earnings of the Secretary of Defense, and where employers can treat Government contracts as special licenses for extortion of the taxpayer.

These and other signs of internal decay and disintegration are enough to set on fire before us the words of a great American who said, "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

Fortunately for each of us, for our families, and our future, this same front—the home front—is the one where you and I can be truly effective, where each can fight and win his own individual battle, and where together we can constitute the difference between national survival and certain defeat.

Fortunately, also, there are enough patriots still left in this land to do the job—enough, that is, if we have the zeal, gumption, and guts to get on with it; if we are willing and ready to fight with even half the determination, fervor, and selflessness of a dedicated Communist.

Do you know what a Communist agrees to do, just in order to be a member in good standing, at the lowest level, of the American Community Party? He agrees to accept any assignment, day or night, that may be given him. He agrees to change his business or abandon his job and sacrifice his seniority if he can be more useful doing something else.

He agrees, on demand, to leave his family and disappear from his neighborhood in order to work under a new identity in a different and distant locality. He agrees, in short, to subordinate his every personal wish and habit and preference in undeviating devotion to his cause.

Is it not then amazing that so many of us patriotic Americans should think that we can continue to enjoy the advantages and opportunities we have inherited, yet do nothing to protect or promote them except pan the politicians and hope that our fellow Americans will somehow wake up in time?

This is not that kind of fight, and we might as well quit kidding ourselves about it. Before our eyes is the big hard fact that we are not going to win it without the voluntary and vigorous expenditure of an im-

portant amount of purposeful time and personal effort.

To be effective, there are three things we simply have to do. Together they constitute the three steps to which I already have referred.

The first is to know something. This is no great new or strange idea, for certainly there is nothing novel about the need for knowledge in order to achieve results.

A physicist is not a physicist unless he knows physics. An electrician who does not know electricity will either destroy himself or set someone's house on fire. A pianist is a pianist because he has mastered the piano; a lawyer must have knowledge of the law; and there is not one of us who will let his best friend remove a lung simply because he means well and is eager to help. We want a man who knows.

If you and I are going to be effective in fighting our individual battles on the home front, we have to know something about the true nature of this home-front war we are in. We have to know something about the principles we are fighting for, what they mean, and where and by whom they are being violated. We have to know what consequeces are sure to follow continued gradual abandonment of those principles by men who put this week's wages, or this month's balance sheet, or this year's political program above the outright survival of the money that pays the wages, the business that makes the balance sheet possible, and the political system under which the programs are offered.

The knowledge we need is fully available. Sound men of our own and other generations have seen to that. Some of their words are old, and some are new. Any man who begins to search them out, and who stays with the study of them long enough to begin to get their feel and their meaning for his own future, will find that they make most of his other reading and listening either dull or downright repulsive by comparison. You will not believe that unless you have tried it, but you will agree 100 percent if you have.

* * * * *

The second thing you and I have to do, along with knowing something, is to be something.

All the knowledge in the world cannot make us effective unless we are something * * * unless we stand for the things we believe in unless our lives are the exemplification and the personification of the principles we espouse.

The temperance lecturer who gets drunk—the preacher who flirts with choir members—the marriage counselor who has twice been divorced—these are familiar illustrations of the destruction of a man's influence by what he is.

* * * * *

There are probably few people in our own country who know more about the fundamental philosophy of American Government than the political experts of the Kremlin. Their knowledge indeed is abundant; yet no one would claim that it is of benefit to us, for it is knowledge held by men who do not believe in a Divine God, and who therefore cannot possibly believe that you and I have inalienable rights with which we are "endowed by our Creator." What they know becomes a liability to us, not an asset, because of what they are.

Not only, therefore, must we know something. We also must be something.

Both of these together—achieved in full measure, pressed down and running over—do not mean, however, that we will fight an effective battle. Success will come, and come only, when we take the third step—when we do something.

A man can know all there is to know about surgery; he can be a model of good behavior in his profession and his community; yet he will never remove an appendix or save a patient's life unless he does something.

* * * * *

The Biblical quotation that "faith without works is dead" is far more than a Sunday school phrase limited to theological application. It is an eternal principle which is as valid on the pavement as it is in the pulpit.

Are you not sick and tired of hearing intelligent people hold forth about free enterprise, fuss about taxes, and fume about Federal interference—when you know their whole lives consist exclusively of scrambling for bigger bank accounts, climbing higher on business and social ladders, and seeking more ways of having fun?

* * * * *

Assuming, then, that we know something, assuming that we are something, and assuming that we want to do something—what, specifically, can we do?

* * * * *

Perhaps the most common mistake we make is to think that when we do something we must do something big—that if we cannot do something big it is futile to do anything at all. If such were the case, our cause indeed would be hopeless, for not a man in a hundred thousand will be able, alone, to do even one thing we ourselves would say was truly big.

To illustrate, you and I know that a major problem confronts us in the fact that many—in my opinion, most—of the regular columns of comment appearing today in the American press are heavily slanted to left-wing, pie-in-the-sky points of view. They say little about high levels of private economic achievement and the widest distribution of private wealth this world has ever known. They emphasize, instead, our pressing need for the type of so-called guaranteed security that has brought stagnation and subsistence living to every nation that has ever tried it.

* * * * *

There is little comment on our magnificent and unmatched record of private philanthropy, and much on the desperate need for Federal philanthropy. Seldom are we reminded that one American farmer feeds the world's choicest diet to six times as many workers as his most advanced Communist counterpart, but often of plans to make the farmer more and more a ward of Washington. There is little about the fiscal or moral necessity of eliminating or reducing any public program, and much about the indispensability or ever-greater spending.

The cumulative destructive effect of such allegedly interpretive writing is tremendous.

Neither you nor I, alone, can possibly halt or reverse it. There is not one among us, however, who cannot visit or write or telephone our own editor to protest against a particular column, who cannot ask the cooperation of a few of our friends in doing the same, and urge those friends to enlist the help of their friends, and to help obtain repetition of the same pattern through friends in other cities.

* * * * *

How many of us have made so much as one personal move on this simple but highly significant problem, and how many in turn have expressed support of constructive columns that are being run or editorial features that are being written?

* * * * *

What is true of columnists is doubly true of some of those who with voices of doom, boudoir, or circus barker seek to influence public opinion via broadcasting. * * *

This is the area of public communication which is probably more sensitive to the open indignation and expressed disapproval of a relatively few patriots than any other. A telephone call to a local program director, a letter to a network, and above all an unmistakable message to a commercial sponsor are sure to get attention. * * *

For the man who knows something and is something, the opportunities to do something stand waiting on every hand.

What about the public schools your children or grandchildren attend? Are the teachers whose salaries you pay using their classrooms to prepare the youth of your community for lives of self-reliance, or are they leading them toward lives that are directed by a distant Central Government and dependent on political handouts? Thus far, local schools are still under local control, and the opportunities still exist for you and me to help make them a philosophical training ground for those to whom we are obligated to leave a nation as decent as the one we inherited.

When one association, speaking for 120,000 teachers, attacks an independent college for its activity in support of freedom forums, warns its members to beware of books released by conservative publishing houses, points the finger of scorn at groups which show anti-Communist films, and opposes dissemination of information from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the time has come for individual men to make sure that their own local schools are not being contaminated or influenced by so monstrous an example of educational perversion.

Your civic club? Does it maintain the myth that it must sidestep every fundamental issue which conceivably might be called political, or does it accept the truth that free chambers of commerce and business clubs are among the earliest casualties of a fully centralized government, be it Communist or otherwise?

The principal association to which you belong? Does it pass resolutions asking Washington to solve the legitimate problems of its members or their industry, and then follow up with flag-waving calls for more free enterprise? And if so, what have you done to expose the hypocrisy of it?

The list goes on and on: personal encouragement of young friends who are or should be participating in campus movements dedicated to a reversal of the trend we are in—active support of the few publications which devote their entire effort to the advancement of fundamental Americanism—and with it all the daily job of influencing the attitudes and opinions of the 160 individuals whose lives are touched by even the lowliest among us.

Somewhere down the line will appear the challenge to get up on your hind legs before a group and speak out for what you believe—perhaps to a small group of neighbors, perhaps to a luncheon club, a class of students, or a State or National convention.

There are some who will say in a hurry that "this is not for me—I have never done it, and I surely can't start now." May I suggest—as the candidates say when they are completely in disagreement—that every man who knows something, is something, and is doing something will discover to his delight that telling his story is not only possible, but pleasing and profitable as well.

* * * * *

Do you know what the secret is—the thing that makes it seem not only normal but necessary to do the speaking and the buttonholing and the letterwriting and the telephoning and everything else that is involved in doing something to win this war we are in?

Of course you do. It is conviction—strong conviction. It is the conviction that political problems, way down deep, are also religious and moral problems. It is the conviction that all men are morally equal, and are endowed with equal rights, but that this does not mean they have any inherent unearned right to equal things. It is the conviction that property and freedom are inseparably connected, that economic leveling is not economic uplift, that change is not necessarily progress, and that sound principles are not roadblocks which must be

cast aside to make way for the forward march of mankind.

Out of strong conviction comes dedication, and out of dedication comes the sort of crusading spirit which is mandatory for those who would fight the most important battle of our century.

The job will not be done by men who insist on comfort and soft cushions at a time when their country needs them for hard crusading—or by men who take the view that because their own staterooms are still above water they need not volunteer to help plug holes in the hull of the ship. It cannot be done by lukewarm men who consistently seek refuge in an anemic phrase called middle-of-the road. There is no such thing as middle-of-the-road where principle is concerned. Stealing is either stealing or it isn't, and it makes no difference whether it is done with a blackjack or with a ballot box.

* * * * *

There are cynics who will say that already it is too late—that the job cannot be done. It can't—by cynics; but we can stand a few cynics if we have enough statesmen. We can stand a few parasites if we have enough patriots. We can stand a few who bury their talents if we have enough who bring back 10.

It is to those who still have faith in their country, faith in their fellow man, and faith in themselves that this message is addressed. There are such men today—men of true courage, men of compelling conviction. All of them did not die 2,000 years ago. All did not live in 1776.

Ours is the call for modern application of the same type of triumphant heroism which brought our Nation into being. There are no horses to be ridden through darkened streets, but there are many Americans to be awakened—no lanterns to be hung in steeples, but many an illuminating example to be set—no muskets to be shot, but many messages to be spread—no cannon to be faced, but many unyielding stands to be taken.

Ours is the call to get iron in our blood, bone in our backs, fervor in our souls, and determination in our hearts—to know all we can, be all we can, and do all we can in a cause that is greater than we can ever become.

As we accept that call, we shall find—you and I—that we have lifted ourselves above the race of the rat to the rich fulfillment of those who lose themselves in devotion to what they know to be right. We shall find the ultimate, enduring gratification—the soul-satisfying happiness—that comes only from living for principles we know will long outlast us.

Brazilian President Makes a Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following thought printed in the Wall Street Journal makes an interesting point:

NO TOUCH OF PREJUDICE

In a letter to Khrushchev, Brazil's President Quadros says that while his country has received "valuable aid from other sources"—including some $3 billion in aid, loans and investments from the United States—Brazil has "something to offer and much to receive" from the Soviet Union.

However, lest Khrushchev get the wrong idea from this aid-seeking plea, Mr. Quadros advised him that "ideological * * * prejudices do not touch" Brazilians.

The United States can vouch for that. Few countries are prejudiced when it comes to making a "touch."

Union Should Be Subject to Antitrust Laws To Curb Abuse of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the one weapon which will adequately curb the abuse of power by some labor leaders whose self-interest exceeds the national interest is to make labor organizations subject to the antitrust laws. My bill, H.R. 8407, would bring about this desired result. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points up the need for a stronger weapon to curb labor actions which endanger national security, than any laws now in effect;

AN ARSENAL AND UNION POWER

President Kennedy is running into delays in getting the "arsenal of weapons" he has requested for dealing with strikes which endanger the safety of the Nation. The delays stem from the difficulty the President's own advisers are having in deciding just what "weapons" to recommend.

The measures under discussion include injunctions, seizures, tax penalties, boards with or without power to make recommendations, and other alternatives. One school has it that by providing the White House with a variety of possible moves, the disputing parties would negotiate more zealously because they would be uncertain what action the Chief Executive might take. This theory, however, has been challenged by other labor-management experts who believe the disputants could rather easily find out what the President planned.

In any case, all Mr. Kennedy's advisers seem to agree that the only answer to industrywide, nation-crippling strikes lies in more Government regulation of "free" collective bargaining. But nobody ever seems to realize this is attacking the problem from the wrong end.

When a giant union and an entire industry are locked in a dispute which threatens the well-being of the United States, a disruption in the economy is possible only because Congress has exempted organized labor from the antitrust laws which apply to all other Americans. If unions did not have the extraordinary power to shut down simultaneously, for instance, practically every steel mill and auto factory in the country, the need for Government intervention in labor negotiations would disappear.

Bringing unions under the antitrust laws would not affect a union's right to strike. But then, at least, the strike would be against one plant or one company and would not represent a major threat to the Nation's safety. No one union could then remove the trucks from our highways, ground our airlines, stop our trains, or close our ports.

Recent history shows union leaders do not hesitate to wield this enormous power when it suits their purposes. And we can expect further strike-caused crises ahead if the unions' unique position in our society remains unchanged.

It is not surprising that the President sees the need for a whole arsenal of weapons to protect the country from organized labor's power. But instead of yet more Federal control, common reason suggests it would be far wiser to reduce the union power that makes a defensive arsenal necessary.

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days a number of comments have been made about the John Birch Society's essay contest which is the latest attempt to advertise the society's avowed desire to promote the impeachment of our Nation's loyal and dedicated Chief Justice Earl Warren.

A very thought-provoking editorial has been written on this essay contest and appeared in the July 29, 1961 issue of the Alameda, Calif., newspaper, the Times Star. This editorial clearly affirms the proposition that in the end truth will erase all doubts and calumny.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A COMPLIMENT TO THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

The John Birch Society is to be complimented on its decision to offer a series of prizes, with a top of $1,000, in a nationwide college essay contest on the subject "Why Chief Justice Earl Warren Should Be Impeached."

The idea is a sound one and should receive the widest possible publicity. Furthermore, we hope that students by the thousand will enter it.

None of those who enter the contest with any intent of winning it will be able to avoid learning far more about the subject than they would ever be likely to learn otherwise. They will have to learn what the grounds for impeachment are and whether or not Chief Justice Warren has in fact committed any of the acts which merit such a termination to his career.

Accordingly, most of them will emerge from the contest—at least they will if they have the brains that justify their getting an education—convinced of the essential nonsense of the John Birch Society's position.

But though they will come out of it with that inner conviction, we do not doubt that the winners of the contest will produce arguments that will be satisfying to the John Birchers. Accordingly, we hope that smart citizens will offer a prize of double the amount, restricting the competitors to only those who have entered the society's contest.

The prize should be offered for the best essays on the subject "Why Chief Justice Earl Warren Should Not Be Impeached."

Thus the students would have the opportunity of exhibiting their abilities to argue on both sides of a question that has all the basic merit of another that engaged the attention of college students in the days of the scholastics—"How Many Angels Can Dance on the Point of a Pin."

Navy Patents New Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in the past several months, several Members have followed with interest the Navy's announced intention of subjecting to rigorous, impartial, scientific analysis a radical new proposal called the WAGMIGHT/VTOL. Our interest, of course, centers on the concern that every possible weapons system that will materially aid in the defense of the United States be given such an examination by our defense leaders to the end that this Nation will have available to it the best fruits of its scientific minds.

In this connection, there appeared in the New York Times on August 21, 1961, an article indicating that the Navy has patented certain basic discoveries engaged in the WAGMIGHT/VTOL project.

Several questions present themselves as a result of this article. Does the patenting of this project by the Navy indicate that there are, indeed, valuable techniques involved that would strengthen the defense of the United States? Has there been completed, as indicated in the news story, a "full and unbiased" review of the defense system's capabilities? Will the results of this review be presented to the appropriate committees of Congress for the necessary policy decisions, aimed at achieving the best weapon mix for the defense of our country?

So that Members may keep abreast of developments in this matter, I include the article appearing in the New York Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NAVY PATENTS INFLATABLE AIRPLANE AND MAKES STUDY OF CAPABILITIES

WASHINGTON, August 20.—The Navy has patented its inflatable airplane. However, the inventor of the controversial aircraft says it is being fought by admirals who fear it as a threat to the role of big carriers.

The Navy has reportedly completed a full and unbiased review of the plane's capabilities as presented by its persistent inventor, Capt. Cooper B. Bright. The results of the review have not yet been disclosed.

In taking out a patent last week on the accumulator compressed air principle, the Navy reserved the nonmilitary commercial rights for Captain Bright. The accumulator principle is intended to give inflatable aircraft vertical takeoff capability.

The House Government Information Subcommittee has reportedly asked for a nonclassified presentation on the project, similar to those Captain Bright has given in the last 2 weeks for top admirals.

PANEL IS INTERESTED

The subcommittee became interested in the project last May after Captain Bright said he had been ordered the preceding November to destroy pamphlets on the project. The officer said certain admirals had suppressed the project for fear it might dry up appropriations for big carriers.

He believes the aircraft could be stored, in collapsed form, aboard merchant ships, destroyers, or any sort of vessel and then inflated and launched when needed.

Navy Secretary John B. Connally said May 26 that the inflatable plane project would receive full and unbiased consideration.

Mr. Connally said Captain Bright had prepared a brochure and had it printed at Government expense "for the apparent purpose of promoting his idea outside the Navy."

"His superiors very properly ordered him to dispose of the copies he had not already distributed and instructed him to cease using the Government printing facilities to support his private ideas," Mr. Connally said.

ORDERS HELD UP

Pending the review, orders transferring Captain Bright to what he considered a dead-end post, inspector of naval materiel at San Francisco, have been held in abeyance.

Captain Bright told the admirals that it takes only 50 pounds of air pressure a square inch to inflate a fabric airplane. He said that the increase of that pressure to 150 pounds would provide a tremendous source of additional power.

The officer said the compressed air could be heated to 1,000 degrees, the same temperature as the engine exhaust gases, and mixed with those gases for a short spurt to double the lifting power at takeoff.

He said that since the compressed-air accumulator was the airplane structure itself, this doubled power would be achieved without any increase in aircraft weight.

Captain Bright has won the support of a distinguished former naval officer, retired Vice Adm. T. G. W. Settle. The latter is a veteran of 100 balloon flights, in one of which, in November 1933 he ascended to a record of 61,237 feet.

Admiral Settle, who was commander of amphibian forces of the Pacific fleet at the time of his retirement in 1958, said he considered Captain Bright's invention "a technological breakthrough of tremendous potential."

I Quit Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has the highest medical standards, the finest medical facilities, and the most dedicated physicians in the world. Our elderly people are getting the best medical attention and best service in the world. Our people are free to choose their own physicians and free to consult their own pharmacists.

Mr. Speaker, let us move forward with our new, modern free enterprise system and not turn the clock back to the old decadent philosophy of socialism and government control.

The following article was written by a man who experienced the tragic consequences of a government-controlled medical care program:

I QUIT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

(By Dr. Lloyd Dawe)

A curious demand came one day in London from a patient of mine, a middle-aged factory worker.

He wanted me to prescribe for him 10 pounds of absorbent cotton, which is used in packing open wounds and which could be ordered almost free under Britain's program of nationalized medicine.

"What on earth do you want with all that absorbent cotton?" I asked.

"I want to restuff a sofa," he replied.

When I refused to approve this improper request, he angrily threatened to withdraw his whole family of six who were my regular patients.

This attitude of disdain for the British health care program and the doctors who serve under it became widespread soon after the national health service was established in Great Britain in 1948.

It is only one—and perhaps the least important—of the potential dangers America faces if a system of nationalized medicine is adopted in this country. A compulsory Federal health insurance bill now pending in the U.S. Congress is the thin end of the wedge that quite probably could bring deteriorating medical standards and medical care in the United States.

As an intern in a London hospital and later in general practice there, I witnessed the unbelievable waste interference and bureaucratic regimentation that have accompanied Britain's unwieldy social experiment.

I paid Government-imposed fines for prescribing the best medicine for my patients. I spent anxious hours in search of hospital space for the critically ill. I saw hospital grants frivolously spent on television sets and new carpeting.

Practice under the national health service soon became intolerable for me, as it has for thousands of British and European doctors who have left their countries to practice in America. I, too, chose freedom and came to the United States to practice under what I firmly believe is the best existing medical system in the world today.

Politicians who favor enactment of new Federal medical care in the United States today are making the same wishful promises and tranquilizing assurances that were heard in England 13 years ago.

Americans should heed the lesson taught in England, and guard well the high medical standards and freedoms they now possess.

The proposed medical care legislation now at issue in Congress would provide for payment of hospital, nursing home, and home health services to aged beneficiaries under the social security system. Providers of the health care would have to agree to meet specific Government requirements. They would be paid by an increase in the social security taxes levied on employers and employees.

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who would administer the proposed law, has been widely quoted as saying that the legislation would not authorize Government supervision or control over the practice of medicine, the manner in which medical services are provided, or the selection of compensation of those offering the health care services.

However, the bill itself states that hospitals, nursing facilities and home care agencies must meet such conditions of participation as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare requires.

The Health Secretary says that doctors would not be included in the program. However, the bill specifically includes pathologists, radiologists, phychiatrists, and anesthesiologists working in hospitals or serving the hospital's outpatient clinics. The bill also would include interns and residents in teaching hospitals.

It is naive to suppose that once this legislation became law it would not be extended gradually to cover all medical practice and health care services for the entire U.S. population. It is equally naive to suppose that Government financing will be provided without Government control and ultimate Government operation of medical services. The Government would be irresponsible if it spent public funds without adequate controls and supervision.

Innocent-sounding provisions of the medical care measure can prove to be far different in practice. I saw similar provisions as they were applied under Britain's National Health Service.

For example, the pending medical care legislation limits the drugs and biologicals that will be provided for patients to those included in the U.S. Pharmacopoeia, National Formulary or New and Nonofficial Remedies.

In Britain the amount and kind of drugs were also restricted for the general practitioner. Only doctors on the staffs of hospitals initially could prescribe new drugs not listed in the British Pharmacopoeia or National Formulary. Government-licensed drug houses supplied medicines, which the general practitioners were supposed to prescribe by their generic name.

HOW HE FACED FINES

Nearly every week, either the doctor with whom I was in practice or I would be fined because we had prescribed a drug which in our best judgment was needed by a patient but which was not on the Government's official list.

Once I was charged for prescribing a drug that actually was in the official listing. I pointed this out rather acidly to the bureaucrats who had erred. The charge was remitted, but I never received an explanation or apology.

On another occasion I discovered that Luminal, a brand name for phenobarbital, which was being produced in large quantities by a private firm, was actually less expensive to obtain than the phenobarbital being made in the Government's drug houses.

The restrictions on a physician's judgment to prescribe the best medicine for his patient fell particularly heavily on the younger doctor. For instance, the new man in the field might prescribe a new and expensive drug for arthritis, whereas the older physician might order aspirin. Since the Government levied a charge on doctors whose prescriptions exceeded a certain percentage of the average cost for the particular area in which they practiced, the physician who prescribed the more expensive medicines suffered financially.

It became natural for a doctor to hesitate to prescribe certain drugs when he knew it would cost him money. It was difficult enough to get by on the restrictive compensation the Government allowed.

A physician in general practice was paid a fixed fee per patient per year no matter how frequently he saw the patient. To earn a living of about $4,000 a year he had to see approximately 100 patients a day. Medical specialist were attached to hospitals and paid a salary by the Government.

I have a friend who has a rural practice in England still. He gets by only because he also has a chicken farm. His income from his chickens is greater than from his practice.

Since medical care theoretically was available to everyone at anytime, we were literally swamped with patients, many of them with trivial complaints or with no ailment at all. I remember one elderly woman who was in and out of the office three or four times a week. This old dear lived alone and mainly wanted someone to talk to.

Free service to all naturally leads to overutilization. Patients and proper medical care suffer.

With the best will and intentions we could not give all the time we should have to our patients. The general practitioner tended to send any cases where diagnosis was difficult or time consuming to outpatient departments of the hospitals. Less and less minor surgery was done in the doctor's office, since there was no time.

Besides the heavy patient load, the time spent on Government paper work was fantastically high. If a man was too ill to work, he had to have a certificate filled out by his physician. For each week he was not on the job, a certificate was necessary, and another certificate had to be completed when he returned to work.

There were certificates for free milk or orange juice for children when this added nourishment was necessary, and complicated forms any time anyone was treated who was not on a doctor's list of regular patients. Form filling and correspondence with the Government thus became one of the physician's major functions. He was reduced to the role of part-time clerk.

The lack of time to care for patients meant more of them had to be shunted off to hospitals. Doctors tended to lose touch with their patients when this happened as practically no general practitioners are on hospital staffs. The doctor could visit his patient in the hospital, but he got the uncomfortable feeling that he was in the way, because he had no responsibility for the patient then. The hospital staff was in authority.

When the patient was released, his doctor got a brief letter from the hospital saying what had been done, but this break in medical care continuity is hardly the best kind of treatment for the patient. Rarely, too, did the patient have any choice over who would treat him in the hospital.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the politicians who support the medical care bill before Congress say that it provides free choice of either hospital or doctor.

Under the national health service, patients not only had no choice of hospitals, they were fortunate to get accommodations at all in the jam-packed institutions.

I remember an elderly patient who fractured her hip. I spent more than 3 hours on the telephone before I could locate a bed for her, and it was in a hospital on the other side of London.

I remember, too, a 24-year-old woman who had a sudden cerebral attack. I believed it was neurological in nature, but I knew she needed a specialist for proper diagnosis. After 4 hours on the phone, I finally was able to get her into a hospital. A brain cyst was discovered. The young woman lived, but the wait had not helped her.

I remember, too, a man of about 60 who had a heart attack and was in a state of some shock. Two hours of phoning finally found hospital space for this emergency case. A central phone service finally was established which relieved this problem to some extent. But private or semiprivate rooms were almost unheard of. In some hospitals the crowded wards even had beds down the middle aisles.

Unless surgery was of emergency nature, up to a 2-year wait was customary. I had several child patients with chronic tonsilitis who were on the waiting list for operations the whole year I was in practice in London.

A major reason why the hospitals were so overcrowded was the heavy load of elderly patients, the very age group that the health care measure now before Congress would cover. Since hospitalization was free, many of the aged in Britain were shuttled off to the hospitals rather than being cared for at home by their families.

I appreciate that the aim of the aged health care legislation is to help a group of citizens who frequently incur heavy medical expenses. However, as a psychiatrist, I am convinced that the elderly person should not be encouraged in dependency. He should not be made to feel that he is a pitied ward of the State, a wornout object of charity. Let us not destroy the self-reliant spirit. The older patient must have an incentive to keep living, to continue to be useful.

Existing legislation, enacted by Congress only last year, provides a program of care for needy aged who cannot afford the costs. But to encourage all the aged to give up their independence and become debit members of society, to receive doles regardless of need, could be a destructive influence on the older population.

Though health care of the elderly is often more expensive than that of younger persons, the British found that their attempts to improve the health services for the minority downgraded the services for the majority. There are even indications that the health of the overall population was not greatly improved by the service as such.

One might expect that, with health care available to anyone regardless of cost, the country would be healthier. However, British businessmen found that absenteeism in plants and companies nearly doubled the first year the health service was in effect.

The dissatisfaction with the national health service has been strikingly shown in the sharp rise in voluntary health insurance plans in Britain. When the health service first was established, private health insurance fell off drastically. But now those who can afford it buy private health insurance because of the better treatment and benefits it assures, though the insured must also carry the heavy taxes that pay for the nationalized health plan.

The poor British taxpayer has been milked dry. The Health Service now costs more than five times the original estimate. One of the main reasons is that there are two or three Government clerks for each doctor. On that basis, if the United States adopts a Government-operated health system, the Federal Government would have to hire nearly 2 million more clerks.

When the British Health Service began, the staff of the hospital where I was an intern seemed to double overnight. The signs of bureaucracy—excessive paperwork, overhead and impersonal treatment—were immediately apparent.

Hospitals apply to the Government for block grants for operating expenses. If a hospital has any money left over when it has completed a fiscal year, the next year's grant is reduced by this amount. Naturally, this system encourages wasteful practices and penalizes economical hospital administrators.

I have seen hospital money spent for television sets, new carpeting and other purposes of a nonmedical nature just to use up remaining funds in a budget.

Patients and pharmacists were not guiltless either. Some patients had arrangements with their pharmacists whereby they would bring in a prescription for Government-paid medicine and use it instead to pay for cosmetics of an equivalent value. The waste and redtape might be worth the price if they assured the best medical practice and health care. However, bureaucratic administration brought outrageous governmental interference that discouraged and handicapped medical men. For example, these two incidents involved my brother-in-law. He, too, is a physician refugee of the National Health Service and is now practicing in New Mexico.

One New Year's eve, my brother-in-law received a message to make three house calls. There was no indication of an emergency nature. But by the time he reached the third house, the patient had already been sent to a hospital by another physician.

A complaint was brought against my brother-in-law and he was taken before a Government health service tribunal that acted as prosecutor, judge, and jury. A doctor under this situation is not even allowed representation. Though he pointed out that he had no way of knowing the patient was in an emergency condition, he was fined £50.

On appeal, the decision was overturned and justice was done, but it had cost him untold

anxiety and loss of prestige, through the bad publicity of this star chamber procedure. He was not even able to sue for malicious abuse or on other grounds.

On another occasion, Government inspectors who periodically check doctor's offices as to the condition of furnishings and even decor, demanded to see the living quarters of my brother-in-law which were in the same building.

I came to the United States because I sought the opportunity to practice medicine in a way that I thought best for both doctor and patient—without regimentation, restrictions, and interference. I want only two people in the medical relationship—myself and my patient. There should be no impersonal governmental third party.

In this country I have found freedom of action and professional choice. Now I feel I am practicing in the best existing system in the world. It is not perfect. But we are striving to make it better. And the best medical care can be given only in the system where a doctor is not a Government clerk but an individual with professional dignity and freedom.

The Fight To Preserve Congressional Responsibility Over Appropriations Not Yet Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, although the House did succeed in temporarily stopping the administration's grab for power in the demand to permit back-door spending over a 5-year period in the foreign aid bill, the fight is far from won. An article from the Wall Street Journal indicates the pressure the administration is applying to have its way in this matter. My only comment is, Why is the President demanding that Congress waive its responsibility over appropriations? The foreign aid program has never lacked appropriations by the exercise of congressional scrutiny. Let us not accept a conference report which will strip Congress of more of its responsibility and place additional powers in a single individual.

The above-mentioned article follows:

KENNEDY STANDS FIRM ON PLAN FOR FINANCING OF FOREIGN AID LOANS—HOUSE-SENATE CONFEREES EXPECTED TO CLEAR BILL FOR DIRECT TREASURY WITHDRAWALS

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy reassured Democratic congressional leaders at his weekly conference with them that he is standing firm on his request for power to finance foreign aid loans to underdeveloped nations by direct withdrawals from the Treasury.

Consequently, the Senate-House conference which will resolve differences between separate foreign aid measures passed by the two Chambers almost certainly will come up with a bill containing the hotly opposed principle of direct Treasury withdrawals—a form of financing called "back-door spending" by its critics.

This would mean the House, which last week rejected the Kennedy plan, again will be faced with the question when it votes on the bill revised by the conferees. Although the conference begins sessions this afternoon, it may take a week or more to resolve 112 separate differences between the House and Senate bills.

Prior to yesterday's weekly meeting of the President and his chief congressional lieutenants, there had been speculation on Capitol Hill that Mr. Kennedy would sacrifice the idea of direct Treasury withdrawals, rather than suffer an embarrassing congressional defeat, and instead try for some other type of long-term financing of foreign economic development loans.

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS AROUSED

This had aroused some indignation among Democratic Senators, who had worked hard to win Senate approval of authority for the President to withdraw $8 billion from the Treasury over 5 years without the need for annual congressional appropriation. The House measure contains no long-term financing provision and continues the requirement for annual appropriation setting a $1.2 billion limit on appropriations for the current fiscal year that would be voted in a separate appropriation measure later this month.

But Mr. Kennedy made it clear at the weekly session that he did not want to compromise on the principle of direct Treasury withdrawals. The most he would retreat, he indicated, would be to accept a pared down Senate plan that would permit withdrawals totaling around $5 billion over a 3-year period.

Moreover, House Democratic leader McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, informed Mr. Kennedy that chances for House approval of a conference report calling for back-door spending are not as bleak as some House Democrat chieftians had previously indicated. The generally more conservative nature of the House plus the power wielded there by the 50-member Appropriations Committee makes that chamber far less willing than the Senate to sacrifice power over appropriations.

Backing up Representative McCORMACK's new-found optimism, the bloc of a dozen or so House Republicans from New England privately passed the word that they probably will approve the bill emerging from the Senate-House conference even if it contains a 3-year Treasury withdrawal plan as expected. This in itself could spell the difference between victory and defeat for the administration.

The possibility that the President was deserting the fight for direct Treasury withdrawals appeared to increase Monday when testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee by Secretary of State Rusk was interpreted by some observers as indicating the administration no longer insists on back-door spending. However, Mr. Rusk informed both the White House and Chairman FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that he was merely emphasizing that some means of long-term financing must be found even if Congress rejects direct Treasury withdrawals.

ADMINISTRATION BEGINS DRIVE

Meanwhile, the Administration began a drive to restore at least some of the money cut by the Senate from the proposed spending authority for military aid grants. Defense Secretary McNamara, testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee, implied that the reduction might even imperil the preservation of West Berlin as a free world bastion because of a reduction in U.S. outlays for Western European armies.

The House-passed foreign aid bill sets a $1.8 billion limit on appropriations this year for military grants, exactly the same amount that was appropriated by Congress last year and only $80 million less than Mr. Kennedy requested. However, liberals who oppose military aid and conservatives who oppose any kind of foreign aid combined in the Senate to cut the figure to $1.5 billion.

The reduction reflected a growing hostility by Senators toward military aspects of the foreign-aid program on the ground that it provides help for prosperous Western European nations who do not need it and helps prop up military dictators in underdeveloped nations. It is likely that the conferees will come up with a military aid figure somewhere between the House and Senate versions.

Communist Use of Psychopolitical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the 28th of July, the Borger News-Herald, published in Borger, Tex., ran an article which I believe would be of interest to every American. The article, written by Mr. J. C. Phillips, in his column "News Into Focus," was entitled "Fronts We Neglect." Mr. Phillips, in the following excerpt from his article, points up the Communist use of psychopolitical warfare, a weapon against which the free world has yet to present an able defense.

FRONTS WE NEGLECT
(By J. C. Phillips)

Representative JOHN R. PILLION, from New York, has entered House Joint Resolution 447 in the U.S. Congress, under date of June 12, 1961. This resolution calls on the people and the Government to recognize formally a state of war exists between the United States and the Communist apparatus.

This resolution makes sense because Soviet Russia through its Communist apparatus in this country is making war on the American people on many fronts where there is no attempt to resist by our Government and too little attempt to resist on the part of Americans immediately in contact with the enemy who need to be alerted to their responsibility, and therefore to resist the enemy where this personal contact is in daily progress.

We are talking about psychopolitical warfare. The enemy uses every means to demoralize and to disintegrate all Communist-Soviet resistance.

Here are a few of the many fronts on which we are being attacked, wherein our Government offers no or very feeble resistance:

The infiltration into our school systems, religious bodies and unions for party organizational purposes and subversion; infiltration of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, movies, etc., to disseminate pro-Communist-Soviet line; and the maintenance of Communist libraries throughout the world.

THESE TWO SHOULD LEAD

Within and throughout our school organizations and within and throughout our church organizations, and certainly including the National Council of Churches, there should be effective leadership to resist infiltration of the Communist propaganda and agents of subversion. These two groups more than any other two groups could do more toward solidifying and unifying the American people into the effective opposing

force that must be massed if we are to destroy the enemy before he destroys us.

That is why there is much merit in House Joint Resolution 447, U.S. House of Representatives, as proposed by Representative PILLION.

National Gallery of Art Program for September 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the program of the National Gallery of Art from Monday, August 28, through Sunday, September 3, 1961, is outstanding.

I am calling the attention of the Congress and the American people to this program to point out that the National Gallery of Art is an active institution, where there is a great deal going on of cultural interest to Americans of all types and varieties. There are paintings, sculpture, lectures, tours, concerts, and films that make the gallery a wonderfully interesting place and a rewarding experience.

If you have not ever visited the National Gallery of Art, you certainly should do so. Find out what a tremendous asset you have as an American citizen to participate in these activities with your family and friends.

We American citizens are fortunate to have one of the outstanding galleries of the world in Washington, D.C., and the hundred million dollars plus that have been donated by your fellow citizens to the National Gallery for your benefit and enjoyment will be a real surprise to you, even if you are no artist, but simply love peace and quiet in beautiful surroundings away from the hubble and bubble of competition, strife, and daily humdrum of workaday chores.

People come from all over the world to enjoy the National Gallery of Art, and we Americans should know of this well managed and outstanding gem on our very doorstep. I enjoy the gallery and its activities so very much myself, that I want my friends in Congress and the citizens of the United States to have this called especially to their personal attention. So I am inserting this coming September program of the National Gallery in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to share my enthusiasm and enjoyment:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, THROUGH SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 3

Painting of the week: Ryder, "Siegfried and the Rhine Maidens" (Mellon collection) gallery 71; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "El Greco and Picasso" (rotunda); Tuesday through Saturday, 1 Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection (rotunda); Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday films: "Art in the Western World" and "Time Enough To See a World," lecture hall, 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10

Painting of the week: Van Dyck, "Paola Adorno, Marchesa Brignole Sale, and Her Son" (Widener collection) gallery 43; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Hals and Manet (rotunda); Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection (rotunda); Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Monday at 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Recent Sculpture—Lost and Found." Guest speaker, Donald B. Goodall, professor of art, University of Texas., Austin, lecture hall, 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, THROUGH SUNDAY. SEPTEMBER 17

Painting of the week: Chardin, "The Kitchen Maid" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 54; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Titian and Renoir (rotunda); Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collecton (rotunda); Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Three Types of Abstract Expressionism." Guest speaker, Carl D. Sheppard, Jr., professor of art history, University of California, Los Angeles; lecture hall, 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24

Sculpture of the week: Agostino di Duccio, "Madonna and Child" (Mellon collection) gallery 6; Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Hobbema and Corot (rotunda); Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collecton (rotunda); Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Tiepolo Drawings." Guest speaker, Graham Reynolds, keeper, department of prints and drawings and paintings, Victoria and Albert Museum, London; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor (music performance trust fund concert); east garden court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, Republic 7-4215, extension 272.

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibition: Tiepolo drawings. A selection of 135 drawings and 8 etchings from the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Galleries 68, 69, 69-A, and 70; September 17 through October 15.

New publication: "Tiepolo Drawings." Exhibition catalog of 50 pages with introduction by Graham Reynolds, 19 illustrations. Size 7¼ by 10 inches. Price $1, postpaid.

New reproduction: A sculpture reproduction of Honoré Daumier's Ratapoil, bronze original in the Rosenwald collection. Height 17¼ inches. Price $50, express collect.

Concerts: The Calouse Gulbenkian Foundation concerts resume on September 24, at 8 p.m. in the East Garden Court.

Sunday lectures: The Sunday lectures, held in the auditorium at 4 p.m., will resume September 10.

LecTour: a radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collection. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturdays 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

The Brakes on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin more nearly coincides with the expressed views of the majority of the Members of the House than any other editorial that has come to my attention, and I am pleased to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE BRAKES ON FOREIGN AID

Rising fear that the Kennedy administration is spreading itself too thin is basic to congressional insurrection on foreign aid.

In the face of the Berlin crisis, prompting billions in new defense expenditures, there is a feeling that the administration is attempting to move too fast, too far, and too soon on too many projects. And that too little attention has been paid to policing up areas where obvious mistakes have been made in the past.

Some of the items which have varying influence on various Members of Congress include:

Opposition in principle to the back-door feature of the 5-year development loan program urged by the President. Under this system the Government simply borrows the money from its own Treasury, instead of getting it by specific appropriation by Congress. The effect is to weaken congressional controls on spending. It is this back-door provision which was wisely knocked out by the Saund amendment before the House passed its version of the bill.

Qualms concerning the broad promises of aid to Latin America, made by Treasury Secretary Dillon at the alliance for progress meeting in Uruguay. The United States appears to have underwritten $20 billion in the next 10 years with at least half of it coming from the Treasury. Congress properly should inquire whether the Latin American nations are living up to their end of the bargain before it puts up this money, or anything like it.

Failure of the administration to provide any dramatic evidence of reform in foreign aid administration, despite the numerous instances of bungling and waste uncovered by congressional investigation.

Continued insistence on expensive new domestic programs combined with a consistently vague idea as to where the money is coming from. Considering the big deficit of last year and the still bigger one expected this year, this attitude threatens inflation and economic disturbance which could severely affect both the will and ability to maintain adequate defenses.

The farflung operations of the administration, worthy though each may be, diffuse the national energies, confuse the public and fail to gain a concentration of attention on

the overwhelmingly important issue of the hour, which is national survival under the new threat of Communist aggression—this year and not some time in the distant future.

Even under the Saund amendment, President Kennedy is offered $1.2 billion in appropriated development loan money for this year, which is all he asked.

In our opinion he should settle for that and be pleased that so much is offered, even if there is a chance that broader authority might be forced through a reluctant Congress, in the final compromise version of the bill. If he comes back next year with a plain record of reform and progress, he need not worry about future financial support.

Textiles: A New England Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appear in the Monthly Business Letter of the New England Merchants National Bank, prepared by the Institute for Business Science, Cambridge, Mass., August 1961:

TEXTILES: A NEW ENGLAND PERSPECTIVE

New Englanders know that the American textile industry has failed to share fully in the growth of the economy since World War II. For example, since 1947: per capita consumption of textile products has declined by more than 20 percent; sales and production have increased less than one-third as much as the average for all manufacturing industry; employment has dropped 33 percent, about 400,000 jobs; more than 300 mills have closed. The gap between textile wages and those of other manufacturing workers has widened—from about 15 percent to more than 30 percent—and textile profits have been consistently below the average for manufacturing industry.

WHAT'S WRONG?

Until 1955, the troubles of the textile industry were largely limited to its northern branch. This was a period of relocation from North to South. The entire industry had operated at a high level of capacity from the beginning of World War II until the 1949 recession. But many mills in the North suffered from obsolescence, and when the bottom dropped out of the textile market they were through. Southern mills, with substantially lower labor costs, took over a growing share of the market.

Since 1955, the major problem has been foreign competition, which has hit mills in all regions. When the textile industries of other countries—notably Japan—were rebuilt after World War II, they installed the latest equipment. Wage rates in Japan and in other countries are far below those in the United States. They easily undersell us in foreign markets. Our export sales have steadily dwindled.

Textile imports into the United States, moreover, have gone up sharply during the past 5 or 6 years. At first, these came largely from Japan. But 5 years ago the Japanese Government agreed to limit shipments to the U.S. market. Imports from other nations have risen markedly since then. The net effect: merely a shift in the sources of imports of cotton cloth. And total textile imports have continued to rise—by more than 600 percent since 1948. Cotton textile imports now amount to about 8 percent and wool imports about 16 percent of output. And carpet imports have jumped even more, amounting to more than one-fourth of total production in this country.

ACTION IN CONGRESS

In 1958, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, chaired a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which made an intensive study of the problems of the domestic textile industry. The subcommittee recommended, among other things, some form of import limitation. But a special interagency committee, representing several executive departments, issued a statement which denied the necessity for Government intervention. Meanwhile, imports continued to mount, and textile employment continued to decline.

Early this year the subcommittee held another set of hearings. It came up with fewer, but sharper, recommendations. It asked for the imposition of mandatory quotas by country and by product category. It also recommended the elimination of the two-price cotton system (under which domestic mills buy cotton at the protected U.S. price, while foreign mills are free to buy it at the lower world price), more realistic depreciation allowances, and a stepped-up program of technical and economic research. Its chairman recommended informally that the President set up a cabinet committee to look into the ills of the textile industry. This was done, with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges as chairman.

The report of the Cabinet committee echoed the Pastore committee's recommendations. But it did not go along with the demand for mandatory quotas. Instead, the President directed the Department of State to arrange a conference of textile importing and exporting countries to seek an international agreement.

This conference was held in Geneva last month, under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). An agreement was reached which placed a moratorium on certain textile exports, and established an international commission to study textile trade problems. The low-wage countries will now export more to Europe, and limit their exports to the United States and Canada. But the conference dealt with cotton textiles and apparel only. Woolens and worsteds, which are today the important segment of the New England textile industry, were not covered.

WHAT OF WOOLENS AND WORSTEDS?

But there is something new this year in the woolen and worsted picture, also. Until January 1961, the Geneva agreements specified a duty of 25 percent on imports equal in quantity to 5 percent of the previous year's domestic output. After this quota had been filled, all other imports entered under a 45-percent duty. This arrangement has now been replaced by a duty of 38 percent on goods valued over $2 per pound, and up to 60 percent on goods valued below $1.27 per pound. The new schedule is designed to limit imports of low-value woolen goods, mainly Italian, which have been hurting American producers.

Woolen and worsted imports during the first quarter of this year were slightly over 14.5 million square yards, significantly below the 32.2 million yards that entered during the same period last year. Last year's total woolen and worsted imports were a record high of 62.3 million yards, up from the 1959 record of 46.6 million. However, it would be wishful thinking to believe that the low level of imports during the first quarter will persist throughout this year. There is a good chance that the year's total will be very close to last year's, if not slightly above it. The rise in duties may prove to have only a limited, temporary effect on imports, and the domestic industry will have to be prepared for more competition from abroad. Apparel makers, too, are threatened with increased foreign competition, as the duties on woven apparel are lower than on cloth.

THE BATTLE AHEAD

Despite any concessions from our foreign competitors, Congress will be under heavy fire when the Trade Agreements Act comes up for extension next year. The textile industry has felt the impact of imports more than other major industries. But others, such as the needle trades, are becoming restive about the rising volume of imports. When the first Pastore report was issued, union leaders in the garment and apparel industries were critical of the recommendation to limit imports. They were in favor of cheaper cloth. But more and more cloth now enters in the form of made-up goods. And in the 1961 hearings, the same union leaders were highly vocal in their demands for protection. For a time they threatened to boycott foreign cloth if the Government did not act.

Like industry, the trade unions are divided on the question of protection. Those in industries which have felt the impact of imports are demanding it. Those in industries with large export markets lean toward free trade. The problem of high-level unemployment here is bound to be brought into the debate over the extension of the trade act.

LONGRUN PROSPECTS

Is the long-term U.S. textile outlook helpless? Not by far. There have been too many premature obituaries of the textile industry. The drop in per capita consumption of cloth is largely due to the loss of industrial markets. Paper, light metals, and plastics have displaced fabrics in many industrial uses. But this cut is now close to the bone. It is not likely to go much further. Stepped-up research will lead to new uses—especially for the versatile new synthetics.

The clothing and household markets will continue to overshadow the industrial market. Here the outlook is bright. Rapid population growth and rising per capita income will insure a greater total demand for textile products. The big question is: How will these markets be divided between foreign and domestic producers?

The startling rise in imports of the past few years will not go unchecked, as the new international agreements indicate. But the long-run survival of the domestic textile industry is basically dependent upon accelerated investment and research. More realistic depreciation allowances are needed to speed mill modernization. Also, technological advances will reduce the labor content of each yard of cloth produced. International labor-cost differentials thus will become less important. There still will be severe competition, but it will be based more on technology and investment than on wage scales.

In any case, however, textile employment is almost certain to drop—whether we buy from low-cost mills abroad or produce cloth in highly automated mills in this country. Hopefully, the necessary adjustments can be made gradually enough to smooth the transition for textile workers. If labor displacement can be geared to normal turnover rates, future job losses in the industry will be much less painful than those we have witnessed in the past decade.

The Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a statement prepared for presentation to the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment on even date herewith:

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment, and trust that I may thereby reflect the views of a substantial segment of my constituents. I think you have embarked upon a most commendable undertaking.

I have a peculiar habit of doing a part of the family shopping for the simple reason that I like to observe the fluctuations of the price index at first hand. I am not above seeking a bargain, but I draw the line on inferior imported merchandise and I do object to the 3 percent that is added on for trading stamps. They are like gambling, in that some people like to indulge and others don't, and I just do not want to be bothered with trading stamps—it's a personal matter. Now, imports, too, are deceptive and usually an inferior article and I have legislation pending to require that the manufacturer's name and address appear on all assembled merchandise, including the textiles. In the first place, a manufacturer is legally responsible for defects in his wares and the absence of a label suggests that somebody is ducking the issue and trying to hide his identity. More important even than that, and my first concern, is the American workman and I would like to see him employed full time. A normal person doesn't want to be unemployed and on a dole, and I for one only want to support him in that manner as a last resort. That is the problem that confronts us here today.

In my locality, textile and wearing apparel is a field of small operations where many family businesses and small plants of national firms predominate. As a result, the impact of low priced imports manufactured in countries with substandard wages and living conditions is widespread. During the past decade, there have been many instances reported where employment opportunities have dropped at an alarming rate. These people did not become unemployed as a result of automation, but because our markets, using words of those in the business, have been "glutted with imports" and merchandise of inferior quality.

Now, we already have the machinery to control imports—it is in the hands of the executive branch of the Government, and the time has arrived to use it. Today, we read that our automobile industry is in trouble and that is not difficult to understand when you look out in the street and observe the number of foreign cars on our highways. They are not superior to our cars, but they are cheap and buyers are demanding economy merchandise, not necessarily the lowest available price but the best buy for the long run.

In my opinion, this is a problem for the experts, and I have wired all of the responsible labor people of my own textile industry for an expression of their views. In closing, I should like to quote the reply of one of the outstanding union representatives in my district and submit that your committee extend serious consideration to the views expressed in the following telegram:

"Congressman J. ERNEST WHARTON,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D.C.:

"The impact of import on our industry, namely, men's shorts and suits, has had a definite damaging effect. The union has proposed several remedies. We take exception to the fact that competitively it is impossible to compete with imports due to low wages and other subminimum conditions. Our manufacturers cannot even make the garments for what an imported garment sells for in this country. Unless definite steps are taken either to set quotas or raise the standard of living in these foreign countries, our workers will be without jobs. We must have reciprocal trade but we must see to it that our workers and manufacturers have competitively equal working conditions.

"Mrs. RITA BAKER,
"Business Agent, Local 186, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO."

How Can Nehru Claim Neutrality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week, during debate on the mutual security bill, I repeated what I have been saying for a number of years, that we ought not give a single penny to so-called neutral nations. I do not know by what stretch of the imagination we can term India's Nehru a neutral. On every possible occasion he lines up with the Soviet Union in any showdown with the free world. He has defended Communist aggression, he was on the Communists side in the takeover of Cuba, and now today, according to the following news story from the Washington Evening Star, he is defending their right to imprison, to seal off East Berlin in defiance of existing treaties and agreements. In spite of Nehru's open hostility to the United States and his affinity for the Khrushchev Communist dictatorship, we will continue to send millions of American tax dollars to maintain his government. I say this is wrong and I am convinced that the American people believe it is wrong and will let Congress know in no uncertain terms, if we continue to insist upon giving the people's money away to those who will gladly contribute to our destruction.

The Washington Star article follows:

NEHRU SEES RED RIGHT ON BERLIN MOVEMENT

NEW DELHI, August 23.—Prime Minister Nehru indicated today he believes the Communists have the right to control movements between West Berlin and East Berlin and between West Germany and Berlin.

Winding up a foreign affairs debate in the upper house of Parliament, Mr. Nehru asserted that Western access to Berlin is "not a right but a concession by the Soviets." German occupation zones only granted the allies the right to occupy Berlin and free access between the Western zones and Berlin was granted by the Soviets a year later.

Access rights were diluted when the joint administration of the city ended after the Berlin blockade, Mr. Nehru said, adding that West Berlin had become the responsibility of NATO and in effect two separate German states exist with each part governing movements as sovereign states normally have the right to do.

Soviet and East German authorities "could easily argue that they can control the movement from East to West Berlin," Mr. Nehru declared.

Although he said "legal rights are confused" in the German question, the comments by the neutralist leader appeared to line him up with the Communists against the West. The United States and the Soviet Union both have tried to win his backing in the Berlin dispute.

Mr. Nehru repeated earlier statements that the crisis should be solved by negotiations instead of troops and threats and that only increased contacts between the two Germanies would bring about peaceful reunification.

Lake Erie Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress has gone on record for legislation, passed only several months ago, to double the Federal effort to assist communities in constructing necessary sanitation plants in their respective communities and to tighten the laws with reference to pollution of our navigable waterways.

One of the biggest problems for residents of my district, and neighboring districts, is pollution of Lake Erie, one of our largest navigable waterways. Therefore, I was very pleased to note the following editorial in the Painesville Telegraph of Painesville, Ohio, commending the U.S. Corps of Engineers for their recent action in asking assistance of interested citizens in preventing such pollution of Lake Erie. The entire southern shore of Lake Erie, especially that portion located in Lake and Ashtabula Counties, has become a real water wonderland catering to many thousands of summer visitors each year. It is essential that the pollution of Lake Erie, as well as the other Great Lakes, be stopped immediately. I think the action of the Corps of Engineers is a step in the right direction.

The editorial follows:

KEEPING LAKE ERIE TIDY

There was a day when polluting water and waterways was no problem. Today, however, in an area becoming more crowded every day and with water resources becoming increasingly popular for recreation, pollution is a very real problem for every citizen.

We were reminded of this the other day by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, launching with renewed vigor a program of assistance in curbing pollution, in this case, of our navigable waterways.

It's such a big, big lake, some folks think, surely a bit of garbage over the side of the

boat won't hurt anybody. If you multiply this rationalization thousands of times—taking into account the throngs of people who ride the rim of Lake Erie in their pleasure craft in every sector—the inevitable result becomes obvious: First-rate pollution of a real water wonderland.

The Corps of Engineers asks any citizen who sees such an act committed to report this violation to the U.S. Coast Guard by time, date, name of vessel, location, and if possible, obtain a sample of the material discharged as evidence. The latter sounds like quite a nuisance (and is not a "must"), but can be understood when the penalty for conviction is $500 fine and 30 days in jail at the minimum or $2,500 fine and 1 year in prison at the maximum.

The Engineers mean business—and thank heavens they do.

Automation, Jobless Concern of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 8, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the business of the Nation continues to improve and the reports of greater productivity increase, the realization that our unemployment rate is not decreasing is most disheartening.

More and more people are recognizing the need for Government leadership and action in seeking a solution to our structural unemployment problem.

I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent statement of the National Council of Churches as reported in the Pittsburgh Press on August 19 in which they urged retraining of our workers, and said that the joblessness caused by automation is the concern of the churches of the Nation:

AUTOMATION, JOBLESS CONCERN OF CHURCHES

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 19.—In a spirited message of good will to the Nation's labor force expressing concern for the unemployed, the National Council of Churches today called for "positive and determined" efforts to bring about "full production and full employment aimed at providing decent living conditions the world over."

The council's department of the church and economic life, in its 44th annual labor Sunday message, stressed that "automation is of critical concern to the churches" and "large-scale unemployment or long continued unemployment for persons able and willing to work is intolerable."

The message has the approval of the executive board of the division of Christian life and work of the national council, according to Rev. Cameron P. Hall, executive director of the department of the church and economic life. Mr. Hall said it is requested that the message be read in the churches on labor Sunday, September 3.

Recognizing that "automation—the invention and use of machines that reduce drudgery and multiply production—has increased opportunities," the text of the statement pointed out that nevertheless problems have been created which "concern us all."

Neither employers nor unions can solve alone the problem of maintaining an adequate level of demand for goods and services to keep our entire work force employed. "This task," the statement said, "involved fiscal and monetary policies and other economic measures. Only in a context of full employment can the problems created by automation be adequately met."

The national council indicated that concern for others in need at home and overseas is a factor which "our Christian faith" demands of us.

Referring to the "increased capacity of our factories and our farms," the message called for "bold new thought and action" in the distribution of "our potential abundance to those in need within and beyond our borders."

To achieve "full employment within our new technology" will require "the best creative thinking and action on the part of everyone, including labor, management, agriculture, government, and the Christian churches," the statement said.

Urging retraining and relocation of workers, better provisions for retirement and transfer of benefits, the National Council called on "all segments of the community" to assume "responsibility for such programs, even as labor must be willing to accept new techniques."

Protecting Rights, Benefits, etc., for Recalled Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in the coming months, as the United States strengthens its Armed Forces to more effectively counter the threats of communism, there will be called to active duty a large number of young men, and some not so young, who are members of the Reserve forces.

I am certain the country is heartened and grateful for the spirit in which those recruits who have been advised of possible recall have responded. Aware of the personal hardships that will be worked upon them, they have not sought to evade their duty.

In addition to those members of the Reserve forces who will be called the enlistments of many individuals on active duty will be extended as will the duty tours of many officers.

We should be mindful that many of the reservist will be coming to active duty for the second time in their lifetime and for some it will be the third tour of active duty, men who served in World War II and during the Korean war.

I need not remind the Congress of the hardships that were worked in so many thousands of cases in the hurried callup for Korea. The great financial stress that resulted in many cases. The thousands of men who had to abandon successful commercial ventures and good paying positions in business and industry.

I am mindful, still of my own expenses over having to give up a budding law practice for my second call to active duty during the Korean conflict. I remind you of these instances, caused in large measure by the unpreparedness of the military departments for a partial mobilization, not because there is the least reluctance on the part of ready reservists to respond in this or any emergency, but to assure that the Congress and the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government will act promptly to see that hardships are held to a minimum in the current partial mobilization.

We recognize that a citizen who is in the Ready Reserve is there either because under the law he has a military obligation or because he desires to serve as a citizen-soldier, knowing full well that he is liable to orders for active duty in such emergencies as presently exist. Nonetheless, his country owes him the consideration to which he is so well entitled.

We should be mindful, also, that the sacrifice which the President calls for in this fight to secure our liberty is not intended, in spirit or in fact, to rest upon the shoulders of a few. It will, of course, rest heavier upon some, as is always the case, but it must rest in some measure upon us all.

While the numbers advised of possible orders for active duty is relatively small, it may well be necessary to increase these numbers, and I am not so certain that we should not already be doing so, before this crisis has been surmounted.

I have asked the appropriate committee chairman to call for a review of existing laws which are designed to protect veterans of active service and to benefit them for service rendered. I know that there have been introduced several new pieces of legislation and I am currently drafting bills to provide certain benefits and protection to which I feel reservists, especially those being called upon for the second or third time, are entitled.

I submit that the Congress should take steps now to provide for specific financial aid to be available to assist persons being called to active duty upon the completion of that duty. These should include business loans, similar to those available to veterans of the Korean war and new type guaranteed loans for reservists who, because of recall, will be required to liquidate a business. I would also extend to those reservists called up in this instance the same educational benefits granted World War II and Korean veterans.

Since many reservists, especially those with large families, will be forced to live during these tours of active duty in higher rental quarters than they would otherwise acquire and will during this period of service incur other than normal family living expenses, and will in all probability leave the service either with increased debts or with limited funds to tide them over in the period necessary to establish themselves and their families in civilian life, I urge that mustering out payments be made to ease the financial hardships.

Steps should be taken to extend job protection to these veterans who may have already served the 4 years of active duty by making job protection under the law applicable for a reasonable period following the termination of the latest period of active duty of a reservist.

Furthermore the Federal Government should do more to assure that these

reservists have full knowledge of all benefits and protections available under the law.

I feel that these and other steps to protect the interests of those called are the least we can do for those dedicated Americans who are being asked to make a far greater sacrifice than are the vastly greater number of our citizens.

"What Goes on Here—Cyrus S. Eaton, the Friend of the Kremlin"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we have read much about Cyrus S. Eaton, a man of great wealth, accumulated under our free capitalistic sytem in the United States; a man who was raised in an area of complete freedom so unlike that of Soviet Russia under the Communist regime of the past 40-odd years.

The editorial I am inserting herewith, was published in one of New York's leading newspapers, the New York World Telegram, under date of August 21, 1961 and written by Henry J. Taylor, well-known journalist and columnist.

I cannot for the life of me, nor can anyone else that I know, understand how Mr. Eaton can be such a close friend of the leaders of the Soviet Union, who are the exponents of the Communist conspiracy to control and enslave all the peoples of the world. What type of mentality can say in the country of freedom in which he accumulated his wealth, that Soviet Russia wants peace. Surely he must realize and know that the peace that Soviet Russia speaks about is that type of peace that will come only when Soviet Russia has enslaved the entire world. This is not the kind of peace that any American can or should visualize. The only peace that we will ever recognize will be that of freedom of all people.

The editorial follows:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

(By Henry Taylor)

Cyrus S. Eaton, the very rich crony of the U.S.S.R., continues to play a thoroughly damaging part in the life of our country. Technically, we are not at war. But if he is not giving aid and comfort to Russia, by what conceivable grave definition can that grave phrase be used?

Our national peril is officially declared. We arm, draft our men, serve notice we will fight for survival. Yet Mr. Eaton finds occasion after occasion to show his support of the Kremlin and display to the world dramatic approval of Soviet activities and of Khrushchev personally.

This is the man I saw rush up to Khrushchev at Orly Field in Paris to wring his hand in congratulations after the Red leader has insulted our President, our Nation and all Americans so violently a few hours before. In fact, Mr. Eaton flew all the way from Cleveland, he said, to do it. May I ask what we would have done if any American had done all this for Hitler?

Khrushchev pounded on the world with his shoe at the United Nations in New York and threatened annihilation of the free world by Red rockets. Mr. Eaton promptly gave him and his iron-fisted entourage a banquet, and a eulogy, at the Waldorf-Astoria. He described Khrushchev's completely phony disarmament plan as the "most statesmanlike utterance in my lifetime."

And now Mr. Eaton could hardly wait for Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin to reach Cuba on his propaganda tour before inviting him and other accompanying Russians to ply that trade up north; Alan Shepard and Virgil Grissom at the same time so properly declining Mr. Eaton's invitation to help the Cleveland tycoon give this Red charade an added push.

What goes on here?

This is the man the Kremlin gave perhaps the greatest badge of dishonor an American can receive—the insidious Lenin Peace Prize. It was after the Soviet butchery of Hungary. Yet Mr. Eaton announced in Moscow, "I am deeply appreciative of this high honor."

Others point to Henry Ford, Sr.'s lapse into the foolishness of his peace ship in World War I. But Mr. Ford's fantasy was whimsy as pure as driven snow and a single sad tour into dreamland. Mr. Eaton's operations are completely different in character and objective, are continuous and relentless and bear on our battle to shield ourselves and the free world from the known menaces of the U.S.S.R. and Communist imperialism.

Khrushchev has cited Mr. Eaton's "realism" in an official report to the Supreme Soviet Council. Mr. Eaton is repeatedly quoted in Pravda, Izvestia, Current Digest, the New Times (distributed throughout the Communist world in nine languages) Kommunist, the political organ of the Soviet Party, and Red radio outlet's which bounce his words off the raw iron girders of the Soviet police state.

In an article Mr. Eaton wrote for the Moscow magazine, the Progressive, he asserts that tension between the United States and Soviet Russia and the threat of nuclear war are primarily America's fault.

He states that America is "obsessed" by war. "I am firmly convinced the Russians want peace," he says. He insists we have not met the U.S.S.R. half way. He writes of America's "swollen pride," "boasting," "arrogance," "truculence," and says "someone will take up the challenge." He disparages the forces indispensable to our security and the free world and heaps contempt on our global battle to check the totalitarian forces he champions. He lavishes praise on Sino-Soviet actions, global performances, programs, and purposes. "Let's stop baiting Russia," he says.

Japanese-American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of reading an outstanding newspaper editorial that was inspired when the editor attended a district conference of the Japanese-American Citizens League. This editorial caused me to remember some of the wonderful experiences that I have had with Japanese-American citizens.

I remember some 20 years ago when my father was the high school football coach in the beautiful little town of St. Anthony, Idaho, and the friendship that we had with the Harry K. Hosoda family. Harry's son, Leo, was an outstanding high school fullback, even though he wasn't as big as most waterboys. What he lacked in size Leo certainly made up for in courage and enthusiasm.

Then there was Paul, another son, who followed in the footsteps of his brother Leo as an athlete. Paul was also very active in the swimming and recreational programs in the community and was a friend to all.

Just a year ahead of me in school was a daughter, Mabel. I will always remember Mabel as a very pretty little girl who always looked exceptionally clean and neat and was very friendly and kind—something that a grade school student didn't always expect from members of the class immediately ahead of him.

During the 8 years our family lived in St. Anthony, it was an annual ritual for Harry Hosoda to bring around a big, beautiful bunch of crisp celery each Thanksgiving. I am sure that there has never been a family living in America to whom Thanksgiving meant any more than it did to the Hosodas. They were the type of family that made the Japanese-American Citizens' League what it is today.

We in Idaho are extremely proud to have thousands of Japanese-American farmers, businessmen, and laborers. They are some of the finest citizens in our State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include this thought-provoking editorial by Drury Brown, editor of the Blackfoot News, with my remarks today:

JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS KNOW WHY

(By Drury Brown)

Saturday evening it was my privilege to be a guest at the concluding session of the Intermountain District Conference of the Japanese-American Citizens League in Pocatello.

Included among the sparkling, well-dressed, cultured people who very obviously were having a grand time were a number of friends and neighbors of Blackfoot.

The people attending appeared to be another cross section of America, the sort that you might see at a district conference of Kiwanis or Rotary International.

In the youth section you were able to recognize some of the youngsters who excel in scholarship, in music, art, and student activities in the Blackfoot, Snake River, Pocatello and Idaho Falls High Schools.

It was a self-assured, proud and happy group whose only concern was that their guests might enjoy themselves to the same degree they were.

The Japanese-American Citizens League must be an unusual organization to inspire such enthusiasm among people who live as busy lives as I know they do, I thought.

Then we were ushered into the banquet hall of the Student Union Building and the banquet began. A master of ceremonies who perhaps might be described as an Anglo-Saxon took over the microphone to welcome the members and guests.

A moment later one of the speakers he had intrduced in an aside to the audience said: "You may wonder about the reason for a person not of Japanese ancestry presiding at a JACL banquet. The answer is that we

as JACL members do not believe in discrimination."

Awards were made to those members who in the junior and senior divisions of the organization had performed distinguished service.

As one speaker after another told how the JACL had served its people in the time of their travail you began to understand the devotion of its membership.

Stirring moments came with the awards by Hero Shiosaki of plaques to three non-Japanese men who unflinchingly stood by the Japanese people when it was not popular to do so.

One so recognized was a courageous bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ, LDS, Sam A. Dunn, Tyhee, who in a community where a number of Japanese lived and where, because of it, anti-Japanese feeling ran high, endured persecution and threats while championing the Japanese people and permitting them the use of the church over which he presided.

There was a plaque presented to Edwin A. Volker, a courageous motor-dealer in Pocatello, who persisted in hiring Nisei after the war started despite threats and boycotts, and who followed on a pin-pointed map the progress in Italy of the 442d Regiment Combat Team in which the boys he had known were advancing at the cost of their blood.

There was the plaque presented in absentia to the blind U.S. Attorney, John A. Carver, by Tommy Miyasaki, a veteran of the 442d Combat Team who was blinded in the service of his country. The citation stated that while the Governor of the State of Idaho promptly forgot his promise, made before Pearl Harbor to the Japanese, the U.S. Attorney, now Justice Carver, never wavered.

One was stirred as they heard the story of the birth of the 442d Regiment Combat Team, the famed outfit known to the rest of the Army as the "Go for Broke" unit.

The Nisei after deciding that the Japanese people could prove their loyalty only through the shedding of their blood, asked to be released from their concentration camps to form an all-Japanese unit. No assignment was too hazardous for them.

Some of the young men who survived the 307-percent casualties suffered by the combat team are now among the businessmen and farmers of our community. (Others rest in Arlington National Cemetery.)

Then it was time for the speaker of the evening, "Mr. JACL," otherwise, Mike Masaoka, JACL representative in Washington.

For sheer presentation of what patriotism involves and how citizenship is earned, few have better understanding or ability of expression than he.

He congratulated the hearers with having won acceptance as citizens and for having proven their patriotism. "But now that you have arrived how do you feel about other minorities," he said.

What about the struggle of the Negro for citizenship?

"Are you willing to stand up and be counted?" he asked.

He recounted how during wartime he knew the inside of a Louisiana jail and knew how it was to have a howling mob on the outside clamoring for his blood.

"How do the Negroes feel? What is happening to the freedom riders once happened to us. How many of us in their time of travail or in the time of travail of any other minority group are willing to make our voices heard?

"Let us never forget that there were Americans who in our hour of darkness lighted the path for us.

"Are you willing to extend to every other American the rights of citizenship that you now demand? Are you willing to fight to extend it to all other Americans?"

He recounted how during the late war Japanese-American and Negro-American troops were denied the right to eat with other American troops while the enemy, German prisoners-of-war sat at the table.

He recited how discrimination remains in America; the discrimination in Colorado employment laws; the miscegenation law in Utah; the alien land law in Washington; the anti-Mongolian law prohibiting the right of non-Caucasians to vote or serve on juries in Idaho, the repeal of which will be voted on in the next general election.

"Regardless of what others may say, do the right thing. There was only one Buddha; there was only one Christ; there are in the Nation only 25,000 Quakers, but all have had an influence out of all proportion to their numbers," he concluded.

To at least one observer who always has taken his citizenship for granted along with the circumstance of having been born with a light skin, the conference was en enlightening experience.

Here were people who knew what it meant to be hated, who had proven themselves to be citizens of the highest order. They combined pride in ancestry with pride in their accomplishments. They knew how their citizenship had been bought.

How many of the rest of us do?

I Fly the Flex Wing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Ryan Reporter of August 1961:

I FLY THE FLEX WING

(By Lou Everett)

There had never been an aircraft resembling it. In an era of missiles, rockets, space vehicles, supersonic fighters and bombers, this strange-appearing creation seemed incongruous. But when I sat on the "Flex Wing" platform for the first time, I experienced the sensation of initial discovery which must have gripped the Wright brothers, Glenn Curtiss, and the other pioneers of flight.

For despite its deceptively primitive appearance, here was a vehicle geared to the space age—an adaptation of ancient principles to such 20th century applications as high altitude recovery of rocket boosters, space craft reentry, remote controlled reconnaissance drones, and helicopter-towed gliders to carry troops, cargo, or fuel.

This was Leonardo de Vinci brought up to date by Francis M. Rogallo, National Aeronautics and Space Administration scientist, whose flexible wing concept so intrigued Ryan that a test bed was designed by our aerospace engineers and manufactured in the company's main plant at Lindbergh Field, San Diego.

Rogallo had investigated the flexible wing's unique characteristics through wind tunnel and unmanned model studies and tests at NASA's Langley Research Center. Now came the start of the payoff—full-scale flights with the research test bed. With no precedent to draw from, this arrow-shaped, kite-like object was to provide the data available only from manned flight.

Hence that feeling of approaching an exciting new frontier when I examined the "Flex Wing" for the first time.

Seated in the open on a slab of aluminum suspended beneath a wing, produced by a sailmaker, I experienced the same sort of exhilaration Orville Wright must have felt when his crude craft leaped briefly from the earth.

The test bed of the "Flex Wing" utilizes such off-the-shelf items as a control wheel from a World War II bomber, a seat from an old light plane, and foot pedals from a more recent light plane.

The wing is Mylar bonded to nylon. It hangs loosely between an aluminum longitudinal keel and two tubular leading edges flexibly joined at the front end of the keel. The wing, with a span of approximately 40 feet, is much like a boat sail in that its lifting power is derived from the flow of air which inflates it.

Suspended beneath the wing is the open-frame body with a four-wheel landing gear. A 180-horsepower Lycoming engine is mounted at the aft end of the fuselage, behind the pilot. The entire machine weighs about 1,500 pounds, including instrumentation.

Among our first discoveries during the taxi runs was the need for relocating the wing pitch control pivot point. This is a critical feature, since the "Flex Wing's" control system functions without conventional hinged surfaces and flaps. The principle is the same as that used by the German glider pioneer, Otto Lilienthal, in the control of his hang gliders.

Lift and drag forces of the wing must pass through or close to the control pivot point in order to keep the control forces from being excessively high. Hence, proper location of the wing control pivot point as related to the wing itself is vital. The body of the "Flex Wing" swings from hinges between the pylon and the wing keel. I move the fuselage forward, backward or sideward relative to the wing by manipulating the control yoke. This moves the horizontal position of the center of gravity relative to the center of pressure on the wing, causing moments which make the wing seek a new angle.

The first liftoff would answer many more questions. As I continued the taxi tests, these questions raced through my mind. Would the "Flex Wing" pitch up, roll over, "snake" back and forth, or just fly smoothly straight ahead?

Sitting so vulnerably out in the open, I thought:

Nothing like this has ever been herded through the air by man before. The closest to this was the hang glider experiments by Otto Lilienthal in Germany and Octave Chanute in this country, and they weren't very successful.

Speeds are building up in taxi tests. That first liftoff could come at any time, ease back on the control column, it's getting light, we're airborne.

It responds nicely to pitch control, a little slow to respond but we expected that because this is characteristic of the delta wing at high angles of attack.

My sensations are different from those experienced in any other flying machine. They can best be explained by imagining yourself sitting in a rocking chair controlled by a giant hand which occasionally rocks you sideways as well as back and forth.

The "Flex Wing" test bed is primarily a two-control vehicle, in that it has only pitch and roll control. Although lacking a rudder for conventional directional control, the plane has high directional stability. It has no tendency to sideslip; thus, when I bank, this stabilizing force keeps the nose coming around in a turn. For rising and descending, the wing is pitched relative to the platform by use of the conventional control column and wheel similar to that on most light planes.

There is no similarity with vertical velocity as is associated with the attitude change in conventional aircraft. You feel an up and down motion integrated with for-

ward velocity, similar to that in a helicopter, inasmuch as the test bed remains in a relatively level attitude.

As for the rocking sensation, I quickly realized—and this was confirmed by motion pictures of the early flights—that this motion is confined to the platform, confirming the fact that the machine as a whole has strong stability. The wing itself has a rock-steady attribute built into its high camber, delta planform.

As a result of our early flight tests, we have progressed through what can be considered a natural course of design changes and development. Most of the changes made were directly associated with proper location of the wing control pivot point as related to the wing itself.

It must be remembered that this test bed is not to be considered even an experimental airplane. It is a research vehicle used to prove basic principles which can be applied to a wide variety of missions of manned and unmanned vehicles that may be powered or unpowered. The applications of the Flex Wing range from small, powered reconnaissance drones maneuvered by remote control to huge, unpowered wings capable of recovering payloads and rocket boosters of 50 tons or more.

As our flight tests of the research vehicle for the U.S. Army Transportation Research Command continue, we will be answering the big question—

Can a flexible wing flying machine utilizing control by shifting the center of gravity be adequately controlled for all potential applications?

All indications to date point to an affirmative answer.

Inherent stability, extremely low storage volume, inexpensive lightweight construction which allows more effective wing area per unit-weight than a conventional wing, greater lift for a given wing weight—these are qualities of the Flex Wing we are proving in the current test program.

And in many ways I have the same pioneering feeling that America's first astronaut, Cmdr. Alan Shepard, must have had on his initial flight in another unconventional vehicle, the Mercury capsule.

Where Do We Stand on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how do we really feel about human rights? This is a serious question we Americans should be asking ourselves as we stand by, apparently helpless, as the rights of the East Germans are ruthlessly trampled under the crushing heel of communism. Where are the champions of liberty who bleed for the freedom riders in our Southern States, who weep for the people of Africa, but who are calm in the face of Soviet cruelties in East Berlin? Can any American read the following article by David Lawrence in today's Washington Evening Star without feeling a sense of shame at our apparent inability to take firm and determined action to halt the further degradation of human beings at the hands of the Communists? In my opinion the time has long since passed for the administration to set forth a clear and firm policy for putting an end to Communist aggression anywhere in the world.

SAD DAYS FOR WESTERN DIPLOMACY—UNITED NATIONS SEEN FAILING IN BERLIN FOR NOT ACTING ON RED AGGRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—Western diplomacy is floundering. It hasn't come up with a solution as to the policy it should pursue. But the simple fact is that more than 17 million human beings in East Germany have just been imprisoned in a huge concentration camp by order of the Soviet Government. They cannot see their relatives or friends who happen to live even just across the streets of the same city. They are sent to jail for looking at a bulletin board giving news of the world.

Meanwhile, the great organization known as the United Nations is floundering, too. It is supposed to be interested in violations of human rights. It is supposed to be concerned when there is a threat to world peace. The U.N. has special meetings when there is a crisis, but it is doing nothing about the Berlin problem. It is strangely silent as the many erstwhile champions of freedom and human liberty hesitate to use the forum to expose to the world the hypocrisies of Soviet colonialism.

There is no question about the violation of human rights. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON went to Berlin to tell the people there of America's moral support. President Kennedy, in a message to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, said the closing of the East Berlin border restricting the movement of refugees underlined the struggle "for the protection of freedom, for human rights and for the principle of the self-determination of people." But here is a Reuters New Service item of Monday of this week:

"An East Berlin court jailed five men for terms ranging from three-and-a-half years' hard labor to 8 months' imprisonment. They were arrested on August 13 and 14 when demonstrating near the sector border against the East German border controls."

When an electric sign was erected in West Berlin a few days ago to carry in big letters the news of the world, persons in East Berlin who tried to read it from a distance were arrested for "demonstrating." East Berlin police have started, moreover, to move families out of houses which look out on West Berlin streets.

The instances cited are but a few of the many evidences of cruelty and inhumanity imposed on the East German people. If they had been freedom riders, they might have gotten sympathy in certain parts of the world. If they had been Tunisians in North Africa, they would have been applauded for exercising their right to self-determination. Indeed, Tunisia is a member of the U.N. and states her case, but the West German Republic isn't. The Soviet Union keeps out the West Germans.

There is beginning to develop in different parts of Europe an impression now that the Western governments fear the Moscow government's power and influence and that they feel it is risky even to debate the Berlin problem in the United Nations, where the Communists have lined up a sizable bloc in the last few years.

Brave words are uttered in the press about the sympathy of the United States Government for the East German people, but there are no signs that the Western governments are ready to make an issue of the flagrant violation of human rights in East Germany. It is vaguely hinted that the legalisms of the wartime agreements about Berlin some day will be negotiated or brought to the U.N. for debate, but the obvious issue—the human rights question—seems to have been sidetracked altogether as a basis for action in either the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or both.

The two major political parties in West Germany have called for a U.N. debate on the Berlin issue. Mayor Brandt of West Berlin appealed personally by letter to President Kennedy to ask for action by the United Nations. Chancellor Adenauer said to the West German parliament a few days ago:

"He who tramples the right of self-determination with his feet must count on the deep contempt of all the people in the world who respect the Charter of the United Nations. There is only one possibility in placing Soviet-German relations on a new basis: The German people must be given the right to form a free and independent government that can speak and act for the whole German nation."

What cause could be more pertinent to world progress and world peace than the right of 17 million human beings to decide for themselves by whom and how they shall be governed? One wonders why the Western governments are shying away from the basic issue. By so doing, they may lose the prestige they have always enjoyed as champions of human liberty and freedom.

Invasion of American Rights on the Part of Arab League Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the assault upon the rights of Americans has become flagrant in Berlin, in Israel and other countries of the world. Our President has indicated with firmness our resolve to protect our rights and the rights of American citizens wherever they may be violated or infringed upon. The American Jewish Committee of the Institute of Human Relations headed by the brilliant Edwin J. Lukas, whom I have known for many years, and with whom I have worked on various aspects against discrimination, has forwarded me a brochure on the invasion of American rights on the part of the Arab League Nations, which I believe the readers will read with interest and with concern. The article follows:

INVASION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS ON THE PART OF ARAB LEAGUE NATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The Government of the United States has always regarded the protection of the essential rights and liberties of its citizens as its prime responsibility. Until recently, the conduct of America's foreign relations reflected firm commitment to this position; it was known throughout the world that actions impairing the dignity and equal rights of Americans, for whatever reason and in whatever land, would not be tolerated by the United States.

Of late, however, alarming departures have been noted. Most of the countries affiliated with the Arab League[1] have been permitted

[1] The Arab League consists of 10 countries: Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic and Yemen.

to impose discriminatory measures which interfere with the rights of Americans.

The purpose of these measures, which are part of a boycott against Israel, is not germane to the present discussion. Regardless of intent, it is in effect a boycott against Americans. This is the overriding fact.

To weigh the impact in terms of inconvenience would miss the crux of the matter. For even if the disadvantage suffered by Americans were negligible, there would still remain a loss which no self-respecting nation can afford—the loss of integrity and prestige incurred by submissiveness to affronts.

That our Government is pursuing a course degrading to the dignity of the United States transcends all other issues and requires close scrutiny by the American people.

Study of the situation reveals four main findings:

1. The Arab League nations have invaded American rights. They have blacklisted American citizens whose travel routes, religious beliefs or personal opinions do not conform with Arab League dictates. Agents of Arab governments operating on American soil have promoted discriminatory practices which are unlawful in many of our States. Americans subjected to these indignities include citizens of all faiths.

2. Our Government has accommodated itself to these and similar measures, even to the extent of yielding to Arab bias in contracts for foreign aid shipments and in personnel assignments to Arab territory.

3. The accommodation of our Government to intrusions upon its sovereignty and discriminatory abuses visited upon its citizens is without justification in American law or tradition.

4. Protests and other critical pronouncements of representatives bodies—the Congress of the United States, the legislatures of several States, the Republican and Democratic Parties—have not resulted in remedial action by our Federal Government.

These, in brief, are the facts. They point to the urgent need for informed public discussion and firm public insistence that our Government immediately reassert the principles of morality and law that have guided American foreign policy and protected American rights in the past.

THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT IN OPERATION

At its initiation in 1951, the Arab League boycott was applied to companies with branches in Israel or otherwise doing business there, and firms and individuals engaging in trade or commerce with that country. Since then, the scope of the boycott has been vastly extended. Specific terms of the regulations, made known piecemeal for several years, were not officially published until 1958.[1a]

Today, procedures of intimidation and discrimination directed from offices in Damascus, Syria (UAR), and the Sheikdom of Kuwait, and applied in varying degrees by Arab League governments, include: [2]

1. Blacklisting many American companies having Americans of the Jewish faith among their officers, owners, directors, or even personnel.

2. Refusing visas to American citizens of the Jewish faith and forbidding them to disembark in some Arab League countries.

3. Preventing American servicemen and civilian employees of the Jewish faith from serving at an air base built in an Arab country with American funds and maintained by the United States.

Our Government, like many others, asserts that it opposes these acts. We have also committed ourselves to aid the economic development of all countries of the Middle East, including Israel.[3]

Thus, American citizens find themselves subjected to measures instituted by foreign powers in contravention of U.S. policy. Moreover, since the boycott is partially prosecuted in this country, we are confronted with a situation in which American principles are flouted by representatives of foreign governments on American soil.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN BUSINESS

In some cases, companies doing no business in Israel are nevertheless subject to the boycott if their management personnel includes Jews. This policy has been in effect since 1956. On March 5 of that year Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, contained the following report:

"Saudi Arabia intends to boycott all Jewish or Jewish-directed firms from trading with that country, according to information received by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.

"This new policy greatly extends the provisions of the existing boycott against firms having branches, assembly plants, or general agents in Israel, as well as firms having shares in Israeli companies.

"Implementation of the new policy normally will be accomplished by Saudi Arabian consulates, who are responsible for legalization of commercial invoices and certificates of origin."

Sometimes it is required, as by Kuwait, that the absence of Jews in American companies trading with Arab countries be certified by an agency of the U.S. Government; sometimes efforts are made to enlist the cooperation of local chambers of commerce.

Fortune magazine informed its readers of the policy as follows:

"Businessmen throughout the world were in receipt some months ago of a strange questionnaire. Dated Cairo, Egypt, the questionnaire pressed them for information on whether their firms were guilty of having Jewish ownership or participation. To such shenanigans has Egypt's Nasser been reduced." [4]

The following questions, excerpted from that "strange questionnaire," are now asked orally and surreptitiously by Arab representatives:

"Do you have any Jewish employees in your company; if yes, how many and what are the positions held by them?

"Are there any Jews on your Board of Directors as members?

"Are any of your managers or branch managers Jews; if yes, please give the names of the department headed by such a man?

"Is any of the persons authorized to sign on behalf of your company a Jew?

"What is the number of Jewish laborers in your factories and offices?"

Most American businessmen deem such questions impertinent. Moreover, in localities where State or municipal legislation forbids inquiring into the religious affiliations of prospective employees, the Arab inquisition is tantamount to law breaking. Some companies which now transact no business with the Middle East and are not presently bothered by the boycott may well be reluctant to employ Jews, at least in prominent positions, lest they be barred from new markets in the future.

While management executives find it exceedingly distasteful to be placed in the position of appearing indifferent to basic American principles, those succumbing to Arab pressures take the view that they are in business for profit; the welfare of stockholders and employees is at stake. It is further argued that individual executives and companies can hardly be expected to sacrifice business interests in order to uphold national principles and policies which their government affirms in word but not in deed.

In several instances, to be sure, the government has spoken. Thus, in 1956, when the boycott was extended to companies having Jewish ownership or participation, the New York office of the U.S. Department of Commerce announced: "The United States does not recognize the boycott." [5] But the truth of the matter is that the United States has taken no effective action.

INTERFERENCE WITH AMERICAN TRAVEL

Among the most discriminatory acts of the Arab League is the closing of some Arab gateways, sea, land, and air, to American citizens of Jewish faith.

Refusal of some Arab airports to permit passengers to disembark is in defiance of established custom. It is normal procedure in civilized countries that when a plane is required to stop en route, whether for unexpected repair or some prearranged purpose, the passengers may rest in the airport until time to resume their trip. By common consent of all who maintain air travel facilities, the traveler has come to expect this hospitality.

Yet in recent years, officials of some Arab airports have forced Jewish passengers—including, of course, American Jews—to remain in their planes. Among the airports where Americans were, until recently, thus affronted is the commercial terminal in Cairo, Egypt, formerly known as Payne Field, which the United States transferred to the Egyptian Government after World War II, when it was no longer needed as a military installation.

A typical incident is related by a veteran of the Women's Army Corps, born in Washington, D.C., who returned from a trip around the world. Flying from Bombay, India, to Rome, her plane made an unexpected stop at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. Upon returning home, she wrote to the Washington Post:

"I remained on the plane during the time it stopped in Dhahran, but could not help but be repulsed by the indignities that Americans and personnel of an American airline are subjected to by the Arab countries. I hope the Department of State will certainly take early and effective action to discourage such degrading practices against American citizens." [6]

Expressing sympathy at the annoyance caused by this experience, the Department of State declared that "the United States, as a matter of policy, does not condone discriminatory treatment of its citizens by foreign governments * * * the Department of State has and will continue to make official representations against any instances of such discrimination which come to its attention."

But there is no indication in this or any other instance that a forthright protest was lodged.

Our Government's passivity in these situations flies in the face of Federal legislation reflecting American policy with respect to travel here and abroad. The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 contains this provision:

"No air carrier or foreign air carrier shall make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, port, locality, or description of traffic in air transportation in any respect whatsoever or subject any particular person, port, locality, or description of traffic in

---

[1a] "The Truth About the Arab Boycott." Arab News and Views, Arab Information Center, New York, Feb. 5, 1958.

[2] A supplement on other aspects of the boycott is available on request.

[3] Sec. 142 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides that assistance shall not be furnished to any nation unless such nation has agreed to join in promoting international understanding and good will, and maintaining world peace; take such action as may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate causes of international tension.

[4] Fortune, August 1957, p. 80.

[5] The New York Times, Jan. 26, 1956.

[6] The Washington Post, May 23, 1961, p. A12.

air transportation to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever." [7]

The issuance of visas by some Arab governments adheres to a similar discriminatory pattern. Americans generally encounter no difficulty unless their passports carry an Israel visa, in which case they are denied entry by most Arab League countries, especially those neighboring Israel. But Americans who are identified as Jewish are automatically barred from Jordan, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia.

Application of these bans to stage and screen stars, including those who have Jewish husbands or wives, or have manifested friendliness toward Israel, has attracted much publicity. Among the many performers blacklisted are Edward G. Robinson, Danny Kaye, and Jerry Lewis.

THE TRADITIONAL PROTECTION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS

American history records numerous attempts by foreign powers to discriminate against American citizens. The resistance of our Government has been, until recent years, consistent and unequivocal. To cite a few examples:

Austria: In 1885, the Austro-Hungarian Government protested the appointment of Anthony M. Keiley, of Virginia, an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States, on the ground that he was married to a Jewish woman.

Replying on behalf of our Government, Secretary of State Bayard declared:

"It is not within the power of the President nor of the Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal in the United States, to take or even hear testimony, or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

"To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disenfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our constitution of government was intended to secure." [8]

Although Mr. Keiley resigned his commission, the United States declined to make another appointment. For several years thereafter only a chargé d'affaires represented our country in Austria.

Russia: A succession of American officials firmly rejected efforts of the Imperial Russian Government to apply its anti-Semitic policies to American Jews who visited or sought to visit its territory. Thus, writing in 1881 to the American Minister in London, Secretary of State James G. Blaine said:

"I am well aware that the domestic enactments of a state toward its own subjects is not generally regarded as a fit matter for the intervention of another independent power. But when such enactments directly affect the liberty and property of foreigners who resort to a country under the supposed guarantee of treaties framed for the most liberal ends, when the conscience of an alien owing no allegiance whatever to the local sovereignty is brought under the harsh yoke of bigotry or prejudice which bows the necks of the natives, and when enlightened appeals made to humanity, to the principles of just reciprocity and to the advancing spirit of the age, in behalf of tolerance, are met with intimations of a purpose to still further burden the unhappy sufferers and so to necessarily increase the disability of foreigners of the like creed * * * it becomes in a high sense a moral duty to our citizens and to the doctrines of religious freedom we so strongly uphold, to seek proper protection for those citizens and tolerance for their creed, in foreign lands, even at the risk of criticism of the municipal laws of other states." [9]

Again in 1895, rejecting the notion that the Russians were at liberty to discriminate against American Jews within their own empire, our Acting Secretary of State, Alvey A. Adee, said:

"Viewed in the light of an invidious discrimination tending to discredit and humiliate Americans Jews in the eyes of their fellow citizens, it is plain that the action of Russian consular officers does produce its effect within American territory, and not exclusively in Russian jurisdiction." [10]

In 1911, outraged by the Russian Government's persistence in subjecting American citizens to various anti-Semitic practices, the House of Representatives urged President William Howard Taft to terminate the treaty which had governed our trade with Russia since 1832. The treaty was abrogated by Secretary of State Philander Knox in December 1911.

Switzerland: In the mideighties, on learning that many cantons in Switzerland refused to admit American Jews, President Fillmore stated that "it is indispensable * * * that every privilege granted to any of the citizens of the United States should be granted to all." Some years later, after vigorous efforts by our State Department, the disabilities against Jews in Switzerland were removed.

In 1924, the Government of Switzerland denied a group of American Mormon missionaries extension of their cantonal residence permits. Assuming that this exclusion was based on religious grounds, our envoy made representations to the Swiss Government. The matter was dropped only when our Government was satisfied there were other reasons for the move.[11]

Germany: Starting with the Nazi decree of April 26, 1938, requiring the declaration of property owned by Jews, numerous protests against similar acts were voiced by the U.S. Government. The United States insisted that application of such decrees to the property of its citizens violated rights of Americans under existing treaties and by virtue of comity and international law.

Italy: In 1938, when the Italian Government ordered the expulsion of Jews, regardless of nationality, who had come to Italy or its possessions after January 1, 1919, the United States registered a series of protests "against the application to American nationals of measures which would have the effect of dividing them into two broad classes; namely Jewish and non-Jewish, and would accord to the former differential treatment." [12]

Danzig: In 1939, the State Department instructed our consul at Danzig to protest the imposition of a property tax levied only on Jews. Here, too, the United States insisted that treaties with respect to the treatment of our nationals abroad be applied to all our nationals "without exception based on race or creed," adding that the United States "declines to recognize the rights of other nations to apply measures to American citizens which would have the effect of arbitrarily dividing them into special classes and subjecting them to differential treatment." [13]

DEPARTURES FROM U.S. TRADITION

In the light of public policy defined and adhered to in the past, citizens of the United States would naturally expect their Government to take an implacable stand against Arab intrusions on American rights. But these expectations have not been borne out. Not alone have agencies of the Government acquiesced passively to the boycott; they have served actively, in many instances, as its instruments.

The Department of State is specifically charged with responsibility to protect the interests of Americans in their relations with foreign governments. Yet in 1959, when the New York State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) investigated a complaint that the Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco) was unlawfully inquiring into the religion of prospective employees, William M. Rountree, then Assistant Secretary of State, wrote as follows:

"Any finding by the Commission (SCAD) which would compel Aramco to employ persons of Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia would hardly be made effective in view of the known attitude of the Saudi Government. Efforts by Aramco to implement such a finding would most certainly prejudice the company's operations in that country and would probably adversely affect the U.S. interests there as well." [14]

The State Department's effort to follow the road of least resistance failed in this instance. The courts of New York State refused to sanction SCAD's ruling that the antidiscrimination law had no application to the case.[15]

The Defense Department has deferred to Saudi Arabia's exclusion of American Jews from the Air Force personnel at the U.S. base at Dhahran, claiming this flagrant act of discrimination a justifiable assertion of sovereignty. The fact that Jewish servicemen are excluded from the Dhahran base stands in glaring contrast to U.S. action under similar circumstances in 1911, when the House of Representatives resolved to notify Russia that "the Government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates between American citizens on the ground of race or religion." [16]

After surrendering principles heretofore deemed fundamental to American integrity in order to retain the Dhahran base, our Government was notified that the treaty granting us occupancy, which expires in 1962, will not be renewed by Saudi Arabia.[17]

Meanwhile, in addition to accepting the continued blacklisting of American Jewish servicemen, the Defense Department, at Arab insistence, also imposes restrictions on Christian worship in Saudi Arabia: U.S. chaplains refrain from wearing crosses; services for American personnel are conducted as unobtrusively as possible, and Catholic priests wear lay attire in order to avoid offending the religious sensitivities of local authorities.

The Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation yield to the boycott even as to contracts for dry-cargo vessels owned by American citizens that carry surplus commodities sold to Arab countries under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). The contracts, insisted upon by Arab governments, state explicity that "the vessel is prohibited from calling at Israel waters or ports. Trans-shipment is prohibited." [18] The law provides that 50 percent of surplus

---

[7] Public Law 85–726; 72 Stat. 731. Sec. 404(b). The Interstate Commerce Act contains a virtually identical provision.

[8] "With Firmness in the Right," by Cyrus Adler, American Jewish Committee, New York, 1940, pp. 325–326.

[9] Ibid., p. 205.

[10] Ibid., p. 251.

[11] "Digest of International Law," by Goren Haywood Hackworth. State Department Publication No. 1708, VIII, No. 286. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1942 "Measures Based on Race or Creed," p. 696.

[12] Ibid., p. 647.

[13] Ibid., p. 647.

[14] The New York Times, May 19, 1959.

[15] Official court report: 19 N.Y. Misc. (2d) 205; affirmed in the New York court of appeals.

[16] H.J. Res. 166, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1911, p. 311

[17] The New York Times, Mar. 17, 1961.

[18] Ibid., Feb. 4, 1960.

products sent abroad must go in American bottoms; thus, while American ships must be used for half the deliveries, we have permitted Arab governments, by constructing a blacklist, to render certain American vessels and owners ineligible for carrying these shipments.

OTHER NATIONS HAVE CALLED THE ARAB BLUFF

The vigorous reactions of other nations stand in sharp contrast to the failure, in virtually every instance, of agencies of the Federal Government to reject the boycott by some effective action, rather than words. Even our occasional lame representations have been rarely spontaneous; usually they have been called forth by letters of protest or inquiry from Members of Congress and interested organizations.

The Dutch Government, through Prime Minister Willem Drees, announced in 1957 that it would resist boycott measures aimed at Israel or Jewish firms which threaten infringement of Dutch interests.[19] This policy remains in effect. In February 1961, Dr. Henrik R. van Houten, Secretary of State to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, condemned Dutch exporters who discriminate against Jews in order to curry favor with the Arabs.[20]

England: With the extension of the boycott in 1956, the London Chamber of Commerce declined to certify firms as not being owned by Jews.[21] During the House of Commons discussion on February 22, 1961, concerning the arrangements for an Arab League office to be opened in London, the Government was asked:

"Has it been made clear to the Arab League that this office is not welcome here if it is to be used to spy on British firms trading with Israel or organizing a boycott aaginst trading with Israel, or publishing anti-Semitic propaganda here?"

To which Mr. Edward Heath, Lord Privy Seal, replied: "We want this office to conduct itself in the normal and proper manner."[22]

West Germany: In 1952, while Israel and the German Federal Republic were conducting negotiations which led to the reparations agreement designed to compensate ex-Germans of the Jewish faith who had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, the Arab League tried to intervene. The West German Government was informed that the contemplated agreement would adversely affect Arab-German relations, and a general boycott of German goods was threatened. So vigorous was the Arab warning that a sizable body of German opinion, especially industrial groups, tried to prevent consummation of the agreement. Yet once it was ratified, the threatened boycott failed to materialize. Egypt resumed trade negotiations with Germany which had been suspended as part of the boycott threat.[23] West Germany has since continued to fulfill its obligations under the reparations agreement and maintains commercial relations with Israel. The Arab League nations nevertheless continue to do business with Germany.

The Arab pose of irrevocable commitment to the boycott obviously collapses when confronted by unyielding refusal to compromise or retreat.

TO REASSERT THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

Calls to reassert the long-established principle that no spokesman or agency of the U.S. Government is empowered to practice or condone discrimination against citizens of this country have come from Congress, from the legislatures of several Sttaes, and from both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

The U.S. Senate, on July 26, 1956, adopted a resolution (S. Res. 323) introduced by Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York:

"Whereas the protection of the integrity of the U.S. citizenship and the proper rights of the U.S. citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of U.S. sovereignty; and

"Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against U.S. citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle."

Both Houses of Congress, on May 2, 1960, adopted a "Freedom of the Seas" amendment to the Mutual Security Act, introduced by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and KENNETH KEATING:

"It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as (1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and (2) the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways; assistance under this act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."[24]

Despite this clear expression of congressional interest, the State Department indicated that nothing would be done to implement the amendment, since it is not a law. In a letter to Senator KEATING, dated February 24, 1961, John S. Hoghland 2d, Acting Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, said:

"The Department has so far concluded that efforts to link the Mutual Security Act directly to the Suez transit question would only intensify the very trade and transit restrictions which we all hope may be eliminated, while at the same time playing into the hands of the Communists by exacerbating Middle East tensions."

The new 1961 Act for International Development (AID), pending, provides for renewed foreign aid and also repeals the Mutual Security Act and the various riders written into the foreign-aid program dealing with discrimination against American citizens, economic boycott and freedom of the seas. AID contains language seeking to restate in a general way the policy provisions of previous foreign-aid acts cited above, but again fails to urge the President to withhold loans or grants derived from funds appropriated under the act from countries which discriminate against American citizens because of race or religion.

The Legislatures of California, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin have called on the Government to stiffen its position in respect to Arab discrimination against American citizens.

For example, the New York resolution, carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1961, states:

"That the Department of State be and is hereby respectfully memorialized (a) to take a firm position against Arab interference in the conduct of the affairs of American citizens and businessmen;

"(b) to obtain from any cooperation with the Arab League boycott activities and policies;

"(c) to resist any efforts by Arab nations to maintain or widen its boycott activities in the United States; and

"(d) to exert all possible efforts and utilize its resources to the fulfillment of the spirit and purposes of this resolution."

The Republican and Democratic platforms of 1960 pledged both parties to firm resistance to the boycott. Similar planks were adopted in 1956.

The 1960 Republican platform promised: To seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades, and boycotts. To secure freedom of navigation in international waterways, the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs.

The 1960 Democratic platform stated: We will encourage an end to boycotts and blockades, and unrestricted use of the Suez Canal by all nations.

During the 1960 campaign, in response to inquiry, presidential candidate John F. Kennedy wrote:

"There can be no doubt of where I stand on this problem. I wholeheartedly joined with other Senators—during the most recent Congress—to support an amendment to mutual security legislation which called on the President to withhold U.S. assistance from those countries that engaged in economic warfare, including boycott or blockade against other states who are beneficiaries of our mutual security program. As President, I would certainly implement an act, expressing the sense of the Senate, when I so enthusiastically supported that piece of legislation. I would also carry out the mandate, twice expressed by the Senate, that the President act affirmatively to protect all American citizens from the practice of religious or racial discrimination by foreign governments."

As recently as May 3, 1961, Senator KEATING entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Brooks Hays, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. Although emphasizing that the Government "does not recognize or condone the Arab boycott," Mr. Hays gave no indication that any effective action was contemplated to support this position. Nor have the policy declarations by other bodies, State and national, or by President Kennedy himself, evoked any constructive response from the administrative officers of the Federal Government.

Yet no arm of our Government can remain forever impervious to thoughtful and sustained expressions of public opinion. The time has come for conscientious citizens and citizen groups to make themselves heard.

The principle at stake was never more succinctly summed up than in the words of William Howard Taft: [25]

"National prestige must be used not only for the benefit of the world at large, but for the benefit of our own citizenship; and,

---

[19] London Jewish Chronicle, Oct. 4, 1957.

[20] The Netherlands Parliament, Second Chamber, Official Record, Government Printing Office, The Hague, Feb. 21–22, 1961.

[21] Circular to Members, No. 402, Mar. 21, 1956. London Chamber of Commerce.

[22] The Parliamentary Debates (Hansard). House of Commons, Official Report, London, Feb. 22, 1961, cols. 491–492.

[23] American Jewish Year Book, vol. 54, p. 485; vol. 55, p. 251.

[24] Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–472; 74 Stat. 134), sec. 2, which amends sec. 2(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

[25] Address delivered at the Thalia Theater, New York, Oct. 28, 1908.

therefore, as we gain in international prestige we ought to assert our insistence that our passport certifying our citizenship should secure to every man, without regard to creed or race, the same treatment, the same equality of opportunity in every nation of the globe."

Public opinion should demand a return to our Government's traditional insistence that it cannot acknowledge as legitimate, much less accommodate itself to, practices or policies which deny the equality of American citizenship.

Foreign countries have no sovereign right to discriminate among American citizens. As recent court decisions have underscored, no such right is vested in our own States, or in the Federal Government. That any other power should presume to tread on liberties declared inviolate by our Constitution is an assault upon the American people, an invasion of American rights. The dignity of the United States, its status as a champion of universal human rights, demands that this invasion be promptly repelled.

AREA OFFICES

New England: 72 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

New York: Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y.; Westchester Division, 48 Mamaroneck Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.

Northern New Jersey and New York State, 45 Branford Place, Newark, N.J.

Pennsylvania: 1508 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Central Seaboard: 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Atlanta: 41 Exchange place, Atlanta, Ga.

Southeast: 1208 Congress Building, Miami, Fla.

East Central: 602 Chester-Ninth Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Michigan: 163 Madison Avenue., Detroit, Mich.

North Central: 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

South Central: 19 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

West Central: 705 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Southwest: 523 Fidelity Building, Dallas, Tex.

Southern Pacific: 590 North Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Northern Pacific: 40 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

Frederick F. Greenman, president.

Louis Caplan, chairman, executive board.

Pearson E. Neaman, chairman, administrative board.

William Rosenwald, chairman, national advisory council.

Maurice Glinert, treasurer.

Arthur D. Leidesdorf, associate treasurer.

Julius S. Loewenthal, secretary.

John Slawson, executive vice president.

Morris B. Abram, Atlanta, vice president.

Max Wm. Bay, Beverly Hills, vice president.

Martin L. Butzel, Detroit, vice president.

William P. Engel, Birmingham, vice president.

Jack A. Goldfarm, New York, vice president.

Andrew Goodman, New York, vice president.

Philip E. Hoffman, Orange, vice president.

James Marshall, New York, vice president.

Irving Salomon, San Diego, vice president.

Gardner H. Stern, Chicago, vice president.

(AJC: Founded 1906, oldest American organization combating bigotry, protecting civil and religious rights of Jews, and advancing cause of freedom everywhere.)

Jacob Blaustein, honorary president.

Herbert B. Ehrmann, honorary president.

Irving M. Engel, honorary president.

Joseph M. Proskauer, honorary president.

Herbert H. Lehman, honorary vice president.

Samuel D. Leidesdorf, honorary vice president.

Ralph E. Samuel, honorary vice president.

Horace Stern, honorary vice president.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., honorary chairman, national advisory council.

The President's Thinking in 1949 on the Loss of Free China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include, without comment, the following reprint from the August 18, 1961, issue of Human Events:

HOW THE REDS CONQUERED CHINA

(Annotated by Dr. Anthony Kubek)[1]

(NOTE.—The following address was delivered by Representative John F. Kennedy at Salem, Mass., on January 30, 1949. It assumes particular significance in view of current persistent rumors that we may recognize the Soviet puppet government of Outer Mongolia and support admission of Red China to the United Nations. This strong statement by Mr. Kennedy would lead us to hope that these rumors are irresponsible and unfounded. Except for corrections made in footnotes, Mr. Kennedy's 1949 statement is clear, accurate and logical.)

Over these past few days we have learned the extent of the disasters befalling China and the United States. Our relationship with China since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament.

When we look at the ease with which the Communists have overthrown the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek, it comes as somewhat of a shock to remember that on November 22, 1941,[2] our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, handed Ambassador Namuru an ultimatum to the effect that: (1) Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and Indochina; (2) the United States and Japan will not support militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China.

It was clearly enunciated that the independence of China and the stability of the National Government was the fundamental object of our Far Eastern policy.

That this and other statements of our policies in the Far East led directly to the attack on Pearl Harbor is well known. And it might be said that we almost knowingly entered into combat with Japan to preserve the independence of China and the countries to the south of it.[3] Contrast this policy which reached its height in 1943 when the United States and Britain agreed at Cairo to liberate China and return to that country at the end of the war Manchuria and all Japanese-held areas, to the confused and vacilating policy which we have followed since that day.

In 1944 Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell presented a plan to arm 1 million Chinese Communists, who had been carefully building their resources in preparation for a postwar seizure of power, and with them to capture Shanghai and clear the Yangtze. This plan was supported by some State Department officials, including Ambassador Clarence Gauss. Chiang Kai-shek refused to cooperate with this plan, which would have presented the Chinese Communists with an easy coup. Chiang requested that Stilwell be recalled, which caused such bitter comment in this country; and Gauss resigned. From this date on our relations with the National Government declined.

At the Yalta Conference in 1945 a sick Roosevelt, with the advice of General Marshall and other Chiefs of Staff, gave the Kurile Islands as well as the control of various strategic Chinese ports, such as Port Arthur and Dairen, to the Soviet Union.[4]

According to former Ambassador Bullitt, in Life magazine in 1948, "Whatever share of the responsibility was Roosevelt's and whatever share was Marshall's the vital interest of the United States in the independent integrity of China was sacrified, and the foundation was laid for the present tragic situation in the Far East."

When the armies of Soviet Russia withdrew from Manchuria they left Chinese Communists in control of this area and in possession of great masses of Japanese war material.

During this period began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek, or force Chiang Kai-shek as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his government to form a coalition.

When Ambassador Patrick Hurley resigned in 1945 he stated, "Professional diplomats continuously advised the Chinese Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. The chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from American career diplomats, the Embassy at Chungking, and the Chinese and Far Eastern divisions of the State Department."

With the troubled situation in China beginning to loom large in the United States, General Marshall was sent at the request of President Truman as special emissary to China to effect a compromise and to bring about a coalition government.

In Ambassador Bullitt's article in Life, he states, and I quote: "In early summer of 1946 in order to force Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into the Chinese Government, General Marshall had the Department of State refuse to give licenses for export of ammunition to China. Thus from the summer of 1946 to February 1948 not a single shell or a single cartridge was delivered to China for use in its American armament. And in the aviation field Marshall likewise blundered, and as a result of his breaking the American Government's contract to deliver to China planes to maintain eight and one-third air groups, for 3 years no combat or bombing planes were delivered to China—from September 1946 to March 1948.[5] As Marshall himself confessed in February 1948 to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, this "was in effect an embargo on military supplies."

In 1948 we appropriated $468 million for China, only a fraction of what we were sending to Europe, and out of this $468 million only $125 million was for military purposes. The end was drawing near; the assistance was too little and too late; and the Nationalist Government was engaged in a death struggle with the onrushing Communist armies.

On November 20, 1948, former Senator D. Worth Clark, who had been sent on a special mission to China by the Senate Com-

Footnotes at end of speech.

mittee on Appropriations, in his report to the committee said, "Piecemeal aid will no longer save failing China from communism. It is now an allout program or none, a fish-or-cut-bait proposition."

Clark said this conclusion was confirmed by Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart and top American Army officers in China.

On November 25, 1948, 3 years too late, the New York Times said: "Secretary of State George Marshall said today the U.S. Government was considering what assistance it could properly give to the Chinese Government in the present critical situation."

On December 21 a Times headline was "ECA Administrator Hoffman, after seeing Truman, discloses freezing of $70 million program in China in view of uncertain war situation."

The indifference, if not the contempt, with which the State Department and the President treated the wife of the head of the Nationalist Government, who was then fighting for a free China—Madam Chiang Kai-shek—was the final chapter in this tragic story.

Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the Nationalist Government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfections of the diplomatic system in China after 20 years of war, and the tales of corruption in high places, that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

There were those who claimed, and still claim, that Chinese communism was not really communism at all but merely an advanced agrarian movement which did not take directions from Moscow.

Listen to the words of the Bolton report: "Its doctrines follow those of Lenin and Stalin. Its leaders are Moscow-trained (of 35 leading Chinese Communist political leaders listed in the report, over a half either spent some time or studied in Moscow). Its policies and actions, its strategy and tactics are Communist. The Chinese Communists have followed faithfully every zigzag of the Kremlin's line for a generation."

This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

---

[5] Dr. Anthony Kubek, head of the Social Science Department at the University of Dallas, is the author of a forthcoming documentary study of the loss of China to the Communists. This book, which is expected to be published next spring, is the fruit of 7 years of painstaking research. It will reveal in clear detail the modus operandi of Soviet conquest.

[2] The date on which Secretary Hull handed the ultimatum to Ambassador Namuru was Nov. 26, 1941. Eight of the ten points of this ultimatum were written by the Soviet agent, Harry Dexter White. War between Japan and the United States had long been an objective of the Soviet Union.

[3] War between Japan and the United States was merely Roosevelt's "back door to war" in Europe. But the war in the Pacific did fulfill commitments Roosevelt made to Prime Minister Churchill at the Atlantic Conference, Aug. 9 to 13, 1941. "To preserve the independence of China" was the pretext, not the reason. Secretary of War Stimson, on the other hand, had long urged war against Japan on behalf of China.

[4] The recently published Teheran documents reveal that Roosevelt's concessions to Stalin, at the expense of China, were originally made at Teheran on Nov. 30, 1943. His assurances to Chiang Kai-shek were made exactly a week earlier, on November 23, at Cairo. The agreements at Yalta merely confirmed, elaborated, and formalized the concessions made at Teheran. Roosevelt, in November of 1943, was healthy and in full possession of his faculties.

[5] As indicated by the dates, the duration of the embargo was about a year and a half, not 3 years as indicated in the quote. Before the embargo, the Nationalist forces were thrashing the Communists. The embargo turned victory into defeat.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Metropolitan Washington's Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an excellent article entitled "City's Ailing Arteries Need Wonder Drugs," written by the very able Jack Eisen, of the Washington Post. I think this article points up the problems facing the city of Washington in the area of transportation, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY'S AILING ARTERIES NEED WONDER DRUGS

(By Jack Eisen)

Metropolitan Washington's transportation doctors are huddling in an endless series of consultations these days trying to decide what to prescribe for the hardening of the city's arteries.

Two widely touted "wonder drugs" are being considered—freeways and rapid transit. Some of the doctors feel one or the other is a cure-all. Others prescribe a balanced dose of both.

All agree on one thing:

Something must be done—soon—to smash the traffic jams that clog the movement of people and goods around the metropolis, threatening to isolate its downtown heart from its residential body.

Dedicated freeway advocates talk of the "freedom of the American road" and extoll the joys of modern driving, and some extremists hint darkly that there is something subversive about forcing people into trains, however modern or swift.

All-out transit backers fear freeway construction is never-ending, that sooner or later almost the whole city will be paved over. Any space that remained would be decked over for parking.

POSITION RETWEEN EXTREMES

Between these extremes is the position held by Washington planners, that both forms are needed.

They believe the civil servant from Wheaton can best be moved to his Federal Triangle office by train in 20 minutes and that the salesman who must make calls at Hyattsville, Falls Church, Anacostia, and Bethesda can reduce his hours of driving with the help of modern highways. So will the motorist on a family outing, since the days are gone when most families go to the zoo by piling onto a trolley car.

Other casual travelers—for example, a Bethesda housewife going downtown to shop—will have a choice. Either by train or road, she will have ready access to her favorite stores. Because of this access downtown will be rescued from its downward spiral.

Up to now, Metropolitan Washington's transportation emphasis has been on highways. Until recently applause for this has been universal, because most persons realize that highway transportation is basic in this modern age.

Hence a substantial network of freeways and parkways has been built, fanning out from the edges of Washington, opening vast tracts of pasture and woods to suburban development. Some roads, like Shirley highway in Virginia, have generated far more rush-hour traffic than they can serve, requiring widening or even "twinning."

The newest of the area's radial freeways, Interstate 70-S, is supposed to reach Washington some day, but it now ends abruptly near Bethesda. The fields flanking it have proved an irresistible magnet to Government agencies seeking new locations with elbow room.

More such roads—Interstate 95 north to Baltimore and south toward Richmond, Interstate 66 westward from Arlington, the Annapolis Freeway, the District's Anacostia Freeway, plus the 66-mile Capital Beltway ringing the city and skimming off traffic that doesn't have to go there—are on the way.

In central Washington, however, traffic including buses and streetcars (the latter soon to be abandoned) must move on streets laid out by L'Enfant and Ellicott in the city's infancy. Too often, in the "rush" hour, it creeps along.

Additional access, including two Mall tunnels and a pair of central area Potomac bridges, is being provided. But various other freeways, including parts of the Inner Loop encircling downtown and radials pushing outward to the Maryland line, have run afoul of planning or financing problems. Or they have aroused the hostility of persons worried that their tranquillity or investments would be disturbed.

EVERYONE WILL BENEFIT

It is true, as many freeway foes in the District assert bitterly, that these roads will benefit Maryland and Virginia residents. Forgotten is the fact that they will also benefit the District, its commerce and its taxpayers, because this politically fragmented region is economically and socially a single metropolis.

And this community also is the Nation's Capital. Once its highway department built the ungainly Whitehurst Freeway. But it well knows it cannot run an ugly elevated road past, say, the Lincoln Memorial, despoiling a cherished landmark as California authorities did to San Francisco's Ferry Building.

The San Francisco incident touched off a local freeway revolt that is widely heralded by opponents of freeways everywhere. It has been cited here.

The point of the revolt is not widely understood. It was not whether the city should have freeways—San Francisco has a network already—but whether it should put all its eggs in the freeway basket, pouring an ever-greater flow of autos into a central city smaller than Washington.

A billion-dollar bond issue for transit comes up for a vote there next year and it stands a good chance. Even freeway-dedicated Los Angeles, worried that dispersal of all its industry and employment from an already weak downtown will destroy its economic fabric, is seriously considering rapid transit.

Washington, too, is working on a rapid transit plan that includes subways. This plan emerged in 1959 from a 3-year study conducted by the National Capital Planning Commission and Regional Planning Council which, in turn, has become a foundation of their proposals for the year 2000.

The area transit plan, now being developed in detail by the new National Capital Transportation Agency, will get its first real test when Congress decides the fate of a pending request for $2.5 million to buy land for transit in connection with freeway projects.

Later the people of Metropolitan Washington will be called upon to pick up part of the tab, which may run to $500 million or more.

For better or worse, the decision on this investment would be easier if it were not for the highway program. But this is no either/or choice.

We are going to have the freeways. The area's basic network is part of the Interstate System. Every car owner in the land helps pay for them with taxes gathered at the gasoline pump.

WATCHDOGS OF ROAD FUND

The taxes go into a Treasury trust fund, and highway officials tap this for 90 cents of every dollar needed to build Interstate freeways. A potent, well-heeled lobby in Washington sees that this fund is replenished as needed and not raided for nonhighway purposes. Even so, the costly urban roads are built with agonizing slowness.

For transit, no huge national fund exists. Hence Washingtonians will not get the system unless they fight for it and are willing to pay a large part of it. Recognizing its interest here, the Federal Government has promised to pay a share.

The experts warn that failure to build new transit now may be far outweighed by the cost of trying to undo our folly tomorrow—a statement often applied, paradoxically, to freeways as well.

Students of urban problems insist there is nothing more blighting to a neighborhood than trying to ram a constant flow of through traffic, including huge trucks, along its streets. Some of the finest streets in this metropolitan area have thus been blighted.

While admittedly a freeway uproots that which is in its path, it can skim through-traffic off the streets and leave them for local use. It can create new economic patterns by providing swift access routes. By contrast with older highways, it is remarkably safe.

Transit—by rail on major lines, by bus on reserved lanes or using special loading ramps on others—can provide "excess capacity" limiting both present and future needs to a reasonable number of lanes.

The heartbeat of the metropolis depends upon transportation. It costs money. Not having it may cost the city its life.

All but Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the influence that the Wash-

ington press has on conditions here in the Capital City since papers published here are the first source of news and reflect Potomac thinking. Sound editorial observations on the nature of the problems in international events are always appreciated by us, and an analysis in the Washington Evening Star on the recent Soviet programs for economic progress are especially pertinent. Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of August 22 entitled "All But Freedom."

ALL BUT FREEDOM

Some French editorialist, whose name is unknown, but who deserves a pat on the back, has written a trenchant footnote to the Soviet Union's new 20-year program for economic progress and communism's triumph everywhere in the world. The program promises that the people of the U.S.S.R. or those of them who can hope to be alive in 1980, will have all sorts of wonderful things given to them for nothing, including medical care, transportation, meals at work, housing, etc., etc. In short, although the Kremlin admits that maybe something will intervene to upset the plan, the average Russian, two decades from now, should be able to have whatever he wants without spending a ruble for it.

However, as our colleague in France has wryly observed, this Red utopia will have one truly tremendous weakness in it: Even though it may eventually offer a lot of goods and services free of charge, what will not be free in it, the thing that will not be given to the masses, is freedom itself. That will still be withheld, which is commentary enough on the nature of Red totalitarianism and its monumental pretensions, its colossal lies and its ceaseless intrigues, including its conspiracy to subvert independent nations everywhere and win domination of the entire globe.

Fair Trade: It's Still the Same Old Salami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 1, 1961, there appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune an editorial with reference to the so-called fair trade proposal. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR TRADE: IT'S STILL THE SAME OLD SALAMI

If medals were given for sheer legislative persistence, one ought to go to the National Association of Retail Druggists and its allies in the fight for a Federal "fair trade" law.

Defeat has followed defeat, but they're back at it again. This time, however (sensitive, perhaps, to the recent antitrust activity), they have a newly beguiling label for their legalized price-fixing scheme. The same measure repeatedly defeated as a "fair trade" bill has been reintroduced as the fair competitive practices bill. But whatever the name, it's the same old salami. And it doesn't smell any sweeter.

The effect, as always, is to make it a Federal offense for retailers to sell nationally branded items at any price lower than that set by the manufacturer. The object, as always, is to protect small retailers from price competition. Broadening of supermarket lines, the discount houses' success, chain-store competition, all have contributed to the corner druggist's sense of insecurity.

State fair trade laws have been a colossal flop, and rightfully so. They run counter to the whole concept of a free competitive market, which is at the heart of the American economy's phenomenal vigor and success. They run counter, also, to the philosophy of the Federal antitrust laws, enacted in an effort to protect competition.

If the fair-traders had their way, Congress would be delegating to manufacturers the power to set economic terms that would have the force of Federal law. Congress would require consumers to subsidize uneconomic retail operations by paying artificially pegged prices. And what apologies would Congress make (what apologies will Senators HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, and SCOTT, sponsors of the current Senate bill, make?) next time the Justice Department hales a group of industrialists into court on charges of conspiring to fix prices for, say, electrical equipment?

"Fair trade" is a speciously deceptive name for a lot of meddling Federal nonsense. It's been buried before, and we trust that Congress will rally to the defense of a free market and quietly reinter it this session.

The Freedom Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it was encouraging news indeed, to learn that the Freedom Press, published in Santa Barbara, Calif., had joined in support of House Joint Resolution 447, in a declaration of war against the international Communist conspiracy.

In back of the Freedom Press are Mr. and Mrs. William H. Drake, two patriotic Americans who have developed their personal love for freedom and country into effective action:

Lillian Drake was born Lillian Usher, grew up in Miami, Fla., where her parents had moved from South Carolina. She attended schools in Miami and was graduated from Florida State University where she majored in sociology and had training in the field of social work. After graduation she was employed in The Travelers Aid in Miami where she gained experience in working with juveniles and handling transient problems. In 1941, Lillian was married to William Drake.

William Drake was born in Lake County, Fla. He attended public schools there, went on to college at the University of Florida and later at Princeton University, where his father had also studied. His studies emphasized economics, politics and related subjects, leading to an A.B. degree cum laude from Princeton in 1932.

He received his law degree at the University of Virginia, as had both of his grandfathers. There he was privileged to hear the late Professor Garrard Glenn explain how the largely self-enforcing principles of law and equity are crystallized from the accepted thinking ofthe community which has been historically developed.

Mr. Drake was licensed to practice law in two States when he was admitted to practice patent law in Washington, D.C. While carrying on this practice he took night courses in calculus, quantitative chemical analysis, and physics.

In 1940, he went on active duty in the U.S. Naval Reserve. Serving in the Navy Department, he administered research and development of explosive weapons. Here he acquired a deep admiration for the conscientious and capable regular Navy personnel who make a career of defending their country. Also he learned to appreciate the dedicated civilian scientists who devised and developed the new munitions of World War II.

Having always ben interested in writing as a hobby, Lillian Drake used available spare time in Washington, D.C., taking writing courses at the American University.

In 1960, Mrs. Drake started publishing articles covering viewpoints that, to her, were neglected in public discussion.

These interests she has managed to squeeze in, for her main hobbies have always been her husband and three children who are the focal point of her life.

Mrs. Drake's publications grew into the Freedom Press. Mr. Drake supported this venture and contributed some articles to this newspaper. His law experience had shown him that opposing advocates develop the truth more fairly than information from one viewpoint. The Drakes agree that the fateful issues of our time are being decided in the court of public opinion. They have confidence in the ability of the electorate to decide wisely if given facts and interpretations on both sides.

The following is an excerpt from the text of the article on House Joint Resolution 447 which appeared in the July issue of the Freedom Press:

CONGRESS ASKED TO DECLARE FIRM POLICY FOR VICTORY OVER WORLD COMMUNISM—JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED TO RECOGNIZE EXISTING WAR BEING WAGED AGAINST AMERICA

(By Freedom Press Washington correspondent)

A joint resolution identifying the Communist Parties of the world as our enemy and recognizing that they are already at war with us was introduced on June 12, 1961, into the House of Representatives by Congressman JOHN R. PILLION, of New York State. This war conducted against us is not a shooting war but a conflict in which international communism uses the strength of Communist nations against us in every other way.

By the Pillion joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 447, the United States recognized that the Communist Parties of the world are welded into one tightly disciplined organization with one man—currently Nikita Khrushchev—at the head. It also recognizes that this international Communist machine is now waging economic, political, and psychological war on the United States, using the power of the nations it controls to work ceaselessly toward the destruction of the United States and the rest of the free world.

In a special interview with the Freedom Press, Representative PILLION emphasized the distinction between relationships with Communist Parties and the nations they control. He pointed out that the United States is already warred upon by international communism, without the Communist nations being at war with us. We should therefore fight back with all the same weap-

ons consistent with our moral standards, using economic, political, and psychological weapons.

LOSING EXISTING WAR

We are losing this existing war, said Representative PILLION, because we do not have a foreign policy directed against our enemy, the international Communist machine. The only way to get a consistent national policy for weakening and ultimately destroying the international Communist conspiracy is to declare war against it and conduct this war in every appropriate way. By the Pillion joint resolution, the United States declares against the Communist Parties of the world a state of war. This phraseology selected does not mean armed conflict, but a mobilization of every resource and the utilization of every appropriate means to weaken and defeat international communism.

Representative PILLION further stated in his interview that Congress has the Constitutional duty to recognize and declare a state of war when it exists. As a part of that duty Congress must set forth the general policy objective to be used in the conduct of that war. He reminds us that many times a U.S. official does not bring about or does not withhold some action by the United States although this is contrary to the U.S. public's clear understanding of the interests of the United States.

NO CLEAR-CUT POLICY

In the absence of a clear overall policy laid down by the Congress for victory over the international Communist organization, U.S. officials will lack guiding authority to insure that they act in harmony with our citizens' desire for this victory. There is need for this pronouncement of policy, stated Representative PILLION, because the United States has been losing this war against international communism for 30 years.

Reply to an Unfair Attack Which Appeared in the Sons of Italy Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.

EDITOR,
Sons of Italy Times,
Philadelphia.

DEAR SIR: I am constrained to take note of the unfair personal attack against me by Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO and the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., which was headlined in your paper, "Sons of Italy Times," in the July 24 issue.

The clear import was that I for "obvious personal prejudices" opposed the appointments of Salvatore Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski to the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs because of their Italian-American and Polish-American origins, respectively.

My "obvious personal prejudices" were not specified although the impact of that allegation was that I am prejudiced against Italians and Poles. Nothing could be further from the truth.

My reasons for opposing the appointments of Mr. Bontempo and Mr. Cieplinski were strictly impersonal since I have never met either gentleman. My reasons, which I stated publicly, were and are that Messrs. Bontempo and Cieplinski are utterly unqualified for the position they were respectively appointed to.

The position of Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, established and defined by law, is a most important one in our government—one dealing with the security of our Nation. The Director has charge of issuing passports, visas, and the security of all our foreign diplomatic installations and personnel. It naturally calls for a highly qualified individual with extensive experience in security, immigration matters and personnel problems.

Mr. Bontempo, as well as his deputy, Mr. Cieplinski, admittedly are lacking in these requisites. Neither of them has handled security matters, nor had they experience in handling immigration, nationality, and personnel matters. Both were, admittedly, appointed for political considerations—solely.

It was for these reasons that I advised President Kennedy and the Secretary of State of my objections to the appointments.

Even though Messrs. Bontempo and Cieplinski have assumed the position, I still have these objections and no information has been supplied to me which would cause me to change my thinking in any respect.

Now, as to the totally false allegation as to my "prejudices against Italians and Poles." My record of 29 years in Congress, which is a matter of public knowledge for all to see, has been to the contrary.

It is no secret that I have Americans of Italian and Polish origin on my personal staff and on the staffs of committees under my chairmanship.

Incidentally, I want to also state that I recommended an American of Italian origin for one of the most important positions in another agency in the executive branch. I haven't heard any protests from the Sons of Italy or the other Italian organizations that my Italo-American candidate failed to get the appointment.

Let me add a more general remark. While I have no quarrel with one having pride with one's ancestry, that pride should not become a controlling factor on whether or not a particular person should be given a job to make certain that a particular ethnic group is given recognition.

Such thinking is prejudicial all right. It is prejudicial unfortunately to the best interests of America since we are and should always strive to be Americans, not Italian-Americans, Polish-Americans, etc.

When we seek to fill a responsible position in Government, the test should be whether a person is qualified by experience and not whether he qualifies because he is of a minority group.

I always have said and I say it again, nationalities groups are not assets for our country. They are a devisive influence. They are an indirect, but nevertheless, formal recognition of an unsupportable thesis—the idea that certain groups in this country have a legitimate interest based on ties with foreign countries. This thesis I reject, as I am sure most Americans with Italian heritage must also reject.

I might add that I know of not one constructive step Representative SANTANGELO has taken on behalf of or in the interest of the people he attempts to categorize as Italian-Americans except to shout vituperations against those who have actually helped these people.

Here is my record in that regard: I have been brought up and educated in an atmosphere of admiration for the Mediterranean cultures and civilization, and all my life I have been an admirer of Italy and a true friend of the Italian people. These are not statements made to suit a politician.

I ask my Italian critic and colleague, Representative ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, to compare the record with his—my record speaks for itself:

1. In 1947, as a member of the House Select Committee on European Aid (Herter committee), I insisted on bringing Italy into the purview of the Marshall plan. I do not have to tell you what the Marshall plan did for Italy and its people.

2. In 1949, after an investigation in Italy and upon my return I sponsored legislation which has restored U.S. citizenship to thousands of Americans of Italian origin who voted in political elections in Italy. I believe that by this legislation I have helped to reunite more than 5,000 families.

3. In 1950, I sponsored amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which included Italian refugees from Venezia Giulia. That amendment helped to provide American homes for 2,000 Italian refugees hopelessly stranded in Trieste.

4. In 1951, I conceived and sponsored the creation of the organization now functioning under the name of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. This 24-nation committee has so far been helpful primarily to the people of Italy, providing oversea homes for upward of 80,000 Italians.

5. In 1953, I sponsored on the floor of the House an amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, providing for the admission of Italians who have relatives in the United States. I believe that I have so far—through that amendment—helped more than 20,000 Italians to join their kin in this country.

6. In 1954, I worked out another amendment to the 1953 act, under which all of the 60,000 additional quota numbers for people born in Italy have been made available to Italian relatives of American citizens, or to Italian refugees.

7. In April 1961 I introduced H.R. 6300, a bill that would revise in some respects America's immigration policies. I quote from the ACIM Dispatch, published monthly by the American Committee on Italian Migration: "In analyzing Mr. Walter's suggested legislation, and using the number of unused quotas from the last fiscal year, 1959–60 as a base—the number was 53,514—we find that Italy is particularly favored and will receive the greatest number as she will be entitled to approximately 6,300 additional immigration visas yearly, over and above its annual quota of 5,666."

I feel compelled to protest against this vicious campaign and answer it with facts, and to ask my critics what they have done to compare with this record.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Impacted School Areas: Will Anything Be Done?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, each day when the Houses of Congress adjourn, the day of adjournment sine die comes 1 day closer. Estimates are it will

come in less than 1 month. Yet legislation to relieve the financial chaos certain to occur in the Nation's impacted school districts is still stalled. There is a petition at the Clerk's desk to discharge a bill extending these statutes. I call it to the attention of the over 300 Members of the House in whose constituencies impacted school districts are located. The need to bring this legislation to the floor is urgent; it is great.

Seek New Ways To Deal With National Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—if it is to keep the wheels of production rolling, particularly in times of crisis—needs to devise more effective machinery in settlement of labor-management differences.

In the past, such differences often resulted in "no holds barred" economic struggles.

Because of an increasingly complex economy—in which the interests of all segments are more closely tied together—however, it is increasingly important that machinery be developed first, fundamentally to enable both labor and management to serve their special interests; and, second, to protect the public interest.

Traditionally, I have felt that we should continue to provide the best possible climate for voluntary, rather than compulsory, arbitration. In disputes in cases where settlements are difficult, or at least long in negotiation—however, there is need for additional machinery by which agreements could be obtained that will serve not only the interests of the disputing parties but also the Nation.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial entitled "Seek New Ways To Deal With National Strikes."

Reflecting upon a matter, particularly crucial at a time when contracts in major industries are coming up for negotiation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 18, 1961]

SEEK NEW WAYS TO DEAL WITH NATIONAL STRIKES

Government experts, aided by distinguished private advisers, are putting together recommendations to Congress to alter drastically the national emergency strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

The issue has been raised anew by the maritime labor dispute. The ships are sailing under an 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction expiring September 21, when, barring settlement, the unions can strike again.

Beyond that expert opinion is virtually unanimous that present procedures are inadequate.

One difficulty is that the results sought from our labor-relations system are to some extent incompatible. Here is a partial catalog:

Production uninterrupted by strikes. Minimum Government intervention in the free collective-bargaining process and preservation of management's right to say no and labor's right to strike. Fair, but noninflationary, settlements. Avoidance of Government controls of wages and prices. Responsible, nonpolitical behavior by labor, management and Government. A maximum of union democracy.

Obviously it is desirable, depending on circumstances, to shift the emphasis on those aims. On one occasion, uninterrupted production may be imperative; on another, a noninflationary settlement.

The key to achieving the most and best of each is to give Government a variety of techniques. President Kennedy favors this "arsenal of weapons" approach. The theory is that if the arsenal includes remedies distasteful to both sides, they will want to settle their differences to avoid Government intervention.

Some weapons suggested are strengthened mediation, fact-finding boards with power to make recommendations, compelling limited operation to avert emergency shortages, injunctions barring strikes for more than the present 80 days, plant seizure by Government, official inquiries to fix blame for strikes, compulsory arbitration (reportedly favored more in Congress than the White House) and no intervention at all, to be spelled out because Taft-Hartley would seem under some circumstances to force presidential intervention.

One administration adviser, Prof. Nathan P. Feinsinger, of the University of Wisconsin Law School, would require labor and management in certain key industries to agree in advance on procedures to use the services of private neutrals to aid in reaching agreement if they, by themselves, were unable to. The great advantage of that plan is that it permits experimentation and allows the parties to tailor the techniques to their own needs.

Investigation and Study of the Effect of Aircraft Noise on Persons and Property on the Ground

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too, rise in support of this resolution. In my opinion a congressional investigation will provide us with very valuable information in connection with two serious problems, namely: noise in connection with aircraft and the hazards to both persons and property as the result of the operation of aircraft.

As has been said by a number of others here today there are many problems involved in an investigation of this kind. I, myself, feel confident that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be ideally qualified to make a full and complete investigation, and I trust that adequate funds will be provided to do just that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] pointed out that the Port of New York Authority has already spent $650,000 with respect to a survey giving their conclusions and recommendations as to a suitable site for a fourth major airport in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. I am not sure how much this billion-dollar agency has spent, but they have been unsparing in their efforts to prove their point.

It so happens that their primary recommendation would result, if they could secure legislative approval in the construction of an airport in Morris County, my own congressional district. That they cannot secure such approval is evident from the fact that the New Jersey State Legislature has strongly rejected the suggestion of a Morris County site. Likewise the Governor must give his approval and both the Republican candidate, James Mitchell and his Democratic opponent have expressed their disapproval. None of this has deterred the Port Authority.

We have had a lot of discussion here today about the serious disadvantages which arise from the operation of existing airports, and particularly from the expansion of existing airports. These inconveniences and difficulties are nothing in compairson to the damaging effects on residents of an area which actually has had no such major air facility. Locating a wholly new major jet airport obviously requires the most careful consideration of such factors as noise and safety. I might point out that the site proposed by the Port of New York Authority has within a 7-mile radius approximately 200,000 persons whose interests would be very directly and adversely affected. There are not only many residential areas, but many fine educational institutions, research laboratories and the like.

As the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has pointed out, an investigation of this kind, no matter how thorough and how complete, will only scratch the surface of a very serious problem. I, myself, feel as part of a program to reduce the hazards and to do something about the nuisances from the noise of such aircraft that we should consider the possibility of enacting some specific legislation in this area.

As an example, I feel, that we should investigate the possibility of increasing Federal responsibility in helping in the determination of suitable locations for airports of this character. In my opinion, the Port of New York Authority has proved beyond any doubt its inability to provide a suitable spot for the location of a fourth major airport, if indeed one is needed the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. It seems to me that the Federal Government might have its hands strengthened in this area. At the very least we should know more than we now do about the real hazards of major air facilities and what we can do about them.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I feel that a resolution of this character, authorizing a full-fledged investigation of the problems in connection with both existing and projected airports, would be invaluable. It can provide a basis for further legislation and for such appro-

priate action as other levels of government may take.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

TVA Yardstick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, when the "TVA yardstick" is mentioned, many people tend to think in terms merely of the lower cost of TVA power compared with that of private power.

However, TVA has provided the Nation with many other valuable yardsticks which have not only measured but have contributed to the growth of our total American economy.

One of the finest discussions of these other yardsticks which I have seen in a long time is made by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Peter Edson.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Edson's column appearing in the July 26 issue of the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press Chronicle be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA IS YARDSTICK IN SEVERAL WAYS

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON.—In spite of charges of a "cheap publicity stunt" by private electric utilities against a Tennessee Valley Authority announcement of power rate reductions, recent developments have shown that TVA is still functioning pretty effectively as a national yardstick for natural resources development, in more ways than one.

This appraisal is not being made as any argument for public power development. For there is still a lot of public power in this country that sells for more than private power.

But the TVA Act of 1933 requires that economies developed by the Authority must be passed on to its customers in the form of lower rates. This is where it got its designation as a national yardstick for electric power rates.

TVA has just put through an 8-percent cut in power rates for residential, farm and commercial users in 2 of the 155 locally owned distribution systems it serves. This was announced on the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late Sen. George N. Norris, Republican, Nebraska, the father of TVA.

The new low rate is applicable in Decatur, Ala., and Alcorn County, Miss. It was the success of the electric power cooperative in the latter area that gave Norris his inspiration for the Rural Electrification Act of 1935.

The REA system is now a $4 billion enterprise. It serves over 5 million customers. And it is a most valuable yardstick for rural development of all kinds.

Furthermore, a look at the power rate map of the United States shows that, next to the Pacific Northwest where Bonneville power is available, TVA offers the lowest rates in the country.

In roughly concentric rings around the TVA area in the eastern United States the rates go up progressively, with portions of Maine and northern Minnesota having the highest rates.

The most interesting thing about the power rate survey, however, is that the private utilities in the area surrounding the Tennessee Valley—which have had to reduce their rates the most to compete with TVA—have shown the greatest growth in their common stock earnings.

The explanation for this phenomenon is that low-cost power promotes greater use of electricity. This, in turn, promotes the sale of electric appliances. So, TVA is here given credit for providing another yardstick for economic growth.

One TVA estimate is that if the average home use of electricity throughout the United States was as high as it is in the Tennessee Valley area, a market would be created for the sale of more than $70 billion worth of electric appliances.

Another, more specific, example is offered by TVA's farm electrification program. A farmer in the valley who wants to make greater use of electricity, gets together with his county agent and works out a plan. This farm then becomes a public demonstration plant. Electrification is increased by planned stages for nearby farms to observe.

A valley beef farm was one of the first to adopt such a plan. To the owner's and nearly every other farmer's surprise, it was found that when electrification was completed, in six stages, it could handle three times as many cattle as it did before, with no more labor.

This is the kind of yardstick for economic development that is proving more valuable than the measure of power rates.

It was TVA that turned up the first evidence of collusive bidding by electric power generating equipment manufacturers. By keeping this industry more competitive and ethical in its business practices, TVA has furnished another yardstick from which the whole country can benefit.

Another valuable yardstick is provided by TVA's development of flood control and water transportation for a whole river system. TVA has, in fact, become an international yardstick for natural resource development. It is a model for river valley development projects all over the world.

President Kennedy gave his warm blessings to TVA in the White House Norris Centennial ceremonies. He told the three Board members to keep up their good work. But they run a strictly bipartisan or nonpartisan operation now.

Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the Board, and Director A. R. Jones were Eisenhower appointees. Aubrey J. Wagner, the third Director, was formerly TVA General Manager.

Why a Rhubarb About Newburgh?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following article concerning the welfare operations in force in Detroit as contrasted to the plan being initiated in Newburgh, N.Y. The article appeared in the August 6 issue of the Detroit News and speaks for itself:

WHY A RHUBARB ABOUT NEWBURGH?—WHAT NEW YORK TOWN FIGHTS ABOUT, DETROIT HAS DONE FOR YEARS

(By E. A. Batchelor, Jr.)

In most essentials, the widely heralded new welfare plan of Newburgh, N.Y., is merely a start toward achieving what Detroit has long accepted as routine.

Daniel J. Ryan, Detroit welfare superintendent, makes that statement—and documents it.

The most publicized of the Newburgh "reforms" are its residence requirement and its rule that able-bodied welfare clients work on public projects.

Keystones of Detroit's program have long been its settlement rule and the obligation of the welfare client, unless physically unfit, to work out in man-hours the equivalent of the money he receives.

NO IFS OR BUTS

The Detroit settlement, or residence, law is inflexible. Ryan believes that if Newburgh had imposed a similar one years ago it would not have had to go to drastic extremes to correct abuses.

The law here has no "ifs" and "buts." To be eligible for Detroit welfare, the applicant must have passed 12 completely self-sustaining months as a city resident. One deviation, even a free doctor call or aid from a private agency, and the residency must start from scratch again.

Unless physically unable—and the welfare department's own doctor makes the decision—every man and woman getting welfare aid must work out the amount paid him at projects assigned by the department. The pay is $1.985 an hour, matching the lowest rate paid an unskilled laborer on the city payroll.

CASH WITHHELD

This is money they never see. They are paid in "work receipts" made out by foremen on a variety of city jobs.

For example, if a man's welfare budget is $19.85 weekly, he must put in 10 hours work. Only then does he become eligible to receive more food stamps, have his rent paid, and get the other essentials covered by welfare aid.

Ryan happily accepts the challenge of the 13 points of the Newburgh plan and ticks off an answer to each.

The Newburgh manifesto sets forth:

1. All cash payments which can be converted to food, clothing, and rent vouchers and the like without basic harm to the intent of the aid shall be issued in voucher form henceforth.

To this Ryan answers: "We find it cheaper to use cash if our client is trustworthy. It is a big savings in administrative expenses. But if a man is unreliable we take all cash out of his hands."

2. All able bodied adult males on relief of any kind who are capable of working are to be assigned for work assignment on a 40-hour week.

Ryan: "Suppose they are only getting $19 or $20 for this period? Would you work them at the rate of 20 cents an hour?"

OLD STORY HERE

3. All recipients physically capable of and available for private employment who are issued a job and refuse it, regardless of the type of employment involved, are to be denied relief.

Ryan: "We have been ahead of them for years, except we demand that it be a living wage rather than letting employers exploit them."

4. All mothers of illegitimate children are to be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief.

Says Ryan: "How can you enforce this? And what do you do, let the children starve?"

5. All applicants for relief who have left a job voluntarily; that is, who have not been fired or laid off, shall be denied relief.

Ryan: "This has been our policy for years."

6. The allotment for any one-family unit shall not exceed the take-home pay of the lowest paid city employee with a family of comparable size.

Ryan: "This works out in practice here."

7. All files of all aid to dependent children cases are to be reviewed monthly.

"We have no parallel situation here because aid to dependent children is a State agency," Ryan said.

8. All applicants for relief who are new to the city must show evidence that their plans in coming to the city involved a concrete offer of employment, similar to that required of foreign immigrants.

Ryan: "If they had our settlement law, this would have all been spelled out for them."

9. Aid to persons except the aged, blind, and disabled shall be limited to 3 months in any one year.

"This is unenforceable," declares Ryan. "What becomes of them the other 9 months?"

DETROIT DOES MORE

10. All recipients who are not disabled, blind, ambulatory, or otherwise incapacitated shall report to the department of public welfare monthly for a conference regarding their case.

"We do more," says Ryan. "Every caseworker sees a case once a month in a planned interview. The worker visits the home every 60 days."

11. Once the budget for the fiscal year is approved by the council, it shall not be exceeded unless approved by council for supplemental appropriation.

Ryan: "We do not have this problem because when our budget gets above a certain millage the State picks up the difference."

12. There shall be a monthly expenditure limit on all categories of welfare aid.

Ryan: "That would be fine if one could predict employment emergencies."

MORAL QUESTION

13. Prior to certifying or continuing any more aid to dependent children, a determination shall be made as to the home environment. If the home environment is not satisfactory, the children in that home shall be placed in foster care in lieu of welfare aid to the family adults.

"The State rules a home is unsuitable when illegitimate children are born into it," said Ryan. "Mothers are removed from aid to dependent children rolls. They then come to us. We permit the mothers to go on our rolls if they meet the other qualifications because the mother is often very devoted to her children.

"We cannot capriciously impose our own moral standards on others. And, from a practical standpoint, it costs $14.45 a week to board a child in a foster home."

Expanding on the Detroit setup, Ryan cited the week ending July 31 to show how thoroughly the welfare applicants are screened.

That week 1,400 persons applied to the central intake office. The claims of 412 were rejected at the first interview. Of the remaining 988, only 41 percent got so much as an emergency food order after further screening.

TYPICAL CASE

It is an article of faith among critics of the welfare program to contend, "If a couple has enough children they can live better on welfare than the average Detroit firefighter."

Weary of hearing this assertion, Ryan recently culled through his files to disprove it.

He chose the case of a former Chrysler worker named Harry W., his wife and their 11 children.

"He is typical of many on our rolls, except for the unusual number of children," Ryan said. "He is 33 years old, born and brought up on a Mississippi farm. His schooling was limited."

He came to Detroit during the labor recruiting drive carried on in the South by many factories in the years immediately following World War II, the records show.

He worked as a punch press operator at Chrysler from 1948 until 1957 when he encountered a series of layoffs. He was laid off permanently in March of 1960.

JOB HOPELESSNESS

With his limited seniority and the increase in automation his chance of getting his old job back is almost hopeless. Barring a lucky break, he will be on the rolls indefinitely, although physically he is 100 percent employable.

To support Harry W. and his family it costs the city $159.62 every 2 weeks. In return he puts in 72 hours during this biweekly period working with a cleanup crew for the Department of Parks and Recreation. The 72 hours is the maximum demanded by the welfare department. One day every two weeks is earmarked for him to pick up his check. The department demands it be called for in person.

Harry W. handles only $25.40 cash of the $159.60 that the city allots him and his family.

Here is the way his biweekly welfare budget breaks down: Food, $110.10; rent, $29.92; gas, $3.30; electricity, $2.80; transportation, 50 cents.

CLOTHING, FUEL

Averaging out annual figures, this would also include $7 for clothing and $6 for heating fuel.

He long ago sold his car under a departmental order applying to long-term welfare recipients.

Like 80 percent of Detroit welfare recipients, the family is given food stamps. Issued in the value of $1 and 25 cents, $88 of the food allowance comes in this form.

However, soap, and certain other nondomestic food items like coffee are not covered by stamps and to purchase these, Harry W. gets $22.10 in cash.

The family also gets $44 extra in food stamps during this period but they don't come out of the welfare department's pocket. The dividend is supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a bonus to those who have adopted the food stamp plan.

COMPARSION

"The lowest paid city fireman gets $6,141," said Ryan. "This breaks down to $236.20 biweekly. Even with the Federal food grants, the fireman is still a long way ahead. True, the welfare client pays no income tax but to make it a true comparison you would have to assign 11 children to the fireman so he wouldn't be paying very much."

What is Detroit's welfare cost and who picks up the check?

In the fiscal year ending last June 30, it cost $27,263,802. The city's portion was $8,508,262. The State paid for $17,832,961.

Polaris Fleet Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Invisible Vigilantes," published in the August 29 edition of Look magazine, which places in proper prospective the grave prospects involved in the cold war, and provides a thorough understanding of this country's foremost deterrent to a hot war—Polaris—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

On the same subject, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from a recent edition of Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N.H., Philip C. Foster, editor, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVISIBLE VIGILANTES

(By J. Robert Moskin)

Polaris is a weapon that will be combat-fired only after most of us have been killed.

On that day, a coded message will speed out to our Polaris submarines under the seas from the President of the United States—or his successor. On each submarine, three officers will swiftly fit the message together, like a jigsaw puzzle, and sound the alarm: "Battle stations—missile."

Every man races to his post. When the sub is at launching speed and depth and the missiles have been checked out, the executive officer, now in the ship's attack center, reports, "We're ready to fire, Captain." The captain orders, "Commence firing," and pushes the permission-to-fire button above his head.

In the heavily guarded missile control center, a red light marked "Captain" blinks on. The fire-control-team chief hits his first launch button. A light signals "Away."

TO DETER AGGRESSION

If everything goes perfectly, he will hurl 16 nuclear-warheaded missiles that could wipe out 16 enemy cities. The last missile will be winging toward its target almost as soon as the first has landed 1,200 miles away.

Like a snarling police dog in the front yard, Polaris' first job is to deter aggression. We pray the Russians won't attack first with nuclear weapons if they know that Polaris-loaded submarines will still be out there—hidden in the depths of the incredibly vast oceans—able to take their time and wait and then to fire. For, as one admiral puts it, "The minute we launch Polaris, we've lost the war and they have too."

To be effective, a deterrent cannot bluff. No one knows how good Polaris will be when we need it. The two great questions about Polaris are: How reliable is it? Can it be fired by mistake?

Unofficial reports have said that only 10 of 18 underwater Polaris test firings have been successful. The experts do not expect to put all the missiles on target, but they insist that those in operation are remarkably reliable. Captain Osborn, skipper of the *George Washington's* blue crew, declares, "We guarantee inevitable destruction."

No other missile is asked to do what a Polaris must. It must first check out; its test equipment is as complex as 1,000 TV sets. Then it must survive a vertical underwater launch by compressed air, travel through salt water, break out through ocean waves, ignite two solid-fuel engines as it flies through the air, enter the vacuum of space and reenter the atmosphere. Its self-contained guidance brain must in 2 minutes—and unfailingly—aim the warhead smack on target.

If the United States were willing to strike first with nuclear weapons, the Polaris system would be as ridiculous as a Rube Goldberg apparatus to replace the toothbrush. Because this second-strike weapon must be self-contained, it is a fantastic conglomeration of computers, guidance instruments, 100,000 transistors, a dozen different navigation systems, ersatz atmosphere, red and green flashing lights, oxygen generators, water converters, frozen food, pressure hulls and garbage ejectors—plus 133 men locked up for weeks in a totally submerged submarine.

In addition to its self-contained possibilities for failure, Polaris must evade two outside dangers. One is the Russian antisubmarine-warfare effort that would be out to destroy our submarines before they can launch. The second is an antimissile defense system that would seek to destroy our missiles after they are launched. Today, neither threat can stop Polaris.

Meanwhile, the Polaris program is not standing still. A 1,500-mile A–2 missile with a higher thrust fuel is now being tested. The A–3, with a range of 2,500 miles, is being designed for use by 1964. Its range will increase Polaris' ability to penetrate the Eurasian land mass and give the subs more room to hide in at sea—vitally necessary improvements.

ONE MAN'S SANITY

Many people are worried about whether Polaris can be fired by accident, error, or madness. Do all our lives depend on the sanity and judgment of one naval officer, thousands of miles from a superior and under orders not to break radio silence?

The fact is that no one man can fire the birds. Three highly trained, carefully picked officers would have to crack up to trigger the holocaust.

Although no skipper can fire his missiles alone, he is the responsible man. All Polaris captains are painstakingly chosen and must pass the grueling trial through which Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover puts every prospective commanding officer of nuclear-powered ships. It is designed to determine how the candidate reacts to crises under extreme psychological pressure.

Both Jim Osborn and Pat Hannifin, the commander and executive officer of the *George Washington's* blue crew, have necessarily passed. Osborn, now 43, was the first man ever given command of a Polaris sub. Hannifin will shortly leave to take command of the *Lafayette*, the first sub to carry the A–3 missile.

Osborn is a dramatic example of the new breed of Polaris captain. He is a tough, smart, cantankerous Annapolis graduate. He admits to smoking as many as two dozen cigars a day, saying lightly, "I'd rather chew on a cigar than on a lieutenant."

When his sub is locked up like a bank safe with a time release, Osborn is the boss. He works his men hard. Lives depend on him. In a job that has few precedents, he says, "We don't say somebody goofed. That somebody is us."

At sea, Osborn, who makes about $15,000 a year sleeps 2 or 3 hours at a time and has ship conned at random courses and speeds. He does not want any antisubmarine force to predict the *George Washington's* behavior. "Someone could conceivably sink you," he says. "This is no picnic; it's reality."

Today's Polaris skipper is no longer the traditional Lone Ranger of the seas. He will fire his missiles only when he is told to. His targets are decided at the overall Strategic Target Planning Headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. Targeting of the entire U.S. arsenal of strategic nuclear weapons is coordinated there.

Polaris is the first of the second-generation missiles to join this arsenal. The Air Force, on President Kennedy's order, is now stepping up development of the solid-fuel intercontinental Minuteman and the bomber-launched, 1,000-mile Skybolt. Minuteman will be shot 5,500 miles from concrete undergound bases and eventually from mobile railroad trains. Skybolt will be launched from planes that will not have to enter enemy air space.

Because Polaris, Minuteman, and Skybolt are relatively invulnerable to nuclear attack, they justify our second-strike policy: We will not hit an enemy until he starts something. Then we will still destroy his cities and his people—a price we trust he will be unwilling to pay. By the time the administration meets its present goals of having 450 to 500 each of Polaris and Minuteman missiles on station, it is hoped these weapons will reduce the chance of anyone's starting a nuclear war.

This is why Polaris' prime targets should be enemy cities, not missile sites and bomber bases. As one Polaris expert puts it, "If you target against missiles, the guy just builds more missiles. This is an Ivan-in-the-street weapon."

Targeting is relatively simple as long as the enemy is known. But as more nations—such as Communist China—build nuclear bombs, the problem will be complicated by the need to determine who shot at us before we retaliate. Polarismen say that their weapon's invulnerability allows the President to take his time.

A lot of money went into giving him this extra time. It was a spectacular gamble. The Navy mobilized American industry to design and build the various parts of the Polaris system simultaneously. Aerojet-General, General Dynamics, General Electric, Lockheed Aircraft, North American Aviation, Sperry Rand, Westinghouse and hundreds of other companies participated. They went ahead, with no proof that, when their components were mated, the whole thing would work at all.

Technical breakthroughs in reduced-size warheads, improved inertial guidance systems and stronger solid propellants finally helped to win the gamble.

OTHER ROLES NEGLECTED

The Polaris program has already received $4.8 billion, and President Kennedy has requested authority to spend $2 billion more over the next 4 years. These large sums are necessary because a fully equipped Polaris submarine costs $116 million; one missile costs $1.1 million.

Almost all Polaris money has come out of the normal Navy budget, arousing protests that other ships and jobs are being neglected. Antisubmarine warfare development has been slowed down, ship repairs postponed, fewer nuclear-powered attack subs built, blimps eliminated, naval stations closed.

Officers like Osborn defend the concentration on Polaris. He says, "The military are the most conservative people on earth. They never throw anything away. If we hadn't changed to tractors on farms, we'd still have cavalry."

Although the Polarismen have been forced to muffle their drumming for a $8 billion fleet of 45 submarines, Kennedy has ordered the program rushed to put 29 subs (464 missiles) on the job by 1965. He told Congress: "The sooner they are on station, the safer we will be."

We now have four submarines deployed overseas, with two or three always on patrol. "Two on station today," says Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, who directed the creation of the Polaris system, "have more destructive power than all the arms of all countries from the time man started making weapons until the nuclear age." These four will soon be joined by the *Abraham Lincoln*.

The first 10 subs will make up Subron 14, based in the Holy Loch. The next two squadrons are probably destined for Atlantic duty, unless Red China's nuclear-weapon threat gives us reason to spot one in the Pacific. President Kennedy has also stated his intention to stiffen NATO with five Polaris submarines.

RADICAL INNOVATIONS

To keep high the percentage of these submarines that can stay on station, the Navy has introduced two radical innovations. One is the mobile oversea base like the USS *Proteus*, whose commander, Capt. Richard B. Laning, led the nuclear-powered submarine *Seawolf* on its record-setting 60-day submerged cruise. The *Proteus* is exposed to neutralist and pacifist attack abroad, but it eliminates wasting time to send Polaris subs back across the ocean to rest their crews and to refit. The submarines will transit the Atlantic only once in 3 years.

The $50 million *Proteus* carries a million spare parts from missiles to screws, 120,000 blueprints, a variety of specialized repair shops and many skilled technicians in its crew of 960. It takes care of most repairs—at the price of a high incidence of ulcers among its officers.

The second innovation is the assignment of two crews to each submarine. This is a major and controversial break with all naval tradition, but Polarismen swear by it.

Eventually, the longer range A–3 missile may eliminate the need for both oversea bases and twin crews. But for now, they make it possible to keep men volunteering for this duty and to plan to keep two thirds of the subs on patrol. All submariners are volunteers, and most Polarismen have also volunteered for the program.

The largest hurdle in Polaris's expansion is finding men who are both intelligent enough for the technical training and motivated for the sacrifices required. There has been a growing shortage of Polaris recruits. One admiral admits, "Our selective process isn't as selective as it was."

When a sailor joins the program, he enters a strange new life. He may spend 3 years training for a skilled job—as long as it takes to build his ship. When his sub is operational, he makes two patrols a year. He spends approximately 3 months away each time and then flies home to the United States for 3 months. He can expect to make six cruises before being transferred.

Once a patrol begins, the Polaris sailor is unable to communicate with his family. Nothing can alter that, not even illness or death. Wives of Polaris men (two thirds of them are married) can send their husbands on patrol occasional radio messages.

Polaris duty can be hard on marriages. Says Osborn, "The tragedy in this lash-up is the families of these people. These guys are no stronger than their wives."

There has been a disturbing number of divorces in the program. As Bob Barkman, who operates missile-control unit No. 1 on the George Washington's Blue Crew, says, "This is the supreme test of a marriage."

The men who serve in the Polaris submarines are truly the free world's vigilantes—volunteers organized to punish aggression when international law fails. They endure today all the dangers and conditions of war except for firing their weapons. Barkman is deeply aware of the horror he and his fellow crewmembers can let loose on the world. He says, "We all know if we ever have to shoot these things, it's not going to be much fun going home."

POLARIS FLEET VITAL

With the activation for sea duty of the Polaris missile submarine *Theodore Roosevelt*, four of these nuclear-powered, nuclear-armed craft are now on patrol in the interest of the free world security. The deployment of these deadly submersibles provides an effective antidote to Russia's intemperate saber rattling.

Possibly stung by this latest announcement of progress in the U.S. missile submarine program, Pravda recently warned that Russia also has atomic-powered submarines. Yet though the Russians are not reluctant to display new developments in military aircraft, evidence of missile subs to match the Polaris type is lacking.

But the question whether East matches West in this weapons category cannot detract from the importance of the U.S. Polaris fleet. From the time the Arctic was proven no barrier to atomic undersea craft, Russia became

vulnerable on her nothern periphery. Historically this area has been immune from attack. Now to have it exposed must be of great concern to the Kremlin.

This is a strategic weakness which the West may be forced to exploit to counter Soviet threats. In a better world these tactics might not be necessary, but realism demands that with freedom at stake the West must use every advantage. In view of the contempt shown by the Communist bloc for our freedoms, the Polaris fleet may have to grow from 4 to 40.

Who Caused the Present Berlin Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, the noted news analyst, has written a thoughtful editorial concerning the present Berlin crisis which appeared in the August 22, 1961, issue of the Washington Evening Star. Mr. Lawrence puts the blame for the crisis where it belongs, squarely on the armor-laden shoulders of the Communists who have enslaved East Berlin. As Mr. Lawrence says:

The facts are plain to see. Four powers allied together in the last war made an agreement to act as trustees for a conquered territory. No single trustee had the power to disregard the will of the others or to continue to occupy any territory or govern any of its inhabitants without the express consent of the other allies.

Unilaterally, the Communists have sealed off East Berlin from the free world. This is a clear violation of the agreement to which Mr. Lawrence refers.

I think every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read Mr. Lawrence's editorial. I, therefore, include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOVIETS ANNEX A PIECE OF BERLIN—MOSCOW ACTION IS TERMED AGGRESSION AND VIOLATION OF TRUSTEESHIP IN CITY

(By David Lawrence)

IN EUROPE.—The Lyndon Johnson visit to West Germany and Berlin is over, and the cheers and the shouting have subsided. It was a good idea for him to make the trip. It gave timely encouragement to the West Berlin populace, which had grown panicky. But the sad, unvarnished truth is that the Western Alliance stands in a dazed, if not frustrated, condition as it becomes clear that the Soviets have in reality seized and virtually annexed a piece of Berlin and apparently have gotten away with their aggression.

The facts are plain to see. Four Powers allied together in the last war made an agreement to act as trustees for a conquered territory. No single trustee had the power to disregard the will of the others or to continue to occupy any territory or govern any of its inhabitants without the express consent of the other allies.

The Soviet Union now has violated its trusteeship. The people of West Berlin were dumfounded when the three Western Powers of the wartime alliance sent a note to Moscow that merely called attention to the violation without seeming to be willing to do anything about it. That's why the morale of West Berlin's population sank and Vice President JOHNSON hurried over to the area to cheer them up and to participate in the welcoming of 1,500 additional American troops who came to strengthen the garrison in West Berlin.

But such a small military contingent and the demonstrations of the crowd for the distinguished American visitors have little, if any signicance so far as the Communists are concerned. This is because, for all practical purposes, the Western allies already have acquiesced in the cutting off of East Berlin, and there is really nothing to negotiate now except the ratification of the Soviet action in annexing the whole East German area through the device of a separate peace treaty.

Most of the voices that come from the Western governments, formally and informally, call vaguely for "negotiation." But there seems to be no iron hand behind the words, and the peoples of Europe really don't expect any militancy from the Western governments now. If the principle involved is of no value, if the Soviets can annex a piece of territory and police it as if it were their own, shutting off access to West Berlin as they please, and the Allies continue only to send diplomatic notes of protest, then indeed the Berlin crisis is over. For the Russians will be glad to talk for months or years about their concepts of legal rights and postwar agreements.

The psychological impact of what has just happened struck the West Germans quickly, but the true significance of the latest aggression by the Soviets has not yet permeated elsewhere in Western Europe.

For all practical purposes, the crucial moment has passed—the expected agreement now is likely to elicit some paper guarantees of the right of Allied access subject to Soviet whims and variable interpretations. But the world will know that the Soviets have not only perpetuated their occupation but have set up a puppet government in East Germany to harass West Germany and the Western allies.

Actually, despite everything President Kennedy has done—the stepping up of the U.S. military program, the dispatch of 1,500 more troops to West Berlin, the organizing of our military effort in NATO—the Communist dictatorship in the Kremlin is still doubtful whether the West means business.

Within the last few days the Moscow government has started in its own way a probing operation. Newsmen in various Western capitals have been approached. Members of different governments have been interrogated privately by Soviet diplomats at luncheons or dinners. There has been a concerted effort to find out how resolute the Western alliance really is.

The skepticism about the Western attitude has resulted from the repeated statements in the American and British press that negotiations, in effect, may include concessions and compromises. If this be true, it is only natural for the Moscow government to continue to press hard toward its goal, and to assume that even tactics of harassment on the corridor between West Berlin and West Germany will not be resisted and that a protracted palaver will be acquiesed in by the West.

What should the West have done? It could have insisted on free access to West Berlin by the East German people and the right of West Berlin residents to go to East Germany at any time, under military protection if necessary. The West, instead, is in the position today of having recognized the right of the Soviet Government to imprison the East German people and to block the free movement of the East Germans within their own country.

Civilian Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, numerous patriotic groups have expressed concern over indications that there are those who would subjugate the sovereignty of this country to the international collectivists. Invariably these groups urge a policy of firmness, devoid of compromise to the international Communist conspiracy. In order to provide facts on the recent controversy involving civilian control of the military, I made the following address which was broadcast over a number of radio stations. I submit the text of this address for the study of the readers of the RECORD:

CIVILIAN CONTROL

The issue of civilian control of the military has been raised in the Congress.

The principle of military subordination to civilian control has been extended by some to include activities which seem to involve matters of conscience.

When one considers that the so-called police action in Korea and the use of Federal troops in Little Rock are traceable to civilian control, it seems to me that a definition of the principle is overdue.

Let us return to the birth pangs of our Republic. Let us review the genesis of the military. Let us search for the truth.

On June 14, 1775, the Second Continental Congress authorized the formation of 10 companies of infantry and directed that these companies join with the 16,000 men of the New England Army near Boston. It is generally accepted that this act created the Continental Army and gave to the Army the distinction of being the senior service among the military components of the Department of Defense. Gen. George Washington, as "chief general" of the Continental Army, maintained a deference to the civil authority of the Congress and its instrumentalities that has served as an unbroken precedent for American military leadership. The Continental Congress, as executive agent for the conduct of the Revolutionary War, developed a Board of War to exercise the function. When the Articles of Confederation of 1777 were finally ratified by Maryland in 1781, the Board was replaced by a Department of War. It is of interest to note that Maryland had instructed her delegates in 1778 not to agree to the Confederation until matters respecting the western lands were settled. However, on January 30, 1781, finding that the enemies of the country took advantage of the circumstance to disseminate opinions of an ultimate dissolution of the Union, the Maryland Legislature passed an act to empower their delegates to subscribe and ratify the articles forthwith. The waiving of disagreements, the closing of ranks and the presentation of a united American front to those who would seek to divide us is traditional.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States (1787), which superseded the Articles of Confederation (1777), provided for Congress "to declare War—raise and support Armies—make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces—calling forth the militia—organizing, arming and disciplining the militia,

and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution further prescribes that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

Still further, article VI of the Constitution prescribes that, "this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land;" The first act of Congress under the Constitution relating to the Army was the act of 1789 which continued in being the Army created by the earlier Continental Congress. In 1792 the Congress passed the Militia Act which remained law until passage of the National Defense Act 124 years later. The U.S. Military Academy was established at West Point, N.Y., on March 16, 1802, with a class of 10 cadets and a faculty staff of 5 officers. Several wars later, in 1857, Secretary of War John B. Floyd recognized the need of an Army General Staff but neither he nor his successors could gain acceptance of the idea until Secretary of War Elihu Root created the Army War College in 1900 and paved the way for the General Staff measures of 1903.

Passage of the National Defense Act of 1916 reduced the Army General Staff from 36 officers to 19, leaving only 9 staff officers for coordinating work. At the outbreak of World War I, the strength of the German General Staff was 650; the French staff, 664; the English staff, 232. The 1916 act also standardized and converted the militia into the National Guard and provided for a Reserve Corps. Also about this time another important change in national policy began to take form. This change, through the succeeding decades, affected in major proportions the Army's organization structure, size, and disposition. On April 2, 1917, President Wilson in a World War I message to the Congress said in part, "The world must be made safe for democracy. * * * civilization itself seeming to be in the balance." This departure in concept from that of George Washington who, in his farewell address counseled against involvement in European affairs and permanent alliances, forced a projection of the Army's organization on the continent of Europe and laid the groundwork for the next generation of politico-military planners.

Based on World War I experience, a reorganization of the War Department and the Army was effected by passage of the act of June 4, 1920, amending the National Defense Act of 1916. This act divided the territory of the United States into nine corps areas and created three oversea departments to which were allotted specific troops. The staff at all levels was organized on identical functional lines. The Air Corps became a separate arm, chemical warfare a separate service, the tank corps was absorbed by the infantry. The Army school system was improved and the Army Industrial College (now Armed Forces Industrial College) was established in 1924. The Officer Reserve Corps and the Reserve officers training program was firmly established. In addition, the act provided the General Staff with the planning function (to present plans for the mobilization of the Nation and its resources in an emergency), and with responsibility for investigating and reporting on efficiency of the Army of the United States and its state of preparation for military operations and the rendering of professional aid and assistance to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff. The General Staff was organized in five major divisions; personnel, intelligence, operations and training, supply (labeled G1, G2, G3, and G4, respectively) and a War Plans Division known as WPD, a mobile division designed to move into the field as the nucleus of a headquarters staff of an expeditionary force.

Unfortunately, the act of 1920 was not clear on the division of responsibility. The control exercised by the General Staff over the supply arms and services was shared with the Assistant Secretary of War (now Under Secretary). The Assistant Secretary was held responsible for the development of plans for industrial mobilization as well as the supervision of the procurement of all military supplies. Chiefs of supply branches reported to the Assistant Secretary on all procurement matters. A tentative distinction was drawn between the military and civilian aspects of the supply problem, with G4 handling the former and the Assistant Secretary the later. However, by 1941 there were more than 1,200 people in the office of the Assistant Secretary and the ability to coordinate successfully was increasingly impaired.

In addition to the G4 supply problem, another general difficulty was created by the large number of commands reporting to the Chief of Staff. The rather extraordinarily wide span of control of the Chief of Staff was further complicated by congressional acts that rapidly increased appropriations and the size of the Army. In 1934–35 the appropriation for the Army had dropped to $277 million and the enlisted strength had been reduced to 118,000 men. Seven years later it bounced up to where 10½ million men and women would find service with the Army and appropriations of billions of dollars would be made.

Except for its civil functions—harbor dredging, flood control, Civilian Conservation Camps, etc.—the Army's work in the mid-thirties was more theoretical than applied. At the outbreak of World War II the Chief of Staff had to deal personally, or through the General Staff, with 40 different major commands and 350 smaller ones.

These difficulties, coupled with the inadequacy of the WPD which had been designed for a "one front" operation and the problem of the relation of the Air Force to the existing structure which had been constant since 1920, led to the reorganization of February 28, 1942. By Executive order of the President on that date, the Army of the United States was divided into three great commands under the Chief of Staff: Army Ground Forces, Army Air Forces, and Army Service of Supply Forces, later designated Army Service Forces.

Thus, after 40 years of wrangling over the administrative functions of the General Staff, the principle of coordination over a large group of subordinates operating agencies was abandoned in favor of the principle of decentralizing to three major commands the responsibility for supervision. It is also important to note, because of subsequent organizational impacts, that President Roosevelt, in his 1941 message to Congress, spelled out his famous "four freedoms" (of speech, of worship, from want, from fear) as American ideals in terms of responsibility "everywhere in the world."

Later in 1945 the President also said, "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent upon the well-being of other nations far away."

Thus the rupture, started by Wilson and the League of Nations in the 140-year policy of no "entangling alliances," was completed on June 26, 1945, with the signing of the Charter of the United Nations. Thus, also, the signing of the various treaties and agreements stemming from the covenants of the Charter has created a "supreme law of the land," and the commitments for which place their own unique requirements on the Army and the way the Army is organized. The Army's proverbial seesawing between the extremes of the famines of peace and the plenties of war have come to an end, at least for the foreseeable future. A more or less stable Army organizational requirement has evolved in order that American principles may be maintained "everywhere in the world" and that "the world may be made safe for democracy."

Reduction of the Army to peacetime size, such as occurred after every war prior to the Korean war is a thing of the past. No longer can the risks encouraged by military weaknesses be afforded by the United States, or by its allies in the free world.

A strong active Army constantly reorganizing to meet the day-to-day advances of technological advancements, is now a permanent fixture of our national policy. At the same time, neither can an Army of extravagances, such as historically evolved out of the emergency wholesale recruitment, procurement and an unlimited purse, be condoned. In its stead every segment and entity of the Army's organization must be constantly weighed in light of its continuing contribution to combat effectiveness. Effective management must go hand in hand with combat effectiveness.

Combat effectiveness must relate to the nature of the war being fought.

Past conflicts have depended on physical force to destroy men and render them hors de combat.

Today the war is fought in the minds of man, to destroy their wills and reduce them to slavery.

In such a war the entire population must be united in positive thought and action.

Americans are born or have by their own free will become members of one organization—the United States of America.

Americans affirm but one loyalty above all—the sacred contract that made us one, under God.

Americans pledge their loyalty to the flag which stands for all that the Constitution has brought into being.

The officials of our Federal Government, in their oath of office, swear to support and defend this Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

The Constitution is the contract that grants them office and, in the event of infidelity to its terms, excludes them from official status.

The Constitution is the essence of the principle of civilian control.

The National Lottery of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint the Members of this House with the national lottery of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia is one of only three Communist nations utilizing the lottery device. It is perhaps noteworthy that the three Communist nations using lotteries, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, are the three nations in the past most heavily subjected to Western influences. The more stringent Com-

munist nations will have no part of lotteries.

The gross receipts of the Yugoslav national lottery came to $20 million in 1960. The net income to the state in that year was $5 million. The bulk of the money is used to assist orphanages, hospitals, and other institutions.

Of the nations of Europe and the Americas, only the United States, Canada, and most Communist countries do not operate lotteries. The two great nations of North America are in rare company.

Activities of the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the activities of the John Birch Society have come under considerable scrutiny of late, and certainly a more thorough understanding of its operations is a public need.

It is encouraging to note that the weekly "grassroots" press of the Nation is giving attention to exposing the society, and I am pleased that one of the outstanding newspapers of Idaho, the Rexburg Standard, has commented on the Birchers' recently publicized essay contest.

I would like unanimous consent that the editorial in the Standard of August 15 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOW AT INSTITUTIONS

The John Birch Society has by its "personal villification" of Chief Justice Warren, aroused the wrath of the American Bar Association. That group's anger is wholly justified, and should be echoed among the general public. For the Birchers, in announcing that they will sponsor an undergraduate essay contest on reasons for Warren's impeachment, have sought to besmirch the Supreme Court.

Whitney North, president of the bar association, delivered at its national convention a speech critical of the Birch Society's action. His remarks were roundly applauded by the convention delegates, who represent lawyers in all parts of the United States.

The Birch Society's conduct, said Seymour, is leading ignorant people into "disrespect for our institutions which maintain liberty under law." Actually, the activities of the John Birch group and other radicals of the far right fringe go deeper than that. They give aid and comfort to our enemies in the world ideological struggle in which the United States and our allies are engaged.

It takes no seer to understand what we are witnessing—a global rebellion of the oppressed, the so-called "revolution of rising expectations." Both we and the Communists pose as their champtions. Millions are wavering between two choices—our way of life and that to which the Kremlin pays a cynical lip service.

When these desperate people hear, from within America, vicious rantings against institutions and ideas accepted by most Americans as the very fabric of our society, what will they conclude? Will they not begin to falter in whatever hopes for fulfillment of their dreams our system may have aroused in them?

Support of Foreign Aid

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8400) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the Mutual Security Act of 1961 has been passed by this body 287 to 140. I was one of those Members who voted for the bill. Also, I was one of the Members who voted for all amendments that called for reductions which, I believe, would have trimmed unnecessary fat from the program.

These amendments included a cut of $50 million from the development grant authorization, the reduction by $181 million of the authorization for the President's supporting assistance fund, a reduction of $50 million in the President's contingency fund, and the deletion of the provision of $25 million for loans to small farmers in friendly foreign nations. In each case the amendments were rejected.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the district I represent generally support the mutual security program. This year 80 percent of those who answered my questionnaire said that they favor continuation by the United States of its mutual security program of economic and military assistance to countries outside the Soviet bloc. I have received a few letters, however, that ask why it is necessary to assist foreign nations when we could use the money for other purposes here at home. I believe that these are people who do not understand that about 80 percent of the money we spend for foreign aid is spent in this country, not abroad.

This money is used to purchase American goods such as machinery, timber products, cement, 106-millimeter recoilless rifle shells, fishery products, as well as milk, cheese, and other farm products. The items I have cited as examples, Mr. Speaker, are all commodities that are produced in my own district. These are American-made products that provide employment and wages for Americans. When we send products to other countries, we are not only helping those nations, but are also helping ourselves.

Another point concerns the benefits of the program in terms of the military support we receive. Many of the nations that receive aid from us maintain military forces which make a vital contribution to our mutual defenses. If we were forced to maintain an Army large enough to replace the armies of our friends, the costs would be much greater than the costs of this program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe the mutual security program works two ways. It helps our friends and it helps us. This is why I have supported it in the past and vote for it today.

The Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an interesting and timely editorial which recently appeared in the South Omaha Sun, of Omaha, Nebr.:

THE PATRIOTS

We hear patriotism is declining in this country, and we don't believe it for a minute. It seems to us that Americans are as patriotic as they ever were. Certainly their response to Khrushchev's contrived crisis over Berlin leaves little to be desired. Except for a few frenetic souls who apparently long to see H-bombs bursting in air, most of the American people have been going about their business soberly, determined to see this thing through, as they have seen through other crises, and ready to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary for the national welfare. If there are any "apostles of appeasement among us, their number is scanty and their voices have been conspicuously silent. We have seen pointed suggestions that there are sinister, unnamed individuals, in the White House and the State Department, who are eager to throw in the sponge to communism. We think such charges are rubbish.

In recent days the American people have been revealing their patriotism in manifold ways. We think of the Freedom Riders, risking life and limb for the ideals of brotherhood and equality. We think of the young men and women responding to the Peace Corps; of business leaders—as in Omaha—going out and doing things for the betterment of their communities; of union men—as in Chicago—fearlessly tossing out the thugs controlling their local. We talk to people every day—teachers and preachers and parents and politicians, Boy Scouts, farmers, waitresses, social workers, soldiers, postmen, diplomats, doctors, lawyers, merchants, chiefs—and we haven't seen any sign that their love of this country has diminished one iota.

Patriotism is not—as some seem to think—a matter of proclaiming one's own adoration of the flag while derogating that of one's fellow citizens. The true patriot doesn't wear his stars and stripes upon his sleeve; he doesn't say—or think—that he and he alone, or his group and his group alone, is the only reliable keeper of the sacred flame. Patriotism is of the deed, not merely the word; of attitudes, not attitudinizing; of a healthy discontent with things as they are and a resolve to do better, not the smug refusal to countenance criticism or change, not standing pat on dogma, not sitting tight on the status quo.

Patriotism, in short, is of the heart and mind, not the lungs, and so far as we can see, the hearts and minds of the American people are sound.

We Cannot Afford Luxurious Living in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, as defense spending rises to $49.5 billion in fiscal 1962—well over half the Federal budget—I think it is time for the Congress to make more vigorous efforts to eliminate the waste of men and money in our Military Establishment.

A special report by the Whaley-Eaton Service, publisher of the American Letter in Washington, D.C., states that many of the 6,700 military establishments of one kind or another in the United States and abroad are unnecessary, but that the Department of Defense is having difficulty shutting down only 73 of the smaller installations due to heavy political pressures.

The report also criticizes the easy life of many military officers who we provide with fine houses, swimming pools, golf clubs, and even military servants.

This criticism is supported by a recent article about the $10,000 being spent to fix up a house at Fort McNair for Gen. Maxwell Taylor, military adviser to President Kennedy. That is a conservative renovation. About $100,000 was spent to renovate quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I urge everyone who is interested in this waste of taxpayers' money to read the following report:

THE MILITARY'S LUXURIOUS COUNTRY CLUBS—SPECIAL REPORT FROM WHALEY-EATON SERVICE, A SUPPLEMENT TO THE AMERICAN LETTER, WASHINGTON, AUGUST 5, 1961

Defense is a wasteful business at best, but are so many military bases, maintained at huge costs because of local political pressures, really necessary?

Only the experts can determine how many guns, tanks, planes, missiles, submarines and other weapons the United States needs for adequate defense.

But it doesn't take an expert to determine that the money spent on many of our 6,700 military bases of one kind or another involves a vast amount of sheer waste.

In view of the urgent demands by the administration for more defense billions, the United States might well give some serious thought to eliminating those surplus military establishments which long ago lost their usefulness.

Nobody will know until they tackle the job whether millions, hundreds of millions, or even billions could be saved. With defense costs already at the $50-billion-a-year level, however, the time has come to "do something" about this needless waste.

Local politicians are forever alert to "protect" their districts from any fall-off in the Federal Government's spending there.

Military bases have long been sacrosanct, protected by Members of Congress fighting to maintain, and if possible increase, the flow of Federal funds to sustain local prosperity.

The "forts" that were built in the 1800's to protect the settlers from the Indians remain. But now these vast establishments cover hundreds of thousands of acres, have all the luxury accouterments of country-club living, and constitute a heavy burden on the taxpayer.

There are 4,500 military establishments of one kind or another in the United States, and there are another 2,200 in other countries.

Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard all insist on having their own separate little empires. But the duplication goes even further. The Army's quartermasters, engineers, medics and what-not all stand up for their individual rights—and their separate establishments, as do the various segments of the Air Force and Navy.

Defense Secretary McNamara, the first Secretary since Forrestal to show any real courage in tackling all this mess, has a magnificent opportunity to bring order out of chaos, and thereby to save billions annually.

If $50 billion has to be spent for adequate defense, let us spend it. But let us, at long last, also tackle the problem of waste.

One hardly needs to be a military expert to be able to name at least a few of the more flagrant examples of military waste in the United States.

Just because there has long been a military base at a particular place is hardly an adequate excuse for keeping that base forever. Nor will the long-dead generals for whom they were named come back to haunt those who seek to economize by eliminating the nonessential.

Is San Francisco's Presidio with its extensive monopolization of some of the most valuable land in the great port really any longer needed?

Is Fort Monroe, an anachronism from the day when great coastal defenses were needed, still worth its cost as a major military establishment?

And what of Governor's Island, Newport, Coronado, Fort Myer or others of the remaining 4,493 costly military country clubs? Take your pick. Are they all vital, or are they merely tributes to the watchfulness of some State's Senators and Congressmen?

Secretary McNamara already has started to do some weeding out, but the process is one which could go much further and move much faster.

The appropriations committees were informed this year that the discontinuance of some 75 bases already classified as surplus would save $220 million yearly. Of these, 52 are scattered through 25 States and the remaining 21 are abroad.

This is at least a starter. Every needless base that is continued in operation is an open invitation to more and more spending. The local politico fights not only to keep what his district has but also to make it larger, more costly and therefore a local business stimulant.

No military officer would openly admit that his is the easy life.

Yet it is true that for hundreds of thousands of officers and men the military uniform is both a protective cloak and a symbol of good living.

The day of harsh discipline, rigid routine, hard training and unlimited hours on duty is long since gone. For the roughness of life in the old-style barracks we have now substituted fine housing, golf clubs, swimming pools, and all that goes with them.

Every base commander nowadays is constantly clamoring for more and better living accommodations—for himself, his officers and his men. This means perpetual pressure on Congress for funds to build additional quarters.

And with more housing there inevitably arises the need (demand) for more schools, commissaries, post exchanges, chapels, hospitals and medical facilities, libraries, nurseries, transportation, warehouses, communications, community laundries, welfare and recreation and other items.

These latter cover a fascinating range. They include not merely playgrounds, swimming pools and athletic fields, but they extend to marinas, fishing and hunting grounds, golf courses, movies, etc.

The Defense Department's requests to Congress for greater appropriations year after year reflect all these demands. Yet the ability to defend the United States is only indirectly reflected in most of this spending.

It has long since become standard procedure for officers and enlisted men alike to move their families with them wherever they go. And this in turn creates a greater and greater call for on-base housing.

Under the military's rotation system this means a constant large inflow and outflow—and every move involves new repair and other expenses.

The further effect of this is to require larger and larger numbers of civilian wokers at all bases.

The military services now have three-quarters of a million civilians on their payrolls merely in operation and maintenance work.

Every time an officer moves, his quarters have to be refurbished for his successor. The Navy frankly states that each such move costs on the average $1,900 for redecorating to please the incoming officer's wife.

Flagrant examples of officers who use their position to provide themselves unauthorized—and costly—improvements in housing are regularly found. In so large an organization, such instances are to be expected, but hundreds of cases probably exist for every one that is exposed.

Military regulations do not permit outlays exceeding $25,000 without specific higher authority. Yet it is a simple matter to break up a big job into a number of under $25,000 subjobs, and this frequently happens.

The commanding general at the Army Chemical Center at Edgewood, Md., was revealed in this year's congressional hearings as having expended some $61,000 to renovate the quarters assigned him.

Another such remodeling operation was reported to have cost well over $100,000—on a house originally erected for around $20,000.

The care and maintenance of military golf courses can now be ranked as big business. Each base tries to outdo the other. Clubhouses become increasingly elaborate. Congressional hearings occasionally bring faint echoes of the costs, but, of course, the officers need the exercise.

The visitor to many a military base is flabbergasted by the luxury of the living and recreation facilities there.

This is not to argue that all those in military uniform should have to live the harsh life of a wartime soldier in the field. But it is to say that the military are, in many cases, pampered beyond reason.

Consider all the facilities which a present-day base provides for its officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men. (These class distinctions in the military necessitate there being three separate sets of facilities for the men at a particular base.)

Housing is, of course, a hodgepodge of varying types and qualities. Officers' homes range from the falling-down to the ultramodern, depending on the age of the base and the generosity of Congress toward it. But on the average, the housing provided both officers and men is far better in quality than that available to civilians in similar income groups.

Housing, however, is only one of the many facilities provided. Many bases have swimming pools of a quality available only to those civilians in the highest income groups

who can afford costly country clubs. Bowling alleys, baseball fields, etc., are equally of the luxury type. And there are indoor and outdoor movie theaters galore.

A congressional committee was shocked this year to find that at Camp Lejeune, the big marine training base, there are 16 movie theaters.

This list included seven indoor and nine outdoor movie setups, but what shocked the committee most was to find that one of these was not even located on the base. This one was in a nearby civilian housing area, but was operated by the Marines for their own personnel—and free of charge.

Despite all the civilian workers employed in operation and maintenance activities at military bases, thousands upon thousands of enlisted men are also assigned to work far divorced from any element of military training.

These men are mowing lawns, keeping up golf courses, doing errands, chauffeuring, or are in a thousand and one other nonmilitary activities.

The new enlistee or draftee goes through weeks and weeks of harsh training. That is as it should be. War is not for the soft. But those who make military service a career have come to know all the angles—which posts are the easy ones, which has the best houses, or swimming pools, or golf courses, or the most elaborate officers club.

The military will defend its "high living" by saying that the major part of the much criticized luxury facilities are self-financed and cost the Government nothing. In other words, the officers club earns a handsome profit, and that profit ultimately goes into the dining terraces, cocktail lounges, dance floors, and banquet halls at which civilians goggle.

Nevertheless, the fact is that as such facilities become more elaborate it becomes easier for the Pentagon to spend more and more to support that particular base.

The whole modern process of allowing all dependents of a military man to live with him has obviously also been carried too far.

It may be essential to permit, in fact encourage, this at most establishments in the United States. But there is far less reason to allow the practice for the shorter period of foreign service.

General Shoup of the Marines minces no words. "These people have no business whatsoever having their dependents with them. Further, I might state that is the way they (the Marines) feel about it, too."

Yet early this year when the dollar situation was serious, as it still is, there was a great outcry when Eisenhower ordered the gradual recall of military dependents from European bases.

One of Kennedy's first acts upon assuming the Presidency was to cancel this order—an obvious political gesture whch looked well at the time. But today, with his request for billions upon billions more for defense, the President is maintaining a significant silence. Yet the Berlin situation is far more tense than it was earlier this year when the return of dependents was strictly a dollar-saving move unrelated to war threats.

There is country club living in Europe—and "it's wonderful." U.S. bases throughout France and Germany in particular are set in lovely areas, have all the amenities of life at home, plus low-paid servants. Wives and children are provided all the school, nursery, hospital, medical and dental, and recreation facilities they would get at home—and at less cost.

Comfortable living standards for officers and men alike require no personal outlays. The services estimate that it costs between $600 and $700 yearly just to maintain and repair each military family housing unit; this is probably substantially above what the comparable homeowner is able to spend. The homeowner pays taxes for the support of community facilities, whereas all these are free to any Army family—and schools, too.

These are areas which a stern conservator of the national revenue would consider as first targets for any economy drive. Most important of all would be a speedup in the reduction in numbers of military establishments from the present undefendable total of 6,700.

The military need not return to Spartan living standards, but some of the frills could at leasted be controlled, and the trend toward spending on more and more elaborate facilities might well be halted.

Appropriations Committees cannot properly police all this waste. What is needed now is another "watchdog" group, such as Senator Truman ran in World War II, to ferret out the necessary from the frivolous.

Farmers Not To Blame for Increased Costs of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Congress recently passed a new wheat program for the 1962 crop. One of its main provisions increased the support level for wheat from $1.79 to $2 a bushel in exchange for a 10-percent reduction in wheat acreage. Just this week, the president of the American Bakers Association said that it would be a miracle if the price of bread is not increased 1 cent a loaf, and the higher support price of wheat was listed as the primary reason for the increase. There was immediately a hue and cry raised about the wheat program. Some people cited this prospective increase in bread prices as further proof of the failure of what they call a multibillion dollar subsidy program for farmers. Now what are the facts? First, increased labor costs, increased costs for wax paper, and increases in a number of other items are listed as the reasons for the increase in the cost of bread. The increase in the wheat price support represents less than one-third cent a loaf, and this increase will not be reflected in the market for another year. This is just another example of how people from urban areas take out their dissatisfaction with higher food prices on the farmers.

From 1950 through 1960 the price of bread rose 6 cents a loaf. Yet, the farmer's share of the cost of each loaf of bread declined 15 percent. Other factors were solely responsible for higher bread costs. In recent months the anti-farmer propaganda has decreased in tone and intensity.

A major reason for this is the fact that the present Secretary of Agriculture stands up for the farmers against unfair attacks. He does not feed the propaganda campaign, as did his predecessor, by undermining and undercutting the programs passed by Congress for the benefit of agriculture. But the farm programs are still fair game for people who like to make political capital out of them in the large consuming areas—even though the facts prove conclusively that the farmers are not to blame—that they are receiving less and less of every dollar spent by the consumer on food.

Frankly Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thought-provoking article from the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal by the sports editor, Mr. Frank Hyde, entitled "Paging Mr. Udall: Did You Know Washington Redskins Have No Arab Players—No Chinese?"

PAGING MR. UDALL: DID YOU KNOW WASHINGTON REDSKINS HAVE NO ARAB PLAYERS—NO CHINESE?

(By Frank Hyde)

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who has gained gobs of welcome headlines over the fire he lit under portly George Preston Marshall, now finds himself in a unique and somewhat uncompromising position. Udall, as reported by the wire services and editorialized on this pillar earlier, arose in righteous indignation over the lack of Negro players on the Washington football team when the new District of Columbia Stadium was being readied for the Redskins, owned by Marshall.

In essence, Mr. Udall wagged a churlish finger at George P., and said: "Erase the color line or you may not have a place to play."

Now the matter appears to be settled as far as Marshall is concerned. He has written Commissioner Pete Rozelle of the NFL that he will sign any outstanding Negroes on his draft list whom he feels can play major league pro football. Whether Marshall keeps his promise remains to be seen, but his letter takes him off the hook for the time being. Not so the talkative Mr. Udall, however. He's impaled with several troublesome possibilities.

For instance, as we brought out earlier, now that the Harlem Globetrotters have booked their summer basketball fun show into the new stadium, it is assumed Mr. Marshall will rush forth with the same righteous eclat and demand that the Trotters employ a white man. Our earlier tome on the subject fell into Mr. Udall's hands or into the hands of someone in his office. It was returned with a marginal scrawl, also by either Mr. Udall or one of his aids: "This is a silly supposition."

It fails to strike us as a silly supposition. They had an old saying when our grandma was a girl—something about "sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." Mr. Udall, being head of the Interior Department, surely knows all about geese and ganders. At least we maintain he's "chicken" if he does not take the same stand against the Trotters as he did against Marshall. And there's no "fowl" intent here, simply asking that the geese and the ganders all be treated the same.

Udall's edict against Marshall could also have other farflung repercussions. Suppose representatives of other nationalities demand

that their race be hired? It's probably just another "silly supposition," but, scanning down the 'Skins roster, we fail to locate an Arab. So, why not a protest, through Mr. Udall, self-appointed spokesman on the subject, demanding that an Arab be signed by Marshall?

Of course, the American Polish Alliance isn't going to say anything because the 'Skins have Johnny Olzewski. Marshall is safe from the wrath of the Irish with Pat Heenan, Fran O'Brien and Sam Horner. The Italians won't press the issue in the presence of Ralph Guglielmi. Bill Anderson protects George P. from the Swedes and the Dutch won't complain with Ray Krouse on the job. But there isn't a single Chinese player listed—so, here we go again.

No one should ban Negro players, Marshall included. Neither should any other race be discriminated against in athletics or in any other walks of life. But it seems to us Mr. Udall has set a dangerous precedent when he waves a discriminatory club of his own over Marshall's head and says, in effect: "You hire this man or else." The burden of proof lies with Udall. Who says, besides Udall, that Marshall is deliberately refusing to sign Negro players? And, isn't it true that if Udall can lay down and enforce this type of edict in behalf of the Negro, simply because the 'Skins are playing in a Government-owned stadium, he can follow the same procedure in behalf of other races? And if Udall does go to bat in a similar vein for other races, and leaves out just one—he can't possibly cover all of them—who is the discriminator then?

It all sounds to us like the talk of a man who doesn't give a hang whether the 'Skins carry a Negro on their roster or not; like the talk of a man who simply wants to take advantage of a situation to ring his own bell and in doing so is causing the Negro more harm than good. And as for the Negro himself, we have talked with several Negro athletes and without exception the gist of their remarks boil down to this: "Sure, if I was a football player I'd like to play with Washington or some other NFL team, but I'd want to earn the right and not be legislated onto the team." The Negroes we chatted with, it appears, are far more broad-minded on the subject than Mr. Udall.

Attacking the Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 23, 1961:

ATTACKING THE PATENT SYSTEM

In any indictment as sweeping as the antitrust action just brought against three leading drug companies there are bound to be many things too fuzzy for judgment until the Justice Department presents its evidence in court.

But there is one aspect of this case that isn't obscure. Running through the whole probe of the drug industry, from the Kefauver committee investigations to the present court action, is the implication that it wolud be good public policy to force the companies to put all their new drug discoveries in the public domain so that anybody can make them.

American Cyanamid, for example, holds the patent on Aureomycin, the first of the broad spectrum antibiotics, and it hasn't licensed anybody else to make and sell it. The Charles Pfizer Co. has its own antibiotic, Terramycin, which it manufactures and sells exclusively itself.

Pfizer also holds a patent on another antibiotic, tetracycline, which it does license to two other manufacturing companies, American Cyanamid and Bristol-Myers, and which it also allows Squibb and Upjohn to sell. But besides these no other drug companies can make or sell tetracycline.

Two attacks are made on this situation by the Government. The first is that Cyanamid, Pfizer, and Bristol-Myers conspired to make the prices of all these drugs noncompetitive. This is an allegation the truth of which must await the evidence in court, although it is worth noting that the only apparent basis for it now is that the prices were substantially identical, a fact which might just as well prove tough competition as noncompetition.

But a good part of the Justice Department's statement is devoted to a broader question. The charge is that up to 1955, when tetracycline was patented, Cyanamid's Aureomycin and Pfizer's Terramycin dominated broad-spectrum antibiotic sales, accounting for 92 percent of all sales in 1953. In short, the charge here is not of conspiracy but of the monopoly situation.

That there was for a time a monopoly situation seems rather indisputable; indeed for 1 year (1949–50) Cyanamid held an absolute monopoly since it briefly had the only patent on a broad-spectrum antibiotic. But this was a monopoly created by the patent system itself.

The patent system, which is embedded in the Constitution, provides that the holder of a patent on a new thing shall have the exclusive rights to that invention for a period of years. It was adopted not to give privileges of profit to a few but for the very practical reason that it thus encouraged men to spend much time, money, and effort in inventing new things, and it prevented others from getting a "free ride" on the successful efforts of the inventors.

Of late this system has been under widespread attack. In other industries, too, there have been antitrust cases the object of which is to have compulsory licensing of new inventions. Technically the inventor keeps his patent but in the guise of preventing a monopoly (which is precisely what the patent law intended) he is required to allow all comers to use it. Senator KEFAUVER's attack on the present system is even less disguised; he would cut the life of any patent to 2 years.

In the case of the drug industry the attack on the patent system has a particularly emotion-packed argument. Why, so we are told, should a company discovering a new miracle drug be allowed to profit from a monopoly? Once an Aureomycin or a Terramycin is discovered, would it not be better public policy to let all the drug companies make it, increasing competition and lowering the price faster? Why should one, or two, companies "get rich on human misery"?

This is an argument not without its appeal. But before either the courts or the public accepts it, we think a little reflection is in order.

We don't know how much money Cyanamid spent to develop Aureomycin, or how much Pfizer spent to develop Terramycin to compete with it. But would Cyanamid have spent any, if it knew in advance that it would have to let every other company, which spent nothing, get a free ride on Cyanamid's research efforts? Or if Pfizer from the beginning could have made and sold Aureomycin, would it have spent time and money to develop a different broad-spectrum antibiotic to compete with Aureomycin?

These questions are not trivial. Whether it be in electronics or in drugs, modern research requires enormous sums of money spent with considerable boldness; there are more research efforts that fail than succeed. Good public policy is that which most encourages men to search for new things from which all society will profit.

And before we wreck the patent system, we might ask whether it is better that somebody have a monopoly on tomorrow's miracle drug than that the miracle lie undiscovered.

Sorenson, Traffic Pioneer, To Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago papers carried a story today, announcing that Leslie J. Sorenson, Chicago's deputy commissioner of streets and sanitation and its traffic engineer for decades, resigned yesterday, effective September 1, after a career with the city that spanned 47 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the story carried by the Chicago Tribune, which highlights the career of Mr. Sorenson.

I believe the public should know of the wonderful service this man performed for the people of Chicago, which also benefited other cities in our country.

There are many fine people of Mr. Sorenson's caliber who dedicate their lives to public service, and yet, they go unnoticed. I believe we should take time to recognize these people, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to one of Chicago's fines servants. The article follows:

SORENSON, TRAFFIC PIONEER, TO RESIGN

(By Edward Schreiber)

Leslie J. Sorenson, 68, Chicago's deputy commissioner of streets and sanitation and its traffic engineer for decades, resigned yesterday, effective September 1, after a career with the city that spanned 47 years.

Sorenson, known as the dean of the Nation's traffic engineers, was appointed superintendent of the traffic and sign division in 1914 by Mayor Carter Harrison. He served under eight Chicago mayors.

In conjunction with the late Mayor Edward J. Kelly, then president of the South park district, now a part of the Chicago park district, Sorenson developed the Nation's first standard school sign for slowing traffic.

FIRST ERECTED IN 1915

In 1915, the first sign was erected at Diversey and California Avenues, adjacent to Chicago's first motorized fire station. Its yellow background with black lettering became standard throughout the world.

Sorenson conducted the city's first traffic survey that year. Chicago bankers had refused to back bonds for the construction of the Michigan Avenue bridge, deeming it unnecessary.

He clocked 1,800 vehicles per hour using the Rush Street bridge, then noted in his report that "traffic was unusual this day

because of sightseers thronging the bridge to see the *Eastland* disaster."

EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWELVE DIED IN DISASTER

The date was July 24, 1915. The *Eastland*, an excursion steamer, capsized in the river near Clark Street and 812 persons lost their lives.

The bankers recanted and Mayor William Hale Thompson was so delighted with the traffic survey that he sent Sorenson on a 3-month European vacation.

Sorenson also remembers the first car assigned to him by the city in 1914—a two cylinder, Sears, Roebuck buggy type vehicle with patent leather dashboard.

CUTS NUMBERS OFF AWNINGS

After Morgan Park was annexed to the city in 1914, it was Sorenson's duty to see that street names and numbers were changed to conform to Chicago's pattern. Residents refused.

"So I sent out a burly policeman," Sorenson said, "and told him to go along 111th Street and cut the street numbers out of awnings over business houses." That persuaded the new Chicagoans, he added.

Sorenson also recalled his first budget request. It was for 1915. It sought $5,000 for traffic signs and traffic engineering. Mayor Harrison returned it, marked "unnecessary at this time."

Sorenson wrote a 3-page essay, returned the request and received the same reply. Then he penned 7 pages, again submitted the budget, and it came back with this note from Harrison: "Give Sorenson his appropriation and shut him up."

At the time, the city was so broke it was paying employes in I O U's.

SOUGHT BY LA GUARDIA

New York's late Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia once tried to hire Sorenson away from Chicago, but he refused. Many of his assistants have gone on to serve countless American cities as traffic engineers.

"There is no one in public office for whom I hold the admiration and respect that I have for Leslie Sorenson," said Mayor Daley yesterday. "He has done a great job in traffic engineering and saving lives, and he is not through yet. I expect to call on him as a consultant many times."

TELLS OF GREATEST THRILL

Sorenson, who said he has a lot of writing to do, told the mayor he would be on call any time, adding, "I don't even care to discuss dollars."

His greatest thrill, Sorenson said, came last January 1 when he learned Chicago had reduced traffic fatalities for the eighth straight year.

He has served many national traffic safety organizations as director and officer and has been on numerous committees on safety named by Presidents of the United States. He and his wife have lived at 6251 N. Magnolia Avenue for 36 years. A son, Jack L., is an associate city traffic engineer.

For the present, Sorenson's duties will be assumed by William R. Marston, first deputy commissioner of streets and sanitation.

Ethiopian: South's Racial Woes Exaggerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of August 22, 1961:

ETHIOPIAN: SOUTH'S RACIAL WOES EXAGGERATED

GREENSBORO, N.C.—Bekele Gared, a young Ethiopian agricultural official, says he is convinced the South's racial troubles have been exaggerated.

Gared, who has lived in Texas and North Carolina for 5 months, says the people who exaggerated these troubles to him were not Russians, but mostly Americans.

Gared is one of 18 Africans currently studying agricultural extension work in the United States. A number of them have lived with farm families in central and eastern North Carolina.

Gared and others of the group were interviewed by a representative of the Department of Agriculture Information of North Carolina State College's School of Agriculture.

"When I came to the United States, I chose to go to the North," Gared said, "because of what I had read about the South."

(Gared said most of the things he had read about the South had appeared in weekly news magazines and Negro newspapers published in America).

Officials of the International Cooperation Administration granted Gared his wish. They sent him to Michigan State University.

"Later, when they told me they were going to send me to Texas, I protested," Gared said. "And when I told people at Michigan State that I was going to be sent to the South, they were most sympathetic."

Gared said he finally agreed to go to Texas "when I found I had no alternative."

The headquarters of his Texas visit was Prairie View A. & M. College, a State-supported Negro college. In early July, he and his group moved to North Carolina.

Since then, they have visited State institutions, businesses; and for about 2 weeks, various members of the group lived with farm families in Wilson, Greene, Wayne, Franklin, Vance, Warren, Granville, Durham, Rockingham and Caswell Counties.

Few African nationals have had an opportunity to observe life in North Carolina so closely.

As a result of his extensive visit, Gared said his attitude about race relations in the South has entirely changed.

"If you don't look for embarrassing things, you won't find them," he said.

"You see a good deal of what you are looking for," said a Ministry of Agriculture official from Kenya.

This official, incidentally, said he tried to eat at a white restaurant in Greensboro and was refused service.

"But I didn't get upset," he said, "because I realized that in my own country a white man may have had the same trouble in many places."

"Racial problems are worldwide," he continued in a distinct British accent, result of 3 years of study at Cambridge University.

"But perhaps, you in America have done more about these problems than many places in the world," he added.

A 36-year-old superintendent for the Ministry of Agriculture in Nigeria, Agorinda Alawode, felt that he had an objective view of America's race problems before he came to this country.

"The American Ambassador explained the situation at a lecture I attended," Alawode said.

Alawode, whose face is marked by tribal tattoos, has attended the University of Indiana for 9 months.

"And I don't see much difference in race relations in Indiana and other places I have been," he commented. "I could get myself into trouble any place," he added, "whether it's in America or my own country."

A Tanganyikan official Ally Mondoma, said he remembered reading about that "rock place" (Little Rock). "But when I got here," he added, "I saw the races were getting along in all phases of life."

One African said if he were an American he would probably be taking part in some of the current efforts to break down segregation barriers.

"But I don't think it is the type of thing for a foreigner to come here and do," he added.

One visitor said, "Anytime people are indifferent to you, you are segregated. And here I found people very sympathetic," he added.

From Ballots to Telephone Directories—Reapportionment Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, of great importance to the State of Illinois and to the Nation as a whole is the problem of redistricting which besets many States since the latest decennial census. As a result of the 1960 census, the State of Illinois loses one congressional seat. The failure of the State legislature to redistrict the State to comply with the latest census will force Illinois to hold an at-large election with all 24 congressional seats being filled in a statewide election. In my last newsletter, I pointed out that it would be the citizens of Illinois who would be penalized by the State legislature's refusal to act. Many responsible citizens and organizations have also spoken out on the consequences of an at-large election and subsequent statewide representation in Congress. A good example of the concern that has been voiced is a recent editorial by Mr. Edward Wallis, general manager of radio station WIND in Chicago, entitled "From Ballots to Telephone Directories—Reapportionment Is a Must."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

FROM BALLOTS TO TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES, REAPPORTIONMENT IS A MUST

Together, let's explore a matter of importance to all of us. Echoes of the late unlamented session of the Illinois General Assembly still strike discordant notes. Legislators failed to remap congressional districts. Reapportionment is necessary because 1960 census figures show that our State is now entitled to only 24 instead of 25 Representatives in the Nation's Capitol.

Unless Governor Kerner includes redistricting in his call for a special session of the legislature this fall, and unless legislators act on reapportionment, Illinois voters must elect their Congressmen on a statewide basis. While the special session will be called primarily to deal with the State's chaotic revenue troubles, Governor Kerner has indicated he may include reapportionment in his special session call. We hope he does. We urgently call upon him to do so, for the State legislature can act in special session only on matters included in the call.

Why is reapportionment important to you and me? When we go to the polls, presumably we try to put our X's in the boxes op-

posite the names of the men we consider best qualified to be our public servants. If we are faced with electing 24 Congressmen at Large, instead of choosing between only 2 candidates for 1 congressional seat, very few of us will be able to vote intelligently. Our ballots will look like small-town telephone directories. It is hard enough to familiarize ourselves with the records and qualifications of only two candidates, let alone scores of candidates for congressional seats. More importantly, we maintain that we will not receive true representation from 24 Congressmen, each with the entire population of the State as a constituency instead of 1 small geographical area. Congressmen should give us grassroots representation. Senators represent us on the statewide level in Washington. Many interests of Chicagoans differ from the interests of those who live in other Illinois communities. Every Illinois community, therefore, stands to lose a precious right if we are forced to elect Congressmen on a statewide basis. We respectfully submit that party loyalties should not override public interest. We admire the Democrat who is a good Democrat and the Republican who is a good Republican; however, we say to the leaders and adherents of both parties that partisan considerations must now be set aside.

We point out to both parties the perils each faces in the event Illinois voters are compelled to choose Congressmen at large. Some incumbent Democratic Congressmen from the Chicago area with records of good public service face the possibility of ultimate defeat when out-of-State votes are tallied, according to some seasoned political observers. These observers are quick to note, too, that the Republican Party in Illinois, would in all probability have an open primary, with perhaps hundreds of candidates for the 24 congressional posts. Incumbent Republican Congressmen with records of valuable service and seniority on congressional committees could well be defeated in the primary.

Prospects for compromise between the parties are brighter now than they have been for months, certainly an indication that such partisan considerations are beginning to take effect with the party decision makers. Whatever the reasons, it is to be hoped they will continue to work for and effect compromise. And compromise they must. It is in the public interest to remap Illinois congressional districts prior to the next election.

Thank you.

Heart Researcher at Tulane University To Receive Billups Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Hammond Daily Star, announcing the Billups Award to Donald F. M. Bunce II, Tulane University. The article is as follows:

NEW ORLEANS.—A Tulane University scientist studying prevention of brain damage by slowing down the body's processes through the "ice box" treatment has been named recipient of the Louisiana Heart Association's Rowell A. Billups Memorial Research Award.

Award of a $4,780 grant-in-aid to Donald F. M. Bunce II, Ph. D., Tulane medical school instructor, was announced by Dr. Harold P. Chastant, of Lafayette, president of the Heart Association.

Dr. Chastant said the grant was part of a $5,000 gift made to the association's research program by W. F. "Buddie" Billups, of Hammond, 1961 Louisiana Heart Fund chairman, in memory of his brother.

Rowell A. Billups, of Greenwood, Miss., who had been a leader for many years in the program of the Mississippi Heart Association, died of a heart attack at Baton Rouge in 1960. He had been a major contributor to heart research in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Dr. Chastant said that Dr. Bunce's project at Tulane was selected because of the importance of the subject and the high degree of thoroughness and skill which has been shown thus far in the work of this investigator.

One phase of Dr. Bunce's work is to determine the value of hypothermia—the "ice box" method of lowering body temperatures—in preventing some or all of the tissue damage which occurs at normal body temperatures when there is a blocking of the big blood vessels supplying the brain.

A second phase will be to study the usefulness of cooling in treating impact injuries or disease damage to the brain itself. The work at present is being done on experimental animals. According to Dr. Bunce, its basic principle is an attempt to find means of swiftly lowering the brain's need for oxygen while at the same time chemically increasing the capacity of secondary vessels to take over the supply job of blocked or damaged major vessels.

The project was selected to receive the Rowell A. Billups award by a research committee of the Louisiana Heart Association.

Dr. Chastant said a small part of the original grant has been allotted to other Heart Fund research projects.

Khrushchev Will Sign Pact, Bartholomew Believes, but No War if United States Stands Pat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank H. Bartholomew, president of United Press International, spoke to the Commonwealth Club of California on August 4th which was the week before the Russians sealed the Berlin border, but I think a summary of his on the spot conclusions in regard to the Berlin situation is deserving of careful study by the Congress:

KHRUSHCHEV WILL SIGN PACT, BARTHOLOMEW BELIEVES, BUT NO WAR IF UNITED STATES STANDS PAT

(From address by Frank H. Bartholomew, president, United Press International)

Sometimes when you get in the middle of a situation, you get a different impression of it from what you get from reading about it.

In Berlin this July, I was able to understand Khrushchev's attitude toward Berlin and why he created the crisis. From his viewpoint, it is completely logical.

It is not as it was last time, when he gave us an ultimatum and it ran out in May 1959. With the UPI bureau manager I strolled through the Brandenberg gate at the midnight deadline to see what would happen. Nothing happened.

Unlike his Chinese counterpart, Khrushchev does not feel the necessity to save face. He has a dozen postures for whatever situation may be developing.

This time, he feels something is going to happen and Khrushchev is trying to see it doesn't happen to him.

WILL SIGN PACT

I have an idea as to his next move. With five UPI bureaus in Germany we have to try to guess what is ahead in order to be ready for it.

I think the situation as of today is such he will sign a pact with East Germany. I'll even predict he'll sign it on either September 17 or October 17.

The first date is on the heels of the German election, when Adenauer will be reelected. The second is the date of the 22d Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow.

It will be one of these dates unless Khrushchev succeeds in bluffing the West into negotiations on Berline alone.

BERLIN CRACKS IRON CURTAIN

One reason Khrushchev will sign is because 'Berlin is cracking the iron curtain.'

It's a showplace of Western prosperity 125 miles inside the Communist zone and it has become absolutely intolerable to him.

The billboards in East Berlin extoll the benefits of Communism as against the slavery of the West but 40,000 East Berliners go West each day for their employment.

The dispatches say Ulbricht is cutting this off, but I think what he is trying to do is permit the flow of labor but stop the defections.

Forty thousand East Berliners go each day into the prosperity of West Berlin and see it for themselves and go back to East Berlin to the solace of the Communist billboards—but they are not stupid.

EAST GERMAN POPULATION DEPLETED

The defections are depleting the population of East Germany. Three weeks ago, defections were 4,000 a week. Now reports say they have stepped up to 1,500 daily.

There is only a casual check on the subways and tramways, both owned by the Communists. If a man carries something extra, the guard might take a second look.

The thought occurred to me—and with no support in this view from anybody—that Khrushchev permits the depopulation of East Germany so that this wonderfully rich farmland will be resettled by Russian peasants.

COULD NOT STAND FREE ELECTION

One thing supporting this notion is that Ulbricht could not possibly stand a free election. The Communists would get no better than 10 percent of the votes—unless the area were resettled.

Unless Khrushchev plans it this way, you wonder why he permits the defections because there will be a complete economic collapse of East Germany if the situation develops further.

In Moscow, people are living better than ever; the living standard is up and morale is up. But the East Germans, who used to be fairly prosperous, know what is going on in West Germany and are not content with what the Communist billboards say. They have a standard to measure by.

AFRAID TO SPRUCE UP HOMES

Driving through East German farm areas, I didn't see a farmhouse that had a coat of paint. The yards were run down, overgrown with weeds, gates were hanging by one hinge. Why?

Is it because of communism? I asked. My German companion told me possibly so, in

part, but basically the people were afraid to spruce up their houses. It would mark them in a Communist society and might lead to confiscation.

The Red billboards call the West warmongers, but Germans don't have to look far to see mile after mile of Russian barracks. Khrushchev obviously has no faith in the East German army or people, for the Russian troops are there.

RAN INTO 20-MILE CONVOY

They are young soldiers, rotated frequently, because the Russians are afraid of exposing them to the West.

We did not go far on the autobahn before we ran into Russian soldiers—20 miles of convoy of Soviet troops, traveling at a strict 45 miles per hour—antitank guns, mortars, searchlight vehicles, ammunition carriers, armed personnel carriers—159 vehicles in all.

Leave West Berlin and go into East Berlin, you travel through an area of rubble and then enter the show center of the city. There is this one-row show street, the fronts of the buildings are falling off. Everything is down at the heels.

The situation in Berlin today is ideal from the Western point of view and Khrushchev can't stand it. Neither can Ulbricht.

KHRUSHCHEV SAYS NO WAR

Khrushchev says there will be no war over Berlin and I am inclined to agree. His reason is that we will either give in—or negotiate (and that would be dangerous).

Our view is there will be no war because Russia can't stand it. From all reports, Poland is ready to burst out of the Russian fetters, like Hungary, although not by revolution from within.

They apparently are waiting for involvement of the U.S.S.R. in world crisis elsewhere. Then they will arise and present Khrushchev with an enemy within.

Khrushchev faces 100 million enemies in the Iron Curtain countries and is making no progress at persuading them to the Russian way of thinking.

NO SHELTERS IN MOSCOW

In Moscow there is no evidence Khrushchev is preparing for war. There is not an air raid shelter in Moscow and they have never had an air raid drill.

Pravda is full of admonitions to the people to continue the 7-year plan, to raise their standard of living and get the Western warmongers off their necks.

We have countermoves. The West can declare Russia has violated the Potsdam agreement; Bonn can simultaneously denounce it and declare Berlin part of the German Federated Republic. The West can protest to the United Nations, for whatever good that might do.

The airlift is ready, but all agree it will not be effective because Berlin has grown so big. But Berlin is well supplied and can survive for a time.

MISJUDGED MAN

When the treaty is signed, I believe Ulbricht will present himself to the West as a misjudged and very reasonable man. As a first step, there will be no interference with free traffic to Berlin.

He will also say that, so long as East Germany controls civil traffic, it will now control military traffic.

The West fears that, if this occurs, there will be simultaneous advertising in the United States by the Committee for Fair Play for East Berlin, or others: "Let us accept the hand that is offered to us and not go to war over red tape."

GRADUALLY INCREASE CONTROLS

I believe that, next, Ulbricht will say there is no need for aluminum to come into Berlin from the West because the East has plenty of bauxite. After that it will be tomatoes, and so on until he has sterilized the city.

Both sides believe the Communists have given up hope of consolidating the two Berlins. The 2-million population of West Berlin is too much of a mouthful.

The alternate will be an effort to isolate and sterilize West Berlin, without at any point causing a wave of emotion in the United States and precipitating war.

This could be upset, of course, when there are so many fingers on triggers in so many places.

As of now, the West's position is proper and strong. We will negotiate on the unification of Germany, which Russia will not accept.

If we play our hand steadily, I think there will be no war—if we stand pat and negotiate on all Germany and not Berlin alone.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. Lloyd H. Truman: Should a tourist scheduled to be in Berlin on September 1 proceed with his plan?

Answer. By all means. Probably nothing will happen until the German election. Every American who can see Berlin should do so. Accommodations are excellent. And he shouldn't miss seeing East Berlin.

Question. K. H. Vernon: In view of his age, why will Adenauer win?

Answer. He's more popular.

Question. Dr. E. K. Williams: Business Week reports fair economic growth in East Germany. Comment?

Answer. There is some economic growth in Leipzig and other centers. It has not kept pace with the West or offset the diminished population, the labor shortage, particularly of young men. Young men leaving their families account for most defections. Farm collapse is almost inevitable.

Question. F. B. Magruder: Can East Germans working in West Berlin bring West Berlin merchandise home?

Answer. They can't drive across the border except under special conditions. Anything brought on tram or subway must be in small parcels. Nothing in the East Zone indicates Western goods in quantity.

Question. What does man on street in Germany think of situation?

Answer. West German thinks situation in Berlin no more dangerous than it has been and great question is, Will United States stand pat? If she will, things will work out well. But if we negotiate over Berlin, the only direction we can go is backward because we have what we want there now.

Question. German reaction on Eichmann trial?

Answer. Eastern Zone has billboards castigating Nazis and trying to identify West with Nazis. West Germans obviously feel embarrassment.

Question. Robert Combe Evans: How effective are Voice of America and other methods to get through Iron Curtain?

Answer. Quite effective. UPI is now also getting behind Iron Curtain. We have operating bureaus in Warsaw and Prague. They are closely controlled but we think any news we can get through, written and edited by Westerners, is to the good.

Question. W. Penn Arnett: If war over Berlin, will East and West Germans fight each other?

Answer. East German Army is probably built around dedicated Communists, but I think Khrushchev has grave doubts of its effectiveness.

Question. Dean Lesher: If East Germans revolt, should West help?

Answer. No chance of revolt. Like Poles and Hungarians, East Germans will wait for misstep by Khrushchev, or major crisis, and then harass his supply lines. While they may eventually separate from Russia, it's possible they will remain Communist.

The Isolated Elite of NSA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, a news dispatch from Madison, Wis., where the annual congress of the National Student Association is meeting reports that the activities of the national conservative youth group, Young Americans for Freedom, are having some success.

The YAF group introduced a resolution expressing sympathy with and support for the Cuban students who are being tried for counterrevolutionary activities against the Castro regime. As an indication of the character of the congress, this resolution was hotly debated and bitterly fought by many NSA delegates. YAF was successful, however, and the resolution was passed.

Another incident at the congress which has drawn fire from YAF is the circulation by NSA officials at the congress of a petition seeking to obtain clemency for Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, two men whose convictions for contempt of Congress were recently upheld by the Supreme Court. Wilkinson and Braden refused to answer questions about their Communist Party activities before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I think it is important for all Members of Congress and all citizens of the United States to be well informed about the background of the National Student Association which claims to be the only representative of the American student. Officials of this organization have testified before congressional committees and have toured foreign countries as representatives of American student opinion.

A recent issue of New Horizons for Youth warns of the danger that the NSA congress is threatened by a takeover by conservatives. This must not happen, the editor warned. The editor of New Horizons is Daniel Rubin, national youth director of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Therefore, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article by Howard Phillips, president of the student council at Harvard College, which was printed in the YAF magazine, the New Guard. Mr. Phillips is chairman of a student group aimed at reforming the National Student Association—the Committee for a Responsible National Student Organization.

THE ISOLATED ELITE OF NSA

(By Howard Phillips)

Bureaucrats do not give up easily, and the elite leftist group which controls the National Student Association is no exception.

"The Liberal Caucus," that small clique composed of NSA leaders and far left-wing advisers which has dominated previous congresses, plans to be even more active at the NSA Congress in Madison, Wis., this month. What's more, it will go underground.

Undoubtedly alarmed by a determined reform movement, the Liberal Caucus has circulated a top secret letter to more than 70 leftwing NSA officials, laying plans for maintaining control of NSA again this year.

The mimeographed letter, dated June 8, 1961, is signed by Al Haber, leader of Students for a Democratic Society (formerly the Student League for Industrial Democracy) and calls for efforts to restrict conservative expression at this year's congress. Haber claimed Young Americans for Freedom was associated with "racist, militarist, imperialist butchers."

MISTAKE?

The letter asserts that "it proved a mistake" at last year's NSA Congress to have the liberal caucus open to all delegates. Instead, Haber urged creation of a "secret steering committee that meets often, that is mobile, that keeps personally in touch with the progress of the congress, and that makes sure there are people appointed to handle specific tasks."

To avoid the "impression of having a line" which would result in an awareness by delegates that a secret steering committee was in operation, Haber called for the formation of a "liberal study group * * * which would have regular, open, and publicized meetings * * * in this way can we cut the ground out from the charges that are sure to come from YAF."

Citing the significance of the student in the total community resolution rammed through at the last congress, the SDS letter urged full recognition by this year's session of NSA's "role as a radical lobby and action force on the campus and nationally for educational reform."

This would most likely involve the representation of American student opinion as favoring unilateral disarmament, recognition of Red China, aid to Communist nations, and understanding for Fidel Castro, positions which many SDS leaders have publicly endorsed. The Haber manifesto also urged study of military influences on the American campus, the unionization of student labor, student immunity from prosecution for "off-campus political activity," and "deficiencies" in American fraternities.

Among those receiving the manifesto were Richard Wolff, Richard Rettig, Dan Johnston, Bruce Payne, Neal Johnston, Henry Boitell, Gene Theroux, Mike Tigar, Paul Potter, Tom Hayden, Sandra Cason, Paul DuBrul, Mark Furstenberg, Garry Weissman, Joe Geier, and Derek T. Winans. Each of these persons is well known for the part he has played in organizations of the far left. In addition to SDS, these include the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Young Socialist Alliance, and the Young People's Socialist League. Several of them were prominent in the San Francisco riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Thus, the National Student Association is clearly worried about the mounting criticism being directed against it by all segments of the American student community. Liberals oppose NSA's undemocratic, elitist policies which have seriously weakened the position of the non-Communist left by denying the right of free speech to its internal critics and by employing the tactics of "guilt by association."

The ever-increasing group of militant conservatives on America's college campuses couple their concern about NSA's abusive procedures with a healthy distaste for its far-left positions and activities which can only be interpreted as having weakened the U.S. stance vis-a-vis the Communist world.

Criticism of NSA is not new, but, for the first time, the opposition is responsibly and effectively organized—and it has widespread support and cooperation to back up its efforts. The Young Republican National Federation, in biennial convention at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 24, charged NSA "with the responsibility of instituting reforms which would insure more representative resolutions and policy statements."

IF NO REFORM

Denied equal representation in speaker selection, workshop and committee heads, resource personnel, and NSA working papers on political issues, the young Republicans are prepared to consider disassociation with NSA if reform is not achieved at this summer's National Student Congress. This would involve the end of any connection by college Republicans with NSA, coupled with young Republican support for the formation of a new national student organization which would be truly nonpartisan and democratic.

Young Americans for Freedom, which expects to have several hundred of its members in attendance at the 14th NSA Congress (Aug. 16–30) in an effort to make their views heard, has also approved resolutions calling for specific reforms in NSA.

SCANR (Students Committed to Accurate National Representation), a nonpartisan committee comprised primarily of liberals interested in the procedural reform of NSA, has rapidly gained support from colleges throughout the country.

In addition, the Committee for a Responsible National Student Organization has welded together a powerful, region-by-region coalition which will work to coordinate the efforts of conservatives and moderates in regional caucuses, workshops, committees, and in the plenary session of the congress. Special working papers have been published by CRNSO for the use of NSA delegates in presenting those aspects of political issues not adequately covered in NSA documents; in addition, a newsletter will be published at the congress to inform participants of new circumstances, as they may develop.

CRNSO is prepared to lead a walkout of member colleges from NSA, if it is clear that the reform forces are not being given a fair chance to achieve their objectives by working within NSA.

HOPEFUL SIGN

One hopeful sign that NSA will react positively to the criticism directed against it can be found in examining the speakers list for the 14th Congress. As we go to press, two outstanding young conservatives, U.S. Senator John G. Tower, and M. Stanton Evans, Editor of the Indianapolis News, are listed among those who will address the Congress.

Another omen indicating NSA's desire to pacify the under-represented American student was the inclusion of articles by Russell Kirk and William F. Buckley, Jr., in a recent NSA publication.

But even when you apply Keynesian economics, two speakers and a couple of articles do not add up to fair representation for the conservative viewpoint. However, it is a start in the right direction. While conservatives should, of course, be pleased to see greater recognition by NSA of the new political trends on the American campus, we must not be seduced by it. Almost everything about NSA is still arrogantly leftist and undemocratic; the burden of proof is on NSA to reform itself—if it does not do so it must bear the burden of continuing opposition.

On another front, NSA has reacted to reform efforts by the publication of an 18-page pamphlet, entitled "Toward a Better Understanding of NSA." Prepared by the NSA National Staff, this official pamphlet attempts—unsuccessfully—to dismiss the validity of all criticism by the use of smear and deception.

Many statements in the pamphlet are at direct variance with the public comment of NSA officials. For example, in replying to my criticism of NSA's financial policies in the April issue of the New Guard, NSA says "The total NSA budget is not one million dollars, and the manner in which the budget is expended is available to all member colleges. * * *" The one million dollar figure was arrived at on the basis of published claims by NSA officials; Neal Johnston, while serving as Chairman of NSA's Illinois-Wisconsin region, frequently boasted, on the record, that this figure was approximately correct.

As for the availability of the budget to inquiring member schools, I would merely reply that after repeated requests, my own student government has yet to receive a copy. It should also be pointed out that the key issue is not the availability of a predetermined budget, but rather the question of who decides how the money is allocated—the member colleges which provide the funds, or the NSA officials who dispense them.

The handling of NSA finances has not, in the recent past, even been brought forth for the consideration of delegates to the National Student Congress. What is NSA afraid of? Don't they believe the duly elected delegates to the annual congresses are competent to decide how the money provided by their student bodies should be spent? Or does NSA maintain, in this case, that the delegates are not truly representative or authorized to speak for their student governments?

FALSE REFLECTION?

After all, NSA is supposed to be a confederation of student governments; and it is supposed to reflect the combined will of those student governments. The duplicity employed in the NSA arguments is underlined by the fact that while denying that its annual budget is $1 million, the pamphlet neglects to state exactly what it is more or less. Can we ever expect to be given this information?

In dismissing the well-documented charge of Kay Wonderlic, leader of SCANR, that all views are not given a fair hearing at a National Student Congress, NSA makes the inaccurate observation that she has never been present at an NSA plenary. With a total lack of respect and consideration for her questions, the author of the pamphlet rejects the facts she has presented as irrelevant and not worthy of discussion.

The 14th National Student Congress, which may prove to be the most significant gathering of American students in a generation, is sure to resolve many of the issues related to NSA and may well determine the direction of an entire generation of young Americans.

Will it be necessary for the American student to isolate NSA from the mainstream of his generation, and to find a new organization through which his views will be fairly and forcefully articulated in programs which truly serve our Nation's educational institutions?

The answer is not ours; we have stated our case and made our wishes known. We are weary of abetting an organization which has abused, used, and misrepresented us. If the leaders of NSA are wise they will move swiftly and responsibly to remove the causes of our protest; they will begin to realize that they hold office to serve their constituents—and that our colleges are not affiliated with NSA to support policies alien to us. The choice is theirs.

Our Nation's Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my consistent policy to place

into the RECORD editorials from local newspapers expressing the grass roots thinking of our Nation's community press. At this time I place into the RECORD editorial comment which does not require any elaboration on my part. It appeared in the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., Thursday, August 17, under the title "Our Nation's Prestige":

OUR NATION'S PRESTIGE

Last year during the general election Senator John F. Kennedy, a Harvard man with his eye on the White House, and Vice President Richard Nixon, a Californian with the same outlook, debated the Nation's prestige. The Senator said we had slipped badly in the eyes of those countries that were sitting on the cold war fence. There was much discussion about a government report that had been buried.

Mr. Kennedy spoke of enhancing America's image abroad and the need for vigor, etc., in the White House. Came November and he edged the Vice President. Those who had picked the winner told the losers that the White House would have youthful, dynamic leadership in Washington.

There has been an onslaught of stories recently concerning President Kennedy's first 6 months in office. Let's review his efforts to rebuild the country's public relations overseas, one of his campaign promises.

The Laos battlefield against communism was another retreat from the Far East for us. The President marshaled many thousands of words on the subject. England and France put their words in; another peacemaking conference was planned and we lost "more face" among the orientals.

Then, there was the Cuban invasion. The Cuban invaders took a beating, and our prestige sank lower. Aided by the President, a citizens' tractors-for-freedom committee was established, and Americans were asked to pay blackmail to get the prisoners released. Because of his unofficial support, it appeared to some that the President was trying to put salve on his conscience for the poorly planned invasion. Castro upped his fee for the prisoners, and then the committee got indignant and broke off negotiations. Did President Kennedy think we could gain a better foreign press by paying blackmail to a Communist?

Castro hijacked our airplanes. Did we rush to Havana and restore our prestige? The President was strangely silent. But when a couple of crackpots later grabbed two other planes, he rushed into the foreground and said that we should not get excited about these two planes going to Cuba, and ordered his Party to pass a hijacking airplane law. In the meanwhile, an Eastern Airlines plane has been sitting at the Havana airport for the world to see. It is expected that the airline company will get the plane back when it is exchanged for a stolen Cuban boat in Florida. The boat was taken to the southern State by a Cuban who left his country. The little Red underdog, Fidel, has been spitting at us and walking away crowing. Is this "prestige on the rise?"

The President said last fall we were lagging in the missile program. The Russians orbit two men around the world. Do we attempt an orbit shot? We wait.

The President's new "image program" seems to us to be one of reaction rather than action. Americans are sick of Yankee-go-home signs, particularly when we have paid billions to total strangers for good public relations abroad. It's about time we start getting some real "vigor" for our Nation's prestige.

Mrs. Waller, Former Pekinite, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following article from the August 23, 1961, issue of the New York Herald Tribune concerning the death of Helen Hiett Waller. I know that all of her long-time friends in Pekin, Ill., were shocked and grieved to hear of her passing. The article follows:

MRS. HELEN HIETT WALLER, DIRECTOR OF FORUM, DIES; HERALD TRIBUNE AID, 47, WAS HURT WHILE CLIMBING IN THE FRENCH ALPS

CHAMONIX, FRANCE, August 22.—Mrs. Helen Hiett Waller, 47, director of the New York Herald Tribune Forum, died today of an embolism at the Chamonix Mount Blanc Hospital here in the French Alps. She had suffered internal injuries while mountain climbing in late July.

She and her husband, Theodore Waller, vice president of Grolier, Inc., New York, and president of its subsidiary Teaching Material Corp., were climbing on Mount Perseverance, near Chamonix, when she was struck by a falling rock which caused internal injuries. She was operated on a few days later and was thought to be well on the way to recovery.

LIVED IN EUROPE 7 YEARS

Mrs. Waller, a native of Pekin, Ill., and a 1934 graduate of the University of Chicago, had an extensive foreign background for her work as Herald Tribune Forum director. She toured the world arranging the annual visits of hundreds of national leaders and high school students to the forum in New York. Mrs. Waller lived on Cantitoe Road, Katonah, N.Y.

A resident of Europe from 1934 to 1941, she worked first with the League of Nations, editing a monthly review of international affairs. To study the Nazi method of indoctrinating youth, she lived for a time in 1937 in a German girls' labor camp.

When World War II began, she was in London, working for her Ph. D. at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Immediately, she joined the Paris staff of the National Broadcasting Co., reporting from Paris until France fell, then from Madrid. Later, for her exclusive radio reporting of the 1940 bombing of Gibraltar, she became the first woman to win a National Headliners' Award.

Eased out of Spain by the Franco government, she returned to the United States in 1941. For a year and a half she gave lectures and broadcast a daily 15-minute news program over NBC. Then she returned to Europe as a war correspondent and finished out the war there.

Upon joining the Herald Tribune's Forum Department in 1945, Mrs. Waller was initially concerned with directing the annual forum, founded in 1930 and discontinued in 1955, which brought to New York each autumn leaders in government and other fields from many parts of the world.

SPOKE FIVE LANGUAGES

Fluent in French, Italian, Spanish, and German, she arranged the forum visits and frequently took part in introductions and questionings at the sessions held at the Waldorf-Astoria.

Beginning in 1946, she also directed the Herald Tribune Forum for High Schools which has brought 444 students from 74 countries to the United States for forum participation and 3 months' residence in the homes of American students in the metropolitan area.

In 1955, after the forum program presented by students in the United Nations General Assembly Hall, she took the group on a world tour, appearing before student audiences in London, Paris, Cairo, Beirut, Karachi, and New Delhi.

Beginning in 1953 she was moderator of the annual television forum series, "The World We Want," which was distributed nationwide, and for the last 3 years moderated the CBS–TV forum-based "Young Worlds" program. She received a number of awards and was author of "No Matter Where," 1944, based on her European experience. She contributed to "Deadline Delayed," 1947, written by members of the Overseas Press Club.

Surviving, in addition to her husband, who also is vice president and director of the library and educational division for Americana Corp., are two sons, Jonathan and Mark Waller; a daughter, Miss Margaret Ann Waller; her mother, Mrs. Stella Hiett, and a sister, Mrs. Margaret Whiteside.

Invasion of American Rights on the Part of the Arab League Nations—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the boycott by American companies against Israel at the instance of the Arab countries cannot be condoned by Americans. We believe in freedom of commerce and cooperation with our friends. Israel is a bastion of democracy in the Far East and corporations which enjoy the protection of American laws should in conscience not boycott our friends for the crass dollar. The American Jewish Committee of the Institute of Human Relations has forwarded me a supplemental brochure on the invasion of American rights on the part of the Arab League Nations which I believe the readers who believe in freedom will note with avid interest. The brochure follows:

INVASION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS ON THE PART OF ARAB LEAGUE NATIONS: SUPPLEMENTAL—RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS AND THE PROFESSIONS

(The American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906, is a national organization which seeks to combat bigotry, protect the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and advance those rights for all people of all religions and races.)

INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Committee recently published an analysis of the Arab League [1] boycott from the standpoint of its interference with the legitimate activities of Americans—their right to travel abroad without being subjected to indignity, and

Footnotes at end of speech.

to serve equally with other citizens in U.S. Military Establishments overseas; their freedom to engage in commercial relationships without discrimination on grounds of religion. These rights and freedoms are traditionally held inviolate by our Government.

This supplemental document deals with still further aspects of the Arab League boycott which affect American citizens, Christians as well as Jews, who are engaged in business and the professions.

The boycott has interfered with the commercial pursuits of Americans and American companies in many foreign countries. It has subjected American foreign trade to arbitrary restraint. It has obstructed American shipping and visited abuse upon American seamen in defiance of international law. It has intruded upon the professional activities of Americans in the entertainment field.

RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS AND THE PROFESSIONS IMPOSED BY THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT

The Arab League has said in effect that American business and industrial enterprises may trade in Israel or with the Arab countries—not both.

BLACKLISTING OF AMERICAN COMPANIES

Approximately 500 American concerns received warnings during 1960,[2] sent through the U.S. mails from boycott offices in Damascus and Kuwait. A typical example is the following communication, dated August 23, 1960, from the Arab League Secretariat in Damascus to a company in New York:

1. Do you have branch factories in Israel? and did you undertake any exploration work for oil in Israel?

2. Do you have assembly plants in Israel?

3. Do you have, in Israel, general agencies or head offices for your Middle Eastern operations?

4. Do/Did you give the right of using your patents, trademarks, copyrights, etc., to Israeli companies?

5. Do/Did you subscribe in Israeli companies or factories?

6. Do/Did you render consultative services or technical experience to Israeli factories?

7. Do you represent Israeli firms in your country?

8. Do you have a branch of yours in Israel? In case you have, please define its position as to your company.

It is essential to have this declaration duly legalized by your competent authorities and countersigned by any Arab consul in your country.

Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that this declaration should reach us within a period not to exceed November 31, 1960. If this period elapsed without receiving your reply, we shall regretfully be obliged to ban transactions with you and to blacklist your company in all of the Arab countries.

Yours faithfully,

DR. ABDUL KARIM EL-A'IDI,
Commissioner General for the Boycott of Israel.

By 1961, according to Fortune magazine, the number of American firms on the Arab blacklist had risen "from about 20 in 1957 to nearly four times that."[3]

Many companies—including Emerson Radio, General Tire & Rubber, Dow Chemical, and Merritt-Chapman & Scott—have refused to yield to the boycott.[4] Some feel that the Arab market, despite its overwhelming numerical strength, would not compensate for loss of Israeli business. Some have discovered that certain cynical Arab countries are not above dealing with recalcitrant companies whose products are in short supply in the Middle East. Some simply object on principle to threats and foreign dictation.

A case in point is a large company in the Midwest, which is building a $2 million plant in Haifa, to be completed in 1962. An official of the company explains its decision to defy the Arab boycott:

Our Board was immediately concerned with the threat of boycott of our products by the nations of the United Arab Republic. We did considerable business in these countries and had received threats of the boycott by letter from four of the countries of the Arab bloc. Remember also the population totals—65 million Arab people to 2 million in Israel.

Despite this, [we] felt that basically most Americans are not in sympathy with the boycott. Our own reaction is one of great distaste.

The whole philosophy of the Arab bloc—its threat of boycott against people doing business in Israel, its attitude toward the Suez, its general political thinking—is opposed by the Western bloc of nations.

The viewpoint of many companies is summed up by Fortune:

The growing willingness of United States and European investors to ignore Arab threats is, of course, due in part to sympathy with the Israeli cause. However, this factor is of less importance than the Arabs would have the world believe. The fact is that Israel offers economic opportunities which make it worthwhile for many types of investors to ignore Arab threats. (Israel's per capita GNP—$1,050—is 13 times greater than Egypt's.) Indicative of the changed outlook is the attitude of R. A. Hutchinson, a vice president of Studebaker-Packard, which opened an assembly line in Haifa in 1960. Said Hutchinson, "We deal with all the Arab States. But if they choose to stop their purchases following our agreement here, that's their affair, not ours."

Moreover, the capricious manner in which the boycott is applied invites defiance. It is not a crime under the blockade regulations simply to sell goods to Israel, but it is considered illegal to invest in Israel, to set up offices there, or to enter licensing and technical agreements with Israeli firms. But some U.S. companies, such as Bulova Watch, which do nothing more than sell their products to Israel, have found themselves summarily placed on the blacklist.

Faced with such arbitrariness, formerly hesitant investors have apparently decided that they might as well be hung for sheep as for lambs.[5]

BLACKLISTING OF AMERICAN SHIPS

The Arab League boycott applies as well to American-owned vessels temporarily chartered to Israeli companies, or, as happens more frequently, carrying materials or agricultural or industrial products from the United States destined in large or small part for Israeli ports. The number of ships thus blacklisted varies; as of now, it is estimated that about 35 American-flag vessels are affected, plus an equal number owned by American companies but registered in other countries.

The closing of Arab ports to ships sailing to or from Israel has also subjected American seamen to insult and hardship.

The crew of the freighter *Westport*, entering the port of Suez en route from Israel in the fall of 1959, was held aboard ship for 22 days in violation of international law. The seamen's papers were impounded by the police. The seamen were forbidden to communicate with anyone except through Egyptian officials.[6]

In the summer of 1960, when the *Isthmian* arrived at Aqaba, Jordan, crew members were quizzed as to their religious affiliations and two members were prohibited from taking shore leave because their surnames did not sound "Christian" to the Arabs.[7]

Outraged by harassment and mistreatment of American seamen in Arab ports, the Seafarers International Union picketed the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* when it arrived in New York in April 1960. The picket line was honored by the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen. Unable to unload its cargo, the ship was stranded in New York for 3 weeks. Efforts by the owners to have the Federal courts enjoin the picketing met with no success.

The demonstration at the dock provoked anxiety in Washington—not because of the grievances which occasioned it, but because it might cause embarrassment.[8] In exchange for the union's agreement to end their public protest, the State Department finally promised to look into the situation and, through appropriate diplomatic action with the foreign countries involved, to renew its efforts to assure freedom of the seas and to protect the interests of our shipping and seamen now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy.[9]

On July 12, 1961, the president of the National Maritime Union, Joseph Curran, charged that American seamen still are subjected to indignities and threats of physical violence.[10] He asked President Kennedy to protest to the United Nations against continued United Arab Republic violations of the principle of freedom of the seas. In a telegram to the President, Mr. Curran warned:

In the absence of action by governments or by the United Nations to enforce the principle of freedom of the seas, the International Transport Workers Federation representing unions of seamen and other transport workers with a total membership of 6,500,000 in 71 countries will have to consider joint action through its own resources, including boycott.[11]

American shipowners were affronted for nearly 2 years, starting in the spring of 1958, by the Navy's acceptance of the so-called Haifa Clause in contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports. In effect, the clause barred U.S. vessels engaged in business with Israel from carrying Navy oil cargoes.[12] In February 1960 when public pressure led the Navy's Military Sea Transport Service to withdraw the clause from its shipping contracts, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, commented:

I hope the public protests which greeted revelation of this now discontinued practice will serve as notice to other Government agencies. The American public does not believe a U.S. Government agency should knuckle under to any form of international blackmail.[12]

DENIAL OF ENTRY TO THE SUEZ CANAL

In closing the Suez Canal to ships of American registry engaging in trade with Israel or stopping at Israeli ports, the United Arab Republic is defying United Nations resolutions and established practice, and violating the convention "respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal" signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888, by Turkey and eight major world powers. Egypt was then under Turkey's rule; the United Arab Republic, as successor to the Turkish Government in that region, is bound by treaty obligations assumed with respect to the Suez Canal.

The very first article of the convention states:

The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

The canal shall never be subject to the exercise of the right of blockade.

The UAR contention that the convention does not apply under conditions of war was clearly anticipated by article XI:

The measures taken in the cases provided for in articles IX and X [which deal with measures to be taken by the Egyptian Government to enforce the treaty, defend Egypt, and maintain public order] of the present treaty shall not interfere with the free use of the canal.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The convention prohibits the erection of permanent fortifications or other impediments to navigation (arts. VIII and XI), and provides for continuation of the treaty beyond the duration of the Acts of Concession of the Universal Suez Canal Company—that is, even when the Government of Egypt should come into direct control of the canal (art. XIV).

On November 2, 1956, during the emergency special session to deal with the Sinai-Suez Canal crisis, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East and urging that "steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation." [14]

The U.S. position was summed up by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1956: [15]

It seemed to us from the beginning that any solution should take account of two basic facts. One is that an international waterway like the Suez Canal, which has always had an international status, cannot properly be made an instrumentality of any government's national policies so that equal passage may depend on that government's favor. That does not require Egypt to forgo the rights which are normal to it as the sovereign nation through whose territory this international waterway passes. It does mean that Egypt should not be in a position to exercise such arbitrary power, open or devious, over the operations of this international waterway that the nations dependent on the canal will in effect be living under an economic "sword of Damocles." That would be an intolerable state of affairs. It would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter requirement that these situations must be dealt with in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

On January 8, 1957, to help defray the cost of rehabilitating the Suez Canal, the United States advanced $5 million to the United Nations. As of July 1961, approximately $3 million had been refunded in three installments, leaving a net of $2 million contributed by the United States. Thus, in submitting to the exclusion of American ships from the canal, our Government is allowing its citizens to be denied access to an international waterway maintained in part out of their own pockets.

The "Freedom of the Seas" amendment to the Mutual Security Act, introduced by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and KENNETH KEATING, and adopted by both Houses of Congress on May 2, 1960, declares that "such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways" are disapproved by the United States and endanger the peace of the world; the amendment calls on the President to "report on measures taken by the administration" to insure the application of these principles in granting foreign aid.[16] But the State Department has not acted on this policy statement by the Congress.

BLACKLISTING OF HOLLYWOOD AND BROADWAY STARS

Numerous American stage and screen stars of all faiths who have performed, or intend to perform, in Israel, or are said to harbor favorable feelings for that country, have been blacklisted by the Arab League. This extension of discrimination to the entertainment industry may well be intended to accomplish something more than appears on the surface—namely, to restrict freedom of expression.

The most publicized instance occurred in March 1961, when the United Arab Republic refused to permit a company of the American Theatre Guild, touring under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of State and headed by no less renowned an actress than Helen Hayes, to perform in Cairo. The reason given was that the company was scheduled also to appear in Tel Aviv. Yet, no military or economic gain would accrue to Israel because of this visit. The cancellation seemed clearly to imply that if well-known persons could be disadvantaged because of their alleged friendly attitudes toward Israel or willingness to appear there, persons of lesser repute might be well advised not to evidence attitudes or make commitments displeasing to the Arab League.

TO UPHOLD THE INTERESTS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Our State Department has repeatedly proclaimed its determination to protect basic American interests which are endangered by the Arab boycott. It has clearly cataloged those interests and its intentions with respect to them as follows:

The U.S. Government protests as a matter of policy discriminatory actions or practices with respect to international trade which adversely affect U.S. firms, vessels, and citizens. The Department will continue to pursue, by all appropriate and effective means, every avenue whereby private American interests in international trade may be fully safeguarded and restored.

As a matter of settled policy, the United States supports the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to foreign ports and facilities. The Department has constantly sought to facilitate the normal pursuit of international commerce by vessels of U.S. registry.

The U.S. Government has long and unequivocally maintained the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the Suez Canal for all nations. This policy has been publicly emphasized on numerous occasions, and was specifically reiterated by the Secretary of State during his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 17, 1959.

The Department of State reemphasizes that our Government neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott, which includes the blacklisting of U.S.-flag vessels in part because of prior calls at Israeli ports. Every appropriate opportunity will be utilized, on a continuing basis, to reemphasize this fundamental position to the Governments concerned.[17]

But these and other assurances of devotion to principle still remain to be implemented by effective means; our Government has yet to move from praiseworthy assertions to appropriate action.

CITIZEN ACTION

The conscientious citizen, who may well ask "What can I do about this?" may find guidance in the State Department's declaration that the Department "gives full consideration to all communications from private American groups with respect to problems affecting the conduct of U.S. foreign relations." [18] In view of this hospitality to the views of private citizen groups, leaders of such groups have the opportunity to address themselves to those aspects of the boycott which are of particular concern to their members:

Business, industrial and trade organizations can urge that Government departments and agencies, and U.S. representatives abroad, henceforth refuse to cooperate with, or facilitate, those activities of Arab League nations which interfere with freedom of action on the part of American companies in establishing, maintaining and extending commercial relations abroad. Business and industrial firms can themselves reject threats of boycott or blacklisting.

Labor unions, which have a substantial stake in frustrating the boycott, can continue to express the views already voiced by several spokesmen of the labor movement emphasizing the need for immediate action to uphold the principles enunciated by the State Department in its official statement of May 6, 1960, to the President of the AFL–CIO.

Religious, patriotic and civic organizations can articulate their opposition to our Government's seeming toleration of Arab League activities which infringe upon American sovereignty and invade the rights of American citizens.

The mass media can interpret to newspaper and magazine readers, and radio and television audiences, the nature and significance of the Arab boycott, exposing it in its full light as an arrogant effort to dictate to the American business and industrial community under what conditions and with whom commerce and trade may be conducted in foreign countries.

Veterans organizations can demand that the Armed Forces terminate their accommodation to Arab discrimination against American servicemen and henceforth refuse to make religious distinctions in the assignment of military and civilian personnel to U.S. establishments anywhere in the world.

All citizen groups can urge that Congress reexamine its foreign aid policy, with particular reference to expenditures for grants and loans to those Arab League nations which discriminate among American citizens and boycott American business and industry. All groups can call upon our Government to suit its action to its word, to insist that:

Citizens carrying American passports must receive equal hospitality wherever they may travel;

Ships flying the Stars and Stripes must enjoy freedom of navigation in whatever international waterway they may choose to sail;

Armed Forces personnel, whether military or civilian, must be assigned to oversea service, wherever such service is required, without regard for discriminatory religious criteria invoked by foreign governments in defiance of American law;

American citizens and American-owned companies must be free to pursue their legitimate commercial and industrial interests anywhere in the world without arbitrary interference and restraint;

Countries seeking to maintain friendly relations with the United States must be guided by these requirements.

In short, public opinion can call a halt to departures from principle in America's foreign relations. Public opinion can demand that our foreign policy be extricated from the quicksands of concession to bluster and affront, and restored to the solid rock of self-respect.

Allies are not won nor admiration stirred for our country by willingness to compromise national ideals on the grounds of expediency. The fallacy, indeed the cataclysmic consequence, of such a course has been borne out all too often in the downfall of once-proud nations.

Today, as in the past, America's true course lies in unyielding commitment to the principles that give us strength as a nation and stature as a leader among nations.

AREA OFFICES

New England: 72 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

New York: Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y.; Westchester division, 48 Mamaroneck Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.

Northern New Jersey and New York State: 45 Branford Place, Newark, N.J.

Pennsylvania: 1508 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Central Seaboard: 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Atlanta: 41 Exchange Place, Atlanta, Ga.

Southeast: 1208 Congress Building, Miami, Fla.

East Central: 602 Chester-Ninth Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Michigan: 163 Madison Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
North Central: 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
South Central: 19 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
West Central: 705 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Southwest: 523 Fidelity Building, Dallas, Tex.
Southern Pacific: 590 North Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Northern Pacific: 40 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

(AJC: Founded 1906, oldest American organization combating bigotry, protecting civil and religious rights of Jews, and advancing cause of freedom everywhere.)

Frederick F. Greenman, president.
Louis Caplan, chairman, executive board.
Pearson E. Neaman, chairman, administrative board.
William Rosenwald, chairman, National Advisory Council.
Maurice Glinert, treasurer.
Arthur D. Leidesdorf, associate treasurer.
Julius S. Loewenthal, secretary.
John Slawson, executive vice president.
Morris B. Abram, Atlanta, vice president.
Max Wm. Bay, Beverly Hills, vice president.
Martin L. Butzel, Detroit, vice president.
William P. Engel, Birmingham, vice president.
Jack A. Goldfarb, New York, vice president.
Andrew Goodman, New York, vice president.
Philip E. Hoffman, Orange, vice president.
James Marshall, New York, vice president.
Irving Salomon, San Diego, vice president.
Gardner H. Stern, Chicago, vice president.
Jacob Blaustein, honorary president.
Herbert B. Ehrmann, honorary president.
Irving M. Engel, honorary president.
Joseph M. Proskauer, honorary president.
Herbert H. Lehman, honorary vice president.
Samuel D. Leidesdorf, honorary vice president.
Ralph E. Samuel, honorary vice president.
Horace Stern, honorary vice president.
Fred Lazarus, Jr., honorary chairman, National Advisory Council.

---

[1] The Arab League consists of 11 countries: Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic and Yemen.

[2] "Comments on Points Raised in New York State Resolution 131." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1961, p. 6568.

[3] "The Frayed Arab Noose." Fortune, July 1961, p. 102.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 106.

[6] Seafarers Log, official organ of the Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL–CIO, Apr. 22, 1960.

[7] Ibid., Aug. 19, 1960.

[8] The New York Times, Apr. 24, 1960.

[9] Statement by Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon to AFL–CIO President George Meany, May 6, 1960.

[10] The New York Times, July 13, 1961.

[11] New York Herald Tribune, July 13, 1961.

[12] The Haifa clause:

"In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"1. To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port,

"2. To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

"3. To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

[13] The New York Times, Feb. 19, 1960.

[14] United Nations Review, December 1956, p. 103.

[15] "The Task of Waging Peace," address before the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas, Tex. The Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1956, p. 699.

[16] Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–472; 74 Stat. 134), sec. 2, which amends sec. 2(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

[17] Statement of Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, op. cit.

[18] Ibid.

Critical Materials to Soviet Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article from the Worcester, Mass., Telegram headed "U.S. Exports to Red Bloc Rise 800 Percent During Crisis."

The heading of this article as well as its contents give rise to some very disturbing impressions in that it would appear that this Nation has stepped up its trade with the Red bloc and strengthened its potential in critical materials and equipment at a time when the Communist conspiracy is pointing a bloody finger in the direction of the United States and the free world.

In view of this article and other information that has come to me recently concerning these matters, I am contacting appropriate officials of the Government, including the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, in order to adduce further information as well as the basis for our doing business in critical materials with the Soviet bloc at this time.

I have also indicated my very strong view that trade with the Soviet bloc which involves the sending of critical materials, or in fact any materials, equipment and supplies that increase the warmaking potential of the slave world, would be sharply questioned and disapproved by an overwhelming majority of the American people, as being contrary to our interests as well as our security.

The article follows:

U.S. EXPORTS TO RED BLOC RISE 800 PERCENT DURING CRISIS

WASHINGTON.—The volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries increased by more than 800 percent in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin.

This has been a cause of both concern and embarrassment to high administration officials aware of the statistics, which have received scant public attention.

Steps already have been taken to reverse the upward trend, although there has been no formal change in export control regulations.

FIGURES SHOW UPTREND

An Associated Press tabulation of daily export licensing reports, made available by the Commerce Department, showed that:

In the 3 weeks preceding Kennedy's July 25 television-radio address on the Berlin crisis, the Department authorized the shipment of $750,196 in American goods to the Soviet Union and her European satellites.

In the 3 succeeding weeks, the licensing total soared to $6,278,566.

SECURITY NOT IMPERILED

Included in the upswing were $2.5 million of rail equipment for Bulgaria; $1.7 million of synthetic rubber for the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary and Rumania; $107,000 of industrial instruments for the Soviet Union, Hungary and Czechoslovakia: $95,000 of coal tar products for Hungary and Czechoslovakia; $38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany; and $23,000 of pipe valves for the Soviet Union and Poland.

The Department ruled that none of these proposed shipments would endanger national security. Export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their war-making potential.

BUSINESS AS USUAL

The licensing officials apparently continued to take a business-as-usual attitude after Kennedy's talk, thus running counter to public opinion as assessed by their boss, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges.

The Secretary told an August 8 news conference: "I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 or 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

We Can Be Proud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the most tolerant nation in the world. We can be justly proud of the harmony and good will that exists among our people. We have by far the best record in the world of any nation with similar problems. We need to tell this story to the world. We can be proud of the tolerance, understanding, and amazing progress being made in race relations.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about our accomplishments—the good things we are doing and not magnify little incidents out of proportion.

Sentiments expressed by our African friends in the following article from the Washington Evening Star is a deserved compliment to the people of our great country:

BIAS IN SOUTH EXAGGERATED, AFRICANS SAY

GREENSBORO, N.C., August 22.—Bekele Gared, a young Ethiopian agricultural official, says he is convinced the South's racial troubles have been exaggerated.

Mr. Gared, who has lived in Texas and North Carolina for 5 months, says the people who exaggerated these troubles to him were not Russians, but "mostly Americans."

Mr. Gared is one of 18 Africans currently studying agricultural extension work in the

United States. A number of them have lived with farm families in central and eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Gared and others of the group were interviewed by a representative of the Department of Agriculture Information of North Carolina State College's School of Agriculture.

"When I came to the United States, I chose to go to the North," Mr. Gared said, "because of what I had read about the South."

Mr. Gared said most of the things he had read about the South had appeared in weekly news magazines and negro newspapers published in America.

Officials of the International Cooperation Administration granted Mr. Gared his wish. They sent him to Michigan State University.

"Later, when they told me they were going to send me to Texas, I protested," Mr. Gared said. "And when I told people at Michigan State that I was going to be sent to the South, they were most sympathetic."

He said he finally agreed to go to Texas "when I found I had no alternative."

The headquarters of his Texas visit was Prairie View A. & M. College, a State-supported Negro college. In early July, he and his group moved on to North Carolina.

EXPERIENCE OPENS EYES

Since then, they have visited State institutions, businesses, and for about 2 weeks various members of the group lived with farm families in Wilson, Greene, Wayne, Franklin, Vance, Warren, Granville, Durham, Rockingham and Caswell Counties.

As a result of his extensive visit, Mr. Gared said his attitude about race relations in the South was "entirely changed."

"If you don't look for embarrassing things, you won't find them," he said.

Members of Mr. Gared's party were interviewed at North Carolina A. & T. College here, where they spent several days evaluating their North Carolina study. There was general agreement with Mr. Gared's observation about racial conditions in Texas and North Carolina.

KENYA OFFICIAL AGREES

"You see a good deal of what you are looking for," said a Ministry of Agriculture official from Kenya.

This official, incidentally, said he tried to eat at a white restaurant in Greensboro and was refused service.

"But I didn't get upset," he said, "because I realized that in my own country a white man may have had the same trouble in many places."

"Racial problems are worldwide," he continued in a distinct British accent, result of 3 years of study at Cambridge University.

"But perhaps you in America have done more about these problems than many places in the world," he added.

INDIANA NOT MUCH DIFFERENT

A 36-year-old superintendent for the Ministry of Agriculture in Nigeria, Agorinda Alawode, felt that he had an objective view of America's race problems before he came to this country.

"The American Ambassador explained the situation at a lecture I attended," he said.

Mr. Alawode, whose face is marked by tribal tattoos, has attended Indiana University for 9 months.

"And I don't see much difference in race relations in Indiana and other places I have been," he commented. "I could get myself into trouble any place," he added, "whether it's in America or my own country."

A Tanganyikan official, Ally Mondoma, said he remembered reading about that "Rock place" [Little Rock]. "But when I got here," he added, "I saw the races were getting along in all phases of life."

One visitor said: "Any time people are indifferent to you, you are segregated. And here I found people very sympathetic."

We Must Meet the Needs of America's Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Bob Cavanaugh, of Eau Claire, Wis., has called my attention to a very thought-provoking article on the needs of America's children. It was written by Ada Barnett Stough, executive director of the American Parents Committee, and appeared in Parents' magazine. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this article in the RECORD:

IF CHILDREN COULD TALK TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

Children have no vote or voice in national affairs. If they had, here are some things they might say to the President and the Congress:

Please give us more schoolrooms. Two million of us are short of classrooms, go to school half-days, and lose the equivalent of 2 months of instruction. Many classes are held in churches, office buildings, and, in at least one city in a school bus. Several million more of us in regular classrooms are handicapped because of overcrowding, and overworked teachers. Please help our communities to build at least 130,000 more classrooms.

Please take the lead in combating juvenile delinquency. For reasons not clearly enough known, some 1½ to 2 million of us do not live law-abiding lives: we steal autos, burgle and a few even commit murder. Our delinquency costs the United States $2.6 billion a year. Many explanations and remedies have been suggested, but there is no central agency to take responsibility. There are too few policemen who know how to handle us; too few psychologists and psychiatrists, too few welfare workers, probation officers, judges and social workers to help us with our problems. Can't the U.S. Government provide leadership and funds?

Please help where parents are helpless. Five million of us have working mothers. We need day-care centers but there aren't enough. When mothers get sick or another calamity arises, we wish there could be homemakers to take over. But county welfare budgets aren't big enough for adequate homemaker services. Couldn't the Federal Government help?

Please help us with our medical care. Many of us don't get needed medical care. Between 30,000 and 50,000 of us are born each year with heart disease. Between a third and a half million of us have epilepsy. About the same number have cerebral palsy. When our parents can't take care of us the Federal Government sometimes helps with money that comes to our communities from the grant-in-aid programs for maternal and child health and welfare, and for crippled children. Please appropriate enough money to keep that help coming.

More than 2 million of us are mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed, or have serious speech or hearing defects. We need especially trained teachers, better diagnostic services, and our parents need advice and counsel about how to care for us. The Federal Government has begun to help. Please see that the funds appropriated are adequate.

Please help those of us who are homeless or whose parents don't look after us. A quarter of a million of us are without permanent homes because of divorce, desertion, illness, mental breakdown or some other reason. There is usually no one to help us but a public welfare worker. Where there is one, often she cannot get to us in time. We need someone to get Aid for Dependent Children money for us—when needed—and to see that it is sufficient. We need someone to find us foster homes—to get us released for adoption. Won't you help?

Please help those of us who can't live like other children. Approximately 100,000 of us are children of migratory workers. About 5,000 of us are employed illegally during school hours partly because there is no schooling for us where we work. The Federal Government could provide leadership and financial help. Help us, please, to get it.

Please remember, Mr. President and Members of Congress, that we are part of the generation who will soon be responsible for our country's welfare. How well we will do depends on our present education, health and the care that contributes to sound emotional growth. Please keep us in mind.

Crimes Aboard Aircraft in Air Commerce

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join the others who have complimented the committee chairman and the committee who have brought to the House H.R. 8384. Certainly, each of us is gravely concerned with the problem of aircraft piracy.

Unfortunately, this is the type of crime which gets wide publicity and thereby is increased the possibility of a rash of such evil offenses.

Because of the fact that aircraft is relatively new in international travel, the old laws of piracy on the high seas fail to fit the needs of our modern society. The committee has brought us an excellent bill to provide for swift prosecution in this field of criminal law. However, because of one aspect of H.R. 8384, I vote for it most reluctantly. This is the matter of the death penalty provision. Firstly, a good case can be made against the death penalty on moral grounds. This broad issue, however, must be debated and considered another day.

My concern with the death penalty provision in this bill is that it goes beyond anything with which I am familiar, either in Federal law, or in California State law in that it provides for the death penalty when there is no death nor injury to a victim (this field of crime is distinguishable from treason where the death penalty is imposed without a show of immediate harm or death to a victim).

The sole justification for the death penalty is its deterrent effect. Considering the probable circumstances of the commission of aircraft piracy, it would seem to me most advisable to provide that the death penalty could not be imposed if there were no death or bodily harm to a victim. It would seem justi-

fied to anticipate that the crime of aircraft piracy would be one which would last over a considerable period of time in its commission and further that there would be opportunity for discussion between some of the victims, particularly the aircraft pilot and the criminal.

It is at this point that the criminal may be, and should be, aware of the fact that if he conducts himself so as to avoid any harm to his victims he will thus avoid the death penalty regardless of what else may happen to him.

No one desires to "negotiate" with a criminal, but the primary concern of this bill is the preservation of life and avoidance of harm to victims. I believe that a sane criminal will be easily persuaded to avoid harm to the victim if that harm will result in his probable death. It is to be noted that the insane criminal will not be executed under any circumstances. Under our penal system we do not execute the insane.

This reasoning was followed in the drafting of the Federal kidnaping statute. I respectfully suggest that the same approach should be used in aircraft piracy.

Dollars Will Not Solve All Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the apparent theory embraced by the administration, we cannot solve all the world's problems by throwing dollars at them. A sound foreign-aid program in the interest of the United States would be a selective one in which we give no aid to our enemies or to Socialist neutrals who aid our enemies. A sound foreign-aid program would be loans to those countries who guarantee freedom to their people, for programs they initiate and want, and with strong guarantees that the loans would be repaid in hard money, not local currency. The lazy diplomacy of the administration visionaries is well defined in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

LAZY DIPLOMACY

It's unfortunate that the foreign-aid debate in Congress has seemed to turn on a technicality. To many, the argument in recent days has appeared to boil down to the administration wanting to spend aid money one way, the House insisting on another.

Certainly, the face of the dispute is aid financing. The administration requests authority to finance a part of its aid program—some $8.8 billion—by direct borrowing from the Treasury over the next 5 years. And the House, for obvious reasons, wishes to preserve the checkrein provided by the procedure of annual aid appropriations.

Yet anyone who reads the debates will see another conflict underlying all the talk of financing. It is, at bottom, a debate about the wisdom of U.S. foreign policy.

The administration, because of the way it looks at the world, would commit the United States more deeply to foreign aid as the chief instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Many in Congress, looking back on upwards of $90 billion in past aid-giving, are profoundly skeptical of further travel on that road.

Their misgivings are supported by a striking fact: In one way or another, foreign aid now flows to 97 of the earth's 110 nations. Any diplomatic device used so indiscriminately is suspect; there cannot be so many vital U.S. interests to be served unless the aid we give is largely an end in itself.

Thus foreign aid has grown into an institution, girdling the globe and embracing allies, neutrals and Communists alike. A few countries are aided out of clear U.S. self-interest, yet in the majority the U.S. interest is the vaguely defined ambition of eradicating poverty and encouraging progress. This justification for aid to the so-called underdeveloped countries arises from circumstances there; from pity for the numberless poor and from irrational guilt at our own well-being; from a shaky hope our dollars are doing something to win friends and lessen the likelihood of Communist takeover. It does not arise from hard thought about the uses of foreign aid.

In its time, the Marshall plan idea was an imaginative stroke of U.S. diplomacy; so was the U.S. military aid sent to some parts of the free world; if a Laos slipped, a Greece and a Turkey were saved. But ever since these efforts, subsequent administrations, trying to live on borrowed intellectual capital, have grossly misapplied the idea. The sprawling U.S. aid program is the result of shrinking U.S. diplomatic insight and resourcefulness.

All this bespeaks of a poverty of imagination. The Communists also give foreign aid, using the device selectively as one diplomatic tool among many. But when the United States faces the problems posed by an emerging nation or a sudden crisis, it looks instinctively to foreign aid to solve them. Washington behaves as though there were no alternative way of influencing men and events; as though the United States could not lead other nations if it lost its checkbook.

There are any number of things wrong with the U.S. foreign aid program. But one of the worst is that it too often serves as a crutch for the intellectually lazy.

Shickshinny, Pa., Now Observing Its Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during this week the Borough of Shickshinny in my congressional district is observing its 100th anniversary. This Saturday, I shall have the pleasure of participating in Shickshinny's celebration and I am eagerly looking forward to seeing the parade, attending a baseball game and the spectacular which has been arranged for later in the day. This fine borough, Mr. Speaker, is an historical area and a thriving farm region as the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader pointed out in an editorial in its issue of Monday, August 21, 1961.

As part of my remarks today, I include the aforementioned editorial:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Aug. 21, 1961]

SHICKSHINNY CENTENNIAL

A salute is in order to Shickshinny today as it begins the formal observance of the centennial of its incorporation as a borough. Actually, it was chartered on November 30, 1861, but the advancement of the celebration will permit it to take advantage of warm weather and the vacation season, thus making it possible for many to participate who might not be able to come 3 months hence.

Shickshinny ranks fifth among boroughs of Luzerne County in age, being preceded only by White Haven in 1842, Kingston and West Pittston in 1857, and New Columbus in 1860.

Actually, of course, the town's history has its roots deep in colonial America. There was a reference to Shickshinny as early as 1774. It was known originally as Shickshawnee. The borough itself was carved from Salem and Union Townships with Jesse P. Enke as the first burgess. The first permanent resident of the town was Ralph Austin, the great-grandfather of Charles Austin, Wilkes-Barre banker. Among the early landowners and mine operators there were the Hollenbacks, Conynghams, Searches, McClintocks, and Stackhouses.

Shickshinny, known to the Indians as the place where five mountains meet, continues to be the center of a thriving agricultural region and retains its rustic appeal. The municipality's population, according to the 1960 census, was 1,831. With its churches, schools, and organizations, it is typical of the small towns that dot the American scene. Its record is impressive in peace and war.

The program for the week calls for special events through next Sunday.

Women's Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, August 26 is the 41st anniversary of the 19th amendment to the Constitution. I am proud to say that in 1920 it was the Republican Party who gave American women the right to vote. Since 1920, women voters have strengthened our Government and the importance of their participation in Government affairs has been recognized by appointment to many high level Government positions.

Women's enhanced position in Government has been paralleled in all phases of American life. More women are being welcomed in professional, technical, and clerical occupations. As every Member of this House knows, without women's participation in U.S. politics, our electoral process could not have kept up with the times. Whether it is actually running for an office at the Federal, State, and local levels, or babysitting while others vote, women assume an important role.

In the 1956 election, 57.6 percent of the eligible women voted in contrast to 60.91 percent of men eligible to vote. The per-

centage is rising fast. Also rising fast is the number of women in State government offices. Seven women are secretaries of state; 34, State senators; and 294 State representatives. I am pleased to say that six women hold important offices in the State of Maryland.

Because today is the 41st anniversary of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, it is not only fitting we pause and pay tribute to her, but also to the millions of American women today who play important roles as leaders of our United States. As we remember them and this anniversary, we look ahead to the future and recognize the demand for equal rights for women in every sense of the word.

An Excellent Résumé of the Wastefulness of Army Policy on Disposal of St. Louis Ordnance Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for months, the St. Louis delegation in the Congress, and the two Senators from Missouri, have been attempting to convince the Department of the Army of the wastefulness involved in present policy decisions to declare as surplus and then dispose of the St. Louis Ordnance Plant. This $300 million installation has been one of the most important facilities of the Army in production of ammunition, and played a most vital role in World War II and the Korean war.

In St. Louis itself, the board of aldermen, on motion of Alderman William L. Clay, of the 26th ward, unanimously urged continued Government ownership of the facility in standby condition, not only because of the importance of the facility to the St. Louis economy but in view of the Nation's possible need for the materials it can produce in time of emergency.

Also, our labor groups in St. Louis have adopted strong resolutions of support for this same position. The International Union of Operating Engineers and the International Association of Machinists have joined the congressional delegation in vigorous representations to the Department of Defense on this, and the American Legion of Missouri has backed us up on it. The St. Louis Labor Council has also been represented in these efforts.

I have just received an excellent summary, in the form of a press release prepared and issued yesterday by Alderman Clay, outlining the current status of the situation and pointing up the wastefulness involved in a policy of disposing of this valuable Government ordnance plant.

Knowing how the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate view with deep concern the off-again, on-again policies often followed by Defense Department officials in deactivating and starting to dispose of facilities which later must be refurbished and put back into operation on a crash basis at huge expense, I am taking this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress the background in the case of the St. Louis Ordnance Plant.

Alderman Clay's statement is, as I said, an excellent résumé, and I submit it herewith for printing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM L. CLAY

The purpose of this release is to pass on to you some of the facts I have gathered regarding the St. Louis Ordnance Plant situation.

I want to assure you that this question of the Government either retaining the fully equipped St. Louis Ordnance Plant or of gutting it by disconnecting and disposing of the machinery and equipment is not a political or labor "pitch" but one that a group of us feels sincerely is of grave import to the Government in its overall defense planning. For a brief résumé, the following is given:

The St. Louis Ordnance Plant was built in 1940–41 and produced its first ammunition the week following Pearl Harbor. From that time until V–J Day in August 1945 this plant produced over 6 billion rounds of caliber .30 and .50 small-arms ammunition. In addition to this production it was a main base for production of steel cores and 105-millimeter shells.

Subsequent to V–J Day, on the announcement that the plant was to be stripped of its specialized machinery and equipment, a group of businessmen and labor leaders, in an audience with the then Secretary of War Patterson and top Army personnel, requested retention of the St. Louis Ordnance Plant on a standby basis. The Army answered that there was no foreseeable future requirement for small arms ammunition other than that which could be produced at the Government-owned Lake City Arsenal located at Independence, Mo., Twin Cities Arsenal located at New Brighton, Minn., plus privately owned facilities which had limited capacities.

On the basis of this decision, the St. Louis Ordnance Plant was stripped of machinery and equipment, including large power transformers and a boiler plant required to furnish process steam and heat for buildings. Because its special design precluded use for purposes other than the manufacturing of small arms ammunition, a large percentage of this equipment and machinery was broken up and sold as scrap iron.

Five years later, in 1950–51, it was determined by the Army that there was a lack of and an urgent need for additional small arms ammunition production facilities. The St. Louis Ordnance Plant was reactivated at a cost of more than $100 million. Even more serious than this expenditure of money, and a point to be considered by those who once again are making a decision as to whether or not to declare the facility surplus to Government needs, is the fact that a period of more than 2 years was required on a crash program basis to have machinery built and installed, and to ready the plant for production.

History now repeats itself. As in 1945 it is again said by the Army and Defense Department that the St. Louis Ordnance Plant is no longer required or, as stated by Assistant Secretary of the Army Paul R. Ignatious in his letter dated August 8, 1961, to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, "the decision to excess the St. Louis Ordnance Plant was made on the basis of a review of current and mobilization requirements for the kinds of small arms ammunition which this facility is designed to produce. This review disclosed that total needs for these items, as computed under the latest planning guidance given the Army, can be met by use of Lake City Arsenal, Independence, Mo., Twin Cities Arsenal, New Brighton, Minn., and commercial plants already in operation. Lake City and Twin Cities Arsenals are smaller installations which can be operated efficiently at much lower rates than the St. Louis Ordnance Plant and which additionally, provide the advantages of greater versatility, flexibility of operation, and dispersal."

The basis for decision reflected in the first sentence of the paragraph quoted above is very similar to that expressed by the Department of the Army in 1945. We realize that the Departments of Army and Defense are in a much better position statisticwise to evaluate quantities of all types of war materials required and we do not question that it is not only their right but their responsibility to make such decisions. It is felt, however, that in view of present world conditions and the realization that future wars may be of a conventional rather than an all-out atomic type, this decision which is based on "total needs for these items as computed under the latest planning guidance given the Army" might well be based, as in 1945, on a false assumption that relatively limited quantities of small arms ammunition will be required in time of war. This assumption can only be conjecture.

It should be pointed out that the Government is spending large sums for the manufacture of NATO 7.62 mm. rifles and machineguns to supplant the caliber .30 small arms used in World Wars I and II and Korea. These 7.62 mm. weapons use a cartridge slightly smaller in dimension than the caliber .30 and this cartridge can be manufactured at the St. Louis Ordnance Plant with very slight modification to existing caliber .30 equipment in a short time with very little cost to the Government. It is felt that in the event the St. Louis Ordnance Plant were stripped of its equipment and converted to other uses, there might not be time in a crisis to reconstruct, reinstall and ready the equipment to produce ammuntion for two of the basic weapons, rifle and machinegun.

The St. Louis Ordnance Plant should be retained by the Government if only to consider it an "insurance policy" (Lake City and Twin Cities Arsenals being the only other small arms ammunition plants in the United States capable of producing ammunition in the mass production required by hostilities). The cost to the Government for maintenance of the plant in its present standby, ready-to-produce status is less than one-fourth of 1 percent per year of the replacement value of the plant (approximately $750,000 per year, more than $300 million replacement value); that is, the plant can be maintained in a state of readiness for a period of 10 years at a cost to the Government of only 2½ percent of the replacement value.

Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers has leased to private industry empty plant buildings which were not reequipped in 1951. The revenue from these leases is approximately $180,000 per year. The sale of utilities (steam and electricity to lessees), the total cost of which is included in the yearly budget required to operate this plant, shows a net return against operating costs of approximately $50,000 per year. The major portion of the plant administration building is occupied by the St. Louis Ordnance District, a large warehouse by the U.S. Army Support Center, other buildings by the U.S. Aeronautical Chart and Information Center. In addition to space, these Government agencies are furnished utilities (heat, light, etc.). The Government tenants in the plant occupy approximately 200,000 square feet of office and warehouse space which, if the Government had to go out and

lease, would cost, out of pocket, approximately $250,000 per year. The revenue from the leases plus the savings accomplished by using portions of the plant for Government offices and warehousing total approximately $500,000 which can be applied against the $750,000 per year budget cost. The brochure issued by the Corps of Engineers shows there is still available at the plant an amount of space which, when leased, should return to the Government another $200,000 per year. On the basis of the above reasoning, this Government facility can be retained by the Government at practically no cost to the taxpayer.

The Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis is the only local group that has expressed a desire that the plant be declared excess and disposed of by the Government. Other groups have taken an active part in requesting retention of the plant.

The board of aldermen of the city of St. Louis has unanimously voted and sent to the Secretary of Defense a resolution to the effect that the St. Louis Ordnance Plant be retained.

The American Legion at its annual department convention in Kansas City in July 1961 voted that the plant be retained and forwarded a copy of this resolution to the Department of Defense.

The labor council of St. Louis has also gone on record as favoring the retention of the St. Louis Ordnance Plant by the Government and has forwarded copies of their resolution to Government authorities.

Senior Citizens in the Peace Corps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, there exists in this country today a great reserve of unused, highly experienced, and in many cases, extremely competent talent. I am speaking of our senior citizens.

Recently, I had occasion to read an article in the St. Petersburg Times which vividly points to this situation. In an interview with a number of senior citizens, the author, Lowell Brandle, finds that many of them are inclined to believe that their mature judgment and experience could be well utilized in the Peace Corps.

In my opinion, this is a sound suggestion—certainly one which should be fully explored. It is often said that there is no substitute for experience. If this be true, certainly the vast experience of those senior citizens who wish to enter the Peace Corps—and are physically and otherwise qualified to do so—would be of immense value of this Nation.

At this point, I am inserting the full text of this article in the RECORD:

WHY NOT SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE PEACE CORPS?

(Interview by Lowell Brandle)

"If the Peace Corps starts working out well, you can be sure that the Commies will try to throw a stick in the wheel somewhere along the line. A Peace Corps youth will be bewildered, unable to understand this deep-dyed treachery. An older person with experience in that country could say, 'Look, this is the way it is.'"

The speaker is H. T. Mooers, veteran of 33 years in the U.S. Foreign Service, in Europe and Latin America. He is one of seven older suncoasters whom Sunday asked: "Why not place senior citizens in the Peace Corps."

A great idea, said these veterans of oversea service. But they had reservations.

"You can't beat youth," continues Diplomat Mooers; a young man or woman of 25 can go through hell or high water and come out still smiling. But the Peace Corps is still an excellent chance for use of older people, not just because they are older, but as a stabilizing influence, because they have been through the mill. It would be ideal to use older people who have years of experience in a country."

Another who agrees about the age of 25 is Mrs. Regina B. Wood, who worked for years in China with the Red Cross and as a teacher and social worker and spent years visiting foreign lands with her husband, head of the Episcopal foreign service.

"Older people do not physically adjust as easily, although this isn't as important as it used to be, because of new advances in antibiotics and vitamins and cures for older diseases like malaria.

"Too, older people are more set in their ways and often they have developed bad habits, little things that can ruin everything—biting your nails is extremely bad manners in China, for instance.

"On the other hand, older people with experience in a country, who are sympathetic and have a real desire to help, could help a great deal if mixed in with younger people. The younger ones would have someone to turn to, a shoulder to cry on.

"Those of us who have worked and lived in foreign countries for a long time have learned patience and understanding of a country and its people. This is a great reservoir of knowledge. We can look back and see where we made our mistakes.

"Once, when I first lived in China, I learned from the cook at a local school that my own cook had been overcharging me. I went to him and accused him of overcharging me. This was the wrong approach, I learned from experience. Now, I would say: 'Go ask the cook at the school where he gets his vegetables. He has found a place where they are cheaper.'

"And one more very important problem where young people are involved in sex. We may as well expect it."

"That's very true," says Edwin P. Connette, who worked in international trade around the world for many years. "I've known many able young men to go into these foreign countries and fail, simply because they could not handle wine, women and song.

"In the Peace Corps, enthusiasm is not enough and formal education is not enough. There must be experience also.

"Businessmen with foreign trade experience can help a great deal in these underdeveloped countries, as they begin to produce. The same need is there for older professionals, for educators and engineers. Many would be willing to help if the proper incentive were given * * * and I don't mean money necessarily.

"I am on record in Washington as being willing to go out again."

Frank Newman, born and reared in Hungary, spent most of his adult years as a labor organizer in the Chicago area. He sees a great need for wise, idealistic labor leadership in the newly emerging countries:

"The objective of the Peace Corps is to raise the standard of living, with new small industries and more productivity, making things and selling them and buying them. The workers must share in this.

"Someone must help give them an incentive to want a better life—maybe not a car, but at least a bicycle. Someone must help them get their share of the country's economic income.

"These countries are going to go through what we have gone through for the past hundred years. I think we have dedicated, idealistic older people who can help them avoid our mistakes, who can give good advice to their governments and businessmen."

Mrs. Margaret Hillman was a teacher of high school and college as a young woman, in China and Turkey.

"The late twenties and early thirties is the best age. I did a better job at that age than I could now. I wasn't as set in my ways; things that amused me then would upset me now.

"Dedication, sympathy, understanding. These are the really important things, and perhaps an older person would have more of them. But I don't think these are a matter of age.

"I remember that 12 American experts in various fields were sent to Turkey while I was there. All were older, over 45, and all except one lived in a hotel apart from the Turks. They were respected but they didn't develop any friendship for America among the people. The other man learned the language and had sympathetic understanding for the Turks. They liked him and he was most effective in his work.

"We must be prepared for some suspicion. When I arrived at one of these schools, the principal said: 'If all the things I hear about America are true, then I don't know what she's doing here. She's either a spy or a missionary, and I don't want to have anything to do with either one.'"

Miss Hildegard Goranson worked with the Red Cross in Australia, New Guinea, the Philippines and Japan, and for 5 years was in Japan investigating Nazi holdings.

"One real advantage to using older people in the Peace Corps, particularly in the Orient, is their respect for age. Orientals feel wisdom comes with age.

"Where advice and counseling are to be given, older people would get a better reception. This would include educators, lawyers, housing experts, bankers, doctors, agriculture experts, and engineers.

"Once, in Australia, I was in charge of a group of 200 Aussies. I looked 25 and they resented my orders, until I had a 38th birthday. When they learned my real age, the atmosphere warmed considerably."

Russell Brooks, who served 32 years in the U.S. Foreign Service, in Europe and Africa, thinks older veterans of life abroad can offer much to the Peace Corps.

"They can contribute understanding of foreign peoples and their way of life. Youth doesn't get this understanding until it has lived in a foreign country for some time."

"I think older people in the Peace Corps, working with the young ones, is a good idea. They are more patient, less easily discouraged. This admirable mixture of youth and age has been used in the Foreign Service a long time, and works well."

Ideas of civilization and progress vary, Brooks says.

"I had a conversation with a Zulu chief once and he kept talking about 'barbarians.' I asked him who he meant and he said everyone is a barbarian except the Zulu."

Senior citizens in the Peace Corps? If it sounds like a good idea—for you—write headquarters, The Peace Corps, Washington 25, D.C. Let them know you're interested.

Moral at Motor Wheel—An Object Lesson to Both Unions and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this era of ugly controversy between some union leaders and management, it is encouraging to observe that some large corporations and some labor unions have evolved areas of accommodation and agreement which are serviceable to both of them as well as to the general public.

Conditions at the Motor Wheel Corp., of Michigan, provide a case in point. I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Congress and the country a report on how cooperation between employees and employers has paid off for all concerned at Motor Wheel. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article entitled "Moral at Motor Wheel," which appeared in a recent edition of Michigan Challenge.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORAL AT MOTOR WHEEL

Of all the States in the Union, Michigan ranks second behind Oregon as the most heavily unionized. Of all the States in the Union, it ranks first in wages paid to hourly workers. And, during the 1961 recession, of all the States in the Union, it had the highest percentage of total unemployed in the country.

One long-established manufacturer in Michigan, Motor Wheel Corp., in Lansing, found itself in a predicament similar to that of many Michigan industries. It leaned heavily on the Big Three automotive producers for the majority of its sales; its wages and benefits paralleled those of the Big Three; it was saddled with a labor contract that contained many antiquated and restrictive clauses; and it was remaining competitive in a highly competitive business only by squeezing its profits.

Add to this that it was paying, along with many Michigan manufacturers, the highest hourly wages in the country, and it was getting, for its money, low rates of productivity.

QUICK WORK

Unlike many industries caught in a similar trap, Motor Wheel decided to do something about it—and do it fast. A management team under the direction of newly appointed Executive Vice President R. J. Wilcox was given a free rein to put together as tight an operation as he could. The team did everything it could possibly do on a management level—consolidating departments, modernizing equipment, dropping unprofitable lines, trimming management, office, and labor personnel to the minimum necessary for present production levels.

The picture improved, but it did not improve enough. The big stumbling block was the labor contract. Management then decided to put the problem before the union and ask them to make the necessary changes. It presented them with a nine-point proposal outlining those changes management knew had to be made.

The wording of the proposal put it quite succinctly: "The time has come when we must solve the production-cost problem in the Lansing operation if we are to continue our present level of production in this locality. Your jobs and seniority are at stake."

FAILED BEFORE

In short, either the union agreed to make the changes in its labor contract that management knew it must have, or management would be forced to take some or all of the operations out of Lansing, idling some 2,300 workers.

The problems were obvious—but would the union see them and cooperate in an all-out effort to get Motor Wheel in line with its competition? More than a few in management doubted it. The simple reason was that 2 years ago, Motor Wheel had made a similar proposal to the union.

Since 1928 the company has manufactured in Lansing a number of consumer items—Duo-Therm space heaters and air conditioners, and more lately Reo power lawnmowers and power snow throwers.

Two years ago, Motor Wheel management told the union that, unless it made specific changes in the labor contract as requested by the company, it would not be able to continue its consumer operations in Lansing. In the penny-conscious consumer market, Motor Wheel could not compete if it continued to pay automotive wage rates to consumer production workers.

VOTED DOWN

The union committee put management's suggested contract changes before its membership, but the entire issue was voted down. Motor Wheel management immediately began to make plans to move.

Land was acquired in LaGrange, Ind.; a new plant was constructed; and equipment was moved from Lansing to the new plant. In December 1960, the last piece of consumer ware to be made in Lansing came off the assembly line. The next piece was to come off the line at the LaGrange plant.

The results in Lansing: 150 hourly workers permanently laid off, and an empty plant up for sale.

Over a 5-year period, Robert W. Dugger, the soft-speaking director of personnel for Motor Wheel, had been working closely with the union, showing them again and again in grievance meetings, union-management meetings, and bargaining sessions that the company had nothing to hide from the union, it was acting in good faith, and what it asked from the union was, in the long run, what was best for the union.

WORKERS DECIDE

Basically, Dugger was banking on the one remaining salvation for hard-hit industries in Michigan—one that was known about but seldom tried; and when tried, seldom successful. The only real move that could be made was to take the problem right to the workers, and let them decide. And the only way this could be done was by management and union first agreeing that there was a problem and then that they would have to face up to the problem for their future security.

Dugger lined up some impressive figures to show the union. High wages, low productivity—these points were hammered home by showing comparisons with other areas, with other industries, and with the company's competition in the automotive parts industry. Motor Wheel's only plea to the union—"put us on the same level of productivity as our competition."

The company set forth, in a proposal submitted to the union in January 1961, nine points that it considered essential if it was to continue to maintain maximum employment in Lansing. The company asked that the union take immediate action. The union, after looking at the proposal, agreed to have its bargaining committee meet with management to iron out some of the language and to vote on the amended proposals that the bargaining committee brought back.

MAJOR POINTS

On March 6, the union membership voted by secret ballot and a substantial majority accepted the proposal and also voted to extend the contract, as amended, from September 1, 1961, to September 1, 1963.

Basically, the contract changes covered these major points: revision of the incentive pay system, adjustment of production rates, integration of maintenance skills, elimination of paid lunch periods for two-shift operations, more efficient seniority clauses based on a new divisional setup in the main plant, elimination of an extra coffee break, revisions of the relief, production setup, and overtime clauses, and arrangements to negotiate changes in the plant's toolroom.

The company also agreed that it would give a 90-day notice to the union prior to moving or discontinuing any product which was deemed unprofitable to the company, during which period the union and management would attempt to bring the product into a satisfactory profitable position.

FINE POINTS LEFT

The union agreed to extend the amended contract for 2 years with the proviso that whatever was negotiated—whether upward and downward—by the Big Three automobile manufacturers and/or Motor Wheel's two prime competitors would be incorporated into the contract.

Many fine points still remain to be negotiated, such as certain changes in clauses concerning the skilled trades—but the basic points, the points management asked that it have, are now part of the contract.

This means, Dugger said, that Motor Wheel can increase its plant efficiency and productivity to bring it up to, and perhaps beyond, that of its competition. It can also mean higher earnings for the company, which in turn will result in greater plant growth and more advancement opportunities for its employes.

HISTORIC CONTRACT

"It should be remembered," said Dugger, "that this agreement to change the contract some 6 months before it was subject to negotiations is unprecedented in Lansing, and nearly so in the State of Michigan. It comes as a ray of hope on the heels of a nationally distributed magazine article pointing out the financial and labor woes of Michigan. And it comes at a time when the entire automotive industry is suffering from the worst year in new car sales since 1952."

Most important to Motor Wheel, Dugger added, is the fact that labor and management could finally agree that their aims are identical. Both seek to keep a business going in as profitable a manner as possible—management because it is responsible to the shareowners of a corporation to make a return on their investment; labor because a profitable organization means steady paychecks and, as the company grows, larger paychecks through job advancement.

NEW RELATIONSHIP

Perhaps Eugene Furnish of the union's bargaining committee summed up the attitude of Motor Wheel employees best.

"We look on this new contract," he said, "as the beginning of a new relationship between the union and management. The company had a problem, and union members rallied behind the company to help solve it. Both management and union wanted the business to stay in Lansing. Management put its problems fairly and squarely in front of us and asked for our cooperation. Our membership voted to give it."

What happened at Motor Wheel is a good example of management-labor cooperation: a clear case of how the men who direct a business and the men who speak for the production forces can get together and reach solutions that are mutally advantageous.

This is only one of a number of such cases that could be cited. Through strong, intelligent leadership on both sides, management and labor are proving Michigan can be competitive with industries in any part of the world. This results in an upward spiral of favorable results for the company, for the workerffis, for teh community, and for the State.

Safeguarding Our Priceless Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall has said that the necessity to meet the outdoor needs of our people now and in the future will in all likelihood be the sharpest and most consistent pressure on our land, water, and forests in the years ahead. It is the responsibility of our generation to see to it that there will be sufficient outdoor recreational areas available to our increasing population so that our children and their children may enjoy the outdoor opportunities which we have had.

I am proud that my home State of Wisconsin is meeting its responsibility in this area. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Times-Review, of La Crosse, Wis., which outlines Gov. Gaylord Nelson's plan to safeguard the vast but endangered outdoor resources in the State.

WISCONSIN THE BEAUTIFUL

A casual drive through Wisconsin can serve as a meditation. God has blessed few States with such an abundance of the beauties of nature as we enjoy in Wisconsin. Our well-kept parks, waysides, camping sites, streams, rivers, lakes, and trees with the scenic bluffs and landscapes form a picture of rare beauty.

Wisconsin residents as well as tourists should be grateful for the far-sighted vision of our State and local planners in the maintenance of our excellent highways and roads (drivers from neighboring States are always in high praise of our highways).

Wisconsin's campaign against litterbugs—the fines imposed upon those who carelessly mar the beauty of our parks, camping sites, and highways—is part of this enlightened program and merits our complete support. We should also support a program of dignity and taste in the use of billboards along our highways so that they don't destroy the beauty of nature.

We congratulate Gov. Gaylord Nelson for his plan to spend $50 million in the next decade to safeguard our vast and endangered outdoor resources. Our Governor acted wisely in this measure; these funds are to come from an additional tax on cigarettes, etc,

With much vigilance, care and sacrifice we must preserve the beauties of nature in our State. We have bitter memories of the last century when the timber barons almost made a wasteland of a large section of the State. This type of selfishness, greed and irresponsibility must never happen again in Wisconsin.

This task is not only the responsibility of governmental officials. It is the duty of every citizen to help maintain a clean, beautiful and scenic State.

We endorse the Governor's Wisconsin plan which provides that the State undertake an extensive program for acquiring further scenic sites. Property owners would lease scenic spots through agreements allowing them to continue using their lands for any purpose which does not destroy esthetic resources. The State will seek easements for public hunting and fishing rights, fencerows to provide game cover and overlook rights along lakes and rivers. Wisconsin has already used the easement plan to preserve scenic values along the Great River Road that follows the majestic Mississippi River.

This plan is not only essential for Wisconsin in providing more recreation facilities and tourist attractions; it is proof that we in Wisconsin are proud of our outdoor resources, that we are grateful to God for the bounties of nature with which He showered our State, and that we are determined to preserve these natural beauties for generations to come.

Wisconsin is a beautiful State with natural adornments rarely equaled anywhere in the world. Every civic-minded person should support our Governor and other State officials in this plan to increase the natural beauty of our State and to preserve these beauties for future generations.

Recollections of a Governor's Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in Alabama we have an outstanding circuit judge who writes a column quite frequently for the Montgomery Advertiser. It is a very interesting column always, but within the last few days he has written one that I have felt was particularly interesting. It is entitled "Recollections of a Governor's Wife." It refers to recollections of his mother and father, Thomas G. Jones, who was one of the distinguished Governors of Alabama. The column was written by Judge Walter B. Jones, of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOLLECTIONS OF A GOVERNOR'S WIFE

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

The sacred old family Bible before me, given in 1873 by my father, Thomas G. Jones, to my mother, Georgena Bird Jones, records in my father's own handwriting that "Thomas Goode Jones and Georgena Carolina Bird were married by the Rev. J. A. Ticknor, at St. John's Church, Montgomery, Ala., on Thursday, Dec. 20, 1866, at 8½ o'clock p.m." Twenty-four years pass. The groom of that December evening is now Governor of Alabama. The bride who stood before the altar with him, "to have and to hold," is the first lady of the State. And so this morning, recalling God's commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," I'd like to recall for my kindly readers a few little incidents which happened while my mother was the wife of Alabama's Governor.

When my mother got to St. John's on her wedding night, in her simple wedding gown, a spray of lilies of the valley her bridal bouquet, my father's best man, Junie Riggs, a look of deep worry on his handsome face, came up and said: "Gena, we can't have any wedding march tonight. The organist in his robes, is dead drunk back in the vestry room." My mother stated that she was going to be married only once in her life and some one just had to play the wedding march for her. But who?

Just then Sidney Lanier, almost late for the wedding came up. He was an accomplished organist. The distressing situation was explained to him. The future beloved poet of America at once discovered Miss Gena's problem, and said, "You must let me play the wedding march for you, Miss Gena." His kind offer was gratefully accepted. The best man hurried him back to the vestry room and with the assistance of a couple of the ushers the robes of the passed-out organist were removed from him and placed on Sidney Lanier.

In a few moments the strains of Mendelssohn's wedding march swelled up through the vaulted arches of the spacious church, Sidney Lanier at the console playing the wedding march as only a musician with the soul of Sidney Lanier could play for a beloved friend.

One sleety and rainy day during Lent, my mother started from our home on foot to attend services at St. John's. She had taken only a few steps from the gate when her feet began to slip. Then the family laundryman, a friend and neighbor, drove up with his horse and wagon. "Where are you going this terrible day, Miss Gena," he asked. "Well, I am trying to get to St. John's Church," she replied, "but I don't think I am going to make it." "Well, if you don't mind, come on and ride with me. I'll get you to the church on time." His knightly invitation was accepted. "Miss Gena" climbed up on the seat by the driver and in a few minutes was safely at the church and on time. Other ladies of the church drove up in all the splendor of their carriages and victorias with liveried coachmen, but the first lady of the State came in a horse-drawn laundry wagon. "Miss Gena" enjoyed the astonishment of her Episcopal sisters and smiled as she entered the church.

An incident of "Miss Gena's" courage: While Governor Jones was away from home, commanding the State troops on riot duty in Birmingham, and repairs were being made to the Jones' home, a tramp late one night forced his way into the bedroom where "Miss Gena" was sleeping with six or seven of her young children around her. There was not a protector in the house.

Filled with righteous indignation, the courageous mother ordered: "Get out of here, you miserable wretch." The intruder hesitated. Quick as a flash, "Miss Gena" was up, putting on her bedroom slippers and throwing her dressing gown about her, she seized a 2 by 4 scantling, ran the tramp from the house, pursued him down Hull Street to Dexter, and was greatly relieved when two mounted police, riding their beat, came up, grabbed the frightened tramp and hauled him off to the calaboose. "Miss Gena" hurried back up the hill to the little white cottage where her heart was, in the bedroom with her children.

When the committee to arrange the inauguration of the Governor-elect came with their plans for the approval of the incoming chief executive and his wife, "Miss Gena" inquired what plans had been made to feed the State troops during the inauguration—the State made no appropriation for this. She was told there was no money for that purpose.

"But, I see," she said, "you have plans for a big inaugural ball—what'll that cost?" Several thousand dollars was the reply. "Well," said the future first lady of the State, "you just leave out the ball. Take that money and feed the soldiers with it." So Governor and Mrs. Jones didn't have any inaugural ball—the money went to feed the colonel's soldiers, whom he had commanded for more than 20 years and who idolized him.

One morning Col. Hilary A. Herbert, Governer Jones' longtime friend, and Secretary of the Navy (1893–97) in the Cabinet of Grover Cleveland, visited the Governor at the Capitol. The two old Confederate warriors talked long past the hour for the midday meal. But Governor Jones invited Secretary Herbert to accompany him home and take potluck. They arrived long past the dinner hour. While the Secretary waited in the parlor, separated by great folding doors from the dining room, the Governor went back to tell "Miss Gena" that the Secretary was taking dinner with them.

The good wife was troubled. The cupboard was practically bare. "Miss Gena" told her husband in a wifely way what she thought about bringing a Cabinet officer to dinner on such short notice. Colonel Herbert overheard the conversation. Gently pushing back the big folding doors, and bowing gracefully, he took "Miss Gena" in his arms, gave her a great big hug, and laughingly dismissed her fears, saying: "Lor', Miss Gena, don't worry about the Secretary of the Navy, I left that old gentleman in Washington a week ago. I'm just your oldtime friend, a hungry one. Tom and I can enjoy the leftovers."

"Miss Gena" hustled about, gave the big family pot a good stirring. Soon the Secretary of the Navy and the Governor of Alabama were enjoying what they declared was the best meal they'd ever eaten.

These are a few of the little incidents I recall of the days when my father was Alabama's Governor (1890–94), and my mother his helpmate, the first lady of the State. As blessed memory brings her back to me, I recall the words of Rabbi Ben Ezra: "God could not be everywhere, so he made mothers."

Government Handouts Weaken the Character and Morale Fiber of Our People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if we continue to expand the welfare state and to make it possible for people to live in some comfort without effort, where will we get the moral strength to ward off the enemies, the Communists, who are waiting for us "to fall like a ripe plum" into their waiting arms? Every hard-working American citizen, putting in hours of labor every day just to pay his taxes, should be terribly concerned and aroused by the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal and the fact upon which the editorial is based:

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

"This is one year people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of their cotton, because we ain't going to do it."

Speaking from his rocking chair is a citizen of Corsicana, Tex., and his words ought to go down as one of the most memorable remarks of the year. And in his observation, reported in a page 1 story this morning, we think the gentleman from Texas is showing one of the chief attributes of intelligence, adjusting sensibly to one's environment. He ain't going to hoe because there ain't no need to.

Without stirring from his chair, save once a month on a Tuesday morning, he can stock his larder with flour, cornmeal, rice and butter, and even feed his family with fancier fare, including peanut butter, oatmeal, beans, eggs and meat. He hasn't struck oil; he's just found a gusher in the Federal surplus food disposal program.

So no longer is the man with the hoe bent with burdens; they have been transferred to others who must pay the taxes to provide him with his pork and beans. And for the life of us, we can't avoid a certain admiration for him and the others like him.

There are a good many others like him, as our reporter found out. Since the administration in Washington broadened the menu of the Federal food program, the number of people taking advantage of it has skyrocketed. Last June when the country was suffering from a recession, there were some 3.3 million people on the public food rolls. At the end of June this year the number had almost doubled, to 6.2 million people.

Since Washington broadened the free food program, the number of recipients in Illinois has jumped from 63,000 to 90,000 betwixt January and June; from 70,000 to 118,000 in Indiana; in North Carolina from 1,000 to 147,000. And all this during a period in which, as Washington reminds us, we are climbing out of the recession.

No doubt there are, among these millions, many who are in true need. But nowadays need is something it is not nice to inquire about; it might embarrass men with pride. So men with no pride, but with sense enough to know a good thing when they see it, can have a field day without ever tilling the fields.

In New York City, for example, people load up with free food and use their money to carry it home in a taxi. In Corsicana, Tex., they cause traffic jams driving to the food office in their automobiles. So, not surprisingly, the local grocer finds his sales of staple foods off 10 percent since the Government started offering pork and beans to all comers. But the same customers boom his sales of cigarettes, soft drinks, cake mixes, and candy—which is not surprising either.

Nor is it surprising that the cost of all this has also skyrocketed. In the first 6 months of this year, the Federal Government quadrupled the cost of the program over the like period in 1960; at $139 million for the whole fiscal year, the total is the highest in the 25 years of the program, which reaches back into the years of the great depression. And in Washington, officials say they "see no reason to believe" the cost will go anyway but up.

For all a man has to do, in most communities, is say he "needs" food and the Government will give it to him. There is no need for anyone to be amazed at men—from Corsicana, Tex, to Newburgh, N.Y.—who see no need to work when they can eat without working. Lazy people are not fools.

So before you start berating the man who threw away the hoe, ask yourself a question. Who is the more intelligent? The man, like yourself, who works hard, pays taxes, and lets the politicians pass around the bounty? Or the man with emptiness in his face who sits back and enjoys the bounty in his rocking chair?

Support for Additional Juvenile Court Judges in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following exchange of correspondence which took place between the Honorable W. W. Woolfolk, judge of the juvenile court of Fulton County, Ga., and myself.

Judge Woolfolk is a distinguished jurist and his views on the value of an independent juvenile court should be of great interest to all of those interested in preserving the juvenile court in the District of Columbia.

The correspondence follows:

JUNE 20, 1961.

Hon. W. W. WOOLFOLK,
Juvenile Court,
District Court Building,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR JUDGE: Last week it was my extreme pleasure to meet with Mayor and Mrs. Stephens of East Point, Ga. They told me of the fine work you are doing in your court.

You may know that in the District of Columbia a controversy has arisen as to whether or not our juvenile court should be abolished and its jurisdiction transferred to the criminal court. An additional proposal is that the age limit be reduced from 18 to 16 so as to preclude those over 16 years of age being treated as juveniles and requiring that they be treated as criminals as a matter of law.

If time permits, I would appreciate your views on both of these topics and would like to have your permission to use your comments both before congressional committees and on the floor of the House.

Thanking you for any cooperation you may be able to extend to me, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

FULTON COUNTY JUVENILE COURT,
Atlanta Ga., July 31, 1961.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: Please pardon my delay in responding to your letter of June 20 relative to the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. I was attending the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges in San Francisco, June 26–30, and found your letter here upon my return, after an extensive tour of the West.

During the meeting in San Francisco, I had an opportunity to discuss the matter with Judge Ketcham and informed him at that time that I had written Congressman DAVIS in support of the juvenile court movement and suggested that he modify his stand in the matter with reference to a reorganization bill placing the juvenile court in a municipal court setup.

The juvenile court movement is based upon the theory of individualized justice, with emphasis on what society can do for a child, rather than what to do against them for their misdeeds. A part of the social approach to this problem is the proper diagnosis as to why a child has come in conflict with the law and what are the factors to be dealt with in bringing about his, or her, rehabilitation. These tech-

niques are peculiarly a part of the modern juvenile court philosophy and procedure and are not found in the adversary procedure as administered in criminal courts.

There was a strong resolution passed by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges condemning the reorganization bill and supporting the continuance of a straight lie, well staffed juvenile court in the District of Columbia. A separate juvenile court would not only serve to rehabilitate the emotionally and socially maladjusted child who comes before the court but also would serve as a shining example both national and international, as the American method of handling the problems of children who come in conflict with the laws of society.

The juvenile court, when properly staffed and administered, is the greatest protection society can have against the rising tide of crime and it is both shortsighted and costly to destroy the juvenile court in the District of Columbia and put in its place a miniature criminal court procedure to handle children who are emotionally and socially maladjusted.

I hope that you are successful in helping to maintain the juvenile court system in the District of Columbia and can give Judge Ketcham enough assistance to do the job well.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WOOLFOLK, *Judge.*

End Control of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many people in the country are greatly disturbed about the continued Government restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil.

In my section of the country, for example, where we depend upon these oils to serve fuel needs of many industries, public utilities, and others, the regulation of the supply of this commodity available in the open market is having many unhappy repercussions.

Oil users are being charged more for their supplies. Generally speaking, the price of the commodity has increased. The products are being dispensed under a control economy which is the antithesis of free enterprise operations.

Current regulations virtually freeze the number of supplies and make it impossible for new suppliers to enter the business.

Bureaucratic regulations requiring coupons are bearing down upon businessmen and users alike. Instances of improper use and misuse of the coupons have been reported.

Users and the people have become restive because of the fear of scarcity of products that are vital to the continuance of business and the comfort and convenience of the people.

I believe it is unquestioned that by virtue of Government controls on residual fuel oil imports, the Government has created a regulated economy for these items and to that extent, has been responsible for higher and greater costs in a seller's market and misuse of coupons.

While I deplore the way much of the residual fuel oil problem has been handled, I must wholeheartedly acknowledge the deep interest and friendly response of my valued former colleague, the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, who has assured me that he will continue to give this important subject his most careful consideration.

I hope that a solution can be reached regarding this question in the near future, that will encourage free private enterprise businessmen, eliminate the inequities and trafficking in residual oil, and, above all, insure adequate supplies for my own district, State and area, and other sections of the country that need and must have residual oil in adequate quantities as a matter of prime necessity to serve the convenience, necessity, and welfare of millions of Americans.

Africa in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Thomas O'C. Kelly of the Icna College Alumni Association, which college is located in New Rochelle, N.Y., was kind enough to forward to me recently a copy of the speech made by His Excellency Alhaji Muhammad Ngileruma, O.B.E., on July 28, 1961, on the occasion of the inaugural Pope Pius XII Lecture in World History and International Affairs. The lecture, sponsored by the Iona College Alumni Association, was delivered at Iona College.

The speech, while controversial in some respects, is a most logical and provocative presentation of the thoughts of an educated and humane gentlemen who has an intimate knowledge of and a firm grasp on the complex problems confronting the Dark Continent.

Because of the increasing gravity of world affiairs and the important role Africa seems destined to play in the immediate future, I feel that His Excellency's views should be made known as widely as possible.

The speech follows:

AFRICA IN WORLD AFFAIRS

I wish to begin by thanking the chairman and the Iona College Alumni Association for inviting me to give this inaugural Pope Pius XII lecture.

Pope Pius XII was a devout Christian and a profound scholar who, although primarily concerned with the spiritual welfare of his church yet found the time for mundane affairs and, in fact, played a significant role in international affairs, particularly during and after the Second World War.

I believe that he would have been delighted by the subject of my lecture because I am sure he would have been interested to see how the new African states to whose emergence the Catholic missionaries have made significant contributions are reacting to the interplay of international forces.

Africa's role in world affairs has been a changing one, from that of insignificance to one of critical importance. Owing to the lack of harbors, the lack of good waterways, tropical fevers, and land rendered impenetrable by forests and desert, Africa went practically unnoticed during the age of geographical discoveries, five centuries ago. The wealth of the Far East was the center of attraction for the European adventurers. In their quest for a western sea route, the adventurers discovered America with its wealth and excellent but rigorous climate. However, the indigenous inhabitants of America were few and their mode of life was not consistent with the requirements of a vast virgin land in need of rapid development. Cheap labor was needed. Africa had such labor and it became the supplier of slaves. Thus from the very beginning Africa was destined to play an important role in the history of the United States of America. But unfortunately it was a role shorn of honor and dignity.

After the industrial revolution, the role of Africa in the world changed significantly, but it was still a role subordinated to the interests of foreigners. The industrial revolution had raised the standard of living in Europe; but to sustain that standard, it was necessary to have access to raw materials and food available in foreign lands, and a big market to absorb the manufactured goods. While I will admit that European colonial policies were not dictated exclusively by economic factors yet they were greatly influenced by them.

While it may not be generous to deny that Africans received some benefit from European colonialism, yet, on the balance, the scale was very much tilted in favor of the Europeans. Africans became involuntary servants of European economies, contributing significantly not only to the profits of European capitalists, but also to the prosperity of the masses of Europe. Thus at this stage of world history, Africa's role was still subordinated to European interests.

The contribution of Africa to peace in Europe in the last quarter of the 19th century is very often overlooked. One tends to think of Africa at that time as the place where imperialist European powers oppose one another in an atmosphere of bitter rivalry which threatened war. A close examination of history, however, reveals that although there were crises they did not lead to major wars. European powers were able to reach agreement during crises by bartering African territories. The Africans themselves were not consulted before the barterings were effected. They were innocent victims sacrificed on the altar of international friendship—victims of European national and imperial rivalries. In this connection, I will point out that the Entente Cordial of 1904, between France and England was based on a deal that recognized the special interests of each in Morocco and Egypt; the secret treaties made during the First World War to keep the Entente powers together were of the same category. Ethiopia fell a victim to one of those secret treaties when she was invaded by Italy in 1935.

Today, the wind of political change is blowing over Africa. In order to dissolve the German Empire the victor powers in World War I fostered the doctrine of self-determination and self-government. This doctrine started a chain reaction that has resulted in African nationalism which in turn has burst the European-African empires open at the seams.

The most dramatic change in world affairs in the past 5 years is the rapid suecession in which African States have achieved their independence. Certainly the rapid change in political relations which the phenomenon creates must have an impact on world af-

fairs. Leninist dogma on imperialism may be superficial. However, there is no doubt that, prima facie, the accession to independence of African States is tantamount to the removal of the imperial foundations of the European colonial powers, and that must have significant consequences for them.

There is nothing anyone can do to stem the trend of events in Africa. In fact, all independent African States, irrespective of their so-called ideological leaning, are committed to working for the total elimination of colonialism in Africa. My Prime Minister, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa said on the morrow of our independence that the independence of Nigeria would not be complete until the whole of Africa was free. Those words I am sure express the sentiments of every independent African State. The security of Europe can no longer be based on the insecurity of Africa. The elimination of colonialism from Africa should not necessarily deprive the West of her legitimate and reasonable needs in Africa, provided the West accepts a new relation with Africa—a relationship based on equality and cooperation.

As I have said, the freedom of Africa is dear to the hearts of Africans. The future relationship between Africa and the West will largely depend on the measure of their sincerity in this crucial matter. Unfortunately, the voting record of the West in the United Nations on colonial questions has been less than encouraging. Take for example, the voting on the memorable declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The declaration asks for no more than the recognition of the right of every people to self-determination and self-government, and yet the leaders of the West did not find it possible to vote for it. Numerous other examples can be quoted, where the West has, by their votes, either actually thwarted or tried to thwart the efforts of African delegations on colonial matters. The recent increase in the resolutions on colonial matters which the United Nations has adopted is due largely to the increase in African membership of the United Nations, the solidarity of the Afro-Asian group and the support of the East. I may here say that the policy of the new U.S. administration on colonial questions seems to have changed for the better as evidenced by their votes on South-West Africa, Angola, and Ruanda-Urundi. It is, however, too early to say whether these votes were merely for propaganda or marked a healthy change in U.S. policy.

The emergence of so many African States has altered, among other things, the composition of the United Nations and perhaps indirectly the urgency of the problems facing that organization. For the first time in world history, Africans are in a position to protect their own interests and to play a role in world affairs, not subordinated to the interests of others.

The African members of the United Nations certainly form an interest group. The group includes most of the poorer and less developed countries, all of which share bitter recollections of colonialism, common abhorence of imperialism. They also share a comon hope and desire for economic development and social progress.

The question of rapid economic development in Africa is of cardinal importance to all African States. Indeed the illiteracy, poverty, and disease and, consequently, the question assumes an emergency of the same order as the emergency of war in developed countries. It is, therefore, not surprising that, with the African States, the problem of economic development overshadows ideological conflicts and the cold war. Thus my Prime Minister, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa said in a statement, in the Nigerian House of Representatives, on Nigerian foreign policy:

"We consider it wrong for the Federal Government [of Nigeria] to associate itself as a matter of routine with any power blocs. This freedom of action will be an essential feature of our policy and will insure that full attention is paid to the opinions expressed by our representatives. Our policies, as I have said before, will be founded on 'Nigeria's interests' and will be consistent with the moral and democratic principles on which our constitution is based."

In pursuance of their policy of nonalinement, African States belong to the so-called neutral bloc in the United Nations. Until recently, neutralism in the context of the cold war was in the opinion of some people in the West, immoral. A sober appraisal of world affairs, however, will reveal that far from being immoral, neutralism, in the context of the cold war, is not only moral but contributes positively to the maintenance of world peace.

To the Africans, a strong and effective United Nations is necessary for the attainment of their aspirations. In the first place, the United Nations presents a platform from which small countries (and all African countries are small in this respect), irrespective of the level of their economic development, can make their voices heard and influence world affairs. Insofar as the United Nations performs this function, it safeguards the interests of the small countries and tends to prevent the big powers from making their usual deals at the expense of the smaller countries, without consulting them.

In the second place, the United Nations, if even it is no more than a talking shop, promotes peace insofar as it presents a forum where the big powers can meet to talk and even discuss. It is in this respect that the neutral group in the United Nations performs a very useful role in keeping the United Nations open as a forum of discussion. Permit me to elucidate this important point.

The world, as we know, is sharply divided into two opposed ideological blocs. This division has given rise to what we call the cold war. Almost every discussion in the United Nations takes place in the context of the cold war. With the two blocs not willing to yield ground to each other, objectivity is lost sight of and the so-called discussions become mere formalities, invariably resulting in stalemates. Certainly this is not conducive to peace.

Economic development can only take place in an atmosphere of peace and security. Since the African States are very much concerned with economic development one can understand their preoccupation with the maintenance of world peace. Reduction in world tension, and better still, disarmament will surely release, to the benefit of all underdeveloped countries, the much needed capital which is now tied up in armaments. Africans, therefore, seeing the hope for peace in the United Nations give their unstinted support to that organization. True enough, we think that the organization of the United Nations Secretariat, the distribution of seats in the various organs of the United Nations, etc., are anachronistic and we would like to see healthy reforms take place; but all Africans are agreed that subject to these desirable reforms nothing should be done to impair the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization.

Having presented to you part of the basis of the African desire for peace, I shall now proceed to relate the desire to maintain their role in the United Nations as neutrals.

I have already told you that the discussion of every question in the United Nations in the context of the cold war, tends to reduce discussions to mere formalities and stultify the efforts of the organization to promote peace. In their role as neutrals, the Africans try to bring objectivity and sanity back into discussions. Since they are not committed to either bloc, each bloc, in its effort to win a majority, has to direct its appeal to the neutrals; each bloc has to argue convincingly instead of relying on slogans. Thus, unhampered by routine commitment to either bloc, the neutrals try to judge each question with objectivity and thereby keep the United Nations open as a forum of discussion. Furthermore, the presence of the neutrals in the United Nations presents to the power blocs a venue of "letting off steam" which, otherwise, might explode into physical warfare under the pressure of the cold war.

Surely, neutralism in the context that I have described is very moral and, in fact, indispensable if the United Nations is to survive. I must emphasize that neutralism does not necessarily imply indecision about choosing between different ideologies. My country, Nigeria, is a democratic country committed to the principles of human dignity, equality, and freedom. And yet she is neutral. Similarly, a nondemocratic country can be a neutral. The essential attributes of neutralism in this context are the refusal to associate itself as a matter of routine with any power blocs and the readiness to treat every question with the objectivity it deserves.

Partly because Africa has had to play a role subordinated to the interest of non-Africans and partly because Africans have confidence in their own ability to look after their interest, the new African states are very jealous of their independence. They loathe any outside interference in African affairs, as evidenced by their irritation at the prospect of the great powers—East and West—getting involved in the Congo.

In every discussion of Africa by the great powers one often hears terms like containment, satellite, extermination of imperialism, etc. To the Africans, these terms are mere slogans invented to camouflage the old diplomatic concept of marking out "spheres of influence" of the great powers. It will be sheer delusion to think that Africa today will gladly accept any great power's influence. The truth is that Africans do not want to be anybody's pawns. As the Economist in one of its recent issues aptly pointed out, I quote:

"It is political death for any African leader to become labeled as a pawn of the West. Equally, Moscow has repeatedly found its favored proteges disappointing, basically for the same reasons."

The newly formed All-African Trade Union Federation has made a ruling that all its members must disaffiliate from the global trade unions identified with East and West. Although the federation does not have the support of all trade unions in Africa, yet their new ruling is certainly indicative of the desire of Africans not to be any power's pawn.

The desire to be independent of the great powers does not necessarily mean anti-West or anti-East feeling. It is usual these days to divide Africa into two groups: the radicals or anti-Western group and the moderates or pro-Western group. It is true that there is a division among the new African States, but the division is surely not on cold-war lines. The lineup of African States on the Congo question again illustrates this point. If there is any anti-Western feeling in Africa it is not due to Communist infiltration. Rather, it is generated more by Western attitude to such burning African and colonial questions as Apartheid, Angola, etc. Even the so-called moderate African States that met in Monrovia a couple of months ago clearly showed how sensitive they are to the seeming insincerity of the West on colonial questions. The truth is that the future relations between Africa and the West depends more upon what the West does than upon Communist propaganda. The tend-

ency, on the part of the West, to regard their military alliances as being so important as to prevent them from supporting African struggle will only antagonize the Africans.

The economic needs of Africa are so great that it is obvious that with the best of intentions no single power bloc can satisfy those needs. Yet, so much concern is usually expressed whenever an African State makes a deal with a Communist state. When Canada for example made a commercial deal with China, that was trade and nobody expressed any concern about Canada becoming Communist. But the mere visit of an economic mission from an African State to a Communist state is enough to start off speculation as to whether the African State is turning Communist. To say the least, such a dichotomy in world reaction savors of discrimination. It is infuriating, but it will not deflect African States from their desire to maintain frendly relation with all nations. My Prime Minister, speaking in the Nigerian House of Representatives recently said.

I quote "We shall, of course, endeavor to remain on friendly terms with every nation which recognizes and respects our sovereignty, and we shall not blindly follow the lead of any one. So far as is possible the policy for each occasion will be selected with a proper independent objectivity in Nigeria's national interests."

Africa has been dormant in world affairs for a long time. The continent is, however, awake now, full of confidence in its own possibilities and determined to play its proper role in world affairs. In struggling to find its feet, mistakes will surely be made but they should not be exaggerated or exploited by those who claim to be more advanced. Africans by themselves will work out their own solutions to their problems. It will be unrealistic to expect them to copy in toto, in all cases, the solutions which Europeans have had to adopt in solving their own problems. After all, the solution to a problem depends upon the surrounding circumstances; but even when the problems appear to be the same the circumstances in Europe are certainly different from those in Africa. The instruments which any country or continent uses depend on the means available and the existing local conditions. In this connnection, may I quote the late Harold Laski to end my speech. In this quotation Laski was writing about systems of government, but what he wrote applies equally to the point I am trying to make—I quote:

"It is well to remember of government what is true of footwear—that the shoes must be suited to the journey it is proposed to take."

Ladies and gentlemen I thank you for listening to me so attentively.

Postage Stamp Requested To Honor Cardinal Gibbons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known religious leaders in our country was James Cardinal Gibbons, who was born in my district in Baltimore, spent the major part of his life in our city, and is now buried under the altar of the Catholic Cathedral, also in my district.

The former Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin, has requested that Cardinal Gibbons be honored by the issuance of a postage stamp in the great Americans series, and I believe he should be commended for his efforts in this regard. In his letter to the Postmaster General, Mr. McKeldin has given an excellent résumé of the cardinal's life and activities, adequate proof that he is eminently worthy of such an honor. Mr. McKeldin's letter follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *August 22, 1961.*

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General of the United States,
Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL DAY: May I recommend to your most favorable consideration that which I am sure already has been suggested to your Department, the issuance of a postage stamp in the great Americans series to honor the memory of a distinguished Baltimorean whose wise counsel and good works were known throughout the world. He is James Cardinal Gibbons, born in this city of humble, God-fearing parents, taken by his mother to her native Ireland after his father's death, but returned here while still a small boy to move on to his destiny of religious and civic leadership and to a place of rare distinction in the hearts of people of all religions everywhere.

Cardinal Gibbons was born on July 23, 1834. He was educated at St. Charles College in Ellicott City and prepared for the Roman Catholic priesthood through his theological studies in St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. Ordained a priest in 1861—the opening year of the Civil War—he served as a curate in various Maryland parishes and as a volunteer chaplain to northern troops. He became secretary to Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, and in 1868—only 7 years after his ordination—he was consecrated bishop and sent to organize the Vicariate Apostolic of North Carolina. At the Vatican Council of 1870 he was the youngest bishop of his church. In his North Carolina assignment he spent 4 years as a missionary bishop, traveling to all parts of the State, visiting with the people of all religious persuasions and bringing to full fruition his natural high regard and love for people in all stations of life.

His book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," written in those formative years of his bishopric—had 40 printings in America and 70 in England and was read and reread and still is read throughout the Christian world.

In 1872 Bishop Gibbons was transferred to the see of Richmond, Va., and 1877 returned to Baltimore as coadjutor to Archbishop James R. Bayley. On the death of Archbishop Bayley in the same year, Bishop Gibbons succeeded him in the see of his native city. In 1886, at the age of 51 years, he was made a cardinal by Pope Leo XIII. His address on the assumption of this principality in the church was a masterpiece, still often quoted, delineating the high place of religion in the American scheme of things, but upholding the wise separateness of the functions of the church and of the state.

Cardinal Gibbons had great pride in America, in the Government of the United States, in the sovereign authorities of the several States, and in the freedom and proper liberties enjoyed and exercised by the people.

His thinking often was far ahead of his time. He saw the essentiality in the future of organizations to serve those who labor at a time when support of such unions was very unpopular in many high places. When others attacked that pioneer labor group—the Knights of Labor—the noted Baltimore churchman defended the Knights in a manner that brought the organization respectable and powerful recognition and encouraged many hesitant workingmen to join the young movement for the betterment of their lots. When European leaders attempted to maintain national controls over immigration groups from their countries settling in the young America, Cardinal Gibbons led the successful fight to break all such ties of control and bring the immigrants into full and free American citizenship.

He was the prime mover in the establishment in Washington of the Catholic University of America and served the institution as its first chancellor and as president of its board of trustees.

His national, international and church activities still left him time, which he used to the best advantage in promoting the civic progress of Baltimore and the advancement of Maryland among the States. He was freely consulted by Governors and mayors, as well as by Presidents of the United States and leaders in great national movements. He served on many commissions and committees designed for the well-being of the citizenry. In 1911, on the occasion of his silver jubilee as a cardinal and his golden jubilee as a priest, the most distinguished men of the Nation, without regard to religious belief, gathered in Washington to pay tribute in praise to this great churchman and citizen.

He died on March 24, 1921. He never has been forgotten.

Respectfully, I, as a member of the Episcopal Church and as a former mayor of this city and a former Governor of this State, must point out to you that any series of stamps dedicated to the remembrance of great Americans would be marked by a grave omission if it failed to contain one in remembrance of James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore.

If additional information is needed for your consideration, it would be my pleasure to provide it, and if there is any manner in which I may be privileged to serve this cause, I would be most grateful for the opportunity.

With thanks for your attention to this, and with kindest personal regards for best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN.

We Should Cherish Our Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Robert Elkins, who is editor of the Thorp Courier, of Thorp, Wis., has written a very thought-provoking editorial that should be recommended reading for every citizen of the United States who neglects one of his basic rights and privileges—the right and privilege to vote. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Elkins' editorial in the RECORD:

HE WILL NOT VOTE

Behind the ragged collar of the shody coat, upturned against the rainy wind, he wears a safe bland smile of no comment.

His eyes are deep-lined. They have seen much.

The day's work over, homeward he trudges along the rainblown street.

He will not stop to buy a newspaper from a rack of many on the corner.

He will not pause to listen as the latest dope damns the policies of the current school administration.

He will argue no school problems at the barber shop.

He will not complain.

He will not vote.

His leaders are called "commissar" now, but in the high offices which dominate the land of his nameless forefathers, no Russian names appear upon the doors.

In Poland, the names are Polish, in Czechoslovakia, they are Czech, in Hungary, Hungarian, in East Germany, German.

No foreign armies have conquered the land—not since the Wehrmacht. There has been no war, no upheaval, no revolution, no cataclysm—just a few quiet changes in the scheme of things and a few quiet executions.

He will go home after his hard day's work. He will believe what he is told to believe, live where he is told to live and labor where he is told to bend his back.

He will die, eventually.

But he will not vote. Will you?

Crisis Adds to Soviet Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently maintained that our State Department in particular, but also our Nation's communications media, tend to paint an overexaggerated picture of Soviet accomplishments and just as consistently understate our accomplishments and progress. I was therefore very pleased to note that two outstanding community newspapers in my district recently commented editorially in this vein, directing the attention of their readers toward certain problems that face the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, these sober, sound analyses of conditions in the Red "utopia" certainly contain valuable thought for us in these disturbing times. I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Park Forest Reporter of August 16 entitled "Crisis Adds to Soviet Woes" and an editorial in the Chicago Daily Calumet of Thursday, August 17, "No Apologies Needed."

CRISIS ADDS TO SOVIET WOES

The crisis precipitated in Berlin by the Communist closing of the Eastern boundary adds credence to the Western belief that aside from spectacular advances in space shots, the Reds have little to crow about.

There's no doubt that the sensitive Russian will become restive now that his East Berlin contemporary is forbidden to cross the line to freedom. Although the hegira of thousands each week to a new opportunity for individual attainment has justifiably drawn the headlines, some 50,000 Berliners from behind the Iron Curtain have lost their means to a livelihood by this decree.

In a nation as prosperous as West Germany, this loss of manpower will be noticed, particularly among the skilled workers. Yet the barring of access to their jobs in a free land will add to the economic chaos which has been building up on the Sovietized side for some time.

We believe the rash move by the Reds was not well planned. Internationally it has only helped solidify the Western powers. It has also shown the neutral and Afro-Asian bloc nations that the Reds can only, when the chips are down, succeed by force and ultimatums.

It's cheering to note that our Government has not relented in face of the threats emanating from the Kremlin. Our reports have been to remind Nikita and company that we are able, ready, and powerful enough to defend the rights of free men. Our allies support this position.

Though the tug of war goes on, for a change we've placed the tight shoe on the Russian bear's paw. We don't believe the East Berlin lockout will lead to an armed conflict. The Soviets know they'll have more to contend with from within than they can safely contend with from without.

The turmoil has spoiled Nik's Crimean vacation. What a shame.

NO APOLOGIES NEEDED

The idea has been too skillfully sold that the United States must do something to catch up with Soviet Russia. Let us consider some of the things that would happen if we were to match Russia, as pointed out in the current issue of Life Lines.

We would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, 95 percent of our electric motor output, destroy two of every three hydroelectric plants and get along on one-tenth of our present volume of natural gas.

If we wanted to be even with the Soviet Union, we would have to rip up 14 of ever 15 miles of our paved highways and 2 of every 3 miles of our main-line railway tracks. It wold be necessary for us to scuttle 8 of every 9 oceangoing ships, scrap 19 of every 20 cars and trucks, and cut our civilian air fleet to a shadow of its present size.

We would have to reduce our living standard by three-fourths, destroy 40 million television sets, cut off 9 of every 10 telephones and tear down 7 of every 10 houses. And we would have to put about 60 million Americans back on the farm.

Let us not be fooled into making apologies for the material accomplishments of our personal enterprise system. Where we are short, and dangerously so, is in national dedication to the fight to save the individual freedom that makes those accomplishments possible.

That is the shortage we need to concentrate on overcoming.

Postmaster General Day Wins Employee Raves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, August 23, 1961:

DAY WINS EMPLOYEE RAVES

(By Mary McGrory, Star staff writer)

J. Edward Day, the crisp and sunny Postmaster General of the United States, pursues a course on the New Frontier that is as solitary and simple as that of a rural letter carrier.

Unlike those who must ponder the effect of a decision of a touchy new African republic or sulky soybean growers, he has but a single concern: The improvement of the mail service.

He sees the President about twice a month. The President mentioned the importance of the postal-rate increase, now pending before Congress, in his Berlin crisis speech; but the mechanics of seeing that the postmen make their appointed rounds, he leaves to Mr. Day, a former life insurance executive.

Mr. Day is the only cabinet officer who is rereading "Wuthering Heights" these days and writing a novel of his own. He is the only one who is not addicted to the 14-hour working day and who claims to lead a normal family life. He finds he can do his work in the hours between 8:45 in the morning and 6 at night.

"I used to work in a law firm where the caste symbol was the bulging briefcase carried home at night. I used to think if they were carrying a live mouse in it, it would be dead by morning. I never carried a briefcase," he remarked jovially.

If he differs from his fellows in the Cabinet, Mr. Day also differs from his predecessors, mainly portly chaps who also were chairmen of their national committees. Mr. Day, lean of countenance and figure, has no party responsibilities at all. He has failed to get this message across.

"A lot of my time is wasted by a lot of people, who ought to know better, asking me to get them jobs as Federal marshals or regional attorneys for the Labor Department. They just don't believe I can't do it."

QUARTERS ARE AMPLE

Mr. Day's office is the largest of any Cabinet officer's. It is paneled in wood and of a grandeur to satisfy General de Gaulle. He works about half a mile from the door at a clear desk with a clear mind.

Across from his quarters is another baronial hall, where one of his most famous predecessors, James A. Farley, used to make his way among the leather armchairs, patting the shoulders of politicos and inquiring for their Aunt Mames.

Mr. Day hasn't figured out a use for the room, while acknowledging its usefulness to inspire awe in the petitioner.

His only constituents besides the letter-writers of the Nation, who are so far unorganized, are the 580,000 employees of the Post Office Department, most of whom are clustered in 15 Federal postal unions.

After 6 months of his open-door policy, he is drawing rave notices. William Doherty, the head of the Letter Carriers Union, said recently in a Dayton speech: "For the first time in many, many years, we are able to work with the Department as partners instead of having to cool our heels in unfriendly anterooms waiting for a few crumbs of comfort to fall from the tables of the mighty."

TREND REVERSER

Mr. Doherty is the author of a book called "Mailman, U.S.A.," which devotes several searing chapters to the previous Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, who he suggests enjoyed as much love and affection from the postal workers as Ezra Taft Benson got from the farmers.

Mr. Day has concentrated in his first 6 months on building up "friendliness, warmth and enthusiasm" in the Department and in "reversing certain trends" started by the publicity-conscious Mr. Summerfield.

"There was too much ballyhoo about post office equipment and automation and too many announcements about sending mail by rocket and coaxial cables."

Mr. Day also insisted on putting in his own men as the 15 regional directors of the postal system. He confers with them by network conference telephone every Wednesday afternoon. He recently completed a 40,000-mile tour of 40 major post offices, where he put to the employees such pertinent questions as whether they liked to pace a mail-sorting machine or preferred to have it pace them. He tried to discourage everybody from calling him "General."

Mr. Day has made considerable impression on Capitol Hill as a witness, a role well suited to one with his appetite for comparative statistics. But he has fared less well as an advocate. His postal-rate increase bill is about as popular as the 5-year term foreign-aid program and Chairman JOHNSTON, of South Carolina of the Senate Postoffice Committee has set his face against it.

"I have differences with Mr. JOHNSTON, but no antagonisms," said Mr. Day.

Mr. Day's introduction of the merit system, whereby men from within the ranks are promoted to supervisory posts on recommendation of a selection board has rendered him something less than a hero with patronage-hungry Congressmen. He is quite stoical about their complaints. He warned every one at the beginning that he would run the Post Office.

HAS ANSWER FOR HECKLERS

He does not appreciate hecklers who point out the superior glories of the European mail system, which still has two deliveries a day.

"The New York City Post Office handles more mail in a day than the entire British postal system," he says firmly. "And the New York City Post Office hasn't had a new building in 30 years."

Moon Lifting: Here's Russia Through the Eyes of a Champion American Weightlifter With His Feet on the Ground and Russia's Eyes on the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, two old friends of mine have contributed to this piece which is the answer to the question: "Is America worth fighting for?"

Louis Riecke Jr. is the son of an old and valued friend of mine, the president of the Orleans Parish School Board.

The writer of the article is Cro Duplantier, a tough ex-marine and one of the better sportswriters in New Orleans. He is on the New Orleans States-Item.

There is nothing to be added to this column.

It speaks for itself and is well worth the time of anybody to read, especially those in whose mind there perhaps lingers any shadow of a doubt of the Russian way and the American way:

RIECKE LOOKS AT LIFE IN RUSSIA

(by Cro Duplantier)

Louis Riecke Jr., New Orleans' gift to international weightlifting competition, came back from a recent tour of most of the principal cities of Western Russia shaking his head.

What he can't figure is how:

The Reds can be so advanced in science and athletics.

And so retarded in every other phase of life.

He realizes, of course, that it's all a matter of concentration—of concentrating all of the nation's interest in what it believes to be the two areas in which it can win the most favorable publicity—science and sports, but * * *

As a member of a U.S. weightlifting team which competed against Russian teams in a series of meets, Riecke got what he described as the Red's red carpet treatment.

Everything first class—or first class Russian, at least.

But first class in Russia, he found, might be regarded as 10th class over here.

Consider these startling contrasts from Riecke's tourist's notebook.

The Russians can send a man into orbit around the earth and bring him back again at a spot pinpointed in advance, but they can't get an elevator to land properly.

"At one of the best hotels, "he said, "every time we rode on the elevators they stopped a foot or so below the floor they were aimed for. And, apparently, the Russians accepted this as one of the facts of life, for no one ever bothered to warn you to watch your step. You were supposed to know that you just had to get out the best way you could."

"And then there was the elevator in another hotel which would not work at all, unless the load was distributed a certain way. The operator would get her passengers all to one side and then take off. Otherwise, it wouldn't rise."

While the Russian scientists are working on a way to send a man to the moon and bring him back again—and may not be far from accomplishing this feat—the streets, including those in the Russian showplace, Moscow, are being swept by women using homemade brooms of branches from trees, with extra twigs fastened to them.

While Russian medical scientists are reporting new cures for some of the world's most troublesome maladies, people queue up at soft drink machines in the cities which squirt syrup and soda into a container much like ours do. The difference: Here you get yours in a paper cup which you dispose of after using. In Russia the drink is squirted into a glass—and after your drink you return the glass, to be used by the next customer.

While Russian athletes, who are emissaries of the Reds for meets at home and abroad, are well dressed and drive nice automobiles, the majority of Russians are poorly dressed and depend on their feet or public transportation to get places. "We never once saw a gas station," he points out.

"It's very doubtful," Riecke says, "that many could afford to be well dressed, since everything costs so much—and they earn so little. And the stores seem almost bare, anyhow. But the athletes are well dressed and their cars are new. And we were amused at one thing—they had radios in their cars and kept pointing them out to us—as though this was something entirely new."

Riecke also was dumbfounded by the treatment accorded his team by the press and radio and TV people, especially TV.

"When we arrived they were all over the place, with TV cameras and cables," he said, "but later we wondered with what results. For while there are television stations apparently, there also apparently are no TV sets.

"We get accustomed here to radio and TV sets in every hotel room. We didn't see TV sets even in the hotel lobbies. And even radios are scarce in the hotels, which usually have one for each floor."

Riecke said an Intourist representative was an almost constant companion of the team. Their name for him was Albert, and Albert gave them one of the best insights into the problems of the Soviet citizen today—and their views on life, health, and cleanliness.

One day the Americans took to admiring Albert's suede shoes, much superior to the footgear of most Russians. Albert beamed. He began telling them how much better the shoes really were than the ones his fellow Russians wear, a lot of them of the sandal variety which means they take less leather and can be bought more cheaply.

"With these," said Albert, "my socks really stay clean. I haven't had to change socks now for 20 days."

All is not well with law enforcement in the Red regime either. Poverty has inclined the Reds to what we would consider petty thefts. For them, however, with goods as scarce as they are the petty items must be big ones—and expensive.

"You never see windshield wipers on cars," Riecke pointed out, "unless it's raining. Because they are stolen all the time, if left in place; the wipers are removed by car owners and kept locked in the car until actually needed."

In his own interest area, Riecke was especially impressed with the facilities, equipment, and the treatment accorded the Russian weightlifters—and of their progress in the sport.

"Their stadiums are beautiful, the facilities the best—and the athletes are treated as national heroes. The weightlifters get as much attention from the fans as does a world champion boxer or a top baseball or football player here," he said.

"And for their weightlifting competition the stadiums are packed—as they would be here for an important football game."

But lurking back in Riecke's mind somewhere is the suspicion that even these stars are not completely happy with the system.

"They know they have it better than most other Russians, but are not so sure about how even their benefits stack up with the things Americans have * * * and they can never really even speak to visiting athletes intimately."

He told how on several occasions one American who spoke some Russian would get into a head-and-head conversation with one of the Russian competitors only to be joined immediately by a government representative, an official eavesdropper.

"And one of them tentatively invited us to his apartment but after making the offer he never brought it up again."

In fact, Riecke came away with a distinct impression that while Khrushchev and company are making big splashes around the world with Soviet feats of science, they are making much smaller an impression on the Russians themselves.

Surely, he figures, they must wonder why a system which can provide sightseeing trips in space for a couple of guys can't provide proper clothes, food, and shelter for the rest of the Russians.

Memorializes Anniversary of Lincoln's Defense of Catholicism

SPEECH
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, let us today memorialize an important event in our national history that took place on August 24, 1855. On that date Abraham Lincoln deplored bigotry then flowing in rampage against Americans of the Roman Catholic faith.

Following the national election of 1852 a secret organization, calling itself the Grand Council of the United States

of North America, was formed. Because its members refused to divulge information concerning it, always replying they knew nothing, the party became known as the Know-Nothings. It was, in fact, a concealed group that arrayed its power against Catholics.

The Know-Nothings adopted a constitution requiring that every member had to be a native-born citizen, a Protestant, born of Protestant parents, and not married to a Catholic. It declared that—

> The object of this organization shall be to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome, and other foreign influence against the institutions of our country by placing in all offices * * * or by appointment, none but native-born Protestant citizens.

Soon the Know-Nothings exploded in rage. The floodgates of the wildest bigotry opened when President Franklin Pierce appointed a citizen of the Catholic faith to be U.S. Postmaster General. Though slanders were hurled at him, President Pierce remained firm.

In New York, Boston, and other cities there were vicious attacks incited by "Know-Nothing" agitators against Catholic churches, schools, homes, and individuals, especially persons of Irish background. The Pope was burned in effigy, along with churches and even dwellings containing women and children. Persons innocent of any offense were beaten and murdered merely because they were Catholics.

From Springfield, Ill., Abraham Lincoln dispatched a letter on August 24, 1855, denouncing "Know-Nothingism." He said:

> As a nation we began by declaring that "all men are created equal." We now practically read it, "all men are created equal except Negroes." When the "Know-Nothings" obtain control, it will read "All men are created equal except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics."

Let us today dwell for a moment on Mr. Lincoln's words. America has made great strides. But some remain motivated by prejudice rather than by reason.

Reasonable Americans may entertain honest differences over the constitutionality of Federal aid to parochial schools. But no measure of prejudicie must color our decision. Involved in the present debate is the interpretation of principles contain in the first amendment pertaining to separation of church and State as well as the guarantee of free exercise of religion.

Let the question be settled on its merit. We must guard against attacks on the patriotism or Americanism of citizens of any faith or race.

Vice President Johnson in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, Vice President JOHNSON reassured the people in Berlin that we are behind them. He went up and down the streets giving away fountain pens, apparently to prove that even a ballpoint pen is mightier than the sword.

Oceanography—Opportunity for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years much emphasis has been placed on the need for knowing more about the mysteries of the deep. As we give great emphasis to the exploration of outer space, we become more conscious of the fact that little is known about three-fourths of our own planet which is covered by the waters of the ocean.

The Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has held detailed studies on my bill, H.R. 4276, and the Senate has held extensive hearings on S. 901, introduced by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington. These hearings brought forth the great need for research, exploration, scientific training, and other developments which will reflect the biological, geological, chemical, and physical factors of underwater environment. President Kennedy, on February 23, 1961, delivered an eloquent message to Congress on the importance of establishing a vigorous program of oceanography.

Mr. Speaker, in the June issue of Data magazine a renowned authority on the subject of oceanography; namely, Rear Adm. Philip D. Gallery, retired, authored a most timely article entitled "Oceanography: Opportunity for Industry." Since the ingenuity of American industry will have a vital effect on the research and development phases of oceanography, I think it is essential that the premises of this article should be given thorough study and consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

OCEANOGRAPHY: OPPORTUNITY FOR INDUSTRY

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
"March 29, 1961.

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The seas around us, as I pointed out in my message to Congress on February 23, represent one of our most important resources. If vigorously developed, this resource can be a source of great benefit to the Nation and to all mankind.

"This is not a 1-year program—or even a 10-year program. It is the first step in a continuing effort to acquire and apply the information about our part of the world that will ultimately determine the conditions of life in the rest of the world. The opportunities are there. A vigorous program will capture those opportunities.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

This letter was addressed to Vice President JOHNSON as President of the Senate. It added to the display of President Kennedy's personal interest in oceanography that was noted in his state of the Union message, in which, for the first time, the word "oceanography" appeared in a state of the Union message.

The Soviet Union, a land bound nation, has invested far more money in oceanographic research, exploration, shipbuilding, training of scientists, and similar fields than the United States, a maritime nation. The author attended the International Oceanographic Congress at the United Nations headquarters in New York in 1959. On a visit aboard the 5,000-ton Soviet oceanographic ship *Lomonosov*, he was shown a most impressive array of scientific equipment, laboratories, specimens collected, even track charts of the vessel's 4-month oceanographic cruise in the Middle and North Atlantic. One unusual fact observed was the number of women scientists aboard—the most prominent woman scientist addressed an assemblage of about 500 scientists at the United Nations that afternoon on her special branch of oceanography. The Soviet ship *Lomonosov* was only one of a fleet of Soviet oceanographic vessels and more were building, we were told. Soviet interest in the seas is obviously not necessarily economic since they have only small seacoast but they possess a fleet of 500 submarines.

OCEANOGRAPHIC INTEREST IN CONGRESS

The President's expressed interest in oceanography adds emphasis to the importance of the passage of two oceanographic bills introduced in this Congress by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, S. 901, and Representative MILLER, of California, H.R. 4276. Last year the Senate passed unanimously the Magnuson bill, but, unfortunately, it was July by the time the House got hold of it so it died as another casualty in the election adjournment rush. Prospects for full passage and implementation by this Congress are considered good.

The Magnuson bill is based largely on recommendations of the comprehensive study by the National Defense Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The research effort involved and ships and equipment required are so extensive that a program of 10 years is initially envisioned, costing about $650 million over that period.

The greatest part of the engineering needs will have to be met by industry so there are great opportunities for the companies that get into the business early.

An indication of the importance of the proposed program and of its permanence is contained in Representative MILLER'S bill which advocates the establishment of a National Oceanographic Council at Cabinet level with the following memberships:

1. Secretary of the Treasury.
2. Secretary of Defense.
3. Secretary of the Interior.
4. Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.
5. Secretary of Commerce.
6. Director of the National Science Foundation.

Among the Government agencies that will be involved are the Department of Defense (particularly the Navy Department, including the Hydrographic Offices, Bureau of Ships, and Office of Naval Research), Fish and Wildlife Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Coast Guard.

OCEANOGRAPHIC DATA CENTER

A first move in implementing this program has already been made in the establishment of the Oceanographic Data Center at the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington, D.C. Previously the data sent in from our currently operating research ships has been laboriously handled and sorted manually. Modern techniques utilizing computers and data-processing equipment will be employed henceforth. The expected mountains of factual data that will be assembled demand that modern methods be installed, requiring

assistance from industry. At present the Navy Hydrographic Office has sponsored the center, located, until recently, at the Hydrographic Office Headquarters in Suitland, Md.

OCEANOGRAPHIC AUTHORITIES

Eventually it may prove necessary to give one agency control of this oceanographic program, perhaps with one individual as administrator and coordinator of the widespread activities. Since the Hydrographic Office has been involved in this field for many years, and, since this will be a Government program, it is felt that the logical "boss" of the program is the hydrographer of the Navy, currently Rear Adm. E. C. Stephan, U.S. Navy.

One of the most qualified and dedicated authorities in the oceanographic field is a naval officer now on duty with the Hydrographic Office—Capt. C. N. G. Hendrix, U.S. Navy. He has the unusual distinction of having commanded a submarine, and a submarine squadron and having acquired his master's degree in oceanography at Scripps Institute of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif. Admiral Stephan has placed Captain Hendrix in charge of coordinating recommendations of various laboratories and agencies for the oceanographic program. Sometime this summer it is expected that a conference of all industry, science and Government personnel interested in oceanography will be called, probably in Washington, D.C.

GAINS BEING REALIZED

The oceanographic bills before Congress emphasize the economic benefits to the Nation and the world and the scientific gains to be realized. The defense angle is scarcely mentioned. The Navy, however, has a vital stake in learning all it can about the ocean for two conflicting reasons: (1) to combat the submarine menace of the U.S.S.R., currently owning about 500 ocean-going submarines; (2) to increase the effectiveness of our own atomic Polaris missile-firing submarines. We need knowledge of the underwater topography, the sound, light, and thermal characteristics of the sea, current data for both acoustic and flow problems and many related areas. All such information can help improve our Polaris attack capabilities and our antisubmarine measures and operations.

Industry has in recent years shown increasing interest in tackling the ASW problem. The National Security Industrial Association and the Institute of Aeronautical Science have sponsored very constructive symposia for hundreds of industry leaders and representatives. The NSIA First National Innerspace Symposium on May 23–25 in Washington is the most recent example. Working committees of the NSIA in the ASW field have come up with a number of concrete and significant recommendations for assisting the Navy in the ASW effort.

Examples of scientific and industrial contributions recently in oceanographic matters are: The "Optimum Track Ship Routing System" developed by Dr. R. W. James, oceanographer of the Hydrographic Office, resulted in an award of $5,435 by the Secretary of the Navy to Dr. James. The development and initiation of this system saves an estimated $10 million a year to the Navy. It has been responsible for similar savings to commercial shipping.

General Mills Nuclear Equipment Department, Minneapolis, Minn., has developed a mechanical arm manipulator to be fitted to the bathyscaphe Trieste for underwater investigation and sampling. General Mills employed its experience in producing manipulators for tending atomic reactors to develop this undersea device. The Trieste program is jointly sponsored by the Office of Naval Research and the Bureau of Ships.

Reynolds Aluminum Co. is developing an all-aluminum submarine for research at depths to 15,000 feet. The success of this model, Project Aluminaut, could lead to revolutionary developments in material used in construction of submarines or even surface ships.

Project Mohole, the probing of the ocean bottom, got off to a surprisingly successful and promising start recently in the Pacific off southern California. Samples 500 feet below the ocean bottom in 12,000 feet of water were obtained. The test demonstrated the feasibility of the delicate maneuvering operation that required the precise positioning of the unmoored barge for perfect initial penetration of the core. The ultimate objective of Project Mohole is to drill through the crest of the ocean at depths of 18,000 feet and then 15,000 feet through crested rock in the bottom. The scientific information obtained is considered of highest value by scientists studying the history and formation of the inner earth.

OCEANOGRAPHY NEEDS

Many of the engineering and equipment needs for this vast program are yet to be determined. Some of the current needs, however, have been expressed by various authorities in oceanographic laboratories, the Navy and industry. Following are a few of high priority equipment needs together with their uses and rough estimate of costs involved:

1. Precision echo sounder for oceanic survey use: A high resolution, stabilized echo-sounding system for detained precision surveys in deep ocean surveys and for ASW developments is urgently needed. Estimated cost of prototype is $400,000 and about 20 more units at $300,000 will be required by 1962.

2. Oceanographic plankton sampler: No such sample is now available to get selected sizes and samples at discrete depths. Estimated cost is $120,000 for development, then $10,000 to $15,000 per unit for about 20 units initially with indefinite number of replacement units.

3. Sea floor sediment sampler and analyzer: Needed to study interaction between biological products in bottom areas. Estimated $300,000 for development and about $120,000 per unit thereafter with 10–20 units required.

4. Marine mobile geophysical packaged system: This packaged system is needed for all oceanographic vessels in existence and in future. It should include echo-sounder, towed magnetometer, seismic equipment, radio communication, portable winch for handling instruments on wire to 4,000 fathoms, and data recorder. Five units complete are needed immediately and 10 additional (less some items) by 1963.

5. Geophysical gravity meter: This device is needed to obtain gravity profiles from ships and aircraft for a variety of departments including Defense. Ten are required by 1962 and 10 more by 1965. Estimated $500,000 for development and $75,000 per unit for production.

6. Electron resonance magnetometer: Needed to obtain continuous measurement profiles of total intensity of earth's magnetic field. Ten are needed by 1962 and 10 more by 1965. Development estimate $250,000 production approximately $25,0000 a unit.

7. Sea floor dredge winch: Present winches are inadequate mechanically and engineering wise. One will be needed for each AGOR and AGS being built or planned. Three will be required by 1962. Estimated cost $100,000 per unit.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDUSTRY

Some people are concerned about the prospect of the huge industrial firms currently in defense business "hogging" this oceanographic effort. The contrary may prove true since emphasis in the field is comparatively new and there is a current trend in Government to make every effort to place more Government business with small business. An example: in November 1960, a contract was awarded to the Christy Corp., Sturgeon Bay, Wis., a small business, for the construction of two oceanographic research vessels for $4,509,411. These ships will have a full load displacement of 1,370 tons, length overall of 208 feet and beam of 37 feet. (In passing, we might note that they are going to require a great amount of equipment, principally from other specialized industries.)

The subject of oceanography is gaining the attention of the entire world and holds great opportunities for industry. The United States is embarking upon a program that not not only may bring important discoveries in feeding the world but should have vital implications in the defense effort. The engineering needs are great for new ideas on equipment for research, data-processing, analysis and distribtuion. There are requirements that both large and very small organizations can tackle. As President Kennedy said in his letter to the Senate urging action on oceanography bills: "The opportunities are there."

The Civil Air Patrol and the Men Who Lead It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 10, I had the honor to address a luncheon given at the Mayflower Hotel for 135 Civil Air Patrol cadets, who were visiting this country in connection with the annual International Air Cadet Exchange program. Mr. Sam Pryor, Jr., of Pan American World Airways, was host at the luncheon and Col. Barnee Breeskin, CAP, was the chairman. This annual exchange program enables foreign CAP cadets to come here for a brief visit, while many of our CAP cadets visit Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and other parts of the free world.

In recognition of the importance of this exchange program, President Kennedy had issued the following statement welcoming the cadets:

> The United States is delighted to welcome participants in Civil Air Patrol's 14th annual International Air Cadet Exchange. Bringing together young men of the free world in a climate of mutual interest and good will, CAP's summer exchange program plays a significant role in America's unceasing effort to achieve a lasting peace through international friendship and understanding.
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, a fine description of the activities of the Civil Air Patrol, its heroic rescue missions and the aerospace education program for its 70,000 and students in more than 500 schools in the United States is contained in an article by Read W. Wynn, director of public information at CAP headquarters, Ellington Air Force Base in Texas. This article, published in the 1961 edition of the Air Force Blue Book, should be of

great interest to all Members of Congress. It is entitled "The CAP, Civilians on Duty," and reads as follows:

THE CAP, CIVILIANS ON DUTY

(By Read W. Wynn)

High in the Nevada mountains, a twin-engined Piper Apache crashlanded in the mid-March snow and subfreezing weather. Five persons were abroad, one a 6-year-old girl.

This plane and its occupants became the objects of one of the most dramatic missions of contemporary aviation.

The Nevada wing of Civil Air Patrol was brought into the search by Headquarters 4th Air Force, at Hamilton Air Force Base, California, on Sunday, March 12, 1960. Because the crash was estimated to be somewhere near Ely, Nev., two CAP officers, Maj. William C. Ooley and Lt. John Barainca, the only senior members of the East Ely Cadet Squadron, volunteered.

Heavy snow, a low ceiling, and 40-mile winds added to the difficulty, as Major Ooley and Lieutenant Barainca flew their Piper Super-Cub into the bitter cold on the first sortie. On the second sortie, Major Ooley was alone, above country he knew. His guess about where an aircraft in distress might try to land proved correct. He spotted the wrecked plane in the mountainous snow near Kalamazoo Pass, 100 miles from Ely. He circled low. A woman waved frantically and signaled; her gestures indicated that there were casualties needing medical help. Major Ooley flew back to Ely for emergency equipment.

The sun was setting when the pilot returned and flew over the wreckage at 11,000 feet. From 75 feet above the site, the wind still strong, he made five drops of food, sleeping bags, and medical supplies he had obtained at an Ely drug store. He radioed Hill Air Force Base, near Ogden, Utah, for helicopter assistance.

Lieutenant Barainca led a party through the night on snowshoes to the wreck. The Air Force helicopter arriving from Hill early in the morning managed a close landing and Air Force medical personnel administered aid to the victims. It turned out that all five were injured, one with a broken back, but doctors said they would recover.

This is but one of the many search and rescue missions performed every day by CAP. In 1959, Civil Air Patrol flew 8,401 sorties for a total of 15,444 hours in support of Air Force search and rescue missions, and was credited with saving 399 persons from possible death or serious injury. This record does not include the many missions of various types flown by CAP under its own orders and direction, often requested by the Red Cross, State Governors, sheriffs' offices, and other State and local agencies. In fact, CAP wings reported more than a quarter million man-hours expended in 1959 on missions other than those requested by the Air Force.

When Major Ooley and Lieutenant Barainca donned the uniform of Civil Air Patrol, like the many thousands of men and women in the 50 States, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, they did so with dead seriousness. It is not for show that they wear this basic Air Force uniform with distinguishing CAP insignia. By wearing it they indicate that, as unpaid civilians, they are in service as volunteer members of an Air Force auxiliary, bound by their own creed to serve their neighbors. The only compensation CAP members ever receive is reimbursement for gas and oil used in their own aircraft when flying on Air Force authorized missions. They buy their own uniforms and pay their own traveling expenses.

Civil Air Patrol will mark its 19th anniversary on December 1, 1960. It is a civilian corporation, under charter by Congress "to provide aviation education and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies." This mark of distinction bestowed by Congress came as a result of CAP's outstanding service during World War II.

The story has been told many times how civilian pilots in their light, low-flying aircraft took up antisubmarine patrols along the east coast when German U-boats were sinking sometimes two or three ships a day. Little Cessnas, Aeroncas, Cubs, Fairchilds and other civilian types even carried bombs and depth charges in special racks underneath their fuselages. CAP pilots flew 24 million miles against the submarines, spotted 173, and officially sank 2. Ninety CAP planes were lost on wartime missions and half a hundred members failed to return.

Antisubmarine patrol was not all; CAP planes patroled the Mexican border against the infiltration of saboteurs and spies; they towed targets for military antiaircraft practice; they carried critically needed plane parts from one base to another; they were special couriers when needed.

The present chairman of the national board of CAP, the governing body of the corporation, is Col. William C. Whelen, one of the original members of CAP, who flew antisubmarine patrol out of Pascagoula, Miss., during World War II.

Civil Air Patrol today is a nonprofit corporation. Most of its $200,000 revenue comes from annual dues. It has evolved from those wartime days to a stable organization of adults and teenagers bent on furthering aviation in this aerospace age. Youth aviation education has come to the fore as part of CAP's mission. At the end of June 1960, there were more than 36,000 teenage cadets, boys and girls, in various stages of aviation training, each striving for the highest cadet award, the coveted certificate of proficiency. This certificate, or diploma, is only won after months of study, weekly training meetings, participation in various cadet programs—and examinations.

In 1959, 2,717 certificates were awarded, 500 more than in any other year. The regard the Air Force holds for this aviation training is best shown in that any cadet with a certificate of proficiency may enlist in the Air Force as airman third class, instead of airman basic.

Nearly 9,000 leading cadets took part in 1959 in summer wing encampments at 36 Air Force bases. Here they learn Air Force esprit and practical factors in aviation.

Other bright spots in summer activities for honor cadets are the National Drill Competition among the entire CAP; the International Air Cadet Exchange between selected CAP cadets and those from 17 foreign countries in 1960; the Jet Orientation Course for 52 honor male cadets at Perrin Air Force Base, Tex., and a similar course for honor girl cadets at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

Cadets are not the only CAPers who continue to train. As in the military, the senior members must qualify for promotion. USAF pilot qualifications are used for determining "professional qualifications and known value to Civil Air Patrol." They study leadership, management, administration, staff organization. A new senior manual, "Aerospace Orientation," is now on their reading list.

This aviation education outlook for Civil Air Patrol goes much further than the education of its own members. It has expanded to the aviation education workshop program in prominent colleges and universities. Notable in this expansion is the growth of aviation education in New York City, where 10 high schools have formed CAP squadrons. In the State of Utah, for example, 13 schools are participating. Other school systems—at least 500 in 1960—are using Civil Air Patrol textbooks produced by national headquarters CAP–USAF, as elective study in their curriculums. More than 13,000 students are enrolled.

In many respects, CAP might falter as a corporation were it not for the Air Force. This is where Civil Air Patrol becomes Civil Air Patrol–USAF, which, when regarded with the CAP corporation, becomes a unique organization of military and civilian components.

The Air Force prvoides a national headquarters at Ellington Air Force Base, near Houston, Tex., as bookkeeper, home office and adviser. Headquarters, CAP–USAF, is under the operational control of the Continental Air Command along with the air Reserve forces.

Brig. Gen. Stephen D. McElroy, USAF, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force Academy is National Commander of Civil Air Patrol. He wears a second hat as commander, headquarters CAP–USAF. He is on hand whenever possible at every region and many wing conferences. His fingers are on the pulse of every phase of CAP activity throughout the regions and wings—many times on that of the lower echelons of the area groups or local squadrons.

His own immediate staff of 146 Air Force officers, enlisted Air Force personnel and civil service civilians, employed by the Air Force, is supplemented by Air Force liaison officers, enlisted men, and civilians at each region and wing level in the field. There is also a civilian aviation educationist in each region. A Philco Corp. technical representative is assigned to each of the regions with a senior "tech-rep" at national headquarters to direct communications policy and maintenance. Total CAP-USAF personnel is about 385.

In April 1960, the Air Force donated 28 aircraft to CAP. Eighteen C–45's, the type of plane being retired from the Air Force's active list, recently were turned over to 16 wings and one region of the CAP corporation. In addition, 10 L–20's were given to the Alaska Wing. Planes are apportioned as to the need indicated by various units. This Air Force contribution swelled the number of corporate-owned aircraft to more than 900. There are 3,434 member-owned aircraft in Civil Air Patrol at last count, and rough estimates have placed the availability of privately-owned aircraft from individuals or aero clubs to CAP in event of an emergency at approximately 20,000, a capable fleet, indeed, should there be a repeat of World War II. There are about 8,500 licensed, fully trained CAP pilots.

The hard core of CAP is its 70,000 volunteer men, women, boys and girls. The less devoted have dropped by the wayside, the rest are gaining aviation knowledge.

The air age is challenging and these people who wear the uniform of CAP are meeting that challenge with hard work. They know that America's future is in its youth.

Mr. Speaker, two men are singled out in the above article for special tribute. One is Col. William C. Whelen, the present chairman of the CAP national board. The other is Brig. Gen. Stephen D. McElroy, the national commander of CAP. At the luncheon on August 10, I had the pleasure of sitting next to General McElroy and to learn of his deep interest in CAP and the activities of the organization. I was very much impressed with his devotion to CAP. He is doing a great job and I want to take this opportunity to pay public tribute to him in recognition of his work. General McElroy has a most impressive background

and I am pleased to include a biographical sketch of him:

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN D. M'ELROY, U.S. AIR FORCE

Stephen Davenport McElroy was born in Terryville, Conn., October 2, 1912. He spent his early years in the State of Virginia, residing in the towns of Appomattox, Marion, and Norton. He graduated from Norton High School in 1929 and that summer received his first military training in an infantry company of the Citizens' Military Training Corps at Fort Eustis, Va. In 1933, he received a bachelor of science degree and a Reserve commission as a second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps from the Virginia Polytechnical Institute. He continued his education at VPI and was awarded a master of science degree in architectural engineering the following year.

After completing college, he did topographic mapping and surveying and worked as a building construction inspector in Texas. It was here that he became actively interested in flying which led to his first solo flight at Waco, Tex., in 1935. During these years he served his required 2-week tours of active duty as a Coast Artillery Reserve Officer. In 1938, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps as an aviation cadet and after completion of flying training at Randolph and Kelly Fields, Tex., was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserve. In 1940, he received his regular commission.

General McElroy's early duties included such assignments as squadron operations officer of the 18th Reconnaissance Squadron, Mitchel Field, N. Y., squadron commander, Headquarters Squadron, 13th Bomb Group, Langley Field, Va.; and assistant group operations officer of the 13th Bomb Group at Langley Field, Va., Orlando, Fla., and Westover Field in Massachusetts. While assigned to this organization he was detailed as a student at the Army Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kan., completing the course in the summer of 1941. He was at Orlando on December 7, 1941, and moved with the 13th Group shortly thereafter to Westover Field.

In May 1942 he became the commander of the 40th Bomb Squadron, later designated the 4th Antisubmarine Squadron.

While under his command this squadron operated from east coast bases of Mitchel, Westover, Langley, and Key West and in the Caribbean area from bases in Cuba, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Bermuda. In the spring of 1943, the unit was based briefly in Newfoundland and then moved to St. Eval, England, where it operated under the operational control of the coastal command of the Royal Air Force. At the end of 1943, the antisubmarine command was deactivated and General McElroy, then a major, was returned to the States with his remaining combat crews and assigned to the B–29 program at Clovis, N. Mex. In March of 1944, he was assigned to a staff position in the bombardment branch of the operations commitments and requirements division of headquarters, Army Air Force in Washington, D.C. Shortly afterward he was promoted to lieutenant colonel and during this period was engaged in the B–32 combat suitability tests. These were combat bombardment missions flown for the 5th Air Force from Clark Field and the Florida Blanca Base in northern Luzon, Philippine Islands. Upon return to the States from this mission, he was assigned to the military missions division of the Caribbean Defense Command, Panama, and in January of 1946, became chief of the military aviation mission to the Republic of Guatemala. In this position he was instrumental in the reequipping of the Guatemalan Air Force with U.S. aircraft, the reorganization of their air force, the development of a flying school and the construction of an airport. He completed this tour in the summer of 1948, and was assigned as a student at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Va.

Upon completion of the course of instruction at Norfolk, Lieutenant Colonel McElroy was assigned to the 307th bomb group (SAC), MacDill Air Force Base, Fla. From January 1949 until June 1957, he served with the Strategic Air Command. His assignments included commander, 371st Bomb Squadron (B–29); director of operations, 307th Bomb Wing, MacDill Air Force Base; deputy chief of staff for operations, FEAF Bomber Command, Advanced Echelon, Okinawa; deputy chief of staff, operations, FEAF Bomber Command, Yakota, Japan; and deputy chief of staff, operations, 6th Air Division (Z–47) at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla. In June 1952, he became deputy commander of the 305th Bomb Wing at MacDill and in September of that year was reassigned to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., as deputy chief of staff, personnel, for the Strategic Air Command. Following this assignment he commanded the 376th Bombardment Wing (B–47) at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., for 2 years and in June 1957 became Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

In January 1959, General McElroy was appointed special assistant to the commander of headquarters, Civil Air Patrol-U.S. Air Force at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

On April 1, 1959, General McElroy assumed command and became the national commander of the Civil Air Patrol.

General McElroy, a command pilot with 132 missions and 875 combat hours, holds the following decorations and awards: Legion of Merit with one oak-leaf cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross with one oak-leaf cluster, Air Medal with three oak-leaf clusters, Bronze Star and Commendation Ribbon with three oak-leaf clusters. General McElroy, a long-time light plane enthusiast, was an active member of Aero Clubs at SAC bases and at the Air Force Academy.

General McElroy is the son of Rev. and Mrs. Charles William McElroy. He is married to the former Corabel Dewees, of San Antonio, Tex. They have one son, Stephen, Jr., age 16.

PROMOTIONS

General McElroy received Reserve commission as second lieutenant, November 13, 1933; Reserve first lieutenant, November 30, 1936, which he resigned to enter aviation cadets. He was commissioned second lieutenant August 26, 1939. He was promoted to first lieutenant October 16, 1941; to captain (temporary), February 1, 1942; to captain (permanent), March 1, 1942; to major (temporary), September 14, 1942; to major (permanent), January 22, 1942; to lieutenant colonel (temporary), March 28, 1944; to lieutenant colonel (permanent), July 1, 1948; to colonel (temporary), July 22, 1950; to colonel (permanent), July 1, 1954; to brigadier general (temporary), November 19, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to take this opportunity to commend the officers at CAP headquarters: Lt. Col. Harold A. Wicklund, USAF, director of cadet training; Lt. Col. Joseph H. Friedman, director of information; Capt. James Ves'sells, deputy director of information; and Tom Porter, associate editor of CAP Times.

As a resident and Representative of the State of New York, I also want to commend the Civil Air Patrol Wing of that area, whose officers and members volunteer their time in the pursuit of this civic responsibility of the auxiliary air force. The officers are: Col. Jess Strauss, commander of the New York Wing, CAP, and Lt. Col. Cliff Johnson, deputy commander of the New York Wing. Special mention should also be given to Lt. Col. William Schulie, IACE, chairman of the New York Committee, International Cadet Exchange, and Lt. Col. Frederic S. Schleger, chairman, Aviation Exchange Alumni Headquarters, IACE.

Testimony of Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York, on Behalf of H.R. 2783

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks I made in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 2783, a bill which would increase the membership of the House to 450:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, ON BEHALF OF H.R. 2783, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to come before you to testify on matters pending before the committee and I appreciate the opportunity to come here today to support a proposal which concerns all of us—the membership of the House.

H.R. 2783 would provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in fairness to the several States of the Union and to ourselves that we must increase the membership of the House by at least these 15 seats. The duties we, as Members, carry are heavy ones and the doubling of the population in the past 50 years since the last increase in the number of Members has placed an additional burden upon us, especially those Members representing the highly urbanized areas of this country.

An increase in the size of the House membership to 450 as provided in H.R. 2783 would freeze the present number of seats apportioned to each of the 50 States and designate that number as the minimum number that that particular State may have. The additional seats would be apportioned to those States which have shown an increase in population which would warrant new seats being apportioned to them.

An index to the importance of this matter to our colleagues is the fact that no less than 20 bills concerning the size of the membership of the House have been introduced since the beginning of the session. I feel strongly that we should act on a measure this session and urge that this committee report out a bill which would increase the membership to 450 and which would further set up the procedure the States are to follow in any reapportionment and provide for court review of any action taken by the legislatures of the States.

With regard to reapportionment in the States I would urge the committee to consider the provisions contained in H.R. 841, a bill which I introduced on January 3, 1961.

H.R. 841 would require the establishment of contiguous and compact congressional districts containing approximately the same number of inhabitants.

Thank you.

Cross Florida Barge Canal Would Speed Delivery of Rockets to Canaveral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fine editorial in the Orlando Sentinel of August 15, 1961. Even in peacetime the present route of Saturns from Huntsville to Canaveral is a burden on our national defense. If such a journey were undertaken in time of war, it is obvious that the dangers from enemy submarines would be tremendous. If the Cross Florida Barge Canal were built, the journey at all times would be speeded, and the journey in time of war would be protected from submarines by the covering land in the Intracoastal Waterway system. The President's budget contains a small item for planning studies for this very much needed canal, and I sincerely hope that Congress will authorize these funds so that the matter can be pursued in a businesslike and prompt manner. The Cross Florida Barge Canal is long overdue and is justified economically as well as defensewise. Its authorization by Congress several years ago was based on its defense value but since that time it has also achieved economic justification as determined by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. The editorial reads as follows:

BARGE CANAL WOULD SPEED ROCKETS

There was a delay yesterday when a barge ferrying the first Saturn rocket booster got caught on a mud flat in the intercoastal waterway near Fort Pierce.

It was only hung on the mud flat briefly but in these days of split-second timing we cannot afford even momentary delay in our rocket development program if it can be avoided.

This, we believe, is a graphic illustration of the urgent need for the cross-State barge canal and the Sanford-Titusville Canal.

In yesterday's incident no damage was done to the barge or the rocket, according to a spokesman for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

But the same spokesman said encounters with mud flats could be expected in the shallow, tricky waters of the river.

And, while we sincerely trust that any other similar difficulty will cause no damage to the costly 75-ton rocket, it is a precarious journey at best.

It has now been 15 days since the Saturn left its birthplace at Huntsville, Ala., on a roundabout journey which required a trip around the Florida Straits.

In times of national peril this is a dangerous trip as evidenced by the nearly $90 million loss of vessels and cargo due to enemy action during World War II.

Even in peacetime the testimony of competent engineers is that the cross-State barge canal would more than pay for itself.

These engineers also say that the canal would avert war losses, should wartime come, to such a degree that the benefit would represent an additional annual economic saving of $3 million over a 25-year recurrence period.

The Saturn rocket represents our main hope of landing a man on the moon in this decade, and its first flight is slated for October or November.

In this race for space a day could be all important; and the Florida canals, if we had them today, could mean the difference in who gets there first.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Structure of Interpersonal Behavior in the Dyad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the talented columnist for the Star-Ledger, of Newark, N.J., and a number of other newspapers across the country, Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt, has recently published a very revealing and interesting column entitled "Between the Lines: Air Force Looking Into Israeli Love Life." The column shows further evidence of the extent to which the Federal Government is trying to intervene into the personal lives of individuals. It also shows what fanciful ideas Federal bureaucrats can dream up for spending Federal largess—particularly at a time when we are running a deficit and are having to spend extra billions for defense purposes.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column by Edith Kermit Roosevelt be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE LOOKING INTO ISRAELI LOVE LIFE

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

The Federal Government is investigating married love in Jerusalem. The Israel Institute of Applied Social Research has quizzed 633 married couples about their sex relations under a $33,100 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Md., and part of a $20,000 4-year annual contract from the behavioral sciences division of the Directorate of Life Sciences of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research.

Preliminary findings are in a 39-page "Little Kinsey Report" to be published in the proceedings of the Stanford Symposium on Small Group Processes, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Heading the sex research project is Dr. Uriel Foa, executive director of the Israel Institute in Jerusalem who authored this report called "The Structure of Interpersonal Behavior in the Dyad."

The word "dyad" means two in social science lingo. And certainly the studies conducted by Dr. Foa, Dr. Louis Guttman, the institute's director, formerly of Milwaukee, and their colleagues appear indeed to have lent the mantle of science to the old "it takes two to tango" theme.

In fact, if any doubt exists in the minds of American taxpayers concerning the truth of that persistent rumor about the birds and the bees these social scientists have settled the question once and for all near where Adam and Eve started it all.

Here are some of their conclusions:

"Sexual satisfaction correlates with social and emotional acceptance of the other." (Translate: It's better if you like your lawful mate.)

"The richness of the vocabulary dealing with interpersonal relations is precisely due to the fact that many different combinations of relations are possible and do occur, in dealing with people." (Translate: Some men will tell a woman anything and vice versa.)

The kiss 'n tell husbands and wives were interviewed separately and simultaneously at their homes by two field workers. The spouses were asked to rate their mates against the ideal lover pictured in three little stories prepared for them by the social scientists.

For example: "Jacob is sure that everything his wife does is important and good and there is no limit to the esteeem and importance that he attributes to her."

Then the couples were asked questions like this one:

"Would your wife say that you resemble the husband in the story."

1. "She would say that I resemble him very much."

2. "She would say that I resemble him quite a bit."

3. "She would say that I resemble him slightly."

4. "She would say that I do not resemble him much."

5. "She would say that I do not resemble him at all."

According to their responses, husbands and wives were then assigned numerical ratings which were charted on 16 tables included in the report.

According to the National Institute of Mental Health, the purpose of these tests of a husband-wife relationship is "to develop a diagnostic pictorial test of both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role relationship of husband and wife."

Dr. Charles Hutchinson, chief of behavioral sciences division of the Directorate of Life Sciences, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, describes the report as "basic research to advance scientific knowledge in some areas that are important for the improvement of Air Force group performance."

Great Waste of Talent Must Be Ended in Public School System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, currently many young Americans are denied full educational opportunities because of the financial plight of their local school systems. In a thoughtful editorial appearing in the August 20, 1961, issue of the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, this unfortunate situation is cogently described.

In view of the significance of the problem, I am pleased to include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GREAT WASTE OF TALENT MUST BE ENDED IN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

The United States no longer can afford the luxury of squandering a large portion of its brain power because of the poverty and inequities of local school systems.

It is not fair to the student with the mental ability to be a physicist that he is educated only to do the work of a farmhand. And it is not fair to the Nation which desperately needs its best minds developed to their fullest.

Ralph McGill, the publisher of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, warned in an article in the Bee that the Russians have evolved an educational system which recognizes ability and makes it a national asset by developing it to the utmost.

McGill believes this is their one great secret weapon.

When Gherman S. Titov floated out of the cosmos after orbiting the earth for 25 hours his success was not due simply to recent discoveries. Nearly 20 years ago his teachers in a tiny village in eastern Siberia spotted him as a peasant's son of superior talent and recommended him for continued study.

To this extent the Russian education system was responsible for his nation's dramatic achievement. The system recognized his genius and did not let it get away.

In America, for all of our boastful talk of efficiency, we have developed schools which are unbelievably wasteful of talent.

A high proportion of the top 10 percent of our high school graduates never go to college. In many cases the reason is simply a lack of money. Sometimes it is the lack of encouragement from an apathetic family. And some parents are in such desperate need of immediate support the child must discontinue school.

There are students who overcome these obstacles but too many are crushed by financial burdens into sacrificing their potential ability to their immediate needs.

In some areas there are schools offering no advance mathematics and secondary schools with no chemistry or physics classes. This is a foolish economy. Each year we lose the full contribution of thousands of our best minds.

McGill is opposed to an American imitation of the Russian education system but he calls for an end to the damaging waste in our present school plan. He said:

"We most assuredly are required, by conscience and the demands of national security, to assume a Federal responsibility for an educational system in which no American boy or girl shall lack opportunity to have all the education he or she is prepared, able and willing to take."

It is difficult to argue with this conclusion.

Those who oppose Federal aid to public education have no alternative to offer which will develop the potential of our youth to its fullest regardless of finances, geography or race.

Strangely those who oppose Federal aid to the public schools seldom show any reluc-

tance to accept Federal aid for roadbuilding or airport construction.

Yet it is difficult to accept the idea that the development of our children is less worthy or less important than the development of our highways.

The choice is not between adopting the Soviet system or leaving our schools unchanged. The answer is to develop our schools fully by our own American methods so every child can fulfill his potential. And the time to do it is now.

Voice of America: How Loud Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the tensions heighten in the East-West conflict, we need to continually reevaluate the effectiveness with which we, as a nation, tell our story to the world.

In the free world-Communist conflict, psychological warfare has become a major field of battle. Its significance is reemphasized by the fact that the Communists are increasing broadcast hours to nations around the globe—as well as increasing other contacts and ties with more and more people.

Recently the Christian Science Monitor published a revealing article on the East-West psychological warfare, entitled "Voice of America: How Loud Is It?" by Courtney Sheldon. Reflecting upon significant facts of the battle for men's minds, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF AMERICA: HOW LOUD IS IT?

(By Courtney Sheldon, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

The cold figures on international shortwave broadcasting show the Voice of America sagging behind Radio Moscow, Radio Peiping, and Radio Cairo.

But, fortunately for Washington, this is less than half the story.

The tabulations refer only to direct broadcasting. They do not take account of the packaged programs the "Voice" successfully places on local medium-wave stations.

Nor do they include the direct "feeds" from the VOA to oversea stations desiring special-event coverage from Washington.

Nor do they include the rebroadcasts of VOA programs.

And there remains the great unknown of what is the relative impact on listeners of the VOA, Radio Moscow, Radio Peiping, and others.

CAIRO MOVES UP

By U.S. estimates, the world total for shortwave broadcasting increased last year by 13 percent to 13,600 hours a week.

Earlier this year Moscow ranked in first place with 997 hours, followed by Peking 687; Cairo 674; the VOA 618, and Great Britain 591.

A spot check in August showed the standings almost the same, except Cairo moved into second place, a spot it occupied until last year. Cairo has stepped up its African broadcasts.

The latest tabulations are Moscow 1,045; Cairo 766; Peking 714; VOA 663, and Great Britain 604.

Using the January figures, the Communist bloc gain was 10 percent over the year before and that of non-Communist broadcasting 14 percent, largely because of new radio broadcasting in newly independent countries.

U.S. officials point out that while these new entrants into shortwave broadcasting are not Communists, many frequently dispute United States positions.

Broken down further, the figures of January show that during the past year in Latin America, Chinese Communist broadcasts rose from 21 to 31 hours weekly.

Soviet broadcasts aimed at Latin America were upped from 49 to 56 hours (the bulk is Spanish and Portuguese) and the total Communist broadcasts to the area rose from 138 to 167 hours.

WHY ENGLISH FIRST?

The Voice of America broadcasted 45½ hours weekly to Latin America (14 in Spanish and 31½ in English) in 1960. To this it plans to add 28 hours weekly in Portuguese by the end of the year and 126 in Spanish, reducing the English.

These would be quite dismal figures, from a competitive standpoint, if they represented the whole VOA output. They do not.

The reason that English did predominate last year in the VOA broadcasts to Latin America required some explaining when VOA officials testified before congressional committees.

The student population, according to VOA research, is one of the largest and it is politically curious—the group which VOA long ago concluded would go out of its way to listen to VOA.

Another reason for English is that there is much evidence that people listen to the VOA in English in order to improve their own English-speaking ability.

And, still further—and this applies to all VOA broadcasting in English—some listeners find what a country says in its own language more believable than when it is translated into another tongue and has more the appearance of deliberate propagandizing.

But, beyond this, Henry Loomis, director of the VOA, told Congress earlier this year, "for many years our major work in radio in Latin America has bene done through local placement, where we have placed material on local radios.

"We place about 3,000 hours a week in Latin America on Latin-American radios. This is predominately in Spanish and Portuguese. We do have some in Indian dialects.

"In addition to that, our shortwave broadcasts (Spanish) are picked up and relayed as such by just over 150 radio stations in Latin America now, in 13 countries. So we are getting double mileage out of them. (The total is currently 235 stations in 15 countries.)

DOUBLE MILEAGE

"We also have feeds, which are a very useful thing. This is our mainstay in Brazil, in the Portuguese language, where three times a week we send down by short wave to two networks, one in Rio and one in São Paulo, special programs of 5- or 10-minute duration, mostly commentaries, roundups of editorials, special news * * * which are again relayed over their whole domestic network."

The U.S. Information Agency is currently asking Congress for funds to triple the placement of VOA packaged radio programs on local medium-wave stations.

The Soviet Union does not have anything comparable to the U.S. placement programs. The United States has been in the field for a long time.

The VOA estimates its nightly audience, outside of Cuba, at about 300,000 to 400,000. Though there is no way of knowing for sure, it is felt that the Cuban audience may well number in the hundreds of thousands.

Six of the new Spanish hours a day will be devoted specifically to Cuba, with Cuban announcers and programs of Cuban interest.

Our Real Enemy to the South—Feudal Lords Are More Dangerous Than Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an interesting article by Gerry Robichaud, published in the May 2 issue of the Harrisburg Patriot:

OUR REAL ENEMY TO THE SOUTH—FEUDAL LORDS ARE MORE DANGEROUS THAN CASTRO

Curiously enough, communism's greatest ally in Latin America is not Fidel Castro but the feudal ruling class that controls the wealth in most Latin-American countries.

These feudal overlords, who make or break presidents as well as lesser political fry, are almost rabid in their hatred and fear of communism.

Yet they, more than anybody else, are largely responsible for whatever inroads the paid agents of Moscow, Peiping, and Havana are able to make in Latin America.

They comprise, at the same time, the most formidable obstacle to the real success of President John F. Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress," or as it is more widely called south of the border the "Kennedy Doctrine."

The typical Latin-American feudal overlord is a man of cultivated tastes of pleasing appearance, well-traveled, and chances are part of his formal education was obtained either in Europe or the United States.

But he pays little or no taxes. He owns vast tracts of land. He is also prominent in his country's industry and commerce. Much of his money is safely stashed away in Swiss or U.S. banks.

From time to time, when he accumulates a bit of extra capital, he may invest it in more land. But when he needs risk capital for some industrial or commercial venture he is likely to try to borrow it from Washington rather than use his own funds.

* * * * *

Because so little of his income goes into taxes, his government's treasury lacks the money to render essential services for the mass of his countrymen. There are no funds available to provide adequate supplies of potable water or sewage systems. The toll of diseases spawned by this lack of elementary sanitation is frightful.

There are no funds available to build all the schools needed to wipe out illiteracy. And no funds to build the roads indispensable to opening up unexploited areas in the interior of the country.

Because he and others like him own most of the accessible and tillable land, millions of peons are landless. Those who work for him on his land are grossly underpaid and often they are forced to live on short rations because they must sell much of the produce of their own kitchen gardens in order to augment their incomes by a few pennies.

There are peons on landed estates in Chile who are paid the equivalent of 16 cents a day and who are able to afford to eat only every other day. Similar examples of human misery can be found in many other Latin-American countries.

Because much of the feudal overlord's money is banked abroad, money in the banks of his native land is not overplentiful. Interest rates on bank loans may run as high as 25 percent, and there is no line of credit for the ordinary worker. The latter usually must resort to loan sharks when he needs money for a burial or a doctor bill, and he may pay as high as 360 percent in interest per year.

Largely because the feudal overlord is untaxed or only slightly taxed, no public moneys are available for ordinary relief measures for the poor and destitute—measures that are taken for granted in the United States.

Unlike many United States and European men of wealth who frequently engage in philanthropic works, the feudal overlord engages in none. About the only place philanthropy can be found in Latin America is in the dictionary.

Opposed to any social or economic changes for the better which would cost him a single penny more than he is now paying, the typical feudal overlord is the biggest breeder of the conditions on which the twin evils of communism and Castroism thrive.

Poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, landlessness, and lack of adequate shelter make the Latin-American peon or common laborer fair prey for the Communists and Castroites.

But to give the typical feudal overlord his due, he is not unwilling to have his country moderately improved, socially and economically—provided the U.S. taxpayer foots the bill.

In some Latin-American countries there is no income tax whatsoever, and in the others the tax is relatively small and usually quite easy to evade.

While exact figures are difficult to ascertain, some economic experts have estimated that Latin-American tax dodgers manage to evade about $2 billion in taxes every year—or four times the cost of the first year's operation of Mr. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress.

Thus it could be argued that in many countries there would be little need for the Kennedy program if all the taxes were collected, especially from the feudal overlords. And if they were taxed on the U.S. scale, there would be no need at all for the Kennedy program.

In underlining tax reform and land reform as conditions for U.S. aid to Latin-American countries, Mr. Kennedy has alarmed and alienated the feudal overlords. They are silent only becaues they are waiting to see if he means it.

If and when they are convinced that he does mean it, they will not boldly do anything to deprive their respective countries of whatever aid might be coming to them. Instead, their strategy will be to get behind some token tax and land reform measures in an effort to fool Uncle Sam—and the funny part about it is that it's likely to work.

Writer Frank X. Tolbert Turns Skill to Padre Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, more and more, the people of the United States are turning their attention to the potential of Padre Island for preservation as a National Seashore Recreation Area.

Mr. Frank X. Tolbert, famed author of "An Informal History of Texas" and of "The Day of San Jacinto," other books, and a daily column in the Dallas News, wrote an article on Padre Island that was published in the Dallas Morning News on August 6.

In the article, Mr. Tolbert discusses in his extraordinarily effective style the area that would become preserved for all Americans if my bill, S. 4, is passed. S. 4 bill would establish an 88.5-mile long National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island, the Nation's last great undeveloped seashore.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article entitled "The Poop on Padre Island" by an outstanding writer, Mr. Tolbert, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLBERT: THE POOP ON PADRE ISLAND

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

SOUTH PADRE ISLAND, TEX.—Padre Island, one of America's last wildernesses, is about 110 miles long and seldom much more than a mile wide. Padre is well planted with resort installations at both its ends. So the real wilderness part of it—great, lonely sand dunes and magnificent, broad, white beaches—is actually about 85 miles of the island's midriff.

Get out your map and take a look at the Gulf of Mexico between the ports of Corpus Christi and Brownsville. There Padre lies, in the shape of a Japanese ceremonial sword, with the green, shallow waters of Laguna Madre, separating it from the mainlands of Cameron, Willacy, Kenedy, Kleberg, and Nueces Counties.

My favorite acreage on Padre—and I've been all over it in 4-wheel-drive trucks—is the southern end. And you will love these southern reaches if you are capable of loving a nearly tropical island (average temperature all the year around is 70) whose waters contain 272 varieties of salt water fish, including my table favorite, pompano.

My editorial expressions of admiration for South Padre Beach have prompted thousands of readers to seek information about the island, and I will be a long time answering all of the letters. So the boss said: "Get us off the hook here by writing a fairly comprehensive piece on South Padre's facilities for visitors."

South Padre is connected with the mainland only by the Queen Isabella Causeway from Port Isabel. And Port Isabel, a clean little town dominated by a gleaming white lighthouse, isn't a bad place to make your headquarters, especially if you're going to put the emphasis on fishing while you're down there. There are numerous motels and hotels with private docks, including one of the State's most handsome hotels, Queen Isabel Inn.

The queen who financed C. Columbus comes in for a lot of mention down here. But I don't think the old girl would like the playing card portrait of her near the tollgate of the Queen Isabella Causeway. This looks like an illustration of the ill-tempered queen in "Alice in Wonderland."

At the causeway you'll pay $1 a car toll, with no charge to return. If you plan to make at least 10 trips over the causeway you can get a bargain book of tickets, and some of the hotels and motels will provide you with these tickets.

On the extreme southern tip of the island are Isla Blanca Park, operated by Cameron County, and the jetties which guard the entrance to the port of Brownsville and port Isabel ship channel. Isla Blanca offers overnight shelters, near the beach, which rents for $5 a night. These are equipped with water taps and a cold shower, a two-burner hot plate, and two double bunk beds with mattress pads. There is a limit of six persons to each overnight shelter, but you'd better fetch along a couple of cots if you're a family of six.

There are also trailer installations in Isla Blanca. And some folks keep trailers there all the year around and have built screen porches for them. The charge for a trailer is $1.50 a day. There is a public bathhouse on the beach, and a communal complex of restrooms, hot showers, and laundries which will accommodate 500 persons.

Beach cabanas, for daytime use only, can be had for $3 a day.

Isla Blanca also has an excellent resturant, the Jetties, which is especially recommended for breakfast.

There's no charge for fishing off the jetties.

North of Isla Blanca Park, hotels and motels begin. Most of the hotels and motels are right on the beach.

And here, South Padre is beginning to take on some of the looks, although none of the other aspects, of the Las Vegas "strip." The Sea Island and the Sandy Retreat are the biggest and most elaborate hotels on the island, but there are many excellent small motels. My own personal favorite happens to be the El Padre Hotel, one of the first on the isle. One of the most handsome new hotels is the Miramar. Some of the others include, the Beachcomber, the Surf, the Dunes, the Sea Grape. Rates are about like highway motels on the mainland. For examples, at the Sandy Retreat you can get a deluxe bedroom with two double beds for two persons at $11 a day. Add $1.50 each for extra persons in the room. And this rate will drop to $9 after Sept. 15. At El Padre about the same kind of accomodations will start at $10. Many of the rooms have kitchen facilities for about $3 a day extra. You write for reservations through the Port Isabel post office.

South Padre's marvelous all-year-around climate and the vast fish population of its clear, green waters are partly attributed to something called Sigsbee's Deep. This is about 100 miles wide and 300 miles long, and is 12,000 feet deep. Sigsbee's Deep lies about 75 miles southeast of Padre Island. "There can be little doubt that the proximity of this enormous body of deep blue water is a direct factor in creating the mild climatic conditions and bountiful marine life of the South Padre area," said one scientific article on the island.

Padre lies in the general latitude of the keys of Florida. The prevailing onshore winds keep the island from being humid. You don't need air conditioning if you build on the beach. And the first 5 miles of South Padre's shore now has many beach houses. Many of these are used all the year around. A recent study shows that South Padre has higher temperatures and more sunny days during the winter months than Daytona Beach, Fla.

Wealthy Mexican families are building beach houses on South Padre. One of the first to build right on the beach was Roberto Sada, Sr., of Moterrey, Mexico, one of the proprietors of Mexico's biggest brewery.

The broad beaches of South Padre are as good for beachcombing as any of the hemisphere. Much debris from Central and South America, such as mahogany logs, rafts, coconuts, and mats, are flung up on the Padre beaches by tricky currents, one of them called the Devil's Elbow.

The pavement now ends 5 miles from the southern tip and it is possible, when beach conditions are right, to drive 33 miles up the beach to the Mansfield Cut. Get a lot of advice from the natives before you risk your car on those tricky beaches, though.

On trips in four-wheel-drive vehicles up the beach I've often "rescued" as many as six cars a day from real trouble in the deep sands inboard or from the spongy wet sands under the fringe of the surf. Once I came on a troop of Eagle Scouts with three cars completely stalled in sand.

You can rent or charter just about any type of fishing craft on South Padre. You can go bay fishing on big boats for as little as $3, although $5 is the usual tariff. The big boats also go out for gulf trolling and to the snapper banks.

Who Controls U.S. Export Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 7, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express extreme gratification that the House Committee on Rules, following a hearing on August 23, 1961, reported favorably House Resolution 403, to create a select committee to conduct an investigation of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949 and related acts.

Having joined with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] in support of this resolution, I think it important that Members of the House be informed as to what this measure seeks to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, in testifying before the Rules Committee, I stated that my preference was legislation to completely cut off all shipments into all Communist countries, including Yugoslavia, Poland, and Cuba. I have introduced H.R. 8547 to accomplish that purpose. However, as a prelude to the passage of my own bill, I am strongly supporting House Resolution 403, because I am at a loss to understand why the administration is allowing the export from the United States of materials that seem to me to be of great strategic military value to the Sino-Soviet bloc and I believe that it is essential that Congress find out more with regard to our policy of issuing export licenses.

As I stated to the Rules Committee, a group of House Members were recently led to believe, by the Secretary of Commerce, that the policy is that we will allow shipment of any materials which the Soviet Union can acquire elsewhere in the world. For example, the Defense Department raised objections to the export of a machine to bore V–8 engine blocks. This machine would have greatly increased the Soviets' capacity to produce automotive engines for trucks so vital to military transportation. Nine days after the Defense Department action, however, it reversed itself and a permit was issued on the basis that similar equipment could be obtained in another country.

In connection with export permits, I have taken strong exception to the policy of the Department of Commerce of not making public the names of exporters. I have been told that the reason these names are not being furnished is that the business firms do not want their names given out. To me, it is obvious that the reason these firms do not want their names publicized is because they are embarrassed to have it known that they are selling materials that are of obvious military significance to the Communists. Ball bearings, synthetic rubber, railroad equipment and all kinds of items that are said to be of nonmilitary value are being shipped behind the Iron Curtain in increasing quantities. The dollar value of U.S. goods licensed for shipment to the Soviet bloc increased 800 percent in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's frank address to the Nation on the Berlin crisis, as compared to the preceding 3 weeks.

In June, the Department of Commerce lifted the ban and announced that its subsidized farm commodities would be sold to the Soviet Union and its satellites. Some of us were told by the Secretary of Commerce that no food was being shipped, following which his attention was called to the fact that he was in error. A recent article in the newspapers referred to a reduction in food shipments, so it causes some of us to wonder if the Secretary knows actually what is going on.

I am now seeking information as to the licenses issued for technical data which is being sent to Communist countries almost daily. I feel that it is important that the Congress know what is going on. I think this should have some bearing on our foreign aid program. For example, we helped Poland build a new steel plant. I asked the Secretary of State recently as to whether or not the Soviet Union would get some of the product of this steel mill and he admitted that it would. He went on to say that he had picketed shipments of scrap iron going to Japan before World War II. I wonder why he now favors sending scrap iron to the Communists?

Mr. Khrushchev has said that he is going to bury us. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are in the process of helping him do just that. I think that someone at a lower echelon is making policy and that the President and the members of the Cabinet are so busy that they themselves do not know what is going on. I think there should be an immediate curtailment of shipments to the Soviet bloc, until a policy in line with the national interest can be worked out with the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, Poland is making a loan to Cuba and among other things, the proceeds will be used to build a shipyard and battery repair facilities. Obviously, this is designed to provide a base for Russian submarines, yet the administration goes on the naive basis that by helping Poland we are buying the good will of the Polish people. Actually, it seems to me we are assisting the Communist leadership of Poland to hold these people under the lash of Godless communism. As I said earlier, I personally believe that we should cut off all trade with all Communist countries, but in the interval and until Congress meets in 1962, I would hope that a select committee, as provided for in House Resolution 403, would look into these things and as a result of their investigations and study let the Congress and the American people know what is going on.

International Institute of Science and Technology in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I had the honor to submit to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris last fall a proposal for an International Institute of Science and Technology in Western Europe—an "MIT of Western Europe" to help assure the continuing scientific preeminence of the NATO community.

Supported by the Parliamentarians Conference, and subsequently considered by the NATO Council, the proposal is now being studied in detail by a NATO committee under the chairmanship of James R. Killian, president of MIT.

In view of the serious study being given to the possible establishment of an International Institute of Science and Technology I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of last fall's recommendation.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO SCIENCE PROGRAM: FORWARD PLANNING

(Report by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, United States of America, Chairman to the Scientific and Technical Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, sixth annual conference, NATO Headquarters, Paris, November 21 to 26, 1960)

The Atlantic world is the birthplace of modern science, and most of the great advances in the forward march of science have occurred in the Atlantic world, either in Europe or North America.

It is the scientific leadership of our Atlantic community which has enabled it to achieve the world's highest standard of living. It is the same leadership which has enabled us to build the armaments needed to deter those who would destroy our way of life.

A continued flourishing of science and technology in our community is needed to maintain our dynamic economic growth. It is needed equally if we are successfully to withstand the across-the-board Soviet challenge to our community, a challenge which may persist for 25 or 50 years in the future.

And today, we find yet another reason why we must not surrender the scientific preeminence of our community. One-third of the world—populated by the billion people who live in the underdeveloped nations—is now in ferment and turmoil. These peoples are bent upon reaping the harvest of scientific advance, in the form of industrial progress, greater agricultural productivity, lower mortality rates, and longer and richer lives. They are not content with the timetables of gradualism. They urgently need scientific and technical help, and they

need it now. If they cannot secure it from our community, they will turn for assistance to Moscow or Peiping.

A full year before the first sputnik, this Conference warned the members states of NATO that our continued scientific supremacy was not preordained. It established a Science and Technical Committee charged with the task of seeking ways and means to invigorate the study and practice of science within our Community.

Subsequent reports of the Science and Technical Committee, all of which were unanimously adopted by the Parliamentarians Conference, made detailed and wide-ranging recommendations for improving the state of science within the Atlantic Community, both through national programs and through cooperative international action. During this period, the member states of NATO have with few exceptions undertaken vigorous programs to accelerate the training and education of scientists and engineers and to put scientific and technical talent to better use.

Initiatives taken by this Conference, upon the recommendation of its Science and Technical Committee, have been directly responsible for NATO-wide efforts to reinforce and supplement national scientific programs.

Specifically, this Conference took the lead in establishing the NATO Science Fellowship program, the NATO Advanced Study Institute program, and a NATO Research program.

The NATO Science Adviser and the NATO Science Advisory Committee are now assisting the NATO Council in developing Communitywide programs for the improvement of science.

In short, the NATO Science program is now a going concern. It works; it is producing resutls; it is engaged in imaginative forward planning across a broad front.

Late last year the NATO Science Advisory Committee suggested that outstanding scientists from our Community undertake a study in depth of the ways whereby science in the Western World could be strengthened. The members of this study group, which was headed by Monsieur Louis Armand, worked at this task long and hard and well. A few weeks ago their findings and recommendations were incorporated in a report entitled "Increasing the Effectiveness of Western Science." This report makes numerous eminently practical and desirable suggestions for invigorating science within the Western World. It merits the careful study of every member of this Conference.

One suggestion in the study deserves particularly close attention. This concerns the possibility of establishing in Western Europe an International Institute of Science and Technology.

In the New World, educational institutes like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the California Institute of Technology have played a central role in promoting scientific and technical development. They bridge the crucial gap between pure science and applied technology. They bring large aggregations of scholarly talent to bear upon cross-disciplinary problems. They do outstanding work in training graduate students.

Western Europe now has no comparable institutions. Nor is it clear whether any one European country, acting by itself, could mobilize the financial and manpower resources needed to establish institutions of equal scope and vigor.

The study points out, however, that the Western European nations, acting in concert, could easily assemble the skills and facilities required to establish and operate a Western European equivalent of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Such an International Institute might grant its own degrees and concentrate on graduate work. It would, of course, in no sense, be a substitute for existing national universities. It would supplement, and not replace, their activities.

There is every reason to think that such an international institute would do as much for science and technology in Western Europe as MIT and its sister institutes have done for North America. The prospective dividends of money invested in such an institute appear great. What is needed at this time is a thorough and detailed study of the practical problems involved in establishing such an institute, together with practical suggestions for solving them.

How would such an institute be financed, both in terms of capital and operating costs?

Where might it be located?

What would be its initial areas of concentration?

How would its first faculty members be chosen?

What would be the yardsticks in selecting students?

What kind of basic laboratory facilities would be needed?

How would the institute relate itself to universities and industrial research centers?

We therefore recommend that the NATO Council speed studies leading toward the earliest practical establishment of an International Institute of Science and Technology in Western Europe.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 22, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of a well-reasoned editorial broadcasted on Wednesday, August 16, by one of the Taft Broadcasting Co. stations, WKRC, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

As the debate over President Kennedy's foreign aid program waxes even hotter, we continue to hope for a congressional slowdown on the frenzied rate of New Frontier spending. The crux of the battle is whether to give the White House a "no strings attached" loan authority for 5 years.

We agree with President Kennedy's highly articulate plea: that we should be remembered for having been willing to pay enough in time for freedom; rather than too little, too late. It's a great phrase; but our argument continues to be with the dsimal failure of our foreign aid programs for a generation, and with the methods that brought on that failure.

Around the world, corrupt and Communist regimes are living off the fat of American billions that have been poured down the bottomless drain of idealism.

Let's have foreign aid by all means; but let us be sure it is administered in such a way as to eliminate or reduce the tragic failures of the past. Even Andrew Carnegie, who gave away a third of a billion dollars of his own for good works, warned against indiscriminate giving. "Financial assistance," said Carnegie in effect, "does more harm than good unless it is used with the full cooperation of the recipient." Our foreign aid is worse than worthless unless it takes the form of specific projects in foreign lands wherein our foreign friends can develop their own resources and their own skills to help themselves.

A drastic change in the past application and use of our foreign aid funds and a congressional curb on their indiscriminate use is an absolute essential to any such staggering appropriation. Without such guarantees, this continual heavy drain on our resources merely hastens the day envisioned by Lenin, when, without the sacrifice of a single Red soldier, we will drop in the Soviet laps like an overripe fruit.

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the subject of Federal aid to States, cities and individuals is not new. It has been debated with some heat and with some light in this Chamber on numerous occasions. Mr. E. A. Jaksha, of Fremont, Nebr., has sent to me a copy of a page from the July 27 bulletin of the Nebraska Poultry Improvement Association which treats the subject of Federal aid in a manner new to me. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Wolf Story," with its important moral, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOLF STORY

Some years ago while in Alaska, we were told a wolf story. Lately, a similar story has appeared in print. These stories add up to the way Eskimos deal with wolf packs. Eskimos embed razor-sharp knives clasp down in the ice and apply a little seal blood. The wolves are attracted by the blood, and lick the knives, cutting their tongues. They are delighted by the seemingly inexhaustible supply of nourishing blood they can lick off the knives, and stand there licking until they drop in their tracks from loss of blood and freeze to death in the snow.

This is a clever trick, but we are in no position to jeer at the stupidity of the wolves. We Americans have been falling for a similar trick for a good many years now, and this year it may be played on us again. The variation in our case is this. In Washington and in our State capitols are a great many politicians. Many of them are poor men, a few well to do, but none of these propose to give the public any of his personal estate.

Instead they propose to give us Federal support. They will empty the Federal Treasury at our feet. Now, we should know that there is nothing in the Federal Treasury but what we have sent there by way of the tax collector. These taxes are our blood, and we cannot be nourished by it any more than those wolves can thrive on their own blood. But we have bought this kind of government. Today the Kentucky farmer is taxed to subsidize the electric bills of a plumber in Tennessee. The Tennessee plumber is taxed to subsidize the Kentucky farmer. We are all being taxed to subsidize each other. We are trying through the Federal process to nourish ourselves with our own blood.

Patronage: Ever Powerful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, of Columbia, S.C., which is edited very capably by Mr. Henry Cauthen, has printed in its August 21, 1961, issue an editorial which rings with more words of truth than just about any editorial I have ever read. It is entitled "Patronage: Ever Powerful." I think this editorial is particularly appropriate at this time when so many Members of Congress are having so much difficulty in getting patronage from the White House.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this excellent editorial printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRONAGE: EVER POWERFUL

One cannot make inquiries about Washington as to the why of this or that without obtaining, among others, the explanation—patronage. The only element new about it is that it gains in force, rather than diminishes.

There are men in the Senate and in the House with backgrounds and, we believe, still-alive personal philosophies which differ diametrically with their congressional actions.

The question, "Why?" may by now, under our political pollution, be naive and scarcely worth the asking. But with us it persist. Even the practical politics explanations do not make us completely understand what happens to some men when they go to Congress. Others were that way before they went.

As a political machine builder, patronage, patently, has no superior. The spoils system is an old one indeed and has managed to survive assaults through the ages. No party is free from it, but there are varying degrees of the practice of it.

There can be no question but that the patronage weapon is being used with maximum force by the current administration. Even on the members of the Democratic Party in Congress its seductive power is strongly felt. Nominations by Senators and others for Federal offices over the country, nominations by stalwart and loyal Democrats, are being held up pending shows of conformity on legislation now before the Congress. Some of these nominations are for important offices in the State of South Carolina.

Patronage, with its bearing on reelection, can be a great equalizer. It can rob men of their convictions. It can result in unwise decisions for their country and can, admittedly, influence the right decisions. It can make men talk out of one side of their mouths at home, and out of the other in Washington.

A new force of some weight has come in to combat patronage. It is the increasing interest of the citizens of the country in an expanding and expensive Government which is increasingly affecting their lives. This has produced stronger and more frequent pressure on the Members from constituents at home. There are times now when the patronage lure must be abandoned in favor of that other reelection influence—the expressed and communicated opinions from the voters themselves.

There is something of an organization of citizens now. From time to time they combine their efforts in making representations to their Members of Congress. In recent years this has had notable effect. Some Members of Congress have even been compelled, under the impact of voter demands, to go back on political associations to which they had been strongly obligated.

But to say that patronage has lost some battles to voter pressure is not to say it has lost the war. It remains perhaps the No. 1 influence in some basic decisionmaking in the Congress.

Need for Counseling With Great Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is always useful to attract to public life, even as informal advisers, those whose service to the country over the years had won them an affectionate place in the hearts and minds of the public. This is the theme of an article written for the Paterson Evening News by former Congressman Gordon Canfield, of New Jersey's Eighth District. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR COUNSELING WITH GREAT LEADERS

(By Gordon Canfield, Member of Congress, 1941–61)

President Kennedy's recent White House talks with former President Eisenhower and America's elder citizen-statesman, Bernard Baruch, has been most wholesome and certainly reassuring to freedom loving people everywhere.

In this time of great peril our second youngest President does well to call for the counsel of these great leaders who posses the priceless asset of long experience for which there is no substitute.

Daily we hear and read that this is the age of youth and adventure. So it was during the days of the Founding Fathers. And how much it meant that in the great Constitutional Convention the youthful Hamilton and the seasoned Franklin could work together and help each other. It is such a blending that down through the years has served to make America truly freedom's beacon light.

RESPECT FOR GRAY HAIRS

My father was never able to go to college but he had some unforgettable experiences that made him a wise teacher. One of the lessons he taught me was to respect gray hairs and learn from the lives and lips of men who had learned the lessons of life the hard way. It was because of this that during my congressional incumbency when faced with difficult problems I was wont to seek the advice and help of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Baruch. They never failed me. Their response was immediate and helpful.

During the current week my good friend, Carlos P. Romulo, who was a delegate from the Philippines to the Congress when I was first representing the Eighth District in 1941, publicly stated no living American better understood Asia than General MacArthur. This famed world statesman suggested that MacArthur could well promote the cause of freedom in our national councils in this hour and I agree.

And I have not given up my "project" which would see former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower joining President Kennedy in such councils in the near future. What a story for all peoples, both this side and the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Wisconsin's Outdoor Laboratories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 25, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation of natural outdoor areas is vital to human progress, to maintenance of a significant feature of America's landscape and to providing "outdoor laboratories" for exploratory, scientific, recreational and other ventures into "heartlands of nature."

With mushrooming cities, expansion of our road system, and other fast-spreading encroachments upon out-of-door areas to meet the needs of a fast expanding population, there is a special need to preserve significant vestiges of our natural heritage.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal published an article about such virgin areas in Wisconsin by Jay Scriba, entitled "Wisconsin's Outdoor Laboratories." Reflecting the significance of these to Wisconsin—as well as encouraging a greater consciousness nationwide of the need for preserving outdoor areas, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN'S OUTDOOR LABORATORIES—PRESERVATION OF OUR SCIENTIFIC AREAS IS VITAL TO HUMAN WELFARE—THEY INCLUDE VIRGIN LANDSCAPE IN WHICH RATTLESNAKES ARE AS WELCOME AS SONGBIRDS

(By Jay Scriba)

It's easy to see why the Ridges sanctuary in Door County is 1 of Wisconsin's 32 officially designated scientific areas. Here, on 700 acres of dune forest and bog meadow, is perhaps the greatest concentration of rare flowers and plants in the Middle West, a natural herbarium containing everything from skunkcabbage and cactus to delicate wild orchids and insectivorous sundews.

Few would question the State's decision to preserve the towering hemlocks in the Flambeau River Forest or the great white pines in Lincoln County's council grounds. The shaded chasm of Parfrey's Glen, near Devil's Lake, speaks eloquently of its worth. So does the Cedar Grove game refuge, one of three areas in the United States where hawks congregate during the spring and fall migrations.

Other obviously worthy bequests to posterity include 30 acres of virgin forest in Door County's Peninsula Park, 20 acres of big white pine in Jackson County's Castle Mound Park and, in La Crosse County, 3 acres of rare prairie pasque flowers tucked between two railroad tracks. There are, however many special area holdings that make taxpayers wonder, at least at first glance.

Why, for example, has the State set aside 60 acres of virgin wet prairie in Jefferson County and 30 acres of weedy limestone bluff in Trempealeau County? Why are we saving 5 acres of dry lime prairie in Grant County, and 25 acres of not very scenic flood plain forest in Iowa County's Tower Hill bottoms? What is to be done with 208 acres of smelly, tangled Cedarburg bog in Ozaukee County?

The hoarding of such scattered and often nondescript parcels becomes all the more puzzling when one learns that most of them will never be improved as parks or even maintained. Most lack roads, parking areas, picnic tables and signs. Some are fenced and posted. When a storm topples a tree, the trunk is left to rot. When an insect blight strikes, there is no spraying. Poison ivy and rattlesnakes are as welcome as songbirds and arbutus.

Furthermore, an official, permanent, five-man board, the State board for the preservation of scientific areas, stands guard to make sure there will be absolute and perpetual preservation of these pieces of virgin (or relatively undisturbed) forest, prairie and bog.

Why save them? For several reasons. With increasing population and the near disappearance of virgin land, such bits of the original Wisconsin landscape are worth saving for their own sake. Like fossil beds and historic ruins, they have a museum value, enhanced because they are living history. They also are essential in nature education. They are often the last sanctuaries for plants and animals facing extinction. They are frequently beautiful and always interesting.

Their most important use, however—the main reason why the State has stepped in to save them—is that they are invaluable, irreplaceable outdoor laboratories.

Virgin land—land that has never been logged, grazed, plowed or trampled by picnickers—may look very much like other land. To a scientist, however, it is as different as a rich soup from dishwater.

A virgin forest is the product of millions of years of evolutionary trial and error. Infinite and endless mutual adjustments have worked to blend its trees, plants, animals, insects and microorganisms into a community integrated with the earth. A virgin prairie contains many more kinds of plants and animals than a cow pasture. A virgin cattail marsh holds a variety and quality of life quite different from a suburban bog that has been sprayed with DDT.

WHAT MAKES THE PRAIRIE RICH?

To a scientist, this picture of myriad natural diversity and complex interaction presents endless questions—many vital to human welfare. And this is why Wisconsin is trying to preserve scientific areas in a representative mosaic of its presettlement landscape.

"That prairie land is rich is known to every child," writes Dr. Hugh Iltis, assistant professor of botany and curator of the herbarium at the University of Wisconsin. "Why the prairie is rich is a question seldom asked—and how to keep it rich is a question that has never been answered.

"What do we really know about our Wisconsin land and soil, our plants and the animals that feed on them, and the myriads of delicate ecological relationships between all these organisms? We know very little, despite the fact that we know more about the natural history of Wisconsin than that of most any other State.

"Natural history is in many ways in its infancy. We may know about how many species of plants grow in Wisconsin, but do we know where and why? And if we think of insects, fungi, bacteria and other small organisms, in many instances we do not even know their names, far less their potential uses, or importance in the schemes of the living world.

"There are countless questions that can be asked. For example, what effect do all these organisms have on soil formation or the growth of trees? What are the factors that produce the types of soil found in Wisconsin? What effect does selective cutting have on the heredity of tree species? Why are species such as chestnut, elm and oak so vulnerable to disease, especially now that most of their habitat has been disturbed by man?

"Can anyone evaluate the potential of the legume lespedeza leptostachya? No one can, for this plant disappeared in the 1880's with the plowing of the prairies. Yet it might have had great value. Prairie fungi gave us aureomycin, streptomycin and strains of penicillium. Who knows but that lespedeza leptostachya might have helped to produce better legumes or proved useful in studies of nitrogen fixing bacteria.

"To get answers to basic questions we must do basic research. To carry out basic research we must have natural or scientific areas."

FEW ACRES PROVIDE MANY ANSWERS

Scientists studying scientific areas have already produced many important answers. It has been discovered that good tobacco crops depend on the preconditioning of the soil by ragweed, that the destruction of micro-flora in the soil is probably the cause of interior trees on land that originally grew giants.

The late Aldo Leopold, University of Wisconsin ecologist, pointed out that it required "only a few wild acres" for J. E. Weaver to discover why native prairie plants are more drought resistant than the wheat, corn, and oats which supplanted them. Weaver found that the prairie plants practice teamwork underground by distributing their root systems to cover all levels, whereas farmer's crops overdraw water on one level and neglect another.

"And it required only a few wild acres," Leopold wrote, "for Togrediak to discover why pines on old fields never achieve the size and wind firmness of pines on uncleared forest soils. In the latter case, the roots follow old root channels, and thus strike deeper."

Wisconsin's acquisition of scientific areas began in the 1940's, with Leopold as prime mover. He and some friends persuaded the conservation commission to put up $5,000 by which the State acquired Parfrey's glen and Cedarburg bog. The group became a State board in 1951, making Wisconsin the only State besides Virginia with a program for preserving such areas.

Most of the present areas are transfers from other State lands, but the board hopes to acquire many more, through gift and purchase.

"We need 300 more areas by 1980," says Albert Fuller, Milwaukee museum botanist and commission chairman. "If we don't have them by then it will be too late."

ALWAYS IN DANGER OF ENCROACHMENT

Groups working nationally to save scientific or natural areas are the Audubon Society, the American Forestry Society and the Nature Conservancy. The Nature Conservancy, which devotes all its efforts to this, recently loaned its Wisconsin chapter $9,000 to buy Abraham's woods in Green County, 40 acres of climax growth maple and basswood. All groups cooperate with the State commission and guarantee undisturbed preservation of areas they acquire.

"This is important," says Fuller, "as scientific areas are always in danger of encroachment. Wychwood Forest, near Lake Geneva, was once held by the University of Chicago as a sanctuary. Now it's the site of a housing development. Ripon's south woods, originally a preserve, has become a park. It is an endless fight even to keep what we have, and it is too bad that more people don't take an interest in it."

Great Britain's Nature Conservancy, a big powerful organization created by Parliament to preserve and study wild lands, voiced a similar opinion in its 10th annual report in 1959:

"Nature conservation must not be treated as the private hobby of a minority of enthusiasts, but must become a soundly based and generally accepted element in national policy and practical trusteeship toward the land.

"Our land and all that lives on it is the Nation's basic resource. No part of the inheritance which we must pass on to our children is more vital to their health and happiness. None is in more danger of being passed on to them badly damaged. Only the fullest understanding of its nature and needs can enable us all to look after it wisely for the future. That is what conservation means."

And that, too, is why Wisconsin is collecting such odd bits of landscape as sedge meadows, pine barrens, peat bogs, sand dunes, oak openings and chasms patched with lichen.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Teachers for the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 22 and 23 the House Subcommittee on Special Education held hearings to consider legislation on aid to the handicapped. Among the bills considered was H.R. 7376, a bill to establish a special training program for teachers of the deaf. This important legislation would make available to deaf children specially trained teachers, and in addition would provide individuals suffering from speech and hearing impairments with specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists to help them overcome their handicap and live a richer, fuller life. I have always been deeply concerned with the problems of the deaf, and H.R. 7376 would make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to help them overcome their handicaps.

I have a very personal interest in this bill. The Maryland State School for the Deaf is located in my hometown of Frederick, Md. All of my life I have known members of the faculty and the students of the school. My father has been a member of the board of visitors for nearly 40 years. I have been familiar, therefore, with the problems of education of the deaf and with the potential for human progress that such training promises mankind. Many students of the Maryland School for the Deaf have remained in Frederick after graduation, and through the years they have been constructive citizens of the community.

I believe that H.R. 7376 is but a modest beginning to meet our country's increased demand to provide for the proper training of deaf children.

It is impossible to estimate the exact number of persons who require specially trained teachers in order to learn the art of simple communication. There are presently, however, over 26,500 students enrolled in classes for deaf persons, all of whom became deaf before they acquired language. A qualified teacher can enable these children to obtain various skills of communication due to the inherent ability of all children to learn. The amount of success obtained in teaching speech skills to these children is primarily dependent on the professional ability and training of the child's teacher. In 1954, the U.S. Office of Education reported that teachers of the deaf ranked first in "difficulty of securing" and there is no indication that this need has lessened.

A recent survey report by the Council of Education of the Deaf revealed the following:

School year	Teachers needed	Teachers in training graduated in the previous year	Shortage	Number of training centers	Number of training centers reporting no students
1958–59...	[1] 516	138	378	25	0
1959–60...	[1] 511	127	384	25	4
1960–61...	[1] 549	177	372	25	4
1961–62...	[2] 653	199	[2] 454	30	5

[1] Responses from 233 of the 380 schools and classes for the deaf in the United States.
[2] Responses from 269 of the 400 schools and classes for the deaf in the United States.

The following additional information was furnished also:

First. Although there are 199 teachers-in-training in all 30 of the training centers this year, those responding to the questionnaire indicated that they have been able to secure 290 trained teachers for next year. This would indicate that 91 trained teachers who have not been teaching this school year have been brought back to active status. Even at that there remains a shortage of 363 teachers for the school year beginning September 1961.

Second. Two hundred and eight schools and classes indicate that they expect to expand their programs during the next 5 years to accommodate more children; 46 indicated that they do not expect to expand and 15 were uncertain.

Third. Of the 208 schools and classes who indicated that they do expect to expand their program, they report that they will need 606½ additional teachers over and above their present teaching staff to take care of the expansion.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has estimated that 27,300 competent professional teachers are needed; 20,000 of these are needed to train children. To train our schoolchildren alone we need to provide 1,500 speech pathologists and audiologists each year for 10 years, and presently we are training less than 400 per year. These numbers include teachers of the deaf only and do not include personnel needed for research nor personnel needed to train the teacher.

This serious shortage of qualified teachers is due in part to a lack of adequate State programs. It seems at this time that a program of Federal assistance is vitally needed in order to provide deaf children with the opportunity to overcome their handicap.

H.R. 7376 provides for an annual payment of $1.5 million for 2 years and such other sums as may be required for an additional 8 years for educational costs and scholarships for teachers of the deaf in nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

The bill also establishes a 10-year program for educational costs and scholarships for speech pathologists and audiologists at institutions of higher education that provide the comprehensive training needed to train teachers for deaf children.

The bill is supported by the National Council on the Education of the Deaf. The council is made up of three organizations directly concerned with education of the deaf: The Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, the Conference on Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc.

In the neighborhood of the National Capital we have reason to be constantly aware of the great work being done in the education of the deaf. As I have said, the Maryland School for the Deaf is in nearby Frederick, Md. Gallaudet College is located in the District of Columbia. Both are adding many useful new citizens to our communities each year. In my long personal acquaintance with the Maryland School for the Deaf and with its superintendent, Mr. Lloyd A. Ambrosen, I have been consistently impressed with the fine record of accomplishment at this school. Such records of public service could be multiplied and improved throughout the country by passage of H.R. 7376 and I sincerely hope that the House will have an opportunity to approve this vital legislation.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Berlin—Why Wait for Mr. K.?" published in the July 14, 1961, issue of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN—WHY WAIT FOR MR. K.?—THE WEST CAN HAVE A GREAT ISSUE IN EASTERN EUROPE, BUT ONLY IF WE WILL WAGE REAL POLITICAL WARFARE

This is a summer of foreboding in the West. Not since 1939 has that grisly prewar feeling run so strong. There is even a fatalistic readiness—among three Americans in five, according to Reporter Samuel Lubell—to use nuclear weapons if need be. And all because Khrushchev has set another deadline (December 31) for a showdown on the free city of Berlin.

President Kennedy could ameliorate this grim atmosphere by a positive line of action. It would, in our opinion, greatly reduce the

chances of war over Berlin; or if worst comes to worst, it would put us in a better position to win such a war. Instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline, Kennedy should set an earlier one of his own. Since Khrushchev has seen fit to raise the Berlin question, why should not Kennedy insist on the right of East Germans to self-determination in free elections, as promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955? And on the similar rights of Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Bulgarians, not to mention the Baltic peoples?—rights spelled out in treaties that have been systematically violated by Russia since the war. Kennedy recently gave verbal support to the East German rights and they are doubtless mentioned in the Allied replies to Khrushchev this week. What we suggest is that Kennedy now make a cause of self-determination for all Eastern Europe and back it with certain actions that could make Khrushchev sorry he ever opened the subject of Berlin.

Militarily, Berlin is an exposed and highly vulnerable Western salient surrounded by 400,000 Russian troops. Politically, however, it is a Western asset and a Communist liability. It symbolizes the chief weakness of Soviet power, which is the unquenched desire for freedom of 100 million captive Europeans. They have demonstrated this desire by heroic revolts and by fleeing westward by the millions ever since World War II. East Germany alone continues to lose 4,500 refugees a week. A food shortage coupled with the threat to their escape hatch has just caused fresh demonstrations by East German workers; some experts predict another revolt. Eastern Europe's hatred of communism is so great a political liability to Khrushchev that it amounts to a military weakness as well. If there were war of any kind over Berlin, "the Russian rear [as Dean Acheson put it] could be in turmoil overnight."

In view of this weakness, it is preposterous that Khrushchev should be allowed to get away with demands in Germany. His very belligerence is probably defensive. The West's passive and strictly defensive show of fortitude about Berlin is also somewhat incongruous. Berlin is not our Thermopylae; it is an opening to the heart of captive Europe, with which its cause is inextricably linked. The freedom of Europe was earned in blood (one-third of East Germany was held by American troops in 1945) and sealed in solemn treaties. Khrushchev should be summoned to a conference not about Berlin, but about the reunification of Germany with free elections under Big Four supervision; and about self-determination, free elections, free press, etc. in Eastern Europe as well.

When he refuses, the West has several recourses to make him change his mind. They are not mere words and do not have to be shouted; they are acts of political warfare, the kind of warfare he has so long conducted against us.

One is economic sanctions. This could mean anything from a complete embargo on East-West trade to an undeclared but systematic sabotage of Western deliveries behind the Iron Curtain. The East bloc is much more dependent on this growing trade than the West. West German steel and ships, factories from Britain, grain from the United States are other items whose stoppage would hurt the Communist economies.

Such measures might antagonize pro-Western opinion behind the curtain. But this could be at least neutralized by a radical step-up in the way the West explains its aims and policies to the captive nations. The Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, RIAS and other organs of propaganda could be remobilized. The captive nations theme, soft-pedaled of late, has proved its ability to enrage Khrushchev. Although RFE did not foment the Hungarian revolt, it has the power to stir up almost any degree of unrest that may suit our purposes. The chief problem is to say no more and no less than we are prepared to support with action.

The third major ingredient in political warfare is active military preparedness. (Khrushchev himself last week canceled proposed reductions in Russia's armed forces and upped his military budget by $3.5 billion.) Kennedy and his advisers are now deeply engaged in contingency planning to prove our resolve to defend Berlin. But if he enlarges his cause to the whole Eastern theater, the military planning should be enlarged too. We could take various emergency steps, and the NATO command could move to a higher state of readiness. In appropriate combination and without fanfare, such acts would give Khrushchev the right message.

It may be objected that political warfare of this kind is out of character for the Western democracies, or even impossible for an alliance of unequally resolute states. But that, surely, has been the trouble with Western policy: its divided and nerveless reluctance to answer Khrushchev's political warfare with our own. Only strong Washington leadership can change this state of affairs. On the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt last month, Leo Cherne remarked: "If freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact, those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom [i.e., Europeans] are permitted to remain slaves."

This doubtless sounds like that old proposition called roll-back or liberation, which was gradually shelved as too risky in a nuclear age. Its opponents say it confronts the Communists with intolerable choices, like cornering a tiger. But since we face the risk of war for Berlin in any case, why not be smart about it as well as brave? Said Mayor Willy Brandt, "In negotiations, if you want to keep what you have, you must ask for more than you have."

There is no solution to the Berlin problem (except Khrushchev's solution) if it is isolated from the problem of the Germanys and Eastern Europe, the unfinished business of World War II. For the West to embrace this larger issue, controlling its course and timing, would put Berlin in a truer perspective. It would tear the mask from Khrushchev's absurd bellicosity on his weakest front. It would rescue our own Berlin policy from the trap of mere nuclear fortitude. It would put that policy back in touch with the great hopes we nurtured, and the obligations we assumed, only yesterday. In Eastern Europe, their memory is still green.

"Ode to the Statue of Liberty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was recently honored by a visit from an old friend of mine from Alanreed, Tex. Alanreed is located on Highway 66 in the southern part of Gray County, Tex. Just north of Alanreed my good friend, Paul M. Bruce, has long maintained a nursery. He has dedicated his life to the soil and the things that God makes to grow. His wonderful work is well known throughout the Panhandle of Texas and the southwest.

In recent months, he came to New York to visit his brother and decided to come by the Nation's Capital for a visit. While so doing, he struck up a conversation with a gentleman by the name of Johnny Walker of Scranton, Pa. Mr. Walker very kindly brought him by my office, as he was well acquainted and familiar with Washington.

Subsequently, Mr. Bruce wrote to Johnny Walker thanking him for his courtesies and enclosing in that letter his thoughts as he viewed the Statue of Liberty. Mr. Walker was so deeply impressed with these two documents that he forwarded them to his Congressman, the Honorable WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, of the 10th District of Pennsylvania. Congressman SCRANTON very kindly forwarded these documents to me, and I am taking the liberty of inserting them in the RECORD. I think that the statements of Paul M. Bruce, of Alanreed, Tex., should be read by every American, and I hope that this will be possible. The letter from Mr. Bruce I insert first and his "Ode to the Statue of Liberty" immediately following:

AUGUST 12, 1961.

DEAR JOHNNY WALKER: I don't have words to express my thanks to you for being so very nice to me in the District of Columbia.

My Representative, WALTER ROGERS, was wonderful, also seeing that I was well cared for while in the District of Columbia. I saw many beautiful sights. God has made us a wonderful nation. When I left WALTER'S office, I was just a little lost. A very nice lady started past me. She said, "Aren't you a little lost here in the District of Columbia? I might help you." "Sure," I said. "I would like to get out in the open." She was from New Mexico. I never have had so many wonderful experiences in all my life. Every time I needed help, someone was right there to help the Texan. I hope I can be helpful to others as they were to me.

I am enclosing my version of the Statue of Liberty as I promised.

I will never forget how nice you were to me.

I wish you success in your every endeavor.

Best wishes always,

Love,

PAUL M. BRUCE.

ODE TO STATUE OF LIBERTY

(By Paul Bruce, Alanreed, Tex.)

I fell in love with her—the Statue of Liberty.

We boarded a helicopter at Idlewild Airport near New York City. It was a beautiful evening. A fine old gentleman sat beside me. He was born in New York City and he began to tell me about the different beautiful sights. "I hope the pilot flies us by the Statue of Liberty." "Wonderful," I said. We could see her at a distance. The pilot headed our plane directly toward her; we passed just above and to my side. I was next to the window as we faced her. She is the most beautiful statue I have ever seen. Standing there in the harbor, facing the ocean, calm, beautiful, poised and serene. That's when I fell in love with her. I waved my hand and blew a kiss to her. Something was telling me she understood. It all happened so quickly, she didn't have time to wave or smile back at me. Then I began to realize what she really meant to me—liberty, freedom, love, and the pursuit of happiness. In fact, everything, all the virtues of life.

Man has no greater gifts than these except eternal life in heaven with his Maker. She stands there in the harbor, facing the ocean, to welcome the weary traveler on his long voyage home across the deep blue sea, or the one seeking a new home on her beautiful and peaceful shores.

We pray to our God in whom we trust, that she will always remain there, beautiful, serene and unmatched, as she stands today and that the peoples of the world will fall in love with her as I have. Please do.

I am wondering if all who have gazed upon her lovely face fully realize what she means to them and what she stands for—let's not forget. We are truly indebted to all who had a part in erecting this beautiful Statue of Liberty. I pray that all who view her or learn of her wonderful ways will fall in love with her as I have. Although I live many miles from her, I will always love her and cherish the memory of her. Won't you?

Everyone in the United States of America that's old enough has heard about her. She is cherished and loved by millions, and not enough millions have looked into her beautiful face—still not enough. You should see her. To see her is to appreciate her more.

Her name is Liberty because she stands for every principle that we know as a free, liberty loving people and Nation. We should do our very best to live the principles of life she stands for. Liberty has cost us much since the birth of our Nation. Let's be brave and not cowards. Let's preserve it, love and keep it. God gave it to us because he loved us.

Let's love and trust Him more. He is the giver of all our blessings. Won't you love Him more? Let Him be your first love.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on August 21, the Czechoslovak National Council of America sent a letter to the President concerning the Berlin crisis. In this note the council praised the President's firm stand and suggested several constructive proposals regarding the captive nations of Europe.

I believe these suggestions deserve consideration, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., August 21, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Speaking to the Nation on July 25, 1961, you asked your fellow Americans for their support of the Nation's new and more vigorous policies and for their suggestions, as well, of ways which might possibly better serve our common purposes.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America, speaking in behalf of thousands of American citizens of Czechoslovak descent, in response to your appeal, is happy to assure you of the loyal support of the entire membership and to submit respectfully the following suggestions:

Let it be clear that we are in full agreement with the general outline of your new policy, preeminently with that part of it which might be summarized by a single sentence: No more appeasement.

Please rest assured that of all your fellow citizens, no supporters of this principle are more ardent than we whose memory of the tragedy of the Munich agreement is permanently alive.

Our spontaneous support is also dictated by our conviction that had the West been able some 13 or 15 years ago to muster the courage, vigor, and decision which we find in your recent proclamation, Czechoslovakio would not be a Communist-dominated country today.

Let it also be understood that even though the issue in this present crisis is not the freedom of the Czechoslovak people, but rather the freedom of their recent adversaries, we nonetheless welcome with a sigh of relief this belated official recognition of the fact that firmness is the only advisable course of action in relation to world communism.

At the same time that we voice our support of the new policy, we feel compelled to submit respectfully for your consideration the following comments in margin to your recent statement.

Just as we sincerely welcome what has been said, we nonetheless deeply regret that we did not find in your text that which, in our judgment, should also have been said: a more specific reference to the problems of the captive European nations.

Just as we fully agree that a divided Berlin cannot be usefully discussed without a discussion of a divided Germany, so we believe that a divided Germany cannot be discussed without reference to a wider context: a divided Europe. The division of Berlin and Germany is most certainly unnatural, unjust and dangerous. We think it would have been appropriate to state at this time that the division of Europe is unnatural, unjust and dangerous on an even larger scale.

These are the reasons why we think that such a widening of the scope of your speech would have been advisable:

Your speech, Mr. President, centers on the defense of legal rights, acquired on the part of the United States by the Potsdam agreement and subsequent agreements between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Your statement carefully avoids any topic which might be misconstrued as a threat to the security of the Soviet Union in East and Central Europe.

It is our considered opinion: first, that the very concept of such a threat is an anachronism and secondly, that we, the people of the United States, as represented by our Chief Executive, have an equal right and obligation to discuss with the Soviet Union the problems of the captive European nations, just as we have the right and obligation to defend our unfettered presence in Berlin.

The inclusion of the captive nations problems would provide a wider basis to our diplomatic initiative; it would not necessarily alienate our major allies, nor preclude any further fruitful negotiation with the Soviet Union; nor could it be—in good faith— misrepresented as an interference in matters which are no concern of ours. We hold, indeed, that the status quo of the captive nations is eminently our concern.

Our right and obligation to insist on a discussion of the captive nations of Europe is based on both moral and legal considerations, as indicated by the needs of our own security:

(a) It is generally accepted as true—and you, Mr. President, have contributed some of the most eloquent statements to this effect—that America's historic mission is to help bring freedom and justice to all the people of the world over that wish to be free and that are able to establish the rule of law under governments of their own free choice.

There is no place for doubt that the captive nations are such a people.

(b) Both the United States of America and the Soviet Union are among the signatories of internationally binding instruments, unilaterally violated, however, by the Soviet Union. This fact gives us a right and imposes upon us a duty to protest.

The Atlantic Charter stipulates that freedom and independence be restored to the nations which had been deprived of them and that territorial changes be made only with the consent of the people concerned. These principles are overtly violated by the Soviet Union, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union endorsed the principles of the Atlantic Charter, as stated in the preamble of the United Nations Joint Declaration of January 1, 1942.

The indirect Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia, which resulted in the Communist domination of that country, is still, 13 years later, an unsolved item on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council. Numerous other aspects of the ensuing relationship of the Soviet Union toward Czechoslovakia and the other satellite nations (above all, the suppression of the Hungarian revolt) constitute many violations of the United Nations Charter.

A long list of instances might be cited of Soviet violations of bilateral or multilateral agreements bearing the signatures of the Soviet Union and the United States of America throughout its satellite empire.

Hence there can be no doubt of our right and duty to protest.

(c) An enlightened self-interest seems to indicate that our security in war and peace shall better be protected if the people of the captive nations continue to be our silent friends in the future. In Czechoslovakia this can best be achieved by providing proof that the present Communist propaganda line is a lie.

This dangerously effective Communist propaganda claims that the United States is no longer interested in the liberation of the captive nations; that it has, in fact, virtually written them off and is interested only in the fate of the Germans; that any future success of American designs in Central and Eastern Europe would necessarily lead—in the case of Poland—to the loss of newly acquired territories east of the Oder-Niesse Rivers, and—in the case of Czechoslovakia—to a forced repatriation en masse of the Sudeten Germans which, in turn, would necessarily result in a repetition of the gruesome experience of 1938–45.

So much for Communist propaganda.

Mr. K.'s answer over the Captive Nations Week resolution, as displayed on the occasion of his conversation with Mr. Nixon, and the measures undertaken by the government of Czechoslovakia, prohibiting the delivery of mail bearing the U.S. "Masaryk" postage stamp, seem to prove sufficiently how very anxious the Communists are to withhold from the captive people any evidence of American interest in their freedom and independence.

We regretfully voice our anxiety lest the absence in your speech of any explicit reference to the captive nations be misused by the Communists in support of their vicious propaganda; lest it adversely influence the existing silent friendship of the captive people and thereby indirectly lower the degree of our future security.

We know, Mr. President, that this could not have been your intention.

The above mentioned considerations of moral and legal character, as well as the dictates of political realism and expediency, prompt us to formulate the following suggestions:

That in any future policy statement concerning East-West relations and in any future top level negotiations with the Soviet Union, explicit reference be made to the unsatisfactory state of affairs existing throughout the captive European nations.

Among the numerous points on which we should rightfully insist, by far the most important are the following two:

1. The withdrawal of all Soviet organs of control from the satellite nations;

2. The holding of free elections under effective international control.

In wishful anticipation of pacific developments in Germany, we might add a further desideratum:

3. If and when a peace conference with a united Germany would be held, the U.S. Government should insist on the presence at the conference table of those who have a better right to represent the true interests of Poland and Czechoslovakia than the present puppet governments, imposed by Moscow.

We wish to avail ourselves of this occasion, Mr. President, to assure you of our deepest gratitude for the spark of hope that you have been able to kindle through your vigor and leadership in the hearts of the people now living under the yoke of Communism.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
EMILIE WELCL,
Secretary,
ANDREW VALUSEK,
President,
FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG,
Chairman, Political Committee,
VLASTA VRAZ,
Executive Vice President.

Drug Antitrust Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the concern that has been registered with Congress relative to the sale of drugs and recent proposals such as the Drug Industry Antitrust Act, I think the following letter received from Mr. Ted Rowell, Jr., vice president of Rowell Laboratories, Inc., of Baudette, Minn., would be of interest to every Member:

DEAR MR. LANGEN: We are deeply concerned with the effect that the passage of the Celler bill (H.R. 6245) will have not only on the pharmaceutical industry in general, but most especially on the small ethical pharmaceutical manufacturer.

We, as a representative of the smaller pharmaceutical manufacturers, know that to effectively compete with the major companies in our field with growth and increased research activities we must have an advantage over our larger competitors. We cannot be satisfied with products that are similar to theirs nor those which are the same as theirs that we would receive through licensing agreements. We must strive for products that are better. We must be able to retain this advantage which can only be done through the patent system.

The American patent law is generally recognized as perhaps the single most important legal spur to the growth of small production businesses into larger ones. It assures the inventive individual or company a temporary advantage in competition. Many small companies have become great corporations because their inventiveness has been rewarded by patent protection.

Under the proposed legislation the patent owner would be required to issue a license to any applicant, and he would also be required to disclose all his currently confidential research information about the product or process. In short, this provision would command the inventor to divulge the knowledge necessary to put a competitor into business. This competitor would have an advantage in that he did not incur expenses to gain this know-how and immediately puts him at price advantage. For this reason total patent costs must be spread over a period of 3 years rather than 17 years. Cuts the price of drugs?

This legislation attempts, in effect, to cancel out or to water down the constitutional right of an inventor to benefit from his own genius. Legal experts believe that, while this will most seriously and immediately hurt the individual scientist and the small company in the drug industry, its overall effect will be to impede progress in medicine, and increase costs to the detriment of mankind.

The very idea that a company must have a license from the Federal Government to go into business or to stay in business is certainly undesirable as it gives one person or one group of people the right to say whether or not we can be in business. For this reason alone this section of the proposed legislation is not only undesirable but unjust.

We are dedicated to the public health and strongly desire to step up the research program to seek out and make improvements in medication. While this desire is strong, it can be killed without the stimulus and rewards of our free enterprise system.

This is well borne out by a study of Western countries by Prof. Jesse Markham, of Princeton University, wherein he found a high correlation between drug studies and patent protection. Professor Markham also wrote that the 42 important ethical drugs discovered in foreign countries were discovered largely in countries which afford reasonable, adequate patent incentive.

It is our philosophy that the American people should be provided with the finest medication available at the lowest possible cost. Any legislation that would be an instrument to this end would most certainly win our support.

This legislation which is now proposed would bring about the opposite effect. Therefore, we ask that you oppose this legislation with every device available to you.

Sincerely,

ROWELL LABORATORIES,
TED ROWELL, JR.,
Vice President.

P.S.—The fact still remains that people spend more for either tobacco, alcohol or cosmetics than they do for drugs.

Macon Moose Lodge Undertakes Polio Shot Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the city of Macon, Ga., Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose has undertaken as a project of community service a survey to determine how many citizens have had their antipolio vaccine shots. Under the direction of Lodge Gov. J. H. Waits, Jr., the survey has as its purpose the determination of how many Macon residents have not been immunized against infantile paralysis. It is a followup to a Moose project of 3 years ago in making Salk vaccine available to all in Macon desiring it, and the data thus developed will become the basis of a drive to persuade those not yet vaccinated to obtain their shots. This is an excellent example of constructive public service which deserves the commendation and emulation of all Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and two editorials about this project which appeared in the Macon papers.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Macon News, August 19, 1961]

SURVEY OF NEED FOR POLIO SHOTS IS SCHEDULED

Plans for a communitywide polio shot survey were announced today by J. H. Waits, Jr., governor of Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose.

The purpose of the project, under the direction of the civic affairs committee, is to find every man, woman, and child in Bibb County who has not had polio vaccine and to then attempt to persuade them to obtain the protection. Waits said.

The fraternal organization's more than 2,500 members are each being asked to contact at least 20 other families and to obtain relative information. Data will also be obtained on how many children under 19 years of age have birth defects or rheumatoid arthritis through the survey.

The Moose Lodge 3 years ago conducted a highly successful campaign to make available polio shots to all who needed them, but Waits said it is known that there are still a number of people in the community who have not had the vaccine, and for the protection of all citizens all persons should have the shots.

Ralph Jones, chairman of the Macon Chapter of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, urged cooperation of all citizens as well as Moose members in the project and said that if it is successful it would be a big step forward in public health.

Local medical and public health officials are expected to endorse the community survey.

Moose members were mailed forms to be filled out and returned by October 1. The forms list members of families by age and specify whether or not polio shots have been administered.

Waits said the Macon lodge has won national recognition for community service in the past and that the present project was but another effort by the organization to continue its record of public service.

[From the Macon Telegraph, Aug. 21, 1961]

MOOSE ADOPT VALUABLE PROJECT

Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose, which won first place in the fraternal organization's national competition for community service last year, is continuing its fine record of interest in civic affairs in the current polio shot survey.

Three years ago the Moose helped to set up stations to administer polio vaccine shots to all who needed them. The response was tremendous. But it is known that there are a number of Bibb Countians, grownups as well as children, who have not been afforded such protection. The idea of the campaign announced by the Moose organization is to find out who are those who have not had

shots and where they live, and to urge them to obtain the vaccine.

This is public health service of the highest order. The polio virus knows no race, creed, or color. It does not differentiate between rich and poor. It does not recognize political boundary lines. The crippling killer may strike anywhere. But the more people who are immunized against polio the less likely it is that there will be any cases, much less a serious outbreak.

[From the Macon News, Aug. 21, 1961]

POLIO SHOT SURVEY

"Have you had your Salk antipolio vaccine shots? If so, how many and when?" These are some of the questions being asked by members of Macon Lodge No. 1455 of the Loyal Order of Moose as those in the fraternal organization cooperate in a communitywide polio shot survey.

Dr. Donald Henderson, of the U.S. Communicable Diseases Center in Atlanta, says polio may be on the defensive, but it is too early to say that it is beaten. He terms the next few weeks critical ones in the fight against infantile paralysis.

What a relief it would be of polio could be completely knocked out, if the dread threat of the crippling killer striking in any family could be removed from the worried minds of fathers and mothers. That is the aim of the Moose who are seeking to find out who has not been immunized, and to persuade them to obtain polio shots. In addition, information on birth defects and rheumatoid arithritis will be gathered in the survey.

Moose members are each being asked to contact 20 other families and obtain valid information. This is a worthwhile project deserving of the cooperation of all citizens. Three years ago the Moose did a splendid job in making Salk vaccine available to all who would show up to receive it. The current survey is in that great tradition of community service.

Hon. Paul J. Kilday, Speech Before VFW Convention, Miami, Fla., August 24, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a brilliant and thought-stimulating address was delivered by the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Miami, Fla., on August 24, 1961.

In the very near future, the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY will leave the Congress of the United States to assume his judicial role as a Judge of the Court of Military Appeals. The loss to the Congress is inestimable, but the gain to the Court of Military Appeals is beyond measure.

The advice contained in the address of the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY is eminently sound. I commend his remarks to all who concern themselves about the future of our national security:

ADDRESS OF PAUL J. KILDAY BEFORE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AUGUST 24, 1961

National Commander Connell, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentleman.

For me to be here with you on this occasion is in itself a most rewarding experience, but to be here as the recipient of an award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars is an honor beyond anything that I might have hoped could befall me. I am sincerely humble and grateful.

But it would be less than candid of me if I did not say that this award is undoubtedly the result of fortuitous circumstances over which I had no control.

It is due to the fact that when I first came to the Congress of the United States, I was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee, and the additional fact that the Congress utilizes the much criticized seniority system, which always seems to become more plausible and reasonable as a Member's seniority increases.

In those troublesome times when I first came to Congress, which seem halycon today by comparison, San Antonio, Tex., was a relatively quiet part of the great southwest, dedicated primarily to the Army Air Corps, Fort Sam Houston, and an Army hospital.

But, I am sure it was the proximity of those military installations and not any particular talent displayed by me, that determined my being assigned to the Military Affairs Committee.

I say this because my service in the Congress thereafter, from 1939 to date, while not exclusively dedicated to the uniformed services and particularly to the men and women who compose our armed services, at least has accounted for more than a major share of the attention I have given to legislative matters. Thus, you honor me today far beyond anything that I deserve for circumstances beyond my control and for my having merely performed my congressional duties in a way that I hoped would reflect some credit upon my district, and at least keep me from being held in disdain by my constituents. Regardless of the reason, I sincerely appreciate the honor.

Thus, it is with great and, I hope, understandable pride that I accept this award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Your organization has continuously adhered to traditions in which you can all take personal pride. You have never vacillated.

Throughout your history you have stood fast for a sound and adequate national defense and a consistent, strong and stable force. Among other things you have an unchanging record of support for civilian control of the armed services and the maintenance of the great and time-tested Joint Chiefs of Staff concept.

It is my firm conviction that these principles of military organization constitute the proper military posture for our country.

Thus, I can say, with great sincerety, that your support has been and, I am convinced, will continue to be, a source of substantial strength to our national security and to the men and women who constitute our Armed Forces.

I am now in the position of completing my congressional career in order to begin a judicial career. It is, I suppose, somewhat paradoxical that one part of my public service must end in order that another may begin.

This also puts me in a painful dilemma for I leave a life which I have enjoyed more each year. Among other things, it has been a life in which I have had daily association with the finest men and women America produces—the men and women who serve or have served in our Armed Forces.

Now, I shall enter a new life, that of the jurist who will be exposed for the most part, I presume, to those who have run afoul of military law. These will, I suppose, consist of the misfits, or at least the misguided and the unfortunates who constitute such a very small minority of our armed services.

But in this Nation of ours, the great and the small, the important and the unimportant, the general and the private, the corporal and the colonel, the wrongdoer and the do-gooder, the misfit and the suited, the wise and the foolish, all are equal in the eyes of the law.

And, in order to insure that this philosophy of our way of life is carried into military justice, the Congress of the United States saw fit to write into law the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I must confess that when I participated in the writing of the law, I never envisioned that I might be called upon at some future date to participate in construing various provisions of that code.

Nevertheless, now I am about to embark on a new career dedicated to the proposal the justice does not cease for any American when he enters the armed services.

I enter a career dedicated to the proposition that, while a military organization must of necessity function differently than ordinary civilian pursuits, nevertheless, certain fundamental concepts of justice are preserved and must prevail in America, even in a military organization.

But I shall not further bore you with my rambling observations on the career in which I am about to embark. Instead, I would like to briefly pass on to you my observations about the structure of the military organization with which I have been dealing for the past 21 years.

When I was elected to the Congress of the United States in 1938, we had an Army of 185,488. This, of course, included the Air Corps. We had a Navy of 119,088, and a Marine Corps of 18,356.

One year later, in 1939, the Army had only increased to 189,000; the Navy to 125,000, and the Marine Corps to 19,000.

In addition, I have seen the strength of our Armed Forces fluctuate from an Army of 8,267,000 in June 1945, to an Army of 554,000, in June of 1948.

I have seen our Navy go from 3,380,000, in 1945, to 381,000, in 1950. I have seen our Marine Corps go from 475,000, in 1944, to 74,279, in 1950.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, on the floor of the House on Monday, July 31, stated, in commenting on the history of the peaks and valleys of our military strength, that "they looked like a profile of the Rocky Mountains."

I, too, have watched this roller coaster defense planning go on for more than 20 years.

And I shall always feel that the greatest disservice we can render the American people is to lull them into complacency when we decrease the size of our Armed Forces. For 20 years, this type of action has inevitably resulted in crash programs to hastily mobilize or recapture the ground we have lost as the result of these unwise and overly optimistic reductions. Traditionally, we have maintained fewer forces than those that were actually required for our national security on a long-term basis.

Now, we have started again on a strength increase to build up the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and, by previous planning, the Marine Corps. It is not a substantial increase compared with some of those that have occurred in the past, but it could well become most significant.

It is an increase which will add muscle and sinew to a body that already is composed of great strength.

For, notwithstanding our shortcomings, I do not share the unwarranted belief of a few that we are weak, or not strong enough to defend ourselves. I am convinced that we do possess tremendous military might.

We do posses a military might with the unquestioned capability of wreaking vast destruction. But it still lacks the capacity to apply small tourniquets in those cases where the bleeding is steady, but not spurting.

The President's latest recommendations for adding to the strength of our Armed Forces will give us an increased strength in versatility which has been, I am afraid, somewhat neglected over the past few years.

The men that will be provided will give the Army 14 full-strength combat divisions.

The new program will increase the Navy's amphibious lift capabilities and improve its antisubmarine warfare capability. It will put the Air Force in a far stronger position than it might otherwise have been in, had the original planned strengths continued unchanged.

But military strength by itself does not win or prevent wars.

Military strength is only as good as the man behind the weapon, and the man behind the weapon is entitled to the best that can be obtained.

This means that we must have not only highly trained men, but also modern equipment.

Simply having bodies in uniform, armed with World War II equipment, will not help solve the problems that face us now and in the future.

Today's soldier, sailor, airman, or marine must be more than the toter of a musket.

He must have the attributes of a minuteman and the courage of a member of Pickett's Brigade. He must also have a versatility superior to that of the enemy he is fighting.

He must know the guerrilla tactics of the rice paddies and the jungle; he must know how to overcome the effects of cold weather on his weapons.

He must understand the effects of nuclear blasts, the urgency of dispersal, the indispensability of mobility, and the power of concentrated fire.

In short, it is not enough that the serviceman of today be a jack-of-all-trades, he must be a master of his profession.

And while I do not suggest to you that we maintain an armed strength beyond our economic power, I do contend that we must agree upon a force structure that contains the capability of fighting both a nuclear and nonnuclear war, and that also contains the equipment to bring the right amount of force upon a given area at the right time.

This means airlift, sealift, Strac forces, Marine Corps readiness, SAC alerts, early warning systems, Polaris submarines, hunter-killer type submarines, antisubmarine warfare weapons, fighter bombers, interceptors, M–14 rifles, modern tanks, modern machineguns, improvements in bacteriological warfare, the ability to engage in a chemical war, and the courage of our convictions that these will all be produced in quantity, and quality, now and for the foreseeable future, until such time as mankind, by ironclad voluntary agreement, can decide for itself whether the fate of the world will be that of peace or extinction.

Our ability to exert this influence, this pressure, and this power, no matter where it may be required, means a force structure of sufficient size and sufficient capability to do a variety of jobs in various parts of the world at different times.

It is my opinion that the strength to which we are now building will improve this capability substantially, if it is attained and sustained.

But let us not again succumb to the otherwise inevitable consequence that this temporary solution will later permit a reduction in force.

So far as I am concerned, a reduction in force following this buildup would be the most dangerous single step we could take toward weakening our position in world affairs.

And let us not lull ourselves into a false sense of security that we can depend upon our mothballed ships to provide us with a constant sealift. We are soon going to have to pay the price of a modern sealift, for we can no longer depend upon those seagoing inanimate veterans of World War II to meet the present requirements of modern sea power.

And just as we must improve our sealift with modern ships, so must we continue to improve our airlift.

Just as we are producing new rifles for our Army, so must we produce new and improved tanks, new and improved personnel carriers, and a multitude of other modern equipment to equal to the occasion of the present and the future. We must wean ourselves away from dependence upon the weapons of yesteryear to do the job of the future.

These are problems that lie ahead for our armed services and for the greatest legislative body in the history of mankind, the Congress of the United States.

I am leaving these matters to take on the more restricted problem of military justice, but I console myself with the thought that we, in America, can still devote ourselves to the welfare of the individual.

It is the attention we Americans pay to the individual that makes us so different from those who adhere to the concepts of communism.

It is this dedication to a concern for the individual that not only sets us apart from communism, but will, in the long run, result in victory for the free world—so long as we are willing to make the same sacrifice in time and wealth, that we have willingly made in the past, to preserve our freedom.

Sacrifice, of course, means different things to different people. But some degree or type of sacrifice is required by all of us if we are to win this long and constant struggle.

For some, it means a sacrifice of time, for others, a sacrifice of opportunity. For others a sacrifice of money, and for others, perhaps even the supreme sacrifice. But I am thoroughly convinced that the only way we will be able to match a dedicated opponent is to equal or surpass his dedication.

And, if I may be permitted, let me close by passing on to you an excerpt from a speech made by John Curran in 1790:

"It is the common fate of the indolent to see their rights become a prey to the active. The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequences of his crime and the punishment of his guilt."

If we will not make those sacrifices of time, opportunity, money, and blood to preserve that freedom which we now possess, then servitude most assuredly will be the inevitable consequence. But I have a great and abiding faith in the courage, the character, and the intelligence of the American people. I know that they will continue to meet this challenge and that men and women, such as those who are here today, will keep our freedom for generations yet unborn.

Our Security as a Nation Demands That the Transportation Industry Be Strengthened if It Is To Portray Its Traditional Role as the Strong Right Arm of an Adequate National Defense

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is an accepted fact that in time of national emergency the transportation system of the Nation is faced with a herculean task in maintaining the equipment necessary in meeting the constantly pressing demands for greatly expanded services.

Failure by this Congress to come to grips with the transportation problem would constitute gross dereliction of duty and abdication of responsibility, to the detriment of our vital transportation industry and of the great American public, whose interests we are sworn to uphold. This I firmly believe, and emphasize, today.

According to the recent report titled "National Transportation Policy" rereleased by a special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee, all of the domestic common carriers of passengers have found the number of empty seat-miles increasing since 1946. The rate of increase has been most pronounced in railroad service causing the passenger deficit to climb from less than $200 million in 1946 to over $700 million in 1957.

More current figures reflecting the decrease in passenger traffic volume reveal that the rate of return for the railroad industry for the 12-month period ending May 31, 1961, was only 1.45 percent—the lowest since the depression period of the 1930's.

With regard to the Nation's airlines the Senate study group found that—

> While the available seat-miles for domestic trunk and local airlines from 1946 to 1959 increased from 7,490 million to 45,793 million, or almost six times, the revenue passenger-miles increased from 5,910 million to only 29,151 million or a little over five times. The result has been an increase of empty seat-miles from 1,580,000 to 16,642,000 or by an increase of 15,062,000 empty-seat miles.

Current figures reveal that during the first 6 months of 1961 the trunk airlines lost $20 million and sustained a 2 percent drop in passenger traffic volume.

In addition to the findings by the special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee the national trade associations for all three of the major public carriers—air, bus, and rail—report they are operating below their capacity for handling passenger traffic. Both the buslines and railroads are operating well below 50 percent of capacity while the current load factor of the airlines of 59.5 percent is at the lowest level in 10 years.

In addition to the decrease experienced by the air, bus, and railroad industries, many common carrier trucklines are also facing difficulty.

Despite recommendations made following the series of studies by congressional committees and in reports filed the past several years following studies made by various States through State legislative committees no positive action has been taken to solve the ills of the transportation industry.

Meanwhile a negative attitude has been taken by the Kennedy administration in dealing with the problems of the national transportation system.

The President opposed repeal of the 10 percent World War II tax on passenger transportation. In addition he postponed until 1962 plans formulated by

appropriate Federal agencies to aid the transportation industry.

Commenting on the prospect of a year's delay of transportation remedies, Richard Wagner, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, said:

I doubt if we can afford to wait this long. This industry, in the last 5 years, has been studied to death, both by the administration and Congress. What is needed is action, not more study.

The Kennedy administration announced that plans to provide legislative remedies for the ills of our transportation system were to be revealed in a message to Congress.

President Kennedy, however, canceled the message, indicating he was uncertain as to what action should be taken. This is plainly evident by his assertion more study was needed.

Speaking of studies and surveys regarding the Nation's transportation system, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the fall of 1959, the Kilday subcommittee, on which I was privileged to serve as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, conducted an investigation into the adequacy of transportation to support the national defense effort in event of mobilization.

Concerning railroads, the subcommittee drew this highly significant conclusion:

No plans for transport dependence can fail to take into account the railroad industry. The other forms of transport, important as they are to the total need, are auxiliary and supplemental to the railroads.

In addition to this investigation, transportation and the Nation's transportation policy have been the subject of six other major studies and reports since World War II. Without exception, these studies have stressed the fundamental importance of railroads—healthy railroads—to the Nation's economy and defense. It is worth recalling here what they found.

From the progress report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, October 1951:

Railroads are the backbone of the American transportation system. This will continue to be the case so long as the railroads serve as the primary means for the movement of heavy materials and commodities in bulk.

In time of war the railroads perform an indispensable service * * *.

From the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization, April 1955:

The railroads may be expected to have greatest flexibility in accommodating an expanded domestic traffic with a minimum increase in equipment. Any policy which strengthens the railroad base will tend to increase the built-in flexibility of our transportation plant.

From the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 1958:

The railroads were, and are, a vital part of this Nation's security.

From the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on "The Passenger Train Deficit," May 1959:

Economic railroad passenger service is, and for the foreseeable future will be, an integral part of our national transportation system and essential for the Nation's well-being and defense.

From a report of the U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1960:

The Government should support the common carrier system upon which the economy must rely, and which is so vital for national security.

From the report of the Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in the United States prepared for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, January 1961:

Railroads are our most pervasive form of mass transportation and, over the years, our most experienced * * *.

Bringing the railroads to a satisfactory state of readiness could be, because of their experience * * * and because of the latent capacity of the rails, the most immediately remunerative.

But despite the acknowledged essentiality of railroads Mr. Speaker, and despite the same authorities having warned with equal unanimity that outmoded transportation policies and laws are forcing this vital industry to the brink of disaster, I call the attention of my colleagues to a remarkable fact: This Congress, although not lacking for concrete proposals and although confronted with grave international crises that could multiply the reliance we place on railroads almost overnight, has failed to act.

Ironically, we have managed to find hundreds of millions of tax dollars for the development of railroads in friendly and not so friendly countries abroad. For the future it appears that we may be called upon not only to continue our multi-billion-dollar program of aid to countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, but also to underwrite a Latin American program costing the astronomical sum of $20 billion. But for railroads at home—for the one form of transportation that is basic to all others and to the Nation's economy and security—the one form that asks only equal treatment and equal opportunity to compete—for that form of transportation this Congress has done nothing.

May I also remind my colleagues Mr. Speaker, of the pledges to right the wrong now being done our railroads which both parties solemnly wrote into their platforms in 1960. In the Democratic platform, a plank pledging the "coordination and modernization" of all forms of transportation reads in part as follows:

The Nation's railroads are in particular need of freedom from burdensome regulation to enable them to compete effectively with other forms of transportation. We also support Federal assistance in meeting certain capital needs particularly for urban mass transportation.

The Republican platform pledged "continued improvement of our vital transportation network." It also made recommendations for "broadly based tax reform to foster job-making and growth-making investment for modernization and expansion including realistic incentive depreciation schedules."

In the face of these pledges, Mr. Speaker, and with the assurance of bilateral support for a positive program to aid this vital industry, I submit that both the railroads and the public are entitled to ask why nothing has been done.

The period of mobilization envisioned by our Armed Services Subcommittee in 1959 is no longer in the realm of speculation; it is upon us. The time for mobilizing or improving the readiness of the one form of transportation that everyone agrees is absolutely vital to the Nation's defense and the waging of war is rapidly running out, if indeed it has not already passed. The mobilization and preparation of our railroads to handle the greatly added burdens that would certainly be theirs must rate equally high priority with the other mobilization measures now underway. For unprepared railroads in time of war could be this Nation's Achilles' heel—the one vulnerable point in our otherwise indestructible armor that could prove our undoing.

Yet instead of getting better, the already critical situation of many of our railroads grows steadily worse. And instead of the forthright leadership necessary to restore them to health, we are offered only more procrastination and foot-dragging delay.

Despite the seven major studies of transportation made since World War II, the President's solution is to call for still another study and report—this one to be made by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary is directed to submit his findings and recommendations by November 1, which of course would be too late for any constructive action at this session and quite possibly too late—in terms of the Nation's security and the threat confronting us in Europe.

In his directive to the Secretary of Commerce, President Kennedy observed that—

The current difficulties facing all segments of the transportation industry will require increased leadership and additional actions on the part of the Federal Government.

I could not agree more. But the time for exercising this leadership is now—not at the next session of Congress, or later, when the opportunity may have been lost for all time.

I recognize, of course, that the probability of enacting at this session the comprehensive program for the transportation industry that is called for is remote. But there is still time for the enactment of measures widely regarded as necessary to keep the transportation industry and especially the railroads afloat until the more comprehensive program can be prepared. These emergency measures were recently described in identical letters addressed to you, as Speaker, and to the Presiding Officer of the Senate by Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads. They include, as I am sure you know, more realistic policies for the depreciation of railroad plant and equipment and repeal of the 10-percent Federal excise tax on the fares of for-hire

carriers. Bills to implement both of these proposals are now before appropriate committees of the Congress.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that both liberalization of depreciation allowances and repeal of the travel tax are called for in four of the major reports on transportation made since World War II. In the other reports they were not subjects for consideration; hence no recommendations were made either pro or con. May I also remind you that depreciation matters have received favorable consideration by both parties in their platforms as well as by party leaders, including President Kennedy.

Enactment of liberalized depreciation allowances, in particular, is the fastest and surest means I know of facilitating railroad modernization and improvement. Compared with other more comprehensive action which must be taken at least in the next session, the proposals for liberalization of depreciation allowances and repeal of the travel tax are extremely modest. I strongly urge favorable action on at least these minimum proposals before this session of Congress adjourns.

Congress Plays "Political Pattycake"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in its issue of August 23, the Albany, Ga., Herald featured an excellent editorial pointing out the incongruity of the Congress of the United States wasting its time on the politically contrived issue of civil rights while, in its words, "the world teeters upon the brink of war." It aptly describes the performance in this regard as playing "political pattycake." The telling point of this editorial is one which the junior Senator from Georgia is sure has not been lost upon Americans who feel that Congress should give more attention to the survival of our Nation than to the winning of the next election. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial, entitled "More Civil Rights Pap," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CIVIL RIGHTS PAP

The world teeters upon the brink of war. The armaments race builds madly toward an approaching climax. The specter of sudden death haunts fully half of the population of the earth. A return of the Stone Age is a grim possibility for the survivors.

Yet in these perilous times, what is the issue under debate in the Senate of the United States? Is it peace or war? Is it survival or extinction? Is it democracy versus communism? Is it freedom against slavery?

No, the sole issue with which our elected representatives in the world's greatest democracy have chosen to come to grips at this tense juncture of affairs is, asininely, civil rights.

Ostensibly, the question is whether the life of the Civil Rights Commission shall be extended from its scheduled expiration of November 9. Actually, however, the question really is how many votes the Republican and Democratic Parties may expect to extract from the growing Negro minority in the 1962 congressional elections.

If the resulting spectacle appears slightly ridiculous in the eyes of anxious Americans, it is because it is, in truth, precisely just that. For the fact is that the several acts of the Congress in the last 5 years, coupled with the provisions of the U.S. Constitution, are sufficient to bulwark all of the rights, civil and otherwise, which any reasonable human being could expect from any society, whatever its political philosophy. The fact is, too, that if the civil rights of American citizens, whatever their color or creed, were being violated on any such widespread scale as the sponsors of this legislation infer, although they do not so specify, the Federal judiciary would be choked with cases brought under the aegis of a stern-eyed, ever watchful Government.

Yet, strangely, there are few such cases in our courts. And there are few such active complaints pending before the Civil Rights Commission.

Why all the hassle, then, in the Senate? Simply because the mathematics of politics is formidably exact. In many congressional districts, and in many States, as was the case in the last presidential election, the Negro vote provides the balance of power in any close contest. Ergo, politically speaking, this minority must be courted carefully and the most productive means yet found by politicians has been via the civil rights route.

Consequently, political considerations outweigh all others, even ponderous affairs of state, in these circumstances. And the Senate, which glories in the characterization as "the most august deliberative body on earth," becomes something less as it plays political pattycake while the Nation edges closer to war.

A Job for the Attorney General?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor, in his article which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun on August 25, has an excellent suggestion for Cyrus Eaton and others like him. Isn't it about time somebody blew the whistle on these so-called Americans?

WOULD CYRUS EATON LIVE IN RUSSIA?
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Cleveland tycoon Cyrus S. Eaton, the very rich and powerful crony of the U.S.S.R., who plays a thoroughly damaging part in the life of our country, violates no statute, although Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut raised the question in the U.S. Senate whether he is not afoul of the Logan Act, which prohibits unauthorized negotiations or intercourse with a foreign power, punishable by a fine or prison sentence (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1960, pp. 9888–9889).

He directed the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Eaton has done and is doing. Eaton was born in Canada, where he still maintains a residence, moved to this country in 1900 and later became a naturalized citizen. It was through the Canadian door that Senator DODD reached the Logan Act question, as follows: "He has publicly urged Canada 'to completely dissociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs. If Eaton said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in public, then he has violated the Logan Act and should be prosecuted."

Supplying some background as well, Senator DODD continued: "Eaton claims 'American politicians in general are relentlessly driving us to war, that American officials do not represent the American people whereas in the Soviet Union the government speaks for all the people.' He says Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world, that 'Dr. Zhivago' was suppressed [there] because Soviet youth cannot bear any criticisms of their beloved government; that the Russian massacre of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon, etc."

Prior to this, at his own request, Eaton appeared (June 1958) before a House subcommittee which investigates pro-Soviet apples in our barrel, Hollywood pro-Reds and some pitiable people as well whose disloyalty, long since abandoned, was an error in youth. The chairman, Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania afterwards issued the following statement, in part: "It is believed that no useful purpose can be served by permitting Mr. Eaton to repeat the groundless accusations that Iron Curtain countries have used for propaganda purposes."

It can well be that communism at any time will put the feet of the world in marching boots. If this powerful man does not know that Soviet imperialism is based on a pattern of bloodshed, barbarism, suppression, and slavery he knows nothing; in his relations with Khrushchev and the Kremlin hierarchy in Russia, here and throughout the Communist world, he blames his own adopted country, the United States, dramatically, persistently and with great force in a whole pattern of charges.

We have room here for only one flag, and this excludes the Red flag which symbolizes all history's wars of conquest and intrigue, of avarice, cruelty, and ambition, while assuming the colors and usurping the banner of freedom.

Any American who says he is an American but also waves that flag lacks the elementary gratitude which anyone lacks who lives in freedom and espouses the cause of freedom's assassins instead of moving back out of the America to which he came and taking his chances in the opposing nation he praises. But will you see Cyrus Eaton moving next to Moscow and placing in communism's tender care the fortune he made here? I do not think so.

The Nature of the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 I placed in the RECORD the third of a series of four editorials appearing in the New York Daily News under the title, "The Nature of the Enemy." I have obtained the first and second in that series

and am glad to insert them, along with the fourth and last of the series in the RECORD today.

These editorials present a thoughtful and constructive treatment of our major national problem. I commend them to the careful attention of all who read the RECORD.

I call attention especially to the last few lines of the fourth editorial which read as follows:

Lastly, in our opinion, we need a new state of mind in the Kennedy administration, and in all administrations that may follow it for the duration of the cold war.

We need an aggressive and offensive state of mind—a will to conquer communism—to replace the notion that the best we can hope for is to hold our own and lose no more important positions to the enemy.

The bulk of the American people, we're convinced, are already in this wreck-the-Reds mood, and have been for a long time.

Our leaders need to catch up, we believe, with the majority of Americans. If they will do that, they can count on popular backing, to the hilt.

The editorials follow:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—I

We've used that title before, for editorials on what makes Communists tick and why they are so dangerous to all human liberty, decency, and progress though party members are rather few in number throughout the world.

In fact, a series of News editorials under this title was reprinted in booklet form a year or so ago. The booklet is obtainable at 25 cents a copy (lower rates for quantity orders) from America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, N.Y.

This new series under the same title is planned to run each Monday in the News for the next 3 or 4 weeks.

The series will summarize a program of the Russian Communist Party, drawn up by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade hoods, murderers, and usurpers, and released to a waiting world several days ago.

Khrushchev and company plan to submit the 50,000-word paper to a world Communist get-together in Moscow next October. You can have one guess as to whether the comrades from all over will ratify it—though the Chineses Reds may object to parts of it.

It is one of the most tedious, terribly written screeds ever, we are convinced, put on paper anywhere.

The fact that at least two News men have read the thing from beginning to end is a testimonial to the way the News constantly sweats and strains to serve you readers, you lucky rascals.

For all that, this latest Communist manifesto is no laughing matter, and its broad outlines ought to be known throughout the free world. Here goes. The introduction sums up in slanted fashion the history of the world Communist movement from 1848 to the present time.

It was in 1848 that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels issued the first Communist Manifesto, leading off with the words: "A specter is haunting Europe, the specter of communism," and going on to put a solemn curse on every aspect of the primitive European capitalism of that day.

FROM MANIFESTO TO PARIS COMMUNE

Few people paid any attention to Marx and Engels when these two doctrinaire dreamers issued their manifesto, and it was years before the Communist movement amounted to anything.

It erupted briefly and disastrously in the Paris Commune (March-May, 1871), just after France lost the Franco-Prussian War. There was fighting on street barricades; the Communists murdered the archbishop of Paris; and at last the insurrection was put down by veteran French troops under Marshal Maurice de McMahon.

The next big development in communism's history was the 1905 uprising in Russia, for which the present-day Reds calmly give all credit to their party.

Actually, though Communists were active in this upheaval, it was mainly a liberal and Socialist affair, and it scared the government of Czar Nicholas II (1868–1918) into bringing about a lot of long-overdue reforms.

MARCH OF COMMUNISM

The Communists really went to town in the Russian Revolution of 1917, when Russia had been hammered to its knees by the World War I armies of German Kaiser Wilhelm II.

Vladimar Ilyich Lenin and his comrade Communist thugs toppled the moderate reform government of Alexander Kerensky in Moscow, and, as the saying went, telegraphed the revolution to the provinces.

Communists have terrorized Russia ever since. They capitalized on World War II and the folly-or-worse of President Franklin D. Roosevelt by extending their slave-nation empire throughout central Europe. Tito's Yugoslavia presently "broke" with Moscow, but remained Communist.

In 1949, the Chinese Reds, with an important assist from various dubious characters in the U.S. State Department, drove Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek off the Asiatic mainland and onto Formosa.

Communism now tyrannizes over some 1 billion people. The program we're discussing outlines plans for extending Communist slavery to the rest of the human race, most definitely including the American people.

Of that, more next Monday.

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—II

This is the second of a series of Monday editorials on the 50,000-word program for the world Communist movement, recently tacked together in Moscow by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade bandits, thieves, and murderers.

After a windy and biased introduction (summarized here last Monday), the document proceeds to a long song and dance labeled "Part One: The Transition From Capitalism to Communism Is the Road of Human Progress."

The juciest item in this section of the Red program, we'd say, is a series of lies about present-day capitalism as it operates in the United States.

It seems, according to "Khrushchev & Co.," that the gap between the haves and have-nots is widening rapidly in our benighted country, and that more and more workers are suffering more pathetically every day.

This is because capitalism is allegedly loaded with "contradictions" (not specified so that an ordinary or even an extraordinary American can tell what they are) which are bound to do our system in soonor or later.

That will be news to a lot of us.

Particularly will it surprise the tens of millions of working people whose standards of living have been improving for decades, and the people in the high income brackets whose earnings are pretty largely grabbed by the Internal Revenue Service.

That makes no never mind to the modern Red doctrinaires, though. They are as convinced as were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the 19th-century pappies of communism, that the rich get richer and the poor poorer under capitalism, and that communism is the next stage in human progress, all over the world.

It will come peaceably to some countries, says the new Communist manifesto, and violently to others. And the Reds everywhere in the free world are instructed to help these upheavals along in every way they can.

WORLDWIDE AGITATION

That explains the Red-inspired U.S. student riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities * * * the ban-the-big-bomb agitations in England * * * much of the unrest in the Congo * * * Fidel Castro's plotting to turn Latin America Communist * * * and virtually all the other ferments and civil turmoils that plague the planet today.

It also explains the Red-front organizations which, wearing innocent-looking masks, get in a great deal of dirty work for the Kremlin in this country and many others.

To hear Khrushchev and his cronies tell it, this current misery is taking the human race to—a brave new world—in which all our troubles will have been wiped away.

In what is quite possibly the biggest of all the big lies in this tedious and frightfully written paper, the authors solemnly state:

"Socialism has solved a great social problem—it has abolished the exploiting classes and the causes engendering the exploitation of man by man. There are now two friendly classes in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the working class and the peasantry."

JUST A BAND OF BROTHERS, IS IT?

Actually, the exploitation of the Russian people by their Communist slavemasters makes the 19th century capitalist exploitation of United States and British workers look like a love feast.

The difference between the highest salaries and the lowest wages paid in Soviet Russia is far wider than in the United States.

As for the peasants, they hate the Kremlin's guts because it takes away all of their surplus crops for distribution among the nonfarm population, with the 6 million or so members of the Communist Party (out of a population of some 200 million) getting the pick of all the produce.

There can be no friendliness between workers and peasants under such conditions. Instead, Russia is plagued interminably with food shortages because the peasants slack on the job and hide what farm products they can from the government food snatchers.

That is a far worse "contradiction" than any that exists in the United States, and one which the Reds in 40-plus years' trying have not been able to solve.

We expect to continue this discussion next Monday.

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY—IV

In this last editorial of a series on the 50,000-word 20-year Communist Party program recently issued by N. S. Khrushchev and his comrade cutthroats, we'll try to outline a few of the things we believe the free nations—particularly the United States—can do to counter and eventually wreck the Communist conspiracy.

This conspiracy is a plot to make slaves of the two-thirds of the human race that are not already enslaved to the Reds.

To keep the cold war from getting hot, we need first, last and always to maintain military forces strong and well equipped enough to clobber any enemy or coalition that may make a businesslike pass at us.

Our best information is that in this department the United States is in reasonably good shape and growing more so.

Holding such an insurance policy against a hot war, we can go—

ON THE OFFENSIVE

In the cold war; and if you ask us, the sooner we take the offensive the better.

We could, for example, start a progressive economic squeeze on Soviet Russia and Communist East Germany, to encourage them to pull back in Berlin, and pull back fast.

The Red slave drivers need Western goods—special steels, electronic gadgets, certain chemicals—far more than the free world needs anything the Red slave empire has to sell.

ECONOMIC SQUEEZE; CUBA; WEAPON TESTS

Castro Cuba is another area where we can and should take the cold-war offensive without further delay or worrying about what our Latin American friends may think. Latin Americans, like other people, respect those who stand up for their rights.

We could begin by cutting off all remaining United States-Cuba trade, follow that up with a naval and air blockade of Cuba, and proceed from there to still more vigorous steps if any were needed—which is unlikely.

We should also, it seems to us, resume nuclear weapon tests as soon as we can. That would (1) rapidly improve our nuclear arsenal, and (2) show the world that the United States at last had stopped believing that you can trust any Communist promises on any subject.

As for the propaganda war which is the important part of the whole cold war effort, we could be doing a lot better than we are.

Eugene Lyons years ago wrote a whole book on the proposition that some of our best potential allies are the peoples of the captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania; and, for that matter, the Ukraine, in Russia itself.

WRECKING 'EM FROM WITHIN

Most of our propaganda effort could well be aimed at encouraging these people to do all sorts of termite jobs on the Red slave-state structure—pull factory slowdowns, turn out defective goods for export, sabotage railroads, keep down production on collective farms, and so on.

Maybe we can't wreck the Communist setup from within; but maybe we can, and the attempt to do so is well worth a lot more energy than is going into it now.

If we must continue to let Soviet cultural and study groups come over here, how about showing them around our whole great Nation (except for defense-installation areas), so that they can tell the home folks how vigorous and wealthy the allegedly decadent United States really is?

Lastly, in our opinion, we need a new state of mind in the Kennedy administration, and in all administrations that may follow it for the duration of the cold war.

We need an aggressive and offensive state of mind—a will to conquer communism—to replace the notion that the best we can hope for is to hold our own and lose no more important positions to the enemy.

CATCH UP WITH THE BULK OF US

The bulk of the American people, we're convinced, are already in this wreck-the-Reds mood, and have been for a long time.

Our leaders need to catch up, we believe, with the majority of Americans. If they will do that, they can count on popular backing, to the hilt.

A Recovery and a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Recovery and a Difference," delivered by Mr. Matt S. Szymczak at the management policy conference of the Kentucky Bankers Association, in Louisville, Ky., on July 23, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RECOVERY AND A DIFFERENCE

Yesterday—it seems like yesterday—I was here very often going back and forth to and from school—high school and college. The school is south of here near where Francis Scott Key wrote our national anthem. In fact, my good friend, Senator COOPER, on his own cordial initiative made mention of that fact in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with my retirement from that Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for which I have and always will have the deepest feeling of gratitude and very high regard. I thank Senator COOPER and, of course, I thank you for inviting me here so soon after my resignation from a Government agency.

I feel very good here. This is the State in which I studied, played football, basketball, baseball, and tennis, swam, went fishing and bowled. I don't remember anybody here who had any trouble with my name. In fact, I don't think that anybody here even know I had a name. I just worked here, I just played here, and, as I recall, it was just yesterday, I played more than I worked and believe me I liked that.

You will, therefore, understand and forgive me for getting a little emotional on this occasion as my memory takes me back to what is so vivid, and so recent, and so pleasant, and as my feeling of cordiality extends into today and tomorrow—very close to yesterday—and express respect for the institution and the human beings with whom I am now associated—C. J. Devine & Co. With them I feel very much at home. I like them, and I respect them, and I am proud of our association.

The title of a talk or an article is usually intended to catch the eye and, if it relates to our personal interests, we pursue it further, if not, we move on to something else, and so with spoken and written messages, they must catch the eye first and to compel further pursuit by the listener or reader must awaken personal interest. I write and speak this message to bankers, not only here but everywhere in our country—to you whose business relates to the depositor and to the borrower. Deposits are money and borrowing is credit. If our economy rises to a high level which can be maintained, you, the banker, are in a better position to maintain your business at a high level and as you do that you help others, you help the economy, you help economic recovery. Like almost anything, our economy has many sides and many segments. It isn't all money and credit. In fact, to a large degree, money and credit are but a reflection of buying and selling—buying by the consumer and selling by the producer or by the merchant. As buying and selling progresses, production by industry increases. As production increases, employment increases.

All this brings us to our message—our message of economic recovery. We were in a recession not so long ago; we are now in the process of economic recovery. The outlook is good, but just as not all recessions are the same or due to the same proximate causes, so too not all recoveries are the same and so too economic policy of our Government has to be adjusted to meet the existing situation as it is and not as it would be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write on. It must be timely, it must be relevant, and both monetary and fiscal policy must integrate to the same end.

Today, therefore, I write and talk on that subject just as often before I wrote and spoke on monetary policy and tried to explain in everyday language what it is and what it can and cannot do in our free, dynamic, competitive economy through the instruments of open market operations, reserve requirements, and discounts and discount rates, as well as the selective instrument of margin requirements. Often before I pointed out that essential to a stable, high level economy is fiscal policy—Government expenditures, Government revenues, and I pointed out how important it is to have both monetary and fiscal policies work in unison to the same end and at the right time. What I write and say here is exactly the kind of information the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have—and much more—in order to meet their responsibilities in the public interest, to you and to me. The best any human being can attain in a single message is to awaken interest to the end of pursuing the subject further: to meet our responsibilities as businessmen, as citizens, and to awaken our interest in the responsibilities of our Government to preserve what we have gained in all these many years, by dedication to our system through its free economy and its democracy.

We are out of the recession. We are making a nice recovery. We can safely look ahead to many months of continuing expansion. If experts disagree it is only about pace and depth of the continuing recovery—are we going to have, before long, a full-blown boom, or is it going to a slow rise—coasting along on a plateau, with plenty of excess capacity remaining, with unemployment continuing high, and with little pressure on prices?

There are indications that this recovery will be rather different from earlier ones, and will raise some problems which we have not faced before. I would like to discuss with you the nature of this recovery and its difference and some of its implications.

You know the record of recent weeks. But let me cite it again for this writing. Industrial output has been rising steadily since March, from 102.6 percent of the 1957 average in March to 110 percent in June. This is as good as July 1960 and only 1 percentage point below the peak of January 1960. Average weekly earnings of factory workers reached an alltime high of $94.24 in June. Business inventories have stopped declining, and in May actually gained $100 million. The Commerce Department estimates that total construction expenditures in 1961 will reach $57.8 billion, a rise of 4 percent over 1960. The latest survey of consumer attitudes by the Michigan Survey Research Center shows that more people plan to buy new cars during the next 12 months than planned to do so a year ago, with an especially heavy gain suggested for the fourth quarter of this year. Installment debt in the first 5 months of 1961 declined by $375 million; seen in conjunction with steadily rising personal incomes, this means that the public is becoming more liquid and is in a good position to step up its purchases in the months to come. Add to this the fact that the rate of Government expenditures is rising, too, especially for defense, and you have solid reasons for believing that the rate of output will continue to climb throughout 1961 and at least the better part of 1962.

There is furthermore no danger that a lack of funds will slow the recovery. Demand for business loans has not been heavy; in fact, commercial and industrial loans in the central reserve cities have recently been falling off. Partly as a consequence, Federal Reserve member banks' free reserves are considerably above $500 million.

Interest rates continue moderate. Money market rates have been moving within a fairly narrow range since the beginning of the year; and the yield pattern on U.S. Government securities is fairly similar to what it was before the Federal Reserve began its nudging operations, with the average inter-

est rate just a little higher than last January. No money tightness is anywhere in sight.

But there are also good reasons to doubt that this continuing recovery will soon reach boom proportions. Fiscal 1962 is expected to show a deficit of approximately $5 billion—a healthy boost to the economy, but hardly enough, in the present relaxed state of the economy, to engender really inflationary pressures. And while expenditures in fiscal 1963 are likely to go up further, revenues at present rates may come to roughly $90 billion. That might make possible a tax cut next year and still yield a surplus. Moreover, while the expected buildup in business inventories will provide a stimulus, there is as yet little indication that capital outlays on expansion and improvement—the great booster during the 1955–57 boom—will change very much. Present plans suggest total capital spending in 1961 of $34.5 billion, 3 percent less than in 1960. The reason seems to be that most industries still have more than enough capacity to meet demand.

That brings me to the features which seem likely to set this recovery apart from the recovery after the first three postwar recoveries. We are clearly headed for new postwar highs in most fields, and there is no evident danger of a downturn for many months to come. But whether the trend will soon carry us to full capacity volume seems very doubtful indeed. Plant capacity, as I have pointed out, is ample in most industries. The labor force is now rapidly increasing, with the war and postwar baby boom hitting the labor market. What is more, the progress of automation makes it possible to expand output with relatively little increase in employment. As a consequence unemployment, which has for months been hovering at just below 7 percent of the labor force, may for a long time remain considerably above the 4 percent level that is considered acceptable by the administration. The implications of this could be far reaching.

Labor unions may in the future be less interested in hourly wage boosts, and put more emphasis on fixed yearly incomes, a shorter workweek, and earlier retirement, in other words, on measures to spread the work. Excess capacity may prevent any early upward pressure on prices. These factors, together with the determination of the administration not to see the recovery prematurely strangled, as was the case in 1960, would lead one to expect that there will be less preoccupation with the dangers of inflation; continued easy or at least neutral money policies; and possibly tax cuts to push the economy closer to its full potential.

What is that going to mean in terms of interest rates and stock and bond prices? In the first half of this year the administration and the Federal Reserve have succeeded reasonably well in preventing the short-term rate from falling any further while keeping the long-term rate from rising as the recovery got underway. Thus, according to Under Secretary Roosa, the policy of trying to encourage a flow of long-term funds into business channels "has succeeded beyond our wildest dreams—the volume of corporate and municipal securities in the second quarter was a record." It must be expected that long-term rates will rise somewhat as the recovery progresses, but probably not excessively. Not only are the authorities poised to prevent a steep rise, but there is also the prospect of more funds flowing into the bond market. For a long time now there has been a remarkable yield spread between stocks and bonds. In the past the willingness of investors to be satisfied with a relatively low yield on equities has been explained on two grounds: expected growth, and hedging against inflation. But the profit squeeze casts doubt on a growth argument and excess capacity and recent instances of price cutting make the danger of renewed inflation seem less imminent. Under such circumstances fixed interest securities may well appear more and more attractive to many investors, especially in view of the higher yields.

There is one last feature of our present recovery that needs to be mentioned: our heightened sensitivity to the balance of international payments. Throughout the postwar years we could implement desired domestic policies with little or no regard to international repercussions—indeed, during the years of the so-called dollar gap, the greatest contribution we could make to international stability was to keep our economy working as close to capacity as possible. But all that has now changed. Not only are we acutely conscious, after 3 years of heavy international deficits, that every pickup in our domestic economy is bound to spill over into increased imports, last year's speculation against the dollar has also brought home to us how vulernable we have become through the use of the dollar as an international reserve currency. With a $17 billion gold stock in our hands, and $20 billion short-term dollars balances in the hands of foreigners, that elusive thing "confidence" has suddenly become important. No longer is it good enough for our balance-of-payments position to be sound; it must be seen and judged to be sound. Fortunately for us, our balance of payments has of late been improving. Our deficit has been running at a rate of approximately $1.2 billion annually so far, and is expected to remain at the figure for the full year, compared to $3.8 billion in 1960. The outflow of short-term capital has apparently stopped, and the value of our exports continues to exceed the value of imports by an annual rate of approximately $5 billion more or less. So far our expanding domestic activity has not yet brought the feared rise in imports, and the continuing boom abroad, especially in West Germany and Japan, gives promise of keeping our exports relatively high. The fact remains, nonetheless, that nowadays we have to keep looking over our shoulder to watch our foreign transactions. Renewed inflation would promptly hurt our exports, and the repercussions would be serious. The fancy-free days of the early postwar years are indeed gone, and we suddenly find, as so many other countries have before us, that prosperity raises almost as many problems as it solves.

That we are in the midst of a healthy recovery is evident, and is something to be grateful for. But it is also clear that in the problems it raises, this recovery is unlike any that preceded it.

None of this is new or revealing or even stimulative. All of this is prosaic, matter of fact, but good for you and me to read and hear over and over again to afford us an informed and receptive attitude for more information and constant search for solutions of the problems that emerge. Let's cease looking for headlines. Let's read and study the facts and the figures.

More pointedly, therefore, let me emphasize the need for us as bankers to know the domestic and international situation; the economic and the political activities—the private and the public needs and satisfactions. No longer can you and I say that we are concerned only with our own bank—our own business—for that means we have no other interest—public or private; those days are gone forever. We must be government conscious—we must be conscious of our national and international economic and political problems and seek their solution. And we must do all of this—as we do our daily work, objectively and thoroughly and consistently. In this way, we make a contribution to the welfare and to the safety and to the efficacy and to the preservation of free enterprise and free markets and freedom of our people. This, believe me, is not just an oratorical outburst at the end of this paper. It comes from my heart and from my years of experience in Government. I know you know that.

Let's get together again—whenever we can.

Flags of Convenience in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the current maritime strike has as one of its principle issues the question of flags of convenience. I am advised that ships totaling approximately 10 million deadweight tons have been constructed by private American capital and are now under foreign registry in Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. Such ships are referred to as flags of convenience.

From a standpoint of national defense, these ships can be recovered for our national needs in the event of a national emergency. However, we are facing a situation under which the owners of these tankers and bulk cargo carriers may sell or make an outright transfer of these ships to foreign countries. In that event, the right of recovery of these ships in a national emergency would cease to exist.

Since we do not have, under American registry, sufficient tonnage of this type of ship to meet the requirements of national defense in times of national emergency, it is both important and urgent that we adopt a national policy which will protect the national interest.

This situation has led to an exchange of correspondence between the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Hon. Roswell Gilpatric, and me. In view of the importance of this matter to the national interest, I feel it both proper and necessary to bring this correspondence to the public attention. The Deputy Secretary has agreed to the necessity and propriety of this course of action.

The exchange of correspondence was as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, August 24, 1961.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to put before you the interest of the Department of Defense in the flags-of-convenience question, one of the issues in the dispute that led to the maritime strike of last spring.

The Taft-Hartley injunction against the continuance of the maritime strike will expire September 20, and if the dispute is not resolved by that time, the strike is likely to be resumed by the west coast unions. If this should happen and the strike should continue, we are advised that some owners of flags-of-convenience vessels may sell the ships to foreign uncontrolled registries.

Because of the effect which such a transfer of tonnage out of U.S. control would have on defense needs in the event of a national emergency, we asked the Secretary of the Navy to review its requirements for flags-of-convenience vessels in the event of war. The Navy has done so and has confirmed its previous position that it is imperative

that "U.S. effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping be retained." That position has been adopted as the Defense Department's position in the matter, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor have been so informed. A complete statement of that position is as follows:

"1. The primary interest of the Department of Defense in flags-of-convenience shipping relates to the impact of our national defense posture and this interest is to insure the availability under U.S. control of as much of this shipping as may be needed in the event of national emergency. The amount of active U.S.-flag shipping now available is inadequate for almost any situation of war or emergency and must be augmented by shipping which can be brought under our direct control as required in the event of an emergency.

"2. It is considered imperative that United States effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping be retained. Further, it is considered that such flags-of-convenience shipping as is covered by agreements or contracts with owners can be brought under our operational control as was done in World War II.

"3. This dependence on effective control of flags-of-convenience shipping for emergency use is an expedient. It would be much more desirable to have adequate U.S.-flag tonnage available. However, this ideal situation does not exist, and until enough U.S.-flag tonnage is available, we will need to rely on flags-of-convenience ships.

"4. Until such time as our national emergency needs can be completely met by modern American-flag shipping, the Department of Defense has no recourse but to support the flags-of-convenience concept. The possible loss of the shipping capability represented by American-owned shipping of Panlibhon registry to uncontrolled registries is of great concern to the Department of Defense."

In view of Defense interest in having available sufficient merchant tonnage for military shipping tonnage in emergency situations we would like to see established a national policy based on the above position, and the Secretary of Labor has informed me that he agrees with this view. Therefore, without taking sides in the current labor-management controversy in the maritime industry, the Defense Department intends to do all it can to have its position adopted as national policy.

Believing that you will share our concern in a matter of this importance to U.S. national security, I would appreciate an expression of your own views in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1961.

Hon. ROSWELL GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of August 24 wherein you outline the interest of the Department of Defense in the flags-of-convenience question, and the possible adverse impact which this question could have upon our national defense capabilities in the event of an emergency.

Inasmuch as the Taft-Hartley injunction will expire on September 20, and none of us can predict developments beyond that date, it is quite obvious that this matter is of the highest importance in defense considerations. By this same token, I deem the prompt adoption of a firm national policy on this matter to be of equal importance.

As you point out, such action is required in the national interest. I want you to know that I fully agree with the national policy position which you propose and urge you to pursue its adoption at the highest levels of government as promptly as possible.

This matter transcends the interests of any individual or group and it is my judgment that our exchange of correspondence on the subject should be made a matter of public record. Accordingly, I propose to insert this correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would appreciate your expression as to that proposed course of action.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

Berlin Bungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, when President Kennedy appointed General Taylor as his personal military adviser—and many Members of Congress still think this is a violation of the law—it was expected that we would have no military problems in the future. Now, as it has turned out and according to the article by Ted Lewis in the New York Daily News on August 25, and the article by David Wise in the New York Herald Tribune on August 26, that we had no contingency plans ready in the Berlin crisis when the Reds sealed off with barbed wire the road to East Berlin, the American people have a right to ask why.

CAPITAL CIRCUS
(By Ted Lewis)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—The most alarming bit of information about our handling of the Berlin crisis is that the Kennedy administration had no contingency plans ready when the Reds sealed off East Berlin with barbed wire.

Now if the Cuban invasion fiasco of last April proved anything, it was that in every crisis there should be hard plans ready for any contingency. In the Cuban experience there was nothing that reflected more on the President and his advisers than the fact that no one had even considered the possibility that the invasion would fail. So the administration had no plan of action ready.

More than 3 weeks ago, 10 days in advance of the setting up of the East Berlin barricades, one of our lower-rung experts on Germany made a good guess as to what was likely to happen. Unfortunately, he was not one of President Kennedy's many advisers.

This expert casually gave his opinion that the crisis would likely develop by sealing off the border, and this could lead to fighting.

"Do you know," he added, "they (the powers that be) have done no advance contingency planning for this?"

We have verified this. On Sunday, August 13, when the barbed wire went up, neither we nor any of our allies were prepared to take action. There had simply been no consideration of this possibility and what we ought to do should it happen.

For the sake of the record, however, once the barricades were clamped down, there came a call by diplomatic veterans for immediate drastic action—to which President Kennedy failed to respond.

In this cadre of Presidential advisers were former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Gen. Lucius Clay, former U.S. Military Governor for Germany, CIA officials (presumably headed by Chief Allen Dulles) and Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. There were others in this group, middle echelon veterans of other cold war crises, so it constituted a pretty formidable array.

This group argues that there should have been a contingency plan. Yet since some of them, including Acheson, have had the President's ear on the Berlin crisis right along, we suspect their pitch for an advance plan was pretty weak tea or they would have got somewhere.

ACT FAST, THEY URGED KENNEDY

They did, however, press the President to act fast, once the border was closed. They urged that Allied troops should move up on the East Berlin border with instructions to pull down barbed wire and masonry walls without a by your leave.

"What if the East German troops start firing?" it was asked.

"That could happen," was the reply, "but we firmly believe they would back off rather than fight. And if they backed off, as we expect, undoubtedly it would be on orders coming from Khrushchev himself. Khrushchev certainly has a contingency plan. Our belief is that it was along this line—if the Allies strike at the barbed wire, don't fight."

This proposal for our troops to tear down the obstructions has obviously become less feasible with every passing day. Yet the hard-line school is still arguing that it should be done, better late than never. If, they say, the protocol boys are unhappy about such rude surprise, action, go ahead and send Mr. K. a little note, telling him that beginning at 8 a.m., Saturday, August 26, for example, we will clear the way into East Berlin.

RUSK'S COURSE SOMEWHAT OF A MYSTERY

President Kennedy, who has been ultracautious since his experience with Cuba, still won't buy this proposal. Instead, he is determined to follow the line pressed mainly by some State Department advisers. These include Assistant Secretary of State Foy D. Kohler and Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen, special assistant to Secretary Rusk and a top Russian expert.

What part Rusk played in influencing the President is somewhat of a mystery. As good a guess as any is that he did the sidelines act, which permitted him to be on the President's side whichever way the President moved.

The case of the Bohlen-Kohler contingent should be stated; otherwise it might appear the President was just running away from a showdown. These advisers argued that West Germany (meaning Chancellor Adenauer) did not favor drastic action at the time and still doesn't. (The reasons are involved, and it is not fair to oversimplify them briefly.)

PLAYING THE CRISIS BY EAR

They also argued that the alleged rights of the Allied powers in Berlin were based on complex agreements. It would, therefore, be unwise to take armed action which might kick off World War III unless we had a clear-cut legal case, which we probably don't in view of the way agreements have been allowed to erode since 1949.

The crux of their argument, however, is that the real guts issue is the survival of West Berlin itself and its people. So we should not fritter away our position by fighting over dubiously grounded rights.

"Keep your eyes on the heart of the matter" was their clincher argument at the White House.

So much for reporting the pros and cons of the inner-administration controversy. The important thing is that the administration is playing important phases of the Berlin crisis by ear. With all the highly touted braintrusters at Kennedy's beck and call, is it asking too much that just one double-

dome be assigned to the job of readying a plan to counter any move the Communists may make?

CRISIS ADVISERS FAILED TO ALERT KENNEDY, FORCED HAND, UPSET PLAN

(By David Wise)

HYANNIS PORT, MASS., August 25.—The East German shutdown of the Berlin border has thrown a gigantic and unexpected monkey wrench into the administration's carefully-geared plan for handling the Berlin crisis.

This is becoming increasingly apparent to administration policymakers now that the effect of the border closing 2 weeks ago has had a chance to sink in. And President Kennedy, who flew here this afternoon for the weekend, is understood to be somewhat disappointed in his own advisers.

The President's discontent, according to informed officials, is based on his feeling that his advisers failed to anticipate the border shutdown and the explosive emotions it would generate in West Germany and West Berlin.

While some advisers made mention of the possibility that the East Germans would close the border between East and West Berlin, most of the working papers that reached the President's desk from the State Department and other branches of the Government failed to emphasize this as a likelihood or analyze the consequences.

As a result the White House found itself in the midst of a crisis that it had not foreseen, and was forced to take emergency action to deal with it.

Before the border shutdown, the administration had devised a timetable of moves designed to convince Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev that the United States meant business when it said it would not be forced out of West Berlin. These moves included a carefully staged military buildup, to be followed by negotiations, first among the Western powers, and then with Moscow, to resolve the crisis.

The border shutdown, officials now feel, has created such a potentially dangerous situation that the timetable may have to be moved up. Before the shutdown, the planning was to do no negotiating before the West German elections September 17. Now, there is talk of a Western Foreign Ministers meeting in New York shortly after Labor Day.

President Kennedy was here on Cape Cod 2 weekends ago when the Communist East German Government shut the Berlin border. The seriousness of the situation and the fact that West Berlin was a tinderbox of emotion became clear only in the days that followed. By the end of last week the President was obliged to act.

He decided to send Vice President JOHNSON and a 1,500-man Army battle group to Berlin last weekend to boost morale.

But the tension in the White House during all of last Friday, when the decision to send the battle group was made final, did not seep out to the public. President Kennedy, it was understood, was seriously concerned over the possibility that Soviet or East German troops would attempt to interfere with the battle group's movement across East Germany to West Berlin. Had this happened, it would very likely have led to an armed clash.

That is why the President left orders to be awakened in case of trouble when he went to bed last Friday at midnight. And that is why his military aide, Brig. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, spent the night in the White House "situation room" scanning reports of the battle group's progress up the autobahn.

The Chief Executive arrived at Otis Air Force Base near here at 4:30 p.m. by jet from Andrews Air Force Base outside of Washington and immediately helicoptered to his seaside home. This is his ninth weekend in Hyannis Port since July 1.

Accompanying the President were his brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy; his sister, Pat, and her husband, Actor Peter Lawford; his brothers-in-law, Stephen E. Smith and R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., and several administration officials and family friends who hitchhiked a ride to summer homes in the area here. Mr. Kennedy will return to the Capital Monday morning.

The Evils of Size

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following penetrating article which appeared in the Minnetonka Herald in my district in Minnesota, on June 1:

THE EVILS OF SIZE

(Guest editorial by Frank P. Leslie)

Anyone who has served in the Federal Government knows the feeling of helplessness that comes over every individual as he is swallowed up by its very size.

To work in any organization where it makes little difference what you do, to find out that everyone around you has come to the same conclusion, inevitably results in a deadening of spirit and in a lessening of conscience.

The indifference of performance that results from such experience is bad enough but it is not the whole story.

When an ambitious man discovers that he can satisfy none of his ambitions for the organization as a whole, he begins to satisfy his own ambitions. He no longer cares what happens to the cause or the work itself but has his eye on what is going to happen to him. Empire building is the inevitable consequence and politics in its worst form the most inviting ambition.

The government then functions not for the sake of the people but for the sake of individuals and their own ambitions.

The government being monopolistic, the disciplines of competition do not restrain the personal ambitions of men, so the people's dollars are spent regardless of the service rendered or the efficiency of the performance itself. All government spending is limited only by the taxing power, not the productive or creative power which motivates individual enterprise.

In the end it makes no difference whether the all-powerful government exists in our country, in Spain, in Russia, or anywhere else. The ambitions of men are the same everywhere. The evils of monopoly are the same everywhere.

Our country was born out of the conception that the individual is important. The greatest teacher of this truth was Jesus Christ. The infusion of Christian principle into our form of government was the real cause for the genius of American creativity.

It is not enough to say that there were great natural resources in our country. The development of these resources came from the awakened spirit of individuals who found in our country, the freedom to do their best and to receive a reward for their labors. The terific impact of human desire to achieve and the belief that each man could achieve is the real secret of the greatness of America.

When everyone thinks he has a chance to achieve, the competition becomes tremendous and inevitably somebody gets hurt. Someone does better than another. We forget that the whole society have done better under this concept than under any other previously invented by the human mind and spirit. We were on the right track when we set up regulatory bodies for such monopolies as public utilities and when we passed the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Now an unfortunate reaction has set in. In our desire to cushion the blows of vigorous competition and individual enterprise, we have overaccented the necessity of security. In our desire for security, we are seeking more and more the benevolence of our Government and therefore increasing its power over us, while losing our faith in ourselves.

Our entire economic system is changing from free vigorous competition to governmental regimentation, and the disappearance of the individual in the labyrinth of governmental domination.

The outworn system of cartels has made its appearance in our American enterprise. Price fixing is just a form of cartel. A closed shop union is another form of cartel. Both represent an artificial attempt to achieve security as a substitute for the earned security we have traditionally sought.

When a poor workman cannot be replaced by a better workman, we are no longer a worthy competitor in anything. Let this concept enter the field of sports and the stands will be empty. Let it prevail in music (the battle is on right now) and the Metropolitan Opera will be no more.

This concept now spreading through all phases of American life is deadly poison. It will kill our country. It is already deadening the spirit of our people.

In the great and generous spirit of the American people, there is a proper desire to help the other peoples of the world. We are attempting it in the same way that a successful father turns out a spoiled son, by giving him everything instead of letting him earn it.

The only real progress any nation will achieve begins within itself. Any nation adopting the concepts which made our country great will throw off their caste systems, their sacred fetishes, their cartel systems and free the talents of their people. They will then take the same hard road that our people took and in time will become the nations of the future.

Toward this end we should be wholly willing to help; provided that we, in the meantime, restore our own health and vigor by returning to our tradition of freedom to achieve, by again believing in ourselves and in our pride of independence.

A Spy Is a Spy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted, I present the text of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 23, 1961. In doing so I wish to again emphatically state that, in my opinion, based upon about 14 years of active membership in the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this is no time in the history of our beloved Nation for any person or persons to sanction or to commit any act

which is designed to weaken the internal security of our Nation or to contribute to the lessening of our national security against either domestic or international subversive Soviet communism.

Mr. Speaker, in making these remarks, I would like to state specifically that at this time, in my judgment, it would be increasingly hazardous to in any way lessen the effectiveness of the FBI, the Senate Internal Security Committee, or the House Un-American Activities Committee or the availability of their respective programs to our people. The work of these three great security agencies, as we all know, is specifically designed for and dedicated to the protection of our beloved country against a spy or any group of spies who are deliberately, actively, and subversively betraying their adopted country—the United States of America.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

A SPY IS A SPY

Federal District Judge William B. Herlands has taken a justifiably stern view of the wartime espionage operations of the convicted Soviet spy, Dr. Robert Soblen. Refusing leniency despite Dr. Soblen's plea that he is suffering from lymphatic leukemia, a usually fatal malady, Judge Herlands said in New York district court: "A spy is a spy, no matter what his health may be."

The judge was mindful of the fact that the evidence had proved that Dr. Soblen, a naturalized Lithuanian who became a supervising psychiatrist in a New York State hospital, had played an important role in a Russian spy ring which sent vital military secrets to Moscow during World War II. Included in the stolen information were data concerning the secret activities of the Office of Strategic Services, our supersecret wartime intelligence agency. As Judge Herlands commented in sentencing Dr. Soblen to life imprisonment, a plot in wartime to give military information to a foreign power could imperil the lives of all Americans.

Dr. Soblen was convicted partly on the testimony of his brother, Jack Soble (the original spelling of the family name), who had pleaded guilty to espionage earlier and had been sent to prison. Why these men from Lithuania, a land seized by the Russians and converted into a Soviet satellite, could be induced to spy for a nation which had robbed their country of its liberty is something not explained. But the fact is that they did betray their adopted country and, in so doing, may have imperiled the lives of all Americans. Leniency in such cases would be out of the question.

Results of U.S. Aid to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the millions of dollars which are being requested by the administration to aid distressed areas in the United States, I think the following New York Times article of July 13, 1961, will serve to illuminate further the absurdity of some of our foreign aid programs. With many thousands of people unemployed in this country, taxes and Government spending almost at the breaking point, and free nations looking to the United States for help, we are not only using American-made goods to further entrench the Communist dictators, but, as this clipping points out, dealing with the same crew of Red leaders who today praise United States-Polish technical cooperation and tomorrow will be again denouncing us.

The opening of this steel plant, which, according to this article, presented a rare opportunity to direct public attention to U.S. economic aid to Poland, offers a most cogent example of the complete inability of the United States to get its message across to the people of the captive nations. While we gratefully accept the occasional token recognition of our aid, we totally ignore the fact that sending this aid to our ideological enemies does not win respect, but ridicule, for our naivete. Our aid does not help the people held in the grip of Communist slavery.

How many stories such as this must we read before we stop behaving like an indulgent rich uncle and begin facing the economic and political facts of life?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article from the New York Times, July 13, 1961, in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time :

GOOD WILL MARKS FETE IN POLAND AS U.S. ENVOY OPENS PROJECT—BEAM, AT NOWA HUTA STEEL PLANT, SNIPS RIBBON TO START UP PRODUCTION LINE PROVIDED WITH U.S. CREDITS

(By Arthur J. Olson)

NOWA HUTA, POLAND, July 12.—In one of the sunnier moments in recent Polish-United States relations, Ambassador Jacob D. Beam ceremonially opened today a new production line at the big Lenin Steel Works here.

The new facility, a continuous steel galvanizing line, was financed with a $2,500,000 credit from the United States. The equipment is American made.

In an unusual gesture of official good will, Ambassador Beam was flown to this new city, outside Cracow, under the auspices of the Polish Foreign Ministry to snip a white acetate ribbon stretched in front of the gleaming new machinery.

Piotr Jaroszewicz, acting Premier during a visit of Premier Jozef Cyrankiewicz in Outer Mongolia, was on hand to praise United States-Polish "technical and economic cooperation" and to express hope for more of it.

DENOUNCED KENNEDY EARLIER

Three months ago, M. Jaroszewicz was the chief speaker at an anti-United States rally in Warsaw during which he denounced President Kennedy as "hyprocritical."

Since then Poland has opened negotiations in Washington for $180 million worth of surplus farm products and for $5 million in industrial credit.

The ceremony gave Mr. Beam one of his rare opportunities to direct public attention to United States economic aid to Poland, which has been under way since 1956. This aid has reached a total of $426 million.

The galvanizing line, designed and manufactured in Pittsburgh and installed here under supervision of American technicans, is "a demonstration of Polish-American economic cooperation," Mr. Beam said.

POLE PRAISES EQUIPMENT

The official reply was delivered by Miroslaw Kaim, Deputy Minister of Heavy Industry. He praised the valuable American equipment, which, "to a large extent, meets our urgent needs."

The 1,000 tons of machinery that went into the 500-foot-long galvanizing line represent the only United States contribution to Communist Poland's development of heavy industry. Of the Lenin plant's 200,000 tons of machinery, 110,000 tons were delivered by the Soviet Union. Most of the remainder was produced in Poland.

Nowa Huta, which was 2 square miles of farmland a decade ago, will turn out 2 million tons of steel this year. Its goal is 3,500,000 tons capacity by 1965.

The Peace Corps Splices Idealism to Practicality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Peace Corps Splices Idealism to Practicality," from the June 4 issue of the Louisville Courier Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE CORPS SPLICES IDEALISM TO PRACTICALITY

The Peace Corps has reached the point of asking Congress for its first appropriation. The sum is $40 million for the first fiscal year. President Kennedy says that from 500 to 1,000 volunteers will go overseas before the end of 1961, with numbers increasing later.

Corps Director Sargent Shriver and his advisers have already managed to allay sincere doubts on several major points.

1. The Corps will start on a small scale, with the volunteers carefully screened and only the most useful accepted. Those sent to oversea areas will have to demonstrate that they have strong bodies, alert minds, and stable personalities. As one official spokesman said recently at Indiana University: "We do not intend to send starry-eyed young people out to spread vague nostrums of good will."

2. The examinations now being given to volunteers are well designed. They bring out not only practical skills but attitudes of mind.

3. It has been positively established that Corps men will only go where they are requested. The first unit will help build roads in Tanganyika, a hopeful African country on the brink of nationhood. Another will aid small farmers in Colombia. Nigeria has offered a rural school as a training center, and has indicated that it wants "all the Peace Corps men we can get." Thus the pattern emerges.

4. The idea that the Corps might become a sort of college house party overseas has been dispelled. The labor unions are working with Mr. Shriver to channel young union technicians into the program, whose skills are urgently needed. The pay has been set at a sacrificial level. Conditions of life in the Corps camps will be austere.

5. Plans have been worked out with J. Edgar Hoover to screen all applicants, so that possible Communist infiltrators will be eliminated.

The Peace Corps is showing its vitality in the enemies it makes. Soviet authorities have denounced it as a "crafty plot of Amer-

ican imperialists." A gathering of far-left African leaders in Cairo warned that the youthful Corps men would be spies and saboteurs. But non-Communist opinion abroad is warming toward the Corps.

The proof of the Peace Corps must yet be shown in its actual operations overseas. There still are serious problems to be solved, including those created for young Americans by difficult climate and unfamiliar diet. But the planning has been impressively practical.

If the program can be made to work as now appears likely, it will serve several worthwhile purposes at once. It will offer a constructive outlet for the idealism of young Americans, now often frustrated and soured into cynicism; it will give help to nations striving to achieve economic as well as political independence; and it will serve as a useful training ground for members of our own career Foreign Service. On all counts the Peace Corps deserves a green light from Congress.

Come and Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday, August 21 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A6541, I inserted a sermon in which the minister raised some rather pertinent questions. His theme—"The Soft American"—and who is there who would deny that because of a paternalistic government, far too many are becoming just that.

In his concluding remarks the minister drew a corollary between the eagle and the oyster. The oyster was probably the first living creature that was given economic and social security. God placed the oyster in a shell to protect it from its enemies. It never moves, simply lies still, opens its shell and food floats in.

That same Creator gave us the eagle, a bird of great strength—with a graceful figure, keenness of vision and powers of flight, which does not wait for its food to float by but goes to the highest peak, builds its own home, rears its family under severe handicaps, goes in search of food, fights for it, if need be, is not deterred by rain and storm, heat or cold, always tending toward complete independence.

When our forefathers decided on an emblem to symbolize the strength of the United States, they wisely chose the eagle than the oyster.

Are we not today developing a race of oysters rather than one of eagles, a race willing to sit back in its easy chair, relax and each time sufficient energy is generated, proclaim in a loud voice—"the world owes me a living"?

The editorial which follows appeared in the August 24 issue of the Wall Street Journal and it, too, is concerned with the question of oysters or eagles. That is a choice that inevitably must be made:

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

"This is 1 year people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of their cotton, because we ain't going to do it."

Speaking from his rocking chair is a citizen of Corsicana, Tex., and his words ought to go down as one of the more memorable remarks of the year. And in his observation, reported in a page 1 story this morning, we think the gentleman from Texas is showing one of the chief attributes of intelligence, adjusting sensibly to one's environment. He ain't going to hoe because there ain't no need to.

Without stirring from his chair, save once a month on a Tuesday morning, he can stock his larder with flour, cornmeal, rice and butter, and even feed his family with fancier fare, including peanut butter, oatmeal, beans, eggs, and meat. He hasn't struck oil; he's just found a gusher in the Federal surplus food disposal program.

So no longer is the man with the hoe bent with burdens; they have been transferred to others who must pay the taxes to provide him with his pork and beans. And for the life of us, we can't avoid a certain admiration for him and the others like him.

There are a good many others like him, as our reporter found out. Since the administration in Washington broadened the menu of the Federal food program the number of people taking advantage of it has skyrocketed. Last June when the country was suffering from a recession there were some 3.3 million people on the public food rolls. At the end of June this year the number had almost doubled, to 6.2 million people.

Since Washington broadened the free food program the number of recipients in Illinois has jumped from 63,000 to 90,000 betwixt January and June; from 70,000 to 118,000 in Indiana; in North Carolina from 1,000 to 147,000. And all this during a period in which, as Washington reminds us, we are climbing out of the recession.

No doubt there are, among these millions, many who are in true need. But nowadays need is something it is not nice to inquire about; it might embarrass men with pride. So men with no pride, but with sense enough to know a good thing when they see it, can have a field day without ever tilling the fields.

In New York City, for example, people load up with free food and use their money to carry it home in a taxi. In Corsicana, Tex., they cause traffic jams driving to the food office in their automobiles. So, not surprisingly, the local grocer finds his sales of staple foods off 10 percent since the Government started offering pork-and-beans to all comers. But the same customers boom his sales of cigarettes, soft drinks, cake mixes, and candy—which is not surprising either.

Nor is it surprising that the cost of all this has also skyrocketed. In the first 6 months of this year the Federal Government quadrupled the cost of the program over the like period in 1960; at $139 million for the whole fiscal year the total is the highest in the 25 years of the program, which reaches back into the years of the great depression. And in Washington, officials say they "see no reason to believe" the cost will go anyway but up.

For all a man has to do, in most communities, is say he needs food and the Government will give it to him. There is no need for anyone to be amazed at men—from Corsicana, Tex., to Newburgh, N.Y.—who see no need to work when they can eat without working. Lazy people are not fools.

So before you start berating the man who threw away the hoe, ask yourself a question: Who is the more intelligent? The man, like yourself, who works hard, pays taxes, and lets the politicians pass around the bounty? Or the man with emptiness in his face who sits back and enjoys the bounty in his rocking chair?

Senator Humphrey Is the Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the Los Angeles Times carried a feature story about HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the senior Senator from my State of Minnesota. Those of us from Minnesota are all proud of the Senator and our praise of him has been heard often over many years. We welcome the words of Mr. Holmes Alexander, of the Los Angeles Times, because he says in a direct and effective way what Senator HUMPHREY's friends in Minnesota have been saying and feel so deeply. Under unanimous consent I insert excerpts of this fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SENATOR HUMPHREY IS THE CHAMPION

(By Holmes Alexander)

Some future Gibbon, when he describes the decline and even, alas, records the fall of the American Republic, will have reason to write that the great Senators of the period were the "naysayers," the "slower-uppers," the "turner-backers."

But while "woe criers," and disciplinarians are the need of the times, they aren't what makes the horses pull the buggy. When you search for the Senator of 1961, you must ask: Who makes the Senate go? Who is the humming, high-powered transmission line from the White House to the upper chambers? Who is Mr. Big now that LYNDON JOHNSON has gone to the Vice Presidency?

Put these questions in this manner, and the regulars of the Senate press gallery, I think, would come very close to answering in unison. Although MIKE MANSFIELD is majority leader, and could win practically any vote of popularity and confidence, the well nigh indisputable winner of Senator of the Year title would go to HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Anybody is entitled to his personal opinion about the causes for HUMPHREY'S astonishing emergence. He has risen from the social Senate ostracism of 10 years ago, the tiresome rabble-rousing of 5 years ago, and the mortifying defeat for presidential honors last year, to true eminence in the world's snootiest and most jealous circle.

Some will tell you that his success is a payoff for HUMPHREY'S what-makes-Sammy-run exertions in his own behalf. Others give the overworked explanation that HUMPHREY is a mellowed radical—keeping most of his friends on the left, welcomed by new friends of the right and center. You can hear it said that he is a parliamentary accident—filling the void created by JOHNSON'S departure.

My own diagnosis being that of an observer rather than a friend and admirer, is synthesized by the Senator's middle name and its literary connotation. In the world that Horatio Alger wrote about, virtue always won, honest, endeavor was rewarded, the kind heart received the recompense of warm friendship and helping hands up the ladder.

Well, HUMPHREY has led a blameless public life. His industry is stupenduous. His loving kindness is undeniable. I first conceived of him as Senator of the Year when I saw him take the floor this winter to pull a couple of angry Democrats off MIKE MANSFIELD'S back.

Later he inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column of mine about John Nagle,

the blind pusher of programs for the blind. Earlier this month I was in the gallery when HUMPHREY delivered a scathing speech against the disgraceful conditions in the Freedmen's Hospital in Washington.

In an election year, acts of kindness by politicians are suspect. Perhaps the best testament to HUMPHREY'S sincerity is that his enthusiasms of 1960, when he was a candidate first for President and then for Senator, are unabated in 1961.

For example peace and disarmament are campaign banalities, and last year HUMPHREY almost never stopped talking about these and the domestic demagogueries of something-for-everybody. But today, with a new 6-year Senate term and with a long-lease tenant in the White House, HUMPHREY babbles on—as if he meant every word of the campaign oratory, a perishable product by most men's standards.

Finally, HUMPHREY'S most winning trait in the book I keep on politicians is his good sportsmanship. I saw him mauled last year in West Virginia by the merciless Kennedy gang. At the Democratic Convention, HUMPHREY dramatized his estimation of John Kennedy by coming out for Adlai Stevenson with no hope of having a winner.

Yet, in the campaign, HUMPHREY turned his back on many Minnesota followers who expressed detestation of Kennedy's religion. And in the Senate, no Member rises more quickly, more effectively, more knowledgeably, to the President's defense than HUBERT HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY is, by these criteria and a wide margin, Senator of 1961.

Kremlin's Crisis Program for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the long term Communist attack on this country—on our internal life as well as our international position—is often minimized by many well-meaning people in the United States. Because a view from outside the country can be especially useful in this situation I want to share with my colleagues an excellent article appearing in the Evening Star of August 22:

KREMLIN'S CRISES PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES: SWISS OBSERVER SEES REDS PLANNING TO COMBINE DOMESTIC, WORLD TROUBLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—I once remarked to a Swiss friend who has spent many years in America that I thought I would like to live in Zurich on the shores of the beautiful Zurichsee. "The lake is pretty to look at, but you'd be bored to death," my friend answered.

It is true that life in Switzerland can be dull. The Swiss are, by and large, stolid, unimaginative (in our meaning of the word) and uninteresting. But they live by the code of commonsense, have a passion for independence and a fierce love for their country. They are uncluttered with experimental intellectual thinking and cling with religious fervor to their constitution, which has prevented them from falling into the claptrap of international adventures.

They have learned that they cannot afford the luxury of playing with deceiving ideologies or wishful thinking like so many big businessmen in the free world. That is why government and business are completely separated.

This came strongly to mind as I discussed the present world crises with one of the most prosperous manufacturers in Switzerland whose interests are spread to the Middle East, the United States and England. His blunt language also strongly reminded me of the fact that we in America no longer speak of certain truths lest they be impolite, undiplomatic or controversial. Because of the wealth of information he is gathering from his representatives around the world it is interesting to sum up his philosophy.

"We Swiss," he said, "have been prepared for the present trouble since the end of the last war. We have done this because we do not fool ourselves that there will be peace in the world for a long time. We are perfectly sure there will be no annihilation of nations by nuclear war—for this is a war of wits. Lenin, Stalin, and now Khrushchev have predicated the success of their efforts to that end, not on military or nuclear adventures.

"Contrary to the belief of the Kremlin, we also feel perfectly sure that a revolution will bring to an end the Communist conspiracy all over the world. But this will not happen until there have been great upheavals everywhere.

"The key is, of course, the United States. There was a time when Washington could have prevented the upheaval, but now I fear it is too late. However, though it was the weak policies of the United States which brought on the present world conditions, the victory of the free world will be led by America.

"The trouble has been that over the last 30 years you have had four very fine men as Presidents, not one of whom has understood the Communist conspiracy. And not one of them has realized that it was not they who guided the destiny of America and indirectly the world, but those who have ensconced themselves in permanent niches in your political life. The changes in administration merely means a reshuffling of positions as far as they are concerned. Many of these once actually believed that if the United States gave proof of its friendship to Soviet Russia it would be reciprocated. When this did not happen, they became stubborn and now they believe that a sugar-coated form of appeasement is the only course to insure peace. You can find them in the executive as well as legislative branches of your Government in Washington.

"The world revolution already is beginning its last phase—just as the statement of the 81 Communist Parties declared in Moscow in December 1960. The most recent phase is to combine, for the first time, internal domestic strife and crises in the nations of the free world, with international crises. This is for the purpose of throwing the free government off keel. In your country, for instance, the hidden Communists have been able by remote control to stir up racial strife which every day is becoming more acute and more dangerous to your domestic tranquility.

"And again, by remote control, the hidden Communists have been able to influence your educational system, or rather to experiment with it. The result is that many of your children no longer have reverence for God, country, and parents. The present highest rate in the world of juvenile delinquency and crimes in America is not in the American character—the minds of your youths have been infected.

"While continental Europe—especially we in Switzerland and Germany—are free of labor strife, you and the British are beset with strikes in many key industries. Your people are literally dizzy with troubles, and the cure for everything from Communist inroads in foreign countries to business slumps is found by you in 'more government.' Europeans, who know of your economic troubles, are aghast at the billions you allocate so lightheartedly, both overseas and at home.

"Your Government seems to believe that American greatness is shown in accepting endless insults. Take the case of Cuba. Russia has taken advantage of your mistakes and has created an enemy country within 90 miles of your shores. For years Cuba was your stanch friend. Overnight it became an enemy base. The United States, which fought World War II, starting almost totally unarmed, and ending up by smashing the Nazi hordes and the Japanese warlords, could not prevent a small gang of Lenin school-trained guerrillas from taking over the island.

"Now Castro has discovered he can rob Americans of their property and insult your President with impunity. With Cuba as the test, the Soviets feel that they will not be hindered in other areas of your hemisphere.

"It is in the cards that under guidance and support of the Communists, your country will be harassed with all kinds of crises. You can be sure more disturbances will be forthcoming. Student riots and demonstrations will increase, also racial riots. And surely, there will be other new provocations skillfully and methodically planned by Moscow."

St. George Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. George, Utah, is celebrating its centennial this week under the able guidance of General Chairman Attorney Lang Foremaster and Cochairmen Vernon Worthen and Mrs. John J. Phoenix. These respected civic leaders, with the combined assistance of many, have devoted untold energies toward organizing a program of religious observance and social activities that will warm the hearts of the residents, former residents and visitors who have come to St. George for this occasion.

Unfortunately the press of legislative business in our homestretch adjournment schedule prevents me from accepting the thoughtful invitation of Mayor William A. Barlocker but I would like to participate in the festivities by word of commendation and proper observance today for the descendants of these brave pioneers who answered Brigham Young's call to the Dixie Cotton Mission 100 years ago. Many of the missionaries chosen for the new colonization had just established their homes in the Great Salt Lake Valley. It was difficult for them to leave their cultivated lands and meager comforts for the uncertainty of conquering southern Utah.

Two apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Orson Pratt and Erastus Snow were chosen to head the mission of 300 families, many of them Swiss emigrants, in search of a climate favorable to raising cash crops

and also to develop a chain of cities south of the "Rim of the Basin" to California. It was here that Erastus Snow enhanced his reputation of being second only to President Young as a colonizer and a leader of men. The Saints had confidence in his wisdom and judgment and later confirmed their trust by electing him their first State senator representing Washington, Beaver, Iron, and Kane Counties.

Orson Pratt, student, scholar and outstanding leader of the Mormon Church became the first postmaster of St. George which, incidentally, was established on March 1, 1862, less than 4 months after the arrival of the pioneers.

Titanic as these men were in the history of Utah and forceful as their leadership and contributions proved to the establishment of St. George, I believe equal credit rightfully belongs to the Mormon women who also tilled the alkalined soil, fought the grasshopper infestation, endured the heat and sand, withstood the dangers of Indian attack, and faced the hardships of frontier life with faith and courage.

The desperate circumstances of the young wife in the frontier days is illustrated in a story of a young woman who told her husband that if he could find just one flower fit to wear on a lady's dress, she would try to be satisfied. In the spring, the story goes, he presented her with a beautiful bouquet of orchid-colored sego lilies which more than answered her challenge. The sego lily is now abundant and beautiful in St. George and is regarded especially by Utahans who have adopted it as the official State flower.

Despite their unceasing labors and ingenuity, the pioneer women of St. George could offer only bran for the first Christmas dinner. The only flour they had was what they brought with them and their normal diet ranged from molasses made from beets to wild spinach, pig weed or perhaps yucca soup.

The most perplexing difficulty that challenged and defied the frontiersmen of St. George was the problem common to all settlers in Utah—water, or the lack of water.

I doubt, however, that the early settlers of St. George would agree with me that there was any lack of water that first year when they were deluged for 40 days and nights with rain that succeeded in wiping out the unembellished colonization they had established. But it was this disaster that focused the combined intelligence of the saints toward a solution and it is significant to note that the fundamental precept of western water law—water rights established by beneficial use—stems from our early Mormon pioneers.

In the early days of colonization of Utah, Brigham Young said, "No man has a right to waste one drop of water that another man can turn into bread."

Thus, the principle was laid down that water belongs to the people and no man can gain title to more than he can use in a beneficial manner.

I am indebted to one of southern Utah's pioneer stalwarts, the late William R. Palmer, for an account of early water troubles in Utah and the gradual evolution of a law for their administration. Mr. Palmer was a bishop and stake president in Cedar City and an author and historian as well .

Writing in the reclamation era in Utah's centennial year of 1947, Bishop Palmer recalled that a William Edwards had a full-day water right in a Paragonah field. He subsequently acquired a piece of dry land a mile away and attempted to transfer his water right to the new field.

A neighbor protested that he followed Edwards in use of the water and it would cost him an hour of his water simply to turn the flow back into a dry ditch and also that the dry ditch would soak up a lot of water.

The dispute finally reached that great arbitrator of early Mormon history, the bishop's court, which found that Edwards could not take the water from the field in which it was allocated without injury and loss to all water users in the same canal. Edwards appealed to the high council court which affirmed the bishop's court decision. Years later the dispute was taken to the civil county court which again affirmed the decision of the pioneer bishop's court.

Thus, the early bishops of the church can be said to have laid down many of the precepts on which our present water laws are based.

One hundred years of progress is being commemorated in St. George this week and, along with many other credits, rapid advances toward the solution of the water problem are to be noted—from the original St. George Rio Virgin Canal to the present-day Dixie project.

The Bureau of Reclamation has now completed plans for the multipurpose Dixie project which would provide supplemental irrigation water to 9,445 acres of presently developed land and provide a full water supply for 11,615 acres of new land.

The city of St. George would be provided with 5,000 acre-feet of water annually for domestic purposes from the Virgin City Reservoir. Construction of the three powerplants as a part of the project plan would produce about 44,500,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electric energy and about 1,900,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy for sale annually. In addition, minor flood control benefits would result as would fish and wildlife and recreation benefits.

The regional director's proposed report on this potential project is now being reviewed on an informal basis by the States of Utah, Arizona, and Nevada; field offices of Federal agencies, and other affected local interests. Following consideration of comments resulting from these reviews, the regional director will submit his final report to the Commissioner of Reclamation here in Washington for further processing as required by law and interagency agreement.

I have an abiding concern and sensitive interest in the water problems of the Dixie Mission and look forward to the privilege of guiding the authorizing legislation for the Dixie project through the House of Representatives next year. This would be a satisfying contribution to the memory of those valiant and dedicated Mormon pioneers who by the sweat of their brow established the community of St. George and left a noble heritage of unmistakable fame.

Edward R. Murrow: Out of Depth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when Edward R. Murrow was chosen to head the U.S. Information Agency, the intellectual smart set thought that the milennial day had arrived. The following articles—by Robert C. Ruark, which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun, August 25, and by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, on August 24—indicate that the Agency needs something more than a cigarette held between the second and third fingers, to be effective.

OLD FILM IMAGE WON'T FADE OUT

(By Robert C. Ruark)

Mr. Edward Murrow, a sad-seeming chain-smoker with a warty voice which first made him famous for breathing drama into a routine dateline, "This—Is London," during the blitz of an ancient war against our present gallant allies, has not experienced the smoothest sailing since he quit CBS to head up the U.S. Information Agency.

He slipped badly when he attempted to smother a documentary on migrant workers, in which the voice was his commercial own before he took up Government toil. He tried to keep the film off Britain's TV with some rather ill-advised pressure phone calls, and wound up looking even more lugubrious than usual.

Now Mr. Murrow is worried about mounting criticism of the fact that American films, both cinema and TV, which are resold for the foreign market, put entirely too much weight on gangsters, gunslingers, depraved private peepers, and teenage violence, as normal parcel to the American scene.

In other words, we are giving America a bad name by showing the outside world some tough truths about America, such as race riots, examples of discrimination in the South, and of course the classic fruitpicker odyssey over which Mr. Murrow was vocally indignant on the judiciously cut film when he was still earning his bread from CBS.

I have been hearing this sad, old song for many a weary year. Everybody—by "everybody" I mean the loose phrase which is used to express inexact opinion—everybody knows that the whole world identifies America by the old Hollywood product, instead of by some of the creakingly dull uplift projects offered by such agencies as the one for which Mr. Murrow currently fronts.

Anyone in his right mind knows that all Americans are a prototypical mixture of gangsters, as portrayed by the late Bogart and Edward G. Robinson and Paul Muni; of naughty girls, as played by Clara Bow; of downright bad girls, as sometimes acted by Bette Davis, Mae West, the late Jean Harlow and maybe even Theda Bara; of sirens as shown by Marilyn and a baker's dozen of others; of nice young men as delivered by the young Jimmy Stewart; of belt-'em-in-the-puss heroes of the Gable and Cagney

stamp; and of noble cowpokes, such as the late and much lamented Coop with his "yup."

There was nothing much wrong with it then, and no more wrong with it now. Everyone knows that there are only three cities in America—Hollywood, New York, and Miami. Everyone knows that all Americans are rich. Everyone knows that there are gangsters behind every bush, and that the way to the heart of a winsome maid is to bash her in the kisser with half a grapefruit. This—is America.

We have no poor in America, unless they are written by Steinbeck and deal with Okies; we have no race problem unless Sidney Poitier plays in it. Crooked cops meet sticky ends instead of winding up with blocks of apartment houses, and until recent sensitivity set in, our hoods were Sicilian exports. Newspapermen wear their hats turned up in front and constantly enjoin somebody on the other end of the phone to hold the presses and rip apart the front page.

Mamma mia. To attempt by awkward channeling to change the image is almost as stupid as our pitiful whining efforts to make all the world love us.

I have seen some rare dogs in American films, but I have seen some even more classic canines in some of the foreign films which play the art houses and occasionally make the big popcorn palaces. I wish Mr. Murrow would go back to CBS, where, at least, he seemed at home, because he is giving me an uneasy impression of a radio announcer out of his depth, and we wouldn't want the world to think that, would we.

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well thought out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The oversea broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But, above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called "the public relations of the United States."

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by short-wave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the oversea service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes sophistication. Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio than the phraseology and big words of overcondensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commmentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the Midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communications in foreign policy needs a new look.

Time for United States To Rouse Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Constantine Brown that appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Saturday, August 26, 1961.

The indicated column follows:

TIME FOR UNITED STATES TO ROUSE ITSELF—SWISS OBSERVER SEES RED NET TIGHTEN IN CARIBBEAN, SOUTH AMERICA, CANADA

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Here again are further views, phophecies and comments of my Swiss industrialist friend who was in a mood to pull no punches—which is a Swiss characteristic.

To listen to such candid views, to hear discussed subjects which many in the United States tend to pass over because of their ugliness, was both unpleasantly refreshing, gripping, and at the same time offering hope for peace in the normal sense of the word.

"Pouring millions and millions of dollars into South America is not the answer to the problem there. As long as South Americans can watch Fidel Castro, from his little island, spit in the face of the great Nation to the north, they will conclude that Washington cannot prevent Communist inroads in the Southern Hemisphere, statements of the politicians notwithstanding. A Castro could suddenly appear in the midst of any one of them and the United States could do nothing to stop him.

"And you seem to be blind to the subtle—or not so subtle—takeover of the Caribbean. If you study the political situation of the bordering countries and possessions along with your map this becomes quite clear. Begin with Mexico, then trace a line through Central America to Panama, the Canal Zone, Colombia, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Haiti. Next comes Panama and then Hispaniola. If you do not awaken to this danger in time, the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean will become known as the Western Red Sea.

"To your north is your historic good neighbor, Canada, with its 3,000-mile border. You have paid little attention to this friendly ally. Yet, the Communists are already saying 'Canada needs another Castro,' and claim that there will be 'another Cuba' there within a few years. Still you go casually along as though no such thought had entered the Kremlin's plans.

"Even further north is the North Pole. Over the years your great American explorers discovered valuable areas and proudly planted the American flag. Now you have signed away these valuable territories in international agreements which include Soviet Russia. No one for a moment would believe that Moscow would honor these agreements. The Reds are this very day planning control of the entire Arctic with its intercontinental airways, weather stations, etc.

"Indeed, the net is being gathered around the Soviet's main target, the United States.

"You remind me that I have said nothing about the Berlin crisis. But in the overall picture, Berlin is just another crisis. When that issue is over there will be another, inspired by the Kremlin and just as important. One of the methods of the Reds in their world revolution is to keep their opponents crisis ridden. From all indications and intelligence in our possession there will be a summit negotiation. The free world will not win the issue but it may obtain a semblance of a Kremlin retreat. This, however, will not be a temporary matter as far as Moscow is concerned. The Soviets will begin immediately to gather their political forces for another crisis and perhaps Berlin will not be the selected target for the next go-round.

"I have given you some pretty gloomy pictures—but these are facts we cannot afford to ignore. However, we do see the

faint rays of the sunrise. The reports we receive here in Switzerland from America point to a great, and at long last, awakening of your people. And once your people are aroused, they attack any encroachment on their independence with fanatic energy. This brings us hope because we have been relying on the commonsense of the American citizens more than on the gyrations of your politicians. The time is coming when the American public will no longer delay after being faced with accomplished facts.

"In this event, it is my belief that neutralists around the world will take heart and courage and this will begin to filter behind the Iron Curtain countries everywhere. The Achilles heel of the Kremlin is its subjugated peoples. Should they—supported by the American people—be encouraged to rise en masse in rebellion the Communist conspiracy is doomed.

"This will be the beginning of the end of the world revolution which Marx and his successors have been striving for since 1848. Only, the victory will be ours. Brave men will take over the leaderships of the world and it will then be truly united in peace in the real meaning of the word, not the Communist's false connotation.

"I cannot emphasize too strongly that we still expect America to be the source whence comes our strength. Our only hope for the survival of free society depends on America countering the gigantic Communist plots. The commonsense and courage of the American people are the real fear of the Kremlin—not your nuclear weapons.

"From a careful analysis of all our information here in Switzerland we are convinced that there will be no war. The United States has enormous retaliatory power, and the Soviets do not want to risk destroying themselves. Neither could a devastated world bring them victory. Their aim is to conquer through internal revolutions. Now, the world revolution has begun; but victory will eventually belong to the free world."

Because the survival of his vast industrial holdings in many lands depends on it, my friend has kept a sharp eye on internal conditions in many countries. If there is trouble, what does it stem from? From Soviet inroads? From weakness of a key official? On this information depends the future of his enterprises. It is for this reason that I have passed on the words and thoughts of the Swiss industrialist.

The Best Defense Is a Good Offense—House Joint Resolution 447 Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful, as all Americans should be, for the fine work being done by the Minute Men of America. This organization is typical of the many patriotic groups in this country whose prime purpose is to awaken the people to the Communist danger now confronting us.

On Thursday, August 3, the Stuart News, published in Stuart, Fla., carried an excellent article by Francis A. Adams, director general of the Minute Men of America, Inc. Mr. Adams' words reveal the desire on the part of the common people of this country for responsive action by our leaders in the face of the Communist enemy.

The following is the full text of the article:

BEST DEFENSE A VIGOROUS OFFENSE, SAYS ADAMS: RESOLUTION BEFORE CONGRESS ASKS NATION TO RECOGNIZE WAR STATUS

(By Francis A. Adams, director general of the Minute Men of America, Inc.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Adams gave this address at the July 19 meeting of Stuart Rotary Club:)

"The best defense is a vigorous offense." No one has ever epitomized the value of action in shorter or better terms.

Applied to our situation today in world affairs and particularly in matters affecting its Western Hemisphere, this admonition to action, means that we in Florida should be giving our most earnest heed to the protection of our coastlines and be equally alert in seeing that our entire State is conscious of the threat of nuclear weapon attack from Cuba.

This peril is imminent.

With this stark fact in mind, it is well for us to consider the advantage that rests with the man, or the State, or the Nation, that declares in no uncertain terms the words "Don't tread on me."

We have a golden opportunity to reassert that sentiment that was first uttered in the days of 1776 when one of the typical flags under which the Colonial forces fought, bore the likeness of a coiled rattlesnake and the legend "Don't tread on me."

In the same Spirit of '76, a resolution is pending in Congress calling for a declaration of war against the U.S.S.R. and its 97 satellites, setting forth that Russia is involved in a worldwide war to destroy free governments and to force its totalitarian power over all mankind.

As long as we, the United States of America, use the bland words of diplomacy and go through the fruitless motions of debate in the United Nations or in special heads of state conferences, we are helping the U.S.S.R. to gain its objective.

By passing a joint resolution the 87th Congress, now in session in Washington, D.C., would give notice to the world at large that we are fully aware of the menace that threatens our peace and happiness.

The steps that are necessary to get a joint resolution passed by Congress are now being taken through the initiative of Congressman JOHN R. PILLION of Buffalo, N.Y.

In the House of Representatives the resolution is being considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When it is brought to the floor of the House, if passed, the draft will be sent to the Senate for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and brought to the floor of the Senate. If passed, or amended the resolution would be considered by a joint committee of the House and Senate and a final draft determined upon.

This final draft would then be voted on by the Congress as a joint resolution.

All of this seems a tedious course but it safeguard all of us from the impetuous action of Congress on a matter that does not call for instant action.

While the resolution is going through the proper processes in Washington, it is the privilege and, indeed, the duty of every citizen to let his or her view be made clear to our elected representatives in the Senate and the House. This is Government of a Republic in action. It is always, "We—the people"—who have the powers to do things. We must act in our own behalf, and exercise our sovereignty by the expression of free speech.

A call has gone out for citizens in all the 50 States and the District of Columbia to get in contact with their respective Senators and Congressmen. This is not an idle effort. It is a direct method of conveying the will of the people to their representatives to guide them in matters of legislation. In answer to that call I had the great privilege on Friday, June 29, to be in Washington, D.C., and to visit the offices of Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS. I was accorded a most cordial reception by the staffs of these Members of Congress from Florida.

In line with usual procedure the Pillion resolution is being watched by the legislative assistants of our two Senators and Congressman ROGERS of the Sixth District.

I showed the legislative assistants the draft of a letter that the Minute Men of America feel should be sent to the Governors of the 50 States calling for affirmative action on the resolution. The text of that letter states:

"MY DEAR GOVERNOR: As a loyal fellow American I urge your support of House Joint Resolution 477 which proclaims that the U.S.S.R. and 97 satellites are waging war against the United States of America.

"Will you alert citizens of your State to wire, phone, or write to their Senators and Congressmen to speak out for this rededication of our faith in free government.

"FRANCIS A. ADAMS,
"Director General, the Minute Men of America, Inc."

We are gathered here as citizens enjoying the right of free assembly.

We may take a deep impression away with us, if we note that it was by exactly this same process of open discussion that the people of the 13 Colonies declared themselves to be a new Nation.

It was bold to the point of dauntlessness for the United States of America to throw down the gage of war to Great Britain in 1776.

In our day, 185 years after our Declaration of Independence, we have a right to reaffirm our sovereignty. We must shift from the defensive and recapture the initiative. The best defense is a strong offense.

The world will be electrified by such action.

Tyrants will pause, downtrodden people will take heart and the danger of piecemeal destruction of free countries will be halted.

Words are mightier than the sword. Let us back this joint resolution. When the 87th Congress goes on record as recognizing that the U.S.S.R. is an open avowed enemy; when Congress passes a joint resolution stating this fact, we as individuals and as a Nation will be on the road to victory over those who think we are too preoccupied to fight for our cherished freedom.

Rotary of Stuart can help bring this to fruition, by sending a message to Senator HOLLAND, Senator SMATHERS, and to Congressman ROGERS.

The 10th day of July 1961, may be a memorable one for your organization.

The call is out for all loyal Americans to answer: "Here." This needs no debating. It calls for action.

Hurrah for Huntington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. HECHELR. Mr. Speaker, I am bursting with pride for my hometown of Huntington, W. Va. I call attention to

the fact that a most significant event took place on Saturday night in Carnegie Hall, New York City. In the contest to choose "Miss U.S.A.," the winner was Miss Joann Odum of the fair city of Huntington, W. Va.

Miss Odum, a striking 19-year-old brunette, is a graduate of Huntington East High School and attended Marshall University. She is a stately 5 feet, 7 inches tall, and weighs 125 pounds. By winning the title of "Miss U.S.A.," Miss Odum will qualify for the competition for "Miss World" which will take place in London, England, in November.

I am particularly proud to announce this great honor to my colleagues for a number of reasons. In 1957, I was one of the judges of the "Miss Armed Forces" contest in Huntington, at which time we chose Miss Joann Odum as the winner even though she was then only a high school student. Miss Odum has poise, charm, and intelligence in addition to her striking beauty.

In addition to her other attributes, Miss Odum has a keen interest in democracy and freedom. On her own volition several years ago, she performed volunteer work in my congressional office. I would like to say to my colleagues that certainly this volunteer work contributed nothing to her winning the "Miss U.S.A." title, but I am happy to note that it did not seem to handicap Miss Odum in being chosen the winner.

I know from time to time various Members have urged that severe limitations be placed on information included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, because I have such a high regard for my friend and colleague from Missouri, the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, who has frequently cautioned us against unnecessary information in the RECORD, I personally consulted with the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman JONES, immediately prior to making these remarks. I am pleased to report that Congressman JONES wholeheartedly endorses my desire to publicize this outstanding feat performed by Miss Odum. He agrees that it is not every day that a "Miss U.S.A." is chosen from one's own hometown.

Mr. Speaker, I have frequently called attention to the fact in a series of speeches that West Virginia is being shortchanged in defense appropriations and contracts. I am proud that the selection of Miss Odum proves once again, Mr. Speaker, that West Virginia will never be shortchanged in beauty.

Brutality in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I have often remarked that many times the more complex issues of the day receive their most penetrating analysis on the editorial pages of the smalltown newspapers. Perhaps this is true because these papers are closer to the people—and therefore are more likely to view the issues as the people view them, with clarity and simplicity, unencumbered by expert opinions. An outstanding example of this thought is an editorial in the August 22, 1961, issue of the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express. This editorial graphically illustrates the meaning of the Communist activity in Berlin—in terms which clearly convey the horror of Communist brutality. I am pleased to call this fine editorial statement to the attention of my colleagues:

BRUTALITY IN BERLIN

Imagine, if you can, what life would be like if there were a boundary line drawn across the heart of Lock Haven along Main Street and Bellefonte Avenue, or through Jersey Shore on Allegheny Street, or along Eighth Street in Renovo, with enemy soldiers on guard to keep people from passing back and forth. What kind of a life would that be? What kind of reaction would we have? How would we like it?

That is exactly what the Russians have dictated in divided Berlin.

There is one street where the sidewalks are in West Berlin and the houses looking out on that sidewalk are in East Berlin. Because their doors and windows look out on freedom, the people in those houses are being brutally dragged away, regardless of their personal preferences, their private interests, their lifetime associations, or any other humane consideration.

Because the Reds have realized that they cannot, much longer, claim to be outdistancing the West, while residents of East Berlin display their eagerness to move into that backward area, instead of rejoicing in Communist "progress", they are giving the whole world a demonstration of what a brutal and brutalizing life communism represents.

Pictures of East Germans putting up walls across the streets, to keep out "Western spies and saboteurs" should be published far and wide, in the neutral nations where the Soviets offer their claims and in the newly independent nations where they seek a chance to impose the blessings of communism. This is a job for the U.S. Information Service.

Meanwhile, however, one cannot help wondering if there is not an opportunity here, also, for a complaint to the U.N.

Is it proper behavior for peace-loving members of the U.N. to bar their territory in such warlike fashion?

If we do not find some way to bring up this matter for discussion, we shall be establishing the sad and shameful principle that, whatever the Communists can claim and fence in, that we will let them have without question.

Senate Told Moscow Attacks U.S. Anti-Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Sunday, the Nation's press serviced by our national wire services, together with our radio-television networks, gave deserved publicity in widely read and heard reports to a startling new report just issued by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the great Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The contents of this highly newsworthy and informative report provide carefully authenticated facts which should concern every patriotic and peace-loving American citizen.

For the record, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the Associated Press report on this Senate document as it appeared in the Sunday edition of the Washington Evening Star, dated August 27, 1961. The entire Senate report can be secured from the Government Printing Office for the nominal price of 25 cents. Many citizens, I am sure, will want to order quantities of this report to circulate to students in their communities and to help alert citizens, generally, to the stealthy, surreptitious methods employed by the Communist conspiracy within our midst.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE TOLD MOSCOW ATTACKS U.S. ANTI-REDS

Senate investigators have been told that Moscow has ordered "a frontal attack" on the anti-Communist movement in the United States and has made use of agents who infiltrated the White House.

The testimony was given behind closed doors to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 11 by Edward Hunter of Port Washington, N.Y., a writer and lecturer.

The subcommittee, in making his testimony public today, described Mr. Hunter as a psychological warfare expert and as the originator of the term "brainwashing." He is the author of the book "The Black Book on Red China" which analyzed Communist techniques in changing minds.

Mr. Hunter testified that the Kremlin has set out to crush a grassroots anti-Communist movement he said has sprung up in the United States in the last couple of years.

Orders for this "Red anti-anti-Communist drive," he said, went out through a manifesto issued December 5, 1960, at the conclusion of a strategy conference of 81 Communist Parties of the world in Moscow.

"A quick Red operation is being attempted like that of a sleight-of-hand artist, to push this administration, the press, and public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States," he said.

He testified that "such operations require a new sort of agent, on which the Kremlin places its main trust nowadays," in contrast to what he described as the old-style cloak-and-dagger man who buys or steals secrets.

Mr. Hunter went on:

"Moscow simply acquired agents who mingled with the new, intellectual elite at the top on terms of equality, were sometimes members of it themselves. They infiltrated the White House and other topmost Government offices."

He gave no names, dates, or other details, but he said "the new-style, pro-Red agent has his role to influence policy stalling or frustrating it, making it fail or end up by hurting ourselves."

Mr. Hunter testified that the primary target of the anti-anti-Communist drive is the Pentagon, "specifically the program to train and alert our troops and our people to the Red techniques and the inherent evil in communism." He said the Reds have seen that "unless this program can be destroyed,

the anti-Communist movement cannot be liquidated."

Shown copies of Defense Department directives issued this year, Mr. Hunter said that in effect they warned against the use of anti-Communist films in troop training programs and marked successes for the "Red anti-anti-Communist pressure drive."

Mr. Hunter testified this campaign "won a stunning victory for itself" when Secretary of Defense McNamara said at a May 26 news conference that military officers should confine themselves to defense matters in public discussions and avoid foreign policy matters.

The subcommittee did not comment on Mr. Hunter's testimony, but said its publication had been approved unanimously.

Two Members, however, subsequently described as "outrageous" Mr. Hunter's written memorandums about some newspapers as printed in the appendix.

In general, Mr. Hunter maintained that the newspaper articles he cited bore out his prediction that there would be "a seemingly spontaneous outpouring of articles * * * that will arise all along the fringes of the communications field where the Reds have influence."

Senators DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, and KEATING, Republican of New York, issued a statement taking issue with this portion of the testimony.

"We were unaware that written memorandums of Mr. Hunter in the form of appendixes were also to be published," the two Senators said.

"In these appendixes, serious charges are made against some of our most distinguished newspapermen, including Cabell Phillips of the New York Times, Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Edward T. Folliard of the Washington Post.

"We believe that these charges are untrue and irresponsible and we consider it outrageous that they should have been published as a part of the testimony before this subcommittee."

Firmness on Berlin Does Not Increase Danger of War; It Offers Best Hope of Preventing It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer on the Berlin crisis:

BERLIN SITUATION IS NOTHING NEW BUT SAME OLD GAME OF BRINKMANSHIP

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

No situation that involves the danger—however remote—of nuclear war can be anything but troubling. But those who speak of the fearful crisis at Berlin leave me gasping with astonishment. Just where have they been living?

The danger of nuclear war has existed since the U.S.S.R. married a nuclear bomb to a superrocket and equaled or outstripped the United States in the production of the latter. Before that no war danger existed—not in Korea or Indo China or East Europe—simply because the United States could have atomized the U.S.S.R. without suffering equivalent damage.

But since the Soviets caught up, the danger of war has been permanent—neither more nor less. The Kremlin may turn the heat up higher from time to time, may challenge the United States in Laos, Cuba, or Berlin. It may seal off East Berlin with its own divisions and East German tanks and police.

But until Mr. K. or his successor realizes that communism can never bury freedom, or unless the West supinely submits to communism, the "fearful crisis" will be permanent. Whether he shouts or whispers is of no importance so long as his basic purpose is to "bury" us.

SHOULD TALK TO APPEASERS

Actually, when President Kennedy urges the American people to be calm, he is talking to the wrong customers. Most of them are calm and 70 percent, according to the polls, believe that if Mr. K. wants a war over West Berlin, he should have it.

The President should rather direct his appeal to the appeasement-minded minority, some of them in his own administration. For they are the ones who are pleading, whining, even screaming (at times) for almost any sort of "negotiation," for "nuclear sanity," for "prudence," and in some cases, even for abandoning the West's marvelous outpost in West Berlin.

Unless he intends to follow their counsel of fear, Mr. Kennedy's job, it seems to me, is to recognize the Berlin situation for what it is: Just one more competition in brinkmanship, where neither side can afford a war—one more hand in a game of diplomatic poker. Mr. K. thinks that by the Pavlovian technique of alternating the carrot and the stick, he can bluff the West into giving him what he wants. This is not his first attempt, it will not be his last. Thus considered, it is nothing for the West to get excited about.

GOOD CHANCE

In fact, it is a great opportunity. The more Nikita shouts and raves that he "has to have" a neutral West Berlin or else, the greater his defeat when he does not get it. Mr. K. has upped the stakes to the point where his failure is going to cost him considerable. I think that communism's failure at Berlin could be the beginning of its failure everywhere. Just what more do we want?

J.F.K. does not have to prove that he can face danger. At Berlin he has a real opportunity to recover all that he lost in Cuba—and more. I cannot believe that he will pass it up merely to please less courageous Americans.

Meanwhile, if his advisers wish to prepare for some definite future by creating a disarmament agency or play at formulating "space law" for the day when communism reforms, there is little harm in either, provided that it does not deflect the administration from its basic task of winning the contest in brinkmanship.

U.S. Timidity at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when will we stop getting pushed around at Geneva? Today's editorial in the Wall Street Journal indicates the ridiculous position the Kennedy administration has placed us in, worldwide, by sending Mr. Dean, hat in hand, to plead with the Russians for consideration of the atomic test-ban treaty.

THE WEAPONS WE BRANDISH

Washington seems to be searching for responses to Soviet pressures against West Berlin, yet it has overlooked one fairly obvious move that would clearly strengthen the U.S. position. This is to break off immediately the deadlocked East-West talks on an atomic test-ban treaty.

Even if there were no Berlin crisis, the Geneva parley, now nearly 3 years old, would be pointless and perilous. Because a crucial East-West showdown is testing our will and strength, it is that much more urgent that we disengage ourselves from a web of futility.

Back in 1958, the United States assumed that a treaty could be negotiated swiftly, and so our tests were suspended without any check on what the Soviets were doing. The risk of the Soviets cheating was deemed slight. Today, it weighs heavily upon Washington, as it should. Said the administration last week: "No nation determined to protect the freedom of its people can accept this risk (of an unpoliced test ban) indefinitely."

And yet, the United States has gone back to Geneva. It is ludicrous, to say the least, for the United States to persist in what are essentially disarmament talks with the very enemy whose threats have prompted massive U.S. rearming. It is utterly self-defeating when military men warn that the refining of U.S. nuclear weapons, a key part of our Berlin preparations, is stalled by the self-imposed test suspension.

A main objection raised to breaking off the test-ban talks is that it would weaken our standing before "world opinion." Perhaps it would. But in the crisis before us, is the passing good opinion of others any substitute for a dependable nuclear arsenal? And if they should assail us on "moral" grounds, we, too, have a clear-cut moral commitment.

It is up to the United States alone to do what it must to uphold its position in Berlin. That task is most likely to succeed if the Soviets have cause to believe that we mean what we say; our words must be matched by relevant deeds. Abandonment of fake "negotiation" and announcement of U.S. nuclear-test resumption would represent one such deed. For our move would convey to the Kremlin an unmistakable desire to improve the weapons we brandish.

In the duel of the cold war, our will is only as imposing as our arms to back it up. And until we throw off the timidity that imprisons us at Geneva, our weapons and our will are equally subject to doubt.

Foreign Aid Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading newspapers in the district I represent, the Hutchinson News, carries an editorial in the August 24 issue on the subject of foreign aid which I thought the Members of this body would be interested in reading. I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID NEEDS AID

The pettishly guarding it pursestring powers by carving out of the foreign aid bill President Kennedy's requested authority to grant long-term development loans, the House of Representatives has sought to manacle Uncle Sam's hand as it reaches in friendship to fledging nations overseas.

It has done this in a critical period when that handshake is vital.

The Senate, recognizing the immense potential of long-range development programs not dependent upon annual congressional haggling, approved the 5-year program. The House kicked it out and substituted a 1-year appropriation.

Although foreign aid, in itself, was not at issue, foreign aid opponents led in the fight against the 5-year-plan. Foreign aid supporters who went along, mouthing speeches about the necessity of congressional control over each year's program, did almost as great a disservice to our national interest as if they had killed an aid bill outright.

Misuse and mishandling of assistance to other countries is a standard subject of criticism. It should be obvious that forcing year-by-year planning where long-term programs are the crying need is misuse.

We have also lamented the lack of appreciation shown for our self-interest generosity. But forcing struggling economies of new nations—at whom the program is aimed—to come hat-in-hand to Washington in hopes that programs won't be scuttled forces a strain, and humiliation, not calculated to stir more than resentment.

At a time when the foreign aid program must be both farsighted and competitive if it is to be really effective, the House is insisting on keeping it from being either.

Will the Callup of Reserve Units Deprive Us of Needed Skills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are none who would oppose calling up the men needed to maintain our military strength, if, indeed, the present crisis in Berlin demands building up our manpower. It is a tribute to the patriotism of our young Americans that they have accepted the President's call for sacrifice on their part with as little complaint as has been exhibited to date. Americans have never failed the call to duty and this generation will be no different. There is a grave question, however, in my mind as to whether or not the hurry-up call may be hurting our buildup in other ways.

From a news story in the Washington Sunday Star I quote the following excerpt. The story deals with the calling up of Naval Air Patrol Squadron 661, Anacostia Naval Air Station. I call your attention in particular to the following quote from the article:

Officials say the squadron is typical of the activated units. If it is, the communities in which the newly activated men live are losing some of their best citizens.

Squadron 661 has more degrees than men.

In civilian life its members are highly trained aviation engineers, chemists, civil engineers, test pilots, lawyers, aviation design experts, missile technicians, college instructors, electronics toolers, and other highly skilled professional men.

Mr. Speaker, do we have such a surplus of highly skilled people in the very fields in which we are trying to maintain a lead over the Communist nations that we can now afford to pull these men out of civilian life? Unless we are now prepared to immediately challenge the Communist aggression, it seems to me we would be wiser to keep from depleting our manpower in technical fields where these skilled men would be serving a far more useful purpose.

Wilderness Preservation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the proposed legislation for a Wilderness Preservation System has created a great many doubts among the people of the Western States as to the wisdom of this action. I feel that while Congress has been deluged by material from many groups, some of whom have never been in any of these vast areas to be blanketed in under the proposal, not much has been heard from the people who will be most affected by the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Buhl (Idaho) Herald of August 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROVERSIAL WILDERNESS BILL

In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, John Bird writes a revealing account of "The Great Wilderness Fight." His title is no exaggeration. This battle has been shaping up for many years and now it seems to be coming to some sort of a climax. On the one side are those who would set aside vast tracts of Government-owned lands and keep them in a totally, or almost totally, wild state forever. On the other are those who would allow some degree of commercial development. And if this sounds like a more or less simple controversy, it isn't. There are a thousand-and-one attitudes toward it, so far as the details are concerned at least, and tempers grow hot when the issue arises.

A wilderness bill is before Congress. It proposes that the Nation select about 30 to 40 million acres of our most spectacular scenic and primitive lands, now in national forests, national parks, wildlife refuges, and game ranges, to be held untouched by ax, saw, drill, or wheel into the boundless future. That about equals the land area of Illinois. And some of the lands contain valuable commercial resources, timber, water, oil, many minerals and so on. The problem seems to be how to save them from ruthless exploitation, and at the same time, if possible, make use of them to help meet our economic needs.

A word is needed here about our long-existing policy toward the national parks, which total, with monuments and other recreation areas, some 22 million acres. These are administered under a multiple-use concept which means each forest or land area is managed to combine uses which are suitable to that particular land and to the public interest. For example, national forest lands may, under very strict controls, be opened to grazing, mineral development, and utilization of water for farms and industries. Opponents of the presently proposed wilderness bill, argue that it would violate the multiple-use principle. They also point out that, because of this principle, the parks bring in more than $900 million a year to the Treasury.

Commercial exploitation of an area, properly conducted, need not be destructive. Twenty years ago 2 million acres were set aside for the moose on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska as their range. Later it was found that major oil deposits lay within it. A group of U.S. oil companies sought permission to drill. Despite protests that this would scare the moose away, permission was finally given, with the companies promising to take every care to protect the moose and their range. As it turned out, the moose weren't bothered at all. The drillers were. The animals have proved friendly and curious, and most of the herd hangs out where drilling is under way.

Numbers of authorities say that overcaution in protecting natural resources can be wasteful and destructive. Mr. Bird cites a forest consultant who told him that there are 500,000 acres of merchantable timber, which can't be touched now, in the Olympic National park, much of it without scenic value or accessibility. It is worth $300 million but if not harvested will die of disease and insect attack.

Bird also touches on the wise conservation practices followed in the Pacific Northwest by leading timber companies, such as Weyerhaeuser and Crown Zellerbach. They look far into the future—the old "cutout and get out" days are over. Their huge "tree farms" assure that over the years, new growth will balance the cut. This is known as sustained yield logging, and amounts to a perpetual reforestation program. The recreational values of timber lands are carefully preserved and in many instances improved.

Included in the proposed controversial wilderness system bill is some 3 million acres in Idaho, much of which contains merchantable timber, and according to most competent geologists, has excellent potential for mineral depositation.

Another sigfinificant aspect of the bill is that restrictions on road building in some of these areas makes the fighting of fires more difficult. On two occasions in recent weeks, fighting of fires has been made more difficult in Idaho's promitive areas because of inaccessibility to the fire areas except by air which proved inadequate. The deep freeze in which some of Idaho's timberland would be placed as a result of the bill would eventually do greater harm than wise multiple use development of the areas.

The So-Called Compromise on the Hanford Electric Powerplant Issue—A Challenge to the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ZAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 28, I mailed the follow-

ing letter and statement to each Member of the House of Representatives regarding the so-called compromise proposed by the proponents of the Hanford Electric Powerplant issue.

The letter and statement are self-explanatory and reveal that the so-called compromise suggested by the supporters of the Hanford Electric Powerplant would be nothing less than complete capitulation by the House of Representatives which has already rejected the project on three different occasions.

The so-called compromise suggested by the proponents of the Hanford Electric Powerplant is nothing more than the authorization of the project in a piecemeal manner. Therefore, this offer to compromise, if accepted, would amount to a complete surrender by the House to the will of the Senate.

The letter and statement follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1961.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: There have been increasing reports that a so-called compromise will be offered in the AEC authorization conference for the addition of one unit of 400,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity at Hanford at a cost of $58 million. This proposal would, in effect, ask the House to consider a proposal which has been studied for approximately one week when the House has already expressed its opposition on three separate occasions to a proposal which had over 2 years of concentrated study.

To understand more fully why such a concession would, in effect, be a complete capitulation on the part of the House, I have attached an explanation of the shortcomings of this proposal.

Based on this analysis, I assure you that my position, which is in accordance with the instructions given to me as a member of the conference by the vote in the House of Representatives, will remain unchanged. I look upon any attempt to the Senate to restore the Hanford project in full or in part as a challenge of the sovereignty of the House. I feel confident that if it is necessary to come back to the House for further instructions the vote against Hanford will be even larger than before.

Any further delay in completing action on the AEC authorization bill will hold up legislation important to the national welfare and to individual constituencies. If such delay continues, the Senate will have to take full responsibility.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

NO REASONABLE COMPROMISE ON HANFORD—JUST COMPLETE CAPITULATION

A careful examination of the proposal to construct 400,000 rather than 800,000 kilowatts of generating capacity at Hanford clearly reveals that the proposal is not reasonable and in no way negates the basic premises made in the separate statement attached to the joint committee report on the AEC authorization bill and the position previously taken by the House of Representatives on three separate votes.

The following points indicate the weaknesses of such an offer of compromise:

1. The most significant point is that authorizing the 400,000 kilowatt facility at a cost of about $58 million would be granting the Hanford proposal on the installment plan. If authorization is granted to construct a facility to utilize half the steam, regardless of cost to the Nation's taxpayers, it would be almost impossible to prevent the Government from going the next step next year in authorizing the addition of another 400,000 kilowatt facility.

2. The construction of a 400,000 kilowatt facility would still have the effect of putting the AEC in the power business on a very large scale, even though this power supposedly would be used exclusively at the Hanford Station.

3. The economic feasibility studies of adding 800,000 kilowatts of power to Hanford reveal the proposal to be rather questionable, to say the least, based on the most optimistic assumptions which could be made. Since the estimated cost of installing one generating unit to Hanford is approximately $10.5 million more than half the cost of the two units, an economic study of this proposal would reveal it to be very unfeasible.

4. The construction of such a unit would have the effect of releasing 400,000 kilowatts of firm power—previously supplied to Hanford—into the Bonneville system. This quantity of power would add to the present surplus and could be used by BPA to justify further the proposed Bonneville-California intertie as the first leg of an all-Federal giant power grid.

5. The construction of such a facility would not make Hanford self-sufficient in terms of power because BPA would still be required to tie into the installation to supply standby power to meet the needs of Hanford during those periods when the reactor would be shut down for any reason.

6. Every one of the 10 compelling reasons listed in the separate statement as to why the 800,000 kilowatt facility should not be constructed at Hanford would continue to be applicable. It would only be a question of the degree of applicability.

On three different occasions the House of Representatives has opposed the Hanford power project. What have been spoken of as compromises are nothing more than the authorization of the Hanford project in a piecemeal manner. This, therefore, would not be compromise but complete surrender to the will of the Senate.

National Lottery of the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of the Dominican Republic. This small nation derives great benefit from its recognition of the fact that people like to gamble.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Dominican national lottery came to $32 million. The Government's income, some $7 million, was not earmarked for any specific purposes but was rather applied to the general fund of the treasury.

There are only 3 million people in the Dominican Republic, which means that the average personal expenditure on the national lottery was about $10. Per capita income in the Dominican Republic is approximately $300. If Americans spent a similar share of their income on a national lottery, the gross receipts of such a lottery would be well in excess of $10 billion a year. When will we wake up to this financial wisdom?

Progress and Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following two articles—one by Gould Lincoln, in the Washington Evening Star of August 24, and the other by Richard Starnes, in the New York World Telegram of August 25—indicate how President Kennedy's alliance for progress is progressing.

The President insists he must have a blank check for spending so that he can plan our Latin American policy. With one Communist in control in British Guiana, another Communist in control of Colombia's economic development, and with the recent change of government in Brazil, it would seem to me that, more than ever, Congress must annually review any funds that are to be spent.

The articles follow:

AND THIS IS PROGRESS
(By Richard Starnes)

A mysterious, half-forgotten figure who was branded a fellow in the consortium of Communist spies that operated in New Deal Washington has returned to haunt President Kennedy's alliance for progress program in Latin America.

He is Lauchlin B. Currie, former administrative assistant to FDR. Currie, now a citizen of Colombia, was frequently mentioned in congressional investigations as a tool of the Soviet spy apparatus in Washington. In 1953 the FBI named him as a procurer of government secrets for Communist spies. Elizabeth Bentley, a former courier for a Communist espionage network, testified that Currie's job was to steal White House secrets for the spy ring.

The former White House aid hotly denied all the charges under oath. But in 1950 he left the country and settled in Colombia, where he became an occasional adviser to the Colombian Government. In 1955 his U.S. citizenship was revoked on the ground that Currie, a native of Nova Scotia who was naturalized here in the mid-1930's, had automatically forfeited his citizenship by remaining outside this country for 5 years.

I can find no record that Currie protested revocation of his U.S. citizenship. In 1954 he married a Colombian national, and so far as the record goes has not set foot in the United States since. The State Department, however, glumly asserted that it had "heard" Currie had been in New York recently. I have been unable to check this tid-bit of information at this writing. The State Department, of course, has ample reason for its uneasy interest in the doings of Currie, erstwhile accused catspaw of Soviet espionage and current adviser to the Government of Colombia.

Currie, for all his flagrant record in Washington, is the author of an economic development plan which is now under serious study by the Government of Colombia. If it is adopted it will become the blueprint for spending that nation's share of the multibillion-dollar "alliance for progress" fund.

Curries' plan, according to State Department sources, is a far-out scheme for "forced draft" industrialization of Colombia. It envisions, among other things, "effective" industrialization within 2 years—a goal which experts regard as wildly unrealistic. Another aspect of Currie's blueprint involves the mass

removal of much rural population to proposed industrial areas.

Treasury Secretary Dillon, who was asked recently what safeguards the United States would have that its huge "alliance for progress" investment wouldn't be squandered on crackpot schemes, replied that much of the program would be administered through such agencies as the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank and would have to meet reasonable investment banking standards.

But the Currie case is beginning to show how difficult this concept may be to enforce. As concerned as it is over the hare-brained Currie plan, our State Department has carefully avoided making any suggestion that the Colombian Government reject it. Any representations, now, the State Department is afraid, would be misunderstood as meddling with Colombian sovereignty.

But the fact is that our officials would be in an equally embarrassing dilemma if a Latin-American government offered a crackpot blueprint in a bid for "alliance for progress" funds. If the Colombian Government, for example, adopted the Currie "forced draft" proposals, and this country then rejected them, it would be interpreted as a tremendous effront by Colombia.

Washington officials, who are frankly unhappy over the whole mess, are hoping such subtle hints as have been dropped in Bogota will be enough to torpedo the Currie scheme without damaging our relations with Colombia.

ANOTHER CASTRO OVER THE HORIZON

(By Gould Lincoln)

A would-be Castro is about to take over in British Guiana—a Communist at heart, although for the present at least as a neutralist. The question in many minds is: Where in Latin America will a third Castro-minded leader grasp power? The spread of Communist support in countries to the south of the United States is becoming more and more a vital issue. The turn toward communism in British Guiana, where Cheddi Jagan and his leftist political party has just won an election, putting them in power, was accomplished without bloody revolution. But the change has been nonetheless effective. Mr. Jagan has freely admitted in the past that he is a Marxist; he has been a great admirer of Castro and Castro's government in Cuba.

The situation for Mr. Jagan, despite his victory at the polls, is still cramping. The British still have not given the country full independence. The British still are in position to control foreign affairs. Mr. Jagan is expected to become Premier and he will have a majority in the country's legislative body. Should he seek to adopt the Russian-Sino Communist line—with nationalization of industry and political bonds with the Kremlin, a la Castro—he may find that Britain will shut down on the complete independence, which has been promised within a year or two.

Nevertheless, Jagan's victory in British Guiana is the first time an out-and-out Communist sympathizer has gained control in a century on the South American Continent. Obviously, it is giving the Kennedy administration concern. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said this Government has been consulting with the British regarding the situation. Also, British Guiana has been getting $750,000 from the United States in technical aid—under the foreign aid program—and recently obtained a $1.25 million loan from the World Bank. Mr. Jagan also has said he wants to participate in the $20 billion alliance for progress program which has been sponsored by President Kennedy.

NO U.S. FUNDS FOR REDS

If Mr. Jagan puts the Communist line into practice there, Congress will never permit the appropriation of any money that would go, or conceivably go—to his government. This includes appropriations for foreign aid and also money for the alliance for progress program under the plan recently signed up at the Uruguay Conference. Indeed, if Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, who represented the United States there, had not announced that the conference that none of the $20 billion fund would go to Castro and his Cuban Government, leading members of Congress say today that body would never appropriate a dollar for the fund.

MAY PLAY WAITING GAME

The problem of the spread of communism and sympathy for the Communist cause in Latin America is increasingly forcing itself upon the Amerivan Government and the American people. This election in British Guiana has sharpened the concern felt here. Mr. Jagan may still continue to put forth reports that his government will play along with such neutralist countries as India and some of the newly independent African countries, in an effort to ally suspicion, believing that a waiting game until British Guiana has obtained its full independence from Britain is the best policy. However, his Chicago-born wife, whom he met and married while he was studying dentistry at Northwestern University and who allegedly had Communist associations, has announced that he and his government will demand immediate and complete independence for their country.

British Guiana borders on Venezuela and Brazil. It is almost on the same parallel with the Panama Canal, although some 1,200 miles distant. A Communist beachhead there, despite the small population (some 600,000 to 700,000) could eventually become a threat—just as the Communist beachhead in Cuba, 90 miles from Florida, may constitute a serious threat. Castro receives arms and economic aid from Soviet Russia. There is nothing to prevent the same kind of aid from going to British Guiana in the future. There was a period after Castro took over Cuba from Dictator Batista during which many people in this country regarded him as a good revolutionary. This feeling for Fidel Castro has vanished into thin air.

Some day the Latin-American policy of the Kennedy administration must be clarified. Except for the Kennedy proposed $20 billion Alliance for Progress, nothing has really evolved there since the fiasco of the United States Cuban invasion. There had been talk of rallying the OAS (Organization of American States) to take action or adopt economic sanctions against Castro's Cuba. But too many leaders of Latin-American governments showed a disinclination for any such moves at this time.

McMillan in Running Battle With the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD an item written by Mr. Edward H. Sims who is head of the Sims Bureau here in Washington and who writes for a number of newspapers throughout the United States.

Mr. Sims, in my opinion, at all times makes an effort to give the people of this country the news in an unbiased manner and if we are to continue to have a free press in the United States, we must have more editors who will refrain from giving the people slanted views of the news and discontinue using the press as a manner of smearing public officials who happen to disagree with their views on certain legislation.

The article follows:

(By Edward H. Sims)

WASHINGTON.—The National Capital, as a city, comes in for much attention by both the politicians and the newspapers of the country. This is as it should be, for the Capital—the District of Columbia—is the property of the 50 States.

Residents in the District of Columbia have not had the right to vote, until recently, when they were given the right to vote in presidential elections. Prior to this, there was constant editorial treatment of the denial of the right to vote to District citizens.

Many are still dissatisfied because residents of the District do not elect representatives to sit in Congress, and because they do not elect city officials to run the National Capital.

The man who has stood in the path of a city government in Washington, the officeholders elected by residents of the District of Columbia, is Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. From a distinguished South Carolina family and the dean of the Palmetto State's delegation, MCMILLAN is flatly opposed to the proposal to turn over the Federal City to local citizens.

"It wouldn't work," MCMILLAN told this writer this week. "It has been tried before and it didn't work then."

To read the Washington newspapers, and to listen to some of the commentators and columnists, one might think that MCMILLAN had four horns and shark teeth. But the fact is that he is against home rule for the District of Columbia for some pretty good reasons.

And because he has fought it, he has been often taken to task by the Washington Post, which has pumped so hard for this "pet" and which has been unable to beat MCMILLAN in the long fight. In recent days MCMILLAN bested the Post on two other interesting counts.

He led the fight for an amendment to the law which would close the gap in law enforcement left by the Supreme Court's Mallory ruling. That court decision hampered the Washington police severely in their efforts to check rising District of Columbia crime, by forcing them to turn lose persons picked up without the proper time to question them at length.

The District Committee of the House, headed by MCMILLAN, held hearings on this question, and the senior judge in Washington, Judge Alexander Holtzof testified in favor of the amendment. So did the U.S. District Attorney. MCMILLAN—in spite of opposition from the powerful and active Washington Post, got the bill passed in the committee and in the House.

He also recently got another amendment through both the committee and the House—an amendment which would close another gap left in Washington law enforcement by Supreme Court decision. This amendment would restore the burden of having to prove insanity to the person pleading insanity. This is the general rule in courts and States all over the country.

However, the controversial Durham ruling of the Supreme Court changed that—so that in Washington today if a defendant in a rape or murder case says that at the time he must have been crazy, it is up to the State to prove that he was not.

Crime in the National Capital is reaching scandalous proportions. It is a fact that 85 percent of the serious crimes are committed

by Negroes, and that the rate of crime rises each year.

McMILLAN says: "I have never done anything to hurt the Negro in my political life. I am not against the Negro nor do I seek to do any person an injustice. But we need to help the police department in the District in every way we can and what I have done is in the best interests of everyone in the Capital, and there is no politics in it."

The Post, meanwhile, has blamed McMILLAN for helping block the nomination of a Negro, Frank Reeves, to be a commissioner in the District of Columbia. McMILLAN denies that he deserves the credit or the blame. "That was a Senate matter and I can't control things over there," he says. (Reeves' nomination seems blocked for a number of reasons.)

In summary, the fight being waged between the liberal Washington Post and McMILLAN is a long one. In this connection, McMILLAN feels the Post seizes every opportunity to knock him, both above and below the belt. To impartial observers, it's clear the newspaper considers McMILLAN a bar to its program. McMILLAN feels the newspaper is a dangerous instrument, as it is run, in the National Capital.

To this writer, it seems that McMILLAN gets the worst of every publicity and news angle carried—at any time—in the Post, which influences many people in Washington.

Summary of Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have conducted an opinion poll among the voters of the Seventh District of Indiana. The tabulation, which I now submit, will be of interest and significance to my colleagues.

Indiana voters overwhelmingly favor a strong, determined stand against Communism, whether in Berlin, Red China, Cuba, or elsewhere.

The tabulation shows that 96 percent said we should resist Communist attempts to force us out of West Berlin. Most of these replies were received before the recent border closing. Only 2 percent disapprove of such a stand and 2 percent expressed no opinion. In response to a similar question last year, 95 percent replied that we should not abandon West Berlin.

Eighty-seven percent of the replies affirm our continued opposition to United Nations' membership for Communist China. Ten percent say we should not oppose Peking's admission and 3 percent did not respond. Last year, 85 percent said the United States should not recognize Red China.

On a multiple choice question concerning Cuba, 87 percent expressed disapproval of the tractor-prisoner exchange, which was abandoned by its proponents after the questionnaire was distributed. Seventy-nine percent favor an economic embargo against Cuba and 48 percent would favor sending United States troops to displace the Castro government if necessary. Thirty-six percent are opposed to sending troops and 16 percent declined to give a "yes" or "no" answer.

With regard to our foreign aid program, two-thirds of those who replied want to see it sharply reduced or ended. Forty-six percent favor cutting it sharply and 20 percent want it completely ended. Twenty-one percent favor a continuation of the program at recent levels and 6 percent believe it should be increased. The remaining 7 percent did not indicate an answer.

Seventh District voters reiterated their previous misgivings concerning Federal aid to education. Seventy percent of the replies expressed opposition to Federal aid to be used for teachers' salaries in the schools and 56 percent opposed Federal assistance for school construction. Only 23 percent expressed approval of Federally supported teachers' salaries and 40 percent backed construction aid. The balance of the replies failed to indicate their opinions.

Only 30 percent favor a program of medical care for persons over age 65 tied into the social security system. Sixty-seven percent opposed this suggestion, and 3 percent were undecided. In response to a similar question last year 36 percent were in favor and 57 percent were opposed.

There is widespread interest in tariff legislation to protect domestic industries from the competition of products made in countries with low labor standards. Seventy-four percent supported such legislation; 21 percent were opposed and 5 percent expressed no opinion. A similar response was received on this question last year.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, the subject of some criticism in recent months, received a strong vote of confidence in the replies received. Eighty-nine percent believed it should continue its investigations, 7 percent are opposed and 4 percent did not reply.

The response to this year's questionnaire is much higher than it has been to any I have distributed in previous years. There is evidence of a growing interest among the people about the international questions which have become so threatening in recent months. Many voters amplified their replies with letters expressing their concern over the increasing aggressiveness of Khrushchev and the Communist world.

I know that many Members of the House send questionnaires to their constituents. I believe they have found, as I have, that these polls give some significant guide to voter sentiment. Beyond that I have found that they tend to encourage discussion and thinking among the citizenry about the vital questions of today. I am deeply gratified by the attention my constituents have given these questions.

The results of the poll follow:

Final summary of opinion poll conducted by Congressman William G. Bray, 7th District, Indiana

Do you favor—	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. In our relations with Cuba:			
(a) Agreeing to the tractor-prisoner exchange?	3	87	10
(b) Economic embargo on all goods?	79	10	11
(c) Sending troops to displace Castro and the Communists?	48	36	16
2. Continuing U.S. opposition to the admission of Red China in the U.N.?	87	10	3
3. Foreign-aid appropriations:			
(a) Continued at present levels?	21	------	7
(b) Cut sharply?	46	------	
(c) Expanded?	6	------	
(d) Ended?	20	------	
4. Stronger laws to protect domestic industries from competition of products imported from countries with cheap labor standards?	74	21	5
5. Increase in social security taxes to provide a compulsory Government program for medical care of persons over 65?	30	67	3
6. Continuing to resist Communist attempts to force us to withdraw from West Berlin?	96	2	2
7. Federal tax money being used to aid States in—			
(a) School construction?	40	56	4
(b) Teachers' salaries?	23	69	8
8. Permitting the Un-American Activities Committee to continue its investigations?	89	7	4

Irish Hospitals' Trust Sweepstakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the Irish hospitals' trust sweepstakes. This public enterprise, although not in a strict senses a national lottery, probably has more repercussions in the United States than any other foreign gambling operation. The Irish sweepstakes not only benefits the Irish hospitals, but it sheds a little light on American gambling proclivities as well.

In 1960, the gross receipts of the Irish sweepstakes totaled better than $47 million. The profits accruing to the Irish hospitals exceeded $11 million in that year.

It is all well and good that the Irish hospitals benefit from the natural urge to gamble, but why is it necessary that they benefit from the failure of the American Government to realize that Americans like to gamble? Do we have such a favorable balance of payments that we can afford to encourage the flight of gambling dollars to foreign shores? Or is this a price that the hypo-

crites are more than willing to pay in order to be able to continue to impose their will on the majority?

Millions of Credit "Dupes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the August 26, 1961, issue of the Ave Maria, a national Catholic weekly published in Notre Dame, Ind.

I believe that H.R. 6725, the truth-in-lending bill is the answer to the problem of hidden credit charges and urge the House to consider this proposal. It is very much in the national interest.

The article follows:

MILLIONS OF CREDIT "DUPES"

Are Americans actually paying more than they think in consumer credit charges? The Credit Union National Association believes so: "When credit granters can hide the true cost of credit, people pay excessive charges without realizing it, and economic waste and personal hardship will result."

CUNA is backing the truth-in-lending bills introduced into Congress by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER. The objective of the bills is "to assure a full disclosure of credit cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy."

According to CUNA, "Such a law would help the millions of families who are still being duped out of a full week's wages or more each year by unnecessary high consumer credit costs."

Whether or not this particular bill is the best measure to dampen the now-prospering success of loan sharks is a matter for Congress and those expert in banking and finance to decide. But it does seem that some congressional recognition of the growing problem is needed to protect American families in our affluent society. Buying has been made easy—too easy—for us. When this easy-buying is linked with values that put speedboats and Bermuda cruises in the "necessary" and "pay later" category, it is time to bring every potential buyer's attention to the real cost of these luxuries.

Families plagued with financial difficulties are insecure and unhappy families, particularly when the head of the family realizes too late that he blundered in his handling of the family treasury. Nagged by past-due bills and threatened with collection calls, households are torn by worries and doubts.

On the other hand, sensible management of even a minimum income leads to harmony and peace of mind, the good realization that what God has given has not been squandered but has been spent wisely.

If what CUNA states is true, that "millions of families" are being "duped out of a full week's wages or more each year" by hidden finance charges, it would seem that the problem is one of national scope; the security of a country depends upon the security of its individual families.

Ironically, an objector to the bill, Senator WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, expressed one of the key reasons why we think some legislation of this nature is necessary: "If stores had to say their revolving credit fund operated at 18 percent interest per year, what would happen to good will? The customer has accepted 1½ percent a month."

Disclosure of these charges could very easily cause buyers to think twice—to stop and consider that a Bermuda cruise could also mean sailing into bankruptcy, or that the trim and speedy little boat they long for could get them into deep water in more ways than one.

Red Agents in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is the shocking story of John Chadwick, as it appeared in yesterday's Long Island Sunday Press, on how Red agents infiltrate the White House.

With Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's muzzling of officers within the Department of Defense to prevent enlightening of Americans on communism, is it not time we took a close look at the whole picture?

What use is it to be strong militarily when we are weak and negligent in dealing with Communist subversion?

The article follows:

RED AGENTS INFILTRATE WHITE HOUSE

(By John Chadwick)

WASHINGTON.—Senate investigators have been told that Moscow has ordered "a frontal attack" on the anti-Communist movement in the United States and made use of agents who infiltrated the White House.

The testimony was given behind closed doors to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 11 by Edward Hunter of 64 Webster Avenue, Port Washington, a writer and lecturer.

The subcommittee, in making his testimony public yesterday, described Hunter as a psychological warfare expert and as the originator of the term "brainwashing."

Hunter testified that the Kremlin has set out to crush what he termed a grassroots anti-Communist movement he said has sprung up in the United States in the last couple of years.

Orders for this "Red anti-anti-Communist drive," he said, went out through manifesto issued December 5, 1960, at the conclusion of a strategy conference of 81 Communist Parties of the world in Moscow.

"A quick Red operation is being attempted, like that of a sleight-of-hand artist, to push this administration, the press, and public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States," Hunter said.

He testified that "such operations require a new sort of agent, on which the Kremlin places its main trust nowadays," in contrast to what he described as the old-style cloak-and-dagger man who buys or steals secrets.

Then Hunter went on:

"Moscow simply acquired agents who mingled with the new, intellectual elite at the top on terms of equality, were sometimes members of it themselves. They infiltrated the White House and other topmost Government offices.

"These were gentlemen all. Gentlemen talked frankly between themselves in comradely manner. Secrets were much easier to steal this way, and immensely more reliable.

"We might cringe at the idea that Red agents, bought and paid for by the enemy, had entree and became members of the White House entourage, but we can brush it out of our minds only at our own peril. As such things happened, they can happen again."

Hunter gave no names, dates, or other details in testifying about this, but he said "the new-style, pro-Red agent has his role to influence policy, stalling or frustrating it, making it fail or end up by hurting ourselves."

He testified that the primary target of the anti-anti-Communist drive is the Pentagon, "specifically the program to train and alert our troops and our people to the Red techniques and the inherent evil in communism."

Hunter said the Reds have seen that "unless this program can be destroyed, the anti-Communist movement cannot be liquidated."

Shown copies of Defense Department directives issued this year, Hunter said that in effect they warned against the use of anti-Communist films in troop training programs and marked successes for the "Red anti-anti-Communist pressure drive."

Hunter testified this campaign "won a stunning victory for itself" when Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said at a May 26 news conference that military officers should confine themselves to defense matters in public discussions and avoid foreign policy matters.

At another point Hunter said "a fundamental objective of the Red drive is to cut off Pentagon participation in the (anti-Communist) grassroots movement that is at long last awakening our people."

"By forbidding the participation of the military in seminars or forums where where politics and policy are discussed," he said, "anti-Communist preparedness can be torpedoed and the character-building aspects of the program can be eliminated."

He said "communism cannot be meaningfully discussed without reference to Soviet Russia, the satellites and Red aggression, and infiltration in places such as southeast Asia and Africa."

Hunter testified that prior to the Moscow manifesto of December 5, 1960, anti-anti-Communist maneuvers took the form mainly of Red fronts, hush-hush methods, and economic pressures.

But since then, he said, anti-anticommunism, "has come out into the open, taking the offensive."

"During the years of hush-hush," Hunter said, "our channels of communication, to all practical purposes, closed their pages to anti-communism, ignored or downgraded anti-Communist books and writings, neutralized or squeezed out anti-Communist editors, authors and speakers, and made the anti-Communist a socially undesirable person."

He said Moscow has now decided that it is necessary to combat the anti-Communist movement in the United States head-on.

"We shall witness a seemingly spontaneous outpouring of articles and persuasions of every character that will rise all along the fringes of the communications field where the Reds have influence and, from then on * * * penetrating all channels of the press and all attitude-changing segments of our society, such as schools and churches."

Protecting Capital of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an edi-

torial which appeared in the News and Courier, one of the leading and oldest daily newspapers not only in South Carolina, but in the South.

I hope every Member will take time to read this article as I am certain every Member realizes the pressure that I have been under during the 14 years I have been chairman of the House District Committee from certain sources here in Washington to report a home rule bill to the floor of the House.

I, of course, cannot see how the Congress can consider a bill giving home rule to the District of Columbia without first amending the Constitution. I have personally been smeared and had every underhanded tactic used on me since I have served as chairman of the House District Committee by certain members of the local press for the simple reason that I oppose this type of legislation.

The article follows:

PROTECTING CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of the Sixth South Carolina Congressional District, who serves on the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives, unquestionably speaks for many thoughtful Americans in every State of the Union when he opposed the Kennedy administration's home rule bill for Washington.

The present form of government of the Federal District was created in 1878. It consists of a Commission of three members, two residents of the District appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and one detailed from the Army Corps of Engineers. Each House of Congress has a committee which is concerned with District affairs.

Residents of the District do not vote in national or municipal elections. It should be understood that Washington was created as a Federal town for the specific purpose of being the seat of Government. The original settlers were not stripped of rights. Moreover, any Government worker may continue to vote in his home State if he maintains a legal residence there.

The District of Columbia is not like any other community in this country. Its business is Government. Taxpayers in every part of the Nation pay the salaries of most of the working people in the District. While the commission system may not be the closest to a perfect municipal government in the Nation, it is vastly superior to the governments of many metropolitan areas.

In considering home rule proposals, the human realities of the District must be taken into consideration. The basic reality is that the bulk of the city's middle class—the people who make possible good government in American communities—have moved out of the District into Virginia and Maryland. In exchange, the city has received a great influx of migrants who, to use the polite term of modern sociologists, are "socially deprived." In plainer terms, Washington is inundated with poorly educated people who are ill-prepared for electing responsible city officials. Because of this population, the crime problem is appalling as has been reported by the Washington Star and other newspapers.

Even if home rule were desirable, now is not the time for it. The migrants need to gain education and understanding of a citizen's responsibilities. To force through home rule would be to fasten demagogic "bossism" on the National Capital. It would be a national and international disgrace that could not be hidden.

For these reasons, Congressman MCMILLAN'S opposition to home rule is a sound and reasoned position that should be respected from Maine to Hawaii.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 26, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District Texas, August 26, 1961)

SUICIDE, NOT DEFEAT—PRIMER OF SELF-DESTRUCTION

If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide.—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction—LENIN.

Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you. Your grandchildren will live under communism.—KHRUSCHEV.

Let's look at some specific ingredients of a primer of self-destruction. Simultaneously, we can trace the United States' embrace of socialism-communism (retreat from freedom and free enterprise) in each, inasmuch as we have partially or completely accepted the Socialist-Communist doctrine and are moving further in that direction. We say we believe in freedom, but we are taking contrary action, which will undoubtedly lead us into the slavery of a Socialist-Communist state.

1. Fiscal irresponsibility (spending ourselves into bankruptcy). The Socialist-Communist theory of Government manipulation of money, artificial interest rates, deficit spending, back-door financing of foreign aid and other programs, including income tax, almost as though modeled on Communist principles. Example of irresponsibility will show up in probable conference report on foreign aid bill which, if adopted will mean the total of "back-door spending" put through in this session of Congress alone will have totaled more than $28 billion. This means, in effect, that Congress will have voted away control over one-third of the entire Federal budget. Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, said (CONGESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 16): "Ever since this session began, we have been spending in the red at the rate of $1 million every hour, day and night." Antidote for this type of suicide: Fiscal responsibility: a balanced budget, flexible interest rates, tax reform.

2. Private business forced out by Government competition. Through subsidizing businesses and outright control by the Federal Government we force private business to compete with tax-free federalized institutions. The solution: Get the Government out of business—eliminate subsidies. Free enterprise does not need Government incentives and aid.

3. The steady and relentless increase of public power projects including nuclear power. A basic Socialist-Communist concept for complete control of the people by state-owned and operated sources of power. In support of freedom we should encourage full and rapid development of private power.

4. Labor monopoly (encouraged by Government) has developed dictatorial labor leaders who make unrealistic demands which continually push up the wage-price spiral and inhibit the operation of a free market and thus contribute to a Socialist-Communist doctrine. To strengthen our economy and to keep American labor free, labor organizations must be subject to antitrust laws.

5. The gradual imposition of State-owned and controlled housing for all the people through federally sponsored and dictated slum clearance and housing programs. Individual rights and private home ownership can be guaranteed only by keeping the responsibility for slum clearance at the local level and the development of housing through private enterprise and individual initiative.

6. A first step in any Socialist-Communist takeover, rob the farmers of freedom to produce. We are accomplishing it through ever-increasing subsidies which create artificial surpluses making more and more Federal control of what the farmer plants and what he sells necessary. To free the farmer we should eliminate subsidies, cut back surpluses and allow agriculture to operate in a free market.

7. Government sponsored and supported industry and Federal distribution of food in an effort to eliminate depressed areas simply worsens the situation, incites the need for further Federal controls, insures the dependency of the people on the Government and the end result is a Socialist-Communist state. Private enterprise is the only solution to the problem of unemployment. Sensible tax laws which make risk capital available, freeing industry and business from bureaucratic control will give the free-enterprise system full opportunity to function. It is under this system we developed the highest living standard in the world for the most people.

8. The Socialist-Communist planners have always started their campaign for a takeover by seizing the minds of the youth. Federal aid to education (and youth conservation corps) must invariably be followed by Federal control and bureaucratic dictation of what is taught, and by whom. A free society can be guaranteed only so long as our schools remain free. This can be maintained only so long as the control of education remains in the hands of the people at the local level who have the most direct interest in the education of their children.

9. A basic Socialist-Communist precept is state directed and financed medical care. Bills now before Congress would open the door for the complete socialization of medicine and ruin the high standard of medical care (the best in the world) now enjoyed by the American people. Only a determined effort to keep the Government from getting its foot in the door by trying medical care for the aged to social security and other proposals being offered, will keep the freedom of our medical men to give our people the best possible medical care.

10. Federal attempts to provide cradle-to-grave security by so-called Government insurance rather than actuarially sound pensions and annuities weakens our future financial strength as well as the character and moral fiber of the people making them ripe victims for Socialist-Communist planners. The answer for free men is voluntary pension plans which are actuarially sound and do not depend upon the support of future generations or political handouts.

11. Our defense against the military aspirations of the Communists has been weakened by a self-imposed nuclear test ban. Self-interest demands that we resume nuclear testing immediately in order to maintain our lead in nuclear weapons over the Soviet Union which refuses to negotiate in honesty and has a history of never honoring treaties or agreements.

12. Giving impetus to the program to spend us into bankruptcy is a foreign aid program which gives away the money of American taxpayers to Communist countries, so-called neutrals and others who have shown a preference for the policies of the Soviet Union and socialism and an enmity of the United States. The least we

can do to keep from contributing to our own destruction is to deny any foreign aid to any country which is devoted to our destruction, Russia, Poland, and other Communist satellites; Socialists and neutrals (like India) which line up with the Communists on every issue; and others who play the United States off against Russia in their own self-interest (Brazil). The ridiculous extent to which we go is stated by Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22) "Dr. Cheddi Jagan and his Communist-dominated People's Progressive Party have apparently won a cloudy victory at the polls in British Guiana. Jagan was receiving all-out support of Radio Moscow, Radio Peiping, and the Castro radio. But British Broadcasting Corp. and the Voice of America did absolutely nothing to help the opposition and nothing to expose the people of British Guiana the Communist nature of the Jagan movement. Worse than this, in the weeks preceding the election we gave our assent to a $2 million loan by the World Bank to the previous Jagan regime, and Jagan was able to use this loan to bolster his political reputation. I consider this nothing short of a scandal I believe Congress is entitled to know how it came about that Jagan got this loan at so critical a juncture." As some see it, South America takeover by communism has begun with our aid.

3. An indecisive and weak foreign policy causes us loss of prestige in the world, weakens the support of our allies, and ripens us for a Communist takeover. There can be no substitute for a strong foreign policy in which we reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine; take immediate steps to free Cuba from the Communists, which will take the pressure off the Berlin situation by showing Khrushchev we are able to take decisive action; protect American citizens and property anywhere in the world where they are threatened; support any free people which shows its determination to resist Communist aggression and subversion.

The choice now rests with the American people. Are we to remain free or continue to sow the seeds of our own destruction? Only understanding and a strong protest from the people to every Member of Congress will reverse the trend and save our free way of life.

THE COMMUNIST PLAN FOR OUR DEFEAT

"War to hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeois will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overturns and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists" (quote from talk given by Dimitri Z. Manuilsky at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1930).

The Equal Rights for Women Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 62

To the members of the senate and house of representatives:

We, the undersigned, committee of conference on the part of the senate and house of representatives for the purpose of considering House Resolution 62, resolving (the senate concurring) that the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment, respectfully submit the following bill as our report.

WILLIAM J. LANE,
PETER J. CAMIEL,
CLARENCE D. BELL,
Committee on the Part of the Senate.

MARION L. MUNLEY,
KATHRYN GRAHAM PASHLEY,
ELISABETH S. WYND,
Committee on the Part of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 24, 1961.

Whereas there has been introduced in the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961, the equal rights for women amendment which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and

Whereas this amendment reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex": Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

We certify that this bill has passed the house of representatives and the senate.

JOSEPH OMINSKY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
HIRAM G. ANDREWS,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
ANTHONY DISILVESTRO,
President pro tempore, Senate.

Approved the 21st day of August, A.D. 1961.

———— ————,
Governor.

Transfiguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Edward Paca, has sent to me an original poem with a prayerful message. Mr. Paca was largely instrumental in obtaining for the last resting place of veterans, the Fort Logan National Cemetery located in my district. At the present time there is pending before committee a private bill to permit Mr. Paca to be buried next to his son in that cemetery. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Paca's message in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRANSFIGURATION

(By Tilghman Paca)

I make my herculean thrust
To say to God: "You surely must
Make in this abhorred dilemma
Mighty men from wind-blown dust.

"Too long have arrant human trash
Belabored life by goad and lash:
In their avaricious fevor
Left a deep unhealing gash.

"The virile manhood in their breast
Had never stood to take its test.
Only You can call attention,
Then their souls will do the rest."

Out of legends grim and gory
Come that soul-bestirring story:
Men, in sunburst of their soul-light,
Glow in God's shining glory.

Swift as the twinkle of an eye,
Decisions made to do or die,
That the purity of honor
They will hold forever high.

Resolutions of General Federation of Women's Club Convention, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years our free way of life—functioning upon the general principles of the Constitution—has been greatly strengthened by voluntary assistance of citizens for serving individual and national interests.

Today, I refer to one such outstanding group, the General Federation of Women's Clubs. As a "voice" for about 11 million members in 15,500 clubs in the United States, and 50 nations around the world, the Federation today is making a useful, constructive, creative contribution to public thinking on the formation of national policy.

Today, I was privileged to receive a copy of the resolution as adopted at the 1961 convention. Reflecting the thoughtful views of the Federation on major national and international interests, I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS CONVENTION, 1961

I. UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs, having international headquarters in Washington, D.C., United States of America, for 11 million members in 15,500 clubs in the United States of America and 50 other nations in the world, declares its support of the United Nations in accordance with a resolution adopted in 1947 and reaffirmed in 1952; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant of the ever-increasing influence of the United Nations as the only true world forum and where every member nation is pledged to seek peace with freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in Board of Directors Meeting, assembled in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on September 29, 1960, commends the continuing achievements of the United Nations and salutes it as the greatest organized hope for all mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs pledges its support of and confidence in the United States of America delegation at the United Nations and in the present Secretary General.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

II. GASOLINE TAX

Whereas the average combined State-Federal tax on gasoline now amounts to a sales tax of approximately 50 percent, the highest rate on an everyday item in the entire economy; and

Whereas when Congress increased the Federal gasoline tax in 1959 it was understood that this would be a temporary measure and that the added 1 cent of tax would expire on June 30, 1961, to be replaced by specified portions of the Federal highway user taxes not now being applied to the national highway program; and

Whereas the national highway program, the costliest public work undertaking in human history, is being financed entirely by the Federal level by taxes on highway users, and nearly 80 percent of the program's support now comes from the Federal tax on gasoline; and

Whereas Federal taxes imposed on gasoline and on motor vehicle ownership and use now cost approximately $4.3 billion a year, but only about $2.6 billion of this revenue is being applied to the support of the Federal share of the national highway program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs hereby calls upon the entire delegation of Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to work actively for the expiration of the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax on the promised date, for the use of the specified portion of the autmobile and parts and accessories taxes for the highway program, as also promised, and for the rejection of any proposal for a further increase in the Federal tax on gasoline; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Senators and to all Members of the House of Representatives.

Submitted by Mrs. Guy Nelson, chairman consumer and finance division.

Approved by the resolution committee.

III. WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Amend water pollution control resolution passed in convention, 1900, reaffirmed 1955:

Whereas our country's waters are vital to its very existence; to its economic and social progress; to its national safety; and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic, agricultural, fishing, wildlife, recreational uses, and industrial productive capacity are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers, and lakes; and

Whereas the responsibility for water pollution control is primarily State and local, a majority of the Nation's rivers are interstate streams or tributaries thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that local, State, and Federal agencies cooperate to accomplish adequate pollution abatement; that pollution control be developed as an integral part of comprehensive river-basin programs; that the Pollution Control Act of Congress, June 30, 1948, as amended, be extended and implemented; and that stronger regulatory laws be enacted to improve water pollution control with the broadest possible benefits to the public.

Amend by deleting paragraphs 3 and 4 and by adding 6 new paragraphs.

Proposed amended resolution

Whereas our country's waters are vital to it very existence; to its economic and social progress; to its national safety; and to the public health and welfare of its people; and

Whereas the domestic, agricultural, fishing, wildlife, recreational uses, and industrial productive capacity are seriously threatened because of pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes; and

Whereas the reports of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources indicate that our Nation is confronted with very serious water supply problems directly related to rapid population and industrial growth and change, making it necessary to use the same water over and over; and

Whereas waste treatment plants in use have not fully eliminated all objectionable pollutants from public water; and

Whereas prevention and control of pollution is necessary to serve the widest possible range of human needs; and

Whereas the responsibility for water pollution control is primarily State and local; therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges its member clubs to promote a program of education emphasizing the urgency of prevention and control of water pollutants; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that (1) private industry, local, State, and Federal agencies encourage research and that they cooperate to accomplish adequate water supply and pollution abatement; that (2) pollution control be developed as an integral part of comprehensive river-basin programs; and that (3) stronger regulatory laws be enacted to improve water pollution control.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Amend technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas resolution passed at convention, 1950:

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has consistently manifested its concern in the material welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its support of the principle of joint responsibility among free nations for economic stability and mutual security; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorses the principles of the program which provides basic technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, encourages private investment of capital needed for this economic development; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress to provide adequate appropriation for the technical assistance program.

Amend by inserting after the word "development" in paragraph 3 the words "and which uses carefully screened, qualified young people and adults in the program":

Proposed amended resolution

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has consistently manifested its concern in the material welfare of the freedom-loving peoples of the world, therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its support of the principle of joint responsibility among free nations for economic stability and mutual security; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorses the principles of the program which provides basic technical assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world, encourages private investment of capital needed for this economic development and which uses carefully screened, qualified young people and adults in the program; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress to provide adequate appropriation for the technical assistance program.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

V. EFFICIENCY IN ELECTION PROCEDURES

Whereas, the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant that, to effect the greatest efficiency in operation, it is necessary from time to time to review methods and procedures; and

Whereas, modern transportation and communication facilities enable the public to become better informed on candidates and issues and eliminate the necessity for lengthy campaigns; and

Whereas the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States merits consideration and study; and

Whereas many responsible citizens in changing their place of residence have been deprived of their right of franchise in national elections due to the variation in State residency laws: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that a bipartisan committee be appointed by the Congress of the United States to study and make recommendations for modern, efficient, and equitable compaigns and election procedures.

Submitted by the resolutions committee.

RESOLUTIONS

I. SUPPORT OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Whereas promotion of Western Hemisphere solidarity long has been an established policy of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Western Heimsphere security is safeguarded by the structure of the Organization of American States,

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its faith in and support of the Organization of American States and urges it to exert firm and active leadership in the threatened areas of the Western Hemisphere, thereby insuring security and preventing further repressive measures.

Submitted by the executive committee.

II. SUPPORT OF NATO

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has supported NATO from the inception of its organization,

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs reaffirms its faith in and support of this Organization, and urges strong leadership within the member nations to safeguard the security of threatened areas.

Submitted by the executive committee.

RESOLUTION

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Whereas the Communist penetration and aggression is a threat to the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas the relentless pressure of communism jeopardizes western hemispheric solidarity: Therefore

Resolved, That the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in the 50 States, the District of Columbia and 53 other countries strongly support the U.S. Government in its efforts to prevent the persistent pressures by the Communists to exploit and take over the free world.

Submitted by the internal affairs department.

I'll Pledge My Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Hoppe, a columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, has recently prepared two columns which I wish to include as an extension of my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first, entitled "I'll Pledge My Fortune" appeared in the August 23, 1961, issue of the Chronicle; and the second, entitled "Teddy's Most Equal of All" appeared in the August 25, 1961, issue of the same newspaper:

I'LL PLEDGE MY FORTUNE

(By Art Hoppe)

Phew. I'm glad we've solved the Berlin crisis. I mean the crisis in which our West German allies got sore at us because they thought we were too chicken to risk a nuclear war in their behalf.

They sent Mr. Kennedy an umbrella to remind him of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. And their officials and newspapers were saying some pretty mean things about how gutless we were, wanting to negotiate with the Russians and all.

Of course we still occupy West Germany on account of we licked and disbanded forever the German Army, which was one of the best in Europe. But it's very important we appease them now. On account of the German Army is one of the best in Europe.

So Mr. Kennedy swiftly dispatches reinforcements to Berlin to show our German allies we aren't gutless. What he dispatches is 1,500 troops and Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON. I don't think the troops alone would have appeased the Germans. Mainly because Berlin's surrounded by 300,000 Russian soldiers armed to the teeth. Of course, we could have pointed out that these odds were no worse than we faced when we invade Cuba. But somehow, I don't think we would have.

No, sir, it was Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON who saved the day. Mr. JOHNSON told the Germans to remember the Alamo and implied we'd never negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Russians. The Germans were so happy they threw flowers at him. He handed out ballpoint pens. And everybody cried.

I though Mr. JOHNSON brought it off awfully well. He's getting to be a very experienced nonretreating allies appeaser.

Every time we get a crisis among our allies, which is very often lately, Mr. Kennedy dispatches Mr. JOHNSON. Like in Asia, Mr. JOHNSON goes all over Asia, says he'll never retreat, climbs on a water buffalo, gets clobbered with flowers, hands out ballpoint pens and everybody cries. It's a great thing for the ballpoint pen industry. I just hope Mr. JOHNSON isn't getting overextended.

But Berlin was his finest hour. He said: "You shall prevail." He said he would never retreat an inch. And then he flew back to Washington.

But what I liked best, even though it had a familiar ring, was when he pledged to defend the Germans, who are now our friends, with "our lives, our fortunes, and our secred honor." I thought that was awfully nice of him and Lady Bird. They've got a lot to lose. I mean I don't have a fortune. And I don't guess my honor's very sacred. So he's not risking much of mine. Just my life.

TEDDY'S MOST EQUAL OF ALL

Some kind souls sent me a clipping out of U.S. News & World Report on Mr. Teddy Kennedy's recent good will tour of South America. It's where he appears before this band of ragged Brazilian peasants and says:

"President Kennedy is personnally concerned with your welfare and as proof has sent me, his own brother, to talk to you as an equal."

That's all U.S. News & World Report reports and it frustrates me. I figure one of the gravest problems we've got is how the rich, like the United States and the Kennedys, can convince the poor, like Brazil and me, that they really worry about us personally. As equals. So how did Mr. Teddy Kennedy follow up that whiz-bang opener? I've had to go and make it up:

"Yes sir, Muchachos, not only am I your equal, but my brother, Jack, is your equal, too. Honest to Dios, I can't tell you how concerned Jack is with your welfare. Personally. On account of you are such a crumby, illiterate lot.

"Yes sir, Compadres, I remember him saying so very well. We are sitting in the sun outside our little casa in Hyannisport. Which is a tiny farming village where the crops haven't been so good lately. And Jack kind of scratches himself and says:

" 'Teddy,' he says, 'I am very concerned, personally, with the welfare of my friends, those crumby, illiterate peasants of the Xylotl Tribe down in Northeastern Brazil. Each and every one of them. Jose, Rosita, Pablo and What's-his-name.

'So I says, 'Jack,' I says, trying to cheer him up, 'you shouldn't worry so. You've worked 6 days making this a better world and on the seventh you ought to rest. After all, I says, "you just scored a tremendous diplomatic victory at Punte del Este in Uruguay.'

" 'Which one's that?' says Jack. "Why," I says, 'that's where you called all those Latin Americans together, told them we were equals, and, after forceful arguing and skillful compromises, got them to accept $20 billion from us.' 'That's right,' says Jack. 'But it's not enough. I want to prove to my crumby, illiterate Xylotl friends that I think of them as equals. And there's nobody more equal than you, Teddy. So I am sending you, my own begotten brother, to descend among them and * * *'"

The only other thing that worries me is that U.S. News & World Report didn't say whether Mr. Teddy Kennedy got back from Brazil all right. I hope so. I mean anyone wandering around making speeches like that is liable to get crucified.

Troops' Best Weapon? Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a column written by Mr. Jack Anderson, Mr. Drew Pearson's associate, that appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 27, 1961.

The indicated material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1961]

TROOPS' BEST WEAPON? COURAGE

(By Jack Anderson)

(Drew Pearson is in Russia. His associate, Jack Anderson, is covering the Washington scene.)

The heroic spectacle of 1,500 American troops rolling into Berlin last Sunday was slightly marred by the antiquity of their equipment.

Those who looked closely may have noticed that this bold battle group, pride of the U.S. Army, was scarcely better equipped than the GI's who swarmed into Berlin 16 years earlier.

These 1961 soldiers carried 1941 rifles, some M–1's, some Browning automatics. Slapping against their sides were .45 pistols, which were first used in 1899 during the Philippine Insurrection.

Their machineguns and hand grenades were of World War II vintage, their mortars and howitzers only slightly improved over the World War II models.

The tall Texan in command, Col. Glover Johns, Jr., bravely ordered his men to look and act like the damn best soldiers in the U.S. Army.

Their performance might have been more convincing, however, if they hadn't been obliged to appear in the battle dress of a past war. Their helmets, canteens, web belts, and knapsacks were hand-me-downs from World War II. The field uniforms, though newer, had the same old look.

In contrast, the Soviet troops surrounding Berlin are completely armed and outfitted for the next, rather than the last war. their weapons include deadly nuclear-tipped tactical rockets.

America Today Through Europe's Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, despite all the roar and thunder during the political campaign last fall, on how strong and firm we should be in dealing with the Communists, thus far all the American people have witnessed has been talk by President Kennedy.

The following article by Constantine Brown, in the Washington Evening Star of August 24, relates some impressions of Europeans on what we are doing vis-a-vis the Communists:

WHERE U.S. POLICIES STIR DOUBT—SWISS OBSERVER SEES AMERICAN ACTIONS WEAKENING OUR HOLD ON FRIENDS

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Headlines of the daily papers reflect nothing but trouble throughout the world, with vastly important crises relegated to inside pages to make way for the newest crises or the latest developments on a current one.

This flood of adverse news has made me ponder more on the prophecies of my Swiss friend whose large industries in foreign lands have made him an earnest and thoughtful student of world developments and who predicted the United States would be plagued with numerous internal strains. The following is a continuation report on his views.

"In Europe," he told me, "the main targets of the Communists are de Gaulle and Adenauer. It is obvious that the Soviets are trying to pull in the net around de Gaulle. The pattern which besets France is similar to that in many other free countries. The French President's sound idea of an Algerian-French community—at one time welcomed by the FLN—has now been rejected by the rebels. Then there was the abortive military

coup last spring which is being used by the Communists who are, by indirect methods, inciting the ultras in France.

"Tunisia's Bourguiba played a cunning hand. He was a friend of France and de Gaulle, but under the impact of the unseen forces in his own government, his hand was forced and he committed an act of aggression against his former dear friend.

"Now, possibly against his better judgment, Bourguiba is turning toward Russia and the Arab League.

"And because U.S. Presidents have been willing to meet with Khrushchev anywhere, any time—even when one of them was left at the post in Paris and then insulted by being disinvited to Moscow—the statesmen of Italy fear that their country can no longer stand firm against the Soviets.

"How long do you think Franco and Salazar, who with all their faults keep their countries on an even keel, can last when the the U.S. policy is to side with the Kremlin and its anticolonialism campaign?

"You may ask what about Germany; it has no internal problems, and the leader, Adenauer, is strong. But why should the Kremlin worry about Germany? If all their allies are weakened by serious troubles, can West Germany survive for long?

"Let us look toward the Middle East once more. Turkey is at the crossroads; the military junta is divided; some believe in standing by the commitments to NATO; others prefer neutralism and friendship with Russia.

"Look at Pakistan, one of your stanchest allies. It now has recognized the Soviet-supported Algerian rebel government. President Ayub Khan is slowly turning toward the Moscow-Peiping combine.

"In the Far East the strong man of Korea fell before the student riots which had the support of your Government. Don't say it isn't so. Was not the student leader invited to lunch at the American Embassy with President Eisenhower when he visited that country? Although the anti-Communist military has taken oven since June, I doubt that in the present turmoil Korea can long survive.

"And Japan, the strongest of all Asian countries, has been licking its wounds from the student riots of 1959 and after, casting a doubtful eye to Washington, is quietly and expediently working toward economic agreements with Communist China.

"Also in the Far East we have the perennial controversial figure of Chiang Kai-shek. It is true that President Kennedy used strong words to reassure the free world that you will do your utmost to prevent Communist China from being admitted to the United Nations. But will your strongly liberal-minded U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson be able to muster sufficient votes to prevent Red China's case from reaching the U.N. agenda?"

The vastly interesting comments of my friend will be concluded in the next column.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. B. Armstrong of Travis County, Tex., is one of the most admired and revered men I have ever known. He was born and reared on a farm and ranch more than 80 years ago and has been engaged in farming and ranching ever since.

He is a charter member of the board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Electric Cooperative, Inc., the headquarters of which are at Giddings, Lee County, Tex. On August 18, 1961, he delivered an address to the area development panel of the Texas Electric Cooperatives at its annual meeting.

Because I know all of us who are interested in the agricultural sections of our districts and particularly in the program of rural electrification will be interested in his remarks, I ask that his speech be made a part of my remarks:

REMARKS BY MR. H. B. ARMSTRONG, AREA DEVELOPMENT PANEL, TEXAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES ANNUAL MEETING, SAN ANTONIO, AUGUST 18, 1961

In looking over this crowd of rural electrification folks I feel that I can speak to the youngest and the eldest. I was born and reared on a farm and ranch in Bell County more than 80 years ago. I have made my living on a farm and ranch ever since.

I have been secretary-treasurer of the Lower Colorado River Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Giddings, Tex., for 23 years and I am a charter member of the board of directors. As one of the charter members I have had an interest and a part in developing our cooperative as it is today. We have experienced as a board of directors many problems. We have faced each problem individually and learned that there is only one way that you can handle a problem—that is with a solution.

In the early days it was a matter of explaining to prospective members the advantage of electric lights over the kerosene lamp. This was a hard and tedious job. The next step was to select a captain to steer the ship in the future and keep it on its course. He is a professional and to him we leave the mechanics of getting done the jobs we directors deem necessary for our cooperative.

Now, I am not here alone. Every member of our board is here—and that is what we have to do. We must attend meetings if we are to keep up to date with new developments. Next year, use your influence to see that your entire board is here.

At LCREC, we feel that the boardroom is the place to discuss policies of concern to our members. We take our members needs very seriously. They had a need for convenient financing so we developed the pay-easy plan. They had a need for a better understanding of how to use electricity, so we developed a power-use department.

Our manager is Martin Hyltin. He has been successful in selling our board on the need for each director to thoroughly appreciate the use of electricity by actually using it themselves. As far as I can ascertain we do not have a single director who uses gas or any other fuel in their own homes—everyone of our directors is all electric. Our rural schools had a need for thoroughly trained VO-AG teachers so we developed a course in electricity to be conducted in association with the Texas Education Agency.

All development arises out of need. As members of the board, we are concerned about the many changes taking place in our area. As all of you know, the average age of farmers or ranchers today is much higher than it was 25 years ago. This means young families who could not make a go of farming and ranching have left, taking our young folks with them. Our schools are consolidating, with the result that rural schools are closing and our cooperative has many idle serves where families used to live. The total value of these idle services represent a tremendous investment.

The congregations in most rural churches get smaller nearly every Sunday. These are the types of churches most of you have devoted a lifetime to building. What will these efforts have been for if there are not enough people left in the area to belong.

Our young families aren't staying—six out of seven high school graduates leave because there is no opportunity for them to remain and work at home. The parents can no longer look forward to their children and grandchildren living in the close-by area. What will be the value of the ranches and farms which have been accumulated if few can make a living in the area—if there are less and less buyers?

What will be the value of the equity of our cooperative lines and equipment if less and less rural folks live in the area to use the service we provide? Can we afford to ignore this economic need of our members? We are fighting to protect our rights in fringe areas. Should we not also, fight just as hard to protect our member's economic position.

We have all been elected by the membership to represent their best interests. It is for each of you to decide if you are actually concerning yourselves about what you and your board can and should do in your members' interests. We have this responsibility to them. The need for improvement is obvious in all rural areas.

There are opportunities for development all around us, but it takes someone to start community action. Take, for example, the recreational and resort developing of a lake. Someone has to cut a road down to the lake front, and run an electric line into the area. If you make it easy for other people they will do the developing. Once they can get to the lake front, they will buy and build.

Many rural churches are hanging on with part-time preachers while others are going under. Help them build a consolidated rural church and they will have the strength to grow. These people are some of the best workers obtainable anywhere. Draw them into your development programs. Make them partners in your overall program. If yours is to be an areawide campaign, organize community councils where neighbors can work together as a part of the county or areawide endeavor.

Each of you are extremely influential in your areas. You have been elected as a director because of your prominence and because your ability is highly respected at home. You must put this influence to work. Your members will listen to you and will follow the leadership you provide.

Start with five or six of your acquaintences. Point out the problems facing rural areas. Census figures will provide you with a wealth of material. Enlist the aid of your county agent, civic clubs, youth leaders, and anyone, and everyone. Give your manager and staff the support and policies they will need to coordinate the efforts of these communities in the total overall program.

We have been working 25 years to get these electric facilities on a firm footing. To pioneer the lines in virgin territory. Now is the time to go to work insuring the future soundness of our co-ops. Our competition serves the dynamic growth areas of Texas. They are prospering because the areas they serve are thriving, busy places. If we are to merely keep pace we must provide the same area development assistance which they have been providing for years.

Area development is a director's responsibility to the membership and a challenge to the board.

What I have said here today—reminds me of what the bantam rooster said to the bantam hen when he came upon the ostrich egg out on the desert. He said to her, "I don't expect you to do this, but it goes to show what can be done if you try a little harder."

Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns Urges More Efficient Procedures With Respect to Federal-Local Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Michael P. Curran, assistant executive director of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns, Boston, Mass., and a statement outlining the league's objectives:

MASSACHUSETTS LEAGUE
OF CITIES AND TOWNS,
Boston, Mass., August 24, 1961.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: At the first annual convention of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns held on May 27, 1961, at Worcester, a policy statement outlining league objectives was adopted by the delegates. A copy of section 5 of that policy statement is enclosed for your information.

Very truly yours,
MICHAEL P. CURRAN,
Assistant Executive Director.

SECTION 5. FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

A. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The Federal Government has adopted a number of aid programs, the intent and purpose of which are to make available Federal funds for the programing and construction of a wide range of local facilities. Such programs include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Federal Planning Advances, HHFA, section 702 Public Law 560; (b) Federal Assistance for School Construction, Public Law 815; (c) Federal Civil Defense Contributions program Civil Defense Act of 1950; (d) Urban Planning Assistance, HHFA, section 701, Public Law 560; (e) Airports, Federal Airport Act; (f) Small watershed projects, Public Law 566, as amended; (g) Public Facilities Loans programs, Public Law 345; (h) Urban Renewal, Housing Acts of 1949, 1954, 1957, and 1959; (i) Sewerage treatment aid, Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956; (j) Rural library service, Library Services Act; (k) Hospital construction, Hill-Burton Act, 1946; (l) Federal highway program, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959; (m) Land for recreation and public purposes, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, as amended by the acts of 1954 and 1959; (n) National Guard Armory construction, National Defense Facilities Act of 1950; (o) Beach erosion control, River and Harbors Act of 1932, together with other legislation pertinent thereto.

In enacting these aid program, the Federal Government geared the allocation of such funds to certain considerations and conditions, few of which seem to be consistent with one another. While some of the programs are administered by the same agency, there are many agencies involved in these aid programs, with national and regional offices located according to their own operating needs.

B. THE MASSACHUSETTS SITUATION

New England has long been considered as a natural unit because of both its geography and its economy. The six States which comprise the region have worked together continuously through the years in the pursuance of a large number of common interests both public and private. The New England Council, New England Board of Higher Education, New England Building Officials Conference, New England Colleges Fund, and many other groups too numerous to mention are indicative of the degree of cooperation which presently exists in the region. Just as the region has long been considered a natural one, so has Boston been considered as its natural center, because of its central location and the availability of water, rail, air, and highway access to it from anywhere in the region.

Currently, New England municipalities which wish to take advantage of any of the various Federal aid programs find it necessary for their officials to contact representatives of a great many Federal agencies. A municipal official seeking information and aid under any of these programs may find it necessary to travel extensively to a number of Government centers, including the District of Columbia, and to talk with many different Federal officials. In doing so, he will find that the regulations governing the submission and approval of project applications vary considerably with the agencies involved.

C. MASSACHUSETTS MUNICIPAL POLICY

Whereas the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns is desirous of more efficient procedures with respect to Federal-local programs,

Therefore every effort should be made to simplify the regulations and administrative procedures required under air programs. To this end, the league urges the Federal Government to adopt a system of standard operating procedures (insofar as it is possible to do so) which may be common to all Federal agencies in carrying out aid programs of benefit to local communities, such simplification of administrative procedures accruing to the advantage of both Federal and local governments, and

Further that, it is recommended that an agency of the Federal Government be established in New England, and preferably in the city of Boston, capable of directing from a single headquarters these aid programs. Such central office would be of great benefit in the processing of applications and progress reports for the entire region, and

Finally that it is strongly urged that the Members of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States support legislation creating a Department of Urban Affairs, with a Cabinet level administrator in the executive branch of the Government.

Columbia Camp of United Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in September the surviving veterans of the war with Spain will meet at Little Rock in Arkansas for the National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans. Columbia Camp in Chicago will be represented as always it has been since the commencement of the organization many, many years ago.

At one time Columbia Camp had a membership of many hundreds, including Col. James Hamilton Lewis, then U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois and one of the most brilliant, eloquent, and colorful statesman in the history of the other body.

I now look over the role of the past commanders of Columbia Camp. Of the 49 who served as camp commanders, only 9 are left. The present commander, Charles Ziesenhenne, and Sam Black, the camp adjutant, have recently sent a letter to the members of the camp. I quote from this letter:

Do you know that the average age of the members of Columbia Camp is 83 years and 10 months? Our oldest member is Charles Graham, who was born February 7, 1868. Our youngest member is BARRATT O'HARA who was born April 28, 1882. These figures were taken from the descriptive book which you signed when you became a member.

It is a rare distinction to be numbered among the youngsters in Columbia Camp and among the oldsters in the Congress.

Day Wins Employee Raves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, August 23, 1961, concerning our Postmaster General, J. Edward Day.

We Californians were very pleased when the President came to our State to select one of his Cabinet members. We are justifiably proud of the record which Postmaster General Day has made during his short term in that responsible office.

Those of us who have known Ed for some time, know of his spectacular business success and of the substantial contribution he made to good government in California as a member of the Governor's metropolitan areas commission. We expected no less from him than the record which is related by Mary McCrory:

AFTER 6 MONTHS—DAY WINS EMPLOYEE RAVES
(By Mary McGory)

J. Edward Day, the crisp and sunny Postmaster General of the United States, pursues a course on the New Frontier that is as solitary and simple as that of a rural letter carrier.

Unlike those who must ponder the effect of a decision of a touchy new African republic or sulky soybean growers, he has but a single concern. The improvement of the mail service.

He sees the President about twice a month. The President mentioned the importance of the postal rate increase, now pending before Congress, in his Berlin crisis speech; but the mechanics of seeing that the postmen make their appointed rounds, he leaves to Mr. Day, a former life insurance executive.

Mr. Day is the only Cabinet officer who is rereading "Wuthering Heights" these days and writing a novel of his own. He is the only one who is not addicted to the 14-hour working day and who claims to lead a normal family life. He finds he can do his

work in the hours between 8:45 in the morning and 6 at night.

"I used to work in a law firm where the caste-symbol was the bulging briefcase carried home at night. I used to think if they were carrying a live mouse in it, it would be dead by morning. I never carried a briefcase," he remarked jovially.

If he differs from his fellows in the Cabinet, Mr. Day also differs from his predecessors, mainly portly chaps who also were chairmen of their national committees. Mr. Day, lean of countenance and figure, has no party responsibilities at all. He has failed to get this message across.

"A lot of my time is wasted by a lot of people, who ought to know better, asking me to get them jobs as Federal marshals or regional attorneys for the Labor Department. They just don't believe I can't do it."

QUARTERS ARE AMPLE

Mr. Day's office is the largest of any Cabinet officer's. It is paneled in wood and of a grandeur to satisfy General de Gaulle. He works about half-a-mile from the door at a clear desk with a clear mind.

Across from his quarters is another baronial hall, where one of his most famous predecessors, James A. Farley, used to make his way among the leather armchairs, patting the shoulders of politicos and inquiring for their Aunt Mames.

Mr. Day hasn't figured out a use for the room, while acknowledging its usefulness to inspire awe in the petitioner.

His only constitutents besides the letter-writers of the Nation, who are so far unorganized, are the 580,000 employees of the Post Office Department, most of whom are clustered in 15 Federal postal unions.

After 6 months of his "open door" policy, he is drawing rave notices. William Doherty, the head of the Letter Carriers Union, said recently in a Dayton speech: "For the first time in many, many years, we are able to work with the Department as partners instead of having to cool our heels in unfriendly anterooms waiting for a few crumbs of comfort to fall from the tables of the mighty."

TREND REVERSER

Mr. Doherty is the author of a book called "Mailman, U.S.A." which devotes several searing chapters of the previous Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, who he suggests enjoyed as much love and affection from the postal workers as Ezra Taft Benson got from the farmers.

Mr. Day has concentrated in his first 6 months on building up "friendliness, warmth and enthusiasm" in the Department and in "reversing certain trends" started by the publicity-conscious Mr. Summerfield.

"There was too much ballyhoo about post-office equipment and automatiom and too many announcements about sending mail by rocket and coaxial cables."

Mr. Day also insisted on putting in his own men as the 15 regional directors of the postal system. He confers with them by network conference telephone every Wednesday afternoon. He recently completed a 40,000-mile tour of 40 major post offices, where he put to the employees such pertinent questions as whether they liked to pace a mail-sorting machine or preferred to have it pace them. He tried to discourage everybody from calling him "General."

Mr. Day has made considerable impression on Capitol Hill as a witness, a role well suited to one with his appetite for comparative statistics. But he has fared less well as an advocate. His postal-rate increase bill is about as popular as the 5-year term foreign aid program and Chairman JOHNSTON of South Carolina of the Senate Post Office Committee has set his face against it.

"I have differences with Mr. JOHNSTON, but no antagonisms," said Mr. Day.

Mr. Day's introduction of the merit system, whereby men from within the ranks are promoted to supervisory posts on recommendation of a selection board has rendered him something less than a hero with patronage-hungry Congressmen. He is quite stoical about their complaints. He warned everyone at the beginning that he would run the post office.

HAS ANSWER FOR HECKLERS

He does not appreciate hecklers who point out the superior glories of the European mail system, which still has two deliveries a day.

"The New York City Post Office handles more mail in a day than the entire British Postal System," he says firmly. "And the New York City Post Office hasn't had a new building in 30 years."

Who Wants Federal Aid to Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, assuming that, before we adjourn we will get proposed legislation on Federal aid to education, the following editorial from the Sturgis Journal, published daily at Sturgis, St. Joseph County, Mich., written by Marla Haines will be helpful:

WHO WANTS FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION?

The strategy of the advocates of Federal aid to education has now become apparent. The powerful school lobby and the welfare staters in Congress, reconciled to the fact that Federal aid for schools, as originally proposed, is a dead issue at this session, have come up with an ingenious scheme to divide and conquer. The plan now is to split the Federal aid proposal into two packages and attempt to force approval of one or both in the confusion of the closing weeks of the current Congress. It will take a determined effort on the part of an aroused public to foil this outrageous attempt to thwart the will of the people and make a political racket of public education.

Back of this latest move to foist unwanted and unneeded Federal aid on our public educational system is ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Negro Congressman from New York, who by some incongruous quirk of politics is chairman of the House Education Committee. The scheme is reported to have the blessing of President Kennedy and the so-called liberal Democratic leaders in Congress. It should be pointed out that by liberal is meant excessive liberality with the taxpayers' money.

If there was ever any need for Federal aid to education in this country it is apparent that it has ceased to exist. The States and local communities have demonstrated that they can and will furnish all needed facilities to meet the requirements of an exploding school population. We have a good example of that right here in Sturgis. There has never been a dollar of Federal or State tax money invested in a local school building.

There is no evidence that any child of school age will be deprived of an elementary education for lack of classrooms or teachers. If colleges and universities cannot accommodate all who seek admission the difficulty can be ovecome by raising entrance requirements and eliminating, in advance, the 25 to 30 percent of unqualified youg men and women who regard a college education as a symbol of social distinction and flunk out in their first year. There are no reliable statistics, but probably half of the high school graduates who enter our colleges and universities are not benefited by their exposure to higher education and, in fact, are frustrated and delayed in adjusting themselves to a life in which they will be happy and for which they are fitted.

Abraham Lincoln once said that the aggregate of all his classroom schooling did not amount to one year. He was never inside a college or academy building. Yet he educated himself sufficiently to become President of his country, abolish slavery, and write the Gettysburg Address, one of the immortal public document of all time. He lives in the Nation's affections as a far greater President that any we have had since, including Harvard graduates.

Here's how the masterminds of the New Frontier hope to put over their project for Federal regimentation of public education:

One bill would provide Federal aid for public (not private) elementary school construction linked with Federal aid for schools in impacted areas, meaning schools where local tax revenues are insufficient due to large tax-free Federal installations.

The higher education package would provide Federal aid for college classroom construction and Federal loans for college students. There is an insidious provision in this bill which would forgive borrowers their indebtedness to the Government if they agree to teach in private or public schools for 5 years after graduation. More regimentation.

No decision has been reached as to which package will include the National Defense Education Act, the legislation now in effect under which Federal aid is being provided for improved instruction in the teaching of sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages. There is no evidence that this act has had any noticeable effect on the quality of teaching in the subjects specified.

Neither package will include any provision for Federal aid to private or parochial schools, and no grants will be available to divinity schools.

There are some meritorious provisions in the proposed legislation such as Federal aid to schools in areas where Government projects have brought an influx of population with a resultant dearth of school facilities. This objective can be easily attained by a single bill or an amendment to some related appropriation bill. The few merits in the dual-purpose bills would be offset by the disastrous effect on the educational system as a whole.

If Congress is so confident that their countrymen want Federal subsidization of education why dont' they submit the question to a national referendum? The answer is that the welfare staters know that it would be buried now and forever.

Fiscal Irresponsibility and More To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, in the August 25 issue of the Wall Street Journal, indicates how deeply into debt President Kennedy has put us in just 7 months of spending. This is only the beginning of the path that will surely lead to national bank-

ruptcy, if Congress and the people don't put a stop to it.

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of $3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least $5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a $1.5 billion surplus you have a $5.3 billion deficit, the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is $6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the $3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of $10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961–62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue estimate for this year is $82.4 billion, some $100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's $3.9 billion deficit, $2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the $6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from $80.9 billion to more than $87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than $800 million of that $2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its anti-recession program. As for the 1961–62 budget, only $3.7 billion of the total $6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of $10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than $4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, $3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining $6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government and all the rest. That $6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that $6.2 billion is $6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary to take additional action this year and that certainly next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump-priming and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to the urgent needs of defense.

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a $10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

Interview of Premier Khrushchev by Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by Drew Pearson on his interview with Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, which appears in today's Washington Post, together with the English translation of Mr. Pearson's and Mr. Khrushchev's talk.

Without attempting to comment on the substance of Mr. Khrushchev's statement, it appears to be one of the fullest elaborations of his views on Berlin which has been printed publicly, if not the fullest, and therefore it is of interest to our Government and people.

Mr. Pearson's article is excellent reporting, and he deserves great credit for making it available.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

K. ASSERTS HE'S READY FOR TALKS ON BERLIN

(By Drew Pearson)

GAGRI, GEORGIA, U.S.S.R.—Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, in an exhaustive discussion of the problems of peace and war now facing the United States and the Soviet Union, said he was "ready at any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western Powers" regarding Berlin. "The solution of the problem," he said, "is one which permits no delay."

Khrushchev also made a flat proposal to guarantee the future freedom of West Berlin with a token force of American, British, French and Soviet troops.

[Assistant White House Press Secretary Andrew T. Hatcher said President Kennedy would have no comment on the Pearson interview.]

He said: "I should like to know what the Western Powers would reply to the following concrete proposal: Let the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union jointly give a solemn pledge to respect and protect the freedom, independence, and rights of the free city of West Berlin." He emphasized that troops should be in number, that there must be no interference with the people of West Berlin by any outside power, and that under such agreement there would be complete access to West Berlin over the territory of East Germany.

But if a peace treaty with East Germany is not signed by the former Allied Powers, Khrushchev said, then Allied access to West Berlin could be assured only on the basis of arrangements with the East German Government over whose territory the Allies would have to pass.

Elaborating on this point, Khrushchev told me, "you are now sending 1,500 additional troops to West Berlin, and under present arrangements you can do this. But after a peace treaty is signed and an American colonel seeks to transport his troops across East Germany, he will be told 'No. Occupation has ended. You have no right to transport troops across this territory, either by land, by sea, or by air.'

"And if, as the American press says, force will be used, that means war."

The man who guides the destiny of 220 million Soviet people and the largest land masses in the world made this new proposal for solving the Berlin crisis beside a swimming pool overlooking the Black Sea, where he recently entertained John McCloy, President Kennedy's disarmament adviser.

The sea, which extends down to Turkey and the famous Bosporus outlet to the Mediterranean over which so many wars have been waged, looked very peaceful in the afternoon sunlight. And Khrushchev on the whole was in a peaceful mood. He kept repeating over and over that his country and his government wanted peace. But he also made it absolutely clear and repeated it several times that Russia would definitely sign a peace treaty with East Germany. He hoped the United States would join.

"But," he said, "whether you join us or not we are going to sign such a treaty. If you will join us that will bring the greatest happiness to our two peoples.

"We fought together. We routed the Hitlerites together. Let's work in peace together," Khrushchev said.

Our conversation lasted several hours during which the man who probably wields more individual power than any other government leader in the world, talked with nostalgia about his meetings with former President Eisenhower, praised John Foster Dulles regarding his latter-day view on Germany, told how he refused to release the RB–47 fliers during last year's U.S. election because it might help elect Nixon, joked about how he once offered a job to Ambassador Averell Harriman, expressed his appreciation of Mr. Kennedy's frankness at Vienna but his disappointment at his belligerent statements afterward, and said that he had many letters from the Red army wanting to remain on for another "hitch" because of the Berlin war clouds.

Because he was introducing some new ideas on Berlin and because of the touch-and-go nature of the Berlin crisis, Khrushchev furnished me the English translation of our talk. And because of their importance, I am making this text available to all newspapers in the United States.

Summarizing his views, Khrushchev said, "Let us sign a peace treaty. Let us establish a free-city status for West Berlin. Let us provide it with necessary guarantees. We are moreover ready ourselves to participate in exercising those guarantees.

"We are ready to agree to these guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. These should be small in number—literally token troops—because no large numbers of armed forces will be necessary to guarantee free-city status.

"In this case agreement could be reached with the Government of the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) regarding freedom of communication for those military contingents.

"That in effect sums up our position on the German question," Khrushchev concluded. "That is what we are calling for. I should emphasize again and again that we are striving for elimination of vestiges of World War II. We want the atmosphere in Europe and therefore throughout the world to become purer; so that all nations may breathe fresh air; so that all countries shall

live as good neighbors; so that they shall build peaceful relations with one another; so that human beings shall live without fear of war.

"It is for this reason that the Soviet Government and other Socialist countries have finally decided not to postpone any further signing of the German peace treaty. We shall regret it if the Western Powers should not wish to join us. But in that event we shall be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

"You ask when it would be desirable to hold negotiations. The answer is that the solution permits no delay. We are therefore ready any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western powers—if they sincerely desire to achieve a realistic settlement of the German problem on a mutually acceptable basis."

TEXT OF INTERVIEW WITH SOVIET PREMIER

The text of the statement given Washington Columnist Drew Pearson by Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev:

"As I understand it, what you call the Berlin crisis are differences between Socialist countries and countries of the West regarding the fate of West Berlin after the conclusion of the German peace treaty. I should like first of all to stress that this question is but a part of the general problem of peaceful settlement with Germany.

"The clamor raised by certain quarters in the West which promotes whipping up of international tensions and military psychosis clearly has the aim of making it difficult to sign a German peace treaty. A start should therefore be made by taking up the major issue—that of a German peace treaty.

"This is all the more important since the proposal of the Soviet Union and a number of the countries which fought against Hitlerite Germany to conclude a peace treaty with two presently existing German states which are legal heirs of former Germany has provoked completely erroneous reaction on the part of Western powers.

"An especially hostile position in this matter is taken up by the Government of West Germany. In this it is supported by the Governments of United States, France, and Britain. According to the Adenauer government they are rejecting reasonable proposals to sign a peace treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, though such treaty in no way affects the interests of the Western Powers.

"Certainly if a united Germany existed such a peace treaty would be signed with it. But at present no such united Germany exists. On the soil of the former Hitlerite Reich, two German states with diametrically opposed economic and political systems have come into being and have taken their own roads of development.

"I do not want to delve into history on this question and give an account of why this happened, though we Soviet people do have something to say on this score. It was United States, Britain, and France who split Germany as far back as 1947 when they carried out a series of economic and political measures to transform their occupation zones first into bizonia, then into trizonia, and finally into the Federal Republic (West) Germany.

"Placed before the fact of appearance in the western part of Germany of a separate state which by the way immediately started to acquire a belligerent revanchard character, the population of East Germany in their turn created another German state, German Democratic Republic, which bore a peace-loving and democratic character.

"Thus, whether we like it or not, there actually exist in central Europe two German states, and it is from this fact that we should proceed. I can but add that the government of the (East) German Democratic Republic has repeatedly sought to persuade the government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany to come to the conference table and devise ways leading to the reunification of the German nation. Not one of those attempts has met with success. The Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany has flatly refused to consider any proposals by the German Democratic Republic concerning the creation of a united German state.

"What prompts this position of the West German Government? This can be given but one explanation: In rejecting peaceful unification of the German Nation, the Government of West Germany is contemplating the forcible seizure of (East) German Democratic Republic. Only a blind man can fail to see that the attempt to swallow that republic will not remain unpunished. Indeed, it is not alone. It has its own true allies who will not leave it in time of trouble.

"It is also known that West Germany, too, has her allies with whom it is linked through an aggressive NATO pact. Under these conditions, attack by West Germany against the German Democratic Republic would not be local conflict but would be the start of thermonuclear war without parallel in history, in which all states belonging to two opposing camps would take part.

"How then are we to act in this situation? Are we to wait until Germany reunites, which, as you see, can take place only by means of terrible war, or are we to sign a treaty with two actually existing states without further delay?

"We believe there should be no further delay.

"Signing of a peace treaty which would write finis to a Second World War and legitimize orders of two German states will tie the hands of revenge seekers and discourage them from indulging in gambles. And only contrary, further delay would be interpreted by revanchard quarters of West Germany as encouragement to aggression, to unleashing war.

"It is proceeding from this that we decided to put an end to procrastinations in the question of a German peace treaty. And if the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany continues to refuse to sign such a treaty, it will be signed with the (East) German Democratic Republic, which has already voiced its agreement. The treaty will legitimize borders defined by the Potsdam agreement, and the (East) German Democratic Republic will exercise full sovereignty on its territory, free from the burden of vestiges of World War II.

"Now with regard to the fate of West Berlin, as I already said, the question of West Berlin is part of the general question of signing a German peace treaty. Following the signing of a peace treaty with the (East) German Democratic Republic, West Berlin will receive the status of a free city and will be complete master of its destiny. Its people will live under such social and political system as they themselves want to have. We propose to include a clause in the treaty to the effect that no one shall have the right to interfere in the affairs of West Berlin or impose their order upon its people.

"It would seem that this would completely suit the Western Powers, which have repeatedly declared that the population of West Berlin must have complete freedom and independence in choice of their way of life. Nevertheless the leaders of the Western Powers are vigorously opposing our proposals and in so doing are whipping up unparalleled clamor around the Berlin issue akin to military hysteria.

"What then are they displeased over? They are displeased over the fact that the signing of a German peace treaty and granting of free city status to West Berlin automatically puts an end to occupation status on whose basis their troops are stationed in that city.

"Contrary to plain and firm statements of the governments of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic regarding their readiness to provide West Berlin with any kind of guarantee, the statesmen of the West, notably Adenauer and Brandt, keep alleging that we want to 'seize' West Berlin. It is not in vain that people say that the lie walks on short legs.

"I should like to know what the Western Powers would reply to the following concrete proposal: Let the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union jointly give a solemn pledge to respect and protect the freedom, independence, and rights of the free city of West Berlin.

"I believe you will agree with this. We too agree. Then where are grounds for inflaming passions and whipping up military psychosis around the so-called Berlin question?

"The question remains of freedom of access to West Berlin. As you know it is around this question that adversaries of signing a German peace treaty are raising particular clamor. It is all the more important to give complete clarity to this question.

"We have said, and we repeat, that no one is encroaching on freedom of access to West Berlin. On the contrary, in proposing a conclusion of a German peace treaty we emphasize that freedom of West Berlin's communications must be guaranteed. The West Berlin Government, as any sovereign government, must have the right to maintain diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties with any country of any continent.

"Then where do our differences lie? They lie in the following:

"We want to do away completely with the vestiges of World War II while Western countries—United States, Britain, and France—are clinging in every way possible to those vestiges, seeking thereby to assure their troops access to West Berlin on the basis of occupation rights which stem from the regime of Hitlerite Germany's surrender.

"But one thing does not conform to the others. Ask any lawyer and he will tell you that if a peace treaty is signed then a state of war is terminated. However, if a state of war is terminated, then how can an occupation regime be preserved in West Berlin? This is impossible.

"The sovereign countries of the world—and the German Democratic Republic is of their number—are guided by a universally accepted rule: if their routes of communication with other countries run through the territory of third states then naturally agreement of those third states is always required in order to use those communications, no matter how they may run—on ground, in the air, or across water. This holds good in regard to any country, regardless of what social system it may belong to.

"As an argument against dealing with (East) Germany, some Western personalities protest that they cannot deal with that government since the United States and other Western powers fought against Germany. This argument is completely unfounded. Indeed we too fought and are known to have borne the brunt of war against Germany, including that part of it which today makes up the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Nonetheless we maintain relations with and whenever necessary deal with the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany.

"Let me give you one example which I have already mentioned in one of my speeches. We are now operating a direct railroad service between Moscow and Paris. These trains pass through the territory of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Before signing an agreement with France we naturally approached the Government of

West Germany with a request that it allow transit of trains through its territory, and it was only after agreement was received and appropriate agreements signed that this train service started to operate.

"Thousands of such examples could be adduced. The same rule should also be applied in regard to access to West Berlin after a peace treaty is signed. Respect for sovereignty must be observed with regard to all countries (East) Germany included.

"This rule represents the law of laws and if we start to flout it there will be no stability in the world, there will be no peaceful coexistence of states, and in general there may well be no peace.

"And if certain state and political leaders say: Let the Soviet Union and other countries sign a peace treaty while leaving the Western Powers that right of access to West Berlin which stems from occupation sttaus, they are wishing for the impossible. When a peace treaty is signed it is quite natural that rights of conquering powers which stem from surrender of conquered country come to an end.

"Two German states with which a peace treaty will be signed will from then on be completely sovereign. And regardless of whether or not other countries like the regime existing in one or the other of them, they shall have to maintain relations with them in conformity with the generally accepted standards of international law.

"It might be opportune in this connection to recall what transpired at the time of the signing of the peace treaty with Japan. Together with the United States we fought against Japan. The Soviet Army routed the main nucleus of Japanese troops, the Kwantung army in Manchuria. After the surrender of Japan, the Soviet Union together with the United States and other allies, devised measures to control postwar development of Japan.

"Soviet repreesentatives took the most active part in the work of the Allied Council in Tokyo. When, however, the question arose of concluding peace, the United States signed a separate treaty, disregarding the Soviet Union. They unilaterally liquidated the Allied Council for Japan and started to oust Soviet representatives from Tokyo. And though we had rights and commitments which stemmed from the fact of Japan's surrender, our allies disregarded them.

"Why then are the United States and their Allies now trying to describe as illegal our intention to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic in the event that Western Powers refuse to join us in a peace treaty with two German states? What suits the United States they declare to be legitimate, but what does not suit the United States they call illegal. Is this logical?

"Thus it is quite evident that the Western Powers are artificially whipping up a dispute around the Berlin question by injecting a spirit of war hysteria in order to aggravate international tensions still further and create a pretext to unleash war against the Soviet Union and the Socialist camp as a whole. Arguments that they are allegedly fighting to preserve freedom and independence of population of West Berlin are false through and through, since no one is menacing that freedom and independence.

We are saying: Let us sign a peace treaty, let us establish free city status for West Berlin, let us provide it with all necessary guarantees. We are moreover ready ourselves to participate in the exercise of those guarantees. We are also ready to agree to these guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

These should be small numbers, literally token troops, because no large number of armed forces will be necessary there in order to guarantee free city status. In that case, agreement could be reached with the Government of the German Democratic Republic regarding freedom of communication for those military contingents.

That in effect sums up our position on the German question. That is what we are calling for.

I should like again and again to emphasize that we are striving for elimination of vestiges of World War II. We want the atmosphere in Europe and therefore throughout the world to become purer so that all nations shall live as good neighbors, so that they shall build peaceful relations with one another, so that human beings shall live without fear of war.

It is for this reason that the Soviet Government and governments of other Socialist countries which took part in the war against Hitlerite Germany have firmly decided not to postpone any further signing of a German peace treaty. We will regret it if Western Powers should not wish to join us in signing a peace treaty. But in that event we will be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

You ask when it would be desirable to hold negotiations. The answer is that solution of the question permits no delay. We are therefore ready at any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western Powers on this matter if they have a sincere desire to achieve realistic settlement of the German problem on a mutually acceptable basis.

To this I should add that they no less than we—and perhaps even more so—should be interested in having this problem peacefully solved and if leaders of Western Powers, notably President Kennedy, want such settlement we have declared long ago that we are always ready to come to the round-table for peaceful negotiations.

And the Sixth Edition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is the author of perhaps the most widely used basic economics text in America's colleges and is one of the New Frontier's thought leaders in the field of economics. Professor Samuelson's "Economics: An Introductory Analysis" was published first in 1948 and as time has progressed, so has Professor Samuelson's text. Economic Intelligence, the monthly report of the economic research department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in its August 1961 issue noted the progress that the professor's text, and apparently the professor, have made during the years from the first through the fifth edition and since. I join the editors of Economic Intelligence in looking forward to a sixth edition of Professor Samuelson's work.

REGRESSING INFLATION

A. "If price increases could be held down to, say, less than 5 percent per year, such as mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Paul A. Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 1st ed., 1948.)

B. "If price increases could be held down to say, less than 5 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 2d ed., 1951.)

C. "If price increases could be held down to, say, less than 3 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An introductory Analysis," 3d ed., 1955.)

D. "If price increases could be held down to, say, 2 percent per year, such a mild steady inflation need not cause too great concern." (Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 4th ed., 1958.)

E. "Price increases that could be held down below 2 percent per year are one thing. But . . . "—Samuelson, "Economics: An Introductory Analysis," 5th ed., 1961.)

F. "If we can hold things down so that the official index of prices goes up by no more than 1.5 or 2 percent, I shall be very content."—Samuelson, Meet the Press, March 5, 1961.

Many people hope that Professor Samuelson will keep on talking and that his book will go through many more editions.

Seven Months of New Frontier Spending Bodes Ill for the Future of Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Wall Street Journal is a sharp reminder of the reckless spending in which the New Frontier has plunged the Nation. Unless this trend is reversed we can expect bigger deficits, greater inflation, and higher taxes. The economy cannot stand many more months of administration sponsored spending programs:

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of $3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totaled up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least $5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a $1.5 billion surplus you have a $5.3 billion deficit the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is $6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the $3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of $10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961–62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue esti-

mate for the year is $82.4 billion, some $100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's $3.9 billion deficit, $2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the $6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from $80.9 billion to more than $87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than $800 million of that $2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961–62 budget, only $3.7 billion of the total $6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of $10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than $4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, $3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining $6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government and all the rest. That $6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that $6.2 billion is $6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in additon to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary "to take additional action this year" and that certainly next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump-priming and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to the urgent needs of defense.

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a $10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

Merry-Go-Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the continuing disturbing developments in the Berlin crisis and the anticipated eruptions in other parts of the world, civil defense operations have undergone considerable review and adjustment. As we move to improve the operations in this field, it is well for us to remember the inconsistencies and problems of the past in order that they not be repeated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a most practical commentary from the August 6 issue of the Southtown Economist, of Chicago, containing its observations on civil defense history in a penetrating editorial entitled "Merry-Go-Round":

MERRY-GO-ROUND

Mayor Daley, in compliance with a request from Washington, has ordered a stepped-up program of so-called civil defense measures. Whether the outcome will be the building of underground shelters at a cost of millions of dollars, reviving the distribution of pamphlets telling the public what to do in the event of an air raid, and similar measures which withered because of the lack of public interest, will not be known until the plan is announced.

What should be obvious, however, is not mentioned. Some cities that went into civil defense in a big way posted signs on roads leading into the country designating the roads as air raid exits.

Since all of our expressways, boulevards, and principal thoroughfares in the Chicago area are jammed to the point of congestion during the morning and evening rush hours, and no solution to that problem has been put into effect, how will those exits be able to carry a mass exodus if one is ordered?

Civil defense is one of those things that sounds good in theory, but it just doesn't work out in practice.

The net result of the new campaign can be another boost in taxes to provide the money for the cost of the measures to be proposed.

As a test of the efficacy of civil defense campaigns to date, ask yourself whether you know what to do in the event the next siren blast is the real thing.

Wheat Referendum—Just a Sample of What Might Have Been

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Red Wing Republican Eagle of Red Wing, Minn., was alert enough to come out editorially on August 25 with what I believe are some acute and accurate observations on the Department of Agriculture's recent wheat referendum.

The concern of the newspaper was not over the result of the vote, but rather the very active campaigning by Department of Agriculture officials to influence the farmer's vote. They draw from this activity an analogy of just what the Department of Agriculture would probably do if the Congress had given them authority to set up farmer committees and then conduct referendum votes on various agricultural programs for individual farm products.

I recommend this editorial to my fellow Members:

FARM REFERENDUMS WEIGHTED?

Millard Nelson, Pierce County's ASC office manager at Ellsworth, is described in Wednesday's Daily Republican Eagle as warning what would happen to farm income if farmers had voted "no" in Thursday's wheat referendum, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in a Minneapolis speech last week, strongly urged a "yes" vote. Freeman is pictured in the Farmers Union Herald holding a big "vote yes" poster.

This sort of thing illustrates, in our opinion, what would be likely to happen under the Kennedy administration's "omnibus farm bill," whose key provisions Congress wisely deleted but whose "supply management" concepts are still very much in the minds of the USDA's present top management.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture was to appoint farmers who would advise him in developing programs, with production and marketing controls, for each farm commodity. Before any controls could take effect, farmers affected would have to approve in a referendum. But if USDA and its handpicked committees formulate the programs, if the ASC arm of the USDA conducts the elections, and if ASC and the USDA's top dogs also campaign for yes votes, won't the results be rather weighted toward one side? Ordinarily the agency conducting an election maintains at least a semblance of neutrality on how voters ought to vote.

What It Means To Be a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Saturday, my colleague in the Senate, FRANCIS CASE; Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and BEN REIFEL, of our State, and I were privileged to attend and address the South Dakota Young Republican Convention in Brooking, S. Dak. South Dakota is the home State of the national chairman of the Young Republican League and young Republicanism plays a vital part in the political affairs of our great State which responds in practice to its proud motto, "Under God the people rule."

Under leave of the Senate, therefore, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared for delivery to this convention by the newest Member of our congressional delegation, the very able Representative, BEN REIFEL, of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. BEN REIFEL, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AT SOUTH DAKOTA YOUNG REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, DELEGATION LUNCHEON, 12 NOON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1961, BROOKINGS COUNTRY CLUB

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, just about a year ago I appeared briefly before you at Sioux Falls as a green candidate making his first venture into the arena of politics.

Now I am back before you, still green, not too much of a politician but a little bit wiser, I hope, a good deal more fearful for the future of our country and a great deal more thankful for Republicans—especially Young Republicans.

Out of that meeting a year ago came a new army of enthusiastic young workers for the Republican cause. And I want to say right now that, without your help, KARL, E.Y., and I might not be in Washington representing you, and Archie Fubbrud might not have had the opportunity to bring good government back to the South Dakota Statehouse. We all are indebted to you.

I remember the way young Republicans, including high school youngsters, came into my campaign headquarters in Aberdeen and offered to put up posters or run errands or

do anything they could. I remember the way young Republicans led the welcome for Nixon at the plowing contest and paraded in the rain for Archie at Sioux Falls. I remember how they worked in our tents at the fairs, swelled the crowds at rallies and hauled people to the polls on election day.

The same thing was happening all over the country, and others tell me it is growing and picking up steam yet today. Young people's rejection of the principle of the welfare state, the cradle-to-the-grave philosophy, the idea that Uncle Sam can spend your money for you better than you can—this has been one of the few encouraging signs I have seen since going to Washington last January.

And I think KARL, and FRANCIS and E.Y.—as well as that walking example of the national resurgence of conservatism who will address you tomorrow, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas—will back me up when I say that the only thing you young people have in common with the national administration and its policies is that there's a young man in the White House, too. And judging by the reception he is receiving around the country and even in his own party, he may not be there in 1965.

Some of the lofty ideals I took to Washington have become a bit shaken by what I found there in the past 8 months. And some of the high-sounding statements we heard last fall and in the early days of the administration have a hollow ring when compared with actual deeds.

The American people were asked to make sacrifices in the name of their country. It appears that those sacrifices will fall most heavily on you young people in the form of higher taxes and less earning power in the future in order to finance foreign and domestic giveaway programs today. It appears that many of our young people will be called upon to take up arms, some of you for a second or third time, to face up to a Berlin crisis that might have been avoided had firm words been backed up by firm action in Laos and Cuba.

"Ask not what your country can do for you" we were told. Uncle Sam will do it anyway, if all the welfare programs go through. He'll pay your wages when you're unemployed, pay you extra if you have children, pay your medical and hospital bills when you're sick, give you surplus food when you're hungry, build you a house for hardly anything down and 35 years to pay, educate your children without Government controls, and pay you a pension when you're old.

The only thing you have to worry about is getting buried when you die. And Khrushchev has said he'll take care of that.

Our form of government was planned so there would be separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Yet this administration offered us a farm bill that—before the Democrats themselves changed it—would make Congress nothing more than a rubberstamp for programs devised by the Secretary of Agriculture and handpicked advisory committees.

Our Constitution says, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Who is to make the appropriations? The Congress.

Yet this administration offered us a foreign aid bill that would give State Department bureaucrats a free hand for 5 years to dip into the Federal Treasury in support of the development loan projects they created overseas. Only once in 5 years would Congress be able to take a look at the program and say, "What are you doing with all that money? Where is it going and what results are we getting?"

Again, Democrats in Congress themselves had to rise up against their own President and, in the House at least, we succeeded in knocking out such authority.

On October 3, 1960, Candidate Kennedy said it is important to have a balanced budget. In 6 months in office the Democrats added more than 67,000 new employees to the Federal payroll. Due to massive Federal spending last year's Federal budget went from a prospective surplus of $3.9 billion in the red. For the current fiscal year the administration officially predicts a deficit of over $5 billion. But it looks more like $7 billion. Currently we are spending $1 million an hour more than we are taking in.

We were told gently in the President's television address on the Berlin crisis that, due to increased defense needs, we might have to cut down on some domestic programs. Congress agreed and we voted him every penny he wanted to step up our defenses.

But to this day not one single request for new or expanded domestic programs has been withdrawn; in fact, the pace of the lobbying has been stepped up. And of the extra $10 billion he wants above Eisenhower's 1962 estimates, 44 percent is for nonmilitary programs.

These are the type of things that disturb me about the current administration in Washington. What a contrast to the kind of taxpayer-first, down-to-earth, fiscally responsible government we have here in South Dakota under a well-grounded Republican Governor and a Republican-controlled legislature.

That's why it's such a pleasure to attend a gathering like this today and have the realization that these things have not gone unnoticed by the youth of our State or country.

Oftentimes we hear it said that the youth of today is going physically soft. The President has even proposed a national program to get them to exercise.

But I'm not half so worried about that as I am that we as a people are going morally soft—that we have forgotten what it is to do for ourselves those things that we can best do for ourselves, that we don't have the gumption to stand up and oppose creeping socialism and the welfare state, that we're content to let ourselves be pushed around by little tyrants 90 miles off our shore and by a bigger tyrant whose sole aim is world domination for his atheistic, freedom-suppressing cause.

I don't think the people of South Dakota and particularly the youth of South Dakota subscribe to that kind of softness. Maybe we're old-fashioned and provincial and out of step to believe in an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, a State government that pays as it goes, and freedom with justice and dignity for all, even if we have to fight for it. I don't think so and I know you don't. We have fought for those principles before and we are willing to do so again if necessary.

That's why the Republican Party is growing each day in strength and vigor.

These are the things Republicans stand for and believe in.

With your help and the help of thousands like you we can make these things endure.

Desalinization Stride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the August 19, 1961, issue of the States-Item of New Orleans:

DESALINIZATION STRIDE

As though in anticipation of Senate hearings scheduled to begin Tuesday, a New Orleans firm announces significant breakthrough in converting salt water to pure.

Employing a revolutionary process to solve the problem of scaling and corrosion in saline water conversion, the Mechanical Equipment Co. claims a 40-percent reduction in the cost of such operation.

This should win hearty approval from the Kennedy administration in view of its research efforts in that direction.

Progress by the New Orleans firm will be particularly welcomed by Interior Secretary Udall, who will appear Tuesday before the Senate Interior Committee.

The committee will be weighing President Kennedy's request for unlimited research in saline water conversion against the ominous prediction that shortages of fresh water will affect every region of the United States by 1975.

This estimate was prepared by the office of saline water, established by the Saline Water Act of 1952.

Current U.S. consumption of fresh water, according to the agency, amounts to 312 billion gallons a day—45 percent for industry, 45 percent for agriculture, and 10 percent for household uses.

Total available supply, which is expected to be overtaken by demand within 15 years, amounts to 515 billion gallons a day.

Mechanical Equipment Co.'s new method completely eliminates scale and almost does away with corrosion in the converter by making it possible to boil seawater at about 107° F., rather than 212°.

Units featuring the new process will produce 10,000 gallons of pure, fresh water a day either from brackish wells or seawater.

Spelling out the importance of salt water conversion is a recent statement by President Kennedy:

"If we could ever completely, at a cheap rate, get fresh water from salt water * * * it would be in the long-range interest of humanity [and] * * * would really dwarf any other scientific achievement."

The breakthrough engineered by New Orleans private enterprise is a stride in that direction.

Understanding of Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a selection from the letter concerning a former constituent, written by Mrs. Robert L. Schwartz. Her laudatory remarks reveal a man of most estimable qualities and one whom I have been proud to know:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I am writing to you about a mutual friend our ours—Rabbi Benjamin Cohen, formerly of East St. Louis, Ill., now of Los Angeles, Calif.

The rabbi has never met me personally, but was introduced to me and my family here in Stamford by my younger sister, who recently moved to Los Angeles and is a member of his congregation. She had told

him of our older sister's illness: multiple sclerosis, in an advanced stage, and no medication used throughout the 8 known years of the illness has thus far had any effect. About 4 or 5 months ago Rabbi Cohen started corresponding with our sick sister, Mrs. David Adelkopf, of Stamford. At the same time he held special services on her behalf, about which our younger sister, Mrs. Paul Zaharia, of Los Angeles, wrote us glowingly. The sister on our sister's morale is astounding. (Nothing miraculous has occurred, which in medical terminology could be construed as a remission—one of the fortunate phases of multiple sclerosis—for which we've prayed all these many years.) But the mere fact that a rabbi chose on his own to take such a deep, personal interest in a stranger stricken with such a pathetic illness, thousands of miles away, moves her to renewed hope that the latest treatment her doctor is using on her at this time, will prove the exception and bring about the longed-for remission.

I, Mrs. Robert Schwartz, am the family correspondent on behalf of Mrs. Adelkopf. In the many letters and post cards the rabbi has written to us, he mentions so many, many others whom he prays for constantly, it is obvious he is unique in giving of himself so selflessly is sufficient to make others turn to God for help and faith.

Rabbi Benjamin Cohen has such a true understanding of human needs and such a selfless desire to help those in difficulty as best he can; he puts me in mind of the definition of the epitome of perfection of his calling, viz:

During World War II, there was a theological panel for selective service headquarters, New York City, whose purpose it was to select the bona fide claimants for IV–D deferment, from the mass of students attending the theological seminaries in this area. I was the stenographer for said panel, which was composed of prominent Judges Jonah Goldstein, Samuel Null, Samuel Levy, now deceased, Irving Kaufmann, etc. Rabbis Leo Jung, Joseph Lookstein, Abraham Soloman, Joseph Goldstein, and many prominent lay-people, such as Dr. Alexander Dushkin, formerly of the Jewish Education Committee for New York, and in recent years one of the founders of the University of Israel. I recall that these men gave of their time freely and willingly and in special Sunday morning session, one of the registrants held the rapt attention of the panel for 3 hours, narrating his unusual experiences and circumstances. He was no ordinary seminary student, born and reared in our magnificent country—on the contrary, he was a native of Warsaw, Poland, and had such a burning desire to be a rabbi that he managed to escape Hitler's Warsaw ghetto and by sheer faith survived pursuit through Russia, via the Orient, into Japan and finally into the United States and on the west coast. Ironically, when he migrated to New York and resumed his formal studies, he was drafted into the U.S. Army, but the panel's conclusion deferred him from service.

Of course, Rabbi Cohen's experiences cannot be compared to those of the aforementioned victim of Nazi oppression, but the burning desire to serve God in whatever way they can and to the best of their ability—often under trying circumstances testing their humble way of living to the utmost—led me to write to you about him.

Thank you for your time and consideration, sir. I truly appreciate your listening.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Robert L. Schwartz.

Gen. E. R. Quesada Discusses Air Safety Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Gen. E. R. "Pete" Quesada, the distinguished former head of the Federal Aviation Agency, discussed some serious problems of air safety in an interview with Edward W. O'Brien, chief of the Globe-Democrat Washington Bureau, which was printed on August 2, 1961, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. By careful research and followup of records, Mr. O'Brien has documented one instance of the type of air safety problem that General Quesada has been warning us about. Increasingly disturbing reports regarding FAA enforcement of air safety standards have been circulated throughout the industry since General Quesada left his post as FAA Administrator. Because the average air traveler has no organized spokesman in Washington, it is necessary for all of us, especially in the Congress, to listen carefully to the warnings of General Quesada regarding the increasing number of unsolved air safety problems. Mr. O'Brien, by hard work and initiative, has obtained the facts on one serious accident. Other similar accidents and near-misses must be fully reported and explored by the press. Because so many persons fly each day, it is important that this subject be closely studied and that the best reportorial talent available be brought to bear on this problem.

PLANE CARRYING 107 HITS TREE: GENERAL QUESADA CRITICIZES FAA LAXITY IN DISCIPLINING PILOT

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—On a rainy dawn in April a Delta jet with 107 people aboard landed at Detroit Airport with part of a 5-inch-thick tree sticking out of the right wing.

Investigation showed the plane, a DC–8, had struck a 48-foot-high tree more than a mile from the end of the runway the pilot thought he was approaching.

The pilot, Eugene Fletcher, of Miami, Fla., believed he had hit some birds. Nonetheless, he revved up the engines when he felt the thud and pulled up for a circle around the airport.

On the second try he landed safely, but with large gashes showing on the wing. The embedded log was 4 feet long.

The next day, April 17, Pilot Fletcher was suspended from flight duty by the airline for 60 days.

The Federal Aviation Agency, charged with air safety, began its own investigation.

Last week FAA found him guilty of operating the plane, with its 100 passengers and crew of 7, "in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the life and property of others."

"By reason of your actions, you failed to exercise at all times the degree of care, skill, judgment, and responsibility required of an airline transport pilot," the FAA letter to Mr. Fletcher said.

FAA's penalty: a 60-day suspension of his pilot rating, to coincide with the company suspension already carried out.

"Since the suspension is retroactive, no further action on your part is required," the FAA letter said.

What FAA meant was that the Government had no additional penalty to impose.

On Tuesday, the man who retired last January as Chief of FAA, retired Air Force Gen. Elwood R. Quesada, scorched FAA's decision not to take further action against Mr. Fletcher.

"Judging from what I know of the case, it was a gross miscarriage. The public's interest was not served," he told the Globe-Democrat.

"The pilot's error and poor judgment were gross.

"A tragedy of the first order was avoided not by his ability but by an act of providence."

The flight was nonstop from Miami, and the pilot was supposed to be landing on instruments.

According to FAA, the glide path he was following at the Detroit airport is fully covered by radio navigation aids extending several miles out and providing horizontal and vertical guidance practically to the ground.

General Quesada, who brought a new era of strict enforcement to civil aviation, accused the pilot of disregard of cockpit discipline and of failure to make proper use of the cockpit instrumentation on which the Government has spent millions of dollars.

The general, now the head of the Washington Senators baseball team, said he regards the pilot's error as just as great as if the tragedy were complete—that is, if the plane had crashed with 107 dead.

General Quesada limited most of his comments to this case, but it is known around Washington he has continued an intense interest in air regulation since leaving the Government in January.

"I am concerned over the apparent weakening of the enforcement program," he told the Globe-Democrat.

His successor is Najeeb E. Halaby.

FAA said that immediately after Mr. Fletcher landed on April 16, it checked its instrument landing aids around the field and found them operating normally.

Just before the landing, a special weather forecast had been broadcasting warning of rain and fog with a 500-foot ceiling and a mile-and-one-half visibility. FAA said Mr. Fletcher claimed he never heard the broadcast.

The Facts of Nuclear Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast in the public interest over radio station WBZ and WBZ–TV, in Boston, Mass.:

THE FACTS OF NUCLEAR LIFE

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

The facts of modern nuclear warfare are grim and horrifying. Official estimates are that a first attack on Strategic Air Command bases and 50 major cities right now would produce 90 million casualties. The scope of such a disaster is almost beyond our comprehension. And for that reason many people have blindly closed their eyes to the danger.

But this head-in-the-sand attitude can't be tolerated any longer. Admittedly, the situation is grim. But it's not hopeless. The time has come for positive action.

To help in this, WBZ–Radio has undertaken a comprehensive public service program called "Operation Survival." It's aim is to educate the public about fallout shelters, which offer the Nation its best hope for survival in the event of an atomic war.

With even a minimum shelter program, it's estimated the toll from an enemy attack would be cut by 10 to 15 million lives. The better the shelter program, the lower the toll would be. Some experts believe it could even be cut down as low as 5 million.

The cost of shelter program will be high, very high. But then what is more precious than life itself? And a shelter program would make it possible to save lives by the millions.

Government will help in providing shelters, both directly and indirectly. But initiative must be taken by private citizens, people like you and me.

The simplest type of shelter can be built in your home basement for $200 to $250. Better and more comfortable shelters can be had for more. The one fact to keep in mind is this: The more shielding you have, the more protection you'll have, not only from fallout but from effects of the blast itself.

As part of its "Operation Survival," WBZ–Radio has helped prepare a test shelter on an island in Boston Harbor. Five young men are now living there under conditions similar to those that would be encountered after a nuclear attack. They are proving that life can go on in cramped, dark quarters.

If an attack should come suddenly, life can go on for you and your family, too, if you have an adequate shelter.

Information on shelter is readily available from civil defense offices. Call your own local civil defense office today. Or if you prefer, write to Post Office Box Home Shelter, Battle Creek, Mich.

Your life and this country's future depend on being prepared. Don't delay getting ready any longer.

Statement of Hon. Howard Buffett, of Omaha, Nebr., Member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, August 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, one of Nebraska's foremost citizens and a former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable Howard Buffett, of Omaha, Nebr., appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, August 19, 1961.

Mr. Buffett served four terms in the House of Representatives and at the close of the 82d Congress retired to conduct his investment business. He has made a long and careful study of foreign aid and its many ramifications.

Mr. Buffett is a member of the National Committee of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. His statement to the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations follows:

It is the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee's belief that foreign aid incites legal Federal embezzlement of the dollar savings of the American people.

Four headings outline the testimony in support of this premise.

1. The Congress is vested by the Constitution with the power to regulate the value of our money.

2. With some short interruptions, Congress has regulated the dollar downward since 1938.

3. As long as foreign aid continues, Congress is constrained to regulate the value of the dollar downward.

4. If foreign aid is continued, then out of respect for the right to know, the American people who are unversed in monetary manipulation should be fully advised by the Congress that the value of their savings in fixed dollar obligations is being persistently diminished.

Parenthetically my presentation may seem to reveal an especial interest in the integrity of Congress. As a former Member, and in respect for the constitutional supremacy of the legislative branch of government, I readily admit my concern on this score.

Congressional continuation of the policy of deficit spending, plus immeasurable guarantees and credit arrangements of various kinds, amount to deliberate regulation of the value of the dollar downward.

When such dilution is done without fully informing the people of the inevitable effects of such action, the only truly accurate label for it is legal Federal embezzlement. It is embezzlement of all unwary citizens by a Federal body, the Congress of the United States.

The fact that other branches of our Government, plus foreign governments, and private groups have pressured Congress to take the actions that diminish the dollar's value is no defense. The final responsibility is on Congress alone.

All these facts you already know. But their importance makes their restatement imperative. We all know that when parliamentary institutions fall into disgrace, freedom itself is the next victim. The danger is not imaginary.

At all costs, I urge you to defend the integrity and good name of Congress in all future actions involving the value of the dollar.

In my introduction, I set out four propositions. Nos. 1 and 2 are simple statements of fact. A demonstration of the amount or percentage that the value of the dollar has been regulated downward seems unnecessary.

So I go on to my third point; the proposition that as long as foreign aid continues, Congress is constrained to regulate the value of our money downward.

People unversed in the realities of politics might question this proposition. But anyone who knows the facts of life about elective officials that control taxes and spending will not. More significantly any thoughtful person who understands the principle of fairplay will not.

This situation can best be portrayed by a homey illustration.

No father could long play Santa Claus for children in other parts of town and Old Scrooge at home. Neither can Congressmen vote continually to spend billions of American tax dollars abroad and at the same time vote for austere economy at home.

Moreover, it is probably unfair and certainly it is unrealistic to expect Congressmen to long oppose ostensibly compassionate schemes to bring additional tax dollars back into their own districts—when the Congress is taking out of their constituents' pockets millions of dollars for foreign groups having no legal or moral claim against American citizens.

The evidence supporting this conclusion is overwhelming. Let us look at the record of the last 8 years under a reputedly conservative administration. That record was tabulated and released by your chairman March 1. He reports:

"Notwithstanding the fact that Federal revenues for the past 8 years exceeded by $53 billion, the total revenues received in the 164 years from President George Washington to President Harry Truman, inclusive, we borrowed an additional $23 billion during the same 8-year period and spent that."

Gigantic as the spending of the Eisenhower administration was, it is already evident that it will be quickly surpassed. The forecast of things to come is seen in the frequent headlines indicating quick passage of new spending proposals.

Nor are the conservative Midlands of America immune to the domestic spending pressures engendered by foreign aid.

In my hometown, Omaha, we elected a new mayor in May. In his campaign, the winning candidate embraced the doctrine that if the Federal Government can spend billions on foreign aid, it is his duty to obtain additional Federal funds for Omaha.

Note these paragraphs from his platform:

"In general it has been my philosophy, backed by proof, that community projects can best be taken care of by the community itself, without resort to Federal aid and its accompanying supervision.

"But with the Federal Government spending billions of dollars for foreign aid each year, it is well to remember the truism, 'charity begins at home.'

"If Federal funds are available to pay for low-cost housing for the many senior citizens well able to take care of themselves with dignity, we should take immediate advantage of them.

"To relegate people victimized by heavy taxation and inflation to institutions once their earning years have passed is inexcusable.

Midwestern people are conservative. Sometimes we are slow to catch on. But after 16 years of foreign aid and the hog trough behavior it engenders in domestic spending, that condition compels us to abandon principle. That seems to be the Omaha mayor's conclusion. Who can justly quarrel with it?

Rather than burden you with more evidence on this point, I urge you to ponder the effect of foreign aid on the morals and morale of the American people.

That brings me to the fourth point, my plea for fairness to Americans who are unskilled on money matters. If foreign aid is not to be stopped quickly, these people should now be given facts that have too long been kept obscure.

The great majority of the victims of regulating the value of our money downward are the less affluent and more trusting of our citizens.

Surely Congress has a moral and legal obligation to them that is prior to any promises or pledges our officials have contracted abroad.

Congress should tell these citizens that governmental inflation is in reality legal Federal embezzlement of all savings payable in

a fixed number of dollars, such as Government bonds.

It should be explained to them that so far diminution of the value of the dollar has been somewhat slowed down by subsidy schemes, official reassurances, and propaganda. Most of all it has been restrained by the patient faith of the innocent victims who excite my concern.

Since 1939 the purchasing value of the savings of the thrifty Americans then invested in Government bonds, building and loan shares, pensions, annuities and life insurance have been cut in half, and then some.

Moreover this confiscation took place during a period when the Government was drenching the American people with advertising and sales promotion praising its bonds and the dollar with such claims as "There's no safer security anywhere."

Today the only persons in the world who have power to stop this Federal embezzlement of innocent people is Congress. Either you stop it, or it goes on until the institutions of republican government are discredited and then vitiated.

You have an awesome responsibility. I know something of the pressures to continue foreign aid spending. Among those against you and the great numerical majority of frugal and trustful citizens are the following groups:

1. Debtors of all kinds and descriptions, whose original obligations, contracted in dollars of higher purchasing power, become smaller and smaller as the value of the dollar goes down and down. This group gains most of what the thrifty classes lose.

2. The majority of promoters and speculators, who understand the workings of Federal embezzlement, and arrange their financial affairs to profit from it.

3. Those enterprises and officials who profit from the reckless spending policies that stem out of foreign aid and its domestic consequences.

4. Union bosses who have exploited currency finagling to entrench and expand their power. Union labor that is promised, and usually receiving, protection from a peril they do not understand, pay additional fees and dues willingly.

The foregoing groups have a vested interest in the continuation of foreign aid because it practically guarantees continuous destruction of the value of the dollar. In fairness, we recognize that there is also a significant number of intellectual and sincere people who believe in foreign aid for more creditable reasons. These people believe that foreign aid brings permanent political strength to other lands and that America has the intellectual, moral, political and economic capacity to do it successfully.

I differ with them on all four counts, but I have discussed only one—our proven inability to carry on this policy without relentless dilution of the value of the dollar.

To those who feel that the mutual security program is a must, even if it ruins the dollar, I offer a bit of history.

After World War I France set out on a program of mutual security. They were determined that if war with Germany came again, they would have allies. Probably they also thought that their mutual security program, like our officials tell us, would prevent war.

What did they do?

France made loan after loan to 10 nations that formed a circle around Germany. A few short years went by. Again the war clouds gathered in central Europe.

How did France's mutual security program work out?

Five of France's mutual security allies fought on Germany's side. Four of them were overrun by Hitler's army in jig time. Number 10 in her mutual security alliance was Turkey. The Turks carefully preserved their neutrality—despite the loans and pledges.

What did this kind of spending do to the thrifty savings of the French people? When I asked former Premier Paul Reynaud that question a few years ago he replied, in five words, "Oh, they were wiped out" and went on quickly to another subject.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, do not let that happen here.

Favors Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the first annual convention of the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns on May 27, 1961, a policy statement outlining league objectives was adopted by the delegates. Section 5 of that policy statement dealt with Federal-local relations. The statement makes a good deal of sense and I agree with the expressed sentiments. I am in favor of a Department of Urban Affairs, proposed by President Kennedy, and believe that such an agency will be effective in resolving the many procedural difficulties that Federal aid programs present to municipalities.

I ask permission to have a copy of this section printed with my remarks in the Appendix:

SECTION 5—FEDERAL-LOCAL RELATIONS

A. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

The Federal Government has adopted a number of aid programs, the intent and purpose of which are to make available Federal funds for the programing and construction of a wide range of local facilities. Such programs include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Federal planning advances, HHFA, section 702, Public Law 560; (b) Federal assistance for school construction, Public Law 815; (c) Federal civil defense contributions program, Civil Defense Act of 1950; (d) urban planning assistance, HHFA, section 701, Public Law 560; (e) airports, Federal Airport Act; (f) small watershed projects, Public Law 566, as amended; (g) public facilities loans programs, Public Law 345; (h) urban renewal, Housing Acts of 1949, 1954, 1957, and 1959; (i) sewerage treatment aid, Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956; (j) rural library services, Library Services Act; (k) hospital construction, Hill-Burton Act, 1946; (l) Federal highway program, Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959; (m) land for recreation and public purposes, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, as amended by the acts of 1954 and 1959; (n) National Guard Armory construction, National Defense Facilities Act of 1950; (o) beach erosion control, River and Harbors Act of 1932, together with other legislation pertinent thereto.

In enacting these aid programs, the Federal Government geared the allocation of such funds to certain considerations and conditions, few of which seem to be consistent with one another. While some of the programs are administered by the same agency, there are many agencies involved in these aid programs, with national and regional offices located according to their own operating needs.

B. THE MASSACHUSETTS SITUATION

New England has long been considered as a natural unit because of both its geography and its economy. The six States which comprise the region have worked together continuously through the years in the pursuance of a large number of common interests both public and private. The New England Council, New England Board of Higher Education, New England Building Officials Conference, New England Colleges Fund, and many other groups, too numerous to mention, are indicative of the degree of cooperation which presently exists in the region. Just as the region has long been considered a natural one, so has Boston been considered as its natural center, because of its central location and the availability of water, rail, air, and highway access to it from anywhere in the region.

Currently, New England municipalities which wish to take advantage of any of the various Federal aid programs find it necessary for their officials to contact representatives of a great many Federal agencies. A municipal official seeking information and aid under any of these programs may find it necessary to travel extensively to a number of Government centers, including the District of Columbia, and to talk with many different Federal officials. In doing so, he will find that the regulations governing the submission and approval of project applications vary considerably with the agencies involved.

C. MASSACHUSETTS' MUNICIPAL POLICY

Whereas the Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns is desirous of more efficient procedures with respect to Federal-local programs;

Therefore, every effort should be made to simplify the regulations and administrative procedures required under aid programs. To this end, the league urges the Federal Government to adopt a system of standard operating procedures (insofar as it is possible to do so) which may be common to all Federal agencies in carrying out aid programs of benefit to local communities, such simplification of administrative procedures accruing to the advantage of both Federal and local governments; and

Further, that it is recommended that an agency of the Federal Government be established in New England, and preferably in the city of Boston, capable of directing from a single headquarters these aid programs. Such central office would be of great benefit in the processing of applications and progress reports for the entire region; and

Finally, that it is strongly urged that the Members of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States support legislation creating a Department of Urban Affairs, with a Cabinet level administrator in the executive branch of the Government.

The Tone's the Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Harlan Trott, correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Oakland, Calif., has written an interesting and absorbing story in the May 23 edition of that paper pertaining to violinmaking. The title of the story is "The Tone's the Thing."

In it he recites the very interesting history of a Scottish craftsman, Frank DeVoney of Greenock, who discovered the secret of the great violinmakers and met the tests of the great musicians of his day.

The story is not only worth reading but it is worth preserving and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEY TO VIOLINMAKING: THE TONE'S THE THING

(By Harlan Trott)

OAKLAND, CALIF.—Bessie Duncan DeVoney is a prim, precise, pleasant little woman wtih a closet full of fiddles—and a heart full of devotion to her Scottish father who made them.

String one up and play it, she insists and it will flood the room with the sublime sounds of a Stradivarius, a Guarnerius, an Amati, or a Bergonzi.

A retired legal secretary, Miss DeVoney is engrossed in the cheerful work of writing a book about how her father, Frank DeVoney of Greenock, came to assert his claim to discovering the creative secrets of those old Cremona masters.

There's something in the humble beginnings of the Greenock craftsman comparable to the flowering fame of the Yankee sculptor, Daniel Chester French, whose Lincoln Memorial is one of the glories of Washington. Louisa May Alcott started French off at the age of 7 with a sculptor's chisel, which he used right away to transform a turnip into a bullfrog.

STOOL BECAME VIOLIN

Only, when Frank DeVoney's father presented him with a woodcarver's chisel, the lad seized upon a kitchen stool and fashioned it into a violin.

For years, violinmakers had been constructing violins by measuring the thickness of the wood and without ever coming close to recapturing the superb sounds of the old Cremona craftsmen.

It was in the late 1870's, Miss DeVoney relates, that her father first heard the tone or sound that came away from the wood on the top and bottom plates of the violin on which he was experimenting.

Instead of measuring the thickness of the wood before the top and bottom plates were glued into place, DeVoney launched out along the lines of a study in physics he had completed in the classroom.

"Cramping" the back of the violin to his workbench, he bowed the edge of the wood firmly. What Bessie DeVoney's transcribed memoirs of her father show at this point is that Frank DeVoney right then heard "the sound" and that he cried out to the walls of the empty shop:

"They made them by sound!"

NO GUARANTEE

The "they" meant the violinmakers of Cremona—Stradivari, Amati, and the handful of others whose instruments are collectors' prizes today.

The family record taken down from father to daughter in Miss DeVoney's skilled shorthand shows how the Greenock "copyist" stumbled onto the secret of the old Italian masters' genius, namely the accoustical method of toning the wood itself in the violin during the course of construction.

Before then, textbooks on violinmaking were based largely on the theory that the Cremonans had made their instruments through their superior adeptness with the calipers in measuring the thickness of the wood. But what bothered latter-day violinmakers was that there was no guarantee, no scientific certainty, that the instruments made to exact measurements would be identical in tone.

DeVoney's claim to the recognition that followed his discovery was that it was vibration, not measurements, that produced stringed instruments with tones of glory in their airy varnished shells, instruments certain in tone and harmony.

LESSON IN PHYSICS

The schoolboy study which sparked his later discovery was a lesson in physics on "Chladni figures" dealing with the configuration of sound.

DeVoney's secret was broadcast through a series of articles he wrote for the newspaper in the People's Friend, published in Dundee. DeVoney was living in Blackpool at the time. He had turned out over a thousand violins prior to his discovery.

But now he was a busy "copyist" for the patrons who flocked to his shop in 63 Milburn Street in Blackpool, England.

Scanning the Dundee newspaper, his attention was drawn to the question-and-answer column in which a reader inquired how to make a good-toned violin.

The editor's answer in effect was: "Be careful with your measurements and trust to luck for good tone."

DeVoney wrote the editor that there was a surer way than trusting merely to calipers and luck. This led to the publishing of a series of three articles by Frank DeVoney in the People's Friend on "The Acoustics of Violin Making."

A patron of DeVoney's, after reading these articles, sent him three backs made by Vincent Panorma. DeVoney said that Panorma made by sound, as did also Lupot and Villaume.

"These three backs of Panorma's in all the 13 notes which I take," DeVoney told his daughter years later, "were identical one with the other, showing absolutely they were made by sound, since the density of the wood differs."

DeVoney tested Lupot's instruments, too; and in each of those examined, he found "the breasts had the identical notes of those made by Carlo Bergonzi."

Reminiscing in retirement here in California, DeVoney remarked to his notetaking daughter: "We know that Villaume worked by tone. He copied Guarnieri's 'Joseph' to such a degree that Guarnieri himself said: 'That is the one of my "Joseph".'"

DeVoney cited an anecdote circulated through a magazine article on "Making of Antiques" in which it was related that Villaume bought a Guarnerius and put his label in it.

"WOODEN SHOE" PLAYED

"But he could not mislead Paganini," DeVoney remarked, "because he was a skilled workman."

DeVoney recalled how Paganini made a violin out of a wooden shoe and played on it to a full house in Genoa, giving the proceeds to the chambermaid as a "dot" on her wedding eve.

It seems that "fiddle fights" were common sport in DeVoney's Blackpool workshop. The owner of a cherished Lupot or Strad or Bergonzi would post a player out of sight while he played first on the old master and then on the DeVoney.

A prominent Leeds collector by the name of Halton stacked his prized Carlo Bergonzi against a copy turned out at Blackpool inside of a week.

Upstairs in the DeVoney shop, Halton's violinist played the composition, Cavatina, on each instrument. He played DeVoney's first. When he was finished, Halton scooted upstairs and said, "The fine flowing tone of my Carlo was played first."

DETAILS RECOUNTED

Then, turning to DeVoney, the Leeds collector exclaimed warmly, "But, DeVoney, you have made a wonderfully fine second."

The details of this "fiddle fight" were recounted at the time in the London magazine, "Strings."

DeVoney was eager to share his secret with the world. That is why he was glad when William C. Honeyman asked him to write a chapter on "The Acoustics of Violin Making" for a book on the violin published in Edinburgh in 1893. Honeyman's book, "The Violin: How To Choose One," reached its seventh printing in 1951.

DeVoney was not a dreamer but a very practical man who could paint a picture or make a brass-railed fender for his fireside. He stressed how his studies were "true and certain." He even taught himself French to see if M. Savart mentioned how the plates were held when he got the notes during his experiments.

But no, Savart was silent. Perhaps Vuillaume knew, but if so, he wasn't telling. Otto, who wrote of the construction of the violin, may have known, but he only said that there was something more which he would not tell.

Could DeVoney produce the tone of Gasparo da Salo or Maggini? Honeyman was sure DeVoney had found the method for doing so.

LARGE, FREE TONE

It was Honeyman's opinion that the violins and cellos made by DeVoney bore out his statements, "for they are, though exceptionally thick in the plates, large and free in tone, equal on all strings, and just such instruments as a grand soloist will delight in when age has crowned and perfected the work of the maker."

The Edinburgh authority found that DeVoney's work as a copyist of famous masters had a quality "which I have never noted in such marked distinction in any new violin."

And Honeyman added: "Clearness and freedom of tone might be roughly set down as the quality to which I allude. A system built upon such a solid and scientific basis cannot fail to produce something like a revolution in violinmaking."

Of course, DeVoney thought so, too. "There can now be no hiding of a particular tone," DeVoney told Honeyman's readers, "for the best violins that can thus be contructed may now be taken to pieces, their exact notes recorded by the acute copyist and the same effect repeated by the humbiest in the land."

DO IT YOURSELFER

A 19th century "do it yourself" exponent of violin-making, DeVoney urged on Honeyman's readers: "Here, then, is a chance to distinguish yourselves, you violinmakers who love the labor and do not grudge thought and study and ceaseless experimenting."

Disavowing any inclination to "grasp the earth" or "keep any secret" or "lord it over anyone," DeVoney insisted "there is a way, a sure way—a fixed and scientific method—follow it and the world shall bless you and the result of your labors through all time. But, mark you, secrecy is now dead."

If DeVoney thought secrecy was out, perhaps he was overly optimistic. Instead, it was his chapter in Honeyman's book that was expunged after appearing in the first edition—his do-it-yourself instructions entitled, "The Acoustics of Violinmaking, and a Method in Which the Body and Character of the Tone of Any Violin May Be Accurately Copied."

In six subsequent printings, Frank DeVoney's chapter has been omitted—as recently as 1951.

NEGLECT BATTLED

It is not her closet full of fiddles and cellos by Blackpool's Frank DeVoney that concerns his daughter. But that neglect and obscurity has settled down over his genius and his generosity.

That is why this spunky little woman has patiently pursued a course in writing, and today is just as patiently pecking away on a book about her father's discovery. She wants the musical world to know and remember Frank DeVoney, especially, perhaps, in Blackpool where the blossom of his fleeting fame was blown.

Indeed, Miss DeVoney does not desire to sell her father's fiddles but to donate the instruments to Britain's National Youth Orchestra as well as the symphony orchestra of London, Edinburgh, and San Francisco as enduring and useful mementos of her father's work.

NO SALE

"A consignment of violins by Stradivarius, sent to London to be sold at the modest price of £6 each, were returned as unsalable. This seems astonishing to us, but it must be remembered that these violins were new, and a Strad with the red varnish whole has rather a vulgar look, and could not be distinguished a few yards off from a cheap French fiddle, while the players that looked at them had the choice of old English and old German violins by the score, and the love of the subtle sweetness of the Italian tone had yet to be created. By the time that education had been accomplished, the violins of Stradivarius had also improved and matured and grown picturesque in appearance with wear, and so found a ready sale." [From: "The Violin: How To Choose One" by William C. Honeyman, Edinburgh: E. Kohler & Son, 1893.]

A 'FIDDLE FIGHT'

(By a Staff Correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

Dr. C. W. Conger of Indianapolis owned a DeVoney violin and being in a position to do so, frequently challenged all comers to beat his violin for tone.

The following letter relates the results of such a contest:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *July 7, 1920.*

C. R. KEITH.

DEAR SIR: We had another fiddle fight at the Circle Theater. The principal judge Ernest Schmidt. He is the conductor of the orchestra (about 30 pieces) and has a truly wonderful ear—positive pitch, absolute tone memory, and thorough training in music. Young, Baily, and Fry, all good judges, besides several violinists.

Schmidt's judgment was as follows:

1. DeVoney.
2. Guarnerius.
3. France Gobeth.
4. Ellis.
5. Bergonzi (Carlos).
6. The joke fiddle I told you of.

My decision was the same on the first three. I made Bergonzi fourth and Ellis last.

Baily made DeVoney first, Gobeth second.

Young made Guarnerius first and Gobeth second and DeVoney third.

Fry made Gobeth first and DeVoney second.

The player gave DeVoney first.

So you see DeVoney must be a good fiddle. I left it with the first violinist of the orchestra and heard it again last night with crowded house, and it comes through like two fiddles all the time. If you have a fiddle to beat it, send it on and try it against the Guarnerius, Gobeth, DeVoney, and Bergonzi (genuine). If you beat them you have something. These trials are fair, player in the dark, big theater, and then orchestra trial beside.

I thought the Guarnerius would certain beat DeVoney, but no. Different tone entirely, the G bigger, but a roughness. Like a new violin under the chin. Bergonzi is harsh and loud.

I have not heard from DeVoney for some time. Hope he is well.

Yours respectfully and hastily,

C. W. CONGER.

Russian Plans for Gas Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted an important article in the magazine Quest, entitled "Russia's Plans for Gas Warfare." This timely and interesting study is of particular importance at a time when we are giving a new look to the adequacy of our civil defense program. I wish to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA PLANS FOR GAS WARFARE

(By David Pursglove)

(The Soviet Union plans to turn any world war III into a "CBR" war, intelligence sources are convinced. And the Reds are far better prepared than we are to withstand chemical, biological, and radiological warfare—with its canisters of tularemia and cholera, its sprays of radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors, its bombs containing nerve gases, and the old standby, mustard gas.)

Officials feel these conclusions are inescapable, since what we know of Russian offensive CBR capabilities is confirmed by the extent of their defenses. Indeed, ever since warfare began, an intelligence officer's best indication of enemy intent has been a look at how the enemy is prepared to defend himself. And the Soviet Union is far better prepared than we.

The average Russian knows as much about protecting himself from CBR attack as he knows about his job. Hundreds of thousands of Russians have especially developed civilian gas masks hanging in their homes or stored handily in office desk drawers. All other Russians know where to turn at any moment to get a government-issued emergency mask from the stocks in their offices, factories, or apartment houses.

Every new building in Russia—office, apartment, or home—has to be built over a civil-defense-approved fallout shelter. All over the vast expanse of the Soviet Union are civil defense stores that sell radiation dosimeters, gas masks, anti-poison-gas kits, and rubber clothing for protection against fallout. And the people know how to use this equipment. Almost every Russian adult and teenager has been through an intensive, compulsory 22-hour civil defense course. Millions have had another three or four courses averaging 10 hours each, and now they are required to pass a new 12-hour course.

Since the Soviet revolution, and especially since their recognition of military airpower in 1931, the Russians have been learning how to organize their massive civilian population into a defense organization as effective as a well-run army. Two major organizations spearhead this program.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD)—once synonymous with the dreaded secret police, and still responsible for regular police and the labor camps—is in overall charge of civilian defense. Many MVD and regular army troops are slated for civil defense operations in wartime. However, the MVD normally runs its home front defense program through public officials.

Each city's administration chart has a dual character. Every official has his normal function and also has a civil defense assignment. These are not static roles. MVD maintains a small corps of civil defense specialists in every city. In war, they will supervise city officials in their defense tasks; in peace, they constantly inspect civil defense readiness, test the results of intensive population training and approve or reject with an eye on civil defense all plans for new streets, subways, parks, buildings and factories.

Closely cooperating with the MVD is the organization that actually conducts training and distributes materials and equipment—the Volunteer Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Fleet (DOSAAF). For 30 years, DOSAAF has conducted courses in marksmanship, skiing, first aid, flying, parachuting, gliding, chemical and air defense. Now anti-CBR defense is stressed through its thousands of units in cities, collective farms, universities and factories in the Soviet Union. DOSAAF has military instructors teaching courses sponsored by the armed forces. There are also civilian instructors who vie with the military in teaching civil defense courses where it is a crime to be a poor or lax teacher.

In the past 2 years, almost every Russian adult has been enrolled in a compulsory civil defense course being taught by 40,000 specially trained DOSAAF instructors. Not only does the course require knowledge, for instance, of how to use a gas mask, but it also demands that the citizen understand gas mask design so he can improvise his own in an emergency. For a solid hour, instructors chosen for what we Americans would call blood-thirstiness, hammer at the newest methods of warfare and what they mean to civilians in terms of blast wave destruction, fireball effect, radiation burn, chemical toxicity and infectious diseases. Most of this arouses interest and gives the citizen a reason to remain alert and absorb the instruction. (There is also another, probably more effective, reason: if he fails, he has to repeat the course.) Another hour is devoted to designing air filters for shelters. Two hours are spent on the theory of protecting food and water from contamination and radioactive fallout.

It is not all theory and classroom work that make up the 12-hour course. There is plenty of practice. After an instructor describes the reasons for skimming surface snow from chosen paths in fallout areas, the students, men and women alike, go outside and shovel snow until the instructor or MVD inspector is satisfied that they are doing it properly. And woe unto the student who fails to understand his gas mask lecture, for as soon as the gas warfare test chamber in city or collective farm is available to his class, he must depend on his mask for protection as he first sits, and then exercises, in an atmosphere of war gas. The gas is usually chloropicrin—actually used in World War I combat. It is a strong, sometimes dangerous, type of tear gas.

For most Russians, however, this is just a refresher course with some new material added. We now know that between 1956 and 1959, most of the population took a similar 22-hour course. And in 1955–56, 110 million Russians—85.5 percent of the civilians between ages 16 and 60—passed a 10-hour course in atomic warfare defense.

DOSAAF keeps local units well supplied with training materials. There are always masks, dosimeters, at least three types of fire extinguishers, first aid equipment, chemical warfare protection and detection kits, and all kinds of tools. There is also a wide assortment of well-written, profusely illustrated training manuals and civil defense pamphlets. DOSAAF units and the MVD supply a constantly changing set of civil defense posters to factory superintendents and building managers who are required to display them. These are not just slogan posters—many of them are enlarged reproductions of pages from instruction manuals. Attention-getting color is widely used in posters and books produced by DOSAAF's own huge publishing house.

Some classes taking advanced training for coveted civil defense badges are called out in the middle of the night on "chemical alerts" and march as much as 10 miles, up to 2 miles while wearing their masks. Others are called out to ski 15 miles, 3 miles with

masks on—and always at night, so not to interfere with regular work.

The Russian civilian gas mask is readily available in civil defense stores operated by DOSAAF. However, it costs $10 to $14—a week's wages for some Russians—and only a few hundred thousand civilians own the masks. The rest of the population trains with masks furnished by DOSAAF. There are mask caches in many office and apartment buildings and factories.

The civilian gas mask is credited as "very good" by U.S. Army chemical warfare authorities. Unlike most masks, it gives full face protection and covers the chin. It is not as compact as new U.S. masks which use cheek pad filters instead of canisters. However, it is used with the canister kept inside the tightly-woven carrying bag which acts as an additional filter against contaminated or radioactive dust particles.

DOSAAF stores also stock, at very low prices, the gauze, cotton and instructions for making emergency masks to protect against breathing radioactive dust. There is a wide line of rubber and rubberized clothing—hats, ponchos, trousers, and boots—to ward off liquid chemicals and fallout dust. Citizens are urged to purchase radiation dosimeters. Two models are stocked: film badges and pencil types. Dosimeters or contamination meters for large areas are distribted to buildings and factories by DOSAAF and to city officials by the MVD.

Not long after intelligence officers started seeing Russian civil defense training manuals and posters, they started getting other pieces of more specific information. They began learning the exact nature of some Soviet work. Take, for example, an atropine Syrette issued to all troops as protection against deadly nerve gases. It looked very much like the one developed for our own troops.

This and other incidents helped to confirm that Russia and the United States probably have been working along similar lines.

Neither nation has a monopoly on knowledge. Said one intelligence officer: "The more I see in this area, the more it proves to me that everybody has the same base level of learning."

There are differences, but they are primarily of degree or emphasis. The Russians are far ahead of us in developing a mass inoculation technique to treat populations exposed to CBR agents. We lead in a program to develop antiradiation drugs as preventive medicine for troops about to enter a radiological warfare zone.

The Russian mass immunization technique uses vaccines in aerosol form—by generating a fine mist of active ingredients. Soviet Army medical specialists seem to feel that their spray generators are fully developed, and that they know enough about the effects of a number of agents in aerosol form to put the technique to use. The U.S. Army Medical Service is approaching the "aerogenic technique" very cautiously. Vaccines that behave one way when injected hypodermically sometimes behave quite differently when tried as aerosols. This is especially true of vaccines that should not contact the respiratory system. Officers believe that some life-saving vaccines can actually produce pneumonia when they are administered in the aerosol form.

We still are working with lower animals in developing our own aerosol vaccine technique. The aerosol generator, which one officer says will be "a very expensive piece of gadgetry," presents the least problems. The physiology is another matter. How does dissemination as an aerosol affect the size of the needed dose? How often should it be administered? What are the differences between walking and running through an aerosol-filled room? What happens if a person, such as a crippled person, stays too long? Until these questions are answered, the Army Medical Service will rely on its rapid, multi-shot, high-pressure spray hypodermic.

Another area where both nations have worked independently but along similar lines, is in antiradiation drugs. Medical officers of both armies are pursuing programs built around mercaptans. These sulfur-containing compounds are highly effective in reducing radiation sickness. However, their toxicity is as great a curse as the radiation sickness that they prevent.

Our program has reached the point of testing small doses of several compounds on men. Army Medical Service officers are confident that an acceptable prophylaxis should be ready for wide testing within perhaps 2 years. If it is the logical outgrowth of the present program, it will require advance warning of radiological attack since it will be effective only if administered several hours before exposure.

The Russians, as well as their satellite allies, are also working on mercaptans. However, even the most likely looking Russian developments have been tested only on rodents, dogs, and monkeys, as far as U.S. officers can learn.

In both nations, the antiradiation drug programs rely heavily on outside research and industrial laboratories for clues to further advances. In Russia there is no problem. All research results in any field are reported routinely to the Minister of Defense. There is no separation between the chemical industry and the State. The Government readily gets what it needs.

In the United States, the situation is much different. The Army Medical Service has to make its problems and needs known to industry and to independent research laboratories, persuade them to cooperate, and convince them that proprietary information will be carefully guarded. All of this must be done on a very small budget.

The Army Medical Service right now limits its requests for information to the field of sulfur chemistry. The much larger industry contact program of the Army Chemical Corps—which seeks information in all fields—perhaps provides a better understanding of how these programs work.

Over 500 of the Nation's 3,000 R. & D. laboratories already participate in a liaison program sponsored by the Army Chemical Corps. Hopefully, more laboratories will join in participating, so that the Army can keep up with the snowballing information it needs in chemistry, metallurgy, medicine, electronics, and the many other fields that contribute to modern chemical-biological-radiological warfare.

Many of these will be the key the Army needs to new incapacitating agents, more effective smoke pots, better flamethrower gaskets or faster poison gas detection systems. Industrial research people in all fields last year reported to the Army several thousand developments and discoveries. Some of these were the intentional results of their research, some were accidental. Often it is the accidental that has proved more promising.

Mustard gas, for example, was known for 50 years before its value as a weapon was recognized in 1917. Its effectiveness probably was first recognized as a result of an accidental spill on H. T. Clarke when he was working in Emil Fischer's Laboratory in 1911 and 1912. Tabun and Sarin—the nerve gases or "G-agents"—were discovered by Schrader in Germany, while he was searching for new insecticides.

An Army Chemical Center spokesman credits the liaison program with the information responsible for a great percentage of the new incapacitating agents that recently have fascinated newspaper readers. These are agents that put a soldier out of action without killing him. They do it by making him overly nervous, or too relaxed, or extremely sensitive to slight temperature changes. Or, they make him laugh himself out of action. Or, they might make him love his enemy, or cause him to vomit so much that he is incapable of fighting.

The Chemical Corps has carried out projects to bring ideas into practical shape for use as weapons. Officials still hope that they never will be used. But only a fool would be without them if his enemy has them.

The whole question of whether CBR warfare should be discussed in public draws the charge, more often than not, that the Pentagon is trying to get a larger budget. This might have been true several years ago when the Chemical Corps had to beg for funds to conduct work. The budget, however, has grown, and, over a year ago, Army Research and Development Director Richard S. Morse, publicly stated that there was enough money for CBR:

"We don't need any more. In fiscal year 1960 we spent $40 million, and this has been expanded. The fiscal 1961 and 1962 budgets are going up, not in a crash program but at an orderly rate."

Despite greater spending, CBR warfare is still kept out of public Pentagon conversation. (A few generals have admitted it into their vocabularies, but with the prefix, defense against.) Too, the State Department now limits its control over the Pentagon's public discussions to the censorship of any references to offensive use of the weapons by the United States.

But perhaps the best indication that the the ostrich has uncovered its head is that references to CBR developments by Government officials, which used to draw indignant charges of amateurish statesmanship, an unforgivable slip, or worse from the British Embassy, now bring little more than raised eyebrows.

Even with the relatively free discussions of CBR warfare these days, few details are made public on exactly which war gases we know the Russians are stockpiling, or which type of germ warfare they are ready to unleash. For such discussions tell the Russians more about us than we are telling our people about the Russians. For each bit of information that is printed in the United States tells the Red about a different facet of our intelligence operations—and about the leaks in their own security.

It gains us nothing to describe in detail what we know of their offensive plans; but rest assured, we do know what they are doing, and we know that it is not very different from what we are doing. Neither nation has a monopoly.

The Russians, of course, know that we are familiar with their CBR defense plans. After all, they have been drilled into the minds of a hundred million of their citizens.

But the question of their defenses brings up the question of ours. And here the Russians obviously are aware of the evaluation of our efforts made by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences:

1. In our limited program, much information and resources are not used properly.

2. The secrecy surrounding many civil defense activities results in withholding some information that citizens need for realistic planning.

3. Civil defense in America will remain ineffective as long as it holds an assigned status lower than military defense.

Basically, the United States has not been able to stimulate enough interest in civil defense. Even where special anti-CBR equipment has been developed—and we have a good, low-cost civilian protective mask, for example—there is not enough interest to warrant mass production and distribution.

Some Russian citizens do not like to give up free time to civil defense instruction any more than Americans would. However, centuries of war, two generations of civil de-

fense, and a controlled press and radio have made most Russians not only receptive, but eager. A Stanford Research Institute expert who specializes in Russian civil and military defense points to another important factor:

"Russians always have had a lower standard of living and more government regimentation than U.S. citizens. By comparison, the Russian has to give up far less to achieve adequate civil defense. Now the area to watch is Communist China—the Chinese will have to give up virtually nothing to develop a civil defense more effective even than Russia's."

What does this difference between free world and Communist civil defense mean to the average citizen in the cold war? Herman Kahn, Rand Corp. specialist on Russian defenses, makes it very clear:

"There is an enormous difference in the bargaining ability of a country which can put its people in safety on 24 hours' notice and one which cannot. If this is hard to visualize, imagine that the Russians had done exactly that, and we had not. Then, ask yourself how you think we would come out at a subsequent bargaining table."

CBR WARFARE—SOME DEFINITIONS

The phrase "CBR warfare" is an abbreviated way of referring to chemical, biological, and radiological warfare. When a military man refers to chemical warfare, he means the intentional employment of toxic gases, liquids, or solids, to produce casualties, and the use of screening smoke or incendiaries. Biological warfare is the military use of living organisms or their toxic products to cause death, disability, or damage to man, his domestic animals, or crops. Radiological warfare employs the harmful ionizing effects of radiation against man, whether directly or indirectly.

Poison gas was proposed for use against the Russians in the Crimean War, and in our Civil War against the Confederate Army, but neither suggestion was put to the test. Tear gases were used for harassment purposes by the French in August 1914. The first significant gas attack was the German use of chlorine on April 22, 1915, against the British and French at Ypres. The British retaliated in kind 6 months later at Loos. The next major step was the German introduction of phosgene, a choking gas which could penetrate the crude gas masks then in existence. The Germans introduced mustard gas in July 1917. This blistering agent could produce casualties even among men wearing masks. Another family of toxic gases was introduced by the French and the Austrians in 1916—the blood gases. The first American use of gas was in June 1918, when phosgene was used against the Germans.

Prohibition of gas warfare was agreed to by a number of countries at The Hague in 1899. Neither the United States nor Great Britain signed this treaty. Since the treaty banned use of gas-filled projectiles, French use of tear gas rifle grenades in 1914, and German use of stationary pressurized chlorine gas tanks for the first attack made it a moot point as to whether or how any treaty obligations had been violated. In 1925 a treaty at the Geneva Conference called not only for prohibition of war gases but also bacteriological warfare. In ratifying the treaty, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., and some other nations made it clear they were bound only in relation to other countries complying with the treaty terms. The United States, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, and Brazil did not sign the treaty.

Biological warfare also goes far back in history. Poisoning of wells was an old trick. In the 14th century, the Tartars besieging the Italians in a fortress in Crimea threw over the wall the bodies of plague victims. By the 16th century, an Italian tactical manual described how to construct artillery shells for delivery of disease to the enemy. In our own colonial days, it is reported that European traders passed out blankets used by smallpox victims to Indians so as to reduce their fighting strength. There is definite evidence that in more recent times German agents in this country inoculated animals being shipped to Europe, so that diseases would be carried there.

Limited biological warfare may have been tested by Japan in China during World War II.

Radiological warfare was not a serious possibility until the perfection of the atomic bomb in 1945. The initial burst of radioactivity from the bomb and fireball is not classed as radiological warfare, only the succeeding radioactive fallout. This definition may have to be modified if a new nuclear weapon designed primarily to produce neutrons is developed. The bombs burst over Japan were not radiological weapons.

Radiological warfare calls for bombing or spraying areas with radioactive materials. These can be isotopes created for RW; they can be the packaged waste products of nuclear reactors.

United Nations, Supported Mainly by U.S. Dollars, Gives Propaganda Forum to Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how long are the American people going to stand for paying most of the bills of the United Nations so that bloodthirsty dictators like Fidel Castro, and power-mad despots like Khrushchev can use it as a forum to turn world opinion against us? I, for one, think we should reexamine our participation in the United Nations and if it cannot function as it is intended to according to its charter, as an organization for peaceful nations, we may have to alter our position regarding it. It is sickening to read such news stories as the following one from the New York Times, in which we are castigated by Cuban representatives, speaking words originated in Moscow as a part of the ultimate Communist goal, the destruction of the United States:

CUBA, IN U.N., SCORES UNITED STATES ON GUANTANAMO

(By Henry Giniger)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., August 24.—Cuba challenged today the right of the United States to retain the naval base at Guantanamo Bay under its treaty with Cuba. The United States countered with a charge of "international lawlessness."

In a vehement speech before a special session of the General Assembly, Mario Garcia-Inchaustegui, chief Cuban delegate to the United Nations, attacked the validity of the treaty, first signed in 1903.

The session began Monday primarily to discuss the French-Tunisian dispute over Bizerte. But the debate, scheduled to end late tomorrow night, has unleashed a flood of rancor and an airing of grievances on the part of small nations that were once under some kind of control or domination by larger powers.

The small nations' outpourings have been abetted by the Soviet bloc, which has mounted a continuous attack on the worldwide system of foreign bases retained from the past or newly negotiated by the West.

While the Soviet delegate sat beaming, the delegates of Cuba and Guinea, a former French territory in Africa, called for the end of all foreign bases, negotiated or not, on the ground that none of the countries harboring such bases could be truly independent.

BYELORUSSIA SPEAKS UP

The Soviet bloc's contribution to the discussion today came from Byelorussia, a Soviet Republic, which declared its "selfless support to the fighters for independence."

After denouncing French resistance to evacuating their naval base in Bizerte, señor Garcia-Inchaustegui brought up the Guantanamo Bay Base, which he implied was Cuba's Bizerte. He said treaties could not be used to justify foreign bases.

"Neither under law nor under international morality can any validity or value be given to documents signed for the purpose of diminishing the sovereignty of states," he asserted. "To bind themselves internationally, states must be sovereign, and they cannot in fact be sovereign if they are forced to admit foreign military forces into there territory."

Señor Garcia-Inchaustegui went on to charge that the Guantanamo base existed not for U.S. defense "but against Cuba and to combat the struggle of Latin-American peoples for liberation." He declared that "at this very moment mercenaries are being concentrated at Guantanamo and in Puerto Rico to be used later against small independent states."

STEVENSON REPLIES

Several hours later, shortly before the close of the session just prior to 6 p.m., Adlai E. Stevenson, chief U.S. delegate, rose to call the Cuban's challenge to the Guantanamo treaty "an extraordinary new doctrine of international law, or rather of international lawlessness."

Mr. Stevenson declared it to be "a normal exercise of sovereignty" for states to conclude defense agreements. He charged that the Cuban representatives had "denied the principles of mutual trust and respect for the pledged word on which progress toward international law and order has been and must be based."

The U.S. delegate labeled as "false and absurd" the accusation that the base was directed against Cuba or other countries. The history of this century, he declared, has shown that the base has been maintained to defend the hemisphere, not attack it.

The United States-Cuban treaty was renewed in 1934. The treaty stipulates that it can be changed only by the mutual consent of the two parties to it. In the present state of relations between the two countries, Washington has signified that it has no intention of consenting to a change.

Mr. Stevenson's skirmish with the Cuban delegate was one of three that developed in the Assembly today. None of them had anything directly to do with the Bizerte issue.

Tunisia called for a special session as a means of rallying world opinion against France to force her to agree to the principle of evacuating the Bizerte base. The crisis erupted July 19 when France used force to defend her positions in Bizerte against Tunisian demonstrators.

For the fourth day in a row, France boycotted the session on the ground that the dispute was solely one for her and Tunisia to settle. Her refusal to argue her case here has added to the animosity of countries hostile to her. Those allied or friendly with her have also been critical of her attitude.

Tunisia's appeal to all nations to forget their relations with France and the East-West split in the world and concentrate on the merits of the case itself has gone un-

heeded on all sides since the debate began. Today's session furnished the best example of this.

UNITED STATES CHALLENGES SOVIET

After answering Cuba, Mr. Stevenson turned to the Soviet delegation. He challenged Moscow to give the same kind of self-determination to East Germany that the United States has given Puerto Rico. He issued challenge because the Cuban delegate had called Puerto Rico a U.S. colony on which were situated 10 military bases.

Platon D. Morozov, the Soviet delegate, retorted by calling the Puerto Rican regime one of "oppression and enslavement." He repeated his charges that the United States was evading any support for Tunisia because of its friendship for France.

The third skirmish was among Africans. Guinea, which broke from France in 1958 under bitter circumstances, called on all African states to sever their ties with former imperial powers that infringed on their sovereignty.

Telli Diallo, Guinea's spokesman, pointed in particular to military pacts that had been signed by African members of the French Community with France. He called the pacts "pseudo-agreements" that "are a constant threat to our recently acquired sovereignty."

FHA-Type Home-Purchasing Plan Can Aid Latin Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an important editorial on FHA-type home purchasing in its application to Latin nations. I am completely in accord with the program which is outlined in this editorial and I have urged its adoption. It appeared in the Pensacola, Florida, News.

FHA-TYPE HOME PURCHASING PLAN CAN AID LATIN NATIONS

At this time when the United States is proposing so much financial assistance for Latin American nations to improve the status of the underprivileged, it is doubtful if any move would have greater effect than proposals now studied to put decent homes within reach of most residents.

That is the objective of a measure sponsored by Florida's Senator SMATHERS which passed the Senate last week. It is designed to provide FHA-type financing of home purchases in Latin America for low income classes. The ultimate effect should be to encourage greater American investments in those nations for that purpose.

The resolution would earmark $25 million of the $100 million Development Loan Fund to guarantee American private investments in home financing in the undeveloped nations. Since the funds also would be guaranteed by the government of the nation involved the risks to the American Government and to the private investors would be reduced to a desirable level.

In this country low interest FHA home financing plans are accepted as a matter of course and millions of homeowners have been created as a result. But conditions in most Latin nations are quite different. In Mexico, for example, a down payment of 50 percent is customary, with interest rates ranging from 12 to 24 percent. Also few home mortgages are issued for more than 5 years. The result is that almost no low income families are ever in position to buy. They remain tenants with almost no hope of bettering their status.

Introduction and encouragement by the United States of such programs would show the rank and file residents of these nations how American democracy really aids the little man. It should be one of the strongest means of combatting communism in the area where the Reds are making their strongest gains. We must never forget that the man who owns or is buying his home is a stable citizen who will be most reluctant to risk its loss in return for vague promises from Communist agitators.

New Haven (Mo.) Leader Comments on the "Disturbing" Fiscal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I noted the New Haven (Mo.) Leader's article of August 3 which delved into the vitally important question of the Government's fiscal situation. The article, written by James W. Douthat, quite properly labels the situation as "disturbing" and makes the point that added defense spending makes it "all the more imperative to trim nondefense expenditures to the maximum extent possible." Mr. Douthat and the New Haven Leader make a clear and important point, and I should like to insert the article by Mr. Douthat at this point in the RECORD.

PROGRESS ACCOMPLISHED WITH FISCAL SANITY: REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS

(By James W. Douthat)

The Government's fiscal condition can only be described as disturbing.

Spending is soaring for many welfare projects in addition to national defense.

The deficit for the 1961 fiscal year (which ended on June 30) was a startling $3,900 million—and all indications point to a much larger one for the current fiscal year.

No one objects to whatever spending is actually necessary for defense—but everyone has a right to insist that all possible waste in military expenditures be eliminated.

And if it is essential to increase military spending, this makes it all the more imperative to trim nondefense expenditures to the maximum extent possible.

As Representative CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, said a few days ago: "In evaluating urgent national needs the administration must recognize that the only economic progress that will mean anything to the American people is progress accomplished within the framework of fiscal sanity."

The accelerated rate of spending since Mr. Kennedy entered the White House is shown by the fact that the budget submitted by President Eisenhower estimated expenditures for the 1961 fiscal year at $78,900 million—whereas they actually jumped to $81,500 million, a gain of $2,600 million.

President Eisenhower estimated receipts at $79 billion—whereas the actual figure was $77,600 million, a drop of $1,400 million.

There are many who think that the Kennedy policies served to retard business recovery and thereby diminished the amount of tax revenue.

Be that as it may, the $80 million surplus forecast by Mr. Eisenhower turned into a $6,900 million deficit under Mr. Kennedy.

The speed with which the deficit mounted is shown by the fact that on March 28—less than 4 months before the final figures were announced—the Kennedy administration had forecast a $2,200 million deficit, and on June 20—exactly 1 month before the final announcement—Secretary of the Treasury Dillon had predicted that the deficit "will approach $3 billion."

As for the present fiscal year, the official forecast before Mr. Kennedy's defense recommendations to Congress called for a $3,700 million deficit.

But there was no doubt, even before Mr. Kennedy's new recommendations, that the deficit would be considerably higher unless the voters waged a determined campaign against unnecessary spending.

Senator BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, a leading economy advocate for many years, told the Senate recently:

"Existing Federal spending programs, along with those currently under consideration, would increase Federal spending to more than $100 billion a year within the foreseeable future."

COALITION STILL VIGOROUS

Proof that the southern Democratic-northern Republican coalition can still be effective was provided by the House vote which killed President Kennedy's plan to reorganize the procedure of the National Labor Relations Board.

Because of some recent Kennedy victories in Congress—a big percentage of them by close votes—the liberals had sought to create the impression that the coalition was dead and that the President's will was sure to prevail on most things.

The vote against Mr. Kennedy on the NLRB proposal was 231 to 179—with 78 Democrats joining 153 Republicans in opposition. Twelve Republicans joined 167 Democrats in support of the President.

Day Wins Employee Raves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I think that Mary McGrory, of the Evening Star, has done a fine story about Postmaster General J. Edward Day, which appeared in the August 23 issue of that paper.

The Honorable J. Edward Day is doing a great job as Postmaster General of the United States and accomplishing it without hullabaloo and fanfare of trumpets which is quite refreshing from the attitude and position taken by his immediate predecessor.

Mr. Day is an outstanding administrator as is proven by the fact that in choosing his assistants he did so on the basis of their knowledge and experience rather than for any other reason. Those of us who have had an intimate relationship with the Post Office and Civil Service Committees on both sides of the House know the sterling worth of Bill Brawley and Fred Belen. Here are two of the most knowledgeable people in

Washington on subjects dealing with the Post Office. It was refreshing to see them chosen to assist Postmaster General Day in leading a vital Department in our Federal Government.

In the few months Mr. Brawley has served as J. Edward Day's Deputy and Mr. Belen as Assistant Postmaster General in charge of the Bureau of Operations. The wisdom of his selection has been clearly demonstrated.

I am pleased to insert Mary McGrory's excellent article on the Postmaster General:

AFTER 6 MONTHS—DAY WINS EMPLOYEE RAVES

(By Mary McGrory)

J. Edward Day, the crisp and sunny Postmaster General of the United States, pursues a course on the New Frontier that is as solitary and simple as that of a rural letter carrier.

Unlike those who must ponder the effect of a decision of a touchy new African republic or sulky soybean growers, he has but a single concern: The improvement of the mail service.

He sees the President about twice a month. The President mentioned the importance of the postal-rate increase, now pending before Congress, in his Berlin crisis speech; but the mechanics of seeing that the postmen make their appointed rounds, he leaves to Mr. Day, a former life-insurance executive.

Mr. Day is the only cabinet officer who is rereading "Wuthering Heights" these days and writing a novel of his own. He is the only one who is not addicted to the 14-hour working day and who claims to lead a normal family life. He finds he can do his work in the hours between 8:45 in the morning and six at night.

"I used to work in a law firm where the caste symbol was the bulging briefcase carried home at night. I used to think if they were carrying a live mouse in it, it would be dead by morning. I never carried a briefcase," he remarked jovially.

If he differs from his fellows in the cabinet, Mr. Day also differs from his predecessors, mainly portly chaps who also were chairmen of their national committees. Mr. Day, lean of countenance and figure, has no party responsibilities at all. He has failed to get this message across.

"A lot of my time is wasted by a lot of people, who ought to know better, asking me to get them jobs as Federal marshals or regional attorneys for the Labor Department. They just don't believe I can't do it."

QUARTERS ARE AMPLE

Mr. Day's office is the largest of any Cabinet officer's. It is paneled in wood and of a grandeur to satisfy General de Gaulle. He works about half a mile from the door at a clear desk with a clear mind.

Across from his quarters is another baronial hall, where one of his most famous predecessors, James A. Farley, used to make his way among the leather armchairs, patting the shoulders of politicos and inquiring for their Aunt Mames.

Mr. Day hasn't figured out a use for the room, while acknowledging its usefulness to inspire awe in the petitioner.

His only constituents besides the letter-writers of the Nation, who are so far unorganized, are the 580,000 employees of the Postoffice Department, most of whom are clustered in 15 Federal postal unions.

After 6 months of his "open door" policy he is drawing rave notices. William Doherty, the head of the Letter Carriers Union, said recently in a Dayton speech: "For the first time in many, many years, we are able to work with the Department as partners instead of having to cool our heels in unfriendly anterooms waiting for a few crumbs of comfort to fall from the tables of the mighty."

TREND REVERSER

Mr. Doherty is the author of a book called "Mailman, U.S.A.," which devotes several searing chapters to the previous Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, who he suggests enjoyed as much love and affection from the postal workers as Ezra Taft Benson got from the farmers.

Mr. Day has concentrated in his first 6 months on building up friendliness, warmth, and enthusiasm in the department in reversing certain trends started by the publicity-conscious Mr. Summerfield.

"There was too much ballyhoo about postoffice equipment and automation and too many announcements about sending mail by rocket and coaxial cables."

Mr. Day also insisted on putting in his own men as the 15 regional directors of the postal system. He confers with them by network conference telephone every Wednesday afternoon. He recently completed a 40,000-mile tour of 40 major postoffices, where he put to the employees such pertinent questions as whether they liked to pace a mail-sorting machine or preferred to have it pace them. He tried to discourage everybody from calling him general.

Mr. Day has made considerable impression on Capitol Hill as a witness, a role well-suited to one with his appetite for comparative statistics. But he has fared less well as an advocate. His postal rate increase bill is about as popular as the 5-year term foreign aid program and Chairman JOHNSTON of South Carolina of the Senate Postoffice Committee has set his face against it.

"I have differences with Mr. JOHNSTON, but no antagonisms," said Mr. Day.

Mr. Day's introduction of the merit system, whereby men from within the ranks are promoted to supervisory posts on recommendation of a selection board has rendered him something less than a hero with patronage hungry Congressmen. He is quite stoical about their compalints. He warned every one at the beginning that he would run the postoffice.

HAS ANSWER FOR HECKLERS

He does not appreciate hecklers who point out the superior glories of the European mail system, which still has two deliveries a day.

"The New York City Post Office handles more mail in a day than the entire British Postal System," he says firmly. "And the New York City Post Office hasn't had a new building in 30 years."

Why Does U.S. Rail Equipment, Synthetic Rubber, and Chemicals Go Behind the Iron Curtain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when it is realized that there are millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who hope for the day when they can be freed from communistic dictatorship, it seems logical to encourage them in every possible way to take whatever action is in their power to speed that day. Under certain circumstances and by certain means it might be well to utilize ways and means to keep them alive and healthy, so long as they know it is help to them, from freemen who want to share with them their freedom. This takes a skillful bit of doing. But it is not an impossibility. At the same time, the quickest way to dash forever the hopes of these people and eliminate their considerable power for the cause of ridding the world of communism, is to indulge in activities of help to the Communist dictatorship.

In this frame of reference, the Kennedy administration has a lot of explaining left to do relative to its trade policies with Communist countries. If it cannot come up with satisfactory explanations, and I doubt that it can, these policies should be swiftly revised.

The following editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram succinctly reiterates this caution:

TRADE WITH THE ENEMY?

President Kennedy has decided that it wouldn't look very nice to open aerial commerce between New York and Moscow at a time when the Soviets are busy sealing off East Berlin from the West.

The agreement to open up a New York-Moscow airline will go unsigned for the time being "because of the tense international situation."

This is a significant but comparatively mild sanction. If the United States really wants to show its displeasure with Soviet conduct, the commerce already taking place offers the opportunity.

This country sends a constant flow of goods into Communist lands, and if material presently licensed for shipping is actually shipped, the flow will increase enormously.

In the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's hard-hitting speech outlining the Berlin crisis and stressing the sacrifices required to meet the crisis, the volume of American goods licensed for shipment to countries behind the Iron Curtain increased more than 800 percent.

Goods which helped account for the increase included: rail equipment for Bulgaria; synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; industrial instruments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany.

Theoretically, American export regulations prevent shipping to the Soviet bloc materials which would increase the ability of the Reds to wage war.

Is anybody so stupid as to believe that rail equipment, synthetic rubber, and industrial chemicals have no bearing, directly or indirectly, on the warmaking potential of the Soviet bloc?

Secretary of Commerce Hodges said in an interview on August 8:

"I think the whole tempo and temper of our people in the last 6 or 8 weeks has changed toward the question of any kind of trade with Russia."

We believe he has assessed the American temper accurately. Many Americans are beginning to wonder whether it makes sense to increase the strength of the power which threatens their own survival.

There Is Danger in a Faulty Analysis of Power of Communist-Dominated People To Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the danger we face in the United States by the

wrong analysis of communism and its many facets, is made too clear in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune. It is seldom I disagree with the editorial content of the Tribune because I have found the editorial writers on this newspaper to be fairly sound in their judgment. However, I do disagree in this instance, and because I believe it is important to make a point, I include the editorial and my reasons for disagreement as a part of the RECORD.

It is wishful thinking to embrace the idea that maybe the East Germans will revolt if the Communists are successful in their present efforts to tighten the bonds of slavery in that area and that such revolt will spread to other Communist-controlled nations. History proves such a theory is a fallacy. People under Communist control cannot revolt because, unlike the French in Algeria—which the editorial points up—the Russian Communists are absolutely ruthless in suppressing any opposition. Having no moral code, the Communists place no value on human lives and meet any opposition by the complete elimination of those who rise up. Witness the brutal and ruthless extermination of the people of Hungary, the many programs and blood baths in Russia itself. Once the Communists have complete control the chance for revolution is past because it will be suppressed even if it means wiping out a whole people.

The only way we can prevent the ultimate victory of the Communists in taking over complete world domination is to prevent the enslavement of any more people, to breach the Iron Curtain, and to help those who seek freedom to regain it.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

IF KHRUSHCHEV GETS BERLIN

We wonder if any of our diplomats has ever bothered to suggest to Mr. Khrushchev that if he gets West Berlin he may have to deal with something even more disagreeable than a bone in his throat.

Take Algeria, for purposes of comparison. Algeria is a backward country with little industry compared with France and a native population that lags far behind the French in numbers, literacy, national consciousness, education, wealth, and pretty nearly everything else. Yet after many years of savage repression, the Algerians have remained in active, armed revolt. They have sustained their rebellion despite the presence at times in their country of something like half a million French troops equipped with tanks, planes, helicopters, parachute battalions, and all the rest of the stuff that a modern army is supposed to have, including firing squads.

To be sure, Algeria isn't Germany. In area it is 20 times the size of East Germany and in population not much more than half as big. In subduing a disaffected Berlin, the Russians could concentrate their forces in a small area but by this very act of repression they might also arouse latent rebellion throughout East Germany.

If the Russian formula—Berlin, a nominally free city in the midst of a recognized East Germany—is accepted, there will be no barrier between the two halves of the city. That can only impose on the Russians the necessity of subduing something like a million and a half West Berliners who will surely be thoroughly discontented. Many of them will be determined to resist.

The hatred of the Algerian rebels for the French is surely no stronger than the hatred of the West Berliners for the Ulbricht regime. The inherent capacity of the Berliners to organize underground resistance and provide it with arms is superior to that of the Algerians. The West German government is not going to guard the border zealously against smugglers supplying arms to blood brethren, and the longer the guerrilla action continues, the less reliable the East German police and militia are likely to become.

Khrushchev might retaliate by exiling Berliners by the hundreds of thousands, but it will be difficult to do this wholesale job in a few weeks or months. Meanwhile, the more severe the repression he attempts, the more determined the resistance is likely to become and the more widely it will spread in East Germany. Equally important, if Berlin is depopulated it will lose its great value to the Communists as a source of manufactured goods of many kinds.

No one can say, of course, that if Khrushchev gets Berlin all these results will follow, but there is plenty of precedent for them and they are well within the possibilities.

A prolonged resistance in Berlin will serve as an inspiration for similar action in Prague, Budapest, Warsaw, and other captive capitals. Anyone who has read European history is aware that once a revolutionary wave starts anywhere in western Europe, it is likely to spread from nation to nation. Mr. Khrushchev may find that instead of having one bone in his throat he has half a dozen, and that instead of merely annoying him, they are choking him.

A College Professor Looks at Russian Roulette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking letter to the editor appeared on August 22 on the editorial page of the New York Times. It was written by a distinguished professor at Wilkes College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Dr. Harold W. Thatcher. I commend Dr. Thatcher's provocative letter to the attention of my colleagues and include it here under leave to extend my remarks:

FACING THE BERLIN CRISIS—WILLINGNESS TO NEGOTIATE HELD TO BE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As the Berlin crisis deepens, with no sign on the part of the West of a willingness to yield an inch, those citizens who give serious thought to the situation cannot but be oppressed with a sense of gloom and impending doom. It seems inconceivable that mankind, whose brains have wrought such miracles in unraveling the mysteries of nature as well as in many other areas, has not the imagination or just plain commonsense to avoid mass suicide. Yet the trend of events compels one to accept the conclusion that this is probably true.

The United States since World War II has displayed a penchant for choosing last-ditch issues and positions which it will defend to the death rather than yield those which are not only most illogical but most indefensible militarily, such as Berlin and Quemoy and Matsu.

Under the present circumstances, insistence on the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin, with the lives of all humanity possibly at stake, is not only unstatesmanlike but inconsistent. We do not, for example, accept the status quo in the satellite countries as unchangeable.

PROPOSALS OFFERED

If the Germans, who a quarter of a century ago were the greatest threat to human freedom, have since become such a bulwark of human freedom that their own freedom must be defended even at the risk of the suicide of humanity, there are many ways in which this can be accomplished without merely standing pat. Probably the best solution would be the demilitarization and neutralization of a wide area in central Europe, including Germany and some of the satellite states, as envisaged in the Rapacki-Eden plans or as suggested in somewhat different form by James Warburg.

Another possible solution would be to make Berlin, or even only West Berlin, a free city occupied by United Nations troops. In such a case the people of West Berlin would be just as free as they are now. They could be just as well defended by United Nations troops as by the troops of France, England, and the United States. In neither case could they be successfully defended if the Russians launched an all-out military attack.

As for the unity of Germany, this is not necessarily a sine quo non. It is very doubtful that our allies, many of whose statesmen have lived through two most destructive wars caused directly or indirectly by German militarism, would really welcome a reunified and rearmed Germany. As for the Germans as individuals, let it be remembered that the golden age of German culture occurred, not when Germany was unified, but when it was divided, not in 2, but in 200 or more component parts. We of the West, with our emphasis on the sanctity of the individual, are in no position to argue that national unity is more important than the happiness of the individual.

CHALLENGE TO STATESMEN

The present crisis presents the gravest challenge to our statesmen. To strike a swashbuckling attitude by merely standing pat, daring the enemy to knock the chip off our shoulder, will, of course, win the plaudits of the unthinking multitude in the West. There must be leaders among us, however, who are capable of taking the more courageous, though less popular, course of willingness to negotiate everything except bedrock principles.

If we must fix a point at which we will be compelled to use military force, let it be that at which the Russians move military forces across the borders of a free nation. Everything else can be handled better by nonmilitary than by military means. If, however, we persist in playing chicken or Russian roulette over the Berlin crisis, with the lives of all humanity at stake, then our diplomacy is indeed bankrupt.

HAROLD W. THATCHER.

FORTY FORT, PA., *August 12, 1961.*

Communicating With People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the battle in the cold war is not only being

fought with economic weapons, in diplomatic arenas, but in an extremely important sense, it is fought in the propaganda arena.

Speaking frankly, I believe that we would all agree that our efforts to counteract Soviet propaganda and display the virtues of our American way of life have been woefully inadequate and unimaginative.

Mr. Speaker, with this thought in mind I place in the RECORD an article which thoroughly and effectively discusses the basic problem of U.S. efforts in the field of international public relations. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Thursday, August 24, and in other newspapers throughout the country. It was written by David Lawrence and was based on his observations during a recent European tour. I insert into the RECORD this article entitled "Communicating With People":

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether, a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well thought out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The oversea broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But, above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called "the public relations of the United States."

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free-enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by shortwave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist-bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the oversea service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes sophistication. Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts, which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio than the phraseology and big words of overcondensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the Midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communication in foreign policy needs a new look.

Outstanding Newsweek Article Details Cuban Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a very fine article is included in the August 28 issue of Newsweek magazine which I call to the attention of the Members, dealing with the Cuban refugee situation in Miami, Fla.

This article poignantly describes the harsh realities of life facing these desperate, freedom-loving people who have abandoned their family ties and tradition, their possessions, their fortunes in Communist-infected Cuba to find refuge, freedom, and a semblance of security and peace of mind in this country, particularly in south Florida.

I am proud of the selfless, humanitarian manner in which Miamians, with the cooperation of local and Federal governmental officials, religious, civic, and private voluntary organizations, have reacted to relieve the deprivation of these Cuban refugees in terms of food, clothing, shelter, and employment opportunities.

I commend the editors of Newsweek magazine for giving recognition to this heartrending situation which exists primarily in south Florida, but which is in reality a source of interest and concern for all Americans in all of our 50 States.

The article follows:

THE AGONIZING WAIT—THEN THE HARD REALITIES OF A REFUGEE'S LIFE

It has become a twice-a-day ritual. At 2 o'clock every afternoon, at 7 o'clock every evening, a great crowd gathers on the observation deck of Miami's gleaming International Airport. Excitement runs through it like wind through a field of sugarcane as the big Pan American DC–7 appears in the sky, from the direction of Cuba.

There is a moment of tension as the plane taxis to a stop, before its doors open. Will the expected loved one be aboard or not? Nobody can be sure. Perhaps there has been some last-minute hitch, perhaps a sudden arrest. Some in the waiting crowd are biting their nails—like Rosenda Fernandez Larrea, a pharmacist who fled Havana early this month and is now waiting anxiously for his 12-year-old twin sons. Larrea spoke bitterly last week to Newsweek's Karl Fleming. "The Communists were going to send them to a Red youth camp," he said.

As the passengers appear at the head of the ramp, each staring hopefully upward toward the airport observation deck, little knots of people in the crowd erupt into cheers and shouts, frantic waving, sometimes laughter, sometimes tears. Pharmacist Larrea spots his twin sons and is beside himself with joy.

Others wait in silence until the last of the 120-odd passengers has come down the ramp; they wait a little longer, clinging to hope, then finally turn away with downcast eyes. But they will be back for the next incoming flight. And the next, and the next.

Meanwhile, the lucky ones who have espied relatives and friends are pressing around the customs office door. For the next 3 hours, at intervals of about 5 minutes, the door opens and another new arrival is met with a flood of wild embraces. Then the newcomer is borne off, still on a tide of emotional exuberance—to face the harsh realities of the life that awaits him, a penniless and almost possessionless stranger, in a foreign city.

And yet the Miami that most of the Cubans enter—the teeming, crumbling downtown section that sprawls over 5 square miles—will scarcely seem foreign to them. Rather, it is a city foreign to Americans themselves that has mushroomed in the heart of Miami, a city now of about 50,000 people (compared with Miami's population of 300,000), a city whose shops and restaurants and movies reflect a Spanish-speaking populace with its own way of life. It is a city literally bursting at the seams, with as many as three or four families living in a one-bedroom apartment. The problem of coping with its needs—particularly with schooling for its thousands of children—has become almost too much for Miami and Dade County authorities, even with liberal dishings of Federal aid. Yet, despite their

crowded living conditions, their hand-to-mouth sustenance, the Cubans have created surprisingly few problems. Not one refugee has been involved in a major crime in Dade County, which has long blushed at one of the highest crime rates in the Nation.

SOLID CITIZENS

The brighter aspects of the refugee picture are undoubtedly due to the fact that the great majority of the newcomers continue to be—as they have been since the true pattern of the Castro regime first became clear—the island's most solid citizens—well educated, well mannered, business and professional people from the middle- and upper-income brackets; people of character, too, cheerfully undertaking the most menial of unaccustomed labor rather than continuing to accept relief. (Many, in fact, have returned their relief checks after finding work. Repayments, as of this week, were flowing into the Miami Cuban refugee center at the rate of $10,000 a month.)

Practically all of those who arrive by plane belong to the middle-upper group, though in recent weeks refugees of a different type have been coming in growing numbers to Florida's shores by boat—fishermen, farmers, day laborers, who with wives and children have been crossing the 90 miles of water between Cuba and the Florida Keys in small, often dry-rotted craft. Last week the largest such single group so far put in at Marathon in the Keys: 37 of them, including a number of small children and pregnant women, jammed into a 27-foot fishing boat.

The boat-borne refugees differ in another way from those pouring in by plane. They are strictly illegal entrants, and their right to stay depends on the granting of asylum. Few of them have friends or relatives waiting to help. For the most part, once they arrive at the city within a city, they are consigned to places like the Tamiami Hotel—once the crummiest of Skid Row fleabags—now an emergency shelter. There they can stay with no questions asked until other arrangements are made.

ORDEAL

In a second-floor room of the Tamiami one day last week, a Cuban girl of 18 sat on a bed beside a baby, fat and sleeping, of 11 months. She wore a man's green shirt, black silk skirt, a man's socks, no shoes. She and the baby and seven others had arrived in Key West the night before after 4 days and 3 nights at sea—the motor of their 18-foot boat had conked out and they were towed in by a passing tanker.

Why had she and the others fled against such odds? The girl shrugged. Food in Cuba was getting scarce and vigilante committees were spying on everyone. Her husband thought it was time to get out.

And where was her husband now? The girl shrugged. "Opa-Locka." The name Opa-Locka has come to take on a major significance, especially to these new refugees. It is a former airbase, 8 miles outside of Miami, where newcomers who cannot give satisfactory accounts of their backgrounds are taken for questioning, which often lasts several days. Undoubtedly, such detention works hardships; but the possibility of Fidel Castro's agents being among the boat-borne raggle-taggle makes careful questioning essential.

Otherwise, though, life in the city within a city has taken on a norm of its own. In the supermarkets, signs are printed in Spanish and English, or Spanish alone. Grocers deal mostly in rice and black beans. Butchers have hired Cubans to cut the meat Cuban style. Drugstores sell various herb derivatives and "Florida water," a 75 percent alcohol lotion which Cuban women favor as perfume. Purely Cuban restaurants have sprouted all over, as have Cuban catering services that send daily dinners of chicken and rice to crowded apartments for $8 a week.

LATE AND LOUD

Their city has its gaieties, too, though cheap ones. Record shops are doing a boom business in Latin disks and music emanates from apartment windows far into the night. Also far into the night run the street corner gatherings, orderly enough but decidedly noisy. "They haven't given us much trouble," says Miami's assistant police chief, leathery Jim Youell, "but they are quite loud and they will stay up to the wee hours arguing and playing those damn radios and phonographs."

Ironically, it is the devout majority of the refugees that creates one of the big problems: The city's Catholic churches are literally overrun by newly arrived worshipers. At the Gesu Catholic Church on First Avenue, the 11:30 a.m. mass last Sunday was attended by 1,800 persons, almost all Cubans, although seating space is for 1,400 only. Its pastor, Father John Sweeney, said that Sunday masses have been increased to 8 and draw close to 7,000 people; 3 priests now hear confessions in Spanish.

Schooling is about to present a far greater problem. The public schools of Dade County are bracing themselves to enroll an expected 8,500 Cuban pupils when classes begin in September.

Aside from accommodation, the big question is language. The present plan, says Joe Hall, peppery superintendent of Dade County schools, is to proceed as last year, teaching entirely in English and using English textbooks only. But Hall concedes that where the percentage of Cubans is high, "we may have to make some adjustments, maybe dividing the students into American classes and Cuban classes and then teaching the Cubans in Spanish."

Inevitably, all of these problems get worse every day as the planeloads—and boatloads—continue to pour in. Very few of the refugees can be persuaded to move out of Dade County, in spite of U.S. efforts to scatter them across the country. Actually, some 6,000 have been resettled in other States—but that doesn't mean much when another 6,000 are arriving every month.

"These people," says Director Marshall Wise of the refugee center, "are different from any refugees in history. Historically, refugees have fled from oppression at home to new countries of asylum where they could start new lives. They burned their bridges behind them. But the Cubans are not here to start new lives. They look upon themselves as temporary exiles. Their every hope, their every desire, is to get Castro out and return to Cuba. They want to stay here in Miami, ready to return the minute Castro cracks."

The Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York State Bar Journal of August 1961.

Judge Halpern illustrates points of legal possibility which are of concern to us all and should stimulate our thinking in the area of world peace through world law.

The article follows:

THE RULE OF LAW

(By Philip Halpern)

(We hear much of "world peace through world law" today. Judge Halpern's address at the Buffalo School of Law, which is here reprinted from the New York Law Journal of July 5, 1961, merits the attention of all New York lawyers interested in the law as an instrument for world peace.)

In its primary sense, the rule of law means the replacement of violence by law. It means the setting up of legal machinery to settle disputes, to adjust conflicting claims, to punish wrongs and to redress grievances. The rule of law prohibits private self-help and private vengeance with their accompanying violence and disorder. The law imposes those wise restraints which make men free. This function of the rule of law, while prosaic, is an important one. It maintains that state of peace and order which makes social and economic progress possible.

However, in modern times, throughout the free world, the term "rule of law" has acquired a broader and deeper significance. It means a system of law which has, as its principal objective, the advancement of the interests of the individual and the protection of the citizen against arbitrary governmental action. The rule of law is based upon the concepts of human dignity and individual freedom which are the fundamental assumptions of our society. The rule of law recognizes the ethical equality of all persons entitling every person to equality before the law and to equal justice under law.

The rule of law thus broadly conceived has its impact upon all three departments of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

As applied to the action of the executive department, the rule of law means that government officials may act only in accordance with duly enacted law, and that, where discretion is vested in them, they must exercise it fairly and impartially. The rights, duties, and responsibilities of the citizen must be prescribed by law and must not be subject to enlargement or contraction at the whim of governmental officials. This is summed up in the phrase in the Massachusetts constitution that ours is a "government of laws and not of men." This concept of the rule of law goes back to the courageous statement of Lord Coke to King James the First that, while the king is under no man, he is under God and under the law.

In its application to the legislative department of government, the rule of law means that legislative power is limited by basic inhibitions embodied in the constitution. Here, the American concept of the rule of law is a distinctive one. In England and in many other constitutional democracies the Parliament is supreme and the observance of fundamental constitutional principles is intrusted to the Parliament's own sense of what is constitutional, in the light of the tradition which binds the conscience of its members. In the United States the power to determine the constitutionality of legislation is vested in the courts. The doctrine of judicial supremacy, now an accepted part of our concept of the rule of law, has had an enormous impact upon the development of our country. There was a period when the U.S. Supreme Court, in the exercise of the power to invalidate legislation, blocked economic and social regulation which the majority of Congress believed to be required in the public interest, but the excesses of that period have passed and legislative freedom in the area of economic and social regulation is now generally recognized. It is in the field of civil liberties that the doctrine of judicial supremacy has made its greatest contribution. Freedom of speech and the

press, freedom of religion, freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, freedom from discrimination—all these freedoms have been given vitality by the alertness of the courts in striking down any invasions or infringements either by the legislative or executive departments. While the basic principle of our Government is rule by the majority, the limitations imposed by the Constitution and enforced by the courts safeguard the rights of minorities against the tyranny of transitory majorities.

The way in which the rule of law safeguards the rights of the individual is best evidenced by the familiar regulations governing criminal prosecutions—all designed to assure fairplay to the person accused of crime and to protect him against the possibility of oppression by governmental authority. Under the rule of law, every person is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. He has the right to be informed of the nature of the charge against him, the right to be confronted by his accusers, the right to counsel of his own choosing, the right not to be compelled to be a witness against himself, and the right to a public trial by a jury of his peers. In civil proceedings, too, every person is entitled to a fair hearing before an independent and impartial tribunal in the determination of his rights and obligations.

It is self-evident that, if the rule of law is to function effectively, the judicial department of government must be manned by able, courageous and impartial judicial officers. But judges do not function alone. The work of the courts is, in Bentham's phrase, that of "judges and company;" the words "and company" refer to the lawyers. Under our adversary system of litigation, the implementation of the rule of law depends upon the work of the advocate. As Justice Jackson has said, all our civil liberties are only "paper" rights until some able and courageous lawyer stands up in court and gives them reality. The bar recognizes that it is the duty of the lawyer to take unpopular as well as popular cases. This includes the case of the person who is charged with a crime against which public emotion may run high. The bar also recognizes that it is its duty to provide counsel, without compensation, for indigent persons accused of crime; the rich and the poor alike are entitled to be represented by counsel. In this way all persons are assured of "equal justice under law."

The rule of law so conceived and so enforced has advanced and protected the rights of the individual in this country to a degree equaled in very few countries and surpassed in none.

The rule of law as conceived throughout the free world is based upon certain fundamental moral premises, sometimes expressed in a written document like the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, sometimes left unexpressed but nevertheless all pervasive. These fundamental moral principles are sometimes stated in religious terms in accordance with the teachings of the world's greatest religions; sometimes they are stated in secular terms as fundamental human rights derived from the inherent nature of man, as in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These principles set up minimum moral standards with which any system of law must comply if it is to be regarded by civilized men as representing a true rule of law. Without this moral base, law may become an instrument of tyranny and, as experience in the last few decades has demonstrated, it may become the means of depriving the members of a minority of all human rights and, ultimately, depriving them of life itself. As a result of this recent experience there has been a great increase of emphasis among lawyers and legal philosophers upon the moral element in law. So we find Professor Wechsler saying at the 1955 Harvard Symposium on Government under Law, that all the participants were "united in belief in norms of right and justice that transcend positive law, yielding criteria by which all government and law may properly be judged."

The concept of the rule of law, as it prevails in the western world, is very different from that prevailing behind the Iron Curtain. The difference grows out of a fundamental difference between our view and theirs as to the nature and function of government. We regard government as an instrument for the advancement of the welfare of the individual, whereas the Communist concept is that the individual exists for the service and aggrandizement of the state. Freedom of dissent and freedom of public criticism of governmental activities are incompatible with the monolithic Soviet society. Personal freedom cannot be countenanced by a totalitarian dictatorship.

In the discussions in the United Nations, as might naturally be expected, the emphasis by the delegates of the Soviet Union has been upon equality rather than freedom. It is possible to have equality in a society which has very little freedom, since all the members of it may equally be deprived of their freedom. Theirs is the equality of the inmates of a prison. Even on the score of equality, there are striking examples in the Soviet Union of the application of the principle satirized in Orwell's "Animal Farm," where it was declared that all animals were equal but that some were more equal than others.

It is idle to talk about the rule of law in a closed society like that of the Soviet Union. An independent judge vested with power to declare executive or legislative action invalid is obviously unthinkable in that kind of society. A true rule of law in the Soviet Union can come about only with a complete change in the nature of the society.

There has been an effort in recent years to apply the concept of the rule of law to the promotion of social and economic interests, as well as to the protection of civil liberties and political rights. The demand for such an extension has come from the underdeveloped countries in which the struggle to reach a bare subsistence level occupies the interest and concern of the people to the exclusion of everything else. Thus, the final resolution adopted by the Congress on the Rule of Law, held at New Delhi, India, in 1959, proclaimed that "the rule of law is a dynamic concept * * * which should be employed not only to safeguard and advance the civil and political rights of the individual in a free society, but also to establish social, economic, educational and cultural conditions under which his legitimate aspirations and dignity may be realized." We may well sympathize with this movement to expand the concept of the rule of law, but I think it is a mistake to so dilute the concept as to deprive it of all specific meaning and to make it an all-embracing synonym for all the social, economic and cultural aspirations of the people. The rule of law, as it has historically developed in the western tradition, has a tremendous significance and great value in the protection of the rights of the individual. We ought not to risk the loss of that significance and value by trying to bring within its coverage the wholly different problems of the social and economic development of the underdeveloped peoples. Those are social welfare problems which are better dealt with, according to our view, by expanding programs of economic aid and technical assistance rather than by trying to stretch the concept of the rule of law to embrace them.

There has also been an effort in recent years to apply the concept of the rule of law to relations between nations. A beginning has been made in the United Nations. Under the United Nations Charter, aggression is forbidden and the use of force to settle international disputes, except in self-defense, is renounced. But the U.N. is not a superstate and does not have the power of a superstate. Because of the inherent limitations and weaknesses of the U.N., some students of the subject have advocated a stronger organization, under the banner of "World Peace Through World Law." They argue that world peace can be attained by the rule of law in the same way in which domestic peace has been assured by it. But the rule of law in domestic affairs is part of the functioning of a sovereign government. The establishment of an equivalent system in international affairs would require the creation of a world government, vested with legislative or policymaking power to settle conflicts of national interest and with the executive power and military means to enforce its decisions. In order to assure peace with freedom and justice, the sovereign authority would have to be given not only the power to resist aggression but also the power to deal with the underlying economic social and political causes which may lead to armed conflict. A world rule of law in this sense is a dream for the distant future; the world is far from ready for it.

As Sir Hartley Shawcross has said, if we wish to deal with this problem in terms of slogans, the slogan should be "World Law After World Peace" rather than "World Peace Through World Law." Only after the cold war between the East and West has been terminated, and mutual trust has been established, can we seriously consider the organization of a world society based upon the rule of law. And this precondition cannot be brought about until the forces of international communism abandon their aim to conquer the world. If and when that should occur, we could undertake the extension of the rule of law throughout the world, not only in its primary sense of replacing violence by peaceful processes, but also in its broader sense of protecting the rights of the individual against the action of his own government.

As we celebrate the achievements and value of the rule of law we should also remind ourselves of its limitations. As Justice Jackson pointed out after his return from Nuremberg, the experience of Nazi Germany demonstrated that there are inherent limitations upon the power of the courts. Justice Jackson said: "I know of no modern instance in which any judiciary has saved a whole people from the great currents of intolerance, passion, usurpation, and tyranny which have threatened liberty and free institutions." He joined Judge Learned Hand and John Lord O'Brian in preaching to the people with the eloquence of the ancient prophets that the responsibility was ultimately theirs and that no court could save their liberties if the people themselves did not value them highly enough to place them first in their scale of values. If the people placed ahead of freedom other values such as economic security, the comforts of life or peace at any price—then freedom would be lost. Unless the people of this country dedicate themselves wholeheartedly to the ideal of freedom, the rule of law cannot save their freedom for them and, indeed, the rule of law itself cannot survive.

Anti-Communist Instruction for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Herald Express recently carried

an editorial cartoon of particular significance. It showed a bombastic character labeled "Leftwing American Strategists," snatching out of the hands of an American soldier a document entitled "What Communism Is and How To Fight It." The cartoon was titled "Yours Not To Reason Why, Yours But To Do and Die."

The editorial accompanying the cartoon read as follows:

MUZZLING THE SERVICES

Perhaps one of the greatest shocks to the people of this Nation in peacetime was the order to commanders of military services which has practically shut their mouths against attempting to imbue their troops with patriotism and knowledge of the enemy, communism.

Imagine what would have happened if such an order had been issued while our fighting men were engaged in the First World War against Germany, or the Second World War against Germany and Japan.

It is all right to say, we are not at war now, but we are right on the doorstep, and the American people should know more about the present enemy who has threatened to "bury" us and to annihilate 140 million people.

And yet the troops who will have to do the fighting if war actually comes have been denied the privilege of having leaders or lecturers tell the truth about the enemy they must fight.

Who is responsible for this order?

According to dispatches from Washington, the roots lie in what is referred to as a memorandum from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

In this memorandum, Senator FULBRIGHT objected to military sponsorship of public forums featuring what he referred to as "radical rightwing speakers." No reference was made to "radical leftwing speakers."

Subsequently, there was a Defense Department directive on the subject.

All over the country, this chilling influence is now being felt in the services. Generals, admirals, captains, colonels, and those of even lower rank are afraid to open their mouths for fear of being disciplined from the very top.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, is hotly critical, referring to this insidious memo as attacking efforts of military leaders "to give American citizens the facts about communism and the cold war."

Senator THURMOND has charged that Communists originated an "anti-anti-Communist campaign subtly concealed behind a nonexistent conflict between civil authority and military leadership."

He said the campaign is focused principally "in an attack on our military leaders."

The South Carolina Senator also declared that "there is specific evidence that attempts to create the impression that this administration wants anticommunism soft-pedaled have borne fruit."

He added that he certainly did not believe either the President or responsible officials in the administration want anticommunism soft-pedaled.

But he also charged that "this censorship of military men's speeches spills over to the point where it allows no criticism of any Marxist-Socialist-Communist theories or practices."

Just where does this leave the common, ordinary citizens of America? At the least, it leaves most in a state of utter confusion.

It leaves before them a frightening question as to the future of this country.

At about the same time the Herald-Express ran the above items, the Long Beach Press-Telegram ran a letter to the editor along much the same lines. It reads as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HITTING ENEMY?

EDITOR:

President Kennedy should instruct the Department of Defense to initiate forceful anti-Communist programs and cease from subjecting patriotic Americans to harassment, censorship, and disgrace, as for instance, Major General Walker and Admiral Burke.

It seems now to be becoming popular in the National Government to investigate and censure military men who have any words of warning to say about Communist influences in American life.

Men who have fought in wars must wonder what kind of struggle we are waging when it becomes a censurable offense to discuss the tactics of the enemy.

Even though our peril is so great, we find a situation developing where military commanders are in danger of being charged with rightwing political theories if they have the temerity to call attention to our danger and point out the methods used by our enemies.

We are counting on the President to help save our country and shall be praying for his wisdom and guidance.

IDAH K. JENSEN.

The disturbing thing both the Herald and Mrs. Jensen hint at but do not discuss in detail is that not only do people in the armed services need basic instruction in what communism is and how to fight it, but Americans generally. Both anti-Communists and anti-anti-Communists tend to intermix politico-socio-economic issues legitimately within the framework of American political action with the question of communism.

By way of extreme examples it works this way: The anti-Communist properly denounces communism and seeks to fight it; he also holds strong beliefs about keeping the private enterprise system uncontaminated by such things as say, social security; although he may not intend it, soon his listeners are gaining the impression he is labeling "social security" as "communism" and anybody that is for it is a Communist. Then along comes the anti-anti-Communist. He is for social security; although he may not intend it, soon his listeners are gaining the impression that anybody against social security is some kind of a nut and therefore anybody that is against communism must also be some kind of a nut.

I repeat that the foregoing example is extreme, but it illustrates the point, many who may be on either side of this issue understand the nature and danger of communism so vaguely, at least, in relation to what is not involved and what is involved, that the business of how to get on with disposing of the challenge to freedom gets obscured by the resulting oratorical smog. And it is precisely this, meeting and disposing of the challenge, that is our vital business today. Muzzling the services under the drooping banner of anti-anticommunism only serves dangerously to gum up that business. Mixing up a lot of non-anti-Communist issues with legitimate anti-communism merely gums it up in another way.

What we really need, and what thus far our Government and even our schools have failed in great part to supply, is a nationwide education program which deal sensibly and understandably with just what communism is and just how to fight it, without mixing it up with anything else.

And we must never forget, that the job of fighting it successfully is one which requires mobilization of the spirit and efforts of every American in Government service and in private life. It seems to me that Mr. Kennedy should dramatically fuze this country's effort together to do this job. A good way to start would be to require every person on the Government payroll, from himself on down, to satisfactorily pass a good course in "What Communism Is—and How to Fight It" before he can draw his paycheck.

Midway in Jet Age Is Like Ghost Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, August 23, 1961, the House passed House Resolution 420, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the problems involved in, and the measures to minimize or eliminate, aircraft noise nuisances and hazards to persons and property on the ground.

During the discussion of this resolution, great emphasis was made of the complaints registered by residents in the area of an airport about the effects of the jet age on their daily lives.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared on the front page of today's Chicago Tribune concerning the economic problem developing at Chicago's Midway Airport, also the effects on thousands of families and businesses in the area once considered the world's busiest air terminal.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the existing problems that face the residents within the area of Midway Airport as explained in the following article:

MIDWAY IN JET AGE IS LIKE GHOST TOWN

Chicago's Midway Airport, 8 miles southwest of the Loop, and for almost 20 years the world's busiest air terminal, has lost its crown.

The jets, with their demands for enormous runway lengths, have passed it by. Today the activity that once concentrated at Midway has shifted over to the still developing O'Hare complex west of Park Ridge.

Out at Midway every phase of the field's operations has changed radically.

CLEAN BUT EMPTY

The temporary terminal that withstood the ravages of a million passengers a year right through the 1950's although it was to have been torn down and completely rebuilt in 1947) has attributes of a ghost town.

However, the corridors are clean and polished. The snack bars and restaurants now have plenty of seats and elbowroom, whereas only 20 months ago customers often stood three deep in the postmidnight hours.

The parking lot is only half full these days.

Out on the airplane aprons at the passenger loading gates, the scene is even more desolate.

NO MORE WAITING

Until recently, the 54 gates at Midway were stacked constantly with 4-engined propeller-driven aircraft, then queens of their fleets.

Arriving planes often would sit with engines turning on parking runways for 40 to 50 minutes, waiting their turns to pull in and discharge their passengers.

Now, even at the so-called peak hours of noon, 5 p.m. and 8 p.m., there is no waiting. In fact, the airline ramp chiefs say, there are always two or three gates for each plane, arriving or departing. The crews no longer are dodging through a maze of whirling propellers to give service to airplanes.

Up in the Midway control tower, which was known the world around as the most hectic spot for controllers, the tension is gone. The experts there, who once were able to keep a stream of planes separated safely for simultaneous landings on two runways—as many as 150 movements an hour—are grateful for even a small private machine to enter their control area.

"We're running an old ladies' home," one of them said.

The change has extended beyond the airport boundaries. The nearby motels, hotels, restaurants, bars, service stations, and parking lots are suffering a lack of business, too. Proprietors are singing the economic blues.

A DIFFERENT ATTITUDE

Effects also extend to thousands of families whose homes are nearby. Many wage earners depended directly on airport jobs or on businesses associated with airport activities. Many who worked for airlines or service groups at Midway are being transferred to O'Hare field and their families are talking of moving north, too.

Alderman John Egan (13th), who for years was in the midst of the turmoil caused by homeowners objecting to noise, low aircraft, and other airport nuisance gripes, has suddenly encountered a different attitude.

Objectors to Midway and its operations have virtually disappeared. Instead, Egan now is conferring with committees of businessmen, realtors, and homeowners whose pleas today are: "What can we do to keep Midway in business?"

Civic groups from 13 southwest suburban areas joined last January to fight the "jet menace" at Midway. They thought at that time that United Airlines would attempt to place its new Caravelle jets there, but this development did not occur. The Caravelles went to O'Hare with the other jets and United reduced its piston engine traffic still further at the south side airport.

Now the civic groups have changed their attitudes. Few want jets but they are "frankly and definitely alarmed" by economic changes already brought on by the departure of air traffic from Midway.

SOME STILL OPPOSE JETS

"It is not than anyone really will welcome jets at Midway," Egan explained. "It's that the property owners are alarmed about the worsened economic situations there. They now feel that if the jets are necessary, they can be tolerated.

"Even now, however, about a quarter of those living in the Midway area are bitterly opposed to any jet innovations. These people live in the flightpaths, and remember the trials with the Caravelle about a year ago. These trials occurred on a warm day and windows were open and people heard the strange new sound of the jets and they didn't like it."

The alderman said that thousands of persons who a year ago had signed petitions protesting against jets for Midway now have changed their minds. Most of them believe that "maybe jets are necessary to keep the field going."

FIGURES SHOW DECLINE

Figures for scheduled airline operations for Midway and O'Hare Fields are astonishing. In July 1960, Midway had 19,634 arrivals and departures, but this had dropped in July of this year to 10,868. O'Hare's July 1960 movements were 10,064, while this year they had climbed to 16,962 (most of them jet operations).

Perhaps the reports from the parking lots at the two large airports give a better picture of Midway's decline. Midway's July 1960 figures were 103,361 cars, whereas O'Hare's in the same month were 61,882. But in July 1961, Midway had only 49,209, and O'Hare had 126,175.

Coal Industry Logic, if Any

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the running attacks of the coal industry on New England consumers of residual oil would be farcical were it not for the unhappy fact that the coal industry has been able to persuade the Federal Government that residual imports actually are a major cause of the coal depression.

The following editorial from the Boston Herald, and letter to the editor, from the president of the National Coal Association, put the situation in sharp focus:

COAL INDUSTRY LOGIC, IF ANY

This is the unkindest cut of all: The coal industry gets New England's supply of cheap residual oil cut down so as to promote coal sales here, and then expresses surprise that we make a fuss about it.

Seems we ought to like to have our imports of this cheap fuel restricted.

President Dunn of the National Coal Association thinks we should be grateful that the coal industry is protecting us from the insecurity of relying on shipments from Venezuela.

In his letter to us, printed in an adjoining column, he asks what became of the $318.7 million we say the import quotas on this oil have cost New England. The answer is the coal industry got some. The coal carriers got some. Holders of import quotas got some. And the rest went into that cavernous maw that always opens when a shortage puts an end to competitive pricing.

Mr. Dunn says the President [Eisenhower] ordered import quotas on residual to protect the national security. But Mr. Eisenhower spoke only of the security of a healthy petroleum industry. Residual imports do not affect the domestic oil producers, for whom residual is a negligible product. If war cut off residual to New England, it would also cut off exports of coal, which would then be available here as an emergency fuel.

As if to say who's hurt? Mr. Dunn says residual imports to the east coast increased from 172.2 million barrels in 1957 to 212.7 million in 1960. His arithmetic baffles us. In 1960 the total of allocations issued under the import restrictions was 154,559,292 barrels. Licensed imports as of April 1 this year were 461,000 barrels a day or the rate of 168,265,000 barrels a year. What is Mr. Dunn counting as barrels of oil available to east coast consumers?

Mr. Dunn's reference to Soviet oil is equally baffling. The Soviet wants to sell crude oil, not residual, and that's another matter.

The energy Mr. Dunn and his organization uses to force a fuel shortage here could so much better be used in constructive ways to aid the coal industry.

COAL WOULD SAVE NORTHEAST FROM HERSELF

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Perhaps the Herald can help locate the $318.7 million which your July 30 editorial says New England and other east coast areas contributed to the bituminous coal industry last year by reason of restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil.

Nobody in the coal industry seems to have seen the money. Perhaps this is because we understand neither your logic nor your arithmetic. The editorial says restrictions on residual oil imports have resulted in the sale of an additional 1.5 million tons of coal, with a value at the mines of $5 a ton. If we accept that premise (we have to start somewhere, though the average value of coal f.o.b. mines in 1960 was only $4.73) we find $7.5 million.

But what happened to the other $311.2 million?

Maybe the $311 million went to the oil importers. You say import restrictions have increased the price of residual oil by 33 cents a barrel over the world price, and that the scarcity "has wiped out competition and invited profiteering."

Who are the profiteers? Not the coal industry. I suggest you direct your abuse to the quota-holding importers whom you cite without censure as being able to "enjoy a 30-cent premium without having to handle a single barrel of oil."

Restrictions on residual oil imports were ordered by the President to protect the national security, not the coal industry. Even under controls, shipment of foreign residual oil into the east coast rose from the 1957 level of 172.2 million barrels, the original basis of the restrictions to 212.7 million barrels in 1960. The fuel shortages of World War II in New England proved the danger of heavy reliance on tanker-borne oil supplies.

If the Herald advocates unrestricted imports of the cheapest available fuel without regard for national security, I can put you on the trail of a bargain. Press reports indicate that a New York firm has been offering oil from Soviet Russia at substantially below the market price. Of course, the Russians might pinch off the supply once our hospitals and factories grew dependent on it, and once other sources of energy had withered away—but meanwhile, look at the money you'd save.

If the folly of this course is apparent, so also is the folly of unrestricted imports of residual oil from the Caribbean along a sea route subject to Soviet submarine blockade.

STEPHEN F. DUNN,
President, National Coal Association.

VFW Gives Copley Its Highest Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the San Diego Union:

VFW GIVES COPLEY ITS HIGHEST AWARD

MIAMI, FLA., August 22.—The Veterans of Foreign Wars today presented its gold medal of merit and citation to James S. Copley, publisher of the San Diego Union, in recognition of positive Americanism.

The award, the highest which can be granted by VFW Commander in Chief Ted C. Connell, was made in a ceremony here at the national convention of the veterans' organization.

The medal which Connell presented to Copley was inscribed "Awarded to James S. Copley for exceptional services rendered to country, community, and mankind."

HAILED FOR LEADERSHIP

The citation commended Copley for "his personal leadership in directing an effective and positive Americanism program through comprehensive reporting and interpretation in all affiliates of Copley press."

Copley, a Navy veteran of World War II, is chairman of the Copley Press, Inc., which publishes 15 daily newspapers in Illinois and California, and operates a worldwide news-gathering service.

The VFW gold medal, established in 1946, last year went to John Daly, then of the American Broadcasting Co.

AWARD TO SENATOR

Another top VFW prize, the Americanism award, today was presented to Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida.

Copley told the convention in a speech following the presentation that newspapers and other communications media must redouble their efforts to protect the American way of life from the onslaughts of communism.

"We are at war with an ideology determined * * * to stamp freedom from the face of the earth," Copley said.

"As a newspaper publisher, it is my conviction that newspapers can help create a community in which everyone individually comes to gain a feeling of importance in the preservation of our way of life, against the threat of totalitarian government."

Copley cited the recent formation of the education department of the Copley Press, Inc., as a step toward this expanded service to the communities in California and Illinois in which Copley newspapers are published.

He said its purpose is to "carry on * * * the work of education in behalf of our system of government, and our publicizing of the benefits of the American system.

"Too few of our younger people have had the benefits of our own bringing up in patriotism," he said. "They need the facts not only about the good things implicit in our own way of life, but the evil things that are implicit in the great conspiracy that is slowly closing in upon us abroad."

KHRUSHCHEV REPORT

The VFW convention was reminded of the report last January 6 by Premier Nikita Khrushchev at a Moscow meeting of representatives of the world's 81 Communist Parties.

"We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism," Khrushchev had said. "But we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

"Our danger is mortal," Copley said. It is clear, he said, that Khrushchev plans that the Communist world "will wage relentless war against the free world until the last capitalist nation is overcome" and that the United States is the No. 1 target.

ULTIMATE HOT WAR

While it may not now be to the advantage of Communists to wage a hot war, Copley observed, Khrushchev holds that nations which continue to resist the cold war ultimately will be defeated with a hot war."

"We are too young a nation to die," he said. "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor—the last more important than anything—are at stake just as much today as they were in 1776.

"The American people are crying for leadership * * *. The leadership must come. It must come from organizations like the VFW, and it must also come from newspapers and other news media. The people must be informed and summoned.

"In fact, the American people already seem to be ahead of their Government in demanding that we escape from this blind, dark alley into which the Russians have tried to trap us."

ACCEPT CHALLENGE

The American people know that Americanism is too precious "to skulk down the wrong side of any alley just to avoid the bully's challenge," Copley added.

"We must again walk bravely," he said. "We must lead the world's timid and fearful. And with our example, they, too, will walk tall and straight. With courage, we will all emerge into the broad, clean streets of an orderly world.

"We are not outnumbered," he concluded. "So far, we have only been outtalked.

"We must do our own talking. We must do it in honesty and conviction. We must do it so all the world will hear and understand and applaud."

PATRIOTIC TEACHING VITAL, CADETS TOLD

PENSACOLA, FLA., August 22.—James S. Copley, chairman of the corporation of Copley Press, Inc., today called for American teachers "who will be aware of the flag in the corner of the classroom, and know that that flag is what stands between us and a godless slavery."

Copley addressed cadets at the Naval Air Training Command here. He spoke under auspices of the Pensacola Council of the Navy League of the United States. Copley is president of the league's San Diego council.

"Some people have wrapped themselves in the flag of freedom of education, so they can feel safe from challenge, while they work to destroy that freedom," he said.

SOME SCOFF

Copley said there are those "who scoff at patriotism as an old-fashioned, outdated thing."

"This voice finds too common an expression on our college campuses. It asks us to put aside our individual God and country in favor of a new belief in superman. This superman is a combination psychiatrist-statesman-jailer who will lead us away from patriotism and free enterprise into the security of a totalitarian world prison."

Looking out over the ranks of Navy flight cadets, Copley remarked that "this is a university campus not concerned with misinterpretation of our freedoms to allow Marxists and atheistic Communists to preach their treason."

In his speech, the publisher stressed his support of freedom of education, but he added, "All freedom is grounded in responsibility, and I am afraid that that responsibility has not been always applied on American campuses."

REQUIRED SUBJECT

"I, for one, want communism to be a required subject of study in our classrooms," he told the cadets. "But I want it to be discussed by patriotic teachers who also can teach Americanism; and who want to do it."

Copley pointed out that the American way of life has become the envy of people all over the world.

"The Communists certainly recognize this fact and realize that in the United States is the only obstacle to their plan for world domination," he said.

"How clearly is this taught by our colleges and high schools?

"How many teachers can tell this story of human achievement?

"If we do not have such teachers, our days as a Nation are numbered. And we are too young to die, too young a Nation to let fall the torch of individual freedom, of individual responsibility for government."

WILL LOSE FREEDOM

"Without old-fashioned patriotism, we will lose our old-fashioned freedom. Without old-fashioned love of country, we will fall victims to old-fashioned hate by other countries.

Copley reminded the cadets of the charge of Adm. Arleigh Burke, who retired recently as chief of naval operations.

"Burke's testament to the Navy contained the words:

"I do commend:

"Love of country, overshadowing all other loves, including service, family and the sea.

"Individual desire to excel, not for aggrandizement of self, but to increase the excellence of the Navy.

"Devotion—perhaps consecration—to personal integrity in oneself, in one's service, in one's country.

"Courage to stand for principle, regardless of efforts to dilute this courage through compromise or evasion."

NO GREATER REWARD

Copley told the cadets that "the golden wings that will be won from this command may well be the means of perpetuation of our American way of life."

"What reward could exceed this," he asked, "the knowledge that you, in your generation, helped to save that way of life?"

Price Fixing Under Guise of Fair Trade Is Blow to Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, any type of price fixing by the Government, even though it is done in the interest of so-called fair trade, ultimately reacts against the interest of the consumer, which is all the people. Fair trade proposals now before Congress will do nothing but increase prices and rob the consumer of his freedom of choice. In this connection I call attention to the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

REENTER THE PRICE FIXERS

Fair traders never fade away, it seems; they just change their names.

Despite defeat after defeat in the courts and nearly 50 years of congressional coolness, the proponents of Federal retail price fixing are massing a new campaign in Washington. As our Mr. Duke reported the other

day, they realize that most people now recognize the once-attractive fair trade label as a fraud, and so the advocates are calling it a fair competitive practices bill.

The immediate objective is to get this thing passed by the Senate at this session, and then work on the House next year. If it actually got enacted, we would have a situation where it would be impossible, by Federal law, for any merchant to sell a national branded item to consumers at any price lower than that set by its manufacturer.

That objective points up one of the difficulties: The history of fair trade in the States that have tried it is that it doesn't work, no matter what any law says. Attempts to enforce it had a lot to do with the rise of the so-called discount houses, which in turn led to discounting by many other retailers.

Now, by a remarkable exercise in illogic, the fair-competition lobby points to the growth of discounting as an argument for enacting their bill. But of course discounting is the essence of price competition, and its rise is a tribute to the vigor of our competitive system when it is left halfway alone.

What is basically at stake is the consumer's freedom of choice, and particularly his opportunity to buy at the cheapest price. An economy without that is neither free, competitive, fair, nor efficient. Yet that freedom is what these zealots are trying to kill. And no matter how many times they change their names, they can't change the smell of price fixing.

Big Push in Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to the attention of every Member of the Congress a thorough—but very disturbing—article on the Soviet Union's massive propaganda machine at work in the world today. Written by Eugene Burdick and William Lederer, this article spells out in detail the wide, and at the same time, concentrated propaganda effort of the Soviet Union, which reportedly is spending at least $2 billion a year in its diabolical scheme to capture the hearts and minds of men, particularly in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa. With our own U.S. Information Agency having an uphill struggle to obtain some $135 million appropriation for fiscal year 1962, it means that our country is spending almost 20 times less to sell America and our democratic institutions abroad than the Kremlin is to sell, falsely and with sugar coating, its communistic form of government.

Today, the Soviet Union and Communist China are publishing and distributing—many of them free of charge—some 2 billion books a year, and this is more than the total books published by all the rest of the countries of the earth combined. The Russians and the Chinese are distributing movie films on life in their countries, and radios which are tuned only into stations in Moscow and Peiping, throughout Asia and the Middle East. Furthermore, budding and established authors in these underdeveloped nations are being paid large sums of money by the Soviet Government for articles written for Communist publications to be distributed in their own countries and "intellectuals," authors, teachers, scientists of these Asian nations are being given the "red carpet" treatment on all-expense paid trips to Russia as official guests of the Red government.

When I visited Asia and the Middle East 2 years ago as chairman of the foreign trade policy subcommittee, I saw the tremendous number of free Soviet and Red Chinese books, magazines, and pamphlets of all kinds on stands and in libraries; sadly, I found no American books or publications of any kind to counter this massive amount of Communist propaganda literature. And I was in Asia as chairman of a congressional committee which seeks to promote American private investment in the underdeveloped nations, and this Communist literature, I soon realized, was a tremendous barrier to the effectiveness of my mission.

All of this points to the great need for our country to increase many times over its educational and informational efforts in order to show the peoples of the world the true superiority of our form of government and our way of life where men truly are free and untrammeled. I have long thought that the first forward step in this direction would be to remove the current legal restrictions on the spending of counterpart funds earned abroad under Public Law 480. Under this law, moneys earned in some 60 foreign countries may be spent only in those nations and cannot be repatriated to the U.S. Treasury here.

Great sums of foreign currencies presently are lying idle in foreign banks—not yet committed to the USIA or any other agency, nor allocated for any particular program. In President Kennedy's budget message for fiscal 1962, it was revealed that there now exists uncommitted and excess foreign currencies available to our government in India, Israel, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Poland, Spain, the United Arab Republic and others; the total money estimated to be available after payment of all U.S. requirements for fiscal 1962 is $650 million.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 634) which if enacted would remove the present spending ceilings on these funds, and thus enable the U.S. Information Agency to increase its programs—particularly the publication and distribution of literature, and the making and distribution of motion pictures—in order to meet the great Soviet challenge in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and the Middle East. The simple fact is that the increased spending of these "counterpart" funds would not cost the American taxpayer any additional expense.

My bill has received favorable reports from the USIA, and from the Departments of State and of Agriculture, and I am hopeful that it will be passed by this Congress. The increase and build-up of our informational program is vital to the security of our country.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article, "Big Push in Soviet Propaganda," which appeared in the August 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, in the RECORD.

The article follows:

BIG PUSH IN SOVIET PROPAGANDA—TO PRESENT A BROTHERLY AND BENEFICENT IMAGE, RUSSIA BACKS A GLOBAL ORGANIZATION WITH TREMENDOUS POWER AND BIG MONEY—A REPORT BY THE AUTHORS OF "THE UGLY AMERICAN"

(By Eugene Burdick and William J. Lederer)

In Manila a young Filipino writer opens an envelope, finds a check for 750 pesos—the largest sum he has ever received for an article. Twenty-eight hundred miles to the southwest at the airport in Ceylon, an anxious mother and her paralyzed son are carefully placed in a plane and before the plane has made altitude a doctor is examining the boy. Five thousand miles to the northwest, in a sunny Russian schoolroom, sixty 8-year-old children expectantly face the door, waiting for a distinguished dark-skinned visitor. When he enters, they sing a song of welcome in Hindi, his native language.

Three rather touching scenes—but they all bear the mark "Made in Moscow." These three episodes are typical of thousands that occur around the world as a part of a comprehensive Communist propaganda program. Only recently have Western scholars been able to put together the fragments of this massive Soviet propaganda apparatus and make educated estimates of its range.

Americans, used to the bluster of Khrushchev and the blatancy of May Day parades in Red Square, will be surprised at the delicacy with which this devastating, yet invisible, structure operates.

In the opinion of many experts this propaganda machine is more dangerous than nuclear-armed ICBM's. The Soviet effort costs $2 billion a year directly and probably twice that much indirectly. By contrast the United States spends about one twentieth as much in money and one one-hundredth as much in effort and intellectual skill.

The Soviet effort is not merely massive. To a startling degree it can pinpoint small targets. Take the three examples mentioned. The Filipino writer had received his check from the Foreign Language Publishing House in Moscow. Although he is a professed "Philippine nationalist," he is now receiving over half of his income from Soviet royalties. The anxious Ceylonese mother with the paralyzed son was flown to Moscow, where her son was given treatment at a polio institute and returned home much improved. The mother, in addition to being an influential journalist, is related to the secretary of a powerful Ceylonese politican. The class of Hindi-singing children were Russian students at a public school in Moscow and their guest was a prominent Hindi-speaking Indian intellectual. When he returned to India, he praised the Soviet Union's "brotherly interest in India and its culture."

The painstaking details of the Soviet effort are stunning. Grassroots indoctrination begins in the Soviet school. All Soviet pupils start serious study of a foreign language in the third grade. By the time they have finished high school they have had at least 6 years' training in a foreign language. They do not confine their language training to English, French, Spanish, and German, but also have thousands of students studying the so-called exotic languages of Africa and Asia. In Singhalese and Bengali, the Russians have a small army of fluent linguists. Our Department of State's Foreign Service does not have a single qualified person, although these languages are spoken by almost 100 million people living in important sensitive areas.

Language is not the whole of propaganda, as we shall see, but it is the vital first step. John Foster Dulles put it this way: "Inter-

preters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language; and, without understanding their language, it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

Soviet language training is so sweeping that Moscow can, if the occasion calls for it, produce tomorrow a skilled plumber who speaks Hindi and is also familiar with the great figures of Hindi literature. As long ago as 1957 Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, said that he had never met a Russian in that country who was not working hard at Hindi, or already reasonably fluent in the language. American officials who are fluent in Hindi could comfortably meet in the livingroom of an average American home.

What are the results? When Moscow contracted to build the Bhilai steel mill for India, a great many of the Russians, from steel muddlers to top engineers, could speak to Indians in their own language. The Indians were so pleased that they did not object when Russian workers taught Russian and Marxist doctrine to Indian workers during the lunch hour.

In Swahili, Nepali, Telugu, Annamese, Amharic—languages spoken by 86 million people—the pattern is the same. The Soviets have platoons of people trained in all these languages. Most Russians will not see duty overseas, but if the need arises the Soviet propaganda apparatus can call upon an immense reservoir of language competence. By contrast, consider that this year only four of our Foreign Service officers are studying southeast Asian languages.

But the real cutting edge of the Soviet propaganda apparatus is the full-time, highly trained expert who skillfully directs his army of assistants. When he goes to work, overseas or in Moscow, he will have survived one of the world's most rigorous indoctrination and screening programs. He is a professional who has been schooled more extensively than a physician. Take, as a composite example, the case of a fellow we'll call Serge Rasonilkov.

Serge was graduated at the top of his class from a high school in Minsk. He was assigned to one of the numerous "institutes" that exist throughout Russia for specialized training in language and area studies. For the first year the average workday was 16 to 18 hours. Serge was one of 25 students making up a class in Twi, a little-known language which is spoken by 2 million people in the northern part of Africa's Gold Coast region. Language make up one-half of the institute's program, and it was taught by an African Communist, specially recruited. The other half of the curriculum consisted of an intensive course in the anthropology, religion, politics and geography of Africa.

At the end of the first year the 25 students were told where each ranked in the class. The bottom five students were dropped from the institute.

For 36 more months the work continued. When the class finally was graduated, it consisted only of five superior professionals. The Russians' estimates of their need for experts in Twi were five per year. Two of the students had been discharged from the institute for "marriage without official permission." The rest were casualties of the competitive system. In addition to scholastic brilliance, other criteria were taken into consideration in grading students—physical stamina, ability to make decisions and boldness.

Serge was one of those who survived. Serge had acquired not only the ability to speak Twi fluently but also knowledge of the Twi folk myths. In addition he knew the names of contemporary political leaders in the areas where Twi was spoken, their backgrounds, their weaknesses.

A few months before being graduated from the institute Serge and the four other surviving students were each assigned a secret topic on which to write a master's thesis. Unbeknownst to any of the five the topics were identical—A Marxist-Leninist Strategy for Twi-Speaking Cultures: The Next 10 Years. Near the end of the term each student was presented with a copy of the other four theses and asked to defend his own publicly in the light of what the others stated. To Western educators such a technique would be not only unethical but extremely cruel. In the Soviet view it produces a potential diplomat-propagandist who is suspicious, tough minded and highly flexible in his application of Communist ideology.

The institute decided that Serge was their most outstanding graduate. The four other graduates were at once ordered to twi-speaking areas of Africa where they took jobs in the Russian Embassy or consulates as chauffeurs, kitchen helpers and messengers. They were given these jobs to permit extensive contact with the natives. Later they would move into propaganda jobs.

Serge remained in Moscow and was sent to the diplomatic school for an additional 2 years. The U.S.S.R. Diplomatic School is top secret. No American, to our knowledge, has ever visited there. A few foreign Communists have briefly attended the school and after defecting from the party have described what takes place in that highly guarded institution.

The first task of the school is to instill in every student an identical notion of the grand sweep of Soviet strategy and "tactical flexibility." The aim of that strategy is to assure the world domination of socialism. "Tactical flexibility" means that in each country, at some time in history, the ever-changing problems will be different and must be handled differently. In some countries it will be possible to move quickly—to give history a push. In others it will be necessary to go more slowly, to mask Soviet intentions, to work in feigned sympathy with unsatisfactory local movements.

Serge also was taught such practical skills as the art of "spontaneous demonstration." The antiriot procedures of police all over the world were carefully studied so that they could be circumvented. Serge personally will never participate in such a demonstration. But he will give the triggering order to the local Communist leaders. The Communists, for example, carefully controlled the pitch and tempo of the Zengakuren student demonstration against the Japanese visit of President Eisenhower. The Communists in Tokyo, vastly outnumbered in the Zengakuren organization by moderates and conservatives, manevered the others during the last 3 days before the President's scheduled visit. The result of this tactic was a stunning historical cataclysm. The soverign head of the world's most powerful nation was prevented from visiting another head of state. To this day most of the members of the Zengakuren, who howled in the streets during those days, are not anti-American and are not quite sure how they were manipulated. For Serge, such a performance is a routine technique.

A former Communist once told us, we thought jokingly, that one of the things taught at the diplomatic school was "the moment for producing the proletarian corpse." By this the ex-Communist meant the technique of mysteriously killing or wounding a well-known native leader—especially one in revolt against white officials. The result of the murder usually is a violent flareup of native rage against those in authority. To succeed in such a political maneuver requires great skill. One of the problems of the propagandist is to calculate accurately when the moment for the murder has arrived—and how to have the corpse "discovered" most effectively.

In recent years we are not so certain that our ex-Communist friend was joking. With an eerie consistency, political deaths around the world inflame insurrections and benefit the Communists. From Laos to Vietnam to the Congo there is a thin, red, bloody strand that is almost surely not accidental.

Upon completion of his studies at the diplomatic school, Serge was ordered to a Soviet embassy in Africa, where he at once had a consultation with the Russian political boss. In most Soviet embassies the ambassador is not the No. 1 man but is only a figurehead. He is the one charged with the energy-consuming task of showing up at social functions. If the ambassador absorbs a staggering number of vodka toasts and a huge amount of caviar at such functions, he can spend the next day recovering. The important political work is done by others who have time to think and study. Usually the real leader of the embassy will occupy what is officially the third or fourth position.

Serge was given almost a completely free hand. The camouflaged "No. 1" said he would issue specific orders only when a change in tactics or strategy came down from Moscow.

At first Serge concentrated on influencing strategically placed persons. Serge also saw that Twi poets, writers and intellectuals had their work translated and reviewed by Tass and in Pravda, or in one of the many specialized journals within Russia. The reviews invariably glowed with praise. Serge made certain that the local intellectual received a Twi translation of the review—as well as substantial royalties.

In the second phase Serge generated an impression of great Soviet admiration for the "folk culture" of the host country. The Soviet press published editorials insisting that selected native intellectuals be invited to Russia as state guests. Such visits were lavishly prepared and widely reported.

In Russia the surprised Africans found themselves surrounded by people who were not only friendly but apparently genuinely well informed and deeply interested in the culture of their own country. Writers who had barely been making a living suddenly began to receive handsome checks from Moscow for work that was translated into Russian. Musicians and artists received the same heady attention.

We once asked a group of Asian intellectuals, all of whom had received royalty payments from Moscow, if they knew that no American or British writer was able to receive royalties for works published in Russia. There was an embarrassing silence. We asked, half-jokingly, how many of them would be willing to return their royalty checks to Moscow as a gesture of "solidarity" with their American literary colleagues.

One of the Asians, more candid than the others, stated, "It is impossible. I am now dependent for approximately 50 percent of my income on Soviet royalties. I could not afford to do as you ask, and I am ashamed of that fact." Most of the writers professed to be unaffected politically by their Soviet incomes.

But a young Indonesian writer told us, "It is difficult to avoid unconscious seduction. The first few articles I wrote for the Communists were fair and objective, and they printed them precisely as I wrote them. Each time they paid me more than I had received before. After a few months, however, they began to suggest slight editorial changes: Would I object to the placing of the word 'imperialistic' before 'American'; would it not be accurate to describe Eisenhower, a former general, as a 'militarist'? If I balked they quietly went along, but they kept the pressure on—partly by raising the payments. One day I finished an article and on rereading realized that it was straight Communist doctrine. I tore it up and have not written for the Communists since."

He is a rare exception. But let us return to Serge.

Serge's next step was an intensive program of cultural exchange. Here Serge took Japan as an example. In 1957 a distinguished Russian pianist, Gilels, made a Japanese tour. This was quickly followed by a tour of the singer, Alla Glenkova. In 1958 the Russians invited the Japanese puppet theater, Avidzi, to Russia, where it received wildly enthusiastic reviews. The Russians also made it known, pointedly, that this was the first trip that the puppeteers had made outside of Japan's borders. Scholars, scientists and famous Russian artists too numerous to mention all visited Japan. In return, numerous groups of Japanese were invited to visit Russia.

Japan is a fully developed society, and Japanese are likely to recognize propaganda techniques when they see them. Even so, the Russians have made a serious propaganda penetration and are constantly working hard to enlarge it.

In the primitive and emerging nations the Soviet effort is proportionately much higher. Communist entertainers and artists and journalists flood to countries like Liberia, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Iran, Lebanon, and all the Arab countries.

In Burma, Russian circuses and Chinese entertainers went to tiny upcountry hamlets where the people had never before seen a foreigner. In some cases the Russian circus staff was larger than the village population.

Serge followed the established propaganda pattern closely. Once key people are cultivated and a mask of friendliness exhibited to the masses, the propaganda dagger is aimed at other victims. The next target group is students. They are invited to fairs, youth festivals, cultural meetings, and universities—all in Russia. Preparations are carefully made. For example, student delegations arriving in Russia from France and Great Britain and the United States, who have some knowledge of Communist techniques and are therefore likely to be suspicious, are housed in drab, ordinary dormitories. But the delegations from Africa, the Arab countries, and southeast Asia are housed and fed in plush luxury—candlelighted tables, a menu meticulously put together with careful attention to religious requirements and native food tastes, and cheerful waiters.

Perhaps the high point in the propagandizing of students took place in 1960 when Khrushchev, while visiting in Indonesia, announced that the Soviet Union had established a "University of Friendship of the Peoples." This university is designed to train engineers, physicians, teachers, and technical experts from all over the world. If successful, it might make it possible for communism to capture the intellectual elite of most of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Fortunately the first few classes did not go well. But the Russians are experimenting; the curriculum of the Friendship University has just been changed.

The countless festivals and youth congresses in the Soviet Union are carefully and generously subsidized. Students from the poor nations pay little or nothing. But the Soviet aid is always carefully presented as a "fellowship" or as a reward for winning a contest or some such face-saving device.

Once an atmosphere of friendliness is established with the intellectual elite and the organization of students in underdeveloped countries is under way, the next step is a careful wooing of the leaders. With a shrewd eye for protocol, the Russians first send a high-ranking diplomat to call on leaders such as Sukarno, Haile Selassie, Nehru, or the Shah of Iran. The foreign head of government is then invited to the Soviet Union. There is no limit to costs.

Take the visit of Nasser, the ruler of Egypt, to Russia. He was flown in a luxuriously equipped Soviet jetliner, the TU–104. When he arrived in Moscow, he was greeted by orderly files of people cheering as he drove down the street. Scrubbed schoolchildren threw flowers at him wherever he went. At small, intimate parties Nasser was shown examples of Egyptian and Arabic works translated into Russian, some of them consisting of his own speeches, which had been catalogued as "masterpieces." He met Soviet Moslems who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca. While traveling in Russia he was shown factories making the most sophisticated military equipment, parts for guided missiles and earth-moving equipment. The implication was clear: The Soviet Union was not only powerful in war but able to supply the kind of equipment needed to build the Asawan Dam; and she could supply seed and farm machinery for the lands to be irrigated by the dam.

At a splendid "state dinner" Khrushchev assured Nasser of the support of "the whole socialist world" in his "struggle for independence." Nasser was also informed that the Soviets had just established a Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With the Countries of the Arab East.

The usual concluding flourish to such a trip is making a gift of the jet plane in which the foreign leader has traveled. Haile Selassie, the Shah of Iran and Sukarno have received such "gifts." U Nu of Burma flies in a plane presented by the Russians.

The Russians pay special attention to local customs. They know, for example, that Indonesians prefer lengthy movies. The longer the show, the more the Indonesians like it. It is no accident that President Sukarno exhibited the 3-hour motion picture of his trip to Russia in preference to the 30-minute movie documentation of his visit to America made by our U.S. Information Agency.

The foreign leader, thus manipulated, sometimes leaves the Soviet Union with the impression not only that the Russians are deeply interested in his country, but that Russia is the "coming" economic and military power. No one lectured him on the "inevitability of world communism." He has met the real leaders of Russia and may have the impression that he can "do business with the Russians" without compromising his position.

The results are alarming. Today in Egypt there are thousands of Soviet technicians, military advisers and engineers. Instruction in the Russian language has begun in secondary schools of the United Arab Republic. Three hundred of her best students are being sent annually to Russia to study.

Now Russia is ready for the last stage of propaganda: "The socialization of the masses." This means a penetrating and widespread propagandization of the citizens of a foreign country. The blueprint of action is clear. In most of the emerging countries where Serge—and a thousand others like him—serves, the public-communication system is either primitive or nonexistent. One of Serge's first steps in socializing the masses will be to see that small radios are distributed to the outlying villages by the native Communist Party. These radios have one peculiarity: They receive only one station—Radio Moscow or Radio Peiping. Powerful broadcasting stations in Russia and China fill the air with programs in Amoy, Tonkinese, Tibetan, Pashto, Bengali, Berber, and hundreds of other languages. In deserts, deltas, and farm areas the entire population of tiny hamlets will squat around the radio in the evening hours. As the young people crank the hand generator, the village listens to Bing Crosby, the Red army chorus, classical music, folk music of their own land—and a carefully edited version of world news. American press reports are rewritten to make us look as bad and unhappy as possible.

The Communists also realize that intense literacy drives among the emerging nations creates a new market for books, magazines, and newspapers. Today the Russians and Chinese are the biggest publishers of books in the world. Between them they produce more than 2 billion books a year, which surpasses the entire output of all other nations. A large fraction of these volumes are published in foreign languages, ranging from obscure African languages, like Fang-Bulu and Kabyle, to Japanese and German. Children's books which successfully convert Cinderella and Little Red Riding Hood into Communist heroes are put out in fine editions, beautifully illustrated. Millions of magazines are distributed throughout the world, each of them aimed at a specific audience: the peasant, the trade-union member, the city worker, and the disgruntled intellectual.

Today the world's best selling author is Joseph Stalin. His books are followed by the Bible, but the next three most widely read authors are Communists. A bookseller in Cairo or Djakarta or Bangkok or Singapore finds it financially attractive to stock Communist literature. First, he pays for the books in the local currency, directly to the Russian or Chinese Embassy. Secondly, their cost is low and the profit is high.

The accumulated local currency resulting from local payments is used by officials like Serge to establish native newspapers and journals. Normally there will be an "overt" Communist newspaper, which concentrates on lengthy analyses of Marxist theory. It is usually turgid and has a small circulation. But Communist money also flows to the "covert" newspapers. They carry neutral titles such as "the Star" or "the Chronicle" and are jammed with popular features attracting a mass circulation. With no visible Communist connections, these papers carry on bitter campaigns against "white colonialism" and the presence of American troops overseas.

Hand in hand with books and newspapers, the Communists have been engaged since 1955 in a stepped-up production of motion pictures. Among other advantages, use of this medium assures that illiterates are not overlooked. In 5 years the number of Communist propaganda films has quadrupled.

Serge is familiar with all these techniques. He has the personnel and assets to use instantly whatever method he judges most effective. Serge can order any Russian in the area to take on a propaganda project; and each receives a specific assignment in addition to his normal job. Whatever money or equipment is needed Serge can get quickly from Moscow. Films, money, printing presses, newsprint, books, a grand ballet—these will be flown in at his request. The Russian Government is organized for this kind of operation. The propaganda agency in the U.S.S.R. has a status equal to that of the Foreign Service or Department of Defense.

There is only one thing Serge may not do: He may not fail. If he makes one major mistake, he is ruined. He will be recalled and placed in a minor post for life. The same applies to everyone involved in Russian strategy and tactics.

Compared with the Communist effort the American venture into propaganda is anemic. Not only is the USIA budget severely limited, but so is its statutory function. It can only project the American image abroad. It is paradoxical that America, where the communications arts are most highly developed and where the technical skills are so far advanced, should be such a slow starter.

Our USIA people are on the whole as intelligent and perceptive as their Russian counterparts. But they are paralyzed by inadequate funds, too frequent shift in

posts, and sketchy training in the language and customs of the area they serve.

The Communists are not infallible. They have made great mistakes. Their ruthless suppression of the Hungarians, the inhumanity of the collective farms in China, and other events have nullified many of their propaganda drives. Then, too, the Soviet Friendship University is by all accounts a dismal place that offends many students. Yet few Asians or Africans are aware of these facts. All in all, the Russians make more mistakes than Americans do. But the Communists have the funds, trained personnel, and organization to take advantage of—or create—American fumbles. We are slow to act.

There is nothing at this moment to prevent Americans from creating the intellectual and technical weapons required to win the great battle for exposing the minds of men to the truth. The Communists already have a formidable machine at work telling lies. Americans can overcome it. All that is lacking at the moment is an awareness of the danger and a determination to do something about it.

Best Way To Strengthen Negotiations With Soviet Union Over Nuclear Testing Is To Remove Our Own Self-Imposed Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Times shows clearly how foolish it is to continue any kind of negotiations with the Soviet Union unless we speak from a position of strength. For 3 years we have allowed the Soviet to make propaganda hay out of the nuclear test ban negotiations. We have adhered to a self-imposed ban on the testing of nuclear weapons which has helped reduce our lead over the Communists in this field. I pray, before it is too late, that we resume nuclear testing. Let us continue the talks, if Khrushchev wants to talk, but let us negotiate from strength by letting him know that we are not going to be lulled into a false sense of security by Communist peace offers in agreements which they have no intention of keeping.

The article follows:

NEW SOVIET MOVE ON TEST BAN SEEN—DELEGATE SUDDENLY CALLED TO MOSCOW FOR CONSULTATION

GENEVA, August 24.—The Soviet Union appeared today to be preparing a surprise to greet the return to the Nuclear Test Ban Conference here of Arthur H. Dean, chief U.S. delegate.

Semyon K. Tsarapkin, the Soviet delegate, boarded a plane here this morning in answer to an unexpected summons from Moscow to return for consultations.

The United States and British delegations were not informed until late last night by the Soviet delegation that Mr. Tsarapkin was leaving.

The Western delegations were assured that the Soviet negotiator would be back in Geneva for the next scheduled session of the Conference on Monday.

FLURRY OF EXCITEMENT

Mr. Tsarapkin's sudden departure only a few hours after the U.S. delegate's return from 2 months of consultation in Washington caused a flurry of excitement and speculation.

The excitement was caused by the timing of the move and the absence of any prior hint of it.

The nearly 3-year-old conference had been dawdling along with only one meeting a week because neither side had anything to offer except recriminatory speeches over the causes for the long deadlock. The East and West disagree on the amount of inspection that would be necessary if nuclear tests were banned.

The Soviet Union apparently appeared willing to have Mr. Tsarapkin wait here patiently to hear what the United States negotiator would have to say when Washington decided to send him back.

Speculation by well-placed Western sources in Geneva centered on the possibility that Moscow might have decided on some dramatic move. The aim would be to undercut the effect on world opinion that the United States hopes to achieve by sending Mr. Dean back. The United States is trying the demonstrate again its desire to make every effort to get a workable test ban treaty.

On Wednesday the United States released a booklet on the negotiations in which it warned that the Soviet Union would invite the resumption of nuclear tests if it again rejected proposals for a treaty banning such tests.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

The stress placed by President Kennedy on the importance of the mission given to his negotiator and the obvious desire of the United States to impress on world opinion the sincerity of its attempts to get a reasonably controlled treaty may have influenced Moscow to act, according to speculation here.

Moscow, it is believed, may want to counteract the propaganda benefits the United States may score at the nonalined nations' parley next month in Belgrade and at the forthcoming regular United Nations General Assembly session.

Conjecture here is that Moscow will try to steal the play from the announcements that Mr. Dean is believed to have ready. These are expected to state that the United States is still looking for areas of possible accommodation despite the Soviet demand for a right of veto over all control operations.

The veto is inherent in the Soviet plan for three co-administrators for the proposed control organization to represent the West, the Communist bloc and the uncommitted states. The East and West originally agreed to a single neutral administrator independent of all governments.

Monongahela Power Co., a Progressive Electric Firm in West Virginia, Receives Excellent Newspaper Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a privilege to invite the attention of my colleagues to articles which have appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette during the past week citing the "Electric Firm Unique"—the Monongahela Power Co., with main offices at Fairmont, W. Va.

In an era when so-called public versus private power controversies can be aroused quickly even on marginal issues, it is proper that we pause to give thought to the fact that neither public nor private power is necessarily all good or all bad but that there are definitely propublic investor-owned utilities generating and marketing electricity just as there are progressive public power facilities. By the same token, we know that there are abuses and inequities in some elements of both investor-owned systems and public power projects.

In this instance, Mr. President, I am privileged to accentuate the favorable as it relates to the Monongahela Power Co., a subsidiary of Allegheny Power System, Inc. I have had a special familiarity with this company over the years because it has serviced my home area in West Virginia, and the survey findings made by Charleston Gazette Staff Writer John G. Morgan in two articles in that newspaper are consistent with my personal understanding of Monongahela Power's policies and marketing practices.

By and large, West Virginia experiences with its investor-owned utilities has been excellent, as have been those with our energetic REA cooperatives. American Electric's subsidiaries, Appalachian Power and Wheeling Electric companies, under scrutiny as close as that afforded Monongahela by Gazette Staffer Morgan, would merit equally favorable consideration and reporting, according to the best information available to me.

In our area, of course, coal fires the boilers which create the steam for production of electricity. Vastly improved technology has made our electricity-from-coal plants among the most efficient in the world, just as mechanization of the mines has increased productivity and efficiency in the coal industry. These developments have enabled our power producers and marketers to hold their rates to consumers at a stabilized level while most other fuels and forms of energy have experienced mounting costs which have had to be passed on to consumers.

This, of course, is one of the features noted by Gazette Staff Writer Morgan in his articles on the Monongahela Power Co., the very able president of which is my esteemed longtime friend, Don B. Potter, one of our State's most active and enlightened leaders in business and civic affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the August 24 and August 26, 1961 issues of the Charleston Gazette, both relating to the Monongahela Power Co.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATE INCREASES, DISCOUNTS OUT

(By John G. Morgan, staff writer)

FAIRMONT.—At least one major utility company in West Virginia never has received

a residential rate increase. Moreover, it never has asked for one.

That rather remarkable company has adopted policies which set it apart from some other utility firms. It grants no free service and no discounts on its residential rates.

Believes that the salaries of its executives are properly a matter of public knowledge; pays no country club fees for its employes. Pays no lobbyist to stalk the legislature. Permits no personal use of company cars.

Named Monongahela Power Co., the unusual utility establishment has its headquarters here. It serves 32 counties in northern and central West Virginia and small areas in Ohio, Maryland and Virginia.

It is a subsidiary of Allegheny Power System, Inc., of New York. Within the system, three companies function under the control of the Monongahela firm. They are Marietta Electric Co. of Ohio, West Maryland Power Co. of Maryland and Monterey Utilities Corp. of Virginia.

Monongahela has approximately 1,580 employees and 225,000 customers. The principal cities served are Parkersburg, Weirton, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Morgantown, Vienna, Weston, Elkins, Buckhannon, Grafton, New Martinsville, and Wellsburg, all in West Virginia; and Marietta, Ohio.

The company's record of no rate increases and no requests spans the 48-year history of the Public Service Commission. The electric system now embraced by Monongahela was started in 1890—23 years before the commission was established.

A company publication says: "Never has Monongahela, even in the face of rising labor and material costs, raised the price of residential electric service." A search of commission records confirms that statement.

Among all utility companies in West Virginia, Monongehela doesn't stand alone if each item on its list of established policies is considered separately. But if the whole list is considered, along with the fact that no increases in rates have been granted, then the Fairmont company apparently occupies a unique position.

The residential rates charged by Monongahela are considered low. However, generally speaking, all electric rates have remained relatively low in West Virginia while gas and telephone rates have been climbing rapidly. Executives of gas and telephone companies say that the nature of their problems has compelled them to seek higher rates more often than the electric firms.

Appalachian Power Co., which serves southern West Virginia, has made only rare appearances before the commission. Its rate increases in recent years have been relatively tiny, and it has effected some reductions. Appalachian's rate of $7.15 for typical monthly use of 250 kilowatt-hours compares with the Monongahela rate of $6.93 to $7.31.

Monongahela's president is Don B. Potter, who joined the company 32 years ago as an industrial engineer. He succeeded A. C. Spurr as president in 1955.

Potter is chairman of an advisory committee for the State department of commerce. He headed a similar group with the State's economic development agency before the new department was created this year.

The president, a native of Pottersdale, Pa., was graduated from Carnegie Tech with a degree in mining engineering. One of his first ambitions was to be a power sales engineer—one who sells industry on the idea of using more electric power. But he got into the executive end of the utility business with Monongahela and decided that he liked it, especially from the standpoint of building the local economy and making community improvements.

Potter said his firm always has followed a policy of permitting no free or discount electric service for anyone. He said that policy applies to all executives or employees on the charges for service in their homes.

"The executives pay the same as the janitor," he said. "We have never given this any other thought. It is just something that should be paid.

"Our employees pay their grocery bills and buy their gasoline. They pay their church dues. Why shouldn't they pay their electric bills?"

He said he hadn't considered whether free service or discounts might be considered illegal under West Virginia law. The company's attorney J. B. Sabel, declined to venture an opinion on the question.

Potter said the company does permit small discounts on equipment sold at its appliance stores. The discounts for employees amount to 25 percent on new equipment and 10 percent on charges for repairs. Equipment is sold to ministers and charitable organizations at a 10-percent discount.

The company sells appliances at 39 locations, mostly in areas where other establishments don't carry a complete line of heavy electrical items for household use. Sale of the equipment is regarded as a promotional effort for the use of more electricity.

The president said that up until about 10 years ago the company paid the country club fees of executives and other employees whose duties made it important to associate with business contacts in the elaborate environment of the local organizations.

Payments were stopped, he said, after the company decided they weren't a "proper function" of the firm. But, he pointed out, the company made salary adjustments so that the personnel involved could pay their own dues.

In each of several small towns, the company follows a policy of paying the dues of one employee in a civic club, Potter said. This employee is called a "public contact man."

In some towns, the contact man is required to join the club.

Potter noted that the company also pays for the membership of some employees in junior chambers of commerce. "We consider this a fair training ground," he said. "Of course, we make sure that the employee has an interest in the activities of the chamber."

No lobbyist is hired by the company simply because he isn't needed, Potter said. However, the firm sometimes sends its representatives to legislative meetings when matters of importance arise.

Policies concerning use of company cars are very strict, he said. As a practical matter, all personal use is denied. A few employees, including general line foremen who might be called to meet emergencies at any hour, are permitted to drive home in company cars.

All company cars, with one exception, are classified in the low-price field. The exception is a Chrysler used by the president * * *.

POWER FIRM FINANCIALLY HEALTHY WITH HISTORY OF NO RATE HIKES

(By John G. Morgan, staff writer)

FAIRMONT.—"We believe that the Monongahela system should give the best service at the lowest cost to the most people within its territory, consistent with fair wages and satisfactory working conditions for its employees and a reasonable profit for its stockholders."

That's the creed of the Monongahela Power Co., which never has asked the public service commission for a residential rate increase.

Furthermore, the company doesn't intend to ask for a rate increase in the near future. "We will hold for awhile yet," said President Don B. Potter.

How has the company managed to hold the line in the past?

Potter's answer included references to a reduction in operational costs, automation, and higher temperatures and pressures achieved through efficient use of coal in the generation of electricity.

His answer is directly related to the two outstanding reasons he gave for the long-range success of the company. Those reasons are: early recognition of the need for economic area development and emphasis on reduction of generation and transmission costs.

The company has three power stations—at Rivesville, Marion County; Albright, Preston County; and at Willow Island, near St. Marys on the Ohio River.

A second generating unit was added to Willow Island less than a year ago at a total estimated cost of $26.6 million. It is designed to burn low grades of coal with maximum efficiency.

Principal offices of the company are here in a 7-year-old, $1.5 million building owned by the New York Life Insurance Co. The building, of a functional-type design, is occupied on a long-term lease basis.

The leasing arrangement is comparable to that used by United Fuel Gas Co., which occupies a $7 million building in Charleston. That structure is also owned by the New York Life Insurance Co.

On every hand, there is evidence of continued growth and prosperity of Monongahela despite the fact that the company never has raised it rates.

Last year, Treasurer E. C. Withers said, the company's total revenues amounted to $39,750,000. Out of that sum, $5,516,000 in Federal taxes and $39,966,000 in other taxes were paid. After payment of taxes, operational expenses, interest, stock dividends, and any other necessary items, the company enjoyed a net profit of $5,755,000.

The net return on investment has been averaging between 6 and 6½ percent annually for several years, Withers said. In lean years, he said, the figure has dipped below 6 percent.

As another indication of the company's financial health, big industry type salaries are paid to executives, and all employees are entitled to liberal welfare benefits. Members of the board of directors receive fees that apparently are within the range of those paid by large private corporations.

Potter was paid a salary of $45,000 last year—$5,000 more than he received the previous year, Public Service Commission records show. In addition, he received $1,567 in fees for attending board meetings last year, or $36 more than the previous year.

Salaries of top executives in the company last year:

Executive Vice President E. C. Summers, $31,000; Vice President J. G. Gorman, $21,500; Vice President R. S. Soule, $27,000; Vice President G. E. Vest, $21,500; Comptroller A. L. Adams, $20,400; Treasurer Withers, $20,400; and Secretary G. J. Jackson, $12,900.

There are 14 members on the company's board of directors. Each, with one exception, received $1,567 last year for attending 12 board meetings. The exception was a new board member who received only $933, apparently because he didn't attend all the meetings.

The total paid to directors last year is in keeping with a new fee schedule, which authorizes payment of $133 per person for attending a monthly board session. For several years previous to 1960, the fee was $100 per meeting.

Potter said he believes the salaries paid to the company executives are in line with those paid by private industrial concerns in the general area. He expressed the same opinion about directors' fees.

The president pointed out that several members of the board live out of the State, but they receive no expense money for attending the meetings. Some live as far away as the New York area.

Members of the board besides Potter and Summers are J. L. Rice, Jr., president of the Allegheny system; E. S. Thompson, chair-

man of the Monongahela board; E. W. Wilkinson, the new member; H. D. McDowell and M. G. Miller, nonsalaried vice presidents; G. A. Banington, T. H. Blodgett, H. F. Butler, Randolph Catlin, J. A. Hill, A. B. Richardson, and G. M. Schurman.

Monongahela's annual report for 1960 shows that the company spent $858,562 in pensions and $226,081 in additional employee welfare expense.

Vice President R. S. Soule explained, however, that a much more liberal interpretation of welfare expenses could bring the total up to about $3.5 million, or $1.04 per manhour.

His compilation included pensions, vacations, time lost due to bad weather, all types of insurance and recreation, the cost of putting out a company newspaper, and a half hour each day per employee for coffee breaks.

As still another indication of financial health, the company contributes regularly to charitable organizations. Potter holds to the prevailing view among top utility officials that the contributed money should be counted as operational expense.

Under that view, the company's customers would have to pick up the tab. However, the public service commission has adopted a policy requiring the money contributed to charity to come out of the pockets of stockholders.

The continuing quest for industry, with a rather heavy investment in time and money, is probably one of the best signs of the company's financial condition and its high hopes for the future.

About 50 active industrial prospects are kept within striking distance of the company's area development bait most of the time.

"We will do better when we can land 1 out of 10 good industrial prospects, or 1 out of 50 among all the prospects," Potter said.

Some Responsible for Projecting Image of United States Do Not Understand What It Is

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following article from the Washington Evening Star, written by David Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence points out the need for better communication with the people of the world and I agree with him completely:

COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE—U.S. BROADCASTS TO OTHER NATIONS HIT AS DEFENSIVE AND IN NEED OF INSIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

EN ROUTE FROM EUROPE.—The most important problem that confronts the U.S. Government today is how to communicate with other people around the world.

There is no lack of radio or mail or press facilities. It is not a matter of funds, nor altogether a problem of getting the right personnel for such an institution as the U.S. Information Agency. It is a matter of constructive and well-thought-out policy and concentration in a courageous way on simple objectives in the great crusade to win the hearts and minds of people in other lands.

The oversea broadcasts today from America are defensive and often seem to be in the pussyfoot category, instead of the militant kind. This isn't the fault of the Voice of America but of some misguided policy directives of past years.

Consequently, the Voice of America is inadequate and not as effective as it could be. It is doing some things well and others poorly. It, of course, needs more funds from Congress to improve its work—the Russians spend millions where we spend pennies. But above all else, it needs a recognition by the President and Congress that the task cannot be left to subordinates to fulfill on the basis of directives fitfully supplied in a sort of haphazard way through a fluctuating diplomacy.

What the U.S. Government needs is a man of Cabinet stature to sit alongside the President and spend his whole time on what might be called the public relations of the United States.

What's needed is someone who has had actual contact through diplomacy or otherwise with the peoples of Latin American countries, Asian countries, Middle Eastern countries, and European countries—someone with commonsense who understands the psychology of foreign peoples. He can have beside him plenty of specialists in communications and in the customs of the foreign press, but he needs, above all, to be able to advise the President and his Cabinet as to how what is currently happening abroad is affected by American action and how suggested American policies would be received in other countries.

Nor is communication a problem altogether of mechanical facilities. As much, if not more, can be accomplished by indirect contact with foreign countries through word of mouth—by conversations with key persons in other lands. This means more contacts by our own diplomats with important persons not only in the press but in other walks of life in each country. It means an organized and not a casual effort. In a total sense, it means reaching through to the heart of the people whose friendship America seeks.

Improvement of the Voice of America broadcasts is imperative. One wonders why so little time is given on these programs to news and serious subjects in the news, and why so much time is consumed on rock-and-roll music or highbrow lectures, some of which seem to apologize for America's free-enterprise system.

This writer has been listening by shortwave radio nearly every night for years, both at home and abroad, to the broadcasts of the various Communist-bloc stations as well as to the Voice of America and the oversea service of the British Broadcasting Co. Music undoubtedly has a certain appeal in attracting listeners. But it is difficult to understand the object of a radio interview with a movie star on what constitutes "sophistication." Surely, the Voice of America could use its precious time more wisely and more effectively.

The Communists, of course, repeat and persist with their points day after day, and they broadcast in simple English that can be readily grasped. Much of the broadcasting on both sides is, to be sure, done in foreign languages, and here the matter of simplicity is especially important.

These criticisms are not new. They have been made by this writer for the last decade to public officials, particularly on the wording of the broadcasts, which still are often hard for the average listener abroad to catch. Simple expressions are better for the radio than the phraseology and big words of overcondensed press association dispatches.

As for editorial commentaries that are supposed to reflect American public opinion, the selection by the Voice of America is not representative of the American press at all. Rarely are any newspapers in the midwest quoted, and rarely are some of the best pronouncements in Congress spread around the world.

There is sometimes, moreover, a tendency to give a leftwing twist to many items, and there is at times an indifference to the conservative point of view in America. There is constant apology, too, for various defects in the American system, without an effort to explain that even racial problems must be handled by constitutional law and not by mobs. It is tragic that American ideals are so little expounded, while American shortcomings are so much emphasized. The whole problem of communication in foreign policy needs a new look.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that some who are responsible for projecting our image to the peoples of the world, do not understand or they have forgotten what the image really is. I call your attention to a news article from the Washington Evening Star, quoting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the effect that he believes it is a function of the Federal Government to help people to become self-supporting:

RIBICOFF ENDORSES HAVING ABLEBODIED WORK TO GET RELIEF

WASHINGTON, August 24.—Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said today that wherever possible a person on relief should work for the money he received.

He would favor Federal participation in such work relief programs, he declared, but emphasized the necessity for what he termed proper safeguards. Under present law, no Federal money can be contributed to State or local work relief programs.

Mr. Ribicoff discussed at a news conference studies he had underway of the entire Federal welfare structure, with emphasis on possible changes of aid to dependent children program.

He expects to make recommendations to Congress in January for changes in the children program and possibly in other welfare fields, he announced.

"I think that to the fullest extent possible a person who can do work should do it for the welfare or relief money he receives," he stated.

"The Federal Government, however, should not and cannot assume the responsibility which is the responsibility of a local community. This is a complicated problem."

He declared it a "discredit to our society that we have not provided a system which helps succeeding generations to become self-supporting.

Mr. Speaker, it was never intended by the founders of our country that the Government should feed, clothe and house the people. We cannot, under a free enterprise system, provide through Federal Government agencies complete welfare for all those unable or unwilling to work. The best way we can help future generations to become self-supporting is not through extending Federal welfare programs, but freeing the people from the heavy burden of such programs so that the free enterprise system will be given full opportunity to function and make possible a better life for all the people.

Employment in the Dynamic American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Special Projects of the House Republican Policy Committee recently issued its final report on "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy."

The August 19 issue of the magazine Business Week took notice of this project in an article entitled "GOP Tries New Way To Harness Scholars."

The person who was responsible for this excellent achievement is our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. Mr. CURTIS deserves the thanks of all of us, myself included, who were privileged to be associated in the project with him.

I am pleased to call this article to the attention of my colleagues:

GOP TRIES NEW WAY TO HARNESS SCHOLARS

A group of Republican Members of the House this week climaxed a unique experiment in economics and politics with a demand for a fresh approach to the problem of unemployment.

This contingent, led by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, has for 6 months been examining unemployment with the aid of 24 academic economists. The scholars volunteered their services in response to appeals sent out by CURTIS.

The project will not end with the filing of a formal report by the academicians, which is all that usually happens when Congress enlists the advice of scholars. Under a plan devised by CURTIS, the 48 Republicans who took part in the project were divided into task forces, each taking up some facet of the unemployment problem.

The House group represents a wide range of viewpoints, from archconservative, JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, to liberal JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York. Each task force worked with an economist who prepared a background paper on the assigned subject. If the members of the group didn't understand the professor the first time around, a new draft was prepared.

When the task force was satisfied, members would discuss the paper in speeches on the floor of the House and introduce the study itself into the record.

SUMMING IT UP

Altogether, 21 such group efforts are now in the RECORD, topped this week by a speech by CURTIS, who summarized what the group thinks should be done to reduce unemployment. Among the conclusions:

There are more unfilled jobs in the country than there are unemployed persons.

The chief cause of joblessness is not automation but deficiencies in vocational training and the job-locating services of the U.S. Employment Service.

Retraining is essential, but more should be left to management and labor unions than the Kennedy administration proposes.

The tax laws should be modified to help bring jobs and the jobless together.

CURTIS and his group accuse the Kennedy administration of taking a defeatist attitude toward reducing unemployment. And CURTIS, individually at least, is willing to concede that the Eisenhower administration also failed to grapple with the real nature of the problem.

PROFESSIONAL VIEW

The professors did not join in the policy conclusions of the group, nor were they asked to.

Plans are underway to publish the background papers and the comments of the participating Members of the House in book form. CURTIS and his supporters think it could give the GOP a fresh start in tackling unemployment as an economic problem and a political issue.

CURTIS has long been exposed to the ideas and methods of professional economists as a member of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. He has been aware that, when it comes to marshaling academic talent, the Democrats usually outgun the GOP. On the issue of unemployment, CURTIS set out to equalize matters.

The result is a project that calls on the talents of such economists as Clarence D. Long, of Johns Hopkins; Robert Triffin, William J. Fellner, and Henry C. Wallich, of Yale; Howard S. Ellis, of the University of California; and Neil H. Jacoby, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Some of the economists have Republican leanings. Wallich and Jacoby, for example, both served as members of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Eisenhower. But Long is an active leader of the Democratic Party in Maryland, and Triffin is an adviser to President Kennedy on international monetary problems.

CALL FOR CHANGES

Now that the papers are in, the Curtis group is calling for changes in Federal and State policies, geared to the central idea that there's no reason to accept any given level of unemployment as tolerable as long as newspapers are loaded with help-wanted ads.

"There's an actual shortage of labor," CURTIS argues.

The first goal of retraining, CURTIS told the House this week, should be the jobs that are going unfilled. He quotes officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as saying that Negroes are being trained for jobs that are disappearing. CURTIS believes this same mistake is going to be made by the Kennedy administration unless retraining is preceded by a nationwide study of jobs.

CURTIS accuses the Department of Labor and the Office of Education of competing in bureaucratic warfare rather than coordinating Federal efforts to make vocational guidance and training fit actual needs. He believes the Armed Forces—"the biggest educational system in the country"—ought to train men with an eye on civilian job needs.

TAX REFORMS

This week's summary of the group's ideas stressed two changes in the tax laws. One would allow the cost of retraining to be deducted from income; the other would declare the legal residence of workers to be where their jobs are, not where their homes are.

Under present law, per diem expenses for workers away from their legal residence are not allowed beyond a limited period, after which the expense money is taxed as ordinary income. CURTIS argues that this is a hardship on workers at isolated projects, and one reason for the difficulty in matching jobless men with manless jobs.

CURTIS also criticized the unemployment insurance laws of 40 States, which cut off unemployment payments during a retraining period. The whole direction of policy should be in the other direction, CURTIS argues. He suggests that the laws could be rewritten to force anyone off the rolls who refuses retraining, though he adds that this may be too severe.

The group includes two standbys of Republican economic policy among its recommendations: balanced budgets to avoid inflation, and rephrasing the Employment Act of 1946 to include stable prices as a goal of Federal policy.

America's Growing Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there is a steadily growing awareness in our country that its progress, its standard of living, and its way of life are not fortuitous accidents; that these are part, parcel, and products of the political system under which we have thrived. This awareness involves a sharpening respect for freedom; personal freedom, political freedom, and economic freedom. It also involves a sharpening perception of the challenges to those freedoms hurled not only by the international Communist conspiracy, but as well by those who would compromise them under the banner of socialism.

Editorial Columnist Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., of the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, recently wrote of these matters, as follows:

WHERE IT HURTS

The parlor pinks and other leftwingers are being hit where it hurts. They are seeing a nationwide upsurge of young people who are worried over the danger of communism. All over the Nation groups are studying the actions and achievements of communism. They do not like what they see and are making their views known. They are calling a spade a spade, and the so-called liberals don't like it. They are frantic in trying to meet the first real opposition they have faced.

The movement is not made up of selfish and cruel reactionaries who would grind down the poor to benefit the rich. Among them are irresponsible people who cloud the issue. We would consider Welch of the Birch Society such a person and harmful to the cause of conservatism. But he is but one of millions of Americans who have awakened to the danger of the leftwing radicals and Communist apologists who have long used the same tactics as Welch has used.

Wishing to see what was being said, and who was taking part in other groups organized to oppose communism, we attended such a group meeting. We were the oldest person in the room. The others were young business executives and civic workers. There were no intemperate statements. But there was an evident concern over the way freedom of men is being delegated to or usurped by Government. There was documented evidence presented to show how far the doctrines of communism have come to be accepted and how they have enslaved every country where they were not fought by the people. Reports tell of thousands of such groups in every section of the Nation.

There is a great problem faced by these people and groups. The Communist sympathizers and so-called liberals have long been free to spread their propaganda in condemning everyone who disagrees with them. No matter whether it is true or false, their

followers praise them. They are heroes to their groups of subversives. But the great mass of Americans are fundamentally honest and conservative. When a man like Welch refers to Eisenhower, Warren, and others as Communist tools, the mass of people turn away. They will not accept the demagog as a hero as do the leftwingers. But the danger is that these conservative Americans become apathetic defeatists and fail to accept their own responsibility to guide such groups in what is vital to safeguarding our freedoms.

The problem is how to awaken the people to the danger of constant appeasement of Communists or their pink followers. The danger is great and should be faced. It is a threat to our freedom as well as that of every other free country. We can freeze to death in a cold war as surely as we can be cooked to death in a hot war. We are facing the Communists with a poor armor. Our national decency and belief in honorable conduct is at a disadvantage when placed against an enemy that has no such scruples. But we can each stand up and be counted among those who are willing to fight against such subversive elements.

The groups over the Nation that have been formed to fight for freedom on the home front are being attacked by attempted ridicule. They are sneered at by those who have spent their adult lives sneering at the American way. But this present nationwide upsurge of Americanism and dedication to the system under which we live is the most hopeful sign seen in the last quarter century. It is late—but not too late to join in the movement to fight against the insidious propaganda and infiltration of Government, schools, churches, labor unions, and even business organizations by those who would change what we have for what is promised us by the Communists, or those who spread their philosophies and sneer at attempts to overcome the menace that faces this and all other free nations. If you do not like the way the fight is being carried out, get in and help guide it. But if you are realistic, you will not be neutral or apathetic.

Wishful Thinking Is Now Sound Financial Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for fiscal responsibility. The Kennedy administration puts great stress on the period of the business cycle theory, figuring that deficits now may be picked up later, if certain economic theories materialize. The trouble with that kind of planning is that the expected increases never catch up to spending. True fiscal responsibility means living within our income, cut Federal spending to what we take in each year. The best possible boost we could give the economy is to adopt legislation I have introduced, along with other Members, to make a constitutional provision that Government must live within its income. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune indicates some of the fuzzy economic thinking of administration officials:

A FORECAST OF OUR OWN

David E. Bell, the Kennedy Budget Director, told a conference of State budget officers that the administration was experimenting with 5-year budget forecasts in order to promote better planning. This is in line with Mr. Kennedy's notion that budgets will even out over the period of the business cycle, so that nobody need be greatly disturbed by the big deficits he has started out producing.

Mr. Bell said that had the parochial outlook prevailed of considering only the problems of the current fiscal year, a tax increase might have been deemed necessary. But, looking ahead to a few birds in the bush, he was hopeful that an additional $10 billion a year in revenue might materialize. If so, the budget would be balanced.

We read into this that it will take $10 billion more to offset the deficit registered for the last fiscal year and that which is in the making for the year to end June 30, 1962. And, on this basis, we think it possible to indulge in a few forecasts of our own, the chief one being that if Mr. Kennedy manages to hang on for 5 years, his annual budget at the end of that period at the present rate of increased spending will have reached a figure of about $115 billion a year. And, things being so, Mr. Bell will still be scouring the horizon for another $10 billion a year or so in the hope of making ends meet.

Operation Employment: Comment by the Journal of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a study group operating under the direction of the Republican policy committee's subcommittee on special projects has recently finished its study of "Employment in Our Dynamic Economy." The effort made and the product of this effort has elicited comment from a number of sources, one of these the respected Journal of Commerce of New York. In an editorial in its August 16 issue, the Journal commended the work of the group and commented on its recommendations. I should like to place this editorial from the Journal of Commerce in the RECORD to give its ideas on these matters the consideration of the readership of the RECORD:

EMPLOYING THE UNEMPLOYED

When a study group attached to a policy committee of a leading political party—in this case it's the GOP—comes up with some sensible recommendations that are not political and which refrain from damning the acts of the opposite party, it's news of the man-bites-dog type. After 6 months of study the group, headed by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, has come up with a report involving some 20 recommendations to aid unemployment.

Although the business recovery is daily providing more jobs, the fact that total unemployment remains so high a percentage of the labor force, with individual terms of unemployment gradually lengthening, is a cause of national disquiet, political criticism, and general viewings with alarm. Nearly everybody has felt that something ought to be done about it; nobody has been able to say just what should be done.

The study committee mentioned may crystallize into direction what has been a vague urge toward motion. It takes the sensible view that with job vacancies so nearly approximating the number of jobless, what is primarily needed is retraining. More important, if retraining is the big need, there has to be an incentive for it right down the line. Forty States will have to change their rules to let unemployed persons stay on the unemployment compensation rolls while they are learning skills now needed or to be needed.

Tax changes must be made to permit workers to continue to get tax free per diem allowances past existing limitations when working away from their families. We are not sure this report said so, but union rules, pension plan regulations, and other limitations upon labor mobility also should be changed.

Employers, the committee said, should get some reward for running retraining schools for their own workers and possibly for other firms' workers. This could be through a broadening of the merit rating concept through which employers can lighten their unemployment tax burdens.

Workers should be able to deduct retraining expenses from their tax bills. There should be a national labor clearinghouse set up which would determine what skills should be concentrated upon in retraining; what part of the country needed or would need what skills.

There should be better coordination between national and State labor agencies, more accurate figures on the jobless rolls. There should even be teeth in regulations—for example, something to cut off from unemployment benefits anybody who refused to be retrained. There should be better vocational guidance in respect to those currently employed in the military services and who will eventually be added either to the rolls of the employed or the unemployed.

Today's unemployment is primarily structural, which means imbalance between types and geographical location of unemployed and types and location of jobs offered by employers. It is therefore eventually solvable and not something that is in the category of things that are to be—indefinitely. It is complicated by distressed area unemployment, upon which, one of these days, we hope to comment.

At the moment the big thing is that a political committee has contributed something that will give purpose and determination to those who will have to live with the unemployment problem for years to come.

Reader's Digest Supports Cuban Refugee Emergency Appeal of the International Rescue Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the earliest and major contributors to the Cuban refugee relief program has been the well-known International Rescue Committee, Inc., with headquarters in New York.

The committee instituted its Caribbean program on July 13, 1960. Since that time, it has helped 20,000 Cuban refugees, some 12,000 in the Miami area and about 8,000 elsewhere, primarily New York, New Jersey, and southern Connecticut. One thousand four hundred were resettled from Miami, and more than

3,000 job opportunities were secured for refugees who turned to the committee for help. New registrations in Miami and New York average 250 a week, or almost 600 people if family members are included. Facing a caseload of 30,000 Cuban refugees by the end of the year, the committee is facing a grave financial crisis.

After the revolution in Hungary in 1956, more than 38,000 Hungarians entered this country. For this gigantic relief program, the committee received a total of $3 million with which it aided in resettling these refugees from oppression.

I point out that by the end of this year, we expect to have received on our shores more than 150,000 refugees from Communist-infected Cuba—more than three times the number of Hungarians. The total program for the Cuban refugees relief program for the year 1960-61 was financed by the committee with $350,000 raised by June 30 of this year. In comparison to the $3 million donated for the Hungarians, this is a meager figure indeed for the existing program of relief and assistance. Not less than a million dollars is needed now for IRC's share of emergency assistance, a stepped-up resettlement program, and intensive retraining.

Of substantial help to the committee in its efforts has been an appeal made by the Reader's Digest Foundation, which solicited the financial support of its readers and contributed a check of $10,000 to initiate a nationwide appeal. During this past month, an information program has been conducted throughout the country in support of the Reader's Digest appeal.

The International Rescue Committee brings 28 years of experience in aiding escapees from dictatorship. I trust all Americans will take an equal interest in its program of assistance so that it may effectvely focus that experience on the needs of the 30,000 Cuban exiles in our midst and all those who will continue to find a haven here in our country from oppression and tyranny.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Secretary of Labor Goldberg Before National Convention of Hadassah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, recently Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg spoke in Denver before the 47th national convention of Hadassah, to a capacity audience of 2,600 persons.

Denver was delighted to meet Secretary Goldberg, and to hear him speak. His well-earned reputation as a creative, dynamic public servant had preceded him there, and he added luster to that reputation.

From civic leaders, from management representatives and from leaders of organized labor alike, the reactions I have received on Mr. Goldberg's appearance in Denver have been unanimously favorable.

He spoke of a number of things, but primarily he spoke of President Kennedy's foreign aid program and foreign policies in this difficult era.

Secretary Goldberg was interrupted more than once by applause. The response was particularly enthusiastic when he said:

We shall neither blow up nor give up.

It is our view that those who see us outclassed abroad and subverted at home have but little understanding of our country or our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Goldberg's address delivered in Denver on August 20 be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF HADASSAH, DENVER, COLO., AUGUST 20, 1961

I am delighted to visit with you today, and to have the honor to bring you a message from the President of the United States:

"Greetings to the delegates and guests of the 47th National Convention of Hadassah.

"You meet at a time when political and economic systems all over the world are being severely tested. The poor, the exploited, and the burdened have all made freedom their cause. This makes democracy our opportunity.

"The common language among all those who speak for freedom is that of compassion, which knows no country, no race, and no creed. It resides in the human spirit. It is the most easily understood but the most difficult to attain.

"Hadassah has a history of such compassion, especially in Palestine and in the new democratic State of Israel. For almost 50 years it has eased the pains of the distraught, sheltered the homeless, and guided the weak. This is the only true posture for a free society, and for the citizens of that society. Your efforts in behalf of assistance for underdeveloped nations, for medical aid, for elimination of illiteracy, and for vocational education in emerging societies have helped show the way to freedom. In these critical days you play a large part in our battle for men's minds.

"I congratulate you upon both your goals and your achievements. Best wishes for a successful convention.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN F. KENNEDY,
"President of the United States."

The President speaks for all of us when he says that we must be known by our actions. And certainly the actions of Hadassah—the great new Hadassah Medical Center at the Hebrew University in Israel, your making available medical teaching and education to Asians and Africans—speak a common language of mercy and service that should characterize all American enterprises in newly developing countries.

This is the policy of unselfish, practical help and assistance enunciated by the President that motivates our entire foreign aid proposals.

It is the policy enunciated by the President, when, as a candidate for that office, he spoke of our friendship for that great sister democracy, the Republic of Israel, and of our relations with all of the countries of the Middle East. He said at that time: "The Middle East needs water, not war—tractors, not tanks—bread, not bombs."

Peace was, is, and always will be our primary objective in the Middle East and throughout the world.

The triumph of the human spirit, not of arms, is the desired goal of American policy. The peace of understanding brings with it new hope for all—the peaceful hearth in place of the empty room, the new power of harnessed rivers in place of the arid wastes of the desert, the care of the young and the old in place of their abandonment, a promise of abundance in place of ancient poverty.

We believe these things are possible for the world—and for the Middle East. The United States has always been prepared to support its commitment to peace and understanding with technical and economic assistance—to give of the wealth of our own people in order to rescue the hopes of others.

A powerful defense is a guarantee that the peace will be kept by offering to any aggressor the certainty of his own destruction. We have and are building such a defense. Yet deterring aggression is only the beginning if freedom is to survive and ultimately triumph in the world.

Behind our defensive system, the work of freedom must go on. It is the work that you of Hadassah have been doing for almost 50 years: building, not destroying; developing, not exploiting; aiding, not ignoring.

You have shown what a Peace Corps can do. The President's alliance-for-progress program, for example, seeks to bring to this whole hemisphere a program for building, developing, and aiding—and bring to an end the destruction, exploitation, and ignorance that result from social and economic injustice.

Elsewhere in the world, as in Berlin, where freedom finds itself engaged, where the distance between freedom and tyranny may become a matter of miles, or of yards, we find people making their choice with their feet. I do not believe this to be merely a choice between political systems that might compete in offering material advantages. It is a vote, not for power but for dignity. As I read what is happening in Germany, people are voting, not for a better breadbasket in the West but for the human and individual dignity that a life of freedom affords.

And we must remember that for the heart of Europe—for Turkey, Greece, Iran, and elsewhere—the choice between national freedom and Communist enslavement would not be possible today if the United States had not, for the past 16 years, shown the depth of its commitment to freedom throughout the world in programs like the Marshall plan, the Truman plan, point 4, and the rest. And today, Allianzo Para Progresso takes its proper place with these massive commitments to the cause of humanity and justice.

You of Hadassah have given continuing support to these programs. Only recently, you have strongly endorsed the President's foreign aid program, the proposals to ban nuclear testing with firm guarantees of adequate international inspection and control, the food-for-peace and National Peace Corps programs, not to mention your firm commitment to the administration's position on vital domestic questions such as civil rights.

I welcome this opportunity on behalf of the administration to thank Hadassah and the members of this outstanding organization, composed of members of both political parties, for this true demonstration of nonpartisanship in the national interest. Throughout the entire existence of Hadassah, its members, by actions as well as words, have shown the truest Americanism by affirming and not denying your origins, to the benefit of our own country as well as to the benefit of the ancestral home of the Jewish people.

It was recognition of this unity, rather than duality of national purpose, that places Henrietta Szold among the ranks of our great American women, along with such women as Jane Addams, Mary Bethune, Lillian Wald, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the others whose life work was characterized by a humanitarianism which, by its very terms, knows no national boundaries.

As these women knew, whether given by government, or by private organizations such as Hadassah, humanitarianism is truly democracy at work.

And for both government and private organizations, it is a good rule that no qualifications should exist as to how a nation attains to freedom, as long as it strives to do so. We believe that nations should chart their own courses, fly their own flags, build their own social and economic systems—as long as they enjoy true freedom for their people and respect the inherent rights that we in the United States consider the foundation of every political society.

Both Israel and the United States for example share a common belief in political democracy, individual liberty, and government by laws, not men.

One of the difficulties we have had in the past in making our aid programs as effective as they might be is the fact that we have been bound to short-term, and often expedient, commitments. It has too often been a program of reaction to other pres-

sures rather than a program of our own long-term commitment to freedom. Foreign aid, in its best sense, is a charter for freedom.

The President has asked the Congress to give him more flexibility in this regard, so that we might be the movers and initiators of needed economic reforms in the world, and help bring other nations to freedom.

He has asked, specifically, for authorization to loan $8.8 billion from the Development Loan Fund over the next 5 years, $1.2 billion for the next fiscal year and $1.9 billion each year thereafter.

The Senate has voted for this 5-year authorization. The House adopted an amendment denying the 5-year authorization.

The real issue in the foreign aid bill is not a technical one of long term versus annual appropriations. The real issue is the substantive one as to whether we have reached that point of maturity in which we will positively assert our position of leadership in the free world, or whether we reluctantly accept this as a burden thrust upon us. This is the genuine issue in this debate. A leader must lead or he will be relegated to the rear rank. I have that degree of confidence in our people that I believe they support strong leadership by our country of the free world.

There are some who say we cannot afford to meet the requirements of leadership in world affairs and at the same time invest resources in social progress and development at home. This is fainthearted counsel. Surely, this is not the style of the American people. But more importantly, it overlooks the basic fact that world leadership and domestic progress are not alternative choices. They are inseparable. George Kennan and others have for long pointed out in the most persuasive ways that the bedrock of American foreign policy must be social and economic progress at home, a healthy and prosperous people sharing in the good things of life.

I know that you share with me the view that if there were ever a measure before Congress necessary to the future of the free world, it is the foreign-aid bill. We can no longer exist as an island of affluence and contentment in a world seething with want and change. We can no longer walk the proud path of indifference, turning our faces away from those who already resent us too much because of the past.

I fully realize that this aid program is expensive, that $8.8 billion is a lot of money.

I also realize that the chances for peace in freedom are very much diminished in a world of chronic have-nots—and very much improved in a world of independent and capable economies and just political systems.

No one would suggest that we can buy friendship. No one assumes we can purchase peace. Nor is that the intention. The intention is to create a world environment in which peace can flourish.

I hope that in conference and by final action, the Congress will give substantial approval to the foreign-aid bill, preserving in amount and in principle what the President has rightfully proposed.

The administration of President Kennedy is pledged to a related set of concepts which should command the approval of every American, and every believer in liberty. They are:

First, as the most powerful nation in the world, immovably rooted in the principles of justice, we are charged with the responsibility to lead the free world. We cannot abrogate this responsibility in this great human cause.

Secondly, our whole history makes it impossible for us to be self-centered in our devotion to the cause of peace in freedom.

Thirdly, in terms of the world alliance we lead, the encouragement that refusal to aid would give to those intent upon conquest, is not to be offered.

Fourth, we welcome all allies devoted to peace in freedom. In this regard, we respect the right of every nation to seek freedom and equality, order and independence in its own way, flying its own flag, charting its own course.

We support the revolution of peace and hope sweeping nations throughout the world, and we offer that support, as the President stated, "regardless of which political or economic route they choose to freedom."

Fifth, our alliance is one of voluntary commitment to peace in freedom. It is not cemented with force, not held together with the bonds of political domination and fear. We do not force nations to be our allies. And we resist efforts on the part of others to compel, coerce, or subvert them to be their allies.

Finally, in this open posture of support for all nations seeking freedom, our sympathies are manifestly with those seeking to end injustice, tyranny and exploitation, anywhere in the world.

I would be less than frank if I did not say our devotion to these principles, which we readily accept, is often questioned by others.

We are, as we think we are, a forward-looking country. But it would be a mistake to suppose that this is the way the rest of the world regards us. To the peoples of struggling, emerging nations of the earth, in many of which the blood of revolutionaries is hardly yet dried on the streets of their capital city, the American Revolution must seem a long way off. In their eyes the burden of proof is upon us to demonstrate that indeed we are part of the new order rather than the old. It is no secret that some conclude the proof is lacking.

This is not an easy thing for Americans to understand. Many have reacted with alarm or with despair. On the one hand we have a group of isolationists who assert that it is wrong to do the things we are attempting abroad. On the other hand, there are those who have concluded that however proper our efforts might be, they will not succeed. Interestingly, these groups start from opposite premises, but come to almost identical conclusions. The isolationist state of mind and the advocates of unilateral disarmament come to the surprisingly similar point of agreement that we should no longer maintain our leadership of the free world.

Let me say to you that the administration of John F. Kennedy does not propose to be bound by either of these alternatives.

We shall neither blow up nor give up.

It is our view that those who see us outclassed abroad and subverted at home have but little understanding of our country or our people.

What we are trying to say to the American people, and to the Congress is, that we can shape our future. That we can generate the forces that direct the course of world events. If we have grown old as a nation, it is because we have stayed young as a people. For on to two centuries this Republic has shaped its own destinies, and we do not now propose to submit to the formulas of Karl Marx, or Herbert Spengler, or, if you will, of the second law of thermodynamics which declare that we cannot go on. Despite our doubts, the fact is that since the end of World War II freedom, both for people and for nations, has been on the upswing throughout the world. New and independent nations like Israel have been created.

These events have not followed any predetermined course of history. They were an achievement of human effort. This is the effort to which we summon the American people.

This is not an administration that would make the best the enemy of the good. During his campaign the President did not propose to scrap everything that has been done and start anew. We have done well, but we can do better.

It is surely not hard to understand that the rest of the world is watching to see whether we will do so. Even those who resent our achievements of the past do not question them. The question is what we will now go on to achieve.

We face many problems in the world—but they are also opportunities.

Will we take the opportunities offered to us?

Will we mount a true and lasting offensive against want and against injustice, both at home and abroad?

Will we prepare a place for people everywhere, not only here, where freedom can dwell?

Will we be true to the truth of our own Revolution? It is one, in the words of Isaiah, that seeks to "bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prisons to them that are bound."

And this same voice of prophecy describes the end we seek:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

The Wall Hides Communist Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while it is true, as stated in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, that the wall erected by the Communists in Berlin may hide the misery and the crimes against humanity of the Soviet system, the premise that the wall will not enslave the German people is a dangerous one. One thing we must not forget is that the Communists allow no disagreement from those they imprison. Dissenters are killed. Already we have seen them shamelessly shoot and kill, in the sight of hundreds on the free side of the wall, a refugee attempting to swim to freedom. There is no way for us now to know how many Germans are being liquidated behind the wall. Yet, we who are still free, wait. Wait for what? Until Western rights are threatened in Berlin, Allied leaders say. Do we think nothing of human beings? Is not the life of a single German who dies trying to gain freedom enough to condemn the Communists in the eyes of the world and cause us to take whatever action is necessary to place them outside the sanctuary of civilized nations? The wall is a grim reminder of the threat the Communist world conspiracy poses to every freedom-loving individual and when freedom dies anywhere in the world, we who are yet free also die a little.

The article follows:

THE WALL

Faced with an accelerating flight of refugees from East to West, the Reds are build-

ing a concrete wall to block the escape of East Germans who would rather abandon home and possessions than endure life under communism. The wall will extend some 15 zigzag miles across the city, augmenting the barbed wire and armed guards that now mark the line between Berlin's contrasting halves.

No doubt the Kremlin feels more secure because the misery and disillusion of the East Germans will no longer be exposed to global view. But while the wall may represent a victory for the Soviets, it could be a deceiving one. It is not enough for Communists to hold a country captive—they require at least docile support from the people if their system is to function even feebly. And such support is not given by a wall.

William Wordsworth knew it more than a hundred years ago when he wrote: "Stone walls a prisoner make, but not a slave."

Mr. Speaker, surely no person in America can read the tragic stories of human beings as related in the following story from the New York Times without a deep sense of shame at our inability to act. While a mother stands, crying at the wall, while a brokenhearted father returns to his children in the slave-half of Berlin and to certain imprisonment or death, while a young man stares through tear-dimmed eyes at his beloved from whom he is forever separated by Communist tyranny, we wait. While human beings are being degraded and broken and tyrannized, we seek to negotiate with the butchers of liberty.

I also include the above-mentioned article:

BERLINERS MEET AT WALL OF TEARS IN CITY SPLIT BY RED BARRICADES—MOTHER OF BRIDE WEEPS IN THE EAST AS HER DAUGHTER IS WED IN WEST—PLEA BY A BROTHER GOES UNHEEDED

BERLIN, August 24.—There was a wedding in Berlin yesterday. The bride and bridegroom and some of their friends and the minister stood in West Berlin, just by the wall that the Communists have built to separate West Berlin from Communist East Berlin.

The mother of the bride stood on the other side of the wall, in East Berlin, crying.

This, and a hundred other tragedies, small when put up against the big issues involved, are what the splitting of the city means.

BROTHERS ARE PARTED

A young refugee from East Germany left the West Berlin camp to look at the barriers being built on the border at Wilhelmstrasse, a lieutenant of the regular army was in charge on the East Berlin side.

Then the refugee saw the officer, "Dieter," he called out. "Think of our mother. Dieter, be decent. Remain a human being."

Dieter, the refugee's brother, turned away, silent. And the refugee went back to the camp.

DEATH IN THE WEST

The Communist police nailed wooden boards across the front door of Frau Ida Siekmann's house, one of the hundreds that stand on East Berlin territory with their front doors facing on sidewalks that are in West Berlin. The police also boarded up windows on the first and second floors.

Frau Siekmann, 59 years old, climbed to the third floor. She opened a window, threw some belongings and her papers on to the West Berlin sidewalk and jumped. She died in the ambulance on the way to the hospital.

The East Berlin woman died on Friday and her body was taken for burial the following Sunday to the East Berlin cemetery. But the entrance to the cemetery is in West Berlin.

Saturday night, the border was closed. The burial took place on schedule as the widower looked over the cemetery wall and the woman's West Berlin relatives tried to see through the gate.

TOMORROW IS TOO LATE

At the corner of Onckenstrasse and Harzerstrasse two 15-year-old girls who have grown up together talked over what the West Berliners call the "Chinese wall" in the middle of the street.

"Tomorrow at the same time," one of the girls said. That night the height of the wall was raised to six feet.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED?

Six East Berlin children are in West Berlin's West End Hospital. The doctors sent a message to the parents of one saying: "Operation successful but condition of your child still gives cause for worry."

The telegram was sent three times. The hospital received one telegram from the parents in East Berlin. It said: "What has happened? Answer immediately."

ORDEAL OF A FATHER

A couple of days before the border was closed, a family of 11 decided to try escape on the elevated railway that used to carry thousands of Berliners back and forth daily across the two halves of the city.

The grandmother in the family took two boys, 6 and 5 years old. Eleven-year-old Petra went on a second train with her year-old brother in a baby carriage. Two boys, aged 10 and 9, went on the same train as Petra, but in a different compartment. The parents and two other children took a third train.

All but Petra and the baby made it. The little girl and her brother were seized by the police before the train reached West Berlin.

"What should we do?" the father asked. "If we go back, we'll go to prison for fleeing. If we don't—." He went back the next day.

TEARS IN THE WEST

A newsman came upon a young man near the border staring intently into East Berlin with binoculars.

"See anyone you know?" the reporter asked jokingly.

"My finance," the man replied, turning away to hide his tears.

ROSES IN THE EAST

On a street in East Berlin today, a French newspaperwoman was walking. An old man came up to her and thrust a bouquet of red roses into her hands. "Take these," he said. "And don't forget us, don't forget us."

Mr. Speaker, we will not put an end to the crime of communism through fine-sounding phrases such as uttered by the Vice President on his recent trip to Berlin. I do not oppose the words of the Vice President, but I think we mock those who are dying for freedom in Berlin, if we are not prepared to do more than talk. We need to take more constructive action than the suggestion of the Vice President, as outlined in this editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, that we merely send more troops and weapons into Berlin:

MATCHES NEAR POWDER

Yesterday there was a dangerous incident along the wall sealing off Communist East Berlin. East German Communist police directed a stream from a water cannon at two American soldiers who had ignored an order to draw back from the border. The Americans reached for grenades, but did not employ them.

It is to be doubted that the participants on either side ranked above sergeant. Yet in a situation as inflammatory as that prevailing in Berlin, a minor fracas like this could easily explode into war. Khrushchev and his Soviet associates have often advanced the possibility that some idiot could trigger a general war simply by pushing the wrong button.

Well, it need not be a hydrogen bomb that goes off. The button operating a water cannon as an expression of Communist insolence will do as well. So will the safety pin of a grenade.

We do not expect much restraint from truculent Communists who have built Berlin into a crisis endangering the peace of the world. But the commanders of our forces should have the prudence to instruct their subordinates against rising to the bait of Communist provocation. Experienced officers should be present with the border patrols. And our leaders in civilian Government should provide an example of moderation, which, we fear from the latest recommendations of Vice President JOHNSON, they are failing to do.

For JOHNSON is urging President Kennedy to rush more fighting equipment, including heavy tanks, to Berlin. We cannot see what service these armaments would perform, for the small allied garrison in the city is a mere hostage to the Reds should Khruschchev force shooting. And even if we are wrong in this, no good can be served by advertising any plan of reinforcement that we may have.

We ought to try to keep things as calm as possible in Berlin unless and until we are pushed into general war. Playing with matches around a powder keg is insane.

Mr. Speaker, there are other actions we can take, short of war, to isolate the deadly virus of communism so that it will wither and the disease will be eradicated. We can refuse to deal any further in the family of civilized nations with an uncivilized government. The United States and all free nations should immediately break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. We should enforce a complete economic blockade so that we stop sending materials of war, and food and fiber to help stabilize and strengthen these governments pledged to our destruction. We can end the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere by freeing Cuba from Communist dictatorship and giving the Cuban people the right to freely choose their own government leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of Congress and every God-fearing American will take to heart the human tragedies now taking place in Berlin and so rise up that we leave no doubt that we are on the side of free people and that we are able and that we have the will to defend the freedom of every last man who desires to be free.

Steel and Politics: At the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Steel and Politics: At the Crossroads."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL AND POLITICS: AT THE CROSSROADS

Any adjustment in prices can be made only in the light of all known * * * conditions.—ROGER BLOUGH.

It may well be that the large steel companies can and should be broken up.—Senator ALBERT GORE.

(By A. J. Glass)

"It almost reminds one of the mating season dances of the gooney birds," said Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, Tennessee, explaining last week to the Senate how the steel industry is preparing to raise its prices for the 13th time since World War II.

Then, with some of the sharpest words legislators have ever addressed to American businessmen, Senator GORE and several of his Democratic colleagues warned the steel industry to cut its mating dance short. Standing among dozens of economic charts and graphs that were set up on the Senate floor for the occasion, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, summed up for the group:

"Let the warning go out," he said, "that if price increases take place in the steel industry in October, then, just as surely as we are here in the Senate Chamber tonight—

"U.S. consumers will be exploited in the coming months.

"The steel industry will have fattened profit margins.

"The prices of goods processed from steel will rise.

"The amount of defense obtained for our defense dollars will be diminished.

"Our balance-of-payments situation will grow worse, our exports will continue to dwindle.

"And in October 1962 there will be another round of price increases, wage increases, and inflation which could spell real economic danger to the United States."

To show that they meant business, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, threatened to meet any increase in steel prices with antitrust charges, while his junior colleague, Senator GORE, spoke of a last-ditch measure: "Utility-type regulations, much as various Government agencies now regulate prices in other fields characterized by monopoly."

Plans for the session on steel were laid well in advance. They first took form several weeks ago when Senator GORE invited every Senate Democrat to dinner in the old Supreme Court chamber on Capitol Hill.

About 20 of the more liberal Senators showed up. The speaker of the evening was Harvard economist, Otto Eckstein, who flatly told the gathering that the steel industry will set off a new inflationary spiral if it raises prices this year.

The question of steel prices is not a new one to the professor: In 1959, he and Gary Fromm of Harvard wrote two papers for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on "Steel and the Postwar Inflation."

A clash between the steel industry and the Kennedy administration over prices has been brewing since May, when the President's Council of Economic Advisers let it be known that they would look upon an upward revision with extreme disfavor. But no administration official has gone as far as Senator GORE to suggest that "large steel companies can and should be broken up into smaller units so that true competition * * * may be restored."

It was understood, however, that the flood of Democratic comment on steel—which all sides agree lies at the core of the American economy—were not the last words that will be heard from Washington about the industry. "Now, we'd like to get some response from the President," a member of the Senate group said.

But, clearly, the keyman in the present situation was not in Hyannis Port but in New York. After conferring with his aids in Pittsburgh, Roger Blough, chairman of the huge U.S. Steel Corp., flew back to New York late Thursday and decided to say nothing for now.

Since U.S. Steel controls nearly 30 percent of the Nation's steel capacity, no competitor can effectively raise his prices without Big Steel's tacit consent. And conversely, if Mr. Blough feels Big Steel should move in October (when the final automatic wage increase in the present steelworkers' contract goes into effect), the others will gladly agree with him.

In any case, the political attack on any planned price increase, buttressed by mountains of statistics on such matters as profit margins and operating rates, left the industry in a dilemma.

Should it choose to make a case for higher prices—by pointing out, for example, that it has not had an increase for a full 3 years—the Senate Democrats and the administration could be expected to respond by intensifying their efforts to control steel margins through threats and appeals to public opinion. Moreover, if the present plan is to raise prices, there would be no point to tipping their hand.

The attack, nevertheless, has left the public impression that the steel industry is incapable of defending its pricing policies, which have seen the cost of the metal more than double in the postwar period.

In an indirect way, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, has shed some light on why Mr. Blough chooses to draw his words with extreme care when he is speaking publicly on steel prices.

"Some 2 years ago," Senator SYMINGTON revealed, "I suggested [to Mr. Blough] that he state the industry did not intend to raise prices and that at the same time he ask there be no wage increase. (Presumably, this was in 1959, during the long steel strike.)

"He said he did not feel that could be done, because to do so, in effect, would be price fixing.

"I could not follow his reasoning at that time; now, today, if there is to be general agreement on increasing prices, it seems to me there would be as much danger of a violation as would an agreement not to raise prices, because an agreement is an agreement."

The steel industry feels strongly that the matter of pricing is more complicated than the argument the Democratic politicians put forth, even allowing for the detailed predictions on the rate of return which could be expected this fall that they presented.

Moreover, the industry, despite its vast importance, no longer enjoys the type of sellers' market it enjoyed throughout nearly all the years between 1940 and 1958.

If limited war abroad or a major boom at home were to start the old sellers' market rolling again, the steel companies—taking no regard of costs and maintenance problems—could probably turn out 200 million tons of steel in a year. This is twice what the industry poured in 1960 and will produce in 1961. It is also 50 million tons more than its capacity, when it was last rated in January 1960.

The widespread introduction of oxygen, which increases the capacity of an open hearth by one-third, has revolutionized techniques. Oxygen has allowed the steel companies to prosper moderately even in the depths of the 1960–61 recession.

The far-reaching end of the salad days for the steel industry, plus the oxygen revolution—each of which now puts new stresses on steel economics—mean that the price situation as it evolves after October 1 can't be compared with anything in the past.

Indications now point to more steel output in October and November than at any time since the spring of 1959. If these early signs hold up, then the under-the-table discounts that took full flower during the recession will first have to go before there is any general price increase.

After that, if the steel companies still want more, they will probably find that they can have it only in certain popular lines where demand is high and competition from abroad and other materials not too significant.

In fact, the price revisions may be handled with such discretion that official Washington won't even know that its toes have been stepped upon.

Shipping Antitrust Ideology Held Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the July 26, 1961, issue of the Daily Shipping News points out that proposals for the United States to regulate international shipping, something never attempted by any other free nation, is dangerous. Such attempt at regulation would, in my opinion, break up shipping conferences, result in rate wars, and, in the final analysis, practically ruin the private American merchant marine.

The editorial follows:

SHIPPING ANTITRUST IDEOLOGY HELD DANGEROUS

The dangerous international effects on shipping of the U.S. antitrust ideology were discussed a few days ago in San Francisco by Sir Donald Anderson, chairman of the board, P. & O. Orient Lines, London. Sir Donald addressed a civic luncheon in honor of the maiden voyage of P. & O.'s new passenger liner, the SS *Canberra*, to San Francisco.

Sir Donald noted that the P. & O. group's interest in cargo as far as the United States is concerned is comparatively small, "so when I touch on one problem that now faces us in the United States, I speak not in the injured tones of one who is likely to be directly affected to any important extent, but rather as one who realizes the indirect effect on shipping all over the world of every action taken by the most powerful commercial nation in the world, and of this action in particular."

"This problem—its short title being the "Dual Rate System in Cargo Liner Trades"—is one that has been blowing up over several years," the speaker continued.

"It moves from court to court, from committee to committee, but so far it is moving to no solution that seems to us acceptable, for the solutions put forward threaten the whole structure of cargo liner services. The threat is not to P. & O. nor to British shipping, nor to non-American shipping. It is, in our view, a threat to all shipping carrying on cargo liner trades.

"The difficulty springs from the antitrust ideology. Hitherto, by suitable legislation, the shipping conferences, which combine to agree on freight rates, but which compete in every other direction, have been exempted from the normal provisions of antitrust law, because conferences and a dual rate system have been found not only necessary for traders and shipping companies alike, but in themselves not harmful. It is now being urged in the United States that if shipping

conferences and the dual rate system are to continue, they must be put under close Government supervision.

"Since conferences are international, with the United States at one point in each service, but with one or more, often several, other countries at other points in the service, the United States is asserting the right of one country to approve and veto the terms and conditions under which shipping companies under all flags give service to various countries," Sir Donald declared.

"No one disputes the right of a sovereign state to do this in respect of its own domestic trades, even though we in the United States, and many others elsewhere have never found it necessary," the shipping official stated. "But no other free country in the world has yet attempted unilaterally to regulate the services of foreign shipping companies in international trade."

He then urged his audience to consider what it means. The United States seeks to assert the right to approve or disapprove of rates and conditions of sea carriage in a liner service between itself, and say, United Kingdom, Holland, and Germany. They are equally interested, since trade is moving in both directions between all four countries, but United Kingdom, Holland, and Germany may each have a different idea of the correct rate of freight on drainpipes, and each may differ from each other and from the United States. What then?

"The shipping companies, which serve all four are going to act illegally in one country or the other, and the only way in which their presidents may avoid the risk of being sent to jail, if they are careless enough to visit the United States, is either to refuse to carry drainpipes, in which case they will equally render themselves liable in the United States for refusing the obligations of a common carrier, or to discontinue their service. And this, of course, will be as true for an American shipping company as for a foreign shipping company."

"What then would have been achieved?" Sir Donald asked. "On the one hand a doctrinaire adherence to an antitrust ideology. On the other hand, the destruction of a system of ocean transport which has been developed over a century, and which alone can give the shipper in international trades the continuity, the security, and the flexibility which he needs.

"You may think that I am exaggerating when I propound this result, and I hope very much that I am, but no one can deny that this is the way that things have been moving so far, and that if the United States—today's leader in world trade—should adopt this new technique, she will be followed by others, and a series of head-on collisions will take place.

"I can only hope," Sir Donald concluded, "that the submissions which have been made by the shipping industry before the appropriate committees on this subject, will not pass disregarded."

Another New Frontier for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, we have just given recognition in Congress to the 41st anniversary of adoption of the 19th amendment to the Constitution by which women of the United States gained right to the ballot box. That action brought an end to a form of political discrimination. But the mores of a people are slow to change, and certain other forms of discrimination continue to act against equality for women.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has discussed this problem in an article which appears in the September 1961 issue of McCall's magazine. Senator NEUBERGER writes of the tendency in social relationships to put women into a kind of "second-class intellect" category. She has noted that this situation is undergoing change in the right direction, led by women in this administration of intelligence and high accomplishment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, entitled "Let's Stop the Ladies From Joining the Ladies."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP THE LADIES FROM JOINING THE LADIES

(By Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

Things have changed in Washington. It is no longer safe or fashionable for men to assume that their female dinner companions are interested only in so-called women's talk. For on the distaff side in Washington today there are many personalities in their own right—professors, like Mrs. Walt Whitman Rostow, first woman professor on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, an authority on diplomatic history and international relations; lawyers, like Antonia Chayes, wife of the State Department legal adviser; artists, like Mrs. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., wife of the Presidential Assistant, and Mrs. Arthur Goldberg, wife of the Secretary of Labor; accomplished public speakers and authorities on domestic politics, like Treasurer of the United States, Elizabeth Rudel Smith, and Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General; specialists in labor relations, like Mrs. Oliver Peterson, and in Asian affairs, like Mrs. Chester Bowles; author and former war correspondent, Eve Curie Labouisse, wife of the Director of the International Cooperation Administration and daughter of the famous Pierre and Marie Curie, who were the discoverers of radium; and an airplane pilot, Mrs. Philip Hart, who helped her husband campaign successfully for election as U.S. Senator from Michigan. And this is but a sampling.

It ought to be no surprise that this generation of women, aware of the realities and challenges of the times, should plunge so directly into the hurly-burly of politics, the vehicle available to them for tidying up and improving an imperfect society. They declined to let others do their politicking for them while they sat decorously and complacently at home. In the last campaign, as in previous ones, they rang doorbells, stuffed envelopes, made telephone calls and public appearances from dawn till late at night, led by the Kennedy women themselvs, including the matriarch of the Kennedy clan, Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy.

Marian Schlesinger, whose collection of children's portraits has been hung in galleries here and abroad, was a key figure in the campaign in the Boston area after she had demonstrated in her family that she has a political mind of her own. Her husband, historian of the Andrew Jackson and Franklin D. Roosevelt eras and an ardent supporter of Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956, capitulated to the Kennedy camp long before his wife did. "I ended up working for Kennedy and being dedicated to his campaign," she says, "but I took a lot more convincing than Arthur did. I think that Stevenson has done a magnificent job as Ambassador to the United Nations. He would have made a wonderful Secretary of State. And I still think Stevenson would have made a wonderful President." This last statement, incidentally, shows that Marian Schlesinger has courage beyond her convictions, for in a Kennedy-dominated Washington it is not fashionable to dwell on the presidential qualities of Adlai Stevenson.

Mrs. Schlesinger illustrates an important point about the women in Washington. A mother of four, she has intense interests far beyond the customary chitchat of "What do you think of the artichoke hairdo, or culottes, or muumuus?" and "Have you found a house yet?" These topics are not ruled out, of course, for even beautiful, intelligent women have a deep interest in talking about children and current styles and housing problems. But they are apt to become edgy, frustrated, and even occasionally cross if the gentlemen at their sides insist on small talk while there is a passionate argument at the other end of the table about whether Stevenson would have handled the Cuban crisis better or whether the meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev had any virtue.

If, as a result of this article, I could give hosts and hostesses everywhere a gentle shove toward the art of "general conversation," I know I would save many professional women, including myself, from many agonizing moments of boredom. Specifically, I would urge hosts and hostesses to encourage everyone at a dinner party—especially a small gathering—to exchange views on one central subject of central interest, particularly when an interesting guest of honor is involved. I recall an experience of my own in this connection. It was at a dinner for Prof. Denis W. Brogan, of Cambridge University, a scholar-historian who is an authority on France and the United States. Professor Brogan that day had attended a luncheon at the White House and now, at one end of the table, was holding forth on his impressions. He was being monopolized by the host and a few male guests. I strained to listen, but somebody was murmuring into my ear something about something utterly inconsequential. As I had been particularly happy to accept this dinner invitation and had looked forward to meeting and talking with Mr. Brogan, this was too much for me. I tapped my glass and, taking advantage of the surprised silence, suggested to my host that all of us be permitted the benefit of Mr. Brogan's views, even at the price of the host's acting as a kind of master of ceremonies. We could put questions to him and then not merely those sitting at his right or left would hear his answers. The nervous host agreed, and it was a delightfully interesting evening.

On another occasion, the eminent historian Arnold Toynbee was the guest of honor. A Cabinet officer called to say he would be late for dinner, and while we waited, I had the fortunate chance to have a good conversation with Professor Toynbee. After dinner, true to the barbaric custom, the ladies were dispersed—or, I should say, segregated—and the men enjoyed the usual monopoly of the guest.

As the Brogan episode demonstrated, the old social habits already are under siege, not alone because of my own temerity in that case but because so many women are just as interested in the wide world about them as I am. They do not wish, thank you, to be patted on the head and sent off upstairs to tend to their subintellectual knitting. Lest I be thought alone in this grievance, listen to what Mrs. Orville Freeman, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture, has to say about

it. Jane Freeman has done graduate work in public administration and has committed herself as a citizen to such wide-ranging activities as work in behalf of neighborhood development, public education, family welfare, the Minnesota Historical Society, the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, and the United Nations, to name but a few. "Why should we be separated and entertained in different rooms after dinner?" she asks. "I don't like it, and the worst aspect is when the women are taken upstairs to the hostess' bedroom for coffee. Why should we miss the most exciting talk, the after-dinner conversation where one gathers in a group to discuss things? After all, my husband and I were invited as a couple."

On the subject of women who drop all intellectual activity when they get married, Mrs. Freeman is equally emphatic. "I could climb up on a soapbox when I think of them," she says, her dark-brown eyes flashing. "It's a crime. I am disappointed in so many of my college friends who were really bright, dean's list, who bury themselves and become stale. They don't contribute anything. It is essential, particularly in an American community, a democracy that allows for the participation of everyone, for mothers to create the kind of community they want their children to grow up in. The men have less time than they used to, so women have to contribute more to the community. Women have the desire and energy to participate, and they should. They become more interesting persons to their husbands and their children, as well."

The existence of intellectual and interested women is not altogether new under the Washington sun. Try talking to Alice Roosevelt Longworth, the tart-tongued daughter of President Theodore Roosevelt and a devoted Republican, about her favorite recipe for old-fashioned pin-money pickles. This politically aware grande dame of the bon—and wicked—mot once demonstrated her interest in pickles, but it took the form of a devastating description of Calvin Coolidge as looking "as if he had been weaned on a pickle." Circulation of that remark may not have been responsible for Mr. Coolidge's reputation for taciturnity, but it certainly helped.

But Mrs. Longworth's fame as a connoisseur of politics and a practitioner of the fine art of conversational devastation has grown and thrived because she has been an exception to the rule of devoted but retiring wives who in the past two administrations have taken their cue from Mamie Eisenhower and Bess Truman.

Someone has laughingly said that I, as a United States Senator, was faced on each social occasion with the delicate choice of whether to join the men after dinner as they smoked their cigars and talked in the study or go off with the ladies. I don't see why any woman should be confronted with the choice. Let the ladies go powder their noses and make over their faces. But please do not banish them until just before the guest of honor is about to take his leave (11 o'clock is the usual witching hour in Washington).

This is not a one-sided plea. I do not ask for a unilateral gratuity from the men, for the capital's women today have as much as their men to contribute to general conversation—sometimes more. Is there not some masculine horizon that could be broadened by a talk with Dorothy Goldberg, the Secretary of Labor's wife, who has had at least five one-woman showings of her paintings and whose interest in human affairs is as informed and perceptive as most men's? "Art happens to measure and mark the generations on earth at a certain time in history," Mrs. Goldberg says. "The New Frontier is not trying to corner art as its own. It cannot be cornered. But what is being recognized is that that which makes an artist is the essence of democracy, the play of all influences upon each other, a greater awareness of living and of life."

Besides her painting, Mrs. Goldberg is vitally concerned with what women do to make use of the middle productive years, that period after their children have been launched. "We have to work on the meaningfulness and significance of life in this 40-to-65 period," she says, "and not approach them like a horse with blinders. Otherwise, we will reach 65 afraid and apathetic. Perhaps 'adult education' have become dirty words, but what is wrong with study when we are shopping around for new interests? Something has to be done to train mothers to understand the nature of creativity, to give purpose to their more leisurely years. And I hope to light fires on this subject wherever I can."

Ethel Kennedy, the Attorney General's wife, may have seven children, but she managed to campaign for her brother-in-law, the President, with a buoyant zest matched by few male politicians. Her stories about a woman's role in the great game of politics would make a fascinating primer for future aspirants to public office. As Ethel Kennedy says, "Never send a boy on a man's job; send a woman."

Who would not want to share views and match wits with Elspeth Rostow, who wears her Phi Beta Kappa attainments with a demure grace, yet can talk colorfully about the whole range of diplomatic history in the 20th century—as both a scholar and a participant? She was graduated from Barnard College at 19, and during the war worked for the Office of Strategic Services, writing situation reports for men about to risk their lives behind enemy lines. In the postwar period, she worked for the London Economist in Geneva, while her husband Walt Whitman Rostow, served with the Economic Commission for Europe. Later, she taught at Cambridge University, in England, and then became the first woman professor at MIT. She has three children and a curiosity to match all three. When, after a few months in Washington, her 7-year-old daughter, Ann, said, "Mommy, when are we going back to America?" Mrs. Rostow cherished the remark not only as an expression of a child's yearning for her Cambridge playmates but as a wise commentary on the provincial nature of our Federal City, which is no more like America than Paris is like France.

By way of interesting companions, let me cite Esther Peterson, whose horizons are as broad as the map. A schoolteacher by vocation, she has lived and worked abroad with her husband—a Foreign Service officer specializing in labor affairs—in Sweden, Belgium, and France. She was one of the founders of the first international school for working women, near Paris, and one of its first faculty members. The mother of four normal, happy children, she nonetheless has scant sympathy for those who argue that a woman's place is exclusively in the home. She is fond of pointing out that those who believe unemployment can be solved by banishing women from the work force to the kitchen are thinking in terms of a world that no longer exists. She simply recognizes the fact that 97 percent of all clerical and stenographic jobs are held by women, and that women keep most of our schools, shops, and hospitals going.

Mrs. Antonia Chayes, wife of the State Department's legal adviser, has combined a bright career as a working lawyer with raising a family of three. A Phi Beta Kappa at Radcliffe, she earned her law degree at George Washington University and practiced in Washington. She also has worked as executive assistant to Dean Erwin Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, and was the first faculty adviser to women law students at Harvard. She is as beautiful as she is brilliant, an authority on interstate law as well as a gay homemaker.

It would be a mutual waste of time for male guests at Washington social gatherings to chatter condescendingly to Mrs. Ermalee Udall, wife of the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, when they could discover a fascinating lot about the American Indians of the Southwest and the vigorous lore of the Colorado River, about which she is an authority; to Mrs. Phyllis Dillon, wife of the Secretary of the Treasury, when they could get an education about France, art, and the esoteric world of china collecting, as well as share her knowledge of the great statesmen of this earth whom she has entertained as a hostess to international society. Virginia Rusk, a history major at Mills College, in California, when she took a course in foreign relations from a soft-spoken Georgian instructor who later became her husband and still later Secretary of State, could discuss with scholarly insight the affairs of a complex world; if one insisted, Mrs. Rusk could, with equal expertness, talk about how she designed her own inaugural ball gown and makes many of her own clothes.

These women do not wear their attainments on their lapels, so to speak, like corsages or battle ribbons. They could, I suppose, escape the women's talk with which men often afflict them, if they were brazenly to blurt out, "Look, I'm as interested in small talk as the next woman; but here we have many gifted men and women present, experts and specialists in foreign affairs, science, history, and I would like to share in the conversation with them." But modesty forbids it, and the shock of such a declaration of open rebellion would, I am afraid, intimidate the menfolk into sullen silence. It will take time for adjustments to be made; but they will inevitably be made, as Washington learns that the women in its midst are personalities in their own right who do not relish being consigned to an intellectual purdah, even though veils may be passé.

Mrs. Henry Labouisse, wife of the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, is a classic example of the frustrations encountered by a woman of talent and accomplishments in the male-dominated life of the Capital. Mrs. Labouisse is the author of several books, has traveled the world as a correspondent, and once served as a special assistant to Lord Ismay, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. "What do I say to people who insist upon the polite small talk?" Eve Curie Labouisse said recently, in discussing the archaic social habits of Washington. "I would not dream of saying I am the former Eve Curie, simply to win their attention or enlarge the conversation. Sometimes it comes out as a natural outgrowth of the conversation; but never would I intrude the fact apropos of nothing except the yearning to be a part of general conversation."

Mrs. Labouisse's experience reminds me of the story of a newspaperwoman friend of mine. As a correspondent who writes under her maiden name—Marguerite Higgins—she is, of course, internationally known. She was attending a quite special dinner with her husband and was seated next to a high official in an earlier administration who had not met her before, and the two engaged in such a spirited conversation about world events that the official was moved to remark on his dinner companion's vast knowledge of the leaders and countries they had discussed. "Why shouldn't she," interposed the hostess, who then proceeded to identify Marguerite. The official was almost speechless with shock. He thought he had been tricked or somehow

cheated. "Wouldn't it have been presumptuous of me to have told him my professional name?" Miss Higgins said, quite properly.

My late husband was a U.S. Senator; I knew something of the segregation of the sexes then. As a Senator now myself, I am still perplexed and bemused by the attitude of my male colleagues, although I must say that in general it poses fewer handicaps than I had supposed it might. Not long ago I had occasion to speak to the Republican minority leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, on the Senate floor. He was seated at his desk, his lap filled with papers over which he was poring. As I approached, he started to stand up, and it was most awkward and inconvenient. "Please, Senator, don't stand up," I said. "I'm just another Senator."

Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, was sitting next to Mr. DIRKSEN and overheard me. "Just another Senator," he repeated, scoffing. "I think a Senator is a pretty important thing to be," he said in a half-amused manner. "I do, too," I defended myself. The point is that Senator DIRKSEN'S almost involuntary action of moving to stand up when I appeared at his desk meant, to me, that he has not yet accepted me as a member of the club. My being a woman still gets mixed up in it. After all, I am there on business, not as a woman but as a U.S. Senator from the sovereign State of Oregon, and I would hope to be treated no differently from a Senator from Illinois or New York.

It was with some misgiving that I appeared before the Senate Rules Committee recently, in behalf of a bill I was sponsoring. I feared all kinds of deferences' being shown me because of my sex. After I had made my preliminary statement and the questions began, I was pleasantly surprised, almost delighted, that they came at me hard and fast, no holds barred. Senator CURTIS, of Nebraska, was pointed and firm, and frankly, I did not have answers to some of the questions he asked. It was refreshing and stimulating to me, and I was glad about it. They seemed to have accepted me as just another Senator. Now, when they start walking into the elevators ahead of me and allowing me to go through doors by myself, I will know I have arrived.

Of course a woman enjoys the flattering attention of men who open doors for them, light their cigarettes, help them with their coats—and I believe the men feel good about it. too. On a social level, these gentlemanly habits are quite proper and acceptable even to the most professional-minded woman, and I would be the last person in the world to want them changed. But when I am at work as a Senator, I want to be accorded the same treatment as my male colleagues, no more and no less.

With the influx to Washington of so many attractive women versed in the arts, the sciences, and domestic and international affairs, women of accomplishments with identities and personalities unmistakably their own, I know the salons of our town are being enriched by their presence. If Pat Nixon and Ladybird Johnson, wives of the former and the present Vice Presidents, could walk among the peoples of Africa and Asia and impress them as something more than ornaments of their husbands'; if Nancy Williams, wife of the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, could visit hospitals, schools, nurseries, and mud huts in the remotest African villages and win the sympathy and confidence of the people there—then I know that they, and others like them, could enhance the life and the mind of official Washington.

These women have revived my hopes for a reversal of anti-intellectualism in this country. Brains are coming into fashion, and I find it a heartening sign of a new renaissance.

Resolutions Adopted by the Building Material Merchants of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of this year the building material merchants of Georgia held their annual meeting on Jekyll Island. While assembled, these practical businessmen adopted two resolutions of more than passing significance. They expressed an attitude of mind which is much in demand in America and their opinions should be carefully heeded. Under unanimous consent, I include these two resolutions in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas President Kennedy has entered a solemn plea that we "ask not what the country can do for us, but rather what we can do for it"; and

Whereas this injunction is most timely at this time when international tensions and competition are with us; and

Whereas the American people must stand together, united in a firm resolve to protect our country both from aggression and from a deterioration of our economy and a softening of our moral fiber; and

Whereas only through intense individual effort on the part of all of our people can we meet the competitive challenges as of foreign economies and ideologies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we Americans close ranks in support of our Government, that we use our voices of opposition only for constructive criticism; that we shoulder more individual responsibility and increase our personal productivity, and that we pray for the help of Almighty God in carrying out these high resolves.

RESOLUTION 2

Because we building material merchants of Georgia are realists, we cannot but know that any lack of success of our businesses is partly a measure of our own individual ineffectiveness in managing and directing our respective companies; and

Because all deficiencies in the management are quickly reflected and magnified in the performance of all of the employees of an organization; and

Because deep down in our hearts we all know and must admit that "normal" business is a highly competitive buyer's market and not the sloppy seller's market which flourished after the war; and

Because we know that the free-enterprise system will not sustain a business which does not perform with the efficiency of its competitors; and

Because we believe in the free-enterprise system as being essential to our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each of us go back to our businesses with the determination to perform better our positions of leadership in our organizations; and be it

Resolved, That we make an honest effort at self-appraisal by asking ourselves such questions as these:

(a) Am I regarding my business as being only a livelihood for myself—or do I accept the fact that my business is an important institution to be protected not alone for personal benefit but also for the benefit of its employees and its community?

(b) Am I putting maximum thought and effort into my work for the business—or am I just working a wage-hour week with primary thoughts of quitting time and payday?

(c) Am I providing an atmosphere between myself and the other employees of our organization in which the employee can make known his gripes or suggestions, and one in which I can explain and make the employee understand the competitive problems of the business?

(d) Am I calling upon each employee to give a good day's work for a day's pay, and following through to see that this is done?

(e) Am I setting him the proper example?

(f) Am I securing the place of myself and my company within our community by accepting my share of community responsibilities—or am I free riding on the work and generosity of others?

(g) Have I the attitude that success in business is available to those who will earn it—or am I making our problems more difficult by screaming "business recession"?

(h) Will I reshape my ideas of pleasure to the point of getting enjoyment from the knowledge that I have done well my day's work—or will I continue to follow the current philosophy that work is drudgery and only idle relaxation constitutes "the good life"?

And be it further resolved that we experiment with a year of this maximum effort and come to our next annual convention with higher spirits, better prospects, and more successful businesses.

A Positive GOP Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following newspaper article which appeared in the Daily Oklahoman, Monday, August 21, 1961, entitled "A Positive GOP Step":

A POSITIVE GOP STEP

The Republicans have moved toward a positive challenge to the Kennedy administration on a vital issue: the problem of continuing high unemployment during high prosperity.

Under the initiative of Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, the House Republican policy committee plans to release a study made for it by a diversified group of professional economists, college professors and other experts on 25 different aspects of the employment problem. These include jobs and their recreation, automation and unemployment, causes of unemployment, and community and industrial efforts to meet unemployment.

A sample of what is expected to come is represented by a bill recently introduced by CURTIS to amend present tax policy to allow a worker who goes to school to upgrade his skills to deduct these costs from his personal income tax as a business expense. Thus, the Republicans would move not to create new bureaus or programs to solve the problem, but to encourage individual initiative by providing a tax break to the person willing to help his own cause.

CURTIS also has proposed to tie retraining into the unemployment insurance program. At present 40 of the 50 States remove a person from the unemployment rolls if he enters a training school to learn a new skill.

CURTIS would turn this around and take the person off the rolls if, unable to get a job because his skills were obsolete, he refused to start learning a skill in demand.

Such positive approaches by the Republicans would serve their cause better than allowing the Democrats always to provide their answers.

Expanding Dairy Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, I introduced a bill (S. 2414) to establish a dairy research laboratory. The purpose would be to find new ways to utilize dairy products for commercial and industrial applications.

In this year of discovery, it is particularly important—both in the interests of the industry and the country—that we apply new techniques of research in dairying as in other fields.

The effort, of course, requires not just the Federal program, but rather full cooperation of the industry itself.

Recently, I was privileged to make some suggestions for expanding research by the dairy industry. I ask unanimous consent to have these suggestions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the suggestions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY CHALLENGES DAIRY FARMERS TO FIGHT FOR THEIR INDUSTRY

Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY—long a supporter of the dairy industry—today challenged dairymen to find more industrial uses for dairy byproducts if their industry is to enjoy the fruits of progress in the future. He said:

"It's high time enterprising and forward-thinking dairymen took a good look at where they've been and where they are going—and do something about it. It seems evident that great strides must be made in finding new industrial and commercial uses for dairy products. Frankly, I'm tired that so little progress has been made in this field. Can it be that our dairy farmers are satisfied with less than a fair return for their investments and labors?

"It's no secret that dairy foods are the best buy and the best eating in the Nation. Fine. But why do the dairy people stop here? Why must they deny Americans possible industrial uses of dairy byproducts?

"It takes only one Ben Franklin, one Alexander Graham Bell, one Albert Einstein, or one Tom Edison to change the course of history. Of course, there have been some breakthroughs in the dairy field: the scientific discovery of an industrial process for the production of lactic acid from whey; textile fiber from the casein of skim milk; and, recently, there has been announced the discovery of a 90-percent effective cigarette filter made of cheese and charcoal.

"We must look to the future; we must not stand pat; we must double and then redouble our efforts of exploring, experimenting, and researching in ways and means of finding better industrial utilization of dairy products. I have faith that it will be the Wisconsin dairymen who will take the initiative and provide the necessary leadership in this vital research and development," Senator WILEY concluded.

Proposed Statement of U.S. National Policies and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF U.S. NATIONAL POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

(By Grandison Gardner)

As we are all beginning to realize, the Communist empire is progressing very successfully on a well-planned and aggressive program to attain domination over the world, and their success is largely due to their having a well-defined plan, and to their following their plan with persistence and patience. We are also beginning to realize that we are defending ourselves without a plan or program and without any clear well-defined intent or objective. We do everything we do on a "hurried judgment" basis in the face of an emergency or as a result of a shock, and we are always on the defensive.

This author has, for a long time, believed that our statesmen should define our national policies and objectives, briefly and clearly, and should make these definitions available in printed form so that all of us (our statesmen in particular) can study them frequently and keep them continuously in mind; and, under guidance of these, devise plans, both aggressive and defensive, and keep ourselves prepared for quick—and correct—action in emergencies and under the shock of surprises.

Ex-President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals identifies 15 goals, from which extracts follow:

1. Further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice.

2. Vestiges of religious prejudices, handicaps to women, and, most important, discrimination on the basis of race must be recognized as morally wrong, economically wasteful, and, in many respects dangerous. In this decade, we must sharply lower these stubborn barriers.

3. To preserve and perfect the democratic process.

4. Education at every level and in every discipline be strengthened and its effectiveness enhanced. New teaching techniques.

A higher proportion of the gross national product must be devoted to educational purposes.

5. In science, greater proportion of our total effort, enrich applied science and technology.

Today we must give high priority to those aspects of science and technology which will increase our military strength, not merely to be ahead of other nations.

6–7–8. The economic system must be compatible with the political system. Grow at maximum rate, full employment, overhaul tax system.

Technological change, retraining.

9. Agriculture, supply-demand equilibrium.

Farmers who operate at subsistence levels, new opportunities must be found through training and through location of new industries in farm areas.

10. Remedy slum conditions; solution for haphazard suburban growth.

11. Medical care; juvenile delinquency and family breakdown.

12. Foreign trade; aid to less developed nations.

13. Defense of the free world; maintenance of an independence and way of life, freedom of other nations, military alliances.

14. Limitation and control of nuclear armament; disarmament should be our ultimate goal.

15. The United Nations.

These goals have not been accepted as national goals or policies or objectives. They have all been considered with great care and diligence by the capable members of the Commission and should be acceptable to all Americans. However, there is one other—though, perhaps, less of a goal to be attained than a goal to be kept secure, or an unceasing intent to live as we choose and not under outside direction—which should be written before and as a basis for all of those cited. It is partly included in 3, 5, and 13 above and it is the following:

"Physical defense of the people, the property and the territorial integrity of our Nation, and the Govcernment of our choice, against all enemies, foreign and domestic." Our international trade, our international alliances and commitments, our world commerce and diplomatic associations, and our international respect and prestige must also be defended.

We might survive indefinitely in spite of some lack of diligence in pursuit of any of the 15 goals identified by the Commission, but the international communistic organization has announced its purpose of world domination and has demonstrated the necessary greed and cruelty to disperse all doubt that they will—if given the opportunity—destroy our Nation as ruthlessly as the Israelites destroyed the inhabitants of their promised land, the Moslem invaders wrought destruction in India—the Mongolians, Ghengis Khan, and Tamerlane—destroyed all in the route of their westward marches, and the German Third Reich destroyed all opposition to its brutal conquests during its relatively short existence.

Dr. James Henry Brested (eminent Egyptologist) has spoken of "the incompatibilities of the human race, and of the inexorable and unaccountable rhythm of the rise and fall of nations." Our Nation, during the 350 years of its existence and its prenatal period, has risen to a glorious height, but, if we are careless about its lofty position, it could fall.

Philosophizing briefly, an individual gives himself difficult times if he fights for everything he wants with other individuals, with his family group, his community, his state, his nation, and with other nations. He gets much more of what he needs if individuals, families, communities, states, and nations work cooperatively, every person and every organized social and governmental group assisting each other to get a maximum for all. However, every individual and every group is thereby continuously and forever beset by the problem of dividing his, and its, efforts between efforts applied subjectively and those applied objectively, and there is unlimited opportunity for cheating and there are unlimited cheaters in all groups.

At some very early time, people began to realize that instead of everyone deciding on the spot what his behavior in any situation should be, it is better to make some rules or laws, written or unwritten, as guides. Clubs, social organizations, commercial and political organizations have rules and bylaws. Cities have ordinances, states and nations have laws and groups of nations have treaties, agreements and other arrangements specifying, in various details or generalities, some of the national behavior of interest to more than one nation. Our Nation originally had a Constitution and a Bill of Rights to establish justice, insure tranquility, provide for common defense, promote general

welfare and secure the blessings of liberty; to provide for governmental organization, obtaining revenue, and for laws to be made in pursuance of the Constitution, etc.

Great volumes of laws, national, State and local, have been enacted since the adoption of the Constitution and enforcement agencies and courts have long been in operation to make the laws effective and as nearly just as possible.

There is, however, no clear, brief, and specific list of the most vital basic policies, intents, purposes and objectives of the Nation, such as one might paint on the wall to assist in promptly and correctly judging the acceptability or unacceptability of the behavior or actions of other nations that may be contrary to these most vital of our basic policies, intents, purposes and objectives. Such a list is suggested below; but such a list should not be published until it has been widely circulated and debated by the greatest possible number of our citizens, and especially by our experienced statesmen.

This list is preceded by a very brief summary of the history of our Nation and its accomplishments and its present state of development; a brief summary of the rise and fall of nations of the world since the beginning of recorded history; and questions as to the destiny of this country.

In 1492 all of the Western Hemisphere was a world that had developed with little inhibition, under the laws of nature, with only minor thought and planning of a race of very primitive people. It was widely but sparsely inhabited by people still living in the stone age. While these human inhabitants were guided, to some degree, by their own intelligence and power to think, community government, with some exceptions, was limited to very small communities: families, tribes and, in some cases, geographic areas inhabited by several tribes. Some groups in Mexico, Central America, and northern South America were approaching what might have qualified for the name of "primitive civilization." The most advanced of these—in Central America—had retrogressed from a promising climax.

In 1541, after Spaniards had seen much of the country surrounding the Gulf of Mexico and had established colonies on the islands of the Caribbean area, in Mexico and in northern South America, Spaniard Coronado—traveling northeastward from Mexico—nearly met Spaniard De Soto—who came westward from Florida—in the Arkansas River Valley.

St. Augustine, Fla., was founded by Spanish settlers in 1565.

By 1605, Santa Fe, N. Mex., was the capital of that Mexican province.

By 1620, British colonies had been established in Virginia and Massachusetts.

In 1543 and 1579, respectively, Spaniard Bartolome Ferrelo, and British Captain Drake had sailed up the Pacific coast as far as present Oregon and present northern California respectively.

American Captain Gray discovered and named the Columbia River in 1792 and Alexander MacKenzie, Br., completed an overland crossing to the Pacific in 1793.

La Salle took possession of the Mississippi Valley for the King of France in 1682.

In 1759, England dispossessed France in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River area.

Russia had claimed and occupied Alaska by 1791.

The original 13 British colonies in America declared their independence in 1776 and a war of rebellion followed. A new nation, the United States of America, was born. Its territorial expense was roughly the land east of the Ohio River, south of the St. Lawrence River and north of Florida.

Probably our most farsighted, most resourceful, most intelligent and most successful statesman, since the birth of our Nation, was President Thomas Jefferson. He saw the need for rapid action in extending and defining the boundaries of the territory of the new Nation. He skillfully maneuvered negotiations, took advantage of opportunities and bought, on April 30, 1803, the entire western slope of the Mississippi Valley from France for a final overall cost (including indemnities and interest) of less than $25 million. The area of the U.S. territory was, thereby, more than doubled. Jefferson sent a party (Lewis and Clark) to the Pacific via the Missouri and Columbia Rivers in 1804–6 thereby establishing claim to their Oregon country.

Florida was ceded by Spain to the United States in 1819. Texas became a part of the Union in 1845, and western Colorado, western Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and California were annexed in 1846–48. The Oregon, Washington, Idaho area became a part of the Union in 1849 by treaty with England. Alaska was purchased in 1867 and Hawaii was annexed in 1898.

In 1912, there were 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. In 1960, there were 50 States.

People migrated gradually, but rapidly, westward from the Allegheny to the Rocky Mountains after 1780 and to the Far West after 1845.

We fought a War of Rebellion with England in 1775–81; a lesser war with England in 1812; a war with Mexico in 1845–46; a war with ourselves in 1861–65; a short war with Spain in 1898; a war with Germany in 1917–18; a war against Germany, Italy, and Japan in 1941–45; a war with North Korea, China, and Russia in 1950–, and a so-called cold war with Russia and her allies in 1944.

Three hundred and fifty years ago, the United States of America was an embryo developing among the great natural resources of the country. Two hundreds years ago, a nation of a few hundred thousand people with the land and the resources of that part of North America north of Florida and east of the Ohio River, was being born. Agriculture was well developed and industry and commerce were off to a good beginning. There were schools and churches, even a university (Harvard). Transportation by sea was well developed.

A few years from now, there will be 200 million people in the 50 States of the United States. We have both an east and a west ocean front and in part are between two friendly nations, with undefended boundaries. We have an enormous economy and economic system, including: air, land, and sea commerce; a great system of land, sea, and air transportation; tremendous agricultural, timber, mining, and other production; an enormous manufacturing industry and other companion activities. Elementary education is available to everyone and nearly all take advantage of it; we are now talking about a college education for everyone and universities in nearly every State are qualifying large numbers of men and women for higher degrees. The application of scientific knowledge in our lives is widespread and expanding.

The area of our country is 3.6 million square miles. We own property and business interests in nearly all other countries and have residents all over the world. The population is over 180 million. The annual income is over $400 billion. We have 3 million miles of roads, 220,000 miles of railroads, and move annually by air about one-third billion ton-miles of freight. Air passenger miles exceed 30 million. We have an enormous international commerce and trade. We export $18 billion worth of goods annually. Our colleges award about 500,000 degrees per year. Church membership is over 110 million. Our health and general welfare are among the world's highest and the same could probably be said about morale and morals. We have a high international prestige, but may be a little deficient or immature in diplomatic skill. We have too much crime, not everyone lives comfortably, and children have been known to die of starvation. The greater part of the crime is a result of inferior mentality, laziness, and unfortunate associations. Suffering, want, and child neglect are due largely to parental incompetence (which should be rectified, as soon as detected, by sterilization). Some discomfort may be inevitable and some may even be beneficial.

A problem of some concern is our military security. Other nations are jealous of us and aggressive nations resent our readiness to protect peoples who might otherwise be molested by the aggressors. Some of these nations would gladly destroy us if given the opportunity.

Who can say what scale to use to measure our development and progress in the nearly 200 years of our existence as a nation? Is it square miles of territory? Population? Wealth? Military strength? Overall security? Agricultural development? Industrial development? Economic development? Development and exploitation of natural resources? Development of transportation? Economic organization and operation? Political organization and operation? Religious organization, development and purpose? Sanitation and health? Education? Attainment of pleasure and comfort? World prestige and reputation? Contribution to the general world welfare? By whatever scale, we have progressed a long way.

Only one who has seen some of the poverty, filth and suffering in which people live in various oriental countries—and even in parts of our own America—can understand how far our level of living surpasses the lowest levels on which members of our own species can and have to live. Any one who has traveled widely would proceed cautiously in making any extensive changes in our political, economic and social systems.

Have we reached the top of a curve of development plotted against time? Do we continue to rise on this curve, level off, gradually decline or, perhaps, decline precipitously? Egypt followed a curve that rose and fell but remained as Egypt and essentially the same race for over 3,000 years, but was then successively ruled by the Assyrians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Mohammedan Arabs, and the Turks for 2,500 years. Sumer, Akkad, and Babylonia grew and prospered and perished; Assyria lived about 1,000 years. The Hittites, Mitanni, Phoenicia, Palestine and others rose and fell. The Persian Empire was one of the most powerful but lasted only about 200 years; the empire of Alexander the Great was even greater but lasted only a part of the lifetime of Alexander. The Roman Empire ruled a major part of the West Asia-Europe world for over 500 years and then declined. France and Germany followed wavy curves. England had its own ups and downs, was conquered by the Romans, by the Vikings, by the Normans but followed a reasonably stable course without great changes in its form of government, and was the world's greatest empire during the latter part of the 19th century and the first part of the 20th. She then shrank to much smaller dimensions but remained stable and remained England. After 1521, the Spanish Empire circled the earth; now it is a relatively small nation with a somewhat shaky government and confined to the Iberian Peninsula. The Mongolian Empire grew from some scattered tribes of nomads to a great empire including Poland and China and the greater part of the world between, lasted for about 200 years and fell back to insignificance. Russia was off to a good start in the 13th century, was absorbed by

the Mongolian Empire, grew again to include the present Russia all the way to Alaska, and included Alaska. It is now, geographically, the world's greatest nation. Russia also boasts of much besides geography. Germany was powerful and belligerent in 1914; was completely defeated and subordinated in 1918; rose again in power and belligerence in 1939 and fell again 1944.

Again, let us ask ourselves where we stand on our curve of progress and where we go from here. One answer might be that our curve can rise, level off, or fall, and whether it rises, levels off, or falls depends on ourselves. We can keep it rising, we might let it level off, but let us hope it doesn't decline and let us make sure it doesn't collapse.

Our Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and our Constitution state our intention of being an independent and self-governing nation and prescribe, in general—methods and limitations of selecting and electing Government officials, collection of money to cover the cost of Government, organization of Armed Forces for the defense of the Nation and some of the general form and mechanics of Government; but, other than being a free and independent people, they do not state any general purpose or objective of the Nation, any goals, any plan for development and progress, any territorial boundaries or other limitations, or any directions regarding international cooperation and organization.

The following is not intended to be an accepted statement of our purposes and objectives but rather to illustrate what the author has in mind and possibly to serve as a guide for preparation of an adequate statement of policies and objectives.

The Constitution is our basic national law. National policies should be based thereon and should stem therefrom. Lesser laws are essential to action in compliance with policies and the Constitution and are, therefore, also based on the Constitution and stem therefrom. Laws sufficient to govern 180 million people grouped in States, counties, municipalities, and many other groups of various kinds, and in all kinds of pursuits, are necessarily many. If listed herein, they would follow the list of policies.

It seems well to repeat that this author is not proposing a list of policies and laws for adoption, but is calling attention to the need for and suggesting the pointing out of existing policies and laws appropriate to our time and to our position in a complex and changing world, and the creation of new ones, as appropriate, primarily for the guidance of our national executive officials, but also for the benefit of the general public.

SUGGESTED PRONOUNCEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. It is our policy and our objective to maintain and retain our 50 States and the land and resources within their boundaries; our coastal areas and adjacent water areas; such lands and other properties in foreign countries as are necessary for embassies, commerce, cooperative military operations, and communications systems; and to maintain our present form of government until such time as changes, in accordance with the will of the people, may be found necessary or desirable.

2. It is our policy and our objective to maintain, as far as possible, friendly relations with all other nations of the world, to trade with them and cooperate with them in every way possible, in the mutual interest, and to assist other nations in cases of special need, in every way possible.

3. It is our policy and our objective to maintain such military defenses as are required to protect our Nation, all of our people, our property, our installations, our commerce, our alliances, our international relations, our institutions, our welfare, our honor, our reputation, our Government, and our prestige, as necessary. It is our policy and our objective to take action, as is determined to be necessary, to prevent the development of any threat against these things rather than waiting to eliminate a threat after it has been developed.

4. It is our policy and our objective to encourage religious beliefs and practices without restraint and to discourage religious conflict and strife.

5. It is our policy and our objective to encourage and promote the widest possible knowledge of the arts and the sciences and to strive to give all of our people an opportunity to avail themselves of a good basic education and to assist and encourage all to take advantage of such opportunities, as will be available, to attain a high standard of education.

6. It is our policy and our objective to develop and utilize the natural resources of our country; to maintain plans for making these resources available to all; to assist the population to be favorably distributed to best utilize the resources; to prevent congestion and crowding in any areas which would unbalance the population and resources; and to discourage the increase of population beyond a balance with resources and the ability of individual families to adjust to the living opportunities (this policy should include the ruthless extermination of vicious criminals and the restraining of the criminal and degenerate from regeneration); the national resources to be judiciously and far sightedly conserved and perpetuated.

7. It is our policy and our objective to, not only encourage, but to demand individual thought, action and responsibility and resourcefulness rather than to develop governmental control of thought and action and to relieve the individual of responsibility for himself, his family and his fair share of the common welfare of the public; every individual to be inured to endure hardship, suffering, and worry.

BASIC LAWS AND DOCTRINE

Adequate laws for carrying out our policies can probably be selected from the existing national codes. The following discussion is limited to only four doctrinal items which, it seems to the author, should be especially considered.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The Monroe Doctrine is now new but is pointed out for renewed consideration. We have done ourselves great harm by allowing the Russian Government to participate in the change of government in Cuba, in direct conflict with the Monroe Doctrine. This failure on our part has been due in part to our ties and agreements with the Organization of American States and this emphasizes a need for a new policy that will prevent our commitments to OAS, NATO, SEATO and U.N. from neutralizing our own Constitution, our own policies and our own doctrines.

AID TO DISTRESSED AND UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

A policy to provide aid to distressed and underdeveloped countries is a deserving one, but it should not be followed blindly. This author was in India (Karachi and Calcutta) and saw just a little of China during the last war. An observation one makes quickly in these countries is that there are many very poor people living on a very low level—some literally in the gutter. One's first impulse on observing these people is to want to help them. It gives one a great deal of pleasure to give a dirty ragged starving child a bar of chocolate, but when one thinks further and more generally about it, one cannot but realize that to help some such sufferers a great deal, one would cruelly prolong a life of utter misery that could better terminate at the earliest possible time—a morbid thought indeed—and, to extend enormous help to improve the family living of such people simply increases the rate of production of such people and increases rather than decreasing the total of misery. This leads the author to say that any program to decrease this awful mass suffering in many oriental and African countries—and even in some of our own American countries—should first of all include a program of birth limitation. At the very least, families of the very poor and the incompetent should be forcibly reduced.

CHARACTER AND ENDURANCE

If we overdo the attainment of peace and prosperity, we may become too accustomed to it and lose some of our strength and endurance, and, if we should have to fight for any reason, those of us accustomed to comfort and luxury may be the losers. We must, therefore, maintain our stamina and capability of enduring hardship. We should be taught to like enough hardship. There is a great gap between what we would call rugged living under hardening conditions and extreme low level living with extreme suffering, and the demand for the first does not imply a need for the second.

NATIONAL GOALS

The goals identified by the Eisenhower Commission could well be adopted as official national goals.

Research and development within our aeronautics and space program fall within the scope of these goals. This author would not include transportation of men to the moon and back within these goals.

True American Spirit Is Brought Into Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 a meaningful editorial was printed in the Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald, an old, respected, and influential newspaper in the upper part of the 10th District of Georgia. It reflects so well the sentiments of the majority of people in our area that it ought to be made a part of the record in national history. A strong America will have many friends abroad.

The editorial follows:

TRUE AMERICAN SPIRIT IS BROUGHT INTO PLAY

Adolf Hitler prior to World War II, said the French people had grown soft and divided and that they were unable and unwilling to meet the sacrifices that would be demanded of them in modern warfare. History already reveals that he was right in this instance.

Because of the growing wealth and addiction to luxurious living on the part of the American people in recent years, there is no doubt that Nikita Khrushchev has had somewhat the same thoughts about this country. He ought to have known better, though, since he has visited the United States and witnessed at firsthand the results of our free enterprise and the high spirits of the American people.

Obviously, he was surprised to witness the effects of a "call to arms" by President Kennedy in his recent address to the people. The Senate, before the echoes of Kennedy's

words scarcely died away, passed by 80 to 0 a defense measure which called for vastly increased expenditures of arms and giving the President authority to substantially increase the Armed Forces of the country.

The effects of the President's "fighting words" have already been felt in Russia and throughout the world. Khrushchev took advantage of a recent conference with the Premier of Italy to express the view that he does not expect the crisis over Berlin to lead to war. By this, he meant that he did not want war and that he well understood the ramifications of another global war in this era of nuclear missiles. He also appears to fully realize that a limited conflict over Berlin with conventional weapons would likely lead to a full-scale war.

President Kennedy has spoken the words that only a totalitarian government such as that of Russia can understand.

A Proposal for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Proposal for Peace." Published in the Providence Journal of Sunday, August 27, the article has for its author, the Honorable Frank Licht, associate justice of the Superior Court of the State of Rhode Island.

It is a provocative proposal on a present danger, with an intelligent analysis by a man who combines the talents of an experienced legislator, a devoted student of history, a humanitarian and distinguished jurist.

With daily exposure to the problems that divide individuals and families, he sees the need for time to prevent disaster within the family of nations. A change in the fundamentals of war, he suggests, invites an innovation in the machinery of peace.

The article deserves our serious reading and serious consideration. I commend Judge Licht for his contribution in this troubled area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPOSAL FOR PEACE

(By Judge Frank Licht, Associate Justice of Superior Court)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is offered by Judge Licht as one citizen's contribtuion to an informed discussion of our international problems.)

We are drifting to war. No amount of analysis of the sheer madness of a nuclear war will avoid the holocaust unless the trend is reversed.

Logic and commonsense do not prevent wars and never have prevented wars. The bulk of mankind is afraid of war, hates war, and has no reason to fight, but this will not prevent a conflagration.

Why, if this is clear, must mankind be driven to its own destruction? The answer is not difficult to find.

A COURT EXAMPLE

I am reminded of a recent case tried before me involving a married couple who were separated. Temporary custody had been awarded the woman. The man was allowed to visit with and take his son on Sundays between the hours of 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. The company for which he worked was going to have its annual family picnic on a Saturday in July. The father wanted to take his son to the picnic. The mother refused permission.

The father appealed to the court for relief during the vacation period when only emergency matters are heard on the ground that the matter was most urgent. Both parties testified before me. Both vowed that they loved the child and that they were thinking only of the child's best interests. The father wanted to give his son a day at the picnic. The mother vehemently opposed her husband's plea because the child, as she said, would be subjected to improper influences at the picnic. While the parents bitterly fought the matter out, the picnic was, of course, of least importance to the 5-year-old child.

Could adult parents settle this matter without recourse to the court, particularly in the light of expressions of love for the child? Obviously the answer is, "No."

To yield 1 inch would have been a sign of weakness, would have given the other side an advantage, would have been inconsistent with the mood of the parties. The matter was resolved, but the combatants could not solve it.

NOT A U.N. JOB

There is a lesson in this. Russia and the United States are too powerful to resolve their differences by direct negotiations. Which state is more powerful has become a matter for testing and probing. Confrontation becomes a test of wills. To agree is apparently a sign of weakness. Men and nations can always rationalize the correctness of their positions.

Moreover, when one has great power it is much easier to insist on a position without resort to reason. It is clear that the power position being what it is, no amount of negotiation at the summit or below the summit will produce agreement. It is this fact of power which precludes the possibility of agreement based on bilateral negotiations.

Russia is for disarmament and so are we, but we will not have disarmament. Russia is for a ban on nuclear testing and so are we, but sooner or later each side will begin testing. Russia is for a settlement of the Berlin question and so are we, and yet pressures are being applied to that area which may result in a military explosion.

It may be suggested that the United Nations is fully equipped to solve differences among nations, but for obvious reasons the United Nations will not resolve the issues between Russia and the United States. This is not to minimize the importance of the United Nations. It simply recognizes its inherent limitations.

THREE CLEAR THINGS

Is man doomed to destruction, or is at least a vast sector of Western civilization so doomed? It may well be that this is so, but as long as the first gun has not yet been fired, an effort must be made to avoid the stupidity, the senselessness and the futility of war. Certain things are crystal clear.

1. Russia and the United States cannot resolve their differences by direct negotiation.

2. The United Nations is not able to resolve differences between Russia and the United States.

3. Neither Russia nor the United States can be made to accept decisions, which are unacceptable to them.

Having arrived at the foregoing conclusions, what is our best hope for avoiding a general war? It is this. We need to put into operation a method of settling differences without resort to war. Differences which are not settled are sores which fester on the international body politic.

How then do we settle differences between the two great powers? It is a fact that we have talked about our differences. We have negotiated directly but we have not settled anything. Not only have we failed to resolve our differences, but we have failed to improve the general climate of political discussion.

WHAT IS NEEDED

The first thing we need is time. Let Russia and the United States renounce war and enter into a peace pact for at least 10 years. Let Russia and the United States, as part of the renunciation of war, agree to a system of conciliation and mediation.

It will of course be argued that all this has been tried before and that war has not been avoided. The Kellogg-Briand Pact of Paris of August 27, 1928, renounced war as an instrument of national policy. The League of Nations system provided for arbitration adjudication, conciliation, and the application of organized international force against covenant breaking nations. Between 1918 and 1933, there were concluded 130 treaties of investigation, conciliation, arbitration, or adjudication and yet the Second World War was not avoided.

These facts are well known, but they do not justify our refusal to explore all honorable avenues for peace. A very thoughtful student of international affairs wrote in 1933 (Schuman International Politics, p. 229):

"War is seldom the result of the lack of procedures to settle differences pacifically. Its roots lie far below this thin veneer of conciliation, arbitration, and adjudication which has been spread over the Western state system in its later days.

"Until the fundamentals are altered, there is danger that the new rules and principles of pacific settlement may come to resemble certain branches of classical economics in that they are addressed to hypothetical situations, which never come to pass in the world of reality."

If our scientists are correct "the fundamentals have been altered." War is no longer a means for the acquisition of riches and power. It is a vehicle of universal destruction. Having altered the fundamentals, the machinery for pacific settlement now has a chance for success. Past failures are not reasons for hopelessness and frustration.

I propose that both sides should agree upon a neutral, perhaps the Swiss, whose function in the first instance would be to explore with the parties the issues at hand. The presence of a neutral during the negotiations between the parties avoids the hardness of direct confrontation between competing giants and permits each to confide in the neutral what it would be unwilling to present to the antagonist.

HOW TO DO IT

It might well be that these efforts at conciliation and negotiation would fail. In such event each side would have the right after an appropriate period to submit the matter for a finding and a decision by the neutral. The decision, as I have already stated, would not be binding since, of course, the neutral could not enforce its decision. It is my judgment that each side might be willing to accept a decision of an impartial neutral not as a result of weakness but as an expression of its willingness to further the cause of peace.

A neutral forum will not always decide for the Russians or for us, nor will it always give each side all that it wants. The neutral has to be guaranteed that its decisions will be respected if not always accepted and that its

neutrality will be guaranteed whatever its decision.

I do not suggest that all the most difficult questions should at once be presented to a neutral forum. Let the decisions which are on the fringe of acceptance be presented, so that the parties may be oriented toward conciliation and so that the neutral may be able to develop and perfect the machinery.

A CONCLUSION

It may well be that the system which I propose may establish a method for settling many of the perplexing problems which divide smaller nations and which in the sum total of international affairs add to the dangers which confront us.

Wisdom and righteousness are not necessary attributes of power. A small nation such as Switzerland—without an ax to grind—and guaranteed its own peaceful existence—might be the means for a peaceful solution of many of the difficult problems which in themselves may be no more important than whether the child did or did not go to the picnic.

I conclude with what I sincerely believe. The American people and their Government passionately and devoutly desire an honorable peace and freedom for all mankind. I suggest this proposal to permit both sides to test their positions at the bar of public opinion and to attempt to resolve their differences peacefully before a neutral forum.

Comdr. Robert E. Hansen, Head of VFW, Takes Stand Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, officially received their new commander in chief, Robert E. Hansen.

Commander Hansen, a patriotic American of whom the VFW can be justly proud, presented his acceptance speech at the organization's national convention, held at the Fontainebleau Hotel in Miami Beach, Fla.

In his acceptance speech, Commander Hansen clearly pointed out the dangerous pitfalls that result from the widespread apathy that exists in this country in the face of the Communist threat.

In order to arouse the American people to a state of awareness of the Communst enemy, Commander Hansen suggests a workable 10-point program.

The text of Commander Hansens' program follows:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH, ROBERT E. HANSEN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AUGUST 25, 1961

I find myself at a loss for words to express my gratitude. The only words that seem adequate at the moment are "thank you," thank you from the bottom of my heart. During the coming 12 months I promise to give to our great organization my every waking moment. I will do everything in my power to carry on the great traditions of the commanders in chief who have preceded me. Thank you again.

Now as we embark on this new year, I would like to outline to you some of the objectives that we hope to reach. First, we shall continue our efforts in behalf of more liberal veterans benefits with special emphasis on relief for our World War I comrades; second, we shall keep a watchful eye on the defense posture of our Nation and if we note any trend to slip back into the old rut, we shall speak out loud and clear so that everyone might hear; and finally, I propose to institute a positive, affirmative program of Americanism that will reach into every community in this Nation to strengthen patriotism and love of country among our people, to strengthen their dedication to individual liberty and to free institutions.

For too long the people of this country have believed that, somehow or other, our troubles would go away, that everything will turn out all right, that there will be a happy ending. We thought the great depression would go away. We thought the Nazis would go away. And there are many who seem to feel that communism will just, somehow, fade away. "Let George do it," let the other fellow do the worrying and the struggling, the fighting and the dying—but not me—that has been the undoing of whole nations and civilizations. What we must realize is that no one is going to save us from Khrushchev but ourselves.

It is this Nation, and this people, that must rouse itself, remembering our great traditions, our great heritage. It is the great, beloved America that must place itself in the front of the battleline, in the place of honor, where the fire is fiercest and the danger sharpest. For to win the great struggle with the Communist world will require a total national effort, one to which every citizen must contribute. And this great organization of veterans who have served their country overseas, has a significant role to play in rallying our people to a stronger, more solid, more dynamic effort in the world struggle.

No contest such as we are engaged in with the Communists can be won with a defensive team alone. We must have teams on every level with positive programs. These teams must operate in organizations, in communities, in States, in the Nation, and internationally. Our total aim must be more than merely to defend a narrowing circle of free peoples. If we are to survive, we must extend the area of freedom. We must do—as we did with nazism—seek complete worldwide victory.

To accomplish this task I suggest a workable 10-point program. It is practical. We can activate it. It will achieve our objectives.

Point No. 1. We must identify the enemy. Confusion among the people as to the enemy who have been warring against us has split our efforts and misdirected our policies. Our actual enemies are the Communist Parties. These control the governments of all Communist-run nations, including the Soviet Union. These parties have declared war against all free peoples repeatedly.

Point No. 2. We must know the enemy. Lenin built a corps of disciplined political shock troops and called them Communists. They fashioned many unorthodox weapons. They use agitation, propaganda, deception, political maneuver, incitment to riot, guerrilla warfare, and civil war as parts of their total war against us. We must learn how these weapons are used, and the plans and strategies behind them. I wish to stress here that we must be very, very careful not to confuse patriotic Americans of democracy, with Communists.

Point No. 3. We must create effective countermeasures. Some people say that to defend ourselves against the Communists we must adopt the Communist weapons and Communist tactics. It would be a sad day if America in an effort to combat communism at home, would adopt the Communist tactics of smearing, distortion, and character assassination. The Veterans of Foreign Wars will not condone such tactics. We do need to develop effective measures to counter Communist expansion. We must muster our full resources, make use of our economic power, our educational structure, our great agricultural productivity. We need to have our Nation humming at full productivity, with full employment.

Point No. 4. We must decide to win. Some may say that this is an obvious point. I say it is the most important step we must take. A people which is willing to settle for the status quo, is bound to lose ground in the kind of war we find ourselves in. Such an attitude means that we will wait for the enemy to make a move before we try to defend ourselves. The struggle can be over before we know it has begun. This happened in Cuba. It could happen throughout all of Latin America. We must move from a policy of merely trying to defend the status quo to a policy of positive, affirmative programing. Any sportsman knows that the best defense is a good offense. It is high time that we let the Communists sweat about what we are going to do next."

Point No. 5. We must develop specific campaigns. As in military warfare, a campaign is designed to achieve specific objectives on a planned timetable. One campaign must be to support economic programs that will destroy the seedbed of communism. Communists make great use of agitation and propaganda, but they can succeed only where people are so distressed and hopeless that anything looks good to them. Communist agitators, working within a hopeless and desperate society, can ride the crest of popular discontent into power. Campaigns to counteract these destructive attacks must have two parts—one is to provide the best possible positive leadership in the community, the State, and the Nation; the other is to know Communist techniques and tactics and when to move in to defeat them. Know the facts and act.

Point No. 6. We must act upon the community level. We all live in communities. This is the starting point. It is not so much the fear that the few thousand ragtag Communist Party members in the United States are going to somehow take over the country. I have no fear that the American people would ever be so blind and stupid as to exchange their free society for communism.

The danger is that our society could someday grow so soft and weak, so fat and listless, that we could not do the things that we must do in the world if we are to survive as a great nation.

The Communists, and other radical groups who preach hate and intolerance, seek to sow the seeds of discord and distrust among us. They seek to turn group against group, brother against brother, to undermine confidence, to destroy love of country, to encourage cynicism and contempt for democracy and liberty. We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have fought for better communities, better opportunities, a better life for ourselves and for all those whom we defended in battle. You can make sure this fight is won now, today, by giving our own communities active, effective positive leadership in solving community problems—be they unemployment, lack of opportunity for youth, or just poor garbage collection service. The stronger and more successful our families, our neighborhoods, and our cities the more powerful are the forces in America that resist Communist attacks.

Point No. 7. We must act upon the State level. Each of our 50 great States has its

own government, its own free mechanisms to consider and solve statewide issues. Success in State politics often is a stepping-stone to national leadership. As strong, positive leadership is needed in the communities, it is needed even more at the State level. Support leadership and stand for issues which will make your state stronger and the liberties of the people in your State more secure.

Point No. 8. We must act upon the national level. Our national leaders are our spokesmen in national and in world affairs. As everyone who has been long in Washington is aware, they are under great pressures from many sources to adopt one course of action or another on crucial issues. Our national leaders in the White House, in the Senate, in the House of Representatives need expressions of popular support (and opposition when this is warranted). These expressions, made individually and through the national office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are essential to the smooth working of our free democratic government. It is in this way that we can call attention to programs that will strengthen our Nation, and demand action when we judge that action is required. Every individual voter has a role to play in guiding our national destinies. Be vocal when it is time to be vocal. Act when it is time to act so that our national leaders in Washnigton will know what we believe is best for the Nation.

Point No. 9. We must act upon the international level. Strong communities, strong States, and a strong Nation make us a powerful influence in destinies of all mankind. Decisions we make in our communities and actions we take often are reflected in world affairs. Any program conducted from our Nation's Capital can directly encourage or discourage, appease or work to defeat Communist aggression. We must act to insure that our Nation's actions on the international level will achieve the same results of isolating and defeating the Communist Parties which we seek in our communities, our States, and in our Nation.

Point No. 10. We must keep informed. Effective action on any level, in any conflict can be no better than the information upon which action is based. Communist tactics change. The need for positive action may be greater in one area at one time; in another area at another time. Battle areas shift. We must know from month to month where the Communists intend to strike next, how they intend to attack, and what countermeasures will be most effective. A successful action begins with good intelligence, is carried out with good operations, and ends with victory. It will be my objective to carry this message throughout the United States. We will furnish our posts, districts, county councils, and departments so that they can carry on this fight. With your help the Veterans of Foreign Wars will move into the peacetime frontlines just as they shouldered their weapons in our wars of the past.

AFL–CIO Has Confidence in Destiny of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 4, the Nation will observe Labor Day. Created as a national holiday in 1894, the observance provides an annual opportunity first, to pay tribute to the American worker; second, to create a greater understanding of, and respect for, the indispensable role of labor in our Nation's progress; and, third, to better utilize labor as a powerful, fast-growing force in American life—for better creation and execution of effective national policy.

As a nation, our progress and security depend to a great extent upon the dedication and responsibility of our 71.5 million working men and women. A dynamic force in the space age, they provide the real manpower and brainpower for a powerful forward-thrust in the future.

Fortunately, the labor movement in America—with a few minor exceptions—has benefited from a sound, responsible, levelheaded, hard-working attitude, both in its rank-and-file members and in its leadership.

Traditionally, it has been fundamentally concerned with workers obtaining a fair share of the rewards of production, including adequate wages, good working conditions, job security, retirement, and other benefits.

Within our free system, we must carefully and vigilantly protect, preserve, and perpetuate the rights of workers to speak—to organize—to bargain.

In these challenging times, however, labor is also faced with—and is notably attempting to shoulder—greater responsibility in serving our Nation.

This includes support for effective domestic and international policies to promote still greater progress and security. In addition, labor—enjoying a unique common interest and relationships with workers throughout the world—has a golden opportunity to serve as a dynamic fountain of the ideas and ideals of freedom.

The AFL–CIO News recently published a thought-stirring editorial by President George Meany, entitled: "AFL–CIO Has Confidence in Destiny of United States." The editorial, in my judgment, contributes significantly to better understanding of labor's role in these challenging times.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEANY ON LABOR DAY: AFL–CIO HAS CONFIDENCE IN DESTINY OF UNITED STATES

Labor Day is completely different from all other national holidays—unique in origin, in purpose and in spirit. It does not commemorate an historic event or a national hero. Instead it salutes the ordinary workingman. During the rest of the year, very little glamour touches the average American worker. But on Labor Day he and his fellows are given recognition for their collective achievement in building America, making it strong and keeping it free.

In other countries and in other civilizations labor has been looked down upon, frequently enslaved. Here in America, on Labor Day, leaders in public life, from the President down, join in paying tribute to labor's great and undeniable contributions to the Nation's well-being and security.

It is too much to expect that this basic truth should be acknowledged every day, not merely on Labor Day. American workers and the trade unions that represent them do not need to be cajoled and praised to do their part. But it must be said that they deeply resent the constant barrage of criticism and attack, the foul blows that are aimed at them in almost every publication and over the air. American labor wants to be treated with respect and fairness not only on Labor Day, but throughout the year. It deserves nothing less.

Those who deliberately seek to poison the public mind against labor are only hurting themselves. They cannot match the invective hurled at us by Moscow. The Kremlin realizes that the strongest and most effective force against communism in the United States is the free trade union movement. The newspapers, magazines, and broadcasters are merely playing into Moscow's hands when they try to defame and destroy our free trade union movement.

Their efforts are doomed to failure, in any event. The workers of this country have earned the confidence and good will of their fellow Americans. Through the trade union movement, they have helped to raise the American standard of living to the highest level of all time. They have supported every worthwhile liberal cause and have won great benefits for all the people of this country by economic, legislative and political action. America's vitality and progress during the past half century are due in no small part to the unyielding struggles of organized labor in behalf of the common good.

Labor Day is a serious holiday. Most Americans take time out to have fun and recreation, of course. But they also pause to reflect on the way we have traveled and on the road stretching into the future. This traditional inventory gives us the opportunity to evaluate our objectives and to survey the problems that must be overcome before we can hope to attain them. For the workers of this country Labor Day represents a day of rededication to the American ideal of freedom and justice.

Just as a plant needs sun and water, our free way of life needs peace and progress in order to grow. The preservation of peace has become the common goal of all freedom-loving people everywhere in the world.

For some years past and to this day, the threat of war comes from one source and one source only—the Communist conspiracy.

Of course, there is a great deal of talk in the so-called neutral and uncommitted countries to the effect that they are caught in the middle of a gigantic power-struggle between Soviet Russia and the United States.

This attempt to equate the policy and position of the two nations and to make them equally culpable for the critical international tension that exists today is nothing but undercover Communist propaganda.

It is Soviet Russia, not the United States, which menaces the peace of the world. It is Soviet Russia, not America, which seeks territorial aggrandizement, as the record since World War II proves. It is Soviet Russia, not the United States, which has vetoed every attempt in the United Nations to seek peaceful solutions for international problems.

Yes, it is Soviet Russia, backed up by Red China, which is the aggressor—the only aggressor.

If the United States were bent on an aggressive course, would we tolerate for one moment the insults, the provocations and the property seizures of the bearded dictator in Cuba?

If the United States wanted war, wouldn't we have started it years before, when America had a monopoly on atomic weapons and could have destroyed all the cities and industry of Soviet Russia within a week?

Surely it must be obvious to every unbiased and intelligent person on both sides of the Iron Curtain that America wants peace.

Khrushchev also talks of peace, but it is strictly doubletalk. When he uses the word, it means peace only under subjection to Communist terror. When we refer to peace, we mean peace with freedom.

America has now served notice that we will defend the free way of life in the strategic areas of the world despite any warlike moves the Kremlin may make. If we have to fight, we will fight in support of our treaty obligations and in defense of our allies. Clearly, if we were to fail to do this we would only be hastening the day of our own downfall.

The trade union movement stands 100 percent behind President Kennedy in the firm stand he has taken to resist any further Communist pressure.

I do not pretend to be a military expert, yet I am fully confident that in the event of an ultimate showdown Soviet Russia would lose and the United States would be victorious.

My confidence is based on two factors:

First, the military significance of Russia's achievements in space has been exaggerated far beyond actuality for the twin purpose of boosting Russian morale and intimidating the free world.

Second, experience has shown that free labor can outproduce slave labor and it will take Russia many, many years to match America's industrial capacity.

We proved that in the last war against Hitler. We will prove it again, if necessary, against Khrushchev.

The Kremlin knows this, just as well as we do. That is why it has launched a new 20-year plan to match the American standard of living, and American levels of production.

There has been a great deal of concern in this country about the state of our missile program, and justifiably so. It is not pleasant or encouraging to realize that the Russians have been able to outperform us in space.

When President Kennedy took office in January, he gave a new emphasis and priority to the missile program that were previously lacking. The Air Force followed up by calling in union leaders to the Pentagon for the first time in February to brief them on the urgency of expediting the program. Less than 2 weeks later, the Building & Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO adopted a no-strike policy on missile base jobs. Soon afterwards all labor gave the Government a no-strike pledge and industry a nonlockout pledge to speed the missile program. On this basis, President Kennedy issued an Executive order establishing machinery for the equitable adjustment of disputes at missile sites. Since then, according to official records, time lost due to work stoppages of any kind has been reduced to the vanishing point.

This is an example of the position of the trade union movement in any national emergency. Traditionally and presently, the trade unions have put the public welfare first.

But other actions must be taken too, if the United States is to pull ahead in the space age. The emphasis the administration is giving to the space program and the prompt action of the Congress in supplying the President with the legislative measures he needed is, in our opinion, a good sign—a sign that America is once again moving ahead.

I wish that I could be as optimistic on other fronts but the truth is that the legislative situation is not generally good. On the domestic economic front there are a multitude of problems—and these problems have a direct bearing on the international situation and on our capacity to meet the Communist threat.

The military buildup which the Communist threat has made necessary and the additional costs of the missiles and space program have provided a segment of America with the excuse they wanted for an attack not only on wages and working conditions but on social justice legislation.

The reactionaries in Congress are trying to tell the people of this country that we can't have guns and butter too. What do they mean by butter? They mean decent housing, they mean adequate social security, they mean school-lunch programs, Federal aid to education, assistance to widows and orphans, and unemployment compensation.

Yet these are the things that strengthen America, not weaken it. America is not a bank, not a corporation, not an inanimate budget. It is people. Services and programs which help people in the most trying circumstances get back on their feet, which promote better education and health and wider understanding of American ideals are not only worth spending for—they are worth fighting for.

The one thing we have to fear is that our national economy will not keep pace with our growing population. With full production and full employment America will become invincible. But if our economy turns anemic, if it continues to suffer recurring bouts of recession, if mass unemployment becomes truly chronic, then we are in for serious trouble.

And we are in for serious trouble if we do not meet the problem posed by our growing work force. In the last decade, the work force grew at the rate of 820,000 a year—820,000 additional people came into the labor market annually. We were not able to find jobs for them—the unemployment figures prove that.

Starting this year, and for every year of the 1960's, the labor force is going to grow at the annual rate of 1,350,000; 1,350,000 more people every year. That's not a guess. That's a vital statistic—a fact of the wartime baby boom.

That means we must find 25,000 new jobs a week every week for the next 10 years just to put our new workers into gainful employment. That's a major problem for a democratic society—and it is one we can and must solve.

The Communists say our free economy is doomed, that it cannot provide full employment, that it is bound to collapse. We must prove—and we can prove—they are completely wrong.

We can prove it not by the Government doing less but by its doing more to keep the the national economy healthy and steadily moving forward.

Only those with limited vision and small minds want to cut back and retreat. America has not come to the end of the road nor has it reached its last frontier. We can get nowhere if we are obsessed with fear. Labor has confidence in America's destiny. We look to our Government for bold and farsighted leadership that will safeguard peace and begin to build a new era of prosperity in the next decade.

The $10,700 Million Change in 7 Months—For the Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, a compelling problem of our time is fiscal responsibility as the cornerstone of economic strength without which we cannot sustain military strength and security. We must spend whatever is necessary for defense and security, and the Congress has responded to the requests of the Executive on that account. But the surplus estimates of the previous administration now turned into red ink deficits for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 in the 7 months of the present administration have vanished in a welter of increased spending, not for defense, but for nondefense domestic programs. The official figures of the administration supply the proof, and the following two editorials from the Wall Street Journal of August 25 states the situation convincingly:

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of $3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has toted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least $5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a $1.5 billion surplus you have a $5.3 billion deficit the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is $6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the $3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of $10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961–62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything, slightly low. The current revenue estimate for the year is $82.4 billion, some $100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's $3.9 billion deficit, $2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the $6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from $80.9 billion to more than $87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than $800 million of that $2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961–62 budget, only $3.7 billion of the total $6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of $10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than $4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, $3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining $6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government, and all the rest. That $6.2

billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that $6.2 billion is $6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary "to take additional action this year" and that "certainly" next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump-priming and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to "the urgent needs of defense."

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a $10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 month's work.

MR. HELLER'S NEW WORRY

The economy is headed toward a "strong and buoyant recovery," says Walter Heller, President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. But instead of cheering him up this has given Mr. Heller a new worry.

Now he sees the danger, unless something is done about it, of a violent swing from the large deficit in prospect for this fiscal year to a sizable budget surplus in the next fiscal years. Hence, he thinks we should have rising expenditures in order to avoid excessive fiscal contraction that might be caused by that surplus.

In answering complaints about the rapid expansion of spending this year, the administration has blamed it all on Berlin and the necessity to offset the recession. But wait until next year, officials have been telling us; then the present $5.3 billion deficit will be offset by a nice surplus.

Well, fiscal 1963 is looming, and sure enough, the Treasury thinks there might be a budget surplus on the basis of present spending levels if business keeps booming. But now this surplus, deemed so desirable so recently, is regarded as dangerous. Never mind that the recession, which was formerly the excuse for spending, is plainly becoming buoyant recovery. The Government has a duty to increase spending further to protect us from that terrible threat raised by the recovery, namely fiscal contraction.

So there you are. If there isn't one reason for spending more, there's another. In a slump you have to have big spending in order to get a deficit. In recovery you have to have big spending in order to keep from having a surplus.

But we really don't think Mr. Heller needs to worry. With so many dutiful people in Washington these days, we doubt if there's any danger of a violent swing—or even a timid gesture—toward Government economy.

Retirement of C. B. Nuckolls, Principal, Booker T. Washington School, Ashland, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few months ago Prof. C. B. Nuckolls, who had served as a professor at Booker T. Washington School, Ashland, Ky., for 30 years, retired. Upon his retirement, he received an award from the Kentucky Education Association for his distinguished service as principal of Booker T. Washington School and also for his services to education in the State of Kentucky.

Also, the city of Ashland tendered him a dinner in recognition of his outstanding service.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nuckolls Receives Major Award at KEA Meeting," published in the Ashland Daily Independent of April 8, 1961; an article entitled "Ashland's Educational Giant Will be Honored," written by Paul Sierer, published in the same newspaper; an article entitled "Nuckolls' Long Career Climaxes With Tribute From Fellow Citizens," published in the Ashland Daily Independent of June 9, 1961; and an article entitled "Five Graduates, Honored Guests Say Farewell at Final BTW Ceremony," written by James R. Sutphin, and published in the Ashland Independent of June 7, 1961.

I can add nothing to those statements except to repeat that an educational giant in Ashland, Ky., has been honored for a distinguished career.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Daily Independent, Apr. 8, 1961]

NUCKOLLS RECEIVES MAJOR AWARD AT KEA MEETING

C. B. Nuckolls, principal of Booker T. Washington School here, received a major award last night as the Kentucky Education Association closed its annual meeting in Louisville.

Nuckolls, 66, received the Lincoln Key Award for his work toward the educational development of Negroes in Kentucky.

W. C. Shattles, superintendent of Ashland schools, lost a close race for the KEA presidency to KEA Vice President Charlton Hummel of Louisville by a vote of 263 to 210.

Only 570 members of the delegate assembly were eligible to vote. The KEA has some 26,000 members and 8,000 of them attended the 3-day convention.

They saw Nuckolls receive his award—a high point of a long career of service.

He is the first Negro to serve on the KEA executive board of elementary school principals. The award is presented annually by the Lincoln Foundation, Inc., and the recipient is chosen by the foundation, the KEA, and the State department of education.

Nuckolls was recommended for the award by Superintendent Shattles in a letter to J. M. Dodson, executive secretary of the KEA. In making the nomination, Shattles wrote of Nuckolls:

"His philosophy on racial relations is basically sound, fair, and just to all concerned, moderate in application, generally accepted by the reasonable thinkers of both races, practiced and lived by him as an example of its soundness.

"He is known and accepted as a great leader in promoting harmony and good will between the races. His untiring work and effective leadership at the local, State, and National levels will long be remembered as an effect catalyst in stabilizing the movement for total desegregation in our American society.

"He has made speeches, participated in discussions, sat in on planning panels at State and National levels; and on many occasions (in most every instance) his presence and influence had a great impact on the decisions in guiding our programs for the total desegregation of our public schools.

"Mr. Nuckolls contributed to the recent Phi Delta Kappa research study publication, 'Action Patterns in School Desegregation', in the interest of desegregation of Kentucky public schools with harmony and smoothness, I believe to recognize the philosophy of C. B. Nuckolls and his patterns of action regarding racial relations would be timely and extremely valuable to us all."

In his concluding remarks, Superintendent Shattles declared:

"If this award is to be made strictly on the merits of contributions made by an individual toward promoting peaceful racial relations, I solicit the selection committee to make a careful investigation of the contributions as C. B. Nuckolls of Ashland, Ky."

The presentation was made by Miss Grace Weller, outgoing KEA president.

Nuckolls was in Ashland when the first class graduated from Booker T. Washington School and he will be here for the history-making last class this year.

Nuckolls came to Ashland in 1922 from Campbellsville where he had taught for 6 years after graduation from Kentucky State College. He was born in Calloway County in western Kentucky.

He has done graduate work at Ohio State University and Fisk University at Nashville.

Booker T. Washington was begun in 1923 through his efforts. It became a 4-year high school in 1929.

In an interview published June 5, 1960, Nuckolls told an Independent reporter that he firmly believes in the flexible type of education which neither promotes strictly hard nor soft education.

"The school has served the community in setting up standards for the cultivation of friendship and human relations which has resulted in good will for all," he said.

Nuckolls, in 1958, received recognition as the outstanding church layman in the city. He belongs to local, district, State, and National education associations.

He formerly was supervisor of elementary rural Negro schools in Boyd County.

For many years he was director of the Kentucky Teachers Association, a Negro group that has merged with KEA. The former association cited Nuckolls in 1956 for "outstanding services in education to the Negro youth."

The same year, he was one of four Negroes to receive citations from the University of Kentucky for "outstanding achievement."

He has represented the KEA elementary school principals at National Education Association conventions.

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Daily Independent, Apr. 8, 1961]

ASHLAND'S EDUCATIONAL GIANT WILL BE HONORED

(By Paul Sierer, city editor)

A short, slightly bent wisp of a man who has been one of Ashland's and Kentucky's giants in education during the past 39 years will be singularly honored at a citywide appreciation meeting at 8 p.m. June 8.

On that evening, all of Ashland is welcome to pay tribute to Charles Buckner (C. B.) Nuckolls, a man who has devoted the greater part of his life to the education and well being of his students and fellowmen.

The public assembly will take place in the Ashland Senior High School auditorium. It will be sponsored by the Ashland Board of Trade.

A fitting program is being organized to shine the spotlight of a just and deserving acclaim upon "the professor." His career of service to his community will be remembered by some of the city's outstanding citizens.

Almost every day, observing people have seen the principal of Booker T. Washington

School, briefcase tucked securely under his arm, walking in short, but rapid, steps the distance between his home at 35th and Greenup to the school.

If it happens to be wintertime and it's windy and cold, he will be bent forward a little as he cuts his way through to meet the routine of school administration that has meant so much to Ashland in the years since 1923.

It was then that the professor was brought to Ashland by the late Dr. F. C. Button, the first president of Morehead State College. Through the efforts of Nuckolls, the first high school began in 1923 at Booker T. Washington and 2 years later the first students graduated. The school was next expanded into a 4-year plan and the first students were graduated in 1929.

This year, the last graduating class will receive diplomas. Commencement exercises are scheduled for June 6.

Nuckolls, who received the Lincoln Key award this year from the Kentucky Education Association, has invited everyone to attend the last exercise.

When he received the award, he was cited for his invaluable contribution to "the educational development of the Negro youth in Kentucky."

Nuckolls was, for many years, director of the Kentucky Teachers' Association, a Negro group that has merged with the KEA. The former association cited the professor in 1956 for "outstanding services in education to the Negro youth."

The same year, he was one of four Negroes to receive citations from the University of Kentucky—again for "outstanding achievement."

He is the first Negro to serve on the KEA executive board of the elementary school principals and has represented the State association at the National Education Association convention.

He never let an opportunity pass for presenting his own philosophy on integration of schools in the South. He was not one to push the change but has always felt it must be a gradual process.

He is a native of Calloway County, graduate of Kentucky State College and did graduate work at Ohio State University and Fisk University.

He and the former Miss Mary Mack of Paris, Ky., were married in 1927 and they have seven sons.

The Booker T. Washington principal issued this statement concerning year-end and history making activities at the school:

"The principal, faculty, and graduating class most cordially and sincerely request all the citizens of our dear, beloved city to be with us. Please arrange now to go with us 'the last mile of the way.'

"As principal of the school, I cannot find words to express to all the good people of Ashland and our entire area, my sincere thanks and appreciation for your good will, friendly relations, interest, and cooperation that you have accorded our work across these 39 years of my best life and service that I have been so happy to give, by the help of God, for the good of our people and our community.

"Through the school facilities and program, we have always adequately met the academic, social, and recreational needs of our people. Due to our fine program of school integration in a progressive community as ours, one of the best in the country, there will no longer be a need for our school, our dear old building.

"We will sing, 'Farewell, Dear Old Booker T. Washington' Tuesday night, June 6.

"We are proud of the hundreds of our boys and girls who are former students and graduates of our school, making good citizens, filling, with honor and dignity, high positions of honor and trust in all areas of life in all parts of the country.

"May God bless everybody to be with us. Our gymnasium will be equipped with speakers, cooling fans and plenty of seating capacity. We will do all we can to make it pleasant for you."

The complete program for Booker T. Washington's commencement will be published at a later date.

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Independent, June 9, 1961]

NUCKOLLS' LONG CAREER CLIMAXED WITH TRIBUTE FROM FELLOW CITIZENS

Climaxing a long career of service to education and community life in Ashland, Charles B. Nuckolls was honored last night by his fellow citizens at a meeting in the senior high school auditorium.

The meeting, sponsored and arranged by the Ashland Board of Trade, was presided over by Davis E. Geiger, vice president of the Ben Williamson Co. and chairman of the committee of the board in charge.

In introducing a series of testimonial tributes to the retiring principal of Booker T. Washington School, he declared that this occasion marked the ending of one era and the beginning of another in the field of education in Ashland. Booker T. Washington School is now closed. Integration of all Negro children into other schools will be complete next September, ending a 5-year gradual desegregation.

After the invocation by the Reverend William Garda, pastor of the Community Presbyterian Church of Bellefonte, a musical program was presented by Miss Thelma Johnson. It consisted of choral numbers by the junior chorus of the Booker T. Washington School, and solos by Miss Alene Tolbert and the Reverend Elzie Thomas.

Six speakers presented brief testimonials of Nuckolls' varied contributions during his 35 years in Ashland.

The first was Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Danz, pastor of Holy Family Church, who characterized Professor Nuckolls as a Christian gentleman and told of his influence for good on both the youth and the adults of the city.

Mayor David Aronberg stressed his civic pride and service as a messenger of good will for Ashland in his contacts throughout the State and at the national educational organization level.

John T. Diederich, Ashland attorney, also told of his contribution to the process of school integration and suggested that his methods of accomplishment offered an example which might well be copied by other communities throughout the country.

John Fred Williams, Ashland Oil Refining Co. vice president and former State superintendent of public instruction, described the valued services Nuckolls had rendered in cooperation with him in the field of education in Kentucky and in the National Education Association.

Townsell G. Marshall, assistant to the Ashland works manager of Armco Steel Corp., brought messages from the general management of his company and read a letter from J. M. Lobaugh, Ashland works manager, praising the contribution Nuckolls has made in handling integration and many other community problems.

W. C. Shattles, Ashland superintendent of schools, said that without Professor Nuckolls, wise cooperation with him in the problems of the past 5 years, the goal now attained would have been most difficult. The principal's loyalty, love of his race and of children, and his wise understanding of the complex problems involved were stressed and lauded.

Robert W. Ross, also closing a long career as teacher at Booker T. Washington, presented a portrait of Professor Nuckolls to the schools. It was accepted by F. S. Crawfords, president of the board of education, who said that it would occupy a place in one of the city's schools.

E. Paul Williams, executive vice president of the Second National Bank, presented a check for $1,275 to Nuckolls as a gift of Ashland friends. He also presented a check on behalf of the employees of the Ashland Post Office.

Earl Weaver, president of the Ashland Board of Trade, presented a scroll expressing the gratitude of the board for Nuckolls' contribution to the life of Ashland.

William D. Jordan, president of the Ashland Junior Chamber of Commerce, gave him a certificate of appreciation from that organization, saying that "service to humanity is the best work of life."

At the conclusion Professor Nuckolls briefly expressed his thanks to all. He said that he felt his contributions had been small and paid a tribute to the fine spirit of the people of Ashland.

Feelingly he said, "I'm not stopping. If I stopped, I would die. I'm working on so long as I can."

[From the Ashland (Ky.) Independent, June 7, 1961]

FIVE GRADUATES, HONORED GUESTS SAY FAREWELL AT FINAL BTW CEREMONY

(By James R. Sutphin)

Amid the pomp and circumstance of graduation, five seniors yesterday evening said farewell to Booker T. Washington High School.

These five graduates comprised the last graduating class of the high school.

Samuel Smith, who delivered one of two class orations, said, "We shall find abundant cause to remember BTW."

He noted that "little incidents will linger on" throughout the lives of the graduates and graduates should be indebted to the school for the future made possible through education.

He concluded by saying, whether it be honor or shame, lies ahead and the man with high purposes "knows no failure or defeat."

George Childs, who delivered the oration "Farewell," said the graduates are now standing at the crossroads of life, "with each to go his own way."

"We are sorry to leave," he said, "but proud to be the last graduating class of BTW."

The commencement address was delivered by Dr. Whitney Young, president of Lincoln Institute, Lincoln Ridge, Ky.

His topic was "Getting Ahead in the World."

He noted that it is easy to get ahead in the world by plane, train and other conveyances.

However, he noted, it is more difficult to get ahead intellectually, socially, spiritually, and financially.

He said, "the coined wisdom of the ages [schools and libraries] is free."

Young then asked the graduates to "cultivate the friendship of refined personalities."

He noted that "nothing outweighs the spirit when it comes to getting ahead in this world."

Young concluded by saying "to appreciate the created is to find the Creator."

F. S. Crawford, president, Ashland Board of Education, presented diplomas to George Childs, Paul Johnson, Sharon Smith, Robert Simpson, and Samuel Smith.

W. C. Shattles, superintendent, Ashland public schools, presided at ceremonies which closed Booker T. Washington High School.

Shattles congratulated the graduates for their success and said "the challenges of life are greater than ever before for the youth of today."

"Tonight history is being made," he continued as he lauded work done by Prof. C. B.

Nuckolls, principal, and the Ashland Public School system in desegregation work.

He said a New York university recently commended Ashland Public Schools for its success in the desegregation program.

Of 790 schools in the United States that were investigated, Ashland schools had the greatest success in desegregation, he noted.

Other comments made at closing ceremonies were:

"Professor Nuckolls has done for the people of Ashland things which might have never been achieved. He is the most conscientious educator I know of in Kentucky."—Dr. E. T. Bufford, principal, High Street High School, Bowling Green.

"This is the first school I know of which closed when the principal retired. This is a demonstration of what can be done when people of good will work together for what is just and right."—Dr. A. D. Albright, provost, University of Kentucky.

"The approach to desegregation in Ashland was sensible. Professor Nuckolls has been an excellent representative for Ashland and the State of Kentucky to the Kentucky and National Educational Associations."—Dr. J. Marvin Dodson, executive secretary, Kentucky Education Association.

Others present at the closing ceremonies were:

Dr. A. E. Harris, dean of the graduate school, Marshall University; Dr. Rufus Atwood, president, Kentucky State College; Dr. Clyde Orr, director, Ashland Center, University of Kentucky; members of the Board of Education and Ashland Board of Trade; city officials; and other school officials.

Musical interludes were provided by the Ashland High School band, under direction of Ernest White, Jr., and the Booker T. Washington chorus.

The Reverend T. D. Johnson, one of the first graduates of Booker T. Washington and pastor of the First Baptist Church of Winchester, pronounced the invocation.

Benediction was given by the Reverend J. E. Newell.

A Food-for-Freedom Program by the Honorable Cal D. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a food-for-freedom program which our former colleague, the Honorable Cal D. Johnson, advocates.

Calvin D. Johnson is one of America's outstanding contemporary speakers. In the course of his public life, he has addressed hundreds of business, civic and fraternal organizations and has stimulated the thinking of many Americans to a new hope in the future of our country.

He began early his career in the public's service. A resident of Belleville, Ill., he served as a member of the school and park boards of his community; 4 years as a member of St. Clair, Ill., County Board of Supervisors; 6 years as a member of Illinois General Assembly.

Elected to the U.S. Congress in 1942, he continued his fight for the American people.

His concern for the traditional American ideals of freedom is inherited from his ancestors who landed at Jamestown in the early 1600's. Born near Fordsville, Ky., Mr. Johnson is a descendant of the famous pioneer Kentucky surgeon Ephraim McDowell, whose likeness stands in Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol.

Few men in public life today can match him for his ability to impart to the people the principles of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, after giving Mr. Johnson's program considerable thought, a plan whereby the military would use our farms as they use our factories to win the cold war, I feel that the President, the American people and the Congress should give serious consideration to such a program, especially since it is crystal clear that the program now in effect, to make friends in foreign lands to head off the devilish Communist threat to enslave the world, has not been effective to say the least. Mr. Johnson's food for freedom program follows:

FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM—A PLAN WHEREBY THE MILITARY WOULD USE OUR FARMS AS THEY USE OUR FACTORIES TO WIN THE COLD WAR

Have the military initiate a giant food-for-freedom program, utilizing present farm surpluses and starting with 1961 supplement the program with approximately $2 billion of military or foreign aid funds to purchase additional farm products over and above those originally purchased by the Department of Agriculture. This would permit the acquisition by the military of special foods to meet the needs of various religious or ethnic groups. It would also permit the military to order the production of products other than feed grains to supply various needs. The transfer of corn acreage to soybean production would materially help to remedy the world's food shortage as millions of the world's hungry to whom corn is unknown have known soybeans as a food since the dawn of history.

Suggestions have been made by leading Americans that this country's surplus food should be made available to the world's hungry through the United Nations. I would suggest instead that we merely notify the United Nations of the total tonnage of various foods we are willing to make available, but let the United Nations act only as an allocating agency, setting the amount to be delivered to each respective country.

I reemphasize, do not let the United Nations distribute our products. Have every pound of food carried abroad by American ships, delivered by American military trucks, and distributed to the needy under the supervision of men clothed in the military uniform of the United States. In other words, have American Armed Forces approaching the foreign needy with a biscuit as well as a bullet, and thus build the image of a benefactor as well as a protector.

I would also suggest that in every package of prepared food supplied by this country, that we enclose a minature plastic replica of the Statue of Liberty or an American flag or a miniature Uncle Sam. Children would keep these and they would serve as a continuing underfoot reminder of American help. It is high time that America starts getting credit for her generosity. The psychological effect of a program of this type would be enormous.

If every American base overseas is a food-distributing center, I cannot imagine any nation demanding that we remove that base as long as it is used to distribute food to needy of that country. In countries where there are no bases, establish military missions (with uniforms but without guns) to handle the distribution of all foods supplied by the United States. Men in uniforms of the United States distributing food to the needy countries will go a long way toward removing the stigma of militarists and imperialists so successfully applied to our Armed Forces by the Russians. That term just doesn't apply to a man giving you food for your needy family.

No doubt the Russians would object to a program of this kind, as for the first time it would put them in a position percentage-wise where they have always belonged.

To the total amount of food made available for allocation by United Nations, it would probably be necessary for the United States to put up 95 percent with Russia and the rest of the world putting up the other 5 percent. If the Russians insisted upon initiating a program of this type of their own, it would be fine for us as we would be distributing 19 pounds to their 1 pound.

No doubt the charge will be that we are destroying the markets of our allies, namely, Canada, Argentina, Australia and New Zealand. To meet this charge, I would suggest the following:

Insist that any country participating in the United Nations allocating program must first purchase anually one-fifth of the total tonnage purchased during the past 5 years before they became eligible for additional assistance. This could be modified if it could be proven that economic changes within a country made this procedure impossible. This, however, will be the problem of the United Nations, but my personal thought is that we should insist on the adoption of this grandfather clause in order to protect our allies. It should be our intention to assist the needy—not the greedy.

In conclusion, the military of this country does things in a big way. We appropriate $40 to $43 billion for defense, and food for a freedom program should definitely become a part of our military operation. Building good will among the people of the world is as important as manufacturing guns with which to subjugate them. Thus taking $1 to $2 billion of this military appropriation and going to the American farmers asking them to produce instead of curtailing production, then distribute the results of their efforts to the world's needy would build unlimited good will throughout the world and restore confidence to the American farmers. There are 2,800 million people in the world and 1,800 million of them go to sleep each night having consumed less than 2,000 calories of food. Communism thrives on empty stomachs and 1,800 million of them is a fertile field in which to propagate.

CAL D. JOHNSON,
Former Member of U.S. Congress.
GLAD ACRES, UPPER MARLBORO, MD.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnson wrote me, as follows:

DEAR JEN: Enclosed is a copy of my proposed food-for-freedom program.

America has through various foreign aid programs given away approximately $100 billion. I consider it high time that we start receiving some credit for our generosity.

Sincerely,

CAL.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling

for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Santa Barbara, Calif.
August 18, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your wonderful bill, House Resolution 211. We desperately need bills such as this one to counteract the actions of those who are determined to go along with communism.

We are writing our good Congressman, Mr. TEAGUE, to ask that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be formed at once.

Our thanks to you for acting like an American.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT WHITEHEAD.

AUGUST 18, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to congratulate you for your House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations, and all your other efforts in this very important and urgent problem concerning our enemy, communism.

Yours is a courageous and splendid example of establishing a policy which is in accord with the finer impulses and desires of the thinking majority in the world, as one of best, the weapon against communism.

We are in a war which the Communists can win without changing their tactics. We cannot win without changing ours.

All loyal Americans will join you in your efforts. For the majority anticommunistic people in the captive nations, your efforts are an encouragement and a witness that this country does not lack morale and other resources needed to contribute to freedom and independence.

Kindly send me a copy of House Resolution 211. I need about 50 copies. These copies I wish to send to my friends in this country who wish to support the resolution as I am doing.

Sincerely yours,
MILINKO D. ALEKSICH,
Secretary of American-Serbian Veterans, Chicago Chapter.
CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am very, very much in favor of House Resolution 211. This would be of great strategic value, and would show the captive people of the world that we still care.

Mrs. EDWARD STASEIT,
Los Angeles, Calif.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *August 17, 1961*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am sending you a copy of the letter I have written to Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Congressman from my congressional district in Missouri, in support of the House Resolution 211 which you introduced. I feel that no effort or objective has ever been more timely than the House Resolution 211 is.

We must do our best to turn on, or turn brighter the lights of freedom in the hearts and minds of the people of the world if we are to continue to enjoy freedom for ourselves. As President Kennedy said in the inaugural address "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it * * * and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

Very truly yours,
VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of the Hall letter to President Kennedy.

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *August 16, 1961.*

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I want to write a note in support of the House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, which, as you know, proposes the formation of a Special House Captive Nation Committee. It would, as I understand, have the primary objectives of studying systematically and objectively and continuously the problems of peoples of the captive nations.

President Kennedy in his inaugural address said, "Man holds within his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebearers fought are still at issue around the globe * * * the belief that the rights of men come not from the generosity of the state but from the hands of God." Somehow one feels that there President Kennedy was stating the heart of the issue of the "long twilight struggle," of which we are so conscious as a result of the current Berlin crisis.

I think that this House Resolution 211 would provide, we the people of the free world, up to date information relative to how millions of silent efforts are now being made by people in captive nations to secure freedom and human dignity for themselves.

It would enable us to seize the propaganda initiative, too long held by the Communists, and strengthen the hopes of the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain. And surely as a result of a better universal understanding of the problem, means can be found to help these people to freedom.

It would help display for all the uncommitted people of the world to see the inside working of Khrushchev's "communistic paradise" and thus strengthen the cause to freedom among these people.

It would strengthen the "self-determination of peoples" phase of our foreign policy by giving us all in the free world a better understanding of it.

I hope you will lend your support to Congressman Flood's Special Committee on Captive Nation Resolution which I am convinced would strengthen the spirit and the voice of freedom around the world.

It is my understanding that both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have approved this, or a similar resolution.

Very truly yours,
VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

AUGUST 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily endorse your fine bill, House Resolution 211, to give help and encouragement to the captive nations. Such a committee should be of value in keeping the finger on the pulse of these poor peoples and encourage them to assert themselves more.

Mrs. J. B. DICKINSON.
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

AUGUST 17, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I strongly commend you for your House Resolution 211 proposition which would provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. This committee will be of great value and will be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we do not now or shall we ever write off the captive nations.

Keep up the good work.

Cordially,
JACK MCWETHY.

AUGUST 15, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD: I am in hearty agreement with your House Resolution 211 for a special House Committee on Captive Nations to be formed at once.

I hope this resolution will be passed.

Sincerely,
MARTHA C. TALBOT.
PASADENA, CALIF.

CHANNELVIEW, TEX., *August 12, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your authorship of House Resolution 211. I feel that we should do all that we can to encourage the millions of people enslaved by communism to revolt for freedom. I was very dismayed at letting the bloody butcher come to our shores. I am sure that his slaves were convinced that the United States was against them when we let Khrushchev and our President kiss each other.

Tell my Representative, Mr. ALBERT THOMAS, that I am expecting him to support your bill or similar bills.

Sincerely yours,
EVERETT LINDSTROM.

ALTAVISTA, VA., *August 15, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is not, of course, a privilege of mine to be a constituent of yours.

I did want to express my admiration, however, for your splendid statement on the Manion Forum, July 16. In this, among other things, you made correct reference to the cynical meaning behind Khrushchev's statement of last December 27, about "Subjugated colonial peoples," etc.

I have earnestly wondered for some time why our Government has not made more use against the Communists of some of their completely provable bald faced lies, not only to the world in general but to their own people, as well as documentary proof of their announced lack of good faith in any agreements or negotiations.

Recently, I secured from a Communist bookstore in New York a copy of the volume Soviet State Law, printed in Moscow. For purposes of identification, I am enclosing the title page of this, as well as the first page of the appendixes, which contains the constitution of the U.S.S.R. Am also enclosing reproductions of the pages which include articles 13 and 17 of the U.S.S.R. constitution.

As complete and total evidence, borne out by our historical experience, of their deliberate bad faith, you will notice that in article 13, in the very same sentence in which they provide for the ratification of treaties, they also provide for the denunciation of same.

As proof of their utter and sardonic cynicism, you will note that article 17 states that each Union Soviet Republic has the right to freely secede. Considering their actions in Hungary and East Germany, to mention merely two examples, which areas are not even officially Soviet Union Republics, it is doubtful that Satan ever coined a more mendacious jest than this provision in their constitution.

If our State Department is sincerely interested in winning the contest with Russia (which on more than one occasion I have had reason to question), why, with ammunition like this, don't we hold them up to the world as the cynical liars they are?

Respectfully,

LANDON B. LANE.

AUGUST 11, 1961.

HONORABLE SIR: In reference to your bill, House Resolution 211, more power to you. God bless you for your work.

MARGIE ALEXANDER.

GLENDALE, CALIF.

Impressive Progress of the Small Business Administration During First 6 Months of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report of the Small Business Administration. It is particularly gratifying to note that the aid given through each of the major SBA programs during the first 6 months of 1961 has been greater than any comparable period since the beginning of the agency.

Certainly John E. Horne, the Administrator, is to be congratulated on this signal service to the small business community of our Nation.

The report follows:

REPORT ON SBA ACTIVITIES IN FIRST HALF OF 1961—HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

Recent gains in significant economic indices show clearly that the Nation is moving out of the business recession, and an economic resurgence is now under way. Small firms are benefitting from this economic upturn, and a continued rise in business activity should bring further improvement in the position of small business in the last half of 1961 and the early part of 1962.

At the same time, various economic barometers indicate that the recession had an especially sharp impact on small firms, and that small business therefore has farther to go than other sectors of the business population in regaining lost ground.

In the 6 months which ended June 30, 1961, and which marked the start of new leadership of the Small Business Administration, the Agency gave record assistance to small business.

Without exception, the aid given small firms through each major SBA program was greater in January–June 1961 than in any comparable period since start of the Agency.

The record volume of assistance to small business resulted primarily from objectives set for the Agency by the present SBA Administrator after he took office in February 6, 1961.

Specifically, SBA has sought since then to make all its services to small business more effective than ever before; to give maximum aid to small businesses and communities in areas of substantial unemployment; and through this expansion of assistance, to help attain President Kennedy's goals of recovery for economically depressed areas, and more rapid growth of the national economy.

Accomplishments in each major SBA program in January through June, 1961, with significant comparisons, are summerized below:

Business loans: SBA received 6,356 applications for $403,901,000 and approved 3,068 loans for $154,170,000. This was a 47-perent increase over the 4,329 applications for $263,752,000 received in January-June 1960, and almost a 47-percent increase over the 2,091 loans for $98,887,000 approved in that period.

Government contracts: SBA and cooperating purchasing agencies jointly set aside 22,320 proposed Government purchases totaling $998,464,102 to be bid on solely by small business; 22,361 contracts amounting to $746,827,443 were awarded to small firms as a result of set-asides. (The number of proposed purchases set aside for small business bidding and the number of contract awards resulting from set-asides do not necessarily correspond in a given period, because bids may not be asked on a set-aside purchase for several months. Further, a single set-aside may result in several contract awards to small business.) The number of set-asides for small business bidding was 81-percent higher in this 6-month period than in January-June 1960; the number of contract awards resulting from set-asides was 69-percent higher. It should be noted, however, that contract awards resulting from the joint set-aside program for small business are only a part of total Government contract awards to small firms. Therefore, an increase in small business awards under the set-aside program does not necessarily lead to an increase in overall awards to small business by the military and civilian agencies. In fact, as discussed subsequently, despite continuing progress of the SBA-Department of Defense joint set-aside program, the small business percentage of total military purchasing declined steadily from fiscal year 1954 until the early part of calendar year 1961.

Small business investment companies: In January-June 1961, SBA licensed 128 additional investment companies to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small business. By comparison, in January-June 1960, SBA licensed 48 small business investment companies. From August 18, 1958, when the program was authorized by the Small Business Investment Act, to January 1, 1961, SBA licensed 175 companies. As of June 30, 1961, SBIC's had total funds of $240.5 million for small business loans and investment purposes; if their authority to obtain operating loans from SBA totaling up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus is included, their potential capital as of June 30 was $360 million.

Development company loans: In January-June, SBA approved 37 loans for $4,480,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for $490,000 to State development companies, to help provide financing and facilities for small business. In January-June 1960, SBA approved 19 loans for $1,972,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for $1,300,000 to State development companies. In almost 2½ years' operation of the program prior to January 1, 1961, SBA approved 81 loans totaling $9,349,000 to local development companies, and 5 loans for $3,614,000 to State development companies.

Management assistance: In January-June 1961, SBA and 144 leading educational institutions cosponsored 207 administrative management courses which were attended by more than 6,700 small businessmen. This compares with 123 courses, cosponsored by 113 schools, and attended by 5,000 businessmen in January-June 1960. In the management publications program, businessmen obtained nearly 1,370,000 copies of SBA publications in the first half of this year, compared with approximately 932,000 in the same period of 1960.

SBA ACTIVITIES IN JANUARY–JUNE 1961

I. INTRODUCTION: ECONOMIC POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Recent gains in a number of significant indexes show clearly that the Nation is moving out of the business recession of 1960, and an economic resurgence is now underway.

Personal income has been increasing. In February of this year, the seasonally adjusted annual rate was $406.2 billion; by June it was $416.5 billion. In June of 1960, the annual rate was $406.1 billion.

As a result of the rise in personal income, retail sales have improved. On a seasonally adjusted basis, they increased from $17.8 billion in February to $18.1 billion in May. Department store sales during the 4 weeks ended June 24 were better than a year ago—42 percent above the 1947–49 average, compared with 39 percent a year ago.

Manufacturers' new orders (seasonally adjusted) increased from $29.1 billion in February to $31.07 billion in May; in durable goods, the increase was from $13.36 billion to $14.87 billion. The trend is up.

Industrial production also is increasing. The seasonally adjusted index of production, based on the year 1957, rose from 102.1 in February to 108.2 in May.

The average workweek in manufacturing industries (seasonally adjusted) also has risen, from 39 hours in January to 39.8 hours in May. An increase in the average workweek typically occurs during the month just prior to new hiring.

Small business—like all business—has benefited from the economic upturn. Furthermore, a continued rise in economic activity should lead to still greater improvement in the position of small firms in the last half of 1961 and the early part of 1962.

At the same time, there is abundant evidence, such as a slowdown in growth of the business population and a continued high rate of business failures, that the 1960 recession was especially severe on small firms. The small business sector of the economy therefore has further to go than the other business sectors in regaining lost ground, and in recapturing stability and profitability.

Business population

Because most businesses start out as small ones, growth of the business population largely reflects the small business "birth rate." A slackening in this rate has been

evident since the third quarter of 1960. In that quarter, the business population increased by 15,000, compared with increases of 20,000 in each of the two preceding quarters. In the fourth quarter, the quarterly increase was only 5,000. In the first quarter of 1961, the increase was 10,000, a gain over the fourth quarter of 1960, but still only half the business population increase in the first and second quarters of 1960.

Business incorporations

Figures on business incorporations also provide a measure of small business growth, since about half of all new, and primarily small businesses, choose the corporate form of organization.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., business incorporations were 5 percent lower in the first 5 months of this year than in the same period of 1960. This year, there were 77,600 incorporations; in 1960, there were 81,441.

Business failures

Business failures, which also relate primarily to small concerns, have continued at a high level. Through the week ended July 13, Dun & Bradstreet reported 9,568 failures this year, compared with 8,356 in the same period of 1960. If failures were to continue at this same rate throughout the remainder of the year, the total would be nearly 18,000. In view of the recent business upturn, this high a total seems unlikely. Nevertheless, the number apparently will be greater than in any other year since the end of World War II.

Sales and earnings of small manufacturers

Data on sales and earnings of small manufacturing concerns—the only small firms for which such current data are available—show that small manufacturers continue to be caught in a profits squeeze that was evident last year.

In the first quarter this year, small manufacturers (those with assets of under $1 million) were able to increase their sales slightly, to $11,202 million, compared with $10,744 million in the first quarter of 1960. However, their after-tax earnings dropped sharply, and were only $24 million this year, compared with $118 million in 1960.

Similarly, in all of 1960, small manufacturing firms were able to hold their level of sales to $46 billion, compared with $46.8 billion in 1959, but saw their after-tax earnings drop to $546 million, compared with $806 million in 1959.

Small business share of military purchasing

Overall, the small business percentage of purchasing by the Department of Defense continued to decline, on a percentage basis, during fiscal year 1961.

During the first 10 months of the fiscal year—that is, from July 1960 through April 1961—small businesses received 15.5 percent of total net military prime contract awards, compared with 16.1 percent in the same period of fiscal 1960. From a dollar standpoint, small firms fared somewhat better, receiving $2,674 million of total military purchases of $17,201 million compared with $2,514 million of total purchases of $15,599 million in the same 10-month period of fiscal 1960.

Contracts for research and development make up an increasingly larger share of total military purchasing, and were 26.2 percent of the net value of awards in the first 10 months of fiscal 1961, compared with 25.5 percent in the same months of fiscal 1960. At the same time, the small business share of these awards continues to decline. From July 1960 through April 1961, small firms received awards totaling $107 million, or 2.4 percent of total awards of $4,507 million. A year earlier, small firms received contracts totaling $121 million, or 3 percent of awards totaling $3,970 million.

A Defense Department report on military prime contract awards in calendar year 1960 shows that 74.6 percent of all awards amounting to $10,000 or more went to 100 large companies and their 135 subsidiary corporations. All other large businesses received only 9.6 percent of such awards.

II. SPECIAL SBA ASSISTANCE TO AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT

The SBA has taken the following special actions to stimulate business activity and create additional jobs in areas of substantial unemployment:

1. Assignment of high priority to requests for Government contracts, loans and other assistance to small businesses and development companies in these areas.

2. Reduction of the interest rate on the SBA share of business and development company loans in these areas to 4 percent, compared with the usual rate of 5½ percent on business loans and 5 or 5½ percent on development company loans.

3. Liberalization of SBA's business size standards to permit financial and other assistance to firms in substantial unemployment areas which are up to 25 percent larger than the businesses normally helped.

III. SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

Record activity in SBA's business loan program in the first half of 1961 resulted from adoption of policies designed to make SBA financial assistance availtable to a greater number of small businesses, and particularly those in economically depressed areas; revision of procedures to give faster service on loan applications; and wider dissemination of information about SBA's loan and other services.

Unfortunately, the Agency has not been able to employ sufficient personnel to serve adequately the increased requests from small businesses.

Applications and approvals

In January through June 1961 SBA received a record number and dollar amount of 6,356 business loan applications for $403,901,000 and approved a record number and dollar amount of 3,068 loans for $154,170,000.

As of June 30, 1961, business loan approvals, on a cumulative basis, totaled 25,351 for about $1.2 billion.

The SBA approved about 56.1 percent of all business loan applications processed in January through June. By contrast, the percentage of approvals in the 6-month period which ended December 30, 1960, was 49.5 percent, and in the first half of 1960 was 51.9 percent.

Business loan applications reached a monthly record of 1,332 in March, and have continued at a high level since then. The April, May, and June totals were the highest for those months since the start of SBA.

Action to step up services

To meet the rising demand for loans, and give faster, more efficient service on applications, SBA has made major organizational and procedural changes.

Regional offices have been given expanded authority to approve loans. They may now approve direct loans (loans made entirely by SBA) up to $50,000, and loans made jointly by SBA and banks up to $150,000, compared with previous direct loan authority of $20,000, and participation loan authority of $100,000. Approximately 75 percent of all loan applications may now be approved locally.

The SBA also has liberalized its special loan programs for small retail, service, and wholesale businesses. Where there is bank participation the SBA has raised its maximum share from $15,000 to $25,000, and where the loan is made entirely by SBA the maximum has been increased from $12,000 to $25,000.

Less emphasis is being placed on collateral and more emphasis on ability to repay where businesses are soundly managed, and have good earnings and credit records, and good prospects.

As a result of the great increase in loan applications, pending applications have risen from 1,063 on December 31, 1960 to 1,501 as of June 30, 1961. This increase in backlog has occurred despite the fact that productivity of the Agency's financial staff has risen in each month since February.

Actions being taken to reduce the present backlog of applicaitons and otherwise improve service in the loan program are these: Streamlining and simplification of loan processing and closing procedures, including development of simplified loan application forms; development of participation loan procedures under which banks may close, disburse and service loans, thus freeing SEA personnel for financial counseling and loan administration; an intensive effort to recruit additional loan examiners where vacancies permit; and borrowing of qualified personnel from other agencies to help handle the tremendous volume of loan inquiries.

New responsibilities

a. The SBA is moving ahead on a loan program authorized by the Housing Act of 1961, for small businesses displaced by federally financed urban renewal, highway, and other construction projects. The Agency has developed necessary loan procedures and, with the cooperation of the Urban Renewal Administration, is streamlining operating procedures to give more effective aid to displaced businesses.

b. The SBA is working closely with the Area Redevelopment Administration on policies and plans for the redevelopment program, and on plans for SBA administration of all commercial and industrial loans made under the program. The SBA will also participate in technical assistance activities, and in increasing Government cotnract awards in redevelopment areas.

IV. DISASTER LOANS

Disaster loan activity varies greatly with the extent of storms, droughts, and similar disasters. In January–June, SBA received 911 applications for $12,419,000 from persons whose homes or businesses had been damaged by storms or other disasters, and from small businesse suffering economic injury through drought or excessive rainfall. It approved 946 loans for $10,423,000 (total includes some loans pending as of January 1, 1961). In January–June 1960, SBA received 349 disaster loan applications for $4,172,000 and approved 305 loans for $2,510,000.

Through June 30, 1961, SBA had approved a cumulative total of 12,019 disaster loans for $122,767,000.

V. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS ASSISTANCE

During this 6-month period SBA expanded and intensified its help to small firms in obtaining Government prime contracts and subcontracts. The cooperative program under which SBA and purchasing agencies set aside purchases to bid on solely by small business was strengthened at the policy-making and purchasing office levels, resulting in record set-asides and contract awards; action was taken to increase the small business share of subcontracts and of research and development contracts; and greater assistance was given individual small businesses.

Joint set-asides for small business

During January through June 1961, SBA and cooperating purchasing agencies jointly set aside 22,320 proposed Government purchases totaling $998,464,102 to be bid on solely by small business; 22,361 contracts amounting to $746,827,443 were awarded to small firms as a result of set-asides.

The number of set-asides for small business bidding was 81 percent higher this period than in January–June 1960; the number

of contract awards resulting from set-asides was 69 percent higher. The January–June 1960 figures were 12,333 purchases totaling $630,412,540 earmarked for small business bidding, and 13,163 contracts for $484,924,485 awarded small firms.

The joint set-aside program also reached new highs in the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961. A total of 34,256 Government purchases amounting to $1.6 billion were set aside for small business bidding, compared with 21,592 proposed purchases amounting to $1.1 billion in fiscal year 1960. Contract awards resulting from set-asides numbered 34,272 for $1.2 billion in fiscal year 1961, compared with 24,152 contracts for $878,168,714 in fiscal 1960.

As of June 30, 1961, a cumulative total of approximately 119,000 purchases amounting to about $6.8 billion had been set aside for small business bidding since start of the agency; a cumulative total of about 128,000 contracts for approximately $4.8 billion had been awarded small firms as a result of set-asides.

Two arrangements that contributed significantly to the set-aside program in January–June 1961 are class set-asides and set-asides of construction contracts.

In the case of class set-asides, a cooperating purchasing agency and SBA agree that purchases of a particular item or group of items, on which small bidders have been competitive in the past, will be set aside in the future without formal determination. This arrangement led to set-asides totaling $186,818,214 this period.

In the second arrangement, the Defense Department and SBA assume that SBA has proposed a set-aside on any construction procurement that is over $2,500 and under $500,000. This arrangement resulted in set-asides totaling $411,081,928 in January–June.

The joint set-aside program with the Department of Defense was strengthened greatly by the President's announcement of March 15, 1961, that the military departments had been instructed to increase the small business share of their contracts by at least 10 percent. The SBA regards this as a minimum goal, however, and will seek a larger increase.

The program also has been strengthened by closer SBA liaison with the military and civilian departments and agencies. In the most important action in this regard, SBA has appointed representatives to work with the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force who determine purchase requirements, plan purchases, and establish purchasing regulations.

SBA officials also have initiated a series of meetings with representatives of major purchasing agencies to discuss ways to further increase the small business share of their purchases.

Future actions to improve the program include: Wider and more intensive SBA efforts to obtain set-asides at major purchasing centers; greater efforts to have contracting officials use more adequate purchase descriptions and specifications and drawings, so as to encourage small business competition, and greater emphasis on obtaining opportunities for small business to bid on purchases now supplied by one or a few large businesses.

Certificates of competency

When a small firm has bid low on a contract, and the contracting officer questions its financial or productive capacity to perform the contract successfully, the firm may appeal to SBA. If SBA determines that the firm is competent to fulfill the contract, it issues a "certificate of competency." The purchasing officer must accept the certificate as conclusive as far as financial and technical requirements of the contract are concerned.

In January-June, SBA received 241 applications for certificates, and issued 134 certificates relating to contracts valued at nearly $60 million. In January-June 1960, SBA received 160 applications for certificates, and issued 68 certificates relating to contracts totaling $10,683,000.

The saving to the Government resulting from the January-June 1961 certificates, based on the difference between the small firms' low bids and those of the next lowest bidders, who otherwise would have received the contracts, was $3.8 million.

Through June 30, 1961, SBA had issued a cumulative total of 904 certificates relating to contracts valued at $175.7 million. The overall saving to the Government through these certificates has been about $14.3 million.

Subcontracting assistance

Because the emphasis in military purchasing is now on large and highly complex items, such as missiles and electronic equipment, prime contract opportunities for small business have decreased. To offset this decrease, SBA is pressing for increased subcontract awards to small firms.

Toward this end, agency officials have scheduled meetings with representatives of major defense prime contractors, industry associations, and Government agencies to plan joint action to increase subcontract awards to small business.

The SBA also has made many contacts with prime contractors and large subcontractors to arrange cooperative subcontracting programs. Agreements have been concluded with 49 large contractors. These led to development of 936 subcontract opportunities in January-June, and SBA called these opportunities to the attention of more than 1,900 qualified small firms.

Research and development contracts

Another prime SBA objective is to increase the small business share of research and development contracts. These contracts make up a growing proportion of all military purchasing, yet the small business share of the contracts has declined steadily in the past 4 fiscal years.

During this 6-month period, SBA worked with top officials of the Department of Defense, the individual military departments, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish joint small business research and development programs.

As a result of these meetings, the Departments of the Army and Air Force now are providing SBA advance information about future research and development projects, and SBA is locating qualified small firms to bid on them. In January-June, it referred about 1,000 small firms to these bidding opportunities, or 4 times as many as in the same period last year. Efforts by SBA and NASA to boost the small business share of NASA research and development requirements also are making progress. In the 9 months which ended March 31, 1961, small firms received 15 percent of the dollar amount of such NASA contracts.

Other contracts assistance services

The SBA made record or substantial progress in other contracts assistance programs in January–June 1961. It helped more than 21,000 small firms obtain listing on appropriate bidders lists and with other problems related to selling to the Government; located about 8,000 small firms to provide small business competition on more than 1,600 purchases where such competition has been lacking; participated in or cosponsored 55 contract opportunity and similar meetings for small business owners; processed 6 applications for approval of small business production or research and development pools; and developed plans for improving SBA's facilities inventory, which now includes data on the productive capabilities of 75,000 small firms, through conversion to a punchcard system.

VI. ASSISTANCE IN BUYING GOVERNMENT TIMBER AND SURPLUS PROPERTY

The SBA is giving small firms increased help in buying Government-owned timber and surplus property. In fiscal 1961, SBA and cooperating agencies made about 120 set-asides of timber in Federal forests for sale to small business. These involved approximately 225 million board feet of timber valued at $4.5 million. Other recent actions include revision of the definition of a small concern in the forest products industry to make certain that logs purchased in small business set-aside sales will go largely to small firms when resold; agreement with the Defense Department on a set-asides of Government-owned timber from military reservations, and development of a program of loans to small loggers and sawmill operators to help them meet the access-road financing requirements of Government timber sales contracts.

VII. ASSISTANCE UNDER SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

Tremendous impetus has been given the small business investment company program this 6-month period by speeding up licensing of applicants through improved procedures; eliminating unnecessary paperwork that had served to discourage prospective organizers of SBIC's; recodifying and simplifying SBA regulations so they are more readily understandable and useful to SBIC's, and providing widest possible dissemination of information about the program.

During January-June, the SBA licensed 128 additional small business investment companies (SBIC's) to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small business. By comparison, in January–June 1960, SBA licensed 48 SBIC's.

As of June 30, 1961, the agency had licensed a total of 303 SBIC's, of which 298 licenses remained in force (5 companies had surrendered their licenses).

Like the number of companies, total capitalization of SBIC's has shown a sharp rise, from $167 million in early February to $240 million at June 30. Of this figure, only $36 million has been committed by SBA in return for subordinated debentures issued by licensees. Thus, for each dollar of Federal funds committed to SBIC capitalization $6 have been supplied by private sources, including 54 commercial banks which have formed, or helped form, SBIC's.

Firm plans of SBIC's could bring into the program an additional $208 million in the next few months. Of this amount, $81 million is represented by applications for licenses in process at June 30 (most of these applications have already received conditional approval). The remaining $127 million is represented by proposed additional public offerings of stock by SBIC's.

If funds available to SBIC's in the form of operating loans from SBA are included, the grand total potentially available to small concerns under the program reaches $672 million.

Development company loans

The SBA also has taken action to emphasize and expand the State and local development company lending programs. As a result, the programs made record progress during January through June. In this period, SBA approved 37 loans for $4,480,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for $490,000 to State development companies to help provide financing and facilities for small business.

In January-June 1960, SBA approved 19 loans for $1,972,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for $1,300,000 to State development companies.

Cumulative totals as of June 30, 1961, were 118 loans for $13,829,000 to local devlopment companies, and 7 loans for $4,104,000 to State development companies.

To make certain all States and local communities know that development company loans are available, a widespread informational program was conducted beginning in March. This program included a letter from the Administrator to all State Governors; to approximately 5,000 local development companies, chambers of commerce, and other organizations concerned with economic development, and to 2,000 county and municipal officials.

Action was taken to increase the number of businesses eligible for financial aid under the lending programs, by authorizing development companies to use optional size standards in determining whether firms may be helped with the SBA loan funds.

The special measures SBA has taken to aid areas of substantial unemployment—reduction of the interest rate on loans in these areas, and provision for a 25-percent upward adjustment in business size standards—also have spurred the program.

Where an SBA loan is to be used to help a specific small business in an economically depressed area, SBA may waive its requirement that the development company provide 20 percent of the cost of the project. Moreover, where there has been community participation in previous development projects and additional local funds are not available, the 20-percent requirement may be waived.

To help small firms obtain access to leased space in shopping centers, SBA is permitting development companies to use loans for construction of shopping centers. As a further step, it is considering the feasibility of some form of rental insurance or guarantee.

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH ASSISTANCE

Each program of management assistance to small business—publications, administrative management courses, research on small business management, and assistance with individual problems—made record progress in January–June.

Management publications

Forty-eight new publications were issued, compared with 43 in January–June 1960. Businessmen obtained nearly 1,370,000 copies of SBA publications in the first half of 1961, compared with about 932,000 in the same period of 1960. More than 10,450,000 copies of SBA's management publications have been distributed since start of the agency.

One publication issued this period that is worthy of special mention is "A Survey of University Business and Economic Research Projects, 1957–61." It provides information about nearly 3,000 business and economic research projects completed or in progress in 320 colleges and universities.

Administrative management courses and conferences

In January–June, SBA and 144 educational institutions cosponsored 207 administrative management courses for small business owners and managers. This compared with 123 courses cosponsored in the same period of 1960, and makes a total of more than 1,100 courses which have been cosponsored by SBA. More than 6,700 businessmen attended the courses this 6-month period, bringing total attendance to date to more than 36,000.

The agency is now seeking to reach additional small businessmen by offering early morning and televised courses. A televised course will be given in Washington County, Md., this fall.

In January–June, SBA and trade associations and other groups also cosponsored 16 conferences and similar meetings aimed at improving small business management.

Management research

During January–June, SBA approved for publication 28 studies of small business management financed through grants to State agencies and public and private educational institutions in fiscal years 1959 and 1960. Typical of these projects was a University of Minnesota study of "Organizational Relationships in the Growing Small Manufacturing Firm" and an Indiana University report on "Control for Profit in a Retail Automobile Dealership."

The 105 grants made by SBA in fiscal 1959 and 1960—one grant of up to $40,000 in every State each year—will result in a total of some 225 separate research projects. Pending an evaluation of the program, no funds were provided for grants in fiscal year 1961.

Management counseling

The SBA counsels new, prospective or established small businessmen through personal interviews, specialized publications, and other forms of assistance. In January–June, about 6,000 inquirers were assisted, compared with 5,600 in the same period last year.

IX. EXPORT TRADE OPPORTUNITIES

The SBA is planning increased assistance to small business concerns engaged in, or seeking entrance to, the foreign trade field. The Agency plans establishment of an Office of Foreign Trade, which will seek to alert small firms to oversea opportunities, to encourage them to explore such opportunities, and to instruct them in methods to be followed in setting up a successful export business. Among other activities, this office will arrange conferences on export opportunities for small manufacturers, such as those cosponsored by SBA last year with the University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, and the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Wellesley, Mass. The SBA has under way several research projects concerning various aspects of foreign trade as they affect small business, and will issue publications of special interest to small exporters, and give small firms other assistance in this field.

X. OTHER ACTIVITIES

The Small Business Administration is appointing Small Business Advisory Councils at the national, regional, and State levels. Through the councils, it will be able to draw upon the advice of approximately 1,000 leading small businessmen and others who have a knowledge of and interest in SBA programs and in the problems of small business.

In the area of small business size standards, SBA is seeking to make its criteria more understandable and useful to small firms, and perhaps ultimately to consolidate them into one or a few standards applicable to all SBA programs.

American Merchant Marine in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress ventures into waters where the United States neither has nor should have any jurisdiciton whatever when it seeks to regulate international shipping. This is clearly pointed out in an editorial appearing in the July 19, 1961, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce. The text of the editorial is as follows:

During the century or so that the ocean steamship conference has been employed to stabilize rates, schedules and services generally among ship operators of many different flags in a given trade, it has been under investigation or the target of restrictive legislation for nearly half that time.

There were British investigations in 1906, 1909 and 1919. There was a big U.S. investigation by the Alexander committee which, beginning in 1912, culminated in the Shipping Act of 1916. There were further investigations in this country throughout much of the fifties, culminating in the Supreme Court's decision in the Isbrandtsen case (1958). This decision cast serious doubt on the legality of the "dual rate" or "exclusive patronage" system used by many conferences in granting lower rates to shippers using conference ships exclusively than to those who did not.

So, ever since 1958, things have been up in the air. Congress has been studying the matter off and on, having temporarily extended the status quo until this coming September 15—its reasoning being that by then it could formulate legislation that would, after a fashion, legalize the conference system without wrecking it.

The result is H.R. 6775, a measure which embodies the recommendations both of the Bonner and Celler committees of the House.

On the surface, this measure appears to sustain the findings of the Alexander committee, of all the British Royal Commission studies and of the studies made recently in Japan; namely, that the steamship conference system is essential to stability in the ocean trades and that the contract rates system so widely employed should be legalized, though with new permanent safeguards to protect the public interest.

So far so good. We have no quarrel with the basic principles on which H.R. 6775 is founded, or is supposed to be founded. But when it comes to spelling the "safeguards" demanded as a price of "relegalizing" the contract rate system, H.R. 6775 ventures into waters where the Congress of the United States neither has nor should have any jurisdiction whatever.

We are referring to provisions which would give Washington power to control conference rates, and to require the production of "information" which could be of a confidential nature from foreign conference members.

The whole effect of this measure is, in fact, to try to create some sort of U.S. control of conference rates and practices paralleling that the Interstate Commerce Commission wields over interstate commerce.

And it represents—to us, at least—a serious error in judgment. The argument that such action is necessary to protect U.S. foreign commerce is quite invalid.

It happens that no country has any foreign commerce exclusively to itself. The trade between Britain and the United States and Japan and the United States is just as much British and Japanese in each instance as it is American. And it also happens that British and Japanese law affecting dual rates, rebates and the like, depart in significant respects from the measures contemplated in H.R. 6775.

In attempting to "export" U.S. regulatory practice and antitrust statutes, the framers of this measure are heading right for a most unpleasant series of jurisdictional clashes on the high seas where no country has any valid jurisdictional rights at all.

The victims of such clashes would, of course, be the ship operators who could get into serious trouble at one end of a voyage for simply complying with the law of the land at the other end.

It seems highly likely, in fact, that the first effect of the enactment of H.R. 6775 in its present form would be to compel withdrawal of many foreign lines from the conferences and the second would be the

collapse of the conferences themselves. Almost inevitably, with this single stabilizing element gone from the ocean trades, a chaotic series of rate wars would follow.

And who would the losers be? First and foremost, the American merchant marine, and especially its large subsidized core. Second, the established lines of Western Europe which, with a few exceptions, represent the mercantile marine arm of the NATO powers. The Japanese might fare less badly, but let it be recalled that it was on behalf of 11 major Japanese lines this week that George Yamaoka presented one of the most persuasive cases yet made against H.R. 6775.

One of the worst features of the Bonner bill (as H.R. 6775 is often called) is that it just doesn't make sense.

Its purported aim is to save the conferences; its practical effect would be to sink them. It seeks to remedy some undeniable abuses by creating a much worse abuse—the extraterritorial extension of U.S. jurisdiction to areas in which it doesn't belong.

Finally, it threatens damage to the shipping resources of the very countries (including our own) whose maritime strength is most important to the free world.

We do not ask for defeat of the Bonner bill because of the necessity of legislation to avoid a hiatus after September 15. It should, however, be thoroughly revised and given some semblance of reality. We shall have more to say of this in the future.

Will Federal Aid Destroy Private Colleges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, is Federal aid a help or hindrance to privately endowed institutions of higher education? Will Federal handouts, with or without strings attached, tend to discourage private contributions and thus make colleges and universities more and more dependent upon tax dollars? Will Federal aid ultimately destroy private colleges?

These questions should be pondered carefully as we consider proposals to continue and to expand Federal aid to higher education. I invite the attention of my colleagues to this thoughtful article, published in the summer 1961 issue of Comments, a periodical published by Illinois College, an outstanding church-related college located in Jacksonville, Ill.:

FEDERAL AID FOR PRIVATE COLLEGES

One of the most far-reaching and fateful problems facing the people of America today has to do with increasing the power and responsibility of the Federal Government. The whole nature of the American system may be radically altered if Government continues to assume greater responsibility in the everyday affairs of its citizens.

The problem has many facets, among which is the relation of the Federal Government to private colleges. A generation ago the Government had almost nothing to do with private higher education. Today it is suggested that the larger private institutions appoint a person or staff of officers to manage governmental relations.

The vast increase began during World War II when most colleges had some sort of training program for the armed services. After that came the GI bill which sent millions of students to college at Government expense. Benefits were extended later to Korean veterans, war orphans, and disabled members of the armed services.

A second relationship had to do with surplus property. Married students housing, "temporary" classroom buildings, used jeeps, blankets, canvas, tools, scientific apparatus, and a host of other kinds of equipment were to be had for little or nothing. Surplus property is still being distributed in large quantities to educational institutions of all grades and types.

One of the major and apparently permanent developments during the last decade was the low-interest Federal loan program for the construction of dormitories and dining halls. These programs are self-liquidating in that payments to the Government of money received from the use of the facilities will pay off both interest and principal charges in about 40 years.

The Federal Government has provided generous grants for research and study for faculty members and graduate students. The National Science Foundation provided a number of grants for Illinois College persons including the cost of a full year's expedition to Africa by a member of the biological staff. Several other faculty members have taken summer courses financed by the Foundation which is supported by Federal funds. A National Science In-Service Training program for high school teachers of physics and mathematics was conducted by Illinois College 2 years ago. Illinois College has also been a recipient of benefits under the Fulbright program for graduate students and faculty members.

The National Defense Student Loan program makes available millions of dollars to students who are attending undergraduate instititutions. In fact, all the money needed to date for generous loans to students has been available.

The tendency is to add to the number and scope of Federal programs in higher education. Proposals for a Federal scholarship program, something like the Illinois State scholarship system, are being considered. It is also suggested that there be matching grants for construction of academic facilities. Some go so far as to propose that the total cost of new buildings for academic purposes be provided from Federal funds. It is also within the possibility that direct grants may be made for operating expenses.

Unquestionably the educational needs of America and the burdensome task of securing gifts to meet mounting costs condition many boards and presidents of private colleges toward the acceptance of Federal funds. However, the line must be drawn somewhere if privately financed independent colleges are to survive. If the private and church related colleges are to remain the monitors of higher education, they cannot depend upon congressional appropriations. It is highly unlikely that churches and corporations would continue to maintain or increase their contributions to the independent colleges if tax funds are to be allocated for ongoing needs. If part of the current budgets of the colleges are to be met from Federal funds, why not all?

The real danger lies in the elimination of the private sector of higher education which has contributed so much to American life. No one would deny the need for tax supported institutions, but no careful viewer of the American scene can conclude that it would be in the best interests of America for all higher education to be tax supported. The only escape the private colleges have from becoming tax supported institutions is the generous contributions of churches, corporations, alumni, and friends. There is plenty of evidence that the needs of Illinois College and others of its kind can be met through philanthropic contributions, and in this direction lies the wise course which will preserve in higher education the essential element of independence which has kept America strong.

Representation in Congress for the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Warren E. Brown, President of the Virgin Islands Unity Party, St. Thomas, V.I.:

STATEMENT BY WARREN E. BROWN, PRESIDENT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS UNITY PARTY, ST. THOMAS, V.I.

We are not dismayed by the action of the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in passing a version of the bill (H.R. 4752), to give the people of the Virgin Islands representation in Congress through election of a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives. Rather, we take the optimistic view that the Congress in its wisdom will soon take positive action to clear the way to welcome into its ranks the Delegate from the Virgin Islands with the same status as that enjoyed by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

We are not unmindful of the fact that the struggle of dependent peoples everywhere for increasing measures of self-government and more recognition, is a long and arduous one. And in this struggle, the people of the Virgin Islands can count on powerful friends in high places, such as the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs; and Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and many others, who have shown a sympathetic understanding of the desires and ambitions of the people of these islands to assume more and more of the duties and obligations of self-government under the American flag.

Additionally in our favor, the voice of political realism is being heard across the face of the earth and will be heard more clearly in the future wherever subject peoples reside. Very early in September, the Caribbean Organization, comprising representatives of hundreds of thousands of Caribbean peoples—British, French, Dutch, American—will meet in San Juan, P.R., to chart a course of economic and political advancement for the peoples of this area. The people of the American Virgin Islands will be represented there and their voice will be heard, as our representatives assist in the drafting of important proposals. This meeting will stamp the people of the American Virgin Islands as partners with the other Caribbean peoples in an international effort to find solutions to common problems of this area. Its importance cannot be overemphasized.

Small though we are, our status as an outlying possession of the United States and our neighborhood among territories of other

nations in the Caribbean, which are fast evolving as self-governing entities, give us a special importance. What America does, or fails to do in granting us more recognition and enabling us to achieve increasing measures of self-government, will be widely noted and viewed as a meaningful demonstration of national policy and competency in dealing with people and problems of dependent areas. Favorable action of the Congress in granting our people effective direct representation will necessarily, and possibly to a larger extent than is now apparent, strengthen our country's position and increase its influence and prestige in the councils of all the nations of the earth.

That is why we in Virgin Islands Unity Party feel that this is a time for the people of the Virgin Islands to renew their efforts and determination to achieve greater recognition. We have faith and confidence in the democratic process, and even though at times Congress seems slow to enter into new fields of legislation, we feel that it will take the high road of political realism and enact a bill giving us a delegate with the same status as that enjoyed by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in the House of Representatives.

Builders or Destroyers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the June 17, 1961, issue of National Review features a book review written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, which, I believe, Members of the Senate will find interesting. The book is entitled "Builders of Emerging Nations," by Vera Micheles Dean.

Dr. Thorning is highly critical of this book for reasons which he clearly outlines in his review. I ask unanimous consent that this item be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDERS OR DESTROYERS?

(By Joseph F. Thorning)

Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean, author of "Builders of Emerging Nations," has been an oracle of the Foreign Policy Association for many years. On April 15, 1937, for example, she pictured the Soviet Union as a place where only two classes, workers and peasants, live amicably side by side and where there is room for only one party, the Communist Party, which boldly defends the interests of workers and peasants to the very end. In her explanation of "the New Constitution of the U.S.S.R.," Mrs. Dean related that Soviet elections would take place on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage, and by secret ballot. She took the document seriously. Leon Trotsky, himself a Marxist-Leninist, was presented as the sole dissenter.

In another FPA report ("Labor and Management in the U.S.S.R.," June 15, 1938), with Mr. Joseph Barnes as a primary source, Vera Dean concluded that Soviet claims of socialist democracy should not be dismissed as false or hypocritical merely because they do not correspond to Western concepts of democratic institutions or Leon Trotsky's interpretation of Marxist doctrine.

It is in the light of such assertions that readers can judge the merits of her portraits of 18 "builders" (2 of them dead: Kemal Ataturk and Ramon Magsaysay, both Freedom Fighters and champions of national independence). Alive and active are Messrs. Mao Tse-tung, Fidel Castro, Rómulo Betancourt, Josip Broz-Tito, Nikita Khrushchev, Nehru, Nasser, Kwame Nkrumah, Sukarno, Tom Mboya, Bourguiba, Houghouet-Boigny, David Ben Gurion, U. Nu, Nyerere, and Ayub Khan. Several of these are respectable, respected rulers.

According to Mrs. Dean, the nations, led by the aforesaid men, may be expected to "adopt authoritarianism" but, we must hope, not totalitarianism on the Communist model; will direct, but not necessarily control, their economies; will show concern for social welfare and encourage change amid tradition; and practice a policy of nonalinement similar to that followed by India." It does not occure to the author that positive neutralism, as happened in the highly industrialized, somewhat socialized Czechoslovakia of Eduard Benes and Jan Masaryk, can simply serve as a steppingstone to Soviet slavery. Apparently, she doesn't know what took place in Fidel Castro's Cuba, far from the Soviet frontiers and with only remote contacts with the Red armed forces of Soviet China and the U.S.S.R. Is this a case of the blind leading the blind; or are there rose-colored glasses interfering with Mrs. Dean's vision?

The lady in question is deeply troubled about all colonialism, with little concern about Marxist-Leninist colonialism. Signs of the latter are discernible in some parts of the Soviet Empire: the Baltic captive nations; bloodstained Hungary; East Germany; Bulgaria; a republic in the American Mediterranean where only the popular Socialist Party is legal; and in that new emerging nation, the kingdom of Laos. A broad coalition government, embracing Communists, Mrs. Dean must know, is as surefire an enslaving technique as the Nazi protectorate was in Central Europe.

As soon as a Soviet gauleiter, or team of gauleiters, emerges to provide constructive economic and political development, free from subjection of foreign rule in Vietnam, or Thailand, or Malaya, or the Philippines, it may be taken for granted that Vera Micheles Dean will produce another manual that, in the words of the publisher, will make "a significant contribution to the understanding of complex developments taking place in all parts of the world today." Such a study might accelerate the pace of events—overlooking the small point that a genuinely neutral regime can be the antechamber of national suicide.

The guided democracy and "guided economy" of Indonesia's Sukarno also elicit warm sympathy from Mrs. Dean. Long ago, she proclaimed that the achievements of "any form of socialism" may be impossible "without resort to coercion." For similar reasons almost lyrical praise is lavished upon the Marxist-Leninist Dictator Tito. Mrs. Dean emphasizes that he "played a major role in building the 'third force' of uncommitted nations, a group which has grown rapidly with the admission of newly independent nations of Asia and Africa to the U.N." Nothing is reported about Tito's support of all major foreign policies of the Soviet bloc, including votes in the U.N. for the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raúl. Can this be an oversight on the part of the FPA expert?

The views of Vera Micheles Dean do not seem to have changed much over the years, although they are stated more boldly than ever before and although the "need for change" is one of the leitmotifs of this most recent excursion into a future utopia. Opening, "the doors to the future," of course, is Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, with his "quick grasp of scientific and technological problems. * * *" This passage portrays him as an idol, or ikon, to "a generation whose most prominent leaders are industrial managers and nuclear scientists, agronomists and astronauts." How alluring is the prospect that there would be just one politician. Expendable, or mere subordinates, would be philosophers, statesmen, judges, prophets, poets, artists, reporters, editors, and upholders of the Bill of Rights. Mrs. Dean is confident that neutralism can conduct humanity to the promised land: One world, one government.

In order to provide such glimpses of a social paradise, Mrs. Dean relies, largely, upon "hope" as a cornerstone of foreign policy for the United States. Billions of American dollars to subsidize the new varieties of "national communism" can shore up Marxist tyrants, provided their personal links to Moscow and Peiping are not too obvious. No free world would vote money to a Nazi Tito; Tito, the Communist, can be financed without strengthening the whole Marxist-Leninist world. * * *

The blind spots on the author's intellectual retina become meaningful as demonstrable special pleading after a scientific scrutiny of her "Selected Bibliography." "Tito and Goliath" by Hamilton Fish Armstrong is featured. No mention is made of "Tito's Promised Land," by Professor Alex N. Dragnich of Vanderbilt University; or "Tito: Moscow's Trojan Horse," by onetime Belgrade University Professor Slobodan M. Draskovich; or "Tito's Communism," by Josef Korbel; or "Ally Betrayed," by David Martin.

Under Latin America three of the scant seven titles recommended are "The New York Times articles by Herbert L. Matthews on the Castro revolution," the somewhat dated biography of Fidel of Cuba by Jules Dubois; and Rómulo Betancourt's "Venezuela: Politica y Petroleo."

Scholars familiar with the classic works of reference on Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, the Soviet empire and Tito's Yugoslavia are apt to repeat with the late Professor William Graham Sumner of Yale University: "The facts never speak for themselves. They are selected and arranged."

Removing the Safeguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of Friday, August 18, 1961, seems to follow very closely the thinking of a majority of the Members of the House relative to the borrowing authority requested by the President in connection with the Act for International Development for 1961:

REMOVING THE SAFEGUARD

President Kennedy asked authority from Congress to be allowed to borrow $8.8 billion over the next 5 years to finance long-range development loans as a part of the foreign aid bill.

But why for 5 years or even 4 years? There is no assurance that Mr. Kennedy even will be President then. Someone else might be elected; someone else will have hold of the purse strings.

The President's argument is that he wants the 5-year-term authority because it would enable the administration to undertake long-range projects on a businesslike basis without the danger of interference by Congress,

which might decide not to advance the money.

But that is what we would not like to see, the abandonment by Congress of its power to carefully oversee, and to deny, the squandering of billions of dollars if it feels such expenditures are not in the people's interest.

It would be a complete surrender of Congress' power to check extravagances. It would be a givein to dictatorship at the top.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, proposed an amendment to the aid bill which would flatly prohibit any assistance to Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, Senator DODD declared: "Aid to the Communist, in whatever guise, strengthens their war machines, reinforces their reign of terror against their own people, helps them to hide their failures, lends them respectability, breaks the spirit of underground resistance, and weakens the free world by diverting our resources from our own vital needs."

Our principal fear is that if the long-range bill should be passed there might be wrongful diversion of the taxpayers' billions, without the safeguard of congressional approval.

No matter how much the committees, or Congress, might oppose any of these loan proposals, they would have no power to stop the spend boys. Even when the spenders are dead wrong.

Although we know this is a period of emergency, there is no good reason for Congress to abandone its power to hold the Nation's purse strings.

Why a Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call the attention of the Congress to an address delivered by Miss Grace Lewis of Newark, N.J., at the Essex County Courthouse on Law Day, May 1, 1961. Miss Lewis, who is State delegate of the National Association of Women Lawyers, was cited for the program of activity of her Committee on Law Day and World Peace Through Law, by the General Assembly of the Association at the 62d Annual Meeting in St. Louis, Mo., on August 8.

In this dangerous era, when destruction has passed the point of no return, the project of World Peace Through Law sponsored by our legal associations is truly commendable. As Miss Lewis pointed out in her speech, "The American Bar, in its infinite wisdom, decided to take action to instill in this world, the value of the force of law, in opposition to the law of force that is being demonstrated all over the world so vividly."

The address, entitled "Why a Law Day," follows:

WHY A LAW DAY

(By Grace Lewis, of Newark)

Our laws are the basis and the force that have made our Democracy the richest and the greatest Nation in the world. Our Democracy is a government of laws made by and for the common people. It is the common people who show the force of those laws to be the rule of our land, and you are the common people.

Today, all over the world, civilization is crumbling, because the law of force is being substituted for the force of law in many of the other lands. The American bar, in its infinite wisdom—and I want to say that I tried to get an appointment with Sylvester C. Smith, who is the incoming president of the American bar, and I am a member of that bar, as I wanted him to take my place to tell you what they did, but I could not even get him—but the American bar, in its infinite wisdom, decided to take action to instill in this world, the value of the force of law, in opposition to the law of force that is being demonstrated all over the world so vividly.

In 1957 a delegation of the American bar decided to make a pilgrimage to England to show this world the necessity for a Law Day, and to establish the value of the force of law. I was one of those participants in that pilgrimage.

In England, where the Battle of Runnimede was fought in 1215, and the Magna Carta was signed, they in their good wisdom, the wise men of the American bar, erected a monument to that Magna Carta, that famous paper that was signed by King John by force to give the common people their rights and their freedoms, and to prove that the authority being exercised all over the world by kings, monarchs and rulers was wrong, and that the common people had rights, and that the Magna Carta gave them those rights.

That Magna Carta was the basis of the first 10 amendments of our Constitution. In 1785 the Founding Fathers of our Constitution called them the Bill of Rights, and those inalienable rights are the difference between the force of law and the law of force. Benjamin Franklin brought back to us from England a copy of that Magna Carta, and that Magna Carta is the basis for your Ten Amendments to our Constitution. When he gave it to them he said, "They give you the rights and freedoms, all the rights to which you are entitled, if you can keep them."

Can you? How?

This is what I told those women, and if it does not apply to you, you just forgive me for it:

1. Preach and practice respect for our laws.

2. Awaken your citizens and remove their apathy about our laws.

3. Be constantly vigilant about the lawmaking processes of our legislators and our politicians. Watch and be a part of the politics of your community. Be a politician, and be a good one."

The National Lottery of Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the members of this House about the national lottery of Brazil and also about the State lotteries of Brazil, for Brazil is not content with just one lottery.

In 1960, the Brazilian national lottery brought in gross receipts of close to $20 million. The net income to the Government, which was treated as ordinary revenue, amounted to about $7 million.

Fourteen Brazilian States operate lotteries, and these lotteries profit the Federal Government as well as the State governments, for the Federal Government taxes the State operations on behalf of the social security program.

Brazil has many Government lotteries, and Brazil profits accordingly. The United States would be immensely better off if it had the wisdom to establish even just one lottery.

Need for American Salesmanship in a Dynamic World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, at the Elks State convention at Hagerstown Md., on the evening of August 26, 1961, Hon. CHARLES "MAC" MATHIAS, Representative in Congress of Maryland's Sixth District, delivered an address on "The Need for American Salesmanship in a Dynamic World."

The convention marked the end of a term of office of a fellow Marylander, Mr. Robert Bowlus, as Tri-State Association president, the Tri-State Association covering the States of Maryland and Delaware, and the District of Columbia. Mr. Bowlus, presently serving as secretary of Frederick Lodge No. 684, is past exalted ruler of that lodge, and was honored with the presidency of the tri-state group as a result of his valuable contribution to the organization and to the community. In speaking of the Elks, I feel constrained to mention the excellent service of Mr. Bowlus.

Representative MATHIAS, in his excellent address before the State convention, stressed the importance of effectual personal diplomacy as an essential weapon in the cold war. The remarks of Mr. MATHIAS revealed the problems which we as a nation must face if we are to sell the American way of life to the world. As the speech is most timely, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BEFORE THE ELKS STATE CONVENTION, HAGERSTOWN, MD., ELKS CLUB, AUGUST 26, 1961—THE NEED FOR AMERICAN SALESMANSHIP IN A DYNAMIC WORLD

The world of today is one of tension as the Berlin crisis deepens by the hour. The President has alerted the Nation to a grave emergency. Congress has approved Presidential authority to call some 250,000 reservists to active duty. Our entire Nation is preparing for any deterioration of the Berlin situation that may materialize in the future weeks. And activities in Laos, Cuba, and other world areas emphasize the inherent dangers of contemporary international politics. All of us hope and pray that the present world crisis will be solved by a just and peaceful solution. This is the spirit that will propel our activities in the weeks and months ahead.

But next year and indeed for many years to come we must face the reality that world crisis will be ever present. The Communist leaders have promised a relentless quest for eventual total dominance over all nations. We must therefore realize normalcy in today's world means permanent crisis with its consequent heavy obligations on the free world. To meet the challenges this continuing crisis demands we must fashion and mold a flexible foreign policy that is aggressive in spirit but peaceful and humanitarian in tone.

Two facets are now of prime importance in any future foreign policy program. We must strive for a rejuvenated and dynamic personal diplomacy. And this in turn must be complemented by our spokesmen and diplomats having a keen, intellectual awareness of our democratic system and its great ability to improve and assist the peoples of the world.

The power politics of the mid-20th century has cast personal diplomacy into a new area of prime importance. Premier Khrushchev has mastered the art of the smile, the wave of the hand, and the high pressure word of mouth—always emphasizing the inevitability of eventual Communist victory. While Khrushchev often seems unable to temper his Communist braggadacio with wisdom and statesmanship, think of the great good that can be achieved by the Western spokesman who not only displays a positive, electric personality but adds to it a sense of wisdom, an intellectual appraisal of his democratic heritage, and a sincerity of expression.

The good will that can be engendered by an effective personal diplomacy was recently evidenced by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's return journey to the Philippines. There, we saw an outpouring of affection and friendship from millions upon millions of people. No matter what your political philosophy, no matter what your feelings for the man, this journey of personal diplomacy has had great significance for each of us in a time of international crisis.

If we are going to engage in successful personal diplomacy, it should now be strikingly apparent that we must send Americans to other lands who understand the concepts and values of the peoples of those lands. And we must also send Americans who have labored in those distant areas, and whose labors have justly earned the respect and admiration of the people there.

Whether we like it or not, we are engaging in personal diplomacy every day at the conference table, at multilateral negotiations, and in diplomatic visits abroad. We are in a continuing contest with a personable Russian leader as well as with other gregarious, extroverted personalities from the Communist world. Thus, when our leaders represent this Nation at international conferences they must realize that they are no longer dealing merely with a finance minister or an agricultural chairman. Rather our delegates are dealing with the peoples of those lands, for in a very real sense they are molding the future lives of such individuals. Consequently, our spokesmen must make their case heard and understood by the people concerned. Empty syllables or rhetorical disguise must disappear from our diplomacy. And in their place must emerge an awareness of the misfortunes of others, a sincere and active effort to dispel starvation and poverty, and a fervor to make our democratic way of life understood and accepted by the new nations and also by the old nations struggling for a better existence.

What we need today are salesmen who can sit down with the shopkeeper and sell him an order of goods; salesmen who can champion the cause of democracy and convey its message and benefits to people everywhere.

Indeed, all of us must have a strong faith in our own political and economic system. We have seen it improve and mold our Nation into a mighty arsenal of democratic ideals. We can now utilize this same system to fortify the world against disease, against poverty, against atheism, against totalitarianism. We can and we must if our own way of life is to survive.

In today's world the dominant ideology has once again become nationalism—this is the pulsating force that propels Western nation and Communist nation alike. But most of all it is the ideological source of life to the uncommitted nations; the newly emerging nations; and the young peoples of the world who are molding their lands and their lives into the international components of the future.

Nationalism is once again the spark that has enflamed a world. The relentless search for a national self-determination is witnessed in one new nation after another across the continent of Africa. We see the quest for growth, strength, and social purpose spreading through Latin America. The struggle for national cohesiveness is reenacted time and time again in the world of today.

While nationalism of the 19th century was primarily directed at "political freedom," nationalism of the 20th century has become a search for freedom from hunger, and freedom from economic exploitation. The ideal of the men and women in the young emerging nations of the world it not a love of democracy or a hatred of communism as such—rather their ideal is the positive realization of social justice, and of political and economic advancement. These are the goals man seeks today. And if the United States and the other Western nations are to have influence with the emerging nations—and most importantly with the peoples of those nations—we must equate democracy with these national aspirations.

But we must all realize that when the young nations achieve a national entity and a national spirit, the shelves in the store are still bare. The job of the salesman then becomes all important—for his job is to fill those shelves with a set of political principles that will fortify the new nations and strengthen the freedom and independence of the western world.

We must therefore, consolidate our ideals and engage in statesmanship and diplomacy to an increased degree of effectiveness. Western democracy has a right to consider itself in harmony and in union with the aspirations of people everywhere, for it is in harmony with those who seek a better tomorrow. Democracy has a claim on the young nations of the world and can further their aspirations principally because its very foundation—its credo—is based on a simple belief in the dignity of the individual—a belief in the dignity of his mind, his body, and his soul.

These very concepts must be utilized to illuminate the vacuous content of Communist ideology as applied to the homeless, the starving, and the oppressed. How vivid the emptiness of communism becomes when we look at events of the past few weeks.

Is it self-determination of people when Communist police must string barbed wire and erect concrete walls to prevent vast numbers of East Germans from leaving their Communist paradise?

Is it economic progress when potato and meat lines are reappearing across Eastern Europe and a severe cholera epidemic has followed an appalling food shortage in Communist China?

Is it social justice when a highly respected Russian scientist defects to the West because as he said, "If I stayed in the U.S.S.R., I would not be able to give to mankind all that I could if I were in a free, democratic country."

If we seek victory in the cold war, we of necessity seek victory of ideology. Our accoutrements of battle become the word of truth, and the deeds of good will. Our ambassadors and representatives must be prepared to effectively refute the boasts of communism and they must make their words heard and understood by the people of the world—not only by their governments.

Furthermore, our deeds must give evidence to our words. Our foreign aid is one such material example. But we must also evidence a singleness of purpose, a comradeship of spirit. The economic and social betterment of the individual must be our motivating force. With fervor of belief in our democratic heritage we must actively seek the positive realization of social justice and of political, economic, and social democracy for peoples everywhere. We must reawaken our international concern for the future and rekindle our dedication to posterity. This is our task of today. And, with courage and patience, this will provide our victory and our peace of tomorrow.

Aid for Depressed Areas: It's Depressing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when the bill providing aid for depressed areas passed the Congress those of us who voted against it did so in the conviction that it would bring little relief to a depressed area that local citizens could not achieve by themselves; and also that it would become a haven for bureaucratic expansionists.

Few of us expected, however, to have our predictions confirmed so quickly. And we are honestly depressed to discover that those in charge have been a little less than forthright in the manner in which areas have been declared eligible for benefits under the plan. In other words, the utter irresponsibility with which areas have been defined as "depressed" has surprised and angered the localities affected which, left to their own devices, had come to the conclusion that they were doing all right.

One of the leading daily newspapers in my district—the Daily Republican of Phoenixville, Pa.—has editorialized on this subject and has pointed to a number of communities that have been labeled substandard to the amazement and anger of the local citizenry. In commenting on this reaction the editor stated:

If the Depressed Area Act hadn't passed, the area would have raised this money locally, too. But now that the act is in force, people everywhere will look to the U.S. Treasury first instead of using their own resources.

The passage of this law points up the necessity of skepticism about new welfare legislation at a time when defense spending must be heavy. We could easily depress the other three-quarters of the United States.

All of which is exactly what I tried to emphasize in opposing the original legislation when it was considered in the

House and it further supports my contention that the depressed area program could prove to be an even bigger boondoggle than WPA.

The editorial in question is made a part of these remarks and is recommended for your careful perusal:

DEPRESSED?

Many Congressmen and citizens questioned the utility of the new Depressed Areas Act and pointed out its shortcomings. Pleas of national need and sympathy for the unemployed drowned them out, though, and the law now is being carried out.

Seldom does a new law verify the misgivings of its critics so quickly.

Even Congressmen who voted for it are amazed that already one county in every four in the United States has been declared a depressed area. Often this has come as a surprise to the local people, who hadn't noticed any distress.

Dawson County in central Nebraska, which earned $60 million through farming last year, found itself depressed by Federal definition. Just before the label was attached, a new auto parts plant was finished in Dawson County town of Cozard.

The plant cost $4.5 million, and needed 250 workers. The owners had a hard time recruiting a work force—because of full employment.

Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, complains that 47 east Texas towns have been declared depressed, and are nothing of the kind. For instance, in a typical recent week the depressed little city of Tyler began building new homes worth a third of a million dollars.

Officialdom in Washington celebrated the declaration of Gassville, Ark., as Depressed Area No. 1. Gradually the facts came out. There will be 1,000 new jobs there, all right, but dickering for the new plant had been going on for years and was cinched when a necessary $535,000 bond issue was approved by local voters before any Federal aid was available. Gassville will get $129,000 as a gift from the rest of us to build a new water system.

If the Depressed Area Act hadn't passed, the area would have raised this money locally too. But now that the act is in force, people everywhere will look to the U.S. Treasury first instead of using their own resources.

The passage of this law points up the necessity of skepticism about new welfare legislation at a time when defense spending must be heavy. We could easily depress the other three-quarters of the United States.

Little League World Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday afternoon I was privileged to attend the final game of the Little League world series, held in Williamsport, Pa. The crowd composed of interested spectators from localities throughout the United States and the free world totaled some 16,000 people—much more than the total combined population of the communities represented by the competing teams. El Cajon, Calif., from a town of 5,418, won out over the team from El Campo, Tex., population 6,216, in an exciting contest conducted in the finest traditions of American sportsmanship. It is not insignificant that the Little League world championship was decided between representatives of small towns, for it is my contention that the small communities constitute the solid, strong, and steady foundation of our way of life. Activities such as the Little League series both instill and exemplify the qualities that have made our country great. Following this reasoning, it is interesting to note that Mr. Mako Perez, a Cuban expatriate who has traveled extensively promoting worldwide baseball activity, recently stated: "In my opinion, Little League baseball is the best good will ambassador this country has."

The August 27 issue of the Grit, the outstanding weekly newspaper published in Williamsport, Pa., contains an editorial summarizing the highlights of the 1961 Little League world series:

Everything good that has been said about all of the previous Little League national tournaments deserves to be repeated for the series of 1961, concluded yesterday. It was another gratifying chapter in the long history of these games in Williamsport. And, crowned at Howard J. Lamade Memorial Field was a new and most deserving champion, El Cajon, Calif.

From the moment when a home run sailed out of the park in the seventh inning of the first game, eliminating Levittown—last year's titlist—the California boys loomed as most dangerous competitors. But El Campo, Texas, also had impressed the spectators, especially in the semifinals when it disposed of Monterrey, Mexico, which twice before had captured Little League championships. Thus, a ding-dong battle, right down to the wire, was expected. And that's just what happened, with a home run by Mike Salvatore in yesterday's final inning sewing up the championship for El Cajon.

Our warm congratulations to the new kings of Little League baseball—but unstinting praise must go also to all the lads who took part in this thrilling international event. There was spirited play and fine sportsmanship throughout.

Incidentally, let the senior division of play be not overlooked. Hearty congratulations to Natrona Heights, representing Pennsylvania, who emerged as champions of this first tournament, played at Bowman Field.

Should We Honor Our 1794 Treaty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there may be times when the path of progress does not always lead in the right direction. The Kinzua Dam might well be a case in point. Have all the possibilities been explored? Many are of the opinion they have not been. Distinguished authorities have suggested more feasible, more desirable, and less costly locations.

The President has said the dam is under construction, it is not possible to stop work or locate it elsewhere. A recent Government report would appear to refute the statement that because construction has been begun it cannot be stopped. The report in question cannot be attributed to the President, but states specifically a road project was started, the feasibility then questioned, funds were exhausted and it now ends on the side of a mountain in the middle of nowhere.

As we reflect, our Founding Fathers did not make too many errors. Should we of this day honor the treaties they made yesterday? The editorial which follows indicates the U.S. Government should keep its word.

SHOULD KEEP OUR WORD

Has the last word been said on the Kinzua Dam, now that the President himself has spoken? This month, Mr. Kennedy made public a letter he has sent to the Seneca Indians, explaining that they will have to give up part of their land along the Allegheny River above Pittsburgh. The dam is under construction, Mr. Kennedy said in his letter, and it is not possible to stop work on it or locate it elsewhere.

We beg to differ. It is perfectly possible to stop construction of the Kinzua Dam. It is perfectly possible to dam the Alleghany at another spot. And it is perfectly possible to keep the pledge that the Government of the United States made to the Seneca Indians in 1794, a pledge which guaranteed the Senecas everlasting rights to the land that is now being taken away from them.

Let us point out, by the way, that this is not the usual case of eminent domain, of private persons surrendering through force of law land which is judged useful for public purposes. Not at all. Privately owned land taken lawfully by the right of eminent domain is different from land ownership of which has been guaranteed by the solemn word of the Federal Government and sanctioned by a President of the United States, in this case, George Washington. Taking the land away from the Senecas involves an outright repudiation of the promise of the U.S. Government. And those who have acquiesced in this action, among whom are Senator CLARK and President Kennedy, are thus assuming a grave responsibility.

We are of the opinion that honor means something. We believe that when the Government of the United States makes a promise, that promise should be kept. President Kennedy has made no solemn pledge in the form of a treaty to the people of West Berlin. Yet he has indicated that we should be willing to fight a nuclear war to keep a moral commitment to these people. At the same time he tells the Seneca nation that the U.S. Government cannot keep its word to the Indians.

The Senecas have agreed to accept the Kinzua Dam if it is demonstrated to them beyond a doubt that this particular dam is necessary. But they are not convinced that it is. They went so far as to consult a distinguished engineer, Arthur Morgan, former head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, who tramped all over the terrain and suggested what, to him, were cheaper and better flood control projects.

We just do not understand why Senator CLARK and others have failed to exhaust every means of finding a way to dam the Alleghany without breaking the promise of the U.S. Government. It can be done. And it should be done. We should keep our word.

A Far-Reaching Discovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just when man discovered that supply and demand determined what he

should do and how he should live is buried in the myths of antiquity, but apparently that truth has been rediscovered.

Business Week of August 26, on page 20, called attention to the present existence of this old truth in the following manner:

HOUSING DEMAND FAILS TO SUPPORT HOPES FOR A RISE

Government programs to aid housing can do almost anything except repeal the law of supply and demand. Nevertheless, demand in the long run determines the rate at which homes will be built.

Evidence mounts that demand just isn't there—at least not enough to support any real comeback in homebuilding this year. And many housing experts are trimming their forecasts for next year as well.

July housing starts are the latest signal that the slight pickup that began in the second quarter may be running out of steam. Private starts last month dropped to an annual rate of 1,317,000 dwelling units (seasonally adjusted)—almost 5 percent below the June rate.

This slippage, coming on the heels of successive increases during the previous 3 months, was disappointing to those who counted on a steady rise in the last half to pull the homebuilding industry out of its slump.

During the 7 months of 1961, housing starts have only pulled even with last year. Work began on 773,400 public and private units from January through July this year, compared to 776,000 units a year earlier.

What's lifting the total, however, is the stepped-up rate of public housing—30,400 dwelling units so far this year, against 18,800 a year ago. Private home building, on the other hand, still lags by 14,500 units.

HOMES—FOR SALE OR TO LET—AMPLE

One explanation for the sag in private residential construction may be found in the mounting vacancy rates.

For-sale vacancies jumped to 1.4 percent of existing structures during the second quarter of 1961, according to Commerce Department estimates. That was an unusually sharp increase in a rate that has hovered between 1 percent and 1.2 percent for the past 3½ years. But it should be no surprise to longtime observers of population and housing trends.

In rental properties, too, supply has been growing faster than demand. It's now easier to find an apartment or house to rent than at any time since the 1930's. Rental vacancies rose to 8.1 percent of available supply during the second quarter of 1961, compared with 7.3 percent a year earlier.

APARTMENT BOOM MAY BE ABATING

The reason for the increase in rental vacancies is not hard to figure. Much of the pressure has been lifted from the rental market by the many new apartment projects that have been going up in the past year.

Last year contract awards for new apartment buildings rose to more than $1.3-billion—a thumping 72 percent increase over the year before, according to McGraw-Hill's Construction Daily. This brisk pace continued through May of this year, with contracts ahead of 1960 by a wide margin.

Lately, however, there are signs that this boom in apartment building may be running down. Contract awards slowed considerably in June and July—enough to pull the 7 months 4 percent below last year.

HOME ALTERATION A RISING MARKET

Builders, discouraged by the let-down in construction of new homes, are increasingly attracted to one burgeoning phase of the residential market—alterations and repairs.

Last year homeowners and tenants spent $13 billion on fix-up projects; $5½ billion of this went for structural changes—additions and alterations.

Commerce Department estimates that for every $10 spent on new homes in the first quarter of 1961, another $7 was spent on upkeep and improvement.

Alarming Power of Bureaucrats To Override Intent of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how easy it is for us to lose our democratic processes and become a regimented people is clearly shown in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune concerning the action of a top-level administration bureaucrat to disregard a congressional action because "he did not agree with it." Mr. Speaker, we had better wake up and put an end to bureaucratic decisions which move us further along the road to dictatorship before it is too late.

The editorial follows:

BUREAUCRATS ON TOP

Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana, has warned his colleagues that if civil service employees of the Federal bureaucracy continue to succeed in superimposing their judgment on the will of Congress, then "we have lost the constitutional authority that is vested in us."

The constitutional power of Congress is to make the laws; the constitutional function of the executive branch, from the President down, is to see that they are faithfully executed.

Yet, said Mr. HARVEY, he was offering an instance in which a bureaucrat overruled Congress. He cited testimony of Edward Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who was questioned about operations to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities.

"We were questioning Mr. Martin as to why a proper deal with one of the major Latin American republics—and a friendly nation—had not been consummated," Mr. Harvey related. "In this instance the country had sent a mission here to Washington to exchange sugar for wheat. They received the contract to sell us sugar but were not given an opportunity to take the wheat in exchange. This was very much in contrast with the policy the House and Senate had set forth in the extension of the Sugar Act, and so we were trying to determine in this hearing, with Mr. Martin as a witness, why the policy of Congress had not been carried out.

"Mr. Martin very distinctly stated that he did not agree with the policy as set forth by the Congress and that he assumed full responsibility for rejecting it, and, in fact, discouraged the visiting country from actually adhering to the policy as set forth by Congress. This particular type of activity * * * indicates an even more alarming aspect of our present position in international affairs: to wit, that the Congress no longer is presumed to have any voice in the policies that are carried out by this country."

It would certainly seem to be more sensible to trade commodities which are glutting storage capacity for something, such as sugar, which we can use, than to compel purchase of the sugar with no diminution of the surplus of wheat. But that is subsidiary to the fact that bureaucrats feel they can ignore their obligation to execute the laws if these laws run contrary to their own judgments or prejudices.

Unless Congress acts with force to end bureaucratic usurpations, it has no one but itself to blame for the fact that its deliberations will be reduced to exercises in a vacuum.

The Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions, I have inserted timely articles on geopolitical, foreign policy, and constitutional questions in the RECORD, among them some by Mr. Anthony Harrigan.

The latest contribution by this distinguished writer is an article in the August 1961 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, the well-known and influential monthly magazine for the advancement of professional, literary, and scientific knowledge in the Navy.

The article carries the following biographical sketch of its author: Educated at Kenyon College and the University of Virginia, Mr. Harrigan served with the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II. He is director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Charleston, S.C., and also associate editor with the News and Courier of Charleston. A contributor to several national magazines, his articles have appeared in the New York Times, American Heritage, and American Historical Review.

The article by Mr. Harrigan follows:

THE WILL TO WIN

(By Anthony Harrigan)

As important to a navy as new ships and late-model weapons is a victory psychology. In the last analysis, it is the will to win that turns the tide of battle. The great conflicts of former centuries are replete with illustrations of the truth that the nation that is emotionally dedicated to victory is the nation that triumphs, even though its weapons may not be a match for the enemy's weapons. To cite only one example, the outnumbered airmen of the Royal Air Force defeated the Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain because they had the will to win.

This is a truth of which American naval officers should constantly remind themselves in these days of exotic weaponry. While modern naval warfare cannot be considered apart from the marvels of science and technology, the crucial element in any battle on, under, or above the seas remains the human being and his determination to win over the enemy.

No group of men is more aware of this than the masters of world communism, whose first objective, throughout the history of their revolutionary movement, has not been the seizure of new territories, but the crippling of the will to win in the hearts of free men. If this will is impaired, all the

extraordinary devices of modern war are worthless, and a nation becomes ripe for conquest.

Grounds exist for believing that Americans fail fully to comprehend this truth. Concern with gadgetry often is excessive in the Armed Forces. When the man at the sonar or behind the missile is considered, talk centers on the question of technical skill or the level of intelligence. But intelligence and skill are not the same as will. According to Webster, will is the "total conscious process in effecting a decision." And the will to win for American servicemen must be a deep-seated determination not merely to fight until a condition of peace is arranged, but to give every ounce of one's being to gain complete supremacy over an enemy.

The United States does not lack brave men who are ready to give their lives in defense of their country. Nevertheless, a case can be made that, to some degree, the Nation's will to win has been disarmed. Indication of this may be found in the notion, prevailing in some circles, that there are substitutes for victory in the free world's protracted war with the Communist enemy. Dr. Thomas C. Schelling, writing in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, has said that Americans "tend to identify peace, stability and the quiescence of conflict with notions like trust, good faith and mutual respect." That is a splendid point of view in a world where good men rule all nations. Unfortunately, in this era in which Communist-dominated nations control much of the globe, good faith is nonexistent in many lands. Thus Americans must not equate the stillness, which is only an absence of all-out war, with old ideas of peace. Indeed, to the extent that Americans confuse the silent war tactics of communism with true peace, to that extent the United States has lost a battle.

The last few years have seen more Americans come to realize that war with communism is not likely to be a single colossal bang, but a series of limited war operations. They are beginning to grasp the truth that world war III, instead of being an event that may occur at some indefinite time in the future, is nothing more nor less than the cold war of the last 15 years. World war III is internal subversion, indirect aggression in Lebanon, Korea, hot war maneuvers off the China coast, unrest in the Caribbean, and a variety of outbursts on the international scene. Together, they constitute a full-scale war by the Communist powers against the United States and its free world allies.

The great danger for the American people is that they may not fully understand this new kind of war. Indeed, many citizens still mistakenly view trouble in Lebanon and trouble in the Caribbean as unrelated events. This is most unfortunate, for it is impossible to comprehend and analyze each international explosion apart from the others.

James Burnham, writing in National Review, has correctly pointed out that "the Suez issue we interpreted in terms of Egypt's 'sovereign rights' and the immorality of an Anglo-French appeal to forces, not in a global context from the perspective of which Nasser's seizure of the canal was a phase in the Russian campaign to take control of the strategic pivot to Eurafrica." This global context can never be ignored by the United States. Formosa, Matsu, Guantanamo Bay, the Panama Canal, and numerous other points of tension are related to one another. Each is a target in the Communist world plan of conquest. International agitation regarding theses points—all of which have bearing on the defense strategy of the United States—often attempts to depict unrest as the result of legitimate national liberation movements. But Americans should take care to realize how nationalist ambitions are harnessed for Communist purposes. Gen. C. P. Cabell, U.S. Air Force, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, testified in a congressional hearing on November 5, 1959, that the "so-called national liberation strategy seeks to offset Communist numerical and political weakness through international organizational support and clandestine techniques of infiltration and coordination." In other words, it is another war technique of which members of the U.S. Military Establishment must be aware.

The United States is engaged in a war waged in a global theater. The security of the waters between Formosa and the Chinese mainland, the political orientation of oversea Chinese, the extent and quality of information programs, and the attitude of American servicemen toward their duties all are aspects of the war situation. No naval commander today can afford to consider simply the operation of his ships. He must be aware of the entire spectrum on which this "world war" is being fought between the free world and communism.

In considering the limited war operations that they may be called upon to take part in during the years ahead, today's officers must fully understand that the quality of response cannot be limited if victory is to be achieved. Wherever American ships, aircraft, and fighting men are deployed, there must be a tremendous effort on the part of each officer to obtain the maximum advantage for his country. Because a war operation may be restricted to one small island or country does not mean that the need for victory is less than in a conflict such as World War II. This may seem an odd point to stress, but the American experience of small wars with limited objectives is not great. Moreover, the American fighting man's psychology is one that is likely to generate a lot of push in the big battle where the threat is clearly understood. But that is not where the big push is needed today; the need is in the small strike or police action or the show-the-flag mission that has strong political overtones. Because the entire world is the battlefield and ideological warfare is part of it, officers must bear in mind that every action, no matter how small, can have a profound effect on the outcome of the war. A sentry who is too quick on the trigger at a base in a host country or a misbehaving liberty party in a neutral nation can mean the loss of a battle.

American fighting men must remember that at all times they have the duty of pursuing national strategic objectives. Sometimes in discussion of the specialized missions of warfare, the basic assignment of the Armed Forces is overlooked. Former Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke once defined this fundamental fourfold assignment as follows:

1. To support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

2. To maintain, by timely and effective military action the security of the United States, its possessions, and areas vital to its interest.

3. To uphold and advance the national policies and interests of the United States.

4. To safeguard the internal security of the United States.

This basic assignment takes precedence ever whatever job an officer is given in his service. Perhaps a new emphasis on this basic assignment is needed so that officers do not forget their ultimate responsibility and the reason for which they are trained in various specialties and given a variety of duties. Before an officer is a destroyerman, a submariner, or flier, he is a defender of the interests of the United States. In an age of technological wizardry, this fundamental role of the officer is not stressed adequately.

Because defense of the interests of the United States is a complex matter, requiring a high degree of understanding of international issues, officers in the naval service must study the methods and objectives of the enemy. This is an arduous but necessary task. The pitfalls are many. As President Eisenhower said in a state of the Union message we live in "a sea of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe." He noted that "police states are called 'people's democracies' * * * and armed conquest of free people is called 'liberation.'" Mr. Eisenhower warned that "such slippery slogans make more difficult the problems of communicating true faith, facts and beliefs."

In trying to find their way through "the sea of semantic disorder," American officers must take care not to become infected with any spurious moralism whereby the enemy has persuaded the gullible that the wants of other nations that are not necessarily friends of the United States are absolute rights that must be respected in the international community.

The American naval officer has one duty and one duty only—to help obtain and hold whatever strengthens the United States in the cold war with the Communist powers. This is an age of nationalism that is stirring nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In viewing this nationalism, the danger exists that some Americans may apologize for their own legitimate national aspirations and needs. Forms of national weakness that must be avoided are feelings of guilt for retarded nations or misplaced idealism that puts the wants of these nations ahead of the strategic needs of the United States. If members of the Military Establishment permit themselves to place an unfounded system of rights ahead of strictly defense considerations, the results would be perilous for the American Republic and its allies. It would mean the formation of a weakness-prone defeat psychology within the services charged with defending U.S. interests under all circumstances.

World communism hopes and plans for precisely that result. The entire agitation and propaganda apparatus of the Soviet Union is directed to weakening the American will to win. One way the enemy hopes to reach success is by playing upon the sensitive national conscience, hoping that an "America last" attitude will develop and thereby blunt the fighting edge of the United States. Communists are well aware that disarming the American will would be as effective for them as disarming the land, sea, and air forces of the Republic.

Therefore, American naval officers and their brother officers in the other services must acquaint themselves with the propaganda war techniques and operations of the enemy and constantly strengthen their resolve to promote a victory psychology in themselves and in the ranks. The first step is to learn that in Communist conflict strategy there are no rigid borders between war and peace. The Soviet submarine fleet maneuvers or defamation of a stanch anti-Communist are simply different phases of a vast military operation, the objective of which is defeat of the United States.

One Communist tactic is to encourage in the free world a morality of self-destruction. Indeed a sizable literature has been created that stresses that the United States is not truly moral when it uses its full strength for its own advantage. A notion is gaining currency that the United States, being a numerical minority in the world, must not antagonize those nations that have the greatest populations. This notion has not gained wide popular support because the American people refuse to endorse appeasement when the issue is clearly understood. Less well understood is the necessity of not accepting limitations on national action imposed by any bloc of nations, irrespective of how they are organized or under whatever auspices. Where strength lies, there must lie command decision. That is a truth that the American people, including the members of the Armed Forces, must study and understand anew. As the principal defender of freedom in the world, the United States must be free to reject all counsels of weakness, no matter

how many nations say it is the necessary response in a particular situation. It is far better for the free world that there be some hurt feelings than for the United States to accept a military or diplomatic program or arrangement that will benefit the Communist enemy. Whatever positions the United States needs to survive, it must hold or obtain. Because, in this age of subversion, weakness will be presented as enlightenment, the will to win must be very strong and very clear in the United States.

Resistance to all the attacks of communism, both open and covert, can never be relaxed. Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, stated this well in a statement to Congress, in 1960. "Our system of government and our way of life," he said, "have come under direct and deadly challenge by an implacable, crafty, and, of late, openly contemptuous enemy of both. If the public statement 'we will bury you' does not carry the message to us, then words have lost their meanings. Attempts to explain away this blunt warning of intentions by calling it jovial, or by saying that it really does not mean a big military funeral but just a little economic one, is a form of jocularity too close to the jugular to lighten my heart."

When communism speaks of peace, disarmaments, and treaty negotiations, even some members of the Armed Forces may be taken in by the seemingly straightforward statements. But anyone so tempted should read the report of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International (1928). Said this report: "The disarmament policy of the Soviet Government must be utilized for purposes of agitation * * * and to carry on propaganda among the masses in support of the only way toward disarmament and abolition of war, viz., arming of the proletarian, overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing the proletarian dictatorship."

Those who have carefully studied the Communist war tactics ceaselessly warn of the perils of propaganda. Raymond Aron, the distinguished French commentator on military matters, writes in "The Century of Total War" that "the battle against propaganda and infiltration must be waged indefatigably." In "Target: The World," Evron Kirkpatrick, professor and author in the social sciences, writes that the free nations face "the most enormous coordinated, self-conscious effort to influence the attitudes and consequently the actions of people the world has ever known."

The results of this effort are tragically plain in the arena of military operations. Discussing the war in southeast Asia and north Africa, Mr. Aron says in "On War" that "the people of Vietnam or north Africa are perhaps no more hostile to the invaders than they used to be. But the French are less convinced of their right to colonize." Thus the Communist success in driving the French from previously held positions was partially achieved by subverting ideas in the French homeland.

The challenge for American officers is to resist ideas that spell weakness and to strengthen the will to win by focusing on the primacy of American national interests in a world threatened by Communist imperialism.

Rowell Laboratories at Baudette, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to an article from the Minneapolis Star's August 22 edition, written by staff writer Edward Schaefer. It tells of a million-dollar business being done by a pharmaceutical company located in the 1,300-population town of Baudette, in Minnesota's far-north country. The magnificent achievement of Mr. Ted Rowell, Sr., who started as a young pharmacist with a vision, is an example of what can be done in the many smaller communities across our vast land. This is the kind of opportunity still provided in the United States and is one of the reasons we have grown to be the greatest Nation and strongest society on earth. This example of American enterprise is another reason why Congress must ever be on the alert to protect these smaller, but equally important businesses in our United States.

The article follows:

The most uniquely located pharmaceutical company in the country is strengthening its research ties with the University of Minnesota, North Dakota State University and South Dakota State College.

Rowell Laboratories, Inc., at Baudette, Minn., sits on a big bend in the Rainy River between Minnesota and Ontario. It announced today that its medical scholarship program at the Minnesota school of medicine will be greatly expanded, probably to seven, next year.

Similar expansions are scheduled in graduate research scholarships at the North Dakota State's School of Pharmacy at Fargo, and at the South Dakota State Pharmacy School at Brookings, where Rowell has financed student scholarships.

The company also has had graduate research scholarships at the Minnesota College of Pharmacy for 3 years.

T. H. Rowell, Sr., president of the company, said a start also is being made toward establishment of a research foundation to formalize the company's endowments.

The company got its start in processing livers of burbot fish into potent vitamin products and now is housed in an ultramodern plant, making synthesized drugs.

Its intention is to give 5 percent of gross sales to medical and pharmaceutical research.

While the company does not publish a financial report, indications are sales this year will be about $1,350,000, up about 10 percent from 1960.

It is the largest supplier in the world of natural quinidine sulphate, used in medicines to regulate heart beats, and imports raw materials from all parts of the world.

FIRM SCORES FIRSTS

Support of general research and special projects is nothing new to Rowell.

Rowell's research with an antibiotic known as para-amino salicylate permitted the company, some 10 years ago, to be the first pharmaceutical house in the country in preparation of a dosage form used in treatment of tuberculosis.

For 13 months the company supplied all the Veterans' Administration hospitals in the United States with the antibiotic.

Before World War II it experimented, unsuccessfully, to find new uses for valuable extracts of the digitalis plant, grown only in Central Europe.

While costly research had gone down the drain, facts were established about the extracts and are available to medicine, in case they ever are needed.

The company is firmly committed to the ethical approach in the presentation of its products.

Rowell's only advertisements are rather staid announcements appearing in medical and similar journals, and its 25 full-time salesmen religiously refrain from anything resembling the hard sell in explaining Rowell products to druggists and doctors.

But this policy does not prevent the company from producing medicines sold under other labels—many large department store drug departments uses Rowell-made products exclusively under their own names.

And the policy does not prevent the Rowell company from producing products eagerly marketed by other companies.

A few years back, Arthur Godfrey began beating the drums for a B-complex vitamin capsule.

The product would, according to Godfrey, cure just about anything except old age, and it slowed even that process a lot, Godfrey hinted.

The orders began pouring in. The demand built up to such fantastic proportions it even swamped production facilities of the large eastern pharmaceutical house which was the prime supplier to the retailers.

That company appealed to the Rowell company to take over some of the production.

For 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for 3 years machines in the Rowell plant filled and packaged capsules which were in effect being sold by Godfrey.

"That financed a lot of research," Rowell said succintly.

There have been recurring rumors in the last year or two that more than one of the large eastern companies would like to get control of the Rowell company.

That was confirmed, in a way, when Rowell said the company is not for sale. He has 51 percent of the stock in his own name.

An associate said Rowell, 56, was not interested basically because the offer included no provision for the 55 production workers, a big employment element in Baudette's population of 1,300, or the scientific, management and sales people to whom Rowell has gradually shifted increasing responsibility in recent years.

CLOSE TO FISHING

There are additional reasons behind Rowell's decision to keep the plant in Baudette and under its present management.

When Rowell was fresh out of the Minnesota College of Pharmacy in 1928 he proved, pretty much on a hunch, that livers of the ugly burbots occasionally caught by his commercial fisherman father were rich in vitamins—six to eight times as potent as cod fish livers.

As he labored to establish a market for the burbot oil he produced in an old frame building, Rowell also kept close to the fishing he loves, in Lake of the Woods.

Rowell, a former mayor, now takes more time for civic jobs, such as pushing through the international bridge which became a reality last year.

Two things have not changed—there still are a lot of game fish to be caught in Lake of the Woods, and Rowell still likes to fish.

Dove or Vulture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, "perceptive" is the word to describe Henry J. Taylor, Los Angeles Times columnist.

Mr. Taylor, in the Times of August 18, 1961, gives us the picture of a Communist dove, operating in its customary cloak of deceit:

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Inside Russia, Premier Khrushchev flies more like a dove of peace than our public may think. A fluttering left hand (the dove) is the secret signal for identification among international Communist Party members. And this wily blimp plays that fraud high, wide, and very well indeed at home. It is his big lie and it is hard for us to meet it with our big truth.

We and much of the world know he is the threat to peace. Russian peasants see him as exactly the reverse. It's the Hitler twist all over again. Hitler successfully swindled German opinion about outside "aggressors," climaxing his myth with the claim that defenseless Germans in Poland were repeatedly being attacked. While we were saying, "How could anybody believe that rot?" the German millions were saying "How long can the Fuehrer be expected to keep his patience?" Then, as their high priest of self-defense, Hitler attacked Poland.

It is easy for Khrushchev, in turn, to remind the Russians that Nazi Germany was the aggressor, the Kremlin leaders the defenders. And the Kremlin did not declare war on Japan until after America had dropped the atom bomb. Eight days later Japan surrendered. Russia was at war with Japan for less than a week.

Khrushchev twists the delay of the Soviet entry into the war in the Pacific into a righteous attempt to "limit the war." And perhaps our public does not realize that he constantly states to the Russians: "If you are an American you die, in Korea. If you are an Englishman you die, in Malaya. If you are a Frenchman you die, in Algeria. But you are a Russian and we Communists are not aggressors, so you do not die."

Stalin was an absolute recluse. Even during wartime he never once visited the fronts or toured the country. Khrushchev's life, of course, is a perpetual baby-kissing fandango, from the parched desert towns of the south to the yak lands off Bering Sea.

The only threat Khrushchev ever had to his dove monopoly was President Eisenhower and, blunder of blunders, Khrushchev invited this rival into his own dovecote. But then came the American President's enormous reception throughout Europe and Asia. Khrushchev saw the movies of this trip—all of them—and so did his Kremlin cabal. As a result, the prospect of Eisenhower dove feathers fluttering around Moscow must have seemed more risky to Khrushchev than the Soviet premier had imagined while conferring with Mr. Eisenhower at Camp David 3 months previously, when he invited the President to visit the Soviet Union.

To commemorate that visit Khrushchev was printing millions of color magazines, with close-pal pictures of our President and beautiful America. Our Central Intelligence Agency, however, had contacts inside the Soviet Government printing plant and, with alertness, suddenly reported to Washington that the press run had been ordered stopped. The mystery of why hung in the air. This was 8 days before the U–2 incident. Then the U–2 fell into Khrushchev's hands to provide its timely pretext, which is exactly and only what the affair did.

Thus the big lie that he is the only peace dove remains preserved inside Russia.

Whether Khrushchev will merchandise his home fraud as the jolly dove, always oozing agreeableness unless aroused, to satisfy the Russian grassroots desire for no war or utilize it as Hitler did is the key question.

And it is the Soviet Premier, not American or the Russian people, who has the initiative in this enormous and decisive choice. For nothing threatens Khrushchev except Khrushchev, age 67. When Hitler struck to win his dream for his future he was 50.

A Request for Elimination of Restrictions on the Import of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the matter of the importation of residual oil has been the subject of a number of talks in this Chamber and innumerable insertions in the RECORD. At various times, the elimination or drastic curtailment of such imports has been urged as a palliative for unemployment, as a boon for the coal operator, as a prop for the Nation's defense. And yet, the evidence is abundant that the proposed increase in residual oil import restrictions is none of these.

The stopping or further restricting of residual oil imports will not alleviate unemployment in the coal fields, nor will it strengthen the economic position of the coal industry; but such action may well weaken industry in other parts of our Nation and spread serious unemployment to other regions. I earnestly wish that those who now seek to curtail the use of imported residual oil will recognize the value of such imports to our total economy and will devote their energies more to assisting the coal miner and operator than to undermining the welfare of other American industries.

On June 19–20, the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment conducted hearings at which both representatives of the coal industry and the oil importers as well as consumers of both fuels were afforded an opportunity to testify. When the arguments pro and con are aired, it becomes evident that the critics of such imports are more interested in finding a scapegoat upon which to heap all blame for the ills of the coal industry than in working to remedy the real causes for economic distress in our coal regions.

In my estimation, the testimony of the gentlemen who spoke in behalf of the New England Council and the Oil Users Association at these hearings did much to dispel the myth that the curtailment of residual oil imports is a panacea for coal and revealed how such restrictions do great injury to many segments of our national economy. Last month, the New England Council and the Oil Users Association were joined by the American Public Power Association in filing a request with the OCDM for the elimination of present residual oil import restrictions. The material they prepared supporting this request is similar to that presented to the Subcommittee on Imports and Exports. Every reason advanced to justify the curtailment of residual oil imports has been answered and discredited in the material prepared by these organizations. Under unanimous consent I include their brief filed with OCDM at this point:

A REQUEST FOR ELIMINATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE IMPORT OF RESIDUAL OIL

The New England Council, the Oil Users Association and the American Public Power Association respectfully request the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to intercede with the President of the United States to rescind the residual oil provisions of the Presidential proclamation of 1959, under which imports of residual fuel oils are sharply restricted.

In support of this request, we submit the following facts and figures which we believe will prove conclusively that:

1. The restrictions on residual oil and the restrictions on crude oil are entirely different, insofar as the national security is concerned.

2. The inclusion of residual oil in the oil import program does not serve the intent of the program.

3. While demand for residual oil is slightly higher, the supply is dwindling in the United States because residual is uneconomic for U.S. refiners to produce.

4. Reduction in residual oil imports are not in the best interests of national security but do, in fact, have the opposite effect.

5. Current restrictions on residual oil imports work a hardship on major east coast industry, on public agencies and institutions, and on millions of private citizens in eastern coastal areas. By blocking normal competitive processes, they take millions of dollars out of the pocketbooks of U.S. consumers.

6. Artificially induced high prices on residual oil in using areas result in placing much of east coast industry at a competitive disadvantage with other geographical areas and in world markets.

7. Residual oil imports do not offer injurious competition to the domestic petroleum industry, nor have they been responsible for the depressive effects in the bituminous coal industry.

8. The program is inflationary. Moreover, it retards economic growth.

In addition, we believe that reductions of residual oil imports cause unnecessary hardship to oil-producing Latin American neighbors and, therefore, are inconsistent with the administration's policies of inter-American cooperation.

BACKGROUND OF THE RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

At the request of the OCDM, President Eisenhower issued a proclamation on March 10, 1959, which sharply restricted the imports of crude oil and its derivatives.

The reasons given were that (1) demand for petroleum products were increasing at a substantially greater rate than were the domestic reserves of oil, (2) the interests of national defense required that further exploration for oil in this country should be stimulated, and (3) excessive imports of crude oil from Latin America offered damaging competition to the domestic oil industry.

No mention was made of the competition with the bituminous coal industry, but it is believed that this was an important factor in the OCDM and presidential actions. This was substantiated in hearings conducted by the Interior Department early this year.

Included in these restrictions were residual fuel oil as a derivative of crude, despite the fact that, due to U.S. efficiency in refining, residual oil is only a small percentage of American production and is inadequate to supply domestic needs.

The effects have been to place residual oil supplies below demand, increase prices to the American consumer (even while world prices of residual have been dropping), and place industry, institutions, apartment houses and small users at a serious disadvantage since they lack the long-term contracts of larger users.

EAST COAST DEPENDENCE ON RESIDUAL OIL

For many years, residual oil has been the principal fuel of most east coast industry. It has also been the principal fuel of apartment houses, hospitals and public buildings. Industrial power units and building heating units have been built around this fuel and cannot be changed to other fuels, or where they can, only at prohibitive costs.

The reasons for this are clear. The delivered prices of coal to these areas are far higher than the price of residual oil, because of high shipping costs of coal.

For example, many industrial areas of the country cannot use coal economically. The logistics of coal to most of New England, for example, call for rail delivery to Hampton Roads, Va., reloading to ships, stockpiling at destination and ground transport for local delivery. Consequently, the shipping costs of coal per ton are actually greater than the price per ton at the mine mouth.

This means that east coast industries have to pay a much higher delivered cost per ton than do those of the inland areas, where shipping is direct and low in cost. To use coal as fuel would seriously affect the competitive position of many east coast industries.

New England has historically depended on residual oil because it is the least expensive fuel available to them in an area where heating costs have usually run 50 percent above the national average. The restriction on residual imports has imposed an additional burden by disrupting normal competition among fuels.

Restrictions on these supplies, the deadening of competition among suppliers and the upward trend of prices in this sellers' market have created a hardship for many millions of consumers and have placed east coast industry at a competitive disadvantage.

IMPORTS ONLY MAKE UP U.S. DEFICIT

The American refiner by and large does not find it economically advantageous to produce residual fuel oil. It brings him less revenue than his other products. He is continually trying to reduce the amount he produces. Thanks to innovations in refining technique he is succeeding. The yield of residual fuel oil from domestic refineries is being reduced each year. Residual produced from crude runs in the United States has declined from 425 million barrels, or 20 percent in 1950, to 332 million barrels, or about 11 percent in 1960. This reduction in yield has been built into our refineries.

At the same time, the demand for residual oil in the United States has shown a slight increase. But on the east coast, in particular, the demand for residual oil is increasing substantially. For example, between 1950 and 1960, the east coast demand rose from 255,426,000 barrels to 318,775,000 barrels.

It is obvious that as the supply diminishes, residual oil must be imported to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

The principal foreign source of supply is Venezuela. Venezuelan crudes give high residual yields. The average yield for all Venezuelan crudes is in excess of 50 percent. Many yield as high as 70 percent residual.

Unlike his U.S. counterpart, the Caribbean refiner wants to produce residual. For him it is not a waste product which he is anxious to eliminate. It represents over 50 percent of his product mix and he refines it at a profit.

It is a shocking fact that despite the shrinking supply of residual fuel oil in the United States and the abundance of residual flowing from the refineries of our South American neighbor, the Government of the United States has undertaken to restrict the imports of residual into this country since March 10, 1959.

It is time to face the facts on residual controls. They are a wasteful hidden cost of living for U.S. consumers. And even their proponents do not actually benefit from them.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT RESTRICTIONS SHOULD BE REMOVED

The following compilation of facts show conclusively why the restrictions on the import of residual oil should be exempted from the oil import program.

These facts clearly show that (1) the domestic petroleum industry cannot supply the current needs, (2) limited import quotas serve to keep residual oil prices unreasonably high, thereby affecting eastern industry and millions of consumers, (3) it is impossible for most eastern users to substitute coal for residual oil, (4) imports of this oil cannot adversely affect national defense requirements, (5) removal of restrictions on this product would improve inter-American relationships, without seriously affecting any part of the domestic economy, and would thereby contribute to our national security.

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL.
THE OIL USERS ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION.

IMPORT RESTRICTIONS HAVE RAISED THE PRICE OF RESIDUAL OIL

CARGO PRICES ARE HIGHER

Since the imposition of import restrictions, the consumer is paying more for residual if he works and lives in areas dependent on this source of fuel.

A study conducted by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization shows the following increases on average cargo prices of residual fuel in the combined east coast region of the United States between the first quarter of 1959 and the first quarter of 1961:

For resale (sales to wholesalers), 11 cents more per barrel; for electric utilities, 16 cents more per barrel; for other users, 21 cents more per barrel.

Although prices have risen generally, they have risen relatively more in the Florida and New England regions. It is significant that in the latest report, prices for Florida utilities went up 20 cents per barrel. The New England States had the following price increases:

For resale (sales to wholesalers), 18 cents more per barrel; for electric utilities, 16 cents more per barrel; for other users, not available.

In this region the price of residual oil for resale has gone from a low of $1.97 in July 1959, to a high of $2.27 in March of 1961—a 30-cent increase.

The first of these increases came during the summer of 1959 after the import restrictions had time to take full effect. It is significant that midsummer is a period when oil prices are ordinarily low.

The fact that residual consumers other than wholesalers and utilities have had the higher costs foreshadows higher prices in the future for all users. Wholesalers and utilities generally are protected to a great extent against price increases by long-term contract. Other users, not similarly protected, must rely on periodic purchases in the open market.

TANK WAGON PRICES ARE UP

Under the impact of the import restriction program, posted tank wagon prices for residual at New England ports increased from $2.49 a barrel in July 1959 to $2.79 by June 1961.

In New York, tank wagon prices showed similar increases.

Platt's Oilgram on May 26, 1961, reported a specific example of the impact of import restrictions on consumer prices in New York. Offerings on bids to the New York City Housing Authority ranged between 0.89 of a cent and 1.31 cents a gallon higher than those submitted in 1959 just prior to the imposition of the quota.

These increases amounted to 37 cents to 49 cents a barrel; from 17 percent to 24 percent higher.

On June 7, 1961, Platt's Oilgram reported further evidence of the impact of import restrictions on residual prices:

"No. 6 retail advances seem ready in New York City area

"NEW YORK, June 6.—Retail prices for heavy fuel appear poised for advances in metropolitan New York City area following recent 8-cents a barrel price hikes at yard level of supply (see June 2 Oilgram).

"One large retailer says he is making blanket increase of 0.3 cent a gallon (12 cents a barrel) in his retail prices for No. 6 fuel, effective June 8. Several of other large retailers plan price advances within next day or two.

"Upward trend in retail listings probably will have greatest impact on low side of current wide price range. Current representative postings are 7.4 cents a gallon, but sources say discount offerings range as low as 6.24 cents a gallon. In some cases, lower prices have been heard."

REDUCED DISCOUNTS MEAN FURTHER INCREASED PRICES

Discounts on posted tank wagon prices have become narrower, since import restrictions have been imposed—raising prices further. Table I shows price differentials quoted in contract awards for 15 public agencies in the Greater Boston area. As the table indicates, not only did tankcar prices increase by 25 cents a barrel, but they also had a further price rise of 23.4 cents based on weighted averages taking into account shrinkages of discounts. The users shown in the table—hospitals, schools, and other public institutions—paid 48.4 cents a barrel more on their fuel bill as a result of import of restrictions on residual.

PRICE INEQUITIES ARE WORSE THAN THE STATISTICS INDICATE

Most surveys and price studies on residual fuel oil prices are based on averages. But nobody pays an average price. During a period when the average price of residual went up 18 cents, the price paid by Middlesex Sanatorium (table I) increased 62 cents a barrel.

Who pays high prices rather than the average price?

The smaller consumer who does not have a long-term contract and must depend on spot purchases.

Consumers such as the New York City Housing Authority and the public agencies in Boston, who are required by local ordinance to purchase fuel for their annual requirements through public bidding.

These buyers suffer from the fact that spot cargo markets have dried up. The spot market is an important element in any commodity market; it acts as a balance wheel and regulates price on both the high and low sides. Without spot offers, the contract price becomes the floor or pegged price.

With artificial restrictions such as those imposed by import controls on residual, the last barrel available is bid to a high price. Unfortunately, it is usually the small buyer—least able to afford high prices—who is forced to bid for the last barrel.

But the large buyer suffers too. Ordinarily he buys fuel under 5- or 10-year contracts. With an assured supply, he can afford to make capital outlays for large-scale transportation, unloading, and storage facilities. Today, uncertain of future deliveries, he is discouraged from designing and building proper facilities for expansion, so that the consumer is being deprived of the savings that follow from capital outlays on such equipment.

TABLE I.—*Results of public bidding—15 Greater Boston public agencies*

Agency	Quantity in barrels	Time of bid	Amount per barrel under posted tank car		Difference, 1960 versus 1961, per barrel	Posted tank car increase, 1959 and 1960, per barrel	Total increase since import restrictions, per barrel
			1960	1961			
Town of Brookline	20,000	Apr. 15	−$0.33	−$0.09	$0.24	$0.25	$0.49
Commonwealth of Massachusetts:							
Danvers State Hospital	42,000	Apr. 26	−.291	−.21	.081	.25	.331
Boston State Hospital	71,400	do	−.40	−.2704	.1296	.25	.3796
Medfield State Hospital	50,000	do	−.24	−.05	.19	.25	.44
Metropolitan State Hospital	43,000	do	−.37	−.151	.219	.25	.469
Chestnut Hill pumping station, Brookline	33,000	do	−.41	−.2704	.1396	.25	.3896
Soldiers Home, Chelsea	11,000	do	−.41	−.2704	.1396	.25	.3896
Fernald School, Waverly	45,000	do	−.489	−.266	.223	.25	.473
State Teachers College, Boston	4,000	do	−.491	−.25	.241	.25	.491
City of Boston:							
Boston City Hospital	100,000	Mar. 14	−.485	−.15	.335	.25	.585
Deer Island	30,000	do	−.451	−.20	.251	.25	.501
Sanitarium Mattapan	20,000	do	−.485	−.15	.335	.25	.585
Long Island Hospital	40,000	do	−.4531	−.16	.2931	.25	.5431
County of Middlesex (House of Correction East Cambridge)	30,000	Mar. 22	−.492	−.19	.302	.25	.552
Middlesex Sanatorium, Waltham	30,000	Mar. —	−.492	−.12	.372	.25	.622
Weighted average increase							.484

RESTRICTIONS PAD THE CONSUMER'S ELECTRIC BILL

In the end, restrictions on residual imports cost everybody money.

Table II shows the largest electric utility users of residual fuel oil on the east coast.

All of these companies have clauses in their industrial rates which provide for them passing along to their customers changes in fuel costs as they occur. All of the companies except the Long Island Lighting Co. also have provisions for passing along costs to residential users of electricity.

The 15-cent price increase in residual of July 1960 has already raised the electric bill of 4.9 million consumers. Based on 1959 oil usage, the additional cost to consumers for electricity purchased from these companies is $4,280,740.

RESTRICTIONS DESTROY BENEFITS OF COMPETITION

One of the most serious consequences of import restrictions on residual fuel oil is that they have restrained competition among suppliers. This has cost consumers money. It has also hurt the taxpayer.

For example, in the hearings before Secretary Udall on February 20, 1961, the General Services Administration testified that since restrictions were imposed it has asked for bids and got only one bidder. This has proved expensive.

General Services Administration said that, from this cause, its costs had increased $660,000 in the last fiscal year in the Washington, D.C., area alone.

In Jacksonville, Fla., the department of electric and water utilities has been faced with the same problem: only one bidder, with resultant increased costs of over $430,000 in 1961.

TABLE II.—*Largest electric utility residual oil users, east coast, 1959*

Company	1959 oil usage, barrels	Customers		Cost of 15 cents a barrel increase on 1959 usage
		Number	Period	
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	8,455,000	2,796,000	Average 1959	$1,268,250
Florida Power & Light Co.	7,780,200	780,000	May 31, 1961	1,167,030
Boston Edison Co.	5,980,700	482,787	Average 1960	897,105
Florida Power Corp.	2,394,700	261,716	Average 1959	359,205
Long Island Lighting Co.	1,189,100	560,465	do	178,365
Central Main Power Co.	1,536,700	247,580	Dec. 31, 1959	230,505
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	1,462,900	173,455	Average 1960	219,430
United Illuminating Co., New Haven	928,100	198,309	do	139,215
Subtotal	29,727,400	5,490,312		4,459,105
Less Long Island Lighting		560,465		178,365
Total		4,939,847		4,280,740

Today no buyer is able to approach a new source for his oil requirements.

Sellers are unable to solicit new accounts.

The normal arms-length between buyer and seller is disappearing rapidly in the seller's market.

CLOSED DOOR ON NEW BUSINESSMEN

Not only has the program restrained competition among sellers; it has also made it impossible for a businessman to go into the residual oil business.

Allocations are available only for importers who imported in 1957, or terminal operators with a history of through-puts for 18 months prior to the start of an allocation period. Under these requirements a terminal operator would have to deal entirely in domestic residual for the period required by the regulation. In a tight market, with a price premium on domestic residual, this is a practical impossibility.

RESTRICTIONS HAVE BRED PROFITEERING

It is now common knowledge that import restrictions on residual have resulted in profiteering wherein the owner of residual covered by an allocation can resell his cargo at a 30 cents per barrel profit without ever having possession of it. The increased costs created by this type of trading are, of course, passed along to the consumer.

RESTRICTIONS ON RESIDUAL IMPORTS RAISE ENERGY COSTS GENERALLY

Increased costs of residual oil have brought increased prices of competitive products—raising energy costs generally.

On October 24, 1960—since the imposition of restrictions—the coal-carrying railroads announced a 7-cents per ton increase in freight rates for bituminous coal which will affect approximately 74 percent of all coal produced in this country.

The gas producers have flooded the FPC with rate increase petitions. Today the commission is stalled by a large backlog of cases.

Fuels other than residual also increase in price as a result of the price parity clause in fuel requirement contracts. Under such contracts, the price of one fuel is geared to the price of another. When residual oil goes up, for example, the price of gas or coal goes up proportionately.

The following statement by New England Gas & Electric Association describes such a contract:

"The contract between the two companies calls for: 'the price of interruptible gas at each location shall be midway between the cost to you of equivalent competitive fuel and the cost to us of interruptible gas.'"

Boston Edison has this to say about such a contract:

"One of the determinants of the price we pay for gas boiler fuel is the average price paid for oil and coal. This means that in increase in the price of residual oil raises the price of gas."

Because of such purchasing contracts, increases in the price of residual oil have meant increases in the cost of other fuels to some large users.

RESTRICTIONS INCREASE U.S. MANUFACTURING COSTS AND DAMAGE OUR COMPETITIVE POSITION

Today in Boston and New York, manufacturers are paying 30 to 33 cents more a barrel for residual oil than their foreign competitors pay outside of the United States.

Residual oil sold in east coast ports as bunker fuel for ships must compete with foreign oil at world prices. Before the imposition of import controls there was only one posted price for bunker oil. However, in July 1959, 3 months after the imposition of import controls, there appeared an additional price quotation—bunker oil for domestic trade. The price premium on this oil in July 1961 is 30½ cents per barrel. This is the same oil coming from the same tanks but sold at a different price because in one instance (international trade), the oil is not under the import restriction program and in the second case (domestic) it is.

Current contract bunker prices, east coast ports

[Dollars per barrel export terminal, duty, and taxes]

	Domestic			International (bonded)			Difference, domestic versus international
	Posted price	Discount	Net price	Posted price	Discount	Net price	
Boston	$2.71	$0.18	$2.53	$2.405	$0.18	$2.225	$0.305
New York	2.62	.10	2.52	2.395	.18	2.215	.305
Philadelphia	2.62	.10	2.52	2.395	.18	2.215	.305
Baltimore	2.62	.10	2.52	2.395	.18	2.215	.305

This 30½ cents a barrel differential can also be substantiated by constructing a derived price for cargo purchases based on known data.

Platt's Oilgram, May 4, 1961, stated:

"So-called going price for heavy fuel oil in the Caribbean is 30 cents off posted or $1.70 a barrel."

Tankers are being chartered for the Caribbean to Boston and New York runs at American Tanker Rate Schedule minus 60 percent which is 18 cents and 17 cents a barrel for the two ports respectively. Taking into account a duty of 5¼ cents a barrel, this oil should be laid down in Boston at $1.93 a barrel and in New York at $1.92.

But because of import restrictions, cargo buyers are paying $2.26 a barrel and $2.25 a barrel respectively.

In the face of steadily decreasing world prices on residual oil, U.S. prices have been increasing.

The net result of restrictions on residual oil has been to deprive the U.S. consumer and the U.S. manufacturer of the benefits of this decline in world prices. The nationwide increase of $167 million [1] in the direct cost of residual fuel oil in 1960 alone tells only part of the story; it does not reflect such indirect increases as, for example, the rise in labor costs because of escalator cost-of-living clauses.

The artificial price differential between residual in the United States and abroad is one more handicap for the U.S. businessmen attempting to compete effectively against foreign competition in domestic markets. This has had the effect in some instances of accelerating the plans of U.S. industries to locate facilities abroad.

[1] Calculated on basis of 30 cents per barrel.

Residual Import Controls Do Not Help the Domestic Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the brief requesting elimination of restrictions on the import of residual oil filed with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on July 21, 1961 by the New England Council, the Oil Users Association, and the American Public Power Association:

RESIDUAL IMPORT CONTROLS DO NOT HELP THE DOMESTIC OIL INDUSTRY

Those who argue that residual must be controlled to maintain a healthy petroleum industry base their argument on the belief that controls help to maintain the price of crude at the wellhead.

In a letter to the New England Council dated October 15, 1960, Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, the Under Secretary of the Interior, made the following comment concerning the objectives of including residual oil in the oil import program.

"Residual fuel oil is included in the oil import program solely because of the relationship of that product to the domestic petroleum industry. Domestic production of residual fuel oil in districts I to IV totals 60 percent of domestic demand in those districts in the year 1959. This volume represents a considerable percentage of the gross revenue received by domestic refiners and, consequently, has a direct bearing on the price the oil purchaser may pay for domestic production of crude oil. Any material reduction in the price of residual fuel oil resulting from excessive imports would probably be reflected in the price of crude oil at the wellhead."

Let's examine this argument:

Refiners in the Texas gulf and Louisiana gulf districts use domestic crude almost exclusively. Their percentage yield of residual is currently running at the rate of 7.6 percent for the Louisiana gulf and 7.4 percent for the Texas gulf. The Independent Oil Producers Association reports indicate these refiners currently are paying an average $3 a barrel for crude at the wellhead. Assuming 25 cents a barrel for transportation to the refinery, the total cost of crude to them becomes $3.25. The low cargo price for residual at the gulf is now $2.20. With a residual yield of 7½ percent, this loss, on a barrel of crude, is 7.9 cents.

If, as a result of the removal restrictions, the price of residual at the gulf were to drop 10 percent to $1.98, the loss per barrel of crude resulting from the decline would increase to 9.5 cents. According to the Interior Department's theory, this would be 1.6 cents less revenue per barrel for the purchase of crude. This is five-tenths of 1 percent of the current crude price, a very small proportion to trace back to the raw material from the byproduct. The effect on domestic refiners of the price fluctuations of a major product such as gasoline obviously obliterate any effects of a change in the price of residual.

In the light of these facts, assigning a major role to residual in buoying up the price of crude oil is like saying the price of sawdust affects the price at which a sawmill purchases raw timber.

To be sure, as the price of the byproduct fluctuates, the net profit of the producing industry also fluctuates to some extent. But the impact of the fluctuations in the price of residual is minimal—quickly lost in the major change caused by price fluctuations in the principal petroleum products, gasoline and light distillates.

RESIDUAL RESTRICTIONS DO NOT ENCOURAGE OIL EXPLORATION

Let's examine the Interior Department's argument further. The theory supposes that residual restrictions, by buoying the price, help to stimulate oil exploration.

Since residual oil cannot be a profitable factor in the domestic production process, domestic producers would not in any circumstance explore simply to supply the residual market.

If, in fact, there is any connection between demand and exploration, the demand for other products more profitable determines capital outlays for oil exploration. In 1959, for example, the oil industry cut back on exploration because of the oversupply of crude and the business recession of the previous year.

Let's go one step further.

How about the refineries that produce no residual at all? There are many of these in the United States. Inasmuch as they represent the most advanced refinery design, still more refineries in the future will be similarly designed to eliminate residual as a byproduct.

Should we turn back the clock and make them produce residual? The argument is patently ridiculous.

TABLE III.—*Residual oil data 1949–60*

[Thousands of barrels]

Year	Residual oil demand [1]			Exploratory wells drilled in the United States [2]
	Total United States	East coast	New England [3]	
1949	496,021	211,482	50,658	7,294
1950	553,793	255,426	64,236	8,554
1951	564,397	262,784	60,575	10,302
1952	555,165	270,735	59,861	10,552
1953	560,474	284,876	65,303	11,062
1954	522,317	266,180	58,889	11,280
1955	557,057	278,214	62,063	12,271
1956	562,813	291,123	61,477	13,034
1957	548,801	297,033	60,109	11,739
1958	531,067	296,972	60,443	9,588
1959	558,800	322,317	71,388	10,073
1960 [4]	556,600	318,775	(5)	9,635

[1] From U.S. Bureau of Mines.
[2] From API Petroleum Facts and Figures.
[3] From Oil and Gas Journal.
[4] Estimate.
[5] Not available.

A MORE CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH TO A HEALTHY OIL INDUSTRY

What do we advocate instead?

We advocate removing the price supports on residual oil created by the import program.

This will encourage domestic refiners to speed up the installation of coking facilities, with the end in view of creating a more profitable product mix.

This policy would benefit the residual oil users on the east coast, eliminating the price penalty they are now forced to pay. It would tend to help conserve America's fuel reserves by using residual refined from Venezuelan crude rather than U.S. crude. And it would help the domestic refiner by eliminating his historical losses on the sale of residual.

RESIDUAL RESTRICTIONS CANNOT RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT IN COAL MINE AREAS

Even though the Government has not justified the restriction on the basis of its effect on the coal industry, we feel it is important to examine this aspect of the question.

Coal interests have consistently claimed that importation of residual oil has resulted in unemployment in the coal mining regions of the United States. That this claim is not true is best shown by the data provided by the coal industry in its "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960." In 1950 the bituminous coal industry employed 415,582 men and produced 516,311,000 tons of coal. The output per man day was 6.77 tons. Ten years later the industry employed 159,100 men and produced 413 million tons at a productivity rate of 13.25 tons per man day. In the 10-year period over a quarter of a million men have left the industry, and the output of those that have remained has doubled.

During the same 10-year period the use of residual oil in the United States has remained relatively constant, 554 million barrels in 1950 and 556 million barrels in 1960. A large portion of these sales are made in areas where coal is not competitive; for example, many parts of New England, Florida, and the west coast. In addition, some markets for residual—ships and the oil industry itself—are beyond the reach of the coal industry and have been for many years.

TABLE IV.—*Bituminous coal data, 1950–60*

Year	Production (net tons)	Men employed	Number of mines	Average number of days worked	Net tons per man per day	Percent of underground production—		Percent of total production—	
						Cut by machine	Mechanically loaded	Mechanically cleaned	Mined by stripping
1950	516,311,053	415,582	9,429	183	6.77	91.8	69.4	38.5	23.9
1951	533,664,732	372,897	8,009	203	7.04	93.4	73.1	45.0	22.0
1952	466,840,782	335,217	7,275	186	7.47	92.8	75.6	48.7	23.3
1953	457,290,449	293,106	6,671	191	8.17	92.3	79.6	52.9	23.1
1954	391,706,300	227,397	6,130	182	9.47	88.8	84.0	59.4	25.1
1955	464,633,408	225,093	7,856	210	9.84	88.1	84.6	58.7	24.8
1956	500,874,077	228,163	8,520	214	10.28	84.6	84.0	58.4	25.4
1957	492,703,916	228,635	8,539	203	10.59	80.9	84.8	61.7	25.2
1958	410,445,547	197,402	8,264	184	11.33	75.3	84.9	63.1	28.3
1959	412,027,502	179,636	7,719	188	12.22	72.1	86.0	65.5	29.4
1960	413,000,000	159,100	7,500	196	13.25	----------	87.4	67.8	29.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of Mines.

The unemployed coal miner should not be deluded that his plight is due to unrestricted imports of residual oil, especially since there has been no increase in the use of residual, and the productivity in the coal industry has been doubled through mechanization. In underground mines the use of mechanical loaders has increased from 67 percent to 85 percent in terms of coal produced and mechanical cleaning apparatus from 35 percent to 63 percent. At the same time equipment improvements in strip mining have been dramatic, particularly in the size and capacity of shovels used to remove overburden.

Productivity in the bituminous coal fields per man-day worked has just about doubled from 1950 to 1960. In order to keep the same number of miners at work it would be necessary to double the demand for coal. This would require bituminous production of an additional 413 million tons per year. This theoretical increase is equivalent to 10.6 times the total permissible imports of residual oil for the year ending March 31, 1962.

THE RESIDUAL MARKET IS RELATIVELY INFLEXIBLE

Could coal take over existing residual markets?

There are severe limitations on the ability of an industrial type fuel user to convert from one fuel to another.

As a practical matter, most heavy fuel users cannot convert to other fuels without prohibitive expense.

A survey by the New England Council in June 1961, of its industrial members reveals that out of 70 manufacturing companies 67 used residual oil extensively, 2 coal, and 1 gas. All of the oil users state they could not convert to another fuel without prohibitive cost. Four said it would be impossible to switch to another fuel or would take so long they would have to go out of business.

A few steam powerplants—in areas where oil, coal, and gas have been competing for the business—are equipped to burn more than one fuel.

Having burned oil for a number of years, a powerplant equipped to burn more than one type of fuel would find the incremental cost of additional labor and maintenance required to return to coal very high. These additional operating costs raise the conversion price parity for coal substantially above the point where conversion would take place on a straight BTU basis.

As noted above, a relatively small number of residual users are able to burn other fuels. The Interior Department has estimated possible conversion might amount to 6 million tons of coal per year. Continued improvements in productivity or a few added work hours by the industry would produce the necessary tonnage. This amount of coal could be produced without putting a single unemployed miner back to work.

WHY DEMAND FOR COAL HAS DECLINED

Two factors are sufficient in themselves to account for the entire decline in demand for coal since the 1947–49 period.

First, the railroads, which used 114 million tons of coal in 1947, have switched almost completely to diesel fuel. On February 28, 1960, the Wall Street Journal noted that use of coal by the railroads had declined to about 1.7 million tons for the year 1960. Here is a single giant former coal customer whose operating changes have accounted for a loss of volume of more than 110 million tons a year or nearly half the total decline in coal demand since 1947. Even the coal-carrying railroads converted their equipment almost totally to diesel. This was done in spite of the fact that coal for years has been the best single revenue producer for the railroad industry, and despite the fact that the coal-carrying railroads are the most profitable in the industry.

Second, millions of families throughout the country stopped shoveling coal into basement furnaces and installed oil burners or gas burners in their homes. In 1947 the figure for retail coal deliveries was 137 million tons; in 1960 the figure was 29 million tons, a loss of 108 million tons per year.

The demand which coal has lost since 1947 would have been lost in any case.

The loss is unrelated to residual imports.

WHY SHOULD COAL BE PROTECTED?

We have shown that unemployment in the bituminous coal industry is due to technological change in mining methods; that residual oil has not been a factor in principal market losses which the coal industry has encountered.

What is the future of the coal industry?

The growing market for coal is in the power generating plants of electric utilities. In this area coal has made substantial gains since 1947. In 1947 utilities used 90 million tons of coal. In 1960 electric power utilities used 165 million tons of coal.

The National Coal Association's publication, "Steam Electric Plant Factors, 1959," having previously defined the coal competitive area as including New England, the Middle Atlantic region, and the East North Central region, presents the following statements and facts:

"Within the above the defined coal competitive areas coal held 83 percent of the total steam electric utility fuel market in 1959. This may be compared with 84 percent in 1958, 85 percent in 1957, 86 percent in 1956, 85 percent in 1955, 83 percent in 1951, 81 percent in 1952 and 1954, 80 percent in 1953. The following tabulation shows the percentage of the coal competitive market assignable to coal, oil, and gas by years since 1950. (Percentages were derived on a B.t.u. basis):

	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Coal	83	81	80	81	85	86	85	84	83
Oil	7	7	8	6	5	4	4	5	6
Gas	10	12	12	13	10	10	11	11	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100"

The National Coal Association predicts that the utilities will use 185 million tons of coal in 1961. In "Bituminous Coal Facts, 1960" the coal industry estimates that electric utilities will burn 475 million tons of coal in 1975 to produce 65 percent of their power output, and that by the year 2000, consumption will be 600 million tons a year.

Based on these potentials, it is only fair to ask why this industry, which is and has been supplying between 80 percent and 85 percent of the fuel requirements for the electric industry in the "coal competitive area," should demand or expect protection, in the form of legislative or governmental fiat, from competition from other fuels.

COAL'S REAL PROBLEM IS NOT RESIDUAL OIL, BUT TRANSPORTATION COSTS

The coal industry has done an outstanding job of keeping down the cost of coal at the mine in the last 15 years of inflation. However, the mine-mouth cost of coal is only a portion of the total cost of coal to users.

In many areas of the United States, coal has never been competitive with oil or any other fuel, because of the cost of transportation from the mine to the user. And it never can be.

In such areas, transportation costs for coal exceed by a large amount the cost of coal at the mine.

A typical example is the case of one large user in New England that buys coal at the mine for under $5 a ton. Rail freight from West Virginia to Hampton Roads, Va., plus vessel transportation to Boston makes the total transportation bill approximately $5.57. Transportation costs do not stop there. The coal must be unloaded from the collier, stocked out into a coal field and then reloaded onto a conveyor belt, put through a crusher, loaded into silos by belt, and then put through mechanical pulverizers. All of this equipment is costly to purchase and install and expensive to maintain.

Contrast this with the current price of $1.16 a ton for delivering residual oil from Cardon, Venezuela, to Boston.

In the first instance, coal costs $5.59 a ton for delivery; in contrast, oil costs $1.16 a ton Putting this on a ton-mile basis merely magnifies the discrepancy. Coal costs 0.6 cents per ton-mile, oil 0.05 cents per ton-mile. The coal rate per ton-mile is 11.9 times that for oil.

A T2 tanker holds approximately 100,000 barrels of residual oil. The transportation bill for such a tanker bringing a full cargo from Cardon, Venezuela, to Boston, at present rates, would be $17,800. In terms of B.t.u.'s, 100,000 barrels of residual oil is about equivalent to 22,000 tons of bituminous coal. To transport 22,000 tons of coal from the bituminous fields of West Virginia to Boston would cost $122,000, over $100,000 more than

the equivalent in residual oil shipped from Venezuela, despite the fact that Venezuela is 1,382 statute miles farther away.

High transportation costs is the coal industry's real problem, one which is beyond its control. Because of high transportation costs, the area where coal is competitive is going to be subject to changes. These are inevitable. In some areas the coal industry has never been able to compete, and in some areas it has been on the competitive borderline compared with other fuels. It must inevitably lose other areas because of the high cost of transportation.

This does not mean that the coal industry's total marketing prospects are diminished in any sense. The large utility consumption within low-cost shipping distances of the coal mines represents a bonanza for the bituminous coal industry.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM IS BEING ATTACKED OTHER WAYS

Nobody questions the vital importance of solving the unemployment problem in this Nation's coal-mining regions. But everyone should agree that the problem should be solved in a constructive and effective way.

Public Law 87-27, passed by the 87th Congress on May 1, 1961, known as the depressed area bill, provides for the following appropriations:

Loans for public facilities: $100 million.

Grants for public facilities: $75 million.

For technical assistance to depressed areas: $4½ million.

For training of unemployed workers: $4½ million.

For retraining and subsistance payments: $10 million.

The cost of this program will be shared by the whole Nation including the residual oil users on the east coast, who also must bear the cost of the restriction program.

In an effort to create new markets for coal, the Bureau of Mines in the Department of Interior has an annual appropriation of $7,750,000 this year, and has an estimated budget of $8,168,000 for fiscal year 1962 for coal research. In addition to this, the Federal Coal Research Act created the Office of Coal Research, also in the Department of Interior, to develop new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal. This is essentially an attempt to deal with coal's short-range problems. At the same time, the Bureau of Mines is concentrating on long-range research. The cost of both of these programs is being borne nationally.

Perhaps the most constructive approach to a sound economic solution to unemployment was advanced by the President in his state of the Union message this year. On May 25, President Kennedy stated that he was transmitting to Congress a new manpower development training program to train or retrain several hundred thousand workers in new occupational skills. This program is to extend over a 4-year period in order to retrain workers with skills made obsolete by automation and industrial changes. The unemployed will be taught the new skills which new processes demand. The President said this was a positive answer to the challenge of technology.

CAPACITY OF COAL INDUSTRY IN TIMES OF EMERGENCY

The coal industry repeatedly has argued that in a national emergency it would be unable to provide the energy requirements for which it would be called upon. This argument does not stand up.

Present residual fuel oil allocations allow for the importation of 461,427 barrels per day. This is the equivalent of 104,000 tons of coal a day or 38 million tons per year. In 1959 the coal industry exported 37,226,948 tons of coal. Most of the export coal being shipped overseas is exported by us for the same reason that we import residual oil. Metallurgical coal in Western Europe and in Japan is in very short supply as is residual oil in this country. For this reason the governments of those nations, national security arguments notwithstanding, have fostered the importing of this coal from the United States.

In the event of a national emergency limitations on the exportation of coal would offset any loss of imports of residual oil.

Restrictions on residual are not necessary to create additional coal mining capacity.

The coal industry already has sufficient capacity to meet any national emergency. The capacity of the bituminous coal industry as it now exists is best described by the National Coal Association in its publication, "Bituminous Coal Data, 1959":

"As it is impossible for all mines to operate every working day in the year, a conservative figure of 280 for calculating potential capacity was suggested some years ago by the Coal Committee of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers. The average output per day worked in 1959 was 2.1 million tons which, if applied to 280 days, gives an annual potential output of 588 million tons compared with the actual production of 410 million tons."

This represents a reserve capacity in the bituminous coal industry of 43½ percent without any further mechanization in existing mines.

WHAT HAS BEEN THE EFFECT OF THE RESTRICTION PROGRAM ON THE COAL INDUSTRY?

Residual oil and coal compete for sales to only three major classes of consumer—industrial users, the space heating market, and electric utilities. Industrial use of residual fluctuates not with oil prices but with the state of the economy. Consumption of residual for space heating shows a steady increase from year to year. Only electric utility use of residual appears responsive to oil price changes.

A source of data on the amount of switching between coal and residual within the electric utility industry since the restrictions have been in effect can be obtained from the Federal Power Commission, table V.

From this it would appear that coal's participation in district I electric utility fuel consumption changed from 72.7 percent in 1959 to 74.4 percent in 1960, and oil from 16.7 percent in 1959 to 14.7 percent in 1960. Based on the total fuel requirements for 1960 (90.2 million coal equivalent tons), this represents a gain of 1.5 million tons for coal and a loss of 1.8 million equivalent tons for oil. The balance of 0.27 million tons was picked up by gas.

Assuming increased coal consumption to be an objective of the restriction program, let's consider at what price this increase was bought.

TABLE V.—*District I—Consumption of fuels by electric utilities*

	Actual units			Million tons of coal equivalent [1]				Percent participation		
	Coal (million tons)	Oil (million barrels)	Gas (billion cubic feet)	Coal	Oil	Gas	Total	Coal	Oil	Gas
1956										
New England	6.1	12.5	9.5	6.1	3.0	0.4	9.5	64.2	31.6	4.2
Middle Atlantic	34.2	12.7	36.5	34.2	3.0	1.4	38.6	88.6	7.8	3.6
South Atlantic	21.5	20.2	85.5	21.5	4.9	3.4	29.8	72.2	16.4	11.4
District I	61.8	45.4	131.5	61.8	10.9	5.2	77.9	79.3	14.0	6.7
1957										
New England	6.3	13.3	11.4	6.3	3.2	.4	9.9	63.6	32.3	4.1
Middle Atlantic	34.9	14.3	64.7	34.9	3.4	2.6	40.9	85.3	8.3	6.4
South Atlantic	22.4	22.0	78.1	22.4	5.3	3.1	30.8	72.7	17.2	10.1
District I	63.6	49.6	154.2	63.6	11.9	6.1	81.6	77.9	14.6	7.5
1958										
New England	5.8	13.0	13.2	5.8	3.1	.5	9.4	61.7	33.0	5.3
Middle Atlantic	31.4	20.1	87.2	31.4	4.8	3.4	39.6	79.3	12.1	8.6
South Atlantic	22.9	23.5	67.8	22.9	5.7	2.7	31.3	73.2	18.2	8.6
District I	60.1	56.6	168.2	60.1	13.6	6.6	80.3	74.9	16.9	8.2
1959										
New England	5.7	16.9	12.6	5.7	4.0	.5	10.2	55.9	39.2	4.9
Middle Atlantic	32.3	25.9	101.9	32.3	6.2	4.0	42.5	76.0	14.6	9.4
South Atlantic	26.0	18.6	120.0	26.0	4.5	4.8	35.3	73.7	12.7	13.6
District I	64.0	61.4	234.5	64.0	14.7	9.3	88.0	72.7	16.7	10.6
1960										
New England	5.9	16.1	12.9	5.9	3.9	.5	10.3	57.3	37.9	4.8
Middle Atlantic	34.0	25.1	88.9	34.0	6.0	3.5	43.5	78.2	13.8	8.0
South Atlantic	27.2	14.1	147.3	27.2	3.4	5.8	36.4	74.7	9.4	15.9
District I	67.1	55.3	249.1	67.1	13.3	9.8	90.2	74.4	14.7	10.9

[1] Conversion factors: Oil=0.240 tons bituminous equivalent; gas=0.0395 tons bituminous equivalent.

Source: Federal Power Commission

We have concluded that the price of oil in the United States is now 33 cents per barrel higher than the world price due to the restriction program. Applied to 1960 east coast demand of 318.7 million barrels, this increase represents an additional cost of $106.2 million paid by users of residual oil to achieve increased consumption of 1.5 million tons of coal through utility conversions. This amounted to a penalty of over $70 for each ton of coal converted.

As Representative HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts has pointed out, it would have been better for the Nation as a whole if there had been no restriction program and someone had bought this coal at the mine and thrown it away.

UNWARRANTED RESTRICTIONS VIOLATE OUR INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICIES

Since World War II, the United States has taken a leading role in liberalization of foreign trade relations. Removal of trade restrictions has been a stated policy of our Government, and still is. One expression of this comes from OCDM, in reporting the

Treasury Department's views on this policy: "The Treasury Department takes the position that the policy of encouraging the expansion of international trade on a nondiscriminatory basis is one from which the United States derives reciprocal benefits."

Import restrictions on residual fuel oil violate this policy before the world. If the national security were indeed benefited, such repressive measures might be justified, but it is not benefited. Therefore, continuation of these restrictions would be a direct slap at those friendly nations whose residual oil is a major item of export.

Specifically, this discrimination is especially difficult for Venezuela, which has been an active supporter of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America. Trade restrictions on residual oil primarily affect Venezuela, and they also serve to limit dollar income that would otherwise be available to buy more American goods.

It is not extraneous to this point that the growth of anti-American feeling, demonstrated in the hostility to former Vice President Nixon in 1958, might be aggravated by any continuing feeling of discrimination against this country. Nor is it to be forgotten that the Venezuelan Government asked Adlai Stevenson in June to end the "abuses and injustices" of U.S. oil restrictions. In a country where a major proportion of petroleum derivatives is residual oil, removal of restrictions on this product could have considerable effect.

A nation which recognizes its responsibility to less-developed countries in the form of money grants and technical assistance should not overlook the advantages inherent in sincere stimulation of trade with those countries.

CONCLUSION

We have shown that the restrictions on residual oil (a) do not enhance the national security, but have the opposite effect, (b) discriminate against important industrial areas of the country, (c) increase costs to public buildings, institutions, and public agencies, (d) take millions of dollars out of the pockets of U.S. consumers, and (e) violate international trade policies.

We have shown also that imports of residual oil have no adverse effects on the domestic petroleum industry, are not responsible for the distress in the coal industry, and continued restrictions cannot be used to rectify that distress.

We, therefore, request that the OCDM recommend to the President of the United States that the restrictions on the import of residual oil be rescinded.

Cost of Federal Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I quote herewith an editorial from the August 24, 1961, issue of the Daily Advance published in Lynchburg, Va., which I consider a penetrating commentary on the deception and duplicity of Federal aid programs:

The bureaucratic brokerage fee extracted by the faceless army of little men who march behind the huge capital letters of Washington's alphabetic agencies is clearly enormous. The proliferating metropolitan Washington suburbia testifies to the level of pay, and the amount of it, Government workers siphon off.

What is somewhat less clear is the cost of the Federal strings which these bureaucarts busily attach to the dollars that they do return to the localities for projects which, in most cases, the localities should have built and paid for on the local level anyway. The city of Lynchburg can now give a definite estimate.

Some time ago this city applied for Federal funds to aid in the construction of some 16,000 feet of sewer from Oakley Avenue to a point in the Sandusky Subdivision near the intersection of Rhonda Road and Sanhill Drive. The total cost of the project was estimated at $250,000; the city requested 30-percent Federal participation.

Because the water control board, which acts as a sifter of these things, approved too many local projects each community had its level of Federal participation reduced in an across-the-board cut. This left Lynchburg with its Federal participation level down to 17.4 percent—or $43,000.

In a report just issued to members of city council by City Manager Morrison and Director of Public Works Wright, the cost of meeting Federal regulations—such as the wage clause and the cost of complying with Federal red tape and discharging the obligations in the Federal strings that would be attached—was estimated at about $43,000. In short, the anticipated Federal aid would only pay for the Federal strings.

Here, then, is an exact price tag which the residents of Lynchburg—and elsewhere—should contemplate in all its implications. According to the report of the city manager and the director of public works, one can bolster ideological arguments with arithmetic. And the figures should issue their own orders. Build the project entirely with local funds.

Kennedy Aids Frustrated by Ill-Informed Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Sunday, August 20, 1961, issue of the Washington Post seems to give the reasons why the New Frontiersmen in the executive department much prefer to have long-term planning and back-door spending so it would not be necessary for them to come to the Hill, where apparently they find such ill-informed Members of Congress:

KENNEDY AIDS FRUSTRATED BY ILL INFORMED CONGRESS

(By Julius Duscha)

The torrent of words which pours from congressional hearings seems to indicate that many Members of Congress are not the best informed persons in Washington.

The ponderous and protracted hearings on Capital Hill that have irritated thoughtful Senators and Representatives for years are now frustrating eager Kennedy administration officials.

Cabinet members and other top administration officials have come away from their baptism of hearings with the conviction that there must be a better way.

No one disputes the necessity of keeping Congress informed, but nearly everyone wonders why more Senators and Representatives cannot find time to do their homework before calling up witnesses.

The record of this session of Congress is full of exasperating examples. Here are some:

For 5 straight days Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara explained the President's expanded military program over and over again to congressional committees.

House foreign-aid appropriations hearings were prolonged by one Congressman who made the same speech six times and who never seemed to grasp the meaning of long-term foreign-aid loans.

The Peace Corps carefully prepared a prospectus for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but when hearings on the Corps began it was apparent that no one had read the document.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman spent hours before the Agriculture Committees talking about the intricacies of such programs as honey and tung oil for the edification of members of Congress with a special interest in, but little knowledge of, such minor farm programs.

Confirmation hearings frequently revealed that Senators had little idea of what the agencies within their committees' jurisdiction do.

Time after time the only incisive questions at a hearing came after a committee aid prompted a Senator or a Representative with a hurriedly whispered suggestion.

Some administration officials have become so disillusioned with committee hearings that they have turned to extensive personal contacts with members of Congress to explain their programs.

Freeman, for example, spent more time on Capitol Hill than in his own office on many days before the administration lost the battle for its farm bill.

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, has met individually and in small groups with more than 250 members of Congress to answer questions about the Corps.

Members of the White House staff have not hesitated to lobby on Capitol Hill even though their work was not directly related to legislative liaison.

Not all hearings are haphazardly run, of course. Some investigations are expertly organized by committee staff members working closely with their chairmen.

But hearings on legislative proposals are usually not models of organization or of lucidity.

They often begin with few members of the committee having an understanding of the proposed legislation. Members wander in and out of the hearings, with the result that some questions get asked many times.

Then there is the all but insurmountable problem of hearings in one House invariably being duplicated in the other McNamara's 5-day marathon on Capitol Hill included much crisscrossing from Senate to House and back again.

Finally, appropriations hearings often cover the same ground as legislative authorization hearings. Foreign aid is a conspicuous example of this sort of duplication.

In the past, suggestions have been made for joint Senate-House hearings to cut down the amount of valuable executive branch time spent on often tedious and repetitious hearings.

But neither the Senate nor the House wants to give up its prerogatives by succumbing to joint hearings. Nor do some individual legislators wish to yield opportunities for vote-getting forays.

When Members of Congress are confronted with the charge that they fail to do their homework the inevitable plea is lack of time.

The only new suggestion that has been heard this year has come from a bright young west coast lawyer who is now shuf-

filing papers for a Cabinet officer when he is not rushing up to a congressional hearing.

"Why couldn't a lot of these things be done by closed-circuit television?" he asked.

It was patiently explained to the new man that Speaker SAM RAYBURN won't even let newspaper photographers into his House hearing rooms.

No Strings Attached?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News of July 27, 1961:

NO STRINGS ATTACHED?

Despite current indications to the contrary, there is ample evidence that the issue of Federal aid to education is far from being dead in this session of Congress.

Washington sources say that as soon as the foreign aid matter is disposed of, a mighty effort will be made by Federal aid proponents—in Congress, the administration, and with the powerful backing of the National Education Association—to enact legislation.

And so the millions of Americans who believe that Federal aid to education is largely unnecessary as well as constituting just one more major move toward centralization of power in Washington, would do well to prepare for a new fight.

For one thing, those against such legislation should again cite the fallacy of believing, as supporters of Federal aid to schools would have us believe, that Washington will dole out dollars without strings attached.

As pointed out by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, wherever the U.S. Office of Education has passed out money, it has exercised control over the program it finances—whether for teachers or classrooms or equipment.

Here are some examples:

The U.S. Commissioners of Education ordered the federally subsidized local high school at Quantico, Va., closed even though the 150 children in the school would have to travel between 13 to 26 miles to other schools.

The Office of Education dictated curriculum and administration practices of a guidance and counseling institute at Nashville, Tenn., for high school counselors.

At Peoria, Ill., under U.S. Office of Education regulations, a language laboratory when not in use to teach modern languages must remain idle. It cannot be used to teach Latin.

A high school teacher related at Hamal, Minn., that a Federal employee threatened to remove a school adding machine if it were used for any purpose but science. The Government had helped the school buy the machine.

At Selma, Ala., the Government set minimum wages to be paid on a school building for whose construction Federal funds were used.

The Federal Government sets the qualifications for teacher and the course of study in vocational education, according to the school superintendent of Norfolk, Nebr. Night classes must meet Federal rules. Classroom size, classroom equipment, length of teacher periods are set by the Government.

There are, of course, many other examples of Federal controls following the Federal dollar. It is perfectly legal. In 1942, the Supreme Court in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* said, "it is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Despite the claims of supporters of Federal aid to education that Federal control does not follow the Federal dollar, the facts show that it can and does.

Yes, indeed, the strings of Federal bureaucracy would be there.

A Cost Increase Is a Cost Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following pertinent editorial from the Wall Street Journal concerning the new contract negotiated between the United Auto Workers and American Motors:

A COST INCREASE IS A COST INCREASE

If the United Auto Workers can win a wage increase, you can't blame them for doing so. And if the auto makers figure that in some way they can handle the increased cost, that's their business.

So we aren't disposed to argue whether the private wage agreement signed between the UAW and American Motors is too high or too low. But we don't think anybody ought to be so bemused by all the gimcrackery in that agreement as to be misled about what it is.

For all that it is dressed up as a "profit-sharing" scheme, it is a cost increase for that auto company and therefore a cost increase for auto customers. And it is just as inflationary—if that is the issue—as any other cost-increasing wage boost.

Under this plan American Motors will pay over to the union and its members 15 percent of its "pretax profits" after a stated reserve. This will be used to finance certain fringe benefits, such as hospitalization, and for the purchase of American Motors stock to their employees' account.

On the basis of the 1960 fiscal year this means that American Motors would pay $12.4 million into the various funds. You need only an elementary course in accounting to see that, no matter how you slice it, this is $12.4 million more than the company would otherwise be paying to its employees.

It is, therefore, $12.4 million to put on the expense side of the ledger. That is where the company accountants will put it and that is the way it will be treated by the Government taxing authorities.

To say that it "comes out of profits" may make it sound different. But it no more comes out of profit than any other wage. One might as well argue that American Motors should pay the steel companies more for steel, which is also an expense of doing business, and just "take it out of profits." On that basis, it could be argued that higher steel prices wouldn't raise the cost of autos to the customers and wouldn't be inflationary.

Indeed, that is about what American Motors Vice President Edward Cushman does argue. "Because of the profit-sharing plan, the proposed new agreement is clearly and demonstrably noninflationary despite the fact that it includes the most liberal benefits we have ever offered." He adds that, for this reason, it will not affect American Motors pricing.

Now American Motors knows better than we do whether it is financially able to add some $12.4 million to its costs without affecting its prices. Perhaps it can. But if it can, then it could as well manage that amount of added cost from a direct wage boost or from a rise in the price of raw materials.

By the same token this may not prove inflationary in the sense of adding to the price you pay for a Rambler, but again if it does not, it will not be because increased expenses from profit sharing are less expensive than any other type of increase in the expenses of making an automobile.

There is, of course, one difference. Since this wage expense is on a percentage basis, it will fluctuate—which means it could be a greater expense than $12.4 million. It could, in theory, be less. But before anyone gets too bemused by that thought, we suggest a question as to what happens if the "profits" aren't sufficient to pay those new fringe benefits. Mr. Reuther has suggested he will cross that bridge when he comes to it. Which, no doubt, he will.

Mind you, if American Motors wants to handle its wage costs this way and pay its employees some $12 million more, that's up to them. But when anybody tells you they have found a magical way to pay more without adding to their expenses, or to yours, as a car customer, just remember that a cost increase is a cost increase.

The Bomarc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, for several years the specter of ICBM warfare has dominated national thinking. Russian successes in hurtling thousands of pounds of payload into space have forced our Nation into adjusting its military capabilities to meet the implied threat of this Russian strength.

With the benefit of hindsight it is possible to see some areas in which our reactions to these threats were not as sagacious as they might have been. With military requirements as complex as they are today and the necessity for quick reaction, it is obvious that not every decision to fund—or take funds from another military weapon program—is infallible to some degree. When the passage of time shows that one of these decisions has missed the mark quite substantially it would seem that if the time and opportunity to correct the situation exists it should be taken as quickly as possible.

The decision alluded to is the one which all but canceled the effectiveness of our area defense missile force last year. To capsule objectively and briefly the history of the decision:

Almost 10 years ago the Air Force formulated the idea of area defense. In effect it substitutes in some cases un-

manned ground-to-air missiles for fighter airplanes in defending a generalized area against attack by air-breathing weapons—bombers, or missiles released by bombers. This type of defense can be contrasted with point defense in which a specific localized area is defended by antiaircraft weapon types. The two weapon types—area and point—supplement each other. To be a bit more candid, everyone who talks with knowledge on the subject agrees they supplement each other. The only time they don't appear to is when there is a keen competition for funds and the priority for truly defense-oriented weaponry is low. Such a competition existed 1 year ago and it obscured and muddied objective considerations rather badly. There are facets of rivalries such as the Nike-Bomarc controversy which are good. There was a controversy. There is none today.

Next, as the Air Force program for developing its area defense missile system progressed and improved, the Bomarc B was brought into the picture. It was designed to do everything the earlier Bomarc A could do and more. On the strength of its paper abilities, a detailed plan was developed for its deployment. The plan would have located bases of these missiles strategically up the west coast, across the northern tier of States and down the east coast. The program was endorsed by the Congress and funded.

Then, several things happened almost simultaneously. First, the threat of Soviet air power diminished rapidly in the minds of most Americans in almost direct proportion to the rising concern over the Soviet ICBM threat. The other significant thing was that the Bomarc B flight test program ran into the sorts of troubles that have plagued so many other development programs. The test problems were neither basic to the weapon nor were they serious. But they came up at a time when the threat that the missile was supposed to defend against appeared to be diminishing and they continued all during the time that the Congress was considering defense money bills which were being scrutinized closely.

The long and the short of the result was that the Bomarc B manufacturing and deployment program, which had been evolved slowly and competently over a considerable time, was scrapped—not abandoned, but scrapped. Work on Bomarc defense bases in the Great Lakes area and in the Northeast was left in the program. That which was eliminated was the production of missiles and the continuation of missile bases on the west coast and along the Canadian border, west of the Mississippi. In other words, the decision which was made amounted to keeping the front door barred and installing locks on some side windows. But the back door and the rest of the windows were left open.

Looking back on the decision today, it looks a bit hazy. One might reason in retrospect that if there no longer appeared to be a real threat the decision to cut back Bomarc defenses was quite realistic. But, why did we permit work to be continued on the bases which were retained in the program? Why fix half of the leaks in the bucket? Either fix it up right or throw it away. The answer, of course, is that the solution was a compromise. We knew that if the Russians really planned to attack us they would not depend entirely on ICBM's. If bombers were becoming obsolete they would still use all they had of them, and, that for quite a while. Even if the Russians produced no new versions, bombers would be the mainstay of any aerial assault on the United States. It boiled down to the realization that we already had a considerable amount of money committed to Bomarc and that we should save as much of it as appeared to make sense.

It appears now that this reasoning was not so very bad; however, we ought now to reapply it to the situation which applies today. Several things have happened in the interim.

The first of these concerns the weapon system itself. The earlier test troubles turned out to be nothing more than the teething problems the Air Force said they were. Dozens of the new missiles have been fired successfully, and the flight test record has been very impressive. The missile has demonstrated, or is demonstrating, every requirement set for it, including both performance and reliability requirements. It has proved it can do the job that it was designed to do. This applies to the Bomarc B bases also. The first of these was delivered to the Air Force on schedule at Sault Ste. Marie on June 1, and the base is operational. The same is true for the second base at Duluth, which became operational early this August.

The other major factor which has changed since the Bomarc B program was scrapped is that current evidence shows that, far from deteriorating, the Soviet bomber threat is more impressive than it ever was. The evidence is the Russian manned aircraft which were displayed so prominently in the recent air show at Tushino. Let there be no doubt about the significance of these airplanes. As we well know, the development of new aircraft is a very major and expensive undertaking. It also involves the employment of a very significant number of highly trained scientists and engineers. The fact that the Russians have these airplanes beyond any doubt demonstrates they consider the developmental effort to be worth the cost and worth the drain it must have put on other programs which undoubtedly rate high in the Russian system of priorities of their warfare capability.

The point is that if this type of offense is this important to the Russians, it must follow, and be equally important, for us to gear a defense to the challenge. As far as cost is concerned, our task would seem the more economical. We already have the proved weapon system, and the developmental costs already have been written off. It now simply is a question of barring the rest of the doors and windows that we so far have risked leaving open.

There is a very definite time limit for us if we are to accommodate this job efficiently. This hinges on the fact that reasonable costs are only achieved in the procurement of weapon systems when the production runs can be maintained on an orderly basis. There was no money in the 1962 defense budget for the procurement of additional Bomarc defense. As we all know, the requirements for this budget were drawn up some time ago—after the Bomarc was proved, but before the Russians flexed their bomber muscles so prominently. The result is that the Bomarc production lines, the engine production lines, and the production of weapon system parts that support the main production line from suppliers across the country are very close to being dried up.

Presently, the Air Force is looking at means of stretching out the program so we will be able to order more Bomarcs without an out-and-out production interruption. This approach is probably the only practical one they have. The prospect of slowing up production to better meet a Russian threat which is present today, however, is incongruous.

There is one other allied subject we should get into focus with further Bomarc funding—this is the subject of anti-ICBM defense. Bomarc missiles will not be effective against ICBM's. They were not designed for this job and they cannot be stretched into a weapon system that will be effective against these ballistic missiles. The two subjects must be looked at separately. The only common ground which they share is that both programs are important and both compete for the limited number of defense dollars which can be made available.

We face a significant threat through the air from both ballistic and nonballistic weapons. Our ability to defend against ballistic missiles is still very questionable, and much attention and probably substantial funding must be applied to it. With respect to the airborne aircraft and missile threat, we know it can be met by the family of weapons we have today, and, that by closing the back door now, we can make this defense effective.

BOMARC ENGINE PRODUCTION AND TESTING

The Air Force established the Bomarc engine production center in Ogden, Utah, in my congressional district, 5 years ago. Earlier, ramjet engines for the Bomarc were produced at other Marquardt facilities in Van Nuys, Calif. A comprehensive survey had revealed that Ogden and the surrounding area met a combination of unusual prerequisites. These included an inland location which could supply a suitable labor market, a location which would be within commuting distance of Marquardt's headquarters in southern California, and a location for a test facility in a remote area, but still near enough to plant and population to make efficient operation practical.

During the 5 years that the missile engine plant has been in operation, all the factors required for its success have been met. With the vocational facilities provided by Weber College, in Ogden, Marquardt easily met its requirements for a skilled manufacturing organiza-

tion, and 85 percent of it was drawn from local talent. When the facility was doubled in 1958, production schedules were met during construction, a tribute to both personnel and plant design. This personnel-facility combination was also instrumental in delivering the first ramjet engine 30 days after the original facility was finished, and since that time all delivery schedules have been met.

The Air Force Marquardt Test Facility, which was dedicated in October 1959, is unique by virtue of its location and design. Situated on a 184-acre section of shoreline of the Great Salt Lake, it nestles in a natural amphitheater which confined test noises and exhaust gases and yet is only 15 miles from the production plant.

Maximum use of the facility was considered in its design, and it readily lends itself to advanced testing programs. Significant in this respect are the aerodynamic cold-flow tests being conducted on rocket nozzles for the Minuteman program. These tests, which supply information for design improvements on the rocket nozzles, are being conducted for Thiokol and Hercules.

The large-capacity air-storage system capable of supplying a supersonic stream of air and a massive, enclosed cell provide an ideal facility to perform tests on rocket configurations. If required, a heat exchanger permits a heated air supply for simulated flight conditions, such as that provided for the Bomarc's ramjet engines.

With an appreciation for the local advantages which first drew Marquardt to the intermountain area, other related industry has since moved to the valley, creating an industrial complex whose services complement and support each other.

This complex, which is now involved in many major defense programs, is a group of industries, with Thiokol to the north, and Sperry and Hercules to the south. Centered around the Ogden Air Materiel Command at Hill Air Force Base, which has logistic support for many major weapon systems, these industries mutually complement each other's services, and support each other's systems.

Most significant in this respect is the Thiokol-Marquardt team, which, working with Boeing, soon to be another neighbor, has developed the Bomarc missile to a key part of our Nation's defense. Boost for the supersonic Bomarc is supplied by Thiokol propellant, which carries it to altitude, after which Marquardt ramjet engines propel the missile to intercept.

Marquardt completed its scheduled production of the ramjet engine for the Bomarc A missile in 1960. As this program phased out, production began immediately on the new RJ43–11 engine, which has already powered the new Bomarc "B" missile in successful test flights. This advanced ramjet engine and its predecessor, the RJ43–3, are the only two ramjets in the Nation to have passed the military qualification test.

In mid-1960, final flight testing of the RJ43–11 was completed when the engine met all flight requirements as it propelled the Lockheed X–7 test vehicle on a complex flight. The X–7 has acted as a flying test bed for airbreathing engines. After flight, a parachute recovery system lowers missile and engine to earth, where complete evaluation can be made.

During a 13-year testing program, the X–7 has flown and reflown ramjet engines and components, simulating Bomarc flight parameters to test and prove the Marquardt propulsion system's reliability before qualifying it for Bomarc service. This test program has not only provided production information invaluable to Ogden manufacturing, but in the process has established an impressive record for airbreathing engines. Powered by a single ramjet engine, the X–7 reached speeds in excess of mach 4—more than 3,000 miles per hour—and it established a world's altitude record for airbreathing missiles by exceeding 100,000 feet.

More significant than these speed and altitude records is the contribution which the ramjet development and testing programs have made to advance the state of missile and engine art. Much invaluable aerodynamic, thermodynamic, special fuels, and materials information has been accumulated as a result of this program.

Though very similar in exterior appearance, the RJ43–11 engine has improved performance which has increased the speed and extended the range of the Bomarc B interceptor missile. Each engine is checked and calibrated to meet the new flight performance requirements. In the huge test cell at the Little Mountain facility, engines undergo a simulated flight and are then recheck for performance characteristics.

Utilizing the knowledge of this test program and research activity throughout Marquardt's history, Ogden developed a precision manufacturing plant and related testing facilities. Advance techniques in metal fabrication have been developed to a production line basis, and similarly machine tooling equipment, predominantly tape-controlled, has allowed the production of precision parts with reduced costs. During the ramjet engine manufacturing program of the RJ43–3 and continuing with the present production of the RJ43–11, unusual metal-fabrication skills and equipment have been amassed. The spin forge machine, which cold-flows metal into various shapes much as a potter does with clay on his wheel, and explosive forming, which blows metal into the shape of a die into which the metal is placed, are two examples of techniques that are being used by Marquardt's manufacturing engineers.

As production techniques kept pace with ramjet engine improvement programs, significant accomplishments in ramjet production were noted. Creating the RJ43–11 engine, now being produced on an assembly line technique at Ogden, required only 3½ years' work rather than the 7 years which were required to bring the RJ43–3 from conception through the successful completion of the qualification tests.

The Bomarc ramjets did much to develop ramjet technology. Out of the program for example, came the successful demonstration of boron hydride fuel in both ground tests and flight. The program also revealed the feasibility of the Marquardt hyperjet, a combination rocket and ramjet which is now receiving serious study as the propulsion system for boosting large payloads into space.

Because this Utah facility was founded exclusively to produce ramjet engines, the Marquardt technicians and engineers have adapted their skills and experience to form a unique team for the efficient and economical production of this unusual propulsion system. Their efforts have provided the quality product which has established an exceptional record of reliability.

I strongly urge that a serious review of this phase of our defense posture will be made by our military leaders without delay.

Let's Sell America by Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, one of our prominent Baltimore advertising executives, Mr. Morton Levinstein, has raised the question: "Why can't the leaders of the Western nations emphasize and repeat over and over to the world the many weaknesses of the Russian position?"

Mr. Levinstein wrote an article on this subject which first appeared in the Baltimore Sun, and which was recently reprinted in the August edition of the Baltimore Beacon, of which Maurice R. Shochatt is editor and publisher.

In his article Mr. Levinstein urges America to conduct a dynamic, aggressive, and militant program to out-point Soviet Russia in the cold war of democracy versus dictatorship.

I believe Mr. Levinstein's suggestions are sound and I would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues by inserting his article at this point in the RECORD:

AD EXECUTIVE URGES UNITED STATES TO LAUNCH HOT IDEAS FOR COLD WAR

It is a sad commentary that America, whose promotional, advertising, public relations, and selling skills have been developed to such a high degree of efficiency, should be so completely overshadowed by Russia in the battle for men's minds among the underdeveloped nations of the world.

One of the most fundamental principles in advertising is the importance of repetition, the necessity for developing a few simple ideas, then repeating them again and again, and again.

Khrushchev, in a country where there is no advertising, seems to have learned this lesson far better than any of our own leaders. For example, his constantly repeated description of the Western countries as imperial aggressors, colonialists, etc., and his description of the Communist nations as the peace-loving peoples' democracies.

He has repeated these statements so many thousands of times that an indelible image has been created in the minds of the peoples of the so-called uncommitted nations. They know what the Soviets claim to believe; they are puzzled, confused, and confounded by our own ambiguous (to them) position.

For example, why not repeatedly (and I mean repeatedly) remind the world of the notorious Russian nonaggression freindship pact with Hitler, which helped bring about World War II? Why not remind the world of Russia's unwarranted attack on little Finland, or of Russia's invasion of Poland in conjunction with their ally, Hitler? Why not remind the world of Russia's annexation of small helpless countries like Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and eastern Poland? Why not repeatedly remind the world of the brutal suppression of the Hungarian freedom fighters? Let's put Khrushchev on the defensive, for a change.

Why must the leaders of the West always be on the defensive? True, some of our representatives in the United Nations have spoken beautifully, idealistically, and eloquently, but usually in reaction to a Communist action and usually in language over the heads of the little peoples of the world, living in poverty and ignorance.

But in the really effective slugging and infighting, we've been outpointed. It's a sad fact that we are losing the cold war, that nation after nation has been slowly swinging into the Russian sphere of influence.

I would like to suggest that a committee of advertising men, public relations specialists, and experts on mass psychology and selling be appointed by the President to help develop a campaign to fill a more important gap even than the missile gap.

It's a real tragedy that we, who have the best article to sell, are doing such a poor job of selling it.

Misinterpretation of Politics Is Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I read the following article by William S. White in the Washington Evening Star with alarm. This type of thinking, this wholly incorrect interpretation of the role of politics in our national life is dangerous to our form of government. Mr. White ignores completely the vital importance of a political party taking the position of loyal opposition. It seems to me the opposition party is failing in its duty to the country if we refuse, under the guise of bipartisanship, to point out the mistakes made by the party in power, even in the field of foreign policy. If, under such a bipartisanship, we cover up the mistakes, sweep them under the rug because we might be accused of playing politics, we compound the errors, heighten the dangers which threaten us, enhance the possibility of bringing about a one-party system which has been the downfall of every democratic form of government, and lead us farther down the road to dictatorship.

The article follows:

POLITICIANS FORGETTING POLITICS?—FOREIGN CRISES PROMOTE BIPARTISANSHIP; KENNEDY EVEN SEEKS EISENHOWER ADVICE

(By William S. White)

This one-industry town—politics being that one industry—might fairly be described as a chronically depressed area these days, so far as its ordinary business is concerned.

Not many are making much politics in Washington. And even those who are making any politics are doing what in the old days of the alphabetical agencies was called "made work." They are working more or less for practice, more or less just to keep their hands in, and in a very tentative way, like a man polishing a fishing rod from which he knows very well he will not actually throw a line into the water any time soon.

A harsh summer of foreign crises—Berlin, of course, being at the top of the list—has indefinitely adjourned politics as it is usually practiced here. In this upside-down world, John F. Kennedy, the leading Democrat, has become simply John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States.

His White House callers often as not are solidly Republican types from big business and Wall Street rather than partisan Democrats.

(Even one of those dreadful "southern Democrats"—a man of the stamp, say, of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, an outstanding congressional authority on military affairs—can be found in quite amiable conference with the President.)

No doubt the President still knows, in an absentminded way, the current location of the Democratic National Committee. But his contact with that agency is practically nil—and so, actually, is his current interest in it.

What he is doing is not merely trying to get help from every quarter he can—thus the Wall Street and big business fellows. He is also getting advice from such men on a wide variety of matters ranging from where good administrative talent for the Government, can be found to business ideas on economic problems.

The Republican leader of the Senate, Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, is often found to be helping rather than hampering the administration—on the big problems, that is.

Senator DIRKSEN, indeed, sometimes seems about as vague about the existence of the Republican National Committee as Mr. Kennedy is about the Democratic National Committee.

From his farm in Gettysburg, former President Eisenhower is doing no intruding act here. Nevertheless, he is constantly on call for advice and is by no means out of the picture here.

The friendly bipartisan relationship which Mr. Kennedy has struck up with General Eisenhower is being emulated by others within the administration.

In his fight for some Federal school aid, Abraham Ribicoff, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is finding rather more reliable allies among conservatives, some of them Republicans, than from the highly liberal school lobbies.

Mr. Ribicoff, indeed, has been moved publicly to warn those who love school aid all too much that their excessive zeal is doing more harm than good. Characteristically, they want all or nothing. Characteristically, he wants what can be had.

Now all this does not mean that politicians have ceased to be politicians. It only means that the best of them, in both parties, recognize that this is no time for politics-as-usual, and that this time will not return until the country has safely passed the present dangers from abroad.

And if this situation is hard on Washington's one industry for the moment, that industry can take comfort. For obviously the best politics right now is no politics at all.

There will be plenty of time later, if under providence we escape war or appeasement, to get back to politics-as-usual.

Those politicians who are able to return then to politics with records of having behaved responsibly in this hour of peril will be all the stronger in the field of contention.

Bureaucrats on Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily Tribune has editorialized on a matter which should be of extreme interest to the Members of Congress. I commend this editorial to them.

The editorial follows:

BUREAUCRATS ON TOP

Representative RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana, has warned his colleagues that if civil service employees of the Federal bureaucracy continue to succeed in superimposing their judgment on the will of Congress, then "we have lost the constitutional authority that is vested in us."

The constitutional power of Congress is to make the laws; the constitutional function of the executive branch, from the President down, is to see that they are faithfully executed.

Yet, said Mr. HARVEY, he was offering an instance in which a bureaucrat overruled Congress. He cited testimony of Edward Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, who was questioned about operations to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities.

"We were questioning Mr. Martin as to why a proper deal with one of the major Latin American republics—and a friendly nation—had not been consummated," Mr. HARVEY related. "In this instance the country had sent a mission here to Washington to exchange sugar for wheat. They received the contract to sell us sugar but were not given an opportunity to take the wheat in exchange. This was very much in contrast with the policy the House and Senate had set forth in the extension of the Sugar Act, and so we were trying to determine in this hearing, with Mr. Martin as a witness, why the policy of Congress had not been carried out.

"Mr. Martin very distinctly stated that he did not agree with the policy as set forth by the Congress and that he assumed full responsibility for rejecting it, and, in fact, discouraged the visiting country from actually adhering to the policy as set forth by Congress. This particular type of activity * * * indicates an even more alarming aspect of our present position in international affairs: To wit, that the Congress no longer is presumed to have any voice in the policies that are carried out by this country."

It would certainly seem to be more sensible to trade commodities which are glutting storage capacity for something, such as sugar, which we can use, than to compel purchase of the sugar with no diminution of the surplus of wheat. But that is subsidiary to the fact that bureaucrats feel they can ignore their obligation to execute the laws if these laws run contrary to their own judgments or prejudices.

Unless Congress acts with force to end bureaucratic usurpations, it has no one but itself to blame for the fact that its deliberations will be reduced to exercises in a vacuum.

World Events: One Easy Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today an editorial comment appeared in the Washington Daily News which serves to point out, in humorous vein, the reality of the difference in the stability of duly constituted government in the United States and in some Latin American countries. In our country such a development as has recently been witnessed in Brazil would be beyond anyone's wildest imagination. Whether or not we completely agree with our duly elected public officials we want them to serve until the next regular election. This is, we should remember, a demonstration of our belief in and adherence to a rule of law, rather than changing the makeup of our administrative officials from time to time due to criticism from a vocal segment of the electorate which may or may not be a majority. In this country while our President was elected in the last election by the smallest majority in history, no one harbors any thought that he should resign because a large percentage of our electorate does not agree with his administrative policies.

I commend this little commentary to the attention of the Members of the House and, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, include the editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

WORLD EVENTS: ONE EASY LESSON

For a clearer understanding of developments in Brazil, assume that John Fitzgerald Kennedy, impatient with back talk about foreign aid, announces you can have the White House. He resigns and takes off for Hyannis Port.

Vice President JOHNSON is wandering around Asia, perhaps trying to talk Outer Mongolia into recognizing the United States. So House Speaker SAM RAYBURN becomes interim President.

Mr. JOHNSON starts for home but Defense Secretary McNamara calls a press conference at the Pentagon. There are, he says, too darned many Texans running things in Washington already, and he won't let LYNDON be President.

"The Vice President," he says, "had better stay abroad because if he comes home I'll put him in Alcatraz."

Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, disagrees. He says he's for LYNDON. So Secretary McNamara hustles him off to jail to think it over.

As we go to press, students at Georgetown University are throwing rocks at the British Embassy, breaking some windows and blacking the eye of a small girl who is passing by on her way to school.

Bins to store wheat have crowded all the people out of Kansas, the national debt has gone up to 3 trillion, the Treasury is running out of paper to print currency which has been devalued at a cent on the dollar and bread has gone up to $2.50 a loaf.

In the inner circles it is felt that something ought to be done and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, calls for sacrifices in a 3-hour speech on the Senate floor. His voice, however, gives out before he gets a chance to name any.

Thru methods of quiet diplomacy the Soviet Union is asked how's about some foreign aid? But Khrushchev sends a typically contrary answer.

"There is no dice," says Nikita, "because you wouldn't pay it back. Why don't you go to work, collect some taxes and then you wouldn't need any aid?" This is properly resented as changing the subject and interference in our private affairs. Our people at the U.N. are instructed to vote in favor of colonialism and see how the Soviets like that.

The events thus crudely sketched are, of course, unthinkable and impossible in the United States. But this is only a somewhat distorted facsimile of what's going on in Brazil, and in various other spots around the globe. As yet no sure cure for these trends has been thought up. Obviously this will take time.

Address by Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, Before the American Legion State Convention, Greenville, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a great speech made by my colleague, the Honorable W. J. BRYAN DORN, before the American Legion State convention recently held in Greenville, S.C. Representative DORN gave a stirring and thought-provoking speech on conditions existing throughout the world and the crises facing us. I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress. The speech follows:

Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN. Mr. Commander, Mr. Adjutant, Congressman Ashmore, Governor Maybank, distinguished guests, members of the auxiliary, and my fellow legionnaires, BOB, I appreciate your very gracious and very kind introduction. I am always happy and honored to be presented to any audience in the Fourth District, by my distinguished, able, conscientious colleague, BOB ASHMORE, your own Congressman. BOB believes in oldtime, oldfashioned Americanism. He believes that Americanism conquered the early American frontier; it developed undeveloped America; it is a principle that is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Therefore, it will conquer, if given the opportunity, the New Frontier, and space. I congratulate BOB ASHMORE on his stand in Washington for those principles and ideals of government and Americanism that have made this Nation the greatest nation on the face of the earth. I am glad to be in the home town of Lieutenant Governor Maybank, who has presided so ably, with honor and distinction, over the Senate of South Carolina, which I still think is the most dignified, able senate body in the world.

I wish also to pay tribute to your great commander. It has been my privilege to know him and meet with him over this State this past year, and also his able adjutant. You know, I saw firsthand the fine work that Nelson Keesee did at Boys State. It was my privilege to be there, and I wish every South Carolinian could see the enthusiasm, the patriotic spirit of Americanism, as exemplified by Girls State and Boys State, particularly under the leadership of our adjutant.

Ladies and gentlemen, we come to you this morning straight from Washington. I bring you greetings from the committee chairman, under whom I serve, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE. He asked that I please give you his very best wishes. Some years ago he spoke to the State Convention of the American Legion of South Carolina. He still remembers it with pleasure. He is doing an outstanding job as chairman of our committee. He is one of the few whom I would follow almost blindfolded. Mr. TEAGUE has the welfare of this country at heart, the welfare of the veteran along with it; and also, he is cognizant of the economy of the United States. So I do bring you greetings from him.

As to our veterans' program today, I think one of the most important parts of it, as Mr. McHugh here could probably tell you, is the long-range hospital program that we have. We intend, over the next 9 years, to modernize, and to maintain our hospitals, and to look after the needs of the veterans of the United States. That program is moving satisfactorily, and I think all connected with it are doing an excellent job. This year we passed a bill to increase compensation for those men who haven't had a raise since 1957. During the time of inflation, increased cost of living, we thought it was timely, thus we passed a bill this year; and I sincerely hope it will be passed in the other body and be signed by the President. I believe that the men who were wounded in the service of our country, and those who gave their lives in the service of our country, their widows and orphans—these people—should receive first consideration. And, if any of you have any comments about the pension bill we passed last year, which went into effect last July, the chairman of my committee asks that you please report to him any suggestions you might have about how that law is working at the grassroots level. So much for veterans legislation.

We gather here today during a great crisis, not only in the history of this country, but in the history of the world. The crisis we are in today is a Russian Communist-created crisis. It is not a crisis of our own choosing. The United States and the free world would prefer to be free, and would prefer the peaceful pursuits of happiness. This crisis—may I repeat—is a Communist Russian-created crisis, just as every crisis since 1945 has been a Communist-created crisis, to further their ambitions—as they have so often publicly stated—to conquer and infiltrate the entire world with atheistic communism. This is the great challenge before each and every one of us today. Very frankly, I think the world situation has moved, until today we are in a great climax, a crucial climax in the history of civilization. And the next 6 months possibly will determine whether we will remain free, whether the world will remain free, whether or not we will continue to move forward down the corridor of history as free people, or whether we will be plunged backward into the dark recesses of slavery, in which the individual, as grains of sand on the seashore, will be shoveled by the totalitarian masters of a slave state to further their own ends.

Yes, we are in that crisis today, this very moment. Summit conferences. Let me recall for you some unfortunate history. I

remember reading, as a very young man, about a conference at Munich, Germany, a conference insisted upon by Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini—a conference, a Nazi-Fascist-created crisis. So, Chamberlain went to Munich. Along with him were his Foreign Affairs Minister, Lord Halifax, Daladier from France, and his Foreign Minister, Bonnat. They formally and officially signed a document. And you remember the pathetic picture of Neville Chamberlain getting off the airplane in London, England, holding up this paper on which were the signatures of Adolf Hitler, Mussolini, Von Ribbentrop, and all of those men; and he said, "Peace in our time." Chamberlain actually sincerely believed and thought that he had accomplished peace in our generation. In a very few months, in that same year, the German armies were goosestepping into Czechoslovakia; and the next year, strengthened and confident by their success at Munich, they goosestepped into free Poland, and launched the German war machine into World War II.

And I would like to point out to you the conference at Yalta and the conference at Potsdam. Most of the world's trouble today, in a military way and as to the power of the atheist enemy is a result of those conferences. They received more at those conferences at Yalta, and Potsdam, and Teheran than they have ever conquered in war. So, I would like to warn my fellow countrymen against the fallacy of sitting down and working out agreements that are not worth the paper they are written on—[applause] working out agreements with bloody gangsters, whose fingers literally drip with the innocent blood of millions. What would you think of the mayor of some of our fine cities, if he would sit down with the bank robber, and draw up an agreement not to rob the bank again, yet let him keep his money. That's exactly what we're doing when we sit down with Khrushchev.

At every single conference we've gone to with these gangsters, the free world has lost something; and America has lost something. We not only lose territory, but we give the enemy confidence, and we lose our prestige around the world. In the last conference at Vienna, not having learned by the experience at Camp David, not having learned from the so-called Paris Conference which was a fiasco, we again decided on another conference. This time we lost Laos; and if we meet with Khrushchev anywhere in Europe or anywhere in the world, including Washington, we are going to lose something else before we start. He uses these conferences not only to build up his prestige and his confidence, and to inflate his ego, but also he uses these conferences to cover up some move in Cuba, some move in the Congo, some move in southeast Asia, or some move regarding Berlin.

So I would say to my fellow countrymen, don't go. Don't sit down with a man we cannot trust. Don't sit down with a man who has never kept any promise, who has never honored any sacred treaty. We cannot depend upon such conferences to preserve the freedoms of the peoples of the free world.

We must rely upon something traditional, something that has always saved and protected the people who have had enough of it—and that, ladies and gentlemen, is cold steel. The strength and power of this country is the only thing that's going to preserve our freedom. And if the Congress of the United States had listened to the American Legion from 1919 until 1939, we would not have had World War II; and we wouldn't have had communism in Europe today—certainly not central Europe—and in China, and throughout the world.

There's no easy road to peace. Peace cannot be bought with conferences. It cannot be bought with agreements—certainly not agreements with the enemy. But peace can be preserved with the most powerful army—highly skilled, mobilized, ready for instant action—a navy that's in complete command of the seven seas of the world, and an air force that is supreme in the air.

And now, in this day of astronautics, we must control space. If we had only spent a portion of the money, not all of it, but just a portion of the money thrown down the drain all over the world, a blank check trying to make the world worship the dollar sign, if we had only saved a portion of that and put it into conquest of space, America would not be worried about Berlin today.

Ladies and gentlemen, Berlin is a crisis. Something is going to break in the next 6 months. Before the end of this year I say this country must stand firm. If we surrender Berlin, if we back up on Berlin, some day it will be Alaska, because Russia still claims Alaska. They say that it was given to America by Czarist Russia; so they don't recognize that. Someday, sometime, somewhere we are going to have to face these masters of the Kremlin, and tell them in no uncertain terms that this is the line beyond which they cannot go, beyond which we will fight with everything we have—and then I think we will make a contribution, once we do that, to the peace of the world. But as long as they believe that through blackmail, through crises they create themselves, they can always get something, someday they know that they will win the entire world.

Yes, we are in a crisis. We're in one over Berlin. We're in one in Cuba, in Africa, in Latin America, in southeast Asia, even in the United States, and throughout the entire length and breadth of the whole world.

But on Berlin, let me say that Russia knows how to get peace. She helped draw up the agreement about Berlin; as stupid as it was, she nevertheless signed it. She is pledged to support the present status quo of Berlin. But she cares nothing about treaties. She cares nothing about her signature, so we should let her know in no uncertain terms now that we are not going to permit central Europe to be overrun by the Communist aggressors from the east. [Applause.] And the sooner we take this stand the better. What would you think of a person who stole your cow and your calf—your neighbor—and then he asked you to have a conference about it; and then to settle the whole issue he would give you back the calf? That's exactly what we propose to do with any future conference on Berlin. I wouldn't talk with anybody, my neighbor or anyone else, until he brought back both the cow and the calf, because with that policy they'll soon demand Alaska, and then Florida, and we won't have anything left. Russia knows that. She doesn't want war. She's getting what she wants without war, with blackmail, with fear hysteria in the United States. The sooner our people stand up and say as Chamberlain and Daladier should have done at Munich, that if you violate this sacred treaty we are going to fight you on the beaches, in the air, as Churchill said, and everywhere because we believe in freedom, then we won't have a war. The surest road to war is appeasement, is compromise, always giving up a little bit to buy a little more time.

And I want to tell you, many of us in Washington are concerned. Late Thursday night when I left the floor of the House to come to South Carolina, the last speech I heard on that floor was by SELDEN of Alabama, chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, a good Democrat, who has always been a Democrat. Yet he has disagreed with Eisenhower. He has disagreed with a lot of the leaders of this country. And the last thing I heard him say was that our foreign policy is still floundering, without a rudder, in a time when we need decision; and we need it now. Tomorrow may be too late. So I would say to my colleagues in Washington, and to this administration, that next year will be too late. We cannot afford another fiasco in Cuba. Regarding Berlin, we cannot afford another fiasco in southeast Asia concerning Vietnam. We cannot afford another Congo. We have precious little time left. So we must stand firm now, or we might lose the freedom of our children and our grandchildren.

I never thought I would live to see the day in this great country of ours when I would see a bearded Carribean beatnik, a tinhorned gangster, that the South Carolina National Guard would lick in 1 week, if given the opportunity. [Applause.] I never thought I would live to see the day when he could sit back on the island of Cuba, in all of his crookedness and corruption and bombast, and buffalo the powerful, the great, the historic, the patriotic United States of America, the arsenal of democracy, the heart and core of the free world. But, ladies and gentlemen, this is exactly what he has done and is doing today; and we cringe in fear; we're even trading with him. I heard these men on the floor of the House Thursday say if we had only invoked the Trading With the Enemy Act we could stop him cold. But we won't even do that. They are bringing in millions of dollars worth of oranges from Cuba, molasses, sugar, cigars coming in through Canada into the United States. We are still building him up with our money. Let's invoke Trading With the Enemy Act. Let's blockade Cuba. If we can't stand firm on Cuba, what is going to happen when they meet over Berlin? Maybe they'll give away West Germany, and France, and England to buy a few more moments of time.

This is the most critical crisis you and your country have ever been in. I heard one of the greatest generals in the world tell me that last year, over a year ago. He said, "You don't have much time left."

The most ridiculous, shameful aspect of this entire Cuban fiasco has been the attempt on the part of citizens of the United States, in violation of the Logan Act, in violation of Trade With the Enemy Act, in violation of the Export Act, probably the Battle Act, and others, to go over and meet with this bloody gangster in Cuba and give him equipment from the United States of America, with which to build airfields, missile bases, and attack Miami, Fla., in a few months. Jet planes coming in this month and next month, with trained pilots from Czechoslovakia. Yet we have people in the United States foolish enough to think they can deal with a modern-day Maw Ferguson, John Dillinger, and Pretty Boy Floyd. You know, I couldn't believe it when I heard about it; and the thing I really couldn't believe was that the Government of the United States was behind this circumvention of these laws put on the books to keep Americans from dealing with gangsters, blackmailers, those who demand ransom. This episode has cost the United States all over the world more prestige. This single event has lost us more respect than any other one incident that I know of since the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

You are not going to buy off Castro. We are not going to be able to buy off Khrushchev any more than we bought off Hitler, or any more than the people bought off Genghis Khan. You know they tried to buy off people back in the days of Rome. The Romans didn't mind that. The Roman legions just moved in anyway, after taking the money.

Oh, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleading today for America, for honesty, for decency, for principle, for patriotism, for a revival of those things that created this Nation, and made this Nation. Are we to sit back through hysteria and fear and see our

freedoms liquidated, and our country destroyed? May I say again, if we can't stop Castro, how are we going to stop Khrushchev? And then 10 years from now, or 5 years from now, Mao Tung of China, with 700 million people behind him, 300 million of whom he would like to lose in a war? Mao Tung says that with war it will still leave him with 400 million people, 2 to 1 over the United States. They are overcrowded so he would like to lose 300 million people in a war. If we are going to let Castro buffalo the United States, then we better run up the hammer and sickle today and get it over with.

But, ladies, and gentlemen, let me tell you something—I feel more confident. Why? Because I spoke in Michigan the other night. The minute I left the Disabled Americans Convention in Grand Rapids they unanimously adopted a resolution in Michigan endorsing every word I said about summit conferences, about being strong, about tractor deals with the enemies of our country. And did you know that throughout the United States of America people are talking the same way everywhere? They are tired of this tin-horned gangster. They are tired of this Carribean beatnik, and his henchmen and his backers throughout the world, buffaloing the United States, making us cringe in fear.

My fellow countrymen, let's stay strong, and, if necessary, invade Cuba with the Armed Forces of the United States, not wait until they bomb Miami, or New Orleans, or Atlanta, or the atomic bomb plant at Aiken. Let's rearm Germany and Japan. The greatest pool of skilled labor outside of the United States today can be found in West Germany and in Japan. You know they don't mind fighting and I say thta we ought to offer every encouragement to them to rearm, and stem the course, the onward march of Communist atheism. One time, if necessary, I want to see an ally on our side like the Germans, who took more punishment during World War II than all the rest of our allies combined. You know it and I know it. They lost more people in Hamburg and Cologne, and one other city than Great Britain did throughout the entire war, and I have a high regard for Great Britain. But if we mean business, let's go into business. Let's use the means at hand to stop communism, and stop it now.

Now remember what those people said when we went through Germany. They said, "It will be Russia next time." You boys remember it. They knew it. They said, "These people are uncivilized. They are atheists." Just like generations and centuries in the history of the world, they roved from Eurasia into Europe and northern Africa. We must stop them.

Let's declare a national emergency, if necessary, today; put this country on a wartime footing. Draft capital and labor and everything, if necessary. If freedom is worth dying for, it is worth spending some money for today before it's too late. Yes, declare a national emergency. Blockade Cuba. Stand firm on Berlin. Build up our armed strength as quickly as possible. Mobilize, if necessary, now. Russia has been mobilized concerning Berlin, for 10 years. No more conferences with men who are not going to keep their promises. People ask me everywhere what can we do as organizations, or what can we do as citizens? One of the most classic examples I know of is the American Legion and its auxiliary, teaching Americanism, putting something in the minds and hearts of the youth of America, in the place of communism, filling their hearts and minds with Americanism so there is no room for communism—Boys State, Girls State, the oratorical contest, junior American Legion baseball. From this organization comes 60 percent of the ballplayers in the National League. And in every community in this country, honoring the flag. Oh, I wish that on next Tuesday, the 4th of July, every community in the United States, every home in America, particularly where there are young children, will fly the Stars and Stripes of the United States, and fly it proudly. This one thing I can promise you, that in my home with my five children, the U.S. flag, larger than this, was flying on my front porch on Flag Day, and it will be proudly so on next Tuesday.

People ask me, "What can we do?" Oh, ladies and gentlemen, we could stop communism cold. We could stop it in America. Back up our Un-American Activities Committee. Show the film "Operation Abolition," whether the "pinks" and the Socialists want us to or not. There are a lot of things we can do. Rededicate our lives and our homes. Tell our children the story of America, just like the American Legion told it to Boys' State, just like they are telling it all over the world. Many of our people go overseas and they can't tell foreigners about the story of America. They don't know much about it, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the right to vote, the right to go to church, the right to assemble, the right to speak. It's a story we need to tell all over the world—the story of Americanism. And let me say this, finally, that we are not going to save America by adopting socialism as we have been adopting it the last 25 years. Here's what Khrushchev said—don't quote me, I'm not the man that said it—Khrushchev said it. In May of this year Khrushchev turned to the delegation of the United Arab Republic and he said that you have communism. Socialism is communism. He said that socialism is the "A" in the alphabet of communism. Don't fight communism when you have socialism, he said; it puts you in a awkward position. Yes, socialism is communism incomplete, and we are adopting it in America today.

Socialism is old. It was tried in the days of Babylon, Greece, in the ancient civilizations of the past. And I have been shocked since I returned from Washington and came back to the grassroots of this country to find people on the dole system today in America, just like they were in Rome, the thing that destroyed Rome, people going up in fine automobiles and getting groceries. And if you ask them what about cutting the grass or helping us work around the house, and "we'll pay you good," they laugh in your face, and then turn around and ask you "Why do you work so hard?" "We are on unemployment compensation and enjoying free food on the side. Why should we work?" Eating out the guts of the United States of America, destroying us from within. Let's move forward with Americanism. Americanism is new. Americanism is modern. Socialism is old. It has been tried and found wanting. Let's turn the wheels of progress forward with Americanism, the free enterprise system, the profit system, the system that made this Nation the wonder of the modern world. Please don't let us turn the clock back to socialism, State control totalitarianism, Federal aid to education. Oh, I wish you could have read the report Judge Smith showed me this week, concocted by the U.S. Education Agency, a blueprint for controlling the minds of the youth of America, for brainwashing our young people down the primrose path of socialism, at the end of which is the black bottomless pit of red, atheistic communism.

Local control—do we have confidence in ourselves? Do we think we can handle this? We have done it, and we handled it in such a way for 150 years that the whole world, including communism, turned to us; and we even gave the Russians $11 billion. We've helped the whole world with our free enterprise system, yet we are adopting socialism, the thing that destroyed them, made them weak, made them ignorant, made them illiterate; and we want to adopt it in America—totalitarianism, control of education, control of business, control of the hearts and minds of our people. Washington calling the tune and playing the music, and the American people dancing, down that road to complete destruction as of Babylon.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my plea to you. May we say with Ben Hill of Georgia when he said, "He who saves his country, saves all things, and all things saved will bless him; but he who lets his country die, lets all things die, and all things dying curse him."

And I want to say to some of those in America today who think when Russia takes over, if they do, that they will be saved. They'll save their hide while pointing out me and saying "DORN was the warmonger. Go get him." That won't work. It didn't work in Korea. Those soldiers who told on the others,—Oh, the Communists came back for more, because they knew they were weak, and submitted them to more blackmail. It won't work. They'll get everybody in America because of their education and background. Those who are capable of raising a revolution in the future will be liquidated. So let's stand up and save our country now, in this year of 1961, because 1962 may be too late.

I wish every Congressman in America could visit the Legion, could visit the auxiliary, see your display of the flag, your oath. They would be encouraged to stand firm in Washington.

And I do hope our beloved President, whom I love personally, will launch out before it's too late, with alacrity and decision. Already he has rescinded the remark he made about the Legion in 1947 or 1948, but I do hope and pray that he'll move forward, and exert the leadership that is necessary now, before it's too late. [Applause.]

Editorial Supports Opposition to Giving Billions to Nehru Because of His Sympathy for Soviet Causes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune points up the stupidity of giving billions of dollars of the American taxpayer to India's Nehru when he can usually be counted upon to support every Communist objective. Even though he has done an about face in the past few days in supporting the Soviet Union against the free world in the rape of Berlin, his new stand is apparently a reluctant one after a lengthy conversation with our Ambassador to India. While I don't know what the Ambassador told Nehru, there is good reason to believe that he may have pointed out that it could be poor public relations to antagonize the American people just as the Congress is voting more billions for India. My own suggestion is we give our own people a break and save at least the money we give so freely to India. Mr. Nehru has not been our friend in the world councils and I see no reason to continue to subsidize a government

which has such close ties with an enemy who has declared its objective to be our destruction.

The editorial follows:

HIS 2 RUPEES' WORTH

Prime Minister Nehru of India has interjected his 2 rupees' worth on the Berlin controversy, and, as usual, has sidled around so that he comes out in support of Soviet tyranny. Nehru has convinced himself that the Soviets were legally entitled to seal off the East Berlin border, but he cautiously refrained from saying that the procedure was justifiable.

The Indian oracle based his argument on a complete misreading, intentional or not, of the agreement reached in 1949 ending the Soviet blockade of Berlin. On May 4 of that year, after the blockade had been defeated by the American airlift, the Soviet Union entered an agreement providing in part:

"All the restrictions imposed since March 1, 1948, by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on communications, transportation, and trade between Berlin and the Western Zones of Germany and between the Eastern Zones and the Western Zones will be removed on May 12, 1949."

A council of foreign ministers then convened in Paris and representatives of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union elaborated the agreement of May 4. They agreed, first, that all of the undertakings of the previous agreement should be maintained.

Further, "to improve and supplement this and other arrangements and agreements as regards the movement of persons and goods and communications between the Eastern Zone and the Western Zones and between the zones and Berlin and also in regard to transit, the occupation authorities, each in his own zone, will have an obligation to take the measures necessary to insure the normal functioning and utilization of rail, water, and road transport for such movement of persons and goods and such communications by post, telephone, and telegraph."

How Nehru or anyone else can read into these agreements any legal authority for the Communists to seal off a sector of Berlin is a mystery. On the contrary, the Communists are pledged to guarantee freedom of movement in all parts of Germany.

Perhaps in realization that his case was feeble, Nehru attempted a second gambit. He said that, as the administration of Berlin had never been joint since 1949, "the Soviet and East German authorities could very well argue they have the right to regulate and control the movement from the East Berlin area to the West Berlin area." To this he added that East and West Germany are both to be regarded as sovereign states.

Again, the argument fails to hold up. The Soviet military was allotted a zone of military occupation in Germany, but all of Berlin was to be administered by a four power council. It was the Soviet Union which departed from this agreement after a free election in Berlin assigned Communists less than a 20-percent voice in the city government.

Although the Soviet Union promulgated the so-called East German government in October 1949, it had subscribed to the description in the agreements with the western allies only a few months before that it was responsible in "the eastern zone" of Germany—"zone" meaning "zone of occupation." Nehru does not explain how a military occupation is changed overnight into a status of "sovereignty" for those occupied. The western nations have always said the sovereignty is a fiction.

Why Nehru feels obliged to offer his ex cathedra pronouncements on a dispute in which he has not the remotest concern is left unsolved. That he should justify arbitrary Communist acts is no surprise—he usually finds it possible to do so. But why the United States continues to underwrite this Kremlin stooge with billions in foreign aid surpasses understanding.

Freedom Has Assumed a Timorous Posture in the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, writing in the August 28, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence discussed the timid stance of the West in the face of communism's determination to imprison 17 million citizens of Germany. Appalling indeed is the apparent failure of freedom to meet the Communists in Germany with resoluteness. I could not agree more with the observations of Mr. Lawrence on what we must do to meet the Communist challenge in Germany.

It is my opinion that all Members of Congress will want to have an opportunity to read Mr. Lawrence's article. I therefore, wish to insert the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

THE BIG PRISON

(By David Lawrence)

(By cable from Europe)

More than 17 million persons were imprisoned a few days ago in East Germany.

They have committed no crime. They have not trespassed upon any other people's territory. They are nevertheless confined within borders prescribed by their Communist masters. Armed guards patrol the barbedwire and concrete barriers erected to prevent their leaving the big prison.

Across a line through the city of Berlin are many relatives and friends whom they are forbidden to visit.

Alone and unbefriended by any other nation, the East German people suffer in silence—unable to express their will and bound by the mandate of their oppressors not to dare to depart to other countries or even to other parts of their own German homeland.

The world has not often witnessed in our times such a colossal act of cruelty.

In these days when "self-determination" is the rallying cry of millions of persons in Africa, many of them not yet fit for self-government, the majority of nations have given more than lip service to the idea that colonialism should be abolished and independence granted.

But where are the champions of the imprisoned millions in East Germany? Do the Afro-Asian members of the United Nations lift their voices in protest or demand special meetings of the General Assembly to seek justice for the 17 million prisoners—educated human beings who obviously deserve a chance to govern themselves? And what do we in America or our friends in Western Europe do about it?

Timidly and with a mistaken belief that it is important not to offend Nikita Khrushchev, the American Government's broadcasts to East Germany tell the people there to be calm and to do nothing to bring about disturbances of any kind. This is advice based on our own alleged self-interest. But it is really a form of appeasement reminiscent of the days of Munich.

Here, for instance, is an extract from an editorial published in the New York Times of August 16 and transmitted by the various press services to the newspapers of Europe:

"While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Does this expression by one of the leading newspapers of the United States represent the thinking of the American people today? Have we forgotten the ideals of yesteryears—the many words of sympathy we have written into the platforms of both of our political parties in decades past as we openly took our stand by the side of oppressed peoples?

Do we really mean to remain passive now lest we offend the Communists? Will this not embolden them to take further steps—perhaps the next time to imprison the people of West Berlin, too?

For if we are obsessed with fears and afflicted with a defeatism which makes us afraid even to encourage other peoples to seek their freedom, then the Soviet Union need have no concern about trespassing further on human rights.

The West Germans are plainly disappointed that their Western allies have indicated their aloofness toward the problem of the East German people. Small wonder that it was deemed necessary by President Kennedy to send Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Berlin to help bolster the morale of the people there.

True enough, nobody wants to see any incitement to war. But wars come from timorousness, and not from resoluteness.

The Soviet Union has committed a major crime in imprisoning the people of East Germany. Will the people of the West fail to speak up against this act of inhumanity?

Diplomatic notes of protest are not enough. Throughout the United States and other Western countries days of mourning should be proclaimed as millions of freemen go to their churches to pray to God to give the East German people the strength to rise up against their captors and emerge from their enslavement.

Demonstrations in all parts of the world should be held immediately so that there can be recorded the protest of a shocked humanity.

For communism, which boasts of its prowess in science and pledges great achievements in economic fields, reveals its true character as it denies human beings their freedom and their individual liberties.

The verdict of the world must be registered, and the United States should take the lead in denouncing the unjustified imprisonment of 17 million human beings behind the walls of imperialistic communism.

What Is the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, an editorial recently appeared in the Farmington Valley Herald concerning the Fed-

eral Communications Commission's proposal to change the status of certain existing television stations through a policy of deintermixture. One of the stations which would be affected is channel 3 in my home district of Hartford, Conn. The editorial is a timely one and proposes an important question as to what the public interest is. I commend the content of this editorial to the Members of the House.

WHAT IS THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

The Federal Communications Commission, the regulatory agency for radio and television, has proposed changing a number of television stations from their present very high frequencies (VHF) to ultra high frequencies (UHF). The move is being undertaken in the public interest, according to the Commission.

Governor Dempsey promptly clarified the public interest as it exists in Connecticut with this statement:

"Channel 3 has established itself as an invaluable asset to Connecticut and adjoining areas through the years it has served the public as a VHF (very high frequency) television station.

In all phases of its operations—public information, entertainment, education—it has consistently adhered to a policy of high quality and has demonstrated an unusually high sense of public responsibility.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) now proposes to transfer this station from its present channel 3 to channel 76, a UHF (ultra high frequency) band. The effect of this change would be to deny to hundreds of thousands of residents the many benefits which channel 3 has brought to their homes and their communities.

To those many thousands of people in Connecticut and adjoining areas who would be deprived of their only acceptable television service, channel 3 has become a vital part of their lives. The loss to them of channel 3 as a VHF station would be contrary to the public interest."

Before the FCC decides any permanent action, it should first determine just what the public interest is, and then act in that direction. The retention of channel 3 as a VHF station is most definitely in the public interest, and the Commission should immediately recognize that fact. Let the Commission authorize additional UHF outlets in the New England area, but it should not deny New Englanders the right to choose, or even to retain. Keep channel 3 right where it is.

Congressman Zablocki, Democrat, Milwaukee, Wis., Urged National Democrat Chairman To Dismiss Paul Corbin, His Special Assistant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the State of Wisconsin I was interested to read an article in the widely read Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal for Sunday, August 27, stating that the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, Milwaukee, had asked John M. Bailey, the national Democrat chairman, to fire Paul Corbin, his special assistant.

Though he represents a different political philosophy than mine, we in Wisconsin have the greatest respect for Congressman ZABLOCKI, and I know that his colleagues on both sides of the aisle regard him as a statesman of high integrity, honesty, and ability.

When Congressman ZABLOCKI makes such a charge I, for one, believe his views should be given the most serious consideration.

The article discloses that Mr. Corbin is not only Mr. Bailey's special assistant but is a man of extensive influence in the administration, screening and selecting some of the most highly placed persons in the Federal Government.

I sincerely believe it should be the proper concern of everyone, regardless of party affiliation, as to who is passing upon the integrity and prudence of the persons presently being appointed to high Government service.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request permission at this point to extend my remarks and insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the news story headed "Urges Corbin Be Dropped."

The article follows:

URGES CORBIN BE DROPPED—ZABLOCKI SAYS PLEAS MADE REPEATEDLY TO PARTY CHAIRMAN

Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Milwaukee, disclosed Saturday that he repeatedly had asked John M. Bailey, the national Democratic chairman, to fire Paul Corbin, his special assistant. ZABLOCKI said that he would repeat his request Monday.

ZABLOCKI said that his most recent request was made to Bailey Wednesday night at a reception given by the National Democratic Committee to Members of Congress at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington.

It was disclosed Thursday that Corbin's political power—apparently derived from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy—in the national Democratic committee has caused growing wonder, in view of his political history, which includes working with Wisconsin Communists 15 years ago.

HELPED KENNEDY CAMPAIGN

It was brought out that Corbin, 47, a former Janesville public relations man, succeeded in making his first national impact when he joined Senator John F. Kennedy's Wisconsin presidential primary campaign in 1960.

For his work in the Wisconsin primary and for his subsequent campaign efforts in the West Virginia and upper New York presidential primaries, Corbin wound up with the post of special assistant to Bailey. He handles patronage in the national committee headquarters at Washington.

ZABLOCKI was an early and leading Wisconsin supporter of Kennedy's presidential campaign. He is considered to be close to the Kennedy administration.

The Congressman said that at the Mayflower reception Wednesday night he called Bailey's attention to "the continuing displeasure of Members of Congress that Corbin is with the National Democratic Committee."

SUBJECT TO INVESTIGATION

"I urged Mr. Bailey to look into the matter and sever Corbin's connections with the National Democratic Committee," said ZABLOCKI. "I did this because I had realized that Corbin's past activities were the subject of an investigation by a House committee (on un-American activities).

"At that time I told him that it was my understanding and that of several other Members of Congress that Mr. Corbin was to have been fired some time ago and we cannot understand why he still is with the Democratic national committee.

"However, Mr. Bailey again repeated that Mr. Corbin was never fired. Mr. Bailey assured me that this matter of getting rid of Corbin from the national committee would receive immediate attention."

ZABLOCKI said that since Wednesday night's reception he had not heard from Bailey.

Bailey was not in Washington Saturday.

ZABLOCKI also disclosed that he had discussed Corbin's position with Lawrence O'Brien of the White House staff. He said that he had told O'Brien that Corbin should never have been hired "and now should be fired."

ZABLOCKI said that he had received a number of complaints from Democrats in his Fourth Wisconsin Congressional District questioning the propriety of Corbin's position.

He said that one of the complainants was a Democrat who charged that Corbin had asked him some 15 years ago to join the Communist Party and to give contributions to the Communist Party. (Corbin has denied the charge.)

"This Democrat who lives in my district told me that he would testify under oath at any time and anywhere that he might be supenaed that Corbin had asked him to become a Communist and to give funds to the Communist cause," said ZABLOCKI.

TELLS OF RESERVATIONS

ZABLOCKI said that he had been a Democrat "all my life and Mr. Paul Corbin was not known to me until the Wisconsin presidential primary campaign."

"I had reservations about Corbin from the first day I met him," said ZABLOCKI. "Because of his past associations with individuals who were known Communists and because of his activities in certain organizations, it is natural that he would be suspect.

"Corbin should be given every opportunity to defend himself and clarify his record. I am sure this opportunity will be given him."

ZABLOCKI said that he would insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stories and an editorial printed on Corbin in the Milwaukee Journal.

The Congressman said that he would also insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared Friday in the Janesville Daily Gazette. It was titled "The Paul Corbin Story."

General Walker Vindicated by Senate Action After Shameful Treatment by the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few weeks ago that Gen. Edwin A. Walker was relieved of his command in Germany by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, for indoctrinating his troops with the truth about communism. Many of us objected, and I assure you we will continue to object, to the shameful treatment of this

fine American soldier. Now he has been completely vindicated by action of the Senate in approving the bill to make the Peace Corps permanent and adding to it an amendment that all volunteers must be indoctrinated in "the philosophy, strategy, tactics, and menace of communism." In this connection I call to your attention the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

OH, MR. FULBRIGHT

The Senate dodged a record vote in approving a $40 million appropriation to place the Kennedy Peace Corps on a permanent basis. The reluctance to go on record is easily explained. The Senators had profound misgivings about the practicality of the program, but they were afraid to oppose it and expose themselves to the charge that they lacked idealism.

An oddity of the legislation was that an amendment offered by Senator MILLER, of Iowa, and unanimously approved, wrote an instruction into law that volunteers in the Corps must be indoctrinated in "the philosophy, strategy, tactics, and menace of communism."

Now, the belief that such instruction, both of troops and of the public, is imperative has characterized the outlook of many high military officers. Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker thought so, and initiated a course for troops under his command in Germany. Many other men in responsible commands thought it extremely proper to respond to directives issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1958 which charged military officers with the duty to inform the people, and particularly those in uniform, concerning the total nature of communism and its many methods and weapons of attack.

But, for doing precisely this, General Walker was reprimanded and put on the shelf, and all of his brother officers were gagged in a Defense Department directive of July 10 which has been given President Kennedy's public approval. This change of policy was the consequence of a fantastic memorandum sent by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to the Secretary of Defense.

FULBRIGHT denounced military men for "right wing radicalism" and said that there was "little, if any, need" to alert the American people to the menace of communism. His document has been attacked on the Senate floor as a prime exhibit of anti-anti-communism and an invitation to appeasement.

Yet, if it is the policy of the Fulbrights, the Kennedys, and the whole administration that nobody must be educated in the nature and methods of communism, what has this crowd to say about the fact that the Senate unanimously declares that these are the very topics in which members of the Kennedy Peace Corps are to be schooled? And, if the vote was unanimous, does that mean Senator FULBRIGHT has recanted?

Castro's There—Isn't He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, "the little man who isn't there" is there—and constantly throwing barbs at the United States.

Robert T. Hartmann, Washington bureau chief for the Los Angeles Times, provides us with a graphic—and disturbing—picture of a Communist island only 90 miles from our shores in the Times of August 18, 1961:

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Last night I saw upon the stair
A little man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today—
Gee whiz, I wish he'd go away!

This is an approximately accurate if indelicate parody of the administration's current attitude toward Fidel Castro's Cuba which is now openly branded a Communist satellite in the western hemisphere.

Unfortunately, Cuba is there. It is closer to the United States than Berlin is to West Germany, closer than Formosa is to Red China, closer than San Nicolas Island is to downtown Los Angeles. And Castro will not go away.

President Kennedy, whose paternal winter palace is within easy range of Cuban pirates, plainly does not like to talk about Cuba. He emphasized at his last press conference that Americans must not be diverted by minor matters from attention to the important inter-American social and economic conference at Punta del Este in Uruguay.

Mr. Kennedy was dissuaded from going to Punta del Este himself and sent instead a retread Republican, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon.

Castro also sent his pet banker, Argentine-born Che Guevara high-scoring Communist of the Latin league and the evil genius of Cuba's revolution. Unless my able friends reporting from Punta del Este have all taken leave of their senses, Guevara has been makiny monkys out of Mr. "Moneybags" Dillon and his Yanqui delegation. All Latins really love this.

Now some Americans express shock and surprise that we are unable to get 19 other OAS members to unite in condemning Cuba, or even to commend the general principle of free elections in flawless Spanish. Why should anyone be surprised? In one of its most cynical deals the United States went along with Venezuela and others exactly a year ago to outlaw Trujillo's Dominican Republic and then watched helplessly while the good neighbors welshed on Castro.

The shameful truth is that the man from Havana stole the show at the much-touted launching of President Kennedy's Alianza para Progreso and we have been had again. Next Monday the Communists in British Guiana may write its epitaph by winning the first free election Communists have ever won anywhere, with full legality and proper certification by a British Conservative government. The first Red beachhead in South America borders on Brazil, Venezuela and another of the last European enclaves on the continent we have kept free since the Monroe Doctrine.

One clever Communist, Guevara, made it perfectly obvious to anyone who knows up from down that the alianza is just another name for U.S. interference in the internal affairs of its sovereign neighbors. If no political strings attach to our dollars, why, in all logic, can't a Communist member in good standing get some, too?

Of course there are strings, and always have been. The Eisenhower aid program for Latin America sought to strengthen "sound peso" regimes, reflecting the "sound dollar" views of the giver. The Kennedy plan differs only in the objective of U.S. meddling, paralleling the New Frontier's domestic goals. Now we insist upon sweeping social reforms as the condition of our "cooperation"—which means cash.

All this is proper and perhaps necessary. But it is not the way to stop communism in the time we have left and it is not the answer to Cuba. I do not pretend to be a Latin expert. I have made the South American circuit three times, only once oftener than Adlai Stevenson, and it is no more my academic specialty than Arthur Schlesinger's, so how can I challenge the counsels they gave Mr. Kennedy? But if I understand it, I have never seen a scheme more certain to fail.

We are going to ignore Castro and let the whole Communist world make Cuba the open Soviet showplace of the Caribbean. By concentrating a fraction of what they steal from invisible wretches behind the Iron Curtain on this tiny island, the Communists in short order can show a greater contrast between Cuba and most Latin countries (including Puerto Rico) than now exists between the two Berlins.

Meanwhile, President Kennedy proposes to drag, wheedle and bribe a score of rival and reluctant ruling oligarchies into voluntarily planning their own extinction. Somehow four centuries of progreso will be bought at a bargain price of $20 billion, providing Congress adds to the $500 million grudgingly advanced on an old Eisenhower I O U.

Serious Fresh Water Shortage May Hit Nation by Year 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I introduce into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Trainman News of August 21, 1961. It is concerned with a subject of the greatest importance to all of us—an adequate supply of clean water.

The article lauds the work of this Congress in passing the recent water pollution control bill, and rightfully praises the work of my colleague and dear friend, JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota.

The article points up the importance of continuing to pay close attention to our water pollution control program, and warns, by implication, that we in Congress may not sit on our laurels in the future. The demands on our water supply are getting greater and greater. Increases in both population and industrialization are multiplying the danger of pollution—and we dare not let these dangers become realities.

The article follows:

POLLUTION IS MAJOR THREAT—SERIOUS FRESH WATER SHORTAGE MAY HIT NATION BY YEAR 2000

Despite those pictures of the drought-parched northern plains that are beginning to appear, the United States has always been a water-wealthy nation. That isn't going to be true very much longer.

"Few Americans are aware that the Nation's fresh-water supply might be in serious trouble by the end of the century unless immediate, large-scale measures are taken to conserve this irreplaceable resource, protect its purity and develop new supplies," the August 1961, report of Population Bulletin points out.

"By the end of the century" used to be a comfortable, far-off phrase rather than an ominously close one. But figure it out for yourself. If the average life expectancy is now approaching 70, then men and women

in the 30-year bracket are going to see the year 2000, and what happens then won't be just theoretical.

In all there will be between 295 million and 420 million Americans alive in the year 2000, and they are going to need an awful lot of pure water.

There is much doubt that they will get it if our present mishandling of our water resources continues very much longer. By the year 2000 we will be able to supply our population with between 600 and 650 billion gallons of water a day—but this is our fixed water supply, all that the Nation will ever have, and we will have to depend on reuse of the same water and desalting of ocean water if we are to meet increased demands.

Right now water pollution is one of our major problems, pollution both from industrial wastes and sewage. Unless the country becomes more aroused over the pollution problem, the Nation as a whole is in for the water shortage tragedy that afflicts many other nations, such as Spain and north Africa.

There are many parts of western United States where water is being "mined" to such an extent that reserves have practically been exhausted and it is not certain how much longer agricultural irrigation can be permitted.

Ground and water supplies are now very limited in parts of Kentucky, West Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Georgia, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas

The Middle West, even with its magnificent Great Lakes, has its water troubles and may feel the pressure of increasing demands on its water supplies to flush away its sewage and industrial wastes within the next 10 years.

The Great Plains Dust Bowl covering some 14 million acres, once again is threatening to return and a repetition of the duststorm disaster of 1934–35 as a possibility.

The populous East more and more is faced with pollution problems that threatens its drinking water with one city drawing its water from another city's wastes. Today, we are wryly told, millions of us drink "antiseptic sewage." Even the "antiseptic" becomes suspect when New Jersey has to forbid clam digging in Raritan Bay and the great Chesapeake Bay has its polluted oyster beds.

Industrial pollution in all likelihood may be even greater than pollution by sewage. Great portions of Pennsylvania, lower New York, Maryland and Delaware, Ohio, Illinois, and other industrialized States today are polluted by acids, alkalis, oils, greases, salts of copper, zinc, cyanides and even radioactive materials. In coastal cities salt water seeps in as fresh water is pumped out.

Fortunately, after years of shameful neglect and inadequate steps, the United States has taken a major step in meeting the problem of providing good fresh water to all our people. Despite the usual cries of "States rights" and Federal intervention, Congress has just enacted a water pollution control bill that may serve to check the worst pollution abuses.

Under the leadership of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, who long has been interested in national resources, Congress has amended its 1956 Water Pollution Act, greatly strengthening it.

This provides a $570 million Federal program for control of pollution. Matching grants will be made to States and local communities for the building of water-treatment sewage disposal plants. Half of the money will go to smaller communities with less than 125,000 population—cities which have been unable to meet the financial burdens of adequate sewage treatment facilities.

The new legislation also puts teeth into the enforcement powers of the Federal Government so that municipalities which neglect their responsibilities and pass their sewage on to others may be brought before the courts.

The 1961 victory of the antipollution forces in Congress who believe the Federal Government must take a strong hand should put to rest any further ideas that water pollution can be safely left to local care.

President Eisenhower, in vetoing the amendments passed by Congress in 1960, made the extraordinary claim that "water pollution is a uniquely local blight, that primary responsibility for solving the problem lies not with the Federal Government but rather must be assumed and exercised as it has been by State and local government."

This statement, of course, was in line with the general conservative philosophy of passing on to the States and local communities any problems and accompanying expenditures that are likely to involve the stiff Federal income tax rather than regressive State and local taxes. Nevertheless, it is an amazing statement in the face of the overwhelmingly national impact of any continued breakdown in the provision of unpolluted and abundant water to the American people.

Outside of the air we breathe, water is probably the one completely nationwide resource that is vital to us as a nation, to our strength and even to our security. To leave it to local and State action is to risk catastrophe.

An Educational Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, delivered the commencement address at the 95th commencement exercise at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Stanton's address is an excellent commentary on the foreign aid program. His chief criticism of the program is its lack of emphasis on education.

Dr. Stanton bases his thesis on the sound and correct principle that few things are possible in the absence of education. He suggests that our foreign-aid program be reexamined in the light of this world need.

I am pleased to bring Dr. Stanton's address to the attention of my colleagues:

AN EDUCATIONAL MARSHALL PLAN

(By Frank Stanton)[1]

Let me first congratulate all of you who are receiving degrees here this morning. Throughout the world, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has an unsurpassed reputation for excellence created by a century of the highest distinction in training exceptional minds. As your impressive centennial convocation this spring demonstrated, you have won recognition in high places everywhere as serious, responsible people, willing to work hard in the pursuit of knowledge—a pursuit that has grown almost daily more intricate, even within the short years that you have been here. I salute you.

As initiates into the company of learned men and women, you will find that training in the disciplines of science gives you capacities that go far beyond the laboratory. I hope that it does no violence to your serene relationships up the Charles, if I cite the perceptive language of the Harvard committee's report, "General Education in a Free Society," which states: "* * * science is both the outcome and the source of the habit of forming objective, disinterested judgments based upon exact evidence. Such a habit is of particular value in the formation of citizens for a free society. It opposes to the arbitrariness of authority and 'first principles' the direct and continuing appeal to things as they are. Thus it develops the qualities of the free man."

"The formation of citizens for a free society" has been the substance and the major point of the American experience. Scientific excellence in itself—as we know only too well—can be achieved in authoritarian societies, where it becomes the master of men, even though it may ultimately go down under the weight of political tyranny. Only when scientific accomplishment is in league with freedom does it become an advantageous servant of man in his perpetual quest for self-fulfillment. It is significant that this Republic had its beginnings in an age as hospitable to scientific inquiry as it was to political innovation.

The vision of democracy that was held by the men who launched the first great revolution in its name, and who constructed an incomparable constitution to give it practical expression, was shared by men everywhere in the Western World. It was an age of optimism, of confidence, in which there was a pressing democratic instinct even where there was not yet explicit democratic faith. The climate of the world was favorable to the democratic adventure.

And conditions in these Colonies were no less favorable for the architects of our democracy. The times were relaxed. The country was small and homogeneous, and we spoke one language. We had roots of democratic thought and experiments transplanted here by our English forebears and going back over the centuries to the seeds germinated by Magna Carta. We were far removed from the rest of the world and its strifes, and relatively unmolested. And we had time to develop slowly the institutions upon which the success of any undertaking in self-government is bound to depend.

In spite of these healthful conditions surrounding our beginnings, there was a clear awareness among the founders of the Nation that this democracy could not survive without an educated and informed people. Franklin, Adams, Madison, Jefferson—all noted the dependence of self-government in any effective form on general education.

Now, two centuries later, new nations are springing into being all over the world, hopefully groping toward democratic characters and destinies of their own. Two great continents, Asia and Africa, have seen in little more than a decade the launching on their own course of two score newly independent nations. In Latin America, old nations, imbued with a new spirit of self-determination, have thrown off the chains of old dogmas and old institutions to venture upon the hazardous trial and error of democracy. Upon the transition of all these nations into resolute, working democracies hangs the fate of the free world. Their success is the re-

[1] In addition to heading CBS, Dr. Stanton is chairman of the board of the Rand Corp., a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and a director of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York. He was introduced by Chairman James R. Killian, Jr.

sponsibility of the whole community of free nations and particularly, because of our strength and resources, of the United States.

What are the odds for these people in a world of violent contention: where everyone is on everyone else's doorstep; where events move so fast there is barely time to react, let alone to understand; where there is an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust and a history of pressures and interventions; where good people, freed from the burden of centuries, bravely set forth upon the most difficult of all governmental experiments with no foundation in democracy whatsoever?

In the hopeful climate of 200 years ago, our founders warned that, without education, we would fail. Is it safe—perhaps I should say is it not reckless—to assume that, in this agitated world, these new nations will survive without even minimal education? Or that they can take a century or two—as we did—to evolve their own institutions without help? Would it be going too far to suggest that it borders on criminal negligence that we here in this crucible of democracy have not given top priority to helping these new nations educate their people?

Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent some $85 billion for foreign aid. Of this, $12 billion went into the Marshall plan, the greatest act of reconstruction in history. Since 1952, the vast bulk of the remaining $73 billion has gone to military, mutual security, technical, and industrial purposes. Only an incidental trickle—split among a score of projects—has borne directly on education—which we ourselves have called the first prerequisite of a democratic society. One by one the emerging nations of Africa and Asia have said that education is their first concern. One by one they have given it the largest share of their limited revenues. And one by one they have seen us neglect to give to their educational development the same high priority we have given their economic and military development.

At the 23d International Conference on Public Education in Geneva last summer, four countries—Ethiopia, Ghana, India, and Pakistan—reported that English has been either adopted as an official language or made compulsory at some level in the schools. These nations represent a total population of some 500 million—one-sixth of the world's people. It is not difficult to imagine the energy and funds the Soviets would have poured into the teaching of their language to these people had Russian been chosen instead of English. Five hundred million people—and right now the United States is making instruction in English possible to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of that total in foreign lands all over the world.

Public libraries, which in our own national experience have been a vital component in the educational machinery (are a commonplace in the satellite countries and still a conspicuous rarity in most of the emerging free nations. Czechoslovakia has 14,431 public libraries; Cambodia has 1. Hungary has 4,360; Ghana has 13. Rumania has 13,645; Pakistan has 59. Poland has 6,594; Korea has 16. The Communists have taken seriously the belief of Benjamin Franklin that public libraries contribute directly to the political awareness of the people.

I wonder whether at a pivotal point in history we are not walking into the trap of a bitter irony. In a world where the democratic idea is on trial in more places, under more desperate conditions, than ever before, we are practicing economic determinism, when we know from every evidence of our own experience that the only road to democratic fulfillment is educational determinism.

There have been—and still are—practical material problems that we ought to help the new and developing nations solve. I am not sure that all of them are foremost problems. I know that the solutions that we advance in terms of technical aid are only stopgaps unless we help solve the larger problem of education. I know that military aid can become a powder keg in the hands of a people unless they are educated. I am sure that education is the neglected world frontier, the neglected world opportunity. As the world's leading democracy we ought to take a good hard look at our national policy on foreign aid and see if we are doing enough to prepare the emerging nations to be truly self-governing and self-sufficient.

Let us take a look at Asia, where 19 new nations have come into being since the end of the war. At a regional meeting of Asian member states of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, in Karachi, in 1960, it was found that there were some 87 million children in 15 countries who have no educational facilities whatsoever and that the other 65 million children go to crowded, inadequate schools for a few elementary grades. One of the most striking social facts of our time is the energy, the determination, the responsible sense of democratic purpose with which many of these countries have moved forward on this front, in spite of the huge dimensions of the need. But in Burma there is still compulsory free schooling only to the age of 11, and in Cambodia and Iran only to 12. And in Burma and Cambodia only 59 percent, and in Iran, 38 percent, of the children get even that. In 22 countries of tropical Africa less than half the children go to even the first grade of primary schools—though some of these nations have tripled the number of their schools in less than a decade.

But the real waste of human resources and the short selling of the democratic effort come in the secondary school bracket. Primary school can do little more than prepare one for the mechanics of living—the reading and writing and arithmetic necessary for ordinary daily transactions. Secondary school is the earliest level where education begins to involve the larger purposes relating to the ability to make distinctions, judgments and decisions that is the very essence of self-government. A people able to read but lacking the knowledge to assess their reading are far readier prospects for totalitarian propaganda than the wholly illiterate. Yet in Asia secondary school is a luxury for the few, running as low as 16 percent of children of eligible age in Iran. And in the 22 countries of tropical Africa, an average of only 5 percent of the primary school children ever enter a secondary school, and in only 4 of the countries does the number going to secondary school exceed 7 percent.

We know that these are not meaningless statistics. Events in the vastly different countries of the Congo and South Korea leave profoundly disturbing evidence that we have turned our backs on the lessons of our own history in hoping or expecting that democracy can take root anywhere without an educated people. In the Belgian Congo, a nation of 14 million, there were just 12,158 pupils in general secondary schools when it received its independence. There were only 549 college students—most of them in agricultural college. There were said to be a dozen university graduates.

Now, with our long heritage of starting free public schools and vigorous colleges long before we were independent and of founding schools at every stop as we spread across this continent, our land-grant program to make possible the establishment of great universities, our personal conviction that our first duty is the eduction of our children—with this background, how can we assume that if we give emerging nations guns and monkey wrenches, tanks, and cement mixers, economic aid and technical assistance, they will become self-governing peoples and stay free?

We find ourselves pushed into defensiveness by Russian ruthlessness because we have lost sight of our values in an effort to wage peace on their terms. We have overlooked the most important peacetime offensive that a democracy can make—a massive educational development program. We need to abandon the old hope that we can ever make the world safe for democracy by strengthening military and economic resources alone. South Korea, gripped today in a military dictatorship, bears unhappy witness to the tragedy of such shortsightedness. We need to make democracy safe for the world by so strengthening human resources that all men once blessed with the vision of freedom will be capable of its realization. We should remember the comment of Epictetus, who recalled the fall of Athenian democracy because only the few were educated: "The state says that only freemen will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

It may be that democracy will be irreparably damaged if the Russians get to the moon before us. It may be that it will be in permanent danger if another of their astronauts is put into orbit ahead of ours. I don't know. But of this I am absolutely certain: democracy cannot survive ignorance, superstition, credulousness, and all the awful uncertainty, the fatal incompetence and the harsh defensiveness of those who have neither knowledge nor understanding—for they will be easy and inevitable victims of aggression from without or corruption from within.

Only education—not manned flights to the moon, not new nuclear tests below the surface or in outer space, not webs of highways and patches of landing fields dotting half the planet—can ultimately prevent the sure collapse of a free nation unequal to its freedom.

This, it seems to me, is the historic opportunity of America in this second half of the 20th century. This is the great new act of faith that America can announce to a world tired and discouraged with rivalries on terms dictated by Russian militarism and materialism.

But it cannot be met by multiplying the fragmented efforts already spread among a dozen agencies. It cannot be met by foundations and universities which are already straining at the seams to support their great work of pilot projects and which have made an enormous contribution from their limited resources. It cannot be met without boldness, without specific commitment, without massive economic support.

The importance of international education development has long been in the air. It has been the subject of speeches and reports and resolutions. Let us now revert to the ancient duty of a democratic people and take the initiative as free citizens. Let us undertake, and be prepared to support, a great Marshall plan of educational aid, a 10-year program amounting each year to perhaps a fifth of our current foreign aid commitment and replacing significant parts of it.

Let us say to the President that we are ready to reaffirm our faith in the democratic ideal and ask of him his direct and personal leadership in marshaling the resources and the talents of this country in a powerful, unified effort at international educational development—not as an adjunct to something else but as the major contribution for the next decade of the world's strongest democracy to the survival of the free world.

Let us urge the Secretary of State that, as a matter of basic policy, we add to the

familiar trio of implements expressing our foreign policy—diplomacy, military aid, and economic assistance—a great fourth arm, educational development.

Let us emphasize to the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees that, mindful of the great good of the student exchange program, as of other limited international educational projects, we believe now that we must no longer atomize, camouflage, and improvise in this field but create a mighty force to give free nations all over the world the only real chance they have for survival and growth—an educated people.

Let us invite other freedom-loving countries to join us in this effort both through increased support of UNESCO and the United Nations Special Fund, and through direct support of educational development in the emerging nations. But let us make it clear to the world that, with others or alone, we are intent upon helping those nations to become vigorous enlightened democracies.

As for ourselves—a Nation of 110,000 primary schools, 30,000 secondary schools, 2,000 colleges and universities, and 70,000 libraries, a Nation which recognized from its beginnings that education was our best hope, a nation which this month will confer a half million academic degrees in scores of disciplines—let us not rest until we have helped the free peoples of the world become capable of the self-government for which they so nobly and hopefully yearn.

This great prospect will not bring you rest as you begin your careers today. But, as Justice Holmes said, repose is not the lot of man. You can have in your time the satisfaction of an affirmative response to the overwhelming realities of our world. And that is enough, for that is the great work facing your generation and remaining to mine, as we see to it that this troubled century makes its point in history.

Another Failure Chalked Up to Our Intelligence Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have been caught flatfooted whenever any international development of any significance takes place. The most recent failure of our intelligence agents came to light with the sudden resignation of Janio Quadros, President of Brazil. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune makes interesting reading on this point:

THEY STILL CALL IT INTELLIGENCE

Janio Quadros, Brazil's leftwing President, has resigned and for the moment, at least, it seems unlikely that his leftwing Vice President will return home to take over the office. News of the abdication reached Vice President Goulart while he was en route to Brazil from Communist China where he had just negotiated a $56-million trade agreement. Mr. Goulart decided that this is an ideal moment to visit his children in Madrid. It is an ideal moment, also, for him to stay away from Brazil if we may believe the statement of the Acting President.

Quadros, although his regime was largely sustained by American handouts during his 7 months in office, managed to prod the United States with a dirty dig as he signed out. His crack about being undermined by outside forces of reaction was quickly interpreted by leftists as an accusation that he had been done in by the United States. Immediately there were the familiar rock throwings at the U.S. Embassy and Information Agency.

Almost equally interesting is the fact that Washington again was caught flatfooted by an unexpected development. On the very morning that Quadros took off, the Kennedy administration announced the appointment of Prof. Lincoln Gordon of Harvard to the "sensitive" spot as Ambassador to Brazil. The professor evidently was chosen in the belief that he was just the fellow to jolly along the neurotic Quadros, who had taken umbrage at reminders of the former Ambassador, John M. Cabot, that Brazil's rightful place was with the American and not the Communist system.

This is another intelligence flop to rank with a long succession, dating from Washington's failure in 1948 to forecast the Communist directed riots in Bogotá, Colombia, which disrupted the conference of the Organization of American States. The prestige of the United States suffered a black eye on that occasion, for the Secretary of State, the late George C. Marshall, was caught on the scene of a well organized anti-American demonstration.

More recently there was the terrible flop of the rebel invasion of Cuba, in which intelligence again did not shine, though its failure was no worse than the executive bungling that launched the expedition.

It can only be hoped that our cloak and dagger corps will be able to recover after being caught off balance in Brazil, and that it will be able to achieve some realistic forecast of probabilities to govern our wavering policy toward that country. One of the guesses which has gained currency is that Quadros resigned only in order to whip up the sentiment of his supporters, so that he may return to office with a "mandate" to run a one-man show.

This is quite possible, but whether it will happen we leave to the Central Intelligence Agency, which is almost certain to guess wrong.

What Does Agriculture Mean To Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement forwarded me by Mr. M. S. Shaw, director, extension service, in Mississippi. I commend this statement to the Members of Congress:

WHAT DOES AGRICULTURE MEAN TO ME?

FOOD, CLOTHING, OTHER GOODS

Our Nation is blessed with a remarkable abundance, variety, and high quality of foods. The cost? If you are an average American, you're now spending only about 20 percent of your free-to-spend income for food. That's more than 2 percent less than you spent in 1939. But this percentage averages 42 percent for the people of Japan and 56 percent in Russia.

You enjoy the comfort and beauty of cotton for clothing and many fabrics used in your home. Cotton has important industrial uses too. Don't forget things made of wood, including paper. Many of our plastics come pretty directly from agriculture.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Our surplus of some agricultural products may be a blessing in disguise. Think how it would be if we had that much of a shortage of the same items. We're way ahead of Russia and her satellites on this—they have serious agricultural shortages. Warmongers short on food hesitate to wage war on a nation with an abundance of food.

Only about 9 percent of our people grow food and fiber for the rest of us. This releases manpower for the Armed Forces and other necessary activities. Most other countries aren't doing nearly this well in proportion to their total populations.

We're sharing our agricultural abundance and technical know-how with other countries to strengthen the free world.

ME, A FARMER?

Many of us were reared on farms but not so many are there now. Maybe you prefer not to farm or would rather that your children didn't. All right, a lot of us can do other things because it doesn't take many people on farms to feed the rest of us. Remember, in some countries it still takes half or more of the people to feed the other half.

But think a minute about the opportunities for your children in agriculture. Although it takes a lot of capital and knowledge to succeed there, a modern farm is a wonderful kind of a manufacturing plant, using machinery and chemicals to make living things grow better. It takes a lot more people than those working on farms to supply the things farmers must have and to get their products to you in the forms that you want them. There's the whole food industry, for instance.

A lot of our young folks want careers in science. Agricultural research offers them the opportunity to study just as deeply as in any other field with plenty to be done in adding to our basic knowledge.

FARMERS DOING PRETTY WELL?

There's talk that with subsidies for some things that he grows, other Government programs and all, a farmer's income is pretty good. The fact is that he gets only 37 cents out of each $1 that you spend for food. Only a few years ago his share was about 50 cents. So you see what's happening.

Some examples: For a man's $4 business shirt, the farmer's share is about 29 cents. The farmer gets 11 cents from a 25-cent quart of milk, a little over 2 cents for the wheat in a 20-cent loaf of white bread, and less than 2½ cents for the corn in a 26-cent box of corn flakes.

WHAT ABOUT AGRICULTURE IN MISSISSIPPI?

It's our biggest industry. And a lot of other industries depend directly upon it. It's growing.

It already accounts for $3.2 billion worth of business a year.

Add it up.

Six hundred million dollars—farmers receive for crop and livestock sales (1959):

Crops	$390,000,000
Livestock	252,000,000

Two billion six hundred million dollars—agri-business for transporting, processing, distributing, and merchandising farm products and providing farm supplies, including:

[In millions of dollars]

Processing farm products (1959): wages paid	264
Wholesaling farm products (1958):	
Sales	813
Wages paid	25
Retailing farm products (1958):	
Sales	682
Wages paid	55
Farm supplies purchased (1959)	441

Most of these figures represent big increases in recent years.

Many other businesses are also part of agriculture.

So our $3.2 billion is a conservative figure.

MORE REASONS WHY MISSISSIPPI'S AGRICULTURE IS HEALTHY

About 40 percent of our farmers' income now comes from livestock. This was just over $250 million last year. It is far more stable and sound than farm income mostly from row crops as we had not a great many years ago. The trend in our livestock income is up, and it's helping to push our entire agricultural income up. This helps everyone.

Total physical assets of Mississippi farmers was estimated at about $2.5 billion as of January 1, 1960.

Farm loans outstanding from all public agencies totaled more than $380 million on January 1, 1961. This does not take into consideration the vast amount of consumer credit and private credit for both production items and consumer goods used by farmers.

Cotton accounted for about 46 percent of all sales from Mississippi farms in 1959, or more than $288 million.

Sales of forest products in 1959 were estimated at more than $69 million.

Almost 275,000 people were employed on farms in Mississippi in 1959. This does not include the thousands of other workers in hundreds of related industries and service organizations.

Be proud of our agriculture. Tell others about it.

Resolution Adopted by the City Commissions of Amarillo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the City Commission of the City of Amarillo, Tex., recently adopted a resolution setting forth the feeling of that honorable body with relation to the acceptance of Federal funds for the purpose of solving local problems that can and should be solved at the local level.

Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all parties may have an opportunity to observe the feeling and the philosophy therein expressed:

Whereas we believe in the providence of God, that all men are created in His image and that He is the source of every man's power and freedom; and

Whereas we believe in the worth and importance of the individual; and

Whereas we believe that the way to build a responsible society is to leave communities free to make their own decisions and solve their own problems; and

Whereas we believe that our Nation's strength is found in its individuals and communities; and

Whereas we believe that most of the problems of our time can be solved at the community level; and

Whereas we believe that governmental action should be at the local level where possible; at the State level where the problem is clearly the responsibility of the State; and at the National level only where the Constitution clearly provides and then only in matters which are clearly beyond the resources of local or State government or in matters pertaining to the National security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Amarillo, That, believing these things, the present City Commission of the City of Amarillo will not seek nor will it accept on behalf of the citizens of Amarillo, financial aid from the Government of the United States for the purpose of solving local problems that can and should be solved at the local level.

Adopted by the city commission on this 24th day of August 1961.

JACK SEALE,
Mayor.
HENRY E. HERTNER,
Commissioner.
RAY S. DANIEL,
Commissioner.
HENRY M. BEVERLEY,
Commissioner.

Should Congressional Committee Hearings Be Televised?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, the dean of the New York delegation and one of the most experienced and honored Members of the House of Representatives, is the author of an article which appeared in the TV Guide under the title of "What Television Would Do to Congress." This article deals with the exposition to television of hearings by the various committees of the House of Representatives. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the position taken by Congressman CELLER, a serious question is raised for the consideration of the people of this country. His, as ever, considered and thoughtful views I find are a source of enlightenment:

SHOULD CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE HEARINGS BE TELEVISED?—A VETERAN CONGRESSMAN SAYS "NO" AND TELLS WHY

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee)

Hearings before congressional committees, like regular sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives, have traditionally been open to members of the public and to the press. This enables the people to keep posted on the activities of their Government, as befits citizens in a democracy. With the coming of television the question has arisen whether this powerful new mass medium should be given the run of congressional hearing rooms under the same terms, subject only to technical limitations, as are now accorded members of the working press. The Senate has no rule on the subject—each committee decides for itself, and Senate committee hearings are sometimes televised. On the House side, however, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has, wisely, I believe, refused to permit televising of committee hearings. The present statement was stimulated by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S interesting article in the May 6 issue of TV Guide magazine, in which he advocates the use of television in this area.

Those who, like Senator MCCLELLAN, recommend that congressional hearings should be televised stress the growing interest of the American people in public affairs. To encourage and satisfy this interest, they argue, it is well to take the people fully into confidence by letting them see and hear, as well as read about, the legislative process.

Procedural fairness will be guaranteed, these protagonists of congressional TV contend, by the fact that possible dictatorial or arrogant behavior by Congressmen toward witnesses will show up and discredit those responsible. On the other hand, they urge, defiant, evasive, and untruthful witnesses will be deterred from excesses or be publicly exposed.

I am unable to share these optimistic estimates of the results of televising committee hearings. Indeed, I fear that we have much more to lose than to gain by turning these necessary factfinding proceedings into television spectaculars.

The heart of the matter is that television, for all its unquestioned wonders, is not well-adapted for broadcasting the sober, factfinding inquiries that committee hearings are supposed to be. Nor does the undoubted success of the medium in broadcasting ceremonies, addresses, press conferences, and debates afford a basis for contrary view. All such events are spectacles; they are intended to be spectacles. They edify as spectacles. What is more, whether the purpose be to dramatize our national traditions, to win or hold political support or to inform the audience on public issues, the participants in these spectacles exhibit themselves voluntarily.

By contrast, the purpose of committee hearings is neither to dramatize, nor to vie for political preferment, nor to entertain the public. It is to inform the members of the committees with respect to the virtues and shortcomings of pending measures and with respect to the need for legislation not yet introduced. Indeed, the sole justification for the exercise of the subpena power of Congress, with its attendant sanction of punishment for contempt, is the search for truth. What is more, in the exercise of that power, congressional committees frequently summon to their hearings participants who do not appear voluntarily, who have not participated in the formulation of the ground rules, and whose interest may even be to conceal or misstate the truth, rather than aid in its search. Whether subjecting such people to the glare of television cameras is calculated to transform their reluctance into cooperativeness is open to serious question.

Insofar as congressional committee hearings partake of the nature of accusatory proceedings, witnesses are neither accorded the traditional safeguards of the criminal law such as the right to cross-examine, nor do they enjoy the privacy imposed upon grand-jury proceedings. In consequence, if the chairman and committee members be unfair, witnesses face the risk of irreparable damage to their reputations under extremely unequal, not to say prejudicial, circumstances. What valid purpose can be served by subjecting them to the further ordeal of television lights and national network audiences?

There are other reasons why the medium is inappropriate for broadcasting such proceedings. I am breaching no confidence when I observe that Members of Congress are, in the nature of their elective office, extremely sensitive to publicity. The tendency of committee members to "get in the act" in the course of hearings is well known. This compulsive need to compete for the spotlight is immeasurably stimulated when the hearings are broadcast live.

Congressional TV cannot be justified by the assertion that the television public has a right to see and hear, in its living rooms, what goes on at these hearings. Historically,

the publicity of legal proceedings was and is a right of the litigants.

Nor has it been established that the interest of the people in receiving telecasts of committee hearings arises primarily from a desire to observe the Government at work. Judging from the type of broadcast the industry has presented, the general public is less interested in the serious, detailed consideration of problems than in the confessions of a Charles Van Doren, the humiliation of a Sherman Adams, the discomfiture of discredited corporate executives, the surliness of racketeers at bay, the number of times a witness takes the fifth amendment. It is the sensational, not the solid, on which coverage is focused.

Finally, it should be noted that although committee hearings are an important part of the legislative process, they are not the only or the most important part. It is the executive sessions of the committees in which the real give-and-take of the process predominantly takes place, and the debates on the floor of the House and Senate in which conflicting views and interests are finally resolved. Only the committee hearings, however, are proposed to be televised, for only they lend themselves to a publicity free-for-all for committee members.

I emphatically agree with the observation that Government business is not show business. The work of Congress requires sober reflection and quiet deliberation. It cannot operate at its best under the scrutiny of floodlights, invisible audiences and the confusion of light and sound equipment. We must not permit any practice, however popular, that tends to weaken the functioning of Government.

Extension of Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I introduce into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram I recently received in support of H.R. 8681. This bill, introduced by our distinguished colleague, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, would extend unemployment compensation benefits for an additional 13 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, if passed, would give great help to approximately 157,000 people of my city of Detroit. I would support it if only for that reason. But the unemployed in Detroit are not the only unemployed in the Nation.

There are over 100,000 people in the United States of America who have not been able to find gainful employment for over half a year. These are all people who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits. And these benefits were not exhausted yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Some of these men have been unemployed for years.

It is difficult, I know, to comprehend misery on such a grand scale. I therefore ask each Member of the House to read this telegram very carefully, and try, by extending the vision of what has happened in one factory, located in one city, to conceive of the heartache and hunger that passage of our colleague's bill would help to assuage:

HAMTRAMCK, MICH.,
August 17, 1961.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Anything you can do to build congressional support for Machrowicz bill, H.R. 8681, to extend unemployment compensation for additional 13-week period will be greatly appreciated. We have 9,000 people laid off at the Dodge main plant, 3,000 last September 29, 3,000 November 17 to 28, rest to approximately April. Existing welfare funds totally inadequate to take care of approximately 157,000 similarly affected unemployed Greater Detroit area.

Please keep us advised. Sincere thanks for your continued efforts on our behalf.

STEVE PASICA,
President, Dodge Local 3, UAW–AFL–CIO.

Government Statistics Used To Confuse Unemployment Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include, as a part of my remarks, the following article and editorial from the Wall Street Journal which show how the administration juggles statistics to prove its own points. During the hearings before my Committee on Ways and Means on the unemployment compensation bill, some of us repeatedly tried to get the administration spokesmen to tell us who are the unemployed. Of course, we did not succeed in getting this information. In these two articles, which follow, we get some of the answer and we get a clearer picture of how unemployment figures are juggled as a bulwark for administration demands for extending Federal controls in State programs and in instituting new welfare state projects:

THE UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS—COMMISSIONER CLAGUE VIEWS THE METHODS OF MEASUREMENT

(By Ewan Clague)

The problem of unemployment has received more public attention in 1961 than at any time since the depression of the 1930's.

The current overall rate of unemployment (about 7 percent of the total civilian labor force) has led some people to raise questions concerning these statistics.

Who is counted as unemployed? What are we trying to measure? And why are we measuring it? The general answer to these questions is that the measurements which have been devised were determined by the public purposes to be served.

The Employment Act of 1946 declared the maintenance of high employment to be the established policy of the Government. Under this act, the Federal Government was given responsibility for creating and maintaining conditions under which "there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work." If there had been no nationwide system of employment and unemployment statistics in existence at that time, it would have been necessary to create one.

As it is, the household survey, the employer reports of employment and hours of work, and the unemployment insurance records constitute the tools upon which any administration in Washington must rely in analyzing the current economic situation, in determining Government policies to deal with recessions, and in planning for the maintenance of economic growth and stability. I want to discuss the concepts we now use, the misunderstandings which exist and the adequacy of the household survey data to meet public needs.

Who are the employed? This is not as simple a concept as many people think.

Some groups are easy to classify. In July 1961 there were about 57 million paid workers for a private employer or government. However, there are individual business proprietors, farmers, self-employed professionals, and others who work on their own—over 9 million altogether. These are more troublesome. Our test is that their work must be for the purpose of bringing in some income; do-it-yourself projects at home do not count.

Then there are some real borderline areas in employment. One is unpaid family labor—a wife helping her husband in his grocery store, or a farm boy working in the field with his father. We count these as employed if they work 15 hours or more during the week in a family enterprise. During the summer there are usually more than 2 million such workers classified as employed. On the other hand, we exclude from the labor force the housewife who works in the home.

Still another borderline area is the worker with a job who is not at work during the week of reference—ill, on vacation, taking part in a strike, etc. Such persons are classified as employed because they have jobs; no new jobs are required for them.

There is one group of workers with jobs, who were formerly classified as employed, but who in 1957 were shifted to the unemployed. These are workers who have been laid off by their employers, but with a notification to return to work within a period of 30 days or less; also, new jobseekers who have a commitment to a job beginning within 30 days. Since these workers often continued to be out of work for 3 or 4 more weeks, and since the promised jobs did not always materialize, it was decided that they more logically belong among the unemployed. When the shift was made in 1957, about 250,000 workers were transferred from the employed to the unemployed.

In each of the above groups are part-time workers. Some of these work only a few hours a day or a few days a week, but want no more work.

There are other part-timers who want more work than they have. In recent months there have been about 3 million such workers. They have jobs, so we put them on the employment side of the ledger.

Some critics argue that the time lost by these workers should be converted to unemployment on the basis of assuming one unemployed person for every 37.5 hours lost. However, there are several million workers holding two or more jobs at the same time, and other millions working substantial overtime on one job. If we compute the shortage, we must also compute the excess.

In summary, the employed work force is a varied and heterogeneous group.

Who are the unemployed? Our definition is clear enough in general terms—a person who has done no work during the survey week, but is looking for work.

Also included are persons waiting to be called back from a layoff, or to a new job; those whose search has been interrupted by

temporary illness; and persons in stranded communities or occupations who have been discouraged in their search for work because of the unavailability of jobs. Note that this definition does not limit the unemployed to those who are "disemployed"—that is, who have been laid off from jobs.

The most clearly defined type of unemployed is the year-round, full-time worker who has held a job in the past and who is looking for one at present. This would most likely be a male worker, perhaps a head of a family, between 20 and 65 years of age; but it could include a single woman, a married woman, or a teenager.

Some people think that teenagers should be left out of the unemployed. In the month of June 1961, there were 2.5 million youngsters under age 20 who came out of school looking for work. Some were looking for permanent jobs; others were interested only in temporary summer jobs. Altogether, about 1.6 million found jobs and the remaining 900,000 were still looking for work by the middle of the month. The sharp June rise in the total unemployment figure for the Nation as a whole was fully explained by this group.

These teenagers, especially those who have never worked before, do raise a conceptual problem. In one European country no person is considered as unemployed unless he or she has previously held a job. However, I believe that our method is the sounder one. We count as employed those who got jobs. Why leave out those who didn't?

In my judgment these figures supply a useful picture of the labor market. We always tabulate these teenagers separately in every month of the year, so that those using the unemployment statistics as a guide can allow for this group. Also, we seasonally adjust the unemployment rates, so that this summer bulge can be discounted in economic analysis.

What should we do with elderly persons drawing pensions? There are at present almost 12½ million men and women drawing social security benefits. Under the law, such persons are permitted to earn up to $1,200 per year without loss of benefits. Many of these are counted among the 3 million men and women over age 65 who are employed, almost 900,000 of them in part-time jobs. At present our figures show that the number in this age group seeking work is about 150,000, but this amounts to less than 3 percent of the total unemployed. However, we publish the figures for this group every month, so that they can be subtracted from the total unemployment figures.

Questions are frequently raised about the method of counting women, particularly married women. Should they be counted as unemployed if they are only secondary wage earners or are looking for only part-time work?

But married women make up about one-fifth of all the unemployed persons in this country, and more than half of all employed women. Almost three-fifths of our increase in employment during the decade of the fifties was accounted for by married women. We can no longer think of them as a secondary or unimportant part of our labor supply.

According to our latest study, the vast majority of unemployed married women—over 80 percent—are looking for full-time jobs (we do not now collect these figures every month, but may do so in the future). Thus, of the approximately 900,000 married women who were unemployed in March 1961, only about 150,000 were looking for part-time jobs. Omission of this group would have little effect on the count of unemployed and probably no effect on the trend.

In summary, we know that with these broad concepts we include many different kinds of persons with many different degrees of job attachments or jobseeking aspirations. Long and loud arguments have gone on for years about the proper classification of certain borderline groups, but the general structure has proved to be useful.

We recognize also that these concepts alone do not meet every need for information about how our working force is being utilized or how well the economy is functioning in providing the right kinds of employment opportunities to the right people. But they do provide a measure of the number of people who have at least some form of employment, and a measure of the number of jobseekers who have not been able to locate what is to them a suitable job as of a given period of time.

The unemployment rate. The doubts of some people concerning our concepts and definitions arise from their serious concern about the effect on public opinion of the unemployment rate, which is the ratio of the unemployed to the labor force (employed plus unemployed).

We publish two rates for total unemployment: One, the actual for the month; two, the seasonally adjusted, which eliminates the wide seasonal variations. In July 1961, they were almost the same—7.0 and 6.9—but they can differ quite widely.

We in the Department of Labor have continually insisted that analysis of the unemployment problem should not be confined to the overall rates. We regularly publish separate figures and rates for men, for women, for teenagers, by age groups, by marital status, etc. It is also possible to shift some groups and to calculate rates on different combinations of employed and unemployed.

Unemployment policies. But all these classifications and reclassifications, valuable as they are, do not quite get to the heart of the controversy. A key issue has been raised by people who question whether persons who don't really need a job should be counted among the unemployed.

In statistical terms, this is not a practical suggestion. Statistical surveys cannot supply answers to the question of need. It would take a social work investigation of the family to determine that.

Even in concept this is not the way to state the issue. Need has no necessary connection with unemployment, or with employment. There are many millions of persons holding jobs in this country who don't really need them. And surely there must be hundreds of thousands of unemployed who could get along without a job. But in a free economy jobs are not allocated on a basis of need. Even in referring the unemployed to jobs, the Employment Service puts its primary emphasis on qualifications and ability.

But people who raise the question of need in connection with unemployment are thinking primarily of the social and economic policies for dealing with unemployment. An unemployed worker seeking a job constitutes a labor market fact; but what the Nation should do about it if he doesn't find a job is an entirely different matter.

While statistical surveys cannot measure such factors as individual or family need, some additional and more detailed classifications might be helpful as guides to public policy. For example, Congress has provided funds to the Bureau of Employment Security to make intensive surveys of the workers drawing temporary extended unemployment compensation. These studies will throw light upon that particular group of long-term unemployed.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is planning some studies next winter on the characteristics of the unemployed to obtain more information in depth concerning the degree of attachment of various classes of workers in the labor force. In my judgment one of the limitations in our statistics is our lack of knowledge of the patterns of labor market participation by the unemployed over a period of years. How many of the unemployed are only lightly or temporarily in the labor market as compared with those who have been full-time, year-round workers for many years?

What is needed in connection with the unemployment problem is not to reject the statistics we now have but to provide for more detail and more meaningful breakdowns, so that the data would be more useful for public policy decisions.

THE PURPOSE OF STATISTICS

A man either has a job or he does not. If he has a job he is employed. If he does not, he is unemployed.

If you merely want to compare the number of people who are working with the number who are not, this presents a logical and adequate definition with a minimum of fuzzy edges.

With such a definition, you can then use standard sampling techniques which will give you a picture of the employment situation in the whole population within a reasonable margin of error. This, as you can see from the article by Commissioner Clague on this page, is the basic approach of his Bureau to measuring the Nation's unemployment rate.

But you will also notice that the Bureau of Labor Statistics does make one major modification in the simple definition of unemployment. Unless a person is looking for a job, he is not counted as unemployed.

Now in a purely statistical sense this is rather illogical. A housewife who is not producing income is unemployed in the economic sense however happy she is with her estate—certainly as much so as the housewife in the same estate who wants to work. Nonetheless, the Bureau makes the distinction for a very good reason.

As Mr. Clague explains, "the measurements which have been devised were determined by the public purpose to be served"—that is, to give us some useful and relevant information about the economic state of the country. It would be statistically accurate to count happy housewives—as well as children and old people—as unemployed, but it would be patently ridiculous. Such a figure would not serve the public purpose intended; for that purpose it would misinform.

This leads directly to the questions that have been raised by many people concerning the unemployment statistics. They have nothing to do with whether Mr. Clague is a good statistician. They ask whether the statistics, however accurate, are relevant to the public purpose to be served.

The teenager at our house is unemployed; no question about it. The economy did not provide a job that met the specifications, which included acceptable hours, proximity to home, and relationship to training. As Mr. Clague argues, if a job had been found, employment would have risen by one; so if there is no job for a jobseeker, why shouldn't unemployment be increased by one?

Still, the fact is that this unit of unemployment is not of the same order as the unit of unemployment created by an unemployed steelworker who must support not only himself but a wife and family, although mathematically a unit is a unit.

The unemployed steelworker, especially when his numbers are multiplied, is an economic fact to trouble all thoughtful people. The unemployed teenager may trouble father, but to equate this unit in any statistical measure with the steelworker is ridiculous. It can actually serve the public purpose ill by misleading everybody as to the true state of our economic condition.

The same difficulty is encountered in other areas. We have, for example, more than 12 million people who are retired and draw social security. Some of them also work; some would like to work but haven't found the

kind of job that meets their particular circumstances. In the same way as the teenager, they are statistical units to be counted.

Now we all think of unemployment as a bad thing, which in the case of the steelworker it is. Yet actually one of our public purposes is to create a society in which some people don't work. A depressed or backward society is one in which teenagers, housewives, and old people must work to survive. By counting as unemployed those who are impelled to work not out of need but for some other reason—and who can afford to be selective in taking a job—we not only distort our view of economic troubles but we actually obscure one of the very good things about our society.

Mr. Clague himself realizes this, for he has lately begun segregating teenager and retired unemployment. But they are still included in the total figure, so that when somebody says our unemployment rate is 7 percent, or whatever, the irrelevant is lumped with the relevant, the good with the bad.

What, then, do we really want to measure? Certainly not just the number of people who don't have jobs, nor even those without jobs who might like to have one if the job suits them. The relevent question is how many people whose livelihood depends upon having jobs are unable to find them. This is the statistic that measures a part of our economic health in a meaningful way.

It begs the question to argue this statistic can't be found because the bureau can't judge whether the unemployed person is needy. The bureau doesn't have to know whether that unemployed steelworker is needy in the sense of being without money to buy groceries. His earnings are the support of himself and others and this is what makes his unemployment a meaningful fact.

But this is precisely the statistic for which you will have to burrow deep to find amid the present array of numbers. We are still presented with an unemployment index as if it meant what it plainly doesn't, because the bureau persists in counting as the same thing things that aren't the same thing at all.

If this isn't the cause of all the misunderstanding about the present unemployment statistics it certainly abets it. And therefore, it seems to us, however accurate they are, Mr. Clague's statistics do not yet best serve the public purpose.

Keep at It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner on last Thursday, August 24, 1961:

KEEP AT IT

As Nikita Khrushchev demonstrated in tantrums directed against former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, his weak and tender spot is the Soviet's colonial empire. Any mention of the peoples groaning under the chains of communism touches the quick.

U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson did a fine job Tuesday of exposing the sore spot on the Red skin. He hit at the "shameless" cynicism by which the Soviet, posing as foe of colonialism, used Tunisia's grievance against France as a vehicle for anti-Western propaganda.

While France has freed many colonies to become sovereign nations since World War II, Stevenson reminded the U.N. General Assembly, the Soviet has not freed an inch of captive territory, but instead has greedily grabbed for more. Millions of people who were free 16 years ago are Soviet slaves today. Poland, Hungary, East Germany are just a few examples.

Attacking the Soviet as the worst colonialist power in the world is a line to be used more consistently than only in an occasional U.N. debate. This is the big truth which Mr. K. can't bear to hear.

When the Soviet talks about colonialism, let us not pussyfoot for fear of offending timid "neutral" nations or the Red countries themselves. A spade should be called a spade, and it is good for the U.S. image to carry the banner of self-determination for the most downtrodden colonials of all—the Soviet empire's.

What Price Glory?—Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Dan Smoot entitled "What Price Glory."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Dan Smoot, nor do I necessarily concur in his writings or in the contents of his report. However, when it comes to a report on Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, of which I know to be factual and parts of which I feel in my heart must be factual, it is my duty and responsibility to place it in the RECORD so that it will be available to the American people, that they may come to their own conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot appeal an admonishment as this report states, and General Walker received an admonishment. It would have been far better for the Nation if he had been court-martialed and could have presented his case to the American people. Since he has been denied his day in court, there are those who represent large segments of the American people who will take his case to the people in spite of forces who would obstruct such effort to bring these facts to light. The American people have reached the crossroads in their maturity as a Nation. The signposts stand before us. We can go down the road to ruin, or we can go up the road to survival. However, let the American people choose which road they prefer. They are old enough to accept good news or bad news. But—give America the news—to this they are entitled.

WHAT PRICE GLORY?—MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER)

(By Dan Smoot)

U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, has inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a fine, brief biography of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. (Ted) Walker, which was published originally in the Richmond News-Leader. Here are excerpts from it:

"He was born in Center Point, Tex., in 1909. He grew up tall and straight, a boy 6 feet 3, who loved horses and soldiering. He finished at West Point in 1931.

"He was at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii when the Germans went into Poland. Brought back to the States, he participated in the swift transformation of the old horse-drawn units into sleek mechanized divisions. But he had qualities too vital to be squandered in artillery logistics.

"Commando. That was his art. He became commanding officer of an outfit deceptively known as the First Special Service Force, a crack team of Canadian and American soldiers unafraid of hand-to-hand combat.

"He had to learn to use a parachute. 'How do you put this thing on'? he asked a sergeant. And 5 minutes later, he jumped.

"He and his men fought their way up the Italian Peninsula. Anzio; the Aleutians; ski fighting in Norway—and a string of decorations to show for it.

"Briefly, peacetime again. Then came Korea: command of an infantry regiment, the exhausting, maddening business of fighting an enemy but never quite defeating him."

Walker was on the ground and in command at the battle of Heartbreak Ridge in Korea. Like all good commanders, he suffered to see his men die; but the lasting heartbreak which he brought away from Korea was the spectacle of American youth, reared in the insipid environment of a flabby, materialistic liberalism—young Americans who had not the slightest notion what they were fighting for and who succumbed to enemy brainwashing, because they knew nothing about the great ideals on which their own society was founded.

In the early fall of 1959, General Walker was ordered to Western Germany as commander of the 24th Infantry Division. Here, in the language of the Richmond News-Leader, is what he found and what he did there:

"There he found the same softness, the same purposelessness, that hundreds of other professional soldiers have found in youngsters raised on the milktoast liberalism that passes for education these days.

"So, he began to talk tough about communism, and what it is, and how the enemy conceals himself in an ambush of gauzy falsehood. He spoke to his troops of gullible, delicate men, safe at home in soft chairs, polishing their fingernails and coughing gently at strong language.

"He spoke bluntly of these influential people, the anti-anti-Communists whose gentle creed is that we must never be beastly to the Reds, the shrill and mocking men who deride patriotism as superpatriotism and love of country as distasteful and embarrassing. His object was to give his troops a new and vital approach toward anticommunism—a positive approach toward the defeat of Communist subversion of the American way of life.

"All this appeared in a paper known as the Overseas Weekly—with sneers, and contemptible little quotes out of context, and a self-righteous editorial along with it.

"General Walker then was called on the carpet by the commanding general of the 7th Army. He was asked for a full explanation. The New York Herald Tribune blasted him in a lead editorial, published also in foreign editions. Said the supercilious Tribune: 'It is repugnant to both the American military and civil heritage to use Army authority in an attempt to shape the political thinking of enlisted men.'

"Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker, soldier, was suspended from his command. He

is not yet 52. He is at the peak of his career as a combat-hardened officer. And the little, soft, spineless parasites of the liberal left have got him. Thirty years as a first-class fighting man. And what price glory?"

When General Walker arrived in Germany in late 1959, he took steps immediately to set up a program that would condition the men of the 24th Division as American fighting men: a vigorous program to condition the men physically; to educate them in the political fundamentals which form the bedrock of their own society; to acquaint them with the atheistic and barbarous philosophy of communism-socialism; to discipline them in proper behavior as men, so that their presence in Europe would create good will rather than hatred for America; and, above all, to keep the troops constantly reminded that they are creatures of God dependent upon and answerable to Him, and, under Him, responsible for themselves and for their treatment of others.

Here are a few excerpts from the official directives which established General Walker's problue program for the 24th Infantry Division:

"To educate military personnel and their dependents in the technique of Communist infiltration, subversion, and propaganda, in influencing legal governments, seizing power, then ruling through brutality and fear.

"To instruct military personnel and their dependents in the recognition of overt and covert Communist methodology in their attempt to subvert military morale, esprit, prestige, and leadership.

"To appraise military personnel, and their dependents, of their personal stake in American political philosophy, the American concept of individual rights and freedoms, and the demand for individual belief, sacrifice, and honor.

"To motivate military personnel and their dependents in adherence to American moral forces and the precepts of individual dignity, the preciousness of every human soul, and the obligations of the conscientious citizen to his God, to his country, and to himself.

"To inform military personnel and their dependents of the power of the American citizen as a unique political force, to study the structure of local, State, and national political organizations, to review methods of assessing issues and candidates, to examine the techniques of Socialist-Communist action, and to note how the American citizen can exert his power in the fight for freedom.

"To indoctrinate military personnel in those aspects of body, mind, and spirit which have a material bearing on morale and mission in the 24th Infantry Division, to examine physiological and psychological factors which affect individual, unit, and division efficiency * * * to create military environment which will produce tough-fibered, aggressive, disciplined, and spiritually motivated fighters for freedom."

The problue program was remarkably effective. After it was initiated, chapel attendance among men of the 24th Infantry Division increased eightfold; morale conspicuously improved; reenlistments exceeded the record of any other American oversea military organization; and the number of "incidents" creating tensions between Americans and the local population decreased until the 24th had the best record in the U.S. Army.

Even Europeans recognized that General Walker had the only division of American troops who were physically, morally, and psychologically ready for combat with Soviet troops, if the necessity arose.

General Walker's success was so spectacular that he should have been commended and promoted in rank with a mission to institute the problue program in all units and branches of all our armed services throughout the world.

In fact, the Army high command had already recognized the man's superior accomplishment, by arranging a promotion for him. In April 1961, General Walker was preparing to leave the 24th. He was returning to his home State, Texas, with a promotion in assignment, to command the 8th Corps.

But on April 9, 1961, the Overseas Weekly editorially complained that General Walker's troop-information program was a John Birch Society project and alleged that the general, in a speech to a PTA group, had called Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Edward R. Murrow, and two or three similar persons "pinkos." On April 14, General Walker denied the newspaper charges. On April 18, President Kennedy—ignoring the general's denial and accepting Overseas Weekly's charges at face value—fired General Walker from his command, canceled his scheduled promotion, and assigned him to a minor role at U.S. Army headquarters in Heidelberg, Germany, pending "investigation of the charges against him."

On May 31, 1961, the Army disbanded General Walker's problue program—12 days before announcing that the investigation of the general had been completed. The Army still denies that it killed the problue program; but I have the story in the words of Sp4 Ashland F. Burchwell, ex-research clerk of the Special Warfare Section (problue section) of the 24th Division. Private Burchwell wrote an "Obituary to Problue," which he sent to me and several other publishers in the United States. In his cover letter to me, Mr. Burchwell said:

"They got Walker; but, what is worse, they got the problue program too. On May 31, we were told to close up shop. Typewriters, which, 8 short months ago, had joined you in a campaign to free America once more, are now silent. The Special Warfare Section is now a memory.

"Use the enclosure as you see fit * * * use my name, if you wish—or tag it with the names of all Americans who believe in freedom and are appalled at the great amount of Communist influence in the United States."

The enclosure was Private Burchwell's "Obituary to Problue." Here are abbreviated excerpts from it:

"Thursday, 31 May 1961, will go on the calendars in Moscow as a victory for world communism. To some people, it may seem a minor victory, but to those who know, the ramifications of this defeat for America may be so far reaching, that in days to come, it may be mourned by the slaves of a Communist world as 'the day freedom lost the war.'

"Ten o'clock in the morning, 31 May 1961, the problue program of the 24th Division was disbanded.

"What a pity! How frightening that a publication such as the Overseas Weekly should wield such influence over the actions of free men as to force the downfall of a program whose only vice was the teaching of Americanism to Americans.

"How is it that a nation, and the army of that nation, can comply so completely with the wishes of their enemy?

"Problue: For God and Country. Problue: Dedicated to developing Americanism. Problue: Voice of freemen speaking. Problue, now in exile, outcast by the witchhead of ignorance, and destroyed by the death's-head of communism. Why?

"Sixteen thousand men, were not only beginning to understand their obligations as citizens of the greatest Republic in history, but were also beginning to act on those obligations and appreciate their right to believe and act on their ideals. Sixteen thousand men were beginning to realize the vastness of the battle they were fighting, and the enormity of the war they were in.

"But now? An article by a paper of doubtful, to say the least, quality and morals, and all the truths taught by problue, become lies. All that was real and sure, only hours ago, is now false. All that was black is miraculously now white. All that was good, now bad. For 16,000 disillusioned men, these are the results of the destruction of problue.

"We now see the outcome of what happens when some men do good and are not supported by all good men.

"Where do we, the men who tried to uphold and teach the obligations of liberty, go now? What will tomorrow bring for those who were deeply engaged in the fight against communism? One, you already know of: he was a general, with a fine war record, who believed in the ideals he had fought in two wars to preserve. He was relieved of command and publicly humiliated. As for myself, I will probably go to a line unit, where I can be watched and not be able to spread my 'blasphemous lies' that communism is evil. My boss will go back to his old job as a first sergeant where he too may be watched. Two will be returned to their units where they will serve, respectively, as a clerk and a radio operator. The rest of the office will be scattered throughout the division filling slots where they cannot continue with the fight against communism on an organized basis.

"But what of 16,000 men who are still wondering just exactly what did happen? And what of 160 million Americans who are left with the impression that we were witch-hunting and that there is no real threat after all? Who will take the place of the problue program in teaching the men in uniform what they are supposed to be doing?

"Me? As a private soldier in the service of the United States and one time member of the 'notorious' Special Warfare Section, as an American who did not lay aside the role of citizen when I assumed the role of soldier, I must continue my search for a battlefield where I can again join the fight against communism.

"But what of you? One of the 160 million free Americans who may, or may not, understand what has happened?"

On June 12, 1961, the Secretary of the Army announced that Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker had been admonished for taking injudicious actions and for making derogatory public statements about prominent Americans.

Being orally "admonished" rather than formally court-martialed, General Walker has no recourse or appeal.

THE OVERSEAS WEEKLY

The Overseas Weekly is a small, privately owned, newspaper established May 14, 1950. It is published abroad, for American servicemen in Europe, by the International Media Co., 380 Lexington Avenue, New York City. Overseas Weekly was incorporated at Wilmington, Del., on February 20, 1952. The articles of incorporation list Marion von Rospach as president; Anthony Biacone as vice president; Harold Melahn as secretary treasurer; and John Dornberg as news editor.

In 1953, Lt. Gen. Charles L. Bolte, then commanding general of the Army in Europe, banned Overseas Weekly as unfit for American servicemen. Later, the Army permitted the paper on Army newsstands again.

U.S. Congressmen DALE ALFORD Democrate of Arkansas, calls Overseas Weekly a "salcious, overseas pink sheet" which habitually features "half-nude show girls—pictures of a type most American newspapers would decline to print."

That is a polite way of calling the thing what it is: a filthy, pro-Communist rag which peddles pornography to capture the attention of soldiers, and which generally (whether wittingly or not) promotes the Communist line in all its serious editorial efforts.

A glance at any issue of Overseas Weekly, and a glimpse at the personal history of people connected with it, will reveal why

the paper's managers resented General Walker's emphasis on patriotism, decency, and truth.

Every issue of Overseas Weekly carries large pictures of seminude (or completely nude) girls in poses so suggestive as to be pornographic. Captions accompanying the pictures have the same flavor.

One issue of Overseas Weekly carried a full story on the publication of a "Ladies Directory," listing (for American servicemen) the names and addresses of prostitutes in the Soho district of London. Another presented a long and lurid review of the autobiography of a European prostitute.

Confidential information from soldiers in the 24th—who admire General Walker and despite the scurvy little rag which they call the Oversexed Weekly—indicates that the old woman, who is president and executive editor of Overseas Weekly, herself enjoys the nude and seminude girlie pictures which habitually adorn her paper, and that her office staff is composed of odd-looking women with similar tastes.

Bob Jones, formerly in the U.S. Air Force, is now Munich correspondent for Overseas Weekly. In August 1960, a claim was filed against Jones by the 7th Army Support Command for taking unauthorized photographs of the Rhine Army Ordnance Depot. Jones is now allowed on U.S. military installations only under escort.

There is some indication that Wince Mulhahey, sports editor of Overseas Weekly, is an alcoholic.

Harold Melahn, secretary-treasurer of Overseas Weekly, was a delegate to the Communist world youth festival at Prague in 1947.

A 24th Division officer in Munich, who was a public information officer in the 5th Corps from 1955–58, says that Overseas Weekly employees generally associate with known Communists and habitually attend parties where they can meet military personnel who handle classified information.

The Overseas Weekly characters had a specific reason for hating General Walker, too.

Shortly after General Walker took command of the 24th, he found out that Siegfried Naujocks, ace reporter for Overseas Weekly, was snooping around headquarters trying to find a pipeline for obtaining military secrets. Naujocks was also trying to damage troop morale, by spreading gossip among the troops that General Walker was mentally ill.

Walker had Naujocks barred from all military installations of the 24th Division. John Dornberg, news editor of Overseas Weekly, threatened General Walker with retaliation.

Naujocks is a Pole, living in West Germany on a German passport. During the days of Hitler, Naujocks worked for the Nazi's Ministry of Propaganda. Late in World War II, he was shipped to the eastern front to fight against the Communists. His subsequent political views, as revealed in his writings, do not indicate that he hated Communists, however.

Naujocks and John Dornberg wrote the Overseas Weekly article which ruined General Walker's career.

Shortly afterward, the Macmillan Co., 60, Fifth Avenue, New York City, published a book by Dornberg. The book is entitled "Schizophrenic Germany". It is filled with the "hate-Germans" propaganda which the Communist conspiracy has been spewing out all over the world—from the American press coverage of the Eichmann trial in Israel, to the disgusting spate of anti-German films and commentaries saturating television in the United States.

The Communists hate and fear Germany, because they recognize it as the only nation of Europe capable of resisting communism. Hence, all Communist and pro-Communist propaganda concerning Germany—including Dornberg's Schizophrenic Germany—is designed to keep Germany disarmed and divided so that it can never again become a bulwark against communism.

General Walker said:

"We have Communists and we have Overseas Weekly. Neither is one of God's blessings to the American people or their soldier sons overseas. Immoral, unscrupulous, corrupt, and destructive, are terms which could be applied to either. If the costs of the bad effects of Overseas Weekly could be accounted in dollars, it would be in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars without including all the benefits to the enemy."

An Army Times editorial, on the Walker case, contains these comments:

"We don't think much of the Overseas Weekly. Called the Oversexed Weekly by the troops, it has been termed 'subversive to the command * * * since it carries news calculated to destroy unit loyalty, smear noncommissioned leaders, and assist anti-American forces * * * by portraying the American soldier as rowdy, disorderly, dishonest, and immoral.' "

WHAT DO WE CARE?

A most disturbing aspect of the Walker case is the general apathy of the American people and of the Congress. A semiliterate, leftwing rag called a newspaper can instigate the public humiliation of a fine American general; and the public seems not to care; and only a handful of Congressmen and Senators even raise their voices.

In the Senate of Texas—General Walker's home State—a resolution was passed (May 23, 1961) expressing support of General Walker and pleading with the Defense Department to reinstate him as commander of the 24th Division. One Texas senator who voted against this resolution—Culp Krueger—said:

"What business is it of ours?"

What business, indeed. What happened to General Walker should be the burning concern of every decent American who loves liberty and justice.

In the National Congress, STROM THURMOND in the Senate and DALE ALFORD in the House have fought insistently in defense of General Walker. They have been joined, somewhat, by men like BRUCE ALGER, O. CLARK FISHER, STYLES BRIDGES, CHARLES GOODELL, KARL MUNDT. A few columnists and commentators like Paul Harvey, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and George Sokolsky have taken up the cudgels for General Walker. But, by and large, the American Congress, the public, and the press, have indifferently permitted the pro-Communist leftwing to humiliate, and wreck the career of, one of our finest soldiers—for being an effective patriot.

SINISTER CONNECTIONS

There is much more to the Walker case and related events than meets the eye. For example, the Overseas Weekly accusation that General Walker's problue program was a John Birch Society project (a charge which the Army investigation proved false) was originally made on April 9—at precisely the time when the leftwing attack on the John Birch Society was at its peak. Oddly enough, however, the news about the Overseas Weekly's attack on Walker did not really capture attention in the United States until the week of April 17.

What else happened that week?

At dawn on Monday, April 17, 1961, an assortment of eight old boats, some of them barely seaworthy slipped into the Bay of Pigs, which is surrounded by the Zapata Swamp on the southwestern shore of Cuba. Aboard the vessels were 1,300 Cubans who wanted to liberate their homeland from Communist dictatorship. Castro forces were waiting for them, obviously well-informed of all their plans. Shore guns raked the ships, immediately destroying the old vessel which was the invaders' communications center. Castro tanks, expertly manned, occupied all the roads through the great swamp. And Castro planes quickly destroyed the air cover for the little force of invaders and began strafing them on the beaches.

There was no geenral uprising of anti-Castro patriots throughout Cuba as the invaders had hoped, because the American managers of the affair had refused to alert the Cuban underground which exists in every hamlet and city of Cuba. Without the promised support of American air and naval craft; without the promised guns, tanks, and ammunition; without the expected support of their own people in Cuba, the invaders were trapped on the beaches of the Bay of Pigs, most of them murdered there or taken captive to be paraded ignominously through Havana and later disposed of.

The fatal blow to the Cuban patriots trying to free their homeland was the failure to alert the Cuban underground. Who delivered that blow, and what does that have to do with the Overseas Weekly attacking General Walker in Germany?

Gene Bernald, 126 Millard Avenue, Philipse Manor, Tarryton, N.Y., is a director of the International Media Co., which publishes Overseas Weekly. Bernald is also a participating operator of Radio Swan—a powerful transmitter, on Greater Swan Island, an American possession in the western Caribbean Sea, just north of Honduras. Radio Swan is licensed for commercial purposes but devotes much of its time to political broadcast beamed to populations throughout Central America. Radio Swan is one of the stations which saturated that area with anti-Trujillo propaganda (Trujillo was an anti-Communist ruler of the Dominican Republic, who was friendly to the United States, but whom the Eisenhower administration repudiated and ruined, at the instigation of Betancourt, President of Venezuela, who is widely believed to be a Communist).

Radio Swan justifies its political broadcasts by saying it fights "isms" of all kinds in Central America, whether of the Castro or of the Trujillo variety.

The anti-Communist Cubans who tried to recapture their country from Communist Castro in April 1961, gave Radio Swan a key role to play. Radio Swan was supposed to broadcast a signal in code to alert the Cuban underground so that an uprising in Cuba could support the invasion attempt. The signal was never broadcast.

It is generally believed throughout Central America that Radio Swan, though managed as a private business by such people as Gene Bernald, is actually a CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) operation and that it was built with U.S. tax money.

A COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN

There is much more which is sinister and profoundly dangerous to America. Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, has been waging a gallant fight (with practically no support in the Congress, little in the press) against the gagging of all anti-Communist patriots in the Armed Forces of America.

The Walker case is merely one aspect of this great issue. Indeed, Senator THURMOND has shown that General Walker was used as a whipping boy to scare other Armed Forces patriots into silence.

The most startling revelation which Senator THURMOND has made is that the attack on anti-Communist patriotism in the American Armed Forces was ordered and initiated by the Communist Party and that Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, played the leading role in promoting this particular campaign.

In a later issue of this report, we will look more deeply into the Fulbright affair which Senator THURMOND brought to light. Mean-

while, I urge all Americans to write Senator THURMOND for information on the official gagging of the military.

I urge all Americans to write their own Representatives urging support of a resolution which Senator THURMOND introduced in the Senate on August 4, 1961 (S. Res. 191). Senate Resolution 191 asks for an investigation, by the Senate Armed Services Committee, "of the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war."

I most particularly urge that all Americans who care about their own country write their elected representatives (in their State capitals and in Washington), demanding that they do something to reinstate and exonerate Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker who was crucified, for being a patriot, by the very scurviest of scurvy leftwing forces.

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking B.A. and M.A. degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a teaching fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the field of American civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He served as an FBI agent in all parts of the Nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for 3½ years, he worked exclusively on Communist investigations in the industrial Midwest. For 2 years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After 9½ years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for "Facts Forum," Smoot, for almost 4 years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side—the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to the Dan Smoot report.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal of Commerce recently presented 10 feature reports from Washington which examined the economic proposals of the Kennedy administration. This publication performed a useful public service by publishing this series which looked into many aspects of the administration programs which, when taken together, present a much more meaningful picture than when these are viewed individually. I hope the New York Journal of Commerce will repeat this series periodically—on a 90- or 180-day basis—and will present new facts and figures as they come to light. A real search for facts about the Kennedy proposals is much needed if sound thinking is to predominate and unwise proposals are to be exposed and defeated. The writer of this series, Miss Eileen Shanahan, deserves much credit for her hard work, initiative and follow-through in preparing this series. She did her work in a scholarly fashion, and her careful research has again earned her the respect of her readers. In view of the often sloppy press reporting which goes on regarding so many of the economic problems and proposals facing us, Miss Shanahan was fair and independent. Without doubt she displeased readers on both the extreme right and extreme left, but to many of us she produced a meaningful series and this deserves recognition.

This series will be presented in separate insertions throughout the RECORD of today and tomorrow.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal of Commerce series on the Kennedy economic programs was kicked off by an editorial in which the editors of the Journal explained the basis of their interest and an outline of what they hoped to do. It appears below:

WHITHER NEW FRONTIER?

The Kennedy administration started out 6 months ago in a manner which most businessmen found reassuring. The new President began his term with an absolute commitment not to devaluate the dollar; the widely anticipated break between the administration and the Federal Reserve System did not occur; John Kenneth Galbraith went to India, not Washington; Mr. Kennedy's first mention of taxes was a promise to aid business investment via tax relief. The hopes of the business community were high.

They are not so high any longer.

The Federal budget is rising even beyond the new administration's own estimates; the old Democratic pattern of Government intervention in labor disputes seems to be on the way back in; a group of America's most prominent big businessmen find that they just cannot get along with the new Secretary of Commerce.

Has the administration really made a dramatic left turn? Eileen Shanahan of the Journal of Commerce Washington staff finds that the answer to this question is yes—and no.

In a series of 10 articles which begin today, she takes first, a general look at administration policies and then, in subsequent articles, analyzes major areas of Government activity of direct interest to business, labor policy, antitrust, taxes and the budget, direct regulation of business, welfare programs and what they cost, money management, land and power programs, and international economic policies.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on July 24, the New York Journal of Commerce carried the first of Miss Eileen Shanahan's articles in the series on the economic programs of the new administration. Entitled "Kennedy Eludes Label," it appears as follows:

POLICY LINE ZIGZAGS—KENNEDY ELUDES LABEL—SHAPE OF STAND ON BUSINESS IS TAKING FORM

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—"The administration has avoided extreme economic views * * * it has in no way shown hostility to business enterprise * * * and the economic moves actually taken by the administration have been more prudent than some of its rhetoric."

BURNS' WORDS

The words are those of Arthur F. Burns, economic adviser to former President Eisenhower. The administration he was describing was, of course, the present one—John F. Kennedy's New Frontier.

Dr. Burns calm summation—which came, incidentally, as the final paragraph of a lengthy article criticizing administration economic policies—would not stand uncontested in any gathering of businessmen or those who represent them in Washington. It would, however, find rather widespread acceptance.

The problem is one of comparisons. It goes without saying, and without argument, that the Kennedy administration is to the left of the Eisenhower administration on virtually every issue. What is not so clear is that it may be to the right of the Truman and Roosevelt administrations in some significant and surprising areas—labor policy, for one.

If the administration is more to the left than most businessmen would wish, it may also be less to the left than they feared it might be.

MUTED HOSTILITY

There is a muted undertone of hostility to big business to be found in Washington today. But there is not a single Government official anywhere in the Capital who publicly describes profits as unnecessary or evil.

It is true that the administration has just pushed through Congress the most enormous housing bill in history. But it is also true that it never even advocated a vast public works spending program to cure the late recession.

The banking community is deeply upset over the administrations unprecedented and possibly unlawful blocking of bank mergers by administrative fiat. But it is well satisfied with the administration's handling, to date, of the problem of financing the vast Government debt.

If Government spending is going nowhere but up—and the bad news on just how much further up, in view of the inter-

national situation, will be made public tomorrow, at least nobody is talking about price controls.

If the need for a balanced budget in prosperous times has been dismissed as a Republican myth—the evidence on this point isn't conclusive yet—the need to keep American products competitively priced in world markets has been accepted by this administration as it was by the last.

The regulated industries, filled with dread of the unknown, facing strange commissioners and reorganized commissions, have nevertheless found that the Government understands some of their problems.

The overall picture is almost indescribably mixed.

The future is even more questionable than the past. Uncounted study groups, interagency committees and task forces are now at work drafting plans for the solution of nearly every imaginable problem facing the world, the country, and business.

Deadlines have been set, mostly in the neighborhood of next September and October, with the objective of permitting time for White House study and formulation of concrete proposals to be sent to Congress in January. The real shape of the administration's attitude toward business will become known then—but there are already a wealth of clues—among the inconsistencies.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the second article in Eileen Shanahan's series on the economic programs of the New Frontier discussed Kennedy and organized labor. This article follows:

KENNEDY DISAPPOINTING LABOR

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—Organized labor is perhaps even more disappointed in the Kennedy administration than business is. It had such high hopes.

The dissatisfaction rests on two grounds: Many labor leaders feel the administration has stopped with half measures to solve the unemployment problem and shown too great a disposition to compromise on minimum wage, social security and other legislation.

UNION FEAR

Even closer to home, many union chiefs increasingly fear that the administration can't be relied on to show up in their corner when collective bargaining breaks down.

Key administration officials will privately agree—some of them with considerable pride—that the latter complaint has merit. No automatic assumption that the union is right and the management wrong characterizes Arthur J. Goldberg, Labor Department, they say.

Stories are told to reinforce this point: tales of Secretary Goldberg "chewing out" Labor Leader Joe Curran in the course of the maritime strike; of the Secretary's flat refusal of a union plea to intervene before the Civil Aeronautics Board to help striking Southern Airways pilots get their jobs back with prestrike seniority.

CASE HISTORY

One interesting case history revolves around the strike of workers at Hanford, Wash., atomic installation, which is operated for the Government by General Electric.

The Government's special atomic labor panel investigated the dispute and proposed a new contract which went against the union on key issues, including union security provisions, but which also included a wage package which GE felt broke the pattern it had established in its settlements elsewhere.

GE resisted but finally, in the face of Government pressure not to prolong a strike involving the national security, agreed to sign.

The next word which came to the Labor Department was from the union—which asked for just one more little item in the package. Secretary Goldberg reportedly hit the roof; told the union he was not yielding to any such pressures; that it could either go back to work on the recommended terms or read his public denunciation in the next day's newspapers. It worked.

SIGNIFICANT SHIFT

The Goldberg lieutenants who tell this story feel that the Secretary's firm drawing of the line precisely where an "impartial" board drew it represents a significant departure from the labor practices of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, when union pressure for just one more little thing was frequently successful.

The story, however, also illustrates another point—one which has business badly worried. When Government gets into labor disputes, the settlement almost invariably gets more expensive.

Just how extensively this administration intends to inject itself into labor-management troubles is not altogether clear. Even some of Arthur Goldberg's firm friends and admirers express a fear that the Secretary simply enjoys dramatically boarding an airplane and flying off to a distant city to settle a strike by sheer personal forcefulness.

The Goldberg "settlements" to date do not reveal very much. Both the tugboat and airlines workers merely agreed to go back to work pending resolution of the complex questions over work rules which had precipitated their strikes. If the proof of the pudding is in the eating these puddings are still being cooked.

SHOCKED THE UNIONS

The Government's resort to a Taft-Hartley injunction in the maritime strike shocked the unions as much as it dismayed the management—aware, as they are, that by the time the 80-day injunction runs out, the pressure will be on for deliveries of fuel oil for fall heating.

That intervention was a matter of some controversy within the administration, but Mr. Goldberg was reportedly able to convince the President with a statistical argument: All but a handful of the strikes which have been halted over the years by Taft-Hartley Act injunction have been settled before the end of the 80 days.

The great question ahead—which may set the pattern for the future years of the Kennedy administration—is whether there will be Government intervention if the current auto industry negotiations break down. Mr. Goldberg's own words on the subject are contradictory.

On the one hand, he has said that "we cannot * * * have a shutdown in the automobile industry." On the other, that "I do not believe * * * that the public interest is served by issuing appeals to * * * an industry and a union which have pursued a constructive path of cooperation without a work stoppage of consequence for more than a decade."

A final major—and still open—question is the future role of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Relations. There are widespread fears that this tripartite group will be thrust directly into labor disputes, the great prestige of its individual industry, labor and public members used to dictate specific contract settlements. Officialdom on all sides denies this.

What the Committee is supposed to be doing is work out answers to the most fundamental sort of labor-management problems. How to handle automation, how to keep American goods competitively priced, and so on. If the Committee does stay together and produce some reports, the union or management which refuses to follow its guidelines may be unable to escape public pillorying.

And every effort is being made to see that the group does continue to function.

Most of its meetings are held right in the White House; the President himself is brought in to participate; briefings have been given not only on international economic problems but the world military and political situation, too. Every effort is being made to emphasize the issues which should unite, rather than divide American labor and management.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the July 26 article, the third of the Journal of Commerce series, the approach of the Kennedy administration to the question of antitrust enforcement. This article is set out below:

KENNEDY STIFFENING TRUST POLICY

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is obviously attempting to establish even more rigorous standards of antitrust enforcement than those which prevailed during the Eisenhower years.

Yet there are conflicts among its personalities and inconsistencies in its approach which makes one wonder whether it will achieve its own objectives.

SEEKS TO SPLIT UP FIRMS

Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, head of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, wants to stress major antitrust cases of a structural nature—splitting up big companies and diffusing their power in the marketplace.

But Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and his Deputy, Byron White—Mr. Loevinger's bosses—have privately let it be known that they would like to concentrate on criminal price-fixing cases, even small regional ones, with the objective of putting some more businessmen in jail.

The Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission are moving in precisely opposite directions on the subject of consent decrees.

The attempt by the Justice Department to prohibit price cutting by major electrical companies—to protect small firms in the field from the dangers of competition—has terrified classical antitrusters who feel their objective should be to force more competition, not less.

PERSONNEL PROBLEM

In addition, a serious personnel problem has developed in the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, where 30 or 40 young lawyers plus the Division's top career man have resigned since Mr. Loevinger took over.

The reasons for the exodus are not altogether clear—the former first assistant, W. Wallace Kirkpatrick, is loyally saying

nothing—but the explanation for the young lawyers appears to be a fear of politics in the Department's hiring and promotion policies.

How much the heavy turnover has hurt is not clear. There has certainly been a drop-off in the number of cases filed, although Mr. Loevinger has said publicly that he is not interested in building up a statistical record but rather in filing really significant cases.

Some leading members of the antitrust bar—lawyers in private practice—say they find a deterioration in the quality of Antitrust Division work, citing in particular alleged sloppiness and inattention to detail in the drafting of the complaint against General Motors on diesel locomotives.

There are, nevertheless, clear signs of a harder antitrust line.

The Justice Department has moved against three major bank mergers—an area over which the Department heretofore believed it lacked jurisdiction—and, by informal agreement with the Treasury Department, arranged to block approval of any future bank mergers it questions until the present cases have been litigated.

The Department has informed Du Pont stockholders—and by inference, stockholders in any other company required to divest itself of interest in another company—that it is not concerned with any personal losses they may suffer as a result of divestiture proceedings.

It has come out in favor of mandatory divorcement of financing companies from manufacturing companies—an issue its predecessors ducked.

At the Federal Trade Commission, a sweeping reorganization has been put into effect which will unify authority over antitrust cases and speed them to conclusion.

There have been a few instances in which the new administration has been more lenient than its predecessor.

There are reports of at least one consent agreement which Eisenhower's Justice Department refused to accept which has now, in substantially the same form, been put into effect by the new trustbusters.

The Department, under its new management, has not pushed further its predecessor's attempt—in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board—to subpena the records of the Air Transport Association with the aim of finding out whether it has discussed unauthorized subjects of interest to the commercial airlines.

LITTLE NEW GROUND

Aside from the bank cases, the Kennedy administration antitrusters have broken no real new ground in the suits they have filed to date.

Judge Loevinger did appear, however, to be taking a strong new preventive antitrust line—blocking the formation of monopolies before they get started—in connection with the plans for licensing American firms to experiment with worldwide communications via space satellites.

PARTICIPATION SOUGHT

He said that equipment manufacturers and other firms, as well as communication companies, must be allowed to participate in this program.

But he has now lost on this issue. The Federal Trade Commission has just authorized a group of communications carriers, only, to enter the space communications program.

Whether the Justice Department lost this issue because Judge Loevinger did not match his public words with private actions or whether he simply did not have enough influence when the chips were down is not yet clear.

There is real new ground, however, in the area of consent judgments.

FTC, JUSTICE DIFFER

While the Federal Trade Commission has announced that it will hold a gun to the heads of business accused of violating the law and give them just 30 days to negotiate the traditional consent agreements—which involve no admission of guilt and may not be used as a basis for the filing of subsequent private damage suits—the Justice Department is taking precisely the opposite approach.

The Justice Department will henceforth sign no consent agreements at all until 30 days after their tentative terms have been made public.

Mr. Loevinger obviously feels that many firms are so anxious to obtain the relative immunity from private suits that the consent settlement route affords that he will be able to force stronger consent decrees on business in cases where the 30-day examination period produces complaints that the decree is inadequate.

Many observers outside the Department feel, however, that the result may be just the opposite. That many companies will decide to litigate—thereby tieing up Department personnel in protracted suits—rather than negotiate a decree which may not be the final one after all. Less effective, rather than more effective, antitrust could be the result, they say.

As for the Department's attempt to force General Electric not to make price cuts which might drive its smaller competitors out of business, a vast array of questions is raised.

Are the antitrust laws to be used as an umbrella over and/or under inefficient concerns? If minimum prices are to be imposed under the antitrust laws, what about maximum prices? With mounting concern in the administration over inflationary potentials, is an anti-price-cut policy at all consistent?

It is unclear, as yet, whether these questions have been brought to the attention of the White House.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the next article by Eileen Shanahan in the Journal of Commerce deals with the administration relations with business and comments on the rift with the Business Advisory Council:

EACH HAD OWN AIMS—HODGES-BUSINESS RIFT HELD NO STORM SIGNAL

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—To those who carefully watch the Washington scene for hints of policy trends in the making, few events of the past 6 months have caused such speculation as the severance of relations between the Commerce Department and its Business Advisory Council.

Although both the administration and the BAC itself, through its Chairman, Roger Blough of Unted States Steel, tried to make light of the break and present it as a mere reorganization, the fact is that it was a divorce.

And while it was probably true that the Government and the BAC—now called just the Business Council—will not follow the ancient Emily Post dictum that the divorced must behave as total and unspeaking strangers, it may come close to that.

GRAVE QUESTION

The grave question presented by the BAC-Commerce Department fight is whether it is a symptom of a basic rejection of the entire business community by the Kennedy administration—and vice versa. The answer is an unqualified "No."

Such a mutual rejection may, in time, develop. But the Commerce Department-BAC scrap had nothing to do with substantive issues—or, in fact, with anything but the organization and function of the BAC itself.

There was intransigence and lack of diplomacy on both sides but the fundamental problem arose out of the unique nature of the BAC and its members' determination to hold on to that unique status.

SIXTY MEMBERS

The Council made up of 60 active members and approximately 60 more graduate members who still regularly attend its meetings—nearly every one of them is the head of a giant corporation—had always lived by its own rules, unlike the hundreds of other business advisory groups which consult regularly with many other Government departments and even the Commerce Department itself.

It named its own members, drew up its own agenda, decided which Government officials it wanted to address its meetings and which it would ignore.

It met in secret and neither the public nor businessmen whose competitiors were members of the BAC ever knew for certain whether the members were receiving valuable information about Government policies not available to others.

Secretary of Commerce Luther B. Hodges set out to change this. He saw no reason why he, himself, should not select the businessmen he wanted to advise him and pick the subjects on which he needed their advice. He agreed with BAC critics among the press and elsewhere that there was no justification for secrecy when Government officials addressed the Council.

RESISTANCE MET

Mr. Hodges proposed changes met with instantaneous resistance. He submitted to the BAC a list of 10 small businessmen from which he asked the BAC to pick 5 as new members, to broaden the Council's base. The BAC agreed to accept only three.

But there was more to it even than that. Secretary Hodges wanted to put the BAC to work on projects of his own chosing. Unlike some of his predecessors, he felt he wasn't getting anything of particular value merely from associating with the assembled captains of industry for a couple of days half a dozen times a year and listening to their random comments on various issues and problems.

Actually, some—although not all—Eisenhower administration officials had also privately expressed some doubts that the BAC was really doing anything useful.

Although there appears to be little doubt that the BAC performed yeoman service for the Government during World War II and, to a lesser extent, during the Korean war, and its various topics in recent years have been superficial in the extreme.

For example, at last May's meeting, the distinguished BAC member assigned to analyze a major Kennedy administration fiscal proposal freely admitted that he had read only the Presidential message on the subject and a condensed version of Treasury Secretary Dillon's statement to Congress—and none of the wealth of supporting material and explanation.

In the BAC's defense, it should be said that there appears to be some evidence that Secretary Hodges wanted to use the Council for political purposes—to drum up support among businessmen at large for Kennedy administration programs.

This was not a radical departure from the past, however, BAC members had used their individual and collective prestige for just such purposes during the wartime controls period and in support of the foreign aid programs of both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

IMPASSE REACHED

In any event, an impasse was reached. President Kennedy, eager to avoid the appearance of a breach with the business community as a whole, agreed that the Council could reorganize, resume its treasured fraternity-like control over its membership, and advise any agency of Government which asked for its help.

Some such request for assistance will doubtless be forthcoming—in addition to Secretary Hodges' request that the Council continue its already assigned study of the maritime industry. Most likely, the new requests will be in the area of foreign policy.

Statement by Hon. Frank Chelf in Support of H.R. 3725, To Provide That the House of Representatives Shall Be Composed of 469 Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a speech made by Congressman FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, before our great Judiciary Committee. There were about 200 of our Congressmen that attended this great hearing and we had some wonderful men from the Congress who made great statements, but the man that put the icing on the cake was this great Kentuckian that you and I love and respect so well.

So many of our Members who have been here for over a quarter of a century have told me they have never heard a greater speech and facts presented to the Judiciary Committee as well as our own FRANK CHELF did at this great gathering.

Mr. Speaker, I called your distinguished and hard-working helper and assistant, the Honorable John Holton, and I am sending him a copy of FRANK CHELF'S speech because I want you to know the facts that he gave us, as not one of us attending this meeting had ever heard them before. I imagine, however, you do know the facts that Congressman CHELF gave us, but I want you to please review them again, because we have decided to come and see you, the man that has been Speaker longer than any man living or dead, that this great United States has ever honored by making him our Speaker twice as long as any Speaker before, even the great Speaker, Henry Clay.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will be delighted for all of your friends and admirers in the House and the Senate to read this speech, because these great men whom you lead day in and day out, year in and year out, represent every human being in this Nation, and so many people in practically country in the world. Even our great Speaker SAM RAYBURN would be amazed at the people that read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As I travel over this great land, men, women, boys, and girls tell me of the great things that they read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am going to have many copies made of this great speech and send it to our schools, our colleges, to our newspapers and all over this country, and I believe every man, woman, and child that reads the Chelf speech carefully will agree that we should make a change in the House. We have had 13 different changes since we have had the Congress of the United States. The first was made by President George Washington and on down the line.

I wish you could have also heard that great Congressman from Chicago, Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI, who has represented Illinois, the great city of Chicago, and this Nation so well and so long. He and the entire delegation of Illinois, who are the fourth largest in the Nation, are for this change 1,000 percent. The gentleman from Illinois, Congressman THOMAS O'BRIEN, whom we all love so well, will help this great delegation lead the fight for the change.

I wish you could have heard the great lawyer and statesman from Louisiana [EDWIN WILLIS], who asked some very pertinent questions which were all answered to his satisfaction and the satisfaction of everyone attending this great meeting and hearing by Congressman CHELF.

Please note what the other nations, like England, France, Japan, and I could mention many more, allow the men that represent them, and it is about one-half of what we in the Congress have to represent. Mr. Speaker, I understood from Congressman LIBONATI that if the census takers had found 700 more people, that they would not have lost a Congressman. Mr. Speaker, if so many of our people had not been out fishing in our great rivers and Mobile Bay, and the Gulf of Mexico, Alabama would not have lost a Congressman.

I wish you could have heard the great speech that your friend and my friend, Congressman OREN HARRIS of Arkansas, made. It is all in the hearings of the Judiciary Committee, and when they come out I hope I can get them to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I want everybody in the Congress and in the Nation to have all of the facts that came out of this gathering and hearing last week.

Mr. Speaker, Alphonse Lucas has been my assistant and helper for 44 years. In all of that time we have worked every Saturday and every Sunday, whether we were in the Capitol or back home in our beloved Alabama. He told me this Sunday, after we had been working from early morning until about 3 in the afternoon, that he had decided to retire, as there was no way for him to answer all of the mail and keep up with all of the additional work that has been put on us. What would we do if we had to run at large? One of the Congressmen told me it would cost $300,000 for him to run at large in his State, and that he would have to run three times every time one of our great Senators had to run one time.

How I had hoped we were going to try to change the time a Congressman should serve to 4 years instead of 2. Of course, I know you agree with me that when a team comes in with the President of the United States, they certainly should stay with him from the time he comes in until the time he goes out. Of course, there are not many of us who can afford to run for the Congress if we have to run in our State at large. This redistricting covers 16 States, about a third of the Nation, and affects many of the greatest men that have ever served under you as Speaker or under any other Speaker. But, they just can't afford to run at large. Think how it would mix them up and think about the tremendous amount of extra help we would have to have.

Mr. Speaker, I understand 160 Members of this great Congress have signed the discharge petition and I understand several more will sign it this week. I believe if we have to run at large that we will lose here in the Congress of the United States some of the best and greatest statesmen that have ever served in the Congress. Think of the wonderful training of the many men who have given practically all of their life to work for their district, their State, and the Nation who would not return. I know you know of this and much more, so we want to talk to you after you have read Congressman FRANK CHELF'S speech and try with all of our heart, mind, soul and body, to get a go-ahead signal. If I remember correctly, that great statesman from Oklahoma, the man that you selected as Democratic whip, Congressman CARL ALBERT, has been working on this and introduced a bill to enlarge the Congress over 10 long years ago, and I feel sure that our Democratic leader, that one and only Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK would go along with us. Also, another great leader, MICHAEL KIRWAN. I have not talked to Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the great Appropriations Committee, who like your good self, has been here and done such a good job for such a long time. I feel sure Congressman CANNON will go along with us, and I believe practically the entire Congress will too. It seems that if they only had the nod from our great and good Speaker, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, then they could go ahead. Mr. Speaker, give us the nod. Let us keep these great men here that have worked with you for practically a lifetime. Several chairmen of committees have signed this petition, some not affected by it and some who are, but all I ask is that you and the rest of us read the great speech and statements and facts that were given to us by that great Kentuckian, Congressman FRANK CHELF:

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANK CHELF, DEMOCRAT, OF KENTUCKY, AUGUST 24, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of Subcommittee No. 3, I appear before you this morning on behalf of the entire Kentucky delegation: Hon. BRENT SPENCE, Hon. JOHN C. WATTS, Hon. WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Hon. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Hon. FRANK W. BURKE, Hon. CARL D. PERKINS, HON. EUGENE SILER, and myself, in support of H.R. 3725 to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469 Members.

There is ample precedent and a historical basis for this legislation. Beginning in 1789, there were 65 Members of the House and as the population increased, the House of Representatives was likewise increased to serve their needs. On April 14, 1792, the number of 65 Members was raised to 106. In 1802, the House was increased to 141, in 1811 to 181, in 1822 to 213, in 1832 to 240, in 1850 to 233, in 1862 to 241, in 1872 to 283, in 1882 to 325, in 1891 to 356, in 1901 to 386, and then in 1911, 50 years ago, the number was upped to 435, where it has remained until the admission of Hawaii and Alaska, which brought it to its present 437. These figures taken from the Congressional Library present a revealing record of the growth of the country and the House of Representatives. From 91,972,000 in 1911, we have grown to 182,000,000 in 1960—double our size. Incidentally, the average congressional district has grown from 200,000 in 1910 to 412,000 in 1960.

The House has not only this precedent but we have a precedent of recent significance. The increase in the Rules Committee membership from 12 to 15, is an addition of 20 percent. I seek to increase the House by 34, which is only approximately 7.2 percent, notwithstanding the fact that the population of the United States has more than doubled. My bill would help 14 of the 16 losing States to maintain their representation. Only two States would not be helped—Iowa and West Virginia. According to the statisticians in the Census Bureau and the so-called equal proportions formula, it would take a House increase to 480 to restore Iowa's loss and an increase to 528 Members to solve West Virginia's loss.

I had hoped that my bill would aid all 16 States losing members but "the chart" of the Census Bureau prevents it.

Notwithstanding the fact, gentlemen, that no legislation introduced will help little West Virginia, all but one of their delegation in the House have signed the so-called Chelf petition. For this sympathetic understanding of our problem, we, who stem from the remaining 15 States involved, are deeply grateful and shall remain everlastingly thankful to these loyal friends and gentle neighbors.

In addition to helping those 14 States that lose seats, my bill would enable those States that have greatly gained in population to acquire seats in addition to those already allocated to them by the 1960 census. Fortunately for them, my legislation would help to reduce their heavy workload per Member. The States that would be entitled to "bonus seats," which are over and above those already allocated, are Texas, two; Oregon, one; Ohio, one; New Mexico, one; New Jersey, one; Michigan, one; Louisiana, one; New York, one; Colorado, one; Connecticut, one; Florida, one; Illinois, one; Indiana, one; and California, three "bonus seats" in addition to the regular eight members already allocated to it.

H.R. 3725 would not only give "bonus seats" to those already gaining but it would also give additional representation to several States that ordinarily would not be affected, up or down, by the 1960 census. In addition to this, my legislation would materially assist 14 of the 16 States that lose seats. As an example, it would help 28 States and harm none.

As it has been stated, prior to 1911, it was the custom to automatically raise the number of the House every 10 years. Inasmuch as no increase has been voted since 1911, we, therefore, have an additional 91 million people in the United States that literally have no representation because if it took 435 members to adequately represent 91 million, I contend that the additional 91 million in the United States are entitled to at least the 34 seats that I seek. Incidentally, the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Hawaii, and Alaska have been admitted to the Union since 1911 and, therefore, these four States have drawn from the established allotment of 435 congressional seats.

Opponents of this and similar bills say that it will make the House unwieldy. They argue that we are selfish in our motives because they contend that our legislation seeks to keep politicians in their jobs and that the cost to the taxpayers would be terrific. These objections are erroneous. For instance, I have been a Member of the House for 16½ years and in all that time, I have never yet heard all 435 Members answer any one rollcall. Deaths, illnesses, important committee meetings and vacancies prevent 100 percent attendance. An accurate and systematic check of the yea and nay votes over the past 16 years shows an average attendance of less than 370 Members per rollcall. This means that an average of 65 Members never vote, no matter how important any business may be. On this basis, if we increase the House to 469, an average attendance would be approximately 400. What is so "unwieldy" about this number?

If the House is too large and too unwieldy as our opponents claim it to be, why is it that we 435 Members of the House are always through with our work (difficult as it may be) at the end of any given session and often have to wait on the other body to finish their work? A few years ago, under the Eisenhower administration, we created 40 new Federal judgships. Several weeks ago, at this session, we created an additional 73 judgships—why? Obviously, this action was necessary in the interest of better government because it afforded better service to the people of the Nation. Due to the very rapid growth of the country, our courts had become clogged with litigation and the only way to relieve the dockets was to create more judges. Why not take action to relieve the Representatives of the people so that they may be in a better position to more adequately serve their constituents?

Insofar as the argument of selfishness is concerned, let me say that this legislation is, to the contrary, most unselfish because it really prevents a Member from growing too powerful and too important by the reduction of the size of a given State's delegation. In other words, I am a more powerful Member of Congress if I am one of four than if I am one of a delegation of eight.

The argument of terrific cost falls flat on its face for the very simple reason that the 34 newly created seats, including Members' salaries, office staffs, allowances, and everything would cost the 182 million people in the United States today an average of three-fourths of 1 cent per person, per year. This is less than the cost of the former penny post card.

With our population explosion, if we keep adding tens of thousands of constituents to an individual Member of Congress, the time will come when he will be so overwhelmed and frustrated by duties in the office that he will have little time in which to legislate and practically no time in which to visit and mingle with his people. Through no fault of his own, a Member would become unavailable and inaccessible, which is just the reverse of what the Founding Fathers envisioned when they drafted the Constitution. As an example, it was never intended that the House of Representatives be separated from the people. I am told that the only occasion on which George Washington, President of the Constitutional Convention, entered into the discussion of the Convention was when he urged that the House be made accessible to more people rather than less. James Madison reported in his Journal of the Federal Convention that when it was proposed that the constitutional requirement of 1 Representative for every 40,000 persons be amended to 1 Congressman for every 30,000 persons, George Washington spoke out on the proposed amendment, urged its adoption and asserted that it would give him much satisfaction to see the smaller ration of representation be adopted in order to further secure the rights and the interests of the people. As momentous and weighty as all the other provisions of the Constitution are, and were, when they were being considered in convention, only on this item did Washington express his direct concern. We must acknowledge the significance of this fact.

George Washington, in my opinion, has made the strongest possible argument for the enactment of H.R. 3725. It was the primary object, intent, and purpose of George Washington and the drafters of the Constitution to keep the Members of the House of Representatives close to the people. It has been possible in the past for a Member to see his people and have his people see him. Let us not attempt to change this "modus operandi" because if we do, good, sound, responsible, democratic Government will become a legend rather than a living, active, moving force. In common parlance, a bricklayer can lay so many bricks in a day, a dentist can fill so many cavities, and a father can support only so many children. Likewise, a Member of the House can serve just so many constituents and no more.

Gentlemen, remember, the size of a Member's constituency has grown from the 30,000 recommended by Washington in 1789 to 412,000 in 1960. Increasing the size of our staff is not the answer. The loyal and faithful members of our staff are truly, in every sense of the word, "Assistant Members of Congress"—bless them—but there are so many things that demand the personal attention of the House Member. When people come to one's office, they want to see the Congressman—not an aid. When the committees are in session, the presence of the Member is required—not his secretary.

When the House meets, we have to answer the rollcall and vote and, with only 24 hours in each day, we find it increasingly more difficult to be at all places, at all times.

The argument has been advanced that this legislation is not necessary because today we have faster means of travel, radio, TV, telephones, and telegraph, and that all of this makes it easier for a Member to serve his people. With the aid of these facilities, we have been able to increase the average constituency from the 30,000 in 1789 to 412,000 in 1960. However, with all of these modern facilities and the invention and use of others since 1911, we still cannot cope with the situation. Frankly, it is getting out of hand. There is no substitute for a face-to-face meeting and a handshake with one's constituents.

As I previously stated, the Rules Committee membership has been increased recently by 20 percent. The seats in the Senate have grown from 92 to 100 in 50 years. This is an increase of 8 percent. Therefore, what is wrong with the House moving up only 7.2 percent on the basis of the requested 34 seats?

Gentlemen of the committee, I implore you to give the 91 million people who have come upon the scene in America since 1911 at least 34 seats, which would make the total 469. I repeat: If 435 Members were needed to adequately represent 91 million in 1911, don't you think 182 million, or double that number, are entitled to some consideration and representation?

Remember—these are electoral college seats that are being lost by these 16 sovereign States.

I urge you to vote for H.R. 3725.

The Rural New Yorker Discusses Mr. Smith's Cadillac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the Rural New Yorker, which is one of the outstanding farm management publications in the country, recently printed an editorial in response to the recent bid for publicity by a person who came to Washington in an expensive automobile, which he claimed was one of the benefits to him of our farm program. The editorial follows:

Not too long ago, a motion picture described how "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," alone and unheralded. It was a well-told story of an ambitious young man, filled with high ideals and determined to put them into practical effect in politics-ridden Washington.

Another Mr. Smith has just gone to Washington—a real-life Mr. Smith, but for quite a different purpose and under quite different auspices.

A few weeks ago, the story of William T. Smith of Big Flats, N.Y., and his $6,100 1961 Cadillac burst upon the world in such full flower that it bore all the earmarks of a carefully contrived plan.

Last spring, Smith, owner of a large inherited farm in Chemung County, voluntarily signed up under the Government's emergency feed grains program and was told he could divert any 104 of his 262 corn acres. He received an immediate cash payment of $3,049, the balance to be paid later in the year.

Smith has had a running battle with the Federal Government since 1954, involving quotas and fines and settlements. Because he has always regarded the Government's crop control program as "not morally right," he bought the new Cadillac to "dramatize the foolishness of the program." On the rear of the car he mounted a large sign reading: "We bought this car with money we received for not growing corn."

As a fitting climax to his demonstration, he drove the Cadillac to Washington, where he was feted and fed by 20 Senators. Significantly, there was complete press coverage.

Mr. Smith's convictions about Government controls are, of course, Mr. Smith's own business and he has every right to express them. Why he chose 1961 as the year for his performance, instead of any prior year, is open to conjecture. Also, considering agriculture's very shaky position on the public relations front, his recent theatrical exhibition was at the worst possible time.

It is this kind of wrong publicity on which newspapers feed and which is never thoroughly explained. How many people know, for example, that Smith derives only a part of his income from farming, that he is nursing a grudge against Government, that his reduction of corn acreage was a completely voluntary act on his part?

Instead of being a perpetual "aginner," he could, as an active member of several farm organizations, better direct his intelligence and energy toward a positive farm program that will get Government out of agriculture and at the same time insure agriculture a fair return on its labor and investment. The negative approach is rarely helpful, and most always harmful.

Smith is a little too frank about his plans: "I'll fertilize and take good care of the 158 acres I planted in corn this year, and I'll probably grow just as much without the diverted acreage. Then this fall I'll plant a wheat crop on some of the diverted land. It won't be harvested until next year, so I'll be following the program. Meanwhile, the weeds are having a ball."

Under the ASC regulations prevailing in most counties, growing weeds on land being summer fallowed is not considered proper conservation practice, especially if the land is to be diverted to wheat acreage. Smith's weed growing may well cast doubt on his eligibility to receive the final corn payment this fall.

This latest version of "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington" would have had a good deal less value to a publicity seeker if the 1961 feed grains program had had some real teeth in it by way of regional quantity controls, instead of acreage controls alone. That is the only constructive lesson to be learned from Mr. Smith's performance. But, no doubt, he would object just as violently to that proposal, too.

Neutrals Seem To Have Close Affinity With Communist Causes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in a few days we will be voting on the conference report on the mutual security bill and shortly we will be called upon to vote additional millions of dollars to so-called neutrals such as Communist Yugoslavia and Socialist India. I, for one, will maintain my position of voting against giving one cent to any enemy country or any country which helps our enemies. Mr. Speaker, there are no neutral nations. These so-called neutrals have never been our friends and history proves they line up with Soviet Russia on every issue and support Communist agression on every occasion. Before we vote any more money to those who would help destroy us, I hope the Members will note the following article by Crosby S. Noyes, foreign correspondent for the Washington Evening Star:

HOW NEUTRAL WOULD NEUTRALS BE?

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS.—It is hard to think of anything sillier than the idea which seems to be gaining ground in some parts that the neutral nations of the world may have an important role to play in resolving the current crisis in Berlin.

This seems, in fact, to have been a major preoccupation of some Western leaders since the crisis began. The neutrals, it was said, could play a restraining role on Russia in Berlin. The legal justifications of the Western position there would impress them. Their reactions are considered important in the question of whether or not to engage Russia in early negotiations. Above all, the outcome of the neutralist conference which opens this week in Belgrade is being watched with nervous concern.

There are, of course, those who have an unshakable faith in the collective wisdom of neutral nations to solve almost every problem raised by the cold war. There are those who hold quite seriously to the proposition that the United States has no interest in the world more vital than the good opinion of uncommitted peoples. Nothing may be done which risks offending the least of them. In every case when the interests of great powers clash some are quite willing to submit the issue to mediation, if not arbitration, by neutrals in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Up to this point the great powers have been willing to go quite far in this direction. The Russians, as well as the Western Powers, have been eagerly lining up neutralist support over the problem of Berlin. They have actively encouraged its inscription on the agenda of the coming Belgrade conference. And they have invited a number of prominent neutralist leaders, including Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah and India's Jawaharlal Nehru to Moscow during this critical period.

REDS MORE REALISTIC

On the question of neutralist influence, however, the Russians are a good deal more realistic than some Westerners. Lionization in Moscow of successions of Asian and African leaders has never had the remotest effect on the formation of Russian policy. The awarding of Lenin peace prizes has never entered into the calculation of basic Russian interests.

On the contrary, the Russians inflate the importance of neutral nations in the expectation that neutralist influence will work to their own advantage. They know—and most neutralist leaders know it too—that Russia is risking nothing in this process since Russia, as Premier Khrushchev freely admits, cares not two hoots what anyone may think or say about its own vital interests. On the other hand, they hope—and events encourage the hope—that Western policy in Berlin or elsewhere can be practically paralyzed by its subordination to the collective will of the uncommitted peoples of the world.

Prime Minister Nehru's recent analysis of the situation in Berlin is an illuminating case in point. His subsequent retraction and clarifications have not changed the central point of Mr. Nehru's original speech to the Indian Parliament: So far as he is concerned the allies in Berlin haven't much of a legal leg to stand on. Whereas, he says "The Soviet and East German authorities could very well argue that they have the right to regulate and control the movement from East Berlin to the West Berlin area."

SILENT ON JUSTIFICATION

The legal argument was all that interested Mr. Nehru. Whether the Communist action in Berlin was justified or not was "another matter"—a matter on which Mr. Nehru as a good neutralist would never venture an opinion. When a good neutralist condemns a political action on moral or humanitarian grounds it is almost invariably the West which is condemned. Such arguments applied to the Eastern bloc are recognized as a pure waste of breath.

When it comes to neutralist opinion on Berlin, however, there are other factors which the West can ignore only at its own peril. Few neutralist leaders feel in any way directly concerned with the cold war struggle in Western Europe. The overwhelming importance of Berlin in this struggle is for them a matter of little interest except as it may affect events in their own areas.

In the Berlin crisis these neutralist leaders see primarily the danger of a showdown between the United States and Russia which may involve them in a general war. Their obvious interest is to prevent this showdown at all cost. And the obvious way to do it is to bring about the capitulation of one or the other of the two parties.

Since as a matter of experience and logic they can expect to have little leverage on the Russian policy, the neutralist effort very predictably from now on will be to undermine and weaken the Western position in Berlin. To the extent that this effort is allowed to influence Western policy the going is sure to get rougher as time goes on. Those who look to the neutralists as arbiters in the Berlin dispute are due for the saddest of awakenings.

Everybody Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, what we need in this country is some good old-fashioned selling, still the best cornerstone for a sound, growing economy.

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, pegged it right in the August 13, 1961, edition of This Week magazine, herewith submitted for the Appendix of the RECORD:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This Week's "Everybody Sell" program in our June 18 issue really shook things up. Newspaper stories, discussion in Congress and mail like we've never seen before. Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, author of the article, "How To Start Things Booming Again," reported a flood of letters. Thousands of reprint requests came in for Wilferd A. Peterson's lively set of guideposts, "Everybody Sell.")

The letters came from every part of the country and from just about every kind of American—corporation presidents, Congressmen, editors, small businessmen, men shoppers, women shoppers—people on both sides of the sales counter.

One letter in particular we thought we'd better pass along. Any smart salesperson who sees Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, coming in ought to know about this.

"Dear Mr. Nichols: The article in your excellent magazine by Luther Hodges is timely and good, but I might say that it is merely saying 'Amen' to precisely the same remarks that I have been making for the past 10 years.

"I have a little test that I make when I visit strange cities. It goes like this. I walk into a store and approach a department like, say, the cosmetic department, and ask for a package of razor blades. I lay out a $5 bill and I will buy anything up to that amount that the salesperson suggests. Believe it or not, in trying this in countless cities over these 10 years I have had only two salespeople get the entire $5.

"Another sad commentary on selling is that in 20 years I have had only two automobile salesmen approach me, even though I have commented on this to several automobile dealers' conventions. American business has just forgotten the importance of selling and, I am sure, feels that all that is needed is an acceptable advertising campaign and fancy pictures. Nothing can top an American salesman who wants to sell.

"Sincerely,

"BARRY GOLDWATER."

Time To Break Off Meaningless Negotiations With the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that we continue to furnish a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union from which they can sell the false idea that the Communists believe in peace. The disarmament negotiations and the nuclear test-ban talks merely serve to confuse the real issues, weaken our position, and give the Communists a respectability they could not otherwise achieve. Three years of fruitless negotiations should be enough to prove to the world the Communists have no intention of reaching an agreement and could not be trusted to keep one if the negotiations were successful. I agree with the thought expressed in the editorial, herein included from the Wall Street Journal, that we would strengthen our position and ease the tension in Berlin if we stopped these talks now.

THE WEAPONS WE BRANDISH

Washington seems to be searching for responses to Soviet pressures against West Berlin, yet it has overlooked one fairly obvious move that would clearly strengthen the U.S. position. This is to break off immediately the deadlocked East-West talks on an atomic test-ban treaty.

Even if there were no Berlin crisis, the Geneva parley, now nearly three years old, would be pointless and perilous. Because a crucial East-West showdown is testing our will and strength, it is that much more urgent that we disengage ourselves from a web of futility.

Back in 1958, the United States assumed that a treaty could be negotiated swiftly, and so our tests were suspended without any check on what the Soviets were doing. The risk of the Soviets cheating was deemed slight. Today, it weighs heavily upon Washington, as it should. Said the administration last week: "No nation determined to protect the freedom of its people can accept this risk (of an unpoliced test ban) indefinitely."

And yet the United States has gone back to Geneva. It is ludicrous, to say the least, for the United States to persist in what are essentially disarmament talks with the very enemy whose threats have prompted massive U.S. rearming. It is utterly self-defeating when military men warn that the refining of U.S. nuclear weapons, a key part of our Berlin preparations, is stalled by the self-imposed test-suspension.

A main objection raised to breaking off the test ban talks is that it would weaken our standing before world opinion. Perhaps it would, but in the crisis before us, is the passing good opinion of others any substitute for a dependable nuclear arsenal? And if they should assail us on moral grounds, we, too, have a clear-cut moral commitment.

It is up to the United States alone to do what it must to uphold its position in Berlin. That task is most likely to succeed if the Soviets have cause to believe that we mean what we say; our words must be matched by relevant deeds. Abandonment of fake negotiation and announcement of U.S. nuclear test resumption would represent one such deed. For our move would convey to the Kremlin an unmistakable desire to improve the weapons we brandish.

In the duel of cold war, our will is only as imposing as our arms to back it up. And until we throw off the timidity that imprisons us at Geneva, our weapons and our will are equally subject to doubt.

Harry Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the city of New York and the country at large suffered an outstanding loss recently with the passing of Mr. Harry Rogers, who had devoted most of his life to helping his fellowman.

Mr. Rogers was the publisher of the West Side News, a local New York City newspaper. The characteristics of helpfulness and public awareness which typified the life of Mr. Rogers, was reflected in this fine publication.

On Thursday, August 31, 1961, there appeared in the West Side News a eulogy to its publisher. It follows:

"Mr. West Side" is dead.

Harry Rogers, publisher of the West Side News, who devoted the greater part of his life to helping his fellow man and to making the West Side the best side of the city of New York, died Friday morning in Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital of a coronary attack. Death occurred at the age of 63 years. With him was his wife, Mrs. Frances "Buddy" Rogers, his constant companion during his recent illness and to whom he had been married for 33 years, Mrs. Rogers was associated with him in the West Side News as business manager.

His death brought to an end a career of more than 40 years of affiliation with charitable, philanthropic, civic, fraternal, religious and welfare organizations and association with every worthwhile cause for the good of humanity.

Prior to acquiring the West Side News, Rogers was in the hotel business and served as president of the Hotelmen's Association. Ten years ago he purchased the West Side News to give voice to campaigns for civic, philanthropic, charitable, and public welfare causes for the improvement of his beloved home community, the West Side.

His keen interest in the area where he made his home for many years earned him the title of "Mr. West Side" by which he was widely known. He was a familiar figure at public hearings in city hall, attending numerous confernces and taking time out from his business to urge city officials and department heads to act immediately on needed improvements on the West Side.

Because of his intimate knowledge of the West side and its needs he was in demand as a speaker at dinners, rallies and public gatherings where his inspirational speeches

were enthusiastically received. He frequently served as master of ceremonies at public functions, secured prominent speakers for dinners and meetings, served on numerous committees and gave unselfishly of his time, talent and money for the public benefit.

Less known are the many hundreds who came to his office in the West Side News to discuss their problems, to ask for his help and to whom he devoted many hours of his time and contributed generously to help his fellow men.

At funeral services Sunday in the Riverside Memorial Chapel, 76th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, where many friends of long-standing, business associates, political and civic leaders, judges and public officials joined the bereaved family in final tribute. Rabbi Edward E. Klein of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue summed up the feelings of all present by saying "no eulogy could do justice to Harry Rogers."

Rabbi Klein added that Rogers' life, his efforts to help his * * * proved street lighting and other civic causes too numerous to list.

Under his guidance the West Side News grew from a small community newspaper to a powerful voice for the community, making "the West Side the Best Side" is his eulogy and remains in the hearts of all who knew him as the greatest tribute to his memory.

Rogers dedicated the West Side News to "the civic and community betterment of the West Side" and devoted all his energies toward that end, often encroaching on home and family life to attend to some matters he considered of importance to the community.

He spearheaded campaigns for adequate housing, rehabilitation of the West Side, more schools, improved police protection, erection of the concrete barricades on the island malls along Broadway to prevent cars from mounting the curbs, removal of the subway kiosk and remodeling of the subway station at 72d Street and Broadway, better sanitation, more parks and playgrounds.

It was read by Senators and Congressmen in Washington, by State officials and legislators by city officials and heads of city departments. Editorials from the West Side News have frequently been read at public hearings in support of civic improvements for the West Side.

Rogers was proud of the part played by the West Side News in securing approval of the various city and Federal agencies for the demolition of deteriorated tenements in the Lincoln Square area and construction of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Lincoln Towers now being built by Webb & Knapp, the Lincoln House Cooperative formerly known as Princess Gardens, Fordham University, and other segments of the Lincoln Square Redevelopment.

He appeared personally at public hearings before the City Planning Commission and the Board of Estimate to urge approval of Lincoln Square and made a special plea for approval of the Fordham University campus in the area which was opposed by property owners and businessmen who subsequently lost three court decisions upholding the right of the university to participate in the project.

In 1958 Rogers was appointed by city officials as chairman of the Citizens Watchdog Committee on Relocation Practices in Lincoln Square. With the committee serving as a clearinghouse for complaints, more than 5,000 families were relocated without a single eviction. In close contact with the Lincoln Center since its inception, Rogers was recently active in crystalizing public sentiment toward neighborhood action for improvement and redevelopment of the periphery area around Lincoln Square. A meeting of community leaders, businessmen, civic, religious and political leaders was held with his cooperation and a committee has been formed to carry forward the objectives discussed at the gathering.

Tributes to Rogers poured in from leaders in all walks of life. Mayor Wagner sent a telegram expressing his keen personal regret. Many other officials and members of the judiciary sent personal messages.

Rogers' affiliations were almost too numerous to list. He was a founder of the League of West Side organizations, founder and executive secretary of the West Side Chamber of Commerce of the city of New York, a member of the board of managers of the West Side YMCA, chairman of the Citizens Advisory Council of the YMCA, member of the board of the West Side Schools Community Centers, member of Lodge No. 1, Loyal Order of Moose, the Grand Street Boys Association, area chairman and advisor of the Boy Scouts and affiliated with numerous charitable, philanthropic, and welfare movements and organizations.

Through the years he received numerous plaques, citations and awards for the service he rendered to mankind. He was named Man of the Year by the American Jewish Congress, by the West Side Lions Club and by the West Side Chamber of Commerce in recognition of his accomplishments.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his mother, Theresa, brothers, Irving, Abe, Sol and Milton; sisters, Birdy Leichman and Carrie Peskin. In his memory contributions are being sent to the Heart Fund at the request of the family.

The Mistakes of the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have pointed out, during the debate on the mutual security program, the mistakes, the mismanagement, and the downright dishonesty which has prevailed in the program. I have called for a thorough investigation before we throw away billions more of the American taxpayers' dollars. The questions I have raised, year after year, have gone unanswered as we continue to vote away our substance. Perhaps some of you, before we vote additional billions this year, will take time to read the timely editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, which I include herewith:

WHY FOREIGN AID FAILS

Rarely has more congressional energy been misdirected than in the debate over Mr. Kennedy's foreign aid bill, which is now in the hands of a Senate-House conference committee.

In all this rhetorical fallout there has been scarcely a mention of the fundamental issue: Is the foreign aid program what we want? Has it justified itself? Can it ever achieve what is expected of it? Is it the best way to spend that amount of money?

These questions were raised and answered with admirable candor and clarity by Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago in Indianapolis last spring. The full text of his speech has only recently become available, but it deserves prompt and wide circulation on Capitol Hill.

The notion that foreign aid is achieving some worthwhile purpose, Mr. Friedman said, is "simply taken for granted." Few Congressmen bother to look for evidences of its success or care about the many manifest examples of its failure. Mr. Friedman gives specific illustrations:

Egypt—where foreign aid built a steel mill "which is a monument like the pyramids, with one exception; its maintenance costs are much higher. It costs the Egyptian Government about twice as much to get its steel from that mill as it would cost to buy the steel abroad."

India—where foreign aid has put the Government into industry and thus induced it to impose exchange controls which hinder the accumulation of capital from other sources.

Burma and Laos—where vast quantities of foreign aid have lined the pockets of profiteers or helped opposing factions fight one another.

Formosa—where American foreign aid "has had very little to do" with her substantial economic growth; and Japan and Germany, which got the least aid and achieved the greatest growth.

"The fundamental objection to foreign aid, Mr. Friedman said, "is that rather than assisting the foreign countries to develop more rapidly it is working in exactly the opposite direction." It tends "to reduce the strength and force of the free enterprise sector, political democracy, and freedom."

Foreign aid fails, Mr. Friedman said, not because of superficial defects but because of its very nature. Giving aid to a government encourages the government to grow at the expense of free enterprise and thus promotes socialism because "there has never been a society, so far as I know, which has been economically centralized and politically free at the same time."

In addition, foreign aid is based on the false assumptions that capital guarantees development and that poor countries cannot get money except thru charity. On the contrary, Mr. Friedman said, if a nation has "the incentive, the drive, and the desire," it will be able to attract capital; if these are lacking, any money thrust upon it will be wasted.

Mr. Friedman suggested other, cheaper ways, such as lowering our tariff and quota barriers, to help backward countries stand on their own feet. But the immediate question is not what alternatives there may be; it is simply whether the present spending for foreign aid makes sense. Clearly it doesn't. As Mr. Friedman said, it means "accepting the premises of the system we are fighting against"—premises which even those who support the program "would abhor and reject out of hand if anybody tried to apply them at home."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Wheat Price Boost No Cause To Increase the Cost of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, recently the president of the American Bakers Association expressed the belief that, in view of higher support prices for wheat, bread prices would probably have to be increased 1 cent a loaf. There is no reason in the world why any bread price increase should be attributed to the new wheat program. I am happy to see that an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, August 29, discussing this matter, concluded:

Neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1961]

EXPLANATION FOR CONSUMERS—WHEAT PRICE BOOST NO CAUSE TO INCREASE THE COST OF BREAD

(By Julius Duscha)

Should consumers blame farmers for the proposed penny-a-pound increase in the price of bread?

And is it true that in these days of billion-bushel wheat surpluses there actually is a shortage of high-quality wheat which millers need for flour?

These two questions were raised last week when Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman conducted a long-distance argument with E. E. Kelley, Jr., president of the American Bakers Association.

DISPUTED INGREDIENTS

As most consumers stood by understandably puzzled, Freeman and Kelley disputed the ingredients which are responsible for an expected rise in bread prices.

The argument began when Kelley, who operates a large bakery in Lakeland, Fla., said that "it will be little short of a miracle if bread prices are not increased in the near future."

He cited an increase in wheat support prices and a shortage of high-quality wheat as among the factors calling for higher bread prices.

Kelley said increases in flour prices that bakers are already paying will add $60 million a year to their operating costs. This amounts to the baking industry's total profits last year, Kelley added.

He also said that a recent increase in Agriculture Department price-support levels for nonfat dry milk, an important commercial baking ingredient, added another $8 million to the industry's annual costs.

Wheat support prices will go up next year under a new farm program passed by Congress this summer and approved by wheat producers just last week.

In exchange for a 10 percent reduction in wheat acreages, farmers will be guaranteed an average price of $2 a bushel by the Government, compared with $1.79 this year.

Farmers will also be paid for the land taken out of wheat production. The payments will vary from 45 to 60 percent of what the farmers could have earned if the diverted acres had been planted in wheat.

But this program will have no direct effect on the price of wheat harvested this year.

There has been no significant change in the price of No. 2 Hard Red Winter wheat, which has been selling for about $2 a bushel. This is the quality wheat that millers need for flour.

As for the supplies of this wheat, the Agriculture Department maintains that they are more than ample.

DROUGHT EFFECTS

The Hard Red Spring wheat crop, which millers also want, is estimated at only 128 million bushels this year, which is about 12 million below the domestic needs of 140 million bushels.

But there is a surplus of Hard Red Winter wheat of almost a billion bushels. In addition there is a stored surplus of nearly 200 million bushels of spring wheat.

The United States needs only 257 million bushels of the winter wheat. The shortage of spring wheat is due in part to the drought centering in Montana and North and South Dakota.

Not all of the surplus wheat is of high quality, but combined with the expected 1961 Hard Red Winter wheat crop of more than 1 billion bushels, it should furnish enough top-grade wheat to meet the needs of bakers.

The protein content of the 1961 crop is about 1 percent less than in 1960, but this year's wheat is considered equal to last year's in protein quality.

The farmer gets only 14 percent of what the consumer pays for a loaf of bread, and this figure includes the cost of the butter and milk in the bread as well as the wheat.

The Agriculture Department says that the average cost of a pound loaf of bread last year was 20.3 cents, of which the farmer gets 2.8 cents.

The share received by the baker and wholesaler, who usually are the same person or company, was 11.9 cents, or 59 percent of the total.

The retailer got 3.4 cents, or 17 percent, and the miller received seven-tenths of a cent, or 3 percent. Other costs amounted to 1.5 cents.

The farmer's share of the cost of a loaf of bread has decreased from 25 to 14 percent during the last decade, while the price of bread has increased from 13.5 cents a pound loaf to 20.3 cents.

The baker-wholesaler's share has gone up from 44 to 59 percent, the retailer's has remained the same at 17 percent, and the miller's has decreased from 5 to 3 percent.

OTHER COSTS RISE

Not all of the costs are profit, of course. Labor costs, for example, have been continually increasing, as have other costs involved in production and distribution of bread.

But where do all of these figures leave the consumer, except holding a bag containing a higher priced loaf of bread?

The figure would seem to indicate that neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Reshaping Lives Is Daily Business of Court's Probation Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Washington Star on August 21, 1961.

This article tells of the outstanding work performed by the municipal court probation office toward the rehabilitation of alcoholics in the District of Columbia. The record of that office, under the guidance of Robert J. Conner, Sr., has attracted the attention of many large cities throughout the country who have struggled with the problem of rehabilitation of alcoholics.

The fine work, progress, and savings to taxpayers that have been achieved through this humanitarian and realistic program in the Nation's Capital, is deserving of national attention. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 21, 1961]

RESHAPING LIVES IS DAILY BUSINESS OF COURT'S PROBATION OFFICERS

(By Dana Bullen)

Municipal court probation officers, engaged in the daily business of reshaping lives, have to be masters of both the soft and hard sell.

They prefer to use the soft sell when possible.

"You've got to let these people feel you will be their friend, if they will let you," said Probation Director Robert J. Conner, Sr.

"The minute you've got their confidence," he said, "you've got the battle (of rehabilitation) half won."

This type of friendly concern for a convicted man's problems is one of the main tools used by Mr. Conner and his 10 probation officers.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR ISSUE

It leads to many things that could hardly be anticipated on the day a judge first places a convicted man or woman on probation.

For example, Mr. Conner recalled his first case as a probation officer—18 years ago.

A Northeast Washington woman was convicted of stealing food. Mr. Conner found she lived in a basement with a dirt floor and had active tuberculosis.

He helped the destitute woman obtain hospitalization for herself and a temporary foster home for her small baby. Eighteen months later, the woman was released as cured.

Even now, years later, the woman occasionally comes to the probation office to let Mr. Conner know how she is doing—and to say thanks.

"She knows she would have been dead in a few months if she'd been left in the place where I found her," he said.

Or take another case.

ORDERED LONG WALK

This man, call him Jones, was convicted of drunken driving. When he came to the probation officer to be interviewed, he was drunk again. Jones was with his wife.

"I suggested to the wife that she drive the car home and let him walk." Mr. Conner said. Two hours—and 8 miles—later, the man was sober, and more receptive.

Jones, with the help of the probation staff and members of Alcoholics Anonymous, licked his drinking problem, Mr. Conner said.

The man hasn't been back to municipal court. He's been too busy leading a useful, productive life. Jones, Mr. Conner said, is now a grade 15 in the Government.

KEEN ON PROGRAM

This story points up one of Mr. Conner's main ideas about rehabilitation. Solve the liquor problem, he feels, and you're miles ahead in solving all the other problems.

Under Mr. Conner's guidance, the probation office in 1958 set up an alcoholic rehabilitation unit to try to keep drunks sober and let other probation officers handle criminal cases.

The special unit, headed by Edward W. Soden, has worked with 7,701 persons during the last 33 months. Of these, 57 percent were not arrested for intoxication again.

COUNSELING PROMOTED

Another of Mr. Conner's beliefs is that a successful probationer needs a paying job. All but 33 of the 669 men and women on probation at the end of the last fiscal year, June 30, were employed.

During the year, probation officers referred 304 probationers to employment counseling services. In the last 4 months, they actually found jobs for 47 persons.

The benefit to the District is substantial. In taxes alone, officials estimated, probationers with jobs paid in $349,638.

These taxes alone exceed the yearly appropriation for operation of the entire probation office. For fiscal year 1962, the allocation for the office is $124,220.

But money is not the main thing Mr. Conner and his staff look at. Every day, men and women pass through the probation office who would otherwise be in jail cells.

The record, naturally, is not all successes. Some probationers, at least at first, wish the probation officer—and his rules—would just leave him alone.

That's where the hard sell may come in. A probationer who won't follow the rules, or won't cooperate, can be jailed, although it's usually a last resort.

RECORD IMPRESSIVE

Probation was revoked, on the recommendation of the probation office, in 105 cases last year. These might be considered the failures, but the percentage is low.

But the record of successes—the jobs found, the men kept out of jail, the tax savings, the salvaged lives—while impressive, is the result of an uphill fight.

In 1957, the Commissioners' Committee on Prisons, Probation, and Parole recommended 20 additional probation officers at municipal court, more clerical help, and better facilities.

Since then, one supervisor, four probation officers, and two stenographers have been added to the staff.

But, said Robert R. Estep, assistant probation director, probation officers still carry almost 90 cases each. This is roughly double recommended national standards, he said.

A lack of stenographers, according to an annual report released this month, requires probation officers to spend up to 50 percent of their time on clerical details.

Requested for fiscal 1962 in this month's annual report were two more stenographers and two additional probation officers. More space at municipal court is not now possible.

Johnson—Long Right Arm of American Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we Texans are proud, very proud, of the job that Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON as an American has done for our whole Nation. But our pride was never greater than it was when he entered Berlin and brought to that beleaguered city the courage and the reassurance that it needed in one of its darkest hours.

In his trip to Berlin, the Vice President was firm but not provocative; courageous but not belligerent. He handled himself with skill and with dedication to the best interests of the free world, and therefore, the best interests of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Waco News-Tribune.

[From the Waco News-Tribune, Aug. 24, 1961]

JOHNSON—LONG RIGHT ARM OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

One of the real turning points in the Berlin crisis was the visit of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Germany and West Berlin. While nobody outside the highest official circles knows exactly what he said to the free German leadership, the results speak for themselves.

German Chancellor Adenauer and West Berlin Mayor Willie Brandt, engaged in a political battle for the chancellorship of West Germany in elections scheduled September 17, needed a settling influence in the face of the sudden Communist action in sealing off the borders of East Berlin. JOHNSON settled them quickly, effectively, and in a way that strengthened the cause of freedom in this moment of tension and potential war.

It is obvious, even at the present level of Red-created crisis, that the Soviets do not want war in Europe. They could gobble up West Berlin in one quick bite if they wanted to risk a war. The trick is to deny them that quick bite without pulling down the nuclear holocaust which hangs over everybody's heads. A miscalculation or a misunderstanding amidst the taut confrontation on the border of East Berlin could start the shooting when nobody meant to start it. There was the prospect, in the German political slugging, that such a misunderstanding might come about. This is what JOHNSON cleared up in his flying visit.

The Vice President spread another layer of firefighting foam in the southeastern Asia crisis a few months ago on another flying mission on behalf of the United States to an area that threatened to ignite a major conflict.

The entire Nation can be grateful, and Texans can be especially proud, over the increasing strength of the Vice President as the long right arm of President Kennedy and of the American people in a time when the Communists are doing their clever best to throw us off balance and sucker us into giving them an opening to grab up the resources of Western Europe and Japan.

The now familiar sight of JOHNSON handshaking with crowds of Africans, Asiatics, and Europeans tells only the surface part of what he is doing for his country. He is a born showman and knows how to get the crowds with him, but he also is politically sensitive, coldly realistic, and knows how to deal with the leadership of friendly and neutral lands in a decisive way. His role in the Kennedy administration grows larger every day because of his unique combination of talents, his tireless energy and his determination to give the country everything he has, wherever and whenever he can serve.

The Kennedy-Johnson combination is gaining stature steadily in grappling with the gravest threat our way of life has ever faced. We have dark and gloomy days ahead, crises to come that will test our nerves to the breaking point. But we have leadership we can trust and if we stand to the test stoutly, we may live to see the day of victory.

Stratford Asks Fallout Shelter Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Kennedy has courageously alerted the Nation to the need for greater civil defense efforts. His leadership has already resulted in wider public awareness of a national need for thought and for action.

Recently, Mayor George F. Dooley of the Borough of Stratford, Camden County, N.J., came to my offices to begin farsighted plans for his community. He and other borough officials met here to discuss built-in civil defense protection for new municipal buildings now in the planning stage. They were told by Defense officials that they were the first municipal officials to take this step.

An editorial in the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post of August 24 describes this visit and the importance of greater public awareness of the situation that we face. I am glad that the Camden Courier Post has commented so well on the action taken by the Stratford officials. Such awareness of the basic need for decisionmaking on all levels of civil defense activity is very necessary and most welcome at this time.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Stratford Asks Fallout Shelter Cash" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATFORD ASKS FALLOUT SHELTER CASH

Stratford has won national publicity by being the first community in the country to apply for Federal funds to help build public fallout shelters under a new civil defense program.

Stratford Borough officials, making the request of James H. Henry of the Defense Department's Operations Research Office at a meeting arranged by Senator WILLIAMS, were told by Henry they were the first in the Nation to do so. They are planning to build public fallout shelters under the municipal building and a new elementary school, and according to Mayor George F. Dooley, Jr., "want built-in civil defense protection in those buildings from the very beginning."

Senator WILLIAMS says he is convinced that a national fallout shelter program will be underway in the relatively near future. We would join him in complimenting the Stratford officials for getting in on or under the ground floor of such a program, if the metaphor is permissible.

Fallout shelters are perhaps the least controversial element of civil defense, and are a major part of the Kennedy administration's civil defense plan. Congress already has appropriated $207 million for an expanded radiation shelter program—the one in which Stratford would participate. President Kennedy asked Congress on August 14 for $73 million more for civil defense food and medical stockpiling programs.

The apparent strategy behind the revised civil defense policy is to convince Soviet leaders that Americans are ready to risk nuclear war, if necessary, to protect rights to access to West Berlin.

Actual physical preparations to withstand a nuclear attack can hardly be anywhere near completion by the time the Berlin crisis reaches its peak, presumably late this year. The marking and stocking of fallout shelters in existing office, industrial, school, and apartment buildings has a December 1962 target date. Such shelter areas, when readied, are supposed to provide reasonably adequate protection against fallout for one-fourth of the Nation's population, or about 46 million persons. Relocation of 126 million bushels of federally owned wheat from current storage sites to areas where food shortages might exist following an attack certainly will take many months. New storage facilities will have to be constructed in many of the 191 metropolitan areas slated for a share of the grain.

The most obvious means of rapidly increasing civil preparedness for the immediate period of international tension would be to encourage individual and communal protective measures. Stocking a 2-week supply of nonperishable food by each family and building of family fallout shelters would fit in this category. But the President so far has refrained from calling for construction of family shelters or for a Federal tax incentive to spur such construction. A major deterrent to such a call is the fear that it might cause undue public alarm.

There is some risk that a truly crash program on civil defense might be misinterpreted by both friend and foe. Initiation of an expanded shelter program, for example, might be viewed by an enemy as signaling a preemptive strike. A student of civil defense has written: "A massive shelter program initiated by either side would be a disequilibrating element in the balance of terror. With only ineffectual shelter measures the [people] of each bloc are in effect nuclear hostages of the other. Putting them under protective cover deprives the other side of its hostages in proportion as the cover is—or is thought to be—effective."

Whether fallout shelters offer any hope of saving millions of lives in the aftermath of a nuclear attack is itself a matter of debate. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified that it was "probably a reasonable estimate that the identification and marking of existing fallout shelters could, without additional effort, save at least 10 to 15 million lives in the event of a thermonuclear attack." One study concluded that a combined blast and fallout shelter program could reduce total casualties by at least 90 percent.

A more pessimistic view holds that any shelter program will become quickly outmoded by new weapons systems, that nuclear scientists underestimate the period of radioactive contamination, and that shelters negate any kind of positive reaction to attack by creating a rabbit warren psychology among the people. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, stated a year ago that he would rather spend money "on offensive weapon systems to deter the war in the first place."

The debate is bound to become more intense if the administration presses next year for a 5-year Federal-State-local shelter program to cost up to $20 billion. Frank B. Ellis, new Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, is known to favor such an effort.

You Don't Have To Be Crazy—The Individual and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 21, 1961]

YOU DON'T HAVE TO BE CRAZY—THE INDIVIDUAL AND EDUCATION

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

U.S. Commissioner of Education Sterling McMurrin, speaking to the Harvard summer school on education administration, made a statement which, to my mind, reveals the hidden desire of the New Frontier to bring the education of our children under the control of the Federal Government.

Advocates of Federal aid to education angrily deny they seek dictatorial powers.

In my opinion, Federal control is explicit and implicit in every suggested Federal-aid bill we have considered.

At Harvard Mr. McMurrin said:

"Educational goals conceived only in terms of the individual welfare are no longer sufficient to insure the preservation of democracy in an age when continuing political, social and cultural crises place the Nation in deadly peril."

"Educational goals conceived only in terms of the individual welfare are no longer sufficient," says Mr. McMurrin. Is this not a demand for collectivization?

The individual, through personal development of whatever talents he posseses, has made this country what it is today.

Individuals produce progress, not the Federal Government. Individuals establish morality, not the Federal laws. Individuals select the national goals and aspirations, not the Congress. Individuals exhibit love and compassion, not the corporate state.

It is the Communists who maintain the people who live under their domination. But the collectivists have failed miserably to achieve even the minimum of material well being for their subjects, and certainly there is no spiritual satisfaction for those who live under Communist doctrine.

Here in the United States of America on one-sixth of the world's real estate, a small fraction of the world's population, operating in a climate of individual freedom, has created more material wealth than the rest of the world combined.

Here we have stamped out starvation, something no totalitarian state has been able to accompilsh.

Our citizens, under what McMurrin now discards as the old-fashioned concept of individual determination, have enjoyed greater educational opportunities than have been available to any other children in the world.

On what valid ground can the U.S. Commissioner of Education argue that the preservation of democracy depends upon the abandonment of our historic educational concept?

How can he suggest that we must now forget the welfare of the individual and direct our concern to the collective?

Freemen as responsible individuals created this Republic and have perpetuated it for our benefit.

I am confident Mr. McMurrin is no Communist, but I think he advocates this central control because, like so many social reformers, he has accepted central dictation as the only acceptable solution to the problems of the 20th century.

I would remind Mr. McMurrin, and all who believe in centralized control, that in modern times tyranny has commenced with regimentation in the classroom, with the removal of individual determination and with the substitution of mass or collectivist objectives.

How do you stand, sir?

Our Democracy of the 20th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have just returned from a meeting held last weekend by the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association. The 81st annual convention of this body of dedicated newspapermen was held at French Lick, Ind., and featured panel discussions of accomplishments of our new State and National administrations.

It was my privilege to discuss our work here in the Senate and its coordination with the White House and executive departments and to introduce four of my Indiana colleagues from the House of Representatives. It was also my privilege to hear discussions of the outstanding work being done by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh and his administration. We were pleased to have with us Mr. Richard Goodwin of the White House staff who spoke to us on world affairs at the luncheon of the editors.

All of this is indicative of the great interests of Hoosiers in the overriding issue of today—survival.

This year the Resolutions Committee of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association drafted an excellent report on "Our Democracy of the 20th Century."

I ask that the text of this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DEMOCRACY OF THE 20TH CENTURY

The Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, in convention assembled at French Lick, Ind., August 26, 1961, by resolution and acclamation of its editor members, finds it appropriate to make the following report:

America has faced strong enemies during the 20th century.

In all cases, the hostile power has generated out of monolithic political systems, whose singleminded dedication was difficult to defeat.

And, according to these enemies, America was weak—hampered by an inefficiency which grows out of controversy and compromise. In such a role, it is hard for the enemies of our society to understand why we have been able to defeat them.

The amazing America of the 20th century has grown strong for precisely the reason that it was singleminded. Our patterns of "inefficiency are vital keys to the growth of our economy, our security, and the social well-being of our people.

Our nation could not ignore the changing world of the 20th century, but it insisted upon following its own system of change—a system which mirrors the ebb and flow of political opinion and action, shaped by the choices of a free electorate.

In areas of economy, security and social well-being, the courageous program of the Democratic Party has defined and developed unique methods of change which so puzzle our enemies. The progressive programs of the Democratic Party have resulted from decisions made by the electorate. It is significant that these programs have not been canceled, although the opposition party elected to office possessed the right and the opportunity to cancel them.

It is clear that peaceful, democratic progress, with its elements of controversy and compromise, has been the central factor in the development of a kind of power that dictators hate and fear.

It is also clear that this means of progress must be protected—and defended against every threat.

In 1960, the wisdom of the electorate again was vindicated when it chose Matthew E. Welsh to be Indiana's Governor. In making this decision, voters not only chose the principles of Democratic progress—but also the important principle of strength through change. In this respect, the voters feared that a particular Hoosier brand of singlemindedness had perpetuated itself long enough.

In spite of Governor Welsh's victory, political opinion in Indiana continues to be dominated by a single party. Central to this domination are party newspapers, which far outnumber those of rival opinion and exist as monopolies in many sections of the State.

As Democratic editors, we do not believe that Republican ideas are dangerous, in themselves, to America's 20th century system. After all, divergency in belief is the very core of the strength of this system.

It is because we believe in the need for continued controversies and divergencies, that Democratic editors must see themselves in roles of unparalled importance in the future of Indiana and the Nation.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
PAUL L. FELTUS,
Bloomington Star-Courier.
RICHARD G. INSKEEP,
Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.
JOHN A. WATKINS,
Bloomfield Evening World.
VIRGIL MCCLINTIC,
White County News.

Playing With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Herald Tribune, David Wise tells us the shocking story of what happens when children play with fire. In this case, one of the children is Richard Goodwin, Presidential assistant, who talked with Major Guevara, Minister of Industries of Cuba and a dangerous Communist. The estimates of the length of the conversation are from 20 minutes, by the Presidential press secretary's own admission, to 3 hours, according to the former Foreign Minister of Argentina.

What was Mr. Goodwin talking about? Why should he engage in a conversation with an avowed enemy of the American people, in the first place? If Mr. Goodwin doesn't have the judgment to determine what effect a Presidential assistant's conversation with a representative of the Communist movement has, he should be summarily dismissed or reassigned to some other, less sensitive field of endeavor. Isn't it time President Kennedy called in all of the do-it-yourself kits on foreign policy, which apparently he has passed out to his intimates?

The article by Mr. Wise follows:

KENNEDY DENIES PLAYING A ROLE IN GUEVARA TALK

(By David Wise)

WASHINGTON.—A cocktail party conversation between an assistant to President Kennedy and Cuba's Minister of Industries, Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, has touched off a minor international incident.

The White House denied flatly yesterday that President Kennedy had any advanced knowledge of the talk between Richard N. Goodwin, deputy special counsel to the President, and Major Guevara at Montevideo August 16. Associate Press Secretary Andrew Hatcher termed the conversation "a casual meeting, completely accidental."

Monday night, Argentina's Foreign Minister, Adolfo Mugica, resigned in the wake of a political storm kicked up in that country after the cocktail party incident.

SENATORS TO CALL GOODWIN

Yesterday afternoon, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee announced it would question Mr. Goodwin about the affair. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate assistant majority leader, said the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs would call Mr. Goodwin for questioning at a closed meeting.

Senator HUMPHREY said Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, was trying to arrange the session to "explore what talks were had and what took place." He said it was not an investigation, but that the subcommittee wanted to be kept informed.

Mr. Goodwin had no comment, but White House sources said the conversation took place when the 31-year-old Presidential aid arrived at a cocktail party at the home of a Brazilian diplomat in Montevideo. Mr. Goodwin was one of several American officials attending the alliance for progress conference at nearby Punta del Este.

INVITED TO PARTY

He was said to have been preparing to retire for the night when he ran into friends at his hotel, who invited him to the party. There, he met Major General Guevara, a Moscow-trained expert in guerrilla warfare and an Argentine by birth who fought with Fidel Castro in Oriente Province.

Major Guevara is said to have approached Mr. Goodwin and launched into an explanation of Cuba's foreign policies that reflected the Castro government's propaganda line.

Last week, there were published reports that Major Guevara had put out "feelers" toward better relations between Washington and Havana. The White House discounted these reports at the time. The Presidential press secretary, Pierre Salinger, said the talk had "no political significance."

He added that it was "just a case of two men meeting at a reception, and one of them being polite enough to listen for a few minutes to some one he met at a party."

GUEVARA'S VERSION

Last Wednesday night in Havana, Major Guevara gave his version of the conversation. He said:

"I expressed our Cuban position that we are willing to talk, that we do not want to fight, that we want to remain within the Latin American system and that we demand the right to be just another country among countries with differing economic systems. It was a short, courteous and cold meeting and it was not important."

Mr. Mugica resigned as Argentine Foreign Minister apparently as a direct result of the cocktail party incident. The Argentine diplomat had told newsmen that the "Guevara and Goodwin conference in Montevideo, Uruguay, demonstrated that Cuba's Fidel Castro regime seeks better relations with the United States."

Argentine President Arturo Frondizi met with Major Guevara on August 18 and came under political fire for doing so. Mr. Mugica said he had told reporters about the Goodwin-Guevara talk to show Mr. Frondizi's meeting with Guevara was nothing more than "acting in the same line" as the United States.

OTHER VERSIONS

President Frondizi's conversation with the Cuban angered the military, and Mr. Frondizi made two nationwide broadcasts thereafter reaffirming Argentina's policy of "pro-Western, Christian and democratic character."

Mr. Mugica said Monday night he was resigning to avoid the slightest trouble between Argentina and a friendly country. Asked by reporters whether he was referring to the United States, he said, "Yes. When I made my declarations about the Goodwin-Guevara interview, I knew in unquestionable form what had happened at that interview, its duration of three hours and the fact that the personal representative of President Kennedy could not have spoken for 3 hours with the Cuban Minister without prior knowledge of his chief."

Questioned about this statement today, Mr. Hatcher said "neither the President nor Mr. Goodwin had any knowledge that Mr. Goodwin would speak with Che Guevara." He added the conversation lasted 20 to 25 minutes, and not 3 hours.

He said about 30 persons were present, and that "90 percent of the conference" was in Spanish, with several persons present acting as interpreters. He said the talk took place in the main room where the party was held, with other persons dancing and talking nearby.

Mr. Goodwin is a Latin American affairs specialist for the President and served on a preinauguration task force on Latin America. He has worked on the alliance for progress program and was a key speechwriter for the President during last fall's

election campaign. He is a graduate of Harvard Law School, former clerk to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter and was a staff assistant on a House subcommittee that probed rigged television quiz shows in 1959.

Keeping Our Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, increasing numbers of thoughtful citizens in my State, as in many others, are concerned by the apparent unwillingness of our Government to determine by thorough and impartial survey whether there is not some workable alternative to the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. As most Members are aware, this project will, if continued, flood some 9,000 acres of land belonging to the Seneca Indians by our treaty of 1794.

The Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress have not yet authorized the $15 million requested by the administration for the continuation of the Kinzua Dam project. But the administration has made clear its intention that the project be continued. I believe that Congress should, at the very least, be in a position to assure our citizens that every reasonable alternative to the Kinzua Dam has been actively, adequately and impartially sought out and explored and that, in the final political decision on whether or not to proceed, the great moral questions involved in breaking a treaty have been fully and carefully weighed. Thus far, the American public has certainly received no such assurance. These would be important questions at any time, but they are emphasized particularly when we are seeking to obtain respect for our treaty rights in Berlin.

I ask unanimous consent, to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on this issue from the Newark Evening News of August 19, entitled "Keeping Our Word."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING OUR WORD

For Americans, only one response is possible, Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles said of the Berlin situation. "We must adhere to our treaty rights, we must honor our commitments." This is a fundamental principle of decent men and decent governments.

To the people of Berlin Mr. Bowles' words must have sounded fine. But how do they sound to the Seneca Indian Tribe right here at home? Perhaps the words are not heard in the clatter of machines engaged in building a Federal dam that will flood the Senecas' land—despite a treaty that promised them undisturbed occupancy in perpetuity.

The Indians' protest is being ignored by this administration as it was by the last. Congress has surrendered to the Army Engineers, appropriating millions of dollars for the dam, which is to be a key structure in a project to control the floodwaters of the Allegheny River.

An alternate plan by Dr. Arthur Morgan, first chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been ignored by the Government, although it offers a way to do the flood control job better and cheaper. Dr. Morgan's plan would use a vast natural swamp for water storage, instead of flooding the best lands of the Seneca Reservation as is now planned by the Army Engineers.

More important than the engineering aspects of the Allegheny is the moral question involved—the treaty of 1794 by which we were assured the friendship of the Senecas in exchange for an irrevocable grant of land.

What Mr. Bowles said about honoring our Berlin treaty applies with equal validity to the treaty of 1794.

Twenty Cents a Day To Live On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following:

TWENTY CENTS A DAY TO LIVE ON—AN APPEAL TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

In reporting to the American people your conversations with Khrushchev, you said:

"A small group of disciplined Communists could exploit discontent and misery in a country where the average income may be $60 or $70 a year and seize control, therefore, of an entire country without Communist troops ever crossing any international frontier."

Your remarks referred to nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America where millions of people live on 20 cents a day. Their governments are trying to preserve their freedom.

"The hope of freedom in these areas," you added, "which see so much poverty and illiteracy, so many families without homes rests with the local peoples and their governments. Yet all this does not mean that our Nation and the West and the free world can only sit by. On the contrary, we have an historic opportunity to help these countries build their societies until they are so strong and broadly based that only an outside invasion could topple them. And that threat, we know, can be stopped."

All this is true, Mr. President. Yet you have left unsaid something of utmost importance. In this struggle to preserve freedom, there is one factor which works to frustrate the purpose of our foreign aid programs, minimizes the heroic efforts being made by friendly governments and their citizens and which if unchecked will turn these people over to Communist enslavement. That unmentioned factor is the current population explosion.

POPULATION PROBLEM MUST BE SOLVED

The phenomenon of the population explosion has been brought about largely by the success of modern medicine and sanitation in reducing infant mortality, prolonging life, and wiping out diseases such as malaria that previously kept population in balance. As a result, the human family is increasing at the unprecedented rate of 500 million persons in this decade, according to the United Nations. This crop of newcomers will exceed the total number of people now living in Russia, the United States, Great Britain, and France combined.

Ambassador Chagla of India, speaking in New York on "The World Population Crisis," said, "India's increase in population has been immense. In 1911, it was 250 million; in 1951, 356 million. As the census which was recently taken shows, our population has reached 438 million in the last decade. The rate of population growth in this decade has been 61 percent faster than the rate in the previous decade. * * * We have received from the United States foreign aid to the extent of $3 billion since our independence. It was a generous gesture on the part of this country. It was also wise and statesmanlike because you realized the importance of economic advance in India in a democratic setup. India was trying to demonstrate to the world that a poor, underdeveloped country can become prosperous without sacrificing freedom or democratic institutions. But the effect of this aid is, to a large extent, being nullified by the increase in population."

President Ayub Khan of Pakistan on his recent visit here did not mince words. "If our population continues to increase at the present rate," he said, "it will ultimately lead to a standard of living which will be little better than that of animals."

President Ayub's Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Said Hasan, added: "The most alarming feature of the census figures is the fact that the population of Pakistan has increased by 23 percent over the last decade. This is a much higher rate than we had anticipated. The rates of increase during previous decades had been much slower. If the trends revealed in the 1961 census continue, then the population of Pakistan, which doubled itself in 60 years between 1901–61, is likely to repeat the performance in half the time from 1951."

WHAT LEADING AMERICANS SAY

The population explosion has not passed altogether unnoticed in the West. Just a few weeks ago Eugene R. Black, president of the World Bank, reporting to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, said, "Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in the poorer countries. Unless population growth can be restrained, we may have to abandon for this generation our hopes of economic progress in the crowded lands of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East."

"The United States," said James Reston in a recent Washington dispatch to the New York Times, "is now embarking on a large new plan of economic aid to Latin America, but here again the whole policy is placed in jeopardy before it starts by the population problem."

It is estimated that the number of people in Latin America will rise from the present 200 million to nearly 600 million in the next 30-odd years. "Nothing is surer," Mr. Reston continued, "than that there will be a decisive revolt against foreign aid one day if the population problem is not faced. Probably never in history has so obvious and significant a fact been so widely evaded or minimized by the governments of men."

The clearest statement, perhaps, of the case was made recently by a top business leader, Marriner S. Eccles, formerly Chairman of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Federal Reserve System.

"The situation," he said, "has largely been brought about by our well-meant interference with the controlling laws of nature. From the most humanitarian motives we have drastically lowered the death rates in these countries, but have neglected to exert a compensating influence on the birth rates."

"Our policy has been to work for death control," Mr. Eccles added, "without taking the necessary steps to reduce the number of births, and so offset the consequent runaway inflation of people. A continuation of this present combination of low death rate with high birth rate is a sure prelude to disaster.

In the absence of realistic population planning, no conceivable economic aid programs will change this course. Inevitably, the existence of masses of people subsisting at starvation levels invites revolution and communism. Any foreign-aid program is, at best, a stopgap unless we deal with the basic cause—which is the runaway population. Unimpeded fertility is giving the underdeveloped countries exactly what they do not need—more people—and hindering what they do need—more capital, more skills and greater productivity."

REALISTIC U.S. POLICY URGENT

Mr. President, in your address to the American people on July 25 you said, "In these days and weeks I ask for your help and advice. I ask for your suggestions when you think we could do better." Responding to that request we, the undersigned citizens, urge you to develop a constructive population program to go along with the economic aid program. This was recommended you will recall in the 1959 Draper Committee report to President Eisenhower in which nine leading Americans called for assistance in population planning to friendly nations upon their request. By embarking on a crash program of research with the aim of meeting the population crisis our Government could make an enormous contribution to world peace and stability, and at the same time answer the increasing calls for help from friendly peoples overseas. We appeal to you, Mr. President, to consider promptly the Draper Committee recommendation. There is no time to lose when the tide of people is rising at a million persons a week, many of whom will not have enough to eat.

The present situation has been stressed in the recent hearings on the foreign aid bill in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Your own Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Wymberley Coerr, testifying on conditions in Latin America, said: "The direction of economic change is downward. The area as a whole is experiencing a population increase that is outpacing the increase in its gross national product and average per capita income. This trend is, in many cases, being accentuated by disinvestment and the flight of local capital caused by the fear of political instability and financial inflation. These developments further weaken the area's economic capacity. The long-range prospect, therefore, is that there will be more and more people to share less and less income."

Chairman FULBRIGHT, switching to the situation in Asia said: "The Indians and the Pakistanis have both very frankly said something has to be done about it. Their finance ministers came to see me and said something had to be done about this. This is fundamental to the success of the economic program. I do not see why the Government should be so reluctant about it."

In conclusion, Mr. President, we wish to repeat that we strongly favor your program for foreign economic aid. If, however, it is not accompanied by aid in population control it may well compound the problem. There will be more people living on 20 cents a day—more and ever greater appeals to Uncle Sam for economic aid.

Kennedy's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am not one who places great reliance on opinion polls as accurate guides to public opinion. In view of the extent to which same polls are quoted as authoritative, however, I believe the following results of a poll taken by the San Francisco Chronicle are interesting:

RESULTS OF POLL ON KENNEDY'S RECORD

Following are the results of Chronicle poll No. 25, which appeared on June 21. They were compiled by the San Francisco office of Statistical Tabulating Corp.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. How would you rate President Kennedy's overall record after the first 6 months in office?		
a. Excellent	24	25
b. Fair	23	17
c. Disappointing	46	9
d. Better than expected	14	21
2. Has Mr. Kennedy made his foreign policies clear—		
a. To your satisfaction?	36	56
b. To the average American?	20	49
c. To our allies?	28	37
d. To Premier Khrushchev?	33	32
3. Before launching the Cuban invasion, do you think Mr. Kennedy should have—		
a. Committed sufficient U.S. forces to overthrow Castro?	36	27
b. Vetoed the invasion before it got started?	54	16
c. Done just what he did?	12	39
4. Do you approve of the Peace Corps?	59	31
5. Are you satisfied that Mr. Kennedy is fulfilling his domestic campaign promises?	47	44
6. Do you favor the Kennedy bills for—		
a. Aid to education?	55	42
b. Medical care for the aged through social security?	61	34
c. Increased aid to Latin America?	70	21
7. Are you satisfied with the President's handling of—		
a. Recession and unemployment problems?	50	40
b. The defense program and the CIA?	33	54
c. Civil rights in the South?	40	48
8. In the November 1960 election did you vote for—		
a. Kennedy?	50	------
b. Nixon?	45	------
c. Another?	2	------
d. No one?	3	------

Address by Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Montgomery County, Md., August 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 14 I had the privilege of introducing the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, BARRY GOLDWATER, as the principal speaker at a meeting in Montgomery County, Md. The speech of Senator GOLDWATER follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, AUGUST 14, 1961

Congressman MATHIAS, Chairman KYLE, fellow Republicans and I suspect, as the chairman mentioned, a few Democrats. They have no other place to go today—and we certainly welcome them. I first want to apologize for having been late. I acted just a New Frontiersman on the way out. I didn't know where I was going.

This neighbor-to-neighbor campaign is one that produced results in 1960 and is one that will produce results in 1962. And let me start right at the outset by telling you people that 1964 is a long ways off. But 1962 is right around the corner. And I don't know if this country can stand 4 full years of the Kennedy treatment. And the only way that we can make sure that we can is to elect a Republican House of Representatives in 1962 which I am convinced we can do. Not only can we take the House, I think we can make rather sizable gains in the Senate—although taking control of that body would be somewhat of a dream right now. We have just too many southerners who are up for reelection and while we are making gains down there, we are not quite strong enough yet. But we do think in the Senate that we can retain the Republican Senators that we have up for reelection, some 15 of them, and we can pick up 7 or 8 Democratic seats, if we get to work, and I mean work hard. You've got JOHN BUTLER running for reelection in this State in 1962 and it is absolutely imperative that he be returned to office. JOHN is one of the most conscientious, hard-working Senators that I know in the whole body, and the thing that I like about him is that he thinks of himself as a U.S. Senator, not just as a Maryland Senator. As you know, there is such a thing as a United States, and in the Constitution we are pretty much charged with thinking of our Republic instead of being selfish in a narrow way and only thinking of our States. And whenever you hear of someone wanting to tamper with the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights or any of the basic concepts of our Republic, you'll find JOHN BUTLER out in the lead trying to defeat that. And you've got "MAC" MATHIAS here running again, in this district, in 1962. So don't be thinking about 1964. We can take care of 1964, if we win big in 1962. But if we don't make sizable gains in 1962, frankly I don't see much hope in 1964.

And don't think that the time isn't ripe. Why, if this election could be held tomorrow, there'd be no question about the outcome. Governor after Governor would be Republican. Statehouse after statehouse would be Republican. The House of Representatives would be Republican. I have traveled since the election in all 50—I'll take it back—49 States. I haven't been back to Alaska yet, and I find the kind of enthusiasm we need every place I go. It isn't just here in Maryland. It's everywhere. And every single speaker we have out, reporting back every Tuesday morning, is just flabbergasted by the amount of enthusiasm in this country for the Republican Party. It's better, frankly, than it was during the election. Don't ask me why, but it is. The people of America are more disturbed today than I have ever seen them in my political life. I think they have every reason to be disturbed. There is great evidence of this disturbed feeling.

We elected a Republican in South Carolina last week. Now, can you imagine that? The first time in history. We elected, about 2 months ago, our first Republican officeholder in the history of Georgia. And, of course, we elected a Republican in Texas,

which is really remarkable. Oh, they're trying to blame that on all kinds of things except the wonderful candidate we had and the fabulous organization Republicans put together. I think you ladies would be interested in knowing that they had ladies of all ages, all over Texas, and they called themselves "Tower's Tomatoes." They wore bright red skirts—they looked like tomatoes, real good tomatoes. They went around punching doorbells and working hard.

And, of course, down there the Vice President lives, and some Texans haven't forgotten that. They're a little upset. We don't like to be too harsh on the Vice President, though, because he did develop something new in this last election. You know he got the State legislature to allow him to run for two places on the ballot. In fact, he could have run for more than that—and—don't laugh about it, because to us in politics it's sort of the Townsend plan. It's Federal aid to the aged politician. You see, if we extend this as far as we can, we can run for every position on the ballot. Now you can't lose them all. You've got to win one or two. I've always thought out in my State of Arizona that I'd like to be sheriff some day; but my legs are too straight.

But these indications that I've given you are not indications of something that just happened. These Republican victories in the Deep South are just the beginning. I might tell you, we expect to win two or three House seats in Texas and we expect to win two or three more seats in Florida. We feel we actually have a chance for a seat in the House of Representatives from Georgia. Now this is on the move. The trend has been developing for a long time. And people haven't paid attention to it. It's been occasioned by young people in the South—growing up realizing that they cannot live under a single-party system; that they have to have a two-party system; that there has to be competition between the parties all over this country in order that the best men and the best women can be sought to run for election and be elected to office.

Because that's all we're interested in—whether we be a Jeffersonian Democrat or a Republican—we're interested in good government. I have to make a definite differential between the word "Democrat" and Jeffersonian Democrat—because there's a great difference. There are many people today traveling under the name of Democrat, who aren't quite sure of its spelling, and have learned about the Democratic Party more from Walter Reuther and John Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, than they have from the teachings of Jefferson.

Now I want to try to impress upon you Republicans and you Democrats who are interested in good government, what happened in the 1960 election. Now, if we forget losing the Presidency—and I'll admit every day that gets harder to do, if we'll just forget that—we had, in my mind, the best election we've had since 1928 in the Republican Party. We picked up 307 members in State legislatures around America. We won two new governorships. We control eight more legislatures. We elected 21 new young Members to the House of Representatives. And we have advanced in local and county government. We elected a total of three new Members to the U.S. Senate—although one, unfortunately, died before he could be sworn in. So the move is on, and this is another move that hasn't just started. We took our whipping in 1958 and many of us saw this coming back as far as 1954, when we were beginning to lose sheriff races and races for State legislatures and gubernatorial races. Then came 1958 and the great debacle that year, and Republicans all over this country began to get to work. And as a result, in 1960 we had an outstanding success, as I say, if we forget the loss in that very close election up on top, which, of course, we can't do anything about.

I heard a disturbing thing along this line coming out here tonight while I was trying to find this school: I heard that there was a rumor that somebody had broken into the county courthouse in Cook County and stolen next year's election.

We don't want that to happen. No, I think America has finally reached a point in its history where, once again, the people are going to make a decided and important change in its political orientation. Now, this isn't anything new in American government. We've gone through these cycles ever since we've been a Republic; ever since we've had a Constitution. We have been successful in government and our people have grown apathetic and lazy and have allowed people to get into government that did not have the best interests of our governmental way of life at heart. I recall 30-odd years ago, during my 1 year in college, the great swing against conservatism. For no reason at all we were resisting conservative professors and conservative businessmen and conservative politicians. We were doing it because we were young people and we were tired of being told what to do, and tired of being told that there was only one concept of government, one concept of economics.

And now, as I travel across America and see in audiences like I see here tonight, a great overwhelming preponderance of young people, I realize what's going on. The same thing in the opposite direction that took place in the late 1920's and early 1930's. The young people of today are asking themselves—why is it, after we have been through some 20 years of the best business in the history of our country—why are we spending four to five times as much on relief as we did when we first started it? Why is it that after having spent billions of dollars in an effort to alleviate what was called by Franklin Roosevelt "the suffering of the people," to relieve "one-third of the nation" (as he used to say, "who were poorly housed, underfed, poorly clothed"—do we still hear the President of the United States asking for more funds to help 17 million people "who go to bed hungry every night," and one-third of the people who are "poorly housed and poorly clothed"?

Young people are very naturally asking themselves, "Is this the way? Is the centralizing of all Government in Washington the answer to our problems, whether they be social problems, humanitarian problems, or the problems of the world?" And the young people are answering themselves by saying, "No"—more and more and more. Young people are looking to the Republican Party to bring to them the kind of government that they know this country deserves; that they know this country has to have if we are going to continue as a free people. The centralizing of government in the city of Washington is the most insidious, most dangerous thing that is happening to the American people today.

I don't rule out communism. I am not like the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who wouldn't know what to do with victory if we won it; who doesn't like the idea that we talk about communism as being a danger. I recognize it as a danger. But there is a far greater danger going on right here in America, and that danger is wrapped up in the idea that you and I as American people can no longer do for ourselves the things that we should. And that we should look instead to Washington; that the money we work hard for, the property we acquire, should be spent by an all-wise Government in Washington, which knows far better than we know about our local needs.

In fact, you are probably aware of the current argument that's been going on in the Senate this week. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and others. This was started, I might say, by a memorandum that was sent by Senator FULBRIGHT to the Defense Department, suggesting that commanding officers not be allowed to discuss problems that they see arising in our country. Yes, they could discuss the enemy, they could discuss military matters, but to discuss dangerous trends in our Government is taboo any more. Well, I happen to be a part-time military man, but tonight I am not. Tonight I am a Senator. So that rule of McNamara doesn't apply to me.

The very interesting thing that has come out of this, that most of the newspaper writers have overlooked so far, has been this fact: nobody likes being associated with Communists, Socialists—with any other form of government, in fact, than our own. And yet, as Senator THURMOND has brought this message day after day to the American people—if we teach the true nature of communism we must recognize that it has a close alliance with socialism.

The people are beginning to think in a way that the—what I call the radical, not the liberal—the radical, has prayed they would never think in. More and more Americans are beginning to understand that all forms of government other than the governments of free men, require central control to become effective. This is a common and an absolutely necessary ingredient of government collectivism. I don't care whether we call it communism, socialism, Fabianism, the welfare state, planned economy, the New Deal, Fair Deal, or the New Frontier. Contained in every one of these, is the absolute essential of government control. And people who have been advocating this, newspaper editors who have been editorializing for the welfare state, do not like to be reminded that they are talking about something that has the same first cousin as all of the other "isms" in the history of man, and that we have today.

Now, whether we call this the welfare state, communism, or something else, the responsibility for the welfare and prosperity and security of the people is presumed by these radicals to rest entirely with the central government. Now, let's take a look at that. If that were the way our Government should have been run, our Constitution would never have been written.

Our Constitution was written by men fresh from Europe and England, where bureaucracy ran rampant; where lives were controlled; where business was controlled; and they came to the shores of America, not to establish another Socialist order or bureaucratic order. They came here to discover what freedom actually is, and they did that. They built a government that would protect those freedoms. And these wise old men who lived here in Maryland and Virginia, Delaware, and in the Thirteen Original Colonies, these men to whom you and I owe so much, these men who said that they would risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, for this Government that they gave us, they discovered why we are free people. They discovered it when Tom Jefferson put down what I guess all of them knew, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If this isn't a good national goal today, and I read an awful lot from pretty smart people who say that we need new national goals—if the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness isn't a good national goal, today, then I suggest that we have to change our form of government. Because the entire Constitution was written to protect these rights, to enable us to use them, to protect these rights from the vagaries of men. And men, today, remain the problem of government, the problem of the world—just the same as men have always been the problem.

What we are doing today in government is flaunting the very concept of the American Republic. We are doing it by telling people, "Oh, you don't have to work. We'll take care of you. Don't worry about your father and mother when they get 65. We're going to have a Federal old-age home for them some place. We'll fix them up." And they're telling parents, "Don't be concerned about your children's education. Don't worry about the PTA, the school board, the county school superintendent, the State school superintendent. Oh, we have some very wise people in Washington who can run these institutions much better than you." In fact, you ought to read some interesting material. Get the book they put out on the education problem. It even goes further. We are going to be responsible for international education. Handling our States isn't enough.

This is the trend that we have taken, ladies and gentlemen: that Americans all over this country are reacting to. I don't buy the idea that the American people have succumbed to the low moral attitude that the Romans did when they thought government should and could provide everything for them. Oh, government might feed you, it might give you the material things of life; but it can't give you peace. It can't give you happiness. It can't give you freedom. You take away the dignity of man by making him subservient to some government, and you have destroyed freedom. You take away freedom, and what good is living? I am disturbed in this vein by some of the utterances of the New Frontiersmen, who go around the world preaching that we can have coexistence, peaceful coexistence, with a philosophy of government that for years has announced as its only goal in life the destruction of the world, and the rebuilding of it in their image. And yet, peaceful coexistence is talked—we hear it everywhere we go.

I don't think there is an American living who actually would like to crawl on his hands and knees to Moscow to avoid having one bomb dropped.

And there is absolutely no question in my mind that the American people stand behind President Kennedy's words of just a few days ago, when he told Mr. Khrushchev what we intended to do about Berlin. I don't think there's a doubt in any American's mind, that if the call comes, we are going to go. No American, Democrat or Republican, wants war. But no American should ever be afraid to fight for the things other Americans have fought and died for. But our people are disturbed. And I find as much of it centered in the failures of our foreign policy over the last 40 years as I do in the concern over the drift in our domestic policy. This is a real concern. The people are not very proud of the United States and its relationship with the problem they call Cuba. They are not very proud of the United States in its relationship with problems that we have created ourselves around the world by being too timid.

Americans, I believe, are tired of having foreign countries write our foreign policy. I think what Americans want, if you don't mind my own personal opinion gained from talking with literally hundreds of our people, is direction. They want to know what is our foreign policy. They suspect it's peace. I haven't heard anyone spell it out; I suspect it's peace. Is it honorable or dishonorable peace? They want honorable peace. And they want to be told how we are going to achieve this. What are we going to do in a psychological way and an economic way, in a political way, to win over communism? Now, mind you there's only one other alternative. And that's defeat. There's no halfway between this thing you call victory and defeat. Because if you try to live with an enemy that's out to destroy you, you're not going to be very happy—because the requirements of that living are going to mean doing away with the things we Americans like. I don't think Americans are too impressed with the idea of that kind of life. They don't like the idea of our continuing to talk about disarmament when—what have we got to give up? I keep thinking of a little simile in this respect. Here's a man about 7-foot five, who weighs about 260—and he's as hard as that table—and I know that just one whack with his fist and I am all through. But I have a gun. And he knows it. One day he says to me, GOLDWATER, let's talk disarmament.

We have that gun. We have the Strategic Air Command. We've got the greatest air force and the greatest military power that the world has ever known. And our enemies just want us to give it up. It's as simple as that—and I don't think we ought to be talking about it at a time when we ought to be maintaining and building our strength instead of appearing like we would weaken and yield in cases here and there and elsewhere.

These things I speak of are not new. And this of course is the surprising thing. We should get everybody in the United States to read history. It would show, for example, that it was the temper of the American people in 1898 that sent us to free Cuba. McKinley resisted it; the Congress resisted it; but the people won. It's been that way in every battle we've gotten into, every battle, whether it's meant war or short of war or argument. The American people have made themselves felt and now in this day and age the people are remembering that the Constitution starts out by saying, "We, the people,"—and they're starting to do something about it.

And the young people are recognizing what we in my generation didn't recognize. that there is a grave responsibility to government, to good government, and that we Republicans present today the only fully sound argument for good government that can be presented by either political party.

And don't buy this idea that the Republican Party is split—that there's some Grand Canyon between a Republican like Goldwater and a Republican like Rockefeller. That's not true. There are many, many areas of agreement. I'd hate to put Proxmire and Harry Byrd together.

Let's not in 1962 and in 1961 get sold on this idea that there is a fundamental difference in this party that's tearing us apart. There is difference. We'll all admit that. But there's also great areas of agreement. And as you go out and sell this party and its candidates to the people in your community and in your congressional district, you're going to have to have the answers—for these questions that they are going to raise with you about the great differences in this party. We actually, if you could see the statistics, are surprisingly close together, even though in some instances we are surprisingly far apart. But we have to have some fun some way. I can't think of anything worse than going through a day without an argument.

So, ladies and gentleman, in closing, let me as a Republican of a State many, many miles from you congratulate you upon what you did and urge you to keep this up—to let this spread.

We've done something like this in my own State. In 1946 when we started the work as a Republican Party, the registration was 9½ to 1 against us. And today I think when they count all the noses it's going to be about 1½ to 1. Their lead is coming down. We're getting closer and closer. But it hasn't been the work of one or two or four or five people. It's been the dedicated work of lots of people, particularly young people, and particularly young women. I have often said at home, you men write the checks, and go on about your gin rummy and golf, and give me your women. And we'll win the election. That's what we do.

Two Giveaways on Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

TWO GIVEAWAYS ON FEDERAL AID

(By C. L. Dancey)

Two things are a dead giveaway that the present approach to Federal aid to education doesn't stop with a simple system for a flow of U.S. dollars to aid local school systems—but goes on to extensive Federal controls of schools.

The first giveaway is in the outline of the Education Agency which the Federal aid law would bring to life in Washington. This would be a monumental bureaucracy with bureau stacked on bureau, division on division, and branch on branch. The blueprint calls for armies of experts and armies of propagandists covering every phase of education from State elementary schools and high schools to universities and even international education.

Such a setup is hardly designed to just economically handle a simple transfer of money to local authorities. It is first a hopeless labyrinth that the applicant for funds must find his way through in order to get a thin dime of aid, and secondly, a basic structure for Federal controls invading every single part of local educational activities.

The second dead giveaway is the attitude of the administration and the liberal leaders of the drive for Federal aid toward parochial schools. They are dead set against including them. They are scared to death of having them included.

Why?

Because Federal aid to subsidiary church activities is against their principles? Nonsense. The FHA is active today and has been for years in aiding church-financed subsidiary activities like homes for the aged, and other such activities. Federal aid goes now to parochial schools for transportation and school lunches.

If Federal aid to education was not going to interfere with teachers or curriculums or such local matters, including parochial schools, it would be no different than present Federal aid activities to various church activities.

But if Federal aid is intended to carry with it Federal controls, they don't dare include parochial schools because State control over church schools would be unthinkable and a clear violation of American principles.

Thus, if parochial schools were included in the aid program it would automatically be limited to just what they have pretended it is—and Federal controls would be effectively blocked forever. That's why the Federal aid people are scared to death of parochial schools.

And that's a dead giveaway as to what is really intended by Federal aid.

A prime example is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church of that city, who is receiving through a church subsidiary a million and a half dollars of U.S. aid for

a church activity—but resists tooth and toenail including parochial schools in the Federal aid program. POWELL wants the program. He supports the administration completely—but like the administration, he wants to bar parochial schools.

The program will add new burdens to the already burdened supporters of parochial schools, and eventually snuff them out as such aid has always tended to snuff out private and local support of any activity. When the parochials are dead—Uncle Sam will run the whole shooting match.

That is the real program planned for us under the name of Federal aid.

And the actual help in dollars planned is a minute percentage, nowhere near the cost burden that would fall on local school taxpayers in Peoria, for example, if our schools had to absorb the thousands of youngsters now educated in parochial schools at their own expense.

As many times as we have been through a similar ring-around-the-rosy you would think more people would recognize it when it comes around again.

Will Congress Measure Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 31, 1961, I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 720, which will help stimulate economic growth and activity and provide additional jobs by the revision of our outmoded depreciation policy.

Our antiquated depreciation system was conceived in the depths of the great depression and was based on the proposition that so long as a wheel will turn a machine will not be discarded. Under modern operating and technical conditions this assumption is fantastically unrealistic.

The Batesville, Ind., Herald-Tribune in a recent editorial entitled, "Will Congress Measure Up?" points out an immediacy about the problems created by existing depreciation policies. Because this editorial imbues an idea regarding the retardation of our economic progress, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CONGRESS MEASURE UP?

Four Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy—have expressed themselves as favoring liberalization of depreciation allowances for industry, but Congress refuses to act, thereby retarding our economic progress.

H. Eugene Dickhuth, an economic consultant, describes the results of a grossly inadequate depreciation tax allowance. It has made one-third of our industrial plant and equipment obsolete. It has retarded the adoption of the latest technological improvements. It has handicapped U.S. manufacturers in trying to compete with products from foreign countries which have far more liberal depreciation allowances. It has blocked the creation of job opportunities for America's new workers who are increasing by 1.3 million a year. All in all, present allowances fall short $8 billion to $10 billion a year of meeting the needs of industry to replace plant and equipment.

There is an immediacy about the problems created by existing depreciation policies that calls for action now, without delay.

Sales and Not Manufacturing Cause Prosperity To Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the series of discussions conducted by various Members of Congress regarding the employment picture in our country. It was my privilege several weeks ago to discuss what creates more jobs in our economy. At that time it was pointed out that the way to create more jobs for more people was to create more sales. A typical example of what one individual can do to create more jobs by creating more sales can be found in the story of Mr. Herbert P. Field, who operates a business in the Sarasota, Fla., area. Several years ago Mr. Field conceived an idea to develop a place which he terms "a resort that is fun for all the family." From a meager beginning, through ingenuity and hard work Mr. Field has created hundreds of jobs and at the same time has made thousands of families happy. Those who chose to visit his resort oftentimes came from thousands of miles away. On their journey they bought gasoline, food, paid for lodging; in fact, all along the way they were creating more jobs for more people because someone was selling them something. But behind all this was their final destination. So, actually, it was Mr. Field who created the additional sales as the family journeyed from northern Wisconsin to Florida.

The following editorial that appeared in the Knight newspapers on Sunday, August 27, 1961, explains much better than I could what it means to our economy to sell something.

The editorial, written by Mr. John S. Knight, is printed below:

SALES AND NOT MANUFACTURING CAUSE PROSPERITY TO BLOOM—CAPSULE COMMENT

How good is business?

One Washington letter, circulated privately to businessmen, says "look at business and see how speedily it's zooming ahead, keeping in mind that only a few months ago we were in a recession."

Another weekly interpretive Washington newsletter reports that "the recovery looks stronger than ever except for consumer buying."

The financial pages tell us that steel, aluminum, paper, appliances, automobiles, radio-TV, furniture, clothing and shoes are bouncing back at a great rate.

Heavy industries have shown no pronounced surge but the economists think Government and defense spending will provide the needed stimulant.

Our minority opinion is that business, while well ahead of recession lows, is neither "zooming ahead" nor "bouncing back." The corporate reports don't show it.

Savings accounts are touching new high levels but these large spendable funds are being used cautiously in the purchase of consumer durables.

Until consumer savings are released in a greater flood of consumer buying, business won't be so hot. The customers are cautious because they worry about Berlin, higher taxes and a variety of national and world ills.

And lazy, inept salesmanship doesn't help get things moving. How long has it been since a salesman really tried to sell you an automobile?

Store clerks, or "saleslades" as they prefer to be called, appear bored and disinterested.

There is no valid reason, other than lack of effort, why business shouldn't be as good as the experts say it is.

We suggest that manufacturing activity should not be mistaken for prosperity.

Someone has to move the merchandise.

I commend Mr. Field and all of the small businessmen in America and congratulate Mr. Knight on his astute observations.

There's a Bright Side, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, there is much in current newspapers which would tend to discourage and depress the American people. In addition to the inflammatory Berlin situation, the uncertainty in Brazil and at the Geneva nuclear test ban talks, the serious setbacks in Cuba and in Laos; we continue to be concerned with domestic economic problems. In spite of the fact that our fundamentally healthy economy has brought us out of the recession faster than expected and stronger than predicted, the cost of living continues to climb, unemployment has not been significantly reduced, and "distressed areas" continue to blight our countryside. A superficial survey of these situations obscures the dominant and essential truth that today the United States is the strongest Nation in the world—militarily because of its balanced defensive might and overall striking force; politically because our institutions have been built and are maintained by free citizens; and economically because of its sound foundation of a free market economy.

Mr. Speaker, this tendency to allow the dark side to blot out the bright side is not restricted to national or international problems. The "crapehangers" are at work locally, too. In the area of Pennsylvania that I am privileged to represent, there are several localities severely affected by unemployment and its accompanying community and family distress. In an August 26 editorial printed in the Lock Haven, Pa., Express, this situation is cogently and carefully

considered. I would suggest that my colleagues examine this editorial, and particularly pay heed to its words of universal application:

A community which lets the "crapehangers" in its midst set its tone and create its atmosphere, is taking the first step toward ruining its own morale.

I am pleased to offer the entire courageous editorial for the consideration of the House:

Into the life of every community, as in the lives of all individuals, comes bad luck and good.

There are differences in community attitudes as there are differences in personal attitudes toward the vicissitudes and the ups and downs which inevitably occur.

Some people take their knocks with grit and teach themselves some useful lessons for the future; others react as if any interruption of good fortune is a treacherous personal blow. These same differences of reaction can be detected in the behavior of a community which is, after all, only the sum total of the people who live in it.

A community which lets the crapehangers in its midst set its tone and create its atmosphere, is taking the first step toward ruining its own morale.

Crapehangers are always on hand. They are the ones who eagerly snap up every bit of bad news to make it seem bigger and worse than it is. They add up a few unfortunate developments, and multiply their effect into a much exaggerated prognostication of future collapse.

Some of the local crapehangers have been having a field day. They keep recounting recent economic misfortunes—the closing of the woven wire mill, the loss of the Sylvania plant, the threat agaist the General Armature & Manufacturing Co., unless its employes and the community can buy the firm, the reductions among executive personnel at the paper mill and the dye plant, occasional layoffs by the aircraft factory, and similar changes in lesser business enterprises.

All these things have occurred, of course. No one would deny that they have been discouraging and disappointing and, in the cases of the individuals affected, personally devastating. That personal aspect also lays its penalty on the community, for many of the people who leave town are among the intellectual and civic leaders, people who have accepted more than their share of the tasks of community initiative. Their loss is a real community hardship.

Yet, there is another side to the picture, a side which the crapehangers do not consider, in their eagerness to make things look as black as possible.

This is not a dead community—unless it decides to lie down and die as the crapehangers seem to want it to do. There is another alternative, to wake up and live.

For one thing, this community has been in much worse fixes in the past than it is in today. For another, the economic difficulties of today are cushioned, much more than those of the past, by the operations of the unemployment compensation system, financed by employers to meet just such conditions.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that this community is blessed by a diversification of industry. When things are slow in the paper business there is a demand for airplanes; when the electronics tube business slumps, there is an increase in the demand for instrument repairs; then the woven wire business goes down the drain, there is an expansion of the women's garment business.

A realistic view of our economic situation should see the good side as well as the bad, the prospects for improvement rather than the fear of more misfortunates.

Lock Haven has much to offer stable industries. The exhibition of courage and faith which is being given in connection with the campaign to purchase the General Armature Corp. is an antidote to the crapehanging tribe. The people who are joining in that enterprise are fixing their view on the future, and that is where the rest of us should be looking, too.

We are, if we but recognize the fact, on the threshold of great new possibilities, brought by the Keystone Shortway, which will be coming through in the next 5 years. This highway will solve one of our problems—that of accessibility.

Our economic history shows that this community first prospered because of the canal, which gave a great boost to the extractive industries and agriculture of this area. Then came the railroad, bringing in its wake new manufacturing industries. We are now in a new period of readjustment, as industry spreads into a nationwide and even an international pattern, which depends upon the entire modern system of transportation for its healthy growth.

In addition, this community has moved wholeheartedly into the new industrial development programs sponsored by the Commonwealth, with initial results, in the shape of the new Bobbie Brooks plant, for one example, which will continue to have a beneficial effect on the local economy day by day.

Because there has been a series of economic cutbacks, we should not overlook our real economic strength, our genuine opportunities, and the solid basis of our community structure.

Uninterrupted good luck is a phenomenon, not a normal condition. Normal life is a matter of meeting ups and downs. It is the manner of meeting them that makes the difference between a strong and sturdy community and a lax and dispirited one.

We should realize our strength and our possibilities, not spend our time counting over our recent disappointments. We want a healthy atmosphere for future improvements; we will not get it from the crapehangers.

First's Loss, Court's Gain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Detroit Free Press. I subscribe completely to the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

Our distinguished, able, and beloved colleague from Michigan will go down in history as one of the really great additions to the court. I can only say that it is a great loss to us in Congress to have the judiciary undercut the legislative branch of our Government by depriving us of some of our finest talent.

FIRST'S LOSS, COURT'S GAIN

Every 2 years now for a considerable while these columns have been advising First District voters that in Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ they had a Congressman who ought to be reelected.

Representative MACHROWICZ hasn't only loomed impressively in the Michigan delegation, which isn't notably difficult, but in our view he had been one of the best seat holders on Capitol Hill.

Now he's going to be a Federal judge, taking the place of Judge Frank Picard, who retired from the bench last April.

It is an appointment both he and his constituents can be proud of, and congratulations are in order. If he does as well on the Federal bench as he has done in Congress (and we know of no reason why he should not) then the court will have acquired an added strength of considerable proportion.

Only, it's tough to lose the kind of a Congressman you can always speak well of, and who at election time can be endorsed with no soul searching.

Modern Day Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is confronted by great demands for Federal expenditures.

Because of such high costs and a huge public debt of over $290 billion—the American taxpayer, and rightly, I believe, is deeply concerned with establishing realistic priorities for Federal expenditures. This includes also, according to my mail, keeping the Federal spending down to absolute essentials.

Unfortunately, however, there is among segments of citizens a somewhat distorted conception of the significance of public spending. Usually, it boils down to this: If it affects me and mine it is worthwhile and necessary. If, however, the programs support other segments of the economy this is very often termed "excessive spending."

Realistically, too, there is a widespread lack of recognition of how the majority of citizens benefit, one way or another, from such expenditures.

Recently, there has been circulating an article, perhaps somewhat exaggerated, but nevertheless at least partially true, about how many Americans often endorse ultraconservative principles of spending; meanwhile, they themselves, either presently or in the past, have in all probability benefited from a variety of publicly supported programs.

All Senators, I am confident, have received letters reflecting this philosophy. I ask unanimous consent to have an article caricaturizing the situation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

The following description of a typical modern-day rugged individual is taken from the Mosinee Times.

It seems a young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army and upon discharge kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capital to supplement his GI checks.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an FHA loan and then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of a GI loan and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

Later, he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments helped pay off his debts. His parents lived comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity and the Government helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it, then the Government paid part of the cost of a pond and stocked it with fish. The Government also guaranteed him a sale for his farm products, if any.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked his money with a Government-insured agency. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free buses, played in public parks and swam in public pools. The man owned an automobile so he naturally favored the Federal-aid highway program.

He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new Federal building and a new post office. He even went to Washington with a group to ask Congress to build a great dam costing millions so that his area could get all the benefits it afforded.

Then one day he wrote to his Congressman: "I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own two feet without expecting Government handouts. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

Dedication of the Crawford County Memorial U.S. Army Reserve Center at Meadville, Pa., August 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the dedication of the Crawford County Memorial U.S. Army Reserve Center, Meadville, Pa., on Saturday, August 26, 1961, and to deliver the dedicatory address.

The memorial center was dedicated in memory of the members of the U.S. Army from Crawford County who made the supreme sacrifice. During the program, Mrs. John J. Healy, a Gold Star Mother whose son, Joseph Healy, was captured at Corregidor and died in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp, unveiled a memorial plaque honoring her heroic son and others from Crawford County for their patriotism and valor.

As master of ceremonies, Mr. Frank Hilton, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducted the interesting program during which time I delivered the following address:

PROGRAM

Musical selections, the Thunderbirds, drum and bugle corps, Mr. Edward Rudler, director.

Raising of national flag, honor guard, members of Battery A, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 43d Artillery, 502d District Headquarters (labor supervision), 4th Mobile Sales Section.

Invocation, Chaplain (Capt.) William E. Brown, pastor, St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Welcoming remarks and introduction of guests, Mr. Frank Hilton, master of ceremonies.

Presentation of center, Col. Robert H. Douglas, commander, XXI U.S. Army Corps.

Acceptance of center, Hon. George X. Simonetta, mayor, city of Meadville.

Hon. Herbert E. Mook, president judge, Crawford County.

Musical selection, the Thunderbirds, drum and bugle corps.

Remarks, civilian guests, military guests.

Unveiling of memorial plaque, Mrs. John Joseph Healy, 425 N. Main Street Meadville, Pa.

Introduction of dedicatory speaker, Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS, Representative, 24th Congressional District.

Dedicatory address, Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Representative, 20th Congressional District.

Closing remarks, Mr. Frank Hilton, master of ceremonies.

Benediction, Rev. Father J. J. Cannon, pastor, St. Brigids Roman Catholic Church.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE CRAWFORD COUNTY MEMORIAL U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER AT MEADVILLE, PA., SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1961

It is an honor to be invited to deliver the address incident to the dedication of the Crawford County Memorial—U.S. Army Reserve Center—in memory of the members of the U.S. Army from Crawford County who made the supreme sacrifice.

This occasion has added significance by the appearance on this program of Mrs. John Joseph Healy—A Gold Star Mother whose son, Joseph Healy, was captured at corregidor and died in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp.

He was the first serviceman from this area to be reported missing in action in World War II.

Today we have witnessed Mrs. John Joseph Healy—with courageous heart and loving hands—unveil the memorial plaque honoring her heroic son for his patriotism and valor in making the supreme sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

The dedication of this U.S. Army Reserve center provides me with the opportunity to reflect on why we build such training centers; on why we spend our hard earned money for military things like guns, missiles, ships, and Reserve centers.

I would like to share my thinking with you on this vital matter—especially today when we face such a mortal test of our courage and strength over West Berlin.

We arm as a nation because our independence and our freedom have been challenged by the growth of international communism.

Indeed the independence and liberty of the whole free world have been threatened by this revolutionary force.

In this century it falls to the United States to act as the leader of freedom-loving people everywhere in the great task of meeting the Communist challenge and ultimately of establishing a world order among nations which is based on common consent and international law.

Our job is to work toward the development of an international community which is committed to the resolution of conflict by nonviolent means.

We have no illusions, however, on the difficulty we face in achieving this noble goal.

We are far from it.

Our experience since World War II has shown us that nations are all too willing to use force to gain their objectives.

They are unwilling to negotiate their differences.

Consequently freemen have had to arm to protect their liberties and the independence of their nations.

Contrary to our own wishes we have been forced to devote vast amounts of our economic wealth and the lives of our loved ones to the buildup of our military strength.

The President has asked us recently to make even greater sacrifices in this direction.

More—not less—military power is needed to meet the Communist challenge to free-world security and independence.

The Communist military threat has never been greater to our political and moral objectives.

It is instructive to examine this threat and to see where free-world interests are in danger across the world.

Militarily, we face three distinct dangers from the Communist bloc.

We must face and must eventually overcome the threat of general war and the possibility of nuclear attack.

Second, we must effectively counter conventional military threats of a less than total nature.

Third, we must learn effectively to deal with the work of saboteurs and subversive elements in many politically vulnerable nations across the world.

We must therefore have various kinds of military capabilities to meet these wide spectrums of Communist military threats.

Most important of all we must have a large ready general war force.

We cannot afford simply to have this force potentially ready as we did before World War II.

Soviet possession of large and growing stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs makes it imperative for us to have our strategic striking forces ready to go on a moment's notice.

We no longer can count on a period of years or weeks in which to mobilize our economic and industrial power for military purposes.

Soviet ICBM's now are only 30 minutes flying time from our major cities and the principal capitals of the free world.

Soviet bombers—while slower and more vulnerable than missiles—also offer a formidable threat to our national safety.

Premier Khrushchev has also announced the Soviet development of rocket-firing submarines.

Although we have no publicly available evidence to disprove his boast, we must avoid discounting it as mere propaganda.

Soviet experts agree that even if Russia does not now possess a missile-launching submarine similar to our Polaris, it has the scientific and technical know-how to produce such a weapon system in the next few years.

Soviet achievements in space permit us very little margin for complacency about its general war capability.

The Soviet Union's possession of strategic striking forces places an enormous political tool within its power.

Its initial effect is to blunt the political significance of our long-range nuclear attack forces.

We are no longer able to threaten Russia with nuclear destruction if it or its satellites should commit an act of open military aggression against some part of the free world without being threatened in turn with nuclear devastation at the hands of Soviet missiles and bombers.

Thus Khrushchev or his military leaders have threatened to send rockets against England and France during the Suez crisis in 1956; against the United States if it should intervene militarily in Cuba; and

against our military bases in foreign countries.

Although we are not afraid of such ultimatums it is important to recognize, nevertheless, that we must proceed more cautiously and prudently in using—or in threatening to use—our atomic might to support our foreign policy goals.

For the present the Communist and Western blocs live in a state which many have correctly termed a "balance of terror."

Both sides now possess nuclear knockout punches which are mutually destructive.

These are the military facts of life which we must understand and on which we must build a successful foreign policy.

Another significant consequence of Soviet nuclear strength is the effect it has tended to have on our allies and on uncommitted nations across the world.

Khrushchev on more than one occasion has threatened—with nuclear blackmail—nations which chose to cooperate with the United States against Communist military encroachments.

NATO countries have been warned that they will be subject to Communist nuclear attack in case of war.

Nations outside the North Atlantic Community have also been put on notice that they will be bombed if they permit U.S. military bases within their borders.

The vulnerability of these nations to Soviet threats—both in and out of NATO—coupled with the emergence and growth of Soviet capacity to strike the United States and its bases with nuclear weapons—has tended to undermine Allied confidence in America's willingness to employ massive retaliation in response to Soviet attacks against them.

Some have voiced the fear that we may not come to their aid in order to avoid atomic attack on our bases or on our shores.

Certainly these fears are groundless.

Nonetheless—the United States has taken a number of steps to allay the legitimate fears of our allies and to keep the Soviet nuclear threat in check.

The United States has placed paramount importance on continued maintenance of the existing balance of terror—while searching for military and technological breakthroughs which will tip that balance decisively in our favor.

The preservation—at the very least—of the existing nuclear weapons equation between the Communist and Western worlds is critically important if we are to avoid being blackmailed or, even worse, of being destroyed before we have had a chance to fight back.

Strengthening our general war capability reflects our determination to use nuclear weapons in behalf of free world interests.

It provides a convincing argument to the Soviet Union that it will risk tremendous damage if it attacks the United States or its allies.

We are spending billions of dollars to strengthen our strategic fighting force.

Both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations have actively pursued this goal.

Last March President Kennedy asked Congress to agree to a number of changes in our defense program in order to expand—and to make more invulnerable—our long-range nuclear forces.

The Polaris program was to be accelerated from 29 submarines by 1967 to the same number of submarines 3 years earlier.

Moreover additional funds were asked for practice firing missiles and for the development of longer-range and presumably more effective Polaris missiles.

Funds were also requested for the Air Force intercontinental missiles—the Titan and the Minuteman.

In addition, changes were made to advance our detection systems against ICBM attack.

More money was to be pumped into the Midas and Samos satellite programs.

Both will be tied to our early warning system to signal possible bomber and ballistic missile assaults or even to record suspicious troop movements and concentrations which might be a prelude to an attack.

The House of Representatives has not only agreed to these changes but has gone further and recommended funds for the continued production of B–52's which were scheduled for termination at the end of fiscal 1962.

To underscore further our determination to help our allies and defend our rights, the President has also taken a number of steps to increase our conventional forces to meet attacks of less than total proportions; to give, as he has recently said, a military capability which provides use with "a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear action."

To achieve this objective the President has decided to increase draft calls for the Army and to expand operating personel for the Navy and Air Force.

In addition the President has asked Congress for additional authority to call up Army and Air Force reservists to active duty.

This new call to arms follows on the President's fiscal 1962 request for a strengthening of our nonnuclear fighting forces.

This Army Reserve Center which we are now dedicating is part and parcel of this conventional force buildup.

Larger conventional military forces help lay to rest the fear that we will use nuclear weapons on the slightest military provocation from the Communist bloc.

More importantly such a force makes it possible to counter a wider variety of Communist military actions.

We are able to meet force with equal force—while holding our atomic arsenal in reserve to backstop any military action we might be forced to take.

With a greater variety of military capabilities—we are in a better position to support the full range of our political objectives and commitments.

These run not only to the maintenance of our national independence but also to lesser—albeit important—goals of unhindered free world commercial activity and the protection of our citizens abroad.

For less important political purposes or against smaller military assaults than nuclear bombing—less military power will more adequately stop the Communists.

A policeman does not shoot every thief or hooligan he sees.

He first uses words to restrain the lawbreaker.

If this course fails, He may take the man into custody.

Failure in this attempt may provoke him into using his billy stick and handcuffs.

If the outlaw still resists and attempts a physical attack, the policeman may be forced to threaten or to use his gun against his assailant.

Similarly the United States must always use words when they will be effective.

Failure at the level of diplomacy may necessitate military action of a gradually expanding nature.

At all times the military punishment we use must be proportionate to the crime committed against our legitimate interests and security.

Only in this way will we use military force wisely and justly in pursuit of our political and moral objectives.

Let us see how this reasoning applies to Europe.

Stronger conventional forces in the NATO army make it possible for supreme commander of NATO's military establishment—General Norstad—to strengthen NATO's defense shield.

More troops as well as better trained and equipped troops will give General Norstad the military forces he needs to discharge three important functions:

(1) To protect all NATO territory against a major aggression by holding a Communist attack until our retaliatory power can be called into operation—(2) to deter limited border incidents or military probing actions by making it clear to the enemy that—to quote General Norstad—"He would have to use substantial force to breach the [NATO] shield—an act he knows would bring down upon him the full weight of * * * our heavy strategic power"; and (3) to permit greater choice in the kind of military force we will use against a Communist aggression.

We need not submit Europe or ourselves to a nuclear holocaust if we are prepared to use other more controllable and politically more feasible forms of our military power.

While we do not for a slightest instance give up our nuclear power—we do afford ourselves more room for military and political maneuvering which is in our best interests.

But Europe is not the only place where conventional forces will improve our military and political position.

Ready mobile troops will possibly have a more salutary effect in Asia and the Middle East.

Through successful conventional military action we stopped the Reds in Korea and demonstrated the West's will to fight.

Now we face military challenges in South Vietnam where jungle warfare is not easily fought with atomic weapons and mass armies.

We need different kinds of military power to win against Communist aggression in this area.

Conventional forces—part of which are trained to fight in guerrilla warfare—are more appropriate military means to achieve our political ends.

The landing of our Marines in Lebanon in 1958 is another pertinent example of the usefulness and pressing need for such forces.

Our quick dispatch of our Marines protected the Lebanese Government against subversion and possible military takeover by Communist forces.

President Kennedy's call for more Army and Marine Corps troops is principally designed to deal with future military crises in South Vietnam and in places like Lebanon throughout the world.

The Mexican National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of our southern neighbor, Mexico.

In 1960 the gross receipts of the Mexican national lottery were over $55 million. The net income to the Government in that year was better than $14 million.

Mexico, like the other nations of Latin America, realized the merits of lotteries long ago. There is not one Latin American nation that does not have a national or state lottery. In Latin America, the lottery is a time-tested and

proven financial device dating back several centuries.

It is time that we in the United States overcome outdated prejudices and biases to take the proper view of gambling and its relation to the Government. Gambling is ineradicable—the Government must act to control it rather than seek to ignore it—and a national lottery would make the gambling urge work for the public welfare.

First Catholic Slovak Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the First Catholic Slovak Union of U.S.A. and Canada, largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world, is holding its 34th triannual convention in Pittsburgh, Pa. An article on the history of the organization appeared in the August 1961 issue of the Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd official organ of the federation, of which the Very Reverend Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D. of Munhall, Pa., is editor. The article was written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist.

I extend sincere congratulations to this distinguished Slovak union for its great fraternal and humanitarian deeds in the past 71 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK UNION CONVENTIONS AND SLOVAKS OF GREATER PITTSBURGH, PA., AREA

(By John C. Sciranka)

The First Catholic Slovak Union of U.S.A. and Canada, will hold its 34th triannual national convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., August 27–31 at the Hilton Hotel. More than 500 delegates will take part in the deliberations of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the world, which was founded on September 4, 1890 in Cleveland, Ohio, by the Reverend Stephen Furdek, known as "Father of American Slovaks."

Preceding the formal opening of the convention, Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh will offer on Sunday a pontifical mass at 11:30 a.m. in the St. Paul's Cathedral. Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., bishop of Gary, Ind., who is of Slovak descent will preach. Bishop Grutka's parents were married in Pittsburgh, at St. Elizabeth's Slovak Church on Pennsylvania Avenue, by the late Rev. Coleman Gasparik in 1901. Inasmuch as Bishop Grutka worked in the steel mill and his diocese is in the well known steel city of Gary, Ind., he is known as "steel workers' bishop." Other dignitaries present will include Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB, Cleveland, Ohio, and Rt. Rev. Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, OSB, Natrona, Pa.

While Pittsburghers and American Slovak fraternalists are reviewing the present status of the organization, which has a membership of over 101,000 and assets of some $28 million, including a home for the aged and the orphanage with a farm and printery in Middletown, Pa., a home office in Cleveland, Ohio, it is timely to recall that the union had previous conventions in Pittsburgh and its neighboring cities.

It is recalled that its second convention was held in May 1891 in the old Allegheny City, now North Side Pittsburgh, at St. Wenceslaus Parish, where it was decided to incorporate the organization. It is also recalled that John Bakos, and Martin Slanina, where the first Pittsburgers to attend original founders' convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on September 4, 1890. Bakos was elected first vice president and Martin Slanina, first auditor. It was at this north side Pittsburgh convention that the official organ "Jednota" appeared 70 years ago for the first time.

In 1895 the sixth convention of the union was held in Braddock, Pa., Rev. Raymond W. Wider, whose centennial birthday is observed was the organization's supreme president. The Reverend Richard Phelan, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh, greeted the delegates and was elected honorary president of the union. Father Wider was pastor of Braddock Parish (St. Michael's) and died on February 8, 1897, at New Haven, Pa.

In May 1898 the 8th national convention was held in Homestead, Pa. (St. Michael's Parish, Munhall) and in 1906 the 12th convention was held in McKeesport, Pa. This convention adopted important resolutions, especially to erect an orphanage in Middletown, Pa., and start a junior department, thus enrollment of the youth was launched.

Then in 1918 a national convention was held at Moose Temple, Pittsburgh, which the writer attended as a representative of youth and extended welcome and greetings.

In 1940 the convention was again held in Pittsburgh, with many new faces and the late Martin Slanina still active to greet the delegates.

Now during the 34th national conclave, it is recalled that the early Slovak pioneers in Pittsburgh and Greensburg diocese were first served by the Benedictine Fathers of St. Vincent's Archabbey, which was established on October 16, 1846, first as a monastery and on August 24, 1855, it was elevated by Pope Pius IX, to abbey. The late Reverend Anton Stromovich, OSB., S.T.D., professor at St. Vincent's and Msgr. Joseph A. Kushner, V.F., Donora, Pa., who devoted a great deal of time to the history of first Slovak and Slavonic pioneers of Pittsburgh area, find that since 1877 a Slavonic tongue was taught there and in 1884 first seminarians were admitted to study the Slovak language. Carl Koutek, Anton Panuch, and Charles Janda were ordained and worked later among the Slovaks.

According to Monsignor Kushner, Father Nepomucene Yaeger, OSB., born in Bohemia was ordained to priesthood at St. Vincent's Abbey, Latrobe, Pa., on July 14, 1875. He was the first Slavonic missioner to administer to the needs of the Slovak Catholics in the Pittsburgh diocese, although the venerable Bishop John Nepomuk Neumann of Philadelphia and well-known prince, Father Demetrius Augustine Gallitizin visited this territory before. Father Yaeger later became first abbot of St. Procopius Abbey, Lisle, Ill., where the Slovaks studied for priesthood in large numbers.

FIRST SLOVAK NEWSPAPER FOUNDED IN 1886

On October 21, 1886, first Slovak newspaper in America, the Amerikánsko Slovenské Noviny (The American Slovak Gazette) was founded in Pittsburgh by two Slovak teachers, Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf, who first settled in McKeesport, Pa., in 1879. This is the 75th anniversary of this first Slovak publication in America.

FIRST SLOVAK SOCIETIES AND PARISHES

According to Monsignor Kushner the first parish in bituminous coal region was established at Crabtree in 1890 by Father Fidelis Busan, OSB. This was followed by St. Cecilia's Parish, Whitney, Pa., in 1891. Father John Martvon, noted Slovak fraternalist and first supreme chaplain of the union, came from Johnstown, Pa. to preach from time to time and administer sacraments. Later Father Adalbert Kazincy of Braddock, Pa., performed same services.

First all-Slovak parish in coke region was established in 1893 at Mount Pleasant, Pa. Father Coleman Gasparik was its first pastor. He then organized on March 31, 1895 the Parish of St. Elizabeth, Pittsburgh, where the writer was baptized on September 8, 1902.

On November 8, 1891, St. John the Evangelist Parish was established in New Haven (West Connellsville), Pa. Father Raymond Wider, well-known fraternalist was its pastor.

St. Wenceslaus, Bohemian parish in Allegheny City first served the Pittsburgh Slovaks. St. Michael's Society was organized on February 9, 1890, in Braddock and parish was established in February 1891. Father Raymond Wider was its first pastor. He was followed by Father John Polyakovich and in May 1896 by the well-known Father Adalbert Kazincy. Father Method Slatinsky also labored among the Slovaks during that period.

The Holy Trinity Parish, McKeesport, Pa., began to organize on December 26, 1892. Well-known Father John Stas visited it and recommended Father Emil Duchon as first pastor, who assumed his duties on December 28, 1894. The first Slovak societies were organized in the following cities and later joined the union: McKeesport, Pa., July 17, 1886; St. Michael's (north side, Pittsburgh, where the writer got his start as fraternalist and delegate), February 24, 1889; St. Michael's, Braddock, February 9, 1890, and St. John's, New Haven, Pa., December 27, 1891.

NOTED PITTSBURGH SLOVAK FRATERNALISTS

Martin Slanina and John Bakos, deserve prominent mention as first supreme officers of the union. Mrs. Ilona Ratkovich a Pittsburgher was first supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, elected in 1892. Andrew J. Pirhalla served as supreme president during the national convention in 1918. Michael J. Wargovich served the union for over 35 years in various offices and for 20 years as its supreme president. He died last January in McKeesport and was eulogized in the U.S. Senate by Senator HUGH SCOTT and in the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLIAM SCRANTON. Both published in the writer's biography of Wargovich in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Andrew Novak, supreme treasurer of the union for over 20 years also deserves an honorable mention and last but not least the late John J. Pekar-Baker, member of Pennsylvania Legislature and president of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an ardent fraternalist.

RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Vincentian Sisters of Charity of Perrysville, came to Pittsburgh (Braddock) in 1902. Sisters of St. Francis (Mt. Assisi Academy) in 1913. Slovak Franciscan Fathers, Avalon, in 1926. Their St. Anthony's Monastery at Uniontown, Pa., was established in recent years.

The highlight of the 34th convention will be the convention banquet on Tuesday, August 29 at the Hilton Hotel. Scheduled to speak are Bishop Wright, Bishop Grutka, and Gov. David L. Lawrence. On Sunday, August 27, there will be special initiation of members. Members of degree team include Joseph A. Demajan, district president; John Gaydos, Paul C. Kazimer, Frank Novotny, Joseph Feledick, Edward Myers, Herman Churilla, Andrew Stepanyak, Joseph Wargovich, Paul Giba, and Robert Kosko.

Monday, August 28, Bishop William G. Connare of Greensburg will offer a pontifical mass at St. Michael's Parish, Munhall, Pa. Msgr. Michal Shuba, Union's chaplain in Canada will preach in English and Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain in Slovak. Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., will give a welcome address. Masses will be offered daily for the living and deceased members. On August 30, mass will be said at St. Elizabeth's Church; August 30, at St. Gabriel's; August 31, at St. Joachim's and September 1, at St. Matthew's.

The following are the present supreme officers: protectors, Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB., and Rt. Rev. Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, OSB.; chaplain, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew Biros; chaplain for Canada, Rt. Rev. Michael Shuba; president, John A Sabol; executive vice president, Edward Minarcak; vice president for the eastern States, Stephen Onuska; vice president for Pennsylvania; Joseph C. Krajsa, Jr., vice president for western States; Stephen J. Kandra; vice president for Canada, John Hurny; secretary, John Sabol; treasurer, Michael J. Zahorsky; chairman of auditors, Francis J. Semancik; auditors: Stephen Ungvarsky, Jr., John F. Iskra, John A. Puhala, and John B. Hassay; general counselor, attorney Edward L. Kerpec; medical examiner, Dr. Rudolph E. Medlen; editor, Philip A. Hrobak; sports director, Cyril M. Ferenchak, and president of supreme court, George Podrasky.

The writer had the privilege to be accepted as delegate to the Jednota convention in 1922 as a mere youth at an age of 19 and served as its assistant editor from 1922 to 1924, thus being the first American born Slovak to achieve this honor. Later on further honors were bestowed upon him by the organization, namely that he served as general chairman of two Jednota conventions in New York City. In 1928 the famous Gov. Al Smith and Mayor James Walker invited the convention to New York and Patrick Cardinal Hayes presided at solemn mass. In 1952 Mayor Impelitterri welcomed the supreme officers in the New York City Hall and proclaimed a Jednota Slovak Week. Cardinal Spellman opened the doors of famous St. Patrick's Cathedral and welcomed the delegates there. In view of these honors the writer is very happy that this privilege was extended to him to write this tribute in the Dobry Pastier, official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, which should be supported by all the true-loving American Slovak Catholics.

No Matter the Reason, Destroying Corn Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

NO MATTER THE REASON, DESTROYING CORN HURTS

When you looked at it, you thought of the dark, unhappy days of Henry Wallace, when young pigs were being slaughtered.

It was a picture in last week's paper—you probably saw it—of a cornfield near Chillicothe. Part of the green, prospering corn had been cut down. Why? Because the farmer—and there are others like him in the county—was over the acerage allowed him under Federal crop restrictions. He destroyed the excess.

It is hard to face this situation without a stab of pain. People think pretty much alike and—if they brought themselves to think about this at all—they probably thought: Here we destroy growing food. In other countries, kids are hungry.

It is an emotional, impractical reaction, of course. But it's true.

Actually, how could the farmer, instead of cutting down this corn, have sent it to some starving fellow human somewhere? It would be impractical, if not impossible. Even for our Government—at least under present policies and approaches.

The Government does, of course, send food abroad in some small measure through our food-for-peace program. But for the most part it is not a matter of merely giving what you don't need to somebody who does. There are trade agreements. There are diplomatic barriers. Some governments frankly do not want our surplus grain, however much their individual citizens might like it, because it would gravely affect their economies.

Yet, the basic, inescapable fact remains: While we destroy food, some go hungry.

It is small wonder that many peoples of the world do not like us. Imagine what response last week's cornfield picture would evoke in a have-not nation of the world. These people heed not the practicalities of international life, but only their bellies.

It is there. It is a problem. It is not easily solved.

We can guess what hungry people think of this. But can we calculate the immense psychological effect this has on ourselves? It is there, whether we want to face it or not.

It is one thing to store our surplus. Always there is the hope that someday, some way, we can use it for good. But destruction is another matter.

Imagine workers with an earthmoving machine half completed—and then told to take a sledge hammer and smash it to pieces.

Imagine a cabinetmaker with a handsome chest half finished—and forced to soak it with kerosene and set a match to it.

It is not just the farmer who feels the pain and frustration of this destruction. It is all of us, individually and as a nation.

For at least a generation we have grappled with this bitter, heartsickening problem. And still it awaits solution—not just because there are hungry people in the world, not just because of what other peoples and nations think of us, but because we must do it for the health of our own souls.

FCC Programing Regimen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission is proposing to become much more restrictive in its oversight of radio and television programing and has given broadcasters until September 7 to file statements of their views on tighter program control. The small broadcasters of the Nation are quite concerned about the proposals. In that respect, I submit for the information of the Members the statement of Luther Martin, owner and general manager of radio station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., pointing out the dangers of the proposed tightening of program control and the difficulties it would impose upon the small radio station:

COMMENT OF LUTHER W. MARTIN, OWNER AND GENERAL MANAGER, SHOW-ME BROADCASTING CO., LICENSEE OF RADIO STATION KTTR, ROLLA, MO.

If it has been established beyond doubt and question, that the Federal Communications Commission has the constitutional right to guide, oversee, direct, or dictate, the programing content of a broadcasting station, then and only then, can the FCC honorably inquire into, and grant or withhold its administrative favors as the licensees fall into line or fall out of line with the FCC programing regimen.

The statutory reason for the existence of the FCC is not to indulge in program censorship and/or control, but to deal with technical problems involved in frequency allocations and the maintainence of signals having acceptable audiofidelity. Without the engineering oversight of the FCC, the broadcast band would be a veritable electronic anarchy, and the entire population of the United States would be the loser. In achieving and maintaining a tight rein over broadcast licensees, it is obviously desirable and necessary that the character, legal qualifications, and financial qualifications of the applicants and licensees be screened. Nevertheless, there is even a limit, in a democratic country, to the extent or degree that a Government administrative agency should delve, in ascertaining the financial qualification of licensees or applicants.

In programing content, it is our contention, that the FCC is almost totally "off base" in presuming to even analyze programing. We realize that in granting mutually exclusive facilities to two or more competing applicants, that some criteria or measure must be utilized in making a determination as to the better or best qualified applicant. However, in the event this determination is based in any part upon programing promises or the lack of them, the FCC by its very action, has stepped into the role, effectively, of program censor. We sincerely believe that in this respect, the FCC has overstepped its constitutional authority.

If I may quote: "Freedom is not a piece of pie that can be cut into segments of assorted sizes and thus distributed. Each gets his equal share. Some are so illmannered, so disrespectful of its rewards, as to lose it altogether. As this applies to the individual, so does it apply to the medium. It is not difficult to stop reading a particular newspaper—or to stop dialing to a given radio or television station. Either action expresses your dissatisfaction with the product, and a sufficient rebelling will eliminate the producer."

The broadcaster thrives on the attention of the public and dreads inattention more than any other single thing. This is the true check, and the democratic one, against insolence of management or policy, as a person's vote is a check against insolence of office. (Harold E. Fellows—from the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, July 1955.)

In the opening paragraph of this statement, we said: "If it has been established beyond doubt and question, that the FCC has the constitutional right to guide, oversee, direct, or dictate the programing content."

Now, we will confine the rest of our remarks to this subject as if such a premise has been and is definitely established.

It therefore being the duty of the Federal Communications Commission to direct and oversee the programing content of station

licensees, then there must of necessity be some means of sampling, analyzing, and determining the nature and degree of various program types.

One of the shortcomings of the "Statement of Program Service" in the present FCC forms, is that it is inadequate in cataloguing and labeling the content of variety type programing. One 60-minute program may range all the way from a diskjockey's brilliant or dull comments, to news items, obituaries, ball scores, Red Cross announcements, and even a somewhat educational statement issued by the county farm agent.

As a small station operator, I must urge that the FCC avoid the adoption of a form of reporting and logging that will substantially increase the work load of our already quite busy "combo men." By a combination man, the small station operator refers to an operator-announcer, who spins the records during his shift, makes out the program log, makes out the transmitter log, reads most of the commercials, or turns on the tape recorded announcements made by some other voice, who runs outside to check the thermometer and raingage, checks the teletype machine, answers the telephone if his is the Sunday or night shift, and who is still sufficiently alert to call the chief engineer if something doesn't sound right, or a meter fails to read normally. This is the kind of a small station operation that will be imposed upon most by any increase in logging detail. Yet we realize that some of this detail will be increased, if the FCC concludes that its province dwells within the realm of program analysis.

We trust that by this somewhat wordy statement, we have initiated those who read it, into a slight knowledge of some of the problems of a small station operator. In any event, we are unalterably opposed to even polite censorship in any form, and the attendant increase in reporting redtape that would be forced upon us.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay Endorses Peace Agency Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lucius D. Clay introduced an important statement into the record during hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs concerning H.R. 7936 on August 24, 1961. His statement ably underlines the need for legislation in this field at the earliest possible moment.

His statement was as follows:

My name is Lucius D. Clay, formerly general in the U.S. Army, now retired. Presently I am chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and my residence is 1040 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N.Y.

I have been advised that there is now proposed for passage by the House of Representatives H.R. 7936, a bill providing for the creation of an agency to be known as the U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

As I understand the purpose of this bill, it is to create an agency within the Government to deal with the manifold aspects of disarmament, arms control and the improved functioning of our methods of keeping the peace. It is my strong feeling that the most serious challenge which this country and indeed mankind faces is the necessity of controlling, if not eliminating, the use of nuclear or thermonuclear weapons of mass destruction by the nations of the world. If we do not do so we and our children are, at best, faced with a life of constant fear and danger, destructive of not only our morale but of our traditional institutions and way of life. To remove this debilitating and constant threat is one of the great demands on statesmanship today.

The subject of disarmament and arms control is a complicated and very difficult one. It requires knowledge of technical and political skills of a very high order and it requires constant application and attention. The subject in my judgment is so vital that it is one with which the Congress of the United States should have close association. It is for this reason that I believe the Agency charged with conducting studies and making recommendations in this field should have a separate statutory authority, a budget of its own, confirmation of its high officials by the Senate and a yearly report to the Congress.

I recognize the need for the Agency and its Director to be subject to the Secretary of State in all matters connected with disarmament which relate to negotiations or communications with foreign governments and I believe the bill before the House makes specific provisions for this. I do not believe, however, that this highly important subject is one which should be dealt with in a bureau of a department of the Government subjecting it to all the layers of authority which that involves.

Though the foreign relations of the country are involved, so is defense policy. I would, therefore, recommend that this Agency should not become a part of the Defense Department even though close cooperation and consultation with the defense agencies of the Government is essential. It is important that the Director of the Agency should have access to the President for there are interests cutting across the agencies which may be involved that will require a decision of the President himself. It will take strong administrative skill and a high degree of ability on the part of the Director if this great need is to be effectively met. However, it is entirely clear in my mind that it cannot be met unless the Agency has a standing of its own and a stature enabling it to present its point of view independent of the special interests of other agencies.

I have read the provisions of H.R. 7936 and, although I cannot purport to comment on all of the details of this bill, it seems to me to be a sound bill and one which fills a gap in our present governmental structure. I would strongly urge the committee to recommend it to Congress so that favorable action can be taken during this session.

The New Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 8, Public Law 87-128—the Agricultural Act of 1961, was enacted.

The law, of course, offers no miracle-type solutions to the extremely complex problems in agriculture. Nevertheless, it is hoped that it will help to contribute, moderately at least, to working toward a supply-demand balance of farm commodities. Generally it is hoped, too, that it will brighten the economic outlook.

The law, however, still must pass the test of application to our farm problems.

Recently, the Farm Journal published a thoughtful evaluation of the major aspects of the farm bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW FARM BILL

We have an omnibus farm law after all and the major farm legislation for the year is now complete. In its final form it's not a bad law. It contains some things which were never at issue, for instance, an expanded farm credit setup, extension of Public Law 480 to implement the food for peace idea, continuation of the Great Plains program, and the National Wool Act, and a more vigorous program for rural community development.

It lacks the dangerous features which the superplanners in Washington tried to put over and which Farm Journal opposed. The rather incredible power grab which would have moved farm lawmaking in effect to the Secretary's office never really had a chance with Congress, which wasn't about to surrender its prerogatives of writing the law. It did reveal quite clearly what the goal of the planners was and probably still is—to take over management of American agriculture if possible.

The law provides for a compulsory cut of 10 percent in wheat acreage, plus a further voluntary cut of 30 percent. Small growers can retire up to 10 acres. The feed-grains law is continued for another year, with feed barley now included.

There is no doubt whatever about the need for cutting both wheat and feed grains. Neither is there any doubt, in Farm Journal's opinion at least, about the necessity of retiring more land in order to do it. We never disagreed with that aim.

We did think, and still do, there were better ways to do it. But something had to be done and something is better than nothing, so let's hope we get the desired results with what we've got.

While we're on the subject a few observations seem in order in the interest of perspective.

1. It's well to remember that the new approach is built on the same basic ideas as the old of recent years. It simply is to pay farmers to retire land.

In one case we called it a soil bank. Also we had reduced crop acreages, with individual allotments, tied to support prices. There were penalties for exceeding allotments, as now. It was possible to take out whole farms, which helped many a marginal farmer and aging farmer get out of farming if he wished. It was a good provision.

This year we're calling it land retirement. We have a different method for paying farmers and we've upped the rental payment as well as supports. We've dropped the whole farm provision and everybody in the business is offered an historic share of the reduced operation, thereby tending to freeze the present pattern rather than let crops tend to gravitate to those regions and those farms that can raise them best. We've tightened up on cross compliance.

These are the chief differences in advancing the same basic idea.

2. Under both programs the critics have made much to-do over "paying farmers for doing nothing." The charge is misleading, but it sticks in the minds of taxpayers.

Actually, of course, instead of paying farmers for doing nothing we're paying them for doing something—for not raising a crop they could sell, from land on which they have a heavy investment. We're paying for stabilizing the Nation's biggest and most important business (raising food). You can't expect a man to lay up part of a productive plant, part of his investment, for nothing. What we're doing is renting it from him, and we should expect to pay the rent. The alternative is to starve him out.

3. We haven't seen the last chapter on farm policy. What we have may be quite temporary. The present program is probably costing $2 or more for every bushel of corn we didn't raise this year (a cost of $800 million or more for reducing the corn crop perhaps 300 to 400 million bushels). When city taxpayers learn that, the ruckus kicked up by "Cadillac" Smith might someday seem like a gentle zephyr. You may as well expect to hear more like it.

Removing the Safeguard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Removing the Safeguard," which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Herald-Express.

I am in agreement with the position of the Herald-Express against the granting of long-term borrowing authority for the foreign-aid program, and believe the editorial may be of interest to many Members of Congress:

REMOVING THE SAFEGUARD

President Kennedy asked authority from Congress to be allowed to borrow $8.8 billion over the next 5 years to finance long-range development loans as a part of the foreign-aid bill.

But why for 5 years or even 4 years? There is no assurance that Mr. Kennedy even will be President then. Someone else might be elected; someone else will have hold of the purse strings.

The President's argument is that he wants the 5-year-term authority because it would enable the administration to undertake long-range projects on a businesslike basis without the danger of interference by Congress, which might decide not to advance the money.

But that is what we would not like to see, the abandonment by Congress of its power to carefully oversee, and to deny, the squandering of billions of dollars if it feels such expenditures are not in the people's interest.

It would be a complete surrender of Congress power to check extravagances. It would be a give-in to dictatorship at the top.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, proposed an amendment to the aid bill which would flatly prohibit any assistance to Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, Senator DODD declared:

"Aid to the Communists, in whatever guise, strengthens their war machines, reinforces their reign of terror against their own people, helps them to hide their failures, lends them respectability, breaks the spirit of underground resistance, and weakens the free world by diverting our resources from our own vital needs."

Our principal fear is that if the long-range bill should be passed there might be wrongful diversion of the taxpayers' billions, without the safeguard of congressional approval.

No matter how much the committees, or Congress, might oppose any of these loan proposals, they would have no power to stop the spend boys. Even when the spenders are dead wrong.

Although we know this is a period of emergency, there is no good reason for Congress to abandon its power to hold the Nation's purse strings.

Seven Months of Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 25, 1961:

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of $3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has totted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least $5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if instead of a $1.5 billion surplus you have a $5.3 billion deficit the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is $6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the $3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of $10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimates for 1961–62 revenues were too high and he cut them back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue estimate for the year is $82.4 billion, some $100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's $3.9 billion deficit, $2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the $6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from $80.9 billion to more than $87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than $800 million of that $2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961–62 budget, only $3.7 billion of the total $6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of $10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than $4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, $3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining $6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government, and all the rest. That $6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that $6.2 billion is $6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary "to take additional action this year" and that "certainly" next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump priming, and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to "the urgent needs of defense."

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a $10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

The 100th Division's Call to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the 100th Division, an Infantry division, has been ordered to active duty effective September 25. It is the first full Reserve division called to active duty in the Berlin crisis.

The 100th Division is a Kentucky division, composed of the 100th, 397th, 398th, 399th, and 400th Regiments, all of which are ready for combat duty.

Nearly 3,000 men serving in its units and representing 44 communities of Kentucky will report for duty on September 26.

The 100th Division is commanded by Maj. Gen. Dillman Atkinson Rash. Brig. Gen. Benjamin J. Butler and Brig. Gen. Albert H. Nosun are assistant division commanders. They are all residents of Kentucky.

Thirty to forty percent of the men of the division are veterans of World War II or the Korean war, and all others have completed at least 6 months of active duty under the Reserve program, as well as their regular training program.

The 100th Division fought in Europe during World War II with heroism and distinction. It helped break the Sieg-

fried line, and captured the German stronghold of Bitche.

Acting military duty for the 100th Division carries with it hardships for its men and their families.

Yet its men are proud that their division has been designated as the first division to be called to active duty, because of their effective state of training and their high morale.

Kentucky is proud of the 100th Division. We know that its men will make their contribution to its history and glory, as did their predecessors in World War II and the Korean war, and that they will continue with honor the military traditions of Kentucky, which began with the Revolution.

General Rash expressed the sentiment of the division and the people of Kentucky when he said the 100th Division faces duty with "pride in knowing a job and being able to do it."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Monday, August 28, one of which specifies the units of the 100th Division and the Kentucky communities which they represent.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING SOLDIERS OF RECRUITS—100TH TO BE DOING A JOB THEY KNOW—TRAINING

(By Tom Reynolds)

Kentucky's 100th Division next month will go to Fort Polk, La., to do a job they know: making soldiers of draftees and enlistees.

For the 2,900 reservists of the reactivated division are mostly instructors, aside from the overhead, or housekeeping, personnel.

The only one of 13 training divisions called up in the Army, the 100th is a versitile teaching organization. It has companies of men to teach artillery firing, tank driving, and giving medical aid.

But, says Operations Chief Lt. Col. Ernest Woodward, II, 535 Primrose Way, the biggest job will be teaching basic. Three of the 100th's five regiments are basic-combat-training units. These are the 397th, and 398th, and 399th.

FOUR HUNDREDTH GIVES BRANCH TRAINING

These regiments will take induction-station recruits and teach drill, discipline, first aid, and rifle firing.

There is the 100th Regiment, a common specialist training unit that will make clerks, drivers, typists, or radio operators out of some of the finished basic trainees.

The 5th regiment, the 400th, an advanced individual-training unit, will give branch training: schooling men for the infantry, artillery, signal, or chemical troops.

THIRTY TO FORTY PERCENT ARE VETERANS

About 30 to 40 percent of enlisted men in the 100th Division are veterans of the Korean or Second World War, estimated Maj. Blaine Guthrie, Jr., division information officer. All others have completed 6 months of training on active duty under the Reserve program.

Some 90 percent of the officers are veterans of one of the two wars.

What chance of oversea duty for the Kentuckians?

"Unlikely," believes Woodward. The 100th has spend several years becoming a training organization, and there should be little reason for converting to a combat outfit, he said.

The 100th is due for an indicated 1 year of duty.

In the past the 100th has been an Infantry and an airborne division.

"Uninvited" for the Korean war, the 100th had played a prominent part in fighting in France during World War II.

The outfit traces its military genealogy to November 15, 1942, when a predecessor division was activated at Fort Jackson, S.C. After training and maneuvers the "Century Division" went to France in October 1944, in time to help break German defenses along the Maginot line.

Members of the 100th shattered 200 years of military history by capturing the stronghold town of Bitche. In the closing days of World War II, the infantry division took part in a pincer movement east of Stuttgart, taking 5,684 prisoners. The 100th stayed overseas 7 months in occupational duty before inactivation of the division in January 1946.

UNIT BECAME AIRBORNE

From 1946 to 1952 the unit was an airborne outfit, then was redesignated as infantry until 1955, when it became a replacement-training organization. Finally in April 1959, it was designated the 100th Division (training).

Through the years since World War II, men of the 100th have drilled and attended 2-week training camps.

When reactivation news came last week, the Kentucky citizen-soldiers had been back from Fort Knox summer camp less than 6 weeks.

Following is a breakdown of the division by company and hometown:

Louisville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Receiving Company; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 100th Regiment; Company A, 100th Regiment; Detachments 1 through 7, 100th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 399th Regiment.

Lexington—Testing Platoon, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Transportation Detachment, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 100th Division; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 397th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 400th Regiment.

Lawrenceburg—Companies I and K, 100th Regiment.

LaGrange—Companies B and C, 100th Regiment.

Shelbyville—Companies D and E, 100th Regiment.

Richmond—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 397th Regiment; Company A, 397th Regiment.

Berea—Company B, 397th Regiment.

Irvine—Company D, 397th Regiment.

Corbin—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 397th Regiment; Companies E and F, 397th Regiment.

Somerset—Company G, 397th Regiment.

Manchester—Company H, 397th Regiment.

Pineville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion, 397th Regiment; Company I, 397th Regiment.

Neon—Company K, 397th Regiment.

Hyden—Company L, 397th Regiment.

Evarts—Company M, 397th Regiment.

Owensboro—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 398th Regiment; Company A and Company B, 398th Regiment.

Henderson—Company C, 398th Regiment.

Hardinsburg—Company D, 398th Regiment.

Madisonville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 398th Regiment; Companies E, F, and G, 398th Regiment.

Providence—Company H, 398th Regiment.

Mayfield—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion, 398th Regiment; Company I, 398th Regiment.

Paducah—Company K, 398th Regiment.

Clinton—Company L, 398th Regiment.

Murray—Company M, 398th Regiment.

Lebanon—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 399th Regiment; Company A, 399th Regiment.

Danville—Company B, 399th Regiment.

Campbellsville—Company C, 399th Regiment.

Harrodsburg—Company D, 399th Regiment.

Bowling Green—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 399th Regiment; Company E, F, and G, 399th Regiment.

Burkesville—Company H, 399th Regiment.

Hopkinsville—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion; Companies I and K, 399th Regiment.

Central City—Company L, 399th Regiment.

Dawson Springs—Company M, 399th Regiment.

Winchester—Company A, 400th Regiment.

Paris—Company B, 400th Regiment.

Mount Sterling—Company C, 400th Regiment.

Nicholasville—Company D, 400th Regiment.

Cynthiana—Battery E, 400th Regiment.

Williamstown—Company G, 400th Regiment.

Georgetown—Company H, 400th Regiment.

Morehead—Company I, 400th Regiment.

Flemingsburg—Company K, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Battery F (Field Artillery), 2d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 3d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Company L (Medical), 3d Battalion, 400th Regiment; Company M (Military Police), 3d Battalion, 400th Regiment.

Fort Thomas—100th Division Band.

Frankfort—Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 2d Battalion, 100th Regiment; Companies F, G, and H, 2d Battalion, 100th Regiment.

ONE HUNDREDTH'S CHIEF PROMISES A CRACKERJACK SHOW—KENTUCKY UNIT'S ENTHUSIASTIC COMMANDER HAS LONG MILITARY AND BUSINESS RECORD

(By John Briney)

Pride—"pride in knowing a job and being able to do it."

That was the first emotion felt by Maj. Gen. Dillman Atkinson Rash when he learned that Kentucky's 100th Division had been ordered to active duty September 25.

He indicated yesterday that his pride was shared by his top aides, Brig. Gen. Benjamin J. Butler, and Brig. Gen. Albert H. Nosun.

"This job is one we've been training for, and we're going to give them a crackerjack show," Rash said.

The 100th—a training unit—is the only full division ordered to active duty in the Berlin crisis. This fact gives Rash—who has a great enthusiasm for things military—a deep and abiding satisfaction.

NEAR HIS OLD CAMP

Rash—a successful Louisville businessman and civic leader—will take his unit to Fort Polk, La. That's not far from Camp Shelby, Miss., where Rash first saw active duty as a young major in January 1941.

Getting away from his business chores poses its problems. But Rash said he felt his military obligation comes first.

His enthusiasm for military life perhaps stems from his childhood days in Earlington, Ky., where he was born and where his father, Frank D. Rash, was a member of the Kentucky National Guard. The elder Rash was later State selective service director.

MALE HIGH VALEDICTORIAN

Dillman Rash moved to Louisville in 1922 and was graduated from Male High School in 1926 as valedictorian.

But in talking to a reporter yesterday, Rash seemed a bit prouder of being a captain in the Male High ROTC than of his academic kudos.

He attended Princeton University, where he was also a cadet in the ROTC, and upon graduation in June 1930, was commissioned a Reserve second lieutenant of field artillery. Shortly thereafter, he was transferred to the Kentucky National Guard, in which he was active until called to duty in 1941.

He was graduated from the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and was an instructor there from 1941 to 1943.

SERVED IN EUROPE

During World War II, he served as acting G–1 (personnel) of the 38th Division and in the G–4 (supply) section for headquarters, European theater of operations, U.S. Army.

Rash landed in Normany 20 days after D–day and has two battle stars on his theater ribbon, although he explained he was never actually in combat.

He was promoted to brigadier general in 1955 and appointed acting commander of the 100th Division on February 3, 1959. He was promoted to major general May 14, 1959, after being made division commander. His decorations include the Bronze Star and the French Medaille de Reconnaissance.

JOINED BROKERAGE HOUSE

His civilian career started in 1930 when he became a securities analyst in the brokerage firm of J. J. B. Hilliard & Son. He later became a partner.

He is now president of Louisville Title Insurance Co. and is a director of the following organizations:

The Louisville Title Co., the Commonwealth Life Insurance Co., Atlas Plaster & Supply Co., Kentuckiana Television, Inc., Booker-Price Co., First National Lincoln Bank, Kentucky Trust Co., Louisville YMCA, and Christian Church Widows and Orphans Home.

He is a member of the board of First Christian Church and is a member of the Louisville Country Club, the Pendennis Club, the Rotary Club, the Arts Club, the Reserve Officers Association, the American Legion, the English-speaking Union, and the Kentuckiana Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

He served as president of the Louisville Chamber of Commerce in 1958 and is also past president of the Louisville Fund.

Rash, 54, and twice a grandfather, believes strongly in physical fitness and speaks proudly of his 30-inch waist. He is 5 feet 9 inches tall and weighs a trim 139 pounds. He's a hard-driving tennis and squash player and also likes to run—he's a familiar sight to golfers at Seneca, trotting over the hilly course in the evenings.

Rash appears as proud of the paratrooper's wings that he won at Fort Benning, Ga., as he is of his major general's stars.

WIFE GOING ALONG

Rash jumped five times to qualify for his wings and "once later to show off" during a Reserve maneuver at Fort Campbell the next year.

Mrs. Rash will accompany her husband to Fort Polk. As she put it yesterday: "It will be a lot easier for us now than it was 20 years ago" when their three daughters were all youngsters and there were all sorts of problems about housing and schools.

While the Rashes are away, they'll leave their house at 545 Barberry Lane for the use of one daughter, Mrs. W. Roberts Wood, and her husband, who live at 2706 Riedling Drive. The other daughters are Mrs. Ralph Brown, a professor of history at Harvard University, and Miss Nancy B. Rash, a senior at Radcliffe College.

Of General Rash's military peregrinations, Mrs. Rash had this to say:

"I always stay with him until we get where I can't go."

ASSISTANTS' BACKGROUNDS

Brigadier General Butler, assistant division commander of the 100th, was born in Trimble County in 1917.

He was graduated from the University of Kentucky in 1941 and entered active military service as a second lieutenant that June.

His military career includes combat service with the 34th Division in north Africa and Italy. He rose to battalion commander and was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Croix de Guerre of France, and the Italian Cross of Military Valor.

Butler was separated from active service in June 1946 but has remained active in the Army Reserve.

NOSUN BORN IN AUSTRIA

Brigadier General Nosun, also an assistant division commander was born in 1903 in Rohatyn, Austria. He attended high school in Pittsburgh, Pa., and received his commission as second lieutenant at Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Nosun served as an enlisted man in the horse-drawn 107th Field Artillery Regiment in 1923. When called to active duty in September 1940, as artillery instructor for the Kentucky Military District he was a captain. During World War II he was a commander of a tank-destroyer battalion in the South Pacific.

He later was assigned as chief of the Philippine Army G–4 section and chief of the maintenance section for Armed Forces headquarters in the western Pacific. His decorations include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, and the World War II Victory Medal.

The Urgent Needs of Medical Schools of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from the associate dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Richard J. Cross, transmitting a brochure prepared by the Association of American Medical Schools which brilliantly summarizes the urgent needs of the medical schools of this country.

In his letter Dr. Cross said he was sending me the brochure:

Because of a feeling that the seriousness of the situation has not been fully appreciated even by those who are deeply concerned about the health of the Nation.

Dean Cross warned that:

Unless immediate steps are taken along the lines indicated, the supply of physicians will inevitably fall far short of the Nation's needs, and the consequences of this will be grave indeed.

If you would like documentation of any of the items mentioned, please let us know. The whole subject has been extensively studied by both medical educators and impartial laymen, and I believe each proposal can be strongly supported.

Because of the importance and timeliness of this subject, I include it here for the information of my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 18, 1961.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: I enclose a brochure prepared by the Association of American Medical Colleges summarizing the urgent needs of the medical schools of this country. I send it to you because of a feeling that the seriousness of the situation has not been fully appreciated even by those, like yourself, who are deeply concerned about the health of the Nation. Unless immediate steps are taken along the lines indicated, the supply of physicians will inevitably fall far short of the Nation's needs, and the consequences of this will be grave indeed.

If you would like documentation of any of the items mentioned, please let us know. The whole subject has been extensively studied by both medical educators and impartial laymen, and I believe each proposal can be strongly supported.

Hoping that you will do what you can to ensure passage of these measures.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. CROSS, M. D.,
Associate Dean.

RESEARCH—SERVICE—EDUCATION

THE PROBLEM: DOCTOR SHORTAGE

Each physician currently serves 750 people.

Unless something is done, 1,125 people will depend on this 1 physician by 1975.

THE NEED

More medical schools and facilities; 3,500 additional physicians must be graduating each year from medical schools by 1975.

More medical students; many students are now discouraged from studying medicine because of financial worries and the long years before monetary reward is realized.

More teaching personnel to educate more medical students; to educate more graduate students (vital for teaching and research); to teach dental, nursing, and paramedical personnel; to train interns, residents, and fellows in special fields of medicine.

Medical education in America has grown great by support from universities, foundations, corporations, States, and individuals. The population is increasing faster than support from these existing sources can be expanded. The need for more trained personnel is national and international.

The Federal Government must now play a more active role by providing support for students and the institutions that will (1) be sufficient to encourage prompt, adequate action; (2) encourage modernization and expansion of existing schools; (3) encourage development of new schools; (4) encourage continuing effectiveness in maintaining diversified sources of financial support; (5) recognize the essential unity of medical education and research; (6) recognize the indispensability of libraries, university hospitals and clinics to medical research and education.

WE MUST MOVE NOW

It takes 6 to 10 years to develop a medical school and 5 to 9 years after college to complete a medical education. If action is taken today, it will be 1967–70 before an accelerated program will begin to produce more medical personnel.

It costs a student approximately $11,000 to go through medical school. To ease students' financial strain, the Federal Govern-

ment should establish nonrefundable predoctoral fellowships available all 4 years of medical school, no way limiting the choice of school, imposing no restriction on postgraduate training or choice of career.

The grants should be available in a lump sum to each medical school, amount determined by enrollment, and administered by each school according to its particular needs, with no restrictions on the use of funds from other sources.

The expanding enrollments, and increasing costs of universities already threaten the survival of many medical schools. For universities to plan new schools, it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide cost of educational grants to bear part of the financial burden.

Congress must help by passing legislation providing grants for modernization, expansions, or replacement as needed of the educational, research, and library facilities of existing schools of medicine; grants for the establishment, modernization, and expansion of teaching hospitals and clinics, granted upon application by the medical school or university; grants for the construction of new schools, including research facilities and teaching hospitals and clinics; grants to students as nonrefundable scholarships; grants to schools to cover part of the cost of education; grants to institutions for studying the feasibility of establishing new schools.

Proposed by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

It is to the unfinished business in health—which affects every person and home and community in this land—that we must now direct our best efforts.—JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America.

Water Pollution a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many arguments were advanced in this Chamber for this year's water pollution control bill before it was passed and before it became law. One of the themes we sounded again and again was that municipal officials needed the provisions of the bill to meet their local problems in such a way that they would make a definite contribution to a national campaign against pollution.

We said, in other words, that a national problem existed, even though it had to be fought on local battlefronts—rivers and streams that pass from one political jurisdiction to another.

Already we see signs indicating that the water pollution law makes a necessary and very important contribution to that national effort. An editorial in the August 26 issue of the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post is one such indication. It gives an excellent summary of the ways in which the new legislation can be put immediately to work. It specifically mentions opportunities for progress in New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Water Pollution a National Problem" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION A NATIONAL PROBLEM

A bill to expand and strengthen the control of water pollution throughout the country has become law and, with the problem a general one across the Nation, it appears that Federal intervention is quite proper.

The legislation gives the administration broad powers to crack down on industries and cities polluting lakes and streams from which the Nation draws its water supplies.

Along with expanding Federal police powers in pollution matters, the measure authorizes sharp increases in Federal grants to local communities to help them build sewage disposal plants.

It empowers the Federal Government to start court action to crack down on any city or industry polluting any of the Nation's 26,000 lakes and streams, whenever State authorities approve. Existing Federal authority is restricted to the 4,000 water bodies which cross State boundaries and may be exercised only if the pollution crosses State lines. This unrestricted Federal authority would remain intact under the new law.

The legislation also will raise to $570 million the existing $262 million ceiling on Federal funds Congress may grant to local communities over the next 6 years to help finance construction of sewage disposal plants.

Moreover, it will raise to $600,000 the existing $250,000 top limit on grants to individual communities. The administration proposed a top limit of $800,000. It feels that bigger cities have been penalized under the $250,000 ceiling. Local communities must provide at least $7 for every $3 received in Federal funds.

President Kennedy feels pollution of rivers and streams has reached alarming proportions. He notes that to meet all needs—domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. The President quite properly has asked stronger Federal powers to combat the problem.

True, President Eisenhower last year vetoed a similar bill. He held that pollution was a local problem for cities and States to solve. That may be partly right, but it must be admitted that the problem has been heightened because many States have been inactive in the field, and Federal intervention against water pollution has become a necessity. One State's effort, for example, can be defeated if across a river or upstream another State is doing nothing.

Pollution control grants are to be distributed under a formula that would give special assistance to low-income States. Since the pollution problem is most acute in the heavily industrialized urban areas, there could be discrimination which might impair the effectiveness of the program by diverting funds from areas which need them most.

However, if the Federal aid program is allotted properly, and abuses are guarded against, the legislation, which the President has signed into law, can become an excellent weapon for combating a growing problem.

Senator WILLIAMS, a strong proponent of the legislation, has released a list of New Jersey municipalities, drawn up for him by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which already have applications pending or being prepared for Federal funds to use in pollution control.

There are 15 of them, asking a total of $1,913,385 in grants to build sewage treatment facilities. They include Mount Ephraim, asking a $70,800 grant to help pay for a $236,000 project; Beverly, seeking $18,900 toward a $63,000 project; and Somers Point, asking for $195,000 on a project to cost $650,000. Wildwood and Wildwood Crest also have applications in preparation.

Under the authorization bill, New Jersey water pollution projects will be allotted $14 million in grants during the next 6 years. The money can be put to good use, as Senator WILLIAMS notes in referring to the recent serious outbreak of hepatitis which apparently was traced to the eating of raw clams harvested from Raritan Bay.

Reports on a Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper account from Assemblyman Norbert Nuttelman, of West Salem, Wis., and a letter from R. L. Schwartz, of Baraboo, Wis., giving their account of a recent trip they took to Europe and the Soviet Union. The trip consisted of a delegation of 36 Wisconsin agricultural leaders. I feel the Members will be very interested in this firsthand impression and the general views of these two men in regard to the countries and the people:

N. NUTTELMAN DESCRIBES TRIP INTO RUSSIA

Norbert Nuttelman, Barre Mills farmer and assemblyman from the second district, described his recent trip through Europe and Russia at the luncheon meeting of the West Salem Rotary Club Tuesday noon.

Nuttelman was one of 32 members of a Wisconsin agricultural good will tour which visited East Berlin 5 days before the Communists sealed off the border. He visited Poland and spent 8 days inside the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow has been prepared as the showplace of communism, Nuttelman said, it was not difficult to "see through the camouflage." The impressive Ukraine Hotel was mostly wasted space, with poor plumbing and no soap, but a reputation for bedbugs. Almost new buildings have metal screens over the sidewalks to protect pedestrians from falling masonry fragments.

The people live in crowded apartment houses owned by the Government. There are no private homes. The individual can be said to own the clothes on his back, but he pays dearly for them.

There were no children playing on the sidewalks or elsewhere. The guide said they were either in camps or in Government nurseries. Despite Government care of children, the birth rate is down.

Subways in Russia serve also as huge bomb shelters. Some are 125-feet underground Airports are some distance from the cities, probably also for civil defense purposes.

At the state farms and collective farms, Nuttelman took exception to the glowing statistics given out by the farm managers. The scrubby dairy cattle with small udders couldn't produce the milk credited to them, he said. The type of hog raised was good, but poor sanitation and other factors made them slow to mature.

Equipment used on the farms was monstrous, without an impressive saving of manpower. All tractors had caterpillar treads. Collective farms out-produced state farms because sharecropping and private use of garden plots was practiced. Corn in the

Ukraine seemed the equal of that grown in this country.

Food served on Russia tables shows a complete lack of refrigeration in food preservation. Whole milk is not served.

Nuttelman felt that the Communists, who compose 4 percent of the population, have succeeded quite well in making human robots of the Russian people. They seem completely outside the Christian tradition as we know it and they worship Lenin and Stalin, whose tombs they visit on Red Square at the rate of 10,000 a day.

Nuttelman also visited in Hungary where hope of deliverance by America is still alive, and in Poland where Communism is resisted to the point of near starvation. He spent a night in the same German community from which his grandfather emigrated to America.

Western European countries are disturbed by our inability to do anything about Cuba. Nuttelman concluded. They see Cuba as a sign of our inability to meet the Communist menace, more so than we do in the United States.

SCHWARTZ FARM EQUIPMENT CO.,
Baraboo, Wis., August 23, 1961.

VERNON W. THOMSON,
Congress of United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just completed my agricultural good will people-to-people tour of Europe and Soviet Union.

It was most enjoyable and educational. I think our group did a great job in meeting the people and getting our message to them. Even in the Soviet Union the people were very friendly if you approached them in the right way, and were then very cooperative.

My idea on breaking down the Communist barrier is to in some way through the U.S. Government to invite 12 to 15 Russian people in the age class of 25 to 35 years to the United States for 15 to 20 days. Bring over a new group every month until we have brought over 100 people from different sections of the Soviet Union. Show them around—the way our people live and the advantages we have. They will carry the message back to their people and we would break down the Communist ideas faster than we can by going over there. We must start with the young people as the old people are set in their ways and cannot change.

I don't think Russia wants war anymore than we do. But let's not sell Russia short. They are doing a tremendous job in the agricultural field and they want to triple their production in the next 10 years. The people know this and with the standards the leaders are going to provide the people, they will, and are working for it.

Yours very truly,

R. L. SCHWARTZ.

Address of Hon. Lester B. Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently a distinguished visitor from Canada, the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, made a significant address at Boston University.

Mr. Pearson is a former president of the United Nations General Assembly, a Nobel prize winner and the leader of Canada's Liberal Party.

Because he speaks wisely on the importance and the vitality of Canadian-American friendship, it seems to me that his remarks deserve the wider audience of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR NORTHERN NEIGHBOR

(Commencement address at Boston University by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, P.C., M.P., M.A., LL.D., Sunday, June 4, 1961)

This is a time of the year when a large number of men and women, who, on leaving college to begin their new education, and even though they may have done nothing to deserve such treatment, are subjected to various forms of exhortation from older men chosen for that purpose. My own research agency informs me that, if all the preachments that have ben aimed at graduating classes since the first commencement at the University of Stonehenge could be put end to end, they would reach that space which is just beyond outer space.

It was, I believe, a cynical French philosopher who said that: "Old men give good advice to console themselves for no longer being able to set a bad example."

I am not an old man, only an older one; old enough to realize, in fact, that, if I had any sense, I would not try to give you advice at all. Yet, if I didn't, how would I justify the honor that has been conferred on me by this great and respected institution, and which I appreciate more than I can say?

Perhaps it is enough to state on this occasion, now that you have B.A.'s and better, and are being launched into a new sphere of activity, that the world is your oyster. I hope that you will feel that it is worth trying to open. Do not take a cynical or defeatist attitude towards this operation, because there are still pearls inside worth going after; especially the priceless pearl of the good life; the good life which is concerned more with the dividends of inner satisfaction than with those from very common stocks, though I admit that there are occasions on which the latter are most helpful, and may even seem at times more alluring than less tangible, if more enduring, rewards.

I also hope, however, that you won't decide that the only way to open this oyster is to become an employee of Amalgamated Oyster Openers, Inc. Such an affiliation, no doubt, will give you the security and prestige of the "organization man" in the gray flannel suit. But the kind of security that depends too much on others, on the group, on the collective, may destroy something of freedom and self-reliance in your development as an individual, which is quite as important, if not more important, than security itself.

The Greeks—who had slaves to do the hard manual work for them—thought that the supreme end of the good life was the intelligent employment of leisure. We, who are being given more and more opportunity for leisure by mechanical slaves, will fail in that test of the good life if, among other things, we lose the satisfaction and enjoyment that comes from honest, hard, creative work; and if we lose respect for its dignity. By love of work, I am not thinking of Jerome K. Jerome's quip: "Work, I love it. It fascinates me. I could sit and watch it for hours and hours."

It is, however, idle to expect anyone to enjoy work if that work does not give some feeling of creative effort, of constructive participation, and of justice in the sharing of the wealth that results from it.

It is not going to be easy—it never has been easy—to achieve the good life, either nationally or individually. That merely makes the challenge more demanding and worth while. There will be setbacks and failures, but no one deserves success who is too easily discouraged by failure.

There will be many opportunities in the days ahead for you to test the value of the kind of education you have acquired here. Those tests will be for you as persons. But you are more than persons. You are citizens of a great nation on whose leadership and power rests the fate of hundreds of millions of people outside your own borders. So your national response to the demands and sacrifices of leadership and power will also provide a test of the value of your own education; in the wisdom and understanding and maturity you will show in reaching the judgments which are your minimum share in the direction of national—and because of your country's position—world policy.

One aspect of the foreign policy of your country—and a more important one than you realize because it normally proceeds without fuss or excitement—is your relationship to Canada, my country, and your northern neighbor; a country which, incidentally, is placed squarely between you and the Soviet Union. This makes us a middle power in other than the usual and more comfortable meaning of the word.

You should know more than you do about Canada; its growing strength, its problems, its policies; and its feelings about living right alongside the most powerful country in the world. Those feelings are a mixture of appreciation and anxiety. We know that we have a good neighbor, as well as a very powerful one; a combination that is not universal. But this doesn't mean that we have no worries about our relationship. We have; and Americans should be aware of them; just as they are often acutely aware of the different kind of problem involved in their relations with their Latin American neighbors.

Awareness of our mutual problems is, in fact, essential to that understanding which is the foundation of good relations. Ignorance, however benevolent, is an unstable and unsatisfactory basis for good relations between even the friendliest countries. Neighborhood doesn't become good neighborliness by accident or neglect.

Of course, we Canadians will naturally have a far greater interest in you than you have in us. This is inevitable, because you are so much more important to us than we are to you. Your influence on every aspect of our life—economic, social, cultural, political—is great and all pervading. You have even converted Canadian rugby into American football—almost—and you have us looking at westerns which are occasionally adult. Our boundary is certainly undefended against whatever emanates from your mass media of communication; press, periodical, radio, television, movie. It is with us a case of "Escape you, never."

Your continental and enveloping embrace is friendly, even at times fervent. But it can also be overwhelming.

In the economic field, your investment in our future—and your market for our goods—have been essential for our spectacular growth in the years after World War II. We Canadians should appreciate that. But it has some aspects that also make us uneasy.

We are by far your biggest and most unbalanced customer. Last year 180 million Americans bought about $3 billion worth of Canadian products, but our 18 millions bought $3,700 million worth from you.

We are deeply in the red on U.S. account and have been saved from its consequences only by your investment of capital in Canada.

This salvation, however, has resulted in more and more of our industries and our resources falling under control of fine and enterprising men who are, unfortunately, not Canadians.

The latest figures show nearly half of all our manufacturing industries are controlled by residents of the United States, who had invested, as of December 31, 1959, nearly $16 billion in our country.

This has been to their advantage and to ours. To keep it that way, American companies and businessmen should be careful to insure that their Canadian subsidiaries behave in every way as a Canadian company would; with maximum Canadian participation in management and ownership, and with business policies determined by Canadian, rather than American considerations.

Our desire, indeed our determination, to control our own development to the maximum possible extent, while keeping our country attractive to foreign investors, is a reflection of the nationalism that now pervades Canada. That nationalism, while strong, is not, I hope, and will not become, either petty or parochial. For it is clear, as never before, that nationalism is not enough; that independence must be subordinated to interdependence. No country has more reason to recognize the importance of such interdependence than Canada.

It is a source of great pride to Canadians—or it was before our economy temporarily slowed down and our spectacular growth was halted—to point to the exciting progress of our nation in recent years. But that satisfaction must be qualified by the knowledge that much of this development—as I have indicated—depends on our financial and trade relationships with our neighbor; on the success, indeed, of its general economic policies which may not be directly concerned with Canada at all. As it has been said, a shiver in Washington or a sneeze in Wall Street and Canada catches cold. Our own policies, in fact, are often directed to finding ways and means of security against or relief from economic ailments, caused by germs which we believe are picked up across the border. Sometimes this may be the case. At other times the germs are very domestic.

This interdependence between us, which is increasing because of the kind of world in which we live, means that the relations between our two countries are becoming more complex and difficult. Do not misunderstand me. Those relations remain close and friendly and, in many ways, are the model of what such things should be between a great and smaller power. Indeed, if Canadians tend to become too touchy and anxious about some aspects of them, they should try to realize what it would be like to be Hungary, or Thailand, or Poland, alongside a Communist totalitarian empire. I assure you that we do appreciate the difference, even though we reserve the right—which is the happiest expression of that difference—to criticize form time to time what our neighbor on this continent is doing.

If we—and your other allies—seem to be too critical at times, just remember that your policies can do us great harm as well as much good; and it often seems that we can't do much about it, one way or the other. It makes for the kind of anxiety which comes from an inescapable dependence on someone else.

Indeed, our reaction to this dependence, which is not to be mistaken for subservience, is exactly the same as it would be with you if the situation were reversed. We are, you know, very much alike which, no doubt, is why so many hundreds of thousands of Canadians have migrated to Boston.

So you must become accustomed to the frank expression of our worries just as we must learn to appreciate that you have far greater worries of your own which are on a world scale and arise out of the world responsibilities which, fortunately, you have assumed. It is on this basis of mutual understanding that good neighborhood can and must be maintained.

While, then, you must expect to receive criticism (and I hope that you will accept it with that stoicism that is the mark of confident maturity) I would not expect you to achieve the perfection of comprehension and charity illustrated by a story that Senator Barkley used to tell in Washington. It concerned a mongrel pup in his boyhood village whose good nature and patience the children used to try by invariably tying a tin can to his tail whenever they could catch him. The dog was both long suffering and adaptable and, eventually, had so conditioned himself to this kind of treatment that every time he saw a tin can, he obligingly backed into it. I am not asking the United States to back into anything—automatically—even to maintain good relations with Canada.

May I be a little more specific. Most Canadians, for instance, disapproved of what we thought to be a muddled intervention in Cuba. But most Canadians also appreciate the danger of a social and economic revolution in Cuba being exploited by international communism in Moscow so that this island, 90 miles off your coast, could become a base for a Communist offensive against Latin America.

This is a situation which may be repeated in other Latin American countries. It is made the more difficult because some of these countries are poor and underdeveloped, where the material for revolution is present and combustible: and where little help from Communist imperialism is required to bring about an explosion. The fact that communism is always at hand to fan, or rather to exploit, these winds of essential change, makes it all the more important, in dealing with them, not to be associated with the forces of reaction in any way which would indicate approval.

When we are associated in such a way, we merely give ammunition to our enemies; just as we do when act at home in ways which make our good words about fundamental human rights and the equality of all men sound pretty hollow.

I think, also important that, if and when action is required against forces of Communist subversion which directly threaten security and freedom on this hemisphere, that that action should not have to be taken by any one government, but collectively through the Organization of American States.

If you reply that Canada's advice on this matter would be more impressive if she herself would be willing to accept responsibility as a member of OAS; well, I agree with you.

But I can't refrain from adding that it wasn't many years ago that we were blackballed for membership in this hemisphere club by Washington—and others. I should also point out that if and when Canada does become a member, we will speak and act—as we have done at the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—in a way which will not mean automatic support for any country; even the United States. We are a friend and an ally; not a satellite. Nor would you want it to be different. Otherwise, our friendship and support would not mean much.

It is fair and accurate to say that Canada has not been hesitant to accept her own proper share of international and coalition responsibilities. Our record is a respectable one.

One of these responsibilities is to play a proper part in collective defense, which includes the defense of this continent.

The Canadian people are not neutralist or isolationist in this matter. There are some Canadians, I know, who would have us break away from our alliances, abandon our share in their obligations for collective defense, and discharge our international responsibilities solely through the United Nations. But they are a small minority, but a vocal one.

The great majority of Canadians realize that there is a real threat to freedom and security in the world today; that no nation on this crowded little planet can defend itself by its own resources, or deter aggression by national power alone; that we must be united to be strong.

So we Canadians do believe in collective security, collective defense, and collective international action.

We Canadians cannot be neutralist in any sense that would put the free, democratic people of the United States on the same level as the unfree imperialism of the U.S.S.R., in terms of Canadian relations, Canadian interests, Canadian friendship.

This would be wrong and inadmissible. Only in case of a breakdown of U.S. wisdom and steadiness in policy and leadership—and we do not believe that this will happen—would Canadians contemplate withdrawing from our existing obligations and commitments.

The effective discharge of this responsibility requires the closest cooperation in defense strategy and planning between our two countries, without regard to our boundary line. It also requires—but does not receive—the same kind of cooperation in defense production and in trade and economic matters generally. There is certainly a boundary in these matters.

While the great majority of Canadians agree on participation in collective defense, we disagree on how this can best be done. The party which I lead, for instance, believes that close cooperation in continental defense does not necessarily require continental integration in all defense matters. Our party also believes it would be a mistake for Canada to join the ranks of nuclear powers by manufacturing or accepting nuclear weapons for her forces.

We believe that the nuclear deterrent in U.S. hands is strategically and politically necessary in today's dangerous world, as long as the Soviet Union has nuclear weapons. But we oppose its dispersal among other powers that do not now possess nuclear weapons because this would make an accidental nuclear war much more likely and general and controlled disarmament much more difficult.

These differences of viewpoint within the two major Canadian parties, however, do not affect our common agreement that Canada should play her part—as she is now doing—in the Atlantic defense coalition; as well as in the United Nations.

I conclude by making a plea for the continuance of the closest and friendliest relations between our two nations; especially at this time when the free, democratic countries must stand together in the face of forces that threaten both freedom and democracy.

The other day I received a letter from an American lady in New York who had watched me on a television program in connection with President Kennedy's recent and highly successful visit to Ottawa, where he received such a tremendous welcome.

I must have said something about Canada's worries over U.S. pressures on her own national development—and this was her comment:

"I have visited your country on two occasions and the thing that disturbed me about the program was the fear of Canadians that they have lost some identity as a Na-

tion, that the Americans look upon them as practically being part of the United States.

"I am writing to say that I, for one, and all of the people I know, have never even considered Canada in this light. I feel proud to know that a nation such as yours borders on ours. I wish that there was a way of letting your people know how we feel here. Thank you."

That was a warm and generous comment.

In return, may I say—and particularly to you, who are leaving this university to take up your new responsibilities:

"I feel proud—and reassured as a Canadian—to know that people like you are on our southern borders as such good neighbors."

Du Pont Stockholders Should Be Taxed Only on Sale of Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent Court decision involving the Du Pont Co. and General Motors poses some tax problems which Congress must settle. Without going into the merits of the decision, it would seem to me that two points are at issue, first, there should be ample time allowed for disposition of the stock so that both the present stockowners and the stock market will not be unduly affected; and, second, the proceeds from any sale of the stocks should be taxed only as capital gain.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal indicates some of the depth of the problem involved:

HALVING AN INEQUITY

There can't be very many Congressmen bemused by the thought that if they took a dollar bill out of their wallet and tore it in two they would thereby be the richer.

Yet here we have a whole assembly of furrowed-brow Congressmen wearying their brains trying to figure out how to tax stockholders of the Du Pont Co. for the profits reaped by tearing a Du Pont stock certificate in two.

For this is precisely what the Du Pont stockholders will do when, under Court order, the chemical company divests itself of its stock holdings in General Motors. A Du Pont stock certificate represents a share of ownership in all the assets of the chemical company, and at the moment a part of these assets are the shares of General Motors stock in the chemical company's portfolio. This has been the situation for many years, and of course the market value of the Du Pont stock is based on Du Pont's total assets, including the General Motors stock.

Now the idea, under the court order, is that Du Pont turn over directly to its stockholders their proportionate share of GM. In other words, the Du Pont stockholder will have two pieces of paper, one representing the GM portion and the other the balance of his shares in what's left of Du Pont's assets.

The Justice Department, the Treasury and the furrowed Congressmen have taken a look at this GM certificate and think, "What ho. This stockholder has a GM share he didn't have before. That's a gain. He must be taxed on this windfall."

Or to put the matter more accurately, they say this is what they think; because actually neither Attorney General Kennedy nor Secretary of the Treasury Dillon nor the majority of the Members of Congress are imbeciles. What makes them pretend to be thickheaded is the political fear that the populace won't understand and that they will be accused of letting the Du Pont stockholders get this wonderful windfall scot free of taxes.

This explains the spectacle now playing in Congress. There are a whole raft of schemes being gravely debated for a special law which will minimize the inequity of taxing the Du Pont stockholders for tearing their certificates in two. The Congressmen's conscience tells them they ought to relieve some of the inequity—but their political caution tells them they had better leave a little inequity. And that, if we may venture a prediction, is what they'll end up doing.

It's all ridiculous, but there's at least one solace for the Du Pont stockholders. As any Congressman can tell you, halving a dollar bill may not be a gain, but half of an inequity is better than a whole one.

The Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, much has been written and said about effectively combating communism. Presently, however, the Lutheran Witness, a magazine of the Lutheran Church, is publishing a series of four very excellent articles on the subject by the Reverend Lambert Brose.

In his first article entitled "The Communist Threat," Reverend Brose points out that when it comes to fighting communism, "We're not much interested in putting our money where our mouth is. This is appalling in view of the enormity of the Communist threat and the little time left before it may engulf us." Then Reverend Brose asks, "Why are we so apathetic?"

He goes on to answer this question. His answer is of such importance and timeliness that I now ask unanimous consent to have this first article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

(First in a series of articles by Lambert Brose)

Many Christians do not oppose communism. Not really. Not in all seriousness.

We make much noise about the evils of communism. But we keep pretty quiet when it comes to doing something about it. Like taking time off to study about this godless ideology and its frightening successes. Or making a personal sacrifice to combat it.

In the parlance of the street—when it comes to fighting communism, we're not much interested in "putting our money where our mouth is." This is appalling in view of the enormity of the Communist threat and the little time left before it may engulf us.

Why are we so apathetic?

ARE COMMUNISTS SMARTER?

The answer is simple. The Communists know they're in the middle of world war III. We don't.

As a result we've taken a licking from Khrushchev and Mao and their henchmen in many parts of the world.

Not militarily. We've stood up to them. Through NATO and the U.N. In Greece, in Korea, in Berlin. But we've taken a licking nevertheless.

The facts are indisputable. Some 40 years ago fewer than 2 million people were under Communist domination. Today that number has grown to more than a billion.

And in another 20 years, according to a projection by the Hugh Moore Fund of New York City, more than two-thirds of the world will be under Red rule if Communism continues at its present rate of growth.

WHY LAUGH AT KHRUSHCHEV?

Many people laughted in September 1959 when Khrushchev, visiting the United States, predicted, "Your grandchildren will grow up under communism."

However, that prophecy has already come true for 6½ million Americans living in our own backyard, for our friends, the Cubans.

Country after country has been drawn into the Red orbit: Mainland China (the biggest nation in the world), Tibet, North Vietnam, North Korea, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary. The list is a long one.

Judging by the cold statistics of the past—of countries won and lost—there seems little reason to laugh at Khrushchev's boast for the future.

(Obviously this statement does not imply any partisan criticism. The Communist victories took place during both Democratic and Republican administrations. But it's bitter medicine for us. Any many still refuse to admit these unpalatable facts of life.)

ATTITUDES MAY BE CHANGING

Perhaps, however, a new day is dawning. Perhaps the sensational events of the past few years—and weeks—are piercing the plush curtain of our complacency. At least some of the "experts" think so.

The new day began, they believe, in October 1957, when the Russians started breaking through the space barrier with a series of fantastic scientific firsts: the first sputnik, the first rocket to the moon, the first missile launched from an orbiting satellite toward Venus, the first man in orbit.

To top it all, polls taken last summer by our own Government's Information Agency, released this January, showed that the majority of people questioned in countries around the world thought that Russia—even before Gagarin orbited the earth—was ahead of us in this all-important conquest of outer space; all-important because of its worldwide psychological significance.

CHRISTIANS WHO ARE HELPING K.

And any American, any American Christian, who remains complacent in the face of these facts—and this is said advisedly—is aiding albeit, unwittingly, Khrushchev and Mao in their goal of enslaving the world.

There is comparatively little danger, it seems to me, of the majority of U.S. citizens being won for Marxism because they are awed by Communist achievements, or because they think that its ideology represents the wave of the future. For despite the Soviet's accomplishments in space, our country is still miles ahead of the Russians—and the Red Chinese—in almost any field one cares to mention.

But there is a real danger, because of our smugness, that communism could subvert and proceed to conquer step-by-step, according to Lenin's well-publicized timetable, Asia, Africa, Latin America, Southern Europe,

Northern Europe, and finally, fantastic though it may seem at the moment, the United States of America and Canada.

After all, the Bible assurance that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church of Christ does not preclude the downfall of temporal governments.

The first step in effectively combating communism is to make a realistic appraisal of it. This we shall attempt to do in a series of articles—an appraisal of its sensational growth; its techniques, its teachings, its goals; and what we Christians can do to halt it by a positive program that entails something more than mere anti-Communism.

A WISE MAN WARNS US

Recently Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former head of NATO, spoke to the annual conference of the U.S. Army Command Chaplains Conference in Washington, D.C.

Describing the inroads communism has made on a global scale, General Gruenther said some startling things about Communist techniques and ther effectiveness.

One reason for Communist successes, said General Gruenther, is that this godless ideology—ironically—has convinced many people in the emerging nations that it really cares about their individual needs; that communism is a humanitarian way of life.

RUSSIA'S MEDICAL MISSIONARIES

Item: Russia alone, General Gruenther pointed out, graduates about 16,000 medical doctors each year. Many of them are sent to the uncommitted nations. There they live with the people—eating the same food as they do, suffering the same hardships. And all the while they treat the inhabitants medically, healing many of their diseases.

Our country? We don't even have enough doctors to treat our own citizens. Neither do the Russians. But they feel that winning the sympathy of the newly emerging nations is so important that they send many of their doctors abroad.

Some of the U.S. representatives, observed the general, seeing the conditions under which they were to live, quickly came back to the States.

The Russians, he went on, "had jolly well better not return to their homeland unless ordered to do so, if they know what's good for them."

Certainly there are Americans who are making heroic sacrifices in far reaches of the globe. Missionaries, doctors, teachers, Red Cross workers, International Volunteer Service representatives, and others. But the point is that the Communists send out their people each year in vast numbers.

FOREIGN SERVICE WORKERS

Item: In Russia today, General Gruenther pointed out—and this has been going on for years—large numbers of students from the Soviet Union and other Communist nations are studying in Moscow to become representatives in foreign countries. They take up to 4 years of university training, studying intensively the country to which they are to be sent: its languages, customs, religions—everything. Then they go to that country to live among the people.

In contrast, General Gruenther stated, most U.S. foreign service personnel live together with other Americans and West Europeans—often unable to speak the native languages—rarely mingling socially with the inhabitants of the country they're in.

Again, some U.S. foreign service workers are doing an outstanding job. The difference is in degree, the tremendous scale of the Soviet operation.

NEW WEAPON: 2-CENT BOOKS

On the other side of the world that second Communist colossus, Red China, is teaming up with the Soviets to overrun southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America like a metastatic cancer.

Realizing the truth of the old adage, "The pen is mightier than the sword," both Russia and Red China are flooding the uncommitted nations with books. Textbooks, comic books, fiction, nonfiction. Books which sell for as little as 2 cents each. Books so inexpensive that even the poor people can buy them; and in the uncommitted nations most people are poor. An instance is on record of even an anti-Communist teacher buying Communist books for his school because he couldn't afford others.

This weapon is tremendously effective. People in the newly emerging nations have an insatiable thirst for books. They'll read almost anything.

BIBLE HAS DROPPED TO SECOND PLACE

Eugene Burdick in an Associated Press story writes: "The Communist book distribution apparatus is so vast that it staggers the imagination. Some figures indicate that the Russians and the Red Chinese produce 3.6 billion books each year. This is more than one book for every person on earth."

Other sources state that the total book production of all Communist countries is now 5 billion annually, compared with the 800 million published in the United States.

As a result of this immense effort, Reporter Burdick notes, Lenin is now the most widely translated author in the world. The Bible has dropped to second place. In third place are the writings of Stalin.

LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD

Woven through each book distributed by the Soviets or Red Chinese, of course, is the Communist teaching, obviously or subtly. Mr. Burdick observes, for example, that in the story of Little Red Riding Hood—immensely popular among Asians—the wolf's face looks a little like that of Chiang Kai-shek. And the brave hunter who saves Red Riding Hood wears a small red star on his hat. The red star is known throughout Asia as the symbol of communism.

What is the United States of America doing in this field? Our U.S. Information Agency, on a limited budget, makes available for foreign consumption only a tiny fraction of the Communist output. The total USIA distribution for all foreign countries in 1960 was less than 5 million.

Moreover, in radio broadcasting to the uncommitted nations, the USIA admits that Red China has now gone into second place behind the Soviet Union. "In other words," writes the head of the Hearst newspapers, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., "we are now a poor third to Moscow and Peiping."

TWENTY TONS OF TNT PER PERSON

Until recent years Communist victories were gained by ruthless force. And in 1961 war is not ruled out; the present struggle in Laos is a case in point. In fact, brush-fire wars will undoubtedly continue endlessly.

However, both our country and the Soviets have now entered the age of the nuclear overkill. Each side has the nuclear power to destroy the other—and perhaps most of the world.

Some scientists estimate that the total nuclear power now stockpiled by the United States and Russia is the equivalent of 20 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth.

Consequently, neither side is willing to start a nuclear world war III deliberately, though each admits that a madman could trigger such a holocaust.

And our Government believes that the best preparation for peace is to remain so strong militarily—to fight big and little wars—that the Communists won't dare attack us.

ON THE WINNING SIDE

But in this world war III we're already engaged in—whether we realize it or not—the Communists have turned to other weapons. They have taken to heart, for their own nefarious purposes, St. Paul's words: "I have become all things to all men."

Recall for instance, some of the headlines that have appeared on the sports pages: "Russians Win Winter Olympics"; Soviets Clinch Unofficial Summer Olympic Title"; "Brumel Outjumps Thomas in Garden."

Some people get angry when you call this to their attention. "So what," they explode, "can't we even engage in sports without bringing in politics?"

Sounds like a reasonable objection, like good commonsense.

The only trouble is that the Russians don't look at it that way. To them, every time they can beat the Western World—and particularly the United States—at something, at anything, it's one more weapon in their arsenal of psychological warfare to bring the uncommitted nations to their side, to what they proclaim as the winning side. Accordingly, their so-called amateur athletes are trained and nurtured by the state.

SPACE RACE AND MISSION WORK

Similarly, many U.S. citizens are outraged by the vast sums of money our country is spending to compete with Russia in the race to outer space. "We'd be a lot better off if we used these billions here in the United States, to heal the sick—to find a cure for cancer, heart disease, and mental depression," they say.

Again, this sounds like good commonsense.

But the Russians and the Red Chinese don't care about commonsense. Or, perhaps, they care about it more than we do—in a more profound way. Undoubtedly they're among the "children of this world" the Bible says we should be "as wise as".

We're told that every time the Russians score another first in space, their agents flood the uncommitted nations with a propaganda barrage. "Look," they say, "just 40 years ago we were one of the most backward nations in the Western World. Now we're first in the race into space. Why? Because of our communistic way of life. You, too, could make sensational progress if you adopted communism."

And anyone who thinks that this does not impress these relatively unsophisticated people, that it isn't important in the conduct of our Nation's foreign affairs and that it doesn't affect the foreign mission work of the Christian church—is simply not being realistic.

The Communists use everything—everything—in their fight to take over the world. And despite internal dissension and agricultural failures and all their other problems, so far they're winning.

This is true, no matter how much we try to explain their victories away.

Should Congressional Committee Hearings Be Televised?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of Congress recently prepared for publication in TV Guide a most illuminating commentary on the question "Should Congressional Committee Hearings Be Televised?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD this very convincing argument by our colleague, the gen-

tleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, in opposition to the televising of congressional committee hearings:

SHOULD CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE HEARINGS BE TELEVISED?

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee)

Hearings before congressional committees, like regular sessions of the Senate and the House of Representatives, have traditionally been open to members of the public and to the press. This enables the people to keep posted on the activities of their Government, as befits citizens in a democracy. With the coming of television the question has arisen whether this powerful new mass medium should be given the run of congressional hearing rooms under the same terms, subject only to technical limitations, as are now accorded members of the working press. The Senate has no rule on the subject—each committee decides for itself, and Senate committee hearings are sometimes televised. On the House side, however, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has, wisely, I believe, refused to permit televising of committee hearings. The present statement was stimulated by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S interesting article in the May 6 issue of TV Guide magazine, in which he advocates the use of television in this area.

Those who, like Senator MCCLELLAN, recommend that congressional hearings should be televised stress the growing interest of the American people in public affairs. To encourage and satisfy this interest, they argue, it is well to take the people fully into confidence by letting them see and hear, as well as read about, the legislative process.

Procedural fairness will be guaranteed, these protagonists of congressional TV contend, by the fact that possible dictatorial or arrogant behavior by Congressmen toward witnesses will show up and discredit those responsible. On the other hand, they urge, defiant, evasive, and untruthful witnesses will be deterred from excesses or be publicly exposed.

I am unable to share these optimistic estimates of the results of televising committee hearings. Indeed, I fear that we have much more to lose than to gain by turning these necessary fact-finding proceedings into television spectaculars.

The heart of the matter is that television, for all its unquestioned wonders, is not well adapted for broadcasting the sober, fact-finding inquiries that committee hearings are supposed to be. Nor does the undoubted success of the medium in broadcasting ceremonies, addresses, press conferences, and debates afford a basis for contrary view. All such events are spectacles; they are intended to be spectacles. They edify as spectacles. What is more, whether the purpose be to dramatize our national traditions, to win or hold political support or to inform the audience on public issues, the participants in these spectacles exhibit themselves voluntarily.

By contrast, the purpose of committee hearings is neither to dramatize, nor to vie for political preferment, nor to entertain the public. It is to inform the members of the committees with respect to the virtues and shortcomings of pending measures and with respect to the need for legislation not yet introduced. Indeed, the sole justification for the exercise of the subpena power of Congress, with its attendant sanction of punishment for contempt, is the search for truth. What is more, in the exercise of that power, congressional committees frequently summon to their hearings participants who do not appear voluntarily, who have not participated in the formulation of the ground rules and whose interest may even be to conceal or misstate the truth, rather than aid in its search. Whether subjecting such people to the glare of television cameras is calculated to transform their reluctance into cooperativeness is open to serious question.

Insofar as congressional committee hearings partake of the nature of accusatory proceedings, witnesses are neither accorded the traditional safeguards of the criminal law such as the right to cross-examine, nor do they enjoy the privacy imposed upon grand jury proceedings. In consequence, if the chairman and committee members be unfair, witnesses face the risk of irreparable damage to their reputations under extremely unequal, not to say prejudicial, circumstances. What valid purpose can be served by subjecting them to the further ordeal of television lights and national network audiences?

There are other reasons why the medium is inappropriate for broadcasting such proceedings. I am breaching no confidence when I observe that Members of Congress are, in the nature of their elective office, extremely sensitive to publicity. The tendency of committee members to "get in the act" in the course of hearings is well known. This compulsive need to compete for the spotlight is immeasurably stimulated when hearings are broadcast live.

Congressional TV cannot be justified by the assertion that the television public has a right to see and hear, in its living rooms, what goes on at these hearings. Historically, the publicity of legal proceedings was and is a right of the litigants.

Nor has it been established that the interest of the people in receiving telecasts of committee hearings arises primarily from a desire to observe the Government at work. Judging from the type of broadcast the industry has presented, the general public is less interested in the serious, detailed consideration of problems than in the confessions of a Charles Van Doren, the humiliation of a Sherman Adams, the discomfiture of discredited corporate executives, the surliness of racketeers at bay, the number of times a witness takes the fifth amendment. It is the sensational, not the solid, on which coverage is focused.

Finally, it should be noted that although committee hearings are an important part of the legislative process, they are not the only or the most important part. It is the executive sessions of the committees in which the real give-and-take of the process predominantly takes place, and the debates on the floor of the House and Senate in which conflicting views and interests are finally resolved. Only the committee hearings, however, are proposed to be televised, for only they lend themselves to a publicity free-for-all for committee members.

I emphatically agree with the observation that Government business is not show business. The work of Congress requires sober reflection and quiet deliberation. It cannot operate at its best under the scrutiny of floodlights, invisible audiences and the confusion of light and sound equipment. We must not permit any practice, however popular, that tends to weaken the functioning of Government.

Convention of Order of Sons of Italy—Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on August 18, 1961, the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention of the Order Sons of Italy in America adopted a resolution embodying recommendations for amending the immigration laws. Let us not forget that both political parties included in their 1960 platforms promises to modernize these outdated laws. Thus far, however, no action has been forthcoming.

In an effort to again focus attention on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee of the Supreme Council, Order Sons of Italy in America, together with the resolution adopted by the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Resolution of Order Sons of Italy in America, 27th biennial supreme convention, Washington, D.C., Aug. 17–21, 1961)

Whereas the Order Sons of Italy in America has had a profound interest in the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, consistent with good Americanism, for over 57 years; and

Whereas the order has adopted a seven-point program to further its goal to bring about more equality, humaneness, and fairness in said laws; and

Whereas the order's seven-point program was in substance accepted by both the Republican and Democratic 1960 National Conventions; and

Whereas numerous bills and resolutions have been introduced in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives which collectively incorporate the order's seven-point program; and

Whereas the 1st session of the 87th Congress is near adjournment and during its existence no major hearing has been had nor legislation approved concerning this vital subject which has been crying for liberalization for many decades; and

Whereas this indifference by our Government has been allowed to go so far as to allow the humanitarian Alien Orphans' Act to go out of existence: Therefore be it

Resolved by the 27th Biennial Supreme Convention of the Order Sons of Italy in America, at Washington, D.C., on this 18th day of August, A.D. 1961, That we respectfully request the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to amend the provisions of existing law or adopt new legislation which shall include the following seven-point program:

1. Amendment of the national origins quota system and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

2. To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.

3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.

4. To grant more favorable preference to relatives of the U.S. citizens.

5. To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.

6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens.

7. To revise and extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans' Act of 1957; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the President of the United States that prior to adjournment of this session of the 87th Congress he express his determination to seek immigration reform consistent with his pledges and past support; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United

States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the chairman of the Immigration Committees in the Congress of the United States, the majority and minority leaders in both Houses of Congress, the Director of the Immigration Bureau, and to each of the grand venerables throughout the United States.

REPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

Two years ago Brother Joseph A. L. Errigo, acting chairman of this committee, wrote a report for submission to the 26th biennial supreme convention, wherein he stated the following:

"We have reason to believe that the McCarran-Walter Act will be drastically amended soon—if not during the current session of Congress, certainly during the next."

This spirit of optimism at the time was justified. The presidential campaign had started and we could reasonably anticipate that candidates and political parties would broaden their scope and recognize fair and humanitarian immigration laws as beneficial to our country's progress and as an effective instrument in our foreign policy.

In this spirit H.R. 5896, providing for the entry of certain relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens into the country, and, H.R. 6118, which provides for the admission of aliens suffering from tuberculosis and extension of the 1957 act for the admission of alien orphans, were approved by Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower. The passage of these laws in the closing days, of the first session of the 86th Congress, during the month of September in 1959, was in good measure due to the efforts of the supreme convention and the Immigration Committee in urging prominent Members of the Senate and the President to approve these bills.

The success we had with H.R. 5896 and H.R. 6118 raised our hopes that possibly Senate bill S. 925 introduced by Senator Keating, or Senate bill S. 1996 introduced by Senator Kennedy, and Senate bill S. 2358 introduced by Senator Humphrey and 11 others, would receive serious consideration during the 2d session of the 86th Congress in 1960.

However, the hopes we had soon faded away as the presidential candidates and political parties found it impractical to sway the chairmen of the Immigration Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the direction of reform of the McCarran-Walter Act. And so, no major immigration legislation was approved by the committees, and, hence, our elected Members of Congress were not given the opportunity to vote upon any of the bills calling for reform of our immigration laws. Congress did approve House Joint Resolution 397 which enables the United States to participate in the resettlement of refugee-escapees and provided for the adjustment of status of nonimmigrants in the United States who desire to obtain permanent residence. The close of the 86th Congress brought with it the end of our hopes and we immediately set our sights on the promises of presidential candidates and the platforms of our two major political parties.

This committee, with the approval of the supreme venerable, anticipated the opportunity to publicize and project the order's immigration program before the platform committees of the Republican and Democratic political conventions during the summer of 1960. Brother Joseph A. L. Errigo, vice chairman of the committee, arranged for Sidney Clark, Esq., a delegate to the Democratic convention from Delaware, to present our seven-point program. Your chairman obtained former Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, a delegate to the Republican convention, to prepare and submit a statement in support of the order's program before the platform committee. Brother George J. Spatuzza, ex supreme venerable and assistant secretary of the Republican convention, cooperated with Governor McKeldin in urging support of our program.

Your committee was gratified to read the immigration planks of both political parties, since both were substantially influenced by our program. Moreover, both candidates, namely, Vice President Nixon and Senator Kennedy, stated they would accept their respective platforms and implement the policies stated therein. The September issue of the OSIA News published on its front page the immigration planks of each party and urged the members of the order to study them carefully.

With the victory of Senator Kennedy, those interested in immigration legislation immediately found hope for profound changes in the McCarran-Walter Act. Your committee was aware of Senate bill 1996, introduced by Senator Kennedy on May 19, 1959, which would substantially liberalize immigration and eliminate the infamous national origin system. Furthermore, in correspondence with this committee on March 27, 1959, Senator Kennedy stated the following:

"It is my feeling that a major effort should be made to revise the national origins system of immigration. I do not underestimate the difficulties involved, but I believe some formula can be worked out that will be acceptable to all interested persons with the welfare of the United States at heart."

Again on April 21, 1959, in another letter to this committee, Senator Kennedy states:

"I am glad that my letter won approval of the persons attending the conference in Toronto. I hope that your pessimism over the possibilities of abolishing the national quota system is overcome by results. I have a draft of a bill and would be glad to discuss it with you and other members of your organization."

In a letter to this committee on September 1, 1959, Senator Kennedy in answer to the order's telegram requesting his support of Senate bills S. 925, S. 1996, and S. 2358, all of which called for broad liberalizing amendments of the immigration laws, he said:

"I want to assure you that I shall certainly continue to work for passage of these bills. As you know, I have long been interested in these problems and I am most anxious that action be taken on these bills."

In view of the above actions and statements of Senator Kennedy, this committee felt that now those interested in immigration reform would under the administration of President Kennedy have the opportunity to press their proposals before congressional committees with the strong backing of the President.

During the month of January, 1961, the Members of 87th Congress who normally sponsor immigration legislation were actively submitting bills in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Among the more prominent legislation in this field were bills by Representative SANTANGELO and Senator JAVITS. The bill of Representative SANTANGELO reportedly has the support of President Kennedy. However, the first sign that your committee had that the President would not actively seek immigration legislation, at least for this session, was that the President's state of the Union message delivered before a meeting of the Houses of Congress on January 30, 1961, did not contain any reference to the need of changes in the immigration laws. Moreover, we have noticed that there have been no changes in the policy and leadership of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Not only has there been no hearings on immigration legislation but the Alien Orphans Act of 1957 which the order favors in its program has been allowed to go out of existence on June 30, 1961. It is incredible that the entire leadership of our Congress and the President could not see fit to reenact this most humanitarian immigration bill. Presently, Senator KEATING, chief sponsor of a bill to extend the program for 2 years, with Senators NEUBERGER, BUSH, CASE, FONG, JAVITS, LONG, SCOTT, and WILEY is fighting very hard to gain passage of this bill by Congress. Recently over the strong objections of some Members of the Senate, Senator KEATING and his supporters managed to tack on the alien orphans bill as an amendment to a foreign educational exchange bill in order to gain approval of their bill. It is regrettable that tactics such as this must be used to move bills out of Congress. It could well be the only way to gain progress in the reform of immigration laws. We commend the Senators for their astuteness. Moreover, the committee recommends that a resolution be passed and mailed to the Members of the House of Representatives urging passage of this bill.

At the plenary meeting of the supreme council held during February 1961 at Miami, Fla., your committee submitted a detailed report at the request of the supreme venerable. Among other things, your committee recommended that our 7-point program be strengthened. After deliberation the supreme council adopted the following program unanimously:

1. Amendment of the national origins quota system and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

2. To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.

3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.

4. To grant more favorable preferences to relatives of U.S. citizens.

5. To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.

6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to admission, exclusion and deportation of aliens.

7. To revise and extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans Act of 1957.

A resolution embodying the above seven-point program was adopted and forwarded to our congressional leaders and to the President of the United States. Through the OSIA News the grand lodges of the order were requested to obtain approval of the program in the form of resolutions adopted by the legislatures of their respective States and for all members of the order to write to their Congressmen urging the passage of legislation compatible with our program in the national interest. We are happy to report and we congratulate the Grand Lodge of West Virginia, under the leadership of Grand Venerable Angelo Viani, on being the first grand lodge to obtain the passage of a resolution by a State legislature urging the Congress to adopt immigration laws along the order of our program.

In closing, we recommend that the convention seriously consider broadening the scope, staff and funds of this Committee. The Committee knows of no more constructive purpose to justify the Order's contribution to the national and international interests of the United States than its enlightened historical interest in fair and humanitarian immigration laws. Congressional committees are looking for data on this subject and grassroots support. Unless the order is prepared to intelligently and effectively supply this need, there will be no real contribution in this field from the broad ma-

jority of the Americans of Italian descent. This will make it possible for those whose aims are not as broad to present themselves as spokesmen for us. The order must face up to its profound responsibility in this field. Until such time as this committee is brought up to full strength and support we shall continue to exercise our voices among our local Representatives and Senators in Congress to press for enactment of our seven-point program.

Members of committee:

JOSEPH A. L. ERRIGO, *Vice Chairman.*
DELAWARE.

ANTHONY O. CALABRESE,
OHIO.

PAUL D'AGOSTINO,
MASSACHUSETTS.

ATTILIO RAETA,
CALIFORNIA.

ERNEST L. BIAGI,
PENNSYLVANIA.

SAMUEL A. CULOTTA,
Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization Committee, Supreme Council Order Sons of Italy in America.

Equal Rights for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week during the observance of the 41st anniversary of women's suffrage, the complete listing of Members of Congress who have introduced House joint resolutions on the equal rights for women amendment in the 87th Congress was not available to me.

Inasmuch as the discussion on the floor of the House should have given recognition to the 128 Members of the House who have introduced the resolution, I, under unanimous consent include the listing of these Members and States represented at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS ON EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AMENDMENT INTRODUCED IN THE 87TH CONGRESS

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York.
Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan.
Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California.
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York.
Hon. JESSICA MCC. WEIS, of New York.
Hon. J. CARLTON LOSER, of Tennessee.
Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland.
Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas.
Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.
Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia.
Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona.
Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland.
Hon. EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky.
Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, of Maryland.
Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas.
Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida.
Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland.
Hon. CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.
Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland.
Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California.
Hon. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, of Maryland.
Hon. THOMAS F. JOHNSON, of Maryland.
Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska.
Hon. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan.
Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts.
Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts.
Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana.
Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California.
Hon. JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., of Alabama.
Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California.
Hon. ABNER W. SIBAL, of Connecticut.
Hon. D. S. (JUDGE) SAUND, of California.
Hon. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California.
Hon. HARLAN HAGEN, of California.
Hon. MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, of Illinois.
Hon. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, of Florida.
Hon. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, of Illinois.
Hon. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., of California.
Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California.
Hon. JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts.
Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas.
Hon. J. ERNEST WHARTON, of New York.
Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX, of Michigan.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.
Hon. JULIA B. HANSEN, of Washington.
Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York.
Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of New Jersey.
Hon. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York.
Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.
Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio.
Hon. WILLARD S. CURTIN, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. CHARLES E. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan.
Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia.
Hon. WILLIAM VAN PELT, of Wisconsin.
Hon. PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska.
Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY, of New York.
Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington.
Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Tennessee.
Hon. JOHN DOWDY, or Texas.
Hon. JOEL L. EVINS, of Tennessee.
Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, of New York.
Hon. JACK WESTLAND, of Washington.
Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts.
Hon. H. R. GROSS, of Iowa.
Hon. PAUL A. FINO, of New York.
Hon. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma.
Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.
Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire.
Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York.
Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine.
Hon. GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho.
Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., of Delaware (by request).
Hon. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, of Illinois.
Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.
Hon. PETER A. GARLAND, of Maine.
Hon. STANLEY R. TUPPER, of Maine.
Hon. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR., of Florida.
Hon. CATHERINE D. NORRELL, of Arkansas.
Hon. WILLIAM T. CAHILL, of New Jersey.
Hon. MILTON W. GLENN, of New Jersey.
Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota.
Hon. HERMAN TOLL, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. PHILIP PHILBIN, of Massachusetts.
Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, of Massachusetts.
Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL, of Virginia.
Hon. WM. W. SCRANTON, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio.
Hon. B. F. SISK, of California.
Hon. WALTER L. MCVEY, of Kansas.
Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana.
Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas.
Hon. WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana
Hon. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana.
Hon. WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri.
Hon. JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa.
Hon. JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida.
Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana.
Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois.
Hon. FLORENCE P. DWYER, of New Jersey.
Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia.
Hon. OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas.
Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.
Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii.
Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama.
Hon. FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky.
Hon. CHARLES DIGGS, of Michigan.
Hon. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.
Hon. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma.
Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI, of Illinois.
Hon. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, of South Carolina.
Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, of New York.
Hon. WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio.
Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana.
Hon. ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York.
Hon. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

Vice President Johnson Builds Job Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a splendid article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which has appeared in his syndicated column, and which is entitled "JOHNSON Builds Job Equality," relating to the work of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON in the field of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON BUILDS JOB EQUALITY
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Without reaching for any headlines, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON is doing more to bring about the substance of racial justice on a very important front than those who talk most about it.

The Vice President has been busy at his work—and his work has been to remove discrimination against Negroes and other minority groups in the vast areas of industry doing billions of dollars of business with the Federal Government. In his role as chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, JOHNSON has signed commitments with nine of the Nation's largest defense contractors guaranteeing equal treatment of all workers and applicants in every aspect of labor-management relations.

These agreements cover approximately 1 million workers. The companies which have undertaken to cease all racial and other discrimination are Lockheed, Western Electric, Boeing Airplane Co., Douglas Aircraft, General Electric, the Martin Co., North American Aviation, Radio Corp. of America, and United Aircraft Corp.

These agreements represent company policy at the highest level and in each instance have been signed by Vice President JOHNSON and either the board chairman or the president of the firm.

This is the work of about 6 months—and only the beginning. Its largest significance is that it sets a pattern of employment practices, a standard and a code for all the rest of industry.

The JOHNSON committee is now negotiating similar agreements with other corpora-

tions and its objective is to extend them to the 50 biggest defense contractors by the end of this year. This would cover 11 to 12 million workers.

The success of the Johnson operation stems, in part, from the fact that it has not rested its initiative primarily on complaints of discrimination by individual workers or job applicants. It deals with these complaints, but its main concern has been to create equality of opportunity at the sources of employment. To this end the Vice President has had conferences not only with company executives but with the top union leaders.

Often the cause of discrimination against Negroes in employment is not with the company at all. There are many instances in which companies are ready and willing to employ Negroes but find that they are not available because they are not fitted for the jobs which are open because the unions have refused them apprentice training.

It is a revealing fact that there are more Negro carpenters in the South than in the North. The reason is that the unions in the South generally are not in a position to prevent apprentice training.

The first equal-opportunity agreement negotiated by the Johnson committee dissolved this kind of discrimination. The Lockheed plant in Marietta, Ga., had trouble employing Negroes for any kind of jobs except maintenance because the dominant local union discriminated against Negroes. One of the first effects of the agreement signed with Lockheed was to desegregate the local union. Now, without "freedom riders" or restaurant sit-ins, the restrooms, the lunchroom and other facilities of all Lockheed plants, including Marietta, are desegregated.

While some politicians are congratulating themselves that the Kennedy administration is doing nothing about new civil rights legislation, Vice President JOHNSON is doing more to further the substance of civil rights (equality in employment) without legislation than most people realize.

Secretary Ribicoff Wants To Feed Congress Federal Aid in Small Doses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune makes the interesting point of how the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare hopes to condition Congress into accepting the principles of Federal aid to education by getting the program passed a little at a time. The best way to avoid control of our schools by Federal bureaucrats is to resist any program which embodies Federal aid.

MR. RIBICOFF COMES CLEAN

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared before a sympathetic audience of National Education Association bureaucrats to tell why he offered a compromise version of the original $6 million Kennedy package for Federal aid to education. The NEA is the principal lobby which has been agitating for Federal aid.

Mr. Ribicoff was moved to unusual candor in begging the understanding of the Federal aid lobbyists. He said that his cutback bill provided the only possible basis "for any legislation this year." Acknowledging that NEA wanted Federal money for teachers' salaries, he said: "But the hard truth is that the House of Representatives is in no mood to approve Federal aid to teachers' salaries."

Then the Secretary got down to his strategic approach: "If all of the major controversies of this year are not resolved by the passage of this program at this session, I firmly believe that next year the controversies will be more bitter and the prospects for success will be worse. And I see little cause for optimism in the years after that if we fail to make this start now."

So it is now or never. Just as we said when Mr. Ribicoff first trotted out his substitute, the administration wants to get Congress to take a little dose of Federal aid now in order to force down a much bigger dose later. For the principle, if once given Congress assent, would lead to organized clamor for more of the same.

The LIFE Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the August 26 edition of the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal World carries a news story, an editorial, and a commentary on a novel program. Lawrence is the home of the University of Kansas. Last Thursday the Lawrence LIFE council was formed. This organization, the first of its kind in the country, is headed by an executive committee of seven local residents and has assumed the responsibility of locating housing for foreign students attending the University of Kansas this year and making these students feel welcome in Lawrence.

The editorial, the commentary, and the news story, are of such nationwide interest that I take this opportunity to bring them to the attention of my colleagues:

THE LIFE PROGRAM

Lawrence has responded in many ways to many worthy causes through the years. The fact the citizens have been so quick to recognize a good project and bring it to completion is one of the main reasons the town has grown and progressed as it has.

Now comes the Lawrence LIFE project. The initials stand for Lawrence International Friendship Enterprise. The purpose of the project is to get more Lawrence residents to become better acquainted with Kansas University foreign students and help them leave our country with greater insight, and perhaps greater appreciation, for our way of life.

The benefits will not be so readily discernible from this effort as they were from the KU HELP program, where money was raised to help with student loans at the university. But the potential of the LIFE effort is tremendous. Lawrence itself may never be able to trace direct benefits from LIFE. But there is a chance to help the country, and what is good for the country is generally good for Lawrence.

This is something of a Peace Corps plan in reverse. We will have these foreign students in our midst, and will be able to show them firsthand how we live, what we think and believe and, perhaps, why. A great deal of good can be accomplished if the citizens will support LIFE the way they have backed other important civic efforts in the past.

A long-range view is necessary, because results may not be immediate.

Then there's another side to the picture.

The only sure way to peace is friendship and understanding among peoples of the world. As these visitors get to know us, so will we get to know them, and why they think, act and live as they do. Out of all this could come a great deal more mutual respect and admiration.

And it's with such stuff that lasting peace is achieved.

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

During the next 3 weeks, Lawrence citizens and those in the surrounding area will have the opportunity to be of service to their hometown, their State, the State university, and their country—as well as having a great opportunity to enrich their own lives.

Thursday the Lawrence LIFE Council was formed. This organization, the first of its kind in the country, is headed by an executive committee of seven local residents and has assumed the responsibility of locating housing for foreign students attending Kansas University this year and making these students feel welcome in Lawrence.

The "LIFE" stands for Lawrence International Friendship Enterprise, and represents an effort on the part of many Lawrence residents to do everything possible to show these students the true American way of life while they are in the United States.

This is a pilot project for the Nation. There are approximately 70,000 foreign students who will be attending classes in colleges and universities across the country this fall. If the Lawrence program is a success, chances are the local framework will be duplicated in cities elsewhere. The Lawrence LIFE program will be closely coordinated with the people-to-people program, which the Hallmark Foundation has assumed the responsibility of promoting. The success or failure of the Lawrence program will be followed closely by officials in Washington, Hallmark Foundation officials and those interested in international educational exchange programs.

Why is there a need for the Lawrence LIFE program?

Perhaps the best way to understand the need is for the reader to assume the role of a foreign student coming to the United States for the first time.

Suppose you were from Istanbul, Turkey; Baghdad, Iraq; Caracas, Venezuela; Bergen, Norway; Hong Kong; Taipei, Taiwan; or Cairo, Egypt, and were coming to Kansas University. You do not know anyone in Lawrence, there is no one to meet you when you arrive, and you know nothing about housing arrangements.

Perhaps university housing facilities are filled to capacity and there is no place to live on the campus. Alone, and without help, you try to find someplace to live. You don't have too much money, so you are not able to rent high-class accommodations. In order to have someone to talk to, you might end up living with a group of other foreign students.

As school progresses, you see little of Lawrence other than classrooms at Kansas University and your living quarters. You are not invited out to visit in any private homes, you are left alone on the campus during holidays such as Thanksgiving and Christmas and you feel completely deserted. Gradually the resentment builds. You had

expected so much from the time you first started planning your trip to America. By the time the school year is over, you have become bitter toward Americans—the people who had been pictured as having so much and being so friendly. When you return home, it will be difficult to say many nice things about your stay in the United States.

This situation actually exists. It has happened in Lawrence and in other college towns. However, it should be pointed out there are many, many cases with just the opposite result.

The difference rests on such little things as a simple "hello," an invitation to have a meal or meals in a private home, perhaps share a Thanksgiving turkey or help open packages under a Christmas tree.

Lawrence LIFE now is engaged in a crash program designed to encourage Lawrence residents to make rooms available to students who will be arriving on the Kansas University campus within the next 3 weeks. If there is not adequate room in the home to house a student, Lawrence LIFE would like to call on residents to "adopt" one or more students and make them feel there are close friends in Lawrence. A place where he or she will be invited to dinner from time to time and take part in other family activities can do a lot for international harmony.

A special housing service has been set up to go into operation Monday at the chamber of commerce office. Those manning the office will be able to give information about the program to anyone interested.

There might be some who say this is a one-way street, with no readily discernible benefits. It would seem the satisfaction of knowing you were doing something worth while for your country would be enough of a reward—but there is the extra dividend of getting to know these students and learning about other parts of the world.

Lawrence and its residents are in a unique position. They will be trying to launch a new, untested program. There isn't much time for thinking about the problem or wondering if you should play some kind of a role. Students will start arriving next week.

In a situation such as this, the Golden Rule should be a good yardstick.

RESPONSE IS GIVEN QUICKLY FOR FOREIGN STUDENT PLAN

Officers of the recently organized Lawrence LIFE program today reported many Lawrence residents have volunteered to offer housing and hospitality to foreign students attending Kansas University this year.

Monday an information sheet concerning the program will be circulated to all civic clubs and church organizations. Odd Williams, a member of the LIFE executive committee, said the sheet is designed to give many details about the program and tell of specific needs. Also, a LIFE housing service will open Monday at the chamber of commerce offices from 2 to 4:30 p.m.

The goal of Lawrence LIFE is to house as many new students as possible in private homes this year and to encourage local residents to extend hospitality.

Typical of the response, since LIFE was organized Wednesday noon, is the offer made by Tom Maupin, of Maupintours, in a letter to LIFE officials. It read:

"My partner, H. Neil Mecaskey, and I and our whole staff of Maupintourns are vitally interested in the objectives of LIFE.

"In our business, we are in contact with people of other nations just about every day and in our travels abroad we meet foreign people and all of us here have come to realize the urgency of every American doing whatever he can to demonstrate sincere hospitality and friendship to foreigners, to gain their friendship and understanding, to help them understand America and Americans.

"I would like to volunteer our facilities for use by LIFE and to volunteer the time and interest of our staff. In fact, all of us here are enthusiastic about the aims of LIFE and each one of us want to help to make LIFE a highly successful organization.

"We have about 50 persons on our staff here in Lawrence and I know there will be 50 persons eager to welcome and provide hospitality to the foreign students attending Kansas University, and to do so throughout the year.

"Our office facilities, available free of charge to LIFE, include:

"1. A number of clerk-typists to do whatever letter writing, mailings, stencil cutting and running, and office work needed.

"2. Mimeograph and ditto machines to run whatever material needed.

"3. An Autotypist to run personally typed letters in quantity.

"4. A conference room where committee meetings can be held.

"5. A large front window for window displays.

"6. Telephones for use in telephone solicitation.

"We also have contracted for the inside back cover of Kansas University's football program which is distributed at all home Kansas University football games this season. This full page, first issue, is available free of charge to LIFE for any public message LIFE may wish to present.

"Copy and any photos for this full page LIFE advertisement should be prepared immediately because the printer will need to have the material no later than September 4, Monday.

"Please let us know how we may be of service."

The Social Planners Worry When the American People Are Prosperous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, just what is really behind the social planners who are the chief economic advisers to the President, may be hinted at in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal. Most of the economic proposals sponsored by the present administration are not designed to maintain a strong, healthy, and free economy—rather they all call for extending welfare programs and Federal controls. The editorial, which I include herewith, shows that the chief worry of Walter Heller, top economic adviser to President Kennedy, is a "strong and buoyant recovery" of our economy. Good times, a sound economy may thwart Mr. Heller's plans to further regiment our people.

The editorial follows:

MR. HELLER'S NEW WORRY

The economy is headed toward a "strong and buoyant recovery," says Walter Heller, President Kennedy's chief economic adviser. But instead of cheering him up this has given Mr. Heller a new worry.

Now he sees the danger, unless something is done about it, of a violent swing from the large deficit in prospect for this fiscal year to a sizeable budget surplus in the next fiscal years. Hence, he thinks we should have rising expenditures in order to avoid "excessive fiscal contraction" that might be caused by that surplus.

In answering complaints about the rapid expansion of spending this year, the administration has blamed it all on Berlin and the necessity to offset the recession. But wait until next year, officials have been telling us; then the present $5.3 billion deficit will be offset by a nice surplus.

Well, fiscal 1963 is looming, and sure enough, the Treasury thinks there might be a budget surplus on the basis of present spending levels if business keeps booming. But now this surplus, deemed so desirable so recently, is regarded as dangerous. Never mind that the recession, which was formerly the excuse for spending, is plainly becoming buoyant recovery. The Government has a duty to increase spending further to protect us from that terrible threat raised by the recovery; namely, fiscal contraction.

So there you are. If there isn't one reason for spending more, there's another. In a slump you have to have big spending in order to get a deficit. In recovery you have to have big spending in order to keep from having a surplus.

But we really don't think Mr. Heller needs to worry. With so many dutiful people in Washington these days, we doubt if there's any danger of a violent swing—or even a timid gesture—toward Government economy.

Migrant Workers' Facilities in Bangor, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as I have heretofore noted we have heard much about the situation of the migrant workers and of possible solutions for their problems. Mr. Andrew Donovan of Bangor, Mich., has set about the matter in a refreshing and typically American way.

He has constructed on his farm a model migrant center, really a self-contained town, with a store and barbershop and outdoor recreation facilities. This summer he has housed 125 workers in his town and expects to expand it by next summer to take care of 500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD several news stories reporting on Mr. Donovan's migrant center. One from the Benton Harbor News-Palladium, July 19, 1961, one from the Bangor (Mich.) Advance of July 20, 1961, and one from the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune of July 15, 1961:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune, July 15, 1961]

MIGRANT WORKER CENTER SOUTH OF BANGOR WILL EVENTUALLY HOUSE 500

(By Jack Stroud, Tribune reporter)

A model migrant center, a self-contained town, is now under construction on the Donovan Lake Farm owned by Andrew Donovan of rural Bangor. Housing for 125 workers will be available this year and space for 500 within the next 5 years.

The town will have its own barbershop and store, in addition to the living quarters, and

plans are underway for a complete recreation program such as the organization of a baseball team, once a week movies, and Sunday religious services.

According to Donovan, who has been in the farming industry all his life, he has been studying the migrant housing problem for the past 7 years and pointed out that actual adequate housing in the area would not take care of 10 percent of all the laborers who annually move in to help with the harvest. He noted, however, that housing for migrants had been improving over the past 3 years.

Another innovation of the town is a central kitchen where all laborers will be fed from a balanced menu which was inspected this week by a dietician from the State health department. The menu takes into account the type of work being done and proper diet for such work.

Donovan intends to use the laborers for his own harvest and after that is finished they will be available to other area farmers while remaining at the Donovan Farm. This is contrary to the general practice which is to dismiss the help once the harvest has been completed.

The Donovan Farm now covers 350 acres and is located about 4¼ miles south of Bangor on the Town Line Road. The owner said he will have need for the 500 laborers himself for his cherry harvest in the next 5 years.

The native Bangorite pointed out that there is only one other known center like this one and that one is in New Jersey. The housing on the Bangor farm now consists of a two-story dwelling along with three 20- by 25-foot one-story bunkhouses which house 22 laborers in double bunks.

He has announced plans to employ mostly male help who are recruited from the Orlando, Fla., area, although many of them come from other States. He said that there should be sufficient work in the area to keep them busy until November.

Donovan observed that the center is rapidly becoming as much of a showplace as anything and is averaging from 20 to 30 visitors daily, many of them farmers like himself.

Henry Florian of the Michigan State Employment Security Commission, offered the opinion that the center should aid greatly in keeping workers in the area. He noted that under the past method, many good workers have moved out due to the lack of housing.

One of the crops which almost annually encounters a labor shortage is the blueberry crop where the last picking often falls after Labor Day when the majority of the workers have left the area.

Donovan noted that in the event that mechanical harvesting reaches the point where laborers are no longer needed, the building can always be converted to other purposes.

[From the Benton Harbor (Mich.) News-Palladium, July 19, 1961]

MIGRANT TOWN TO HOUSE 500—MODEL CENTER BEING BUILT ON DONOVAN FARM

BANGOR.—A model migrant center which will be a self-contained town is now under construction on the Donovan Lake Farm.

Owner Andrew Donovan of rural Bangor said housing for 125 workers will be available this year and space for 500 within the next 5 years.

The town will have its own barbershop, store, along with the living quarters. A recreation program, including baseball, and movies, will be offered. Religious services will be held on Sundays.

Donovan, who has been a farmer all of his life, has been making a study of migrant housing problems for 7 years. He said the actual adequate housing in the area would not take care of 10 percent of the laborers who move in annually to help with the harvest. He believes, however, that housing for migrants has been improving over the last 3 years.

Donovan's plan calls for a central kitchen where laborers will be fed a balanced menu which is based on the nature of the work performed.

After the harvest is completed on Donovan's 350-acre farm, he will allow them to remain on his property even though they wish to assist other growers.

Owner Donovan said he knows of only one other similar type operation. He said it is in New Jersey.

Currently, the Donovan farm has a two-story dwelling which is divided into three one-story bunkhouses.

Henry Florian, a representative of the Michigan State Employment Security Commission, offered an opinion that he thought the center would keep employable farmhands in the area. Blueberry growers face labor shortages when late pickings fall after Labor Day.

Donovan said the building could be converted to other uses if mechanical picking ever replaces the migrants.

[From the Hartford (Mich.) Day Spring, July 20, 1961]

NEW TYPE OF FARM LABOR CAMP OPENS, HOUSING 125 ON ANDREW DONOVAN FARM—DORMITORIES TAKE PLACE OF SINGLE CABINS

A new concept in housing of temporary farm labor is being tried this year by Andrew Donovan, and so far it has proved an unqualified success.

Donovan has built a labor camp housing 125 workers on his farm northeast of Hartford. Liberal use of white paint and wallboard has transformed a former cowbarn into an attractive dining hall, kitchen and offices. Metal-covered pole type buildings have been erected for dormitories.

All of the 125 workers are Negroes. Except for six couples, the group is composed of single men. Donovan said that he plans to provide more housing for couples by next year.

The new camp went into use 2 weeks ago, and Donovan said that so far there has not been a single argument. In describing the reaction of the workers to the facilities which Donovan has provided, Crew Leader Clarence Jones said, "They're crazy about it." LeRoy Mixon, who has picked fruit in many areas, says the Donovan camp offers the best facilities he has seen.

Working through State farm labor offices, Jones recruits the workers in the South, mostly in Florida. Nearly all of them are experienced fruit pickers. Besides working in Donovan's 350 acres of fruit, the workers are hired out by the day to other farmers in the area. Donovan said that every grower who has used his workers have asked for them back again.

In Donovan's camp, the former cowbarn not only houses the dining hall and kitchen, but also a concession stand, a store, and a barbershop. A commercial laundry provides pickup and delivery service. The dining hall also serves as a recreation area and is equipped with a jukebox and shuffleboard game.

Donovan employs one man full time on cleaning and another as a night watchman who patrols the camp, particularly to watch for fire. The county health department and State fire marshal's office have assisted him in building the camp.

All workers in the camp are required to pay $12.50 a week for board, which provides them with three meals a day. In just 2 weeks, Donovan said, the men have begun to gain weight. A baseball field adjoins the camp, and Donovan has provided equipment for the sport.

By providing work on both his own farm and others, Donovan can offer employment to the present group of workers until November 1. He predicted that his camp may expand to the point that it will be housing 500 workers 5 years from now.

Donovan freely admits that his previous housing for temporary labor was as bad as anybody's; maybe worse. The new camp is in direct contrast to the rows of one-room shacks that long have been the typical housing on southwestern Michigan farms.

AREA LABOR CAMP IDEA APPEARS TO BE SUCCESSFUL

An unique experiment in migrant labor is going on virtually unheralded within a stone's throw of Bangor. Actually it is an attempt to improve migrant working, and living conditions. The method is commonly known as a labor camp.

However, the migrant labor camp located on the Andrew Donovan farm, south of Bangor on Town Line Road, is actually a small city located amidst the rolling hills covered with fruit bearing trees. Another way of describing it would be to compare it to an Army post of the World War II era. Donovan's as yet unnamed camp, is complete with kitchen, messhall, barracks-type sleeping quarters, snackbar, library, clothing store, latrine, laundry facilities, and private quarters for married couples.

While it is still too early to tell whether Donovan's experiment is going to be successful, there is every indication that it will be. The secret is in obtaining the good will of the people living in the camp. If they take an interest in it and want to make it go for their own benefit, then it will be successful. Donovan thinks he has achieved this. From the attitude of the people living in the camp he apparently has.

Labor camps and the migrant living therein are different from the typical run of the mill migrant house which dominates the area now.

Donovan contracts for his pickers through the U.S. Department of Labor. Most of his workers come from the Deep South, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. All of them are colored.

Elmer Sampson is typical of those living in the camp. He comes from Baltimore, Md. He couldn't find work in his home State, so he joined the ranks of the migrant worker out of sheer desperation. He doesn't like being away from his family but it is work and this means food and clothing.

All of Donovan's dealings are with the labor contractor and crew leader. "I deal with him and he in turn deals with the pickers," Donovan said. It is his responsibility to recruit the workers, get them here and return them to their homes at the end of the season.

As far as Donovan knows, his is the only labor camp of this type in Michigan. Health department workers have told him that the only similar type camp that they know of is located in New Jersey.

What is camp life like as seen through the eyes of the migrant worker living in the camp? And what is it that appeals to him? What makes it better than shifting from one migrant housing to the next?

At Donovan's camp the pickers are aroused at about 4:30 a.m., depending of course upon the crop being harvested. Music piped from a jukebox located in the dining room through loudspeakers into the compound area is used to signal the start of another working day. The worker files through a chowline much like those used in the Army. He eats in a large dining room and then leaves for the field. At 11 a.m. hot meals are brought to him wherever he is working. The pickers usually work a 10- to 12-hour day during the peak of the harvest. When the workday is completed they return to the camp area and their respective barracks or bunkhouses where they have time to wash and clean up before supper. Sup-

per is served in the dining room. For this the worker pays Donovan $12.50 a week. This money comes from the wages the worker received. The money is not taken from his pay. The grower pays the crew leader for the work performed and the crew leader in turn pays the worker, who then pays the camp for his room and board. The worker can collect his money either weekly or daily. The choice is up to him.

Following supper he is free to visit the snackbar, which is well stocked with many items including coffee, ice cream, bakery goods, etc., borrow books from the lending library or spend some time in the combination dining room and lounge.

Kitchen help supplied by Donovan is in charge of planning the menu, which meets with the health department requirements. The menus allow $1.20 per day per person as the cost to feed the worker. This allows for ample amounts of food. It isn't fancy food, but there is plenty of it. There is no reason for anyone to finish a meal hungry. Many of the people in the camp will tell you it has been this way in other places they have worked. In most cases pickers working for a labor contractor have had to furnish their own food. "In past years I have seen pickers put a chunk of bologna between stale bread and call it dinner," Donovan said. A man simply cannot turn in a full day's work when he doesn't get enough to eat. A hungry worker is not a happy worker.

A typical day's menu at the labor camp consists of pancakes, sausage, sirup, and coffee for breakfast. The noon meal consists of neck bone, cabbage, rice, baked bread, and coffee. For dinner last Saturday evening workers were served liver, mashed potatoes, sweetpeas, biscuits, and coffee.

The housing facilities consist of three single-story and one double-story bunkhouse. The single-story units can sleep a total of 58 pickers. The double-story unit can house 52 men. In addition there are eight private quarters for married couples. Donovan plans for a total of 125 pickers. There are 60 in the camp now.

The bunkhouses are of pole-type construction and covered with metal roofing and sides. Native lumber was used inside of the buildings. Each bunkhouse is swept out daily and scrubbed two times weekly.

At night the area is patroled by a watchman, who also does cleanup work about the camp. It takes about 10 people to run the camp efficiently. Five women are employed in the camp kitchen, a maintenance man is needed to keep the area in general repair, one office man to aid in record keeping, and a woman to run the snackbar and clothing store. There is also a room for a barbershop which now has a chair in it. Donovan hopes to have it in operation within a short while. As soon as he runs across a worker who can cut hair to the satisfaction of those living in the camp it will be in operation.

Recreation is a problem. A ball diamond is being built behind the camp now. Plus that, there is room for dancing and various types of machine-operated games, such as bowling, etc. Once a week, Donovan tries to organize some sort of party or entertainment. He hopes to obtain a movie once a week and plans to install a television set in the dining hall.

Most of the work is done in the camp by the pickers themselves. "It is up to them, they can make this place as nice as they want it," Donovan said.

How do the pickers feel about it? Most of them will tell you that they like it fine. "It's just like home," one of the kitchen workers said. "We are happy." In some cases the labor camp is probably better than home ever was. "At first some of the workers were dissatisfied with the setup, but when they learned that nobody was trying to rob or cheat them and when they started getting their stomachs full, the grumbles and discontentment declined to a minimum," Donovan said.

As of yet the camp hasn't been named. "They want me to give it a name, but I told them, 'It's your camp, you name it.'" As a result a contest is now being conducted in the camp to find a suitable name.

While it is too early to really tell how the labor camp idea will turn out, indications are that it is going to be successful. If it isn't, it won't be because Donovan hasn't tried his level best to make it so. He's done just about everything he can. The rest of it is up to the people living there.

Women's Suffrage

SPEECH
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a few observations in connection with the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, providing women the right to vote.

It has been a long time, even for those who remember it well, since the suffragettes paraded before the White House in the dead of winter with their placards and refused President Wilson's invitation to come inside to get warm for fear accepting it would admit frailty and consequently jeopardize their crusade.

Women at the polls greatly altered the world of politics. In the last 41 years, certainly women as voters, as political workers, and as elective officeholders, have had a profound influence on our national legislation, especially in the fields of education, child labor, social welfare, and social justice. There can be no question of their interest in the affairs of our Nation and the world. Men are no longer condescending in their attitude toward women voters and women politicians. We have developed a hearty respect for the majority of them and are grateful for their contributions to our public life.

Perhaps the caliber of women active in politics has been the greatest single factor in our maturing attitude. No longer are we confronted with Suffragettes in severe mannish dresses and stern impassioned faces. We have the happy privilege of working with women who are true to their feminine heritage even in the midst of the most heated political debate. No better example of the fine caliber of women currently on the national political scene can be found than the senior Senator from my State of Maine, a former Member of this House, the Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH. It may seem inappropriate for a freshman Member of Congress, such as myself, to call to your attention a woman who has compiled an enviable record in her 20 years in the House and Senate and has built a national reputation for capable and knowledgeable performance. However, it is certainly appropriate that any male Member of Congress marvel at the ability of Senator SMITH and the other women Members of Congress who engage in this demanding and often shrewdly calculating business of politics, and yet retain those attributes we admire in the female sex.

The accomplishments of the many women in public life and the responsible and informed attitude toward voting by women in general, is indeed, and in itself, a fitting tribute to those who had the foresight 41 years ago to ratify the 19th amendment.

United States Should Not Tolerate Waste of Atom Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Modesto Bee, Modesto, Calif., concerning the Hanford plutonium reactor.

The Modesto Bee is a member of the McClatchy newspaper group, which is one of the leading independent newspaper chains in the Nation. In my opinion, the editorial quite accurately represents the majority thinking of the people of central California on this proposal.

Although the House has twice acted unfavorably on this project, I would hope that we would have another opportunity to vote this year on this important issue, and that the earlier rollcall votes will be reversed.

Following is the text of the editorial:

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT TOLERATE WASTE OF ATOM ENERGY

Behind the scenes in Washington, D.C., an epochal battle is going on over a proposed appropriation to construct the world's largest atomic power plant at the Government's plutonium works in Hanford, Wash.

It would utilize atomic wastes which could be harnessed to develop 11 million pounds of steam every hour of the day and night. This would generate 750,000 kilowatts of electricity. To produce an equivalent amount in a conventional steam plant would take 7 million barrels of fuel oil a year.

Yet, notwithstanding this tremendous waste, the appropriation is being fought bitterly by the lobby for the private power interests. Oddly enough, no private company has shown any interest in building the atomic plant. The power lobby simply is determined to block out any and all public power, whether generated by hydro, fuel oil or atomic energy.

Speaking in Seattle last Monday, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall sensibly declared in referring to the Hanford plant:

"America cannot afford to waste its resources, be they of the land or of man's scientific ingenuity."

Indeed it is little short of a crime that this vast amount of energy should continue to waste down the Columbia River when the Pacific Northwest by the best calculations

will be 117,000 kilowatts short of its firm power requirements by 1965.

Also the electricity from the Hanford reactor could feed into the proposed transmission intertie which would link the Pacific Northwest and southern California in a transmission grid.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, said failure to utilize the heat generated at the Hanford reactor for beneficial purposes would be completely indefensible. Even stronger were the words of John McCone, the AEC Chairman under former President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"To waste the great amount of heat produced at Hanford, to fail to utilize it, would be a vast disservice to the people."

And U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, in a speech on the Senate floor said that in building this, the largest dual purpose plant in the world, "America might point to leadership in this field. Prestige—or respect—is an important item in the life of nations today."

It is possible that in the long run America would achieve even greater respect and prestige in the eyes of the people of the world this way than it would in being the first to send a man to the moon, and at a great deal lower cost.

Paul Harvey on Spending Ourselves to Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as I have consistently pointed out, we are in far greater danger of destroying ourselves through irresponsible spending than of losing our freedoms through outright attack by the Soviet Union. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include a powerful statement delivered by the newscaster, Paul Harvey, over the American Broadcasting Co. network last Saturday:

SPEED AND POWER ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS—EXCERPTS FROM PAUL HARVEY NEWS, AUGUST 26, 1961

West Germany's Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has, for almost a century now, guessed right.

He says, "The Berlin crisis will not spark a war."

He says, "Russia is preparing for 20 years of cold war, instead."

The Soviet Communist Party is scheduled to meet in Moscow in October.

The announced agenda is "a 20-year plan", to supplant the previous 5-year plans.

Britain agrees with Adenauer.

Britain is keeping Britain strong.

The British Government has ordered an austerity program intended to conserve Britain's resources.

Britain has even ordered reduced military spending, reduced budget for NATO, reduced foreign aid. Keep the money at home.

Britain has ordered reduced imports, reduced total foreign spending 20 percent, keep the money at home.

Britain has ordered, on the homefront, no more wage increases, throttle credit, tax capital gains, increase luxury taxes 10 percent thus to prevent runaway inflation, to have economic power for the long uphill pull.

And the British people are, with only minor objections, willing to interrupt the best years of their lives to tighten their belts and hold the line in the cold war with the same bulldog determination with which they have held the line in hot wars.

But while Russia is planning for 20 years of building Russia, and while Britain, wisely, is husbanding her resources, President Kennedy has decreed for us easier home loan credit, increased oversea extravagance, increased imports.

On the homefront we persist in round after round of wage increases, loose credit; our dollars are worth less and less as the cost of living continues to shatter every previous record high.

All this because we've let Khrushchev scare us into preparing for hot war.

Thus to exhaust our resources mobilizing men and refinancing our sometimes friends and dissipating our energies and dashing off toward the moon while he lays plans to inherit the earth.

It seems the American people are brainwashed to accept any extravagance if it is camouflaged in olive drab.

Massive subsidies for schools because we've got to catch the Russian sputnik.

Wasteful glut of stored foodstuffs, rotting in warehouses, because this is ammunition in the food for peace giveaway.

Accelerate the highway programs in all directions because we must prepare for war.

Meanwhile our domestic welfare handouts make the United States a paradise for parasites.

While the President urges hard work and physical fitness on one hand, on the other hand he seeks to increase the cash reward for the indigent, the lazy and the leeches who are unwilling to work.

We have a $3.9 billion dollar deficit just behind us and another $5 billion dollars worth staring us in the face.

All this bleeding red ink we do in the name of preparedness.

Preparedness for what?

For dime dollars, fiscal collapse and cold war defeat?

Your car is geared either for speed or for power, you can't have both.

This race with the Communists is a marathon race, not a hundred yard dash.

Unless we pace ourselves, we'll poop ourselves.

We will utterly exhaust ourselves if we intend to sprint from here to the next election, while our enemies are making plans for the next generation.

Holmes Alexander Views the "Lunatic Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Holmes Alexander recently undertook to identify a group he refers to as the "lunatic left" and having identified the group, he went on to comment on predictable actions and reactions of this species. Mr. Alexander has given an insight into something that deserves the attention of this country and I should like to insert his column, "The Lunatic Left," as it appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 17, in the RECORD at this point.

THE LUNATIC LEFT
(By Holmes Alexander)

Names are news, as the reporter learns first and had better not forget, but there are occasional stories which can best be written about nameless, faceless men.

Call them the "lunatic leftists." It is important that we know them as a class of men, know them by their reactions, so that we can (since these men are not branded, as they ought to be, upon the forehead) recognize them and walk wide.

The story is timely. During June, July, and August the emergence of "lunatic leftism" has become the most significant development of the session. Busy at covering other yarns, I am not fully filled in on the dramatis personae, but I expect to be using names the next time around.

Meanwhile, from books, and at the feet of wiser men, and out of some years of using my own feet around town, I think I can name the one distinguishing characteristic of the "lunatic left" that never fails to show.

It is this—national patriotism is abhorrent to them. This is why they were implacable toward fascism, but are characteristically soft on communism.

Many of them, closing the gates of mercy on Germans and Japanese, 1939–45, participated in the development of the atomic bomb and supported the "war criminal" trials after World War II, but flinched (or worse) from treating our Red enemies the same way.

Many who called for unconditional surrender in the 1940's were soon falling back in horror when MacArthur wanted to bomb Red China and win the Korean war. The same ones enjoyed the route of Batista and gloated over the assassination of Trujillo, but would not have us lay a hand on Castro.

It is vain to show a lunatic leftist that some rightist dictators are pro-American and that practically all leftist dictators are anti-American.

It is equally vain to show a lunatic leftist that in brutality, inhumaneness and immorality, the Communists are the worst offenders—or certainly as bad as the worst—in all history. I have never known a lunatic leftist, for example, who would fully accept a truly tough indictment of communism.

Here is one taken from the new biography of Khrushchev, "The Grand Tactician" by Lazar Pistrak. The author is building up to Khrushchev's rise to power by suppressing workers' strikes, disciplining farmers, constructing the Moscow subway with forced labor, much as the Pharoahs produced the Pyramids.

The author writes:

"It would be a fascinating task to compare the tribute in sweat, tears, and blood, which subjugated peoples have paid to their mother countries, with the tribute the Soviet people have paid to their own Government * * * so that it could surpass the world * * * The price paid so far by the (Russian) people has been high, certainly much higher, than a subjugated people ever paid to a conqueror."

The "lunatic leftist" reacts almost similarly when he distinguishes between liberals and conservatives at home. The leftist finds little or no fault with presidents and populist leaders who demand that the people be given womb-to-tomb federalized care—no matter if that means torturing the Constitution and endangering the Republic.

But the leftist falls to trembling with fear and rage at the conservatives who quote things like the Farewell Address and the federalist papers, who insist upon loyalty oaths for those who serve the government or take its scholarships, and who assert that the war against communism is a total war, fought in our midst as well as at the front.

"Lunatic leftists" are not traitors—but they are antipatriots. They are not Com-

munists—but they can't abide anticommunism.

American nationalism is always opposed by the lunatic leftists who, of course, support internationalism in all its forms. Foreign aid, which diminishes the American Commonwealth, and every sort of reduction of American sovereignty, are things of glory to the "lunatic left."

Every breakdown of American custom, every abandonment of American advantage in military or trade barriers—all these are welcomed as manna falling from heaven upon the leftist.

I have often thought—and I now propose—that persons described above should be challenged when they take the oath to "uphold the Constitution of the United States." For this oath is, or should be, preclusive.

It is a vow to "uphold the Constitution"—and to uphold nothing else besides. Not the United Nations, not the party platform, not anything else at all.

Puerto Rican Board of Guardians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, a group of dedicated citizens of New York City, under the chairmanship of William J. vanden Heuvel, has commenced a dynamic program to aid Americans of Puerto Rican descent.

The New York Times of Wednesday, August 30, 1961, in a most significant article, details this vital program. The article follows:

A campaign to raise $225,000 to start a vigorous program for the Puerto Rican Board of Guardians to combat delinquency and to aid the city's Puerto Ricans was announced yesterday.

The effort is being modeled on work of the Jewish Board of Guardians here for the last 60 years.

William J. vanden Heuvel, chairman of the Puerto Rican organization, said it had operated on only a small scale with volunteers since its incorporation by Mrs. Stella Davis, a social worker, in 1955. It has only $1,500 to $2,000 in the bank, he said, but will now seek community and foundation support for a program in a dozen fields.

Top priority will go to help Puerto Rican children in difficulties, and "we hope their first contact with the law will be with a friend," Mr. Vanden Heuvel said. He spoke at a news conference at the Overseas Press Club, 54 West 40th Street.

CONSULTATIONS UNDERWAY

Consultations have already been underway with the city's Domestic Relations Court and Youth Board. The agency's basic operation would start with an executive director of Puerto Rican descent and six caseworkers in Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens, costing $50,000 a year, including office expenses.

Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman of the executive committee of the Puerto Rican group, issued a report that said 85 to 95 percent of the city's Puerto Ricans—now about 750,000 persons—had "always been completely self-supporting." While the census classifies only 7 percent of Puerto Ricans as Negroes, the report said, "the majority are discriminated against as if they belonged to the Negro race."

Cultural differences cause difficulties, Mr. Biddle said. In Puerto Rico, women are more strictly supervised and restricted; because of New York's industrial needs, more Puerto Rican women have become employed here than men, reducing the husband's status. Both parents must work because of high rents, and emotional problems then arise for children.

Mr. Biddle's report said Puerto Ricans had "outstanding" qualities—family responsibility, less materialism than most groups, lack of prejudice about skin color, a deep sense of individual dignity.

Projects envisioned by the board include summer camping for 400 boys, $30,000; public information and fund-raising, $35,000; five fellowships in social work, $10,000; jobfinding, $10,000; 25 college scholarships, $25,000; a study of Puerto Rican children in the city's schools, $10,000; home economics courses, $12,000; a remedial reading project, $5,000; English and orientation courses, $15,000; three youth clubs, $13,000; financial help in emergencies, $10,000.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the July 28 issue of the Journal of Commerce carried the fifth in the series on the administration's economic programs.

This article is concerned with public power policy:

ADMINISTRATION FOLLOWS PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The major locus of unadulterated left of center thinking in the Kennedy administration today appears beyond question to be in Stewart Udall's Department of the Interior.

It was in this very area of electric power, water and land development, over which Mr. Udall now exercises dominion, that the Eisenhower administration made perhaps its most valiant effort to reverse the 20-year Democratic trend toward concentration of power in Washington. Mr. Udall has reversed it right back.

POWER COMPLAINTS

True, the extreme advocates of Federal control over the development of natural resources are complaining a bit. They want to know, for example, why the administration has done nothing about starting a truly national public power system by construction of electrical intertie lines linking the various huge Government power generating facilities across the country.

But they will concede that they are, on the whole, well enough pleased with the New Frontier.

Businessmen are, in the same proportion, fearful and worried.

The administration's most meaningful steps, thus far, have been taken in the field of Government power generation and marketing. Expansion of Federal activity elsewhere in the resource development area is still largely on the bureaucratic drawing boards.

Three significant decisions have been made on public power:

The administration has asked for funds to finance Government construction of an atomic-fueled power generating plant at the Hanford, Wash., atomic installation. The issue is still before Congress—and the outcome in doubt.

The decision to ask for funds for the Hanford facility represents a sharp break with the Eisenhower administration policy of cooperating with industry in the development of atomic-fueled power but allowing industry to construct any plant for generation of power for commercial sale.

COLORADO PROJECT

The Government has proposed the construction of a power transmission grid from the upper Colorado River project, undoing, in the process, an Eisenhower administration-utility Company agreement for private transmission of the power.

What is publicly billed as a reregulating dam—for flood control purposes—on the upper Snake River in Idaho is in the works. But private utility companies claim that the dam's main purpose will really be power generation and that the decision to undertake it came about because the presently existing dams were not generating sufficient power to meet the needs of municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and other "preference customers" in the area.

PRECEDENT SEEN

The Idaho Power Co. had expressed its willingness to supply the additional power needed but the Government decision to proceed with the construction of another Federal dam is seen as establishing the precedent—for the first time outside the Tennessee Valley Authority region—that Government dams will meet all the needs of "preference customers."

There are hints of even further actions in the direction of bigger public power programs. On the very point on which the public power advocates are complaining—the lack of any steps to interconnect existing public power areas—utility spokesmen here have some questions.

They note the recent approval of the largest-ever Rural Electrification Administration co-op generating facility in Indiana, a region which has been a significant blank spot on the public power map. They figure that Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is cooperating with Secretary Udall in this, with bigger plans ahead than meet the eye.

That there has been a step-up in REA activities is unargued. Those who favor it speak glowingly of the help local REA co-ops are now receiving from Washington in planning expansion of already-existing systems. Those who oppose it claim that REA actually has teams of workers in the field drumming up REA co-op interest in expanded facilities.

NEW PROGRAMS FEARED

As for giant basinwide development of rivers, along the lines of TVA, while this has not been revived, as such, there are considerable fears that just such programs might grow out of legislation now pending before Congress authorizing the creation of a National Water Resources Council and river basin commissions.

Substantial expansion of Federal Government land holdings—and administration of these lands—is implicit in a number of proposals ranging from conservation of underdeveloped regions in their natural wild state to plans for creation of more urban parklands.

The Eisenhower administration's "Mission 66," originally conceived as a program, to be completed by 1966, for improvement of national parks which had fallen into decay during World War II may be used for some expansion of the park system, too.

Government plans—unofficial as yet—for rehabilitation of so-called small woodlands—5,000 acres or less—are seen by the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce, for one, as a Government land grab.

There is some question of whether changes are in the offing concerning mineral rights—whether the administration may not attempt to put all minerals in federally owned areas under leasing, as oil and gas are, rather than granting outright patents.

The Nail on the Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Father Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., associate professor of History at Fordham University, one of the great Jesuit institutions of learning in America, in a recent letter published in the Washington Post, has struck the nail on the head as far as the real issue before the world is concerned.

With the clarity and logic so typical of the majority of Jesuits, Father Clancy has brought into focus the manner in which communism should be attacked and the master of the Kremlin exposed.

This is a job that the U.S. Information Service under Edward R. Murrow should do without delay. This is not propaganda. This is asking a simple answer to a simple question.

This country and its educational institutions needs more Father Clancys.

Here is his letter:

FREEING ALL CAPTIVES

Your perceptive editorial of July 20 wherein you remark "that even if the Berlin crisis subsides * * * the central challenge will remain," is the occasion for this letter. I have also been motivated by President Kennedy's courageous speech of July 25 in which he stated that he is determined to abandon a merely negative type of foreign policy.

In this same talk the President was kind enough to invite the participation of his fellow Americans in forging a positive program for international affairs. My suggestions are as follows:

It seems to me that the tension now surrounding the Berlin question could be considerably lessened if Mr. Kennedy, instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline of December 31, would set an earlier deadline of his own. Since Moscow has chosen to raise the Berlin issue why should not Washington insist on the right of East Germany to self-determination in free elections? This was promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955.

And while our Chief Executive is on the question of freedom, he ought to press for similar rights for all the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. Their rights, too, have been guaranteed by the solemn treaties that have been consistently violated by the Communists since the close of World War II. Berlin, far from being our Achilles heel, is rather an opening to the heart of captured Europe. Freedom is indivisible, and the fate of Berlin is inseparably linked with that of Eastern Europe.

An international conference with or without Khrushchev, should be held not merely about Berlin, but about Germany and Eastern Europe as well. If the master of the Kremlin refuses to attend this conference, the West should resort to political warfare in an effort to change his mind. This could take the form of economic sanctions.

The fact of the matter is that the Communist bloc is much more dependent on trade from the West. Grain from the United States, factories from Britain, steel and ships from West Germany, are products that help build a strong Communist empire. I am advocating a complete embargo on East-West trade with concurrent explanations of Western aims by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This might well make Khrushchev think seriously about keeping his promises. The West cannot do less for freedom's sake.

Leo Cherne's remarks last month on the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt are pertinent to the current crisis, and are deserving of frequent quotation. He declared that "if freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom [i.e., Europeans] are permitted to remain slaves."

HERBERT J. CLANCY, S.J.,
Associate Professor of American History, Fordham University, New York.

Inconsistency of Bureaucratic Farm Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of Government planned and regimented farming is indicated in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

NEW FARM SURPLUS

As one way of inducing farmers to grow less corn, the planners in the Department of Agriculture last spring decided to encourage them to plant more soybeans. Obviously, the way to accomplish this was to raise the guaranteed price of beans. It was boosted 45 cents to $2.30 a bushel, the highest support level for this crop in 8 years.

Soybeans are the fifth most important cash crop American farmers produce. But unlike corn and wheat, soybeans up to now have been free of surpluses, and market prices at times have been far above support levels. By the end of the current marketing year (September 30), the carryover of soybeans from last year's crop probably will be no more than 5 million bushels.

Now, however, crop forecasters are talking about a record soybean crop of 700 million bushels, which would be a fifth larger than the previous record crop in 1958. By the end of the 1962 marketing year the carryover from a crop that big could be as much as 120 million bushels. Most of it could end up in Government hands under price support operations at a cost to taxpayers of up to a quarter of a billion dollars.

The inconsistency here should be obvious to taxpayers, even if it is not apparent to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and his chief economic planner, Prof. Willard W. Cochrane. The Government is paying farmers not to grow corn and other feed grains to reduce the surplus, while guaranteeing them higher prices to overproduce soybeans. Thus a new surplus is being created and bureaucratic management is being extended to a commodity that was doing all right in the marketplace before the planners of the New Frontier interfered.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Program—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, regulation of industry is the subject of the sixth in the series of Eileen Shanahan articles on the Kennedy economic programs. This article appeared on July 31.

KENNEDY CONTROL VIEWS PUZZLING

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the Nation's thousands of businessmen, probably none have been so apprehensive concerning their fate under the Kennedy Administration as those under direct regulation by the Government.

Their fears commenced long before Inauguration Day—and not without reason. They continue to exist—also not without reason.

UNCERTAIN FUTURE

But just exactly what lies ahead for the transport, communications and other regulated industries still remains far from clear, though there are increasing signs that it may be different things for different ones.

The temptation to lump together in one package all regulated industries—and all regulatory agencies—is strong. But it can also be misleading.

This fact was clearly enough recognized by James M. Landis—whose preinauguration assignment by Mr. Kennedy to the chore of figuring out ways of making regulation more effective, and whose continuing presence in the White House, has been the major single source of industry alarm. In his very first report, Mr. Landis drew significant distinctions among the agencies—ranking them, from his viewpoint, in a range roughly from fair to terrible.

OPINIONS VARY

Now, after 6 months, the reactions of the regulated industries themselves to the New Frontier regulatory commissions—some of them reorganized along the lines of Mr. Landis' proposals and some of them not—range from something bordering on complete delight on the part of the commercial airlines to something bordering on incoherent rage on the part of the broadcasting industry.

The regulated industry which knows the least about its future fate is maritime. Although the adoption of the reorganization plan is no longer in doubt, the identity of the new Commissioner is just a matter of rumor.

A lesser degree of uncertainty—though still a large one—prevails in the industries regulated by the Federal Power Commission, which is now completely controlled by Kennedy administration appointees but which has not, as yet, come forth with major trend-setting decisions.

In the field of ground transport, a very mixed picture exists. The influence and predictions of unfamiliar Commissioners remain untested.

No particular pattern emerges from decisions made to date.

The administration strongly backed heavier taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires, to finance the highway program—to the pleasure of the rails and the fury of the trucks.

The administration initiated a crackdown on contract carriers who illegally offer themselves as common carriers—something the licensed trucking lines have long wanted.

It has, to the satisfaction of the rail lines, advocated restriction of the bulk commodities exemption employed by barge lines.

But it also shook the confidence of many rail executives by its refusal to save the New Haven Railroad from bankruptcy.

Its tax proposal—since agreed to by the House Ways and Means Committee—to charge full tax at ordinary income rates on profits made from sales of depreciated property is potentially so costly to air and truck lines as to completely nullify, for them, the investment credit plan for business tax relief contained in the same White House package.

AIRLINES CONFIDENT

The airlines alone, among all the regulated industries, seem to feel that they have already seen enough to be confident of understanding treatment by their regulator—the Civil Aeronautics Board. The new CAB chairman, Alan E. Boyd, has let it be known that he is sympathetic to higher air fares and that he will encourage, rather than discourage mergers in an industry which he feels is overpopulated.

He has even—in the face of a generally internationalist trend in the administration as a whole—shown great sympathy with the U.S. lines' concern over growing foreign competition, although it is not yet certain that his activities in this direction are thoroughly known at the White House.

The questions ahead are literally endless. Is Newton Minow, the boy wonder of the Federal Communications Commission, just waiting for his second try at a reorganization plan to get through Congress before following up on his tough words by denying some radio station a license renewal? There are those in the broadcasting industry who fear so.

Is the ICC going to resolve the B. & O., C. & O., New York Central tangle under radical new criteria, involving examination of areawide transportation facilities?

To what extent is the Justice Department going to try to interpose its antitrust views on the regulatory agencies—exercising concurrent jurisdiction where it has it and influence where it doesn't?

To what extent may the courts continue their recent trend toward not interfering with regulatory agency "expertise" in the determination of the facts? Or may the courts possibly commence finding more flaws in the hastier decisions of the reorganized commissions.

Above all, are the regulated industries age-old pleas for speedier disposition of their cases going to be answered only with faster moves toward adverse conclusions?

It would be helpful if there were answers to these questions. But there aren't yet.

Amazing Export Policy of the Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I shall never understand or cease to be amazed by statements of Secretary of Commerce Luther B. Hodges in connection with his Department's administration of the Federal Export Control Act of 1949. His most recent pronouncement of administration policy in this field occurred during a press conference on Tuesday, August 29. The Secretary stated that the United States is making "doubly sure" it sells nothing of strategic value to Communist countries, elaborating further, he went on to say, the Department of Commerce is exercising a "much tighter scrutiny" of license applications.

Finally, he said that the reason more licenses are being granted is because Department policy now demands quick "yes" or "no" answers to exporters requesting licenses for shipment to Iron Curtain countries and the Secretary attributes the increase in shipments to the speedup in decisionmaking. However, he concluded, the only licenses being granted are "for items demonstrably nonstrategic."

For the record, Mr. Speaker, let me cite the licenses issued, commodities involved, and the country of destination for the 2-week period immediately preceding the Secretary's press conference of August 29, starting with Monday, August 14 up to and including Friday, August 25:

Number issued	Country	Commodity description
21	Yugoslavia	Electron tubes. Processing vessels. Copper cable. Construction machinery and parts. Petroleum products. Copper scrap. Borates. Electronic testing machines and parts. Silicon. Automotive parts. Aircraft parts. Synthetic resins. Physical properties testing and inspecting machines. Iron and steel scrap. Semiconductors. Steel pipe. Synthetic lubricants.
5	East Germany	Semiconductors. Surgical and medical instruments. Cigar leaf tobacco. Technical data (patents filed). Synthetic resins.
6	Hungary	Technical data. Chemical specialties. Industrial sewing machine parts. Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.
8	U.S.S.R	Steel and iron staples. Textile machinery and parts. Bakery machinery and parts. Glass products. Manmade fiber and manufactures. Asbestos gaskets. Saw blades.
8	Cuba	Spanish radio transcriptions. Small red beans; dry, ripe. Technical data. Vertical record-filing cabinets. Malaria eradication commodities.
1	Bulgaria	Industrial chemicals.
2	Rumania	Resistors. Synthetic resins.
15	Czechoslovakia	Industrial chemicals. Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations. Industrial instrument and parts. Safety apparel and equipment. Geographical world globe. Rubber manufactures. Synthetic resins.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a very sorry record. Consider for a moment the commodities cleared for export in this 2-week period. Substantial quantities of iron and steel scrap, copper scrap, industrial machine parts, aircraft parts, construction machinery to name just a few. The question arises does the Secretary really think that the general public and the Members of this House are so naive as to believe these commodities are in fact nonstrategic? According to his quoted statements this must be the case. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt action on my bill, H.R. 8547, which would bring an immediate stop to this traffic by barring all trade with Communist countries and bring an abrupt and timely halt to the activities of these so-called fast decision makers in the Department of Commerce. At the same time, I urge that House Resolution 403, reported out by the Rules Committee, which would establish a Select Committee of the House to investigate the Export Control Act of 1949, be immediately called up for consideration.

The sands of time are indeed running out. The hour grows late, and we can no longer afford to daily and procrastinate on matters that so seriously involve the security of the United States.

Excerpts of Remarks by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Prepared for Delivery at 26th Annual National Convention, Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Hotel Utica, Utica, N.Y., Friday Evening, August 25, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, my city of Utica, N.Y., was recently host to the 26th Annual National Convention of Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc. In a memorable address on this occasion, the distinguished Governor of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, recounted the notable contributions of Americans of Italian descent to the defense and strengthening of our country. The Governor's expression of this proud heritage is a worthy tribute, recalling as it does the wide range of dedicated service. I am sure it will be of interest to every Member of this House:

First of all, my warm thanks to you for making me an honorary member of your organization during last year's convention. This is the first chance I've had to tell you how much I appreciate your generosity. It is a very great honor to be associated with a group which has contributed so much to America in war and in peace. In World War II, Italo-Americans were the largest ethnic group from New York to serve in the U.S. Armed Forces. Throughout America, the services mustered over 1,500,000 men of

Italian descent—over 10 percent of the might of America.

I share with you your pride in your heroes—including those Italo-Americans who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest decoration, for valor on the field of battle:

Pvt. Michael Valenti of the famous Lost Battalion of World War I, now the city marshal of Long Beach, N.Y.;

T. Sgt. Peter J. D'Alessandro, of Watervliet, N.Y., who won the Medal of Honor in World War II;

The immortal Sgt. John Basilone, of New Jersey, who won his first Medal of Honor with the Marines in the Pacific, was ordered back to the States as an instructor, insisted that he be returned to action—and died in battle on Iwo Jima, winning a second Medal of Honor posthumously;

Then there is Capt. Don Gentile, of Ohio, the leading American ace of World War II;

First Lt. Willibald C. Bianchi, of Minnesota, with the Philippine Scouts;

Pfc. Frank Petrarca, of Ohio, the gallant medic;

S. Sgt. Arthur F. deFranzo of Massachusetts—all of them Medal of Honor heroes.

I mention these men and I share your pride in them because they remind us all of the rich diversity of peoples which has made America great. They remind us that every group has important contributions to make to our society—that the real genius of America is the way it has brought all these groups together in the greatest free society on earth.

The Italian heritage of America, of the entire Western Hemisphere, is truly fabulous. It begins, of course, with the man who discovered it all, Christopher Columbus; and with other great explorers: Amerigo Vespucci, who gave the Americas their name; and Giovanni da Verrazano, who entered New York Bay almost a century before Henry Hudson, and whose name is preserved in the bridge now being built from Brooklyn to Staten Island.

It begins, too, with the less-known names—such as that of Peter Alberti, the Venetian who settled in the old colony on New York Bay in 1535—almost 90 years before the founding of the Dutch Province of the New Netherlands that ultimately became New York. He was our first Italian immigrant.

And then there was Col. Francis Vigo, who served on General Washington's staff in the Revolution, and later became the explorer of the Indiana Territory.

From these and many other pioneers come the beginnings of the rich Italian heritage that is interwoven in the heritage of all the New World. Wherever I have gone throughout the Western Hemisphere—in Caracas, in Sao Paolo, in Buenos Aires, in Lima, here in New York, the Midwest, on the west coast—I have witnessed the tremendous Italian contribution in business, in culture, and in the social and intellectual life of the community.

I think of a Giannini, the Italian immigrant boy who grew up to found the greatest bank in the United States; of the Matarazzos, the great industrial family of Brazil; of a President Arturo Frondizi in Argentina; of a Joe Martino, the New York industrialist who serves on the Port of New York Authority.

I had breakfast at my home in New York City last week with the most-decorated member of New York City's police force—and his name was Mario Biaggi. When the New York State Legislature met last Monday, it was Speaker Joe Carlino in command of the assembly majority—and Assemblyman Tony Travia leading the opposition.

Congressman PAUL FINO is my party's candidate for president of the New York City Council, Joe Periconi for borough president in the Bronx, John Marchi for borough president on Staten Island. All through the politics of America, as in Governor Volpe of Massachusetts or Governor Di Salle of Ohio, Americans of Italian heritage are in roles of leadership.

In my own official family, Frank Votto heads the State division of veterans' affairs, Carl Spad is my appointments secretary, Tony Pittarelli is one of the staff of brilliant young lawyers in counsel's office who are my closest advisers on legislative matters. And Tony's immediate predecessor, I might add, was Fred Perrotta.

It is most fitting that in this free land, in this hemisphere of freedom, names of Italian origin should appear so frequently all across the spectrum of democratic leadership. For the New World importantly owes the development of the concepts of freedom and civilization to many outstanding Italians. From Dante to Marconi, from Raphael to Fermi, from Saint Francis to Benedetto Croce—in the arts and sciences, in poetry, philosophy and literature, in every branch of culture—and, above all, in deep principles of religious faith—the impact of Italian thought has been profound and enduring.

In a world where freedom is challenged as never before, both the Italian people in Europe and those of Italian descent in America stand as bulwarks on the side of liberty. Not once has the resurrected Italian nation faltered in its support of the dignity and freedom of mankind against the tyranny of atheistic communism. I emerged from a recent visit with Premier Fanfani with the conviction that it never will. And among the 3 million Italo-Americans of New York State, the 12 million Italo-Americans in the United States, no stronger friends of freedom and democracy, no firmer believers in the worth of the individual human being are to be found anywhere.

Yours, then, is a proud heritage—as Americans, as veterans, as men of faith and a rich background of infinite cultural variety. Such a heritage demands more than personal satisfaction: it summons each of you to personal dedication and high resolve to be worthy of it.

In a world divided between those who believe in human freedom and dignity and those who look on man as a cog in the machine of the all-powerful state, our choice is clear and our duty is clear.

The times call for steady nerves, for courageous determination that world freedom shall be preserved and extended.

The times demand that each of us shall work to build the strength and resolve of America on which the whole cause of freedom depends.

If we are to be true to the heritage of the past, if we are to build the brighter future that is within our grasp, we must work unceasingly, each in his own way, for the ultimate defeat of that soulless Communist statism that denies God and denies individual worth.

All that we are, all that we believe, all that we hope to become, is bound up in this great struggle. We must not fail, we cannot fail, we shall not fail.

Overdevelopment in Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the summer 1961 edition of Western Outdoor Quarterly entitled "Overdevelopment in Our National Parks," by Mr. Devereux Butcher, the editor and publisher of the National Wildlands News:

OVERDEVELOPMENT IN OUR NATIONAL PARKS

(By Devereux Butcher)

The national parks, as masterpieces of nature, are perfect and complete as they came from the hand of the Creator. Nothing we can do can make them more so. The introduction of hotels and extraneous diversions and distractions cannot increase our enjoyment of their beauty, for the preservation of which they have been established, and any alteration of their landscapes impairs their beauty—never enhances it.

During stagecoach days, travel was too slow to permit visitors to see more than a little of any one park in a single day. It was necessary, therefore, to build hotels and camps inside a park to enable visitors to remain long enough to see it adequately. Today, with smooth roads and quick transportation, it no longer is necessary for us to remain inside a park overnight. This is true even of the largest—Yellowstone.

Should we not, therefore, take advantage of this fact and remove all needless buildings from the parks' heartlands as rapidly as feasible? On the contrary, Mission 66, designed to take care of increasing numbers of visitors, is building more and larger hotels and motels and, in some instances even whole new villages, in the very landscapes that the parks are intended to keep unimpaired for future generations.

Exceptions are Great Smokey Mountains, Kings Canyon, Wind Cave and Acadia National Parks, which have no overnight accommodations; yet each is accessible for public enjoyment. Certain other parks, notably Olympic, Hawaii, and Mount McKinley have overnight accommodations on or close to their borders, their heartlands remaining intact. In these national parks the two directives of the National Park Service Act of 1916—to keep the parks unimpaired and to provide for their enjoyment—are in the closest possible harmony.

The same cannot be said of Yellowstone, Yosemite, Everglades, Grand Canyon, Mammoth Cave, and others, which contain resort centers, and Big Bend, where two new resorts are partly constructed. Many more parks have large hotels and other facilities in their heartlands. Why have the big construction projects of Mission 66 sprung up almost unnoticed by the groups and individuals who regard themselves as the defenders of the national parks?

During the past decade, two events captured our time and attention:

1. In the early part of the decade, there was the struggle to save Dinosaur National Monument from Echo Park Dam.

2. In the latter part of the 10-year period, the wilderness bill was introduced, and has been absorbing time and attention ever since.

Both of these events have deserved all of the attention they have been given; but we should not have become so diverted as to have ignored what has been happening to the National Parks. It is not enough to keep working for the preservation of new areas. We must remain alert to threats to areas already established.

Even before Dinosaur had been made safe, Mission 66 was introduced. Although well received and widely publicized, it got little attention from then on. Yet there were those who, while realizing something had to be done to take care of the increasing numbers of park visitors, felt concerned lest it turn out to be a vast construction program to the detriment of the parks. The

often repeated words of former National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury during the war and postwar period came to mind: "We have no money and we can do no harm."

With millions of dollars suddenly made available to carry out Mission 66 objectives, there was the question whether large construction plans would lead to abandonment of protective principles. Unless National Park Service leadership had vision and dedication to highest ideals, it could mean just that.

Mission 66 is well along and going full tilt, and we know now that the fears of those who expressed concern have been realized. Let's examine the record:

After the present Park Service administration came into office, in December, 1951, a change in policy became apparent. Wherever there was sufficient snow, for instance, the policy was to install mechanical ski lifts; and today, besides the classic example at Yosemite's commercial Badger Pass winter resort, as well as a skating rink in Yosemite Valley, Rocky Mountain has its Hidden Valley ski area, complete with lifts, skating rink, lounge, ski rental shop, infirmary, lunchroom and large parking area. Mount Rainier, Lassen Volcanic, Olympic and Sequoia, too, have ski resorts; yet not one of the parks needed to be so violated because many and adequate ski slopes are available outside.

Powerboating is another resort type amusement that has crept into certain national parks, notably Yellowstone, Everglades, Grand Teton, and Glacier. In these parks there should be, instead, only quiet concessionaire-operated launches for naturalist-conducted cruises. A large fishing-yachting resort of the kind that are a dime a dozen in Florida, has sprung up in the heart of Everglades, to accommodate the amusement seekers. This is in violation of the park act which directed that the area be kept unchanged. Two large marinas are to be built in Yellowstone, one of them now under construction. With lakes, rivers, and coastal waters everywhere open to all kinds of boating, there has been no justification to permit the few park lakes to become places for water sports.

In the early 1950's, the writer warned about the dangers of weakening the national policy. He advised that further introduction of mechanical ski facilities be stopped, and he urged that outboard motors and speedboats be removed from all national park waters. These warnings were ignored, and today, national park defenders are having to rescue the Park Service from the effects of its own shortsightedness:

1. We are having to oppose the efforts of powerboat enthusiasts to keep all of Yellowstone Lake open for their amusement. This amounts to an attempt on their part to deprive the Service of its authority to establish regulations.

2. We are having to oppose the demands of local commercial interests to turn the high wilderness of Olympic's Seven Lakes Basin into the "largest winter resort in the Northwest."

Had the National Park Service supported basic park principles through the past decade, our ability to prevent these commercial efforts would be assured. The fact is that had the Service made it clear that resort type amusements are a misuse of the national parks, these two problems might never have arisen. Having established the big fishing-yachting resort in Everglades, and for years having accommodated outboard motors and speedboats—even concessioner-operated ones in Yellowstone and other parks, and having encouraged and subsidized the development of the ski resorts already named, how can the Service expect the public to respect its request to close the southern arms of Yellowstone Lake and to prohibit establishment of the proposed Seven Lakes Basin resort? The sad truth is that the Service, by allowing all these developments, has misled the public to regard national parks as centers for resort amusements. Little wonder, then, that pressures for more amusement facilities are building up.

Toward the beginning of Mission 66, one of the projects carried out in Yellowstone, for instance, was the clearing of the antiquated lodge and cabins on the south side of Yellowstone Canyon and construction of the much larger, more elaborate Canyon Village on the north side, back from the rim. A Park Service news release, issued at the time, quoted Director Conrad L. Wirth as saying that the Service had been authorized to move the old buildings because they were an intrusion on the natural scene. Did the director fail to realize that the new village was an even greater intrusion?

In the director's 1959 annual report, photographs on facing pages show the old village in Yosemite Valley and the site after removal of the buildings. What the pictures did not show was that much larger new buildings for the same concessioner had been built on the opposite side of the valley.

The editors of National Wildlands News are certain there is a way park visitors can be accommodated without cluttering the national parks with more and larger hotels and other facilities. Atfer years of study of the problem, we have found what we consider a practical way to take care of increasing numbers of visitors, and at the same time save our fragile, irreplaceable national parks. There is nothing new about the plan. The Park Service actually is putting it into effect at Rocky Mountain National Park and is trying to do so at Mount Ranier, namely, to remove hotels from the heartlands of these two areas. We believe this should become general policy for the entire system of national parks and monuments.

Our recommendation is to adopt now a national policy, to be enforced by legislation, to build no more overnight accommodations or other facilities inside the heartlands of the parks, but as more are needed, and as existing ones become obsolete, to build new ones at the perimeters of the parks near the entrances, just inside, by concessioners or, better still, just outside by local private enterprise. (If by private enterprise just outside, there will be the added advantage of no cost to the taxpayer). The editors of the News further suggest that no more resort facilities or amusements of any kind be installed, and that existing ones be removed gradually, but as rapidly as possible.

This proposal, we believe, should appeal to everyone sincerely dedicated to the preservation of the national parks as a most precious heritage of us all. We therefore call on our friends and allies from coast to coast to join forces to win the people and Congress to support this proposal, and to help to bring it to reality with all haste before further harm is done.

Wheat Plan Slaps Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Jonesboro Sun of Jonesboro, Ark., carried a splendid editorial in its August 23, 1961, edition which I recommend to the Members of the House. I hope that the Department of Agriculture will reevaluate its decision to ship wheat into rice-producing areas for use in an emergency. Rice is ready to cook. It is easy to prepare. It is nutritious and a most delicious food. If grain is needed in the States that grow rice it would be easier and much more economical to set aside sufficient quantities of rice for this purpose. A program to deliver rice to critical areas of the whole country should be inaugurated to supplement wheat. There is need for both but between the two rice is much more adaptable for use in an emergency.

The Jonesboro Sun article follows:

WHEAT PLAN SLAPS RICE INDUSTRY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has proposed a plan to ship surplus wheat into Arkansas for storage in event of wartime need. The proposal has drawn a strong protest from ricegrowers.

It would seem that such a proposal gives little consideration to the ricegrower and to the product. The President has asked Congress for $47.2 million to cover costs of the program, which would transfer 160 million bushels of wheat from midwestern storage areas to 191 cities which are listed as possible targets for atomic attack, including Little Rock and North Little Rock.

If the Government is sincere in the purpose of this expansion of storage facilities for grain, then it has selected the wrong product. Conversion of the wheat grain to an edible form would require much more time and processing than rice. Unless vast new processing facilities are constructed, the most you could expect to do with the wheat would be to convert it to flour for bread.

With rice the entire outlook would be different. It could be stored indefinitely in packages for immediate home consumption. Rice is the basic food for a large percent of the world's population. If we are talking about storing a food for use in case of an atomic attack, then what better food could you select than rice? During World War II people of many Far East countries, including American prisoners of war, lived on a diet of virtually nothing but rice for 4 years and longer.

Certainly we wouldn't recommend a diet of nothing but rice as long as there are other foods for variety, but if we are talking about food in an extreme emergency such as all-out war, then rice, which wouldn't have to be shipped anywhere as far as Arkansas is concerned, certainly would be far more beneficial than any other grain.

We would urge strongly that the U.S. Department of Agriculture take a second look at this proposal and by all means include rice in its storage plans—especially in the rice-producing areas of the Nation.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker in her next article, Eileen Shanahan looked into the money policy of the Kennedy administration and the role of the Council of Economic Advisers and Federal Reserve Board.

MONEY POLICY SUCCESS—SO FAR

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The monetary policies advocated by the Kennedy administration in its first 6 months, its management of the Government debt, and its relations with the Federal Reserve System, remind some observers here of a famous old cartoon.

The panel showed a man who had fallen from a tall building who, as he hurtled earthward, called out to onlookers at lower floor windows: "I'm all right—so far."

For the administration and its money management policies, no one can yet say positively whether a tragic mess or a safe landing in a fire net lies beyond the picture. What is clear is that all those with direct responsibility—both in the administration and at the Federal Reserve Board—are determined that there will be a safe landing, if humanly possible. If they have to shift position a trifle to assure it, they will.

Much such shifting has already occurred—to the surprise of those who predicted nothing but open warfare between the administration and the "Fed."

Accommodations have been sought—and found. Consistent attempts have been made on both sides to distinguish between disagreements involving fundamental principles—of which there have, to date, been none—and those involving merely timing, magnitude, or narrow tactics.

HELLER, MARTIN VIEWS

A good example of the latter arose from the problem of long-term "structural" unemployment, and what to do about it.

Chairman Walter W. Heller, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin, on successive days, gave their views on this subject to the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Dr. Heller, with page after page of statistics, sought to demonstrate that those who are unemployed because of fundamental changes in production patterns and other "structural" causes constitute an insignificant percentage of total unemployment. The jobless will be put back to work, he said, if the economy grows.

LONG-TERM PROBLEMS

Nonsense, Mr. Martin answered, in effect. There are very real long-term structural unemployment problems, and attempting to solve them just by raising overall economy activity will not only fail, but threaten to create inflation as well.

The battle lines appeared to be drawn. But instead, Mr. Martin accepted an invitation to a White House meeting at which a statement was drafted for President Kennedy—it was subsequently used as the basis for the answer to a press conference question—minimizing the differences in position on the unemployment issue between the administration and the Federal Reserve.

Both Mr. Martin and Dr. Heller spent the next several weeks publicly volunteering the view that the other fellow had a point.

The absence of dramatic conflict so far between the administration and the Federal Reserve appears to stem only in part from the real mutually held desire to avoid it, if honorably possible. Additional explanations can be found in personalities—and in the thesis that the division between the two was never so great as was imagined in some quarters.

KEY APPOINTMENTS

These two factors may even be interrelated. The key appointments made by President Kennedy in the money management field may be a reflection, as much as a cause, of a disposition on the part of the White House to work out money management problems in a manner satisfactory to the business and financial communities.

The key appointments have been three—Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, first of all. Then, closer to the firing line, Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa. And finally George W. Mitchell as the first Kennedy nominee to the Federal Reserve Board itself.

If Mr. Mitchell, a Democrat and former Adlai Stevenson adviser in Illinois, was not the first choice of the conservative community—and he wasn't—he was also, as a vice president of the Chicago Federal Reserve Bank, far preferable to most of those who were rumored for the job.

As for Mr. Roosa, another old Federal man, his management of the Government debt has so far been beyond criticism by the financial community and, oddly, by easy money advocates as well.

Mr. Kennedy's Treasury inherited one of the most crowded debt maturity schedules in history from the Eisenhower administration and an intransigent Congress which refused to repeal the constricting 4¼ percent interest ceiling on Government bonds.

But in the face of this, and a need to borrow some new money, too, plus a commitment to a program of keeping longer-term interest rates relatively low until something close to full employment was restored, it has, nevertheless, not lost sight of the objective of lengthening the maturity dates of the Federal debt wherever possible.

Severe difficulties in the whole money management field may, of course, lie ahead. Not only is the recession clearly over—with all that implies about the possibility of inflation and too much boom—but the international economic situation has taken a troublesome turn.

BRITISH RATE IMPACT

With the British bank rate now at 7 percent, will an outflow of hot money from this country—and gold also—be resumed? Will the administration, its eye still on the highly unsatisfactory unemployment figures, willingly permit the Federal Reserve to push short-term interest rates up for international purposes?

How deeply does the White House still feel that the natural recovery-born rise in both short and long rates should be blunted by monetary policies? If it decides not to resist an interest rate uptrend, how long can it keep the congressional easy money advocates from nipping at its heels?

Will there be a conflict over continuation of operation nudge—the Federal Reserve's moderately successful attempt to hold short rates up and long rates down in the interest of reconciling domestic and international financial objectives?

What the Federal Reserve most fears at the moment in a judgment on the part of the administration that there is no need for restraint on growth until the economy is filled up to the brim in every compartment. The Federal Reserve can foresee a need to put on the brakes long before we get to that point.

But on the basis of the record to date, there appears to be considerable validity in this private comment of one Federal Reserve Board official:

"Of course we have differences with the administration. But you're making a bad mistake if you see this thing as an inevitable walk down toward doom as in 'High Noon.'"

Keeping the Guard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the recent tension in Berlin, we have again turned our attention to the reserve strength we have in the National Guard. It is unfortunate that our interest in these units tends to slacken except in times of tension.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I want to insert an editorial from the August 28 issue of the Indianapolis Star:

KEEPING THE GUARD UP

The approach and development of the crisis in Berlin brought an interesting degree of reliance by the Department of Defense on the National Guard. Possibility of calling up Guard units was seriously discussed.

Air National Guard units across the country have been placed on an alert status, and some have been notified of call-up on October 1.

Currently there is much speculation in Army circles as to what can be done to enhance further the readiness of the Nation's many Guard units. Should they have three weeks of summer training instead of only two? Should their weekend assemblies and other armory drills be increased?

The National Guard has not always been regarded, during calmer periods, with the interest now being shown in a time of possible need. Several times since World War II there have been major efforts to reduce the strength of the Guard. Congress intervened. Even with Congress standing fast on that point, however, the Guard has felt the squeeze of the Bureau of the Budget and has been forced by fund limitations to curtail its training and school programs.

We hope the day will come—soon—when the Nation's defense planners will recognize more firmly the absolute need for these bodies of trained "citizen soldiers." They are needed because of the economic impossibility of maintaining standing Armed Forces of such size as to meet all possible military needs.

Indiana is, and should be, particularly sensitive to the problem because of its interest in the State's highly rated 38th Infantry Division and the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing. Both are outstanding military units and we are proud of them. They deserve support in fair weather as well as foul.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the administration ideas in taxes and tax reduction is the subject of the eighth in the Journal of Commerce series on the Kennedy economic program:

TAX REDUCTION ALMOST IN LIMBO

(By Eileen Shanahan, Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Gurgle, gurgle, gurgle.

Was that the sound of next year's promised tax cut for upper-bracket taxpayers going down the drain?

Likely so, though there remain some in the administration who still cling to the hope that such a reduction can be recommended next January—along with a series of proposals to close alleged tax loopholes which will hurt some high bracket citizens more than a cut in the top rate would help them.

CUT NOT DISCUSSED

For the public record, of course, the administration is no longer talking about tax

reduction at all. Instead, President Kennedy has committed himself to a tax increase next year if the Federal budget will not balance without it.

But administration tax decisions are being made within the framework of three basic tenets of economic and fiscal theory which have now become quite clear and which have gained almost unanimous acceptance within the administration.

An examination of these tenets provides significant clues to what lies ahead. One of them is leftish, one is less and less controversial and one finds nearly unanimous acceptance in the business community. In that order, they are:

The administration believes that the level of Government expenditures and taxes during the late 1950's and up through last year exerted, overall, a depressing effect on the economy.

Either expenditures were too low or taxes were too high but, in any event, the budget came into balance—and, as such, exercised a neutral effect on the economy—at less than full employment levels of business activity. Changes in the relationship between Government income and outgo were needed, according to this view, so that the budget would balance precisely at full employment levels, run a surplus in good times and a deficit in bad.

The tax structure is too complex, cumbersome, and inequitable, with the result that speedy changes in tax rates to meet budgetary and economic stabilization needs have become all but impossible.

The old New Deal concept that the one and only way to enhance economic activity is to add to the incomes of consumers is wrong. Incentives for business—and individual businessmen—do work and create growth.

FULL EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

The administration has now "solved" the problem of a budget that balances when business activity is too slack. It has solved it through raising expenditures.

And President Kennedy's commitment to propose tax increases next year if the budget isn't balanced gives a pretty clear indication of the level of Government outgo which the administration has identified as a "full employment" budget which ought to be in balance—somewhere in the general neighborhood of $92 billion or $93 billion.

This is, of course, at the forseeable rate of total economic activity. As the gross national product rises, the level of the full employment balanced budget can rise, too, according to the administration theory.

Yet, even in the face of the decision that next year's probable budget expenditures, well in excess of $90 billion, meet the needs of economic stabilization policy, the administration's commitment to a simplified, more flexible, and—in its view—fairer tax system remains strong.

If it is at all possible to avoid raising the taxes of lower income citizens—a situation in which a simultaneous cut in top bracket rates would be politically impossible—it will propose a reduction in top bracket rates as the attractive aspect of a major tax reform bill.

How much real chance is there that budget expenditures will grow sufficiently little—or, conversely, the economy grow sufficiently much—for a tax increase to be avoided next year?

The answer is: a fighting chance, though budget outlays in some respects, seem almost out of control.

ESTIMATE TOO LOW

The budget estimate which the administration submitted to Congress as recently as last March for the fiscal year which ended on June 30 turned out to be more than $1 billion too low when all the facts were known at the end of July. To be sure, a large portion of the rise stemmed from defense procurement acceleration ordered by the Eisenhower administration.

The budget expenditure estimate of $93 billion for next fiscal year—which some officials are using as a tough working assumption—is, for purposes of comparison, more than $20 billion higher than the $71.8 billion figure which curled former Treasury Secretary George Humphrey's hair in January 1957, 5 years ago.

Of that $20 billion increase, about half can be attributed to the Eisenhower administration and half to the present one.

RISE NOT ENORMOUS

Surprisingly, however, when budget expenditures are seen in the context of the gross national product, the increase has not been enormous.

In fiscal 1955, the Eisenhower administration's lowest expenditure year, regular budget outlays amounted to 17 percent of the gross national product. Using an optimistic, but not outlandish, forecast of GNP for the current fiscal year of $540 billion, Kennedy administration expenditures will amount to a shade under 17 percent of GNP.

What is possibly more surprising is the budget GNP for expenditures other than national security in 1955 and the current year. It is up, but not very much—from 6.3 percent in 1955 to 6.7 percent now.

One thing is certain. If the economy does grow sufficiently to balance a budget at $93 billion or so next year, regardless of the reasons for the growth, those who would prefer to see a much reduced level of Federal spending are going to have more difficulty than ever in winning their case.

What Can I Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the El Capitan Citizen, of August 24, 1961:

WHAT CAN I DO?

Testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Edward Hunter, former OSS man and foreign editor from Europe, Africa and China said: "I have been watching developments under communism in other parts of the world and now I see exactly the same developments here in America."

According to Hunter, these developments include, "first of all, the penetration of our leadership circles by softening up, and creating a defeatest state of mind * * * liquidation of our attitudes on what we used to recognize as right and wrong, what we used to accept as absolute moral standards." We now confuse the crackpot Communist philosophy that everything changes, with true moral standards, says Hunter.

APATHY CAN KILL US

Hunter says too many Americans have the feeling that if we can just stall long enough, this situation will take care of itself. They couldn't be more wrong. An apathetic America is a dead America. Now is the time for action.

By now, some of you are saying, what can I do. The answer is plenty. You have influence, wherever you are. Within your family, your club, your community, you have influence. Learn to speak up—politely, ever so politely. Learn the knack of polite contradictions.

And above all, remember that whenever you espouse anything that gives the Cmmunists trouble, you can expect trouble from them and their Red-wing buddies.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

First, you must know your enemy. Read books, pamphlets, and newspapers that show the current Communist line and how to counteract it. You will soon learn to recognize it when it comes from the mouth of important people. In San Diego, there are numerous study clubs who examine the current Red line, and plan anti-Communist activities. Join one of these, or pursue the matter on your own.

Next, learn to write your Congressman, Senators, and other legislators. Every good Communist and crackpot is writing continuously. Your elected lawmakers can't serve you unless they know what you want. Make your opinions heard too.

These letters are extremely effective. For instance, Congressman BOB WILSON, chairman of the Republican congressional committee, said last week that "an aroused and indignant American public" killed the attempt to recognize Outer Mongolia. And how else could the administration know of the American public's indignation, unless it received letters or other communications from the individual citizens.

DON'T FORGET NEWSPAPERS

As long as you have pen and paper in hand, don't forget the "Letters to the Editor" column in your local newspaper. This is the most widely read section of the newspaper. Don't waste your time on useless or rabid criticism. Promote American ideas, broadcast the current Communist line to warn others, and, above all, be factual, informative, and polite.

Some newspapers dote on out-of-town letters to show wide circulation. Send letters even if they don't get printed. If the paper continuously gives prominence to the other type of letters, at least you will know the temper of those who are paying his bills for him.

Do not, under any circumstances, use the term "Communist" loosely. Remember, it is not enough to be against communism; you must promote America and American principles in order to succeed.

AID YOUR LEGISLATORS

Since the Communists have poured out so much time and effort to knock out the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, the time you give supporting these groups would be well spent. These committees are really our best weapons against subversion because they provide the documents and sworn testimony revealing Red espionage and penetration over the last 25 years.

Support anti-Communist legislation now on the books, such as the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Subversive Activities Control Act. These acts have have crippled the Communist Party in the United States, and more acts of this type are needed to counteract some of the Supreme Court decisions. Support anti-Communist legislation when it is introduced. Let your Congressmen and Senators know you support these bills and similar legislation.

PATRONIZE AMERICAN FIRMS

Give your patronage to companies that advertise pro-American and anti-Communist magazines and newspapers. Support those advertisers who sponsor anti-Communist radio and TV programs. And write to the sponsors and let them know you are doing this. By the same token, withhold your patronage from firms backing left-

wingers and Red-wingers—and write to tell them why.

Give financial support to competent magazines, writers, speakers, and organizations fighting communism.

THEY'LL ATTACK YOU

And above all, remember whenever you start this work you are going to be attacked by Communist and their Red-wing gangs.

They won't meet the issue head-on by merely calling you anti-Communist. They will attack you personally, your business, your family. They will lie about you, smear your reputation, and try every despicable trick in the book to stop you.

For instance, one Lakeside man made it a habit to write letters to the editor exposing Communist chicanery. After a short while, he started receiving threatening phone calls in the middle of the night. He said he then asked the newspapers to give him a pen name. After that, he says the threats stopped.

Much of the attacks on you will be lies. Communists and their Red-wing dupes do not stick to the truth when they attack you. They work on the principle of the big lie—if you tell it often enough, people will begin to believe it.

NOT ENOUGH REDS

But remember, there aren't enough Communists or dupes to attack all red-blooded Americans. As the number of Americans increase, the amount of Communist pressure on each will decrease.

Our country started with a saying, "We must all hang together, or we shall surely hang separately."

And the same idea is true today.

The Berlin Crisis Can Be Made an Asset For Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the present Berlin crisis, the third such crisis provoked by the Russians, is a symbol of the idealogical conflict between the new totalitarian dictatorship and the free, open society of the West. An editorial which appeared in the July 20 issue of the Washington Post made the point, "that even if the Berlin crisis subsides, the central challenge will remain."

Today's issue of the Washington Post carried a timely and penetrating analysis of the basic meaning of the Berlin crisis. That letter to the editor was written by Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., associate professor of American history, Fordham University, who takes the position that Berlin is not a weakness of the West, but rather it is one of the great strengths of the West because it is an opening to the heart of captive Europe. I commend this letter to the reading of those who prefer political action to military action in meeting the aggressive, imperial threats of Moscow. Under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the letter to the editor:

Your perceptive editorial of July 20 wherein you remark "that even if the Berlin crises subsides * * * the central challenge will remain," is the occasion for this letter. I have also been motivated by President Kennedy's courageous speech of July 25 in which he stated that he is determined to abandon a merely negative type of foreign policy.

In this same talk the President was kind enough to invite the participation of his fellow Americans in forging a positive program for international affairs. My suggestions are as follows:

It seems to me that the tension now surrounding the Berlin question could be considerably lessened if Mr. Kennedy, instead of waiting apprehensively for Khrushchev's deadline of December 31, would set an earlier deadline of his own. Since Moscow has chosen to raise the Berlin issue why should not Washington insist on the right of East Germany to self-determination in free elections? This was promised by Stalin at Yalta and Potsdam, and by Khrushchev at Geneva in 1955.

And while our Chief Executive is on the question of freedom, he ought to press for similar rights for all the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. Their rights, too, have been guaranteed by the solemn treaties that have been consistently violated by the Communists since the close of World War II. Berlin, far from being our Achilles heel, is rather an opening to the heart of captured Europe. Fredom is indivisible, and the fate of Berlin is inseparably linked with that of Eastern Europe.

An international conference with or without Khrushchev, should be held not merely about Berlin, but about Germany and Eastern Europe as well. If the master of the Kremlin refuses to attend this conference, the West should resort to political warfare in an effort to change his mind. This could take the form of economic sanctions.

The fact of the matter is that the Communist bloc is much more dependent on trade than the West. Grain from the United States, factories from Britain, steel and ships from West Germany, are products that help build a strong Communist empire. I am advocating a complete embargo on East-West trade with concurrent explanations of Western aims by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This might well make Khrushchev think seriously about keeping his promises. The West cannot do less for freedom's sake.

Leo Cherne's remarks last month on the anniversary of the 1953 East German revolt are pertinent to the current crisis, and are deserving of frequet quotation. He declared that: "If freedom is really our purpose then it must be defended where it was once enjoyed—not merely urged where it has never yet flowered. In fact those who have never tasted freedom may never live under it, if those who have pioneered freedom (i.e., Europeans) are permitted to remain slaves."

HERBERT J. CLANCY, S.J.,
Associate Professor of American History, Fordham University.
NEW YORK.

Washington Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is not my regular practice to place in the RECORD the newsletters which I send to my constituents. In the past some of them have been put in the RECORD and I should like to insert my most recent newsletter in the RECORD as the result of a letter which I have received, a letter which I also wish to have appear as a foreword to my newsletter, for I believe that there are some important points raised in it. The letter, from Mr. Emmet Layton, of St. Louis, and my newsletter follow:

LAYTON, LAYTON & ASSOCIATES,
St. Louis, Mo., August 14, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Congressman, Second District of Missouri, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: You will find enclosed an abstract from your July letter which we have taken the liberty of printing for a limited distribution to those who might not otherwise have received it. All these years we have enjoyed and thoroughly appreciated your reports without writing to express our sincere gratitude. But your July communication was so very outstanding that we are compelled to let you know how deeply it impressed, how truly it satisfied and how clearly it stated the problem which might well lie at the root of an increasing failure to communicate with each other.

It is with bewilderment that people find themselves surrounded by half truths and a distorted picture of their Nation, their environment and the very heart of what they have held most dear. Many of us are in an embattled position, forced to prove what should be considered self-evident.

The great creation which was—and is—the United States has something of a sacramental quality—an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. The grace to be free and to share that freedom with others is being gradually eroded away to the point where the simple among us are confused, the mature are frustrated and the intellectuals are angry—and often mad.

Is it possible for your July letter to be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? It deserves the widest possible distribution—and we thank you again, most sincerely.

Very truly yours,

EMMET LAYTON.

A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPRESENTING THE SECOND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, TOM CURTIS

JULY 1961.

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: The deeper I get into the major issues that face our country today, the more difficult I find it is to pass back information to you. Part of this difficulty arises from the fact that some of these issues are complicated, but I am satisfied that this is not the essence of the problem. I find from my question and answer sessions with groups ranging from high school students to golden age clubs that the people by and large are perfectly capable of understanding the issues of the day, even when they are a bit complex. In fact, politics can be fun if we conduct it on the level of reason and not of prejudice.

EXCHANGE OF IGNORANCE

A new definition of an expert is as follows: You are an expert when the reporters begin quoting you on subjects outside your field.

Indeed, it is a great temptation to discuss subjects about which you have only a smattering of knowledge. Few of us can resist this temptation, particularly when we are egged on. Furthermore, the less we know about a subject, the easier it is to make sweeping generalities about it; the more we know about a subject, the more cautious we are in making unqualified statements.

Today in America we are engaged in a great exchange of ignorance. Experts have not exercised self-discipline about popping off on subjects outside their specialized fields. All of us are alert to the sensational, and that which is most sensational is a sweeping generality.

LABELING

The housewife has learned a great deal about the merchandising art of packaging and labeling products. She has learned the truth of the ancient maxim that all that glitters is not gold and has become wary. We ordinary citizens are just becoming aware of the fact that ideas are being merchandised just like soap. We must become wary and look behind labels to see what the real product is. We must look behind the handsome face and cultured voice of the salesman, or the hero who endorses the product, at the product itself.

We also must be wary of the negative sale—the sale that downgrades the ideas of the competitor instead of pointing up the virtues of one's own ideas. Or, worse still, the negative sale that avoids all discussion of the ideas and resorts to a personal attack on the label and the salesman of the competing ideas.

CRITICISM OUT OF CONTEXT

The most sensational generalities arise from criticism out of context. This kind of criticism is most difficult to handle because the criticism itself may be accurate. Just as soon as you try to put the criticism in context by pointing out the favorable points in the problem, the criticizer comes back to retort, "Oh, then you are satisfied with the situation.", which of course, is not the case at all.

HARVEST OF SHAME

Let me illustrate by an example one of hundreds of examples from which I could select. Many of you saw the CBS television "documentary" film of our itinerant farm laborers narrated by Edward Murrow. I know this because many of you wrote to me about it asking me about its accuracy.

This film was a prime example of criticism out of context. There is certainly a serious problem in the standard of living of our itinerant farm laborers. However, let us put the problem in context. It is not a new problem in America. It is not a neglected problem. A great deal has been done in the immediate past to get on top of this problem. It is a rapidly disappearing problem because of what the many people concerned with it, experts, have been doing about it. If Mr. Murrow wanted to show the problem in context, he would have gone to the experts to find out when the problem arose, what had been done about it, what was being done about it, and what the future prospects for eliminating the problem were. Furthermore, in context he would have pointed out that the problem existed nowhere in the world outside America, because it was not a problem of failure but a problem created by the success of our American system.

Our itinerant farmworkers are a social problem because of the contrast of their living conditions with the higher living conditions of almost everyone else around them. In Mexico, the living conditions of the American itinerant farm is so much higher than the general living conditions in Mexico that there is a 2- or 3-year waiting list to be permitted to enter the United States to become an itinerant farmworker.

Now, back to the beginning. Because I have tried to put the problem in context, does this mean I am satisfied with the progress we have made? Not at all. America thrives on criticism; that's one way we move ahead to improve our system.

FRUSTRATING THE COMMUNISTS

I once told a member of the Russian Embassy that in many respects the Russians were a great help to America. They were constantly on the alert to find things that were wrong in America, to pick at them, and try to build them into major issues that would damage America. However, America by and large is on the lookout for things that are wrong, and when things are brought to our attention we go out to correct them. There is nothing like an astute critic, whatever his motives, to bring improvement.

The damage occurs, however, when we permit the Communists or anyone else to get away with criticism out of context. By treating a matter out of context we can destroy the essential goodness and the progress we have been making in an undue concentration on the flaw that we are seeking to eliminate. So Mr. Murrow's broadcast hurt to some degree the progress we were making in coping with the problem by treating the matter out of context. He hurt America by directing a personal criticism against our society by the title he selected, "Harvest of Shame." Indeed, there is no shame in the amazing progress America has made in the field of agriculture, freeing men and women for the first time in history from the animal drudgery this activity has demanded. There is no shame in the contrast we have created between the itinerant farm laborers and the rest of our people unless we are to say that whenever any group moves ahead of another group it is shameful to have a lower group. The shame would exist if this were a problem that we were not doing something about. But we are doing something about it, and Murrow had to search pretty hard to get the pictures he did without showing the progress being made.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Most of the criticism directed against our systems of promoting health, education, and welfare has been badly out of context. If we wish to criticize in context, let us start out with this basic and irrefutable statement—our society has the best health, education, and welfare of any society in history by a considerable margin. Furthermore, we have attained this high standard by preserving, indeed I would state by placing emphasis on, personal freedoms.

There has been a din of exchanges of bits of ignorance in this area. Let me point up one for illustration. Russia has a superior system of education. What is the truth? Russia has over half her children in rural areas, where there is no rural electrification, no farm-to-market roads, and very few schoolhouses. Russia has compulsory education in rural areas of only 4 years. Does this mean that we can learn nothing from Russia's quality educational programs? Of course not, we can learn from them and any society, but it certainly does mean that we should not seriously think for a minute of exchanging our educational system for Russia's.

It has been said that people over 65 have higher medical bills than any other age group in our society. This is true, and it is out of context because older people also have lower costs in every other area of their budgets than any other age group in our society—rent, clothing, food, recreation and bearing the cost of rearing and educating children. It has been said that older people have lower incomes from salaries and wages than any other age group in our society. This is true, and it is also out of context because older people have more liquid assets and more savings than any age group in our society. Does this mean that we have no problem in the health cost of the aged? By no means, but on further analysis it shows that the problem of health costs is not peculiar to any age group. We all have the problem and it will be met, and is being met through more health facilities and more and better health insurance programs.

It has been stated that 18 million Americans go to bed hungry. This is true, and it is irresponsibility out of context. The statistic related to balanced diets and had nothing to do with financial ability to have balanced diets. The teenage group apparently has the least desirable balanced diet of any group in our society. Doctors are telling Americans to eat less and more selectively, and not eat more. If you follow your doctor's advice, you become one of the 18 million Americans going to bed hungry.

All of this criticism out of context bears great danger. 1. It may cause us to damage or even destroy a system which has produced the highest standards ever attained by any society, in our narrow concentration on the flaws we are seeking to correct. 2. It certainly does cause us damage in the eyes of the world which is hard put to believe that America's standards in health, education, and welfare are as high as they are.

RACIAL PROBLEMS

Probably there has been more criticism of America out of context in the field of race relations than any other area. So out of context has the criticism been that it shocks people to realize that in this area, too, nowhere in the world has there ever been such high standards of race relations as exist in the United States today.

A great deal of criticism is constantly being directed against the United States from India on the subject of race relations. Any student of India, or even a person with half a knowledge of India is aware of the fact that no people or no nation has such a poor record or standard of race relations.

Much is made of U.S. race relations in respect to the U.S. prestige in the new nations of Africa. Has anyone listened to those who have made a study of race relations between the various groups of native Africans? I am somewhat knowledgable of the Caribbean nation, Haiti, which is entirely Negro. Both race and class relations in Haiti are at such a low standard that to relate them to the problems in the United States is almost meaningless.

CUBA, LAOS, WEST BERLIN AND FOREIGN POLICY

The exchange of ignorance that constantly goes on in the field of our foreign policy is the most shocking of all to one who digs into these matters. It does not shock our people generally, because they have been kept in the dark about even the rudiments of facts. Statements that are fantastically false are treated with the same response that carefully weighed statements receive.

The following is only a glimmer of what I am referring to. I my judgment, the essence of the Cuban situation lies in sugar. Under U.S. policy established and maintained over 50 years ago, Cuba has been encouraged to become and remain essentially a one-crop economy—sugar. All nations for defense reasons have to maintain a sure supply of sugar. Not to take care of our sweet tooth, but to manufacture industrial alcohol and other ingredients needed for ammunition, rubber, and other war materials. The U.S. sugar policy rests in this area. For 11 years the Congress has had no real hearings or open debates on sugar policy. When the Sugar Act has been extended, as it has from time to time, the issues have been decided behind closed doors by a very small group of Congressmen, Government officials, and people outside Government.

I have made many public statements on the need for the Congress, representing the people, to learn about sugar, and as they learn about sugar to inform our people about the issues surrounding it. By doing this, we probably will find the proper answer to Cuba, both for our benefit and for the benefit of the Cuban people.

HIDING INFORMATION FROM THE PEOPLE

I have concluded that the major issue facing the United States today is getting public debate on a higher plane * * * a plane that sets forth the proper rules of debate * * * a plane that permits those who have studied a field to be heard and the facts they have adduced to be weighed. This

means that we must call the House to order and still the student voices of ignorance which shut out the voices of scholarship and reason. I have the greatest faith in the wisdom of the American people if they are permitted to hear honest and forthright debate on the issues that face us.

America Must Return to Idealism if We Are To Be Worthy of World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the role of any leader is to lead and this cannot be done by waiting to determine the popular course or by being afraid of incurring criticism. I am afraid the present administration lacks the determined will to reach a decision on how to meet the challenge of communism because administration policymakers seem to be waiting for some miracle to happen which would give an answer that will meet with worldwide popularity. This is not the way the United States can command respect, nor indeed, be worthy of world leadership. Our decision in Berlin, in Cuba, in every other area of the world where freedom is threatened by the Communist conspiracy must be based on the idealism upon which our country was founded. When we find the courage to clearly state our position on the side of freedom, we will command the respect, and eventually the loyalty of the great majority of the people of the world. To do less is to play into the hands of the Kremlin and give them a continued advantage in winning the battle for men's minds. The following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star, and the editorial from the Wall Street Journal, point up the issue and how we can rebuild American prestige:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

UNITED STATES FAILING ON WORLD LEADERSHIP—THOUGH NATION IS STILL HIGHLY REGARDED, ITS ROLE AS HARMONIZER IS CALLED WEAK

(By David Lawrence)

Some impressions formed in Europe during nearly 2 months of observation there are presented here today. They are derived from many frank conversations with heads of government, foreign ministers and well-informed editors of important newspapers abroad.

There is, first of all, a high regard for the United States. Its prestige has never really been impaired, though disappointments in the postwar years have been noted and editorial criticism at times has been severe.

Basically the United States is looked to for leadership, which is somehow expected to be perfect in form and substance and method. The moment American policy seems at variance with what highly placed officials in other countries think it should be, they do not hesitate to express themselves about it. Too often the newspapers reflect this dissatisfaction, and the episodes then become magnified beyond their true importance.

There is, however, fundamentally a difference in viewpoint. European nations are struggling for economic equilibrium and ways and means of satisfying the pressures for more and more welfare programs for their growing populations. They are not as strong by any means as the United States, nor have they its potential resources. They have drifted into sheer dependence on America for military, if not economic, support.

As for a big war, it is feared but everyday life doesn't seem to be modified because of that fear. Normal processes of development continue, and officials, though worried, seem confident that war will be avoided.

If this correspondent brings back, however, one single impression about the whole situation, it is that America is not furnishing the leadership it should in the world today.

It's too bad that President Kennedy has not himself heretofore had the benefit of actual experience in international affairs. Two years from now he will be doing perhaps many of the things he ought to be doing today. For he will learn the hard way that trying to harmonize differences with the Western allies is a frustrating task and results in the end in policies that represent a common denominator of weakness rather than strength.

President Wilson during World War I gave an example of leadership that might well be repeated today. He did not worry too much about what his allies said or thought about the large programs of policy that he believed should be formulated for the postwar years. He spoke out directly and forthrightly. He didn't feel that he had to consult allies on how each paragraph of his speeches or statements should be worded.

Today there is a conflict between materialism and idealism, between adherence to principle and a readiness to barter with the Communists—to buy peace at the expense of principle. The Western allies are divided in their concepts of what ought to be done about East Germany, for instance, and are allowing themselves to be pushed around on the subject of human rights in East Germany as well as in East Berlin. The United States gives an impression of timidity in what is euphemistically described as caution and restraint. But it actually is furnishing to Nikita Khrushchev—as happened with Hitler—the feeling that the Western alliance is not as strong as it is cracked up to be.

Outwardly, some lipservice is being paid to the cause of reunification of Germany. But, under the surface, there is fear of such a contingency. Memories of the war have not vanished in Europe, though American policy toward Japan shows how wartime feeling can be superseded by a new sense of friendship for a former enemy.

The Bonn Government is a free and democratic government. Like the Weimar Republic of the 1920's, it needs help and encouragement. West Germany needs to be reunited with East Germany. Otherwise, West Germany will be repossessed someday by the same kind of militaristic groups that gave Hitler his chance to rule.

Keeping Germany divided is dangerous to the peace of the world. President Kennedy should speak out in this cause, even if the Western allies do not dare to do so publicly. They should already know the spirit of revenge that can be built up inside a defeated country. And they should know, too, that some strong voice of leadership must emerge today if the Berlin problem is to be put into its proper perspective.

Mr. Kennedy's plea for a reunified Germany would not be applauded publicly today by the heads of government in Western Europe nor by some of the politicians. Public opinion within their countries isn't ready for it. So American spokesmen must lead in this cause. It takes a rare courage to speak out and lay before the world the basis of an enduring peace and to strive to get world opinion behind such a program.

If the Weimar Republic had been supported in the 1920's by the West, with financial and economic programs, there wouldn't have been a Hitler or a Second World War.

The Russian people don't want war, but they don't know that the way is being prepared for it by their own misguided rulers. They are not being told. The true voice of America that can help prevent a world war and insure peace has not yet been heard.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

POWER AND OPINION

Twenty-four "uncommitted" countries will meet this week in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, to express their opinions on world affairs. The Soviets don't seem especially interested, but Washington is waiting rather anxiously to hear what the "neutrals" think about Berlin.

What accounts for this sharp difference in attitude? Soviet disinterest is explained by the fact that the nations which will assemble at Belgrade are weak, and weakness does not command Mr. Khrushchev's respect. Moreover, he doesn't take the "uncommitted" tag seriously. In his brutal view, the world is split into Communist and non-Communist camps; so-called neutrals are merely those against whom the full weight of Soviet power is not yet committed. Their opinions are of no importance.

The United States, on the other hand, has long placed great importance on showing a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. And properly so. We would, if we could, have every nation understand why we act.

Harsh as it may seem, Khrushchev's view of the world—as the arena of struggle between two great powers—is more realistic. Small, weak, and backward nations cannot deeply influence the cold war. Indeed, their independence is a result of the West's power to check the ambitions of the East. The fact is, the U.S. commitment to opposing communism permits their posture of noncommitment.

Yet, paradoxically, the United States gets little but criticism for its pains. Part of the explanation of this is that others do not understand, or refuse to admit, that their own rights flow from the rights we uphold. If the world had to count on the Soviets to protect the right of self-determination, it would soon see the blessings of U.S. self-assertion.

But the heaviest blame for neutralist buffeting of U.S. policy falls on ourselves; we invite it. While the Soviets stand stony-faced and quick to punish those who cross them, Washington seems only too willing to try to please everyone. It even takes the "uncommitted" at face value, crediting them with a special place above the cold war battle that makes them somehow more "moral" and peace-loving than the fully committed antagonists. Yet the more influence they gain over U.S. policy, the more they must scorn a great power that does not know its own mind.

No one can argue that the United States should be indifferent to the opinions of others. But if the neutrals cannot see how their self-interest coincides with our interest in safeguarding freedom, their blindness does not excuse our paralysis. The danger of placing the world's good opinion before all else is that, when other disapprove, we may become powerless to do what we must.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Eileen Shanahan looks into the policy of the new administration toward American business abroad in the ninth of the articles in the Journal of Commerce series. This appeared on August 3:

KENNEDY POLICY SERVING TO SPUR BUSINESS ABROAD

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—What's good for American business abroad is good for America.

This sweeping statement, which has not, in fact, been made in precisely so many words by any member of the Kennedy administration, nevertheless comes pretty close to expressing the viewpoint now held in Government circles.

An outstanding exception to it, of course, can be found in the administration's unsuccessful attempt to impose immediate taxes on all oversea operations of U.S. companies in industrialized nations and even on some activities—construed to be tax avoidance "gimmicks"—in underdeveloped countries.

But looking at the total picture, it has become clear in 6 months of the New Frontier that the Government recognizes that it needs business help—and, as a consequence, needs to help business—if American objectives around the globe are to be achieved.

NO MAJOR SHIFT

This attitude does not represent a major shift from the views and policies of the Eisenhower administration, although a case can be made that there has been some intensification of the partnership-with-business policy.

It does, however, involve—and this point has largely been missed in the public commentary on the subject—a very decided evolution from the attitude of the Truman administration, which entertained few thoughts concerning the role of private enterprise in development of the underdeveloped world.

The administration's partnership concept of the solution to oversea development has been made clear in a number of ways.

PRIVATE ROLE

President Kennedy has said that of the $13 billion needed in Latin America for success of the Alliance for Progress, half must come from private sources.

The foreign aid bill now making its way through Congress contains a broad array of guarantees against loss on oversea private investment.

The Export-Import Bank, breaking a policy of 30 years' standing, offered a program of insurance against credit risks on short-term export transactions and then in the face of protests from the U.S. insurance industry, offered to let the insuring be done privately on a sort of subcontract arrangement, if the details can be worked out.

RISKS INVOLVED

The Government's program of assistance to business in establishing oversea operations is not, of course, without its risk of Government interference of a sort which business may not like. The official State Department document explaining the Kennedy administration's new foreign aid proposal contains an explicit warning on this point.

"To the degree that special governmental incentives or financing devices are employed for the objective of enlisting private American business in the public purpose of assisting economic growth in less developed countries. The businesses that use them are engaging in a public service, not merely a private one. The private businesses affected take on a special trust and subject themselves to the imposition of conditions."

There have been no public reports, so far at least, of any Government attempt to impose "conditions" at which any business firm has seriously balked. But the potential for conflict is present.

The administration is known to feel strongly, for example, that equity ownership in American companies should be opened to citizens of the host countries and that every effort should be made to employ local personnel in managerial and other skilled positions.

The extent to which the Government might attempt to impose its views on the type of facility to be erected abroad, and the locale, against the objections of the American firm involved, is not clear.

Ever since the Cuban confiscations of American property and the public disorders in the Congo, however, American firms have been increasingly disposed to seek Government advice on location and timing over their oversea investments, and to take it.

CLEAR PICTURE EMERGES

As for the other major aspect of Government policy toward international business activities—trade policy—a clear, though not absolutely unmixed, picture is emerging.

The administration is committed to a program of freer trade, and while its proposed solution to the textile problem—creation of a worldwide quota system, for the first time, on a manufactured product—was viewed in some quarters as a retreat from free trade concepts, the general view among free trade advocates was that it represented the only feasible solution in view of the very difficult domestic and international political problems involved.

President Kennedy's action in remanding to the Tariff Commission for further investigation the glass, ceramic tile, and baseball glove cases was not only a landmark decision but a hint of things to come, as well.

BROADER STUDY ASKED

In his letter to the Commission, Mr. Kennedy instructed it to examine factors far beyond the mere statistics of domestic production and volume of imports, which, under present law, provide the basis for most of the Commission's recommended increases in tariffs, including these three.

The President told the Commission to look into the possibility that one or more of these industries were losing their domestic markets because they have engaged in monopolistic marketing restrictions, been laggard about making advances in production technology, or simply held their prices too high.

Standards of this sort are expected to be recommended for inclusion in next year's major overhaul of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Meanwhile, the incoming Chairman of the Tariff Commission itself, Ben Dorfman, is an advocate of the classic free-trade position.

Pressures for protectionism will, of course, continue, including demands from the politically potent farm bloc, which may obtain the backing of Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman.

FINDING NEW MARKETS

Meanwhile, the Government—notably the Commerce Department—is taking more and more steps to help American business find oversea markets.

The Department is expected to announce shortly a reorganization of its Bureau of Foreign Commerce, which will separate the Export Promotion Branch from the licensing and economic functions and enlarge promotion activities at the same time.

Although administration plans to speed and simplify export licensing procedures have so far achieved only limited success, the effort is still being made. And the Commerce Department, after a couple of early goofs, has been able to follow through on Secretary Luther H. Hodges' pledge to see that export licenses, once granted, will not be withdrawn.

Aid to Education Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have hoped during the entire session that soundly conceived education legislation could be considered and enacted by the House this year, the situation with which we are presented today is extremely disappointing.

Instead of a carefully considered bill called up for debate under normal procedures, we are confronted this afternoon with a hastily drafted piece of legislation brought to the floor under the seldom-used Calendar Wednesday procedure. No copies of the bill were even available until Monday. No hearings were held to consider the entirely new feature relating to school construction which the bill contains. No report from the Education and Labor Committee on the bill was available for study until we reached the floor of the House at noon today, just minutes before we were expected to cast our votes on the measure. No reasonable opportunity was given to file minority views to the committee report. No effort was even made to secure a rule from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a slipshod and haphazard way of considering legislation which simply cannot be condoned. I am disappointed and discouraged that the administration and the leadership in the House have allowed a matter of such grave importance as the adequate education of our young people to come to this.

In the past, I have supported the National Defense Education Act, and I feel very strongly that it should be extended. I have supported the impacted areas program and it, too, should be continued. A year ago I supported President Eisenhower's efforts to secure enactment of a school construction program, and I continue to believe that the Federal Government can play an effective role in providing help in this area. I am in complete sympathy with the aims of Representative GREEN'S bill, H.R. 8900, dealing with assistance to institutions of higher education.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am definitely opposed to the procedure which is being attempted here today, and I shall vote against consideration of H.R. 8890 in this manner. I sincerely hope that this

effort to bring to bill to the floor today will be defeated and that as a result an opportunity to carefully analyze and evaluate the administration's latest proposals will be available to us. Only in this way can those who are sincerely concerned with the Nation's educational problems insure themselves against the adoption of a hastily conceived and completely untried device for meeting the school construction problem.

Journal of Commerce Examines Kennedy Economic Programs—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the windup article of the Journal of Commerce series on the Kennedy economic programs undertakes a look into the future as Eileen Shanahan attempts to outline what can be expected in the future from the current administration. This final article, which appears below, was published on August 4:

DOMESTIC PROGRAM SEEN MORE DRASTIC: KENNEDY'S 1962 PLANS IN MAKING

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—Any President has only about 3 years to get his domestic program through Congress.

Regardless of whether he is in office for a year beyond that time, or another 5 years—or, as in the case of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, another 9—his relations with Congress seem inevitably to deteriorate to a series of petty wrangles which, in the absence of any fundamental change in domestic or international conditions, effectively block enactment of any but truly essential legislation and authority to continue existing programs.

RECORD IS LONG

The historical record which documents this assertion is long. And the 3-year phenomenon, while never a subject of much comment among academicians or anyone else outside of government, is almost universally accepted by the inner circle of skilled tacticians of both parties who really run the Congress.

President Kennedy, as much a student of history in his way as a Truman or a Churchill, is doubtless aware of it, too.

The Kennedy administration has, in a certain sense, thrown away its first year, so far as enactment of bold new programs is concerned.

While much of the legislation it has been backing—successfully for the most part—seems on the radical side from the point of view of the business community, it has not, in fact, been very new.

MANY OLD IDEAS

Instead, its major legislative proposals have embodied ideas which have been kicking around among Democrats and their friends for years—many of which actually passed Congress during the Eisenhower administration, only to run into a Presidential veto which could not be overridden.

Among the items which fall into this category are the program of assistance to chronic unemployment areas and inauguration of Government supports for middle-income housing. Even many of the tax reform proposals and the administration's proposed long-term authorization of foreign aid nearly got through Congress in years past.

If truly new domestic programs are to be enacted during the Kennedy years, they are going to have to be proposed next year. Otherwise, the clock may have run out.

NEW APPROACHES WEIGHED

A great many drastic new approaches are under consideration, including an attempt to grasp the nettle of coordinating transportation policy, some better means of dealing with strikes affecting the national security, coordinated treatment of the development of metropolitan areas and of natural resources, and a vast array of welfare programs, many of which would directly increase business payrolls.

Just how new and how sweeping any of these administration programs may be—and whether they will actually be proposed at all—awaits decisions which have not yet been made and may not be, for the most part, until next January.

CONTROVERSY IN MAKING

Several things are clear, however, for one thing, the ideas under study are far from noncontroversial, even within the administration itself. And a fundamental controversy lying behind the individual controversies is asserting itself more and more—can and should new domestic programs, nearly all of which will cost money, be enacted when enormous budgetary strains are being imposed by the international situation?

There are those in high positions within the administration who agree with most Republicans and businessmen that many of the planned new programs can be postponed until the Nation's checkbook shows a more comfortable balance.

Two other significant points concerning the present administration's attitudes and tactics emerge from an examination of its record in its first 6 months.

COMPROMISES NEEDED

It takes a pretty unemotional approach to the compromises that must be made in the process of achieving its legislative objectives and, in the process, frequently winds up with half a loaf. Whether it might win the whole loaf if it were less flexible—or, conversely would lose all—is a matter of bitter controversy among the administration's own best friends.

An example of this can be found in the minimum wage measure which went through Congress this year. In a tactical maneuver to gain the necessary margin of votes for passage of the bill, the administration agreed to exclusion from coverage of the very group of workers about whom organized labor and "liberal" everywhere had been most distraught—laundry employees.

President Kennedy has clearly decided that his international programs—military and economic—deserve the topmost priority in his battles with Congress. If support is to be found for their enactment in substantially the form he wants, he cannot permanently alienate any major sector of the American public—including business. He knows this.

This fact of life will serve to temper radicalism in the administration's proposals in the years ahead.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

"Chances Are Growing for Medical Aid Plan Under Social Security," Wall Street Journal Staff Reporter Asserts in Comprehensive News Article—Senator Randolph Calls for Bold and Courageous Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was intrigued by this headline in the Wall Street Journal today: "Care for the Aged: Chances Are Growing for Medical Aid Plan Under Social Security; Election Year Pressure Will Help 1962 Prospects—Cost Worry May Limit Benefits—Local Polls Sway Lawmakers."

The news article by John A. Grimes, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, under that headline is encouraging to those of us who support the principle of medical care for the aged under the social security system.

I hope the quotation included in the story, "It is no longer a question of whether; it is when," is an accurate appraisal of sentiment in the Congress favorable to prepaid medical care benefits for our senior citizens through the social security system. When? My anwer is that enactment of legislation on this subject cannot come too soon, and hopefully during the life of this 87th Congress.

In West Virginia, I have campaigned consistently on the affirmative side of this issue and I know from my many contacts with the people at the grassroots and from the volume of my correspondence on the subject that a preponderant number of our citizens of all ages support the affirmative viewpoint. There is a real desire that a start be made on the establishment of a plan embracing the principle of paying in the productive years for medical care which few will escape needing in their periods of retirement.

Senator KERR and other members of the Senate Finance Committee gave painstaking attention to this problem. I believe, as I stated during debate on care for the aged, that the esteemed senior Senator from Oklahoma deserved commendation for his sincere efforts in the formulation of a plan. That program enacted into law during the 86th Congress should be supplemented. If we embrace the broadest social security formula a merited advance will be achieved.

I am not wedded to any thought that the initial approach to bringing medical care for the aged under social security must be an all-benefits-included plan, because I know the system will have to be evolved on a relatively gradual basis in order to be fiscally sound and administratively feasible. Nevertheless, even the first step must be a bold and courageous one.

At every opportunity in the 86th Congress and again in this 87th Congress, I have taken and will continue to take advantage of every appropriate occasion to express my support for the principle that medical care for the aged should be made a part of social security.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the House Ways and Means Committee on August 2, 1961, in favor of pending legislation on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXPAND SOCIAL SECURITY TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I am most appreciative of the opportunity afforded by this committee to present my views in support of proposed legislation which would expand the social security program to provide medical care for the aged on a prepaid insurance basis to supplement the medical assistance for the needy aged provisions of Public Law 86–778.

West Virginia was one of the first States to enact legislation to enable it to participate in the health care program for needy aged under Public Law 86–778. The initial action taken in our State was the enactment of necessary legislation by the West Virginia Legislature in an October 1960 extraordinary session called for that purpose.

Ours was perhaps not the only State which entered into the program on what was then believed to be a temporary expedient basis on the assumption that Congress would pass a more substantial and more meaningful measure under social security tax financing. In a sense, West Virginia now is being penalized for this early action in behalf of those of its aged citizens who qualify under the Federal-State program authorized by Public Law 86–778 and our State law which implemented it.

The failure of Congress to move ahead with and provide social security coverage for medical care purposes has already necessitated in West Virginia the development of plans for a cutback in the existing program of medical services for the needy aged. And if the proposals for social security expansion are delayed beyond this year it is estimated that West Virginia's share of the cost of the limited needy aged care plan will advance to between $10 million and $12 million.

In a recent cogent article on the medical care-for-the-aged problem in West Virginia, a well-informed writer for the Charleston Gazette wrote:

"Without passage of the administration proposal for expanded social security coverage to include medical care for the aged, which would shift financing to social security from general revenue, this State will be hard pressed to meet its aged care obligations in the year ahead. * * * Medical care for the aged cannot long be supported by direct taxation. Social security, under which the individual would pay for his care in unproductive years while he is still productive, is the only solution for financing on a permanent basis.

"When the present program of medical assistance for the needy aged was passed last October 1960, the financing plan adopted was a temporary expedient. The Governor recommended a shift of funds from other purposes to carry the program until March of this year, and the legislature acquiesced.

"The 6-month plan was calculated to coincide with action in Washington on the social security proposal. It was anticipated that the shift from general taxation to social security would be made within 2 months after Congress convened in January.

"When it was realized early this year that the social security measure was in trouble, the West Virginia Legislature decided to continue the program in the old form until January of next year. Aged care as a public service had been so slow getting off the ground that much of what was appropriated in October 1961 was still available when the legislature faced the problem anew in February.

"With this backlog of funds, plus an additional appropriation of $1,325,256, it was believed that West Virginia would have enough money for its needy aged medical care program to last through December, with the Federal Government paying 70 percent of the program's costs.

"But the situation has changed radically since the legislature went home in March. Medical care costs have skyrocketed. Where they were running at $153,867 when the legislative decision on anticipated needs was made in February, they were running at $391,859 last month, June.

"State Welfare Director W. Bernard Smith is indeed worried. There is no longer any cushion to carry the program past December 31, as there was last March. As conditions stand, Smith either has the choice of stopping the program before the legislature returns again to appropriate more money or of curtailing services. Chances are he will order a cutback in services very soon. He and his staff are now studying ways to reduce services without wrecking the program.

"And what does the future hold after next January? In event the social security program is again sidetracked, it is believed that West Virginia's share of the cost of needy aged care will run to $10 or $12 million annually.

"This is a shocking prospect when one realizes that the next legislature has nowhere to look for so much money without going through the painful process of revamping the entire tax structure after having already done so during the last regular session before adjourning in March."

That is the picture confronting the officials and the citizens of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who support the social security concept of medical care for the aged do not deny the value of Public Law 86–778. But many of us have acknowledged its value as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for social security financ-

ing. As a general measure, Public Law 86-778 fails to provide the soundest financing and it adds an inordinate load to the already overburdened States, and it falls far short of offering adequate medical care for the needy aged, including the great majority of elderly persons who are unable to finance their health care under the impact of constantly mounting costs.

The inadequacy of the present law and its heavy impact on States through matching requirements are attested to by the small number of States which have programs in effect and the few which have elected to participate in its benefits this year. This record of achievement is inadequate to the needs of one of the most urgent social and humanitarian problems of our day.

Neither logic nor experience, neither social justice nor economic prudence can justify the resistance to social security financing of aged health care, which would allow men and women to pay for their later medical needs during the most productive years of their working lives. This program is opposed on the grounds of dogma rather than experience, and it is attacked by scare slogans rather than reason.

We are informed, too, that during the 6 months after Public Law 86-778 went into effect on October 1, 1960, Federal matching payments to the States for old-age assistance and medical care increased by $44.5 million. This has enabled some States to decrease their spending for old-age assistance, to be sure, but when the number of States fully participating in Public Law 86-778 increases materially, I am certain the result will be that both Federal participation and State expenditures will mount rapidly.

This situation, developing at a time when the demands upon general revenues at both the Federal and State levels are on the increase, must be rectified—and this can best be done by turning to the social security method of financing medical care for the aged and by increasing the social security tax for this purpose.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news article published in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal to which I made reference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARE FOR THE AGED: CHANCES ARE GROWING FOR MEDICAL AID PLAN UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY—ELECTION YEAR PRESSURE WILL HELP 1962 PROSPECTS; COST WORRY MAY LIMIT BENEFITS—LOCAL POLLS SWAY LAWMAKERS

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Chances are growing that Congress next year will approve the hotly controversial plan for medical care for the aged via social security.

Passage, if it comes, will not be easy. Because of the cost, backers may have to settle for a cut-down version of President Kennedy's present scheme to pay hospital, nursing home, and other bills for 14 million Americans aged 65 or more.

But the belief is growing among foes as well as friends of the plan that it is destined for congressional approval in some form. A hard-core opponent of the proposal, sensing the trend in capital sentiment, concludes: "It's no longer a question of whether; it's when." Adds another foe: "There's just too much pressure for Congress to hold out against."

Almost as soon as the legislators return to town next January, they'll be greeted by an election-year concert of demands for new health help. Many of the folks 65 or over will make themselves heard; even in the present lull, says one Congressman, "there's enough mail tricking in to remind you that they're watching." Labor's lobbyists will turn on a flood of letters from union members and their families. State Governors tussling with budget problems will prod lawmakers for social security financing; this might ease the States burdens under medical care programs they now partly finance. And President Kennedy's legislative strategists, who have deliberately refrained from pressing the health issues to any showdown this year, will turn on real heat.

COST AND COMPULSION

All this pressure is now expected to overcome stony resistance among conservatives who object to the cost and compulsory aspect of social security financing, and among doctors who see a step toward socialized medicine.

Administration lobbyists are concentrating their fire on the House Ways and Means Committee, where a medical care bill must start its trip through the legislative mill and where the opposition has been tough. "We've changed some votes," asserts a key lobbyist, "though I don't know for sure that we've changed enough."

More particularly, Kennedy aids are trying to win over Committee Chairman MILLS, an Arkansas Democrat who not only voted against a social security health bill last year but helped author the Federal-State cost-sharing program that Congress enacted instead. "If we can get MILLS, we've automatically got the votes we need," figures one tactician. Officials are confident the issue can be negotiated with Mr. MILLS, even if it means cutting down the benefits in the President's plan for the sake of establishing a principle.

It's too soon to tell if any special pressure will be applied, but Kennedy men will at least appeal to the Congressman's sense of party responsibility, working through such administration supporters on the committee as Louisiana's Representative BOGGS.

ADDED AMMUNITION

As added ammunition, White House lobbyists are counting heavily on arguments that the Federal-State plan adopted last year is proving inadequate to meet old folks' health needs. In the first 6 months of the law's operation, reports Assistant Health Education, Welfare Secretary Cohen, only a few more than 10,000 new ailing elderly people received State medical help. States are moving very slowly, HEW officials contend, to pick up their part of the burden.

"A lot of Congressmen went home last year thinking they'd taken care of the oldsters' medical problems, and found themselves still on the spot," remarks a key congressional staff man. "Now, some of them are almost eager to vote for the social security plan."

As an indicator of the support for the social security health plan, some lawmakers from supposedly conservative districts are getting some surprising results in polls of the home folks.

Republican Representative WIDNALL of New Jersey, expressing astonishment at a 20-percent response to 60,000 general questionnaires mailed out, reports a 62.5-percent yes vote for the proposal. Pennsylvania's GOP Representative SCHNEEBELI reports a 59-percent vote in favor of the social security approach. And a poll by Republican Representative HOSMER, of California, while finding constituents opposed to Federal aid for teachers' salaries and thought labor needed more regulation, simultaneously came up with a 53-percent yes response on the social security question.

BETTER MOBILIZATION?

By next year, the supporters may be better mobilized than ever. Retired Democratic Congressman Forand, of Rhode Island, who helped father the plan for medical benefits under social security, has just announced formation of a National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security, with headquarters on Capitol Hill, as a lobby to work for the goal its name specifies.

The present stealthy advance of this proposed boom for the elderly marks a comeback from seeming disaster. Last summer, amid the heat of Presidential politicking, both the Senate and the House fought off all efforts—Candidate Kennedy's included—to shoehorn a health schedule into the social security law. This year, despite the President's placement of the plan high on his legislative "must" list, Congress has gone no further than to hold 2 weeks of hearings on it.

Even apart from any socialized-medicine danger, there's genuine apprehension among many lawmakers as to where this new plunge might take the social security system in the long run.

"Anything we okay along this line will be just a foot in the door," frets a key Ways and Means Committee member. "It could end up costing more billions than anyone has been talking about." Another influential Congressman worries that social security tax increases necessary to pay for possible expansions of a health-care program, along with other tax boosts already scheduled, would bring a revolt by the public against the whole social security system.

The Congressmen who are worrying about even the early costs of a health plan under social security note that the administration already has been having trouble with its cost estimates. Administration officials have conceded that their first figures on the cost of nursing home care were too low.

Leonard Larson, president of the American Medical Association, labels Mr. Kennedy's plan "unpredictably but extremely expensive." J. Douglas Colman, speaking for the Blue Cross private health insurance plans, contends the administration's cost estimates are "hazardously low" for all but the first year or two of operation.

Next year's battle over health care for the aged will revolve, initially at least, around the administration's plan now hanging fire in the House Ways and Means Committee. This calls for payment, out of a special social security account, of certain health bills for any or all of 14.2 million persons aged 65 and over who now are eligible for social security pensions—whether they need the help or not. The benefits: Up to 90 days of hospital care for one illness, after an out-of-pocket cost to the patient of $20 to $90; 180 days of skilled nursing-home care for one illness; 240 home health service visits a year; and hospital out-patient expenses that amount to more than $20 apiece. Cost of the package, by administration estimates, would be $1.1 billion in the first full year of operation, rising to $2.6 billion by the year 2000.

TWO-WAY TAX BOOST

To collect the necessary funds, the administration proposes a two-way increase in social security taxes paid by workers and their bosses. First, the maximum amount of each worker's taxable wages would be increased to $5,200 a year from the present $4,800. In addition, the tax rate would be boosted by one-quarter of a percentage point each on employer and employee; the present rate is 3 percent apiece. This would pluck an additional maximum of $13 a year from the paycheck of a worker now covered by social security, and a like amount from his employer's cash register. This increase would be piled atop already scheduled tax boosts which would take the top annual social security paycheck bite from $144 each for a worker and his employer now to $222 starting in 1968.

By comparison, what Mr. MILLS fashioned last year, with the help of Oklahoma's Senator KERR, was a program to fatten Federal public-assistance payments to the States; the increase was earmarked for medical benefits for needy old people. As envisioned by its authors, the plan could be stretched to cover as many as 12 million of the nearly 17 million persons aged 65 and over, whether they are on social security rolls or not.

First, Uncle Sam agreed to put up 50 percent to 80 percent of an added $12 a month—a sum raised just this year by Congress to $15—for increased medical benefits to be made available to some 2.4 million Americans already getting Federal-State old-age assistance; the top payment in which the United States will share now stands at $80 a month per individual. Second, under a new medical assistance program the Government undertook to shoulder 50 percent to 80 percent of the cost of certain health benefits offered by the States to as many as 10 million more senior citizens who, though not on public assistance, might find the cost of an illness more than they could afford. The total Federal bill, it was estimated, might climb as high as $165 million in the first full year that all States had some sort of plan working.

CLAIMS AND CHARGES

Though the Kerr-Mills plan is less than a year old, its performance to date has already brought both claims of success and charges of failure.

The American Medical Association, which sees the evil of socialized medicine lurking in the administration proposal, insists that the record of State participation so far is "remarkable proof" that the Kerr-Mills plan is working. The doctors' group, along with other opponents of the social security plan, insists the 1960 law in combination with the spread of private health insurance plans will take care of the problem by reach the old people who really need medical help.

HEW officials take a less hopeful view. Their calculations show that about half the 43 States already offering medical help to old-age assistance recipients have taken legislative steps to improve these programs, and three States have started giving such aid to needy old-age assistance beneficiaries for the first time. But State adoption of the other half of the Kerr-Mills plan is moving more slowely. As of mid-August, HEW statisticians reported that 14 States were operating, in some form, medical-assistance plans for the aged not on old-age assistance roles; eight more States have adopted the necessary legislation and hope to have a program working by next year; and another eight States have legislation pending or have enacted a program but no funds for it. Action on plans in 19 more States "is not anticipated," HEW officials claim.

DRUGS AND DENTURES

Furthermore, they add, many State plans fall far short of the glowing list of benefits set forth in the law as eligible for Federal matching funds; these range from full hospital services down through doctor and dentist bills and the cost of doctor-prescribed drugs and dentures. One example cited: Kentucky limits hospital stays to 6 days, has a two-call limit on physicians' services, and a ceiling of $48 a year on dentist bills covered. HEW Secretary Ribicoff complains unequal treatment from State to State is "not fair to the elderly."

Mr. Ribicoff warns, too, of a "fantastic drain" on hard-pressed State treasuries if the present plan ever is broadened to cover the major share of medical costs for the aged. He forecasts a possible $1 billion-a-year price tag, with the States having to pay just under half of this.

Declares a report by the special Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged, headed by Democratic Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan, an ardent backer of Social Security financing: "The States already are experiencing difficulty in financing other essential programs. * * * The danger emerges therefore that the economic burden of the medical assistance for the aged program will tend to restrict the scope of benefits and the aged population to be covered, and thus fail to meet the long-range legislative intent of the program."

Added to all this pressure on Congress is the steady growth in the number of old folks, many of them demanding help with medical bills. Since 1950, the 65-and-over population has climbed by nearly 4.5 million to around 17 million; by 1970, it's expected to top 20 million. More and more, Congressmen report, the elderly have become a formidable political bloc.

Climbing medical costs are also keeping the health issue hot. This past June, the medical care category of the Government's consumer price index stood at 168.8 percent of the 1947–49 average, 3.9 percent above the level of a year earlier and far over the 105.4 percent reading for June 1950. In the same 10-year period, the total cost of living index rose from 101.8 percent of the 1947–49 average to 127.6 percent.

George Whelan Anderson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the great Borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York was accorded a signal honor by our President in the appointment of one of her native sons to a high position in the defense forces of the Nation. On June 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy announced the nomination of Vice Admiral Anderson as Chief of Naval Operations. He succeeded Adm. Arleigh Burke in that position on August 1, 1961.

George Whelan Anderson, Jr., was born on December 15, 1906, in Brooklyn, N.Y., son of George W. and Clara (Green) Anderson. He attended Brooklyn Preparatory School, and entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., from his native State in 1923. Graduated and commissioned ensign on June 2, 1927, he subsequently advanced in rank to that of rear admiral, to date from August 1, 1954. He served in the rank of vice admiral from May 1, 1957, until January 18, 1958, and on September 14, 1959, he again assumed the rank of vice admiral.

Following graduation from the Naval Academy in 1927, he remained there for the short course in aviation, before reporting to the U.S.S. *Cincinnati*, on which he served as a junior officer until 1930. He was then ordered to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training and, designated naval aviator in October of that year, was ordered to the Atlantic Fleet for duty in the aviation units of the U.S.S. *Concord* and U.S.S. *Raleigh*, successively.

Between 1933 and 1935 he was assigned to the flight test division of the Naval Air Station, NOB, Norfolk, Va., after which he had duty afloat with Fighting Squadron 2, based on the U.S.S. *Lexington*. He was detached from that squadron with orders to the Newport News (Va.) Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., where the U.S.S. *Yorktown* was building, and joined that aircraft carrier on her commissioning on September 30, 1937. From the fall of 1939 until early 1940 he was attached to Patrol Squadron 44, Patrol Wing 4, based at Seattle, Wash.

He was next assigned to the plans division, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., and while there participated in the formulation of the American aircraft program for World War II. This included association with wartime agencies charged with production and allocation of all U.S. aircraft, and planning the aircraft aspects of the expansion of naval aviation. For his liaison work with the Army Air Force while in that assignment, he received a letter of commendation from the War Department, with authorization to wear the Army commendation ribbon.

In March 1943 he again reported to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., this time to asist in fitting out the new U.S.S. *Yorktown*—CV–10—and became navigator and tactical officer when she was commissioned on April 15, 1943. He was aboard that aircraft carrier during her early action in the Pacific, and received a letter of commendation, with authority to wear the commendation ribbon, from the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, for outstanding services from August 15 to November 1, 1943, while attached to the U.S.S. *Yorktown*.

He is also entitled to the ribbon for, and a facsimile of the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the U.S.S. *Yorktown* for "extraordinary heroism in action against enemy Japanese forces in the air, at sea and on shore in the Pacific war area from August 31, 1943, to August 15, 1945."

He next had duty as plans officer on the staff of commander aircraft, U.S. Pacific Fleet, and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct as head of the plans division of the staff of commander, Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet during the period from November 1943 to March 1944" he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

On March 28, 1944, he reported as assistant to the deputy commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. He was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for "meritorious achievement—in that capacity—during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, from March 28, 1944, to April 16, 1945."

In June 1945, he became aviation officer in the strategic plans section on the staff of the commander in chief, U.S. Fleet, with headquarters at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C. As such he also had duty as Deputy Navy Planner on the Joint Planning Staff. Ordered to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, he was appointed a member of the Permanent Joint Board on Defense—Canada-United States—in November 1946; was also one of the Navy members of the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission and served with the Joint War Plans Committee of the Joint Staff.

In July 1948 he returned to sea as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Mindoro*, and when detached from that antisubmarine carrier in August 1948, reported for instruction at the National War College, Washington, D.C. Completing the course there in July 1950, he joined the staff of the commander, 6th Fleet, as fleet operations officer. In December 1950 he transferred to the staff of the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe—SHAPE—and remained there until July 1952 as the senior U.S. officer in plans and operations. He served as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* for a year, and when detached from command of that aircraft carrier in June 1953, reported for duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

In July 1953 he became special assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C., continuing to serve in that capacity until July 1955. On August 3, that year, he assumed command of the Formosa Patrol Force with additional duty as commander, Fleet Air Wing 1—his title was changed late in 1955 to commander, U.S. Taiwan Patrol Force. He was Chief of Staff, Joint Staff, commander in chief, Pacific, from July 1956 until May 1957, when he reported in the rank of vice admiral as chief of staff and aide to the commander in chief, Pacific. He was commander, Carrier Division 6, from July 1958 until September 14, 1959, when he became commander, 6th Fleet, and commander, naval striking and support forces, southern Europe, with the accompanying rank of vice admiral.

In addition to the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon—Navy—the Commendation Ribbon—Army—and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon with one star, Admiral Anderson has the American Defense Service Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with two stars; the World War II Victory Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal. He has also been awarded the Order of the British Empire, rank of honorary officer, from the Government of Great Britain.

Admiral Anderson's official address is Brooklyn, N.Y., but he makes his home in Washington, D.C. He is married to the former May Lee Lamar Sample, of Pensacola, Fla., and has two sons, Lt. George W. Anderson III, U.S. Navy—class of 1957—and Thomas Patrick; a daughter, Mary Annette; and stepdaughter, Miss Carolyn Sample.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join our colleagues in commending Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, on his birthday.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to know and work with Congressman KEOGH through the last 25 years. He and I came to Congress the same day. All through this period we have been warm friends. By any yardstick of measurement Congressman KEOGH is one of the big, effective, and outstanding Members of Congress. His efforts for his district are always solid and effective; his advice on national matters is sought by many of us. I congratulate the people of his great district on their wisdom and good judgment in electing him continuously to represent them.

May Congressman KEOGH have many many more happy birthdays.

Wheat Price To Affect Bread Slice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, consumers are naturally concerned when they read that bread prices may rise again soon. If such a rise does occur, who will be responsible? Would it be justified? What about the quality of our bread, and are we getting our money's and nutrition's worth even now? Mr. Julius Duscha of the Washington Post has written an analysis of the wheat-bread-price dilemma, which I commended to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT PRICE BOOST NO CAUSE TO INCREASE THE COST OF BREAD

(By Julius Duscha, staff reporter)

Should consumers blame farmers for the proposed penny-a-pound increase in the price of bread?

And is it true that in these days of billion-bushel wheat surpluses there actually is a shortage of high-quality wheat which millers need for flour?

These two questions were raised last week when Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman conducted a long-distance argument with E. E. Kelley, Jr., president of the American Bakers Association.

DISPUTED INGREDIENTS

As most consumers stood by understandably puzzled, Freeman and Kelley disputed the ingredients which are responsible for an expected rise in bread prices.

The argument began when Kelley, who operates a large bakery in Lakeland, Fla., said that "it will be little short of a miracle if bread prices are not increased in the near future."

He cited an increase in wheat support prices and a shortage of high-quality wheat as among the factors calling for higher bread prices.

Kelley said increases in flour prices that bakers are already paying will add $60 million a year to their operating costs. This amounts to the baking industry's total profits last year, Kelley added.

He also said that a recent increase in Agriculture Department price-support levels for nonfat dry milk, an important commercial baking ingredient, added another $8 million to the industry's annual costs.

Wheat support prices will go up next year under a new farm program passed by Congress this summer and approved by wheat producers just last week.

In exchange for a 10 percent reduction in wheat acreages, farmers will be guaranteed an average price of $2 a bushel by the Government, compared with $1.79 this year.

Farmers will also be paid for the land taken out of wheat production. The payments will vary from 45 to 60 percent of what the farmers could have earned if the diverted acres had been planted in wheat.

But this program will have no direct effect on the price of wheat harvested this year.

There has been no significant changes in the price of No. 2 Hard Red Winter wheat, which has been selling for about $2 a bushel. This is the quality wheat that millers need for flour.

As for the supplies of this wheat, the Agriculture Department maintains that they are more than ample.

DROUGHT EFFECTS

The Hard Red Spring wheat crop, which millers also want, is estimated at only 128 million bushels this year, which is about 12 million below the domestic needs of 140 million bushels.

But there is a surplus of Hard Red Winter wheat of almost a billion bushels. In addition there is a stored surplus of nearly 200 million bushels of spring wheat.

The United States needs only 257 million bushels of the winter wheat. The shortage of spring wheat is due in part to the drought centering in Montana and North and South Dakota.

Not all of the surplus wheat is of high quality, but combined with the expected 1961 Hard Red Winter wheat crop of more than 1 billion bushels, it should furnish enough top-grade wheat to meet the needs of bakers.

The protein content of the 1961 crop is about 1 percent less than in 1960, but this year's wheat is considered equal to last year's in protein quality.

The farmer gets only 14 percent of what the consumer pays for a loaf of bread, and this figure includes the cost of the butter and milk in the bread as well as the wheat.

The Agriculture Department says that the average cost of a pound loaf of bread last year was 20.3 cents, of which the farmer gets 2.8 cents.

The share received by the baker and wholesaler, who usually are the same person or company, was 11.9 cents, or 59 percent of the total.

The retailer got 3.4 cents, or 17 percent, and the miller received seven-tenths of a cent, or 3 percent. Other costs amounted to 1.5 cents.

The farmer's share of the cost of a loaf of bread has decreased from 25 to 14 percent during the last decade, while the price of bread has increased from 13.5 cents a pound loaf to 20.3 cents.

The baker-wholesaler's share has gone up from 44 to 59 percent, the retailer's has remained the same at 17 percent and the miller's has decreased from 5 to 3 percent.

OTHER COST RISES

Not all of the costs are profit, of course. Labor costs, for example, have been continually increasing, as have other costs involved in production and distribution of bread.

But where do all of these figures leave the consumer, except holding a bag containing a higher priced loaf of bread?

The figures would seem to indicate that neither a greater return for the farmer nor a shortage of quality wheat is responsible for the projected price increase.

Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot Should Be Reopened and Reactivated To Prevent Another "Pearl Harbor"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Kenneth T. Lyons, national president of the Federal Employees Veterans' Association in Boston, and a statement in support of reactivating the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot at Hingham, Mass.:

NATIONAL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES
VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Boston, Mass., August 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The enclosed brief relative to a request for the reactivation of the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot, together with portions of a letter that was submitted to naval activities concerning a shortage of conventional ammunition as it pertains to the Navy's worldwide supply, is cause for alarm and demands that the Defense Department immediately review the present status and future of the Hingham Ammunition Depot's importance as it pertains to our national defense.

The enclosed brief is based on facts derived from congressional sources and Navy records.

It is hoped that your office will seek immediate action on the part of the Navy Department and/or Department of Defense to speed the reactivation of the much-needed ammunition depot in Hingham, Mass.

Thank you for your cooperation, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH T. LYONS,
National President.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS ASSOCIATION, 10 TREMONT STREET, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 29, 1961

A demand that Congress act to reopen and reactivate the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot in order to prevent another Pearl Harbor to our naval fleets operating in the North Atlantic, was made known today by Kenneth T. Lyons, national president of the Federal Employees Veterans Association in a lengthy brief that was submitted to the Massachusetts congressional delegation and to the Armed Services Committee of both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

Lyons stated today that "We have not time to lose and the situation is quite serious. The Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot must be reopened and reactivated in order to prevent another Pearl Harbor to our naval fleet as the rapidly expanding North Atlantic Fleet is without an ammunition depot in the northern waters extending from New York to Canada. As serious as this threat may be, the Navy's present worldwide conventional ammunition shortage makes it mandatory that the Hingham Depot be placed on a full production capacity."

Lyons is backing up his disclosures that the Navy was short on conventional ammunition revealed the fact that the Navy's commanding officer of the U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot in Crane, Ind., notified all fleet units on March 16, 1961, and again on June 5, 1961, that 190 different types of conventional ammunition items were in limited supply. The items that are in a limited supply, according to the comanding officer refers to the stock status of convention items on a Navy worldwide basis. Some of the items that are in a limited supply include various types of hand grenades: 3-inch by 50-inch shells, 500-pound bombs, 2,000-pound bombs, rockets and certain types of fuses.

Navy fleets sailing to Boston, Newport, and Portsmouth for overhaul without any missiles or ammunition on board constitutes a calculated risk and an inability to meet conditions that might well arise. Whether the Navy should accept this risk should be given serious attention and a strong consideration for reopening the facility at Hingham.

Ships at sea without ammunition or missiles constitute a dangerous risk to our national security in a time of perilous peace.

The Hingham Ammunition Depot was one of the most efficient installations in the naval complex of ammunition depots. This was not a consideration in determining the specific installation to be closed. The depot had a perfect record of achievement never experiencing a disaster or explosion since its inception in 1904.

The plea for the retention and reactivation of the Hingham Naval Ammunition Depot will not in any way interfere with Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH's proposal for the NASA Apollo site being located at Hingham, for it is our earnest and factual view that the Navy and/or Department of Defense need only to reopen the back river section of Hingham to take care of the Navy's needs. There is adequate land, supplies, storage facilities and buildings available for the NASA site and ammunition depot at Hingham.

For our Congress, our Navy, and our Defense Department, to ignore this plea could within the near future prove disastrous to the safety of New England and the overall defense of our east coast.

The 100th Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, when the Defense Department launched our Nation's largest military buildup since the Korean war, the Commonwealth of Kentucky was extremely proud to provide the cornerstone in the training of thousands of young fighting men under the emergency mobilization program.

In recalling the "Centurymen" of the 100th Infantry Division to active duty, the Military Establishment paid high tribute and honor not only to the excellence and proficiency of the division but also to the traditions of high patriotism and sacrifice which Kentucky has always displayed in the face of national adversity.

The 100th Division, a unit in the U.S. Army Reserve, consists of 5 regiments whose rosters number approximately 3,000 men in 44 Kentucky communities. The "Centurymen" will report for duty on September 26 at Fort Polk, La. Its primary mission will be to establish an Army Training Center at Fort Polk in order to expand the mobilization training base of the Army.

In addition to the 100th Division, the Defense Department also called up the 304th Military Police Unit—USAR—Bardstown, and two National Guard outfits, the 413th Ordnance Company, Frankfort, and the 3d Medium Tank Battalion, Bowling Green. All reporting October 1, the ordnance company will go to Fort Benning, Ga., the military policemen to Fort Hood, Tex., and the tankers to Fort Knox, Ky.

The makeup of the Century Division reflects a complete cross section of life in Kentucky. Its members include bankers, college educators, attorneys, truckers, clerks, farmers, grocers, and right on down the line. Kentucky fighting men have always been in the forefront when duty called. They have never hesitated to take up arms during crises. Kentuckians spearheaded the advancement of our Nation westward beyond the Alleghenies, and have served with distinction and heroism in every conflict involving our Nation.

It is interesting to note that during the Civil War, Kentucky oversubscribed its quotas for service in both the Union and Confederate Armies. It is also interesting that of the recent order calling up some 76,000 reservists and National Guardsmen, Kentucky will provide about 3,500 men or approximately 4.5 percent of the total. Populationwise, Kentucky provides less than 2 percent of the national population.

Undoubtedly, the dislocations of active duty will impose hardship on many members of the 100th Division and their families. The sacrifices which these citizen-soldiers have been called on to make will be felt in innumerable ways in their home communities.

The attitude of the 100th Division is best summed up by its commander, Maj. Gen. Dillman Rash, who commented, "This job is one we have been training for, and we are going to give them a crackerjack show."

The Century Division, which saw 163 days of frontline action in France and Germany during World War II and shattered two centuries of military history by capturing the stronghold city of Bitche, has been called up for 1 year. It has spent several years becoming a training organization, and it is to this mission that it is now assigned.

The excellence of the 100th Division's training capabilities is exemplified by the fact that it is the only one of 13 full training divisions called to duty at this time. In short, the Division is the best one qualified to do the job.

Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., himself a Kentuckian, has written to each member of the Kentucky congressional delegation explaining the reasons why the 100th Division was called to active duty. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Stahr's letter to me

be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, August 28, 1961.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: The following information concerning the selection of the 100th Division (Training) for mobilization and subsequent stationing at Port Polk, La., for the purpose of establishing an Army training center to expand the mobilization training base for the Army is being provided to you and the other members of the Kentucky delegation in the hope that it will be of assistance.

The selection of the 100th Division (Training) for mobilization was determined by the Department of the Army in coordination with the Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command.

The following basic criteria were utilized in arriving at this decision:

(a) The unit's reasonable geographical proximity to Fort Polk.

(b) The readiness of the division is considered higher than other training divisions located within a reasonable distance of the training site.

(c) The assigned strength is high.

(d) The division has actually conducted highly satisfactory training center instruction for the past 3 years during annual active duty for training at Fort Knox, Ky.

(e) The annual evaluation of this division during summer training has consistently reflected a high state of readiness.

Sincerely yours,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMPTON, CALIF.,
August 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Should like very much to see some favorable action on your bill, House Resolution 211. A Special House Committee on Captive Nations, it seems to me, could do a tremendous amount of good. Do hope it gets lots of support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BLANCHE BRILL.

AUGUST 22, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a clipping from Draugas reproducing the Lithuanian News Agency's ELTA (anti-Communist) statement on Soviet reaction to the Captive Nations Week.

The statement says that Radio Vilnius on July 22 had broadcast that the week had been organized by the most reactionary circles, including the "remnants of bourgeois-nationalists who managed to escape beyond the ocean." They still are embracing the idea of restoration of capitalist system in the countries of "people's democracy."

A certain Morkuckis, a returnee from Argentina, was chosen to make known a Soviet people's opinion. He categorically asserted that neither the U.S. reactionaries nor Lithuanian bourgeois-nationalists would ever see capitalist system restored in Lithuania. This was followed by denunciation of living and working conditions in capitalist countries and praise of the same conditions in "people's democracies."

Evidently, all this was a monitored program of Radio Vilnius. Such programs are monitored in Western Germany. They used to be evaluated and classified at the Library of Congress, but this has been discontinued because of lack of funds.

In the concluding part of the article, ELTA quotes Izvesta of July 19, speaking on the same subject. If needed, translation of the article could be secured through the Library of Congress.

Perhaps you could use above information as ammunition in your struggle for the Committee on Captive Nations. The fact remains that all references to captive nations are strongly resented in the Soviet Union. They are extremely sensitive on this matter. The committee would be a very good instrument of constant needling, and at the same time would serve as a reminder that the captive nations are not forgotten and written off. I wish you all the luck in this campaign.

Sincerely,

Dr. ALBERT N. TARULIS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am highly in favor of House Resolution 211.

I am writing my Congressman urging him to ask for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be formed at once.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. R. SCHROEDER.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

FREE WORLD COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., August 12, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We commend your introduction of House Resolution 211 to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations of the enemy Red empire. The peace of the world depends on free world victory in world war III. We hope that this peace may be won by the peoples of now Communist-occupied lands before it becomes necessary for the United States to extend its military operations to the use of nuclear weapons.

Yours truly,

THOMAS H. LATIMER,
President.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211 would be a good way to help captive nations.

Very truly yours,

ISABELLE CAGNEY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

AUGUST 14, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed are clippings of two articles that appeared in the American-Lithuanian daily, Draugas, published in Chicago. One appeared on July 29 and is based on my information that clarifies your role in the fight for the Committee on Captive Nations. The other is an editorial written by Draugas' people. It speaks of the Captive Nations Week and places particular emphasis on the July 24 commemoration in the House of Representatives; your address is highly praised. The same is true of your role in furthering House Resolution 211, to which the last part of the editorial is devoted.

Sincerely,

Dr. ALBERT N. TARULIS.

CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Good luck on House Resolution 211.

J. LOELETT.

BURBANK, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily approve your bill to form a Special Committee on Captive Nations at once.

Mrs. GEO. MCEBORY.

PASADENA, CALIF.

PALOS VERDES ESTATES, CALIF.,
August 15, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: All Americans should be grateful to you for introducing House Resolution 211 in Congress. A Committee on Captive Nations could do much to give hope and courage to the millions who are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

I am now reading "I Saw Poland Betrayed" written by our Ambassador to Poland at the end of World War II, and it is shocking to learn that the U.S. Government gave the Polish Government, which was completely in the hands of the Soviets, the sum of $90 million at a time when that same Government was arresting American citizens and our Ambassador was unable to ascertain where they were and was not allowed to see nor speak to them, and many of whom never did return from such imprisonment.

I hope that you will be successful in your effort to get House Resolution 211 passed, and am writing my Congressman today asking that he support this resolution.

Very truly yours,

G. S. SOULE.

AUGUST 17, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211, providing a Special House Committee on Captive nations, will, if passed, give hope to millions of enslaved persons

throughout the world. I have written my Congressman to give it his support.

I hope Congress, at the close of this session, will decide to recess, not adjourn. I am told that in the latter case, only the President can reconvene it; if Congress merely recesses a single member can call it into action again.

Very truly yours,

Miss ABLIDA C. BALLAGH.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

Fashion Editors and Singers for Padre Island, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Miss Loraine Daly, singer and author, is writing a book on the colorful and exciting history of Padre Island. The book tells of the area which my bill, S. 4, would make into a national seashore recreation area, for use for all the people.

Miss Daly's book, "The History of Padre Island," to be published in November, will deal with the history of the island from the year 1500 until the present. Miss Daly, who has made an intensive study of the island in research for her book, has said she favors passage of the bill to make Padre Island a national park.

My bill, S. 4, has been brought out of the Public Lands Subcommittee and placed before the full Senate Interior Committee. This is meaningful progress.

I request unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning Miss Daly's forthcoming book on Padre Island, which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on Sunday, August 26, 1961, under the title, "Singer: Turns Author on Padre Island."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SINGER: TURNS AUTHOR ON PADRE ISLAND

(By Gay Simpson, fashion editor of the News)

Most Texas ambassadors of good will make headlines with the spoken word but a songstress from San Antonio charms to date with her singing voice and modeling. Soon her writing talents should add new devotees as she is doing her final editing on her book on Texas' Padre Island.

Loraine Daly, who will be at the Statler Hilton Hotel with the Ken Harris orchestra until September 2, calls herself a singer first and a glamour girl second. Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Norman Weicklein, San Antonio, she finds German songs in her parents' native tongue are favorites with her audiences. She sings in talking register.

A graduate of the Incarnate Word College, she first studied seriously with the sisters.

"Six years ago I left San Antonio and wound up with my first TV and radio work in Dallas. Then after graduating as a fashion and photographic model from the House of Charm, in Sacramento, Calif., I taught there until I had finished a singing contract."

As a model for the Aluminum Co. of America, the statuesque Texan wore an aluminum swimsuit of golden Lurex threads.

"To introduce this 100-percent aluminum fabric, entertainer Hildegarde also wore a formal gown which is now in the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago.

The green-eyed beauty, whose measurements are 34–24–36, has as her favorite work clothes accordion-pleated nylon chiffon skirts "that fight back against wrinkles" and blouses of silk, velvet, or lace.

It was while Loraine was singing with the Nick Stuart orchestra that she met her husband, trumpeter Jerry Jolliffe. They were married on ABC's "Bride and Groom" show in Hollywood.

It was being chosen Miss Padre Island that inspired Loraine to write a book on the fascinating history of the island. She began studying its history and did most of her research from old newspaper files. She has followed its history from 1500 when it was a virgin wilderness to its development as a resort.

"This island that the Spanish explorers touched before the Pilgrims will be the Miami Beach of Texas. I get chill bumps when I think of how I love it with its rich history of pirates who hid their loot, the 52 ships buried in Devil's Elbow where five ocean currents meet, the island where Zachary Taylor moved his troops and where cattle lived in style with mahogany corrals.

"Your Frank Tolbert's expedition to find the lost city is included in 'The History of Padre Island' to be published in November by the Naylor Co. I'm hoping the bill before Congress to make Padre Island a national park goes through."

Miss Daly tries to keep her private life simple and casual.

"I don't want to cheat Jerry out of home life. When he finishes college, we hope to live on Padre Island where we have bought two lots. Since he is from a bookish family and is majoring in English and education, he'll probably teach. Besides keeping house, I'd like to have a TV woman's program."

Lotteries of West Germany and West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the Members of this House about the government lotteries of West Germany. There are two major regional lotteries in West Germany, and an additional one in West Berlin.

The total gross receipts of the German lotteries in 1960 amounted to about one quarter of a billion dollars. The net profit to the government in that year was close to $50 million.

West Germany and West Berlin gather large revenues from these lotteries, and we would do well to profit from their example in these days when our financial resources are being taxed as never before to enable us to meet our defense requirements. Now, more than ever, America needs a national lottery—especially if it is the only alternative to higher taxation.

Filling the Empty Seats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the August 28, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

FILLING THE EMPTY SEATS—AMERICA'S HUGE TRANSPORT NETWORK NEEDS TO BE SENSIBLY CONDENSED, WITH ITS BASIC COMPETITIVENESS PRESERVED

The greatest single transportation system in the world appears to be headed for trouble in several departments in a way that might be called typically American.

It is suffering from too much capacity.

It is unbalanced by too much fragmented competition.

It is partially frozen by the very Government regulation that was expected to keep it from becoming rigid under monopoly ownership—private or Government.

Despite the fact that the heavily used New Haven Railroad is now bankrupt, that busy Capital Airlines was consumed by deficits, that standing-room-only commuter travel is encountering discontinuances, that common-carrier trucks are being challenged by producer-owned trucks, and that the eastern railroads are in a gigantic battle to preserve their skins through mergers, the situation does not yet amount to a crisis. The Kennedy administration was probably wise to defer sending Congress its transportation crisis message this year.

But the lawmakers should be preparing to take action next session. For much public and private money, as well as travelers' and shippers' anguish, can be saved by moving ahead of crisis conditions.

The automobile is responsible for a good part of America's transportation overcapacity. While trains once carried some 83 percent of all passenger traffic, the individual car now carries 88 percent. And with an average of less than two persons per six-passenger car.

RAILROAD DEFICITS; MISSING PASSENGERS

Today Government provides rights-of-way for air, water, and road travel—three of the four major transport systems. The result is a rush of buses, trucks, barges, and planes to use the Government-built tracks.

But railroads have shrunk little in carrying capacity. So seats—and boxcars—are often empty.

Between 1946 and 1957 the passenger deficit of U.S. rail lines increased from $139,776,000 to $723,670,000. Only liberalized Federal regulations permitting abandonment of little used lines has let this drop back to $485 million in 1960—still far too much red ink for the financial health of lines needing money for new equipment and better service.

It is estimated, furthermore, that freight operations are so far below capacity that an additional 75 percent could be handled.

Buses, which have been generally holding their own, have also had to contend with an uneconomic increase in empty seats.

Even the bustling, expanding airlines suffer from this problem. There has been

an increase in empty-seat-miles flown from 1,580,000 in 1946 to 16,642,000, in 1959.

For years some rail lines were able to keep their net income steady by deferring maintenance and replacement of equipment. But the chickens have begun to come home to roost.

FRANCHISE FOR THE VICIOUS CIRCLE ROUTE

In the Doyle transportation study group's comprehensive report to the Senate Commerce Committee this year note is made of how this process has become a vicious circle. With less freight traffic, the railroads have condensed service. Trains are then run on a tonnage basis rather than a schedule. They are longer. Yards cannot handle them easily. Delays increase. Business decreases further. Borrowing in financial markets costs the railroads more because they represent a greater financial risk.

Even some of the airlines are now on the borderline of what is called debt financing as compared with equity financing. The equity value of their planes and equipment does not cover their debts.

The higher cost of borrowing, of course, serves only to add to the problem of declining net income. (Railroad nets dropped 40 percent between 1955 and 1959.) This is a hard circle to break out of.

Obviously when the railroads in general—and eastern railroads in particular—are having such problems they are no longer the kind of monopolistic octopus that the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally designed to fight. Already some 150 trains have been discontinued, and 9,859 miles of track were abandoned between 1946 and 1959.

But in any solution of the persent problem the railroads must remain a key ingredient. In the fields of long distance freight and short distance passenger commuting there are tasks that only the railroad, with its large capacity and unhindered rights-of-way, can perform well.

The Kennedy administration's deferred legislative program would take care of some of the immediate inequities. It reportedly would permit faster tax writeoffs on rail equipment. It would allow tax deferment on reserve funds if these were used within a reasonable period to purchase needed new equipment. It would seek to have State and local tax overloads on railroads reduced.

These are logical steps. They amount to a form of support that does not just subsidize the status quo but aids a sensible modernization.

SUBJECTS CONGRESS OUGHT TO ACT UPON

But in addition a much more far reaching—and delicate—legislative threshold must be crossed if the transportation system of the Nation is to continue an efficient evolution. Congress ought to be asked to take steps covering the following:

Mergers—The lawmakers should instruct the ICC to consider all current merger requests as a whole, making certain that each major region is served by strong, competing systems as a result of mergers. Quite understandably, current mergers tend to involve only matings of the strong and profitable with the strong and profitable. Weak links need to be integrated, too.

Joint routes and rates—Congress should make clear its intent that the ICC use its power to force rail, truck, air, and ship lines to give shippers rates for joint routes. Such a policy strictly enforced might begin to end the rivalries that force shippers to use only one medium of transport when good sense would demand that a shipment start, say, by rail and be transshipped by truck.

Common carriage—When a meatpacker buys his own fleet of delivery trucks and then begins to pick up orders of fruit in them for the return run, private carriage begins to challenge the position of common carriage. Private carriage is not controlled under the strict rate and route decrees that the ICC imposes on common carriers. The result is that unregulated private truck use increased 350 percent between 1946 and 1959.

Common carriage is vital to the Nation's economic health. A balance between private and common carriage must be preserved. Therefore the administration's recommmendation that private carriage be placed under some regulation makes sense—if only to assure that ballast runs charge going rates and don't cheat common carriers of business.

MORE VIGOR NEEDED IN RAIL MANAGEMENTS

Transportation companies.—The logical next step beyond joint rates and routes is the formation of transportation companies, firms operating trains, trucks, buses, and barges. These would have to be as firmly policed by the ICC as the powerful railroads were early in the century. They should be allowed to coalesce only where fair competition in the public interest will clearly be preserved. But they seem inevitably a part of the future in an integrated America.

At present there would appear to be few firms ready for such crossbreeding. But Congress should consider instructing the ICC to give them a go-ahead on an experimental basis as soon as any applicant appears.

The Doyle Committee report recommends, wisely, that if such a go-ahead is given the combine be licensed for only 3 years. This would permit periodic review to make sure competition is preserved.

Many other steps need to be taken within the transport industry itself. Railroad management needs to be shaken into more vigorous salesmanship and active recruiting of young executives. Labor must cooperate in trimming out unneeded personnel. There is sense in suggestions that major lines set up an independent subsidiary management to deal exclusively with passenger service.

The experience of the North Western, which overhauled its Chicago commuter operation and is now making a profit, is encouraging. So is the determination of Erie-Lackawanna to do the same thing in New York.

Increases in population and business volume mean that the current overcapacity of American transportation will eventually disappear. But careful research as to the pattern of this growth, plus more forward-looking Government regulation, are needed to prevent the adjustment from being wasteful and costly.

General Federation of Women's Clubs Urges Action on Election Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as one who is very much interested in the need for changes in our electoral procedures, I am happy to note that the General Federation of Women's Clubs at their 1961 conference took a firm position on this very important issue. Commenting on a number of electoral problems, including disenfranchisement because of State and local residency requirements, the Federation urged the establishment of a bipartisan committee to make a study and recommendations in order that we can develop modern, efficient and equitable campaigns and election procedures. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator KEFAUVER, and I recently introduced a Senate joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to liberalize residence requirements for voting in presidential elections. Our amendment is Senate Joint Resolution 128. It would require a 90-day maximum on residence requirements and would also require that where a citizen is qualified in all other respects at both his old and new residence, he shall be permitted to vote for President and Vice President. I believe that this is a very important and meaningful electoral reform, and it is my hope that the Congress will act upon it in the near future.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. EFFICIENCY IN ELECTION PROCEDURES

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is cognizant that, to effect the greatest efficiency in operation, it is necessary from time to time to review methods and procedures; and

Whereas modern transportation and communication facilities enable the public to become better informed on candidates and issues and eliminate the necessity for lengthy campaigns; and

Whereas the method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States merits consideration and study; and

Whereas many responsible citizens in changing their place of residence have been deprived of their right of franchise in national elections due to the variation in State residency laws: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges that a bipartisan committee be appointed by the Congress of the United States to study and make recommendations for modern, efficient, and equitable campaigns and election procedures.

(Submitted by the resolutions committee.)

Juvenile Delinquency Control Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8028) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training and personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 8028, a bill designed to "provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and dem-

onstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problem relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields."

Having always been interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency and having chairmaned a special legislative committee to investigate this problem in Ohio when a member of the Ohio Senate, I cannot help but believe that the amount requested for this study is wholly inadequate to do the job that needs to be done. However, this is a start in the right direction and I support the effort.

Home-Study Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I was present recently when Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges received the first Home-Study Man of the Year Award from International Correspondence Schools of Scranton, Pa. Standing nearby was the 7 millionth student to enroll with this world famous home-study institute and he, like Secretary Hodges some four decades before him, chose a course related to his job so that he can move ahead and qualify for new job opportunities as they evolve.

The people of my State have ample reason to be proud of the national and international educational service provided by this leader among home-study institutes, a fact duly recognized by the States of Ohio—where "Mr. Seven Million" comes from—and Pennsylvania, and the city of Scranton, which proclaimed August 14 to be "Home-Study Week" and singled out ICS for special commendation.

The campus of ICS, often called the world's schoolhouse, has always been in Scranton. It was founded by Thomas J. Foster, editor of the Shenandoah Miners Herald, who first realized the value of home study when question and answer columns in his paper helped prospective mining supervisors pass State examinations. Modern technology long ago made the first ICS course in coal mine safety obsolete, but keeping up with the rapidly changing job requirements of our dynamic economy has always been a prime objective of ICS. The successful use of special courses it developed to help train U.S. military personnel in both World Wars led to the establishment of the Armed Forces Institute. Nor can we ignore the heavy reliance that our opponent in the cold war is putting on home study—it has been estimated that some 50 percent of all persons being educated at the college level in Soviet Russia are studying with 22 institutions by the correspondence method.

In our country, it seems inevitable that there will be an increasing demand for accredited home-study courses to help upgrade job skills, raise general educational levels, expand cultural horizons and broaden human understanding. On the basis of past performance, those of us from Pennsylvania have every expectation that International Correspondence Schools will make a major contribution toward meeting these learning needs of our Nation.

The text of the Home-Study Award to Secretary Hodges follows:

HOME STUDY MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 1961

To the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, U.S. Secretary of Commerce—

Whose own career in private business and public service is an inspiration to the more than 2 million Americans now engaged in home study, exemplifying as it does, the priceless qualities of personal sacrifice, thirst for knowledge and a determination to qualify for and succeed in the most challenging assignments; and

Whose creative leadership as Secretary of Commerce is uniting every sector of our economy in an alliance for economic progress, geared to the modernization of U.S. industry and the maximizing of new employment and reemployment opportunities for American workers; and

Whose public expression of his own confidence in the vitality of the private economy was a significant factor in stimulating a business upturn and stemming unemployment early in 1961; and

Whose tireless efforts to improve the business climate at home and pioneer new markets for U.S. goods abroad, projects the useful vigor and confidence of a free society; wherein business has a voice in the deliberations of government while discharging its responsibility to serve the public interest, International Correspondence Schools, oldest and largest home-study institute in the United States, presents its Home Study Man of the Year Award for 1961 and confers upon Secretary Hodges membership in its hall of fame.

JOHN C. VILLAUME,
President.

(Presented to Hon. Luther H. Hodges in Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.)

All Unnecessary Spending Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are puzzled over the administration's continued request for record spending on new domestic programs in this period when it is necessary to commit vast sums to strengthen America's defenses at home and throughout the world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter I received from Mr. Joseph C. Drilling, managing director of station WJW–TV, Cleveland, Ohio, which clearly expresses the thoughts of so many on this subject:

WJW–TV TELEVISION,
Cleveland, Ohio, August 7, 1961.

The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: I have been concerned for some time about our public spending under the present administration. Recently, action was taken which influenced me to write to you with an expression of opinion concerning some of the vital expenditures being made and being contemplated by the Government.

It is, I feel, important that emphasis be placed on the subject as one of service to the country and your constituents, and not merely as the vocal objection of a single taxpayer.

The contemplated deficit is difficult to understand and even more perplexing to accept. No sound businessman likes a deficit operation and I personally feel the administration should look to reducing rather than increasing this deficit.

In regard to the explosive Cuban situation and the overall foreign relations policy, strength is needed. I am in complete accord with a strong policy in foreign relations and the essential military strength to support it. Funds to support this foreign relations policy can be readily obtainable, should the Government substantially reduce the nonmilitary expenditures. A wealth of unnecessary items are draining the moneys from vital areas. I feel it is most important that we stress the need to cut down on heavy outlays in the direction of farm relief and foreign relief, to name just a few.

Without evidence of a reduction in unnecessary political spending, which is not now visible, individuals and companies are distressed at the call to tighten their belts. We are all eager to do our part and will continue our concerted effort toward the best interests of our country. I hold great hope that you will help influence your colleagues to follow some of the thoughts I have expressed.

Thank you sincerely for your considerations of the past and those of the future. We stand ready to assist you at any time.

Cordially,

JOSEPH C. DRILLING,
Managing Director.

Airline Proposes Tourist's Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Bonanza Air Lines, which is the first airline in the Nation to convert entirely to jets, recently inaugurated a new program of low excursion fares and less expensive air travel in the four States served by this important Nevada company.

From all indications, the excursion fare program has proven a financial success in increased volume and also as a cure for declining airline revenues. The operators are hopeful that increased commercial revenues will have the salutary effect of reducing subsidies.

The new program, which I hope will become widely adopted in the aviation industry, could be of great assistance to the U.S. foreign travel service, which seeks to promote tourism from foreign lands to this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article dealing with Bonanza Air Lines' proposals which appeared in the New York Times on August 5, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE PROPOSES TOURISTS' SCHEME: WOULD SELL NONRESIDENTS UNLIMITED TRAVEL TICKETS

(By Joseph Carter)

Bonanza Air Lines, which appears to have struck a rich lode in excursion fares, has come up with another travel plan, which it describes as "entirely new for airlines."

G. Robert Henry, executive vice president of the western carrier, said in a telephone interview in Las Vegas, Nev., yesterday, that the plan "should go over with a bang."

Bonanza has filed a proposal with the Civil Aeronautics Board under which customers living outside the four-State Bonanza area could buy unlimited travel over the system for 15 days for $90, or 30 days at $160. The airline, which operates in California, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah, wants to put the program in effect October 1.

Original transportation to that area would have to begin at points in this country east of the Mississippi, or in Alaska, Hawaii, or below the 25th parallel in Mexico or other points outside the United States.

Mr. Henry compared the Bonanza air tour plan to the successful Eurailpass, available to North and South Americans on 13 European railroads since January 1959. For $110 Eurailpass permits unlimited travel on any member railroad, for 1 month. A $150 pass is good for 2 months, and a $180 pass for 3 months.

The airline executive said Bonanza had received a number of expressions of interest from foreign and domestic carriers concerning the air tour proposal.

PASSENGERS UP 20 PERCENT

Mr. Henry said the airline carried 154,117 passengers in the first half of the year, a gain of 20 percent over the similar period of 1960. Bonanza flew 38,639,000 passenger-miles in the first 6 months of this year for a gain of 21 percent.

Bonanza excursion fares started in April. Mr. Henry said that traffic in the excursion markets in the second quarter of this year was 121 percent greater than in the comparable period last year. "While revenue plane-miles flown in the first half were down slightly," he continued, "reduced resort and commercial fares produced far more than enough additional traffic to offset lowered yield."

The airline operates nine 40-passenger Fairchild F-27A jet-prop transports. It serves major cities and resorts in the four States.

The carrier has two excursion fares currently in effect. One is a 7-day commuter fare with a reduction of about 25 percent on several routes without any restriction on days of use. The other is a 10-day time restrictions and discounts of 22 to 38 percent.

Mr. Henry noted that the airline filed a so-called youth-fare plan with the CAB in June providing for a 50-percent discount to travelers 12 to 21 years of age. It is similar to the plans announced late last month and early this month by American and other airlines.

Mr. Henry said the Bonanza plan was rejected because of technicalities but was refiled with the Board last month. The airline intends to put it into effect August 10. "It would allow reservations at any time," he said, "and is not on a space-availabl basis as are the plans of the other carriers."

Depressed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, when the depressed areas bill was sent to Congress by the President we were urged to pass it at once because of the immediate need for legislation in this field. The following editorial from the Findlay, Ohio, Republican-Courier indicates how unnecessary it is to have this program. It further indicates that the taxpayers are becoming a bit weary of having their hard-earned money spent on useless projects and the needless expansion of Federal bureaus. It has become apparent that some of the New Frontier programs ought to have been studied more carefully before they were whiplashed through Congress:

DEPRESSED?

Many Congressmen and citizens questioned the utility of the new Depressed Areas Act and pointed out its shortcomings. Pleas of "national need" and sympathy for the unemployed drowned them out, though, and the law now is being carried out.

Seldom does a new law verify the misgivings of its critics so quickly.

Even Congressmen who voted for it are amazed that already one county in every four in the United States has been declared a depressed area. Often this has come as a surprise to the local people, who hadn't noticed any distress.

Dawson County in central Nebraska, which earned $60 million through farming last year, found itself "depressed" by Federal definition. Just before the label was attached, a new auto parts plant was finished in Dawson County town of Cozad.

The plant cost $4.5 million, and needed 250 workers. The owners had a hard time recruiting a work force—because of full employment.

Senator JOHN TOWER of Texas complains that 47 east Texas towns have been declared depressed, and are nothing of the kind. For instance, in a typical recent week the depressed little city of Tyler began building new homes worth a third of a million dollars.

Officialdom in Washington celebrated the declaration of Gassville, Ark., as a Depressed Area No. 1. Gradually the facts came out. There will be 1,000 new jobs there, all right, but dickering for the new plant had been going on for years and was cinched when a necessary $535,000 bond issue was approved by local voters before any Federal aid was available. Gassville will get $129,000 as a gift from the rest of us to build a new water system.

If the Depressed Area Act hadn't been passed, the area would have raised this money locally, too. But now that the fact is in force, people everywhere will look to the U.S. Treasury first instead of using their own resources.

The passage of this law points up the necessity of skepticism about new welfare legislation at a time when defense spending must be heavy. We could easily depress the other three-quarters of the United States.

An Old but True Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, no one has been penalized more severely for his improved efficiency than the American farmer who has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. Since 1947 to 1949 the prices the farmer received for his crops and livestock have dropped 12 percent while the price he pays has risen 20 percent. As his production efficiency has gone up his income has gone down, yet a large segment of the American people, especially those living in large urban areas, still believe that the American farmer is coddled by Government. An enlightening article on this subject written by Mr. Carl Wickstrom, of Marshfield, Mo., recently was published in many southwest Missouri newspapers and under leave to extend and revise my remarks the article follows:

AN OLD BUT TRUE STORY

According to the best estimates of our intelligence experts and our foreign relations specialists; Russia, Red China, and the satellite countries do not want an all-out war at the present time. They are avoiding war because of a food shortage.

Today, the Iron Curtain countries are in trouble with their food supply. And, apparently, it's fortunate they are because the lack of food seems to be a major deterrent to an all-out war. If this is true, it follows that our Nation's food supply is as important to us in a military sense as it is to our economic system.

A lot of people are badly misinformed concerning American agriculture. Few people realize that the total investment in American agriculture is nearly $200 billion. Even in these days when we speak of millions and billions, the investment in agriculture adds up to a lot of money.

Remember, too, that agriculture is the biggest single industry in the United States, directly employing 7.1 million workers. It takes 6 million workers to supply farmers with their production needs, and about another 10 million to store, transport, process, and merchandise the products of American agriculture. The United States has grown from a Nation in which 1 of every 4 workers had to produce food, to a Nation where 1 farmer produces food for 26 people.

Today, most people in the world spend one-half of their disposable income for food. In some nations it is necessary to work 18 hours a day just to be reasonably sure of a meager and not too nourishing meal, two times a day. By way of contrast, in the United States consumers spend about one-fifth, or 20 percent of their income for food. That leaves 80 percent for the products of industry; houses, medical care, education, and recreation. The farmers are furnishing more and better food now than they did 10 or 15 years ago.

If a consumer in 1960 had bought the same kinds and quantities of food he ate in 1935, he would have spent only 14 percent of his present-day income. The consumers are paying for special packaging, inspections, etc.

For all items on the cost of living index other than food, the increase to mid-1961 was 31 percent. Transportation was up more than 46 percent, housing 32 percent, rent 43 percent and medical care 60 percent.

Food (and this includes food served in restaurants) increased not quite 21 percent.

Putting it another way, 1 hour's work in a factory buys a lot more food today than it did 20 or 30 years ago. In 1929 an hour's labor would buy one-half pound of round steak, by 1939 it had increased to 1.8 pounds, and in 1960 an hour's labor would buy 2.2 pounds of steak. As far as milk goes, in 1929 an hour's labor bought 7.8 pints of milk. This had increased to 10.4 pints in 1939 and today you can get 17.6 pints of milk for an hour's labor.

Let's look at what has happened to the farmer. The farmer's share of the food dollar in 1960 was 39 cents, 40 cents in 1940 and 53 cents in the war year, 1945. As a general rule, the farmer's share of our food dollar declines as the amount of food processing increases. The wheatgrower's share of the consumer dollar spent for white flour is 33 cents. When the flour is mixed with other ingredients and baked as white bread, the farmer's share of his wheat drops to 11 cents. The farmer's share of the consumer dollar spent for milk last year was 43 cents.

We find the consumer on the plus side right down the ledger sheet. Yet, in far too many cases the consumer still pictures the farmer as an inefficient public charge receiving gigantic sums of money in subsidies and Government aid. And, what about this efficiency business? Efficiency is a favorite word of a good many experts. Let's apply it to agriculture and see how it measures up.

One hour of farm labor today produces four times as much food as it did in the 1920's. Crop production is 65 percent per acre higher. Output per breeding animal is 88 percent greater. Productivity of the American farmworker is now increasing about three times as fast as the productivity of workers in industry.

That is the farmer's record of efficiency, but he hasn't profited from it. He has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. Since 1947–49 the prices the farmer received for his crops and livestock have dropped 12 percent while the price he pays has risen 20 percent. Thus, while the farmer has continued his production efficiency at an unmatched and unprecedented rate, his income has gone down.

There probably is no simple answer to the farm problem. There are a lot of complexities to producing, processing and distributing food for 175 million people each and every day of the year. On the other hand, before a solution to the farm problem can be found, the understanding of the nonfarm segment of America is a must. So, let's tell the American consumer our side of the story. The American farmer has nothing to be ashamed of. On the contrary, there is every reason for pride and self-assurance in the heritage of American agriculture.

Where Los Angeles Stands on the Upper Colorado Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the President's budget includes an item of some $13 million to continue construction of the Federal transmission system for the Upper Colorado River project. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is a major user of Colorado River power, as well as water.

To clarify any possible misunderstanding in connection with the transmission line question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an explanatory telegram that I have received from Los Angeles. It is from Mr. Samuel B. Nelson, general manager of the department of water and power, dated August 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 26, 1961.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A question has been raised as to whether an appropriation for Federal construction of the transmission lines serving the Colorado River storage project would adversely affect the interests of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. We believe that it would not, and we recommend this appropriation, although our system is not included within the service area of the proposed lines.

We, with other California agencies, have urged Federal development of the Colorado River between Glen Canyon and Hoover Dam (including the Bridge Canyon, Marble Canyon and Kanab project sites, and transmission lines interconnecting them with each other and with Glen Canyon Dam). We believe that power generated on the Colorado in the lower basin will be more equitably distributed among the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California if all dams, powerplants and transmission lines on the river are federally owned than if any of them are built and owned under license by individual States or State agencies.

We believe that Federal ownership of the Colorado River storage project lines will facilitate interchange of upper basin and lower basin power to the advantage of all. We believe that this consideration should be controlling in this instance, quite aside from any policy or political choice as between private and public power.

SAMUEL B. NELSON,
General Manager and Chief Engineer,
Department of Water and Power,
City of Los Angeles.

Protest Against Any Attempt To Muzzle or Gag the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to the President of the United States from a highly respected citizen of my State, Mr. Ulric M. Gwynn, Jr., manager of the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce.

Freedom of speech is among our most cherished rights in this great Nation. Mr. Gwynn, together with countless other citizens, is rightly concerned over the possibility of any abridgement of that freedom.

Military officials are guaranteed that constitutional right just as fully as any other citizen. Yet, our military leaders are attacked and condemned when, based upon their unique qualifications gained from firsthand observation available to few of us, they attempt to alert our citizenry to the menace of the international Communist conspiracy.

The much-publicized case of General Walker is a case in point. Mr. Gwynn's letter refers to criticism leveled against Capt. Robert T. Kieling, commanding officer of the Naval Air Station at Minneapolis, who performed a notable public and patriotic service in participating in an action seminar on this subject.

I am grateful that a constituent of mine is among those raising their voices in protest against any attempt to "muzzle" or "gag" the military. Mr. Gwynn is but one of many who are shocked and concerned at recent happenings suggesting such a turn of events.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 29, 1961.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I was privileged to be a participant in the program known as "Project Action," presented at the Naval Air Station, Minneapolis, Minn., on April 28 and 29, 1961. I have been very much amazed at certain statements in the press attributed to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in which criticism has been leveled at Capt. Robert T. Kieling, commanding officer of the Naval Air Station at Minneapolis.

It is my opinion that Captain Kieling performed with dignity fitting his command and his position as a naval officer of the U.S. Service. At no time in any of his welcome comments was he critical of your administration and, in fact, was inspiring in his remarks of awakening American citizens to take an active part in informing themselves against international communism.

The speakers who appeared on the 2-day seminar left no doubt in my mind that a grassroots undertanding by every man, woman, and child in this country is necessary if the American ideals are to be upheld. One of the speakers, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, emphatically pointed out he could not talk on the subject "'The Philosophy of Communism' since the word philosophy from the Greeks meant love, and there is no love in communism."

As President of the United States and as Commander-in-Chief of the armed services of our great Nation, I am certain it will be your earnest endeavor to preserve for all, a continuing awareness and appreciation of the heritages which we hold so dear.

Respectfully yours,

ULRIC M. GWYNN, Jr.

Mrs. Harold Price, Aid on Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the hospital ship *Hope* is soon to return to the United States after about a year of work in the Far East as a medical teaching

center. During the time the ship was anchored at Saigon, Mrs. Harold L. Price of Hazleton, Pa., served as a volunteer secretary.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about Mrs. Price which appeared in the Hazleton Sentinel on August 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZLETON WOMAN IS AID ON STAFF OF HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE" IN CAPITAL OF SOUTH VIETNAM—MRS. HAROLD PRICE HELPS PROJECT WHILE HUSBAND SEEKS COAL DEPOSITS

Mrs. Harold L. Price, of Hazleton, was in Saigon, feeling a little bit bored. She was living in the handsome old Majestic Hotel overlooking the Saigon River, in one of the world's loveliest cities.

But her husband, who is in South Vietnam for the International Cooperation Administration leading a team of engineers searching for anthracite in the jungle, was only in Saigon 5 days a month. Without household chores, Mrs. Price didn't have much to do.

At home in Hazleton, Mrs. Price had been active. She is past president of the League of Women Voters, on the board of directors of the Crippled Children's Association, a volunteer Red Cross worker, and had been a nurse's aid.

One day, she was walking on Tu Do Street when she ran into Ralph Bellamy, whom she had seen in movies and Broadway plays. When two Americans meet halfway around the world, they don't wait for introductions.

"I asked him what he was doing in Saigon," Mrs. Price said. "He told me he was making a documentary film for NBC about the hospital ship *Hope*." The *Hope* is tied in the Saigon River across the street from Mrs. Price's hotel. It has been there since arriving in South Vietnam in mid-June on the last phase of its maiden voyage.

"He asked me what I was doing," Mrs. Price went on, "and I told him almost nothing. He said they needed extra help on the ship and the next morning I went down there and was put to work immediately."

Mrs. Price, whose Hazleton home is at 125 West Fern Street, is now a volunteer secretary aboard *Hope*, handling communications between the 15,000-ton ship and the shore points where *Hope* staff members are working. She is in charge of the communications center.

The *Hope* is a former Navy hospital ship which was loaned to the People to People Health Foundation for use as a medical teaching center. The project is supported by contributions from the American public and much of its equipment and supplies came in the form of donations from business and industry.

Like Mrs. Price, many of its medical staff are volunteers. The group includes a permanent corps of doctors, nurses, dentists, technicians, pharmacists, and secretaries who sailed from the United States last fall and spent 7½ months working in the islands of the Republic of Indonesia before going to South Vietnam.

These people are joined for periods of several months at a time by physicians who are specialists from many fields of medicine. They go to *Hope* as unpaid volunteers, then are replaced by others in their fields as they come home to resume their practices. (One of these volunteers now with *Hope* in Saigon is Dr. Howard Kremer, a Philadelphia internist.)

The staff of *Hope* is widely scattered in Saigon. The ship is anchored in the city, but the staff flies off to Delta villages to hold clinics and goes ashore to six city hospitals, where *Hope* personnel are working and teaching.

Meanwhile, the ship's wards are full and three operating rooms are busy all day. Vietnamese nurses, medical interns and residents are working and studying aboard the floating medical center.

Communications is an important part of the *Hope* Saigon program, and Mrs. Price is filling a great need.

The Hazleton couple will be in Saigon until next March, though Mrs. Price's *Hope* chores will last only until September, when the ship returns to the United States from its first mission.

Until then, Mrs. Price will be working an 8:30-to-5 day on the ship and she says, enjoying it tremendously.

Vowing She Would Ne'er Consent, Consented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Krock has an excellent analysis of the foreign-aid legislation in this morning's New York Times. He quite correctly observes that the conference report represents a position the administration now accepts as wholly satisfactory, although opposing it vigorously for weeks. In fact, the administration could have had substantially the same provisions as provided in the conference report by adopting the Byrd amendment. I submit that the conference report is a clear example of sound congressional action, correcting unsound executive proposals. Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer Mr. Krock's column for the RECORD:

VOWING SHE WOULD NE'ER CONSENT, CONSENTED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—It takes a lot to surprise Senator BYRD of Virginia where events in the arena of politics are concerned. But even he must have rubbed his eyes when he read last night's White House statement that the agreement of the House-Senate conferees on the modus operandi for long-term development loans in the foreign aid program was "wholly satisfactory" to the President.

For the conferees agreed on a 5-year "authorization" of the President to make development loan commitments in a total of $7.2 billion, with an actual appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962, but "subject" to annual appropriations by Congress. But what the President had fought for to the finish was a Treasury borrowing credit of $8.8 billion over 5 years, entirely freed of the restraint of the annual appropriation procedure of Congress. And the administration had proclaimed with one voice that this delegation of Congress' power of the purse was absolutely indispensable to the viability of the development loan program.

SURPRISE FOR SENATOR BYRD

But there was a more personal factor of surprise for Senator BYRD in the White House announcement. The President had successfully used extraordinary pressures to defeat a Byrd amendment which gave him the same 5-year authorization to commit the full $8.8 billion he sought for development loans, $8.8 billion more than the conferees authorized, subject only to the same annual appropriation procedure of Congress the conferees imposed.

The White House explained this about-face on the differing phraseology of the conference report and the Byrd amendment, asserting that the latter "recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will continue to be forthcoming over a period of years." On this wholly semantic argument the administration based its rating of the conference report as "wholly satisfactory" in contrast with the Byrd amendment. But the following text of the amendment invites the conclusion that this was a tactical move to cover an enforced retreat:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated [supplied] to the President for use in carrying out [the long-term development loans program] such sums, not to exceed $1,187 million for use beginning in the fiscal year 1962, and not to exceed $1,900 million for use beginning in the fiscal years 1963 through 1966, as the Congress shall determine to be necessary, which amounts shall remain available until expended.

THINGS EQUAL TO THE SAME THING

One is as clear a congressional statement of intent as the other. And the practical restraint imposed by Congress' retention of the power of the purse is precisely the same in the conferees' language—"subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds"—as in BYRD's language—"as the Congress shall determine to be necessary," because each specifies an authorized 5-year commitment total in annual amounts. Except that BYRD's total increases the amount authorized. This fundamental similarity, including the rejection by both of the President's basic request for foreclosed 5-year Treasury borrowing authority, was generally acknowledged here today, as for example this comment by the Evening Star: "The compromise finally agreed upon is virtually identical with the BYRD amendment."

For his own part, Senator BYRD observed that the conferees' report and its acceptance by the President "vindicated the efforts" of himself, the House Republicans and some others, "to preserve to Congress the right to appropriate, and assured that each year's appropriation for development loans committed would be properly expended." But he wondered with many others why, and on what counsel, the President had been induced to climb out so far on a weak limb from which his retreat had to be made in full public view.

In such circumstances as these, however, the direct consequences so freely prophesied rarely materialize. The administration of foreign aid, particularly of development loan projects, will probably be greatly improved by the refusal of Congress to relinquish its only effective power of review of Government spending. The President's leadership will suffer no serious permanent damage from his defeat, and even may usefully impel him to reappraise the judgment of some advisers. And the principle of long-term development planning has been salvaged by Congress from the blunders of its advocates.

Foreign Aid Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, in a large sense the consideration of the

foreign-aid bill was a contest of the wills of the executive and legislative branches of Government, testing whether this country's purse strings should be handled in a free and easy manner by the Chief Executive or jealously guarded by the legislators.

Now that the conferees have filed a report, each one of the contestants is claiming victory, and I insert into the RECORD two editorial articles from two leading newspapers presenting some highly interesting observations concerning who might have won and who might have lost:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 31, 1961]

BOUND BY BILLIONS

It's clear enough that the administration won't get the kind of long-term financing of foreign-aid loans it wanted. But a fairly obvious defeat is being hailed by some as a moral victory for the White House.

As whipped into shape by a House-Senate conference committee, the aid-financing bill omits the administration scheme of direct Treasury borrowing. Instead, it authorizes loan spending of up to $7.2 billion over the next 5 years and empowers the administration to make commitments to foreign countries in advance of annual congressional appropriations. This grant of authority, it's said, puts Congress under a new moral commitment to make good U.S. aid promises as they come due.

Congress has committed itself, to be sure. But when in the past 15 years has Congress not been committed to maintaining a U.S. foreign-aid program? Wisely or not, Congress has in practice long given U.S. policymakers assurance that foreign aid won't be cut off abruptly.

But Congress is no more bound now than it ever was to give the aid givers precisely the program they want. For all the talk of aid financing, the debate this year actually was about whether the White House or Congress would set the standards by which U.S. aid is judged. In keeping the check of annual appropriations, Congress has sensibly upheld its right to tell the White House where it's wrong.

And there are plenty of things that can go wrong with the administration's new aid plans. Moreover, many assumptions and practices proved wrong and wasteful in the past remain unchanged. In a sense, the administration has won a considerable victory in convincing a skeptical Congress that new billions ought to be committed on the strength of promised reforms.

So there is indeed a moral commitment involved in the foreign-aid program. But it falls squarely on the administration which has promised to Congress and the American people that foreign aid will be wisely spent.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 30, 1961]

WHOLLY SATISFACTORY

It may seem like a typographical error, but it isn't. For this is what the White House actually said—that the foreign aid financing compromise worked out by Senate-House conferees is "wholly satisfactory."

This compromise agreement authorizes the President to make foreign aid commitments over a 5-year period. But there will be no Treasury borrowing or, as some called it, "back-door financing."

Mr. Kennedy wanted legislative authority to finance the program through Treasury borrowing, and some of his aids were suggesting that doomsday would be just around the corner if he didn't get it. But these dire forecasts evidently were part and parcel of what the late Wendell Willkie used to call "campaign oratory." For now that the battle is over, the White House puts its stamp of approval on the compromise and correctly says that it provides "reasonable assurance" that long-term aid commitments will be met.

The main objective—orderly planning on a long-range basis—surely is attainable under this compromise. The necessary appropriations, of course, will have to be sought on an annual basis. But this, we think, is as it should be, for Congress, as a matter of principle, ought not to surrender its control over the public purse. The granting of authority to make commitments obviously imposes a special duty on Congress in the future to refrain from the kind of politicking which would expose this country to accusations of bad faith. We do not believe there will be any difficulty on this score, however, provided the commitments made are sound and that the program as a whole is competently administered.

Major credit for this victory for sound financing belongs to the Republicans in the House. But it might be pointed out that much time could have been saved if the administration had been willing to accept the amendment offered early this month by Senator BYRD of Virginia. The compromise finally agreed upon is virtually identical with the Byrd amendment.

Testimony of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, Third Massachusetts District, Before Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Foreign Affairs Committee, on House Joint Resolution 488, To Establish a Temporary Loan Guarantee Program for the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship, August 29, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert testimony which I recently gave before the distinguished House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, urging Federal encouragement and support of the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship to be held at Orange, Mass.:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, THIRD MASSACHUSETTS DISTRICT, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 488, TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM FOR THE 1962 WORLD SPORT PARACHUTING CHAMPIONSHIP, AUGUST 29, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as author of one of the bills to establish a temporary loan guarantee program in connection with the 1962 World Sport Parachuting Championship to be held at Orange, Mass., I am very thankful indeed for the expeditious manner in which this outstanding committee has scheduled hearings on these bills and, of course, for the opportunity to appear here today.

In my opinion, great importance is attached to this scheduled event, which is the sixth World Sport Parachuting Championship.

You recall that you previously considered and reported what is now Public Law 86–796, providing for an invitation to attend this great event and such invitation has been delivered by an official of the American Embassy in Vienna to the Parachuting Committee of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale and has already been accepted by 15 or more nations.

It should be noted that the selection of the United States as host for 1962 was opposed publicly by the Soviet Union on the grounds that this country could not conduct a championship parachuting event as well as the three previous events of this type which were held behind the Iron Curtain.

As planned, this sixth championship will be the largest international aviation competition ever held in the Western Hemisphere. The championship will be conducted over a 26-day period in August, of 1962. Fourteen of these days will be competition days—the remainder scheduled for rest and recreation of the competitors. It is expected that from 15 to 20 nations of the world will be represented and that up to 500,000 spectators will attend. In 1958, 600,000 people attended the fourth biannual competition at Bratislavia, Czechoslovakia.

I am informed that as host State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has appropriated $125,000, and that $100,000 of this appropriation is contingent upon at least a matching amount from a Federal source.

For that reason, if this important championship is to be assured for the United States, the Congress must immediately approve legislation guaranteeing a loan by private banks to the nonprofit championship corporation in an amount not to exceed $500,000.

These funds would be employed to promote the championship on a national and international level and as operating funds for the competition period—August 9 to September 4, 1962. The $100,000 provided by the Commonwealth will be allocated for promotion on a statewide basis, improving the present facility and planning and coordinating the event.

I am informed that management consultants retained by the commission promoting the event have estimated that if the championship is promoted on a modest scale, it will gross proceeds sufficient to pay all the expenses of the event.

In that case, of course, the proposed loan guarantee of the Federal Government would be inoperative and the Government would never have to pay out 1 cent.

So far as I am concerned, I would not be concerned even if the Federal Government would underwrite the entire obligation because I feel strongly that apart from promoting international good will and encouraging a rather unique and very valuable sport, that there are extremely vital tones of the national interest involved in this proposal.

The Soviet has long since been following the policy of encouraging and supporting organized sport in all fields. The Soviet has not only set up but has financially supported an extensive and large international program in Russia itself and among the satellites to promote sports of every kind, and this has accounted in large measure for the fine showing that Russia has been able to make in the past two Olympic games. There can be no question that this type of activity has been strongly subsidized by the Soviet.

But as meritorious as this feature of the proposal is, I am not arguing for the program provided for by the bill on this ground

alone. I am convinced that this is but another field in which we should and must eagerly enter into determined and extensive competition with the Soviet and other nations of the world. We cannot afford to be behind any nation in this kind of activity. The encouragement of sport is involved here, to be sure, but so is the entire gamut of competitive activity which in this time of stress, anxiety, and pressure, this Nation must be prompted to engage in to retain its prestige in the world, adequately meet its international commitments, and properly defend the United States. In the Soviet world, hundreds of thousands of boys are engaged in parachute jumping and related sports. The roll is growing larger every day so that, indeed, we are led to believe that millions of boys are participating in this activity.

Whether you call this activity sport, as it certainly is viewed in one sense, or whether you call it preparation for national fitness in time of emergency and danger, it seems to me that the proposal is of such merit as to be mandatory and imperative.

I in fact, for my part, I do not see how it could be rejected and ignored at a time when the Soviet and all nations in the Communist orbit are forging ahead in this important field.

Even if the Congress has to subsidize this activity and the bill I have introduced does not require this, but calls merely for a guarantee with definite assurance of repayment, I would still feel that the proposal was justified and should be undertaken without slightest hestitancy or delay.

Whether we like it or not, we are competing with the Soviet in every field that relates to our total national potential and if we fail to do so, through inadvertence, miscalculation, or underestimation, of our opponents, we will live to regret our indifference and complacency and failure to understand the stark realities of the world in which we live.

I recognize that there will be some who consider this proposal as a waste of money, and intrusion by the Government into fields in which it has no concern. There were those who opposed Federal support of the Olympic games on this basis just as there were and are those who opposed building up the defense potentials of our own Nation and the free world.

There are those who very clearly underestimate the nature of the threat we face and perhaps overestimate our own potential even as they languish in smug complacency and apathy while the enemy stands without the gates and is, in fact, entrenched within the gates to a greater degree than many people are willing to recognize.

But I sincerely hope that the Members of the Congress will not adopt this attitude. On the contrary, I hope and pray that we may be awakened to a deep, moving awareness of the challenge confronting us and act in this matter which, in itself, calls only at the worst for assumption by the Government of relatively meager funds. Before our overall strength and readiness dangerously declines and fails to keep pace with the ruthless forces that oppose us in this confused, perilous, and crucial time in world history, I respectfully urge the chairman and members of the great Foreign Affairs Committee of the House that this bill be considered and adopted in the best national interest and that this Congress go on record as favoring closing at least this part of the gap which presently separates us from the powerful totalitarian complex that is surreptitiously and brazenly working for our destruction and the destruction of freedom in the world.

My distinguished and able colleague Congressman JAMES A. BURKE has asked me to record him as being in support of the bill.

I respectfully urge the committee to report the bill introduced by my valued colleague, Congressman SILVIO CONTE; in whose district the event will be held.

I also ask that one of the coauthors of the bill, my distinguished and able colleague, Congressman THOMAS O'NEILL may include his views in the RECORD.

Essay by Paul Weissman on United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a 16-year-old constituent of mine, Paul Weissman, an honor graduate this June of Dwight Morrow High School in Englewood, N.J., has won a major distinction. Among an estimated 60,000 secondary school entrants across the Nation, Paul won first prize in the annual high school contest on the United Nations sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations. His prize was a trip to Europe this summer, from which he is returning to enter Harvard University as one of 50 members of the freshman class awarded an honorary scholarship.

The high school contest on the United Nations is conducted through a 3-hour examination. Half of the scoring on the examination is based on short-answer questions of a factual nature, the other half consisting of three essay questions, answered without the aid of notes or books and within the time limit.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the essay questions asked in this year's contest and Paul Weissman's answers to them. His work shows, I believe, not only a remarkable knowledge of United Nations affairs but also a remarkable ability in original thought and clear expression under test conditions.

There being no objection, the questions and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. (20 points): You have been assigned to write an article for your school newspaper on the Congo. In explaining to your readers the significance of the problem in the Congo, discuss the following points:

A. The background of events which led to the present conflict.

B. The political, economic and geographic importance of the Congo which led to U.N. intervention.

C. The conflicting aims and policies of Congo leaders as they affect the role of the U.N.

D. U.N. purpose and policy in the Congo.

II. (15 points): When the United Nations Charter was adopted, some observers thought the General Assembly would be little more than a debating society; the Security Council, it was thought, would exercise most of the power and enjoy most of the prestige.

In a well-organized essay, explain how and why the General Assembly has tended to grow in authority and respect since 1945, while the Security Council has tended to lose power and status in public opinion. Include the following in your answer:

A. Reasons, specific events, and evidences of success or failure in actions taken.

B. Three serious weaknesses that have become apparent in the United Nations since its organization in 1945.

C. Three ways in which the United Nations might be strengthened.

III. (15 points): The following letter appeared in a metropolitan newspaper, read by millions:

"DEAR SIRS: The U.N. is no good. The Communists run it. They use it to spy on our country. It costs us a fortune to belong and all we get is abuse. The whole thing will collapse just like the League of Nations, and the sooner the better. Why do we have to have this nest of traitors in our city? Let's send the United Nothings to Europe.

"Yours for a safer America,
"(Name withheld)."

Answer the letter, explaining the value of the United Nations, pointing out some of its specific achievements, and its importance to America's survival.

I

It is consistent with the confusion of our modern age that the Congo, less than a year ago unknown to most of the world, should have become in so short a time the very center of the East-West conflict and thus perhaps the most important place on earth. The battle now being fought there, although more with propoganda than with guns, will decide not only the victor of a major episode in the cold war; also at stake is the very existence of the United Nations, which has put itself into mortal danger by attempting to solve the Congo's problems. For those who truly believe that the U.N. is "our last, best hope," the Congo situation is the most important crisis since the Second World War.

The roots of the U.N.'s present dilemna go back into the days of 19th century colonialism, when Britannia yet ruled the waves and all was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Desirous of a share in the rich African Continent, Belgium's King Leopold dispatched a "trading expedition" to the present Congo area. Although he had only narrowly edged out the British and the French, Leopold soon had a huge territory, some 50 times the size of his kingdom, under his control.

For the next half century, the Congo was enslaved mercilessly to the greed of its Belgian conquerors; while the Rockefellers were building an empire in America, Leopold and his successors were making huge profits under their policy of human and mineral exploitation. Belgium, of course, had long since become a constitutional monarchy, but the Congo remained a fief of the crown, not subject to parliamentary questioning or interference. Thus, even in modern times, the Congo was as yet unacquainted with the outside world, and best known, perhaps, by the famous lines of Stephen Vincent Benet, written when the Dark Continent was still a place of mystery: "Mumbo-jumbo, god of the Congo, he will come to voodoo you."

This state of affairs persisted right up to the end of World War II. Exhausted by their mighty effort to defeat the Axis, the Allied nations sat comfortably back and prepared to resume their old, peaceful ways; but a new force, born of war and upheaval, had entered the world. In all the colonies and territories of the earth, there was a mighty wave of longing for freedom as a nation and for the full measure of dignity that goes with being a man. India was the first to break loose; many others followed after her.

In 1959, the new wave reached even the heart of Africa. Riots began in the Congo, and threatened to become worse. Whites as well as natives were being killed, while property damage was immense. It was ap-

parent to the Belgians that they could not hold on much longer; they had made the mistake that so many other colonist nations had made, and are still making, the mistake of believing that, by keeping the native population downtrodden, colonial rule could be perpetuated forever. Belgium has come very near to paying for her mistake with her life as a country, and she may yet succumb to the conflicting forces that the Congo disaster has unleashed.

Driven against a wall, Belgium's administrators at first offered independence in 10 years, then in 5, then in 2. Finally, it was agreed that July 1, 1960, should be the date when the new nation would come into being. It seems likely that the Belgians had at least an idea of what would ensue from independence; after all, their own colonial policy had seen to it that less than 3 dozen Africans were educated to any degree at all beyond high school, and that the Congo was patently incapable of governing itself. Nonetheless, they were virtually forced to accede to the African demands.

Even before being born, the Congo had two strikes against it. Its first problem was that Moise Tshombe, political leader of the mineral-rich Katanga Province; had not been long in proclaiming that his state would of itself secede from the other Congo provinces to become an independent country in its own right. Not only would this step have deprived the Congo of a large part of its natural wealth, it would have endangered the very existence of the country as a political unit. Other dissenting factions and tribes, of which the Congo has an abundant supply, would be sure to follow Tshombe's lead.

A second problem of the Congo was political disunity in its own capital. The premiership of the new government had been hotly contested by Joseph Kasavubu, from Leopoldville Province, and Patrice Lumumba, whose strength lay in the outlying areas. Lumumba won in the balloting, although this is hardly a reliable barometer of popular opinion ,in one instance, returns from two districts were lost when the canoe carrying them to Leopoldville was swept over a falls), and Kasavubu contented himself with being President and official Chief of State. But the rivalry still remained.

Burdened by these considerations, the Congo as a nation had been beaten before it began. Even before independence, the rioting started: uneducated natives thought that being free meant freedom from all restrictions whatsoever, and acted accordingly. One native was even quoted in the New York Times as asking, "Independence? Can I eat it?" Particularly endangered were the Congo's white citizens, on whom the natives seemed to be taking vengeance from decades of injustice.

A bare 2 weeks after independence had been granted, Belgium sent her troops back into the country to protect her citizens. Then began the long sequence of comic-opera events in which, as Dwight MacDonald of the New Yorker has said, "History seems to be parodying itself." Lumumba protested the Belgian intervention violently, and called on the U.N. to send troops; this was done, barely in time to prevent utter chaos. Meanwhile, Katanga had carried out its intention of seceding, and was engaged in warfare with pro-Lumumba Baluba tribesmen. Lumumba himself soon began making overtures to the Communist bloc, and for a time it looked as if a Russian beachhead had been established in Africa.

Seeing his chance to take power, however, Kasavubu fired Lumumba from the premiership, on a charge of consorting with Communists; in turn, Lumumba fired Kasavubu. Into this rather ridiculous state of affairs stepped a relatively unknown, Col. Joseph Mobutu, who proceeded to announce that he was taking power. Eventually, Mobutu formed an alliance with Kasavubu against Lumumba; Lumumba was jailed on charges of treason and shipped to Kantanga, where he was almost certainly killed by Tshombe's henchmen, despite an elaborately faked press release.

Lumumba's death leaves the Congo on the brink of ruin. Tshombe is still defiant of the central government, and a new mining state, led by one Albert Kalonji, has appeared in southern Kasai Province. Meanwhile, Lumumba supporters have established a government of their own in the Provinces of Oriental and Equator. The West as a whole supports Kasavubu and Mobutu in Leopoldville; the Communist bloc supports the Lumumbists in the east; and Belgium supports the cooperative Tshombe. But no one of the three factions is a government in the true sense of the word, and at this moment a civil war between them seems imminent. The outcome of such a war would be important to the participants in the cold war: as has been stated, if Russia gets a toehold in the very center of Africa, it may be costly for the world's democracies. By geographical position, mineral wealth, and political significance, the Congo is just suited to assist the Soviet greatly in its plans for expansion. The danger, of course, is that, the stakes being so high, the United States and Russia will feel compelled to aid the opposing sides in the civil war and thus bring on a global conflict.

The U.N.'s role in the Congo has thus far been successful in that relative peace has been kept; but the basic problem, that of reconciling the different factions, has not been solved. Ostensibly, the U.N. is not to interfere in what many Security Council resolutions have termed "internal affairs," but the definition of this term is both difficult and hazardous. Also, the U.N. forces have been hampered by the playing of politics on the part of several national contingents in the UNEF: several delegations, including those of Morocco, Indonesia, and the UAF, have already withdrawn or are preparing to withdraw because of lack of U.N. support for the Lumumba faction.

The primary purpose of the U.N. is to keep the peace, and, to be sure, not to intervene in a nation's domestic affairs. But the course of recent events has suggested that perhaps this concept of noninterference is inadequate to the exigencies of current world affairs, and that the U.N. may have to take an active role in shaping a nation's political destiny. If so, speedy action will be needed to prevent a situation for which the entire human race will be sorry forever after.

II

It is undeniable fact that, since 1945, the Security Council has decreased considerably in importance and that its authority has in large measure been transferred to the keeping of the General Assembly. Virtually the entire responsibility for this fact must be borne by the device of the veto, written into the U.N. Charter by request of both the United States and U.S.S.R. at San Francisco in 1945.

The effect of the veto, briefly, has been to prevent the taking of any action that amounts to anything by the Security Council in an international dispute. Since any world conflict will very probably be associated with one of the five major powers, an action regarding that conflict is unlikely to receive the affirmative vote of the power involved. This truth has been demonstrated over and over again by the Security Council vetoes of Britain and France on Suez in 1956; of Russia and Hungary, in 1956 and thereafter; and of Russia on many matters relating to international inspection and arms control. In fact, the Soviet Union has to this date used the veto some 89 times in an attempt to work its own will. It is not difficult to understand how effectively this device has hamstrung the Security Council's usefulness. The only exception to the prevalence of inaction, albeit a notable one, is the resolution passed in 1950 beginning the Korean war; as is well known, however, this resolution was passed during a boycott of the Council by Russia, and this constitutes no real exception to the general rule.

To some extent, the very decline of the Security Council has brought a larger measure of power to the General Assembly. Specifically, the so-called uniting-for-peace resolution, first proposed by Dean Acheson in 1950, has been instrumental in allowing the General Assembly to expand its franchise of power. The effect of the resolution is simply to allow the Assembly to consider legally any matter blocked in the Security Council by a veto. With this power, the General Assembly has been able to work successfully not only resisting agression in Korea, but in establishing order at Suez in 1956 and in condemning the Soviet Union for its treatment of Hungary in the same year. Moreover, the very knowledge that the veto is not the absolute end of consideration of a matter has made the United Nations more flexible and far better able to cope with the problems of the world.

Nonetheless, the veto power is one serious flaw that has developed in the U.N. structure since 1945. Another such flaw is the present organization of the World Court, for two reasons: First, the Court has not been used to any great extent by the U.N.'s member nations; and second, it has not been consulted even by the General Assembly itself. As Louis B. Wehle points out in an article in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, the Court's connection with the United Nations has been "an exercise in frustration"; less than a dozen times in its history has the General Assembly or one of its organs asked the Court for an advisory opinion. Furthermore, no action is taken against those who, although parties to the Court's statute, disobey decisions or refuse to submit cases for consideration. If the Court is to be at all effective, it must be utilized, and the United Nations itself is in the best position to encourage utilization.

A third flaw has developed in the organization of the U.N.'s Emergency Force. Recent events have made it obvious that, first, the U.N. must be equipped with a standing army responsible to the U.N. alone, and that, second, this army must have powers considerably broader than those presently given to it. U.N. operation in the Congo has been severely hampered by the political designs of those states who have furnished troops for the Emergency Force; because of Hammarskjold's refusal to give direct aid to Lumumba and, now, Antoine Gizenga, the contingents of Morocco, Indonesia, and the United Arab Republic have already withdrawn their support. Such political maneuvering cannot be permitted to take place within the U.N.; if an international body is to have authority and respect, it must be a power of its own, subject to the rules drawn up by member states, but not dependent on these nations for its life in times of stress. Thus, a body of troops is needed which could be taken by the U.N. for its own and be made subject to no other command.

On the question of the power to be given to an emergency force, it is apparent that in the Congo the U.N.'s power is not sufficient. The policy of domestic noninterference may be wise when applied to a nation with a real government of its own, but it is absurd to force this policy to work in a country which actually is not a political unit at all, but only a fractionated salad of squabbling factions. What exists in the Congo today is a vacuum, not a government,

and thus the situation is tailor made to some sort of international political control, something analogous to a trusteeship. Certainly, unless the vacuum is filled by nations collectively, it will be the subject of a conflict between individual nations that could well become critical in a short time.

Corresponding to the three problems pointed out above, then, I think that three definite steps should definitely be taken as soon as possible: the substitution of majority rule for the veto in the Security Council; a policy of consultation with the World Court by the General Assembly and Security Council, and of respect for the Court's decisions; and an establishment of some kind of permanent world security force, solely under the command of the U.N. and empowered, where necessary, to take steps with the internal affairs of a nation in order that the peace of the rest of the world may be assured.

III

Aside from the fact that this letter probably appeared in the New York Daily News, it represents an attitude that is all too prevalent in this country, and which must be corrected if America is to participate in the shining world which, we hope, will follow upon our present era of turmoil and trouble. The basic train of thought underlying the logic of a letter like this one is that America doesn't need anyone else; we are self-sufficient and should have nothing to do with anything beyond our shores except participation as an interested, but unconcerned, observer. The writer makes specific reference to the failure of the League of Nations, but fails to point out, or to realize, that this very failure was due in large part to the isolationism of Senator Lodge and his colleagues right here in the United States. With American support—who knows?—the League might have succeeded. With success, it might have prevented the Second World War. We have let one chance slip through our hands, and have paid most dearly for it; to let another such chance go by would be an unforgivable folly The fact is that America is not self-sufficient, nor ever will be again; by withdrawing our support from the U.N. we would sentence ourselves to damnation, and would very likely drag the rest of the world down with us.

The primary value of the U.N., of course, is in keeping the peace. The record of success has not been 100 percent; but a long string of triumphs for international law becomes apparent when we remember Iran, in 1946; India and Pakistan, in 1947; Israel, in 1948; Korea, in 1950; and Suez, in 1956. In all these cases but one, war was avoided or ended, and in the one exception, a war was fought that a more terrible war might be staved off.

This record indicates that the U.N., despite adversity such as a Hercules would fear to take on, has in truth guarded the peace of the world. To be sure, there have been reverses, events such as the Hungarian and Tibetan rebellions of 1956 and 1959 in which all that the world's democracies could do was to shake angrily in their impotence. But always, the aggressor has been made to feel the weight of hostile world opinion, a force which is not so innocuous as it sounds. At the very least, the fact that an aggressor may now be branded as such and proclaimed a criminal to the world is better than rule of the jungle, where there is no one to cry out at injustice. And perhaps, if we take steps to strengthen the U.N. now, we may yet build upon the foundation that has already been established and reach the goal of a true world government. Certainly, it is heartening to note that the new President of the United States, on being inaugurated, pledged himself and his country to the furtherance of international law.

For its protection of peace alone, the United Nations would be worth even the "fortune" that "it costs us to belong." But the U.N. is active in many fields, all of them doing good for the world's population. Old organizations, such as the UPU and ITU, have been given a place in the framework of the U.N. where they may continue their work. Others, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, are being created every year as the need for them arises. Most important perhaps are those "specialized agencies" which contribute directly to the health and spiritual and physical well-being of the world's population. The World Health Organization fights malaria, yaws, and other crippling diseases all over the globe, and educates the poor to practice cleanliness and good health habits; UNESCO makes possible the exchange of cultural good-will missions between countries, and works to raise the world's literacy level; UNCEF feeds and cares for underprivileged children in Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, and virtually dozens of other places. Such organizations as the World Bank, International Finance Commission, and the recently created Special Fund make possible the development of riches in many underdeveloped countries and thus the raising of everyone's standard of living: projects now going on include studies for a dam on Ghana's Volta River, a dam on the Zambezi in Rhodesia, and various public-works projects in the new African state of Nigeria. As more money becomes available for loan, the number and size of the works which can be done will grow.

Finally, the U.N. acts in many areas to perform real services to the governments of the world. Among the organizations included here are the International Monetary Fund, which makes possible the exchange of world currencies; the International Civil Aviation Organization, which coordinates air flights all over the world, and gives aid to poorer nations in developing aviation systems; the International Maritime Union, which coordinates and standardizes world shipping; and the World Meterorological Organization, which makes possible the integration and unification of data on weather from all over the world.

Burns Ditch Project: Wrong Place, Wrong Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 30, yesterday, I attended the Army Engineers' hearing on the proposed harbor project in northern Indiana.

This hearing was held in Indianapolis, Ind., and was conducted by Col. Joseph A. Smedley, district director of the Chicago regional office of the Army Engineers.

I am hereby submitting the testimony and facts which I gave in person concerning my opinions and recommendations on this large expenditure of taxpayers' money:

STATEMENT OF RAY J. MADDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS OF INDIANA, AT ARMY ENGINEERS' HEARING ON BURNS DITCH HARBOR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., AUGUST 30, 1961

Mr. Chairman: The building at public expense of an $86-million harbor and port at the proposed site just east of Burns Ditch would not be in the interest of the people of Indiana. I shall briefly state the commanding reasons why this is so.

First, I think it is clear that a harbor built at the Burns Ditch site would be of direct benefit, almost exclusively, to the two major steel companies, Midwest and Bethlehem. This is a fact which is clear on the face of the situation to anyone knowing the circumstances. This is a fact which is clearly stated by the Army Engineers' report, which, as I understand it, is being reconsidered by this hearing. Although I am informed by the Corps of Army Engineers officials in Washington that this report, "The Army Engineers' Interium Report on the Burns Waterway Harbor," dated October 1960 in their words, "is no longer considered a report" because it has been sent back to the field for reexamination.

According to this Army Engineers' report, 97.3 percent of the future benefits coming from this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch will go to the two steel companies, namely, Midwest Steel, a wholly owned subsidiary of the National Steel, and Bethlehem Steel. On page 19, paragraph 57, the report states the estimated average annual benefit will be $8,157,000. Of this amount general cargo or shipping exclusive of steel mill operation, would account for only $217,000. The entire balance would be accounted for by coal, iron ore, and limestone shipments for use by the two steel mills on the premises.

Mr. Chairman, I fail to see the justification for the expenditure of millions of dollars of public money to provide a harbor and port for the exclusive benefit of these two wealthy and powerful steel companies. Moreover, I find it additionally absurd to provide such a harbor in an area where only one relatively small piece of industry now exists. I might also say that the ardor of the steel companies to construct the promised steel mills is less than pressing at the moment, so it would seem public investment in a Burns Ditch Harbor would be a risky venture, at least, even if building a harbor at public expense for the almost sole use of two steel companies were otherwise justifiable. As an elected representative, Mr. Chairman, I for one, am not willing to endorse the expenditure of public funds for a risky and special interest serving private project.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I think there is good evidence to indicate that because of the character of the lake itself, the Burns Ditch location on Lake Michigan is simply not suitable for a harbor. It is hardly necessary to point out that the great Indiana sand dunes are high and deep at the Burns Ditch site precisely because the currents of the lake waters placed them there and continue to shift sand and other materials to this point. Again, I think the evidence on its face raises serious questions about the economics of maintaining a port at a point of maximum buildup of lake deposits. For the lake currents carry southward, stone and earth from the west banks of the lake and deposit them on the south banks, almost precisely at the Burns Ditch site. The Burns Ditch location is at the southern tip of the 50-mile north to south sweep of storms and winds coming from the north and northwest. Hence the terrific sand and deposit fill at this point.

I would encourage the Army Engineers, in their reevaluation of this Burns Ditch Harbor proposal, to fully report on the problems which certainly must come from the continuing deposit by the currents of sand, pieces of rock, and other debris. Evidence of the great force of the currents in this area is provided by the Army Engineers interim report of October 1960 to which I have referred earlier. In appendix F, paragraph 45, it states that at this part of the lake,

there is a dominant east to west lateral transport of sand and other matter, and that the effect of the projection of a harbor into the lake at the Burns Ditch site will result each year in the erosion of 27,000 cubic yards of sand west of the harbor and equivalent fill to the east of the harbor. This seems to me good evidence of the doubtful economy of maintaining a harbor at this site. Also, it should be pointed out that these facts about the current indicate the harbor would cause increased fill at the State park, perhaps to the extent of drastically harming its beaches. This Dunes State Park is now self-supporting, but it may well be asked if it could still continue to support itself without State tax aid when faced with the expensive costs of keeping the sandfill from ruining its beaches.

Above all, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty caused in the Burns Ditch area by the lake currents, seems to me to be a strong reason for considering the feasibility and advisability of locating the proposed port further west in Lake County. I shall mention this again at the close of my remarks.

The third reason why I am opposed to the proposed spending of $86 million or more of public funds for the construction of a harbor at Burns Ditch is, very frankly, because such an expenditure would be extremely wasteful and ill-advised at this time. I hardly need remind anyone here that the Federal Government is spending some $88 billion in the next fiscal year and will incur a budget deficit of close to $5.5 billion. The distinguished Representative in Congress from the Second District, Mr HALLECK, has almost daily reminded us all of the need to cut out nonessential expenditures, and I sometimes wonder about the consistency of urging economy as minority leader of the House of Representatives, while endorsing as Second District Congressman, expenditures for a project which would primarily serve two special interests and for which neither the justification nor feasibility has been established.

I have heard talk of course, that the State of Indiana would be willing to "go it alone" and build the harbor without Federal assistance. This too makes me wonder about the urgency which leads the Burns Ditch supporters to push the harbor at any cost—whether it be by further burdening the already overtaxed citizens of Indiana or by a shared expenditure with the Federal Government.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to this proposed location of a harbor and port at Burns Ditch because it is not economically justifiable in this time of increased national defense preparation.

I cannot find in any of the recent hearings by the Army Engineers, testimony revealing the fact that efforts to construct a major harbor on the southernmost point of Lake Michigan has been tried at different intervals for 125 years.

On July 4, 1837, Senator Daniel Webster made a Fourth of July speech at Michigan City on the occasion of launching the preliminary efforts to establish a major harbor in this region.

In 1836, the Government began work of improving and expanding a harbor at Michigan City and appropriated $20,000.

In 1837, an additional appropriation was made of $30,000.

In 1840, a third appropriation was made and the harbor work went on under the charge of Captain Stockton of the Army and appropriation was made amounting to $60,733.

In 1849, another appropriation by the Government of $25,000.

In 1852, another appropriation of $25,000.

Then, for a period of years, the Government abandoned all work on the harbor and for more than 14 years it lay a useless wreck. The primary difficulty having been the terrific storms which swept down from the 500 mile north to south stretch of Lake Michigan.

Again in 1865, the Michigan Harbor Co., through subscriptions, spent $100,000 for piers and other work in order to make a permanent major harbor at Michigan City.

In 1867, the Congress again appropriated the sum of $75,000.

We must remember a $25,000 appropriation in 1850 compares to $200,000 today.

These above facts were taken from the history of this area, procured from the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. I mention them merely to remind the taxpayers of Indiana that the present well-promoted project did not start with the administration of Gov. Harold A. Handley.

But, Mr. Chairman, there should be a major harbor in northern Indiana, and it should be constructed where it will best serve the people of Indiana. I believe for the reasons I have stated in part here today, that the proposed port and harbor should be constructed in the industrial Calumet region where it could also serve the State of Indiana.

1. Where it would serve many industries and businesses already established, and not simply serve one industry, steel, which is only promised and which in other parts of the State is not even working at maximum levels;

2. Where adequate land for additional steel mills and other industries could be made available by filling in along the shore;

3. Where lake currents and the constant buildup of debris would not be likely to provide difficult problems to keeping the port in operation;

4. Where the feasibility of a deepwater port and harbor has already been shown by extensive study;

5. Where large numbers of skilled workers and thousands of idle and part-time workers now reside.

The last time the Lake County steel mills operated at 100 percent for an extended period was in 1946, immediately after World War II. During the last several years, the Carnegie-Illinois, Inland Steel, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube in Lake County, have operated as low as 46 percent, but with automation, increased efficiency, and modern inventions, the outlook for a 100-percent improvement in the present steel production capacity is very remote. The construction of a $80 million harbor to promote two additional steel mills in this area will bring about further additions to the unemployment and relief rolls of northwest Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, about a month ago I filed a request with the Public Works Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives, a resolution for an exhaustive Army Engineers survey of the possibility of a major deepwater harbor located in the area adjacent to Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago on the shores of Lake Michigan, bordering the Illinois-Indiana State line. I wish to herewith incorporate with my remarks a letter which the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman of the Committee on Public Works in the U.S. House of Representatives received from Maj. Gen. William F. Cassidy, U.S. Army, Director of Civil Works. The same speaks for itself.

I also wish to incorporate with my remarks a copy of the resolution which was passed by the Committee on Public Works in the U.S. House of Representatives on August 24, 1961, wherein this committee requested a review and survey of the Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago shoreline for the purpose of expanding its harbor facilities as mentioned above.

What the Small Business Administration Can Do for One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "What the Small Business Administration Can Do for You," which was written by Larston D. Farrar and published in the August 1961, issue of the Graphics Arts Monthly, the largest printing magazine in the world, I am told.

Larston Farrar, the author of this article, is noted as a writer of books, stories, and articles throughout America. He is a native of Birmingham, Ala. He held his first jobs on the old Birmingham Post—now Post-Herald—and was a featured columnist and reporter for the Birmingham News, known as "the South's greatest newspaper," at about the time I was first getting elected to Congress. He and one of my longtime associates, Charles Brewton, attended Birmingham-Southern College simultaneously in the early 1930's.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, I am always glad to draw attention to the constructive work of the Small Business Administration, which has meant so much to so many small businessmen through the years. As is well known, my former administrative assistant, John E. Horne, is now SBA Administrator and is doing an extremely capable job in his new post. The Farrar article is a good roundup of the various services SBA performs and of how small businessmen might take advantage of these services for their benefit and for the benefit of the Nation itself.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION CAN DO FOR YOU

(By Larston D. Farrar)

The U.S. Small Business Administration, which began its 8th year of operation in July, year by year has become more of a vital force in the lives of small businessmen, including printers and others in the industry. It has become particularly important (and helpful) to those in the industry who are planning for the future and are striving to maintain a place in the expanding economy.

Just what the SBA, as it is called for short, can do for any specific businessman of course depends upon his specific needs and his desires. If the businessman is satisfied with the kind of job he is doing, the profits he is making, and so forth, obviously he needs no help from SBA, or any other source. But if he is dissatisfied, and is striving to find ways to better his operating techniques and to render a better and more efficient service to the public, there's a good chance he can get some tangible assistance from the SBA, if

he will take the trouble to learn how best to obtain the agency's services.

The SBA is not interested in any specific business, in any particular line, from a selfish standpoint. It cannot be. It is a public agency and its programs necessarily are broad and must be geared to helping all businessmen who feel the need to take advantage of its services, its credit, and so forth.

GOALS OF SBA

The major ways in which SBA might assist you are indicated in the agency's goals, as follows:

1. To give counsel to small business concerns on their financial problems; to help them to obtain financing from private lending sources, and to make loans to them when private financing is not available on reasonable terms.

2. To license, regulate, and help finance privately owned small business investment companies, which in turn extend long-term and equity-type financing to small businesses.

3. To make loans to help restore or replace businesses and homes damager or destroyed by storms, flood and other natural disasters, and to help small businessmen who may have suffered substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall in their areas.

4. To make loans to State and local development companies to help them to provide facilities and financing for small businessmen in their areas.

5. To assist small companies in obtaining a fair share of contracts and orders for supplies and services for the Government, and a fair share of property being sold or leased by the Government.

6. To assist small firms in overcoming production problems, and in diversifying their product lines.

7. To assist small businessmen with their management problems, and to finance research into the problems of small business.

8. To sponsor and publicize management courses with institutions of higher learning in various areas, so that small businessmen may haxe expert assistance in studying the complexities of subjects ranging from accounting to personnel problems.

Overlooking the loan programs of SBA, the principal ways in which SBA can help you lie in the field of management education. "All studies into the causes for the failure of small businesses, in any line of endeavor, rank lack of management know-how as one of the most important factors," John E. Horne, the new SBA Administrator who took office shortly after President John F. Kennedy's inauguration, declared in an interview in Washington.

"In line with our resources and with the clear mandates of Congress as embodied in the basic law creating SBA, we intend to do everything in our power to make available to small businessmen the very latest managerial techniques we can devise and distribute. It is our hope that, through business journals and other media, we can help every present small businessman, and all those who are interested in becoming small businessmen, to learn all the possible angles to managing themselves, their employees, and their businesses in such a way as not only to stay in business but to grow with a growing economy."

TECHNICAL, MANAGEMENT AIDS

The Small Business Administration's educational program for businessmen takes various forms. Perhaps the one that has been most widespread, in net effect, has been the regular release of both technical aids leaflets and management aids leaflets by SBA, each of which deals with some specific phase of management, ranging from accounting and bookkeeping to personnel and sales efforts.

So far, there have been hundreds of individual topics in the two series of leaflets, with experts in the various fields giving freely of their superior knowledge in order to help educate small businessmen who may not have known of the facts and factors involved. If you have not been receiving these leaflets, which are available at no charge, you should get in touch with the SBA field office closest to you, and ask about getting the back copies, and/or to be put on the mailing list to get future leaflets issued under this program.

Many business owners have reported not only getting a great deal of valid knowledge out of these booklets, but say that they make it a point to pass the leaflets around among their employees, with instructions that each employee read the advice and, insofar as possible, to assimilate the facts contained in the printed material. Literally tens of thousands of small businessmen have found this information helpful.

MANAGEMENT BOOKLETS

In the same general area, SBA for years has been preparing—through the services of experts qualified in the various fields—booklets in its Small Business Management Series. These booklets available from the U.S. Superindent of Documents for nominal fees (seldom more than $1), are crammed full of interesting and useful information which every businessman must know if he is to be able to buck the tide of competition and to remain in business in the hurly-burly business world of today.

Typical booklets include "Ratio Analysis for Small Business," "Profitable Small Plant Layout," and "New Product Introduction for Small Business Owners." The trick in using this material—some of which may not seem useful to you—is to read it with the idea of acclimating the advice to your own field. A writer in one of the booklets may tell about trucks and their auxiliary uses, and this might give you some idea about ways you can lease, or rent, your trucks during the periods, or even weekends, when these trucks might be sitting idle and producing no income for you.

If you want to get a list of the booklets already printed by SBA in its Small Business Management Series, you can obtain this at the SBA field office, on request, or by writing to the U.S. Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

RESEARCH STUDIES

Another integral part of what the SBA is doing for you is its management-research program, through which it is striving to isolate the various factors, internal and external, which work to hurt or to destroy small businesses.

"There is a great need—among small business owners and managers and those who service small business—for additional knowledge concerning the successful operation of small businesses in all fields," SBA officials declared. The SBA is trying to help by financing small business research studies by college and university researchers, and other professional research organizations. By law, the SBA may finance such projects up to a maximum cost of $40,000 a year in each of the 50 States."

If there are specific facets, relating to business management, which you feel should be researched, you might get in touch with your State university, or some other educational institution, with the view of having that institution apply for an SBA grant to do the research. Since this $40,000 for each State is available, and since there are many phases to business operations which still remain puzzling to students and businessmen, you might be doing yourself and the businessmen of the future a great favor by spurring such basic research.

An integral part of SBA's educational program is the agency's sponsorship of management courses with institutions of higher learning in various States. Since the beginning of its administrative management course program in 1954, some 30,000 small businessmen have gone back to school, taking some 938 courses conducted by management experts in more than 300 institutions of higher learning.

Remember, the SBA is operating through your tax money. If there are to be benefits gained from it, it is up to you to learn of them and to use the SBA facilities to the fullest. There's a good chance that, in one way or another, it will pay off.

Why Is the Administration Demanding New Dictatorial Powers in Foreign Aid Financing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to pose the question I have been asking since the current debate on foreign aid started: Why is the administration demanding new powers for financing foreign aid when Congress has never failed to approve appropriations which have been requested? The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points out that the Congress has been voting foreign aid funds every year for the past 15 years. The program has never been held up by failure of Congress to act. Yet, the administration now claims that unless more dictatorial power is given to the Executive to bypass Congress, the whole program will fail. Why does the administration want this additional power? Is Congress not entitled to a straightforward answer to this question?

BOUND BY BILLIONS

It's clear enough that the administration won't get the kind of long-term financing of foreign aid loans it wanted. But a fairly obvious defeat is being hailed by some as a moral victory for the White House.

As whipped into shape by a House-Senate conference committee, the aid-financing bill omits the administration scheme of direct Treasury borrowing. Instead, it authorizes loan spending of up to $7.2 billion over the next 5 years and empowers the administration to make commitments to foreign countries in advance of annual congressional appropriations. This grant of authority, it's said, puts Congress under a new moral commitment to make good U.S. aid promises as they come due.

Congress has committed itself, to be sure. But when in the past 15 years has Congress not been committed to maintaining a U.S. foreign aid program? Wisely or not, Congress has in practice long given U.S. policymakers assurance that foreign aid won't be cut off abruptly.

But Congress is no more bound now than it ever was to give the aid-givers precisely the program they want. For all the talk of aid financing, the debate this year actually was about whether the White House or Congress would set the standards by which U.S. aid is judged. In keeping the check of an-

nual appropriations, Congress has sensibly upheld its right to tell the White House where it's wrong.

And there are plenty of things that can go wrong with the administration's new aid plans. Moreover, many assumptions and practices proved wrong and wasteful in the past remain unchanged. In a sense, the administration has won a considerable victory in convincing a skeptical Congress that new billions ought to be committed on the strength of promised reforms.

So there is indeed a moral commitment involved in the foreign aid program. But it falls squarely on the administration which has promised to Congress and the American people that foreign aid will be wisely spent.

Time and the Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill providing for the adoption of the perpetual calendar devised by Dr. Willard E. Edwards of Honolulu. Dr. Edwards is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma and of Jackson College in Honolulu. He is a registered professional engineer and has been employed in Federal civilian and military service since November 1941. He was called into service during World War II and attained the rank of lieutenant commander. He has been a professional licensed radio engineer, science teacher, commercial airlines pilot, and has devoted many years to the study of calendar reform.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Time and the Calendar" written by Dr. Edwards be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME AND THE CALENDAR

(By Willard E. Edwards, Litt. D., originator of "The Perpetual Calendar")

The lack of fixity of our present calendar and the inequalities of its divisions are fatal faults. The international use of a more logical arrangement is highly desirable. Such a proposal eventually may be considered by the United Nations. If the adoption of a new civil calendar is then recommended, all countries could benefit by such a decision.

Our present seasonal calendar was considered corrected in 1582 when a fixed date was chosen for spring. The Council of Nicea had met in A.D. 325 when the vernal equinox occurred on March 21. This month-date was therefore chosen for future use as the first day of spring in order to commemorate the council's meeting.

The Julian Calendar averaged 365.2500 days, whereas the solar year is 365.2422 days in length. An annual gain in the calendar of 0.0078 day had thus occurred between A.D. 325 and 1582. By the latter date, spring was arriving on March 11. This was 2 weeks before the beginning of the Christian year at that time. Ten calendar days (October 5–14) were therefore dropped in 1582 to make the next Vernal Equinox occur on March 21, 1583. At the same time, the beginning of the year was moved from March 25 to January 1. These changes were not accepted by Great Britain and her colonies until 1752, and 11 days were then dropped. George Washington, born February 11, 1732, had to wait until February 22, 1753, before he became 21 years old.

A more scientific and humanitarian change would have been the addition of 10 days to February in 1582. This would have allowed the next vernal equinox to come on March 1. That date could then have been made the beginning of the year, as it was formerly. Starting the year at an equinox, when day equals night, is far more logical than at a solstice. In comparison, we usually show a 360° sine wave starting at the zero reference line, not at a plus or minus 90° peak. The four quarters of the sine wave are comparable to the four seasons of the year.

TIME IS A MEASURABLE DURATION

However, the subject of a new starting date for the year has already been studied internationally. It was done at the request of the League of Nations Calendar Committee. All but South Africa were against such a change, and the subject therefore has not been seriously considered since.

Time is a measurement of the earth's rotation on its axis and of its revolution around the sun. The laws of nature determine the length of the solar or tropical year. It is the interval between consecutive returns of the sun to the vernal equinox. This interval is currently decreasing at the rate of about one-half second each century. It is 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 45.51 seconds in length of the present time. When this period is reduced to a decimal, it becomes 365.242193402777.

By adopting a new leap-year rule in 1582, the length of the calendar year was reduced. It now averages 365.2425000 days over a period of 400 years. However, subtracting 365.2421934 from 365.2425000 shows that the calendar year is 0.0003066 day greater than the solar year. How many years will it take for the calendar year to get ahead of the solar year by 1 whole day? The answer is found by dividing the figure 1 by the average annual difference. This would give us a period of 3,262 years, provided the present annual difference of 0.0003066 day remained constant.

Instead of the correct figure of 45.51, the number of seconds at the end of the year is often taken as 46.00. Using this larger figure, the length of the solar year would be 365.2421991 days. This is 0.0003009 day less than the calendar year. Dividing the figure 1 by this incorrect annual difference gives 3,323 years instead of 3,262, an error of 61 years.

PRESENT LEAP-YEAR RULE PRACTICAL

Adding 3,262 to the year 1582, it is seen that future generations will not have to correct the calendar again until A.D. 4844. That year would normally be a leap year. But if it is counted as a 365-day year instead, the calendar will then be corrected for another 32 centuries. Surely this is an entirely effective, simple, and practical correction.

Pope Gregory XIII changed the leap-year rule in 1582. Of all the years ending in two zeros, only those divisible by 400 would henceforth be counted as leap years. There are now 97 leap years of 366 days, and 303 years of 365 days every 400 years. This correction of the Julian Calendar gave us our present average calendar year of 365.2425 days. This is accurate enough for all of our ordinary practical purposes. There is no need to change the Gregorian correction for determining the length of the average calendar year.

In fact, astronomy does not require consideration in present calendar revision problems in any way. There are simply two outstanding faults in the current civil calendar. In the first place, it lacks fixity. And in the second place, its divisions are unequal. Every year starts on a different day of the week, and the lengths of the months, quarters, and half-years are unequal. These two fatal faults result in much inconvenience and great annual expense in the social, economic and business worlds.

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR CORRECTIONS

But these two faults are corrected in "The Perpetual Calendar," a proposal for a new international standard civil calendar. To obtain fixity this plan (shown herein) begins with "New Year's Day" as a day apart from any week. This is the most logical day for the purpose since it is already a regular international holiday. To obtain equal divisions, it is followed by a 364-day equal-quarter year starting with Monday, January 1. This calendar has 26 working days in each month, plus rest days or Sabbaths, and there are 13 whole weeks in each quarter. Christmas and other proposed holidays fall on Mondays, and the 1st and 15th of all months fall on weekdays. Incidentally, there are no "unlucky" Fridays-the-13th in the entire calendar year.

In leap years, another international holiday is definitely named and accounted for as a day apart. It is called simply "Leap-Year Day," the first day of the second half year. It follows Sunday, June 31 and precedes Monday, July 1. The use of the 2 days apart is the only logical way of revising the calendar to obtain fixity, plus equal monthly and quarterly working periods, and yet keep it within the solar year. Without such revision, any other proposed change becomes impractical.

The majority of those seriously studying the subject consider "The Perpetual Calendar" to be the most practical and sensible 12-month calendar ever devised. It is the simplest proposal for an equal-quarter fixed civil calendar. Its nearest rival was a plan called "The World Calendar." This latter proposal was first presented to the League of Nations by Octavius Smith of Canada in 1925. The association promoting its adoption closed its offices in April 1956.

"The Perpetual Calendar" may be printed with either Sunday or Monday as the first day of the week. However, Saturday and Sunday are already considered as "the week-end" in most countries. Also, the airlines and the majority of schools and businesses consider Monday as the first day of the week. The calendar is regularly printed this way in many European countries.

A NEW CALENDAR RHYME

In "The Perpetual Calendar," the months always begin on significant weekdays; Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Each quarter of the year has 91 days, with three complete months of 30, 30 and 31 days. To replace the presently-used 400-year-old calendar rhyme of Richard Grafton, the following is given:

With a day apart, the year's begun,
Followed by thirty, thirty, thirty-one.
Months always start a certain way,
On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
Each quarter and each year the same,
Is The Perpetual Calendar's aim.

This calendar has been widely endorsed as the most practical 12-month plan ever proposed. Its international adoption will benefit the entire social and economic world. It will save time. Hundreds of thousands of hours are now wasted yearly due to figuring with a shifting and unequal calendar. This present loss occurs in all scheduling and comparison work; and in all business, industrial, and social accounting throughout the civilized world.

ANNUAL LOSS CAN BE PREVENTED

The main point is that once "The Perpetual Calendar" is adopted, its use will be of inestimable value. It will actually save hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

All insurance and transportation companies; all banking, accounting, and tax people; and all schools and colleges throughout the world will benefit. Also, think how much easier it will be to remember wedding anniversaries and all other annual events. They will always be associated with both a fixed weekday and a monthly date.

The present calendar has been in use about 2,000 years. Yet many nations are in agreement that a new fixed international standard civil calendar is highly desirable. There is only one such plan which has received any official U.S.A. endorsement, and that is "The Perpetual Calendar." It was officially endorsed by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii in 1943 and by the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1952. Asking for its widespread printing, study, and approval at this time will help greatly toward its eventual international adoption.

Change is the result of natural growth, and no progress is ever made without change. There is nothing to be gained by cherishing or defending our present calendar. It is simply an awkward and expensive heritage from the past. But "The Perpetual Calendar" has both fixity and equality in its divisions. It is an efficient, timesaving, scientific plan. Let's adopt it for our daily international use, especially when it can be done so easily.

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

JANUARY						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

FEBRUARY						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

MARCH						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

APRIL						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

MAY						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

JUNE						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

JULY						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

AUGUST						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

SEPTEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

OCTOBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

NOVEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

DECEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Labor Day Statement of Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO:

LABOR DAY STATEMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO

The Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, extends warm fraternal greetings to free organized labor the world over on this traditional holiday of America's working people. We offer our good will to free men and women the world over. To those held captive in totalitarian bondage in so much of today's world, we pledge our continued efforts in the struggle to extend freedom and human rights.

Industrial labor especially pledges its solidarity to those free workers of Berlin and the West who today stand on the most critical battlefronts against tyranny. The struggle for freedom on these key outposts is our battle. If this struggle is lost, our own freedom to speak out and unite for common cause will be seriously endangered.

Labor Day 1961 comes at a time of grave peril involving the survival of all humanity. It is our hope and our prayer on this holiday of labor that world crisis will be resolved and that peace will truly prevail throughout the world.

Peace without freedom is intolerable. In the battle for peace, we stand foursquare with all who hold life dear. But we stand united and firm on the side of freedom, and we warn all who would extend tyranny that we have fought our way up from wage slavery and we will not retreat.

We urge that the problems now before the world shall be settled through open negotiation. But negotiation cannot and must not mean surrender. Nor can it mean the abandonment of any now free to those who would enslave them or hold them captive in a system to which they are opposed.

The Kremlin has laid down to the free world a challenge and has boasted that it will outstrip and leave us far behind in the next 20 years. Here is a challenge that we of free American labor fully understand.

We accept the Khrushchev challenge gladly and in turn challenge the Kremlin to give the world the opportunity for peaceful competition. We will be happy to permit history to judge which of our worlds is superior so that our children may choose freely the kind they desire.

With the Khrushchev challenge in mind, we point out that all is not well with the American economy and that redoubled effort now is in order to meet the problems of our domestic scene. We reject the argument that America cannot meet her defense needs without cutting back welfare programs and refusing to meet public needs at home.

We are sadly disappointed at the lack of action on aid to education in the present Congress. We note that the Kremlin 20-year challenge will be as much a challenge on the educational front as it will be to create greater material well-being. We call upon the administration and the congressional leadership to redouble their efforts for a bold education bill.

While applauding the Housing Act passed this year, we call also for a further attack upon the decay now so apparent in our cities. The Soviet challenge will not be met until, as the words of "America, the Beautiful" recite, ours are truly gleaming "alabaster" cities. The rebuilding of our cities cannot be permitted to be limited to new luxury housing and fancy commercial structures. Our cities must become centers in which the average citizen can live, breathe, and gain cultural fulfillment.

The neglect of the health needs of America's elders is as great upon this Labor Day as it was a decade ago. Action here is long overdue. The free world watches how we treat our senior citizens and conscience surely dictates that we shall provide to them the care they have earned through years of toil and contribution to our way of life.

Throughout the current period of economic upturn, joblessness has hovered near the 7-percent mark, despite even new highs of industrial production. Automation is bringing to U.S. industry ever greater man-hour output. It is criminal that this higher productivity should be permitted to cause unemployment.

The serious continuing slack in the U.S. economy is a clear answer to those who would curtail essential domestic civilian programs in the name of defense. With her great wealth and potential for the creation of ever greater wealth, America can well afford to improve the conditions of her people while meeting defense and foreign aid obligations.

Present unemployment is creating a serious drag upon recovery. It would be unthinkable to permit a new recession just when the U.S. economy must be the major bulwark of free world strength. The need now is for selected public works, schools, a broad-scale youth corps at home, and other measures which will create new wealth while providing jobs and economic strength to bolster the defense of the Nation.

While progress has been made in the area of civil rights, the Negro and other minority groups continue to be denied equal citizenship. Freedom and humanity cry out for strong civil rights legislation. Industrial labor pledges its continued support for full civil rights, recognizing that without these its own objectives will not be achieved.

On this Labor Day, we pledge to workers in newly developing nations that we shall do our utmost to aid them in their struggle for adequate livelihoods and effective unions. To this end, industrial labor hails the new Alliance for Progress and stresses that it will do all in its power in support of this great step forward. We pledge also our support and cooperation for continuing programs of effective economic assistance.

Arlington Court Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us experience a sensation of

pride and satisfaction when the fine work of good friends receives the recognition it merits. Such is my feeling on learning that the Arlington County (Va.) Traffic Court has been accorded outstanding recognition by the Standing Committee on Traffic Court Program of the American Bar Association.

Its highly prized award is for first place in its population group for improvement in practices and procedures in traffic court cases in 1960.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter notifying the Honorable Burton V. Kramer, judge of the Arlington County Court, of this ABA award.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
TRAFFIC COURT PROGRAM,
St. Louis, Mo., August 7, 1961.

Hon. BURTON V. KRAMER,
Judge, Arlington County Court,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR JUDGE KRAMER: You are hereby notified that the court over which you presided in 1960–61, has been awarded first place in group VI (100,000–200,000).

This award is based on improvement in practices and procedures in traffic court cases as set forth by you in the 1960 report in the annual inventory of traffic court activities conducted by our association.

We are now ordering the plaque, and it should be available shortly. In the meantime, we would appreciate having you give some consideration to a date after September 11, 1961, which would be appropriate for a ceremony designed to present this award to your court.

Please advise us by letter at your earliest convenience so that we may take steps to select our representative for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. HOUGHTON,
Chairman.

J. Edgar Hoover Honored by Resolution of the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Director J. Edgar Hoover enjoys the finest reputation possible in the field of law enforcement. Possessing high character and remarkable ability, he has brought the Federal Bureau of Investigation to a position of respect and authority. The Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association, meeting in convention in Nashville, passed a resolution expressing appreciation for his leadership and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it:

Whereas Tennessee and the entire Nation face the gravest crises of all times because of the startling increase in crime and lawlessness, as evidenced by a national crime increase of 98 percent in the past decade, with a 14-percent increase in 1960 over 1959, and with a total of 1,861,300 serious offenses committed in 1960, and

Whereas the forces of law enforcement are meeting the challenge as evidenced by the fact that 71 percent more cases were cleared by arrests, 65 percent more persons were arrested, and 42 percent more court convictions resulted in 1960, as compared to 1950, and

Whereas the professionalization of law enforcement through better personnel, more efficient equipment, continued intensified training, and increased recognition and support of citizens has been achieved, and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has for over 37 years dedicated himself and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the professionalization of law enforcement in America, and has made available the entire facilities of the FBI for that purpose, and for the struggle of law enforcement against lawlessness and crime: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association and its individual members rededicate themselves to the fight against crime and lawlessness and express to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover the appreciation and continued support of this association and its members.

Rightwing Radicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have warned before of the repeated attacks being made on patriotic Americans whose only desire is to safeguard and protect their country. In recent days, Mr. Karr Shannon, author of the column "Run of the News," which is published in the Arkansas Democrat in Little Rock, Ark., has written an article entitled "Those Warnings Against Rightwing Radicals." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of this article:

THOSE WARNINGS AGAINST RIGHTWING RADICALS

(By Karr Shannon)

Arkansas' Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has become alarmed at what he regards as the preaching of rightwing radicalism by military officers in various information programs. Some of the Nation's other statesmen and some of our newspaper editors have also voiced such alarm. Mr. FULBRIGHT sent a private memorandum to President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara deploring the alleged rightwing radicalism, but was mum on leftwing radicalism, Communist infiltration, et cetera.

The brave chief of the New Frontier and his liberal advisers, like the Arkansas Senator, are simply appalled by the rightist preaching of certain military officers—they have issued a directive commanding officers to cease and desist such evangelism, to submit to "policy guidance" in their participation in educational programs reaching any part of the public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and the editors et al. contend that there are unwarranted fears in this land of the fleeced and home of the brave relative to Communist subversion in government and in other avenues.

Would they have us forget Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Lauchlin Currie and the other undermining characters of the New Deal and Fair Deal? Do they want us to forget Truman's "red herring" philosophy?

Mr. FULBRIGHT, a statesman and scholar, also deplored a tendency to attribute international difficulties to our softness toward communism, policies of appeasement, forgetting, so it seems, Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, the Communist conquest of China, the Korean war. Nor did he get around to mentioning the United Nations farce. He just left the general impression that anybody who objects to anything sponsored or proposed by the New Deal, Fair Deal, or New Frontier was a "rightwing radical."

We are in a cold war. The chief strategy of Communists is to take over a nation from within. This was the formula set forth by Karl Marx, founder of the theories of present-day communism and the forerunner of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and Khrushchev. Communism's greatest advancement is built on the chaos and misery that come with dissension, pitting class against class, confusion.

INTOLERANCE OF LIBERALS

The intolerance of the liberals, ultra-liberals and half-baked Socialists appears to be far more pronounced than any expression or philosophy emanating from conservatives.

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was lambasted because he tried to teach his troops something about the cold war we are waging with communism and how they might fight for our rights in such war. Heavy criticism has been directed at the film, "Operation Abolition," intended to document what is common knowledge—that the Reds are out to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The liberals have also turned their fire on Dr. George Benson, president of Harding College, and the crusade of the National Education program. The film, "Communism on the Map," which depicts the strategy and gains of communism, has come in for a shellacking because, so the liberals say, it is causing "unnecessary hysteria."

HEMINGWAY AND CHAMBERS

It was coincidental that Ernest Hemingway, the Pulitzer Prize winning and Nobel Prize winning author, and Whittaker Chambers, Communist turned American, died at about the same time. Hemingway stood for substantially nothing. He never endorsed anything good or condemned anything bad. Chambers produced the evidence to convict Alger Hiss. He wrote an expose of communism, "The Witness," which was widely read. Hemingway's overcoat wouldn't make Chambers a toe-rag. But Hemingway was eulogized in newspaper editorials across the land, while Chambers was scarcely mentioned.

Does this differentiation between respect for two famous men represent modern America's attitude toward people who risk their lives and fortunes to fight communism from within?

There is a ceaseless fight against the John Birch Society, which is doing nothing more than pointing up the Communist menace—and fighting it wherever found. This organization has begged to be investigated by any congressional committee. If it is un-American, why not an investigation?

WHY? WHY?

Why should any person, civilian or military, be condemned for fighting communism from within as well as fighting it on the the battlefields? Why should we condone one type of Communist strategy and fight the other? Why should we send billions of dollars abroad to keep Communists from taking other countries from within and, at the same time, ignore or ridicule such operation in our own country?

When an American becomes a high officer in the military, does he, as a consequence, lose his constitutional right of freedom of speech?

Is a conservative American without honor in his own country? Has the reactionary become a criminal?

Is it wrong for a college to teach Americanism?

Leave it alone and it will go away. That may be good tactics in dealing with a rattlesnake, but not with the Communist menace, which is worse than a jillion rattlesnakes.

Chaotic Sugar Trade War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of August 29, 1961:

CHAOTIC SUGAR TRADE WAR

(By Peter Edson)

Soviet Russia is now believed to have moved into the position of being able to conduct an international trade war in sugar, controlling world prices and markets. The situation is being closely watched by U.S. sugar interests.

The development arises through Russia's barter purchase of 4 million tons of Cuban production and through the still more important fact that Russia is now the world's largest sugar producer. Its output this year is believed to be 7 million tons. Cuba will be second with 6 million tons.

Accurate data are not available, but there are industry reports that Russia built 50 refineries last year and has plans to build another 100. This indicates a growth potential.

Sugar is a high heat and energy food considered desirable in cold Russia. Sugar is not rationed, except by government control of prices. These have run as high as 50 cents to $1 a pound. This yields a nice capitalistic profit to the Communists particularly on the sugar Russia gets from Cuba.

There has been some speculation that Russia finances much of its agricultural expansion on sugar profits. Any over supply it can dump on world markets at ruinous prices.

In what is unquestionably one of the worst deals the Castro-Guevarra regime has made, Cuba gets paid in cash for only 20 percent of the sugar Russia gets. For the other 80 percent, Cuba must take in barter whatever Russia wants to supply—jet planes or caviar—at prices determined by Russia.

The ineffectiveness of this deal may be shown by Castro's desire to trade prisoners for U.S. tractors. It was an open admission Russia wasn't supplying what Cuba wants most.

One other sore spot for Cuba is that some of the sugar Russia takes may be leaking to the world market through Czechoslovakia at reduced prices. This violates the agreement. Cuban white sugar is now obtainable in Europe at prices below Cuba's raw sugar price.

If the Russians are double-crossing their Cuban ally in this way, it would explain Castro's and Guevarra's repeated overtures to the United States for a resumption of sugar sales to this country.

Just what's going on in this tremendously complicated business may be revealed in part at the forthcoming International Sugar Council meeting which opens in Geneva, Switzerland, September 12. U.S. Government and sugar industry representatives will attend. ISC is a United Nations commodity subsidiary of 29 exporting and 9 importing countries with many observers.

Exporting and importing countries have relatively equal votes, and its decisions are usually unanimous. Russia with 95 votes, Hungary with 15 and Czechoslovakia with 245 votes have been exporter members for 12 years. They have been generally cooperative though they haven't given much information on their own production and consumption.

The United States and Britain are principal importing countries with 245 votes each. Russia, importing 4 million tons this year, could qualify as the biggest importer, but prefers to be designated an exporter.

ISC negotiated a 5-year agreement in 1958 but provided that it could be reviewed after 3 years. This job will be complicated by world market changes resulting from the Cuban situation, new high levels of world sugar production, currently depressed prices and uncertainty over future U.S. sugar policy.

Existing U.S. sugar law expires June 30, 1962. Before that time, Congress must determine what to do with the 3-million-ton allotment formerly given to Cuba but now distributed to 21 other producing countries.

Captives of East Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Berlin crisis is destined to remain with us for sometime, and the action of the Soviet Union in having its East German puppets seal off the citizens of East Germany from freedom is certainly action which cannot be condoned by responsible leaders or public opinion in the free world.

The people of East Germany, and for that matter, the people behind the Iron Curtain and the Russian people themselves are rightfully classified as captives of communism.

Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding semiweekly publications in my district, the Chicago Heights Star, in its edition of Thursday, August 29, discussed the issue of East Germany in an especially penetrating manner. Under leave granted, I include in the RECORD this editorial entitled "Captives of East Berlin":

CAPTIVES OF EAST BERLIN

A favorite theme, some years ago, of those who looked kindly on socialism and communism was that while America was the land of planty, it would be the land of even greater plenty under such a system. If the standard of living happened to be lower in a socialistic country—as it indeed was—this was attributed to a lack of natural resources.

In the light of this, it is interesting to observe that Mr. Khrushchev has found it necessary to close the door on residents of East Berlin in order to halt their flight to West Berlin. Communist East Berliners are now living in something of an open air penitentiary.

It is incredible that East Berlin could have had substantially fewer natural resources than West Berlin when the city was parceled out among the victors in World War II. Mr. Stalin, having been able to sell his allies on virtually everything else, certainly would not have accepted the less promising sector of the municipality.

Yet collectivism and other communistic schemes in the Red sector have given its residents little more than an urge to travel—beyond its borders to prosperous, capitalistic West Berlin.

It might be hoped that a lesson will be drawn from this, not only by dreamers of dreams in the United States but by the uncommitted nations of the world.

And if East Berlin's plight can be traced in part to siphoning off of its assets by the Russians, the lesson to be learned by the uncommitted nations should be even more valuable.

In any event, we hope the world at large has taken note of recent events at the border.

Address of Mayor Sam Ridley, Smyrna, Tenn., Before American Municipal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Sam Ridley, mayor of Smyrna, one of the fine cities I have the honor to represent in the Congress, recently addressed the 38th annual meeting of the American Municipal Association in Seattle, Wash.

Mayor Ridley in his address on "Federal Aid and the Small City" pointed out many of the programs through which the Federal and local governments cooperate to provide improved service to the citizens of the local community.

The mayor states that while many people think of various Federal programs as providing assistance primarily to the big cities this is not necessarily true. He shows by several examples that the present Federal aid programs as enacted by the Congress provide much needed help for cities both big and little.

The remarks of Mayor Ridley are most interesting and contain many good examples of how our Federal programs are being used effectively in Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mayor Ridley be reprinted in the RECORD.

The address follows:

[From the Daily News Journal, Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 24, 1961]

RIDLEY LAUDS FEDERAL AID AT SEATTLE—CITES WAYS THAT GOVERNMENT CAN HELP ALL AREAS

John Sam Ridley, mayor of Smyrna, is scheduled to address the 38th annual American Municipal Association on August 26, 1961.

Mayor Ridley left Tuesday morning for Seattle, Wash., where the Congress is meeting. He will discuss Federal aid and the small city.

His speech follows:

"It is a rare privilege to address this group of experts in government on one phase of

intergovernmental cooperation—Federal aid to local governments.

"I understand President Hummel wanted one of the speakers to represent smaller municipalities. Regardless of my other qualifications, I believe I fill the bill on that. My hometown of Smyrna is the best in Tennessee, but with a population of 3,600 it certainly is not the biggest.

"As mayor of Smyrna for over 14 years, and as a former president and member of the Federal Committee of the Tennessee Municipal League, I have gained some knowledge of Federal grant-in-aid programs. I like what I have learned.

"Some people today have the attitude that anything Federal is somehow evil. They seem to think the Federal Government is a menace, a monster, awaiting a chance to gobble them up. They have nightmares about socialism, and loss of individual freedoms to what they call big government or an all-powerful centralized government.

I am not one of them. And it is interesting to note that most of these people, when pinned down, do not object very much to any Federal Government activity which benefits them. It's the project helping the people in the next county, or over in the next State, that is leading us all down the primrose path to socialism.

I for one, as a small city mayor, am not petrified with fear or blinded by suspicion in connection with the activities of the Federal Government. The people who operate the Federal Government are public servants, just as I am. Many of my personal friends are in Federal employment. I voted for some of the people who are in Congress, and I would vote for them again.

And I don't think election to Federal office makes the successful candidate start scheming about how he can destroy my individual freedoms. It is true that some of the people elected to the Congress seem to require a little larger hat size after being up there for a while. But they can always be replaced—and they know this better than anyone else.

It is extremely helpful, also, to have organizations such as our league and the American Municipal Association to keep the people in Federal Government constantly aware of our interests.

I did not mean to make this sound like a defense of the Federal Government, although in some quarters it appears that there is a real need for loyal citizens of the United States of America to rise to their feet occasionally with a kind word for our National Government—especially since its enemies abroad have it under constant criticism and dangerous attack.

To me, the Federal Government is one of several governments which serve me, and the people of Smyrna. I like to feel that the Federal Government does just about what the people want it to do—and what it can do better than other levels of government. I think this is true of the municipal government of Smyrna. And to me this is real freedom, true liberty, and good government.

As our country has filled up with people, and as our complex and truly national economy has developed, we have had to make some basic decisions about what we wanted Government to do.

It is obvious that we need a nationwide network of highways, and the secondary and feeder roads serving the communities off the main highways.

It is obvious that we need a nationwide system of airports, along with airports in the smaller communities to serve local requirements.

Two major questions confronted us in connection with these and other issues demanding some kind of governmental action.

The first question was: Can this activity be supported successfully out of municipal tax revenues when all local tax bases are naturally and severely limited?

The second question was: If these activities are important to the Nation as a whole, shall we have vast Federal departments which own and control them, or shall we use our State and local governments to the fullest as the administrative agencies, the democratic units of government which keep effective control of these activities as close to the people as possible?

Wisely, and in the true American tradition, we have chosen not to nationalize these great programs, but to decentralize their administration and control.

Although the Federal Government has put up 50 percent of the money for so-called Federal highways, and is providing 90 percent of the Interstate System cost, the highways are owned and controlled by the State and local governments.

Although the Federal Government has been providing 50 percent of the money for airport construction and expansion projects, the airports are owned and operated by the cities.

Some larger cities probably could go it alone on their commercial airport programs if they were forced into it although at a tremendous financial strain. But the smaller airports—such as the 40 small locally owned airports in Tennessee outside our metropolitan areas—must have assistance to stay alive.

By the same token, the local governments must have highways to survive but they do not have the financial resources or the jurisdiction to enter into the highway construction business all by themselves.

Without assistance from Federal and State Governments, these small communities, now served by adequate highways, and now able to enjoy a moderate amount of air service, would still be stuck in the mud.

The principle is just as true in Federal-State-local cooperation. The local community, the municipal government, can serve its citizens best by using the superior levels of government as supplemental tax collectors. The municipalities of Tennessee have demanded both State assistance and home rule and we have both. The State of Tennessee returns to local governments in one form or another about two-thirds of its total tax collections amounting to some $50 million last year.

The central objective of the Tennessee Municipal League in both State and Federal legislative policy has been this:

To maintain maximum home rule and local self-government and to accomplish this by encouraging both the State and Federal Governments to turn over to municipalities the administration and control of everything the municipal governments are big enough to handle.

We have believed that government under the democratic process works just as well at the local level as at any other level. Therefore, we have urged that government should be concentrated for its control and administration in our municipal governments, which are closest to the people.

Despite the vast size of Federal programs, the small city need not feel left out or insignificant.

Consider Tennessee. We have some 250 municipalities, but only 23 have more than 10,000 population; only 8 have more than 25,000; only 4 have more than 100,000.

Does this mean we have a limited interest, and derive a limited benefit, from Federal grant, loan and assistance programs? Quite the contrary.

Some people think of urban renewal as a big city program. But more than 20 Tennessee municipalities are engaged in urban renewal. Three-fourths of them have less than 25,000 population. These small cities have 31 urban renewal projects underway. More than $67 million in Federal funds have been reserved to complete these projects. And in the 1961 Housing Act, Congress considered the financial limitations of small cities by providing three-fourths Federal grants for urban renewal in cities under 50,000, and only two-thirds grants in larger cities.

Some people think of low-rent public housing as a big-city program. In Tennessee, 73 municipalities are involved in the public housing program through 57 local public housing authorities. Nearly 20,000 dwellings are in operation, under construction or under contributions contract.

One of these Tennessee municipalities is New Tazewell: population 808.

I will admit that New Tazewell is near a larger city, which also is in the housing program. That larger city is Tazewell—population 1,263.

The Federal urban planning assistance program, of course, is aimed directly at the small city which cannot have its own full-time planners. In Tennessee, more than $830,000 has been authorized to assist local planning. Approximately 65 small communities were aided through grants amounting to $560,000, and $235,000 was allocated for regional and metropolitan planning.

Another program of exclusive benefit to small communities is the public facility loan program. Since it was renewed in 1955, Tennessee communities have obtained 35 loans amounting to more than $15 million. Most of them were for water distribution systems.

As you know, the Housing Act of 1961 provides an additional $500 million for this extremely helpful program, and lowers the interest rate to 3⅝ percent or 3⅜ percent in officially designated redevelopment areas. It is a small-city program, limited to communities under 50,000.

The Federal interest-free advances to local governments to help finance public works planning can mean the difference between success or failure of a local project. About 20 Tennessee communities have been aided by this program. Advances have totaled more than $280,000.

Another outstanding example of small city-Federal cooperation is the water pollution control program. Grants are limited to a maximum of $600,000 thus directing these funds to small cities.

At least 13 Tennessee cities, and possibly 17, can expect to obtain help for sewage treatment plant projects during this fiscal year. Some of them are totally and completely unable to move in this critical area without outside assistance.

I might mention in passing that one of the Tennessee municipalities which have obtained help from the water pollution control program is Sharon, population 966.

The Federal Aid programs returned nearly $155 million to Tennessee during fiscal 1960. I am convinced that our smaller municipalities got their equitable shares of this money, perhaps more than their share based on population alone. And it was more important to them than to larger, more nearly self-sufficient units of government.

I frankly doubt that any of these programs were carried out over the sincere opposition of any sizable segment of any community. The Federal Government does not force these programs upon anyone. They are available. They are valuable. Cities may use them if they so choose.

Some people make their strongest argument against all Federal aid programs except of course, the ones that benefit them directly, on the charge that money sent to Washington shrinks to almost nothing by the time it gets back to the local community.

What are the facts?

The House Government Operations Committee has reported that it costs about 44 cents to collect $100 in Federal taxes. But it costs 95 cents to $2.34 to collect $100 in State taxes.

British Fiscal Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial published by the Charlotte Observer in its issue of July 28, 1961.

Faced with a sharp drop in gold reserves and foreign currency and, at the same time, confronted by the present national emergency, the British have instituted an austerity program designed to promote sound fiscal management at a time of serious crisis.

The editorial very wisely points out that the self-discipline so admirably displayed by the British should serve as a good example to our own administration which, in the face of a national emergency, insists upon pursuing a profligate domestic spending program calculated to fan the flames of inflation:

UNITED STATES COULD WELL AFFORD SOME BRITISH SELF-DENIAL

With the remarkable maturity and self-discipline displayed so often in the past, Great Britain has just announced a new belt-tightening austerity program.

Its highlights:

A 10-percent increase in excise and customs taxes affecting cigarets, intoxicating beverages, autos, home appliances, and all luxury goods.

A hold-the-line policy on all wages and salaries.

A capital gains tax to discourage stock market and real estate speculation.

A possible reduction in farm support prices.

Tighter control of homebuilding loans and all forms of construction.

Firmer control of loans for installment buying.

A hold-the-line policy on British aid to underdeveloped nations.

A reduction of 20 percent in foreign spending.

An increase from 5 to 7 percent in the bank rate.

The program brings to an end a decade of "Tory prosperity," probably the best years the British people have ever enjoyed. It was dictated by internal economic ills and a sharp drop in British reserves of gold and foreign currency.

For centuries, Britain has lived by trade, importing raw materials and selling finished goods in the markets of the world.

But the tide of prosperity has been running out in the last few years, so strongly that Britain has finally abandoned its traditional aloofness from continental entanglements and entered the European Common Market.

Britain had little other choice. In the past 5 years, Britain's gross national product grew by only 12 percent as compared with 33 percent in West Germany and Italy. In 10 years, worker productivity has gone up 20 percent in Britain and 55 percent in the Common Market nations. Britain's share of world markets has fallen sharply and even in the British Commonwealth, where Britain has tariff advantages, her exports have increased by only 5 percent in the past 5 years as compared to an increase of 60 percent in sales to Commonwealth nations by the Common Market.

Because Britain is an island dependent upon trade, its economic problems cannot be compared with those of the United States.

Yet the effect is basically the same. Because of ever higher wage demands, low worker productivity and out-of-date factories, Britain has been pricing itself out of the world markets. British export prices have risen 10 percent in the past 7 years whereas Common Market export prices have increased only 2 percent.

If the parallel between Britain and the United States is inexact, there is nonetheless a lesson for us in Britain's economic distress. We, too, have been pricing ourselves out of the world markets and we will continue to do so unless we apply enough national self-discipline to hold back inflation.

President Kennedy strongly implied in his recent address that our economy is strong enough to afford the new and heavier burden of military preparedness plus all of the high-cost domestic programs he has advanced without starting another inflationary spiral.

The record of history does not supply that view and if the President himself is not willing to advocate some measure of restraint and austerity in domestic spending during the current national emergency, then the Congress should use its power over the public purse to that effect.

Vowing She Would Ne'er Consent, Consented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, today, to give my support to the adoption of the conference report on S. 1983—the foreign aid authorization bill. Although the final product, which combines long-term authorizations with the annual appropriation process, is being hailed in some quarters as representing a "moral victory" for the administration, I would chose to regard it, instead, as a considerable moral victory—and a victory for commonsense, too—for those of us in the House who have worked toward this very compromise.

It is true that, in a sense, Congress has now committed itself to maintaining a vigorous foreign aid program over the next 5 years, but we have retained our constitutional duty to oversee the proper expenditure of such committed funds, and it would, therefore, be more realistic to say that whatever "moral commitment" may be involved falls more heavily on the administration which has heretofore promised both the Congress and the people that, from here on out, foreign aid moneys will be wisely spent.

I am also pleased to note, after all the dire predictions of "doom and gloom" that emanated from the White House about what would happen if the President was not given the borrowing authority he said he needed, that the President now terms the compromise represented by this conference report as being a "wholly satisfactory" one.

Arthur Krock, writing in today's New York Times, gives an interesting analysis of the manner in which that compromise was arrived at in the following column, which I herewith set forth under leave to extend my remarks:

VOWING SHE WOULD NE'ER CONSENT, CONSENTED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—It takes a lot to surprise Senator BYRD of Virginia where events in the arena of politics are concerned. But even he must have rubbed his eyes when he read last night's White House statement that the agrement of the House-Senate conferees on the modus operandi for long-term development loans in the foreign aid program was wholly satisfactory to the President.

For the conferees agreed on a 5-year authorization of the President to make development loan commitments in a total of $7.2 billions, with an actual appropriation of $1.2 billions for fiscal 1962, but subject to annual appropriations by Congress. But what the President had fought for to the finish was a Treasury borrowing credit of $8.8 billion over 5 years, entirely freed of the restraint of the annual appropriation procedure of Congress. And the administration had proclaimed with one voice that this delegation of Congress power of the purse was absolutely indispensable to the viability of the development loan program.

SURPRISE FOR SENATOR BYRD

But there was a more personal factor of surprise for Senator BYRD in the White House announcement. The President had successfully used extraordinary pressures to defeat a Byrd amendment which gave him the same 5-year authorization to commit the full $8.8 billions he sought for development loans, $1.6 billion more than the conferees authorized, subject only to the same annual appropriation procedure of Congress the conferees imposed.

The White House explained this about-face on the differing phraseology of the conference report and the Byrd amendment, asserting that the latter "recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will continue to be forthcoming over a period of years." On this wholly semantic argument the administration based its rating of the conference report as "wholly satisfactory" in contrast with the Byrd amendment. But the following text of the amendment invites the conclusion that this was a tactical move to cover an enforced retreat:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated [supplied] to the President for use in carrying out [the long-term development loans program] such sums, not to exceed $1,187 million for use beginning in the fiscal year 1962, and not to exceed $1,900 million for use beginning in the fiscal years 1963 through 1966, as the Congress shall determine to be necessary, which amounts shall remain available until expended."

THINGS EQUAL TO THE SAME THING

One is as clear a Congressional statement of intent as the other. And the practical restraint imposed by Congress retention of the power of the purse is precisely the same in the conferees' language—"subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds"—as in BYRD's language—"as the Congress shall determine to be necessary," because each specifies an authorized 5-year commitment total in annual amounts. Except that BYRD's total increases the amount authorized. This fundamental similarity, including the rejection by both of the President's basic request for foreclosed 5-year Treasury

borrowing authority, was generally acknowledged here today, as for example this comment by the Evening Star: "The compromise finally agreed upon its virtually identical with the Byrd amendment."

For his own part, Senator BYRD observed that the conferees' report and its acceptance by the President vindicated the efforts of himself, the House Republicans, and some others, to preserve to Congress the right to appropriate, and assured that each year's appropriation for development loans committed would be properly expended. But he wondered with many others why, and on what counsel, the President had been induced to climb out so far on a weak limb from which his retreat had to be made in full public view.

In such circumstances as these, however, the dire consequences so freely phophesied rarely materialize. The administration of foreign aid, particularly of development loan projects, will probably be greatly improved by the refusal of Congress to relinquish its only effective power of review of Government spending. The President's leadership will suffer no serious permanent damage from his defeat, and even may usefully impel him to reappraise the judgment of some advisers. And the principle of long-term development planning has been salvaged by Congress from the blunders of its advocates.

Foresight Is Better Than Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent able, thoughtful, and timely editorial from Gist Research, by Frederick Burdick, setting forth his views on keeping the peace:

FORESIGHT IS BETTER THAN HINDSIGHT
(By Frederick Burdick)

The old saying that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" holds true today as in the past. It applies particularly to the Berlin situation, where each day there are reports of near armed conflicts between forces of the West and those of the East. Interviews with Congressmen show that it is the consensus of the Nation's lawmakers that quick action should be taken to keep the opposing forces apart at a safe distance.

Another basic reason for such action is that under present circumstances it is conceivable that misjudgment or recklessness on the part of military commanders could plunge the world into the worst war in history, one that might destroy not only civilization but humanity. It is well to keep in mind that the Constitution specifically gives to Congress the power to declare or decide on war, not the military.

Another important factor to remember in the present crisis is that world public opinion is overwhelmingly for peace and against war and all that it stands for in destruction, death and human misery. America can help win the hearts and minds of people everywhere by pursuing peace-preserving policies.

Should the Berlin situation worsen and become a still greater threat to world peace, the issue should be taken to the United Nations without delay before incidents develop into catastrophic conflicts. Another alternative is to start negotiating without further delaying or face-saving tactics so that problems may be solved around the conference table instead of tragically multiplied and complicated on bloody battlefields.

Navy Inventor To Be Bounced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Members will recall that several weeks ago I placed in the RECORD a series of newspaper articles by Mr. Robert E. Hoyt, of the Knight newspapers, dealing with the controversy surrounding the Wagmight/VTOL weapons system. At that time, I noted that the Navy appeared to be mishandling the affair in attempting to silence Capt. Cooper Bright. In a recent article by Mr. Hoyt, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, August 4, 1961, it was reported that Captain Bright has been given a year to resign or be forced out of the Navy. Whether or not this has any connection with his controversial inventions remains to be seen.

So that the Members may keep themselves informed of developments in this matter, I insert this article, under unanimous consent in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NAVY BOUNCING ARDENT BACKER OF NEW AIRCRAFT
(By Robert E. Hoyt)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy is getting rid of Capt. Cooper B. Bright, despite encouraging prospects of Wagmight, his controversial concept for a collapsible missile/aircraft.

It has been learned that Bright was "selected out" of the Navy by a recent Continuation Board. He has a year to resign or be forced out of the service.

The captain has been a thorn in the Navy's side for the last 3 years. He headed a 1958 study group that came up with the Wagmight concept to make every ship in the Navy a carrier of collapsed planes and missiles.

Several times the project has been revived after hostile Navy carrier brass thought they had stopped it.

The current evaluation of Wagmight was ordered May 26 about the "silencing" of Bright. He had been forbidden to discuss the project with anyone, on duty or off duty. The study has not yet been completed.

Bright has no comment to make on the action of the Continuation Board. He says, however, "I intend to spend the next year proving that Wagmight is the best thing that ever happened to the Navy."

The latest blow to Bright comes at a time when his hopes for Wagmight are higher than ever. During June and part of July he worked under the direction of Dr. James H. Wakelin, Assistant Navy Secretary for Research and Development, preparing the new proposal.

The potential of Wagmight as a V/TOL (vertical takeoff and landing) aircraft was increased greatly during the preparation. The "lift" capacity from air stored in the wings is 10 times greater than under earlier proposals.

The board which "scuttled" Bright was headed by Vice Adm. Page Smith, commander in chief of Naval Forces, Europe.

Similar boards twice passed over Adm. Hyman Rickover, "father" of the atomic submarine, who was then promoted by Congress to save him from forced retirement.

The board headed by Smith met between July 5 and 19, first to select officers for advancement, then to cut down certain Navy classes by forced retirement. Navy jargon labels this second function the "plucking" board.

Smith's board "plucked" 152 captains, 35 percent of the classes of 1937 and 1938.

The actions of the "plucking" boards are always highly secret. The names of the captains are not released. The board gives no reason for its action. Because it is partly a face-saving device the names seldom are learned.

Captains "selected out" are given a year's notice, during which time they may file a letter of resignation to avoid the stigma of being "fired."

Bright was "fired' before his work on the latest refinement of Wagmight was finished.

He completed his most recent proposal on July 18.

This report has been sent for evaluation to the Bureau of Weapons which is to be assisted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In addition, Dr. Wakelin is sending the Wagmight proposal to Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Department Research and Engineering.

Before his work under Wakelin, Bright estimated it was possible to get about 4,500 pounds of "lift' from the use of compressed air in the wings.

With the aid of engineers from the General Electric, the "lift' potential has been increased to more than 50,000 pounds.

This lifting power would be in addition to the lift from a jet engine which power the plane in flight. The use of the compressed air would eliminate the need for a second "lifting" engine. Returning from a target the pilot could build up air pressure in the wings with an "accumulator," to provide an airstream cushion for vertical descent.

West Scores Three Big Victories Over Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the cold war continues it is increasingly important to portray to the rest of the world and in particular to the uncommitted nations the true advantages of democracy over communism. This is made difficult at times because of the barrage of Soviet propaganda that is inflicted upon many of the nations of the world. However, the Western nations do win propaganda victories and recently we have scored three important ones.

Newspaper Columnist Ray Tucker has pointed these victories out in a recent column which appeared in the Cookeville Citizen, an excellent newspaper in Cookeville, Tenn., in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this column be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The column follows:

WEST SCORES THREE BIG VICTORIES OVER REDS

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Soviet propagandists have scored many victories over the West in recent years. Western frankness, honesty, and naivete have made democratic nations suckers for the devious Communists.

But the last 10 days, the West has gained three tremendous propaganda triumphs. And, interestingly enough, these victories were handed to the West by Communists themselves.

These are our victories gained:

1. The Communists' encirclement of West Berlin. This act told the world that thousands of Germans could not stand life under communism; it told the world that force was necessary to keep people in bondage to communism. The risks people have taken to escape to West Germany have let the world know that some people believe death is better than life under communism.

The concrete barricades, described in news stories and on radio, and pictured in photos and on television, are concrete evidence that force is needed to hold people prisoners of communism.

It confirms in a highly dramatic way the West's statement that, given a choice, people will choose democracy over communism.

2. The defection of Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko, prize-winning Soviet scientist. When Dr. Klochko asked asylum in Canada, he confirmed what the West has been saying for 15 years.

Dr. Klochko, 59, winner of a Stalin prize and the Order of Lenin, defected because, he said, he is "seeking freedom of scientific expression denied him in Russia." He is seeking, he added, "to save what is left of my human self-respect."

His defection is of extreme importance to Western propaganda because the Soviets have boasted how well off their scientists are.

3. The defection of Capt. Jorge Navarre and 10 members of the crew of the Cuban ship *Bahia de Nipe* in the Chesapeake Bay. They, too, said life under the hammer and sickle is unbearable.

The significance of these event is being dinned into the ears of neutral listeners by the Voice of America.

The Communists are beginning to understand the size and importance of the victories they have handed to us. This is shown by the frantic effort of Communist propagandists to stir up countering and diverting propaganda.

Communist propagandists are now accusing "agents of the American bacteriological warfare bureau" of being responsible for a cholera epidemic in South China, where 30,000 persons are reported to have died.

They are accusing the West of making plans to kill millions of people in Iran, Pakistan, and Afghanistan to create a "scorched earth" barrier to the Russians in event of a war.

The Honorable Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending congratulations to a very able and very popular Member of this body, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE J. KEOGH. GENE KEOGH, as he is known to all of us, has reached an important milestone in his life and in his service to the Nation: a quarter century of devoted service as a Member of the House of Representatives. This anniversary also coincides with his birthday.

GENE KEOGH is a dear friend of mine of long standing. His district in Brooklyn borders on my district. I have collaborated with him ever since I first came to Congress in 1950. If I am any kind of a legislator, it has been due to his wise counsel and his guidance over these years. I have found him to be courteous in every respect, a keen analyst of the American political scene, and a capable parliamentarian. We, in Brooklyn, are very proud of his record and his achievements in Congress over the past 25 years.

I want to wish for him many more years of continued service to the people of his district and to the Nation as a whole. I want to wish him also continued good health and happiness in life, together with his charming and lovely wife, Virginia, and his children. May the future be as rewarding to him as the past.

Health Care for the Aged: Insurance and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the 87th Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee once again studied the problem of the health care costs of persons over 65 and once again heard the proponents and opponents of the social security approach to financing these costs present their views on this proposal. One of the important points of controversy in the hearings, as it has been for some time, was the question of what is being done in the private sector of the economy to meet the needs which our older citizens face in financing their medical care. This problem, as I have pointed out before, is one of success and not failure; the problem arises because we have done so well, we have given the people of our society 10 or 15 years longer to live by our advances in the medical field and the needs come because this success was unforeseen at the time these people were planning for their retirement.

The private sector of the economy has been very active in this field of providing for the needs of our older people. I should like to cite two major areas of activity in this field—private health insurance and provision by industry for health benefits for retired workers. On the former, I am inserting the title page, table of contents, and introduction of a new booklet which has been prepared by the Health Insurance Institute on guaranteed lifetime health insurance for persons both over 65 and under that age:

REPORT ON GUARANTEED LIFETIME HEALTH INSURANCE FOR PERSONS OVER 65, FOR PERSONS UNDER 65

(By Health Insurance Institute)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Senior citizen hospital-surgical group and group approach plans.

II. Senior citizen lifetime guaranteed renewable hospital-surgical expense plans.

III. Weekly benefit senior citizen hopsital expense plans—group approach and guaranteed renewable for life.

IV. Senior citizen catastrophic expense plans.

V. Additional hospital-surgical expense plans providing continuation of protection regardless of changes in health.

VI. Guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans—issued to persons under 65 years of age.

VII. Guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans fully paid up at 65.

VIII. Guaranteed renewable major medical plans with lifetime coverage or extended benefits beyond 65.

INTRODUCTION

Today Americans, 65 years of age and over, have available to them a variety of health insurance plans and policies provided by insurance companies which guarantee lifetime protection against health care costs.

These health insurance programs help policyholders meet the expenses of both serious and catastrophic illnesses and injuries. They offer a wide range of benefits which can be selected to meet the individual's budgetary situation and health care requirements.

This report, compiled from material published as of June 1, 1961, contains a broad selection of the many health insurance plans and policies now available which offer protection guaranteed to be renewed for the lifetime of the insured person. This listing, although lengthy, should not be considered all inclusive.

The selected yearly premiums shown in each of the following sections refer to the cost ranges of the plans as listed. Benefits listed within each program show the minimum and maximum amounts available—along with the entrance ages required for application.

It does not take into consideration persons over 65 who are working and protected under employer group health insurance plans nor the growing trend in extending the benefits of such employer plans to retired employees. Rather, it outlines a representation of plans and policies from which noninsured 65 plus people can select their health insurance protection.

For those persons who have not as yet reached the senior citizen years, this report also contains many health insurance plans whose guaranteed protection can be carried into their older age. Some of these plans become fully paid up at 65 with their benefits continuing for life.

On the second, the activity of industry, I should like to make reference to material which I have inserted in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 4222. This gives a nonexhaustive list of companies which provide some form of assistance in meeting the medical care costs of their retired workers. It also makes a deeper study of the specific provisions of 23 companies, some on the list and others not on it. It shows a growing interest in the

problem and increasing action to meet it on the part of America's private businesses.

Our society is not standing still, ignoring the needs which exist. It is moving to meet them in an effective way.

Soviet Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I filed a resolution calling for the State Department to alert organized labor and other groups to arouse public opinion on the facts of the Soviet violation of the Quadripartite Agreement of 1949 regarding the freedom of West Germany and West Berlin.

The following is an editorial by H. B. Snyder, publisher and editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune on this proposal:

TWO KINDS OF CRITICISM

Representative RAY J. MADDEN probably will have plenty of support for his idea of making next week "criticize Russia week" except that a great many will not want to wait.

What MADDEN asked in the resolution he proposed to the House was that the President set aside the week beginning with Labor Day "as a period for all labor, industry and business, and all civic and fraternal organizations and other groups, to pass resolutions and take other appropriate action condemning the Soviet Communist leaders for violating and abrogating the Quadripartitie Agreement of 1949" by closing off East Berlin.

Probably there will be no more active critics of Nikita Khrushchev and his entourage than members of the 395th Evacuation Hospital Unit, the Gary Army Reserve unit called up for active duty, and the increasing number of young men being summoned in the draft.

Their criticism will be two-pronged. There will be, of course, the grousing and griping understandable with any whose normal lives are interrupted because their country needs them, not anger aimed at their own country but at the fate which makes them the instruments of their country's need, and particularly at the international Communist conspiracy which activates their current fate.

But, in addition to their grumbling criticism which is inevitable, these young men and women called into active service will be a part of the criticism which can count—the quiet criticism of military strength in being, the sort of criticism which can be converted into action.

Included in the above groups of critics, also, will be the numerous young men from Gary and the entire area who are already on active duty, many of them in such far places as Korea, Germany and Formosa, whose tours of active duty seem likely to be extended for at least 2 months. Two months may seem a short time when you're sitting at home, but any added time is a long time when one already has begun counting days in the hundreds—until he gets out.

The feeling still is strong that these young people called to duty probably will not be called to action. If that is true, it probably will be largely true because of the very fact that they have been called to duty. A build-up of military strength is the type of criticism the Kremlin understands most readily.

"Certainly nobody in his right senses wants a shooting war," said the Gary Congressman in supporting his resolution on the floor of the House last week, "but experience with the Communist dictators and Hitler and Mussolini has taught us that failure to act in protest and insist on justice, will ultimately mean the loss of liberty eventually throughout the whole world."

We share MADDEN'S view that "sometimes our State Department during recent years has been heistant in doing anything that might offend Nikita Khrushchev," but we think that now he may be offended where it hurts—by an addition of military strength.

The administration has in these recent days taken some of the painful steps it pledged at the outset by calling on some for the sacrifice it said would be needed. Whether it has called on enough yet remains to be seen.

We hope a great many organizations will follow Representative MADDEN'S suggestion of criticizing the Soviet Union's worldwide imperial designs next week.

We hope more firmly that the criticism now being activated by the national administration will be heard in Moscow in the words it means to say—that America doesn't want war, but that America is getting ready because it has no intention of accepting any further Soviet expansion lying down.

Speech of Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, on the 25th Anniversary of Service of Hon. Eugene Keogh in the House of Representatives

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending birthday greetings to my esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE KEOGH, and in commemorating his 25th anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives.

This body is fortunate in having as one of its senior members a man of the stature of GENE KEOGH. He is a bulwark of strength in the Ways and Means Committee. His knowledge of the laws within our jurisdiction is deep, detailed, and precise. I know of no individual who has a more brilliant mind or who is a stronger advocate than GENE KEOGH. He has sponsored, successfully, during his period of service in this body, a great number of legislative measures in the public interest. His district is indeed fortunate in having such representation in the Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means is fortunate to have him as one of its senior members. We in the House are fortunate in having the benefit of his brilliant mind, his professional skill and his powerful advocacy.

I join with all his friends in extending to GENE KEOGH many happy returns of the day, and I join in the wish previously expressed that we will have the opportunity of commemorating many subsequent such occasions.

Analysis of Operation Employment Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers of the Nation are currently engaged in editorial and analytical comment as to the recommendations of the House Republican policy committee report, "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy." This is all to the good, and should be encouraged in the future.

One of the best examples of such comment is an article by Prof. Sidney C. Sufrin, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, which appeared in the recent issue of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal. Professor Sufrin has here analyzed more fully our recommendations on coordination of services between the U.S. Department of Labor and the Office of Education, and on the need for vocational and educational guidance in national manpower policies. His conclusions as to the need for integrated employment services are excellent, and I would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues by inserting his article at this point in the RECORD:

WORK POLICY NEGLECTED—UNITED STATES NEEDS INTEGRATED PROGRAM

(Increasing attention is being directed toward "retraining" those chronically out of a job so that they can move to communities where manpower is needed. Experimental legislation is now before Congress, although it probably will not receive favorable attention at this session. The Republican Policy Committee has finished a 7-month study by 48 GOP Members of the House who presented 20 recommendations for channeling unemployed into job-offering areas, stating that "there is actually a shortage of labor in the United States." Among the 20 recommendations was a call for "greater emphasis on vocational and educational guidance in national manpower policies and in the Armed Forces and better cooperation between the Department of Labor and the U.S. Office of Education." The following article explores that recommendation.)

(By Sidney C. Sufrin)

The first bill of the Kennedy administration presented in the Senate dealt with distressed areas and was enacted into law. It provides help in the form of Federal loans and grants to communities and rural areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

Yet those who supported the program, including the President himself, recognize that this law is not very effective in reducing chronic unemployment in distressed areas.

President Kennedy has requested that Congress consider additional legislation to assist people in communities which have lost their economic foundation to move—with Government help through additional

education, training and funds—to more prosperous areas so that these people can again become self-supporting.

Congress is considering a bill which, in token fashion, would grapple with assisting unemployed people, as families, in distressed areas to fit themselves for gainful employment, rather than stressing the economic rehabilitation of communities.

All things considered, their is small chance that all areas of chronic unemployment are capable of undergoing any appreciable industrial expansion in the foreseeable future. Young people, and to a lesser extent middle-aged people, will have to find jobs away from their homes.

Sometimes this involves migration; at other times, merely long daily treks to other communities. To find and hold a job in another community often requires training and education different from the training and education found at home. School programs and technical training undertakings in a community take on the coloration of the community.

For example, the industrial orientation of education and training programs in such places as Utica and Amsterdam were reflections of the historic business activity of those communities. It was years after the economic complexion of those cities changed that the educational and training institutions began to reflect the full force of the changes.

It is clear that training as a public concern is closely related to the whole question of migration.

This migration is not of small magnitude. In the 1950's such States as Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Vermont, and West Virginia had a net outmigration of at least 10 percent of their population.

Delaware, Florida, Maryland, Alaska, and California had a net in-migration of at least 10 percent of their population.

In a State such as New York, which has little net migration, there is a large in-migration which is offset by an equally large outmigration.

In the United States at present, population is on the move. These people take with them the education they received in their old homes.

New York suffers by the poor educational substance of the States which send people here.

What is being done to better fit the population of the United States which is on the move for jobs and living in their new environment? The answer, sadly enough, is precious little.

There is at present no agency of the Federal Government which has a primary responsibility to concern itself with this monumental problem.

The Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture are all concerned, but their concern is neither coordinated nor is there a basic statute nor even a fragmentary law which is directed to alleviating the lot of industrial migrants.

What is true of agricultural migrant labor is true of the industrial migrant population.

The departments of Washington scarcely are aware of each other's responsibilities at the working level. Criticism, then, should be directed against the lack of an integrated program, which in turn reflects the lack of a general policy concerned with the national aspects of chronic unemployment, migration, and education.

The Federal Government, if it is to be effective in strengthening the economy and assisting people to find jobs, should concern itself with learning about employment opportunities where they are, skills that are needed and take steps to assist unemployed, especially unemployed youngsters in fitting themselves for these jobs in the appropriate location. And this task will require more than study and statistical analysis.

It is a tall order, but because the problem is difficult it should not be avoided. On the contrary, because the problem is difficult it should be faced with determination and all the resources which the Federal Government can muster.

Traditionally, America has been a land of migration. That tradition persists.

Family migration will be more difficult and complicated than it was in the past. It is one of the great challenges of the 1960's.

Life Without Viruses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of August 29, 1961:

SALK SEES POSSIBILITY OF LIFE WITHOUT VIRUSES—ONE SHOT MAY BE ABLE TO CONTROL MANY DISEASES, DOCTOR REPORTS IN JOURNAL

(By Albert W. Bloom)

Dr. Jonas E. Salk yesterday held out the prospect of life without viruses.

And Dr. Salk, conqueror of polio at the University of Pittsburgh Virus Research Laboratory, declared that it appears possible to control viral diseases with killed virus vaccines.

One shot may control many diseases.

Also, says Dr. Salk, immunity to a virus disease can, theoretically at least, be given with a single injection if the immunity-stimulating vaccine is potent enough.

AIRS VIEWS

Salk aired his views in the current issue of "Postgraduate Medicine," official journal of the Interstate Postgraduate Medical Association.

"The exciting possibilities for the future include the addition to the poliomyelitis vaccines of other viruses which may behave in the same manner, to permit the induction of immunity to any diseases at the same time," Dr. Salk declared.

Very little new knowledge is required for this to be possible in the years ahead.

"The more exciting idea," says Salk, "is what life will be like without viruses."

Developing vaccine potent enough to immunize with one dose won't in itself eliminate paralytic polio from this country.

EXTENT OF USE

"The important and crucial factor is the extent of use of the vaccine," said Dr. Salk.

He said Detroit's polio epidemic of 1958 depicts a typical story that has recurred throughout the United States in the past several years.

In Detroit, polio broke out among the Negro population but not among the white population.

The reason was clearly a difference in degree of use of vaccine.

The same pattern was observed in Des Moines, Iowa; Providence, R.I.; Little Rock, Ark.; in Chicago, and elsewhere, wherever localized outbreaks of polio occurred.

Salk took a scholarly swipe at those who persist in claiming that killed virus vaccine can't do as complete a job as live virus vaccine.

WHY DOES IT MATTER

"Why does it matter whether a live virus or a killed virus is used? In part," said Salk, "the question is of academic interest in the kind of discussion which goes on in scientific circles and which no one else cares about."

Many scientists have long insisted that killed virus vaccine would bring about complete immunity, that the effect would be transient, and repeated injections would be required.

Said they, in effect, "Only a live virus vaccine can ultimately eradicate poliomyelitis."

Salk shies from the use of the word "eradicate." He prefers some less extreme word conveying the idea "of approximating extinction." To wipe out a disease absolutely is unlikely.

"Preconceptions that only live virus vaccine could wipe out a disease were false," said Salk.

Killed virus polio vaccine has now been shown to offer effective, potent, and long-lasting immunity—if it is used.

Call for Private Power Probe Shocks Lawmakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Durango Cortez Herald, of Durango, Colo., August 27, said charges made by Democratic National Chairman John Bailey that the private power companies should be investigated hit the upper Colorado Basin delegates like a thunderclap this weekend. I would like to say it also hit other Members of Congress like a thunderclap. I personally was appalled that a person in such high position as Mr. Bailey should have the audacity to suggest that any private citizen or group of citizens should be investigated for exercising their constitutional right of communicating with their elected representatives concerning matters which vitally affect their future welfare.

The Durango Cortez article further said the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ASPINALL, was coldly furious about the unfortunate tirade made by Mr. Bailey. I would like to compliment my very good friend from Colorado—with whom I have had the privilege of serving on the Interior Committee for many years—for his righteous indignation about these threats and attempts at intimidation.

Because of the seriousness of this situation and the thorough manner in which the reporter for the Durango Cortez reported it, I am inserting the article in the RECORD at this point with the sincere wish that every Member of this House read it with extreme care:

CALL FOR PRIVATE POWER PROBE SHOCKS LAWMAKERS

WASHINGTON.—Charges by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey that the private power companies should be investigated in the red-hot Upper Colorado power

dispute hit the Upper Colorado Basin delegation like a thunderclap this weekend.

Bailey charged in the August 28 issue of the Democrat, the party publication, that "private power barons are spending in excess of $20 million to grab control of a billion-dollar taxpayer investment," the Upper Colorado storage project.

"The power companies' goal is obvious. They want to be the middleman and profiteer between Federal power generating facilities and nonprofit distributors. Power companies are fighting for a license to bleed the consumers of $3 to $5 million annual extra rate payments.

"We think it's about time the Congress and the Federal Power Commission investigated these operations," Bailey said.

"The question of how much electricity users should be charged to pay for high-priced public relations men whose main aim is to boost the cost of power begs an answer," Bailey stated.

He claimed that the private power lobby had thrown lush parties at an Arizona country club, and cocktail parties and dinners in Colorado to build up support for their offer to construct some of the Upper Colorado transmission lines. He also claimed that an Arizona power company vice president had been detailed "to spend the year lobbying in Washington."

Bailey's charges followed an investigation made by the staff of the Senate antitrust subcommittee of the activities of the coal lobby here following the recent public versus private power battle over Federal construction of generating facilities in the Hanford, Wash. reactor. The coal interests here are burned up over the investigation. Both the Bailey charges and the subcommittee probe were privately interpreted on Capitol Hill and elsewhere as an attempt to intimidate the coal lobby to withdraw its opposition to Hanford and the private power lobby to withdraw its opposition to Hanford and the all-Federal Upper Colorado transmission system. And some predicted the moves would backfire.

Checks made with Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, Democrat, of Colorado, of the House Interior Committee, the office of Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, Senators Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado, and John A. Carroll, Democrat, of Colorado, and with H. F. McPahil, of Salt Lake City, executive director of the Colorado River Basin Consumers Power, Inc., indicated that none was aware of the Bailey statement prior to the press release.

ASPINALL was coldly furious about it.

ASPINALL said, "Both sides—the power companies and the preference users—have lobbied in the transmission line controversy. But their activities have been open and aboveboard and I have seen no evidence of unfair tactics," ASPINALL stated.

He said that the Bailey statement was "an example of very poor liaison between Congress and the Democratic National Committee." ASPINALL added that Bailey might have called him, as sponsor of the original storage project, before issuing the blast.

ANDERSON left Washington Friday to have a gall bladder operation at Bataan Memorial Hospital in Albuquerque early this week. His office staff said that the Bailey statement was news to them. Earlier, ANDERSON had told the press that the private utilities had warned the coal industry to oppose Hanford on pain of losing their utility customers.

Udall and McPhail declined to make any public statement about the Bailey charges.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, who is a member of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, said that he was unaware not only of the Bailey charges but also of the subcommittee staff investigation of the coal lobby. CARROLL said that he had not been contacted much by either side in the upper Colorado controversy, perhaps, he said, because his position is well known as a public power man.

ALLOTT called the Bailey statement "a dreadful shame, from the standpoint of western resourcee development." ALLOTT said that the rural cooperatives favoring the all-Federal upper Colorado transmission lines had "outlobbied the power companies 25–1" so far as he was concerned. He said that he had received calls from about 50 preference users and that he had only received two calls from private power representatives. He said that the activities of both sides were aboveboard, as far as he knew. "No one has asked me to dinner, even to lunch," ALLOTT stated.

W. L. Reilly, vice president of Arizona Public Service Co., could not be reached for comment about the Bailey charges. Reilly is the captain of the team of the five Colorado River State utilities which seek to build the backbone transmission lines in the upper Colorado project. But after the coal lobby was investigated here by Senate investigators, the private power men were braced for a similar grilling.

Springfield, Ill.—The Land of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to sponsor the U.S. Travel Service Act which was enacted during this session of Congress. Through this act the sponsors envisioned an extensive program to attract tourists into the United States. If this act is to be successful we must have the cooperation and assistance of our States and cities. We need to attract tourists from other countries to visit the United States.

One of the special attractions is the Land of Lincoln at Springfield, Ill. In my travels throughout the world I found that the name of Lincoln was known in nearly every corner of this earth. I feel certain that these Lincoln shrines will attract many foreign visitors. I have today received a very interesting article on this subject written by my friends, Clyde C. Walton, the Illinois State historian, and published in the Ozark Air Lines News. For the benefit of my colleagues I would like to include this article as part of my remarks:

"VISIT U.S.A."—THE LAND OF LINCOLN,
SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Highest point in the central Illinois plain is a silver dome by day and a red beacon by night—the State capitol in Springfield. To Ozark passengers visiting the city it means the Land of Lincoln—fascinating history from a century and more ago.

On arriving at Capital Airport the visitor is 4 miles from downtown Springfield, where there are three major hotels and numerous lesser ones, plus two new motor hotels (there are more than a dozen large motels on the edges of the city). All of them are within walking distance of most of the Lincoln sites—although an automobile tour would be quicker and much less wearing.

First on the history sightseer's list is the Lincoln Home, at Eighth and Jackson Streets, the only home the Emancipator ever owned and where he lived from 1844 until 1861, when he went to Washington. This two-story frame dwelling is completely furnished with pre-Civil War pieces, many of which belonged to the Lincoln family.

Six blocks west of the Lincoln Home is the Centennial Building (Second and Jackson Streets), one of six buildings in the capitol group. Located on the site of the Ninian W. Edwards home, where Abraham Lincoln and Mary Todd were married in November 1842, the Centennial Building houses several agencies of interest to the tourist. On the first floor you can buy your Illinois automobile license; and on the third and fifth floors, respectively, are the Illinois State Historical Library and the Illinois State Museum. In the historical library you can see scores of original letters in Lincoln's handwriting—some of the 1,200 Lincoln documents in the library's collection. There also are Lincoln paintings and sculpture, photographs, miniatures, and many articles that belonged to Lincoln—his shaving mirror, white kid gloves, gold-headed cane, for example, as well as the desk on which he wrote his first inaugural address and a charming walnut handcrafted bookcase from the Lincoln-Herndon law office.

In addition to its Lincoln manuscripts, the library has more than half a million other original documents and 100,000 books relating to the history of Illinois and her leaders. These books and documents may be used on request.

The Illinois State Museum is, like the historical library, a many-purpose agency—used by scholars as well as casual visitors. Its exhibits include outstanding natural history habitat groups, an art gallery, displays of Indian costumes and artifacts, as well as special exhibits that change from time to time, varying from collections of oriental lacquer work to medieval armor.

Visitors are also welcome in the Illinois Archives Building, the handsomely refurbished State capitol, the supreme court building, the State armory, and the new State office building.

Three blocks east of the capitol group, in the heart of downtown Springfield, is the historic Sangamon County Courthouse, a simple sandstone building of Doric design, which served as the Illinois State capitol from 1840 to 1876. There, in the old chamber of the house of representatives, Abraham Lincoln delivered his famous "House Divided" speech in 1858. And there, 3 years later, Stephen A. Douglas made his impassioned plea for preservation of the Union.

Three blocks from the old Statehouse is the First Presbyterian Church, at Capitol and Seventh, where visitors can see the pew rented by the Lincoln family.

But the most impressive of all the Lincoln shrines in Springfield is the Lincoln Tomb in Oak Ridge Cemetery, about a mile north of the courthouse square. The beautiful monument which marks the burial place of Abraham Lincoln and his wife and three of their four sons is a towering obelisk of granite, dedicated in 1874. Inside the plain square base of the monument are the Lincoln crypts, which are reached by corridors, lined with Lincoln statuary. Engraved in the wall above the Lincoln cenotaph are the words of Lincoln's Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton: "Now he belongs to the ages."

A very different kind of memorial to Illinois' great Civil War President is the 60-acre Memorial Gardens—composed of native wild flowers and trees. These gardens, created by the Garden Club of Illinois, are located on the eastern shore of Lake Springfield, a few miles southeast of the city.

This 4,000-acre lake, completed in 1933, is symbolic of modern Metropolitan Spring-

field. Surrounded by fine homes and public recreation areas (which include a golf course and beaches), the lake provides a source of pure water for domestic and industrial use for Springfield and a number of smaller communities within a radius of 15 miles. Near the steel and concrete dam which impounds the lake is a coal-burning electric power generating plant. The combination of ample water supplies and low municipal power rates has attracted many diversified industries into this rich farming area.

Eighteen miles northwest of modern Springfield, the visitor finds himself in another world—the sleepy Sangamon River village of New Salem, reconstructed as it looked in the 1830's when Abraham Lincoln lived there. One of the original log cabins in the village, the Onstott Cooper Shop, is still there, and the other buildings—13 homes, a tavern, a school, a saw and grist mill, and several stores and shops—have been reproduced and furnished in authentic style.

The village is one of Illinois' State parks, and the State divsion of parks has provided picnic and camping grounds in the park area. Several modern motels and inns are also located nearby. Transportation from Springfield to the park can be easily arranged.

Returning to Springfield from New Salem on the Lincoln Memorial Highway, the 20th century visitor can follow the same trail that Abraham Lincoln walked more than a century and a quarter ago.

Secession and Fort Sumter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following address by the Honorable James F. Byrnes is not only a magnificent oration, but is a remarkably accurate, historical document worthy of preservation for all time to come:

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES AT THE CHARLESTON CONFEDERATE CENTENNIAL, APRIL 11, 1961

The Senate Judiciary Committee in reporting the resolution establishing the Centennial Commission stated its purpose was to encourage public knowledge of the history of the social, economic, and other causes of the Civil War and its results.

There can be no doubt of the good intentions of the sponsors of the Resolution but in my humble opinion it was a mistake. Winston Churchill, in his "History of the English Speaking Peoples" wrote: "The cleavages of the great Civil War (of England) dominated English life for two centuries, and many strange examples of their persistency survive under universal suffrage in English Constituencies today."

Our Civil War was the greatest tragedy in the history of any country. After two centuries its battles might be commemorated but one century is a short period in the history of a country and I fear it is quite impossible to relive the 4 years of the Civil War without recalling experiences that will be unpleasant to the people of both the North and South.

However, I am confident no man is more anxious, and if let alone, is more able to administer the resolution than Gen. U. S. Grant III.

Southerners frequently make history but seldom write it. Many sincere northerners from their reading of history, have an impressive entirely different from the accepted view in the South as to the causes of the war. In the next 4 years many speeches made by northerners on this subject will displease you. My views on the subject and particularly as to the bombardment of Fort Sumter may displease others, but I must state my view, which is based in great part upon the official records.

For the views of southern leaders in 1860 as to the right of a State to secede, there was justification. The Declaration of Independence had referred to "free and independent States" and the fundamental opposition of the people to Government "without consent of the governed."

The 56 signers of that instrument, in referring to the compact between the United States of America spelled the adjective "united" with a little "u." The Continental Congress drafted the Articles of Confederation which declared that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence," and every power which is not delegated to the United States.

In the treaty ending the Revolutionary War, Great Britain referred to each one of the States separately, acknowledging them to be free sovereign and independent States.

At the Constitutional Convention, Madison declared that "the use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war than the infliction of punishment." And the great Federalist, Alexander Hamilton, said that "to coerce the States is one of the maddest projects ever devised."

This desire of the people of all States to limit the power of the Federal Government was so well understood that the men who drafted the Constitution thought it unnecessary to declare it. However, when the instrument was submitted for ratification, it appeared certain to be rejected by the States until pledges were received from its advocates that the Constitution would be promptly amended. This was done in the Bill of Rights, the 10th amendment declaring, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

That is in the Constitution today and no political party would dare advocate its repeal. Instead, through the years the proponents of a centralized government have advocated legislation in violation of the 10th amendment and have relied upon such violations being approved by the Supreme Court.

In the half century following the ratification of the Constitution cheap labor from abroad enabled the northern States to make great progress industrially while the South, relying almost entirely upon agriculture, made less progress. The industrial North demanded tariff laws to protect its industries. The South opposed a protective tariff law because it meant increased prices for what they had to buy.

The economic conflict that divided the sections was mild compared to that arising out of slavery. The African slaves were brought to this country first by slave traders of Spain; then by British traders and later by the slave traders of New England. When the Constitution was adopted slavery existed in 12 of the 13 States. The industrial northern States soon found it impractical to use slaves in manufacturing plants and gradually sold them to the agricultural South. When they had disposed of their slaves, the North began efforts to abolish slavery in all States.

There can be no doubt that the cold war of 100 years ago was started by many who sincerely opposed the institution of slavery. It was opposed by many leaders in the South. It is my belief that in 1860 slavery was on the way out, and had there been no war, ways and means would have been found to abolish it.

From my own study in boyhood days, I could not understand how the people of all the States had ever favored slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own a human being. New England brought them here, but the South bought them. For our sin we are still being punished. It is our cross and it prevents us from giving to many subjects the unbiased consideration of which we are capable.

The economic problems, plus the agitation of the slavery problem, aroused the passions of the people. Whenever that happens, people do not think or act wisely. The political leaders found it impossible to devise a satisfactory compromise between the National and State Governments.

In 1857 the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case held that within the meaning of the Constitution, a Negro was not a citizen and could not sue in the U.S. courts. The decision aroused the nonslave States. On June 26, 1857, Abraham Lincoln attacked the Court and argued the decision was not binding as a precedent. The Supreme Court was widely denounced in the North, but no editor there attacked the critics of the Court nor argued that the decision was the law of the land.

In Boston, following the decision, there were rumors of secession and efforts were made to hold a secession convention at Worcester, Mass. That doctrine did not originate in the South.

As early as January 1804, Senator Timothy Pickering, in a letter to George Cabot, said: "I do not believe in the practicability of a long-continued union. A northern confederacy would unite congenial characters and present a fairer prospect of public happiness; while the Southern States, having a similarity of habits, might be left to manage their own affairs in their own way. If a separation were to take place, our mutual wants would render a friendly and commercial intercourse inevitable."

During the War of 1812 there was held at Hartford, Conn., a secession convention with delegates from five New England States. They demanded seven changes in the Constition and complained of many violations of the rights of the States. A committee was appointed to present their demands to the Congress and report back in 6 months, but when shortly thereafter the war ended with a satisfactory treaty with Great Britain, the subject was dropped.

The people of the Original Thirteen States did not doubt their right to withdraw from the compact whenever they believed it in their interest. They knew the National Government had been created by the States and thought the creature could not be greater than the creators.

It was with full knowledge of these historical precedents that, when the cold war, diligently conducted by the political extremists of the North, could no longer be tolerated, South Carolinians met first at Columbia and then in Charleston in December 1860, and finally with great reluctance, adopted the resolution of secession. Other Southern States followed.

In February 1861, the Congress of the Confederate States of America met in Montgomery and Jefferson Davis was inaugurated President. In his inaugural address, President Davis did not once mention slavery. He did defend the Constitution and the right of States to withdraw from the compact between the States. His address was really a prayer for the preservation of peace.

When Lincoln was inaugurated, Davis, still hoping to avoid war, dispatched three commissioners to Washington to request through

the Secretary of State an audience with the President to convey to him the sincere desire of the newly created government of the Confederate States, to bring about a peaceful settlement.

On March 15, they sent such a written request to Secretary of State Seward. With the approval of President Lincoln, Seward took the position that he was entrusted only with the control of foreign affairs, subject to the approval of the President, and he could not see the commissioners or grant their request to arrange a conference with the President because it might be construed as recognition of the Confederate States of America. That was a mistake. A conference might have averted a war.

Seven of the Original Thirteen States then composed the Confederate Government. If Lincoln chose to take the position that the 5 million people of those States had not seceded, they were still citizens of the United States and he could have received their representatives. If he could not receive them publicly, he should not have dealt with them secretly through intermediaries, as he did.

The Secretary of State asked Justice Nelson, a New Yorker, and a member of the Supreme Court, to request Justice Campbell, of Alabama, to act as a mediator.

Campbell, accompanied by Nelson, called on Seward who said that a civil war might be prevented by the mediation of Campbell. Seward authorized Campbell to advise Davis that "before this letter reaches you, Sumter will have been evacuated."

Justice Campbell wrote to Judge Crawford, one of Davis' commissioners, that Fort Sumter would be evacuated "within the next 5 days." The 5 days elapsed. Campbell and Nelson again called upon Seward with a telegram from General Beauregard stating Fort Sumter was not evacuated. Seward assured them the failure was not due to bad faith but to causes necessary to carry out the intention to evacuate.

In the meantime a Captain Fox, professing a peaceful mission, was allowed to visit Fort Sumter. Then a Colonel Lamon, a Springfield friend of President Lincoln, visited Charleston and told Governor Pickens he came to arrange for the removal of the garrison. Lamon did advise Lincoln that Major Anderson favored evacuation.

Because of many rumors, Campbell again communicated with Seward and on April 1 received from him a written statement, "I am satisfied the government will not undertake to supply Fort Sumter without giving notice to Governor P." But Lincoln ordered the expedition to start for Charleston by April 6. That order was equivalent to a declaration of war.

On April 7 Justice Campbell again addressed Secretary Seward, stating that the government had alarmed the South by its reported preparations of a fleet to reinforce Sumter. Seward's reply was the cryptic "Faith as to Sumter fully kept—wait and see." On that day the Charleston Courier announced that en route to Charleston Harbor was a formidable armada. According to the Federal Government's own statement, this armada consisted of "8 vessels carrying 26 guns and about 1,400 men."

The day before Seward gave Campbell the assurance that "Faith as to Sumter would be kept" written instructions dated April 6, had been given to Robert Chew of the State Department, to be read to Governor Pickens and General Beauregard: "I am directed by the President of the United States to notify you to expect an attempt will be made to supply Fort Sumter with provisions only, and that if such an attempt be not resisted, no effort to throw in men, arms, or ammunition will be made without further notice or in case of an attack upon the fort."

From the record, it is evident the arrival of the expedition was expected shortly after the delivery of Lincoln's message, at a late hour on the 8th. That would have given Beauregard no opportunity to get instructions from the Confederate Government.

Complete deception was thwarted by a severe storm off Cape Hatteras which delayed the Federal ships. And, because President Davis had received confidential information from many sources of the sailing of the fleet, he had advised Beauregard to be on the alert for a conflict and the Confederate forces stood in readiness.

From official records, it is clear Lincoln had conflicting advice. He requested the advice of Gen. Winfield Scott, who advised it would be a tragedy to attempt to reinforce Sumter. Scott prepared an order for the President's signature providing for the evacuation of the fort. Lincoln decided to disregard the advice of his military advisers. He sent to Charleston Capt. Gustavus Fox, a textile agent of Massachusetts, who formerly had been a naval officer, to decide whether Sumter could be successfully reinforced. Fox, on the false pledge that he came on a peaceful mission, was on March 21, permitted by order of Governor Pickens to visit Fort Sumter. He did not tell Anderson his purpose, but later reported to the President that Sumter could be reinforced. At his request, Lincoln sent him to New York to secretly prepare the expedition and placed him in command of it.

Lincoln was not the first nor the last President to do harm because of the advice of an unofficial but ambitious do-gooder.

These were crowded days. On April 11, the President of the Confederacy instructed Beauregard to demand evacuation of Fort Sumter and if the demand was refused, to reduce it. That afternoon under a flag of truce, the ultimatum was conveyed to Major Anderson. Because of the recent instructions from his Government, Anderson decided he could not comply and sadly remarked "I will await the first shot" and then added "if you do not batter us to pieces, we will be starved out in a few days."

President Davis understood the terrible situation confronting his old friend, Major Anderson and he saw through Lincoln's efforts to goad the South into shooting. Anderson's reply quickly became known and aroused great excitement in Charleston. People lined the waterfront looking toward the sea. Notwithstanding the demands for immediate action President Davis, with patience and his love of peace, made one more effort by having his Secretary of War wire General Beauregard a message, pursuant to which Beauregard, at 11 p.m., wrote Major Anderson, "We do not desire needlessly to bombard Fort Sumter. If you will state the time at which you will evacuate Fort Sumter, we will abstain from opening fire upon you."

When the message was presented by Colonel Chestnut, Major Anderson at midnight held a conference with his top officials. He had a fateful decision to make: If to avoid a war he agreed to evacuate, he knew he would be branded a traitor. The alternative was that his men would face death. Finally Anderson answered, in writing, that he would evacuate by noon of the 15th provided he did not receive prior to that time controlling instructions from his government or additional supplies.

The proviso imposed made acceptance impossible because Chestnut knew that at that very moment some of the ships were at the entrance of the harbor. Colonel Chestnut asked for paper and pen and addressed to Anderson one sentence, notifying him that they would open fire on Fort Sumter 1 hour from that time. It was then 3:20 and at 4:30 the first shot was fired from Fort Johnson.

That afternoon Beauregard wired President Davis that he would take possession of Fort Sumter the following morning and allow Major Anderson the privilege of saluting his flag. Davis was happy when he learned no one had been killed in taking the fort.

Most historians have overlooked the treatment accorded Major Anderson. He was kept entirely in the dark. Captain Fox, a civilian friend of President Lincoln, sought information of him but gave none.

Lamon led Anderson to believe the idea of relief had been abandoned. Not until April 7 did Anderson receive any word from his government. Then he was advised by Secretary of War Cameron that the expedition was on the way and he should hold out if possible until the ships arrived.

The following day Major Anderson wrote the Adjutant General, Col. Lorenz Thomas, a significant and courageous letter, from which I quote:

"I had the honor to receive by yesterday's mail, the letter of the honorable Secretary of War, dated April 4, and confess that what he there states surprises me very greatly. I trust that this matter will be at once put in a correct light, as a movement made now, when the South has been erroneously informed that none such would be attempted, would produce most disastrous results throughout our country.

"It is, of course, now too late for me to give any advice in reference to the proposed scheme of Captain Fox. I fear that its result cannot fail to be disastrous to all concerned. Even with his boat at our walls, the loss of life (as I think I mentioned to Mr. Fox) in unloading her, will more than pay for the good to be accomplished by the expedition.

"We have not oil enough to keep a light in the lantern for one night. The boats will have to, therefore, rely at night entirely upon other marks. I ought to have been informed that this expedition was to come. Colonel Lamon's remark convinced me that the idea, merely hinted at to me by Captain Fox, would not be carried out.

"We shall strive to do our duty, though. I frankly say that my heart is not in this war, which I see is to be thus commenced. That God will still avert it, and cause us to resort to pacific means to maintain our rights, is my ardent prayer." (Official Records, series I, vol. 1, p. 294.)

Because of the general knowledge that the military expedition was then on its way, this letter was intercepted and it appears in the official records of the Confederacy.

It is significant because this loyal Federal officer described the expedition as a "scheme of Captain Fox"; and significant, too, is the reference to "the war to be thus commenced". It was thus commenced.

President Lincoln must have known of the solemn promises made by Seward to Justices Campbell and Nelson that Fort Sumter would be evacuated, and it is certain that Seward knew at the time he made these pledges, that Lincoln had ordered the outfitting of the expedition and that the fleet was then on its way.

Lincoln had deliberately goaded the Confederate government into firing upon the fort and when the scheme was discovered, the people of the South were enraged.

The attitude of the responsible officials of the Confederate government at that time was accurately expressed by President Davis in his address to the Confederate congress: "We protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice, save that of honor. We seek no conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the States from which we have lately been confederated. All we ask is to be let alone and that those who never held power over us should not attempt our subjugation by arms."

Had their hope for peace been based on power, there was little justification for it.

The Northern States had three times the population; four times the bank deposits and five times the number of factories of the South. In the face of such odds, hope had to be based on principle supported by courage of a free people willing to sacrifice their fortunes and their lives.

Four years later, at Appomattox, Lee surrendered and with his surrender the issue of secession was forever settled. But I cannot refrain from saying, it was settled by might and not by right, under our Constitution.

The centennial resolution refers to results of this war, but with the tensions existing throughout the world today, I would not discuss events of the resulting reconstruction era. However, in mitigation of what was done by the army of occupation, I express the belief that most of the oppressive acts from which we suffered were committed not by the fighting men of the Union Army as it existed prior to the surrender.

We can recall how, after both World Wars, men in the armed services maneuvered to secure discharge. I am sure the Union soldiers, after 4 years of war, similarly exerted every influence to be permitted to return to their homes and businesses. They were replaced by other men, many of whom had no homes and no businesses, and who saw an opportunity to prey upon a conquered people. When southern leaders protested against the crimes of reconstruction, many northerners thought it was only the cry of poor losers. Gradually, however, the truth was realized in the North, and many retired Union soldiers assisted the courageous southerners to bring an end to the tragic era.

During that nightmare which lasted 10 years, the governments of the Southern States were in the hands of adventurers from the North, called carpetbaggers, plus southern traitors, called scalawags. Of course, their control was possible only because of the votes of the recently freed African slaves, and the support of the army of occupation.

The white men and women who lived through that period seldom blamed the Negroes. They knew that the white man had behind him centuries of training and self-control, and they should not apply the same yardstick to the recently freed slaves who had no such background and no educational opportunities.

With the return of governments to the control of the white people, cordial relations were soon established between the white people and the Negroes. Negro men worked by the side of white men; Negro women worked in the homes of white women. Without a Marshall plan or aid of any kind from the Federal Government, they brought the South from poverty to prosperity.

In the years that have passed, the Negro has made greater progress in the South than in any other place on earth. One has but to read of the Negroes in Africa today to realize the fabulous progress of the southern Negroes. They are being educated and, certainly in this State, their schools are as good and in many instances, are superior to the schools for white children. They have gone into the professions and into business. Thousands own their farms and their homes. I am proud of their progress.

Even more incredible to the foreigner is the fine relationship existing between the people of the South and the North. Our people have shown a surprising capacity for forgiveness, even if they do not forget.

Our willingness and ability to unite was proved soon after reconstruction, in the Spanish-American War. In World War I the loyalty of the South was again demonstrated. When the first draft law was enacted the county of Union, in this State, furnished so many volunteers that not a single man was drafted. In World War II and in the Korean war the heroism of the sons of the South was too dramatic for me to attempt to recite.

In the field of domestic affairs our people will differ and fight for what they believe to be right, but all the world should realize that when danger threatens from abroad, our differences will be forgotten and all Americans will unite to defend the land we love.

Wheat's the Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this distinguished body a reprint of an article from the Great Bend Tribune, appearing in the Hutchinson News of August 28, entitled "Wheat's the Thing," which I thought my colleagues would enjoy reading, in connection with the storage of wheat in urban areas:

WHEAT'S THE THING

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has proposed that some of the Nation's wheat surplus be stored near metropolitan areas, for emergency use in the event of nuclear war.

The suggestion brought catcalls from Kansas' Republican legislators. They say the shipment and storage involved would be a waste of money, and they question whether the public would know what to do with the wheat if they had it.

As we analyze it, the public's ignorance in the field of raw wheat would in this case be bliss. It would actually be the saving feature of the program. Secretary Freeman apparently hasn't contemplated putting a sack of wheat in every household, hence the GOP groans about storage expense. Here Mr. Freeman has failed to go the whole mile. There is no reason why the wheat couldn't be delivered right to the housewife, for storage in her basement, or in some seldom-used closet.

The arrangement would work for the very reason that Mrs. John Q. Public wouldn't know what to do with her sack of wheat except to store it.

Mr. Freeman's idea, ostensibly is to provide emergency food stores for use in the event that the Nation's normal distribution system is paralyzed. It would seem then that delivery now to the family doorstep would best serve the ultimate goal. If placed in the hands of the ultimate users, the wheat won't be locked in some towering concrete bin while the resident's of Gotham or Philadelphia cower in their basements. The wheat should be right beside them, where they can eat it.

And this is why wheat is such a natural. If the Government sought to store canned goods in Mrs. J. Q. Public's basement, Mrs. Public would snitch. She'd slip down from time to time—on those occasions when the stores are closed and she has run short of greenbeans—and borrow from the emergency larder. Long before the war, she would have cut her supplies down to a few cans of okra and sauerkraut.

Trying to stay alive on what she hadn't already worked into the family meals would hardly be worth it.

But what wouldn't tempt her. Her grandmother, maybe, but not the modern-day housewife. She isn't even very friendly with flour. Brown-and-serve rolls and add-milk cake mix are her forte. Her emergency wheat supply would be just that, a source of protein in dire emergency. She wouldn't any more borrow a cup under peaceful circumstances than she'd bake one of her daughter's mud pies in the oven. When the last stale bread crumb and frozen TV dinner were gone, and after the pangs of hunger were fairly pronounced, then this sack of little brown berries would take on meaning.

Frankly, we had thought Secretary Freeman was nuts too. Popcorn, we mused, would be so much more useful as an emergency food item. The housewife still knows the rudiments of popping. She could keep the family alive for days on the easily stored, easily prepared grain.

It was then that we could see the Freeman wisdom. If the Government gave the public popcorn, it would be gone long before the battle. Wheat's the thing.

Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk these days about having negotiations with Russia on the Berlin problem.

To negotiate means to evaluate the elements of a problem toward the end of effecting a solution, with compromise being an ingredient vital to the total process.

Inasmuch as Russia has historically proved to be without reason in instances where the United States has attempted to solve problems existing between these two nations, one wonders just what miraculous formula our officials have conceived to permit them to reason with unreasonable people.

Talk can be cheap, particularly when it does not succeed in accomplishing a constructive purpose. In this respect, I insert into the RECORD an appropriate article from the editorial section of the August 31 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

TALK

But what are they going to talk about?

This isn't a facetious question. For plainly there are going to be talks between the West and the Soviets over Berlin; Secretary of State Rusk says they may take place before the opening of the U.N. General Assembly in September, but in any event sometime during the fall. And equally plainly, if men are going to negotiate on any issue they have to know what there is to negotiate.

West German Foreign Minister Von Brentano, says that the talks are urgently needed to "make clear" the positions of both sides, East and West. At best, this is an incomplete statement of the task. The Russian position is certainly clear enough: West Berlin is a bone in Mr. Khrushchev's throat, and he wants to pluck it out. The Western position is that we will not surrender in that place to another aggression by the Communist empire—or, at least, that is the West's position if the words of its statesmen mean anything.

The British equally skirt the issue, or so it seems to us, when they say the purpose

of the talks is to avoid a war over Berlin. The avoidance of war is indeed a prime task of statesmen, but if the avoidance of war were their only task then it would be simple. War can always be avoided by yielding to an aggressor; if Hitler had been yielded to at every point there would have been no World War II. There will certainly be no war over Berlin if Mr. Khrushchev "negotiates" the whole of it.

So we come back, then, to the deadly serious question: What is it that, in these talks, we intend to negotiate?

Mr. Khrushchev says he is going to sign a treaty with the East Germans and that this will give their puppet government jurisdiction over all the access routes to West Berlin. Perhaps, as some people have argued, the East German Government would then be willing to sign an agreement with the West reaffirming our routes of entry. Are we prepared to accept this "quid" when the "quo" would be the acceptance of the East German Government as a separate, sovereign entity—and therefore the recognition of a permanently divided Germany?

There has been much talk about making West Berlin a "free city." This was proposed by Mr. Khrushchev and seconded, though in different words, by some Members of our Congress. Is this an acceptable proposal to men who remember Danzig? And if it is to be talked about, does it mean that the West withdraws its troops from West Berlin while the Communists keep their tanks in East Berlin just across the Brandenburg Gate?

In this phrase "free city" there is a yawning trap of words unless we know precisely what we are talking about, and what the Communists are talking about. Its allure is in the promise that it will preserve all those rights of the West Berliners for access to West Germany. Its share is that making it a denationalized city would cut it off from West Germany. Its snare is that making it a the communism which surrounds it.

All these "points of negotiation" have one thing in common. They would make the city of West Berlin, which is now free in the true sense of the word, less free than it was before. Therefore the Communists stand to gain from any negotiated changes in the forms and technicalities. And the Communists know it—whether we do or not.

For negotiation to have any real meaning it would have to embrace also changes in the encircling communism in East Berlin and East Germany. But this is what, so far, the West is not agreed to insist upon. And it is, of course, precisely what the Soviets refuse to negotiate.

The truth is that we have a Berlin crisis today only because the Communists want to swallow the prey. Until that changes, every time the statesmen of the West sit down to talk with the men from the Kremlin the question will abide: What are they going to talk about?

Poor Return to the American Taxpayers for Their $8.2 Billion Given to Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News reminds us of the return the American people are getting from the so-called neutral nations for our freely given dollars. The leaders meeting in Belgrade see nothing morally wrong in accepting $8.2 billion from the American people to keep their nations secure and at the same time line up on the side of the Communists on every issue Khrushchev stirs up to bring about our destruction. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members may reconsider our foreign aid program when the appropriation bill comes up next week and eliminate every cent for countries who have consistently aided our enemies, or who deny their own people the basic freedoms. Let us put an end to the foolhardy course we have been following of spending billions for defense against communism and billions to build up and maintain nations who are allied in philosophy and almost in practice with the Soviet Union.

OUR NEUTRAL FRIENDS

"Why should that man speak ill of me?" once asked Pennsylvania Political Boss Boies Penrose. "I've never done a favor for him."

Meeting in Belgrade this week are the representatives of 24 nations or political entities that could, if they would, count favors from the United States to the total of $8.2 billion.

That is the amount of money we have given, or are committed to give them, in various forms of aid—military, economic, food, loans, grants.

It is advertised as a meeting of neutrals.

It will be interesting to observe—from their deliberations and resolutions and future votes in the United Nations—whom they are neutral against.

Let's call the roll, alphabetically, and list the U.S. dollars:

Afghanistan, $146 million; Algerian FLN, none; Burma, $93 million; Cambodia, $263 million; Ceylon, $65 million; Cuba, $41 million (pre-Castro); Cyprus, none; Ethiopia, $114 million; Ghana, $4 million; Guinea, $4 million; India, $3,500 million; Indonesia, $560 million; Iraq, $46 million; Lebanon, $86 million; Mali, none; Morocco, $194 million; Nepal, $40 million; Saudi Arabia, $46 million; Somali, $9 million; Sudan, $44 million; Tunisia, $135 million; United Arab Republic, $295 million; Yemen, $11 million, and Yugoslavia, $2,200 million.

Some of these countries have also received substantial Russian aid.

The largest voices at the Belgrade powwow, as the figures indicate, will be India's Nehru, Yugoslavia's Tito, UAR's Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno. They will all be vocal for peace, in sincere idealism, and also perhaps as a matter of self-interest. For if big-power shooting should start, the foreign aid spigot would be shut off tight while we used all our resources for our own survival, and some neutrals would not even be able to feed themselves.

And as self-appointed umpires of the cold war, they'll have ideas on how to settle the Berlin crisis—ideas easier to come by since none has a single soldier guarding the freedom of Berlin.

But will they applaud Britain, France and the United States for trying to keep the peace? Will they condemn the U.S.S.R. and puppet East Germany for erecting concrete and barbed-wire barricades across Berlin and creating the crisis? On the basis of past performance, that is not likely. For the neutrals have learned they may criticize the free world and be heeded, whereas the Communist dictatorships pay no attention whatever to criticisms.

Neutrality has its obvious advantages to all of the nations represented at Belgrade, and we could wish some were more neutral than they are. But it would be heartening if there were an occasional sign of recognition that their neutrality is possible only because there are free world powers to give them protection.

Dominy Shows His True Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently a good friend from Boise, Idaho, sent me a very interesting byline column which appeared on Sunday, August 20, in the Idaho Statesman, and an editorial which appeared in the same newspaper on August 21. This column, written by John Corlett, was called Politically Speaking.

The main topic of Mr. Corlett's column concerned a speech made recently by Reclamation Commissioner Floyd Dominy at Rupert, Idaho, in which the Commissioner has evidently shown his true colors as an outright proponent of public power.

Mr. Corlett points out that Dominy said that Washington was "filled with special interest groups whose aims do not always coincide with the national interest." This columnist then correctly observes whether the national interest is something determined out of the trial and errors of the people's views or "as something dedicated by a Bureau in Washington." He goes on to observe that Dominy and the administration "has decided that federalization of the electric power industry is in the national interest."

I sincerely urge every Member of this body to read these observations by Mr. Corlett because they give a clear indication of the extent to which the man who is responsible for the Nation's reclamation program has apparently decided to scuttle the basic purpose of the program for the sake of public power. Can this be the same Floyd Dominy who gained his reputation and stature as a dedicated public servant straightening out the problems of floundering reclamation projects in the West with impartiality? Can this be the same Floyd Dominy whose apparent lack of bias prompted the former Secretary of the Interior to appoint him as Commissioner of Reclamation and prompted the present Secretary of the Interior to continue him in that capacity?

As a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have previously taken exception to some of the positions espoused by Mr. Dominy and I again take strong exception to his newly found public power attitudes expressed in the Rupert, Idaho, speech. I wonder now whether these are newly found attitudes or whether the Commissioner of Reclamation has long been masquerading as a wolf in sheep's clothing. When I think back to some of

the suggestions he made even under the previous administration with regard to the Burns Creek project and the all-Federal transmission system in the Upper Colorado River Basin, I become more and more convinced that he was a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this column by John Corlett, which appeared in the Idaho Statesman on Sunday, August 20, in the RECORD at this point so that my thoughtful colleagues may have the opportunity of reading Mr. Corlett's observations:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING

(By John Corlett)

When Floyd Dominy spoke at Rupert Saturday, you could turn the calendar back to 1951 and 1952.

It has been obvious since President Kennedy took office last January that the policies which existed in the Department of Interior prior to 1953 when Mr. Eisenhower became Chief Executive, were simply resurrected and reinstated. Whatever happened in water resources and Federal power development in the 8 Eisenhower years were shunted into the shadows, out of sight and out of mind.

Mr. Dominy speaks in the voice of Mike Strauss, the public and Federal hydropower dedicated Commissioner of Reclamation under Mr. Truman. Before Strauss, the Bureau of Reclamation, run by engineers, hewed a fairly straight line and stuck to its business of building irrigation dams. And if the dams could generate power, well and good, but it was a byproduct.

Under Strauss, a newspaperman and public relations expert before his Government service, power became the tail that wagged the dog in consideration of reclamation projects. This policy was exemplified in the high Hells Canyon Dam, which did not irrigate a single acre, but its power was to be used to help pay for reclamation projects.

At Rupert, Dominy lost no time in raising the ghost of Hells Canyon and moaned that progress in reclamation had thereby sustained a blow.

Surely he must know that the water users of southern Idaho raised up in numbers to kill the High Hells Canyon Dam on grounds their water rights would be endangered and that the big structure was uneconomical.

This is a fight well known to Idahoans, but Dominy insists that interested Idahoans don't know what is good for them.

He brought up Mr. Truman's old bugaboo of special interests. He said Washington, D.C., was "filled with special interest groups whose aims do not always coincide with the national interest." What is the national interest? Is it something determined out of the trials and errors of the peoples' views, or is something dictated by a bureau in Washington?

Dominy and the Kennedy administration has decided that federalization of the electrical power industry is in the national interest. Wherever the people have been allowed to speak on this issue in local and regional elections they have turned down this view.

Dominy complained that the special lobbying groups distort facts or omit key facts. Does he imply that the special interest he is espousing as an official on the Federal payroll does not distort or omit facts?

The distortion and omission of facts by the Interior Department and public power groups in the High Hells Canyon case were legion and I documented many of them in the hundreds of thousands of words I wrote on that issue.

The strangest words in Dominy's prepared text are in this paragraph:

"Downstream on the Snake River, below Hells Canyon, there is a war on as to whether to utilize the Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce hydroelectric sites and whether public or private utilities or the Federal Government will construct the proposed dams. But Idaho, which has the most to win or lose, is strangely silent even though this State has the biggest stake in this last use of the water before it passes beyond your boundaries."

The implication here, if not stated directly, is that Dominy is begging Idahoans to work primarily for Federal development of either one of these two sites. The Reclamation Bureau and the Interior Department has just shifted emphasis from the dead Hells Canyon Dam to High Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce.

But someone failed to keep Dominy advised. The Idaho Legislature adopted a memorial asking for the private development of High Mountain Sheep. The Idaho AFL–CIO wants High Mountain Sheep, on which the Pacific Northwest Power Co. has spent millions of dollars in preliminary development The Idaho Wildlife Federation favors the development of High Mountain Sheep as proposed by PNP. The Lewiston area people want High Mountain Sheep.

Dominy concluded, according to his prepared text, with these words:

"Despite the loud voices of those who oppose progress, this remains a government of the people and it will be responsive to your wishes. But you must speak as one, with a unity and desire to push ahead as your forefathers did before you when the Magic Valley was purely a gleam in some visionary leader's eyes."

Well, Magic Valley was developed by private enterprise with private money. True, extra and supplemental water was made available in later years by reclamation dams at Jackson Lake, American Falls, and Palisades. But the initial development was by private capital.

This initiative still exists. Since the end of World War II, about 350,000 acres of land have been developed in the central Idaho area by private individuals with private capital, compared to 100,000 acres developed by the Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial appearing on August 21 was entitled "They Never Give Up." It also was concerned with Commissioner Dominy's "public power trumpet bleating" at Rupert. It is particularly effective in its criticism of the Commissioner and his observations and the locale which he chose to make them.

May I remind my colleagues that this is the same Reclamation Commissioner who advised the former Secretary of the Interior to approve the all-Federal transmission system in the Upper Colorado River Basin. It should also be pointed out that the report prepared for the Secretary's consideration and upon which he made the decision was full of inadequacies and omissions which would probably have had some effect on the decision made. It is also interesting to note that it was this same Commissioner who recommended to the present Secretary of the Interior that the all-Federal transmission system be approved even though the present proposal is drastically different from the proposal supplied for Mr. Seaton's consideration.

I also commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues:

THEY NEVER GIVE UP

It's been a long time since Idaho has heard the public power trumpet bleating in one of our outposts but the sound was loud and long at Rupert Saturday. Reclamation Commissioner Dominy, in Idaho for a land-drawing ceremony on the Minidoka project, used the opportunity to inform Idahoans that they have been traveling the wrong road, and they ought to get smart. His answer for Idaho's progress, natch, is public power.

Mr. Dominy has been on the Washington scene for some time. He is an Eisenhower appointee. We don't recall his public power activity during the pre-Kennedy times. It might just be that Mr. Dominy, testing the Washington liberal winds, and wanting to keep his job, flopped over and wanted to make sure that someone in Washington heard about it.

Had Mr. Dominy found the opportunity to go to north Idaho and make his speech, not much attention would have been paid to it. But when he went into Magic Valley and spread the word, he was like the dog that tackled the beehive. He was in the wrong place and had he investigated before he opened his mouth he would have found this out. Magic Valley has some grassroots reclamation progress that seems to have created quite an agricultural area and all of this came about before the Government got the idea it had to take over the power business. Of course Mr. Dominy could point to some acreage of the Magic Valley that is vaguely intertwined with public power but there are a whole lot of acres that came into production on the shoulders of the kind of private enterprise that still is preferred in Idaho.

What The Statesman imagines happened with Mr. Dominy's speech is that one of the former Idaho resident employes of the public power boys now in Washington was asked to write him something to say at Rupert. That was a good opportunity for a public power ghost writer but it sure left Mr. Dominy with his oratory down, assuming again that he didn't compose the dilly with all its inaccuracies, not to mention the large share of just plain bunk.

Reclamation Commissioner Dominy is supposed to represent all the people of the Nation, and all the people of Idaho. He was not assigned to his position as a crusader for public power. His compensation is paid in part by the taxes private enterprise power provides the Government. It would seem, therefore, that in addition to being a long way off base in Rupert Saturday, he is also away out in left field when he is supposed to be something of an impartial umpire.

Idaho's attitude on public power is well identified. The Hells Canyon conclusion which Mr. Dominy bemoaned, he should know could not be stomached by members of Democratic-controlled House committees. He also should know more about Burns Creek Dam than he appears to know, especially the cost information that makes this public power project the most ridiculous ever considered. He can read about it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He can also find out why Burns Creek is stymied.

Perhaps Idaho is fortunate that she is located out in the intermountain country, considerably distant from such busybodies as Mr. Dominy. If he, and the others of his stripe, lived any nearer, it would be continually irritating whereas now it is only an occasional grinding on the private enterprise disposition of the people of an intelligent State, one ready to row its own

canoe. For in spite of Mr. Dominy, his opinion, and the opinion of others following his crusade. Idaho is getting along quite well. That will continue as long as we can keep up our guard against too much Federal Government electrical power or anything else.

Address by Paul A. Carbone, National Junior Commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to participate in the 26th annual national convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., which was held in my city of Utica, N.Y.

Among the highlights of this convention was the following address delivered at Chancellor Park incident to a memorial mass parade from the Hotel Utica to Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church. Gathered for this observance were the Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Frank M. Dulan, mayor of the city of Utica, National Commander Vincent Loparco, National President Angeline Tenuto, General Convention Chairman John F. Nave, National Honorary Chaplain John Positano, Convention Co-Chairman Bennie Graniero, Parade Marshal Leonard D'Amico, and several thousand delegates and Uticans.

I am glad to share this inspiring message with the Members of this House:

ADDRESS BY PAUL A. CARBONE, NATIONAL JUNIOR VICE COMMANDER OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

It is most fitting that we gather here this morning to pay tribute to the honored dead of those citizen soldiers of Italian ancestry who have made the supreme sacrifice on behalf of their country. It is also a great honor to all of us assembled here in the name of the the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, to memorialize these honored dead on the occasion of our 26th annual national convention here in the city of Utica.

Whereas in normal times of peace, such an event has taken place without undue significance and yet always with the greatest of respect, today, as we stand on the brink of perhaps another war, we carry out our bounden duty imbued with an even greater feeling of trust and obligation.

As we are assembled here this morning, at the threshhold of a world crisis and contemplate the specter of other sacrifices which may be made in this and other lands, we realize fully well with an even greater emotion the impact of the phrase "our honored dead."

It is customary in a commemoration of our war dead to show our respect and honor for these heroes of the past by the symbol of this tangible wreath.

In our organization we are ever mindful of the past in order to fulfill adequately our duties of today. Our national emblem reminds us daily of our past and present duties and responsibilities. The green-colored laurel wreath of our emblem represents peace, and the supreme sacrifice made by our departed comrades is indicated by the field of red upon which rests the laurel wreath.

We must fervently pray in order to invoke the blessings of God that the sacrifice of these honored dead shall not have been in vain and that we, as responsible citizens of today, shall have the strength and fervor to carry forth in the name of our country so that the cause of freedom and peace shall prevail.

Twenty Billion Dollars Will Not Save Latin America From Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the well-known columnist, Henry J. Taylor, puts into words much better than I can at this point the fruitless gesture in the fight against the Communist conspiracy of throwing another $20 billion into Latin America. Mr. Speaker, how long will it be and how many failures must we experience before we admit that we cannot solve all the world's problems by throwing dollars at them? What is needed to save Latin America from communism as well as the rest of the free world, is for the United States to enunciate a strong and firm foreign policy backed up by action which will free Cuba from the Communists, serve notice on Khrushchev that he risks war and defeat if he pushes his Berlin demands any further and beef up our nuclear power to support our words:

NO WAY TO RUN A RAILROAD
(By Henry J. Taylor)

Former New York City Mayor Jimmy Walker used to say, "When you don't know how to do something, praise it." This is known in more elegant circles as eulogizing the objective while you tuck the problem under the bed.

Accordingly, our U.S. delegation of 46 armchair conquistadores has tangoed back from Punta del Este eulogizing the alliance for progress program and, incidentally, announcing another great success. We have found some more people willing to accept $20 billion; thereby besting Cuba again.

Anybody who does not know we want a strong, coordinated and friendly Latin America must be out of his mind. But simply eulogizing this excellent objective without any real idea how to achieve it while spending our billions raises large moral questions which in all good conscience our officials should answer.

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon remains improperly vague or silent on the method side of utilizing this money, which is the guts of the whole thing, just as did Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, in manipulating the appropriation through the Senate.

They are silent because they do not know the answer and neither does anybody else. Or perhaps, sadly, it is impossible to achieve more with new billions down there than with old billions in the past, and we should face up to that. But, in any case, this new money of itself is not the answer. Yet, when the words all float away to the rafters this is the impression which is left. In all honesty, is that the way to run the railroad?

Again and again we rush into places and projects like this with words and the taxpayers' money, as tantalized as a blind dog in a butcher shop and without much more knowledge of what we are really doing, or how to stop, than the eager squirrel in the revolving cage.

The practice has been going on many years and has built itself into a tragic and dangerous mirage. It has led us to imagine we can do many things with dollars which dollars alone simply cannot do.

For example, the Cuban debacle was a debacle in thinking. The shabby tragedy in the Bay of Pigs has already cost us more in Latin America than this 20 billion can ever unwind. There are not enough dollars in the world to underwrite such ghastly mistakes in policy and performance. And the reckoning is here.

Nearly every time the White House sends Congress a demand for an appropriation it is pressure-propelled and promoted as absolutely vital, no matter what. It is a continuous "your money or your life" technique, which was Senator FULBRIGHT's trick, and frequently dubious. We'll never last long enough to beat communism that way.

A few days more at Punta del Este and Secretary Dillion would have thrown in the family silver. It was very expensive applause we got down there; and tentative. Several obstacles in Latin America, which face our money like a sponge faces water, require some discussion in the next article.

But without overcoming these, and no one has told us how, we will finally end up merely buying Latin America's raw materials—copper, tin, wool, timber, beef and perhaps even wheat and cotton, etc.—at a premium over the world price on the pattern of our former Cuban sugar subsidy and do very little else until we run out of money and get the same blame we got in Cuba when we stop.

Is it too much to ask that we know what we are doing ahead of time every now and then in our enormously complicated problems? If not, we will one day dollar ourselves to death, still lacking methods for success while we spend and spend and spend for objectives we praise and praise and praise.

Another Surprise Coming?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in the July 24, 1961, issue of the magazine Aviation Week and Space Technology, its editor, Mr. Robert B. Hotz, covered the very important subject of the possibility of Russia's resuming nuclear weapons testing. Because of the fact that the Russians have now announced their intention of proceeding with this testing, Mr. Hotz' editorial is of added interest. I commend to the Members of the House the contents which follow:

ANOTHER SURPRISE COMING?
(By Robert Hotz)

The Tushino air show of a few weeks ago provided a sharp surprise to the American people, who had been misled by their leaders in recent years to believe that the Soviet Union had abandoned advanced development

of manned aircraft and was concentrating solely on ballistic missiles and space weapons. These leaders in turn have been badly informed by their intelligence services, not because of the working level input but because of top-level intelligence counsel decisions to ignore evidence that did not suit their preconceived ideas of what should be transpiring.

Although Cuba and Tushino revealed some of the incredible incompetency in the use of our national intelligence estimating machinery, the full impact of this sad bureaucratic bungling has yet to be told, primarily because it is well shielded under the official stamp of secrecy.

However much of a shock it is to the American people to discover that the Red air force, which was supposed to be fading into obsolescence, had suddenly blossomed out with a full array of new generation aircraft across the whole technical spectrum from supersonic bombers and long-range interceptors to assault transports and helicopters, we wonder if an even greater shock may not be in the offing. We wonder if the self-imposed ban on nuclear testing that the United States has been operating under for the past 3 years may not be leading toward the dissipation of our once commanding lead in nuclear weapons development. Will we wake up another Monday morning soon and find that the Soviets have been secretly testing new generations of nuclear weapons when they confront us publicly with their operational capability?

This possibility has also been raised by John McCone, a California Republican who has had a long and distinguished career in Government, both in the Defense Department and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This is what he had to say on this point recently:

"Nuclear weapons development by underground and outer space testing will give to either the United States or the Soviets an arsenal of weapons, both large and small, more powerful, more versatile, and more useful in modern warfare than those now existent. The Soviets can proceed with these developments behind their walls of secrecy without detection, as no present scientific means of discovering their actions exist or can be created without inspection posts within their country and the right for on-site inspection.

"The Soviets' adamant refusal to accept a reasonable plan for policing a test ban agreement by refusing appropriate means for inspection is reason to believe they are developing new and improved weapons by clandestine testing. Thus they can develop a great military superiority, and we, respecting a self-imposed moratorium, will take second place.

"Efforts to reach agreement have now failed because of Soviet unreasonable positions. Our security is at stake. We must resume weapon testing as essential to the safety of our country and the free world. Soviet protestations that they are not interested in testing appear undependable as similar statements were frequently made regarding manned aircraft, but now they display several new military planes secretly developed.

"Will they soon display advanced nuclear weapons?"

The initial impetus toward a nuclear test ban came from the world-wide public hysteria over nuclear fallout assiduously promoted by the Soviet Union. Admittedly, the stupid secrecy imposed by the Atomic Energy Commission on the basic facts of fallout contributed enormously to the success of the Soviet hysteria promotion and is another key example of how secrecy hurts much more than it can possibly help.

Now, however, thee techniques of underground testing have been developed to the point where considerable development work can be done by this method without any atmospheric fallout. Development of nuclear testing in outer space is certainly feasible, although considerable work on adequate instrumentation must be done before it will be practical. Here too, atmospheric fallout is eliminated.

The really important lesson to be learned from the Tushino airshow of 1961 and the fatal trap to be avoided in continuing a unilateral nuclear test ban is that in dealing with the Soviets, we must cover all technical possibilities across the board if we are to avoid the disastrous consequences of strategic surprise. There is no easy shortcut to national security in dealing with as determined and formidable an adversary as the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Union is developing every phase of its military power, from the masses of land troops reequipped with mobile missiles that move by giant helicopter or armored caterpillar launching vehicles, airborne tanks and artillery to the supersonic bombers and fighters of the air force, also armed with formidable missiles, to the ballistic missile rocket forces and finally into the military applications of outer space.

This country can no longer afford to swallow the complete untruth that our military forces are in readiness to cope with any situation the Soviets may present. In all but a few areas our state of military preparedness is extremely low.

If we are to convince either our friends or foes that we mean what we say about Berlin or any of the other crises that are certain to arise along the United States-U.S.S.R. interface, we had better stop talking about how wonderful our "wonder weapons" are and begin to actually do something about plugging the great gaps that exist in our current military power. At the same time, we must continue adequate preparations for the future development of all of the incredibly fantastic possibilities the galloping technologies of our time now reduce to the realm of probability.

Century-Old Ledger Reveals Tavern Life in 1845

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 28, 1961:

FOUND IN MCALILEY HOME—CENTURY-OLD LEDGER REVEALS TAVERN LIFE IN 1845

(Editor's Note.—The following article by Viola C. Floyd is a review of a century-old ledger found recently in one of Chester's oldest home sites by Frank Roberts of Lancaster Road. Mr. Roberts said he saw a for sale sign in the yard of the McAliley home on West End several months ago and decided to investigate the dwelling. In the basement, covered with coal dust, he found the old ledger and brought it by the Reporter office as the costs of the different items were a far cry from today's standards.)

(By Viola C. Floyd)

The perusal of century-old account books is a delightful diversion. An old ledger bearing the name of John T. M. McAfee, presumably of Chester, S.C., dated 1843–52 is interesting when used as a comparison for prices. The maximum charge for a dinner was 25 cents. This may seem unbelievable to one who has had the experience in modern days of stopping at some of the very attractive roadside restaurants that now dot the countryside. In most instances the prices are in line with other things. But occasionally the traveler comes out wondering why he paid $2 for two spoonfuls of blackeyed peas, a small piece of sweet potato—beg pardon, yam—and a slice of ham through which you could see the design on the plate, plus a glass of tea flavored with leftover lemon. Can it be possible anyone ever complained of the fare received for 25 cents?

To top the 25 cent charge the ledger records the information that A. H. Davega was charged $149.54 for board and lodging for 1 year and 2 weeks. Figured on the weekly basis that averages about $2.75.

In those days everybody smoked "se'-gars" and that was the way to spell it. Segars came at various prices. One brand sold at 6¼ cents a dozen; another at 37½ cents a dozen. Doctors seemed to prefer the latter brand. Dr. Dunovant bought "one fourth box of segars" for which he was charged $6.25.

The most foreign sounding name was the account of Fes Charner De Graffenreid. Thomas De Graffenreid paid $96 with 16,000 brick on a $205 account. In 1853, he settled the total bill which was for board and lodging for self, wife, two servants and three horses.

The tavern was a stopping place during court week. The vouchers given jurors were used in payments. "Dinner for self and horse, 50 cents" or "bed for self and horse were" were entries. Share and share alike.

Drinks were the leading item charged. There was a choice of Jamaica rum, whisky, brandy, wine, gin or beer. Usually the price ran from 6¼ to 12½ cents per drink. Dudley Culp took a "julep".

A gallon of peach brandy sold for $1; a quart of "cog. brandy" for $1; and madeira at $4 per gallon.

During the course of 2 years Matthew Williams ran up an account for $27.45 for segars, whisky and brandy—and left the bill unpaid.

John W. Owen had a fondness for kisses. He bought 12½ cents worth on December 30, 1845 then returned the same day for 25 cents worth more. Popular with the girls or a house full of children?

Harry Kennedy had a taste for oysters, herring and crackers—plus brandy. He sometimes ate as many as three plates of oysters at the time. (If three different people ate dinners all charged to one person that was carefully recorded.)

The Lafayete Lodge No. 8 confined its purchases to "cans of oil" for which it settled in cash.

In lieu of cash, payment was often made in goods. A calf skin brought a credit of $2. A 26-pound green hide was given credit of $1.30 and a dry hide of 15 pounds brought $1.50. The tavern sold the byproduct of hair at the rate of so much per bushel.

Twenty-two loads of wood brought $16.50, or 75 cents per load; O. P. Farrar hauled 29 loads at 62½ cents per load and 21 loads at 18½ cents per load.

James K. Reedy was given credit for $12 on three cords of bark used for tanning. Slave labor could be used for credit. William A. Lewis paid his bill with "4 days hire of Jim" at 46 cents per day and "4 days hire of Charles" at 75 cents per day.

Fodder brought three-fourths cent per pound. (The fraction of a cent was used frequently in all accounts.) One man exchanged $46.76¼ worth of beef for drinks of whisky, brandy, gin, and wine. Two lambs brought $1.75 and two pigs with a total weight of 85 pounds brought $4.25—5 cents a pound.

W. Perry Gill seldom put drinks on his account and if he did, it was apparently when he treated a group. His bills were paid in cash.

Even an old copper still brought $4.50. John Gill built a "Little House" for the tavern and was credited $10 for same. Eli Hamilton was given $4.50 "by hide receipts." Robinson Bradley charged an account of $101.23 during 1844–46 but paid the bill in full in 1852.

Peter Wylie, the County Ordinary, settled his entire bill in green hides. Tailors charged, then exchanged, sewing. James Aiken's credit of $2 for work done on a coffin was canceled by a line drawn through the record. Tavern owner's health improve?

A. B. Holbrook paid $5 cash on a $14.68 account. Dr. Carter Lee paid $37.50 on an account of $278.37¼. The "balance of Act. forgiven." Family physician?

Between two and three hundred accounts are in the ledger, all beautifully written and accurately kept. Among other names found are such familiar ones as: Patterson, Pratt, Reed, Miller, Pardue, Ford, Cornwell, Lathan, Beckham, Hardin, Roberts, Love, Lowery, Kirk, Gibbs, Ross, Steenson, Adams, Walker, Carroll, Pride, Bennett, Nelson, Howser, McClintock, Neal, Able, Wright, Johnston, Sadler, Simpson, Parrott, Lattimer, Williamson, Jennings, Dye, Gilmore, Hammond, McNinch, Hicklin, Bratton, McDonald, Gladden, Price, Darby, Simril, Parks, Byers, Boyd, Robinson, Beam, Orr, Henry, Land, Woods, Meek, Wilkes, Kirkpatrick, McClure, Love, and Stroud.

Commonsense in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, has long been recognized as an advocate of the improvement of our election laws. He has written many enlightening articles which have been published in the Nation's press, and he has spoken eloquently in support of legislation sponsored by him to abbreviate presidential election campaigns.

His efforts in the interest of the public and for the health and welfare of the candidates themselves have attracted national attention.

With unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a comment on Mr. MONAGAN'S program made by Mr. Morgan Beatty in his "News of the World" program carried by the National Broadcasting Co. on August 23, 1961:

NEWS OF THE WORLD, AUGUST 23, 1961

MR. MONAGAN AND THE ROADBLOCK AGAINST COMMONSENSE IN POLITICS

For several years now an alert and enterprising Congressman from Connecticut has been campaigning his political fingers down to the quick for a reform that 90 percent of the voters approve.

JOHN S. MONAGAN has been fighting for a short presidential election campaign and a remodeling the "Roman circuses" called national political conventions.

Tonight he has decided to challenge the roadblock that has stopped him cold. He mapped out a plan to persuade the powerful Judiciary Committee to spring his two bills to the House floor for debate and action. They provide, either by constitutional amendment or by plain legislation, to forbid any candidate for President to start campaigning before September the 1st on election year. This would reduce the 3 months of hullabaloo to 60 days. Sparking the Congressman's decision is an article appearing tomorrow in the current McCall's magazine. Author Robert W. Sarnoff, chaiman of the board, National Broadcasting Co. Mr. Sarnoff points out that the present long campaign was a part of the stovepipe locomotive era. In that day William Jennings Bryan had to huff and puff along 18,000 miles to make 600 speeches and reach only 5 million voters. In the last campaign, says Mr. Sarnoff with the help of radio and TV both candidates spoke to 120 million Americans, coast to coast on four different evenings in a mere 4 hours. What's more President Kennedy has assured the Nation he will face his next opponent if he is renominated in the same way. The Sarnoff idea is the chairman of the two political parties should work out an agreement for a shorter campaign beginning as late as mid-September.

Mr. MONAGAN wants to put the force of law behind the idea. Surveys show 90 percent of the people want shorter campaigns. Mr. MONAGAN suspects some of the old line pros in both parties, some of whom date back to the stovepipe locomotive, oppose the short campaign because, well, some say Truman would have lost in 1948 if he had had to shorten his "give 'em hell campaign." Maybe a Republican would want extra time in the next campaign. But the pressure is on—and it's building toward a modern and dignified appeal to the voters.

Naval Shipyards Provide Essential Support to Vessels of the U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Rear Adm. R. K. James, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, speaking before the Naval Civilian Administrators Association in Washington, D.C., discussed the Navy's position with regard to the current plight of the private shipbuilding industry. I believe that my colleagues will be interested to read excerpts of that speech which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NAVAL SHIPYARDS PROVIDE ESSENTIAL SUPPORT TO VESSELS OF THE U.S. NAVY

As of January 1, 1961, a naval ship construction and conversion program having a total cost of over $4,323,000,000 was under contract with private yards. Thirty-one private shipbuilding firms throughout the country are participating in this program.

This contributes importantly to the economic well-being of the shipbuilding and repair industry. It is unfortunately true that many commercial shipyards are in a depressed condition and some have closed and still others face bankruptcy today. The primary cause of the difficulties does not rest with the Navy.

One of the least publicized, but one of the most obvious reasons for the difficulties experienced by the private shipbuilders has been a decline in commercial ship construction and repair work. Insofar as employment is concerned, private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,069 in 1957 to 41,743 in 1960.

Nevertheless, in spite of this increased employment on Navy work, overall employment in private shipyards went down from 127.1 to 117.5 thousand in the same period. This pinpoints the cause of the industries' reduced operation—a decline in commercial work.

I can offer no panaceas for the commercial shipbuilding industry, but I do not think it is reasonable to hold the Navy responsible for their plight. In the allocation of Navy shipwork we have always shown and continue to show great concern for maintaining the mobilization potential represented by private shipyards.

We must, however, retain flexibility in determining how much naval ship work can be advantageously apportioned to private yards, without destroying an important part of our military potential—our naval shipyards.

Naval shipyards have a long and illustrious history dating back to 1797 when the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives recommended that a sum be appropriated for a proper site for a Navy yard. Following the Appropriation Act of 1799, the Secretary of the Navy purchased sites for the shipyards at Norfolk, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York, Charleston, Mass., and Portsmouth, N.H.

An act of Congress on August 31, 1852, authorized and directed the Secretary of the Navy to select a site for a Navy yard in the San Francisco Bay area. Every single one of the naval shipyards was established in this manner by the Congress acting for the people of the United States. Each of the naval shipyards has been, since establishment, the subject of continual congressional approval by inclusion in the various appropriation acts of funds for their maintenance, improvement, and in many cases, their expansion.

The reason for the establishment of all of these naval shipyards was to provide essential support for the vessels of the U.S. Navy.

Let me reemphasize the point I have just made. If the naval shipyards are in competition with private shipyards, it is an accidental and incidental result of the necessity, as determined by the Congress, to maintain the naval shipyards to support the fleet. The overriding consideration must be the effective support of a strong Navy. The naval shipyards do not exist at the whim of any person or group of persons in the Navy. They are an essential element of national defense.

Let's spend just a minute recounting the factors that make the naval shipyards "an essential element of national defense." In doing so be warned that a strict listing of the factors is not inspiring—at least to a layman's confidence in the unlimited capability of private industry.

The understanding that you, as experienced shipyarders have, is needed to fill out this outline—to give it real meaning. For example, our detractors have failed to mention the effect their quest for more conversion and repair work would have on ships' personnel. We can reply that our naval bases have the facilities needed to give these men an opportunity for recreation, for training, for medical and dental care, for churchgoing and for welfare.

Further, we can state that the low bidder would rarely, if ever, be located in a place where such services would be readily available for our shipboard personnel. We know that this is true and we know that our men and ships need such services, if they are to operate at top efficiency.

However, the typical layman does not personally benefit from such services and is

not personally in a position to evaluate their effect. You are in such a position based on your personal contact and experiences.

I am sure you appreciate the great importance of having ships assigned whenever possible to the ship's homeport to permit the morale building effects of family life. Under competitive bidding practices, as I have indicated, the assignments to homeports would have to be abandoned, as this work would have to go to the lowest bidder.

The naval shipyards maintain the messing and berthing facilities to service ships' crews who must be billetted or fed ashore as is very often required during the course of overhauls. This is another reason for performing this work in naval shipyards.

To move along quickly, our reasons include the facts that:

We are oriented in producing quality work on time and, thus, our efforts can be readily integrated with fleet operational schedules.

We carry an extensive inventory of shipboard equipment and spare parts in our shipyards which permits us to finish work expeditiously.

We do not go out on strike, which means the fleet can depend on us at all times.

We maintain facilities and capabilities which would not be economic in a profit type organization but which permit us to take on any job with adequate reserve.

For good and sufficient reasons we do not normally prepare for repair and alteration work, plans and specifications adequate for comparative bidding.

Other similar reasons you could list as well as I.

As I indicated above, the problem is to get an understanding of the validity of these reasons, and they are valid. Further, any efforts in this direction must be completely ethical and within any administrative restrictions.

I believe you will note that for each of these reasons I have listed above our detractors can provide a counterargument—usually in the form of an assumption that they will do in their normal course of business something they have never done before. I am convinced that the effectiveness of the fleet will be greatly reduced if its support is turned over to profit making organizations which cannot have, unless heavily subsidized, the same motivation towards service that you people in this room have.

The naval shipyards do not operate for profit but function wholly to support the naval forces operating at sea. We are staffed and equipped just for this purpose. On the other hand, private shipyards need not maintain a similar level of skills and facilities.

Private yards' skills and facilities are controlled by economic analysis with the greatest profit in mind and for this same reason they tend to pick and choose the work they will do. The naval shipyards, on the other hand accept all jobs and perform them quickly, promptly and as economically as possible. I think it is important to reemphasize the capabilities possessed by the naval shipyards to perform extremely complex and difficult repair and alteration work expeditiously and at the same time, to properly service the ships' crews.

Discrimination in Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the recent Republican Policy Committee's study project, Operation Employment, a number of facets of the employment question were discussed. In the process of making that study, one major emphasis was on the problems of progress, the fact that the dynamism of our economy has brought about severe manpower shortages in the skilled labor categories at the same time the economic value of other skills has been lost through new procedures and new machines. Herbert Hill, the labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, recently addressed himself to that matter, and the related matter of discrimination in employment, in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 8219. Mr. Hill's statement is a significant one and I believe that it deserves wide attention. For this reason, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT HILL, OF NEW YORK, N.Y., LABOR SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 22, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Herbert Hill and I am labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People whose national office is located in New York City at 20 West 40th Street. I wish, first of all, to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear and to comment on the bill relating to apprenticeship training now under consideration.

I appear in support of H.R. 8219 which proposes to withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship programs which operate on a discriminatory racial basis.

We strongly urge the passage of this bill because we believe that the Federal Government and all of its agencies must as a matter of basic policy withhold its sanction and its financial support from apprenticeship training and other programs refusing to admit Negroes and members of other minority groups.

Today, the American economy is characterized by a great paradox in relation to manpower utilization, for in the midst of the serious rise in unemployment during the past 2 years many jobs are going begging because of a lack of skilled workers. Even in such a critically jobless area as Detroit and other industrial communities where there has been a continuous and alarming rate of unemployment, industry has been unable to find an adequate supply of skilled craft workers and there is every indication that this problem will continue to become ever more serious.

For every 100 skilled workers that the Nation had in 1955 it will need 122 in 1965 and 145 in 1975, yet all of the available data clearly indicates that the Nation's apprenticeship programs as well as other training programs are not even turning out enough new craftsmen to replace those who retire. Automation and other technological changes in the economy have greatly increased the demand for skilled workers and currently, the large appropriations for national defense also significantly increase the demand for skilled workers and technicians. It is now clear that in the next decade the entire American economy will be faced with a serious crisis because of the lack of skilled manpower.

A major factor contributing to the irrational, wasteful and socially harmful operation of the Nation's apprenticeship training programs is the color discrimination and racial exclusion which characterize apprenticeship training programs in major sectors of the economy in the North as well as in the South. Discrimination in apprenticeship training programs is also greatly responsible for the fact that for the past 3 years Negro unemployment has been almost consistently two or three times greater than the total unemployment rate and that nonwhite workers today make up a very large portion of the hard core permanently unemployed group in American society. In Chicago, 17.3 percent of Negro workers are jobless whereas 5.7 percent is the community's total unemployment rate; in Detroit, with over 185,000 unemployed, 112,000 are Negro; 10 percent of the Negro work force in New York City is unemployed compared to 6.4 percent of the total work force; in Pittsburgh, 24 percent of Negro workers are unemployed as against 11.6 percent for the community total; in St. Louis, Mo., the unemployment rate is 8.4 percent while Negro unemployment is 20 percent; in Philadelphia, Negro unemployment is 28 percent as against the total unemployment rate of 7 percent; in Gary, Ind., Negro unemployment is 44 percent while 6.3 percent is the rate of unemployment for the community and in Columbus, Ohio, where the total unemployment figure is 5.6 percent, Negro unemployment is over 10 percent.

The current status of the Negro wage earner is characterized by drastic change and crisis. Many traditional sources of Negro employment as on the Nation's railroads and in mass production industries are rapidly disappearing as a result of automation and other technological changes in the economy. The fact that there is such a great concentration of Negroes in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled means that the increasing introduction of advanced methods of production causes the large scale displacement of Negroes previously employed in unskilled jobs. Already one can cite many instances where a highly trained white man and a new machine have replaced a significant number of unskilled Negro workers. The virtual exclusion of Negroes from apprenticeship and other training programs forces them to remain as marginal employees in the economy and directly affects the economic well-being of the entire Negro community as it removes potential sources of stable employment in high-income occupations from the group.

For many occupations the only way a worker can be recognized as qualified for employment is to successfully complete apprenticeship training programs. This is true for the printing trades, among machinists and metalworkers, in the various crafts in the building and construction trades industry and many others. By apprenticeship we mean registered programs that consist of formal on-the-job training and related classroom instruction in the theory, content and techniques of a great variety of skilled craft occupations involving a minimum or 4,000 hours of instruction with a rising scale of wages for each 1,000 hours of participation.

Recent studies such as that made by the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, as well as by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, clearly indicate that no significant advances have been made by Negroes in those craft union apprenticeship training programs which have historically excluded nonwhites. An examination of available data makes evident that less than one percent of the apprentices in the building and construction industry throughout the United States are Negro. In the 10-year period, 1950–60 in the State of New York, the increase of Negro participation in building trades apprenticeship programs rose only from 1.5 percent to 2 percent. The executive secretary of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins, recently stated that "given a continuation of present rates of advance, it will take Negroes 138 years, or until the year 2094

to secure equal participation in skilled craft training and employment. Surely this condition will not be accepted by Negroes and we hope it will not be countenanced by others."

Open access to plumbing and pipefitting apprenticeship controlled by the Plumbers Union is a very rare experience for young Negroes in the North as well as in the South. Similarly Negro youth are almost completely excluded from apprenticeship programs operated by the Sheet Metal Workers Union, the Lathers and Plasterers Union, the Ornamental and Structural Iron Workers Union and from other craft unions operating in the construction industry.

Among the most important of the building trades craft unions is the Carpenters Union which has severely limited the opportunities of colored craftsmen by organizing segregated Negro locals (in those instances where Negroes are permitted to join) and giving them jurisdiction over areas where there was little or no construction or prospect of construction. In addition, Negro locals are subjected to jurisdictional raids by all-white units, these latter being much better situated in terms of resources and power. This is true both in southern and northern areas where the jurisdiction of the Negro local is usually limited to the Negro ghetto, and therefore, Negro carpenters are barred from employment on the major construction projects. As a consequence, many Negro carpenters have left the trade entirely.

The railroad craft unions as well as the railroad operating brotherhoods remain adamant in their opposition to Negro craftsmen and openly bar apprenticeship opportunities to Negro youth. Almost equally exclusive are the printing trades unions. In a survey made by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People of the seven major New York City newspapers, we find that with the exclusion of building services and maintenance personnel, less than 1 percent of those employed on the major newspapers are Negro. Virtually all of the Negroes employed on these newspapers are in the white collar jurisdiction of the New York Newspaper Guild.

We estimate that less than one-half of 1 percent of those currently employed in the newspaper crafts outside of the guild's jurisdiction are Negroes. This includes printing pressmen, compositors, photoengravers, stereotypers, paper handlers, mailers, and delivery drivers. As far as apprenticeship training for these crafts are concerned we have been unable to detect a single instance where Negroes have been recently admitted into a training program in the newspaper crafts in the city of New York or in other major cities in the United States. Primarily, these craft unions are motivated by a continuing security consciousness and are opposed to any lessening of restrictions on the number of craftsmen employed in a given trade. Exclusive control is perceived as being directly beneficial to craft unions in the collective bargaining process and the expansion of the supply of artisans is still thought to be essentially detrimental to union power. Thus, potential Negro craftsmen are prominently among those denied opportunities in these fields.

In the recent report entitled "Made in New York: Case Studies in Metropolitan Manufacturing," published by Harvard University, we are told that "Negro and Puerto Rican women who are on the lower rungs of the city's economic ladder, have become important in the New York garment industry, but they work mainly in the more standardized branches and with few exceptions * * * they do not become highly skilled tailor-system workers on dresses or 'cloaks.' As a result, a shortage of skilled sewing machine operators is developing."

A recent study made by the Council for Civic Unity of San Francisco revealed that Negroes are not participating in the electrical, plumbing, and carpentry apprenticeship training programs in that city and that only one Negro served as an apprentice in the metal trades. A report made by the Michigan Fair Employment Practices Commission entitled "A Study of Employment, Training and Placement Patterns in the Michigan Area" indicates the exclusion of Negro youth in the structural steel, sheet metal, lathers, and tile setters apprenticeship programs in Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, and Muskegon. The Connecticut Commission on Civil Rights has published a study entitled "The Training of Negroes in the Skilled Trades," which concludes that a similar condition exists in virtually the entire State of Connecticut. In a study entitled "Negro Employment Practices in the Chattanooga Area" it was found that there was an absolute ban on apprenticeship opportunities for Negroes in the building trades and other reports indicate that the same condition exists in many other Southern States. A major factor contributing to the permanently depressed status of Negro workers in the South is that in the new industrial centers rapidly developing in the Southern States the technical training programs offered in the segregated Negro vocational schools are extremely limited and frequently were found to be obsolete in terms of modern industrial technology.

In Fort Wayne, Ind., not a single Negro participates in the apprenticeship training programs conducted by either the electricians union, the Plumbers & Steam Fitters or the Mason & Plasterers Unions; in Milwaukee, we are unable to find a single Negro in apprenticeship training and the same holds true for Minneapolis in relation to the building trades, the printing trades and the metal crafts industry. In Newark, N.J., where there are 3,523 apprentices currently participating in approved apprenticeship training programs there are exactly 2 Negroes enrolled; in New Orleans, not a single Negro apprentice is to be found in electrical installation, plumbing, painting and other building trades apprenticeship programs; in Philadelphia, less than 4 percent of the apprenticeship trades are accessible to qualified Negroes; in St. Louis, Mo., there are no Negro apprentices in the following training programs: electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, carpentry, masonry, cement finishers, lathers and painters. There is one Negro apprentice at a nonunion Negro-owned sheetmetal company. It is estimated that there are exactly 14 Negro apprentices in St. Louis. These are: six bakers, one bricklayer, two machinists, one sheetmetal worker and four meat cutters; in Tulsa, Okla., not a single Negro apprentice; in Springfield, Ill., not a single Negro enrolled in any registered apprenticeship training program; in Warren, Ohio, there are no Negro apprentices in the building and construction trades crafts; in Washington, D.C., there are no Negro apprentices in the following crafts: electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, masonry, lathing, and plastering. However, there is one Negro in the carpenters' apprenticeship program. This data is indicative of the national pattern.

In most of these programs the role of the labor union is decisive because the trade union usually determines who is admitted into the training program and, therefore, who is admitted into the union. There appears to be a complete lack of uniformity in local union apprenticeship practices even within a given international union. Thus, the constitution of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (a major offender in this regard), dated July 1956, page 46, section 15, reads: "Each local union has power to adopt its own apprenticeship training or helper rules as the condition of each community may require. But after apprentice or helper has worked 6 months under the sponsorship or jurisdiction of a local union he shall be admitted or initiated into the IBEW through the local union and the local union shall send to the international secretary per capita tax as provided in article X."

Most frequently apprentices are indentured by joint labor-management apprenticeship committees which are established in many crafts and industries where this organizational form provides the most practical method of sponsoring skilled craft training. Joint apprenticeship committees are usually composed of equal numbers of management, labor, and public representatives in any given trade. For all practical purposes, however, joint apprenticeship committees are very frequently controlled by the labor organization and represents the interests of particular craft unions in formal training systems. This appears to be especially true in the building trades where joint apprenticeship committees predominate.

Craft unions also play an important role in the recruitment and selection of apprentices through their relationship to employer indenturing units. These relationships may range from simple acquiescence in management's choice of apprentices, to unilateral selection of apprentices by the craft union as in Cleveland where apprentices are directly indentured to Local 38 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Labor unions also exercise control over apprenticeship manpower through its ability to dispatch apprentices via hiring hall procedures in de facto closed shop situations. In these circumstances, craft unions have the power to either promote or prevent the admission of individuals or of an entire class of persons.

By means of these controls, craft unions are frequently the decisive factor in the recruitment process in many apprenticeship programs and often directly prevent Negro youth from becoming skilled craft workers via the established route of apprenticeship.

A careful analysis of most apprenticeship training programs currently operating in the printing trades, the metal crafts, the construction industry, and in many other skilled craft occupations will clearly indicate the utter lack of a system of objective standard criteria for admission into apprenticeship training. At the present time there is no objective basis for determining admissions. Persons are admitted or not admitted because of nepotism and the caprices of certain union officials acting in collusion with management. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor in certifying apprenticeship programs in effect provides the sanction of the U.S. Government for a variety of antisocial practices of which racial discrimination is one important aspect.

On the level of the small shop and local union, the tradition of racial discrimination has now become deeply institutionalized. A form of caste psychology impels many workers to regard their own positions as "white men's job," to which no Negro should aspire. These workers and, often, their union leaders, regard jobs in their industries as a kind of private privilege, to be accorded and denied by them as they see fit. Often, Negroes are not alone in being barred from such unions, which attempt to maintain an artificial labor shortage. This is especially true of trade unions in the building and construction industry and printing trades, which have much of the character of the medieval guild. On the local level, the tradition which sustains discrimination is to be found among skilled workers in big industry as well as among craftsmen, and in the North almost as commonly as in the South.

The discriminatory policies and practices of craft unions described here are in direct contravention of 24 State statutes which prohibit the barring of employment oppor-

tunities on the basis of race or color. They appear also to be in opposition to the intent of Executive orders prohibiting discriminatory employment practices in the fulfillment of Federal Government contracts. Clearly, this is in direct violation of the ethic of a democratic trade union movement operating in a free society.

But the record will clearly indicate that the national labor federation and the affiliated old-line craft unions have refused to tackle this problem seriously and they have not to any significant degree eliminated the traditional national pattern of Negro exclusion from trade union controlled apprenticeship training programs in a variety of skilled craft occupations. The repeated protests of Negro workers from all over the country as well as the detailed reports and requests for action made by the NAACP and other civil rights organizations to the AFL–CIO have proved to be a futile exercise. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the Federal Government, acting through the Department of Labor, assume its proper responsibility in this urgent matter by refusing to subsidize with public funds racial discrimination in apprenticeship training programs. The passage of H.R. 8219 is not to be regarded as a substitute for the vitally needed Federal fair employment practices legislation, but if vigorously and intelligently enforced it could have a very real effect in eliminating discriminatory racial practices in the Nation's apprenticeship training programs.

Recently the NAACP secured the admission of a Negro for the first time into the sheet metal apprenticeship training program in St. Louis, Mo. In an unusual procedure, the association secured certification from the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the U.S. Department of Labor for a nonunion firm owned by a Negro. This occurred after local 36 of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association had repeatedly refused to admit Negro applicants into its apprenticeship training program and had prevented the participation of the Negro-owned company in apprenticeship training programs conducted by the industry. The owner of this company (Kennedy and Sons Sheet Metal Shops), offered to have his employees join local 36 of the Sheet Metal Workers Union but the membership applictions of the Negro workers were refused by the all-white local affiliate of the AFL–CIO.

Recent action by the New York State attorney general, acting at the request of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, made possible the admission of the first Negro into the apprenticeship training program operated by the Plumbers Union in the State of New York.

A sustained program of activity by the Oregon Fair Employment Practices Commission and the State apprenticeship council resulted in the admission of Negroes for the first time into various apprenticeship programs conducted by unions affiliated to the Oregon AFL–CIO Building Trades and the Metal Trades Councils. These isolated actions, however, are completely inadequate as they do not eliminate the broad national pattern of Negro exclusion from apprenticeship training programs.

Increasingly, apprenticeship and other forms of technical training become the heart of fair employment practices. The continued exclusion of Negro youth from such programs, especially those controlled by AFL–CIO craft unions in the printing industry, the building and metal trades and in other craft jurisditcions, prevents thousands of young persons from realizing their full human potential and dooms them and their families to a marginal economic existence. It is in this area that the disparity between the public relations pronouncements of the AFL–CIO on civil rights and the day-to-day reality for Negro workers is most sharply outlined.

Federal and State agencies perform a variety of functions directly and indirectly in the operation of apprenticeship training programs. The National Apprentice Training Act (Public Law 308, known as the Fitzgerald Act) was passed in 1937 and established the Apprentice Training Service as a constituent unit of the U.S. Department of Labor. In 1942, an Executive order transferred the Service to the War Manpower Commission. In September 1945 the Apprentice Training Service was returned to the Department of Labor by Executive order and is now called the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

In several instances there are industrywide apprenticeship committees. Among the most important of these are to be found the general committee on apprenticeship for the construction industry consisting of leading representatives of contractor and labor organizations which acts as a coordinating body for apprentice training for all branches of the construction industry and helps to promote the development of national and local apprentice training programs. A number of national employer associations and trade unions have set up apprenticeship committees which meet as joint labor-management committees to develop national trade and apprenticeship standards and to encourage local employer and trade union affiliates to establish training programs in conformity with the national standards.

Federal, State, and local governments can make a decisive contribution to eliminating discriminatory racial practices in the operation of apprenticeship programs by immediately withholding all forms of support from discriminatory apprenticeship training and insisting on nondiscrimination as a basic criteria for certification as an accepted and registered apprenticeship program.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship Training of the U.S. Department of Labor, in giving certification to an apprenticeship program, provides the legal basis for public subsidies to apprenticeship programs. The Federal Government, through grants-in-aid coming from the U.S. Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, provides funds which subsidize apprenticeship training programs in many States. The Federal Government, therefore, is directly subsidizing discrimination in the skilled trades whenever a trade union or employer excludes Negroes and members of other minority groups from admission into a registered apprenticeship training program.

State governments also provide a variety of public subsidies in the operation of these programs, and municipal and county boards of education in thousands of communities across the country subsidize offending apprenticeship programs by permitting the use of public school buildings, providing instructors, power and materials as well as in a variety of other ways.

As is apparent, Federal, State, and local governments are significantly involved in the operation of apprenticeship training and very much so in terms of providing the essential subsidies without which most of these programs could not operate. It is equally clear that governmental agencies have not, with very few exceptions, exercised their considerable power to assure that apprenticeship training programs are open to all youths regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People believes that Federal and State agencies must as a matter of basic policy refuse certification and withhold funds and other forms of subsidization from apprenticeship training programs refusing to admit Negroes or members of other minority groups, that municipal and county boards of education immediately withdraw all forms of support from discriminatory apprenticeship programs including the use of vocational school buildings and other facilities; that management institute fair employment policies and insure their fulfillment by subordinate employees and that the great industrial corporations operating with U.S. Government contracts must begin to comply with Federal Executive orders prohibiting bias in employment.

We further believe that apprenticeship agencies have the responsibility of establishing an atmosphere of equality of opportunity in which integration may be achieved by individual apprenticeship units especially in the matter of recruitment procedures and the establishment of objective standards which will be uniformly applied in accepting or rejecting applicants.

All of the foregoing should take place in the context of full employment and economic growth and should be given the highest priority by the basic institutions of American society, with the understanding that there is an urgent need to make possible the complete realization of the abilities and talents of all of our citizens if the United States is to continue to function as a powerful and free nation in a world where industrial power is decisive.

Private Funds Spark Urban Renewals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an article which indicates that all urban renewal projects are not promoted and financed by the Federal Government although in the recently passed omnibus housing bill $2,500 million of Federal funds were authorized for this purpose.

This article indicates that much of these funds are not necessary if proper measures are used to promote private interests to develop urban renewal projects:

PRIVATE FUNDS SPARK URBAN RENEWAL

NEW YORK.—Urban renewal in metropolitan downtown areas, once considered an exclusive function of government, now is being sparked in many cities by private capital, according to Robert A. Futterman, president of the publicly held $70 million realty corporation which bears his name.

"This trend toward private investment in urban renewal is especially prevalent in communities which have actively solicited such financing to improve their downtown commercial cores," Mr. Futterman declared.

His company, which owns and operates 34 major properties in 23 cities in the United States, now is an active participant in large-scale rehabilitation ventures in Atlanta, Ga., and downtown Akron, Ohio, and Norfolk, Va.

"Private sponsorship of urban renewal for investment purposes is on the upswing throughout the country," said Mr. Futterman. "Utilities, insurance companies, unions, manufacturing concerns, and individual investors are participating in ever-increasing numbers."

Some of the rehabilitation and renewal projects in which private capital has assumed the leadership are located in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, and Washington. Other aggressive metro-

politan communities, such as Houston, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and Kansas City, have projects either underway or on the drawing board.

Mr. Futterman noted that as a long-range investment urban-renewal projects are proving attractive to large manufacturing corporations because they provide a mass-exposure showcase for new products. Alcoa and Reynolds Aluminum are moving their money into urban-renewal projects in Los Angeles and Philadelphia, where some of their new products will be utilized in construction.

"The key to future investments in this field is the profit factor," asserted Mr. Futterman. "Privately sponsored urban renewal is not new—Rockefeller Plaza, for example, dates back to the 1930's. However, this practice has been limited largely because private investors find it unproductive to tie their capital in with low-return housing projects which constituted the bulk of urban-renewal activities in the past."

Within recent years, however, opportunities have risen for private sources to finance commercial redevelopment ventures, containing centrally located stores, office buildings, hotels, and luxury apartment buildings. In these instances, an investor can anticipate a good return while at the same time performing a public service.

One of the Nation's leading exponents of downtownism, Mr. Futterman feels that too little has been done on a national scale in this area of redevelopment.

Just a Little Law Enforcement Will Help Cut the Cost of National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Saturday Evening Post of August 26 comes the following:

With Hawaii and Puerto Rico threatened by serious food shortages and the ports of our coastal cities faced with a disastrous paralysis of shipping, President Kennedy reluctantly invoked the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act that calls for a cooling-off period of 80 days and a resumption of work while a commission appointed by the President looks into the causes of the strike. The Nation breathed a tentative sigh of relief.

But the President, in his statement on the subject, deplored the absence of a statute more flexible than Taft-Hartley and promised to suggest modifications to Congress later on. And Secretary of Labor Goldberg described the decision to enforce the law as distasteful. From all this apologetic reluctance one might get the impression that National Maritime Union leader Curran was to be put on the rack and tormented with thumbscrews and hot pincers. Actually all that was happening was an 80-day stay of execution from a sentence of economic stagnation imposed on the Nation by a small group of irresponsible labor leaders for an object that employers could not grant if they wished to. Instead of expressing reluctance and distaste, our national leaders might better have given thanks that their previous efforts to defeat and discredit this essential statute had not been successful.

The consequences of this tendency to take our blessings sourly were dramatically illustrated at the Cape Canaveral missile base, the scene of outrageous extortion and gouging by unions, as developed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S subcommittee on investigations. Because the unions at this base had control of the hiring of individual workers, vital projects were held up while wiring already installed was ripped out and installed over again by the "right" union. It was the judgment of many responsible observers that, but for such conscienceless gouging, Commander Shepard might well have made his flight into space before Russia's Maj. Yuri Gagarin accomplished his feat.

Except for failure to enforce protective legislation, none of this scandalous racketeering need have happened. Florida has a clause in its constitution which states that "the right of a person to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union or organization." Had this provision been enforced, no union could deny the right to work at the Canaveral missile base to nonmembers of a union, any more than employers could deny the right to work to union members. What happened was that closed-shop unions moved in early and threatened to walk off the job en masse if nonunion workers were employed. A total of 23 stoppages for a total of 9,045 man-days occurred to enforce this illegal monopoly. The result was that nonunion workers and firms that employed them were excluded from the base, leaving the field open to the gougers.

It is true that Florida seems not to have passed legislation specifically stating how its constitutional right-to-work clause could be enforced. But Senator CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, a member of the McClellan subcommittee, insisted that Florida officials had ample authority to proceed by injunction and otherwise to curb these vicious practices. Why were these powers unused? Behind the many excuses is the reluctance of officialdom to enforce any restrictions on the monopolistic practices of union leaders until the Nation is faced with a crisis or collapse."

Corps of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps offers a splendid, challenging, and exciting opportunity for utilizing some of the vast reservoir of latent talents among our young people to promote and create better understanding between the United States and other nations of the world, particularly the so-called underdeveloped countries. While material economic assistance is of great importance, how greatly this could be enhanced by the personal touch of the United States extending a friendly, helping and understanding hand via the personal representation and direct participation of the able, earnest and dedicated young American men and women in our Peace Corps.

While it has often been said that it is important that the people of the world know and understand us, it is equally important for us to understand the people of the world, their culture and their problems. The Peace Corps merits the open and full support of the Congress, not only as a means for enhancing our image abroad, but also in turn, because upon their return these young people can inform us realistically from their experience of the true needs, hopes and aspirations of the people with whom they have lived and worked in a joint effort for the betterment of man.

I have every confidence that this program, under their very able and dedicated director, R. Sargent Shriver, will be a most valuable asset to the foreign policy of our Nation.

I highly recommend this editorial from the August 30 issue of the Washington Post to all my colleagues. As the editor succinctly and persuasively states, we stand to gain a great deal should the Peace Corps succeed.

CORPS OF HOPE

Despite the earlier grumbling about its dangerous idealism, the Peace Corps seems to be doing fairly well, thank you. The other day the Senate by a voice vote passed the legislation which made the new agency permanent. Even Republican Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, who could not exactly be termed an upward and onward type, observed in the Senate that there was some good in the idea. And now President Kennedy has greeted the 80 recruits who are ready to embark on the first missions in Africa.

Actually, there has been overall a warm popular response to the Peace Corps. Even those who are skeptical about the practicability of the Corps admit that it is a good idea worth trying out. The appeal of the Peace Corps touches deep springs in our heritage. As a nation, we prefer making bridges to making war and we take an inordinate pride in the fact that our young people are among the best advertisements of our country.

Of course, it remains to be seen whether the new Corps can fulfill its promise. Certainly R. Sargent Shriver, the Director, has gone into the job with kinetic enthusiasm. The background of the first recruits holds out the hope that these youngsters will confound the stereotype of the ugly American. If successful, the Peace Corps can help to win battles that no military hardware could possibly decide. The new Corps deserves a vote of confidence in the House every bit as strong as that already given by the Senate.

We'd Better Know What We Are Going To Talk About if We Negotiate With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to call attention to the following article from the Wall Street Journal and issue a word of warning that the United States had better have a firm policy of strength and determination before we enter into any further negotiations with the Communists:

TALK

But what are they going to talk about?

This isn't a facetious question. For plainly there are going to be talks between

the West and the Soviets over Berlin; Secretary of State Rusk says they may take place before the opening of the U.N. General Assembly in September, but in any event sometime during the fall. And equally plainly, if men are going to negotiate on any issue they have to know what there is to negotiate.

West German Foreign Minister Von Brentano, says that the talks are urgently needed to make clear the positions of both sides, East and West. At best, this is an incomplete statement of the task. The Russian position is certainly clear enough: West Berlin is a bone in Mr. Khrushchev's throat, and he wants to pluck it out. The Western position is that we will not surrender in that place to another aggression by the Communist empire—or, at least, that is the West's position if the words of its statesmen mean anything.

The British equally skirt the issue, or so it seems to us, when they say the purpose of the talks is to avoid a war over Berlin. The avoidance of war is indeed a prime task of statesmen, but if the avoidance of war were their only task then it would be simple. War can always be avoided by yielding to an aggressor; if Hitler had been yielded to at every point there would have been no World War II. There will certainly be no war over Berlin if Mr. Khrushchev negotiates the whole of it.

So, we come back, then, to the deadly serious question: What is it that, in these talks, we intend to negotiate?

Mr. Khrushchev says he is going to sign a treaty with the East Germans and that this will give their puppet government jurisdiction over all the access routes to West Berlin. Perhaps, as some people have argued, the East German Government would then be willing to sign an agreement with the West reaffirming our routes of entry. Are we prepared to accept this "quid" when the "quo" would be the acceptance of the East German Government as a separate, sovereign entity—and therefore the recognition of a permanently divided Germany?

There has been much talk about making West Berlin a free city. This was proposed by Mr. Khrushchev and seconded, though in different words, by some Members of our Congress. It this an acceptable proposal to men who remember Danzig? And if it is to be talked about, does it mean that the West withdraws its troops from West Berlin while the Communists keep their tanks in East Berlin just across the Brandenburg gate?

In this phrase "free city" there is a yawning trap of words unless we know precisely what we are talking about, and what the Communists are talking about. Its allure is in the promise that it will preserve all those rights of the West Berliners for access to West Germany. Its snare is that making it a denationalized city would cut it off from West Germany and leave it prey in fact to the communism which surounds it.

All these points of negotiation have one thing in common. They would make the city of West Berlin, which is now free in the true sense of the word, less free than it was before. Therefore the Communists stand to gain from any negotiated changes in the forms and technicalities. And the Communists know it—whether we do or not.

For negotiation to have any real meaning it would have to embrace also changes in the encircling communism in East Berlin and East Germany. But this is what, so far, the West is not agreed to insist upon. And it is, of course, precisely what the Soviets refuse to negotiate.

The truth is that we have a Berlin crisis today only because the Communists want to swallow the prey. Until that changes, every time the statesmen of the West sit down to talk with the men from the Kremlin the question will abide: What are they going to talk about?

Award to Congressman Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, has been the recipient of an unusual honor. He has been cited as Congressman of the Year in Science, an award which he richly deserves and which he earned by his efforts to promote the cause of science to the betterment of this country and the free world. It is fitting that Congressman BROOKS, as the chairman of the only committee in Congress with general jurisdiction over science, should receive this award.

The award was presented to Mr. BROOKS by Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine, the second oldest publication in the country devoted to aerospace sciences. The presentation was made by Mr. Maurice A. Kimball, of Los Angeles, the president and publisher of this highly respected trade journal.

We, the members of his Committee on Science and Astronautics, are indeed happy that our colleague has received this great honor and I am sure that all Members of the House join with me in congratulating him upon his receiving this award and wishing him a speedy recovery from the major operation which he recently underwent at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

We all look forward to seeing our colleague back at the Capitol soon, leading his committee to bigger and brighter horizons.

As part of my remarks, I would like to include the text of the award, which follows:

AWARD OF CONGRESSMAN OF THE YEAR IN SCIENCE, 1961, TO HON. OVERTON BROOKS, OF LOUISIANA, AUGUST 30, 1961

Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine takes honor in awarding to the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, Congressman from Louisiana and chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the U.S. House of Representatives, its 1961 award as Congressman of the Year in Science.

Mr. BROOKS has been foremost in Congress in promoting the cause of science in the United States and in the free world. For his work in this field the Nation owes him a great debt.

He has labored unceasingly to bring to the attention of the Congress and the public the achievements and the needs of American science.

As chairman of the sole committee in Congress with broad legislative jurisdiction over science, he has furnished to distinguished spokesmen of many scientific disciplines an important forum through which they could bring to the attention of the American public and the world their views, their plans and their hopes for a better, more peaceful world.

Acting under his guidance, his committee has conducted numerous public hearings and studies on research and development in many fields. The following subjects, while not complete, indicate the wide range of the committee's interest: Air Force, Navy, and Army missile and space research; Department of Defense research and engineering program; agriculture, ground effect machines; saline water; chemical, biological and radiological warfare; oceanographic research; dissemination of scientific information; hydrofoils; mechanical translation; boron high energy fuels; inflatable aircraft; scientific and professional education in the United States and abroad; the effect of noise on man and machine; space propulsion technology; mobile sea launch capability; and inflatable structures in space.

Mr. BROOKS has also recognized in a unique manner the important role that science plays in today's world by appointing a Panel on Science and Technology to meet periodically with the committee to review scientific problems. The panel is composed of 14 scientists, engineers and educators who have distinguished themselves in the fields of biophysics, physics, applied mechanics, meteorology, chemistry, zoology, geophysics, physical geography, aeronautical engineering, astronomy and jet propulsion.

For his diligence, for his perseverence, for his unremitting efforts on behalf of science, Western Aviation, Missiles and Space magazine takes pride in naming the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS the Congressman of the Year in Science.

SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, my enthusiasm for project Hope is well known among my colleagues so it was with particular pride that I learned several months ago John C. Rawling, M.D., a prominent physician of Flint, Mich., had been selected to serve aboard the SS *Hope* at Saigon.

I have been fascinated by Dr. Rawling's letters describing life aboard the hospital ship and his impressions of this humanitarian program to help our fellow man. Recently, I received a letter of such general interest from him that I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House. It is with much pleasure that I share Dr. Rawling's comments, relating the impact of this worthy project, written earlier this month as he was preparing to return to the United States:

SS "HOPE,"
THE PEOPLE TO PEOPLE
HEALTH FOUNDATION, INC.,
Saigon, Vietnam, August 10, 1961.

Congressman CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: Within a few days I shall be on my way home, so I have virtually retired from the operating suite and have more time for tourism and reflection.

Some months ago I considered the advanced skills of medicine in the United States and the ability via the Project Hope to convey these things to our confreres in other lands. As a result, I volunteered to contribute what I could to this cause.

During my first week in Saigon I visited the local hospitals which, with few exceptions, are managed by the Minister of Health or the Department of Defense. I was impressed that the physicians with whom I became acquainted were well read and capable,

but equipment and trained nursing and laboratory personnel were far behind. To try to find the reason for equipment and drug deficiencies is like searching for the answers that are a part of any bureaucracy.

The local doctors have been hospitable and at all times delighted to have us as consultants in their hospitals. I have had the privilege of performing surgery in their operating rooms and to talk about medicine for hours during their working day. I believe the same exchange between the nurses and laboratory personnel has been the greatest contribution of the Project Hope.

I was surprised one day when one of my friends at a local hospital told me how happy the patients were to see the *Hope* doctors from the United States. "They are pleased," he said, "that the United States sends us something besides guns and bullets."

In other ways we find balance and counterbalance. There were many thousands of applications for treatment aboard the ship, the needs of which are impossible to satisfy. As a result, many have been disillusioned because we cannot care for active and contagious diseases, such as tuberculosis. On the other hand, the patients with startling deformities and disabilities that were corrected will be lifelong examples of true human charity of which I am proud to be a part.

The opinion of many people in America is that perfect results in medical care is a birthright and anything less is grounds for legal action or Government control. Consider the Vietnamese, about 5 feet tall, weighing 75–100 pounds, living for years on a diet less than adequate in calories, vitamins, and minerals and frequently weakened by parasites. They do not heal or react to the stress of surgery like the average American citizen.

For this problem there is no magic solution. Elevation of living standards is the result of prosperity and peace which is not in the forseeable future for this area. Survival, in a country which is fighting a full-scale civil war, seems more important than sound economy. And yet, I wonder if an attempt to unleash the free enterprise system of democracy might be a better weapon against socialism and communism.

I look back now on my experience with the Project Hope with the reassuring thoughts that the basic philosophical concept of this ship is as true and effective as I originally believed. I have though sometimes of the words of the late Dr. Tom Dooley, "I believe that easy and condescending charity will destroy an individual's, and even a nation's, pride and self-respect." Exchange of friendship and knowledge enriches our lives. The free donation of even medical equipment is difficult to do gracefully. One cannot avoid some resentment, in that, we have the wealth to give.

If another opportunity on a people-to-people basis should be available to me, I shall probably respond like the old fire horse when the bell rings.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN C. RAWLING, M.D.

Danger in Negotiations With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following pertinent column by William S. White which was printed in the Washington Evening Star. Once again the free world is faced with the alternative of risking war with the Communists or negotiating with them on issues which are not negotiable and thus give away more of our freedom. This is indeed a time of grave decision. For myself, I believe we cannot appease the Communists any longer. We cannot buy peace at the price of liberty. If we are to hold discussion on Berlin they should be direct and to the point, give the Communists a stated time to desist in their illegal blockade of East Germany, demand unification of Germany and free determination of the kind of government they want by the German people themselves. Nothing else can be negotiated without giving another victory to Khrushchev. If he insists upon the foolhardy course upon which he has embarked and insists upon the enslavement of millions of Germans, then he alone will bear responsibility for any war which starts. Let us hope that we have the national leadership with the courage to take the only course available to us if we are to live in freedom and in honor.

The article follows:

RIGHTNESS OF BERLIN NEGOTIATION—NO WEAKNESS SEEN IN ALLIES MOTIVATION IF WE DO NOT GIVE AWAY WHAT IS OURS

For the West, for America, and for President Kennedy the hour of real crisis over Berlin is at last approaching. This is the hour when we take the fateful course of accepting negotiations with the man who alone caused it all, Nikita Khrushchev.

It is not possible to deny that the position in beleaguered Berlin offers the endless possibility of war, and that something to ease the strain is deeply needed. But it also is not possible to deny that this Western decision to take the initiative toward negotiation carries with it a clear and desperate danger that appeasement of international communism may be the ultimate consequence.

Mr. Khrushchev has given many fair words of late to Western visitors while he again tries to picture himself as just a pretty reasonable old fellow, a kind of well-meaning foxy grandpa. But on the substance of the great issue over Berlin he has not given a single inch of ground. His kind of negotiation still presumes what it did in the beginning—that what is his will remain his but that what is rightfully the West's will now be open to bargaining.

In this situation the West is damned if it does and damned if it doesn't. It risks war against an irresponsible adversary if it does not negotiate. And it risks the beginning of the end of Western solidity and determination in Europe when it does negotiate.

No one who is only a commentator—or a Senator, either, for that matter—is wise enough to say for certain that Mr. Kennedy's conclusion to negotiate is the wrong decision. It is a fact that negotiation as such is never bad—is at worst useless—so long as negotiation is accompanied by an iron resolve backed by military power not to negotiate away what is ours by right. That is, we ought not to fear negotiation simply as negotiation.

Moreover, those who will easily denounce this course should remember one thing: It is easier to talk of tough lines, of yielding no concession whatever, the farther one is removed from that place of awesome responsibility which is held by the leaders of the West.

But, equally, no one at all—not even the Western leaders themselves—is able to say with certainty that this agreement among the West to go to Mr. Khrushchev is either wise or right. It may well convince him—and this is a crucial point—that we are not willing to fight in any circumstances. It may well convince him, as Hitler was convinced a decade and more ago, that he has only to go on demanding and that we will retreat and retreat again.

What this correspondent is saying, as one observer here, is that he does not even pretend to know exactly what ought to be done and when and how. He does believe, however, that at least some things are entirely plain. Surely we ought, at minimum, to find ways of restating in the strongest possible way that there will be a point at which we will fight, if fight we must.

Surely all Americans—or rather some Americans—ought to stop acting as though this were just a dispute between two more or less equal antagonists. This is not a case in which there are wrongs on both sides. There is in simple fact no wrong on our side, and there is no right on Mr. Khrushchev's side.

It was not the West which opened this threat to all mankind over Berlin; it was Mr. Khrushchev. It is not the West which is trying to destroy anybody's rights; it is Mr. Khrushchev. And in allowing itself to be in the position of seeking negotiations at this stage, the West's motivating force will not be seen as weakness—so long as we don't give away what cannot honorably ever be given away. This is the right of the West to stay in Berlin and to maintain full access to it.

This is the whole nature of the twilight hour which now draws near, along with autumn, in Washington: We have the world firmly to save, whatever the cost, or meanly to lose, whatever the motive.

Rally Behind Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am pleased to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader in the U.S. Senate, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. As a Member of both this House and also the other body for more than a quarter of a century he has commanded the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Senator DIRKSEN was only a very young man in his early thirties when he first came to the Congress. This was indeed a fortunate circumstance for the country for the reason that despite his long and valuable experience as a legislator, he remains available at this critical hour in our Nation's history to continue to lead his party in the Chamber where he now serves during the years that still lie ahead. This he will do with the same imaginative vigor and resourcefulness that have led him to his present position of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, our country sorely needs the continued service of experienced, dedicated men like the junior Senator from Illinois. A grateful party, indeed, a grateful constituency that embraces people from both political parties, will

eagerly support him as he continues to serve the people of his State and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to incorporate in my remarks at this point the editorial opinion of the two largest newspapers published in the district that I am proud to represent, the Rockford Register-Republic and the Rockford Morning Star:

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Aug. 11, 1961]

RALLY BEHIND DIRKSEN

Illinois Republicans will push their party off to a strong start in the 1962 congressional election race by getting solidly behind the candidacy for reelection of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader and stalwart spokesman for solid Republicanism.

Republicans in this State, by closing ranks now and avoiding an intraparty fight for the senatorial nomination next April, will strengthen their position in the campaign for 24 seats in the House of Representatives, which might be decided on a statewide, at-large basis.

A squabble over the U.S. Senate nomination would be costly to the Illinois Republican Party in a crucial election year. DIRKSEN, on the basis of his outstanding record—he served eight terms in the House and is completing his second Senate term—should have a clear path to the nomination. Then Republicans could bring all their guns to bear upon contests for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Republican central committees in Winnebago and other northern Illinois counties, which consistently bulwark the GOP vote in this State, should take the lead by declaring themselves united for Senator DIRKSEN. Once started, this movement could spread through other Republican county organizations in Illinois and result in DIRKSEN's nomination by acclamation.

Although the Register-Republic favors open primaries under normal political conditions, there is too much at stake in next year's primary for the Republican Party to engage in a senatorial nomination fight which could leave deep wounds, waste energy, and give the Chicago Democratic machine unnecessary advantage in the November 1962 election. Chicago Mayor Daley would welcome a bitter Republican fight for the senatorial nomination. Daley has indicated he would support Illinois House Speaker Paul Powell of Vienna for the Democratic senatorial bid, Illinois doesn't want another Daley-picked U.S. Senator, joining PAUL DOUGLAS, whose claim to represent all Illinois is a myth.

Illinois Republicans must recognize that their party needs solid downstate support, along with maximum possible Republican support in Cook County, to elect a candidate in a statewide race. The 1962 races for Congress give Republicans throughout the country opportunity to increase their party's Senate strength, possibly to win House control. The minority party generally picks up seats in off-year elections; thus, 1962 is not the time for any divisive, rank-shattering campaigns.

Senator DIRKSEN, spared of the necessity of waging a fight for renomination, could devote full energy to leading the Illinois Republican drive for Congress. His skill as a campaigner would then be available to the entire Republican ticket. It is of urgent importance that Illinois Republicans look ahead now to 1962, assure Senator DIRKSEN an unopposed primary place, and concentrate upon congressional races. A substantial gain by Republicans next year will strengthen the GOP's hand in the 1964 presidential race.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star Aug. 8, 1961]

LET SOLID GOP BACK DIRKSEN

Illinois Republicans, looking for a rallying and unifying point in the 1962 election, have one at hand in the candidacy of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN for another term in the U.S. Senate.

And it is not too early to be considering tactics for a campaign of vast importance in the makeup of the next Congress, and of equally great importance in planning for the 1964 presidential race.

Senator DIRKSEN's reelection is an essential step in the achievement of Republican leadership in Illinois, and it should be assured by a rallying to his support well before the primaries next spring.

The Democrats would like nothing better than a Republican Donnybrook in the senatorial primary next spring, for they believe cleavages could be opened that could not be healed by fall; divisions between Chicago and downstate Republicanism could be deepened; and a lot of campaign energy and money that should go to the fall election would be expended to no end save division.

Illinois has found Senator DIRKSEN an able and militant spokesman for Republicanism. He deserves another term. His skill and intelligence are needed in the Senate, where it is not likely the Republicans will be able to achieve a majority in 1962.

So any ambitious Republicans who might consider themselves worthy competitors for Senator DIRKSEN's toga should invite themselves out. Let them give their energy to the Dirksen campaign and to the House campaigns, which may see at-large races for 25 seats. Next April's senatorial primary is not a proper stage for political adventuring and maneuvering. This newspaper, under ordinary circumstances, likes to speak for open primaries. But the coming Senate primary is not an ordinary circumstance; the stakes are too high, and the quality of the incumbent Republican is such that he ought to be given a clear track.

For Illinois ought not to take the risk of a divided Republican Party, with its ammunition expended in an intraparty fight, getting us another Paul—a Paul Powell of Vienna to be added to a Paul Douglas of Chicago—and leaving Illinois with no GOP representative in the Senate until 1966 at the earliest. Nor would either of the two Democratic Pauls be representative of this State, leaving party out of it.

There is a forthright and effective way to assure Senator DIRKSEN what would be tantamount to an acclamation nomination in the primary. Let each Republican county organization declare at the earliest possible date this fall that it will support DIRKSEN in the April primary. Our own Winnebago County Republican Central Committee should take the lead. With county organizations on record for DIRKSEN, no merely venturesome contender is likely to enter the race.

Some county chairmen may argue that they are committed to open primaries—cannot take a stand for a single candidate, no matter what his stature. But let them ask themselves these questions:

Does DIRKSEN, on his record, his ability, his importance to State and National Republicanism, deserve another term? Clearly he does. Then should not the path to reelection be made as open as possible?

Under existing circumstances, when Republicanism is underdog, is it wise to demand of a candidate the party wants that he go through a harassing and costly open primary merely to maintain the fiction that county organizations keep their hands off the primary?

Will the Republican Party not be stronger if DIRKSEN's unchallenged skill as a campaigner is utilized for the whole party, as it will be if he is freed of the necessity of going through an exhausting primary fight? And is not this enlisting of DIRKSEN's campaigning skill not doubly important with the possibility that representatives in Congress may be nominated at large next April?

The need for unity and unified purpose has never been greater in Illinois Republican history.

This newspaper proposes that the Winnebago County Republican Central Committee, and like committees throughout this area, take the lead in declaring promptly their support of DIRKSEN in the primary, and make clear to any prospective contenders where they stand and their total lack of enthusiasm for boat rockers in a critical campaign.

Address by Mr. Walter J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following address which was made on July 17, 1961, at the Ocean Forest Hotel in Myrtle Beach, S.C., where the South Carolina Broadcasters Association held its summer convention. The address was delivered by Mr. Walter J. Brown, president, Spartan Radiocasting Co.—WSPA-AM-FM-TV—Spartanburg, S.C. Mr. Brown is an outstanding figure in the field of radio and television communications and I salute this address and wish to include its text in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY WALTER J. BROWN, AT SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, SUMMER CONVENTION, JULY 17, 1961, OCEAN FOREST HOTEL, MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.

Distinguished guests and fellow broadcasters: It was a high honor to be asked to be your keynote speaker at our summer convention. I accepted the invitation with a certain amount of trepidation because I realized the severity of competition for the thoughts of men at the seashore in the summertime. My father, who was a Georgia politician of some renown, was brought up in the old school before electronic devices, and he had to depend entirely on his own voice power to reach his listeners. As a boy, I remember him saying: "I will speak at a county fair provided I am isolated, but I absolutely refuse to speak if forced to compete with a flying jenny."

Competing at the seashore is even more difficult, but I hope we are sufficiently isolated this morning to do a little serious thinking on the problems and opportunities that are ours as broadcasters in this exciting and critical era of the sixties.

First of all, let me say that one of the most effective avenues of assistance to help us seize our opportunities and deal with our problems is a strong State Association of Broadcasters. We must not only support our association with our dues but with our time.

Never before has there been such a need for a strong State association. An example is our effort to wipe out tax discrimination against broadcasting stations. I hope you will hear the report by Dudley Saumening at this convention, and let's resolve to take

this issue into the 1962 campaign on both the local and State level if this discrimination is not eliminated by the legislature at the next session.

Another example of why it is imperative we have a strong State association is that our way of life in South Carolina and the South is under attack. We are operating broadcasting stations which most every day are broadcasting news and programs from national networks which are slanted against the South. We cannot monitor every newscast, but we can insist that our networks not distort the news or lose its balance of fairness.

In the months ahead I am afraid our problems in this field will become more serious. South Carolina and the South have a side in this controversy, and as broadcasters, we should do what we can to see that it is fairly presented to the public.

I hope broadcasters of South Carolina will band together with other southern State associations and work to convince the networks and the news services that they should not be overinfluenced by these minority blocs who are being pampered as they peddle their vendettas against the South.

Broadcasting must remain free—free from coercion by pressure groups and free from destructive Government regulation.

If we should ever destroy our system of free broadcasting in America, we would be far down the road to a totalitarian state. We must never cease our efforts to assure for broadcasting the same freedom which is enjoyed by the press.

But we cannot go about muttering platitudes about free broadcasting unless we as broadcasters are willing and do assume the responsibility which goes with such freedom.

William S. Paley hit the nail on the head when he recently said:

"This problem of freedom and responsibility can be stated in pretty simple terms: This medium is too powerful, too persuasive, too important not to have the safeguards of the same freedom that, as a free society, we have insisted upon for the press. That freedom presupposes, in us as broadcasters, a clear sense of responsibility. If we fail to see the dimensions of that responsibility and to measure up to them, we are in for constant threats of restrictions and policing."

Now, how do we assume that responsibility?

First of all, I think that every radio station and every television station should subscribe to the NAB codes. They provide what I consider the minimum standards of responsibility. We as broadcasters can and should go further. Many of us do and were so doing before this recent hue and cry broke out against broadcasting.

It is nothing new for broadcasters to give free time for political candidates. Our radio station has been broadcasting without charge for 20 years the joint debates which are held under our political system in South Carolina. Ever since our television station has been on the air, we have devoted free time to all candidates. Other broadcasters have done likewise, and I am sure broadcasters as a whole have lost no opportunity to carry programs designed to contribute to an informed electorate and to get out the vote.

Broadcasters also have given freely of their time in presenting programs and public service messages which have permitted almost every facet of our free society to get its message before the people.

As we read some of the speeches coming out of Washington and comment in the newspapers and magazines, one would think that all broadcasters have done is sit in their office and count their money. Some would have it appear we have been oblivious to anything that would contribute to the public interest and to the education, civic advancement, and the religious inspiration of the people it is our privilege to serve. We all know the absolute contrary is the truth.

What we are witnessing today, as I see it, is a concerted effort to crucify the many for the sins of the few.

Certainly, there have been some broadcasters who have looked upon a radio or television station as a counting house to the exclusion of public service.

Certainly, there have been broadcasters who have delegated their responsibilities to others and permitted producers and talent to do things which should not have been done.

Certainly, there have been programs not in good taste so far as children or even adults were concerned.

But I maintain these are the exceptions.

Regardless of how noble our motives may be, however, and how much we desire our stations to serve the public interest to the maximum degree, we must have a successful economic base to operate from before we can do an effective job.

A lot of people have the idea that if you own a broadcasting station all you've got to do is turn on the power and the money comes rolling in. There is money to be made in broadcasting today, to be sure; however, I think some of the dogooders who are now finding so much fault with radio and television should realize this license to broadcast is not like having an oil well presented to us where we only have to turn a switch and reap excessive profits. Especially is this true in the smaller cities which are the very backbone of American broadcasting. Our economic problem has become more acute as a result of increased competition from more stations and increased operating costs. Network affiliated stations find our own networks competing with us for national spot business by selling minute announcements on both radio and television networks. If the networks do not restrict their activity in this field, they may kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

There is no more competitive business in America today than radio broadcasting, and in most markets this applies to television. While broadcasting has become more competitive, our newspaper critics and competitors have become more monopolistic. One has to look hard in America today to find a competitive newspaper city. Take Atlanta, as an example, a city of a million people. The only two newspapers there have common ownership and I might add absentee ownership. In every major city in South Carolina the newspapers are under common ownership. In all these cities there are competitive broadcasting stations.

Everyone agrees broadcasting fills the need for broader news coverage. It also can fill the vacuum for more editorial points of view. Because broadcasting is competitive and not monopolistic as are most newspapers, I think editorializing is one of our greatest untapped opportunities to contribute to good government and a virile democracy. On the other hand, I cannot think of any more terrible fate that could befall any broadcasting station and the city or area it serves than irresponsible editorializing.

Canned editorials are not the answer as I see it. I think the owner or the management must either personally direct the editorial policies of the station and write their own editorials or be in a position to hire competent people to produce the station's editorials under clearly defined policies. If this can be done and broadcasting assume its full editorial responsibility, we will have vastly increased the scope of editorial comment in this country. This will be a tremendous public service. It will take courage, it will take perseverance and it will take economic strength for stations to properly editorialize. But it will elevate broadcasting as a profession and enable stations to make an even greater contribution to our society and our democracy.

When broadcasters do exercise their right to editorialize, then it is to be hoped that the Commission and those in power in Washington will stand by the broadcasters and not force them to employ legal counsel in Washington every time some special pressure groups take exceptions to the editorial viewpoint expressed by the broadcaster. A broadcasting station must have the same protection as a newspaper and in editorializing we cannot be subjected to intimidation because we operate under a Federal license.

Broadcasters who editorialize must see to it that any opposing view is given a right to express itself; but when this is done, broadcasters should not be punished, harassed, or harangued because they have taken an editorial stand unpopular with one group or clique or faction.

Broadcasting, and especially television, today is being blamed for almost all ills of our society from the womb to the tomb. We are being blamed for juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, free love and most every problem that has confronted mankind since Adam ate the forbidden fruit. And here again, all we hear is the bad about television and little about the good in television. A columnist in our local newspaper recently began his column like this:

"Look in your living room or den this very minute and you'll probably see the most expensive excuse this country has ever had for sin.

"Yep. It's that one-eyed television set. The same that shows Cartoon Carnival, Kaptain Kangaroo, and Sunset Strip.

"Its convenience probably is one reason why television has become the national scapegoat. After all, everyone has one."

This columnist interviewed our probation office and our sheriff, a former FBI agent, and they said television in their opinion had not contributed to juvenile delinquency and crime.

As a boy, I can remember that juvenile delinquency was blamed on the movies, the funny papers and the magazines. Prohibition and various other factors were given as the cause for crime and wayward children. What was true then is true now. Children become delinquent because they have not had good training in the home and have not been properly controlled and disciplined. When there was no television, children were delinquent. And when we reach the moon, we will still have juvenile delinquency and we will still have crime.

And speaking of the moon, I wonder how many of you have read Joseph Klapper's book on the "Effects of Mass Communication." As my young son would say—it is "way out," but I think it is good reading for those of us associated with mass communication.

Klapper, in his chapter on the effect of radio and television on children, reminds his readers that only a few years ago the educators and teachers were appealing to broadcasters to cease broadcasting programs about space ships and rockets to the moon. They then said it was terrible to fill a child's mind with all this make-believe stuff and getting him away from reality.

I wonder if these educators remembered their criticism when we broadcast Commander Shepard's flight into space.

For every one kid who may have been influenced adversely by what he saw on television or heard on radio. I believe 1,000 kids have benefited by television and radio in becoming better informed, better educated and more closely knitted to the family circle.

How silly can we get when a Congressman stands on the floor of the House of Representatives and says when his aunt recently died and when his wife broke the news to his 7-year-old boy, he asked: "Who shot her?"

I do not say that we have not had too many Westerners or too many whodonits or too many private eye programs on television. But I do say I have never seen any research or any findings that caused me to believe that broadcasting has been a substantial contributing factor to juvenile delinquency.

When I hear some of the talk about Westerns, I think of my boyhood in Georgia, I sold papers to get my spending money, and much of it went for picture shows. I did not go breaking down the doors of our picture show hall to see Macbeth or Romeo and Juliet. The guy I was most interested in seeing was William S. Hart. I shall never forget his ability to strike a match with his thumbnail and also his masterful handling of a Smith and Wesson. Those Western pictures showed the type of two-fisted Americanism that developed the West and made this Nation great. As a boy I saw a lot of Westerns and there was plenty of shooting but they did not cause me to ask my mother when her sister died, "Who shot Aunt Cora?"

Why do they not talk about what radio and television have meant to people who seldom had an opportunity to see or hear a big league baseball game or enjoy a Broadway play or any worthwhile entertainment. My hometown in Georgia was isolated from the world. Now, that town has a window on the world. As a boy I drove in a horse and buggy with my father 12 miles to see a man fly an airplane. My son sat in our living room and saw Commander Shepard rocketed into space. All of this in one generation. Broadcasting is in its infancy, Sure, mistakes have been made, but I say there is no group of people more anxious to correct these mistakes than are the broadcasters themselves. And what is more, we are correcting them.

Think of the early day of journalism. As many of you know, I came into broadcasting from the newspaper field. Newspapers were established and for a long time enjoyed the privilege of a free press purely to promote one political thought or one political candidate. There was sensational journalism and yellow journalism to increase circulation.

The newspapers have made tremendous strides but still there are some which feature sex and crime to sell papers. It took the newspapers 150 years to assume the responsibility which goes with a free press. I say that within less than 50 years the broadcasters of America are assuming their responsibility under free broadcasting much more quickly than did the newspapers.

Then why all this wrath from the newspapers and magazines against broadcasting? Could the reason be they want to cripple broadcasting and get back the advertising dollars they have lost to a new competing media?

We are told the airways belong to the people. Some used to think that the primary function of Government in broadcasting was to be a traffic cop of the airways to prevent interference. The degree Government should go in regulating broadcasting is, of course, debatable. Certainly, the FCC should see to it that broadcasters live up to their commitments in securing their licenses. The Commission must discharge its responsibility to seeing to it that stations operate in the public interest—a mandate in the Communications Act which is subjected to wide and varied interpretations. As the Commission interprets the meaning of "public interest," we can expect change.

The extent to which the FCC in the public interest should project itself into programing, however, and not become censors is the important question free broadcasting faces today.

I am sure no present member of the Commission wants to establish censorship and usurp the program prerogatives of broadcasters. But I have had experience in Washington both in Government and as a newspaperman. Whatever power the Commission may adopt over programing will not be exercised by the members of the Commission but by lesser people in Government, many of whom will crave the power to have a hand in programing to promote their own political or sociological ideas.

As assistant to the Director of War Mobilization during World War II, I saw these type people operating. At times I thought they were more interested in grasping power to promote their own pet theory of government than in winning the war.

Here again, what I am talking about is the exception and not the rule, but what we as broadcasters, what the Commission and what the Congress must be eternally on guard against is the camel getting his nose under the tent and wrecking the covering protection of free broadcasting.

Broadcasters realize the airways belong to the people, but no station can please all of the people all the time. If in our programing we do not try to please most of the people most of the time, we will soon go out of business.

To please most of the people most of the time does not mean that we cannot have program balance, that we cannot devote a good percentage of our broadcast week to programs which we know have a small but important audience. An audience small in number is often important in stature.

And this brings me to the numbers game in broadcasting.

I do not believe we have a reliable rating service because the samples are too small and the margin for error too great.

The decision of the rating companies to undertake to tell an advertiser how many homes were viewing or hearing a particular program every 15 minutes in the day was a disservice to broadcasting and, I believe, is largely responsible for many of our ills. In the first place, it cannot be done accurately on such a small sample, and secondly, there is no more justification to attempt to provide quarter hour circulation than for newspapers or magazines to establish the number of peopel who read each page in the newspaper or the magazine rather than their gross circulation.

It is almost a crime the way broadcast time is bought today. A time buyer in a little partitioned office picks up a book, takes the number of homes delivered at a particular time and feeds that together with the station rate into a Monroe calculating machine. Out jumps the cost per thousand. The station with the lowest cost per thousand gets the business. They call this on Madison Avenue, "The Monroe Doctrine."

We hear a lot about a station image. Time buyers care nothing about this. They give no credit to a station for being a code station. They seldom make any qualitative analysis to determine the type income bracket or location of those listening to or viewing a station.

You cannot blame the time buyers. They have to justify their buy to the media director and, unfortunately, the only criteria of justification they know is numbers.

I do not see why broadcasters can't be as smart as newspaper publishers and set up their own bureau of circulation. Such a bureau of circulation would have to be headed by competent people, and it would have to have the confidence of the advertiser. If there was only one circulation source, as newspapers have, the audit could cover sufficient homes to be reliable and accurate. As has been suggested, we need a lot of research on this subject, and I fully realize that the solution of this rating problem is not an easy one. But I am firmly convinced unless there is a new system for buying broadcast time in this country, we will never stabilize broadcasting, and we shall continue to live in a jungle of rating warfare which is not healthy for broadcasting.

The solution of our rating or circulation problem would, in my opinion, serve to upgrade our programing, but this would not satisfy those who are now howling at the heels of broadcasters. The intellectuals, so called, are having a Roman holiday in their criticism of broadcasting. They want us to program for the few instead of the many. Since the people themselves own the airways, should not our objective be to satisfy the greatest number of people keeping in mind, of course, the need for balance in our program structure and presenting a fair percentage of these programs strictly designed to inform, educate and to uplift the cultural standards of our listeners and viewers?

Television and radio alone cannot raise the cultural level of our people. Certainly, we can help and we are helping. We are not downgrading culture as our critics suggest. Max Wylie recently pointed out that:

"In the 66 years from 1895 to now, the top 15 bestsellers included 3 inspirational books, 2 cookbooks, 1 book on baby care and 9 novels. The baby book, of course, is the one that you know, Dr. Sprock. You're familiar with two of the inspirational books, Dale Carnegie's 'How to Win Friends,' and Charles Sheldon's 'In His Steps.' Of the novels, 'God's Little Acre,' by Erskine Caldwell was a dirty book, 'Peyton's Place' was a dirty book. Those are two of the nine. The remaining seven novels among the bestsellers of the past 66 years were all written by the same man—and his name is Mickey Spillane."

"Television critics hate to have to take this unhappy truth into account," Mr. Wylie said, as they blame broadcasters for not putting more intellectual programs on the air.

Broadcasting has many functions to perform. Certainly, it must educate. It must promote religious inspiration. It must provide a forum for discussion of public questions. It must serve as a news medium and, most important, it must entertain. We are doing all these. No one claims the perfect balance has been found, but we are making progress and will continue to make progress if broadcasting is not put in a bureaucratic strait jacket, and we can maintain economic stability.

What concerns me about the present climate in which broadcasting now finds itself is that it has become apparently smart in elite circles to criticize and belittle the American system of broadcasting because our programing does not measure up to their highly refined expectations.

What is good broadcasting to some is stupid broadcasting to others. A station cannot be all highbrow or all low brow. As Bob Sarnoff points out so vividly in his recent article in the Saturday Evening Post, television can feed an increasingly number of cultural and cerebral programs and as a result promote a general upgrading of viewing habits. However, if radio or television should start programing their stations to satisfy the intellectual top 10 percent of the audience, we would soon find a broadcasting blackout in 90 percent of the homes.

I have always said that programing a radio or television station is like providing a balanced diet for the human body. We must have ham and eggs, grits and some pinto beans in our diet. Also, we must have some spinach, but we cannot make broadcasting strictly vegetarian and hold our audience.

As broadcasters we must strive at all times to upgrade our programing. But we cannot upgrade our programing faster than the American people to choose to upgrade their cultural and intellectual standards.

Radio and television programing is changing all the time, and I believe for the best. This has been true since the inception of radio because if we do not program well that little flip of the wrist comes into play, and we are dead.

I have only scratched the surface in discussing the problems and opportnuities that await us as broadcasters. There are many more, and all of us have different opinions as to the best way to deal with our problems and take full advantage of our opportunities. But we all must have one objective and that is the full utilization of our opportnuities to provide the best broadcasting possible.

Let us not be discouraged because we feel we are being unjustly criticized. And let us never forget that problems of today may become opportunities of tomorrow.

Not since the day I entered broadcasting have I been free of problems. It is a business that challenges your ingenuity, your stamina, and your patience. Every day in every week and almost every hour of the day we aer made aware that broadcasting carries tremendous responsibility, but with it all I know of no endeavor more satisfying and more awarding for the effort we put forth.

Despite all the fanfare of criticism being hurled our way, I am still proud to be a broadcaster and especially proud to be a South Carolina broadcaster.

Answer to Congressman Francis Walter in Connection With the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in the August 24, 1961, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A5966, my colleague, FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, inserted a letter which he mailed to the editor of the Sons of Italy in Philadelphia, answering an allegedly unfair personal attack against him by me. He refers to a letter which the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., of which I am president, sent to John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, condemning Congressman WALTER for his threat to abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department, subsequent to the President's announcement that he was going to appoint Salvatore Bontempo as Director and Michael Cieplinski as Deputy Director. Mr. WALTER invited me in his concluding sentence to answer him. Prior to Mr. WALTER'S letter, I had not inserted any article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in view of Mr. WALTER'S invitation, I take this opportunity to reply to his statement and incorporate the resolution which the federation sent to our President, John F. Kennedy.

As long as Representative WALTER'S name is attached to the immigration law that is currently on our books and which is known as the McCarran-Walter law, it is difficult to see how he can escape the suspicion of prejudice against certain national groups. Many of the bills that he quotes to prove his pro-Italian sympathies would be needless if we had an immigration law based on fairness instead of on national origins which discriminates against immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. The national origins concept has lost its meaning in view of the lack of unimpeded access to the United States by American-born sons and daughters of Europeans who emigrated to the Western Hemisphere.

Not only does the general public dislike the McCarran-Walter law, but also do many of our colleagues, who have introduced omnibus legislation to abolish the law and to enact a law which they regard as fair and reasonable. Approximately 28 Congressmen at some time or other led by Congressman CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have introduced omnibus immigration laws designed to repeal the McCarran-Walter law.

Eastern Europe is now largely closed to us as a source of immigrants, but no European who lives in a country whose quota is filled for the next 10 years or more while thousands of unfilled quota places remain elsewhere is likely to think of Congressman WALTER as a friend and benefactor. Mr. WALTER is regarded by many as "Mr. Immigration." No legislation apparently can be enacted without his approval.

During the last presidential campaign, our President pledged to me in writing that he would espouse legislation revising the immigration law to make it more humanitarian, to reunite families, and to reallocate unused quotas. While Congressman WALTER has introduced legislation this year, meaningful immigration laws carrying out the President's program has not been forthcoming. In view of Mr. WALTER'S breastbeating as to his accomplishments, I urge him to take action this year to carry out the President's pledge of reunification of families and reallocation of unused quotas.

I notice that while Congressman WALTER attacked the appointments of Salvatore Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski, he makes no mention of their conduct in the positions for which they were appointed. Is it possible that in the short period of time since their appointment that they have proven to be able men and that they are doing the job well? Finally, it will be much easier for Americans to stop being Italian-Americans or Polish-Americans when laws such as the McCarran-Walter immigration law are no longer in existence to remind them of their origins:

The original resolution of the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, which is the basis of our controversy, is set forth, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has recently nominated Salvator Bontempo as Administrator of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, an American of Italian ancestry from New Jersey, and Michael Cieplinski as Deputy Administrator, an American of Polish ancestry from New York, and

Whereas as the appointees are qualified by reason of their background and demonstrated experience; and

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has taken unprecedented steps to prevent the appointees, Salvator Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski, from serving in the posts to which they have been designated by threatening to abolish the entire Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, a Bureau of 800 which handle passports and visas and refugee problems, and also makes security checks on all State Department employees, and which was created 8 years ago by a bill coauthored by Representative WALTER; and

Whereas the aforesaid Bureau has performed and is performing valuable functions essential to the security of our Nation; the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., believes that such legislation to abolish the Bureau is motivated by obvious personal prejudices and considerations rather than by the best interests of the welfare of the United States; and

Whereas, the federation believes that Representative WALTER'S actions are a manifestation of discriminatory attitudes toward nationality groups, particularly against peoples of the Mediterranean area and Slavic countries as demonstrated in the provisions of the biased Walter-McCarran Immigration Act: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the federation protests and condemns the attempted rebuke of the President of the United States through the methods of Congressman WALTER'S proposed legislation to abolish the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs subsequent to the President's nominations; and it is further

Resolved, That the federation condemns the attitude and conduct of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER in seeking to abolish the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to which Salvator Bontempo and Michael Cieplinski have been nominated by the President of the United States to serve.

A Freedom Rider Quits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the fine editorial contribution of the Lakeland Ledger appearing in the issue for Thursday, June 8, 1961, and I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A FREEDOM RIDER QUITS

One of the so-called freedom riders has quit in disgust. He became disillusioned when he got to know more about his fellow freedom riders.

He is a white minister from Chicago, a Baptist who conducts a mission there and has worked for years with Negro delinquents on Chicago's Southside.

He said he was shocked when he discovered the background of some of his companions of the freedom ride through Alabama and Mississippi.

He was shocked, he said, to learn their attitudes toward communism and atheism, and to learn that some of them had police records.

"I had expected a high type of people," he said. "I am disappointed with their caliber. I will not knowingly associate with any questionable group."

Part of his disillusionment came when he learned that one of the freedom riders had been arrested for thefts, that another had served 5 months for being absent without leave from Fort Dix, N.J., and that another "believes there is no God."

Some of the others told him they would not hesitate to support the Communist Party openly.

The disillusioned minister's conclusion:

"I don't see how any group like that can do anything about segregation in the South."

Thus he arrived at the same conclusion most of the people of the South reached as soon as they learned the freedom riders were moving through the South.

The riders simply did not sound like authentic crusaders.

And it may be that the remarks by the young Baptist minister from Chicago have shed light that will cause many people in the North to be less enthusiastic about the freedom riders.

It should be gratifying to the South that the Chicago Tribune ran an extensive report of the minister's shock and disillusionment and gave the story a prominent position in the paper.

Not all papers in the North treat the racial situation objectively in their news columns. Often the racial incidents there are given only casual mention and published far inside the paper while incidents in the South are spread on the front page.

The young minister from Chicago has rendered a service to both the North and the South by speaking out as he did to tell the Nation what kind of individuals he found the freedom riders to be. Let us hope Attorney General Kennedy has taken careful note of the report.

Plain Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, every now and then we need to be reminded that America's little peoples are still the real voice of American conscience.

I am happy to be able to give the House the editorial entitled, "Plain Joe American's Ideas" from one of the little Pennsylvania daily newspapers, the Latrobe Bulletin:

PLAIN JOE AMERICAN'S IDEAS

Here is a letter John P. Meehan of Haverhill, Mass., wrote to the Manchester Union Leader.

It is one which we believe gives all of us something to think about and perhaps reveals some shortcomings in the demeanor of an American and his comparatively indifferent attitude toward communism.

Excerpts from the letter follow:

"I am not an important man, nor an influential man, nor a rich man. But I am an American. I make less than $100 a week. The car I drive is 9 years old. The banks owns more of my home than I do, and when election time rolls around, I control only one vote—my own. In other words, I am from the low-income group which pays most of the taxes, does most of the work, and is always ready to fight the wars of America.

"Many times I have read editorials and articles, concerning communism and its threat to America. Well, here is where I start to question.

"What is being done about it? Where is there any national organization proposing firm rebuttal and counteraction against communism? Any threat to America is a threat to me personally and to my family, but I am only one man. Now, if I am concerned about this threat to me, then surely there are millions of men equally alarmed. But we are, by the very nature of democracy, lone individuals. We want, we must have, organization, direction, leadership. Where is it?"

When I watch TV, I see thousands of Cubans rally to shout, "Cuba, si: Yanki, no!"

But do I ever see Americans rallied to sing "God Bless America" until their throats are hoarse? Of course not. Well, why not? It was done during World War II. Aren't we in world war III right now? Then why haven't I heard any agitators for freedom, for loyalty, for patriotism, for Americanism?

I'm an American, a citizen of the United States, and I'm proud of it. I must admit, however, that I am not proud of the way America has been handling communism.

I'm not proud of the way the Hungarian issue has been allowed to slide. I'm not proud of the way the Cuban invasion was bungled. I'm not proud of the way this country stood by and let Castro steal millions of dollars worth of American investments from us.

I can remember when an American citizen could travel almost anywhere in the world and know he was safe simply because he was an American. Not so anymore. I am deeply ashamed of the way the Communists have been allowed to humiliate my country before the eyes of the entire world.

Each time we come into contact with the Communists we seem to be caught in the dilemma of "wrong if we do, and wrong if we don't."

Let me take another look at TV. What do I see this time? May Day, Russian style and Cuban style.

In Russia a tremendous display—missiles, tanks, huge guns, and rank after rank of soldiers. In Cuba hundreds of marchers carrying Cuban flags, hundreds of militiamen armed with submachine guns.

Shades of Hitler and Mussolini, but isn't that familiar? If there had been only one "Sieg Heil" or "Banzai" I would have known I was watching a 25-year-old newsreel.

I have heard that the fight against communism is a fight for the control of men's minds. Since the Communists intend using submachine guns to gain control of my mind, then I want a submachine gun to defend it.

While on the subject of men's minds, it seems to me that the easiest and surest way of combating communism in the United Stataes is to bring about a resurgence of the love of country which prevailed during World War II.

If the minds of the American people are filled with the fervor for freedom and love for America which existed at that time, then there can be no room for the seeds of communism to take root and prosper.

Sure, I'm advocating a program of flag waving. Once more I ask, "Why not?"

Is "flag waving" a dirty word?

Is it a thing to be ashamed of?

Not for me.

As I said before, I am an American, a citizen of the United States, and I'm proud of it.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Secretary McNamara Moves To Improve Supply Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for many years congressional committees, the Hoover Commissions, and other objective groups have endeavored to bring about more efficiency and economy in the Department of Defense procurement activities.

In 1958 I sponsored an amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act which gave the Secretary of Defense broad authority with respect to more efficient management of common supplies and services. It is extremely gratifying to me to know that Secretary McNamara is now using this broad authority to consolidate the sprawling activities within the Defense Establishment. Only yesterday he announced the creation of a Defense Supply Agency which would have broad authority in the management of common supplies.

An excellent article appears in the Wall Street Journal today, which I insert herewith in the RECORD:

PENTAGON MOVES TOWARD FORMING AGENCY TO CENTRALIZE PURCHASING FOR ALL SERVICES

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon took the first step toward setting up a central procurement agency that could ultimately handle common supply purchasing and service activities for all branches of the military.

Plans were announced to establish a Defense Supply Agency that will lump the present "single managers"—outfits that buy certain supplies for the entire Pentagon—into one unit. This new agency is the organizational shell that is expected to become the Pentagon's central procurement arm by expanding its control over military buying.

Defense Secretary McNamara ordered the top priority project in an effort to achieve greater efficiency and economy. A central procurement agency with broad powers, defense officials say, will reduce overhead costs, tighten management control over the massive military procurement program and cut red tape for private companies selling to the Pentagon.

Eventually, the new agency may buy, maintain, and distribute every kind of item—from food to aircraft parts—commonly used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In addition, Pentagon policymakers are considering assigning the agency management of all common service activities, such as internal auditing, weather forecasting, and post exchange management.

While looking toward greater consolidation of purchasing, officials note that a central procurement agency would not handle the major military "hardware" items, such as bombers, missiles, and ships. Rarely are these weapons common to all military services, though defense leaders do hope some triservice aircraft can be developed in the future.

M'NAMARA FAVORS CONSOLIDATION

The entire program is in line with Secretary McNamara's desire to consolidate top-level control of defense operations and merge as many activities as possible. Recently, for instance, he ordered the merger of all military intelligence into a single Defense Intelligence Agency.

Efforts to establish the new procurement agency are bound to meet some resistance since the military services will certainly lose some of the control they have over supply activities. Nonetheless, defense leaders have decided they must begin to set up a central procurement outfit. If the Pentagon successfully brings under the Defense Supply Agency all the supply items that defense officials are thinking about, it's estimated annual savings may total about $50 million.

The single managers are units within various military services that handle certain kinds of buying for the entire Pentagon—such as the Army-operated Textile Procurement Agency and Navy-run Military Petroleum Supply Agency. Other single managers are charged with buying and distributing food and medical supplies. And in the past year, the Defense Department has ordered the establishment of single managers for construction supplies, automotive supplies, industrial supplies, and general office supplies.

Defense officials claim major savings through use of these managers. On food, clothing, medical, and petroleum supplies alone, officials report, inventories have been cut down by more than $500 million since 1956. Annual savings in personnel and operating costs for these for supply areas are now runnig at the rate of $20 million, according to the Pentagon.

NEW SINGLE MANAGER EXPECTED

As another step toward merging common supply activities, Mr. McNamara is expected to add soon a new single manager for electrical and electronic supplies. This unit, too, would be placed under the central procurement outfit—along with others to be created in future years. Candidates for inclusion under single managership before long include aeronautical spares, or standard aircraft components such as engines, and chemical supplies.

Placing this growing number of single managers under a single agency would offer many advantages, according to defense sources. It would allow the Pentagon to reduce inventories, obtain better prices through quantity purchases, and reduce the number of military personnel devoted to supply activities.

For companies selling to the Defense Department, it would mean dealing with fewer people and a central agency.

Defense officials note they've already started moving toward centralized management in at least one new activity, private line telephones. Recently, the Pentagon approved a plan setting up the Defense Department—rather than the separate military branches—as the central control point for management and leasing of private line communications. As a result, for the first time the Defense Department will be treated as a single customer when leasing private line communications facilities from common carriers. In the past, each military service separately leased its own communications.

Service activities currently operated by the Pentagon on a consolidated basis include sea transportation, air transportation, traffic management, communications, and intelligence. Under study for possible future merger are military recruiting, post exchanges, commissaries, housing management, warehousing, and medical and hospital service.

Gen. Troy H. Middleton Brings Credit to His Native State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is a remarkable achievement for most individuals when they devote their lives to a single endeavor or chosen profession in which they excel. Today, I invite the attention of the Senate to the brilliant career of a native Mississippian who has excelled in two major fields.

The man about whom I speak earned wide recognition and great respect as a professional soldier and military leader of outstanding ability in World War I and World War II.

After his retirement from the Army, he was called upon by the governing board of Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge to assume the high post of president of that great institution.

This man, born and educated in Mississippi, in keeping with his acceptance of responsibility, with straightforward conviction took the job as LSU president. And, after 10 years of outstanding service in this capacity he is now about to retire.

It is with great pride in the outstanding career of this remarkable individual that I ask the Senate to join me in saluting a man who has given "two full measures" to the service of mankind.

He is Gen. Troy Houston Middleton, retired Army general and now soon to be retired as president of Louisiana State University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of August 22, 1961, commending and praising the good works of President Middleton.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. TROY H. MIDDLETON BRINGS CREDIT TO HIS NATIVE STATE

Lt. Gen. Troy Houston Middleton has closed his second brilliant career with his

retirement from the presidency of Louisiana State University.

He previously had retired from military service after years of distinguished service and decorations from American and foreign governments.

He has made no announcements, but chances are the general, who will be 72 years of age in a few weeks, will continue quite active for several years longer in administrative or executive capacities.

General Middleton is a native of this State and a graduate of Mississippi State University, class of 1909. He was a campus leader at Starkville, member of the honorary leadership fraternity, Omicron Delta Kappa, and distinguished for his record.

He went on to advance in the Army, make a fine record in the First Forld War, study at all the top service schools in the Nation, and retire from the military as a full colonel to accept an administrative post at Louisiana State University.

He was, of course, recalled to the service in World War II and earned rapid promotion. He commanded the 45th Infantry division in Sicily and Italy, and then took the VIII Corps through France, Belgium and into Germany. After serving in the Army of Occupation in Germany, he again retired from the service and returned to Louisiana State University as its administrative dean.

The university turned to him in 1951 for its president, and his ability, character and prestige have served the university well in the 10 years that has elapsed.

Under General Middleton, Louisiana State University has grown prodigiously. Enjoying the confidence of the citizens, legislature and governors, the university has received huge appropriations for development. It stands today with a faculty of 700, a general staff of 2,700, with 15,000 students on four campuses.

General Middleton's successor, Dr. John A. Hunter, is a man with several years of experience at Baton Rouge under the Middleton administration.

As the general departed from his campus responsibilities, he was praised by the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, which said among other things about him:

"He has been able to make difficult decisions with a freedom of judgment possible to few, and to command respect in troubled times that few could have commanded. In the same position, a lesser person might more than once have found himself and the institution which he headed in serious difficulty."

Mississippi honors General Middleton as he again "retires" from a job exceedingly well done.

Manpower Development and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, September 6, 1961, the House Rules Committee will give a hearing to H.R. 8399, the manpower development and training bill. This legislation, largely the result of the untiring and imaginative efforts of my colleague, the Honorable ELMER HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, is one, if not perhaps the most fundamental pieces of legislation which this Congress will have the opportunity of approving. It should be of tremendous interest not only to labor, but also to management, for it may well provide the answer in the long run for the successful future or failure of our free enterprise economic system.

Many have recognized its importance, but it is perhaps most ably summed up by an editorial appearing in the New York Times of Friday, September 1, 1961. The editorial follows:

JOB TRAINING BILL

Senate passage of the administration's manpower development and training bill is a big step forward in dealing with the hard-core unemployment problem—finding work for those who have lost their jobs because the jobs themselves have been eliminated by new methods and machines.

The bill would make training available to more than 100,000 unemployed workers to enable them to get and fill new jobs—a $655 million program to run 4 years. It provides funds for a wide range of public and private educational institutions—which will give the training—and financial assistance to the trainees when they need it while learning.

The program is to be given a solid foundation of essential facts through a survey by the Secretary of Labor to determine what skills are called for and where—all in relation to jobs and workers available. The Secretary will use State employment agencies in getting this information and also in the selection of trainees and their referral.

A rapidly growing number of private companies, including some of the Nation's largest, are retraining their own employees for new jobs when those now held are eliminated in the march of technological change.

But corporate retraining does not help the workers who have already lost their jobs. Federal action is also imperative. The bill passed in the Senate was approved by the House Education and Labor Committee on July 27 but is still in the hands of the Rules Committee awaiting clearance to the House floor.

Seat Belts Could Save 5,000 Lives in America Per Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 2191, requiring that all automobiles manufactured for sale in interstate commerce after January 1, 1962, be equipped with anchors for seat belts. Naturally, I have been attracted to reports of activities by many groups and organizations—both private and governmental—urging seat belts to save lives and reduce injuries.

In August, my home State of South Dakota, under the leadership of Gov. Archie Gubbrud, observed a special highway safety month and the week of August 20–26 was Safety Belt Week.

Here in Washington, D.C., the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, working on this problem, has issued a statement that 5,000 lives could have been saved last year by the use of seat belts.

The Public Health Service, American Medical Association, National Safety Council, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and numerous other organizations, in addition to law-enforcement bodies, are doing something about this idea.

A study by the Auto Industries group on "Seat Belt Installation and Use" estimates that over 2 million automobiles are now equipped with seat belts, based on a nationwide poll. This is about 3.3 percent of the Nation's automobiles. A release on this poll was issued on August 19, 1961.

A second article, published in the American Farm Bureau Federation Official Newsletter of August 7, 1961, reports that the Kansas Farm Bureau is promoting the use of seat belts and has sold approximately 8,500 since 1956, when the promotion campaign began.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these releases be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation's Official News Letter, Aug. 7, 1961]

KANSAS FARM BUREAU PROMOTES SALE OF AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELTS

Using the slogan, "Your Life Could Depend On It," Kansas Farm Bureau has sold approximately 8,500 seat belts since the organization started promoting the use of safety belts in 1956.

The safety department points out to farmers in Kansas that thousands of postaccident investigations and countless tests have proved conclusively that auto seat belts can prevent injury and save lives.

Promotional material emphasizes that seat belts are no substitute for commonsense. Belts are a safety measure to prevent serious injury after a collision occurs, but the best way to avoid being killed or injured is not to have an accident.

In addition to using actual reports from people who have been kept from being killed or seriously injured because of seat belts, the safety department tries to educate members by using facts from the National Safety Council.

Seat belts will help in the following ways in case of an accident:

Keep you from being ejected; reduce the impact if you should hit an interior surface; help keep the driver in his seat after a jolt and enable him to maintain better control of his car; help you survive crashes which would otherwise mean certain death.

If you crash, seat belts will not prevent all injuries; help you in a nonsurvivable collision. If the car is crushed or demolished, it makes no difference if you wear a seat belt or not; cause any serious injuries themselves. If you are bruised by the restraining belt, chances are the impact would have killed or badly injured you without the belt; help you as much if they are not properly installed.

It would be impossible to measure the good which has been done by the 8,500 seat belts sold by Kansas Farm Bureau. The belts will not prevent accidents, but in case of an accident they should help the person wearing them. They also tend to serve as a constant reminder to be careful.

SEAT BELT INSTALLATION AND USE POLL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is estimated over 2 million automobiles using our streets and highways are now equipped with seat belts for passenger safety. This estimate, based on results of the first nationwide poll of seat

belt installation and use, indicates a growing acceptance of this proven automotive safety feature.

In revealing results of the poll, M. R. Darlington, Jr., managing director, of the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee stated: "The fact that 3.3 percent of our automobiles are equipped with seat belts is surprisingly high in view of the relatively recent public acceptance of their use. It is also particularly encouraging to note that more than one-third of the seat belt users contacted in the poll use them at all times to protect their families and friends.

THREE OF FOUR ACCIDENTS NEAR HOME

"It would seem apparent that regular seat belt users have become aware of the facts that three out of four traffic deaths take place within a radius of 25 miles of home," he added, "and more than one-half of injury producing or fatal accidents occur at speeds of less than 40 miles an hour.

"Substantial increases in seat belt sales, as well as public knowledge that all 1962 model cars will be equipped with seat belt anchorages, should bring about a decided change in future polls," Mr. Darlington said. "Public officials and organizations urging the installation and use of seat belts are confident a noticeable improvement will also be reflected in traffic accident statistics."

Recent studies indicate that 5,000 lives might have been saved last year if all occupants of automobiles had been using seat belts. Studies also indicate that serious injuries to occupants could have been reduced by at least one-third.

This first nationwide poll of seat belt use was conducted during May and June in 47 States and the District of Columbia in connection with the National Vehicle Safety-Check program. More than 60 percent of participating communities and NADA dealer members reported results of their surveys. A similar poll is planned for 1962 and subsequent years to provide continuous information.

Advance information on results of the seat belt poll were presented to President Kennedy and referred to in his recent letter to Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs. The President commended the Federation on their "Women's Crusade for Seat Belts," cosponsored by the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee.

THE 1961 NATIONWIDE POLL OF SEAT BELT INSTALLATION AND USE, COMPILED BY AUTO INDUSTRIES HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Installation, 3.3 percent.

Total vehicles included in seat belt poll, 757,164.

Total vehicles having seat belts, 24,897.

Use: 73 percent of the drivers of the 24,897 vehicles equipped with seat belts responded to the following questions regarding seat belt use:

1. Always use seat belt, 34.5 percent.
2. Use on long trips only, 37.3 percent.
3. Seldom use seat belt, 29.4 percent.

Johnson's Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. IKARD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared a day or so in one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, the Wichita Falls Record News. This editorial is so timely, and so much to the point with regard to the recent activities of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, that I want to make this editorial available to the Members of Congress and others. The editorial sets out in graphic detail the invaluable assistance in our foreign policy program which has been and is being rendered to his country by this great Texan and most distinguished American statesman.

JOHNSON'S ACHIEVEMENTS

It takes an effort to recall the surprise which greeted LYNDON JOHNSON's unexpected acceptance last year of the No. 2 spot on the Democratic presidential ticket. Here was a man actually contemplating giving up the power of his position as majority leader in the Senate for the somewhat less than vital duties of Vice President.

JOHNSON, to be sure, played it shrewdly like the professional he is by running for reelection to the Senate simultaneously in his home State of Texas. But to some, this bifurcation of his appeal to the voters made his complete political retirement look even more like a distinct possibility.

It takes an effort to recall this because JOHNSON has been treading in anything but the backwaters of the Vice Presidency for the past 8 months. He has been in the swim of Government in a vigorous fashion. And most of this effort has been in unfamiliar international waters, to stretch the metaphor as far as it will go.

As President Kennedy's personal envoy, he has been to Geneva, Africa, the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, India, and most recently, Berlin. The value of these trips to the President should not be understated.

Like other areas of the Constitution, what is not said about the Vice President is more important than the few duties specified. Yet only in recent years, especially during Richard Nixon's tenure, has the Office become anything more than an honorary sinecure for the heir apparent, potentially significant though it be.

Vice President JOHNSON's trip to Berlin may be viewed chiefly as a boost to the morale of the West Berliners, and in that respect it apparently was a successful maneuver. But another point is of overriding importance.

At one time, it would have been the peripatetic John Foster Dulles hopping on the plane to Berlin. But it was not the Secretary of State, it was the Vice President—the second in line—who went to that city the other day.

That fact is not lost on the Berliners, nor on others, who have never viewed the office of the U.S. Vice President with the disdain that has been bred among ourselves by familiarity with this aspect of our constitutional system—at least, as it once was.

The Vice President may be developing into something new on the American scene—Prime Minister and Plenipotentiary for Foreign Affairs. This would be much more than errand boy and much less than President, yet would be a unique and important position all its own. It could handle certain functions, such as a prestige visit to a foreign land, less easily carried out by the President or the Secretary of State, while freeing them for concentration on other facets of foreign policy.

This, Vice President JOHNSON seems already to have done in large measure. At the same time, he has been sharpening his knowledge of international political currents, both overall and in particular areas of the world.

This firsthand experience being gained by the Vice President certainly will not be counted superfluous in the remaining 3 years of the administration.

Tribute to the Significance of Corn in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, early in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, there occurred a spirited colloquy among Members of this body on the subject of selecting a national flower. At that time the esteemed senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] held forth in eloquent and persuasive terms in favor of corn.

Without associating myself as a partisan in the cause of my good friend from Illinois, I would draw attention to some comments by notable Americans on the significance of corn in our national life which have been compiled by Miss Margo Cairns, a lady who has zealously devoted much time and energy to the effort of having the corn tassle adopted as a national symbol.

The nutritional importance of corn cannot be overemphasized. But I would also note than it was one of the first symbols adopted for some of the decorative motifs on the columns of this Capitol Building—the appropriateness of this choice having been observed by some irreverent individuals in relation to comments which are occasionally uttered in these legislative Chambers.

In the form of cereal grain, flour, and also in its more rarified or distilled form, corn has become an integral part of American life; it has sustained our physical life and enriched our language and folklore. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the comments on corn compiled by Miss Margo Cairns.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THEY SAY—COLLECTED COMMENTS ON CORN

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president, Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge: "This Nation could not have fed itself through the years had it not been for maize, Indian corn.

"More than any other bloom in the bounty of God's garden—the corn tassel exemplifies the food by which America under our free system has been fed.

"May the means come to make this essential blossom the symbol of America both fed and free."

Gov. Luther H. Hodges, now U.S. Secretary of Commerce: "In order to provide North Carolinians with an opportunity to acknowledge the economic and traditional significance of a truly southern food product, the State will observe Cornbread Week during the period of October 5–11.

"Cornbread has long occupied an important place in North Carolina and the South. From our earliest days it has been a basic

ingredient in our region's worldwide reputation for culinary excellence. In infinite varieties—from hoe cake to spoonbread—the tasty and nutritious products of cornmeal are a delightful part of our way of life.

"Cornbread also occupies an important place in the economic life of North Carolina. Seed dealers, farmers, millers, and retailers all owe a substantial part of their livelihood to the production and marketing of corn and corn products.

"In recognition of the many benefits—tangible and intangible—derived from cornbread, I am glad to designate the week of October 5–11, 1958, as Cornbread Week in North Carolina."

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, May 11, 1961: "Corn symbolizes American abundance. It connotes the gratitude we have for its indispensable presence in the days of our ancestors' need, our present magnificent productive capacity, and the past, present, and future bounty our citizens have furnished to hungry peoples all over the world. It is a fitting symbol of our country in the plant world.

"I believe that the importance of corn both in our past history and in our society today clearly calls upon us to recognize this useful plant by making its golden corn tassel our national floral emblem. I am proud to introduce the golden corn tassel resolution for this purpose."

Congressman WALTER H. JUDD: "All Americans must know the story of the struggles for life by the early settlers of Jamestown and Plymouth and that it was corn, America's native plant that fed and sustained them. Perhaps not all Americans know that it was corn that saved starving Russians in the famine of the 1920's.

"Today this same American plant is feeding hungry peoples in many overpopulated lands. Corn has become the U.S. ambassador of good will around the globe.

Herschel D. Newsom, master, 1956: "The national grange, by action of its delegate body, favors the corn tassel as our national floral emblem. The resolution establishing this policy, and adopted by our delegate body, reads as follows:

" 'We recommend that the Congress enact legislation to declare the corn tassel our national floral emblem—corn being symbolic of the agriculture of our 48 States, native to our soil, and the object of cultivation for centuries—both by the red man and the farmer of today.' "

Wheeler McMillen, vice president, Farm Journal, Philadelphia: "It would take 11 tables stretching from San Francisco to New York to seat 180 million Americans for one single meal. We consume 540 million meals every day with little worry as to where the food is coming from.

Dorothy Giles, author, "Singing Valleys": "Corn is bread and ham and eggs and milk and cream and cheese. Corn is sugar and starch. Corn is oil and wine. Corn is clothing for men's bodies and shelter above their heads. Corn is life. Its life is the life of men.

"To us, in America, it is the strength of our past, the power of our present, the security of our future. For corn is the symbol of American democracy. And the story of corn is the story of the American people."

Harriet Simpson Arnow, author, "Seedtime on the Cumberland": "It is impossible to overestimate the importance of corn in the settlement of America. Corn was not only a proved and mighty plant of a growth so rapid it could lift itself above the weeds, but it could be planted with a hoe or grubbing hoe in ground too filled with roots and stumps for a plow to make a planting furrow. Another advantage of corn was that it would grow into a tall but sturdy plant able to hold its ears well out of reach of turkeys or racoons, but down-hanging and so well wrapped no damage could come from rain or snow and the smaller birds.

"There was, too, something kind and proud and free about the corn, big stuff a man could walk among, and reach his arms for the ears, 6 feet above the ground on 14-foot stalks. It grew in a wide variety of soils, and would yield at least something for bread on poor ground in a dry year.

"Travelers from Europe commented much on the American grain that was 'neither sown nor reaped.' "

Carl Sandburg, Flat Rock, N.C.: "All my life I have enjoyed watching corn grow, with something of wonder about how the stalk slowly rises from the ground and eventuates into the ripening ear with its brown silk. Now I find myself having added wonder about what happens and why it happens underground when the seed of corn is planted."

Dr. George D. Scarseth, director of research, West Lafayette, Ind.:

"Congratulations on your deep wisdom and understanding in seeing a great American character in the corn plant. Your suggestion that the corn tassel be selected as our national floral emblem is most appropriate.

"What can be a revelation more beautiful to the glory of God than the mechanism and the magic that takes place in a growing plant where the little balls of green chloroplasts race one another inside the cytoplasma, or juices of the cells of a green leaf? These are working to capture the sunshine some 90 million or more miles away and convert it into new life here on earth.

"The corn is one plant that captures more solar energy than any of our farm crops, and it has such a marvelous physiological mechanism in reproducing itself; in this the corn tassel is one of the keystones.

"We Americans have so much to live with and yet we hardly recognize that we have more to live for. So here's to you in your effort to make the corn tassel our national floral emblem."

Henry A. Wallace, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture:

"A lovely flower for a living room is one thing; a floral emblem symbolizing a great nation is quite another."

Mrs. Julia Proctor White, educator, Peoria, Ill.: "A national floral emblem is not a thing of unrelated, arbitrary choice. To be truly symbolic it must have been interwoven with the story of the land and the people, and its associations with them must be potent and enduring. Our stately maize, the golden corn, is the one plant we have which amply fulfills these requirements.

"The corn tassel, flowering at the tip of its tall stalk, is in itself a symbol of the whole plant and thus doubly a symbol of the United States."

Mrs. Gertrude Stevenson, Minneapolis, Minn.: "A floral symbol must have more than beauty; though it must have that, it certainly must have a great deal more. It must have meaning—sacred and deep. It must be both subtle and evident. It must have history behind it and promise before it. It must awaken thanksgiving and continuity and reverence and faith. The corn tassel is the symbol of the only thing that grows that has all of this."

Val Bjornson, Minnesota state treasurer: "Scoffers, blase journalists, those who always look for some hidden selfish motive, are charmed and challenged by Miss Cairns' story of a plant cultivated by the red man for centuries before the white man came to our hemisphere, a plant native to our soil, symbolic of our agriculture, and, through its countless byproducts, of our industry."

The Professional Writers Club, Washington, D.C.: "The fabulous story of corn was unveiled for the delighted members in an address by Miss Margo Cairns supported by color motion pictures at the January 1961 meeting. She traced the history of corn from some secluded valley in the Andes, at least 10,000 years ago, to the fabulous fields of hybrid corn in our Western States today. Christopher Columbus found it in the Caribbean, the Pilgrims found it in New England, the Indians had used it for hundreds of years before the Europeans arrived, and the Incas had sculptured cornfields in gold, just to mention a few of her revelations."

With One Hand Tied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are considering authorizations and appropriations for extended foreign aid as well as new social programs, I think we can well afford to listen to the following advice of Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

WITH ONE HAND TIED

The boast, "I could lick him with one hand tied behind my back," is seldom put to the test in the boxing ring. But it now appears that we are planning to attempt this foolhardy stunt in the international arena.

The Berlin crisis is a dangerous challenge and we should be prepared to stand firm with both hands free in case we are forced to defend ourselves. However, administration statements and congressional action seem to indicate that we are expected to engage in an extremely costly arms buildup and at the same time carry the crushing load of multi-billion-dollar welfare state divide the wealth schemes.

Congress is asked to appropriate millions for the youth corps, hundreds of millions for distressed areas, a billion for Federal aid to education, assistance to foreign nations at the rate of 4 billion per year and more billions for farm program losses.

We are asked to support subsidies for private housing construction, grants to cities for slum clearance and sewage disposal plants, socialized medicine, and increased unemployment and welfare payments.

The result—a huge Federal deficit, a new high for the national debt, almost certain increases in income tax rates, new threats of inflation and a dangerous balance-of-payments situation. In other words, business as usual regardless of international dangers.

If we are to present a strong front in the cold war and be dequately prepared for worse developments, we must get our financial house in order. The successful prosecution of a long struggle, either hot or cold, will depend upon a high degree of citizen morale based on confidence in our Government.

Irresponsible Government spending, excessive taxation that discourages saving and investment, liberal welfare, and subsidy payments based on the "big brother" sharing idea rather than need, the something-for-nothing philosophy—these are the seeds that grow to destroy morale and sap the strength of a nation.

President Kennedy merits the support of every American in his courageous stand stand against the threat of the Soviets in Berlin. His request for manpower, money, and machines is being granted promptly. His call for sacrifice by all citizens will be accepted in good faith—providing the administration, the Congress, and the Washington

political bureaucracy are also willing to sacrifice.

The secrifice we have a right to expect from the administration leadership is an indefinite suspension of the torrent of lavish spending proposals that have been flowing from the White House to Capitol Hill.

We are willing to ask, "What can we do for America," but the administration and the Congress must demonstrate their good faith by halting the constant barrage of legislation that encourages all of us to more frequently ask, "What can America do for us?"

We need the strength and muscle that comes from placing responsibility on individuals and by insisting on an honest day's work for a full day's pay. Government policies that dull incentives to produce and encourage the indolent make us soft and vulnerable. The "business as usual" idea must go. Yes, Mr. President, we are with you and we can win, but not with one hand tied behind our back.

A Defense of the Legislative Branch of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fact and Comment: A Kind Word for a Much-Maligned Species," written by Malcolm S. Forbes, and printed in Forbes magazine for September 1, 1961. This article contains a word of appreciation and consolation for us all. It is a defense of the legislative branch of Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND COMMENT: A KIND WORD FOR A MUCH-MALIGNED SPECIES

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Along with mothers-in-law, Congressmen are America's favorite whipping boys. As the current session pushes toward adjournment, the usual chorus of gripes against Congressmen rises from a thousand typewriters and a thousand rostrums.

Take this matter of winding up the current session. There are those who have demanded that Congress stay in session until certain pet legislation has been passed. Others insist that it would be sheer folly for Congress to adjourn during the Berlin crisis. Yet some of the most vocal of these stay-in-Washington groups are the very ones who gripe when their Congressman is unavailable for local ribbon cuttings and complain that "the only time we ever see you around is at election time." So it goes. On the matter of adjournment, as in most other matters, the Congressman is likely to be damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

At the risk of being shot at as un-American during this open season on our lawmakers, I'd like to defend the much-maligned Congressmen. Yes, all of them. Even that handful who are so benighted and willful as to fail to see things my way.

I'll defend, for example, the mail weighers. This group, much scorned by high-minded, do-gooders, actually performs a rather useful function in our society. The mail watchers, those sensitive souls, have but one conviction: the importance of their own reelection. About burning issues, expect no firm expressions of opinions from them. To do may be to die if they decide to reason why on a legislative hot potato. They weigh, not the issue, but the mail.

Perhaps this type of Congressman is not exactly a social scientist's idea of what the Founding Fathers had in mind for Congress. But the stubborn fact is that they perform a valuable function all the same. No scientist has yet devised a seismograph more sensitive than a Congressman holding up a wet finger into the political winds. No rhapsodic rhetoric about ideals or visions of sugarplums will garner their vote—unless it looks like most of the "folks back home" have been moved, too—and first. In short, the mailwatcher, however timid his character, plays a rather important part in making representative government really representative.

In further defense of our legislative branch, I'd like to mention an even larger group. This sizable majority of representatives spends month after month trying to figure out what they think may be best for the country by the way of a new law or no new law. These misguided fellows aren't obliging enough to accept my opinion—sometimes not even yours. They've even indicated our personal opinion may be selfishly motivated, that there may be two sides to the issue. These fellows may even listen to those who disagree with us.

So they go on and do all sorts of foolish things gor a good many hours after any sensible man has gone home from work. They hold committee hearings, public and private. They pass hours listening to visiting constituents. They even seem to spend a lot of time answering their mail and looking into, firsthand, some of the operations of Government for which the committees they belong to are responsible.

Taking into account all three categories of Congressmen—the stubborn, the seismographers and the bunch we were just talking about—it is sort of a wonder anything good gets done by them. Yet it does. That's why I wanted to take time out from the good old American sport of Congressmen sniping to say a word on behalf of our lawmakers.

Correcting a Table Listing Accelerated Depreciation Granted Certain Investor-Owned Electric Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 there was inserted in the RECORD by our colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, a table under "Appendix A—Continued," on page 13759. This table is alleged to set out the amount of accelerated depreciation granted commercial electric utilities from the beginning of the program in 1950 through September 15, 1959, with estimated interest-free loans and subsidy benefits by company. I do not note in the remarks by Mr. HOLIFIELD accompanying this table the source of his information, but one company listed was the Kansas Power & Light Co. doing business in Kansas with headquarters in Topeka. This Kansas company takes exception to the validity of Mr. HOLIFIELD's figures and requested that I so correct the table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. Pursuant to that request, I am including a letter from Mr. William L. Perdue, a representative of the Kansas Power & Light Co:

THE KANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.,
Topeka, Kans., August 17, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: We note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—House of August 7 (p. 13759) a table which purports to list the amount of accelerated depreciation granted certain investor-owned electric utilities.

We cannot answer for the validity of those figures pertaining to other companies. In the case of our own, however, the information given is in error.

In the first place, the figures are not for accelerated depreciation, but for accelerated amortization. In the second place, the amount indicated for Kansas Power & Light Co. should be $7,151,968 instead of the $25,252,000 shown on the table.

We point this out to you in case this matter comes up for discussion again.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. PERDUE.

Fish Farming in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article concerning fish farming in Arkansas appeared in the August issue of the Rice Journal. This new type of farming has great potential for my State and many other areas throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH FARMING IS GOOD POTENTIAL IN ARKANSAS RICE AREAS

(By Mary Louise Wright)

With the help of extensive research, aquiculture, one of Arkansas' newest and most unique industries appears to be on its way to becoming a giant in the State's economic picture.

It promises a better living for many farmers and additional employment and income in such allied industries as processing, packing and marketing.

Begun with the accidental discovery less than 10 years ago that commercial fish production was possible in conjunction with rice farming, what started out as an incidental operation offers also valuable secondary benefits such as soil and water conservation, increased rice crop yields and new recreational facilities.

Since the modest beginning, more than 300 Arkansas farmers have been licensed to raise fish on their rice lands. However, the present potential has not been the story long,

for until recently, pioneers in the new venture have done their fish raising by trial and error methods with little benefit of research, and their results have not been too gratifying.

Some farmers during the experimental years have made small profits from sales of fish, rotated with rice, and have increased their rice yields, without fertilizing, or by using less fertilizer following crops of fish than they would have otherwise. But the larger number of them who have tried to raise fish in reservoirs adjacent to streams from which they have pumped water infested with all types of fish, who have put their water in natural bogs, or who have stocked with new fish in areas already infested with trash fish and parasites have found their methods both expensive and discouraging.

But the cooperative efforts of the farmers with State and Federal agencies have stimulated and provided valuable research, especially during the past year or so, which is now resulting in more scientific practices with increasingly better results in prospect.

"Until now many of our farmers have found harvesting of fish more expensive than anticipated," said Arkansas County Agent Leamon Looney, who works with perhaps more fish farmers than any other county agent because there are more licensed fish farmers in Arkansas County than in any other in the State.

The agent added that a lot of farmers had become discouraged in the enterprise because of their haphazard methods of reservoir construction, draining and harvesting of fish crops, and in not knowing how to get rid of trash fish. In a number of the fish farming projects, trash fish populated the reservoirs fast and in great numbers, and cannibal fish ate many of the more desirable species, or the species with which the farmer stocked his acres.

"In this area we are finding it more profitable to construct reservoirs where land can be rotated with rice," Looney said. "However, it is not economically feasible to rotate every year. Fish should be raised for 2 or 3 years, and then rice 2 or 3. And of course, planning must go into the construction of the reservoirs, looking toward the harvests, and also in stocking them with desirable species of fish."

He explained a 2-year method under the fish-rice rotation plan now being used by some of the local farmers:

Brood buffalo stock are placed in the early spring into two one-fourth-acre plots at the rate of 500 to 600 per plot. When the temperature reaches 65°, the brood stock is placed in three one-half-acre spawning ponds and left there approximately 2 months. Then the fish are transferred into two 5-acre ponds and left until they are 5 to 8 inches long, which is usually in the fall. Fifty catfish 5 to 10 inches long are stocked per acre along with the buffalo fingerlings.

The second spring, 50 bass per acre could be added to the buffalo and catfish stock. Harvest could be made at the end of the second year, when the buffalo weigh between 6 and 8 pounds, the catfish between 2 and 4 pounds.

Fall harvest, the agent suggested, is best from the price standpoint, because it is usually then that the catch by commercial river fishermen is low.

"Some of our farmers are finding, however, that they can make more money by stocking their reservoirs and selling fishing rights to sportsmen or opening the reservoirs for commercial fishing," Looney said, and he add that it appeared to be the best prospect moneywise until further research was done.

In rotating fish with rice crops, though, there are other values which the agent pointed out. The fish add to the fertility of the soil, and flooding for fish is a means of eradicating undesirable grasses and weeds from rice cropland.

Arkansas delta lands have around 100,000 acres capable of producing fish commercially within 2 or 3 years. Only about one-fifth of that acreage is being used for that purpose at the present, but fish raising has progressed to the extent that a modern processing, freezing, and cold storage plant is in operation at Dumas in Desha County, and Arkansas and her sister States in the Mississippi River Delta are said to have a potential for an ultimate production of billions of pounds of nutritionally valuable fish.

In the several States, approximately 2 million acres are encompassed in the area capable of producing 1,000 to 10,000 pounds per acre annually. While this staggering production is not expected to be reached in the next few years, it does provide a valuable reserve for the needs of future generations.

Present average is less than 200 pounds of fish per acre, and production, also, will have to be increased for a profitable operation, along with more efficient harvesting methods.

But progress is being made rapidly, and working hand in hand in the development of the new industry are Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, the University of Arkansas and its industrial research and extension services, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission research and experimentation during the past 2 years, with Andrew Hulsey, chief of the commission's fisheries division, and Joe Hogan of the State fish hatchery at Lonoke working closely with fish farmers on a treatment for control of parasites that commonly infest fish, have successfully used benzene hexachloride, a common ingredient in cotton insect poison, in ridding ponds of parasites, and a free booklet on the subject can be had by writing either the Game and Fish Commission, Little Rock, or Mr. Hogan, Lonoke.

Another big step in the research field is the installation of a new fish farming experiment station adjacent to Arkansas Rice Branch Experiment Station east of Stuttgart and a substation at Kelso this summer. The Stuttgart station will have a staff of more than a dozen, headed by Dr. James Stevenson. While construction will not be completed until fall, it opened on July 24.

A Department of Interior appropriations bill OK'd by the Senate Appropriations Committee in June earmarks $179,000 for the research work—$114,000 of that amount to go to the fish farming station at Stuttgart and Kelso substation, and $65,000 to be allotted to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for marketing research and other assistance to the fish farming industry, headquartered at Dumas and directed by Leo J. Sullivan.

Roy Prewitt, a Little Rock lawyer and former State welfare commissioner who moved to a farm in Lonoke County to become one of the pioneers in the business, says that the fish farming industry already brings in at least $1½ million new money from the outside annually. Arkansas farm-raised fish are being shipped by air all over the world.

And a million pounds of fish a year, if the markets can be found for them, is in the foreseeable future for the State through its aquiculture program.

Government Operated Shipyards Flourish While Private Yards Diminish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in 1954, my good friend from California, Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, made the following statement before the House Committee on Government Operations:

I don't think it is at all the desire of the military of this country to take over private business. I don't think there is any design in the Defense Department or any branch in the military to take over private business or take over or run this country on a military basis. But I do say that unconsciously the military can expand its operations to such an extent that some day we might suddenly find that they are engaged in so many commercial activities that they are throttling private business, and we could just as easily slip into a military system without being aware of what was happening or without any design to have it happen as other countries have in the past.

The wisdom of Mr. SHELLEY's words is genuinely and lastingly recognized. However, when one reads in the public press that the tax-free, high-cost naval shipyards are increasing their payrolls while tax-producing, low-cost privately owned shipyards are laying off workers, it is hard to believe that the military is not "throttling private business." But that is exactly what is taking place in what is supposed to be a free competitive enterprise way of life. Today, where naval ship work is concerned, there are twice as many people employed in the naval shipyards than in the private yards.

Marine News magazine, in its August issue, puts this situation in clear focus in a provocative editorial entitled "It Doesn't Make Sense," which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

(By Wilber W. Young)

In round figures the World War II U.S. Navy Fleet was comprised of 10,000 fighting ships. To support that fleet there were 11 naval shipyards. Now, 16 years later after the end of the war, the fleet has shrunk to 817 ships, but the same 11 naval shipyards remain active and are employing steady labor. In the last 10 years, more than 20 private shipyards have gone out of business for lack of work. This situation does not make sense.

We are not unmindful of the Navy's long range requirements for maintaining the fleet in readiness to meet any emergency. Nor of its need for constantly activated shipbuilding and ship repair facilities especially in the light of world conditions today. The problems confronting the Department of the Navy and the Bureau of Ships are of such

enormity that any criticism short of positive, constructive suggestion would constitute a disservice to national security.

In that spirit we point to the progressive shrinkage of private shipbuilding facilities while the Navy is admittedly trying to get "more mileage out of its appropriated dollars" for construction, repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels. The Navy is quoted as having stated that more than $40 million can be saved through construction of one aircraft carrier in a private shipyard instead of in a Navy yard. Furthermore, top Navy officials have conceded in recent hearings before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Congressman GEORGE H. MAHON of Texas, that, "we could, in today's market, buy ships cheaper privately than we can in naval shipyards" * * * also at the same time they revealed that costs of ship work done by Navy yards are 8 percent to 15 percent higher than in private yards.

Navy ship work (80 percent of all repairs, alterations, and conversions) is allocated to naval yards on the basis of maintaining steady employment in these tax-exempt, high-cost facilities while thousands of skilled workers in private shipyards face unemployment and the future of U.S. shipbuilding and ship repairing industries is in jeopardy. This Federal competition is a constant drain on the Public Treasury and it is a glaring contradiction of the philosophy of free enterprise, costing taxpayers millions of extra defense dollars.

Against such a background there is the ever-present threat of an emergency. And when the worst happens, suddenly the Government turns to private industry for the necessities that are vital to national survival. Thanks to the loyal, fighting patriotism of the industrial community as a whole they have always delivered the goods when the chips were down. For example, during World War II the base facilities of private shipyards were expanded 1,300 percent to meet the Navy's requirements in excess of its capacity, which, by the way, was increased only 300 percent above the normal base during the same period. At the close of hostilities, the Navy, as is its custom, just as suddenly, again became self-sufficient and, through its shortsighted and self-serving policy of holding naval shipyard facilities at normal level, regardless of the cost, has materially contributed to the present plight of private shipyards.

It is neither necessary nor wise to accept the waste of preparedness and war as an unmitigated verity. This is an area in which both peacetime and wartime waste can be meliorated by spreading the work load more economically in peaceful years. Such a policy would keep the ship construction and repair yards at a level of prosperity and readiness from which they could spring into full production faster and at far less cost to taxpayers.

President Kennedy has said that we are living in an age of change in which the American people must put forth their best efforts in meeting present challenges. Also in that and every other sense the private shipbuilding and ship-repairing industries pledge their best efforts to the Government to insure that the United States Navy will always be the best in the world. Is the Navy aware of that pledge?

Twenty defunct shipyards will have great difficulty in fulfilling the pledge that their industry is reputed to have made and many yards now struggling to stay in business would welcome some patronage by the Navy.

The Secretary of Defense has appointed a special committee to review operations at many military establishments, including naval shipyards, to determine those which could properly and economically be reduced without hindrance to national security. This is a step in the right direction. The findings and recommendations of the committee will be awaited with great interest in many quarters.

The Shipbuilders Council of America has launched a program under the direction of the Council's vice president, Edwin M. Hood, designed to bring all of these problems into sharp focus and to promote closer cooperation between the Navy and private shipyards. "When all of the facts are gathered and evaluated," said Mr. Hood, "we have no fears that our defense officials will recognize the wisdom of placing greater reliance on the tax-producing, low-cost private shipyards throughout the country."

To that we say "Amen."

A Dairy Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, I introduced bill S. 2414 for establishing a dairy research center to find new industrial and commercial uses for dairy products.

I am delighted to report that there has been widespread interests and enthusiasm for this approach to better utilizing our dairy resources to serve the American people.

On August 29, the Green Bay Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published a splendid article on the merits of such a laboratory. Presenting good solid reasons why Congress should move ahead on this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, is proposing legislation to establish a dairy research center at Madison. The purpose, he says, is to find new ways to utilize dairy products for commercial-industrial uses.

He points out that over the years we have built a huge dairy industry for the production of milk, cheese, butter, ice cream and other foods for human consumption. He thinks now, however, that we need "Columbus-type researchers" to discover new industrial and commercial uses for milk, cheese, butter, and other dairy items.

The need for such an undertaking has been clear to many people for a long time. However, Congress has been slow to act probably because the dairy industry is centered largely in a very few States and thus does not have the broad appeal necessary to get Federal legislation.

However, R. E. Hodgson, president of the American Dairy Science Association, said recently in a speech in Wisconsin that the declining acceptance of milk and milk products is one of the top problems facing the dairy industry. He said there has been an increase in the use of nonfat solids in milk and a decrease in fat consumption. The decrease in the use of butterfat has been due in part to the development of competitive fats and also in part to the advice of doctors to many persons to avoid animal fats. More generally, however, the widespread slenderizing programs followed by many persons have reduced the consumption of butter and butterfat in cream and in rich desserts made from dairy products.

Senator WILEY is proposing that the Federal Government put up the research center and provide facilities and equipment to search for new ways to utilize dairy products and their constituent parts for new purposes. He believes that this would be a tremendous boon, not only to the dairy industry, but also to the economy of the Nation. We think the Senator is absolutely right and that such an investment by Congress would not be inflationary because it would add to the Nation's prosperity generally and enrich all of the people to some extent.

Address by Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, U.S. Navy, to Officers and Men of U.S.S. "Yorktown"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the stirring remarks by Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, U.S. Navy, commander of the Antisubmarine Warfare Forces of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, aboard the U.S.S. *Yorktown*, on August 5, 1961. The remarks were addressed to the officers and men of the Antisubmarine Warfare Forces.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. J. S. THACH, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE FORCES, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET ABOARD THE U.S.S. "YORKTOWN," AUGUST 5, 1961

First, I want to welcome the officers and men of this splendid hunter-killer group.

You are here in Hawaiian waters for an operational readiness evaluation. This is not going to be easy. I don't want it to be. This will be a test of your stamina, as well as your skill as a team before you deploy to the forward areas of freedom in the western Pacific.

You are here to demonstrate your readiness and readiness is really needed in today's tension-filled world.

This is a team test of ships, submarines, naval airpower, but, above all, of men working together to carry out your mission and mine—antisubmarine warfare.

Pearl Harbor is far from Berlin—far from Berlin geographically—and yet we in the Pacific are most mindful of the global implication of today's Berlin crisis. Indeed, we are keenly aware also of the modern submarine threat that can confront us as a new crisis compels us to consider carefully our readiness and take a hard look at our capability to contribute.

Sophisticated systems in the submarines today show a trend toward emphasis on quality rather than quantity. This is true not only in our Navy but in all the other navies of the world. The threat of modern submarines has increased a great deal. As a result, today fewer submarines can pose a far more potent threat than was the case several years ago.

The need for modernity in the ASW Forces that must oppose the new nuclear submarine is manifestly clear. We too must capitalize on the revolutionary progress of this past

decade of accomplishment to keep pace. We can't afford not to catch up with the modern submarines that may oppose us.

As we prepare to meet this modern threat we realize that effective ASW provides a rock bed foundation for control of the seas. Antisubmarine warfare is a common strategic denominator of all types of conflict. It covers the broad spectrum of all contingencies—from limited through general wars.

Just because submarines have not been used in a limited war in the past is no reason to be complacent and assume that they will not be used in the next one. For example, in 1950 at the time of our limited war in Korea, Red China had no submarines. But today, they have the fourth largest submarine fleet in the world. With more and more countries acquiring submarines a serious and perhaps quite confusing situation could arise by a country using submarines converted in a limited war so that we would never know which country's submarines were involved. This would pose the perplexing problem: "Who fired the torpedo—or missile?"

In testing our readiness naturally we must consider the spectacular American achievements in submarines capability.

The Polaris system at sea, the product of revolutionary technological progress through scientific accomplishment, makes crystal clear the magnitude of our future challenge. Modern mobile submarine hunting forces must meet this growing threat responsively—if we would deter convincingly.

Our hunter killer forces need nuclear power for sustained mobility as they search for submarines. They need nuclear submarines as members of their tri-dimensional team effort. Longer range detection systems are needed to reach out, and modern weapons of swift reaction are needed for fast decisions in the rough-and-ready game we play. Positive and quick kill capability is needed to win.

All of us have found that ASW is a tough job. It is not glamorous. ASW is a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week task. But it is rewarding work for those who accept the challenge.

This is a challenge of leadership and morale, an acid test of character and conviction. Our success or failure in ASW hinges on the determination and strength of people like you who work on ASW around the clock. That is why I have said so many times that it takes dedicated men to be good in ASW. We can seek the stars and moon in space but it is here on earth the test will come and the decision made as to whether we will remain free to do these things. This you men will decide by your performance, by how well you handle the weapons and equipment our country is providing.

Recently our President talked to the Nation. He told of the seriousness of the Berlin situation. He also told us what we must do to defend freedom.

There were a thousand and one things that he could have mentioned. He only had time to talk of a few.

But he did talk about ASW.

This fact is important to us in our business. The entire Nation became aware of the urgency of our effort—the top flight importance of this task. The President provided an incentive to work harder. He focused world attention on ASW as a race in liquid space. As you can see I could talk all day about ASW; it is fascinating. But we are here today for a change of command. We in the Navy always participate in these ceremonies with mixed emotions.

Adm. Bill Stuart jointed the ASW team as a hunter killer commander approximately a year ago. His dedicated efforts as well as his professional ability are reflected in the readiness of this force. Well done, Bill, we say aloha to you with sincere reluctance.

To Adm. Joe Cobb we extend a warm welcome and wish you well as you assume command of this fine group. Needless to say you arrive at a time when a premium is placed on combat ready ASW forces to meet the threats that confront us. Welcome to our ASW family of the Pacific.

I am confident you and your team will demonstrate the real readiness which is needed more today than ever before in our peacetime history.

Apple Institute Views on Strength of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention to an excellent and penetrating statement by Mr. James B. Moore, the executive vice president on the National Apple Institute, entitled "The Strength of American Agriculture."

Mr. Moore makes a point with which I heartily agree. He notes that our farm problem is one of overabundance, and that this is a much better situation to have to contend with than underabundance, as is the case in so many parts of the world. This does not mean we do not need to take vigorous steps to improve, update, and make less costly ou basic farm programs. To the contrary, it is an affirmation of the strength and effectiveness of our free-enterprise system.

The apple industry can be proud of the fact that it has dealt realistically and firmly with its own market situation. Apple growers do not receive Government price supports, and they have not asked for them. What is more, they have on their own initiated many fine programs to expand the sales of their product.

Mr. President, I think this is a particularly thoughtful statement which Mr. Moore has written, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Two gigantic forces are currently locked in a struggle for survival. These forces are popularly symbolized by the so-called East and West, or specifically the United States and her allies versus the Soviet Union and her satellites. This struggle is referred to as the cold war, a struggle for men's minds, where economics and political philosophy are the major battlefields. It seems that in this struggle we have overlooked the most outstanding story of the value of our free economic system to all peoples, in not adequately publicizing the fantastic success story of American agriculture.

We, in this country, gnash our teeth and wail about the problems of American agriculture, and yet when we analyze this problem, it always boils down to the fact that we are just too efficient. This is a problem of surplus in a world where the mass of human beings live their lives at the brink of starvation. There can be no more remarkable story of the vitality and value of the free enterprise system than this story of American agriculture. The ability to feed the Nation and then go on to create an economic problem through overabundance is absolutely fantastic in view of world food supply conditions. A really significant part of this story is that the vast majority of our governmental activities in the agricultural area are concerned with reducing, eliminating, utilizing, storing, and purchasing surplus. This production is the result of freemen working as individuals on their own land with a profit motive. We contrast this with mandatory cooperatives on state-owned land, highly organized, dictatorially directed, unable in many parts of the world to produce enough food to provide for the most basic needs of the domestic populations.

During the past year there have been numerous reports of mass starvation, inadequate food supply and political turmoil created by underfed people coming out of Communist China. Factually we know that the Chinese Communists have arranged to purchase 235 million bushels of wheat and barley to sustain the meager diet of their citizens. In a recent speech Premier Khrushchev severely criticized Soviet agricultural performance, which fell far short of predicted production.

Now pause to reflect upon these problems of Communist China and Soviet Russia. Translate them if you will into the physical and emotional anguish of parents unable to feed their children, of entire communities void of food, individuals such as you and I, multiplied into countless millions unable to provide themselves with the most basic human need, the very fuel of human energy—food. Bearing this very strongly in mind, reflect on the tremendous problem of American agriculture, overabundance. How completely odd that we are put on the run in defending our system of free enterprise in the face of such gross inefficiency by our competitors. There should be no race at all. We possess the means, the ability and the applied science capable of lifting the entire world out of the morass of economic and social depression so that all can live as freemen with not only the basic human needs but the surplus of leisure and culture which modern society demands.

Apple growers can be particularly proud of the fact that they have not only contributed to this national economic state of abundance but in addition have organized themselves voluntarily into State, regional, and national organizations which are engaged in promotion, research, education, and advertising. They are creating and enlarging their markets without the funds and control of Federal Government.

This activity is a visible living testimony to the fact that freemen who are socially mature enough to voluntarily organize themselves to cooperatively meet their common challenge can accomplish a great deal more than any governmental controlled mandatory society.

The Eternal Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, it was the pleasure of this body to hear a score and more eloquent tributes commemorating the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States in August 1920. I have nothing but praise for the think-

ing men of our generation who today accept and rejoice in the demonstrated capabilities of our lovely and gracious ladies of America.

Mr. Speaker, of all the praises bestowed by my distinguished colleagues, I heard none so well expressed as one written by a young man from Apple Springs, Tex. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Eternal Woman," by Travis C. Tullos, Jr., be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Groveton (Tex.) News]

THE ETERNAL WOMAN

Poets down through the ages have tried to describe her. Painters immemorium have struggled to catch her image on canvas. Lyricists have written many thousands of lines to melodious sounds with the prayer that their efforts would truly reflect the splendor of her charms, and she would be caught for all time in the harmony of music and words. Shakespeare wrote of Desdemona, Van Gogh stroked "The Naked Maha," and how about modern songs such as "Georgia," "Jeanie, With the Light Brown Hair," and "Maria." And the writers, of course, have tried their hand in such books as "Gone With the Wind." Most of us remember the personnage of Scarlett O'Hara from that novel. But somewhere in my meanderings through these art works I have failed to find in every respect the key to the sort of person which would inspire such efforts.

I feel emphatically that I have met a few. Not many, just a few.

And yet, though personal contact has been limited, it is my observation that there is a certain unfathomable quality entrenched in each one of the delicate creatures. What is there, for instance, in the Mona Lisa smile? Sex appeal, you say. Naw, I think it's more than that. There is a sweet mystery, a web of frustrating unpronounced mystery. Maybe that is it. This could possibly be the strange aura that has caused many a young man to toss in his sleep at night (and I suspect some older ones too).

The concept of an eternal woman may sound glorified. And maybe it is. But somewhere in the personality of such an holy occurrence there does lie a seemingly indestructible force which defies the existence of death or suppression. It cries for the right to be recognized and appreciated for the rarity it is. Probably the worst punishment of a human nature that can be reaped upon a woman of this caliber is to not be thought of for what she really is. Unfortunately, this is the problem for most of them.

These women mature early in life. Both physically and mentally. Their wisdom usually, in many ways, exceeds that of their male brethren. One characteristic of prominence is the more liberal and understanding judgment they exercise at times of crisis. When a situation of great moment presents itself, they are tough as nails. It would be fair to assume that this ability is what helps to make them the tremendous mothers they are. They accept the burden of child-bearing with overwhelming fondness and love. This is their most unlimited faculty. Love. For children, for husband, for friends, and, even for chance acquaintances, but most of all for the first two. To a husband, or even a lover, she is the epitomy of feminity. Affection is her vanguard. And beauty. The beauty of this unique and curious being is unsurpassable, but not in the Hollywood, glamour-girl fashion. No, this beauty of which I speak wells up from within. It flows like an artesian well, without ceasing or unnatural production. It hints at something mental as well as physical. The tide of it is never brooked. Take a blossom from a magnolia, allow a drop of softest dew to fall, bathe both with an ember-soft glow of moonlight, and then lightly, just lightly, let a cool evening breeze caress them all. There is just a hint of what beauty lies at the depth of the eternal woman. The flowing lines of an appropriate red dress can achieve the same effect.

This is the eternal woman. Wise, profound in many ways, motherly, loving, unrelinquishingly desirable, colorful, durable, and excruciatingly proud. A foolish concept? Maybe so, maybe so.

The American Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in an age when it is so all-important to recognize and preserve each of our cherished freedoms, one of our foremost tasks becomes the job of knowing what it is in our heritage that we must perpetuate.

An excellent address on one aspect of this problem was recently delivered in Baltimore by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland, at the national president's luncheon of the Jewish War Veterans Auxiliary. Because of the depth and importance of Mr. McKeldin's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the representative of the Freedoms Foundation my first duty today is to acknowledge with gratitude the helpful interest that the Ladies Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans has always taken in the work of the foundation. My second duty is to speak to you on a theme as familiar to you as any in the world, but which is not worn out by repetition, but is only carved more deeply upon our minds and hearts the oftener we consider it.

This theme is the "American Credo" as expressed by the Freedoms Foundation in its 17 enumerated rights. There is, I believe, an 18th right that might be added to that credo, although I suppose it need not be stated explicitly, since it is implied in all the others. Still, I propose to talk about it a little while.

This implied right is not easily stated in specific terms. The best I can do is to call it the right to recognize excellence wherever it may be found. You may think, because of the way I have stated it, that this is not much of a right anyhow, and it isn't denied; but a little reflection will convince you that you have been misled by my awkward words.

As a matter of fact, it inspires and gives value to all the other rights, and it is constantly denied or restricted almost everywhere in the world. For what gives value to freedom? What makes it worth having? We all know that to win it and keep it involves labor, peril and sacrifice, even to the sacrifice of life itself. Then what gives it this transcendent value? What is this freedom that is worth everything else in the world?

The word, of course, covers innumerable things. Merely being out of jail is freedom, of a sort, but we don't believe that that is what Jefferson meant when he listed "liberty" among the three gifts with which the Creator has endowed mankind, and which, because they are gifts of the Creator, mortal man has no right to take away.

Perhaps the clearest definition is that of Lord Acton, called a historian, but really a great philosopher of history. He called true freedom liberty to pick and choose, among the countless things that claim our attention, those that are really excellent, rejecting those that merely seem to be desirable. The fact that a man may misuse this liberty is no excuse for depriving him of it. If he mistakes brass for gold, we may try to teach him better, but we must not deny his freedom of choice, for that is more valuable than gold.

Yet it is denied. All over the world it is constantly denied by one means or another, and that is why the battle to maintain freedom is never ending.

Let me illustrate the point by a very gross example. A few years ago, during the rule of the beast in Germany, the German people were subjected to a moral slavery worse than any fetters of iron. It came home to me early in the war when the son of one of my friends was killed in battle. The young man died like an officer and a gentleman, in the highest tradition of military service, and it was my privilege on meeting his father, to take off my hat and thank him for having produced a man who had added to the honor of our Nation.

But I could do that only because I am an American citizen and a freeman. Had I been a slave of the German dictator, I could not have done it. I should have had to suppress my tribute to valor because the valiant dead had worshipped God by a rite different from the one that I follow. He was a Jew.

When any man is deprived of the right to recognize, and rejoice in, and pay tribute to excellence, wherever it may be found, he is no longer a freeman; indeed, he is no longer a whole man. He is morally deformed, spiritually crippled; and though he may stride through the world with the tread of Caesar, attended by an army of sycophants, and spreading terror wherever he goes, he is but a poor thing. He has no liberty, he has only license, which is as counterfeit as a dollar stamped from lead.

Now let me repeat that I cited Hitler's Germany as a particularly gross example of what I meant. It is probably the worst example in modern times, but let us not delude ourselves that it is the only one. Let us not flatter ourselves that even in this land of freedom we are wholly guiltless of the same error. Whenever and wherever a fine deed is done and the man who does it is denied his due meed of praise on account of his race, or his religion, or on account of any extraneous circumstance, the right to recognize excellence is to that extent denied and the denial deprives the people concerned of their true freedom. Note that I say nothing of the man who has achieved excellence. He is usually accounted the victim of prejudice and injustice, but in point of fact he has suffered only a minor injury; the deeply hurt are those who have lost their freedom to recognize and to follow the good because they are in bondage, if not to some human dictator, then to some invisible, but powerful prejudice, or passion, or false tradition. They have lost the very essence of freedom, the thing that makes it more valuable than life itself.

More than that, when we Americans lose it, we are twice guilty—guilty first as regards ourselves, and also guilty as regards those whose heirs we are. For we are pledged to act otherwise. Don't think that only John Hancock and those who with him signed the document are bound by the Declaration of Independence. They were not acting on their own; they were acting as representatives, as agents, of all the American people, including their posterity.

Consider, then, the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal * * * that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights * * * and to the support of this declaration we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Along with our liberty we inherited this pledge, and when we accepted the liberty, we accepted the pledge. We are bound by it, and if we repudiate it, we are perjured.

And as I am speaking to the mothers, wives, and daughters of Jewish war veterans, let me point out that the Jewish American is doubly bound. For he was pledged a long, long time before 1776. Read on the bell that announced the signing of the Declaration, and which was cast before independence was thought of, this inscription: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof." That command was not issued to the American colonists. It is from the Book of Leviticus, the law of the Jews. Again, the Prophet Isaiah, denouncing mere formalism, derided mere rites and ceremonies, including fasting, and continued, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen—to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?"

"To undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free"—that, said the Prophet of God, is the religion of the Jews, of which fasting is a mere outward token. In view of this, I find it nothing strange that so many Jews have made extraordinarily good Americans, from Haym Salamon, who gave his fortune during the Revolution, all through the years down to my friend's son who gave his life in the Second World War. They were undoing heavy burdens, they were letting the oppressed go free; and in so doing they were vindicating the inalienable rights with which the Creator has endowed all men.

It is a great inheritance, and at the same time it is a solemn bond. I believe that we should rejoice in the inheritance, and I believe that we should cultivate our children's pride in it. But even as it is great, so are we strictly bound to see that it shall pass to the generation that comes atfer us intact; and that means that we must not for a moment forget the bond that came with the inheritance.

Our land is a land of freedom, but only relatively so. We lead the nations, but that does not mean that we have attained the goal. It is still in the distance and there is many a long day's march before us, a march through dust and heat, possibly through peril and blood, before we reach it. But our fathers before us were still further away, yet they set out valiantly and continued faithfully. If we have inherited only the freedom they won, and not the faith and courage by which they won it, how shall we account ourselves their true sons?

And among all the countless races and creeds and conditions that make up this great Republic, it seems to me that the heirs of the promise to Abraham should be among the most reliable. So I think that the spirit of America has said, and will continue to say to the Jewish American the words of Adonijah to Jonathan: "Come in; for thou art a valiant man, and bringest good tidings."

The Human Side of a Great Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of a better world, in which men can seek and attempt to attain their aspirations and dreams in a climate of freedom, depends upon the establishment and execution of, adherence to, and respect for, a good system of laws.

At best, laws, not just rigid chains to bind the souls and lives of mankind, should be universally recognized codes of conduct that best serve the individual and society.

Justice, even under good laws, however, cannot be obtained unless administered by men of wisdom, good judgment, and a sensitivity for the rights of individuals and society.

Throughout our history, we, as a nation, have benefited from the service of such jurists.

As a unique example, I humbly pay homage to one such outstanding jurist, the late Judge Learned Hand. During his lifetime, he became one of the most admired, respected and revered judges in our history.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article entitled "The Human Side of a Great Judge." Reflecting the philosophy which helped a great man to make an outstanding contribution to an improved judicial system in our country, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 30, 1961]

THE HUMAN SIDE OF A GREAT JUDGE—LEARNED HAND, THE FOREMOST JURIST OF HIS DAY, COULDN'T STAND PLATITUDES BUT HE WAS TOLERANT OF WEAKNESSES OF THE FLESH—HIS WRITINGS AT BEST WERE LITERATURE

For the last 20 years or so, any mention of "the great judge" was well understood by Americans without the addition of the name. Learned Hand was conceded to be our greatest living judge, in the line of the foremost jurists in our history: Marshall, Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo.

Great he was, not only as a lawyer but as a thinker, writer, patriot, democrat, humorist and human being, a retired judge of U.S. courts in New York, died August 18 at 89.

Two years ago, a lavish ceremony was held at the New York Federal courthouse on the occasion of Hand's 50th year on the bench. Responding to the many eulogies, the veteran jurist remarked that his life had been "uneventful, unadventurous, easy, safe and pleasant."

"Those five adjectives are inadequate and inaccurate," Justice Felix Frankfurter retorted. "I propose, instead, 'daring, romantic, antediluvian, sophisticated and lucky.'"

Yes, "romantic" undoubtedly would apply.

"When we were boys," Hand used to recall, "my cousin Augustus and I liked overnight camping in the Adirondacks. We would spend a month planning a single night in the woods, but the project appealed excessively to my romantic nature." (The late Augustus Noble Hand also became an outstanding Federal judge.)

JUDGE HAND ON LIBERTY

Learned Hand's writings at their best are literature. His best known composition is that which he read at an "I am an American" observance in 1944:

"What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith.

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but never quite forgotten: That there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

For less exalted subjects he displayed a lively sense of fun. In the 1920's the enormous success of the stage comedy, "Abie's Irish Rose," inspired the writing of a play on a similar thesis, "The Cohens and the Kellys." The owners of "Abie" brought suit on grounds of copyright violation, and the court ruled in favor of the defendant.

"There are but four characters common to both plays, the lovers and the fathers," he stated judicially. "The lovers are loving and fertile; that is really all that can be said of them, and anyone else is quite within his rights if he puts loving and fertile lovers in a play of his own."

HE KNEW THE FLESH IS WEAK

For weakness of the flesh, the stern jurist revealed a consistent tolerance. A woman from Europe had been refused citizenship because, according to the evidence, her unworthiness was revealed by moral laxity. The case was appealed to Judge Hand, who declared:

"A continued illicit relationship is not inevitably an index of bad moral character. A person may have a good moral character even though he has been delinquent upon occasion in the past; it is enough if he shows that he does not transgress the accepted moral canons more often than usual."

In a similar case the errant applicant was a 39-year-old bachelor.

"You wouldn't want your daughter to marry such a man," the government attorney told the judge, who was the father of three daughters.

"I wouldn't want her to marry a man of 39 who hadn't had the impulse," the court replied sharply.

His shifting and contrasting moods were relished by his colleagues and onlookers more than by the attorneys who argued before him. Deep in thought, he was riding the elevator to his office when a stranger told him, "Pardon me, Judge Hand, but I want to tell you how much I admire the opinion you delivered yesterday."

"Thank you very much," the jurist answered and smiled broadly. As he entered his office he shouted a hearty "Good morning, really a splendid morning" and told his clerk of the encounter with the stranger. For the next few minutes, from his chambers, he could be overheard whistling tunes from his beloved Gilbert and Sullivan. Then he sounded the buzzer for the clerk, who found him looking deeply contemplative.

"I cannot fathom," he said deliberately, "why I allowed myself to care what that fellow thought of my opinion."

NO PATIENCE WITH WINDBAGS

For lawyers who rambled or uttered platitudes, he had scant patience. He would interrupt them with cries of "Rubbish." Or "Enough, enough, I can't take any more." If an attorney would begin, "As the court is well aware," he would snap back: "We are aware of nothing—you are here to enlighten us." Of another windy debater he demanded: "May I inquire just what are you trying to tell us?"

In the writing of his more than 2,000 decisions he worked his staff as well as himself many hours overtime. He didn't mind if a clerk or stenographer brought along a sandwich and coffee, but he was death on chewing gum. A specimen of his dictation to a clerk might be: "Now, in relation to the appellants' rights in this maritime insurance—ah, ah, sonny, we've come to the parting of the ways. I can smell Spearmint again. Throw that gum away—the appellant's rights in this maritime insurance."

When prohibition was on the books, Judge Hand ruled that the enforcement of the 18th amendment applied to American ships on the high seas.

"Naturally, I have nothing to say about the wisdom of the amendment or the law," he said, "but, wise or not, one thing is clear, that a drink of whisky is as hurtful to health and morals outside as inside Ambrose light."

RULES OF THE GAME MUST BE OBSERVED

Some of Hand's really important decisions involved the Communist menace, which he recognized in 1950 when, in a 20,000-word decision, he affirmed the conviction of 11 American Communist leaders.

"The American Communist Party is a highly articulated, well contrived, far spread organization, numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate Utopian faith that is to redeem mankind.

"Our democracy, like any other, must meet that faith and that creed on the merits or it will perish; and we must not flinch at the challenge. Nevertheless we may insist that the rules of the game be observed; and the rules confine the conflict to weapons drawn from the universe of discourse."

Yes, the rules must be observed, he insisted again a few months later when he reversed the conviction of Judith Coplon on an espionage charge. "Her guilt is plain," he conceded, but found that the Government had not followed the rules: It had not obtained a warrant for her arrest and its gathering of evidence by illegal wiretaps was questionable.

UPHELD FREEDOM TO DISSENT

Judge Hand would not let himself be scared by ideological threat. In 1952, when the American anti-Communist hysteria was blowing gustily, he spoke up stoutly that "American democracy would be threatened by suppression of freedom to dissent, by the making of denunciations without evidence, and by loss of faith in the eventual supremacy of reason.

"Risk for risk," his widely publicized address continued, "for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry."

In Judge Hand's opinion, the qualities that clear the path to truth are: skepticism, tolerance, discrimination, urbanity, some—but not too much—reserve toward change, insistence upon proportion and, above all, humility before the vast unknown.

The great judge confessed himself in awe of judicial proceedings and imperfections: "As a litigant I should dread a lawsuit almost anything short of sickness and death."

In one of his last public appearances he cited the chief qualifications of a judge: "Detachment first and then imagination—for after all, the work of a judge, like a poet's or a sculptor's, is an art." He illustrated his faith by quoting a Shakespeare sonnet which is an address to time: "Thou shalt not boast that I do change," and which ends thus:

"This I do vow, and this shall ever be;
I will be true, despite thy scythe and thee."

—WALTER MONFRIED.

The Necessity of Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the best reasoned statements in justification of our farm programs that I have ever seen appeared in the August 27 issue of the Arkansas Gazette. The column by Leland DuVall, in that issue, places our farm programs in perspective and correctly points out that "subsidies are a part of modery economy." It is seldom mentioned in the press that subsidies cover practically every aspect of our economy. Unfortunately, a sizable segment of the public is under the impression that farmers are the only recipients of Government subsidies.

I hope that my colleagues will read this interesting article and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Aug. 27, 1961]

FARM SUBSIDY PLAN NECESSARY TO KEEP ECONOMY VIGOROUS

(By Leland DuVall)

Most nonfarm people—and even many who are connected with agriculture—seem to miss the point entirely when they discuss Government farm progress.

Quite often, it seems, people regard farmers who attempt to defend the principle of Government assistance as pampered pets of the politicians.

The attitude can be explained, in part, by the general lack of understanding of the total farm program. The problem is complicated by the changing conditions in agriculture and by an altered "public image" of the farmer himself.

In the old days, the cartoonist's concept of the farmer—was a rugged individualist with tough corns in his hands, patched overalls and a frayed straw hat. He was satisfied if people stayed out of his affairs and permitted him to battle the weather, diseases in his livestock, insects, tricky markets, and all his other natural enemies. He was a man to be admired, but few people envied him.

This picture was never quite accurate, even when the sparse population made individualists of all Americans. However, the caricature was closer to the truth than the modern image. The more insidious drawings present the farmer as a complaining miser who spends more time standing in line for Government subsidies or counting his money—most of which was derived from Government checks written at the expense of honest taxpayers—than he spends farming the back 40.

Perhaps these cartoons would contain an element of humor if the cruelty could be filtered out. Actually, they are little more than "sick" jokes but the real tragedy is that some people believe they are true.

Admittedly, there are farm subsidies—just as there are subsidies for several other business, labor and professional groups—but the tendency is to exaggerate the amount and ignore the benefits to all the economy that result from keeping agriculture out of bankruptcy.

Subsidies are a part of modern economy, primarily because no one has figured out how to provide equal opportunity—or anything approaching it—by any other method. Agriculture must receive certain benefits because of the long-term practice of having the farmer sell in a buyers market and buy in a sellers market.

E. Hofer & Sons, since 1913 the publisher of Industrial News Review, unexpectedly made out the case for subsidies in its latest issue of the business letter. (Incidentally, the Review is an extremely conservative publication that represents the viewpoint of the far right. Its case for subsidies applied to American steamship lines, not to agriculture. It is flatly against all forms of farm programs.)

"It is the intention of the law that subsidies should do for the American shipping companies what a handicap does for a golfer—put him on equal footing with his competitors," the Review said. "U.S. steamship companies must compete for business with vessels from the rest of the world if they are to keep their ships operating. That is why differential subsidies are, and long have been, an integral part of our merchant marine policy. We must have them if an industry which is essential to our economic well-being and national security is to be kept vigorous."

This is a convincing argument and it applies to agriculture—in spades. The Nation must have an ample supply of farm commodities if the total economy is to remain vigorous. If proof is needed that such a condition would not be possible without some sort of Government assistance it can be found in the preludes to recessions and depressions that periodically swamped the economy in the times before we had a farm program. In each case, agriculture led the way down and it would happen again if Government assistance were withdrawn.

(Here it should be noted that there is a persistent tendency to exaggerate the amount of subsidies farmers receive. Many expenditures that benefit the farmers only indirectly in that they help the total economy are charged off to the Department of Agriculture.

(The school lunch program is designed primarily for the benefit of urban children—since most of the people live in cities—but its cost is charged against the USDA; meat inspections protect the consumer; many foreign aid donations consist of agricultural commodities and are under the direction of the State Department but the cost often is charged to the Department of Agriculture. All these and many other expenses help swell the budget and create an inflated picture of farm subsidies.)

Perhaps the most damaging error of all to the prestige of the farmer is the common belief that high prices for commodities are responsible for the gradual increase in living expenses. Actually, grocery prices have inched upward for several years while farm markets declined and while the farmer received a progressively smaller share of the consumer dollar. If farm prices had increased at the same rate as other prices, or even held steady, the living costs would have climbed much faster.

W. C. Greenway of Atlanta, program director for the Sears Foundation, discussed the need for improved agricultural public relations last week at a conference of vocational agriculture teachers.

"People today gripe about how little a dollar will buy when compared with 30 years ago, but they are not seeing the whole picture," he said. "The real story is how much an hour of labor today will buy in comparison with the same work unit in the good old days. In 1931 an hour of labor would pay for 1.2 pounds of steak; today it will buy 2.1 pounds. Under the old price relationship, an hour of work would buy 1.3 pounds of bacon; now it will buy 3.3 pounds. The comparison could be extended through the entire grocery list."

This is true as far as it goes but it is not complete. It refers only to the relationship of labor—wages—and agriculture and does not mention the price comparison of farm commodities and industrial or professional income.

An industry that processes farm commodities spends a far smaller percentage of its gross income for raw material than it spent in 1931. Persons engaged in professional or nonmanufacturing enterprises have achieved the same kind of improvement and, in many cases, to a far more favorable degree.

A general understanding of this situation would not solve the farm problem but it would at least remove some of the roadblocks thrown up by well-intentioned people who have not examined all the facts.

Declaration on Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Declaration on Americanism, made by the Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons of America, in session at Seattle, Wash., on May 13, 1961, representing 39 grand lodges in the United States.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION ON AMERICANISM

To the end that all men might know: The Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons of America in session assembled at Seattle, Wash., May 31, 1961, representing 39 grand lodges in the United States, make this pronouncement of its position as to our way of life:

Recognizing that we are in the midst of world upheaval, in an era of unrest and resolution; that in the midst of world crises, there are those who seek to usurp the very foundation of our democratic way of life, and that, in such times of stress and strain and upheaval, our country needs and wants the support of every loyal citizen, Prince Hall Masons everywhere, through the unqualified commitment of the leadership of this conference pledge to support, defend, and protect the American way of life; to uphold the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and to work toward the goal of one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We further pledge ourselves to make it known throughout the world that as a distinct ethnic group, we are unreservedly opposed to communism—its godless ideology, its subversive activities, its ruthless procedures of violence and deceit and anarchy, and resolved at all hazards to resist in every way, with every possible means and with greatest dispatch, the rising tide of this damning influence. We shall disseminate with all possible zeal, information as to the dangers inherent in this arch foe of Americanism, and constantly warn our people against being deluded by its overtures.

And we further declare that beyond all else, we take the position that our country—America—claims all of us—claims our every passion; her liberties claim our every thought. Our hopes and our labors at all times shall be, in fair weather and in foul, in good times and in bad, that she shall by the blessings of God, become a vast and splendid monument. A monument—not of oppression and of terror—but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberties, and upon which the world may gaze with admiration—forever.

To this we give our heart and hand—God helping us.

Grand masters present: Amos T. Hall, Oklahoma; Richard H. Stitt, New York; Alfred W. McClanahan, Wisconsin; Clark S. Brown, North Carolina; Freddie E. Williams, Oregon; John G. Lewis, Louisiana; William O. Greene, Michigan; Solomon Richardson, Arkansas; A. William Hill, Jr., Pennsylvania; John L. McHie, Jr., Minnesota; P. G. Porter, Kansas; Samuel T. Daniels, Maryland; Herbert Greenwood, California; J. Blakely, Washington, D.C.; Obed E. Vanderburg, Illinois; Wilbert Kirkpatrick, Missouri; James C. Gilliam, Mississippi; Elijah Johnson, New Mexico; J. T. Maxey, Texas; Johnny Allen, Washington; Carl L. Wilson, Ohio.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has conducted the affairs of his committee in a manner that has won not only the admiration but also in a very real sense the affection of both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee. I join, too, with my colleagues in congratulating Dr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BURLESON, Mrs. BOLTON, and Dr. JUDD on the tremendous service they have rendered the Congress and the country by returning from the conference with a bill that satisfies the President and that reconciles such differences as there may have been in matters of approach to the objectives of the program.

In voting for the acceptance of the conferees' report, however, I shall have a sense of deep regret that the language of the House bill on the matter of international waterways and discrimination has been watered down. Very much of what I feel was expressed in the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

It had been my privilege and pleasure to work with Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HAYS in the framing of the statement of policy as regards international waterways that was contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1960. It will be recalled that this statement of policy as regards international waterways that originated in the House was objected to in the other body, that there was a long debate on the floor of the other body, and that after the debate there was a vote, and the other body by a susbtantial majority elected to stand with the House and the language remained in the bill.

This to me was proof positive that the statement of policy as regards international waterways in the Mutual Security Act of 1960 was in conformance with the thinking of a vast majority of the Members of both bodies of the Congress.

This year the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a unanimous vote reinserted the language in the Mutual Security bill of this year, and added thereto other strong language firmly stating the position of the United States of America on the matter of discrimination against any Americans in whatever land stationed on the lines of religion. The vote in our committee on this reaffirmation of the moral law was unanimous. There was not a voice raised against it on the floor of the House, and from this I can conclude that the statement in the House bill as regards international waterways and religious discrimination expressed the thinking of every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we win strong and enduring friendships when we seek temporary favors by the barter of our self respect. As an American I wish no more nor no less than that which is accorded all other Americans. Members of this body have been denied access to other countries because their approach to the understanding of their relationship with the infinite was through a religious faith not in favor in those lands. Frankly, I do not see how we can hold up our heads with self-respect if we permit any country to discriminate against Americans on any other grounds than those of character.

I am happy and I am proud that the body of which I am a Member has asserted its position, without one dissenting vote, on this fundamental issue of the moral law as applied to foreign policy.

I am confident that had the membership of the other body been given the opportunity of expressing itself directly on this issue, its decision would have been exactly the same as that expressed in the House.

On Acceptance of Conference Report of Foreign Aid Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am against passage of the conference version of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. My opposition is not because I am opposed to foreign aid in principle, but because I feel that the conference version failed to actually and completely eliminate the so-called back-door spending feature of the program. Contract authority, along with the public debt transaction, note cancellation and revolving funds, comprise the four types of back-door devices which abrogate congressional control of the purse strings.

It is my conclusion, after careful consideration and after listening to the debate on the floor that once the executive branch of our Government commits to another nation for assistance, that the House of Representatives and the Senate are morally obligated to fulfill the commitment. I object to the House of Representatives abrogating any of its exclusive prerogative to originate and pass upon bills permitting withdrawal of money from the Treasury. The U.S. Constitution specifically sets out this responsibility as an exclusive duty of this legislative body.

Further, there was some indication on the floor that perhaps the legislative

branch of our Government would not be able to obtain all of the facts in detail pertaining to these loans and grants once committed. In other words, under the cloak of executive privilege, documents and evidence essential to congressional scrutiny of foreign aid programs may be denied.

In conclusion, let me point out that perhaps our most successful foreign aid program was the Marshall plan which was fundamentally based on annual appropriations by the legislative branch of our Government. This is a shining example of a program succeeding without rigid long-term commitments.

Khrushchev Declares for "International Anarchy" if Not Given His Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent declaration by Mr. Khrushchev that Russia will renew atomic testing, I am glad to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of a talk by Mr. Stuart L. Hannon of the Free Europe Committee, Inc., which was delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California on August 18:

(By Stuart L. Hannon)

"Sir Henry Layard, a British Ambassador of the last century, who probably knew the Russians as well as anyone today, once observed: "My experience of Russian diplomats has led me to believe that they are so trained to habits of deception and dissimulation that their word can be rarely if ever depended upon."

The influence of fuzzy thinking, the homilies of chronic penitents and apostolic moralists, tend to lose their cloudy persuasion, as the Soviet Communist forces bear down on freedom with increasing ruthlessness.

For example we have finally dropped the absurd plan to recognize Outer Mongolia, and presumably we will come to our complete senses about Red China.

Our policy planning is now beginning, at last, to recognize the role of trade as a weapon, wielded so far only by the enemy, and we may well consider embargoes, boycotts, perhaps even sanctions.

Probably the greatest positive achievement for the Western World in our century took place early this month. I refer to the British decision to join the European Economic Community, to cross that channel which has been an almost incalculable barrier to European security and understanding. This tremendous advance, together with the remarkable Franco-German rapprochement, bridges an outdated and often tragic system for which both England and the Continent have paid dearly.

Today, as in 1939, international law is confronted by unparalleled international anarchy, spearheaded and manipulated by the Soviet Union. Only last month Khrushchev threatened to oppose the entire United Nations, even if they agreed as one against Soviet policy.

His words: "Even if all countries of the world adopted a decision which did not accord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security, the Soviet Union would not recognize such a decision but would uphold its rights, relying on force."

ANY POINT IN KEEPING RELATIONS WITH SOVIET?

Earlier he had stated, "Even if 99 percent of the General Assembly voted in favor of Dag Hammerskjold, the Soviet Union would still oppose him." This is the kind of chaos, of course, which leaves open to serious question the purpose of having any relations with the Soviet Union.

Power is more monstrous today because of the existence of a predatory leviathan state which has employed, and threatens to employ, all of its national force and its international conspiracy, in defiance of international law, to destroy all who reject its dominion, large nations as well as small, committed as well as neutral. Even Communist states which prefer a neutral role, completely independent from the Soviet Union, are in danger.

Its aim is still a world Communist confederation commanded by the U.S.S.R.; its method international civil war.

We have been losing the cold war for some time and the immediate future indicates no change. The stock reasons given for our predicament are complacency, arrogant confidence, preoccupation with materialistic pursuits.

U.S. PROBLEM IS IGNORANCE OF ADVERSARY

Such a diagnosis simply doesn't hold up. Our problem is not complacency but ignorance of the adversary to our system, and of the national psychology we need to win.

The clue to everything is whether we want to win the cold war; whether we want to survive. If we cannot win the cold war, if we cannot understand the need to defeat decisively the Soviet resolve to put us out of business, our defeat will result.

We must with discipline, innovation, courage and even ruthlessness, set about to undermine the Soviet and Communist conspiracy by every means at our disposal.

NEGOTIATION COULD WEAKEN U.S. POWER, PRESTIGE

We cannot accomplish this and at the same time negotiate, arbitrate, or associate with the dedicated and implacable forces of communism in any way which will weaken our power or prestige, above all in the eyes of those whose respect, and possibly allegiance, we are trying to influence.

FIVE GREAT STRENGTHS OF WEST

This is a fact of power and propaganda which we have not understood and still do not understand.

Let us assess Western power:

First of all, the people of the United States and Western Europe (530 millions) vastly outnumber the population of the entire Soviet bloc.

Second, West European and American industry in terms of steel, 61 percent of world output, hydroelectric power, coal, etc., not to mention purchasing power, can run circles around the Soviet Union.

Third, a good 75 million people of the Soviet bloc, in case of a showdown, are quite unlikely to remain chattels and serfs of Russia if they see a clearly demonstrated effort in behalf of their freedom by the West, to which civilization they preferably belong.

Fourth, there is NATO, strengthened and united as a result of the Oslo Conference, renewed U.S. commitments, and Soviet behavior of recent weeks.

UNITED STATES HAS 1,700 STRATEGIC BOMBERS—RUSSIA 150

Fifth, we have approximately 1,700 strategic bombers as compared with 150 for the Soviet Union. On the seas, the Russians have nothing remotely comparable to our Polaris submarines, not to mention our carrier and supporting fleet units. When it comes to ICBM's, we seem to be about equal. Even assuming that Russia may have substantially more, Khrushchev, Malinowsky, and all the rest of the pack know as well as anyone who can count, that they couldn't begin to cover all of our ICBM bases, SAC bases, and heavy naval units. And in addition to our heavy, long-range equipment, there are, as we know, large stores of medium-range missiles and medium bombers based close enough to Russia to pay personal visits.

MR. K. HAS HEADACHES

Then, Khrushchev has such imponderables as agricultural problems, the Moslem and other minorities in the Soviet Union, stoppage of much needed trade with the outside world, possible involvement of Japan and the Nationalist Chinese armies, and even the Red Chinese, who might enjoy overrunning new positions around the U.S.S.R. Even in the name of Leninism, this would not please the Kremlin.

I mention these facts only to emphasize the fact that we of the West are far from helpless. In fact, it is our refusal to wither away that so irks the Soviet Union.

We still possess enormous power, enough I firmly believe to bury the Soviet system several times over.

To me this means we should employ this power to the hilt—politically, economically, socially, propagandistically. In dealing with an aggressor who has dealt only with power, we should certainly never apologize for our power.

WE MUSTN'T BARGAIN WITH COMMUNIST DRIVEL

(It might be good if even the press would cut down on the psychological advantages that they hand Russia free of charge. In fact, communism should be asked to pay for publicity space like any other patent medicine.)

Fortunately, Soviet and Communist provocations are bringing us around to a position of rising up from the reclining and squirming positions we have occupied for so long.

Soviet charges of American militarism and sanctimonious wailing about colonialism can be handled by counterpropaganda; our policymakers, the military and least of all the President, should not preoccupy themselves with such drivel, bicker or bargain with it.

A most competent social scientist says "we lack a philosophy of the place of power in modern institutional life."

Our intellectuals are fond of quoting "power corrupts." "Weakness invites" is more appropriate for our time.

MUST PROVE SUPPORT OF HUMANITY BY ACTIONS

Those who find promising the atmosphere of perpetual debate must remember that behind all the language of negotiation and intent lies force, naked power. This reality must be faced, contained and in one way or another reduced to civilized restraints if democracy is ever to triumph over totalitarianism.

There should be from any point of view a shift of emphasis which correlates the central theme of foreign policy, not to an attack of war but rather to the support of freedom for all humanity, a firm commitment of policy to all efforts which prove by words and actions our support of common humanity. Thomas Mann said, "What is needed is a militant humanism."

A most remarkable fusing of power and propaganda is Soviet manipulation of the word-concept, "peace," as an instrument of force, tension, and blackmail, the propaganda of peace as a master key to unlock the minds and defenses of the West or of parliamentary systems which block Soviet power.

Our ability to cope with ruthless adversaries is impaired by a national psychology

which considers power as evil and propaganda as something insidious or untrue.

Propaganda itself can be an instrument of power when it becomes a substitute for the latter because of the skill of one nation in applying both elements and the inability of another nation to understand either. It is regrettable that a substantial segment of American public opinion reflexes are still subject to facile manipulation.

RED PROPAGANDA MAKES NAZIS LOOK MODEST

We are combatting a world power and propaganda skill which makes the limited Nazi effort look comparatively modest.

There is considerable difference between admitting heavy losses in the field or on the home front, in time of war, and giving generous coverage to political, economic or social failures of a system which its dedicated enemy for 40 years has already seriously undermined, both in its influence and security, by doing the same thing.

It is both fallacious and foolish to present this unbalanced world (more than half of which is hardly capable of calm reason and political wisdom with a so-called objective balance of good and bad), commendatory and derogatory, in our oversea broadcasts.

WHY ADVERTISE OUR SHORTCOMINGS TO WORLD?

There are many U.S. proponents of self-flagellation and intellectual masochism as a stunning method of winning friends and influencing people. There has been much of this, I regret to say, in many American broadcasts, not to mention American newspapers, minimizing our successes, giving more coverage to Soviet or Communist "persuasion" than to our own on vital international issues, proving how impartial we are by playing up our failures, even when no comment is needed. The practice of Radio Free Europe, for example, is to do all possible to win the cause as one wins a good case, by dramatizing its merits—not explaining them in terms of enemy obloquy—by outlining its strength and not its weakness, by emphasizing majority observance rather than minority abuse, by letting the whole society speak for itself, historically as well as currently, and not by misrepresented or distorted by fractional or dissected elements thereof, in the puerile assumption that such an image, i.e., any image out of context, is an objective image or necessary to the effort.

There is a historic truth about this Nation and everything for which it stands, which can be slowly undermined by a puritanic code of publicising every unpleasant fact that mars a good society.

WE WOULD WIN BY STRESSING OUR MERITS

An example of racist brutality in Alabama does not represent the truth of race relations on that day in the other 49 States. This is one area of distortion in which Communist and Soviet propaganda does not need our assistance. The American case will be won on the central truth of its overall merit, not by a parade of its defects. Our own propaganda is not only ineffective, but destructive, when it attempts to compete in this schizophrenic state, trying on the one hand to counter communism and on the other, so understating or overstating our own case that it becomes false.

Victories will not be won by patterns of retreat or compromise, above all when such patterns are unilateral or suggest in any way the negotiation of issues out of fear or weakness.

COMMUNISTS USE BRUTE FORCE AND BRUTE INTELLECT

The Soviet Communists are not just brute force, they are brute intellect; they represent not only physical power but dialectical brilliance, and there are whole mobs of Western publicists trying to oppose them without knowing the maze of transubstantiation through which they work, and possibly without ever having read anything of Hegel, Marx, Engels, Lenin.

We must have "a crash program for peace"; we are now near the moment of truth when we require immediate investment, with all the brains and money available, in a dynamic crusade for the security of American free enterprise. Government has done about all it can, whether well or badly is now immaterial, and every Government initiative now is dangerous initiative. The leviathan states of the nuclear era are virtually stalemated so far as the uses of physical power are concerned. The tocsin has sounded for total utilization of the immense resources and genius of the Nation's industry.

U.S. FREE ENTERPRISE CAN DO WHAT GOVERNMENT CAN'T

President Kennedy himself last February, before the National Industrial Conference Board, as much as said: "Help me." "We know," he said, "that your success and ours are intertwined, that you have facts and know-how we need. We seek the spirit of a full-fledged alliance." This leaves the methodology up to free enterprise.

American private enterprise must enlist the people of the world by helping them to acquire proprietary interests, allowing them practice as well as promise, reaching them directly and not remotely through incumbent governments, which may fall tomorrow.

COMMUNISTS WORK FROM BOTTOM

One reason why Communists have been successful in the economic-political complex of emerging nations is because they have worked from the bottom, and by the time we have begun to pour in from the top, there is a considerable base of opposition to capitalist plots, intervention, and the like.

With practical emphasis on freedom in free enterprise, with tangible evidence of enterprise as a crescive value for little men, with demonstrable proof that free enterprise demands peace for progress and therefore cannot possibly espouse war, by such statesmanship the American businessman can give himself, his government and the underdeveloped nations greater benefits than all three have ever known before.

HANNON ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (Hilary H. Crawford, Sr.): What can we do to improve our propaganda?

Answer. Government and business together should mobilize far more than in the past. The Soviet attack has from the beginning concentrated on religion and on free enterprise. There should be a very close partnership between the Government and free enterprise in fighting the cold war.

Question. Radio Free Europe propaganda effective?

Answer. Propaganda can only be effective as to foreign policy. We cannot create the illusion of success when success is nonexistent.

Question. (Edgar M. Kahn): Should press-radio freedom in reporting news be curbed in a democracy during peacetime or in a cold war?

Answer. A loaded question. Answer is "Yes" and "No." Recalls President Kennedy's recent efforts to secure cooperation from publishers. Is a matter of judgment. Free press depends on a free nation—so there is mutual responsibility. And this is not peacetime—this is a cold war.

Question. (Robert Konter): Is Russian fear campaign causing timidity in our foreign policy?

Answer. No—not now. We have reached turning point. Reverse is now going into effect. State Department Secretary Dean Rusk's speeches now are contradicting some of his earlier expressed views.

Question. (Gen. B. G. Cheynoweth): Lenin emphasized action is true foundation of good propaganda; do we not attribute too much importance to words unrelated to action?

Answer. Yes—attribute far too much to words unrelated to action. We should insist upon academic courses in our university that teach the Communist dialectic and how to combat it.

Combating Communism Effectively

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Lutheran Witness recently published the second in a series of articles by the Reverend Lambert Brose. In this article, he asks, "Why Does Communism Appeal?"

Because his answer is extremely interesting and informative, I ask unanimous consent to have this article reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBATING COMMUNISM EFFECTIVELY, II—WHY COMMUNISM APPEALS—WHAT DOES A COMMUNIST LOOK LIKE?—THE 1961 VERSION, I MEAN—LIKE SOME DIRTY, UNSHAVEN BUM?—A SKID-ROW TYPE DERELICT?

(By Lambert Brose)

That's the mental image I've had of a Communist all my life—the Bolshevik in the newspaper cartoon. But chances are I couldn't be more wrong. The typical Communist Party member, 1961 style, is not "ugly" at all. In fact, to millions of people in certain parts of the world he's "beautiful."

COMMUNISM IS "BEAUTIFUL"

And communism itself, the 1961 version, is not repulsive. Communism is very attractive—to the natural instincts and desires of man.

You'd think this would be perfectly clear to those who really want to fight this godless ideology. But it isn't. I sincerely believe that most Americans—and most American Christians—fail to see how beautiful communism is to multitudes, especially in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

And this, it seems to me, is one of the main reasons why we've been taking a sensational licking from the Marxists—in parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Until we understand the tremendous appeal communism has for many people, we won't fight it very effectively.

MANY FACES

It should be understood that statements in this article about communism's "beauty" refer only to certain aspects of Communist activity. Not, obviously, to the tactics of ruthless force used in taking over Eastern Europe and mainland China and other parts of the world, when millions of people lost their homes, when their friends and relatives were murdered. These victims will always recognize communism for what it really is—ugliness at its worst.

Moreover, communism itself has not changed. It will, whenever and wherever it can, "liquidate" those who are hopelessly indoctrinated with capitalistic ideas, those who cannot be "educated" to the "beauty" of the "Communist state."

But communism, 1961 style, has many faces. Confronted with a nuclear stalemate,

Communists are fighting world war III in some parts of the world with medicine, machinery, literature, and culture.

For millions—especially in the "have not" nations—this fair face of communism has great appeal.

"CREAM OF THE CROP"

"Communist Party members are beautiful." Let's study this statement a little further. It helps explain why communism has made such strides.

There are some 200 million people in Russia. Only about 1 of every 40 is a member of the Communist Party.

Red China now has a population of roughly 700 million. Only about 1 of every 100,000 is a member of the party.

Why? Because the party wants nothing but the best. The cream of the crop. The "upper class"—ironical as it sounds in the framework of Marxist thinking.

Communist Party members in Russia for example, are absolutely among the best educated, brilliant, dedicated people in the Soviet Union. If they weren't, if they didn't have some outstanding ability, the party would never accept them as members.

Lenin once said: "It would be a mistake to imagine that it is enough to adopt the Communist formulas and conclusions of Communist science without mastering the sum total of different branches of knowledge. Communism becomes an empty phrase, a mere facade, and the Communist a mere bluffer if he has not worked over in his consciousness the whole inheritance of human knowledge."

COMMUNISTS ARE SMART OPERATORS

In reality, of course, Communists are not well educated or brilliant at all. They're the greatest of fools. "The fool hath said in his heart, 'there is no God,'" the Bible tells us.

But in the earthly, worldly sense they're "among the top 5 percent of their class."

If we are to combat communism effectively, let's get one thing straight: We're up against some of the smartest operators on this planet.

BREAD

Of greater importance is the fact that communism itself is most appealing to millions.

There are two reasons for this. First: Three-fifths of the people on earth today, we are often told, go to bed hungry almost every night of their lives. Groaning under the glut of farm surpluses, Americans find it hard to picture this. But millions upon millions of our fellow human beings rarely know what it means to be without the gnawing pain of hunger.

To these people the Communist offer—bread.

As a rule, hungry people do not ask where the bread is coming from. All they want is to ease those awful pangs of hunger.

We're talking about bread in the wider sense, of course. Bread. Rice. Milk. Clothing. Shoes. A roof overhead. A plot of ground.

To be sure, the Western World, especially its Christians, also give bread to the hungry. Lutheran World Relief and other church and private agencies are doing an outstanding job.

THOSE GREAT HUMANITARIANS

But the Communists offer bread in a still wider sense.

In most of the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America there are only two classes of people: the extremely rich and the extremely poor. There are no middle classes.

The Communists—those great "humanitarians"—come into a country and say, "It isn't right that a few people in your land should have millions and millions of dollars, while the rest of you go hungry most of the time. Stand up and throw off the chains. We'll help you. We'll give you guns and planes to revolt against the rich. We'll redistribute this wealth. We'll give you a plot of ground for your very own."

To the poor, starving wretches of the world, such a generous offer looks simply beautiful.

Only later on do most of them find out they've been duped, that they themselves have not become owners of the land, that the Communist state has taken over, that they are merely slaves.

Then, of course, Communists and communism become repulsive. Then communism shows up for what it really is—a bestial teaching of the devil, leading people into slavery and hell. But by then it's usually too late.

HAVEN'T READ ABOUT STALIN

You see, most of these unfortunate people haven't read how Stalin laid the foundations of Russia's booming industry by exploiting the peasants of the U.S.S.R.—killing millions of them in the process via the starvation route.

They haven't read how Mao is doing the same thing in Red China today. On a much larger scale.

They haven't read or heard much about these things. Because in these faraway places Communist propaganda is outgunning the West decisively.

NOT PREPARED FOR INDEPENDENCE

To people whose stomachs cry out so loud they can't hear anything else the Communist promise of bread is beautiful indeed.

Add to that these facts: The people of the newly emerging nations are intensely nationalistic. The Communists capitalize on this drive.

Some colonial powers have not prepared their former territories for self-government or for economic independence. The Communists quickly fill the vacuum, pouring in political advisers, technicians, teachers. They ship in goods produced cheaply under dictator methods for political purposes.

It isn't hard to see why communism has such great appeal to newly emerging governments and their peoples.

WHAT COMMUNISM TEACHES

Second: The theory of communism appeals strongly to the natural mind of man.

This is what communism teaches:

As it is in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, so all human society is composed, to a greater or lesser degree, of two classes of people: those who own the means of production, possessing great wealth; and those who do the monotonous, hard, physical labor involved in production—but do not receive much of the fruits of their labor.

In many parts of the world this distinction holds true to a greater degree. In North America, Europe, Australia, and several other areas, however, it's true to a far lesser degree. (To observers who note how millions of people—even a few in the lower income brackets—own stocks in the United States, this "two classes" theory doesn't hold much water at all. But in about two-thirds of the world it does.)

"CAPITALISM WILL FALL"

Now, say the Communists, we shall work for the day when there will no longer be the owners who possess—and the laborers who do not possess. We shall work for the day when all of us will share the world's goods—more or less equally. "To each according to his needs, and from each according to his ability."

The history of mankind, say the Communists, is a record of constant conflict. Out of this struggle—by means of revolution—new forms of society continually develop. Capitalism and communism will fight it out until some day capitalism will be defeated. Just as feudalism gave way to capitalism, capitalism ultimately, through a series of gradations, will give way to communism. It's absolutely inevitable, they say. It can't miss.

The Communist Manifesto does not argue, for example, that these changes ought to occur. Marx continually stresses the fact that they will occur. Communism teaches that its eventual triumph is as certain as death and taxes.

BLUEPRINT FOR UTOPIA

And communism has very specific information and blueprints for man to use in achieving this utopia.

A Communist is taught, for example, that utopia will be won through the use of many methods: war, peace, economic penetration, subversion, occasional collaboration with the enemy, murder, foreign aid, propaganda, psychology—even a posed, temporary tolerance of religion, where this may be helpful to the cause.

And the party member receives rigorous training in how to utilize this great variety of weapons.

Communism's blueprints are wrong, of course, but they sound plausible. And so often the natural mind of man is impressed by a logical presentation, by the outward form of something rather than by its contents. He likes everything neatly laid out for him. He doesn't like to think too much. Communism does his thinking for him. Communism explains everything.

Do you begin to see something of the great appeal of communism?

I myself—a man—a woman—together with other men and women can achieve this paradise I can do something worthwhile in this humdrum life. I'm working for a tremendous goal. Not for pie in the sky, as Communists like to call it sarcastically. But for a world in which every person will have enough of this world's goods to live comfortably—or at least not starve.

ULTIMATE IN WORK RIGHTEOUSNESS

This is the ultimate in salvation by works. This is what natural man wants.

After all, the Christian doctrine does not appeal to natural man, man as he is before the Holy Spirit regenerates him. Salvation by grace alone, by the cross of Christ, is foolishness, says the Bible—to those who are not Christians.

Man as he is by birth, man in his sinful state, wants to be self-made in every way, also spiritually. He wants to be known as a man who pays his own way.

APPEALS TO MAN'S IDEALISM

Christianity is beautiful to man only when the Holy Spirit, working through the Word, has changed his natural heart and has made the love of Christ appealing to him. Then it is the most beautiful of all doctrines.

But to unregenerate man a salvation given full and free as an act of divine grace alone is abhorrent and ridiculous.

Communism, however, is something else again—an ideology whereby man through his own efforts can change the world. That's beautiful. That appeals to his idealism. That challenges him.

THERE IS NO GOD

Above all, how beautiful to natural man is this basic teaching of communism: There is no God. Along with political independence communism offers independence from God.

Communism teaches that everything is material. There is nothing spiritual. No soul. No life after death. Nothing at all supernatural.

Under communism man is not accountable for his sins. And, of course, there is no morality—not in the sense that we speak of morality. If lying will help bring about this perfect world of the classless society, lying becomes good. If robbery and murder

and subversion will help—even these become moral.

OPIATE OF THE MASSES

A supernatural God? Not for a Communist. Religion is the opiate of the people, the gin fizz of the masses. He—man—is god. At least so he tells himself.

And because the church teaches there is a God, the church must be "purged."

CHURCH SERVICES IN RUSSIA?

Let us not be taken in by what we hear about the existence of Christian churches behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. For propaganda purposes, Communists sometimes allow some churches to function—after a fashion. A case in point is the much-publicized Baptist church in Moscow. This number of congregations allowed to conduct services varies in different countries according to the expediency of the moment. Whenever it suits their purposes, Communists will pose as being tolerant of religion.

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S WARNING

Calling attention to this tactic, J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, quotes a Communist writer as stating: "The people's state holds that the question of religious belief is a private matter; belief or nonbelief in religion relates to the personal freedom of an individual."

But, as Mr. Hoover warns, let's not be fooled. The campaign against the Christian religion is unrelenting. The pressures—subtle or not so subtle—on people who try to live their religion are tremendous.

"Question 7," the Lutheran Film Associates, Inc., production, a documented motion picture describing how difficult it is to be a practicing Christian in East Germany, bears eloquent testimony to these pressures.

The Christian church—as an effective influence in men's lives—must eventually be destroyed. "We shall remain the atheists that we have always been," said Khrushchev.

"NOT THROUGH EVERY MUDHOLE"

It isn't necessary for a Christian to have an extensive and profound knowledge of the teachings of Communist theorists—Marx, Lenin, Engels, and others—to combat their atheistic ideas effectively.

As it is with all other sin, so it is with communism. One of our seminary professors used to say in regard to sin, "You don't have to wade through every mud hole in the neighborhood to know that it's dirty."

However, a Christian certainly ought to make the effort to know as much as he can about this "disease" so that his opposition will not merely consist in spouting ineffective anti-Communist slogans. A Christian must be able to do something that really counts in the fight against this terrible menace to mankind.

BEWARE OF THE MAILS

In connection with the final article in this series we shall publish a bibliography. Meanwhile, a word of caution: Beware of the literature on communism that comes to you through the mail. Beware of it as you would of taking all the medicines advertised through the mail, without consulting your doctor. Some of those medicines could kill you.

Just because a pamphlet or book is anti-Communist doesn't mean that it's good. Hitler, too, was anti-Communist—most of the time.

Arbitrarily being against everything the Communists stand for can do great harm, because Christians—and believers in republicanism and democracy and capitalism—also stand for some of the same things the Communists stand for.

For example, as we have tried to show in this and the preceeding article, Christians, capitalists, and Communists sometimes use seemingly identical methods in trying to build their totally different worlds: feeding the hungry, educating the illiterate, and healing the sick.

Blind anticommunism often only causes division and weakens the forces opposing this evil ideology, so menacing to us all. Thus it only furthers the Communist cause.

International Relations Between United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we realize that our Nation has been the envy of the world and that envy in international feelings often results in intemperate opinions and actions on the part of nations which should exercise better judgment.

The slow but steady deterioration in United States-Canadian relations has been almost entirely the responsibility of misguided activities by Canadian officials and deliberate acts of distortion in presenting to their public the relationship of the United States to their domestic economy and their international trade problems. Much too rarely has the contribution of American capital and American enterprises and individuals to the steady growth of the Canadian economy been emphasized and appreciated by the leaders north of the border.

Mr. Speaker, a most timely comment on the latest Canadian activities appeared in the August 26 edition of Chicago's American in the column by George Sokolsky. In view of the penetrating nature of this article, I wish to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

CANADA WOOS CUBA, SPITES US

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Canadian airlift to Cuba makes no sense. The business is not large enough to justify the inevitable loss of American friendship. To most Americans, it looks like spite. The Cubans are taking every advantage of the Canadians because they assume the Canadians are greedy and willing to make any sacrifice to get business. The best example is the use of Cuban-hired Canadian planes rather than shipping on Canadian freight planes.

I quote an instance from the Financial Post of Toronto:

"One airline—World-Wide Airways of Montreal—holds an air transport board license to airlift freight from Canada to Cuba.

"Company complains it's not getting any business, and a DC–4 sits idle at Montreal Airport.

"Another airline—International Airfreighters of Edmonton—bought a North Star plane from Trans-Canada Airlines in May, assembled Canadian airmen, and 'dry leased' the plane and crew to Cubana (the Cuban airline).

"This company has been moving practically all of the Canadian air cargo to and from Cuba, and the owners say they are making money."

BASIC COMMUNIST ASSUMPTION

What the Canadian expected of the Cubans is hard to say. Cuba is a Communist state and, like all Communists, assumes that capitalists will do anything to get income; that capitalists have no honor or patriotism; that all that is necessary is to hold a carrot in front of a capitalist and he rushes forward even into a cesspool.

The Air Industries and Transport Association of Canada has urged the Canadian Government to "act immediately to withdraw permission for further Cuban flights until such time as the Cuban Government agrees to live up to a firm understanding."

The Canadians thought they had a 50–50 deal with the Cubans but now discover they have been done in. There are always selfish businessmen who adopt the attitude that a sale is a sale—no matter to whom or what for. They are like some American companies who situate branches in European countries so that they can sell to Russia, in absolute betrayal of their own country. Last Sunday, 1,500 American boys risked their lives by riding into West Berlin along a 110 mile lane of peril; they might have been shot down by steel manufactured by American-owned plants situated in European countries.

GOOD RULE, UNLESS IT KILLS YOU

The Cubans, being Marxists, count on this attitude on the part of Canadian sellers: Sell anything to any buyer. It is a good rule unless the buyer turns around to kill the seller.

No American can develop much sympathy for any Canadian who loses by his trading with Cuba. The Canadians went into the Cuban market with the intention of capturing a new market even if to do so meant to hurt the United States, its close and long-time friend. Suffering from false pride and petty nationalism, there are those in Canada who believe that it does not matter that they damage United States-Canada relations; that the United States will take anything that comes along.

The truth is that the American people are weary of being abused by countries which depend upon American capital for their development and the American market for their trade.

Mr. Sokolsky, writing in the August 28 issue of Chicago's American, discusses another subject of immediate importance to us; namely, the policymaking operations within our administration, and more specifically, the State Department. I wish to insert the article into the RECORD at this point:

REMOVE POLICY BLUNDERERS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Politicians play little games that often involve costly irretrievable errors. Some are not understandable, such as the establishment of the American Zone of West Berlin inside East Germany—110 miles inside without a corridor. If there was to be a divided Berlin, each sector should have had a corridor. By agreement, Berlin was divided into American, British, French, and Russian sectors. The Western countries united and the people of West Berlin elected a government of their own, headed by Mayor Willy Brandt.

Russia declined to join in this renationalization of Berlin, and established East Germany as a separate area, controlled by the Soviet Union. This was a violation of all agreements, but Russia has maintained there are two Germanys, that there will remain two, and that Berlin actually is within the Soviet Zone, in East Germany. Therefore the Western Powers, who may be there legally, are there irrationally.

KENNEDY CHALLENGED RUSS VIEW

Khrushchev makes this point now. He holds that after 16 years, a settlement must be reached that makes sense from the Russian standpoint. President Kennedy has challenged the Russian point of view in the most practical manner possible, by sending

troops into Berlin and by sending Vice President JOHNSON there.

The initial error undoubtedly was made by President Truman, Prime Ministers Churchill and Attlee, and the American and British chiefs of staff who accepted the Russian formula. It was unsound when adopted and is unsound now.

This kind of historical error not only was made as regards Berlin but also as regards China. I have been reading Robert Morris' remarkable book, "No Wonder We Are Losing," in which he gives the details of his services as a counsel for congressional committees.

TELLS RED AGENTS' ACTIVITIES

He establishes beyond question the activities of Russian agents and spies within the State Department and White House. He describes carefully what we now call, to avoid libel, "Russian-oriented" persons who played an enormous role in the development of American policy toward Red China.

A final example of error and carelessness is to be found in the entire Cuban mess, including the amateurish and abortive invasion.

This country will have to take a sterner attitude toward experts who make mistakes.

A Kind Word for a Much Maligned Species

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, kicking Congressmen around has been a favorite American sport since colonial days. However, once in a great while one of the Nation's leaders will say a few kind words about us Members and the work we do. The September 1, 1961, issue of Forbes magazine carries one of the most perceptive pieces that I have ever read in our defense.

It is written by the magazine's publisher and editor in chief, Malcolm S. Forbes, himself a man of great experience and solid accomplishment in the field of government. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A KIND WORD FOR A MUCH MALIGNED SPECIES

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Along with mothers-in-law, Congressmen are America's favorite whipping boys. As the current session pushes toward adjournment, the usual chorus of gripes against Congressmen rises from a thousand typewriters and a thousand rostrums.

Take this matter of winding up the current session. There are those who have demanded that Congress stay in session until certain pet legislation has been passed. Others insist that it would be sheer folly for Congress to adjourn during the Berlin crisis. Yet some of the most vocal of these "stay-in-Washington" groups are the very ones who gripe when their Congressman is unavailable for local ribbon-cuttings and complain that "the only time we ever see you around is at election time." So it goes. On the matter of adjournment, as in most other matters, the Congressman is likely to be damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

At the risk of being shot at as un-American during this open season on our lawmakers, I'd like to defend the much-maligned Congressmen. Yes, all of them. Even that handful who are so benighted and willful as to fail to see things my way.

I'll defend, for example, the mail-weighers. This group, much scorned by high-minded do-gooders, actually performs a rather useful function in our society. The mail-watchers, those sensitive souls, have but one conviction: The importance of their own reelection. About burning issues, expect no firm expressions of opinions from them. To do may be to die if they decide to reason why on a legislative hot potato. They weigh, not the issue, but the mail.

Perhaps this type of Congressman is not actly a social scientist's idea of what the Founding Fathers had in mind for Congress. But the stubborn fact is that they perform a valuable function all the same. No scientist has yet devised a seismograph more sensitive than a Congressman holding up a wet finger into the political winds. No rhapsodic rhetoric about ideals or visions of sugar plums will garner their vote—unless it looks like most of the "folks back home" have been moved too—and first. In short, the mail-watcher, however timid his character, plays a rather important part in making representative government really representative.

In further defense of our legislative branch, I'd like to mention an even larger group. This sizable majority of representatives spends month after month trying to figure out what they think may be best for the country by the way of a new law or no new law. These misguided fellows aren't obliging to accept my opinion—sometimes not even yours. They've even indicated our personnel opinion may be selfishly motivated, that there may be two sides to the issue. There fellows may even listen to those who disagree with us.

So they go on and do all sorts of foolish things for a good many hours after any sensible man has gone home from work. They hold committee hearings, public, and private. They pass hours listening to visiting constituents. They even seem to spend a lot of time answering their mail and looking into, first hand, some of the operations of Government for which the committees they belong to are responsible.

Taking into account all three categories of Congressmen—the stubborn, the seismographers, and the bunch we were just talking about— it is sort of a wonder anything good gets done by them. Yet it does. That's why I wanted to take time out from the good old American sport of Congressmen-sniping to say a word on behalf of our lawmakers.

Pay Increases for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the law relating to longevity step increases for postal workers. This bill is a companion measure to legislation previously introduced by other Members of Congress in the House and the Senate.

Over the years it has been the intent of the Congress to eliminate some of the discrimination against postal employees, and this bill will give them benefits comparable to those now enjoyed under the Classification Act by other Federal employees.

Under the law now in effect regular civil service employees receive longevity increases after 10, 13, and 16 years' service in the same grade. However, as a result of the antiquated law affecting postal employees they receive such increases only after 13, 18, and 25 years' service in grade.

The approval of this legislation will bring the benefits of postal employees more in line with those accorded other employees of the Federal Government, and will correct an inequity which has been in existence far too long.

The Senate has already acted on similar legislation, having passed S. 1459 on July 17; and I am very pleased to see that our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had referred the legislation to the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, which held hearings on the same yesterday. I am hopeful that prompt and favorable consideration of the bill can be completed in the near future.

Needed: A Broader Agricultural Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in these days when the competition to enter college is so keen, it is remarkable to learn that enrollment in one vital sector of education is failing off. Only about half as many agricultural degrees were granted in 1958 as in 1950, and the trend apparently is continuing. At the same time, agriculture and businesses directly related to agriculture offer 15,000 new jobs per year.

The summer issue of Corn, a quarterly published by Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., succinctly reviews this problem. The article deals with the agribusiness symposium held last spring in which nearly 100 representatives of land-grant colleges, industry, and the agricultural press met to diagnose the illness of agricultural education and to prescribe a cure. The symposium, sponsored by the Foundation for American Agriculture, promises to have far-reaching effects.

Because of the significance of the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A BROADER AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

More than three centuries after the soil of this continent was first tilled by the white settlers, and 99 years after the establishment of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the ancient simple business of farming has become big industry, its gears meshing with

those of virtually every other industry in the Nation.

There is a word, "agribusiness," familiar to some people though still strange to many, which expresses this farm-industry interlock. This concept of agribusiness, as an extension of the traditional meaning of agriculture, is essential to the subject of this report.

Factors contributing to this metamorphosis of farming are familiar history. The vast upsurge of population brought a parallel increase in the need for food and fiber. New knowledge of chemistry and engineering, growing out of the so-called industrial revolution of 1850–1950, was applied to agriculture, and where 1 bushel of corn or wheat once grew, 3 or 4 grow today. Indeed, since 1950, one of our great agricultural problems has been overabundance, surpluses so huge that extraordinary measures have been instituted to reduce them.

It is doubtless a technologic triumph that this tremendously swollen output of farm crops is the work of fewer farms and farmers. In 1860, about 80 percent of the entire U.S. labor force was tilling the soil. In other words, 8 men fed and clothed 10—themselves and 2 others. What the other two did is of litle concern to us, but almost certainly they were in some line of business that directly or obliquely touched agriculture. They didn't think of it as "agribusiness," but likely that is what it was.

By 1860, the segment of the population engaged in farming had dropped to 59 percent, and by 1910 to 35 percent. In 1930 the figure was 25 percent, and by 1959 only 12 percent of the total U.S. working force was producing all the food and fiber we needed, plus towering surpluses of corn, wheat and other crops. Instead of 8 men feeding and clothing 10, 12 men were now performing these vital services for 100, with plenty to spare.

This huge industry which is modern agriculture grosses nearly $34 billion a year. Chiefly responsible for this production are about one million so-called "commercial" farms which account for somewhat more than 90 percent of our agricultural output. These one million farms have an estimated average investment of about $100,000, an annual gross income of over $30,000, and a net income of $10,000. On some of the big ultramodern farming plants, employing a degree of automation equal to that in many industries, these averages for investment, annual gross and net, are multiplied several times.

Then superimpose upon this vast design the new concept of agriculture in all its relations to industry. This is agribusiness, defined as "the sum total of all the operations involved in producing a farm commodity and getting it to the ultimate consumer in its final form." A simple definition, yet its implications are virtually boundless. It encompasses the processing of farm commodities into hundreds of food and nonfood products, and the marketing of same. It entails the production and sale of basic farm supplies: machinery, feed, seed, fertilizer, chemicals, farm building materials, and all else that today's agricultural plant needs to stay in business and make a profit. Even banking and insurance, as they relate to farm financing and farm protection, come under the aegis of agribusiness.

In all its ramifications, agribusiness is said to be a $100 billion industry, employing 35 percent of the Nation's labor force. As such, agribusiness offers 15,000 skilled jobs a year.

You would suppose that an agrico-industry complex of these dimensions would attract youth, particularly farm youth who have the background, the heritage, the tradition of agriculture in their blood. Considering the opportunity, and the availability of education, with a land-grant college in every State, you might even expect that the country boys and city boys too would be jamming the entrance gates of every institution that teaches agriculture.

On the contrary, as someone once said of a Broadway play, they are staying away in droves. In 1948, according to the Stanford Research Institute, 391,656 students were enrolled in our land-grant colleges. Of these, 45,853, or 11.7 percent, were taking agricultural courses. In 1959, total land-grant college enrollment had climbed a little to 411,437, but numbers of ag students had dropped to 31,722, or 7.7 percent. Agricultural degrees granted in 1950 numbered 10,908; in 1958 (latest year of record) the total of 5,525 agricultural degrees was barely one-half of the figure 8 years previously. Among total college enrollment in the United States today, the agricultural colleges can claim only 1.5 percent.

In the face of agribusiness's annual 15,000-job demand, the agricultural colleges are currently graduating about enough to fill one-third of the potential. If this trend continues, the ag colleges will be graduating only 3,000 by 1970, or enough to fill one-fifth of the agribusiness positions that will be crying for trained men.

Accompanying this decline in numbers there is evidence that the ag students' average ability is below that of students in other fields. Among nearly 500,000 male college students taking the Army general classification test, both the entering freshmen and graduating seniors in agriculture were next to the lowest among groups which included business, economics, education, engineering, history, the humanities and arts, law, natural sciences, psychology, and social sciences.

Other investigations, on more limited bases in various parts of the country, tend to confirm the findings of the Army general classification test.

IS AGRICULTURE BEING SOLD SHORT TO YOUTH?

What's behind this apparent disinterest of young men, particularly the brightest young men, in careers in agriculture and its related industries? Is agricultural education falling behind its obligation, failing to recognize its modern challenge?

This question is currently of deep concern to educators and to business firms which process farm crops or manufacture the vital materials of modern farming. These industries desperately need chemists, engineers, food technologists, economists, salesmen, and marketing experts. Particularly they need those who have, underlying their specialty, an agricultural background. Only the ag colleges can supply that essential thing.

The ag colleces are teaching agriculture but, in the view of the agribusiness firms, few of them are teaching all the rest that is integral to and inseparable from agriculture today. The combination, the nice balance that agribusiness needs, is difficult to find.

So agribusiness goes elsewhere for its manpower—to the engineering, polytechnic, and business schools, to the non-ag courses of the State universities, and even to the liberal arts colleges.

Last spring, at the Michigan State University, East Lansing, nearly 100 representatives of land-grant colleges, industry, and the agricultural press, held a 3-day agribusiness symposium, under the sponsorship of the Foundation for American Agriculture, to diagnose the illness of agricultural education and to prescribe a cure.

This meeting, the first large-scale forum of its kind, served to crystallize a good deal of thinking on the part of industrial leaders and educators. Those gaps in agricultural teaching which now seem obvious to many were first recognized, several years ago, not by industry but by the universities themselves, specifically members of the agricultural division of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges. The East Lansing meeting was a direct outgrowth of the initial vision of these men.

Many at this conference felt strongly that agriculture is being sold short to youth, that young men are being discouraged from agricultural careers by their families and their high school vocational advisers. If the image of agriculture has been bright in the past it is decidedly tarnished now in the youthful eye and in the minds of those who counsel the young on their careers and who fail to scent the infinite opportunity implicit in today's agricultural revolution.

Parents who have never farmed think of agriculture in terms that were obsolete decades ago—as a dull, laborious business lacking most of the cultural amenities, a career in which a man dedicates himself to a lifelong wrestling match with intractable soil and stubborn livestock, gets manure on his shoes, and earns less in a year than he could earn as a bank clerk.

Even the parents who have farmed all their lives may present to their sons a dismal picture of agriculture as a calling. Those who have not succeeded, because of too little capital or land or knowledge, certainly cannot be shining examples of the promise of the farm life.

In too many high schools, as the critics see it, the vocational-agriculture course is a refuge for the lazy and dull, a comfortable escape from the sterner threats of the languages and higher mathematics. Other subjects are glamorized for youth; agriculture is held to be a plodding, hayseed enterprise, unlikely to provide enviable income or social position. Kids who are excited by the "status symbols" they believe to be attainable in business or science see little promise of such rewards in agriculture.

At the East Lansing meeting no group was above criticism—by itself or by others—for failing to present agriculture to youth as a dynamic and rewarding profession.

One spokesman noted that the Federal Government itself acts as if it were ignorant of the need to inspire farm youth to stay on the farm, or to seek careers in the many businesses which deal directly with the farm. The Bureau of the Census publishes a discouragingly low average per capita income for farmworkers 14 years old and over, and those who read this sort of statistic decide that almost any other enterprise is more promising. What the Bureau doesn't say is that all so-called farms are included in this dismal average. A farm, in the Bureau's 1959 lexicon, can be any rural or suburban venture that cultivates less than 10 acres and sells $250 worth of produce a year. If it's 10 acres or more, the yearly sales need be only $50, as if mere acreage, not the yield therefrom, constitutes a farm. What the Government statisticians should emphasize to the upcoming generation of farmers and agribusiness technicians is that 1 million family farms net close to $10,000 each, annually, and offer a comparable market for the products of industry.

Even among industry—the agribusiness firms—there is a broad area of indifference to the need for expansion of curriculums in agricultural courses, despite an acute awareness of this need on the part of a few agribusiness leaders. Some spokesmen for the colleges, at the East Lansing conference, felt that industry has not made known just what it expects in ag-college graduates, and should be more specific in citing its career opportunities. This bouquet was handed back to the colleges by an industry representative who urged that the colleges make greater efforts to learn the requirements of agribusiness. He further suggested that an industry committee to counsel the agricultural colleges on curricula would help attain this end.

Other proposals included periodic industry-college seminars, industry-sponsored scholarships for ag students, and one-the-

job training in industry for superior undergraduates.

Generally, it was felt that agricultural-college curriculums should be broadened to utilize the full resources of the university, including colleges of business, engineering, and the liberal arts. A serious imbalance was seen in the fact that while all educational facilities are in short supply, and many universities cannot accept more than a small fraction of their applicants, agricultural-education facilities are not being fully utilized.

There was unanimous agreement on the need to attract youth to farming and agribusiness careers at the high-school stage of their education. While the 4–H Clubs recognize the importance of acquainting youth with the "total agricultural enterprise," high schools are manifesting widespread ignorance of the career opportunities. Traditionally, most ag-college students have come from the rural high schools, hence it is particularly important that the city schools know what the agricultural colleges can offer.

The sort of curriculums that agribusiness wants would benefit equally the student who intends to farm. Mere production, in farming as in business, is held to be an obsolete ideal. Formerly industry made what it could out of its raw materials and sold the resulting products for whatever they would bring in the markets open to them. Today, industry thinks first of potential new markets which a new product might supply. If the market analysis warrants, the new product is made. Agriculture should do just that, indeed has done so many times. The science of genetics is back of many strains of corn, wheat, and other crops that were unknown a generation ago. Research in animal and poultry nutrition and husbandry has, in effect, created markets for improved livestock and poultry products. Modern farming is in itself big business, demanding a high order of skill in the chemistry and engineering of crop production, and the economics of marketing and purchasing.

ARE WE BLUNTING OUR BEST COLD-WAR WEAPON?

Here and there in this discussion you can hear notes of alarm for America's continued world leadership in agriculture. Our supremacy in this field, long acknowledged, is held by some to be jeopardized. Russia may be ahead of us in satellite technology and moon-probing, but she is far behind us in the vital business of producing food and fiber.

While the Communist world is fighting a desperate agricultural shortage, our greatest farm problem is how to control a superabundance of crops. The attempt has cost us some $20 billion in the last 20 years, yet the Communists would gladly swap their own agricultural headache for ours.

Agribusiness points out that U.S. industry can be largely credited for our world-beating agriculture. Industry manufacturers the tools of farm-crop production, supports millions of dollars worth of basic research in agriculture annually, and affords huge markets for the harvested crops. Russia does not yet have equally broad markets for her farm commodities or comparable ability to produce the essential materials of modern farming.

America's knowledge of agriculture is a doubly potent weapon because it can be imparted to the underdeveloped and underfed countries which are still undecided whether communism or the West offers the better way of life.

Yet some thoughtful men have expressed a real fear that this keenest of our cold war weapons may become blunt and rusty if agricultural-education standards are allowed to decline.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND AGRIBUSINESS

"Agribusiness" is a new word, yet all that it expresses is almost as old as agriculture itself. The first tiller of the soil who bought a hoe, or who sold some of his harvest instead of consuming it all himself, was engaged in a primitive form of agribusiness.

The huge complexity of the farm-industry relationship today, however, does seem to warrant a word. "Agribusiness" is a useful and expressive one. In the opinion of this writer, however, it should not be employed chiefly to glamorize agriculture in the youthful mind. For agriculture is still a respected word and a respected occupation, deserving the best education to be had. Indeed a sound agricultural education, embracing all the aspects of agribusiness, will prepare youth for many kinds of rewarding careers and thus attract the students who today go elsewhere.

Offering these added curriculums, the traditional institution of the agricultural college need not become, through any distortion of emphasis or terminology, a college of agribusiness.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

Agriculture and the industries concerned with it want a review of ag-education capabilities. In this desire they are far from unique. Huge private grants have been made by various sources for the evaluation of curricula and teaching procedures in other fields. Engineering, for example, has benefited by a $21 million study, and the physical sciences have been granted nearly $9 million. For the study of other professions—the arts, law, education, social sciences, administration, and business—various foundations have provided funds ranging from $330,000 to $7½ million. Agriculture, that most basic of all human endeavors, is conspicuous by its absence from this list.

A program for such a study, costing approximately half a million dollars, has been drawn up in detail by the Stanford Research Institute and submitted to a committee of the Division of Agriculture, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

This survey of ag-education shortcomings and how to start, at least, to correct them, was made under the direction of the Farm Film Foundation, the Foundation for American Agriculture, the Land-Grant College Agribusiness Subcommittee, and a special Operations Committee composed of farm and business leaders.

The Agribusiness Symposium in East Lansing last March brought together for the first time a broad representation of agriculture and industry, the men who best understand the concept of agribusiness and its educational needs. Out of the organized discussions at this meeting, and others of its kind which will follow (or perhaps out of the mind and heart and energy of one man or a few men), agricultural education should acquire whatever scope and depth it needs to meet the demands of the future.

The Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by David Lawrence, editor and publisher of the U.S. News & World Report, is an excellent review of the rapidly changing conditions in the world with particular reference to the present struggle between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies.

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

To recall what one saw here in Europe just after both World Wars and to review the mistakes made in the two reconstruction periods is worthwhile only if it indicates what may lie ahead today.

For, while this is a constantly changing world, history repeats itself often. Things do not remain static, of course, because hundreds of millions of energetic, restless, intelligent individuals strive constantly to attain new goals.

Each generation prides itself on its triumphs. Reading the other day a book of the 1850's written as a diary by a New York lawyer, this correspondent noted the emotional enthusiasm of those times as an Atlantic cable was successfully laid, establishing instanteous communication for the first time between Europe and America. The event had far more practical meaning than an orbital flight in space has today, and it has had a more lasting effect to date on the welfare of mankind. For better and better communication between people is still the main essential of human progress.

In retrospect, the lessons of history have often been ignored. We didn't settle World War I equitably, and we failed in the 1920's to mobilize economic aid to help the Weimar Republic in Germany to become stable. Instead, a dictatorship there took advantage of the economic chaos. Had we come forth in the 1920's with something like the Marshall plan, World War II might well have been averted.

Then, after the Second World War, we failed to assure self-government to the peoples in Eastern Europe. Certainly we have learned the lesson that economic development is a prerequisite to peace and stability. But we haven't solved the problem of a society caught in the meshes of a fanatical ideology, as in Soviet Russia, where millions of human beings are prevented from enjoying the fruits of their own labor.

Will the group of tyrants who dominate the Soviet Union and control its whole life make the same colossal error that the expansionists of previous decades made? Their threat to world peace is reminiscent of the passion of the Kaiser's demagogs as they cried out for more territory and resources for a rapidly gowing population. Have we forgotten nazism's expansion into Austria and the Balkans by military force? Its counterpart today is international communism on the march in every continent.

Materialism is its basic motive. It seeks to benefit the few—not the people as a whole. The battle in Africa is for the control of natural resources, including the oil of the Sahara. In the Middle East and in Latin America, rich resources are also at stake.

The new formula for economic progress in Western Europe—the Common Market—on the other hand, gives promise of a rising prosperity on the European Continent.

The reconstruction of Western Europe with the aid of America's funds has been a notable achievement. It is heartening in contrast with the scenes of destruction in each of the two World Wars. For today the streets are filled with automobiles—signs of a more rapid system of communication inside every country. New construction is going on everywhere. There is increased commerce, relatively little unemployment, and certainly more enjoyment of the recreational side of life. Poverty has been lessened. Street beggars are rare. There are indications of a better and better life.

What shall we say then of the war clouds that hover constantly over us? This is a

constant reminder that greed, the lust for political power, and the desire to control millions of other human beings have not vanished. Weapons of war grow in number and power, while large armies, navies, and air forces—offensive and defensive—train for the war that mankind does not want. It is hoped that the very destructive power of nuclear weapons as a means of inflicting incalculable damage to both sides may push a big war farther and farther away.

Today peoples are better informed than ever before. Communication is better than at any time in human history. In this fact lies the hope of tomorrow.

But we fail to express ourselves adequately and effectively. A babble of voices marks our diplomacy. Alliances are cumbersome and difficult to coordinate.

Ideals, however, are not hard to articulate. For dictatorships are not invulnerable. The peoples under Communist thought control are still intelligent human beings who know the difference between freedom and slavery. Oppression does eventually breed revolt, and even the best-trained armies turn someday on their own tyrannical rulers.

The quest for life, liberty, and happiness is never ending. Today in Eastern Europe that quest is slowly but surely manifesting itself in widespread unrest. Simultaneously, on the other side of the Iron Curtain, we are witnessing a successful realization of what freedom can really mean in advancing the economic and social well-being of the human race.

Flow of Communist Propaganda Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and others on the floor of the House yesterday—pages 16702–16708—with respect to the flow of Communist propaganda into the United States, came as a very great source of satisfaction to me.

The matter to which the gentleman has spoken by the introduction of his bill which would curtail this flow, not only affects the future security of the United States but, so long as it is tolerated, reflects the kind of intellectual confusion which militates against us by inviting international Communists to overreach. I intend, of course, to support the bill, but I should like to introduce into the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. John J. Minges, a distinguished citizen of Iowa's Second District, a school superintendent who understands that in the making of an American, and in the making of an effective worker in the cause of freedom, believing is no less important than knowing:

COGGON COMMUNITY
SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Coggon, Iowa, June 8, 1961.

Hon. JAMES E. BROMWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROMWELL: Recently I received two back copies of the magazine U.S.S.R., which apparently originated in the Russian Embassy, 1706 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The magazine purports to be sent on a reciprocal agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, in return for which we are entitled to send the Amerika to the Soviet Union. I don't know what postal arrangements were made, but it appears to me that this is not the type of publication to be sent to the schools in the United States. It is obviously highly tainted with propaganda in its nature.

Particularly offensive was the article which appeared in the September issue of the said magazine dealing with a religious theme which would give the American student the idea that Christianity or religion in general is a basic part of Russian life when, in fact, all of our intelligence reports indicate that the opposite is true.

I presume that we have no way of preventing this type of literature from finding its way to the news stands, but I would certainly question permitting this type of material to be sent to the schools in the United States.

As a veteran of World War II and in the Korean conflict and a member of the Active Reserve for nearly 20 years, I feel that my patriotism is above reproach, and after reading several of the articles in the above-mentioned magazine, I was tempted to seek Soviet citizenship and enjoy some of the benefits which they so glowingly describe.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MINGES.

The So-Called Hanford Powerplant Compromise Is a Sham and for That Reason the House of Repreesntatives Should Stand Fast by Refusing To Accept It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure every Member of the House of Representatives realizes, the conferees on the AEC authorization bill met yesterday and decided to try to force a half a loaf of Hanford on the House of Representatives. As the minority manager on the part of the House I have refused to sign the conference report because in my opinion it is still contrary to the instruction clearly and emphatically given to the House conferees by a vote of 235 to 164 to stand firm in opposition to the Hanford electric generating project. The proposal to authorize $58 million for the construction of one 400,000-kilowatt unit is a feeble attempt to dilute the effectiveness of the position the House has taken on three previous votes. This so-called compromise—even with the proviso that the electric energy be used exclusively at the Hanford station—is like saying, "Let's compromise, you give me half your beer and I'll give you half my foam."

We have often heard it said that half a loaf is better than none. But, I can assure you that in this situation half a no-good loaf to begin with is substantially worse than none.

Mr. Speaker, never in my many years of legislature experience have I seen such a loose treatment of facts and figures in an attempt to get congressional authorization for a project as I have seen in this Hanford situation. Two years of intensive study went into the original proposal to add electric generating facilities to the new production reactor at Hanford. Two years were required because several different studies with varying assumptions had to be made before the proponents could come up with one which might barely pass the test of economic feasibility. In fact, the Joint Committee report on the original project stated on page 8:

> The economics of NPR (during the power only operation) are about break even or moderately favorable (depending on bases and assumptions).

Therefore, it stands to reason that to increase the cost per kilowatt of installed capacity at Hanford by almost 22 percent—and that its exactly what happens when one constructs a 400,000-kilowatt station for $58 million—the economic feasibility obviously must be much worse. But again, we find the assumption jugglers busily engaged in trying to find a combination of secret assumptions which might make the project appear feasible. It will be noted from the conference report that they even had to increase the assumed plutonium production campaign by 3 years to accomplish their desired ends.

The majority conferees list four so-called advantages which they claim would accrue from the authorization of the single electric generator facility at Hanford. Let us examine these so-called advantages to determine whether they will stand up under the searching light of evaluation:

> 1. All of the electric power produced at the facility will be used for national defense purposes at the AEC Hanford plutonium weapons material production installation.

This is a true statement as far as it goes but it does not actually reflect what effect the project will have on national defense. At this time in our national history when we are engaged in a national defense spending program, unprecedented in our history, it would be foolhardy to dissipate this effort by spending $58 million to produce 400,000 kilowatts of electric power, even to be consumed at Hanford, which could be purchased more economically through the existing arrangements with the power suppliers. It is not sufficient to maintain that it "would be used for national defense purposes" when it is clearly demonstrated that the net effect would be to diminish the effectiveness of the defense effort.

> 2. Since the electric power production is limited to the AEC Hanford installation, the question of whether or not AEC would be in the commercial power business is completely eliminated.

This is one of the most blatant attempts to mislead and to confuse the basic issue contained in the conference report. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 specifically requires that power may be produced incidentally in research and development reactors or production

facilities. It cannot be argued that the addition of 400,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity is incidental, but rather it becomes a major purpose of this facility. The fact remains that an equal amount of power which was previously supplied to Hanford would be released into the Bonneville system to add to the existing surplus in the Pacific Northwest. The fact remains that this additional surplus of 400,000 kilowatts would be used as a justification for the proposed Federal intertie between Bonneville and California as the first leg on an all-Federal giant power grid. The fact remains that public power planners already have on the drafting board plans to construct other Federal powerplants and transmission lines to compete with existing power suppliers.

Since the conference report assumes an 11-year plutonium production campaign at Hanford, one may ask whether it is also assumed that Hanford will not be required for plutonium production after 1973. If this be the case, what will become of the 400,000 kilowatts of power in this reactor at that time?

3. The Hanford atomic electric plant at 400,000 kilowatts would still be the world's largest atomic powerplant from a single reactor.

It might be further stated—as was pointed out during the previous debate on the original proposal—that this would also be the world's most ridiculous example of obsolete, outmoded, and retrogressive engineering. There can be little benefit gained either technologically or in world prestige by wasting critically needed taxpayers' dollars to build an antique teakettle.

There is no doubt that the United States already enjoys the world's leadership in development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We do not have to make ourselves appear to be foolishly striving for bigness, regardless of the contribution which such bigness might make in the refinement of reactor technology.

4. Economic studies submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission indicate that the entire capital cost of the generating facility will be paid for with interest in 9 years of dual-purpose operation.

I have already addressed myself to this point in the first part of my remarks. For this reason, I think it will be sufficient merely to reiterate that the increase in cost per kilowatt of installed capacity of almost 22 percent in this new proposal would certainly have an adverse effect on the economics of the proposition which the House has three times rejected.

Mr. Speaker, the attempts of the conferees to force half a Hanford loaf on the House of Representatives in no way negates the 10 compelling reasons listed in the separate statement attached to the Joint Committee report on the original AEC authorization bill and the position previously taken by the House of Representatives. Under the circumstances, I sincerely urge my colleagues in this body to rise in even greater force to announce that they will not tolerate such a complete disregard of the need for economy at a time when we are already involved in the most expensive defense effort we have ever undertaken. I feel it is the responsibility which every one of us has to our constituents and to the Nation to assure the most prudent and effective expenditure of Federal funds. The Hanford proposal contained in the conference report is indeed a question of waste. However, it is not a question of wasting steam, but a question of wasting more precious Federal dollars.

School Aid Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that the New York Times in an editorial today agreed with many of us who took issue with the procedure involved in attempting to bring up an inadequate, hybrid education measure under Calendar Wednesday procedure. The Times editorial properly dubs the collapse of education legislation for public schools as a "tragic end to a chapter of legislative irresponsibility and inept Executive leadership." It goes on to point out that "much of the burden of the defeat remains on those who mismanaged the measure," and on "inept behind-the-scenes talk of compromise."

The editorial correctly points out that the use of the Calendar Wednesday procedure "lost even the support of some honest advocates of Federal aid," and noted that "The totally new bill, based on a distribution formula different from earlier measures, had to be voted on within 1 day, without proper study or debate."

No further comment is needed on one important sentence in the editorial:

This leaves room for suspicion that some of those who adopted this dubious procedure were more interested in going through the motions and clearing themselves of responsibility than in having school aid enacted.

The editorial is included in its entirety, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1961]

SCHOOL AID DEBACLE

Satisfactory Federal aid to the public schools, although solemnly promised in both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms and labeled with highest priority by the Kennedy administration, has been killed beyond hope for revival in this session of Congress. This is the tragic end to a chapter of legislative irresponsibility and inept Executive leadership.

Inevitably, the post mortems will allocate the blame to everyone's political advantage. The fact is that the blame must be shared across party boundaries. The bipartisan antiaid coalition, of course, did its best to exploit every extraneous controversy. The parochial school issue was welcomed by those who gladly use any means to obstruct aid to public education.

But much of the burden of the defeat remains on those who mismanaged the measure. Inept behind-the-scenes talk of compromise, particularly the offer to use the National Defense Education Act as a vehicle for backdoor aid to nonpublic schools, consolidated the opposition and disheartened supporters. The bill that was held captive in the Rules Committee was sound. It was worth a far greater effort for rescue. It needed the urgency of pressure from the White House and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; instead it received offers of soft compromise.

When the inadequate hybrid measure was finally brought to the floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure it lost even the support of some honest advocates of Federal aid. The totally new bill, based on a distribution formula different from earlier measures, had to be voted on within 1 day, without proper study or debate. This leaves room for suspicion that some of those who adopted this dubious procedure were more interested in going through the motions and clearing themselves of responsibility than in having school aid enacted.

There remains, however, another issue of overriding importance. As a result of the political horsetrading, extension of the vital National Defense Education Act has not yet been voted. Without such extension the colleges will not be able to offer loans to this year's high school seniors. Nor will academic institutions be able to plan effective science, mathematics, language, and fellowship programs, with any assurance of continuity. Enough damage has already been done through the failure to enact public school aid; it must not be compounded by failure to extend the entire NDEA before Congress adjourns.

Look South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Railway System in the following article very vividly points out the fantastic growth and development of the South. This article recently appeared in many nationally circulated publications:

HOW DOES THE FUTURE LOOK TO YOU?

Your outlook on the future can well depend on where you look to see it. Especially is this true in these highly competitive times, when profits everywhere are much harder to come by. So, we say again to profit-minded businessmen—don't despair. If you have set your sights on a prosperous and rewarding industrial future, look South now to find it.

You will be in good company. Last year, along the lines of Southern Railway alone, there were 372 new industrial developments representing an investment of almost half a billion dollars—greater than any year since 1956. Among these are industries of all kinds and sizes, all looking for the same thing—increased inplant production efficiency plus fast-growing markets nearby, to absorb the goods they make at a reasonable profit to the manufacturer.

Why not let a member of our industrial development department give you the facts and the figures about your prospects for the future in the modern South? No obligation, of course—and in complete confidence. Call or write today.

Look ahead—look South.

A recent U.S. Department of Commerce report shows the modern South leading the national rate-of-growth average in 29 of the

34 fields of business activity covered. Here are examples:

	Percent increase	
	For the South	For the United States
Dollar value added by manufacture	120	90
Number of manufacturing establishments	35	24
Manufacturing employment	28	12
Dollar value of manufacturing payrolls	131	97
New plant and equipment expenditures	65	49
Dollar value of retail sales	65	53
Number of retail trade establishments	5	1
Dollar value of retail trade payrolls	77	59
Dollar value of wholesale sales	68	50
Number of wholesale establishments	36	17
Wholesale trade employment	23	13
Dollar value of wholesale trade payrolls	80	59
Number of service trade establishments	58	46
Number of industrial and commercial firms	29	13
Dollar value of life insurance in force	253	172
Number of motor vehicle registrations	117	91
Dollar value of bank deposits	73	58
Production of electric energy	238	158
Dollar value of personal income	111	101
Per capita personal income	74	64
Dollar value of minerals produced	87	70
Cash farm income	23	10

The Big Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the Berlin crisis and its effect on the peace and people of the world.

In the August 28, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report an excellent article entitled "The Big Prison," by David Lawrence appears.

This article was brought to my attention by a patriotic citizen and friend, Henry A. Spindler, of Wood-Ridge, N.J.

Because of the universal interest in Berlin and Germany at this time, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE BIG PRISON

(By David Lawrence)

EUROPE.—More than 17 million persons were imprisoned a few days ago in East Germany.

They have committed no crime. They have not trespassed upon any other people's territory. They are nevertheless confined within borders prescribed by their Communist masters. Armed guards patrol the barbed-wire and concrete barriers erected to prevent their leaving the big prison.

Across a line through the city of Berlin are many relatives and friends whom they are forbidden to visit.

Alone and unbefriended by any other nation, the East German people suffer in silence—unable to express their will and bound by the mandate of their oppressors not to dare to depart to other countries or even to other parts of their own German homeland.

The world has not often witnessed in our times such a colossal act of cruelty.

In these days when self-determination is the rallying cry of millions of persons in Africa, many of them not yet fit for self-government, the majority of nations have given more than lipservice to the idea that colonialism should be abolished and independence granted.

But where are the champions of the imprisoned millions in East Germany? Do the Afro-Asian members of the United Nations lift their voices in protest or demand special meetings of the General Assembly to seek justice for the 17 million prisoners—educated human beings who obviously deserve a chance to govern themselves? And what do we in America or our friends in Western Europe do about it?

Timidly and with a mistaken belief that it is important not to offend Nikita Khrushchev, the American Government's broadcasts to East Germany tell the people there to be calm and to do nothing to bring about disturbances of any kind. This is advice based on our own alleged self-interest. But it is really a form of appeasement reminiscent of the days of Munich.

Here, for instance, is an extract from an editorial published in the New York Times of August 16 and transmitted by the various press services to the newspapers of Europe:

"While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Does this expression by one of the leading newspapers of the United States represent the thinking of the American people today? Have we forgotten the ideals of yesteryears—the many words of sympathy we have written into the platforms of both of our political parties in decades past as we openly took our stand by the side of oppressed peoples?

Do we really mean to remain passive now lest we offend the Communist? Will this not embolden them to take further steps—perhaps the next time to imprison the people of West Berlin, too?

For if we are obsessed with fears and afflicted with a defeatism which makes us afraid even to encourage other peoples to seek their freedom, then the Soviet Union need have no concern about trespassing further on human rights.

The West Germans are plainly disappointed that their Western allies have indicated their aloofness toward the problem of the East German people. Small wonder that it was deemed necessary by President Kennedy to send Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Berlin to help bolster the morale of the people there.

True enough, nobody wants to see any incitement to war. But wars come from timorousness, and not from resoluteness.

The Soviet Union has committed a major crime in imprisoning the people of East Germany. Will the people of the West fail to speak up against this act of inhumanity?

Diplomatic notes of protest are not enough. Throughout the United States and other Western countries days of mourning should be proclaimed as millions of freemen go to their churches to pray to God to give the East German people the strength to rise up against their captors and emerge from their enslavement.

Demonstrations in all parts of the world should be held immediately so that there can be recorded the protest of a shocked humanity.

For communism, which boasts of its prowess in science and pledges great achievements in economic fields, reveals its true character as it denies human beings their freedom and their individual liberties.

The verdict of the world must be registered, and the United States should take the lead in denouncing the unjustified imprisonment of 17 million human beings behind the walls of imperialistic communism.

The European Common Market Challenge to the United States: Christian Science Monitor Comments on Analysis of Congressman Henry S. Reuss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article in the August 30, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor concerning the challenge of the European Common Market as a new monetary power in the world today.

The article contains an exceptionally interesting analysis of the views of our distinguished colleague, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, concerning the present monetary balance in the free world.

The article follows:

FRAGILE MONETARY BALANCE

(By Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

BOSTON.—The free world's delicate monetary balance is poised on eggs. A single slip could destroy it.

In many respects the monetary balance is the most fragile part of the alliance of the North Atlantic community. It exists without treaty, without formal, signed, legal agreements.

This monetary balance is ad hoc. This means that the moves to maintain it are literally "played by ear."

It seems incredible that the monetary security of the free world hangs thus by a thread, dependent totally on the good will, unselfishness, and cooperation of those concerned.

An ad hoc balance is better than all-out monetary warfare. It is a step removed from the monetary jungle of the late 19th century and early 20th up to 1933. It succeeds at all only because sophisticated persons are working hard to maintain it.

Yet it is fragile, as fragile as eggs or a spider's web. Last year it was nearly demolished. Again this spring it was nearly torn down.

The monetary balance is the most sensitive problem the United States faces among its allies. In many respects the monetary security of the United States is in their hands. A rip in this ad hoc alliance fabric could destroy or seriously weaken the superimposed military alliance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

If the Soviet Union could upset this sensitive balance, it could achieve a greater economic victory than it ever could do with its clumsy Berlin-type bludgeoning.

The monetary ad hoc balance is the economic Achilles heel of the free nations.

It is doubtful if the Soviets are clever enough to upset this balance by themselves. They are accumulating gold, probably more rapidly than any other nation today. Their gold wealth is not known, but it is believed

to be between $8 billion and $12 billion. The Soviets have gold in their hills, and they have golddiggers combing them, panning them, and flushing them in search of the yellow stuff which has become the nation's symbol of solvency.

Yet, even with their gold, the Soviets cannot upset the free balance unless the members of the free balance themselves permit imbalance to occur.

Here is the risk and the rub.

Citizens of the prosperous United States—its buoyant consumers—know little, if anything, of the great wide world of international monetary exchange. They never have concerned themselves with it. In Britain where international trade is the vital source of prosperity the average Briton knows about his country's vital reserves in the balance of trade. The enthusiasm or solemnity of the country goes up and down with the reserves.

A Briton knows that if the nation's reserves in international exchanges are dropping, the country faces a little greater austerity at home. This is what is happening now.

The average American knows hardly anything about his country's reserves and cares less.

Yet he must learn about them if he is to understand the influences which are operating today which directly affect his own daily existence.

The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress has just published the hearings and analysis of the free world's exchange and payments arrangements which its subcommittee under Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, conducted. These reports (one costing $1 and the second 15 cents from the Government Printing Office) contain a thorough analysis of the problems and of the several proposed solutions to the monetary problem, especially as they affect great trading nations such as Britain and the United States.

Representative REUSS, incidentally, is one of the most alert Members of the Congress on this problem. He is an outstanding, forthright liberal, in the true sense of the term, who thought of the Peace Corps, who led congressional debates for cultural programs in television and radio, and who has spoken frequently for Kennedy administration programs in the Congress.

Yet Representative REUSS is far ahead of the administration on the world exchange balance and is more accurate in his analysis of the problem than any Member of Congress. He is well out in front, far ahead of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, who, first in the Eisenhower administration and now in the Kennedy administration, has not told the American people what the European Common Market may mean to them as thoroughly as has Representative REUSS. Nor have other members of the Kennedy administration, such as George Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, correctly presented the picture.

Mr. REUSS has had the courage to tell the administration in a speech in the House on August 7, 1961 (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, No. 134, p. 13760), that it "has painted the United States into a corner." "Our U.S. officialdom is expressing its delight at the state of affairs," he said in reference to the administration's policy on the European Common Market.

Mr. REUSS sees in the European Common Market the climax of 1,200 years' effort to achieve a single empire in Europe, "going back to Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Empire, the grand design of Henry IV, the pan-European movement of Aristide Briand, and all the impetus toward European integration following World War II."

"But," Mr. REUSS asks, "was it necessary to divide the free world in two—Western Europe and its dependencies, on the one hand, and the rest of the West on the other—in order to obtain these economic and political benefits? The United States in Marshall plan days encouraged Western Europe to discriminate against U.S. goods because it was Western Europe that was suffering a severe deficit in payments. Yet now that the shoe is on the other foot—now that it is the United States that faces the payments deficit, while most of Western Europe has a whopping surplus—we find ourselves still insisting on the Common Market and on the expansion of the discrimination against us by a host of additional countries.

"In short, we have encouraged a European particularism at just the stage in history when we should have been discouraging a European particularism in favor of a free world generalism."

President Kennedy himself gave Dr. Walter Hallstein, president of the European Common Market, the pledges of U.S. support. It was President Kennedy's desk-thumping insistence to Prime Minister Harold Macmillan which finally forced the British Prime Minister into the critical decision to try to integrate Britain with Europe. Instead of attempting to work creatively for a countervailing power of unity between the United States and Britain and the British Commonwealth, the youthful U.S. President slammed the door on an economic alliance with Britain.

Now the administration is trying to argue that its support of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is its answer. Actually, the OECD was a British idea, advanced first by Sir Oliver Franks, and seized upon by Mr. Dillon, then an Eisenhower aid, because the U.S. administration was bankrupt of a program of its own.

But reports from Europe now indicate that the new economic power of the European Common Market is growing so rapidly that the new OECD, which comes into faint being in October, will have difficulty exercising a unifying or countervailing power.

Underneath all this is the sensitive monetary balance on thin eggshells.

The European Common Market today is the new monetary power of the world. Today this is seen by alert men such as Mr. REUSS, and, of course, the British are well aware of this development. In perhaps three years, barring a third world war, the power of this development will hit U.S. officials and citizens, when they realize they have moved themselves at their own momentum into a second-rate monetary status.

The gold of the European Common Market countries today exceeds that of the United States. As they move themselves progressively toward the new empire, a momentum which now has accumulative power, the new scenes will unfold so that all can see. Even now the franc is replacing the dollar in a small way as an international currency. If the franc becomes the currency of the new empire, the dollar progressively will take a back seat. The center of monetary power will no longer be New York. It will be Brussels or Paris. Thus, subtly, history changes while the actors in it seem hardly aware of the changes.

The present stage of the monetary balance is one of an ad hoc system which is rapidly growing out of date and becoming unworkable. This is simply an informal, nonbinding agreement among central bankers of Europe not to cash their dollars into gold or their sterling into gold.

Each dollar outside the United States is a check promising to pay in gold. Up to now European countries and central banks have been content to build their economies on the credit system of the dollar without exchanging their dollar reserves for gold.

This is the ad hoc situation. No treaty, no legal arrangements, no binding pledges exist to preserve it.

As France, Italy, and West Germany grow in economic power so will the European Economic Community, the new empire envisaged by Dr. Hallstein.

Return to God—A Way To Stop Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the announcement by Soviet Russia that it will resume nuclear weapons testing, I should like to make the following comment:

The Communist devil has come out of hiding. It has cast off the mask of its sheeps' clothing.

I believe the U.S.S.R. has been secretly working on the huge nuclear bomb she is talking about which has a power equal to 100 million tons of TNT or 5,000 times bigger than the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. Now she must make open tests to prove them out.

Khrushchev probably feels that he is now ready for the kill and is not afraid of exposure nor diverse public opinion. He must think that this is the hour to scare both the powerful and the weak nations into submitting to Russia's demands on Berlin and anywhere else in the world she chooses to strike. Even now both Russia and Red China talk of peace while they prepare to swallow up the world.

But there is one thing that can stop these godless countries and that is true moral and spiritual rearmament of humanity everywhere. Only a superior ideology, based on faith, morality, genuine freedom, and righteousness for all, can be effective and bring real peace to a tormented world. Military, economic, and political means are important, but they alone will not suffice.

If ever I believed in this cause, I believe in it now with all my heart. This is the time to unite the world by rearming all peoples with the moral and spiritual strength of our Saviour, who alone crushed the invincible but godless Roman Empire. All nations, except atheistic Russia and China, will follow such leadership. The weapons are not made and never will be made to crush such a spirit.

If Russia wishes to use its deadly weapons she will have to use them now, before the whole world, imbued with the moral strength of religion and faith, will rise up against her. Even her own people, who still have a spark of humanity in them, will drive the devils out of their country.

Rushing Into Khrushchev's Hands—Allies Seen Solving Kremlin's Problems by Eagerness for New Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continued saber-rattling and deliberate violations of agreements being perpetrated by Soviet Dictator Khrushchev in the Berlin crisis, all responsible Western leaders agree that a firm stand is our first line of defense at the present time. It is, therefore, with considerable dismay that we reflect upon the decision of the Kennedy administration to rush into new negotiations with the Kremlin which, if the pattern of the past is followed, will result in major concessions by Western diplomats.

Certainly the concessions and blunders of Roosevelt and Truman are too tragic a chapter in our nation's diplomatic history to be so easily forgotten, and the mistaken spirit of Camp David is the most recent reminder of the failure of both compromise with communism and the failure of summit diplomacy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I for one wish to raise my voice against the confused, vacillating, wind-blown nature of our present foreign policy and urge that for once the President's State Department advisers take the pulse of the American public and stand firm, rather than to negotiate away our positions of strength.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, Columnist Constantine Brown, writing from Rome, discussed in a most effective manner the question of coming negotiations. Under leave granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this article entitled "Rushing Into Khrushchev's Hands.":

RUSHING INTO KHRUSHCHEV'S HANDS—ALLIES SEEN SOLVING KREMLIN'S PROBLEMS BY EAGERNESS FOR NEW NEGOTIATIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The fear expressed some weeks ago by some realists in the political and military world that we would bail out Premier Khrushchev at a time when conditions in the Soviet Union and the satellite states were at their worst for him is now by way of being realized.

Despite President de Gaulle's definite opposition to the West's making overtures to the Kremlin for negotiation to solve the Berlin problem and other pending difficulties, Washington, London, and even Bonn are anxious for a summit meeting.

General de Gaulle's initial opposition to the Western powers' urging negotiation with Mr. Khrushchev was based on incontrovertible evidence that things in the U.S.S.R. were at their worst economically and at the same time the political and economic situation in East Germany had become desperate.

Under these conditions, General de Gaulle argued, why not let the Russians come to us and suggest that we meet to discuss not only Berlin but everything else? We would then be at a great advantage by condescending to talk with the Soviet boss. Our military strength (all panicky reports and rumors about Russia's superiority notwithstanding) is such that the Russians would not dare pull the trigger.

This realistic French approach to the diplomatic crisis is shared by the military of the NATO. We definitely have the wherewithal to make the Russians pay dearly for any military attempt. And the Russian general staff is aware of this.

Mr. Khrushchev is a shrewd and stubborn man, however; before swallowing a bitter pill, he intended to try something against the West, as usual, by proxy. That something was to be Berlin where he decided to create a real brink, pitting the East Berlin government against the allies in West Berlin.

There were, according to responsible informants, two plans. One, the most daring and likely to cause a real explosion, was to order the East German forces to raid a sector (preferably not American) and take it over. Mr. Khrushchev is reported to have toyed with that idea as being the most spectacular. But it could have involved a shooting problem which could occur bfore the whole matter could be brought before the United Nations. The Russian generals reportedly said "Nyet."

The second plan, which was put into effect on the night of August 13, was then decided on. It involved less risk, especially if the closing of all communications between the Eastern and Western city was to be done by piecemeal. Mr. Khrushchev's expectations were fulfilled. The step-by-step measures taken by Walter Ulbricht after several days of discussions in Moscow with the Russians and the Prime Ministers of the satelite countries created only an academic reaction in Washington, London and Paris.

The closing of the avenues between free and Communist Berlin brought the usual meaningless protests. The frame of mind in Washington and London was there is nothing we can do about it except make diplomatic representations. Even the decision to send Vice President JOHNSON and token reinforcements was taken only after President Kennedy received agonizing cries from Chancellor Adenauer and Berlin Mayor Brandt to do something. But simultaneously with these gestures, Washington, London and Rome let it be known to the world that the situation was so tense and full of danger to the peace of the world that a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev at the earliest convenient time must be held. The Russian dictator had not miscalculated.

On the surface the Soviet Union is not directly involved. It is the "sovereign People's Republic of East Germany" which has taken the restrictive measures to defend herself against "espionage, saboteurs and black marketers." The Soviet Union, it was announced, stands firmly as usual behind her allies. A number of Red divisions were brought to the Russian zone and Marshal Ivan Konev, one of the heroes of the last war, was placed in command.

Today despite General de Gaulle's stubborn opposition to rushing to a summit conference, the betting in Europe is that the other powers will make their approach to the Kremlin boss. This will add another feather to his cap by having won another victory over the powerful West by his usual method of bluff and blackmail.

Perhaps at the time when the NATO was at its lowest ebb, such an attitude by the Western Powers might have been described as necessarily circumspect. But today when the Allied forces are strong—although not yet at their peak—and when there is a definite will in America and Europe to stop Mr. Khrushchev's nibbling tactics, this rush to negotiate appears from this side as ludicrous, especially when conditions in the Soviet Union are such that Mr. Khrushchev cannot pull the trigger.

The First 7 Months: President Kennedy and the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the text of my August newsletter dealing with the first 7 months of President Kennedy's administration and the 87th Congress.

The newsletter follows:

As the 87th Congress drives toward adjournment, I think you'll be interested in a summary of our first 7 months' work under the Kennedy administration. Here's how it looks from Washington:

Although the threat to Berlin is the major concern here, President Kennedy has made clear that his purpose is to bolster the Nation's strength in order to meet crises in other parts of the world as well. His speech on Berlin drew bipartisan support. Congress responded quickly to his call for $3.5 billion for a military-civil defense buildup, authority to raise draft calls and order some Reserve units to active duty. By increasing our conventional forces, President Kennedy seeks to give us an alternative between surrender and nuclear war. He wants to demonstrate to Khrushchev that we mean to stand firm in Berlin and that we intend to negotiate from strength, not weakness, in other trouble spots of the world.

The Berlin crisis emphasizes the shift in attention of the administration from domestic to foreign problems. When the President took office in January, recession and unemployment were in the headlines. Then the Congo, Laos, Cuba, especially Berlin, changed that. As General MacArthur told the President during his recent visit, "Well, the chickens have come home to roost, and you happen to live in the chickenhouse." In spite of troubles abroad, Congress has made a record of solid achievement on domestic legislation in the first half-year of the administration.

Ten of the President's sixteen priority bills have been written into law. Five were requested in Mr. Kennedy's program for economic recovery and growth:

1. Thirteen-week extension of unemployment benefits.

2. Aid to needy children of jobless workers.

3. Area redevelopment program to encourage industry and jobs in hard-hit communities.

4. Increase in minimum wage to $1.25 and extension of coverage to 3.5 million new workers.

5. Improved social security: Minimum pension raised from $33 to $40; more benefits for widows; male workers can now draw reduced benefits at age 62.

Other major requests now law: The program to curtail feed grain surpluses—which has sharply cut corn production—extended for 1 year. A new Office of International Travel to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States. Seventy-three more Federal judgeships including two for Indiana via a bill I cosponsored with Senator HARTKE.

Also enacted: A highway bill which will finance, largely through new highway user taxes, completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System by 1972 as scheduled.

An omnibus housing bill providing 35-year, 3-percent downpayment loans for low and moderate income houses and 20-year, limited interest loans up to $10,000 for home im-

provement; 100,000 units of low-income housing; expansion of urban renewal to provide $75 million for grants to States and localities for city planning, $650 million in loans to local communities to help improve water, gas, and sewage plants; $2.8 billion in loans to help colleges build dormitories and dining halls.

The pickup in the economy has economists saying we're out of the recession, another boom is possible. What worries those who support the Kennedy program for economic growth is this: The gain in jobs has been moderate despite the encouraging increase in output. More than 5 million Americans still can't find work. In our own Third District unemployment remains the No. 1 problem. July reports showed some 10,700 jobless in the South Bend-Mishawaka labor market alone. This amounts to 11.5 percent of the work force—highest percentage in Indiana. Coming months will tell whether we can reduce hard core unemployment, bring about the spurt in economic growth we need to maintain our industrial lead over the Communist world.

My greatest satisfaction this year has been to announce, jointly with Senator HARTKE, award of Federal contracts in the Third District worth more than $50 million. Studebaker-Packard Corp. in June won contracts totaling over $27 million for military trucks. Earlier, Studebaker-Packard was successful bidder to supply Federal civilian agencies with passenger cars worth $4,480,321. Bendix-Mishawaka will do most of the work on a new $20 million contract for the Navy's surface-to-air Typhon missile. The project may ultimately run to hundreds of millions of dollars. I was glad also to lend a hand to the U.S. Rubber Mishawaka plant which recently won a contract for Polaris missile casings and, to consolidate operations, will transfer a department from Providence, R.I., to Mishawaka.

With foreign aid legislation prominent in the news, I think it essential to keep two major points in mind:

1. Without an adequate foreign aid program, an economic and political vacuum will be created in the underdeveloped nations which Communist imperialism will certainly fill.

2. Over 80 percent of U.S. foreign aid funds are spent right in this country for goods and services.

While I support President Kennedy's aid program, as I did President Eisenhower's, I feel very strongly that our foreign aid operations overseas should be conducted more efficiently and effectively. That's why I sent a letter on behalf of 30 House Democrats asking Foreign Aid Chief Henry Labouisse for detailed answers to four questions. Here's a New York Herald-Tribune article of August 7, 1961, concerning the letter:

"FOREIGN AID BACKERS ASK END OF WASTE—SEEK ASSURANCES BY PROGRAM CHIEF

"WASHINGTON, August 6.—Thirty House Democratic supporters of President Kennedy's $8.8 billion long-range foreign aid program sought assurances today that the money will not be wasted.

"They asked Aid Director Henry B. Labouisse in a letter what steps he planned to take to prevent any further bad planning, waste, and unsuitable projects. They also asked what he intended to do about firing unsatisfactory aid officials.

"Their statement came as Assistant Senate Democratic Leader HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, spoke out on behalf of the most controversial feature of the President's aid plan.

"CONTROVERSIAL FEATURE

"The provision would commit Congress to a 5-year aid program not subject to annual appropriations as required in the past. This long-range financing feature faces a tough fight in the House and in the Senate which is now working on the aid bill.

"The Senate opened debate on the aid bill last week. The House will take up the bill later.

"Senator KEATING said in a statement that long-range aid planning was of crucial importance.

"BERLIN CRISIS CITED

"Senator HUMPHREY declared in a separate statement that the Berlin crisis had underlined the need for consistent long-term aid planning.

"The letter by the 30 Democrats pointed up congressional concern about the long-range feature of the President's aid program. Most of the group consider themselves liberals and are firm supporters of the aid program.

"But they told Mr. Labouisse there had been 'documented instances of bad planning, waste and unsuitable projects.' They asked: 'What specifically will be done to prevent the repetition of such instances?'

"CONSTRUCTIVELY CRITICAL

"The group, which represents 16 States, prefaced its query to Mr. Labouisse by saying it agrees that the President's foreign aid program 'is both essential to the security of the United States and consistent with the desires of the American people to encourage economic development and strengthen free political institutions in other nations.'

"But they said their duty to be 'constructively critical' prompted four questions, including the one on how waste will be stopped.

"They also wanted to know what will be done to make sure aid goes to the people who need it; how private business firms will be protected against expropriation or currency blocking; and what steps have been or will be taken to remove aid officials 'whose performance is unsatisfactory.'

"Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, spokesman for the group, said that although its members believe in foreign aid, 'we are also convinced that our aid program abroad can be conducted more efficiently and effectively.'"

The new Soviet feat of orbiting a man around the world for 25 hours is more dramatic evidence that in the struggle with the Communist world, brainpower is indispensable. That's why I feel those who insist on denying help to American education where it is really needed are playing Russian roulette with our national security.

It's therefore a tragedy that President Kennedy's three education bills are still mired down in the House and Senate. These bills would: (1) provide grants to States for more classrooms and/or better teachers' salaries; (2) provide loans and grants to colleges for academic facilities plus scholarships for needy, able students; (3) extend the National Defense Education Act.

If Congress fails to get a chance to vote on these bills, the losers will be American students and the national interest; the winners, Mr. Khrushchev and the Communist leaders, who are continuing to press their countries ahead scientifically and industrially.

In New York City a few weeks ago, I stood on street corners talking to young gang leaders who know—though still in their teens—all about murder and robbery and narcotics. The night our congressional subcommittee visited Brooklyn, a 17-year-old boy was beaten to death over a dime.

I'm convinced that juvenile delinquency is a problem that must be solved at the local level, not by the Federal Government. But youth crime is becoming so serious in many areas that I have introduced a bill to help local communities tackle it. Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Secretaries Goldberg of Labor and Ribicoff of Health, Education, and Welfare have all testified in support of the bill, which would: (1) finance pilot projects to find better techniques to combat delinquency, and make the findings available nationwide, (2) help train more specialists to deal with delinquents and youthful offenders.

During our visit, one 18-year-old girl told us it would take just "three steps from my stoop" to find narcotics in New York. Few of us realize what jungles of crime exist in some of the towns and cities of our country.

A new frontier in TV has been opened by WNDU–TV with its "Washington Tie-Line" series. At WNDU's request I have been recruiting people with significant jobs in Washington for interviews with questioners on the other end of a long-distance line in South Bend. First guest, appropriately, was Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, fresh from his famous debut speech in which he described much of TV as a "wasteland" and called for more public service programs—like "Tie-Line". Next guest was the new U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, de-Lesseps S. Morrison. The Ambassador spoke of the "incomplete revolution" in Latin America and the task facing the United States in helping bring both social reform and economic progress to the rich but troubled continent south of us. Appearing on August 5, Miss Pamela Turnure, press secretary to Mrs. Kennedy, talked of her exciting job, which requires both long hours and much tact in dealing with the White House news corps.

Labor Day 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as America pauses to observe Labor Day, 1961, it is fitting that we as Americans pause to reflect upon the special meaning and significance of Labor Day this year.

In the past, the labor of our people has resulted in the strongest and freest nation which this world has yet known. It was by labor that we expanded from our earliest beginnings in New England past our western continental boundaries to those great new and far distant States of Hawaii and Alaska. But these accomplishments should not lead us to believe that our labor has ended; in fact, the challenges of today cause us to rededicate ourselves to toil not only for the benefit of our great Nation but also for the entire world.

The international challenges of today are extreme. The free world looks to us for leadership; the entire world looks to us for the establishment and endurance of a lasting peace. Therefore, on this day which we set aside to pay tribute to labors past we must pause to reflect on the Nation's future and on our world's future. For the great burden of preserving our democratic heritage rests upon the American citizen whose work and in-

dividual initiative has molded this Nation into a land of free ideals.

With a renewed dedication Americans must labor with deeper conviction than ever before that the preservation of our individual freedom and democratic principles rests upon the shoulders of Americans themselves—Americans who are dedicated to this land of opportunity and its destiny of freedom.

On this Labor Day let each man resolve to give new meaning to his labor in order that we may rise to the challenges of the day and provide a lasting peace for tomorrow.

Tribute to Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d day of January 1937, the gentleman from New York, Mr. EUGENE J. KEOGH, first presented himself in the well of this House—young, handsome, smart, and debonair. At the expiration of 25 years, he remains today young, handsome, smart, and debonair.

However, there are attributes which he has acquired in these 25 years. Today, he has more service for his age than any other man in the Congress, but beyond this, he has acquired the esteem, the devotion, the admiration, and the affection of all his colleagues. It would be accurate to say that no Member of this body has more good will and less ill will from his colleagues than he.

There is reason for this. The reason lies in his brilliant analytical mind, his keen perception, his absolute fairness, his love of his fellow man and his complete integrity, all of which he combines with modesty and utter lack of pretension.

It makes me happy to join with his other beloved colleagues in felicitating him on the commemoration of his long service, and the anniversary of his birthday.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Disabled American Veterans' Code of Ethics for National Guild of Attorneys in Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, over the years the Disabled American Veterans have steadfastly concentrated upon service to its members who have been disabled in the military service and upon legislation to assist these veterans, their widows and dependents. The Disabled American Veterans maintain a national staff of national service officers assigned to each regional office of the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of assisting applicants in the presentation of their claims for the benefits which Congress has given them. In this respect these national service officers are attorneys in fact.

Throughout the years they have adopted a code of ethics as a standard of conduct among themselves by which they could live and work for the benefit of all of our disabled veterans and their dependents. However, for the first time they have reduced this to writing and set forth their dedication to the cause of the disabled.

As a member of this gerat organization I take pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to this code of ethics and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the code was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE VII—CODE OF ETHICS FOR NATIONAL GUILD OF ATTORNEYS IN FACT, THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

I. PREAMBLE

As the basis for this code of ethics, we refer to and adopt the statement contained in the published report of the Attorney General's Office of the United States, filed April 22, 1940, as authorized by Senate Resolution 248, under which authority the administrative procedures in Government agencies were investigated by a group of the Nation's most prominent lawyers, and which report included the Veterans' Administration. The report, speaking of representation by the Disabled American Veterans, and others, in part states:

"Their representative staffs are ordinarily headed by a chief lawyer; there are medical consultants on the service-organization staff. Most of the actual representation of claimants before the various Administration boards, however, is performed by nonlawyers, experienced in matters pertaining to veterans' affairs. The result has been a salutary one: Representation is expert, nontechnical, and aware of the precise issues. The service organization representatives devote their full-time to the task of serving claimants, and their performances, thus far observed, have been of the highest caliber. It is apparent that the individual case is thoroughly studied and the facts, no matter how detailed and medical in form, well learned. Aided by intimate knowledge of the methods of the Administration, the service-organization representatives have developed an able specialized bar.

"Finally, the service organizations, through intimate contact with the Administration, play an important part in shaping its policies. Conferences between service organizations and Administration officials regarding not only individual cases and individual personnel but the broad problems of management and procedure are constant. The organizations are alert to detect vagaries of policy and are not reluctant immediately to attempt correction. The administration of veterans' laws in its broadest aspects, in brief, is, in practice, the result of the mutual efforts of the Administration itself and of the service organizations."

Thus, this investigative group of the U.S. Government has characterized our attorneys in fact of the Disabled American Veterans as an able specialized bar.

II. PURPOSE OF ETHICS

Section 1, to dignify the profession: With the creation of the National Guild of Attorneys in Fact, the Disabled American Veterans, for the purpose of setting up goals to more firmly and adequately establish our service as a calling which merits recognition as a profession, it becomes necessary to adopt a code of ethics. The professional man governs himself by a code of ethics. This is true of law, medicine, theology, and the military, and the scope of our work embraces and encompasses not only those professions but the humanities as well.

Section 2, the practical purpose: The rules we seek to define are not rules for their own sake, but for the practical purpose of discovering and applying the norms and rules of right reason and right conduct in the profession to which we dedicate our lives day by day in representing the disabled war veterans, his widow and orphan before the U.S. Veterans' Administration and/or other governmental agencies through which they may seek entitlement to benefits. Ethics is both a science and an art. As a science, ethics tells us what acts are good and which are bad, in an easy and effective manner. Ethics fulfill the function of science by discovering the truth, and as an art by translating that truth into our conduct and our actions.

III. THE RULES OF ETHICS

No code or set of rules can be framed, which will specify all the duties and responsibilities of the DAV—attorney in fact who is officially recognized and authorized by the Veterans' Administration to represent claimants before this agency of the Federal Government. It involves his professional conduct toward the veteran and/or his dependent, and toward the members of the rating boards before whom he must represent the rights of the claimant to the best of his ability in presenting both the facts of service, disability, and the law applicable to the individual case. The following rules of ethics are adopted as a general guide, yet the enumeration of particular duties should not be construed as a denial of the existence of others equally important, though not specifically mentioned:

Rule 1: The attorney in fact shall endeavor at all times to follow the highest moral principles both as a person and in his conduct with those he serves, as well as with the employees and officials of the Veterans' Administration—his reputation for honesty, integrity, and fair dealing should always be of the highest quality.

Rule 2: The relationship of attorney in fact and claimant is by law and VA regulation made confidential, and this confidential relationship must at all times be guarded and protected, and it continues on even after the case is no longer active, and it applies with equal force to the clerical staff of his office.

Rule 3: The attorney in fact has a continuing duty to further his education and training on a day-to-day basis by keeping current with the new laws, regulations, and VA interpretations, as well as the instructions and information on rating policy released by the DAV national director of claims.

Rule 4: The attorney in fact in assisting the veteran should be completely thorough in ascertaining both from the veteran and his official records, each and all of the rating issues arising out of disease or disability incurred in service, and by carefully analyzing, developing, and presenting the circumstances of military service, and the facts of disability in service, and/or those which may have arisen as secondary disabilities, and then properly plead, allege, and raise each and all of the rating issues for diagnostic investigation, and rating evaluation. Disabilities not properly diagnosed, can never be properly rated.

Rule 5: It is not only proper but it is the duty of the attorney in fact to request a rating board to explain all or any part of a rating which is still unsigned and in the work-sheet stage. The rating issues can be discussed here again or a request filed to defer the rating for the purpose of submitting additional new and material evidence. Timing is most important and a rating should never be signed off when it does not do full justice to the veteran, since he may have lost his opportunity to have the issue properly decided.

Rule 6: Part of the duties and functions of an attorney in fact before the Veterans' Administration is to clarify rating and adjudication problems, and the important task of cutting through redtape to expedite action, and release money awards, particularly in hardship cases.

Rule 7: The attorney in fact is duty bound to participate in all staff meetings called by the Veterans' Administration, and to further inspire and request such meetings whenever there exists a problem relating to policy and VA procedure that may need to be changed or modified to carry out the basic laws and regulations and our joint mission of efficient service to the claimant.

Rule 8: There is a duty falling upon the attorney in fact to formally protest any report of examination or hospital report for rating purposes where on its face the report appears to be incomplete, defective and inadequate under the standards of the VA for rating consideration, and there is apparent some indication that it did not cover the "whole man," so that an important rating issue is omitted, and it has all the earmarks

of being hurriedly made by the examiner or the veteran may have reported his dissatisfaction and a lack of sympathetic treatment during the examination. Hurried examination often lends itself to carelessness, and this may deprive the veteran of an adequate and complete diagnostic investigation for rating action.

Rule 9: It is not considered ethical for an attorney in fact to solicit a veteran to change his power of attorney from another organization to this one. The veteran should be referred to the organization which already holds his power of attorney without criticism. In event the veteran is a member of this organization, and requests that we undertake to represent him, then there exists a duty to do so. Neither is it considered ethical for one DAV—attorney in fact to make overtures or extend to a veteran impressions that he might possibly do a better job than his own DAV associate who has had the management of the case in the past. It is desirable practice in offices where there are more than one DAV—attorney in fact that the office procedure be adjusted to enable the veteran to be served from time to time by the same accredited representative. This saves time, and builds for greater confidence as between attorney in fact and claimant.

Rule 10: Candor and fairness should be the outstanding attributes of the DAV—attorney in fact. Once rapport and understanding of the claimant's case is accomplished, he should represent the claimant's viewpoint but keep in mind that by reason of his training and experience, the attorney in fact is expected to help and contribute his knowledge by assisting and directing the management of the claimant's case in such a manner that all facts and rating issues will be developed and presented.

Rule 11: Recently, there has been initiated a movement, now rapidly spreading throughout the United States, whereby joint committees of county and State bar associations, and their corresponding medical associations, have adopted an interprofessional code. One such joint code states: "This interprofessional code constitutes the further recognition that with the great developments in the science and art of both medicine and law, it is inevitable that the physician and the attorney are drawn into increasing association, as the law calls with increasing frequency upon medicine for its scientific knowledge, and for its evaluation of facts so that the rights of individuals and of the Government may be appropriately determined before various tribunals."

Thus, these joint committees of medical and bar associations are defining and agreeing to be bound by general principles as to the duty the physician owes to his client to furnish evidence involving medical facts to the client's lawyer, and the duties owed by the lawyer to both the physician and their mutual client for whom they have each a professional duty to serve. Therefore, it is the duty of the DAV—attorney in fact through contacts with both the bar and medical associations in his particular area, and to the individual members therof, and to point out the obligation which doctors particularly owe to the disabled veterans of our wars to furnish full and complete statements when required by their clients for use before the U.S. Veterans' Administration in keeping with the facts of disability, treatment, and their professional evaluation of the disabilities, and without bias or prejudice against the Veterans' Administration as a Government agency.

Rule 12: The procedure of the Veterans' Administration provides that a claimant may have a hearing, either informally or a recorded formal hearing before regional rating boards for determination of issues there, or on appeal to the Boards of Veterans' Appeals in event the case justifies such action. The DAV—attorney in fact—has a duty where the individual case warrants such action, to arrange to conduct such hearings if they will contribute factual information to the record upon which the case can be more equitably and properly decided. The burden of proof is on the claimant to establish his claim by a fair preponderance of all the evidence. The DAV—attorney in fact—should be prepared to conduct first the direct examination with proper questions to the veteran and his witnesses, and later to summarize the evidence, and draw reasonable conclusions therefrom in support of the veteran's contentions, after the rating board members have finished their cross-examination to test the probative value of the evidence. Here the DAV—attorney in fact—must possess that ability of a trial advocate, and with poise and dignity, and firmness in the right, as God gives him to see the right.

As Hoffman's resolutions so well state: "Nothing is more unfriendly to the art of pleasing than morbid timidity (bashfulness—mauvaise honte). All life teems with examples of its prejudicial influence, showing that the art of rising in life has no greater enemy than this senseless defect of education. Self-possession, calmness—steady assurance—intrepidity—are all perfectly consistent with the most amiable modesty, and none but vulgar and illiterate minds are prone to attribute to presumptuous assurance the apparently cool and unconcerned exertions of young men at the bar—they who bear the white banner of modesty, fringed with resolution."

The Fulbright Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many thinking Americans are concerned over recent action taken by the Defense Department as a result of the Fulbright memorandum. Not alone are Members of the House and Senate concerned but a great swell of opinion is growing throughout the country in protest to the allegations made in this memorandum.

Typical of the feeling in the country is a statement vigorously condemning the contentions of Senator FULBRIGHT, issued by the Committee on Anti-Communist Activities of Omaha Post No. 1, American Legion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report from the Omaha World-Herald on the action of this fine American Legion post:

LEGION POST 1 STATES STAND—CONDEMNS FULBRIGHT MEMO ON OFFICERS

Omaha Post No. 1, American Legion, Tuesday condemned the memorandum in which Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, charged that some armed services commanders are "right-wing radicals."

The post issued a statement vigorously condemning the contentions of Senator FULBRIGHT. Its recently activated committee on anti-Communist activities stated:

"Senator FULBRIGHT falls into the Communist trap of terming anticommunism on the part of military personnel as the education of the public on political issues."

The report said that on the basis of intimate contact of Post No. 1 with the regular miliary establishments the post recognizes that the officer corps is composed of highly trained, intelligent, educated, and dedicated personnel.

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following for the right and truthful editorial which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on September 2, 1961:

THE PRICE OF PEACE

It sounds like a strange thing to be talking about disarmament when the Soviet announces new nuclear tests and war itself is mentioned on the lips of more than a few people. But the subject cannot be very far from our minds and the longing of our hearts even though the moment may appear to be an unfavorable one. It is today during which we plan for tomorrow.

The Congress at the present time has had several bills introduced, notably one sponsored by the administration, which would set up a permanent Government disarmament agency for world peace and security. Although the matter has come up a few times before, it has never been able to gather enough interest to become law. Perhaps the very urgency of these days can help us to understand its present necessity and its future possibility.

If there is any hope that we will see in our lifetimes even a kind of international quiet which we can call peace, it will have to come by way of disarmament and positive peace policy. The United States has been serious, certainly, in its aims for world peace; we are not an aggressor nation and our people do not accept readily the ways of war. We are not however a supine people who shy from war when the alternative is servitude; we can fight and we can win, as history demonstrates. All the same, our preference is peace.

With this commitment made we must be prepared to work as positively and as powerfully for peace, as we have in the past, when the times required it, worked at war. We do not have, however, any real machinery for peace, anyone researching the possibilities and probabilities of peace, anyone seeking out the ways of winning peace, anyone organizing the friends of peace, and so on. What a new agency in Government would do for us would be to find realistic ways to bring about a reduction in armaments, to find formulas which would protect the national interest and at the same time promote the cause of peace.

Some people are bound to say that the establishment of a disarmament agency means that we are selling out to the opposition, that we are adopting some modified pacifism as a national policy. Nothing could be farther from the truth. What we will demonstrate to the world, however, is that the United States, first among all the nations, has set up in its official Government pattern a serious effort at a policy of peace. An effective disarmament agency will not mean that we are willing to settle for peace at any price; but it will show that we are not afraid to pay the price of peace.

Farmer-Grocer Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an interesting example of cooperation between the men who grow our food and those who sell it recently came to my attention. It was outlined in an article in Advance News, a publication widely circulated in the food field by Family Circle magazine.

The article was written by Mr. William Golub, president of Central Markets, Inc., of Schenectady, N.Y. The grower-distributor program of Central Markets, a 21-store food chain in my State, is a simple but effective plan which has brought economic benefits to farmers and also enabled the retailer to do a better job of serving consumers.

Mr. Golub is a leader in his community and an active member of the National Association of Food Chains, which sponsors nationally a farmer-retailer marketing program. I ask unanimous consent to have this article, which appeared in the September issue of Advance News, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROCER AND FARMER GET TOGETHER

(By William Golub, president, Central Markets, Inc., Schenectady, N.Y.)

Bringing to customers finest quality produce and at the same time helping the local economy by providing a consistent market for homegrown products are the twin objectives of the grower-distributor program of Central Markets, Inc. The result—more efficient, successful growers and greater volume and earnings for the distributor.

This matter of obtaining top quality produce from local farmers has been a problem for multiple store operators. It also has caused dissatisfaction among growers who have not been successful in selling their produce to stores in their own area at a fair price—all too frequently resulting in poor public relations, grist for the political mill, and Government investigations.

There are many advantages to procurement of produce right in the area in which stores are located. By cutting down time and distance from point of production to the retail store, produce that is more truly "garden-fresh" can be offered to the consumer. Furthermore, by buying produce locally, the retailer can help pump money back into the local economy, with both economic and public relations benefits.

Yet, despite these advantages, food retailers have been going further and further afield to obtain a number of fresh produce items that could be grown locally.

The reason for this has been that in so many local producing areas the growers have not offered produce that would measure up to the chain's quality standards and the quantities required to supply a number of stores. Frequently the pack, the containers, lack of controls in harvesting, etc., used by local growers have not been satisfactory for warehouse handling and delivery to the retail outlets. The basic ingredients for mutually satisfactory business dealings are, and always were, there—the only difficulty has been that no one seriously made a persistent effort to correct the shortcomings.

Nevertheless, it concerned me greatly that as our company grew in size, we tended to go to greater and greater distances in order to supply our produce needs.

We gave a great deal of thought as to how we might work with local farmers so they could not only produce the kind of products that our customers wanted, but that would also meet our requirements as to controls, pack, grade, size, and quality. All too often a grower produced a fine quality product but due to lack of controls and other reasons, it did not reach the consumer in that top quality condition.

We talked with men from the State Department of Agriculture and representatives of the extension service at the State College at Cornell and received their assurances of interest and support, along with many helpful ideas and suggestions on how a grower-distributor program could be developed.

About 10 years ago we decided to make a start and selected eggs as the locally produced commodity with which we would start the program. We were not satisfied with the quality of the eggs we were handling at that time. They were often shipped to us from distant points and frequently did not meet our own standards or those of the State egg inspection service. As a result, our egg sales were not what we felt they should be.

With the help of the Department of Agriculture and the extension service we located a poultryman who was interested in working with us. We explained our requirements and he agreed to produce, handle, candle, and carton eggs the way we wanted and deliver them to our retail stores.

Our customers were pleased with the better product we were able to offer them and our egg sales began climbing. Now we have 10 poultrymen supplying eggs according to our specifications for all our 21 retail stores. We pay a premium price for these premium quality eggs—high enough to cover the extra costs of production and handling and give the poultrymen a profit.

With the soundness of our idea proved by the success with eggs we gradually expanded the program to vegetables and some fruits. We work closely with our growers keeping them informed as to our requirements and needs. They, in turn, cooperate closely with us, always striving to improve their controls, quality, grade and pack.

We believe we have been of real help to local growers in adapting themselves to the merchandising procedures of the modern supermarket. We believe we have aided in making them successful, purposeful businessmen.

We demand high quality and we pay for it. We don't try to put the squeeze on our local growers for lower prices in case of a temporary surplus, but instead try to help them move out the extra supply at a fair price.

This has not only been a good deal for the growers, but it's also a good deal for us and for our customers. Because our produce is now fresher, we have less spoilage in the stores. The produce stays fresh longer on the stands because proper controls have been exercised and it has spent less time in transit. The quality and freshness we can offer have increased our produce sales volume.

I'm a firm believer in the free enterprise system. To me, it seems that in order to maintain this system and enjoy its benefits, everyone must share in the responsibility for providing a healthy business climate in the area in which he does business. We profit directly by making it possible for the grower to get a better price for his product, because he in turn gives us consistently top quality which, because of greater customer satisfaction and lesser shrinkage, results in greater volume and earnings for us.

We benefit indirectly from the additional money put into circulation. Also there is a great deal of satisfaction to all of us at Central Markets in feeling that we are trying to be a friend to our farmer neighbors. We are indebted to them for their cooperation and for the good will they have expressed toward us.

Many agricultural organization officials and publications have commended us for pioneering a practical, simple, down-to-earth program that could go a long way toward building lasting and friendly relationships between the food chain industry and the agricultural community and lessening the clamor for Government interference.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria, Pa., Celebrates Its 51st Anniversary by Completing a Fine Recreational Project of Great Value to the Children of the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, nestling in the mountains of central Pennsylvania is the community of Beccaria, situated in Clearfield County and having a population of less than 600. Despite the size of the community, it has set an example of civic cooperation through the activities of the Slovak Educational Society which has rendered outstanding service during the 51 years of its existence.

In addition to the many programs launched by the Slovak Educational Society the most recent one has attracted widespread attention since it concerns the recreational needs for over 200 of the community's children. The great success of the various programs is indicative of what can be accomplished by an organization of 235 members who have the determination to make their community a better place in which to live.

The following interesting article titled, "Fine Playground Is Latest Project of Beccaria Lodge" was written by Jane F. Smith, staff writer for the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress and appeared in the August 30, 1961, edition. The article pays a deserving tribute to the officers and members of the Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria and is a fitting salute to that organization in celebrating its 51st anniversary:

FINE PLAYGROUND IS LATEST PROJECT OF BECCARIA LODGE

(By Jane F. Smith)

BECCARIA.—Celebrating its 51st anniversary this year, the Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria points with pride to its latest community project—a modern supervised playground for youngsters of the area.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria was organized in 1910, for the "purpose of educating and promoting noncitizens to be-

come good citizens of these United States of America." During the past 20 years, in addition to meeting those objectives, it has educated and promoted good fellowship and citizenship of the entire membership, which is presently 235 strong.

Among its milestones are its playground and building programs and its active participation in various community fund drives on the National, State, and local levels.

Recognizing the recreational needs for 200 youngsters of the Beccaria vicinity's population of 550, this organization went in action in 1958 to establish a playground across the street from its clubhouse in Beccaria.

After 3 years of landscaping and development, the supervised playground today is as modern as in any large town. The equipment includes a combination unit with sliding board, seesaws, and swings. It can boast a merry-go-round with enclosure safety platform; an American safety giant stride unit with six giant stride ladders and an American nursery three-swing set for the tiny tots.

Future plans call for the purchase of additional land adjoining the present playground and for a ball diamond for adult and little league baseball. Interest is keen in this sport, already evidenced by the young boys' softball team comprised of Michael Dobish, Thomas Piestrack, Michael Yelko, Daniel Dobish, James Washell, David Dobish, Norman Dobish, John Bungo, Alan Fundack, Donald Kitko, Arthur Yelko, Dennis McCoy, and M. Joseph Gero.

Tennis courts and a swimming pool are also on the agenda in the playground planning program.

Now many of the Beccaria swimmers are making use of the Smithhill swimming pool. This the society assisted with physical and financial support during its construction several years ago, along with its various fund campaigns.

Officials of the Beccaria Slovak Educational Society lauded the boys and girls of Beccaria for their respect for the playground equipment and their expressions of gratitude to the organization for the benefits derived from the community activities provided by this adult group. Because of the youths' appreciative attitude, the society has taken initial steps to sponsor Boy and Girl Scout units at Beccaria.

A spokesman stated, "These youngsters are our citizens of tomorrow. We aim to provide the very best opportunities for our boys and girls today, so that in the future they, as adult community leaders, will be even more prepared to continue the community betterment program that is presently evident in Beccaria. We feel that boy and girl scouting will assist the youth to become good citizens, along with the other opportunities they have in their school, church, and community activities."

Located in the heart of Beccaria, the one-story frame brick-shingled clubhouse of the Beccaria Slovak Educational Society was built by members in 1940. Attractive both inside and out, the building was constructed under a very unique financial plan of action.

Usable material from a building purchased for $250 from the Berwin White Coal Co. at 29 Shaft, near Beccaria, was used for the clubhouse construction. This building program was under the guidance of John Mondy, who was head boss, carpenter, stonemason, and plumber, as related to the writer by an official of the society.

Every member who contributed time toward the construction was paid 25 cents an hour. The amount of time worked was accurately recorded by a timekeeper.

Under completion of the building in about 3 or 4 years, the organization received its club license. This meant the society was in business. It also meant that with an income the organization could meet its obligations by paying off the promissory notes at 6 percent interest to the members who loaned money for construction expenditures; also it meant that all members who put in long hours on the building construction would now receive wages at the rate of 25 cents for every hour they worked.

The members can be well proud of their clubhouse with its 50- by 40-foot social room; a 42- by 20-foot grill room, and its 10- by 20-foot kitchen. It also has a large basement and storage space. Steam heated and air conditioned, the clubhouse is modern in every detail. The rooms are fully equipped for banquets and other social events.

Interested in all community betterment projects, the society annually supports the numerous fund drives, starting in January with the "March of Dimes" and on down the line of monthly fund campaigns.

It is an ardent supporter of the B–C–I Joint High School band and its B–C–I Band Boosters Association. It annually plays host at a luncheon at the clubhouse to the band on Memorial Day.

It was the first contributor of funds toward the erection of a new church for the Beccaria Christian and Missionary Alliance, which lost its building by fire several years ago.

It has also given its financial support to the recently innovated B–C–I Quarterback Club in its sponsorship of football at B–C–I.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria is taking steps for a big celebration in commemoration of its 51st anniversary, which calls for a September open house at its clubhouse. Four charter members will be honored guests. They are John Scollins, Andrew Popyack, Sr., John Kollar, and John Kovalsky.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria is presently under the leadership of an executive board composed of Andrew E. Popyack, president; John Bungo, vice president; Joseph T. Washel, secretary; John Temchack, treasurer; John Bartek, financial secretary; John Piestrack, Joseph Gero, and Michael Dobish, all trustees.

It's Finally Up to the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of the importance of man in our modern defense concept. The Congress has expressed its unwillingness to rely on missiles and push-button warfare alone. I believe the following editorial from the Junction City (Kans.) Daily Union is most pertinent and will be of interest to Members of the House:

IT'S FINALLY UP TO THE MAN

It would be difficult to find a more forthright and outspoken individual than Gen. Curtis LeMay. Also it goes without saying it would be almost impossible to find a more hard-bitten advocate of manned aircraft than the former head of the Strategic Air Command.

With these thoughts in mind, it is interesting to read his remarks before the national convention of Jewish War Veterans in Baltimore. "Missiles will never replace man," General LeMay said, "You can use a missile only in war. Before you push the button you are at peace. The moment you push it you are at war. With a manned system you can do many things. You can launch a manned weapon if you suspect an enemy attack is imminent, then recall it if the alert proves false. Manned aircraft and missiles complement each other, one does not replace the other."

And we feel that had General LeMay been pressed, he would have admitted that after all is said and done the ultimate weapon is the foot soldier, just as it was at the Marne, Belleau Wood, Guadalcanal, Okinawa, Omaha Beach, the Hurtgen Forest and the Rhine River.

Soviet Nuclear Policies Threaten Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union represents a serious threat to peace and a new danger to our security and a hazard for human life.

Reflecting "about-face" changes in Soviet policy, I would like to quote remarks from Mr. Khrushchev's earlier statements regarding nuclear testing:

First. Speech at the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960:

We shall do everything in our power to make general and complete disarmament a reality, to rid humanity of the arms race and the threat of a new war of annihilation.

Second. February 15, 1958:

The Soviet Government stands firmly for the complete and unconditional cessation of atomic and nuclear-weapons tests. Three years ago the Soviet Union was the first of the great powers to propose an agreement to end these tests and in that way take the first step toward the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination from national armament.

Third. On January 14, 1960, he said:

Should any side violate the obligations [to refrain from testing] to which it has committed itself, the instigators of such violations will cover themselves with shame, and they will be condemned by the peoples of the world.

With characteristic "doubletalk", the Soviet Union is now attempting to justify its change in nuclear policy and to blame the United States for its action.

On Sunday, September 3, I was privileged to discuss major aspects of this new situation in a broadcast over Radio Station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES WESTERN ANTIDOTE TO NUCLEAR TESTS BY COMMUNISTS

This week Soviet Premier Khrushchev, once again, undercut the world's hopes for progress toward peace. How? By declaring that the Soviet Union will resume testing of nuclear bombs. In my judgment, the resumption of such tests could be a dangerous step toward man's destruction.

Provocatively it represents—

A threat to the security of the United States—which has suspended nuclear testing since 1958;

A heightening of world tensions;

A serious hazard—that could have not only immediate, but long-range effects—to the health of the nearly 3 billion people of earth, by further saturation of the air we breath with radioactive fallout.

The resumption of testing, too, will result in higher costs of armaments for both East and West.

Moreover, it may hasten the day when Red China—a grave threat to peace in the Far East—will possess nuclear bombs to support its aggressive policies.

By experience, we know that such major changes in strategy do not happen accidentally in Red policy.

Around the globe, then, the question is being asked: Why should Khrushchev choose this time to resume testing of nuclear bombs? The range of answers includes the following:

1. He wants an opportunity to test and show off the 100-megaton superbomb—about which he has been bragging.

2. Unsatisfied with present tactics, attempts at nuclear blackmail, again will become a major aspect of Communist policy. Specifically, this includes, as we have witnessed, threats of annihilation against countries cooperating with the West for common defense—particularly those in NATO.

3. A further heightening of world tensions—including raising the specter of nuclear war—may be necessary to keep the dominated people mobilized against the West.

Following the ominous, provocation declaration, Mr. Khrushchev is now busy trying to justify the decision. Around the globe, the Red-propaganda machine is cranking out lame excuses—including in engaging in double talk aimed at blaming the United States for the Red decision to resume testing.

In the face of such false charges, however, the United States must be alert to speak up in self-defense.

The peaceshaking provocation, too, is making its own dramatic impact upon world thinking. Reactions of nations have been crystallized in such terms as: "dangerous action;" "bad news;" "setbacks to progress toward reduction of armaments;" "a fateful decision that seriously threatens world peace."

In the face of this new aggressive tactic by the Soviet Union, then what can be done?

First, and foremost, I believe that—

1. The nations attending the Conference in Belgrade should demonstrate their mettle by speaking out against resumption of nuclear testing:

2. The U.N., opening September 19, should take vigorous action to discourage further nuclear tests, as well as to establish a system of arms reduction and control—including test bans.

Overall, the prevention of nuclear war is a matter of great concern, not just to the opposing East-West nations, but to all the countries of the world.

Despite the magnitude of the dangers, let me stress this: This is no time for hysteria, paralysis by fear, or adopting of an attitude of peace at any price by nations. Rather, we—confident in the rightness of our cause—must fearlessly take steps to meet the challenges, including the following:

A solemn evaluation of the danger;

Further strengthening Western deterrent power—including taking the necessary steps to protect ourselves with a nuclear antidote;

Exertion of a greater effort for halting the arms race; and

A mobilization of world opinion against Red tactics, which threaten to endanger the lives of all people—either by war, or by oversaturating the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

Letter From a Private, First Class, in Germany to His Family Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter which was handed to me by Gen. Bruce Clarke, who commands our troops in Europe. It is a letter of a private, first class, in the U.S Army written to his family back home. This is a down-to-earth but thrilling account of the reaction of an American boy to the reception given to his unit on their way through East Germany and after their arrival in West Berlin. This letter should tell all of us a great deal that we need to know:

——— COMPANY,
1ST BATTLE GROUP, 18TH INFANTRY,
APO 28, New York, N.Y.

DEAR FOLKS: I suppose that by now you have read about the sharp strike outfit of the 1st Battle Group, 18th Infantry moving into Berlin. I think I can truthfully say that this is the most exciting thing I have ever participated in in all my life. Man, we were ready to fight our way across the Helmstedt Gate. They woke us up at midnight of the 19th on an alert. Six hours later we had everything loaded on the trucks and we were on the road. Half of the men didn't get breakfast, but I managed to get six eggs. Good thing I did, too, for we kept on driving right through lunch. That night at the border we got nothing but soup and coffee. We pitched our tents at midnight and broke them at 0015 and loaded everything back up. Sitting up in the 2½'s was not much fun while waiting for the daylight to come, but thinking about the ammo that was being passed out to the line companies in case we had to shoot our way into Berlin kept us awake. Well, we left at about 0500 and ate cold C rations (by then they tasted pretty good) on the road. The next time we stopped was when we pulled into this kaserne in Berlin. I am telling you that I have never in history seen anything like the way the people of this city greeted us as we drove in. They lined up by the thousands from the gate all the way to this kaserne. And we drove up and down all the main streets of this monstrous city as a show of strength and a demonstration that the Americans are going to defend these people all the way. I broke out my camera and took 34 pictures of the entire episode in this city. We had what just about amounted to a guided tour. The people were so happy to see us that some of them were literally crying. Placards, banners, posters, everything greeted us as though we had just returned from a victorious war. I felt just like General Eisenhower on his victory parade in New York City after World War II. About a third of the way down the parade we passed Colonel Johns (our CO) standing on a platform next to LYNDON JOHNSON watching the men pass by. You better believe I took pictures of that. When Mr. JOHNSON saw me pass by standing up taking a picture of them he looked at me and waved. Big thrill, but not as much as the one from the realization that I am really in the thick of it all defending my country and freedom and democracy the world over in the world's hottest spot. The whole trip yesterday was an experience to top everything else I have ever done. Driving right through the Communist troops—and they had units on both sides of us and men stationed along the road every few hundred meters—was really something. What a change of air there was as soon as we got into East Germany. The people were very glad to see us going through to Berlin, and every time we passed a group they would wave if there were no Communist soldiers watching. I could go on and on about all this, but I am sure that this is a familiar story to you all, particularly Dad.

———

Mobilization for Religious and Welfare Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in view of the deepening crisis over Berlin, it is imperative for the entire Nation to plan and consider what action must be taken to meet this crisis.

The National Jewish Welfare Board is already moving to meet additional demands of Jewish religious and welfare services for military personnel and their dependents, as a result of the emergency buildup in Armed Forces strength. I am glad to observe the immediate and patriotic response of this association to meet the new personal as well as military demands for our people and to make firm and lasting the ties between the individual, his home, and his religion.

I ask unanimous consent to include a press release from the National Jewish Welfare Board in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD REPORTS TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON REMOBILIZATION FOR RELIGIOUS AND WELFARE SERVICES TO JEWISH GI'S SUNDAY, AUGUST 6, 1961

NEW YORK.—The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) today reported to President John F. Kennedy that it is remobilizing all its resources and manpower to meet additional demands for religious and welfare services to Jewish military personnel and their dependents resulting from the emergency buildup of Armed Forces strength requested by the President and approved by Congress.

In a letter to President Kennedy, Solomon Litt, New York, president of JWB, declared that "on behalf of American Jewry, which the National Jewish Welfare Board has represented since World War I in serving their religious, welfare, and morale needs of Jewish military personnel and their dependents, it is my privilege to report to you that we are remobilizing all our resources and manpower to meet whatever needs may arise in the light of your call for a buildup of military strength."

JWB is the Government-authorized agency for meeting the religious and morale needs of Jewish military personnel and of Jewish patients in Veterans Administration hospitals, and represents the Jewish community in the United Service Organizations (USO). JWB is also the national association of Jewish Community Centers and YM–YWHA's.

In his letter to President Kennedy, Mr. Litt cited four steps JWB has already taken:

"Our Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy and its associated rabbinical bodies are mov-

ing swiftly to assure that there is adequate chaplaincy coverage at every military installation at home and abroad.

"Our armed services division is alerting its 260 local committees and their thousands of volunteers to be ready to provide whatever additional morale and welfare services may be needed.

"We are reviewing our logistical support of religious supplies, literature and services over and above that provided by the Government with a view to meeting all the religious and morale needs of men in the Armed Forces.

"We are also calling upon our more than 300 affiliated Jewish Community Centers and YM—YWHA's to be ready to lend their know-how and facilities for any expanded morale and recreational services to the military that become necessary."

Mr. Litt wrote the President that his address of July 25, "alerting all Americans to the critical world situation that requires a major enlargement of our military forces, has placed upon all of us the responsibility to do whatever may be in our power, individually and collectively, to answer your call. May God give our country the vision and courage to continue, under your leadership, unhindered and unafraid to pursue the path of decency and righteousness which we have always trod and which you have recharted for us."

We Must Act in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a page 1, Los Angeles Times editorial August 10, 1961, calls for some strong action by the United States in Cuba.

The basic theme is still timely. How are we to show firmness in Berlin if we allow this Communist sore to fester only 90 miles from Florida? I submit the editorial for the attention of all Americans.

WE MUST ACT IN CUBA

Communist Cuba is a modern Caribbean pirate nest. Its rulers encourage by example all the Communist conspirators, criminals and crackpots of the islands and the adjacent continent. They have shown they can threaten American lives and property, and injure the prestige of the U.S. Government at a critical time in international affairs.

So the United States has got to destroy this pirate nest.

The fact that the Cuban Government released the last hijacked American plane and its crew and passengers does not alter the necessity of action by the U.S. Government. As long as Castro operates as an outlaw he will inspire outlawry throughout the hemisphere.

The case against the Castro government is plain. What is less apparent is that unless the Unites States acts at once against Castro, and acts boldly this country will be isolated from most of Latin America in short order—sooner than Moscow's time schedule calls for the event.

We have made war for less injury than Castro has done us and for less threat to our legitimate interests in this hemisphere.

The United States can't wait hopefully for an internal revolution in Cuba. Massive Soviet aid to Castro has made that impossible without external help.

The United States ought to move now and move with all necessary military strength.

Study of Nation's Transport Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our Nation's transportation system is in vital need of a major revamping. This is most important not only from the standpoint of national defense, but for economic strength and stability as well as continuation of our free enterprise system. For these reasons and others, I recommend that my colleagues read the following story from the August 15 issue of the Daily Bond Buyer reporting on President Kennedy's assignment to Secretary of Commerce Hodges to study all phases of transportation and make recommendations to him by December of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE SECRETARY HODGES READY TO TACKLE STUDY OF NATION'S TRANSPORT PROBLEMS

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—There was a wistful quality in Luther Hodges' voice as he spoke to reporters last week about the Nation's transportation problems. "It's probably the toughest assignment I'll be asked to take, so long as I'm in this job," the Commerce Secretary said. "And, by the way, if any of you have any suggestions on how we can lick this thing, I'll certainly welcome them."

Suggestions are one thing Secretary Hodges doesn't need. For the past 20 years, at least; his Department has been surfeited with suggestions, as he and his new aid, Dr. Gayton E. Germane, will soon discover, when they take up the monolithic task President Kennedy has handed them: To analyze the Nation's transportation system; evaluate it in terms of our needs for the next decade; summarize the entire problem in one concise memorandum; add a draft omnibus bill that will satisfy the railroads, airlines, truckers, coastal ship operators, barge owners, shippers, freight handlers, users and passengers, unions and management, State and local governments, and the public—and deliver the completed package to the President's desk by December 1.

Huge as this task may be, Mr. Hodges and his staff aren't getting started a moment too soon. Indeed, drastic action next year may be too late to prevent the nationalization of railroads within the next 10 or 15 years, a substantial reduction in the number of airlines and the tight regulation of what would become an essentially noncompetitive system.

CRITICS PICTURE

Critics of this and previous administrations who are genuinely fearful nothing short of a miracle can bring some kind of order out of the present day chaos, insist that consistent procrastination—interrupted only by suggestions and studies—has produced this picture:

Railroads today are earning 1.45 percent on their investment. Carloadings are 13 percent under a year ago. Expenditures for new equipment and rolling stock is off by a third.

Airlines lost almost $20 million in the first 5 months of 1961, and made only $2 million last year, despite total revenues of nearly $2 billion. Because of the high costs of jets, ferocious competition for business on the lucrative routes and flights that have been running 40 percent empty, airlines will be most fortunate if their total losses this year aren't double their slight combined profit last year.

Intercity buses are carrying only 18 or 19 passengers on an average trip, the same number as they carried 10 years ago, while the capacity of the larger buses now in service is 39 passengers, as opposed to 35 in the 1950's.

Trucks and barges that do not now come under effective Federal regulation haul one-third of the intercity freight, compared with 21 percent in 1946. Nonregulated carriers are expected to carry 61 percent of the business 10 years from now.

These are but a few of the hallmarks of universal gloom. There are more. A Senate staff study estimated earlier this year that at least $50 billion will be needed in the next decade to keep the transportation industry abreast of the expected needs. Yet, said the report, prepared by Retired Gen. John P. Doyle for the Senate Commerce Committee, the industry can be expected to generate only 10 to 20 percent—or $5 to $10 billion—of the $50 billion needed for investment purposes.

Massive Government aid which means stepped-up subsidies, nationalization or carefully regulated competition—or very possibly all three—and not merely tax relief or relaxed ratemaking rules will be needed. Much of this helps to explain the administration's reluctance to plunge into the transportation crisis until now, and its preference to put off decisions in the name of additional study. It also explains what Mr. Hodges and his experts will have to hump, if they expect to salvage anything even distantly akin to what has often been euphemistically referred to as "a free competitive transportation system."

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Doubtless, the Government itself, and its hodgepodge mess of regulatory bodies, must share prominently in the blame. James M. Landis, the President's adviser on regulatory agencies as well as on transportation problems, has opposed sugestions that a Department of Transportation be established to coordinate Federal transportation policies and regulations. Rather, Mr. Landis argued for a White House coordinator to see that agencies concerned with some aspect of the problem were not working at cross purposes.

The recent Senate study, a massive 732-page affair, however, as well as President Eisenhower's administration, were solidly behind the idea of a Transportation Department. The President's recent decision to give the job back to Secretary Hodges, for the time being, at least, impliedly tendered Mr. Landis his comeuppance, and it augurs well for the creation of an independent department, since Mr. Hodges is known to lean in that direction.

Except for the functions of the Federal Aviation Agency, most transportation administration functions are centered in the Commerce Department. Regulatory activities are parceled out to such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Maritime Administration.

The FAA's Najeeb Halaby, by far the administration's most able appointee in the transportation field, frankly admits that he is concerned solely with promoting aviation, even though such activities may be to the detriment of the railroads or buses on short-haul routes that could be just as well, or better, served by surface transportation.

The ICC, where the chairmanship still rotates and cannot be controlled by the administration, is intolerant of any intervention into affairs it considers its own domain. Thus when Mr. Lanids and Myer Feldman, another White House aide, worked long hours and days trying to shore up the New Haven Railroad, which recently went into receivership, the ICC chose to ignore their efforts. Similarly, the proposal to combine the Baltimore & Ohio and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads was kicked around from expert to expert until it arrived finally at the ICC, where, if past performances are any criteria, it will remain for months, if not years.

After years of trying to elevate the Maritime Administration to a stature loftier than that of a mere counter of vessels, President Kennedy ordered into force last Sunday a reorganization plan that the Senate had reluctantly approved, because "anything would be better than what we have now." Primary changes in the reorganization plan will serve to expand its regulatory powers to a degree not yet determined and to give the Maritime Administration direct jurisdiction over shipbuilding subsidy programs.

All of these internecine quarrels and jealousies do little except complicate still further Mr. Hodges' problems. He may not be surprised, but he should be shocked, when he learns that the FAA and the CAB do not talk to each other, literally. (A bond buyer reporter covering a story in the FAA, was given the information he sought only on his solemn pledge not to tell anyone in the CAB where he got the information or what he was writing.) The ICC refuses to recognize the existence of the Maritime Administration, as was demonstrated not long ago when the ICC refused to let Maritime read its preliminary reports in a piggyback case involving the rails and ships.

TRAGIC NONPERFORMANCE

Ludicrous as some of the instances may be, the overall pattern is one of tragic nonperformance. A classic example of the lack of cooperation in an area crying for correction is the expansion of air traffic and the decline of railroads over such short routes as Washington to New York or New York to Boston. Here are routes where railroads or even bus transportation could be as convenient as air travel from the crowded skies over Washington and Boston to the even more congested New York approach patterns.

Still another smirch on the escutcheon of transportation is the disappointing record of the $41 billion highway program which has moved slowly despite its political popularity and the persuasive lobbying activities of the automotive and trucking interests. Shortly after the President freed an additional $650 million to help speed the program the Bureau of Public Roads proudly released its quarterly report on progress. It states that 10,800 miles of the 41,000 national system are now open to traffic. But it makes no mention of the fact that the program scheduled to be completed in 1972 won't be finished until after 1975. Nor is any mention made of the untold interstate squabbles, or the 10 or more still unsettled cases of graft and fraud, that have combined to slow down work on a major system, large portions of which will be obsolete, when the total project is presumed to be finished.

ALLIGATOR TEARS FOR HODGES

Transportation experts readily acknowledge the enormity of these billion dollar problems, and their sympathy for Mr. Hodges and his aids is profound. Yet many of these same experts, in and out of the Government, are themselves much to blame for they cannot divorce themselves from the vested interests they hold. Unions and many sectors of management are equally guilty, and many, in fact, want no tampering with the transportation system whatever. They prefer things as they are.

Consequently, when Mr. Hodges contemplates facets of his toughest assignment, and gropes for suggestions on how to do the job, there can be, in the end, only one suggestion. Do it.

Sure, Talk Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in yesterday's New York Daily News presented a thoughtful analysis of the problems of colonialism, past and present. I agree with the analysis and recommendations there stated and I am glad to be able to place the editorial in the record. I hope it will be widely read and supported:

SURE, TALK COLONIALISM

Rather than shoot a conventional Labor Day editorial today, we'll wish our friends in organized labor prosperity and discretion, and proceed to discuss Soviet Russia's request that colonialism be put on the agenda of the upcoming 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

This request by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko is of importance to U.S. organized labor, as is any Soviet maneuver—because if communism ever takes over the world there will be no more labor unions as we know them.

What Gromyko wants discussed is colonialism as long practiced and now being largely abandoned by Britain and France.

What U.S. U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson should insist on also discussing is colonialism as currently practiced by Soviet Russia and Red China.

Russia has long held—in cruel bondage a huge fistful of once independent nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine.

Red China up to now holds only North Korea and Tibet in slavery, but hopes to expand its colonial empire.

TYRANNICAL RED EMPIRE

Both Russia and Red China are far more cruel to their colonies than the British, French, Germans, Dutch, and Portuguese ever were.

By all means let's insist that Soviet colonialism go on the General Assembly agenda for an exhaustive discussion.

Continued and vigorous agitation of the captive nations' question is one of the best propaganda weapons we have against the Red slave empire—as a means of keeping its rulers off balance and, conceivably, of some day causing that empire to explode from within.

There is a grave question though, in many people's minds as to whether the Kennedy administration intends to use the captive nations weapon in the cold war, or even to keep it.

In his July 25 speech on the Berlin crisis, the President said, among other things:

"We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet these concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area."

To a lot of us, that sounds like a cautiously worded offer to Khrushchev to forget all about our concern for the liberation of the captive nations, in return for a promise by him to let West Berlin continue free, capitalistic, and unhampered as to its routes of communication with West Germany.

Khrushchev would be happy to make such a promise at such a price.

But he would break the promise the moment he felt he could get away with doing so; and the price itself is too great for us to pay.

By paying it, we would officially admit Khrushchev's right to keep the captive nations in chains forever, give those peoples over to despair for themselves and hatred of us, and junk one of the best cold-war weapons now in the Western arsenal.

TALK TO KENNEDY IN HIS LANGUAGE

How to blast out of the President's mind any thoughts he may be having along these lines?

We'd suggest that the Assembly of Captive European Nations and all other Iron and Bamboo Curtain refugee groups in this country get busy, and get busy now.

Their objective should be, it seems to us, to convince President Kennedy that, if he sells the captive nations or any part of them down the river, he and his party can count on losing large blocks of Polish, Hungarian, German, etc., etc., votes permanently to the Republicans.

The Republicans can contribute their bit by stepping up their own longstanding insistence that the captive nations never be written off by the American people.

Just as Khrushchev best understands brute strength, so Kennedy best understands the language of practical race group politics. The abovementioned groups had better start putting the pressure on him before it is too late.

Role of Labor in 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday our Nation observed Labor Day. The observance not only offered an opportunity to pay tribute to the indispensable role of labor to our security and progress, but also to reasses the role of labor in the ever-greater challenges of the future.

Privileged to review these and other aspects of the labor picture in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SEES LABOR AS VOICE OF FREEDOM

Labor Day, September 4, offers an opportunity to:

Pay tribute to the 73.6 million men and women in our labor force—including more than 1.6 million in Wisconsin; and

Create a greater understanding, and respect for, the unique, indispensable contribution of our workers to the Nation's progress.

Today, the Nation is experiencing a high rate of employment—estimated at more than 68 million. Regrettably, however, there are still far too many unemployed—more than 5 million, or about 7 percent of the labor force. This includes approximately 70,000 in Wisconsin.

In Labor Day observations, then, we—in addition to paying recognition to the role of labor in our economy—must also face the challenges of—

Finding new jobs for the unemployed;

Creating more effective machinery to minimize the up-and-down economic cycles—particularly the down—that too often result in our rate of unemployment;

Promote peace in the labor field; and

Generally find ways to further improve the economic status of the workers—although now at the highest level in the history of the world.

Within our free system, workers in the vineyard of our national life—and that includes all of us, one way or another—enjoy all too often taken for granted opportunities and privileges, as well as responsibility. These include—

The right of selecting one's own vocation—not having it dictated by the State;

The right to bargain for a just share of the fruits of labor;

The opportunity to advance—according to one's ability and the worth of his contribution to progress;

The choice even of changing jobs—in the midstream of life—if this best serves our personal needs;

The opportunity—occurring to an ever larger degree—of having a voice in both management and national economic policies.

ROLE OF UNIONS

Historically the voice of working men and women has not always been proportionate to their contributions to progress. Advancement by the trade union movement, however, has changed this picture.

Throughout the United States union membership has increased from 3 million in 1953 to more than 17 million. As a result, today the worker through his union represents a great and growing force in American life.

Traditionally, workers and their unions have, for example, concentrated their efforts toward attaining a fair share of the rewards of production efforts, including better wages, greater job security, improved working conditions, retirement, and other benefits.

With a powerful collective voice, the worker is now also "speaking up" and helping to design policies for economic progress, as well as national security. With such power, of course, goes, hand-in-hand, a greater responsibility, not only for serving the labor force, but the welfare of the country.

Naturally, labor has its special interests—as does management, the consumer, and others. The challenge, however, is to attain—and exercise—the maturity and perspective which will allow each interest to pursue its special purposes. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the impact which such actions—particularly if powerful and far-reaching—can have upon the overall interests of the Nation and its people.

Fortunately, the labor movement in America, with some exceptions, has benefited from sound, responsible leadership. Particularly in Wisconsin, we have reaped the rewards of good, levelheaded, hard-working forward-looking leaders.

In the world of tomorrow, our Nation will demand, and require, an even greater sense of public responsibility from the leaders and rank-and-file members of labor, management, and all walks of life. The purpose: To assure our Nation the capability to meet the challenges of its security and fulfill the needs of its people.

Without this creative, farsighted, dedicated sense of civic and national responsibility, we may not survive. With it, we, as a Nation, shall—I am confident—win victory over communism and create an ever-better life for our people—and, yes, mankind around the globe.

RESPONSIBILITY GOES HAND IN HAND WITH POWER

Within our free system, we must then carefully and vigilantly protect, preserve and perpetuate the rights of workers to speak—to organize—to bargain.

In such bargaining—a process fundamental to labor-management cooperation and economic progress in our system—however, there is also a larger responsibility for—

Consideration of the effect of wage-price boosts on consumer buying and living costs;

Evaluation of the effect of higher production costs on ability of U.S. products to compete on the domestic and world markets;

Keeping abreast of the impact of technology and automation on production and employment, and devising ways to cope with such problems;

Assuring that labor benefits result from proportionately greater productivity;

And other broad scope considerations—which, if neglected, may, in the long run, adversely affect our future.

In our closely integrated economy, no great segment—labor, industry, professional groups, or others—can adopt a wholly self-serving attitude—ignoring the public interest.

We recall, of course, regrettable circumstances in which it has been necessary to take disciplinary action for a minority. However, this should not, and must not reflect unfairly on the vast majority of able, competent leaders and members of any labor force. Rather, the aim must be to provide a climate in which abuses can be curbed; but, at the same time, the rights and legitimate aims of workers and unions can be fully protected.

Today, we are engaged in a great global battle. The struggle will determine whether freedom or communism rules the world.

Around the globe there is a strong, common bond among workers of all nations. As powerful forces, unions have ever-greater opportunity and responsibility to serve as voices of peace, progress, and freedom. As dynamic transmitters of the ideas and ideals of freedom, U.S. labor can demonstrate—

How free trade unionism best serves a working people;

How free collective bargaining can create a workers-share-in-the-rewards kind of economy—not a trickle-down benefit system from either a cartel-like business system or a state-controlled dictatorship;

How under freedom the worker enjoys respect for his rights and integrity, including the maximum degree of freedom allowable within an organized society; and finally,

How participation in Government, of, by, and from the people, has created the best standards of living in the history of the world and promises ever-better living for the future.

If freedom is to survive, we must more effectively mobilize our people and resources. The working men and women of America, I believe, can be a real strategic force in the fight against the Red global conspiracy.

CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Now, what about the future?

Generally, it would appear that the American worker can look forward to real—not just promissory—improvements in his economic life. Among other things, this may well include—

A further refinement, and, as warranted, improvement of wage scales to reflect value and expansion of productivity;

Liberalization of retirement benefits;

Greater job security; and

Ever-better working conditions.

In times of peace, also, our workers could probably look forward to a shorter workweek. In these critical days, however, the Nation may well require greater—not lesser—effort to meet the threats to our security.

Of great significance, also, is the need to encourage maximum exercise of the ingenuity, creativity, and enterprising spirit—by free Americans working in a free climate. Upon this foundation, we, as a people—and our forefathers—have created the greatest nation in the history of the world. Upon this resource, too, we will depend for the new ideas to meet the complex, difficult challenges ahead.

On the responsibility side, the public, I believe, has the right to expect of our workers—particularly in times of crisis—extra dedication, devotion, and willingness to work and sweat to create the tools of progress and security. In the past, this record has been outstanding. I am confident this will be true for the future.

Hanford Project—Statesmen's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the controversial public/private power issue has plagued Congress for decades.

Irrespective of merits on either side, the heated controversy it generates inescapably scortches whatever it contacts.

This has become the case with the Nation's nuclear science program—because of the Hanford project dispute.

It is immaterial whether the public/private power issue logically belongs in the Hanford dispute—either in its original $95 million 800,000 kilowatt form or its current $58 million 400,000 kilowatt conference report form.

It has, in fact, become involved and its adverse affects are apparent to the extent some legislators are talking of a "bare-bone" Atomic Energy authorization bill unless the House agrees to the conference report.

This would mean many research projects necessary to maintain our country's lead in nuclear science would be stripped out at this critical time in world history.

Yet, in the end, accepting the conference report would not bring a better result.

Accepting it would establish atomic energy authorization bills as a legitimate battleground of the public/private power controversy. Next year, the following year and in the years beyond this con-

troversy repeatedly would plague the Nation's nuclear science efforts.

These annual controversies would accumulate delays in our nuclear science program in the aggregate as stifling as those involved in a "bare-bone" bill this year.

There is a way to avoid this dilemma. It is by keeping power projects such as Hanford out of atomic energy bills entirely. Fighting them out on some less critical battleground. This can be done simply, but it will require a high order of statesmanship.

It amounts to adopting and adhering to a policy of placing nuclear-electric facilities, other than experimental, prototype, and demonstration facilities, in the public works authorization bill rather than the atomic energy authorization bill.

Thereby the public/private power issue will not be permitted to impede our nuclear science programs.

Nor, in the public works bill as independent items of appropriation to power administrations such as TVA and BPA, should the controversy unduly impede progress with other, nonrelated public works items.

Two Unforgettable Characters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Blue Anchor published by the California Fruit Exchange.

The article is a deserving tribute to Fred and Mary Motz who now reside in Mathews, Va.

For 41 years "Doc" Motz served ably in several types of public service. Let me emphasis the word "service" for that was Fred's guiding dedication.

Perhaps more than any other, Fred Motz was responsible for the rebirth and revitalization of our Foreign Agricultural Service in 1954. He had been one of the first to join this Service at its inception in the late 1920's. He had seen this Service become "Foreign Agriculture Relations." This did not please Fred Motz for he wanted a vital "service" capable of serving American agriculture day by day.

I am happy that I was one of those Members of Congress to whom he explained just what the Service should be and what it could do. This finally resulted in its reorganization in 1954. The record since has been good.

Both Mrs. Horan and I have experienced the warm and gracious hospitality of Fred and Mary Motz. Both of us are happy that Al Smith and Fred Read have made this article possible:

TWO UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTERS

(By Fred W. Read, general manager, California Fruit Exchange)

(AUTHOR'S COMMENT.—The introduction to this article has been written by J. A. Smith, president of Gwin, White & Prine, Inc., of Seattle, Wash., one of the largest exporters of boxed apples in the United States and intimately acquainted by reason of long years in Europe, with conditions in that part of the world. "Al" Smith, as he is known, has been and continues to be a longtime friend of "Doc" Motz. His comments are particularly timely.)

A PERSONAL NOTE ABOUT "DOC" MOTZ AND MARY

"Fred Read has written a story about a truly successful couple—Fred 'Doc' and Mary Motz. Old friends never think of them separately but, in a fruit publication, the emphasis is appropriately on 'Doc.'

"I met him in London just over 30 years ago, shortly after he had been appointed the U.S. Department of Agriculture's European Fruit Specialist, with headquarters in the American Embassy. His assignment was commercial—to assist U.S. producers to market their fruit in Europe. His efforts were remarkably successful. But, notably, 'Doc' was then, in the 1930's initiating a unique type of personal diplomacy which was to prove as effective as any our Government has ever provided in any area of diplomatic activity known to me. Would that more of our political diplomats had his depth of understanding, resourcefulness, analytical ability, technical know-how, dedication to the jobs at hand and personal magnetism.

" 'Doc,' in Europe over 25 years, was everlastingly an American, abounding with unchanging American characteristics and creating an atmosphere of mutual respect with the Europeans he contacted. In the language of the Foreign Service, he never went native, and Europeans liked him all the more for it.

" 'Doc's' renowned humor is expressed in anecdotes and runs the gamut from Chaucer to Joe Miller, his dialect something that surely must have had its roots in Oregon, was polished a bit in Virginia, but somehow seems to take its sustenance from the Carolina hills. His experience, as broad as his interminable travels, includes the intricacies of the worldwide fruit production and marketing, to preserving the magnificent Austrian strain of horses, the Lipizzaners, while doing food administrative work following Austria's liberation in World War II.

"It all added up to a remarkable diplomatic career during which the U.S. fruit industry had numberless occasions to thank its lucky stars that he was the industry's man, and today, several years after his retirement, no fruitman travels from the United States to visit his European customers without benefitting from the trading foundations 'Doc' built.

"To me, above, all, the secret of success lies in 'Doc's' and Mary's capacity for friendship. There are no detours—it's straight from the heart and it's abundant—as friends from this country and abroad are reminded when they visit the Motz' in their delightful Virginia retirement."

THE STORY OF "DOC" MOTZ

In a way, the word "characters" which appears in this title, does not seem quite appropriate for Fred A. Motz and his lovely wife, Mary, but here we use the word attempting to describe two people who leave an indelible impression on one's memory. Although those who know them best, think of them as inseparable, nevertheless this is laregly a story of "Doc" Motz as he is affectionately known by his scores of acquaintances and friends. Mary, his wife, is also a definite part of this narrative.

"Doc" Motz, in my book, throughout a long lifetime was the finest and most useful public servant ever employed by the Government in foreign fields in the interests of the fresh fruit industry of the United States. This superlative statement is only limited by the extent of my own acquaintance with foreign government representatives. In all of this endeavor his wife has been a charming and gracious hostess, adding immeasurably to his effectiveness in the principal European capitals where he worked from 1929 to his retirement in 1958. His main centers of operation were in London and Paris, but from these points his activities throughout all the nations in Western Europe were farflung and widely acceptable.

Fred "Doc" Motz was born September 12, 1893, in Crookston, Minn. His father was a native of Germany, coming to the United States at the age of 3 and acquiring his citizenship at age 21 in the year 1884 in the city of Philadelphia. His mother, Hanna Rasmussen, was born in Davenport, Iowa. "Doc" married Mary Moore at Norfolk, Va., and they have a daughter, Mary Virginia, married to Capt. A. Rasper, now located at Fort Lewis, Wash.

"Doc's early training, and education highly fitted him for his later work. He was graduated from Oregon State College at Corvallis in 1917, where he received a B.S. degree in horticulture and pomology. He accepted an offer from Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, Va. where he started as an extension horticulturist. During the years from 1917 to 1929 he became professor of horticulture. In that period he also acquired ownership of a 100-acre apple and peach orchard, finally resigning to enter Government service.

From September 1929 to September 1939 he was located in London, England, starting as a marketing specialist and finally as agricultural commissioner. During this 10-year stint he was engaged in planning and conducting research and service work in the field of domestic and foreign markets of agricultural products, with special reference to fruits and vegetables. He studied trade preferences, established and maintained contact with Government officials, prepared material for publication, and generally became of enormous service to producers in this country, interested in exporting fresh fruit to the United Kingdom and the Continent.

When war came in 1939 and exports were discontinued, he was assigned to basic studies of the fruit industries of Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and Mexico. In that work, which continued until 1942, he made original studies and contributed publications which were of enormous value to this country. In 1943, he served as chairman of the combined Food Board and during that year was largely instrumental in organizing the National Horticultural Council, which is still functioning quite effectively.

In 1944, he was asked to accept a position with the Austrian Mission Military Government as food and agricultural advisor to Commanding Gen. Mark W. Clark. He served 3 years as agricultural attaché and chief of the agricultural section of the military government. In 1948, he returned to the prewar fruit marketing activities with headquartires in Paris; in 1954, he was transferred back to London; and, in 1958, he retired.

To no single individual does the fruit industry of this country owe a greater debt of gratitude for stimulating exports than to "Doc" Motz. He, together with Irving J. Woodin, former general manager of the California Fruit Exchange, was responsible for the introduction of the Emperor grape to the United Kingdom and other European

markets, a business which has grown and prospered. He developed an exceedingly wide acquaintance among importers and prospective importers, not only in the United Kingdom and France, but throughout Western Europe. His title might have been "Ambassador Plenipotentiary Extraordinary."

No representative of a fruit company from this, or any other State, who looked up "Doc" Motz was ever let down. The writer, on two separate European trips, in the interests of stimulating exports, was directed by "Doc" Motz with suitable introductions to all the principal members of the trade in England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as to the countries of Western Europe. On many occasions he accompanied me personally. He arranged conferences, opened the doors of government, initiated meetings with our agricultural attachés and State Department officials. He was equally generous with all. His intimate knowledge of fresh fruit, its packaging, and the market requirements of the foreign buyer made him perhaps especially helpful. The detailed information he passed on to fruit shippers in this country through government channels, has made the trade both here and abroad, much more alive to market requirements. This goes especially for grapes, plums, apples, citrus fruits, pears which are among the principal items in the export trade.

Gifted with an uncanny sense of commercial values, many a transaction was initiated in his fertile brain and put into action, resulting in benefit to both buyer and seller. He is loved and respected by the trade, both here and abroad, because of his intimate knowledge of the business, his unfailing courtesy, and his good humor. In his life's work, as stated before, his wife, the former Mary Watson Moore, was an invaluable asset. He met Mary in Blacksburg while at Virginia Polytechnical Institute. They were married in 1922, and "Doc" has always said this was "the best day's work I ever did." Mary has worked as hard for the fruit industry as "Doc." They both love it. It was and is their life.

It would be impossible to mention in the short confines of an article, the myriads of friends he made with the importing trade of the United Kingdom and Western Europe. But an article like this would hardly be complete without mentioning such stalwarts as John Colyer and Willie McCaig of the Fruit & Produce Exchange of Great Britain and other members of this splendid organization; of John and Bill Anderson of W. B. Anderson & Sons, Carlisle, England; of Willie Rankin of Edinburgh, Scotland; of Wilfred Sims of the London Borough Market. Then there is M. and W. Mack Ltd., George Monro, Ltd., T. Walton Ltd., Keeling and White, Ltd., Connolly Shaw Ltd., Louis Reece, J. & J. Lyons Ltd., all of London, and scores of others throughout the United Kingdom. And, of course, there is Henri Cordier of Paris, whose enormous orchard in southern France was actually laid out in part with the help of "Doc's" expert advice. Then comes a host of importers in Germany and the low countries, including Dan Pingel of J. A. Kahl Co., of Hamburg; Scipio & Fischer of the Fruchthof in Bremen; Continental Fruit Co. of Rotterdam; F. V. Hartz of Copenhagen; Joh. Bruce of Stockholm; Bernh. Botolfsen of Oslo. These and many others formed the nucleus of the importing business for which "Doc" Motz was responsible in large measure.

During all the years spent in Europe, he became a connoisseur of objects of art, including paintings, furniture, rugs, bric-a-brac and the like. Now retired, and living on a beautiful estate on tidewater country at Mathews, Va., he and his wife at long last are enjoying the beautiful treasures they collected and stored over a 25-year period. They grace their large inviting home as though they were bought for that specific purpose. In fact, they probably were, for both "Doc" and Mary had planned their retirement carefully, even to the type of home and location to which they looked forward over a long period of years. Virginia tidewater is indeed a historic country. While the oyster bed on its shores has perhaps contributed little to past events, just across the water you can see Yorktown, famous in Colonial history, and within a short ride you are in Williamsburg, the seat of a revolutionary restoration and the home of William and Mary College, ranking with Harvard in antiquity. Their home is a mecca for many loyal friends who continue to visit them from all over the world. "Doc" and Mary Motz are now enjoying life in what, we hope, is continued good health and sheer contentment. They have both earned a high place in the regard of the fruit industry of this country.

"Doc" and Mary Motz, we salute you, and wish you every happiness in the years ahead. As you say, in your favorite expression, "keep in touch."

John O'Donnell, Veteran Newspaper Great, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us will be sorry indeed to hear that the veteran newspaper great, John O'Donnell, has put his typewriter away and retired from the arena.

Mr. O'Donnell wrote the column "Capitol Stuff" in the New York Daily News for many years. In his column he was always forthright and courageous. He could dish it out, but he could also take it, a rare attribute in a journalist, or for that matter in a human being.

The following article by Frank Holeman appeared in the New York Daily News of September 4 and relates briefly the story of John O'Donnell's colorful career:

(By Frank Holeman)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—When a general or an admiral retires, it's customary to hold a big ceremony for him with flags, drums, and a final salute from his troops.

Well, John O'Donnell, who has been chief of the Washington bureau of the News since 1933, and our "commanding officer," officially retired last Friday, September 1.

We couldn't hold a ceremony for him, because O'Donnell is in Georgetown Hospital here, seriously ill. Besides, he wouldn't stand for any sentimental guff from the hired help or anybody else.

But after all this is an important event. It isn't every day a colorful, controversial, world-famous newspaper columnist officially retires after 46 years in our business. (He has been on extended sick leave from the News since last January.)

So, I'd like to mark the occasion in some way. We could talk about the tough, sparkling column, "Capitol Stuff," which he wrote in this space, beginning in 1933. But his vigorous opinions on public issues and personalities are well known to readers of the News.

Instead, I'd like to take this opportunity to tell you some things you may not know about John O'Donnell, as a man, a boss, and a friend. I'd like to tell you how he got in this business in the first place, instead of becoming a professional baseball player, which he nearly did.

O'Donnell was born in Somerville, Mass., a suburb of Boston, July 23, 1896. His father was Dr. Louis P. O'Donnell, a famous surgeon and X-ray specialist. His mother died when John was a boy.

PLAYED A FAST SECOND BASE

He attended parochial school in Somerville and later a district school in Meredith, N.H.

He was fired from his first newspaper job, as a columnist on the Melrose High School Life, for criticizing the local police chief's handling of sports crowds. Young John himself played a fast second base on the high school baseball team.

He went to spring training camp with the Boston Red Sox in Hot Springs, Ark., one year, along with some other schoolboy players and a fellow named Babe Ruth.

After high school graduation in 1915, young O'Donnell got a job as schoolboy sports writer on the Boston Record and filled in as a precocious sports editor. At 17, he was covering Boston police headquarters. Then he decided to go to college, entering Tufts in the fall of 1916.

When World War I came along, he tried to get into the Signal Corps Air Service but his eyes flunked him. So he entered the infantry. He emerged as a lieutenant, although he never got overseas.

MADE PHI BETA KAPPA AT TUFTS

He graduated from Tufts in 1920 with an A.B. degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key. Then he studied Shakespeare for a year at Harvard.

After college, he worked for McCall's magazine and NEA Feature Syndicate in Cleveland. In 1922 he came to New York as a drama critic and feature writer for that syndicate. He soon shifted to the old New York American as a crime reporter. In 1927, he joined the News.

During the prohibition heyday of the gangsters, O'Donnell was assigned to Legs Diamond. Legs, for some reason, wouldn't talk to anybody else. His girl friend, Kiki Roberts, once let O'Donnell turn her in to the law in Albany to face a kidnaping rap.

Readers of Capitol Stuff were accustomed to quotations from Shakespeare, "Alice in Wonderland," and other classics side by side with the brashest, most vivid lingo of the underworld and sports. It was all authentic. O'Donnell's favorite Shakespearean play was Macbeth. His favorite gangster was Legs Diamond. He could quote soliloquies from either, at the drop of a hat.

O'Donnell was sent to Washington in March 1933, to cover the first inauguration of F.D.R. The following Monday, he tried to pay his hotel bill and return to New York. But all banks were closed, under F.D.R.'s bank holiday order, and the office couldn't send him any dough.

BECAME A CORRESPONDENT BY ACCIDENT

While he was waiting, big news began to pop. The late Capt. Joseph M. Patterson, founder of the News, decided to maintain a permanent bureau in Washington. "I became a Washington correspondent because I couldn't pay my hotel bill and get out of town," O'Donnell told me once, with a grin.

In the early New Deal days, O'Donnell and his wife Doris Fleeson (they were later divorced; have a daughter, Doris) were very friendly with the administration. As World War II approached, the friendship cooled, and F.D.R. came to hate O'Donnell with a passion.

I attended the White House press conference in 1942 when F.D.R. awarded the Iron Cross to O'Donnell for his hard-hitting criticism. After the conference ended, I saw F.D.R. turn to the late Earl Godwin, a radio newsman, and hand him the German medal.

"When you see John O'Donnell," said F.D.R., "give him this."

I could hardly believe my ears, because O'Donnell was in the room all the time. He had taken me over to show me how the White House was covered.

People liked his column or they hated it, but everybody read it. He never asked anybody to agree with him. He fought with Presidents, prime ministers and the other big shots of our time. But he never used his lance against little guys.

Some people who disagreed with O'Donnell most violently on public issues became close friends because he was such a civilized companion.

I heard somebody say about another great newspaperman: "You can't buy him, you can't scare him and you can't fool him." That is John O'Donnell, a big league newspaperman.

If you want to drop him a line, his address is Georgetown Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the Princeton Alumni Weekly of February 3, 1961, Prof. Martin Summerfield wrote an article entitled "The Case for Federal Aid," in which he argued that the Federal Government should assume a material share of the responsibility for the general support of colleges and universities. Roger A. Freeman, research director of the institute for studies in federalism at Claremont Men's College in Claremont, Calif., was prevailed upon to reply to Mr. Summerfield's article. Mr. Freeman did, and exerpts of his reply appeared in the summer edition of the University, a Princeton magazine.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy has always accompanied the issue of Federal aid to education and this session of Congress has been no different. Many eloquent arguments have been advanced on both sides and if they have accomplished nothing else, they have served to focus the attention of all Members of Congress, as well as the general public, on the major, vital issues of this proposed bill.

It is no mystery to the Members of this House or to the Members of the other body or to the American people that the Federal Government has overstepped itself many times over in the expenditure of moneys it does not possess. "Why," asks Mr. Freeman, "has it—the Federal Government—been unable to raise enough revenues to meet its expenditures more than 80 percent of the time in over 30 years, with a cumulative deficit that averages $9 billion annually? If, on the other hand, the Federal Government already is trying to bite off more than it can chew, as the record suggests, why give it additional responsibilities? What taxing authority, is it claimed, does the Federal Government have which the States do not also possess?"

Mr. Freeman, in his reply to Professor Summerfield's "The Case for Federal Aid," has done an outstanding service to the opponents of Federal aid in that he very clearly lists and clarifies the many overwhelming reasons why Federal aid to education is impractical, undesirable and unnecessary. It is for this reason that I commend Mr. Freeman's article to all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman is well qualified to discuss the problems of financing education. Roger A. Freeman, research director of the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., directed the research for the Study Committee on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education of the U.S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1953–55, was consultant on school finance to the White House Conference on Education and has served on the White House staff and as assistant to the Governor of the State of Washington. For the past 4 years he has been chairman of the Committee on the Financing of Public Education of the National Tax Association. He just completed a research project on the financing of the public schools whose results were published in two volumes: "I—School Needs in the Decade Ahead," "II—Taxes for the Schools," The Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1958 and 1960.

The article follows:

THE MISSING CASE FOR FEDERAL AID

(By Roger A. Freeman)

In "The Case for Federal Aid" (Princeton Alumni Weekly, Feb. 3, 1961) Prof. Martin Summerfield argued that the Federal Government ought to assume a material share of the responsibility for the general support of colleges and universities. The article is one of many treatises, ranging from the learned to the demagogic, which have been written in an effort to convince the American public that Federal aid to education is desirable and necessary.

The issue has been explored, considered, and debated time and again. Some study groups, such as President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education in 1938, recommended Federal aid to schools and colleges, other groups have taken an equivocal stand, while still others have opposed it. The Commission on Financing Higher Education, sponsored by the Association of American Universities in 1952, left no doubt of its position. In the words of one of the commission members, President Carter Davidson of Union College, Schenectady: "One broad highway to financial security the members of the commission viewed unanimously as the primrose path that leads to the everlasting bonfire. This road was named Federal Government support. * * * There was a feeling that increased Government support from Federal sources was not only a blind alley, but also blinded those who traveled down it."

It has been a puzzlement to many observers why Congress has not enacted a program of general support for schools and colleges in the hundred or so years that the debate over Federal responsibility in education has been going on although it has seen fit meanwhile to authorize a thousandfold increase in the national budget. Foreign visitors, accustomed to a more centralized government, often admit inability to comprehend the reasons behind the American penchant for keeping education local.

Protagonists of Federal aid tend to attribute their lack of success to prejudice against education or suspicion of educators ("eggheads") among politicians. They blame their defeats on reactionaries on Capitol Hill who, they feel, eventually will have to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century.

On the whole, the argument for Federal aid has changed little in a hundred years. Some of the speeches delivered in the U.S. Senate in the 1870's and 1880's could have been given yesterday, with but a few adjustments in the statistics. Professor Summerfield uses a partly novel approach. Low salaries in our academic institutions, he holds, are forcing faculty members to seek supplemental income through research contracts, consulting, and other means which divert their interest from teaching to contract-getting. This corrupts wide segments of our universities. The institutions are unable to raise salaries to an appropriate level because their established sources of support, State governments and private donors, cannot, or will not raise sufficient funds. So, Mr. Summerfield reasons, "the logical source of funds seems to be the Federal Government, the only entity that can provide large sums for national purposes, the only entity that has a taxing authority commensurate with the job to be done."

This suggests some pertinent questions: If the Federal Government has a taxing authority commensurate with its job, why has it been unable to raise enough revenues to meet its expenditures more than 80 percent of the time in our 30 years, with a cumulative deficit that averages $9 billion annually? If, on the other hand, the Federal Government already is trying to bite off more than it can chew, as the record suggests, why give it additional responsibilities? What taxing authority, is it claimed, does the Federal Government have which the States do not also possess? What types of income, property or transactions can it tax which are not located within the boundaries of the 50 States and subject to their taxing powers? What makes the Federal Government such a "logical source of funds" when it seems incapable of financing its established activities, and when it has consistently refused to assume responsibiloty for education while the States have multiplied their educational appropriations beyond expectations? Is it because Federal money is believed to come for free from an inexhaustible National Treasury? Are State tax systems inadequate to meet requirements? "The 'weakness' of State and local taxing systems iis the impact of heavy Federal taxes" advised New Jersey Gov. Robert B. Meyner a congressional committee. Can we improve this situation by placing further burdens on the National Government?

TOO MUCH SPONSORED RESEARCH?

Professor Summerfield cites low salaries as proof that the established financing arrangements are inadequate. He asserts that an immediate consequence of the low salary schedule is the widespread practice of "consulting" which forces faculty members to become "contractor getters" and corrupts them and their institutions.

If it be true that college teachers accept—or hunt for—research projects because of low salaries, why is it that, as a rule, the best paid professors at the institutions with the highest salary scales hold the most numerous and juiciest research contracts while lowly paid instructors and assistant professors, and low-paying institutions in general, receive far less of the manna from heaven? Is it not likely that the magnitude and location of sponsored research is governed by factors other than the salary level? Does it not appear that, by and large, the job is seeking the man rather than the man seeking the job?

In his provocative article "The Affluent Professors" (the Reporter, June 23, 1960), Spencer Klaw observed correctly: "The need to supplement low academic salaries is only one of the reasons why professors consult. When a group of sociologists were asked a few years back about their extracurricular activities, more than 90 percent of those who consulted said that even if their salaries were much higher they would go on doing so. Professors point out that consulting can be exciting, intellectually stimulating, and good for their teaching."

It is unlikely that even a sharp rise in college salaries would reduce the practice of consulting to a significant extent. Dexter Keezer, of McGraw-Hill, estimated (in a paper presented at the 1959 American Economic Association meeting) that the research expenditures of the Federal Government would rise from $7.2 billion in 1959 to $12.4 billion in 1969. He projected the share of colleges and institutions to climb from 14 percent of the total in 1959 to 20 percent in 1969. In absolute terms Federal research funds for higher education would rise from $1 to $2.5 billion. Is this undesirable? Would it be in the interest of the Nation, of defense or of education to channel all or most of these funds to Government laboratories and private industry? Is it not more likely that all parties benefit under the present arrangements? Is there a necessary conflict between the sponsored research and the objectives of academic institutions?

Gen. James McCormack and Vincent A. Fuller of MIT said in a paper on "Federal Sponsorship of University Research" prepared for the American Assembly in 1960 that "the central incompatibilities are not severe and can, with understanding management, be turned into strengths. Society would be the loser if government administration failed to use university research resources or proceeded to use them without comprehending the educational forces which dominate the academic community. The university would be the loser if it seriously inhibited the access of its science and engineering faculty and students to the powerful technologies of our time, in which government is often crucial to meaningful participation. Sponsored research is a desirable aspect of university life, not because it is free of basic conflicts, but because the area of mutual interest between sponsors and universities far overshadows the area of conflict."

Professor Summerfield states "that the injection of half a billion in contract money into the universities may be a good way to buy the research that the Government needs but a poor way to support education." He warns "Let us not confuse, as we are now doing, the service we offer the Nation with the business of getting money for the university." Who seems to be doing the confusing is Mr. Summerfield. Universities have long complained that Government-sponsored research does not pay its way and is a drain on their resources rather than support. Chancellor C. C. Furnas and Vice Chancellor Raymond Ewell of the University of Buffalo wrote: "In order to uphold their end of the research function, universities are being forced into deficit financing simply because those who are supposed to be supporting research are not paying the full bill." They charged that the Armed Forces are shortchanging the institutions but that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation are the worst offenders.

Mr. Summerfield's attempt to blame some of the other extracurricular activities of college professors on the present system of educational finance is no more convincing.

My heart does not bleed for professors who, according to Mr. Summerfield are "systematically engaged in stock market ventures or real estate trading" because I know some of them. They regard such extracurricular escapades as a fate far less worse than death, and are not sorry for themselves, save in times when the Dow-Jones drops or land prices sag. Some even tell me that they like business ventures on the side, and, in fact, the experience of having to meet a payroll may elevate their understanding of the practical workings of our economic system. I could name some to whom such an experience could prove most beneficial.

HIGHER SALARIES AND COLLEGE EFFICIENCY

All of this does not mean that colleges should not continue to boost faculty salaries. Better pay for academic work is an urgent and most worthy objective. But the solution is not simply a "direct across-the-board support of higher education" by the Federal Government, as Mr. Summerfield suggests. It is a strange fact that so many academicians are unable to see the connection between the effectiveness with which college resources are used and their level of pay. Executives in private industry seldom suffer from such myopia. But then, an industry which utilized its skilled staff and costly facilities as inadequately and wastefully as colleges would have been bankrupt long ago.

In its "Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources," the fund for the advancement of education outlined four handles to attack the problem of increased efficiency: place greater responsibility on students for their education, rearrange course structures, discover new resources both in teaching and in performance of duies ordinarily expected of the teacher, and increase the institutional reach of colleges and universities.

When will institutions be ready to abandon the superstitition that a low faculty-student ratio is a measure of quality? "All that is accomplished [by low ratios] is to enable the teacher to communicate his mediocrity in an intimate environment" commented the late President Charles Johnson of Fisk University. All over the country the faculty-student ratio has been falling in recent decades and is now far lower—approximately half—of what it is in European universities. Hundreds of studies and experiments have failed to show an advantage of small classes over large. Also, an outstanding course on TV, once on tape, such as the famous White physics course can be taught to hundreds at a fraction of the cost of live instruction.

Most institutions keep spoon feeding their students just because high schools fail to train them adequately in the essential skills nor teach them study habits. Could not higher admission standards force the common schools to shift from more pleasurable pursuits to the grim business of education? Is there any reason why our institutions of higher learning should not place upon the student more responsibility for getting an education, as universities do throughout the rest of the world?

In a recent survey of several studies Samuel Baskin reported in a booklet "Quest for Quality," published by the U.S. Office of Education "The data from the present experimentation in independent study seem clear on this point: Students are able to learn as well with much less classtime than we have been accustomed to require of them."

Why must we continue the fantastic proliferation of the curriculum which Seymour Harris, head of the Harvard Economics Department called "a scandal from the viewpoint of both economics and education"? I wonder what Mr. Khrushchev thought when on visiting Iowa State University he was shown a class in ironing? But then maybe we were lucky he did not drop in on courses in flycasting, family camping or bachelor living.

Beardsley Ruml and Donald Morrison (both since deceased) proposed in their book "Memo to a College Trustee," prepared for the Fund for the Advancement of Education 2 years ago, to trim the curriculum and to double the number of students per faculty member, from the present 8 or 9 to about 20. This would enable the institutions to double salaries without additional funds. The authors concluded that "new money is not needed in anything like the amounts presently estimated. Many of the necessary funds are already at the disposal of the college or can be made so; but they are being dissipated through wastes in curriculum, wastes in methods of instruction, wastes in administration, and in the use of property and plant."

We have stretched 12 to 13 years of education and spread them over 16 or more years. This fritters away the institutions' resources, and the students' time. It postpones their earnings career and leads to numerous other difficulties.

Columbia University President Grayson Kirk wrote an article in the Saturday Evening Post that "College Should Not Take 4 Years" but be compressed into 3. Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield of the University of Pittsburgh pioneered the trimester plan which keeps the plant in operation the year round and enables students to obtain a B.A. degree in 3 years. A few other institutions are now using or considering similar plans. Why should this not become more general? Dean Elmer Easton of Rutgers' Engineering College pointed out in a booklet, "Year-Around Operation of Colleges," that such a schedule would provide up to 56 percent more degrees, per year, make up to 30 percent more use of instructional facilities, increase faculty salaries approximately 30 percent.

PLANT NEEDS AND SPACE UTILIZATION

The need for additional college facilities is sometimes pictured to be staggering. A study of the American Council of Education by John D. Long and J. B. Black placed the 1958–70 requirements at $11 to $14 billion. A U.S. Office of Education report by W. Robert Bokelman and John B. Roark set the 1956–70 needs at $17 billion ($7.1 billion for academic, $5.3 billion for residential facilities, $4.8 billion for replacement, rehabilitation, and repair). But several studies have shown the present inadequate use of college facilities. A recent M.S.U. survey of 100 schools placed the utilization, on the basis of a 44-hour week at 46 percent of capacity; at only 25 percent of capacity in terms of student stations.

Space utilization analysis, a group of management consultants who have done work for several universities, government, and industry, placed the 1957–70 facility requirements of American colleges and universities at $12.7 billion under current space utilization practices but estimated that with better space programing in new buildings the amount could be cut to $7.2 billion, with such practices in all (new and old) buildings to $4.3 billion.

The above-mentioned ACE and USOE estimates call for annual plant expenditures slightly over $1 billion. Outlays for physical plant of all colleges and universities totaled $417 million in 1950, $685 million in 1956, and exceeded $1 billion in 1958. There is no indication that the construction boom in higher education is about to collapse. With national income and product expected to climb another 40 or 50 percent in the 1960's, what reason do we have to believe that the established sources will not be able to meet all essential requirements for plant funds?

ARE TOO FEW GOING TO COLLEGE OR TOO MANY?

A more fundamental question may be raised about the desirability and potential effect of sending two-fifths—and if current trends continue much longer, one-half—of

our young people to college. Few of the culturally leading countries have as much as 10 percent of their youth in higher educational institutions. Do they all fail to meet their professional manpower needs?

It may at first glance appear to be encouraging that, under current projections, between 1930 and 1970 the population of the United States will have grown 72 percent, the college-age population 18–21) 61 percent while college enrollment and the number of degrees granted will have jumped 500 percent. But will it really advance the Nation's welfare that in our eagerness to make everybody fit for college we have made college fit everybody? "Are we going to get fewer sheep just by handing out more sheepskins?" asked Fordham President Father Gannon a few years ago.

Seymour Harris concluded in 1948 "that we may be turning out too many graduates and that there is a danger not only of a relative but of absolute deterioration—falling income and employment" ("How Shall We Pay for Education?" p. 67). While employment has absolutely risen there has been a relative decline in the earnings of professional workers. David Blank and George Stigler pointed out in their book, "Demand and Supply of Scientific Personnel" that supply has been rising faster than demand and that scientific earnings have been drifting downward in relation to manual workers, as census statistics also show and as academicians well know.

In a more recent paper for the National Manpower Council's Arden House Conference in November 1959, Professor Harris predicted that it will not be easy to find openings for an average of a half million college graduates in the next 10 years in management and the professions. They may find jobs but at depressed wages. What this country needs is not more college graduates but better qualified ones who are more broadly educated and thoroughly trained. Our present love affair with numbers may be leading us into a blind alley.

Over the past 20 years professional workers have lost 15 to 20 percent in earnings compared with manual workers. In the next 10 years the population of the United States will grow 18 percent, and the number of new degrees is projected to rise 75 percent. What impact will this have on the wages of the average graduate? Is it not time to do some rethinking of investment in marginal prospects for higher education. Gary Becker's study for the National Bureau of Economic Research raises some weighty questions in regard to comparative rates of return (American Economic Review, May 1960).

WHO SHOULD PICK UP THE CHECK?

No matter how successful colleges and universities may be in using their resources more wisely and more effectively, they will still need to boost their income very substantially. Some have estimated that funds ought to be doubled while others want them tripled. Such increases are well within the realm of possibility if Government spending for other purposes does not get out of hand. The higher education budget has multiplied 12 times in the past 20 years—from half a billion to about $6 billion. This is an encouraging trend.

What indication is there that the States will not continue to expand their financial resources and educational appropriations? Since World War II the national income has risen 118 percent, State and local governments revenues 256 percent. The revenues of the National Government meanwhile increased only 68 percent; its finances spurt ahead only in wartime.

Private giving also has shown a splendid growth. Why should students and their parents, as well as private donors, not be able to augment their contributions as incomes rise and particularly if the Federal Government keeps its budget under control and grants tax relief?

The most neglected source of higher educational income is tuition payments in State institutions. Most State colleges and universities charge no or low tuition, or mere token fees. It has at times been charged that the American people spend more on liquor and tobacco than on education. This is incorrect except for many students at State colleges and universities who spend more on cigarettes than on payments to their alma mater, and far larger amounts for cars, liquor, and various forms of entertainment.

It has been suggested that higher tuition fees might ease the parking problem around certain campuses. It is, of course, possible that some of our students would rather part with college than their car. If so, why should they not be allowed to spend their time as well as their money according to their own set of values?

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching suggested in its 1956–57 report:

"Private institutions may eventually have to charge the full cost of education in tuition. They can then go even further than they have to date in providing various forms of scholarship aid for those students who need it." Grants and loan scholarship funds from State and private sources have shown a healthy growth and may be expected to expand further unless the Federal Government decides to enter the field with a major program which would tend to dry up other sources. Private finance companies are now advertising loans for college students. Most promising is the plan by the College Life Insurance Co. of America and the Foundation for Voluntary Welfare to set up guarantees for student loans for educational purposes. Some observers however frown on what they call students mortgaging their future although they find no objection to no downpayments on large purchases and debts for more mundane purposes.

Numerous proposals have been submitted which would permit students and their parents to offset part or all college expenses on the Federal income tax through additional exemptions, deductions, or tax credits. This would make higher tuition fees easier to bear. Students from families which pay little or no income tax would still be eligible for scholarships. Donations to institutions could also be encouraged by a more liberal form of income tax credit.

Why do those who believe financial aid from the National Government to be necessary not support such proposals? Tax credits would eliminate the controversial problem of an equitable allocation of governmental grants among public, private nonsectarian, and sectarian institutions and leave the freedom of choice to students and their parents, as the GI bill did. If Mr. Summerfield feels that the support of higher education has become a national problem that calls for action by the National Government, why does he not even refer to plans which would use the fiscal powers of the National Government without disturbing the structure of higher education?

The President's proposals to the 87th Congress suggest loans and grants for facilities but not the "across the board" aid which Mr. Summerfield calls for. This program, if enacted would not raise faculty salaries.

In conclusion then, there are these three ways of meeting higher education's financial needs: greater funds from established sources and wiser use of those funds; Federal income tax credits; Federal direct grants. But the worst of these is Federal grants.

Why this would be the worst method and what the dangers are in Federal aid was pointed out by George C. S. Benson, president of Claremont Men's College, and John M. Payne in a booklet, "National Aid to Higher Education" (American Enterprises Association, Washington, D.C., 1958).

Coal Research and Nuclear Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy concerning the item in the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill for the power generating facility in connection with the Government's nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash. This matter, and another item of $5 million for coal research through application of nuclear processes, represent the points of difference between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 7576 now in conference.

I supported the Hanford project during House action on the measure, but this body voted to delete it from the bill. The Senate restored it and also, on motion of the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], added to H.R. 7576 the amendment to authorize the $5 million coal research project by the Atomic Energy Commission. Both Senators from West Virginia voted with the majority in that body for restoration of the Hanford power project.

Meanwhile, there was pending in the Senate a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and cosponsored by 62 other Senators, including the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to provide for a national fuels and energy study by a Senate committee. This legislation—Senate Resolution 105—was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is believed to be scheduled for what is hoped will be favorable Senate action before adjournment of this session.

The Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, in its issue of August 29, 1961, published an editorial in discussion of these pending legislative matters which is both pertinent and cogent. It very appropriately commends the statesmanship and effectiveness of the Senators from West Virginia in their handling of these problems in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Fairmont Times to which reference has been made.

RANDOLPH GETS A RESOLUTION THROUGH

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, recently called a recess in the attacks on U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH for his support of a proposed nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash., to praise him lavishly for getting a resolution for a national fuels study through the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RANDOLPH and his colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, initially introduced the resolution, and obtained threescore other Senators as cosponsors. Its endorsement by the committee is tantamount to its approval by the full Senate, which means that the study will start, in all probability, soon after adjournment of the present session of Congress.

The resolution itself is the legislation for which the National Coal Policy Conference was originally created to promote. Since the study will be made by a standing committee of the Senate instead of a special group set up for the purpose, any legislation it deems advisable to recommend can be prepared without going through the more complicated machinery that a separate investigation would entail.

The efforts exerted by RANDOLPH and BYRD in behalf of the resolution are the most conclusive proof that they have not "sold the coal industry of West Virginia for peanuts," as some of their Republican critics are repetitiously insisting in the hope of making a campaign issue for next year and 1964.

It will take all the political acumen and powers of persuasion at RANDOLPH'S command, however, to offset some of the damage that has been done by the bitter attacks on the Hanford proposal. The Interior Committee is headed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico, a former Secretary of Agriculture, and its ranking majority member is Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, the State in which the Hanford generating plant is proposed to be located.

Senators from Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Alaska, Utah, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Hawaii, California, Arizona, and Iowa make up the rest of the standing committee. Not one of them comes from a major coal-producing State and their interests lie more in such things as the Hanford project than the protection of the bituminous industry.

Three Senators, RANDOLPH among them, are scheduled to be added to the committee for the purposes of the fuels study. This means he not only will have to convince his fellow Members that the Nation's coal interests are not blindly prejudiced against every proposal which does not redound to their immediate benefit, but will have also to sell his colleagues on coal's story.

Perhaps RANDOLPH'S vote for the Hanford project "in the national interest" also was one way of telling the western Senators that each constituency has its own problems worthy of consideration.

Leaving aside the partisan political attacks on RANDOLPH and the others who voted for Hanford, the National Coal Association and the United Mine Workers of America must surely realize that a prolongation of the bitter dispute will render less likely their chances of being able to present testimony in connection with the fuels study in a favorable climate.

Even if everything that has been said against the Hanford job is true, the coal industry and its allies could well afford to trade it for the establishment of a national fuels policy. It seems to us that regulation of residual oil and "dumped" natural gas on terms that the coal industry can live with is, on balance, far more essential than what becomes of waste steam produced by a plutonium generator in the Pacific Northwest.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this tribute to the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH in celebration of his 25 years as a Member of the House of Representatives—and also his birthday. He is a distinguished legislator and a fine lawyer.

As a new Member of the House, I came here in the 86th Congress, and I was advised by his many friends throughout the great State of New York to see him. The scholar that he is, he advised me wisely on many occasions on the procedures in the House. Mr. KEOGH is quiet in his ways, but impressive and convincing in his deliberations. His actions and fine record should be an inspiration to all new Members coming into the House of Representatives.

My life has been enriched and my work has been more interesting because of my acquaintance with Mr. KEOGH. May God in His divine wisdom grant him many happy years with his family and friends, and may he continue to enjoy many fruitful years in his legislative work.

Congratulations and best wishes on this momentous occasion.

World Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans are showing ever-increasing concern over world developments. Surely, this is reflected in the volume and content of mail pouring into congressional offices.

One of my constituents, Mr. Robert W. Capps, of Lancaster, expresses the sentiment of a large segment of Americans. His letter follows:

The Berlin situation is getting worse by the day, and it is a matter of only a spark to set the whole thing beyond the conference table talk. Why talk further with Khrushchev anyway for we already have a signed Russian agreement, and any more signed agreements would be no better than the one we now have. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics do not honor any treaty or agreement of any nature regardless—if it suits their purpose to do otherwise. We know that is the truth, so I rather agree with Charles de Gaulle, stay away from further conferences with Khrushchev, and hew to the line we have already laid down, and if war it is to be then he, Khrushchev, is the one that brings it on, for it is Khrushchev that has caused all this present commotion on Berlin, and it is he that has made all the threats. I do not agree with some statements made by men of prominence, that there will be no war over Berlin. There is a matter of principle involved here that the Western Alliance cannot but defend, for to do otherwise would be complete capitulation all down the line. Khrushchev is playing for high stakes, and he knows better than anyone else what he has to gain if the Western Alliance can be broken down over this Berlin issue, then the Communist world has little resistance left in its way. The free world will stand or fall upon what decision they make here in Berlin, and it is that simple. Again I want to cheer Charles de Gaulle for his adamant stand against the show of any weakness by importuning Khrushchev for a conference. And he took this stand even as against suggestions for such a meeting by the others of the Western Alliance. As of this moment it is like a game of chess, one false move and the game is either won or lost. We are at this very moment much closer to actual war than we have been at any previous time in our country's history. The assassination of just one man (Crown Prince Ferdinand) in a small town called Sarajevo, was all that was required to spark the start of World War I. It was only hours after this man died that Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany ordered a state of war. The daily news bulletins from Berlin can be watched with care, for it is here that the caldron is boiling with all the ingredients of violence, and the fate of far more than the 2 million souls now residents in West Berlin is at stake. The fate of the free world is on the test, and just one throw of the dice could ring down the curtain. I do hope that President Kennedy has the fortitude to stand firm, and it will take nerves of steel to carry him through the test that lies ahead. For Khrushchev baited and set this trap in Berlin and he has studied his moves to entice the prey into the midst of his ensnarement. Daily you note, one by one, he is adding more snares. He is testing the nerves of NATO and he will continue to the brink. This is his goal, and his leadership of the Communist world is also in the stakes that are being here tested—win or lose.

Cuts to Foreign Aid Bill Should Be Restored

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in opposition to the amounts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for mutual security during fiscal 1962. I am in support of those who would restore the 21-percent cut made in the amounts provided and passed by this very Chamber less than a week ago.

Now I have read in many newspapers during the last few days that the terms of the authorization bill somehow "morally commit" the House to restore these cuts. No such thing. The basic legislative intent of section 202(b) of S. 1983 was clearly developed on the floor just last Thursday in a colloquy between the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN]. At that time they both agreed that the President of the United States had stated the case clearly at his press conference the day before, when, in answer to a question from a reporter as to whether he thought there would be at least a moral obligation to make the full appropriation, he said: "No. I would think that the Appropriations Committee would have to make their own—meet their own responsibilities." In other words, the action last week of the Committee on Appropriations as expressed in the bill before us, in no way violates the terms of the authorization bill. In short, because the record clearly knows that the percentage cut under previously enacted foreign aid authorizations is not at all a break with tradition, we are getting exactly what some of us asked for.

Anticipation of such action compelled me to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND]. Moreover, the bill before us serves to further sustain my original bewilderment at the "wholly satisfactory" evaluation of the authorization bill by the President last week.

If, according to the terms of the authorization bill, we are not morally committed to restore these cuts, then what? Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that we should rather be committed to sustaining the collective judgment of the members of the legislative committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who deliberated for months on the authorization bill. We should further be committed to supporting the judgment of the members of the conference committee, who laboriously compromised with the committee from the other Chamber, in arriving at what they thought were justified authorizations. Last but not least, there are 260 of us who, just 5 short days ago, voted for the level of authorizations contained in the conference report—and at least that number should feel constrained to sustaining their own respective personal judgments in this matter. It is in this direction that our moral commitments lie. To act otherwise would be sheer ambivalance.

In recent weeks I have heard a lot of talk about the constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch with respect to the powers to appropriate. I think it is about time some of us started worrying about the vanishing powers of our legislative committees, whose recommended authorizations to appropriate are carrying less and less meaning with the Congress each year. I have long maintained that it is precisely for this reason that the executive branch, together with many disillusioned members of our legislative committees, have seen fit to support measures that would bypass the annual appropriations process. This trend will stop only when some of the powers of the purse are restored to their rightful legislative owners.

Mr. Speaker, we have that opportunity now.

Why Talk of Enemy So Softly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the following column by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star of September 2 is of special significance in view of the fact that Mr. Brown is in Italy and has had occasion to listen to the Voice of America:

WHY TALK OF ENEMY SO SOFTLY?—SOFT-PEDALING OF FREE WORLD MESSAGE SEEN IN BROADCASTS TO CAPTIVE PEOPLES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The dullness of Voice of America broadcasts is surpassed only by the dreariness of the propaganda radio behind the Iron Curtain. While the Ed Murrow organization spreads the American story to various countries by treating them to tape recording containing dull generalities about freedom and the nobility of man (mostly from such men as Senators HUMPHREY and FULBRIGHT), the Reds are equally boring with their denunciations of "warmongering Americans."

Obviously, attacks against the Red oligarchy are not considered conducive to peace in our time, or the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. Hence, speeches or statements by "reactionary" Americans, such as Senators BRIDGES, GOLDWATER, THURMOND, DODD, and LONG, must be taboo. This, at least, is this reporter's conclusion after having heard a whole month of VOA broadcasts while in Germany and Switzerland recently. There are the inevitable gentle slaps at the Soviets by some of the VOA editorialists. But they carry nowhere near the weight which the above-mentioned Senators carry.

Foreigners, and particularly Germans, listen with genuine interest to what America has to say—particularly those in the legislative branch of Government. They follow with an interest akin to anxiety the dispatches from Washington.

I found no German, or for that matter any other European, who doubts the sincerity of President Kennedy's line of sternness toward Moscow. But equally, I found nobody who does not ask, "How can we reconcile what your President tells us with what his own important party leaders and especially the chairman of the most important Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, says in public, on the floor of the Senate and in radio and television interviews?"

The suspicions of what may be termed a schizophrenic foreign policy started some time ago when Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, and later Senator FULBRIGHT urged negotiations on Berlin after Mr. Kennedy had taken a formally strong stand on that very matter.

And I found many Germans in responsible positions both in the government and newspaper profession, who wondered why Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate's most important committee, had used his power and taken the initiative in demanding that the Defense Department muzzle the generals and admirals who were denouncing the Soviet regime and communism. I noted raised eyebrows on this subject even among some Frenchmen who believe as firmly as we do in the civilian control of the military.

The order was directed at men who may have the responsibility to lead their men in battle against the enemy. They were not guilty of any political activity; they were merely preparing their men for a tragic eventuality when they would be asked to risk their lives.

Parenthetically, I add that while listening to a Frankfurt military station broadcast of a blow-by-blow description of war games I found the commentator describing the operation of an advanced unit never said "We are now attacking the enemy." The word enemy was replaced by the obviously diplomatic expression "aggressor."

It is difficult for the hard-bitten European military to understand why the generals can no longer indoctrinate their troops against the Communists who have been, in fact, declared enemies by Commander in Chief Kennedy himself. Before the last war the French and British also neglected to indoctrinate their forces. The result was disastrous for the French, at least. Their men believed they were fighting to save Poland. Their spirit was not in it and they fought badly. Not until they went down in defeat and General de Gaulle began his national movement from England did the new French forces realize that they were fighting for the survival of France as a free nation.

Are we going to allow our defense forces to believe that they may be fighting to save Berlin for Germany? That deduction is implied if the full truth of the Communist worldwide conspiracy is not brought with full force to the attention of the men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Or are there two policies in the United States? That of the Chief Executive, strongly backed by the American people, and the other by a few influential Members of Congress and certain "invisible men" in the administration? This question was asked of this reporter by many substantial men all over Europe who, by virtue of their positions, have wide knowledge about our official commitments.

There is an inclination on the part of questioners to believe that the appeasers are still firmly in the saddle. How else, they ask, could it be explained that at the time Mr. Kennedy made his first two statements regarding our policy toward the Kremlin, Senator FULBRIGHT came out flatly urging negotiations.

Strangely enough, we are now on the road to negotiating what used to be described as "nonnegotiable." It is obvious, say those who have closely followed developments in the United States since Mr. Kennedy's return from his talk with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna, that the appeasers are winning the first game.

Power and Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Marguerite Higgins is most timely and as usual Miss Higgins is very adept at untangling the web of Soviet intrigue and deceit, and uncovering the amazing and pathetic naivete of the United States of America.

Will we ever realize that it is better to be respected than liked, and that we are far more likely to be liked if, and when, we are respected.

If we do not learn this truth soon the words quoted in the article may indeed come true and Americans will be fighting on Cape Cod:

POWER AND POPULARITY

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—One of the chief weapons of the neutralists in cudgeling the West has, of course, been a threat that, stripped to its essentials, says: "Give me what I want when I want it or I'll sidle even closer to Moscow." That is why, from the point of view of either veteran neutralists like Egypt's Nasser or newcomers like Tunisia's Bourguiba, it was most inconsiderate of Premier Khrushchev to announce resumption of nuclear tests only hours before the so-called nonbloc countries were to gather together in Belgrade to confer. For by the nuclear test announcement the Russian leader tainted the neutralist threat of cozying up to Moscow, turning it into a dirty weapon full of psychological fallout and difficult of service to nations who, in public gatherings, prize a high moral tone as much as playing off West against East.

And despite a certain number of neutralist proclamations of shock, how much of a propaganda victory has Mr. Khrushchev in reality handed the West? More important, what practical purpose will this victory serve? Could it, from the point of view of

the struggle to contain Communist expansionism, boomerang against the West by underlining the fact that the Russians are immune to popular pressures (when they don't serve Communist purposes)? Will this renewed emphasis of an old fact of international life (remember Hungary?) merely inspire the neutrals to redouble their efforts to wring concessions for peace from the West, since only the West cares enough for propaganda victories to make real sacrifices on the behalf of such victories?

Six months will be required really to tell the tale, but President Nkrumah, of Ghana, in his address to the Belgrade Neutralist Conference gave a glimpse of attitudes to come. Although he too spoke of shock at the Soviet announcement, this did not prevent him from promoting the Soviet line all the way on the crucial question of Germany and Berlin.

As to the West, the surprise with which the man in the street greeted the Soviet announcement is a tribute to the Kremlin's psychological skill but the real triumph was the gullibility over the years of those who ought to know better, especially the scientists and diplomats.

In this connection, it is important to point out that it takes many many months to prepare nuclear test experiments. With regard to the latest Soviet test series, this is all the more true because the experimental site is a new one in far Siberia near Outer Mongolia. This meant that massive transfer of equipment, instruments, weapons, fortifications, etc., had to take place before the tests could start.

But as late as May and June, while the Soviet test preparations were in full swing, Soviet scientists and diplomats, with a dutiful bow to hypocrisy, were carrying on a subtle campaign of telling westerners "confidentially" that Russia—despite its outward intransigence—was really anxious to avoid testing. They tried to give a certain credibility to this thesis by spreading the word—even more confidentially—that the real reason Russia did not want to test was fear that experiments might bring pressure from the Chinese for Soviet atomic secrets.

But as a Polish Communist put it; "You Westerners are too complicated. There is a simple reason why Moscow halted tests. It is a reason provided by the United States, which has stated repeatedly that it is head of the Russians in sophistication of weapons [reducing the nuclear warheads into more manageable shapes and sizes]. When both sides halted tests, Moscow thought this would handicap your side far more than theirs. Did you really think the Russians would agree to something like a test ban if it would leave the United States ahead of them in any field of weapons? They needed time at the drawing boards and in laboratory tests to catch up. Now the time has come when they have to put their new formulas to the test. To them being ahead of the United States is more important than what Nehru thinks."

Mr. Khrushchev's priority of power over popularity (when the choice is necessary) is, of course, straight out of the Soviet book. Those American diplomats who quiver and quake at the thought of an adverse vote in the United Nations would do well to look at history from 1945 to 1950 when the Soviet Union repeatedly came out the loser in United Nations balloting. This adverse vote did not inhibit Josef Stalin from expanding his empire in those 5 years at the rate of 50 square miles an hour.

But these saddening reminders are useful only if they help put Washington's almost giddy emphasis on propaganda victories in some perspective. In the Berlin crisis, for instance, it was seriously claimed by a prominent State Department official that the Soviet erection of a Chinese wall in mid-Berlin and the imprisonment of 1,100,000 previously semifree East Berliners (free to cross over to West Berlin or West Germany) was a propaganda victory.

But as one hardheaded European put it: "Five more 'victories' like that last one in Berlin and you Americans will be fighting on Cape Cod."

Is Defense Department Sitting Out Fight Against Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune, dated Thursday, August 31, 1961:

IS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SITTING OUT FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM?

The mission of the Defense Department, as its name clearly indicates, is to defend the United States.

The overriding threat in America today against which we must defend ourselves with every resource at hand is communism.

If the mission of the Defense Department and the U.S. Government is not to fight communism and defend and uphold our Constitution, we would like to know who changed the mission.

Certainly, the American people did not change it.

The threat of communism is total. It doesn't menace just a section of America, or a particular group of our people, or a political party. The target marked for destruction is even bigger than the Nation. It is the whole concept of freedom and the dignity of man that has come to full flower under our Constitution and the free enterprise system.

This total threat demands a total defensive response by the people, the Government, and the military. We've all got to be in this together.

But the Defense Department is muting its support of civilian efforts to learn more about communism and how to fight it.

This happened when the Department acted on a memorandum by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, gagging military leaders from speaking out on communism.

It happened more recently when the Department denied permission for the 11th Naval District band to play at an anti-Communist rally in Santa Monica.

The reason given was that the rally planned to show so-called "controversial movies," including "Communism on the Map," which the Defense Department has banned for use on military bases.

Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, had an apt comment on this when he asked: "Since when is communism controversial?"

This isn't a partisan political matter in which we choose up sides:

There's only one side, and that's the side of Americanism.

The fight is between free, constitutional government and dictatorial, socialistic government. And the attacks are coming from within as well as from outside the United States.

Where does the Defense Department stand? In a letter to Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, explaining the Navy Band action at Santa Monica, Arthur Sylvester, public affairs officer of the Defense Department, said:

"It is the firm policy of the Department of Defense * * * to refrain from participation in any public activities which are not directly connected with the mission of the Department and which might give the public the impression that the Department was directly or indirectly sponsoring or endorsing such public indoctrination activities."

Which brings us back to the question: Isn't the Defense Department and its public affairs officer, Arthur Sylvester, in the fight on the side of our free, American institutions and the Constitution of the United States?

If not, who changed the mission? Not the American people.

The Fish Flour Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a dramatically important new food product known as fish flour is proving itself a lifesaver in underdeveloped areas of the world. Yet, because of an "esthetic" objection, its sale and distribution in this country are prohibited by the Food and Drug Administration. I am hopeful this unfortunate situation will be corrected following a public hearing this fall. Meanwhile, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following article by Brad Hathaway in the August 30 issue of the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, which tells the fish flour story and describes the process involved in the production of this remarkable protein-rich food:

HIGH-PROTEIN FISH FLOUR FROM NEW BEDFORD PLANT IS NEW FOOD FOR THE WORLD'S POOR

(By Brad Hathaway)

NEW BEDFORD.—The fishing port of New Bedford is playing a big part in a revolutionary development which has achieved remarkable success in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world. The new development: high protein fish flour.

ONLY U.S. PLANT

The only fish flour manufactured in the United States comes from fish meal made in the plant of New Bedford Fish Products Corp.

And the fish flour is keeping hundreds of undernourished children alive in Latin America, Africa, and the Far East.

Strangely enough, the flour cannot be purchased on the retail market in this country.

Its sale and distribution here is prohibited pending approval by the Federal Food and Drug Administration. This agency, so far, has refused to issue its approval on "esthetic grounds." That is because every part of the fish is used in making the meal from which the flour is produced.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the U.S. Department of the Interior has recommended that its sale in this country be approved.

And Congress has appropriated $50,000 for research in the use of fish protein concentrates (another name for fish flour).

Fish meal is being turned out at the rate of 16 tons a day at the Acushnet River plant of New Bedford Fish Products Corp.

SHIPPED OVERSEAS

The meal is shipped throughout the Nation and to many overseas points as a high protein food supplement for hogs, cattle, poultry, and mink.

Some of the meal is transported to Monticell, Ill., where the parent firm of VioBin Corp. processes it further and turns out 7,500 pounds of fish flour a month for human consumption—overseas.

The man behind it all is Ezra Levin, president of VioBin Corp. He's a man who believes "the sea holds the solution of the future of humanity."

BOON TO FISHING INDUSTRY

The New Bedford plant is the only one in the country which manufactures fish meal by the exclusive VioBin process—a method of low-temperature manufacture in which valuable protein and other nutritional elements in the fish are not destroyed. Operations were first started 4 years ago.

The plant has helped the city's fishing industry considerably. When Food and Drug Administration approval for the sale of fish flour in this country is given, a $400,000 fish flour manufacturing plant will be built in the old whaling city by VioBin.

Such a plant would utilize 200,000 pounds of industrial fish and fillet plant waste daily in its operations.

Present meal and flour production accounts for a good part of the fishing fleet's industrial fish landings—landings which last year totaled 10,435,000 pounds.

The fish meal manufacturing process at the New Bedford plant begins in the "raw box." There fish frames (fillet house waste) or industrial fish—red hake, whiting, skates, eel pout, sculpins, dogfish, sea robins, monkfish and angler fish—are pitched onto a moving conveyor belt.

From there they move through a vacuum system of pipes, grinders, cookers and desolvenizers before emerging as meal and moved on to a storage tank. The meal then goes through a hammer mill for further pulverization and then is stored in hoppers or weighed out into 100-pound bags for shipping out.

Additional processing of the meal at the Illinois plant produces a neutral tasting fish flour.

Mexican studies on the use of VioBin fish flour show that it is the first satisfactory product found in 10 years of work that apparently solves the problem of protein starvation disease.

Studies in El Salvador show the fish flour "is a valuable protein supplement in bread, as a protein extender in school lunches and in foods for restaurants, hospitals, and military establishments."

Controlled studies have proved the fishmeal processed in New Bedford is superior to any fishmeal used previously as a supplement in animal and poultry feeds.

PROTEIN IS PRESERVED

The 4-year operation of the New Bedford plant has established the following facts:

Cost of processing by the VioBin method is no more than conventional processing. All of the protein of the fish is conserved. Practically no oil remains in the meal and no oil remains in the flour.

The meal is stable because it is defatted. It can be stored indefinitely without fear of deterioration.

The meal, being defatted, does not contribute fishy tastes to eggs, pork products, or milk. Conventionally made fishmeals containing oil must be fed in limited quantities because these meals taint eggs, pork products, or milk when fed to animals.

The process used at the New Bedford plant involves temperatures of 100° or lower. This fact insures the conservation of all vitamin values. The meal is never toxic.

Fishmeals now manufactured in other parts of the country varies in biologic quality and cannot be used for human consumption.

With Food and Drug Administration approval for sale of VioBin fish flour in this country, the port of New Bedford can look forward to a much brighter future for its fishing industry—an industry already ranked second in the Nation in the value of its fishery products.

Danger From Within?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the soundest and most constructive editorial voices in North Carolina emanates from television station WRAL–TV, channel 5 in Raleigh. Mr. Jesse Helms, WRAL–TV's vice president of news and public affairs, recently visited Gettysburg and his reflection on that visit, delivered to WRAL–TV viewers on August 23, 1961, are so pertinent to the current challenge confronting our Nation that I believe they should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore wish to include this outstanding editorial under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

A few weeks ago our family, as typical tourists, stopped at Gettysburg for a visit to the hallowed place where President Lincoln made his most famous address. Such pauses offer the valuable therapy of causing us to be reminded of what we owe to yesterday.

America the Beautiful, as we know it, was purchased by the courage and dedication of men and women who assumed responsibility in days of crisis. And as Dr. Harold Blake Walker wrote a few months ago: "We may wisely profit by (our forefathers') understanding of both the nature and hazards of freedom."

Probably most people who visit Gettysburg return home to brush up on the life of Lincoln. This activity in our household brought to light another great speech by Mr. Lincoln, but one not nearly so well publicized. In January 1837, speaking in Springfield, Ill., Mr. Lincoln warned that America's destruction, if and when it comes, will come from within—not without.

The danger, he said, "if it ever reaches us must spring from amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Mr. Lincoln, of course, knew nothing of missiles or hydrogen bombs or jetplanes. But though he lives in a different age, what he said in 1837 remains true today.

The crisis in our time, as in Lincoln's day, is vastly more internal than external. If we continue to believe that there is, somehow, the miracle of something for nothing, if what we want is extravagant reward for minimum productivity, then we are asking for the peril that Mr. Lincoln foresaw.

Mr. Lincoln, so very long ago, realized that no nation can bear the burden of its people turning their backs on personal responsibility. To be sure, as Governor Sanford said at Manteo Saturday, we live in a complex society and in a crowded world. But in it, individuals are no less significant than in the days of the pioneers. And their responsibility to do what is right, even at the risk of unpopularity or political defeat, remains the price of freedom.

Much is being said these days about sacrifice. Yet, where is the sacrifice? All around us, intelligent citizens know—in their hearts—that things are wrong in the trends of our community, our State, our Nation. But who speaks up? And why so often do they not?

A paternalistic government is recognizable; socialism is definable. The destination of a society that accepts and embraces them is predictable. Abraham Lincoln predicted it in 1837. But instead of facing up to where we are, and where we are headed, we use words to persuade ourselves that there is no danger when principles are compromised.

Can we deny that we are assuming the role of Dodo, who in "Alice in Wonderland" said pontifically: "Everyone has won, and all must have prizes." We have the appearance of liking everything about socialism except the name. Let a politician lift a plank out of the old-time Socialist Party platform, paint it red, white, and blue, and the voters go on a stampede until they find some public office for him. But in any opinion poll, these same voters are as hostile to the socialist label as they are friendly to its substance.

This, we believe, is what Mr. Lincoln meant in 1837 when he warned of destruction from within. There is no occasion to believe that the people of America would deliberately destroy the very freedoms of which we so often boast. Rather, Mr. Lincoln raised the ultimate question of whether we care most for our comforts, or most for our convictions. Do we believe sufficiently in the truth that set us free to stand up for it?

It is popular, of course, to go along with the crowd. It always is; it always has been. It took courage for history to record the names of Jefferson and Lincoln and Washington and Patrick Henry. They were not always popular with the crowd but if they had chosen other courses there would have been no freedom for us today.

Lincoln was not speaking merely to one generation when he said: "If destruction is our lot, we must ourselves be its author." He was speaking to all generations—including this one.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the many friends of our distinguished colleague, EUGENE KEOGH, in expressing best wishes on this joyful occasion.

Today, marks not only the celebration of Mr. KEOGH's birthday but the observance of his silver anniversary as

a Member of the House of Representatives.

While I knew GENE before coming to Congress in 1953, I did get to know him better during my service in this House.

The gentleman from New York, in my opinion, is a great legislator and a fine public servant who has dedicated a quarter of a century to this great body. His outstanding services to the people of his district in Brooklyn as well as his services to the Nation as a whole have distinguished him as a great American.

We, who have had the honor and privilege to serve with him, admire and respect him as a friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, on this happy event, I wish to extend to Congressman KEOGH and his family my best wishes for their continued health and happiness for many, many years to come.

United States Must Not Back Down on Berlin, Ike Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article by Scripps-Howard Political Writer Charles Lucey, in which former President Eisenhower outlines his views on the Berlin situation and other matters.

I found, as usual, that Mr. Eisenhower speaks in a manner which correctly sums up the prevailing sentiment in this country. Two quotations from the article make this apparent:

The question of negotiating a Berlin settlement with the Russians is immensely difficult—but any time Khrushchev makes you take one backward step, by whatever maneuver, he promptly will try to make you take two.

Also:

The United States must not allow itself to hit the peaks and valley facing the long-haul crisis—our defense programing should be kept in balance and if greater defense outlay is inevitable, there should be an effort to save money on domestic spending.

I found this review of President Eisenhower's opinions and sentiments most interesting. I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT BACK DOWN ON BERLIN, IKE SAYS

(NOTE.—How does it go at Gettysburg these days with America's famed soldier and ex-President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower? What is Ike's thinking—and how does the man who knew so many crises, in his own two terms, view those now facing his successor? Scripps-Howard's top political writer has been visiting Mr. Eisenhower, and this is the first of two on-the-scene dispatches.)

(By Charles Lucey, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

GETTYSBURG, August 28.—"Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re," runs a Latin legend on Gen. Dwight Eisenhower's desk here. "Gently in manner, strongly in deed"—and it fits the famed soldier's credo today on world crises.

No bluster or bombast flows from the ex-President in angry reaction to Soviet provocation at Brandenburg gate. The green Pennsylvania hills roll gently away from this little town in shimmering late-August heat and the mood is not for rashness or hysteria. The moment may be tense but the man touched often by crisis contemplates rather the long haul.

Today he believes—

That if we abandon insistence on free access to Berlin, we're on the run.

He cannot stomach—a word he uses with friends—any thought that we can appease Nikita Khrushchev.

The question of negotiating a Berlin settlement with the Russians is immensely difficult—but anytime Khrushchev makes you take one backward step, by whatever maneuver, he promptly will try to make you take two.

THE BIG AIM

Khrushchev plainly is out to get the United States to agree to some type of compromise. We should recognize this isn't going to be a clear-cut thing of stopping the United States by force—to General Eisenhower this is not what seems to be on the Soviet leader's mind. The drive is to get us to recognize the East Germans.

General Eisenhower as President never would stand for it. But the world moves; there is doubt about what kind of support we would get from Europe. It is tough, the soldier tells friends—tough. It will be a hard one, he says.

Yet General Eisenhower tells a visitor Americans should not be downhearted; they have faced many crises. Americans, the people as well as their elected officials, have got to live with a situation. Private Citizen Eisenhower sees little hope of the world situation improving for years—perhaps 40 years, he tells friends.

General Eisenhower paraphrases an old line of Napoleon inveighing against great hysteria in victory and panic in defeat. The United States must not allow itself to hit the peaks and valleys facing the long-haul crisis—our defense programing should be kept in balance and if greater defense outlay is inevitable, there should be an effort to save money on domestic Federal spending.

OLD CAMPAIGNER

Appearing as vigorous and vital as in many years, General Eisenhower follows world affairs with the keen interest of an old campaigner who knows every foot of the terrain, every commander, every possibility of maneuver on either side.

To friends he manifests neither great objection nor great enthusiasm for rushing new troops into Berlin—his feeling seems to be that maybe it was necessary for the moment to strengthen West Berlin morale but it is, after all, mostly show. When he moved troops, he recalls, it was because they were to be needed at a certain point. His belief today is that such a move tells nothing new to Khrushchev that he does not already know. This does not scare him.

General Eisenhower's counsel to Americans is that the Berlin argument not be made strictly on legal or juridical grounds by the West but that it be placed on moral grounds. He asks:

Where is there right or justice in separating families as the Soviets and East Germans are doing by slamming the gates at East Berlin?

What is so wrong or so wicked about East Germans wanting the simple freedom to leave East Germany if they wish?

In conversation with visitors, General Eisenhower refers repeatedly to the need for Americans to be more fully informed on critical situations facing the Nation such as Berlin. He commends the press and radio for trying to do this; to friends he mentions particularly a tragic picture published widely in newspapers and magazines—of an aged East German couple being turned back at the East Berlin gateway by East German troops.

URGES SUPPORT

At Gettysburg today General Eisenhower wishes to be certain he never is cast in the role of second-guessing the man who succeeded him in the White House. Quite the contrary, to visitors he stresses the need of the Nation to support the President fully once the decisions are made.

Yet that he differs with President Kennedy in major respects is unquestioned. His ideas about domestic spending, at a time when heavy increases are demanded in defense outlay, are far more conservative than those of the Kennedy administration.

In private talks, the ex-President voices some mystification at the way Mr. Kennedy seemingly has organized his White House staff, some wonderment at reports the President makes his decisions after a series of meetings with single individuals involved in phases of a problem.

General Eisenhower, as military man and President, favored having all sides of a problem debated out in his presence—before a planning board, a National Security Council meeting or elsewhere, with the President then making the decision on the basis of all he had heard. The boss never abdicates his position, says he, and when the decision is made he directs his staff to follow through on its being put to work throughout the vast Government.

ONE EXAMPLE

An example of how closely he follows the news was made clear to one recent visitor in a comment on Indian Prime Minister Nehru's remarks favorable to the Soviet-East German side of the Berlin question. General Eisenhower observed he always had told Nehru he could understand his wish to be militarily neutral but insisted that where a moral issue was concerned neutrality seemed impossible to him.

Is the ex-President, in moments when recurring crises plague the Nation, detached and apart?

This reporter, after visiting Gettysburg, thinks this emphatically is not so. General Eisenhower believed that after leaving the White House his great feeling would be one of relief. Yet there are times today when almost certainly he regrets that he no longer is in a position where he could put to work, for his country, his experience of so many years. To at least one visitor he has confided that he wishes he might have stayed a little closer in recent months to the matters which had claimed his attention so long.

WOULD SERVE

He has mentioned, in some conversations, the crises that arose when he was President—in the Far East, in Lebanon, in Iran—by way of modest suggestion that perhaps he could have something to advance in the way of approach.

The old soldier today has many projects here in Gettysburg but none so important he could not easily slip away for a mission in which his name, his experience, his world prestige would serve well the Kennedy administration and the Nation. He knows there can be only one President and he and John F. Kennedy would have to agree on the correctness of such a mission. In that circumstance the old soldier would say "Yes."

The Honorable Eugene Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the many nice things

said today on the floor about our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. I would like to associate myself with those sentiments, however, to congratulate GENE on his birthday and the silver anniversary of his service in the House, and to wish him many more years of outstanding public service.

I believe that the people of the Ninth District of New York, and our Nation as a whole, are fortunate to have a legislator of his caliber serving in the House of Representatives during this critical period of our history. His understanding of the issues confronting our Nation, his skill as a legislator, and his devotion to the public cause, place him in the front ranks of our great legislators, both past and present.

I have known GENE for many years, and I cherish his friendship and value his counsel. I know that he is admired and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. I wish him well and I sincerely hope that he will continue to serve in Congress for many years to come.

Constitution Outdated—Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and include extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith submit the following news article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner of July 29, by Ron Moskowitz, in connection with a speech made by Senator FULBRIGHT which was filmed in Washington and delivered by film before the Cubberley conference on education at Stanford University:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 29, 1961]

CONSTITUTION OUTDATED—FULBRIGHT

(By Ron Moskowitz)

The Constitution of the United States, designed for an 18th century agrarian society, needs reforming.

And America itself must relinquish some of its jealously guarded sovereignty.

In dropping the two bombshells at Stanford University, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared the Kennedy administration's war on our national complacency.

FULBRIGHT said both the constitutional reforms and the relinquishment of sovereignty are necessary if this Nation is to win in its competition with Russia.

He spoke via a color film to nearly 1,000 educators gathered on campus for the Cubberley conference on education. He was scheduled to speak in person, but the press of Washington business prevented that, his office reported.

"The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to concerted action," he warned, "by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society far removed from the centers of world power.

BASIC CHANGES

"It is imperative that we break out of the intellectual confines of cherished and traditional beliefs and open our minds to the possibility that basic changes in our system may be essential to meet the requirements of the 20th century.

"Noninvolvement in world affairs today is unthinkable," he said.

"The North Atlantic nations, with their common values as well as common enemies, must surrender far more of their jealously guarded sovereignty than they have already done and press forward with the developments of supernation institutions."

He said this will mean the further development of NATO as an organ of both political and economic cooperation. It will also mean the vigorous implementation and expansion of other existing organizations designed to unite the free nations, he said.

FULBRIGHT said the two major changes are necessary if America is to compete with Russia. He said things move quickly in international affairs and America must be equipped to keep abreast.

Without changes in the outdated Constitution, he said, we will not be able to do so.

"While our basic values may remain essentially unchanged from those which guided the founders of the Republic two centuries ago," he said, "the strategy for defending those values must change with time and circumstances."

He said that public opinion usually lags years behind in its attitudes and assessments of international relations.

HEAR MINORITY

"Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster wise and effective national policies.

"Only the President can provide the guidance that is necessary. Legislators display a distressing tendency to adhere slavishly to the dictates of public opinion, or at least to its vocal and highly organized minority segments.

DIFFICULT TASK

He said both Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt each in times of national crisis, had trouble shaping the national consensus.

"President Kennedy is faced with a far more difficult task," he said. "We are confronted by the most formidable and resourceful adversary ever to have challenged us but the challenge takes subtle and ambiguous focus.

"The President is thus compelled to shape a new kind of consensus, and he is compelled to do without the powerful assistance of cataclysmic events.

"The consensus which President Kennedy must shape should be quite different in character from those which responded to the crises of the past.

MORAL COURAGE

"The American people must be aroused from their bemused preoccupation with trivial self-indulgence. A new kind of consensus is needed: It must be rooted in patience as well as boldness, wisdom as well as resourcefulness, quiet determination as well as righteous dedication, and perhaps most of all, in moral as well as physical courage."

He said that society dedicated to democratic goals is dependent on its education system to cultivate the free mind—free of ignorance and taboos, rigid dogma and blind tradition.

"As a legislator," he said, "I strongly support President Kennedy's program for Federal grants to the States for both school construction and teachers' salaries."

FISCHER SPEAKS

The last speaker of the weeklong meeting, which ended yesterday, was John H. Fischer, renowned dean of Teachers College, Columbia University.

He said the fact that so many American schools are very good should not obscure the fact that so many are equally as bad and need attention.

"But as we reach for new solutions," he said, "we shall have to be careful not to lose what is good in our present situation."

FEDERAL AGENCY

Fischer suggested the creation of a Federal agency concerned with education and responsible to the American people as a whole.

"None of the existing organizations represent the total national interest in education," he said. "We must find ways to correct the local incapacities that cause our worst educational failures while we preserve and enhance the local freedom and initiative that have produced our best schools."

Senator George A. Smathers, of Florida, Receives Veterans of Foreign Wars Gold Medal Americanism Award for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, well-deserved recognition was given recently to Florida's outstanding U.S. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS. I take particular pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues that the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave the distinguished and handsome Senator SMATHERS their Americanism Award for 1961.

The VFW is a great organization, long interested in the fostering and development of patriotism, loyalty, and Americanism and in the welfare of the veterans of this country. Therefore, it is particularly significant that the VFW presented their gold medal Americanism Award to Florida's favorite son, the articulate Senator SMATHERS, during their recent convention in my district.

Few men, if any, in this country, have spoken more eloquently or passionately, called more clearly or pointed more forcefully than has Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS to the epochal needs in Latin America, for better understanding between all the Americas and for the exacerbation of communism. The clarion vision of this internationally and domestically astute politician is verified in the facts of today as they exist.

I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their nationally popular selection of Florida's distinguished and favorite son, U.S. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, to receive the Veterans of Foreign Wars gold medal Americanism Award for 1961.

The Miami Herald, one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, had this to say about Senator SMATHERS' leadership and the award:

RECOGNIZING LEADERSHIP

For 12 years, Florida's Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS has been acting as a Paul Revere on the subject of Western Hemisphere solidarity.

It was a thankless task until last night when the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave

Senator SMATHERS their Americanism Award for 1961. They chose him for his leadership in alerting the Nation to the need for a better understanding of the rest of the Americas.

That the gold medal was presented here was a gracious conjuncture. Miami is the Senator's hometown. The VFW is holding its 62d convention at Miami Beach this week.

By their presence here, members of the VFW will get an eyewitness view of the consequences of a Communist takeover in Cuba just over the horizon across the Florida Strait. They will see the throngs of Cuban refugees in our community, and hear them speaking their native tongue.

The experience should be revealing to visiting veterans from the other 49 States.

Apart from that, we join in welcoming them to Greater Miami. Their parade tonight and the Pageant of Drums tomorrow in the Orange Bowl will give Miamians a pleasant chance to join in their annual get-together.

The Key to Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, to dramatize the importance of fallout shelters and demonstrate that shelter living is feasible, five volunteers recently subjected themselves to 10 trying days in a darkened shelter on Lovell's Island in Boston Harbor.

I commend to the attention of the House two editorials on this venture. They are entitled "The Key To Survival" and "Meeting the Peril." Both were broadcast by radio station WBZ and WBZ–TV and both contain an important message for us all: America faces a grave threat, but it can be met and perhaps the peril avoided if the people are adequately prepared.

THE KEY TO SURVIVAL

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

WBZ has gone all out in the past week to awaken its listening audience to the need for fallout shelters.

The project has centered around Lovell's Island in Boston Harbor. There WBZ Radio News Supervisor Ed Fouhy and four other young men are subjecting themselves to 10 trying days in a darkened shelter. As this dramatic test of shelter living goes into its final stages, we'd like to take a moment to discuss the basic philosophy of this defense program.

We view shelters not only as a means of personal safety, but part of a positive national defense policy. The shelter program is not based on panic; it's based on commonsense.

We live in a deeply divided world. We're faced with a cruel and calculating enemy which could launch a nuclear attack upon us.

To stand up to that enemy and the challenges it will continually create around the world, we must be strong, both offensively and defensively. Without this strength, we leave ourselves open to the threat of nuclear blackmail.

Military officials admit there's no effective defense against missiles. The country's future, then, depends on the people's ability to survive an attack. And the shelter program is the one key to survival.

Ultimately the hope of the world lies not in bomb shelters but in disarmament, the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. But bringing about arms control is not an easy job; at times the Russians have made it seem almost impossible.

Until some effective way of controlling nuclear warfare is agreed upon, this country must remain strong militarily. That means having weapons for use against the enemy. But it also means having the survival facilities available for the people at home.

You can do your part by getting a shelter ready for yourself and your family.

MEETING THE PERIL

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

Operation survival on Lovell's Island is over.

WBZ–Radio News Supervisor Ed Fouhy and four other young men have emerged from the darkened shelter where they spent 10 days. They volunteered for this ordeal to test out the conditions that you and I would have to live under in the event of a nuclear attack. Now here's Ed to share this experience with us.

"Shelter living is certainly no picnic, nor is it as difficult as the five "Operation Survival" volunteers had anticipated. Our 10- by 20-foot shelter, about the size of the average family living room, was adequate for the five of us. And while our accommodations were not luxurious, they would be easy to endure, had it been a matter of life and death. We learned, through bitter experience, that it is impossible to plan too well a family fallout shelter; and we learned, too, that every person planning his own shelter must provide for his own leisure time needs, as well as his dietary preferences. We did little reading, for example, because the lighting was so poor. With so much leisure, even the men who had never played scrabble or chess learned quickly. The sense of isolation, and the resulting sense of depression, is an enemy perhaps even more dangerous to persons living in a shelter than boredom. This at least was our experience. Our portable radio was a valuable aid in combating this feeling. In short, "Operation Survival" proved the feasibility of shelter living, but most of all it proved that Americans have a good deal more inner strength than the Kremlin might like to believe."

The prospects of a nuclear war are horrifying, but they must be faced. Should it come, the difference between life and death for many millions of people, the difference between survival and extermination for this country, would be adequate protection from fallout. And that protection can be had only in properly constructed and equipped fallout shelters. The Lovell's Island test has shown that average people can carry on in such quarters.

Admittedly shelter living would be no picnic. But neither was life easy in the trying days in which this country was founded at Plymouth, Lexington, and Valley Forge, in the march across the western frontier. Nor was it easy for those who have fought and died to preserve this country before in wartime.

America again faces a grave threat to its existence. But this peril can be met and perhaps avoided if the people are adequately prepared. You can do your part by getting a shelter ready for yourself and your family. Start preparing for survival today.

Wisconsin Has Pioneered in Social Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we in Wisconsin take particular pride in the fact that our State was the first to enact a constitutional State workmen's compensation law. Wisconsin has always pioneered in the field of social reforms and progressive social legislation. This great heritage is certainly in keeping with our State motto—"Forward."

On August 31 a ceremony was held at the White House to launch the special postal stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of this legislation in Wisconsin. One of the speakers was Peter Schoemann, who is vice president of the AFL–CIO. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include his address in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF PETER T. SCHOEMANN, VICE PRESIDENT, AFL–CIO, AT THE WHITE HOUSE CEREMONIES ON ISSUANCE OF A POSTAL STAMP COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WISCONSIN STATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Mr. President, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations deeply appreciates this opportunity of participating in the issuance of this beautiful postal stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Wisconsin State workmen's compensation law. That was, of course, a significant action, but it is more meaningful because today every one of the 50 States has followed Wisconsin's example.

In the beginning, workmen's compensation was based on the principle that the workman injured on the job, regardless of fault, should receive a money indemnity to replace approximately two-thirds of his wage loss.

With the passage of 50 years, many States have substantially improved their workmen's compensation programs. The question is whether they have improved them enough. Today, our doctors and those employed in the healing arts can do things for the seriously disabled which were undreamed of 50 years ago.

What the AFL–CIO seeks today, therefore, is a program that would restore each occupationally injured worker to his maximum physical and mental capacity, with whatever retraining is necessary to return him to useful service to society. These goals are not idle dreams. They are practical and attainable.

The AFL–CIO invites your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that State governments have failed to enact the legislation, and to provide the administrative supervision, needed to assure to hundreds of thousands, injured in their employment, the medical care and related assistance needed for rehabilitation and reemployment.

We pledge our support, Mr. President, to your efforts to arouse the American people to see again the vision of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and those who pioneered with them in developing legislation to protect the injured workman and his family. We will do all we can to see that our State governments attack this problem

with the same boldness and sense of social responsibility that the Governor and Legislature of the State of Wisconsin demonstrated 50 years ago.

A truly great nation will not be indifferent to the families of the thousands of workers who are killed annually on the job, and the millions who are permanently or temporarily disabled.

We sincerely hope this stamp, this ceremony, and your leadership will inspire the States to assure all injured on the job the goals of a modern workmen's compensation system.

Address by Congressman Holifield at Fort Belvoir, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of our best informed colleagues both on atomic energy, its hazards and potentialities, and on civil defense, who is serving as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, was the speaker at the graduation exercises for shelter program personnel at the U.S. Army Engineer School at Fort Belvoir, Va., on September 1.

Since his subject is of great interest to all of us, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix, his remarks on that occasion, and recommend them for your careful perusal.

Gentlemen, I am honored to be here at the U.S. Army Engineer School and to attend your graduation exercises. You are taking an important first step in the civil defense shelter program as it begins operations under the Department of Defense.

It is good for the future of the program that Army, Navy, and Air Force engineers, civilian and military, have been drawn into this first phase of the training program. Your experience will be useful to you personally; I know it will contribute much to the success of the program.

These are short training weeks. But you have a background in the engineering profession. This is a reorientation course.

I trust that you are ready to proceed with all speed and diligence into the job ahead. As I understand it, you are to begin training the pyramid organization of personnel needed to take the program into all parts of the country. You are to train them well and to train them fast.

We don't have any shelters yet, so accomplishments are still ahead of us. The President, the Congress and the public are interested. After years of talking about shelters, our Government proposes to do something specific about getting them, and you are going to help.

This graduation exercise marks a transition in public and official thinking. I like to put it this way: "America is coming of age in the thermonuclear age." We have a pledge of action, and today is the first downpayment on a program. Some of us have been calling for this kind of action for a long time, and we are very happy to see it begin.

Not all of those who watch with interest will have friendly eyes. I don't need to remind you of that. There is still a wide range of opinion about civil defense among the American people. And even those of us who recognize the dimensions and the difficulties of the problem, will keep on debating the merits of particular plans and activities.

As far as our committees are concerned—I refer here to the Military Operations Subcommittee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee—we will maintain a friendly but critical regard for your efforts. We will do so because we work for a better and better program. The knowledge you gain here will help the Congress and it will help the country to understand what is needed in the future.

The first mistakes or misdirected efforts will beget you criticism from all sides; you might as well be prepared for that. Don't let that knowledge make you overcautious or dismayed. You must simply be professionally concerned and conscientious.

There are many people who will look on this survey and marking program as a necessary first step, but not much more. This may be disheartening, perhaps, to some of you who are engaged in a large and demanding job. But everyone will be interested in the final results, and in their accuracy and significance for many parts of this great country, and for the Nation as a whole.

I look upon your immediate job as undertaking a technical building census for survival. I say "technical" because this will be a professional job, not a mere counting procedure. It is not glamorous, but it is important for national survival.

As Department of Defense personnel, no doubt you are accustomed to being satisfied with a well-done message from your superiors who know your problems. We want to assure you that those of us who understand the need, and the importance of your work, will be very gratified to see the completion of the urgent mission entrusted to you.

Let me talk about efficiency for a minute. I hope your training here does not suggest a too-rigid approach to what is new, and what is perhaps a one-time problem. I hope that each of you will be ready and able to jump on every new idea and shortcut that may be suggested—either by yourselves, the persons you train, or others who have competence and knowledge. Undoubtedly you will find great regional and special problems that must be tackled with individual initiative and effort.

If this job can be done in less time, or for less money, the country will have great cause to thank those who make it possible. The benefits may be far more important than the specific savings. I charge you all with the responsibility of seeking shortcuts which will hasten the work without impairing its value.

The time is late. Programs along this line should have been started some years ago. Fallout was known to the scientists and weapon specialists from the time the first bombs went off. They knew a lot more about it in 1953–54, when the winds shifted in the Bikini Atoll and showed the dimensions of the fallout hazard.

So, I congratulate you, and commend you on your new assignments, and convey to you without their knowledge the thanks of millions of Americans who will be given the chance of survival in the event of a nuclear war.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in tribute to my colleague from New York on the occasion of his birthday and the silver anniversary of his service in the Congress. As a freshman Member of this august assembly, I have been encouraged by and profited from the words and actions of GENE KEOGH. His dedicated service to our country as a Member of this body has brought dignity and honor to the Congress as well as to himself.

As the best dressed man in the Congress GENE KEOGH brings a propriety and decorum to this Chamber which few can match. His diligent efforts in behalf of his constituents and his Nation are reflected in his work on various committees of the House. His reputation as an effective and able Member of the Congress has preceded this tribute we offer today.

I join my colleagues in paying due respects to a gentleman who has done much to serve his Nation and one whom I know will continue to serve with honor and distinction.

Support for Truth in Lending by One Who Extends Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post, September 5, 1961. It is heartening to see Robert Hall Clothes, Inc., an institution which extends credit, endorsing the principles of H.R. 6725—a bill which I introduced on May 1, 1961, which would require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with the extension of credit.

The advertisement follows:

WHY DOES A FAMILY CLOTHING CHAIN BECOME A BOOK REVIEWER?

Our stores are rooted in 345 American communities throughout the Nation. It is an honor we cannot treat lightly. No merchant could. With it comes a responsibility to serve each community honestly and well.

For this reason we depart from our daily task as merchants to call your attention to a forthright and extraordinary book. Called "Buy Now, Pay Later," it was written by a perceptive and painstaking reporter, Mr. Hillel Black, and published by William Morrow & Co. In very human terms, it deals with the effect runaway consumer credit has upon our lives and our futures.

Mr. Black started this book after covering the story of a 19-year-old boy's innocent dream to see if he could really "live it up" on a credit card binge. It was Mr. Black's first introduction to the startling, oftimes tragic, effects of debt living in today's modern-minded, luxury-loving era. The book came as a natural development an essential, driving examination. Carefully documented, fervent and provocative, it tells of the strains and tragedies imposed on people who are trying to keep up with the bill collector. It tells of the moral abandon many families indulge in because of easy credit. It tells of the lack of knowledge most people have about what they really pay for the privilege of buying on credit.

We believe, as Mr. Black does, that credit, without adequate information, self-discipline, and good judgment can get out of hand.

We urge consumers everywhere to familiarize themselves with the truths as presented in "Buy Now, Pay Later."

Last year 100,000 families went into bankruptcy. This is an alarming increase over the past decade and more than the total number of bankruptcies filed during the depths of the depression of the 1930's. How could this happen during an era of our greatest abundance?

On-the-cuff-living easy payment plans are being booked 24 hours a day. Purchases are being made not with cash on hand but with future earnings. It is becoming easier and easier to go into debt. If for any reason families who have assumed excessive credit cannot meet their payments, they are faced with the tragedy of bankruptcy.

We believe, as Mr. Black believes, that consumers once again must become hard traders, comparing values, demanding accurate information and taking on responsibilities that they can realistically handle. And they must buy what they are sure fits their actual budgets.

Consider this: In most instances the consumer, because it all looks so easy, is completely uninformed on what he actually pays for the privilege of running a buy now, pay later debt.

What does "small service charge" really cost? The price for consumer credit is frequently astounding, reports Mr. Black. One civic group gave these examples: a store sells a product for $329.95 on a 24-month contract with a $10 downpayment. Mr. Consumer pays the store $66 extra for credit—enough to buy 285 quarts of milk.

Or, assume, Mr. Consumer wants to buy a big luxury item for $2,660.52 with a $460.52 downpayment. Credit charges on the $2,200 balance on a 36-month contract can cost him over $400. Think of it. A charge enough to purchase a washing machine and a dryer.

Are we turning into a nation of consumer automatons? We buy without asking the cost and pay without adequate information.

Isn't it about time consumers started asking questions about credit? Living in a fool's paradise of carefree buy now, pay later habits will not serve to strengthen our free enterprise economy.

We join hands with Mr. Hillel Black in his plea for a return to the tried and true American traditions of respect for thrift and restraint in mortgaging our future.

ROBERT HALL CLOTHES, INC.

Tribute to Representative Keogh on His Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with his many friends and colleagues in extending to my fellow New Yorker, EUGENE J. KEOGH, my good wishes on the occasion of his birthday and his 25th anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I had the pleasure of serving with GENE KEOGH in the New York State Legislature from which we were graduated to membership in the House of Representatives. As an alumnus of that body and as a member of the House I had occasion to observe him; and I do not hesitate to say that I consider him one of our most competent legislators and, I might say, skillful diplomats.

Many have been the encomiums uttered on this occasion and there is little I can say in addition. I wish only to add a personal prayer that he will continue his devoted and valuable service to our country for many years to come.

Special Stamp Conveys Tribute to Wisconsin Workmen's Compensation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, it was my privilege to attend the White House ceremony that introduced the commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the enactment of Wisconsin's Workmen's Compensation Act. During the ceremony, Postmaster General J. Edward Day gave an inspiring speech, which I would like to include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

REMARKS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY AT CEREMONIES INTRODUCING THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, THE WHITE HOUSE, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1961

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Post Office Department is highly honored that this ceremony is being held at the White House, with the President and so many significant leaders of government and of the labor movement participating.

Fifty years ago tomorrow, the Nation's first constitutional State workmen's compensation law became effective.

Enacted by the Wisconsin State Legislature in early 1911, and signed into law by that State's Governor, this statute became the forerunner of legislation now in effect in each of the 50 States of the union.

Because of the humanitarian convictions of that generation of State legislators, millions of American families are insured today against those unfortunate and unforeseeable circumstances which might, through injury or death, remove their breadwinners from the payrolls of American industry.

The passage of workmen's compensation laws represented the starting point for a series of major enactments, State and Federal, which over these 50 years have given increasing recognition to the dignity of the working man.

It is a privilege, Mr. President, that through your auspices this commemoration takes the form of a U.S. stamp, which will convey our tribute to the four corners of the world.

Because it is our policy to honor only a very few highly significant people or subjects each year through our commemorative stamp program, this occasion has increased importance.

The stamp which we are unveiling here today will first be placed on sale at Milwaukee, Wis., on Labor Day—September 4.

One hundred million of the stamps will be printed. They will be on sale in every one of our 35,000 post offices from Point Barrow to Key West and from Maine to Pago Pago.

The design of the new workmen's compensation law stamp is essentially abstract, seeking to communicate the ideal of law—perfect justice.

Printed in blue and gray, it features the scales of justice and equality, with a workman and his family balancing a representation of industry.

We can assume that this stamp will find a place in the albums of many of the millions of stamp collectors of all ages and in all parts of the world as a permanent reminder of a great milestone in social progress.

Inland and Burns Ditch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my statement before the Army Engineers' hearing on the Burns Ditch proposed project when the hearing session was held at Indianapolis on August 30th.

The following is an editorial by James S. DeLaurier, editor and publisher of the Hammond Times, setting out facts submitted by the Inland Steel Co., of East Chicago, Ind., as testimony at last week's Army Engineers' hearing:

INLAND AND BURNS DITCH

One of the more significant voices opposing a Port of Indiana at the Burns Ditch area of Porter County was unheard—although on the record—at the U.S. Army Engineers' port hearing in Indianapolis last week.

It was that of Inland Steel Co., the eighth largest steel producer in the United States and operator, at its Indiana Harbor Works, of the third largest steel mill in the Nation. Inland is against locating a Port of Indiana at the Burns Ditch site.

Why it opposes the site in Porter County was set forth in a written statement submitted on behalf of the company for the hearing record by Hjalmar W. Johnson, vice president for research and planning. It was placed in the record although not read at the hearing.

To begin, Johnson makes clear that Inland Steel has a valid interest in the Porter County area, where it is proposed to locate the port. Since 1919 Inland has owned more than 800 acres of land, including the mile of shoreline from the Lake-Porter County line eastward to Ogden Dunes.

"This property has been held and continues to be held for the purpose of building a steel plant with harbor connections," Johnson points out. Actually, maps locating the proposed port's future extension to the southwest show the harbor line touching the southeast corner of the Inland Steel property south of U.S. 12.

Inland's statement declares that the October 1960, interim report submitted by the Army Engineers estimates that oversea general cargo would amount to only 165,000 tons a year by the 10th year after the proposed Burns Ditch port is completed, and only 370,000 tons a year by the end of a 50-year period.

In contrast, the annual waterborne tonnage for steel mills proposed to be built at the site would run to 10 million tons per year.

This, Inland says, would mean that State and Federal Governments together would be investing $74 million "mainly for the benefit of two private steel companies."

But even this tonnage, Inland says will be "negligible" until coke ovens, blast furnaces, and steel furnaces are installed. Inland says that day appears to be some distance away.

Inland Steel takes note that Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago have urged Congressman RAY J. MADDEN to petition the Army Engineers (MADDEN has done so) for a study of what has come to be known as the "Tri-City Port" which would extend along the shores of the three cities and would be created by building a long breakwater between existing breakwaters at South Chicago and Indiana Harbor.

Furthermore, Inland points out, the Monon Railroad is going ahead with plans to improve the harbor at Michigan City at its own expense, which would provide a port for handling bulk and general cargoes.

Inland asks the Army Engineers to disapprove the Burns Ditch site until a study can be made of the proposed "Tri-City Harbor" in Lake County.

So far as is known, this is the first time that Inland or any other of the major steel companies in Lake County has taken a position on the most recent proposals for building a Port of Indiana at Burns Ditch. There is some feeling that Lake County steel mills have refrained from speaking out on the Burns Ditch site question in the past for fear it might seem they were taking a "dog in the manger" attitude.

Now that Inland views have been officially placed on the record, it is apparent that the Lake County mayors and the Hammond and East Chicago Chambers of Commerce have gained powerful supporting voice in their drive to build a Port of Indiana in the "Tri-City" location.

The West's Voice of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on September 3, 1961.

The column follows:

THE WEST'S VOICE OF FREEDOM
(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN.—President Kennedy has said there are three Western rights in West Berlin which are not negotiable: The right of its people to a government of their own choosing, the right of Western access, and the presence of Western troops to prove that we will defend these rights.

I would like to add a fourth.

The fourth Western right which we ought not to yield nor negotiate away is the Western Voice of Freedom in Berlin, which has the largest audience of any radio station in all Eastern Germany, which symbolizes the very heart of what we stand for—freedom of thought—and which the Soviets yearn to snuff out.

I refer to RIAS (radio in the American sector), which is the only radio station with a signal strong enough to be heard widely throughout East Germany and whose reporting is so trusted as the nearly lone source of truth about what is going on in the world.

Let's be clear about this. The only way Western rights in West Berlin can be secured is to show that we have the will and the means to defend those rights—by force if necessary. These rights will not be any more secure by giving away the freedom and the facility to report the truth.

Recently East Berlin newspapers and radio commentators have pounced on President Kennedy's reference to "any actual irritants in West Berlin" which the United States would be ready to remove. They have suggested that "above all" they would like to rid themselves of RIAS. Of course they would. But there is no evidence whatsoever that the core of Western rights to West Berlin would be more secure if RIAS were liquidated.

RIAS is an irritant to the Soviets and East German Communists only because any freedom of speech, any freedom of the press, is an irritant. But just because the Soviets would like us to throttle the Western voice of freedom in West Berlin is no reason we should do so.

The denial of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in East Germany is an irritant to us, but I fear no suggestion from Mr. Khrushchev or Herr Ulbricht that they would put its removal on the agenda of negotiation with the West.

Let us not throw away RIAS for nothing. In fact, let's not throw away RIAS for anything. I doubt that President Kennedy intends to do so. Let us not be tempted into the mistake of believing that abandoning RIAS would reduce by one iota the Soviet threat to Western rights in West Berlin.

The very violence of the East German attack on RIAS is evidence of its effectiveness. During the week I have been in Berlin, RIAS has been the continued target of Communist vituperation, which describes it as the "swamp flower of the U.S. Government" and accuses it of being "inducers of youths to become incendiaries" and "director of the NATO spies."

I have examined the RIAS programs in detail and they contain no appeal to the East Germans to revolt, no call to arms. They are provocative if factful reporting of the news and calm expression of Western views are provocative. They are provocative only if it is provocative to report to the East Germans news and views they cannot get elsewhere.

Now that the border has been sealed by Khrushchev, the work of RIAS is more necessary and more wanted by the East Germans than before. It is a revealing fact that RIAS is receiving more letters from East German listeners now than before travel to West Berlin was banned.

No German radio station has the kilowatt strength under the Amsterdam Treaty to reach East Germany effectively. RIAS is needed as the Western voice of freedom. We ought not to let Khrushchev talk us or threaten us out of it.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in saluting our beloved colleague, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, upon this notable occasion. As he observes his birthday and his silver anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives, GENE should take pride and satisfaction in the brilliant record he has carved for himself through the years. His constituents and his fellow countrymen everywhere are indebted to him for his dedicated legislative service. His fine qualities of mind and heart have won GENE the admiration and affection of all his colleagues who rejoice with him on this significant milestone in his life. I extend to GENE my warm felicitations and my very best wishes for many, many more years of success and happiness.

Immediate Service or Letter in Quadruplicate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is obviously growing in intensity is the question of public against private power. The Members of Congress are thoroughly familiar with the issue and it is not my purpose to discuss it in detail.

However, Mr. Speaker, a weekly community newspaper in my district, the Worth Record, in its edition of Thursday, August 24, contained an editorial entitled "Immediate Service or Letter in Quadruplicate." This editorial comment is a thought-provoking and penetrating observation on public versus private power, and I am sure will be appreciated by those who may note it in the RECORD. I, under unanimous consent, insert it in the RECORD:

IMMEDIATE SERVICE OR LETTER IN QUADRUPLICATE

"For government to compete with its citizens in areas where private business is iminently capable and willing to do the job is wrong in principle and is counter to our American system of economic free enterprise."

That is the view of the Ogden, Utah, Standard-Examiner. And it cites a clear-cut case of proposed and totally needless socialism.

The proposal, now before Congress, would authorize a $176 million Federal electric transmission system to carry power from the Colorado River storage project. The system would cover Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

It is needless because investor-owned utilities in these States have offered to carry the power over their lines, at moderate cost. The Standard-Examiner sums up a number of specific benefits that would follow. For one thing, the taxpayers would be saved the huge building costs. For another, the utilities would pay $3,280,000 in taxes, including $1,160,000 which would go to schools, whereas the Federal system would pay none.

The newspaper observes that the congressional battle over this matter may be involved and abstract. However, it adds, that it can be reduced to one simple question in operating terms: "* * * when we private citizens experience a sudden power failure in our homes would we prefer to immediately

phone the local electric utility company, or would we prefer to mail a letter in quadruplicate, to a faceless Washington bureaucracy?

Nixon Hole in One Not an Ace, Just Par for the Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, former Vice President Nixon is reported to have scored his first hole in one at Bel Air, Calif., this Labor Day weekend. I submit that the report is possibly in error on two counts:

First. This is not the first day that Mr. Nixon has executed a bold stroke at the expense of labor.

Second. He did not reach this hole with one blow. I would recount two other whiffs or mulligans or shanks which he indulged this week before he rose to the tee for a sporting shot at Bel Air. He made the first pass when he took a fast backswing and scored a clean miss. I refer to the report which I heard over a nationwide radio network this morning stating that the erstwhile presidential candidate saw fit to chide the members of the Washington press on their White House coverage because they did not know, according to Mr. Nixon, that the wife of our President, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, was pregnant. As usual, Mr. Nixon would appear to be presently untimely, characteristically incorrect, and unbecomingly improper.

I too much respect the offices of Representative, Senator, and the Vice Presidency to suggest that one who has held all three might not have the stature necessary to stand more than eye level with a bedroom keyhole. However, I urge that in this instance Mr. Nixon seek out a more reliable 19th hole, if not a more manly locker room. I am sure that Mr. Nixon will agree that his wife, mine, and Mrs. John F. Kennedy must remain inviolate from the low-level pitch from the trap which scatters sand and fails to move the ball, politically or otherwise.

On his second shot, Mr. Nixon's approach from the rough terrain of sour grapevines was no more accurate. Evidently reminiscent of the three-putt, repeat putt, putt, putt, results of our foreign policy of the past 8 years he tried to shave a stroke and attempted to use a wedge to pitch into a situation which he did little to solve in those 8 years. His criticism of the Berlin situation with respect to the use of the 1,500-troop task force directed by President Kennedy is just so much yapping at the dogleg, out of bounds, and wide of the pin.

As a military man who once stood within 110 kilometers of Berlin in our Armed Forces I would remind the former Vice President that reinforcements always strengthen, never weaken, and are much respected by the enemy. In fact even one American going in the right direction at this time should give pause to the thinking of the communist dictator.

I submit the editorial from today's New York Journal American from the same edition which carried the report of Mr. Nixon's hole in one:

NIXON'S CRITIQUE

Our readers may recall that in the Presidential campaign last year we supported Vice President Nixon because we thought he was more experienced in foreign affairs, particularly in combination with Henry Cabot Lodge.

However, that does not preclude observing that in his recent criticism of President Kennedy, regarding the strengthening of our garrison in Berlin, Mr. Nixon seemed to be speaking more from personal politics than international sagacity. He called the addition of 1,500 more troops "an empty gesture."

As the victor in the 1960 contest pointed out at his press conference last week, the purpose in sending in the troops was not to make Berlin impregnable, since from the military point of view it is untenable.

The purpose was (a) to emphasize to the Russians that we mean to defend our position there and (b) to remind Berliners that we are standing by our commitment to them.

"I don't see really how that weakens our commitment," said the President. "If troops were withdrawn, would that strengthen it?"

It was a pretty good tag line. Anyway, perhaps Mr. Nixon might better occupy himself by deciding whether he's going to run for Governor of California.

In conclusion no, Mr. Nixon, your latest was a decent shot but the last two were slices or hooks from bad lies or worse. I respectfully suggest that you stand up to the ball, take a firm grip, a slow backswing and follow through. If you do all these you will understand the game that our President is playing. As far as I am concerned, for the past eight months, President John F. Kennedy has been shooting for eagles all the way. These are the eagles of course with the olive branches in one claw and the arrows in the other. You may look good on the par threes but for the long ones the big hitter, President John F. Kennedy is doing a grand job without hitting too far down or taking too much divot in the process.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do certainly not want to miss the opportunity to join with so many of my colleagues today in paying tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE J. KEOGH, who is observing the anniversary of his 25 years of service in the House of Representatives, and who is also celebrating his birthday.

Having been so closely associated with the gentleman from New York—we are in the same delegation—I have had ample occasion to observe his dedication to duty and his outstanding record as a public servant over the years. He enjoys the respect and admiration of all those with whom he serves, and rightly so.

Many times I have benefited by his wise counsel and advice, and so I take double pleasure in extending my best wishes for his birthday, and my congratulations on his silver anniversary in Congress.

City of Pensacola, Fla., Concerned About Efforts To Muzzle Military Personnel's Comments Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in my State of Florida, the city of Pensacola has been very concerned with efforts to muzzle military personnel who have had the courage to speak out against communism and for Americanism. For instance, the Greater Pensacola Chamber of Commerce has called upon area citizens to urge an investigation of the Fulbright memorandum. I quote from the Pensacola Journal of Sunday, August 27:

Patently alarmed by statements made by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas in the controversial memorandum made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 3, W. M. Swinford, chamber president, had this to say:

"If we are to safeguard the constitutional right of every man to speak—in uniform or out—this memorandum and its intent must be fully investigated.

"Senator RICHARD RUSSELL'S Military Affairs Committee will complete this investigation, and, we feel sure, take appropriate action if enough citizens urge them to do so."

"FULBRIGHT'S memorandum, in which he deplored so-called right wing radicalism," also urged restriction on public utterances by military leaders on foregin affairs.

"FULBRIGHT also singled out such organization's as Pensacola's Project Alert, apparently as examples of rightwing radicalism.

"Primary Mr. FULBRIGHT'S remarks are statements proposing that members of the Armed Forces not exercise their constitutional right of free expression to speak, either to comrades in arms or the general public on topics which relate to foreign affairs, topics on which many of the military are extremely well informed.

"Mr. FULBRIGHT requested the Defense Department to silence military men, threatening their careers if they fail to comply.

"In the same vein, the Senator has attempted to cast doubt upon groups of civilians who have sought through patriotic efforts to tell the true story of the Communist menace before their fellows.

"Our own project alert has been criticized in this vein.

"In short," Swinford concluded, "the Senator has said that 'the American people don't need to know about foreign policy or affairs.' "

Swinford asked that all citizens of Pensacola write to Senator RUSSELL immediately urging that his committee complete the investigation.

He said they must act at once, since the congressional session will be over in 2 weeks.

Action by the chamber was the latest in a series of criticisms of the Fulbright memorandum since excerpts from it were published on July 20. Originally it had been sent to the Secretary of Defense.

Among others who criticized the memorandum were Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who called it "one of the most shocking documents I have read since coming to Washington."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, credited the Fulbright memorandum with the issuance of a Defense Department directive which BRIDGES contends has the effect of "muzzling" members of the armed services.

He called for the investigation by the Military Affairs Committee.

I submit, also, Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Pensacola News, of Tuesday, August 29, which deals further with this important subject:

FRONTIERSMEN WOULD BANISH TEACHING OF CONSERVATISM

One of the greatest shocks this Nation has ever undergone came at the close of the Korean war when Americans learned of the number of U.S. soldier-prisoners who preferred to defect and follow the Red line.

Certainly this deserved concentrated study to determine just why any American who had lived under this Nation's freedoms and opportunities would voluntarily choose another ideology. The study which followed revealed that many of our troops and many more millions of civilians had no real basic knowledge of the principles of Americanism, and how these benefit them. It therefore seemed obvious to any intelligent, loyal American that we have been sadly remiss in teaching the ideals, principles, and advantages of our form of Government.

Because of this there have been many different organizations created in recent years with this objective and basic aim—to inculcate in American minds the true principles of freedom, personal independence, and the American way of life which is a basic guarantee of the continuation of the liberties which we find so dear.

There have been many variations among these organizations, just as there are differences in the thinking of Americans on all facets of life. That is a part of the American tradition, for without the differences, and the freedom of independent thought which creates such differences, America could never have reached the heights which it has attained.

Among these are those who advocate more and more governmental activity to protect the individual, to assure him of a better way of life, to care for him when he is incapable of providing for himself.

There are others who sincerely believe this trend has gone much too far in recent years, that our policies have threatened the individual liberties of our citizens, have made them dependent on governmental handouts, have destroyed their personal initiative. The latter have become convinced that if such trends are not curtailed, even reversed, this Nation ultimately will plunge headlong into complete socialism which can only end in the ultimate loss of all liberty.

They point out that socialism in such a form is different from communism only in name—that Communists of Russia consider themselves Socialists.

Among the latter organizations is Project Alert of the Greater Pensacola area. Created and directed by leaders of civilian life in the community, it has paralleled in some respects the moral leadership program instituted by military leaders to improve the ethical standards of service personnel and install a greater loyalty to this Nation and what it stands for. Since the objectives of the two movements are quite similar, some military leaders have become identified with the civilian program.

The success of both efforts has been outstanding.

But the gains attained do not conform to the ideas of some New Frontiersmen of Washington. The latter consider it a radical rightwing approach which does not represent their ideas of what is best for and about America.

These do not have the same fears about the possible dangers of even more radical leftwing thinking.

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, one of the most stanch defenders of liberal trends, has protested to President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara concerning the spoken position of some military leaders who consider the conservative attitude is best. Senator FULBRIGHT outlined his position in a lengthy statement which has become known as the Fulbright memorandum. Because of it the White House has issued orders which in effect have gagged our military personnel.

This gagging has become a red hot issue in the Pensacola area because the memorandum cites Project Alert as one of the programs which should be out of bounds because of alleged political overtones.

That leaves us wondering if there would be similar concern about politics if the emphasis had been toward the far left.

Maybe, to be on the safe side, the Project Alerters should follow the Chicago Tribune's tongue-in-cheek advice and refer to Red Chinese as agrarian farmers, join the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and become local distributor for the Worker.

If this gag on free speech and free thought is continued our basic right to liberty will be lost without a shot fired.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted for all Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the debate on the conference report on the mutual security bill, I would like to make a statement regarding this legislation.

I have always supported our foreign aid program in the past and I will support this conference report today because it is apparently the best compromise the conferees could obtain.

However, I am greatly disappointed to note that the statement of policy in the bill has been watered down to the point where it has little meaning. The language in the House bill offered greater protection to American citizens and American business regarding their rights against boycotts and blockades, and I feel that this language should have been retained by the conferees. The House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House itself voted in favor of the stronger language and I am sorry the Senate conferees insisted on weakening it. I do not see how we can possibly improve our own position by offering less protection to our own citizens and businessmen.

The removal of that portion of our statement of policy which granted the right of commercial access to other countries makes it appear that the United States condones the actions of some countries in boycotting American trade. If we are to continue to give aid to other countries, I do not think it is too much to expect them to trade with American business, without discrimination.

By watering down our statement of policy, we are opening the door for those nations guilty of discrimination against our citizens to charge that Congress does not care if they pursue their blackmail, blockades and discrimination of American business. The statement of policy originally passed by the House let the world know that the United States objects to such actions, especially by nations we are helping through our mutual security program.

Because I realize the good accomplished by our aid to other countries, I will support this conference report, but I want to go on record as protesting the wording in our statement of policy because I feel that the language indicates that our Government is not prepared to protect the essential rights and liberties of its citizens. "Trade—Not Aid" is an excellent motto and I feel very strongly that America has the right to trade with any other nation in the world, regardless of the internal disputes of one nation with another.

A Small Voice in a Noisy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my news report of August 25, 1961:

A SMALL VOICE IN A NOISY WORLD

The other day the House of Representatives opened its session exactly as it did the first time on March 4, 1789, in New York City. The Speaker rapped for order and asked the Chaplain to pray.

As Members of the House, the many clerks and hundreds of visitors in the galleries bowed their heads, a rich baritone flowed to every nook of the big chamber. Quoting from Daniel 11: 32, the voice intoned: "The people that know God shall be strong and do exploits."

It was the voice of the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., the House Chaplain. As he prayed, I was struck again by the thought of how much good one dedicated man can accomplish. Among scores of strong personalities, who really are world famous, Dr. Braskamp is a humble, retiring minister.

He is completing his 12th year as Chaplain. Most of the clergymen before him held pastorates in active churches as well as the duties of House Chaplain. So did Dr. Braskamp. He came here from Princeton Seminary in 1911 and was on the staff of the National Presbyterian Church, now known as "Ike's Church." In 1952, he resigned his pastorate of Gunton-Temple Church, because his Capitol Hill duties were requiring most of his time. He is the first House Chaplain

to devote full time to Members of Congress, their staffs, and their families.

Dr. Braskamp has one of the biggest parishes in Washington. He not only opens the sessions with prayer every day, but is available day and night to anyone who wants his services. He performs baptisms, weddings, funerals, visits the sick and dying in their homes and hospitals, and is a tower of strength and comfort for hundreds who seek his counsel. He estimates that he has over 3,000 persons in his pastoral care.

The youngest and newest file clerk in a Capitol Hill office or the chairman of some powerful congressional committee get equal time, attention, and help from Dr. Braskamp. The demands on him for counseling and other services are growing constantly. He rejoices in this, for he sees it as a general trend toward religion in troubled times. His reward is to see people gain inner peace and strength.

It is no exaggeration that what Members of Congress do today affects not only Americans, but humanity itself.

We are bedeviled on every side by harsh, cruel enemies, who scorn the ethics and mandates of any religion and openly jeer at even the rules of decency. In dealing with them, it would be the human tendency to match them in injustice and hatred. But day after day, the calm voice rolls over the House and with fervor reminds the lawmakers of the things that are God's and of His justice.

Nobody could calculate what influence for good Dr. Braskamp has on our world today. But it can be appreciated and many thousands do.

Combating Communism Effectively

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Lutheran Witness published the third of a series of four articles on how we can effectively combat communism written by the Reverend Lambert Brose. In this extremely informative treatise, Reverend Brose emphasizes that there are three questions each must answer to separate the men from the boys on how serious we are about fighting communism.

Because these questions and the answers are important to us in understanding what our program of action should be in the cold war, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBATING COMMUNISM EFFECTIVELY—III: PROGRAM OF ACTION—THE COST

(Third in a series of articles by Lambert Brose)

In 13 seconds you may decide to stop reading.

Because now we come to the bitter test that separates the men from the boys: those who just want to shout about the evils of communism and those who are willing—to repeat an expression used earlier—to "put their money where their mouth is."

Give yourself a quick yes or no test on these three questions:

1. If a Negro family moved in next door, would you move out as fast as you could sell your house?

2. If you were asked to give another $100 a year to help people in the underdeveloped nations, would you "yell your head off"?

3. If someone said that what you yourself are doing to "preach the Gospel to every creature" ought to be written up in the comic books, would you dismiss it with a shrug of the shoulder?

HAVE WE THE COURAGE?

The way we answer these questions—at least our general attitude toward them—will show, to a considerable degree, whether we really want to go all-out in the fight against communism.

I don't think most of us have the courage to do it. Not yet.

But I also think that if we see the desperate need and—above all—faithfully continue to study God's Word, the Holy Spirit will give us the courage.

In the fourth and final article of this series specific steps the individual Christian can take to combat this godless ideology will be proposed. Included will be a discussion of Communist infiltration in our own homeland and what we can do to stop it.

The present article points up what such a program of action will cost. Perhaps in changes in our thinking. Surely in time, effort, and money.

DARK EYES WATCHING

Next to the population explosion and hunger—race relations is perhaps the biggest issue of our time.

Look at the facts. The white race is a minority on this globe. There are more than twice as many colored people as whites.

All over the world—from the Congo to the Ganges to the Yalu to the Nile—searching eyes are upon us. Upon us and the Communists. Billions of dark eyes watch intently to see how each world power treats the question of race.

And the United States enters this decisive struggle with two strikes against it. For us it's a question of coming from behind if we are to win.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN NEW YORK?

Recently NBC News reported that the only possible reason United Nations headquarters might be relocated (perhaps in Vienna, as Khrushchev has suggested) would be that the now numerous African delegates might vote for such a move. Because of the racial discrimination practiced against them in New York.

Not in Atlanta or Montgomery or Little Rock. But in New York City. Just across the harbor from the Statue of Liberty.

JAMES FACKLER STORY

It's old stuff to recite the following. But it's frighteningly true. Every time Negroes are jeered and taunted (as were 80 hotel fire victims on June 26 while being temporarily sheltered in Missouri Synod Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Chicago); every time a preacher to the Negroes is flogged in Alabama (as happened March 16 when Missouri Synod Vicar James Fackler was beaten up by segregationists); every time a diplomat from one of the African countries is refused service in a U.S. restaurant (March 9 near Hagerstown, Md.), these unfortunate events are blazoned across the vast nonwhite world by radio, TV, newspapers, and word of mouth.

And the people in Asia and Africa and Latin America don't care whether the Communists exploit these incidents for propaganda purposes. All they know is that in Chicago—and Maryland—and Alabama—once more a black man has been treated like a slave. Or a white man sympathetic to the Negro has been beaten up. All this in the country supposedly leading the fight for freedom.

DELICATE MATTER

Race relations is a most delicate and difficult matter. People have honest differences of opinion—in both the South and the North—as to how we should handle it.

All I'm saying is that we'd better find a solution—and fast—if we want to combat communism effectively.

AFLAME WITH NATIONALISM

If we didn't have to deal with this terrible menace, we could perhaps work out our racial problems more slowly and deliberately. But the emergence of the Communist threat in all its enormity has changed the picture radically. All Africa and Asia—almost the whole nonwhite world—is aflame with the spirit of nationalism. If this spirit isn't guided courageously and wisely by the West, especially by the United States; if the Communists should succeed, partly because of the race issue, in winning the favor of this tide of humanity—God help us all.

MONEY—MONEY—MONEY

Next we come to a phase in the fight which many who complain the loudest about communism would like to forget.

Money. Billions upon billions of dollars.

Can we afford it? Without spending ourselves into bankruptcy?

Any American who isn't willing—together with fellow citizens and fellow men throughout the free world—to spend tremendous sums in fighting communism may as well forget all about combating it effectively.

We're not talking primarily about money for military defense. Most U.S. citizens are convinced, and rightly so, that one of the best ways of preparing for peace is to be so strong militarily that no one dare attack us.

We're talking now about spending to help the people of the "have not" nations help themselves.

This is not popular. But it is absolutely vital, in my opinion.

HAM VERSUS METRECAL

Here are the facts:

Sixty percent of the people in the world are trying to stay alive on the protein equivalent of one thin slice of ham a day.

At this moment, while millions of Americans are trying to pare off weight with low-calorie diets, billions of people suffer from lack of food.

Do you really believe that they will go on starving just because food might come from Communist sources rather than from the free world?

Russia and Red China cannot feed their own people adequately. But both of ruthless dictatorships, especially the Soviets, have starved millions of their own citizens in order to develop the science and industry that culminated in a sputnik and a cosmonaut.

Nor do they hesitate to send food to some obscure, newly emerging country—Chad, the Malagsy Republic, Dahomey, Gabon, Mali, Senegal, Niger, Brazzaville, Togo, Upper Volta—if they feel it will draw another nation behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtain.

RUNNING OUT OF OUR EARS

Last year the Communist countries, chiefly Russia, spent a billion dollars on foreign aid, while many of their own people were poorly fed.

Our country? We've spent much more. Private and church agencies alone distributed almost $292 million in 1960 for foreign aid.

But remember: Despite this summer's drought in parts of our country, food is running out of our ears. We're trying desperately to get rid of it. And the amount we've given to a starving world—Federal plus church plus private assistance—is just

a drop in the bucket, compared with the need.

UPSET THE GRAIN MARKET?

The first step, then, is to get the food and the other necessities of life from the two-fifths of the world drowning under its surplus to the three-fifths hungrily reaching out for it.

The problems involved in this initial step alone—the danger of upsetting the world grain markets, etc.—would give pause to a Solomon. Trying to solve these matters even partially will cost vast sums of money.

Besides, after feeding the three-fifths of the world until the people have sufficient strength to grow their own food, we've got to teach them how to produce and preserve it.

This will take additional billions. But it can be done.

VACCINATED CHICKS

Much has been done already.

A Dutch agriculturist has upgraded crop production at least 300 percent in Pakistan by using the right kind of fertilizer.

Milk production rose 54 percent in El Salvador when a U.S. dairy farmer reorganized 82 farms in that country and set up 77 new ones.

Tens of thousands of chickens were snatched from disease in Thailand by a British specialist who developed a vaccine and inoculated the animals.

Example after example like these may be found in "That No Man Shall Hunger," by Maxwell S. Stewart (U.N. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 304).

WE MUST SCORE

But licking the problem of hunger is only a starter. We'll have to teach these people how to build their economies—and their governments—and their schools.

We'll also have to teach them the superior values of a democratic society. Only we'll have to do our teaching much faster than the Communists do theirs. We must do this so much faster and send so much more money because we have two strikes against us in the uncommitted nations: (1) the race issue and (2) something for which the United States is not to blame but some other countries of the West are—the past record of colonialism. We must score some runs fast.

OUR LAST CHANCE

Expert after expert tells us that a vast area of northeastern Brazil—often referred to as the most poverty-stricken in all Latin America—is ripe for Castroism unless the free world moves in speedily with aid.

U.S. advisers tell our Government that things look so bad in Latin America that this may be our last chance to keep that area for the free world.

Once again, this will cost vast sums of money. If we are to do it successfully, that is. If we are not to use halfway measures which have so often nullified our aid programs in the past. "There's no use in building a bridge halfway across a river," as President Kennedy has said.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE APPROVES

The principle of foreign aid is now approved by most elements in our Nation, even by many who have been most reluctant to endorse it. Recently the U.S. Chamber of Commerce came out with a statement backing foreign aid, though it suggested a considerable cut in the President's request, recommending especially that no additional economic help be given to European countries now recovered from the ravages of war.

Objections to foreign aid today center almost entirely on the abuses and mismanagement in the program, not on the principle itself.

For Christians foreign aid has special meaning. We have the direct command of God to feed the hungry, to visit those in prison, to help the sick. We ought to embrace this opportunity with joy, whether we have the privilege of doing it through our Federal Government, private agencies, or the church. Most likely we'll have to do it through all three—if it is to be done on the massive scale required to make it effective in the fight against communism.

WHERE DO WE GET THE MONEY?

And so we come to the big question. Where do we get the vast sums?

Our Nation's factories are now capable of turning out so much more goods than we ourselves can possibly use. We're up to our necks in almost everything: oil, feed grains, steel, clothes; you name it. With the rapid advance of automation U.S. plants can pour out this superabundance—at the same time laying off more and more workers.

Unless we build up the have not world to the point where teeming populations can buy the products of our factories, there is little doubt in the minds of many that financial disaster will overtake us.

THE NEAREST MIRROR

Nevertheless the objection that we spend ourselves into bankruptcy is valid. So what's the answer?

There is no one answer. It will take doing on many fronts.

We shall find one of the big answers by walking to the nearest mirror.

If the almost 105 million Christian church members in the United States will take seriously their God-directed responsibility to be good citizens; if they will really work at the job of helping run the government by strongly protesting to their legislative representatives against waste and mismanagement and corruption in almost every area of our government—then one facet of the problem is on the way to being solved.

THE 13-CENT COTTER PINS

Item: Last winter's strikes at our missile bases at Cape Canaveral for unheard-of wages.

Item: One of our Nation's biggest corporations selling cotter pins to the Navy for 13 cents each. Cotter pins that it bought from another corporation for little more than half a cent each.

Etc., etc., etc.

The U.S. General Accounting Office report to Congress on the waste and mismanagement in our Defense Establishment during 1960 is a real shocker.

This goes on year after year—to a greater or lesser degree—in almost every area of our Federal Government, including the foreign aid department.

Moreover, State and local governments are, if anything, worse in this respect. To quote the lead sentence of a June 23 United Press International story: "A thread of corruption spreads through the Nation's States and cities today as broad as some of the highways alleged to be crumbling because of it."

WOULDN'T WALK ACROSS THE STREET

Certainly ours is the greatest Government in the world. But it's a republic, a form of government in which the people themselves ultimately have the responsibility for its policies and administration. Our Government in the last analysis can be only as good and efficient as the people allow it to be.

Unfortunately the typical American, it has been said, will cross the ocean to fight for his country but will not cross the street to vote in a local election.

IF 105 MILLION U.S. CHRISTIANS

Christians, it would seem, have a special responsibility to make our Government work. As Edmund Burke put it so eloquently, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is that good men do nothing."

If the almost 105 million Christian church members in the United States will finally get it through their heads that participation in politics is not a violation of the separation of church and state, that God wants them to help make their Government as effective as possible so that the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ can be done as efficiently as possible, that it is their Christian duty to talk or phone or write or wire to their legislative representatives demanding an end to waste and mismanagement and corruption—then we shall be on the way to saving the billions necessary to put the emerging nations on their feet without spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

CYNICS WILL LAUGH

Oh, I know. The cynics will laugh this off as hopeless idealism. It won't be that easy, they will say. Of course it won't. But Christians are not to be cynics. We are to be practical idealists.

This is a long-range process. I'm convinced, though, that enough good citizenship can be exercised now so that we can do what is necessary in a hurry.

One thing is certain: If Christians do not begin in ever-increasing numbers to take a more active part in running their government, the future looks very black indeed.

In the words of our President: "Let us begin."

THE $1.77 FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS

Of supreme importance is this:

If we are to combat atheistic communism effectively, we Christians must bring to the multitudes of Asia and Africa and Latin America the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But fast.

That, too, will take huge sums of money. Much more than the $1.77-per-person average given last year for foreign missions by U.S. Protestants in the 10 largest denominations, including the Missouri Synod.

Let us not belittle what the Christian church has done in this field in the past. Even non-Christians admit that up until and including recent years most of what was done to help the uncommitted nations was done by Christian missionaries, doctors, teachers, deaconesses.

But in view of what needs to be done the Christian church has been acting as if its foreign mission program were a sort of hobby—something to keep the ladies' aids and the men's clubs out of mischief—rather than something that's compellingly urgent as preached by the Savior and His first disciples.

STUFF FOR COMIC BOOKS

One dollar and seventy-seven cents per person per year. This ought to be written up in the comic books—if it weren't so tragic.

No wonder that—as Dr. H. H. Koppelmann wrote in the July 11 issue of the Witness—"Percentagewise the Christian church is losing out against other religions of the world. Of the major religions, Christianity is the only one experiencing such a decline."

God forgive us.

WILL THEY STEAL OUR MINDS?

That's why I say in all sincerity: I don't believe that most of us have the courage to fight communism. Not yet.

But I'm convinced that when we finally recognize the great need, when we apply ourselves earnestly to a study of the Gospel of Christ, the Holy Spirit will give us the courage. And the will.

In the final article we shall list specific ways in which the Christian church collectively and Christians individually can combat communism effectively. Especially how in a positive manner we can deal with the most dangerous threat of all, the diabolically clever effort to steal our minds.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 2, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 2, 1961

THE ENEMY WITHOUT AND WITHIN THE UNITED STATES [1]

Communism today [2]

Current events, Berlin, Cuba, Brazil, the nuclear test ban, disarmament talk, relative military strengths, may obscure the basic struggle, largely undercover, going on through which the United States will nobly win or meanly lose the last great hope of men for peace on earth. Current legislative efforts and current events are overshadowed by this titanic struggle in which only one side will win. This is not and cannot be a stalemate. Ignorance of this is possible, remaining personally unaffected by it is not.

The Communists ceaseless efforts to subvert the remaining free nations, including the United States reached a turning point in last December's Communist meeting. The Red Manifesto then issued recognized the success of U.S. anti-Communist forces in understanding the Red plan of conquest. Their new doctrine, obligatory on all Communists, is to discredit and smear the United States anti-Communists, simultaneously pushing the new line which is "there is no danger of communism in the United States, but abroad." A gigantic effort, a "psywar" or mind warfare, brainwashing and indoctrination, is to lull all Americans into complacency thus facilitating the infiltration and subversion of our country, while the people sleep, a calculated effort to destroy our patriotism through a corrupting trance. By suppressing criticism of communism the people will think the danger is gone. Khrushchev brutally explained it "you spit in their faces and they call it dew."

To accomplish this there must be a double standard as they see it, that is, suppress criticism of communism as antisocial and violative of various civil liberties, but simultaneously step up criticism against the United States. An attempt to monopolize all news and communications media will be made, in which past success has been the rule. Anti-Communist material must be eliminated in schools, public meetings, and the military—more and new agents will infiltrate the Government to influence, stall, and frustrate Government policy and directives. Anti-Communist personnel in Government key spots must be squeezed out whenever possible. Character assassination, smears, rumors, even blackmail is to be used on any and all influential anti-Communists in and out of Government to discredit and remove them.

The success of their effort is chronicled by Senator THURMOND as he lists the tough, but accurate, anti-Communist material removed from use by the military, such films as "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map." Articles furthering this line have appeared in the Worker, the U.S. Communist paper, the New York Times, Washington Post, the Reporter, and others.

Senator THURMOND's strongest criticism is directed at the so-called Fulbright memorandum which he says, "candidly expresses as its major fear not the Communist menace but a grave distrust of the American people to govern themselves" and that, "the American people need to be restrained in their desire 'to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos.'"

The criticism of the memorandum lists these dangers: (1) the repeal of the directive which authorized the military anti-Communist seminars; (2) increased censorship of military speeches and others. Such muzzling further limits the widespread understanding of communism by our people. Their knowledge is what the Communists fear the most. To correct all this Senator THURMOND, and I agree, suggests an immediate full-scale investigation, now, before further success crowns the Communists in their determination to socialize and then communize the United States. To meet this danger we must know about communism and Communists. My effort here is directed toward that end. In knowledge, there is strength, without it we are easy prey. Let's look at what the Communists are up to:

"YOU CAN TRUST THE COMMUNISTS TO DO EXACTLY AS THEY SAY

"(By Dr. Fred Schwarz)

"Communists can be trusted to do exactly as they say once you understand their beliefs. They are dedicated, of deep conviction, superbly organized. Communists know they will conquer the world, it's only a matter of time. In keeping with their beliefs—not ours—they are predictable and understandable. Marx preached class warfare. Lenin proclaimed the Communist Party the instrumentality to win this worldwide war. Marx joined Feuerbach's materialism with Hegel's dialectic reasoning to provide dialectic materialism, the philosophic basis for communism's blueprint of conquest and enslavement of man's mind and badge.

"Class warfare exists between the bourgeois and proletariat, that is between the owner and worker, the wage payer and wage receiver, capital and wages, capitalism and socialism, hence between United States and Russia. The war is thus between nations as well as within nations not yet socialized. The war is to total victory and defeat with all weapons to be used, of the pen and the sword. Education, language, trade, diplomacy, negotiation, religion, cultural exchange, economic—in every field and in every way the battle is fought. The war will end with world domination.

"Peace then is the great goal. They believe in peace, everything is for peace, the peace following world victory. Every violent murder, the thousands and millions slain—these are acts of peace. No lie detector test of any Communist would show otherwise. Beyond rational argument and conviction, paranoic as it seems to us—peace is their definition for violence.

"Truth is whatever the Communists say it is. Once the top command, the 'politburo' has decreed a statement as true, it is the truth. Communists never lie by their definition. There are no absolutes in morals, only as relative to the class struggle, that is, war. Any statement that furthers communism's success is true, the contrary a lie. Their truth is that wherever communism comes to power there is happiness, health, prosperity, and good, and that American and capitalism are evil, degenerate, poor, and unhappy. The facts do not alter this truth, in their minds. They can murder and blame us for their misdeeds, divorced apparently from their senses and this is to them the truth.

"Righteousness is to work, sacrifice and die for the party. Torture, murder, pillage, even their confessing to crimes uncommitted and accepting fellow Communist imposed execution is righteousness since by definition this advances the Communist [Party] clause.

"Love can be manifested by promising military officers no punishment if they surrender, and protection for their families, and then after surrender murdering the officers and disposing viciously of the women and children. To Communists this lying duplicity is unquestionably love for mankind, since it brings the glorious day of world communism closer to fruition. A lie detector test would so confirm their belief.

"What brings human beings to such a strange about face of morals? "Dialectical materialism" the basis for all communism holds that man is only matter in motion, as is everything, no more than an animal, although with more complex conditioned reflexes. Action is automatic and compulsory, no free will. Ultimate reality is material, not mental. Oddly enough, Hegel's dialectics brought to materialism devotion, sacrifice, initiative and dedication so that the Communist has an intense passionate dedication to make the inevitable happen. The dialectic teaches that progress is inherent in change, and everything changes constantly (this to be accepted by faith) so that what is seen is not so important as what will be. The future belongs to the Communist not because of evidence (as overcoming U.S. great strength) but because of faith in dialectics' what must be.

"The nature of progress is go forward then back a little, then forward. Communists believe in abolishing the family. Yet now they strengthen the family to accomplish world takeover. Then they'll abolish it. The logic or illogic here is fantastic. Religion the same. They will use it until they can abolish it, after conquering.

"The nature of conflict in dialectics is shown as thesis (communism) meets antithesis (capitalism) which clash results in synthesis (socialism). Socialism then evolves into communism. All matter in the world is likewise engaged in comparable clashes. So violent revolution is needed to change capitalism to socialism. Some Communists have held that capitalism will evolve into socialism, then communism.

"The ultimate goal of 'dialectical materialis,' world conquest, without God or deity, is to permit the Communist Party to so alter man's environment as to change human nature. Then there will be scientific regeneration of human beings into perfect beings. They will love to work and give their effort and proceeds to others. No hand will be lifted in anger. No crime, no violence, no police, no tax—only mutual cooperation.

"To accomplish this the world must be freed of capitalism and the profit motive. Those who are not agreeable will be killed, by the millions, if necessary. Those remaining will be reeducated. Children will be trained by Communists. Public prostitution will replace family life.

"Communists are recruited largely through appeal to student intellectuals, feeding on discontent. Four ideas are utilized: (a) Disenchantment with capitalism, which causes depressions and war, through imbalance of goods and money (this reasoning fails to recognize (1) the dynamic nature of money and credit, (2) advertising and psychology, (3) expanding market, (4) people's capitalism, individuals' enlarging ownership of property, (5) role of government (antitrust, etc.) and the facts which further show that capitalism has produced more prosperity than ever known, and is accompanied by freedom, not enslavement);

---

[1] Supplementary to last week's newsletter.

[2] Recap of—

1. Senator THURMOND statements.

2. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program."

3. Dr. Fred Schwartz' "You Can Trust the Communists To Do Exactly as They Say."

(b) materialist philosophy, a substitute for those who have doubts about religion and Deity, and are materialistic in leaning; (c) intellectual pride, an appeal to youthful learners who are delighted at freedom from family and old ideas, it appeals to the curious and those seeking new experiences; (d) unfulfilled religious need: A replacement for religion in sacrifice of oneself in a cause.

"A Communist is molded by the Communist Party, as a prerequisite to membership, through work, discipline, and complete obedience under observation. An intellectual elite is the core of the party who are able to control masses by superior knowledge and organization. The membership price is giving oneself completely, foreswearing all else, including dying happily for the party, as did Bukharin, who said death is preferable than life outside the party.

"The organization is controlled from the top down. Local units or cells send a representative to the district council, whose representatives go to higher councils, ending finally in the presidium or politburo. Here decisions are reached by vote (although in practice those disagreeing with top leaders usually are later purged), votes always become unanimous. This is reported then to the Central Committee, and then to the lower echelons and all decisions are binding and without appeal. Any violation, as reported by secret police and informers, who are everywhere, is punishable by expulsion or death.

"Communists work through front organizations they established or through captive organizations they have infiltrated and captured. Communists work secretly or covertly usually. They work through fellow travelers who are not party members, who in turn work through sympathizers, who use pseudo-liberals, who rely on dupes, the latter being well-meaning patriotic citizens who give the money and the respectability. The techniques for seizing power stem from Lenin's belief in violent revolution to destroy the bourgeois and government, rather than use the existing government.

"Seizure of control can be accomplished by (1) internal revolt through control of labor unions, (2) military conquest or (3) military blackmail forcing peaceful surrender.

"Successful techniques for seizing power can be seen in (1) Russia after the Czar was overthrown Lenin's party of 40,000 promising peace and land (promises contradictory to Lenin's basic Communist doctrine but anything is permissible to come to power), beat out other parties, gave land to the peasants, took back the harvests, killed the peasants, starved out the complaining Ukraine (7 million), liquidated all opposing groups, collectivized the farms and enslaved everyone. (2) China: communism won over the students, and promised land, freedom from debt and exclusion of white people. Troops were trained and a brilliant combination of political infiltration followed by military conquest, plus guerrilla warfare, reduced the people still living to complete subjugation and enslavement. (3) Czechoslovakia (likened to technique being used on America): The Communists with massive military power ever present at a threat exacted a series of small concessions from the Czechs, each a small one, with war as an alternative. Meanwhile, Communist agents infiltrated the Government in key spots. In 3 years the takeover was complete.

"The consolidation of power is necessary after initial takeover. The people are disarmed. All potential leaders are killed. Communication media are monopolized, likewise education. The party has an economic monopoly, controlling all jobs. The secret police and informers spy on everyone. Revolts are stopped aborning and revolters killed. Promises and fear keep people in check. Freedom of movement and association are stopped. Mass trials and executions. Children are set against adults. Harvests are taken, and collective farms operated with a new slavery system as labor. This is a complete dictatorship. The Communist Party is supreme, controlled by the top man or men.

"Allies of communism are responsible for communism's success. The party is very small in number. The success is through getting others to do the work. What permits this? How is it possible?

"(a) Intellectual dishonesty: People believe what they want, and they refuse to believe that Communists are Communists and that they really intend to enslave the world. The evidences of Communist success are fivefold: (1) Numerical: Communists numbered 17 in 1903; 40,000 in 1917; 1 billion in 1959, 6 times the population of the United States, more than those who have ever heard of Christ. Five children are learning about communism now to one learning about Christ. How long then before the 2¾ billion in the world are under Communist control? (2) Military: Communists may have military superiority by 1965. (3) Educational: Communists graduating 3 times the scientists (10 times including China) 100 times the language specialists. They stress science, mathematics, and language and learn without freedom. (4) Economic: The gap economically is closing. A greater percent of their national production goes into economic warfare since they control production and don't need profit. They can undersell us in any world market by choice, to create chaos and infiltrate agents. (5) Communications: Their literary crusade of books is directed toward the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa and South America to tip the balance their way (another 1 billion people). Their children's books are good literature. In propaganda they seek to convey communism's goodness and capitalism's evil. They are reaching 100 people to our 1. (The truth of people fleeing from communism is never told.)

"(b) Cultural exchange: Since there is no freedom of movement or communication in Russia our visitors to Russia come back unwitting Communist agents.

"Brainwashing: Communist technique is accurate and destructive of the mind. Through exhaustion, confusion, chronic pain, and fear the person's established mental patterns are shattered. New memories, a guilt complex, and love for their tortures are replaced in new patterns. Indoctrination outside of brainwashing occurs through repetition of the big lie and good advertising techniques. Result is the creation of a false image of the United States throughout the world. They know it is not what we do that counts but what people believe we do. The fact that people flee communism and go to America is never told.

"For the United States to survive confronted with communism our people must have knowledge. We must render our anti-Communist program effective and Russia's anti-anti-Communist program ineffective. Thus far, we are victims, not of their hypocrisy, but of our own ignorance. Our success will hinge on three things: Our motivation, knowledge, and organization.

"Motivation: For the United States to survive this attack our citizens must understand communism and its terrible danger to the United States. We must reaffirm our beliefs in willingness to expend time, money and effort. We won't be hypnotized or lulled into slavery through apathy or failure to realize our great strengths—spiritual and moral—nor will we be so stupid as to be fooled into believing communism is no threat, so that infiltration and subversion can prepare us for the takeover. Our motivation is love of God and our fellow man—that means preserving our country and freedom.

"The knowledge we need is simply the realization that communism is not just another economic system; it is tyranny, slavery, not freedom. We must study and know the tactics of the enemy and then abort his plans.

"The organization required is at the grassroots, not a super group or nationwide organization, just the dedicated perseverance of our many diversified religious, civic, and educational groups. We need not adopt regimentation. Self-discipline is the only discipline needed. Everyone fights communism right where he is.

"Conclusion

"We categorically reject this claim. We are not the helpless victims of our environment, doomed to destruction. The fault lies not in our environment but in ourselves. The political, judicial, educational, and cultural organizations of a free society can function only when the individual citizens have enlightened minds and are dedicated to the foundations of freedom. The basic responsibility rests on each one. The success of this book can be measured by the number of readers whose attention has been redirected from the responsibility of others to their own responsibility; who are asking the question, 'What can I do?' Upon such a foundation, the political, legislative, and cultural programs necessary can be built.

"Material forces alone do not determine the destinies of men. The resources of an infinite God can change the balance of material assets. These resources are liberated through the prayer, the sacrifice, and the intelligent organization of people filled with the love of God. Fundamentally, the problem is a moral and spiritual one. The foundations of freedom must be girded with a moral and spiritual revival. As free men humbly seek God and present their bodies, minds, and hearts to their country and the cause of all mankind, we may well believe that tyranny shall not triumph and freedom shall not perish from the earth."

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brooklyn and the city of New York has given many distinguished citizens to the Nation. We are especially proud and happy to greet our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH on this memorable day—the celebration of his birthday and his 25th year of service in the Congress of the United States. He is a very versatile leader and a loyal friend. His accomplishments are admired and respected. He has always given advice to new Members and is ever ready to serve their interests. To praise GENE KEOGH is not only a privilege on our part, but an open and honest acknowledgment of the great accomplishments that have been his in his great career in the House of Representatives. We greet him with true friendship on this momentous day and leave him in the warm embrace of his loving wife, Virginia, and his dear children, Susan and E. Preston. May God bless and keep him with us in the Congress for many years to come.

You Can Help Save America's Historic Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article by the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, which appeared in This Week magazine of the Boston Herald Traveler on Sunday, September 3, 1961:

YOU CAN HELP SAVE AMERICA'S HISTORIC TREASURES

(By the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman, 22d Ohio District)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A few years ago grieving Charlestonians watched a wrecking crew tear down the beautiful, 152-year-old Orphan's Chapel to make room for five more cars in a parking lot.

The city of Bridgeport, Conn., recently sent wreckers across a picket line of angry preachers and housewives to tear down the Harral-Wheeler mansion, a 115-year-old landmark and example of the Gothic revival in America.

Despite the unanimous plea from the New Jersey assembly and senate to save the building, the Stevens Institute of Technology has just demonlished Castle Stevens, a 105-year-old Victorian landmark on New Jersey's Hudson River shore.

All over our land the bulldozer is pushing over some of the most charming and important reminders of our past. To make room for service stations, parking lots, superhighways, and the other structures demanded by a machine civilization, we have already razed 4 out of 10 of the historic buildings that were standing in 1941.

The destruction is not, I have learned, inevitable. Vigorous and organized protests can save irreplaceable historic buildings threatened with demolition. Charlestonians, for instance, have put aside their grief over the Orphan's Chapel to fight for the 112-year-old customhouse, a superb example of the Classic Revival of a century ago.

All these struggles may be hard, but it is far harder to restore a building once it has been destroyed. Right now, for example, a struggle is going on in Philadelphia to rebuild the house in which Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Today the site of the original building is occupied by a hotdog stand. Independence Hall Association is working at the task of raising $475,000 to restore the handsome brick house—far more than to preserve the original.

If you are afraid that your community will lose a legacy from the past—a neoclassical mansion soon to be razed for a trailer sales park, a log-cabin schoolhouse to be torn down for a concrete cloverleaf, a battlefield to be buried under a housing development—then speak up, and loudly. As a veteran of many successful preservation battles, I know it can be done.

In 1957, for example, the woodland on the Potomac River's Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon was threatened by the spread of Washington's suburbs. I helped found the Accokeek Foundation to save the unspoiled river bank and the view from Washington's home. I was heartened by the help that came from any quarters once the work was started, but somebody had to make the first move.

If you need encouragement to make that vital first move, consider these battles that were won by determined citizens:

Louisiana antiquarians angrily and stubbornly resisted when the local government tried to build a sewage plant on the battlefield where Andrew Jackson stood off the British at New Orleans. The plant site was finally changed. And the battlefield is now part of the Chalmette National Historical Park.

When a 100-year-old upstate New York church was threatened, a Cornell student who had worshiped there as a child bought it with $675 from his own pocket and saved it for a civic meeting hall.

Four citizens of Savannah have saved the houses in historic Marshall Row by buying them; they will resell at the same price to anybody who will restore the buildings and put them to good use.

One determined woman in Tombstone, Ariz., sold shares in a frankly played-out mine to find money to preserve the town's frontier appearance.

In Massachusetts the Walden Citizen's Committee of Concord, is a stubborn body of citizens who refused to admit the fight was lost even after Thoreau's Walden Pond had been made into a public swimming hole. They kept on fighting in the courts and recently the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court ordered the county to change the pond back to the forest lake it was in the time of Emerson and Thoreau.

If you want to save an historic site in your community, remember this: The law is on your side. The courts have held that a community has a right to protect itself from loss of its historic heritage.

But before you spend your energy, be sure that the fight is worthwhile. Just because a building is old does not mean that it is worth saving.

Ask yourself these questions before you try to save a threatened structure or area:

1. Does it have true historic or cultural worth?
2. Is it still in good enough condition to be worth restoring?
3. Can the public get to it, and will it be useful after restoration?
4. Can we pay for the restoration, and can we maintain the building in good condition afterward?

If you can answer "Yes" to these questions, your next step is to enlist help. Look for help close about you: Not to distant foundation or Federal departments. Nobody will listen to you until you have a well-organized program at home. You can find help at the chamber of commerce, local newspapers, civic groups, patriotic associations, historical societies, or any of the local institutions interested in public matters.

Shrewd organizers will get powerful help by pointing out to local businessmen that U.S. tourists will spend more than $26 billion this year.

After you have organized a local preservation group, you can ask for help from larger groups, most notably the National Trust for Historic Preservation, a group chartered by Congress to help save historic "sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture." Write them at 815 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. They will help you by:

1. Providing suggestions to help you decide if the project is worth your effort.
2. Judging your chances for success.
3. Advising on organization and fundraising.
4. Telling you how best to spend the money you raise and use the building you save.

If you think a speaker from the national trust would help impress the importance of your project on local civic clubs, or if you think an experienced staffer would help to guide a legal effort to save your project, the trust will send you a troubleshooter for the price of his travel ticket.

Trust staffers know all the tricks on both sides. They can tell you from hard experience how not to be stabbed in the back; they can show you how to use every legal weapon in the book—and there are legal weapons strong enough to win most preservation battles if you are stubborn enough to keep fighting.

Sometimes you think that nobody cares, that the fight is not worth the cost—but when you finally win, when the bulldozer is turned aside and your historic building is saved, you feel a tremendous surge of pride in a job well done.

Beware of Russ Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, personally, I was pleased to note the recent decision of the State Department to break off negotiations with the Soviet Union relative to direct flights between Moscow and New York that were contemplated.

I am well aware of the fact that the rising international tensions are the official reason for the termination of the negotiations. I am also aware of the fact, as are most Members of Congress, that the increased international tensions arise in part from deliberate Soviet belligerence based on their premise that our State Department will vacillate under pressure and make great concessions to them in forthcoming diplomatic conferences.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it of special significance that the Chicago Daily Calumet editorial of Friday, August 25, has directed its editorial to some very practical reasons for refusing to permit the Soviet Reds to penetrate our shores with their Government-operated airlines. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the editorial entitled "Beware of Russ Flights":

BEWARE OF RUSS FLIGHTS

We live in a curious, as well as a grim and unpredictable time.

Relations between this country and the Soviet Union never were more tense. There is a strong feeling that a final showdown over Berlin—a showdown which conceivably could lead to war—will come this fall or winter.

Yet various kinds of relations and negotiations between the two nations go on. Among them has been a meeting to discuss a commercial air treaty.

The American negotiators have been warned to keep on their toes in this and the idea of Russia-to-America flights has been vetoed by the administration for the time being. It's just as well this way for it wasn't a good deal to start with.

The American line which would be permitted to fly to Russia would be Pan American World Airways, a private enterprise which must pay its own way and attempt

to make some kind of profit for its 40,000 stockholders.

The Soviet line is Aeroflot, a branch of the Soviet Air Force and a wholly owned arm of the Soviet Government. Profit and costs mean nothing to it. Significantly, the Soviet negotiator is a Soviet Air Force general.

Aeroflot, moreover, is a potent and expanding instrument in the Soviet Government's economic offensive against the whole free world. Given a chance, it could present unmeetable competition because it would have no regard for operating losses.

The Reds would love this chance to demonstrate their superiority with all the cards stacked in their favor if we're dumb enough to take the bait.

Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which Mr. Ernest H. Gaunt, of Orlando, Fla., has asked me to insert for the information and consideration of the Members of the House of Representatives:

ORLANDO, FLA., *August 10, 1961.*

Hon. A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR.,
House Member from Florida, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERLONG: The search for tax loopholes, in which I understand the Ways and Means is engaged, and the proposal submitted to that committee for a current census of wealth including a public listing of all tax exemptions—National, State, and local—is not a new idea.

When William the Conqueror became King of England (latter part of the 11th century), he instituted a remarkable historical document called Domesday book which was a complete inventory of all wealth throughout England. The current proposal to the Ways and Means Committee showed, with carefully researched figures, the apparent fact that two-thirds of our national wealth is tax exempt—leaving the unbearable burden of mounting taxation on the remaining one-third.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, was reported on August 8, 1961, in the Orlando Sentinel as speaking vigorously on one aspect of tax exemptions, private foundations. But there are other aspects of tax exemptions which probably need more serious investigation and consideration.

For example, tax-exempt Federal Government property is reliably estimated as $276 billion. Could not at least one-half of this be sold to private owners who would pay taxes? And, the estimated total of all tax-exempt property in the United States is $661 billion compared with total national wealth of $898 billion.

The Federal Government is the largest in the Nation of: holders of grazing land and of timberland; owners of grain; warehouse operators; shipowners; truck fleet operators; electric power producers; landlords and tenants; lenders and borrowers; insurers and insured.

In the July Readers Digest is an article condensed from the Harvard Business Review titled "Big Danger in Big Government," by Paul Mazur, an outstanding economist and banker. It points out that the increases in taxation will in the end make it impossible for the Government itself to raise as much money as it really needs.

"Something's got to give." An up-to-date inventory of all tax exemptions including the $20 billion of tax-exempt bonds (also of all Government grants and subsidies and special tax privileges) seems to be an order of first importance. With the national debt nearly $300 billion, the interest on which comes from the taxpayers—isn't it time to reappraise the whole national financial picture? In a book by Jerry Voorhis, "Out of Debt—Out of Danger" it is pointed out that under President Andrew Jackson the national debt was zero. Another book by Freeman Tilden, "A World in Debt" treats of the same subject.

The desirability or undesirability of any particular tax exemptions can only be judged by the people if they have at hand all pertinent facts.

Sincerely,

ERNEST H. GAUNT.

The Rights and Wrongs of Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the September issue of Pageant magazine.

Mr. W. V. Levy has done an excellent opinion survey of the Governors of our States. Since they hold it in their hands to initiate action toward the abolition of the death penalty at the State level their views are particularly interesting. We in the Congress hold the power to abolish capital punishment in the Federal judicial system and in the District of Columbia and I sincerely hope that we will take advantage of that power in the near future. Toward that end I have introduced H.R. 829 which would prohibit the imposition of the death penalty in the District of Columbia and H.R. 844 which would prohibit it in all Federal jurisdictions.

The article follows:

THE RIGHTS AND WRONGS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By W. V. Levy)

Does the death penalty make murderers of us all? Today there are those who say not even society should take a human life.

Blonde Edythe Klumpp, an attractive divorced mother of three, stood before a judge in a Cincinnati courtroom on a July day in 1959 and heard the sober, dispassionate words that condemned her to death for the murder of her lover's wife.

A jury had convicted her—without recommendation of mercy—of shooting and beating Mrs. William Bergen, stuffing the body into the trunk of a car, and burning it. Over a 2-year period, her attorneys appealed the case to higher courts, but without success. Her last flickering hope for life rested in executive clemency from Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, an articulate foe of capital punishment.

As he has done in all capital cases that have come before him since assuming office almost 3 years ago, DiSalle initiated a personal investigation. He granted two stays of execution. He interviewed the condemned woman several times in prison, and, finally, was present when a psychiatrist administered sodium amytal, a so-called truth serum. Based on Mrs. Klumpp's responses while under the drug, DiSalle commuted her death sentence to life imprisonment early this year and indicated, pending further study, that she might ultimately be freed.

DiSalle's widely publicized action angered law enforcement officers, just as it drew unrestrained praise from opponents of capital punishment—adding fuel to the already raging controversy over legal executions, an issue that is troubling men's minds as never before.

This year, legislation to abolish capital punishment was introduced in almost half the 41 States in which it is still on the books. Squarely in the middle of the tugging lobbies on each side of the debate are the Governors of the States—men like Michael DiSalle.

Because State Governors frequently—and literally—hold the power of life and death in their hands, and because they are in a strong position to influence legislators in their deliberations, Pageant, in an exclusive survey, went directly to the chiefs of the 50 States. How do they feel about the death penalty—and about their own powers regarding it?

Of the 33 Governors who responded to Pageant's questions, 16 said they were opposed to capital punishment, primarily because they felt it was morally wrong and did not serve as an effective deterrent. (These are key arguments of organized abolition groups.)

Eight favored legal executions.

Six indicated that their support for the death penalty was predicated on existing statutes in their States.

Three formally declined comment.

Among the group solidly against legal executions were the Governors of four of the Nation's most populous States: DiSalle, of Ohio; Edmund (Pat) Brown, of California; Otto Kerner, Jr., of Illinois; and David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania.

The others opposed are John H. Reed, of Maine; John A. Notte, of Rhode Island; John B. Swainson, of Michigan; Elbert N. Carvel, of Delaware; Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire; John M. Dalton, of Missouri; Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; Orval E. Faubus, of Arkansas; J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland; William F. Quinn, of Hawaii; Gaylord A. Nelson, of Wisconsin; and Elmer L. Anderson, of Minnesota.

Governor DiSalle, who once argued in favor of capital punishment during a debate in his freshman year in college and later, as a member of the Ohio Legislature, introduced and followed to passage a measure making kidnaping a capital offense in the State, admitted that during the ensuing years he had changed his mind.

"Each time I think of the ritual that we go through in disposing of human life," he told the Ohio Legislature in a special message on capital punishment, "I wonder why we don't use the tomtoms and the wild, abandoned tribal dances which were so necessary in the past to create the emotional pitch before indulging in the lust for the taking of a human being's life."

To a man like DiSalle, who has come to oppose capital punishment after thoroughly exploring arguments in its favor and even supporting these arguments for a time, the exercise of executive clemency must necessarily be a matter requiring profound thought. During the first 30 months of his tenure, he commuted four death sentences and permitted three prisoners to die in the electric chair.

"I have made it a practice not to interfere with the judgment of a court or a jury unless there is mitigating evidence that was not presented before the court," he said.

One of the three men for whom DiSalle refused to intervene was Cop Killer Walter Byman. But the night of Byman's execution in the Ohio Penitentiary electric chair was painful for Ohio's chief executive.

DiSalle said that before the execution he notified the State highway patrol that he would be in his auto and available to them by radio.

"I did not want them to know exactly where I was," he recalled. "Shortly afterward, the words came over the radio, 'Warden reports detail completed 8:07.' The detail, what was it? The taking of a man's life. What did we accomplish by it?

"The next morning I woke up with a very empty feeling. The State the night before had gone through with its ritual, had given a man a choice of what he wanted for a last meal. We had carefully shaved his head, we had cut slits in his trousers so that electric current could not be deterred in any fashion, and then we put him in the electric chair before witnesses.

"We, members of a humane and civilized society, had cold-bloodedly and with premeditation taken a life—which did not restore a life; had performed an act which served no purpose, which deterred no one. And then in the end there was that empty feeling that this life was gone and no useful purpose had been served."

California's outspoken Governor Brown ranks with DiSalle as an opponent of capital punishment. Brown was caught up in the worldwide controversy which developed last year when—since he felt unable under California law to prevent it—he allowed Convict-Author Caryl Chessman to go to the San Quentin Penitentiary gas chamber after an 11-year-10-month battle for life.

Brown pointed out that in 1955 there were 417 homicides in California. But only 52 defendants were convicted of first degree murder. And only eight—or 2 percent—were sentenced to death.

"There can be no meaningful exemplary value in a punishment the incidence of which is but 1 in 50," said Brown.

Reflecting on the matter of executive clemency, Brown told Pageant: "In the last analysis, there are no rules and few guides except a man's own quiet conscience and a feeling for what seems to be the right decision. Each case is unlike any other. Each is its own way of sorrows."

Fortunately, many Governors are spared this agonizing need to come to the "right decision" because their power to commute depends solely on a recommendation from the State pardon and parole commission.

The Governors in Pageant's survey who favor retention of the death penalty are S. Ernest Vandiver, of Georgia; Price Daniel, of Texas; Frank B. Morrison, of Nebraska; Donald Nutter, of Montana; Norman A. Erbe, of Iowa; F. Ray Keyser, Jr., of Vermont; J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia; and Bufford Ellington, of Tennessee. They vary, however, in the degree of their advocacy. Many believe that it serves as a deterrent to violent crimes, but should be used only in cases of extreme viciousness.

"Although admittedly there is room for argument upon this point, I believe that retention of the death penalty has a deterrent effect upon criminals and upon crime, and I would not at this time favor its abolition," said Ellington.

Somewhere in the middle were Governors such as Grant Sawyer, of Nevada, who said, "I have serious reservations concerning both the morality and effectiveness of capital punishment. I am, however, sworn to uphold the laws of my State and shall do so until such time as they are changed."

"There are weighty arguments on both sides of this question," said Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey. "I have tried to keep an open mind on it because of the possibility that legislation affecting the death penalty may come before me."

What are the pros and cons in this argument over man's right to take a human life? They usually boil down to three categories—religious, moral, and statistical. And both sides quote the Bible to substantiate arguments.

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Genesis 9: 6), and "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword" (Revelations 3: 10) are quotations frequently offered by those favoring capital punishment.

The abolitionists retort with such quotations as "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord" (Romans 12: 19), or "Judge not that ye be judged not" (Luke 6: 37).

One of the most significant breakthroughs for the abolitionists was a decision in March 1961 by the Protestant Episcopal Church to work aggressively for abolition of the death penalty. Episcopalians were urged to help create a climate of public opinion that would induce State legislatures to abolish legal executions.

Previously, the Methodist Church, the American Baptist Convention, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States, and numerous other religious groups had raised their voices in a chorus of opposition to capital punishment.

Moral and statistical arguments against capital punishment fill volumes, and many of them were advanced by the Governors in the Pageant survey. But a nine-item indictment of capital punishment presented to and approved by the Delaware Legislature in 1958 reduces to simplest terms the basic thesis against legal executions:

"1. The evidence clearly shows that execution does not act as a deterrent to capital crimes.

"2. The serious offenses are committed, except in rare instances, by those suffering from mental disturbances; are impulsive in nature; and are not acts of the 'criminal class.' Of those executed in Delaware, 50 percent had no previous conviction.

"3. When the death sentence is removed as a possible punishment, more convictions are possible with fewer delays.

"4. Unequal application of law takes place because those executed are the poor, the ignorant and the unfortunate without resources.

"5. Conviction of the innocent does occur and death makes a miscarriage of justice irrevocable. Human judgment cannot be infallible.

"6. The State sets a bad example when it takes a life. Imitative crimes and murder are stimulated by executions.

"7. Legally, taking a life is useless and demoralizing to the general public. It also is demoralizing to the public officials, who, dedicated to rehabilitating individuals, must callously put a man to death. The effect on fellow prisoners can be imagined.

"8. A trial where a life may be at stake is highly sensational, adversely affects the administration of justice, and is bad for the community.

"9. Society is amply protected by life imprisonment."

Based on these points—and supporting testimony—Delaware became the seventh State in the Nation to abolish capital punishment. The number jumped to nine when Hawaii and Alaska entered the Union. (Hawaii had abolished the death penalty in 1955, and Alaska in 1957.)

The movement to abolish capital punishment in the United States began more than 100 years ago. In 1847, Michigan became the first State to abolish the dealth penalty, and was followed by Rhode Island in 1852, Wisconsin in 1853, Minnesota in 1911, and North Dakota in 1915. Maine first abolished the death penalty in 1876, restored it in 1883, and then removed it from the statutes again in 1887.

However, three of these States permit the death penalty under extreme circumstances—Michigan for treason; Rhode Island for murder committed while serving a life sentence, and North Dakota for either of these crimes.

Nine other States abolished the capital penalty for short periods, only to restore it after a particularly vicious crime.

Those who favor legal execution maintain vigorously that its value as a deterrent upon would-be rapists, murderers and kidnappers is immense, although they often readily admit this cannot be proved by statistics.

Although J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is a strong advocate of the death penalty, nevertheless he has said: "There is nothing so precious in our country as the life of a human being—whether he is a criminal or not. On the other side of the scale must be placed all the legal safeguards that our society demands.

"Experience has clearly demonstrated, however, that the time-proved deterrents to crime are sure detection, swift apprehension and proper punishment. Each is a necessary ingredient. Law-abiding citizens have a right to expect that the efforts of law-enforcement officers in detecting and apprehending criminals will be followed by realistic punishment.

"It is my opinion," However concluded, "that when no shadow of a doubt remains relative to the guilt of a defendant, the public interest demands capital punishment be invoked when the law so provides."

Legislative skirmishing so far this year has proved decisively that lawmakers tend to agree with Hoover and are still reluctant to surrender longstanding rights of legal execution. Legislatures in State after State spurned attempts to eliminate the death penalty.

Despite the fact that the States themselves have been hesitant about abolishing capital punishment, they have certainly become more restrained in their actual use of the death penalty, largely because of the growing feeling against it. If the trend of the last 10 years is any barometer, capital punishment could virtually become extinct by the end of this century without the changing of another statute.

With an occasional deviation from the pattern, the number of executions has declinded steadily each year since 1951, when 105 persons were executed.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, which issued a comprehensive report last March, only 57 persons were executed in 1960, the second lowest total since the Bureau began compiling statistics in 1930. The previous low was 49, in each of the years 1958 and 1959. Highest number of executions in any single year was 199, in 1936.

The growing public attitude of opposition to the taking of a prisoner's life was clearly reflected in a Gallup poll last year, when, at the height of the war of nerves and words over the Chessman case, only 51 percent of Americans questioned said they favored the death penalty. Thirty-six percent of the respondents were opposed to legal executions and 13 percent were undecided.

In 1953, 68 percent of those polled by Gallup said they were in favor of capital punishment, while 25 percent were opposed and 7 percent undecided.

As further evidence of rising antipathy toward the death penalty, prosecutors in various sections of the country report it is be-

coming increasingly difficult to select juries for capital cases. More and more prospective jurors automatically disqualify themselves because of admitted opposition to legal execution.

Last year, the grim hand of the executioner reached into 20 States. Five States accounted for 37 of the 57 deaths. California sent nine men to the gas chamber at San Quentin, including Chessman. Arkansas and Texas each executed eight persons, and Georgia and New York each sent six to the electric chair.

Forty-five of the executions were for murder, eight for rape, two for kidnaping, one for robbery, and one for aggravated assault by a life prisoner.

Over the 30-year period covered by the latest Bureau of Prisons report, 3,724 convicts have walked the so-called last mile. Yet this was only a bare fraction of the actual number of persons found guilty of capital crimes. The rest were spared by merciful juries, judges, and Governors.

Almost two-thirds of the country's executions since 1930—2,235—have taken place in the South. Georgia, which this year turned down a measure which would have raised the minimum execution age from 16 to 18, led the South and the Nation with 358 executions. The heavily populated Northeast took the lives of 598 prisoners, including 325 in New York State; the North Central States executed 384 (led by Ohio's 167), and the West (led by California with 271) killed 476.

As the abolitionists this year renewed their efforts toward eliminating capital punishment, obviously those with the most to gain by any reversal of existing laws were the 210 prisoners under sentence of death in penitentiaries from New York to California.

By year's end, some 50 to 60 of these prisoners will have been executed. Many will wait out nagging weeks, months—even years—while attorneys exhaust every legal move to reverse the death sentence. A handful will have their sentences commuted.

Perhaps next year many of these condemned prisoners will find the specter of death has been laid for them by the action of sympathetic legislatures. Certainly the American League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment (a national nonprofit organization headquartered in Brookline, Mass.) and other like-thinking groups operating in 24 States are pledged to keep working diligently in that direction.

And, as the Pageant survey shows, a surprising number of public officials are on their side.

COMMENTS OF VARIOUS GOVERNORS

William F. Quinn, Hawaii: "I am opposed to capital punishment on the grounds that this form of punishment has never proved to be an effective deterrent to crime, and its abolition has not brought about a rise in what would have been capital crimes."

Price Daniel, Texas: "I feel that our juries should retain their authority to impose death sentences for extreme crimes such as malicious murder and the sale of heroin to children. I believe that the death penalty is a deterrent to premeditated murder."

Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas: "I would like to see the abolition of capital punishment. However, I doubt if it is possible or in the best interests of society at the present time."

Otto Kerner, Illinois: "I am against capital punishment."

J. Millard Tawes, Maryland: "The idea of taking a human life is repellent to me personally, but I have taken the position that the establishment of criminal penalties is a legislative matter and is not part of my function as chief executive."

Norman A. Erbe, Iowa: "I believe the death penalty should be retained in Iowa."

John B. Swainson, Michigan: "I am opposed to capital punishment. Statistics tend to show that the incidence of capital crimes in Michigan is not significantly different from that of comparable States having capital punishment. It pleases me to say that the State of Michigan has never executed an innocent person. This same positive statement cannot be made in States which do impose a death penalty."

Edmund G. Brown, California: "* * * The naked, simple fact is that the death penalty has been a gross failure. Beyond its horror and incivility, it has neither protected the innocent nor deterred the wicked. The recurrent spectacle of publicly sanctioned killing has cheapened human life and dignity without the redeeming grace which comes from justice meted out swiftly, even humanely.

"The death penalty is invoked too randomly, too irregularly, too unpredictably, and too tardily to be defended as an effective example warning away wrongdoers."

J. Lindsay Almond, Virgina: "The death penalty is imposed in Virginia only in the most aggravated of capital cases.

"The fixing of the sentence is a jury function, unless the jury is waived by mutual consent of the prosecutor and the defense counsel. Our supreme court has been careful in its review of such matters I feel, therefore, that capital punishment in these instances is warranted."

Donald Nutter, Montana: "Our Montana statutes presently provide for capital punishment and at this time I see no justification for a change."

Matthew E. Welsh, Indiana: "As Governor of Indiana, it is my responsibility to uphold the laws of the State, which do provide for capital punishment. As long as those laws remain on our statute books, I have no alternative but to enforce them."

Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon: "I am opposed to capital punishment for three principal reasons. The largest number of those who receive the death sentence are from the lower income brackets. This would seem to indicate that this group cannot afford the necessary legal counsel which would enable them to present an effective case in their behalf.

"There is a great deal of inequity in the application of capital punishment. In other words, local customs and mores appear to influence whether one who commits a capital crime will be sentenced to death.

"Capital punishment is final. It does not take into account the possibility of human error, and there is no room for flexibility."

Farris Bryant, Florida: "Capital punishment is the law of the State of Florida. As Governor, it is my duty, unpleasant though it may be, to carry out the laws as created by our legislature."

Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska: "I recognize that society must protect itself; if capital punishment is necessary to serve that end, it may be justified—but only in very unusual and extreme circumstances, where the public welfare without question demands it. Statistics show that capital punishment, as such, does not decrease the crime of murder and cannot be justified on that basis; in fact, evidence indicates that sensational executions tend to increase rather than decrease crimes of violence."

David Lawrence, Pennsylvania: "I have been against capital punishment all my life because I firmly believe that the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' means just what it says. For the same reason, I am opposed to war. I don't think we should take human life. I think it should be a matter for the Almighty himself to decide when we come in and go out of this world. I think people, pretty generally, have become convinced that the execution of an individual is not a deterrent to murder."

Ernest Vandiver, Georgia: "I feel that capital punishment does accomplish, to some degree, its primary purpose of deterring premeditated murder."

Albert D. Rosellini, Washington: "Under the State constitution, I am charged with the responsibility of upholding the laws of the State regardless of my personal feelings. A long time ago, the State legislature decided that capital punishment should exist. Unless some future legislature changes the law, it is my duty to uphold it. Capital punishment, then, becomes a policy matter which must be decided by members of the Washington State Legislature, who in practice reflect the will of the people."

John M. Dalton, Missouri: "I am opposed to capital punishment, but my job is to administer the laws of Missouri."

Labor Day 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, since 1961 is the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first annual message to Congress, this Labor Day is the appropriate time to recall this passage from that brilliant communication:

> Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights.

Setting aside a day in recognition of America's working people did not come about for more than two decades after this excellent expression of labor's proper status, and another twoscore years elapsed before the full membership of our States began to observe the first Monday of September as Labor Day. Thus this honor to the men and women who are the predominant force in the Nation's population and character was long in coming into being, but in recent years the event has had increasingly more significance.

While labor must still devote considerable effort to organizational work, general recognition of the union movement as a component of the Nation's economic structure permits leaders to give more attention to the union's role in society's overall development. Energy once devoted to defending the right to organize and bargain collectively may now be used, in cooperation with management, toward attaining the objectives necessary to proper economic and social balance.

The holiday also has its unhappy aspects. Neither labor, management, nor Government can overlook the necessity of returning job opportunities to the millions of workers who are unemployed through no fault of their own. On the contrary, all elements must join hands in seeking whatever adjustments are required in the economic order to eliminate the surplus labor conditions that are

prevalent in so many regions of our country.

Labor Day is the proper time to renew our dedication to the task of making the realignments essential to provide work for everyone who wants to work. In common cause, and with the help of God, we must all devote ourselves to the fulfillment of that ideal.

Control of the Military and General Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, I spoke to the residents of my district over radio station KLRA in Little Rock on the subject of control of our military men. Because this topic is of such great importance at the moment, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of this address in the RECORD:

RADIO BROADCAST BY CONGRESSMAN DALE ALFORD, OF ARKANSAS, RADIO STATION KLRA, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., SEPTEMBER 3, 1961

One of the topics receiving the most attention in debate in the halls of Congress recently has been that of civilian control of the military services of our country. It is strange, indeed, that this subject should be up for debate when world tensions are now focused near the boiling point. The military of our country have always been and are at this present moment distinctly different from the military of other nations in that our military is unmistakably subservient to civilian control. The officers and men of our Armed Forces take an oath to defend our beloved land against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Please note that the wording of this oath is to defend our country against domestic enemies as well as foreign enemies. Our military leaders have led us, our brothers and our sons into bloody battles against the Communist enemy. It is the duty of every military leader to know the nature of the enemy so that he and his men can be better equipped to defend our Nation against the enemy. America's enemy today is international communism.

Despite the fact that the United States is in a so-called cold war, economic, political, and psychological, against communism, there is increasing evidence that many persons of high political position are not properly informed as to the nature of our enemy, international communism—or, what is infinitely worse, they are completely duped by the psychological warfare methods of our socialist enemy. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated that "we cannot hope to successfully meet the Communist menace unless there is a wide knowledge and understanding of its aims and designs." In a recent address in the U.S. Senate, Senator STROM THURMOND said: "The events of recent years provide unimpeachable proof that we do not understand the nature or methods of Communists and communism. Had we understood and appreciated the menace of communism, we would not today be suffering from the losses of our blind negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam. Had we understood and recognized communism when we saw it, we would never have made the mistake of officially characterizing the Red Communist Chinese as agrarian reformers. Senator THURMOND continued: "Had we the ability to detect a Communist and a Communist movement, Castro would never have had our support in establishing a Communist dictatorship over the Cuban people 90 miles from our shores." Recently, however, the American people have shown real evidence of their awakening to the web that is being woven around us to destroy our Constitution, our economy of free enterprise, and our very way of life, Western Christian civilization.

There is definitely a campaign now on foot to destroy the strong anti-Communist crusade that is, at long last, sweeping our land. In other words, we are now witnessing from the leftwing element, political as well as press, an anti-anti-Communist campaign. This anti-anti-Communist campaign is particularly directed at the military. The Communists have for years made no secret of their campaign to discredit our military leaders. Recently, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution by the Communist International of 1921 meeting in New York City calling upon members of the Communist Party to launch a campaign against the military leaders. As Senator THURMOND has pointed out in recent addresses, this "gag the military line" is cogently illustrated by the space devoted to the subject in the August 13, 1961, edition of the Communist Party, U.S.A., organ, the Worker. Among the articles devoted to the anti-anti-Communist propaganda effort is one headlined on page 1, entitled "Rightist Plotters Open Attack in Senate." This article consists of a perverted account of the discussion which has taken place in the Senate concerning the use of military officers and facilities for alerting military personnel and the public to the menace of the cold war under the 1958 National Security Council directive.

The most glaring example of purging the military for their efforts to inform their troops and all Americans of the true nature of our enemy was the reckless recall of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker from his post as commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany. I am proud to say that there is a group now forming on Capitol Hill in Washington known as the Congressional Committee for Justice for General Walker. I have the honor of being temporary chairman of this group for both parties of the House of Representatives who are working to secure justice for an American soldier whose only crime was patriotism.

Recently, the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main Post Office, Yonkers, N.Y. published release No. 18 with the topic, "General Walker." Because their review of this situation is so concise and to conserve time, I shall quote extensively from this publication by the Patrick Henry League:

"Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was born in 1909 at Center Point, Tex. He was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy on July 1, 1927, and gave his life from then on to the service of his country.

"He served in the following campaigns: Aleutian Islands, Naples-Foggia, Anzio, Rome, Arno, south France, Rhineland, central Europe, U.N. summer-fall offensive in Korea, second Korean winter, Korea summer-fall 1952, and third Korean winter.

"He won military honors fighting up the Italian boot and into southern France and Germany during World War II. Later, he was decorated during the Korean war. As commander of the 2d Division Artillery at Heartbreak Ridge, he led his men in firing a record of 22,000 rounds every 24 hours for 14 days.

"General Walker's awards include the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Senior Paratrooper Badge, the French Croix de Guerre, the Norwegian Order of St. Olav, and the Order of the British Empire.

"A bachelor, Walker has had the single-minded devotion to the combat effectiveness and welfare of his troops. After the dismaying spectacle of some American prisoners of war in Korea succumbing to communism, he set his mind and energies to the task of trying to do something about the moral and spiritual stamina of our fighting men.

"What was General Walker's crime? A staff officer was commenting on a map which showed Communist countries in red and America and her allies in blue. The officer referred to the free world as anti-Red. 'That's defensive thinking,' Walker responded. 'We're problue.' Thus was the name given to General Walker's problue program for his 24th Infantry Division in Augsburg, Germany. Initiated in October 1960 the program was, in the general's own words, 'designed to develop an understanding of the American military and civil heritage, and the facts and objectives of those enemies who would destroy it.'

"The problue program brought to our soldiers in Germany the best education in American citizenship and anticommunism that could be found in print. Also, religion was stressed. The general's outline for the problue program stated: 'One of the basic areas of problue is the individual's relation to God. When the individual has the right relation with God he belongs to the family of God and, as such, conducts himself as a child of God.' The program undertook to raise soldier morale, and to stress discipline, law, and order.

"General Walker is well known for his desire to surround GI's under his command with a climate of morality and clean living. He and his problue program ran head on into conflict, therefore, with a filthy tabloid sold on European military bases, Overseas Weekly.

"The first and last pages of Overseas Weekly usually carry nude-type pictures. Many of the headlines are so lurid as to be unrepeatable. Lt. Gen. Charles Bolte, commanding general of the Army in Europe in 1953, banned Overseas Weekly as unfit for American servicemen. It was later reinstated when the chief owner and publisher, a Mrs. Marion von Rospach, agreed to 'clean it up;' a promise she never kept.

Overseas Weekly is represented by Pan American Publishers Representatives (PABCO). PABCO also represents Swank, an obscene publication which features work of notorious Communist fronters. Parent publishing firm for Overseas Weekly is the International Media Co. (IMC). An IMC director, Gene Bernald, is a participating operator of a CIA-linked radio station in the Caribbean, radio SWAN, which aided in the failure of the recent Cuban invasion by mysterious failure to broadcast a prearranged signal to Cuban freedom fighters."

Remember, I am quoting from the Patrick Henry League. Since there has been so much erroneous information in the local morning paper relative to my statements on radio SWAN, let me repeat this statement from this publication from Yonkers, N.Y.:

"An IMC director, Gene Bernald, is a participating operator of a CIA-linked radio station in the Caribbean, radio SWAN, which aided in the failure of the recent Cuban invasion by mysterious failure to broadcast a prearranged signal to Cuban freedom fighters."

Now, I continue to quote from the Patrick Henry League:

"News editor of Overseas Weekly is John Dornberg who has undertaken a one-man anti-West Germany campaign with his disgusting book, "Schizophrenic Germany." An owner of Overseas Weekly, along with Marion von Rospach, is Harold Melahn. Melahn was a delegate to the Communist World Youth Festival in Prague in 1947.

When owner Rospach went to the Pentagon to appeal the 1958 suspension of Overseas Weekly by General Bolte, she was accompanied by Samuel W. Yorty. Yorty has been identified under oath as a Communist by former Party Member Arthur J. Kent. In her writings, Marion von Rospach has betrayed herself as fond of Communist-front joiners and anti-Catholics.

"General Walker did not like what Overseas Weekly was trying to do to his troops and he said so. Further, he barred Overseas Weekly Reporter Siegfried Naujocks from all of the 24th Division's installations. Naujocks had been caught seeking a pipeline into the command headquarters. A native of Danzig, Poland, Naujocks is recorded as a former Nazi mercenary living in Germany and doing the bidding of Overseas Weekly.

"As apparent retaliation against General Walker, the Overseas Weekly ran an attack by John Dornberg on April 16, 1961. The 'exposure' of the general and his problue program was repeated later on by (of course) the New York Times. And the scene was set for another witch hunt by the lunatic left.

"New stories accused General Walker of indoctrinating his troops with John Birch Society materials. This, because he made available 'The Life of John Birch,' (a Baptist missionary and soldier in China) an inspiring biography which makes no mention at all of the John Birch Society. The book was only one of many generally accepted works made available to men under Walker.

"When this charge against the general seemed to be falling through, new protests were made. Walker was 'reported to have said' that Mrs. Roosevelt is 'pink' and was 'quoted as being of the opinion' that America's TV and newspapers are greatly infiltrated * * * these vague accusations against General Walker were even further obscured by the Overseas Weekly style of innuendo.

"Finally, on June 12, 1961, Secretary of the Army, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., a recent Kennedy appointment, announced that Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was being officially admonished for having 'made derogatory remarks' and for 'participating in controversial activities.' The Pentagon announcement made no mention of Overseas Weekly, but an Army spokesman did say that the John Birch books were being barred from Army newsstands in Europe.

"Following the admonishment, the general was removed from orders assigning him to head the 8th U.S. Army Corps in Texas.

"On May 31, 1961, all members of the staff of the Special Warfare Office in the 24th Infantry Division in Germany were transferred to other duties and the problue program, left without any staff, was destroyed.

"On June 18, 1961, the New York Times quoted an unnamed Pentagon civilian official as stating that he hoped 'the extremists' in the Army would 'get the message' from what had just happened to General Walker and 'use good judgment in what they say and do.'" End of quotes from a publication of the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main Post Office, Yonkers, N.Y.

Yes, my fellow Americans, your patriotic officers and men of our Armed Forces, our military, have gotten the message. They are afraid to stand up and speak out against the mortal enemy of our very American way of life, afraid to make any more talks to their fellow Americans alerting them to the nature of international communism. What on earth goes on here in the land of the free and the home of the brave? The matter of control of the military cannot be taken lightly. Do you realize the men and women throughout the land that are serving not only in our Regular Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force, but all Americans serving in any Reserve unit or National Guard are brought under the broad scope of gagging the military. What better way for our domestic enemies to gain victories within our border than putting a clamp on the freedom of speech on those who are authorities as to the nature of communism?

However, the Communist Party's Daily Worker, in its August 13 issue, was not limiting its poisonous pen to the military. On page 5 there is a slanderous article directed at the anti-Communist efforts of our own Harding College, an outstanding Church of Christ school, located at Searcy, Ark. This article entitled, "Poisonous Web Spun from Arkansas Town" is filled with abuses and untruths. A review of such articles is adequate demonstration that no issue of civilian control of the military is really and truly involved. Military leaders have shown no evidence of violating their oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. But, alas, a few notable examples of individuals high in official and political circles have recommended a revision of that greatest of all legal instruments, the Constitution of the United States. I join with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable STROM THURMOND, in carrying the message throughout the land that we must not allow the real purpose of the anti-anti-Communist campaign to be camouflaged behind a smokescreen of the question of civilian control over the military. Instead, we should be thankful for military men of courage who are Godly men, men of integrity and the determination to fight the psychological war for the minds and hearts of men as well as fighting the war for materialism. The Communists fear an upsurge of patriotism in America more than anything else today. What the Commies really fear is a widespread understanding by the American people, both civilian and military, of the nature of communism and the tactics used by them to infiltrate every facet of our lives, our religions, our schools, our clubs, and our homes. When all Americans reassert once again the principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, the system of less government and more freedom of speech and more freedom of enterprise, a tremendous wave of patriotism to our American Republic will mean the complete destruction and stamping out in our land of the pre-cancerous socialism which results in a totalitarian atheistic state.

My fellow Americans, let our prayers be this day, God give America a new breath of patriotism.

Tribute to Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend, EUGENE KEOGH. GENE has been my next-door neighbor in the New House Office Building for several years. I know of no better way to judge a person than to live beside him, and I could want for no better neighbor. That our staffs also have had a pleasant association is, I believe, a reflection of the friendship GENE and I have enjoyed over the years. He is an able legislator and has been helpful to me on many occasions when I have consulted with him about legislative matters that I have had before his committee. I extend to him warm good wishes for continued good health and happiness.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President's bill to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security has been sponsored by more Members than any other specific bill in this session of Congress. With this considerable support, I am hopeful that the bill will pass before the recess and before debates on disarmament at the U.N. this fall.

As many know, backing for this legislation has come from all parts and segments of the United States. President Eisenhower has joined leading Republican and Democratic statesmen from Defense, State, and other departments in support of this bill to create a research and negotiating agency for disarmament.

Many religious bodies have also spoken out on this subject. As the following item from the August 10 Catholic Messenger indicates, the Catholic Association for Peace, and the able work of the association's vice president and director of the Peace Research Center, Father Edward A. Conway, S.J., have demonstrated the power and depth of religious feeling for a new approach to peace and security:

[From the Catholic Messenger, Davenport, Iowa, August 10, 1961]

CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, JEWS ASKED TO BACK DISARMAMENT

RENSSELAER, IND.—Catholics, Jews, and Protestants were urged here Tuesday to unite in support of the administration's proposals for a U.S. Disarmament Agency.

The call for prompt and united action in behalf of bills now before Congress was voiced at the Young Christian Workers' National Study Week by Father Edward A. Conway, S.J., director of the Peace Research Center at Creighton University, Omaha.

He reminded the 500 delegates meeting at St. Joseph's College that the official agencies of the three faiths had issued a joint declaration calling for progressive reciprocal disarmament in 1953.

"Today, for the first time since their precedent-setting act of interfaith cooperation," he said, "our Government shows its willingness to devote the resources required for adequate arms control planning. If the churches are still interested, now is the time for strong cooperative support of the pending legislation."

Noting with warm approval that Catholics had recently joined Jews and Protestants in united support for foreign aid and immigration measures, Father Conway asserted cooperative support of the Peace Agency bills was equally important.

"In fact," he said, "unless this runaway arms race is arrested within the next several

years, there may be no nations to aid nor immigrants to welcome."

In reply to doubts about the possibility of disarmament in the present conditions of tension, Father Conway argued that plans must be ready for presentation in saner times. "After the contestants over Berlin have teetered on the brink of thermonuclear hell for a couple of months, they may come to their senses and decide that one such balancing act is enough," he predicted.

Father Conway closed his address with an appeal and a warning: "It will take many months to produce a thoroughly safe and scientifically and politically feasible arms control program; and, therefore, it is absolutely imperative that this agency be approved in this session of Congress.

"Both officially and privately, the religious groups of this country should press the Congress to complete action before it adjourns. The reasons for cooperative action are megatons more important than they were 18 years ago."

Overwhelming Superiority of Combination Transmission Proposal Wins Support of Upper Colorado River Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of the resolution from the Upper Colorado River Commission dated September 1, 1961, endorsing the proposal of the utility companies for transmitting power from the Colorado River storage project. This Commission, representing the four Upper Basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming was established by interstate compact, authorized and ratified by Congress in 1949 to supervise the regulation, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

This commission is not concerned with the public versus private power issues involved in the controversy but only with the best interests of the project which both the Congress and the commission recognize as the reclamation or irrigation features. The commission's endorsement of the utilities' transmission proposal represents the official position of the four sovereign States and is adequate demonstration of the overwhelming superiority of the combination system.

If the Western States are to continue to receive funds from taxpayers of the East and Midwest to develop the lands of their area, they should be aware of the wastefulness of Federal funds on projects such as the public power advocates favor under the guise of reclamation.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I am naturally very concerned with unnecessary spending and wish to call the following to the attention of my colleagues:

Denver, Colo., September 4, 1961.
Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We understand that very soon House Appropriation Committee will be considering Bureau of Reclamation appropriation to construct an all-Federal transmission system to bring hydroelectric energy from the Colorado River storage project to the preference users of the area.

Within hours the Upper Colorado River Commission has obtained a concession from five investor-owned utilities that they stand ready to negotiate a firm contract with the Bureau of Reclamation to deliver hydroelectric energy from the Colorado River storage project to preference users at competitive wheeling rates which we believe are distinctly advantageous to the Colorado River Basin.

In the last minute developments Mr. Ival Goslin, chief engineer and executive secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, will hand you a copy of the unanimous endorsement by the Upper Colorado River Commission of the revised combination transmission system sponsored by the utilities. The members of this commission are Gov. George Clyde, Utah; John Bliss, New Mexico; Earl Lloyd, Wyoming; and former Gov. Ed Johnson, Colorado.

If combination system is approved by Congress funds requested by Bureau of Reclamation could be reduced by approximately $135 million for transmission facilities without decreasing services or increasing delivery costs to preference users. Most respectfully we urge favorable action on our recommendations.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Colorado River Commissioners.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 2, 1961.
Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: After having received assurances from the five investor-owned electric utilities of the Upper Colorado River Basin area that the utilities will reduce their charges for transmitting electrical energy to preference consumers after the utilities' capital investments in transmission facilities used for wheeling have been amortized, or after the initial 50-year period of wheeling, whichever is earlier, to actual costs of ad valorem taxes and operation, maintenance and replacement, the Upper Colorado River Commission adopted the enclosed resolution endorsing the combination transmission system proposed by the investor-owned utilities for transmitting electrical energy to be generated by the Colorado River storage project.

The resolution was adopted by the commission at a special meeting on September 1, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Chief Engineer and Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Congress exercises the policy-making power of the United States; and

Whereas Congress authorized and ratified an interstate compact among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which created a commission representing Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to supervise the regulation, conservation and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas the legislature of each of said five States ratified said Upper Colorado River Basin compact; and

Whereas the chairman of said commission is appointed by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the commissioners are appointed by the Governors of the said four States—each Governor naming one commissioner to serve at his pleasure; and

Whereas the utilization of the waters apportioned by said compact for the generation of hydroelectric energy is subservient to the use and consumption of such waters for agricultural and domestic purposes; and

Whereas the regulation, conservation and utilization of the waters of the said basin requires the construction of both storage projects and participating projects; and

Whereas this development is implemented by the enactment of Public Law 485, 84th Congress, an act authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas said projects will generate electric energy which will be marketed; and

Whereas the revenues from such marketing must repay the construction costs of said storage projects including electric facilities and a portion of the construction costs of said participating projects; and

Whereas the early development of the participating projects is of great importance to the progress and welfare of the upper basin States; and

Whereas at the hearings of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in 1954 and 1955 on the authorization for the construction of said Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the investor-owned electric utilities offered to wheel storage project power to preference users over their transmission systems; and

Whereas the Congress in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session, expressed favorable interest in these proposals and stated at page 17: "The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected"; and

Whereas under the provisions of law certain parties are entitled to a preference for the purchase of project electric energy at the price established by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas in the Upper Colorado River Basin investor-owned and Federal transmission lines serve both preference and private users; and

Whereas the investor-owned utilities have proposed a combination transmission system with certain lines to be constructed and operated by the Federal Government and the remaining lines to be provided by the investor-owned utilities with wheeling service for Colorado River storage project energy over such lines to specified load centers; and

Whereas according to recent tables submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation changing from the yardstick to the modified system thereby increasing the number of delivery points from 15 to 24, the irrigation assistance to States has been reduced approximately $50 million; and

Whereas the controversy over the construction of transmission lines has been exceedingly detrimental to reclamation and must be resolved quickly on merit alone; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission believes that the investor-owned utilities after their capital investments in wheeling facilities have been amortized should adjust their wheeling charges to cover only ad valorem taxes on such transmission facilities, plus operation, maintenance, and replacement costs actually incurred; and

Whereas such reduced wheeling charges would substantially increase the revenues available for the basin fund as compared with the originally proposed "combination" system; and,

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission has the direct responsibility to protect the adequacy and integrity of said basin fund above other considerations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Colorado River Commission, having obtained from the investor-owned utilities firm assurance that they will enter into agreements with the Bureau of Reclamation for bona fide wheeling contracts in which the utilities will limit their wheeling charges after their capital investments in said transmission facilities have been amortized or after the initial 50-year period, whichever is the earlier, to cover only actual ad valorem taxes and actual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs on transmission facilities associated with such wheeling contracts, endorses the combination proposal of the investor-owned utilities, provided that the Congress determines that under such proposal the project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected when compared with other methods of energy transmission; and, be it further

Resolved, That the commission advise the Congress of this endorsement and that the chief engineer and secretary of the commission is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to members of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress and to other interested parties.

I, Ival V. Goslin, chief engineer and secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly passed and approved by the Upper Colorado River Commission at a regularly called meeting of said commission held at Denver, Colo, on the 1st day of September 1961.

Witness my hand this 1st day of September 1961.

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Chief Engineer and Secretary.

Address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest traditions of Maryland is the custom of conducting an annual Sunday school picnic in many local communities. These gatherings bring together families and congregations and serve not only as homecomings, but also as reminders of the values of church and home which have been so important in the formation of our national character.

On September 2, it was my privilege to attend the Mountaindale Union Sunday School Picnic and I wish to congratulate Mr. Gordon F. Palmer, superintendent of the Sunday school and all his committee for their continuing support of this splendid American custom.

The principal speaker on Saturday was the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin whose service to his fellow citizens as mayor of Baltimore and Governor of Maryland are too well known to require further mention. Mr. McKeldin's address is so timely that I am appending it for the benefit of the Members of this House.

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, MOUNTAINDALE UNION SUNDAY SCHOOL PICNIC—78TH ANNUAL—FREDERICK COUNTY, MD., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1961

On Monday—the first Monday in September—we will observe a national holiday, and, by custom and by law, pay tribute to the working men and women of America. While in this country nearly all of us are workers, and all will share in the tribute, the day is particularly dedicated to those of the mass production industries and related enterprises in which was discovered and proven, many years ago, the wisdom and even the necessity of organization among the employees and, by collective bargaining, to give them a united voice in dealing with those who employed them.

On Monday, we will honor the memories of the great leaders of the past—like Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and Peter McGuire, who founded the celebration of Labor Day—men who directed and guided the organization of labor and abolished the sweatshops, eliminated the exploitation of children in factories, and raised the men in the mills, the mines, and other industrial enterprises from stages of slavery to degrees of independence and decency in their livelihood.

When one sees today the great and lucrative market for all the goods of our production and commerce that exists in labor's massive ranks, one wonders how the giants of industrial management ever could have been so blind as to deny to so many people the means to buy and the time to use and enjoy the fruits of their own and their fellows' labor I could go on to speak at great length of the past contributions of labor, but rather, for this Labor Day, I should like to say a few words concerning conditions that threaten the progress of the workingman and the economic welfare of our country, and make a few suggestions for Maryland

Nationally, the figures for July show 5,140,000 unemployed—more than a million out of work for at least 6 months Another 1,300,000 nonfarm workers are struggling for an existence for themselves and their families in part-time jobs because they cannot obtain steady full-time work Here in Maryland there are 71,400 unemployed, and I might add that during the month of July total employment dropped by 12,499

Who are the unemployed? Almost all the workers in this unfortunate category are men over 45 years of age, nonwhite, and unskilled laborers. It is highly doubtful in the future if many of these workers will be given employment because they lack the education and skill needed to fill most of the jobs that will be created as automation increases.

Automation is the main threat to full employment today. However, no man in his right senses would call for the abolishment of automation. The development and production of the great machine are part of the American system—part of our progress—the proof of our inventive genius. And that genius had and continues to have its own great role in the development of the American economy.

The problem of automation and its contribution to the unemployment statistics is one that Government cannot ignore. It will not readily cure itself. The Congress of the United States has been studying the matter. Just last month, the Senate passed Senate bill 1991 which would provide for the training and retraining of many workers in new skills. While this bill would call for the cooperation of State vocational educational agencies and other available training agencies, it would be financed for the first 2 years of its operation by the Federal Government—then on a 50–50 matching fund basis with the participating States.

It is a step in the right direction. I hope that the House of Representatives will enact it promptly. I know that the President will sign it because the bill originated in the administration. In the event of its enactment, the State of Maryland should lose no time in implementing it.

There are those who feel that government should not enter into such programs. In fact, there are persons who take the attitude that a 4-percent unemployment rate is tolerable in our economy. I do not subscribe to these views. Moreover, I feel that only full employment of all those willing and able to work is the answer to unemployment, and government—I mean government at all levels—has a direct interest in seeking this goal. This principle was fully approved by Congress in its declaration of policy in the Employment Act of 1946.

What can we do here in Maryland to increase employment and to strive for the goal of full employment?

As I stated earlier we can begin studying a training and a retraining program which can be quickly implemented and expanded in the event of the enactment of Senate bill 1991.

We need a more adequate program developed to provide assistance to long-term, hard-core unemployed. We should strengthen our State guidance and counseling services.

Acceleration of our building program, both private and public, should be actively encouraged.

We should attract new industries to Maryland. Of course, the prime responsibility rests with local industries and local citizens, including the chamber of commerce and various civic groups. However, the State could well consider the need of implementing the program of the Maryland Economic Development Commission to provide for financial assistance for firms wishing to locate here. Approval, however, must be based on local conditions, sound contracts, and the number of new jobs created, but above all, the inability of the community to go it alone.

State government can and should cooperate, both in directing inquiries about site locations to those communities where unemployment is high and in the performance of needed services within the realm of State government—just as we did some years ago when we cut yards of red tape to provide an essential road into the site of a large glass plant for Cumberland.

Maryland long has been active in inducing employers to employ handicapped persons, and with considerable success. Much remains to be done. The campaign is a continuing one that cannot rest.

And in much the same manner we should strengthen our program against the foolishness of those employers who need men and women in their business and industries but refuse to hire many of those who apply because they have reached a certain age. This is utter waste and nonsense.

It may well be time to review our tax laws to determine if a revision is advisable to encourage employment and further capital investment in Maryland.

Most important we should open our doors of opportunity for all our people. In this way each can make his full contribution to our progress and live in self-respect. Individual merit of each person should be the sole judgment by which employees are hired.

Unemployment is a big problem but one that can be solved—and one that requires the attention and the action of governments and people from now on. Economists contend that there always will be some unemployment and maybe they are right—but we cannot escape it as Gospel. We must strive for perfection—for the happiness and pros-

perity of our whole people. People and jobs create markets for all consumer goods.

As Governor of Maryland and as mayor of Baltimore, I supported progress for the workingman and advocated his just causes. Making Maryland an attractive State to work and invest in is the best insurance for our continued economic growth. So, on this Labor Day of 1961 we salute the 73 million working people of America and express our appreciation for their contribution to our progress, security, and defense.

Pharmacies: The Health Service Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout this entire session of the Congress, there has been a constant concern over the practice of the healing arts of the United States. In Louis C. Zopf, dean of the college of pharmacy at the State University of Iowa, has an eminent and well qualified spokesman who, in the August issue of the Iowa Pharmacist has contributed significantly to current discussion of pending legislation.

I herewith submit this article and commend it to the consideration of all thoughtful citizens.

PHARMACIES: THE HEALTH SERVICE STATIONS
(By Louis C. Zopf)

All pharmacists must take an active part in the defense of pharmacy as a profession. The people of the community have every reason to expect a lucid discussion by a professional person, regarding legislative proposals and government regulations which affect the health of the Nation. Pharmacies are the health service stations of America.

Chain Store Age reports 260 new products released in the first 6 months of 1961. The biggest breakthrough, according to this journal, was the announcement of the oral contraceptive products, with other major developments being the release of potent antiinflammatory steroids, several new psychotropics, and an important breakthrough in the development of measles vaccine. They list 24 basic discoveries during this period of time. As pharmacists we frequently question the apparent duplicity in drug products, but let us remember that patient response is an unpredictable variable. Though similarity may exist in therapeutic agents; slight modifications, chemically or pharmaceutically, do cause a variance in biological response in certain cases.

Mr. and Mrs. Public read about new drugs at almost the same time they are released to the health professions. The individual's next contact with the new drug is during an illness, when he is confronted with the economics of the product. In the interim, and particularly following a satisfactory therapeutic response, the value of a new drug is most conveniently weighed by its cost.

Pharmacists must give more time to explaining the true value of continuous pharmaceutical research. Mr. Walter A. Munns, president of Smith Kline and French Laboratories, has pointed out that the current Kefauver-Celler bill proposes to change the wording of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by adding the words: "efficacy" and "efficacious" where the words "safety" and "safe" now appear. On the surface, such a change in the act would merely legally require drug companies to continue doing what they are actually doing now; that is, to present clinical evidence showing that a drug is safe and effective in treating a specific condition. The new provision would not of itself change the current administrative practice of the FDA. On the other hand, it is a well known fact of government administration that statutory requirements are often extended, by the device of "administrative practice" to acquire more than the language of a bill specifically stipulates. Just as "safety" has been interpreted to include "efficacy" under the present act, "efficacy" may be extended to include the concept of "comparative efficiency." Spokesmen have been testifying that it is their belief that the drug companies should be required to prove a new product more effective than an already marketed product. Others have complained about duplication of products. Under the bill the Commissioner of Patents would be given the power to turn down a patent application unless the manufacturer can prove to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that a given molecular modification or combination has a significantly greater therapeutic effect than products already on the market.

The concept of a comparative efficacy of drugs certainly cannot be made by nonprofessional people when professionally trained individuals admit that they are unable to agree on values of a drug's therapeutic merit. How then can we expect advancement of pharmaceutical product development when the control of therapeutic agents is based on the proof that a new agent has demonstrable superiority to products already on the market? Dr. Modell, in "Drugs of Choice," states: "Many drugs have more than one action and more than one sphere of clinical application. In each of these, the same drug may be relatively more or less effective, more or less dangerous, more or less important * * * relative utility may vary with the clinical application. * * * As in the case of the phenothiazine compounds which were recently introduced only for their antihistamine action, new therapeutic uses are being continually proposed."

Where would we have been, if for example, digitalis had been discarded when it was used solely as an infusion for its diuretic effect? The Veratrum Alkaloids were discarded many years ago but through consistent, scientifically controlled investigation by many workers, they now appear as accepted antihypertensive agents. Drugs originally introduced for the treatment of one condition frequently find their greatest value in the treatment of some other disease. Hormones, antibiotics, and tranquilizers are examples of drugs with tremendous potential therapeutic values. They are not specifically designed for the treatment of only one type of disease or condition and they therefore properly appear as modified and variable dosage forms. The value of certain of these drugs has surpassed the initial purpose of their acceptance and it is reasonable to believe that many new uses may still appear for these therapeutic families. There is much more to liberty of developing a new drug product than some lay groups like to believe. They are encouraged to think that development of new drug products is a sales gimmick.

We have recently been introduced to an oncolytic drug whose source is from the periwinkle. This drug, defined as an alkaloid, is said to have definite value in the treatment of Hodgkins disease and some hope that it may have definite value in the treatment of malignant neoplastic conditions. The introduction of this new agent by one of our leading pharmaceutical houses will encourage all pharmaceutical research personnel to reconsider and reevaluate products of similar design. Certainly this represents the challenge of another success which will be of benefit to the health of all. Some shelfworn materials may possess the needed variable to make them outstanding agents in the fight against cancer. Certainly our natural resources are capable of yielding many important therapeutic products. When these are developed they may rightfully and properly lead to the development of valuable synthetic products. The motivation for pharmaceutical research can be smothered if the concept of "comparative efficiency" becomes a reality.

Pharmacists are completely articulate, therefore, let each of us explain the values of pharmacy's contributions to the public health. Our obligation currently is magnified. Let us do our share.

A Constituent's View of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I received this letter from Mrs. H. G. Pedersen, of Pewaukee, Wis. It was originally sent to the Waukesha Daily Freeman and discusses a previous letter from a Mr. Hunt. I think others may agree with me that this is a most straightforward and thoughtful expression of opinion on the subject of foreign aid:

PEWAUKEE, WISC., *August 27 1961.*
To the FREEMAN (WAUKESHA DAILY FREEMAN):

In regard to the present foreign aid bill, the question has been raised, "Can we afford it?" That depends, I suppose, upon what we mean by "afford." We are the richest country in the world and enjoy the highest standard of living. Many people in this same world are literally starving to death or foraging in garbage heaps to stay alive. Even if it means raising taxes which in turn might mean our having to go without some of the luxuries we now enjoy, I would hope that we could afford it.

As to the reason for foreign aid given by Mr. Hunt (Freeman, August 26): "To me foreign aid means funds to effectively aid people interested in their own struggle to effectively oppose communism where it can be appraised of some tangible value to the United States," I prefer President Kennedy's reasoning, "* * * we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right." The fact that we hope the present aid bill will meet a desperate need of our own (self-preservation) is a fortunate coincidence.

What alternative is offered by those who wish to restrict or eliminate foreign aid? I fail to see any except to watch as one country after another revolts and establishes a Communist regime. Then one day when we inevitably stand alone we will most certainly lose our precious wealth—and count it the least of what we lose. President Kennedy also said, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Because our aid has sometimes taken a wrong direction in the past, this should not serve as a justification for not granting the new administration its current request. Our aid is now to be directed to countries willing

to help themselves which means land and tax reform on their part and economic aid and technical assistance on ours. Past failures have often been the result of supporting extreme right-wing governments (vocally anti-Communist, but unwilling to make necessary reforms) and has taken the form of military aid. As Vice President JOHNSON said, "You will have to look a long time before you find people willing to fight to defend poverty and ignorance."

As for the long-term borrowing authority, it is my understanding that once granted it would be up to Congress to take the initiative to cancel it. This could be done then if the program does not prove successful. Isn't this correct?

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Well?

Very truly yours,

JO ANN PEDERSEN,
Mrs. H. G. Pedersen.

Will the United States Never Learn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are asking the question: When will the Government of the United States clamp down on the export of vital and essential defense shipments to the Soviet Union and its satellites? An editorial published by the Paragould Daily Press under date of August 22 is recommended reading for every Member of the Congress.

A few days ago it was my privilege to hear the discussion before the House Rules Committee of a resolution introduced by Representative A. PAUL KITCHIN, of North Carolina, which would create a select committee to make a thorough investigation of shipments of critical materials to the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries. The Rules Committee approved the resolution and it is now before the House for action. I hope that the Kitchin resolution will be speedily approved and the work of this probe started with a minimum of delay.

The Paragould Daily Press editorial follows:

WILL THE UNITED STATES NEVER LEARN?

Will we never learn? Does U.S. stand for Uncle Simpleton?

A Commerce Department report, released this week, shows an increase of more than 800 percent in the volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries—in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin.

In the 3 weeks preceding the President's address (July 25), the Department licensed the shipment of $750,195 in American goods to the Soviet Union and her European satellites.

In the 3 succeeding weeks, the Department authorized the shipment of $6,278,566 to Nikita Khrushchev and his Communist cohorts.

Broken down, the authorizations included: $2,500,000 of rail equipment for Bulgaria; $1,700,000 of synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; $107,000 of industrial instruments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; $95,000 of coal tar products for Hungary and Czechoslovakia; $38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia; $35,000 of industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany; $23,000 of pipe valves for Russia and Poland.

Now here's the clincher. The Commerce Department says that none of these proposed shipments will endanger national security. Officials also point out that export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their warmaking potential.

Humbug. Anything that helps the general economy of the Communist bloc—and don't say the above authorizations will not—aids and abets the Soviet Union's warmaking potential. When Khrushchev and company can purchase "staples" from old, gullible Uncle Sam, they can increase their efforts to turn out the horrors of war and to the space race.

Isn't it about time we lowered the boom on these "patriotic businessmen" who rate the dollar above their country's welfare? And, isn't it also time for the Federal Government to wade into something that is their "business" for a change?

Doing business with the Soviet bloc is one heck of a way to fight communism and all it stands for.

Address by President Eisenhower at Rededication of Washington Confederate Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as the Civil War Centennial commemoration continues there will be many ceremonies in different parts of the country, but none will have a deeper significance for the past and the present than the events which took place in Hagerstown Md., on Sunday, September 3. On that occasion the Civil War Centennial Commission, through its executive secretary Karl Betts, awarded its gold medal to General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower who served as honorary chairman of the Commission while President of the United States. President Eisenhower then participated in rededication of the Washington Confederate Cemetery where 2,500 unknown southern soldiers lie buried in a common grave.

By recalling to mind the difficult, demanding, dangerous days of the 1860's in the equally difficult, demanding, dangerous days of the 1960's we are further inspired to summon up the courage and fortitude which will be necessary for the survival of the Union and the continued existence of a great republic conceived in liberty.

President Eisenhower expressed the spirit of the day forcefully and eloquently. It is my privilege to append his speech for the benefit of the Congress and the country:

A full century has passed since our Nation underwent, in bitter and prolonged Civil War, a grave threat to her existence.

Irreconcilable differences in the convictions of a divided citizenry put to the test of arms the asserted right of any State to withdraw from the Union, as opposed to the belief of others who held that we are—always have been—and must ever be, one Nation, indivisible.

Under this earth, where we now stand, lie men, who, in that war, gave their lives in defense of the convictions they held to be right.

In the background of the tragic conflict was another issue old as history—the struggle for human dignity in all places, in all climes, in all ages.

The war, fought with courage and tenacity, and ending only when one side reached utter exhaustion, settled the political issue in favor of national unity; while the cause of human dignity in the world was advanced still another step in its long and tortous progress toward fulfillment.

As we meet today to pay tribute to the gallant fallen of that conflict we sense, with all our faculties, that our Nation, now united, is living through another dangerous trial of strength which, though not accompanied by the clash of arms, is waged on a global scale.

On the one side are those who, seeking world domination, hold that man is a soulless creature born to serve, without choice, the decrees of an all-powerful state and, on the other, those who see man as created in the image of his Maker, guaranteed the blessings of liberty and master of the government under which he lives.

The threat strikes at the very foundations of our Nation—at all the values that free men cherish.

Dedicated, without reservation, to the advancement of our faith in man's Divine origin, we thank these men, now almost a 100 years in their graves, for the inspiration they—and their equally dedicated opponents in that war—have given us in their shining example of courage, endurance and fidelity.

May we, always, in the long and bitter contest stretching out before us, feel our convictions as deeply—and so faithfully sustain them—as they.

Our salute to them—our prayer for them and for our Nation—is this: "May you rest well in this place, and may your sons and daughters ever be the proud possessors of, and live in, the strength of conviction, the courage of the selflessness that you so richly displayed."

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the end of a busy session, there will continue to be issues on which our votes will be split or perhaps not cast. On the subject under discussion, however, there will be no dissenters nor abstainers. For on both sides of the aisle there is nothing but a single resolve: That today be as happy and memorable as any other single day in his good and distinguished life for our beloved and respected colleague: GENE KEOGH.

There is much I could say but let me say only that this is a man amongst us whose friendship I cherish, whose wisdom I respect, whose courage I salute, whose manner I admire.

Happy birthday, GENE. May God bless you and your family and keep you well to serve as you have served.

Address by Hon. John Tower, of Texas, Brookings, S. Dak., August 27, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of the Honorable JOHN TOWER, a junior Senator from the State of Texas, given at the picnic during the Young Republican convention in Brookings, S. Dak., Sunday, August 27.

I am certain that the remarks, the thought and the philosophy of Senator TOWER will be of special interest not only to every conservative, but to every Member of Congress:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN TOWER, OF TEXAS

Fellow Republicans, discerning Democrats, fellow Americans, it's a great privilege and pleasure for me to be in South Dakota, particularly in these exciting days when we are celebrating the centennial of the Dakota Territory. I've had the opportunity to participate in some of the festivities, and I must say that you Dakotans are better than Texans in extending warm hospitality, and I am deeply grateful to you, and I'm enjoying myself immensely here.

We Republicans sometimes have been likened unto a family that I knew of in east Texas. Down in east Texas we have quite a lot of sharecroppers—they live in little shacks on little patches of land, and the whole family sleeps together. One night outside one of the little shacks the old hound dog was just a howlin' and howlin'. Indoors the family was asleep on the pallet, and papa woke up and rolled over and said, "Mama, go out thar and see what is wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." Mama rolls over and shakes the son. "Son, get up and go out thar and see what is wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." He rolls over and shakes his sister. He says, "Sister, go out thar and see what's wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm too tired to move." Sister rolls over to little brother, and says, "Little brother, go out thar and see what's wrong with that hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." Little brother rolls over and there wasn't anybody else there, so he had to go outdoors to see what was wrong with the dog. Pretty soon he came back in the house and his daddy said, "Son, just what was wrong with the old hound dog?" And he said, "Well, daddy, he was a settin' on a cocklebur and he was just too tired to move."

But, I don't think this is characteristic of the Republican Party any more and of Republicans on the grassroots level generally because we have come to realize that instead of sitting around and griping about what is going on in Washington, it is high time we did something about it.

There is a great resurgence of conservative feeling in the United States today, and if we Republicans don't win some elections next year, it's our own fault. Now, next year's elections are elections that not only Republicans but discerning Democrats have a stake in. I know that there are a number of Democrats who appreciate America's fundamental institutions, who recognize our basic strengths as free people, who espouse the principles of Thomas Jefferson, who believe that that government is best that governs least; and I know that there are a lot of dissatisfied Democrats today. Maybe all the dissatisfied Democrats have already seen the light and joined the Republican Party in South Dakota; they're still in the process of enlightenment in Texas. It may take a little time, but eventually we have high hopes. Actually, they are not leaving the Democrat Party, the Democrat Party has left them; and the Democrat Party as presently led nationally does not espouse the traditional principles of that once great party—the party of Jefferson, the man who believed that the people should have the resposnibility of governing themselves—because the present administration and the present leadership of the national Democrat Party has the idea that the people should not have the responsibility for governing themselves, that the people are too stupid to make their own decisions.

The men who now surround the President—his covey of advisers for whom he has denuded the faculty of Harvard University—are men who have made some statements that if implemented into the law and into public policy, will mean the end, I believe, ultimately of self-government as you and I know it. They hold, for example, that the people have too much money and that they spend it foolishly. They spend it on automobiles, TV sets, boats, and personal pleasure—"personal indulgence," as Mr. Kennedy calls it. I don't know where he dreamed up that phrase—I guess it was while he was on his yacht off Hyannis Port. So, since we're so stupid and can't exercise freedom of choice wisely, they're going to take our money away from us and spend it in a manner that the Harvard professors know is best for us. As a matter of fact, one of them—Mr. Schlesinger—says, with ecstasy in his eyes, "There are new potential sources of taxation we haven't even explored yet." Heaven help us. I thought they had just about gotten to us every way they can, but apparently they're trying to figure out some new ways.

You ought to sit up there in the Senate of the United States day after day and watch how we're spending your money—just like it's going out of style, and at the rate they're spending it, there won't be any to be in style after a while.

Now, I personally believe that the American people do have the confidence to make their own decisions. The essence of self-government, the essence of liberty is freedom of choice. We are allowed to make our own decisions, and freedom of choice should be limited by laws and regulations and rules only to the extent necessary to preserve order in the society, to protect us in the enjoyment of our rights as individuals, and to provide for the national defense. And these are the only limitations that it should have.

Our people, I think, over a period of years have been reduced to a state of dependency on the National Government to the extent that many of them think that it is the function of the Government to afford everybody a minimum standard of living. Now, my friends, you can't have cradle-to-the-grave security and freedom of choice—you've got to choose between them, because whenever you abdicate your responsibility for the preservation of your own welfare to the National Government, it may take a load off your back, but it also takes away from you freedom of choice and individual liberty, and remember that.

Think about what is happening to the Republic. The more the Government takes away from you and spends, the less freedom of choice you have. You know there is no democracy like the democracy at the marketplace. Here is some Federal currency. This bill represents a great number of things to a great number of people. It may represent groceries or automobiles or a new television set or some personal security. The one thing else that it represents is freedom of choice. There is no democracy like the democracy at the marketplace because this dollar bill is in effect a ballot. You take it into the marketplace, you place it on the counter, and in so doing, you are voting for goods and services that American industry produces for you. Now, the more of this that the Government takes away from you, the less freedom of choice you have, the less democracy there is.

The Communists advocate a system in which the state will wither away eventually. They say, "We won't use currency anymore, we won't use money. This is certainly an instrumentality of capitalism." And the Communists feel that some day they'll be able to get rid of it. But, of course, when that day comes, if it comes, all the people who live in such a society will only be cogs in a machine. The only incentive they will have to produce is some vague thing called the good of society.

We are individuals, and because we have for centuries adhered to the Christian ethical system, we believe that as individuals we have a great deal of value and worth, and we believe that as individuals we should make as much individual progress as we can; but we cannot hope to achieve anything, we cannot hope to make progress unless we have a climate of liberty. I may be a common man, and I dislike that term "common man," but I want to preserve the type of system that will allow me, however common I am, to aspire to be better.

The fact that a man has been allowed to own property and to develop it, to better himself economically, to better his community and business steadiness—it has been the genius and the dynamic behind the very great growth of our America, it has not come as a result of a bunch of New Frontiersmen taking our money away from us and spending it for us.

Now, for the most part, I oppose virtually all of the domestic programs of the New Frontier. The liberals always say to me, "Well, TOWER, you oppose everything, what are you for?" I will tell you what I am for. I am for the preservation of the American Constitution and political system. I am for the preservation of the capitalist economy. I am for the preservation of the recognition that every individual has his worth. I am for freedom of choice and freedom of association. I am for personal progress. And, because I am for these things, I must necessarily oppose that which I know to be destructive of these things. This is no more a negative approach than that of the man who stops a runaway horse that threatens to trample down your children in the streets.

I think we can take pride in opposing those things which go against the American tradition. I am a conservative, I wear the badge of conservatism proudly, I will make no apologies for it. I am a conservative not because I am a stick-in-the-mud, not because I am antiquated in my ideas, not because I resist progress; quite to the contrary, I am a conservative because I recognize the great progress that our people have made historically, I should like for us to continue to make progress, I believe that conservatism is synonymous with progress because it seeks to preserve those things that history and experience have proven will make us progress as a people.

Now, the liberals very sneeringly call us cave men and Neanderthals, and they say that BARRY GOLDWATER is so good looking that he ought to be in the movies; namely, 18th Century Fox. This, of course, is dirty pool. It is misrepresentation of the worst

type, because it paints an image of conservatism that is completely false.

You think BARRY GOLDWATER is not a progressive? This guy flies jet airplanes—he's a product of the jet age. Have you ever been inside his automobile? It takes a graduate engineer to operate the thing—it's got more gadgets in it than you can shake a stick at. Here is a man who is vitally interested in new things, and he knows that a free and dynamic people will continue to afford worthwhile change and a better life for us all.

I've been accused of being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century. As somebody said, TOWER is slightly to the right of McKinley and slightly to the left of Alfred the Great. But it is the New Frontiersmen who are medieval in their outlook. Back in the Middle Ages in our Anglo-Saxon society, it was the king and his court who made all the decisions for the society. I seem to see a striking resemblance between the king and his court and the bunch that are running Washington now.

I don't believe that the American people think that a handful of people in Washington are more capable of making their decisions and ordering their lives and their destinies than they are themselves. I don't believe that the American people believe that the wealth and resources of the country should be marshaled by the Government and redistributed in the form of welfare benefits. I don't believe that the farmers of this country feel that the production of food and fiber should be nationalized. But all of these things have been advocated by the men who surround the President now.

These are perilous times for America. We face the grave threat of Communist imperialism from without. My friends, we also face a threat from within—a very insidious threat—because its false front is a political program that appeals to all that is weak and selfish within us.

I remember Harry Truman campaigning on the platform, "You never had it so good." I know the New Frontier promises to do everything for us. They say, "Here is a crying need and the Federal Government must go in and fulfill that need." I will concede that there are needs in many areas, but the fulfillment of these needs is our responsibility, and historically, as a people, we have, as a free people, disciplined ourselves to do for ourselves the things that need to be done.

I went to church here in Brookings this morning—the Methodist Church. I noticed they have under discussion the possibility of building a new church. There is church building going on all over the United States. I've never seen anything like it—old churches being refurbished. Does the Federal Government tell us we must build churches? Does the Federal Government levy on us and take the money and build churches? No. This to me is proof that the American people, recognizing their spiritual obligations, will do by themselves without any Government intervention the thing that needs to be done. And I think the same thing would apply to education, to roads, to old-age assistance, to almost anything if the Government would just let us alone.

My friends, freedom is a hard-bought thing. You young people have enjoyed the benefits of a free society. I think the reason you are turning conservative is because you realize you may not enjoy them for long. Our American democracy has evolved over a period of centuries—it is not something we have come by overnight, and we must fight now to preserve it because although we have not come by it overnight, we can certainly lose it overnight if we are not careful.

The enemy could lay waste our cities, our factories, and our farms, and in a generation we could rebuild them. But if our free institutions are destroyed, generations yet unborn will live in an absolute state. I want to preserve the blessings of liberty for my three little girls. I know that we all value our liberty. Let's recognize the threat to it, and let's go forth now to resolve that we shall turn them back at the polls in 1962.

New VFW Chief Called Thorough, Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is proud of Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, Minn., who has been elected national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The following article from the St. Paul Dispatch of August 28 aptly describes his many contributions to his community and his country:

NEW VFW CHIEF CALLED THOROUGH, MAN OF ACTION

(By Carl Hennemann, staff writer)

Robert E. Hansen, the new national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is a man who likes to get things done the right way.

An insurance man, he operates the Robert E. Hansen agency at 211 Grand Avenue, South St. Paul, where he was born January 28, 1926. He and his wife, Pauline, have two children, Lynda Sue, 9, and Kim Robert, 3. They live at 1711 Pleasant Avenue.

Robert Hansen's friends say he likes to get down to the core of things. This shows up in everything he does—giving youngsters in youth activities a choice of athletics, or scouting around to discover what his community might need most, then getting people to tackle and solve the problem.

He was nominated by his father Chris B. Hansen, also a VFW man; Orville L. Freeman, former governor who is now Secretary of Agriculture, seconded the nomination.

South St. Paul will hold an official Welcome Bob Hansen Day, September 9. Arleigh Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, will speak at an official welcoming dinner in Hotel St. Paul the same day.

"I don't think anybody could buy Bob off, after he made up his mind he was doing the right thing," said a friend. "He will want to give the VFW the best he's got. He'll never try to do things lightly, just to get them done."

The VFW chief has held almost every office in his organization, from offices in the Gallagher-Hansen post at South St. Paul to district, State and national posts—he was senior vice commander nationally when elected.

He graduated from South St. Paul High School in 1943, and from the American Aeronautical Institute in St. Paul later, then entered the Navy in March 1944, serving as flight engineer in the Alaska-Aleutian area with naval air transport.

He became an insurance salesman in 1948 and opened his own agency 2 years later.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William J. Nagle, speaking on behalf of the Catholic Association for International Peace, recently gave broad and thoughtful support for a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. His views (appearing in the Catholic Reporter for August 25), suggests the great urgency of passing legislation to create this agency in this session of Congress before the U.N. debates on disarmament in the fall:

[From the Catholic Reporter, Kansas City, Mo., Aug. 25, 1961]

CATHOLIC PEACE GROUP FOR DISARMAMENT AGENCY BILL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—World tension over the Berlin crisis makes the creation of a U.S. Disarmament Agency more important than ever, a Catholic spokesman told Congress.

The spokesman said that quick congressional action toward coordinating U.S. disarmament efforts would have "a salutary effect on world public opinion" by giving evidence even in a time of crisis American policy is to press for an end to the arms race.

Appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. William J. Nagle spoke on behalf of the Catholic Association for International Peace. He said the CAIP endorses "with enthusiasm" a bill (S. 2180) which would establish the agency.

Nagle is chairman of the association's committee on morality and warfare. He is director of a private research organization and editor of a recent volume of essays dealing with Catholic views on moral problems of modern warfare.

Nagle said the lack of clearcut authority and responsibility for coordination of disarmament policies within the Government has proven a major handicap to our disarmament efforts. A single, central agency would also be able to make more effective use of disarmament studies carried on by university research centers, he said.

Setting forth the CAIP position, Nagle quoted frequently from a column by Norma K. Herzfeld, Washington correspondent for the Catholic Reporter. Mrs. Herzfeld is a former CAIP vice president and former committee secretary for the organization.

Mrs. Herzfeld wrote: "We have kept no more than a handful of experts working—usually part time—on disarmament proposals, implying that we give less importance to this subject on high Government levels than to the matter of starling removal in the District of Columbia."

She said that internal disagreements among the Armed Forces, CIA, Atomic Energy Commission, and the State Department have frequently kept the United States from making important policy decisions, and this at times when agreement seemed possible with Russia.

She charged also that Government authorities have never sought to inform the U.S. public on the meaning of arms, the meaning of arms control, and the degree of our own national sovereignty which would have to be

given up for an enforceable system of inspection and control.

Nagle said the CAIP urges as strongly as it can that Congress pass the bill before the adjournment of the current session.

"Passage of the bill would provide an excellent complement to the President's speech on Berlin and to our present arms buildup. In our concern over Berlin, we must not lose sight of the long-range advantage in world public opinion that would accrue to the United States if we passed the bill creating the Disarmament Agency within the next month."

Utt Family Reunion, Gladesboro Lutheran Church, Carroll County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 20, 1961, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, and I were guests at the Utt family reunion in Carroll County, Va. The reunion was held at Gladesboro Lutheran Church near Fancy Gap, Va., in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains. The occasion was one of wonderful fellowship and we enjoyed a fine picnic dinner and were privileged to hear a comforting sermon, delivered by the Rev. A. F. Tobler. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Mr. Tobler's sermon:

THE STORMS OF LIFE

Jesus spake unto them saying: Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.—Mathhew 14: 27.

Were you ever in a storm? The disciples of Jesus were once in a storm. The ship was in the midst of the sea of Galilee tossed by the waves—for the wind was contrary. Their Master had just miraculously fed 5,000 hungry souls on five loaves and two fishes. The people were astonished at the miracle. They would have made Him King then and there by force—but He slipped away up into the hills to pray. He wanted to be alone. His throne was not of this world. He had come to reign in the hearts of men—"to seek and to save the lost" to redeem a world lost in sin. He said to His disciples—"Take the boat and cross over to the other side, while I send the multitudes away."

No doubt His disciples were reluctant to leave Him alone. It looked like being disloyal to Him. It seemed like deserting Him. But He had urged them to go—they must obey. Hath not God said: "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams?" "Obey My voice and ye shall be My people, his servants ye are to whom ye obey." So His disciples obeyed.

The evening on which His disciples set sail no doubt was fair and lovely. They anticipated a pleasant voyage across the sea of Galilee. But lo, they encountered a violent storm instead. The boat was buffeted and tossed for the wind was adverse.

Is that not a picture of life? All life is like that—storm after storm arises.

How often God's children run into storms when only calm weather is anticipated. How often the brightest beginning ends in gloom. How often the finest day is followed by storms. How often the morning sun is blacked out by storms by noonday. How often our dearest treasures are snatched away without warning—and our fairest hopes blighted and instead of mirth there is mourning.

But do not sailors expect to encounter storms at sea? Do they not carry life preservers and life boats?

How foolish it would be to put to sea and not to be prepared for gales and storms and contrary winds. Life is not all sunshine; storms arise.

And so on this day—suddenly the songs of the sailors cease. The favorable breeze becomes a mighty wind. The calm sea rolls and writhes—it becomes a thing of fury. The sailors are alarmed. The ship is being tossed—the disciples struggle and toil against the angry wind and waves. Their lives are in danger. It is dark. It is night. Their Master is away. They are alone. They seem so helpless.

Is this not a fit representation of our life? Contrary winds, darkness, perils, storms. And oftimes even Jesus our refuge and strength seems far away—just when we need Him most.

How stormy life is. These stormy gales and winds of life come to all of us. Bitter disappointments. Grievious losses. Perplexing cares. Anxious apprehensions. Pinching poverty. Temptations. Cutting words. Painful diseases. Darkness. Death. O what black clouds arise. What whirlwinds of storms. How tempest tossed we are.

Are not tests and trials like storms to be expected? If the disciples of Jesus escaped not but were storm tossed—shall we escape? Are we better than they? "Are there no foes for me to face, must I not stem the flood?"

From His place of prayer on the mountain side, through the darkness of the night Jesus was keeping watch. His disciples might think He was far away, yet He was near.

His disciples must have looked out across those wind-swept waves toward the hills from whence must come their help, still hoping that somehow Jesus would come to their aid. It is always darker just before the dawn. Truly, this was a dark hour for the disciples. They needed Jesus so much, death was so near, they could almost touch it. They were so afraid. Then just when they needed Him most, Jesus came to their rescue. He came walking on the angry waves. They saw Him, but they thought it was ghost—they were now alarmed more than ever.

But above the wind and the raging sea they hear a voice. It is the voice of Jesus. Across the waves He calls: "Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid." What comforting words.

So in our trials, tests and troubles—in our sorrows and disappointments we need to remember that Jesus is always near. He has promised, "Lo I am with you alway." In every calamity we are not alone. He speaks to us just as truly as He spoke to His disciples long ago. Across the ages His Word comes to us: "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." "It is I," involves everything.

To His disciples His voice was a familiar voice. They had heard it often. It was a voice of authority, of sympathy, of love, of comfort and security. It was the voice of power. All power is His. He held heaven and earth in His hand. They heard His voice and obeyed His will.

Not only was He able to calm the raging sea and the advance wind—but He was able to calm the troubled spirit of His beloved disciples.

The disciples recognized His voice. And when the waves and the wind grew calm they were ready to cry out: "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God.

So with us, we must recognize His voice as He speaks to us through His word and through His church. We must confess our sins and accept Him as our divine saviour and redeemer. He is the way, the truth and the life. He is the only way.

I'm sure the disciples remembered how Jesus would not send the hungry multitudes away until He had satisfied their hunger. And in their distress believed that He would find a way to help them in this awful storm.

We, too, need to remember that no soul ever came to Jesus for help and went empty away. In these turbulant days, in these stormy times in which we live—when so many dangers threaten us from every angle of life, we, too, need to Hear and Heed the Voice of Jesus. It is only when Jesus is with us that we feel perfectly safe—only then are we safe.

God does not tempt us—but He does test us to try our faith—to test our loyalty and our love.

The Apostle Paul says: "We are to glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation, worketh patience, patience experience, experience hope, hope maketh not afraid or ashamed, because the love of God is shed in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us."

Jesus was tested and tried. He knows all about us. He knows how frail we are. He knows there are adverse winds and that storm clouds arise.

He faced the storm. He was hungry and weary. He was despised and rejected. He was deserted, denied, betrayed and crucified. The wind never blew so hard as that dark night in Gethsemane, when He sweated great drops of blood in agony. No night was ever so dark. No load so heavy—never was agony so great as on that Good Friday when Jesus died on the cross, to pay the debt for the sins of the world, to pay the debt for you, for me.

Yet as he faced the cross only a few hours before His crucifixion, with a shout of triumph He was able to say to His disciples: "In this world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

We, too, can overcome the world, and sin with all its trials and troubles and tribulations through Christ Jesus and only through Him can we win the victory.

No matter how dark the night or how great the loss, or how heavy the load, or how contrary the wind, or how severe the test—remember that Jesus is always near—ready, willing, and able to save to the uttermost. Remember that His grace is sufficient for every human need.

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your faith in His excellent word.
What more can He say, than to you He hath said,
To you who for refuge to Jesus have fled?
Hide me, O my Saviour, hide,
Till the storm of life is past."

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to join in the tribute to a great Congressman, EUGENE J. KEOGH, on his birthday and his 25th anniversary of dedicated service to his country.

GENE KEOGH has an enviable record and has been and is an inspiration to me, a new Member of the House. It is my privilege to represent a district which many years ago was also represented by my distinguished colleague. To this day fine words of praise are echoed by many of my constituents for the great services rendered by him.

To you, GENE, go my very best wishes for continued good health, happiness, and many more years of service to your district, State, and Nation.

Dr. Wangensteen's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the great medical men of the world today is Dr. Owen H. Wangensteen, professor and chairman of the Department of Surgery at the University of Minnesota School of Medicine. His contributions to medical science are well described in the following article from the Journal of the American Medical Association of August 26, 1961:

DR. WANGENSTEEN'S CONTRIBUTION
(By Leonard W. Larson, M.D., Bismarck, N. Dak.)

The honor roll of doctors in medical science and research, who have received the Passano Foundation Award since 1945, represents 16 outstanding careers which have been of immeasurable value to humanity. As further evidence of the distinction of their developments and discoveries, five winners also have received the Nobel Prize. Each new name added to this honor roll gives recognition and appreciation to another of those individuals who can, through his own ability, spirit, and vision, pass on to others the knowledge and inspiration needed to help solve our present-day problems, and hasten the promise of tomorrow.

Such a man is Dr. Owen H. Wangensteen, professor and chairman of the Department of Surgery at the University of Minnesota School of Medicine. I consider it a privilege to add his name to the honor roll as the 17th recipient of the Passano Award for his many contributions to surgical techniques and postoperative care of the patient. Perhaps his finest contribution to medicine, however, is the number of exceptional proteges he has prepared to occupy positions of honor, and to make their own impressive contributions. But Dr. Wangensteen's own words best express what I consider to be his most outstanding contribution to medicine. He said, "In the final analysis, the only real gift in life is a part of oneself."

For over 30 years, Dr. Wangensteen has been giving the gift of a generous part of himself to medicine, reluctantly at first because he did not want to be a doctor; he wanted to be a farmer. But his reluctance, which I suspect was really only Norwegian persistence—sometimes known as Scandinavian stubbornness—was aimed at the Norwegian persistence of his father who kept after him to enter medicine. They saw eye to eye finally, and tonight we are honoring both the ability of one Wangensteen, and the judgment of another for a lifetime dedication to what the doctor modestly terms, "only extending our knowledge a little bit." But, remember, a key is a small item, yet it has opened doors leading to vast treasure.

In addition to his father's insistence, there were two other influences which led to his medical career. While still in high school, he showed skill and resourcefulness in solving a farm problem of sows that could not farrow their young. He did research in the Breeders' Gazette, the Farmer, and several books on veterinary problems. He unsuccessfully tried a mechanical device. Finally, he found that his hand was the best instrument to deliver pigs. His father was impressed and pleased. The other occurrence involved hauling manure every day for about 3 weeks during a summer hot spell. Anything, he became convinced, would be better than that.

Dr. Wangensteen's gift of himself to medicine comes to us in many forms. His contribution to growing excellence in medical education stems from his dedication and strength in protecting and expanding the atmosphere for academic research. This atmosphere, alive now in Minnesota because of facilities and standards which he established, is being carried on into the world by graduates who owe their outlooks and enthusiasm to that atmosphere. Who can tell the immeasurable benefit which our Nation has received and will receive from this fountainhead. Dr. Wangensteen has an explanation for this successful atmosphere. He says, "I found that you've got to take a stand and stick to it." He also says, "Success in any endeavor, each of us comes to know, is an enterprise of a lifetime. It is a heavy and recurring responsibility."

His lifetime endeavor has nurtured a postgraduate research program which has paid off handsomely. Among Dr. Wangensteen's proteges are eight recipients of the John and Mary Markle scholarship. Many former Minnesota residents now occupy key posts in teaching hospitals throughout the country.

The most celebrated reward of Dr. Wangensteen's stick-to-it-iveness is the recent pioneering efforts in cardiovascular surgery. Former Resident Dr. Clarence Dennis originated one of the early pump oxygenators. Dr. F. John Lewis, now of Northwestern University, was the first to employ hypothermia successfully in open-heart surgery. Dr. C. Walton Lillehei was among the first to perform open-heart operations assisted by cardiopulmonary bypass. His pump oxygenator was devised by Dr. Richard DeWall, chief resident on Dr. Wangensteen's service.

Dr. Wangensteen himself has devised surgical procedures which are credited with playing an important role in reducing operative mortality in many kinds of abdominal surgery. His procedures in cancer surgery have made it possible to salvage 10 percent of otherwise hopeless gastric cancer patients, and 25 percent in cases of advanced cancers of the colon. His most recent innovation is the use of hypothermia to control severe gastric bleeding which has made surgery feasible, or in some cases entirely unnecessary, for patients with severely hemorrhagic duodenal ulcers.

On behalf of myself and the American Medical Association, I say that again you have chosen wisely in honoring a truly outstanding man. Over a year ago, Dr. Wangensteen said about one of his friends: "We need his example far more than he needs our praise." Tonight, I give the doctor back his own words. We need his example as we need his influence to continue the advance of medical knowledge through the chain reaction of learning, and of medical practice through the strength of dedication.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the following article gives an indication of the solid feeling that many American Catholics have for disarmament. Mr. Donald McDonald's thoughtful piece, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Catholic of August 24, is not only a cogently written argument, but an index of the broad support this legislation has. I hope that other Members may be as favorably impressed by it as I was:

[From the Pittsburgh Catholic, Aug. 24, 1961]

U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY
(By Donald McDonald)

It may seem incredible, but it has taken our country 16 years—from the dropping of the first atomic bomb until now—to create a special, permanent agency for disarmament, thereby serving notice on the world that we propose to make a sustained, organized and systematic effort leading to eventual universal disarmament.

The agency has not yet been established. But the necessary legislation has been introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania. It has bipartisan support and seems assured of passage if the House can make room for it in the crowded, closing weeks of this session of Congress.

For 16 years the disarmament problem has been treated by both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in a spasmodic, haphazard manner. It has at times been oversimplified, at other times distorted (e.g., certain propagandists have persistently deceived the American people by pretending that all American advocates of disarmament favor unilateral disarmament by the United States which would indeed, if true, be a foolish and dangerous position.)

At one time, Mr. Eisenhower (or was it Sherman Adams?) found a little office in the White House for Harold Stassen and installed him as the Nation's disarmament expert. But when Mr. Stassen began delving into some of the ramifications of disarmament and began seriously negotiating with Russia, Britain, and France in London, his job and his office were dissolved.

This is not, mind you, a matter of the disarmament sincerity of Mr. Eisenhower or the late John Foster Dulles, or of Mr. Truman who accomplished little more.

The deficiency, I think, has not been one of sincerity, but rather of imagination and intellectual power, together with conviction and confidence that what must be done—i.e., universal disarmament and the establishing of world peace and world order—can be done.

All of these qualities of mind and heart must be present in any President and his administration if they are to overcome the inherent difficulty in disarmament—that is, the formidable psychological task of mounting and sustaining total disarmament effort at the same time that the Nation must be totally committed, for sheer survival reasons, to an all-out armament program.

What a nation can accomplish in disarmament planning and negotiating is related, of course, to the climate of public opinion in the country. But the government itself can influence that public opinion, for or against

disarmament, by what it says, how it acts, how much official concern it shows for the problem.

If the proposed U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security is merely the latest move in the international propaganda game, if it is to be staffed by people with anything less than total conviction about the urgency of universal disarmament, and if it is to be bypassed by Government officials who have for years dismissed disarmament as the dream of naive idealists, then we shall be no closer to realistic disarmament than we have been since 1945. And we shall leave public opinion both cold and uninformed about the possibilities and the urgency of disarmament.

I bring up these hypotheses not because I think they correspond to present reality but because they reflect some of the inhibiting conditions that surrounded our disarmament efforts in the past.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk's statement on the agency to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee encourages hope that at last the United States is going to take more than a stop-and-go interest in the No. 1 problem in the world today.

He avoided (properly, perhaps, in that context) the matter of whether universal disarmament can be negotiated and enforced outside a worldwide legal and juridical structure.

But Mr. Rusk is aware of the seeming paradox and internal conflict of working simultaneously for disarmament and armament. Aside from the political and ideological conflicts in the world, he said, "the arms race itself creates an element of instability and insecurity."

"We cannot," he said, "let the recurrence of political and military crisis prevent us from addressing ourselves to the kind of world we hope to see."

Our disarmament agency can be immensely useful on the technical level alone—for there is a vast amount of scientific, military, political, and economic matter that must be absorbed, sifted, correlated, and passed along to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Rusk.

But were the President and the Secretary to limit the agency's usefulness to the technical, they would limit disarmament itself, and limited disarmament, like limited war, is a snare and a delusion. We have grounds, I think, to hope that this will not be the fate of our first permanent governmental agency for disarmament, world peace, and security.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Why Hush-Hush About the Communist Conspiracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern among red-blooded Americans over our soft pedalling, hush-hush attitude toward the international Communist conspiracy. Khrushchev talks big. He does not muzzle his military men when it comes to running down imperialistic Americans.

Traveling American newsmen are apparently finding this concern reflected abroad. Constantine Brown, writing from Rome, says Europeans are finding it difficult to understand why our generals in Germany can no longer indoctrinate their troops against communism.

Mr. Brown's column follows:

WHY TALK OF ENEMY SO SOFTLY?—SOFT-PEDALING OF FREE WORLD MESSAGE SEEN IN BROADCASTS TO CAPTIVE PEOPLES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The dullness of Voice of America broadcasts is surpassed only by the dreariness of the propaganda radio behind the Iron Curtain. While the Ed Murrow organization spreads the American story to various countries by treating them to tape recordings containing dull generalities about freedom and the nobility of man (mostly from such men as Senators HUMPHREY and FULBRIGHT), the Reds are equally boring with their denunciations of "warmongering Americans."

Obviously, attacks against the Red oligarchy are not considered conductive to peace in our time or the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. Hence, speeches or statements by "reactionary" Americans, such as Senators BRIDGES, GOLDWATER, THURMOND, DODD, and LONG, must be taboo. This, at least, is this reporter's conclusion after having heard a whole month of Voice of America broadcasts while in Germany and Switzerland recently. There are the inevitable gentle slaps at the Soviets by some of the Voice of America editorialists. But they carry nowhere near the weight which the above mentioned Senators carry.

Foreigners, and particularly Germans, listen with genuine interest to what America has to say—particularly those in the legislative branch of Government. They follow with an interest akin to anxiety the dispatches from Washington.

I found no German, or for that matter any other European, who doubts the sincerity of President Kennedy's line of sternness toward Moscow. But equally, I found nobody who does not ask, "How can we reconcile what your President tells us with what his own important party leaders and especially the chairman of the most important Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, says in public, on the floor of the Senate and in radio and television interviews?"

The suspicions of what may be termed a schizophrenic foreign policy started some time ago when Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, and later Senator FULBRIGHT urged negotiations on Berlin after Mr. Kennedy had taken a formally strong stand on that very matter.

And I found many Germans in responsible positions both in the government and newspaper profession, who wondered why Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate's most important committee, had used his power and taken the initiative in demanding that the Defense Department muzzle the generals and admirals who were denouncing the Soviet regime and communism. I noted raised eyebrows on this subject, even among some Frenchmen who believe as firmly as we do in the civilian control of the military.

The order was directed at men who may have the responsibility to lead their men in battle against the enemy. They were not guilty of any political activity; they were merely preparing their men for a tragic eventuality when they would be asked to risk their lives.

Parenthetically, I add that while listening to a Frankfurt military station broadcast of a blow-by-blow description of war games I found the commentator describing the operation of an advanced unit never said "we are now attacking the enemy." The word "enemy" was replaced by the obviously diplomatic expression "aggressor."

It is difficult for the hardbitten European military to understand why the generals can no longer indoctrinate their troops against the Communists who have been, in fact, declared enemies by Commander in Chief Kennedy himself. Before the last war the French and British also neglected to indoctrinate their forces. The result was disastrous for the French, at least. Their men believed they were fighting to save Poland. Their spirit was not in it and they fought badly. Not until they went down in defeat and General De Gaulle began his national movement from England did the new French forces realize that they were fighting for the survival of France as a free nation.

Are we going to allow our defense forces to believe they may be fighting to save Berlin for Germany? That deduction is implied if the full truth of the Communist worldwide conspiracy is not brought with full force to the attention of the men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Or are there two policies in the United States? That of the Chief Executive, strongly backed by the American people, and the other by a few influential Members of Congress and certain invisible men in the administration? This question was asked of this reporter by many substantial men all over Europe who, by virtue of their positions, have wide knowledge about our official commitments.

There is an inclination on the part of questioners to believe that the appeasers are still firmly in the saddle. How else, they ask, could it be explained that at the time Mr. Kennedy made his first two statements regarding our policy toward the Kremlin Senator FULBRIGHT came out flatly urging negotiations.

Strangely enough, we are now on the road to negotiating what used to be described as nonnegotiable. It is obvious, say those who have closely followed developments in the United States since Mr. Kennedy's return from his talk with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna, that the appeasers are winning the first game.

Report by Joint Committee of Judges and Members of the Bar on Use of Electronic and Mechanical Sound Reporting in District of Columbia Courts and Tribunals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the court reporter has been the silent but indispensable man in legal proceedings for centuries. Without any fuss and certainly without any fanfare, he has performed a difficult and demanding job with skill and precision. His profession is a specialized one. However, in this age of automation with its increasing emphasis on machines and not men has raised the possibility as to the use of electronic sound recording devices in the courts.

Mr. President, this is a technical subject which has been analyzed thoroughly by technicians, that is, a joint committee of judges and members of the District of Columbia bar. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the report of the joint committee be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, MAY 11, 1961—REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF JUDGES AND MEMBERS OF THE BAR TO STUDY, CONSIDER, AND TEST THE USE OF ELECTRONIC AND MECHANICAL SOUND REPORTING OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURTS AND TRIBUNALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Charles F. McLaughlin, U.S. district court, chairman)

Pursuant to the resolution adopted at the 1959 Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, which called for the appointment of a committee of judges and lawyers to "study, consider, and test the use of electronic and mechanical sound reporting equipment for verbatim reporting of the proceedings before the courts and tribunals" of the District of Columbia and which required that "the results of any such testing be compared for accuracy, speed, economy, and feasibility with the present system of verbatim reporting," the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, on December 8, 1959, appointed the following committee:

Circuit judge, Warren E. Burger; district judge, Charles F. McLaughlin; Joseph D.

Bulman, Esq., Paul R. Connolly, Esq., J. Harry Welch, Esq., and Edward P. Troxell, Esq. Judge McLaughlin was appointed chairman.

This committee met several times to discuss plans for a simple method of testing. Because the electronic equipment was not readily available and required extensive installation, it was not possible to complete a thorough testing before the 1960 judicial conference. Accordingly, an interim report of the activities of this committee was submitted to the 1960 judicial conference and the committee was authorized to proceed to the completion of its work.

Through the cooperation of Hon. Warren Olney III, director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, John E. Airhart, assistant director, and William R. Sweeney, vice president, Soundscriber Engineering Corp., North Haven, Conn., two Soundscriber electronic tape recording devices were obtained.

Thereupon the committee recommended to the district court that a comprehensive system of testing the recording of court proceedings by use of the Soundscriber be adopted in the district court. The chairman of this committee placed the following motion before the judges of the district court in executive session at a meeting of May 10, 1960:

"Moved, that the judges of this court respectively in the order of precedence, install a soundscriber in their courtroom and that each judge study, consider, and test the use thereof for a period of 3 weeks; that such testing be in addition to the customary verbatim reporting which presently takes place in that court and that the results of any such testing be conducted for (1) accuracy, (2) speed, (3) economy, and (4) feasibility with the present system of verbatim reporting; and it is further

"Moved, that each judge thereafter return to the chief judge a written report of the results of said testing and of said comparisons."

The motion was adopted. Thereafter, as soon as the business of the court permitted, engineers of Soundscriber commenced installing the two available machines in the courtroom of the various judges of the district court on a 3-week basis.

Following the conclusion of the test of the machine in his courtroom, each individual judge submitted to the chairman of this committee a written report.

This committee has met on several occasions to study these reports and to listen to individual comments of the members of the committee. As a consequence, the committee can now report upon the results of this extensive testing.

From the comprehensive experience gained from the actual use of the Soundscriber equipment, which this committee found to be the most advanced and suitable available, the committee feels and therefore recommends that such equipment, at present, is not an adaptable or feasible substitute for the present system of verbatim reporting of proceedings in the U.S. district court by skilled individual court reporters.

The machine possesses too great a sensitivity in that it records not only the spoken word but coughing, footsteps, rustling of paper, and other extraneous noises. Yet its sensitivity is limited by the placement of microphones. Speech which takes place beyond the perimeter of sensitivity of the microphones is inaudible. In other instances involving proceedings with multiple parties or multiple counsel, it is difficult to distinguish from one sound tape precisely what has occurred. The machine, therefore, lacks the very important human function of discriminating intelligently as to what has transpired.

Again this lack of discrimination does not particularly recommend the machine for use in instances where the court has occasion to refer back to prior testimony, comments or proceedings. Perhaps this is largely the result of a deficiency in the method of operation of the machine employed during the test period. In every instance the machine was operated by the courtroom clerk. The other duties imposed upon this person prevent him from maintaining a careful watch on the operation of the machine and from keeping an accurate log of the many signal points in a day's proceeding.

Therefore, should this machine be used for the verbatim reporting of court proceedings, it would have to be manned exclusively by an individual whose duty it was to maintain a watch over the equipment and to keep a full and complete log of the various salient points in court proceedings or in the course of testimony. Thus no substantial economy would be realized by a reduction in court personnel. A human reporter would still be required to operate the machine.

Although it is suggested that a transcript could be quickly provided from a magnetic tape, the necessity for such an immediate transcript is the exception in the district court, and in any event there is no substantial difference between the speed which could be obtained in this manner as compared to the use of successive court reporters.

Where the machine was used in courts having a great variety of business before it, such as the assignment court and short motions, where there are unavoidable interruptions and consideration of matters piecemeal, the use of the Soundscriber is completely impractical because of its lack of flexibility and again its lack of discrimination.

This same lack of flexibility and discrimination in the machine would require, in order to obtain a suitable transcript, an adaption of courtroom practices and techniques to the requirements of the machine. Even if this was a desirable result, a considerable period of time would be required to educate both judges and lawyers to this new technique. All remarks would have to be made directly to the microphones. The sensitivity of the microphones would have to be variable and directional so as not to eavesdrop on either counsel or court. Bench conferences would probably have to be dispensed with and, in all, a new, rigidly ordered trial would have to be decreed. The committee feels that this imposes too rigorous a burden upon the participants in a judicial proceeding and sacrifices the spontaneity of trial and the necessary indulgence to individualism to a technique for obtaining a precisely accurate transcript. The transcript is largely useful only on appeal. Since cases are not usually tried in order to be appealed, the necessary revision in trial techniques would seem to be losing sight of first purposes.

The lawyers and judges comprising this committee are generally satisfied, on the basis of their own experience, with the present transcripts that are available from court reporters. It would seem desirable however for the district court to establish certain minimal standards of excellence for court reporters in order to avoid hiring the incompetent. Although this has been such a rare occurrence that no substantial problem is posed by the threat, yet such standards should be imposed. One of the criteria adopted should certainly involve a requirement that the reporter's work product be readable by other reporters on the Court's staff. In this manner, the inability to procure a transcript by reason of the death, illness or removal of a reporter will be avoided.

Accordingly, although the committee recognizes certain possible future advantages in the use of electronic equipment for verbatim reporting of trials and proceedings in the courts of this jurisdiction, the committee does not feel that the art of electronic reporting has yet reached such a suitable level that it is a proper substitute for the present system. This is not to say that the committee has adopted a position of fixed opposition to the adoption of an electronic reporting system at some future date. The development and improvement of methods, means and techniques for the utilization of electronic facilities and devices is proceeding at a rapid pace. The committee has taken notice of this scientific fact. The present impediments which we have observed to the current use of electronic reporting may in the not too distant future be reduced or completely overcome. The committee is of the opinion that the prospects for suitable development of electronic reporting are such that the developers should be encouraged in their work by offering to cooperate with them in the way of providing additional testing, constructive criticism and advice. However, for the present the committee must recommend retention of the present system of verbatim reporting.

Robert Ellsworth Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a tribute to Robert Ellsworth Gross, industrialist, philanthropist, and patriot.

Robert Gross, born in Roxbury, Mass., graduate of Harvard, died Saturday at a hospital in Los Angeles.

In 1932 Robert Gross, his brother, Courtland, and a group of associates bought the bankrupt Loughead Aircraft Co. for $40,000. Today Lockheed, as it is now known, employs 66,000 people and has a net worth of $548 million, all in 27 years. It manufactures airplanes, ships, electronics, and does research and development in these and allied scientific fields.

Robert Gross, who was chairman of the board since 1934, was president from 1934 until 1956, when he was succeeded by his brother, Courtland.

We knew Bob Gross as a fine citizen, an able executive, a church leader, and genuine friend. He was known for his extreme fairness to employees, his appreciation of the worth of others, his indefatigible energy, his great modesty, his spirit of team play. He was truly an enlightened employer.

Extremely conscious at all times of his responsibility to his community, his State, and his country, he spared no effort in doing his duty, as he saw it.

Burbank, Los Angeles City and County, the State, and Nation have lost a great citizen and many hundreds have lost a true friend.

His memory, however, will prove an inspiration to many thousands.

Today, memorial services will be held in St. Alban's Church in Westwood, Calif., in final tribute to a distinguished American.

West Virginia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Continues To Hold Top Ranking in Proportion of Population Rehabilitated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, statistics compiled by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reveal that the vocational rehabilitation agency of the State of West Virginia continues to rank first in the Nation in the proportion of population rehabilitated to productive and satisfying life.

This fact was officially recognized in a telegram sent August 30, 1961, by Director Mary E. Switzer of the HEW Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to Gov. W. W. Barron of West Virginia.

Veteran Director F. Ray Power of the vocational rehabilitation agency in our State has had associated with him an efficient staff and they have worked admirably together in the building of an outstanding program and an effective organization. They are to be congratulated on their achievements and West Virginians in substantial numbers join me, I am sure, in appropriately recognizing the fact that the program fashioned and administered by Director Power and his staff throughout the State has been a most purposeful and useful one which has brought real benefits to a substantial number of individuals who have been vocationally rehabilitated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the telegram sent by Director Switzer to Governor Barron.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 30, 1961.*

Hon. W. W. BARRON,
Governor of West Virginia,
State Capitol Building,
Charleston, W. Va.:

It is with greatest pleasure that I inform you that your vocational rehabilitation agency again has ranked first in the Nation in the proportion of its population rehabilitated during the past fiscal year to productive and satisfying life. West Virginia helped 188 disabled people in each 100,000 of population to achieve rehabilitation. This is the highest mark ever set by a State and is almost 4 times as great as the national average of 51 per 100,000 of population. The closest competitor among the States rehabilitated 152 per 100,000 of population. Not only did West Virginia lead in per capita rehabilitations but ranked fourth among all States in the absolute number of rehabilitations behind only such populous States as New York, Pennsylvania, and Georgia. I extend my congratulations to you and your legislature for your wise recognition of the value of vocational rehabilitation and your support of the program. I include congratulations to your director of vocational rehabilitation, F. Ray Power and the members of the extremely dedicated and efficient staff that he has assembled in all parts of the State. Their work has been truly outstanding and it is all the more notable because of the economic and employment difficulties which have beset your State along with many other parts of the Nation.

MARY E. SWITZER,
Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Salute by New Haven Register to Judge Robert P. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a great citizen of Connecticut is Federal District Judge Robert P. Anderson. Recently he had the heavy responsibility of naming the trustees for the New Haven Railroad, which went into bankruptcy. Judge Anderson conducted his own investigation and appraisal to decide who would be the best men to serve as trustees of the railroad. He withstood heavy pressure from the Kennedy administration to make a political appointment of the trusteeship. This he refused to do.

The New Haven Register has paid tribute to Judge Anderson in an editorial entitled "Our August Salute to Judge Robert P. Anderson," published in the issue of August 31, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AUGUST SALUTE TO JUDGE ROBERT P. ANDERSON

If the rest of the Nation were to pick a man of the month for New Haven, the current choice would probably be Judge Robert P. Anderson of the U.S. district court here. To Judge Anderson has fallen the task of launching the reorganization of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. And the judge's conduct of this difficult task has prompted commendatory comment wherever people are concerned not only about the New Haven but wherever they are concerned for the health of all railroads.

The course of justice is not easily defined in a matter so immeasurably tangled as the final bankruptcy of a railroad.

The jurist who must lead the way, by all manner of steppingstones, to a new pattern of financial sensibility is called upon to consider the interests of the railroad's owners, of its operators (who are not always quite the same as its owners), of the regional public which is served by the carrier's lines, and—beyond that—of the national good. There are management pressures, and union pressures, and public pressures and political pressures at work in such a situation—and while they may not be instantly or directly felt by a judge clothed in the dignity and authority of the U.S. court, they are there and they must eventually be faced in one way or another.

Judge Anderson has successfully weathered the task of selecting the trustees who will run the railroad as an ultimate arm of his court. And in doing so he firmly bypassed the recommendation of the Department of Justice and the Kennedy administration for the sole trustee, ignored the $45 million owed the Federal Government which might in some eyes have justified a Federal voice in the trustee selection, rejected a trustee-candidate because his "whole life and career are identified with political activity," and turned for his managerial know-how to a team of established railroad technicians.

Since then the judge has emphasized that George Alpert will have a voice in, but no control of, whatever reorganization plan evolves for the railroad. And most recently he moved to restore suspended pension payments to past New Haven presidents while questioning the wisdom of such high spending in some cases.

Judge Anderson, in simplest terms, has displayed complete independence of viewpoint and of action in the crucial attack which he is mounting against the New Haven Railroad's problems. He would, of course, be the first to see in this nothing beyond the judicial duty demanded of a man in his position. But in his clear and determined application of the law to the railroad mess he has provided the public with a fine demonstration of the law, and the bench, at work on a problem of the public interest.

Only the first of the knots in this Gordian tangle have been cleared—and months and years of deliberation on this railroad issue may face Judge Anderson. But his efforts to date have been both illuminating and constructive—and surely no man in this community more deserves a public salute at the end of a busy August.

Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9033) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the 7th year it has been my privilege and responsibility to report the mutual security bill for your consideration.

Without a doubt, this is the most controversial, complicated, complex money bill that you are called upon to consider. During the 7 years in which it has been my responsibility to conduct investigations, hold lengthy hearings, travel hundreds of thousands of miles inspecting projects and endeavoring to write a fair bill, I have yet to satisfy either side, the opponents or proponents of this legislation. It is too much for many and too little for others. But I hasten to assure you that each and every year the Committee has recommended funds in excess of the actual needs.

As we come to you today, asking you to support the recommendations of the subcommittee and the full committee, we do so assuring you that we have again recommended ample funds for every program envisioned by the administration. Should I not indicate at this

point in the record that the cost of foreign aid since the end of World War II now exceeds $106 billion, and it is now, past, present, and planned, into 97 of the 110 nations of the world. Even after reducing the President's requests in the past 6 years in the amount of $4½ billion we still left the program overfunded.

Mr. Chairman, I can say frankly and factually that the committee is fully fortified with facts to protect its action. We have had to fortify ourselves with these facts in face of the almost unbelievable such as, to put it mildly, pressure, promises, pleading, propaganda, persuasion, and political plum pulling.

Can you imagine this, Mr. Chairman, and I have nothing but admiration for people with such enthusiasm. While I was reporting the bill to the full committee, they were making telephone calls to get members of the full committee to vote against the subcommittee's recommendations. And believe me this, the Assistant Secretary of State was passing letters in for distribution to the full committee.

The bill before you is the committee's bill. This year, as in previous years, I shall to some extent vacate my personal views and support the committee's views. I do not find it too difficult to face up to my responsibility and present the bill as the committee has approved it, and that is, fairly and factually. On that basis, I ask for your sympathetic understanding and your unanimous support, realizing if you will that it would have been impossible to have gotten this bill past the 12-man subcommittee and the 50-man full committee without being fortified with facts.

First. This is the largest foreign-aid bill that has been presented to the committee in 7 years. Putting together all facets of the foreign-aid funds available for fiscal 1962 for expenditure and/or obligation, the total amounts to:

Bill before you	$3,555,245,000
Unexpended prior years	5,334,134,000
Foreign currencies applicable	1,917,400,000
Total	10,806,779,000
Recommended increase	175,000,000
Total	10,981,779,000

Now, we must take into account that just recently we approved $600 million for the Inter-American Bank. Also, the Export-Import Bank is authorized to make development loans up to $600 million. So that makes a grand total in the foreign-aid item, as such of $12,181,771,000.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are fantastic and stupendous, but that is the way it is.

Second. Explain public debt: Exceeds by $23,710,500,000 the public debts of all other nations of the world combined. So great has been our generosity and so great the demands for domestic and foreign aid this year that we have already withdrawn from the Treasury during the first 1 month and 28 days of this fiscal year, $3 billion more than was withdrawn during the same period last year.

Third. Gold reserves.

Fourth. Dollars.

Fifth. Gold being drawn off by recipient nations.

Sixth. Explain in detail each item in the bill from the committee report.

Gold holding of United States and rest of free world Dec. 31, 1960

	United States	Rest of free world
End of calendar 1952	$23,252,000,000	$13,028,000,000
End of calendar 1960	17,766,000,000	19,400,000,000
Total	−5,486,000,000	+6,372,000,000

U.S. balance-of-payments position, 1950–60

[In billions of dollars]

Year:	Balance
1950	−3.6
1951	−0.3
1952	−1.1
1953	−2.1
1954	−1.5
1955	−1.1
1956	−1.0
1957	+0.5
1958	−3.4
1959	−3.7
1960	−3.8
Total dollar deficit (11 years)	−21.5

Foreign-held short-term dollar assets

End of calendar 1952	$10,546,100,000
End of calendar 1960	21,430,600,000
Increased by	10,884,500,000

Mutual security appropriation bill

Fiscal year 1956: House bill	$2,701,275,000
Fiscal year 1957: House bill	3,665,920,000
Fiscal year 1958: House bill	3,191,810,000
Fiscal year 1959: House bill	3,078,092,500
Fiscal year 1960: House bill	3,186,500,000
Fiscal year 1961: House bill	[1] 3,584,500,000

[1] $200,000,000 more or less?

Item	Authorization act	Committee recommendations	Reduction below authorization
Development loans	$1,200,000,000	$1,025,000,000	−$175,000,000
Development grants	380,000,000	259,000,000	−121,000,000
Investment surveys	5,000,000		−5,000,000
Development research			
International organizations	153,500,000	153,500,000	
Supporting assistance	465,000,000	400,000,000	−65,000,000
Contingency fund	300,000,000	175,000,000	−125,000,000
Administrative expenses	50,000,000	45,000,000	−5,000,000
Military assistance	1,700,000,000	1,300,000,000	−400,000,000
Inter-American Bank	110,000,000	110,000,000	
International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	
Total	4,425,156,000	3,529,156,000	−896,000,000

NOTE.—Plus $50,000,000 of unobligated funds and $100,000,000 of deobligated or dereserved funds for the military assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, may I also once again bring to the attention of the House the strange occurrence of an international incident that happens almost every year at the time when we are about to pass the foreign aid bill. It seems almost as if international events conspire to occur at certain strategic times. If it is not a foreign submarine lurking in our waters, it is the Chinese shelling of Matsu and Quemoy, or our Marines landing in Lebanon, or the Russian sputnik, or the Nixons in Latin America, Haggerty being attacked in Japan, Khrushchev canceling Eisenhower's invitation to visit Russia, Khrushchev insulting our President in Paris, or the U–2. Yes, and even the Korean war. This year it is the crisis of Berlin.

Next year it will probably be some other crisis such as the Russians setting up a rocket screen at the North Pole. The strange incidence of these recurring crises is that we allow ourselves to be unduly influenced by them in our thinking on foreign aid. These unnatural phenomena should not be allowed to influence us to such an extent that we think that by appropriating more dollars we can set aside those things that worry us.

In my opinion, foreign aid should not be a makeshift response to a sudden demand.

Mr. Chairman, this is the 7th year in which it is my privilege to be chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriation Subcommittee. During the past 6 years our subcommittee members have conducted our hearings dilligently, have made our appraisals impartially and have always attempted to bring before the full committee and the House a recommendation that would give the program an even chance of passage while taking cognizance of the overall demands of our national interest. Our full Appropriations Committee has always supported the totals we proposed for each year.

Before laying before this House the 1962 appropriation bill for foreign aid, I wish to draw the attention of the House once again to the stupendous totals of our foreign aid program; the greatest giveaway program of all history. In 21 years, from 1940 through 1961, we have assisted 104 nations of earth to the tune of $131 billion. This works out at about $850 for every man, woman and child in the United States during the whole period. Since the end of World War II the total is just under $91 billion. These stupendous sums stagger the imagination.

Our American Nation seems gradually to have fallen into the delusion that we are building up a free world fortress, with our military aid, economic grants and credits. The activities of our foreign aid program have become so widespread and complicated that few bureau-

crats administering the program have any comprehensive idea of all the aspects of our aid projects currently being carried out in 90 nations and in 30 other colonial territories.

Repeatedly I have been cast in the role of the man who would jeopardize the foreign-aid program because I criticize the waste, the extravagance, the unnecessary disbursements, the excessive buildup of personnel, the foolish planning and programed needs, the uncompleted programs, the entrenched officialdom, as well as the perpetuation of their concepts.

Once again I am being called to play the part of Joshua, to blow down the illusionary fortress of aid whereas my primary function, as is the duty of our subcommittee, is to cut and prune this ever-growing foreign-aid plant of ours, so as to contain it, to train its branches aright and by this very process to insure that fruit will result. Sometimes our pruning knife may cut deep, but the purpose is to cut our wasteful growth and insure proper results commensurate to the purpose and nature of our planting. As any good husbandman knows, without this pruning, the best of plants runs wild, loses its vigor, and dies off.

I have been, and still am, working toward the goal of controlled aid; aid given with a purpose, controlled by dedicated administrators, and checked continually for fulfillment of its basic purposes. This responsibility we should not relinquish, as we are also responsible to our electorate in this regard.

I do not speak in frustration, although many people write to me in deep frustration because they do not see many tangible results from our giveaway programs. Many may think we have cause to be frustrated because of our unremitting efforts to keep the foreign-aid program within reasonable channels and not succeeding. During the last 6 years the committee has cut over $4.5 billion from the administration requests, but each year new requests are put forth for more money and newer methods of financing; all this in spite of the fact that year by year the uncommitted total of appropriated funds grows larger and larger. On June 30, 1961, this carryover fund totaled $5,443,412,000.

Here is our proposal to the House for funds to be appropriated against the authorization as passed by this House:

Item	Authorization, 1962	Recommended in bill, 1962	Bill compared with authorization
Development loans	$1,200,000,000	$1,025,000,000	−$175,000,000
Development grants	380,000,000	259,000,000	−121,000,000
Investment surveys	5,000,000		−5,000,000
Development research			
International organizations and programs	153,500,000	153,500,000	
Supporting assistance	465,000,000	400,000,000	−65,000,000
Contingency fund	300,000,000	175,000,000	−125,000,000
Administrative expenses	50,000,000	45,000,000	−5,000,000
Military assistance	1,700,000,000	1,300,000,000	−400,000,000
Total	4,253,500,000	3,357,500,000	−896,000,000

This appropriation request envisions a reduction of $896 million in the total as authorized. Our reasons for the cut of 21 percent of the authorization total can be explained briefly:

Section 202: We feel that although $1.2 billion was accepted by this House under the Saund amendment and also by the Executive, our proposal of $1,025 million for this fiscal year will be closer to the mark for loans that can be fruitfully made. On June 30, 1961, our Development Loan Fund and unexpended funds totaling nearly one and a half billion dollars, of $1,488,758,000. Granted that most of these funds might have been obligated or tentatively committed pending this current legislation some time will elapse before all the contracts can be consummated.

Our proposal that the Development Credit Fund be cut to $1,025 million stems from the fact that only a few countries will receive relatively the major percentage of these loan funds—notably India, Pakistan and Brazil. It has been stated that only those countries could rightfully absorb these development credits where the preconditions of economic growth are such that capital investment can take place. Such preconditions concern education, social reform, public and fiscal administration and also a responsible corps of officials in the public services. It is said that these three countries mentioned above will be primarily eligible for development credits because they are committed to realistic developmental plans. Yet, in India we have several hundred million of unspent rupees, resulting from our surplus farm products disposal plan, which we are already lending them as long-term loans. Brazil is one of the countries that will benefit substantially from our Inter-American Bank.

By cutting our current appropriation for development credit funds to $1,025 million, we will still give the development program a leeway of over $2½ billion to be spent during the remaining 10 months of this fiscal year. This is an enormous sum of money for this purpose, and I sincerely doubt whether arrangements could be finalized whereby all the funds will be committed in credits. By cutting the total we lessen the temptation to grant impractical and ill-conceived loans.

Section 212: I come now to development grants. The authorization is for $380 million; our proposal is that this total be cut to $259 million. We arrived at this total by carefully weighing the needs of the developing nations, nations whose economies are such that even long-term credits could create a repayments hardship. One project loan must be very large in all its aspects to contribute to economic growth. In this instance, the greatest necessity is for small projects that will gradually help to build up the preconditions so very necessary to economic growth. Here again it is far better to proceed slowly. The very nature of the hundreds of small projects in the 50 different developing nations demand the planning, supervision, and execution of thousands of AID employees. Rather than disperse our attack on illiteracy, disease, and lack of technical facilities over too wide a field of projects, let us keep the programs within bounds. In the past we have seen how many thousands of projects were ill-planned, ill-executed and finally left without completion in the rush to obligate funds. To obviate the continuance of such slip-shod planning, especially where we give the money by grants, let us not tempt our AID officialdom by too much money. Unexpended development and special assistance funds totaled $243,803,000 on June 30, 1961. Adding another $259 million to that total will create an availability fund of over $500 million to be given away during fiscal year 1962. Accustomed as are our AID bureaucrats to the disbursement of large sums, I doubt whether even they could find enough projects on which to squander this total during the next 10 months.

Section 232: The next item concerns $5 million for investment surveys. This is an entirely new departure for the use of aid funds. The recommendation is that nothing be given for this purpose as we already have trade, commercial, and investment officials in our foreign representation offices. In addition, the present ICA office is adequately staffed to relay investment opportunities found in foreign countries to our American business community. In our estimation, this sum will merely provide a good holiday for many people at Government expense. Any businessman seriously interested in investing in foreign ventures is quite willing to invest money in such surveys. If any company or association of companies is too small to be able to afford to do so then our Department of Commerce is always willing to supply the leads in the country selected.

Section 302: The conference total for international organizations was for $153,500,000. This total is ample for our participation.

Section 402: As passed by the House, we allowed an authorization of $465 million for supporting assistance. Defense support assistance is supposed to provide supplemental economic resources which countries receiving U.S. military aid require to maintain a healthy rate of economic growth. We suggest that the total be cut to $400 million. As of June 30, 1961, the unexpended funds in this category amounted to $673,491,000. In other words, over $1 billion in defense support funds will be available during fiscal year 1962. May I point out to my colleagues that it is in this category that in our subcommittee hearings and in the audits of the Comptroller General it was discovered that the grossest mismanagement of funds took place. The largest percentage of the available funds has gone to Korea, Turkey, Cambodia, and Laos. In the latter two countries im-

mense sums of money were squandered on luxury imports on behalf of political functionaries who were subject to graft and corruption. We know what a reputation we got in Cambodia and Laos when this type of foreign aid was disclosed.

Section 451: President Kennedy requested $500 million for his emergency fund. The House authorization cut this down to $300 million. We recommend that appropriation of $175 million be made. On June 30, 1961, this unexpended total of the President's contingency fund consisted of $252,106,000 plus $50,757,000 in his Asian fund. By appropriating the total as suggested the fund will rise to over $457 million. Surely this total will be sufficient for any exceptional needs in the immediate future. In addition, the President has access to several billion dollars of counterpart funds for emergency relief and famine.

Section 504: The House authorized $1,700 million in military assistance for fiscal year 1962. Our recommendation is that an appropriation of $1,475 million be made. On June 30, 1961, unexpended funds in this category amounted to $2,519,643,000. The new appropriation will bring the total to over $4 billion. I submit that this category is oversupplied with funds for it is largely a bookkeeping transaction. Much of the military material shipped overseas came our surplus military stockpile. It is merely a bookkeeping entry whether we charge $1, $20,000, or $2 million for a surplus tank or plan.

It has been proved time and again that an appalling wastefulness has occurred in this category—just one example concerns the building of the latest type of Army barracks for soldiers in Iran, with most moden kitchen and dining facilities and washrooms, whereas the simple soldiers preferred to cook their food over an open fire and sold the bathroom fixtures in the nearest towns.

In some cases, our military assistance has assumed the form of a prestige buildup, for example, in our supplying the latest jet fighters to the Emperor of Ethiopia. The question has arisen whether we should supply military aid to any members of the neutralist bloc of nations. They themselves decry such aid and unless such aid is for our oversea military security, such as airfields, bases and pipelines, we should be extremely careful not to antagonize any other of our free world friends. Where military aid in the form of the latest rockets or other missiles is demanded, it would be extremely detrimental to our own interests to supply these. In any case, most of the industrialized nations are now on their economic feet as it were, and are quite capable of bearing their own defense costs, rather than having these paid by the American taxpayer.

May I also point out that in the past there has been a continuous sequence of transfers between the defense support funds, military assistance funds and the President's contingency funds. By cutting the military assistance funds to $1,300 million, leeway for any military emergency will still be allowed by the availability of funds in the other categories, funds that can easily be transferred for exceptional needs.

Section 635: The House authorized $50 million for administrative expenses. We have cut this total to $45 million. On June 30, 1961, over $8 million in unexpended funds were available. In any case we suggest that the new AID agency be staffed by capable men and that much of the deadwood or holdovers from the previous alphabetical agencies be dropped. Too many of the intermediate echelons are there merely to protect their jobs and have not kept abreast of the dynamic changes in our national policies or methods to achieve our aims.

Peace Corps: It has been estimated that $40 million be appropriated for the Peace Corps for the first year. Since the program is in its infancy and there is much doubt as to its effectiveness, our proposal is that $20 million be appropriated as a start. Should this program succeed during the first year, assurances can be given that Congress will always lend a sympathetic ear for expansion the next year. Instead of starting off with a huge bang or running as it were toward maturity, let us first learn to crawl and then as we grow stronger, increase our capability and pace.

Mr. Chairman, I have said in the beginning that the pruning knife has to hurt to produce the best results. Even with all the pruning that our subcommittee has done, and which has been approved by the full Committee on Appropriations, a most substantial sum is proposed for fiscal year 1962 and I hope that our proposals will be accepted by the House.

Democracy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for August 8 carried an article by Reinhold Niebuhr which deserves the best attention of anyone concerned—as who is not—with the world of today. It is a dispassionate and thoughtful discussion of the concept of democracy. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM—OUR INSTITUTIONS ARE NOT ALWAYS APPLICABLE AS COUNTER TO REDS

(By Reinhold Niebuhr)

The world is divided between the Communist bloc of nations and those who define themselves as members of the free world, and for the free world, democracy is the normative concept of government.

But democracy is not an easily attainable form of government. As more and more nations achieve independence, and at all stages of cultural and economic development, the question arises whether we of the free world have not regarded democracy as too simply and generally an alternative to communism in all nations and cultures. Democratic self-government is indeed an ultimate ideal of political community. But it is of the greatest importance that we realize that the resources for its effective functioning are not available to many nations.

It is our common assumption that political freedom is a simple summum bonum. It is not. Freedom must always be related to community and justice. Every community seeks consciously or unconsciously to make social peace and order the first goal of its life. It may pay a very high price in the restriction of freedom so as to establish order; but order is the first desideratum for the simple reason that chaos means nonexistence. The situation in the Congo should persuade us of this obvious fact, if we had not been aware of it before.

Order alone can, of course, be bought at a very high price, usually at too high a price from the standpoint of those classes in society who must pay it. The second goal of any society therefore is justice. Aristotle defined justice as giving each man his due. Since in the long history of Western democracy no one has ever offered accurate criteria by which each man's due is measured, we must come to the conclusion that open societies have solved the problem by allowing a free competition of social forces, which enables every force in society to make its claims upon society and to acquire enough social and political power and prestige to enforce its claims.

MEASURING LIBERTY, EQUALITY

And liberty and equality are generally recognized as the twin principles of justice. But abstract radical libertarianism and equalitarianism falsely regard them as simple historical possibilities. They cannot be simple possibilities. Liberty must be measured against the community's need for security against internal and external peril. Equality must be measured against the need for the hierarchy of social function by which a community integrates its life and work. That is why history has refuted both Jacobin libertarianism and Marxist equalitarianism.

Democracy itself did not emerge in Europe until the 17th and 18th centuries. And it did not come to terms with the necessities of justice in industrial collectivism until the end of the 19th century. This tardiness was in fact the reason for the Communist rebellion against bourgeois civilization. I think we may understand more fully why it is wrong in the present hour to present democracy as a simple alternative to communism if we reflect upon this history, attempting to answer two questions. (1) Why did free institutions emerge in European culture so very late? And (2) Why was Europe tardy in establishing justice within the conditions of an industrial economy?

Democratic institutions emerged late for two primary reasons. High standards of literacy are required to prepare all classes to participate in the dialogue about justice, and particularly to enable the "lower classes" to make their claims and make them effective. The nondemocratic European nations of our own day still lack this standard of literacy; we know that the "poor world" has not attained even the minimal standard.

It is important to recall that the emergence of democracy in European culture depended on the development of forms of ethnic and linguistic homogeneity; on these depend communal cohesion. If these forms of the sense of kind and these instruments of communication are lacking, no free government can either create them or live without their influence for order.

Most of the European nations achieved linguistic homogeneity through the translation of the Bible into one of the many vernaculars; the printed language became

the normative language in triumph over the dialects, which are transmitted by oral traditions. Among the nations of European culture, only three have achieved both integral community and democracy under conditions of linguistic diversity: Switzerland, Belgium, and Canada.

And the matter of language brings us to the matter of race. Language is an historical achievement and therefore malleable; race is a biological fact.

Now if one surveys the non-European nations today, particularly the democratic ones, one must be struck by the ethnic and linguistic, rather than racial, hazards to national unity which most of them face. The language riots in India in 1956 prove that a sense of common race will not do when there is a linguistic conflict in which no language may prevail.

And many of the other Asian nations have comparable difficulties with the ethnic and linguistic bases of integral community. On a much lower level of culture, the forming nations of Africa demonstrate daily that so-called African nationalism is really a pan-African revolt of the black races against their former masters. There are not enough resources of literacy and communication-through-print to establish linguistic community. The confusion of dialects and tribal loyalties, of which the situation in the Congo is a vivid example rather than a unique phenomenon, makes clear that it is the pan-African sentiment of black men, together with subnational tribal loyalties, that are at work here, stronger than the cohesive forces of nationalism. Free institutions can, in the words of the preamble of the American Constitution, "establish a more-perfect union." But they must presuppose some other kind of union, some force of loyalty below conscious political contrivance.

Consider the situation in Ghana. The rather less-than-ideal democracy over which Nkrumah presides may be defective in democratic liberties because of the boundless egotism of the young African leader, drunk with the heady wine of political authority. But there is also the possibility that national unity was out of reach altogether unless rigorous and not quite democratic measures were taken to subordinate the powerful Ashanti tribe of the hinterland, proud of its ancient royal house, to the integrity of the new nation, whose parliamentary institutions were formed in the more sophisticated culture of the urbanized former Gold Coast.

Two other passions further complicate the achievement of integral community below the level of conscious political contrivance. One is regional loyalty, which may coincide with tribal loyalty—and may not.

INDONESIA, PAKISTAN

We see that Indonesia, in addition to its other difficulties, must contend with the regionalism of the two large islands of Sumatra and Java, one richer and the other more populous. Democratic institutions can solve such regional tension if the strains do not run too deep. But some of them run very deep indeed. Pakistan, one of the most loyal members of the free world, is functioning under a popular and seemingly beneficent military dictatorship because the parliamentary regime was unable to mitigate the regionalism of a nation divided into two regions a thousand miles apart. The previous democratic regime was, incidentally, involved in corruption, a defect which is a reminder that minimal standards of honesty are prerequisites of a healthy democratic regime.

If ethnic and linguistic homogeneity are prerequisites for community below the level of conscious political contrivance, then tolerance amid a diversity of religions and cultures would seem to be also. Habits of tolerance between different religious communities—which political freedom may encourage but cannot create—are necessary to make given cultural diversity compatible with national stability.

But since it required at least 2 centuries to persuade the two warring versions of Christianity to live in a tolerably peaceful coexistence, one has some apprehensions about the ability of non-European nations, democratic or not, to establish political unity against the hazard of religious division.

The former imperial India is now two nations rather than one because even Gandhi could not bridge the gulf between Hinduism and Islam. Among the new nations, Indonesia in Asia and many of the new African nations (particularly Nigeria), have diverse cultures, containing Islamic, Christian, and primitive religious elements. Our recent presidential campaign, which certainly did not threaten the unity of this Nation, was nevertheless a reminder of the virulence which religious passion may reach even in a highly cultured nation.

To sum up: Many of the nations to whom we commend democracy quite obviously do not have the prerequisities of national unity which were fashioned in Europe before the rise of free governments.

To glimpse the vast difficulty of establishing democracy, it is even more important to consider our second question, to attempt to recount the reasons why the European democracy was so tardy in coming to terms with problems of justice in an industrial society. To begin with, let us agree that modern industrial cultures do not have the simple two-class social structure of bourgeoisie and proletariat which the Communist dogma affirms. They have a complex pattern of class interests.

They have not, in fact, been able to achieve health without establishing a tolerable equilibrium of power between at least four classes: The class of landed wealth, the middle class of commercial and industrial owners, the industrial workers, and the men of the soil. Or more exactly, since landed wealth has been either liquidated in the rise of democracy (as it was in France) or has been nonexistent (as in the new nations of America and the British Commonwealth) or has been gradually merged with the new commercial classes (as in Britain), modern free governments have had to achieve some kind of tolerable equilibrium of power among the three remaining classes.

Of these, the men of the soil, whether Asian peasants or European yeomen or American and Canadian farmers, appear to be the stuff of history rather than the creators of historical dynamic.

WORKERS AND BOURGEOISIE

Only two, then, of the four classes of Western history, the bourgeoisie and the industrial workers, have been politically dynamic. The Communist dogma pictures them as the protagonists of two contradictory forces which are marching toward the Armageddon of history. Their roles in the history of Western democracy have in fact been somewhat more complex. They were partially hostile forces and partially allies in destroying the mold of traditional feudal, monarchial society. Undoubtedly the middle classes, pictured by the Communist dogma as the devils of history, were the primary agents of rebellion. They could find no place in the traditional feudal-agrarian order for their new and more flexible and dynamic forms of property, and they were conscious of the significance of their own competence and initiative, which was not adequately recognized by political regimes dominated by landed wealth.

The right of the franchise, which was destined to refute the Communist charge that bourgeois democracy was nothing but the "executive committee of the owning classes," was indeed established partly to serve the interests of the owning classes; but it was extended, by political forces beyond their control, to give political power to the class which was pressing on their heels as democracy and industrialization progressed.

The slow diffusion of the right of suffrage had much to do with the tardiness of European democracy in establishing justice in the contest of forces in an essentially collectivist technical society. Yet more important, and more laggard, was the decline of the individualistic approach to collective problems, the inheritance of traditional bourgeois democracy.

The classical expression of this individualism was embodied in Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," published, significantly, in 1776, and therefore contemporaneous with both the French and American Revolutions. Smith, the founder of classical economics, thought that the free market would guarantee justice by the automatic balances which the law of supply and demand would create. The price of labor, as well as the price of commodities, would in Smith's theory be justly determined by the free market. The obvious defect of the theory of laisses faire was that the individual laborer, with his family obligations and his lack of mobility in seeking employment, did not have equal bargaining power with the owners of ever more centralized industry.

The whole of the 19th century (and in the United States the period ending in 1932) was required to correct this defect in the theory of bourgeois democracy, to grant the industrial worker the right to organize and bargain collectively, and to create the equilibrium of power which is the basis of justice in any society.

The Vanishing Breed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Max Rafferty, new superintendent of the La Canada Unified School District in my congressional district, is a sharp sighted and eloquent educator.

His recent speech, "The Passing of a Patriot," presents a disturbing picture, but one which is important to all Americans:

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

I want to talk to you this evening about a vanishing species—the American patriot. I hope to show you what you and I have done during the last 20 years to make possible—nay, to render inevitable, this dwindling decline of a once noble breed. And, at the end, I shall propose to you a simple question: "Is this what we want?"

First, go back with me if you will in time 185 years. Our country is in a strange sort of undeclared war against the forces of despotism, then as now. A young man volunteers to go behind the enemy lines to collect information, also then as now. Instead of many thousands of dollars a year, he is being paid nothing at all, and here the parallel breaks down temporarily. But it builds up again when he is captured and tried as a spy and publicly questioned.

And then the parallels diverge sharply and completely and forever. Surrounded by the jeering foe, cut off beyond all hope of rescue, the rope already knotted around his bared throat and the pallor of approaching death already on his cheeks, he breaks his steadfast

silence. With the wind of another world cold upon his forehead, he speaks one short sentence, and his words echo down the corridors of time to us today, ringing and lighthearted and magnificent: "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

His statue, with the throat still bared, stands today gazing with blind stone eyes across the green park in New York City, where I saw it not too long ago. He was a schoolmaster like some of us here tonight—God rest his soul—and he did not live to see his 22d birthday.

What were those blind eyes looking for a year ago, I wonder, when another young American—the end product of 185 years of public education—went on trial for his life? If the stone heart could have quickened, and the stone lips have moved, they might have spoken after this fashion: "I died, after all, for a dream still nurtured in the womb of the future. That dream, watered with the unstinted blood of countless thousands over the many years that lie between, has grown to glorious life and wonderful reality—the last, best hope of men on earth. Surely this youth—with reality to defend, not just a dream—will better my example."

DIDN'T KNOW

And what would the stone ears have heard across the void of time and space? The voice of young America after well-nigh two centuries of growth unparalleled, wealth beyond the dreams of avarice, power so staggering it stuns the imagination—the voice of rock-and-roll, high-speed, carefree young America: "I didn't know what I was doing."

And—while the sinister judges smiled and nodded and nudged one another knowingly: "I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Nathan Hale could have blamed George Washington, I suppose. He might even have had a chance to save his neck. Perhaps it's just as well that stone ears can't hear, nor stone eyes see, nor a stone heart beat heavily with shame for one's countrymen.

Oh, I can see what you're thinking. They're not all like that. No, thank Heaven, they're not. But this one was. So were a sickening, staggering number of our young men just 10 years ago who sold out their fellow American soldiers, and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders, and made tape recordings praising communism. So are all the phony sophisticates who clutter up our colleges, and who seem to spend every waking moment agitating against ROTC, booing congressional committees, and parading in support of Fidel Castro.

Whether we like it or not, ladies and gentlemen, this is our doing—yours and mine. Not in La Canada, thank goodness, but widely in California, in the Far West, and throughout the Nation, the great mistake was made by my profession, and by the voters and taxpayers who permitted it.

BIG HAPPY FAMILY

These spineless, luxury-loving, spiritless creeps came right out of our classrooms. Fifteen years ago, they were in our kindergartens. They went on our field trips to the bakery, and danced around ribboned poles at our May festivals. Only about 9 years ago, they were studying something called "social living" in some of our seventh grades. They were tested and guided and motivated. They were "adjusted to their peer groups." They were taught that competition was bad, and cooperation was supremely good. They were told little about democratic capitalism, and that little was usually taught with a curled lip. They were persuaded that the world was very shortly to become one big, happy family, with everyone loving everyone else. They were taught to be kind, and democratic, and peaceful.

These last are praiseworthy goals. What went wrong?

There were two things, you see, what we didn't teach them. And oh, how they needed to learn these.

One was that most of the inhabitants of this big, bad-tempered, battling planet hate our American insides. This is hard to teach, and unpleasant to learn. It is the simple truth, nevertheless.

The other thing should have been sublimely simple for us to get across to the children entrusted to our care. It was to teach them every day in every necessary way to memorize and to believe and to live Decatur's great toast: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right, but our country, right or wrong!"

Had they been taught to love their country with the same passion that inspired other generations of American youth they would not now be wondering what all the fuss is about. They would know that their country was in danger, and that would be enough. It was enough in 1861, and 1917, and 1941. It's not enough today. Too many of them neither know nor care.

SAVE THE NATION

It's our own fault, and this is what frightens me. What will history have to say of my generation of educators—the generation of the thirties, the forties, and the fifties. We were so busy educating for life adjustment that we forgot to educate for survival. Worse still, we forgot that the first duty of a nation's school is to preserve that nation.

Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms and the consciousness of the pupils.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

"We have met the enemy, and they are ours."

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools, in the hearts and minds of too many of our children. The golden words are gone, and in their place brain-numbing projects on the Nation's second-class mail service, units on the orange packing industry of Los Angeles County, or accounts of the trucking business on Highway 66. We must all, you see, grow up to be orange packers or mailmen or truckers or school administrators. We have no further need of Websters—nor of Nathan Hales.

Our sin was greater than this, however. Patriotism feeds upon hero worship, and we decided to abolish heroes. Even the nursery rhymes, poor innocent little things beloved by generations of children and which had come down to us from time immemorial, we pronounced too "violent" and "sordid" for the children to hear until after we had tinkered with them. The fairy tales we felt were far too crude, and so we neutralized and dehydrated Hansel and Gretel to the status of Cincinnati children on a Sunday School picnic, and Jack the Giant Killer to a schoolboy swatting flies. Everything that was fearful and wonderful and glamorous we leveled off to the lowest common denominator.

HEROES GONE

Ulysses and Penelope have been replaced by Dick and Jane in the textbooks of our schools. The quest of the Golden Fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passé, and the peregrinations of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets and littered alleys of Blah City are deemed worthy of numberless pages in our readers. The sterile culture of the Pueblo Indians looms large in our curriculum, but the knightly Crusaders are glossed over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck with good old crotchety Mr. Jones, while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unwept, unhonored, and unsung. It is interesting, and I think significant, that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

Today's hero—if there is one—is old fashioned in the blasphemous image of ourselves.

He is "Daddy" in the second grade reader, who comes mincing home with his eternal briefcase from his meaningless day in his antiseptic office just in time to pat Jip the dog and carry blonde little Laurie into the inevitable white bungalow on his stylishly padded shoulders.

He is "Mommy" in the third grade books, always silk-stockinged and impeccable after a day spent over the electric range, with never a cross word on her carefully made-up lips and never an idea in her empty head.

He is Dick and Jane and Tom and Susan and all the insufferable nonentities who clutter up the pages of our elementary textbooks with their vapid ditherings about humdrum affairs which could never be of conceivable interest to anyone above the level of an idiot.

DULL AS DISHWATER

In my right hand I hold one of our California State third grade readers. Two of the principal characters are Paddyfoot the Indian boy and Uncle Will the cottonpicker. Harmless they are, and gentle—and as dull as dishwater.

In my left hand I hold a McGuffey third grade reader, published in 1879. It contains a hair-raising description of a trip through the Himalayas to Tibet, a short story illustrating the horrors of drink, a series of fictional tales dramatizing Aesop's Fables, and several poems by Wadsworth and Whittier.

Quite a contrast.

Now please don't go home quoting Max Rafferty as advocating a return to McGuffey. Some of this quaint, old-fashioned material we would consider quite unsuitable for today's children—especially the story of the town drunk who ends a career of crime breaking big ones into little ones on the county rockpile.

But it moves. It sparkles. It interests.

The boys and girls who were raised on this fare never forgot it. Even today, some old gaffer is apt to walk up to me after one of these talks and quote McGuffey verbatim—after 60 or 70 years. Which of our present-day pupils, I wonder, is going to recall after even 1 year how Richard Lane and nice Miss Allen the schoolteacher planted the flower bulbs in the window box for 15 pages and 2,600 words in "All Aboard for Storyland"?

Why have we—for 25 years and more—subjected our children to this tripe? No wonder so many of them don't read very well. We haven't given them anything worth reading for almost a generation. I wouldn't read this junk myself. Would you?

OWE BETTER FARE

In La Canada, we owe it to our fine teachers and eager youngsters to provide better intellectual fare than this.

When I think of the doors we've closed upon the children. The wonderful pantheon of youthful gods and goddesses that my generation knew and loved; the great parade of heroes who made old earth a magic place for boys and girls.

Wilfred of Ivanhoe rode stirrup with Richard the Lion-Hearted, and the evil hold of Torquilstone burned eternal witness to the power of youth and goodness. Laughing and shouting in the same great com-

pany rode Arthur with his Table Round, forever splintering their lances in the cause of right. Roistering and invincible swaggered Porthos, Athos, and Aramis, with the young D'Artagnan, ever ready to draw those magic blades for truth and glory and the Queen.

Remember?

The horn of Roland echoed through the pass at Roncesvalles, and somehow caught and mingled in our memories with the far-off blast of Robin Hood, calling down the misty years upon his merry men of Sherwood.

Were not these fit heroes for our children?

LOOKING BACK

Apart and in a happy company leaped and played the Child Immortals. Hand in hand with longhaired Alice walked Christopher Robin, bright eyes alert for talking rabbits and greedy little bears. Sturdy Jim Hawkins counted his pieces of eight and chaffed with Captain Flint, while young Tom Sawyer kept a wary lookout for the menace that was Injun Joe. A battered raft floated to immortality upon the broad bosom of the father of waters, and Huck became the apotheosis of all boys everywhere. Meg, Jo, and Beth chattered gaily to Amy, and Dorothy skipped arm in arm with the scarecrow down the yellow brick road. Remember?

When—in any age—have children had such shining exemplars?

It remained for our generation to turn its back upon the heroes of the children. For Siegfried in the lair of Fafnir, we have substituted Muk-Muk the Eskimo boy, and we have replaced Horatius at the Bridge with little Pedro from Argentina.

Mark this. Until Conant, most schools on all levels were teaching trivia. Today, too many—especially on the elementary level—are still doing so.

If you doubt this, don't take my word for it. Visit classroom after classroom in widely separated regions of this country, as I have done.

Watch the abler pupils grow dull and apathetic, bored and lack luster, as they yawn and watch the clock over Bill and Tom's Trip to the Farm, or Sally's Fun at the Orange Grove. Then, suddenly—as though opening an enchanted window upon a radiant pageant—give them the story of the wrath of Achilles. Let them stand with Casabianca upon the burning deck. Trek with them in spirit to the Yukon, and with glorious Buck let them answer the call of the wild. Place them upon the shot-swept shrouds of the *Bonhomme Richard* and let them thrill to those words flashing lipe a rapier out of our past, "I have not yet begun to fight." Kneel with them behind the cotton bales at New Orleans with Andy Jackson at their side, as the redcoats begin to emerge from the Louisiana mists and sullen guns of Laffite begin to pound.

Watch their faces. See the eyes brighten and spirits ruffle. See the color come, the backs straighten, the arms go up. They dream, they live, they glow. Patriotism will come easily to them now as it does to all of us who know our Nation's past—and love it.

Teach them the grand old songs. How long has it been since California children learned to sing "Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean"? And why was it dropped? Because someone—probably in the State Department of education—decided that the lines which end, "The Army and Navy forever. Three cheers for the red, white, and blue" were hopelessly out of place in our brave new world of foreign aid and peaceful coexistence and collaboration.

I say that we had better thank God for the Army and Navy. And—with half the world at our throats—we had better teach our children that it is not a disgrace, but a priceless privilege, to wear our country's uniform.

The crux of the problem, of course, is this: "Do we believe it ourselves?" I am convinced with all my heart that we do. It's not the fault of teachers as individuals that our profession has been brainwashed for a quarter of a century with slogans like: "There are no eternal verities"; "Everything is relative"; "Meet only the felt needs"; "Teach the child, not the subject"; and—worst of all—"Nothing is worth learning for its own sake."

MANY FAIL

The results are plain for all to see; the worst of our youngsters growing up to become booted, sideburned, ducktailed, unwashed, leatherjacketed slobs, whose favorite sport is ravaging little girls and stomping polio victims to death; the best of our youth coming into maturity for all the world like young people fresh from a dizzying roller-coaster ride, with everything blurred, with nothing clear, with no positive standards, with everything in doubt. No wonder so many of them welsh out and squeal and turn traitor when confronted with the brutal reality of Red military force and the crafty cunning of Red psychological warfare.

We as a people have been taunted and reviled and challenged in the last few years, and months, as we thought no one would ever challenge us. A soulless thing slavers at us today on all the continents, under all the seas, and out into the void of interplanetary space itself, a rotten, hateful, vicious entity. Our national nose has been first tweaked and then rubbed contemptuously into the dirt. The flag for which our ancestors bled and died has been torn down and unspeakably defiled by a dozen little pipsqueak comic-opera countries emboldened by our weak-kneed spinelessness and encouraged by our sneering enemy. I don't know when at long last the American people will rise in all the power and majesty of their great tradition to put an end to this role of international doormat which we have assumed of late, and which becomes us so poorly.

TIME IS SHORT

But I do know one thing, when that time comes—and it cannot be far distant—we educators had better not be caught short. We had better not be caught withholding from the Nation's children the wonderful, sharp-edged, glittering sword of patriotism.

In a word, this means indoctrination. An ugly word? I think not. But if it is ugly to teach children to revere the great Americans of the past—to cherish the traditions of our country as holy things—and to hate communism and its creatures like hell—then I say let's be ugly, and let's revel in it.

What is the alternative? You see that all about you now, in all the headlines. Do you like it? As I said in the beginning, "Is this what we want?"

Or rather, do we want our young people informed and disciplined and alert—militant for freedom, clear-eyed to the filthy menance of Communist corruption? Do we want them happy in their love of country?

If your answer is "Yes," then go home from this meeting tonight and get busy. We have not an hour to spare. It is to this that I propose we dedicate ourselves for the years to come in La Canada. If Almighty God grants us the time and the will, we may still be able to help preserve this lovely land of ours as it once was and—please God—will yet be again; a nation fit for heroes—serene in the knowledge of our past—confident and ready for whatever the future may bring—stretching in warmth of heart and unity of purpose "from sea to shining sea."

Preservation of Old Fort Davis by Congress Is Praised by Dallas News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in an editorial Thursday, August 31, the Dallas Morning News of Dallas, Tex., stated that restoration of Old Fort Davis will make it a mecca for many tourists and will preserve a fascinating spot in Texas history.

A bill to make Old Fort Davis a national historic site, introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Representative J. T. RUTHERFORD, a companion bill to one I introduced in the Senate, has been sent to the President to be signed into law.

Old Fort Davis, founded in 1854, was a rugged frontier outpost that recalls to us our heritage of the frontier and the conquest of a continent. For more than a quarter of a century, soldiers at Old Fort Davis fought off repeated Apache attacks and protected the widely separated ranches and lonely travelers from marauding Apaches and Comanches.

Representative RUTHERFORD deserves commendation for his dedicated work and leadership that is leading to preserving for Texas and the Nation the best remaining example in the Southwest of a typical post-Civil War outpost.

As the only Senator from Texas who has ever lived in west Texas, I am particularly pleased to support and work for the Fort Davis bill, to call attention to this editorial in the Dallas Morning News and the fine work of Congressman RUTHERFORD. Having visited Old Fort Davis first more than 30 years ago, I have long advocated this step to preserve for posterity this historic spot, nestled in the Davis Mountains of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have reprinted in the RECORD Appendix an editorial entitled "Old Fort Davis" from the August 31, 1961, edition of the Dallas Morning News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD FORT DAVIS

Restoration and upkeep of old Fort Davis are virtually assured by the Senate action to make it a national historic site. Already the House took similar action, and now only a few minor differences in the two bills need to be ironed out.

This frontier fort, about a mile high in the Davis Mountains, is one of the most picturesque outposts of its kind. In early Texas history it played an important role in protecting caravans of gold seekers and settlers on their way to California and traders going to and from Mexico. It also safeguarded some of the early stagecoach lines in southwest Texas. Once a camel caravan from Texas to California camped there.

Named for Jefferson Davis when he was Secretary of War, the frontier fort was aban-

doned and destroyed during the War Between the States. But later it was rebuilt and again served as a deterrent to marauding Comanches and Apaches. Its restoration will make it a mecca for many tourists and will preserve a fascinating spot in Texas history.

Taxes Must Be Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein a recent very penetrating and analytical editorial from the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Telegram captioned "Must Taxes Be Confusing?"

This well-reasoned article relates to the incredible confusion and injustice precipitated by the court decision requiring Du Pont to divest itself of 63 million shares of General Motors stock.

Who does this ill-considered decision hurt? First, it hurts the companies concerned, and some misguided groups might deem them expendable, though this attitude is distorted and unfair.

Secondly, the decision hurts the economy by bringing elements of uncertainty and instability into two of the Nation's greatest, most productive industries and related industries taken together employing very many thousand American workers and industries vital to national defense as well as to general prosperity.

Thirdly, this regrettable decision directly, adversely, and most seriously affects the pecuniary interests of literally thousands and thousands of small people—moderately comfortable business and professional people, farmers and artisans, and men and women with their hard-won earnings and savings invested in Du Pont stock.

The Telegram's proposal to relieve these people strikes me as being meritorious and urgently called for to avoid unfairness and hardship, and in agreeing with these sound editorial comments, I am especially pleased to note that sometime ago, prompted by similar sentiments, I urged our House Committee on Ways and Means and its able, distinguished members and esteemed colleagues to take effective action to ameliorate the threatened detriments of the court decision and report out fitting legislation to spare American industry and all the people concerned the unhappy consequences of unwise and unjustifiable legal divestiture of valuable property rights endangered by shortsighted judicial rulings.

The question arises: How could any American judicial body arrive at such a warped and confusing result? Many intelligent Americans are wondering how our courts could ever reach such an impractical and disruptive conclusion.

The law and the courts are supposed to insure and dispense concrete as well as abstract justice. When through error, or obliguity, or studied transfer of assigned duty to the legislative branch, great violence is done to our system of justice and loss of confidence in the courts ensues as has been the case in this instance.

There are those who believe that in tax matters Congress should merely lay out broad principles and leave specifics to administrative agencies or to the courts. This unfortunate decision does much to cast doubt on such a proposal.

It is clear from this case that, far from leaving specific application of tax laws to administrative agencies and the courts, Congress must increasingly and more meticulously lay out and delineate not only the substantive law, but also the applications and detailed procedures by which tax laws shall be applied.

In that way and probably only in that way can the people be duly safeguarded in their property and other legal rights and be protected against the oppression of overreaching tax collectors and courts moved more by sociological doctrine than legal precedents or congressional intent. I hope complete corrective action may be taken by Congress at an early date to achieve justice in the Du-Pont stock case. It would serve salutary notice on all concerned to respect the rights of the American people or face speedy congressional restraint.

The editorial follows:

MUST TAXES BE CONFUSING?

The Treasury and Congress appear to have joined forces once again to make a simple tax problem complex and confusing. Why is it that the pangs of taxes must be made worse by the extraordinary difficulty of computing them?

The Du Pont Co. has been required by the courts at the behest of the Justice Department to divest itself of 63 million shares of General Motors stock it acquired more than 40 years ago.

Since the Du Pont stockholders are the ultimate owners anyway, nothing could be simpler than to pass along their GM shares to them.

Thus a Du Pont stockholder who formerly held a certificate showing a share of ownership in all the Du Pont assets including the GM stock, would now find himself with two certificates, one attesting a share of ownership in all the Du Pont assets except the GM stock and the other attesting the share of ownership in GM.

He would be neither richer nor poorer than he was before. His dividends would come to him in two checks instead of one, but the total would stay the same as it would have been if no distribution had been made.

The Justice Department would be satisfied that Du Pont would no longer have any special "in" enabling it to make GM buy Du Pont products. And the tax problem could be equitably and simply settled whenever the stockholder sold his GM stock. At that time he could be assessed a capital gains tax on the difference between what he got for his stock and what Du Pont paid for it back in 1917–19.

But no, this won't do. The Treasury Department has insisted that the distribution of GM shares must be taxed as dividend income, just as if the Du Pont stockholder had somehow been enriched by getting direct possession of the GM stock he formerly owned through the Du Pont Co.

Since this tax would force heavy selling of both GM and Du Pont stock, with consequent depreciation of the value of both, Congress has been searching for a relief means.

But nothing so simple as the obvious capital gains device.

Congress is leaning toward a different capital gains tax, figured on the amount by which the value of the General Motors stock received by the stockholder exceeds his cost of the Du Pont stock.

May we spare you the intricacies of that? It will keep accountants and tax lawyers well occupied.

The political principle seems to be that no stockholder should get anything, even a slip of paper, without paying a tax on it. But when he gets not only taxed but confused besides, is there no mercy?

World Law in Platform for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 19, an Asian conference on world peace through law starts in Tokyo, Japan.

Sponsored by the Ford Foundation, the conference will be attended by lawyers from 19 Asian nations. If the meeting even partially fulfills its objectives the conference, in my judgment, will be a historic landmark in efforts to lay a foundation of law and justice for peace.

The world, I believe, can be particularly gratified that the legal minds of these nations are gathering together to try to determine and blueprint a fundamental set of principles for order and peace in the world.

Recently, the LaCrosse Tribune published an editorial entitled: "World Law in Platform for Peace." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD LAW IN PLATFORM FOR PEACE

Lawyers from 19 Asian nations will attend an Asian conference of world peace through law in Tokyo, September 17–20. It is the second of four scheduled continental conferences, sponsored by the Ford Foundation.

The working blueprint for the conference has been distilled from the views of 10,000 lawyers around the globe. "The great strength of this movement lies in its grassroots nature," says Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association and chairman of the association's committee on world law. "We are mobilizing a worldwide army of practicing lawyers."

In the view of many, and their number grows, some system of world law offers the only hope for ever establishing a just and permanent peace. The old ways simply will not work any more.

It is to be hoped that a conference such as this will stir a world-sweeping moral tide. As former President Eisenhower said, if the world's leaders do not find a way to peace, the people will do it for them.

But they must first vanquish the ancient enemies of indifference, apathy, and inflexibility.

Khrushchev's Global Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the test of whether we can successfully match wits at global chess with Khrushchev will come over the Berlin crisis. If he can outmaneuver us there where will he move next? One thing is sure—he will not give. He heads a worldwide conquest.

David Lawrence, widely read columnist, has ably outlined the game he is playing in an article in which he emphasizes that an economic blockade by the West offers a bold and effective move to counter Khrushchev's scheming.

Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S GLOBAL CHESS GAME—PREMIER THREATENS TO CHECKMATE WEST; ECONOMIC BLOCKADE HELD ONLY RESPONSE

(By David Lawrence)

All over the world the guessing game is on. What is Khrushchev up to? Does he really intend to plunge the world into a nuclear war?

Maybe the answer is to be found by examining the situation in terms of what might be called a chess player's strategy. For the Russians play a lot of chess. Anyone who plays it must figure out not merely the next move but the move after the next and sometimes two or three moves afterward, too.

Basically, the Soviet Premier knows that any nuclear war means devastation as well as destruction of human lives in his own country. He knows that, no matter how quickly he may wipe out bases inside the United States by striking the "first blow," he cannot at the same time render powerless all the manned bombers that are in the air or located at oversea bases. But, most important of all, how can he be sure that American submarines—hidden under the seas, with their Polaris missiles—cannot still inflict terrible destruction on his own people? Would he risk the loss of even 2 or 3 million lives out of his total population? Whose lives would these be? Nobody in Russia can know, so a whole nation would become fearful.

A player who knows he holds advantages on the chessboard plans to follow them up deliberately and thus win the game. The Soviet Premier has made up his mind to win the Berlin game first. He thinks he has his opponents in a trap. They talk big, but he assumes they will not act big. Take, for instance, what has happened since the sealing off of the border of East Berlin. This was a probing move by the Soviet Premier but he found out what he really wanted to know—that the West wouldn't fight a nuclear war over Berlin. For all practical purposes, the Soviet Government has openly acted to annex East Berlin and has dared the West to fight back. Nothing has happened except the pronouncement of some strong words of protest in diplomatic notes.

The true goal of the Soviet Premier is to control all of Berlin. He cannot get this immediately, so his strategy is to isolate the entire city and he plans to do it by signing a peace treaty with East Germany. Once this is done, the Allies will, of course, not go to war over it. They will wait to see if the air corridors to West Berlin are blocked. The Soviets will harass the corridors, and incident after incident will occur to argue about. There will be negotiations—a dilatory process that can last for years—but no military conflict.

Meanwhile, Berlin as a Western city will gradually deteriorate not only in spirit but in its economic strength. All Mr. Khrushchev has to do is to read the news dispatches coming now from London, Paris, and Washington, and he will reassure himself that, even if he signs a separate peace treaty with East Germany, the West will not take any retaliatory action in a military sense.

Resumption of nuclear tests by Moscow was doubtless designed as another exploratory move. Already voices are raised in influential circles in Britain and America against the resumption of nuclear tests by the West.

What, therefore, is left? Are the Western countries just going to forget the game as Nikita Khrushchev proceeds to threaten a checkmate? If he wins Berlin, will he stop there?

Unfortunately, most people in the West have been led to believe that there is no way out short of war, and they are already saying: "Berlin isn't worth a war." They do not see that behind the Khrushchev maneuvers on the world chessboard are dangerous threats to press his advtntages in other areas. He has his apparatus operating at full speed in Latin America, Africa and Asia. America is striving to offset this by a big foreign aid program. This is important, but it is of a long-range character and cannot at once frustrate the activities in which the Soviets now are engaged on every continent.

There is but one course of action for the Western allies. It is painful and expensive. But it is likely to save the world from an accidental clash that could lead to a nuclear war. The time is ripe for a publicly announced plan of economic blockade which need not be imposed for many months to come but which the Moscow Government would recognize beforehand as an effective countermove and alternative to war.

Cutting off not only the Soviet Union but all the Communist-bloc countries from economic ties with the West would mean stopping even the international conversion of Russian currencies, with which worldwide espionage is being financed today by Moscow. Any so-called neutral nation that sided with the Soviets and refused to join in the blockade could find itself blockaded, too. The West could not afford to tolerate any economic aid given to the Soviet Union from any quarter. The West has the power to contain the Soviets in their own area, and, to use a famous phrase of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to "quarantine" a potential enemy.

The American Government, moreover, along with other Western governments, could appropriate enough money to help compensate their own citizens who might be financially hurt by the economic blockade. Measures like these are drastic, but they are better than a nuclear war.

The Fulbright Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all recognize that the Reserve Officers Association speaks for our military personnel, reserve, and regular. It was therefore most interesting for me to receive a letter from the president, Department of Nebraska, ROA, condemning the Fulbright memorandum.

I believe that this expression by the ROA organization in Nebraska is very close to the reaction of the dedicated military leaders of this Nation who are serving on active duty, but who are unable to express their true feelings about the Fulbright memorandum for fear of retaliation by civilian officials.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include the text of the letter from the Nebraska ROA group:

DEPARTMENT OF NEBRASKA,
RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Grand Island, Nebr., August 30, 1961.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: The Nebraska Department of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, consisting of 455 members, strongly urges you to oppose vigorously all parts of the Fulbright memorandum to the Defense Department.

It is further urged that you support Senator STROM THURMOND in his efforts to establish an investigation of the origin of the memorandum. The gravity of this memorandum is such that Senator FULBRIGHT should be forced to reveal the origin and authorship of this document, normal senatorial courtesies notwithstanding.

PAUL J. ROETTELE,
Major, United States Army Reserve, President.

We Were Had on A-Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

WE WERE HAD ON A-TEST BAN

The Soviets have suckered us again. That is the real significance of resuming nuclear testing.

We shouldn't mix up the fact of new testing with the propaganda baloney about a superbomb.

The fact was forecast from the beginning, and U.S. officials admittedly never really expected to achieve a negotiated test ban.

Consider how Khrushchev took us over the jumps in typical Red tactics.

Four years ago, we enjoyed a very great lead over the Soviets in refinements and military uses of nuclear weapons. Our nuclear scientists were foreseeing other major advances, and also some which gave promise of tremendous gains for the American consumer and the American economy.

The Soviets were falling farther behind again in this field. What did they do? They announced that they were canceling all nuclear tests for "humanitarian reasons," and demanded that we do the same.

They backed up this diplomatic offensive with a worldwide "ban the bomb" campaign. They preached the doctrine of dangerous radioactivity—and so did a good many "soft" people in the United States.

What did we do?

We stopped testing and waited. We waited and we waited. As much as 3 years ago American scientists in this field were be-

coming upset because of the restraint on them, and fear that we would lose our lead if we couldn't move on ahead.

This concern became evident finally when President Eisenhower indicated that we had waited about long enough.

Mr. Nixon expressed concern that further delay was becoming dangerous to our nuclear lead, and said he would set an early deadline and resume testing if the Soviet's didn't play ball—(if he were elected president.)

Mr. Kennedy, at that time, said he would not act hastily, but would make another college try at negotiations—indicating that a new regime in the United States might be able to negotiate more successfully with Khrushchev than the old one. He would set no deadline. That was uncouth of Mr. Nixon.

So, we waited some more until the Russians were finally ready.

A high U.S. official told this writer just 2 weeks ago that we actually had no real hope of fruitful negotiations on this issue, but would not resume testing because of "world opinion."

So, we waited.

When they were ready, did the Russians worry about world opinion?

They just blasted out that now they will resume testing, and without a quiver turned their back on their 4 year "humanitarian" campaign. It had served its purpose.

The Russians have a different philosophy about "winning the minds of men." While we have waited for them out of worry over whether other people will like us—and will doubtless use the Red test announcement to propagandize what nasty folks the Russians are—the Russians decided there was a victory to be had in this too.

So, they say that they are doing so in order to test a huge superbomb.

They don't care if people like them or not, if they can frighten people enough to submit to their tactics.

Politicians will try to make another "propaganda victory" out of this Red move, but it's hard to hide the fact that we have really been had.

C. L. DANCEY.

Let's Stop Apologizing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial appearing in the Asbury Park Evening Press on Thursday, August 31, entitled "Let's Stop Apologizing."

I think that many of my colleagues will agree with me that it is time for us to stop apologizing to representatives of foreign nations who violate our laws and regulations. It seems to me that these people who are guests of our Nation should be expected to respect the authorities in our country just as well as any of our citizens.

I am always incensed when I read that some attaché of an embassy here in Washington is excused from traffic and parking violations while our own citizens are required to obey them. This is not right and I believe that our Government would enjoy greater respect from everyone, our own citizens included, if it insisted that all should obey the laws.

The editorial follows:

LET'S STOP APOLOGIZING

It seems that no matter what the United States may do in international affairs it provokes but one response—criticism. When we send funds abroad in the form of economic aid we are either criticized because the amount is too small or because it finds its way into the wrong hands in the country we are aiding. And, if we curtail our largesse we are told that we are stingy and trafficking in other peoples' misery.

Latest incident involving the unpopularity of the United States found expression in a set-to between a Guinealan diplomat and the New York police. It seems the diplomat's car struck the rear of a taxi. When the taxi driver left his cab to survey the damage he claims the man from Guinea assaulted him. Police were called and they claim the Guinealans attacked them. The Guinealan Ambassador, defending his colleague, asserts that the exact opposite is true: The diplomat got out of his car to survey the damage and was attacked by the taxi driver. According to this version, the police were at no time attacked. The New York police commissioner has made an investigation of the matter and he finds the Guinealan at fault.

This collision is simply one more accident in the life of a great city. Dozens of cars collide in the course of a week and scores of drivers embroil themselves in arguments as to which driver was at fault. But the man from Guinea is not content to let this pass as such. He sees an opportunity to belabor that nasty old capitalist Nation known as the United States. He proceeds to do so by charging the New York police with bias because they found his man in the wrong. And the accident, which his man caused, is described as having political overtones. Oh, yes, it also recalls a lynching incident."

It has become standard procedure to blame the Western World for everything. Whenever a stupid head of state leads his nation down the path to disaster he always blames Western imperialism. Also, it has become standard procedure for this Nation to give the impression that the charge is true by stepping up economic aid to our attacker. No wonder it has become popular to attack the United States. It pays.

We wonder what would happen if we reversed our position. Suppose we told the Guinean Ambassador that our investigation shows his man to have been at fault and, since he has diplomatic immunity from court action, we wish he would go back to Guinea. And, moreover, if the Ambassador feels we are biased against him because of his race, and that a routine police investigation has political overtones and is reminiscent of a lynching incident, we suggest he, too, be deemed persona non grata, which is a diplomatic way of saying "Go home."

And, suppose, we told the nations who are being fed through American generosity that if they want our succor to continue they should act as if it were welcome. We might tell them that we don't expect them to caress the hand that feeds them but we would be pleased if they would stop biting it. And we might also disabuse their minds about that old chestnut of threatening us with Russia. Stop telling us that if we don't give them the money they ask for they will appeal to Russia. Let them appeal. They'll shortly find that they can do much better in the United States of America.

We can offer no guarantee that this scheme will work. But in view of the colossal failure of the established pattern of giving to nations in distress we can't believe a change would do any harm. To date, and we glean this from the news reports and the statements of our own Ambassadors, we have an impressive list of enemies to show for our billions invested in foreign aid.

The Late Eugene A. Tighe, a Dedicated Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the basic strength of our body politic is municipal government, and the success of our system is attributable to those officials in municipal government who give so much for a so little. At the head of most of these local governments is the mayor, usually a dedicated man, whose only desire is to serve the best interests of all his citizens. He not only has his official duties to perform, but in our smaller communities he must be a family counsellor, a guide to youth, and settle disputes of all sorts, real or imaginary, within or without his officialdom. Such a man is hard to come by, and once in office is a paragon of strength to his community.

My home city of Margate, N.J., has had such a man as mayor for the past 16 years. He was the Honorable Eugene A. Tighe.

On Thursday afternoon, while on the floor of the House, I was told of his death, and it was such a shock that I had to retire to my chambers, for Eugene Tighe was not only a great mayor, he was a close and dear friend. We had been associated in municipal, county, and State government for 30 years, and what success I have had in my political life has to a great extent been attributable to the support of Gene Tighe. He was always steadfast and sincere—forceful when necessary, but always kind, understanding and gifted with a deep compassion for his fellowman. He was a model family man with a wonderful wife at his side and three fine children now following in their father's footsteps as fine American citizens. As neighbors we watched our children grow up together, and he was as proud of his daughter and sons as I am of mine.

While my personal loss is great, it is shared with thousands of our citizens of Margate, and the adjoining communities of south Jersey.

The greatness of this public servant is attested by an editorial appearing in the Atlantic City Press, as follows:

MARGATE'S MAYOR EUGENE A. TIGHE

Margate has lost a faithful and conscientious public servant in the death of Mayor Eugene A. Tighe. Sharing in the loss is the entire seashore area, whose interests he advanced both as advertising man and public official.

There was nothing stuffy or pompous about Mayor Tighe. He was a down-to-earth, practical unassuming man. His shy humor usually came to the fore on his rare

appearances at Press Club dinners. The last such occasion at which we were privileged to see him was in May.

He seemed in excellent spirits and parried some good-natured ribbing about taxes like the good sport that he was. Illness overtook him about two months later. He entered Jefferson Hospital, Philadelphia, where he passed away last Thursday from complications resulting from kidney failure. He was 64.

Even while hospitalized, he showed concern over municipal matters. Tighe's public career dates back to the depression years of the thirties when he served Margate as magistrate, overseer of the poor and commissioner of revenue and finance. He became mayor in 1945.

Under his leadership, Margate grew from a sleepy village to the thriving, bustling, expanding community of 10,000 that it is today.

Politics was his avocation. His vocation was the advertising business and he was very successful at it. He was identified with the Dorland Advertising Agency since the Roaring Twenties, when under the aegis of the late Governor-U.S. Senator-Ambassador Walter E. Edge, it pioneered resort and hotel advertising.

Like most men in public life, Mayor Tighe made some enemies as well as friends. But not even his enemies questioned his sincerity. His high sense ethics was the hallmark of his popularity.

He will be widely mourned. The sympathy of the community goes out to the members of his family.

Margate has lost a hard-working chief executive, and the county and State a distinguished citizen.

Money Can Grow on Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota is quite generally considered to be one of the Plains States and few people, including many North Dakotans, would recognize the State as being identified in any way with the wood industry.

Mr. C. M. Nelson, president of the North Dakota State School of Forestry at Bottineau, N. Dak., has very kindly provided me with a copy of a news story appearing in the September 2, 1961, issue of the Farmer, a St. Paul, Minn., publication, which describes the activity in the wood market in our State.

I know that many of my fellow Congressmen will be interested in learning more about our fine State, and I am pleased to provide this article for your information:

THANKS TO NEW MARKETS FOR WOOD, MANY NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS HAVE FOUND REAL TRUTH IN THE SAYING THAT "MONEY CAN GROW ON TREES"

About the time snows flies this winter an increasing number of North Dakota farmers and woodlot owners will be turning to a new but surprisingly profitable occupation for a prairie State—lumbering.

Forestry in North Dakota has suddenly boomed into a fast-growing business which is providing a sizable new source of income from standing timber, much of it owned by farmers.

At Towner, N. Dak., for example, a woodtreating plant is now serving markets that until a few years ago had been overlooked. Homegrown poles, posts, crossties and lumber are being treated, then sold all over the State. Cottonwood from old groves is being sawed into crossties, switch ties and car blocking for use in North Dakota's coal mines. Aspen poles and posts, treated with preservatives, are being used on North Dakota's farms and ranches. Lumber for homes, and buildings on new Air Force bases in the State is also being treated at this modern new plant on the prairie, which began operation in October 1959.

At Bottineau, the Dakota Wood Products Co. completed its new plant for volume production of stakes and lath last March. This new plant provides a profitable market outlet for farmers whose trees have grown too large for sale as posts or poles, yet are not likely to mature into healthy sawlog material.

These new plants at Towner and Bottineau offer complete utilization of farm timber, most of it harvested by farmers on their own farms. Thanks to new markets such as these, and to an accelerated program of forestry management, farmer-owned woodlands have become valuable investments with a sizable potential for profit. Neglected farm woodlands, which heretofore weren't worthy of much care and attention, now are being looked to with increasing interest, now that new markets for farm-grown timber are opening up.

In eastern North Dakota, the Red River and all its major tributaries have American elm, green ash and basswood as the major forest types. In the Pembina Hills, Devils Lake and the Turtle and Killdeer Mountain areas, aspen, birch and burr oak are common. Cottonwood is found in fine large stands along the Missouri and Little Missouri Rivers. In the Badlands area of southwestern North Dakota, ponderosa pine and juniper are common. Of these, only elm, ash, basswood, aspen, birch and cottonwood are considered commercially important.

The ash-elm-basswood type makes up 34 percent of the commercial forest acreage of the State and contains 56 percent of the sawtimber volume. The aspen-birch type is second in volume, covering 28 percent of the forest area, but containing only 3 percent of the sawtimber volume. Oak covers 19 percent of the forest area and has 12 percent of the sawtimber volume. Cottonwood covers 10 percent and contains 25 percent of the sawtimber volume.

Seventy percent of the commercial forest land of North Dakota is privately owned. Farmers are the largest ownership group, accounting for over 40 percent. Other privates owners hold less than 30 percent. Federal and State government owns or manages the remaining 30 percent of the State's commercial forest area.

North Dakota's promising outlook for forestry didn't develop overnight, nor did it come about solely by chance. It is the result of a well-planned program which was started in 1957 when the State's forest service conducted a survey to take stock of the situation.

"We found farmers and others talked about managing their woodland properly, but only a very few were doing anything serious about it. Land clearing had decimated areas that should have remained in timber. Fires had and were ravaging vast wooded areas, even though increased protective measures had been initiated. It was obvious that a new approach was needed," Duane Green, deputy State forester, told the Farmer.

"Lumber in many cases was of doubtful quality, poorly manufactured and sold green. There was a complete lack of both local and regional markets," says Mr. Green. "And without management and markets, timber growth in the State was exceeding removal by 77 percent. Worst of all, over 66 percent of that removal was due to mortality. Such removal of timber benefits no one."

The answer to the problem was obvious—farmers could be counted on to manage and protect their woodlands, if there was a profit incentive to do so. Creating the incentive was the key. It hinged on three factors—development of adequate markets for wood products, sound forest management, and protection of each farmer's investment in timber, all of which go hand in hand.

FIRST: FIND MARKETS

In June of 1957, Vernon Meyer was hired as district forester and market utilization specialist. His first step was to survey local markets for the large volume of second-growth Aspen in the Turtle Mountain area of North Dakota. These surveys indicated excellent marketing possibilities for treated posts, poles, and lumber. When it was found impractical to ship raw materials out of the State for treatment, the attempt was made to interest local investors in undertaking such a venture. Leads were investigated and the necessary backing secured for starting the wood-treating plant at Towner. The North Dakota Wood Preserving Co. thus was born.

As a result of that foresightedness, acres of timber which formerly contained worthless trees are now being thinned and harvested. Posts and poles are flowing through the plant to markets across the State. In the first 9 months of operation, more than $30,000 was returned to farmers and other tree owners in the local area. Marketing of homegrown timber has afforded local farmers a chance to earn added income in winter when farming operations are slack. Forest fires have decreased. Farmer requests for inspecting and managing timber by the State's forest service have increased. Farmers began "talking wood" soon after the new processing plant appeared on the scene.

Additional surveys showed possibilities of an excellent market for stakes and lath all over the State. Aspen and Cottonwood are ideal for manufacture of these items and lend themselves well to high-volume, low-cost production.

The company operating the new plant at Towner, recognizing the need to assure itself of a sustained quantiy of wood and also to supply these new markets for North Dakota wood, aided in the establishment of its subsidiary plant, north of Bottineau. New machinery was installed and the Dakota Wood Products Co. went into volume production last March.

Stakes and lath produced in the plant are bundled for shipment to soil conservation districts, contractors, lumber yards, and many other customers who want quality lath at a reasonable price.

"An average farm woodland in the Turtle Mountain area will yield from 6 to 10 cords of salable "bolts" per acre, each 50 inches long and varying in diameter from 6 to 12 inches. These are subsequently cut into stakes and lath," says Mr. Green. "Gary Soland, a farmer north of Bottineau, earned up to $20 a day from his woods last winter. Now, with forest management, the productivity of his and other farm woodlands can be greatly increased. Growth rates can be accelerated and poor-risk trees can be removed under the timber stand improvement practices of the ACP program."

Some Pertinent Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from an esteemed constituent. It is most thought provoking. It is addressed to all the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate:

TOWNVILLE, PA., *August 31, 1961.*
To the Honorable Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN: I have the highest respect for your office and the deepest sympathy for you because of the testing times through which you are going. I would not add an ounce to your burdens but there are some questions in the minds of thoughtful Americans to which I believe you owe some answers.

Before listening to, or reading, this communication, you will want to know something concerning the writer. I am an alumnus of college and university, was a former professor of economics and sociology in Morris Harvey College, have spent 32 years in the ministry of the Methodist Church, am author of volume "Popular Amusements, Destructive and Constructive," three later booklets, and over 100 articles which have appeared in leading religious and temperance journals. In politics, I am nonpartisan. I have never belonged to any Communist front and have no sympathy with communism in any form. My ancestors have been in every war in the history of our country, always on the side of democracy and freedom. In the Hall of Statuary under the Capitol dome you will see the statue of General Muhlenberg of the Revolutionary War. He was in my mother's direct family line. So much for personalities. Now for questions.

1. Was not the U.N., with its vast facilities, for the exchange of information, its intricate organization founded at great expense for the purpose of helping to solve national and international problems? Why has not the Berlin problem been taken to the United Nations?

2. Will a nuclear war solve any national or international problems, or accomplish anything but the ruin and desolation of all the major nations? If this is true, why then ever even consider a nuclear war—at least without exhausting all possible means of negotiation?

3. Is it sane or safe for any members of the Government to carry chips on their shoulders or hurl around ultimatums in an international atmosphere as tense as today?

4. Concerning civil defense, have you read the article by your colleague, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, in the June edition of the Reader's Digest under caption "Civil Defense—Billion-Dollar Boondoggle?" What percentage of chances have average people of getting into their shelter after alert, being perhaps a long ways from home, or at work? How can they survive in the shelter when the oxygen in the air is exhausted by explosion? What will anyone find who gets out of the shelter except all vegetable and animal life dead and water supply contaminated for 2 or 3 months? Is the statement being made true that the people are being misled to believe that they can survive bomb attacks in order to enlist their continued support of the cold war? Some of the highest nuclear authorities have told us there is no defense from hydrogen or cobalt bombs, and some highest military authorities have told us that only a small fraction of enemy bombers can be intercepted before they reach their target.

5. We are told by high authorities that the second greatest danger to our Nation is increased inflation. If we cannot pay the interest on our national debt in boom times, when can we ever pay the principal? Is not our national bankruptcy one of the major aims of the Communist Party?

6. Is not the request for the appropriation of billions of dollars to put a man to the moon before the Russians utterly insane and irresponsible? The distance to the moon in relation to interstellar spaces is almost negligible. The moon, in relation to the number of other celestial bodies, is as a grain of sand to the sands along the shores of the ocean.

7. Fifteen years ago we were arm in arm with the Russians, and the Germans were Huns and barbarians and now we are arm in arm with the Germans and the Russians are the Huns and barbarians. Can civilized nations become Huns and Huns become civilized within the short space of 15 years?

8. I am wondering if the Members of Congress heard the debate on Cuba on the "Meet the Press" program a few weeks ago, on the Cuban situation, between Senator SMATHERS and the Washington correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. If you did not, you ought to read the verbatim report. It seems strange that a foreign reporter should apparently know more about the history of Cuba, the rise of Castro, the revolution, and the present status of Cuba than a U.S. Senator. Did not a leading Member of Congress recently say that the policy of the U.S. Government toward Cuba is responsible for Castro and the present status of Cuba?

9. Can any Member of Congress tell us of any instance in history, our history or the history of the world, in which a major armaments race was not followed by war? The last two World Wars have shot to a thousand tatters the motto "In time of peace prepare for war." Nations, like men, reap what they sow. If they sow bayonets, they reap battles; if they sow love, they reap life; if they sow hate, they reap hell.

10. Why does our Government appropriate more billions to arm the backward states than they do to remove their poverty, disease and ignorance, which are the seedbeds of communism? How can our Government profess to be seeking peace when it is spending more than $12 for war for every $1 spent in support of the United Nations? How can it make this profession when it spends over $200 in paying for past, present, and future wars for every $1 spent in the quest for peace?

11. Has not Mr. Khrushchev, during recent months, offered to negotiate concerning the Berlin problem in a way which would leave the Western channels of communication from Berlin open?

In conclusion, I would remind you that it is Congress, only, which can make a declaration of war, or authorize others to do so. Thus if nuclear war should come, yours will be one of the primary responsibilities.

I believe that you owe it to the thoughtful citizens of our country to answer frankly the above questions. You may have ample reasons for all the decisions which have been made in relation to foreign policy, but many of us common people do not know all the reasons.

Lest it be thought that I have been expressing only my own opinion and speaking only for myself, I should add that during recent years I have spoken in 610 churches of leading Protestant denominations, including Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist, E.U.B., etc., and I have had an opportunity to sense the opinion and feeling of ministers and laymen concerning our foreign policy and the questions I have raised. I believe that you gentlemen of our Congress should know something about how the ministers and laymen of our churches are thinking and feeling, and the questions that are on their minds.

Furthermore, several years ago I wrote extended articles blasting our foreign policy which were published in leading Methodist, Lutheran and E.U.B. journals. I close, as I began, in expressing my personal regards for you, and believing that you want all of the facts concerning the opinions and feelings of the people of our country to assist you in making your crucial decisions. I remain.

Yours fraternally,
LEE RALPH PHIPPS.

Rail Officials Can Blame Selves for Financial Woes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from Trainman News, dated September 4, 1961, pertaining to the statement made by the Senator from Ohio, the Honorable STEPHEN M. YOUNG. I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments he has expressed as I have found that traveling by railroad between Buffalo, N.Y., and Washington, D.C., is a strenuous ordeal. I can justifiably say that our railroad system has deteriorated.

The article follows:

SENATOR YOUNG CHARGES: RAIL OFFICIALS CAN BLAME SELVES FOR FINANCIAL WOES

WASHINGTON.—Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat of Ohio, now knows why prospective passengers on the Nation's railroads "stay away in droves."

He took the 226-mile trip on the Pennsy from New York to Washington recently and said, "* * * it is the last one I hope to take, unless conditions change."

Declared Senator YOUNG in the Senate:

"Four hours of traveling on a dirty, crowded, poorly ventilated coach gave convincing evidence that railroad officials regard passengers as necessary evils and make their money carrying freight.

"There was no dining car on the train, or even a snack bar. Every coach was a candidate for the junk heap.

"Railroad officials should blame themselves for their sad financial plight."

The Ohio Democrat pointed out that he has received hundreds of letters from his constituents complaining of poor service and deplorable conditions on passenger trains, and asking that the Federal Government do something to correct the situation.

He said it's "noteworthy that trains which are kept in good condition, operate regularly on good schedules, and furnish good service are filled. When the trains are not in good condition and the service is poor, the number of passengers always drops accordingly."

Continued Senator YOUNG:

"Our highways become overcrowded as fast as we build them. Passenger train service is more and more becoming a greater necessity, especially in our large metropolitan areas.

"Unless railroad executives immediately begin taking action to improve and expand

this service, we may soon find ourselves in a transportation crisis of great severity."

He said it is of the utmost importance to all Americans that railroad problems be solved and that railroad officials respond to the demands of the times, offer good and fast service to people, attempt to accommodate prospective passengers, and go all out to keep travel on a reasonably accurate schedule. Officials must see to it that trains leave and arrive at the time scheduled.

"Nowadays some railroad transportation officials seem to regard passengers as a necessary evil. If the train leaves on schedule and arrives not more than an hour late, they consider they have done well."

Senator YOUNG contrasted rail service in this country with that in Italy where, he said, "it is a pleasure to ride on the Rapido, a bullet-shaped train making a long trip from Rome to Milan in 6 hours. This train is beautifully decorated, has new coaches with artistic panels, and passengers are offered Expresso coffee. The cost of making this 400-mile trip is less than air fare. It is a trifle more than passengers pay on slow trains."

Asserting that U.S. railroads lag behind those of Italy in efficiency and comfort, Senator YOUNG suggested that perhaps rail officials and unions in this country should ask our Government to invite Italy to send a reverse of the Peace Corps to the United States to teach our backward railroad operators to take proper care of passengers, and thereby earn money for dividends for their stockholders.

"Why, in a country which sent a man into the outer atmosphere and returned him safely, have we failed to provide comfortable railroad trips from Cleveland to Cincinnati and from New York to Washington, to cite two examples?"

Senator YOUNG also brought to the attention of his fellow Senators a letter which a resident of Shaker Heights, Ohio, had written Alfred Perlman, New York Central president, complaining of New York Central service and opposing the road's petition to reduce passenger service between Cleveland, Columbus, and Cincinnati.

An angry Barry Pomerantz wrote Perlman that he was protesting the passenger service cut because "I believe that less passenger service is what you and your railroad desire and are trying to meet this end by discouraging rail fare."

Pomerantz said other forms of transportation are not trying to decrease service between the points mentioned, but have increased service and are trying to make it more attractive.

"Only the railroads have refused to face the competition," he added. "In fact, with the way the railroads are running their business now, it leaves little doubt but that they are trying to discourage rail fares."

Pomerantz gave examples of the treatment New York Central passengers are given these days.

"On two trips during the past year between Cleveland and Cincinnati, trains that carried some relatives and me have been delayed for unreasonably long lengths of time for no apparent reason. On one such trip a train from Cincinnati, traveling to Cleveland, usually a 6- to 7-hour journey, arrived in Cleveland 6 hours late. By doubling the regular traveltime this trip was turned into a 12-hour torture.

"Another train that I had the misfortune of traveling on from Cleveland to Columbus stopped midway in its journey for a 3-hour delay. The train made a 4-hour trip in 7 hours. This same train, by the way, besides carrying the few stouthearted travelers, also carried cockroaches. This in itself would make anyone not wish to travel by train."

"Your railroad, along with others," wrote Pomerantz, "has tried to discourage rail passenger travel by unethical means, so that you might, by showing to the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio a loss of revenues, be allowed to curtail your passenger service and thus concentrate on the more profitable freight service."

All-Federal Transmission System for the Colorado River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter dated August 29, 1961, from Mr. I. W. Patterson, manager of the Empire Electric Association, Inc., of Cortez, Colo.:

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of the August 15 issue of the Electrical West Industry Newsletter. We would like to call your attention especially to the article on the front page.

It appears that the people of Canada are developing their own rivers, and not allowing the power companies to interfere. It is a deplorable situation when five profit-hungry utilities attempt to dictate to the U.S. Government on the development of a great river basin. The privately financed utilities would do better to develop their own lines and leave this river development to the people who were authorized to build it.

We urgently request your vote for the all-Federal transmission system for the Colorado River Basin.

Very truly yours,
EMPIRE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.,
I. W. PATTERSON, *Manager.*

Mr. Speaker, after reading the letter from Mr. Patterson, I also turned to the enclosure and read the article referred to. The article reads as follows:

Government seizure of British Columbia Electric and Peace River Power Development companies was approved without a dissenting vote by the British Columbia Legislative Assembly in special session August 3. Nationalization, made retroactive to August 1, reportedly came as a surprise to utility management.

Although rumors of expropriation had been voiced during political bickering between Ottawa and the provincial government over Columbia River development, apparently British Columbia Premier Bennett's threat of a takeover was generally thought to be a bluff.

Ironically, while Bennett was proclaiming BCE a crown corporation, funeral service was being held in Vancouver for Dal Grauer, chief executive of the utility and its parent, British Columbia Power Corp. Dr. Grauer, who died July 28 of leukemia, master-minded BCE's $650 million postwar expansion.

The takeover was effected by enactment of bill 5 or the Power Development Act of 1961. Although existing legislation would have allowed the seizure, Bennett considered the extraordinary implications warranted a special act.

The new bill empowered the government to convert BCE into a crown corporation through (1) purchase of BCE common shares, held by the parent corporation, for $110,985,045; (2) issuance of $100 million in special government bonds to replace BCE shares; (3) assumption of BCE debts estimated at about $399 million.

The government promised it would, if necessary, take over other assets of the parent corporation, including B. C. Engineering and Western Development & Power. B. C. Power Corp., may demand that BCE buy it out at $38 a share, which would require an additional $67,014,955.

Peace River Development Co., will receive the amount spent on engineering studies and surveys, estimated at between $5 and $7 million.

Under provisions of the act, all directors in the private company were dismissed. A new six-man board is headed by Dr. Gordon Shrum, former dean of graduate studies at UBC and the Premier's hydro trouble shooter since 1958. President Harry Purdy was asked to continue in office and has disassociated himself with B. C. Power Corp.

In San Francisco August 9 for the opening of British Columbia House, Premier Bennett declared the province friendly to private enterprise and said that the federal tax on private utilities resulted in high-cost power. (For some months he had been pressing Ottawa for abolishment of the special federal tax on privately owned power corporations or for a larger share for British Columbia. Last March British Columbia got $260,000 as its share of taxes, estimated at $1,700,000.)

British Columbia cities have had no assurance as yet of what, if any, "in lieu" taxes they can expect. Vancouver alone received some $1,800,000 annually from BCE.

Bennett said that the Peace River project would be started immediately. A Columbia start is farther away because the treaty must be ratified by Ottawa and financing arrangements have still to be made. The Premier has indicated, however, that he expects the federal government to allow export of power to the United States and while in San Francisco he spoke of possible sale in California.

Although the British Columbia Energy Board in its report made no firm recommendation that the Peace and Columbia be developed simultaneously, it said such a procedure was feasible, if export were allowed. The energy board said further that both are sound from an engineering viewpoint and cost would be almost identical if they were government developed. Its estimate: Columbia, 4.4 mills; Peace (private), 6.59 mills; Peace (public), 4.37 mills.

As presently planned BCE and British Columbia Power Commission will be kept separate, with the former developing the Peace and the latter the Columbia. Bennett said, however, that if Ottawa permanently blocked the Columbia development the two would be merged.

Mr. Speaker, it will be seen immediately that Mr. Patterson is applauding not only river development by the Government of British Columbia, but the expropriation of the property of the British Columbia Electric Co. and the Peace River Power Development Co. Apparently, expropriation is to be accomplished at the will of the Legislature of British Columbia, and at a price to be determined by them alone.

Mr. Patterson is applauding the very thing which many people have feared might be the end result of the predominance of public power in the United States. The transmission lines which Mr. Patterson wants the Government to build would make possible the connection of the Mississippi River Basin Federal powerlines with Hoover-Parker-Davis and the Central Valley project of

California. It would then require only a linkup with the Northwest Power Pool for a complete Federal grid to be established which would encompass the entire western part of the United States. Once this is accomplished, I can imagine the next step which could be advocated by Mr. Patterson and others who think like he does. In fact, I do not have to even imagine what would be suggested, because Mr. Patterson has just provided us with a blueprint.

The International Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently President Kennedy announced the appointment of Mr. Howard C. Petersen as a special assistant to prepare an international trade program to go into effect next year, after the expiration of the present reciprocal trade program. Mr. Petersen shows himself to be expert in the area of international trade, and in a recent speech before the German group of the European Committee for Economic and Social Progress he discussed many phases of this great program. I have selected for insertion in the RECORD a small portion of that speech which deals with a facet of particular interest to me, concerning our agriculture and the problem of import competition from low-wage areas such as Japan and Hong Kong. One quotation from Mr. Petersen's address is particularly significant:

> I think we cannot permanently refuse efficient producers access to our markets. The general prescription of gradualness in trade liberalization in the approach I am suggesting will ease the process of adjustment. Also if, as I suggest, trade barriers are reduced by all the members of the area the burden of adjustment will be broadly distributed and less serious for any one country.

I ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the great common interests we all share is the interest in helping the underdeveloped nations of the free world toward a better standard of living and higher economic efficiency. This is nothing less than our interest in keeping as large as possible the area of freedom—the area in which the civilization we value can flourish. But each of us has a separate idea of what is a fair sharing of the burdens of such assistance. Insofar as it calls for increased receptivity to imports from less developed countries, each of us has an interest in not being singled out for the adjustments such imports require.

The movement toward more liberal U.S. commercial policy that began in 1934 has now encountered considerable resistance. This is to be seen in the imposition of quotas on petroleum, lead, and zinc. It would be an oversimplification to regard this as entirely due to the interests of particular industries that would be affected. The real question is why so many people who would not be directly affected share the hesitancy about further trade liberalization.

The classic efficiency argument against high tariffs has never had a great following in the United States. The main force behind our tariff-cutting efforts from 1934 to World War II was the desire to help certain American export industries, including agriculture, and a probably mistaken impression of the contribution this would make to economic recovery. The movement was carried along after the war on a wave of enthusiasm for the rebuilding of Europe.

These motivations have now abated. So, as I have noted, have our tariff levels.

We are concerned now in the United States with finding the right combination of economic policies to reduce local pockets of persistent unemployment and economic distress.

Our recent and continuing experience with our balance of payments is another factor stiffening resistance in the United States to further tariff reductions. Our large balance of payments deficits have revealed a qualification to one of our most persuasive arguments for trade liberalization: namely that trade is a two-way street, and if we import more we will export more. We have seen that, for a considerable time at least, foreigners can do other things with dollars than buy goods from us. This may seem an odd concern for a country that exports much more than it imports. But our problem is at the margin. Will our exports grow when our imports grow, or will increases in imports be unrequited? Our recent experience suggests that the linkage is much looser than we commonly said.

All this does not mean we have come to an end in the liberalization of U.S. trade policy. Some of the influences I have mentioned are temporary. We are recovering from our recent recession, and our balance of payments position is looking better. Improvement in these areas will weaken protectionist arguments. I think it is safe to say that the European economic community will find enough in the offers of tariffis reductions by the United States in GATT, especially when our offers are considered together, as they should be, with the concessions offered by Great Britain and others, to justify making permanent EEC's temporary 20-percent reduction in its external tariffs.

Nevertheless, permanent and systemic influences are at work.

I think that there is a growing realization in the United States of a deficiency in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements procedure that is reducing enthusiasm for the program. The trouble lies with precisely that feature of the process that makes it appear so sweetly reasonable. We will consider every case on its merits, and make reductions in those cases where the gains exceed the losses. This is one of those instances where to consider every case on its merits is to disregard the merits of the case. For the arguments against tariff reduction are primarily arguments about particular cases whereas the arguments for tariff reduction are arguments about the tariff in general. To put the decision in the arena of particular cases is to stack the deck against reductions.

The revival of European competitiveness was helped into being by U.S. trade as well as aid policies. That same revival now gives the United States pause in its movement toward further trade liberalization. The same European recovery and modernization also created confidence that helped bring about the European Common Market. EEC discriminated against United States and other non-EEC trade, putting another stumbling block in the way of new U.S. trade liberalization. Although it was aware of these consequences—hopefully, short term—the United States strongly supported the establishment of the Common Market, and still does.

One industry whose position in world trade worries us increasingly is agriculture. The advanced countries of the temperate zone are coming to regard agriculture as a ceremonial institution, like the Beefeaters and ravens at the Tower of London, to be maintained at national expense. The Beefeaters and ravens at least attract tourist income, which redundant farmers do not. This situation is especially irksome to the United States because we believe that we are among the world's most efficient suppliers of many agricultural products and would export much more in a rationally organized world trading system.

We have fallen into the trap of exempting agriculture from the efficiency considerations that apply to other international trade. The United States had a big part in constructing this trap. We are also coming to recognize that we are among its chief victims. The picture is, of course, complicated by the three-price system under which American agriculture operates—the domestic price, the world price, and the development assistance price, which is effectively much lower than the world price. We have stimulated agricultural production by high support prices. At the same time we have limited production by controls, we have absorbed surpluses in Government-owned stocks and we have disposed of surpluses outside commercial markets at concessional terms. On balance, we would sell more in Europe than we do if markets at home and abroad were free. The European restrictions on imports cannot be justified as a necessary offset to U.S. subsidies.

Beyond this we should then seek a general cut by all countries that is in some sense "equivalent." The term "equivalent" in this context is exceedingly slippery. There is intuitive appeal in the ideas that those who have the highest tariffs should make the biggest cuts, or that all rates should be cut equally, or that all rates should be brought down to an equal level. Quite aside from the fact that these standards point in somewhat different directions, it is hard to define them precisely in a significant way.

An important and troublesome problem will be the treatment of agriculture. U.S. agricultural policy has been one of the main impediments to rationality in international commercial policy. I think you should know that U.S. policy in this respect is no longer frozen but is in a state of flux.

For one things, agrarian political authority is declining as the farm population shrinks and the redistricting of the voting population takes account of the shift. In 1929 a quarter of our population was on farms. In 1950, a sixth of our population was on farms, and by 1960 our farm families accounted for only an eighth of our total population.

For another thing, resistance has been rising to the cost of producing farm products in excesses that have to be impounded in Government stocks. Price support and production control programs cost us $1 billion in 1954, the first time that figure had been reached. The cost was $2 billion 2 years later, in 1956, was over $3 billion 1 year later, in 1957, where it has hovered for several years. It is expected to go up to about $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1962, just commenced. And, these vast and growing outlays have not solved the problems: farm products taken off the market by the Government from 1954 through 1960 totaled over $11 billion.

In view of these circumstances, a new search is on for a more rational U.S. farm policy. The search centers on a hunt for effective and acceptable controls over production. We regard this as an open situation in the United States, subject to radical improvement, even if the improvement takes, as it may, considerable time. On this basis, I

think, we can hope for a restoration of the principle of comparative advantage to an important place in agricultural trade. We regard the principle of comparative advantage as calling for a reduction of European barriers against U.S. farm products.

I shall refer to one more problem, without pretending to have exhausted the list. This is what is called the problem of import competition from extremely low-wage areas where advanced technoolgy is in use, such as Japan, Hong Kong, and perhaps India. The problem is that international trade has not adjusted to the existence of a strong comparative advantage in the production of particular items in particular areas. In the low-wage countries the average level of productivity is relatively quite low, but productivity in a few industries—textiles, cameras, transistor radios—may be nearly as high as the best in the world. There are several reasons for failure to adjust to such comparative advantages. The advantage has only recently developed in some cases. In other cases, it has only recently reemerged after the war. In many cases the adjustment has been postponed for a long time by quotas and tariffs. The problem is accentuated because some countries, and this includes the United States, have been much more liberal than others in accepting the products of these low-wage areas, with the result that the burden of adjustment is concentrated on them.

I think we cannot permanently refuse efficient producers access to our markets. The general prescription of gradualness in trade liberalization in the approach I am suggesting will ease the process of adjustment. Also if, as I suggest, trade barriers are reduced by all the members of the area the burden of adjustment will be broadly distributed and less serious for any one country. Perhaps in particular cases further measures will be temporarily needed to moderate the adjustment process. Whether this is so should be the subject of international consultation, since it is all too easy for each party to discover the need for its own protection.

Tariff Could Stimulate More Shrimp Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives held a hearing on various bills, including my own H.R. 6424, which would impose a 35 percent ad valorem duty on processed shrimp and limit duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimp annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimp in 1960. Because enactment of this legislation would preserve the domestic shrimp industry and open the door to expansion of Alaska's infant shrimp industry and because I am a sponsor of this legislation, I joined other witnesses in testifying in its support.

Most people are not aware of the vast shrimp potential of the States of the Pacific Northwest. Yet, off the coasts of California, Oregon, Washington—and most particularly, Alaska—there exists a potential production which can equal or excel the production of the Gulf and South Atlantic States. With an adequate market, Alaska's vast shrimp production capability, estimated at 100 million pounds annually, would someday be realized. Hence, it is not surprising that Alaskans take issue with those who oppose appropriate limitations on the import of foreign shrimp.

Accordingly, for the information of my colleagues, I submit a cogent editorial which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times, and urge support of the legislation in question. The editorial follows:

TARIFF COULD STIMULATE MORE SHRIMP FISHING

Alaska's budding shrimp industry faces a bleak future if the trend in imports is allowed to continue.

The U.S. Tariff Commission apparently doesn't care. It has reported to Congress that Alaska shrimp are small in size and suitable only for canning. There is reason to believe that the commission was wrong on both counts.

Alaskans should care because shrimp resources in the coastal waters of the State have been reported tremendous.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has supported this view in reports on explorations in central Alaska, around Kodiak Island, and along the Pacific side of the Alaska Peninsula. Russian fishermen have noted the big shrimp resource in the Bering Sea. Japan is actively fishing for shrimp there. There are also shrimp in Prince William Sound and southeastern Alaska.

The Tariff Commission has taken a stand unfavorable to a quota system to protect the U.S. market from foreign imports. It has contended that a limitation would preclude development of shrimp processing for lack of adequate supplies of raw shrimp.

Without a quota, there is reason to fear that foreign imports will swamp the U.S. market with ruinous results to all American fishermen.

The domestic market has tripled since shrimp were declared duty free in 1930. In that period, domestic production has increased some, but not as rapidly as imports. Foreign nations supplied 1.8 percent of U.S. market requirements in 1931, 36 percent in 1957 and an estimated 50 percent in 1959. The number of foreign suppliers increased from 10 countries to 30, and is still rising.

Proponents of the shrimp tariff and quota bill contend that they seek a sound basis for future development. They say it will assure a stable market that will benefit both domestic and foreign suppliers.

Alaska could capture a commanding position in an important industry if her shrimp resources were developed.

Shrimp is now the most valuable seafood caught by U.S. fishermen. Operations in Alaska could produce values in excess of those in the salmon industry.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has published reports showing Alaska shrimp are plentiful and that they "tempt and tantalize the palate of the average man as well as the gourmet." Nowhere has the service corroborated the statement of the Tariff Commission that they are suitable only for canning.

Those engaged in shrimp processing and marketing have told Congress that the potential for shrimp production in Alaska "is substantially larger in pounds than the entire domestic shrimp landings in the Gulf and Atlantic fisheries combined." The Alaska catch rates and potential have been termed unequaled anywhere in the world.

Alaskans constantly talk about broadening the base for their fishing industry. They chronicle the great resources and point to the potentials. Development of the shrimp industry has just begun.

Without tariff restrictions, Alaska shrimp will be pushed out of the market by shrimp processed in India where labor is paid from 31 to 63 cents a day, and from other countries where labor rates are low.

It would be well for the fishery leaders and State officials to make themselves heard on this point. The legislation in Congress should not be allowed to die because the Tariff Commission has erred.

Central Intelligence Agency: A Guardian of the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the September issue of Firing Line, published by the American Legion, contains an article entitled "Central Intelligence Agency: A Guardian of Our National Security." The Central Intelligence Agency is an organization of which little is really known; but from what I know of it, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and through my personal contact with many members of that Agency, I believe it has rendered outstanding service for the United States.

I have for 30 years known Allen Dulles, Director of the CIA, who occasionally comes under strong criticism. If something happens to go wrong, the blame is often placed upon him, as it was in the case of the Cuban invasion fiasco. From what I know of that action, I do not believe the blame belongs on his shoulders. However, he is a man who never says anything to defend himself. For that reason, he is apt to bear a large amount of unjust criticism. I rate him a brave, dedicated, and brilliant American with a long record of distinguished service to the United States.

The article about the Central Intelligence Agency, published in Firing Line, gives an excellent appraisal of that organization. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY: A GUARDIAN OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

A strategic bulwark in the United States life and death struggle against the increasing imperialistic threat of international Soviet communism is the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Established in 1947 under the provisions of the National Security Act as a successor of the Central Intelligence Group, the CIA is primarily responsible for coordinating the intelligence activities of certain Federal departments and agencies in the interest of protecting the security of the Nation. Among its other important duties, CIA is charged with correlating and evaluating intelligence "relating to the national security, and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Govern-

ment." Functioning in both its Washington, D.C., headquarters and in numerous farflung oversea areas, the CIA operates under the direct supervision of the National Security Council, a top-echelon Presidential advisory group.

Unlike other Government administrators, the Director of CIA has been personally vested by Congress with wide autonomous authority in managing the affairs of his organization. While the CIA is authorized by law to have access (under certain limitations) to all intelligence in the possession of the Government, it is significant to note that the Agency has no police, subpena, law-enforcement powers, or internal security functions. Due to the extremely sensitive nature of CIA's mission, reports regarding its operations and other activities are never disclosed to the American public for obvious security reasons. An article appearing in the July 9, 1961, edition of the New York Times reported that CIA does not "confirm or deny published reports," whether accurate or inaccurate, favorable or unfavorable; "never alibis; never explains its organization; never identifies its personnel" (with certain minor exceptions); and may not under the law publicly discuss its budget, its methods of operations, or its sources of information. The news report revealed that although CIA's "activities are not subject to public inspection and review, the Agency is directly accountable to Presidential authority and control."

The American Legion has gone on record as a stanch supporter of the Central Intelligence Agency. In a strongly worded resolution adopted at its 42d national convention held in Miami Beach, Fla., in 1960, the Legion urged full continuation of the American intelligence effort in every particular deemed effective for the protection of our Nation, and expressed full confidence in the Central Intelligence Agency, for its foresight in providing for the protection of our Nation against surprise attack by our enemies. Within recent years, there has been an increasing intensified campaign on the part of the Soviet Government to discredit, and thereby, attempt to seriously weaken the effectiveness of the CIA. One of the numerous Soviet apparatuses intricately participating in the U.S.S.R.'s sinister anti-CIA campaign is the formidable Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti (Committee of State Security), commonly known by its corresponding initials, KGB. As the lineal descendant of the terroristic CHEKA, OGPU, NKVD, and MGB, the powerful Soviet KGB is mainly responsible for the development of espionage and counterintelligence operations throughout the world.

In a dramatic appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on June 2, 1961, CIA Assistant Director Richard Helms comprehensively outlined certain phases of the unrelenting Soviet propaganda attack against the United States and particularly the CIA. According to the scholarly presentation entitled "Communist Forgeries," the CIA official stated that the "Soviet propaganda campaign against the West grows daily more intense. It focuses on the United States, our Government, and our diplomatic, military, and intelligence services. Even before the U–2, but particularly afterwards, the Soviets began to train heavy artillery on the Director of Central Intelligence (Allen Welsh Dulles) and the CIA."

Mr. Helms disclosed that the Soviets have been utilizing so-called documentary frauds as a propaganda weapon in intensifying their cold war against the United States. The CIA official revealed that the domumentary fraud devices have consisted of various kinds, including: "The false news article, the forgery, the fabricated intelligence report, the distortion of a genuine document, and the false or true account attributed to a nonexistent organization." Interestingly, Assistant Director Helms testified that "the Russians have a long tradition in the art of forgery. * * * Long before 1957 the Communists were as skillful as the Nazis in the production and exploitation of forgeries." According to CIA evaluations, "each Soviet forgery is manufactured and spread according to a plan. Each is devised and timed to mesh with other techniques of psychological warfare in support of Soviet strategy." Mr. Helms stated that CIA analysis revealed the Soviets use the forgery device for three specific purposes, namely: (1) To discredit the West generally, and the United States and its Government specifically, in the eyes of the rest of the world. (2) To sow suspicion and discord among the Western allies. (3) To drive a wedge between the peoples of nonbloc countries and their governments by fostering the line that these governments do not represent their citizens because they are the puppets of the United States.

Commenting on the aforementioned points, the CIA witness testified that the "campaigns to sell these three themes to the world are planned by the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Staff units of the Party's Central Committee work out the details. If the plan includes forgeries, they are prepared by a Soviet or satellite intelligence service." In the course of the past 4 years, the Soviets have forged 32 documents designed to imitate communications ostensibly written by or to U.S. Government officials. Mr. David Lawrence, distinguished journalist, reported in his syndicated column appearing in the July 14, 1961, edition of the Evening Star (Washington, D.C.) that the "Soviet Union is looking forward to its biggest victory in the cold war—the possible disruption and disintegration of the CIA * * * which has for many years been a thorn in the side of international communism * * * Soviet agents look with satisfaction at the controversy they have helped to stir up in this country over the activities of the CIA. Long before the Cuban invasion episode focused attention on the CIA as a formidable opponent of Communist espionage, the effort has been underway to convince high officials of the American Government that the CIA should be split apart or weakened in its operations."

Mr. Lawrence frankly stated that the "Soviets do not, of course, work directly. They operate through intermediaries—two and three times removed * * *. Perhaps the boldest manifestation of the influences which are behind the scenes in the fight against the CIA is to be found in the demand that the Agency give an accounting to congressional committees not only of its expenditures but all of its activities."

In referring to the fact that many a hatchet job has been attempted indirectly by the Communists against J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, Mr. Lawrence stated that "now comes a bombardment of Allen Dulles, who has directed the CIA since 1953 * * *. As the attack on the CIA develops, there should be an opportunity to find out who is financing the spread of literature inside this country attacking this all-important Agency. For if the confidence of Congress in the CIA should be weakened—the main objective of the current campaign—the Kremlin will have won a big advantage in fighting the cold war. The Communist Party, U.S.A., has been candidly hostile in condemning the CIA in recent months through the media of its key publications, the Worker, People's World, and Political Affairs. Numerous other domestic subversive organs, including the National Guardian and the Militant (weekly newspaper of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party), also have been supporting the Soviet line in viciously attacking the CIA and its esteemed director. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, an extremely active Communist-front, has consistently smeared the CIA in its newsletter, Fair Play.

Marzani & Munsell, Inc., publishing house for the Liberty Prometheus Paperback Book Club, distributed free copies of its newly released 72-glossy-page booklet "Cuba Versus the CIA" to members and supporters of the aforementioned Fair Play for Cuba Committee in June 1961. "Cuba Versus the CIA," a thoroughly distorted attack against the Central Intelligence Agency, was written by Robert E. Light, an associate editor of the National Guardian and Carl Aldo Marzani, president of Liberty Prometheus Paperback Book Club. It is interesting to note that Marzani (alias Tony Whales), an identified Communist Party official, was indicted in 1947 after termination of his employment (in an intelligence capacity) by the U.S. Department of State. Marzani was subsequently convicted for falsely denying before Federal employment officers that he was a member of the Communist Party. Appearing before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1953 and the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1956, Marzani repeatedly invoked the fifth amendment to the Constitution when asked about membership and activities in the Communist movement.

THE NATION MAGAZINE EXCORIATES CIA

Perhaps one of the most malicious attacks to be launched against the CIA recently emanated from the Nation, a weekly journal published by the Nation Associates, Inc., 333 Sixth Avenue, New York City. According to the Fifth Report (1949) of the California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities, the Nation was characterized as having a long record as a liberal publication. The report stated that the Nation "cannot be described as Communist," but it is "so infiltrated with the Communist Party policy that * * * (it serves) * * * the interests of the Communists and * * * (confuses) * * * liberals on many issues, much more than do some of the Communist publications." Speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 4, 1951, Congressman George A. Dondero declared that the Nation "is knowingly serving the cause of communism" and remarked that information in his possession indicated that "under the guise of being a journal of liberal opinion, the Nation is in many respects a propaganda agent of the Kremlin, especially in the key field of foreign policy."

In its 10th report (1959), the aforementioned California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities disclosed that "there is little need for the Communist Party to finance propaganda publications when a magazine like the Nation * * * will attack the FBI, support the Communist fronts, editorialize sympathetically in behalf of witnesses that appear before legislative committees, and generally parrot the party line for nothing."

The following individuals are currently affiliated with the Nation: George G. Kirstein, publisher; Carey McWilliams, editor; Victor H. Bernstein, managing editor; Robert Hatch, books and the arts; Harold Clurman, theater; Maurice Grosser, art; M. L. Rosenthal, poetry; Lester Trimble, music; Alexander Werth, European correspondent; and Mary Simon, advertising manager. It is noteworthy that both Kirstein and McWilliams signed a petition to the 87th Congress in February 1961, calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. McWilliams, who has served in various editorial positions on the Nation since 1945, is an identified member of the Communist Party. A supporter of over 30 Communist-front enterprises, McWilliams was formerly an organizer of a lawyers unit of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. The previously mentioned 1959 California report revealed that McWilliams "has been listed as a member of practically every major Communist-front organization that ever existed."

Justin Gray, a former employee of the American Legion national organization, in collaboration with Victor H. Bernstein, now managing editor of the Nation, published a book in 1948 called "The Inside Story of the Legion," a scurrilous piece of yellow journalism. Fred J. Cook has been a frequent contributor to the Nation. Specializing in criticizing U.S. intelligence agencies and security procedures, Cook has previously concentrated his articles in the field of attacks against Federal court convictions of Alger Hiss, and a Soviet agent, William Walter Remington (now deceased); and has written a whole special issue of the Nation on the FBI and one on the CIA. Cook's broadside attack against the CIA appeared in the entire June 24, 1961 issue of the Nation. Ironically characterized by Editor McWilliams as an "astute craftsman," Cook attacked the CIA by utilizing a mixture of distortions, innuendoes, half-truths, and statements merely based on suppositions. The thread which has run through the Nation, particularly in recent years, since McWilliams became editor, is the thread of vicious and highly biased attacks against those organizations which have been most damaging to the Communist movement, namely, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

A PRESIDENTIAL TRIBUTE TO CIA

Speaking on the occasion of the cornerstone laying at the Central Intelligence Agency's new headquarters building at Langley, Va., in November 1959, President Eisenhower declared that "by its very nature the work of this Agency demands of its members the highest order of dedication, ability, trustworthiness, and selflessness—to say nothing of the finest type of courage, whenever needed. Success cannot be advertised: failure cannot be explained. In the work of intelligence, heroes are undecorated and unsung, often even among their own fraternity. Their inspiration is rooted in patriotism—their reward can be little except the conviction that they are performing a unique and indispensable service for their country, and the knowledge that America needs and appreciates their efforts. I assure you this is indeed true. The reputation of * * * (the CIA) * * * for quality and excellence under the leadership of your Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, is a proud one."

The Honorable Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to join with our many colleagues who have spoken in praise of our distinguished colleague, GENE KEOGH. I extend to him my best wishes on the joyful occasion of his birthday and my hearty congratulations upon the observance of his silver anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Congressman KEOGH has achieved an enviable record of service in the House of Representatives. The people of the Ninth District of New York are fortunate in having such an able and conscientious Representative in Congress; our Nation has benefited by his ability and dedicated service. I have enjoyed my friendship and many years of association with him.

I wish for him and his family many more years of continued happiness, good health, and all the best things which this life can afford.

The John Birch Society Is a Threat to Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an article entitled "The John Birch Society Is a Threat to Whom?" by Dr. S. M. Draskovich.

Dr. Draskovich, a native of Yugoslavia who migrated to the United States soon after the Second World War, has intimate knowledge of Communist ruthlessness. His father, Milorad Draskovich, was assassinated for having had the Communist Party outlawed in Yugoslavia in 1920—at that time his father was a Cabinet Minister in the Yugoslav Government—and in 1944 his brother and brother-in-law were killed by the Communists.

An outstanding scholar, Dr. Draskovich has written "Tito: Moscow's Trojan Horse," a book published in 1957 by Henry Regnery Co., the thesis of which is that the break between Marshal Tito and Moscow was a complete fake and that Tito is still a trusted agent of the international Communist conspiracy.

On several occasions Dr. Draskovich has testified before committees of the Congress, and many of his articles have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His article "The John Birch Society Is a Threat to Whom?" is one which I believe every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE JOHN BURCH SOCIETY IS A THREAT TO WHOM?

(By Dr. S. M. Draskovich)

A few weeks ago, as if an invisible hand had pushed a button of prefabricated public opinion, the liberal press in the United States opened a concerted barrage of attacks, admonitions, and warnings against a dangerous enemy. Our public opinion-makers, the experts who think for us and make decisions for us and tell us what to like and what to dislike, were up in arms. Our country was in mortal danger, our rights and liberties jeopardized, our institutions were being undermined; there was ground for the greatest concern and alarm. Forces were at work to deprive you and me and every American of all his earthly possessions earned by the toil and sweat and struggle of our forefathers and guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

THE LIBERALS ARE WORRIED—WHY?

The superliberals, superdemocrats, superhumanists were very angry. There was no time to lose. For weeks the newspapers were filled with reports about the terrible threat, speeches were made in the U.S. Congress, a former Vice President was interviewed, and our Attorney General looked into the matter and considered an investigation of the horrible (potential) subversives.

Now, what had caused the ire and righteous anger of our hidden political persuaders? Were they alarmed at the shocking handling of the Laos situation? Were they shocked at the U.S.S.R. launching a man into space before us? Were they shocked at the way we, with an incredible lack of responsibility, are fostering the movement for "independence" of new nations, totally unaware of the Communist machinations behind it which are making those movements tools for the spread of communism? Were they shocked by the abortive revolt in Cuba?

Are the Liberals worried because recent events have filled the American cup of bitter disappointment, humiliation, appeasement, containment, surrender, and shame to the brim?

Have the lofty liberals suddenly had enough of all the policy of weakness, retreat, and disaster of the last 8 years when:

The Vice President of the United States was insulted, spat upon and stoned during his trip through Latin America, while the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the State Department were blissfully ignorant of the conditions there;

President Eisenhower was unable to defend the American way of life from the attacks of the Soviet Marshal Zhukov, who "left me breathless" arguing that communism was better;

The Pentagon organized a scientific study of surrender of the United States in case of war;

Our Government handed on a platter the greatest possible political victory to Moscow and world communism by inviting the ruthless Communist murderer and criminal, Nikita Khrushchev, to our shores;

Our own U.S. Government confirmed—in a move of self-debasement and guilt and an admission unique in 6,000 years of recorded history—that we were practicing espionage against the Soviet Union;

Communist-led Japanese mobs prevented the President of the freest and mightiest country on earth from visiting Japan and thus inflicted on the United States a shattering loss of face throughout Asia and the world?

Or was it that our superhumanists, superliberals and superdemocrats were worried because we were suicidally continuing and increasing our aid to Tito, the most useful agent world communism ever had;

Or because we forbade our highest ranking soldiers to do their duty by warning the Nation against Communist machinations and deceit;

Or because Tito—in open contempt for Uncle Sam—was undertaking expensive trips in Africa to spread communism with U.S. dollars;

Or because the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee—probably deeming that we had not helped communism enough—approved a bill permitting increased financial and economic assistance to Communist-ruled nations;

Or because the U.S. Government recently decided to remove all barriers for the Communists to flood the United States with their propaganda literature;

Or because the world is increasingly asking itself whether the United States is really fighting Communist imperialism or helping communism and facilitating the Communist drive for world conquest;

Or because we have displayed in the case of Laos a shocking lack of wisdom, foresight, intelligence, and virility;

Or because world communism has established a beachhead 90 miles from our shores;

Or because our handling of the Cuban invasion of April 1961 has given ample material to Communist propaganda to blast the United States before the whole world as aggressors, bunglers, and weaklings;

Or because we are going from defeat to defeat, and our prestige in the world is reaching new lows as a consequence of our indecision, vacillation, and appeasement?

Is that why the public-opinion makers of the press, television, radio, and other media are so mortally worried? Is that why their ire and indignation have been so mightily aroused?

No, no, and no. Not at all.

The great danger to our United States, its institutions, people, principles, and future is—the John Birch Society.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IS THE THREAT

And what is the John Birch Society?

To believe the slanderers and character-assassins of long standing, it is a semi-secret, monolithic, authoritarian, totalitarian, ultrareactionary, Fascist, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-American and, oh, yes pro-Communist organization. It is allegedly outdoing Senator Joe McCarthy in its witch hunting and represents an even greater threat to the United States than the late Senator from Wisconsin. It intends to turn the United States into a Fascist hell. It is thus evident that the John Birch Society is helping communism.

However, the slanderers themselves do not believe their own stupid and base inventions. They are lying and deceiving the public, deceiving the American people about whose welfare they are so terribly concerned. For any person with even only an ounce of honesty and intelligence can very easily find out that:

The John Birch Society is not a secret, or even semisecret, organization, but an organization which works above board in every respect, calling a spade a spade and openly telling the world what it wants and is striving to achieve;

The John Birch Society, being thoroughly and unconditionally American, is against any and all discrimination based on creed, race, color, or national origin;

The John Birch Society, being thoroughly American, is striving to rally Americans of any creed, color, racial, and national origin to the defense of our greatest common good—the United States of America—against all foreign and domestic enemies;

The John Birch Society is not trying to destroy, but to restore, the basic principles of the U.S. Constitution:

The John Birch Society is most strongly and stanchly against communism and the Communists not only in its intents, but in its actions and effective work.

Then why the hysterical outburst of venom, the hypocritically indignant outcry? Why the vicious witch hunting against the John Birch Society and its founder, Robert Welch?

Why? Precisely because of what they are and what they are trying to do. The John Birch Society is hitting the Communists and their helpers hard, very hard. That must be stopped, because it goes deeply and irreconcilably against the policy of appeasement, containment, weakness, coexistence, peace at any price, unilateral nuclear disarmament, and surrender, which has been practiced so long and on which the strength and influence of the Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Geneva, Camp David, and Cuba "experts" have been based.

Obviously, the gulf between the John Birch Society and the "experts" is too big to be bridged. The "experts" feel that with our moral and political positions crumbling in the whole world and the Communists winning everywhere, everything is going fine. So anybody who is disturbing the march of communism and trying to prevent the downfall of the United States should be indicted and immediately sentenced as subversive, unpatriotic, dangerous, ultraconservative Fascists—and made inoffensive.

The position of the John Birch Society is the opposite. Its founder, its members, and its many friends feel that the present course is a course of disaster and that all the best energies of the American people should be mobilized to reverse that course, remove the incompetent, stop the traitors, and bring about a rule of responsibility, honesty, firmness, and patriotic dedication in this country.

The basic fact which explains the creation and rise of the John Birch Society is that the American people are sick and tired of defeatism, humiliation, incompetence, surrender, and treason.

The history and rise of the John Birch Society is the history of the revolted, misinformed, deceived, abused, angry American.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE SICK AND TIRED OF—

The American people are sick and tired of irresponsibility, of shocking indifference and moral callousness, of incompetence in high places, and permanent and unchangeable poor judgment concerning the task and responsibilities of the United States.

They are sick and tired of hearing all the time, while the United States is going down and losing all the battles of the cold war, that nobody is responsible, that nothing could be done, that nobody is guilty, that responsible people who acted irresponsibly are not to be blamed or taken to task or tried before the court of U.S. public opinion.

They are sick and tired of hearing all the time that in every important case and question involving the vital interests of the United States, there was nobody to take care of them, or that there was simply an "error of judgment," or that the disastrous course of our national affairs and the catastrophic deterioration of our positions in the world could not be prevented.

The American people are sick and tired of the policy of the double standard, always used against the national interests of the United States, and in favor of its mortal enemies—who never tire of proclaiming their deepest contempt for all the achievements and institutions of the United States and the principles upon which it was built.

They are sick and tired of the perverting of all our traditions, principles, ideals, and standards, leading us to believe that the mortal enemies of the United States are in Little Rock, but never permitting us to recognize any mortal enemy of America in Moscow or Peiping.

They are sick and tired of the dishonesty and duplicity of our liberals who are deeply upset and hysterically alarmed whenever anybody defends the United States or endeavors to alert his fellow Americans to stop the treasonable machinations of the Communists and their helpers, but who are perfectly serene and indifferent when the Communists and their helpers are destroying America by destroying its political positions, moral fiber, principles, beliefs, and foundations.

The American people are sick and tired of the shamelessness of our one-worlders who are always deeply concerned about the fate of the world and mankind, but who never give the slightest thought to the fate and future of the United States.

They are sick and tired of being told that the march of mankind always somehow works in favor of the Communists and necessarily against our own U.S. national interests.

They are—in one word—sick and tired of being told from high places that the policy of weakness, appeasement, and surrender is the only possible U.S. policy and that the final defeat of the United States—through the erosion of its morale, the confusion of its mind, and the progressing paralysis of its will to fight and survive—is unavoidable.

And being sick and tired, the American people are no longer willing to be told to shut up and leave it to the "experts." They are asking questions, more and more, which they want answered. And these answers must be in favor of, not against, the national interests of the United States.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT THE RAMPARTS OF OF THE UNITED STATES TO BE WATCHED

What is at stake is the basic principle of free society, of the United States, of our American way of life; it is the basic principle of any civilized society—the principle of public responsibility. If our ramparts are being watched, then we cannot be going down all the time. If, however, we are going down all the time, it obviously means that our ramparts are not being watched. And the American people can no longer tolerate that situation. If they pay taxes, fulfill their obligations, go to war and give their lives for their country, and if they elect their representatives to run the country for the common good, they expect those representatives to do their duty and watch the ramparts of the United States of America.

That is what the John Birch Society is all about. And that is why the hidden opinion-makers are so worried. If the John Birch Society were a narrow sect, Fascist, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, reactionary, etc., the "experts" would not give it a second thought. But the John Birch Society is neither led by nor composed of crackpots; it is not a sect of reactionary extremists, trembling over its vested interests.

No, the John Birch Society is much, much bigger. It doesn't speak for a small, exclusive group. Its "vested interests" are those of the United States. It expresses and echoes the feelings and disappointments and frustrations and hopes and dreams and will of the American people. That is why the super-democrats, super-liberals, super-humanists, the surrenderers (from Yalta to Cuba and Laos), the one-worlders are so concerned and alarmed. They feel that they can no longer "carry on as usual," as during World War II and after World War II, and step unhindered from defeat to defeat and from surrender to surrender.

In World War II and the Korean war over 300,000 Americans were killed and many thousands more were wounded and mutilated. For what? For freedom, for the good of the American people, for a better future and a better world? No. For the spread of communism, which enslaved 300 million more people and is advancing constantly and being helped and financed by the United States.

This basic, incredibly shocking, nightmarish situation will not go away because of any Liberal, antifascist or progressive witch-hunting of patriots, or the shameless anti-anticommunism of our super-humanists, or their intimidation, character-assassination, and wild accusations against anybody who dares ask questions and insist on answers.

Our hidden political persuaders; our "experts"; the masters of our minds, will, fate, and future would like us to be just nice boys and girls, read their newspapers and magazines, watch their TV programs, listen to their radio broadcasts, attend to our own private business, and leave it to them to make all the decisions for us and carry the United States to its grave for Nikita Khrushchev.

But it is later than they think. The era of silence for the American people is over. The American people are not feebleminded; they are not a bunch of minors who need liberal guidance and one-world nurses to do everything for them. The American people are mature enough to take their affairs in their own hands. And they mean to do so.

And for that purpose they are going to turn the tables on their muzzlers, their silencers, their hidden conditioners and persuaders. They want the public servants to be the servants of the people, not their masters.

The John Birch Society stands with nothing to lose and everything to win by an investigation of its aims, program, and methods. Not so, however, our Yalta-to-Cuba experts, who stand with everything to lose if the American people learn the full truth about their nefarious role and influence in our foreign policy.

The great threat to these experts is not merely Robert Welch or the John Birch Society or its members. The threat is the American people, who want to know why they are being led from defeat to defeat, who want to make an end to the policy of surrender and disaster, and who want to become not Communist slaves, but masters of their own destiny, as the Lord meant them to be.

The John Birch Society is a threat indeed. It jeopardizes the survival of those who threaten the survival of the United States of America.

Judge Learned Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the legal profession and the Nation were greatly saddened to learn of the recent passing of the outstanding and most distinguished jurist, Judge Learned Hand of New York, one of the great legal minds that the free world has known.

Judge Hand served in the Federal judiciary since 1909 when he was appointed by the late President William Howard Taft, a period of service longer than that of any other Federal judge in the history of the Nation.

Educated at Harvard and dedicated from early youth to the study and application of law in a dynamic, advancing, social and economic system, Judge Hand's career has hardly ever been equaled.

His numerous legal opinions were so cogent, incisive, and outstanding for their clarity, legal substance, and practical commonsense that he was long recognized by lawyers and in judicial circles as "the 10th member of the Supreme Court."

Why he was never selected for that august and distinguished body is certainly a matter of serious speculation, because his great ability, legal training, and many epochal decisions marked him not only as an untiring student, penetrating mind, and keen, gifted appraiser of legal problems but also as a great political and social philosopher.

During his 42 years on the bench he wrote 2,000 opinions, many of which were literary gems as well as accurate legal treatises and decisions. He interpreted the Constitution the way it should be interpreted, as an instrument for protecting the rights of man and reenforcing the free system under which America progressed.

This philosophy was based on an abiding patriotic fervor and a profound religious spirit which was typified by understanding, tolerance, and fair dealing.

In one classical opinion he wrote some memorable words, which are well worth recounting in these days of turmoil, materialism, and challenge to free institutions:

> The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago taught mankind a lesson that it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

Judge Hand was not the only distinguished judge in his family. His brother, Federal Judge Augustus N. Hand, was another celebrated jurist who served for many years as a contemporary of Judge Learned Hand in the Federal Southern District Court of New York; also an outstanding judge noted for his scholarship, ability, devotion to the rule of law, and dedicated to lofty American principles.

The Nation can ill afford to lose such great jurists as Learned and Augustus Hand, but those charged with the appointment of our judges, can take inspiration from their illustrious service and the high standards they set by seeking for the Federal bench men who meet the promise of their high qualifications, their selfless zeal, and their patriotism. The Nation and the legal world will long gratefully remember the outstanding service of Learned Hand and his distinguished brother, Augustus Hand. They will go down in the history of American jurisprudence as among our very best judges.

May the good Lord bring them eternal peace in their heavenly home.

The Kaiser Center: A Beacon to U.S. Industrialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the impressive Kaiser Center located in the Seventh California District, which I have the privilege to represent. This center, rising majestically 28 stories above Lake Merritt in Oakland, is an outstanding landmark in this city of 367,000 people.

It is more than a city landmark, however; it is as the Christian Science Monitor in a recent article so fittingly put it, "A majestic monument to the genius of the eminent industrialist"—Henry J. Kaiser.

I am sure that my colleagues will find the Monitor's article on the construction of this notable building interesting, and I commend it to their attention:

KAISER CENTER: A BEACON TO U.S. INDUSTRIALIST—CALIFORNIA BUILDING RISES 28 STORIES

(By John R. Churchill)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Henry J. Kaiser is one of the outstanding American examples of a self-made industrialist. The Kaiser Center, built on the edge of Lake Merritt in downtown Oakland, Calif., is a majestic monument to the genius of the eminent industrialist.

The building, rising 28 stories and with 3 basement levels below ground, is a milestone in the history of Oakland and a beacon in the career of an American boy who at the age of 13 worked for $1.50 a week to help support his mother.

It was back in New York State that Mr. Kaiser got his start. His perserverance, ingenuity, and faith made it possible for him to become the head of an industrial empire with assests of nearly $2 billion.

More than 60 percent of the center's 7-acre site has been landscaped. Shrubbery, lawns, and decorative ground-fill gardens are used extensively. Annuals and bulbs are changed frequently to gain the colors of seasonal planting.

A great portion of this landscaping is the roofgarden atop the adjoining garage. This makes a soft pleasant view from the office building above and is not tiring to the eye.

STARTED IN 1955

The adjacent garage, connected to the office building by a second-story covered walkway, is a 5-level structure with a capacity of 1,200 cars at one time, or 5,000 cars a day.

The White House Department Store occupies a three-story structure on the entire 20th Street frontage of the center. It is a showplace for fashion-minded shoppers. "We've worked hard to make this the most beautiful store in America," says Reginal H. Biggs, president of the White House.

In 1955, Mr. Kaiser realized that his enterprises were getting so numerous in the United States and abroad, that it would be necessary to assemble them in one place.

On the banks of Lake Merritt stood several old buildings. One of them, a 7-acre city block bounded by 20th, 21st, and Webster Streets and Lakeside Drive, was built in 1868. This he purchased.

Workmen moved into the three-story building the last week in January 1955, and like a crew of lumberjacks began cutting away the huge timbers weakening the structure until the 80-year-old building toppled over and was cleared away. Trees were uprooted and hauled off and excavations for this new huge showcase building started on August 8, 1957.

The big job was undertaken. A hole had to be dug 420 feet long, 90 feet wide, and 40 feet deep. To make this hole 130,000 yards of dirt and rock had to be dug out and removed, but first piling had to be driven to hold back the water from the lake across the street while the foundation was built. Some people said it couldn't be done, but like other Kaiser jobs, it was accomplished with dispatch.

STEEL AND CONCRETE

With the hole completed, forms were built into which a 5-foot-thick slab of concrete could be poured on which this great building was to be built. A steady stream of concrete poured into the form day and night after the ironworkers had placed more than 1,500 tons of reinforcing steel, until the forms were filled.

An approximate 11,500 cubic yards of concrete were used which, when completed, measured 420 feet long, 62 feet wide, and 5 feet thick.

Altogether 236 contractors and subcontractors were involved in the design, construc-

tion, and furnishing of the center. Miles of telephone wire were installed to accommodate the switchboard for the building.

An approximate 2 million pounds of aluminum were used in the form of wire, electrical conduits, curtain wall system, doors, walls, interior trim, ceilings, and so on, and the latest light fixtures. In fact, if the aluminum had been made into a 12-inch roll of aluminum foil, it could reach around the world with several thousand miles to spare.

Enough electricity is used to care for the needs of a city of 20,000.

ALUMINUM ACCENTED

The largest single application of aluminum is in the 28-story office building's exterior front and rear walls. More than 1,230,000 pounds of aluminum sheets and extrusions were used, much of this as decorative gold and gray anodized aluminum alloy panels set in anodized natural finished aluminum framing.

To the average passerby the building did not really take form until the curtain wall went up. This is the inner as well as the outer facing of the building—the outside skin anchored to its frame after the steelwork is in place.

More than 6 miles of aluminum window frames—5,000 in all—were set in place. Six of these were combined to form a "bay." Fourteen bays were required to cover each floor at the front of the building.

An unusual feature about the Kaiser Center building is its gentle and graceful curvature. The curtain wall, independent of the steel frame, trues up the structure and gives it its accurate outline. For this reason the aluminum used in the facing put on by the Spandrel Co. was rolled in an arc, calling for exacting work by Kawneer Co. craftsmen. The job was done in an elapsed time of 4½ months.

Labor Day Broadcast by AFL–CIO President George Meany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, any remarks or address made by President George Meany of the AFL–CIO are worthy of deep consideration, for George Meany is not only a great American, a man of deep faith, but in the ranks of labor, he is a sound and constructive leader.

On Labor Day, September 4, 1961, President Meany delivered an able and forward-looking address over the National Broadcasting Co. network, which address I herewith include in my remarks:

SPECIAL LABOR DAY BROADCAST BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

Good evening. Let me begin with the wish that all of you have enjoyed a safe and happy weekend, and that your holiday will continue to be so in the hours that remain.

One of the tragic ironies of our time is that the leisure we have won for ourselves, especially the long weekends in summer, should bring injury and pain and death to so many men, women, and children.

Yet we know that this is not necessarily so. We know that we have it within our power to cut down the death toll of the holiday weekends. And in the same way, we have it within our power to bring about a better and safer life in other respects.

Let's look at our national life—the well-being of our people as a whole—as it stands on this Labor Day.

Since this is a domestic holiday, one that is, especially our own, I want to talk about the internal, rather than the external, problems facing our country.

Just a year ago, in another Labor Day broadcast, I referred specifically to a number of those problems. I spoke about depressed areas; about slums; about the inadequacy of the Federal wage-hour law; about the need for medical insurance for the aged under the social security system; about the shortcomings of our educational system; and about the persistent plague of racial discrimination.

Let's see where these problems stand today. I think you will agree that the record shows substantial progress.

An area redevelopment bill, closely in accord with our recommendations, has become law. Projects are being approved as fast as plans can be drawn up. While the depressed areas still remain, they can at last look to the future with some assurance of relief.

A new assault on slums—and on the Nation's housing needs generally—is assured by the enactment of the strongest Federal housing law in 12 years. Moreover, executive agencies, through administrative action, have wisely begun to reduce the interest rate on home mortgages and have otherwise encouraged new construction.

A much-improved minimum wage law, extending protection to several million additional workers and raising the wage ceiling to $1.25, officially takes effect today. We in the AFL–CIO take special pride that our unions—few of whose members have anything to gain, in a direct way, from this legislation—led the long fight to bring a greater measure of justice to workers who are most in need of Federal safeguards.

While no civil rights legislation has been adopted, the administration has stepped up efforts to wipe out discrimination in Government and on Government contracts, and has pressed the enforcement of voting rights for all citizens. Further actions have been promised within the framework of present laws. Also, congressional hearings are scheduled this fall on a genuine fair employment practices law.

Of the six problems I cited a year ago, only two have not been relieved at all. It can hardly be said that even these two have been neglected.

There is good reason to hope that medical care for the aged, under social security, will become a reality early next year. Aid for education, as you know, is currently enmeshed in an unfortunate and unnecessary legislative tangle; yet the will of a majority in Congress is clearly in favor of far-reaching Federal aid, and is bound to prevail before too many months have passed.

These six areas are by no means the whole record. Let me remind you of some other achievements.

A bill extending unemployment compensation benefits on a temporary basis was enacted early in the year. What may be more significant in the long run, the terms of this bill reflect a Federal responsibility in the financing of this program.

The social security pension system was somewhat strengthened, with a higher minimum benefit, easier eligibility, a provision for early retirement and benefits for the children of unemployed parents.

A long-delayed Federal program was established to eliminate pollution of our rivers and streams.

A greatly strengthened bill for the supervision of health, welfare, and pension funds is well on its way through the legislative mill and should become law.

A manpower development bill, covering such needs as retraining and relocation of workers, appears close to enactment.

In evluating these accomplishments, it is important for us to remember what the circumstances were last January.

Despite the election of an administration dedicated to progressive action on labor and social legislation, the liberal forces in the House of Representatives had been weakened. There were some who predicted, on a purely statistical basis, that there was less chance for progressive legislative than in the previous Congress.

However, this time the cause of progress had the forceful leadership of a progressive President, determined to carry out his campaign pledges. The key battle on the rules of the House—the fight to take control of the House Rules Committee out of the hands of a reactionary coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats—was won; and this paved the way for other victories, though each one was by a narrow margin.

Against this background, the first session of the 87th Congress must certainly be looked upon as a constructive one. We in the AFL–CIO can take justifiable pride that we supported all the positive measures I have mentioned. There were times when we seemed to be the only voice supporting the President, and his program, outside of the administration itself.

Unfortunately, the achievements I have listed have been overshadowed by the hard and painful fact of high-level unemployment. By every other index the recession is coming to an end and the Nation's economy is on its way back to health; yet unemployment has remained; month in and month out, at nearly 7 percent of the work force. As long as this is true, the recession will not be over.

Obviously, the legislation already adopted will create jobs, in due time. But we believe just as strongly as we did a year ago that more vigorous action is needed.

I am not suggesting that the administration has been indifferent to unemployment. It has accelerated the Federal highway program; speeded up farm support payments; arranged for advance payment of veterans' life insurance dividends and generally pushed forward the spending of funds already appropriated.

However, it has not done enough. Specifically, we feel it should have supported—and should now support—two measures that would bring swift and badly needed stimulation to employment.

One is the bill by Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, providing Federal aid to short-term public works programs that have already been fully planned, and which need only the help of Federal funds, on a share basis, to get underway. I am glad to see that President Kennedy has endorsed the principles and purposes of this bill, and will make it a part of his legislative program in 1962.

The second is a temporary forgiveness of the withholding tax on income, to the extent of $100 a taxpayer, in order to make additional purchasing power immediately available to millions of families—and thus stimulating employment of every kind.

We deeply regret the failure of the administration to support these steps early in its term, and of the Congress to enact them. If both these measures had been carried out last spring, I am confident that unemployment, by now, would be at a far more reasonable level.

The fight for more jobs will continue to be our No. 1 undertaking. That is the biggest item of unfinished business, not only for Congress, but for the Nation.

The great difference between this Labor Day and a year ago, when we look at our domestic affairs, is that at last we have

really begun to move again. It's true we have moved too slowly on some matters—much too slowly on the problem of unemployment. Yet the record as a whole has been encouraging. Congress has taken important steps toward social and economic progress. Many of the laws adopted this year will have far-reaching effects—beneficial effects—that are not yet being felt.

Above all, the obligation of the Federal Government to act on national problems has been reaffirmed and reestablished. Indifference and inaction have been replaced by determination and concern. I am sure we can look forward to more progress in the year ahead.

But we must all remember that progress is never automatic. As I pointed out earlier, the legislative balance is razor thin, especially in the House of Representatives. The reactionary coalition, though narrowly defeated in a number of contests, came out victorious in many others. The coalition is far from dead, as it has shown again in recent weeks.

We in the labor movement must play an ever more active role if our country is to keep on moving ahead; if the promising beginning America has made this year is to be followed by further advances, rather than a return to aimlessness and inertia.

It was far easier to point the way to action a year ago; a national election was impending, and labor's primary objective was to register, and to promote the candidates who shared our goals.

But if we are to bring our objectives within reach—if we are going to create the more perfect society, the more prosperous economy and the richer life we seek—we must work at it all the time, not just in national elections.

We must be alert to the issues; we must write to our legislators; we must be active in our communities, among our neighbors, spreading understanding of our program, and of the good it will do for all Americans.

If we do that, if we do our full job as citizens, day in and day out, then the future will be bright.

We have come a long way in 1 year. Personally, I did not fully realize the extent of the progress until I compiled the record for this broadcast. We have good reason to be encouraged.

But I want to emphasize again that there are no grounds for complacency. No American can be complacent when more than 5 million others are idle; when employment in many industries is shrinking under the impact of automation and technological change; when our school system is being strangled for lack of funds; when many of our aged are pauperized by medical bills; when full citizenship and full opportunity are denied to millions of Americans because of their race or creed.

Yet the contrast with last year is clear. We now have achievements as well as problems to point out; and we can look with reasonable hope toward the time when today's unfinished business will be tomorrow's accomplishment.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in recognizing EUGENE J. KEOGH's 25 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives and in saluting him on this double anniversary, for I understand today is his birthday.

One of the most pleasant experiences I have had since my election to Congress is knowing the gentleman from New York. I have found him to be a sound legislator, a wise counselor and an engaging personality. I am happy to extend my best wishes and congratulations to him upon this occasion.

Know Your Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, repeated discussions relative to the cold war, communism and freedom have dwelt upon the propaganda aspect. It is apparent to those of us who study matters closely that the Communists, through their international propaganda outlets, use every possible means to distort facts, to exaggerate their accomplishments, to smear our virtues, and downgrade our accomplishments. Certainly it would be well for the cause of freedom throughout the world if our U.S. Information Agency performed effectively, rather than negatively, as it does in its operations.

Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I noted a recent editorial in the Suburban Life, a semiweekly newspaper which serves the west suburban area of my district. On Thursday, August 31, their editorial page included a very sound and studious article entitled "Know Your Enemy," calling attention to the issue to which I refer. I ask leave to insert this editorial into the RECORD at this point:

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

"It is up to the United States to let the world know what it is doing in the cause for freedom rarther than wait until the Russians act and then criticize them."

Those were the words of Thomas Goss, a representative of the American Association, in a talk to the Brookfield Kiwanis Club. Goss reviewed the objectives of the United Nations and its aid to 1.5 billion people in their transition to self-government during the past 15 years.

Contrast Goss' statement with the following:

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist we cannot live in peace; in the end one or the other will triumph. A funeral dirge will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Those words were spoken by Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, later known as Lenin, a disciple of Karl Marx and the developer of modern day communism. His words are the creed of the Russian Communists.

The gist of Goss' talk was that the United States should beat the Russians to the punch. He urged that mankind must be willing to negotiate diffedences or face possible destruction, and he's right.

But the United States has repeatedly made offers to negotiate with the Russians. Khrushchev has made offers also but with a notable distinction.

Nikita offers peaceful coexistence, but only on Communist terms; that is compliance with Red ideas. He has banged his shoe at the United Nations, disgracefully snubbed former President Eisenhower, rattled his rockets and threatened us with annihilation. His actions follow Lenin's theories to the letter.

Make no mistake about it. Communism does work in certain places. It works in Russia and China because it is a better system than the populace knew before communism.

It is not better than what the Czechs, Poles, Lithuanians, and other peoples behind the Iron Curtain knew before communism. But those people are held in bondage by a small core of fanatic Communist Party members who rule by force and fear with the armed might of Russia behind them.

Communism is not a better system than what we in the United States know. The Reds are out to force it on us.

To forestall the Reds we must know what communism is. It must be brought out into the open and discussed intelligently. Communism should be dissected in the classrooms by competent teachers. Some schools have already made advances in this direction.

The U.S. populace recognizes communism as a menace, but what makes it work is not generally known. Only when we as a people know the evils of a totalitarian state will we be able to meet the Communists on a common ground and reject them.

Senator Johnston's Feat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial from the State newspaper of Tuesday, September 5, 1961. This editorial salutes my senior Senator, the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, for a brilliant article which appeared in the New York Times last Sunday. I, personally, congratulated my senior Senator on his magnificent effort, and I salute that effort again today. The article is as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSTON'S FEAT

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON should be commended for his able exposition of conditions in the South, and the background of these conditions.

His article appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, and was reprinted in part in the State on Monday. He was extended an invitation to submit the article only after charging that northern newspapers generally refused to lift the "paper curtain" and give objective news about the South.

New Yorkers of the integration-is-education school may well have been stung by the figures showing thousands of Negro children, whose parents have gone North, are being left behind to attend segregated schools. The Negro parents simply do not care to have their children exposed to conditions that exist in New York City schools, for example.

Senator JOHNSTON's article covered a large part of the range of the case for the South, and must have amazed many who read it

and who had been denied many of the basic facts about the history of the South, especially of its problems.

It is a remarkable breakthrough that the Senator has achieved.

Which Monument?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Septemper issue of the Illinois Agricultural Association Record contained this thoughtful comment on our moonshot, an editorial by John J. Lacey:

WHICH MONUMENT?

When Nikita Khrushchev's Berlin firecracker exploded, Washington bounced into fast and furious activity. We called up the Reserves, stepped up the draft, doubled our missile efforts, authorized the spending of billion on billion, and—incredible as it may seem—we resolved to put a man on the moon.

People won't object to defense spending; but some of the best scientific minds regard the space boondoggle as a piece of incredible folly.

The excuse given for the space trip is simply that we must get there ahead of the Russians for the sake of national prestige. We have thrown away a lot of that commodity lately, and now we must recover some of it by a spectacular stunt. The champion U.S. high diver, arguing with his Russian counterpart, says: "I can dive off the Washington Monument into a tank with only 6 feet of water."

If such a boast is foolhardy, the moon project is even worse. If nuclear war is so imminent, why isn't it urgently necessary to use every available Federal dollar to build bomb shelters for the 50 percent of us expected to survive the blast?

Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and a scholarly researcher if there ever was one, paid his respects to the moon project in a speech before the American Rocket Society last May.

Dr. Weinberg agreed with Fred Hoyle, an English astronomer, who insists that large-scale space research is not worth the money and manpower involved. He warned that to shield a man from radiation in space will require a ton of material. He added: "The idea of a man tramping around on the moon's surface without shielding for any extended time seems quite unlikely to me."

As to the cost, Dr. Wienberg seriously questioned the validity of the estimate of $20 to $40 billion. We were told that a billion dollars and 10 years of effort would put a nuclear plane in the sky, but we have spent the time and the money but have only words flying about. The space race, he said, is one event in what he termed "scientific Olympics," with only a vague "prestige" riding on the outcome.

As the Sphinx is a monument to an ancient Egyptian civilization, said that scientist, so the monuments to our age will be our scientific achievements. If we do not use extreme care in selecting our projects, some of them will be as useless to humanity as the Sphinx.

Dr. Weinberg said, "We should remember the experience of other civilizations. Those cultures that have devoted too much of their talent to monuments that had nothing to do with the real issues of human well-being have usually fallen on bad days.

"It is for us to learn well these lessons of history. We must not allow ourselves, by shortsighted seeking after fragile monuments, to be diverted from our real purpose, which is the enriching and broadening of human life."

Speaking for myself, I would hazard the guess that the United States would do more for humanity if it would spend one-tenth of the cost of a moon trip in finding cause and cure of the common cold.

JOHN J. LACEY.

L.B.J. Accents the Role of the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appeared in the Kansas City Star of August 24, 1961:

L.B.J. ACCENTS THE ROLE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

In the game of government, as in baseball, the good utility man is indispensable. After 7 months of the Kennedy era, it is clear that LYNDON B. JOHNSON is playing such a role. He has proved to be a versatile man in the field and at bat.

Indeed, we may regard the Johnson story as a continuation of the evolution of the vice presidency that began under President Eisenhower. Never again, we imagine, will a Vice President of the United States be referred to as "his superfluous majesty." Comedians will quietly lay to rest the countless old jokes about the vice presidency. We doubt that the humor will be missed.

Obviously, LYNDON JOHNSON has proved highly adaptable. Before he made the move to the executive branch, he was strictly the legislative man, and something of a law unto himself on Capitol Hill. Many Washington observers thought L.B.J. would find it most difficult to play in his new uniform.

But he has made the adjustment without breaking stride. It is difficult to estimate his influence as an adviser to Mr. Kennedy. But you cannot miss the significance of the President's frequent references to "the Vice President and I."

More openly, JOHNSON has been a highly useful personal representative of the President around the globe. The hurried but symbolically important trip to Berlin is a case in point. The skill of the political craftsman, which Richard Nixon once praised so warmly, has been a sound asset. In the Senate, although he was preoccupied with the duties of majority leader, the Texan did his homework on foreign affairs carefully. Like Nixon, he had the background for his new job.

In addition, the Vice President has worked effectively as chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. As head of the Space Council, he has a big assignment in this great program of cosmic adventure. Occasionally, we hear, JOHNSON drops by the Senate to preside at a session or two.

But Nixon was not tied to the senatorial gavel, nor is his successor. In effect, a period of 8 years has seen the development of the No. 2 job into a really top-level assignment. There is no question that you will continue to hear a great deal about LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON.

The Shovel To Bury Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HEISTAND. Mr. Speaker, we ofttimes have the feeling that we are unconsciously aiding the aims of the Communist conspiracy. Among us, as well, are those who purposely attempt to undermine our system and way of life.

Henry J. Taylor, whose columns maintain a high mark of consistency, pinpointed this danger in a recent column in the Los Angeles Times. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit Mr. Taylor's column to the attention of my colleagues.

(By Henry J. Taylor)

When Khrushchev said he would bury us, this man was crazy as a fox. We have the shovel. We are burying ourselves. If Khrushchev has any brains he will just do a Rip van Winkle and let us do the rest.

We are not fighting communism. We are promoting it—by political spending which punches hard at self-reliance, programs which aggressively make state dependents out of larger and larger parts of our population, tax laws which to a major degree nationalize property and wages, and by the veiled dive into welfare-state socialism which is, in fact, the over-all objective.

It is a matter of intent. And this is the intent. It is also the chassis of totalitarianism by any name, and any government in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate for it whatever.

When you think of socialism, think of the force content of the plan. That's the key. And socialism's only proven advantage is to the planners themselves. It is notorious as a politician's paradise. It guarantees the planners power by its bribes for votes; suports "the love of governing," as Voltaire defined political ambition; and suits its intellectual jockeys' cynical dream that they are the brains and we are the horses.

If we do not intend to create free and independent citizens, the United States has gone to a great deal of trouble and expense for nothing. This is what the Constitution intended and we depend on everybody to recognize the worth.

Our Constitution was not written to limit the people. The people can always change the Constitution. It was written to limit the politicians. This is why they so often have trouble with it. And today we are witnessing every dodge and ball trick to circle this defense in a mood, an intent, of conquest. Thus, regardless of cause, the great oath of office becomes nothing more estimable than a ceremony.

The future comes 1 day at a time. There is absolutely no guarantee we can indefinitely withstand internal totalitarian encroachments. Totalitarianism means adherence to a single will, not necessarily a soldier or personal tyrant. Just one man. Democracies shatter themselves by blindness to this. The truth is the only hope: We are being deliberately manipulated further and further into such control. This is the eel under the rock and we had better see it. For the facts are undisputable and the truth can stop it if the public grasps the facts.

Back-door spending of billions in foreign aid without congressional control, sweeping executive decrees having the effect of law without due process of law, multitudinous

powerful Government agencies which report only to the President, attacks on the trinity of checks-and-balances provided by the separation of Federal powers, the battle against the rights of the States—these are all symptoms of a deep malaise imposed on us.

Put into that malaise, as well, the systematic pressure for congressional votes by offers of public money for local projects, the juggling of judgeships and jobs, and nepotism, too, for that is being practiced, and the power steering accessories are thus added to the totalitarian chassis.

None of these activities is needed by America. They are needed only by the men who perform them. And all are as inappropriate as if our Constitution's model had been Hinkey Dink and Bathhouse John in the river wards of Chicago.

Khrushchev flexes. We have a tough battle on our hands not only because the Red enemy is fierce and powerful but because the enemy is invisible and everywhere. The only proper test of men in public life today is whether they have courage enough to fight self-interest of all kinds, beginning with their own.

Progressive Care Center in Winston-Salem, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem, N.C., has recently added a minimal or progressive care center which is unique in hospital management and treatment. It provides primarily for those individuals who are being prepared for operation or hospital care in the hospital itself, as well as those undergoing convalescence following discharge from the hospital. The entire facility has been most tastefully furnished and attractively decorated.

While admittedly this does not have complete adaptability to the Veterans' Administration medical system, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I am interested in seeing if this idea can be used in the Veterans' Administration medical system. The initial construction and daily operation costs are 50 percent or more below hospital construction and operation generally.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on this center from the August 16, 1961, issue of Hospitals—Journal of the American Hospital Association—as well as the April 1961 issue of Baptist's Topics which also describes the operation in some detail.

MINIMAL CARE UNIT LOWERS PATIENTS' BILLS, FREES ACUTE CARE BEDS

(By Robert Walker, administrative assistant, North Carolina Baptist Hospitals, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.)

A new minimal care unit at North Carolina Baptist Hospitals, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C., designed to reduce the cost to the patient and increase the number of beds needed for intensive care in the hospital itself, has been in operation since March. The new unit has 80 beds, and the cost per day ranges between $7 and $12 per room.

The decision to build the new unit came after the trustees of the hospital, anxious to reduce patient cost and still increase bed capacity, studied a patient survey that showed that on almost any day at least one patient in five, or sometimes one in four or even one in three, did not require full professional hospital care. When this was discovered, it was decided that the best way to accomplish the objective was to construct a facility large enough to provide for minimal care patients. The trustees also believed that the construction costs of $800,000 for the Progressive Care Center, as it was called, could be amortized over a 20-year period.

With these objectives in mind, the hospital administration began its preliminary planning. The hospital had available a building that could be converted into such a center. This was the former student nurses' residence, a five-story structure adjoining the hospital.

Converting this building would fulfill one of the requirements of the administrative and the medical staffs—that the patients be near their physicians and the hospital's treatment and diagnostic facilities. Since most of the medical staff members have their offices in the department of clinics in the hospital's main building, and all are on the faculty of the Bowman Gray School of Medicine of Wake Forest College, with which the hospital is affiliated, the nearness to physicians was no problem.

There remained to be determined what type of facility would best meet patients' needs, how it should be staffed and how it could carry out the requirement of trustees that it be self-supporting.

NONINSTITUTIONAL LOOK

It was decided to stay away as far as possible from any hint of institutionalism in planning rooms and furnishings. From this, it was only a step to contemporary furniture, wall-to-wall carpeting, Japanese grass cloth wall covering with silk imprinted murals, sofa beds, lounges on each floor, and a decor that suggested comfort bordering on luxury.

Architects came up with a plan that provided 80 rooms, each with private bath, telephone, and a remote-control television set. The plan also provided adequate lobbies, lounges, barbershop, beauty shop, recreation room, snack lounge, housekeeping areas, and other requirements. In addition, there was a nurses' station and dispensary, an examining room, and space for living quarters for physicians on emergency call, something the hospital looked upon as a bonus.

Air conditioned throughout with proper moisture control, efficiently lighted, served by elevators and completely fireproof, the building was, according to the contractors, constructed for "a century of service."

When the new center was completed, Baptist Hospital had a total of 530 beds instead of 450 because the 80 beds added by the Progressive Care Center released 80 beds in the hospital proper for the use of the acutely ill. This program, in fact, gave the hospital the equivalent of a sizable new wing at a cost of $10,000 per bed at a time when it costs more than twice as much per bed to build and equip a hospital.

Based on 75 percent occupancy, the 38,020 square foot facility can be amortized over a period of 20 years. Rates for rooms range from $7 to $12 a day, depending upon the size of the room.

The following rental schedule was established: 24 rooms at $7, 13 rooms at $8, 35 rooms at $9, 8 rooms at $12.

How do these compare with daily hospital charges? The least expensive ward bed is $13.50; semiprivate rooms are $18 to $18.50; and the most expensive private room is $26.

The main factor in the difference in cost is in the saving made possible in payroll. Although the hospital has 2.71 employees for each patient, the ratio in the center is three patients to one employee. In the center, of course, the patient takes his own medication, has his meals in the hospital's cafeteria and is not subject to hospital routine. If he requires a special diet, it is arranged by the physician with the dietary department and is served in the cafeteria.

Based on 68.75 percent occupancy and rent at $7 a day per room, which is the minimum charge, the income for the center would amount to $140,525 in a year's time.

Expenses were set up as follows:

	Annual cost
Nurses' station, 12 persons (24-hour coverage)	$29,040.00
Housekeeping at 27.4 cents a square foot	10,417.48
Maintenance at 67.2 cents a square foot	25,549.64
Laundry at 3 cents a piece	5,256.05
Administration, 2 persons	6,000.00
Total	76,263.17

This amounts to $3.80 per patient day and leaves $64,261.83, or $3.20 per patient day to be applied to mortgage payments.

FACILITIES FOR RELATIVES

Of the hospital's cases, 95 percent are referrals. Many of them are sent to the hospital for diagnosis from some distance, and often they are accompanied by a relative. It has sometimes been difficult for these persons to find a reasonably priced place near the hospital where they can stay. With this in mind, those who planned the center made arrangements for taking care of close relatives.

Each room in the center has sleeping space for an extra person. In rooms furnished with a double bed, the daily cost to the relative is $3. In rooms having an extra single bed, the added cost is $5. All except 24 of the rooms have the single beds as well as the patient's double bed.

The nursing station, just off the main lobby, is maintained on a 24-hour basis by a professional nurse, a licensed practical nurse, and an aid. Other personnel consist of five maids, a housekeeping supervisor and one porter. Maintenance is handled by the hospital's engineers. The registration desk, staffed all hours, is operated similarly to a hotel registration desk.

The hospital could have filled the new center with patients just as soon as it was completed, but this, of course, would not have been wise because this was a new venture in care of patients and it was essential that in the beginning haste be made slowly so that any problems which arose might be taken care of without inconvenience to patients. On the whole, however, everything has moved smoothly. All of the important problems had been anticipated and solved before they arose and the small ones were not difficult.

A strict and careful plan of operation was devised. It requires that a patient must have a history and physical examination done by his attending physician before his admittance, which is arranged by the physician.

No patient is admitted who is scheduled for surgery, except cases which the physician wishes to stay at the center for a period before moving to a general hospital bed for preparation for surgery. However, patients who are to have minor operative procedures and do not require preoperative and postoperative medication may use the center.

The whole matter of eligibility for admittance is covered in the following provisions: To be eligible, patients must be (1) transferred from Baptist Hospital for convalescence or (2) admitted for diagnostic studies or a therapeutic regimen not requiring intravenous drugs. They must be able to walk to meals—patients with fever or infection are not eligible for admission.

Patients are asked to be in the center by 3 p.m. so that any medication which is nec-

essary may be obtained before the pharmacy closes.

Certain drugs, including sedatives, are stocked and dispensed by the nurse in charge upon telephoned or written orders of the physician.

In the case of prescription drugs, the patient goes to the pharmacy in the hospital, gets his prescription filled, takes it to his room and uses it according to the physician's instructions just as he would if he were at home.

PATIENTS EXPRESS SATISFACTION

Since the center has been in service, the physicians, the hospital and the patients have found that it successfully achieves the purpose for which it was established. For example, there is the case of a resident of Martinsville, Va., 60 miles from Winston-Salem. She had been brought to the hospital in an ambulance, suffering from a low-grade infection and bronchitis, which had failed to yield to treatment 2 weeks before. She was admitted to the hospital and then on improvement was transferred to the Progressive Care Center. She was taking the medication which had been prescribed, was visited each day by her physician and was expecting to go home in a few days. She had been a patient at the hospital twice before, but was pleased that by staying in the center and handling much of her own care she was getting well at much less cost than had she been in a room in the full care area of the hospital.

Another patient who was pleased with the center had been referred to the hospital for treatment of a kidney ailment. She was having X-rays and numerous tests made and stayed at the center.

Also among the patients was a man who had been treated for duodenal ulcer in a hospital in his home area, 90 miles away. He had been on a special diet since that time. When he began to have difficulty again, he came to Baptist Hospital on referral. He had been a patient for several days and was told he would probably have to remain another week. He was getting his special diet at the cafeteria.

A physician reported that a patient who needed drugs to quiet her thyroid in preparation for surgery had occupied a room in the center for 10 days before the operation, taking the medication prescribed by the physician, walking to his office and the examining rooms and taking her meals in the hospital cafeteria. The day before surgery she entered the hospital and 3 days later she returned to the center for 2 days before going home. She spent 12 days in the center at a total cost of $84. For 3 days in the hospital, she spent $60. Her total room charges were $144, instead of the $300 she would have paid if she had stayed in the hospital itself for 15 days.

Another patient with migraine headaches came for diagnostic studies and treatment. She remained in the center at approximately half the cost of staying in the hospital.

The general philosophy of the center is to concentrate in one unit relatively well patients who require no complex care and give them the advantage of greatly reduced hospital care costs. It is a philosophy that works.

OUR NEW PROGRESSIVE CARE CENTER

This issue of the Topics presents the hospital's newest facility, the Progressive Care Center.

Just recently completed and opened, the center is designed to help solve the problem of growing costs of medical treatment and hospital care while, at the same time, providing the same high standard of service to patients that the hospital has given throughout its history. It operates on a basis of giving to patients who come for diagnosis and those who are convalescing from surgery or serious illness the care they need in attractive surroundings and permitting them to do for themselves services they are able to perform.

Thus, they are saved the cost of complete nursing care and other attention which is not necessary to their well-being. The hospital, in turn, is saved the expense of providing this care. The saving is passed on to the patient. For example, the hospital's greatest expense is in employment of personnel. It must employ 2.71 persons for each patient who receives full care. In the center, it can cut this cost greatly, for one person can take care of three patients.

In this way, the hospital is endeavoring to help its patients through a difficult time. Approximately 20 percent of them could benefit.

The center is the former student nurses' residence, completely renovated and transformed into 44,000 square feet of space devoted to the service of diagnostic and convalescent patients. The contractors say it is built for a century of service. Planned with an eye to both economy and beauty, it is colorful and comfortable. It also is an achievement in value received for money invested, for it not only provides room for 80 additional patients at an expenditure of less than $10,000 for each patient. It, too, at a time of critical shortage of hospital beds when it costs $20,000 a bed to build and equip a hospital, releases 80 beds in the complete care area for the use of the acutely ill.

Because of savings effected in operating costs, the hospital can serve patients in the center for as little as $7 a day, plus meals (approximately $2 per day), which is from $10 to $16 a day less than daily rates for complete care. For such patients, the amount saved can easily be as much as half of the bill he would have paid before the center was in service.

PROGRESSIVE CARE CENTER PLANNED WITH WELL-BEING OF ITS PATIENTS IN MIND

When the Progressive Care Center was being planned, a careful study was made to determine what the patients it would serve would like best in a place where they would spend a period for diagnosis or convalescence.

We found they wanted an atmosphere that was not at all institutional. The center meets this requirement in every way.

Patient rooms are arranged to be pleasant. In the daytime, they become living rooms, for the beds are converted into comfortable sofas or chaise longues. Each room has wall-to-wall carpeting and walls are covered in Japanese grass cloth with silk imprinted murals. Remote control television sets are in all rooms. There also are telephones for the patients' convenience and pleasure.

Each room has its own private bath. In these, too, the use of color adds cheerfulness and beauty.

Many patients who come to the hospital for diagnosis or for treatment that does not require complete care and many who may benefit by transfer to the center for a period of convalescence after surgery or serious illness like to have a close relative with them. In the past, a place for this relative to stay has been a problem. However, this has been solved by the center, for each room has an extra sofa bed which the accompanying member of the family may occupy. In fact, the 80 rooms have sleeping facilities for 168 patients on this basis.

The center is connected to the main hospital building and is very convenient for patient "guests." They can walk a short distance to physicians' offices, examining and treatment departments, and the hospital cafeteria without going outdoors. In the cafeteria, those who are on special diets can always find what the doctor has prescribed.

Each floor has a lobby or recreation room and there is a snack lounge for light refreshments. A beauty shop and a barber shop are in operation for those who want these services.

A professional nurse is on duty at all hours, and there is an emergency examining room for use when needed. When a doctor is necessary, a call on the patient's telephone, which is connected to the hospital switchboard, will locate him.

Air conditioned, equipped with elevator service, acoustically treated, and modern and beautiful, the center is in its first weeks of existence proving its value to the patients it serves.

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES GUEST OF CENTER

Completion of the center after many months of work was a time for celebration.

To the hospital, there seemed to be no better way to observe this happy occasion than to ask representatives of the Baptist associations in the State to come and spend the night in the center as its first guests. The associations have from the beginning of Baptist Hospital supported its work with real devotion, spearheading for each Mother's Day a program to make the offering for the care of the needy sick a success. In their honor, each of the center's 80 rooms is named for an association and insofar as was possible the hospital representative from each association was assigned to his organization's room.

The hospital representatives and, in many cases, the association moderators and associational missionaries, accepted the invitation. They were guests at a dinner addressed by C. B. Deane, president of the Baptist State convention, and presided over by Colin Stokes, chairman of the hospital's board of trustees. Other guests were a number of the hospital's friends from Winston-Salem and other North Carolina cities.

A tour of the center was on the program and the guests were enthusiastic in their praise of the facility, which they agreed would serve a most useful purpose. Many said they knew of patients from their home areas who would benefit greatly from the reduction in cost of care which makes it possible.

Hospital representatives spent the night of Thursday, February 23, in the center. The next morning they participated in a meeting held to make plans for the 1961 Mother's Day offering. With the calls for help from the needy sick increasing from year to year, Baptists are urged to be more generous in their giving this year than ever before.

Midcontinent Newspaper Appraises Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the best, most sensitive, and most accurate newspapers in midcontinent America is the Lawrence (Kans.) Journal-World. Because of that, and because we are nearing the end of the first Kennedy-dominated session of the Congress, I want to bring to the attention of the Congress the September 2, 1961, "Saturday Column," by Dolph C. Simons, Jr., the very able and widely known journalist who is associate editor of the

Journal-World. The column for last Saturday consists of an appraisal of the administration to date, seen from the viewpoint of the heartland of America:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN

(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

In periods of national emergencies when this country is faced with critical dangers, Americans unite and support the administration. It has been this way in the past and the same pattern will behold for the future.

Even the most optimistic optimist would have to agree that America now is in one of these critical periods with the December deadline on the German question drawing near along with the Russian decision to resume nuclear testing. There are many other situations which could be tossed in to prove that these are indeed serious and dangerous times—not only for the United States but for the entire world.

Although there may be differences of opinion on how certain matters should be handled or what action the United States should take, a President of the United States knows he can count on the support of Congress and citizens of the country in dangerous times. There are many who differ with President Kennedy and his advisers, but these differences are, or should be, put aside when the security of the country is involved.

However, even though this is the case, a great many Americans must be extremely disappointed in the performance of the Kennedy administration. Aside from giving money away, there is not much of a record of accomplishment—either at home or abroad.

A year ago, the presidential campaign was in full swing. Both parties had finished their national conventions, Kennedy and Nixon had been chosen to head their respective parties and the race was on.

The Kennedy team pounded away on the idea that the Eisenhower administration had let this country's prestige slip and that Communist leaders were marking up victory after victory. Democratic spokesmen said the Nation's military position was pitifully vulnerable.

Nixon's backers countered that American prestige had not slipped, and that the military position of the country was in good shape. The lag between Russian and American space efforts was blamed on the Truman administration which had made no effort at all to get the U.S. into the space program.

The results of the election showed the voters of the United States were pretty evenly split on their choice for president. Kennedy won by a narrow margin and certainly couldn't have entered the White House thinking he had the overwhelming support of the country.

The Kennedy team got right to work and started building an organization. It was pictured as being extremely bright, young, vigorous and dynamic. There were problems faced by the United States, but there was no question but that the new administration would find the answers. The young, Harvard-Yale-MIT trained advisers were ready for any challenge. Those who had been called away from the classrooms of eastern universities to serve on the Kennedy team would show they could do a better job than the Eisenhower team which had its background in the business world.

Americans were hopeful that this new group would be successful. They were anxious for Uncle Sam to start marking up some "firsts." No matter what political party a person might belong to, he or she was eager to see Kennedy swing into action against Khrushchev. Kennedy had been articulate and forceful on the campaign trail. Americans were hopeful he would be able to make the Soviet boss realize the United States meant business.

What has happened since the Democratic administration took over?

Many say current troubles in Laos and Vietnam signal the takeover of most all Asia by Communist forces; the Cuban invasion was a farce with no chance of success after someone in the administration withdrew U.S. air support; Korea has gone through several political changeovers; Russia has orbited two men around earth; a Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting was held in Vienna where the Red boss evidently was in a telling mood, not a listening mood; a deadline of December was renewed on the East-West Berlin and German situation; the Russians stalled as long as they wanted at the Geneva talks and now have announced they are going to resume nuclear testing; and, Uncle Sam has been spending or planning to spend millions more dollars around the world. The U.N. Congo operation is a tremendous drain on American taxpayers; and the huge loan program for South America may be upset by recent events in Brazil.

Just as it would be unfair to say Eisenhower and his group were responsible for every setback during his administration, with no blame on the preceding Truman years, the same is true with the current White House team. There's no question but that many events which now are coming to the surface had their beginning one way or another during Eisenhower's Presidency.

But the point is, Americans would like to see some kind of evidence that the United States is steering a straight course and is not being blown off course whenever Mr. Khrushchev decides to do this or that. In too many instances it has appeared that the dumpy-looking and dumpy-acting Khrushchev has been able to make the smart boys of the western team jump whenever he says "jump."

Americans are generally willing to do whatever is needed to help win the battle against Communist forces around the world, but they want to see proof of sound, firm leadership. So far, there has been far too little evidence of this.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in the significant tribute being paid to our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE KEOGH, on the occasion of his birthday and the commemoration of the silver anniversary of his service in this House.

I have known GENE KEOGH through virtually all his years as a Member of Congress. Before the congressional reapportionment of 1944, the boundaries of his district included part of Queens County, and for 4 years he was the Congressman of a good portion of the area I was honored to represent in the New York State Senate.

This afforded firsthand opportunity to work with GENE and to get to know him.

From the first, I was attracted by his personal charm, humor, and understanding. I was impressed by his skill, perceptiveness and his unique talent to get to the core of a situation and come up with the right answer. Time has only buttressed this impression; it has enhanced my feelings about GENE even more. To have come to Congress myself, to serve as his colleague, to observe him in action, is a privilege I shall always cherish.

The annals of Congress will bear lasting testament to GENE KEOGH'S exceptional talents and great achievements. He has contributed invaluably to the history of our Nation; he has helped immeasurably in making this land a better place for every man, woman, and child.

What greater tribute can be paid to a human than to have his works translated into the well-being of others? This is the significant testament to GENE that will always remain, no matter how much, in all his genuine humility he may scoff at our plaudits.

Mr. Speaker, what I say here comes right from my heart. And, I know in so expressing myself, I reflect the esteem, the respect, the admiration and affection for GENE of all our colleagues. I am proud to be among them.

Congratulations, GENE. May you and your dear ones be blessed with joy and good health in the many fruitful years ahead.

The Agricultural Act of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and informative letter received from Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, conveying to me, as I assume he has done to other Members of Congress that "the recently approved Agricultural Act of 1961 is the most constructive and promising farm legislation in many years," and "it is a significant step toward a healthier farm economy, and will therefore strengthen the economy of the entire Nation."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 25, 1961.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am certain the great majority of farm families across the Nation share my appreciation for the constructive interest the Congress has demonstrated in agriculture during the current session. The recently approved Agricultural Act of 1961 is the most constructive and promising farm legislation in many years. It is a significant step toward a healthier farm economy, and will therefore strengthen the economy of the entire Nation.

The act recognizes both the principle of expanding our use of agricultural products and the necessity for adjusting our abundant production to quantities that we can use. Its provisions for wheat and feed grains will make for higher farm incomes, and at the same time provide substantial savings to taxpayers by reducing storage costs that would otherwise occur. Its expansion of marketing

order programs will bring about greater and more effective use of this self-help method of increasing farmers' bargaining power. Better farm incomes can also be expected as a result of provisions in the new act that expand and improve the supervised credit service of the Farmers Home Administration. Supervised credit will now be more useful in meeting credit needs of young farmers struggling to get started and a more powerful instrument in eliminating rural poverty, strengthening family farms, and revitalizing rural communities.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture will seek to carry out its responsibilities under the new programs with maximum concern for their success. We shall seek to consult and cooperate with farmers wherever appropriate, and to welcome suggestions from producers and groups of producers who seek to improve programs that affect their economic welfare. We shall seek effective implementation of the intent of the Congress as expressed in this act. We expect to learn from our experience under these programs, to the end that they may be improved and perfected. We welcome your suggestions.

We regard the period immediately ahead as an opportunity for further study and evaluation of proposed policies and programs, and most particularly for further efforts to build greater public understanding of the farm situation. We regard it as a challenge to formulate the next steps in seeking to reach our goals: continued improvement of farm income without exploitation of consumer or taxpayer, and thus contributing to a healthy national economy; and continued efforts toward greater use of our agricultural productivity to meet human needs at home and to contribute to the advancement of progress and freedom abroad.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Tribute to Dr. Daniel David Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK R. MILLER
OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of Iowa's leading citizens is Dr. Daniel David Palmer, president of Palmer Enterprises, in Davenport, Iowa. In the July 24 issue of Broadcasting magazine, the business weekly of television and radio, appeared a fine article about Dr. Palmer. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPECTS TO DR. DANIEL DAVID PALMER, PRESIDENT, PALMER ENTERPRISES—BROADCASTING AND PUBLIC SERVICE ARE FAMILY TRADITIONS

Broadcasting is even more than a deep personal interest to Dr. David Palmer. It's a family responsibility.

Now president and chief owner of the Palmer properties, including WHO–AM–FM–TV Des Moines and WOC–AM–FM–TV Davenport, Iowa, Dr. Palmer for more than 3 decades shared with his late father, Col. B. J. Palmer, the top executive management of the stations.

From 1929 until only a few weeks ago, Dr. Palmer was vice president of the Palmer interests, embracing the broadcasting stations, and the Palmer School of Chiropractic, Davenport, as well as a printing plant, public and private clinics associated with the school and Clear View Sanitarium. He also holds the office of treasurer.

Citizens on the local scene point out that Dr. Dave, as he is warmly addressed by students and business associates, through these decades has been a principal influence for the encouragement of broad public service through broadcasting and personal participation. They observe that through his great devotion, service and involvement in local charitable and civic affairs he has by example led the way for the Palmer administrators and employees.

RADIO PIONEER

Dr. Palmer has been in broadcasting ever since the early 1920's when he was a young but enthusiastic radio amateur in the "pigeon roost" of the family home on Brady Street hill in Davenport. It was here that he first heard Robert Karlowa broadcast talk and music on his amateur station 9BY at Rock Island, Ill., just across the Mississippi River.

Young David's excitement over the new communications medium prompted his father to purchase the station in March 1922 and move it to quarters atop the Palmer School. Now WOC, it quickly earned its place as an Iowa institution. In 1930 WHO was acquired.

The Palmer stations subsequently pioneered FM and TV in their respective areas, too, including color TV. WHO is a class I–A clear cannel outlet on 1040 kilocycles with 50 kilowatts. WOC is on 1420 kilocycles with 5 kilowatts. WHO–TV is on channel 13, WOC–TV channel 6, both full power. The radio-TV outlets in both markets are affiliates of NBC, an association that began in 1927 when WOC became western leg of the early NBC radio network.

PART OF FAMILY

Growing up with WOC is the background that gives unique emphasis to Dr. Palmer's sincerity when he explains how he feels about each of the Palmer stations. "This is a family obligation to me," he states. The station associations "have given me a sense of real family responsibility to our community, because I know what a wonderful opportunity our radio and TV stations have to continue to help make our community healthy, live and prosperous." He consistently has refused offers to sell the properties.

All of the Palmer stations long have enjoyed a record of program and public-service achievement, but Dr. Palmer is aiming still higher. We must continue to be a deeply interwoven part of the life of our community and a vital force for good," he believes, "and I intend to see that WOC and WHO are even increasingly dedicated to our local economic and civic affairs."

Dr. Palmer puts his beliefs of close personal interests in the welfare of others into practice in the community of his employees as well as the community at large. He recently further expanded pension and bonus plan benefits for station personnel at WOC and WHO, the cost absorbed by the company.

EXPANSION

Dr. Palmer now is directing extensive modernization of the Palmer School of Chiropractic. He next plans to construct a new million-dollar color TV and radio studio for the WOC properties.

He foresees an eventful and successful future for color TV and his expectation is high for FM, too. His plans include multiple stereo operation in FM and expansion of FM programing separate from that on AM.

Dr. Palmer predicts continuing growth for AM radio, also, particularly for its broad and basic service to the communities of mid-America and the vast, rich, rural market there.

NATIVE SON

Dr. Daniel David Palmer was born January 12, 1906, in Davenport. He is named for his paternal grandfather who was the discoverer of the chiropractic technique and philosophy, which were fully developed by his late father, Dr. B. J. Palmer. The Palmer School of Chiropractic, founded in 1895, now has nearly 1,000 students on campus and 25,000 graduates.

He attended public school in Davenport and after the family acquired WOC he spent every spare hour at the station, first running errands, then later serving as announcer and a general helper in every department. Early year sheet music pluggers like Little Jack Little, Wendal Hall and Tom Small, and other name personalities, soon became close family friends during their stops at WOC.

From these experiences, through the years, Dr. Palmer can recall many stories of both humor and respect for many broadcasting pioneers, from network officials to talent. He can recall, too, early broadcasts of Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, of Lindbergh, and of "Radio Rex" Willets' cooking show for the ladies. He can't forget early on-air benefits to buy crystal sets for shut-ins, because as a young man it was Dr. Palmer's job to deliver them.

In high school he made his mark in business as well as in scholastics. He was advertising manager of the school paper and senior yearbook and twice he was elected president of his class, in both his junior and senior years. Dr. Palmer earned his B.S. degree in economics in 1929 at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania.

FAMILY HONOR

During the 1930's, after he had become vice president of Palmer Enterprises and out of respect for the Palmer family tradition, he enrolled in the Palmer School of Chiropractic for the full course (about 4,300 classroom hours) and was graduated with the D.C. degree. Three years ago he spent a semester at Harvard for graduate study in management.

Dr. Palmer married Agnes High at Davenport on June 27, 1943. They have three girls: Bonnie Joan, 12; Jenny Wren, 11, and Vicki Ann, 8. Mrs. Palmer joins her husband in wide interest in community affairs. The list of groups in which he is active fills a page. Dr. Palmer is a Mason and a member of the Episcopal Church. His hobbies: golf, baseball, and billiards.

Ideas Are Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding speech by my good friend, Mr. Albert H. Rosenthal, when he addressed the graduating class of Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo. I am sure that all Members will enjoy reading this outstanding address:

Ideas Are Weapons

(Commencement address, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo., August 17, 1961, by Albert H. Rosenthal, regional director, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Denver, Colo.)

President Ross, members of the board of trustees, honored guests, graduates, and friends, the purpose of a commencement is not to hear a long commencement address. It is rather to honor the graduates who have achieved a milestone in their academic careers, to pay tribute to the faculty and parents, who in many cases have greatly assisted in the accomplishment of this goal, and to recognize, in this symbolic occasion, the significance of learning and the contribution made by this great university under the leadership of our distinguished president, Dr. William R. Ross.

I am addressing myself this evening primarily to the graduates. I call your attention to the fact that this ceremony tonight, while it marks the end of your academic work for a particular degree, is called a commencement. Webster defines commencement as a beginning. Your able faculty have labored hard to make available to you the body of knowledge essential in your particular field. Now that you have graduated, you will have the opportunity of pursuing this body of knowledge in depth. The process of learning is one which will take place all of your lives.

Those of you graduating tonight know that you are graduating into a world of crisis. Some of you have had your plans changed and others are living in a period of anxiety concerning your future plans because of the current international crisis.

The student of international affairs today knows that even if there is a negotiated settlement on the Berlin question, there are still the burning issues of ideological difference bubbling and ready to reach the boiling point in such far distant places as Laos, the emerging governments in Africa, and in our neighboring countries of South America.

I am suggesting, as my thesis this evening, that underlying the emerging crisis which currently has brought us close to the realization of the possibility of war, lie major differences in the field of ideas, and that it is in the ideological area in which we must greatly strengthen our country's posture. Essentially, the cold war has been defined as the struggle for men's minds. My purpose this evening is to give you a brief statement on this subject which I have entitled "Ideas Are Weapons."

I plan to approach this subject under three headings: The first I call "A Philosophy of Freedom"; the second, "Goals for Americans"; and the third, "More Beautiful Music."

I. A Philosophy of Freedom

Most Americans today would have great difficulty in stating the meaning of democracy in present-day terms. With our constructive and greatly expanding student, teacher, and professional exchange programs, many Americans are faced at home and abroad with the question from a foreign visitor or foreign host, "What do you mean by democracy?" What does it mean in presentday terms?" Most Americans fall back on a quotation from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or a beautiful statement of Jefferson or Lincoln. These are usually presented in a somewhat vague manner and half apologetically.

Adlai Stevenson, writing in the August Harper's magazine, with the title of "America Under Pressure," states: "The great social purposes of a community—its security, the quality of its life and education, the beauty of its public monuments, its images of greatness, its communion with past and future—all these must be expressed in the political dialog."

We must remember that roughly three-fourths of the people of the world do not have enough to meet their basic needs; literally millions of people go to bed hungry each night; and most of the modern benefits of advanced medical care are not available to them. The use of a philosophic phrase is not enough to express the full meaning of democracy. As Gandhi once wrote: "To a hungry man, God appears in the form of bread." Democracy must be presented as a way of life that meets people's needs and gives them the opportunity to develop to their fullest capacity.

We are faced, in the struggle to seek the support of the majority of the peoples of the world—those living in the great underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia, and the Near East—of expressing a positive, meaningful philosophy that protects individual freedom, and at the same time meets human needs. The Scandinavian governments have jointly published a book describing the health and social programs of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland, and they have entitled this book "Freedom and Welfare." This I suggest—the development of a philosophy of freedom which expresses in modern terms the concepts of democracy and is applied to the meeting of the needs of emerging peoples—is the imperative challenge confronting us. The Bible states: "For if the trumpets give an uncertain note, who shall prepare himself for battle?" We cannot effectively and successfully attract the support of the great underdeveloped countries of the world toward our democratic ideals if we do not put forth a positive and meaningful program.

One of the great difficulties confronted in the effort to develop a philosophy of freedom is the fact that many Americans do not agree on the specific application of the great principles upon which this country was founded. The story has been told that a professor at an eastern university had the Declaration of Independence reprinted without its title and passed this document around to several business and industrial leaders asking if they would sign a petition to Congress for its adoption. In response, several telephone calls were received by the president of the university stating that the university had a faculty member who was a radical and who was advocating un-American concepts.

The fact that many of our citizens do not know the rich history and the basic principles on which this country has been founded, is a major cause of this difficulty. When these concepts were adopted, they were stated proudly and defiantly, they were meaningful and they were principles that men needed to fight for. While the basic concept of importance of the individual, government under law, and equal opportunities for all are still the significant issues, the application of these concepts in specific instances has changed. William Faulkner raises this question in the words: "What happened to the American dream? We dozed, and it abandoned us; and in that vacuum now there sound no longer the strong loud voices * * * speaking in mutual unification of one hope and will."

Because of this lack of background or interest in political philosophy on the part of many of our citizens, a number of confused ideas have been developed and quite readily accepted by many Americans. There is a great confusion of the concept of "individualism" and "the importance of the individual." Individualism is a selfish concept when it is based upon the belief that each person lives for himself alone. It has been developed in literature by such writers as Spencer who wrote that the law of nature should govern all conduct and that the strong should rule and the weak fall by the wayside. This is a completely un-American philosophy. In contrast, the importance of each individual in our society is a basic concept of democracy. If each individual is important, this means that every individual must have the opportunity for an education, the benefits of modern medical science, employment, adequate housing, and other things that are requisite in modern society for the development of each individual's capacity to the utmost.

Our Declaration of Independence and the great Constitution of the United States reflect the teachings of democracy as presented in the philosophic works of the early Greeks, the Roman lawyers, Rousseau, John Stewart Mill, Thomas Jefferson, DeTocqueville, Thomas Paine, and others. In a democracy, the government is the primary social institution dedicated to serving the needs of the people and protecting their rights. The Declaration of Independence lists self-evident truths and inalienable rights, and states that "to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." Article I, section 8 of our Constitution, authorizes our Congress "to provide for the general welfare." It is this clause, expounded by Alexander Hamilton in his Federalist Papers, later supported by the great justices of our Supreme Court, Story, Brandeis, Cardozo, and Douglas, that constitute the legal foundation for social legislation in this country. Dr. Karl de Schweinitz, writing for the American Council on Education, has stated:

"Only slowly is the ideal of government as a positive good winning over a concept of government as repression and as a negative force. We are only beginning to discover that human initiative has a greater reservoir in economic, social, and personal security than in fear and deprivation."

We must not be guided by tags or labels. It has become popular for those who oppose a public policy to charge that each Government action will lead to the "welfare state" or socialism. It is significant that the same charge was leveled against our great statesman, Alexander Hamilton, when he advocated the establishment of a national bank, which has developed into our Federal Reserve System. We need a Government responsive to the needs of people. Jefferson, the great protector of individual rights, gives us this as our purpose of government. These needs change as problems arise. As Justice Cardozo, in the classic Supreme Court decision in *Helvering* v. *Davis*, wrote:

"Nor is the concept of the general welfare static. Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times."

Our government at local, State and Federal levels, has been established as the major instrument of our democracy. And yet today, we find that many people have developed an almost irrational fear of their government. Instead of applying themselves to the task of improving our governmental processes and insuring that government remains responsive to the people, certain of our citizens have organized themselves into groups with the stated purpose of protecting themselves against their government. Is it any wonder then that Americans have difficulty in stating the role of government in a democracy in understandable and specific terms to those we are seeking to win in the fight for the free way of life?

I have sought to point out the imperative need for the development of a meaningful and dynamic philosophy of democracy which can be widely supported and practiced in this country for all to see.

As President Kennedy said last January in an address before the Massachusetts State Legislature, "I have been guided by the standard John Winthrop set before his shipmates on the flagship *Arabella* 311 years ago, as they, too, faced the task of building a government on a new and perilous frontier. 'We must always consider', he said, 'that we

shall be as a city upon a hill—the eyes of all people are upon us'."

This leads me to the second point which I would like to present this evening—"Goals for Americans."

II. GOALS FOR AMERICANS

President Eisenhower, during his term of office, appointed 11 oustanding Americans, which he called the President's Commission on National Goals, and requested that the group use every possible resource and task force studies to develop "a broad outline of coordinated national policies and programs and set up a series of goals in various areas of national activity." The Commission was chaired by Henry M. Wriston, formerly president of Brown University and currently president of the American Assembly at Columbia University, and included such distinguished leaders as James B. Conant, formerly president of Harvard; Judge Learned Hand; Clark Kerr, president of the University of California; and, other business, educational, and labor leaders.

In November of 1960, the Commission submitted its report to the President. The report of the Commission is divided into three main parts. These are entitled (1) "Goals at Home"; (2) "Goals Abroad"; and (3) "A Financial Accounting." Added to the summary report of the Commission are a number of task force reports written by distinguished leaders in the several fields of American life. In brief, the report, "Goals for Americans" develops a set of programs designed to express the concepts of democracy in terms of the needs and issues of our modern society. Let me commend this report to you. I can, this evening, touch only briefly on a few of its highlights.

Under the heading "Goals at Home," the report focuses on 11 areas in which attention must be given to advance the democratic ideal. The first states: "The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. Our own institutions—political, social and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice."

The report becomes more specific when it states: "Respect for the individual means respect for every individual. Every man and woman must have equal rights before the law, and an equal opportunity to vote and hold office, to be educated, to get a job and to be promoted when qualified, to buy a home, to participate fully in community affairs. These goals, which are at the core of our system, must be achieved by action at all levels."

Other topics stressed in the report are: the need for tremendous strengthening of our educational process; improvement of living conditions; and, extensive efforts, through both public and private resources, to make available to every citizen the full advantage of medical and hospital care.

Under the heading of "Goals Abroad," the report states "We must encourage far larger numbers of qualified Americans to live and work abroad." The importance of personal and cultural contacts is stressed. The goal of ultimate disarmament is stated, and full support of the United Nations is strongly recommended as "* * * the chief instrument available for building a genuine community of nations." The report concludes with the stirring words, "Man has never been an island unto himself. The shores of his concern have expanded from his neighborhood to his nation, and from his nation to his world."

In the interest of being brief, I have been able to sketch only a few of the highlights of this significant study. I am suggesting that efforts of this nature can help us develop a meaningful and positive philosophy of democracy. These are terms which have meaning to a native in a mud hut in Africa whose wife is dying of tuberculosis. These have meaning to parents in underdeveloped countries in Asia whose children are hungry. This is the philosophy of democracy. We must state it positively. We must practice it even though we recognize that often the reach of an ideal may exceed our grasp. These programs, expounded by a greatly increased teacher, student and professional exchange program, with highly qualified representatives, can give the world a picture of the real America and the goals for which we are striving.

This leads me to the third point, which I would like to present this evening, which I have called "More Beautiful Music."

III. MORE BEAUTIFUL MUSIC

In Greek mythology, the Odyssey of Ulysses tells us the story of Sirens Island. This was an island by which many passing ships were wrecked and sailors drowned because of the music of beautiful women who sat upon the rocks and sang such lovely songs that the sailors let their ships drift upon the shoals. You will recall that Circe instructed Ulysses to stop the ears of the seamen with wax so that they could not hear the songs of the sirens. Ulysses himself was to be bound to the mast of the ship and not be freed, no matter what he said, until they passed from the sirens' island. In this way, Ulysses and his sailors passed safely by the sirens' island. A later ship's captain, guided by the great Greek philosophers, brought with him on his ship some of the finest musicians of Greece. By playing more beautiful music on the ship, the ears of the sailors did not need to be filled with wax or the captain bound to the mast. Instead the sailors listened to their music and safely and happily passed through the sirens' water.

In our approach to the threat of communism to the free world, we do not want to fill our ears with wax so that we cannot hear or know of Communist activities. Neither do we want to bind our people to a figurative mast to escape this danger. Instead, let the teachings of democracy, applied in practice, play their music to the world, and we will find that we can pass these shoals freely and happily toward the goals of a richer and fuller life.

If we will state affirmatively and constructively, and exemplify in practice, the real meaning of democracy, we need not be afraid in the competition of ideas of the ultimate victory of the free way of life. We gain every time a qualified exchange student, teacher or professional representative from this country represents us effectively behind the Iron Curtain. The exhibits of life in the United States we show abroad make a definite imprint. We must remember that these programs are established as exchange programs, and not be fearful when exhibits, visitors or other exchange representatives come to this country from abroad. We must exemplify our teachings of freedom, and not establish a curtain of our own. As peoples speak to peoples, the basic truth of the democratic ideal can prove the value of the educated child, the dignity of the aged, availability of medical care for all, as much more significant than the tallest rocket or the biggest bomb. Eric Sevareid states it concisely, "Let those who wish, try to discover the composition of a lunar crater; we would settle for discovering the true mind of a Russian or the inner heart of a delinquent child."

While I share the need to keep America strong militarily in this period of stress, I am urging an additional intensification of efforts in the area of our greatest strength, the more beautiful music of the free way of life. This music was written by the great composers of democracy—the words must be brought up-to-date to strengthen the importance of every individual, at home and abroad. This is the concept that every person shall have the opportunity to fulfill his dreams, hopes and aspirations in accordance with his ability.

In summary: (1) We have reviewed briefly the need for an affirmative statement of what I have called "The Philosophy of Democracy," in terms and practices that meet present day conditions and problems which have meaning to the great numbers of emerging peoples of the world; (2) I have sought to sketch the recent report "Goals for Americans" as an example that it is possible to give content and application to our basic concepts of democracy; and, finally, (3) I have suggested that we need not be afraid in this great competition of ideologies—that ideas are weapons—and that the arsenal of democracy, stocked with such ideas as the dignity of man, freedom and development of every individual, is an invulnerable one.

In closing, I believe that we could join today with Aristophenes in the prayer this great poet-philosopher prayed in the ruins of the great Greek temples devastated by the Pellopenisian wars:

"From the murmur and subtlety of suspicion
with which we vex one another
Give us rest
Make a new beginning
And mingle again the kindred of the nations
In the alchemy of love
And with some finer essence of forebearance
Temper our minds."

Hyannis Port: A Cool Summer Visitor From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, Wednesday, September 6, 1961:

HYANNIS PORT: A COOL SUMMER VISITOR FROM WASHINGTON

(By James Reston)

HYANNIS PORT, MASS., September 5.—In this summer political capital everything is cool and informal, including the President of the United States.

This Cape Cod village is obviously President Kennedy's home, a safe tribal harbor in a stormy world. The hedges around the the Kennedy compound are green, high and private. His Republican neighbors are discreet and tolerant, half resentful and half proud. There is an air of opulent simplicity about the place, all expensively concealed, and in this setting he relaxes much more than in the clamorous bustle of Washington.

It is now just 3 months since he met Nikita Khrushchev in Vienna. Since then the jovial evaporationist has been threatening, every hour on the hour to obliterate the human race, but Kennedy remains calm and even confident.

He seems perplexed about Khrushchev rather than angry. What puzzles him is why he cannot get down to rational discussion with the Soviet leader about the factual situation in Berlin and central Europe. Kennedy's approach to the problem is highly pragmatic. He would like to discuss in tangible terms Khrushchev's problems and explain to him his own problems and then

see whether an honorable accommodation is possible. But Khrushchev did not approach the impasse in this way in Vienna, and he has said nothing since then to persuade Kennedy that Moscow is ready for this kind of talk.

Nothing could be further from the truth than Moscow's representation of Kennedy as a reckless and combative young man spoiling for a fight.

THE PRACTICAL POLITICIAN

The striking thing about him is that, after 7 months of disappointing negotiations with the Russians, the allies and the Congress, he is taking his frustrations with such equanimity. He has not got the military buildup he wanted from the allies in Europe; he has had to divert his attention from Berlin to wheedle votes out of the House Appropriations Committee for foreign aid; he has got nothing from Khrushchev but threats and misrepresentations, but he is not personal or vindictive in any of his comments about these things.

Behind this impersonal, almost detached, approach, however, is a fairly simple yet severe analysis of the Berlin problem. This is that if the Soviets want to negotiate an honorable accommodation, he is ready to go along, even though he realizes that any new accommodation may be interpreted by his political opponents as something worse than now exists, and therefore as appeasement. But if Khrushchev and his wholly owned subsidiary in East Germany try to block the West's access to Berlin the risk of war will be taken.

The main danger is that this calm Kennedy appraisal of his responsibilities may be misjudged in Moscow. Official reports from there indicate that Khrushchev believes the United States would not resort to nuclear war unless American territory were attacked. The only trouble with this belief is that it just happens to be totally wrong.

Any action which closes U.S. access to Berlin will certainly lead to counteraction by the West, first in the U.N., then in the field of economic countermeasures, then, if necessary, with an airlift or conventional military action on the ground to force the passage of supplies.

THE LINE OF HONOR

Any assumption, however, that the United States would acquiesce in the defeat of its command on the ground without resorting to the ultimate weapons of nuclear power would be highly reckless. For nuclear war in such circumstances is not "unthinkable." It is, in cold fact, being thought about and planned, and Mr. Khrushchev, unless he wishes to preside over a Soviet wasteland, next door to 800 million Chinese, would be well advised to take this into account.

One gets the impression that Kennedy is not wedded to any formula for Berlin save the genuine preservation of its freedom and the preservation of the honor of the United States. His mind is not cluttered up with rigid commitments to the technicalities of the past. His emotions are not engaged in the defense of lines on the map or even on rushing to the aid of the East Germans who had 15 years to get out of their jail. He will negotiate in good faith but he will not be bullied.

He has been trying now ever since Vienna to make this clear to Khrushchev without success. He has rejected advice to tear away the barbed wire between East and West Berlin and has withheld economic sanctions or appeals to the U.N. But these are questions of tactics and timing rather than of principle, as Krushchev will discover if he tries to close the access routes to the former German capital.

The ironic thing about all this is that it is Kennedy, rather than Khrushchev, who is ready for peaceful and competitive coexistence. It is Khrushchev who is trying to direct the course of history and Kennedy who is ready to accommodate himself to history on the basis of "coexistence." The question is whether Khrushchev will allow an honorable accommodation to take place.

Juvenile Delinquency Control Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8028) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, juvenile delinquency has long been a serious problem, one for which the Congress and the executive branch must not shun their responsibilities. The enactment of this legislation bears out that Congress realizes this fact and wants the Government of the United States to assume its proper role to conquer this vital disease that has infected so much of America's youth—our greatest national resource.

Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with H.R. 8028, for which S. 279 was substituted. This bill is comprehensive and realistically confronts the problem. Nevertheless, I had hoped that the committee would broaden the legislation by establishing the kind of machinery I believe necessary for directing youth programs on a national level. I refer to the provision in my own legislation, H.R. 8260 which I urged the committee to consider and which I fervently hope will be given priority action, now that this important phase of the delinquency-abatement program is moving forward.

Mr. Chairman, ever since I came to this House and for years before that I have advocated cooperation among governmental agencies on all levels in connection with youth programs.

As a New York State senator for many years, I was close to the State and local approaches to this problem. I was the sponsor of legislation that created the New York State Youth Commission and the enabling legislation to establish the New York City Youth Board. I am fully aware of the responsibilities of all levels of Government in this field. None can be effective without the other. Human behavior is not confined to local or State lines.

The role of the Federal Government is important if the problem is to be met head on; Federal leadership is vital. Holding this view in 1959, I introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a Federal Youth Office to be administered under an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a subcabinet position especially created for the purpose.

I firmly feel the problem is vital enough to warrant such high level status. Only through such Government recognition can proper leadership be given in this field.

My original bill is not dissimilar to H.R. 8028. As a matter of fact, there are many sections in it that are nearly identical. Because of this and in view of the assurances I have been given that the differences will be considered as a separate matter, I have joined in fully associating myself with H.R. 8028 and have introduced supporting legislation, my bill being H.R. 8343. I am privileged to be a cosponsor of this measure and I feel its overwhelming approval will serve notice that Uncle Sam is ready and willing to roll up his sleeves and do something meaningful about the delinquency problem.

Now, to get back to my further recommendation which I urged the committee and the Members of this House to give their every evaluation and their consideration. Among the added features to my original bill is the provision to establish the new unit in HEW to administer an effective program. Surely we all agree the field of youth activities is highly specialized and essential to the strength and health of America. Our Nation of tomorrow can be no better than our youth of today. Then, is not the subject worthy of such agency recognition?

The Federal Youth Office, as I envision it, would provide the required leadership for intergovernmental cooperation to strengthen State, local, and private efforts in youth problems. It would develop formulas and standards for Federal grants to States, localities, and private agencies on a share-the-cost basis. It would assist the States in the establishment and operation of juvenile delinquency control and prevention programs. Moreover, the office would encourage research in, and demonstration of, new techniques in dealing with teenage behavioral problems and crime and would provide for the training of personnel to staff programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The agency would also provide a national clearinghouse for exchange of information on youth problems and on methods and techniques for dealing with them.

The Youth Office, therefore, through its efforts with State, local, and private agencies would enable a complete, fully coordinated attack on the serious problem of juvenile delinquency. We must have more accurate data on the nature and amount of delinquency in different areas. We are seriously hampered by not being able to secure an accurate national report on delinquency. The Federal Bureau of Investigation provides statistics on juvenile delinquency as a part of its overall crime reporting program, and the Children's Bureau gathers some statistics from certain juvenile courts throughout the country. But neither of these agencies has the resources to develop the type of information collection and dissemination

which will aid the communities most effectively.

The Federal Youth Office would be able to provide such comprehensive information, and thus it could indicate which correctional agencies and local areas most need the technical assistance provided for in the bill. In the new attack on delinquency, we need such new resources to manage the increasing demand for technical help.

On matters of general policy and procedure, my bill also makes provision for close cooperation with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Such cooperative work at the Federal, State, and local levels of government is vital for any successful preventive work.

The Federal Government is spending $126 million a year merely for the custodial care of 40,000 child delinquents. Contrast this figure with the proposed cost in the juvenile delinquency bill of $10 million. This money will be spent for the prevention of crime and not merely for bigger enforcement and correctional programs. Our main objective should be the prevention of those early law violations that begin criminal careers, and we must pour as much money, labor, and thought as possible into achieving this aim.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer sit back and believe that this is just a temporary situation that will pass. Juvenile delinquency is a grim, stark reality. We cannot coddle it any longer. We must face it squarely.

The Federal Government is spending billions abroad to strengthen our position in the free world. We are spending billions to keep America strong on the homefront. Yet, what are we doing to prevent the deterioration and moral breakdown of so many of our youth—the backbone of our strength?

Our country should reflect to the rest of the world an image of human decency, dignity and government by law. What do they think of these continuing stories of teenage crime and violence? The way we can convince them that this does not reflect America is to do something about eliminating it. And, to do that, you must have the tools for prevention and cure.

Certainly this condition involves only a small percentage of our young folks. The vast majority are good, clean, fine boys and girls. But, pointing to percentages is not going to stop these rampages.

The problem, unfortunately, is growing worse. J. Edgar Hoover reported in March 1961 that crimes by youths increased some 6 percent over the previous year, and at this rate of increase, a million or more youngsters may be arrested in the year 1962.

In the fact of these tragic statistics, again I emphasize, Congress cannot shun its responsibility. It is time that the Government of the United States assumed its proper role in this crucial situation. I believe a long step forward is being taken through the enactment of H.R. 8028, with which I am proud to be identified as cosponsor.

Living Theater Returns From Europe's Bravos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Stuart W. Little, one of the New York Herald Tribune's top writers, has written a fine column about the performance of the Living Theater on its European tour. Julian Beck and Judith Malina are to be congratulated on the fine job they have done and the Living Theater, as always, is right on top.

The article follows:

LIVING THEATER RETURNS FROM EUROPE'S BRAVOS

(By Stuart W. Little)

With a newly acquired international reputation, the Living Theater will resume work today at its 14th Street headquarters.

The acting company led by Julian Beck and Judith Malina performed their three-play repertory before 20,000 Europeans this summer in Rome, Turin, Milan, Paris, Berlin, and Frankfurt.

On the mantlepiece of the producer's crowded office as mementos of this successful 5-week tour are a replica of the Eiffel Tower, signifying the Grand Prix of the Theatre des Nations in Paris, which was voted by the critics of the 28 participating countries; a medallion signifying their designation by the Paris critics as the best acting company, and a large ostrich egg.

This last was presented by the students at the Paris Festival and was meant as a sincere mark of esteem. "Obviously, they don't know the American idiom," said Miss Malina.

Not even by daring to play Brecht before audiences which had seen Brecht's famous "Berliner Ensemble" did the Living Theater falter on its tour. They performed Brecht's "In the Jungle of Cities" to critical acclaim in Paris especially. The two other plays were William Carlos Williams' "Many Loves" and Jack Gelber's "The Connection," the play almost everyone the Becks encountered had heard of.

" 'The Connection' was the play Europeans everywhere were most anxious to see," said Mr. Beck. "They had all heard about it. They kept associating it with the 'beat' generation. In Paris there were 18 curtain calls on the opening night of 'The Connection.' That was the greatest response we received on the tour."

Everywhere they went the Living Theater was invited back. The producers already are in serious planning for a second and more comprehensive tour next summer. They brought back prizes this time but they failed to find any new European plays to perform.

"We asked everybody," Mr. Beck said. "France has a lot of activity but other producers are getting those plays, such as the work of Genet and Ionesco. In Italy and Germany there are no playwrights. Either they were all killed during the war or this period has raised an uncreative generation."

Mr. Beck looks for the next artistic activity out of Germany to come from the present "vital and energetic" generation of 20-year-olds.

The Living Theater, suspended since June 4, will resume with "The Connection" on September 12, "In the Jungle of Cities" on September 26, and "Many Loves" on October 3. In 5 weeks in big European theaters, they played to 20,000 Europeans. At the 199-seat house on 14th Street, it takes the Living Theater about 20 weeks, or over half a season to play to this many Americans.

Senator Keating Highlights Berlin Crisis in Dedicating Endicott Municipal Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to participate with the junior Senator from New York, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, in ceremonies marking the dedication of the magnificent new civic administration center conceived and built by the dynamic and forward-looking community of Endicott, N.Y., which I am proud to state lies in my home district. Senator KEATING was the principal speaker at the Endicott dedication ceremony.

His address was at once so pertinent to the occasion and so significant in the broader area of the present world crisis that I feel its message should be made more widely known. Therefore, under leave previously granted, I include the address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, AT DEDICATION OF CIVIC ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ENDICOTT, N.Y., AUGUST 27, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Mayor Lee, reverend clergy, Dr. Kerr, Congressman Robison, distinguished civic and State officials, members past and present of the board of trustees, my friends of the Endicott area, it is a genuine pleasure and a privilege to be with you on this occasion so memorable, so meaningful in the long history of this fine and progressive community.

Khrushchev talks about the wave of the future. Here in America we're not talking about it. We're living it, experiencing it. And what better example than this memorable occasion that brings us together today. For the future is happening before our eyes. Progress is not on the drawing board. It is in production. You good people here in the Endicott community didn't stop with dreams. You gave architects the blueprints of those dreams—and today, in this magnificent fulfillment we see those dreams translated into brick and steel.

Now I don't need to take off my shoe and pound it to get that point across—because the evidence is right here—all around us.

Speaking of shoes at a spot like this, of course, is a little like talking about home runs to Mickey Mantle or Roger Maris. I mean I'm talking to the pros of the business—for the brand names that have made this area famous are known the length and breadth of our land.

Then, of course, this is IBM country, too.

You know, the way IBM has been perfecting its machines might result in some interesting developments. We may see the day when one of these machines will get elected to public office, to the Senate, perhaps. Well, I'll admit I'd hate to have to debate with one. They have all the facts and figures. The only danger is that they might tend to

get heated up in those rough and tumble Senate debates, and maybe blow fuses all over the place. Seriously, though, I think our elected officials are safe—until IBM teaches its machines to kiss babies and eat hotdogs at a political picnic.

At this point I want to say how deeply I am impressed by the fact that the site for this magnificent center was donated by the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corp. This is a unique and most praiseworthy gesture of civic mindedness. It is, of course, less a source of surprise to those who know the long, long history of Endicott-Johnson's identification with the growth and with the progress of this entire community. This great and honored firm has once again shown that it is not merely located here. It was born here. It lives here. And Endicott couldn't ask for a nicer neighbor.

You know, there are constant comparisons of the Soviet system and our own—and we talk always in terms of either relative military power or gross economic product, with breakdowns in such heavy industry categories as steel, oil, and electric power.

There's one thing this kind of comparison overlooks. And the point is vital in any true comparison. What I refer to is the fact that our economy is achieving two objectives—while the Soviet is dedicated to one. Their concentration is on raw power—on the building of military and industrial muscle.

We on the other hand are committed to two simultaneous objectives—to creating and strengthening the military potential we must have—and at the same time—in a modern miracle to often overlooked—to providing our people with consumer goods unparalleled in quality and in quantity, with no Government-imposed ban on their possession and enjoyment.

This modern industrial miracle of having both guns and butter—of equating our military needs with the advanced consumer needs and desires of our entire population—constitutes living proof of the superiority of the free enterprise system.

I would say to you that what stands before us here today is more than a complex of superbly planned and constructed municipal buildings. What stands before us is a reflection of the very spirit of our people here in America—a reflection of the drive and the daring, the energy and the imagination of a free nation. The America we know today wasn't created under the orders of a tyrant. It was created by free men, taking orders from their own consciences, from their own sense of what is good and what is true, and mindful that God gave every man nobility by the mere act of creation—and made human dignity a common possession, not a prerogative of power.

Now Khrushchev has said that he's going to bury us. That's one of his singing commercials—one of many—for believe me, in Khrushchev we are dealing with one of the great salesmen of history. Keep that in mind when he makes his pitches. He's trying to sell a product. He's trying to sell it on a worldwide scale—and there are no holds barred—no better business bureau to say that he's an out-an-out con man, and take away his peddler's license.

When I use the term "con man," I'm calling the shot on this traveling salesman.

Any man who strokes the dove of peace with one hand and holds a bomb behind his back—any man who assails imperialism; when he, himself, is the master imperialist of all time, any man who cries that a nation like Cuba must be free—so that he can be free to swallow it—such a man is running the biggest confidence game the world has ever been swindled by.

With this in mind, let's take a good, hard look at Berlin. When a salesman has his merchandise rejected, when it becomes public knowledge that his product isn't moving, that salesman is frustrated and he will do his best to save face.

That's exactly what the story is in Berlin. This mass flight from communism—this human hemorrhage that has been bleeding East Germany white—is about as dramatic and eloquent a denial of communism as we can find anywhere in the world. It isn't German real estate that's involved here. It's Russian prestige. It's not the fate and future of West Berlin. It's the fate and future of communism. Khrushchev knows that. He knows that East Germany is a showcase, not of Red victory but of Red defeat—and the sooner he pulls down the lid in that showcase the better for the world sale of his product.

The United States and our Western allies have made clear—crystal clear—to Khrushchev that West Berlin is the chalk line we do not erase. This is the end of the line. Freedom cannot keep on fighting a rear-guard action. It must make a stand—for every backward step is a step towards defeat.

There has been much talk of negotiation in this Berlin crisis. In all solemnity I would say this—freedom is not negotiable. It is not negotiable here. It is not negotiable anywhere in the world.

We may sit down with the Communists and talk about ground rules on Berlin, we may discuss details of occupation and of garrison strength and deployment—but the basic principles here involved are not up for bargaining. Freedom has no mark-down price-tag—because freedom is not a matter of price but of value—and when you try to sell it short you've sold it, period.

For Berlin is more than a place on the map. It is the symbol of man's right to be free—and of his will to be free. It is not only a German city.

It is the hometown of humanity's best hopes and highest aspirations—a voice that must not be stilled, a sovereignty that must not be diminished. All the world watches—for the world's fate may well be at stake in this tiny but historically critical geographical area.

Freedom has had its heroes and martyrs. One of them was killed only several days ago. You read about him—an East German attempting to swim the canal that divides free Berlin from slave Berlin. None of us knew this man—yet, he is not a stranger to us. He is indeed a brother—for he chose the side of freedom—our side—and died trying to reach it. His supreme sacrifice should not go unmourned and unremembered.

It is to be assumed that his body was recovered by West German frogmen. I would therefore suggest that the free world he died to reach grant him the tribute of a full state funeral—and more, that throughout the free world memorial services be held in his memory and in his honor. Let this martyr be no victim of communism. Let his courageous death proclaim to the world the brutality of a system that must imprison its citizens in order to hold them.

In this regard, I think there is one readily available means of getting to the world the true picture of what West Berlin represents.

If we are to judge from the recent statements of neutralist leader Premier Nehru, of India, there is indeed some fuzzy thinking on the subject of our rights in Berlin as related to the Soviets. For this reason, I would suggest that the cause of truth might well be served on a global level, if the United Nations would authorize the sending to Berlin of a group of observers—specifically from the uncommitted nations—to study the entire question on the spot and to report their findings on this whole matter of legality and right. I believe this would not only open the eyes of certain nations and leaders, but would give the truth the circulation it should have.

Moreover, if East Berlin is building walls against people, it seems to me that the least we can do is to build walls against trade with this satellite nation. I therefore strongly urge that consideration be given to the imposition of economic sanctions on the East German puppet state. Let not the West continue to support an economy directed toward a struggle against the West. East Germany needs these economic transfusions from the West because it is suffering from pernicious anemia—Communist style. Why should we help them build up their resistance to the forces of freedom?

In closing, may I make this observation. Berlin is at once the moment of truth for the free world, and the point of no return. We are in a time of national crisis, of world crisis, and we must soberly face this cold, hard reality that we have faced so often before in our history.

I am confident that if we face it squarely and boldly, sure of our cause, and sure of our strength to defend that cause, we shall not only maintain the freedom of Berlin, but we shall remain true to the great heritage of our past—and to all the Americans in our history who loved freedom enough to fight for it and to die for it.

Improved Highway Engineering Productivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of all Members of Congress the fact that a whole new world of improvements is becomming effective in the construction of highways throughout our country by the increased use of new engineering practices and technical devices.

These great steps forward will not alone permit our Federal highway program to maintain schedule but will also materially reduce the cost of planning and engineering, as well as provide better highways.

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the State departments of highways and public works, and the highway engineers and contractors through their national associations are working closely as a team to bring into the highway planning and construction field the latest electronic computing devices, wider use of photogrammetry in surveying, the fast reduction of engineering data, and many new exciting ideas and uses of newly developed methods.

On August 24 and 25, the First Regional Conference on Improved Highway Engineering Productivity, was held in Boston under the auspices of the American Association of State Highway Officials, in

cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, and the engineering schools in the Greater Boston area.

More than 400 State highway officials, engineers, and manufacturers of highway equipment attended the 2-day session, coming from every State in the Union. A number of leading manufacturers displayed their newest equipment and models, ranging from the latest computers to new devices to give warning of icing conditions on highways.

The theme of the conference, established by Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Works, Hon. Jack Ricciardi, welcoming the visiting experts, was "Sharing the Knowledge," and every moment of the 2 working days was spent in discussion and exchange of views.

The official report of the conference, while somewhat technical, compiled by H. A. Radzikowski, Chief of Development, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, reveals the breadth of discussion and the tremendous strides that have been made in the highway planning and construction field since the Federal-State highway program was established in 1956.

I recommend its reading to every Member of Congress who looks forward to the day when all of our highway needs are fulfilled. The United States today is recognized in every foreign country as the leading nation in highway planning and construction, and it is from such conferences that we can learn about our continued leadership, and the problems that face us in the future.

This is the report as submitted by Mr. Radzikowski:

RECAPITULATION OF CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS AT REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON IMPROVED HIGHWAY ENGINEERING PRODUCTIVITY

(By H. A. Radzikowski, secretary, AASHO committee on electronics, Chief, Division of Development, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads)

(The American Association of State Highway Officials, through its committee on electronics, held a regional conference on improving highway engineering productivity. The conference was held in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, and engineering schools in the Greater Boston area. The meetings were held on August 24–25, 1961, at the Somerset Hotel, in Boston, Mass. Many new developments have taken place in the past few years which can aid highway officials in further improving efficiency, economy, and quality in the highway program. The conference was designed to encourage the exchange of experience on the latest developments in electronics and other scientific areas which have application in the highway program.)

The Boston Regional Conference on Improving Highway Engineering Productivity disclosed the tremendous advancements in technological methods that have occurred since 1956. Their use has fostered increasing productivity, economy, and quality of operations in the Nation's highway programs. The conference also disclosed the eagerness of the highway industry to work for further improvements in highway technology. Papers on 45 subjects were presented at the conference by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; by officials from 12 State highway departments; by officials from the Bureau of Public Roads; by members of 6 engineering schools; by the presidents of 3 nationwide highway associations; by a vice president of the New England Road Builders' Association; by members of 10 consulting engineering firms; and of 11 nationwide business corporations. Each voluntarily contributed his experience on methods of improving highway operating efficiency through the application of modern electronic and other methods in the road program.

There were 415 in attendance at the sessions, including representatives of most State highway departments. Their active discussions further contributed to the mutual exchange and communication of experience between highway organizations on improved technology. This should lead to the selection and use of the best engineering methods throughout the Nation.

Governor Volpe called for a continued effort toward the emancipation of highway engineers from repetitive routines through the use of electronics and other technological aids. This would mean that engineers could devote more time to the planning, designing, and construction of more efficient and economical highway transportation systems with emphasis on built-in safety to decrease accidents and human suffering. Massachusetts Commissioner Ricciardi, a sponsor of the conference, pointed out that the most modern electronic computer and other engineering aids that his organization is using assure efficient engineering and quality control of highway construction. He expressed pleasure that highway departments are sharing the knowledge. He described what can be accomplished by citing how he called the First Massachusetts Department of Public Works Highway Conference. "The highway men and the engineers came from the State's 351 cities and towns, and counties as well. * * * Their basic discussions brought out interesting new procedures, techniques, and information which was shared to the benefit of all."

Mr. Everett Preston, Ohio director of highways and general chairman of the AASHO Committee on Electronics, called attention to the fact that 47 of the 50 State highway departments of the Nation are now using elecronic computers for processing, storage, and retrieval of data in highway engineering and management. Extensive progress has been made in that State in the utilization of new, proven technological advancements. Further developments for an electronic road were illustrated with a talk and moving picture of instrumentation by Harold A. Bolz, dean of engineering, the Ohio State University. A panel discussion on teleprocessing field data from division to State office and return was headed by Earl M. Raley, data processing engineer, Ohio Department of Highways. A new nuclear moisture-density gage developed by Ohio and a self-electroluminescent road sign were described as under study by Mr. William D. Ashton.

Mr. Paul F. Royster, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads, pointed out that the road program since 1956 would not have been a success but for the utilization of technological advancements. This helped to overcome the shortage of an estimated 10,000 highway engineers. Mr. Ralph Bartelsmeyer, chief engineer, Illinois Department of Public Works and Buildings, and president of the American Road Builders' Association, expressed support for the use of new electronic and other technology. He pointed out that the ARBA convention theme for the March 1962 San Francisco, Calif., convention will be "Modernizing the Highway Industry."

Mr. Clare Miller, president of Associated General Contractors, called attention to the fact that the contracting industry has grown of age with over 50 years of highway building experience. He suggested that the 7,200 AGC contractor members be given the opportunity to operate under result specifications where feasible so that they could choose the tools and methods which they had learned from experience were best for accomplishing well-defined results. Method specifications that spell out in detail the tools to be used do not allow the contractors to put proven ideas to work.

There were five workshop sessions: (A) new methods in highway location and design; (B) bridges and the use of electronic computers; (C) urban operations; (D) electronics in management; and (E) impact of electronics on new equipment methods, specifications, and contractors' acceptance of new methods.

A summary of two of the workshop sessions will give an indication of the technical tone of the conference and the effectiveness with which the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads are exchanging ideas for greater efficiency.

Workshop session on bridges and the use of electronic computers, moderated by Mr. D. O. Cargill, chief engineer, Rhode Island Department of Public Works: bridge geometrics, C. A. Marmelstein, Georgia State Highway Department: Mr. Marmelstein gave a very good discussion and description of the bridge geometry problem. He also disclosed how the computer is being used in his State to solve this type of problem that is encountered in the location and layout of bridge structures. Some interesting statistics by Mr. Marmelstein relating to the computer and its extensive use in bridge design in Georgia are:

The bridge department had 1,053 bridge problems solved in its computer center during 1960, and of this number 325 were problems relating to skewed bridges. To indicate the computer's worth, he estimates that the 325 problems would have required the efforts of six men using desk calculators for 1 year if they had not had an electronic computer at their disposal. The bridge engineers in Georgia have made good progress in the use of the computer, and it was noted that they intend to progress still further. With equipment of greater capacity and speed soon to be at their disposal, they are anticipating greater increase in engineering efficiency, more refinement in methods of design and further reduction in engineering and construction costs.

Continuous spans: J. H. Kane and J. F. Willard, Massachusetts Department of Public Works: Mr. Kane of the host State, Massachusetts, indicated that they, too, have made excellent progress in applying the computer to bridge design work. He described one of their recently developed computer programs for aiding in the design of continuous span structures. His discussion also included setting forth all of the engineering principles involved in this problem and how they were incorporated into an automatic machine operation. This discussion was very interesting and beneficial to the other engineers present because it disclosed how useful and thorough a computer can be when it is properly given a chance.

A new approach to bridge deck design, Jerry Chang, Richardson, Gordon & Associates, Pittsburgh, Pa.: Mr. Chang talked about a new approach to bridge deck design for short span bridges, the orthotropic plate. His topic and presentation generated much interest among those present at this session. He also spoke of the role of the computer in this new design approach. According to Mr. Chang, the use of the orthotropic plate for a bridge deck is the most interesting advancement in bridge design over the past 10 or 20 years. Europe has had some orthotropic steel plate bridge decks in use for some time. Now, in this country, there are some industrial bridges using this type construction. In discussing the role of the computer in this new design approach, he noted that

the complictaed mathematics involved in the orthotropic plate analysis was the main reason that delayed the use of this type of bridge construction in this country. The role of the computer in this new design approach was given as being in four parts: one for solving the long and complex mathematical equations included in the plate analysis; another to use the computer to determine the range of values for which the mathematical equations were considered valid. The computer was also used for reducing the lengthy equations to a short, more practicable, and usable form by creating a mathematical model of the system. And finally in this aproach, the computer is used for determining physical section properties for various structural elements and for calculating stresses due to various loading conditions.

Availability of bridge programs, W. H. Collins, Bureau of Public Roads: The attending bridge engineers were informed by Mr. Collins about many other areas where the computer is being effectively used in bridge design work. It was noted that the computer was being used on the extremely difficult and complex problem of analyzing sharply curved girders. It is being used also for making steel girder designs, for load analyses on open web-type structures, and in all phases of concrete design. Another interesting computer application mentioned here was one dealing with the determination of optimum spacing for bridge stringers. This was interesting for those present because the indicated computer results differed a great deal from other accepted authorities on optimum stringer spacing. Also during this session, an idea was advanced stressing that all bridge engineers who have access to the use of the computer should learn to communicate and deal directly with the computer in order to improve the effectiveness and usefulness of this tool for bridge design work. In order for bridge engineers to do this, it was suggested that they obtain and study other available computer programs, in the bridge field, which are in a meaningful form to engineers, for learning computer procedures. And from these programs, engineers would discover new ideas in bridge design. Several sources for programs understandable to bridge engineers having little knowledge about computers were mentioned—such as the Bureau of Public Roads electronic computer program library, various computer user groups, and the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Workshop session on new methods in highway location and design, moderated by Mr. L. R. Schureman, chief, electronics branch, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads: Automatic Readout From Stereoplotters—R. H. Sheik, Ohio Highway Department. Mr. Sheik traced the development of automatic readout devices for digitizing terrain data obtained from stereoplotters from its inception in 1956 to the present time. He described the systems developed by the Ohio Department of Highways, Benson Lehner Corp., Photronics, Inc., and others. He also discussed the use of these devices for preliminary location studies, for design, for final pay quantities, and for right-of-way requirements and plans and cited readout speeds of 500 points per hour, over three times faster than manual measurement and recording.

Mr. MacDonald described the photogrammetric system in use at Lockwood, Kessler, and Bartlett and the automatic readout device developed collaboratively with the Electro-Logic Corp. The increased accuracy, speed, facility, and freedom from error attainable through the use of this equipment were stressed.

Digital cross sections, C. C. Tevis, Missouri State Highway Commission: Mr. Tevis described the use of digital cross sections in place of drawn cross sections in Missouri. This method was first used in 1958 and has increased to about 60 percent today for interstate, primary, and urban systems. Digital cross section tabulations are prepared accurately from data obtained in the stereoplotter and form the basis for payment on plan quantities. Cross sections in digital form are accepted and even preferred by their construction engineers and contractors. No difficulty has been encountered in administering contracts for which digital cross section data have been furnished in place of drawn cross sections.

DTM system for highway location evaluation, P. O. Roberts, MIT; Richard A. Pucci, New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways; Walter J. Verrill, Maine State Commission: Professor Roberts described the changes made in the original DTM system to improve its versatility, usefulness, and accuracy and to extend its application to land acquisition costs. He also described the work being done at MIT on vehicle operation simulation to determine road user costs. Mr. Pucci reported that New Hampshire to date has used the DTM system over 200 miles of alinement and earthwork computation. Substantial savings in construction costs through the use of this system were reported. Mr. Verrill of Maine reported a saving of a quarter of a million dollars in 1 mile of a section of the interstate system through the use of DTM. The ratio of DTM time requirements to manual time requirements has been determined to be approximately one-twelfth for fixed horizontal alinement and one-ninetieth where both horizontal and vertical alinement may be adjusted.

Electronic distance measuring instruments, C. Parks, Maryland State Roads Commission: Mr. Parks described Maryland's experience with the Tellurometer and also provided basic information on the Geodimeter. Both instruments were reported to be valuable aids in reducing field time and increasing accuracy in photogrammetric control surveys.

Composite plan of route location and right-of-way requirements, E. C. Richardson, Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., Rochester, Pa.: Mr. Richardson described the work done at Michael Baker, Inc., on the automatic plotting of slope stake points on plan and profile views as an aid in drainage and R/W requirement determinations and as an additional dimension for construction engineers and contractors. Acceptance has been excellent.

Electronic computer analysis of highway drainage design, Philip King, King & Gavaris, consultants, New York, N.Y.: Mr. Philip King of King & Gavaris, consulting engineers, described the computer programs developed in his organization for open channel surface profiles and for the analysis of storm drainage systems. These programs have expedited substantially the hydraulic analyses involved in highway engineering projects handled by this firm.

COGO system for highway design, C. L. Miller, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Professor Miller of MIT described the computer programing system he has developed for facilitating the solution of geometric problems on the electronic computer. The term COGO is coined from the two words "coordinate" and "geometry." This is an extremly flexible system. One of its major advantages is that it is completely problem oriented and eliminates the need for the engineer to work through a programing technician in using the computer.

A panel discussion of professors from Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Wentworth Institute, Northeastern University, Tufts University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology was headed by Prof. C. L. Miller of MIT.

The general view was that in this electronic and space age, they could think of no better way of attracting talented, science-motivated high school students toward the study of civil engineering than by publicizing these new electronic applications and by providing space in the curriculum for a moderate amount of actual manipulation of automated equipment. Many do not. The principal reason for such lack is financial cramps in civil engineering budgets. There is a reservoir of need for such equipment and a strong indication that curriculum time would be found for students to use the equipment to good advantage in engineering education.

Mr. Ellis L. Armstrong, former Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, and now president, Better Highway Information Foundation, Washington, D.C., after diligently attending the 2-day conference, had this to say in the closing session:

This conference has shown that our electronic computers can take literally millions of bits and pieces of data and put them together into a coherent story; they do the work of 10,000 men. What an opportunity this presents to get the story across of the dynamic, challenging, interesting, inspiring field that highway engineering is today and what we are doing about it.

The measuring of compaction, immediately and accurately, with nuclear measuring apparatus has now been well proven. Get this story told, and understood, to each other so that we can get on with this complex problem of keeping up on controls with the speed with which our modern machines can build. And this presents opportunity for quite a story to John Q.

The improvement in administration made possible by electronics and computers is a fascinating story. The up-to-the-minute inventory of parts, equipment, and of all the roads and their sufficiency ratings; vast amounts of data stored on a small reel of magnetic tape with many details and combinations of details available for immediate retrieval; the transmitting of detailed data by "data-phone" and by radio; all of these developments and many others developed and in the development stage present administrators with means to get answers to questions and information almost immediately so that effective controls can be maintained and sound, effective, and efficient decisions can be made.

The improvements in equipment today are of great interest and are dramatic. We have now tested and are utilizing the capabilities of the "first generation" computers; we are rapidly sizing up the potential of the "second generation"; and we are looking forward with anticipation to the "third generation." The applications of photogrametry and electronic measurement; the conquering of complexities of hydraulic study and design, of transportation traffic analysis in complex urban areas, of bridge design analysis; all speak well of the breed of men who are highway engineers.

This conference has produced documented evidence that the great day is here. We have been presented with an unexcelled opportunity to get a lot of work done that badly needs doing. We have the tools, the techniques—and with proper understanding there is no limit to accomplishments. The time has come to get with it.

The success of this regional conference in a large measure was due to the support and active practicipation of the commissioner of the department of public works in the host State, Mr. Jack P. Ricciardi. His staff, under the direction of Mr. James F. Kelley, very efficiently handled countless details to make the meetings proceed smoothly. Mr. George Hines, Washington representative of the department, gave valuable assistance and advice in planning the conference. Mr. William D. Dillon, Assistant Chief, Division of Development, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, acted as conference manager.

Taxes Related to Corporate Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], delivered a thoughtful and interesting speech before the Tax Executives Institute in Detroit, Mich., of this year which deserves the consideration of Congress. The speech was printed in the Tennessee Law Review, volume 28, summer 1961, No. 4. Because I know it would be helpful to Members of Congress I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES RELATED TO CORPORATE ACTIVITY

(Address by Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, before Tax Executives Institute, Detroit, Mich., May 24, 1961)

A modern State has political purposes and social and economic goals all its own. Political, social, and economic goals should be mutually compatible and mutually supporting, the more so the more viable, and perhaps the more enduring, the society will be. In a modern democracy, certain generally accepted ends are pursued on a continuing basis. Among these ends, in a free society, is a proper distribution of the fruits of the economy, for political democracy and the nonstratification of society will hardly survive without it.

In the United States, it is desirable that economic gains be widely shared. Deep poverty, on the one hand, and the accumulation of untoward amounts of wealth by any individual, on the other, are equally to be shunned. Equality of opportunity is to be preserved. A meaningful regard for future generations as well as our own must be kept in mind. The process of raising up the bottom layers of society is a continuing one. Only if we follow these guidelines can the extremes of power, so inimical to democracy, be avoided. Only on this basis can political democracy be preserved for ourselves and for our children, or so it seems to me.

Taxation is a vital part of the foundation of our whole national structure. Indeed, the tax system is one of the primary tools used by a society, through its government, for achieving the goals that society has set for itself. If this view is accepted, taxation has functions other than revenue. Sufficient revenue must, of course, be obtained and this is the primary purpose of taxation, but it must be obtained in such a way as to further the general aims of society, not to hinder their fulfillment.

I think we have no particular difficulty in agreeing on the other generally accepted principles of taxation. Most of us, for example, would readily agree that we must adhere closely to the principal of ability to pay. Few people today seriously support the benefits received theory. Of course, there are always exceptions. Some may refer to the ability to pay principle as a soak the rich scheme. But even Adam Smith recognized the correct application of the principle. You will recall that he started the section on taxation in his classic "Wealth of Nations" with this statmeent: "The subjects of every state ought to contribute toward the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state."

I doubt if there is any widespread objection to using taxation for the accomplishment of specific social and economic purposes, in principle, so long as the purposes themselves receive widespread public support. The taxation of oleomargarine is a case in point. We also have a graduated estate tax in an effort to prevent the accumulation of too much economic power in the hands of any one person. We could go on for hours discussing principles of taxation, and succeed, perhaps, in developing wide areas of both agreement and disagreement. What we are really interested in are specifics which violate our subjective judgment as to what is equity. In my view, our tax laws are so riddled with instances of tax favoritism that our system is not now equitable. It certainly cannot be said that equal incomes are today bearing equal tax burdens. Realizing that one man's loophole is another man's equitable adjustment of properly taxable income, we will neither begin nor end in wholehearted agreement. I assume, however, that since you invited me here, you are interested in some of the views held by me and by others of like mind in the Congress.

Many of you, I am told, are associated with corporations. So, although there are many inequities in the individual tax field, perhaps I should concentrate on the corporate tax structure, and taxes directly related to corporate activity. Among the most frequently discussed topics in this area today are the treatment of depreciation and depletion allowances, the taxation of income earned abroad, and means by which corporations compensate their "key" officers and employees at a reduced rate of effective taxation.

I. DEPRECIATION AND DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

First, let us look at depreciation and depletion. The corporate tax rate of 52 percent is high. Everyone will admit that. But it is also admitted that revenue is needed, and no serious attempt has been made recently, and none will be made this year, to lower the corporate rate. This will not be done until we have some overall tax reform or world conditions change drastically. This "temporary" rate of 52 percent will be extended again this year without any hard fight in the Congress. What has been done, and what will be attempted from time to time, is to lower the effective tax rate on corporations by liberalizing depreciation allowances. This is a kind of back-door-type reduction.

You are familiar with the arguments on this point. Some of you, perhaps, have gone before the Ways and Means Committee or the Finance Committee at various times to testify in favor of liberalized depreciation. Some will say that depreciation is merely a recovery of capital and has no bearing, no matter how liberal, on the effective tax rate. In my view, this is not good logic, under growth conditions. As long as the economy is growing, and a corporation is growing along with it, expenditures for plant and equipment are going to continue to increase. And, as long as this is the case, liberalized depreciation has the effect of lowering the effective tax rate. In other words, this is not tax deferral we are talking about, but tax reduction.

Mr. John B. Madigan, an officer of the Hartford Electric Light Co., has put this about as well as anyone. He stated, in an address before the National Conference of Electric and Gas Utility Accountants at Chicago in 1959, that by "using liberalized depreciation in our company we reduced our Federal income tax by 14 percent in 1957 and as much as 30 percent in 1958." He went on to say that "with very few exceptions the annual tax bill will continue to be less under accelerated depreciation than under straight-line" and "the cumulative amount of tax savings will be still growing at the turn of the next century." In considering any type of liberalized depreciation, then, let us bear in mind that we are actually talking about reducing the effective tax rate for those corporations able to take advantage of the liberalization.

President Kennedy has proposed a tax credit based on above normal capital expenditures. This is a new form of liberalized depreciation. This method of tax reduction favors some types of enterprises over others. Industrial corporations, for the most part, are pretty much in the same situation vis-a-vis investment in plant and equipment. But what about the corporation which uses relatively little capital equipment or machinery, such as financial institutions or research organizations? Even the industrial corporation which has invested heavily in modern plant and equipment during the past few years, and whose long-range program now calls for a slowdown in purchases of new equipment for 3 or 4 years, will be at a disadvantage.

Then, too, the type of tax credit President Kennedy has recommended may work somewhat counter to the built-in stabilizers in our tax system. In years, such as 1957, when demand is sparked by plant expansion, there will likely be good profits and high taxes, and therefore there will be a desire to take advantage of a tax credit. This may serve to bunch expenditures even more in a peak year. On the other hand, in years of recession when plant expansion should be encouraged, profits will be low, with reduced tax liability. But cash flows will continue to be relatively high due to high depreciation allowances for past expenditures. There will be little incentive to try for a tax credit, and capital expenditures will therefore not be encouraged. As a member of the finance committee, I am continuing my study of this recommendation, as well as of our existing depreciation provisions. At the present time, I have reservation about increasing depreciation allowances.

I said I was going to discuss depreciation and depletion. Perhaps there is no need to say very much about depletion. Percentage depletion is, in my opinion, one of the most unjustified tax gimmicks ever perpetrated on the taxpaying public. Depletion, like depreciation, is designed to allow the taxpayer to recover the value of a capital investment tax free. Our system of percentage depletion, however, bears no relationship whatsoever to the cost, or even to the value at any stage of development, of the capital asset. Cost may be recovered many times over, and still this tax deduction continues to run.

The argument most often advanced is, of course, that a big so-called depletion allowance is necessary to encourage expensive exploration. Put in this way, this type of allowance is nothing more than a subsidy. Moreover, it is, under present law, a continuing subsidy after there is no longer any relationship between the subsidy and any possible developmental incentive. Of course, percentage depletion is available to those who do no exploration. To these, it serves as a tax reduction, pure and simple, and without justification. I am hopeful that the administration will join those of us in the Congress who wish to move next year against percentage depletion. To date, this decision has apparently not been made.

II. TAXATION OF INCOME EARNED ABROAD

Let us now move to another aspect of corporate taxation in which most of you, I am sure, are interested, that is, the taxation of income earned abroad. Private foreign investment is getting to be a problem of rather serious proportions. It is getting to be seri-

ous because our tax laws continue to be heavily weighted in favor of foreign investment, as against increased domestic investment, and world conditions have, in the last 3 or 4 years, changed sufficiently to begin to make this tax favoritism effective in siphoning off capital and increasing the volume of its flow to Europe and other industrially developed areas.

Let me hasten to say that I am not against foreign investment. I am just in favor of taxing its profits. Now every time anyone begins to talk about foreign investment, someone will rush to its defense with the argument that, in the first place, increased foreign investment increases our exports, and in the second place, we get back more in dividends than we send abroad in new money. Let us see about this.

If a company is exporting machinery to Italy, let us say, and it finds that it needs to manufacture spare parts, or make final assembly, or do servicing in Italy, does it need a tax concession to encourage it to set up a small operation in Italy? Will such a company turn its back on this export source of profit because it is required to pay taxes on that part of its profit earned in Italy? I hardly think so. And do we really get back more in dividends than we send abroad in new money? We may if dividends from subsidiaries and profits from branch operations are combined, although even this is doubtful. Branch profits are repatriated because they are taxed currently, although sometimes very lightly. As you know, much of the foreign operations carried on in branch form are in the petroleum and mineral area, and many of the companies concerned, when they combine the foreign tax credit with the depletion allowance, pay practically no U.S. tax whatsoever. Naturally there is no inclination on the part of these companies to try to hide their profits in a subsidiary in Liechtenstein.

What I am really concerned about in this field are subsidiary operations. This is where the big tax avoidance lies. This is where you will find the tax haven abuses. When an American company doing export business in Latin America collapses its Western Hemisphere trade subsidiary in favor of a Swiss subsidiary which, in turn, fronts for a Liechtenstein subsidiary, which, in turn, performs no function whatsoever except to receive a 20-percent commission on all corporate exports—and these exports are actually sold by outside agents—then things have gone too far. This sort of thing is happening daily.

Now, some may say that we should not tax all subsidiaries, but instead we should plug up these various kinds of tax haven loopholes as they are discovered. This is easier said than done. In the first place, it is hard to discover the true facts. Liechtenstein, for example, has such a tight economic espionage law that our Internal Revenue agents working in Europe face the prospect of a long jail term if they go inquiring in Liechtenstein to find to what American-owned subsidiaries are up to. And once a particular type of operation is discovered, it is sometimes difficult to devise specific legislative language to stop it.

Consider the rather limited field of reinsurance. We find at least three variations. In one case, an American operating company will reinsure with a dummy subsidiary in a tax haven, with the reinsurance treaty rigged so as to pull most of the profits into the tax haven. As a variation on this, a foreign company may set up an American operating subsidiary with a reinsurance treaty which pulls the profits of the American company into its parent abroad or into a tax haven subsidiary of that foreign parent. A third variation is to have an American company set up a subsidiary in a tax haven which, in turn, sets up an operating subsidiary abroad. The reinsurance treaty can be so rigged that the losses of the foreign operating company are paid by the U.S. parent out of funds earned but untaxed in the United States, while the profits of the foreign operating company go into the tax haven subsidiary. The only sure way to cure these abuses is to tax all subsidiaries currently on their profits.

III. RESTRICTED STOCK OPTIONS

As to special means of compensating certain "key" corporation employees, the restricted stock option plan is a favorite. The restricted stock option is a loophole which affects both the corporation and the individual beneficiary. I classify it as a loophole because, as it has been used by many companies and insiders, it amounts only to a scheme for transforming what is in fact ordinary income into a type of income which the tax code recognizes as being entitled to a capital gains tax treatment, if taxed at all.

Here is a case which has been called to my attention. It does not involve a Michigan company, I am glad to say. In this particular company, reportedly almost 5 percent of the shares of stock outstanding were set aside for options. Those insiders who were able to take advantage of the situation have made a profit of about 500 percent on the arrangement. Even worse, when the options were exercised, in at least some cases, the company accepted a note from the officers exercising the options for 95 percent of the purchase price, with a rate of interest so low that the dividends would pay the interest on the loan. What a free ride—500 percent profit without capital, without risk, and with very little tax liability.

But the ordinary stockholder can do nothing. The stock exchanges require fairly full disclosure in proxy statements, but that is, perhaps, all they can do. No Government agency has any authority to review these plans, in most instances.

The root of the trouble lies with the Congress. Because of faulty legislation, this sort of thing has been encouraged until it is now at the point of becoming a national scandal. The only way to put a stop to this sort of thing is to correct the laws. I am trying to accomplish that during this session of Congress.

You know, people have short memories. Just last December the Wall Street Journal ran a wrap-up article on restricted stock options, and the headline, believe it or not, was "Options on the Wane." During the period covered by the SEC March report, officers and directors of the companies listed on the major exchanges reported 358 separate purchases of stock under options, with a market value—based on the closing prices for May 8, 1961—of $27,144,000. Restricted stock options are anything but "on the wane." Every time the market goes up, both sales and purchases increase.

So far as I am concerned, the restricted stock option is wholly unjustified. I am told that corporate executives need stock options to encourage them to do a conscientious job. I don't believe it. Would you quit your job if the law were changed? If you did, what would you do? Would you be less conscientious in your work if you did not have stock options? Of course not.

I am working for greater tax equity. I would also like to see lower tax rates. But the only way we can have lower rates and more equity is to eliminate special tax favoritism, only a few instances of which I have mentioned tonight. When that is done, we can begin to treat equal incomes, from whatever source, equitably, and with some possible preference to earned income.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 17, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has come to my attention that you have authored House Resolution 211, a bill asking that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be created.

Congratulations. I sincerely approve of this bill as a means for the American people to receive reliable information systematically and methodically reported concerning peoples of captive nations. Good thinking, Congressman.

A copy of this letter is going out to the Congressman from my county of San Diego, Calif. and as well to the local newspaper.

Again, congratulations and the best of luck to you.

Mrs. TOM LUCAS.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We are writing in regards to your House Resolution 211. We think a Special House Committee on Captive Nations is a wonderful idea.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PATRICK SEATON.
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.,
August 15, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman of Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: You are to be commended on House Resolution 211. I hope a Special House Committee on Captive Nations will be formed at once.

Continue your fine work striving for what is right.

Most respectfully,

Mrs. O. L. PUTTLER.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of the bill you authored, House Resolution 211. I would let the people in the captive nations throughout the world know that the United States has not forgotten them and some day, God willing, we will free them of their atheistic chains.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOAN G. MCDONALD.

ENCINITAS, CALIF.

AUGUST 10, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Just a line to let you know that I like your House Resolution 211 to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Keep up the good work.

RONALD P. SCHMIDT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily approve your bill, House Resolution 211. We certainly need this kind of legislation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. COX.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.

AUGUST 18, 1961.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your House Resolution 211, to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Mrs. LOIS SALMANS.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.

AUGUST 24, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am writing to congratulate you on your fine bill, House Resolution 211, which would provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I'm sure if your bill is passed, it would bring hope to the millions of enslaved people throughout the world. It is very important for these people to know the free world has not forgotten them. It would also be a reminder to Khrushchev that we have not abandoned these people. These people need hope.

I am writing my Congressman about your bill, and I certainly wish you success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. S. SAMUELS.

FULLERTON, CALIF.

GRYPHON OIL & GAS CO.,
Amarillo, Tex., August 19, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Anticommunistic actions speak louder than our foreign-aid giveaway. Passage of your House Resolution 211 will do far more good to help stop the growing tide of communism than all the millions of dollars the executive branch would pour into Communist captive nations.

We must expediently show the Russian dictators that we do not now, nor do we ever intend to write off the captive nations. We must offer the people of these nations new hopes for freedom, which the committee under your resolution would do by letting these enslaved people know that we do care, and at the same time we will not furnish capital to their masters to further the Communist criminal conspiracy through foreign aid.

Congratulations for your foresight to present this bill. It will meet with unequivocal approval by those who know the real meaning of the atheistic international Communist conspiracy.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. SHAW.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD: I strongly support the proposal to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. We can't forget these nations that have been enslaved by the Communist murderers. It would certainly boost their morale to know that the United States has still been thinking of their plight.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GRAHAM KRAUS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *August 15, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Could you please send me some information on your bill, House Resolution 211, to "establish a Committee on Captive Nations." This seems to me an excellent idea, which will perhaps offset some of the odium attaching to our foreign relations failures.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BAIN.

AUGUST 22, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I came across this item in Elta, the official publication of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania. Thought you might like to include it with other similiar "mouthings."

The very idea of Captive Nations or Captive Nations Committee has gotten under the skin of the Soviets.

My very best to you.

Sincerely,

MARY KISZIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

[From Elta, the official publication of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, Aug. 26, 1961]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK ATTACKED BY RADIO VILNIUS

The Captive Nations Week 1961 was fiercely attacked, as in the previous years, by the media in Soviet-occupied Lithuania. Radio Vilnius stated on July 20 that the week was organized by the most reactionary circles in the United States together with the "splinters of bourgeois nationalists who have fled across the ocean." These "splinters," according to radio Vilnius, do not lose hope to restore capitalist order in the countries of peoples' democracies.

AUGUST 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for introduction of this bill to form a House Committee on Captive Nations. This should give hope to the millions of Communist-enslaved people of the world. I am asking my Congressman WALT HORAN to give you his support on this bill.

Sincerely,

CHARLES UHDEN.

SPOKANE, WASH.

California State Water Plan Is Outgrowth of Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a tragic drought again is menacing broad expanses of the West. California is experiencing its third dry year in succession and this is its driest year in the last quarter century. In the most populous counties no drier year has been recorded since statehood, 111 years ago.

Grim disaster is being averted in California this summer and fall only by the existence of two great reclamation projects built by the Federal government, and the related aqueducts and local projects built by agencies in California. I refer to the Boulder Canyon project on the Colorado River which regulates that stream and supplies water to much of southern California and to the Central Valley project which serves the great Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. My State this year would have become a major disaster area without these projects.

This is recognized in California where, under the leadership of Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, new ground is being broken in Federal-State cooperation in water resources development. The voters of California last year approved the mammoth California State water project which will transfer excess water from the Feather River south as far as the Mexican border through a great system of reservoirs and aqueducts. The job is being undertaken by the California Department of Water Resources headed by William E. Warne as director. Many of you will remember Bill Warne as a former Reclamation official and Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Warne has written an article, now appearing in certain California newspapers, which emphasizes the value of the Central Valley project to the new State water plan. It is an expression of the cooperation and coordination I have noted. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

(By William E. Warne, director, Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, Calif.)

The Central Valley project of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation in California is known worldwide, and well it might be, since it is outstanding among its kind.

Originally conceived by the State of California, the Central Valley project was taken over for construction by the Federal Government on a finding of feasibility by Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes which was approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on December 2, 1935. At the start, the project was

financed from Public Works Administration allotments.

There is a certain parallel between the birth of the Central Valley project and that of the new State water project. Both grew out of long-range studies begun in 1921 by the Department of Water Resources, which in the early days had different names, but much the same planning function. Each was a plan to shift water from more bounteous supplies in the north to needy areas in the south, though the Central Valley project had a shorter north-south span as opposed to a north-south reach of almost 750 miles by the State water project.

The Central Valley project proposal was submitted to the people at a special election in 1933 and was approved. Its plan, however, contemplated revenue bonds to finance the construction and during the great depression these did not prove salable.

The State water project was submitted to a vote of the people on November 8, 1960, and was approved. The $1,750 million bonds authorized, although they are expected to be repaid from revenues of the project, are backed by the general credit of the State. They will be readily marketable.

The period of time since the Central Valley project was first put forward is nearing 30 years, about the time the State water project is expected to serve emerging needs of California, i.e., until 1990.

There are major differences in these two projects, of course. The most apparent one is that the Federal Government, which is building the Central Valley project, has used it as the chassis on which it has built a more elaborate and expansible project.

First construction was begun on October 19, 1937, on the Contra Costa Canal unit. The canal was completed and began delivering water August 16, 1940.

Whereas the original estimate of the cost of the Central Valley project was $170 million, the Bureau of Reclamation had spent as of June 30, 1960, $651,758,982.84 on a greatly expanded plan, and is now estimating the completed cost of the much larger undertaking at $1,160 million. The estimated cost went up last year, for example, by $290,430,000 by reason of the addition of the San Luis unit as part of the Central Valley project.

Of the more than $651 million invested as of last June, $363,351,410.15, or more than half, was for multiple-purpose facilities and $54,494,919.76 for irrigation, and $101,570,036.04 for electric facilities.

The Bureau of Reclamation has adjusted its reimbursement plan and schedule so that the expanded project has not suffered as to its economic feasibility. New capacities, for example, made more water or power available and increased revenues to offset the added costs, and, likewise, new units incorporated into the plan, such as the Trinity River Diversion, and San Luis were figured into the financial tables. Already, gross income to the project has amounted to $178,143,211, more than the first estimate of cost of the original project as then planned.

The Central Valley project, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, will serve 10,654 farms, providing full irrigation service to 265,833 acres, supplemental to 860,483 more, and temporary water to 95,434 additional acres. Regarding the irrigation benefits, the Bureau says very nicely of the project:

"The value of agricultural production in the vast Central Valley is greater than that of most whole States. The principal crops grown are grapes, olives, nuts, figs, citrus and other fruits, grain, cotton, sugarbeets, beans, alfalfa, vegetables, potatoes, and melons. In 1953, a typical year, the Central Valley produced 98.5 percent of the figs, 87 percent of the almonds, 83 percent of the olives, 64 percent of the grapes, 35 percent of the asparagus, 25 percent of the rice, 18 percent of the cantaloups, 16 percent of all fruits and nuts, and 10 percent of the cotton raised in the United States. Thus irrigation and drainage have turned a desolation of swamp and desert into an area of rich farms and attractive cities, supporting a population of more than 2 million."

A simple enumeration of the units that compose the Central Valley project is impressive:

Shasta dam, lake, and powerplant: Keswick dam and powerplant; Delta Cross Channel; Contra Costa Canal; Delta-Mendota Canal; Tracy pumping plant; Friant Dam and Millerton Lake; Friant-Kern Canal; Madera Canal; Folsom dam, reservoir, and powerplant; Nimbus dam and powerplant; Sly Park Dam and Camp Creek diversion; Sacramento Valley canals, including the Red Bluff diversion dam, the Corning Canal, the proposed Tehama-Colusa Canal and the Chico Canal; Trinity River diversion, including Trinity dam and powerplant, Lewiston diversion dam, Clear Creek power conduit, Clear Creek powerplant, Whiskeytown Dam, and Spring Creek power conduit and plant.

At least two of the dams are listed in the Nation's top 10, and the canals are notable. Even the old names bespeak the history of California: Keswick, Whiskeytown, Millerton, and they are being tied into the future history through the project.

As one who has been connected as an outside observer, as an official of the Bureau of Reclamation, and as an official of the State of California, three ways, with the Central Valley project, I have many memories concerning it. The late Ed Hyatt, State engineer, and the late Bob Edmundson, his successor and an architect of the State water project, were frequently in Washington, when I was there as Associated Press staff writer, in 1934 and 1935. I followed the developments prior to the approval of the project by Secretary Harold Ickes as enthusiastically as I would have if I had been on the staff of the State engineer. I was in the Bureau of Reclamation as an editorial assistant when the project finally was adopted and for the next 16 years was intimately associated with its development. As Assistant Secretary of Interior for Water and Power Development, I cut the ribbon with CLAIR ENGLE, now Senator, and Joseph R. Knowland, who was chairman of the California Centennial Commission, when Shasta Dam was completed and dedicated in 1950.

For the memories involved, perhaps, but also because of its exceptional importance as an instrument of development in California, I look upon the Central Valley project as a worthy model of multiple-purpose water development to hold before the world.

If the new State water project can succeed in its assigned roles so well as has the Central Valley project, there can be no regrets when the score is toted up on the big, new project in 1990.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to those congratulating the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] on attaining his 25th year in the House. His youthful and cheerful appearance belies the birthday he also celebrates this date and bears little trace of the legislative battles he has waged and won.

From the start of my own service in the House, I have found occasion many times to seek the counsel and friendly advice of the gentleman and he has always been considerate and helpful. His store of knowledge with respect to tax law is abundant, and he has an outstanding ability in the field of legislative procedure.

I believe the spontaneous outpouring of tributes which has marked this day is testimony to how highly regarded GENE KEOGH is in the U.S. House of Representatives. I know we all wish him and his lovely wife the best of fortune in the years ahead.

Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continuing international crises have naturally brought forth a multitude of suggestions and thoughts relative to the nature and the problems of present world tensions.

The word "emergency" has been used frequently to discuss the present world turmoil, and rightfully so. The deteriorating nature of world affairs is being felt by millions of citizens throughout the country, directly and indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Emergency," which is a very practical, thorough analysis of the repercussions of the world situation. This article appeared in the Thursday, August 31 issue of the Southwest Messenger Press, a weekly newspaper chain in the southwest suburban area of Cook County, Ill.:

EMERGENCY

The impact of the stepped-up military program has not yet been felt. But this period of relative tranquility (if such a word can be used in today's unpredictable world) will be short lived. In the near future thousands of reserves and members of the National Guard will be called to duty. This will be done, in the beginning, at any rate, on a selective rather than a unit basis. Certain skills are needed now, and individuals possessing them will get the summonses.

Draft calls are to be increased three times over, at the start. If conditions worsen, of course, much larger increases will follow.

The overall military budget is now $48 billion a year. Congress swiftly approved the President's requests with hardly a dissenting vote, and in some instances, appropriated more than was asked for. As columnist Robert S. Allen writes: "That stupendous total could go higher, depending on what happens in Berlin, Cuba, South Vietnam, Iran, and other danger points. But $48 billion defense budget is a certainty for the next several or more years."

The President has said that he may ask for tax increases, of an as yet undisclosed nature, early next year. He added that

whether he does or not will depend on the Government's receipts from existing taxes. At the same time, he has promised balanced budgets to come. Very few economists believe that the receipts will increase enough, even if there is a big business boom, to take care of the multi-billion dollar boost in the budget. And congressional leaders have said that they will approve higher taxes when and if they prove necessary.

Along with all this, a highly significant change in military attitude has been taking place. For a considerable period of time all the emphasis was laid on major nuclear war—war to the absolute finish, in which the ultimate weapons would be employed. Some military men anticipated that such a war would be decided in 24 or 48 hours. But now there is a widely held belief that the chance of this kind of war is remote, that no one would be insane enough to start it, and that future conflicts, if they come, will be fought with what are known as conventional weapons. They would thus be limited in scope and destructiveness.

On top of that, the ultimate weapons would not be suited, all other questions aside, to the so-called "brush-fire" wars we may be called upon to fight in various far-flung parts of this seething world. So the soldier with a gun in his hand—even though it is a very advanced kind of gun—is again being given a high place.

U.S.-Backed Clinic Begun in Cracow, Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, September 6, 1961:

U.S.-BACKED CLINIC BEGUN IN CRACOW

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

WARSAW, September 5.—Two vacationing sisters of President Kennedy—Mrs. Eunice Shriver and Mrs. Jeanne Smith—made a small detour today in their sightseeing tour of Cracow, in southern Poland, and paused to stare at a hole in the ground.

The hole, in a wooded hilltop on the edge of Poland's ancient capital, represents the dream of a Polish-born architect who made his fortune in the United States.

It marks the start of construction of a 300-bed children's hospital and pediatric research center. It is expected to be, when finished in 1964, the only American hospital in a Communist country and one of the best pediatric institutions in Europe.

This will be the creation of Wladislaw O. Biernacki-Poray, who heads his own architectural firm in New York, with indispensable assistance from the U.S. Government.

While sitting up with his seriously ill daughter one night in April 1958 Mr. Biernacki-Poray conceived the idea of doing something for the benefit of children and also of his native Poland. The next morning he decided the project should be a children's hospital in Poland.

At first Mr. Biernacki-Poray planned to finance the project himself. But the four-story circular hospital that he designed, flanked by laboratories, teaching and surgical structures, exceeded even his ample means.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray heard about the U.S. accumulation of frozen zlotys in Warsaw, now in excess of 8 billion ($320 million at the tourist exchange rate). This bank account was built up from the sale of $360 million worth of surplus agricultural products to Poland since 1957.

The Battle Act, as enacted in 1950 to impose sharp restrictions on U.S. aid to Communist countries, forbade using funds from the zloty account to build anything for Polish use.

BATTLE ACT AMENDED

With the help of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Mr. Biernacki-Poray persuaded Congress to amend the act to authorize zloty expenditures on his hospital.

Then he flew to Poland to fight the battle of bureaucracy in Warsaw. In the last 3 years he has acquired more Polish visas in his passport than any other American.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray has negotiated with four Polish Government ministries over issues ranging from the amount of equipment he would provide—$1,500,000—to his insistence that a Roman Catholic chapel be built in the hospital.

Yesterday the soft-spoken architect, who lives at 195 Christopher Street, Montclair, received assurance that his 1958 inspiration would become a reality.

As president of the American Research Hospital for Children, Inc., Mr. Biernacki-Poray signed a construction agreement with the Ministry of Health.

WORK STARTED OWN RISK

In fact, his bulldozers were already at work at the site. In his urgency to get started, the architect assumed personal responsibility 6 weeks ago for all interim construction costs should project eventually collapse.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray will be in Krakow next month for the formal ground breaking, probably in the company of Senator HUMPHREY and Representative ZABLOCKI.

He has taken an apartment in Warsaw and plans to spend much of the next 3 years nursing his 146 million-zloty ($6 million) hospital into being.

The timetable calls for the admission of the first patient in the spring of 1964. Judging from Mr. Biernacki-Poray's performance so far, the prospects are good that the schedule will be met.

ARCHITECT-HUMANITARIAN: WLADISLAW BIERNACKI-PORAY

Almost the last thing Wladislaw Biernacki-Poray would have wanted was celebration as an international figure. A warm, home-loving man, he prefers to avoid the spotlight. "He would even like me to accept his awards," says his wife.

But his devotion to the cause of humanity and his professional skills have brought attention to this modest Polish-born American architect.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray is the originator, designer, and construction overseer of one of the few U.S. institutions to penetrate the Communist world without arousing resentment: a children's hospital and pediatric research center on which work has just started in Cracow, Poland.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray, who is 37 years old, is an active member of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects. He has fared well as a designer of schools, hospitals, shopping centers, and other commercial and institutional buildings.

It was on an April night in 1958 that he thought of building the hospital in Poland. With the family doctor, the Biernacki-Porays were at the bedside of their 3-year-old daughter, Christina, who was ill with a cold virus.

In this quiet period of thought and consideration, the father wondered aloud: "How would it be in Poland at a moment like this?"

The reflection was followed a few days later by Mr. Biernacki-Poray's decision to go to Washington with his proposal for the hospital project. He had hit upon a way to serve humanity and help the country of his birth in one stroke.

WARSAW APPROVES PROJECT

Yesterday, the petite, dark-haired Mrs. Biernacki-Poray, also Polish-born, received a telegram from her husband telling her that he had signed an agreement with the Polish Government that the work would go forward.

A short, compactly built man with dark hair, rosy cheeks, and shining eyes, Mr. Biernacki-Poray is a tennis player and horseman who has had to give up most of his outside activities to give more time to his profession and his family.

It is a rare night, says his wife, Zofia, that he does not come home from his Montclair office, join the family for dinner and a short period of relaxation, and then return to his office until as late as 2 a.m.

His remaining leisure-time interests are cardplaying—bridge, poker, and almost everything else—and music. But it is the consensus of wife and friends alike that the center of his life is his children and his home.

"He has very little time these days for anything but work and the children, whom he spoils terribly," Mrs. Biernacki-Poray said.

In addition to Christina, now 6, they have a 4-year-old daughter, Teresa, and a 2-year-old boy, Marek.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray was born in Lwow, in southern Poland, on June 9, 1924. He was brought to the United States by his parents when he was a small child. They returned to Poland for a visit shortly before World War II.

JOINED POLISH ARMY

When the Germans invaded Poland in 1939, Mr. Biernacki-Poray, then 15, joined the Polish Army. Later a member of Polish Army units abroad, he fought in the Middle East and was wounded at Monte Cassino, Italy. Both of his parents were killed during the war and he now has no close relatives in Poland.

After the war, he began his architectural studies in Rome and then went to the School of Architecture at the University of London. It was there that he met his wife, who was studying economics and commerce at the London School of Economics.

He worked at his profession in Britain from 1950 to 1952, when he returned to the United States. Mr. Biernacki-Poray is licensed also to practice in Britain and Canada.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members who quietly and without fanfare goes about his business and contributes materially to the progress of legislation is the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH. Whenever he is called on to preside as

chairman of the Committee of the Whole, or whenever he takes the floor to present an argument, he does so with dignity and persuasiveness. His influence as a senior Member is widespread, and his leadership in the Ways and Means Committee is well known. He is one of the best loved Members of Congress.

It is a privilege to join with other Members of Congress in paying tribute to Congressman KEOGH, in recognition of his outstanding qualities as a leader of the world's greatest legislative body.

President McKinley Fatally Wounded 60 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad and significant anniversary in our history.

Sixty years ago, on September 6, 1901, President William McKinley was fatally wounded while attending the Pan-American Exposition, at Buffalo, N.Y.

Interest in the martyred President is very much alive in his hometown and mine, Canton, Ohio, and I have just received a very moving account of the assassination from George R. Bechtel, of Canton, an admirer of the late President and collector of McKinleyana. The repository of Canton also has taken note of this anniversary.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Wisconsin Dairyman Reports on Agriculture in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the freedom-versus-communism struggle, the differing systems are contesting on all fronts.

With a standoff militarily—for the present at least—the nonmilitary aspects of the struggle become increasingly significant.

Because of the closed curtain, it has been extremely difficult to get realistic information on the progress in the Soviet Union and the Red orbit countries.

Unfortunately, too, there is a great deal more fiction than fact in the spewings of the Red propaganda machine. Consequently, there exists a deficient—if not distorted—picture of Soviet progress.

For this reason, it is also gratifying when "rays of light come through" reflecting more accurately conditions and progress under the Communist system.

Recently, Mr. W. T. Reese—a dairyman of Seymour, Wis.—visited the Soviet Union. Following the tour—including 32 Wisconsin citizens—the Green Bay Gazette of Green Bay, Wis., published an article, entitled "Seymour Dairyman Reports on Tour of Farm Areas in Soviet Countries."

Reflecting, interestingly, upon the human side of life as well as actual progress in the agricultural and other fields of the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEYMOUR DAIRYMAN REPORTS ON TOUR OF FARM AREAS IN SOVIET COUNTRIES—STATE RESIDENTS TOURED EUROPE TO OBSERVE FARMING

(By Ray Pagel)

Russian farmers don't work too hard. Their hours may be shorter than the average northeastern Wisconsin dairy farmer takes for granted.

But—

The typical Russian farmer lives in one or two rooms, shares kitchen and bath with two or three other families.

His clothing is old, tattered, shabby; his wife and kids go barefooted much of the year.

He may have electric lights, but no refrigerator, practically no other appliances and conveniences.

He has no car, no TV, probably no radio.

He works like a hired hand; somebody higher up makes the decisions, issues orders.

That's part of the report from W. T. Reese, operator of a small dairy business in Seymour who spent 12 days in Soviet areas this summer. Bill is pretty sure our farmers wouldn't care to live there.

"And we saw only the better farms," he pointed out. "We can only imagine what the others are like."

Reese was in a group of 32 Wisconsin residents, all men, making a tour of Europe primarily to observe agriculture. Don Wilkinson, chief of the marketing division of the State department of agriculture, headed the party as coordinator.

AREAS ARE VISITED

They were in Soviet areas, including Poland and Hungary, for 12 days. The party also visited Belgium, Holland, East and West Berlin. Then, in a smaller group, Reese spent several days in Zurich, Madrid, and Portugal.

The entire trip took just about a month—from July 28 to August 24. Traveling by plane, the men were able to get full measure for their time.

"Russian farms," Reese observed, "are extremely inefficient. The units, for one thing, are too large and cumbersome."

The huge state farms, strictly government enterprises, run up to 75,000 acres. The older collective farms are somewhat smaller, and retain a semblance of community enterprise.

"Collectives seem to be better operated, and officials reluctantly admit they outproduce state farms," Reese remarked. "They are trying to discourage collective farms, and it is embarrassing to concede that they are the better of the two systems."

Soviet authorities would just as soon have foreign visitors take standard, scheduled tours. They tried to discourage the Wisconsin observers from getting too nosy about farm operations.

CONDITIONS BETTER

"We found conditions slightly better on the collective farms," said Reese. "Each farmer has a small plot of land for family use, and has a chance to sell the surplus produce. He may even own a cow or two."

With women doing so much of the work, farm labor is no problem. Machinery is big and cumbersome, but pretty good.

Farm buildings on the giant state layouts are located in a central village area, where the laborers live in units resembling barracks. Collectives also have villages, but with the frontyard gardens and often single-family dwellings they look less like a military outpost.

From the villages daily go the workers, and the women, to their assigned tasks. For those on state farms it's just like a factory, with wages depending on the job description. Collective farmers, however, share in the proceeds of their production.

Women care for the cows, and do all the milking.

Modern conveniences are lacking in the rural villages and the people are relatively isolated from the rest of the world. But, in Bill Reese's opinion, there are some compensations.

"They are deprived of many cultural opportunities, but farm families have better living in some respects than city families," he remarked. "There is more chance for real family life, which you don't find in the cities."

In Moscow, Kief, and Krasnodar, as well as Warsaw in Poland and Budapest in Hungary, along with other cities, the Americans observed a serious interest in culture. The Soviet Union encourages good music, the theater and the arts generally.

"Big outdoor loud speakers carry classical music, as well as the Russian version of news and Khrushchev's speeches. Ballet, symphony concerts, and folk dancing in the parks are well attended.

"Few people own automobiles, so they acquire culture.

"They seem to accept the fact that they can't have cars," according to Reese.

"They can rent them from the state, but that's expensive. Public transportation is cheap, and Moscow and Kiev have subway systems that are beautiful and marvelous.

"Their airplanes are good, though not as luxurious as ours. Railroads, which still use steamers, are doing a good job."

Russian people are very friendly, curious about the rest of the world, the visitors found. They have difficulty believing that ordinary Americans like the men from Wisconsin—farmers, small businessmen, teachers, and state government employees—are able to travel to Russia on their own resources.

The party was conducted on the Russian tour by an intelligent, attractive school teacher.

"Just call me Tanya," said she. "And if you think I do a good job, tell them at headquarters that Tanya is a good tour conductor."

SHEPHERDING TOURISTS

Tanya was shepherding tourists during the summer. The rest of the year she teaches English, earning 80 rubles, or about $88 a month.

Her husband, an electrical engineer off on vacation at the time, is paid 120 rubles. Their son, 4½ years old, was at camp.

Highly patriotic, Tanya was earnestly trying to qualify for Communist Party membership.

"She was stiff and cold at first, very anti-American," according to Reese. "But before 12 days were up she was a different girl. She told us she would like to visit the Unfted States as a tourist."

Tanya and her husband and boy live in a one-room apartment. They share kitchen and bath facilities with several other families in the building. She is hopeful, however, that they would be able to get a better place soon.

Reese, with a houseful of growing youngsters at home, noted few children on the streets of Moscow. They go off to camp for 3 months in summer, he learned.

"The Russians do a remarkable job of disciplining their children, and they claim they have no juvenile delinquency problems," Reese remarked. "The kids have no cars to chase around with, they are kept busy in a camp and school, and their play and recreation are supervised."

DISCOURAGE FAMILY LIFE

Official Russia seems to discourage family life. Pregnant women work until 2 months before the baby is born, return to their jobs 2 months later. The infant goes to nursery school.

The mother may work with a road gang, or in an office or factory. Or she may be a schoolteacher.

"You see big, husky women running cranes, mixing concrete and laying bricks," Reese reported. "The labor force in Russia is said to be 40 percent women.

"That the Communists are concentrating their best efforts on the military and the space race was quite evident. The newer buildings in Russian cities are poorly constructed. Reese saw nets strung across the fronts of buildings in Moscow to keep falling stucco from striking pedestrians.

"The same thing was true in East Berlin, but Budapest looks fine and West Berlin is tremendous.

"West Berlin is the most fascinating thing you ever could see."

Business and industrial facilities in West Berlin compare favorably with New York City. East Berlin is shambles by comparison.

"People in East Berlin are not happy—you can see it in their faces, and by the great numbers who have escaped to the West," Reese asserted. "But West Berlin is a boom town, and they are importing labor from Italy, even Switzerland."

DIDN'T LIKE FOOD

Reese and his companions didn't care for Russian food. Meals are high in starch, and cabbage, cucumbers, and cold soup were regular fare for the visitors.

"There wasn't much in the way of dairy products except for sour ice cream, some of which wasn't so bad," he said. "We didn't miss our milk, though, after seeing how they handled it in their so-called modern plants."

In West Berlin they visited a brandnew dairy plant—built with American dollars, sure, but paying its way.

"It is run by a brilliant young dairy scientist. It's a beautiful setup, quality right up to the best. Milk is hauled in from West Germany by tank trucks," Reese said.

Visitors to Russia are watched constantly. Luggage is gone through regularly.

Any real animosity? Once in a while a fellow in a crowd would shake his fist, but on the whole the Russian people were polite and even cordial toward the Americans.

"The better educated people cling to you, asking question after question," Reese related.

CONVERSATION EXCHANGE

On a Sunday afternoon the party of 32 visited a park in Krasnodar. The Russians were enjoying a day off from work gathered around. Some spoke English or German, and a lively exchange of questions and comments was enjoyed.

"They showed us charts on bulletin boards marking their progress in industry, in space exploration, and education. These charts are posted everywhere in the Russian cities and villages," Reese said.

He told about an incident in front of a hotel one evening.

"A young fellow got into conversation with us. Soon we heard a whistle from a Communist Party member. Two cops came, collared this fellow, and hustled him away."

Lenin is the Russian's idol. Statues of him stand everywhere, even in the fields. People line up for blocks at his tomb. Workers who meet production goals are rewarded with a free pass to view his preserved body.

A West German young man remarked on this point, stressing that communism is deep in the hearts of the people.

"We're competing with a religion," the German told Reese. "The Russians were very religious, and when the Communists took God away they gave them Lenin."

REESE IS CONCERNED

Bill Reese is concerned. Former high school agriculture instructor and State department of agriculture employee, he feels Americans are too concerned with personal comforts and ambitions.

He put it this way:

"We don't appreciate what we have here. The Communist thing is a serious threat, and we had better wake up."

Committee on Appropriations, Public Works Appropriations Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of either the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the acting majority leader as to when it is expected this bill will be taken up. If I remember correctly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee obtained consent for the consideration of the bill tomorrow, and in connection with that indicated that the vote would go over until Friday. I have now been informed that it is proposed to delay the consideration longer. If that is the plan, and I certainly hope it is not the plan, but if it is, I do not know what all the rush is about regarding the filing of the report. I would hope that the matter could be taken up tomorrow as was originally planned and programed for action by the House. That measure has to be acted on so that we may adjourn sine die. I see no reason why it should not be called up tomorrow as originally planned. It is one of the last obstacles to a sine die adjournment, and I would express the hope under this reservation that it could be called up tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course the leadership is anxious in connection with this matter to cooperate with the House membership and with the Committee on Appropriations. The leadership will only change the date on which the bill is programed if the chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations desire a change to be made.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if this request is granted when do you propose to call up the bill, and if it is not called up tomorrow, why?

Mr. CANNON. That is a matter which rests with the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I am in error about my recollection that this measure was programed for tomorrow, I would like to have someone so inform me.

Mr. ALBERT. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has advised me, and he is here, that the committee will not be ready tomorrow. It is only on that basis that we have considered postponing consideration of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the committee could be ready tomorrow, without any question. This matter has been before the committee for a long, long time. I fail to see any real reason why it could not have been brought to the floor of the House a long time ago, unless there were some extraneous matters under consideration.

I am constrained to believe that is the real reason, but I want the Members of the House generally to know, those who hope for an early sine die adjournment, that this sort of delay only postpones the date of adjournment and, in my opinion, is not right. Of course there is nothing further I can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Frances Slocum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Frances Slocum was a white woman who, after being kidnapped by the Indians at the age of 5, grew to be a highly respected member of the Indian nation in what is now my district of Indiana. She lived happily among the Miami Indians for many years and she contributed greatly to the fine relationship which her tribe developed with the white settlers.

Ma-con-a-qua, as she was called by the Indians, married a war chief of her tribe and became a member of the influential circle of leadership of the Miamis during a time when the final settlements were made between these Indians and the U.S. Government. During her years of influence in the tribe, almost all of the important Miami treaties were signed. Frances Slocum became a great symbol of the peaceful relations of the Indians in the Midwest, and remains so today. She is honored by the Indians and the white people alike in my State as being a vital and helpful link between the two civilizations at a very critical period.

Ma-con-a-qua is buried in Wabash County, Ind., just 6 miles southeast of the city of Peru, Ind. She is buried in a part of a section of ground ceded to her two daughters by the treaty of 1838 along the banks of the Mississinewa River.

It is interesting to note that Ma-con-a-qua is buried in Indiana, and not in her family's adopted State of Pennsylvania, because she refused to return to her brothers' home in that State when she was discovered by her family late in life. She is buried in Indiana and not in Oklahoma or Kansas because of an act of Congress which allowed her to stay in the land of the Miamis which she so loved, when other members of the tribe were moved to reservations in the West.

Within the next several years, a flood control project of the Corps of Engineers will cause a reservoir to flood the Slocum cemetery in which she is buried. In the development of the project, the Engineers will move her grave along with the graves of others buried in the reservoir area.

According to the procedures of the Engineers in a situation of this kind, the

heirs of Frances Slocum will be contacted to seek from them an indication as to the place in which her remains should be reinterred. They will then proceed to purchase land for the new gravesite, remove and rebury the remains and to replace the monument in the new site.

In this regard, I have on file in my office a letter from Mrs. Eva Bossley, the secretary-treasurer of the Miami Indians of Indiana speaking in behalf of the tribal council and the great grandchildren of Frances Slocum which says in part:

> We feel the most sensible decision to be made * * * is to respect the wishes of Frances Slocum when she herself was asked by her brothers to go back with them to live. She chose to remain in Indiana with the people she loved and with the ones she knew were her own. We hope and pray that her remains will stay in the State of Indiana.

A great, great granddaughter of Frances, named Little Princess Macanaquah, after her illustrious ancestor, wrote me and expressed similar sentiments, "She should be left in Indiana. Let her rest in peace in her own land."

At a meeting of the descendants of Frances Slocum in the city park in Wabash, Ind., on August 20, the question of her grave removal was raised. More than 100 of her descendants voted to demand that her grave be retained near her former home. Only two members of the family did not vote affirmatively on question. They abstained.

Both the Wabash and the Miami County Historical Societies have gone on record favoring a new gravesite in Indiana. They have, in fact, begun work on securing such a new gravesite as might be appropriate, and to develop a plan for further tribute to this great historical figure. The local sentiment is quite clear, as is the sentiment of those who are the next of kin to Frances Slocum. They want to have her grave moved to a place in Indiana close to the present site.

The Federal Government will follow a procedure to reestablish a grave and monument to this great figure in Indian history. I offer today a bill which will establish the new Government-purchased gravesite and the monument, erected thereon at the expense of the Government as a consequence of the flood control project, as a national monument.

Frances Slocum is a national figure. She was born in the State of Rhode Island. Her family moved to the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania when she was a child. She was taken from her parents' home there with migrated west with the Delaware Indians across Ohio and Michigan and into Indiana where she lived and died. Her influence on the Indians contributed to the peaceful settlement of the entire Northwest Territory.

Her contributions to the Indian-white relations of the period are legendary. She became, in her own way, a leader and a force for good among the Indians. She became one of them, but she remembered her white culture and blended elements of it into her life and the life of her Indian community. She was a white woman, but she chose the life of the Indian when she could have returned to her family home. In these ways, she developed a better understanding between the cultures which she had bridged. In this manner, she contributed as much to the development of the Northwest Territory as many of the great military leaders which we honor.

In my bill, I indicate that the monument should be established in Indiana near the site of her present grave. I make no specific designation of the site because there are two fine suggestions which have been made concerning the new location of the memorial.

One site suggested is the Frances Slocum State Forest. This State operated game and forestry preserve is on the North Bank of the Mississinewa River, adjacent to the section of land ceded to Ma-con-a-qua's descendents and just across from the site of her present grave. The Conservation Director of the State of Indiana, Mr. Don Foltz, has indicated that his department would be agreeable to such a plan. The area is being developed into more of a recreational area and the inclusion of the Frances Slocum memorial would add to the historical significane of the area. The thousands of annual visitors to the facility would be reminded by the memorial of the contributions of this great woman and the honor to her would thus be increased.

Another suggestion is that the remains of Frances Slocum be reinterred in the last remaining tract of Indian land. This area, a part of that ceded to the last chief of the Miami Indians, is the only land in the area which has never been in the possession of anyone other than the Indians and their leaders. It was held for the Indians for the welfare of their people and it would, of course, be fitting to establish the new grave site here, also.

Both of these plans have merit and the proper course can be determined in time by the proper authorities. My concern is that the remains of Frances Slocum be reintered in the area which she so loved and that the new grave site be established as a national memorial.

There are those who would want the Federal Government to assist in the rekidnaping of this famous woman. There are those who would want to return her remains to the area of Pennsylvania in which she lived for 2 or 3 years of her early life. Others would want her moved to Ohio, through which she passed on her way to her home. I have not heard from the citizens of Rhode Island, but there may be a movement afoot there to have this great lady returned to the place of her birth and further memorialized there.

There is no case whatever for moving the grave of Frances Slocum out of the area of her life. There is strong evidence of her personal sentiments in this matter, and we must take heed of it.

Ma-con-a-qua had not related the story of her life to any white settler, although she had ample opportunity to communicate with them, until 1835, when she was sick and thought that she might be dying. Only then did she tell a young merchant, George Washington Ewing, and asked that he not relate her story to anyone while she was still alive. She was afraid, she told him, that some of her relatives might come and make her return with them to her family's home.

But Ewing could not keep his secret, and within 2 years her family had been contacted and they made plans to visit her. Two brothers, Joseph and Isaac Slocum, and their sister, Mary Towne, went to Peru and visited with their sister, Frances, for several days. Several times they asked her to return with them to their homes. She refused. They asked that she return for just a visit. She replied that something might happen that she would not return and, in that way, she refused. She was concerned that she live her remaining years in the happy, peaceful Mississinewa Valley.

In 1838, the United States made a treaty with the Miami Tribe, making land grants to certain ranking members of the tribe and making dispositions of claims. Among the Indians granted land were Frances Sloucum's two daughters, O-zah-wah-shing-qua and Ke-ke-se-qua. The land was given to them since Frances, as a white woman, was not theoretically a member of the tribe, nor was she entitled to Indian benefits. The grant in the treaty was awarded to the family as descendants of a principal chief of the tribe, Frances' husband and the girls' father, She-pun-can-ah. This is the first incident of Federal action to assure Frances Slocum a home in the State of Indiana. It defined her land as "one section of land on the Mississinewa River, to include the improvements where they now live."

When the treaty of 1840 stipulated that the Miamis should abandon their land in the Wabash Valley and move to the reservations in the Kansas territory, many of them dreaded the move. Among those wishing to remain were Frances Slocum and her family. In January of 1845 she memorialized Congress in this fashion:

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, Frances Slocum, a resident of Wabash County, in the State of Indiana, would to your honorable body most respectfully represent: That at the age of 6 years, about the close of the Revolutionary War, she was taken captive in the State of Pennsylvania by the Indians, and has ever since lived among them, and is now, and for the last 30 years has been, recognized as a member of the Miami Tribe. That, from the time she was taken captive as aforesaid, she heard nothing of her white relatives and friends (the greater portion of whom reside at the place where she was taken, in the said State of Pennsylvania, and others in the State of Ohio, and the said State of Indiana) until about 7 years since. That she has entirely lost her mother tongue, and can only enjoy the society of her adopted people, with whom she intermarried, and became the mother of a family, and with whose manners and customs she has assimilated. That she is informed that the greater portion of the Miamies will be obliged to emigrate to the home assigned them west of the Mississippi in the course of 1 or 2 years, where their annuities will thereafter be

paid them. That she is too old to endure the fatigue of removing; and that, under any circumstances, she would deplore the necessity of being placed beyond the reach of her white relatives, who visit her frequently, and have extended their kindness toward her since she was discovered by them. That her children are the owners of a section of land granted to them by the treaty between the United States and said tribe of Indians of the 6th of November, A.D., 1838, who now reside upon and cultivate the same, and with whom your memorialist now lives; and that it is the wish and design of her children and their families, if it be the pleasure of the Government, to continue to reside upon and cultivate the same.

Your memorialist further shows, that a portion or the annuities of said tribe, in pursuance of the 14th article of said treaty, is to be paid at Fort Wayne, after said tribe shall emigrate to the country assigned them west of the Mississippi; and that the payment of the annuities due your memorialist and her family at Fort Wayne or Peru, in said State, would not increase the expense or add any inconvenience to the Government of the United States.

"Your memorialist therefore prays that Congress may by law direct that the following persons, to wit: (1) Ke-ke-na-kush-wa, (2) We-saw-she-no-qua, (3) Te-quoc-yaw, (4) Ki-po-ki-na-mo-qua, (5) Ki-no-suck-qua, (6) Wa-pu-noc-shé-no-qua, (7) Ching-Shing-gwaw, (8) Pe-tu-loc-a-te-qua, (9) Sho-quang-gwaw, (10) Waw-pop-e-tah, (11) So-eel-en-ji-sah, (12) No-ac-co-mo-qua, (13) Coch-e-no-qua, (14) Po-con-du-maw, (15) Tah-ki-qua, (16) Ki-ki-o-qua, (17) Te-quoc-yaw, Jr., (18) Soc-o-chu-qua, (19) Peem-y-o-ty-maw, (20) So-eel-en-ji-sah, Jr., (21) Pun-ge-she-no-qua, children and grandchildren of your memorialist, as also your memorialist, and such children as they may hereafter have, shall hereafter receive their annunities at Fort Wayne, or at Peru, Ind., as to your honorable body may seem most expedient and proper. And, as in duty bound, your memorialist will ever pray, &c.

FRANCES SLOCUM.

JANUARY 17, 1845.

On the 28th of January 1845, Mr. Cave Johnson—Tennessee—from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported a joint resolution for the benefit of Frances Slocum, her children and grandchildren, of the Miami Tribe of Indians, and it was read a first and second time.

Hon. Benjamin A. Bidlack, of Pennsylvania, who represented the Wyoming district in Congress at that time, said he hoped "no motion or resolution would intervene to prevent the passage of this resolution. The memorialist was taken prisoner in the Valley of Wyoming at an early age, during the trials and difficulties to which the early settlers were subjected."

Her relatives are among the most worthy and meritorious of my constituents—they are my neighbors and friends; they searched after the captive with zealous and praiseworthy efforts and diligence, from the time of her capture until within a few years, and they have found her in the condition set forth in the memorial and report. The incidents set forth and connected with her eventful history would afford a beautiful theme for elucidation and remark.

But as debate is not now in order, I will not trespass on the indulgence and courtesy of the House. What I desire is not to make a speech, but to ask the unanimous consent of the Members for the immediate passage of the resolution.

If the resolution is sent to the Committee of the Whole I fear it will never be reached, and this earnest request of the memorialist will never be reached and granted.

The proposition is intended to extend to her as the widow of an Indian chief, the same privileges in relation to the payment of annuities due her and her family, and are provided for by treaty stipulation in regard to certain of the Miami chiefs.

Frances Slocum was taken from her white friends when a child. She is now desirous of dying among her red friends where she has lived for half a century, without being compelled to remove west of the Mississippi. Let her first and last request be granted.

The resolution then passed.

Then Mr. White, chairman of the Committee on Indian affairs, to whom it had been referred, made the following Senate committee report under date of February 21, 1845:

That the joint resolution provides for the payment in Indiana of the annuities due this family, instead of requiring them to receive payment with the Nation in the emigrant territory west of the Mississippi River. The reasons assigned are that former treaties have made similar provisions in favor of the other families of this Nation; that lands have been by treaty reserved to them in Indiana, to the personal enjoyment of which they have a right that cannot be embarrassed by requiring them to go west of the Mississippi for their annuities; and, thirdly, that the petitioner is by birth a white woman, who more than 40 years ago, in her infancy, was captured by the Indians, transferred to their country, lost her mother tongue, affiliated and intermarried with the Miamis, has by this marriage reared a large family of children (who are named in the joint resolution), but some 7 years ago was for the first time discovered by her white relations (who reside in Pennsylvania), whom she has refused to accompany because her whole nature has been changed by her strange destiny; and life out of the woods, and away from her husband and children, would have no charms. Yet these white relatives do frequently visit her, and minister to her wants, which they could not do if she were removed 600 miles to the west.

The committee cannot resist the force of these reasons, although in a conversation with General Milroy, the late intelligent agent of the Miamis, he expressed a fear that the adoption of the joint resolution might disincline other Miamis to remove to their new homes.

This case has such a thrilling interest, that the committee beg leave to append to their report the petition itself, with the letter of Mr. Cole that accompanied it.

They recommend that the resolution be adopted.

On the 3d of March 1845, the joint resolution passed.

So, by an act of Congress, Frances Slocum was allowed to stay in Indiana.

These are the significant facts of the case. Frances Slocum wanted to live in Indiana. She certainly wanted to be buried there. There is no other course than to have her reintered in a location close to her home. Let these people from Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, who have so little claim to share the honor of Frances Slocum, accede to her own wishes with regard to her burial site. And let them join with us who seek to honor her memory further by establishing her new grave as a national monument.

I have heard several times lately a word or two of protest at establishing monuments at a cost to the Government during these trying times. Let me explain that this monument will cost the Government nothing extra. The Corps of Engineers are forced to move the grave and reestablish the monument at a new grave site. In establishing the new grave as a national monument the Government actually gets more for its money. In fact, if plans can be worked out, we stand to save money, because there is a good chance that the land for her new grave can be donated. This is a very good possibility in either of the locations which I mentioned earlier.

I ask, then, that we honor the wishes of the White Indian Princess and direct that she be reinterred in a location close to her beloved home. And further, let us pay tribute to this lady who bridged the white and Indian civilizations and aided in the peaceful settlement of the Indiana territory. She is a symbol of the peaceful relations which developed with the Indians in so many areas. We see and hear so much of the violence associated with the settlement of the West and Midwest, especially since westerns became so popular on television. I think it is important that we take this opportunity to recognize Frances Slocum as a national symbol of the fine, peaceful pattern of living which developed between the great majority of Indians and their white settlers in early America.

The American Heritage: Address by the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD, a splendid, thoughtful address by the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, from the First District of North Carolina, presented during the closing ceremonies of the great historical pageant "The Lost Colony," at the amphitheater in the Fort Raleigh National Monument at Manteo, N.C., on Saturday, September 2, 1961. Congressman BONNER spoke at the 1,999th performance of this dramatic portrayal of the beginnings of Anglo-American civilization in the Western Hemisphere.

The message draws a clear analogy between the ferment and turmoil in the world of the 16th century and our own troubled times. The inspiration of his address upholds America's dream for peace and progress throughout the world.

The text of Mr. BONNER's speech follows:

Friends, you and I are honored to be here tonight, in attendance at this magnificent pageant conceived and staged by a great native North Carolinian, Paul Green, in celebration of the very beginning of Anglo-American civilization. You have seen—you will see—drama that is heart and soul of

America today. It is drama that began nearly 400 years ago on this hallowed ground when intrepid souls set out from the mother country, England, in their tiny vessels, to found the dynamic civilization in freedom, which we now enjoy but, perhaps do not always appreciate.

This week marks the end of the 1961 season for the presentation of "The Lost Colony" pageant performed by its able and dedicated cast of actors, musicians, dancers, and choristers.

I must open my remarks with special recognition of the genius of Paul Green who felt the deeper meaning of the American dream—the American goal—by creating this tremendous outdoor symphony on this site some 25 years ago. Each year there has been some change—for he has sought to perfect this phase of his presentation of the meaning of the American heritage.

America's greatness has grown from its variety, and Paul Green has extended his vast talents to other historical phases of our national growth with such successes as "The Common Glory," now in its 15th season at Williamsburg, Va.; "Faith of Our Fathers," in the National Capital; "Wilderness Road," at Berea, Ky.; "The Founders," at Jamestown Island, Va.; and "The Confederacy," at Virginia Beach, Va.

In the light of all that, my friends, you must know that this is a night to remember, to feel deeply, and to cherish.

When I was asked not so long ago if I, as Congressman from this First District of North Carolina, would participate briefly in this seasonal closing of our State's historic drama, the news in Washington, D.C., was exceedingly grim. The world seemed beset by cold fire—interspersed here and there with brutal bursts of passion that did not—do not—make sense in a civilized world. The intervening weeks do not look any better.

Korea, though some 10 years behind, has left scars which may still pain many who are here tonight. The Suez crisis of 1955 and 1956 made a deep impact on the nations of the world as the Arab States went through pangs of extreme nationalism and flirtations with the untiring Communist powers, China and India reached serious crises over boundary matters. A President of the United States was advised not to visit one country because of the possibility of disorders which might threaten his safety. And later, he and the United tates were outrageously affronted by the Premier of the Soviet Union at a meeting in Paris of top officials of the great world powers—the United States, Soviet Russia, the United Kingdom, and the Republic of France.

Today, we have one crisis on top of another. The West Germany/West Berlin situation is boiling and dangerous in light of the extreme measures which have been taken to seal off the unhappy East Germans from access to the West. The problems of the French in Algeria and between the French and the Tunisians, gravely, though indirectly, affect these shores. The turn of our near and formerly friendly neighbor, Cuba, to communism and Soviet domination is frightening. Recent developments in Brazil are mystifying. Africa is in a tremendous ferment. And who knows what has really happened in Laos and Vietnam?

These things are of great concern to us in Washington, D.C., at the seat of our Government.

I know they are to all of you.

National divisions, realinements, and inconsistencies seem to plague the world. We have a North Korea and a South Korea; we have a North and a South Vietnam, there is an East and West Germany—complicated by the city or cities of East and West Berlin located 110 miles within the World War II boundary of the Federal Republic of Germany. In the Union of South Africa we see the concept of apartheid, or white supremacy, carried to greater extremes than it has ever been in this country. In other parts of Africa the concept of black supremacy seems to be on the rise.

These are the things of today and of recent years. But let's go back to the times portrayed by Paul Green's pageant, the time when the English-speaking peoples asserted themselves on this continent.

Things were no different then than they are today. Not really.

History books have to cover time by recording the main events. They cannot give us the infinite details which we learn from our daily newspapers, radios, and television.

But those books do tell us that power struggles in Europe were then, as now, shaking the structure of the entire civilized world at the time our brave Roanoke Island colonists came to these shores.

We know that Spain had been in control of the seas for a hundred years or more. That the Portuguese were competitors. We know that the English were, through their ruling classes, in violent diplomatic and religious conflict with the rest of Europe. We know that the Dutch were straining to compete in the colonization of the unsettled areas of the world.

In the official souvenir program for tonight's entertainment—the one that costs 50 cents per copy—there appears a chronology of Pre-Colonial America, it tells about Columbus in 1492. It shows that England wasn't going to wait very long, and John Cabot discovered North America for England in 1497. It shows that an Italian explored the present North Carolina coast for France in 1524. And it shows the vigorous efforts of the English under the direction of Sir Walter Raleigh to establish a colony in the New World, at Roanoke Island—where we now stand.

The Colony was lost. Its fate is intriguing, and historians have been interested for more than 370 years in finding the answer to the disappearance of the sturdy, well-balanced and well-provisioned group of colonists. They brought families and produced English children. They had brought Christianity. They had established law and order in the wilderness. They had taken the first steps to move the Western World into the modern era.

In this great drama—Paul Green suggests an answer to the fate of the first brave groups to begin the history that becomes the cornerstone to English, then Anglo-American and then American heritage. His story of the lost colony is self-sufficient.

But I want to say in conclusion that as we look backward we must look forward. "The past is prologue."

There was a cold war then—between England and Spain. There was no declared war—but the Spanish Armada sailed against England—and was defeated. From that date English seapower was supreme all over the world—upholding the freedom of the seas for all nations who would use them for peaceful purposes. From those perilous times to the present perilous times man's indomitable spirit has pushed the frontiers of civilization and knowledge incredibly far.

Think of this analogy and feel a surge of hope for the future that lies ahead. Our faith in God and country may be summed up in the final beautiful lines of this great pageant:

"Let the wilderness drive us forth as wanderers across the earth, scatter our broken bones upon these sands * * * it shall not kill the purpose that brought us here. * * * The dream still lives. It lives * * * and shall not die."

How the Cuban Invasion Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the September 1, 1961, issue of Time magazine:

HOW THE CUBAN INVASION FAILED

Last April's U.S.-backed invasion of Cuba's Bay of Pigs will be long remembered and angrily debated. In the September issue of Fortune, the magazine's Washington Correspondent Charles J. V. Murphy tells in behind-the-scenes detail the incredible story of how that invasion failed. Excerpts:

The idea for the invasion had taken root during the early summer of 1960. By then, thousands of defectors from Castro's Cuba were in the United States. Many of them were soldiers. The job of organizing and training them was given to the Central Intelligence Agency. It became the specific responsibility of one of the CIA's top deputies, Richard M. Bissell, a former economist who is also a highly practical executive.

During the summer and fall of 1960, President Eisenhower from time to time personally reviewed the scheme. In late November, the last time it came up for his comprehensive review, an operational plan had not yet crystallized. It was taken for granted that a landing in force could not possibly be brought off unless the expedition was shepherded to the beach by the U.S. Navy (either openly or in disguise) and covered by airpower in whatever amount might be necessary. Eisenhower, the commander of Normandy, understood this well enough.

After his election, Kennedy had been briefed fairly frequently on the Cuban situation. He discussed Cuba at length in both his preinaugural talks with Eisenhower. On taking office, Kennedy decided that he had to have from the Joint Chiefs of Staff a technical opinion of the feasibility of the project.

HOW IT WAS PLANNED

The plan still assumed that U.S. military help would be on call during the landing. Castro's air force consisted of not quite two-score planes—a dozen or so obsolete B–26's, plus about the same number of obsolete British Sea Furies. But in addition, there were seven or eight T–33 jet trainers, the remnants of an earlier U.S. transaction with the Batista government, so the force was not the pushover it appeared at first glance. Armed with rockets, these jets would be more than a match in a battle for the exiles' B–26's.

It stood to reason that, considering how small the landing party was, the success of the operation would hinge on the B–26's controlling the air over the beachhead. And the margins that the planners accepted were narrow to begin with. The B–26's were to operate from a staging base in a Central American country more than 500 miles from Cuba. The round trip would take better than 6 hours, and that would leave the planes with fuel for only 45 minutes of action over Cuba. In contrast,

Castro's air force could be over the beachhead and the invaders' ships in a matter of minutes. Hence the absolute necessity of knocking out Castro's air power, or at least reducing it to impotence, by the time the ground battle was joined.

This, in general terms, was the plan the Chiefs reviewed for Kennedy. They judged the tactical elements sound, and indeed they accorded the operation a high probability of success. But some of Kennedy's closest advisers were assailed by sinking second thoughts. What bothered them was the immorality of masked aggression. They recoiled from having the U.S. employ subterfuge in striking down even as dangerous an adversary as Castro, and they were unanimously opposed to having the United States do the job in the open.

THE CHANGES

The immorality of the intervention found its most eloquent voice before the President during a meeting in the State Department on April 4, only 13 days before the date set for the invasion. The occasion was Bissell's final review of the operation, and practically everybody connected with high strategy was on hand—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Lemnitzer, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, as well as McGeorge Bundy, Paul Nitze, then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas Mann and three Kennedy specialists in Latin American matters—Adolf Berle, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin. There was also one outsider, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose support Kennedy wanted. After Bissell had completed his briefing and Dulles had summed up risks and prospects, FULBRIGHT denounced the proposition out of hand: it was the wrong thing for the United States to get involved in.

Rusk said he was for it, in answer to the President's direct question, but as would presently be manifest, he privately had no heart for it. Two other men among the President's senior foreign policy advisers, not present at the meeting, shared FULBRIGHT's feelings: Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles and Adlai Stevenson. In deference to these views, Kennedy made two separate rulings which were to contribute to the fatal dismemberment of the whole plan. First, U.S. airpower would not be on call at any time. Second, the B–26's flown by our Cubans could be used in only two strikes before the invasion—first on D minus 2 days and again on the morning of the landing.

Dawn of April 15, by the timetable, the B–26's, having flown undetected through the night from their Central American staging base, appeared over Cuba and bombed the three fields on which Castro's ready air was deployed. The attack was, on the whole, highly successful. Half of Castro's B–26's and Sea Furies and four of his T–33 jets were blown up or damaged.

REQUEST FOR "BOXER"

Sunday evening, only some 8 hours after Kennedy had given the final go-ahead, the expedition in the first dark was creeping toward the Cuban shore. In Bissell's office, there was a call on the White House line. It was Bundy, being even crisper than usual: The B–26's were to stand down, there was to be no air strike in the morning, this was a Presidential order. Rusk was now acting for the President in the situation. Bissell was stunned. He and CIA Deputy Director General Charles Cabell, an experienced airman, went together to the State Department to urge Rusk to reconsider. Cabell was greatly worried about the vulnerability to air attack of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. The ships, he suggested, could unload and retire to the open sea before daylight; as for the troops ashore being unduly inconvenienced by Castro's air, it had been his experience as a colonel in the Burma theater that air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear: military considerations had overruled the political when the D-minus-two strike had been laid on; now political considerations were taking over.

Past midnight Bissell and Cabell restudied the battle plan while signals of consternation welled up from their men far to the south. At 4 o'clock, less than an hour before first light on the Cuban shore, Cabell went back to Rusk with another proposal. It was manifestly impossible for the Cuban brigade's small force of B–26's (only 16 were operational) to provide effective air cover for the ships from their distant base. Cabell now asked whether, if the ships were to pull back to international water, the U.S.S. *Boxer*, a carrier on station about 50 miles from the Bay of Pigs, could be instructed to provide cover. Rusk said no. The President was awakened. Cabell registered his concern. The answer still was no.

THE END

The invasion force had little chance. They were without the ranging firepower which the B–26's with their bombs and machine guns had been expected to apply against Castro's tanks and artillery. Castro's forces came up fast. He still had four jets left, and they were armed with powerful rockets. He used them well. Before the morning was done he had sunk two transports and driven off two others.

Now Kennedy and his strategists became alarmed. About noon on Monday, Bissell was told that the B–26's could attack Castro's airfields at will. But the orders came too late. Most of the pilots had been in the air for upward of 18 hours in an unavailing effort to keep Castro's planes off the troops and the remaining ship. That night a small force was scratched together. It was over Cuba at dawn, only to find the fields hidden by low, impenetrable fog.

Tuesday was the turning point. The men ashore had fought bravely and gained their planned objectives. They had even seized and bulldozed the airfield. But they were desperately short of ammunition and food, and under the pressure of Castro's superior firepower and number they were being forced back across the beach. There remained one last chance to make the thing go. *Boxer* was still on station. The release of a few of its jets simply for air cover should see two landing crafts with ammunition and rations safely to the shore.

At a White House meeting that night, Bissell made it plain that unless U.S. air power was brought forward, the men on the beach were doomed. He asked that *Boxer's* planes be brought into the battle. Rusk still would not have this. Several others were also opposed, including the President's personal staffers. Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke vouched for the worth of Bissell's proposition. The outcome of the meeting was a singular compromise. Jets from *Boxer* would provide cover next morning for exactly 1 hour, long enough for the ships to run into the shore and start unloading and for the remaining B–26's to get in a hard blow.

Next morning, through an incredible mischance, the B–26's were over Cuba half an hour ahead of schedule. *Boxer's* jets were still on the flight deck. But Castro's jets were ready. Two of the B–26's were shot down; others were hit and forced to abort. That was the melancholy end.

The House Vote on the Conference Committee Report Containing the So-Called Hanford Compromise Is Scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the House schedule for next week, which includes consideration of the conference committee report on the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill. It is important that every Member of the House who voted to instruct conferees to delete the Hanford electric power provision from that bill, and all other Members in sympathy with this position, be present when this legislation comes to the floor.

I am certain that some of my colleagues are discouraged at the long delay incident to the handling of this legislation. The growing resentment at the way in which it has been batted about is quite understandable.

After having deleted the Hanford powerplant provision from the Joint Committee bill, the House found it necessary to take the unusual step of instructing its delegates following the Senate's reinsertion of the provision. If you will recall, the motion to instruct conferees to delete the project carried by 235 to 164, a majority which one might assume would be adequate to notify our friends in the Senate that we are unqualifiedly opposed to the project.

If proponents of this measure are of the opinion that Hanford will become more palatable as this session nears to a close, it is my opinion that they are in for a big surprise. There is not going to be any flexibility on a matter of such importance to the national welfare.

Actually, by dragging out final action, proponents may very well be building up greater opposition to their project. While the bill is collied across the Capitol, tension mounts in Berlin. Anyone who might have had a tendency to be apathetic about the international crisis heretofore is now getting his daily jolts from newspaper headlines. As the gravity of the situation comes into focus, appeals for junk projects that would deprive the defense structure of necessary funds have far less chance of reaching sympathetic ears. The Hanford generating station has no place in the defense program. There is absolutely no room for it in the national budget.

Just to keep the record straight, I want to notify my colleagues that, while this legislative breakdown has been persisting, the case against the Hanford powerplant has been building up among those who suffer most from it. I refer to representatives of the coal industry and residents of mining communities as well

as regions throughout the country which would be placed in an unfair competitive position in area development work. The coal industry—the National Coal Association, the United Mine Workers of America, coal company officials, and members of families who depend upon this industry for their livelihood—these groups have worked tirelessly in opposition to the threat of subsidized heat and power that would eventually take bread and butter from the people who help pay the tax bills.

In reply to an erroneous published report that miners in the Northwest were not aware that a Hanford powerplant would take away their jobs or remove whatever chances they have of getting back to work, Sam Nicholls, president of District 10, UMWA, sent a letter to Members of Congress, a copy of which follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Renton, Wash., September 1, 1961.

Hon. Catherine May, and Other Congressmen and Congresswomen, and Senators:

I read in the House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that you, Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY, asked consent to have printed in the House RECORD, an editorial from the Tri-City Herald of Pasco, Wash., on August 21, as follows: "Coal Industry Bites Hand That Feeds It," stating also that neither private power nor coal mining interests from the Northwest, were in opposition to the Hanford, Wash., dual reactor and only the Eastern States were in opposition.

This editorial was not correct in its statement, for the officers and members of the United Mine Workers, District No. 10, State of Washington, and their international officers, have made known their opposition to the Senators HENRY JACKSON and WARREN G. MAGNUSON, both by telegrams and letters, and the United Mine Workers Journal. The United Mine Workers of this State are opposed to this dual reactor at Hanford as we believe the reactor is a threat to the welfare of the coal industry and the continuance of coal mining in the Pacific Northwest, and this project is a waste of taxpayers money.

The Bonneville Power Authority have a power surplus of nonsaleable hydroelectric power, and are now losing millions of dollars a year, and they are still building hydroelectric dams. This surplus power could be firmed up and sold by using the millions of tons of coal that we have in this State and open up the depressed mining areas and put the unemployed miners, railroad men, and truckers, to work. We fail to see any help for the coal industry by placing such high cost project in a State that has the cheapest power in the United States and has millions of tons of coal, and hundreds of experienced miners unemployed.

This reactor is a very high cost power provided for by Government subsidies. It will produce 800,000 kilowatts of power a year, this is equivalent of over 2 million tons of coal a year, this production of coal would be a great help for this State. At one time King Coal was a major industry of this State, and for years it has been necessary for the coal industry to fight for an existence, against out of State and foreign Canadian oils and natural gas. We feel that our elected Congressmen and Congresswomen and Senators should help us to build the economic conditions of this State, and help open up our coal mines and put the unemployed to work. We are also opposed to the compromised bill to be offered to the House. This would provide for 400,000 kilowatts of power for Bonneville public power system by releasing the power now used by Hanford and used in other industries.

Yours very truly,

SAM NICHOLLS,
President, District No. 10.

Nor has the coal industry been lulled into believing that cutting the Hanford capacity in half, as proposed in the conference committee report, would lessen the economic danger. Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, expressed the coal industry position on the compromise in the following letter sent to me after the conferees' action last week:

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
September 1, 1961.

Re Hanford compromise.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT: Last Thursday the Senate and House conferees adopted a so-called compromise in connection with consideration of the AEC authorization bill (H.R. 7576) by recommending one 400,000 kilowatt generator at Hanford instead of two. This was agreed upon by the House conferees notwithstanding the specific House instructions to exclude Hanford by a vote of 235 to 164 on August 8.

The purpose of this note is to express the hope that you will stand by your previous vote against Hanford and will not accept the so-called compromise which would reduce the project by half. Of course it is impossible to compromise with principle and our view is that the proposal actually constitutes approval of an unnecessary public power project at Hanford on the installment plan basis.

We appreciate the position you have taken in the successive votes against Hanford and hope that you will find that the compromise is unacceptable when the conference report is presented for House consideration.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
STEPHEN F. DUNN,
President.

No, Mr. Speaker, none of us who has a basic interest in a free competitive economy is going to back down on this issue. The strategy of bringing this $58 million package before us is actually ludicrous. A generating station at Hanford is unacceptable regardless of its size. But no one who has had any experience with the operations of a bureaucracy would be so credulous as to believe that proponents of Hanford would be satisfied to stop there. This unit is only a part of one of the most unnecessary and extravagant programs ever conceived by the Government.

The plan is already in operation. The Secretary of the Interior yesterday announced the appointment of a community of 26 leaders in Pacific Northwest economic development to work with the Bonneville Power Administration in connection with a 2-year study of basic resources and potential industrial growth. Here is what the BPA administrators had to say about this study:

"Predicted expansion in basic industries will provide a means of estimating growth in production, employment, and population of the region, as well as future power needs so intelligent plans can be made to meet future requirements," Luce pointed out.

"Pooling of all available information on a regional basis," Luce stated, "will supplement present information gathered by State and local organizations and also make possible an expanded and coordinated development effort by the individual States."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of Congress who does not admire the ambition and diligence of our many civic, business, and labor leaders who devote considerable time and effort toward attracting new plants and factories. We want the Northwest to prosper, just as we hope the rest of the Nation will prosper. The area development program has created a new concept of competition among our States and localities. It is a healthy sign. It develops ingenuity and has even been responsible for entire new lines of consumer goods. It is bringing for general consumption many products that not long ago were so expensive that only the highest income families could afford them.

The State of Pennsylvania and the congressional district which I represent have invested years of time and millions of dollars trying to lure new industry. The anthracite region, while still far from normal, would be in much worse condition economically were it not for the foresight and devotion of residents who recognize the value of redevelopment programs.

Philipsburg, Bellefonte, State College, Clearfield, Du Bois, Altoona—these and a score of other communities within my constituency are making every sacrifice to attract new industry. Electric power is one of our basic attractions because of our abundant coal reserves, and because the coal and electric industries have employed research and development programs to keep costs down. We look to these commodities to grow in importance as this age of power, which we have entered comparatively recently, moves into high gear—where more and more homes are electrically heated and electrically cooled, and where a multitude of electrically controlled devices will increase our standard of living.

We cannot look forward to the substantial improvement of the economy of our districts if competition is going to come from areas which can outbargin us because their electric power is subsidized by the Federal Government. We are never going to get out of our own end zone if the weight of the Federal Government is used to reinforce our opposition.

I appeal to you to run this game on a fair set of rules. For the protection of your district and mine, I urge you to be ready to join with us in sending the conference report—indelibly stamped "unsatisfactory"—back to committee next week. I shall keep you informed of the time schedule as closely as possible.

Kit Clardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Kit

Clardy, came to Congress in January of 1953, but my acquaintance with him, though we lived in different sections of the State, began when I was first a candidate in 1934.

A comparative stranger, he nevertheless volunteered to help. He spoke many times in my behalf and in behalf of the party. He held deep convictions and never failed to adhere to and support every move which tended to retain our constitutional Government.

He was an uncompromising advocate, always logical, always eloquent, and, understandable, a trait which some of us sometimes seem to lack.

Serving here, he never missed an opportunity to emphasize the necessity of retaining our form of government, fighting every move, no matter how insidious, to destroy us.

His services on the Committee on Un-American Activities were recognized as outstanding.

In his passing, our State and our country has lost an able, vigorous, uncompromising advocate of sound principle, clean thinking, and commonsense methods

Youth Fitness Program Initiated at Muskogee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the pilot project of President Kennedy's physical fitness program gets underway in the public schools of Muskogee, Okla. On this occasion I think that both the fine teachers and administrators of the Muskogee public schools and Bud Wilkinson as national director of the physical fitness program should be congratulated for their effort to conserve our Nation's most important resource—our Nation's youth.

I think it is very appropriate that the Muskogee public school system, which is among the finest in the country, should be picked for this pilot program. In the past, Muskogee schools have been leaders in scholastic achievement and competitive sports. Now the Muskogee schools will be leaders in this other vital role of education—the physical advancement and well-being of all the students as well as the natural athletes.

Coach Wilkinson personally got the program underway last week when he addressed a general faculty meeting of all Muskogee teachers. He emphasized that the success or failure of this program will depend largely on its success in Muskogee.

I am happy to report after visiting Muskogee this weekend that everyone in the city is enthusiastic about undertaking this vital project.

All students, except for the first three grades, will participate in the program.

As Coach Wilkinson outlined, there are four major points to the physical fitness operation:

First, all pupils must have a continuous health appraisal.

Second, the undeveloped children must be recognized and brought up to par.

Third, every boy and girl must get a minimum of 15 minutes of vigorous exercise every day.

And fourth, the same type tests for grading in academic subjects will be used to grade a student's physical advancement.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written and said recently about America's arms races and space races with the Russians. Almost totally overlooked until this year is the effort we must maintain for individual physical fitness. In the final analysis, it is the American man and woman, and not powerful weapons, which must swing the balance of power in the continuing race for world leadership.

Mr. Wilkinson ably pointed this out in his article in Sunday's Parade magazine. He said:

> There will be many stresses for us as a nation in the months ahead. Whether we turn back or surge to the top will depend upon our fitness and determination. It is a fact noted by historian Arnold Toynbee that 19 of the 21 notable civilizations perished not because of conquest from without but from decay within. National softness could prove in the long run to be more deadly than missiles.

As an American, as an Oklahoman, and as a father, I am proud of the work Coach Wilkinson and the Muskogee public schools are doing in spearheading the prevention of this internal decay, and in building a stronger people and Nation.

Robert E. Hansen New VFW Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 25 of this year, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, Minn., accepted the gavel of leadership as commander in chief of the 1¼-million member Veterans of Foreign Wars national organization. In so doing, Mr. Hansen, who is my constituent, became the first Minnesota man in history ever to assume this position.

Mr. Hansen is eminently well qualified for this responsible post. Only 35 years of age, he has served through the chairs of Gallagher-Hansen Post 295, South St. Paul; the 2d District of Minnesota; the Department of Minnesota; the 12th District National Council, and he has been a member and a chairman of many top national committees. He was elected junior vice commander in chief at the Los Angeles national convention in 1959 and was elevated to senior vice commander in chief at Detroit in 1960.

Mr. Hansen's inspiring acceptance speech at the national VFW convention in Miami Beach on August 25 is one in which all Americans can take heed and heart. Under unanimous consent I include the message of VFW Commander in Chief Hansen to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is taken from the September issue of Gopher Oversea'r, the official publication of the department of Minnesota VFW:

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF ROBERT E. HANSEN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF

I find myself at a loss for words to express my gratitude. The only words that seem adequate at the moment are "thank you," thank you from the bottom of my heart. During the coming 12 months I promise to give to our great organization my every waking moment. I will do everything in my power to carry on the great traditions of the commanders in chief who have preceded me. Thank you again.

Now as we embark on this new year, I would like to outline to you some of the objectives that we hope to reach. First, we shall continue our efforts in behalf of more liberal veterans' benefits with special emphasis on relief for our World War I comrades; second, we shall keep a watchful eye on the defense posture of our Nation and if we note any trend to slip back into the old rut, we shall speak out loud and clear so that everyone might hear; and finally, I propose to institute a positive, affirmative program of Americanism that will reach into every community in this Nation to strengthen patriotism and love of country among our people, to strengthen their dedication to individual liberty and to free institutions.

For too long the people of this country have believed that, somehow or other, our troubles would go away, that everything will turn out all right, that there will be a happy ending. We thought the great depression would go away. We thought the Nazis would go away. And there are many who seem to feel that communism will just, somehow, fade away. "Let George do it," let the other fellow do the worrying and the struggling, the fighting and the dying—but not me—that has been the undoing of whole nations and civilizations. What we must realize is that no one is going to save us from Khrushchev but ourselves.

It is this Nation, and this people, that must rouse itself, remembering our great traditions, our great heritage. It is the great, beloved America that must place itself in the front of the battleline, in the place of honor, where the fire is fiercest and the danger sharpest. For to win the great struggle with the Communist world will require a total national effort, one to which every citizen must contribute. And this great organization of veterans who have served their country overseas, has a significant role to play in rallying our people to a stronger, more solid, more dynamic effort in the world struggle.

No contest such as we are engaged in with the Communists can be won with a defensive team alone. We must have teams on every level with positive programs. These teams must operate in organizations, in communities, in States, in the Nation, and internationally. Our total aim must be more than merely to defend a narrowing circle of free peoples. If we are to survive, we must extend the area of freedom. We must do—as we did with nazism—seek complete worldwide victory.

To accomplish this task I suggest a workable 10-point program. It is practical. We can activate it. It will achieve our objectives.

Point No. 1. We must identify the enemy. Confusion among the people as to the enemy who have been warring against us has split our efforts and misdirected our policies. Our actual enemies are the Communist Parties. These control the governments of all Communist-run nations, including the Soviet Union.

Point No. 2. We must know the enemy. Lenin built a corps of disciplined political shock troops and called them Communists. They fashioned many unorthodox weapons. They use agitation, propaganda, deception, political maneuver, incitement to riot, guerrilla warfare, and civil war as parts of their total war against us. We must learn how these weapons are used, and the plans and strategies behind them. I wish to stress here that we must be very, very careful not to confuse patriotic Americans of democracy, with Communists.

Point No. 3. We must create effective countermeasures. Some people say that to defend ourselves against the Communists we must adopt the Communist weapons and Communist tactics. It would be a sad day if America in an effort to combat communism at home, would adopt the Communist tactics of smearing, distortion, and character assassination. The Veterans of Foreign Wars will not condone such tactics. We do need to develop effective measures to counter Communist expansion. We must muster our full resources, make use of our economic power, our educational structure, our great agricultural productivity.

Point No. 4. We must decide to win. Some may say that this is an obvious point. I say it is the most important step we must take. A people which is willing to settle for the status quo, is bound to lose ground in the kind of war we find ourselves in. Such an attitude means that we will wait for the enemy to make a move before we try to defend ourselves. The struggle can be over before we know it has begun. This happened in Cuba. It could happen throughout all of Latin America. We must move from a policy of merely trying to defend the status quo to a policy of positive, affirmative programing. It is high time that we let the Communists sweat about what we are going to do next.

Point No. 5. We must develop specific campaigns. As in military warfare, a campaign is designed to achieve specific objectives on a planned timetable. One campaign must be to support economic programs that will destroy the seedbed of communism. Communist agitators, working within a hopeless and desperate society, can ride the crest of popular discontent into power. Campaigns to counteract these destructive attacks must have two parts—one is to provide the best possible positive leadership in the community, the State, and the Nation; the other is to know Communist techniques and tactics and when to move in to defeat them. Know the facts and act.

Point No. 6. We must act upon the community level. We all live in communities. This is the starting point. I have no fear that the American people would ever be so blind and stupid as to exchange their free society for communism.

The danger is that our society could someday grow so soft and weak, so fat and listless, that we could not do the things that we must do in the world if we are to survive as a great nation.

The Communists, and other radical groups who preach hate and intolerance, seek to sow the seeds of discord and distrust among us. They seek to turn group against group, brother against brother, to undermine confidence, to destroy love of country, to encourage cynicism and contempt for democracy and liberty. We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have fought for better communities, better opportunities, a better life for ourselves and for all those whom we defended in battle. You can make sure this fight is won now, today, by giving our own communities active, effective positive leadership in solving community problems—be they unemployment, lack of opportunity for youth, or just poor garbage collection service.

Point No. 7. We must act upon the State level. Each of our 50 great States has its own government, its own free mechanisms to consider and solve statewide issues. Success in State politics often is a stepping stone to national leadership. As strong, positive leadership is needed in the communities, it is needed even more at the State level. Support leadership and stand for issues which will make your State stronger and the liberties of the people in your State more secure.

Point No. 8. We must act upon the national level. Our national leaders are our spokesmen in national and in world affairs. As everyone who has been long in Washington is aware, they are under great pressures from many sources to adopt one course of action or another on crucial issues. Our national leaders in the White House, in the Senate, in the House of Representatives need expressions of popular support (and opposition when this is warranted). These expressions, made individually and through the national office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are essential to the smooth working of our free democratic government. It is in this way that we can call attention to programs that will strengthen our Nation, and demand action when we judge that action is required. Be vocal when it is time to be vocal. Act when it is time to act so that our national leaders in Washington will know what we believe is best for the Nation.

Point No. 9. We must act upon the international level. Decisions we make in our communities and actions we take often are reflected in world affairs. Any program conucted from our Nation's Capital can directly encourage or discourage, appease or work to defeat Communist aggressions. We must act to insure that our Nation's actions on the international level will achieve the same results of isolating and defeating the Communist Parties which we seek in our communities, our States, and in our Nation.

Point No. 10. We must keep informed. Effective action on any level, in any conflict can be no better than the information upon which action is based.

Communist tactics change. The need for positive action may be greater in one area at one time; in another area at another time. Battle areas shift. We must know from month to month where the Communists intend to strike next, how they intend to attack, and what countermeasures will be most effective. A successful action begins with good intelligence, is carried out with good operations, and ends with victory. It will be my objective to carry this message throughout the United States. We will furnish our posts, districts, county councils, and departments so that they can carry on this fight. With your help the Veterans of Foreign Wars will move into the peacetime frontlines just as they shouldered their weapons in our wars of the past.

A Moral Issue Belies Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, September 6, 1961:

A MORAL ISSUE BELIES NEUTRALS: SOFT STAND ON BERLIN AND NUCLEAR BLASTS BELIEVED LOSING THEM MUCH RESPECT

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the 25 so-called nonalined nations thought they were building up their prestige by their summit conference just held at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, but the truth is they gave the world an example of why double dealing doesn't pay.

This group of nations can hardly be called neutral, for they do take a position on issues which affect them directly. They cannot truly describe themselves as nonalined because they have for the most part sought favors, financial and otherwise, from both sides—the East and the West.

The 25 nations sought to give the impression that they are not only against war but have become the chief exponents of all that is good and virtuous in international relations. The sad fact is, however, that when the Soviet Union broke faith with the world and abandoned its pledges that it would not resume nuclear tests unless the West did so first, the voices of protest from the nonalined group were soft and almost inaudible. It was indeed proof that they were alined with the Soviets. For they failed to denounce the steps taken by Moscow—three nuclear tests in the air—during the very time the nonalined nations were actually in conference at Belgrade.

Former President Truman, who is by no means inarticulate on these matters, put it this way:

"The only thing that pleases me is the jolt the neutralists got. They got what's coming to them. They ought to take sides with the free world if they're going to survive. They're free now because we made them free. The Russians didn't do that. All the satellites they (the Russians) took after World War II are slave states now. You name one that isn't."

The conference of the nonalined was, however, a useful event in one respect. It exposed the hypocrisy of the uncommitted nations. They are uncommitted primarily because they want to derive benefits from both sides—the East and the West. But when the subsidies and donations and grants are added up, it will be found that these nations got many times more from the United States and its allies than from the Russians.

The impression made here by the Belgrade Conference is a painful one. Officials in Washington were shocked to note that, in the resolutions adopted, there was no denunciation of the Soviets for resuming nuclear tests in the air. Despite all the talk by Nehru of India about the importance of preserving peace, he himself was restrained in his comments.

The mission of President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali, in coming to Washington on a special trip to persuade President Kennedy to negotiate with Nikita Khrushchev at a summit conference, is something of an anticlimax.

Here was a group of nations which profess to be against war and especially against colonialism. Yet they fail to stand up to the biggest practitioner of colonialism in the modern world—the Soviet Union. If ever a moral issue has presented itself to challenge the peace-loving elements of the whole world, it is in the Berlin issue—especially in the fate of the people of the divided sectors of Germany. Despite all the pious words about "liquidating colonialism wherever it exists," not a word was spoken or written at the Belgrade Conference in favor of liberating the East German people from the colonial yoke imposed upon them by Moscow.

Also, despite all the many words denouncing nuclear tests, the action of the Soviet Government in resuming such tests in the atmosphere was glossed over.

The conclusion is inescapable that most of the so-called nonalined nations are not idealistic but materialistic, that they will play the West against the East and vice versa in order to get funds. As between right and wrong, there can be no neutrality. Countries like Sweden and Switzerland, which shunned the Belgrade Conference, are neutral, too, but only in the sense that they stay out of international disputes on the political front. Their newspapers, however, are far from neutral, and the sharpest denunciation of Premier Khrushchev's policy in resuming nuclear tests in the air has come from Swedish and Swiss newspapers.

The nonalined may have thought they would gain prestige by the Belgrade Conference. In truth, they have lost the respect of many other governments. For most of the group of nonalined now are considered alined with the position of Moscow, though professing not to accept its doctrines. The Belgrade group seems to be willing to equate the evils of aggression—as evidenced in the Berlin issue—with the heroic efforts of the West to preserve peace and save the "nonalined" nations themselves from being enslaved.

Diplomats of America Live Luxuriously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an article from the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of Monday, August 28. This article concerns the people overseas and shows why we get the name of "Ugly Americans." Our State Department representatives, in keeping with the waste program, are living the life of luxury overseas and, I suppose, are disgusting to the very people they give the handouts to.

I call this to the attention of the House, not that I have any hopes that the State Department is going to mend their ways, as I do not think they are patriotic enough to do that, but in order that people may know that some of us deplore this situation.

The article is as follows:

DIPLOMATS OF AMERICA LIVE LUXURIOUSLY
(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—Simple but lavish is the only way to describe the luxury with which the American taxpayer is made to swaddle the diplomatic and foreign service career men, who compounded do gooding into international confusions.

Luxury quarters and high living are the reward of those, who made their contributions to delivering free nations into Iron Curtain slavery, selling out Nationalist China to communism, sparking the Korean war by dividing Korea at the 38th parallel, failing to provide access to West Berlin and other plaguing decisions ripe with the seeds of war.

In Washington, the State Department this year opened its new $53 million building, which provides bureaucrats on the lower rungs of the policy ladder with offices of a spacious elegance which would set many a so-called fat cat in business purring.

Relaxed elegance is the description given three plush reception rooms, replete with museum quality heirlooms—art, tapestries, screens, porcelains, and furniture fashioned in the 18th and 19th century. Living on a scale beyond Louis XIV, the Sun King, is what taxpayers might call it.

The atmosphere is one of dignity, beauty, and quiet charm if you listen to those who are living at taxpayer expense at a scale they cannot provide for themselves. One can hear the tax dollars pouring out of a coal chute as he walks through the offices, through the reception rooms, the auditorium with 800 red-leather seats, the 500,000 volume library, the international conference room, and the State dining room with a balcony which provides a view of the Washington Monument and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials.

Luxurious housing and lavish living are the rule abroad. In India the United States has a pretentious Embassy on a 26-acre lot which cost about $2½ million. In addition, a miniature of the costly edifice is the Ambassador's $300,000 residence.

In neighboring Karachi, Pakistan, the United States spent $2 million on an Embassy only to discover that the capital is being moved to Rawalpindi some 700 miles away, which will no doubt result in taxpayers being tapped for another $2 million.

In Cuba, a new Embassy, which cost $1½ million in 1953 was emptied of American officials by Fidel Castro. It will make a lovely barbershop if the Communists in battle fatigue suits ever go in for shaving.

In Rio de Janeiro, the U.S. Embassy building, a modern 12-story structure, was completed in 1953 at a cost of $2,800,000. The capital was moved to Brasilia, necessitating drafting of new building plans. The United States opened the first Embassy in the new capital last April 5. Plans are to commute between the two cities.

A new Embassy was built in Stockholm, Sweden, at a cost of about a million dollars. New Embassies in Oslo, Norway, and Copenhagen, Denmark, cost as much and the new Embassy in London far more.

Not only do large sums go for Embassies and ambassadorial residences, but the State Department has tried to do as well by its file as it does by its rank. In Bonn, there was a scheme for a $17-million luxury housing project for American staffers in the West German capital.

There are plans for $50,000 homes for each of three American military attachés in Sweden; a $122,000 lease for housing a consul general; a $200,000 residence for the consul general in Dakar plus $18,000 for furnishings; and a $100,000 consul general's residence in Madras.

A $50,000 home plus some $16,000 in furnishings seems to be the rule for deputy mission chiefs and comparable foreign service officers.

Never have so many had it so good.

Sugar and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the hectic summer now ending a number of the Members of this body had, working in their offices, young people from various colleges throughout the country. These summer interns, as they are known, are in Washington to work and to learn, and from my experience they do both quite well. I was fortunate this summer in having with me a Yale senior, a resident of New York's 17th District, Kurt Koegler. Because of my expressed interest in the subject, Mr. Koegler undertook a research project on the importance of sugar to our defense effort, the underlying rationale for our country's actions in the sugar market. The result of this project is a well-researched paper deserving of the attention of those in the Congress and the administration who makes our sugar policy. Because of the quality of this work and the importance of the information it contains, I am placing in the RECORD the study "Sugar and Defense" by Kurt Koegler, Yale 1962:

The full extent to which sugar and its by-products enter into nonfoods is difficult to estimate because there is no established procedure for collecting the necessary information.

On the whole it is not surprising that so little information is available concerning nonfood uses of sugar because so much of it is sold through local brokers and jobbers without knowledge of its end uses.

The inconclusive nature of the replies obtained by the Sugar Task Group, and the inadequacy of other statistical material suggests that better methods be found for assembling such data. Undoubtedly, the lack of solid facts is not restricted to sugar but extends to all agricultural products which have industrial uses.[1]

The information gathered in this paper would seem strongly to indicate that the sugar industry has no special claim to being a vital and unique contributor to defense production. To be sure, sugar and its by-products do enter into the production of some final products which are of value to the national defense. The available statistics, however, do not indicate that, in the production of such products (with the possible exception of a small amount of pharmaceuticals), sugar and its byproducts are free from competitors which share the market and offer economically sound alternate methods of production. Sugar, that is, shares whatever defense role it has with innumerable other raw materials. During World War II, it is true, a situation did exist in which sugar played an irreplaceable role in the production of war necessities, but that time is now passed.

In order properly to evaluate the statistics which appear in this paper it is necessary to bear in mind the statement of the President's Task Group on Sugar which appears on the preceding page. Full statistics are just not available. In order to prove that sugar is not a unique component of defense production it would be necessary to examine complete production and use statistics for every product in the production of which sugar plays a part. This is impossible. The indication that sugar is not as important as has been suggested does seem strong enough, however, to suggest that the burden of proof must lie with those who claim such a special importance for sugar.

PART I: MOLASSES AND ETHYL ALCOHOL

Any importance that sugar has with respect to defense must largely be accounted for by the utilization of its byproducts. This situation is illustrated by the fact that less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the total refined sugar consumption in the United

Footnotes at end of speech.

States is accounted for by nonfood uses.[3] Of the sugarcane byproducts molasses has been considered in the past the most important, largely because of the fact that it served during the Second World War as an essential raw material in the production of ethyl alcohol, which in turn served (and still serves) as a raw material in the production of synthetic rubber, explosives, and poison gases. In recent years the discovery of synthetic processes for the production of ethyl alcohol and the subsequently decreasing costs of these processes have done much to affect the importance of molasses, and thus of sugar, in the economy of defense.

The nature of molasses

Blackstrap molasses, the principal raw material in the production of fermentation alcohol in the United States, consists of the residues of evaporated sugar-cane juice after the extraction of crystallizable sugar and contains from 50 to 60 percent sugars. At times it is profitable to use high-test molasses in place of blackstrap. High-test molasses is the original sugar-cane juice evaporated to a sugar concentration of 70–80 percent.[3]

About 45 gallons of blackstrap molasses are obtained for every short ton of sugar produced. Since the production of blackstrap is directly related to the amount of sugar produced, there is a definite maximum of availability. High-test molasses produces a greater amount of industrial alcohol per unit than does blackstrap (about 30 pounds of blackstrap are needed to produce one gallon of alcohol as compared with 23 pounds of high-test), but since the use of high-test reduces the amount of edible sugar available it is by no means used exclusively.[4]

The production of high-test molasses is obviously related to the sugar price and supply situation. All molasses not destined for human consumption can be shipped to the United States regardless of the sugar quota and with only an infinitesimal import duty of 0.012 cents a pound (or 24 cents per short ton).[5] Since high-test is an alternate end product, it follows that when the world supply of sugar is insufficient and the price is correspondingly high, little high-test is produced. On the other hand, when prices are low or when U.S. quotas are filled greater amounts of high-test are produced and can be delivered in the United States.

During the prewar period from 1935, high-test molasses production rose to new heights, reaching 338.7 million gallons in 1941. During the early war years, production slacked off because of the greatly reduced supply of sugar on the market. In the war emergency of 1944, however, the great demand for ethyl alcohol stimulated the production of high-test to a total of 225.5 million gallons for the year. This, of course, had a bearing on the already overtaxed supply of edible sugar.[6]

This information gives us some clarification of the edible sugar shortage during the war, the reasons for which have been briefly described as follows:

"The wartime shortage in the United States had a combination of causes. It was largely the result of the loss of supplies normally produced in the Philippine Islands and Java, the reduced production in Europe, particularly Russia, 3 years of small crops of beet sugar in the United States beginning in 1943, and a very short Cuban crop of sugarcane in 1945. In addition, the use of sugar to make industrial alcohol, which was needed in previously unheard of quantities largely because of the program for making synthetic rubber, further reduced the amount of sugar produced for use as food." [7]

Ethyl alcohol

Ethyl alcohol is one of the most important of organic chemicals. The bulk of consumption is accounted for by two uses: (1) as a solvent, including its use in explosives; (2) as a raw material for the production of other chemicals, which include butadiene and styrene which are used in turn in the production of synthetic rubber.

TABLE I.—*Ethyl alcohol (nonbeverage) use in the United States, selected fiscal years 1937–50*

[In millions of wine gallons]

Use	Year ending June 30—						
	1937	1940	1944	1945	1948	1949	1950
Total alcohol withdrawn or used	94	129	562	593	172	159	189
Withdrawals of undenatured alcohol, tax paid	2	4	2	4	2	3	3
Withdrawals of undenatured alcohol, tax free (hospitals, Government use)	2	2	67	61	2	2	3
Withdrawals of completely denatured alcohol (chiefly for antifreeze)	12	15	27	32	18	5	4
Specially denatured alcohol consumed, total	78	108	466	496	150	149	179
A. As a solvent, total	44	46	67	68	46	46	52
(1) In cellulose, resin, and related products, total	12	12	28	30	8	7	9
(a) Lacquers, varnishes, enamels	7	7	4	5	4	4	4
(b) Plastics	3	3	6	5	4	3	4
(c) Explosives	(1)	1	17	18	(1)	(1)	(1)
(d) Other	2	1	1	2	(1)	(1)	1
(2) As solvents and thinners for shellac, cellulose, resin, and others, total	17	18	22	19	18	19	22
(a) Proprietary solvents	15	17	21	18	18	19	21
(b) Other	2	1	1	1	(1)	(1)	1
(3) In toilet preparations	4	4	4	5	5	6	6
(4) For processing industrial, food, drug, and other products, total	5	6	10	10	11	10	10
(a) Nitrocellulose (dehydration)	3	3	4	4	5	4	5
(b) Other	2	3	6	6	6	6	5
Specially denatured alcohol consumed—Continued							
A. As a solvent—Continued							
(5) Pharmaceutical products for external use, total	4	4	1	1	3	3	3
(a) Rubbing alcohol	3	3	(1)	(1)	2	2	2
(b) Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
(6) In cleaning, preserving, and flavoring preparations	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
B. As a raw material for production of other chemicals, total	34	58	398	425	102	102	127
(1) Vinegar	5	8	8	7	4	4	6
(2) Acetic acid			5	5	1	3	7
(3) Ethyl acetate	8	7	11	10	5	5	6
(4) Ethyl chloride	7	12	14	15	8	10	5
(5) Other ethyl esters	(1)	1	3	3	3	3	3
(6) Aldehydes	10	25	65	55	73	68	87
(7) Ethyl ether	1	(1)	3	4	1	1	1
(8) Ethers, glycol and others	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
(9) Ethylene dibromide	1	3	4	4	1		(1)
(10) Synthetic rubber			286	316	(1)	2	4
(11) Rubber accelerators	(1)	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	1
(12) Other	1	1	2	4	4	4	6
C. As a fluid, total	(1)	4	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)
(1) Antifreeze	(1)	4	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
(2) Other	(1)	(1)	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)
D. As a fuel	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	1	(1)	(1)
E. For laboratory and experimental purposes	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	1	(1)

[1] Less than 500,000 gallons.

Source: This table from U.S. Tariff Commission Industrial Materials Report No. M–1; 1951.

Table I should give some idea of the importance of ethyl alcohol in defense production. The figures concerning its use in the production of explosives and synthetic rubber should be noted in particular. Increases in the use of ethyl alcohol for other purposes during the war period and subsequent decreases after the war may be noted throughout the table. This, of course, indicates that the use of ethyl alcohol for purposes directly connected with defense was not limited to synthetic rubber and explosives. There is no reason to believe that a mobilization at this time that involved the production of similar war materials would not call for similar increases in the production of ethyl alcohol; that is, there is apparently no substitute for it available on a large scale. Whether a new mobilization would call for

Footnotes at end of speech.

the same materials as it did 20 years ago is another question.

Molasses and ethyl alcohol

In the year 1935 molasses was used in the production of 85.5 percent of all industrial alcohol. This percentage suffered a relatively steady drop through the years, including the war years, until in 1960 only about 5¾ percent of ethyl alcohol was made through processes involving molasses.

Table II gives the figures for the production of ethyl alcohol for selected years from 1935 to 1960.

TABLE II–A.—*U.S. production at industrial alcohol plants, by kinds of material, specified fiscal years, 1935–50*

Year and kind of material	Ethyl alcohol produced	
	Amount in wine gallons	Percent of total
1935—Synthetic materials	9,255,000	9.7
Molasses	81,284,000	85.5
Other	4,537,000	4.8
Total	95,076,000	100.0
1937—Synthetic materials	17,836,000	15.2
Molasses	88,954,000	75.7
Other	10,674,000	9.1
Total	117,464,000	100.0
1943—Synthetic materials	50,915,000	21.6
Molasses	83,784,000	35.6
Other	100,978,000	42.8
Total	235,677,000	100.0
1944—Synthetic materials	59,860,000	17.9
Molasses	109,223,000	32.6
Other	165,956,000	49.5
Total	335,039,000	100.0
1945—Synthetic materials	58,778,000	16.4
Molasses	100,106,000	27.8
Other	200,817,000	55.8
Total	359,701,000	100.0
1948—Synthetic materials	73,809,000	38.2
Molasses	74,910,000	38.8
Other	44,575,000	23.0
Total	193,294,000	100.0
1949—Synthetic materials	94,951,000	48.0
Molasses	67,047,000	33.9
Other	35,896,000	18.1
Total	197,894,000	100.0
1950—Synthetic materials	103,931,000	57.5
Molasses	56,874,000	31.5
Other	20,036,000	11.0
Total	180,841,000	100.0

TABLE II–B.—*Ethyl alcohol production, by kinds of materials, selected fiscal years, 1953–60*

Year and kind of material	Quantity used, amount in gallons	Ethyl alcohol produced	
		Proof gallons	Percent of total
1953—Synthetic materials		281,511,403	56.23
Molasses	221,049,047	184,324,062	36.81
Other		34,853,343	6.96
Total		500,688,808	100.00
1957—Synthetic materials		365,574,126	82.77
Molasses	33,032,424	39,579,005	8.96
Other		36,569,735	8.27
Total		441,722,866	100.00
1958—Synthetic materials		418,742,564	82.30
Molasses	62,882,736	56,673,473	11.14
Other		33,407,724	6.56
Total		508,823,761	100.00
1959—Synthetic materials		437,614,709	87.50
Molasses	42,244,943	39,467,045	7.85
Other		25,630,359	4.65
Total		502,712,113	100.00
1960—Synthetic materials		471,199,985	88.20
Molasses		30,688,087	5.74
Other		32,302,815	6.06
Total		534,170,887	100.00

Table II–A adapted from Tariff Commission report noted above. The base for the figures differs slightly from that for table I because of the difference in strictness with which beverage alcohol was deducted from the 2.

Table II–B—figures taken from Internal Revenue Service reports on alcohol and tobacco for the years selected for use. The base differs slightly from that of table I and table II–A for the same reason noted above and also because the figures are reported in proof gallons rather than wine gallons (wine gallons take no account of impurities, proof gallons deduct impurities from the total).

In spite of the slight differences in base the figures retain their significance, particularly the percentages, because none of the different bases would affect molasses alcohol any differently than alcohol made from other products.

PART II: OTHER USES OF MOLASSES

Molasses has a variety of other uses besides that of serving as a raw material in the production of ethyl alcohol. The following is a list of the most commonly noted products derived from it: (1) stock feed; (2) molasses for human nutrition; (3) food yeast; (4) acetone; (5) butyl alcohol (butanol); (6) citric acid; (7) lactic acid.

It seems obvious that the first three items on the list have little to do with defense production. Nothing will be said about them except to note that in 1960 75 percent of the total utilization of molasses was for stock feed.

The last four items on the list may have a somewhat more direct bearing on defense production. They are all chemicals with a variety of uses. Several facts would suggest that molasses has a minimal defense value because of its use in producing these intermediate chemicals. First, in the case of acetone, butyl alcohol, and lactic acid is not now of major importance as a raw material in their production. Second, the very difficulty of obtaining statistics on these materials would seem to indicate that none of these chemicals has been pinpointed as being itself particularly important to the national defense.

Acetone

Acetone is a colorless inflammable liquid with a variety of uses. It is used as a solvent in the production of paint, varnish, lacquers, cellulose acetate, plastics and fibers, and acetylene cylinders. These direct solvent uses are estimated to account for 33 percent of total consumption. Thirty-one percent is estimated to be used in derivative heavy solvents such as methyl isobutyl ketone, methyl isobutyl carbinol, methyl oxide, hexylene glycol, diacetone alcohol, and isophorone. The third largest use is in the production of plastics other than cellulose. This use is estimated to represent 16 percent of total consumption. Export and miscellaneous chemicals, which include chloroform, acetyl acetone, and acetic acid, consume the remaining 20 percent.

Two final products of acetone are cordite and silk.

"Fermentation plants have large capacities, but only produce when cheap molasses is available and a favorable market situation for butyl alcohol exists * * *. The fermentation process for acetone has retained a lesser and lesser proportion of the acetone market. The coproduct, butyl alcohol, has also been made by synthesis. Hence the fermentation process has steadily contracted and may now be considered obsolete." [8]

The following figures for the years 1947 and 1956 illustrate the declining importance of the fermentation process:

Process	Pounds produced	Percent of total
1947—Fermentation	40,000,000	10.0
Synthetic	357,000,000	90.0
Total	397,000,000	100.0
1956—Fermentation	23,494,000	3.8
Synthetic	583,149,000	96.2
Total	606,643,000	100.0

What gives these figures added significance is the fact that molasses is not the only material available for the production of fermentation acetone. Corn and potatoes have at times served to push molasses out of the market in this small corner of the field.

Butyl alcohol

Butyl alcohol is a colorless liquid with a vinous odor which is used as a solvent and as a reagent for the production of a number of chemicals. One of the largest uses in the past has been in the production of lacquers for automobile finishes.

As was noted above, when produced by the fermentation process, acetone and butyl alcohol are coproducts. Consequently the decline in fermentation-produced acetone infers a decline in fermentation-produced butyl alcohol. In the production of fermentation-butyl alcohol, corn has in the past played a larger part than molasses.

Citric acids

The consumption of citric acid has been broken down as follows: [9]

	Percent
Foods and beverages	60
Drugs, mostly of the seltzer type, though including sirups, elixirs, anticoagulants, and spermicides	16
Sodium salts and esters	10
Exports	7
Industrial uses to sequester iron in oil well recovery as a water conditioner in metal pickling baths for metal cleaning	5
Cosmetics	2
Total	100

The market for citric acid produced in the United States has been estimated to be 80 million pounds for the year 1961 [10] and has been growing considerably for the past few years. Almost the total supply comes from three main manufacturers, all of whom use a molasses-fermentation process.

It would seem logical to conclude that sugar and its byproducts gain some unique importance through their role in the production of citric acid, important as it is in the production of some pharmaceuticals. However some additional factors ought to be taken into consideration before making a final decision. First, the question arises about the existence of substitutes and competing products for citric acid in the production of the drugs noted above. There is probably no competing product for the seltzer products, but there may be for the others. The second point to note is that a very small amount of molasses goes into the production of drugs through the production of citric acid. In 1960 only 10 percent of molasses utilization was accounted for by yeast, citric acid, and vinegar production.[11]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Of the amount used for citric acid alone, 84 percent was for nondurg purposes.

Lactic acid [12]

The chemical lactic acid of its derivatives has a wide variety of uses, a list of which follows:

Food and beverages—lactic acid has a pleasant sour taste and no odor—it is miscible with water and serves as a food preservative; deliming of hides in the leather industry; textiles and laundry—used for finishing rayon and silk; manufacture of cast resins; soldering flux composition; aerial disinfectants; extracting cellulose from wood; glues and surface coatings; acid drying oil resins; thermoplastic resins.

At the present time virtually all lactic acid is made through a fermentation process. Most of this is made from glucose (dextrose), but other sugars, including lactose from skimmed milk, sucrose (from cane sugar) and maltos may be used. The material chosen is, of course, governed by the availability in a given situation, but it has been found advantageous to work with as pure a substrate as possible. Thus although molasses is very attractive from a price point of view, its complex nature does introduce difficulties in the later purification of the desired product, and is consequently not used to a very large extent.

The use of lactic acid as an intermediate in the chemical industry has not expanded as quickly as once thought possible. This is largely due to price considerations.

Some sources indicate that other chemicals, and consequently other final products have been made from molasses, but these same sources suggest that little has been done practically in these areas and that what has been done is to develop alternate processes for the production of what is already being manufactured on a large scale.

PART III: BAGASSE [13]

Bagasse is the fibrous portion of the sugarcane which remains after the recovery of sugar.

A substantial amount of bagasse (90 percent of domestic production in 1950) is used for fuel by sugar refining plants or nearby consumers. The remainder, which can be used as a raw material in industrial production, may be of value either from the point of view of its physical properties or its chemical properties.

Physically, bagasse produces fibers similar to fibers from cereal straws, cornstalks, and some farm residues. The largest use of bagasse, other than as fuel, is based on this characteristic, and includes the manufacture of pulp for paper, cardboard, and wood substitutes. Bagasse from the physical point of view would seem to have little unique defense value.

The most important chemical that can be made from bagasse is furfural, known variously as furfural, furol, and furfuraldehyde. Furfural is a colorless, flammable, volatile organic compound. In World War II it played an important part in the production of synthetic rubber and was strictly allocated. In recent years furfural has been used, most importantly, in the production of nylon. It is also used in the refining of wood rosins and of lubricating oils and as a component of thermosetting adhesives and plastics. Other furfural products include core binders and castings, impregnating solutions, and plasticizers and herbizers. It is used as a solvent in the production of synthetic resins.

Furfural can be obtained from a number of products, however oat hulls and corncobs are the most important, having accounted for 100 percent of production in the United States in 1950. Any inroads that bagasse has made on the market in the last 10 years would seem to be insignificant, although no precise figures are available.

It is interesting to note that furfural suffered a market collapse in the late 1950's when Du Pont changed from it to butadiene in the manufacture of adiponitrile, an intermediate in the manufacture. This helped keep any new producers of furfural out of the market.

According to one source, progress has been made in utilizing the chemical properties of bagasse in the manufacture of plastics which are already made from other raw materials. The role of bagasse in this area is that of a substitute coming into being.

PART IV: DEXTRAN AS A PLASMA

Plasma and plasma extenders are essential to defense for this reason: serious injuries and shock result in direct loss of blood volume out of the body or loss of blood volume due to the fact that fluid may be driven from the veins into the tissues of the body. Recovery may depend on the restoration of normal or near normal blood volume. Plasma and extenders are used as a means to this end. One of the differences between plasma extenders given intravenously and intravenous feeding is that in the former the nutrient value of the product is not of primary importance. What is of major importance is that the extender serve as a physical replacement for the lost fluid in order to keep the system physically in operation.

A bibliography on plasma substitutes published by the U.S. Army Medical Library in 1951[14] has this to say about plasma extenders:

"It was not until the early years of World War II that the so-called plasma substitutes again were seriously considered as a part of the armamentarium in the treatment of shock * * *. In the United States the advisory and coordinating committee was the Committee on Blood and Blood Substitutes of the National Research Council.

"Great strides were made in the collection and preservation of whole blood, the processing of blood into plasma, and the fractionation of plasma and the isolation of some of its derivatives. Because of these advances and the success of the American Red Cross blood donor program, the extensive field use of the plasma volume expanders was never fully realized. Nevertheless, considerable experience in the use of gelatin solutions, pectin, etc., was accumulated. The most suitable and effective of the substitutes studied was slightly degraded gelatin made of bone.

"In the fall of 1950 the subcommittee on shock of the National Research Council was formed primarily to study the problem of therapeutic use of plasma expanders in the treatment of traumatic shock. Over the past 10 years several macromolecular substances have been developed in this country and Europe. The foreign experience has been much more broad in regard to such substitutes as dextran, polyvinol pyrrolidone, and animal plasma. Dextran was developed as a plasma expander in Sweden with generally good results. Likewise in Germany a synthetic polymer, polyvinol pyrrolidone, known as Periston, had wide clinical use during the war. In addition to the previously mentioned plasma volume expanders, numerous other biologic and synthetic polymers are being investigated by the National Research Council."

The sugar industry has said this is an information sheet recently put out: [15]

"Dextran, a product made only from common sugar, promises to become an important part of the Nation's preparations for defense as a result of investigations into its use as a blood plasma 'extender' * * * research teams have examined a number of substances to determine whether they are capable of maintaining the volume of blood 12 to 24 hours after shock or injury without creating undesirable side effects. Only three—dextran polyvinolpyrrolidone (known as PVP), and bone gelatin are still being studied, and possibly all three will be used eventually."

No independent source was found which confirms the view that the field of possible blood extenders has been narrowed to three. No information was found indicating whether bone gelatin is still the blood extender most favored by the National Research Council. One of the chief researchers in the field, Anders Grönwald, confirms the fact that dextran, although entirely built up of glucose, it must nevertheless be produced from sucrose (common sugar).

No information has been found about the amounts of sugar going into dextran manufacture.[16]

PART V: SUCROSE IN INTRAVENOUS SOLUTIONS

In 1945 Prof. C. Jelleff Carr of the University of Maryland prepared a paper for the Sugar Research Foundation on "Intravenous Sucrose Administration in Clinical Practice." [17] No equally comprehensive work of later date has been found.

Professor Carr reported that intravenous sucrose solution has several advantageous uses. The most important of these he described as follows:

"The most extensive use of sucrose solution has been in the reduction of intracranial pressure. Intravenously administered sucrose solution lowers intracranial pressure without a secondary rise that results from the use of hypertonic dextrose solution."

Professor Carr reports further that there are certain possible complications resulting from the use of sucrose, but that they can be avoided with the employment of reasonable care.

His researches led him to the conclusion that sucrose solutions offer little of value as nutrients, since 88 to 98 percent of the sucrose injected is passed off by the body within a short time.

"These findings clearly indicates that intravenously administered sucrose is almost completely excreted by the kidneys. The authors concluded that sucrose injected in the bloodstream cannot be utilized by the general tissue cells."

The substance of Professor Carr's report would seem to be that sucrose will find certain specific applications in the intravenous field, but that it is not destined to share with glucose one of the latter's most important intravenous values—the feeding of the body.

PART VI: SUGARCANE WAX, BEET PULP, REFINED SUGAR, AND SURVIVAL RATIONS

Sugarcane wax is produced from the filter press muds of raw sugar mills. Wax finds usefulness in the manufacture of carbon paper, polishes, lacquers and varnishes, leather finishing, inks, and mold lubricants. Production, according to figures up to the year 1957, is at the rate of about 1 million pounds of refined sugarcane wax per year, although the total demand for vegetable waxes in the United States is about 20 million pounds a year. Cost has been a factor inhibiting the use of sugarcane wax.

Beet pulp, the vegetable portion of the sugarbeet which remains after the extraction of sugar, was used in 1957 exclusively as cattlefeed, although there is a possibility that it will become a source of pectins and other compounds.

As mentioned earlier, only 0.6 percent of refined sugar is used for nonfood purposes.[18] Some or all of this amount may be accounted for by the production of dextran and intravenous solutions.

In 1947 under the auspices of the Quartermaster General a conference was held on survival and emergency rations. From the report [19] of this conference it may be understood that in the estimation of the exports sugar should play a role in the preparation of emergency rations, but this role should not be so dominant as once thought. A part of the report reads as follows:

Footnotes at end of speech.

"[We have heard] about the physiological aspects of survival nutrition and how our ideas have changed from those which prevailed during the last war, in which it was believed that the individual under survival conditions should eat only carbohydrates [which include the sugars] in order to preserve water. With the development of newer information, we know that if the individual under such conditions has 1,800 calories per day, he may eat carbohydrates, fat, and protein, provided they are in the proper balance, and still preserve water equally well or even better than if he eats carbohydrates only."

According to the survival ration requirements adopted at the Food Laboratories Institute, in the rations under development 60 to 70 percent of total calories were still to be provided by carbohydrates, but not all of this by any means from sugar. It is true, however, that each proposed daily ration did contain some sugar.

---

[1] The President's Appointed Bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products; Task Group on Sugar; interim report; Jan. 8, 1957.

[2] Ibid.

[3] U.S. Tariff Commission; Ethyl Alcohol (Industrial Alcohol); Industrial Materials Series Report No. M–1; 1951.

[4] This information supplied by Sugar Information, Inc., of New York.

[5] This information supplied by Mr. Hans Hirsch of the Department of Agriculture.

[6] Industrial Alcohol; miscellaneous publication No. 695; Department of Agriculture; P. Burke Jacobs, author.

[7] Sugar During World War II; War Records Monograph 3; Department of Agriculture; Roy Ballinger, author.

[8] Chemical and Engineering News, June 9, 1958; most of the information on acetone and butanol was found here.

[9] Chemical and Engineering News, Dec. 7, 1959.

[10] Chemical Engineering, April 3, 1961.

[11] Feed and Industrial Molasses, annual market summary, 1960; Department of Agriculture; Agricultural Marketing Service.

[12] Information in this section from Industrial Chemist, June and Aug. 1959.

[13] Information in this section primarily from two sources: (a) "The Industrial Utilization of Sugarcane Byproducts," Walter Scott; Kent House; Port of Spain, Trinidad; 1950; (b) Chemical and Engineering News, Mar. 20, 1961.

[14] Plasma Substitutes; U.S. Army Medical Library; bibliography, compiled by Karl A. Baer; 1951.

[15] "About Sugar: Its Place in Defense;" Sugar Information Inc.; New York.

[16] "Dextran and Its Use in Colloidal Infusion Solutions", Anders Grönwall; Academic Press Publishers, Inc.; New York; 1945.

[17] "Intravenous Sucrose Administration in Clinical Practice"; C. Jelleff Carr; Sugar Research Foundation, Inc.; New York; 1945.

[18] Information in this section up to this point from the Task Group on Sugar Report.

[19] Conference on Survival and Emergency Rations; Research and Development Branch, Office of the Quartermaster General; Quartermaster Food Container Institute for the Armed Forces; Chicago, Ill.

Dangerous Trends of Our Times

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply indebted to the people of my district and my State, who have been mighty good to me through the years. First elected to public office when I was 21 years old, I am now completing my 20th year in the Congress. I have served longer in Congress than any Mississippi Member, including our Senators, other than my colleague, Hon. BILL COLMER.

Mr. Speaker, most of my service here has been on the Appropriations Committee, where each year, as a part of our duty on the overall Appropriations Committee, we review in detail defense and military construction operations. Each year we have heard the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and other top military witnesses, including the Director of Central Intelligence.

In this position I have tried to be constructive. I have sponsored investigations of procurement practices and policies, bringing about changes which have saved many billions of dollars. We have forced the use of many existing bases instead of building new ones, and so forth.

Despite our best efforts the needless waste is appalling. All too frequently expenditures are made which are not really for defense; in fact, they weaken real defense. See pages 8605–8612, 8950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1960.

FOREIGN AID

We are underwriting the incumbent government in countries all over this world, willy-nilly. Human nature is the same the world over. As soon as the incumbent government fails and they stop receiving our aid, they are against us.

As to the South American countries. We know their history. Just as soon as American business grows up there, fully guaranteed against loss, under this bill, it is an open invitation for revolution and for some unfriendly dictator to take over—and like Cuba; I suppose we will sit and take it.

The only question is how soon will it happen.

Oh, I have heard my friends here make speeches that we ought to do something about Cuba. I am not going to give away any of the secrets I hear as a member of the Committee on Defense Appropriations and in other sensitive places.

Remember this, if you think about it, you will be bound to conclude that the reason we have not protected ourselves against Cuba, right off our own coast, is that our commitments are spread out all over the world to the extent there would be retaliation somewhere else. We have made commitments in Asia, Africa, Europe, and every other place, and in the process we have left ourselves vulnerable on our very doorstep. Russia is in Cuba, military construction is going on today in Cuba. Ships from Russia are coming into Cuban ports. Russian planes are in Cuba. Are they building missile pads? Every indication is that they are, and we sit by, afraid that if we protect the threat against us on our own doorstep, we will be hit on a hundred farflung fronts.

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

If there is any group of nations which looks to some strong man at home and respects strength abroad, it is the Central and South American countries. To them, with our rush offer of $600 million after Castro's actions in Cuba, now skyrocketed in one speech to $20 billion, we must appear scared to death. Certainly, they cannot believe this is the same nation which announced the Monroe Doctrine and made it stick.

WE PAY PROFITS, PAY TRIBUTE, AND MAKE ENEMIES

We have insisted on granting funds to other countries for buying new material, when many times those nations had usable supplies on hand. By granting such governments dollars for new purchases the ruling powers in some of these countries get a cut, a rakeoff, a handout, and American interests make a profit. In the process we are inflaming many people against us and defeating the very purpose we seek.

Look at what happened in Korea, in Laos, in Vietnam. We see what happened in Japan, and in Cuba. We have granted more than $2 billion to Yugoslavia. For what?

Today we aid Poland, let U.S. industry trade with Cuba and Russia, assist Egypt. However good our intentions, in the eyes of the world we are, in effect, paying tribute. Paying blackmail has never worked, throughout history. It will never work.

It is difficult to get Americans to look at this program objectively. Too many Americans are reaping profits. American and foreign companies have been organized and have gotten rich doing this business for us, frequently without any real investment on their part. We have made competitors out of customers, competitors whose output is now doing real damage to American agriculture and industry and to American workers, thus weakening our overall economy on which our safety depends.

WE MUST REVERSE OUR COURSE

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, through foreign aid we have gotten ourselves deeply and dangerously involved in the internal affairs of every nation which accepts our aid—and we have spent $100 billion doing it. Because of it we have been afraid to protect ourselves against Cuba, just off our shores. We must change our course, show our courage and determination, and demonstrate to the world that we will not continue to pay tribute or attempt to buy friendship. We must regain our ability to defend ourselves from the dangers close by—as it is through foreign aid we show our weakness, and invite disaster.

WE MUST DEVELOP OUR OWN COUNTRY

Recognizing that the greater our debt, the more our problems, and the more imperative it is that we protect our country, I have used my position as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture to provide for the protection of our watersheds, our streams, our land, and the natural resources of our Nation, on the basis that we must at least protect our natural resources, on which everything else depends.

In the field of domestic public works, I made the motion which resulted in overriding President Eisenhower's veto of the domestic public works appropriation, thereby protecting the program for

the development of our rivers and harbors for flood control. Pages 18597 and 18603–18604, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, 1959.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I mention the length of my service and the experience I have had that you may know my belief that we are losing too many beliefs upon which our Government was founded, both as individuals and as a Nation, beliefs which have carried our Nation through the many trials that have beset us in the past, is based on long service and experience with many subjects.

We appear to be on the road where to spend more dollars, with everyone trying to get his share, seems to be the order of the day. These are matters which I have discussed in great detail before the Congress, in dealing with specific programs. If the Nation is to stand—if we believe history—we must reverse our course.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to quote from a speech which I made on the occasion of Jefferson Davis' birthday, in which I pointed out—in what I trust was a temperate, moderate, and judicious manner—what the use of armed power to force conformity in 1861 has led us to in 1961. Truly, there is such a dangerous similarity between conditions existing in the United States in 1861 and today as to be appalling.

I hope these thoughts and views may have the prayerful study of my colleagues from all sections.

I quote:

Jefferson Davis was born June 3, 1808, a man destined to lead a lost cause with courage and honor. Long before the outbreak of the Civil War, however, Jeff Davis had served his country well as a U.S. Representative, as Senator, and as Secretary of War. With all his ties to the Union, when the States of the South called him to support their cause, to protect the right of local self-government, he did not hesitate. His service as President of the Confederacy during the tragic war was such as to make us all proud.

Jefferson Davis possessed the highest principles of integrity, honor and duty. He faced his problems with determination and energy.

THE CIVIL WAR OR THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

One hundred years ago, in 1861, the Civil War, or War Between the States began. This centennial year is being marked by caremonies, memorials, holidays, and reenactments throughout the South, which, except for commemorating the valor of our forefathers, I personally believe could well be used to point out how very similar our situation today is to that tragic situation of 100 years ago. Present conditions are so similar we should pause to remember that heartbreaking conflict, which pitted brother against brother and father against son.

As we look back upon those troubled times we can see that sound leaders of both sides deplored any effort to settle the issue by armed conflict. Unfortunately, the radicals of that day prevented a peaceful solution. Then, as now, they were not satisfied to run their own local affairs, but insisted that all other sections conform to their pattern.

In the period leading up to the Civil War, any objective study of history would clearly show that slavery in the South was on its way out. A further study, however, will show that the North, which had contributed greatly to importing the institution of slavery into the United States for economic reasons, had gotten rid of its slaves by 1850, so those who wished could look at the matter in the abstract, without any fear of economic effect in their own area.

However bad the institution of slavery was, it did provide supervision and care which were essential to the welfare of the Negroes of that day and time. With the end of the war these untrained and uneducated people were turned loose without any type of control, aid, or assistance. The terrible days of reconstruction were very similar to those we see in the Congo now, where all experienced leadership has been forced out, just as happened in the South.

SEGREGATION NOT LIMITED TO THE SOUTH

Thus, today, it is very easy for people in other sections of the country to agitate and feel that they are morally right in insisting on forcing integration in the Southern States and the destruction of local laws. Many people adopt a holier than thou attitude, taking the view that they do not have segregation in their own area. However, living here in Washington and having visited most of the major cities of the United States, it is apparent that minority groups live almost entirely among themselves in all areas of the country. Integration is a token matter. Through the practice of economic segregation those who wish to force integration on the South can live in sections where they do not meet the problem. Thus, again, it is easy for them to strike at the matter in the abstract.

I am sure most of the people of the United States would agree with us who live in the South if they had the same situation and knew all the facts. Unfortunately, the radio and press often write what their readers wish to believe, and the full facts are not presented to the public.

It is impossible however for those who support integration to fully ignore what is happening in their own areas. Appearing this week in the Christian Science Monitor was the following article:

NEGRO AND THE TEEN CRIME

The hidden Negro problem of the North is seen as packing an explosive force more hostile to the stability and welfare of the Nation than the recent race eruptions in the South.

SOCIAL DYNAMITE

In practically every instance, it is the teenage Negro who is involved. Police forces have been increased and supplied with trained dogs, but the crime wave continues.

And this report appeared in a Los Angeles paper:

"LOS ANGELES MOB QUELLED

"LOS ANGELES, May 31.—An angry throng hurled rocks, bottles, cans, sticks, and baseball bats at police when a riot broke out * * * started when officers tried to arrest two youths—part of a group of youthful Negroes * * * soon a mob of 200 was advancing on the officers. Of the 75 police called out 5 were injured."

Instead of forcing integration upon the Southern States, truly it would be well for the rest of the country to learn from the States of the South that the way for peace and harmony is to provide for separate but equal facilities and protect each race in the enjoyment of its own way of life.

THE SUPREME COURT

We have a Supreme Court from whose decisions there is no appeal, which has taken unto itself the right to change the Constitution without constitutional amendment. In effect, the Court has said that even though, for the moment, certain other statutes are constitutional, it reserves the right to declare them unconstitutional at a later time, unless they are carried out as the Court desires.

In the history of the world, those governments have stood which had something solid around which the tides of public opinion could ebb and flow. In our country it was the Constitution, the interpretations of which had become a part of it, had made it fixed and stable, a steadfast rock, around which statutes could be passed and decisions rendered. But when the Court sets aside all prior decisions as to what the Constitution meant, decisions on which the States of the South had relied, it means that from week to week you don't know what the law is. A short time ago, we saw France call General de Gaulle back into power, to a position approaching dictatorship. Why? Because the French constitution was being subjected to the day-to-day whims of the legislative body, which meant that the nation had no stability in law.

What does the Supreme Court's recent line of decisions mean? My friends, by way of homely illustration, the accuracy and soundness of the description of the land on which this Capitol is placed depends on the permanency of the marker from which the first survey started. The Supreme Court has moved the constitutional marker from its place. As a result everything which was tied to such post or marker has lost its meaning; and, further, the Court has reserved the right to keep wiggling such marker around to serve the whims of a majority of its members.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS

You may well ask why the Supreme Court took such action. My friends, I have many reasons and much evidence to support the belief that the threat of a Russian victory was used to bring about the unanimous decision by the Supreme Court in the Brown integration case. It was probably argued that if we don't bring about integration with the colored people in the United States, we will lose the contest with Russia throughout the world; and if we don't do this, Russia will eventually conquer the world. It was said by the press, "If Russia takes over here, the first thing they will do is set up a dictatorship. If Russia takes over," they charged, "they will do away with the right to trial by jury." "Yes," they said, "if we do not integrate, Russia will force on us a system similar to Hitler's in Germany or Stalin's in Russia."

What did they do in Germany and Russia? What was the source of their absolute control of those nations? Why, they had the courts issue decrees, then they used troops and government officers to enforce the decrees.

Haven't we done that here? We have seen the Supreme Court, unwilling to wait for constitutional amendment in the regular process, change the Constitution by decree. We have seen the President send troops and Federal officials to enforce such decrees. We have seen the President recommend, and the Congress pass, legislation doing away with the right to trial by jury. Our Government, itself, has done much of what we feared Russia might do.

We are told we have to integrate all the races of the United States or we can't hold the friendship of the people of India, China, Japan, Africa, and all the rest. If that be true, why have China and Japan been at daggers point throughout history? Talk about India—in spite of what you read, we know in many areas people of the same color cannot even touch each other.

No, the agitation is right here at home, promoted perhaps by the Communist Party, whose purposes it serves. People are using the threat of Russia here in the United States to accomplish their personal desires and actually to impose the Russian system of required conformity upon us. My friends, if this were the real "McCoy," if the proponents of this destruction of our

American way of life and the pride in our race were sincere, they would look at certain nations around us and wonder why those countries with the same great natural resources as we have, nevertheless, have such a low economic level. They would wonder why elections in those countries are often determined by violent revolutions. If John Marshall had held the same views as the present Chief Justice, and if Thomas Jefferson had been of the same opinion as our recent President, and had brought about integration in their day, perhaps by this time we would be on the same low economic level as some of our neighbors for whom Congress has provided hundreds of millions of dollars—without even a plan—all in the hope it might help our cause.

My friends, history clearly shows an individual must have pride or he makes no real progress. A family must have pride or it goes down the scale. So it is with countries. So it is with race. Any race, whatever it may be, which feels it must be intermixed with another acknowledges its own lack. Such a race will not serve itself well, nor that with which it wishes to intermix.

Don't believe my statement simply because I say it. Read history. It is replete with proof. In all history there is no exception.

Integration, where it has taken place, has only led to great turmoil. We all know that if you go into some sections of almost any northern city where there is a sizable Negro population, you take your life in your hands.

Rape, murder and robbery are commonplace in some areas of Washington.

THE FREEDOM "BUSTERS"

In recent weeks we have seen agitators deliberately go into areas of the South for the admitted purpose of violating laws of the States, which have never been held to be beyond the power of such States, but rather have been held to be within the power; and then we have seen the Federal Government move its force in to protect such individuals in their avowed purpose of "testing" existing laws.

What if it were the law against murder they wished to test, or rape or robbery? Is there one rule in the Federal Government for laws the Executive or the Judiciary likes and another for the laws they don't like?

These so-called "freedom riders," who might better be called "freedom busters" could do what they wish in their own areas. They are out really to "bust" the laws which others have found best for themselves. Here we find them, with the support of Federal officers, attempting to force their views on people, black and white, who have different views and, therefore, different rules and laws for getting along peaceably and with mutual respect—and they do it on the basis of fighting intolerance. Could anything be more intolerant than to push their views on others?

Ladies and gentlemen, there are those who say if integration were forced into public places, the present controversy would end. Of course, it would not. Each step leads to the next one. Don't the people know that if every family were integrated, if every family were amalgamated, then there would be still a distinction based upon shades of color, upon purity of race? If you want proof, merely look at those countries where the white and black races have amalgamated.

My friends, power breeds desire for power. No dictator ever stopped short of taking it all. This concentration of supreme power in our Supreme Court, backed up by the Executive, will not stop with school and public facility integration, nor with race. Once seized this power will be used to control industry, to control agriculture, yes, and eventually even labor.

In Russia everyone is supposed to own everything. However, for all practical purposes everything may as well belong to the Communist leaders, who control according to their own desires. In our country, if the present trend continues, it won't simply be the Chief Justice, the President, or even the Attorney General who issues orders, it will be every little Tom, Dick, and Harry who speaks in the big chief's name. So it has been in history and so it will continue to be, for the basic traits of human nature do not change.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOWS THE SAME WEAKNESS

I was at the opening session of the United Nations last fall. I saw Khrushchev as he virtually ran the length of the floor to embrace Castro, though they had been together all morning. Yes, and I saw the representatives of African nations, such as the African Congo, each with a vote, though many of them represented virtually only a small tribe, recognized and seated there at our instance, another group for whose vote we must bid, not once and for all but on every issue as it arises.

Today, a hundred years after the Civil War, the United States moved into the local affairs of almost every country which would let us. We have granted funds and goods to foreign governments, which in turn sold such goods to their own people for what the traffic would bear. We extend this foreign aid primarily on the promise, but many times merely in the hope, that incumbent governments would support our wishes. Through this means we have made a few persons rich here and abroad. In many of these nations we have forced them to take on our ways, to the point many countries are virtually defenseless, both from revolution within or from enemy attack from without.

In many of these nations we have lined ourselves up with the 3 or 4 percent which have almost all the wealth, and left ripe for the picking by Russia the other 96 or 97 percent. Not only does our Government seem unwilling to permit the people of any State of the United States to run their local affairs as suits them, but it has spent more than $60 billion in foreign countries, largely in an effort to keep "our crowd" in, whether the people of the area want that particular "crowd" or not. We have made competitors of customers and now wonder why our gold reserves are depleted and our cash markets reduced.

In view of our foreign entanglements, I flinch each year when Washington's farewell address, warning of the dangers of foreign entanglements, is read in the House of Representatives. I feel it is almost sacrilege.

My friends, my speech here today is not meant to be an attack upon any individual nor upon any political party. Both parties and many leaders have contributed to our situation, including some in our own Southland.

We wish for our President the greatest success, not only on his present trip but throughout his tenure of office, for as he goes so goes the country. We are all in this boat. We had hoped, however, for a reassessment of all these matters which I have mentioned to you and, therefore, have been disappointed to see the request for more forced integration, not less, for more foreign aid, not less.

COURAGE IS REQUIRED TODAY

We do well to honor that great American, Jefferson Davis; we do well to remember the character and courage shown by him and the hundreds of thousands who stood by him 100 years ago today. I pray we may have the same courage today, not merely to save the South, but the Nation.

In this centennial year of the beginning of the Civil War, the American people would do well to review and recognize the great similarity between conditions which prevailed on June 3, 1861, and those which prevail today, June 3, 1961. They are so similar as to be frightening. Sometimes we, too, wish we could resolve the issue in some simple, clear-cut way. Such a course is not possible. Any solution will require helpful understanding on the part of many people. We must do our part.

Not since the Civil War have our people faced a more trying time. Our problems today call for the best within us. The attack on the Constitution and on our way of life is insidious. It comes under the guise of government. It is offered with an appeal to the natural tendency of Americans to be law abiding. It appeals to religion, is presented in the name of world peace, but creates strife, dissension, and disturbance. It is said to be necessary to protect the rights of individuals, but is itself based on usurpation of power. We are told it is necessary in order to maintain our form of government; yet its starting point is the destruction by judicial decree of the rights of the States, of the Congress, and of the people. Yes, it begins with destruction of the Constitution itself. It can only lead to complete ruin.

History books are written one way for use in the Southern States, another way for the other States. However, one fact is inescapable. Might, for all practical purposes, has the same effect as if it were right.

It has taken us a hundred years to see just how far such a situation can go—today it is the Supreme Court and the executive department which apply the force. Once again we see what might can do.

WE MUST CHANGE OUR COURSE

I sincerely hope that our Supreme Court, our President, and those who would control our newspapers, our radio and our television, will recognize, before it is too late, what the present course leads to. It was not merely the South which lost the Civil War, it was the Nation. It has taken a hundred years for us to fully see that might, when taken to be right, can destroy a nation.

We must review our domestic and foreign policy and reverse our course. We must realize that any nation such as ours must permit local difference, reflected in local self-government.

We must realize that the people of other nations are not going to give up their right to change their government as they see fit. We must realize that friendship purchased with cash will fail when the cash is gone—not only that, but we must realize that in most countries those now out of control will, in the course of events, get into control; and then, the United States will be the subject of the greatest hatred. Thus it is that we are in such a precarious situation throughout much of the world.

In conclusion, may I say, we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a foreign policy which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we don't approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign countries are going to do it anyway, and we will continue to be the loser.

If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we hold dear will be gone, for no dictator can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an allpowerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Why Should Federal Funds Be Used To Help Make Possible the Building of $325-a-Month Luxury Apartments in Federally Assisted Urban Renewal Projects Which Have as Their Purpose the Rehousing of Slum Dwellers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, why should Federal funds be used to provide $325-a-month luxury apartments in federally assisted urban renewal projects which have as their purpose the rehousing of slum dwellers?

The Washington (D.C.) Post reports today, September 7, that the contest-winning design for residential development of an 8.4-acre urban renewal site in southwest Washington will provide rental apartments from $120 to $325 a month.

The Congress has provided nearly $70 million for the southwest urban renewal project, and has further sweetened the project with a number of Federal office buildings, without which the project would not even have been started.

I am indeed touched by the concern of this administration for the poor and the underprivileged, but how can a slum dweller afford a $325-a-month apartment even under the Democrats?

I am, of course, interested to know that the President and his administration is moving so decisively to rid the Nation's Capital of noisome slums and to build in their place $325-a-month luxury apartments to rehouse the slum dwellers who lived in those slums.

Of course, if it should turn out that the slum dwellers who formerly lived in the southwest urban renewal project area have simply moved to new slum areas in other parts of the city in these New Frontier days then the poor downtrodden taxpayer should not be condemned if he were to feel as bilked as the slum dweller.

He would be justified in objecting to the use of his tax money to provide $325-a-month luxury apartments for people who, if they are able to pay that much money in rent each month, should be able—even in the Nation's Capital—to find suitable living quarters in privately financed apartment houses.

Several of my colleagues have joined me in introducing legislation to provide for the protection of residential and business realty which is not substandard and which is held by homeowners and small businessmen in urban renewal project areas in the District of Columbia, to encourage and assist private owners of commercial and residential realty to undertake the renovation and modernization of such realty, thereby reducing the necessity for huge expenditures for publicly supported urban renewal programs.

That this new, far less costly, and much more human approach to urban renewal is not a partisan matter is shown by the fact that I have been joined in its sponsorship by the brilliant, courageous, and distinguished gentlemen from New York [Mr. MULTER], Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL], and Iowa [Mr. KYL].

I invite all of my colleagues, who are really concerned with the mounting and unjustified expense of urban renewal in the Nation's Capital—which has been estimated to cost more than $400 million under present and projected programs—to help save this vast amount of Federal funds by introducing legislation similar to my House Joint Resolution 532, the text of which is included along with the text of the Washington (D.C.) Post article to which I referred earlier in my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, Sept. 7, 1961]

WINNING BUILDING DESIGN IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON UNVEILED BY REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

(By Morton Mintz)

The contest-winning design for residential development of an 8.4-acre site in Southwest Washington was unveiled and approved by the Redevelopment Land Agency yesterday.

The design was prepared by the Washington architectural firm of Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon. One of 11 entries in an RLA-sponsored competition, it won the unanimous acclaim of a panel of five famed architectural and planning critics.

FOUR 9-STORY TOWERS

The design calls for construction of 384 apartments in four 9-story towers and 86 row houses on the Area C site bounded by the proposed Washington channel waterfront park and M, N, and Fourth Streets SW.

The land, which has been cleared of blighted buildings, is valued at more than $1.1 million. Construction will cost an estimated $8.6 million.

The design was prepared for the Tiber Island Corp., the development firm which was formed by the W. C. & A. N. Miller Development Co., Berens Real Estate Development Corp., and Frederick W. Berens, Inc.

RLA Executive Director John R. Searles, Jr. said the developer could begin construction within 4 months and complete it 13 months later—in February 1963.

PRICED UP TO $32,500

The contemplated range of rentals for the apartments—efficiencies and one- and two-bedroom units—is $120 to $325 a month. A decision has not been made whether the row houses will be sold, but the projected sales prices range from $22,500 to $32,500.

The row houses, grouped in four quadrants of the site, will be connected to the elevator buildings by covered walks and arranged around small landscaped courts. In the center of the project will be a large paved square. Under it will be a 280-car, two-story garage.

The RLA set the land price at $3.10 per square foot. In 1953 real estate tax revenues from the site totaled $9,800. After redevelopment, they will amount to $161,000.

The architectural review panel consisted of Louis Justement, Washington; Jacob L. Crane, Annapolis; Carl Koch and Hideo Sasaki, both of Cambridge, Mass., and G. Holmes Perkins, Philadelphia.

In its report recommending the Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon design, the panel said it "is the only one of the submissions that would be wholehearted accepted by a majority of the panel.

"The panel was most favorably impressed by the relationship of the main building masses with the approved projects to the north (the Town Center commercial and residential development) and south (the Harbor Square residential project) and with the relationship to the waterfront."

Searles said that the panel's decision was concurred in by the RLA staff, the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the District Department of Licenses and Inspections.

H.J. RES. 532

Joint resolution to provide for the protection of residential and business realty which is not substandard and which is held by homeowners and small businessmen in urban renewal project areas in the District of Columbia, to encourage and assist private owners of commercial and residential realty to undertake the renovation and modernization of such realty, thereby reducing the necessity for huge expenditures for publicly supported urban renewal programs, and for other purposes

Whereas the President has asked the Congress to give industry tax abatements of up to $1,700,000,000 as an incentive to modernizing plant and equipment to keep them competitive with rivals in Europe and Japan; and

Whereas American cities and their residential and commercial areas are deteriorating further and faster than factory plant and equipment, even though these are just as much a part of the economic capital of the Nation as are factories; and

Whereas instead of giving tax rebates or otherwise providing incentives for modernizing residential and commercial structures in slum areas, most cities increase taxes on property that has been improved, and a slumlord who buys property and lets it deteriorate is benefited by being given depreciation allowances while a property owner who maintains and improves his property is penalized by tax increases; and

Whereas such publications as the Christian Science Monitor and House and Home and Look magazines have pointed out that today's taxes make misuse of land more profitable than good use and that slums are subsidized by undertaxation while developments are penalized by overtaxation and speculators are suzsidized by public improvements for private profit; and

Whereas some Scandinavian and Caribbean countries, as well as France and Italy, put higher taxes on land to encourage people to use it for productive purposes instead of speculation; and Australia and New Zealand lighten taxes to encourage home and private improvements, and have made land cheaper and have removed tax penalties for improvements; and

Whereas the repair, improvement, renovation, and restoration of residential and commercial property by the owners of such property should be encouraged by all means and should not be penalized by higher taxes; and

Whereas such publications as Life magazine have declared editorially that "The housing problem requires many different solutions; but the roles of the bulldozer, the big project, and the professional 'housers' have long been overdone" and have called for tax reforms, better incentives for private landlords, and easier credit for rehabilitation; and

Whereas studies by the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York, and other groups, both private and public, have documented the fact that rehabilitation of basically sound structures is usually less costly than new construction on the same site; and

Whereas such publications as the Saturday Evening Post have editorially declared that the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1960's may turn out to be the urban renewal program, and that in "cities from coast to coast, areas of historic interest, pleasing architecture, and gracious living are being condemned as 'substandard, blighted, deteriorating' or plain 'slum' "; and

Whereas destruction of many fine homes, as well as homes which should have been salvaged, has already taken place in the Southwest urban renewal project area in the District of Columbia; and a study commissioned by the National Conference of Catholic Charities declares that urban renewal in Southwest Washington has not met the clear purpose of the Federal urban renewal program, that responsible civic opposition was not honestly accommodated, that undue pressure was exerted by experts with a vast knowledge of ways and means of bypassing those whose interests and vision extended beyond the immediate project into which concrete could be poured, and concluded that "our shining new cities cannot and must not be built on the suffering of our less fortunate citizens"; and

Whereas the Washington Real Estate Board of the District of Columbia has declared that more than seventeen thousand families—perhaps as many as eighty-five thousand persons—may be removed from their homes in the next five years by urban renewal and highway construction programs, that such programs should be moderated and appraised from a humanitarian aspect, and has called for the creation of an office in the District of Columbia government charged with the responsibility of keeping displacement activity in tune with availability of adequate shelter, and has further recommended that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia should issue a rule requiring "agencies causing displacement to certify that adequate shelter is available to displacees prior to the time when these agencies move in with their bulldozers"; and

Whereas $325-a-month luxury apartments should have no place in urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia designed to rehouse slum dwellers, and individual homeowners and businessmen in the District of Columbia have successfully reclaimed, at no cost to the Federal Government, such areas as Georgetown, Foggy Bottom, Kalorama Triangle, Lanier Heights, Mount Pleasant Village, and Capitol Hill from decay and obsolescence thereby saving the taxpayers many millions of dollars for urban renewal programs which would have, otherwise, had to be undertaken by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; and

Whereas, in spite of widespread citizen dissatisfaction expressed by organizations of citizens such as the Kalorama Citizens Association, and the Lanier Place Protective Association, as well as by individuals and groups deeply concerned with the preservation and restoration of commercial and residential realty, officials have refused to change the Adams-Morgan urban renewal plan which declares that the Kalorama Triangle area, Crescent Place, and Lanier Place in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia are "blighted", even though they are generally recognized as among the finer residential areas of the Nation's Capital, and proposes to clear Lanier Place to establish a parking area, and on the basis of such haphazard planning by officials charged with urban renewal functions in the District of Columbia the Housing and Home Finance Agency has already approved an application for Federal planning advance funds and has made a capital grant of more than $460,000, a glaring example of the inappropriate use of some of the funds made available for urban renewal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act of August 14, 1894 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–705), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 6.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any increase in the value of the tract or lot of real property, on which the taxpayer's personal residence is located (or of the improvements thereon) which is the result of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration of such residence shall be disregarded in making the valuation of the property under subsection (a) for the fiscal year in which such repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration is completed and for the four succeeding fiscal years. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'taxpayer's personal residence' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their personal residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to repairs, alterations, renovation, and restoration completed in fiscal years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3(a) of title III of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1557b (a)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(16) EXPENSES OF HOME REPAIR MAINTENANCE, ALTERATIONS, AND ADDITIONS.—In the case of an individual, the expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair and maintenance of, or alterations or additions to, the personal residence of the taxpayer. The deduction under this paragraph shall be allowable only to the extent of the aggregate of such expenses actually paid by the taxpayer, and in no case shall it exceed $2,000. Such deduction shall be applicable only to expenses which are not otherwise allowable as deductions in computing net income under section 1 of this title. As used in this paragraph, the term 'personal residence of the taxpayer' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, maintennace, alterations, or additions involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their personal residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to expenses paid during taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–706) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) structures (including both residential and commercial structures) which are not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and

"(2) the owner of any substandard structure (residential or commercial) which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition in a project area shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such structure shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration, has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring the structure, shall itself provide for such rehabilitation or restoration whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate and shall dispose of the structure so rehabilitated or restored at such time and on such terms and conditions as it may determine to be in the public interest."

SEC. 4. The Act entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–413 et seq.), is amended by redesignating section 17 as section 18 and by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"SEC. 17. The provisions of this Act shall apply to chanceries and other business-type buildings of foreign nations in the District of Columbia, so as to conform with the general practice among nations of requiring the observance (by countries with which they maintain diplomatic relations) of their laws and zoning regulations in the location of such buildings; and the Zoning Commission shall accordingly include in its regulations under the first section of this Act such provisions as may be necessary to insure that such buildings are hereafter located only in areas appropriately zoned for such purposes."

H.R. 9000: Extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress and the National Defense Education Act of 1958

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the membership of this House has been subjected to make a decision on a measure that was put together during the waning days of this session of the 87th Congress—a time when expediency takes precedence over genuine principle. I refer to H.R. 9000, a bill to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, which provide Federal funds for the construction of minimum school facilities in impacted areas and authorizing cost of maintenance and operation, including teachers' salaries; and extends the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for 2 years.

The haste in bringing these measures to the floor of the House as one package under suspension has resulted, I believe, in poor legislation with no opportunity for improvement at this time.

The two programs condensed in this bill are vastly different, and yet, we are asked to submit to acceptance of the impacted area program if we favor the National Defense Education Act, for there is no choice under the rules of suspension. Proponents of the sport of boxing would agree this to be the best one-two punch ever delivered because the defense of extended debate and amendments are overruled.

The New York Times eloquently revealed the true nature of this proposal

when they titled it "Hypocrisy." For, in analyzing the course of events regarding Federal aid to education in this Congress, how else can we describe what has happened in this Chamber? If there is such overwhelming support to assist impacted areas, then this same support should be given to nationally distributed Federal aid to schools, for there are many nonimpacted areas whose schools are in far greater need of help.

I have publicly announced my support for a general aid to education program and I strongly favor it. There is a great need for advancing our educational programs at all levels, which has been revealed by many surveys that have been taken.

But I object to H.R. 9000, for we sacrifice those amenities which spell civilized living for local vote-getting interests. The defeat of this bill would not impair the National Defense Education Act, which I fully support, since it does not expire until 1962. The impacted area provision of H.R. 9000 turned me against the bill. Federal aid to education is needed nationally, not only in impacted areas. Refusing to support those select areas may result in the needed support of a national program. Expediency can work both ways.

Saluting "Uncle Sam" Wilson of Troy, N.Y.

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill before us saluting "Uncle Sam" Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of Amercia's national symbol of "Uncle Sam," I think the Members of the House will be interested in a broadcast which I wish to insert at this point. This broadcast was made by Al Quinn, veteran Maryland broadcaster over WBAL in Baltimore, in his nightly program Maryland Report, on the subject of "Uncle Sam":

MARYLAND REPORT

Good evening, this is Al Quinn with Maryland Report: So now they're trying to locate the grave where Uncle Sam is buried.

And shucks. I didn't even know he was dead.

And a lot of us who remember the grand old man with the whiskers and the stovepipe hat and red, white, and blue pants, in the Fourth of July parades of our youth just aren't going to believe he passed away. We know he's still alive and always will be as long as the United States of America exists.

And who's trying to declare Uncle Sam interred in the cold earth? The Communists? The Fascists? or some other gang of crackpots?

No, sir. It's certain Members of the U.S. Congress.

The Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate already has placed the grave of Uncle Sam in Troy, N.Y. They did that by approving a resolution presented by Senator KEATING of New York, declaring that the original Uncle Sam was a fellow named Samuel Wilson, who lived in Troy back around the Revolutionary time, and had something to do with supplying the Revolutionary troops.

Now Indiana is rarin' up on its hind legs, and claimin' through the voice of Representative ADAIR of that State that the real original Uncle Sam was a Hossier whose final resting place can be found somewhere out there among the corn and soybeans.

And in New York City, there's a fellow named E. D. McMullen who has been communicating with Representative ADAIR and claiming that the real, true Uncle Sam lived and died, not in Troy, N.Y., or out on the banks of the Wabash, but in New York City itself—an old bewhiskered codger of Revolutionary days named Samuel Huntington.

There are rumors that Texas also is getting ready to present a claim of possessing somewhere in its 267,339 square miles the remains of the tall fellow whose initials are the same as those of the United States.

And you can be sure there will be others. Why shouldn't Massachusetts enter the game with the contention that old Samuel Adams was the original Uncle Sam—or the inspiration for the coining of the name. Surely, Sam Adams had a bigger part in the maturing of the Colonies and the birth of the Nation than did those other characters whose names are being bandied about.

And there were Samuels of some prominence all over Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and in all of the other Thirteen Colonies, including Maryland. Like Maryland's Samuel Chase, signer of the Declaration of Independence, Member of the Continental Congress and an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court in the early days of the Republic.

Yes, there were Samuels of note all over the place—and many of them sporting chin whiskers.

But none of these was Uncle Sam. And none of their graves is the grave of Uncle Sam. Because Uncle Sam isn't there. He is here. He isn't dead. He lives.

He was with Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses when Patrick defied the British sovereign. He was at the tea party in Boston, and he fanned the blaze that burned the tea ship, Peggy Stewart, in the harbor at Annapolis. He was in Frederick for the repudiation of the British Stamp Act.

Yes Uncle Sam is a spirit who lives where the true spirit of America manifests itself. He was with Washington and his barefoot troops at Valley Forge. And he was at Trenton and Long Island and especially at Yorktown, and he was with the American forces at Fort McHenry and in all the other battles of the War of 1812, and maybe he whispered to Francis Scott Key some of the words of the Star Spangled Banner.

He was with the Yankee troops at Chateau Thiery. And at Belleau Wood. And at the Bulge and all the other great battles of the Second World War.

He stood on the frozen hills of Korea when Americans fought there for the sake of freedom.

And he must have been at the elbow of President Kennedy a few nights ago when the President laid out the true American position in regard to the threats and challenges of Soviet Russia, and he has been at the recruiting offices of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in all the subsequent days as young Americans have signed up to defend the American way of life and the freedom of humanity.

Yes, Uncle Sam is very much alive today from the rockbound coast of Maine, as they say, to the sunny shores of California, and from the Canadian border to the Mexican. And in all the farflung outposts of the American fighting men who are defending his cause, the cause of human liberty.

He isn't buried in Troy, N.Y., or Manhattan, or Muncie, Ind., or Houston, or Richmond, or Baltimore because he isn't buried at all. He isn't dead.

And it's high time those fellows in the Congress of the United States got wise to themselves and to the facts of the American story. And if they want to go grave hunting, let them find the graves of all the mere mortals who lived and died in the American cause. Let them even place a stone over a rise in the ground and say "Here lies Johnny Appleseed," or "Here are the remains of Paul Bunyan," or even of Paul's great blue or by the name of "Babe."

Let them claim for their localities of their States the dusty bones of Tom Swift and Ragged Dick, and the James brothers and the Merriwell brothers and all the other heroes of fact and fiction—of truth, exaggeration, and simple myth. Maybe there are enough of them to distribute throughout the 50 States and satisfy the ghoulery of all the tombstone huntin' patriots in the Congress.

But not Uncle Sam.

All the resolutions or bills that Congress can adopt or pass will not kill Uncle Sam or place his grave in anybody's buryin' ground.

And it's time for some Congressman with more sense than the average, say some Maryland Congressman, to get up a resolution declarin' that Uncle Sam, the livin' and ever-livin' Uncle Sam, belongs to no particular town or State, but rather to the whole United States. And that the argument over his place of burial is absurd, silly, stupid, and rash, because there is no such place, and, as long as there is a United States, never can be such a place.

Because Uncle Sam has never died.

And thank you for listening; this has been Al Quinn with Maryland Report.

Berlin Is Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Manchester Free Press, Manchester, N.H., of August 24, 1961, entitled "Berlin Is Forever":

BERLIN IS FOREVER

In our opinion one crucial point has been left out of all the talk about nuclear bombs and the American people.

It is we, and not the Russians, who need and depend on atomic bombs.

If it were not for the threat of our nuclear arsenal the Communists could spread across Europe and Asia like a flood. If we were to tackle the Chinese and Russian armies in a conventional land war we would be overwhelmed by numbers alone.

One weapon holds the Communists at bay—the nuclear bombs. Therefore, those who denounce the horror of hydrogen bombs, per se, neglect that these hideous weapons are our only real defense. The bomb is our backbone—the only real deterrent to attack and world domination by the Communists.

Since we depend on these bombs we must admit that one day we may be committed to use them. If we use them, the enemy will certainly retaliate. If we accept nuclear weapons as our last ditch defense, we must

complete the strategy and build shelters to protect ourselves.

Nations who manufacture poison gas never neglect to provide gas masks. Likewise nations who aim atomic bombs should not overlook the building of adequate defenses.

We have listened to many people who sincerely believe the building of shelters against hydrogen bombs is futile—like ants crawling under a bottle cap to escape an avalanche as one person put it. They consider an adequate defense impossible.

Others look to an atomic war as a thing too hideous to contemplate. Even if the initial attacks could be weathered they believe it would leave the country a charred wasteland alive with deadly radiation. The United States as we know it would be gone and life would no longer be worth living.

These people fail to take seriously the information published by the Government which says that complete destruction is not inevitable and there is a way to save millions of lives in the event of an attack.

As long as our enemies see that we have no protection against atomic attack they can be relatively sure we will never use the weapons. This, plus the above mentioned defeatist attitudes, place us in a very weak position—a posture that will tempt our enemies to try us in one crisis after another.

Still others say this Government plea for home shelters is just a psychological offshoot of the Berlin crisis. They say this will pass and shelters will be forgotten. We say this Berlin-type test of our convictions will come again and again. The time has come when people must face up to the staggering fact that there probably will be a nuclear war.

Perhaps the Berlin tension will simply come to a boil, then simmer down at a summit meeting, and pass. But assuming the German hot spot cools off, we must be ready for others.

How can our security in these times actually be assured? Can we be sure it will be a bluff when China—not to mention Cuba—has the bomb. We are going to face the atomic threat time and again during the next decade. If we fail to build shelters we are indirectly stripping our country of its greatest defense.

We must prepare for the day when the red telephone on the President's desk rings. The cold war tension of Berlin will not pass. Berlin is forever. We are no longer on the threshold of the atomic age. We are in the midst of it. We must adjust to its brutal way of thinking, stand up to its threats, and dig in to survive and prevail.

What if the Critics Are Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the television industry, as we all know, has been subjected to voluminous criticism of late, from a variety of quarters. It is, indeed, a great concern to all of us that this medium, so full of potential as a conveyor of culture to men and women in all walks of life, should be accused of mediocrity.

In a recent speech, Mr. Henry Schachte, executive vice president of the Lever Brothers Co., delivered before the Broadcasting Executives Club of Boston, clearly recognizes this danger. Mr. Schachte, more than merely criticizing, presents a process by which the quality of television entertainment can be improved—by assumption of initiative and responsibility by broadcasters. As Mr. Schachte points out, increased quality of televised programs is an end shared by all parties: the viewing public clamors for it, sponsors are eager to meet the public demand, and broadcasters, quite obviously, follow suit.

The full text of Mr. Schachte's remarks follow:

WHAT IF THE CRITICS ARE RIGHT?

(By Henry Schachte, executive vice president, Lever Bros. Co., before the Broadcasting Executives Club, Boston, Mass., May 25, 1961)

It would seem rather elementary that my assignment today, in view of the specific interests of this audience, is to discuss some aspect of broadcasting.

This is difficult. I have reviewed what has been said about broadcasting in the last few weeks, and have come to a sorrowful conclusion. There's almost nothing left to say.

Somehow I've recently gotten the impression that a man named Newton Minow has become both interested and disappointed in what you are doing. Perhaps it has seemed that way to you, too.

I get a similar feeling from reading the words of another newcomer to broadcasting—a man named LeRoy Collins. I think you will agree that he does seem critical.

In addition, some educators don't like you. Likewise some politicians and some self-appointed defenders of public morality and taste. Ditto some advertisers, including me, from time to time.

Nobody loves you broadcasters, except the people who live in 50 million American homes.

If this is trouble, I know a few soap products that would be delighted to have it.

I don't claim that the viewer and the broadcaster live today in a constant state of bliss and ecstasy, but even Romeo and Juliet occasionally disagreed.

However, before you take too much comfort from the tremendous size of your viewing audience, let me remind you that the American Revolution was fought—and won—even though only some 5 percent of the colonists were mad enough to want to fight.

And today, some of television's critics are pretty mad.

Furthermore, all the statistics about audience viewing aren't good. In fact, there is at least one alarming negative trend.

Recently, at the request of our company, the Nielsen people put together a study of evening TV viewing trends over the past 3 years. The findings startled us.

In those 3 years, the time-spent-viewing dropped each year compared with the previous year. The drop was for the season as a whole—for every half-hour period from 7:30 to 11 p.m.—and for every night of the week except Friday.

And Friday represents no victory. Its viewing has traditionally been several points lower than the other nights. It simply stayed at its lower level while the other nights came down to join it.

We sent this report to a number of network executives and asked for comments. We received in response some replies, some silence, some evasions, some sanity, and some accusations.

Some said we used an inflated base for our study, since 1957 was the year of the national flu problem, thus implying that all we needed to restore vigorous viewing is another red-hot epidemic.

I personally reject the notion of germ warfare as an adequate answer to television's problems.

However, not all the answers were in such an unconstructive vein. One network president simply said, "We've got to do better programing." Hooray for him! And while some of the other answers tended to be defensive, I know personally that—in their franker moments—all networks feel the same way—they want to do better programing, and they really are trying.

Isn't everybody saying really the same thing—everybody from the Minows and the Collinses to the Smiths and the Joneses?

And who doesn't want better programing? Certainly the broadcasters, be they network or local, do. I can guarantee that the sponsors do. That just about makes it unanimous, and it pictures the interesting and unusual position of professionals, public, and critics really agreeing.

I am not implying here that you—or I—agree with all the statements of all the critics. I specifically reject the idea that television is downgrading America's culture, and I call on, for evidence, a quote from a recent article in Television Age, by one of my favorite authors, Max Wylie, who says:

"In the 66 years from 1895 to now, the top 15 best sellers included three inspirational books, two cook-books, one book on baby care, and nine novels. The baby book, of course, is the one that you know, Dr. Spock. You're familiar with two of the inspirational books, Dale Carnegie's "How To Win Friends" and Charles Sheldon's "In His Steps." Of the novels "God's Little Acre," by Erskine Caldwell was a dirty book. "Peyton Place" was a dirty book. Those are two of the nine. The remaining seven novels among the best-sellers of the past 66 years were all written by the same man and his name is Mickey Spillane. Television critics hate to have to take this unhappy truth into account."

But you don't get better programs by making speeches which merely deplore and denunciate. There is a reason for the present state of television's programing, and until that is treated, there won't be any real improvement.

Nor will you broadcasters make much progress trying to get guidance from some of the very broad generalities being tossed your way—statements like—"There's too much violence."

Let's talk about violence. Here, again, quoting Max Wylie, is the digest of the plot of a recent TV show, translated into contemporary language:

"Joe's girl, a gun moll, suspects that he's too soft for the killing he's got to undertake. So the next night she pours liquor into the victim's bodyguards and gets them drunk, takes their guns, gives them to Joe and tells him to go in and do the killing; which he does. But the next night there's good reason to kill the gang leader's lieutenant. Joe is so scared that he pays a couple of local boys to do the job with clubs. By this time Joe keeps seeing the lieutenant in a hallucination. His nerves are shot. He decides that if he doesn't kill everybody in his way, they'll kill him. But the mob turns on him, kills him and, just to make sure, cuts off his entire head."

I think I detect some violence in this story line. Yet the show which I've just paraphrased got nothing but rave notices. I never heard a single criticism of it, although it was carried on a network and viewed by millions. In fact, 2 weeks ago, it had its moment of greatest acclaim, when it was honored with five separate Emmy awards, more than any other show this last year.

That show was written by a nonmember of the Writer's Guild, one Will Shakespeare. He titled it "Macbeth."

Some of the same people that scream against television violence read their children to sleep as Jack, of beanstalk fame,

slaughters the giant, or Red Ridinghood's woodsman chops up a wolf.

What people really want is not different subjects. They want the same old ones, including violence. But what they do want—what they are now demanding—is interesting, professional, exciting, talented presentations, done with the skill, the taste, the showmanship, the artistry that comes from talented people who are groomed, tried, and trained in television's very particular arts.

The plain facts are that there just aren't enough of these tried and trained people—writers, directors, technicians, even performers—and at the very time when we absolutely must have them. And the broadcasting industry—with few exceptions, and most of those at the network level—is doing almost nothing to find and develop them.

Practically everyone outside as well as inside the business fails to realize the unbelievable appetite of television for program material, and the tremendous number of trained people needed if that program material is to measure up to our rising standards.

A legitimate theater may present five or six different programs a year.

A motion picture theater may present 100.

But even a small TV station may present 3,000.

This explains, I think, why old movies, like Laurel and Hardy's, don't die. They go on TV.

It explains it—but it doesn't excuse it.

It explains a lot of things—but it doesn't fix any.

Television needs a whole host of talented new program people every year, and it gets a handful.

And as long as it does, there will be no major improvement in programing, for all the pleading and threatening. Good programing doesn't come from speechmakers, nor does it result from speeches. And I don't know any networks that aren't trying—urgently—desperately—to really improve their program output. They want to do better. All this public urging and nagging is like insisting that the jockey whip the horse when he's running as fast as he can.

Unfortunately, the solution isn't that easy—or that quick.

What has caused this paucity of creative talent and what can be done about it?

Today we are trying to build major league television talent without any minor league.

We used to be able to borrow talent from a great variety of sources, most of which are, today, either dried up or reduced to a trickle. There used to be local and traveling stock companies producing trained actors, writers, directors, technicians. There used to be burlesque, producing Red Skeltons and Phil Silvers.

There used to be vaudeville—traveling shows—minstrels. There used to be thousands of grade B performers in Hollywood, trying to graduate to grade A.

There used to be thousands of carefully written, rehearsed, and produced radio shows, network and local—back in the good old days when radio was something more than a word from the sponsor, followed by a word from the deejay, followed by a wail from Paul Anka.

Most of those sources which television, in its formative years, drew on so heavily, are gone, and nothing is replacing them. Nothing but old films.

Today, television must build its own talent, if it is ever to rise above the three R's—repeats, reruns, and residuals—that are producing more money for a few people and more boredom for millions than any other scheme ever perpetrated on America.

And if television is ever to start building this great pool of talented, trained people for every phase of programing, it can't ever be done just by the networks. The costs are too high, the audiences are too large whenever the network throws the program switch, to risk them on unproven talents. Performers in the network league must have seasoning in the minors. But how can they get it, when the minor leagues have never been organized?

Most of the program—and people—development can and must be done by local stations.

In my opinion—which will not be a popular one here today—the major failing in program improvement—and hence the major blame for its lack—rests squarely on the shoulders of local station management.

With a few notable exceptions, locally originated programing in too many markets consists almost entirely of two staples—local news and weather—one man, or one woman—in front of one camera.

This is hardly the kind of daring, hardly the kind of challenge or opportunity that will allow local stations to make much contribution to the advancement of television programing.

How, then, can it be done? Am I proposing that local stations now break out in a rash of local shows? Certainly not. There's not even enough trained talent for that.

If they did, where would the money come from? Specifically, you might ask, would Lever Bros. sponsor in a local market a weekly sing-along with the West Overshoe Junior High School Glee Club?

No—not likely—especially since I no longer have children in a junior high school.

What I'm proposing does not have to result in on-the-air shows at all—in fact, it may not ever happen on the air—certainly not at first. What is needed, first, before any specific action is taken, is a real sense of mission on the part of television people in every station in creating long-range opportunities—and thousands of them—for minor league talents to practice.

If local station managements really set their minds to it, there are many ways they could help. As examples, certainly not to be taken literally, maybe you do no more than offer a closed-circuit opportunity to high school or college dramatic clubs to try their hands at TV drama. Perhaps, after a competition, you might find one show worthy of broadcasting. And perhaps this simple thing might spark the flame that ignites the next Fred Coe, or Paddy Chayefsky.

Maybe it's a $100 prize for a script, even one that's never used—or $1,000 scholarship to a school that trains TV performers or writers or technicians. Maybe it's a contribution of equipment or money to a college that offers broadcast courses. Or maybe it's the guarantee of a job to at least one graduate every year—or a summer fill-in assignment.

Or a hundred other ideas, perhaps seemingly remote from the solution to a complex national problem that we face with some urgency today.

Whatever it is, if some kind of specific activity to help train TV talent were happening modestly—today—every day—in some 500 local stations, if local managements felt some obligation, some dedication to help in the long-range task of swelling the roster of rookies, in a few years the world series would indeed be something to behold.

Until there is undertaken some such broad attack on the development of television program skills, it is fatuous to believe that television programing will be tremendously improved.

Some changes will take place—some, because of mounting pressures, which may please critics more than the public.

Television ultimately must rest on its programs. That is its product.

Until now, its history has been a little like the early years of another relatively new product—instant coffee. It's been so convenient—just the flip of a switch, and presto, entertainment.

But now people are beginning to savor the flavor.

And while they're still tuning us in, even though perhaps not as much, they're also importuning us. They'd like television to be better—and we'd better respond.

Like almost any task we face, if we get enough of the right people to do the program job right, and train them right—right where we are—we can realize fully the tremendous promise of what is still a very exciting industry.

The alternative is a lot more speeches like this one today on how television ought to be improved.

And I'm sure you don't want that.

A Foreign Aid Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., of September 3, 1961:

A FOREIGN AID WEAKNESS

Representative GEORGE MEADER of the Second Congressional District (which includes Jackson County) voted against the foreign aid bill because the Senate-House conference committee which put the measure in its final form struck out an antisecrecy provision.

The bill as passed, represents a sharp defeat for the administration in that it provides for long-range aid programs, but with congressional approval over year-to-year appropriations. The administration suffered another setback when the House Appropriations Committee reduced the request for an appropriation for this year.

Now all these things are related. Congressman MEADER very well may have put his finger on one of the principal reasons why a Congress controlled by the President's own party is refusing to give him everything he asks for.

The item to which Mr. MEADER objects gives administrators of foreign aid the right to deny information to congressional committees if the President backs them up.

Investigations in the past have shown a great deal of waste and mismanagement in foreign aid programs. While spending abroad has done much good, a need for constant policing by the legislative branch of Government certainly has been demonstrated.

The power to suppress information is an invitation to cover up mistakes when there is no element of national security involved. Congress has learned that through experience. It has had trouble, in the past, in digging out facts on foreign aid and have found them sad when they finally are brought to light.

Congress is proving itself skeptical on this subject. The Kennedy administration has much to do to win the full confidence of the legislative branch of Government. By overreaching itself on foreign aid and insisting on the secrecy provision the administration is making trouble for itself in requests for future programs.

Miss Alice Nelson, Rural Teacher of the Year in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the improvement and expansion of our educational system is one of the major challenges confronting our country.

We recognize, of course, that with a fast-growing school enrollment—estimated to hit an all-time high of 49,300,000 this year—we need to further expand classrooms and facilities to provide ample opportunity for our youth to get a good education.

By experience we have learned that the motivating spirit of education centers on the teacher—capable not only of instructing and informing, but also inspiring students.

Recently, an outstanding voice of agriculture, the Wisconsin Agriculturist—in cooperation with the National Education Association—presented its rural teacher of the year awards to Miss Alice Nelson of Douglas County, Wis., and Mrs. Ida Fitzpatrick of Baraga County, Mich.

Reflecting upon their accomplishments, as well as outstanding contributions to education, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR RURAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR
FROM WISCONSIN

In recognition of their dedication to rural youth, their loyalty to the teaching profession and their great service to the communities in which they live, the Wisconsin Agriculturist—in cooperation with the National Educaton Association—is honored to present its 1961 Rural Teacher of the Year Awards to Alice Nelson of Wisconsin, and Ida Fitzpatrick of Michigan.

The award winners were selected from those rural teachers whose names were submitted for nomination by local organizations in their own home communities.

Alice Nelson wanted to be a rural teacher as far back as she can remember—even when she was a small girl growing up on a dairy farm in Douglas County. By the time she was in the seventh grade she had already mapped out her plans.

"My teacher that year was one of those dedicated individuals who inspired their pupils," says Miss Nelson. "I made up my mind that I would not only be a rural teacher, but I would be like her."

Just out of teacher's college—still in her teens—Alice Nelson began her first teaching job. It was a one-room school with eight grades. "I often walked to school along an old logging trail that wound 2 miles through the woods," says Miss Nelson. "In the winter the snow was often deep and the roads weren't always kept as clear as they are now."

That was 32 years ago. Altogether Miss Nelson has taught in five rural schools—all in her native Douglas County. For the past 10½ years she has taught second grade in the Nemadji school.

Several years ago, she stopped teaching school for a few years to make a home for two of her nieces after the death of their mother.

Anxious to improve her ability as a teacher, Miss Nelson took extension courses and attended teacher's college during summers. In 1960 she received her bachelor of science degree with honors at the Wisconsin State College in Superior.

Active in community affairs, Miss Nelson has helped organize a 4–H Club, teaches Sunday school and summer Bible school. She has served as secretary-treasurer of the Douglas County Teachers Association and has taken an important part in PTA, church affairs, and the local home and school club.

But Alice Nelson's greatest interest in life is the pupils in her classes. "Miss Nelson has dedicated her life to the children of the community," says one grateful mother. "She knows how to bring out the best in every child."

"In all my experiences, I've never witnessed such outstanding work," says one of her supervisors.

"Over the years our four schoolchildren have had a great variety of teachers, but one name always comes up as an alltime favorite of all. Alice Nelson has won the affection of every child she ever taught. And her interest in young people extends through the years," says another family.

But perhaps the greatest tribute of all is a letter a fourth grader sent to the judges. "I was a second grade pupil of Miss Nelson. I was not an A–1 student, but she was an A–1 teacher. One of the best in the world."

FROM UPPER MICHIGAN

Pelkie is a farming community in Baraga County, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. A closely knit community, the local grade school has always been a community center.

Ida Fitzpatrick has taught at Pelkie school for 35 of her 38 years of teaching. Throughout the years, Mrs. Fitzpatrick has become a symbol of the school and a leader in many community activities. At present she is principal, but she continues to teach grades four through six.

"She was my teacher in a country school in Houghton County in about 1921 when I was in the fourth or fifth grade," says the principal of the nearby Baraga High School. "In 1941 I accepted a teaching position in the Pelkie School in which Mrs. Fitzpatrick was teaching.

"Through all these years she has done an outstanding job of teaching the boys and girls that have come her way. Not only has she done this during the regular scheduled school hours, but her door has always been open to those who have needed extra help to get them over the rough spots.

"She has maintained a continuing interest in professional growth by taking in-service training courses and attending educational conferences," says the superintendent of the township schools.

Mrs. Fitzpatrick has a bachelor of science degree in elementary education and a life certificate.

"The people of Pelkie have been very fortunate in having a teacher who has taken an active part in all community activities," says the county chairman of the American Cancer Society. Mrs. Fitzpatrick has been active in the cancer crusade, fundraising chairman for the polio drive and the Salk vaccine immunization campaign, a charter member of the hospital auxiliary, a leader in the extension club program and PTA, and active in church affairs.

"She has given her time, guidance, and outstanding effort for the 4–H program of our community for the last 34 years," says the leader of the local Sturgeon Valley 4–H Club.

Mrs. Fitzpatrick served as a 4–H leader for many years. She received the diamond 4–H award for 25 years of leadership.

A neighbor sums up the feeling of the community for Mrs. Fitzpatrick. "Because she is such a gracious, outgoing, selfless, sympathetic, understanding, and encouraging person, for us she has always been the teacher of the year."

George Romney, American Motors President, as Michigan's Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the morning press tells us that General Motors and the UAW workers have agreed on a new contract, designed essentially after the terms of the agreement between American Motors and the union. That agreement, speaking generally, was some kind of a profit-sharing agreement.

It is extremely difficult for the average individual to understand all the implications of these agreements, though one thing the automobile buyer does know is that when the workers get an increase in wages, corporation officials a bonus, and stockholders a dividend, the individual who buys the car pays.

Undoubtedly all these contracts will work out all right as long as would-be buyers have the money or the credit to buy a new car. But it is possible, if not probable, that sometime the workers and the corporation will shove the price so high, or automobiles will become so numerous on the highways, that the number of new cars purchased each year will drop. Then someone other than the automobile owner will be holding the bag, and the life of the average car will be extended a few months, or maybe even years.

Mr. Romney's ambition to become Governor of Michigan is a worthy one, and apparently he can successfully operate a motor company, while pleasing the employees.

That he is also able to take care of Mr. Romney is obvious from a statement of the AP printed under a Detroit dateline of February 16, 1960, and which reads as follows:

ROMNEY SELLS AMC STOCK TO BUY MORE SHARES

DETROIT, February 16.—George Romney, president of American Motors, delved deep into the maze of high finance today as he explained that he sold 10,000 shares of his stock for a $700,000 gross profit last month in order to make enough money to buy more of the same stock.

Despite Romney's explanation, the company's stock plunged 4⅝ during the day on heavy trading to close at $69. "I want to make it absolutely clear," Romney told a hastily called news conference, "that I did not sell because of any lack of confidence in American Motors. On the contrary, the future of the company is brighter today than at

any previous point in its history and I will buy more stock as soon as it is legally possible."

Romney said that since 1954 he has been granted three blocks of stock options by American Motors—one of 35,000 shares at $9.56 per share, one of 21,000 shares at $31.825 per share and one of 21,000 shares at $56.29 per share.

He said he had bought 20,500 of the $9.56 shares, much of it with borrowed money. Additionally he bought some 4,500 shares outside the options.

Last month, with the price of the stock at about $90 a share, Romney sold 10,000 shares for about $900,000, or, according to him, a profit of about $700,000.

He said his capital gains tax amounted to $200,000, his tithe to the Mormon Church on his profit was $70,000, and his personal debt incurred to buy the stock was $200,000.

"This," he said, "leaves me about $430,000. I have options left for 14,500 shares at $9.56, which will cost me $139,000, but because of SEC regulations I can't exercise these until July." He said he has additional options to buy 12,600 shares at higher prices.

As to the immediate future of American Motors, Romney said the company will set a weekly production record of about 11,000 cars this week, that the rate will rise steadily to about 12,500 weekly by June and that dealer orders and projections are running far in excess of production schedules.

During his campaign for Governor and while speaking at other public meetings, it might be helpful if Mr. Romney would explain just how he personally, as an executive of American Motors, will be able to take care of his own interests, those of the company, and the UAW workers, and, incidentally, give a little consideration to the prospective auto purchaser.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my great admiration for the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, who is celebrating his 25th year as one of the most able and outstanding Members of Congress.

I have had the pleasure of serving with GENE KEOGH since 1943. I have come to know his great ability and his many fine attributes. Truly, he is a distinguished statesman who represents the great State of New York with eminence in this body.

In describing GENE KEOGH, the Congressional Directory merely states: "EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, Brooklyn, N.Y.; elected consecutively since 1936." This, indeed, is the kind of humble statement which could be expected from GENE KEOGH. It would take many pages in the Congressional Directory to describe his many accomplishments. In order for me to outline adequately his activities it would take more time than I am allotted. Not only is GENE KEOGH an outstanding and able Congressman but he is a stanch friend and a devoted family man as well as a great humanitarian. For me, it has been a happy privilege to serve with GENE KEOGH, and it is with great pleasure that I extend to him my heartiest congratulations and wish him well on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my colleagues in wishing our able friend from New York many more years of faithful service in the Nation's interest. In the perilous times that lie ahead, we need the talents of GENE KEOGH, and I am sure that his district and his Nation will not find him lacking. To me he is one of our greatest and most distinguished Americans.

Twenty Great Years: The Doherty Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the September issue of Postal Record:

TWENTY GREAT YEARS: THE DOHERTY STORY

For those who sat in the vast Philharmonic Auditorium in Los Angeles on September 6, 1941, it was a tense moment. Few of those present realized how historic that occasion would prove to be.

On the stage a new President of the National Association of Letter Carriers was being sworn in. He was 39-year-old William C. Doherty, of Cincinnati, who had been elevated to the presidency after serving a relatively short time as a member of the National executive board of the association. He was succeeding the grand old warrior of Federal unionism, Edward J. Gainor, who had served as president of the NALC since 1915 but who had not been a candidate to succeed himself. Gainor and the NALC had been practically synonymous for 26 years. It was difficult for many who had lived through those years to visualize the NALC without the eloquent, gray-thatched "Father of the 40-Hour Week" at the helm.

PROBLEMS NUMEROUS

The new president, as he raised his right arm and took the oath of office, faced many problems which would have discouraged a lesser man. Although there were 67,845 dues-paying members of the NALC (making it then, as now, the largest organization of Federal employees in the Nation), the Treasury was depleted. There was not enough money in the till to pay salaries until the 1942 per capita tax payments ($2.80 per year per member) would start rolling in 4 months later.

The insurance programs of the NALC were solvent, but small. The chief collector of the Mutual Benefit Association, L. E. Swartz, reported a membership of 6,715 and a balance of $2,884,651. During the previous 2 years death benefits had totaled $390,662.

More impressive, however, was the report of Reuben B. Kremers, now the secretary-treasurer of the NALC, but at that time the young president of the board of directors of the National Sick Benefit Association. Kremers reported 25,864 members and total assets of $128,025. During the previous 2 years $373,893 had been paid out in benefits to members.

However, there were other problems facing the young president which do not show up in ledgers and financial statements. One was the fact that letter carriers (and other postal employees) were receiving the same salary they had been getting 16 years previously. Letter carriers were being paid $2,100 a year maximum while substitutes were getting the princely sum of 65 cents an hour. It must be remembered that this was just 3 months before Pearl Harbor. The United States was already operating on a wartime economy. Workers in defense plants were earning as much as $150 a week in jobs requiring far less skill and intelligence than the job of a letter carrier. Stenographers were earning at least twice as much as letter carriers. The cost of living was reflecting these high wages and letter carriers were caught in a tight economic squeeze. They were hungry and, naturally, resentful. Never was an organization president under a more insistent mandate to produce, and produce fast.

It may be said, also, that there was a certain degree of skepticism among the older members of the NALC. Earlier in the year a national referendum had been conducted which prohibited any national officer from running for reelection after he had passed his 65th birthday. This had automatically eliminated President Gainor, Secretary Mike T. Finnan, Chief Collector Charles D. Duffy, of the Sick Benefit Association, and L. E. Swartz, chief collector of the MBA from contention. It had also shortened the potential careers of other national officers who were approaching the age limit. It was natural that, among the senior members of the NALC, a "wait and see" attitude should prevail. And prevail it did, until an extensive list of solid achievements by the Doherty administration dispelled the doubts of the most hardened skeptic.

A ROUGH ROAD

The story of what has happened since 1941 has been beautifully told by President Doherty himself in his book, "Mailman, U.S.A."

He arrived in October of 1941 with his friend and secretary John T. Donelon, who had hung up his letter carrier's sack in Cincinnati to accompany him to Washington. (Donelon became the president's administrative assistant and right-hand man. He is now in charge of the health benefits program for retirees as well as several others of the important functions of the NALC.) The board of resident officers included, besides Doherty, William F. McHale, of New York, who had served on the committee on constitution and laws; William J. Gorman, of Brooklyn; Clarence F. Stinson, of Bayonne, N.J.; and Daniel R. Sullivan, of San Francisco.

In "Mailman, U.S.A.," President Doherty tells the story of how the NALC was teetering on the edge of financial insolvency when Mike T. Finnan, who had served as secretary of the NALC for 24 years and had retired at the Los Angeles convention at the age of 75, walked in and offered to lend the association $25,000 to tide it over the rough times ahead. This beautiful gesture will always be remembered in the NALC as a shining example of the kind of generosity and dedication which has inspired its leadership. The debt was paid back in 3 months' time and the NALC has never looked back since those days of financial insecurity.

NEW LOOK APPEARS

The new administration immediately began to give the NALC a new look. One of the most symptomatic changes was the quiet disappearance of "Raffles" from the cover of the Postal Record. "Raffles" was the name given to the figure of a letter carrier which had adorned the cover of each issue of the Record since January 1907. In a spontaneous outburst of experimentation he had been modernized for the issue of August

1938. His mustache had been removed, his wing collar replaced, his pointed patent-leather shoes rounded at the toes, and his ancient woolen tunic brought up to date. Editor (and vice president) William J. Gorman continued to use the washed-out greenish blue cover on the Record, despite the introduction of some variety in the decoration. The first break in this unvarying color scheme came in the May 1943 issue when Postmaster General Frank C. Walker was portrayed in dark purple-blue. The first multicolored cover (the American flag) appeared in the July-August issue of that same year. The first real modernization of the Record began, however, with the October 1946 issue, the first to come off the presses under the regime of the present editor, Vice President Jerome J. Keating. Ever since that time there has been a steady progression to modern type faces, extensive news coverage, reporting in depth of association activities and of legislative proceedings, and so forth.

Since the Postal Record is the public image of the NALC it is a reflection of the improvements and the progress that have been made.

PROGRESS TRACED

Although each forward step during the past 20 years has been fought for every inch of the way, often against the neolithic opposition of stubborn postal administrations, the progress has been steady and impressive.

In the past 18 years there have been nine pay raises. (And, there could be a 10th one coming up. See President Doherty's editorial in this issue of the Postal Record.) The years of the Doherty administration have seen such fringe benefits come into being as national life insurance for Federal employees, national health insurance, the enlargement of health benefits, the liberalization of sick benefits, liberalized annual leave provisions, the $100-a-year uniform allowance, and a great number of other improvements both in working conditions and work procedures within post offices. Bill Doherty, in his role as president of the NALC and as a senior vice president of the AFL–CIO has been in the forefront, leading the fight for every improvement that has been won for postal employees in particular and Federal workers generally.

EDUCATION STRESSED

One of the most significant improvements in the Doherty regime has been the expansion of all the facilities which assist the letter carrier both on and off his job. The unique seminar program, instituted originally by former secretary-treasurer (and now a regional official in the Boston region) Peter J. Cahill has been a tremendous advantage, and it is an advantage which only NALC members, among all postal employees, enjoy. The handling of grievances at a local, regional and national level has been refined to a degree undreamed of before the Doherty administration. And, under the imaginative and aggressive leadership of Assistant Secretary-Treasurer James H. Rademacher, this program is continually improving and expanding. It is fair to say that no postal organization serves its members nearly as well or exerts nearly as much influence on Capitol Hill or in the executive branches of Government as does the NALC.

THE NALC RECORD

The change in the status of the National Association of Letter Carriers as an association has been incredible since the comparatively low ebb of 1941.

Instead of inhabiting cramped and inadequate quarters in the old A.F. of L. Building, the NALC now owns its own $3 million white marble building facing Capitol Hill. (As a sign of further growth the association is currently building an eight-story annex to house its mushrooming health insurance program.)

The membership of the NALC is now nearly 150,000, roughly 2¼ times its 1941 level. Although the per capita tax is now $10 instead of $2.80, the salaries of regular carriers are 2¾ times what they were in 1941 and the salaries of substitutes are 3⅓ times what they were.

Instead of being the forgotten men of the Federal service, the letter carriers today are the best known and most effective of all Government employee groups. Because of the courage and integrity of Doherty and of Vice President Jerome J. Keating, who heads up all legislative activity, the NALC is the acknowledged leader in every progressive movement in the Federal service requiring legislation. The relationship between the Congress and the NALC is unique and healthy, based on mutual respect and mutual affection. This relationship is a development of the past 20 years.

The insurance programs of the NALC have grown and prospered to a formidable degree.

George A. Bang, director of the NALC life insurance program reports a membership of 14,910, almost 2¼ times the 1941 figure. Benefits paid during 1960 totaled $395,293, of which $220,408 was in death benefits. More significantly, the NALC life insurance program now has $21,486,657 worth of insurance in force; its assets amount to $7,727,684 and it is actuarily 122 percent solvent. All investments must be unanimously approved by the NALC investment committee and all funds are invested in Government bonds or securities of equal dependability.

Naturally, the health insurance program, which is managed by Director James P. Deely and Assistant Director J. Stanly Lewis, shows the most fantastic evidence of growth, since it has expanded to many times its former size during the past year (or since the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act went into effect on July 1, 1960). The program now has 111,000 members. In June 1961 it paid 12,579 claims for a total expenditure in benefits of $1,455,441. With a new enrollment period coming up, October 1 to 16, the health benefits program is scheduled for still another season of sudden growth.

NALCREST

One of the most typical developments of the Doherty regime has been the fruition of Nalcrest, the proposed $4½-million retirement paradise which the NALC is planning to build on the shores of central Florida's Lake We-Oh-Ya-Kapka (Walk-in-the-Water). This project, which was first suggested by similar labor union programs in Europe and in our own country was first communicated to the membership at the 40th annual convention in Minneapolis in 1956 and received enthusiastic support. Successive conventions have endorsed and encouraged the project, and it is now planned to open the doors of Nalcrest in late 1962 or early 1963.

Nalcrest will provide gracious, inexpensive retirement living for NALC members when they finally hang up the bag. It has long been a Doherty dream and now, because of the tenacity and the foresight of a great leader, it is coming true.

When President Bill Doherty finally does retire as president of the NALC he will leave behind him innumerable monuments. He will know that he has made the burden lighter not only for the members of the National Association of Letter Carriers and their families but for all the postal and Federal employees in the country. He will know that he has made for each and every one of them the opportunity to live a richer, fuller life.

But, it may well be that in the world of tomorrow the Nalcrest idea will be the most permanent of them all.

In the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, amidst all the ornate tombs and memorials of lesser men, is the simple plaque above the grave of the architect who built the church, Sir Christopher Wren. On that plaque is this simple inscription: "Si monumentum requiris, circumspice." (If you seek his monument, look about you.) In reflecting on the first 20 years of the administration of William C. Doherty as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, each member can say the same thing: "If you seek his monument, look about you." He has been the architect of a better way of life, a new and greater type of association, a new concept of trade unionism in Government. The past 20 years have seen more improvements in the welfare and treatment of postal and Federal employees than any other comparable period in history. And, typical, Bill Doherty is not resting on his oars, reflecting on the glories of the past. His days are spent planning for the future, drawing plans for a greater tomorrow for everyone who looks to him for leadership.

TWENTY YEARS WITH BILL DOHERTY

(By Jerome J. Keating)

Twenty years ago a young Cincinnati letter carrier came to Washington. He had been selected by his fellow letter carriers to serve as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. Organized in 1889, the NALC has always been an effective organization. The only organization to represent letter carriers, it has always been able to boast of a 100-percent organization. During its first 52 years it had many capable leaders and could recite a record of numerous achievements, but no prior 20-year period can compare with the 20 years that letter carriers have had under President Bill Doherty.

In the past 20 years, life has become more complex, and legislative problems more difficult. Isolationism has all but disappeared and the Congress today devotes a major part of its attention to international affairs. Domestically we have become an urban nation, great corporations dominate all forms of our Nation's business. New techniques and new procedures have been required to produce success.

Under the capable leadership of President Doherty, the challenges have been met and the letters carriers of the Nation have moved forward on many fronts. President Doherty's leadership has been productive, courageous, and imaginative. His leadership has increased the prestige and the influence of the NALC, not only in the United States but throughout the world.

During the Doherty regime, letter carriers have had nine pay increases—these in the face of and in spite of four presidential pay vetoes.

The Civil Service retirement program has been much improved by the establishment of new formulas producing larger annuities, by the introduction of survivorship benefits for widows and children, minimum annuities for survivors and those retired on disability. Retirees have received several increases. There have been many improvements in the compensation for injury law. That law today is perhaps the most liberal one in the world. The amount of annual leave has been increased. Letter carriers now receive an annual allowance for uniforms. Government employees now receive life insurance partially paid by the Government. Health benefits partially financed by the Government have been secured for active and retired employees. These are the major legislative improvements, but there have been many others. Labor-management procedures have been improved and we are now on the threshold of a major breakthrough in this field.

President Bill Doherty has furnished courageous leadership to meet high legislative hurdles. This was clearly exemplified in the pay fight of 1960. In the face of much opposition a reluctant committee chairman was forced to hold limited hearings (limited in time, not in completeness of testimony), a previously unheard-of 2-day discharge petition got the bill past the Rules Committee chairman, the bill passed the Senate twice and the House once, a veto by President Eisenhower and then a quick override by both Houses of the Presidential veto—only the second time in 8 years that President Eisenhower had a veto overridden.

During the past 20 years the Nation has gone through two wars, World War II and the Korean war, and the Nation has been in constant turmoil because of world unrest. New legislative techniques were necessary to secure action on the vital problems of the letter carriers. To meet the many objectives of the past 20 years, six discharge petitions were resorted to. Discharge petitions are seldom successful. The Congressional Quarterly characterized the discharge petition as a "seldom used device," indeed they have been; only 33 have been successful in 51 years. Six of these have been NALC petitions. It took a great deal of courage and daring on the part of President Doherty to move in that direction. Every discharge petition attempted has been successful. President Doherty inaugurated legislative conferences. From these have stemmed Washington congressional breakfasts and salary rallies. Realizing the need of greater cooperation among Government organizations Bill Doherty took the lead in organizing the Government Employees' Council. Further experience has demonstrated the need of one big union and President Doherty's voice has been the one strong voice caling for such an organization.

Bill has demonstrated great powers of imagination. In 1943, shortly after taking office, he called on the NALC to build its own headquarters in Washington near the Nation's Capitol. We have had it since 1953, it is practically paid for, and a new addition is now underway. In 1950, the NALC hospitalization was organized. This lusty youthful organization now pays hospital, doctor, and medical bills for NALC members amounting to as much as $1½ million per month. Nalcrest, the latest dream child, is on the way and should be ready by 1963. When the Post Office Department scattered its operations among 15 regional offices, the NALC was first in the field establishing full-time officers to serve all regions—a step that has paid substantial dividends—a step that other organizations have yet to take.

In prestige and influence the NALC has gained much during the Doherty years. Bill has been an outstanding labor leader during all these years; he has served as a vice president of the AFL, and then the AFL–CIO since 1941. He was one of the leaders, along with President Meany, in organizing the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions that stopped the Communist infiltration of trade unions in Western Europe. He has represented the labor movement in many international meetings. He is an executive member and one of the real leaders of the Postal Telegraph and Telephone International. He has been selected by two Presidents of the United States—President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy—to represent the National Government in important international conferences.

The feature of the September Postal Record is the Doherty years. I can't think of a better way to commemorate Labor Day than by recalling these years. A great chapter in labor's history.

The Week That Shook the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 9, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Columbia Broadcasting System, in its excellent Sunday afternoon telecast, "Twentieth Century," presented the America people a dramatic opportunity to view in detail the tragic events that preceded the beginning of World War II on September 1, 1939. This particular chapter of the "Twentieth Century," narrated in a most skillful manner by Mr. Walter Cronkite, was appropriately titled "The Week That Shook the World."

Here was television at its very best. The Columbia Broadcasting System deserves the highest commendation for bringing to the American people this graphic description of the various conferences, negotiations, and meetings between world leaders in an effort to dissuade Hitler from launching the barbaric attack on Poland in 1939.

The producers of this particular program, through the use of film clips of that tragic week in 1939 preceding the invasion of Poland by the Nazi Wehrmach, gave millions of Americans an opportunity to understand fully the tragedy of appeasement. It was fitting that the Columbia Broadcasting System should have produced this particular program at this time when our own President and the entire free world is trying so desperately to chart a course which will preserve peace and retain the dignity of free men.

The Columbia Broadcasting System has demonstrated what a tremendous contribution television can make toward helping Americans understand the complex nature of the present world situation by providing this sobering reminder that the appeasement used by world leaders in 1939 only garnished the insatiable lust for conquest of power-crazed dictators of that era.

If the American people today are standing firmly behind President Kennedy in his determination to deal forcefully with Khrushchev, I am confident that this type of unity among our people has been greatly enhanced by realistic programs such as the one that the Columbia Broadcasting System produced.

We are living in an era that tries the strength and courage of men. If our Nation had been as thoroughly alerted to the dangers of appeasement in 1939 as our people are today—thanks to the contributions of information media as demonstrated by CBS—World War II might well have been avoided and the millions of people who died in that struggle might still be alive today.

This particular program, "The Week That Shook the World," so dramatically showed how the American people—the man in the street—were completely oblivious to what was going on in Europe and how Hitler's brutal destruction of nation after nation was laying the seeds for World War II.

I particularly congratulate the producers of this CBS telecast for using the film clips of average Americans who, with monotonous repetition, insisted that what was happening in Europe was of no concern to the United States and that America should stay aloof to foreign entanglements.

The Columbia Broadcasting System has helped us turn back the clock and today, in retrospect, realize why barbaric dictators like Hitler could sow their seeds of mass destruction while the free world slept in the security of its own local communities.

Watching this particular program in retrospect, we could at once understand why President Roosevelt's gallant plea for permission to stop the dictators of Europe before they started their harvest of death fell on deaf ears in this country. Here in this half-hour presentation, so excellently compiled by Columbia Broadcasting System, millions of Americans could at once understand how and why World War II occurred. But more important, Mr. Speaker, in this half-hour presentation, CBS helped weld this Nation together into a resolute determination that never again can we engage in blind appeasement.

If America stands ready to meet the great challenge of international communism, it is only because networks like the Columbia Broadcasting System have done such an excellent job in alerting our people to the mistakes of the past.

Here in Washington, D.C., within the shadow of this Capitol on Pennsylvania Avenue, stand two monuments in front of the National Archives Building. On one are inscribed the words: "What is past is prologue"; and on the other: "Study the past." By reaching into the past and presenting it in such dramatic manner to millions of Americans, the Columbia Broadcasting System, through its project, "Twentieth Century," is helping all of us Americans understand the genesis of war and the anatomy of destruction.

I am indeed proud that the Chicago affiliate of the Columbia Broadcasting System, television station WBBM, carried this and other programs of the "Twentieth Century" series. Here is television at its finest, and I hope that those who would be so quick to criticize and denounce American television would ponder the effect and results of efforts such as we see manifested in this particular CBS project.

I believe the Prudential Insurance Co., which sponsors this particular series, should be commended for playing such an important role in helping Americans better understand the complex world in which we now find ourselves. Here is a shining example of private enterprise in America playing its role toward a better understanding among Americans of the

responsibilities that they must bear as free people, and through the medium of television reminding them that freedom is everybody's business.

Great civilizations have collapsed in the past, and freedom has been turned into slavery only because the people failed to contribute their own individual effort toward preserving their liberties by failing to understand the responsibilities of freedom.

I am confident that so long as we have media such as the Columbia Broadcasting System and sponsors who are willing to underwrite programs such as "Twentieth Century," our people will be kept fully aware that they can enjoy freedom only so long as they are willing to defend it.

Since Vienna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the critical situation in the world today, and especially in Berlin, it is important that every viewpoint be given deep consideration. Accordingly, I am inserting in the RECORD Walter Lippmann's column, "Today and Tomorrow: Since Vienna," published today. It is a penetrating and stimulating analysis:

SINCE VIENNA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last June at the meeting in Vienna the President realized how seriously Mr. Khrushchev means business about Berlin. A Western policy had to be formed at once, and measures had to be taken before the end of the year. However, it is apparent now that while the Vienna conversations alerted and aroused the President, they did not provide him with the practical working basis of a policy. In order to have a policy he needed to know not only that Mr. Khrushchev would move on Berlin, but how he intended to go about it.

Not knowing this, the President and his advisers supposed that Khrushchev in 1961 would repeat what Stalin had done in 1948, that he would try to conquer West Berlin by blockading it. Thus far, the assumption has proved to be wrong. As a result, the Western allies were caught unprepared to deal with the actual, as distinguished from the supposed, Soviet strategy, which is revealed by the action of August 13. For instead of blockading West Berlin, Khrushchev sealed off East Berlin.

The administration had failed to take into account the fact that Khrushchev could act powerfully, but with measures short of war, to reduce the Western position in West Berlin. It has long been known that an embargo was a possibility. But the preoccupation of the President's advisers with the memory of Stalin's blockade in 1948 prevented them from preparing adequately for the formidable measures short of war which were available to Khrushchev.

The effect of the miscalculation has been far-reaching. It led the administration to concentrate its energy on convincing Khrushchev that the West would fight if he interfered with physical access to West Berlin. This is true. It will fight if he interferes with Western access to West Berlin. It was a prudent precaution to make this plain to Khrushchev. But it should not have been sold to the American people and to the world as a policy. The exclusive and excessive preoccupation with proving our will to fight a blockade left us unprepared to deal with the actual embargo. On August 13 we had no policy, and there is reason to ask whether we are on the way to having one now.

By concentrating so exclusively on deterring another blockade, the President found himself accepting the advice which came to him from Paris and from Bonn and in Washington from the veterans of Stalin's blockade. He was told that if he stood firm, he could stand pat. Khrushchev was bluffing and if the President did not flinch first, Khrushchev would flinch first, and would once more retreat, as he did in 1958, leaving everything as it is. Until it was swept away by events, this pipedream clouded the vision and narcotized the will to face the realities of the German situation.

On August 13 Khrushchev went into action. He used a very different strategy than the one which this country had been told to prepare for, and so the test of wills turned out to be not a wrestling match but ju-jitsu. By the embargo, which was illegal and cruel but was a measure well short of war, Khrushchev struck a deep and damaging blow at the Western position in West Berlin and West Germany.

His highly sophisticated action could not, I think, have been improvised in the few weeks after the President had called for a degree of mobilization. The sealing off of half a city is a highly technical operation. The action had all the marks of long deliberation on how to strike most surely and most accurately, without the risk of war, at the Achilles' heel of the Western position. Moreover, only if we assume that the plan has long been in Khrushchev's mind can we explain why he has been swearing that he would get the Berlin bone out of his throat this year and at the same time that he would do it without a blockade and a war.

The Achilles' heel of the Western position is that the morale of the West Berliners, their will to stay in the city and to resist pressure and blandishment, depends on their faith in the Atlantic alliance. They have to believe that they will live to see the alliance bring about the unification of the two Germanys and the restoration of their own city as the German capital. This belief is what Khrushchev struck at on August 13. Without attacking West Berlin, he raised a wall which was designed not only to stop the refugees but also to prove to the Germans that the Western Allies were unable to reunify Germany. The Germans understood this at once. But so unprepared was Washington for the reality of the German question that days passed before it realized how momentous a change had been brought about. Washington had no policy to deal with what actually happened—unless sending the Vice President and General Clay to West Berlin can be called a policy.

For a true measure of what has happened, we may take an official statement, made in 1959, by Dr. Grewe, who is Dr. Adenauer's ambassador in Washington. He was writing about the previous Berlin crisis. "West Berlin cannot, in the long run, be held," he said, "if its population must come to the conclusion that the West has in fact accepted the division of Germany." Why? Because if Berlin cannot again become the capital of Germany, many of its people, particularly the younger ones, will drift away to the West and others will make their peace with the East.

We are now in the preliminary stages of those negotiations which both sides have declared they want. The negotiations will begin with the stark fact that Khrushchev has forced the Western Allies to acquiesce in, to acknowledge tacitly, the partition of Germany. He is to be sure, some distance from his full objective which, in the current campaign, is to bring about what he calls "the codification" of the German settlement, that is the formal and legal recognition that World War II has ended with the partition of Germany. But during this summer he has put himself in the position of negotiating from the accomplished fact that the partition has taken place and that it has not been opposed. He holds in the iron grip of the Red army the thing on which negotiation will turn.

With the division of Germany a physical fact, the significance of West Berlin has been greatly reduced. Berlin is no longer the escape hatch from the East. It is very much less than it was before the entry point of Western propaganda and intelligence. Its economic expansion is throttled down, and almost certainly its working population will decline. Above all, West Berlin is no longer the visible symbol and tangible pledge that communism will be pushed back of the Oder-Neisse line, perhaps back of the Vistula River. What is left is a human and moral commitment, which will be honored, to protect the physical basis of the way of life which people of West Berlin now enjoy.

There is no denying that our bargaining position has been diminished. It will take a very high order of statesmanship to repair it. Such statesmanship does not come cheaply. Besides insight and imagination it will need the kind of moral courage which is very rare, the courage to tell the people hard and unpopular truths which it has long been thought inexpedient to speak about.

In another article I shall attempt to describe some of the problems of negotiating about Berlin.

Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will have before it next week appropriations for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of the transmission system for the upper Colorado River storage project. I think my colleagues may be interested in the following telegram from Mr. LaSelle Coles, of Prineville, Oreg., urging support for these funds. As many of my colleagues are aware, Mr. Coles speaks from long experience in the reclamation movement and is currently president of the National Reclamation Association.

AUGUST 29, 1961.

The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Bureau construction of Colorado River storage project transmission lines is essential to the completion of water resources projects in Upper Colorado River Basin States.

Failure to construct transmission lines threatens payout of the entire undertaking which could seriously impair future of reclamation throughout the West.

I would like to urge you to give full and immediate support to this phase of appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. Would you also contact other Members of Oregon delegation and urge their support.

LASELLE E. COLES.

Carpet Textile Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America at their meeting on August 22, urging the approval by the President of the Tariff Commission's recommendations increasing the duty on Wilton and Velvet carpets. Since the Textile Workers Union of America represents the people who are most directly and immediately affected by the impact of foreign imports, their recommendations should, I believe, deserve the most serious attention on the part of all concerned. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION—CARPET AND RUG IMPORTS

The woven carpet and rug division of the textile industry has suffered severe setbacks from imports. As a result the total number of production and related workers has dropped from 30,000 in the early postwar period to a current total of approximately 18,000.

The Axminster division, which accounted for nearly one-half of the industry's output, has been severely hurt in competition with tufted and other types of carpets. In 1960, its output was cut to 11.7 million square yards from a previous level of some 40 million square yards. As a result, employees in many large and small plants have lost their jobs.

We are now experiencing an even more serious threat to the survival of the remaining Wilton and velvet divisions. This principal danger here is the rising volume of imports. Production of Wilton and velvet woven carpets reached a high of 54.7 million square yards in 1950. However, it was cut to a 40-million-square-yard level between 1951 and 1956, when imports climbed to 11 percent of domestic production.

Since 1956, production dropped further to 31.5 million in 1960 while imports continued to grow, reaching a level of 8.1 million square yards, or 25.9 percent of domestic production. The first half of 1961 has seen an aggravation of this trend, with imports constituting an even larger percentage of domestic production.

The disastrous impact of imports has been felt most sharply by Wilton carpets which, in 1960, constituted about 36.7 percent of the velvet and Wilton industry's total shipments. The reduction in this division has occurred so rapidly that in the first 5 months of 1961 imported Wilton carpets constituted 32.4 percent of total domestic shipments.

Wilton carpet shipments reached a high of 17.1 million square yards in 1953 and have consistently dropped, with the result that they declined to 13.7 million square yards in 1960. In the first 5 months of 1961, they were 29 percent below the comparable period of 1960. By 1957 they stood at 2.1 million square yards, representing only 14.3 percent of domestic shipments; but by 1960, they represented 41.6 percent of domestic shipments, and in the first 5 months of 1961, they reached 49.8 percent.

The deterioration of the wilton industry is continuing under the impact of these imports. The threat is dramatically disclosed by the low-average unit value of Japanese carpets, which consist substantially of wilton carpets at $2.91 per yard, whereas the average domestic wholesale price is at least twice this amount.

The executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, CLC, is deeply troubled by the threat of a further increase in imports for this will tend to close down many small mills located in established textile communities which are dependent upon them for their existence. Several chronically distressed areas, such as Amsterdam, N.Y., are former textile communities. The closing of these additional mills would be disastrous.

We point out that the employees in these mills have great skill and long periods of service. Many of them are third and fourth-generation carpetworkers. What is at stake here is the destruction of two established divisions of the textile industry. We are most apprehensive that failure to act would mean the elimination of the wilton woven carpet industry because present trends in imports could well level the remainder of this industry.

Currently before the President of the United States is the recommendation of the U.S. Tariff Commission that the ad valorem duty on wilton, velvet, and tapestry carpets and rugs be raised from 21 percent to 40 percent.

The executive council of TWUA joins in the Commission's finding that "the industry has been seriously injured by increased imports of like competitive products." We also agree that relief is necessary to avoid further injury to this industry.

As a result, we urge the President of the United States to adopt the 40 percent ad valorem duty proposed by the U.S. Tariff Commission. But this is only a partial remedy.

We also urge the President to take a further step to safeguard the remaining jobs of American carpet and rugworkers. The approach we advocate is the negotiation of an agreement with carpet and rug exporting nations, such as Japan, Belgium, and Luxembourg, which would limit their exports and thus insure the present productive level of these divisions of the textile industry in the United States.

These nations have already accepted the application of this principle to cotton and other textile products, and it is our earnest hope that a similar agreement will be achieved by the administration in the interests of American carpet and rugworkers.

A Tribute to Robert E. Gross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. team, and as a personal friend of Robert E. Gross, I wish to express my sincere sorrow on his passing, September 3.

Robert Gross was one of the finest examples of American ingenuity—a man of foresight, courage, and integrity. It was my privilege to work with him in the years 1942 through 1944 as manager of plant protection, in the organization he rescued from bankruptcy in 1932 and has since built into the 28th largest industrial company in the United States. Under his direction, Lockheed grew and prospered, and as it grew and prospered it contributed immeasurably to the growth of the communities surrounding it, particularly the cities of Burbank and Glendale, Calif., two of the major cities in the district which I have the privilege to represent.

It is extremely difficult to adequately convey the sense of loss that his family, his friends, and his loyal employees feel at this time. May I simply state that he will be greatly missed, and that my sincere sympathy is extended to his wife, his mother, his daughter, and his brother, as well as the entire Lockheed family.

Purposes of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address of Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the 24th annual summer meeting of the North Carolina Feeder Manufacturers Association, Cavalier Hotel, Virginia Beach, Va., August 25, 1961.

In his speech, Mr. Murphy outlined the purposes of the Department of Agriculture in a most interesting and timely manner. I feel the Members and the general public, and particularly our farmers, will be interested in Mr. Murphy's statement:

PURPOSES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Address of Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the 24th annual summer meeting of the North Carolina Feeder Manufacturers Association, Cavalier Hotel, Virginia Beach, Va., 11 a.m., August 25, 1961)

There are three fields of endeavor in which every red-blooded American excels—at least to his own satisfaction.

Each of us recognizes himself as an authority in these departments: quarterbacking a football team; raising other peoples' children; and solving the farm problem.

We all have winning records as quarterbacks—primarily because we take charge on Monday of games that were actually played Saturday and Sunday.

And, after periodically viewing with alarm the children growing up around us, we always wind up pointing with pride to the finished product.

Solving the farm problem is different. In that field, we still have more losers than we do winners.

Most people have sense enough to talk about how they would solve the farm problem and let it go at that. Some of us, unfortunately, are not that smart. I am afraid this is what happened to me. I talked too much and actually ended up right in the middle of this thing.

As you may know, I am not an agriculturalist by training, but a lawyer. So, when I got to the Department of Agriculture, I was exploring some new ground.

Let me hasten to tell you I have found it very exciting. We haven't solved the farm

problem yet, but we are working at it. And we do expect net farm income this year to be about $1 billion higher than it was last year, and we are very proud of that.

The thing that has surprised me most about the Department of Agriculture is the tremendous scope and variety of its work. It extends far beyond the farm problem, and it extends far beyond farmers. This Department of Government is doing some things that are of utmost importance to every American. We have our hands full, and we need all the help we can get. We would like to have your help and your understanding. To that end, I would like to tell you what it is—as I see it—that we are trying to do.

I would say that the Department of Agriculture has seven main functions: (1) To help provide food and fiber for the American people, (2) to strengthen the national defense, (3) to help achieve world peace, (4) to conserve and develop natural resources, (5) to strengthen the national economy, (6) to serve people in rural areas, and (7) to help increase farm income.

I would like to say a few words about each of the first six and something more about the seventh.

1. To help provide food and fiber for the American people: Everyone recognizes that this is a prime function of American agriculture. Few people realize how magnificently American agriculture is performing this function.

American families buy more food, of better quality and wider variety, than any other families in the world—and do it at less cost in hours of work than any other families in the world.

We spend only 20 percent of our take-home pay for food. The Russians have to spend over 50 percent of their income for food, and in France and England it is about 30 percent.

Moreover, we are getting more food for less work than ever before in history. Wages from an hour of factory work buy 83 percent more round steak, 126 percent more milk, 138 percent more oranges, or 169 more bacon than in 1929.

The result is that our people are not only getting their food for a smaller share of their income, they are also getting better food. In fact, if the average family today had the same kind of diet it had in the 1930's, its food bill would be one-fourth less than it is now.

The main credit for providing for the American people so abundantly belongs to the farmer. But there are many others who should share in it.

The industry represented by leaders in this room has made a major contribution. Processed feeds have enabled the farmer to get more milk from fewer cows, and have substantially cut the feeding time and labor that has been associated with poultry, hogs, and beef cattle. You have given the farmer the benefits of research in usable form.

I am proud to say that I think the U.S. Department of Agriculture is also entitled to a substantial share of the credit. Through its research and other aids to increased farm efficiency, it has made possible enormous cost savings. Without the benefits of this research, it would cost many millions of dollars more to produce today's output of American farms. And it is perfectly plain that most of the benefits of the cost savings are being passed along to the consumer—because the farmer certainly has not been pocketing the money. Farm income was much lower last year than it was 10 years ago.

There is another way in which the Department of Agriculture contributes directly in providing food for the American people—through its food distribution programs.

During the year which began July 1, approximately $265 million will be invested in healthier children through the school lunch and special milk programs.

Another $375 million will go to provide food for those suffering, through no fault of their own, reverses associated with illness, unemployment, old age and natural disasters and to residents of tax-supported institutions. Millions of our fellow citizens benefit from this distribution.

The Department of Agriculture also has in operation eight pilot food stamp programs, designed to lay the groundwork for increased efficiency in distribution of foods to the underprivileged through maximum use of commercial sales channels. Preliminary reports on these operations are most encouraging.

Truly, I think we can say that helping to feed the American people is one of our major purposes.

2. A second major purpose of the Department of Agriculture is to strengthen the national defense: All of us know that if a country gets into war, food is just as important as guns. We have to have it. An army still travels on its stomach. And a civilian population lives the same way. The ability of American agriculture to produce, plus the stockpiles we have on hand, is one of our greatest defense assets. But more than that—even more important—is the fact that the efficiency of American agriculture has made possible our total economic advantage over Russia.

Because farmers have found new and better ways of doing things and have sharply increased output per man, it has been possible for many years to channel a steadily growing volume of high-quality human resources from the land into industry, business and the professional and personal services.

One American farmworker feeds 26 people. One Russian farmworker feeds five. In food production, one American farmworker equals five Russians.

More than 40 percent of the total labor force of the Soviet Union works in agriculture and forestry. In this country it is only about 10 percent. If our farmers were no more efficient than those of the Soviet Union, between 20 and 25 million Americans who are now in manufacturing, construction, mining, the trades, transportation and other nonfarm business would have to be on the land and in the forest—or we would not be so well fed and clothed and housed.

The industrial growth of a country is limited by the number of workers it must leave on the land in order to feed its total population. Efficiency in agriculture is the fundamental basis for the mighty industrial strength of the United States.

This is our great advantage over the Communists. Anyone who thinks it tough to compete with the Communists now could really get worked up contemplating the picture if the Russians and Chinese could move three of every four people now on farms into other productive endeavors.

That is why, when Nikita Khrushchev toured our country a few years ago, he was far more interested in our farms and farmers than in missiles and missilemen.

It is also the reason that this country may get more national defense value—dollar for dollar—in money spent for agricultural research than in money spent for military research.

3. To help achieve world peace: Perhaps no program has captured the imagination of our own people and the hopes of people in underdeveloped countries abroad to a greater degree than the food-for-peace program.

Through gifts, sales, and through barter agreements we are moving a substantial share of our abundance into areas of great need. Approximately $2 billion a year is invested in food for peace by the Department of Agriculture.

We cannot, of course, fill the world food gap alone. And we are using food to help underdeveloped nations help themselves. Irrigation, roads, and power are all factors in food production, and our food-for-peace shipments in many instances help to pay workers engaged in those construction projects.

We have reappraised, I believe constructively, the barter phase of food for peace and are exploring the expanded use of long-term credit. At the same time, we are increasing the dollar markets for American foods abroad.

The food-for-peace money is well spent—perhaps as well spent as any outlays of the U.S. Government—but don't let anyone be under the misapprehension that it is spent just for the benefit of farmers and foreigners. Peace is indivisible. It is worth just as much money to the city dweller as the farmer, and is just as valuable in North Carolina as in India.

4. To conserve and develop natural resources: All of us know that we are completely dependent upon our resources of land and water for our continued existence. We have a vital interest as individuals and as a Nation in saving and improving these resources, whether they are publicly or privately owned.

The responsibility of the Department of Agriculture for the conservation and development of our Nation's total land and water resources is very heavy. First, it has complete custodial responsibility for 186 million acres of national forests and national grasslands. In addition, it has functional responsibilities for land and water development on private lands throughout the 50 States.

Three-fourths of the Nation's land area is in private ownership. Sixty percent of the Nation's land is in farms and ranches. Most of our water falls on farm, ranch, and forest land. How farmers, ranchers, and woodland owners deal with that vast land surface, therefore, determines in large measure the quality and quantity of water that will be available for cities and industry as well as agriculture.

So, when we work with farmers on soil and water conservation practices, when we develop watershed projects, and when we improve forestry practices on public and private lands, we believe that we are serving the highest and best interests of all the people.

5. Strengthens the national economy: Although the USDA owes a primary responsibility to the farmer, we recognize our obligations toward all elements of the national economy. This is especially true in the case of industries related to agriculture—the manufacturers, processors, shippers and merchants who supply the needs of farmers—and those who process and market farm products.

There are 7 million Americans engaged in growing food and fiber. There are more than twice that many—16 million—workers in fields with total or partial ties to agriculture. These are the people who supply farmers—who make, ship, and sell tractors, combines, milking machines, feeds, chemicals, fertilizers, fencing, and building materials * * * who generate and transmit electricity * * * refine petroleum and make tires.

These are the people who transport, store, process, and market farm products who mill, bake, can, dehydrate, concentrate, and freeze foods. They work in meat and poultry packinghouses, and are in the cotton and woolen mills and in the sewing rooms. They put food and clothing aboard railroad cars, trucks and ships and unload them. They warehouse these products, and sell them.

For 16 million Americans who are not on the land, agriculture is all or a substantial part of payday.

These agriculture-related industries and businesses are a major part of the American economy. They are dependent upon agriculture, and upon one another, for their well-being. The entire Nation is dependent upon all of them for prosperity.

The Department of Agriculture has extensive dealings with many of these industries. We usually rank third among railroad customers. During the last fiscal year our payments to warehousemen and grain elevator operators totaled approximately $426 million, and another $163 million went to cover transportation expenses.

Furthermore, we recognize that the administration of many of our programs—notably in the regulatory field and the price support field—have a direct and substantial effect on business enterprises. We want these enterprises to thrive and prosper. We want to be scrupulously fair to them—we want to help them every way we properly can—recognizing that we have a primary responsibility to the farmer himself.

6. To serve people in rural areas: Everyone is accustomed to thinking of what the Department of Agriculture does for farmers. Few people think much of what we do for rural people who are not farmers.

Today, only about one-third of the people in rural areas live on farms. The other two-thirds are nonfarm people. Several of the Department's major programs serve these nonfarm people just as they do farmers. Notable examples are the rural electrification program, the rural telephone program and the rural housing program.

We all know that more than 90 percent of the Nation's farms are now electrified—thanks to REA. But we should also remember that REA brings electricity to nonfarm families as well—and it is just as great a blessing to them as it is to farmers.

In the housing field we are now in a position to expand our services to nonfarm families. The rural housing provisions of the new housing act passed by Congress this year provide funds and authority for housing loans to nonfarm as well as farm families.

Another of the programs on which we are working very hard now is rural areas development. Working with State and local groups throughout the country, we are going to do all we can to create new jobs—develop new industries—bring new prosperity to rural communities. This program is meeting with enthusiastic response all over the Nation. We have great hopes for it. To the extent that it is successful, it will, of course, create new jobs for nonfarm people as well as those who live on farms.

7. To help increase farm income: Now we come to the farm problem.

The heart of the problem is the paradoxical fact that the more the farmer produces the less money he makes. The more efficient he becomes—the poorer he gets.

The fastest technological advance in the United States has taken place in agriculture, not industry. With about the same total quantity of resources, agriculture produced about one and one-half times as much food and fiber in 1959 as in 1940. Throughout the 1947–57 period, gain in output per man in farming averaged 6.2 percent per year, as compared with 3.7 percent in manufacturing and only 2.3 percent in all nonfarm industries.

But here is the other side of the coin.

Prices the farmer receives for his crops and livestock have dropped 12 percent since the 1947–49 period. New Jersey egg producers saw their net income drop 68 percent while they were raising net production per farm 54 percent. When eastern Wisconsin dairy farmers succeeded in raising production per farm 42 percent, they earned 2 percent less. Producers of wheat, small grains, and livestock in the northern plains stepped up production per farm 16 percent, and their net income slipped 28 percent. Hog and beef fattening farmers in the Corn Belt raised production per farm 36 percent, while their income dropped 28 percent.

Fortunately, producers of some of the major crops in the Southeast have done better. Tobacco producers have fared reasonably well. The reason for this, of course, is the tobacco allotment and price support program which has brought some stability and order to the market.

There is some mystery about why this program was allowed to remain relatively intact during the past 8 years—when so many other farm programs were being torn down. But whatever the reason, we are glad it was saved.

The cotton, peanut, and rice programs were also saved in varying degrees—and they have helped a lot in the lean years the farmer has been passing through.

The time has come now to restore and rebuild. This will be a long, slow, and difficult task, but we know we can do better; and we think that substantial progress has been made already in these past 7 months.

We are fortunate in the leadership and support we are getting from President Kennedy. We are most fortunate to have Orville Freeman as Secretary of Agriculture. He is a man of great energy and ability, and he is devoting all his talents to his work. He is an eloquent spokesman and a true champion of American agriculture.

Basically, our objectives in improving farm income must be balanced programs of production and marketing. Many of the techniques we have learned from successful programs already in effect can be adapted for other commodities. Since each commodity has its own special problems, its program needs will be different from others. Above all, any program to be successful must have producer support and participation.

With all of us working together, we think we can do a great deal.

We have a long way to go. We think we can do it.

We appreciate your interest and ask for your understanding and cooperation—not only for farmers, but for a better America and a better world.

Mr. Udall Is Saving You Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of September 5, 1961:

MR. UDALL IS SAVING YOU MONEY

Whatever mistakes he may have made, U.S. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has come up with a cracking good policy on pamphlets.

The idea is revolutionary in politics. Udall has decided to save the taxpayers money by leaving his name off of the 139 different pamphlets that his Department gives out each year. Tourists and visitors pick up about 11 million copies in a year's time.

When he became Secretary, Udall found many thousands of pamphlets on hand, each bearing the name of Fred Seaton, the Republican who held the job before him. Udall found it would cost $130,000 to print a new year's supply of pamphlets bearing his name instead of Seaton's.

He decided to save the taxpayers the $130,000 and to hand out the old pamphlets bearing Seaton's name until they gave out.

What's more important, Udall ordered that while he is Secretary the pamphlets will not bear the name of any Secretary.

Bravo. Think of the publications, plaques, markers and such that are issued at taxpayer expense—each boldly advertising the name of the Government official running the show.

Mr. Udall deserves congratulations for saving the taxpayers money—and for declining to advertise at taxpayer expense.

"This is Where it All Began"—WCAU–TV's Dramatic Account of the City and the Building Where Our Nation Was Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 10, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, John Adams believed the American people would always commemorate their independence on July 2, the date of the adoption of the Resolution of Independence, rather than on July 4, the date of the adoption of the Declaration written by Jefferson. But Philadelphia television station WCAU recently called attention to another important time in the life of the Declaration in this 185th anniversary year of our freedom. It presented a moving and eloquent program entitled "This Is Where It All Began," the story of the building and the city where the United States was born.

The WCAU–TV news presentation, produced by and narrated by Charles Shaw and directed by Jim Hirschfeld, was broadcast on July 27, 1961. As the script reports, this was the time of year in 1776 when the engrossed copy of the Nation's birth certificate—the Declaration of Independence—was being prepared for signature by Members of the Continental Congress. The first signatures to the document, which we now treasure in the Archives Building here, were affixed to the engrossed Declaration on August 2, 1776.

I have obtained a copy of the script for this program, and I congratulate WCAU's general manager, John A. Schneider, and News Director Shaw, and all others associated with the program, for the excellence it reflects. For, as this program points out:

Many Americans forget, and many foreigners do not realize, as revolution sweeps the modern world, that the United States was born of revolution, that what happened here in our city 185 years ago has been of inspiration to freedom fighters throughout the world ever since.

An old story which, if properly told around the world today, can restore the United States to its position as the fountainhead of inspiration to all people yearning to be free.

Mr. Speaker, the narrative portion of "This Is Where It All Began" was prepared to illustrate and amplify a wealth of visual material presented with it—

films, tapes, paintings, interior views of Independence Hall, and so on—but standing by itself, as it must in the cold type of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it nevertheless still makes a dramatic story, which I think many Members of the House and Senate would enjoy reading.

Consequently, under unanimous consent, I submit the narrative portion of the script of the July 27 channel 10 reports program, "This Is Where It All Began," as follows:

Music: "Appalachian Suite," fade BG after 15 seconds for:

Announcer: Channel 10 reports: The story of the building and the city where the United States was born. Your reporter: Charles Shaw.

Music: "The Battle of Trenton" (full on bell tolling for 6 seconds, then fade BG for:

Shaw: It's 10:30 by the old statehouse clock in Philadelphia.

Ten-thirty, July 27, 1961, which could be, if you let your imagination wander, a July night in 1776.

The time—the place where it all began. The time—the place of the greatest news event in the crowded history of our Nation. It was 185 years ago this month that it happened. A nation was born—fated at the very moment of its birth for a rendezvous with destiny. One hundred and eighty-five years ago tonight, our Nation's birth certificate—the Declaration of Independence—was being prepared for signature by Members of the Continental Congress. The first signatures were affixed to the engrossed Declaration on August 2, 1776—185 years ago next Wednesday.

Tonight, we roll back the tide of time; we dissolve the present into the past as we enter the place of our nativity as a nation.

Philadelphia, a city of narrow, cobblestoned streets, had a population of less than 30,000 in 1776—but it was the second largest city of the English-speaking world.

The first was London.

Most of Philadelphia's people lived between Seventh Street and the Delaware River and in the few blocks to the north and south of High Street, as Market Street then was called.

By 18th century standards, life was good for most people in colonial Philadelphia. Gerald W. Johnson called colonial Philadelphia a neat metropolis, its neatness not yet broken by the passage of centuries. It was a town of cheerful people—a town very obviously English, yet not English.

English manners and customs were the basis of Philadelphia's social life; but English convention had to be adapted and modified to fit the New World environment.

The Philadelphians of 1776 were religious people; they had a deep faith in a Supreme Being, variously called God, Nature's God, the Supreme Judge of the World and Divine Providence. They expressed their beliefs as Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews and as members of groups which stressed morality and ethics without formal religious dogma.

But these people were, above all, revolutionaries—revolutionaries long before actual revolution against the Crown was thought of. Their way of life in this recent wilderness was revolutionary * * * and it was a life that the King and his Ministers in London could not understand. And it's because of that that we devote a half hour of this July night in 1961 to reporting the events of July days and nights in 1776; because many Americans forget and many foreigners do not realize, as revolution sweeps the modern world, that the United States was born of revolution * * * that what happened here in our city 185 years ago this month has been of inspiration to freedom fighters throughout the world ever since. A news story that is 185 years old is at the same time as current as the lead story which John Facenda will report 25 minutes hence. An old story which, if properly told around the world today, can restore the United States to its position as the fountainhead of inspiration to all people yearning to breathe free.

Superficially, life in Colonial Philadelphia bore similarity to life in London. The cheerful people of this neat metropolis—the gay, the genteel—had developed a gracious way of life. They delighted in such songs as Francis Hopkinson's "Beneath a Weeping Willow's Shade."

"Beneath a weeping willow's shade,
  She sat and sang alone.
Her hand upon her heart she laid,
  And plaintive was her moan.
The mock bird sat upon a bow,
  And listened to her lay.
Then to the distant hills he bore
  The dulcet tones away."

Music: "Weeping Willow's Shade."

But from the distince came other sounds—the sounds of war, the clash of resounding arms. Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill—these had been acts of violence in 1775. Before that, the Boston Massacre of 1770, the burning of the British schooner *Gaspé* in 1772, the Boston Tea Party of 1773.

A year before Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, delegates from every Colony except Georgia met here in Philadelphia's Carpenter's Hall. That was the First Continental Congress. Meeting between September 5 and October 26, 1774, the delegates avowed their loyalty to the person of King George the Third, a bluff, red-faced 38-year-old who occupied the British Throne—sometimes ruling with great intelligence when his mind was clear, acting with mulish stubbornness in the periods of mental unbalance which later became permanent insanity. In its first meeting, the Continental Congress condemned oppressive British legislation, approved the raising and arming of local militia and endorsed economic sanctions against Great Britain. There was talk of union of Great Britain and the Colonies * * * and of dominion status for the combined Colonies. But nobody was urging independence. On May 10, 1775, the Second Continental Congress met in the Pennsylvania State House, and the members were in a different mood. Less than a month before, the British had attacked Lexington and Concord. On the day that Congress met, American forces captured Fort Ticonderoga.

George Washington was named commander in chief of the Continental Army by Congress on June 15—the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought 2 days later. An August 2, Congress adjourned for a month and 10 days; when the delegates reconvened, they set upon a course which led to independence and the birth of a nation. The colonies were at war * * * shots heard round the world were being fired. But on January 15, 1776, this man—39-year-old, lean, hawk-faced Thomas Paine—set off a barrage of words also heard round the world. They were contained in a pamphlet "Common Sense," published anonymously and at Paine's own expense but immediately identified as the work of the so-called radical from the slums of London, a resident of Philadelphia less than 2 years—a close friend of Benjamin Franklin.

"Every spot of the Old World," wrote Paine, "is overrun with oppression. Freedom has been hunted round the globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger. And England has given her warning to depart."

Paine aroused the colonial patriots with this appeal: "O, receive the fugitive and prepare in time an asylum for manhood. The birthday of a new world is at hand. We have it in our power to begin the world all over again."

Thomas Jefferson received one of the early copies of "Common Sense." Jefferson was quoted as saying, "The time for debate is over". But in the State House at Phiadelphia, debate continued, with many of the Continental Congressmen still loathe to dissolve ties with Britain. But Thomas Paine's argument that it was absurd for an island to rule a continent, that a government of our own is a natural right gained wide acceptance.

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia submitted a resolution that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the states of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved." The resolution was submitted to a committee composed of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Roger Sherman and Robert R. Livingston, with Jefferson assigned to write the draft.

He submitted his draft on June 28; debate began on July 1. There was opposition from a few delegates who still hoped for reconciliation with Great Britain.

John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, was among the opposition leaders. The South Carolina delegation also opposed the resolution. Delaware's two-man delegation was split for and against. New York's members abstained while awaiting instructions from home.

On July 2, the South Carolina delegation changed its position and supported independence. A majority of Pennsylvanians followed suit. And Delaware's Caesar Rodney, after riding 80 miles horseback by night and day through rain and thunder, arrived in time to break his delegation's tie in favor of independence. The resolution was passed unanimously, with New York abstaining. Her delegation cast its affirmative vote on July 15.

On July 4, the resolution adopted on July 2 was passed again as a Declaration of Independence and signed at the time by John Hancock as President of the Continental Congress, and Charles Thomson as Secretary. And when New York's approval was voted on July 19, Congress ordered the Declaration to be engrossed for signing by all Members of the Continental Congress.

Timothy Matlack, of Philadelphia, who had served for a time as assistant to Secretary Thomson, was given the assignment of copying the Declaration on parchment.

On August 2, his task completed, the engrossed copy received its first signatures. It was several months before all the signatures were affixed.

A new nation was born, and this was its birth certificate.

The birthplace of a nation—a nation born of revolution. A national shrine, which could be—as it already is to many foreigners—a world shrine.

The symbol of man's eternal struggle to breathe free—the antiquity of that struggle epitomized by the ancient words girding the Liberty Bell—words from the Old Testament:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Latter-day revolutionaries in other lands, faithless to their trust by having substituted one tyranny for another, lay claim to leadership of today's genuine revolutionaries.

But this is where it all began—the old statehouse in Philadelphia, now Independence Hall—185 years ago this month.

Music: "Appalachian Suite."

Announcer. Channel 10 Reports: "This is Where it all Began," was directed by Jim Hirschfeld, produced by Charles Shaw, and was a WCAU–TV news presentation.

Dangers of Indiscriminate Use of Consumer Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Tuesday, September 5, a most intriguing full page advertisement entitled "Why Does a Family Clothing Chain Become a Book Reviewer?" appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and other newspapers from coast to coast.

This public service advertisement, sponsored by Robert Hall Clothes, Inc., is a timely warning about the dangers many citizens face today because of the indiscriminate use of consumer credit—often called living on the cuff, debt living, or living on the easy payment plan.

Their message recommends a recent book on consumer credit by Hillel Black, "Buy Now, Pay Later"—to use their words—a carefully documented, fervent and provocative book which tells of the strains and tragedies imposed on people who are trying to keep up with the bill collector.

Moreover, the advertisement warns:

In most instances the consumer, because it all looks so easy, is completely uninformed on what he actually pays for the privilege of running a buy now, pay later debt.

This message poses the crucial question which is disturbing many people today.

Are we turning into a Nation of consumer automatons? We buy without asking the cost and pay without adequate information.

Isn't it about time consumers started asking questions about credit? Living in a fool's paradise of carefree buy now, pay later habits will not serve to strengthen our free enterprise economy.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this message be printed after my remarks.

Recently, the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held extensive hearings on S. 1740, the truth in lending bill, which would require all lenders and sellers to fully disclose in a uniform manner the costs of consumer credit. Thousands of pages of testimony before that committee have conclusively demonstrated that most consumers do not know what price they pay for credit. Because of lack of accurate information, consumers are unable to compare credit prices and shop intelligently for credit.

It is indeed gratifying to see a great national company speak out so eloquently on the abuses and potential dangers involved in the massive burden of consumer debt—problems which have also deeply concerned sponsors of S. 1740, the truth in lending bill.

I hope that many other businessmen who have a deep interest in business ethics and the future of the free enterprise system will now join Robert Hall Clothes in alerting the public to current abuses in consumer credit and in pleading for "a return to the tried and true American traditions of respect for thrift and restraint in mortgaging our future."

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DOES A FAMILY CLOTHING CHAIN BECOME A BOOK REVIEWER?

Our stores are rooted in 345 American communities throughout the nation. It is an honor we cannot treat lightly. No merchant could. With it comes a responsibility to serve each community honestly and well.

For this reason we depart from our daily task as merchants to call your attention to a forthright and extraordinary book. Called "Buy Now, Pay Later," it was written by a perceptive and painstaking reporter, Mr. Hillel Black, and published by William Morrow & Co. In very human terms, it deals with the effect runaway consumer credit has upon our lives and our futures.

Mr. Black started this book after covering the story of a 19-year-old boy's innocent dream to see if he could really live it up on a credit card binge. It was Mr. Black's first introduction to the startling, ofttimes tragic, effects of debt living in today's modern-minded, luxury-loving era. The book came as a natural development, an essential, driving examination. Carefully documented, fervent, and provocative, it tells of the strains and tragedies imposed on people who are trying to keep up with the bill collector. It tells of the moral abandon many families indulge in because of easy credit. It tells of the lack of knowledge most people have about what they really pay for the privilege of buying on credit.

We believe, as Mr. Black does, that credit, without adequate information, self-discipline and good judgment can get out of hand.

We urge consumers everywhere to familiarize themselves with the truths as presented in "Buy Now, Pay Later."

Last year 100,000 families went into bankruptcy. This is an alarming increase over the past decade and more than the total number of bankruptcies filed during the depths of the depression of the 1930's How could this happen during an era of our greatest abundance?

On-the-cuff-living easy payment plans are being booked 24 hours a day. Purchases are being made not with cash on hand but with future earnings. It is becoming easier and easier to go into debt. If for any reason families who have assumed excessive credit cannot meet their payments, they are faced with the tragedy of bankruptcy.

We believe, as Mr. Black believes, that consumers once again must become hard traders, comparing values, demanding accurate information and taking on responsibilities that they can realistically handle. And they must buy what they are sure fits their actual budgets.

Consider this:

In most instances the consumer, because it all looks so easy, is completely uninformed on what he actually pays for the privilege of running a buy now, pay later debt.

What does "small service charge" really cost? The price for consumer credit is frequently astounding, reports Mr. Black. One civic group gave these examples: a store sells a product for $329.95 on a 24-month contract with a $10 downpayment. Mr. Consumer pays the store $66 extra for credit—enough to buy 285 quarts of milk.

Or, assume, Mr. Consumer wants to buy a big luxury item for $2,660.52 with a $460.52 downpayment. Credit charges on the $2,200 balance on a 36-month contract can cost him over $400. Think of it. A charge enough to purchase a washing machine and a dryer.

Are we turning into a nation of consumer automatons? We buy without asking the cost and pay without adequate information.

Isn't it about time consumers started asking questions about credit? Living in a fool's paradise of carefree buy now, pay later habits will not serve to strengthen our free enterprise economy.

We join hands with Mr. Hillel Black in his plea for a return to the tried and true American traditions of respect for thrift and restraint in mortgaging our future.

ROBERT HALL CLOTHES, INC.

Remarks of Clyde T. Ellis, General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at the Annual Meeting of North Central Mississippi Electric Power Association, Byhalia, Miss., August 16, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

REMARKS OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, GENERAL MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF NORTH CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION, BYHALIA, MISS., AUGUST 16, 1961

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, to me there is always some very special significance attached to rural electrification meetings held in Mississippi, because this is the State in which the Government-sponsored rural electric cooperative program had its beginnings. It happened 65 miles east of here, at Corinth.

Even before the Rural Electrification Act was passed by Congress and signed by President Roosevelt, the farmers of Mississippi realized how much more productive their agriculture could become and how much easier and more enjoyable rural life would be if they had low-cost electricity. In 1934, rural electrification was virtually unknown in the United States. Only 11 percent of America's farms enjoyed central station electric service. Of the 312,000 farms in Mississippi at that time, 308,000 (99.1 percent) were without service.

Then, in 1934, a group of Corinth businessmen, farmers from the surrounding area, and representatives of the newly formed Tennessee Valley Authority met in the rear of a furniture store at Corinth. The farmers said, "We want electricity. We want cheap electricity to light our homes, to help us perform our chores and modernize our farming operations." The businessmen said, "We want to help you electrify rural Mississippi, because rural electrification will boost your income and create bigger sales for our stores." The TVA spokesmen unfolded blueprints and said, "This is how to electrify your farms. We can help you finance the lines, with loans from TVA, an agency of the Federal Government. Together we will establish a cooperative."

This historic meeting was the beginning. With the thin lines of electricity that were extended beyond the city limits of Corinth, Miss., foretold a complete economic revolution for rural America.

A year after the meeting in the furniture store at Corinth, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on May 11, 1935, signed his Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration to supervise a program for the generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity in rural areas. Depression-born Federal emergency relief funds were used to build the first projects.

Then on May 20, 1936, the Norris-Rayburn bill, as it was known then, which provided the permanent statutory basis for the rural electrification program, was signed into law as the REA Act of 1936.

As we look back, with 27 years of hindsight, toward the furniture store meeting of 1934 at Corinth, we cannot help but take more than a little pride in what the rural electrification program has accomplished—both here in Mississippi and throughout the United States.

Less than 1 percent of Mississippi's farms enjoyed electricity in 1934. Today, 90 percent of Mississippi's farms and rural residents are served. Over $100 million has been invested by the 27 member-owned electric power associations throughout the State. They have constructed more than 55,000 miles of distribution and transmission lines from which they serve some 276,000 meters—well over a million persons.

Throughout the Nation as a whole, over 1,000 such consumer-owned rural electric systems serve more than 5 million meters—some 17 million people—over 1,500,000 miles of transmission and distribution lines.

Since the program's inception in 1936, Congress has authorized and REA has approved the lending of more than $4 billion to bring the convenience and advantages of modern living to small towns and farms throughout the length and breadth of America.

All of this money will be repayed with interest in 35 years from the loan dates by the rural electric systems. The rural people of America, in building and operating these consumer-owned electric facilities, have compiled the best loan repayment record in the history of the Federal Government. Other Government lending agencies boast of a 99-percent repayment record. But of the $2.8 billion of REA loan funds outstanding on May 31 of this year, only some $170,000 was more than 30 days overdue, less than six one-thousandths of 1 percent delinquency—99.99 percent repaid on or ahead of schedule. That's a record for us all to be proud of—unmatched anywhere insofar as I know.

Today many of you are attending your first rural electric system annual meeting, for you have just recently become members. Indeed, 2,700 member families and rural establishments have become members of this co-op within the last year. That is a majority of the 3,303 total members served by North Central.

I am proud to be able to join in welcoming each of you to membership in what I believe is one of the most significant movements in America today—a movement which greatly helped America in supplying virtually the entire free world with food and fiber during World War II, and a movement which, again in 1961, is helping us to produce the food and fiber necessary to keep freedom alive in our own country, in the nations with which we are allied, and in many of the underdeveloped nations yet uncommitted to either communism or freedom.

As rural electrification developed across America, the hundreds of systems that were busily erecting poles and stringing wires began to feel a need for professional legislative representation in Washington, for a nationally coordinated membership information program, for a management improvement program, for lower cost insurance services, and for many other activities and services necessary to preserve their position in the competitive American economic system. To get these jobs done, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association was formed. NRECA is your national service organization to which more than 90 percent of all REA financed electric systems belong.

It is as the general manager of that association—as your employee—that I accepted your invitation to meet with you today. I am directly responsible to each of you through the NRECA Board of Directors. That Board is, like your local North Central board, a grassroots group; one member elected each year by the rural electric systems in each State.

Mr. Hardin Shattuck, manager of the Coast Electric Power Association of Bay-St. Louis, represents Mississippi on the national board; and represents it with vigor and ability.

You have slightly more than a hundred employees in your national association's Washington office; administrative, professional and clerical, all working hard to assure for rural electrification a role in America's future. We testify for you before committees of Congress on legislation affecting your interests. We research and assist with problems affecting your financial position, your territorial integrity, your wholesale power supply, and your management. NRECA has a whole section devoted to developing and publicizing ideas on how to help your consumers more efficiently use electricity in their homes, farms and industries.

NRECA publishes Rural Electrification, a monthly magazine devoted to your program; and other weekly and monthly news services to keep your leaders informed of matters of interest to them.

Your NRECA Insurance and Employee Welfare Department has developed a whole series of life, accident, health, and casualty coverages tailored especially to your needs, and which save all the rural electric systems a great deal of money.

We invite you to use all of your NRECA services or whichever of them suit your needs. Most of these services are set up on a pay-as-you-use-them basis, so that if you don't use them you don't pay for them. But most of them actually save you money. We hope you will visit your national office as often as you come to Washington.

Membership in the North Central Mississippi Electric Power Association is for each of you a real privilege. It is, however, a privilege coupled with a heavy responsibility to participate in the work of the association. A cooperative or electric power association is much different than an investor-owned utility company. In the latter type of organization the stockholders, the directors, and the management, as a group, bear little or no relation to the customers. The customers of an investor-owned company have, as such, no status whatsoever in the operation and management of the company.

The cooperative, however, cannot long exist unless the members are willing to actively participate in its affairs. For the membership and the consumers of the electric power association are all the same thing. The board of directors then is elected from the consumer-members and by the consumer-members. The board formulates association policy. As members of North Central, you are participating in this meeting today for the very purpose of electing your board of directors. This you will do every year, so long as you are members of the association. In time you will get to know each other better and will look forward to attending your own annual meetings of the consumer-members.

As many of the oldtime members of North Central well know, there are also some very special and challenging problems which go with membership in this particular electric power association.

A few years ago, I never dreamed that I would ever again have the privilege of participating in an annual meeting of "Mississippi 48" as your system has come to be known at REA. Five years ago, in 1956, most people thought that North Central had reached the end of its financial rope, that it was bankrupt and would soon be dissolved and its assets sold. At that time, the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington actually encouraged such a sellout and thought it would be a good idea if you surrendered your system.

Many of the association's members, I am told, felt that there was no alternative under the circumstances but to sell out. Others, however, especially your president, Senator Williams, your vice president, Mr. R. P. Funderburk, would not give up. They remembered the days when they and 99 percent of the rural people of Mississippi did not have electricity. They wanted to preserve this cooperative association that had changed that picture and had brought them out of the darkness.

What was needed was temporary financing to gain time so that territorial adjustments between the co-op and the Mississippi Power & Light Co. could be settled, and the co-op's service area rearranged to improve its financial feasibility.

And despite all the prophecies of doom, this temporary financial shot in the arm was forthcoming late in 1957, when the Woodruff Electric Cooperative of Forrest City, Ark., expressed complete faith in your co-op, North Central, by lending you $85,000. And, as time went on, you borrowed a total of $230,000 from Woodruff Electric across the river as you worked toward a permanent solution of your territorial problems. Woodruff Electric Cooperative, under the able leadership of its manager, T. E. Bostick, made rural electrification history when it came to your co-op's rescue with such a large loan. It made history and it surprised the socks off some who thought the co-op was gone.

Finally, on December 23, 1960, after more than 3 years of work, REA approved a regular long-term 35-year loan of over a million dollars so that North Central could buy 232 miles of line from Mississippi Power & Light Co. to carry out a previously agreed upon exchange of territory with the company. This transaction increased the number of members served by North Central from 1,600 to 3,300 and increased your annual revenues from $75,000 to $300,000 a year.

And on February 20, 1961, an additional important step was taken when your sister rural electric systems of Mississippi banded together and loaned your co-op $230,000 to repay Woodruff Electric all that you had borrowed from it. This was indeed a noble gesture on the part of your sister co-ops in Mississippi.

So, you members of North Central have in the past few years accomplished what many thought impossible. You are due great credit. Along the way you have had the help of a lot of important folks. Gov. Ross Barnett and your State public service commission deserve a lot of credit for helping you work out your territorial problems. The leadership of the rural electrification program in Mississippi—such people as Blaine Eaton, manager of the Southern Pine Electric Power Association of Taylorsville, and Louie Spencer, manager of the Delta Electric Association at Greenwood, Miss., have contributed heavily to your success. Mr. Bostick of Woodruff Electric and his entire board of directors—the group that provided your temporary financing without which you could not have been successful—all of these and many others who have helped can take pride in their accomplishment.

And there is one additional man—a great Mississippian—to whom North Central will always owe a debt of gratitude. That man is Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN, who has

represented this Second District of Mississippi in the U.S. House of Representatives for 20 years.

As you all know, rural electric systems throughout the United States such as North Central are constructed with funds loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington. And, in order for these funds to be loaned they must be authorized by Congress. Under the terms of our Federal Constitution, all appropriation bills must originate in the U.S. House of Representatives. For 12 of the 20 years during which he has served in Congress, Representative WHITTEN has been chairman or ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. This is the subcommittee which has responsibility for originating REA loan bills. Mr. WHITTEN proudly says that during that time, and despite some difficult and trying experiences, REA has never once had to refuse a loan request because of inadequate funds. Your Congressman, Mr. WHITTEN, has been one of the stanchest and ablest friend of rural electrification ever to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. He has served not only the interests of rural electric systems in his home State of Mississippi, but across the entire Nation. It was he, as much as any other single person, who prevented the dissolution of North Central when financial disaster seemed inevitable.

JAMIE WHITTEN is my friend as he is yours, and I want you to know that it has been a real pleasure for us of your national association to work with him in the cause of rural electrification all these many years.

It must be quite evident to all of you by this time that this rural electric system—North Central—is at last emerging from a period of trial and distress during which its very existence was constantly in jeopardy. It has now weathered the storm successfully. A great tribute to you all, and I congratulate you upon chalking up here another great success story in the history of rural America.

I urge each of you to remember that the flames of a newly kindled fire must be nursed to maturity with care, with skill, and with an understanding of the difficulties involved. I urge you to meet your problems of organization and development with tolerance, with patience, and with a determination to bring reliable central station electric service to your membership at the lowest cost.

This is not a time in which our program can afford the extravagance of internal dissension. In many sections of the country the rural electric cooperatives and the Federal Government agencies from which they purchase power—like TVA— are being characterized as socialistic or worse. Rural electric systems are criticized on every conceivable ground.

Your sister electric cooperatives in Indiana are enduring almost daily attacks via full-page newspaper advertisements merely because they have requested and received an REA loan to build a generating system.

Our enemies are determined to kill us off as something undesirable. But our enemies are selfish groups and I say that our rural electric co-ops are as American as apple pie and are more truly in the American tradition than are the tactics of those who oppose us.

This is a time in which we must prove to the Nation that we are an integral part of the American free enterprise system, that our only desire is to provide our membership with an abundance of electricity at minimum cost, and that we are ready and able to bear our full equitable share of the financial burdens of our country. We must maintain reliable service and constantly increase our use of electricity. We must develop programs to properly handle our systems' reserve funds. We must take measures to assure our future wholesale power supply—in your use through TVA. And, we must protect our territorial integrity. The achievement of these objectives will require the unified efforts of rural electric system members throughout the United States. If we cannot achieve harmony among ourselves, we cannot hope to muster the strength necessary to overcome others who attack us from the outside.

There is always a little give-and-take in the successful operation of any business enterprise. You, as the consumer-member-owners of the North Central Power Association have the privilege, the responsibility and the duty of seeing to it that your system is operated harmoniously; that the energies of its board of directors and management are directed into useful channels. I know you agree with me when I say that those of you who are elected or reelected to the board of directors owe it to yourselves and to your constituents to take this promising cooperative, which is now emerging from a long period of very real difficulty, and build it into one of the strongest and finest electric distribution systems in the entire country. I want to help you achieve this goal. Your national association exists for no other purpose than to help you. Call on us every time we can.

Watch Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the New York Daily News, in its editorial today, does not pussyfoot in pointing out who are our friends and who are our enemies.

There are so many international phonies who claim to be our friends that the name "Uncle Sam" has given way to "Uncle Sucker."

The editorial follows:

GIVE 'EM THE ICE

The conference of neutral nations wound up yesterday at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, with a communique showing just how neutral these 25 countries are not.

France was told to get out of Tunisia and Algeria, Portugal to quit Angola, and the United States to vacate its big naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba.

Nothing was said in the neutral blast about Soviet Russia's fistful of slave nations, Red China's rape of Tibet, or India's long refusal to let the people of Kashmir vote on whether to remain captives of Nehru or join Pakistan.

The conference also had the gall to name delegates to visit President Kennedy and Khrushchev and urge them to hold a summit meeting aimed at total disarmament. The bringers of this message to Mr. Kennedy are to be Presidents Sukarno of Indonesia and Modibo Keita of Mali, arriving in Washington Tuesday.

President Kennedy can hardly tell these uninvited guests not to come here. But he can make it plain to them that they are not wanted or welcome.

Why not give them the coldest reception possible? What more do we owe to bums who take our money but reserve the right to stab us in the back?

Land Reform and American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, now we have heard it all. If it is true that our Secretary of Agriculture is suggesting that we need land reform by the comment credited to him the other day, "We are selling land reform to other countries while drifting into trouble here in our own country," I hope he will take the trouble to clarify just what he meant.

"Land reform" is a phrase heard from time to time, and lately in connection with the needs in Latin America. Several years back it was used in connection with China, where it was supposed to be the answer to China's problems. I wonder today if a truly free vote was taken in China whether or not its people would overwhelmingly express a preference for its present system of "communal" living and farming to their previous system. It would be interesting to find out; and I believe the same could be said for Russia, since both countries are known to be in considerable difficulty with their agricultural economy.

The trouble we have here, of course, is too good a system of agriculture, if anything can be said to be "too good." Our difficulty, most certainly, is not because people find it impossible to settle on a farm if they choose to do so. The actual difficulty seems to be in being allowed to farm once they are settled. Our land reform took place many, many years ago when the Federal Government gave land grants to any citizen who had the intestinal fortitude and enough interest in farming or ranching to make the required effort to stake out the land he wished to possess.

So I believe if either the Secretary or the Department of Agriculture is wise, they will try to avoid any suggestion that land reform is needed in this country. Instead, they will find ways and means to reform some of the thinking which has gotten our agricultural system, admittedly one of the finest and most efficient in the world, into its present predicament.

I would like to include with my remarks a copy of the Wall Street Journal editorial of September 6, 1961, entitled "Blight Upon the Farm":

BLIGHT UPON THE FARM

Anyone who wanders about the Department of Agriculture these days is sure to hear the phrase "land reform" crop up in the conversation soon or late. Indeed, Secretary Freeman observed not long ago: "We are selling land reform to other countries while drifting into trouble here in our own country."

Well, it seems clear that what this country lacks is land reform. But what isn't clear at all is what Mr. Freeman means by this phrase he tosses about.

Land reform is usually associated with backward, feudal countries, where many are

landless because they lack the means or the opportunity to satisfy their hunger for their own piece of ground. Antiquated land-tenure systems and perpetuation of great holdings in the hands of a very few are common obstacles. In some countries, the hunger of the many has been satisfied without grave injustice to the few; landholders have been paid for what they were required to surrender.

In other countries, land reform is a catchphrase to cover robbery, or worse, by the state. In Castro's Cuba today, as in the Soviet Ukraine a generation ago, "land reform" is the regime's euphemism for forced collectivization of the soil and the debasing of the tillers to serfdom.

But wherever land reform is carried out, regardless of the circumstances, it means government redistribution of the land—the taking of one man's property and the giving of it into the hands of others.

How can anyone even consider such a scheme in a country where land is distributed and redistributed daily by the free market? Any man who pleases may go into the market, without let or hindrance by the Government, and realize his wish to own or sell land. Indeed, we are a Nation of landowners, if only of a piece of greenery in suburbia. Moreover, 97 percent of the Nation's farms, according to the Agriculture Department's own figures, are family operated units.

True, a great deal of the land is presently ill-used, and some men in Government think it is because it isn't in the "right" hands. That reasoning is familiar enough; it is of a piece with the prevailing philosophy in Washington that the Government must set its hand to running just about everything.

Yet much of the Nation's farmland is ill-used only in the sense that what's grown on it is intended not for use but for storage in the Government's overflowing warehouses. Certainly it is not the farmer who puts his hand to such useless toil. It is the Government which directs his hand that bears the blame for this foolishness.

So there is something to be said for reforming the land, and Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has said it well: "The only land reform American farmers need is greater opportunity—not more restrictions." Land reform is an excellent idea—if it reforms the main evil, namely the blight of Government controls upon the land.

Italy's Drug Dumping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I think that practically every Member of this body is aware of the deep-seated feeling that I have concerning the injustices to which the American drug industries have been subjected. In the New York Herald Tribune, dated August 8, 1961, a very excellent article appeared by Donald I. Rogers. I submit it for the RECORD so the Members may have the opportunity to read it:

ITALY'S DRUG DUMPING

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Ever since ESTES KEFAUVER, the varmint-shootin' Senator from Tennessee, began his somewhat one-sided investigation of the drug industry, the manufacturers of the compounds that make you healthy have been subjected to a form of "open season" and every bounty-hunter in and out of Washington has been taking pot shots at them.

It's refreshing, now, to learn that the U.S. Treasury Department, which is not always the most popular branch of Government, has come out forcefully in favor of decency and fair play for this American industry, having decided, counter to popular Washington thinking, that the dumping of cheap foreign drugs in the United States is contrary to the national interest, regardless of the political unpopularity of the domestic industry that is being victimized.

Thus, Treasury has moved to investigate the dumping of drugs on the U.S. market by Italian producers—drugs that have been developed and patented in the United States, but whose patents are not honored because of a law passed in Italy by Mussolini.

I was never smart enough to be a lawyer, but from my reporter's seat (it's actually a chair inherited from Horace Greeley's copy boy) this looks like a clearcut case. The Italians have been selling bulk tetracycline, a broad-spectrum antibiotic, to a large U.S. buyer at prices that are about half the bulk prices on the Italian domestic market. If that isn't dumping, then I can't tell a dump truck from a Bugatti sports racer. While only tetracycline is involved in this case, other drugs have been purchased in Europe at what may be dumping prices.

The intriguing feature of this, both legally as well as morally, is that the U.S. buyer is an agency of the U.S. Government—the Military Medical Supply Agency. Further intriguing fact: If the Treasury finds that dumping has occurred, it will report so to the tariff commission, which may then decide to hold liable either the Italian sellers or the Government purchasers. Penalties could amount to a half-million dollars.

After the hot words that have appeared in this space on the subject, I can't find fault with the MMSA for wanting to spend as little of the taxpayer's money as possible on the material it buys. I do earnestly submit, however, that the agency would have shown better judgment in regard to any other commodity or at any other time. Only in the atmosphere created by Senator KEFAUVER could this have been possible.

For the Senator has held the drug industry apparently helpless in his pillory of propaganda about high prices for so long that we can almost excuse the well-meaning soldiers and sailors for missing the subtleties of the situation. These subtleties entail more than dumping, though that's the only aspect actually illegal at the moment.

There's a moral issue. The Italian companies from whom the Government has been buying drugs are no better than the drug-racket branch of the Mafia as far as American law is concerned. Italy does not grant patent rights on drug products. Italian manufacturers are perfectly free to steal drug discoveries from other countries and turn out the drugs with lower cost labor, paying no royalties and spending nothing on research.

Since most successful drug research in recent years has been done by American drug companies, it is not surprising that tetracycline, the item purchased by MMSA was hijacked from an American patent holder by the Italians in just this way.

Fortunately, legislation has been introduced to plug the legal rathole through which our substance has been stolen. Representative RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Republican of Indiana, has sponsored a bill to make it illegal for the U.S. Government to purchase a commodity covered by a valid U.S. patent from any source other than the patent owner or the holder of manufacturing license granted by the patent owner.

If the patent system makes any sense at all, this bill deserves passage. Even Senator KEFAUVER, as a proponent of compulsory licensing, should—logically—vote for it. If American companies should be compelled to grant licenses, why shouldn't Italian companies be compelled to apply for them?

Still, you never know about Senator KEFAUVER. When the subject of Italian patent piracy came up during his hearings, he cut short the testimony because, "this committee is not going to be used as a forum to disparage the people or the scientists in a friendly allied nation."

He was not to be diverted when he was intent on disparaging American scientists and American businessmen.

Two Decades of Achievement—Congratulations Pour In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Postal Record:

TWO DECADES OF ACHIEVEMENT—CONGRATULATIONS POUR IN

During the past weeks, as the date of President W. C. Doherty's 20th anniversary at the helm of the National Association of Letter Carriers approached, congratulatory messages have been pouring into the national headquarters in Washington.

There follows a selection of excerpts from these congratulatory messages:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 1, 1961.*

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Congratulations on your 20 years as president. You certainly are under full sail and going strong. With my deep appreciation for your friendship, cooperation, and support and my best wishes for next successful 20 years in carrying the leadership for progress of our good U.S. postal workers. Count me on the team.

Congressman JIM FULTON.

R. B. Kremers, secretary-treasurer: "It is a pleasing opportunity indeed to have a small part in contributing to this portion of the Postal Record. Editor Jerome J. Keating has aptly named it "the anniversary issue" because it commemorates the completion of 20 years' activity as president, of our distinguished leader, William C. Doherty, who was elected to the exalted position September 6, 1941.

"It was my good fortune to be an officer on the platform in Los Angeles in 1941 when Bill reached the highest pinnacle within the realm of this association. I had been associated with him as an officer 5 years previous to that time and have known him for more than 30 years. Hence, I feel I have some qualification about entering something into the record at this momentous turn in evolution.

"Twenty years seems a long time, and it is a long time. Yet it can also appear to be exceedingly short. That's how these 20 years have been. All of this obviously can be attributed to 20 years brimful of activity, ambition, accomplishment and, above all, never-dying enthusiasm and zeal to promote the welfare of the brother in the blue-gray uniform.

"Further, his aims and aspirations have gone far beyond the realms of our own people. Bill has had a burning desire all his life to help the downtrodden wherever he may exist; and I am certain that he will continue just that sort of activity so long as an ounce of energy remains in that tremendous constitution of his.

"The fabulous number of achievements during his fruitful 20 years of stewardship are, of course, far too numerous to mention. Suffice it to say, however, that no opportunity has ever been passed up to improve the lot of the letter carrier. With pardonable pride letter carriers can point without equivocation or challenge to the indelible fact that the letter carriers, as an organization under the brilliant leadership of Bill, has been the bellwether organization for everything good for the letter carrier and the postal employee in general.

"I am happy to be a part of the record, as previously stated; and I am thankful for my 25 years of association as a colleague national officer of the greatest leader of Federal groups in the Nation's Capital."

James H. Rademacher, assistant secretary-treasurer: "The NALC is a great organization. William C. Doherty has made it that way.

"In other articles on the subject in this Twentieth Anniversary résumé, the attention of the membership will be called to the numerous benefits derived by the NALC since the election of Bill Doherty to the presidency in 1941. This article, therefore, will report activities other than legislative gains for the NALC and which have been beneficially adopted during the leadership of Bill Doherty.

"Although there are many words which can aptly describe the president of the NALC there are two adjectives which point out reasons for progress during the past 20 years—imagination and courage. No previous president ever shared his imagination and thoughts with the membership as the NALC's present leader has. No other president of the letter carriers has ever displayed the courage and forthright determination to build a strong organization and at the same time improve the conditions of wages and employment of the membership.

"Dissatisfied with the activity of the previous leaders of the NALC, Bill Doherty, immediately following his election, set out to change the normal, routine course of travel of the NALC. National legislators had no idea what the future held for them when the Doherty family arrived in the Nation's Capital in 1941. Little did they realize that the dynamic and energetic Doherty would eventually cause them to want to sign discharge petitions and even override a Presidential veto. Little did the legislators know in those days how the Halls of Congress would shake with the thunderous footbeat of the Nation's letter carriers embarked upon legislative campaigns. This all came true and on many occasions under Commander in Chief Doherty, Capitol Hill was made intensely aware of the NALC. This awareness has brought with it prestige, dignity, and respect.

"Aside from the admiration and respect that Bill Doherty enjoys from the Nation's legislators, there is similar recognition from top officials of other international unions as well as the leadership of U.S. postal unions. Although these same postal unions have not seen fit to answer the gallant plea of Bill Doherty to merge these organizations into one big postal union, the rank and file postal employees have expressed the hope that some day there will be one spokesman for the Nation's one-half million postal workers. Eventually through the achievement of one postal union, we could realize one big organization of Federal employees with a spokesman before Congress representing 2 million Government workers. This hope is another of Doherty's realistic approaches to progress.

"Bill Doherty's strong and keen imagination has caused him to consider the important fact of perpetuation of the NALC. He has often stated that the organization will be here long after all present members are gone. In his realization of this most important fact, Bill Doherty has sought out younger members of the organization in hopes of recognizing them in positions where they can be an asset to this strong association. Unlike some of his aged predecessors who kept the organization far distant from their ivory tower, Bill Doherty surrounds himself with those younger people whom he feels some day will guide the destinies of the NALC. At the same time he values the counsel and guidance of the senior members whose wealth of experience has provided background in many campaigns.

"Bill Doherty has brought the organization closer to the membership and at the same time has brought the membership closer to the organization. He has done this with his demands for a regionalization program which is second to none in any Federal organization and he has inaugurated a seminar program to bring the membership closer to the knowledge of their responsibilities. He has allowed the assignment of national officers to every corner of the country wherever there was a gathering of letter carriers. Through his biennial reports he makes known to each and every member the internal workings of their great organization and every official movement of the NALC is a matter of record to be read by all. Through his vision and wisdom there is no reason why the NALC should not continue to progress in the future as it has over the past 20 years. The groundwork has been laid, the membership need now only follow the program of the greatest labor leader working people have ever had serve them."

J. Stanley Lewis, assistant director, health benefits plan: "My thoughts, as they concern this issue of the Postal Record, dedicated to honoring the 20th anniversary of the election of President William C. Doherty, are varied. My service as a letter carrier started only a short time before the momentous convention in Los Angeles, Calif. in 1941 which elevated President Doherty to the position he has filled with such honor and distinction during these years.

"I heard of the years of inactivity preceding this period and of the long dry period in which postal employees marked time awaiting a new, young, vibrant and aggressive leader. Hardly had President Doherty assumed the leadership of our organization before such a long-needed want was fulfilled. Immediately a change in operational procedure became evident. Many long established customs were abolished and new methods and techniques were displayed. To paraphrase the slogan of the present Federal administration, 'The NALC began to move forward.'

"It would be redundant to try to review the achievements in the field of legislation during the leadership of President Doherty in the past 20 years. The record, written on the statute books, eloquently speaks for itself. My purpose is to express some of the progress and innovations within the organization that might not have been so well publicized and recognized.

"One of the first objectives of our great leader, and one dreamed about for many years, was to establish our own home for the executive operations of the NALC in the Nation's capital. This first was expressed in the Denver convention in 1943 and less than 8 short years after this first public expression, this dream became a reality with the dedication of our monument to the letter carriers in the blue-gray uniform at 100 Indiana Avenue NW., in Washington, D.C.

"Another objective of President Doherty was the establishment of a hospitalization program to offer protection to our membership in the same manner as the Mutual Benefit Association and the National Sick Benefit Association. This objective was achieved by action resulting from his recommendations at our 1948 convention. This subsidiary has grown from a mere committee, which had to borrow $5,000 from the general fund of the NALC in order to get started, to a huge, fraternal business concern which now pays out in excess of $18 million a year in benefits to its NALC members.

"When the Post Office Department decentralized their activities from the Washington level to regional offices in the field, President Doherty was the only leader of employee groups within the postal system who recognized the necessity of meeting this change with a regionalization program of our own. Again, as the result of his foresightedness and recommendations to our 1956 convention, a program of regionalization was adopted which has now placed field directors in charge of the NALC activities in each of the 15 regional areas established by the Post Office Department. The wisdom and effectiveness of such a move has been demonstrated many times over in the past 5 years. We now have elected field officers, responsible directly to President Doherty, safeguarding the interests of our membership in the area where the decisions are being made.

"One additional dream of President Doherty still remains unfulfilled, but each day brings it closer to fulfillment: The establishment of Nalcrest.

"This outstanding leader of ours has long felt that we, as an organization, should do even more to make the sunset years of our retirees more rewarding. This Nalcrest dream is well on its way toward realization and will be an actuality before our next convention.

"While these many projects have been underway President Doherty has always had an eye toward the future expansion and progress of our organization. He has always surrounded himself with young, forward-thinking aggressive officers to help him build for the future. The fact that when he assumed the presidency there were only three national officers resident in Washington, and that he has since seen the wisdom and necessity of expanding this to seven, is an indication of his willingness and ability to meet any situation as it arises.

"On occasion, we as members of the NALC, lose sight of the fact that there is more to this organization than sometimes is apparent on the surface. It is hard to place a tangible estimation upon the respect with which letter carriers are held in the labor movement. The fact that President Doherty was formerly a senior vice president of the AFL, and now not only is a senior vice president of the AFL–CIO, but also a powerful and respected member of its executive council, is often overlooked. The prestige gained by letter carriers through this cannot be too highly regarded. Too, in the field of the international labor movement, an area in which he is an acknowledged leader, and his membership in the PTTI, an organization devoted to combating Communist activities through the members of labor on a worldwide basis, are not sufficiently recognized.

"But above all, Bill Doherty's greatest contribution has been his unwavering devotion to the NALC under all conditions; at all times and in all circumstances."

John H. Sullivan, chairman, executive board, NALC: "Future historians undoubtedly will single out the past 20 years as the most progressive period in the annals of the NALC. The victories that will be most remembered will be those that have been achieved in the legislative battlefield.

"Among the most dramatic achievements in my memory was the defeat, in 1954, of the infamous Summerfield pay bill which was based on the equally infamous Fry report. It will be remembered that this bill would have given top-ranking supervisors as much as $5,000 a year in additional pay, and would have given some letter carriers the munificent sum of $10 more a year. Bill Doherty employed all the wisdom and courage at his command and eventually was able to overcome the pressure and power of the aggressive Postmaster General and the entire Federal administration. Anyone who lived, as I did, through the excitement of that period will carry the memory in his heart forever.

"I have selected this victory among many because recent achievements may have caused it to have dimmed in peoples' memories. In fact, the memories of too many people are inclined to grow dim. If this were not the case, every postal employee, be he postmaster, supervisor, clerk, mail handler, or special delivery messenger would be joining the letter carriers of the Nation this month in offering thanks for all that Bill Doherty has done for them. And every Federal employee outside the postal service should be giving equal thanks."

James C. Stocker, field director, St. Louis and Memphis regions: "I remember so well 20 years ago, going to my first national convention. I went on our special train from St. Louis and little did I realize that this was going to be the historic occasion which would see the election of the greatest Government-employee-organization leader of all times.

"How well I remember the opposition of the old guard both prior to and during that convention. And how well I remember how all the opposition and antagonism vanished as Bill Doherty proved himself to be the magnificent leader he is.

"I have just been reviewing the official program of that convention. Of the 21 national officers serving at the opening of the convention, only 4 remain (President Doherty, Jerry Keating, Rube Kremers, and John Sullivan). Through retirement and other causes there has been a very large turnover. I had the honor and pleasure of joining the 'official family' May 1, 1957, after having served in a semiofficial capacity since 1949 as delegate to the AFL. These experiences, under the leadership of President Doherty, have been both educational and gratifying. It is a great pleasure to serve under such a great leader. May he be around for a long time to come."

Martin F. Kalbow, president, board of trustees, MBA: "In these short 20 years I have seen the letter carriers build an eight-story building in Washington, D.C. This building houses our MBA insurance plan, national sick benefit plan, hospitalization plan, and provides office space for our resident national officers. Due to the rapid growth of our hospitalization plan, we needed more office space, so plans are now underway to build an eight-story addition to the present building. Plans are underway to build and sponsor a home for retirees in the central part of Florida, so that the retirees may have a place for rest and recreation in their declining years.

"Yes, all of these things and many others too numerous to recount have happened in the past 20 years, all through the efforts of a great leader, William C. Doherty."

John Schmidt, field director, Minneapolis region: "A sincere salute and heartiest congratulations to the fighting Irishman, William C. Doherty, upon his 20th anniversary as president of the NALC. Well do I recall his first election to national office at the Atlantic City convention in 1933 because this led to his eventual election to the presidency in 1941.

"During his 20 years as president, this unflinching, venturesome, strongminded Bill of ours created a record which has made him the recognized leader of all postal and Federal employee organizations.

"Some of the most distinguished editors in the country have proclaimed his book, 'Mailman, U.S.A.,' as the best of its kind ever written, and this has added to the prestige of every letter carrier in the country.

"His visits to Milwaukee have always caused me to marvel at his understanding and patience. His wise counsel averted quite a few conflicts, and his suggestions were always well received both by our workers and our postal officials. He has always been true to his ideals and his ideals have been always the highest."

Philip Lepper, field director, New York region: "In one score of years, the rising militancy of the NALC has dramatically and abundantly exemplified the attainable progress of civil service employees. Our association vigorously continues to push its less dramatic but more enduring fight against the whole broad spectrum of injustices perpetrated upon the individual who earns his livelihood by the sweat of his brow—20 years of a progressive fight wherein a dynamic and sterling leader made possible, at the very least, an endurable life for postal as well as other Federal employees.

"In the midst of many leaders who refused to discuss the issues publicly, although civil service employees debated them seriously among themselves, with unity of purpose and decision, the clarion and decisive voice of Bill Doherty spoke out for all.

"Bill Doherty would be the first to maintain that we have merely scratched the surface. He would also be the first to maintain that there must be a relentless drive to reach the objectives of recognition of human values; for a decent American standard of living; for absence of fear or reprisal; for an opportunity for one's dignity to be respected. In short—justice for all."

Carl J. Saxsenmeier, acting field director, San Francisco region: "Looking back over the past 20 years of tremendous achievement under the leadership of Bill Doherty I can think of innumerable reasons to be grateful. But, from a personal point of view, I shall always remember the indomitable courage he showed at the San Francisco convention in 1958. His very dear friend of many decades, Dan Sullivan, died on the eve of the opening of the convention. Despite the heavy grief which filled his heart, Bill Doherty determined not to let this interfere with the success of the convention. In fact, he vowed that the San Francisco convention would be the greatest ever, as a kind of memorial to his dear friend. Being very much on the inside during the planning and conduct of that convention I knew what courage it took for Bill Doherty to run that memorable conclave. But then, as always, he never permitted anything, even his personal grief, to interfere with the welfare of the letter carriers whom he represented.

"There was an amusing sidelight to the San Francisco convention: Invitations, as usual, had been extended to all the top political dignitaries at the State and Federal levels regardless of political affiliation. Unfortunately there were numerous regrets. The top-ranking official to accept an invitation was Edmund Pat Brown, then the attorney general of the State, and a candidate for the governorship on the Democratic ticket. He was asked to act as marshal for the parade. This caused the then Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, to fly into a rage. As a result, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission threatened President Doherty with prosecution under the Hatch Act, if he persisted in his plan to honor Pat Brown. (The Hatch Act at that time was interpreted to include any civilities extended to a practicing Democrat).

" 'Pat' Brown withdrew as marshal to save embarrassment, but Bill insisted that he address the convention.

"Naturally, the newspapers had a field day with this story. (It was later chosen as one of the 10 top stories to come out of San Francisco during that year.) The ensuing publicity was so great that it proved to be instrumental in winning the election for 'Pat' Brown."

Thomas M. Flaherty, field director, Philadelphia region: "The innumerable benefits we have received during the past 20 years have been due mainly to Bill Doherty's courage and wisdom plus his knowledge and understanding of our problems. This is proven by the headquarters building we built at 100 Indiana Avenue NW. in Washington, D.C., as a tribute to all letter carriers both living and dead. His interest is not only centered in the letter carriers of America but also in letter carriers and postal people throughout the world as evidenced by his interest and leadership in the PTTI. Last, but not least, on his everlasting devotion to the needs of our retired people in the development of plans for Nalcrest where retirees will be able to live in peace and contentment for the remaining years of their lives.

"On behalf of all the carriers whom I represent, and myself, it is our sincere prayer that God in His infinite mercy may shower William C. Doherty and his family with manna from heaven so that he may live in health and happiness for many, many years to come."

Dean E. Soverns, field director, Denver and Wichita regions: "I remember so well meeting President Bill Doherty for the first time. It was when he was inaugurated at the Los Angeles convention in 1941. I was a substitute at the time, and his kindness toward me will always be remembered.

"Then, 2 years later President Doherty came to Denver for the purpose of discussing plans for the streamlined 'austerity' wartime convention to be held here that year. His conduct of that convention, under extremely trying conditions, was a masterpiece of tact and forcefulness. (I well remember my own baptism of fire at that time, acting as master of ceremonies at the open house function on Labor Day night, and sitting between President Doherty and the then Postmaster General, Frank Walker.)

"The same combination of tact and forcefulness which marked Bill Doherty's handling of the 1943 convention, has made him over the years not only a brilliant president of the NALC but a leader respected and admired among all organized labor both in the United States and abroad.

"Branch 47 is proud to be the host for the 1962 NALC convention and we can assure President Doherty that this time it will not be an austerity convention."

A Typical Instance of Public Service by American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of our country has there been a greater need to reenunciate and rearticulate the indispensable problems of family unity and family soli-

darity. Certainly, no one can question the wisdom of spreading the gospel of bringing the family closer together in these turbulent days of a crescendo of juvenile delinquency and a very dismaying divorce rate.

Because my constituents and I are tremendously interested in family living as an integral part of the fabric of America, I want at this time to pay tribute to a project of public service being carried out by the Modess Division of Personal Products Corp., a subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson.

Five years ago, come November, the president of Personal Products, George Murphy; the vice president, J. Jay Hodupp, and, indeed, the entire management team of Modess, in answer to a crying need gave life to a nonprofit public service foundation known today as the Modess Family Life Institute.

This foundation over the past 5 years has made a major contribution to bringing the entire family closer together by explaining the problems that are daily rending it apart. It has further encouraged family homogeneity by dramatically calling attention to the attributes that spell out love, devotion, and dedication of one family member to another. The foundation has accomplished this by its magnificent public service national radio program over NBC called Family Living, 1961, which has won, in addition to eight other awards, the coveted Peabody Award. Each week great names from all walks of life join an expert to give Mr. and Mrs. America and their children a better insight into their own problems.

The results of surveys taken by the institute have found their way into national publications where they are seen by millions year after year. Educators who do the very important job of teaching our young have been furnished with much information and valuable material thanks to material furnished by MFLI. Religious leaders and sociologists alike have seen fit to applaud and to draw upon the work of this public spirited group.

Mr. Speaker, may I now add my voice and that of the people whom I represent in congratulations to Modess; Personal Products; their offspring, the foundation, and particularly to Gen. Robert Johnson, whose farsighted leadership and humanitarian interest in the good and welfare of America have made all this possible.

Poland's Problems in Current European Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, a delegation from the Polish American Congress, headed by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president, was in Washington on August 17 and 18, 1961. They were at the White House and had a conference with the President of the United States, Hon. John F. Kennedy, on August 17, 1961. They also met with the Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Rusk, on August 18, and presented the following "Memorandum of the Polish American Congress on Poland's Problems in Current European Crisis":

MEMORANDUM OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS ON POLAND'S PROBLEMS IN CURRENT EUROPEAN CRISIS

Deeply aware that in the Berlin crisis, precipitated again by the Soviet Union in an obvious implementation of the Red manifesto of December 1960, the free world is now approaching one of the most dangerous climaxes of the cold war, we respectfully submit this memorandum of the Polish American Congress, a representative body of over 7 million Americans of Polish lineage:

SUMMARY

1. The status of Berlin and even the question of German reunification cannot be taken out of the European framework of peace and stability and be solved independently. The road of European unity in freedom, and in a large measure, of American security, does not end in Berlin; it runs through Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and other capital cities of enslaved nations.

2. Strictly defensive fortitude in Berlin will not bring us victory in the cold war. We believe the time is ripe for an intensified diplomatic, economic, political propaganda, and cultural offensive against the Soviet empire. This offensive should be primarily directed toward Poland as the key nation in East Central Europe. We submit, that the first step in this direction should be an early restatement of the U.S. Government declaration, that it will not be a party to any arrangements or treaty which would directly or indirectly confirm, or prolong the unwilling subordination of the formerly sovereign European states now in bondage (Potomac Charter, June 19, 1954):

"We must never, at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our minds, recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe." (President Kennedy's statement of March 8, 1961).

3. The peoples behind the Iron Curtain in Europe are our spiritual kin and our traditional allies. Their historic ties with the West are being undermined by German revisionism, which leaves them no other alternative but the unwanted acceptance of Russian "protection."

4. Recognition by the Western Powers of the Oder-Neisse line as the final and permanent boundary between Poland and Germany would bring to an end the unrealistic demands and turmoils of German revisionists, who, perhaps unwittingly, are strengthening Russia's stranglehold over east central Europe. Half-measures on the part of Western Powers will not alleviate the fears and mistrusts generated by German revisionism.

SOVIET WEAK SPOTS

Communist propaganda, flagrantly misrepresenting and distorting ideals of freedom, independence and dignity of nations, sets forth hypocritical slogans against colonialism. It is thus trying to divert attention of the free peoples from the only remaining colonialism on earth, namely, Soviet colonialism and its brutal exploitation of subjugated nations.

The people of Poland and of other European countries now enslaved by Soviet imperialism are fully aware of this Communist sophistry.

The Poles cannot forget that Russia has exiled 1½ million of their compatriots to Siberia, two-thirds of whom perished, murdered over 14,000 of their intellectuals at Katyn, annexed half of their historic land and placed their country under Communist rule through overwhelming military force.

The Poles realize, furthermore, that Russia is attempting to force Communist doctrine upon them, reshape their national character, their historical and cultural heritage. They are fighting these encroachments with all the psychological resistance they can marshal under difficult and trying circumstances.

The Communists themselves are aware of the futility of their attempts in this direction. Khrushchev's hysterical reaction to the Captive Nations Week in the United States and Gomulka's berating of President Kennedy's statement that the Poles do not enjoy true freedom are only two instances among innumerable others of similar nature, indicating the insecure position of Communists in Poland.

The importance of Poland's resistance to communism cannot be overemphasized, for Poland, with other nations of East Central Europe, occupies a tremendously important position in the overall strategy in the cold war. Politically, Poland, as the key to East Central Europe, constitutes the weakest point in the Soviet empire.

The people of Poland, however, are beginning to show signs of frustration after 20 years of ceaseless struggle with German and Soviet occupations.

The future of the countries of East Central Europe, their eventual reintegration in the European community of nations, or their further enslavement by Soviet imperialism will be determined by the fate of Poland, due to her national heritage and geographical position.

The pro-Western attitude of Poland is undoubtedly of great importance to the free world in this global struggle with communism.

Thus, economic aid to Poland, though it must be delivered through Communist channels, will strengthen the Polish people in their resistance to communism, and will keep alive their hope of liberation and eventual return to the Western family of nations.

In addition to technical assistance and aid in the form of credits for food and machinery for consumer's goods, we believe the U.S. initiative should be directed toward educational and humanitarian undertakings, especially in the utilization of American counterpart funds in Warsaw. These should be applied to the general welfare of the country, such as health services, research centers, preservation of cultural monuments, amelioration of the Vistula, etc. Efforts of this kind would perpetuate traditional frendship and admiration of the Polish people for the United States.

The political effects of American assistance, already extended to Poland, are real and important. They will not win over or even soften the Communist hard core, which rules Poland on Russia's behalf, it is true. However, they constitute a set of factors which have already placed Poland in an exceptional situation among the satellite states. They forced the Warsaw regime to leave the door ajar toward the West, permitted tourist movement in both directions, and granted a measure of tolerance to western cultural influences which permeate the Polish atmosphere and outlook.

Furthermore, this assistance creates a serious handicap for the regime which is trying to force communization upon the Polish people. By nature individualistic, by long tradition deeply religious and linked with Latin culture, the Poles already are exerting a definite anti-Soviet influence in other subjugated countries.

GERMAN REVISIONISM

The pro-Western attitude of the Poles is being weakened and hampered by German revisionism. This is a strong statement, but it will stand scrutiny.

It is a matter of record that the West German Government openly appropriated 2 million German marks for expanded revisionist propaganda in the United States and Great Britain. This sum is in addition to millions of German marks in other funds, hidden in budgets of various ministries and departments of the Bonn Government and earmarked for anti-Polish activities.

According to the Advertiser's Weekly of London, for example, the West German Embassy in the United States alone, will spend $820,000 for publicity this year.

The nature of this publicity is revealed by the Bulletin, a weekly survey of German affairs, issued by the press and information office of the German Federal Government in Bonn and distributed in the United States by the West German Embassy.

Volume 9, No. 19 of the Bulletin states that: "After World War II, when the Soviet Union annexed part of eastern Poland, Moscow told the Polish authorities that as compensation they might have the Oder-Neisse in the West."

It acknowledges the fact that these territories were placed under Polish administration but conveniently omits one important detail, namely, that they were not considered as part of the occupation zones. It states further, that "Communist authorities expelled the German population and have been treating the administered land as part of Poland."

Were the statesmen of the United States, Great Britain, and France part of the Communist administration, when they agreed on orderly and humane removal of the German population from former German territory, as the Potsdam Protocol plainly states?

Volume 9, No. 22 states that "the occupation powers declared that the status of the Oder-Neisse area would be kept open pending a German peace treaty." Keeping a status open and stating unequivocably that only final delimitation of the boundary line is left until the conclusion of the peace treaty are two quite different concepts.

Even cursory reading of the Potsdam agreement will prove that the Bonn government is sowing ill will in East Central Europe by erroneous interpretation of the letter and intent of this document.

In addition to these official pronouncements, countless other "hate Poland" and "return prewar boundaries" articles, handbills, booklets, press releases can be listed. They are obviously sanctioned by the Bonn government.

This can only be interpreted as a German attempt to destroy European unity even before its conception. This unity, to become a fact, must include all European nations reared in Latin culture, including those, now engulfed in the Communist tide.

Freedom has a corollary. Its corollary is, above all, responsibility toward nations that lost freedom through no fault of their own.

West Germany's absurd equivocation is jeopardising a sane approach to European unity and forcing Poland and other East European nations into a desperate dependence on Russia.

Spreading revisionist propaganda, threatening the nations of Eastern Europe with "correction," or even "return" to German borders not only of 1937, but to the borders before World War I, is playing directly into Russian hands. The people of Eastern Europe are justifiably fearful of renewed German aggression and genocidal Drang Nach Osten.

No answer to the German revisionistic clamor directed especially against Poland, is needed for persons versed in central East European history and in World War II developments which led to the Potsdam agreement.

We wish to stress one point most emphatically, however; namely, that the most important outcome of these developments was the establishment of the Oder-Neisse line and the dissolution of the Prussian state.

Thus, a new order in east central Europe has been created. It is, for the time being, only a geographical correction of past wrongs. It has, however, within itself, a real potential for the stability of future Europe which will, some day, emerge from the present division.

The Potsdam papers, recently published by the State Department, disclose that Churchill, Truman, and later Attlee voiced one question regarding the Oder-Neisse boundary:

"Will the Poles be able to repopulate, redevelop and fully utilize these war devastated areas?"

This was, indeed, a crucial question. It would be relevant today, had Poland not been able to rebuild, develop, without outside help, and repopulate the Oder-Neisse territories and successfully integrate them with the rest of the State.

Without these accomplishments of the Poles, any change in the political map of Germany, undertaken in the interest of European peace, security, and stability, would have been in vain.

Failure of the Poles in this specific challenge would only lead to permanent Soviet occupation and colonization of the Oder-Neisse lands in the same manner in which Lithuania and other Baltic States have been occupied and colonized by Russia.

This would have far-reaching and catastrophic consequences for Europe and for Germany itself.

It is an irreversible fact of history that over 8 million Poles resettled the western provinces along the Oder-Neisse line; half of this population has already been born there.

Resettlement and economic development of these territories on a truly gigantic scale prove conclusively that they are vital for the existence of Poland and controvert all doubts which Messrs Churchill, Attlee, and Truman might have had in this matter.

On the other hand, Germany, bearing the guilt of the world holocaust has neither economic nor historical right to demand revision of its eastern boundary and claim lands east of the Oder-Neisse line. In case of reunification, it will encounter great difficulties in repopulation of its eastern half now occupied by the Soviets. On the present Polish western territories, the reunified Germany would be compelled to use Polish slave labor force again.

Recognition of the Oder-Neisse line is necessary for bolstering the faith of Poland and Czechoslovakia in the American Nation and for liberation of these nations from Russian blackmail.

The recognition of this boundary is unavoidable in the current phase of European crisis.

It should be accomplished as an act of friendship and acknowledgement of vital interest of the Polish nation, and not as an act of yielding to the pressures of Khrushchev.

European public opinion is well prepared for this recognition, as attested by President de Gaulle's declaration, debates in the House of Commons, and numerous statements in other European countries and at international gatherings, etc.

President de Gaulle reached the heart of the problem, when he declared that France is ready to join hands with Germany in the cultivation of a common European garden, but only on the condition that Germany give up quarrels and feuds as to the garden's boundaries.

For the Polish American Congress:

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Polish National Alliance.

ADELE LAGODZINSKA,
Vice President, Polish American Congress, President, Polish Women's Alliance.

THADDEUS V. ADESKO,
Vice President, Polish American Congress, Judge, Cook County Court, Ill.

Rev. VALERIAN S. KARCZ,
General Secretary, Polish American Congress, Supreme Chaplain, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

STANLEY P. TURKIEWICZ,
Treasurer, Polish American Congress, President, Polish Roman Catholic Union.

ROMAN PUCINSKI,
Director, Polish American Congress, President, Illinois Division, Polish American Congress.

F. LeVerne Winne, an Outstanding Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the power of the press and the great force for good that newspaper reporters and editors can do in this free democratic system of ours. In recent years the growth of the great metropolitan dailies has perhaps reduced to some extent the attention that is paid to newspapers published on a weekly basis in smaller local communities, and yet in many spots in this country these papers have a tremendous influence, and the men and women who are responsible for their operation hold a very special place in the communities in which they live.

The other day in historic Cherry Valley, N.Y., in Otsego County in my district of New York State, there passed away suddenly a man who has carved for himself a real niche not only in his own community but in the whole State, as an understanding, forthright, and fearless newspaper editor, one who served as a power for good in the community and who made his newspaper a real medium of communication with his friends and neighbors. He was F. LeVere Winne, former editor, publisher, and owner of the Cherry Valley News. Shortly before his death, Mr. Winne stepped down from the active newspaper business and had sold his newspaper to a new owner and editor. Something of the impact which Mr. Winne had on his community can be judged from the article which appeared in the Cherry Valley News following his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to the magnificent job which LeVere Winne did, and I am pleased to have been able to count him as a close personal friend. The people of Cherry Valley and Otsego County will miss him greatly, but I know they are also glad that he lived among them and served

so well in the great responsibility which his newspaper placed upon him.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Cherry Valley News of August 24, 1961:

F. LeVere Winne, Editor Publisher, Owner, of the Cherry Valley News, Dies Suddenly

With very little in the way of warning, angina pectoris took the life of Frank LeVere Winne in the earliest hour of the morning Thursday, August 17, at the age of 65, he having been born in this village on June 12, 1896; the third son of Frank Alonzo and Cora Finehout Winne.

While still in school, he became a printer's devil in the shop of the old Cherry Valley Gazette. Quitting school in Cherry Valley High before graduation, he became a linotype operator in the plant of the above newspaper, where he remained until its sale to the D. M. Green Co. With the change of ownership, he found employment with the General Electric Co. for a short period, transferring to the Maqua Co., a subsidiary of GE as a linotype operator. Limitations in the use of the linotype there caused him to change to the Schenectady Gazette. From Schenectady he moved to Albany to be with the Brandow Printing Co., in his chosen field. But, the call to newspaper work, and not commercial printing, took him to the plant of the Knickerbocker Press, until 1926, when he purchased the plant of the Cherry Valley Gazette which he operated as a commercial printing establishment until he founded the Cherry Valley News, the first issue of which bore the date of October 13, 1932. He sold the business and plant, in April of this year to the present publishers.

But, perhaps, his greatest love, outside his home and family, was history—more particularly, the history of Cherry Valley. For many years, he did a lot of research work in this connection, and had in preparation a new history. Unfortunately, his untimely death prevented its completion. It would have enlarged upon the former history, and corrected some generally accepted beliefs.

Though never elected to public office, he had held three appointive ones—treasurer of the cooperative board of educational services, clerk of the board of education of Cherry Valley Central School, and, beginning just this spring, treasurer of the same school board for which he had previously been clerk. His appointment to the last came in May of this year. Both the town board and the village board made him historian for the town and village some years back.

As the original promoter, and a charter member of the Cherry Valley Rotary Club he had put his talent to work.

Added to the above, he was an elder of the First Presbyterian Church; his place will have to be filled as the president of the Cherry Valley Memorial Library, secretary, and also curator of the museum of the local historical society—a project he had envisioned, and for which he had collected a large number of historical items, including some valuable manuscripts. He also broadcast, both live and by tape, area news for both rural radio, and the General Electric stations WGY and WRGB.

He was a member of Cherry Valley Lodge No. 334, F. & A.M., and a past master of that order.

Mr. Winne's first marriage was to Virginia Frary Wasson, for some years a teacher of much more than average ability in the local school. She brought to his home a son, Valentine Wasson, also a teacher of great popularity and competence in Canajoharie. She bore him a son, Maj. F. Levere Winne, U.S. Army Reserve, now heading the quality control section of the electronic division of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. in Pittburgh. He lives in Blairsville, Pa., with his wife and three children.

The wedding of the late editor and Gertrude Nagelschmidt, born in Pittsfield, Mass., was solemnized August 2, 1934. To them were born three daughters: Mrs. Claude W. Biava, of Kingston, Ontario, Canada; Joyce, a student at Oneonta State Teachers College, and Gail, at home here.

Two brothers; Harry A., a retired vice president of General Electric, and now a consultant for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, living in Schenectady, and Lewis, now calling Rhinebeck his home, who enjoys an enviable reputation as a hotel manager, are still living.

There are also two sisters; Mrs. R. Peter Keese, of Cobleskill, and Mrs. Donald W. Dodd, Daytona Beach, as well as five grandchildren, and a number of nieces and nephews.

The Masonic funeral ritual was said at the Ottman Funeral Home, Saturday night. The Reverend Robert W. Meyer, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, said the services at that house of worship and at the grave in the Cherry Valley Cemetery.

Evolution of the National Peace Agency: Prototype for the U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President's legislation to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security has been cosponsored by 71 Congressmen and has been reported unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One reason for this broad support is the obvious need to fill the huge gap in our disarmament research. Another is the fact that this bill has received a great deal of thought over the last 2 years by a number of eminent Americans.

The National Peace Agency bill, which was the prototype for the President's new bill was introduced in the last Congress. It received broad cosponsorship both last year and this year. Many of the cosponsors of the Peace Agency were in contact with the White House during the drafting of the Disarmament Agency legislation. Satisfied that the new bill meets all of the objectives of the early proposal, they have enthusiastically transferred their support to the President's legislation.

I think that many Members may be interested in the evolution of a concept giving rise to these bills. The following notes describe the story of the Peace Agency's development from the summer of 1959 and show how the thinking of a number of eminent Americans went into the original proposal:

Notes on the Evolution of the Democratic Advisory Council Proposal—A National Peace Agency

1. The idea for an independent Government agency to promote peace is an outgrowth of the work of the Pasadena group (led by Trevor Gardner and Harrison Brown, members of the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology of the Democratic Advisory Council). This group was set up at the first meeting of the committee (Apr. 26, 1959) to examine problems of science and technology in relation to U.S. military and foreign policy.

2. The Pasadena group had a series of luncheon meetings during the summer and, as Trevor Gardner recalls, it was at an August meeting that he and Harrison Brown came up with the concept of an agency which would have the responsibility for developing instruments and techniques for implementing international inspection of arms limitations agreements.

3. At the second committee meeting (Oct. 11, 1959) Harrison Brown presented the idea as item 16c:

"The establishment of national and international agencies which will engage in and sponsor research aimed at solving the technological problems involved in monitoring and inspecting disarmament agreements."

Dr. Pollard, chairman of the committee, called the proposal "very important and certainly novel" and found that the committee was unanimous in its endorsement of the concept.

4. The proposal for a "Peace Laboratory" became the lead item in a press conference held by the committee at noon, October 11, 1959. Drs. Harold C. Urey and Polykarp Kusch, members of the committee, endorsed the proposal and it received widespread, favorable publicity including front page stories in such newspapers as the New York Times.

5. Trevor Gardner, assisted by Drs. Richard Roberts and McClure presented the proposal before a meeting of the Advisory Committee on Foreign Policy (November 16, 1959). Mr. Gardner spent some 2 weeks working on this first draft of the Peace Agency proposal.

6. Trevor Gardner subsequently revised the first draft of the Peace Agency proposal, incorporating suggestions and modifications advanced by members of the Foreign Policy Committee. This November 23, 1959, revision was then circulated to members of the Science and Technology Committee for approval. A time limit was set for December 1, 1959, in order that the proposal could be presented to the Advisory Council on December 5, 1959.

7. By December 1, 1959, 12 members of the committee had aproved the proposal, some suggesting modifications, and ultimately all members approved it. Additional suggestions from the Director of the Council, Charles Tyroler 2d, from the Foreign Policy and Administrative Committees of the Council were incorporated in a final revision made on December 1–2 by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp. Additional emphasis was placed upon the aid to underdeveloped countries.

8. The National Peace Agency proposal was brought up as the first item of business before the advisory council at 9:50 a.m., on Saturday, December 5, 1959 (Jansen Suite, Waldorf Astoria, New York City). Trevor Gardner made a brief presentation explaining the purpose and scope of the proposal. He stressed the scattered and inadequate activities of the U.S. effort in arms limitations inspection and urged that the National Peace Agency be created to "fill an organization hole." Gardner expanded on the value of a Laboratory for Peace which could undertake extensive research and development along the lines of the 17 items listed in the proposal. He estimated that the new agency would probably follow a budgetary curve similar to that of the U.S. Space Agency.

9. President Truman commented that he had read the paper and hat it was a "good statement." Senator Kennedy telephoned the evening before that he could not be present at the morning session but that he ap-

proved the statement and wished to be listed as a signer. Governor Harriman suggested that emphasis be placed upon technical aid to underdeveloped countries. After additional discussion, led by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and suggested changes, Governor Lehman moved that the proposal be adopted and President Truman seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously carried.

19. Trevor Gardner and Dr. Lapp made the suggested changes in the proposal and the final version was given to the press at noon that day for release to a.m. newspapers (Sunday, Dec. 6, 1959) as a policy statement of the Democratic advisory council. Mr. Paul M. Butler and Trevor Gardner held a press conference at the Waldorf Astoria at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday, December 5, 1959.

11. The policy statement received extensive front-page coverage in the Sunday newspapers and on TV-radio networks.

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dr. Ernest C. Pollard, chairman: chairman, Biophysics Department, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Dr. Richard B. Roberts, vice chairman: Department of Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution, 5241 Broad Branch Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Samuel K. Allison: professor of physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Harrison Brown: professor of geochemistry, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

Dr. James F. Crow: professor of medical genetics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Dr. Leslie C. Dunn: professor of zoology, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Louis B. Flexner: chairman, Department of Anatomy, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Trevor Gardner: chairman and president, Hycon Manufacturing Co., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. H. Bentley Glass: professor of biology, the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. David L. Hill: consulting physicist, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch: professor of physics, Columbia Radiation Laboratory, Columbia, University, 538 West 120th Street, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Fritz Lipmann: the Rockefeller Institute, New York, N.Y.

Dr. F. T. McClure: chairman, research center, Applied Physics Laboratory, the Johns Hopkins University, Silver Spring, Md.

Dr. John S. Toll: chairman, Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Dr. Harold C. Urey: Institute of Technology and Engineering, University of California, La Jolla, Calif.

ETV Students in South Carolina Scored Tops in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., September 4, 1961:

ETV STUDENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA SCORED TOPS IN NATION

South Carolina pupils taking elementary algebra over educational television scored in the top 20 percent in the Nation this year, R. Lynn Kalmbach, general manager of the South Carolina ETV Center here announced today.

Achievement levels of the South Carolina pupils were measured by a nationwide test.

Of the South Carolina pupils taking the test, 83 percent scored above the National average, with only 17 percent failing to match the National average, Kalmbach said.

Some 50 South Carolina high schools took elementary algebra over ETV in the first year it was offered on a statewide basis.

"Growth of pupils under ETV during the past school year is most encouraging," Kalmbach said.

"We have found by analyzing the results of nationwide published tests that South Carolina pupils under ETV were found to equal or exceed the National average by the end of the year," Kalmback said.

"In geometry, the National average made on the cooperative plane geometry test, published by the educational testing service in Princeton, N.J., was 54.1. The May average for South Carolina ETV pupils was 54.27.

"In algebra, the national average was 52.9 while the South Carolina average was 60.77.

"This compares favorably with the average made by the Educational Records Bureau schools, a group of private schools in the East whose population is made up of pupils who have gone through a selective admissions process," he added.

"As a matter of fact," Kalmbach said, "I'm concerned about this year's high scores. They are higher than we have a right to expect."

"We know there were a number of eighth-graders in this group and we know they made very high scores. Therefore, some of the gain must be attributed to selective techniques," he said.

For the most part, individual schools offered the algebra course to ninth graders.

Kalmbach added, however, that projects in Hagerstown, Md., and Atlanta, Ga., have experienced similar pupil achievement gains under ETV.

"Further analysis of the test data reinforces our belief that the contribution made by the classroom teacher in cooperation with the studio teacher cannot be underestimated," he said. Where the studio teacher and classroom teacher formed a working team, worthwhile gains in pupil achievement were noted. Where doubt or lack of coordination was evidenced lesser gains appeared to be the rule.

One of the interesting aspects of the results is the achievement of pupils in rural areas. There is a strong indication that despite previous beliefs that they would score low on achievement such is not the case.

"It is our hope at the ETV center to devise methods and procedures to reinforce this 'team teaching' operation," Kalmbach said. "Nationwide results with ETV indicate this to be an important area."

Kalmbach said that student progress has to be viewed in terms of "what we know pupils have done in the past." He said he regretted that no more information on pupil progress in South Carolina was available.

When published test material is available, he said, the ETV center has urged that all participating schools use this material in evaluating growth of pupils learning over ETV.

The tests were made by the individual schools on a voluntary basis, Kalmbach said. "We had a high percentage of volunteers," he added.

The test data was assembled by an expert who also compiles test results for the State department of education.

A Retort to Clergymen Who Question the Veracity of "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have received from a constituent of mine, Kenneth P. Gow, a letter which he directed to the editor of the Whittier Daily News, a newspaper published in Whittier, Calif., in response to a statement printed in that paper which questions the veracity of the film "Operation Abolition." The statement was signed by 29 clergymen. Mr. Gow's letter carefully refutes the false assertions of the clergymen. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Gow's letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Gentlemen: In a paid statement published in the Whittier Daily News on May 20, 1961, you affirmed your faith in democracy, in the Christian Church, in the National Council of Churches, and reaffirmed your faith in Jesus Christ. Under the heading of democracy, you opposed communism and under the heading of the National Council of Churches, you listed a report which you stated dealt in part with Red China and you paraphrased the summary statement of reference one regarding the showing of the film "Operation Abolition."

The two of you with whom I have discussed the subject had not seen reference one prior to May 20, and I sincerely believe they are Christian men worthy of their place in the community. In all due fairness, your statement did not explicitly endorse the National Council of Churches' stand on these items but neither did it indicate disapproval—and your names do appear to lend credulity to the NCC stand.

It is my opinion, that had each of you compared the full text of reference one with the contents of J. Edgar Hoover's report, reference two, dealing with the May 13, 1960, San Francisco riots, that the majority of you would have insisted on a less questionable example.

Reference 1 quotes a selected portion of reference 2 and states that Hoover did not term certain meetings in 1959 as subversive but fails to mention what Hoover said two sentences later about the same groups in 1960. Neither does it mention Hoover's statement as to organizational meetings in preparation for the riots. For instance that Mickey Lima at a May 6, 1960, meeting stated that campus activity had begun to pay dividends. It contains comments at variance with Hoover's statement on the actual start of the riot as well as a number of half-truths. For example, on page 14 it gives the names of eight who are accused by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of being Communists but fails to indicate Hoover evaluation of the same individuals. On page 17 it mentions considerable police brutality, being at variance with both references 2 and 3, but fails to mention pages 9 and 10 of Hoover's report describing Archie Brown's plan to emphasize "police brutality" as a rallying cry.

As to how the Communists view the booklet can be seen from reference 4 which repeats a letter attributed to Frank Wilkanson (now in a Federal prison camp) recommending the use of the booklet for propaganda purposes.

The reason for my attaching such great significance to "Operation Abolition of the HCUA," stems from recent history. Consider the role of legislative investigative bodies in removing Alger Hiss from an executive position in the State Department, consider also the disasters of Yalta and the Korean war, consider the implications of the Cuban debacle, consider the fact that the FBI, despite the integrity of its investigations, is powerless to act against someone with high executive office protection (reference 5 points out other FBI difficulties and fallacies of communism); and it becomes apparent that the legislative investigative bodies serve a vital function in preserving our liberties. The only apparent background reason for all the agitation against the HCUA is that the HCUA might hurt some Communist plan.

As to the National Council of Churches, none of the defenses which I have seen or heard have explained the half truths or worse in reference 1; rather the defenses have appeared to me to claim righteous indignation as Skousen illustrates, reference 6, regarding Gregory Silvermaster, or to repeat the more insidious assaults on anti-Communists described in reference 7, or sometimes blame theological conflict—which could in some cases be Communist planned dissension. Neither am I inclined to believe that there is a large number of Communists in the clergy but rather that most of the trouble could originate with a few skilled propagandists in key positions. Furthermore the key positions might not be as expected—for instance the emphasis on infiltrating book reviews reported in reference 7. On the other hand, I can understand how a person who lost a relative in Korea or who is gravely concerned about the Communist threat, could feel ill toward the 29 of you. It should be noted that Hoover in reference 8 points out that the Communist Party within the United States is now an exceedingly dangerous hard core organization filled with optimism and that we can expect an ever increasing agitation and propaganda activity.

My purpose in writing this letter is not to endorse any attack on the church but rather to encourage a better understanding of the Communist assault on the United States. With this in mind, I am enclosing a number of the references along with other material. I am also offering to pay for my ministers ticket ($10 is the half price to teachers, students, and ministers) to the Southern California school of anticommunism to be given at the Sports Arena, August 28 through September 1, 1961. If you favor such schools please go for additional information; if you must criticize such schools, please go so that your criticism can reflect personal factual experience.

It is my suggestion that we take Hoover's suggestion in "Masters of Deceit," reference 9, and learn to better understand Communist goals and methods. The books by Skousen, reference 6, Schwartz, reference 10, and Hoover are often recommended—are they in your church library? Even reference 1 is educational—after the other material has been assimilated.

Very truly yours,

KEN GOW.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Reference 1: "Operation Abolition," some facts and some comments, published by the National Council of Churches of Christ, Feb. 22, 1961. Editor and names of personnel supporting the document not listed.

Reference 2: Hoover, J. Edgar, "Communist Target—Youth," 1960.

Reference 3: ROUSSELOT, JOHN H., "Operation Abolition," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 21, 1961.

Reference 4: BRUCE, DONALD C., "National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1961.

Reference 5: BRIDGES, STYLES, "Report of American Bar Association Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 22, 1958.

Reference 6: Skousen, W. Cleon, "The Naked Communist," the Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 8th edition 1961.

Reference 7: "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1960.

Reference 8: Hoover, J. Edgar, "Communist Party, U.S.A.," reprinted from "Ave Maria," Apr. 30, 1960.

Reference 9: Hoover, J. Edgar, "Masters of Deceit," published by Pocket Books, Inc., New York, 5th printing Feb. 1961.

Reference 10: Schwarz, Dr. Fred, "You Can Trust the Communists," Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., fifth printing Feb. 1961.

The Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, two sisters of the President, Mrs. Eunice Shriver and Mrs. Jeanne Smith, this week took the time to go over the construction site of a 300-bed children's hospital and pediatric research center which is expected to be completed in 1964. This will be the only American hospital in a Communist-dominated country, and it is planned to be one of the best pediatric institutions in Europe.

Along with a number of my colleagues I have done everything I could to aid the brilliant American architect, Wladislaw Biernacki-Poray in the various stages of this great project.

I include as part of my remarks an article from the New York Times on this project, as well as a resolution adopted recently by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware and by the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress:

[From the New York Times, September 6, 1961.]

U.S.-BACKED CLINIC BEGUN IN CRACOW—HOSPITAL PROJECT CONCEIVED BY POLISH-BORN ARCHITECT

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

WARSAW, September 5.—Two vacationing sisters of President Kennedy—Mrs. Eunice Shriver and Mrs. Jeanne Smith—made a small detour today in their sight-seeing tour of Cracow, in southern Poland, and paused to stare at a hole in the ground.

The hole, in a wooded hilltop on the edge of Poland's ancient capital, represents the dream of a Polish-born architect who made his fortune in the United States.

It marks the start of construction of a 300-bed children's hospital and pediatric research center. It is expected to be, when finished in 1964, the only American hospital in a Communist country and one of the best pediatric institutions in Europe.

This will be the creation of Wladislaw O. Biernacki-Poray, who heads his own architectural firm in New York, with indispensable assistance from the U.S. Government.

While sitting up with his seriously ill daughter one night in April 1958, Mr. Biernacki-Poray conceived the idea of doing something for the benefit of children and also of his native Poland. The next morning he decided the project should be a children's hospital in Poland.

At first Mr. Biernacki-Poray planned to finance the project himself. But the four-story circular hospital that he designed, flanked by laboratories, teaching and surgical structures, exceeded even his ample means.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray heard about the United States accumulation of "frozen" zlotys in Warsaw, now in excess of 8 billion ($320 million at the tourist exchange rate). This bank account was built up from the sale of $360 million worth of surplus agricultural products to Poland since 1957.

The Battle Act, as enacted in 1950 to impose sharp restrictions on U.S. aid to Communist countries, forbade using funds from the zloty account to build anything for Polish use.

BATTLE ACT AMENDED

With the help of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Mr. Biernacki-Poray persuaded Congress to amend the act to authorize zloty expenditures on his hospital.

Then he flew to Poland to fight the battle of bureaucracy in Warsaw. In the last 3 years he has acquired more Polish visas in his passport than any other American.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray has negotiated with four Polish Government ministries over issues ranging from the amount of equipment he would provide—$1,500,000—to his insistence that a Roman Catholic chapel be built in the hospital.

Yesterday the soft-spoken architect, who lives at 195 Christopher Street, Montclair, received assurance that his 1958 inspiration would become a reality.

As president of the American Research Hospital for Children, Inc., Mr. Biernacki-Poray signed a construction agreement with the Ministry of Health.

WORK STARTED AT OWN RISK

In fact, his bulldozers were already at work at the site. In his urgency to get started, the architect assumed personal responsibility 6 weeks ago for all interim construction costs should project eventually collapse.

Mr. Biernacki-Poray will be in Cracow next month for the formal ground-breaking, probably in the company of Senator HUMPHREY and Representative ZABLOCKI.

He has taken an apartment in Warsaw and plans to spend much of the next 3 years nursing his 146 million zloty ($6 million) hospital into being.

The timetable calls for the admission of the first patient in the spring of 1964. Judging from Mr. Biernacki-Poray's performance so far, the prospects are good that the schedule will be met.

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of Polish descent gathered at a meeting commemorating the 22d anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War, commenced by the joint attack of Germany and Soviet Russia on Poland, sponsored by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in State of Delaware and by the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress, held on Sunday afternoon, September 3, 1961, at the Pulaski Legion of Delaware Hall, Wilmington, Del., have approved and adopted the following resolution.

Whereas in the struggle with communism, assuming presently on strength, and in changes and transitions passing through the world, the role of the strong Europe in alliance with the United States is brought into prominence; and

Whereas the Europe is not able to fulfill its role while being in its residual state after the Second World War and without bringing to order its political structure; and

Whereas any political move in relation to Europe should result from the long-term planning directed into construction of the politically stable Europe; and

Whereas besides the liberation of the Eastern and central Europe, one of the Europeans problems ready for solution is that of the Polish-German boundary on the Oder-Neisse Rivers, unrecognized by the Western Powers, although their governments issued their agreement to its effect 16 years ago at the postwar preliminaries; and

Whereas the regained by Poland territories east from the Oder-Neisse line were meanwhile fervently absorbed by the Polish nation, which in spite of the proverbially bad Communist management, forced upon it, populated them with 8 million Poles, after the war destruction rebuilt, in a great effort, creating from them a basic factor of the Polish economy. This integration became an irreversible process; and

Whereas the lack of the official recognition of this fact by the governments of the Western Powers results in—

(a) giving an effective propaganda tool for Soviet Russia which pretends to be the protector of this boundary;

(b) deepening distrust in the intentions of the West, which spreads not only in Poland but in all countries which underwent the German occupation in the Second World War and are now dominated by Soviet Russia;

(c) encouraging the German revisionism which, through official association with it of the Bonn Government in recent time, became a new political factor in Europe;

(d) dangerous frictions in NATO alliance: Therefore be it

Resolved, To appeal to the leading political authorities in the United States for the official recognition of the Polish-German frontier on the Oder-Neisse Rivers and entering by this fact on the road of constructive long-range policy for the political stabilization of Europe and bringing the world conditions to order; be it further

Resolved, That the liberation of Poland with countries of the Eastern and Central Europe should become a main item on the agenda of the U.S. policy if it has to change its defensive policy for offensive in relation to the Communist world. It cannot be motivated only by tactical reasons against Soviet Russia but from upholding these ideals with which this country associated itself in its history and the defense of which is connected with its future; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, U.S. Senators, and Representative from Delaware.

CASIMIR CHETKOWSKI,
President of the Polish Council.
ADAM J. ROSIAK,

Power Fight Hurts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Oregonian, published in Portland, Oreg., recently published an editorial which makes cogent comment on the continuing fight over the proposal to utilize waste steam at Hanford to produce needed electric energy. It should be noted that the Oregonian describes itself as an independent Republican newspaper.

The editorial follows:

POWER FIGHT HURTS

If the House of Representatives accepts the cut-in-half, compromise item for the Hanford dual purpose reactor it will be only because the private utility and coal lobbies have counted the risks and withdrawn their opposition. In view of their record, to date, we do not expect this to happen.

The original proposal, approved by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration and consultant groups as feasible and logical, was to put into effect the earlier intent of Congress. The sum of $25 million previously was appropriated to make the new plutonium reactor at Hanford convertible to production of electricity by use of heat now wasted. The item rejected by the House this session, but approved by the Senate, would have appropriated $95 million to install two turbine generators capable of producing 800,000 kilowatts or more of electricity at a cost lower than hydro.

The conferees now have voted, 6 to 2, to cut the appropriation to $58 million, to install one generator instead of two, and to permit generation of about 400,000 kilowatts to serve only the needs of the Hanford project which now drains about that much from the Federal Columbia River power system. None of this power, it is proposed, would be sold commercially through BPA. But the 350,000 or more kilowatts of hydropower now used by Hanford would be available to Bonneville buyers at the $17.50 wholesale rate.

BPA urgently needs any long-range supply of firm power it can get for industries and for private utilities which wish to buy power without the 5-year recapture clause which obtains in the Bonneville Project Act. It is ridiculous that the House will not allow full development of this wasted energy at a cost cheaper than could be obtained from a new hydro project. But the utilities and the coal companies and United Mine Workers Union, who are allied in opposition, are not likely to alter their stand.

Coal industry spokesmen make the absurd statement that Hanford should not even be allowed to supply its own electrical needs from wasted heat because this would free BPA power to compete elsewhere with private power and private fuels. How silly can these lobbyists get? Private industries and private utilities would be the principal customers for a new supply of power. Publicly owned distribution agencies—PUD's, municipalities, REA's, etc.—are getting all they need, now, under the BPA preference clause. One of the best arguments for Hanford power generation is that it would relieve BPA of the obligation to supply this AEC installation and make additional power available for the job-creating industries of the Pacific Northwest.

In taking this unreasonable stand against what we believe to be its best interests, as well as against the public interest, the private utility lobby is risking retaliation on several fronts. The pro-Hanford group in House and Senate, for example, is angry enough to stop Federal contribution of millions of dollars to nuclear reactor projects sponsored by private utilities. It could also put a stop to the Federal practice of buying plutonium byproducts from such reactors. Such actions would be harmful to nuclear power research. But they have been threatened.

The private utility lobby, on another front, is making a strong bid to have Congress authorize construction and use of private transmission lines to interconnect the Federal multiple-purpose projects of the upper Colorado system. It is our view that the Government should build its own backbone transmission lines in the five-State Colorado project, as it did in the Northwest, rather than to turn over its power at the bus bars to the private utilities and pay a "wheeling" charge. One suspects that the utilities' victory in the House on the Hanford reactor would end any hope they may have of changing congressional intention to build transmission lines for the Colorado project. The Senate will see to that.

The major battlefront in Congress on the public power-private power issue has been opened by the private utilities. The Hanford reactor was not a sound issue, and it is our apprehension that it will come back to haunt them, and to harm the Northwest.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZ.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations on your House Resolution No. 211. We are all for it.

Sincerely,

BILL and SADA O'BRIEN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *August 19, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read about your introducing House Resolution 211 which would provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Thank you for introducing this resolution. Surely, a measure that would give real hope to the enslaved people deserves speedy passage.

Very truly yours,

HELEN D. KAY.

THE NORTH CAROLINA
SOCIETY FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN
AND ADULTS, INC.,
Chapel Hill, N.C., August 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Would you be so kind as to send me a copy, or if I might ask two copies, of the House Resolution 211? This would be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT PACE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I like House Resolution 211 very much. This country needs more such resolutions and men like yourself.

Yours truly,

A. DOUGLAS MAYES, Jr.

ANKARA, TURKEY, *August 21, 1961.*

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal in the House of Representatives, on the establishment of a Special Captive Nations Committee of 10 members, pleased us, the people of the Azerbaijan, to the utmost. The proposal is another most important step after the Captive Nations Week which was declared primarily by President Eisenhower in 1959, then repeated in 1960, approbated and continued by President J. F. Kennedy. As the Captive Nations Week, which is in the aim of keeping alive the love of liberty and the hope of freedom of the nations put under the yoke of Soviet Communist rule, and to make known to them the sympathy of the Americans, we also believe that the committee, searching the means for their freedom and continuously working on their claim, will also put into deed many profitable services and show the light of hope to the people of our nation, who met the greatest misfortune of being behind the Iron Curtain, and to other nations. The Captive Nations Committee and similar positive deeds, will at the same time shake the foundations of the legend frightening the free world that Soviet and Chinese communistic regimes are unresistible and impossible to defeat. So in this way will give the possibility to take a deep breath of security to the many small and big nations of the free world.

The Azerbaijan—which led a free and independent life in its whole history—after continuous and bloody battles of 25 years was put under the reign of Czarist Russia in 1828. On the 28th of May 1918, it had once more won its independence, and constituted in the Southern Caucasia a republic resembling the Swiss democracy and led this happy and bright life for 2 years. The national Republic of Azerbaijan which was recognized "de facto" by many small and large governments made great progress in science and art, and reached to a high level. As a section of the great Turkish world Azerbaijan made such fame in folk music, national classical music, national opera, operetta and ballet, that because of these qualities was called the "Hungaria of the East." So, for a land of such a high level of civilization, what a pity that it lost its freedom by the unlucky invasion of Red imperialism. Since that time the Azerbaijanians never ceased struggling. The people never accepted invasion. With revolts reaching a hundred in number inside the country they caused many a loss for Communist imperialism.

Although the Bolshevik administration declared Azerbaijan as one of the so-called independent 15 federal states, after signing the boundaries as it desired, Moscow ruled the country by agent appointed in Moscow, in spite of the will of the people of Azerbaijan. With petroleum on the first hand, it plundered all kinds of riches of the country and the Communists tried to destroy all moral values, including freedom of thought and religious beliefs and the national language and alphabet. The invader is systematically trying to annihilate the native people of the land by massive executions and exiles, and in place of those people places other elements brought down from the north. In a word, the most cruel and unjust sample of colonialism has been applied in the administration of our motherland for 41 years.

The Azerbaijanians at other places continued their fight bravely and with resolution, by means of international conferences, publication of books, magazines, and newspapers, and as it has been seen in the Second World War by forming voluntary troops and fighting by guns against the Red Army. Now the people of the Azerbaijan outside their motherland have gathered under the flag of the "National Azerbaijan Union of Freedom." This organization has established its branches in Turkey, Persia, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, France, United States of America, and many South American states.

As you see, Mr. FLOOD, the Azerbaijani, as one of the nations that you have enumerated, believe in the ideals of freedom. And as our short explanation shows, this people is worthy of your efforts and of the whole free world's interest, love, respect, and help.

We are very sure that, by the help of God, the ideal of an independent and free democracy of Azerbaijan will be realized someday in the near future. With its nationalistic and humanistic conduct, the hard work of its people, its high level of culture and songs and melodies, it will be heard all over the world. You will see, Mr. FLOOD, that it will win the appreciation of everyone and will never forget the honorable people, like yourself, who have served for its ideal in the days of slavery.

We heartily congratulate and thank you, and support the proposal with very sincere hopes of success.

With our best regard,

MUSTAFA VEKILOGU,
President of National Azerbaijanian Union of Freedom, Ex-Minister of Interior of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *August 19, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We wish to express our hearty approval of your House Resolution 211, for the great and needful purpose of encouraging the brave people of the captive nations. We feel the committee would be of invaluable service to those nations and their brothers who are in our beloved United States.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. F. L. EICH.

BUENO PARK, CALIF., *August 21, 1961.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would like to congratulate you on House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. The committee could do a much-needed service to awaken American citizens as to the truly miserable conditions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

It would also provide a spark of hope within the hearts of the enslaved peoples. Our greatest weapon against communism is the mass of slaves whom Khrushchev must suppress with treachery and tyranny. And yet the leftwing element and Soviet apologists in the press and radio and television throw a smokescreen to confuse and pacify the American people, until you have people telling you "it wouldn't be so bad to live under communism."

Through your committee, public testimony could be made by people who have escaped from communism and who know whereof they speak. This would be a powerful weapon to combat the "Russian lullaby" sung so loudly in our country by dupes who have never lived under communism or who have taken the "fixed" guided tour through one of the Iron Curtain countries.

Sincerely,

JOYCE DOBIAS.

DEDHAM, MASS., *August 26, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your bill, House Resolution 211, reference to Committee on Captive Nations, is excellent. You have my wholehearted approval. Good luck and God bless you.

Mrs. L. M. MURRAY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *August 21, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Your bill, House Resolution 211, which would establish a Committee on Captive Nations is a perfectly marvelous idea. The actions of our Government have sometimes indicated that we are forgetting just how and why the peoples of these countries are in their present predicament, and I think your committee would be an effective reminder to both the Communists and our Government, especially the State Department, that they are under foreign domination. I am thinking particularly of our foreign aid policy when I say this—it is absolutely beyond me how those who urge it can find justification for giving our good American dollars to puppet regimes of the Communists.

Very truly yours,

JOAN GRIGGS
Mrs. Arthur E. Griggs.

ROLLING HILLS, CALIF., *August 21, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We are in full agreement with your House Resolution 211, and have written to our Congressman, CECIL R. KING, expressing our approval and requested that he support your resolution to immediately form a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Respectfully,

HARLEY J. LUSE, Jr.
Mrs. ILENE F. LUSE.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Death of Theodore K. Quinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to pay my humble respects to Theodore K. Quinn who died August 28. The history of Mr. Quinn's remarkable achievements is well summarized in the account of his passing contained in the New York Times, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

As a business man and advertising executive Mr. Quinn was outstanding. By 1927, at the age of only 34, he had become the head of General Electric's new refrigerator department. Three years later General Electric refrigerators were grossing $50 million annually. But for reasons described in his later books, he left his position as vice president of GE in 1936. The reasons for his resignation are suggested in the titles of some of those books: "I Quit Monster Business," "Giant Business—Threat to Democracy," and "Giant Corporations: Challenge to Freedom."

It was Mr. Quinn's conviction that the steady growth of small enterprising firms into big firms, then into giant corporations and then into what he termed "monster businesses" not only deprived the consumer of lower prices through competition but created far-reaching changes in our social and political institutions and indeed posed a menace to our democratic way of life. He brought to bear on the concentration issue an intimate knowledge of the workings and operations of huge firms which only those who have been among their management hierarchy can possibly obtain. Repeatedly in his books and appearances before congressional committees he stated that, far from being necessitated by the requirements of efficiency, giant corporations tend to stultify the creative process. Inventions, he held, must ultimately and always stem from the individual. It was his view that the climate within the giant corporation, with its emphasis on minor improvements and product engineering, is not conducive to the freedom of inquiry which alone is the ultimate source of the important breakthroughs of scientific research.

The revelations before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, particularly those involving the recent price-fixing activities of high officials of General Electric, amply justify the apprehension which Mr. Quinn long felt concerning the impact of huge enterprises on moral and ethical standards. That top management of a huge corporation such as GE might exhibit a cynical contempt for the antitrust laws, as was certainly revealed in our hearings, was almost predictable from Mr. Quinn's analysis of the corroding effect of the possession of great power on the individual's sense of right and wrong.

Above all else Theodore K. Quinn was a true American in the real sense of the word. He possessed to a remarkable degree the finest features of our American heritage. He was an ardent individualist and a strong believer in individual enterprise which he felt was being choked off by the growth of corporate collectivism, just as in the days of our Founding Fathers it was being throttled by Great Britain. He also shared the American heritage of having the courage of one's convictions. How many persons would resign the position as vice president of a giant corporation, with all of its emoluments, the prestige and the power, because of a personal conviction that what was good for the company was bad for the country. Also like the framers of our Constitution, he was, though largely self-educated, a very literate man, well-read in economics, philosophy, law and many other subjects. His was the inquiring and creative mind—the very opposite of the "conforming" mind which is all too prevalent today. The country and indeed the entire free world has suffered a tragic loss in the passing of this honorable, courageous and creative citizen whose life was a testament to the ideals for which this country was founded.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEODORE K. QUINN DIES AT 68; TURNED AGAINST BIG BUSINESS—FORMER GE AID ASSAILED INDUSTRIAL GIANTISM—WROTE SEVERAL BOOKS

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., August 28.—Theodore Kinget Quinn, a former big businessman who had become a leading critic of big business, died of a heart attack Saturday at the home of his son-in-law, Dr. Arthur Gramse. He was 68 years old.

Before retiring last year as president of the Monitor Equipment Corp. and the T. K. Quinn Co., Mr. Quinn had been a prolific writer, a promoter of General Electric's refrigerator, and assiduous reader of philosophy and economics, an auditor, accountant and onetime factory hand at $7 a week.

Never a man to veil his views, he even was outspoken in his book titles—e.g., "I Quit Monster Business," "Giant Business: Threat to Democracy," "Giant Corporations: Challenge to Freedom," "Liberty, Employment and No More Wars."

Born in New York City, he was the son of Patrick Quinn, a founder of the Knights of Labor. But while a career in labor relations tempted him, he considered it "inexcusable that anyone should be as poor as we were."

He was determined to make good, and it was this determination, along with a business talent, that marked his rise from the $7 job at the National Lamp Works at Cleveland to the head of General Electric's new refrigerator department in 1927, when he was only 34 years old.

By 1930, GE's refrigerators were grossing $50 million annually.

WENT TO NIGHT SCHOOL

Mr. Quinn was never idle. When he was a stock clerk at the National Lamp Works, he reportedly posed as a stenographer—although he had no facility with stenography; then, by quickly learning it, he obtained a higher paying job in the sales department.

At night, he attended college, and graduated from law school in Cleveland following his undergraduate days at Baldwin-Wallace College.

In 1936, Mr. Quinn left General Electric to become president of the Maxon, Inc., New York advertising agency and affiliate of Maxon, Inc., of Detroit. The reason for his leaving his vice president's position at GE, it was said, was a desire for more "independence and more leisure."

Fortune magazine said Mr. Quinn recalled that his father had quoted Robert Burns on wanting money "not for to hide it in a hedge, nor for a train attendant, but for the glorious privilege of being independent."

In 1942–43, with more time on his hands, Mr. Quinn released his book "Liberty Employment and No More Wars," in which he stated:

"No purely manmade system is so sacred as to be blindly held unchanging in the face of wholly unnecessary need and want. Each of us is 'his brother's keeper.'"

In the same year, as director general of the production drive of the War Production Board, he charged that loafing on the job, slowdowns, and general indifference "actually exist in too many instances in Detroit war plants," a view that did little to make him friends.

In 1944 Mr. Quinn and a number of independent appliance dealers formed the Monitor Equipment Corp. and he was president until 1960.

In 1955, appearing before a Senate monopoly subcommittee, he called for Federal curbs on the "sheer size and power" of such companies as General Motors.

Mr. Quinn declared that "General Motors is entirely too big—it unwittingly threatens the very existence of countless good companies and eventually our own free American institutions."

To curb industrial giantism, he proposed a graduated system of Federal taxation that would penalize corporations with net worth of $100 million or more. Steel, automobile, and other industries requiring larger capital might be allowed as much as $300 million in net worth, he suggested.

ASSAILED "HOGGING"

In 1959 he again attacked big companies: "In times of shortage the big companies hog the available raw materials. They did so during the last steel shortage, as the record reveals, and forced thousands of good, small companies into bankruptcy."

He also testified on monopoly investigations before the Senate, and was a member of the advisory committee of the President's Economic Report in 1955.

Still to be published of his books is "Unconscious Public Enemies—an Interpretation of the Industrial Revolution."

Mr. Quinn who lived in Barnstable, Mass., and Largo, Fla., was a member of Sigma Kappa Phi and the Cloud Club.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Adeline Mary Smith Quinn; a son, Theodore Kinget, Jr., of St. Petersburg, Fla.; a daughter, Mrs. Jean Sherman Gramse; and five grandchildren.

"Boy Wonders Why His Dad Can't Pay All Those Taxes," by Lisa Larson Turner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert the following feature article in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise newspaper of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., of Thursday, June 29, 1961. The writer of this article, Lisa Larson Turner, is recognized as a very analytical yet understanding feature writer. I am pleased to have the opportunity and privilege of including this feature in today's RECORD:

BOY WONDERS WHY HIS DAD CAN'T PAY ALL THOSE TAXES

(By Lisa Larson Turner)

"Why should I have to pay income taxes? I'll only be working for 3 months. It's not fair."

These were the yells of a 16-year-old boy who landed his first real job, and when querying his dad about how much he'd actually get to bring home found out.

"You're working; did you think I would pay your taxes?" his dad asked.

"You can afford to pay them. You make more than I do," the 16-year-old argued.

"No; I can't afford to pay your taxes.

"Your working will put me in a higher bracket and you should pay your share."

"WHAT DO I GET?"

"What do we have taxes for anyway. What do I get out of it?"

Right here is where the father launched into the explanation.

"Taxes pay our Navy, our Army, our Air Force to protect us, and you, too.

"Taxes pay President Kennedy, the Senators, the Congressmen, and others who guide the destinies of our country and Government.

"Each man who lives here, works here, pays taxes here."

"Who's our Senator? Is he any good? Who is our Congressman now? Is he any good? Do we really need so much money to run our Government?"

SEES IMPORTANCE

All these questions gushed out like water from a broken fire hydrant.

All of a sudden, city, State and National Government were important.

How it operated, and how much it cost to operate and where countrymen could cut down so he, a 16-year-old, could keep more of his first pay became of paramount importance.

This is a true story.

Perhaps if you are a parent you disagree with this father's thinking. Perhaps you feel father should pick up the boy's taxes.

Why? What would the boy learn?

WILL BE STUNNED

Thousands of youngsters like this one, will go out on to their first jobs next week. They'll see their first paycheck and be stunned by the deductions.

What they can learn from this depends on how his parents handle the situation. What they tell him, what they do about it.

This boy learned a valuable lesson. With only 3 days left of school, he started attacking history and civics books with a vengeance, not for a grade, but to honestly learn, and try to find out what he could do and should do.

What he was getting for his tax dollar, and who was getting it.

A BETTER WAY

The father was wise. He knew his child. He's built dreams around this boy, about a better, cleaner world.

If other parents act as wisely, maybe the youth of the country will find a way better than today's way.

To write this I am proud.

I am the wife of the wise father and the mother of the tax-paying boy.

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Its Role in Financing Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the growing importance to our domestic economy of increasing our exports, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent speech on the role of the Export-Import Bank in financing foreign trade by Hon. James Smith Bush, a director of the Export-Import Bank, and a brother of our distinguished Senate colleague from Connecticut.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON—ITS ROLE IN FINANCING FOREIGN TRADE

(Address delivered Sept. 7, 1961, by the Honorable James Smith Bush, Director of Export-Import Bank, before the Milwaukee World Trade Club)

I am highly honored and most gratified to visit my birthplace, Milwaukee, and to have the opportunity to discuss foreign trade with its business leaders.

My father, Samuel Prescott Bush, lived in Milwaukee during the Gay Nineties, when he was superintendent of motor power of the Chicago-Milwaukee-St. Paul Railroad. As a matter of fact, he was testing out a new locomotive on a run from St. Paul to Milwaukee when I was born here April 11, 1901. He had heard about my imminent arrival and it is said that he made "the run that made Milwaukee famous."

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was created on February 12, 1934, to facilitate trade between the United States and Russia. An immediate and substantial increase in trade between the two nations was expected to follow the U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union in late 1933. Soon after the creation of the bank, difficulties arose in the discussion of the settlement of debts owing by Russia to the U.S. Government and U.S. citizens. Consideration of the settlement of such debts was one of the subjects of agreement involved in the recognition. In March 1934, the Board of Directors of Eximbank adopted a resolution stating that the Bank would not enter into any transactions with respect to trade between the United States and the Soviet Union prior to the submission by the Russians of an acceptable debt settlement. As evidence of good faith, all the resources of the Bank were reserved for over a year for the anticipated trade with Russia.

At the same time or shortly thereafter, the U.S. Government was seeking a solution to a request by the Government of Cuba for a loan to finance the purchase of silver and the minting thereof into Cuban pesos. The proposed transaction was considered by the Cuban Government as the only practical means of meeting a serious budgetary deficit that had resulted in the nonpayment of Cuban civil servants, and also as a means of instituting a program of useful public works. Accordingly, on March 12, 1934, the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C., was organized. The statement of its legal purposes and powers was identical to that of the already existing Export-Import Bank of Washington, but it was announced that the Second Bank would use its facilities to finance trade between the United States and Cuba.

The first business transacted by either Bank was a loan by the Second Bank in favor of the Republic of Cuba in the amount of $4 million to finance the purchase of silver bullion and its coinage at the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia into 10 million pesos. Four more such credits were extended to Cuba between 1934 and 1938.

The Russian debt negotiations failed, and consequently, the original Bank had no business. Finally, in 1935, the two Banks were merged and the original Bank, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, was authorized to extend its activities to finance trade with all countries except Russia. All of the original loans to Cuba to purchase silver bullion and to coin it were repaid promptly.

In retrospect, it is interesting to recall that the sole original purposes of Eximbank were to finance foreign trade with Russia and with Cuba.

Since those early days, Eximbank has come a long way. It has authorized over $12 billion in loans, of which some $6 billion are outstanding or committed today. In fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, Eximbank's business took the following form:

	Number	Amount
Exporter credits (1 to 5 years)	421	$49,000,000
Aircraft credits (usually 7 years)	18	94,000,000
Project loans (6 to 20 years)	75	1,100,000,000
Total loans	514	1,243,000,000

In addition, we issued 273 guarantee contracts covering U.S. exports of some $170 million.

You might wonder where all this money went or will go and what purposes it will serve. A brief rundown is as follows:

Brazil, $193 million, of which $25 million was to help finance the purchase of U.S. jet aircraft. The balance will be used to pay U.S. exporters for a multitude of goods and equipment.

Japan, $110 million, of which $60 million will be used to purchase U.S. cotton, $16 million to help purchase U.S. jet aircraft, and the balance for a wide assortment of

U.S. machine tools, machinery and equipment.

Chile, $120 million to purchase U.S. equipment, machinery, and related services for iron ore mines, thermal power units, and railways.

Venezuela, $100 million to pay U.S. exporters for a wide assortment of U.S. commodities and machinery and to purchase more U.S. equipment for small- and medium-sized industrial concerns and businesses throughout Venezuela.

India, $81 million to buy paper mill machinery and hundreds of other pieces of equipment, including jet aircraft from U.S. manufacturers.

Philippines, $77 million for steel mill and airport equipment and a host of other U.S. products.

Argentina, $66 million to import highway equipment, steel mill machinery, machine tools, and other capital goods from the United States to stimulate the Argentine economy, and, incidentally, to stimulate our own economy.

Colombia, $63 million to purchase U.S. aircraft, hospital equipment, agricultural and highway equipment, and many other items of U.S. origin.

Spain, $58 million to help finance the importation of steel mill, tinning mill and thermal power equipment from the United States.

Yugoslavia, $50 million to purchase from U.S. exporters a wide assortment of U.S. goods and machinery.

The foregoing credits, totaling $918 million, represent the major portion of Eximbank's authorizations in the 12 months ended this past June 30.

Please note carefully that these are authorizations and not actual disbursements. Sometimes it will be 2, 3, or even 5 years from date of authorization before a large loan is finally completely disbursed. This is because it takes a long time to build a new steelmill, dam, iron ore mine, and the like.

Actually, in fiscal 1961, Eximbank disbursed $526 million on loans and collected $528 million in principal and interest. Thus, we collected $2 million more from foreign borrowers than we disbursed. This is interesting from the standpoint of the U.S. international balance of payments. Our collections of $528 million helped the U.S. balance of payments to this extent. Our disbursements of $526 million were mainly placed to the credit of foreign buyers in U.S. commercial banks, which, in turn, paid U.S. manufacturers and exporters for the goods and services. Thus, the dollars themselves never left the United States only the goods and services that were financed. Obviously, our balance of payments is not hurt when the dollars remain in the United States.

I have referred frequently to assistance granted foreign buyers to purchase U.S. aircraft. By far the largest dollar amount was for jets, such as Boeing 707's and 720's, Douglas DC–8's, and Convair 880's. However, several smaller airplane manufacturers were assisted by Eximbank, notably one in Osceola, Wis., Champion Aircraft. Small aircraft are purchased for cropdusting, flying clubs which young people join to learn how to fly, and for executive purposes, such as in Argentina where ranchers have to cover thousands of acres to supervise their agricultural operations.

Some of the least publicized and most important of Eximbank's activities are the lines of credit that are extended to industrial banks in foreign countries or to foreign governments and their agencies, which utilize these funds for the purchase of U.S. equipment for resale to small- and medium-sized industrial and business concerns throughout their economies. Three years ago, Eximbank authorized a line to the Government of India of $150 million, and another $50 million a few months ago. To date, some $84 million has been disbursed against the first line and has already resulted in orders being placed with over 400 separate U.S. suppliers. It is important to note that U.S. exporters are paid cash on delivery when they make sales under these lines.

Early in 1961, a line of $25 million was granted to the Industrial Bank of Japan, in consortium with 12 Japanese banks. This credit was used to purchase a wide variety of U.S. equipment, although the largest percentage was for machine tools. Some 100 U.S. suppliers have already received orders under this line.

Similar credits have been made in Spain, Argentina, and Chile. The borrower, such as the Industrial Bank of Japan, or Argentina, is permitted to use his discretion in making small and medium-sized loans throughout his country to help finance the importation of U.S. goods. However, when the borrower makes a loan of $100,000 or more to a single buyer, the transaction must receive the prior approval of Eximbank I would say that it is a fair statement that well over 1,000 U.S. concerns have benefited directly from these lines of credit referred to above. These figures do not include subcontrators, who, of course, also benefit. Eximbank has documentation of the fact that over 3,000 U.S. suppliers, including subcontractors, received orders as a result of two loans that it made, one for a copper mine in Peru, and one for an aircraft credit to Brazil. I tell you all of this because few Americans, including the U.S. beneficiaries of these credits, realize to what extent Eximbank has helped the exporters of this country by the extension of these lines of credit.

Eximbank, of which I am one of the five full-time Directors, has done a great deal of business with manufacturers and exporters in the State of Wisconsin. This has ranged from issuing political risk guarantees on short-term transactions, to medium-term exporter credits and guarantees, and finally, to long-term project financing abroad from which the industry of your State has received orders on a cash payment basis. I am glad to say that your commercial banks have begun to participate with Eximbank in medium-term exporter credits, and we are hopeful that this happy relationship will increase greatly in years to come.

Eximbank will shortly announce new plans under which American exporters will be afforded insurance and financing facilities at least equal to those offered by any other free nation in the world. A large group of private casualty insurance companies is proposing to form an association which will issue a single comprehensive insurance policy to cover American exporters on their shipments to all parts of the world. This insurance would cover transactions that are sold on terms up to 5 years. Eximbank proposes to join with this association by assuming a portion of the credit or commercial risks involved and assuming practically all of the political risks covered by the policy. The latter risks include inconvertibility, export-import restrictions, war, hostilities, civil war, expropriation, and other causes beyond the control of the exporter or the buyer arising from events occurring outside of the United States. However, it does not, as an ordinary rule, cover devaluation.

These policies will be issued to the exporter near his place of business by his insurance agent or broker, thus making it unnecessary for him to negotiate directly with Eximbank in Washington. I cannot tell you tonight what the premiums will be on these insurance policies. However, it should not be long before the private companies complete a rate schedule and announce it publicly. It is my understanding that rates will vary from one foreign area to another and will be based on figures compiled from studies on credit losses suffered by exporters over recent years.

In addition to these insurance policies to be issued by this association of casualty companies, there will be a new plan under which an exporter can handle many of his transactions through his commercial bank. Under this plan the exporter, the commercial bank and Eximbank would each carry a portion of the risks involved.

Although Eximbank's expanded facilities to exporters through their commercial banks will not be publicly announced or become official for a week or 10 days, it is hoped that the guarantees under this proposed program will be most attractive to both the exporters and the commercial banks. In a general way, I will say that this plan, if and when adopted officially, will reach out into the "grassroots" of the United States and make facilities available to moderate sized exporters and banks which heretofore have not found it attractive to engage in foreign trade or the financing thereof. It is our hope to make it so attractive to commercial banks that they will not be able to withstand the temptation.

By now, it must be obvious to you that Eximbank's objective is to repose the responsibility of financing foreign trade in private hands to the greatest possible extent, only helping out where the private bankers and insurance people can't do the business. Actually, Eximbank will become more of a guarantor and a reinsurer, with the money coming from private sources. This, of course, will assist the Federal budget and give private capital the opportunity to finance the exports of this country, just as private capital does in all other major exporter nations of the free world.

The Board of Directors of Eximbank, I am very glad to say, believes that private businessmen and bankers are fully capable of handling our foreign commerce and we are looking forward to the day when all of the financing and insuring of U.S. exports will be done by private institutions, with the Export-Import Bank acting as a backstop only when necessary.

The backbone of any organization like ours is, of course, the staff, which is divided into four principal divisions; namely, economics, loans, engineering, and legal. Somewhere between 50 and 100 loan or guarantee applications are passed upon by the Board each week. This necessitates considerable study, in view of the fact that Eximbank has extended credits in some 69 countries around the world.

Eximbank's lending authority has gradually been increased by Congress over the years and today is $7 billion. This is represented by $1 billion of capital stock held by the U.S. Treasury, and a borrowing authority of $6 billion. At the present time, Eximbank has approximately $1 billion uncommitted lending authority, and it looks as though this figure will diminish rapidly between now and the end of the current fiscal year. This is because exports are increasing, and especially because U.S. exporters are being called upon to extend terms to their foreign customers. The competition from manufacturers and exporters in Western Europe and Japan is increasing rapidly, and these countries have begun to offer attractive terms to their foreign customers. It behooves all of us to watch this trend closely so that we will not let the United States become outmatched by its foreign competition, but, at the same time, keep its terms on a basis that is consistent with sound business principles.

Exmibank is required by statute to have "reasonable assurance of repayment" before extending a credit or loan, and is also required "not to compete with private capital," rather. to assist it. Thus, Eximbank does not

want to extend a 3 or 5 year credit on a transaction when the pattern in the private international market has been for 1 year 2 years. Manufacturers in Wisconsin can be of great assistance to Eximbank in keeping us informed as to financing terms and patterns that may develop in your dealings in various parts of the world.

The United States should be exporting at least $5 billion more in goods and services against dollar repayment in order to maintain a healthy balance of international payments. The drain on our gold and dollar reserves of over $10 billion in the past 3 years cannot continue without serious injury to this country's economy. The sound way to correct this imbalance is to sell more goods abroad against dollar payment in cash or in notes repayable quarterly or semiannually in good, sound dollars. The U.S. Department of Commerce has developed a splendid program for export expansion, particularly with respect to opportunities that will exist for sales to foreign markets. The Department has an active field office near you in Chicago, which can be of great assistance to you. They have field offices in 32 other cities to assist U.S. exporters.

Exporters should bear in mind the increasing activities of the World Bank, the new Inter-American Development Bank, and the new AID agency which will combine the lending functions of the Development Loan Fund, the International Cooperation Administration, and the State Department. The World Bank's and the Inter-American Bank's projects will, of course, be subject to international bidding for the equipment and supplies. However, some portion of the new AID agency's loans will undoubtedly be tied to U.S. purchases and should offer U.S. exporters good opportunities for sales.

Eximbank will continue to increase its loans and guarantees in support of American exporters and close contact should be kept with us so that you will know just where we are extending lines of credit or making development loans. After all, each of you, as a taxpayer, is a stockholder in Eximbank and, as such, you have the right to know what we are doing and to benefit from our operations.

In closing, I will report to you, our stockholders, that in fiscal year 1961, Eximbank had a gross income of over $138 million. Our operating expenses were $2.5 million, and our interest paid to the U.S. Treasury on borrowings was roughly $43 million. We charged off one loan of $700,000. This left $92.5 million from which we paid $30 million in dividends to the U.S. Treasury. The remaining $62.5 million was added to reserve which, as of July 31, 1961, stood at roughly $685 million.

It is our intention to continue to operate on a sound and conservative basis. It is also our intention to leave no stone unturned to carry out President Kennedy's directive that United States exporters receive from Eximbank financing and guarantee facilities that will be at least equal to those offered to exporters by any other free nation of the world. My fellow directors join me in making this solemn pledge to you.

Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the conservation of our resources is a subject of profound implication for our Nation. It is of the greatest importance that all of our remaining resources be efficiently utilized to prevent their haphazard depletion, and pollution, as well as the loss of their aesthetic and economic value.

In this regard, an editorial published in the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News of August 19 appropriately expresses the need for proper planning and utilization of our resources and the effective continuing contribution of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station at New Brunswick, in this field. The editorial should help to kindle awareness of this basic need and the type of action required to alleviate the problem. These comments are of special interest considering the tremendous population overflow of our urban centers to the suburbs which has been so vividly emphasized by the latest census and which necessitates effective measures which must be taken now to preserve land for park and general recreational purposes and to plan orderly communities rather than becoming victim to sporadic overflow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Trying to Save Our Resources," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRYING TO SAVE OUR RESOURCES

To effectively meet the needs of people in New Jersey, the Agriculture Experiment Station must change in accordance with changing needs of the State, Dr. Ordway Starnes, associate director, told a gathering of editors and legislators the other day.

"New and improved products and the practices developed at the station return to citizen-stockholders every year more than all the funds invested in this program since 1880 when it started," Starnes said.

Shortly after the turn of the century the station gained recognition as a publicly-supported research organization to which people might turn for solutions to such problems as those associated with mosquitoes, flies, ticks, and other pests of importance to human health. Then came problems associated with water supply, waste treatment, and disposal, and, more recently, problems in the conservation of such natural resources as air, water, land, and forest.

It was interesting to learn that in 1960 New Jersey harvested four more crop acres than 30 years ago although with nearly 33,000 miles of highway, railroad and 1¾ million homes and other structures, our 8,700 square miles of land are rapidly becoming a nonrenewable resource.

"We have in excess of a million acres of undeveloped land, much of it with great agricultural potential," Stearns said, "but every acre of that land must be efficiently utilized for the orderly development of our State in the centuries ahead."

New Jersey's scientists have found that our air is far from free and that contaminants in our urban area are producing problems of growing importance. As to our forests, they raise this question: Can the 43 percent of New Jersey's land which is forested be saved, not so much from the ax as from the bulldozer, and can we utilize these forests as a multiple use resource?

In brief, New Jersey's most important natural resources of air, water, and forest are being abused to the extent that either they are becoming exhausted or their usefulness is being impaired through quality deterioration.

Talents at the station are endeavoring to reverse such conditions through practical research so as to provide the best aesthetic and economic benefits to New Jersey.

The future of the Agricultural Experiment Station in any State is interwoven with the future of the State. Because the New Jersey Experiment Station serves a larger segment of the community today more effectively than ever before, we know it will continue to do so in the future.

An Opportunity Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts of remarks prepared for delivery by Arthur M. Richardson, president of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, Inc., at the summer meeting of the association held in Jamestown, N.Y., Saturday, August 26:

AN OPPORTUNITY CORPS

As Republicans we recognize that the free enterprise system is the fountainhead of our way of life. It cradles the energy, the imagination of the people of our Nation and from it springs forth ideals and materials that give us not only a high standard of living but a philosophy of life that is the goal of all free nations of the world.

Recently an idea was proposed in a letter to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING that embodies the very soul of our national beliefs. It was suggested that we have a Peace Corps in reverse. The program would be as follows:

1. A company would bring a number of able young men or women from an undeveloped nation into its plant for training in a technical field. The company would see that the trainees are properly housed and supervised.

2. Upon completion of the training the young people would be returned to their country to practice their trade.

3. The American Company would supply them with the machinery necesary for manufacture. When the plant is established and profitable, the cost of the original machinery will be repaid.

The idea is basically simple and American to the core. What better way to win the minds of the new nations of the world. Let their future leadership grow up in the crucible of democracy—the free American economy. Let them work shoulder to shoulder with American workers. Let them take back to their country the techniques of successful management. Let them see for themselves the meaning of our great Nation.

The cost is a mere fraction of the millions that will be poured into a Peace Corps, that at its best will send thousands of semi-trained young people into areas to explain matters that they do not fully understand themselves. What is even more important, the principles of our economic life will be taught our foreign visitors by men who actually participate in our working system and not by young men and women who, regardless of seniority, have little more than theoretical knowledge of their subject.

We have long since discovered that the successful programs undertaken by our peo-

ple are motivated by individual action with Government participating only in the areas of absolute necessity. The tax relief granted to the participating industries will be a stimulant to world trade and not a dole paid from the pockets of the American worker.

The materialization for this program should come from young Americans who have a long-term stake in the economic and political direction of the young citizens of other nations. This is a direct challenge to world communism for it states clearly that Americans believe their economic system can best serve the underdeveloped nations of the world. That Americans are willing to train and equip industrious young men and women to improve the standard of living of their nations from within and without strings attached. That Americans recognizing the fundamental self-respect sought by all peoples of the world, require that repayment be made for services rendered out of the profits of successful free enterprise.

We do not need a Peace Corps but rather an "Opportunity Corps" that will offer hope to the newly emerging nations of the world.

Why I Am Proud To Be an American, by Dann Harter, President, Bellflower Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your distinguished self and my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the text of an article which appeared in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., on Thursday, August 3, 1961.

I respectfully submit the text written by Donn Harter, the distinguished president of the Bellflower Rotary Club which is the first of a series of articles written by members of the Bellflower Rotary Club for the purpose of accentuating positive faith in our country. The article is as follows:

WHY I AM PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Donn Harter)

Have a coke, a hotdog disguised in mustard, or munch popcorn while enjoying the sports-minded fanatic pastime of a Dodger game. These are symbols of an energetic, hardworking, leisure-loving people. The spirit that survives, win or lose, is the motivating factor behind a nation of free enterprise that has developed a capitalistic system unequaled in world history.

The opportunities of an expanding, exploring and developing young America that beckoned to the aggressive with a promise for the future; built a foundation of pioneering spirit and prosperity that stands today as the stronghold against communism.

Critics condemn our way of life as being too loose and our morals as becoming decadent, yet with the coming of Brigette, Dick Tracy, the "Untouchables," rising delinquency, more taxes, creeping socialism, and an upward spiral of living costs; we have more libraries, schools, larger attendance than ever in colleges, more material conveniences, increased leisure time, and a growth in technocracy that has opened a complete new era of opportunity.

It is a marvel when you trace the 331-year history of our country and see what has been accomplished. We have developed our own unique problems, solved some and aggravated others, produced an industrial and agriculture capacity unequaled, and fought to victory through two terrible wars, and lest we forget, we accomplished this through a deep dedication to the American way of life, its pitfalls and privileges, but yet the best we know for you and me.

A warm (if not sometimes soft) hearted people accustomed to frenzied activity at work or play and all the time in search of a challenge.

It appears that we have met our challenges well, for now we represent the leadership against a world of Red influence. The freedom of worship, political criticism, business opportunity, and democratic selection that are embodied in our Constitution guarantees each of us an opportunity of being proud Americans.

If Khrushchev is trying to slander us by calling us capitalists, then he has failed. For I am proud to be a part of the capitalistic system, the same system my father helped nurture, that I shall certainly further and fight for that my children may enjoy and participate in.

This is why I am proud to be an American.

Slovak Contributions to New England's Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on July 13, 14, and 15, 1961, the Slovak Catholic Sokol a fraternal and gymnastic organization held its national gymnastic and athletic meet, known as Slet, in the city of Bridgeport, Conn. The 800 gymnasts and athletes, all Americans of Slovak descent of second and third generations, stayed at the Fairfield University for their competition under competent leaders of this organization, which was founded on July 4, 1905, in Passaic, N.J., and has over 52,000 members in 11 States. The city of Bridgeport, and the State of Connecticut hold a large number of its membership.

During the 3-day event many new records were established by gymnasts and athletes in the organization. On Friday evening a picturesque parade was held in old Slovak section, with many floats and bands, including a float, which depicted the oldest Christian church of St. Emeram, built in Nitra by Slovak ruler Pribina in A.D. 830. U.S. Army Col. C. Benjamin Chapla was grand marshal of the parade.

This gymnastic and athletic meet created great interest and both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe beamed it to Czechoslovakia in general and Slovakia in particular. The Bridgeport Post published an article entitled "Slovak History Gives Details of Many Contributions to New England's Cultural, Religious Activities," by John C. Sciranka, Slovak author from Passaic, N.J., and I am happy to introduce a portion of Mr. Sciranka's report into the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport Post, July 13, 1961]

SLOVAK HISTORY GIVES DETAILS OF MANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEW ENGLAND'S CULTURAL, RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Those reading of the Slovak Catholic Sokol National Meet may ask what is the Slovak Catholic Sokol and when did the Slovaks begin to settle in New England and Connecticut?

The Sokol is a gymnastic and athletic organization which had its origin in 1862 in Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia and next year it will observe its centennial.

NAME MEANS FALCON

The name means falcon and the movement is accepted by all the Slavonic nations, whose heroes were known as sokols. Bards, and poets have written about the fight of the sokols against tyranny. They were and are true exponents of democracy. Later some placed greater emphasis on physical fitness more than on spiritual values and the Slovak Catholic Sokol was founded 56 years ago.

Three years after its existence, it had its third national convention in Bridgeport, where its ninth assembly was founded in 1906.

The Reverend Matthew Jankola, then pastor of Sts. Cyril and Methodius parish, was elected national chaplain of the organization in 1908 and the late Andrew Zitney served as supreme president. Thus, the Sokol organization took strong roots in Connecticut and the New England States.

The second question, "When did the Slovaks begin to settle in the New England States?" brings us back to the doughty Capt. John Smith of Virginia fame, who, according to historians implanted his name firmly in the history of the New England States half a dozen years before Capt. Myles Standish appeared on that scene with the Pilgrim Fathers.

Capt. John Smith fought the Turks with the Slovaks and other Christian Slavs before coming to establish Jamestown, Va., in 1609. He brought Slovaks, Poles, and other craftsmen with him to the New World. Smith admired the courage of the Slovaks, Poles, and other Slavs with whom he fought the Turks. After winning many decorations for bravery against the Turks, he visited as a hero, Poland, Slovakia, and other countries of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

And again these Slavonic warriors, when they witnessed Smith's bravery, did not hesitate to join his expedition to the New World, where he headed the Virginia colony as its president. Although Smith was forced to quit his presidency of the colony he put New England on the map.

He was known as the "Admiral of New England," for he commanded a two-ship expedition to the coast of New England in 1614. After his return to England with a cargo of codfish, Smith planned to come to establish in New England. No doubt he had Slovaks and Slavs, his faithful warriors, on this expedition.

Second thoughts turn to Harvard University, where the educator Johannes Amos Commenius (Komensky) was invited almost three centuries ago to be its rector. Komensky was born in Moravian-Slovakia and spent most of his youthful years in Presov, the metropolis of Eastern Slovakia, whose ordinary, Byzantine Rite Bishop Paul Gojlic, died a victim of the Reds a year ago.

History tells of Maj. John L. Polerecky, son of Count Andrew Polerecky of Slovakia, who came to America with the French expeditionary army of Rochambeau to fight under General Washington.

Major Polerecky remained in America after the Revolutionary War. First he resided in Boston and later in Maine. He occupied various offices and served as town clerk of Dresden, Maine, where he died on June 8, 1830. John Hancock, as Governor of Massachusetts, signed his naturalization papers.

ADDRESSED BY TAFT

It is no wonder that Slovaks are known as "Yankees of Central Europe" when we appraise the statement of former President William H. Taft who, in 1917 during World War I, addressed 7,000 of them in Bridgeport, saying: "The truth is we need a little poetry among our native Americans; we need an appreciation of poetic ideals; we need to have mixed with our everyday humdrum life a little bit of the romance that you bring from the old country and we welcome you on that account. Slovaks are among the most loyal 'Americans by choice.' They feel for America a deep gratitude. Here many of the rights, denied in their native country, have been theirs unquestioned. It is on American soil that Slovak literature has largely sprung into being—even the Slovak language has here been shaped."

"The Story of Bridgeport," published in 1936 in honor of the centennial of the city, reports on page 124 that Slovaks were represented in Bridgeport "in goodly numbers as early as 1875. While the last census shows 4,371 foreign born of that nationality here, few are Czechs, most of them being Slovaks."

Alexander Halkovic said several years ago that when he came to Bridgeport from Slovakia in 1882 he found five Slovak and three Polish families.

The Slovak families constituted those of Joseph and John Sedlar, Charles Kostrapsky, Joseph Mrazik, Joseph Kocis, and Andrew Hajgel. Joseph Mrazik was the first to come to Bridgeport with his family. Later settlers here were the Grohol, Csorba, Ruzicka, Kolesar, Pisty, and Dugas families.

George Kolesar, 94, of Stratford, is the oldest American Slovak fraternalist residing in this area.

The first Slovak settlers met at Mrazik's home until "Big Joe" Sedlar established his hall on Willard Street, which was the center of Slovak activities several decades. Up to 1936 about 2,000 Slovak weddings had taken place in Sedlar's hall.

FIRST SLOVAK SOCIETY

On September 7, 1887, the Society of St. John Nepomucene was organized. Joseph Sedlar, Joseph Sirovjak, Alexander Halkovic, Michael Lozinak, John Mitro, Stephen Grohol, and Paul Dudra were its founders A year later, September 2, 1888, the Society of St. Stephen was founded. Joseph Sedlar was its commander.

The members paraded in foresters' uniforms and drilled to maintain physical fitness. These two societies founded the First Slovak Wreath of Free Eagle organization, which has its headquarters in Bridgeport, and will observe its 65th anniversary this year.

FOUNDED CHURCH IN 1891

In 1891 the Slovaks organized the St. John Nepomucene parish in Bridgeport. The patron saint, who was born in Bohemia and was martyred for upholding the seal of confession, was chosen as the patron of the parish for the reason that in the new world laxity was spread by some agitators against confession.

The Reverend Joseph Formanek was the first pastor, serving from 1891 to May 1895. After his departure Rev. Lucian Bujowski, later of New Britain was administrator. In 1897, the Reverend Francis Pribyl was pastor 1 year. He was succeeded by Rev. Joseph Kossalko, who was pastor from 1898 to 1908. A new church was built under his pastorate. He was assisted by Rev. John Madar, Rev. Edward Knovach, and Rev. Desiderius Major.

Fifty years ago, in 1911, a young priest, the Reverend Andrew E. Komara, became pastor. Father Komara was ordained on May 30, 1910, by the late Bishop John J. Nilan. He built a parochial school in 1913. His pastorate marked a new era of Bridgeport Slovaks.

Father Komara visited Rome in September 1927, and encouraged the Slovak Jesuit, Father Vendelin Javorka, S.J., founder of the now famous Russicum, where priests are trained for missionary work in Russia. The Reverend Michael Golob accompanied Father Komara on his trip.

Father Komara also encouraged the late Most Reverend Joseph M. Koudelka, Bishop of Superior, Wis., to give missions in Slovak to his parishioners. Father Komara and the late Father Gaspar J. Panik founded the Messenger of the Sacred Heart (Bozske Srdce Jezisa), a monthly publication in Slovak.

After Father Komara's death in 1932, Reverend Michael J. Carnicke became his successor. Father Carnicke, now a monsignor, is the first American Slovak to be honored as domestic prelate in the New England States.

After the establishment of the Bridgeport diocese, Monsignor Carnicke became the pastor of the Holy Name of Jesus Parish in Stratford and the Reverend Albert A. Tomasko, assistant pastor of St. John's, was appointed pastor. Father Tomasko has served St. John Nepomucene parish since his ordination 25 years ago. The parish is known as the mother parish of New England Catholic Slovaks.

Sts. Cyril and Methodius parish was founded April 14, 1907. The initiative was given by the St. Joseph's Society on April 9 after a talk by George Mizak. The organization meeting took place 5 days later in Sedlar's Hall. Andrew Repko presided at the meeting.

The Society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius was founded with its first officers as follows: Michael Kvaka, president; Michael Senko, recording secretary; Joseph Ondek, Jr., financial secretary; Andrew Repko, treasurer, and Andrew Zitnay, Matthew Mihal and John Tomasko, Jr., auditors.

The late Bishop John Nilan gave his permission to organize the parish. The Reverend Matthew Jankola became its first pastor in November 1907. The old Polish church of St. Michael was bought for $16,250.

ESTABLISHED SCHOOL

In 1908 Father Jankola established the parochial school. He is founder of the Slovak Order of Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius with the mother house in Danville, Pa. They teach in the parochial schools. After Father Jankola's death May 15, 1916, the Reverend Gaspar J. Panik of Torrington became pastor.

During Father Jankola's pastorate a beautiful church was built and during Father Panik's pastoral a school, convent and rectory were erected. Father Panik died on January 22, 1933, then only 48 years old.

Bishop Nilan appointed the Reverend Stephen J. Panik to be his successor Father Panik had the church redecorated. He encouraged many young men to study for the priesthood. After his death in 1953, Father John F. Murcko became pastor. During his pastorate the parish celebrated its golden jubilee. Father Murcko had the body of Father Jankola exhumed in 1959 and moved to Danville, Pa., during the golden jubilee of the Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius.

The three predecessors of Father Murcko, Fathers Jankola, Gaspar Panik and Stephen Panik, were supreme chaplains of the Slovak Catholic Sokol.

Father Gaspar Panik founded 45 years ago, a Slovak monthly publication, Ave Maria, which is published in Passaic, N.J., by Slovak Benedictine fathers of Cleveland, Ohio. Father Stephen Panik was editor of "Children's Friend" (Priatel Dietok), youth's publication of the Slovak Catholic Sokol which is observing its golden jubilee.

HOLY NAME PARISH, STRATFORD

On May 13, 1922, the parish of the Holy Name of Jesus was organized in Stratford. John Kupec, Joseph Stemple, Joseph Nagy, Veronica Sulik and Anna Marfiak were the first committee of laity for the organization of the parish. Bishop Nilan appointed on June 10, 1923, the Reverend Michael J. Carnicke as first pastor.

The first small church was blessed on December 10, 1923. Father Carnicke was transferred to St. John Nepomucene parish in 1932 and was succeeded by the Reverend Stephen Grohol who continued in the work of building the parish. During his illness, Father Joseph Maco was administrator. Later, Father Joseph Pisarcik was appointed pastor and he continued as publisher of Sacred Heart Messenger after Father Komara's death. During his illness, Father John Filip was administrator. A church, school convent, and rectory were erected and in 1957 Monsignor Carnicke returned as pastor.

OTHER SLOVAK PARISHES

In 1912, the parish of Sacred Heart was organized at Torrington with the Reverend Gaspar J. Panik as pastor. When he became pastor of Sts. Cyril and Methodius Parish in Bridgeport, the Reverend Stephen J. Panik became Torrington's pastor, serving until 1933 when he was transferred to Bridgeport. He was succeeded by Father John Zihala, a native Bridgeporter, who is the present pastor.

A Parish of All Saints was organized four decades ago in New Britain with the Reverend Stephen Grohol as pastor. He was succeeded by the Reverend Paul Spodnik, also a native Bridgeporter. The present pastor is the Reverend Paul Maco, also of Bridgeport.

The St. Benedict's parish, Stamford, was founded 30 years ago with the Reverend John F. Murcko as pastor. After his transfer to Bridgeport, the Reverend Francis Metro became pastor. When Father Metro died 3 years ago, the Reverend Stephen Grinvalsky became pastor.

Other pastors of Slovak descent are the Reverend John J. Filip, pastor of St. Francis parish, Wilton, and diocesan director of CYO; the Reverend Andrew Hajzus, pastor of Our Lady of Good Counsel, Bridgeport; the Reverend Joseph Kupec, pastor of St. Stephen's parish, Stepney Depot.

There are Slovak parishes of St. Peter, Westfield, Mass., with Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky as pastor; St. Anthony's, Webster, Mass., with Rev. Joseph Nerenz as pastor and Sts. Cyril and Methodius parish, Lisbon, Maine, with Rev. Fabian Onyderovsky, O.F.M., as pastor.

Slovak missioners are affiliated with the Passionist Monastery, West Springfield, Mass., with Father Eugene Kozar, C.P., established there.

Some of the younger priests serving in Slovak parishes in Connecticut are as follows: Rev. Andrew Horvath and Rev. Robert Maty (St. John Nepomucene, Bridgeport); Rev. John Pitonak and Rev. Joseph Gorecki (Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Bridgeport); Rev. John Tomis and Rev. Joseph Pekar (Holy Name of Jesus, Stratford); Rev. John F. Smolke (Stamford); Rev. Paul Spodnik (retired); Rev. Leo Spodnik (Sacred Heart, Torrington); Rev. Francis Mihalik (Immaculate Conception, Terryville); Rev. William Dudchak (St. Francis Hospital, Hartford); Rev. Edward Gresh (St. Lawrence, Hartford);

Rev. Marshall Filip (St. Joseph's, New Britain); Rev. Edward Muha (St. Michael's, Waterville); Rev. Anthony Sima (St. Francis, Torrington); Rev. Stephen Vitka (St. Francis of Assisi, New Britain); and Rev. Edmund Mochak, East Douglas, Mass.

All of these have relatives in Bridgeport.

Slovaks of Bridgeport raised during World War I, $62,000 for the establishment of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia. Their last Sokol meet was in Bridgeport in August 1927. Since that time the organization increased in membership to more than 20,000 and its assets exceed $15 million.

Sports in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the youth, and some of the not so young, of the space age have found and developed a new series of sports—the sky sports. These include such sports as parachuting, ballooning, soaring, aeromodeling, and aerobatics. An increasing number of our youth is now taking part in these sports. Indeed, the National Aeronautic Association of the United States has now many chapters and members all over the country—including my own State of Wisconsin—who practice these sports. The Parachute Club of America, which is an affiliate of the National Aeronautic Association, will indeed have a distinguished undertaking next year—when it will act as host for the world parachuting championships. This will be the first time that these championships have been held in the United States, and teams from some 20 nations are expected to participate. It is hoped by many that this occasion will help promote in this country an increasing interest in sky sports. In the past, Russia and its satellites have been the leaders in this field. Of some 82 world records in these sports Russia holds 60 and the remaining 22 are held by other Iron Curtain countries. The United States holds no records.

Much is being done in this country to make up for the time during which parachuting and other sky sports were looked upon as mere stunts for people who had little or no regard for their necks. Parachute jumping has been increasing in this country—for fun, for competition, and for emergencies, both military and peaceful, including firefighting, and so forth. Parachuting is one of the fastest growing peacetime sports in the country. It is also a strategic method of deploying troops at the scene of battle. There is no longer room in today's parachuting for the stunt boys, the reckless or the careless. Skill and discipline are the rules. It is estimated that last year some 50,000 nonmilitary parachute jumps were made in this country.

Russia and the Iron Curtain countries have used training in parachute jumping as a means of preparing their youth for future military purposes. It certainly does not help U.S. prestige to have all the parachute records held by the Iron Curtain countries. It is hoped that bringing the world championship here next year will improve the posture of the United States. Indeed, Russia vigorously objected to holding the championship competition in this country.

When the world championship was invited to come to the United States the Congress of the United States joined in the invitation—Public Law 796, of the 86th Congress. It is now requested of the U.S. Government to help in making the preparations for this championship competition. Last week the National Aeronautic Association testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I believe it is important that these championships be planned in a way that will bring credit to the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Martin M. Decker, on behalf of the National Aeronautic Association, before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARTIN M. DECKER, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL AERONAUTIC ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS, AUGUST 29, 1961

We appreciate this opportunity to acquaint you with our position regarding the sixth world sport parachuting championships scheduled to be held at Orange, Mass., in August 1962, and to clarify various proposed legislation regarding these championships and other championships of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, which our association is anxious to host in the near future.

The National Aeronautic Association is the sole U.S. representative of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, which is a world organization representing 48 nations and was founded in 1905 to further the advancement of aviation throughout the world and to stimulate international competition and air touring. It is also the organization that certifies all world records for aircraft, spacecraft, parachuting, ballooning, soaring, and aeromodeling.

There are five FAI world championships—parachuting, ballooning, soaring, aeromodeling, and aerobatics. No FAI world championships have ever been held in the United States, and during recent years, the majority of championships have been held in Iron Curtain countries.

The United States sent its first parachuting team abroad to compete in world competition in 1956, when the parachuting championships were held in Moscow. U.S. teams have participated in each parachuting championship since that time. There are 82 parachuting records held by various countries throughout the world. Every one of these records is held by an Iron Curtain country, and Russia holds 60 of the 82 records. The United States holds none. We are pleased to inform you that, only last week, a U.S. team participated in the invitational international parachuting event in Europe and took first place in every event. Because of the comparative youth of organized parachuting in this country, this is the first time a U.S. team has taken first place in parachuting.

The National Aeronautic Association is extremely interested in seeing the five world championships held in the United States next year, along with the general conference of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale. The FAI general conference has been held in the United States only twice since 1905, and the last time was in 1958. It is not within the financial means of the National Aeronautic Association to host these events alone. As a result, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, introduced H.R. 6068 on March 29 of this year. You will note that the bill authorizes the appropriation of $450,000 to provide assistance in connection with the world championships and the FAI general conference.

We realized at the time that this amount alone would not be sufficient to support each of the events properly; however, we fully expected additional financial support from outside sources.

The situation at this moment involves the three joint resolutions mentioned earlier, which were introduced at the request of the Sport Parachuting Commission of Massachusetts, and H.R. 6068, which was introduced at the request of the National Aeronautic Association. These two organizations are in complete agreement that, should H.R. 6068 be favorably considered by the Congress, the loan guarantee amount requested in the three joint resolutions submitted on behalf of the Sport Parachuting Commission of Massachusetts would be reduced by the amount included in H.R. 6068 for parachuting.

I respectfully call your attention to the attached copy of Public Law 86–796, approved by the 86th Congress on September 15, 1960. This law states that, "The Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the National Aeronautic Association to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to hold the 1962 world parachuting championships in the United States at Orange, Mass. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale."

In view of the above, our association and the Government of the United States are committed by Public Law 86–796 to host the 1962 world sport parachuting championships. We feel that these championships should be staged in such a manner as to reflect the highest possible credit upon this Nation, particularly among the participants from some 20 foreign countries. Our team that participated in the 1956 parachuting championships in Moscow report that the Soviets made every possible effort to stage the championships to reflect the highest possible degree of efficiency and impressiveness. We feel that we should do no less.

Each year, the United States officially sends groups abroad to represent this country—groups that include musicians, actors, sportsmen, etc. In view of today's headlines and the importance of aviation to world freedom and national security, we can think of no other field in which so much good can be done by making good showing for this country internationally than through proper hosting of such events as the FAI world championships and general conference, and having our teams take honors in international competitions.

We sincerely hope that this report will be helpful to you in considering the international significance and importance of the FAI world championships and general conference and, particularly the sixth world parachute championships which we will host.

We appreciate this opportunity to call this to your attention and we sincerely solicit the support of the Congress in helping host the sixth world parachuting championships and any other FAI championships which we are fortunate enough to hold in our country. We believe this type of activity is in the national interest.

Keynote Address by Amvets National Commander Harold Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, one of the great veterans organization leaders in the United States since World War II has been Harold Russell, who just completed his third term as national commander of the American Veterans of World War II and Korea. I have counted it a privilege to be associated with him in AMVETS and to know him as a good personal friend. To me, he symbolizes the unquenchable spirit of the war disabled and the vision of a man who is working for world peace, and for the rehabilitation of the victims of war and persecution.

Millions of Americans still remember Harold Russell as the academy award-winning star of the motion picture "The Best Years of Our Lives." As leader of the AMVETS and, for 10 years, as vice president of the World Veterans Fund, Inc., he has traveled throughout the world. In addition to extensive work in the United States he has visited both the capitals and the villages of England, France, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Israel, Egypt, Pakistan, India, Japan, Burma, and Thailand.

Harold Russell is a native of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, who moved to Boston, Mass., with his family, when Harold was six, following the death of his father. In February 1942, while going through basic infantry training as an Army volunteer, he volunteered for service with the paratroopers. By June 1942, he had qualified as a paratrooper instructor specializing in demolition and explosives. In that role, he made more than 50 jumps. An explosion cost him his hands and altered the whole course of his career.

Harold Russell's long fight back to health in Army hospitals, the development of a new state of mind in which he determined that "it's not what you lost but what you have left and how you use it that counts," have been an inspiration to millions of Americans and others throughout the world. His book "Victory in My Hands," has been translated into 20 languages.

Harold Russell has worked with the Treasury Department to spur the sale of savings bonds, he has aided the Red Cross, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, CARE, the Committee for International Economic Growth, and the Society for Crippled Children and Adults. In 1950, he was chosen by the junior chamber of commerce for their annual award as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year.

Harold Russell and his lovely wife, Rita, live in Wayland, Mass., with their two children, Jerry and Adele Rita.

Harold Russell is an indefatigable and extremely popular speechmaker; he has appeared on rostrums of every State in the Union; he has testified frequently on Capitol Hill before congressional committees; he has visited veterans' hospitals everywhere—probably more of them than any man alive. He has also been a recipient of numerous awards to honor his work and principles, including one honorary degree.

One of the finest addresses in his career was his keynote address to the AMVETS Convention in Louisville, Ky.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Harold Russell's keynote address to the 17th Annual AMVETS National Convention, delivered on August 24, 1961, in Louisville, Ky., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF THE KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER HAROLD RUSSELL, AMVETS 17TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION, LOUISVILLE, KY., AUGUST 24, 1961

Fellow Amvets, few men in AMVETS have been privileged to enjoy the esteem and high honor you have conferred on me in generous measure over the long years. Twice in our history we have turned the corner of a new decade together.

Now, as I prepare to leave my command for the third and final time, you have honored me again by asking me to sound the keynote of a National AMVETS Convention. But as a far greater leader said, not too long ago, I do not shrink from this responsibility, I welcome it.

Only 20 years have passed since the fire and flame of total war reached out to test the valor of American soldiers and sailors; a brief moment in the reckonings of history. And yet how remote, how incredibly far away does the world of 1941 seem to us now.

Twenty years ago television was unknown in our homes. Twenty years ago our fastest commercial aircraft cruised at 130 miles an hour. Transocean flying had just been inaugurated. Twenty years ago the United States was still bemused with the hope that it could stay clear of Europe's wars, safe in fortress America. Twenty years ago AMVETS did not exist even as a concept. Twenty years ago man was still a hopeless captive without means of escape from the prison of his own atmosphere. There were no A-bombs, no H-bombs, no means of total destruction. And some of us were the problem teenagers of another generation, and all of us were young.

I ask you now to turn and look to the rear of this hall, to the replica of that incredible capsule, an instrument of release from earth, a vehicle that can travel with living men at a speed of 18,000 miles per hour into the dark and dangerous vacuums of space itself.

There sits the strange symbol of the revolution that has engulfed us during these 20 years—a revolution of frenzied progress, of explosive growth, of ferment and struggle.

Our world of 20 years ago is ripped and torn, gone forever in the throes of revolution, to a degree and in a manner far beyond the wildest imaginings of our own revolutionary forebears. And this revolution is not only political. It is also economic, social, and scientific.

History may well look back at our mid-century as the beginning of a new renaissance of the human spirit and the human mind. Or if we fail there may be no history at all on a burned-out cinder spinning without meaning, silent in the darkness of eternal time.

We must ask ourselves then what shall be our role as a nation and as Americans in the convulsions of our generation. The answer to that question is the overriding issue haunting the hopes of the world.

We Americans were born of rebellion and revolution. Our forefathers wrote what Lincoln has called the immortal emblem of humanity: The Declaration of Independence. It was our forefathers who rose up with arms to overthrow the oppressions of a colonial tyranny. We are the people who gave birth to the doctrine of the consent of the governed. America invented and made workable the most powerful and most modern weapon in the world today—the instrument of self-determination through revolution.

Let me tell you something: Our invention has been stolen. It has been stolen by the apparatus of the international Communist movement headquartered in the Soviet Union—political mobsters who have made a career of stealing other people's inventions.

We don't mind the theft. The real crime is that they have perverted and corrupted its meaning and its use. Today in Asia and Africa and even in Latin America the only books on revolution are Communist books. And Karl Marx, not Tom Paine; Lenin and Stalin, rather than Jefferson and Madison, are given the credit for the contents.

We have been so preoccupied looking for Communists under our own beds, so intent on fighting dialetical materialism with dollars and bombs, that we have forgotten or neglected the most powerful weapon of all—our own concepts of revolution and freedom and justice and self-determination—ideas that sprang from the hearts and blood of our native land.

It is not my purpose here to downgrade either the urgency of fighting subversion at home, or of strengthening our military might in this era of total challenge. We must have the brute power of arms that are absolutely vital to our survival as a deterrent against reckless military adventurers who seek dominion over the world.

And we must regain our lost leadership in the race for space. I am shocked by those voices among us who question our need for the money to be first on the moon. Any theory that the penetration of outer space is just some sort of sporting contest without great significance is a dangerous and half-baked theory. Let me remind you that the nation controlling outer space controls the world. And don't let any politicians kid you about that.

But these are subjects for another time and place. I am talking now about another race—the race to regain leadership in the validity and vigor of revolution as conceived and expressed by Aristotle and by the Founding Fathers of America, concepts born in America but borrowed from the heritage of Judaeo-Christian civilization and from the humanity of Buddha and the Moslems—ideas and ideals massively betrayed by the stinking cynicism of Stalin and Mao Tse-tung and such lesser traitors to mankind as Fidel Castro.

Red China has called us a paper tiger. America rejects this insolence, secure in the knowledge of its strength. But to millions throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America, watching our voting record in the U.N. and the development of our foreign policies, we give the impression of standing only for a paper revolution. Why should this be?

The fact is that we are no longer a revolutionary society because we have no need to be. The institutions we have created through revolution in the 18th century have flourished and endured. Our achievements are the envy of mankind.

But are we as a people and a nation prepared to understand this yearning? Are we prepared to recognize the revolutions for

true freedom and to prevent them from being subverted in other places and among other people? I say we are only just beginning to understand this kind of ferment. I say we must act and act positively, within the limits of circumstance, at whatever cost in effort and wealth, to regain the faith, the belief, and the confidence of the millions who still aspire to real freedom and who, in the ultimate, may hold the balance of power.

The Communists and the cold war leave us no alternative. We must recapture the flavor of our revolutionary past, recapture the power of our own invention, and prove to confused and misled millions the enormity of the Communist lie and the potential of true freedom through both words and deeds. Only thus can we validate our credentials.

This fact is no less true in Berlin and Bizerte than in Cuba or the Congo.

AMVETS, as the only recognized World War II and Korean veterans organization, has a responsibility in this endeavor as the spokesmen for what our President has called a new generation of Americans, born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a cold and bitter peace, and proud of our ancient heritage.

How, you must ask yourselves, how sturdy is this structure we have built in 16 short years? How effective is this vehicle of ours for advancing the cause of freedom, the cause of democracy, the cause of survival? Are we big enough in numbers and are we big enough in our understanding of basic issues to provide the kind of leadership and the kind of impact that alone can justify our presence in this hall?

I have said before that we are not yet big enough in numbers. But a rollcall alone does not measure the worth of a cause or the value of an ideal. If only numbers counted, the crusades could not have altered the shape of history. The Communists would not control the vast continent of Asia and our own revolution would not have fired the imagination of the world.

Strength does not lie in numbers alone. Strength is found in the sum total of dedication by even a handful of men to ideals and objectives which, over the course of history, survive as beacons of hope because they are forever valid. And the service rendered by the least among us adds up to an uncommon totality of useful meaning.

But numbers do count in terms of impact. Numbers are needed in exerting significant influence. And when an organization stops growing, it begins dying.

We must grow to survive. We cannot afford to lose ground. Neither can we afford to stand still. Either course betrays the faith that Congress has shown in our right to speak for the veterans of World War II and Korea. And either course dishonors the effort and sacrifice that have shaped our policies and our power.

Later, in this convention, I shall present to you far-reaching proposals for internal strengthening of the AMVETS organization. Some of them may seem revolutionary to you. But those among you who fear or resist revolutionary change have indeed forgotten your heritage. We who live today in revolutionary times and sprang from revolutionary soil are less than we ought to be if we shrink from revolutionary necessity.

To all of you, then I say: If the passage of time and the burdens of life have caused your spirit to waver, even a trifle, now is the hour to rekindle the full flame of your fervor—to burnish again your faith in the process of democratic action and your pride in the destiny of the Amvets dream—a dream born in the foxholes and jungles of World War II and brought into being by you and all the men and women around you.

For our country and for Amvets we have reached a point in time where the challenge to our future has reached its ultimate peak.

History alone shall record how we react to this challenge—to what our president has called America's hour of maximum danger.

Fellow Amvets, this indeed is our moment of truth.

The moment that demands that extra ounce of muscle, that extra unity, that extra spurt of energy, that extra touch of wisdom, flowering upward from the grassroots of America, spurring us forward, each in his own way, with the determination to achieve the realization of our lofty aims as a people, in fulfillment of our heroic and revolutionary destiny as the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Thank you very much.

Only in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very excellent article. Its title is "Only in America," and it is from the August 18 issue of the Marion (Ind.) News Herald.

The article is a tribute to a man named Nick Michos—to him and to thousands of other "men and women born on other shores who made this Nation better and greater by their decision to come here."

Because I believe that these few words deserve to be read and thought about, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY IN AMERICA

News Herald carries no news of marriage, divorce, birth, or death and seldom comments on the demise of a local citizen, despite—in many cases—the fact of the editor's close friendship with the deceased person.

The reason is simple. News Herald lacks the space to pay editorial tribute to all those whom we know to have been outstanding citizens and we do not desire to pick and choose whom to mention.

However, the recent death of Nick Michos—who like Russ Bragg, Dave Shiff, Glen Runyon, Orla Westfall, and others whose deaths have saddened the whole community the past year, had only friends and no enemies—makes temporary departure from the custom acceptable.

It is not the purpose of this editorial to eulogize Nick. His life, like the lives of many others, was its own eulogy. A kindly gentleman needs no editorials, as an individual.

Our purpose is to point out that Nick Michos was one of the highest type of immigrants, the men and women born on other shores who made this Nation better and greater by their decision to come here.

Some immigrants have attracted unfavorable attention by their constant demands on the United States and a stolid refusal to contribute anything to their new home's welfare. They are a minority.

The overwhelming majority of these people—Swedes and Germans, Irish and Poles, Italians and English, Greeks and Chinese—whatever their national origin, have settled here, reared their families in the ways of the Lord, established their businesses and homes and churches and have been capital A Americans and capital C citizens.

The minority draw the resentments. But the majority give the United States of America as much—and often more—as they receive.

This is a better Nation because there are people named Michos and Pappanelli, Shiff and Goldberg, Lazzeri and Swanson in it, as well as people named Jones and Smith, Johnson and Wilson, Bragg, Westfall, Runyon, and Harrison.

Our diversity is our strength. Only in America could the great-grandson of penniless Irish immigrants sit in the White House. Only in America could a man born on foreign soil have had his funeral flowers transported to the cemetery in four trucks, as did Nick Michos last week.

The life and death of such men deserves editorial notice, not on a personal note but because they speak for millions—the good Americans, be they born in Marion or Jerusalem, Ohio or Poland, Swayzee or Athens.

Omaha's Aviation Day at Eppley Field—Address by Gen. James H. Doolittle, USAF, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the growth of aviation in America has been rapid and dynamic. This was graphically illustrated last weekend by Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, speaking at a dinner celebrating the opening of the new Eppley Air Terminal in Omaha. He recalled first landing an airplane in Omaha about 40 years ago in a converted pasture. He looked ahead to commercial adaptation of the B–70 which, at 2,000 miles per hour, would mean coast to coast in an hour and a half.

Many American cities are proud of their efforts to keep pace with this spectacular growth in aviation. One of the proudest is Omaha, which offered a twin salute to flying by opening its magnificent new Eppley Terminal and at the same time honoring the 15th anniversary of the Strategic Air Command, the world's most powerful aerospace force.

Mr. Arthur C. Storz, Sr., the only chairman the Omaha Airport Authority has ever had and an aviation enthusiast since 1917 when he was an aviation cadet, introduced General Doolittle at the dinner. Mr. Storz, whose vision and dedicated leadership made Eppley Field a possibility has a deep love of Omaha, reflected in many other civic and charitable activities. Civic activity to him is not a matter of self-glorification. It is not only a duty. To him, it is an obligation and a privilege.

The father of two World War II Army Air Corps pilots, Mr. Storz has long been active in the Air Force Association and was named its Man of the Year in 1955. He won its Medal of Merit and was

named to its national board the following year.

The new airport is named Eppley Air Terminal, after the late Eugene Eppley, who was a pioneer aviator who knew Orville Wright. He became interested in aviation in 1911 when he was running a hotel in Lima, Ohio. He went on to build the biggest individually controlled hotel chain in the world.

When Omaha chose the site of its present airport in 1929, Gene Eppley was one of the members of the selection committee. In 1959, a year after his death, the Eugene C. Eppley Foundation, Inc., which he established to handle his philanthropies, announced a gift of $1 million to help finance improvements at the field. This was only one of his many legacies and made possible the Omaha terminal as it is today, a $3,750,000 reality.

It was fitting that Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, himself a pioneer in flying, should discuss the past and the future of aviation. I ask unanimous consent that his thoughtful address be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. JAMES H. DOOLITTLE, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, AT A DINNER CELEBRATING THE OPENING OF THE EPPLEY AIR TERMINAL AND THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, HOTEL SHERATON FONTENELLE, OMAHA, NEBR., SEPTEMBER 2, 1961

It was something like four decades ago that I first landed an airplane at Omaha. The airfield was, if I remember correctly, a converted pasture. It did not then need a terminal building. It was called Ak-Sar-Ben Field. I do not know what inspired the selection of "Nebraska" spelled backwards as the name for the pioneer location of this city's aviation activity. It was certainly not prophetic for there has never been anything backward about Omaha's purposeful participation in America's civilian and military aviation development.

Even in those old days the people of Omaha were intensely interested in aviation. My good friends, Gould Dietz and Colonel Thomas—long since gone to their rewards—were two of the early enthusiasts, as was Gene Eppley, the aviation pioneer for whom the Omaha municipal airport is so fittingly named.

When Omaha early emerged as a primary link in the Nation's air transportation chain it became obvious to the farsighted that ever increasing airfield facilities would be required. But progress does not always occur in an orderly fashion. Aviation has developed so rapidly that throughout the Nation necessary ground facilities have almost invariably lagged—and in most municipalities still do. By the time or shortly after needed improvements are completed, more, larger and faster aircraft become available and further improvements are required. This trend will continue.

Describing the situation here, cured today by the opening of the new Eppley Airfield Terminal, the Omaha World-Herald commented editorially that the old terminal was "jammed * * * overheated in winter, sweltering in summer" and inadequate in everything.

While Omahans can view with pride—and air travelers with relief and satisfaction—the tangible effect of the Eppley Airfield Terminal, the story behind the accomplishment of this achievement is of equal significance with the ramps, buildings and handsome appointments. It is the story of a group of dedicated men who overcame inertia to bring about the creation of a new terminal.

Although there are many to whom credit is due for what has been done, there can be little doubt that the leadership of Art Storz and his associates of the Omaha Airport Authority—Jim Moore, Mike Flannigan, Pete Kiewit and Jim Regan—was the indispensable ingredient in the drive toward the culmination which we observe today. Richard Mooney, the airport director, worked indefatigably and is entitled to much credit for the prompt, efficient and economical manner in which the task was accomplished.

I've known Art for a long time. He is a "getter of things done"—a very persistent person. When he took charge—with the creation in March 1959 of the Omaha Airport Authority—it was a foregone conclusion that the Eppley Terminal would become a reality.

Five or six million dollars were required to implement the master plan for Eppley Field. Art and his colleagues have managed to raise the funds without—they proudly point out—cost to the Omaha taxpayer. Revenue bonds issued by the airport authority account for $2½ million. New contract terms with the air carriers and allotments under Federal and State programs have added to the fund. And, finally, a million-dollar grant from the Eugene C. Eppley Foundation, plus almost a million and a half of Government matching money, raised the total to that required for the improvement program.

While Eppley Field and its new terminal justly call for a considerable measure of our attention during this "Omaha Salutes Aviation" observance, it is appropriate that we mark another important aviation event in the history of Omaha—the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the Strategic Air Command now headquartered at Offutt Air Force Base.

It was in November 1948 that Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, who had taken over command of SAC the previous month, moved his headquarters to Offutt Field—which we oldtimers remembered as Fort Crook.

When SAC moved to Omaha it was yet another evidence of the significance of Omaha as the strategic center of the United States. Just as the railroads and later air transportation found the geographic location of this city—in almost the precise center of the United States—a major factor in their planning, so did the SAC planners find it an ideal site for their operational headquarters—the nerve center of their farflung, worldwide operations.

In 1946, the year of its formation, SAC was assigned the responsibility for developing a long-range atomic striking force which, at that time, was necessarily wholly based upon the concept of delivery by airplane.

By the time of the move to Omaha the force consisted of about 52,000 people and 1,000 aircraft operating from 22 land bases. Today, under Commander in Chief Thomas S. Power it has a total force strength—military and civilian—of some 270,000 people. SAC operates from approximately 80 bases worldwide of which about 60 are located in the continental United States. The total bomber inventory approximates 1,700, including nearly 1,100 B–47's, 550 B–52's, and two wings of B–58's. The bombers are supported by about 1,000 tanker aircraft, 450 of which are all-jet KC–135's and 550 propeller-driven KC–97's. SAC Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles are operational and on alert at Vandenberg, Offutt, and Warren Air Force Bases.

More Atlas sites and hardened and dispersed Titan and Minuteman bases are going in at an ever-accelerating rate. They constitute a new and important increase in SAC's deterrent strength. SAC's business is peace—peace through strength. SAC people truly say "Peace is our profession." Only through military strength can we avoid war. Military weakness, on our part, would invite war. If the Soviets believed that they could decisively defeat us with a quick military coup—without—unacceptable damage to themselves—they would be sorely tempted to endeavor to achieve their avowed objective of world communization and world domination in that way. The Soviets must know that to attack us would be suicide.

It should be pointed out that we live in a very complex and highly competitive world and even though we are able to continue—with honor—to avoid war, we cannot avoid conflict. Already we are in ideological and technological conflict and will soon be faced with increasingly intense economic competition with the Communist bloc. But with this, if we wake up and work, we can cope. It is infinitely preferable to nuclear war.

Perhaps here I should say a word about the missile program. The Soviets started an all-out missile development program in 1946. By 1953 the reports on their progress were becoming increasingly disturbing. In 1954, 8 years after the Soviets had started, our Government gave top military priority to an ICBM program and the Air Force was made the executive agent. It took us 5 full years of all-out effort to catch up with the Soviets in missile technology. We probably have not yet caught up in numbers of missiles.

Assembling what has been described by Undersecretary of the Air Force Joseph V. Charyk as "an unusually competent group of scientists, engineers, and technicians who provided the systems analysis, systems engineering and technical direction" of the vast program, the Air Force also marshaled the resources of a significant segment of the industrial capacity of our country to win this race against time. Time was of the terrible essence. There was no margin to permit the orderly step-by-step development which marked other earlier—and simpler—weapons system programs—programs in which 7 years was an accepted leadtime from conception of a new type aircraft to its operational readiness.

While the ever-alert bombers of SAC, armed with their deterrent nuclear bombs, maintained the peace, scientists, engineers and industrialists pressed forward under Air Force guidance toward the concurrent solution of the myriad of technical and production problems associated with the development of the missile weapon systems for which no precedent existed. Novel problems such as guidance, propulsion, and reentry—to mention a few—were solved at the same time that ground handling equipment and command communications systems were progressively designed to be compatible with the requirements of the missiles themselves.

As an interim measure, that Air Force directed industrial team brought into being the Thor intermediate range ballistic missile which was swiftly deployed overseas to launching sites within striking distance of the potential enemy. This was accomplished in less than 4 years.

In September 1959, SAC announced that the first Atlas Intercontinental Ballistic Missile had been launched by a SAC crew at Vandenberg Air Force Base. A month later, the first Atlas was delivered to Warren Air Force Base.

The missile race had been won—but we have to keep it won.

The ICBM, with nuclear warhead, has—because of its high speed, relative invulnerability and great destructive power—been called the ultimate weapon. Already anti-ICBM weapon systems are being developed for the purpose of defense against ballistic missiles. I am sure there is—as yet—no ultimate weapon; though it is not inconceivable that a weapon or weapons can be

designed and built which could destroy all life on our planet. This is a grim thought.

It has been said that the ballistic missile will eventually replace the airplane. This may be so, but I am convinced that this will not occur in my lifetime—and I expect to live for some considerable time. The ICBM role will increase in importance. By 1966, according to present plans, the striking force of SAC will be almost equally divided between aircraft and missiles.

To me the missile and the airplane supplement each other. Together they provide a flexible and balanced force.

People speak of the vulnerability of the airplane. I do not know of a U.S. Air Force air strike ever having been turned back from its target due to enemy action. True, many aircraft were shot down, but the remainder always pressed on to target; none was ever driven back.

In World War II, in the skies over Europe, our principal enemies were German weather, German fighters and German flak—in that order.

Today our SAC bombers fly over the weather and are therefore almost entirely unaffected by it.

The Soviets have in their arsenal a large number of ground-to-air rockets such as that used to shoot down the U–2. These are effective weapons, but their effectiveness can be reduced or negated by chaff, electronic countermeasures, and decoys carried by our bombers and by the saturation of Soviet defenses.

The use of rockets with nuclear warheads, such as the Hound Dog and Skybolt, carried by the big bombers, permits them to fight their way in with a bomb load or to stay outside the highly defended areas and lob their lethal weapons in.

No, I do not see the airplane obsoleted for some time yet. I see continued improvement in the B–52's and I see an entirely new generation of bombers eventually replacing them. This new generation is represented by the B–70 with a speed of mach 3—2,000 miles per hour—flying at extremely high altitudes, able to reach any Soviet target, with increased bomb load and with more and still better penetration aids.

There is no question in my mind but that there will soon be commercial air transport adaptation of the B–70. Two thousand miles per hour means coast to coast in 1½ hours; Omaha to London or Paris in 2½ hours; Omaha to Tokyo in just over 3 hours. The mach 3 transport plane is, with today's knowledge, technically possible and economically feasible.

And after the B–70 will come the aerospace plane taking off from and landing on conventional airfields, going through the earth's atmosphere and making most of the journey in space at speeds of from 10,000 to 15,000 miles per hour.

A commercial aerospace plane could go from any point on earth to any other in less than an hour. Such a plane could be made today, from a technological viewpoint, but new inventions in propulsion will be necessary before carrying passengers would be economically practical.

A dream? Not on your life it isn't. And if we in the United States of America do not develop these military and commercial air and aerospace craft, then another nation will. And you know who that will be.

From the Air Force ballistic missile program have come the boosters that have been used in our space investigation and space exploration programs. There will be continued development of scientific satellites, navigation satellites, weather satellites, communication satellites, reconnaissance satellites, surveillance satellites and satellites that will give early warning of a sneak attack.

SAC will soon have the use of weather, navigation and communication satellites. They will, ere long, have the advantage of space surveillance and reconnaissance. They will also have satellite early warning of enemy missiles at launch. This will give from 20 to 30 minutes' warning.

Our present DEW—Deep Early Warning—radar stations in Alaska, northern Canada, and Greenland give up to several hours warning of an air strike, but only 10 to 15 minutes' warning of a missile strike.

We have openly stated that we will never start a nuclear war. This policy gives an enormous advantage to the enemy. Our deterrent strength is really what we will have left after his first strike. It is therefore extremely important that we have maximum warning of an attack.

Today part of SAC's aircraft are always airborne with bombs aboard—ready for arming—and with targets selected. Many of the rest of the SAC aircraft are on 15-minute alert. That is, they can be airborne, armed, in 15 minutes—as can SAC's ICBM's. SAC should have that much tactical warning. With strategic warning the entire force would be held ready for instant takeoff.

As SAC's capabilities continue to increase it will eventually become an earth and space-based airspace force. With the continuing support of all of our people it will remain our protection against aggression—maintaining the peace.

Omaha is now and will continue to be the peace center of our planet as well as the aviation hub of our country.

The people of Omaha have chosen for these 3 days of observance Omaha Salutes Aviation. I suggest that it might with equal validity be said "Aviation salutes Omaha."

The Value of Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated Stamford, Conn., September 5, 1961, and signed "Grandmother of Five Public School Children," to the editor of the New York Times, on the subject of the value of schools.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO LEARN VALUE OF SCHOOLS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I saw in the Times of September 3 that Jomo Kenyatta, the Kenya African nationalist leader, said: "Any country, any people who are not educated cannot advance," and he urged sending African students to the United States to study.

Would it not be a good idea if this program were reciprocal and we sent our Congressmen and Senators to Kenya to learn the value of schools? The majority of the House Rules Committee might learn from the trip, and Mr. Kenyatta and all surely should profit.

GRANDMOTHER OF FIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN.

STAMFORD, CONN., *September 5, 1961.*

Freedom Is Not Guaranteed, It Is Only Promised—Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your distinguished self and my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the text of a certain newspaper article which appeared in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise, of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., on Sunday, July 2, 1961, a newspaper in the great 2d District of California which I have had the honor to represent in this my 8th term in Congress.

I respectfully submit the exact text which was printed on the front page of this fine local newspaper.

The article is as follows:

FREEDOM IS NOT GUARANTEED, IT IS ONLY PROMISED—BILL OF RIGHTS

(By Donald Culross Peattie)

The most significant piece of paper in the life of every American has come almost to your door.

Borrowed from its shrine in the Archives Building in Washington, it will be on display in every State of the Union.

Millions of citizens will gaze in reverence on the original document that promises us, in ink that has faded in these 156 years but in words that never dim, most of what we mean by our constitutional rights.

Few of those rights are found in the Constitution itself. They are in the first 10 amendments, adopted in 1791. The single sheet that bears on its yellowing face these precious liberties is called the Bill of Rights.

And it means more to the American citizen than the Constitution itself, which is the blueprint for our governmental machinery.

You might, for instance, change the way by which, under the original Constitution, Senators are elected (indeed, it has been done) without causing the national blood pressure to jump. But lay one finger on, say, article I of the Bill of Rights, to kill freedom of utterance, and every good American should be up in arms.

It is the same with the other nine amendments; take away one and you weaken all; take freedom from your neighbor and you enslave yourself.

"Liberty," said the late beloved William Allen White, "is the only thing you cannot have unless you are willing to give it to others."

To Americans, the first 10 amendments have the force of moral law, on a higher plane than ordinary legislation.

They are our fundamental articles of faith. They cannot be abridged or abolished even by Congress. They are the supreme law of the land, and we set the Supreme Court to prowl around the liberties they promise and to nullify any laws that would lessen their force.

Yet, marvelous to relate, they are not written in lawyer language. Anybody can understand the Bill of Rights, just as anybody can understand the Ten Commandments: "Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal."

Take article I, which sets forth in one sentence enough freedoms to make dictatorship impossible here:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

There in one breath a government took the unprecedent step of protecting the citizens against itself.

It freed religion from all interference by the state, and by promising free speech and press it exposed itself, as no dictatorship dares do, to the bracing winds of open criticism.

So you may with impunity criticize and roundly denounce Congress, the President, even the Supreme Court, provided that you do not slander or libel individual persons.

One hardly knows what to admire more in this—the wisdom of providing a safety valve for the pressures that inevitably build up in a complex society, or the way such freedom operates to keep government on its toes.

True, some other countries permit most or all of the rights in these immortal amendments.

But in other countries they are usually found in tradition, precedent, or common law. Our Government was the first to collect them all in one place and write them into its very Constitution.

No confiscation of your property by the Government, says the Bill of Rights, unless you are indemnified for it; no searching of your house without a warrant; no accusation by witnesses unless they can be produced in open court; no putting you on trial twice for the same accusation.

The Bill of Rights promises you freedom from excessive bail, freedom from torture to obtain confessions, freedom from cruel and unusual punishment.

It gives you the right to a speedy trial by jury, to a definite written accusation if you are tried, and to have counsel and subpena witnesses in a criminal trial. So, as long as we remain vigilant, we are the freest people on earth.

But we didn't get our Bill of Rights because some high-minded gentlemen penned self-evident truths shortly after our country was founded.

Our democratic liberty was conceived ages ago in the dark of dungeons where brave mind whispered to unbroken soul.

It was wrenched into birth when limbs were pulled apart on the torturer's rack, and knew the screams of women who saw their men butchered.

It drew its breath of life as the ill-trained farm boys choked their last, pinned to the earth by the bayonets of Hessian mercenaries.

The fight to gain recognition of these "unalienable rights" is as old as man's faith in them. Tyranny is a sleepless foe.

Always somewhere in the world men are being told they have no rights but what the state allows. Such a state gives you but one liberty—to obey. What a world of difference from our belief that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The limitations on the power of government which we have defined in the Bill of Rights are foreshadowed in earliest laws and morals. Some are suggested by Magna Carta.

Some are written into the Roman code which maintained the essential dignity of the free citizen however poor. Some are implicit in the teachings of Christ which set human values above property values.

Over and over the Old Testament tells us that all men are created equal—not alike, naturally, but equal in the sight of a just God before whom kings stand naked as their slaves.

Actually the American people had been hammering away at the problems of democratic self-government for 150 years before our Revolution.

Rocking on the wild Atlantic, the Mayflower Pilgrims in 1620 drew up, in their famous compact, the first instrument of our Republic—imperfect, but an honest beginning.

The primary mistakes of the Puritans were corrected by Roger Williams' statement of religious freedom in 1644.

Then there followed William Penn's famous Charter of Liberties granted to his Pennsylvania colonists.

The words "inviolable rights" turn up in a petition signed by the inhabitants of Anson County, N.C., in 1769.

The Virginia Bill of Rights (1776) and the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights (1780) were but the elder sisters of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Many of these and other documents in the growth of American citizenship will accompany the Bill of Rights on its tour.

No wonder that, when the Founding Fathers signed the Constitution that enumerated only a few rights of the common citizen, the people were indignant.

They had fought a bloody war, ill-armed, starving, barefoot, for more than this—they had fought to secure their individual liberties, their rights. And they knew what they meant by them.

So did some of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, who refused to sign the original document because it contained no Bill of Rights. So did Thomas Jefferson, who wrote from Paris (where he was Ambassador) indignant protest at this crying lack.

Some of the States ratified the Constitution only on the understanding that a Bill of Rights would be added.

In his first inaugural address, George Washington reminded Congress of this duty. That is how, on June 8, 1789, James Madison came to present nine amendments to the Senate.

They drew largely on the earlier Virginia bill of rights authorized by George Mason, one of Washington's neighbors on the Potomac, and on Madison's own work for religious freedom in Virginia.

In the House, 17 amendments were offered. Eventually House and Senate agreed on 12, but the States failed to ratify the first 2 that you will see on the original document.

The remaining 10 amendments became the law.

Sometimes you hear that your Bill of Rights "guarantees" you your liberties.

I asked the Attorney General of the United States, Tom C. Clark, about the word, as we stood examining the grand old document in the Archives Building. That night I asked Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court the same question.

Both gave the same answer: The Bill of Rights promises much, but it is up to the American people to make that promise good.

Somewhere in the country the Bill of Rights is violated almost every day.

Its most dangerous foes are not foreign dictators but those of us who while claiming every privilege of individual liberty would deny it to others.

To rise to a neighbor's aid in defense of his rights is a first duty of citizenship. A second is outspoken criticism of every form of local and Federal Government when it fails in its duty to the first 10 amendments.

When the people think, and say what they think, this government obeys.

The great liberties of the Bill of Rights were paid for in agony and blood, and can be kept safe only by restless conscience and the courage to speak out. (Reprint from the June 1947 issue of the Reader's Digest.)

FREEDOM PRAYER

On these great truths we stand,
And pledge, by heart and hand,
In all we say and do
To keep these great truths true,
With all our strength to strive
And keep these truths alive:
That God makes all men free
In human dignity
To worship, live and labor,
Each equal with his neighbor;
To speak his mind out clear,
Without reproach or fear;
To tread where heroes trod
In freedom under God. Amen.

—*The American Heritage Foundation.*

FREEDOM PLEDGE

I am an American. A free American.
Free to speak—without fear
Free to worship God in my own way
Free to stand for what I think right
Free to oppose what I believe wrong
Free to choose those who govern my country
This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
For myself and all mankind.

—*The American Heritage Foundation.*

Sky Jacking—An Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your distinguished self and my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the text of a certain editorial which appeared in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise newspaper of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., on Sunday, August 18, 1961. I am proud to include this editorial by a valiant editorial staff of a distinguished newspaper serving the total community of Bellflower. The editorial follows:

SKY JACKING

(By Maurice Harris)

Events have come to a pretty pass when the United States continues to talk, rather than act, in relations with Castro, the Cuban Commissar.

Our President should take a positive stand with Cuba regarding our rights, and let Castro know, in no uncertain terms, that we will no longer tolerate his acts of piracy.

In brief, we should give him 1 week to return our property. If, at the end of that period of time, this has not been done, we should employ all of our might and main to do it ourselves.

Like all Communists, Castro construes meekness as weakness. The time for words is long past.

In preparation of positive action, we should notify all other Latin American nations that we can no longer tolerate Castro's conduct, and assure them that in taking action, our only motives are protection of our rights, and of American citizens.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A Response to New York's Mayor Wagner's Welcome Address to the Grand Lodge of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World (in Session at the Commodore Hotel)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an eloquent and inspiring address delivered recently by Lt. George W. Lee, of Memphis, Tenn., in response to the welcome address of Mayor Wagner, of New York City, to the Grand Lodge of the Improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World.

Lieutenant Lee is grand commissioner of education, IBPOEW, and in addition to being one of the greatest orators in America today, he is a successful businessman and philanthropist.

The address follows:

A RESPONSE TO NEW YORK'S MAYOR WAGNER'S ADDRESS TO THE GRAND LODGE OF THE IMPROVED BENEVOLENT PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD (IN SESSION AT THE COMMODORE HOTEL)

(By George W. Lee, grand commissioner of education of IBPOEW)

Grand exalted ruler, his honor the mayor, and delegates assembled, the late Perry W. Howard, national Republican leader, once told a joke about a white passenger, who sat near him on a trip up north. He said the white passenger scribbled on a newspaper and passed it on to him. It was his way of calling Perry's attention to an article about how two Negroes had robbed a bank. Under the article, the white passenger had written, "Don't you think this is mighty bad for your race?" After reading the article, Perry penciled in, "Yes, it is pretty bad. Negroes are getting more like white folks every day."

You, sir, preside over the greatest city in the world. Not even the poet, whose fantastic imagination soars beyond the boundaries of mortality, has been able to construct on the loom of his genius anything in the world of fantasy that does not exist here in actual reality. Your jeweled skyscrapers standing like jagged peaks with streets running by them like canyons, your tunnels, stabbing through under the beds of rivers have engaged the wonder of civilized man; your Greenwich Village has captured the attention of art, and music has entrusted itself to the joyous care of your Tin Pan Alley.

Truly, sir, yours is the greatest city in all of the world and the improved Benevolent Protective Order of Elks of the World is getting more like you every day.

So the greatest city greets the greatest fraternity and the greatest mayor extends his hand in happy fellowship to the greatest exalted ruler.

Sir, you have welcomed to this fabulous city many of the world's great leaders; crowned heads and ambassadors of countries who boast of great heritage.

You have welcomed here the French—from the land that holds within its bosom the remains of Victor Hugo and Voltaire and the ashes of that restless man Napoleon, who conquered the Alps and mingled the Eagles of France with the Eagles of the Crags.

You have welcomed here the English, whose island home is the cradle of the Magna Carta and Shakespeare, whose mind as clear as the waters of an English spring, touched all the discovered shores of human thought. You have welcomed here the Germans of philosophic speculations, consecrated to science, whose Mozart smote the lyre of the Scottish plowman and stayed the life of the German priest.

You have welcomed here the Russians, who through force, violence, and brutality seek to harness science to the chariot of destruction and quench every spark of freedom in rivers of blood.

You have wlecomed here many of the heads of the new African government, whose products to a large extent we depend upon for our production line. Ninety percent of the manganese with which we make our steel comes from India, Brazil, and the African Congo. The largest supply of uranium yet found in the world is in the African Congo. Our chrome, our cobalt, our tin, our tungsten comes from many of these dark countries.

The American Negro, whom the Elks symbolize, have come here not from foreign shores—we have no hyphen in our voice. We were born here—others came here. We are at home, even though we are sometimes treated as strangers in our own home—forced into the back alleys of life with only the crumbs that falls from the table of democracy.

We were here a year before the *Mayflower* landed at Plymouth Rock and just 2 years after the founding of the first Virginia Colony. We saw the light in the tower of the old North Church. We saw Paul Revere as he dashed through the night. We fought at Bunker Hill until the talons of the American eagle were wet with blood.

The Negro, sir, and the Negro alone is native to American freedom. Only can the Negro say that around his fortunes, over his hopes, and amid his anxious tears gathered the great minds and souls of this Nation. Only the Negro can say that around him broke the storm, which shook heaven and earth and all but dismembered this Union. Through the American Negro, sir, the revolution became the drama of history. The Declaration of Independence in which is found a divine flavor was proved; the Constitution vindicated, and freedom itself was loosed from the ugly grasp of night.

In Cuba, when the Monroe Doctrine was challenged and a white colonel of the old 24th Infantry cried, "To the rear"—a black sergeant snatched the sword from his hand and commanded, "To hell you preach, forward." They moved over rocks and over crags with the song on their lips, "There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight." They played a major role in driving the last vestige of foreign resistance from the American shores.

A few days ago, a subcommittee, headed by Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, in accusing Cuba of campaigning to subvert the American Negro against his own Government, but, it said, "the campaign had been unsuccessful." The subcommittee charged that the government of Fidel Castro and his Communist henchmen have been unsuccessful in embroiling American Negroes in their nefarious designs.

Despite bruising words and unkind speech; despite the shackles of race prejudice, which has not only been a handicap to us, but has manacled our Nation in its fight for survival.

Despite the plague of flagrant Jim Crow signs over the doors of the South and over the hearts of the North, in public transportation, in recreation, in theaters and higher education—our faith remains unshaken. A noble cry rises from the lips of the American Negro, "though you slay me yet I trust you."

Others boast of lands and temples—they boast of a heritage of names feared by kings. The American Negro makes no boast. He enters no controversy with racial groups here or abroad, the Negro fights to remove segregation not because he is hungry to mingle with white groups but because he wants to remove the legal stigma of Jim Crow. He wants participation in government and not paternalism with a handout; he wants to join the community and be a part of the community's load and fight to reduce provocations without destroying the essential elements of progress; he wants to work with white people with a self-dedication to maintain the bonds of brotherhood and love; he wants to compete with them only as individuals and not as a group in our society; he wants the right to live; to work; to build a home; to educate his children; to increase their chances of success in a highly competitive environment; and to be promoted on his job. He isn't asking for any special treatment, any special laws, or any special sections of town in which to live.

When the historian views the whole panorama of American progress, in search of something which has endured, he will pick up the broken pen of promise—dip it in the sunlight of immortality and write; the American white man with his daring, who heard God's voice and came with his loved ones across the seas, opened up a continent and peopled a forest with the mighty creations of science; the Jews with their religion; the Irish with their myrth; the Germans with their philosophy; the English with their law and then the moving hand of history will pause and then write about the Negro who stood in the watchtowers, guarding the American Constitution against the destruction of man's last great hope in this world of ours.

While others use their best talent to circumvent the Constitution—the Negro has used his all to protect the Constitution. His has not been just racial protest and special pleading. But, sir, we have today a broader concern. The concern of strengthening the democratic foundations of America because

we realize that we cannot help America survive (if Ameria continues to exclude us from the necessary education, training, and dignity which are essential to human criterion).

So when the historian of the future writes about America, let him say that the American Negro accepted his responsibility to free America from the shackles of racism and helped this great Nation to come of age and reach the level of adaptability, which is so necessary for its survival.

A Long History of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the motion picture industry's long history of outstanding service to the Nation in time of need is a familiar story to all of us. But perhaps less known to many is the fact that each year Hollywood contributes over a million dollars to national and local charities through a unique fund-raising organization known as Motion Picture Permanent Charities.

This year, Motion Picture Permanent Charities will conduct its 20th anniversary campaign throughout the film and allied industries with a goal of raising $1,250,000 for the 22 major health and welfare agencies it supports.

Notable in this 20th anniversary year is the fact that some time during the campaign, the Motion Picture Permanent Charities will reach a total of $25 million raised to help worthwhile charitable organizations. This, I think, is a truly remarkable achievement for a single industry to accomplish. But the record for outstanding achievements by Motion Picture Permanent Charities is equally remarkable.

It was formed in 1940 as a clearinghouse to screen and approve agencies appealing to the film industry for funds, but by 1942 it became evident to its leaders that a different kind of fundraising organization was needed by the film industry.

Thus, late in 1942 Motion Picture Permanent Charities, under Samuel Goldwyn's leadership, created its own campaign organization and consolidated all charity appeals within the film industry, the first such comprehensive program undertaken by a single American industry.

Following this pioneering venture, Motion Picture Permanent Charities set another first in the charity field by instituting the fair plan, payroll deduction system by which an employee contributes voluntarily a fixed amount from each paycheck. So successful was this system that other industries and other charity federations have modeled their fund-raising programs after the fair plan.

Undoubtedly Motion Picture Permanent Charities will pioneer other programs in the future, but on this 20th anniversary I think it appropriate to extend to Hollywood and the Motion Picture Permanent Charities the applause and thanks quite properly due them.

Educational Program in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the remarkable growth, development, and improvement of the public school system of Mississippi has been so noteworthy since World War II that I wish to share some of the pertinent facts with my colleagues of the Senate.

When public schools opened their doors for the 1960 fall term, State Superintendent of Education J. M. Tubb advised me that 573,059 students were enrolled, an increase of 6,638 over the previous year. Enrollment figures for 1961 are not yet available.

Those students were attending a public school system that has added 10,000 new classrooms since World War II at a cost of $150 million.

Mr. President, few will realize and will be surprised to learn that 65 percent of those new classrooms were constructed for Negro schoolchildren. Moreover, 300 new cafeterias have been built in the last 15 years to provide hot lunches for the schoolchildren of Mississippi.

Schoolteacher salaries have enjoyed a tremendous boost in recent years. Mississippi ranks No. 1 in the Nation in the percentage of increase in instructional pay to teachers—137 percent.

The public school system of Mississippi owes a great deal of its present well-being to the guiding hand of W. F. Bond, the man who served as the head of the department of education for 20 years, 1916–36. He is appropriately honored in the attached editorial by Editor J. Oliver Emmerich, of the Jackson (Miss.) State Times, September 6, 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRUSADER FOR EDUCATION NOW VIEWS THE HARVEST

(By Oliver Emmerich)

Today nearly 600,000 boys and girls will matriculate in the elementary and high schools of Mississippi. The cost of this school term will be $108 million.

This is an appropriate time to review the work of a crusading State superintendent of education who laid the groundwork for the modern schools these children will attend.

During the 20 years that he was head of the State department of education (1916–36), W. F. Bond, now retired and living in Jackson, assumed the responsibility of converting scattered one-teacher and two-teacher schools into a commendable public school system.

Mr. Bond, a man of sagacity, dedication and superb sense of humor, held meetings in each of the 82 counties in Mississippi. Many people opposed his crusade for consolidated schools. They did not relish the idea of higher taxes to pay for larger schools, longer school terms, high teachers' salaries, and schoolbus transportation.

Said Mr. Bond recently, "I finally stumbled upon a statement which carried an appeal." We reproduce that statement herewith:

"Your children now think you are the best daddies and mothers in the world. That is as it should be. Some day, however, they will have the minds of men and women and will know then whether or not, because of the love of a few cold dollars, lack of cooperation with your neighbors, or indifference, you failed to give them the training they are going to need to get on in the world in which they live after you are dead and gone.

"When you look into the faces of your children you see boys and girls in whose veins flow as good blood as ever coursed the veins of any child since the beginning of time. They are your children. If given a chance, they are capable of becoming the equal, in every respect, of any other people anywhere else in the world."

Commenting on the response to this statement Mr. Bond said, "When I presented this picture I observed that men would stroke their beards and women would hide a tear. I knew this was winning them over—and it did."

Many fathers and mothers who were inspired to action by Mr. Bond's appeal did not live to see the birth of a new day in Mississippi. We are happy that Mr. Bond himself has lived to see the fruition of his dream and his crusade.

A few days ago this editor chatted with Mr. Bond. He had jotted down the names of some Mississippi youths who have graduated from his schools and have made careers for themselves and America.

Below we reproduce the list of names of Mississippians who have helped create the new Mississippi in the dream of W. F. Bond; names which bear evidence of the quality of the school system which he helped to improve. Here is what he wrote:

"Within the last few weeks John Satterfield of Jackson and Yazoo City has been made president of the American Bar Association. Bryant Horne of Jackson is now head of the Garden Clubs of America, and Leslie L. Wilkinson is national president of the tire dealers association. A few years ago Mayor Allen Thompson of Jackson was head of the U.S. Municipal Organization. Boyd Campbell, native of Attala County, served as president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Tom Ellis, our State supreme court clerk, for 3 years was head of the largest Masonic order in the world, and Luther A. Smith of Hattiesburg is now (lifetime position) head of the southern jurisdiction, Scottish Rite Masons."

The late Dr. F. J. Underwood, native of Monroe County, was recognized internationally as an authority on public health. Buford Ellington, native of Holmes County, is now Governor of the State of Tennessee.

Duke Humphrey, of Tippah County, is president of University of Wyoming, Roger Hull, of Attala County, is president of Mutual Life of New York, and Lewis Cutrer, of Pike County, is mayor of the South's largest city, Houston, Tex.

Mark Ethridge, of Meridian, is editor of Louisville Courier Journal, Turner Catledge, of Tupelo, is editor of New York Times, George Healy, of Natchez, is editor of Times-Picayune.

William Faulkner, of Oxford, the Nobel Prize winner, Miss Eudora Welty, of Jackson, and many others, are nationally known in the literary field. Clayton Rand, of Gulfport, and others are nationally known after-dinner speakers. Chief Justice Harvey McGehee has just retired as the president of the Chief Justices Association of America.

I could name many more men and women of Mississippi who in agriculture, science, education, politics, industry, and business, have distinguished themselves, and in so doing, have reflected glory upon our schools.

Mr. Bond speaks with truth. Education is described as the debt the present owes to future generations. We, of this present,

and the future of that past, are indebted to the pioneers who sacrificed so that we today can enjoy a new Mississippi.

Farm Legislation in the 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress is drawing to a close, and it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for the Members of the House the work of this Congress, thus far, in behalf of agriculture.

This report is a matter of great pride for me, and I am sure the majority of the Members of this body feel the same deep satisfaction in what is accomplished.

This 87th Congress, which convened in January, already has done more to change and improve the fortunes of the farm families of America than perhaps any Congress since the enactment of the basic agricultural laws that were designed to lift agriculture out of the great depression.

We have moved effectively to ease the cost-price squeeze that for almost a decade has strangled the farm economy. We have reversed the long downward trend in farm income. The effects of our work already are evident. During the month ended August 15, the index of prices received by farmers rose nearly 2 percent. The mid-August index was 3 percent above a year earlier.

This is being achieved because we have an administration and the Congress working together, with common objectives.

When this Congress convened in January, the time was nearing when farmers would plant their crops. A new administration was coming into power. Time was of the essence, if we were to come to grips in 1961 with the deepening depression that had settled upon the farmlands of our Nation. The situation demanded courageous and swift action.

The most pressing problem of agriculture confronting us was the great and burdensome surplus of wheat and feed grains, and the prospect that crops to be planted this year would build this surplus to more costly and staggering proportions.

The new administration, after Orville Freeman had been named the Secretary of Agriculture, and after he had consulted with farm legislators in the Congress, came forward with a proposal that offered the one great promise of injecting stability in a large area of agriculture in 1961. This was the feed grains bill.

This bill proposed to establish a one-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in 1961, and thereby to alleviate the conditions of oversupply and low prices then seriously depressing a major segment of the Nation's agriculture and placing on taxpayers the burden of holding nearly $4 billion of these grains.

Our Committee on Agriculture called this legislation up for consideration against a background of almost a decade of national controversy and bickering on farm policy, during which time the farm economy had gradually deteriorated. The basic issue in this background was between those who would remove restraints upon an already exploding production and those who contended that the only way for agriculture to achieve a fair price structure is to adjust production to the needs of the markets. Our Committee on Agriculture, with remarkable speed, resolved the issue in a determination to make the law of supply and demand work for the farmer, and not against him. We reported the legislation to provide incentives for farmers to reduce their production of feed grains. The Congress promptly passed the bill, and it was signed into law by the President.

Farmers responded magnificiently. They cooperated in the new program far beyond expectations. Consequently, feed grains production has been brought into reasonable bounds in 1961, to the great benefit of farmers and taxpayers as well.

Mr. Speaker, the program is expected to add around $750 million, in 1961, as compared with 1960, to the income of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley and soybean producers.

This 1961 feed grain program has worked, as follows:

First. Payment in cash or in kind for retiring 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage—or up to 20 acres, whichever is greater on individual farms. Eligibility for price support for corn and grain sorghum to be contingent upon participation in this diversion of 20 percent of acreage or 20 acres.

Second. Payment in kind for retiring an additional 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage. However, this additional acreage diversion would not be required as a condition for price support eligibility.

Third. An increase in the price support level for corn from $1.06 to $1.20 a bushel, and increases in the supports for grain sorghums and other feed grains. Also, an increase in the support level of soybeans, intended to divert at least 2 million acres from corn and grain sorghums.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture, with the feed grains program underway early in the spring, turned forthwith to work upon general farm legislation, to be effective with the 1962 crops.

I want to commend the members of our committee and the Members of the House, regardless of political party affiliations, who worked so long, so hard, and with such dedication, to reverse the long, desperate, downward trend in farm prices which had depressed the farm economy and impoverished large areas of agriculture. I am especially encouraged at the substantial support many Members representing city constituencies gave to this effort to stabilize the farm economy.

Agriculture is by far the Nation's largest industry. Farming employs more persons than the steel industry, automobile industry, transportation industry, and public utilities combined. This 87th Congress has demonstrated a sound awareness that what happens in agriculture bears directly not only upon farmers but ultimately upon consumers, taxpayers, and the economy as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the great range of clashing views abroad in this country on the direction farm policy should take, this Congress proceeded with the job that had to be done. We passed, and the President has signed, the Agricultural Act of 1961. I think it is the most important piece of legislation, in the interest of farmers, to be enacted in a decade.

Following are the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1961:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The act makes a broad declaration in behalf of policies in order more fully and effectively to improve, maintain, and protect the prices and incomes of farmers, to enlarge rural purchasing power, to achieve a better balance between supplies of agricultural commodities and the requirements of consumers therefor, to preserve and strengthen the structure of agriculture, and to revitalize and stabilize the overall economy at reasonable costs to the Government. It specifically declares it to be the policy of the Congress to "recognize the importance of the family farm as an efficient unit of production and as an economic base for towns and cities in rural areas and encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise."

TITLE I—SUPPLY AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Consultation on agricultural programs

Provides authority for consultation and advising with farmers and farm and commodity organizations in developing agricultural programs.

The 1962 wheat program

1. A mandatory reduction of 10 percent in wheat acreage and incentives for producers to reduce their acreage voluntarily another 30 percent to a maximum 40-percent acreage curtailment on individual farms. A producer could retire up to 40 percent of his allotment or 10 acres, whichever is greater, and receive payment for such diversion.

2. An exemption from marketing quotas limited to 13.5 acres per farm or the highest acreage planted for harvest in 1959, 1960, or 1961. The present exemption is 15 acres.

3. Price support limited to producers who do not exceed their reduced 1962 acreage allotment and who divert an acreage at least equal to 10 percent of their previous acreage allotment to conservation uses, with payments in cash or in kind on up to 45 percent of normal production for such diversion.

Secretary Freeman has set the 1962 wheat support at a national average of $2 a bushel. This is 83½ percent of parity. The support this year is $1.79 or 75 percent of parity.

4. Payments in cash or in kind up to 60 percent on normal production on wheat acres voluntarily removed from production above the mandatory 10-percent diversion.

5. Authority for producers to plant castor beans, guar, sunflower, safflower, or sesame, if designated by the Secretary, subject to the conditions that no payment shall be made with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity.

6. Increases the marketing penalty from 45 to 65 percent of parity price and establishes stricter computation of amount subject to penalty, in cases of noncompliance with allotments.

7. Provides that where producers can prove their 1959 and 1960 acreages and yields, these figures shall be accepted.

8. Authority for 3 years, beginning with 1962, for the Secretary to increase Durum wheat acreage allotments if the supply warrants. No export subsidies on Durum if acreage is increased.

The 1962 feed grains program

1. A voluntary retirement of acreage previously devoted to corn, grain sorghum, and barley. The 1962 program would add barley to the grain program in operation for corn and grain sorghum in 1961. A special exemption is provided for producers of malting barley.

2. Payments to producers on retired acreage up to 50 percent of the normal value of production on these acres, at the current support rate, for the first 20 percent of the corn, grain sorghum, and barley acres retired to a conservation use, and payment up to 60 percent of the normal value of production on land retired above 20 percent of the previous acreage in these crops. Any producer may place a minimum of 20 acres of cropland in conservation use and receive payments.

3. A price support level determined at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, but not less than 65 percent of parity. Under similar provision in the 1961 program the Secretary set the support of corn at $1.20 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity, and grain sorghum at $1.93 a hundredweight, or 78 percent of parity. The corn support in 1960 was $1.06 and grain sorghum $1.52.

4. As a condition of eligibility for price support a producer of corn, grain sorghum or barley (except as provided for malting barley) must participate in the acreage reduction program for these crops in 1962, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary. To be in compliance with the program, a producer of corn or grain must not increase his acreage of barley and a producer of barley must not increase his acreage of corn or grain sorghum.

Marketing orders

1. Adds to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, peanuts by areas of production, turkeys and turkey hatching eggs, cherries and cranberries for canning or freezing; and also adds apples, both fresh and for canning and freezing (and products except canned or frozen products are covered) in Michigan, New York, New England, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, and California. The provision relating to peanuts requires that if any orders are developed for peanuts, each of such orders shall be limited to peanuts produced in one of the areas named in the bill. Tobacco would remain in the list of commodities where producers, if they wish, could develop marketing orders. Soybeans are deleted from this list.

2. Requires processors representing over 50 percent of the volume of cranberries, cherries, and apples for canning or freezing to approve any marketing order, as well as producers, before it can become effective.

3. Also includes provisions: (a) amending the above-parity provision of the act to prevent termination of orders prior to the end of the marketing season; (b) changing the civil penalty provision to aid enforcement by reducing the penalty and dropping "willful"; (c) permitting orders for groups or portions of commodities; (d) requiring referendums for initial orders and that the ballot describe the order; and (e) providing for processor refrendums in cases where processor approval is required.

4. Adds to the commodities subject to import regulation under section 8e, when marketing orders are in effect on the same commodities in the United States, oranges, onions, walnuts, and dates except dates for processing.

Wool

Extends the National Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1966.

TITLE II—EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 480—AGRICULTURE TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

1. Amends title I (sales of commodities for foreign currencies) of Public Law 480 to (a) extend title for 3 years; (b) establish a limitation of $4.5 billion on disposal of surpluses under title I agreements for a 3-year period and an annual limit of $2.5 billion; (c) authorize the use of foreign currencies for dollar sales to American tourists; (d) improve the agricultural market development activities in foreign nations by setting aside 5 percent of the foreign currencies acquired each year to this purpose and by requiring that not less than 2 percent of the foreign currency sales proceeds be convertible into the currencies of other foreign nations as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary to improve overall U.S. market development activities.

2. Amends title II (food donations to relieve distress among friendly peoples) to (a) extend title II for 3 years through December 31, 1964; (b) extend authority for economic development for 3 years through December 31, 1964; (c) continue present authorization of $300 million per year, plus carryover; (d) make annual limitation applicable to amount programed rather than amount spent.

TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

1. Real estate loans:

(a) To persons who are or will become owner-operators of not larger than family farms.

(b) Available to all farm owners and tenants for soil and water conservation measures.

(c) May be made to certain nonprofit associations for soil and water conservation, drainage, and flood control, with an insured loan limit of $1 million and a direct loan limit of $500,000.

(d) Sets the limit on loans to individuals for land acquisition at $60,000.

(e) Both insured and direct loans may be made up to 100 percent of normal value of the farm.

(f) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 5 percent plus fees. Out of 5 percent paid by insured loan borrowers, one-half of 1 percent to go to insurance fund and one-half of 1 percent now used for administrative expenses could go to the lender as additional interest.

(g) In determining eligibility for real estate loans the Secretary must consider prevailing private and cooperative interest rates in the community and must determine that the applicant is a U.S. citizen, has farm background and either training or experience, and is or will become a family farm owner-operator.

2. Operating loans:

(a) Increases loan limit from $20,000 to $35,000, and limits term of loan to 7 years. Not more than 25 percent of the annual appropriation can be used to create borrower indebtedness in excess of $15,000.

(b) Authorizes participation loans up to 80 percent with private lenders.

(c) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 5 percent.

(d) Authorizes loans to soil conservation districts which are unable to obtain necessary credit elsewhere on reasonable terms and conditions, to purchase farm equipment customarily used for soil conservation purposes. Single loans are limited to $35,000 outstanding indebtedness and total loans cannot exceed $500,000 in any 1 year.

(e) In determining eligibility for operating loans the Secretary must consider prevailing interest rates in the local community and must determine that the applicant is a U.S. citizen, has farm background and either training or experience and is or will become a family farm owner-operator.

3. Emergency loans:

(a) Authorized in areas suffering from natural disaster conditions.

(b) Provides interest rate of not to exceed 3 percent under terms applicable to regular real estate or operating loans.

(c) In determining eligibility for emergency loans the Secretary must consider any established farmer or rancher or citizen of the United States or a private domestic corporation or partnership engaged primarily in farming or ranching in designated areas with experience and resources sufficient for probable successful operation, and persons or corporations outside designated areas who have suffered severe production losses not general to the area.

TITLE IV—GENERAL

1. Extension of Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971.

2. Extension of the school milk program for 5 years through June 30, 1967, with the House provision requiring annual appropriations.

3. Extension of the veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs for 3 years through December 31, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the earlier special feed grains bill are the major enactments of the 87th Congress thus far, in behalf of agriculture. But along with this work we have developed and enacted other important legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture, thus contributing to the strength of the general economy.

Of particular importance was the bill to extend and amend the Sugar Act.

In July 1960, Congress enacted Public Law 86–592, which, first, extended the Sugar Act for 3 months—from December 31, 1960, to March 31, 1961—second, authorized the President to set the Cuban sugar quota for the balance of the calendar year 1960 and for the first 3 months of 1961 at any level not in excess of the Cuban quota under the basic quota system of the Sugar Act, and, third, directed the manner in which replacement supplies of sugar were to be obtained upon reduction of the Cuban quota.

Under this authority the Cuban quota has been cut to zero.

The sugar bill we enacted this year extended the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962. It did not change the basic provisions of the act, although the legislation embraced two amendments to the emergency authority: First, to relieve the President of the obligation to purchase any part of the sugar formerly supplied by Cuba from any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations; and second, to require that in above-quota foreign purchases consideration should be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

The necessity of passing the bill before the Sugar Act expired on March 31 this year, and the complicated nature of the Sugar Act, which finds all of its provisions interrelated and dependent upon each other, made it impossible for the committee to take action on several propositions which would have made substantial changes in the basic act.

It was the committee's intention, upon completing work on the Agricultural Act of 1961, to return to sugar problems and hold the necessary hearings and conduct the essential studies to enact long-term

sugar legislation, dealing with quota adjustments for foreign supplies and with the desire for expansion of domestic sugar production in old and new areas. We were awaiting recommendations from the Department of Agriculture, which administers the sugar program.

On August 3, I received a letter from Secretary Freeman advising that for several reasons it appeared inadvisable for the Department to present recommendations for amending and extending the Sugar Act before the beginning of the next session of Congress. He said "world production and marketing of sugar are undergong realinement and the situation has not yet stabilized," and this fact, coupled with other uncertainties in the international fields "lead us to believe it wise to reserve judgment for the present about some of the major issues respecting sugar import quotas." Moreover, the Secretary said "within the domestic sugar industry there are also important unresolved issues."

I subsequently announced that no further sugar legislation would be considered at this session but that such legislation will be given preferred treatment when the Congress returns in January. But, ever alert to the problems relating to sugar, internationally and among our own producers, our committee on September 7 adopted resolutions:

First. That the President be requested to instruct those in charge of administering the sugar program that it is the clear intent of Congress that in making any foreign purchases of sugar for the calendar year 1962 clear preference is to be given those countries which offer to buy a reasonable quantity of U.S. agricultural commodities in return for our purchase of their sugar.

Second. That it is the sense of the committee that in allocating the sugar tonnage necessary to supply the domestic growth factor, the Secretary of Agriculture should make allocations to new mills so that this new tonnage can support the development of the sugar industry in new areas in anticipation of passage of legislation revising the Sugar Act in 1962.

Third. That the committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement, which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas such as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws.

Mr. Speaker, the three major farm enactments I have discussed are Public Law 87-5—the special feed grains program for 1961; Public Law 87-15—amend and extend the Sugar Act; and Public Law 87-128—the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Our committee has considered and reported to the House many other bills in this session dealing with specific matters relating to agriculture. A number have become public law, including:

Public Law 87-8—Farmers Home Administration loans (ceiling increase).

Public Law 87-10—extend time for application of 1959 amendment to Federal Nematocide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act.

Public Law 87-28—amend title I of Public Law 480 (provides $2 billion additional authority during 1961).

Public Law 87-33—temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

Public Law 87-37—cotton acreage allotments transfer from flooded areas.

Public Law 87-62—emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve acreage in drought areas.

Public Law 87-67—special milk program for children, expanded and extended to June 30, 1962.

Public Law 87-104—wheat referendum time extension to August 26, 1961.

Public Law 87-106—emergency livestock loans extension.

Public Law 87-127—surplus grain sales in disaster areas.

As I make this report, several bills relating to agriculture are awaiting final action before we adjourn. Among these is the Mexican farm labor bill.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this report, let me emphasize again to my colleagues that the work we have done in this first session of the 87th Congress, particularly in the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the special feed grains program for 1961, will restore stability to large areas of agriculture. It will reduce burdensome farm surpluses. It will save taxpayers almost $1 billion by diminishing expenditures on farm programs.

However, Mr. Speaker, we by no means have solved all of the problems of agriculture. Some commodities will not be helped by what we have done. They still will be in trouble when this session is adjourned.

In most of these commodities, effective action by the Congress must await the development of unity among producers on what kind of program they want.

The 2d session of the 87th Congress, which convenes next January, will write further general farm legislation. I am hopeful, and I am sure my colleagues here are hopeful, that leadership and unity among farmers themselves will develop in such a way that we may then be able to take another great stride to provide adequate rewards for the people of this country who have made us the best fed nation on the face of the earth.

Dedication of Younger Generation to Future of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Hebrew words "kibbutz," "sabra," "Nachal," and "Moishe" may be unfamiliar to many of us. Yet these words are the key to the future of Israel and their significance to the people of this great nation is evidenced by the article from the September 1, 1961, issue of the Minneapolis Star.

A kibbutz, Mr. President, is an Israel community, and the sabras are the youth who are native Israelis. Moishe, who in the United States would be John or Mike, is a member of the Nachal, the kibbutz army. Moishe, and other dedicated young Israelis like him, have laid personal gain aside and is fighting for a cause—the greatness of Israel through equality for all.

Mr. President, this article from the Star was written by a young man who speaks from firsthand experience. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Sept. 1, 1961]

ISRAEL'S REBELS WITH A CAUSE—YOUNG, VIGOROUS ELEMENT HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE KIEBBUTZ

(By Richard Gilmore)

A long, curving road lined with tall, ethereal pine trees. Fields of hay, tomatoes, and potatoes. Richard orchards of peaches and succulent plums. A large iron gate skirted by barbed wire. Simple cottages overlooking the Mediterranean and Lebanon. Sturdy people working, singing, sweating, smiling. This is Kibbutz Mazzuva, a communal settlement in the north of Israel.

Twelve years ago the rich fields to the right and left of the main road were arid spaces covered by layers of rocks. Sixteen years ago water had to be gathered in buckets from the nearest possible source which was in Arab territory. The beautiful cottages were shabby tents. The people sweated more than they smiled.

Thirty-three original families worked to build and defend Mazzuva. Other families joined this group to make the Mazzuva of today a reality.

To the adults and other members of the kibbutz has been added a new element—the sabras. They are the youth who are native Israelis. Most of them seem to feel a strong, chauvinistic spirit toward their new country. They are the realization of their parents' dream.

Although their parents came from approximately 80 different countries, the sabra represents the true Israeli in his culture, his way of life, his new dynamic spirit.

The Hebrew word, "sabra," is applied to a cactus plant which is hard and impervious on the outside, but quite soft and sensitive on the inside. This word describes the Israeli youth.

The sensitivity is derived from their heritage, their education, their social and moral code, and their human inadequacies. The external qualities of the sabra are his hardness, his spirit, his courage. These characteristics of sabras are most apparent when they serve in the army of Israel.

At Mazzuva there is a kibbutz army, the Nachal, composed of boys and girls from 18 to 20. These are sabras who are the new pioneers of both young and poorly established Kibbutzim, as well as the older Kibbutzim.

An average sabra in the Nachal could be called Moishe. Since Moishe is in the army, he is in prime physical condition and very proud of his strength, his birth, and his fortitude.

Moishe is a rebel with a cause. His family lives in Tel Aviv and is quite prosperous. Naturally, they want Moishe to live the same sort of existence they have chosen in Israel.

However, Moishe is a much greater idealist than his parents.

He believes in the kibbutz philosophy in pursuing socialistic concepts until a certain progress has been achieved. He feels that personal desire should be as limited as possible. The raison d'etre he advocated is to have equality on all levels, to help his country without the use of personal gain and to raise his children without clan conflict.

For these reasons Moishe has left his home. He must first fulfill his compulsory army service, and second, become a part of the kibbutz movement. He especially wants to work in an underdeveloped kibbutz. To train for this future, Moishe has joined the Nachal. He lives in army barracks, but works in various kibbutz endeavors.

Moishe has been working in the banana fields for a long time. This has become his customary profession. At night, he puts his name down on the night watchman's list for 3:30 a.m. rising. This is the time he must get up to begin work in the banana fields at 4 a.m.

When he arrives at the banana plantation, he is given his usual job, which he will have for the entire summer. His task consists of selecting the ripe banana bunches, cutting them, covering the bunches from the sun, and cutting down the old banana plant. Moishe enjoys this work because of its physical difficulty as well as its importance to the kibbutz.

After working for 4 hours Moishe returns to the shack in the field to eat his well-earned breakfast.

Until 1 p.m. Moishe continues the same work with equal enjoyment and vigor. At the approaching hour, Moishe pulls himself, with shirt in hand, to the tractor. This time he jumps up on the flat wagon, having finished his work for the day. When he returns to the kibbutz, he has a pleasant main meal, which is like an American dinner.

After the meal, to the showers or a pool and then to bed. At 5:30, usually by instinct, Moishe awakes in time for his evening meal. For this meal, Moishe appears in army uniform. Although the attire is different from that worn at breakfast; nevertheless, the meal is the same.

After dinner there is more time for relaxation, dancing, and sleeping. But soon night falls. Moishe returns to the barracks, laughing, content, proud. The adults go back to their rooms. The children are asleep. Crickets awake, drowning out the sound of the sprinklers. The bright moonlight reveals the road, lined with the tall trees still winding its way through dark fields to Mazzuva gate.

Extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 of 81st Congress and the National Defense Education Act of 1958

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 9000—which will extend the expired provisions of Public Law 815 and 874, and the National Defense Education Act for another two years—but I will do so with great reluctance. In fact, if this legislation were not of such great financial importance to my district, I would vote against it.

Let me make it clear that I fully recognize the importance of this legislation in its own right. I believe, however, that it is a sad commentary on our perception of the crucial problems confronting us nationally in the field of education today when legislation as limited as this is the maximum effort which can be brought before the Congress. To be blunt, Mr. Speaker, I am sorely disappointed that the constructive proposals for dealing with our serious shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers—have been sidetracked.

I can only say that I am very hopeful that legislation of a similar magnitude will be brought before the House in the second session of this Congress, and that it will be passed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my best judgment that legislation of this nature is absolutely essential if we are to meet one of our fundamental commitments as a Nation—a commitment of insuring every child the opportunity for an education that will develop him to the fullest of his abilities. These are crucial times in which we live and nothing short of such an effort will enable us to remain strong and free as a nation—nothing short of such an effort will enable us to remain the leader of the free world in these troubled and difficult times.

Myers Bros.: Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, this year Myers Bros. Department Store of Springfield, Ill., is celebrating its diamond jubilee. This store is as much a part of that city as the historic Lincoln shrines. In a sense it is a Lincoln shrine, as the present store is located on the site once occupied by a law office of Abraham Lincoln.

This occasion commemorates more than just 75 years in the retail business. It marks the consistent policy of the Myers Bros. to follow fundamental rules of responsibility of business in a country of free enterprise.

The combination of energetic work, business ingenuity, forward-thinking, and a tradition of providing top quality merchandise at the lowest possible price are the major ingredients of success in this "store that quality built." Coupled with this strictly business attitude, however, is the family's pride in their hometown. "Civic duty is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in our community," has been the motto of the Myers brothers since the founding of their business in 1886.

There is quite a contrast between the first and present stores. Myers Bros. in the beginning, was a two-story building, 22 feet wide, located on the west side of Lincoln Square and the Sangamon County Courthouse. Albert and Louis Myers, later joined by their younger brother Julius, purchased the business in 1886 from Sam Rosenwald, whose faith in these young men was so profound that he personally chose them as the new owners and lent them money for the purchase of the store. Rosenwald was the father of Julius Rosenwald, who later became famous through his association with Sears, Roebuck & Co., and as a great philanthropist.

Albert and Louis started out with one clerk and credit to buy merchandise. But through economical management, they had cleared their indebtedness and were making a profit from their venture before the first year was out.

By 1900 the store had expanded from the potbellied stove and kerosene lamp atmosphere, and the business was moved into a brandnew five-storied building on the corner of Fifth and Washington Streets.

In 1924, disaster struck, and the store was burned to the ground. Undaunted by this setback, the Myers brothers bought out a store down the street—lock, stock, and barrel—and were back in business the next day, making plans for their present 10-story home. Without a halt in operation or inconvenience to their customers, Myers Bros. were back with an expanded business in only 1 year.

This example is typical of how the Myers brothers weathered other rough times—wars, depressions, boomlets and booms. But as times and methods change, the Myers brothers family proved not only adaptable to such change, but succeeded in accumulating a record of leadership in both local and national business affairs.

Locally, Myers Bros. collected a string of "firsts." Their store was the first Springfield business ever honored with front-page recognition in the Wall Street Journal; the first to use color advertising, first to hold a live flower show in connection with spring openings, first to publish an extensive Sunday rotogravure section, first to carry a noncontributory pension plan for their employees, and first with store-home deliveries for their customers.

Countrywide recognition came when Julius Myers, now deceased, became the first president of the National Retail Merchants Association. Myers Bros. are also recipients of the sixth annual retail award plaque, 1954, citing them as brand name retailer of the year.

Thus, what began as a small store in a pioneer town has now blossomed into an established business with six branch stores throughout central Illinois, servicing Jacksonville, Danville, Lincoln, Mattoon, Havana, and Alton.

Myers Bros. have come the long way from a one-clerk operation to a payroll of 250 persons. Their average employee has 6 years' service, and many have 25 years or more. The store now has 67 selling departments, and 14 service departments, all coordinated and timed in buying and selling procedures to keep up with and anticipate current trends in the market.

The brothers themselves have contributed three generations of service to their business and their community. There is virtually no major civic group that has

not felt the personal help and leadership of one or more of the Myers brothers. From the founders to the present managers, Stanley C., Albert M., Alan J., James E., Morris and Louis, the Illinois State Capital and subsequently other communities have benefited by their devotion as active citizens.

Whether it is a Boy Scout, junior college, YMCA, hospital or civic club drive, one of the Myers family can always be found in assistance. To these men, such work is merely in keeping with their philosophy that "a growing and progressive community and a growing and progressive business are one and the same."

Thus, credit to Myers Bros. is not just a passing recognition of a successful business, which it is; but also the recognition of a sincere application of principles and integrity, in the quest for a better future. Myers Bros. are evidence of the fact that a strong community is based on the permanence of economic enterprise and faithful citizenship.

In closing I would like to note that the founders of this fine and upstanding business were close friends of my father, Peter F. Mack, Sr.; and I am proud to say that the present owners are good friends of mine.

Progress Report on Rural Areas Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, the progress of the rural counties of the United States is just as vital, if not more vital in many ways, to the continued progress and prosperity of this country as our great cities. The establishment of the Area Redevelopment Agency in the U.S. Department of Commerce has been a good step in the right direction toward the relief of those cities hard hit by the recession which this country experienced the past year. I have long been interested in the plight of some of our more rural communities, and am pleased to be able to insert in the RECORD at this time, the following statement provided me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture telling of that Department's activities in the rural areas of the country. This is just another sign of the tremendous interest of the Kennedy administration in all our peoples, be they in cities or the rural areas. Under unanimous consent, I included this information in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PROGRESS REPORT ON RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Agriculture has launched a full-scale campaign to end rural poverty by aggressively promoting more jobs and other opportunities in the Nation's rural counties.

Since January 20 the Department has moved rapidly to mobilize its resources and personnel for a total program of rural areas development, which Secretary Freeman terms, "more important to the long-range future of our Nation than any other program now being conducted by the Department."

In the short space of 7 months the new RAD program has gone into operation throughout the Nation, reinforced by new and strengthened services of the Department. Some highlights of the remarkable progress that's been made:

Establishment of a top level Department of Agriculture RAD Board and staff to get the program into operation.

Organization of State and local RAD activities, with Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and Federal Extension Service assigned the full-time job of helping local groups get underway.

Naming of 487 rural counties as eligible for financial aid under the new Area Redevelopment Act, and direct USDA assistance to leaders in making use of ARA to strengthen their economies.

Stepped up rural electrification, farm credit, and small watershed work of the Department to make even greater resources available for rural development. Of particular importance is more imaginative use of REA section 5 loans to finance machinery in rural industries.

The task of rural areas development is national in scope, international in gravity. Today in the United States more than 36 percent of all farm families have incomes of less than $2,000 a year. Last year, if underemployment in the Nation's farm regions were converted into terms of unemployment, there would have been 1.4 million persons in rural America unemployed.

RAD aims at more rapid economic growth in farm communities and small towns where these underemployed families live. This is a key factor in winning the cold war. The United States must prove to noncommitted peoples of the world, most of whom live in rural sections, that rural poverty and suffering can be eliminated at home. Otherwise they will turn to other governmental systems for an answer to their problems.

For both domestic and international reasons, therefore, Secretary Freeman has placed RAD at the top of his priority list of USDA objectives. In March 1961, as a first step, he established the Rural Areas Development Board representing 12 USDA agencies. In June he set up an Office of Rural Areas Development to staff and coordinate the program. At that time, the Secretary also assigned specific jobs to three key USDA agencies, with the aim of getting work started at the grassroots as soon as possible.

Farmers Home Administration is responsible for establishing RAD panels to supply State and local leaders with technical aid in promoting new enterprises.

Federal Extension Service is responsible for providing organizational and educational leadership to State and local RAD committees. These include civic leaders, farm and business representatives, rural electric borrowers, State development agencies, trade union representatives, and all other interested groups.

Rural Electrification Administration has the job of stimulating new business and other enterprises to build employment in rural areas.

Drawing on a broad background of work with farm and other rural people, each of these key USDA agencies has rapidly geared up for its RAD assignments.

Farmers Home Administration set up a special staff to handle RAD work, and is now holding a series of training meetings with key field personnel. REA also has a new staff of some 15 specialists who are helping communities develop new rural enterprises. Rural electric and telephone co-ops are enthusiastically joining in local RAD programs. For many rural electric co-ops, rural development is tied in closely with their future operations. And in July Federal and State extension officials mobilized additional resources at National, State and county levels to support the program and conducted a series of regional meetings to intensify staff contributions for the program.

Other USDA agencies represented on the Department's RAD Board have also acted to strengthen and step up those programs that promote area development.

This rapid action on the part of the Department of Agriculture has resulted in RAD program organizations in 38 States, with local program districts of two or more rural counties already organized in 25 States.

The Department of Agriculture also has the job of helping eligible rural counties obtain benefits under the new Area Redevelopment Act. These benefits include Federal loans and grants for public works and industrial development, technical aid, and retraining of workers, including farmers and farmworkers.

Among the Department's major assignments under the act are selecting rural counties to receive assistance; reviewing area plans for development; and most important, helping local leaders put together plans and projects that will take full advantage of the new ARA program.

Because of the Department's already existing organization for Rural Areas Development, rapid progress has been made in selecting rural counties for the ARA programs, formulating area-wide plans, and setting up local groups capable of running the program in the rural (5b) areas.

Nearly a third of the Nation's counties are covered by areas now eligible to apply for the ARA program, including 487 rural countries in 41 States and Puerto Rico. Long-range economic development plans for revitalizing their economies already have been approved for 180 counties in 22 States. The majority of these are rural redevelopment counties, assisted by the Department of Agriculture, or other similar areas with large numbers of underemployed people living in farm areas.

ARA is another tool the Department of Agriculture is using to promote maximum economic development in farming areas, along with its own extremely important kit of aread evelopment services and aids.

Many of these regular programs of the Department which implement and further local area development plans have been stepped up in this revitalized Rural Areas Development campaign against rural poverty.

Since early 1961, REA has approved 144 electrification loans amounting to $166,781,000 and 125 telephone loans totaling $42,594,000. Loans for generating and transmission facilities amounted to 57.6 percent of the electric total, and included a $60 million loan, largest in REA's 26-year history, to Hoosier Cooperative Energy, Inc., of Indiana.

On September 8, REA approved a $25,000 loan to a rural electric cooperative which will enable a small North Dakota firm to add equipment and create new jobs in a farming area. It was made under the consumer financing provision (section 5) of the Rural Electrification Act. REA policy on loans to help consumers acquire electrical equipment has been expanded to gear this lending program to the needs of rural areas for increased nonfarm income.

Between January 1 and August 1, 1961, 55 small watershed projects including 4.5 million acres were authorized to receive planning assistance, and 36 projects including 1.6 million acres were authorized for operations. On August 1, 325 projects including 18.6 million acres had been authorized for operations.

Between May 19 and August 14 President Kennedy sent to the Congress for approval work plans for 54 watershed projects including 3.9 million acres, the largest number

sent to the Congress in a 90-day period since the program was authorized in 1954.

The Farmers Home Administration had a sharp rise in lending activity during the past 7 months and ended the 1961 fiscal year lending $397 million, an all-time high.

Recent legislation is now being implemented which will make a more adequately financed, broadened, and expanded credit program available to a wider range of farmers, particularly young farmers just getting started and farm families on the smaller farms.

Under the Housing Act of 1961 rural residents including those living in small communities are now eligible along with farmers for more than $430 million rural housing loan funds available over the next 4 years to construct, improve, or repair homes and related facilities.

Secretary Freeman has called the achievement of full prosperity in America's rural areas "a key factor in the world contest with communism."

"I believe that in the rural areas development program we have the weapon to wipe away the chronic depression which now enchains many areas, it can lift the curse of underemployment which saps the strength of our rural economy in every area and it takes the first step toward the permanent prosperity of the rural community.

"This program, combined with the freedom of economic choice which the Kennedy farm legislation will provide the farmer, will help restore full freedom of economic opportunity to those who live in rural America," the Secretary said.

Ben-Gurion Foresees Democracy in Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a Republican did not make the following statement as reported in the September 11 New York Times; perhaps it will now be believed:

BEN-GURION FORESEES DEMOCRACY IN SOVIET

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL SECTOR), September 10.—Premier David Ben-Gurion said today that if the cold war would end, in 20 years the United States would be a welfare state and the Soviet Union a democratic country.

The caretaker Premier made the prediction in an interview for the newspaper Yedion Ahronot on the eve of the Jewish New Year.

Mr. Ben-Gurion also drew a sweeping picture for the future of Israel. Within 40 years, he said, Israel's population of just over 2 million will double. Much of the population growth, he said, will occur in the desert region of the Negev.

In light of the above, the following column by David Lawrence in the September 11 New York Herald Tribune is of interest:

STEEL PRICE CURBS VIEWED AS ROAD TO COMMUNISM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration has crossed the Rubicon. It has decided to make war on conservative economics and embark on a course of radical economics. It is ignoring the risk that it may plunge the country into more unemployment within the next 18 months and bring about perhaps the worst recession since the 1930's.

For President Kennedy has determined to put certain limits on business profits and the return on investments that stockholders have hitherto expected when putting their savings into private enterprise. The net result could be the gradual collapse of the private-enterprise system in America and the beginning of that era of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has predicted will inevitably lead to communism in another generation in the United States.

President Kennedy's crucial step came a few days ago when he openly threatened the steel industry with reprisals by Government unless it agreed to forego any price increases at this time. Mr. Kennedy vaguely promised that next year, when the unions ask for still higher wages, he would urge "moderation." He didn't define the term. But the entire business world noted that Mr. Kennedy significantly refused to ask the unions at this time to forego the additional wage increases scheduled for them at the end of this month under a contract signed early in 1960 after a long strike.

The steel industry thus far has absorbed a 10-percent rise in labor costs since 1958 without a price increase. Fairplay would seem to require that, since the steel industry has already absorbed this large increase in wages without a price rise, the least that Mr. Kennedy might have done was to ask labor to cancel its increase scheduled for October 1 this year.

COMPARISON IS MADE

But the Kennedy administration has sitting in the Cabinet, as Secretary of Labor, the man who was general counsel of the biggest steel union in the country. Had there been a Secretary of Commerce in a Republican administration who had previously been a leader in the steel industry—either as president of a large company or as its principal negotiator just a few months earlier during a major strike—the howl that would have gone up about "conflict of interest" would have been heard from coast to coast.

Industry has no voice in the Kennedy Cabinet. The Secretary of Commerce is afraid of his shadow and allowed himself to be influenced by the radicals in the administration when he ordered the virtual suppression of the Business Advisory Council which had existed for decades as a means of communication between business and the executive branch of the Government.

President Kennedy's procedure in writing a letter to 12 steel companies and in immediately making it public is the subject of sharp criticism. He did not invite these steel executives to come to Washington beforehand to give their side of the issue. He took them by surprise as he issued his letter and threatened restrictive measures if they didn't obey.

This is one of the most surprising moves any President has made in recent years, and it is small wonder that it is being regarded as the beginning of a series of hostile acts to throttle American enterprise and to pave the way for nationalization or socialization of the larger industries in America.

ADVISERS BLAMED

Mr. Kennedy himself has never been regarded as a radical, but he has surrounded himself with advisers who sincerely believe in Government ownership. In giving their advice, they can hardly refrain from advocating a philosophy which could eventually mean the end of private capitalism in America. Every one of these advisers hates communism and all that Mr. Khrushchev stands for, but, as is the case in Britain with the Socialist Laborites who favor nationalization of industry, they don't always realise the ultimate consequences of current action.

Mr. Kennedy is not himself an economist. He finds himself lost in economic jargon and economic arguments, and tends to follow what seems to him a plausible policy. His economic advisers concede that it is a most hazardous undertaking to estimate future output and profits in steel, but they did it just the same and took no account of the need of different companies to buy new plant and equipment or to continue to earn a proper return on investors' money. Instead, a blanket order was favored that would cut profit margins and let labor have its October 1 increase just the same.

Meanwhile, the Department of Justice is engaging in a crusade against large business enterprises by brandishing antitrust suits in their faces almost every day. It is interesting to note that the executives of the 12 companies which got the President's identical letter are virtually forbidden to discuss it with each other, since the subject is price-making. The steel companies could be hauled into court for price collusion if they as much as sat down together to discuss what kind of replies they should make as an industry.

Indeed, the future of all trade associations in America may well be in jeopardy if the Kennedy administration cries out price fixing every time business leaders go to an annual convention of their industry to discuss common problems, including threats coming from foreign competition. The annual meeting of the American Iron & Steel Institute had, for instance, long been scheduled for this week, but it was canceled for fear that any meeting of steel executives at this time would be misunderstood. And all this happens in "free" America.

High Commissioner Goding Reports to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, among the lesser known areas under the legislative jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States through its House Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

This 300,000-square-mile area, located in the western Pacific, is longer than the United States but contains only 687 square miles of land upon which resides roughly 76,000 inhabitants. The territory belongs to the United Nations but is administered by Interior Department's High Commissioner of Trust Territory and his staff.

Each year the High Commissioner reports in writing and verbally to the United Nations Trusteeship Council on the preceding year's activities. On June 14, 15, and 16, I, and several members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Representatives Westland, Carey, Durno, Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern, of Puerto Rico, and our committee counsel, T. R. Witmer, attended the Council meetings and were well pleased with the manner in which High Commissioner M. Wilfred Goding,

former High Commissioner D. H. Nucker, and Mr. Tosiwo Nakayama, President of the Trukese Congress and adviser to Mr. Goding, presented their statements, answered their questioners, and explained their administration to the Trusteeship Council members.

Mr. Speaker, I submit four statements for reading by our colleagues. The first three are presentations by High Commissioner Goding and the fourth by Special Adviser Nakayama. The first statement follows:

It is a privilege to appear before this body as the special representative of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This is the first time that I have had the honor of serving in this capacity, and I look forward to receiving the comments and suggestions of this body.

On May 1 of this year I was appointed High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, and my tenure in the territory, thus, has been very brief. I have, however, visited four of the districts and have had the opportunity to observe firsthand district-level problems and needs. The Administering Authority also has designated Mr. [Delmas H.] Nucker, the former High Commissioner who is well known to the council, to serve with me as a second special representative for this session, and with your permission I will be referring to him questions on past events and programs with which I may not be familiar in detail. For my part I shall endeavor to the best of my ability to amplify or clarify any questions on present and proposed programs.

This year's review by this council has several important and significant features. A new national administration has come into being in the United States, and a new High Commissioner has been appointed for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The council also has before it for review the comprehensive report of the 1961 visiting mission in addition to our annual report. The combination of these factors gives our administration a unique opportunity to review accomplishments of the past 10 years, to reassess needs, and to plan programs for the future.

The visiting mission was the fifth mission to inspect the territory. It was also the first to devote its attention exclusively to our territory. Accordingly the mission was able to spend approximately twice the time in our area than had any other previous mission. This enabled the members to visit more areas, to hold more conferences with the staff and local Micronesian groups, and to conduct more public meetings. It afforded them the opportunity to delve deeply into specific problems. The mission penetrated into village areas near district centers, where shortness of time previously had prevented visits. Equally important, the mission was able to visit more out-islands than any previous mission. The travels of the mission by plane, by motorboat, by outrigger canoe, by jeep, and by foot—and, I am told, on one memorable occasion by swimming on the part of at least one member—brought to the members, perhaps more than to any previous mission, an appreciation of the many difficulties imposed by our peculiar logistic system, our extremely limited natural resources, and the differences in language and custom which exist throughout the territory. The 1961 mission had an unparalled opportunity to participate firsthand in the unique difficulties which confront us in trying to handle the many phases of social, economic, and political development. The mission performed its task conscientiously, ably, and with great devotion. On behalf of the Administering Authority I wish to thank the members of the mission for their valuable report and to assure the council that the recommendations will be studied with care and given every consideration.

Since our annual report and the visiting mission report provide the council with much detail on specific programs, I propose today to sketch only the highlights of our major activities since June 30, 1960, up to the present time.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Significant progress has been made on all levels in the field of political development.

The fifth annual meeting of the Interdistrict Advisory Committee met last August to consider problems of common interest in the territory. A holdover subcommittee on economic development was elected and given the task of visiting all districts to study problems of economic development, and the committee has done so. Its report, along with that of the social development subcommittee—both excellent reports—will be important agenda items at the forthcoming interdistrict conference this summer. This year it is proposed that the interdistrict conference elect a third holdover subcommittee—on political development—to work on common problems in the political field. Thus three subcommittees dealing with major areas of interest will be available during the year to advise the High Commissioner's office.

Two events of note concerning the Interdistrict Advisory Committee might be mentioned.

At its spring session the Palau District Congress passed a bill calling for popular election of the interdistrict delegates rather than election by the Congress, as is now the case. This bill is still in committee, but I propose to approve it when it is submitted and further intend to call it to the attention of the other district congresses for their consideration.

At the meeting next September Saipan District will send two full-fledged delegates, rather than an observer as has been the case in the past.

Both of these events, we believe, will aid in developing more of a territory-wide consciousness among the people of the districts.

By the end of the next year all delegates to the interdistrict body should be elected at large from their respective districts. One of the main tasks of the proposed subcommittee on political development will be to work out plans, in collaboration with district leaders, for conversion of the present Interdistrict Committee into a Territorial Council. We envision, if the present rate of political growth and progress continues, that by 1965 we should have a territorial legislative council in existence.

Political development on a district level has been most satisfactory. The spring sessions of the various district congresses have just been concluded, and they were, in our estimation, the most successful to date. Palau Congress, for example, sat in session twice as long as at any prior session and thus was able to devote more time to study the bills before them. The visiting mission had an opportunity to meet with representatives of the district congresses in all districts, and the members will attest, I am certain, to the sincerity and concern of these district congresses to the problems of their respective districts.

On a municipal level work continued on the formal chartering program. Since the establishment in 1959 of the target of chartering all municipalities, 43 have been chartered and our goal of chartering on an average of 10 municipalities a year has been realized to date. The municipalities closest and most accessible to the district center have been chartered first. Palau and Ponape Districts now have each chartered all but one of their municipalities. The Marshalls, Truk, and Yap Districts, which have isolated out-island municipalities, are now beginning to move out into the remote areas with terms of political development workers. Increasing emphasis will be placed this coming year on training of local political development teams for this phase of local political development. There is an increasing awareness amongst the inhabitants of common political interests. It is out intention to foster and encourage all steps which will aid in increasing and solidifying this consciousness. One such step I propose to take this coming year is to add a political affairs officer to my staff.

ADMINISTRATION

Among the major events of general administrative significance during the past year were a number of interrelated changes concerning the Micronesian title and pay plan. These consisted of the institution of an approximate overall pay raise of 10 percent for all employees, the establishment of a longevity wage schedule, and the establishment of a senior professional and executive category with a special wage schedule designed to compensate adequately the Micronesians who qualify for these top positions. A very recent change was the institution of an annual salary pattern for these senior professional and executive employees in place of the former hourly wage system. This change was the direct result of an informal recommendation made by the visiting mission at the time of their visit. This institution of an annual salary, we feel, will add to the prestige and dignity of these top positions.

The general administrative goal of replacing American staff with trained and qualified Micronesians has moved steadily forward. Since 1951 some 60 major positions held by Americans have been taken over by Micronesian counterparts. For example, during the past year two additional American hospital administrators were replaced, thus leaving only two districts at the present time with American hospital administrators. An additional finance officer position was filed by a qualified Micronesian with the result that all districts but one now have Micronesian finance officers.

Micronesians also are increasingly taking over senior administrative positions. In Palau, for example, during the past year the administration activities were divided into two major departments, those of public administraiton and administrative services, and each is headed by a Palauan. It is anticipated that within the near future these particular individuals may become our first assistant district administrators. Other districts also are grooming Micronesians for senior administrative posts. In Rota the administrative officer, a Rotanese, already has served on several occasions as acting district administrator and is the second-ranking officer of the district.

The training program for Micronesians in all fields was intensified during the year through the inservice training project at headquarters. Special training courses and inservice training also were in process at the district level.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Copra production, which had fallen in 1958 and 1959 due to the effects of several typhoons, increased during the past fiscal year to almost 11,000 tons. A favorable price on the world market during fiscal year 1960 resulted in income of approximately $1,587,000, which was the highest level thus far attained in the territory.

In the first 9 months of the present fiscal year a total of 10,500 short tons of copra was produced, and if this rate of production continues, total copra production at the end of June 1961 may well reach 13,000 tons. A somewhat unfavorable market price of the past 6 months, however, has reduced the copra price paid to the producer this past year. Yet in spite of the falling market, we have been able, through our Copra Stabiliza-

tion Fund, to maintain a price of $110 for grade 1 copra the past 6 months. Total revenue for the present fiscal year is anticipated to be about $1,600,000. Unfavorable market conditions continued to bring about a decline in trochus production in the territory. The total revenue from trochus dropped from the $174,000 figure of the previous year to $148,000 for fiscal year 1960. Vegetable produce and fish export revenue, on the other hand, materially increased, almost doubling in the case of vegetable exports from $60,000 in 1959 to $104,000 in 1960. Fish export revenue rose from $19,000 in 1959 to $27,000 in 1960, and if local and interdistrict sales are added, fish revenue totaled approximately $100,000 for the year.

Interest in cacao has been maintained at a high level. Two hundred and sixty-five thousand new trees have been planted since the cacao subsidy program started 2 years ago; the majority, 200,000, were planted since January 1961. The cacao subsidy program originally called for a quota of 100,000 trees, and all but 10,000 of these have been planted. The remaining 10,000 of the subsidy trees are scheduled for Palau and Yap districts. The cacao program in these two districts is being intensified this coming year. It will be noted that as many trees have been planted by farmers on their own as have been planted under direct subsidy.

The first shipment of cacao, a sample shipment of 1,250 pounds, was sold in early 1961 on the world market and was rated as very good to excellent in quality.

From the interest demonstrated in the cacao program, the cacao specialist anticipates that there will be considerable increase in the number of plantings this coming year. Truk farmers have ordered 350,000 nursery planting bags, and Ponape farmers 250,000 planting bags. While not all these nursery seedlings will survive, it is conceivable, particularly if the Yap and Palau plantings are added, that half a million new cacao seedlings will be planted this coming year.

As the visiting mission report indicated, interest and concern in economic development is prevalent at all levels. District economic development boards are taking an increasingly active role in local economic affairs. The activities of these boards include the organization of credit unions and cooperatives, fisheries projects, development of handicraft, and small-scale industries such as charcoalmaking, boatbuilding, brick, and ceramic manufacture, coir fiber products, and small-scale hydroelectric power projects in areas where such development is feasible. The district congresses and administration authorities are working closely with these local economic boards.

It has been noted by members of this council in the past and by visiting missions that many small-scale industries and activities which flourished in the prewar era have not been rehabilitated or revived. Many of these activities were run by Japanese entrepreneurs and catered almost exclusively to the Japanese community or to the Japanese market. Others, like the sugar industry, were heavily subsidized by the Japanese Government for byproducts such as industrial alcohol. These activities were conducted in direct support of or in preparation for the Japanese war effort. In certain instances markets which formerly were found in Japan for local fiber products no longer exist, since synthetics now have taken over these markets. This administration, however, will make every effort to give encouragement and support to those industrial developments which offer promise for the local economy.

Since 1945 a number of detailed economic surveys have been made of the territory. The economic potential of the area, thus, has been quite well defined. We intend though to reevaluate all such economic reports and to update the analyses, in line with previous recommendations made by this body. Presently we are in the process of strengthening the economic staff at the headquarters level. Recruitment of an economic development officer as well as a marketing expert will be undertaken immediately. The first function of the economic development staff this coming year will be to bring up to date all available economic data concerning the territory, as well as to give support and aid to specific local developmental projects.

Strengthening of district economic administration activities also is underway. The district economic boards have been mentioned earlier, and each district has staff in the economic development field. Saipan district, for example, recently added an American economic development officer to the district staff, and it is understood that his service will be available for territorywide programs in fields of his special competence. In other districts Micronesians hold these positions, with American staff members serving in advisory capacities on the local economic development boards.

Banking facilities now are available in three districts in the northern Marshalls through the Bank of Hawaii branch in Kwajalein, in Saipan through the Bank of America, and in Truk district through a branch bank of the Bank of America. A fourth district, Palau, will have banking facilities within a few months, since a branch bank of the Bank of Hawaii is slated to begin operations there in late or early September of this year. The Saipan bank already has a Saipanese manager. In the other district banks there is an American resident manager. However, all other staff is Micronesian, and training programs underway call for eventual replacement of the American manager.

Mounting interest in credit unions and cooperatives is seen. During the past year five credit unions have been formed in Palau District alone, and this coming month a territory wide credit union training course for participants from all the districts will be conducted in Palau. A copra and cacao producing and marketing cooperative has been formed in the Truk Atoll. The members of the visiting mission had an opportunity to be in on the birth of this pioneer copra and cacao cooperative, and they will be interested to learn that the Faichuk cooperative (named for the Leewards Islands of the Truk Atoll) already has 900 applicants, has raised $3,000 in membership shares, and currently is negotiating for a loan of $12,000 from the Administration Loan Fund for the purchase of copra-hauling boats. This loan, I can assure the council, will be approved by the administration.

Additional improvement of our transportation system is anticipated this coming fall when a new field-trip ship, now being built to our specific requirements, will be placed in operation. This new ship will have cargo capacity equal to that of the present larger ships now used for field-trip service; it will have increased and better passenger facilities and should be more economical to operate.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the second of a series of four statements for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statement was presented to the United Nations Trusteeship Council by High Commissioner M. Wilfred Goding.

Mr. Goding's statement continues as follows:

AGRICULTURE

The program of coconut rehabilitation and replanting has been moving steadily forward. Approximately 300,000 selected seed nuts were distributed under the coconut development program this past year.

The typhoon rehabilitation programs initiated after the disastrous typhoons of 1958 and 1959 in the Marshalls, Truk, and Yap districts are progressing very satisfactorily and all are ahead of schedule. In the areas of complete or almost complete destruction, however, it will be another 5 years before the new palms will begin to bear. Last December saw another disastrous typhoon strike in Yap district, but serious damage was confined mainly to Ulithi Atoll. Widespread destruction in Ulithi necessitated the establishment of a long-range relief and rehabilitation program. Since the visiting mission visited one of the islands of Ulithi Atoll before major clearing had begun and before long-range rehabilitation work had started, I particularly wish to report on the recent progress of this program. The Americans agriculturist who will be in charge of the Ulithi rehabilitation project is now on the job as are two Yapese extension agriculturists. Temporary schools and dispensaries have been built on all the islands which suffered damage. Funds for the construction of five permanent combination school and dispensary buildings, which also are to be used for typhoon shelters, have been set aside. Work on these will start as soon as the major replanting, which must have precedence, is under control. The clearing and replanting is underway on all the islands, but the severity of damage will necessitate some 12 to 18 months of hard work before the bulk of the major replanting will be completed. A food relief program has been established, and housing materials, tools, boats, and other essential items have been furnished to the inhabitants.

The agriculture extension program has been strentghened in all districts. A Territory Farm Institute, the first true agricultural training school in the territory, is being built in Ponape and is scheduled to open this coming January. The program of sending promising students abroad for training in tropical agriculture has been accelerated. One scholarship from each district per year now is earmarked for study in tropical agriculture, and currently 10 agriculture scholarship students are studying agriculture in the Philippines.

One of the most significant developments in our insect eradication program has been the experimental work on Rota conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in collaboration with the trust territory and the U.S. Navy on the control of the serious pests, the oriental fruit fly and the melon fly, through the use of irradiated sterile flies. Several million sterile flies have been released on Rota since December 1960, and the experimental program should be finished by the end of this coming fiscal year. Work on the rhinoceros beetle control continues through biological and sanitation measures. Other entomological control activities are being carried out as part of a long-range entomological program.

Our fisheries development project, which is explained in detail in our annual report, received a setback some months ago by the death of the territory's fisheries management officer. A replacement reported for duty early this month, and the program again will soon be in full operation. Among the major scheduled goals for the coming year are the opening of a Trust Territory School of Fisheries in Palau, completion of a 25-ton freezing plant, and completion of fish storage facilities. These projects will be followed by the establishment of a pilot fish cannery, construction of suitable types of fishing boats, and other subsidiary projects. Smaller scale fishery development projects are also under consideration in the other districts.

CONSTRUCTION

Construction of needed facilities has continued in all districts. The new hospital for Palau District is over 85 percent completed. In Truk the dock project passed the halfway mark. As previously outlined to this body, the dock project at Truk is designed to give that district dock facilities

capable of handling large oceangoing vessels. When the dock is completed, ships from the United States and elsewhere will be able to pick up copra and to discharge cargo at Truk. This is a major construction program which, when completed, should bring material benefits to the Truk area. In the Marshalls, the construction of the new intermediate school buildings is well underway, and some of the buildings, such as school dormitories, should be in use with the opening of school this fall. The new intermediate school dormitories at Truk also will be ready for occupancy this fall. On Saipan two units are in operation in the new Hopwood Intermediate School. Five more units will be added during the coming year. Work has begun on new hospitals in the Marshall Islands and Saipan Districts. Elsewhere rehabilitation and construction of refrigeration plants, powerplants, administration buildings, administration housing, road repairs, and other activities were carried out during the year as part of the regular construction program.

PUBLIC HEALTH

In six of our seven districts the district public-health programs are headed by qualified Micronesian directors of public health. The district health activities center around nine hospitals, from which all the medical service to outlying areas through health aids, dispensaries, and field-trip medical parties flow.

Postgraduate training for Micronesian medical and dental staff has been stepped up this year with the institution of a refresher program in special and general subjects for selected Micronesian medical officers at the naval hospital in Guam. A similar postgraduate course is underway for dental officers at the naval base dental facility in Guam, and an administrative training course for head nurses at the naval hospital will be conducted this coming year.

The first graduates of the new school of dental hygienists received their diplomas last week at the graduation ceremonies at Majuro, where the school is located.

Specialized public-health training in other fields, particularly in sanitation and laboratory work, was accelerated during the year. The sanitation department has held special courses for sanitarians at the district centers and has sent interdistrict sanitarian teams to work for a month or more at a time in selected districts. A special postgraduate training course for sanitarians currently is underway in Guam in cooperation with the Guam Department of Sanitation. Special teaching courses are conducted for laboratory technicians at the various hospitals, and the chief laboratory technician additionally conducts special training programs for small interdistrict teams at times throughout the year.

A Micronesian, Mr. Nachsa Siren, of Truk, who had been serving as acting director of sanitation, was appointed several months ago as director of sanitation and has the honor of being the first Micronesian division head on the High Commissioner's staff. Another Micronesian sanitarian now is being groomed for the position of assistant director of sanitation.

Tuberculosis, which is our major health problem, has continued to receive constant attention. By the end of June 30, 1961, the assistant director of public health will have completed the setting up of specialized tuberculosis treatment and control teams in all districts. The BCD vaccination program proceeds as a regular part of the tuberculosis control project.

Health education is conducted through joint efforts of the department of public health and department of education. The department of public health has established the position of health educator on the district public health staff to permit the expansion of this essential type of health education. District congresses also are showing increasing awareness in this aspect of health education. The Truk Congress, this past year, established and financed a health educator position in addition to the administration program.

Considerable progress was made this year on hospital construction, as indicated in my comments on the overall construction program. Additionally, the construction of a complete new hospital was started this month in Saipan. The clearing of the site and installation of water and power facilities are completed, and actual construction work on the buildings is slated to begin before the end of the month. When completed, the hospital will be entirely staffed by Saipanese.

A new hospital for Truk District is scheduled for 1963, and ground will be broken for it in late 1962. Budget plans for a new hospital for Ponape for fiscal year 1963 are also under consideration.

EDUCATION

It has been the aim of our education system to provide a type of education which would equip the Micronesians for more effective participation in their developing society. Requirements for Micronesian leadership in all fields, and the progress of social, economic, and political growth demand that the role of education and training must occupy a vital place.

Half of the population of our particular territory is under the age of 20. This dramatizes the many problems we face in our education program since all the usual problems of a developing educational system are magnified by a factor of a rapidly expanding school-age population. Here the great challenge lies, since it is these young people who will mold the future of Micronesia. We can meet this challenge only by the administration and the communities joining forces in an attempt to provide the best possible education in terms of local circumstances and needs for the youth of Micronesia.

Our annual report has a detailed description of our educational program, and I shall only cite a few noteworthy items of the past year at this time. One-fifth of our population—some 15,000—is enrolled in the public and private schools of the territory. The bulk of all district congress revenues goes for the support of the elementary schoolteachers.

District school boards and congresses working in collaboration with the administration departments of education have standardized teacher requirements and salaries.

For the past several weeks the social development subcommittee has been studying the problems of the elementary and intermediate schools in the districts. The committee's report will be one of the major items of this year's interdistrict conference. We propose also to discuss at this conference the comments and recommendations of the visiting mission on our educational program.

During the year a trust territorywide curriculum for intermediate schools was developed and put into effect. The new unified curriculum has taken the best features of the various district intermediate school curriculums, and its implementation should substantially improve the level of our intermediate school training.

Policies with respect to English-language instruction in the elementary schools will be subjected to careful reappraisal, especially in the light of the comments and recommendations made in the report of the visiting mission.

Our teacher-training program has been intensified in all districts, and continued and increased emphasis is planned for this vital part of our educational program. Planning is underway for the establishment of a teacher-training department as an adjunct of the Pacific Islands Central School.

The grant-in-aid project has been accelerated. Sixteen new elementary schools either have been built or are currently under construction through the grant-in-aid program. Others are anticipated for this coming year.

Advanced education outside the territory is an important aspect of the overall education program. The district congresses more and more are recognizing this importance, and the budgets of several congresses this year had appropriations for special scholarship aid. The administration continues its program of offering three scholarships per district each year in the fields of general education, agriculture, and vocational arts. Additional scholarships are given in special professional categories, in medicine, and in a variety of special categories.

CLAIM SETTLEMENT

The only remaining land claims of significance are those of Majuro Atoll and Kwajalein Atoll. As the council is aware from previous meetings and reports, it has not been possible to reach a satisfactory agreement on settlement. However, active negotiations are now being conducted looking to a mutually agreeable and satisfactory settlement of this most perplexing problem.

STATUS OF DISPLACED MARSHALLESE

The general adjustment of the people of Kili and Ujelang has been satisfactory. Annual interest payments from their trust funds give the people of these two islands a regular cash income in addition to their subsistence economy and cash proceeds from the sale of copra. The agricultural rehabilitation program on Ujelang has been completed, and regular field service on an average of every 2 months has been maintained for the past 2 years.

At Rongelap the agricultural rehabilitation program has been virtually completed, and the American agriculturist has turned over the supervision of this program to a Marshallese extension agriculturist. The medical survey on the Rongelap people was carried out last March by a team composed of Trust Territory medical staff and Atomic Energy Commission specialists. Preliminary results of this year's medical survey again indicated that no aftermaths of fallout are discernible and the general health of the Rongelapese is satisfactory.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Contact with international organizations has been maintained on a number of levels. Three Micronesians during the year studied in the United States, the Philippines, and Burma under United Nations fellowships in the fields of social defense and social welfare. Headquarters and district staff personnel during the year participated in South Pacific Commission conferences in the fields of health education and cooperatives. Two Micronesian delegates currently are participating in a conference on youth problems now being held in the neighboring trust territory of Australian New Guinea.

WAR-DAMAGE CLAIMS

With respect to the question of war-damage claims, the U.S. Government recognizes that, as a result of damages suffered during the period of hostilities between the United States and Japan, certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands suffered loss of life, bodily injury, and damage to property. As a result of these damages there have arisen valid and just claims on the part of the inhabitants which must be satisfied. The United States recognizes its obligation as the administering authority of the territory to see to it that every effort is made to deal promptly and equitably with such claims.

This matter is considered by us to be one of the highest priority. Within the last 2

weeks our administration has taken action to institute an evaluation of the extent and nature of claims which may warrant compensation, and we have designated a task force to carry out that inquiry. We have advised the Japanese Government that we will resume negotiations with it on this subject as soon as this evaluation has been completed.

I am grateful to have this opportunity to present this brief summary. We shall attempt to provide any additional information which members of this Council may desire in connection with the report of the visiting mission or our annual report.

High Commissioner Goding's Closing Statement to the United Nations Trusteeship Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the third in a series of statements presented to the United Nations Trusteeship Council concerning the U.S. administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This statement was delivered by High Commissioner M. Wilfred Goding following extensive questioning by members of the Council.

Mr. Goding's statement follows:

On behalf of my colleagues, Mr. Nucker and Mr. Nakayama, I should like to express their deep appreciation for the kindness and courtesy extended to them by members of this Council. I know that Mr. Nakayama will take back to the people of the territory the warm expressions of friendship that have been extended to them by the Trusteeship Council. Mr. Nucker, who cannot be here today, wishes me to convey his heartfelt thanks for the tributes paid him by members of this body during this session. I concur in these expressions that Mr. Nucker carried out his duties as High Commissioner in a devoted and outstanding manner and that he will be sorely missed by the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

For my own part I wish to express my appreciation to all members of the Council for the kind words of welcome they extended to me. I am especially grateful, Mr. President, for the patience and courtesy you have demonstrated toward me during the course of the meeting.

I propose to make a very brief concluding statement, since I feel that the exhaustive examination which has been made of the visiting mission report and our annual report during the past 2 weeks has covered almost every aspect of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and has presented clarification on almost all points. I do wish, however, to comment briefly on several specific points brought out in the questioning and in the general debate.

I have been most impressed by the sincerity with which the members of the council have approached the problems of our trust territory. Though we might not necessarily agree with all the interpretations, suggestions, and recommendations, I have felt that, with the exception of those made by one delegation, all have been offered in a spirit of cooperation and constructive assistance. As such, they are worthy of serious reflection on our part, and I can assure the council that they will receive careful review.

I am grateful for the interventions of the distinguished chairman of the visiting mission, Ambassador (Carlos) Salamanca (of Bolivia), as well as those of his colleagues on the mission, during the questioning to amplify certain sections of the visiting mission report. These amplifications I found to be most helpful and informative. They aided me greatly in placing the visiting mission report in proper perspective.

ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

As I assume my duties as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I am deeply aware that Micronesia, once remote, isolated, and little touched by the outside world, is entering the mainstream of the political and economic life that is now quickening the entire Pacific area. It is our role as administering authority to encourage and assist the people of the Trust Territory to participate actively and fully in this development. Our own attitude was aptly summarized by the distinguished representative of Paraguay in the following words:

"We wish to do everything possible to advance the moment when the people of the trust territory to partccipate actively and the peoples of other territories, have achieved a sufficient degree of political maturity and training to enable them to establish their own political institutions and decide their own destiny."

The development of a trust territory-wide political consciousness and the establishment of central government organizations in which Micronesians will play roles of rapidly increasing responsibility are matters of great concern to this council and to the administering authority. This concern underlies the interest in such specific areas as the transfer of the Northern Marianas District to civilian administration, the remolding of the Interdistrict Advisory Committee of the legislative body, and the location of the headquarters within the trust territory.

The Interdistrict Advisory Committee was organized some 6 years ago and has been looked upon as the future legislative organ of the trust territory. We have outlined certain concrete steps which are being taken to establish within the near future a legislative council solidly based upon the experience and knowledge gained from the Advisory Committee. At the risk of repetition, we should like to point out again that it is proposed at the next session to create a holdover subcommittee on political development. Its work will supplement and round out the work of the older social development and economic development subcommittees.

Secondly, the Saipan district will send delegates to the September meeting of the Committee, rather than observers as in the past. We anticipate that the active participation of the Saipan representatives as delegates will be a major contribution to the work of the Committee. Thirdly, we shall work toward the popular election of all delegates to the Interdistrict Committee.

LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT

In my opening statement I commented that, if the present rate of political growth and progress continues, we envision the existence of a territorial legislative council by 1965. We believe that the present rate of growth will continue and, in fact, hope that it will accelerate. We do not, therefore, regard 1965 as being the earliest possible date for the creation of a territorial legislature. It will be our policy to advance this date, if possible, and we are hopeful of being able to do so. Thus, we can assure the distinguished representative from the United Arab Republic and his colleague, the distinguished representative from France, that, for our part, we shall seek to speed the formation of a territorial legislative council.

A word is necessary with respect to the location of the trust territory government headquarters. I hasten to point out that the administering authority agrees that ultimately the headquarters should and will be located within the trust territory itself. While we would further agree that the location of national capitals has frequently been a matter of historical happenstance, we also believe that the people can and should have an opportunity to influence the selection, as has been the tradition in the United States. To this end I have suggested that the Interdistrict Committee should meet in the various districts so as to enable each member to become familiar with each district and thereby form a considered and informed judgment as to the future site of the capital of the trust territory.

The U.S. delegation has also been glad to hear the views of the visiting mission and members of the Council with respect to the desirability of unifying the administration of the entire territory under the High Commissioner. As we have already stated to the Council, this matter has been receiving most careful attention at the highest level of our Government, and I can now further say that the departments concerned are agreed in principle that the administration of the territory should be unified. The detailed steps for bringing about this unified administration are now in process of being worked out.

As essential underpinnings of political development, emphasis in the past has been put upon the development of democratic institutions at the municipal and district levels. For a people who a few short years ago had little concept of a political identity beyond the village or clan, the development of representative self-government separate and apart from traditional allegiances has progressed satisfactorily and rapidly, given the geographic circumstances of the trust territory and its diversity of languages and cultures. We propose to continue and to intensify political education and training programs in the districts. It is, after all, on the local level that any people come into close and continuing contact with their government. It is on the local level that participation in governmental processes is a real and personal experience to the average individual.

As the distinguished representative from Belgium stated last Wednesday, "The rapidity with which a territory can be led to the stage where it would be in a position to govern itself is directly proportionate to the number of problems which are entrusted to the local leaders."

Reference has been made to the program of chartering municipalities, and the thought has been expressed that the goal of chartering at least 10 municipalities each year might be increased to 15 or 20. We would subscribe to the philosophy of this proposal, but in doing so we must point out that the chartering of a municipality is meaningful only when the people of the municipality understand the concepts embodied in the charter. We believe that the substance, not merely the form, of representative institutions is important.

The visiting mission suggested in its report that ways and means should be found to expand the effective functions of the district congresses. Through the subcommittee on political development, through strengthening our political affairs staff, and through the efforts of the district congresses themselves, we are confident that these legislative bodies will achieve increasing authority and responsibility. This matter will, of course, receive our full attention.

In connection with the development of the district congresses and governmental institutions in general, I should like to quote

a line from the visiting mission report. On page 20 the mission stated:

"Though strong attachment to tradition still exists in several parts of the territory, the elders are beginning to recognize that responsibility should be placed in the most capable hands irrespective of a person's position in traditional society."

We fully share the view of the visiting mission that this is an encouraging development, and we submit that this development is due in large measure to policies of patient and progressive training and education in the political field. As the distinguished representative from the United Kingdom stated yesterday, "The touchstone of political advance must be the wishes of the people themselves."

Our goal has been to turn over positions of authority to trained and qualified Micronesians in a continuing replacement program. Some 60 important positions have been taken over by Micronesians in the past 10 years, and with the intensification of our training program, both inservice and scholarship training outside the territory, this rate of replacement should continue.

A number of delegations expressed concern over the fact that senior administrative positions such as district administrators and assistant district administrators have not, as yet, been taken over by Micronesians. The distnguished representative of India during the course of the questioning commented that it was his opinion, based on his observation in the territory, that the administration already possessed a pool of competent young administrators and therefore our target goal of one or more assistant district administrators by 1964 appeared to him to be rather slow. Other members of the Council put forth somewhat similar views. I agree completely that we have a corps of young, able administrators undergoing training from which our potential senior administrators will come. Our problem now is one of seeking suitable candidates but one of providing the opportunity for seasoning and experience which a district administrator or assistant district administrator must possess if he is to do a good job for his district and his people. The Council may be assured that Micronesians will be placed in senior positions as rapidly as they gain the necessary experience and demonstrate their competence to handle these assignments.

PROGRESS IN SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL FIELDS

It was encouraging to note the expression of confidence voiced by the distinguished representative of Burma in the progress being made in the social and educational fields. There are many problems to be solved, but I am confident that, given the continued and wholehearted support and cooperation of the people of Micronesia, we shall continue to achieve steady advancement in these important areas. As I indicated in my opening statement, the social development subcommittee of the Interdistrict Advisory Committee currently is engaged in studying social and educational problems and will present a report of findings and recommendations at the forthcoming meeting of the territory-wide conference of the Interdistrict Advisory Committee this fall. This conference will pay particular attention to elementary education problems.

The rapidly expanding school population is posing difficult problems for the local communities and for district congresses which provide the funds for payment of elementary school salaries.

The recommendation made by the distinguished representative of New Zealand, and concurred in by the distinguished representative of China, that the administration should give additional direct financial aid to the elementary school districts, specifically in the support of teachers' salaries, is one to which we shall give every consideration.

I wish also to note that the administration already has under study the point brought forth by the distinguished representative of India on the lowering of the compulsory age of schooling from the present 8-year level. Over 1,000 children under the age of 8 years presently are enrolled in public and private schools. In any case I wish to assure the representative of India that this recommendation, which also was made by the visiting mission, will receive every consideration at the forthcoming interdistrict conference when problems of education are discussed.

It was gratifying and encouraging to hear the favorable comments of members of this Council on the general health program of the administration. I use the words "gratifying and encouraging" deliberately since this is a program which is completely handled by Micronesian district directors of public health and their staffs. The commendations of the various members, thus, will mean a great deal to these dedicated young Micronesian men and women who are working so valiantly in the field of public health in their communities.

I am particularly pleased to carry back to our public health staff the special interest in their work which was expressed by the distinguished representative of Australia.

I can assure the council that we shall make every effort to provide the technical assistance and aid that the Micronesian medical officers may request. We are in full agreement with the visiting mission that increased attention must be given to the improvement of health services to the outlying islands. This, indeed, is one of the major programs of the Department of Health and one which shall receive the highest priority.

ECONOMIC POTENTIALS OF THE AREA

Action to speed programs which will increase the productivity of the territory and provide higher living standards has received the greatest emphasis in the report of the visiting mission, in the questioning by members of the council, and in the very thoughtful and constructive statements made in the general debate. This emphasis on the economic field is by no means misplaced.

The relevant relationship of the economic field to that of the political was effectively highlighted in the careful and well-phrased concluding statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. I would only add that this relationship to political development is one that also pertains to each of the other major areas under review, the social and educational. It relates, also, to land tenure. A sound approach to land use is obviously of fundamental importance to the economic future of the territory.

While we have found the visiting mission report to be most helpful and generally constructive, we cannot concur with some of the rather sweeping and unqualified observations in paragraph 73 in the introductory chapter on economic advancement. The mission report states flatly, for example, that "* * * the Territory's main natural economic resources have not as yet been exploited." We agree that they have not yet been fully developed and that, with respect to the resources of the sea, for example, they have so far been little exploited in the commercial sense of that term. However, we believe that the basic agricultural resources have been developed to a very considerable extent and that sound programs for upgrading the agricultural productivity of the area have been initiated. As we have pointed out during the discussion, a good start has been made in commercial fishing.

Moreover, it seems to us that this particular paragraph in the report might be interpreted to suggest that the territory enjoys great natural economic resources, above and beyond those already developed and in process of development. That this is not the case, at least to any considerable degree, is clearly indicated by other, more specific paragraphs of the report.

Great emphasis has properly been placed on the need for intensification of our efforts in the economic field. As I repeatedly indicated during the questioning period, we feel that the time now is at hand for an intensification of our effort. Our economic staff is being strengthened, and I hope to increase materially the resources which can be used for an economic development revolving fund.

The potentials of the area are not unknown. Surveys in almost every field have been undertaken in the past, and, as I elaborated in an answer to the distinguished representative from Australia, in the past several years we have had followup studies carried out in such areas of potential development as mineral resources, forestry, fisheries, trochus, cacao, coconut fiber products, and the like. I have stated that I conceive the first task of the strengthened economic section at headquarters essentially to be one of updating past surveys, as well as developing plans for broad and integrated economic development, rather than the conducting of a new basic economic survey. I would like to assure the distinguished representative of Burma that, when I remarked that some of the past economic surveys were out of date, I did not mean to imply that the basic resource data of these surveys were outmoded. I was referring primarily to the fact that marketing conditions may have changed and that the supply-and-demand factors should be reevaluated in terms of present-day conditions.

I assure the members of the council that the many detailed recommendations in the economic section of the visiting mission report will receive careful attention. We are, indeed, most appreciative of the various suggestions made by the visiting mission in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, poultry, handicrafts, as well as in matters pertaining to transport and communications. As was noted by the representative of the United Kingdom, we have already taken action on a number of recommendations made by the visiting mission in this field and very likely will act favorably on others after further study. Certain recommendations we may not agree with or find feasible at this stage of economic development. But, again, I would assure the representative of the United Kingdom that, even though from our viewpoint certain recommendations, to use his terminology, might seem somewhat fanciful, they will receive the same careful consideration that will be accorded to all others.

In summary, the U.S. delegation agrees with the report of the visiting mission and with various proposals by members of the trusteeship council that increased economic development of the territory is most important and is indeed basic for the advancement of the territory toward the objectives of the charter and the trusteeship agreement. The administering authority will give careful attention to these proposals and will see what further funds can be made available for stimulating the much-needed economic progress of the territory.

SITUATION OF RONGELAPESE PEOPLE

I would be remiss were I not to comment further upon the situation of the people of Rongelap, 82 of whom were exposed to radioactive fallout in 1954 as the result of a most regrettable mischance. There appears to be no question among the medical personnel who made an intensive study last March that the general physical health of the Rongelapese is satisfactory.

The team has advised me that the physical complaints of the Rongelap people who were actually exposed to radioactive fallout are no more numerous than those of the larger, unexposed population on the island. The medical team found no existing physical illnesses attributable to exposure to radioactive fallout.

With regard to the statement in the visiting mission report that the complaints of the Rongelap people are confirmed by the local health aide, I should like to point out, first, that the mission itself questioned the competence of the health aide and, second, that as one of the persons exposed to fallout, the health aide in question cannot be considered a disinterested observer. As we have previously stated, this health aide continues at his post at the specific request of the Rongelap people. We shall, nonetheless, continue regular physical examinations, making every effort to minimize their psychological impact on the Rongelap people.

The visiting mission and many members of the council have suggested that rehabilitation efforts be intensified, including the stationing of American personnel on Rongelap to live among the people and so to help allay their fears. I should like to point out that an American agriculturist had been stationed on Rongelap for almost 2 years to assist the Rongelapese in reestablishing agricutlural enterprises.

In my opening statement I mentioned that the agricultural rehabilitation program has now been virtually completed and that the American agriculturist had turned the program over to his capable Rongelapese extension agent. The step of withdrawing the American agriculturist was partly taken in a further effort to encourage the community to stand on its own feet.

It should also be pointed out that the problems of rehabilitation are vastly complicated by the fact that many relatives of the people of Rongelap have moved to the island. There are now more than 200 people living in a community which in 1954 numbered 82. The stresses and strains resulting from this influx of population have added considerably to the psychological problems which must be overcome in the rehabilitation of Rongelap.

As to various other matters touched upon in the general debate, I believe that they are sufficiently covered in statements previously made by me or by Mr. Bingham.

In closing, Mr. President, may I state that, as in previous years, we shall make available to Micronesians throughout the territory the summary records of this meeting and the closing statements of all of the delegations. I might further add for clarification that these records will be distributed within the next few weeks, since it is our practice to have them reproduced in quantity by our own reports office. Thus, Micronesian leaders, staff members, students, and others will have the complete record for study before the end of July.

There is keen interest in the deliberations of this body throughout the territory, and, rather than wait for the official printed records, which do not reach us for many months, we have felt it well worth while to issue preliminary reports so that the people of the territory may have them as soon as possible after the closing of the debate on our territory.

We shall also be glad to prepare and distribute, as suggested by the visiting mission in paragraph 71 of its report, a document explaining the objectives of the trusteeship.

May I again thank you, Mr. President and all of the members of the Council, for your interest in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Adviser Tosiwo Nakayama Reports to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the final of a series of statements presented to the United Nations Trusteeship Council on the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This statement was delivered by Mr. Tosiwo Nakayama, president of the Trukese Congress and adviser to High Commissioner Goding on June 13, 1961.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. NAKAYAMA, JUNE 13

I feel honored and grateful to the Government of the United States and to that of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which made it possible for me to have the opportunity to appear before the Trusteeship Council today and relay to the members of the council warm greetings from the people of the trust territory that I have the privilege and honor to represent. It is hard for me to believe that I have traveled across the vast Pacific Ocean to New York to sit here in the Trusteeship Council. I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet again with the distinguished members of the United Nations Visiting Mission, with whom I had the honor and pleasure to travel and to serve as their interpreter at several lengthy meetings held on Truk earlier this year.

The people of Truk—my home district—especially wish to convey to the Trusteeship Council and to the members of the last United Nations Visiting Mission to the territory their sincere wish for a successful meeting and for everlasting success in the maintenance of peace and growth of opportunity for the peoples of the world over.

I am certain the firsthand experience gained from my visit with the Trusteeship Council will no doubt be of great value and assistance to me in my responsibilities as the president of the Truk District Congress, as a member of the Truk district political development team, and as economic and political development adviser to the district administrator.

MUNICIPAL CHARTERING PROGRAM

As a member of the political development team, Mr. President, I am charged with the responsibility of planning and coordinating our municipal chartering program under the guidance of the Truk district administrator. During the course of my career since 1958 as a member of this team, I have had the pleasure of seeing seven municipalities in the Truk District celebrate the receipt of their charters. To me it was gratifying to view the effort and interest of people of these municipalities showed in preparing for their charters. And gratifying also is the fact that these people have since demonstrated satisfying ability in governing themselves in a democratic manner in accordance with procedures and laws they initiated. I am sure the same result is attained by people of the chartered municipalities throughout the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

As you are all aware, it is not easy to carry out political development work in communities where there are a great number of uneducated people and where there are strong conservative social and political traditions. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has within itself many such communities. There is also, of course, the different added problem of communication and transportation, although I think even this can be solved more easily.

I believe that, in order to preserve the good customs and traditions of the people of the Trust Territory, political development programs must be directed and carried out in such a manner that, when something either supplements or replaces an aspect of the existing structure, it does so only if and when the people concerned deem it desirable and necessary. In no way should it be forced upon the people of the Trust Territory. I would rather see them guided rather than led by the Administering Authority, for I feel it is their job to decide for themselves their own destiny in accordance with the goals of the trusteeship system.

MICRONESIANS CONSCIOUS OF RESPONSIBILITIES

The program of replacing American personnel with qualified Micronesians as soon as feasible is one that needs close attention. American personnel should not be replaced by Micronesians simply for the sake of budgetary savings but only when the Micronesians are capable of taking over the responsibility.

Today the people of the trust territory feel much closer to their Government because they see their own brothers and sisters sitting in the chairs which not long ago belonged to their American predecessors. And instead of having to communicate through an interpreter, which was often embarrassing, in giving an account of one's trouble to the American physician, the Micronesians are pleased to feel at home discussing their problems with their Micronesian doctors. I can recall the time when the people of Truk used to refer to the administration as the "American office," a term which is no longer used. But because of the number of Micronesians in jobs formerly held by American personnel, the administration is today referred to as the "big office." This means to them that the office has bigger responsibilities but that it is theirs. In order to do a good job in the "big office," of course, the Micronesian realizes that he must educate himself.

The people of the trust territory, however, have been very fortunate to have the opportunity for free education at home and abroad under trust territory government sponsorship. As the result of this progam many promising young men and women are emerging and have acquired for themselves leadership status in their communities. Having the respect and confidence of the conservative older people in their respective municipalities, it can be assumed that they are the ones that will determine the future of the trust territory. Realizing, of course, the importance of education, more and more district congresses are now setting up scholarship funds to provide for opportunities for their young citizens to study abroad.

I am pleased to report that the Micronesians are quite conscious of their responsibilities and that they are undertaking ever-increasing responsibility. This to me underlines the steady growth of the people of the trust territory toward self-government.

THE TRUK DISTRICT CONGRESS

The Truk District Congress, of which I am a member and currently president, came into being in 1957, when it was incorporated after long preparation and as a result of a decision of the chief magistrates' conferences. It was on August 23, 1957, that the former Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Fred Seaton, presented to the Truk Congress its charter. This occasion

marked the birth of the first Trukese legislative organ which was to deliberate upon matters of significance to the welfare of the Trukese community.

The emergence of the Truk District Congress also created a new era in the life of the Trukese people in that it carries home to the grassroots of their communities the essence of democratic government, the ideas of equal representation and of freedom and equality under the law.

The congress charter, to which I have referred, requires that members of the congress be elected by secret ballot and by popular vote. This is the procedure that is used throughout the trust territory. As you all know, there are various sizes of population units, and to give equal representation in the congress poses a special problem. On what basis would representation be achieved so that it is fair to both municipalities with only 30 people and those with a population greater than 3,000? The congress charter provides that for every 500 people one representative must be elected from the municipalities with a large population and one representative from each of the municipalities whose populations are less than 500.

In order to function properly, each district legislative body imposes certain types of taxes, either upon general imports or otherwise, for the purpose of its budget. If I am not mistaken, the average budget of a legislative body in the trust territory is approximately $40,000 a year. The Truk District Congress this year has a budget of nearly $50,000, and $36,000 of that is for the payment of elementary school teachers' salaries. This year $3,000 has been appropriated for the United Nations Day program. This is $1,000 more than the sum appropriated last year. Other districts finance the United Nations Day program in one way or other, and the people of the trust territory celebrate the anniversary of United Nations Day as one of the most significant occasions of the year.

The district congresses can be viewed as the training base for the trust territory people who may in the future form a territorywide legislative body, but I believe that the desire for a territorywide legislative body must come from the people of the trust territory rather than being forced upon them by the administering authority or the United Nations. I can assure you that the time will come when the people of the trust territory shall demand that they have such an organization.

EDUCATION AND INSERVICE TRAINING

Though we can say that we are better off in modern technology than our forefathers, there still are many problems confronting us. We must educate ourselves in order to bring ourselves closer to the rest of the rapidly changing world. But thanks to the administering authority and the United Nations, scholarships now are enabling competent young men and women of the trust territory to receive the kind of education that they would not otherwise have.

Despite their limited budgets, the district congresses in the trust territory also are setting up scholarships for qualified young men and women of their districts to study abroad, usually in specially designated fields such as agriculture, sanitation, general education, and the like. This summer, for instance, the Truk Congress is awarding a $1,000 scholarship to 12 prospective students for special study at the College of Guam. These 12 young men already hold key positions with the trust territory government.

Among these special summer scholars are the director of sanitation for the entire trust territory, the Truk district representative of the public defender, the Truk district representative of the public prosecutor, and currently acting land title officer, the principal of Moen Elementary School, two intermediate school teachers, the Truk district assistant land surveyor, the assistant land title officer, a personnel clerk, an assistant statistical analyst, and a senior employee from the U.S. Weather Bureau in Truk district.

Agreement was reached between the congress and the administration that, since this program is, in a way, an inservice training program of the scholars, the trust territory government will continue to pay the salaries of those in its employment during the 3 months they will be in school at Guam. Under the same arrangement Palau district is sending 12 senior teachers and key personnel from their education department, while Ponape district is sending 2.

Detailed plans for this program, including rules of conduct and housekeeping, are strictly their own. From their number they are to elect one overleader and an executive board which will deliberate upon matters of general interest to them all.

In my opinion this sort of program is extremely valuable from all points of view. It is a program that will bring together the potential leaders of the territory. And by virtue of their being together over a period of 3 months, they will certainly learn from each other to understand better how to meet the needs of all the people of the trust territory. Because of the various values derived from a program such as this, our Congress did not hesitate a bit in awarding the sum of $1,000, which in our budget is a sizable amount.

These are but a few of the significant steps that the people of the trust territory are taking in striving forward for self-sufficiency. We believe that it is through educating ourselves in the modern ways that we will be able to determine for ourselves our future status and attain our destiny.

The trust territory grant-in-aid program is a commendable one, for without it the building of good elementary schools and community buildings by the people of the trust territory alone would have been impossible. I need not describe this program, for I believe you are already familiar with it from the reports of the administering authority. But I do wish to emphasize that we benefit greatly from this program and that we have great need for this form of assistance for many more years to come.

PROGRESS IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

There are a number of encouraging changes that have taken place in our social life. People who once were reluctant to accept modern medicine and sanitation now realize that they were unwise.

The administering authority has done a great job in training Micronesian medical officers and other personnel in other fields of work within the trust territory governmental setup. There is not a single hospital in the trust territory, except that of Saipan District, that is not staffed and operated by Micronesian directors. The Micronesian medical officers have proven capable, and they have an advantage over a foreign doctor in that they have a greater understanding of their Micronesian patients and their troubles. In the education field we see a gradual taking over by Micronesians of the jobs formerly held by Americans.

The grouping together in various schools of Micronesians, who to me are more different than alike in their ways and cultural beliefs, unites them and enables them to see their similarities and differences and develop in themselves a feeling of friendship and mutual ties. It is here that the future of the trust territory is being built by the hands of our men and women who will some day lead their people toward attaining the goals of the trusteeship system. Pacific Islands Central School, the University of Hawaii, and the College of Guam, for example are the places where Micronesians get to know each other well.

There are in the trust territory various special types of organizations. In my district, for example, there is a women's organization whose membership includes Trukese and American workingwomen. This organization's officers at the present time are all Micronesian women. This group meets every month to exchange ideas and learn from one another about their different ways of life. Although there are many obstacles that stand in the path of our social development, nevertheless encouraging progress is seen throughout the territory.

In closing, I wish to say that your continued assistance and guidance have been well directed and well received and that the people of the trust territory continue to benefit from them. To the administering authority we are most indebted for the constructive programs it has carried out during all the years of its responsibility.

Again I wish to thank you for this opportunity to appear before this body and to express the appreciation of the people of the territory for the interest this body has in our welfare.

Soviet Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Moscow talks peace and tests arms—the same old cynicism. When will we learn that communism is determined to win victory, not to work out a national settlement.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET NUCLEAR TESTS LEAVE US FREE TO STEP UP CRASH PROGRAM

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear tests has been a terrible shock to many in all countries and probably to some extent helped the popularity of the United States among the nonalined peoples.

It has also let a breath of the harsh reality into the tenderly nourished summerhouse of make-believe and delusions about the world situation in general and the intentions of the U.S.S.R. in particular.

For this reason I welcome the resumption. That act of defiance of the world opinion upon which some have been depending for world peace has called the attention of all sincere people back to the main fact of international existence: the Kremlin means to bury us and counts upon brute force to blackmail the non-Communist world into surrender. The new Soviet military effort is necessary to support successful Soviet aggression without major war—at Berlin and everywhere else.

Moscow's strategy now seems clear. First, by alerting scared neutrals and nuclear pacifists everywhere, it induced the Eisenhower administration to declare a unilateral moratorium—as recommended by Candidate Stevenson in 1956.

Then for almost 3 years it strung gullible Americans and English along at 339 futile meetings.

REDS BUILD UP DEFENSES

Meanwhile, in Russia, Soviet scientists and technicians moved heaven and earth to create a firmer basis for the next blackmail moves against the West. That basis was making Russian cities relatively invulnerable to American attack. The means chosen

were evacuation, plans for which have been going forward steadily, and the development of ground-to-air missiles. Such missiles may someday become antimissile missiles. But meanwhile they can be a pretty sure defense against that airplane counterblitz of Soviet cities upon which American deterrent plans have depended. For, once Soviet gunners can shoot down most of our counterforce, our ability to resist nuclear blackmail will shrink alarmingly.

Some American experts believe that the Soviets have now successfully tested four such ground-to-air missiles.

The conclusion is obvious: at the coming Communist congress in Moscow, Khrushchev may announce that he can now ward off any American attacks—and demand the immediate neutralization of West Berlin. He expects that this will panic our allies and that President Kennedy, under pressure from them and from domestic appeasers and nuclear pacifists, will have no course open but retreat.

FIRM STAND CAN AVOID WAR

If this diagnosis is correct, Mr. Kennedy has less than 2 months in which to prepare the Western world, physically and psychologically, to resist any such blackmail. In short, to avoid war he must seriously face the possibility of nuclear war. I believe that by a firm stand he cannot only save Berlin but avoid nuclear war both now and 1, 2, or 5 years from now.

Meanwhile—and I say fortunately—the United States is now free to step up a crash program of creating our own antimissile missiles, of building shelters and of shifting from dirty to clean bombs which we can use with a clearer conscience. If J.F.K. does these things, the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear testing may be a blessing in disguise.

Now a postcsript: a newsman close to the President reports that he still wonders "why he cannot get down to rational discussion" of an "honorable accommodation" on Berlin with the Soviet leader. How strange. For that wonder assumes that Mr. K. wants an "accommodation" on Berlin. Mr. Kennedy seems to believe that what Stalin would not do for F.D.R. (whose aid saved Russia during World War II) or for Truman, or what Khrushchev would not do for war hero Eisenhower—namely, make real peace—the Soviet leader should be ready to do for a former junior American Senator who managed to become President of the United States by a handful of votes.

How amazing. When will our young and courageous leader realize that the U.S.S.R. wants not peace but victory—total and worldwide—and will get it unless an awakened and embattled West decides to stop him?

Mr. Kennedy's Mule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I will make it short and sweet. The following editorial from the September 8, 1961, issue of Life points up what I have always emphasized to my constituents—"you don't get something for nothing":

"TANSTAFL," IT'S THE TRUTH

Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his reflections on the Berlin crisis, expressed alarm at Kennedy's big stepups in civilian spending along with the necessary bolstering of defense to meet new Soviet threats. In this area, Life has long contended that the billions we spend on needless farm surpluses is the ultimate absurdity, and as a case in point submits this week the story of Corsicana, Tex., and Groceries Day.

Groceries Day, which comes to Corsicana one Tuesday each month, began when President Kennedy, in the first command he issued, ordered an increase in the free food being distributed to the U.S. needy. Since free food was a means of getting rid of the surpluses piled up by giving subsidies to farmers, nobody objected. Besides, the plague of chronic unemployment made it seem highly desirable.

But the Government not only increased the amount of food, it also ordered a tastier variety. To the surplus staples of flour, corn meal, rice, lard, and butter, the Agriculture Department added fancier items like meat, beans, eggs, oatmeal, bought on the open market, and the monthly handouts soon included such delicacies as canned pork and gravy (called Mr. Kennedy's Mule in Corsicana).

This increased the program's cost. For the 1,401 U.S. counties now receiving free groceries, the $110.2 million cost in 1961's first half is nearly quadruple Eisenhower's $29.2 million in the same period last year. It also vastly increased the popularity of free groceries. Since January the number of people getting them has risen from 4.1 to 6.2 million, even as unemployment was sharply dropping. Because each State determines its own standards of eligibility, and these vary even from county to county, recipients have included a New York City man who carried his bags away in a taxicab, and some folks in Jefferson County, Tex., who took them away in an air-conditioned Cadillac. In Navarro County, where Corsicana is located, almost 1 out of every 10 people—3,367—began surging in for Groceries Day.

The Wall Street Journal reports some interesting results. For example, Grocer Henry Slate's food sales dropped off some 10 percent but his business has increased sharply in cigarettes, soft drinks, cake mixes, and candy.

But more interesting, and ironic, is the complaint of farmers that free groceries keep some able-bodied men from working on farms to produce more surplus crops to be handed out as free groceries. Said Farmer D. H. "Blackie" Allen, "I had 24 hands in the fields the day before the last handout. On Groceries Day the number dropped to three and for the next 3 days the most I could get at any one time was nine." L. G. Avery, a farm laborer, quite content with "Mr. Kennedy's Mule," was rocking away the day on the porch of his house. "This is one year," said Mr. Avery, "people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of their cotton, because we ain't going to do it."

If free food thus contributes to unemployment, there are nevertheless some offsetting benefits. Employment increased in New York City, where Welfare Commissioner Dumpson added 39 civil service employees to his department (at a cost of $136,500 a year) to handle the stocks of food. Obviously, this job could not be done by people on relief, since they could scarcely carry their own groceries home while handing them out to others.

All of which, fellow taxpayers, who carry the load for farm surplus as for Groceries Day, bears out the sapience of that wise man of old who, when asked to compress all his wisdom into a single word, cried: "Tanstafl," and when asked to explain it, said the mystic word stood for this:

"There ain't no such thing as free lunch." There ain't.

Goldwater Proves He Can Slug in Same League as Maris and Mantle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Mr. Morrie Ryskind which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times.

I believe that it gives a good analysis of how the average American is thinking on national problems.

GOLDWATER PROVES HE CAN SLUG IN SAME LEAGUE AS MARIS AND MANTLE

(By Morrie Ryskind)

The boy has definitely grown older. Here Roger Maris and Mickey Mantle, hot on the heels of the immortal Babe Ruth's home run record, were scheduled to appear against the Angels at Los Angeles' Wrigley Field. In the old days, wild horses and a regiment of East Berlin guards couldn't have kept me away. Nor even a date with Gina Lollobrigida.

And there I was, riding instead 40 miles to the outskirts of town because I'd read in the papers that BARRY GOLDWATER was going to speak at the little college stadium under the auspices of some Young Republicans. How silly can you get?

But, if this was midsummer madness, our party of four wasn't alone, as we discovered while trying to park. Some 7,000 of the younger set had had the same idea. Oh, there were quite a few of us who had reached the years of Jack Benny—39—for BARRY appeals to older Republicans, too. But this audience was overwhelmingly in the 21–35 age group. I have heard the Senator both in New York and California, and these are definitely his people. And, frankly, as one who is used to attending GOP meetings composed almost entirely of sturdy but elderly citizens, I find this face-lifting process highly attractive.

I had dallied with the notion of pulling rank and exercising the privilege of the fourth estate by sitting in the press section, so that I'd get a chance to say hello to the Senator. But at the hotdog stand we got into conversation with some of these young conservatives, as folks do on these occasions without the formality of introductions, and decided we'd rub elbows with them to see what makes 'em tick.

Well, we certainly rubbed elbows with them because the El Camino stands, designed to accommodate 5,500 or so, had at least another 1,000 packed into the seats that night in a spirit of real togetherness. When we couldn't inch together any more, they let the rest sit on the grass.

I recalled hearing Mr. Truman at Gilmore Stadium, far easier to reach, during his 1948 campaign—and he carried the prestige of the Presidential toga with him—and this crowd was easily twice as large. My guess is that the man from Arizona can right now—and certainly in this age group—outdraw any native son in the latter's home State. And I don't mean only on the trigger.

These youngsters are Republicans all right, but they are Goldwater Republicans—which means they're Jeffersonian Democrats, too. They are not Republicans because their fathers were, not because it's a lifelong habit. They have weighed the New Deal baubles and the New Frontier trinkets—and have

found them wanting. They have read—almost without exception—the Senator's "Conscience of the Conservative," and this is the banner they have enlisted under. It seems to them, rightly or wrongly, to epitomize what the Founding Fathers meant America to be, and they are determined to keep it in the path.

There is no doubt their hearts belong to BARRY. They gave him an ovation when he entered, and another when he announced his daughter had just that day made him a grandfather again; they punctuated his speech with salvos of applause, and had enough left over for another ovation at its conclusion.

Not that he said anything startlingly new or revolutionary, for the only revolution he really cares about is the one we had in 1776. But he restated the eternal verities he finds in the horse-and-buggy principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with vigor and clarity and wit. And that's what they had come to hear.

For this is no mere bobby-sox affair, replete with the shrill whistles given Frank Sinatra and Elvis Presley. If Barry has their hearts, it is because he has appealed to their minds, too. These are young people dedicated to a cause—the restoration of individual freedom from the shackles of the welfare state—and they see in BARRY the Moses who will lead them out of slavery into the promised land.

And if I were a bigwig in GOP politics, I think I'd have sense enough to see to it, in coming candidates and platforms, that this not inconsiderate group got considerable attention, beginning with the 1962 by-election. If I judge them correctly, they will not be content with a Republican Tweedledee running against a Democratic Tweedledum. If that's all they get, as sure as shooting—with or without BARRY—there'll be a third party where all these nice young voters and their nice young votes will wind up.

Don't say I didn't warn you.

Connecticut Bank's Timely Gambit in Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose in this extension of remarks to call the attention of the House, and of the people of this country, to the recognition which has been given in the banking field, to a patriotic enterprise of an institution which is widely known and respected in my district, the Middletown Savings Bank.

Other financial institutions have been quick to hop onto a good idea, but, so far as I know, the Middletown Savings Bank was the first to offer its assistance in the program which is currently the concern of households all over the country, particularly in the present world crisis when no one can tell whether or not we shall or shall not have a nuclear war.

The Middletown Savings Bank offered to homeowners who wished to build fallout shelters on their property, loans at an interest rate far below the prevailing work for homebuilding or home improvements.

The offer not only attracted wide attention in the community, but also attracted the attention of the American Banker, the only daily banking newspaper, which, in a recent issue, devoted its leading editorial to the enterprise of the Middletown Bank.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial at this point:

THREE-PERCENT LOANS TO BUILD FALLOUT SHELTERS—CONNECTICUT BANK'S PROGRAM BRINGS FAVORABLE RESPONSE

An interesting and timely gambit in civic service and bank public relations has been initiated by the Middletown (Conn.) Savings Bank, in its offer to finance the building of home fallout shelters at the lowest possible interest cost. A preferential rate of 3 percent will be given to citizens whose mortgages are held by the bank and who will build shelters for their families according to approved plans. Middletown Savings is first in the State to offer this special service.

Howard W. Smith, president of Middletown Savings for the past 15 years, and previously director of the then Department of Real Estate Finance of the American Bankers Association, has been impressed by the menacing turn in the cold war on the one hand, and by reports of widespread building of atomic radiation shelters in Russia, along with that country's training of both children and adults in survival requirements.

Middletown, he feels, would not be a prime bomb target. Located midway between New York and Boston, and some 15 miles south of Hartford, its problem is more likely to be fallout of radioactive dust rather than blast.

MINIMUM COST

Survival outside of an immediate atomic blast area, the bank points out, depends on avoidance for a period of days of radioactive dust which may blow into an area from a bombed area. A shelter equipped with air filter, water, food, radioactivity dosimeter, sanitary facilities (including a broom), battery radio, and eating and sleeping accommodations, can be built for sums ranging as law as $300. The broom, Civil Defense officials point out, is necessary to sweep out any fallout dust that may seep in around the shelter door.

For $250–$300, depending on how much work the householder does himself, a minimum approved shelter can be built, Mr. Smith tells local residents, to accommodate a family of five, utilizing basement space up to 10 by 9 feet. The two concrete basement walls serve as two sides for the little room. The two other walls are to be built of concrete, and a roof of concrete is to be poured just under the basement ceiling. Finally, a door as tight fitting and heavy as possible must be provided. Then, says Mr. Smith, the family should spend some days learning how to live together in such tight quarters.

The venture into fallout shelter promotion, he reports, "has been one of the most satisfying things I ever did. We must and should take seriously the problem of survival and our announcement has brought all kinds of favorable opinion, indicating that householders generally are grateful that we have taken leadership in this respect." He reports applications began coming in immediately after the first publicity, and this week the bank processed its first shelter loan, $238, for building materials for a do-it-yourself structure with four walls of solid concrete. The borrower is a telephone company man with a family of five. His payments will be $11 monthly for 2 years.

The bank, meanwhile, is making available at its offices copies of "The Family Fallout Shelter," a booklet supplied by the Civil Defense Administration, outlining the shelter-building problem. In addition, the bank has erected a full-size model of a home-type shelter in its lobby and initiated plans for creating its own shelter in the bank's basement.

GOOD PUBLIC RELATIONS

Announcing the special 3-percent fallout shelter loan rate, Mr. Smith told the press that this is only half the rate now being charged on home improvement loans. Over a 3- to 5-year repayment program, on monthly installments, the 3-percent rate means a reduction of about 10 percent in monthly payments, he said.

Much local publicity and favorable editorial comment has attended the bank's announcement. A new service, such as this, tied into the news of the day, and considering growing emphasis in Washington on civil defense activity, makes the best sort of grist for good publicity since it casts an institution in the best of light as a civic-minded corporate citizen.

But Mr. Smith disclaims publicity as the motive of the directors of the bank and himself in making fallout shelter promotion a prime program for the bank and the Middletown community. The real necessity of preparing as best we can for the worst, so that chances of survival will be the best possible, prompted their decision. This is as it should be.

Good public relations has been defined as "doing good and getting credit for it." Essentially the Middletown Savings Bank's idea has been to provide leadership in what has been called officially a vitally good movement. Like bread cast upon waters, benefits are bound to come back to the bank in ways both measurable and unmeasurable.

Status of the Regular Appropriation Bills and Legislative Back-Door Appropriation Provisions, 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and the country, I include up-to-date tabulations on the status of the regular appropriation bills and identified legislative bills carrying back-door provisions of one kind or another.

With presentation of the two conference reports today and the public works bill scheduled in the House tomorrow, we are near the conclusion of the regular appropriations schedule of the session. The usual last supplemental bill of the session will be reported tomorrow and disposed of this week. As disclosed by the tabulation, the District and foreign assistance bills are in the Senate. The State, Justice, judiciary bill is in conference and will be forthcoming.

The appropriations business has been delayed inordinately this session by the unexplained lateness of the growing practice of processing authorization bills annually. The Committee on Appropriations has been marking time for several weeks on certain bills waiting for the authorizations to clear.

The tables follow:

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 1st sess., as of Sept. 11, 1961

[Does not include any back-door appropriation bills]

Title	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	House action compared with budget estimates	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Senate action compared with—		Final conference action	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
						Budget estimates	House action		
1961 SUPPLEMENTALS									
3d supplemental	$1,235,482,769	$803,506,119	−$431,976,650	$5,275,213,127	$4,637,419,970	−$637,793,157	+$3,833,913,851	$1,694,055,637	[1]−$3,581,157,490
Inter-American program	600,000,000	600,000,000		600,000,000	600,000,000			600,000,000	
4th supplemental	88,024,000	47,214,000	−40,810,000	88,024,000	47,214,000	−40,810,000		47,214,000	−40,810,000
Total, 1961 supplementals	1,923,506,769	1,450,720,119	−472,786,650	5,963,237,127	5,284,633,970	−678,603,157	+3,833,913,851	2,341,269,637	−3,621,967,490
1962 APPROPRIATIONS									
Treasury-Post Office	5,371,801,000	5,281,865,000	−89,936,000	5,371,801,000	5,327,631,000	−44,170,000	+45,766,000	5,298,765,000	−73,036,000
Interior [2]	782,387,000	753,319,000	−29,068,000	782,387,000	813,399,850	+31,012,850	+60,080,850	779,158,650	−3,228,350
Labor-HEW	4,282,148,081	4,327,457,000	+45,308,919	5,004,281,081	5,161,380,000	+157,098,919	+833,923,000	4,915,965,000	−88,316,081
Legislative	105,647,577	104,353,335	−1,294,242	136,082,802	135,432,065	−650,737	+31,078,730	135,432,065	−650,737
State, Justice, Judiciary	795,891,202	751,300,050	−44,591,152	795,891,202	762,038,550	−33,852,652	+10,738,500		
Agriculture	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	−140,778,000	6,089,244,000	5,967,457,500	−121,786,500	+18,991,500	5,967,494,500	−121,749,500
Loan authorizations	(612,000,000)	(629,900,000)	(+17,900,000)	(612,000,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)	(+95,600,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)
Independent offices	8,625,561,000	8,404,098,000	−221,463,000	9,174,561,000	9,098,769,500	−75,791,500	+694,671,500	8,966,285,000	−208,276,000
General Government-Commerce	666,278,000	626,958,000	−39,320,000	666,278,000	650,438,200	−15,839,800	+23,480,200	641,135,800	−25,142,200
Defense	42,942,345,000	42,711,105,000	−231,240,000	46,396,945,000	46,848,292,000	+451,347,000	+4,137,187,000	46,662,556,000	+265,611,000
District of Columbia	(292,438,188)	(268,122,400)	(−24,315,788)						
Loan authorization	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(+4,400,000)						
Federal payment	39,753,000	32,753,000	−7,000,000						
Military construction	1,047,568,000	883,359,000	−164,209,000	1,047,568,000	1,020,146,750	−27,421,250	+136,787,750	[3] 947,878,750	−99,689,250
Foreign assistance	4,993,991,000	3,835,245,000	−1,158,746,000						
Public works	3,732,038,000								
Supplemental									
Total, 1962 appropriations	79,474,652,860	73,660,278,385	−2,082,336,475	75,465,039,085	75,784,985,415	+319,946,330	+5,992,705,030	74,314,670,765	−354,477,118
Total, all appropriations	81,398,159,629	75,110,998,504	2,555,123,125	81,428,276,212	81,069,619,385	−358,656,827	+9,826,618,881	76,655,940,402	−3,976,444,608
Total, loan authorizations	(636,600,000)	(658,900,000)	(+22,300,000)	(612,000,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)	(+95,600,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)

[1] Major reductions include 2 items submitted directly to Senate (S. Doc. 19): (1) $2,969,525,000 to restore funds of Commodity Credit Corporation. Entire estimate disallowed in conference; $1,951,915,000 resubmitted for 1962 in budget estimates for Agriculture (H. Doc. 155); (2) $490,000,000 for "Payment to the Federal extended compensation account." Reduction made by Senate. Resubmitted to Senate for 1962 in Labor-HEW bill (S. Doc. 30).

[2] Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, $15,000,000; House reported and passed, $10,000,000; Senate reported and passed, $10,000,000.

[3] Pending final disposition in House, with $3,812,000 not settled (and not included in this figure).

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

New authority to obligate the Government carried in identified legislative bills—1st sess., 87th Cong. (public debt borrowing, contract authority, use of receipts, and authority to use existing authority)

[Please note that for some bills no amounts are shown; thus the grand totals understate the situation]

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with executive requests—	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to enacted				Full basis	Comparable basis
1. Veteran's direct loans, multiyear (H.R. 5723; Public Law 87-84) (public debt)	[4]	[4]	$1,050,000,000	$1,050,000,000	$1,050,000,000	+$1,050,000,000	+$1,050,000,000
2. Area redevelopment, multiyear (S. 1; Public Law 87-27) (public debt)	[5] ($300,000,000)	[5] ($300,000,000)	[5] 300,000,000	[5] (300,000,000)	[5] 300,000,000	+300,000,000	+300,000,000
3. Agricultural commodities, sales for foreign currencies, for calendar year 1961 (S. 1027; Public Law 87-28) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)	[6] 2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000		
4. Special milk program for fiscal year 1962 (S. 146; Public Law 87-67) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)	[7] 105,000,000	[7] 105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000		
5. Special feed grain program for 1961 (H.R. 4510; Public Law 87-5) (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)	[8]	[8]	[8]	[8]	[8]		
6. Housing Act of 1961, multiyear (S. 1922; Public Law 87-70) (Public debt and contract authority):							
(a) FNMA, special assistance (public debt)	750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000	[7] 1,550,000,000	[7] 1,550,000,000	+800,000,000	+800,000,000
(b) College housing loans (public debt)	1,350,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,350,000,000	1,200,000,000	[9] 1,200,000,000	−150,000,000	+200,000,000
(c) Public facility loans (public debt)	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	500,000,000	450,000,000	+400,000,000	+400,000,000
(1) Mass transportation loans (public debt)			100,000,000		50,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
(d) Urban renewal grants (contract authority)	[9] 2,500,000,000	[9] 2,500,000,000	[9] 2,500,000,000	[9] 2,000,000,000	[9] 2,000,000,000	−500,000,000	−500,000,000
(e) Public housing (contract authority):							
(1) Annual contributions	[10] 3,146,000,000	[10] 3,146,000,000	[10] 3,146,000,000	[10] 3,146,000,000	[10] 3,146,000,000		
(2) Demonstration grants	[11] (10,000,000)	[11] (10,000,000)	[11] (10,000,000)		[11] 5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
(f) Open space land grants (contract authority)	[12] (100,000,000)	[12] (100,000,000)		[12] (100,000,000)	[12] 50,000,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
(g) Mass transportation demonstration grants (contract authority)	[13] (10,000,000)	[13] (10,000,000)	[13] (50,000,000)		[13] (25,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
(h) Farm housing loans (public debt)	[14] 207,000,000	[14] 207,000,000	[14] 207,000,000	[14] 407,000,000	[14] 407,000,000	+200,000,000	+200,000,000
Total, housing bill	8,003,000,000	7,653,000,000	[15] 8,103,000,000	8,803,000,000	8,858,000,000	+855,000,000	+1,205,000,000
Loans	(2,357,000,000)	(2,007,000,000)	(2,457,000,000)	(3,657,000,000)	(3,657,000,000)	(+1,300,000,000)	(+1,650,000,000)
Grants	(5,646,000,000)	(5,646,000,000)	(5,646,000,000)	(5,146,000,000)	(5,201,000,000)	(−445,000,000)	(−445,000,000)
7. Cape Cod National Seashore Park (S. 857; H.R. 5786; Public Law 87-126) (Contract authority)	[16] (16,000,000)	[16] (16,000,000)	16,000,000	[16] (16,000,000)	[16] (16,000,000)		
8. Federal aid to airports, 5 years (H.R. 6580; S. 1703; H.R. 8102) (contract authority)	375,000,000	375,000,000	375,000,000	[16] (375,000,000)			

See footnotes at end of table.

New authority to obligate the Government carried in identified legislative bills—1st sess., 87th Cong. (public debt borrowing, contract authority, use of receipts, and authority to use existing authority)—Continued

[Please note that for some bills no amounts are shown; thus the grand totals understate the situation]

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with executive requests—	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to enacted				Full basis	Comparable basis
9. Mutual security loans, 5 years (H.R. 8400; S. 1983; Public Law 87-195) (public debt borrowing, use of certain repayments, and contract authority):							
(a) Public debt borrowing for development loans	$7,300,000,000	$7,300,000,000	$7,987,000,000	[17]	[18]($7,200,000,000)	−$7,300,000,000	−$7,300,000,000
(b) Use of receipts from old loans for development loans	[19] 1,487,000,000	[19] 1,487,000,000				−1,487,000,000	−1,487,000,000
(c) Drawdown on Defense stocks and services for military assistance purposes (Defense can incur obligations in anticipation of reimbursement) (sec. 510)	400,000,000	400,000,000	200,000,000	$400,000,000	300,000,000	−100,000,000	−100,000,000
(d) Use for foreign currencies (House, sec. 611; Senate, sec. 612)	[20]	[20]	[20]	[20]	[20]		
Total, mutual security	9,187,000,000	9,187,000,000	8,187,000,000	400,000,000	300,000,000	−8,887,000,000	−8,887,000,000
10. Highway Act of 1961 (H.R. 6713; Public Law 87-61) (diversion of general fund revenues to "trust" fund; contract authority):							
(a) Diversion of ½ of 10 percent tax on trucks, buses, and trailers [21]			1,660,000,000	1,803,000,000	1,660,000,000	+1,660,000,000	+1,660,000,000
11. Agricultural Act of 1961 (H.R. 6400; H.R. 8230; S. 1983; Public Law 87-128):							
(a) 1962 wheat program (use of CCC funds involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)			[5]	[5]	[5]		
(b) 1962 feed grain program (contract authority and use of CCC funds involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)			[5]	[5]	[5]		
(c) Agricultural commodities, sales for foreign currencies (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)	[22] 7,500,000,000	[22] 4,500,000,000	[22] 4,500,000,000	[22] 4,500,000,000	[22] 4,500,000,000	−3,000,000,000	
(d) Famine relief (contract authority involving subsequent reimbursement of CCC)	[23] 1,500,000,000	[23] 900,000,000	[23] 900,000,000	[23] 900,000,000	[23] 900,000,000	−600,000,000	
Total, Agricultural Act	9,000,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	−3,600,000,000	
Grand total (as to amounts listed)	28,670,000,000	24,720,000,000	27,196,000,000	19,561,000,000			

[1] Department endorsed need for some legislation, but no specific request was submitted by the administration. Bill extends over 6 years.
[2] Recommended usual-type authorization of appropriation to 3 revolving funds plus use of receipts derived from operations. House concurred.
[3] For 3 revolving funds plus use of receipts derived from operations.
[4] For calendar year 1961 only (to a total of $3,500,000,000).
[5] Originally submitted as part of the general farm bill, to be financed in this manner for fiscal 1962 and thereafter through the more usual annual advance appropriation.
[6] Amounts not precisely determinable.
[7] Basis for this figure is set out on pp. 54–55, H. Rept. 447.
[8] For 4-year period; full executive request and Senate bill were for 5-year period.
[9] For 4-year period.
[10] Represents estimated maximum cost of annual contributions for 100,000 units of public housing to be paid out over period 40 to 45 years. See pp. 55–56, H. Rept. 447.
[11] Regular authorization for appropriation in Executive request and Senate bill. House bill made no provision. Bill changed at conference stage to contract authority.
[12] Regular authorization for appropriation. Senate bill made no provision. Bill changed at conference stage to contract authority.
[13] Part of, and included in, item 6(d), urban renewal grant authority.
[14] Executive request and Senate bill proposed a 5-year extension of availability of the uncommitted balance of previous authority otherwise due to expire on June 30, 1961. (Amount variously estimated at $207,000,000 to $235,000,000; actually turned out to be $227,612,000.) House bill and final version extend such balance and add $200,000,000 additional—limited, however, to a 4-year period. See pp. 57–58, H. Rept. 447.
[15] Excludes $1,200,000,000 carried in Senate bill for veterans direct loans inasmuch as the program is also accounted for in the first bill listed in tabulation.
[16] Regular authorization for appropriation.
[17] Usual form of appropriation authorization—$1,200,000,000 for fiscal 1962 only.
[18] Authorizes this amount to be appropriated over 5 years, 1962–66, but confers authority on the President to make agreements "committing" such appropriation authorizations, "subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds."
[19] Officially estimated at $287,000,000 for 1962 and $300,000,000 for each succeeding year.
[20] Precise amounts not identified.
[21] While technically this is not "New authority to obligate the Government," it has the same effect insofar as general budget totals and results are concerned in that it is, in final effect, the same as an expenditure from the general fund. Amounts shown taken from p. 12, S. Rept. 367. "New authority to obligate the Government" carried in the law, and requested, is $11,560,000,000 for the Interstate program over the period through 1972; but it is against the highway "trust" fund, not the general fund. Not shown here are the executive proposals (1) to increase new obligating authority for the A–B–C program; (2) to shift financing of forest and public land highways from the general fund to the "trust" fund; and (3) to redivert aviation gas tax revenues from the "trust" fund to the general fund. They are not shown because action was postponed to a later time.
[22] Enacted and Senate bills for 3 calendar years 1962–64. Full executive request was 5 years 1962–66. House was for 3 years 1962–64 with no limit, but in order to avoid gross distortion of totals and comparisons, $4,500,000,000 is arbitrarily inserted.
[23] Full executive request was for 5 calendar years 1962–66. Senate, House, and enacted are for 3 calendar years 1962–64.

There Is More Business, Commercial, Industrial, and Development Activity Per Capita in Houlton Than Any Other Town in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, a will to work, a will to win—that is the story of Houlton, Maine, a community which through self-determination and resourcefulness has created an economic climate in which businesses and commercial enterprises thrive and grow.

It is interesting to note that while the Federal Government is exerting every effort to provide economic stimulation in various areas of our country, the Houlton community has gone ahead and shown us just how it can be done on a basis of community initiative.

Here, then, is indeed a remarkable economic achievement, something that stands as a credit to this community and a challenge to other municipalities. I proudly insert into the RECORD an article from the August 31 issue of the Houlton Pioneer Times, for I sincerely believe that the details of this community's attainments are worthy of the scrutiny of my colleagues:

(By Aubrey A. McLaughlin, industrial director, Houlton Regional Development Corp.)

In analyzing at this time the economic activity in Houlton, a statement made a short time ago by a prominent State official upon the conclusion of a 3-day tour of Houlton and northern Maine is still applicable:

"I would estimate that there is more business, commercial, industrial, and development activity per capita going on at this time in the town of Houlton than in any other community of comparable size in the State of Maine."

At a time when unemployment rolls throughout the Nation have generally been increasing, those at Houlton have been decreasing; at a time when the employment level in general has been remaining constant or decreasing, in Houlton the employment has been and is now at an alltime high; at a time when the amount of new construction throughout the Nation has generally been down, new construction in Houlton has been at an alltime peak.

All business barometers normally used today indicate that Houlton over the past 3 or 4 years has established a mark which has caused even some of our bigger brothers to stop and take another look.

In analyzing this economic activity, it is most misleading to summarize only that of the past year. Many things that have become a reality during the past year actually had their origin years before. As example: the establishment in Houlton during 1961 of one of the county's most modern, newest and largest potato starch processing plants at a total cost of approximately $2 million was over 3 years in the research, planning, and building stage—a period during which every citizen in Houlton not only was affected but also was involved one way or another.

AN INTEGRAL PART

The citizens of Houlton now look upon this plant and the tenant company with humble pride and regard it as an integral part of a community that has proven its desire to share with others—its greatest inherited quality.

Or take the case of the Houlton International Corp., a wood products manufacturing concern. During 1961 that company also established its roots in Houlton but again only after nearly 2 years of study, research, negotiations, hard work and sweat—a period during which again the citizens of Houlton, municipal government, its utilities, banks, transportation companies, local business and others joined hands to make this a reality.

This same procedure and activity has been repeated many times in Houlton. The Allied Houlton Footwear Corp., one of Maine's newest and most northerly shoe manufacturing plants, which, not only is presently working at capacity with approximately 225 employed, but also is working out plans and negotiation for expansion—and Houlton's Reliable Cedar Products Co. which within the past year has become one of Houlton's major industries as well as one of Maine's fastest growing cedar products companies.

Ward Cabin Co., a nationally known manufacturer of custom-built log homes, is another that typifies that which Houlton and its citizens are so proud and which has made it possible for the statement that Houlton leads the State in activity.

This remarkable industrial and economic growth is primarily the result of a general philosophy of Houlton, its citizens, its business, and its industries—a philosophy which is the very foundation for community economic growth.

It is recognized by Houlton people that there is nothing as constant as change and that we must, at all times, prepare for and direct those changes.

Yes, change we must and change we do. Change is constant. The population growth of our great country; the geographic shift of the population; the changes in eating habits and living habits; new developments in transportation and communication; the great technological advances; changes in the form of military preparedness program are but a few of the things that do affect and cause continual shifts in the economy of an area.

These influences are most certainly not of recent origin; they have been around since the very beginning of time. However, the idea of working with these changes is of rather recent origin.

Houlton citizens fully realize and accept the fact that do not meet the challenges deriving from these changes will only result in a slow but most definite deterioration. The community has, therefore, been the leader in developing a program to be used in meeting these shifts and these changes. A program developed and designed to constantly analyze and determine the problems, the needs and also to include and carry out procedure for counter action. This is one reason why Houlton has been and is, so progressive in its relations with industry.

CANCEROUS

As has been stated so many times before, usually most economic ills are not, even in the broadest sense, of recent origin. Many of the unfavorable conditions that exist in any community today actually started years and years ago and have been somewhat like a cancer—ever increasing in severity, becoming further and further entrenched, affecting more and more of the very heart and soul of the community, its people and its businesses.

Houlton's industrial and economic development program is not, therefore, born from a crisis or from an "everybody's doing it" attitude but rather is the product of progressive planning—planning which has resulted in a community that knows its assets and its liabilities; a community that still knows how to live, work and play such as people all over the world dream about; a community that not only is proud of its progress but is willing and desirous of sharing it with others.

Another part of Houlton's overall philosophy is, "you cannot be what you are not." This honesty and sincerity is simply indicative of the inherited quality of the area and its people.

It is interesting to note all the communities, areas, cities, etc., that are the center of, the capital of, the king of, the home of, the origin of, the home of the greatest, the area of the lowest, etc.

Houlton also can boast of many such things but above that the citizens are much more desirous of sharing with others the many, many inherent assets, and characteristics of the community—share them in such a way that there could be no other choice and no regrets. Whether this be our outstanding transportation system, our favorable taxes, our nearly unmatchable insurance and utility rates, or our sportsman paradise, such as our lakes, streams, and woods, or even our abundant, progressive, and industrious labor, our unmatched forests, our industrial capabilities, or our unmatchable way of life, Houlton wants to share it.

"We cannot be what we are not but we can be what we are—that is what Houlton believes in."

BENEFICIAL TO BOTH

"You must give in order to receive." It is Houlton's firm belief that when an industrial operation considers locating in an area that the deal must be beneficial to both the community and the industrialist.

This has been demonstrated by the fact that within 4 years' time the Houlton Regional Development Corp. has become one of the largest real estate owners in the community and that over 400 citizens and businesses as well as the municipal government have become participants in industrial programs and have collectively expended over $300,000 in cash and assumed additional financial obligations of nearly $1 million as well as making available buildings and sites valued at approximately $1¼ million.

This is why Houlton as a community is forever searching for the problems as well as the answers. We want to provide the kind of community and the business atmoshere that the industrialist as well as the native want. This is being done.

FORGING AHEAD

In summary, it can be said with pride that without question Houlton is one of the most active communities for its size in the State of Maine, in business, commercial, industrial and development activity. While the national economy became soft, Houlton forged ahead as leader of the area.

This is primarily as the result of practices governed by the philosophy that "if change is inevitable we are prepared to change"; "that we can only be what we are and do not attempt to be what we are not"; and that "in every deal there must be mutual benefits—to the operating company as well as the community."

Without question this area is embarking upon a whole new concept of capitalizing upon our vast agricultural capabilities. Tremendous opportunities lie ahead. Our vast forestry empire also is awakening in such a manner that more and more of the 1,300 to 1,500 wood products manufacturing jobs which are now exported in the form of logs will be brought back home. Our area has all the characteristics needed to emerge as the playground of the Northeast.

Our opportunities are unlimited and our future is bright as we, of northern Maine, embark upon a road paved with aggressiveness, imagination, awareness, ambition and cooperation. Houlton, the economic leader of northern Maine, has its road well paved and will continue to forge ahead at full speed.

We Should Be Ashamed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Long-Islander of August 24. I think the analysis of our treatment of an old and honest friend is entirely correct, and I am glad that they noted the fine letter of former Ambassador Esteves that I placed in the RECORD.

Friends are not easy to come by and those that we have should be treated with honor and respect.

[From the Huntington (N.Y.) Long-Islander, Aug. 24, 1961]

WE SHOULD BE ASHAMED

Besides using up cash we haven't got in persisting in the role of Lady Bountiful to the world—our obsession to be loved by all, or practically all—is earning us the profound lack of respect usually accorded such conduct.

With our foreign policy based for the most part on the theory of reaction to the moves of the opposition camp—and Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles admitted on a recent "Meet the Press" TV program that we shall continue playing it by ear—it is no wonder Americans are confused and our allies dumbfounded.

On a par with our fumbling in Cuba and Laos our bumbling from Montevideo to Taiwan and our reckless sparring in the sundry Geneva talkathons is the matter of turning against one of our most faithful allies, Portugal, and joining the free world's arch enemy, the Soviet Union, in the matter of Angola. Not once, but twice, U.S. representatives voted in the United Nations for Communist-inspired resolutions urging internal reform in this old-established and once serene Portuguese-African colony.

The resolutions unleased the violence and disorder desired by the Reds. A letter from the Portuguese Ambassador to the United States commenting on this reign of terror was entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by New York's Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE. The leader of the organized bands killing, plundering, and raping Angola settlers, says the letter, is an admitted Communist who is quoted as saying at

a press conference in Leopoldville: "We will kill their women and children." Nearly 2,000 defenseless victims, the Ambassador reported, were slaughtered—the majority being women and children.

Great Britain and France abstained on both resolutions—without apparent umbrage from the Afro-Asians. But the United States voted, in effect, first to impose "independence" on Angola, despite the object lesson of the Belgian Congo; and again, after the initial murderous attacks on the settlers, to "convict" Portugal of repressive measures in Angola. Obviously, the United States was voting in fear—in fear that the "new nations" of Africa might think the Russians were nicer to them than we. At the very same time we were slapping our NATO allies with both hands, we were loudly urging stronger military and political unity in this beleaguered stronghold of freedom.

Justice demands that Portugal receive better treatment. Survival of the West requires that the United States reject expediency and double-dealing as substitutes for a national policy, forget the silly and ruinous idea that we can buy the affection of nations and reflect that a code of honor has always been our strongest shield.

Perhaps the impending crisis of divided Germany will sober our diplomats.

Shame and Anger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the editor written by Mrs. V. R. Thomson, one of my constituents. This letter appeared in the Santa Ana Register, Santa Ana, Calif., on August 19. I have had numerous letters from my constituents indicating that this letter expressed their views completely. I know that it expresses mine.

SHAME AND ANGER

EDITOR, REGISTER: I love my country, but today I feel nothing but shame and anger. There is no pride in my heart as I say "I am an American citizen of the United States." There is heartbreak and anguish as I watch this great civilization of free men, women, and children sink steadily lower into the quagmire of oblivion. Too many elected and appointed officials of our Government, whom we must of necessity trust, have betrayed the people of this Nation; some unwittingly, some through lack of courage and personal integrity, some by deliberate design. They seem bent on handing us over "gift wrapped" to the enemy. By "they" I refer to our President, our Supreme Court, Congress, the United Nations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the foreign aid program and many more too numerous to mention. They protest loudly: "If you think this wonderful gift is for you, you are crazy. We will protect our freedom. We will not let you take it from us." All the while their fingers are busy tying the bow on the "gift wrap" in such a manner that the Communists will have no trouble struggling to open their "package." Just one quick tug at the loose end of the ribbon and, "open sesame," the great prize, the United States of America will be in their hands and along with it all the other "free" nations in the Western World.

I am an American housewife, I belong to no groups. I am not an expert on anything. But it does not take an expert to see what is happening. Even I can see "the whites of their eyes." (It is almost possible to count their eyelashes.) It is past time for the action to start. To wait another moment will be disaster. I feel that our country is in its most severe national emergency in history. It's as it was 20 years ago, a few minutes before the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. We were completely unprepared then. We were badly defeated. We were almost wiped out. But, we rallied, and our great strength eventually won the war. But only because our Nation became united, and because American husbands, fathers, sons, brothers and sweethearts were being killed, and American property was being destroyed. The American people rose up as one huge enraged tiger and lunged ahead toward one specific goal: Win the war, save our freedom, sacrifice anything, keep our Flag flying at whatever the cost. And of course we won. At a great price. Why didn't we learn our lesson for all time?

What has gone wrong in the last 20 years? Are we a Nation of stupid, blind idiots? We are letting the same thing happen all over again. Only this time the enemy isn't sneaky. He boasts and pounds the table for emphasis, "We will bury you." Our people shrug and say, "Ha." He has not wavered. He warns and threatens us daily. He insults us. He shoots down our planes. He murders our citizens. He builds missile bases and submarine bases 90 miles off our coast. He plucks a commercial airliner out of our American skies and takes it, along with the American citizens who happened to be aboard, to his satellite outpost nestled snugly just off our shore. And he won't give it back. We say "Give it back or * * *," but we don't say or what. So he still has it, and we say, "The nerve." Our people stand in the streets and gaze awestruck at an enemy spaceship zooming across American skies and say, "So what." So, it will be too late to change from defensive to offensive this time. We won't have a couple of years to catch up. We'll have less than a couple of minutes. It will be over before we know what happened. Because we are not prepared. The tiger lies tranquilized and rolls over on his back and bats his paws like a kitten, leaving his soft underbelly exposed, and the heavy spiked boot of the Soviet is poised, ready to smash down with death-dealing force on that soft underbelly.

Americans, we've got to get that tiger on its feet, purge the tranquilizing drugs forever from its digestive tract. I want to hear the tiger roar and I want to see the claws and teeth in action, first by tearing off the lovely gift wrappings of our American heritage, and uncovering that basic human instinct, self-preservation. If our Government is floundering, perhaps it is because they can't hear the voice of the people. Perhaps the people haven't been speaking loudly enough, if at all. We must shake off the lethargy, unit, and through the strength of our masses force our Government to listen and to take certain steps. It is still a government of, by and for the people. But we have become lazy. Shame on us. We must write letters, telephone, send telegrams. The voice of the citizen must make itself heard.

The following represents the actions that one citizen, this writer, feels are obvious:

1. Consolidate the efforts of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and civilian space programs into one cohesive unit, working together, pooling knowledge, resources, material, and the taxpayers' money. This should be immediate action. It should be a crash program to catch up with and beat the Soviets in all areas of space achievements. Why should they be first? Why should they hold the heavy heavy over our heads? We are a greater, wealthier more powerful nation. We must regain supremacy, and quickly. But it will take a coordination of effort; not the bickering, secretive, strike plagued mess of American competing against American that it has been. It should be considered an act of treason to go on strike at a missile base, and punished accordingly.

2. We should take a good clear look at Cuba, at the utter madness of our country to permit such a situation to exist. We should invade with marines and whatever military needed, blacken the sky over Cuba with U.S. fighters and bombers while our fighting marines land on the beaches backed by U.S. warships. I truly believe not a shot would be fired. I truly believe that the shadows of our military planes alone would have Castro waving the white flag with trembling hands. That is what I think would happen today. Tomorrow, when the missile bases are complete, when Cuba has a retaliatory ability, well, it would be a different story. I feel we should take over Cuba and render her powerless to threaten the north and south continents of America, and so that we American citizens can begin to raise our heads again and let the blush of shame begin to recede from our faces. Is there any law which says we must always let the enemy strike first? There is nothing wrong in a nation being aggressive when she is protecting her very life. The tiger doesn't wait for the enemy to march up with crashing feet and steal her cubs before she strikes. She goes out and fights to the death, if necessary, to preserve her family when she is first aware of the enemy's direction and purpose. (I don't know why I keep using a tiger as a symbol—it just seemed appropriate. Our national emblem of course is the eagle. The eagle reacts in exactly the same way as the tiger.)

3. Another, immediately if not sooner, thing we should do is to demand that the United States completely sever all connections with the United Nations. Then we can really start carrying our heads high again. The United Nations needs us because they use us. They mold us to their will. They drain us for their own gain and everything they do helps the Soviets and furthers world communism, while injuring us. We do not need the United Nations. The creation of the United Nations coincided, at least in my opinion, with the beginning of our Nation's degeneration and degradation. Why, in the name of Heaven, we have allowed ourselves to wallow in this impossible situation is completely beyond me. I have read and listened to the so-called benefits of our support of and membership in the United Nations, and even though I am certainly not an expert, or maybe because I am not an expert, it has never made sense to me. The title itself is ridiculous. What United Nations? Do we actually feel we are united with the Soviet Union, to mention only one? It just isn't logical that this great, powerful, courageous Nation should continuously engage in an activity that has continuously funcitoned to the detriment of her interests. To me, it seems sheer madness to pour billions of our taxpayers' dollars via foreign aid into Communist controlled countries. Not to mention tools, machinery, wheat, foodstuffs, etc. Since when does a country finance, feed, and sustain the enemy who has sworn he will dedicate his life to destroy her? Throughout the centuries wars have been won by "starving out" the enemy, and many times this has been the only weapon needed.

4. We must oppose every single attempt of our Government to control those areas of our lives which we can take care of our-

selves. The U.S. Government has no business sticking its nose into the education of our children. We must remain free to educate our children as we want them educated, and we must elect local and State officials and representatives who will strongly resist any effort by our Government to deny us that right under the guise of Federal aid. The same goes for social security as a compulsory tax, medical aid as a compulsory tax. Anything which becomes a compulsory law in this country should be voted on by the people.

5. I feel strongly that the Justices of the Supreme Court of this land be limited to 2 years in office. If ever our Constitution needed amending, it needs it now in relation to the functions and terms of office of our Supreme Court. It is only right that Supreme Court Justices have their records reviewed from time to time, and Justices whose decisions have been questionable and not in the best interests of the preservation of the Constitution of the United States can be removed from office. Do you realize that every Justice in the Supreme Court is on the bench for life? No one group of men in this Nation should have that much total power. Especially when that group represents the top echelon of power. Even the President of the United States has no power over the Supreme Court. Of course Congress has the power to impeach, but has done so rarely, and involves merely a board of inquiry which has resulted in only four removals from office since our Constitution was written.

The hour is very late, maybe too late. I have asked myself, What can I do? The one thing I know I must do is let my feelings be known to those in positions of governmental responsibility. I have said to myself, "one small voice, who will listen?" Maybe no one will listen. My letters may not even be read or taken heed of but I've got to take that chance. I can't just sit here helpless and ashamed and accuse everyone else of being apathetic. Perhaps if my letters were joined by 180 million, or even 80 million perhaps then our experts would be able to consolidate their knowledge and experience with the true will of the people and by putting the brains and logical reasoning powers of all our Nation's experts together, with a clear understanding of what the citizens of this country want, well, maybe the tiger will stop mewing and the mew change to a thunderous roar and the sinewy muscles flex and the sharp claws unsheath and the clear and precise intent of a great civilization of free men will be unmistakable and strike terror into the hearts of the entire Communist world. It is past time to stop cowering * * * it is time to begin stalking, and with cunning and courage and stout hearts and never a backward glance—to conquer.

Maybe it is already too late for us. Many people think we are at the end of a fuse which has already been lit. I don't know. Perhaps a lot of people reading this will not agree with me. I may even be accused of wanting war. I feel we are already at war, and losing. All I can say is that my conclusions are based solely on information which has been available to everyone with the power to hear and the ability to read. Namely, the press, radio, TV, magazines, and books. There is so much I have left out. So many sickening facts that space does not permit. If you have been listening and looking and reading and have average intelligence and logical reasoning powers plus a desire to hang on fast to your personal freedom and our Nation's independence, then it seems to me that as surely as night follows day your conclusions should be similar to mine. If they are not, please show me where I have erred.

Sincerely,

Mrs. V. R. THOMSON.

Lizzard Lick Man Proposes Cold Cash Plan To Keep Money on Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a novel undertaking has come to my attention. I found a press release on my desk, announcing a plan to get folks on a cash basis. This indeed is revolutionary in this day of "a dollar down and a dollar when." I was especially impressed that this undertaking is directed by Connie B. Gay, a farm boy from Lizzard Lick, N.C., who already has made good and is a friend of many Members of this body.

I believe Mr. Gay's "cash and profit and save" plan deserves wide attention. Therefore, with the permission of the House, I am inserting a portion of the aforementioned press release in the Appendix of the RECORD—and I am sure my colleagues will find it interesting.

The press release follows:

NEW CONSUMER CLUB PROFITS CASH PAYERS

Connie B. Gay, the Lizzard Lick, N.C., farm boy who became a Washington, D.C., millionaire by awakening and exploiting America's deep-rooted love of country music, appears to have gripped and run with another even more basic American emotion—anxiety over unpaid bills.

"The average American is in debt to his eyeballs," says Mr. Gay, man of many hats. "Trouble is he's so deep he's afraid to look at how much it's costin' him."

As a successful impresario, writer, talent manager, knife-sharpener pitchman, music publisher, and owner of the Connie B. Gay Broadcasting Corp., Mr. Gay himself does not have to worry about creditmen dogging his footsteps. Anyway, he's a cash and carry man. If he has his way, he will sell a lot of his fellow Americans on the wisdom of doing likewise through his new organization—Cash Card International Club. Philosophy behind the plan is to save people not only the high cost of credit, but to pay them for their thrift. Result, according to Mr. Gay, is more money in more pockets: the consumer, the merchant, and, of course, the instigator of the newly organized cash movement, himself.

Here's how this "credit card in reverse" plan works:

Members join cash card by buying a $10 membership card which entitles them to discounts from member merchants. The member is provided with a merchant discount directory listing stores and the discounts given at each. After making a purchase, a customer takes out his membership card entitling him to the discount (usually ranging from 5 to 40 percent) and this amount is deducted from his bill.

Assuming a family did all of their buying at any of the several hundred member stores in the District of Columbia area, they would not only save the $132.40 the average family pays for credit charges, but an additional $187.48 in discounts—many times the cost of membership. (Figured on average 10-percent discounts and based on Washington-area average annual expenditures for goods and services.) This makes a grand total of $319.88, or total net savings—including a deduction of $10 for membership card—of $309.88 in 1 year. A family whose annual expenditures for goods and services exceed the area average of $1,972.94—and most Washington-area families do—of course, saves a correspondingly larger amount.

In the works is still another bonus—a plan which will entitle members to premiums on presentation of a still-to-be-determined amount of cash discount receipts. A club publication, The Exchequer, is also planned for distribution to the more than 5 million members which the Gay organization expects to enroll by 1964.

According to Mr. Gay, the businessman benefits through increased cash flow, decreased bookkeeping costs, and customer goodwill which will be reflected in increased sales volume and higher income. Merchants pay no membership fee, and will benefit through advertising and merchandising at no cost to them. Advance market testing indicates that as many as 250,000 cash card memberships will be obtained in the greater Washington area alone.

It is Mr. Gay's view that merchant benefits accruing through increased business and cash flow and decreased costs will more than make up the discounts given customers.

Mr. Gay has no illusions about the obstacles in the way of unqualified public embrace of his idea. He is well aware that American psychology has become increasingly geared to the charge-it deferred-payment way of life. "It won't be easy," says Mr. Gay realistically. "We have gradually been brainwashed to live by the adage: 'Never pay today, that which you can defer until tomorrow.' But I think if people get wise to how much this is cutting into their budget, and figure how many other things they could buy with their interest money, plus, the discount bonuses, then I think this thing will really go like a house afire."

Nine New Plants Financed by MIBA Will Be Completed and in Operation This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maine is populated by an enterprising citizenry that assiduously adheres to a do-it-yourself philosophy.

In consonance with this theme of citizens and State independence, the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act of 1957 established a unique organization designed to promote industrial development in the State of Maine.

Under this act, an industrial authority was set up, such an authority being empowered to guarantee up to $20 million in loans extended by banks and other lending institutions to local nonprofit corporations located throughout the State.

This authority, in order to meet its obligations, was authorized to issue up to $20 million of its own bonds, and these bonds are fully supported by the full credit of the State of Maine.

Only nonprofit development corporations are entitled to borrow under this program, the maximum for any single loan being $1 million. Under the program's operation local development corporations rent building facilities to exist-

ing and new industries on a lease or lease-purchase basis. New structures are built only at such times as clients give adequate assurance of active interest.

The act provides that the local agencies must have a minimum of 10-percent equity in any undertaking; hence, participating banks could lend as much as 90 percent of the valuation. Furthermore, the act permits that such loans may be made for periods up to 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a particular interest in the functions of this authority, for prior to 1958 the Federal Reserve Act prohibited national banks from making loans in excess of 66⅔ percent of valuation. This had the effect of preventing national banks in the State of Maine from participating in full accord with the 90-percent-of-valuation loan provision of the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act.

Through legislation introduced by me and other interested Congressmen, this restriction was lifted through an amendment to the Small Business Act of 1958, which permitted 90-percent-of-valuation loans to be made by national banks in those instances where the bonds of a lending authority were supported by the full credit of a State. Through such an amendment the financial resources of national banks in Maine became sufficiently available to implement the provisions of the Maine Industrial Building Authority Act.

That this State-advanced effort is bearing fruit is borne out by the results, and in this respect I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the August 31 issue of the Houlton Pioneer Times that gives some insight into the economic dynamics generated by this State-sponsored authority:

[From the Houlton Pioneer Times, Aug. 31, 1961]

NINE NEW PLANTS FINANCED BY MIBA WILL BE COMPLETED AND IN OPERATION THIS YEAR

(By Roderic C. O'Connor, manager, Maine Industrial Building Authority)

Nine new industrial plants, financed with the assistance of the Maine Industrial Building Authority, will be completed and start operations this year.

These plants will provide jobs for 1,300 employees and provide a total payroll of more than $4 million. The plants will have a total floor area of about 500,000 square feet.

Total cost of the nine plants is over $5 million; insured mortgage loans involve $4.25 million, with $3 million of such loans made by private Maine lending institutions.

The nine new plants, their location, cost, footage, and products are:

Tenant firm	Location	Project cost	Square footage	Product
Morningstar-Paisley, Inc	Houlton	$1,100,000	60,000	Potato starch modifications.
Hamilton & Sons, Inc	Auburn	33,000	5,000	Metal fabrications.
Northeast Gases, Inc	Saco	80,000	8,000	Industrial gases.
Potato Service, Inc	Presque Isle	1,250,000	120,000	Processed potatoes.
Hancock-Ellsworth Tanners, Inc	Hancock	800,000	70,000	Sheepskin leather.
R. & L. Manufacturing Co., Inc	Waterboro	160,000	23,000	Trophies.
Vahlsing, Inc., Maine	Easton	1,150,000	95,000	Processed potatoes.
Casco Printing Co	Portland	130,000	15,000	Job printing.
Lynn Innersole Co., Inc	Saco	65,000	98,000	Shoe innersoles.

Straight Talk to the Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I proposed the establishment of an Ideological Warfare Agency. The purpose would be to develop and execute a more effective policy for waging a psychological-ideological battle against the Communists.

Over the years, efforts—many of them excellent within their limitations—have been conducted in this field. If we are to win this significant nonmilitary contest, however, we need a more effective effort to: First, correlate the scattered efforts now widely dispersed in the Government; second, cope with the strong-voiced Red propaganda machine; and third, and more effectively tell the story of freedom.

Recently, the Evening Star published a thought-provoking article by David Lawrence entitled "Straight Talk to Russian People." The article again re-emphasized that we need a stronger global voice to sell the ideas and ideals of freedom. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE—GIGANTIC PUBLICITY JOB HELD IMPERATIVE ON SOVIET DICTATOR'S PLAYING WITH FIRE

(By David Lawrence)

Everyone in America would back up almost any effort President Kennedy might make to avert another world war and to bring about a reduction in the current cost of "peacetime" armaments.

But, as so often happens when governments get bogged down in the rituals of diplomacy, the obvious is overlooked. Reliance is too often placed on strong talk to the Kremlin about bigger and better weapons or the mobilization of armies. But this doesn't reach the Russian people.

Today the most obvious fact staring the whole world in the fact is that a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union which lies to its own people by completely distorting and misrepresenting the viewpoint of the western countries. This is not an academic matter for the Russians, either. For if war comes, millions of them will lose their lives.

Yet the U.S. Government is falling down badly in communicating its views to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The excuse usually offered is that it is hard to penetrate Communist-controlled areas and that radio broadcasts can be "jammed." This is partly true, but there are ways of reaching into the Soviet Union if a massive effort were made by the United States.

It seems incomprehensible that in a country like America, where publicity and advertising have reached such a high degree of effectiveness, the Government itself should be fumbling and bumbling in presenting its views to the world. President Kennedy has an alert mind, and he fully understands the art and value of publicity in domestic politics. It is a mystery why he has allowed the publicity of the U.S. Government abroad to be neglected.

It is not a question of which individual should manage the U.S. Information Agency or how much staff the Voice of America itself should have for its broadcasting operations. There is need for a vigorous and aggressive policy with a powerful directive from the President of the United States which would authorize direct appeals to the people of the Soviet Union. The bureaucrats may oppose it, but they are not realistic in view of the threat that faces the world.

The existing directives, for instance, are based on a pussyfoot policy of forbearance. They provide that care should be taken not to seem to be dealing with internal affairs in Russia. So broadcasts are made in vague and abstract jargon, designed mostly to reach so-called intellectuals. Highbrow lectures are offered to such an audience, when simple truths need to be stressed to publicize the current behavior of Nikita Khrushchev.

Today, when the world faces the possibility of a nuclear war, is not the time to handle America's viewpoint with tenderness or politeness. It is a time for straightforward and plain speaking by the American people to the Russian people.

The United States, moreover, need not hesitate to tell the Russian people that Nikita Khrushchev is threatening world peace, that he is suppressing the truth about his own nuclear tests, and is following a dangerous course which can lead to a war that neither side really wants.

Facts about the suppression of the truth and the enslavement of hundreds of millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain—these are matters which need emphasis over the airwaves everywhere. They must be repeated persistently, day in and day out, so that the whole world will have a basis for condemnation of real tyranny and real colonialism.

Nor is there any good reason to ignore the nonalined or neutral nations either. Their peoples, too, should be told the truth. In many of these countries, which profess the virtues of their neutralism, censorship of the press and radio is maintained, so that the American viewpoint doesn't become known or is deliberately misrepresented. Many Americans are beginning to ask why billions of dollars of their tax funds are being given away in foreign aid to such nations while virtually nothing is being spent by America in those countries to give directly to the people themselves the truth about American policies.

A gigantic job of publicity is imperative. It will require not just the $140 million which Congress has planned to appropriate for information services abroad, but at least $1 billion. Congress would provide the funds quickly if there were a constructive policy and a comprehensive plan. This could, moreover, save the world from a costly war and make unnecessary some of the huge expenses being incurred by this country with its military budget of more than $46 billion.

When will the administration stop overlooking the obvious? Time is running out. Officialdom has sidestepped the problem for the last 15 years. It is not a political or partisan question. It is a simple matter of directly telling the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc, in their own languages, that the West is truly interested in peace and that the Soviet leaders are playing with fire and can bring on a nuclear war.

An Analysis and History of Castro's Communist Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following address delivered to the Miami Kiwanis Club on August 11 by Carlos Todd, former political editor of the Times of Havana, gives the best analysis and history of Castro's Communist revolution, and is worthy of our study and attention.

The question again arises, Why did our State Department not know these things, or did they know and were sympathetic to the revolution? These questions should be answered.

The address follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS MADE TO THE KIWANIS CLUB OF MIAMI—AUGUST 11, 1961

Gentlemen, allow me to say that it is both a privilege and a pleasure to address you today in a city that has opened its generous heart to those of us who have been forced to leave our country.

Miami, which up to a short time ago—it feels like centuries—was the resort city of Cubans, has now become our home; and it is the people of Miami, with their friendliness and willingness to help, that has made a painful transition a great deal easier on all of us.

I wish to speak to you today about a murderous process that has been erroneously, if not indifferently, described as the Cuban problem, the Castro mess, and again as tension in the Caribbean.

I am a Cuban citizen, born in Cuba, who has lived most of his adult life in that lovely and unfortunate island. As political editor for the newspaper Times of Havana, I lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality the Communist conquest of Cuba.

I have been witness to the total eradication of all freedoms in Cuba; to the destruction of its wealth and industry by the Red invaders; to the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and to the poisoning of the minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of a people who were once gay and happy and carefree.

I have seen all this happen before my very eyes; and I cannot dismiss it with the word "tension."

It is totally inadequate to say that I speak to you about "tension in the Caribbean," when that so-called tension has become open warfare to the death.

There may be some among you that still believe that the word "war" implies only much shooting and desolation and nothing else. Only very recently, we have had occasion to witness this type of warfare in the ill-fated, abortive invasion attempt by a handful of young Cubans who willingly sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom.

Nevertheless, that skirmish—for it was no more than that—was only a small armed engagement which served to accentuate the other kind of war, a war that is being waged relentlessly in the Caribbean and in every corner of this earth, the war for public opinion.

That tyrant and superb politician, Adolf Hitler, wrote "Mein Kampf" that public opinion was the mightiest factor of our time. He used it well and used it to the hilt. He has been surpassed and left far behind by Soviet Russia, which adopted some of his methods and added embellishments of her own.

This war—the war of advertising, for that is what propaganda really is—is being fought with tenacity, intelligence, and diligence by international communism.

The immediate and direct result of this type of warfare is what you call "tension," under the accepted semantics of the Western World. But it remains war to the death, no matter what you choose to call it. Mao Tse-tung recognized the principle years ago and wrote, "Politics is war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed."

This tension, this war without bloodshed in the Caribbean, dates from the time that Fidel Castro, together with his Communist master, Ernesto Ché Guevara, landed in Cuba in December 1956. From that moment, and throughout the succeeding months, tension increased fearfully within the island of Cuba; but it had not, as yet, reached any appreciable degree outside the country.

Tension in the Caribbean began from that date as it inevitably begins in every single place in the world where the Communists initiate their well tried and successful program of infiltration, subversion, propagandizing and bribery to secure total power in any given area. The Congo, Laos, Vietnam, Berlin, Cuba—every single focus of tension can be directly attributed to Communist action.

Open bloodless warfare—tension, if you insist in calling it that—intensified and finally burst forth from Cuba with explosive force, immediately after Castro and his Communists came to power on January 1 of 1959.

It became open warfare in the armed sense when the Cuban Communist Government attempted an abortive invasion of Panama in April of 1959. It is worthy of note that the invaders were politely returned to Cuba by the Panamanian Government. Castro tried again, in August of that year, to invade the Dominican Republic, in an attempt that also died at birth. The seas around the island were containing armed Cuban Communist aggression.

They did not and have not contained the open bloodless warfare, the tension that has spread throughout the countries of South and Central America. It has become impossible to limit that warfare to the Caribbean, to quarantine it, as you would a deadly disease, from the rest of Latin America. It is increasing daily and it is achieving new victories and faithful adherents in this hemisphere.

It has invaded this country today; and for the last 4 months it has become the subject of urgent discussion from the top of the White House down to the home of the humblest citizen who reads newspapers or watches television.

For the origins of this tension, one may begin with the relationship that existed between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, Central and South America, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those relations were at an alltime high; and the political, commercial, and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your government was a strong bond for hemispheric unity.

Curiously enough, the policy of the good neighbor became, unconsciously to Latin American nations, the policy of the good father. An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians received their share of largesse; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, whilst leaving the Latin American republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the pater familias of the hemisphere; and in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship.

You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing had been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered safe by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between tolerance and contempt becomes very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tin-pot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships; revolutions, and the installment of the so-called independent governments of the left. The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of yours hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better humpty-dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel: international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of an "independent government of the left" in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the pristine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special Government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto Ché Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism, took over Fidel Castro. Your "independent government of the left" became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere—and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the

United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"He who remains silent, relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great Nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, kidnap its planes, jail and execute its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its Ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America * * * "You are with communism or against it." And never forget that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The recent fiasco in Cuba has only served to confirm that conviction to Caribbean and other Latin American nations. The harm that has been done by the failure of a small expedition is incalculable; and you now stand on the threshold of a "Götterdämmerung" in this hemisphere.

For the tension, the open warfare that emanated from little Cuba has grown to monstrous proportions in Latin America, and your own Security is being threatened, according to the recent words of President Kennedy.

They have served, if only momentarily, to give pause to the Communist offensive; and they have brought some measure of hope to those people of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, which have always looked to the United States as the paladin of freedom and the shield against Communist aggression and intervention.

For the moment only; for that aggression and intervention has been made perfectly evident in the Caribbean today, with a Cuba invaded and conquered by the evil forces that guide the moves of the men of the Kremlin and Peiping.

The presidential words did not allay the fact that the defeat of an invasion of Communist Cuba has been a major defeat for this country in the eyes of all Latin America and the world. Condemnation for the American-backed invasion in the United Nations and in many Latin American quarters is not a condemnation for U.S. intervention in Cuba, and I say intervention between quotation marks. The condemnation comes because, in the eyes of the world, this country lost.

Will Rogers said it in well chosen words, viewing the American political scene years ago, when he stated, "On the day after election, they do not ask you whether you held a nice, clean campaign. The only question they ask you is: Did you win?"

And that is the only question that was asked silently by the nations of Latin America after the failure of the U.S.-backed, Cuban-manned invasion. Did you win? Nothing else. For nothing else matters.

Consider, ladies, and gentlemen, that these nations who regarded you as a protector—although they paradoxically screamed intervention just recently—have only to glance at the map of the world to judge you a bad security risk.

Within the short space of 16 years, the Communists have won control over more than 800 million people in 13 countries; and they have advanced from their initial base in Russia to win sensational successes in four continents * * * including North America. It is incontestable to say at this moment that they are winning that war to the death, the war of tension. And it is perfectly evident that, with the exception of the Cuban skirmish, they have done it without resorting to an all-out shooting war.

Indeed, they have won an armed clash at your very doorstep, which has left the people of this country stunned and aghast at their impotence before the Communist invader.

The world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted this attack and acknowledged a small armed victory with impunity—no matter what other considerations must be taken into account by you—has not been lost on Latin Americans.

Weak countries, like people, will forever look to the strong for guidance and help. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us Latin Americans in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act against the armed might of Soviet Russia and its Chinese ally, already firmly entrenched across the straits of Florida?

Be certain that no matter how you act, you will find worldwide criticism hurled at you. You are called imperialists and aggressors without sending a single armed man into Cuba. You will be called much worse if you do. The Communists will hold a worldwide propaganda feast, and the United States will be served up with an apple in its mouth.

Yet, if you are to survive as a nation, if you are to keep what little prestige American power still maintains, you must act, and you must act quickly. Otherwise, Khrushchev's words will become tragically prophetic within a very short time: "Your grandchildren will live under communism." The man means what he says. He intends to see to it that it becomes a reality.

We Latin Americans are accused of being dramatic, passionate and mercurial in our ways. Underneath that exterior, we are all hard realists. And it is difficult for us, as realists, to understand exactly how you have permitted such open and arrogant Communist intrusion in your own bailiwick, with total impunity for the intruders on our hemispheric and your national security.

It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

It is happening again. But this time the enemy is organized on a worldwide basis and is busily subverting, infiltrating and corrupting the very system that you are called upon to defend—and doing it from within your own borders. And you are tacitly permitting him to do so with ghastly unconcern.

Do not believe for one moment that the rest of Latin America is not going to follow in the footsteps of Cuba. The southern continent will go entirely Communist; and it will do so very soon, unless you act rapidly to prevent it.

To those of you who still do not believe that a well organized, aggressive minority can take over a country with frightening ease, let me point to the case in Cuba. And, gentlemen, do not forget that right here, in the United States, a well organized, aggressive minority succeeded in changing your Constitution. Recall the 18th amendment. Recall, please, that a majority of your people bowed to the wishes of a well organized, aggressive minority, which condemned you to years of prohibition.

Meanwhile, the Communists are busy with plans for their Latin American takeover. Czech machineguns are being shipped to Colombian Red elements; and frenzied efforts are being made to unite them into a cohesive and effective force. In Cuba, Castro's guerrilla tutor is training Cubans for the invasion of Venezuela and Panama. The main attack is being directed against Venezuela, where Betancourt's hold becomes more tenuous with every day that passes. Brazil is another danger zone. Only in Peru—where documents of the most incriminating nature were abducted from the Cuban Embassy by Cubans, providing a huge conspiracy against the Peruvian Government, has communism been contained—not defeated.

At the moment, you stand tied hand and foot by the very "entangling alliances" that George Washington warned against. Whilst Soviet Russia conveniently ignores the United Nations and international treaties when it suits her—and gets away with it—you are ensnared in a web which will eventually smother you to death; and which is now being used with diabolical cleverness to stay your hand in your own defense.

The weapons that you have at hand in the international arena lie forgotten by your former Latin American allies. The Rio Treaty and the Caracas Declaration, which provided the means and the force to cast out communism from this hemisphere, are crumbling into dust.

You are being slowly and inexorably surrounded. Most of Europe is gone. Asia is practically gone. The entire west coast of Africa, facing the Atlantic, is going. Latin America is about to go.

It does not take much imagination to see the realization of Lenin's dream when he said, "We shall surround the United States. Without having to fire a shot, it will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

If this country is to survive, it must accept not only the responsibilities, but also the risks, of power. And it must come to understand one of the basic laws of power: it must be demonstrated or it must be used. Otherwise, power is nonexistent.

As Americans, you are faced with the greatest challenge that history has ever hurled at you. As Americans, you have always been mortal enemies of tyranny and despotism; of mass executions and mass imprisonment; of the concentration camp and the torture chamber; of viciousness and cruelty and oppression. Time and again you have fought against these things; and now you must fight against them once more.

Yesterday, you called these things nazism and you fought and won. Today these same things are called communism; and again you might fight and win. For if you do not face the issue squarely, you will go down to inevitable defeat, and the entire world will become prey to the forces of evil.

Your forefathers never wavered, never hesitated, never counted the risks, never considered the odds * * * and they won. You, their descendants, cannot allow this precious heritage to be destroyed.

The fate of the entire world is at stake. You hold too much of the future of mankind to allow it to slip so heartrendingly from your hands.

Redtape and Dictation Result When Cities Give in to the Lure of Government Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in the September 1961 issue of Nation's Business an article by a former Peoria educator pointing up the evils of Federal aid to education.

Dr. Anthony Marinaccio, the author, has devoted 27 years of his life to education. He has been superintendent of public schools in Davenport, Iowa, since July 1959. He also has been superintendent or assistant superintendent of schools in three other Midwestern communities—including Peoria, Ill.—a college professor and school principal.

The article follows:

EDUCATOR SAYS: "WE REJECT FEDERAL AID"

Don't let anyone tell you that Federal aid to education won't lead to Federal control. I have been on the receiving end of Federal aid and I have seen the controls develop and grow.

It's a dangerous delusion—this notion that aid from the Federal Government does not lead to interference with the freedom of local schools to manage their own affairs.

In a Missouri community where I served as superintendent of schools I saw a dramatic example of how this can happen. The public schools there were receiving Federal funds for vocational home economics education.

Ostensibly, there were no strings attached. In fact, however, we were harassed by a school supervisor who, in her capacity as an inspector employed by the State—but actually paid by Uncle Sam—attempted to force changes in our curricula and facilities which our own vocational training specialists knew to be inadvisable.

When we refused to accept her ideas, she said, "Well, I am not sure that I want to approve the funds you get for this program."

What did we do? We did what I feel every school system in America should do in a situation where its basic rights are threatened. We rejected the Federal program and ran our own.

There are other examples of the controls which come with so-called aid from Washington. But before I enumerate some of those which my 27 years in education have revealed, I want to make this point most emphatically to all Americans—and particularly those responsible for the training of our youth: America is in real peril of losing its freedom as a result of corrosion from within, and that corrosion, I am convinced, will be hastened if the Nation adopts large-scale programs in which the Central Government finances local schools.

Some will say that I am an alarmist, that I am painting the picture in unnecessarily dark colors. Let me say that I am not wearing blinders or fighting for a preconceived idea. I am, I think, a realist. I know that sometimes circumstances make its necessary for the Federal Government to help localities with their school problems.

One such special case is what is known as an impacted area. These are communities where, because of Federal installations, tremendous numbers of children come in suddenly and fill up the schools. Such communities should be given Federal help.

NEED FOR AID NOT WIDESPREAD

In most public school systems, there is no need for asking or expecting Federal help. The job can be done at the local level—where it should and must be done if we are to preserve our freedom. America has been built out of this thing we call freedom. People can learn how to handle freedom—to be free—only if they have such powers as free education. Essential to free education is the power of the community to decide for itself what its schools should teach, and how to finance the teaching.

If we allow Federal aid to education to come on a big scale, we will be moving—perhaps slowly at first, but more rapidly later on—to centrally directed education that could take us down the same road traveled by Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin and all the totalitarian societies of the past. I don't want this to happen. But it could happen. It's precisely the danger which Washington and Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin were concerned about when they met at the inn in Williamsburg after the Revolutionary War.

"Now that we have won this thing," they said in effect, "are we able to educate the masses of Americans to be free and to have responsibility for control of their freedom—or will chaos result?"

Proponents of Federal aid to education continually assure us there will be no control. In Davenport, in Peoria, Ill., in Missouri, and in other places where I have had contact with public schools, I found the opposite to be true. Control does follow aid.

Those who administer aid want to check the programs and courses of a study. They suggest programs. They suggest the type of personnel you should hire and what you should pay them. They suggest what you should teach and, through these suggestions, they are actually controlling the situation.

Uncle Sam cannot hand out large sums of money without checking to make sure this money is properly spent. When you get to checking the spending you have to have a standard against which to check it. This becomes control. It is really as it should be. Billions of dollars should not be loosely distributed and their use left unmonitored. So, you're in a vicious circle. If you're running a public school system which receives Federal tax dollars, you have to pay attention to what the Federal Government or its agents say, or you just won't qualify for the funds.

Look at the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which sets up grants for science and mathematics.

The preamble to this act disclaims any intention to control local schools, yet you should have seen the thick report which we had to prepare in Davenport if we wanted to qualify for NDEA funds. We had to spell out in detail our program, our organization, and so forth. If that isn't control, what is it?

I know of communities which are spending thousands of dollars on science equipment, language laboratories, additional guidance personnel and tests financed from NDEA funds before they are ready for these things and before they know what to do with the new facilities.

This is an outrageous drain on American taxpayers. Many such communities spend the money from NDEA simply because it is there and its availability invites someone to spend it.

In my earlier experience with vocational education, the supervisor wanted us to redo our home economics laboratory. Instead of having a limited number of areas in which to teach cooking and so on, she insisted on having enough for everybody.

Well, this would have been a tremendous waste. We knew we would have only so many students in there, and we didn't want to leave other areas idle. After we rejected the federally supported program, we split the student group so that some were cooking, some were sewing, and some doing other things. That way we saved a lot of money and—most important—did a better job of teaching.

We are now starting an electronic program under vocational training for adults. Federally connected people, through the State, worked with us in making out the courses of study, and the plans for the program. They made suggestions for the kind of person we should find, and how much we should pay him.

In their letter they said, "These are only suggestions." Well now, you probably know what "only suggestions" means coming from a superior office.

The drive for Federal aid to education has been gaining momentum in recent years because of a tremendous growth in the numbers of children to be educated and the teachers and facilities needed to do the educating. In addition, inflation has led to a rise in the cost of materials needed for school construction and, most important, in the salary requirements of teachers, many of whom are still underpaid. The net impact of all these pressures in many communities has been almost revolutionary. The average taxpayer sometimes can't see why his taxes should be so high.

We have to get across to the taxpayer—at the local level—that his higher taxes are buying better schools and better education. If he is tempted to think that running to the Federal treasury will relieve the burden, he must be shown that nothing comes from Washington that doesn't originate in his own pocket.

Most communities can handle these increased needs locally if they will recognize the needs and have the initiative to do the job. In Davenport, where our board of education is on record as opposing Federal aid, we overcame the problem of teacher pay. Our school board spearheaded the campaign, starting about 3 years ago. The board enlisted the support of our local chamber of commerce, and other civic groups. Result: In 3 years—counting next year, which is already budgeted—the average classroom teacher will have realized a pay hike of from $1,000 to $3,000.

We did this by getting local support for a school tax increase. I am gratified by the result. It has raised the morale of our teachers. They have seen that the public recognizes their economic status and have thrown themselves into the job. They have organized new courses of study, invented new materials for the classroom, introduced language labs, including the teaching of foreign languages to children in the second grade. They work after school and on Saturdays.

LOCAL ACTION ESSENTIAL

This is the heart of the matter. Local action to solve local problems. Not enough communities are doing this, in my opinion. Too many bond issues are thrown out because of lack of understanding; too many tax levies are being voted down. When that happens, the superintendent of schools and board of education run to the Federal Government for money.

We lost one bond issue last year but a committee came right back to push it and get the job done. One of the obstacles is the fact that the administration has come out for Federal aid. Many people in Davenport, meeting me on the street, say: "We're not against your program, but our taxes are high and we think we can get the money from the Federal Government."

One of the things which we should all recognize, realistically, is that if Federal aid is ever voted on a massive scale, many communities—including my own—will tend to think that they should apply for it, just to get their share. This is another reason why

it is so important that the Federal programs be stopped before they get started.

I have studied history, and I am disturbed by the lessons it teaches. I see some ominous things in our society which emerged in past societies prior to their collapse. One of the most menacing signs is a drift into centralization, abandonment of individual responsibility.

What is happening in America today is comparable to what happened to Rome and Greece and Egypt. After the individual citizens of those states arose to great heights and everything became abundant, they forgot how they got the abundance. We are living better than we have ever lived, yet I wonder if we are not forgetting how we got there.

We got there through individual initiative, not by turning to someone else to solve our problems. If we let the centralization trend continue, we will wind up in the predicament described to me by a Russian teacher to whom I talked recently. I asked this teacher why Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders are pushing so hard to surpass America.

"We won't have to fight you," this teacher replied with cold impersonality. "You will fall from within."

The reason why we are drifting toward the superstate and consequent loss of local initiative, stems, I feel, from widespread ignorance of our economic and political system. Our youngsters—for the most part—simply do not know what got us where we are today, and what makes our system tick. The same must be said about our teachers.

In our public schools you see very little in our curricula that even refers to our system of free enterprise. The student has to elect one economic course out of 12 years of work, one semester. We teach our economic system in only an incidental way.

Let me illustrate this: Say a youngster makes a pair of book ends in shop. He gets the mistaken notion that, since he paid 15 cents for the two pieces of scrap wood he used, and perhaps 15 cents for his shellac and what not, the book ends are worth less than a dollar. Then, when he sees a pair of book ends in a store window for $19.95, he assumes that somebody is making $19.

If our teachers understood our economic setup better they would say:

"Now look, boys, you are going to make a pair of book ends," and then they would study together how book ends are produced by industry; what the overhead cost is; how much goes for taxes; what it costs to supply the tools and to pay the workers. When you put it all together you might find a 2 percent margin of profit, or 3 or 4, and that would give the youngsters a more accurate grasp of competitive enterprise.

Why are our teachers so poorly equipped in economics? Many of today's teachers weren't taught economics when they were in school—or, at least weren't motivated to study it. You must add to this the fact that some teachers feel they do not receive an adequate financial return from the society they serve.

RETURN TO OUR EARLIER VALUES

The challenge we face nationally has subtle aspects. When I was a boy young people were quickly acquainted with the fact that they had responsibilities. We carried groceries, or sold door to door. The importance of hard work, initiative, and self-reliance was made plain to us not only in our own families, but in our schools and in our communities.

We have slipped away from those principles, and we must get back to them. Our emphasis should not be on having big government do more and more for the individual, but on the individual doing more and more for himself.

If Federal aid to education becomes a reality, I am afraid it will mark the first step toward complete control of the education process by government. Dictation would move slowly, but surely, just as it did in Mussolini's Italy, where even the textbooks were changed and Il Duce's picture finally showed up on about every fifth page. The schools would eventually become an agency of government, and many people would take their children out of them, leaving the public institutions to accommodate only the paupers and unfortunates whom no one else would take into their private schools. Even private schools would be drawn to the magnet of Federal aid.

We must not let these things happen. The public school is the basis of our strength. It's the bulwark of our society.

In the future we must teach our children to be able to make comparisons between our way of life and communism, but the only way we can teach these things is, first of all, to make sure that they understand what America stands for. Then we should try and teach the truth about communism as nearly as we can see it, and as nearly as we can tell the story. This becomes a difficult thing because our teachers, while they are well meaning and patriotic, generally don't have a foundation which would enable them to compare the American way of life with communism.

I would want to have an intense in-service education program so that our teachers would know. Out of this would come a strong desire to promote the American way.

For a long time I have felt rather comfortable about our relationships with Russia, thinking that someday the people would overthrow their government, but after talking with some Russians, I don't believe they are about to overthrow the Government. They have a strong desire, almost a religious feeling, that their country is going to rise to tremendous heights.

They have been imbued with the idea that they are going to surpass America. They have been given a little more than they had—and they had nothing before—and this to them proves that they are making progress.

We must give our youngsters the same faith and strong desire to fight for and to promote American values, and I am afraid that is an area where we are falling down.

We face a difficult job, but we must get this job done, or we truly will fall from within.

Controlling the Pesticides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Controlling the Pesticides," appearing in the New York Times of July 31, 1961, setting forth the dangers inherent to our people and wildlife in pest-spraying programs carried on either entirely or in large part from Federal Government subsidy and assistance.

With the dangers so richly inherent in the use of these pesticides and with the lack of coordination manifested heretofore in their utilization by the Federal Government and States, it is indeed a happy sign to observe that one of our country's leading newspapers recognizes the grave danger of haphazard use of these extremely toxic and dangerous substances.

The article follows:

CONTROLLING THE PESTICIDES

Efforts to modify Government pest-spraying programs, so as to safeguard public health and minimize damage to wildlife, are making some progress. But the recklessness of official pest-control agencies is only part of the problem.

Government uses but a small fraction of the estimated three to four billion pounds of the so-called economic poisons that are being spread annually, and in increasing volume, across the American landscape. Most of the new, potent chemicals are sprayed or broadcast privately by farmers or householders with little thought given to the effects upon wildlife, to the consequences of a build-up of poisons in the soil, or the dangers of runoff into streams and reservoirs.

Drenching trees and the soil beneath them with DDT has been highly destructive of bird life in many communities, while failing to halt the spread of Dutch elm disease. There is evidence that some insect problems have grown worse with the use of chemicals, the effects of which are not yet fully known.

Federal and State studies of stream pollution show a growing number of instances where fish have been killed by agricultural poisons. In one example cited by the U.S. Public Health Service, fish kills occurred in 15 different tributaries in the Tennessee River Valley following the application of an insecticide to cotton fields in eight Alabama counties.

To meet this difficult and growing problem two things are necessary. The first is more intensive research into safe control methods and more specific poisons, i.e., materials that will kill the pest without damaging a variety of other living forms. The second need is for adequate information to the public about the dangers.

At present no agency of the Federal Government, and probably none in most States, has been given authority or direction to instruct the public in safe methods of applying pesticides and in the hazards of misuse. If the industry fails to assume its own responsibility, Government may have to step in with controls.

Commencement Address by Donald Ripley at Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, during these trying times, it behooves each of us to do our very best. The following address by Mr. Donald B. Ripley, principal of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, High School, is an inspiration to all of us. I know the graduating class of this past year will long remember his sound presentation to them:

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH BY DONALD B. RIPLEY, JUNE 8, 1961

Tonight you have reached one of the first major crossroads in your life, which road will you choose. You and I were born into a society designed to stimulate individual effort through individual freedom and with offers of individual rewards—and; after see-

ing this produce more of the good things of life for more people than any other in the history of man, we suddenly begin to lose our nerve. We get soft. We start running scared. We begin to worship security instead of opportunity. We sneak around frantically seeking protection instead of developing strength. There are those who are trying to protect every human being from the cradle to the grave—who want to make either the Government or labor unions some sort of huge insurance agency to furnish security from sickness, job layoffs, worry, accidents, human error, lack of thrift and old age. The incredible thing is that they believe this king-sized insurance policy on everything in life demands the payment of no premium whatsoever. They certainly haven't been looking very closely at the deductions on their paychecks. What's happened to our old beliefs such as "May the Best Man Win"—"There's Always Room at the Top."

It seems today that one of the finest distinctions to which any one can hope to aspire is to be rated as a common man—a man with no greater potentialities than his neighbor. I suppose there is something safe about it. But it is a deadly thing. It supplants achievement with mediocrity. It replaces human dignity with uniformity. This is a fantastic vote-getting apparatus. It covers ruthless ambition with the cloak of false humility.

It sounds so good—the common man. But that definition has come to mean a man who must be nurtured and protected like some rare tropical flower. We have put this so-called common man on a pedestal.

Isn't it ironic that when we are sick we want an uncommon doctor—when we are at war we want uncommon generals—when we go to church we want uncommon clergymen?

Today we are faced with a national tragedy of too many common men. We need more uncommon men, more people struggling to rise from the ranks, to produce better, to sell more, to make more money, to write better songs, to build better houses, to preach better sermons, to live fuller lives.

Sometimes we have to remind ourselves just who we are. We are not sniveling lackies who are used to plodding along like oxen. We are people who got on a boat and crossed an ocean because we refused to live in a place where man wasn't permitted to decide the things that under God, he ought to have the right to decide for himself.

We are the people who froze to death in the snow at a place called Valley Forge rather than submit to taxation without representation—while the whole world watched. We asked for no guarantee against failure.

We are the people who suffered the awful birthpangs of being born a republic that could not go on being half slave and half free.

We gave the world the electric light. We built the first horseless carriage. We pushed back the horizon of ignorance on land, in the air, and on the sea, in the laws of the land, and in the minds of men. We carried out a program of progress second to none in history * * * as individuals, not as a government bureau or a union committee.

If we give all this away piece by piece, inch by inch, then who will answer those thousands who died on the battlefields such as Concord Bridge, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, the Argonne, the Normandy landing, and Inchon to protect our way of life?

Are we going to have the courage and the faith to pin our present welfare and our future dreams on the idea that has made America great? Or are we going to be panicked and pressured into gradually adopting the very type of economy and social concept which is so distasteful to us when we call it communism?

If this happens, it inevitably follows that on some cold gray morning those who have been striving to succeed will suddenly halt in the harness and look at their penalties and their burdens and decide "Why bother?" And they'll stop. And those who have been riding free will find that nothing is free—and this thing called human dignity—this reflection of the light of God for men to live by will cast its last dying spark into the night to return again only when some other generation buys it back with blood.

America's future lies in the hands of young men and women like you, who must aspire above commonness to greatness. May God grant you the aid to achieve that goal.

True Report on the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, along with thousands of other Americans living in the South, I am deeply appreciative of the article written by the senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, which was published in the New York Sunday Times magazine.

This is a factual account of the conditions as they exist today in the South and the efforts of the South to solve a problem which has existed since the founding of this country.

The News and Courier, daily paper of Charleston, S.C., which is one of the oldest newspapers in the United States, has written a very fine editorial expressing appreciation of this article published by the New York Times which I beg to enclose so that all may see that we appreciate the fact that the New York Times has given space for this very timely and objective article by Senator JOHNSTON.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON's article for the New York Times Sunday magazine, published in response to his challenge to the Paper Curtain Press to present the South fairly before the country, carries the unassailable strength of truth.

To anyone familiar with the facts, his account of the background of the current controversy over race is accurate. While naturally the viewpoint is sympathetic to the region which he represents in Congress, Senator JOHNSTON does not deviate for the sake of emphasis from the well-known history of Reconstruction and recovery.

The News and Courier commends Senator JOHNSTON for his journalistic competence, and the Times for giving him space to tell the story. We have no doubt the article will draw replies, perhaps attacks. Some readers of the Times are so conditioned by years of misrepresentation that they will automatically discount Senator JOHNSTON'S statements. Many of them, however, have fresh personal experiences and observations that may give them a clearer approach to the South's biracial problems.

For this reason Senator JOHNSTON'S exploit in piercing the Paper Curtain is especially timely. He has skillfully avoided some of the irritants that in the past have reduced the effectiveness of southern arguments. If any good thing is to come out of the dreary discussion of race that has filled the columns of the American press, including the News and Courier, it is a better understanding of one another in the South as well as in the North.

As Negro citizens progress in economic, social, and cultural channels, they will be able to participate more fully in the rewards by their own accomplishments. Also, they may find doors opening more willingly than they do under the pressure of force. Many of the demands being aired nowadays in the press are so unrealistic that the public becomes hopelessly confused. The school integration issue itself is largely false. Negro children are not being denied education. They receive public schooling geared to their needs and taught by members of their own race. Disciplinary problems that plague integrated schools in the North simply do not exist in southern classrooms.

White and Negro families dwell in harmony in communities all over the South so long as they are not disturbed by deliberate agitation. Senator JOHNSTON has performed a public service to both races and all regions in his intelligent report.

Time Has Run Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic on Sunday, September 3, 1961:

TIME HAS RUN OUT

Time has run out for the United States. The Soviet decision to resume nuclear testing has shown the bankruptcy of our foreign policy. President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk can no longer depend on the weak United Nations to solve America's problems. It has no major accomplishment to its credit, nor will it have under present conditions. It cannot resolve the Berlin crisis, except in our ignominious withdrawal. It cannot achieve nuclear or any other kind of disarmament. It has made a mess of the Congo, and promises to repeat the process elsewhere in Africa.

The United States must take the offensive in the cold war. It cannot do so if its hands are tied by its allies and if its course of action is blocked by the fear of offending the neutralists. We must abandon the pious hope that the Soviet Union will agree to a lessening of world tensions. We must forget the fantastic belief that Khrushchev will listen to world opinion.

Today we are confronted with brutal, ruthless power that will yield only to superior power. The United States has that superior power. We can destroy the Soviet Union, and Khrushchev knows it. We must call the Soviet Union's bluff on making Berlin a free city. We must match the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing by renouncing our own foolish ban against testing. We must stop attributing to the Communists the same ethical and moral values that dominate our own thinking.

Above all we must stop the upside-down policy of claiming our defeats are victories. It was no victory when we humbly sought negotiations on Laos, but we talked as though it were. Cuban patriots died valiantly on the beach of the Bay of Pigs while air cover was denied them, but the landing was a bitter failure—and we should have learned our lesson instead of glossing over

our mistake. We were told the Communists were admitting a great defeat when they sealed the borders of West Berlin, but the world saw only Communist strength in that illegal action.

When the Soviet Union announced it would resume atomic testing, Secretary of State Rusk said the Soviet disregard of world opinion "should sink in hard everywhere." Of course, the news reports are full of neutralist dismay over the Soviet action, but none of the neutralist countries has the strength to oppose Russia. Neutralist and world opinion won't help us and it won't hurt us. But our own failure to act as a great nation will certainly destroy us if we continue on our present course long enough.

If we preserve the United States, we will preserve the free world, and the neutralist nations as well. If we permit timidity and fear and the ideological beliefs of other nations to dictate our foreign policy, Communist victory is inevitable. And if we continue to dissipate our material wealth and economic strength in hundreds of unimportant places, instead of concentrating on the real enemy in the Kremlin, we shall lack the power as well as the will to stand up to Khrushchev.

Time has run out. We must act now. Not next year or next month but now. The United States must abandon its wavering, excuse-making, mawkish policy dictated by countries too small or too fearful to stand up and be counted. The time for President Kennedy to adopt an American policy is now.

Should the United Nations Seat the World's Leading Dope Peddler?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Free Front, a journal published in Asia by the free countries there as they seek to acquaint the world with the activities of Red China as they are seen firsthand. The author, Father Raymond J. de Jaegher, is a distinguished Belgian priest who served heroically in China until driven out by the Communists. He carries on from the Republic of Vietnam the fight against the Communist world conspiracy, the greatest enemy of mankind that all history has known:

[From Free Front, May 1961]

RED CHINA'S OPIUM OFFENSIVE

(By Raymond J. de Jaegher)

The world needs about 250 tons of opium annually for medical use, but in 1960 Red China exported 7,000 tons of opium and its refined products. According to Chinese circles in Hong Kong, the great center of opium trade in the world, export of opium by the Chinese Reds has had a tremendous increase during these last years.

Red China's export of opium was 3,600 tons in 1950, 4,300 tons in 1951, 4,600 tons in 1952; 1953 showed 4,800 tons; 1954, 5,100 tons; 1955, 5,500 tons; 1956, 5,700 tons; 1957, 5,900 tons; and 1958, 6,200 tons. Those large quantities of opium smuggled into the world are bringing high profits to subsidize Communist Parties all over the world.

The use of opium is very old, but the large-scale use and production of opium as a systematic production and distribution of narcotic drugs by the Chinese Reds as an organized government monopoly is a communistic invention. No other item of international trade yields a fraction of the revenues which flow into Mao Tse-tung's treasury from the opium traffic. Narcotics experts in the U.N. estimate the gross income of the Peiping Government of Red China at more than a billion U.S. dollars a year.

FOREIGN MUD

As first used medicinally in China opium was no serious social problem—with the exception of the unaccounted for deaths from overdosage—until Manchu Emperor Khang Hsi from the North conquered Amoy, in Fukien Province, and the island of Formosa in 1683, his soldiers learned the "delight" of opium smoking from the inhabitants there. Still it was not a serious menace to Chinese civilization until European traders began their work of exploitation.

Portuguese traders from the footholds in India were the first of these Western traffickers; their initial freight of 200 chests in 1729 increased fivefold within the ensuing 40 years. Increasing use of the drug created a widening demand for it among the Chinese and eventually the wall of Chinese isolation was broken through by the British who secured the open-door policy for the trade. The British-chartered East India Co., and its successors (1600–1874) sold freely to Chinese merchants. By 1796—a short 60 years—the welfare of the Chinese people was seriously menaced by what a century before had been considered "a minor article of domestic commerce." Emperor Yung Chen was the first of the Chinese Emperors to issue an edict against the habit-forming smoke. His proclamation, initiating a series of laws against opium, said nothing, however, about the steady tide of opium flooding China from foreign ports. Finally, in 1800, the problem waxed grave in China, and the importation and the cultivation of the opium poppy were prohibited. In spite of the laws, the opium trade continued, growing unabated.

THE OPIUM WAR

In the early days of the 18th century the British, following the venturesome Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish had established a trading base at Canton where they soon outstripped in activity their European competitors. From the beginning and, in fact until the treaty of Nanking, 1842, the trade of the British, together with that of other Europeans, was restricted by regulations devised by the Chinese to keep the foreigners at arm's length, yet permitting the Chinese to continue to export their teas and silks and to receive desired English goods. The export of Chinese commodities far exceeded the imports of British goods and this resulted in an adverse cash balance to the British traders. Initially these debits had been discharged by silver payments, but by the close of the 18th century there was found a new commodity that balanced the books and ultimately provoked a war. That war commodity was opium. The East India Co. had exercised a controlling government-sponsored monopoly of all British-Asiatic trade since the early 1600's. The cultivation of opium in India was included in this monopoly. The entire Indian crop was sold to independent merchants at the famous Calcutta auctions. In turn, these firms shipped opium to China coasts where, with the aid of dishonest Chinese officials, it was smuggled into the country. This illicit opium traffic, it has been estimated, was several times as great as all the legal trade combined. The British imported into China through legal channels cotton and woolen goods worth approximately $3 million. British interests, however, were exporting from China almost five times that amount in tea and silk and, in addition to and despite this adverse trade balance, were actually exporting Chinese silver, whereas normally they should have been importing it to pay the trade balance between their exports and imports. By what device was this accomplished? The opium traffic provided the means.

Under the aegis of the East India Co. the independent trading companies would export a few million dollars of tea and import many times that amount in opium, thus acquiring large silver balances in their favor. These firms then gave to the East India Co. the use of these balances and in return received payment in London. Thus, because the trade balance was tilted in their favor by the opium revenue, British interests were enabled to export considerable silver from China.

The East India Co. had obtained virtually a world monoply of opium due to their control of its cultivation in India, and the funds derived from the yearly auctions at Calcutta comprised a very large and important part of Indian state revenues. This government-granted monopoly was thus the source of vicious trade traffic, which the Crown could have effectively delimited, had it so desired, by limiting cultivation in India and prohibiting export. This course, however, would have seriously impaired Indian revenues.

Lin Tsê-hsu, an honest Chinese official, was appointed by the Emperor governor-general in Canton because the Emperor received no income from the illegal traffic in Indian opium and also because too much silver was leaving the country.

Lin's arrival at Canton in 1839 issued an edict which required that all opium stocks be surrendered within 3 days and restricted all future imports of opium, and if any imported, death penalty would be enforced. Captain Elliot, the chief superintendent of British colony, surrendered the opium with the promise that the British Government would indemnify the Chinese merchants for their loss. The opium was turned over and destroyed. This act, of itself, undeniably constituted complete and full recognition by the British Government of the illegality of the opium traffic.

Palmerston, the British Foreign Minister, under the tutelage of William Jardine, the greatest and most influential of the opium smugglers, expressed a desire that the China market remain open and that he was prepared to employ force to accomplish it. Palmerston never told the British people about the seizure of opium by the Chinese, but the British went to war, defeated easily the Chinese at that time and on August 29, 1842, in the Treaty of Nanking five treaty ports, Shanghai, Canton, Foochow, Amoy, and Ningpo, were opened to free trade and Hong Kong was ceded to England.

China was opened to free commerce, and the opium traffic continued to flourish because of its tremendous benefit to Indian revenues. Within 10 years after the war its volume increased almost threefold, and until the traffic was finally terminated by an agreement on May 8, 1911, it continued to be an important source of revenue.

American firms also participated in the opium traffic business and one-fifth of the opium entering Shanghai was carried by American ships.

JAPANESE TOOL OF WAR

Opium has become an effective and subtle tool of war and Japan used that tool long before World War II, when Japan was preparing the invasion of China. The drug was to undermine the Chinese people and to provide Chinese agents for the Japanese on the mainland of China. In the big cities of China, like in the small villages, the drug, mostly heroin, could be bought. During the Japanese occupation, huge quan-

tities of Iranian opium arrived in China through Shanghai for the Japanese Army. This was in 1938. The explanation the Japanese gave for the importation was that the opium was being shipped into China for use by a large heroin factory at Shanghai. In Nanking four groups were chiefly responsible for opium circulation: the Special Service Section of the Japanese Army—the so-called reform government of Nanking (puppet government of Wang Ching-wei) independent Japanese and Korean drug runners—the Japanese firms. In 1938, one-eighth of the Chinese in Nanking were slowly being poisoned by drugs.

The Japanese did much to insure the merchandising of drugs. Well-lighted and attractive clinics were opened. Some of them displayed a deceptive red cross. Illuminated street signs led victims from the highways, byways and side streets to the opium stores and dens. Newspaper advertisements told of the various diseases the drug would allegedly cure. Patients entering a clinic were given a cursory examination by a quack doctor or drug dispenser and then were listed as sufferers of some disease the cure for which was drugs. Thereafter, as often as they wanted it, heroin or morphine was sold to the patients and in amounts unlimited.

RED CHINA OPIUM BUSINESS

A report from the U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs dated March 10, 1952, is showing that now it is not Japan responsible for smuggling opium in China, but it is Red China now smuggling opium and heroin from China into Japan, the United States and other countries. Again the policy of trying to weaken an enemy by subsidizing addiction was at work.

This time the objective was the free people of the world, especially the people fighting against communism.

The major illicit sources of the world's narcotic supply are first of all Red China, then Burma, Malaya, India, Japan, Turkey, Thailand, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Italy, and Mexico.

Since 1948 Italian heroin has been smuggled into the United States, but it is Red China and the Chinese Communists who are exploiting the poppy, who are financing and fostering aggressive warfare through depravity and human misery.

The main export routes are: Mukden to South Korea and Japan; Hong Kong and Macao to the Philippines and the United States; Kunming to Burma, Siam, India, Malaya, Laos, Singapore, and Indonesia.

Midway stations are well organized in Vientiane, Bangkok, Manila, Tokyo, and San Francisco.

The Chinese Red finance minister organized a subsidiary trade division under Yeh Chih Chuang and Wang Feng-chi, chief of Hopei Opium Prohibition Bureau prohibited the drug in Red China, but was in fact the actual person in charge of the export of opium and heroin from cities like Tientsin and Canton. Peiping on February 24, 1950, issued the circular order for the strict prohibition of opium inside Red China. In 1952 information which leaked out of a higly secret meeting in Peiping under Po I-Po indicates that the revenue obtained from its sales of narcotics abroad reached approximately U.S. $70 million out of which $30 million were sent to Red China and the remainder was spent for party activities outside Red China as well as information collection; that the largest outlet was southeast Asia countries, followed by Japan and the United States.

Richard L. G. Deverall wrote a book "Red China's Dirty Drug War," 220 pages, published in Tokyo in 1954, giving a lot of evidence of the large-scale opium business operated by Red China.

Early in 1954, 160 pounds of opium produced in Yunnan and Manchuria reportedly arrived in Canton for transshipment to Hong Kong through Shuchun, to Macao through Chung-San and Po-un.

Details of the Chinese opium traffic are presented in a recent report from the United Nations Commission on Narcotics.

Experts attached to the Commission estimate that more than 5 million acres of land in starving China is now devoted exclusively to intensive cultivation of opium poppies.

Abroad everyone connected with the Communist dope traffic is charged with the daily responsibility and duty of recruiting new addicts.

Anslinger, U.S. delegate to the special U.N. conference on Red China's opium racket, documented for the Commission the case of a young Japanese seaman, Saito, who was not an addict, but signed on one of the ships of the Red Chinese dope fleet from Yokohama. During his first voyage Saito was tied hand and foot and forcibly given heroin injections until he manifested a craving for the drug. He soon became a confirmed addict.

Youngsters thus forced into addiction become ready servants of the Communist dope mobsters, eager for any criminal assignment or violence which will assure their daily narcotic requirements. By this technique, Red China has built up a ready army of criminals in all the principal port cities of the world.

Despite intensified police work throughout the United States, new addicts are found daily in every major city of the United States, chiefly because Communist sources send in constant dope supplies.

All the documents examined by the United Nations coming from all governments in that area point to the fact that Communist China is the major source of supply of narcotics for the entire world (p. 202).

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Illinois, and all of California were cited by Anslinger as the principal retail dope markets in the United States. In 1 recent year, Los Angeles accounted for 7,000 narcotics arrests out of a total of 24,000 for the entire United States.

New York City has now increased its police narcotics squad to 200 men.

A CALCULATED SCHEME

In California, after months of intensive investigation, which took a lot of money and very dangerous undercover work, we came up with a group of Chinese who had been smuggling from Communist China. They had a direct connection with Hong Kong. A fellow in Hong Kong by the name of Judah Isaac Ezra, whom we had sent to the penitentiary years ago, had connections inside China, and was taking care of most of the traffic into the United States (p. 182).

For several years I have presented documented facts which establish that narcotic trafficking from the China mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist régimé to obtain operating funds and at the same time spread debauchery of narcotic addiction among free nations. Anslinger's report to the U.N. continued: "In most instances the heroin was brought into the country concealed on the persons of seamen. Ornately carved camphorwood hats with specially built compartments were also used for the smuggling operations."

Looking through the history of opium, we have seen that the British East India Co. was selling opium as a private company operating with public charter. The opium-pushing activities of the Japanese Imperial Army was a part of the planning of a military group in Korea, Manchuria, and China. The Japanese army clique was just a clique, it was not the government. Red China is doing the opium business, not privately, or by a group, but as a government business and as matter of calculated policy promoting sales of opium and heroin in foreign countries while suppressing it at home, to help the finances of the government by foreign trade.

The narcotics traffic serves international communism in two very practical ways. It provides tremendous dollar and sterling exchange, pools all around the world; secondly, the traffic is a fiendish weapon of sabotage against the free world, for every new addict impairs and undermines in some degree the total productive power of the victim nations.

Investigations reveal that roughly one-third of all cash receipts throughout the free world are left in the country to finance Communist organizations. Another third of the profits in each country goes to the Red Chinese Army, which protects and delivers shipside all over oversea dope packages. The final third goes to the special trade trust for promotion and expansion of the demoralizing trade.

SHOULD RED CHINA ENTER THE U.N.?

Should the United Nations vote to admit the world's biggest dope peddler? Membership of the U.N. would give Red China lawful activities a great chance to smuggle all over the world, officially through through routine trade missions to every major city in the United States, Latin America, and Western Europe.

We should fight against those, like Mao Tse-tung, who are willing to build Red China with all means—legal or illegal and even immoral ones.

In Red China the people are now starving from the worst famine in Chinese history—but still 5 million arcres of land in starving China are devoted to intensive opium cultivation, the Chinese people are enslaved and during this worst period in Chinese history on account of the Communists—the free world would recognize Red China as a peace-loving country—this really would be the limit and would discourage the people of China. Its not so much a natural calamity than the refusal of the Chinese people to accept communism, that's the real cause of famine in China. China has to pay for the massive Soviet industrial and economic aid to Red China and this aid is repaid by raw materials, foodstuffs, tea, gold, and American dollars from the opium and heroin of Red China sold outside of Red China.

So long as the Communists control the mainland of China, Asia and the free world cannot have peace; peaceful coexistence with Red China and Soviet Russia is impossible. Knowing well the Communists, we must make our choice, and help to build up a free world, but to build up this free world we need a mainland of China free of communism.

Take the Guesswork Out of Air Crashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week 78 persons were killed when a commercial airliner crashed just a few minutes after taking off from Chicago's Midway Airport. This was the worst plane crash in Chicago's history.

During this past weekend another airplane crashed shortly after taking off from Shannon, Ireland, killing another 80 people.

Two of Chicago's outstanding newspapers, the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune, have spoken out in support of legislation which I have introduced which would require all commer-

cial airliners to carry a recording device in a shock-proof, heat-proof container installed in the cabin of the aircraft with an open microphone constantly recording all conversations in the cockpit of the aircraft.

I introduced this legislation more than 2 years ago with the sincere hope that we would be able to eliminate a good part of the agonizing speculation which follows every major air disaster by having a record of the pilot's efforts to save his plane during the last tragic moments before a crash. I am convinced this information from the pilot would provide vital information to establish the cause of a disaster.

The Federal Aviation Agency has advised Congress that it already has the authority to order installation of such recording devices.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Najeeb Halaby, told a press conference in Chicago last week there are technical problems involved in the installation of such devices. I have the highest degree of confidence in Mr. Halaby and am sure that if he will order an urgent program for the development of this equipment, such equipment can be perfected very quickly. I hope there will be no further delay in ordering these recorders installed in commercial airliners.

These recorders in themselves could not have avoided the two most recent crashes, but certainly had they been ordered installed at the time I introduced the original legislation, we would be in a much better position today to evaluate the causes of these crashes and take appropriate action to prevent similar tragedies in the future.

It is inconceivable to me that there would be any further delay in the installation of this equipment. The Airline Pilots Association favors such an order; in my discussions with operators of commercial airlines I have found no one who has raised any serious objections; and the Federal Aviation Agency itself has been working on this project for more than 2 years now.

I am confident that with all the technological gains we have made in practically every field of human endeavor, we should have no problem perfecting a device that will do this job effectively and will at least give us a better idea of what is the cause of these crashes.

I hope the FAA Administrator will order the installation of these devices fortwith; and in support of my contention, I include in the RECORD today two excellent editorials. The first appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on September 2; the second appeared in the Chicago Tribune on September 9.

I hope there will be no further delay in carrying out this project.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 9, 1961]

THE MISSING CLUE

Unofficial reports from the men investigating last week's airplane disaster seem to confirm the belief that there was a structural failure and that part of the tail assembly, including a rudder, broke away just before the plane crashed. This would explain why this section was found, relatively undamaged, about a quarter of a mile to the rear of where the rest of the plane first hit the ground.

Weakening of the tail assembly, it is theorized, would have interfered with and perhaps destroyed the pilot's control of the plane. This might explain the sharp right turn which the plane made just before crashing. The captain may have called on the copilot for help, thus explaining why no radio call was made. Then, as part of the tail broke off, the rest of the plane would have been thrown into an uncontrollable dive.

If the investigators could be sure that this was what happened, they could promptly rule out other theories and concentrate on why the metal gave way. They would be done with their job sooner, their conclusions would probably carry more conviction than otherwise, and their recommendations would be that much more likely to prevent a recurrence. It would help them immeasurably to know what was said in the cockpit just before the crash.

The same could be said of previous crashes in which, for one reason or another, no hint of trouble was given by radio.

Nearly 2 years ago, after an earlier and inadequately explained crash, we suggested that a tape recorder might provide much necessary information. Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, of Chicago, has asked Congress to require airlines to install one in the cockpit, where it would run constantly while the plane is in flight.

The record need only cover a few minutes; older sounds and voices could be automatically erased as later ones are recorded. The tape would have to be in a shockproof and fireproof container, but the evidence it provided would save time and uncertainty during investigations and would very likely save lives. It should be worth the relatively insignificant cost of the equipment.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 2, 1961]

CHICAGO'S WORST AIR DISASTER

The worst plane crash in Chicago's history, and the worst in U.S. commercial aviation involving a single plane, killed 78 persons early yesterday only minutes after takeoff from Midway Airport. Especially poignant, entire families on gay vacations with their children were among the victims.

With the rest of the community, we join in mourning the losses which have been suffered by so many loved ones and friends of those aboard the craft.

At this writing, the cause of the disaster is not known. A passenger on an earlier leg of the cross-country flight, who disembarked at Chicago, has told of hearing a strange noise and feeling unusual vibration during the flight here. The FBI is investigating the possibility that a bomb was responsible. Witnesses said they saw a "blinding flash" as the plane circled before falling.

A regular procedure is to reconstruct the plane from the wreckage in an effort to determine what structural failure or operational difficulty was responsible for the tragedy. This is a long-drawn process and offers no certain prospect that the cause of the crash will ever be found.

U.S. Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, has proposed that all planes be equipped with automatic tape recording devices, in crashproof, sealed containers, that would preserve the last 5 minutes of a pilot's and a copilot's conversation. It would continually erase earlier conversation.

Thus, after a crash, investigators would have the testimony of the nature of the trouble from the best possible source, the men flying the plane. Plane-to-ground radio does not assure any such message. Contact can be lost in a storm, or the radio can be destroyed in a fire.

Such recording devices exist and the Federal Aviation Agency has authority to install them. We understand that an order for them to be put in use was to have been issued earlier this year but got sidetracked. There should be no further delay on this.

With airliners steadily increasing in size and passenger capacity, everything possible should be done to prevent disasters such as yesterday's. Determining the cause of crashes is part of prevention. The tape idea should at least be tried.

Appeasement at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is small wonder we are losing the cold war when President Kennedy is so confused about how to handly tyrant Khrushchev. The story of Neville Chamberlain should have taught him by now.

The following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, which appeared in the Long Island Press on September 8, shows in detail our President's indecision:

TWO SETS OF ADVISERS PULL AT J.F.K.

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

John F. Kennedy reminds me in one respect (only one, please note) of Huckleberry Finn's dad, as described by Huck's friend, Jim, after consulting a hairball "which had been took out of the fourth stomach of an ox":

"Yo' ole father doan' know yit what he's a-gwyne to do. Dey's two angels hoverin' about him. One of em is white and shiny, en t' other one is black. De white one gits him to go right a little while, den de black one sail in en bust it all up. A body can't tell yit which one is goin' to fetch him at de las'."

I refer of course to the two sorts of advisers of J.F.K. has "hoverin' about him." One set urge him to concentrate on defending and enlarging freedom—winning the cold war. This came out in his admirable inaugural when he said:

"In the long history of the world, few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

But the other set (the reader can decide for himself whether black or white) concentrates on relaxing tensions. To them the Communist threat is secondary, or at least, temporary. The effect of their advice came out recently, when in briefing newsmen, the President omitted any reference to communism or freedom in outlining the three main problems of our generation. These were, he said (1) the emergence of the new nations; (2) the impact of the new technology; and (3) the threat of nuclear weapons.

President Kennedy would obviously like to defend freedom and to relax tensions through pleasing the new nations, raising standards and arms control. But in the effort to do both simultaneously, he is being successful in neither.

Here are some instances: He has not kept Laos on our side and South Vietnam is being seriously threatened by communism.

Intervention in Cuba to restore freedom was crippled fatally by the President's fear of displeasing the neutrals or provoking the U.S.S.R.

He stated his intention of maintaining our position in Berlin and then tamely per-

mitted East German soldiers to enter and put up a wall through that city—both illegal. His advisers are still seeking points on which we could yield at the forthcoming quite unnecessary negotiations.

Such examples seem to show that defending freedom and relaxing tensions are basically incompatible. In striving for both—to defeat Nikita while seeking the approval of Ghana, Indonesia, etc., J.F.K. is doing neither very well. Nikita still indulges in the rankest power politics (Stalin asked, how many divisions has the Pope?) while the nonalined nations favor aggressive Russia against pacifist America. There has been no progress toward arms control.

So, the question today is less what Khrushchev will do next, than when our Presidine will decide between winning the cold war and a futile search for accommodation. In short, when will he choose between the white angle and the black angel—called advisers—"hoverin' about him"? On that day only we Americans will know "which one is 'goin' to fetch him at de las"—and incidentally fetch the entire free world along with him.

Welfare Outruns Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of September 10 in the Appendix of the RECORD.

When a paper as liberal as the Post thinks our welfare programs are out of proportion, then we are really in trouble:

WELFARE OUTRUNS GROWTH

The administration has promised more rapid economic growth. At the same time it has argued the case for higher welfare expenditures. When the President presented his program last winter, proposals for growth and for welfare seemed to be fairly evenly balanced. What has become of this balance at the hands of Congress?

It is sadly apparent that growth has fared a lot worse than has welfare. Not all programs and laws, to be sure, fit neatly into this classification. But it is remarkable how many of them do, and the count is not cheering. The President's program contained two major growth proposals. One was the tax reform, centering upon an investment credit. This would have encouraged an increase in plant and equipment expenditures for modernization and expansion. The Congress first reduced the size of this credit, and eventually put the entire legislation over until next year. The other was the series of bills to aid education. Investment in education has been ranked as probably the most important long-run stimulus to growth by the Eckstein Report prepared in 1959 for the Joint Economic Committee. Aid to education largely if not totally failed of enactment. This is particularly deplorable because investment in human beings takes a long time to mature. Even if something substantial is enacted next year, some young people will have suffered an irretrievable loss. The vocational training bill meanwhile has also been defeated.

Other new proposals involving growth fortunately have done better. The depressed areas program, as well as modest increases in the highway program and in national resources development, will help growth. Legislation on water pollution will improve community facilities, as will airport grants, assuming the bill passes. Expenditures for space exploration should provide some spill over of research into the earthbound sector of the economy. Most of these items, however, are quantitatively not very important.

In terms of money, the enlarged housing program is probably much the largest of the new growth expenditures. But housing generates less GNP, per dollar of capital invested, than almost any other investment expenditure. Housing expenditures are growth oriented, but less effectively so than most others.

The list of welfare measures is more impressive. Some of these were made necessary by the recession, such as temporary unemployment compensation and aid to dependent children. Others were unrelated to the recession, such as enhanced social security benefits, aid to agriculture, and the Minimum Wage law. Of major welfare proposals, only enlarged medical aid to the aged has failed of enactment.

It is clear that the Nation cannot do everything at once. Particularly at a time of sharply rising military expenditures, some other desirable items can and should be postponed. But this year's legislative experience suggest that welfare programs may have greater political appeal and smoother political sailing than growth programs. If that is the case, the administration may find it advisable to weigh next year's proposals more decisively in favor of growth, in the expectation that they will suffer attrition as they go through the political process.

Of Costly Pearls and Old-Age Survivors Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, we were reminded last Friday of Valentine Byler of New Wilmington, Pa. Members will recall Mr. Byler as the Amish farmer who earlier this year lost some horses by distraint because he had failed and refused to pay his social security taxes. On last Friday, September 8, it was reported that Commissioner Caplin of the Internal Revenue Service had invited a group of Amish bishops to meet him here in Washington tomorrow to discuss problems of collection of social security taxes on self-employed persons.

In this Congress we have H.R. 7268, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], which provides an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program for individuals where religious doctrines forbid such participation. This bill would resolve a painful conflict between God and country for this faithful and gentle people. Nothing has been done with it. I realize that there are not enough votes to be squeezed out of this issue to change the color of political litmus paper, but I hope it succeeds, as have many other measures in this House, for freedom's sake.

Just a year ago an editorial appeared in Liberty, the periodical of the International Religious Liberty Association, which was addressed to this issue. I offer it now as a reminder of H.R. 7268, and of the visit of the bishops to Washington tomorrow.

OF COSTLY PEARLS AND OLD-AGE SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Eighteen bishops of the Old Order Amish Mennonites from 13 States have signed a petition to Congress asking for legislation that would excuse members of their sect from participating in the social security program on grounds of religious objection. Pointing out that the U.S. Constitution provides safeguards for freedom, the Amish declare that "the Social Security Act is abridging our faith, which is older than this Government. We feel justified to do all in our power to defend and protect these costly pearls [of religious freedom] and not trade them for an old-age survivors insurance."

There would seem little ground to doubt the sincerity of the Amish. They hold that all charity should be administered by the church, and back up their words by taking care of their sick and aged members through contributions levied by the deacons of each church district. Their performance should also dispel fears that their needy may become a drain upon a fund to which they have not contributed.

For what reason, then, should they be forced to violate their consciences? For the sake of conformity? One should hope that the spirit of American individualism is not yet dead. To avoid a precedent that would disrupt the social security program? One can safely aver that not many moderns will trade in their automatic-gadgeted autos for an Amish buggy, nor put aside their Dior copies or Ivy League sport coats for the garb of the Mennonite sect—not for the sake of saving a few dollars in social security payments.

No; the millions will go right on receiving their doles, and the Amish growth chart will show no dramatic upturn. There is no precedent here that would jeopardize the social security program of the United States. But if the petition of the Amish is not honored, if individual conscience is to be traded for collective old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, it may well be that when lost pearls are sought on some great day of reckoning ahead, the transaction will be seen to have cost altogether too much.

R.R.H.

No Aid for Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a letter Mr. Carl L. Shipley, chairman of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, demands an end to the billions of dollars of aid that have been and will be given by the Kennedy administration to those foreign nations which have the gall to call themselves "nonalined, neutral, and uncommitted."

The time has come to unmask and put an end to this double-dealing, the practice of which has been allowed to grow under the regime of the Modern Republicans as well as the New Deal and New Frontier Democrats.

Following are the views of Mr. Shipley in which I concur completely:

The somber reports from the unalined nations conference at Belgrade should en-

lighten our fuzzy-thinkers at the U.N. and the State Department on the evils of neutralism.

The so-called uncommitted nations are simply pro-Communists camouflaged in another bird's plumage. The billions of dollars of foreign aid and military assistance we have lavished on Yugoslavia's Tito, India's Nehru, Ghana's Nkrumah, and Indonesia's Sukarno, to say nothing of Laos and Brazil, is largely an exercise in cutting our own throat. Neutralism shows a pro-Communist double standard.

The 25 neutralist nations at the Belgrade Conference have failed to denounce Russia for resuming nuclear tests in the atmosphere or for negotiating in bad faith these past 3 years at the Geneva Conference on nuclear tests, all the while developing new atomic weapons to be tested when ready. But they did engage in an unrelieved attack on the United States and all that we have done for the cause of freedom.

Henceforth the United States must adopt a new policy on foreign aid. Generous aid and military assistance for our allies and friends, yes, for neutralists, no. It is now clear that every dollar of foreign aid that goes from the United States to a neutralist is a contribution to our own doom.

The Kennedy administration should characterize neutralism for what it in reality is—anti-American and pro-Russian, through and through. If our Government continues to grovel before the neutralists after the Belgrade performance, the injury they do us will be richly deserved.

It is folly for our Government to recognize neutralism as a legitimate position. It assumes there is a logical, moral, ethical, and legal basis for choice between capitalism and communism, between religious conviction and godlessness, between free enterprise and socialism, between freedom and totalitarianism, between right and wrong. We should not lend dignity to the neutralists by cloaking them with respectability.

Any nation that cannot forthwith make a rational and deliberate choice between the United States and Russia is no friend of ours. Indeed, any nation that is so confused or immature that it must pause on the threshold of such a choice is too weak a reed for us to bother with. At best such nations will fail us in the final showdown; at worst, they will betray us all along the way.

We can well recall the words of Theodore Roosevelt that "it is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong. Impartiality does not mean neutrality. Impartial justice consists not in being neutral between right and wrong, but in finding out the right and upholding it wherever found, against the wrong."

Help Khrushchev Avoid a Dangerous Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, herewith, an article which appeared in the September 16, 1961, issue of Nation's Business:

HELP KHRUSHCHEV AVOID A DANGEROUS MISTAKE

As the moment of truth in Berlin comes nearer, the American people are solidly with the President in facing up to Russia. They have accepted willingly—perhaps eagerly—whatever peril or sacrifice a firm position in this crisis requires.

They will, as the President predicted, bear "the burdens which must be borne if freedom is to be defended. Americans have willingly borne them before and they will not flinch now."

The world will be spared much misery if our enemies accept this presidential analysis as accurate. The danger is that, like others before them, the Communists may make what Mr. Kennedy has called "the dangerous mistake of assuming that the West was too selfish and too soft and too divided to resist invasions of freedom in other lands."

Unfortunately, this dangerous mistake is not unreasonable. Anyone might make it after listening from a distance as Washington catalogs the urgent needs that our people are reportedly unable to meet for themselves.

Such a listener could justifiably believe that, without Government prodding and support, Americans were too flabby to educate their children, build proper houses, clean up their cities, care for their aged, or show compassion for the unfortunate. He could believe that even our diversions are so decadent that a Cabinet officer must concern himself officially with the hiring practices of a professional football team and a Government agency must bring Federal standards to our television shows.

As reported from Washington, the American people are poorly educated, ill housed, out of work, badly entertained and facing a bleak old age. This is hardly a picture to deter a determined aggressor.

In the interests of peace and a true picture of American fiber we should tell our foes about Indianapolis, where the people have long met their own problems without Federal subsidy; of Davenport, Iowa, which is on record as opposing Federal money for schools; of Carlsbad, N. Mex., where the school board has stated it wants no Federal intervention in local schools and the city counsel has refused to ask $500,000 in Federal funds for a sewer system;

Of Italy, Tex., which preferred to rebuild itself rather than accept Federal funds after a tornado, and a lengthening honor roll of other localities which stand ready to resist invasions of freedom, not only from foreign governments but from their own as well.

Our President can make his warning to Mr. Khrushchev more convincing by pointing out that we can have whatever defense we need, along with sound money, and a stronger economy simply by restricting the Federal Government to its essential duties.

This isn't even austerity. It's merely commonsense.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 9, 1961.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

SEPTEMBER 9, 1961.

As predicted in my newsletter of August 19 a greatly amended foreign aid authorization bill was sent back to the House from conference and was approved on August 31, 260 to 132. The final bill authorized appropriations of $4,253,500,000 for foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion in each of the following 4 years for Development Loan Fund long-term, low interest development loans. The bill also authorized the President to establish a new foreign aid agency. The final bill did not include the long-term borrowing authority requested by the President. He had asked for authority to borrow $8.8 billion from the Treasury for the Development Loan Fund over a 5-year period fiscal 1962–66 to finance long-term, low interest development loans. The final bill authorized $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion a year for fiscal 1963–66, making $7.2 billion available for development loans over the 5 years but required annual appropriation of funds (at least a partial victory for those of us in the House who fought the transfer of responsibility for appropriations from Congress to the Executive).

The foreign aid appropriation bill was whipped through the House in 1 day, September 5, by a record vote, 270–123. The bill as approved appropriated $3,357,500,000 for foreign aid, $896 million less than carried in the authorization bill, but $300 million more than recommended by the House Appropriations Committee.

One of my principal objections to foreign aid is the money we give to our enemies and so-called neutral nations. This objection was supported during the debate on the foreign aid bill by Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, who pointed out that the dollars of U.S. taxpayers are being sent to Cuba to bolster the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. Congressman LIPSCOMB, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, pointed to the report on the Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill. He said each year the President requests millions of dollars to cover U.S. contributions to international organizations. In just one instance, LIPSCOMB pointed out, the Pan American Health Organization is providing 32 Russian jeeps for a malaria eradication program in Cuba. Although malaria has a low incidence rate there, the eradication allotment in 1961 is $79,766, or 20 times the amount budgeted in 1958—before Fidel Castro came to power. This has been augmented by a $99,000 allotment from the World Health Organization Malaria Eradication Special Account, for the purpose of providing the Soviet jeeps to Cuba. The American taypayer pays 66 percent of the cost of the so-called health plan for Cuba instigated by PAHO.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

LIPSCOMB reminded Congress that this Fund, to which the United States contributes 40 percent, on May 24 granted $1,157,600 to aid agricultural research programs in Cuba. U.S. contributions for the fiscal year 1961, both assessed and voluntary, amounted to $241,799,522 to over 50 international organizations and their related activities. According to Congressman LIPSCOMB, it appears that very few, if anyone, have ever attempted to figure out where this money actually goes, and actually what it is used for.

Add to these startling statements of how the U.S. taxpayer is contributing to countries dedicated to our destruction, the utter contempt for the United States and our ideals expressed by the delegates to the Conference of Uncommitted Nations at Belgrade last week, and the course we are taking to our own national suicide (newsletter of Aug. 26) becomes more apparent. The nations present at the Belgrade Conference have been the recipients of $7.2 billion from the American taxpayers. Yet not one voice was raised in behalf of American policies. Not a single delegate protested a vicious attack on the United States by the Communist delegate from Cuba. On the other hand, no official action was taken by the Conference to

condemn the Soviet Union for its wanton disregard of humanity for its devious use of 3 years of useless negotiations on banning nuclear testing to build up its own arsenal and then arrogantly begin testing within hours of an announcement that it would. No protests from the uncommitted nations for the enslavement of 17 million human beings in East Germany. While India's Nehru piously asks the United States to negotiate with the Communists on issues which are not negotiable, he utters not a word of protest at the brutal and barbaric invasion of Tibet and the inhuman atrocities practiced on her people by the Communists.

It's time we faced facts. The uncommitted nations are not uncommitted, nor are they neutral. For whatever reason, fear or self-interest, they are alined with Soviet Russia and when the chips are down, in the final contest between freedom and Communist slavery, they will be against us unless they are convinced that we are stronger and will win the battle. There are no moral grounds for neutralism in a fight to the death. Those countries which give aid and comfort to our enemy also become our enemies. My own position is opposed to foreign aid until it is used in the self-interest of the United States.

Steel Companies Are the Whipping Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today's article by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune brings into focus the calculated plans of President Kennedy and his administration to make successful businessmen the whipping boys from now on. It is hard to believe that Secretary of Labor Goldberg can be very neutral; he dare not bite the hand that fed him so well for so many years:

STEEL PRICE CURBS VIEWED AS ROAD TO COMMUNISM

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration has crossed the Rubicon. It has decided to make war on conservative economics and embark on a course of radical economics. It is ignoring the risk that it may plunge the country into more unemployment within the next 18 months and bring about perhaps the worst recession since the 1930's.

For President Kennedy has determined to put certain limits on business profits and the return on investments that stockholders have hitherto expected when putting their savings into private enterprise. The net result could be the gradual collapse of the private enterprise system in America and the beginning of that era of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has predicted will inevitably lead to communism in another generation in the United States.

President Kennedy's crucial step came a few days ago when he openly threatened the steel industry with reprisals by Government unless it agreed to forgo any price increases at this time. Mr. Kennedy vaguely promised that next year, when the unions ask for still higher wages, he would urge "moderation." He didn't define the term. But the entire business world noted that Mr. Kennedy significantly refused to ask the unions at this time to forgo the additional wage increases scheduled for them at the end of this month under a contract signed early in 1960 after a long strike.

The steel industry thus far has absorbed a 10-percent rise in labor costs since 1958 without a price increase. Fairplay would seem to require that, since the steel industry has already absorbed this large increase in wages without a price rise, the least that Mr. Kennedy might have done was to ask labor to cancel its increase scheduled for October 1 this year.

COMPARISON IS MADE

But the Kennedy administration has sitting in the Cabinet, as Secretary of Labor, the man who was general counsel of the biggest steel union in the country. Had there been a Secretary of Commerce in a Republican administration who had previously been a leader in the steel industry—either as president of a large company or as its principal negotiator just a few months earlier during a major strike—the howl that would have gone up about "conflict of interest" would have been heard from coast to coast.

Industry has no voice in the Kennedy Cabinet. The Secretary of Commerce is afraid of his shadow and allowed himself to be influenced by the radicals in the administration when he ordered the virtual suppression of the Business Advisory Council which had existed for decades as a means of communication between business and the executive branch of the Government.

President Kennedy's procedure in writing a letter to 12 steel companies and in immediately making it public is the subject of sharp criticism. He did not invite these steel executives to come to Washington before hand to give their side of the issue. He took them by surprise as he issued his letter and threatened restrictive measures if they didn't obey.

This is one of the most surprising moves any President has made in recent years, and it is small wonder that it is being regarded as the beginning of a series of hostile acts to throttle American enterprise and to pave the way for nationalization or socialization of the larger industries in America.

ADVISERS BLAMED

Mr. Kennedy himself has never been regarded as a radical, but he has surrounded himself with advisers who sincerely believe in Government ownership. In giving their advice, they can hardly refrain from advocating a philosophy which could eventually mean the end of private capitalism in America. Every one of these advisers hates communism and all that Mr. Khrushchev stands for, but, as is the case in Britain with the Socialist Laborites who favor nationalization of industry, they don't always realize the ultimate consequences of current action.

Mr. Kennedy is not himself an economist. He finds himself lost in economic jargon and economic arguments, and tends to follow what seems to him a plausible policy. His economic advisers concede that it is a "most hazardous undertaking" to estimate future output and profits in steel, but they did it just the same and took no account of the need of different companies to buy new plant and equipment or to continue to earn a proper return on investors' money. Instead, a blanket order was favored that would cut profit margins and let labor have its October 1 increase just the same.

Meanwhile, the Department of Justice is engaging in a crusade against large business enterprises by brandishing antitrust suits in their faces almost every day. It is interesting to note that the executives of the 12 companies which got the President's identical letter are virtually forbidden to discuss it with each other, since the subject is pricemaking. The steel companies could be hauled into court for price collusion if they as much as sat down together to discuss what kind of replies they should make as an industry.

Indeed, the future of all trade associations in America may well be in jeopardy if the Kennedy administration cries out "price fixing" every time business leaders go to an annual convention of their industry to discuss common problems, including threats coming from foreign competition. The annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute had, for instance, long been scheduled for this week, but it was canceled for fear that any meeting of steel executives at this time would be misunderstood. And all this happens in "free" America.

Nuclear Attack Protection for Civilian Population Urged as War Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, mankind today lives in fear and dread, perhaps as never before in all time, in the stark contemplation of the holocausts of cities, if nuclear war should break over the world. Some people with deeply penetrating minds have dedicated themselves to finding the means to fortify ourselves for survival, against the possibilities of such cataclysm. There is the thought brought forward that the stronger we build the ways of survival the less likely an enemy will dare attack us.

I have received a thoughtful and discerning discussion in this area, from Mr. Kemp P. Yarborough, St. Marys City, Md. It is of such a nature as to deserve attention. Therefore, with the permission of the House, I am inserting this discussion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Yarborough's letter follows:

ST. MARYS CITY, MD.,
September 6, 1961.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: The Kennedy administration and the present Congress have shown their concern for the needs of civil defense by increased appropriations and by plans for greater protection against radioactive fallout. I am writing to submit for your consideration two aspects of this problem which I believe should receive attention in future civil defense legislation.

In the first place, is not protection against the heat and blast effects of nuclear weapons also imperative? Fallout shelters alone, it is true, would shield most of the population in case of a nuclear attack that would spare cities and concentrate upon the destruction of missile sites and long-range striking forces. Humanitarian considerations call for such a limitation on nuclear warfare; nor do military strategists discount the possibility of a limited nuclear conflict of this type. If for no other reason, a potential enemy might thus restrict the use of his nuclear force lest he invite retaliatory blows against his own cities and population. However, is it not possible that the development of a civil defense gap or other important difference in the offensive and defensive strength of the antagonist nations could create a situation in which an enemy would not deem it to his own interest to so

refrain, or would assume the risks of total nuclear conflict when total world victory would be the prize? While there is conflicting testimony as to the extent to which the Soviet Union has engaged in civil defense preparations, many authorities (including Leon Gouré of the Rand Corp.) believe that extensive preparations have been made. Premier Khrushchev claims that the Soviet civil defense organization enlists 22 million trained personnel. Their motivation may be entirely defensive; but a wide civil defense gap, once achieved, could weigh as a considerable factor in the political and military calculations of the Soviet leaders, both offensive and defensive, or could serve as the basis for blackmail threats of total war.

Red China has a population approaching the billion mark, most of whom are still widely dispersed in agrarian pursuits and hence less vulnerable to nuclear attack than industrialized populations. She is likely to become a nuclear power within a few years. Her leaders are more warminded than the Russians, and are apparently not deterred by the human cost among their own people in the pursuit of their objectives. If they are bent upon an eventual showdown with the United States, a weak posture of civil defense on the part of this country might induce them to initiate an unlimited nuclear war in which they would be willing to accept immense retaliatory blows and sacrifice vast numbers of their people. It is also possible that a limited or limited nuclear war might be transformed by the pressures and momentum of that conflict—especially as one side or the other faced disastrous reverses—into an unlimited nuclear one. Again, an atomic holocaust might be caused by error, accident or miscalculation, or through the agency of a small nation. The development of means of producing thermonuclear bombs relatively inexpensively, and thereby bringing them within the capacity of almost any nation, is a real possibility. Planning for civil defense should not be confined to the requirements of a limited nuclear struggle, or otherwise restricted, but should include preparations for as wide a range of foreseeable contingencies as possible.

Shelters against fallout only, if combined with plans for the evacuation of urban populations, might be adequate even for the contingency of an unlimited nuclear war, provided the commencement of hostilities should be preceded by a crisis of sufficient duration to permit evacuation, and provided the war should be limited to one nuclear strike phase which would determine the outcome. However, they would be inadequate against surprise or sudden nuclear attacks giving too little time for massive evacuation, or in a war of attrition in which the economic factor could be decisive. In the latter instance the destruction of the Nation's urban industrial structure might prove a heavy handicap, and its restoration or replacement in time to meet the exigencies of war might be rendered very difficult by subsequent and repeated nuclear attacks. The massive evacuation of cities during a crisis might be interpreted by the enemy as a preliminary step toward a nuclear attack and thereby precipitate just such an attack on his part before the evacuation could be completed, in order to strike the first blow. Under such circumstances a substantial measure of protection against all the effects of hydrogen bombs for personnel and for essential governmental and industrial installations in blast areas might be indispensable, combined with a large degree of industrial dispersion. The dispersal of Soviet industries has been underway a long time; their decentralized control has been instituted under Khrushchev; and according to reports Russian civil defense shelters are being constructed against blast as well as against fallout so as to afford security in all cases except a direct hit.

Dr. Willard F. Libby, Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Admiral Strauss, and others have declared that excessive importance has been attached to the dangers of radioactive fallout. Short-term survival from the terrible immediate blast, heat, and radiation effects of nuclear bombs within the blast area should not be allowed to become the stepchild of civil defense. Were not most of the deaths and injuries inflicted at Hiroshima and Nagasaki the result of blast and burning rather than of radioactivity? And were not very few of the radioactive casualties the result of radioactive fallout beyond the blast areas?

The value of protection against fallout should not be minimized; but is it not urgent that the strength, practicability, and mass production possibilities of shelters built to give triple protection against blast, heat, and fallout be investigated and tested? One of the witnesses at the hearings held by Chairman HOLIFIELD of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations was Associate Director Walmer E. Strope of the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory. Basing his views upon 4 years of testing, he expressed the belief that a high degree of protection against nuclear blast, fire, and radiation could be provided by shelters costing between $50 and $125 per person, and that group shelters might eventually be provided to protect 100 people for 14 days at even less cost. The shelters already tested are flexible steel arch structures, 25 feet wide, 48 feet long, and covered by several feet of dirt. If the relatively cheap production of personnel shelters should be feasible, then a "crash" program to provide personnel shelters held to minimum requirements might be combined with a long-range program designed to secure the wide dispersal of population and industry and protected structures for vital governmental and industrial activities.

The second point which I would like to call to your attention is the importance of having civil defense integrated as an essential and conditioning element in all phases of the Nation's political, social, and economic development. In all Federal loans, grants, construction projects, and contracts with business firms for supplies and procurement, through tax reduction allowances, and in all phases of urban renewal, shelter construction, built-in protection for vital installations, and the dispersal of offices and plants should be required or encouraged. The ends of civil defense would often require not radical new departures but merely the acceleration, expansion or modification of policies already underway or projected, and would serve sometimes as a positive factor in the solution of serious problems. The problems of urban traffic congestion and mass transit could be met by subways constructed to serve also as civil defense shelters. Multiple uses for shelters, conversely, should be feasible in all types of structures—industrial, business, educational, and residential. The allocation of huge tracts for parks, forests, wild life sanctuaries, and recreation would promote dispersion. The suburban movement, which is already taking over 1 million acres of croplands annually, should be fostered. The systematic dispersion of population and industry would promote public health, efficiency in transportation and circulation, and the reduction of atmospheric, water and land pollution. Speaking without reference to civil defense, Representative REUSS of Wisconsin recently pointed out the benefits which would accrue from the decentralized location of many governmental agencies away from Washington. He declared that a moderation of Washington's rate of growth would assist materially in the solution of the problems of water, of sewerage, of transportation, of metropolitan planing, without ruining the Nation's Capital. He argued also that many agencies (such as the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Soil Conservation Service) would operate more efficiently if located closer to the areas of their primary responsibility, while many communities throughout the country would benefit from the infusion of stable employment and taxpaying groups of Federal employees.

The agricultural surpluses could be profitably utilized as much as possible in the large-scale stockpiling of food and supplies. Civil defense requirements could be a stimulus and conditioning factor in the technological modernization of the industrial plant of the United States. A public works program directed toward the purposes of civil defense would stimulate business, alleviate unemployment, and contribute also to the "work relief" policy advocated by Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen. If necessary, a Civil Defense Construction Corps could be created similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal. It is noteworthy that the Rural Electrification Administration, having virtually completed its New Deal assignment of providing electric lights, and the accompanying services for rural homes, has been charged by the Kennedy administration with a new task—that of creating jobs for some 1,400,000 unemployed rural Americans, the occupational casualties of agriculture's mechanization and increased efficiency. The solution contemplated lies not in encouraging migration to cities already suffering from unemployment, but in establishing small industries and recreational facilities in rural areas and small towns. Both the REA and the area redevelopment program could be granted greatly expanded sums to promote the widest possible distribution of factories and industrial projects.

The possibilities of the immunization of human beings against the fatal or injurious effects of radiation should receive attention. Dr. R. R. Overman of the University of Tennessee, speaking before the American Federation of Societies for Experimental Biology in Atlantic City this year, reported the success of such immunization in the case of animals, through the administration of small doses of radio-protective compounds prior to each exposure. Vigilance should also be exercised in the apprehension of weapons or devices of chemical, biological, and germ warfare and in the preparation of countervailing measures, including training and equipment for the public.

Besides serving as insurance against destruction or defeat in case of war, a strong civil defense would strengthen the deterrent effect of America's armaments, balancing their offensive power with a firm defensive base. It would make possible a saner, more credible, and more determined stand against Communist expansion, rendering less desperate and suicidal the choices which would confront the administration in times of crisis. Synchronized with and providing impetus to the solution of social and economic problems, it could play a constructive role in the Nation's life.

Such a program would undoubtedly be expensive and difficult. But the development of thermonuclear methods of warfare imposes two heavy responsibilities upon the nations: (1) a constant, unwearying search for an effective ban on nuclear tests and effective limitations on nuclear weapons; and (2) the preparation of civil defense measures against such weapons. Expert witnesses before the Military Operations Subcommittee, including Herman Kahn and Norman A. Hanunian of the Rand Corp., estimated in general that an elaborate program, including large underground group shelters and detailed evacuation and reconstruction plans, would cost from $10 to $30 billion

spread over 2 or 3 years, but could hold deaths to 10 million even in case of an unlimited nuclear conflict in which every city and military installation in the country would be hit by hydrogen bombs. Is this sum, or much more if necessary, too high a price to pay to safeguard scores of millions of lives?

Sincerely yours,

KEMP P. YARBOROUGH.

ST. MARYS CITY, MD.

Honorary Life Membership in ROA to Hon. Paul Kilday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that on last Thursday, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States bestowed an honorary life membership in ROA to the Honorable PAUL KILDAY, who is leaving his seat in the Congress soon to take a place on the U.S. Court of Military Appeals to which he has been appointed by the President.

The award was made at a luncheon attended by about 30 Members of this body, including our Acting Speaker, the leaders of both the major parties in this House, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson; the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John B. Connally; the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Carlisle P. Runge; the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Curtis LeMay; the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable Carl Vinson; and several other Members of this body and the Senate, along with representatives of the press, national officers of the ROA, and the national staff of this association, all of whom are so well and favorably known to us.

The presentation of this honorary membership in ROA, which is rarely bestowed upon any individual, was made by the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, and the ROA citation was read by the national President of ROA, Rear Adm. John E. Harlin, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Admiral Harlin, who for 34 years has been in the Naval Reserve, is the senior pilot of Trans-World airlines, flying new type jet transport aircraft between the United States and Europe. He is still active as a member of the pilot staff of the Military Air Transport Service.

I should like to call your attention to the remarks made by Admiral Harlin in presenting this citation, together with the resolution adopted by ROA's national convention at San Antonio earlier this summer relating to the service of PAUL KILDAY, in whose service we all take pride:

This is our association's tribute to the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, a Representative in the Congress of the United States from Texas since 1939, in honor of the tremendous contributions of this learned and much respected and loved man, who has done so much for the welfare of his constituents, the State of Texas and the American people, and most especially those who serve and have served in our Armed Forces. To him we present an honorary life membership. This token of our high esteem for PAUL KILDAY is but a slight indication of the very great regard in which we and all who know him hold this man. No person in recent memory can claim authorship of so many legislative accomplishments which have played such a vital role in the maintenance of high morale among our Armed Forces. Every pay raise and incentive law since 1949 have been under the direct leadership of this outstanding legislator. Legislative acts such as the Career Compensation Act, the pay raise of 1952, the Pay Act of 1955, the Pay Act of 1958, the Dependents Medicare Act, as well as countless other laws of benefit to the uniformed services have resulted from his direct leadership. But he has not taken unto himself just those things that are sweet to the ears, since he has also assumed responsibility for such laws as the Navy "Hump" Act and the Air Force "White Charger" Act. These laws have benefited and will continue to benefit the younger officers at the expense of older officers. But all of this was for the best interest of the uniformed services and whenever the best interests of the uniformed services is involved there you will find PAUL KILDAY'S main interest. He now leaves the Congress to assume the great and demanding tasks of a jurist. A successor will be elected to fill the vacancy he will leave, but the Reserve Officers Association can truly say that there can be no one who will ever surpass PAUL KILDAY in his devotion to that which is best for the country and the uniformed services.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES—HONORARY LIFE MEMBER

Whereas the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, of San Antonio, Tex., has eminently represented the Second District of Texas for 23 years in the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas during these years of service he has consistently demonstrated his ability to lead, his talents to create, his knowledge to convince and good judgment in rendering exceptional services to his district, the State of Texas, and the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas Congressman KILDAY'S great concern for the welfare of the personnel of the defense forces and Government employees individually, and as a group, has contributed immeasurably to their high state of morale; and

Whereas as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives his leadership has been a dominating influence in shaping our national defense policies and providing funds for their implementation; and

Whereas Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY has upon all occasions demonstrated his sincere interest in the Organized Reserves and the program sponsored by the national headquarters of the Reserve Officers Association by conferring with committees of the ROA and by attending and addressing our State and National gatherings; and

Whereas Congressman KILDAY has been appointed by President John F. Kennedy as judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this national convention assembled this 23d day of June 1961 in San Antonio, Tex., convey to the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY its deep and lasting appreciation of his long, valuable, and eminent service to the cause of national defense and thank him especially for his consistent support and friendly and appreciative attitude toward committees of the ROA in discussions of subjects affecting our welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY having demonstrated a sincere and abiding interest in the objectives of the ROA, be elected to honorary life membership in the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

Recommended by the executive committee in accordance with article A–3(e) of the constitution.

Adopted by the 35th national convention, June 23, 1961.

Will Rayburn Return to House Speakership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prominent newspapers in my congressional district, the Pontiac Press, recently published an editorial tribute to our Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

May I join in this good wish for a speedy recovery for "Mr. SAM," and add the hope that he will soon be with us again as chairman of the House of Representatives.

It is difficult to remember the day when the gentleman from Texas was not Speaker of the House. He has established a record for continuous service in one of the most demanding, one of the most important positions in our Federal Government.

Speaking as a Member from the opposite side of the aisle from the Speaker, I have been constantly impressed with his dignity, the fair play and the wisdom he has demonstrated in his dealings with the Congress.

During my freshman days here on Capitol Hill, Speaker Rayburn was always courteous and kind toward those who were first learning their way around this maze which is our Federal Government.

There has been talk that the Speaker's back problems may prevent him from resuming his chair next session. I, for one, hope that these prove to be unfounded rumors, and that Mr. SAM will once again be with us supplying the leadership and the continuity that the legislative branch of the Federal Government needs to make it operate smoothly and in the best interests of all our citizens.

Certainly, his wisdom and experience are unmatched anywhere in this Nation, and I think it important that our Nation be permitted to make use of this great store of experience which is available to us through our Speaker.

For the information of my colleagues, the excellent editorial follows:

WILL RAYBURN RETURN TO HOUSE SPEAKERSHIP?

There is plenty of speculation around Washington, and especially on Capitol Hill on whether or not "Mr. SAM" will return to the House speakership.

Temporarily, the reins have been turned over to Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK. For the last 21 years SAM RAYBURN has been the undisputed leader of the Democrats in the House.

We are sorry to read that this old political warrior has bowed out for a much needed rest. His political savvy at the Speaker's podium will be missed.

With a new regime in power, the know-how and dedication of men like RAYBURN are needed. Mr. SAM is getting on in years, but at 79 his spirit is almost indestructible.

If his back difficulty proves too much and he can't return for the next session, his job could well be up for grabs. Current reports are that MCCORMACK is at odds with the President.

Be that as it may, we are pulling for Mr. SAM to regain his health and take over top leadership of his party.

Student Congress Doesn't Speak for All Collegians, Public Told; Letter From Brian Edwards, Former Elections Commissioner, Long Beach State College, Class of 1961, Appearing in the Column "Letters to the Times," in the Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles, Calif., Thursday, August 31, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call your attention to the following letter appearing in the column "Letters to the Times" in the Los Angeles Times on Thursday, August 31, 1961:

STUDENT CONGRESS DOESN'T SPEAK FOR ALL COLLEGIANS, PUBLIC TOLD

Noting the August 27 article, "Student Group Assails House Red Quiz Unit," referring to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would like to comment on the National Student Association Congress meeting in Madison, Wis.

The group does not represent the true feelings of the college students in the United States.

Last March a representative of this group approached the officers of the Associated Students of Long Beach State College with the hope that our campus would join their ranks. After 2 hours of discussion with the representative, and reviewing the previous year's student body president's suggestions, we unanimously turned down the offer. Reasons cited were:

1. That the former student body president had attended the congress last year, and felt the experience was not worth the expense.

2. That the congress did not represent all of the college students of the United States, just a minority of liberal-leaning individuals.

3. That the college and student government would not wish to be associated with the left-leaning congress.

I hope that readers will realize that American college students are ofttimes spoken for by a minority group who do not truly represent their views.

BRIAN EDWARDS,
Former Elections Commissioner, Long Beach State College, Class of 1961.

Basic Facts on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include excerpts from remarks made by Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul H. Nitze at a meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army here last week:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS MADE BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE PAUL H. NITZE

Berlin is the focus of a larger problem. Our capacities to meet the Berlin situation extend beyond the confines of the city and its access routes. I was reminded of this during the recent negotiations at Geneva over the problem of Laos. To emphasize his argument, Mr. [Andrei A.] Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, repeatedly pointed at a map of Laos marked to show territories said to be held by the different forces, saying, "Just look at the map."

The question was not what one would see on that map, but whether that map was the right one. Was it big enough? Mr. Gromyko wished us to center attention on a map restricted to an area of preponderant advantage to the Communists—not on a bigger map showing our respective strengths on a global scale.

The point is that we can offset a local preponderance of Communist strength by a determination to apply Western strength on terms other than those selected by the Soviets. Soviet tanks across the autoban to Berlin would interpose at only one of the many points throughout the world where the important or vital interests of the Soviet Empire are vulnerable.

In meeting the Berlin or other Communist challenges, general nuclear war should not be our only recourse. But let me be very clear: we must first have nuclear striking power before our other capacities to meet these challenges can be effective.

DETERRENT POWER INCREASED

Thus, one of the first tasks to which this administration addressed itself was the strengthening of our nuclear deterrent capabilities both for the immediate future and the longer-range future.

To achieve this the United States took a series of measures. First, we moved to improve our missile deterrent by emphasizing hidden, moving, or invlunerable delivery systems. We accelerated the program for building of the Polaris submarine force. We expanded the development of the solid-fuel Minuteman. We are developing improved air-to-ground missiles, such as the Skybolt.

Second, to protect our existing bomber forces for their nuclear deterrent role, we have increased our ground and airborne alert capacities and are working to install bomb alarm detectors and signals at key warning and communications points and all SAC [Strategic Air Command] bases.

Third, we are constructing and improving our continental defense and warning systems, such as BMEWS [ballistic missile early warning system] and the satellite-borne Midas system to add precious additional minutes to our warning of an attack.

Fourth, we are examining with care the problem—organizational and technical—of command and control of nuclear weapons to assure that the decision to use such weapons can be responsibly exercised under the authority of the President and to minimize the risks of triggering war by accident or miscalculation.

Fifth, as an insurance policy to mitigate devastation of our population should there be a nuclear war, we are seriously undertaking a program of civilian defense.

Finally, in spite of the Soviet resumption of nuclear tests, we shall still strongly support sensible proposals for achievement of responsible arms control.

If a strong nuclear force were all we had to meet Communist challenges, a situation of superior local Communist strength might force on us the alternatives of either national humiliation or all-out war. For this reason, the second goal of the administration is to strengthen and expand the intermediate options in terms of military force.

ARMY'S ROLE STRESSED

In these intermediate options the U.S. Army plays a vital role. Our ability to respond to challenges with increased levels of force short of all-out war has been neglected in the past. We are doing our best to make the necessary adjustments.

The increases in conventional capability will strengthen, and not weaken, our policy of deterring war. For the ability to commit forces in the intermediate range makes more credible to the U.S.S.R. the certain prospect that we will back our nonnuclear forces by the use of our strategic capabilities, should that be necessary.

In summary, first, we have great nuclear capabilities. We are not particularly impressed with the Soviet threat to develop nuclear weapons in the 100-megaton range. We are not interested in arms of terroristic nature, but rather our nuclear capability is tailored to specific tasks.

We have a tremendous variety of warheads which gives us the flexibility we require to conduct nuclear actions from the level of large-scale destruction down to mere demolition work. I could not, of course, give specific numbers, but I can say that the number of nucelar delivery vehicles of all types which the United States possesses provides the flexibility for virtually all modes and levels of warfare.

Second, at the same time, we have a growing nonnuclear capability with a large growth potential. The economic base represented by the United States and our Western European allies far outdistances that of the Communist bloc.

But to apply it to the development of enough conventional military power to offset fully the Communist conventional power will require determination, will and sacrifice. I can only assure you that as these are called for by developments, the administration will ask for them in the full confidence that the American people will respond as they always have when their leaders lay great issues before them, and that our allies will do their share.

Opponents of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most acute, sensitive, and sincere statements on communism and Christianity I have seen, was made recently by Rev. Leopold Hoppe, rector of Grace Episcopal Church, in Ottawa, Kans. His statement took the form of a letter to the editor of the Ottawa (Kans.) Herald,

and was printed as the Herald's lead editorial on Wednesday, August 30, 1961.

The letter follows:

OPPONENTS OF COMMUNISTS

As a clergyman, I must take exception to a letter which appeared in the Ottawa Herald several days ago. That letter implied that clergymen were either willingly or unwittingly promoting communism.

I would like to be the first to admit that some of the clergy have been used by the Communists, and even a few have been openly pro-Communist, but I must object to any insinuation that the clergy of this community—however much I may disagree with their theological position—are promoting the cause of communism.

It seems to me that the clergymen of the community should be considered the most telling critics of communism, because they should be the first to understand the basic errors of Communist theory. These are the infinite perfectability of man and the belief that the Kingdom of God is something that is realizable here and now.

In 1788 Edward Gibbon completed his work, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," in which he listed five reasons why that civilization crumbled before the barbarian onslaught:

1. The rapid increase of divorce: The undermining of the sanctity of the home which is the basis of society.

2. Higher and higher taxes and the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the populace (like the construction of unnecessary public buildings).

2. The mad craze for pleasure: Sport becoming more important in the life of the people with every passing year.

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy was the decadence of the people.

5. The decay of religion; the rise of many sects; and the disrespect of the people for their religious leaders.

I believe there are some lessons for us here today.

Rev. LEOPOLD HOPPE,
Grace Episcopal Church.

Purchio Was a Good Selection by Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last week Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, appointed one of my constituents to the position of superior court judge for Alameda County. He is John J. Purchio of Hayward. Judge Purchio has a distinguished career in the legal profession. He has tirelessly served his community and State. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the San Leandro Morning News which gives fitting tribute to the new judge as well as offering an appropriate compliment to the Governor upon the wisdom of his selection.

PURCHIO WAS A GOOD SELECTION BY BROWN

This week the Morning News reported exclusively that John J. Purchio, one-time mayor of neighboring Hayward, will be appointed by Gov. Edmund G. Brown to fill one of Alameda County's two vacant superior court judgeships.

Now, scooping the field—as the saying goes—brings a great deal of satisfaction. Satisfaction which takes the place of miser's gold. But relax. This isn't a verbal backpat. It's a comment on the very basic soundness of Brown's choice.

John Purchio started his law practice in 1947. Over the years, he has become known as one of northern California's top trial attorneys. If competence and technical knowledge were the only criteria for the selection of a superior judge, the man in consideration would qualify without question.

And yet, a judge should possess—in his person—more than bare facts and a familiarity with those facts' previous applications in pertinent courts of law. He must have a deeply rooted understanding of the human mechanism; he must have and exercise daily all the commonsense and compassion which his title implies.

Happily, John Purchio is not a man who could be counted out because these latter, bonus qualities are lacking. A judge's wisdom is the gift of his years on the bench, but Purchio's personal code and his manner of dealing with people show that the seeds are there—show, indeed, that the seeds of wisdom have already burst their pods.

Governor Brown should be commended for picking this man. And, incidentally, such throughgoing knowledge of the material at hand is hardly the earmark of a spineless administration—which was one of the arrows shot by Robert McCarthy when he stepped out as State director of motor vehicles.

Another Morning News editorial, written and run long before the actual decision was made, asked Brown to consider a south county man for the bench.

Well, consider he did.

And select he did.

And his choice was a smart one. As smart as a judge.

Russia's Plans for Gas Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following article from the current issue of an excellent quarterly magazine, Quest, which has come to my attention. Unfortunately the circulation of this publication is limited, and so I believe it is worthwhile to call attention to the discussion of Soviet civil defense entitled "Russia's Plans for Gas Warfare."

In the light of the disclosures of our own civil defense weakness, it does not make pleasant reading, but I am hopeful that this sort of information will give added impetus to the development of a civil defense program which is at least as adequate as that of the Soviet Union. My mail contains many letters from people in the Sixth District of Michigan who are concerned about the lack of a definite program for defense against modern warfare. I take their letters as evidence that the informed citizens of a democratic nation will cooperate in a program for their own defense without the Government coercion which is part of the Soviet system and is described in the article which follows:

RUSSIA'S PLANS FOR GAS WARFARE

(By S. David Pursglove)

(The Soviet Union plans to turn any world war III into a CBR war, intelligence sources are convinced. And the Reds are far better prepared than we are to withstand chemical, biological, and radiological warfare—with its canisters of tularemia and cholera, its sprays of radioactive wastes from nuclear reactors, its bombs containing nerve gases and the old standby, mustard gas.)

Officials feel these conclusions are inescapable, since what we know of Russian offensive CBR capabilities is confirmed by the extent of their defenses. Indeed, ever since warfare began, an intelligence officer's best indication of enemy intent has been a look at how the enemy is prepared to defend himself. And the Soviet Union is far better prepared than we.

The average Russian knows as much about protecting himself from CBR attack as he knows about his job. Hundreds of thousands of Russians have especially developed civilian gas masks hanging in their homes or stored handily in office desk drawers. All other Russians know where to turn at any moment to get a government-issued emergency mask from the stocks in their offices, factories, or apartment houses.

Every new building in Russia—office, apartment or home—has to be built over a civil-defense-approved fallout shelter. All over the vast expanse of the Soviet Union are civil defense stores that sell radiation dosimeters, gas masks, anti-poison-gas kits, and rubber clothing for protection against fallout. And the people know how to use this equipment. Almost every Russian adult and teenager has been through an intensive, compulsory 22-hour civil defense course. Millions have had another three or four courses averaging 10 hours each, and now they are required to pass a new 12-hour course.

Since the Soviet revolution, and especially since their recognition of military airpower in 1931, the Russians have been learning how to organize their massive civilian population into a defense organization as effective as a well-run army. Two major organizations spearhead this program.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD)—once synonymous with the dreaded secret police, and still responsible for regular police and the labor camps—is in overall charge of civilian defense. Many MVD and regular army troops are slated for civil defense operations in wartime. However, the MVD normally runs its homefront defense program through public officials.

Each city's administration chart has a dual character. Every official has his normal function and also has a civil defense assignment. These are not static roles. MVD maintains a small corps of civil defense specialists in every city. In war, they will supervise city officials in their defense tasks; in peace, they constantly inspect civil defense readiness, test the results of intensive population training and approve or reject with an eye on civil defense all plans for new streets, subways, parks, buildings and factories.

Closely cooperating with the MVD is the organization that actually conducts training and distributes materials and equipment—the Volunteer Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force and Fleet (DOSAAF). For 30 years, DOSAAF has conducted courses in marksmanship, skiing, first aid, flying, parachuting, gliding, chemical and air defense. Now anti-CBR defense is stressed through its thousands of units in cities, collective farms, universities and factories in the Soviet Union. DOSAAF has military instructors teaching courses sponsored by the armed

forces. There are also civilian instructors who vie with the military in teaching civil defense courses where it is a crime to be a poor or lax teacher.

In the past 2 years, almost every Russian adult has been enrolled in a compulsory civil defense course being taught by 40,000 specially trained DOSAAF instructors. Not only does the course require knowledge, for instance, of how to use a gas mask, but it also demands that the citizen understand gas mask design so he can improvise his own in an emergency. For a solid hour, instructors chosen for what we Americans would call bloodthirstiness, hammer at the newest methods of warfare and what they mean to civilians in terms of blast wave destruction, fireball effect, radiation burn, chemical toxicity and infectious diseases. Most of this arouses interest and gives the citizen a reason to remain alert and absorb the instruction. (There is also another, probably more effective, reason: if he fails, he has to repeat the course.) Another hour is devoted to designing air filters for shelters. Two hours are spent on the theory of protecting food and water from contamination and radioactive fallout.

It is not all theory and classroom work that make up the 12-hour course. There is plenty of practice. After an instructor describes the reasons for skimming surface snow from chosen paths in fallout areas, the students, men and women alike, go outside and shovel snow until the instructor or MVD inspector is satisfied that they are doing it properly. And woe unto the student who fails to understand his gas mask lecture, for as soon as the gas warfare test chamber in city or collective farm is available to his class, he must depend on his mask for protection as he first sits, and then exercises, in an atmosphere of war gas. The gas is usually chloropicrin—actually used in World War I combat. It is a strong, sometimes dangerous, type of tear gas.

For most Russians, however, this is just a refresher course with some new material added. We now know that between 1956 and 1959, most of the population took a similar 22-hour course. And in 1955–56, 110 million Russians—85.5 percent of the civilians between ages 16 and 60—passed a 10-hour course in atomic warfare defense.

DOSAAF keeps local units well supplied with training materials. There are always masks, dosimeters, at least three types of fire extinguishers, first aid equipment, chemical warfare protection and detection kits, and all kinds of tools. There is also a wide assortment of well-written, profusely illustrated training manuals and civil defense pamphlets. DOSAAF units and the MVD supply a constantly changing set of civil defense posters to factory superintendents and building managers who are required to display them. These are not just slogan posters—many of them are enlarged reproductions of pages from instruction manuals. Attention-getting color is widely used in posters and books produced by DOSAAF's own huge publishing house.

Some classes taking advanced training for coveted civil defense badges are called out in the middle of the night on "chemical alerts" and march as much as 10 miles, up to 2 miles while wearing their masks. Others are called out to ski 15 miles, 3 miles with masks on—and always at night, so not to interfere with regular work.

The Russian civilian gas mask is readily available in civil defense stores operated by DOSAAF. However, it costs $10 to $14—a week's wages for some Russians—and only a few hundred thousand civilians own the masks. The rest of the population trains with masks furnished by DOSAAF. There are mask caches in many office and apartment buildings and factories.

The civilian gas mask is credited as "very good by U.S. Army chemical warfare authorities. Unlike most masks, it gives full face protection and covers the chin. It is not as compact as new U.S. masks which use cheek pad filters instead of canisters. However, it is used with the canister kept inside the tightly woven carrying bag which acts as an additional filter against contaminated or radioactive dust particles.

DOSAAF stores also stock, at very low prices, the gauze, cotton and instructions for making emergency masks to protect against breathing radioactive dust. There is a wide line of rubber and rubbarized clothing—hats, ponchos, trousers, and boots—to ward off liquid chemicals and fallout dust. Citizens are urged to purchose radiation dosimeters. Two models are stocked: film badges and pencil types. Dosimeters or contamination meters for large areas are distributed to buildings and factories by DOSAAF and to city officials by the MVD.

Not long after intelligence officers started seeing Russian civil defense training manuals and posters, they started getting other pieces of more specific information. They began learning the exact nature of some Soviet work. Take, for example, an atropine Syrette issued to all troops as protection against deadly nerve gases. It looked very much like the one developed for our own troops.

This and other incidents helped to confirm that Russia and the United States probably have been working along similar lines.

Neither nation has a monopoly on knowledge. Said one intelligence officer: "The more I see in this area, the more it proves to me that everybody has the same base level of learning."

There are differences, but they are primarily of degree or emphasis. The Russians are far ahead of us in developing a mass inoculation technique to treat populations exposed to CBR agents. We lead in a program to develop antiradiation drugs as preventive medicine for troops about to enter a radiological warfare zone.

The Russian mass immunization technique uses vaccines in aerosol form—by generating a fine mist of active ingredients. Soviet Army medical specialists seem to feel that their spray generators are fully developed, and that they know enough about the effects of a number of agents in aerosol form to put the technique to use. The U.S. Army Medical Service is approaching the "aerogenic technique" very cautiously. Vaccines that behave one way when injected hypodermically sometimes behave quite differently when tried as aerosols. This is especially true of vaccines that should not contact the respiratory system. Officers believe that some lifesaving vaccines can actually produce pneumonia when they are administered in the aerosol form.

We still are working with lower animals in developing our own aerosol vaccine technique. The aerosol generator, which one officer says will be "a very expensive piece of gadgetry," presents the least problems. The physiology is another matter. How does dissemination as an aerosol affect the size of the needed dose? How often should it be administered? What are the differences between walking and running through an aersol-filled room? What happens if a person, such as a crippled person, stays too long? Until these questions are answered, the Army Medical Service will rely on its rapid, multi-shot, high-pressure spray hypodermic.

Another area where both nations have worked independently but along similar lines, is in antiradiation drugs. Medical officers of both armies are pursuing programs built around mercaptans. These sulfur-containing compounds are highly effective in reducing radiation sickness. However, their toxicity is as great a curse as the radiation sickness that they prevent.

Our program has reached the point of testing small doses of several compounds on men. Army Medical Service officers are confident that an acceptable prophylaxis should be ready for wide testing within perhaps 2 years. If it is the logical outgrowth of the present program, it will require advance warning of radiological attack since it will be effective only if administered several hours before exposure.

The Russians, as well as their satellite allies, are also working on mercaptans. However, even the most likely looking Russian developments have been tested only on rodents, dogs, and monkeys, as far as U.S. officers can learn.

In both nations, the antiradiation drug programs rely heavily on outside research and industrial laboratories for clues to further advances. In Russia there is no problem. All research results in any field are reported routinely to the Minister of Defense. There is no separation between the chemical industry and the state. The Government readily gets what it needs.

In the United States, the situation is much different. The Army Medical Service has to make its problems and needs known to industry and to independent research laboratories, persuade them to cooperate, and convince them that proprietary information will be carefully guarded. All of this must be done on a very small budget.

The Army Medical Service right now limits its requests for information to the field of sulfur chemistry. The much larger industry contact program of the Army Chemical Corps—which seeks information in all fields—perhaps provides a better understanding of how these programs work.

Over 500 of the Nation's 3,000 R. & D. laboratories already participate in a liaison program sponsored by the Army Chemical Corps. Hopefully, more laboratories will join in participating, so that the Army can keep up with the snowballing information it needs in chemistry, metallurgy, medicine, electronics, and the many other fields that contribute to modern chemical-biological-radiological warfare.

Many of these will be the key the Army needs to new incapacitating agents, more effective smoke pots, better flamethrower gaskets, or faster poison gas detection systems. Industrial research people in all fields last year reported to the Army several thousand developments and discoveries. Some of these were the intentional results of their research, some were accidental. Often it is the accidental that has proved more promising.

Mustard gas, for example, was known for 50 years before its value as a weapon was recognized in 1917. Its effectiveness probably was first recognized as a result of an accidental spill on H. T. Clarke when he was working in Emil Fischer's laboratory in 1911 and 1912. Tabun and Sarin—the nerve gases or G-agents—were discovered by Schrader in Germany, while he was searching for new insecticides.

An Army Chemical Center spokesman credits the liaison program with the information responsible for "a great percentage" of the new incapacitating agents that recently have fascinated newspaper readers. These are agents that put a soldier out of action without killing him. They do it by making him overly nervous, or too relaxed, or extremely sensitive to slight temperature changes. Or, they make him laugh himself out of action. Or, they might make him love his energy, or cause him to vomit so much that he is incapable of fighting.

The Chemical Corps has carried out projects to bring ideas into practical shape for use as weapons. Officials still hope that they never will be used. But only a fool would be without them if his enemy has them.

The whole question of whether CBR warfare should be discussed in public draws the

charge, more often than not, that the Pentagon is trying to get a larger budget. This might have been true several years ago when the Chemical Corps had to beg for funds to conduct work. The budget, however, has grown, and, over a year ago, Army Research and Development Director Richard S. Morse publicly stated that there was enough money for CBR:

"We do not need any more. In fiscal year 1960 we spent $40 million, and this has been expanded. The fiscal 1961 and 1962 budgets are going up, not in a crash program but at an orderly rate."

Despite greater spending, CBR warfare is still kept out of public Pentagon conversation. (A few generals have admitted it into their vocabularies, but with the prefix, "defense against * * *.") Too, the State Department now limits its control over the Pentagon's public discussions to the censorship of any references to offensive use of the weapons by the United States.

But perhaps the best indication that the ostrich has uncovered its head is that references to CBR developments by Government officials, which used to draw indignant charges of "amateurish statesmanship," "an unforgivable slip," or worse from the British Embassy, now brings little more than raised eyebrows.

Even with the relatively free discussions of CBR warfare these days, few details are made public on exactly which war gases we know the Russians are stockpiling, or which type of germ warfare they are ready to unleash. For such discussions tell the Russians more about us than we are telling our people about the Russians. For each bit of information that is printed in the United States tells the Reds about a different facet of our intelligence operations—and about the leaks in their own security.

It gains us nothing to describe in detail what we know of their offensive plans; but rest assured, we do know what they are doing, and we know that it is not very different from what we are doing. Neither nation has a monopoly.

The Russians, of course, know that we are familiar with their CBR defense plans. After all, they have been drilled into the minds of a hundred million of their citizens.

But the question of their defenses brings up the question of ours. And here the Russians obviously are aware of the evaluation of our efforts made by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences:

1. In our limited program, much information and resources are not used properly.

2. The secrecy surrounding many civil defense activities results in withholding some information that citizens need for realistic planning.

3. Civil defense in America will remain ineffective as long as it holds an assigned status lower than military defense.

Basically, the United States has not been able to stimulate enough interest in civil defense. Even where special anti-CBR equipment has been developed—and we have a good, low-cost civilian protective mask, for example—there is not enough interest to warrant mass production and distribution.

Some Russian citizens do not like to give up free time to civil defense instruction any more than Americans would. However, centuries of war, two generations of civil defense, and a controlled press and radio have made most Russians not only receptive, but eager. A Stanford Research Institute expert who specializes in Russian civil and military defense points to another important factor:

"Russians always have had a lower standard of living and more government regimentation than U.S. citizens. By comparison, the Russian has to give up far less to achieve adequate civil defense. Now the area to watch is Communist China—the Chinese will have to give up virtually nothing to develop a civil defense more effective even than Russia's."

What does this difference between free world and Communist civil defense mean to the average citizen in the cold war? Herman Kahn, Rand Corp. specialist on Russian defenses, makes it very clear:

"There is an enormous difference in the bargaining ability of a country which can put its people in safety on 24 hours' notice and one which cannot. If this is hard to visualize, imagine that the Russians had done exactly that, and we had not. Then, ask yourself how you think we would come out at a subsequent bargaining table."

HOW TO CURE PASSIVE RESISTANCE

This example of how the Russians plan to use radiological warfare in a conquered area would have done credit to Machiavelli:

Wherever passive resistance by civilian factory workers is encountered, the Reds will spray the area lightly with radioactive agents each week or each month. They will then announce their action and describe the necessity for daily decontamination. The decontamination stations will be located in factories—or on farms or other locations where the Reds want the workers to report. The technique, besides bringing in the workers, can be used to regiment the population for other purposes.

CBR WARFARE—SOME DEFINITIONS

The phrase "CBR warfare" is an abbreviated way of referring to chemical, biological and radiological warfare. When a military man refers to chemical warfare, he means the intentional employment of toxic gases, liquids, or solids, to produce casualties, and the use of screening smoke or incendiaries. Biological warfare is the military use of living organisms or their toxic products to cause death, disability, or damage to man, his domestic animals, or crops. Radiological warfare employs the harmful ionizing effects of radiation against man, whether directly or indirectly.

Poison gas was proposed for use against the Russians in the Crimean War, and in our Civil War against the Confederate Army, but neither suggestion was put to the test. Tear gases were used for harassment purposes by the French in August 1914. The first significant gas attack was the German use of chlorine on April 22, 1915, against the British and French at Ypres. The British retaliated in kind 6 months later at Loos. The next major step was the German introduction of phosgene, a choking gas which could penetrate the crude gas masks then in existence. The Germans introduced mustard gas in July 1917. This blistering agent could produce casualties even among men wearing masks. Another family of toxic gases was introduced by the French and the Austrians in 1916—the blood gases. The first American use of gas was in June 1918, when phosgene was used against the Germans.

Prohibition of gas warfare was agreed to by a number of countries at The Hague in 1899. Neither the United States nor Great Britain signed this treaty. Since the treaty banned use of gas-filled projectiles, French use of tear gas rifle grenades in 1914, and German use of stationary pressurized chlorine gas tanks for the first attack made it a moot point as to whether or how any treaty obligations had been violated. In 1925 a treaty at the Geneva Conference called not only for prohibition of war gases but also bacteriological warfare. In ratifying the treaty, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., and some other nations made it clear they were bound only in relation to other countries complying with the treaty terms. The United States, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, and Brazil did not sign the treaty.

Biological warfare also goes far back in history. Poisoning of wells was an old trick. In the 14th century, the Tartars besieging the Italians in a fortress in Crimea threw over the wall the bodies of plague victims. By the 16th century, an Italian tactical manual described how to construct artillery shells for delivery of disease to the enemy. In our own colonial days, it is reported that European traders passed out blankets used by smallpox victims to Indians so as to reduce their fighting strength. There is definite evidence that in more recent times German agents in this country inoculated animals being shipped to Europe, so that diseases would be carried there.

Limited biological warfare may have been tested by Japan in China during World War II.

Radiological warfare was not a serious possibility until the perfection of the atomic bomb in 1945. The initial burst of radioactivity from the bomb and fireball is not classed as radiological warfare, only the succeeding radioactive fallout. This definition may have to be modified if a new nuclear weapon designed primarily to produce neutrons is developed. The bombs burst over Japan were not radiological weapons.

Radiological warfare calls for bombing or spraying areas with radioactive materials. These can be isotopes created for RW; they can be the packaged waste products of nuclear reactors.

This is Progress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Arizona Republic of September 4, 1961. This editorial depicts a situation which should be called to the attention of all Members of Congress, and to those who administer our foreign aid program. While this program is not intended to invade the sovereignty of any other nation, certainly we do not need to give aid to nations which hire Americans to distribute it with the record of Lauchlin Currie. It is my understanding that there is a rather large Communist movement in the Republic of Colombia. Does it not seem reasonable to assume that an Administrator with Mr. Currie's leanings would use our own dollars to further that movement? The editorial entitled "This Is Progress?" follows:

THIS IS PROGRESS?

The $20 billion alliance for progress, a 10-year plan to socialize Latin America, is off to an inglorious start. For the man reportedly chosen to distribute alliance funds for the Colombian Government, and the author of "Operation Colombia," a Socialist blueprint for regulating that nation's economy, is none other than Lauchlin Currie, former assistant to F.D.R. who was named under oath as a Soviet spy, and who subsequently renounced his American citizenship.

Currie, born in Nova Scotia, taught economics at Harvard before moving into the Government in 1934. He gradually worked his way into Roosevelt's confidence and during the war was assigned to Far Eastern

affairs for the White House. During those years, Currie seemed to be everywhere at once: He arranged a journey through China and Siberia for Henry Wallace, accompanied by Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent; he arranged for longtime friend Lattimore to be appointed special envoy to Chiang Kai-shek; he helped pick delegates and guests to two international conferences of the Institute of Pacific Relations, a notorious pro-Communist organization to which he belonged; he arranged an interview with State Department officials and a Soviet spy who posed as a Tass correspondent; and he arranged a 1942 conference between Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles and Communist Party officials Earl Browder and Robert Minor, in which Welles gave Browder a memorandum, published in the Daily Worker 4 days later, hinting U.S. sympathy for the Chinese Communists.

Currie was busy in a dozen other ways. He served as character reference for top Communists who came into the Government; he hired a veteran Communist as his assistant; he recommended for a wartime commission in Army intelligence the "millionaire Communist," Frederick Vanderbilt Field; and he intervened to clear Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, who intelligence reports said was "beyond reasonable doubt * * * a member and a leader of the Communist Party and very probably a secret agent of the OGPU."

In July 1948, a former courier and paymaster of two Soviet espionage cells within the Government, Elizabeth Bentley, named Currie as a member of the Silvermaster spy cell. He and Harry Dexter White, she said, were the two best avenues through which the Communists placed their agents and sympathizers in strategic Government positions. Furthermore, Currie gave the party important information such as the U.S. attitude toward China, and the news that America was on the verge of breaking the Soviet code. Currie, under oath, admitted his long and friendly acquaintance with Silvermaster and other Red spies, but denied knowing they were Communists. Furthermore, he denied transmitting confidential information to unauthorized persons and said he was not a Communist.

In 1950 Currie took off for Colombia where he soon became an adviser to the Colombian Government. He married a Colombian woman and applied for citizenship in the country where presently he operates a cattle ranch and other businesses. In 1953, the FBI named him as one who had supplied U.S. documents to a Russian spy ring, and in 1956, the State Department withdrew his citizenship because he remained outside the U.S. longer than the 5 years permitted by law for naturalized citizens. Today, however, Lauchlin Currie is back in business, preparing to spend U.S. taxpayers' funds, thanks to the alliance for progress.

Strengthening the Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a strong two-party system is one of the bulwarks of our democracy. Believing as I do that we must all take advantage of any opportunity afforded to strengthen the two-party system, a few days ago I addressed the following letter to the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, former Governor of the State of West Virginia:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1961.

Hon. CECIL H. UNDERWOOD,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR CECIL: I hope you will run against me for Congress in 1962.

It seems to me that in the interests of the two-party system the Republican Party should run its strongest candidate. As a former Governor of West Virginia and temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention in 1960, you are far and away the strongest possible candidate.

There are three reasons which may have kept you from wanting to run for Congress: (1) the responsibilities of your present position as a coal executive; (2) a dislike for the 2-year term; (3) a feeling that the three new counties added to the Fourth Congressional District make Republican success difficult.

Let me analyze each of these. (1) You have made a great contribution to the development of the coal industry in your present position. But no man should refuse a call to the higher duty of public office, where your talents would be available on a far broader scale in the interests of the State we love.

(2) A campaign every 2 years is admittedly difficult. Yet if you should win in 1962, this would be an excellent stepping stone for another statewide race in 1964 for a longer term as Governor or Senator. Meanwhile, by defeating me in 1962, you would not only win the congressional seat for the Republicans, but also make the task easier for the Republican Party in the 1964 congressional race—even if you decided in 1964 to leave Congress in order to run for the Senate or the governorship.

(3) Despite the new counties added, the Fourth Congressional District is still a swing district where the vote will be very close.

In case you are concerned by the Democratic registration majority, perhaps the following figures on your 1960 Senate race within the counties of the new Fourth Congressional District are very revealing:

1960 U.S. Senate race

County	Underwood majority	Randolph majority
Cabell	3,454	
Jackson	1,362	
Lincoln		825
Logan		7,921
Mason	978	
Pleasants	5	
Putnam		406
Ritchie	2,044	
Roane	889	
Tyler	2,001	
Wayne		2,018
Wirt	16	
Wood	3,327	

As you can see, you carried 9 out of the 13 counties in the new Fourth Congressional District. Your total vote in these 13 counties was 96,372 to 93,466 for Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH—a majority of 2,906 against a superb campaigner and a peerless orator. If you could get close to a 3,000 majority over a powerful candidate like Senator RANDOLPH, you should not be afraid of me.

I think if you ran against me we would help to bring the issues forcefully to the attention of the voters, and thereby strengthen the forces of democracy. Such a campaign would stimulate greater interest in government by the people. Whatever the result, the people of West Virginia would gain through wider participation as we both worked constructively for the interests of our State.

You owe it to the Republican Party to make this fight. Even more, you owe it to the State of West Virginia. I hope you will decide to make the race.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

When Are We Going To Wake Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, no doubt many have read of the recent newspaper statements by the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, concerning the dangers of a continued nuclear test ban. You will recall that 3 years ago our country, in an effort to lead the way, voluntarily declared a ban on all testing of nuclear materials. During this time, officials of the United States have met repeatedly with U.S.S.R. representatives in an effort to come to some workable agreement which bans the testing of nuclear weapons forever. A sound agreement which would safeguard our country's interest could never be reached due to the Russians efforts to torpedo each conference.

While our scientists cannot prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Russians have continued testing, there appears to be little doubt in the minds of most knowledgeable persons that the seismographic readings obtained from stations around the world indicate that a number of disturbances centered in mid-Russia during the 3 test ban years were in fact the results of underground nuclear testing. Now suddenly, and with little or no warning, the U.S.S.R. has exploded five nuclear weapons. It is entirely possible that they have completed as much underground testing as can be profitably accomplished and that the final tests for new weapons must be conducted in the open. This, then, is the signal for their announcement a few days ago followed by five nuclear shots in rapid succession.

It is entirely possible that when the Russians have confirmed and updated their nuclear calculations with these tests, they will then sit down at the conference table and attempt to drag out another lengthy series of disarmament conferences while our country continues its test ban in good faith. If the U.S.S.R. has not already overtaken us, they certainly have greatly closed the gap on what was once an exclusive American Nuclear Society.

The facts are: First, that our Armed Forces are today equipped with nuclear weapons which have never been completely tested by actual explosion; second, that our scientists feel reasonably sure from previous data obtained using a method known as extrapolation—or carrying forward certain phenomena which they have been led to believe will most likely occur—that our weapons will explode with the yield expected;

and, third, that the very survival of the United States may well rest with nuclear weapons that we think will explode if it becomes necessary to detonate them in the defense of our country.

Is it not about time that we resume nuclear testing before it is too late? The test ban has also kept our scientists from developing lighter and more efficient weapons. Near and dear to the heart of everything American is the dream of world peace. You want it, I want it, everyone in their right mind wants it. Peace can only be assured if we are strong enough to impress an enemy with the foolhardiness of his intentions to impose his will upon us. The U.S.S.R. is the only country in the world big enough and with avowed intentions expressed in the Communist manifesto as early as 1848 and reaffirmed just this year—a dream of world conquest and domination—to challenge our very way of life—our very existence.

The following newspaper articles represent expert opinion regarding the necessity for resuming nuclear testing in the face of the scare tactics of the Kremlin and the imperative need of safeguarding our national security.

[From the New York Journal American, Sept. 1, 1961]

TEST AND LIVE—DE SEVERSKY

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 1.—"It would be national suicide not to resume nuclear testings in order to keep abreast of Soviet Russia," Maj. Alexander P. De Seversky told a cheering audience at the Southern California School of Anticommunism in the Sports Arena last night.

"As long as war itself is not abolished, it is unthinkable to weigh the possibility of this Nation or any other free nations with the potentials to abolish nuclear weapons," the noted and militant authority on air power declared.

"The leaders in the Kremlin do not share our live-and-let-live philosophy, 'coexistence' propaganda to the contrary.

"Therefore, barring instantaneous disintegration of the Soviet state from within, war is inevitable.

"The disintegration must be instantaneous, because at the first sign of serious unrest as a prelude to revolution, the commissars will plunge the world into an atomic holocaust to save their own skins."

However, the author of the best-selling book, "America: Too Young To Die," said he did not believe open war is an immediate danger.

"Right now, Russia is not looking for war with the West," Major De Seversky continued. "Our Strategic Air Command has the capability to retaliate after any overt action against us by the Soviets.

"The real danger lies with ourselves. That danger is in dragging our feet in the development of nuclear power and the ability to match or surpass Russia's space program.

"If we go at the regrettably slow rate we have been proceeding, Russia, by 1962, will certainly be able to equal the striking power we now have in our superb Strategic Air Command.

"When Russia will have both ballistic missiles and the striking power of the Strategic Air Command, then the Bear will really throw his weight around and war will be more than a possibility, virtually a certainty."

[From the Washington Post]

STRAUSS URGES TEST OF NEW A-WEAPONS

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said yesterday the United States has been producing nuclear weapons throughout the test moratorium and should now see how they work.

Strauss suggested that this country resume nuclear testing now that the Russians have started up again.

In a copyrighted interview with U.S. News & World Report, the retired admiral said if there is any delay in American testing, "we ought to have our heads examined."

According to Strauss, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower had made up his mind last fall that he intended to resume nuclear testing. He said "his patience with the Russians had worn thin by that time."

But the victory of John F. Kennedy in the November elections presented Mr. Eisenhower "with a situation which made it impossible for him to resume our test program without tying the hands of his successor." Strauss said this was the proper course.

He said it was his belief that the Russians had been secretly testing during the moratorium that began in October 1958, although "I can't substantiate it—I cannot produce hard evidence."

He said no one could give an authoritative answer to the question of whether secret Russian testing could have endangered the American lead in nuclear weapons. However, he said "the fact remains that we have not been able to test any of our newer developments during this period, nor to proof-test any weapons that have been in our existing stockpile for 3 years and more."

Strauss emphasized that the moratorium has been on testing, not on production.

"The Soviets and we, and the British and French, for that matter, have continued to produce weapons during that period," he said.

Immediate U.S. testing is necessary, he declared, because "any new development in the way of weapons needs to be tested. You cannot go into the enterprise of manufacturing and stockpiling types of weapons whose effectiveness and reliability depend only on theory."

[From the New York Journal American, Sept. 1, 1961]

PAULING STILL OPPOSED—EXPERTS FAVOR TESTING

(By Frank Donoghue)

LOS ANGELES, September 1.—Taking the position that the United States must move ahead of the Soviet in atomic potentials, three of the Nation's leading nuclear experts urged here today that America meet Russia's superbomb challenge by resuming nuclear testing.

A fourth condemned a resumption of testing by the United States and other nations as possible motivation toward nuclear world war.

John A. McCone, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said the United States has no alternative but to resume atomic tests.

"I believe our security is at stake," he said. "Resumption of weapon testing is essential to the safety of our country and the free world."

Mr. McCone, now board chairman of the Joshua Hendy Corp. here, said the Russian announcement caught him by surprise.

Dr. Willard F. Libby, Nobel Prive-winning UCLA chemistry professor who previously held the view America should not resume nuclear testing, answered the Russian challenge by reversing his position and declaring this country should engage in a "nuclear crash program."

"It is very necessary that we keep our armaments ahead of Russia's," Dr. Libby declared. "Meanwhile, I hope President Kennedy makes the right decision. He has many factors to consider—facts which no other person has available. But whatever the President decides, we stand behind him."

Even more militant was the stand taken by Dr. Stafford Warren, dean of UCLA's medical school and world expert in the medical aspects of atomic fallout, who said:

"I believe we should resume testing immediately to insure we are not outflanked by Russia in weapons development.

"It now seems obvious that the Russian space program was largely directed at developing huge vehicles for their cumbersome nuclear devices. I believe we should not limit our testing to underground shots. We need to do some testing in the atmosphere."

Dr. Linus Pauling, long-time foe of nuclear testing, remained adamant in his opposition to such experiments and appealed to the Soviet Government to reconsider its decision to resume tests.

The Nobel Prize winner said at the California Institute of Technogolgy he would continue to advocate that the United States continue to refrain from nuclear testing regardless of Russian action.

"I strongly condemn the militaristic action of any government that makes it harder to achieve general and complete disarmament," he said.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear that one country after another, since World War II has fallen under the domination of the Russians who have denied human rights, dignity, freedom of speech, and the other human liberties to country after country as they fall into the Red sphere.

We had better wake up, America, and resume sufficient nuclear testing to assure that our fighting forces are equipped with the best tested weapons which our scientists are capable of producing before it is too late.

Anatomy of the Cold War

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, America's awakening to the vital challenge thrust upon us by the international Communist conspiracy is one of the most significant and encouraging events of our time. But merely to be awakened to the danger is one thing. Handling it intelligently and effectively is another.

This requires a broad general understanding of who we are up against and what we are up against. It requires the relinquishment of many outdated concepts no longer applicable to the world situation today. It demands original, hard thinking to replace them with concepts that are realistic in relation to facts as they brutally are, not as we might wishfully think them to be.

For instance, we must accept the concept of a bipolar world in which the U.S.S.R. and the United States represent the poles. No longer is the world the "family of nations" conceived by late 19th and early 20th century political thinking. Nor do the so-called uncommitted nations of today possess power of sufficient strength, moral or physical, to sway these poles.

We must regard the international Communist conspiracy which opposes us

as first, the force described by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, plus second, all the considerable human and physical resources enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. The two are, in fact, in combination.

This discussion seeks to define and analyze only some of the background involved, only some of the strategy and tactics applicable, and only a few of the cold war techniques utilized to advance Communist objectives. Necessarily only a few, because altogether they are as vast as the problem itself. Hot war also is discussed. Necessarily because hot war and cold war are interrelated parts of the total conflict in which we find ourselves.

COMMUNISM'S GOAL: WORLD DOMINATION

The resolve of Soviet Communist leaders to extend their demonation worldwide—with Moscow as the seat of author—has remained unshaken for over four decades. There were periods when it was expedient for them not to press this determination because of some more urgent problem, as in World War II. But once they have dealt with a crisis, the Soviets waste no time in renewing their attack. There is current evidence of a desire by Chinese Communists to play a larger role in directing communism's expansion. Their leverage is growing as witnessed by the Communist bloc's intense ideological struggle over the peaceful coexistence policy. But, and though this may not always be the case, it is still Moscow, not Peiping, against which the West principally must calculate its dangers and erect its military and nonmilitary defenses to thwart the master plan to install a Communist government in every nation on earth, with all looking to Moscow for guidance.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY: TOTAL CONFLICT

Toward achieving its ends, Communist dogma dictates utilization of any means which are expedient, as long as the Soviet revolutionary base is not endangered. Military force is one instrument for carrying out this policy, and the Communists are inhibited by no moral restrictions from using it to gain their ends. To them, the important factor is that inadmissible risks must not be undertaken. To do so would constitute adventurism, a serious deviation from Communist ideology.

At the same time, if within the limits of the risks which Soviet leaders deemed wise to take, an opportunity presented itself to strike the United States a blow which would remove it as the chief obstacle to the Soviet goal, Soviet leaders would consider it a sin just as serious as the other deviation not to take advantage of the opportunity.

In short, Communist doctrine places on Communist leaders a constant responsibility to proceed by the most expeditious means possible and these may range from dropping pamphlets to dropping thermonuclear bombs. The degree of violence to be selected is that which can gain the most advantage with the least proportionate cost under the particular circumstances existing at the time of decision.

THE SPECTRUM OF CONFLICT

Thusly Communists fight toward their goal all the time over a spectrum of conflict which can span the full scope of human activities—from sports competition to thermonuclear war. They have no set time schedule for bringing this conflict to a successful conclusion. The Communists are patient, willing to accept temporary setbacks if necessary. They conceive the conflict as a protracted one and their patience in waging it is based on a confidence in the ultimate victory promised by Marxist-Lenin doctrines.

It is obvious that the spectrum of conflict divides itself into two major segments according to degrees of violence: military war and nonmilitary war—hot war and cold war. In turn, each segment resolves itself into sectors based on the same patterns of intensity.

Cold war in its present stylized spectrum ranges from scientific demonstrations, such as space efforts, propaganda, and economic competition, to military-political-humanitarian foreign aid, to presence of forces, as in East Germany, to threats of force, such as Khrushchev's talk of 100-megaton nuclear bombs, to assistance to engaged allies, as was given to Red China in the Korean war. In the same style hot war ranges from police action, to limited war, to graduated retaliation to unrestricted war. In a gray area between hot war and cold war fall such modern-day instruments of aggression as rioting, border incidents, and guerrilla warfare.

Fundamental to U.S. survival is, first recognizing we are engaged in this total, protracted conflict; and second, developing an irrevocable determination to win it. But that is only the beginning. We must organize ourselves to fight it as a major enterprise, on a scale for victory, with all the physical and moral resources at our command. We must never forget that the weapons employed against us are varied and limitless. Subversion, spying, sabotage, and diplomatic perfidy are but a few illustrations. We cannot concentrate exclusively on defending against just some of the weapons of Communist attack, leaving the ramparts unguarded elsewhere. We are faced with total conflict and we must fight that conflict in all its totality—on all the cold war fronts at all times, on all the hot war fronts if ever we must.

Moreover, we can never expect victory if we fight only defensively. We must take the initiative, bring the fight to the enemy's own home base in cold war just as we are prepared to do in hot war. Doing this involves risks and it involves escalating up the scale of violence whenever required. The risks so involved must always be calculated against the risks of not taking action of sufficient intensity to achieve our purposes. Often timidity is more risky, in the end, than boldness. In any event, our enemy must be convinced we treasure our freedom, our way of life, and our country sufficiently to take the degree of action necessary for preserving them. Otherwise he is left free to achieve his ends via the piecemeal surrender route of bluff, bluster, and blackmail.

DETERRING HOT WAR

The willingness and ability to fight the hottest kind of war, if survival depends upon it, feeds back into considerations regarding the taking of all kinds of actions less in degree of violence. This is because the hottest kind of war is the reference point from which decisions are calculated for the taking of all lesser military and nonmilitary actions in relations between nations.

During the Lebanon crisis the landing of U.S. Marines and presence of U.S. Naval Forces evidenced a U.S. determination and willingness to fight, if necessary, to keep the Communists from taking over this part of the world. The Soviets, in face of this clear evidence of intention to resist piecemeal surrender backed away. Put another way, they were deterred from pursuing the course of aggression in this area they had embarked upon. Had we not taken the risk of displaying this show of power, they could have achieved supremacy in the Mideast. The consequence of that would be to put us in a situation far more risky than proceeding as we did. By way of contrast, we failed to provide air cover for the Cuban invasion in the spring of 1961 even though the risk involved was small. As a consequence, Castro achieved even greater power over Cuba and the resulting situation is more risky than before.

The same principles apply to deterring Communist leaders from attempting to achieve their goals by starting all-out nuclear war and attacking the United States. Our deterrent system must plainly be capable of inflicting unacceptable damage on the enemy. If he believes we will use it for that purpose if he does attack, he will be deterred from doing so.

Like a parachute, the deterrent system must always work or disaster will follow. Its most obvious capability must be to accept whatever damage a Soviet first strike may inflict and still retain sufficient second strike capability to impose unacceptable damage on the Soviet homeland. It does not involve a capability merely to strike first. Nor does it require expenditures for a capability to strike second with vastly more destruction than needed to deter.

The very success of a system deterring all out nuclear war makes more likely the resort to lesser violence in the form of limited war and intensified cold war. Thus skeletonizing limited war conventional land, sea and air capability by overexpenditure on deterrence cannot be tolerated.

Neither can the important third front, nonmilitary warfare, be neglected if our overall defense posture is to succeed in thwarting Communist ambitions. We can freeze to death in cold war as easily as we can burn to death in a hot war.

In any event, the cost of creating and maintaining a deterrent force is extremely high. For the sake of our national economic health it is important that money is not spent unnecessarily in this direction.

WHAT WILL DETER THE SOVIETS?

Determining what will deter the Soviets can be learned from the answer to

another question: How much destruction to their homeland are Soviet leaders prepared to risk in order to achieve their ultimate goal if cold war methods do not succeed or, in their opinion, they are too slow?

Obviously, only the Soviet leaders themselves can answer that question. It is doubtful if even they have arrived at it precisely. It is likely that within limits the answer will vary from time to time because of the Communist doctrine holding that whatever is dictated by historical circumstances is true party line at any particular moment and shall be implemented.

Nevertheless we should be able to achieve an order of magnitude concept of the destruction they might be prepared to accept by examining Communist objective and doctrines, making historical comparisons, studying the writings and speeches of Soviet authorities and analyzing the progress which the Communists have made so far toward their goal.

It is clear that Soviet leaders, if it can be avoided, have no desire to become involved in nuclear war, either growing out of surprise attack or by escalation of limited war. Khrushchev often refers to the deadliness and horror of general nuclear war in his speeches. A leading Soviet military analyst, Maj. Gen. Nicolai A. Talensky recently wrote a widely publicized article pointing out the futility of resorting to nuclear war to decide political controversies.

How accurately such expression reflect Soviet military philosophy and how much they reflect the long standing Soviet propaganda campaign aimed at nuclear disarmament of the West cannot, of course, be determined. It would be dangerous error, in any event, to assume Soviet leaders would not make a sudden massive attack against the United States if their calculation of relative strength convinced them it could be done without serious risk of disaster to the Soviet revolutionary base.

Such a situation could arise if the relative balance between forces suddenly tipped in the Soviet's favor through some scientific or technological breakthrough. It could arise should the United States allow its deterrent system to deteriorate badly. It could arise if the U.S. position became so weakened by repeated cold war and limited war defeats that retaliation would be made quixotic and unbelievable. Our only security against surprise nuclear attack is balanced strength, which includes a retaliatory capacity so swift, so certain and so deadly it rules out the possibility. How deadly?

WHAT PUNISHMENT WILL SOVIETS ACCEPT?

What punishment would be too great to accept to achieve victory over us? While some contend there would be no victory in a general nuclear war, this is not the present Soviet view. In January, 1960, Khrushchev told the supreme Soviet that in such a war the U.S.S.R. would suffer heavy misfortune and sustain great loss of life, but it would survive because its territory is enormous and its population less concentrated in large industrial centers than in many other countries. On the other hand, the West would find that it would be their last war, and it would be the end of capitalism.

One way of arriving at some understanding of how much destruction Soviet leaders might be willing to exchange for gaining their objective is by making historical comparisons. For one thing, the standard of living is substantially higher in the United States than in the Soviet Union, and the farther a civilization progresses from its primitive beginnings, the more value is placed on human life. Also, the continental United States has enjoyed nearly a century of stable government without suffering the consequences of invasion or attack by outside military forces. During this period the Russians have had a very violent nationwide revolution and civil war and have experienced extensive destruction of life and property during two world wars, as well as a costly and humiliating defeat in the Russ-Japanese war. What would deter them is not necessarily what would deter us.

Another factor which has bearing on our question is Soviet civil defense. Until late 1953, the Soviets made no preparation for civil defense in a nuclear war. Today their effort is the most extensive to be found anywhere in the world. The effort which the Soviet government has made in this direction indicates it takes a realistic attitude toward the possibility of Soviet participation in a general nuclear war. However, its objective should not be misconceived. There is no evidence of a newly acquired benevolence toward human life amongst Kremlin bosses greater than amongst western leaders in the ratio of Soviet to western civil defense efforts. A characteristic of communism is callousness toward human life. Primary interest is not in saving human lives per se, but in preserving the skills, so important to Soviet industry and strength, represented by them.

Nevertheless, assuming reasonable effectiveness of the civil defense program, the result is this: If concurrently with a Soviet first strike, 80 percent of the 50 million people in the largest 160 Soviet population centers is evacuated to nontarget areas with reasonable fallout protection, casualties from nuclear retaliation would be cut from 50 million to 10 million— a factor of five.

Ten million lives is a large number, but, in U.S.S.R. experience, by no means a prohibitive or even a crippling price to pay to achieve important objectives. A study made in 1959 by Prof. Warren W. Eason of Princeton concluded that the Soviet Union suffered 25 million World War II casualties, about 13 percent of total population. This followed the purges of the 1920's and 1930's which accounted, by some estimates, for almost another 25 million deaths.

Physical damage of all kinds from Nazi military operations also was massive. In addition to nonindustrial losses, the official Soviet historical review of World War II estimates 40 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s industrial capacity was totally destroyed, a figure generally accepted by Western students of the war's consequences.

Despite these huge losses of life and the enormous damage inflicted on the Soviet economy, the rate of production in the U.S.S.R. by 1950 was greater than at any time in its history. Even granting some increase on the value placed on human life by reason of improved living standards, it seems reasonable to assume that Soviet Communist leaders would accept punishment at least equivalent to World War II in exchange for eliminating the United States as a checkmate to their goal.

WHAT PUNISHMENT MUST UNITED STATES BE ABLE TO INFLICT?

Here then, is an absolute minimum limit for U.S. deterrent capability: A second strike ability to inflict damage equivalent to the combined effect of erasing 14 percent of the Soviet Union's population and 41 percent of its industrial capacity.

That these are damage equivalent figures and not the outline for a targeting pattern must be understood. Aside from the moral questions involved in threatening death to such large numbers of people, over 29 million in a population of some 209 million, the combination of civil defense and natural dispersal over 8½ million square miles of territory make attempting it utterly impractical.

For this reason a deterrent system targeted against population would not be believable and would fail to deter. Further, even if it were practical to carry out a death threat against 14 percent of Soviet citizens, there is no good reason to believe Soviet leaders would not willingly trade that many—or 15 or 20 or 50 percent or even more—if the deal guaranteed them world supremacy. Equally clear is the physical futility of basing deterrence on a major threat to the agricultural economy of this vast land stretching across two continents.

All this by no means implies that within the limits of peacetime budgets a steady, stable deterrent to Soviet button-pushers cannot be achieved. In the final analysis what Soviet leaders fear most is impairment of the means by which they seek to accomplish the Communist goal of world domination. Their principal instrumentalities for exercising power on the international scale are first, the Soviet military establishment, and second, the Soviet industrial economy. Consequently, a positive U.S. second strike capability targeted at crippling these to an unacceptable degree will effectively deter. Moreover, these are the targets within the U.S.S.R. particularly vulnerable to nuclear impairment by the present and projected combinations of manned aircraft and missile weapons systems making up U.S. strategic forces.

It would be necessary to utilize only a small portion of these forces to achieve the minimum damage figure discussed earlier. Just under 100 retaliatory missions would be needed to bring 60 percent of the U.S.S.R.'s industrial complexes under attack. Even assuming as many as one-third were turned back by Soviet defenses, the resulting destruction would still approximate 41 percent of all Soviet industrial capacity.

U.S. RETALIATORY CAPABILITY EFFECTIVELY DETERS

U.S. capability obviously goes far above that percentage. This is because an adequate, flexible transportation system is essential to any nation seeking to exercise the role of a major world power. It is a prerequisite for effective utilization of military forces and vital to bring in raw materials, supply power, and move out the finished goods of an influential industrial society.

The Soviet transportation system is characterized by an especially heavy reliance on railroads, 85 percent of all tonnage, compared to 50 percent for the United States. About 10 percent is moved on inland waterways and the remaining 5 percent by highways, pipelines, coastal shipping, and air transport combined. The estimated number of major centers fed by the national rail network is 160. Only 160 nuclear knockout blows need be pressed home against this rail system at freely chosen, less defended locations to fragmentize the U.S.S.R.'s interdependent society into as many cutoff and isolated segments.

It is clear that U.S. strategic forces are fully capable of deterring Soviet leaders from initiating nuclear war. We possess the determination to strike back without hesitation and the capability of destroying that which they know they cannot afford to lose. The real question is how much more deterrent capability are we buying than we really need?

DETERRED FROM HOT WAR, SOVIETS WAGE COLD WAR

Thus, deterred from quick explosive victory, the Soviets and their allies in international communism have turned to measures short of all-out nuclear war to advance toward communism's goal. While carrying on a general nonmilitary offensive against the free world—aimed at weakening its physical ability as well as destroying its will to resist—on a geographical basis they are employing a three-prong strategy calculated to segment the free world and isolate its parts.

The prongs are thrusting:

First. Over the pole through Iceland and down the Atlantic—to be aided by the large submarine fleet—for the purpose of cutting off Europe from North America;

Second. Down from the soft underbelly, through the Mideast, into Africa and spanning the Atlantic to Cuba—to sever North from South America and Europe from the Far East; and

Third. Out from Communist China through Vietnam, Laos, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, the Malay Peninsula, and hopefully turning the corner and proceeding up the Philippines and Japan—to cut off the Americas from the Far East and isolate India and Australasia.

The importance which Communist leaders attach to securing these geographical areas is evidenced by their willingness to escalate considerably up the scale of violence where they are concerned. Limited war by proxy in Korea, guerilla fighting in Laos, the revolution in Cuba, civil disorders in Iraq, the Congo, and elsewhere, are examples.

Our enemy's successes using such techniques amply illustrate that our posture in these sectors of the spectrum of conflict is inadequate. Our limited war forces are seriously handicapped by lack of proper mobility, by obsolescence of conventional weapons and by a confusion with respect to the role of nuclear weapons. As to the latter, aside from whether or not nuclear weapons should be used in specific and particular limited war situation, there is no validity to the notion they can never be so used without inevitably resulting in escalation to all-out war. It simply does not follow that facing defeat in a limited nuclear war, a nation will choose to be decimated in an all-out one.

Because of the nature of nuclear warheads and the 15-year Communist propaganda campaign against them, to many, their use under any circumstances has been enshrouded in a calamity curtain which, if parted, they say, would mean the end of mankind. This is false. A legitimate distinction exists between strategic and tactical use of nuclear weapons, and, it is, whether the range of the delivery unit is within the rather sizable dimensions of today's battlefields or beyond.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Peaceful coexistence is what Khrushchev chooses to call this present state of affairs. We call it cold war or nonmilitary war. Khrushchev says it is merely a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle between the socialist camp and what he calls the aggressive forces of imperialism. This, he says, is a better way of achieving world communism than war. But what he means is that today it better advances the Communist cause to proceed by nonmilitary warfare than it does by military warfare—tomorrow it may be different, if tomorrow's circumstances are different. Even under today's circumstances peaceful coexistence as waged by the Soviets must be understood as neither peaceful nor aimed at coexisting for one instant longer than necessary.

Except for all-out war between major powers, in the final analysis, it amounts to a no-holds-barred conflict for world domination played under Soviet ground rules.

One of these rules is that the world is divided into the peace zone—Communist territory—and the war zone—non-Communist territory. And the contest shall be carried on entirely in the war zone. Another is that all action to forward the Communist cause is just and any action to resist it is unjust. Thus, subversion and sabotage of free world institutions are Communist instruments of peaceful coexistence and revolts such as in Algeria and Latin America are encouraged under the guise of national liberation movements. These are deemed just acts and just wars, to be fully supported by the Kremlin.

Recent successes lend weight to Moscow's contention that their current policy is, indeed, a presently effective substitution of political-economic-psychological warfare for military force.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

The current Berlin crisis is a classic example of Communist strategy and tactics in waging cold war to gain their objectives. For months Khrushchev's truculent belligerency built up tensions over Berlin. Fear was fed on fear. Then with dramatic ruthlessness he torpedoed the Geneva A-test-ban talks and announced Soviet test resumption. He coupled this with terror talk of 100 million million ton K-bombs—K for Khrushchev. All aimed at creating worldwide hysterical fear in hopes of euchering concessions which will give him control of Berlin as a step toward control of Germany as a step toward control of all Europe.

Why the Kremlin plays this bold game of nuclear blackmail is simple. It has little to do with Communist ideological abstractions and our resistance to it has little to do with democratic idealism. It is because Berlin is the political key. West Germany is the industrial lock. And West Europe is the economic gate to the world.

To control the world by force requires a superior economic-industrial base in support of arms. To control the world by economic domination requires a superior economic-industrial base in support of an unfaltering flow of capital goods and trade. By 1970 the estimated value of all goods and services, gross national product, and thus the most comprehensive measure of productive activity will be:

	Billons
West Europe	$800
United States	740
Soviet bloc	630
Underdeveloped nations	300

Thus, the United States, plus West Europe, equals $1,540 billion against Soviet bloc equals $630 billion.

But, if the Soviet bloc can successfully use West Berlin as the key to West Germany, the lock, to gain access to the industrial capacity of West Europe, the power situation radically changes to the following:

The United States equals $740 billion against Soviet bloc plus West Europe equals $1,430 billion.

The Soviet Union now knows it cannot surpass West Europe and the United States in the industrial capacity needed to support an arms race or a protracted armed conflict.

The Soviet Union now knows it cannot, even by the most stringent denial—industrial growth without public consumption—match the combined economic resources of the United States and West Europe.

But the Soviet Union knows that with the industrial plant, economic resources, scientists and technicians of West Germany and West Europe it can control the world.

These are the stakes in the Berlin crisis. These are the reasons why Mr. Khrushchev intensifies the cold war to the hilt and threatens a nuclear holocaust. They are also the reasons why he will not go beyond the brink and start a

nuclear holocaust. If he does all Europe's industrial capacity will be reduced to ashes. There will be no $800 billion gross national product of Europe to strengthen his empire. He must obtain these assets undamaged, in running order and with the people to run them. If we but keep our cold war wits and act accordingly, the crisis of Berlin can be passed without loss and without damage. Mr. Khrushchev will be relegated to another way and another day to seek his objectives.

COLD WAR

Unfortunately these cold war wits of ours I have mentioned are, at this point, neither sharp nor plentiful. Our enemy has 40 years leadtime in knowhow and experience in fighting cold war. There are many things we must do and do quickly, not only to surmount the crisis of Berlin, but other crises to come again and again in the future from aggressive actions by our relentless challenger.

I have mentioned that we must actually recognize we are now engaged in a conflict in which the stakes are freedom and national existence itself. This, the cold war, need not necessarily be a mere preliminary bout to a hotter main event. It could well be the main event itself and the loser will have no second chance. I have mentioned that we must develop an irrevocable determination to win this contest. Having developed it, we must broadcast that determination to the world and enlist the help of all men everywhere who cherish freedom in this great battle for its survival.

Americans are not unique in their desire for freedom, only in their vast power which causes people throughout the world to look to the United States for leadership in the contest to preserve it. These people, too, want to fight effectively in the common cause. They, too, have their worries, their doubts, their fears that the time of freedom is running short. But until the United States moves, and moves decisively, as a world leader should, others cannot be expected to go it alone in these battles.

As such a call to nonmilitary arms I recently introduced House Joint Resolution 517. It is patterned after the declaration of war following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, but declares conflict rather than war. It states that the international Communist conspiracy has committed repeated acts of nonmilitary aggression against us and our allies, formally declares the state of nonmilitary conflict thus thrust upon us, authorizes the President to employ the entire power of the United States to carry on nonmilitary conflict, concluding: "and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

There are several important considerations that are often overlooked in discussing cold war and how to wage it that I now propose to touch upon.

INDENTIFICATION OF THE ENEMY

We must clearly identify the enemy. There are two U.S.S.R.'s. Only one is the enemy. U.S.S.R. B is the people, the country and its resources. It is not our enemy. Country B is the poor country, the horsemeat country, which sometimes cannot even supply its capital city with food and fuel. Our enemy is U.S.S.R. A, the international Communist conspiracy of an elite few who have enslaved country B and extort from it the wherewithal to present the illusion of a large and powerful society and the false image of a new system to better mankind's lot.

In reality, country A is no stronger than country B. This we must understand ourselves. And to the people of U.S.S.R. B, China B and all the other B countries—the captive nations—we must drive home that they have friends outside the Iron Curtain who seek to share with them their freedom.

WHOLE THINKING

As a people we tend to cling to a kind of fragmentized thought process in international affairs which categorizes peace and war into two separable states, which, in fact, no longer exist. We live in a world which is neither at war in the classic definition of the word or at peace. It is in conflict—a new and deadly kind of conflict—and we must think in terms of its totality and the wide spectrum of actions over which it is being fought. The Reds do not make this mistake. They are realistic, if nothing else. Their thinking is as total and integrated as their objectives are clear and precise. Let us examine how this affected the postwar situation following both the World Wars.

World War I was carried on by the Allies as a purely military operation. Only after the Armistice, at Versailles, in 1919, was the problem of securing the peace faced A cordon sanitaire, or series of buffer states, came out of Versailles—Czechoslovakia, Poland, Jugoslavia, and the like. All to protect the Western European peninsula from what Sir Halford J. Mackinder so vividly described in terms of: "He who controls the Eurasian land mass controls the world island and thus controls the world."

In World War II—at the insistence of the United States and over the protests of Sir Winston Churchill—we of the West carried on the war in terms of no total military victory and unconditional military surrender. There was little or no thought of postwar problems and postwar strategy. The old World War I conventional thinking all over again. However, this time there was no Versailles to bail out postwar problems. The Soviet Union, with due regard for the totality of the spectrum of external relationships, while still in hot war was thinking whole—looking forward to postwar. It realistically secured these peripheral buffer zones to itself and satellized them. Thereby, both enhancing its own future defense and weakening the future position of its then temporary allies, but future protagonists.

Only both a great understanding on their part—and a great ignorance on our part—of the basics of national external relationships could underlie two such divergent courses of action. The best that can be said is that it presents us a clear lesson in facts of international life which we must learn and learn well.

CRITERION FOR SACRIFICE AND EXPENDITURE

There is, however, apparent from this fiasco one absolute criterion about which there can be no argument—only understanding—which, again, it appears that the Reds possess and we do not:

It is, simply: the efficacy with which a particular action will implement a nation's external objective should determine the amount of money and manpower to be expended upon it—not the irrelevant consideration of whether the action is being taken in time of "war" or time of "peace."

Our country will accept every sacrifice in resources, men and money when it comes to fighting a war; but because of our fragmented thinking and naive misconceptions about the implementation of our external objective, we irrationally tend toward the opposite extreme when there is no shooting going on.

This kind of inflexibility is not characteristic of the Kremlin. Not only in expenditure, but right down to Khrushchev's alternating smiles and frowns to probe our weaknesses, there is exhibited a quick effective flexibility. This, notwithstanding our fervent eagerness to accept a monolithic concept of the operations of the Communist apparatus.

We must learn that what will be achieved, not whether it is achieved during hot war or cold war, is the true standard for our efforts and sacrifice during the protracted conflict.

COMMUNIST AND FREE WORLD OBJECTIVES COMPARED

Now it becomes logical to examine what is to be achieved, and to compare the external objectives of the Communist world and our own. Perhaps real understanding of the contrasts here is as important as anything else toward achieving understanding of what we are against and how to go about combating it.

In briefest form, these objective can be summarized this way: Ours, peace and friendship in freedom; theirs, peace and friendship in communism.

Only a word of difference—but they are poles apart. One states a positive objective, the other a negative one. One states an indefinable objective, the other a definable one.

Since Karl Marx first put pen to paper, double meanings for stock words and phrases have been standard tools in Communist dialectic. I have purposely stated these objectives in these double meaning words to reemphasize the tricky business of Red rhetoric which we must beware.

Light was shed on a facet of our problem by former President Eisenhower in his 1960 state of the Union message by saying:

> We live in a sea of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe. Police states are called people's democracies. Armed conquest of free people is called liberation. Such slippery slogans make more difficult the problem of communicating true faith, facts, and beliefs.

To the former President's list we can surely add the word "democracy" which means "communism" to the Communists and the opposite to us. Indeed, today, such fundamental words as "peace,"

"friendship," "war," and many others are no longer meaningful without rather extensive qualification.

Peace has come to mean, rather than a state of tranquillity amongst nations, a misty goal as legendary as the Seven Cities of Cibola. In terms of relationships between nations, friendship hardly can be recognized as meaning what the dictionary describes as a "mutual regard cherished by kindred minds." "War" must be qualified by the adjectives "hot" and "cold" and the line between tension, strife, and war is illusory.

When Nikita Khrushchev came to this country in 1959 seeking "peace and friendship" he blew up a considerable storm on this "sea of semantic disorder." Freely translated, this is what he meant when he talked of seeking "peace and friendship" with the United States:

I seek a Communist United States of America. Our dogma says capitalism breeds wars. Tear up your capitalistic Constitution, turn Communist, and we'll have peace. One doesn't oppose his friend's desire. We desire to rule the world. Be friendly—stop bucking us.

On another occasion the Red dictator summed up communistic objectives more bluntly and less dialectically in the phrase: "We will bury you."

That is a clearly stated and certain objective, if ever there was one. The clarity with which it can be stated is of obvious value in the day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month, year-to-year selection of techniques and actions to implement it.

MORALITIES

Further, Communist rational places no moral restrictions whatsoever on their selection of these techniques and actions. Starting with the premise that capitalism breeds wars and thus must be rooted out and destroyed to achieve peace—anything, however immoral in and of itself, when used to this end is moral. Lying, cheating, betrayal, murder—the entire list of perfidies—are thus approved weapons in the Communist arsenal, to be used freely whenever, wherever, and however they will implement its objectives.

By way of contrast, our own external objectives basically represent attainment for all mankind those enlightened precepts of morality, freedom, dignity of the individual, inherent human rights, and so on that can hardly be defined other than as: "The best and highest values which Western civilization have to offer."

Because of the inherently nebulous nature of our objectives, they are incapable of precise definition. As a consequence, selection of techniques and actions to implement them can never be accomplished with calculated precision.

And, because of the moral characteristics of these objectives, we are limited in selecting means to implement them which in and of themselves fall within the range of Western civilization's standards for individual and national morality.

The advantage of precise objectives and unlimited choice in means in achieving them is great.

NEGATIVISM

Nor can the advantages of conducting a negative campaign be underestimated. It is always easier to criticise, tear down, and destroy than it is to accomplish constructive action. Watch the way the prosperity issue is handled in political campaigns—it is not so much a positive promise of a chicken in every pot as it is a negative warning of "no chicken in the pot if you elect the other fellow instead of me." Millions of dollars of a certain toothpaste have been sold not on the merits of the product, but upon the demerits of having bad breath. The slogan about "a thinking man's cigarette" is not a postive appeal to the intellectuals—there are too few of them for a mass market—it is a negative warning not to be tagged as stupid for dragging out somebody else's brand.

In short, the contrast between the Communist and the freedom in terms of objectives and techniques and actions to implement them is simply this:

Communism: Clearly defined negative objective. No restriction on techniques and actions for implementation.

Free world: Nebulously defined positive objective. Restrictions on techniques and actions for implementation.

Understanding our problem thus requires recognition that we start out with these unavoidable handicaps:

First, imprecision of objectives; second, to restriction on implementation; third, the extra burden of positiveness.

Although the foregoing handicaps are unavoidable, there are very many courses of cold war action that we are not restricted from taking, should be taking, but, because of our generally fuzzy conception of what we are up against, we are not taking. For example:

CIVIL DEFENSE A COLD WAR WEAPON

Earlier the very substantial Soviet civil defense effort was mentioned. It was estimated to be sufficiently effective to enable them to reduce casualties by 80 percent in case the Soviet homeland suffers attack.

Thus Soviet civil defense constitutes a major dulling of the deterrence capability of our retaliatory bomber and missile strikeback forces. That is, it makes it less costly for the Soviets to initiate war and thus operates as a factor encouraging them to do so. This situation also presents monumental possibilities in connection with nuclear blackmail. This is adequately illustrated by hypothecating a full-scale Soviet civil defense evacuation timed in coordination with an "or else" ultimatum, taken in context of our own daily 5 to 7 p.m. metropolitan area evacuation problems.

Civil defense is thus, in fact, a cold war weapon of equivalent value to say, the DEW line-Pinetree line warning systems and anti-missile missiles. But contrast our "bit-thinking" relative expenditures on civil defense in comparison to these warning systems. Moreover, civil defense is a moral type of action which is not denied to us. Failing to recognize its cold war possibilities, we have almost completely neglected it and given our challenger a decisive advantage on this rampart of the total conflict.

During the hearings in 1959 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy attempted to estimate the effect on the United States should we suffer a surprise nuclear attack totaling 1,500 megatons. It found that 60 million U.S. casualties would result—one-third of our population—48 million killed and 12 million injured. Yet, at the same hearings a Navy scientist testified that simple fallout shelters giving protection against nuclear radiation by a factor of 1,000 can be built at a cost of only $100 per person. These would be sufficient, he estimated, to avoid two out of every three of the hypothecated casualties.

In short, for just 1 year's cost of the U.S. farm subsidy program, $6 billion, shelters could be built that would prevent 40 million surprise attack casualties—avoid 32 million deaths and 8 million injuries. Coupled with workable evacuation procedures, this 66⅔ percent avoidance of casualty rate could well be upped to the 80-percent figure I have estimated for the U.S.S.R. civil defense program.

I leave you to your own speculation how far adrift in the sea of semantic disorder we are when we take civil defense to mean only what the dictionary may define the words to mean. I also leave to your speculation how great a part our reserve forces, marking time in almost every city and hamlet of our country, could play in our total effort; vis-a-vis, the international Communist threat if they were realistically put to work preparing an adequate U.S. civil defense effort.

A good deal of resistance to spending money on civil defense as well as some of the other necessary actions we must take for survival stems from those who argue that thermonuclear war is neither believable nor feasible, so basing any efforts on the possibility of it occurring are senseless. Resistance also comes for others who argue that such a war would be so terribly destructive that we should surrender rather than fight it. In short, they say, "it is better to be Red than dead." It is now my purpose to expose the fallacies of these arguments.

BELIEVABILITY OF THERMONUCLEAR WAR

We may quite agree that thermonuclear war is horrible to contemplate and that every intelligent effort should be made to avoid it. But it is feasible and unless we are willing to submit to nuclear blackmail and capitulate to the Communists, we must so regard it.

This is founded on my earlier mention that the believability of a nation either initiating or accepting the most violent action, unrestricted war, underpins first, the effectiveness of any less violent steps toward implementing national objectives; and second, the capability to resist nuclear or other blackmail.

It is obvious that a less violent degree of action could not succeed in implementing an objective of the U.S.S.R. if the United States knows it can threaten to resist with only one higher degree of violence and thereby cause the U.S.S.R. to back down.

By like token, the United States could never thwart the U.S.S.R.'s implementation of a national objective, say control

of the Mideast, if the U.S.S.R. knows that all it has to engage in is a little blackmail by threatening more heat than we will risk.

Within the recent past: first, the Rockefeller study concluded that the possibility of nuclear war must be faced. Second, hundreds of Russian military books and articles translated by the Pentagon all reveal the U.S.S.R. thinks in such terms as a matter of course. Third, a Johns Hopkins University study for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee warns that the United States is open to nuclear attack. Fourth, Congress appropriated almost $45 billion for national defense, which included substantial amounts for maintaining our own nuclear arsenal operative.

FEASIBILITY OF THERMONUCLEAR WAR

Mathematician Herman Kahn recently completed a 2-year study for the Rand Corp. and concluded that thermonuclear war is feasible.

The facts and assumptions on which Dr. Kahn reached his decision were corroborated fully during our Joint Atomic Committee hearings last year which took several days' testimony from expert witnesses regarding the effect of a hypothecated nuclear attack on the United States followed by our nuclear retaliation against the attacker.

Briefly, the most pertinent thermonuclear war facts are these:

Genetic effects: An increase in children born seriously defective of about 25 percent from the current level of 4 per 100 of all births to 5 per 100. This is a large penalty since it would have to be paid through 30 to 40 generations. But it is far from annihilation.

Medical problems: Bone cancer, leukemia, and other life-shortening effects of internal and external radiation would amount to 1 to 2 years for lighter exposures and 5 to 10 years for heavier exposures. In any case, life will go on.

Economic recuperation: Assuming casualties in the 60 million range and semitotal physical destruction of the 53 standard metropolitan areas, expect full recuperation; that is, restoration of immediate preattack gross national product within 5 to 10 years. This is far from national suicide.

Conclusion: So much for feasibility. It exists, as does believability.

BETTER RED THAN DEAD?

Disposing of the depressingly cowardly and unrealistic "better Red than dead" philosophy requires us to get out of the rut of the 1,500 megaton, mass-destruction Hollywood movie script—congressional hearing's pattern for a moment and think about some other possibilities should the Communists really decide the day has come to push the button.

Hypothecated wars are never fought. No actual war ever has been carried on in the manner previously predicted. Casualty figures are statistics. Statistics always apply to the other fellow, not to you or me. With these truisms in mind, I will indulge in a little hypothecation myself in order to illustrate a means of getting down to an individual, personal answer to the question: Would I be better off Red than dead—or does my survival still depend on the intelligent, effective, and protracted conduct of survival efforts for my free country?

A wholly depopulated, totally destroyed United States would serve only one Communist purpose: Elimination of the opposite pole of a bipolar world and accomplish their one world, a Communist one, objective. But it would be done at the price of denying to them a number of things they could put to advantageous use. Recalling their attribute of whole thinking, we should at least contemplate other possibilities for action they may be considering in their strategic thoughts.

For instance, they could utilize the production of our machine tool factories, our steel furnaces, and certain of our other industrial capacities. All, of course, assuming selected trained slave labor survived to operate them. They do not need our oil or chemical production, for example, but they would be glad to dismantle the undamaged plants and haul them back for use in their own country as they did with so many German factories. I suppose quite an inventory could be made—and probably has been made in the Kremlin—along these lines.

HYPOTHECATED COMMUNIST ATTACK

Assuming so, the Soviet move might well be one calculated to induce surrender with the least possible material damage and personnel casualties, than to go about the business of mass murder and destruction on a selective basis afterward.

It might go something like this:

Strike terror with a few nuclear bombs—the horrors of nuclear war propaganda background already has been laid for that—but forgo the all-out attack. Damage communication facilities as little as possible so that where panic is created, it can be communicated elsewhere and infect other parts of the country. Delve into the unknown, it is always more terrifying than the known. Strange, horrifying and morale cracking nerve gases might be released by infiltrated saboteurs and fifth columnists. Shockingly hideous physical and psychological illnesses might be induced by germ warfare. Avoid destruction of Washington, D.C., so a Government will exist to surrender as panic, terror, and hysteria mount in increasing crescendo to demand it.

Then follow with a military occupation to carry out what, for lack of a better name, I call selective genocide. Genocide is defined as the systematic extermination of whole racial, political, and cultural groups. Here we are dealing with such a systematic extermination as it applies to:

First. Occupational groups which do not contribute to the needs of the Communists;

Second. Nonproductive persons; and

Third. All persons philosophically hostile to the regime.

Selective genocide was carried out ruthlessly in Russia itself when the Communist seized power. It happened in China. It happened in Hungary. It is an accepted Communist power technique and would certainly be used if they took over here.

The pattern is all too clear. In the initial phases they send agents out to stir up resistance movements and march the nonconformists against prepositioned guns and tanks as they did in Budapest. That does a pretty complete, quick, and dirty job of getting rid of most potential antigovernment leadership. They dump the ill, the aged, the insane, all the military and like groups into concentration camps where starvation and disease soon eliminate them. Lawyers, ministers, teachers, farmers always go this way, too, when the Reds take over. No bankers, insurance men, advertising executives, newspapermen, or even file clerks would be required by the Red regime, so they would be exterminated, too. Scientists and engineers could look forward to the same fate suffered by their German counterparts following World War II. Not many slave doctors would be needed either, to tend the few slave laborers left operating plants and facilities of value to the conqueror.

INDIVIDUAL'S SURVIVAL TEST UNDER COMMUNISM

This hypothecation of mass murder could go on and on. I think I have said enough as preface to the proposition that all you need to do to estimate your chance of survival if the Reds ever took over is honestly to answer the questions: Is what I think OK with the Communists? Is what I do any value in a Communist regime?

Think it over.

IF THE REDS TOOK OVER: U.S. CASUALTY ESTIMATES

I have tried estimates for this from population employment statistics, and when you include the family along with the employed person, which you must do, and count about 10 million deaths from the initial bombs, nerve gas, germ warfare, and the like, the total U.S. casualties starts at a low of around 60 million and runs as high as 100 million dead within 12 months following a Red takeover.

Americans have a personal stake in this thing all right—it is their lives. Even if the Communists took over without firing a shot, there still would not be a choice between being "Red" or "dead." The sooner we understand it the better. The price tag on surrender in terms of lives, freedom, and every other way is much greater than the price tag on fighting and winning the protracted conflict.

But, say some, there is a third alternative to fighting or surrender that is open to us and should be used. It is the alternative of negotiation. We should negotiate out our differences with the Communists. It is true that ordinary negotiation is a third alternative. But only in instances where both sides are willing to negotiate, willing to forgo some of their demands as a price for peaceful settlement, and willing to keep the promises made. Although Communists are willing to negotiate, they are seldom willing to negotiate at any cost which involves forgoing their ultimate goal of world domination. In fact, they have, since the beginning, pursued a calculated course of insincere negotiation wherever it would forward that goal.

This is not to say that no negotiation at all is possible, but to warn that only is it possible in those limited cases where some factor in addition to good faith alone is present to compel Communists to keep their treaty promises.

TREATY VIOLATION

Summed up masterfully by the distinguished international lawyer, Adm. Chester Ward, the Communist philosophy on treaties is this:

> Communist dogma insists that promises, like piecrust, are made to be broken. Whom the Communists would destroy, they first invite to coexist, and offer a nonaggression pact.

In its 40-year history, the Soviet Union has signed over 2,000 agreements with non-Communist governments. It is safe to say that those remaining unbroken by the Kremlin are only those which expediency has not yet dictated the breaking. Last summer I prepared an illustrative table of only some of the more important of these treaty violations. It took six legal size, single-spaced pages to list them. If nothing else, it indicates the order of magnitude of treaty violations as a device for Communist aggrandizement.

Treaty violation, as practiced by the Communists, has two facets:

First. The conventional breach of existing treaties whenever, because of changed circumstances, they no longer serve its current purpose; and

Second. The more Machiavellian practice of deliberately seeking treaties involving immediate concessions by the non-Communist signatory in exchange for delayed Communist concessions which are subsequently avoided by formal or informal treaty violation at time performance is called for.

Such Communist diplomatic perfidy is a regrettable fact of international life that cannot safely be ignored. It must be recognized as a dangerous pitfall in any and all negotiations between East and West. It must be accepted as a limitation on talks, conferences, and negotiations as a means toward achieving a stable world order, based on respect for, and conformity with, international law.

Realistically citing the demonstrated disregard by the Communists of their pledges as one of the greatest obstacles to success in substituting the rule of law for rule by force, former President Eisenhower declared a basic rule for Western self-preservation in his 1959 State of the Union message by saying:

> We have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are regarded in Communist doctrine and in practice to be mere scraps of paper. As a consequence, we can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms.

The inspection—self-enforcement procedures Eisenhower called for are necessary because the process of negotiation and agreement inherently involves concessions. Unless matched by equivalent Communist bloc concessions any Western concessions can represent only steps away from, not toward, the goal of successful conclusion of the protracted conflict for they would constitute a further whittling away of an already weakened Western position.

Equivalency, however, is not measured by the paper magnitude of mutual concessions. Concessions by the Soviet bloc must be self-enforcing upon them. Unless this is so, they will never be honored to the impediment of the advancement of international communism. The quid pro quo of the agreement's words is an illusion without this inherent safeguard. Without it, no agreement "relaxing tensions" as a "first step" toward peace, as the emotional agreement goes, is a step toward peace as the West understands it. It is a step toward peace as the Hungarian freedom fighters were savagely taught it.

INTERNATIONAL LAW CONCEPTS CONTRASTED

As the West understands it, the solemn observance of international obligations is the backbone of international law and underlies settlement of differences between nations without resort to war. As the Communists understand it, the timely breach of international obligations is simply another expedient weapon in their protracted conflict arsenal, and international law is only a "shell game" for playing on a worldwide scale.

This is the basis of Stalin's observation regarding relations with non-Communist countries that:

> Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

And from the standpoint of Western concepts of morality, it is the basis for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's evaluation:

> You must be a liar, a cheat, and probably a spy before you can represent a Communist nation in international diplomacy. You must have no more regard for honor when you sign an agreement on behalf of your country than a forger does when he puts a name on a check.

Communist contempt for international law and decency is the theoretical and practical basis on which Red Army commissars, despite promise of safe conduct, arrested and executed the leaders of the Hungarian revolution while ostensibly negotiating an armistice.

NEGATORY PROPAGANDA

With the Hungarian example in mind, we reach a point where negatory propaganda can be defined and illustrated using the nuclear-test-ban issue as an example.

By negatory propaganda I seek to describe a technique aimed at negating use by your opponent of a device or weapon of value to him by propaganda aimed at creating such intense public opinion against its use, that it is in fact denied or negated.

BAN THE BOMB

For a period following 1945 the United States, only, possessed nuclear capacity. We had a weapon which could overcome the Communist bloc's great military superiority in terms of conventional arms and armaments. As a consequence, to deny us use of the weapon, and thus the superiority, the Kremlin and Red agents everywhere propagandized the world on the alleged horrors which would stem from use of the weapons. Many well-intentioned non-Communists became inadvertent allies of the Communists by taking up the ban-the-bomb hue and cry. The propaganda did, in fact, negate our use of nuclear weapons in Korea. This cost us dearly in both lives and effort.

The Communists adopted a two-step technique by directing major propaganda efforts first against nuclear testing. Strontium-90 was made a household word and its terribly crippling effects milked right down inside the tender bones of newborn babes suckling at their mothers' breasts. All to the end of banning tests of the bomb because that is too horrible, and then, when that is accomplished ban the bombs themselves with the argument: "If they are too horrible to test, they are too horrible to use.

But while feverishly denouncing nuclear weapons, the Soviets mounted a massive effort to achieve them. They did so by the early 1950's. This did not change their line or alter their efforts, however, because denial to the West of the use of nuclear weapons still is still an obvious way to tilt the balance of power to their direction.

Their gigantic propaganda campaign raged on with consummate skill right up until the recent moment when it became more advantageous to them to torpedo the Geneva A-test ban talks and resume atmospheric testing than it was to keep the talks going and stall us from improving our own defensive weapons stockpile. Revelation to the world of their total hypocrisy by firing off a series of tests—obviously in long preparation under cloak of the Geneva talks—was a small price to pay for the advantages they gain thereby.

An obvious advantage is the jump it will give the Soviets over the West in nuclear weaponry. A less obvious, but perhaps greater advantage calculated by Kremlin minds is nuclear blackmail in connection with the Berlin crisis. Coupled with the already high tensions generated by Berlin, "terror talk" of a 100-megaton super-bomb plus new fallout in the atmosphere is supposed to generate such hysteria in the world that concessions to the Reds will come out of negotiations over the issue.

Aside from the quite apparent fact that the only way to handle blackmail is to resist it and the only way to surmount a bluff is to call it, there is a more basic lesson we must learn from the 2½-year test-ban fiasco. It is: The moral issue is not the type of weapons which the free nations must stock in their arsenals to preserve freedom and the rich heritage of Western civilization. The issue is: The morality of stripping those arsenals, imperiling that civilization and relegating its millions of souls to mass murder or to the slavery of the communes.

Whether we surrender in one lump sum or are propagandized and blackmailed into it on the installment plan, the result is the same.

FREE WORLD PROPAGANDA

There are many who observe these Communist propaganda efforts, their successes, and say if only we spent more money on our own propaganda overseas

they could be turned back. True, our efforts can and should be stepped up. But we must accept the fact that our own propaganda efforts cannot, in the short term at least, produce results as impressive as theirs simply because theirs is based on lies, exaggerations and deceptions rather than upon truth. Truth is by far the greater power, but by far the more difficult and time consuming to propagate. The standards of morality by which we must gage our actions limits us to the truth.

Further, as to areas behind the Iron Curtain, we are under additional handicaps to the transmission of information. First, the Iron Curtain blocks communication in both directions. Second, neither world public opinion nor internal public opinion is an appreciable factor in the decisionmaking process of the Communist masters. Third, even if you overcome physical barriers to communication with people behind the Iron Curtain, there is still a psychological barrier to surmount. It stems from the fact that most of the population has come to adulthood since communism took over. large gaps in public understanding and knowledge exist which cannot be spanned by the kind of appeals effective with Western minds. Their policy of brainwashing from birth to death often has so twisted truth and history that counterappeals must be developed from that specialized frame of reference.

A personal illustration concerning this last statement: While in Russia in 1959 I attempted to discuss the brutalities committed by the Red army in Hungary. No Russian ever heard of them, nor would any believe what I said. Yet all would tell you for hours how the "brutal, beastial, U.S. Marines aggressed against the defenseless people of Lebanon at the behest of Wall Street millionaires." They also told me again and again that the United States was blocking a nuclear test ban treaty by demanding that it include inspection and inforcement procedures to insure compliance. "The U.S.S.R.," they told me with straight faces,' "always lives up to its treaties."

SUBVERSION

Subversion is one of communism's most potent cold war techniques and is practiced all the time, everywhere. What we must keep in mind is that it is only one of many techniques, however. Nor is it even as potent a weapon for the Communists, within the United States, at least, as our own general lack of understanding of what they want and how they are going about getting it. I recently suggested that the President order a good course on "Communism and How To Fight It" prepared and taught to every person in Government from himself on down. Passing the course would be required before any Government employee could draw his paycheck. The course would also be available to the public generally. This step alone would obviate a necessity many have suggested for investigating the State Department or any other Department of Government—where in my belief ignorance is a hundred times more responsible for the inept conduct of our defense against communism than are subversion and disloyalty. This ruthless, resourceful determined enemy cannot be combatted effectively unless Americans know its true identity and understand the way it fights.

LATIN AMERICA

The real danger from subversion is in less developed areas, Latin America, for instance, where communism is attempting to leapfrog the Atlantic and take over countries both by infiltration of existing governments and by seizing control of liberal revolutionary movements. Each year hundreds of Latins receive revolutionary training in Moscow and are sent back to work ceaselessly to replace lawful government with regimes dominated and controlled by international communism. In connection with Cuba in particular and Latin America in general the following seven-point program is suggested:

First. Take a firm stand against Communist expansion, then tell and show the world we mean what we say—that the Monroe Doctrine is not dead.

Second. Declare the Western Hemisphere to be a peace zone, and tell the world we mean to keep it that way through use of national power, if necessary.

Third. Declare all Communist war material, including fuel, as contraband and prohibit its shipment into the peace zone.

Fourth. Use national power to send back, jettison, or seize all contraband sent into the peace zone.

Fifth. Adopt as U.S. policy the ousting of Castro's Communist dictatorship from Cuba, and enlist active support from anti-Castro and anti-Communist forces in Latin America to help us get the job done.

Sixth. Develop and expedite a tailor-made information program for our hemisphere which makes it clear that we will not tolerate guerrilla invasions and power seizures of Latin American countries by Cuban or other Communist forces, or Communist expansion of any kind.

Seventh. Use our national power to the extent and in the manner required to free the Cuban people and give them the right of self-determination.

In order to implement the first four points mentioned above I have introduced House Joint Resolution 524, declaring Communist arms and munitions contraband in the Western Hemisphere and making provisions to enforce the same.

ORGANIZATION FOR HOT WAR

Our present military structure—Army, Navy, Air Force—coordinated at the Department of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff level, represents an effective overall organization for waging hot war. Because of its effectiveness it actually deters hot war. Our military leaders are skilled and knowledgeable. They do the best possible job with the hardware and forces at their command.

I do not agree with Maj. Alexander de Seversky's contention that the services should be merged and overriding emphasis placed on airpower for delivery of massive nuclear destruction. That would limit us to a choice between nuclear holocaust and surrender—an inherently hopeless set of alternatives which would merely afford the "better Red than dead" propagandists more chance to spread their poison. With properly balanced military forces we can control and deter all-out nuclear war. Then, with proper organization for nonmilitary war—cold war—we can achieve victories instead of defeats in this area.

ORGANIZATION FOR COLD WAR

But, in contrast to our splendid organization for hot war, we are almost totally unorganized to wage and win cold war.

It would be madness to attempt to fight a military war without national strategy, without a top-level command, without war plans, without offenses and planned defenses, without mobilizing the national effort and without appealing to the patriotism of our people to work, to sacrifice, and to win. Yet, without any of these things, we are engaged in a new, strange, and deadly kind of war which we are not winning. It is our clear duty to establish the organization we need to fight this kind of war, to mobilize our people and our resources, and to embark on the long, difficult road toward victory.

This effort involves economics, diplomacy, intelligence, science, psychology—all the phases of human activity short of military operations between major powers. The effort required goes far beyond the State Department or any other department of Government—far beyond the formal government even—it sweeps across our whole society.

The President alone has the broad power and control over the wide range of functions which must be organized, carried on, timed, coordinated and pushed to overall success to meet the enemy and overcome it. At the top, with the President's daily attention, must be the national nerve center and command post. Call it the Strategic and Tactical Office of the President—Stop. Here at Comstop, in the White House itself, stopping communism must be a 24-hour-a-day operation for as long as it takes to win.

Here are just a few of the activities that must feed to and from Comstop:

National strategy and tactics, military and nonmilitary strategy and tactics, intelligence, political operations, diplomatic moves, labor and industrial mobilization, economic operations, finance, agricultural and commercial functions, covert and overt international operations, cover and deception, informational and cultural programs, ideological positions, psychological warfare, military liaison, posture evaluation and a host of others.

All these operations must be tied together constantly—orchestrated like a symphony. Each must be run by managers who are themselves knowledgeable in the political, strategic, and psychological nuances of nonmilitary war. Command of these activities requires as great a skill as military command. We must quickly train in our universities and elsewhere the knowledgeable Amer-

icans needed to officer and man this fourth force in our defense.

It should be reemphasized that Comstop must not only defend against actions the Soviets mount in what they regard as the war zone, but must, if we are ever to win, carry the fight into their peace zone. Within the Communist empire are countless areas of weakness and possible internal strife. Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff in urging former President Eisenhower to wage cold war and turn Moscow's own weapons against world communism said: "Our potential fifth column is greater by millions than the enemy's."

CONCLUSION

Concluding a discussion of this nature and extent by attempting a summary would be futile. I have given little more than a skeleton outline of the dangers we face and what we must do to surmount them. So I will reiterate only that we must constantly deter hot war by being capable of fighting and winning it, if necessary, and we must declare the nonmilitary war and mobilize all our physical and material resources to win it.

All this will take the highest and best our generation of Americans has to offer its country. Let us take faith from the courage and wisdom of the men who founded our country and made her great. If we, today, but possess equal courage and wisdom—and I firmly believe we do—there is no domestic problem we cannot solve nor foreign force we need ever fear.

Secretary Freeman Lays It on the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, the Dairy Record carried a forthright editorial on Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's stand on my national milk sanitation bill. The Dairy Record is well known as a fair and impartial spokesman for the dairy industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD:

FREEMAN LAYS IT ON THE LINE

To his everlasting credit, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman cast political caution to the winds when he testified on the national milk sanitation bill before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He laid it coldly on the line that the legislation would eliminate the opportunity to misuse milk sanitation programs as economic trade barriers, and he stated that there is considerable evidence indicating that the milk sanitation regulations of many States and municipalities frequently are used to obstruct the movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce.

Secretary Freeman did not sidestep the issue; rather he met it head on and forthrightly told members of the committee that the old arguments used by opponents of the measure that their milk sanitation requirements are far more strict than the model milk ordinance and code adopted by the U.S. Public Health Service are not substantiated by the facts. He pointed out that 36 States and over 1,900 local jurisdictions, including a number of large cities, have regulations which are based on the model code.

As proof he submitted a comparison of requirements set up in the code and those of several States where producer organizations have been most vociferous in their opposition to the Milk Sanitation Act.

In New York State, for example, where producer organizations in a tizzy of self-righteous indignation have placed themselves on a quality pedestal, the milk laws generally follow the basic requirements of the USPHS code although two-compartment wash vats, hand washing facilities and bacterial rinsing of milkers' hands are not required as they are in the model code. Neither do the New York regulations include many requirements which the USPHS considers necessary for pasteurization and protection of milk from contamination. The New York laws do not require easily cleanable construction of walls and floors, effective screening during fly season or a separate receiving room for raw milk. The code is quite specific on these requirements. The bacterial counts specified in the New York regulations for raw milk and pasteurized milk are identical with those of the code.

The New York law requires that farms and plants be inspected by industry initially and at least annually thereafter. Samples of raw and pasteurized milk are required to be obtained and examined by the processor at intervals of not more than 3 months. In contrast, the USPHS code requires at least one inspection of each farm and each plant every 6 months with followups on violations. Laboratory examination is to be performed at a minimum frequency of at least four samples every 6 months and in the case or raw milk, industry inspection and laboratory examinations are only supplementary to official inspections and examinations.

New Jersey is another State that has been rather haughty concerning its stiff requirements. Yet, the New Jersey laws do not include regulations covering requirements for indicating and recording thermometers, leak protector inlet and outlet valves on pasteurization vats and stops on pasteurization vat outlet valves. The bacterial standard for raw milk for pasteurization is 150,000 per milliliter for producers shipping in cans and 50,000 per millilieter for those using bulk tanks. The USPHS code specializes 200,000 per milliliter for raw milk. The New Jersey bacterial standard for pasteurized milk is identical with the model code or in other words, 30,000 per milliliter when delivered to the consumer. The New Jersey regulations do not specify the frequency of inspection of producer facilities and milk plants. Neither are there specific requirements as to the frequency of laboratory examinations.

The Secretary stated unequivocally that there is considerable evidence that indicates that milk sanitation regulations of States and municipalities "frequently are used to obstruct the movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce." He went even further and pointed out that the claim made by opponents of the Milk Sanitation Act that a number of States have higher sanitation standards than those recommended by the USPHS is not supported by the facts and that actually the health of consumers of milk will be more effectively protected if the legislation is passed.

Secretary Freeman presented a strong case for the bill. In view of his testimony and the endorsement and backing of the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the conference of State Sanitary Engineers and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, it is hard to understand how the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House can do anything else but approve the Sanitation Act with a recommendation of passage. If it does not take such action, one can only conclude that politics are paramount and are more important than the public welfare.

Resolution Adopted by the Department of Michigan, Polish Legion of American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I would like at this time to introduced into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of resolutions adopted by the Department of Michigan, Polish Legion of American Veterans, at their 27th biennial State convention.

In these perilous times, it is gratifying to have such an expression of confidence in the Government by men who, along with many of the Members of this body, have been through the horrors of war.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF MICHIGAN, AT THE 27TH BIENNIAL STATE CONVENTION, HOTEL BANCROFT, SAGINAW, MICH., SEPTEMBER 4, 1961

1. We express our appreciation and gratitude to the city of Saginaw, its mayor, police department, and all its officials for their warm and friendly hospitality which contributed to the success of our convention.

2. We are grateful to Rev. Father Michael Kujawa, pastor, Holy Rosary Church, for the spiritual guidance which he gave our convention.

3. We condemn the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere by the Soviet Union because this is a war against all humanity, and we fear that the resumption of these tests by the Soviet Union may mean a new armament race between the Western World and the Communist bloc. However, we, as veterans who have fought with arms and have seen our comrades make the supreme sacrifice for freedom and the defense of liberty in past wars, hereby urge the Government of the United States, through the courageous leadership of its President, John F. Kennedy, not to relinquish the position of leadership which the United States has in the entire world. We urge your Government to continue to develop new weapons. We declare ourselves prepared to pay for the weapons of war, both conventional and atomic, because they are so necessary for the guarantee of our freedom.

We know full well that the only deterrent to full-scale war is the United States' stockpile of atomic weapons. As long as we hold this position of supremacy, Russia hesitates to declare full-scale war on the United States. We are in accord with the position taken by President Kennedy that there can be no nuclear disarmament without adequate inspection. There must never be any disarmament on the part of the United States as long as Communism exists. Disarmament on the part of the United States would only lead to the Chinese Communists beating us to death with plow shares; this must never be allowed to happen.

We urge that the United States safeguard future nuclear weapons testing by conducting these tests underground or in some manner so as to prevent nuclear fallout.

4. We reaffirm our support of our great President, John F. Kennedy, and through this resolution confirm the action of our State commander, Bernard V. Dozek, taken in May 1961, wherein he expressed our admiration of President Kennedy and his heroic and courageous administration.

5. We are grateful that President Kennedy saw fit to appoint the Honorable THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, a charter member of this organization, to the U.S. district court at Detroit, Mich.

6. As Americans of Polish descent, we are mindful of our obligation to the United States of America and its fine institutions, and we pledge ourselves to fight for their preservation; nevertheless we are mindful of a duty to our brothers in Poland who are behind the Iron Curtain through no fault of their own. Therefore, we ask that the United States continue help to the people of Poland, as distinguished from its government, in order that our unfortunate brothers may not lose all hope of ever regaining liberty and freedom.

7. We, the members of the Polish Legion of American Veterans in Michigan, thank our commander, Bernard V. Dozek, for his leadership of our organization during the past 4 years. His administration was a success because of his energy, courage, diligence, and perservance. At the cost of great personal sacrifice to him, our organization has prospered and grown.

8. The chairman of the resolutions committee is directed to furnish copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Michigan delegation to Congress, and such other persons as may be interested.

Respectfully submitted.

Judge BENJAMIN C. STANCZYK,
Chairman.

EDWARD MICHALSKI.
CHESTER WIERZBINSKI.
LARRY EVANS.
JOHN PTASZKIEWICZ.

A Diplomat Should Be a Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, from the New York Herald Tribune of September 9, indicates that just because a diplomat comes from Africa he has no right to misbehave. If the new nations of the world which have recently acquired independence send representatives like the recent delegate from Guinea, it would be reasonable for other nations to assume that some of their diplomats have not come of diplomatic age:

THE ASSAULTED MAN WHO'S NO LONGER HERE

Guinea's sudden move to spirit United Nations Delegate Michel Collet out of the country might be taken as a tacit admission that the Guinean Ambassador had told less than the truth about Mr. Collet's scuffle with police. But enough damage has been done for the case still to leave a sour taste in the mouth, and to call for a more forthright apology.

A foreign diplomat who rams a taxi, slugs the driver and then brawls with police is fully entitled to diplomatic immunity, as a legal matter, but not to sympathy. Such immunity is a necessary tradition of long standing, without which the conduct of diplomatic affairs would be subject to unconscionable hazards. But it places certain moral and practical obligations on those entitled to claim it—including a readiness on the part of each nation to discipline its own envoys when they commit gross breaches of the peace.

Guinea's U.N. Ambassador Diallo Telli compounded Mr. Collet's offense with unwarranted attacks on the United States and on the New York police. His charge that the incident "manifestly had aspects of racial discrimination" and was akin to a lynching (merely because the three men Mr. Collet fought happened to be white) itself quite manifestly had aspects of scurrilous mischief-making.

If the police had knowingly and without provocation—as Ambassador Diallo charged—beaten up an African or any other U.N. delegate, it would have been one of the most thundering cases of police misbehavior in New York's history.

A police investigation, upheld by both Mayor Wagner and Ambassador Stevenson, absolved the policemen involved of any misbehavior. When Mr. Collet finally identified himself, at the station house, he was immediately granted immunity and released. Yet the Afro-Asians, assembled in special conclave, listened to Mr. Diallo's patent absurdities and unblinkingly condemned the "brutal assault" on Mr. Collet, calling it the "latest in a series of incidents involving humiliation, indignity and racial discrimination against Afro-Asian diplomats which have been occurring in recent months."

Mr. Collet's case is hardly one for talk about dignity, except perhaps for a lecture on what it consists of. As for discrimination, the witnesses to the affray—all Negroes—unanimously sided with the police.

If the Afro-Asians would lay their own prejudices aside long enough to look at the facts, they themselves might be first to condemn Mr. Diallo not only for abuse of diplomatic immunity, but for involving their collective dignities in a cheap and unworthy cause.

We Are Missing the Boat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the article by Marguerite Higgins, in today's New York Herald Tribune, shows how we are failing to use the cold war weapons at our disposal, in our problem in Berlin. Of what use are token additional troops sent to that trouble spot unless the United States shows the fortitude and single-mindedness of purpose that is needed but so far lacking in President Kennedy:

TENSION, PLEASE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—In a recent interview with the British Ambassador in Moscow, Premier Khrushchev, in his new role as a master statistician of international terror, declared: "We have it all figured out, you know. It will take eight nuclear bombs—pardon, my mistake—nine nuclear bombs to demolish all of England."

Hence it came as an infuriation, but not as a surprise, when Premier Khrushchev last week blatantly pictured England (and France and Italy) as "hostages to me" because their fear of annihilation would, he claimed, cause them to betray the alliance rather than fight, if the chips were down.

So far, in this and similar rocketrattling, Mr. Khrushchev has achieved an enviable code whereby one man's warning is another man's provocation. In any case in this latest instance no Western power has risked being "provocative" to the point of enunciating any counter truths to Mr. Khrushchev's "warnings."

Even so, there are times when a little reverse rocket rattling appears essential if only to keep Mr. Khrushchev from getting away with the lopsided picture of relative nuclear strength with which he tries to overwhelm the weak and paralyze the strong.

And the truth is that if England and France and Italy are hostages to the Soviet Union in the sense of being vulnerable to atomic devastation, then in the reverse sense Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, East Europe, China, and Russia itself are hostages to the United States, which has the power to devastate every populated area throughout the Communist bloc. When the Red Chinese, for instance, declare that they do not fear war because, out of a population of 600 million, at least 300 million would survive, they are talking nonsense born of ignorance of nuclear arithmetic. The number of Red Chinese surviving a nuclear attack would under present circumstances depend on the selectivity of the United States as to the numbers of targets hit and the types of weapons used. And there is no shortage of big American bombs capable of doing to the Communist bloc precisely as much damage as Khrushchev threatens to wreak on England, Italy, and France.

The game Mr. Khrushchev is playing with his "hostages" talk is obvious, if it is remembered that he professes to believe that America is afraid of ever going it alone in matters of war and peace or even foreign policy.

This is a dangerous assumption for Mr. Khrushchev to be permitted. Hitler made the same sort of error when he thought England would not go it alone after its European allies were overwhelmed.

No responsible American is ready to admit, of course, the slightest doubt about the will of the European allies to live up to their promises to resist further Communist encroachments on Berlin or anywhere else. But it is important to make clear to the Communists that in the unlikely event that any ally should welsh on its responsibilities, it would be a miscalculation to expect the Americans to do the same. It should be made plain that an allied defection would never be tantamount to the paralysis of America and that we would indeed "go it alone," reluctantly but steadfastly, to live up to our word in such places as Berlin.

In any case, the pain truth is that the overwhelming brunt of any resistance of Mr. Khrushchev's European ambitions would have to be borne by Americans plus West German power. The French have been a tower of strength in the war of nerves with the Russians, but their contributions to NATO are handicapped by the continuation of the war in Algeria. Since Berlin, the British, Danes, Belgians, etc., have made only token gestures to increase their overall military strength. Whatever the allies do, America alone is capable of wreaking on Russia the same type of damage that Mr. Khrushchev threatens for others.

Mr. Khrushchev's new all-out campaign of terror and tension might additionally be slowed somewhat if he were persistently reminded that many people behind his Iron

Curtain are hostage not only to the West's nuclear might but to the West's ideological pull.

Why was it that in Berlin during the recent crisis every single East Berlin policeman had to be yanked out of the city and be replaced by young East Germans from faraway provinces like Saxony? Why is it that there have been defections even in the ranks of these replacements who are largely ignorant of the situation and, more important, new to the terrain? If the Communists can't trust their police in the time of a hot peace, how could they trust them in the turmoil of a hot war?

Certainly, as the Communists charge, free West Berlin is a hornets' nest. But the hornets are on our side—and the West must never forget what an advantage this is. And the truth is that there are a lot more hornets on our side everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. If Mr. Khrushchev carries his brinkmanship much further, he is likely to stir them up.

"Red Exposé"—Editorial Appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner, Los Angeles, Calif., on Friday, September 1, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of an editorial in the Los Angeles Examiner for Friday, September 1, 1961. In connection therewith, I will say that during, and since, the closing of the school mentioned in this editorial, I have received literally dozens of letters from American citizens in my Congressional District, and in nearby Congressional Districts, asserting their determination to do all posible to protect our internal security against subversive communism and also to support and strengthen the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

RED EXPOSÉ

Capacity crowds which attend the Los Angeles sessions of the Southern California School of Anticommunism eloquently attest to the thoughtful determination of patriotic citizens to realize the nature and intentions of a universal enemy.

The event has surpassed all expectations of success.

It has presented a group of distinguished authorities who exposed the Marxian conspiracy as calmly and minutely as scientists dissecting a deep-sea monster.

They refuted with scholarly precision the superficial appeals with which the oldest form of tyranny baits a trap for the ignorant and the unwary.

One after the other, political experts, social philosophers, criminal investigators and military strategists drew on their experience and knowledge to confirm with logic the natural repugnance of a free nation to the modern version of total slavery.

It is a tribute to the quality of the Los Angeles audiences that their attention and response were immediate.

Altogether the sessions supplied the facts and aroused the resolution to meet them, an attitude that has always sustained Americans in every crisis.

The tremendous Los Angeles success of the School of Anticommunism now gives promise of its extension to other metropolitan centers. We hope this is done, for this invaluable service should be available to all Americans.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman Gives Unqualified Support to National Milk Sanitation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the September 6, 1961, Dairy Record, which tells about Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's favorable stand on my national milk sanitation bill:

KILLS RUMORS THAT HE WOULD OFFER WEAKENED ALTERNATE PROPOSAL TO PLACATE EAST

WASHINGTON.—Rumors were finally set to rest that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman would suggest an alternate proposal when he appeared before the House Interstate Commerce Committee last week when he came out unequivocally in favor of the National Milk Sanitation Act.

He did not hedge his statements; rather, he laid it squarely on the line that he favored passage of the bill. Secretary Freeman stated "After a long and careful study, it is our conclusion that the legislation before the committee will serve the purpose of providing maximum protection of the public health at the lowest possible cost to the farmers and to processors and distributors of milk, and thus to consumers as well. Therefore, we urge its enactment into law."

It is the first time that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has come out in favor of the Milk Sanitation Act.

HAS BACKING OF KENNEDY

Questioned by Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, of California, whether the stand taken by him was shared by President John F. Kennedy, Secretary Freeman pointed out that as Secretary of Agriculture in the cabinet of President Kennedy was evidence to show that his stand had the support of the President.

The Secretary upheld the adequacy of the U.S. Public Health Service model code, and he pointed out that supporting the measure were the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the American Public Health Association, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and many individual scientists of national repute.

CAREFUL CONSIDERATION

He declared that the USDA had given careful consideration to the claim made by opponents of the bill that a number of States have higher milk sanitation standards than those recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service. He released a report made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which the regulations of certain States and the model milk code are compared, and he asserted that the report leads to the conclusion that the claim made by the opponents is not supported by facts. It was also his stated opinion that the health of consumers will be more effectively protected if the legislation is passed.

Adoption of the legislation, the Secretary pointed out, also will eliminate the opportunity to misuse sanitation programs as economic trade barriers. He stated that there is considerable evidence to indicate that milk sanitation regulations of States and municipalities are used frequently to obstruct the movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce.

QUOTES MARKETING REPORT

As a basis for his argument, he quoted the 1955 Marketing Research Report No. 98 prepared by the Agriculture Marketing Service that stated: "By far the most common policy standing in the way of free movement of milk was the refusal of given jurisdiction to accept milk produced or handled under the supervision of other jurisdictions having substantially equivalent sanitary standards."

Fears of milk producers in areas that passage of the Milk Sanitation Act might result in a reduction in price were held to be unjustified by Secretary Freeman who declared that the cost of transporting milk and the preference of plants for nearby milk supplies will continue to be legitimate economic factors protecting milk producers in high production cost areas.

COMPARISONS MADE

Comparisons made by the Public Health Service were entered into record. The States included Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee, North Dakota, and California and the Secretary pointed out that all but five are in the Northeast.

The comparison made by the USPHS with Pennsylvania regulations brought an immediate statement from William L. Henning, secretary of agriculture of that State. The Pennsylvania regulations were criticized by the report for not being more specific and Secretary Henning denied that such was the case. He also added that the Northeastern States have opposed the milk sanitation bill on the grounds that it would supersede all State control of milk supplies.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suppose that a good many people become discouraged, as I do at times, at attitudes and positions taken by some of our fellow citizens who constantly seem to be apologizing for our country or who seem to be ashamed over a demonstration of honest-to-goodness, old-fashioned patriotism.

Happily, I do not believe such expressions reflect the depth of feeling of most Americans, and it is a pleasure to call to attention an editorial which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Black Hills Press, published in Sturgis, S. Dak.

The editorial was written by Mr. Robert Lee, the editor of the paper, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET 'EM WAVE

We heard a couple of patriotic speeches the other day, and we were deeply impressed by them.

We liked them for many reasons—and not just because many things were said that needed saying. The speeches were given before the local Rotary Club by George Moses and Joe Monroe of Rapid City. They are members of the Rapid City Chamber of Commerce's speaker bureau and their mission was to alert the local Rotarians to the Communist conspiracy. They did a very effective job of it too.

Most of us recognize that the Communists have never deviated from their publicly announced objective of eventual world conquest—by peaceful means if possible, by war if necessary. The pattern has been followed from Lenin to Khrushchev, and there has been no indications that it will ever change. Yet, too many of us fail to comprehend and we seem impotent to counteract this conspiracy that threatens to engulf us as it has so many other countries of the world.

What we liked most about these two speeches was that they were truly patriotic addresses—something you don't hear very often any more. There was talk about the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bible and the free enterprise system—the cornerstones of America's meteoric rise to prominence among the nations of the world. It was refreshing to hear somebody actually boast about our capitalistic system for a change. It thrilled us to hear somebody challenge the American people to wake up to the dangers confronting our priceless heritage just as our founding fathers must have aroused patriotic fervor in our forefathers.

It was flag waving at its best, and we say there is need for far more of it. There have been too many apologists for our economic system and our hard-won heritage. We agree with the speakers who said that Americans who want to trade our heritage for the kind of economic system that has led nation after nation to ruin are either Communists or plain stupid. The lessons of history are plain—if we will but read and comprehend.

We also agreed with the speakers when they pointed out that capitalism and communism cannot peacefully coexist as long as world conquest remains the objective of the Communists. We have seen no evidence to indicate a departure from this long-range goal of the Communists. In fact, there is ample evidence they are sticking to it with fervent tenacity.

Our capitalistic system, based on the principle of freedom of individual opportunity, has given us the highest standard of living in the world. Our gross national product, the value of all goods produced, exceeds that of every other country of the world. The most socialistic countries—and even the Communists with their slave labor camps and collectivism—have failed to match the productive power of the free enterprise capitalistic system.

In fact, our capitalistic system has brought us so many benefits that we can be generous in sharing them with countries whose own economic systems have relegated them to a beggar status. Many of them have accepted our extensive foreign aid while remaining critical of the system which has enabled us to extend it, despite the fact that their own system has failed to stand the test. But the poor have always been jealous of the rich, regardless of the merits of the wealth, and it will probably ever be thus.

SPIRITUALLY STRONG

While achieving this pinnacle of prominence among the nations of the world, America has retained its spiritual strength by continuing its faith in a power mightier than men and governments of men. America is a materialistic nation, but our spiritual values have been the motivating force for all the good that has been accomplished under our way of life.

We have rejected socialism and the welfare state because we recognize that in the long run they don't really help anybody. It was Lincoln who said, "You don't help the poor by destroying the rich," and that principle is as true today as when the great humanitarian coined the phrase. Yet, there are those in the country today who would junk the time-tested capitalistic system for the discredited socialistic form of government which has enabled the Communists to gobble up country after country.

If we need any proof that socialism and the welfare state is the harbinger of communism, there is ample evidence in the tragic decline of numerous countries. Unfortunately, there are people in America today who advocate the path that has led to ruin for these other countries. They would shelve the principles of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the free enterprise system, and—yes, even the Bible—as old-fashioned and not applicable to our times.

But we say these principles will never become old-fashioned—that our Nation will follow these others to ruination only when we abandon them. We go along with Lenin who said that America will fall from within—if we let it. We must not let it happen.

But, to prevent it, we need modern patriots—citizens who will proudly wave the flag and rally us to it.

One speaker commented that the side which will win this historic struggle will not necessarily be the side that is morally right—but rather the side with the most dedicated followers. No truer statement was ever uttered. We know the Communists have many dedicated zealots. We need to counter with dedicated fighters for the capitalistic cause.

Our heritage was handed to us; now we've got to earn the right to keep it.

We congratulate the Rapid City speakers and the chamber of commerce there for reminding us of the need for eternal vigilance and courageous, patriotic action against the forces that would bury us. The threat is a very real one and it's high time we realized it.

The Rapid City speakers suggested that individuals can best combat the Communist conspiracy by learning all they possibly can about Communist objectives, methods, and strategy, and then standing up to vigorously defend our own capitalistic system against all challengers. We have much to crow about if we are patriotic enough to do it.

If that be flag waving, make the most of it.

Education or Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while human beings, wherever you find them, have certain basic and similar characteristics, their ideas and attitudes can be influenced and molded by education. We hear a great deal about the progress in education in the Soviet Union and it is apparent that they have made strides in the field of science. It should also be remembered that the education of the young people in Russia is a state-controlled program and is used by those in control of the Government, who are all dedicated Communists to further the acceptance of the Communist philosophy. It is worth noting that while progress in the field of science has been made, it is very apparent that the socialistic philosophy, when applied to the production of basic necessities of life, has not been successful. Agricultural production in Russia has never come close to the fantastic ability of the American farmer under a free-enterprise system. Further, these great strides in the field of science have not been aimed to the use of science for peaceful means, as has our many advances thus far.

At this time of crisis in dealing with the saber-rattling Khrushchev, we Americans must bear in mind that the Russian people have been subject to an educational system which teaches what it wants the people to know and withholds what it wants kept from the people. If the Communists were really sure of

their system, they would not keep the Iron Curtain so tightly drawn around the countries under Communist absolute control. We must not confuse, in the name of education, true dissemination of knowledge and facts and the Communist concept of education which limits to its own interests the facts made available to those being "educated." Indoctrinated, in the Russian instance, is probably a much more realistic word.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Daily News there appeared an article entitled "Education or destruction?" by Henry J. Taylor, which is an interesting commentary on Russian policies of withholding information from its people. I commend it to the Members of the House, and under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION OR DESTRUCTION?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Our wartime North Atlantic convoys delivered Communist Russia complete chemical factories, steel-rolling mills, textile mills, tire plants, petroleum refineries, electric power stations and block-signal systems, not to mention $1,647,000 worth of buttons. They were not sent or meant for war use. They were goodies to be used whenever peace came; like stored-up plums from Aunt Mary.

No conception of this or everything else we gave ever reached the Russian people. Nor, of course, has the Kremlin paid the vast sums in default.

I was present with Gen. Mark W. Clark in Vienna when an officer of the Soviet forces that met our troops there asked him in all seriousness: "General Clark, will you please tell me how your American Army got so many Russian jeeps?"

Russia never even made a horn's toot for a jeep. Yet even this officer thought the Soviet was on the giving end until General Clark dropped his soldierly gallantry and replied in a hurry.

We watch the excellent Bolshoi Ballet twinkle here, see Mr. Nixon in the kitchen or pictures of peasants in the fields and in other ways get the correct impression that, like average people everywhere, the Russian people mean well. But perhaps it is impossible for us to put ourselves in the position of a mass mind of 200 million people where a government controls every newspaper, radio, moving picture, billboard, loudspeaker, book, encyclopedia, library, training center, school, university and all sources of information, and has for over 40 years.

In our Western way, and thinking in terms of the objectives of our own education, we may feel dimly encouraged by the growth of Soviet education; and perhaps, as the Russians "know more," many may see through the vicious shams. But the Soviet little red schoolhouse remains the big Red arsenal. And it is not our friend.

We saw what happened to the young German millions in Hitler's little red schoolhouses. Hitler had only 7 years before 1939 to indoctrinate in nazism. The Communists have had 44; every Russian younger than 45 was born under the Red fraud.

Thus our thinking is vulnerable. Knowing the Soviet people are being better "educated," and consequently—such is our conclusion—more enlightened, we confuse our terms. To let Soviet propaganda impress us by the growth of education among the population in the straitjacket of indoctrination is like listening to a dancing master eulogize the waltz while he cuts off the pupils' legs. Our own educators should be very careful to straighten our public out on that fact and never praise a fraud.

Our truths when they do strike home—by radio, exhibits, people-to-people programs or other means—are immensely valuable for their limited effect and we must try to keep delivering the truth by every possible means. But Russia is an enormously diversified and very big country—11 time zones to our 4—and the truth must jump the deep trench of slanted history and generations of misinformation which has done there what Hitler did to German youth but for six times as long.

No education by us from far away or from within by the growth of schools can create any decisive break between the Russian mass mind and the Kremlin. Tyrants do many things badly but they are very good at self-preservation.

Visiting British Student Likes To Bounce Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Experiment in International Living has given many visitors from abroad the firsthand opportunity to learn about the United States and the people of the United States.

Their reactions often can be helpful to us as we try to analyze our own Nation and our own ways of doing things.

In my hometown, Westfield, N.J., a British engineering student and four others from Britain are getting a taste of American life. They are asking questions, learning, and even trying their hand at bowling. An article in the Newark Star Ledger of August 1 describes their visits here and a few of their reactions.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Visiting British Student Likes To Bounce Around" inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITING BRITISH STUDENT LIKES TO BOUNCE AROUND

When a British engineering student comes to America for a visit, what appeals to him the most?

For one such student, now staying in Westfield—David Wilkinson of Leeds University—skyscrapers and cyclotrons are fine but you can't bounce on them. His answer to the above question, after a week in New Jersey:

"The most exciting time I've had here so far is jumping on the trampoline. We don't have them in England."

David is the guest of Mr. and Mrs. Irvin Bales of 760 Scotch Plains Avenue, Westfield. With five others from Britain, four men and a woman, who are spending a month in Westfield, he is getting a taste of American life under the Experiment in International Living.

The visitors will stay in Westfield until August 17, then go to Washington before returning to England.

Miss Joan King, a clerical officer of the Nottingham Education Committee, is staying at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Evans of 408 Salter Place.

Intrigued by the differences between the English and American educational systems, Miss King has already launched her own study of the local schools.

Alan Cresswell, a student at the College of Technology in Chesterfield, was curious about the huge bowling establishments that dot the Jersey countryside. His hosts, Westfield Councilman and Mrs. James Kefalontis of 8 Tamaques Way, took him to one to show him what it was like.

Cresswell was caught up in the spirit of the bowling fans, and decided to try a few games. He had never bowled before in his life, but scored over 200 to beat Mr. and Mrs. Kefalontis.

Brian Keefe, a schoolmaster staying with Mr. and Mrs. George Davidson of 520 Millcrest Avenue, said America and England have much in common.

"America seems just like another home," he commented.

Other visitors are James Elliott of Swansea College in Wales, living with Mr. and Mrs. John Centa of 415 Lincoln Avenue, and Bakar Gokal, Pakistan economics student, staying with Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bristol of 21 Carol Road.

The Cattle Brand—Identification—Inspection Program in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry has historically been by far the largest agricultural activity in the State of Texas. Cattle stealing, or rustling, has always been one of the greatest problems. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association was organized at Graham, Tex., almost 90 years ago for the primary purpose of eliminating cattle stealing. It is today the largest livestock association in the United States and its primary activity remains the abolishing of cattle rustling.

Actually, there is more cattle stealing today than at any time in history. It is probably due in large part to the development of modern transportation which enables a cow thief to load stolen animals into a truck at night and sell them in any one of a hundred different markets tomorrow. The need for a coordinated system of cattle identification was never as great as it is today.

Historically, branding has provided the best and most practical means of identification, but branding is not now and never has been a universal practice, nor is it the exclusive method of identification. Obviously, natural breed, size, age, coloring, and so forth, provides effective identification, but it is not as readily described as brand identification.

About 1942 Congress passed legislation which empowered the Department of Agriculture to authorize local agencies to conduct brand inspection within their areas. In many States there is an official or State program of brand inspection. In Texas this program is conducted by the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, and it in-

volves the identification of cattle by all practical means, not simply by a record of brands alone. For a number of years this inspection was confined very largely to the larger terminal markets. With the extension of Federal control to all auction rings, this service was extended to possibly 200 markets in Texas and some in more distant points. The association provides inspectors, pays their salaries, and maintains a general clearinghouse at Fort Worth, where records of all animals brought on to a posted market are kept, as well as reports of all stolen cattle. The reports of sale go into the Fort Worth market every night. Of course, reports of theft are made as rapidly as they are discovered. Here, within the limits of information available, the association conducts a kind of fingerprint identification. Such identification cannot be conducted by any other existing agency because there is no such agency presently in existence which has the organization or facilities for this activity. This checking of sales has resulted in the apprehension of hundreds of cases of cattle stealing.

Apparently, there was no objection to the work of the association until the large number of auction rings were brought under its jurisdiction in 1957. At that time 13 rings joined in protest. Two of the operators have formally withdrawn their protest in the meantime and no one knows if many of the remaining 11 are actually interested in conducting this protest. It is, however, that that the protest and the only protest to the activities of the Association was filed by the operators of auction rings, not by livestock producers.

If the legislation was passed for the benefit of livestock producers, as the Congress apparently assumed it was, it seems that the Department would want to determine the degree of producer acceptance of the present practice. On the other hand, if the legislation is to be interpreted as having been passed for the benefit of auction rings, then it would seem that the number of auction rings favoring the program is many times greater than those opposing it. In the above-mentioned protest those auction rings opposing the program indicated that their opposition was based on, first, the fact that the association makes a charge of 8 cents per head for each animal on which they file a report. This is indeed a fact, but apparently no one contends that the 8 cents is excessive. On the contrary, it is apparently the smallest charge made in any State for this purpose. It is also contended that in some cases the inspector did not actually inspect the animals for which the charge was made. The association has agreed that this situation should be corrected and that in the future no charges will be made for animals not physically inspected.

The protesting auction rings in their complaint also argued that in many parts of Texas branding was not common practice. Admittedly, it is not a universal practice in any part of Texas. Admittedly, it may not be conducted by a majority of producers in certain parts of Texas, but certainly branding is used by a representative number of cattlemen in every part of Texas. In discussing the prevalence of branding, however, the auction operators ignore the fact that this inspection program is indeed an inspection of all identifying marks, not simply a brand inspection program. Much of the confusion in regard to this program seems to stem from a misunderstanding of this point.

The United States Must Wake Up to the Marxist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a news article covering a speech made to the Rotary Club in Harriman, Tenn., by one of my esteemed constituents, Mr. Theodore F. Wagner, an engineer who lives in Kingston, Tenn.

In his address, he warned members that the "United States must wake up to Marxist threat."

The report of this speech which appeared in the Harriman, Tenn., Record, on Thursday, August 24, follows:

"Communism is a reality. We can't hide from that fact without dire consequences."

And—

"America is in grave danger of being taken over by communism.

"What can stop it? The American people, who must shake off their complacency and wake up."

These warnings were sounded before Harriman Rotary Club last Thursday noon by Theodore F. Wagner, Oak Ridge engineer, of 707 Sunset Drive, Kingston.

Speaking on facts and impressions he obtained at a national civil defense meeting in Colorado, Mr. Wagner told the club that international communism is audacious, vicious, greedy, inhuman, and that its purpose is to overthrow the world.

Communism, he pointed out, has announced openly that its plan is to take over the United States.

"Are we worried?" he asked. "Are the American people worried about this boast and threat?" He answered: "I don't think so. Most Americans keep thinking it can't happen here. But it can happen."

Pointing out that between 1917 and 1960—in just 43 years—communism has spread over one-third of the world, that between 1946 and 1950 70 square miles and 13,000 people an hour went behind the Iron Curtain, the speaker told the club members that it is time for Americans to wake up to facts.

Mr. Wagner, in his talk, urged a five-point program for the United States to combat communism:

1. Pursue a policy of coresistance, not just coexistence.

2. Pursue a policy of education. Teach our children about communism. Teach our people about communism, so they will know what they are up against.

3. Maintain our superior military might.

4. Use economics and world trade more actively to achieve our aim to stop the spread of communism. Don't feed a sluggish communistic economy in a satellite country. Let Iron Curtain economic pressure discredit communism and create demands for freedom.

5. Take the political initiative at the United Nations and at regional and summit conference. Get off the defensive.

WORK BY PLAN

He quoted the British statesman, Edmund Burke, who said, "The only thing to insure the success of evil is for good men to do nothing."

"International communism is working according to a plan. It has even published that plan, with a schedule of takeovers," he said.

At first it spread out from Russia, taking over adjacent countries. But now—and this is a new feature added by Khrushchev—it is leapfrogging over the world, jumping over one country to get to another.

Mr. Wagner, who is a graduate of both the University of Tennessee and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, quoted what Nikolai Lenin, the Communist theorist, said in 1930:

"First we will take eastern Europe. Then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States of America which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

He also quoted Nikita Khrushchev in January 1959, while visiting in the United States, Khrushchev then said: "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you * * *"

Mr. Wagner told the Rotarians that Americans cannot ignore such boasts. Nor can America survive if its people are complacent in face of such threats.

One of the most effective means the Communists have used, Mr. Wagner said, has been international trade.

"Khrushchev has said that trade is not for profit but for power," he pointed out. "The Communists use trade to drive a wedge between free world trading partners. The Communists then take over sources of material of which a certain country is short of supply. Thus, they force that country to become dependent upon Russia."

Mr. Wagner pointed out that the United States has been active, too, our principal means being at the United Nations, keeping them talking while we maintained our strength. We have also used international aid, including the Economic Cooperative Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, the Foreign Operations Administration, and the International Cooperation Administration, on the theory that the strength of the United States is dependent on other free nations.

Although there has been some graft, losses and mismanagement in this foreign aid, 67 percent of it so far has been in military assistance, he said, and no nation to which we have given military aid has ever gone over to Russia.

"Force is the only thing the Communists recognize," he said.

Pointing out that the free world today has 200 divisions, of which only 17 are those of the United States, and 30,000 planes, 2,500 naval vessels. Mr. Wagner said he felt American military assistance has been well spent. He pointed out that little South Korea—the size of Indiana—has 22 divisions against the 17 of the United States.

"While Russia may be ahead of us in a few areas, the free world is ahead in the overall military picture," he said.

"We need, however, to do more," he said. "We need to combat Russia's propaganda more. We need to let the people of other nations know more what we do, and to combat more effectively the lies put out by Russia."

Mr. Wagner pointed out that "communism is the master of the big lie, of deceit, and of propaganda."

Russia claims it has increased its industrial production 100 percent. But from what base? The Communists don't say. If you start from nothing it is easy to increase production 100 percent.

When we negotiate a treaty for trade with a country, we give it little publicity. Russia gives it tremendous publicity in Pravda and in newspapers in the country affected. Russia will give a country in trade or in aid—not what the people of that country need—but what will benefit Russia the most.

WE'D HAVE TO CUT

"I think these statistics are interesting, about how much Russia has gained industrially," he said. "In order to enjoy all the glories of the present Soviet system, we in the United States would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, 95 percent of our electric power output, destroy two of every three of our hydroelectric plants, and get along on a tenth of our present volume of natural gas.

"We would have to rip up 14 of every 15 miles of our mainline railway tracks. We would have to sink 8 of every 9 of our oceangoing ships, scrap 19 of every 20 of our cars and trucks, and shrink our civilian air fleet to a shadow of its present size.

"We would have to cut our living standard by three-fourths, destroy 40 million television sets, and 9 of every 10 telephones, and 7 of every 10 houses, and then we would have to put about 60 million of our people back on the farm.

"If we did all this, we would have the glories of communism which Russia has now."

A Bill To Deal With Problems Arising by Reason of Communist Propaganda Originating Abroad and Distributed in the United States by First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill which is designed to deal with certain aspects of the rather complex problems arising by reason of the influx of millions of pieces of Communist propaganda which have their origin abroad and are now disseminated in great part by first-class mail within the United States. This bill is proposed to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the Postmaster General in certain cases to give notice to the addressee of the use of the mail for the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

Within recent months we have observed an acceleration of the Communist brainwashing effort directed at the free world and particularly to residents of the United States. This increased tempo of Communist propaganda activity, I believe, bears a close relation to the rising temperature of the international situation, which in turn is a consequence of the growing power and arrogance of the Communist bloc. Communist propaganda items from abroad transmitted through the U.S. postal service have increased in the year 1960 to an astounding 137 percent over the year 1959, whereas the increase in the year 1959 over the year 1958 was only 18 percent. During the year 1959, the U.S. Customs Service processed over 6 million packages of Communist propaganda, containing over 10 million items of printed matter. In 1960, over 14 million packages were processed, containing in excess of 21 million items, such as newspapers, magazines, books, pictures, and posters. During the 2 months of February and March 1961, over 162,000 packages of magazines and 11,000 packages of newspapers were addressed to the United States from Communist Cuba, which is now the base of Communist operations in this hemisphere. The extraordinary Communist effort in the field of propaganda is further attested by a report of the U.S. Office of Education indicating that in 1959 the Soviet Union published over 30 million books, containing 830 titles, in 26 foreign languages, for dissemination to non-Communist countries and which were either distributed free or sold far below cost mainly to Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In the above figures of packages of Communist propaganda entering the United States, I did not include in that number the millions of pieces of first-class mail, containing Communist propaganda, also received from abroad. Such mail is not opened for inspection, and presents certain obvious problems. It is significant that the Communist conspiracy is now extensively utilizing first-class mailing privileges as a means for disseminating their poison and fiction. I have received reports and complaints from all areas of the United States. Many people have become annoyed, and some confused, and others alarmed. A good bit of this mail is addressed to foreign language groups, who sense the possibility of blackmail or harm. The extent of the effort clearly attests the importance with which the Communists regard this propaganda campaign. George V. Allen, formerly Director of the U.S. Information Agency, previously estimated that the amount expended by the Communists in the year 1957 for propaganda in the non-Communist world was between $500 to $750 million. Present estimates of the amount being expended in this field indicates that the amount may well exceed $2 billion.

How does one cope with this propaganda? Does one collect and destroy such items of propaganda piece by piece? Is this presently practicable, or even desirable? Curiously, Lenin long ago pointed up the absurdity of such an effort. In his notorious theoretical document, "What's To Be Done," Lenin laid down the basic doctrine for the conduct of Communist propaganda, and agitational activities. While stressing the importance of the distribution of "illegal literature" by his band of secret Communist revolutionaries, he amused himself by pointing out the difficulties which the opponents of communism would find in coping with it. He said, "the police will soon come to realize the folly and futility of setting the whole judicial and administrative machine into motion to intercept every copy of a publication that is being broadcast in thousands."

Now I would point out that the success of such "illegal literature" depends upon the people to whom it is addressed. Lenin must have assumed the existence of an unsophisticated audience. That will not be the case in the United States. The antidote for the poison of Communist propaganda is knowledge and truth. I have no real fear that this absurd Communist propaganda will seduce any appreciable segment of our people, or lead them from the path of reason and loyalty—if our people are adequately informed as to its nature, origin, and character.

In the Internal Security Act of 1950 (title I, cited as the Subversive Activities Control Act) we there had to deal with the problems involved in the dissemination of Communist propaganda within the United States by Communist-action and front groups. Under section 10, these problems were met in part simply by requiring Communist organizations, against whom a final order to register is in effect, to label all publications transmitted in the mail as being disseminated by a Communist organization, and to announce that sponsorship of any radio or television broadcast conducted by them. We there felt that if our people were informed of the nature, origin, and contents of such propaganda activity, they would be able to judge and deal with it. The bill which I have introduced yesterday, in fact and in effect, supplements section 10 of the Internal Security Act. While section 10 requires the labeling of Communist propaganda disseminated by internal Communist organizations, the bill I introduced extends the disclosure process to publications transmitted by mail from without the United States to persons resident here.

Moreover, I believe that it is important to strengthen the democratic process, which I believe is the natural effect and result of this type of disclosure and information statute. If our people are informed of the nature and techniques of Communist propaganda—and this is a responsibility of the educational process and the free press—we shall not need fear that our people will become infected. Knowledge is the most effective immunization against the propaganda virus. I believe that when all our people understand the degraded and corrupt tactics of Marxism-Leninism, the Communists will find their propaganda effort to be waste of money and paper. They will not undermine our society. They shall only destroy themselves.

The Strategic Food Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the increasingly tense world situation, un-

derscored by the possibility that the Berlin crisis could trigger nuclear war, has brought thinking citizens more and more to a realization that much of our civil defense planning is dangerously outmoded.

Leaders of industry and science are increasingly becoming aware that it is not enough to think only in terms of deterrent weapons and purely military strength, necessary as they are, to counter an enemy blow which could wipe out millions of our people and subject many millions more to the ravages of disease and hunger.

I have long believed that one of our major weak spots has been lack of adequate civil defense planning to assure that we can feed survivors of an atomic attack. It is for this reason that I have supported the creation of a reserve of storable commodities strategically located throughout the Nation against the terrible day when it will be vitally needed to insure that we can survive and recover from an enemy attack.

A leader in the renewed drive to bring orderly, comprehensive planning and action into this key area of national defense, Mr. Edmund F. Buryan, president of Motec Industries, Inc., Minneapolis and Hopkins, Minn., showed an acute awareness of the problem and its solution when he stated to the 1961 Farm Forum in Minneapolis:

> In past wars, we needed merely to ask the farmer to increase his acreage and the food was grown. But after nuclear attack our land could become a wasteland for a time. Providing a strategic reserve of food could allow us to survive and also serve as a deterrent to enemy attack.

Mr. Buryan, a business executive of long experience in U.S. and world markets, struck a very significant theme, I believe, when he suggested the creation of a strategic food reserve and urged that we take a new look at our "so-called agricultural surpluses." These "surpluses," as Mr. Buryan pointed out, are not surpluses at all but a very basic weapon in our nuclear age defense arsenal. Contrary to the popular impression of huge and wasting farm surpluses, there may actually be underproduction in terms of the Nation's survival needs.

Mr. Buryan's remarks to the 1961 Farm Forum are thought-provoking inquiries into a challenge to which we have not yet fully faced up. In order to bring this important analysis of a very basic problem to the attention of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Buryan's statement, as printed in the September 1, 1961, issue of a leading business publication, Implement & Tractor magazine, be printed as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A STRATEGIC FOOD RESERVE

(By E. F. Buryan, president, Motec Industries, Inc.)

Recently a newspaperman asked me my thoughts on the farm surplus problem. I tossed the question back by requesting that he give me a definition of the term "surplus," for nowhere in the press do we see references to the petroleum surplus problem or the molybdenum surplus problem. In general, such stocks are referred to as "strategic reserves."

The solution to the farm problem demands an examination of the surplus situation—for there never has been a proper definition of the term "surplus." Before the Nation can determine what a surplus is, it must first determine what the strategic reserve should be—along the same lines as determination of strategic reserves of oil, tin, molybdenum, and other essentials. Once such a strategic reserve requirement can be determined, then stocks above that figure might be considered surplus.

It is interesting and at the same time very sobering to discover that in planning for the possibility of attack upon our country or other national emergency, that the stockpile report to Congress lists 76 materials which are classified as "group 1 of the list of strategic and critical materials for stockpiling."

It is reassuring to note that the Federal Government has stockpiled these critical materials, and that there are 26 million tons of such materials valued at $6 billion.

These materials, to name only a few, include items from aluminum to zinc, and include certain agriculturally based products such as opium, castor oil, and feathers. But not one reference to food.

I am shocked, however, not to find a strategic and critical stockpile of food in the "Stockpile Report to the Congress," even of June 1960.

There is, of course, another "annex 31" to the civil defense national plan which is entitled "The National Food Plan." This booklet says that "the food industry, including farm producers and those industries supplying requisites to them, are responsible, in cooperation with appropriate Government agencies, for planning and executing measures designed in accordance with the plan to assure a continuing supply of food to the Nation."

Annex 31 says that as regards the public: "Individuals and families are responsible for maintaining personal stocks of food in their homes or shelters, sufficient to meet their needs until other supplies are available. These stocks should be sufficient for at least 2 weeks following attack."

What kind of strategic reserve of food and fiber does this provide? Hadn't we better get busy right away and lay plans for a realistic stockpile of strategic cotton and corn, soybeans and sugar and other farm products supposedly "in surplus"?

Let's look at some figures of production and consumption of a few major crops.

Our total annual sugar supplies are a little over 11 million tons. We use a little more than 9 million tons. In the event of disaster, the balance of 2 million tons would last us a little more than 2 months. Is that sufficient?

Our supplies of oats are about 1.4 billion bushels. We use over a billion bushels each year. Our balance is about 270 million bushels.

In case of emergency, this balance would last us a little more than 2 months. Can you call that surplus?

In the case of milk, we have a production of 124.4 billion pounds a year. We use all of this each year, and only 4 percent of the supply is canned or condensed.

Our total cotton supplies amount to 23.5 million bales, and we use 16 million bales each year. This leaves us about a 6-month supply of cotton. If we canceled all our exports, we would have a little more than 18 months' supply of cotton for our use, but I do not think we would deny our allies food and fiber in the event of a general attack.

Our supplies of corn are approximately 5.9 billion bushels. We use up a little more than 4 billion bushels, of which 3.5 billion is for livestock feed. This leaves a balance of close to 2 billion bushels, about a 6-month supply. That could be classified as a strategic reserve.

The situation in wheat is, however, of a different dimension. Our carryover for the 1959 year was 1.3 billion bushels. We harvested over 1.1 billion bushels and imported 7 million bushels, for total supplies of about 2.5 billion bushels of wheat. We used something over a billion bushels, including exports of a half a billion bushels. Our total usage, then, was about 1.1 billion bushels.

If we exclude the export of a half-billion bushels, our total domestic usage would be on the order of 600 million bushels. Placed against our supplies of 2½ billion bushels, this would mean a reserve of about 4 years' wheat.

If we include export wheat in our usage we still have a balance of a year's supply.

Since we have not established the amount of strategic reserve of food that the American people would require in the event of a disaster, our so-called surplus is still open to question as "surplus." Perhaps we need all of it as a strategic reserve.

Up to this point we have been talking about food in the rough—wheat, corn and oats. But we also need in our strategic reserve tremendous quantities of food in more readily available forms—canned pork and gravy, perhaps, such as is now being purchased in millions of pounds for people in depressed areas, or the packaged rations used by our Armed Forces.

And we need this food strategically located in the perimeter areas of large centers of population.

In past wars, we needed merely to ask the farmer to increase his acreage and the food was grown. After any nuclear attack, though man may escape an attack, our bountiful land may become, in fact, a waste land.

Is it, then, anything less than simple caution to provide a strategic reserve of grain and fiber and milk and meat properly stored?

Has any administration given proper consideration to how far ahead of Russia we are in what should be strategic reserves of food? Until that has been done, I for one cannot go along with proposals for cutting back acreage.

Let us never forget that we are faced with a threat—not merely to our cities and our farms and our industry—but to our very existence.

We can rebuild structures of stone and wood. We can fabricate new machine tools and erect factories. But the ultimate winner in any conflict will be the population that survives—and it must eat to survive.

Children Handicapped by Deafness

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER A. GARLAND

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Members of the House for their favorable action yesterday on H.R. 9011. My interest has been so deep for this particular cause that I have submitted my own bill, H.R. 5623, for the training of special teachers for children handicapped by speech and/or hearing impairments.

From the research I have done on the current ability of our schools and communities to properly care for and train these children, it is obvious that there are serious shortages that prevent the proper training of these young people

who could be more useful to themselves and their communities if they received the special instruction they require.

I am anxious for this shortage of specially trained teachers of the deaf, pathologists, and audiologists to be corrected and augmented by a Federal program of assistance. The program I have proposed will be of the grant-in-aid variety and would be administered by the Commissioner of Education in coordination with accredited training institutions. Since the encouragement of these specially trained teachers cannot be fostered at the local level, it is imperative that the Government take steps to help, not by gifts, but by assistance that will be matched by participating training institutions.

This problem is not theoretical. Its severity cannot be ignored. The situation is revealed in the experience over the years. In the past, it has been necessary for schools such as the Governor Baxter State School for the Deaf, in Portland, Maine, to obtain retired teachers, to get extensions for older teachers as they come to the normal retirement age, and to get teachers from the public school system who do not have this very vital specialized training.

It is obvious that this is detrimental to our handicapped children who are so deserving of this help.

Other programs have been tried, such as scholarships, but even this has not been sufficient to maintain the necessary staff members qualified for this work.

It is my belief that recruitment must come on a national level to fulfill these teaching needs. Schools for the deaf are under a tremendous pressure to obtain these specialized teachers because of our expanding population. Federal assistance for training these people is desperately needed.

The key to this problem is simply that there are not enough trained teachers to deal with speech and hearing impairments. The public school systems cannot handle the problems and needs of these handicapped children, and the local communities cannot or will not supply the funds to attract the number of teachers required.

This bill provides our handicapped children with the opportunity to help themselves to become more useful and valuable citizens because this legislation assists in providing them with a proper education under the guidance of expert instructors.

These children are depending upon us to help them. I am proud that we have not let them down.

Remaking the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, entitled "Remaking the Constitution?" This article appeared in the September 11, 1961, issue of the Evening Star and provides much food for thought.

It may be difficult for some of us to understand, but there are many in the world today who seriously question the practicality of adherence to the basic truths which most of us have considered the very cornerstone of our form of government and our religion.

The article follows:

REMAKING THE CONSTITUTION?—BELIEF THAT IT SHOULD BE MADE EASIER FOR PEOPLE TO BE LED IS QUESTIONED

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—Working abroad affords a reporter more time to read and reflect than when he is in the maelstrom of Washington's political turmoil. And a small news item sent by a friend or reader can provide food for such reflection.

Once upon a time—not long ago—fundamental, basic truths were considered the foundations upon which were built our laws, the dogmas of our churches, and our code of ethics. But recently a clique of social scientists has convinced a number of intellectuals and politicians that basic truths are "absolutes" which should be viewed with an open and inquiring mind. And, it is contended, "absolutes," such as the Ten Commandments, belief that God is truth, and the moral standards accepted over many generations, hamper our thinking apparatus.

It is no wonder then that our Constitution has fallen into the category of an "absolute," which, it is said, is hampering the President in both foreign and domestic affairs. To us who have spent a lifetime of trying, as well as we could, to live by the Ten Commandments, to fear God (that's just the trouble with God, say the new theorists; God breeds unnecessary fear) and firmly believe in the Constitution and the greatness of our Nation, it comes somewhat as a shock that our Constitution is now up for reappraisal, reexamination and possible fundamental revisions.

The first trial balloon went up on June 9, 1960. It was released by Dr. Brock Chisholm, former chief of U.N.'s WHO, and until recently president of the World Federation of Mental Health and vice president of the World Association of World Federalists. He was addressing a session honoring World Mental Health Year at Atlantic City when he sent up this balloon which apparently attracted little attention in America.

According to a small news item in the Washington Evening Star, this internationally known psychiatrist is reported to have said, "Dependence on the obsolete Constitution of the United States is a form of magic Americans must give up to survive in the nuclear age." This item goes on to say that "the United States is hamstrung by the almost 200-year-old document in the conduct of foreign affairs * * * the Constitution is regarded as a sacred book, he noted. 'To criticize it is like saying to a Fundamentalist Baptist that the Bible is out of date.' * * * Dr. Chisholm explained he doesn't think the Constitution should be scrapped but it certainly should be amended."

The only ripple this news item caused at the time was one feeble letter of protest to the editor of the Star.

But the idea, propounded by this Canadian did not die; its roots grew while we slept. A reader in California was kind enough to send to your reporter in Rome some clippings from the San Francisco Chronicle, News-Call Bulletin, Palo Alto Times, and the Examiner of July 28 and 29 which reported a televised speech of Senator FULBRIGHT before the Cubberly education conference at Stanford University. As one item began, "Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, today urged Americans to face the possibility that basic changes in our constitutional system may be needed to meet the needs of the 20th century * * *. The President is 'hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society far removed from the centers of world power, he said."

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has apparently been convinced that the American public, besides going to the polling machines, is no longer capable of conducting its own affairs. The reports quoted him as saying that strong Presidental power is needed, for only the President can rise above parochialism and private measures and hope to overcome the excess and inadequacies of public opinion.

Another California paper reported him as saying that both the constitutional reforms and the relinquishment of sovereignty are necessary if the United States is to win in its competition with Russia. Public opinion must be educated and led, he is quoted as saying.

Senator FULBRIGHT might be able to convince some Americans that this is so, but he is sadly lacking in understanding of our European allies when he is reported to have said that "The North Atlantic nations, with their common values as well as enemies, must surrender far more of their jealously guarded sovereignty than they have already done and press forward with the development of supernational institutions."

Nowhere will he find a stronger sentiment for nationalism and sovereignty than among the NATO nations. It is a mistake to believe that they abandoned one iota of their sovereignty when they joined either the military-political NATO alliance or their political-economic Common Market. Cooperation with other nations with like interests does not mean that they are one-worldists. Quite the contrary.

Somehow or other, American public opinion, despite its it-can't-happen-here attitude, has suddenly awakened to the many inroads our enemy has made in our Nation. And this awakening seems to have pushed the panic button among some policymakers in Washington. One Capital reporter recently wrote, citing the alarm in official circles, "Americans are increasingly in a to-heck-with-prudence mood." He goes on to write that the proportion of people who think this is sizable, "and it has certain important perils for President Kennedy."

This item draws attention back to Senator FULBRIGHT's Stanford University speech. Is it considered by some of the new ideologists who want to remake America from the Constitution up, that since public opinion refuses to follow the line of appeasement toward Soviet Russia and international communism and is hewing more to old-fashioned patriotic beliefs, the Constitution must be amended so that the President will have the power to educate and lead the people as propounded by Senator FULBRIGHT.

Tribute to Senator Aiken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, recently the Barre-Montpelier, Vt., Times-

Argus published an article by Dr. Albert Norman which is a tribute to my distinguished senior colleague.

This tribute brings to focus the many fine qualities which he possesses and the pride which Vermont takes in her senior Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIKEN: VERMONT'S PROFILE OF COURAGE

(By Dr. Albert Norman)

Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.—Isaiah 1: 17.

I like to think of GEORGE D. AIKEN, U.S. Senator from Vermont, as New England's George Norris.

Yet I never met the Senator but once. I met the Senator about a year or two or so ago in Montpelier quite by chance, while waiting in the office of a physician of high repute. I can recall nothing special that we talked about. It could have been the weather; it could not have been women, for I am too old and the Senator too honorable.

I was impressed, however: the stocky figure; the large, bold features; the luster in the steel-blue eyes; the bounteous mind; the serious but kindly mien.

For much longer still have I admired the Senator's politics: in scope imposing, in my opinion; impressive for strength and accumulated momentum; large by comparison with other, typical, men of politics; of a quality of heart, it seems to me, that always has enabled men—and ennobled them—to face the moral risks of life with moral valor.

I gain the impression that in her senior Senator Vermont prides herself. And the Nation is not ashamed.

SPEAKS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Not sumptuous, Vermont is, in the main, an agricultural society. No one need apologize, for she is moderate in temper and pursuit. Her old, yet viable tradition—elsewhere, unfortunately, under attack—gives the State a sounder social stability and her internal politics, even at its worst, a lighter hue; not perfect harmony—heaven forbid—just less of that severity and passion that is to be found where more extreme points of view and interest compete for power. Vermont's agricultural interest has much of the 19th century's Populist tradition in it: "free soil," common man's tradition—the tradition of social justice.

Senator AIKEN, I believe, is its spokesman.

Merely by way of illustration: as recently as last month he led in a Senate contest against jeopardizing the right of farmers to act together effectively through their cooperatives in purchasing and marketing their products. It does not require a ton of brains to get the meaning of this, to find out on which side of the fence the Senator stood up to be counted. In 1956 he argued on the Senate floor against high rigid price supports, which would, he said, make the farmers less prosperous. Furthermore, unless the farmer took matters into his own hands and stopped relying on Government officials to work out his salvation he will never get his full share of the national income. He blamed rigid price supports for the decline of the dairy farmer's lot, because the reduced available supply has led to the use of dairy substitutes. Flexible supports, the Senator contended, would increase the consumption of milk, for example.

HE SPEAKS FOR VERMONT

And so he spoke for Vermont—for the main body of her people. And so he spoke on other issues as well.

Without going into the merits of public versus private electric power—there is much to be said for both sides under given conditions—Senator AIKEN, if I am not mistaken, champions the cause of Norris, the great Nebraska Republican, father of TVA. Where the choice is clearly between rigid proprietary-managerial control-ownership and the broader body politic, our senior Senator would, I feel, choose the latter, whereas someone else might not.

Although it would be grossly impertinent of anyone to belabel our Senator, I would not hesitate a moment to express my conviction that he is a liberal Republican or, to put it differently, a liberal conservative or a conservative of liberal, or broad rather than narrow views and feelings.

CONCERN FOR MANKIND

A deep and abiding concern for humanity is clearly discernible in much of what Senator AIKEN says and does. Humanitarianism, the long lost sentiment, survives and thrives in him as it does among the great body of folk, luckily untouched by the coarse strands of modern positivist philosophy. In a solution of both national and international problems humanitarianism cannot be ruled out, until war is forced upon us as an arbiter. Even then, the laws of humanity apply. Internationally, Senator AIKEN said in 1957, our policy should be dedicated to the search for a formula for lasting peace without sacrificing the requirements of our growing defense needs.

Despite its largely agricultural complexion, Vermont is slowly moving toward a more complex society resulting from industrialism. However much desirable it may be, industrialism is bound to be accompanied by the problems that have plagued every industrial society since the industrial revolution first came to England, unless social statesmanship like that of Victorian England and progressive-Republican (Theodore Roosevelt) and liberal-Democratic (Wilson - F. D. Roosevelt - Truman - Kennedy) America succeeds in preventing an extreme concentration of power on either side of the industrial scale.

EARTHLY ANGELS ARE FEW

In line with his interest in the people on the lower rungs of life, our senior Senator recently supported an extension, rather than limitation, of minimum wages.

No man is faultless. Few women, I am told, are impeccable. There are, in other words, no angels this side of heaven.

So that whatever our revered Senator's faults and whatever his vote on certain issues, there is no question in my own mind, though in fairness to others there might legitimately be in theirs, that he speaks the majority conscience of Vermont.

Without men of moral courage and of generous and noble heart, this State, this Nation—indeed the world—would be, as the prophet Isaiah says (Isaiah 1: 30), "as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water."

Give on Berlin Sure—What To Give Is Thorn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, which appeared in the September 10 issue of the Washington Post, and which is entitled "Give on Berlin Sure: What To Give Is Thorn," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE ON BERLIN SURE—WHAT TO GIVE IS THORN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The apparent stepping up of Nikita Khrushchev's fall crisis timetable has had a jolting effect in Washington. But once the Berlin border was physically sealed and the nuclear test ban moratorium was junked, the focus of American policy discussion returned to where it long has been: how to find an answer to Khrushchev's relentless demands for a new status for beleaguered West Berlin, including access to and from the city.

It is worth surveying the problem in some of its larger aspects now that the tempo of crisis has been increased and as two neutralist leaders are about to arrive here to plead with President Kennedy that he be "reasonable" in the face of Khrushchev's seeming intransigeance.

THE FISHING IS POOR

American tactics up to now can be divided into two parts. First, since the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting at Vienna in June, efforts have been made to convince the Soviet Union that Mr. Kennedy not only has the weapons but the will to use them against Russia if it comes to war. This effort has taken the form of warning words and publicized actions in beefing up American military power, especially nonnuclear capabilities.

Second. American officials have sought to discover Khrushchev's minimal demands. This is the objective of Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson's current inquiries in Moscow. It will be Secretary of State Dean Rusk's objective when, he hopes, he talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the United Nations next week.

So far, however, diplomatic probings have been close to fruitless and the old hands in dealing with Moscow would be amazed if Gromyko told Rusk the time of day. More likely, the gloomier diplomats figure, not until a Kennedy-Khrushchev summit meeting later this year will the Soviet hand the discernible.

Moscow's way of doing business is to put up a stiff front, take a self-righteous pose and then drop some hints in odd places to indicate its real bargaining position. So far there have been few of the latter.

A QUESTIONABLE FEELER

One hint was picked up in West Berlin a week ago by the New York Herald Tribune's Gaston Coblenz. He reported a private Soviet suggestion that some form of international air traffic organization could serve as an intermediary between the Western powers and East Germany in a new agreement on Western air passage across that puppet state.

As Coblenz said, this could be a way of sugar coating future East German sovereignty over the air routes. But such hints are often repudiated by the Soviet Union. They form only a tantalizing clue to what in the end turns out to be Moscow's real position.

Incidentally, President Kennedy has said that "no summit between East and West is useful unless the groundwork has been laid beforehand which will insure some success." Former President Eisenhower said much the same thing. But it now seems probable that Mr. Kennedy, like General Eisenhower before him, will nonetheless go to a summit without any substantial prior groundwork and without any real indications of success.

JUST SHORT OF WAR

The many months of cogitation here on the Berlin problem have by now produced some major themes. First of all, there is general agreement that Khrushchev wants an agreement without having a war but that he is willing to go to the brink to get it. While there is some talk that Khrushchev is acting from internal Communist bloc weakness as well as from nuclear weapons strength, the predominant view is that he believes the balance of power has so shifted in his favor that now is the time to claim some major fruits from it.

Given this assumption, it follows that some new East-West arrangement is inevitable. What, then, to seek?

American officials say privately that they can see some advantages in a settlement which would clarify the status of Berlin and of Western access to it. Despite the loud public claims of Western access rights, not all of these rights are clearly documented.

The record is indeed so fuzzy that the Soviets have been able to destroy their legal basis in many minds. In effect, certain rights exist more as a result of years of Soviet acquiesence than from any explicit Soviet words in formal documents.

It also is recognized here that many quarters, both inside and outside the West, see merit in the Soviet contention that World War II is long over and that the West should not try to stand indefinitely on its wartime occupation rights.

OLD HANDS RELUCTANT

Those diplomats and officials who have lived longest with the Berlin controversy are generally most loath to abandon these old positions. Some of the recently arrived New Frontiersmen are inclined to argue that here, indeed, is an opportunity to put West Berlin on a better longtime basis.

Events, however, are forcing the Kennedy administration to face up to a series of dilemmas involved in the Berlin issue.

The President and Rusk have made West Berlin a symbol of Western resistance to Communist enroachment. There have been many warnings against Soviet "salami" tactics, the practice of slicing away the Western position in West Berlin. In effect, the flag has been nailed so high on the West Berlin mast that any alteration in the city's status would seem to many the equivalent of a Western retreat.

The President is very aware of this. He feels that if the United States appeared to be caving in on Berlin, it would not be long before the neutrals began to make their own private arrangements with Moscow. Hence, assuming that some "give" will be required of the West to get a new Berlin status, the details of what is offered Khrushchev are of the utmost importance in Mr. Kennedy's mind.

That some "give" is inevitable, no one here doubts; it is the price of inherently exposed and therefore weak Western geographic posture in West Berlin.

The President and Rusk have stressed that the "heart of the matter," to use Rusk's phrase, is threefold: the right of Western military units to be in West Berlin; the freedom of both military and civilian access to and from West Berlin, and the viability of the city of West Berlin.

During the abortive 1959 East-West conference on Berlin, the Western nations offered to limit their troops, agreed not to introduce nuclear weapons and said they would curtail their propaganda and intelligence activities there. Now the Communists are hollering for an end to what they call Western espionage, sabotage and propaganda activities, including the silencing of RIAS (Radio in the American Sector), the lone voice of truth which can be heard in East Germany.

The Communists doubtless were encouraged to demand all this by Mr. Kennedy's statement in his July 25 radio-TV speech of "our readiness to remove any actual irritants in West Berlin." To the Soviets, the list of "irritants" is all-inclusive.

In retrospect, some diplomats now are saying, it would have been wiser to have removed some of these "irritants" as a unilateral Western action during the period of relative East-West calm over Berlin earlier this year. But it was not done; the State Department never recommended it. Any changes in a new agreement with Moscow thus will be labeled "concessions" both by the President's political opponents at home and by Communist propagandists around the globe.

Finally, Rusk is determined to do what his predecessors failed to do: to keep secret until the bargaining table the Western "fall-back" positions; that is, the maximum the West is willing to concede to Moscow.

This secrecy so far seems to have been wrapped more around an absence of policy than around any hard and fast decisions on fall-back positions. But in the end, it will mean a certain sense of shock to the West if and when concessions are revealed.

But when all of this has been said, the question of specific policies remains. This the Big Four Western foreign ministers will have to tackle when they gather here Thursday. At least three major factors have been under intense discussion in Washington.

One is the problem of de facto recognition of East Germany. A major Khrushchev aim is to stabilize this shaky puppet regime; a big step in that direction was the closure of the Berlin border, which stopped the flow of refugees from that unhappy land.

But Khrushchev wants the West to recognize his puppet and he is using the Berlin issue as a lever to force it. He says that once he signs a peace treaty with East Germany, the Western Powers will have to deal with that regime if they want a new agreement on access to West Berlin.

The American face is flatly opposed to any formal (de jure) recognition of East Germany and Khrushchev appears to accept that. But more and more there is a willingness here to accept East Germany's existence as a fact and to deal with it whenever such diplomatic intercourse is necessary; that is, to grant de facto recognition. After all, it is argued by some, we deal de facto to some degree at least with Red China.

The core of the problem, however, is the effect of recognition on West Germany. For one of Khrushchev's aims is to have the West deal with East Germany as a symbol that there are now and for the indefinite future will be two German nations, East and West. To grant de jure recognition would be to accept Khrushchev's contention formally; to deal with East Germany de facto would be interpreted as close to the same thing.

American officials have been unable to come to grips with this problem with West German officials because of the elections there next Sunday. But once the voting is over, the issue will have to be faced. The question then will be whether the shock of the Berlin border closing plus Khrushchev's nuclear blackmail will bring West German acceptance of a new policy of dealing with East Germany.

Some way of sweetening such a concession, something akin to the rumored Soviet idea of working through an international air traffic organization, for example, might provide an answer.

West Germany today has considerable dealings with East Germany, including a trade agreement which includes the right of passage for West German civil traffic down the autobahn to West Berlin. But the psychological hump of direct American-East German negotiations would be something else again.

A second factor under discussion here is Khrushchev's longtime demand that the West formally accept the Oder-Neisse line, provisionally set by the Allies and Russia in wartime, as the final border between East Germany and Poland. French President Charles de Gaulle already has publicly accepted it. But West Germany today includes millions who formerly lived in the old German lands east of that line and it has been considered political suicide for any West German politician to accept it as final.

In any East-West agreement, however, the line probably will be accepted. There is no disposition outside West Germany to make a great fight to leave the border issue open.

There are some reports, however, that in any East-West negotiations the West will bring up the Rumanian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian peace treaties and perhaps the postwar accords on Poland. The argument, it is said, would be that the West will no longer continue to wink at the Communist disregard of the obligations those agreements include, among them free elections.

This idea amounts, some believe, to an effort to swap the status quo in Eastern Europe, including acceptance of the Oder-Neisse line, for something akin to the status quo in West Berlin. The efficacy of this idea is, however, doubtful.

Finally, there is a search going on for ways and means of reaching some agreement on what is vaguely termed "European security." It long has been felt here that to negotiate only over West Berlin means only Western concessions; hence the negotiations should be broadened.

There have been several fruitless East-West exercises on the security theme, fruitless because the Soviet aim has been to have American troops pulled out of West Germany as part of a demilitarization scheme. American policy has accepted as valid West Germany's demand that it be treated as an equal partner within the NATO framework.

To agree to a special status for West Germany in some European security arrangement, the argument goes, would be to loosen that strong and virile nation's ties to the West.

But this sort of question cannot be resolved until the American Government and its allies resolve the fundamental issues, especially that of de facto recognition of East Germany and what it might entail.

Despite the many months of cerebration here on the Berlin issue, President Kennedy has been unhappy about some of the staff work. He himself has delved into the remotest corners of the problem in a way his predecessor left to his Secretary of State and others. The best that can be said is that while Mr. Kennedy has not found the answer, he certainly has been trying. And he hasn't had any cooperation from Khrushchev.

As to the outlook ahead, it would be risky to say more than it is likely to be a very cold fall and winter with the world's vision obscured by a storm of Communist verbiage mixed with nuclear thunderbolts designed to weaken Western nerves. What the picture will be when the clouds lift is beyond conjecture.

Darien Group Sends Magazines and Books to Readers Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to peace between nations is mutual

understanding. This is not easy to obtain on a government-to-government level. Official exchanges between governments all too often obscure the true moods and feelings of the people those governments represent. Were these true feelings really known they would have to be recognized by the governments and reflected in official policies. Personal contact between citizens of different countries is undoubtedly the most effective way of reaching international understanding, but this is very difficult to do on a significant scale. Another way is through an exchange of literature which accurately portrays the moods and feelings of each country.

There is in my district, a dedicated group of volunteer women, organized as the Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., a nonprofit organization, which has sent thousands of American books and magazines overseas since its formation in 1949. I would like to take this opportunity to salute the work this organization is doing and to draw to it the attention of other Members of Congress in the hope that this approach may spread to many other parts of the country. In this connection, I submit for the RECORD a recent article on the Darien group, which appeared in the New York Times:

DARIEN GROUP SENDS MAGAZINES AND BOOKS TO READERS ABROAD

(By Richard H. Parke)

DARIEN, CONN., September 6.—From an abandoned firehouse on the Boston Post Roads here, thousands of books and magazines are being sent abroad to further international understanding.

The project is being carried on by nearly 100 Fairfield County women volunteers under the auspices of the Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., a nonprofit group founded in 1949. An old barn at the rear of the firehouse is being remodeled to provide additional space.

The books and magazines, all donated, are packed in 70-pound cartons and shipped to U.S. Information Agency centers for presentation to individuals, libraries, schools, and colleges.

In addition, the women fulfill personal requests for reading matter—some from residents of Communist countries. Not long ago a man in Hungary wrote that he had read about the "earthworm industry" in the United States.

"I would like some books on it," he said, adding wryly, "though I know if it is successful here, it, too, will become nationalized."

Mrs. John W. Barnes, president of the Book Plan, succeeded in finding two books on the subject for him.

A grateful Polish woman wrote in broken English in acknowledgement of a book she had requested.

"I wish American people easier to an understanding. Please forget me not. Blessings and goodby."

A resident of Tanganyika, East Africa, said he had refused some books from Cairo, Egypt, because they contained "false doctrines."

"I believe in democracy and nothing else," he declared.

Wednesday and Thursday are workshop days at the former firehouse. Teams of women preparee the books and magazines for shipment, a task that begins with a careful sorting and ends when each magazine or book is stamped, "From Your Friend, Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., Darien, Conn., USA."

Spiritual Life Spurs Wisconsin's Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years I have welcomed many opportunities to point with pride to outstanding features of my home State, Wisconsin—deep in the heart of America. Playing a significant role in the Nation's economic, social and political life, I believe my State has made an outstanding contribution to its progress.

Despite other major assets, however, our most important contribution continues to be our people—a strong, sturdy, forward-looking, ambitious people, guided by high ideas and strong spiritual faith. Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel published a splendid special edition on progress in Wisconsin. Among the articles was included a special feature by James M. Johnston, entitled "Spiritual Life Spurs Wisconsin's Residents." Reflecting the integral role of faith in the lives of our people—symbolizing the significance of a wonderful spiritual heritage to all America—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRITUAL LIFE SPURS WISCONSIN'S RESIDENTS

On any other hill, John Weitzer would have turned back long ago, for conquering this steep, winding roadway near Hubertus in southeastern Wisconsin represented lots of exercise for a man 82 years old.

But Weitzer, widely known in West Allis business circles before his retirement a few years ago, kept right on. He has made the trip for the past 46 years.

His wife and 43 relatives kept climbing, too. They realized that the shrines at the top of Holy Hill and the view of the surrounding countryside are well worth the effort.

Weitzer is one of thousands of annual visitors to Holy Hill. Tourists of many religious persuasions flock to the Hill throughout the year, for the Discalced Carmelite Monastery, with its stations of the cross and famed chapel, have become national attractions over the years—just one of the many religious traditions of Wisconsin.

Spiritual life in the State grows at such shrines—as in the hundreds of crossroads houses of worship with tall steeples, and in the great cathedrals in Milwaukee, Madison, Green Bay, and other cities.

Among the larger edifices, Wisconsin's own Frank Lloyd Wright is represented, having designed the Unitarian Church at Madison, and the new Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church on the northwest side of Milwaukee.

The church structures in Wisconsin represent a multimillion-dollar outlay every year. The traditional Gothic style is being priced out of the market, but imported altars, stained glass windows and unique interior decorations keep the church construction totals high.

At least two rural spots are centers of Protestant conclaves and worship.

Conference Point at Williams Bay, Lake Shore, in southern Wisconsin, draws delegates to a "Geneva School of Missions" every year. Also Council of Churches secretaries from all over the Nation gather at Conference Point to talk shop each June.

The other spot is the American Baptist Assembly at Green Lake, in the central part of the State. This is a year-round meeting place, with its heaviest activity during the summer.

This year about 7,500 persons will attend 33 national conferences at Green Lake between June and September.

Some of these are the National Missions Conference, the Christian Writers and Editors Conference, the Christian Education Workers' Conference, the Recreation Leaders' Laboratory, the Older Youth Conference, the Citizenship Conference, etc.

Some of the prominent speakers will be the Reverend Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg of St. Louis, former president of the National Council of Churches; Charles W. Ferguson, senior editor of Reader's Digest; Elizabeth Yates, author; Dr. Roland E. Welseley, professor of journalism at Syracuse University; Dr. Joseph Sittler of Chicago, and Dr. J. Carter Swaim, Bible authority for the National Council of Churches.

Wisconsin has 1,301,474 Roman Catholics in 5 dioceses.

The Milwaukee archdiocese is the largest, headed by Archbishop William E. Cousins. The other dioceses are Green Bay, headed by Bishop Stanislaus V. Bona, and Bishop John B. Grellinger, auxiliary; La Crosse, by Bishop John P. Treacy; Madison, by Bishop William P. O'Connor, and Superior, by Bishop George A. Hammes, consecrated last year.

Wisconsin also has active Jewish congregations of the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative branches. Congregations are autonomous, submitting to no superior organization. They engage their own rabbis and own their own property. Milwaukee and Madison are large Jewish centers.

Wisconsin has at least five large Lutheran groups, which will be reduced by one after 1962, when our Augustana Lutherans will merge with the United Lutherans, represented in Wisconsin by the Wisconsin conference, of which the Reverend Dr. Paul L. Roth, of Kenosha, is president.

Missouri Synod Lutherans in Wisconsin are divided into north and south Wisconsin districts. So are the Wisconsin Synod Lutherans, though the national headquarters of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod is at Milwaukee. The Reverend Oscar J. Naumann is president.

The new American Lutheran Church is is also divided into northern and southern districts in Wisconsin, as is the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Three dioceses serve Wisconsin's Episcopalians: Milwaukee, headed by Bishop Donald H. V. Hallock; Eau Claire, by Bishop William Herstick, and Fond du Lac, by Bishop William Brady.

Methodists are divided into eastern and western conferences. Bishop Ralph Taylor Alton of Madison, rounding out his first year of episcopacy, presides over both conferences.

Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Assemblies of God, and Evangelical United Brethren, each have one State unit. The Reverend Ezra G. Roth is serving his last year as executive director of the Wisconsin Baptist State Convention before retirement.

Other State executives are the Reverend Dr. William V. Longbrake of Waukesha, Wisconsin Presybterian Synod; the Reverend Dr. Jess Norenberg of Madison, Wisconsin Congressional Conference; the Reverend Darwin Heuser of Waupaca, the Wisconsin District of the Assemblies of God, and Bishop Harold R. Heininger of St. Paul, Evangelical United Brethren.

Cooperative Protestant work in the State is guided by the Wisconsin Council of Churches, headed by Methodist Rev. Carl Stromberg of Madison. Ellis H. Dana is executive vice president.

Lutheran organizations knit the congregations of their synods into one unit for charitable works. These include the Lutheran Welfare Society, now in its 25th year as a Wisconsin agency; the Lutheran Children's Friend Society, in its 65th year, and the Lutheran Institutional Mission, in its 60th year.

Discrimination in the Peanut Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to clarify the misunderstanding about the differentials established by the Department of Agriculture between the support price of various types of peanuts, it should be understood that there are five major types of peanuts: The Virginia type grown in Virginia and North Carolina; the Southwest Spanish type grown in Texas, Oklahoma and New Mexico; the Southeast Spanish type grown in Georgia, Alabama and Florida; the Runner type also grown in Georgia, Alabama and Florida; and the Valencia type grown almost exclusively in New Mexico.

Next, it should be understood that since the Commodity Credit Corporation support prices are expressed for each type in dollars per "average ton" of farmers' stock or unshelled peanuts, no meaningful comparisons may be made between the support by types since the "average ton" of the various types are not comparable as to kernel content and quality. The meaningful price to the commercial user of peanuts is expressed in support per pound of sound mature kernels, for that is what the commercial buyer uses. The Virgina and Valencia types will contain a substantial percent of premium nuts which will sell for more than the regular sound mature kernels. Likewise, all farmers' stock peanuts will contain a small percentage of immature, split, or otherwise imperfect kernels. These imperfect nuts must naturally bring something considerably less than the sound mature kernels.

For many years the runner type was recognized as an inferior peanut and was considered basically a hog feed. Over the years plant breeders have been able to develop runner peanuts until they now fully compete on even terms with other varieties in the commercial market. In fact, they are preferred to other types by some users. The sheller who buys the farmers' unshelled peanuts and processes them for the manufacturer pays for them principally on the basis of sound mature kernel content. The manufacturer buys peanuts, not by type of "average grade ton," but on the basis of shelled peanuts. In other words, the buyer of peanuts is not interested in the weight of unshelled—farmers' stock—peanuts. What he wants to know is how many pounds of sound mature kernals he is buying. Of course, if he buys split, damaged or immature kernels, he expects to pay a lesser price, no matter what the type of peanuts.

For a number of years the Department has maintained two differentials in the support price about which there has been considerable argument. Southeastern Spanish type peanuts have in the past been supported at several dollars per ton of sound mature kernels higher than southwestern Spanish type peanuts of the same grade. This differential has gradually been reduced. Last year it was $2 per ton. This year it has been eliminated. The change has made southeastern Spanish type peanuts more competitive with southwestern Spanish.

At the same time, Runner peanuts have been supported at $9 per ton of sound mature kernels less than southwestern Spanish peanuts of the same quality. This gives a very decided marketing advantage to the runner type peanuts. The commercial user can and in fact does buy the type of peanuts which gives him the largest amount of sound mature kernels for his money. Growers in the Southwest have contended that all differentials, except premiums for large nuts and nuts for roasting in the shell, should be abolished and supports should be based solely on what the processor actually buys—that is, sound mature kernels with a lesser competitive payment for other kernels. In this way, all types will compete fairly in the market.

Representatives of the Southeast have realized that they enjoy an advantage in the market and have objected to equalizing the differential between Runners and Southwest Spanish-type peanuts, but they asked for and secured an equalization of the differentials in support between southeastern and southwestern Spanish-type peanuts. It is interesting to note that this adjustment was made the first of August in spite of the fact that the southeastern people successfully argued with the Department that it was too late in the season to make any change in the differentials between Runner and Spanish-type peanuts. To the impartial observer this seems to be an unwarranted discrimination on the part of the Department in favor of the Southeast.

To make it clear just what the new support prices do, here is the picture. The support price per pound of sound mature kernels of peanuts is:

	Cents
Virginia type	16.00
Southwestern Spanish type	15.85
Southeastern Spanish type	15.85
Runner type	15.45

Thus, it can be seen that the new supports do not, as the Department's news release indicates, continue the 1960 differential which existed between southeastern and southwestern Spanish-type peanuts, but they do continue the differential which has existed between the Runner-type and Spanish-type peanuts.

All that the Virginia-Carolina and the southwestern peanut producers and shellers are asking, since all of these peanuts go to the same end use, is that this differential be eliminated, just as the Department eliminated the differential between the two types of Spanish peanuts. They are completely agreed that the Virginia and high quality larger Valencia peanuts should receive a higher support price. A number of Senators and Representatives from Virginia to Texas have introduced legislation to achieve this result. Hearings were held by the Oilseed Subcommittee but due to the pressure of adjournment these hearings were not completed and will be continued early next session unless the Department shall in the meantime have equalized these supports.

There seems to be some hope that this may happen because the Honorable Stephen Pace, spokesman for the southeastern interests, stated in a letter of August 5 that "we had insisted at the last hearing, July 31, (3) that differentials should be fixed in the fall or first of each year," and he added, "You will observe that the Under Secretary concurs." This would indicate that we could expect action before next session.

As to the nature of the action which we can expect, we can only refer to the Department's report on the bills forwarded to Chairman COOLEY over the Under Secretary's signature on August 24, 1961. In this report Mr. Murphy stated "In the circumstances, and particularly because the planting time for the 1961 crop was past, it did not seem wise to change substantially the differentials established for the prior crop."

At least if we are again denied equal treatment we will have to be given a new reason.

The southwestern producers full well recognize the desirability of maintaining a united front in the peanut industry but they feel very strongly that this unity cannot be purchased at the price of acceptance of any differential between the support price of a pound of sound mature peanut kernels, whether these kernels come from a runner vine in the Southeast or a Spanish bush in the Southwest.

Prescription Drug Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in the New York Post of Sunday, September 10, 1961, comments in her column on the excessive prices of prescription drugs and the legislation proposed to correct conditions which have caused these prices. Her observations are most timely and provocative. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mrs. Roosevelt's column which deals with the subject of drugs be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have long wanted to mention in this column the public debt of gratitude which I think we owe to the Senate's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and its energetic chairman, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Anyone who has had even a mild illness knows that the cost of drugs is alarmingly high, and year by year becomes more of a burden, especially to the lower income families.

Modern drugs, like other advances in medicine and surgery, have meant that many more people are alive and well today than would have been a decade ago. Certainly, we must be prepared to pay for the production and advancement of these life-saving drugs and techniques.

I was shocked, however, by the revelations of eminent medical men before Senator KEFAUVER's committee that price-fixing and monopolistic practices have raised the cost of drugs far above what is reasonable or necessary.

I was deeply troubled also by testimony charging that hidden and serious dangers in drugs are not revealed in advertising or information supplied even to doctors—that physicians have no reasonable way of evaluating the conflicting claims, the myriad names, and the bombardment of promotional material.

I was amazed to learn that drugs are often promoted and sold before adequate clinical trials have been performed so that patients very often serve as unwitting guinea pigs.

Senator KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, have sponsored a drug industry antitrust bill (S. 1552) that will go a very long way toward correcting many of the abuses and deficiencies of current practice. This bill would have the effect of increasing competition and diminishing the temptation to fix prices. It would put teeth into the regulation and control of drug manufacture by the Food and Drug Administration. Most important, it would stimulate prescriptions by generic name through long overdue central control over the naming of drugs.

Prescribing drugs by generic name was first advocated by the Citizens' Committee for the Children of New York in its own intensive study of the impact of modern prescription drugs on the family budget, made some 3 years ago prior to the Kefauver investigations.

Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast in the public interest by radio and television station WBZ in Boston:

LABOR DAY

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

Today we celebrate Labor Day. And appropriately enough there's little public ceremony to mark the occasion. Instead, either at home or off on a trip, most of us will simply be enjoying the many pleasures of modern American living.

There are still shameful pockets of poverty across the country, but generally we Americans have never had it so good. Much of the credit for this prosperity and the time we have to enjoy it must go the American labor movement. Perhaps the best tribute to those who started that movement is to enjoy the holiday to the hilt.

But this is only 1 day of the year. With the great strides in our economy, average weekly work time has been cut drastically, from 70 hours down to 40 hours or less. The workweek has fallen from 6 days to 5, and some economists see the 3-day weekend in the not-too-distant future. Now there are holidays and leisure time for everyone throughout the year.

We'd like to suggest today that the American public use at least a portion of this new leisure time for the public good. This effort could well be regarded as our repayment to a society which has treated us so well.

This repayment can be made in many ways.

There's a great shortage of volunteer help in most of our communities today. People are badly needed to work in hospitals and homes for the aged, for various religious and civic organizations. They are needed to guide youngsters in groups such as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and the YMCA.

Nor should we overlook the political world. One of the problems confronting both local and State governments has been the lack of popular participation in politics. The tendency in the past has been to let George do it, and our Georges unfortunately haven't been doing it very well. We must all share responsibility in the democratic process. And this means more than just intelligent voting; it requires continuing interest in the affairs of government, participation in political life.

There's been increasing concern across the country about the lack of national purpose, the decline in our public and private morality. It would be silly to look for a one-shot cure to these problems. But undoubtedly they are based on selfishness. Improvement will come only when people start to think more of the needs of their community and their fellow man.

This is a challenge for us all on this Labor Day, 1961.

The Pilot Who Led the Way to Hiroshima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, bombs of destruction are so much in the limelight these days that one's mind cannot but turn back to the horror of Hiroshima. Our action there is something I have never accepted.

Not too long afterward, when I was flying across the Atlantic, sitting in the copilot's seat with a young pilot. The pilot turned to me, and asked if I had sons, and if they had been in the war. And then very quietly said:

As that is so, Mrs. Bolton, may I talk to you? I must talk to someone.

And then he poured his heart out:

We, a civilized Christian Nation, how could we perpetrate this unspeakable horror?

He said he woke up nights with it before his eyes.

I turned to him very quietly and said:

Son, I feel as you do, particularly so for there was much information indicating that the Japanese had begun to come our way, and that in a week or so they would have asked for peace.

We talked a little of the man who flew the plane that dropped the bomb. Both of us dreaded what might be the after-effects upon him. I have just recently had sent to me a story from the National Guardian of March 27, 1961, under a by-line of Robert E. Light that answers the question of what has become of him. I hope everyone who sees this will read the tragic story of a loyal soldier who obeyed orders—orders that broke his heart, orders that haunt him day and night. These are things that should be brought to our attention as we view the immediate future.

The article follows:

THE PILOT WHO LED THE WAY TO HIROSHIMA—THE STORY OF CLAUDE EATHERLY: CONSCIENCE OF MAN CONFINED

The truth is that society simply cannot accept the fact of my guilt without at the same time recognizing its own far deeper guilt.—CLAUDE R. EATHERLY, August 1959.

(By Robert E. Light)

Fourteen years ago Maj. Claude R. Eatherly returned to Texas a war hero. He was acclaimed as the reconnaissance plane pilot who gave the go-ahead signals for the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Today he is a patient in the psychiatric ward of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Waco, Tex., adjudged insane and committed by a county court.

For a decade Eatherly was racked by the memory of the hundreds of thousands he had helped to kill. He wrote to the survivors of Hiroshima begging forgiveness. At home he rejected the hero's mantle and sought society's punishment by a series of crudely committed crimes from forgery to burglary. When he was committed to the hospital January 14, psychiatrists concluded that he was suffering from a guilt complex. The treatment presumably will be directed toward ridding him of guilt feelings.

NEVER AGAIN

But it is clear from Eatherly's writing that he is not insane. He seems to have come to understand what has tormented him and how best to expiate his sin. He said last year that he never expected "to do another antisocial act again." He hopes to "lend influence toward peace, to end nuclear buildup, to safeguard the rights of all people, regardless of race, color, or creed."

It has been suggested that the Air Force intervened to keep him confined. But there is also a move for reexamination of Eatherly by an international panel of psychiatrists—a move initiated by Austrian philosopher Dr. Guenther Anders.

THE BEGINNING

In 1945 Eatherly was one of a group of "superpilots" assembled for a secret mission in the 509th Composite Group on Tinian Island in the Marianas. Each had a top service record and had passed a thorough security check. None knew the precise nature of the assignment.

Newsweek (May 25, 1959) said that Eatherly was "an enlistment-poster figure then: A tall, sun-burned wavy-haired Texan, carefree and convivial on the ground, calm and stable in the air."

In its decision to drop the bomb, according to the book "No High Ground" by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, the U.S. high command sought a target which would

"include both a military installation and surrounding houses and buildings susceptible to maximum blast damage." Target cities were limited to Hiroshima, Kokura, and Nagasaki, in that order of priority.

BOMB PRIMARY

At 1:37 a.m. on August 6, 1945, three B–29 weather scout planes took off for the target cities. Eatherly flew the *Straight Flush* over Hiroshima with orders to radio the bomb-carrying *Enola Gay* if weather conditions were favorable for a bombing. Only the *Enola Gay* crew knew of the atom bomb; Eatherly knew only that the raid was something special.

At 7:09 a.m. the *Straight Flush* reached Hiroshima. A cloud bank rimmed the city, but there was a clear hole with a diameter of more than 10 miles. At 7:25 Eatherly radioed the *Enola Gays* "Advice. Bomb Primary." An hour later the first atomic bomb exploded in anger fell on Hiroshima. *Enola Gay* copilot Capt. Robert A. Lewis, on seeing the mushroom cloud said: "My God, what have we done?" The answer was later tabulated: 78,150 dead, 37,425 injured, 13,083 missing.

Three days later Eatherly flew the same mission over Nagasaki. He also flew reconnaissance missions over the cities with instruments to record the damage.

THE HERO HOME

Eatherly resigned his commission in 1947, after 7 years in service and returned to Texas. He was acclaimed and publicized as a national hero. But his wife said he used to wake up at night screaming, "Bail out, bail out."

His anguish increased when his wife suffered miscarriages of malformed fetuses in 1947 and 1948. Subsequent tests indicated that many of his sperm cells had become peculiarly malformed.

Two daughters were eventually born to the Eatherlys, one in 1950 and the other in 1954, but both were found to have a rare blood disease similar to pernicious anemia. Blood tests at the time showed that Eatherly suffered from the same blood ailment.

Before Eatherly resigned his commission, he had participated in atomic bomb tests at Bikini; after one such test his plane had been isolated and washed down. But no one had ever told him that he might have been exposed to radiation.

In 1950 Eatherly began to wander around the South and Southwest. He was drinking heavily. He was arrested in New Orleans, Beaumont, and Houston, on charges of forgery, robbery, and breaking and entering. Police and courts were lenient because he was a "war hero."

Nine times Eatherly entered the Waco VA hospital as a volunteer patient. In April 1959, he told Dr. O. P. Constantine: "I feel I killed all those people at Hiroshima." While he was out of the hospital on a 90-day trial period in 1956, he and another patient were questioned about a series of robberies. Eatherly said: "I don't know why we did it. We didn't need the money."

A CLASSIC CASE

Eatherly twice attempted suicide. Waco psychiatrists described his case as "neurosis with psychotic manifestations" and "a classic guilt complex."

One psychiatrist said that "he has sought the punishment of society by acts which would bring down its wrath. "But," he added, "the role of therapy is to get at the predisposing factors—Hiroshima in itself is not enough to explain his behavior."

Eatherly believes that Hiroshima is the cause of his actions. In 1959, he began to correspond with Dr. Anders in Vienna. (Anders had written to him after reading a story about him in Newsweek.) Anders is a noted philosopher and author of "New Morals in the Atomic Age." Their correspondence indicates that Eatherly has come to understand his inner torment and wants to publicize it so that society will recognize "its own far deeper guilt."

He wrote to Anders in August 1959:

"I accept the fact that I am unlikely to bring about that recognition by getting into scrapes with the law, that I have been doing in my determination to shatter the hero image of me by which society has sought to perpetuate its own complacency."

HE CANNOT LEAVE

Last November 22 Eatherly left the Waco Hospital, in accordance with his rights as a volunteer patient, and never returned. The Washington Post and Times-Herald (Dec. 5, 1960) reported that "VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or take him back to the hospital." But Eatherly was picked up and on January 14, on request of his brother, was declared insane, and committed. As an involuntary patient he cannot leave.

On learning of Eatherly's commitment, Anders wrote to President Kennedy and simultaneously released the letter to the press. It caused a stir in Europe. Psychiatrists in several countries have shown interest. Bertrand Russell wrote in the London New Statesman (Feb. 17) that Eatherly's statements "are entirely sane." But no U.S. publication has picked up Anders' letter and no group is working for Eatherly's release.

AGE OF THE APPARATUS

In his letter, Anders called Eatherly's case "a moral scandal which threatens to go down in history as the Dreyfus affair of the 20th century—no, perhaps as an even more fateful affair." To Anders, Eatherly is "the attempt to keep conscience alive in the age of the apparatus."

Anders wrote that the court's "verdict contradicts the facts." He said, "Every reasonable medical man knows: It is abnormal to act normally during or after an abnormal situation. It is abnormal if, after an appalling shock, someone goes on living as if nothing has happened."

He recalled Getthold Lessing's words: "He who doesn't lose his mind over certain things, has none to lose."

Anders explained that "through his sham criminal action [Eatherly] has tried to enforce that punishment which was not granted him." He suggested that the United States could not accept Eatherly's remorse because it "would have been an indictment * * * against the Hiroshima mission."

He also asked whether the VA psychiatrists understood the criminal acts as reactions to his guilt over Hiroshima and would treat him properly.

Anders said: "It looks as if the Air Force exerted pressure on the hospital staff * * * to keep Eatherly interned indefinitely." He questioned the legality of arresting Eatherly after his voluntary departure from the hospital.

He proposed an international commission of psychiatrists—for instance, a Swede, a doctor from India, a Pole, and a Japanese—to reexamine Eatherly. Anders included excerpts from Eatherly's letters:

June 21, 1959: "My personal experience needs to be studied if its true significance, not only for myself, but for all men everywhere, is to be grasped."

August 22, 1959: "It seems that those sleeping under the ashes of Hiroshima were crying something for peace. I hope that people could together, hand in hand, make a better world."

August 1959: "One has only one life, and if the experiences of my life can be used for the benefit of the human race, then that is the way it will be used, not for money nor fame, but because of the responsibility I own toward everyone. In that way I will receive a great benefit and relieve my guilt."

May 27, 1959: "To most people my method of rebellion against war is that of an insane person. No other way could I have made people realize that nuclear war is a moral degeneration as well as physically destructive."

Eatherly's words are not insane: the imbalance rather is in those who would make "bigger and better" bombs. Anders put it thus: "Happy the times in which the insane speak out this way; wretched the times in which only the insane speak out this way."

A FELLOW VICTIM

On July 24, 1959, 30 Hiroshima girls suffering from "the atomic sickness" wrote to Eatherly "to convey our sincere sympathy with you and to assure you that we do not harbor any sense of enmity to you personally—you are also a victim like us."

If Eatherly is a "Hiroshima victim," then these questions must be asked:

Will he be "cured" by shutting him away, or by allowing him to go out in the world to testify against war?

Is he being labeled insane so that the warmakers may bear the seal of sanity?

By permitting him to be confined, is society seeking to still its own conscience?

These are questions a nuclear age society must answer to Eatherly. To itself it must answer: For whom is Eatherly dangerous? And the answer must be: To all of us, if we do not heed his cry.

Those whose conscience is not interned might follow Dr. Anders' lead and write to President Kennedy in behalf of Eatherly's freedom.

Propane Gas Import Restrictions Should Be Lifted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has presently under consideration the question of the need of lifting of the restrictions on the importation of residual oil. I wish to point out that during the consideration of this question, we must not overlook an additional product which is now restricted and on which such restrictions should have been lifted.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the importation of propane gas.

An objective study of the background leading to the issuance of the President's proclamation on import restrictions indicates that mandatory import controls were not intended to apply to propane and could not reasonably have been an influencing factor in the issuance of the proclamation. The proclamation was based upon a report of the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The Director's analysis in no instance makes any reference to propane gas or to "unfinished products." It is also important to note that propane was not included under the voluntary control program. It is apparent from this cursory examination that propane was not an influencing factor in the promulgation of the President's proclamation, as can be amply demonstrated from that fact that no propane was imported

into district 1 through 4 during the period covered by the Director's report. Furthermore, there has been and is no allocation for the importation of propane.

Therefore, it is obvious that an order to prevent importation could not and should not apply to a product that was not at the time even being imported.

It is also clear that the importation of propane had absolutely no effect upon the growth and development of the domestic propane business or on the production of crude oil or unfinished products. It is obvious that propane was not intended for mandatory control and the Director should decontrol propane.

The unique position of Florida, Mr. Speaker, makes it desirable and necessary to decontrol the importation of propane into Florida. This would be true, even if it were found reasonable and justifiable to impose controls upon the importation of propane. In my view, there is no such justification.

Notwithstanding that, however, Florida does have a special case. Florida is the 10th leading State in the consumption of propane, with an expected phenomenal increase in population, and a corresponding increase in propane consumption. It has no underground storage facilities and the geophysical structure of the soil does not make such facilities feasible. It has no production of propane and has a wide seasonal fluctuation in demand and consumption.

In addition, Florida is far removed from the sources of domestic propane and, therefore, has an unusually long supply line which makes the cost of transportation of domestic propane extremely high. The facts show that historically, over an average period, transporation amounts to over 50 percent of the cost of the product delivered in Florida by tank cars.

In the Miami area alone, there are over 15,000 household consumers who are entirely dependent on propane for home-heating purposes. Florida produces no coal, natural gas, or oil products, and must rely upon products from outside, distant sources for such heating fuels. Electric power is not available for mass space-heating needs. One only needs to briefly examine the newspapers of my district during any winter season to see the urgings of the power company that residents do not make unnecessary demand upon electric consumption for heating purposes and, strange as it may seem, the power company urges people to convert to other sources such as oil or propane for space-heating purposes.

Notwithstanding this unique demand and the unusual position of Florida, the importation needs are comparatively quite small and could not in any sense, adversely affect competition with fuel oil, coal or other domestically produced fuels. It has been estimated that the needs in my area are 1 percent of the total propane produced or consumed in the United States. It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, extremely difficult to perceive how an importation of this amount could in anywise adversely affect competition with other heating fuels.

Fundamentally though, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to understand how the importation of propane gas could in anywise impair national security or result in damage to the oil import program.

Therefore, the refusal to decontrol the importation of propane into Florida is completely unjustified on the basis of the national security or unjust competition and only results in severe hardship and higher costs to the users of this product in my district.

Troika Crisis Looms in Redistricting Hassle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting and most timely statement of Mr. Charles H. McGlue, former special assistant attorney of Massachusetts on the subject of redistricting.

TROIKA CRISIS LOOMS IN REDISTRICTING HASSLE

Early in the first F.D.R. administration, the word "troika" would recall memories of "La Troika," a Russian night spot on Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., just below the then newly opened swank Hotel Mayflower, or perhaps the familiar three-horse Russian sleigh which made its appearance in "A Night at Garde's" in a very intriguing scene in the Russian musical, "Chauve-Souris."

"Troika" today has an entirely different connotation. It is a Khrushchev expression for a three-way operation to administer or maladminister a given proposition. The Troika setup is a factor in the congressional redistricting problems, affecting three States; namely, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. In each of these three States, there is a potential deadlock that might result in requiring all Congressmen to be elected at large.

TROIKA DILEMMA

Massachusetts has a Democratic senate, a Democratic house of representatives but a Republican Governor. Illinois has a Republican senate, a Democratic house of representatives, but a Democratic Governor. Pennsylvania has an evenly divided senate, 25 Republicans and 25 Democrats, a Democratic house of representatives, and a Democratic Governor. In accordance with the population count in 1960 national census, Massachusetts will lose two Congressmen, dropping from 14 to 12; Illinois will lose one Congressman, dropping from 25 to 24; while Pennsylvania will lose three Congressmen, dropping from 30 to 27.

The law governing congressional redistricting generally requires the passage of a redistricting measure through both State legislative branches together with the signature of the Governor of each State. The case of *Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U.S. 355 (1932)) determined that a redistricting act in order to be legal required the same process as that of any legislative bill and that the term "legislature" as used in article IV section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, referred to the legislative power of the State however it might be distributed.

Thus it becomes obvious that in each of these three States there must be an agreement for the passage of some form of redistricting, or in lieu thereof, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania must resort to a superchaotic election-at-large for all their Congressmen in November 1962.

The existing U.S. statute on redistricting States that if the number of Representatives (Congressmen) is decreased and the number of districts in the State exceeds that number, then all are elected at large. However, Congress still retains its constitutional right to change the statutory provisions at any time. Also, the constitutional right of Congress to be final judge of the elections and qualifications of its own Members should not be overlooked. U.S. Constitution, article 1, section 5.

CONGRESSMAN CELLER

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, has made an exhaustive study of the problems arising from congressional redistricting. Representative CELLER states that the question of congressional control over the acts of the State legislatures regarding apportionment was first met in 1843 when objections were raised concerning the election of certain Members from States wherein the elections were not held by districts. By parliamentary maneuver the House avoided the direct issue and the Members in question retained their seats. In 1901, the power of Congress to regulate districts was challenged in an election case, but this time the House took no action and the Member retained his seat. In 1910 the House was faced with a similar issue, but no action was taken.

Although the most direct attack upon the power of the Congress to regulate redistricting under article 1, section 4 of the Constitution is found in the reports of the House itself, it appears to be well-established by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court that the Congress has general supervisory power over the subject of the elections of the Representatives, including the matter in which a State is divided into congressional districts. (*Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U.S. 355 (1932)), *Ex Parte Siebold* (100 U.S. 371 (1879)), *Ex Parte Yarborough* (110 U.S. 651 (188–)), *Wood* v. *Broom* (287 U.S. 1 (1932)), *Colegrove* v. *Green* (328 U.S. 549 (1946)).)

JUSTICE FRANKFURTER'S OPINION

In the case of *Colegrove* v. *Green* (328 U.S. 549 (1946)) Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a majority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court invited congressional action in the following statement:

"The one stark fact that emerges from a study of the history of congressional apportionment is its embroilment in politics, in a sense of party contests and party interests. The Constitution enjoins upon Congress the duty of apportioning representatives among the several States according to their respective number (art. I, sec. 2). Yet Congress has at times been heedless of this command and has not apportioned according to the requirements of the census. It never occurred to anyone that this Court could issue mandamus to compel Congress to perform its mandatory duty to apportion. 'What might not be done directly by mandamus could not be attained indirectly by injunction' (Chaffe) congressional reapportionment (1929), 42 Havard Law Review 1015–1019)."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CELLER

"In the light of the court decisions and the legislative enactments, the importance of the problem of fair, equitable apportionment both by the Federal and State legislatures is one that demands a final and prompt solution.

"It must be a solution which goes to the very root of the problem and eradicates the sources of the evil. A mere glance at the contours of various congressional districts and the wide variances in the population of these districts compels the conclusion that

the drawing of congressional districts cannot be left to the whims and uncontrolled discretion of the State legislatures. The problem is one that involves the fundamental principle of equality which permeates our entire Constitution so that this denial imperils the very heart of our democracy."

Services Losing a Great Friend in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives to an article appearing in the September 9, 1961, issue of Army Times with reference to our esteemed colleague, Representative PAUL KILDAY, of San Antonio, Tex.

This article is a tribute to the services Representative KILDAY has offered over his years on the Armed Services Committee and on the House floor to the men and women of the military services. Because I feel it applies equally to his services to the civilian element as well, and to the country as a whole, and because it so clearly describes his many fine attributes, under unanimous consent, I include this commentary on Representative KILDAY's unique abilities in the Appendix of the RECORD. I know all of us who have been privileged to serve with him will heartily agree with the closing sentiment of this article, "I'm Sorry To See Him Go," and will wish him Godspeed in his new capacity as judge on the Court of Military Appeals.

The article follows:

SERVICES LOSING A GREAT FRIEND IN CONGRESS
(By John J. Ford)

The men and women of the military services are losing as good a friend as they ever had on Capitol Hill.

That's because PAUL J. KILDAY, the gentleman from Texas, is retiring from Congress. Members of Congress are always called gentleman all the time but Mr. KILDAY always was one. He was also the most knowledgeable man in the Congress on military personnel legislation and the champion of service people at every turn. He fought a great many battles for them and he very seldom lost any. I can't help but wonder if their battles will be won as often in the future when he's not there.

There are good men and true in the House and in the Senate who are concerned about the welfare of servicemen and their families. But there is only one PAUL KILDAY. The subcommittee of which he was chairman has undoubtedly written more legislation of benefit to military personnel than any other in the history of the Congress. The dependent medical care law, career improvement bills for doctors, nurses, trailer owners, pilots, divers and many other groups needing special help, the improvements to the Justice Code, the Career Compensation Act, the last three pay raises—all were written by Mr. KILDAY's subcommittee. And after they were written he guided them through the committee and through the House.

There are 37 members on the Armed Services Committee. That's a lot of politicians to bring into agreement and on difficult legislation they can get themselves embroiled in some monumental confusion. Time and again in such situations Mr. KILDAY would ask for recognition, explain the situation clearly and lucidly and suggest the most reasonable solution. The committee would accept it, like men shown the light, and that would be that.

I have spent the better part of the last 7 years listening to politicians talk. It is not an occupation calculated to increase one's appreciation for the spoken word. But PAUL KILDAY was a joy to listen to. He has as good a voice, as clear a mind and as even a temperament as any man I ever knew.

One place where this showed so clearly, and where the Armed Services Committee is likely to miss him so much, is on the floor of the House. His great prestige in the House helped to gain passage for bills that might have had a rough time without him. A case in point was the recent accrual flight pay bill debate.

For those who do not understand the background of the bill it would be easy to criticize it as a measure to "pay officers for not flying." An unskilled floor manager would have had a very unhappy afternoon defending the bill. But Mr. KILDAY handled it so skillfully that by the end of the debate he had the midwestern archconservatives congratulating him for saving the taxpayers' money.

The bills he handled were often, of necessity, extremely complex but his explanations of them were wonderfully lucid. He could always put the problems of the military into clear focus for the Members of the House. They relied on him and few indeed were willing to do battle with him. Fortune magazine called him 1 of the 10 most influential men in the House and Senate on military affairs.

PAUL KILDAY was born with a temperament for leadership. Over the last 7 years I must have covered 90 percent of his committee hearings and most of his floor debates. I never saw him lose his temper. I never saw him angry. I never saw him lose control of a political situation. He was always calm and he was always in command.

He also has those rare political qualities of humor and humility. Political leaders are vain by nature. If you can get them intelligent and honest and energetic that's usually the most you should hope for; you must expect them to be towering egotists. But KILDAY looks at the world and his place in it with humility and detachment. He'll probably be less impressed with a column like this than just about anyone else in the Congress.

In the nature of things most military people will be unaware of the debt they owe to PAUL KILDAY. But they shouldn't be.

Mr. KILDAY won't be entirely out of military personnel matters. He's been appointed a judge on the Court of Military Appeals.

But I hope those of you in the military service will pause to think of what PAUL KILDAY has accomplished in 22 years in the Congress. I'm sorry to see him go. When he's gone, reporting won't be as much fun for me—and the living might not be as good for you.

Safety Program of the Mifflin Toppers 4–H Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following material, which was distributed by the Mifflin Toppers 4–H Club at the Iowa County Fair. I feel this club is doing a great job in calling attention to safety-first measures that should be practiced around the home and farm:

As part of our safety program this year
We would like to spread a little fear.
It isn't always the other fellow who gets hurt
So, with these such dangers never flirt:

Being careless with firearms.
Poison in reach of children.
Swimming alone.
Boating without lifejackets.
Power mowers.
P.T.O.—all working parts of farm machinery.
Cutting traffic law corners, etc.

It is a bit ominous we'll admit
But we just want you to think a bit
And perhaps by spreading our safety alert
A few major and minor mishaps we'll all avert.

Along with safety comes good health, too
The blessings it gives us aren't just a few
Don't forget to be wise when you eat
Also good posture is an important feat.

Especially to young folks who may be tempted to slouch
Stand straight and tall
You'll feel better we vouch.

Think safety first.
Have fun at the fair.

MIFFLIN TOPPERS 4–H CLUB.

Bob Lusk Gives Eyewitness Report on Quemoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota's talented Bob Lusk, editor and publisher of the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., is presently on a world tour reporting to his many readers conditions abroad as he observes them. His wife and daughter are accompanying him on this globe-circling venture.

Very recently, Bob Lusk spent a day on Quemoy. His impressions are most informative and encouraging. I ask that the column he wrote following that visit together with a piece of equal interest which he wrote about Formosa, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Sept. 7, 1961]

STEPPINGSTONE TO MAINLAND—FAR EAST'S "GIBRALTAR" THORN IN REDS' SIDE
(By Robert D. Lusk)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—There would be less talk about abandoning Quemoy and Matsu to the Red Chinese if the public knew a little more about these very important islands.

This, apparently, is the conclusion that the Nationalist Chinese have reached, with the result that we spent a day visiting the military installation on Kinman Island, as the Chinese call Quemoy.

The conclusion that our group of visitors without exception reached after seeing Quemoy is that any talk of giving it up makes absolutely no sense at all.

Quemoy is a small island, about 7 or 8 miles long and from a half to 2 or 3 miles wide. A ridge of rocky hills runs along it. It is surrounded on three sides by Red China across straits from less than a mile to several wide.

PLANES FLY LOW

We flew the hundred miles from a military base on Taiwan to Quemoy in Chinese Nationalist army planes. The last few miles, the planes dropped to 100 feet from the water to avoid the Red Chinese radar. We all had to put on lifejackets, despite the sticky heat which prevails in this part of the world at this time of year.

We were assured by our military guides that there was nothing to worry about as this was an even-numbered day and the Reds didn't bomb Quemoy except on odd-numbered days. In fact there had been no bombing for several days, a fact that no one seemed to be able to explain. But since the bombings started, more than 800,000 shells have been lobbed onto Quemoy.

HEAVILY MINED BEACH

We landed on a beach on a part of the island that looks for all the world like the South Dakota Badlands. Aside from the runway, the beach was covered with barbed wire and was heavily mined. Our plane was run into a prepared hiding place and we boarded jeeps for a trip around the island.

Quemoy is very deceptive looking. A casual glance reveals only a bit of rather bleak and rugged terrain. But look closer. See that slit in the rock. Something is sticking out of it. It's a machinegun. Then you begin to get the idea. You study the scene more carefully. Everywhere are gun emplacements. Everywhere are camouflaged entrances to caves where soldiers live, armed and at battle alert.

In between these caves may be fields of crops being casually cultivated by the natives of Quemoy who continue to walk behind their bullock-drawn plows despite the hot-cold war that goes on around them.

MEN ARE THERE

The tour of duty on Quemoy for the Nationalist Chinese is 1 year, and of Taiwan's 600,000 troops, it is estimated that one-sixth are on Quemoy. A several-hour drive over the island will reveal a couple of hundred. But the men are there. You pass a small mountain. There is nothing to see but rock. But this mountain houses, in tunnels that cut into and through it like an anthill, a whole division of 14,000 men.

We had lunch in the middle of one such mountain. It was the general headquarters for the island. I asked whether it was safe against nuclear weapons.

"What do you think?" was the reply. "There are 600 feet of granite overhead."

During the 1960 political campaign in the United States there were suggestions made that "we can't defend Quemoy" and that "we should give it up."

HELL OF A FIGHT

We don't have to defend it. The Nationalist Chinese will defend it. And there is going to be one hell of a fight if the Communists try to take it. They have tried a couple of times with heavy casualties and no success. I am no military expert to say whether it could be taken, but I can well believe outside military experts who have said that they would hate to have to try to take it.

So there stands Quemoy, outpost of freedom, manned by 100,000 troops and stocked with great underground warehouses of ammunition.

The Red Chinese are going to have to take this Far Eastern Gibraltar before they can break out of the mainland; and it would seem to be a fair bet that the only way they're ever going to take it is if some jughead in Washington gives it to them.

For my part, Quemoy is one of the most reassuring things I've seen in the Far East. And I hope it not only can serve as a block to Communist expansion, but as a steppingstone to an invasion that will someday free the Red Chinese on the mainland.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Sept. 8, 1961]

OR IS IT REST OF WORLD?—FORMOSA OUT OF STEP IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Robert D. Lusk)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN (Formosa).—In today's mixed-up world, Taiwan is difficult to understand.

To a pacifist, bombing Japan, Taiwan is an irritation. To America which has talked "containment" and holding the line, as it let Laos go and Cuba grow as a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere, Taiwan is out of step.

In a world that is ready to compromise on Berlin, that fears communism, public opinion, and asserting its own strength, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is not a popular figure, but is tolerated because in a free world that can summon little courage in the face of the enemy it is difficult to get up the courage to deal adversely with a friend.

VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

Chiang Kai-shek and Taiwan have long since made up their minds about their roles in today's world. They are not for "containment," for holding the line, for apologizing for freedom; they are for carrying the war to the Communist world and defeating it. They are for freeing "mainland" Chinese from Red tyranny. They are for victory over communism.

Taiwan is a beautiful land of green mountains, of rich valleys and of great rivers. Today it is prosperous as never before. But it is a dedicated land, with a dedication that is always apparent, always present.

VISITORS CONFUSED

The visitor from elsewhere in the free world is confused, and even vaguely amused, as if watching a people playing at war day after day, year after year.

How could this little island with its 2 million "mainlanders" and 8 million Taiwanese hope to win out against 600 million Red Chinese?

Hunger and hate on the mainland are the basis for hope in Taiwan. There have been, they will point out to you, 30,000 recorded uprisings of one sort or another in Red China in the last decade. Someday, with the help of Taiwan, the whole Red tyranny will be overthrown.

NEXT 5 YEARS

I asked Chiang Kai-shek when they expected to return to the mainland and he replied that it would be in the next 5 years.

He said his intelligence agents have reported a breakdown of internal security in Red China. The Chinese Nationalist forces retreated to Taiwan in 1949.

Replying to questions by a group of more than 60 U.S. editors and publishers and their wives, Chiang said he foresaw an uprising on the mainland in the near future.

ISLANDS IMPORTANT

He told the Americans, on a tour of the Far East sponsored by the National Editorial Association, that his Government attaches equal importance to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. "Like Berlin, the offshore islands are obstacles to Communist expansion and aggression," he said.

Madame Chiang was seated with her husband during the interview. At one point she said, "Quemoy and Matsu are like the right and left eyes of China. Which is more important, your left or right eye?" The American audience laughed in approval.

BAD TO WORSE

Chiang told the group that in Hong Kong you can find out from refugees about the conditions on the mainland. He said conditions on the mainland had gone from bad to worse.

"The terror, hunger, slave labor, and death brought on by the Red dictatorship is unbearable to the Chinese on the mainland," he said.

All of this may seem to those from the land of containment as a disturbing and ludicrous statement out of a "never-never land;" yet maybe this disquieting feeling arises from our own guilt; our own inability to make up our minds to the fact that victory in the cold war will come only to those who are ready and willing to fight for it.

HARD TO UNDERSTAND

Maybe someday, a day when the West screws up its courage to rid the world of communism, to bring freedom to people everywhere, we will understand better the determination of the Taiwan Chinese to bring freedom to their fellow Chinese on the mainland.

And when that time comes we will be more appreciative of the important logistic fact that today Nationalist China is maintaining a splendid army of 600,000 men on the side of freedom on a strong springboard base 100 miles from Red China.

The Will To Resist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable essay was written by 17-year old Dianne Kerr, of Pacific Palisades, Calif. I think so well of it that I commend it to the Members of the House for study:

THE WILL TO RESIST

It is our plan to "break the will to resist" (stated by the Communists).

America is a Nation which has grown up resisting. In 1620 the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, resisting the religious persecution in Europe. In 1775 the Revolutionary War was fought, resisting the unrepresentative government controlled by the British. In 1812 the War of 1812 was fought, resisting the control England and France tried to extend over the foreign trade of the United States. In 1861 the Civil War was fought, resisting both the ownership of slaves and the division of the Union. In 1918 the First World War was fought, resisting the spread of dictatorships. Likewise in 1941 World War II was fought to defend democracies against fascism. Our ancestors had the will and the strength to fight for what they believed to be right; and to resist what they believed to be wrong, but do Americans today possess this strength and this will?

Communism seems to have found a new weapon, one which was not used against our ancestors—ideological warfare. Ideological warfare is a weapon dreadfully harmful and although not physically deadly, is deadly to the soul—our mind's guide. It is this weapon which the Communists are using to kill democracy from within. By employing various ideological methods the Communists are destroying America's resistance.

First of all, the Communists use every chance they get to actually destroy America's prestige abroad. But more harmful than destroying foreigners' faith in America, is the destruction of Americans' faith in America. This is what the Communists are achieving. By planting trained Communists throughout the American society, to mix with the average population, Communist views can be supplanted in the open-minded individual. Within the individuals mind the initiated idea grows and he doubts the ability of America's leaders, the correctness of America's policies, and the worth of democracy. Losses plied on the United States (Laos, Cuba, etc.) disfavor felt toward America, and leaders of our country admitting defeat (prominent Americans' belief that America's prestige abroad extremely low) as viewed in the newspapers, add to the infiltrated American's doubts. The defeatist, or useless attitude is then acquired by the doubter, and the Communists' inroad into America's democratic resistance is a little deeper.

The Communists are also destroying American resistance by creating false ideals. The first of these is peace. Naturally peace has always been a desired ideal by the American. Like people everywhere he dislikes killing and abhors destruction, especially if his loved one is being killed or his possessions are being destroyed. Yet Americans have always resisted wrong and if necessary fought for right. Even if it meant the contribution of his life, the American would donate it for his country. In fact, Patrick Henry regretted that he had but one life to give for his country. But in America today a different atmosphere prevails—a passive atmosphere. I cannot believe that Americans, of their own free will, do not wish to fight aggression. The passive atmosphere must prevail because the Communists have created peace as a false ideal. Instead of peace being set up as a goal for coexistence to flourish under, the Communists have encouraged the American to preserve peace at all costs. A perfect example of preserving peace at all costs, finally led up to World War II. The British bought time by handing Hitler Europe piece by piece, a passivist movement, which did not work.

Any mother can tell you that giving a child candy to keep him from writing on the walls will only divert his attention until the candy is gone, when he will resume his previous action. However, if he is rewarded with a spanking it is unlikely that he will continue to mark on the walls. So it is with nations. As you can see, peace cannot always be preserved. In fact as long as peace within your own household is impossible to keep, peace within the world of nations will remain impossible; and the passive ideal—unrealistically tagged peace by the Communists—is a false pretention destroying the American will to resist.

The second false ideal created by the Communists is security. If you look around, you can observe the security Americans are establishing for themselves. Every male is expected to obtain a college education if he plans to be successful. He then must acquire a worthwhile job before most parents will give away their daughter. The couple then are careful to acquire insurance, make investments, save money, and build up any other additional security, which will protect them supposedly from the world. Because of this seemingly American idol—security—the elected representatives of our Government are trying their hardest to make every individual more secure. Laws are being passed to take care of widows, orphans, the sick, the unemployed, and the aged. The Government is planning on giving Federal aid to education and already sponsors various plans to allow most anyone the chance to attend college. All this insures the American of a better life—a more secure life. But is a secure life a happy life?

In Sweden—a democratic nation where security flourishes—the people are still not content. For although the older person enjoys security, the teenager and young adult desire something else. They want a chance to build their own life; to make a success of themselves. All through history man has reached out of his present position and left security behind. The Pilgrims left their homes and security, and sailed for a wilderness they knew nothing about; the American pioneers left their homes to move West, forgetting security; Carnegie and other foreigners left their homelands to come to America, waving off security; Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Alva Edison, and others in the field of science, who invested either (or both) their lives and fortunes in their work, gave up security; in fact all the men and women in American history who stepped from their positions, leaving their homes and reaching for something better, traded security for the chance to prove that they could be successful. The teenager and the young adult have unlimited faith, immense daring and curiosity, and a wealth of adventurous energy. Yet all this initiative is being overlooked as the Communists influence the older generation, assuring them that security will create an atmosphere of happiness, destroying all worries. But complete security, or security at all costs, is socialism; and like peace, security is only good to an extent. When it destroys the will to understand, explore, and resist, it becomes a misleading ideal not worth having.

Now that we have observed how the Communists are destroying us, by destroying our will to resist, mainly through the creation of false images—peace and security—we Americans must decide what America's real ideals are. What do the American people really want?

Would the doctor prefer to treat as many patients successfully of his own choosing as he can; or would he prefer to treat those assigned him by the Government—one week 5 patients and maybe another week 25, with equal pay for both weeks of work? Naturally the first way of practicing is more acceptable—the democratic way. The teacher too undoubtedly would prefer to teach a child to think independently, by using his own methods, rather than ordered by his superiors to follow a strict plan. The farmer would much prefer growing as much of any crop he desires and selling it for any price he can get, rather than working on a collective farm where all workers receive according to their need (depends on the number in the farmer's family) and work according to their ability. The scientists too would prefer to delve into whatever subject interested him, rather than studying that which the Government delegated. Of course the factory and labor workers prefer their privileges; the right to strike or quit, rather than being forced to do a certain job until the Government decided differently. Even though all these preferences may be achieved under democracy—impossible under communism—even more extensive privileges are afforded the American people. Preserved since the beginning of the United States the ideals set forth in the Constitution and in the first 10 amendments are extended to all citizens. Taken lightly, perhaps, yet terribly important to all Americans are the rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, the right to vote for representatives to the U.S. Government, freedom to travel throughout the Nation, freedom of speech, free enterprise, and various other rights, which only a democracy has to offer. There is not possible way of obtaining the above ideals except under a democratic government. Therefore in order to preserve these great American ideals we must defend our American democracy, not only by words but with deeds, remembering that faith without works is dead. We Americans must not become intellectually lazy, intoxicated with entertainment, limited in our horizons, and inherently selfish, as the Communists have already accused us. We must find time to educate ourselves, recognize our enemy, and proceed to help destroy him. We in the United States must regain our will to resist, we must not be afraid to vote for someone who advocates old-fashioned, but real American ideas, for we live in a democracy. It is our duty to vote for those who we believe can lead our country best, to give our representatives our opinions and views through letters, to adopt true American principles (and stand for them) and to attack communism the best we can whenever and wherever we might encounter it.

Americans, I urge you not to let the Communists destroy your will to resist, unless you're an un-American coward, who would rather be Red than dead.

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since H.R. 8666, along with numerous other bills today, is being processed under suspension of the rules, an amendment would be out of order. I feel it necessary to call to the attention of the House certain inconsistencies in the operation of the cultural exchange program that I hope the committee will consider and I certainly hope will adopt in the coming years.

I wish to direct your attention to section 109, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, and I call your particular attention to subsection (e) which provides that a foreign exchange student who acquires his training and skill in the United States may return to this country for admission as a permanent resident after spending 2 years out of the country upon his departure after completing his training program.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told on numerous occasions that the purpose of training foreign students here in the United States is that they will return to their native lands and use their newly acquired skills and knowledge to advance living standards in their native countries. Certainly, when they acquire permanent residence in the United States to practice their skill they in effect violate the intention of the cultural exchange and education program.

I am positive that many Members of the House have shared my experience in receiving requests to introduce private

legislation to establish permanent residence for exchange students here in the United States. Many of them come to this country with no intention of returning to their native lands once educated here and use every conceivable gimmick to remain.

Mr. Speaker, had this bill been brought to the House under normal procedure, I was prepared to offer an amendment requiring that the student reside in his native country for at least 5 years following his departure from the United States so that for at least that nominal amount of time the people of his native land could benefit from his acquired skill.

I certainly hope the Foreign Affairs Committee will give this matter its earnest consideration so that a practical solution could be forthcoming to adjust the abuses now prevalent in this program.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, although I feel, in the spirit of constructive criticism, that some of the demerits or the weaknesses ought to be pointed out to the House in the hope that perhaps in years to come they might be perfected. For example, there is the question of exchanges of artists and the American performers. We could take the American Olympic track team and send it throughout the world. Their tour would be of benefit in creating good will of people toward our country. I am not so sure that sending a few of our eccentric artists or characters from the entertainment world around other parts of the world at Government expense is helpful to the image that we want people to have of the United States. I merely point that out as a constructive thought.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think there is room for debate about certain art exhibitions—I mean by that the theater arts and so on. I would say to the gentleman that we did put in the report the expression that the committee understands that when these are sent abroad the only expense the Government would pay would be the difference between the official fees and what it actually cost to send them. In other words, we are not going to subsidize them and have them make a lot of gravy on the side.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out on page 16 of the committee report the language wherein there is discussed the Immigration Act amendments. During the 3 years that I have served in the Congress, I have been requested on four occasions to introduce private bills to keep in this country doctors who have come from abroad, studied in American schools, and then decided they did not wish to go back to their native lands. I can understand if a man reaches this country and studies, for example, English, and then is offered a job as a professor teaching history in this country at one of the outstanding universities—I say this is fine, and he should stay here. But if he gets admitted into this country and we educate him in the humanitarian sciences such as medicine, dentistry, and so forth, I think we should write into the law sufficient safeguards so that he does return to his country and works in his particular field.

I see, for example, according to the committee report, that students from the Philippines, Iran, and Turkey go to Canada to serve their 2-year period rather than return to the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. The matter the gentleman mentions is adequately dealt with in this bill. The language employed was recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of eliminating the evasions of obligation to serve the basic aims of the program. The language of section 109 of this bill is consistent with the basic Immigration and Nationality Act. Under it an exchange student cannot have his immigration status adjusted, he cannot become a permanent resident until after he had returned to his own land and remained there for a period of 2 years thus complying with what we believe is his obligation freely assumed when he accepted assistance in order to come and study in this country. If he goes to some other land instead, this Government will determine, before readmitting him, whether that has served the purpose of the bill before us.

Religion in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. R. Richard Renner, gave a very interesting talk before the annual pilgrimage of Religious Heritage of America which was held in Washington this year on June 22.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting Dr. Renner's address in the RECORD, believing my colleagues will enjoy reading it as much as I did:

RELIGION IN RUSSIA

(Address delivered by R. Richard Renner, M.D., a report to the Religious Heritage of America at the annual meeting, June 22, 1961, Washington, D.C.)

We, Mrs. Renner and I, feel honored at this time to give to the Religious Heritage of America our report of the World Peace Mission to Russia. We thank you for your confidence in appointing us as official delegates of the Religious Heritage. On our way we first stopped to counsel with the outstanding peace leaders of Britain, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and West and East Germany. Everyone thought peace the most important problem before the civilized world today. And everyone thought that only one-tenth of 1 percent of the moral and spiritual leaders of the world are really doing anything personal for the cause of peace. The rest of the religious people are complacently trusting their governments to take care of the peaceful solutions of the world's governmental, ideological conflicts, which, according to our preparation and spending will sooner or later lead to war as the final total settlement of the conflict.

We were personally warned by our friends of the dangers of such a mission especially in the light of the Berlin crisis about to come to a head in 1959. Even close relatives doubted the wisdom of the trip and when it came time for the final briefing by a representative from our State Department on how to act and what to do, we found that a large percentage of the delegates had decided because of the Berlin trouble not to risk the trip. There were only 12 of us.

While the plans had been perfected more by the Baptists than any other church group, we personally carried letters of introduction from our brotherhood to Dr. Zidkhov, head of the Baptist Christian Churches in Russia, inviting him and delegates of the church to come to America and especially to church conventions the following year in Scotland. We are happy to say that two delegates came and took an active part in the World Convention of Christian Churches last year in Edinburgh.

Our first encounter with the people behind the so-called Iron Curtain came in Berlin. We transferred to a different bus at the Brandenburg Gate. The East Berlin people had sent an interpreter and a noted historian, Dr. Beck, to meet us there and show us the city. East Berlin still shows the terrible destruction wrought by the American Air Force. Hitler's Reichstag is left not one stone on another, and Hitler's bombproof shelter with its six layers of concrete reinforced by steel rails is nothing but a hole in the ground with the protecting tower toppled on its side. Where there was hustle and bustle and much store and window shopping in West Berlin, the streets are much more quiet and almost deserted in East Berlin. True, they have completely rebuilt Unter den Linden, now renamed Stalin Allee. For over 2 miles the beautiful wide street is now lined with new apartment buildings with some stores on the main floors.

There is a Russian monument west of the Brandenburg Gate with two Russian soldiers guarding the first tank and the first large cannon to arrive in Berlin. But this was small compared to the large Russian Memorial Cemetery in East Berlin where 600,000 Russians who died in the march on Berlin lie buried. Here were Russian soldiers on guard as at the Tomb of our Unknown Soldier. I found out the monuments were made out of the stones from the Reichstag which permitted me to understand more why Hitler's final headquarters is now only a mass of weeds and rubble.

After the tour, we were taken to the Newa Hotel where a group from the Department of Education, Welfare, and Peace entertained us with a regular banquet. They all seemed very sincere and were anxious to document many things about the rearming of West Germany to which they strongly objected. We were all permitted to have our say. Some of our group were determined to let them know how much superior democracy is to communism. It was all very friendly and in the end someone proposed a toast to peace saying how much better it would be if our governments could meet around a common table and freely discuss the problems of world peace.

We had to be at the East Berlin airport at 7 a.m. the next morning so we could all get clearance for the 8 a.m. plane for Moscow. At 9:30 we were told the plane would be delayed and they gave us some breakfast. After lunch we finally got through the gates and were on our way.

At Vilnius we ran into the worst storm I have ever experienced in an airplane. The stewardess took the pilot up a little extra bracer but we did not fasten seat belts or

anything. Here at Vilnius we had dinner and filled out papers concerning our money and our lack of hashish and other narcotic drugs. About 11:30 p.m. we arrived in Moscow. The airport was literally crowded with people sitting or lying on the floor. Eventually, a bus came for us, and coming in over the country roads I was surprised that the driver used only his dim lights all the way. He turned his bright lights on only in passing cars and at intersections. This is the custom in much of central Europe for night driving.

Soon we entered the city and passed long rows of apartment buildings all about the same—seven or eight stories in height on either side. Eventually, after midnight we arrived at the Leningradskya Hotel. It was a big new skyscraper building. Inside were marble pillars and stairways, red velvet carpets, huge chandeliers and everything magnificent. Soon we were up in our room where we found everything very ornate; fine linens on the beds; a large round table with a linen tablecloth; a sort of anteroom with a pretty sofa and easy chairs and with a large modern all-tile bathroom and large coat closets. This was their second best hotel built in 1953 near the four depots on Komsomalska Square and it certainly made a good impression on us.

The next morning on our way to breakfast we met Carl Sandburg, there to help open the American Exposition. After breakfast in the ornate dining room I went out and stood in front of our hotel overlooking the public square just to study the Russians. People were hurrying to and from the subway, the four railway stations and the suburban trains. After some considerable study I formulated in my mind the striking difference between the Russian and American women. The Russian women wore bubushkas mostly instead of hats. The hair, even though combed, did not have all the pretty "wrinkles" and curls like the American women. The lips and the cheeks were unpainted. The clothes were mostly of one color. The skirts were all much longer. The shoes were all black, without the high heels, and the stockings were also black and coarse like grandmother used to wear.

The men wore caps, berets or old hats, tunics with some jackets and their pants were not well pressed at all like American pants are. Many carried baggage. The women all did their fair share. Some carried over their shoulders bags made of string netting through which you could see bread, crackers, fruit, vegetables and other articles bought at the store. Nothing came in cans or in paper packages. Old newspapers, sacks and cigarette packages were not used. That made the job of the women with large witches' brooms cleaning the entire street on our side of the square much easier. You never see rubbish or litter of any kind in the wide clean streets in Russia, thanks partly to the women with the brooms and partly to the fact that there is nothing with which to litter the streets.

I thought as I studied the people that I could see there a far away sad look in their faces. No one else mentioned this. I was perhaps giving way to imagination for we often read into people's faces as well as their minds that which is mirrored back from our own minds.

The people from the Moscow-Leningrad area go south to the Urals and the Black Sea for their vacations, but all the rest of the Russian people come to Moscow and Leningrad. That is why we had opportunity to meet people from many different states. One couple we met at the puppet show had traveled 7 days and nights from Omsk, Siberia, where the man was manager of a cooperative farm. They both spoke good English. They were delightful people. We met many, at the permanent Russian Exposition and in the Kremlin Gardens, from the Uzbek and other republics. Not once did we come in contact with any person who was mean or unfriendly to us.

The line was four abreast, about one-half mile long, waiting to get into the Lenin-Stalin Mausoleum. Our guide took us to the head of the line, but no one seemed to resent it. Down in that cold red granite tomb I studied the two perfectly preserved men who, in all-glass coffins, would seem to be still alive. There was no sign of any wrinkle in the skin, discoloration or other change you would expect even in the perfectly embalmed body. The only bodies I had seen to compare with these were in Madame Toussaud's Wax Works in London. Therefore, one wonders if these are not wax reproductions of Lenin and Stalin and the tomb is kept cold at all times to prevent the wax from melting.

That night at the circus everything was in one ring. Ed Sullivan was there with the President of the Eastman Kodak Co. We saw many acts that might fit well on the "Sullivan Show." But I was surprised at the second half when they let down from overhead enough water to fill the entire ring and the last half was a water show with tigers swimming around in that water doing some simple stunts.

At the permanent Russian Exposition there were large beautiful buildings representing each different Soviet Republic. Inside each building were shown the farm and manufactured products of each republic. Outside were beautiful fountains and all in all it made me wish that somewhere America had a place where each State could show visual evidence of its achievements.

We had visited the Russian Exposition in the Coliseum in New York and naturally made comparisons at the American Exposition in Moscow. It did not seem to me that a great number of our ultramodern paintings was appropriate for the average Russian. As I watched the faces of some of the Russians, it seemed to me they were wondering about the American mind and our sense of the beautiful. The "Family of Man" exhibit, showing the origin from prehistoric times, was puzzling to me as well as to the Russians. An American exposition ought to show things common to America and not what probably was the condition of man 10,000 to 50,000 years ago. The most crowded part of the American Exposition was the auto show, which you could not get near, for the mass of people wanting to closely inspect those new Fords, Plymouths, and Chevrolets.

Our visit to Zagorsk, the famous seminary for training of Orthodox priests, was most enjoyable. This seminary, located 50 miles north and founded in 1320, has never been shut down and continued to train priests all during the revolution. Monk Paul, whose picture was in Life magazine, was the one to show us through the educational part of the seminary. There were many beautiful churches. Some of the turnip-shaped cupolas on top were covered with gold leaf and some were a deep blue with gold decorations. Many people of the town came for the noon services. At that time I slipped out of the fortress-like walls of the seminary grounds to explore and was able to get pictures wherever desired on the back streets and the poorer parts of the city. Outside of the numerous television aerials, even over the poorest unpainted houses, the unpaved back streets and alleys with the dirt sidewalks and community wells with women carrying water two or three blocks was about what we had in many of our smaller villages several generations ago.

Along the way we had seen several "living" churches, those where services were being held regularly. The larger ones that could not support themselves were made into museums and obviously thought of as "dead" churches. However, in these museum churches I noticed people still bowed and crossed themselves before the statues and ikons showing there is still much religious faith in Russia.

We visited one day the home of the Metropolitan Nicolai or as we would say, the topman or head of all the Orthodox churches in Moscow. He spoke to us in English and tried to make us welcome; telling us much about the present-day status of the church. Later, there was a nice reception in the gardens for us. The next morning at his church I was surprised to find the sanctuary filled to overflowing. There were no seats. Everybody stood for the 2-hour services. There was wonderful singing by the choir without benefit of organ or other musical instrument. The Metropolitan Nicolai had many assistants to help him with his different robes, vestments, and head crowns. The procession had worked its way to the back of the church, when I noticed an open side door near me. I stepped out into the sunlight and looked around for some interesting things for the movies.

Across the street were many people going in and out of a building. On closer examination I found it was a shoe store. The people came in, went over to a clerk, showed a card, then went back to the racks of all black shoes stored on shelves all down the middle of the room. The women's shoes were little different from the men's. After they had handled the proper size shoes, they measured them beside their feet, maybe tried another pair, and then carried them back to the clerk who flipped one unit of the abacus. They then put the shoes in the net bag and left the store. No time was wasted trying on the shoes because there was not a single chair in the store. It had our self-serve stores beaten in every way.

But, I wondered and began to ask about the Sunday closing laws. Slowly I learned everybody works on Sunday; they do their shopping on Sunday for the weekend and Monday is the day of rest.

This accounted for the fact that most of the people in the churches were old people. While they do not openly stop church attendance they discourage it by keeping up all business as usual on Sunday and having Monday of each week as the day off. This was obviously a left-handed slap at the church to prevent attendance. It was the Government's way of telling the people that nothing, not even their religion or their God must come between them and their work. This was striking at religion "below the belt."

When I arrived back at the church, here was our group outside ready to go over to the Baptist Church. But three women had followed the group out saying the Metropolitan was worried about us leaving for fear something was wrong. We tried to explain that the Baptist Christian group was expecting us over at their second service. We finally compromised and some of our leaders stayed at the Orthodox Church while the rest of us went across part of the city to the Baptist Christian Church.

It had become expedient after the war for all the Protestant groups to be united in one church because of lack of building space for meeting houses. The Baptists being the predominant group have their name first but its official name is Baptist-Christian. Here we found ushers waiting to take us to seats in the balcony where we could look over the entire sanctuary. It is hard to believe but even in the aisles and across the front and back, people were standing. There were some younger people in the audience and a good proportion in the choir. Dr. Zidkhov was preaching an expository sermon when we arrived. When the services were over the people shook our hands and we felt the sincerity of their welcome. In the private conference following, we delivered our personal letter to Dr. Zidkhov. Assistants trained in England were good interpreters. There is no place in Russia to train other than Orthodox ministers. In

the conference we learned that their greatest need was for Bibles printed in the Russian language. Since the Government there controlled the presses and would not permit the printing of Bibles, they hoped we could get some from the American Bible Society and mail them without any outside markers, simply as gift books, addressed to their private homes.

There had been on earlier Sunday service and there were to be three more with only an hour between so we had to part with these kind people. But all of us were convinced that morning, that in spite of any godless government, religion is not now dead nor even dying in Russia.

Our next religious trip was to the home of Tolstoi, about 150 miles south of the city. We got a faster bus but it still took 5 hours. The little country homes in the little towns along the way with the common well and the women washing clothes along the edge of the brook reminded me of travel through the Indian villages of Mexico. There were no gas stations or Howard Johnson restaurants anywhere and the only comfort station was a woods about half way along where the bus stopped and the men and women disappeared in two different directions.

Beyond the city of Tula is the large former estate of Leo Tolstoi. His home containing the library and other relics is lovingly preserved and cared for. I gained a great respect for the man and decided to study his life in detail as soon as I had opportunity.

Next, we went to see his grave. I expected to see a large monument in the local cemetery to this great man of Russia and one of the greatest authors the world has ever known. We were led along a winding path about a third of a mile into the woods behind the home. There, in the deep woods on his estate, with no monument or Orthodox cross, no headstone of any kind, is the lonely grave with some white flowers growing upon it. We learned he could not be buried from any church, nor have his final resting place in any cemetery. He could not have a priest, let alone any Metropolitan Nicolai, all because he had taught that serfdom was wrong; that men should not be in bondage 3 days a week to the government of the Czars, but should be educated; they should be nonviolent; they should avoid conscription and military service; they should avoid intoxicants, drugs and tobacco. People should share their wealth, give up their monopoly, end serfdom and all forms of war and military service. You might readily see why this teaching would turn the Government against him and cause many of his followers to be banished to Siberia. But why would teaching like this turn the church against him when it would seem to be in line with the teachings of Christ?

It is hard to understand until we study and realize that the state, the Government and the church were one. The Czar was head of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Government gave complete financial support to the church. Therefore, the church gave complete moral, spiritual and political support to the Government. And when Tolstoi offended the Government he doubly offended the church. Standing there in the deep shade of the forest I gave a silent prayer of thanks for the heritage of America, wherein our wise forefathers planned and tried to make certain and final the complete and total permanent separation of state and church in this beloved land.

Our experiences with the people were very much the same in Leningrad as in Moscow. I took movies and we went around by ourselves in the evenings whenever we knew where we wanted to go and thought we could get back without getting lost. St. Isaac's most beautiful catherdral is now a museum and swinging from this third highest church dome in the world is a Foucault pendulum, proving scientifically that the earth rotates on its axis. People still cross themselves at all the holy places in front of the beautiful ikons. It is perfectly logical to know these enormous cathedrals could not be supported and maintained by free will offerings and naturally the government could solve the problem by converting them into public museums.

I would like to tell you about the one, Kazan Cathedral, converted into an anti-religious museum, showing in many ways the horrors of the inquisition, the rack, the burning at the stake, the massacres on St. Bartholomew's Day and the many crimes which we admit were committed in the name of religion. These crimes helped drive religious people to America which is the only good thing I can say about them. I have tried to point out that these crimes were committed mostly by the state when the church and state were one. Just because a government commits a crime in the name of religion and with the consent of so-called religious people does not make it any less a duty of every Christian to see that his religion is never dependent on political or financial support of any government. In this connection I would like to point out that the crucifixion of Christ was a crime committed by the government under the sanction and in the name of religion.

We were greatly impressed by the summer palaces of the czars and the 600 fountains at Peterhof on the Gulf of Finland. The czar went to Versailles and came back to make a park more wonderful and impressive. I believe he did. Water comes down from the mountains over 200 miles away to keep the fountains going night and day. Many women are busy keeping the grounds perfect. The summer palaces are beautifully restored on the outside but on the inside they are still a shambles because it was here the German Army was quartered during the 900-day siege of Leningrad which was completely surrounded that entire time. Over 1 million people starved to death in that period. The only lifeline was over the frozen Lake Ladoga in the dead of winter. And it seems to be a fact that Russia lost over 20 million people, killed or starved to death during the war. This bad news was kept from the Russian people during the war to prevent them from becoming discouraged. This might give America some idea of how much help Russia was to us in winning World War II when some authorities tell us they suffered 80 times as many casualties as we did.

At the Baptist Church in Leningrad they were repairing the front of the church. We entered from the rear and were immediately ushered up to the very front row. The assistant pastor came down and asked me about our world peace mission. He announced to the whole audience what I had told him. There were two different moderately short sermons. In English we were welcomed. They too had hoped we were bringing Bibles. But their desire for peace seemed sincere to us. At the conclusion, we sang with them "God Be With You 'Till We Meet Again." I looked back. They were waving their white handkerchiefs above their heads and tears were streaming down the cheeks of many of those people.

At the Hermitage Art Galleries I could hardly believe my own eyes. It was the big Palace of the Czars filled with the most costly original art treasures of all the world. Catherine the Great gets credit for accumulating most of these treasures. Where she got the money to buy them would be a mystery to any thinking person. There were few guards as we spent most of the day going from one big beautiful room to another. Some say the Hermitage is second to the Louvre in Paris and the National Gallery in London. The settings and the surroundings made a great impression on me and I would call the Hermitage second to none. However, that is not the voice of authority for art is not my specialty.

Near here is Revolution Square and the famous gate where the people poured through on November 9, 1917, with the slogans on their lips of "Peace and land for the peasants" and "Peace and bread for the workmen." It was here that I asked "What caused this sudden revolution in the first place?" Oh, it was not sudden," I was told. It had been coming on for over a half century and was all due to the autocracy of the Czars and the ruling nobility and their suppression of the peasants and working people who were unable to own their own land and had to work 3 days a week for the Czars. In 1859 when Tolstoi first began to write against serfdom there were over 23 million bound to the soil with no civil rights and always bound in debt owing heavy dues and services to their lords.

Czar Alexander II was forced to start freeing these people in 1861. He would probably have made more reforms but he was assassinated in 1881. As the new Czar Alexander III came to the throne he received a letter from the opposition, protesting crimes of the government and ending up as follows: "Revolutionists are the creation of circumstances; of the general discontent of the people; of the striving of Russia after a new social framework. It is impossible, by means of repression to stifle discontent. Discontent only grows the more when it is repressed." But Alexander III only repressed the people more and more. As the world industrial revolution began to affect Russia, the power and discontent of the lower and middle classes grew.

Son Nicholas II became Czar in 1894. He had less intellect and less character than his father. He gave the fierce Cossacks and the secret police full power to deal with the revolutionary societies in any way they desired. The Russo-Japanese War was expected to unite the people against Japan but even war failed to make the people forget their sad condition and they blamed the Czar's regime for the defeat.

On January 22, 1905, a priest named Father Gapon on this Sunday led an enormous crowd with a petition to the czar at the winter palace in St. Petersburg. The petition in part declared: "We workers—have come to you, sire, in search of justice and protection. We have fallen into poverty; we are oppressed; we are loaded with a crushing burden of toil; we are insulted; we are not recognized as men; we are treated as slaves who should bear their sad and bitter lot in patience and silence. Do not refuse to protect your people; raise it from the grave of arbitrary power, poverty, and ignorance; permit it to dispose of its own fate; free it from the intolerable oppression of officials; destroy the wall between yourself and your people—and let them govern the country with you."

Before they got near the czar, just as they approached the palace the waiting Cossack guards opened fire on this defenseless crowd, killing many and wounding more.

The London Times correspondent described this as "the most horrible spectacle ever witnessed." Blood flowed in streams on the hardened snow. Police slashed blindly at the crowd. They used their revolvers and whole companies of infantry "discharged murderous volleys on the shrieking crowd. Women and children covered with blood fell wounded over the dead in the cold snow. This is not a strike. It is a revolution."

As a result of this Red Sunday massacre a general strike was called. Russia was paralyzed. The Orthodox church, long the bulwark of autocracy, tried this appeal to the people: "Workers of Russia, children of toil. Work, according to God's Word, with the sweat of your brow and remember that he who will not work, neither shall he eat.

Beware of false counselors who, pretending anxiety over your needs and well-being foment disorders which lose you your homes and your food. They are the lesser agents of the evil enemy who desires the destruction of Russia."

This revolution of 1905 eventually failed due to the military power of the czar and the supporting power of the Orthodox church. Many people were hanged and many were deported to Siberia. While the Russian Revolution was driven underground, do you wonder that it would disrupt again when Russia was torn asunder by World War I and that because the Orthodox church, being supported by autocracy and supporting the czars, would be considered as a factor that must have no part in the new government of 1917? No part of the Bolshevik policy has received more criticism than their treatment of the Orthodox church. But the Orthodox church was partly to blame because of their complete subordination to the czars. It was only natural that the new government would deprive the church of its powers over education.

But it goes deeper than that for the Communist Party is intensely jealous of religion and thinks the individual should have no loyalty except to the state. That is why attendance at divine services was forbidden to party members. Religion could not be taught to anyone under 18 except in the home. No religious activity was permitted except worship. Anti-religious teaching was stressed and many churches were made into museums. Our guide was willing to argue with me and openly declared she could not see how I could be a scientific practitioner of medicine and still believe in God.

The pendulum that swung so far against religion under Stalin is now swinging back slightly under Mr. Khrushchev. They have learned that religion is not stamped out by law. The Jews have a nice synagogue in Moscow and Leningrad. For the Moslems in Leningrad there is an exact replica of the tomb of Tamerlaine in Samarkand, a most beautiful mosque. Tolerance of minorities is increasing and well it should be, for some day the religious people of Russia will awake to the fact that the whole Communist Party is about the least minority of any group in Russia (1 to 2 percent) even if it at present is the most powerful. And no small minority can forever rule the great majority when that majority becomes aware of its own power.

In conclusion, it would be my impression that we in America should remember that:

1. The Communist regime represents approximately only 2 percent of the Russian people.

2. The Russian people are better off now than they were under the czars.

3. The Russian people are friendly and would like to be friends of America.

4. The Russian Government has been able to instill in them some fear but no hate for America.

5. The antireligion in the present Government is due to the fact that the Orthodox Church was part and parcel of the hated czarist autocratic government.

6. The pendulum always swings too far in times of reovlution and even now the pendulum in Russia is swinging back to the side of religious freedom.

7. America should be strong at home but not flaunt its military power over all the world to make people think they personally are in danger of our wrath.

8. We should keep up more religious, spiritual, and cultural contact with the Russian people.

9. We should invite delegations of Russians to come to America to visit our churches as well as our farms and factories.

10. We should remember Russia fought on our side in World War II as well as World War I. Russia lost 20 million people in World War II and still has a genuine fear of a reunited Germany. It is time now to end World War II with a peace treaty and thus end the cold war. America should take the lead in peace and send our Peace Corps to Russia as well as to the rest of the world.

Satellite Communications System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am presenting an article from the September 11, 1961, issue of the New Republic which is entitled "Enterprise in Space." Because this subject is so very timely, I want to call it to the special attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

ENTERPRISE IN SPACE

The debate over the ownership of the unborn communications satellite system continues. Thirty-five Members of Congress wrote to the President on August 14 warning that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. would get "very probably a monopoly position" under the administration policy placing the system in the hands of private enterprise—with Government participation limited to the provision of ground support where necessary.

Many assume that a resource of such potential usefulness should be owned and operated by the same Federal Government which has already poured so much of the people's money into its development. But the problem is more complex than this. Public operation is not necessarily the best approach to the management of a technology that has the fluid and experimental character of space communications at the present time. There are reasons to believe that the practical application of this technology will be facilitated by integrating it with existing international communications systems.

When the Federal Communications Commission invited 10 U.S. international communications concerns in the telephone and telegraph business to form a committee and determine how much capital each of them would put up to launch the proposed space communications industry, only four, according to recent press reports, have shown interest. They are troubled, among other things, by the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that the system should be inaugurated on what amounts to a crash basis, that is, at the earliest possible time; that global coverage should be provided even to unprofitable areas and that they may be called on to put up as much as $400 million. They are also bothered, in all probability, by the requirement that the participating companies shall refrain from managing the system to the detriment of any other common carrier of long-distance radiotelephone or TV services.

In 1960 oversea telephone calls increased 20 percent. Indeed, the growth of demand in the industry is so great that this alone could justify the outlay needed to develop a satellite communication system. Here we have a clue to the unannounced reason why the administration has limited the initial participation to firms already in the business. It is they who are pressed by this demand and can be expected to contribute the risk capital needed now. And the risks are great, even when shared between Government and industry. On the basis of the record fully half of all future satellite launchings will fail. Whether the rocket vehicle carrying the satellite goes the whole way up or not, the cost of shooting one is $6 million, and the cost of the communication satellite in the nose of it $3 million or more, depending on the type. The cost of a single working space satellite may well be, then, twice the sum of these figures. While theoretically, a limited service could be furnished by three satellites, if a truly global and reliable system is desired (and that is what the President asked for) as many as 50 may be required.

At the present time the working life of these satellites is unknown, which means that it is impossible to calculate the replacement factor and set up amortization schedules, as in any normal business. Further, most of the comunications satellites now under development must be oriented or rotated to face the ground stations which they are to serve. This adjustment can be made by radio signals from below, or should the receiving apparatus in the satellite be locked onto a coded signal to prevent mischievous people from sending a signal that will instruct that dumb hunk of mechanism to turn the wrong way around? If so, this may introduce still more extra cost as well as an element of potential unreliability. Moreover, one can only orient communications satellites toward ground stations that already exist, that is, toward actual radio and wired telephone systems. Clearly, it will be anything but roses, roses all the way for the companies, who may be asked to install expensive ground equipment in underdeveloped countries which possess no well-developed communications network to receive input from the international satellite system. President Kennedy has conditioned private operation of the system on the provision of facilities to all countries—including the less developed.

The various national communications systems that function today are owned and managed by Government departments, or Government corporations, or Government-regulated (private) companies. They have developed agreements that have worked without a hitch through war and peace; this is one area that continues to be unaffected by politics, or even the cold war. Management of an international space communication system could be adjusted, probably without trouble, between the parties involved in the present disagreements. But this does not dispose of the domestic hobgoblin of monopoly. For there is no escape from the fact that a small group of companies, or one supercorporation, may dominate the new development.

What we are confronted with is a clash between broad social policy and, in this case, immediate efficiency. Nobody can claim that any small- or medium-sized business has an industrial research capability remotely resembling that of the Bell Laboratories, a subsidiary of A.T. & T. In fact, Bell is regarded as the best setup of its kind in the Western World. Out of it have come many of the basic developments that make communications satellite technology feasible: the transistor, the solar battery, the traveling wave tube, and the ruby red maser. This too is where space communications satellites have been in development for a long time; as far back as 1955, John R. Pierce, now director of research at the laboratories, published a paper in which he discussed the various types of satellite radio repeaters which are under consideration today. In

many cases involving highly experimental technology the question appears to be not so much whether Government should supplant big business, but whether Government can, in fact, exercise control over big business in the public interest. Those who pose the question in traditional antimonopoly terms should remember that it is the need to exert such control which provides the fundamental justification for big government.

New Dimensions in U.S. International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many people, both in the United States and abroad, the Peace Corps is a new frontier. As a secular missionary program, the Peace Corps appeals to the American tradition of unselfish service, which persists even in the absence of denominational religious motivation. The idea of personal service to individuals in other countries is a simple, strong, and appealing concept.

I was extremely pleased to note that two Delawareans have been selected for service abroad in the Peace Corps program. In a personal visit to my office on August 29, Mr. Jacob Feldman, of Wilmington, Del., explained to me his preliminary training at Texas Western College in El Paso, Tex., prior to his immediate assignment to further training at the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico for the Tanganyika project.

Mr. Feldman will undoubtedly meet another Delawarean, Peace Corps Volunteer Thomas J. Kincaid, of Seaford, Del., at the Puerto Rico Training Center. Mr. Kincaid has been accepted for formal training next month at Pennsylvania State University in preparation for the Philippines project.

I know that Delawareans join with me in extending good wishes to Peace Corpsmen Feldman and Kincaid in this new and bold dimension in American mutual assistance programs.

While Peace Corps volunteers will provide international communications on a person-to-person level, advice and guidance to governments of many countries is also offered under the aegis of other U.S. foreign assistance programs.

I am especially proud of another Delawarean who is making outstanding contributions in efforts by the United States to increase the welfare of men and improve understanding among nations.

I am privileged at this time to recognize the commendable public services of Mr. Charles David Crocker, of Frankford, Del. A 1938 graduate and Phi Kappa Phi of the University of Delaware, Mr. Crocker served with distinction in the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during World War II. Prior to his current assignment with the U.S. Operations Mission in Cambodia, Mr. Crooker served as a soil conservation specialist in Korea from July 1957 to February 1961.

The high regard for Mr. Crocker's work held by those who observed him at close range, was reported several months ago in the Korean press. Beyond the news article, which I shall include as part of my remarks hereinbelow, I would like to point to an uncommon act of benevolence on Mr. Crocker's part in his assignments overseas. While serving in Korea, Mr. Crocker donated 4,560 grams of blood for Korean patients; for this humanitarian conduct he was awarded a Medal of Merit by the Korean Red Cross. Since his arrival in Cambodia last February, Mr. Crocker has made regular contributions as a donor to local hospital blood banks in that country.

In addition to his formal duties in Cambodia, Mr. Crocker is a lay reader for the Angelican-Episcopalian congregation at Phnom-Penh. I have been informed that this congregation is also visited monthly by Rev. Dr. Welden Pell III, who now lives and serves in Saigon; Delawareans will remember Reverend Pell as the former headmaster of the St. Andrews School in Middletown, Del.

There are many Americans who, unlike those able Delawareans cited above, regard citizenship as sinecure, who fear involvement and shun personal commitments but, nevertheless, reserve the right to criticize. There are those citizens who still avoid the many unique opportunities for helpful action offered to us at this period in our history when our Nation has become a world leader.

Two leading principles of conduct which moved the Founding Fathers were: do your part and do your best. It is in this great tradition that Messrs. Feldman, Kincaid, and Crocker have taken their stand and they are conducting themselves in ways which give our foreign policy new and dynamic dimensions. Their contributions are, indeed, welcome and they are in the direction of the kind of help which will effectively overcome the kind of criticism reported in "The Ugly American."

I include a news report on Mr. Crocker's Korean assignment which was published in the Korean Republic newspaper on January 19, 1961:

SOIL ADVISER HELPS TO KEEP COUNTRY GREEN
(By W. G. Beck)

A handsome, tall American has taught Koreans how to make and keep their country green.

Charles D. Crocker, of Frankford, Del., has set up a land management program to arrest land erosion, reforest barren hills, bring new areas under cultivation, and reduce flood damage.

A graduate of the University of Delaware, Crocker worked as soil adviser with the U.S. Operations Mission in Korea.

Because of the mountainous terrain, the 16 million farming populace of Korea have depended on the very small level parts of the country for farming. Errosion losses have been enormous and inadequate use and poor management of land have been tragically common.

Crocker exercised leadership in cooperation with ROK officials in setting up a momentous program to protect land and boost the productivity of upland farms.

The program brought reforestation, conservation, and proper land use to some 11,000 acres in 1958, 50,000 in 1959, and 460,000 in 1960.

In assisting the Korean Government in drawing up and initiating this mountain land conservation program, he has conducted training of more than 1,000 technicians and officials in 38 demonstration areas, and at several agricultural institutions in the country.

He assisted the ROK Government Bureau of Forestry in setting up 140 conservation demonstration villages, one in each county, and worked through 49 forest erosion control stations, assisting the forestry bureau with its 10-year program to rehabilitate denuded forest areas and to improve production from the hill lands.

He trained Koreans in land classification on the basis of soil production capability. Attempts were being made to farm some land with little value except for forest land, and a great deal of potentially good farm land was classed as forest land. Maps based on land capability surveys change these classifications to more appropriate productive use.

For example, extensive areas can be used for raising grass and important nitrogen-producing legumes. Crops like hairy votch and lespedeza can be raised in relatively poor land which is used in highly productive areas to reduce fertilizer costs. Other lands can be used to produce more chestnuts, walnuts, orchard fruits, and mulberry for silk production.

He also trained Koreans in making the necessary adjustments in land use and in developing a sense of land stewardship on the part of Korean villagers.

He promoted democratic, local, self-determination of conservation measures and self-help operation of the conservation program. He accomplished this by starting freely elected village conservation committees as the bodies for carrying out the program.

When, for the first time outside the Western Hemisphere, a chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America was organized in Korea, he was the organizer and first chairman.

Crocker, after 3½ years of service in Korea, leaves Korea shortly for a new post in Cambodia.

Construction of Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am presenting an item from the editorial page of the Washington Post of September 9, 1961, containing comments from one of my constituents, President D. W. Reeves, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, in Albuquerque. My presentation of this news item does not necessarily mean that it represents my viewpoint concerning the transmission line question.

The item follows:

WHO SHOULD OWN THE GRID?

On August 23, you published a letter from Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The letter poses a question of importance to the American people far surmounting that of constructing a transmission system in the Rocky Mountain States areas.

First, the investor-owned companies in the Rocky Mountain States have actively supported and will continue to support the irrigation and reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project as well as any other true irrigation or reclamation project. We realize the importance of water in the Rocky Mountain West and we appreciate the support of other sections of the Nation for necessary reclamation projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which is under Mr. Holum's direction, proposes to build an all-Federal transmission system for the distribution of power from the Colorado River Storage project hydroelectric generating plants to deliver power to preferred Government customers in the five-State area of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The five investor-owned electric companies, who are now serving this area, recommended the Government construct only certain transmission lines and use the company lines for distributing power to Government customers.

Congress, at the time the Colorado River storage project was authorized, specifically noted that the power features of the project were incidental to the primary objective of irrigation and reclamation. Congress further directed the Bureau to cooperate with the private utilities in the area, and to use the existing and planned transmission lines of the private companies to market project power.

As a result of exhaustive studies, and in accordance with congressional instruction, the utilities proposed a combination Federal-private transmission system in which the Bureau would build certain transmission lines and utilize the existing and planned transmission lines of the companies to deliver power to the preferred Government customers. Under the utility proposal the Federal expenditure would be approximately $53 million. Under the all-Federal system, as proposed by the Bureau, the Federal expenditure would be about $188 million, a difference of $135 million which must be repaid with interest to the Federal Treasury.

All of Mr. Holum's arguments, such as interconnections with other Federal systems, rights of preferred Federal customers, control of the Federal system, and many more, have been fully discussed before congressional committees and the Bureau has agreed that the combination system, as proposed by the utility companies, meets all but one of their requirements.

The only requirement which the Bureau doubts is the amount of payout. Competent engineering and economic studies show that the combination Federal-private system will, in a shorter period of time, provide the most revenue to repay the cost of electric facilities; and provide the most revenue for authorized and planned irrigation and reclamation projects—all this without increase in the cost of power to the preferred Federal customers.

If the Government assumes responsibility for transmission with the proposed all-Federal system, what will happen as the preferred customers' requirements increase? With an all-Federal system many additional miles of transmission lines will be required to deliver power to the Government's customers. Who is going to build these lines? It would be the REA with 2-percent Government money. Who is going to build steam generating plants to firm up the Government's hydroelectric power? Already we hear G. & T. Cooperatives are planning construction of steamplants to carry out this responsibility. This would, of course, be financed with additional millions of 2-percent REA money. The $188 million required for the Colorado River storage project is just the beginning. More hundreds of millions would be required from the Federal Treasury before the proposed plan is fully consummated.

Mr. Holum says that "a backbone Federal system and interconnection with other public systems is essential to such an operation." It is not essential or even necessary to the marketing of Colorado River storage project power. It is only essential to the establishment of a nationwide Federal power grid system. The entire job of marketing all of the project power can be accomplished much better by the combination Federal-private system. The combination system will save the Government an immediate expenditure of $135 million and untold millions of future expenditures, all without adversely affecting consumer power rates. In addition, use of company transmission lines will provide many millions of dollars in increased Federal, State, and local taxes, which when considered with direct project benefits show the overwhelming advantages of the utilities proposal.

To me, the attempt to justify the all-Federal system is an effort on the part of the proponents of political electric power, to create a national supergrid, owned and operated by the Federal Government.

D. W. REEVES,
President, Public Service Co., of New Mexico.
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention was focused on recent hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor on a bill which would prohibit discrimination in all types of apprenticeship programs. The statement submitted by the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council is a constructive contribution, and I believe my colleagues will find it of interest:

STATEMENT FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR INVESTIGATING DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN APPRENTICESHIP

The District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council is an agency of the District of Columbia government established under provisions of the Bridges-Randolph District of Columbia Apprenticeship Act of 1946.

It is composed of six members appointed by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners from management and labor people who have had outstanding experience in the problems of training apprentices and other trainees on the job.

The three management members represent the major management organizations in the District of Columbia, and the three labor members the major labor organizations. The Council was first appointed in 1946.

1. The District of Columbia Apprenticeship office never received directives from the U.S. Department of Labor indicating objection to such notations. The council has asked for copies of such directives. So far, none have been received. If the Council had known at any time that there was objection to such designation, even when used as a confidential record, it would have discontinued the practice immediately. Though representatives of the public schools and the U.S. Employment Service have attended the Council's meetings regularly, among the members of minority groups, this point was never raised.

2. The practice was discontinued by the council immediately after Mr. ROOSEVELT raised objection, and all such designations have been removed from the file. As it has been repeatedly said, the practice was instituted merely to find out what trades Negro youths were most interested in currently so that special effort could be devoted to promoting programs in these trades. We little suspected that this simple procedure would be so widely misunderstood. In fact, the Council is wondering how such information could be used for discriminatory purposes. Obviously, when an applicant appears at an employer or union office, his identity is immediately revealed.

3. The USES for the District of Columbia has been coding job orders C and W for years. We understand that since the hearing, this practice has been discontinued.

4. The U.S. Department of Labor publishes reports on workers by color. We refer to the publication Employment and Earnings, July 1961, issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which carries statistics by color in tables A–6, A–11, A–14, A–19, and table C on page 4–E. Also "Special Labor Force Report No. 14," republished by BLS from the Monthly Labor Review, April 1961, carries the following tables listing color: Tables A–4, B–5, C–7, F–4, and F–5.

5. Some District of Columbia government agencies require race information and use racial coding. The District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation distributes a list to employers and unions with the notation N and W beside the person's name. All District of Columbia drivers permits carry the coding N and W. Through 1955, U.S. Civil Service Commission Standard Form 50 (7 part) reported the person's race in item 16.

6. District of Columbia public schools regularly publish figures by color on students and dropouts. County public schools do the same.

7. No one outside of the council's office ever saw the file or knew about it. In fact, the newer council members heard a summary report on these figures, but did not know how they were compiled. The figures in summary form were reported not only at council meetings, but also at "career days," and meetings with employment and vocational counselors, youth problem conferences, the council's reports, and to agencies requesting such information.

8. To date, no one has filed a complaint with the council on racial discrimination under any programs it has approved.

9. The council's investigation reveals that Clarence E. Williams, the young man who appeared at the hearing before Mr. Simi, has been on the IBEW Local No. 26, Joint Apprenticeship Committee's applicants list since May 12, 1961, when he submitted his high school diploma. We do not know why he did not include this information in his testimony.

10. As it was repeatedly pointed out at the hearing, Federal and local apprenticeship agencies, such as the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, or the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, are not placement agencies. This is the function of the U.S. Employment Service and its State counterparts.

Hereafter the council will refer all requests for information for apprenticeship openings to the Special Services to Youth Office of the USES for District of Columbia, 1724 F Street, NW. This office is not only in position to enforce all the latest U.S. Department of Labor directives against discrimination, but it also gets information on apprenticeships which are not covered by the council.

Only about 50 percent of the potential apprenticeships in the District of Columbia

area are under the council's minimum standards. The Potomac Electric Power Co., C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington Gas Light Co., and D.C. Transit have apprenticeship programs outside of the council's minimum standards. Incidentally, all of these companies have union contracts. Federal and District of Columbia government agencies also are not cooperating with the council. Also most of the hotels, large apartment houses, office buildings, hospitals, universities, and department stores, all of whom employ skilled workers in many trades, are not cooperating. But all of these establishments call on the USES for apprenticeship and trainee applicants. The council gets an average of four or five reports on openings a month, and these are all promptly reported to the USES's Special Services to Youth office.

It seems that because the council has to work with labor unions, it is guilty by association as far as certain undesirable practices are concerned. The council also works with nonunion employers, so, by association, it presumably is also guilty of whatever social sins nonunion employers are guilty of.

We are enclosing copy of the council's order No. 14, issued August 7, 1959, more than 2 years ago. We believe that this is the first time an apprenticeship or District of Columbia government agency has gone on written record against discrimination.

We are also enclosing a copy of a resolution passed by the National Association of State and Territorial Directors at its annual conference December 9, 1959, a letter Mr. Simi received from the U.S. Department of the Navy in 1943, commending him for special services rendered, and a copy of a report of registered apprentices by States. It will be appreciated if this material can be printed as part of this statement. Thank you.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1959.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL'S ORDER NO. 14

Pursuant to authority vested in this council by the Bridges-Randolph Apprenticeship Act of 1946, Public Law 387, 79th Congress (60 Stat. 204 ch. 267) and title 36, chapter 1–A, D.C. Code, 1951; it is ordered:

That for the purposes of this act and title, and in the best interests of the council's planned apprenticeship program for the District of Columbia area, the officially declared policy of the council regarding the selection of apprentices is to recommend to and encourage employers, their agents, and apprenticeship committees with approved programs, to give first consideration to applicants who, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, are best qualified by background, training, and natural aptitudes to develop into competent, all-around journeymen craftsmen.

This has been the basic policy of the council since it was first established in 1946. It is so self-evident and consistent with the American concept of apprenticeship that the council has not thought it necessary to further clarify it by making it a matter of written record. However, because of recent attempts to create the impression that on this point the council favors a policy of discrimination and arbitrariness, it feels that, in the best interest of the program and the community, it should make its policy on this point a matter of public record.

Approved by the council at its 57th regular meeting, Friday, August 7, 1959, and copies ordered transmitted to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the District of Columbia Register.

ROBERT E. PHELPS,
Vice Chairman.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL APPRENTICESHIP DIRECTORS

Resolution reaffirming its stand against discrimination in selecting apprentices

In line with the remarks of the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, on December 8, 1959, in welcoming the 1959 annual conference of the National Association of State and Territorial Apprenticeship Directors at Washington, D.C., the association goes on record as reaffirming its traditional stand against discrimination in the selection of apprentices and again urges all employers and apprenticeship committees training apprentices under State and territorial minimum standards to give first consideration to the best qualified apprenticeship applicants on the basis of native aptitudes and intelligence, and employment and educational background, regardless of race, color, creed, ancestry, or national origin.

Approved December 9, 1959.

(NOTE.—Introduced by Gino J. Simi, District of Columbia, and seconded by Hubert L. Connor, Massachusetts, and Thomas Yoczik, Connecticut.)

TABLE 4.—*Ratio of registered apprentices to population—Adopted from Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961*

States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population	States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population
United States	(1937)	179,323,175	161,128	1,112.9	27. Massachusetts	(1938)	5,148,578	3,881	1,326.6
1. District of Columbia	(1946)	763,956	2,267	336.9	28. Tennessee	(None)	3,567,089	2,662	1,340.0
2. Arizona	(1941)	1,302,161	2,582	504.3	29. North Dakota	(None)	632,446	462	1,368.9
3. Nevada	(1939)	285,278	527	540.3	30. Indiana	(None)	4,662,498	3,403	1,370.1
4. Connecticut	(1938)	2,535,234	4,358	581.7	31. Maryland	(None)	3,100,689	2,165	1,430.3
5. Hawaii	(1941)	632,772	1,054	600.3	32. New Jersey	(1953)	6,066,782	4,177	1,452.4
6. Washington	(1941)	2,853,214	4,064	702.0	33. North Carolina	(1939)	4,556,155	3,105	1,467.3
7. Rhode Island	(1942)	859,488	1,172	733.3	34. Louisiana	(1938)	3,257,022	2,096	1,506.2
8. California	(1939)	15,717,204	21,219	740.7	35. Oklahoma	(None)	2,328,284	1,521	1,503.7
9. Minnesota	(1939)	3,413,864	4,559	748.8	36. Iowa	(1936)	2,757,537	1,783	1,546.5
10. Oregon	(1931)	1,768,687	2,345	754.2	37. Pennsylvania	(1939)	11,319,366	7,129	1,587.7
11. Vermont	(1939)	389,881	513	760.0	38. Maine	(1942)	969,265	606	1,599.4
12. Alaska	(1946)	226,167	284	796.3	39. Nebraska	(None)	1,411,330	878	1,607.4
13. Montana	(1941)	674,767	838	805.2	40. Virginia	(1938)	3,966,949	2,467	1,608.0
14. Utah	(1949)	890,627	1,094	814.1	41. Idaho	(None)	667,191	391	1,706.3
15. Wyoming	(None)	330,066	378	873.1	42. Texas	(None)	9,579,677	5,457	1,753.6
16. Colorado	(1937)	1,753,947	1,939	904.5	43. Georgia	(None)	3,943,116	2,196	1,795.5
17. Wisconsin	(1911)	3,951,777	4,229	934.4	44. Arkansas	(None)	1,786,272	943	1,894.2
18. Ohio	(1939)	9,706,397	9,808	989.6	45. Kansas	(1941)	2,178,611	1,144	1,904.3
19. Florida	(1938)	4,951,560	4,967	996.8	46. South Dakota	(None)	680,514	356	1,911.5
20. New Mexico	(1945)	951,023	935	1,017.1	47. Kentucky	(1940)	3,038,156	1,557	1,951.9
21. New York	(1941)	16,782,304	16,331	1,027.6	48. Puerto Rico	(1947)	2,282,000	1,107	2,061.4
22. Michigan	(None)	7,823,194	7,366	1,062.0	49. Mississippi	(None)	2,178,141	1,003	2,171.6
23. Delaware	(None)	446,292	417	1,070.2	50. West Virginia	(None)	1,860,421	820	2,268.8
24. Illinois	(None)	10,081,158	9,183	1,097.8	51. South Carolina	(None)	2,382,594	878	2,713.6
25. Alabama	(None)	3,266,740	1,978	1,145.9	52. New Hampshire	(1941)	606,921	210	2,890.1
26. Missouri	(None)	4,319,813	3,264	1,323.4					

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1943.

Mr. GINO J. SIMI,
Field Representative, Apprentice Training Service, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMI: This Office wishes to express its appreciation for your aid in solving the manpower problem of the Atlas Machine & Iron Works, Washington, D.C.

There is no doubt that the additional workers will contribute directly to the ability of the company to maintain its production schedules on the important Navy equipment which it is producing.

Very truly yours,

A. C. WOLF,
Lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve,
Manpower Utilization Unit.

(NOTE.—Succeeded in getting union to accept Negroes.)

Gen. E. Arthur Evans (Retired) Leads Fight To Lift Restrictions on Importation of Residual Oil

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join in the efforts of many Members of Congress, the New England Council, the Oil Users Association, and the American Public Power Association, to have the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization investigate the advisability of easing its present restrictions on the importation of residual oil. The responsibility in the hands of the Director of this Office, Mr. Frank B. Ellis, is the determination of whether from the standpoint of national security, the control of residual fuel oil imports should be continued, modified, or terminated.

The deadline for filing statements in support of termination of present restrictions was July 21; the deadline for filing statements of rebuttal was August 21. All of us who are vitally interested in a healthy trade program and its beneficial effects upon the social and economic development of South America and in preserving for our citizens reasonable electricity rates, expectantly

await Mr. Ellis' decision in this matter which is vital to our Nation's security and the furtherance of this country's foreign policy goals.

At this time, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a statement issued by the Oil Users Association dealing with an address by its managing director, Gen. E. Arthur Evans. General Evans has been well known to me over a period of years. Leaving the post of executive director of the Reserve Officers Association in the early 1950's, he was chosen for the difficult and arduous position of city manager of Miami, Fla. To this challenging task, he brought tremendous energy, ability, and imagination. His 6-year tenure has gone down in the history of the city of Miami as one of the most enlightened and progressive periods since that city's emergence as one of the leading metropolitan areas of the Nation.

General Evans has made an excellent case for the 20,000-member organization he represents. The points he raises in the following news story are of equal interest to all of our citizens whose interests are involved in the impending decision of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:

"Both the consumer and the unemployed coal miner lose under the residual oil imports program. The only winners are a few privileged quota holders," said a consumer spokesman today.

Gen. E. A. Evans, managing director of a group of more than 20,000 oil users in Eastern States, spoke about the review of residual imports now being conducted by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

He said import restrictions have resulted in price increases of more than 30 cents a barrel for consumers and have created price spirals in all the products and services of the industries that use residual oil for fuel.

Imports of residual fuel oil have been restricted—since March 10, 1959—through a Presidential proclamation based on recommendation of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. OCDM now is taking a fresh look at the impact of these restrictions on the residual fuel oil picture.

"Coal miners have been led to believe import controls would force oil users to convert to coal, thus providing employment in the coalfields. This has not happened," Evans continued. "Shortages of residual have speeded some conversions to natural gas, but very few users have been willing or able to turn back the clock to the use of coal."

"The fact is," said Evans, "even the railroads, which at one time gained high freight earnings from hauling coal, have converted to oil. The loss of jobs in coal mines is caused by consumers electing to use fuels other than coal. No Government action short of dictatorship can change these consumer preferences."

"The unfortunate coalworker is denied a real solution to his problems by being given false hopes that oil imports will solve his problem," Evans continued. "Nothing could be further from the truth."

Evans noted that the artificial shortages resulting from the imposition of import quotas on residual have produced profits for a select few who have been given import allocations under the import program. He said quota tickets have become valuable property.

"The difference between U.S. prices and world prices on residual oil is more than 30 cents a barrel. Possession of a quota ticket enables the ticketholder to cash in on the windfall profit."

Civil Defense Experiment in Baltimore Highly Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of our civil defense program, many persons feeling that it would be absolutely useless in case of attack; others believing that it should be left entirely in the hands of the military; others equally strong in the belief that it should be left to the civilian authorities. In the spring of this year, an experiment was conducted in Baltimore which I believe proves that the military and civilian groups can work together effectively and provide the protection necessary.

The entire program was coordinated by a public relations man, William J. Muth, and provided an all-out informational and instructional project based on the necessity of a greatly accentuated fallout shelter program. It included protection against chemical, biological, and radiological contaminants.

It proved that the military, civilian, and industrial segments of the population can combine efforts to accomplish such a mission. It also established concretely that all media of press, radio, and television are more than willing to cooperate. Many continuing stories on this shelter project appeared in 113 newspapers from Texas to Maine and as far west as Ohio. Complete coverage was provided by UP, AP, and INS.

This experiment included the sealing of a young nurse from the University Hospital, Miss Sara Rafter, in a fallaut shelter for 7 complete days. Prior to this, Maj. William Kiser, U.S. Air Force Reserve, spent 24 hours sealed in the shelter to test the operation for safety.

The following organizations cooperated in this subject:

The 628th U.S. Air Force Hospital Reserve Unit, Baltimore, Maj. William S. Kiser, commanding.

State of Maryland Civil Defense Agency, Sherley Ewing, director.

Baltimore City Civil Defense Organization, Col. Arthur H. Shreve, U.S. Army, retired, director.

Dr. Arthur A. Woodward, Aberdeen Proving Ground.

Chemical Corps, U.S. Army.

Miss Sara Rafter, R.N., University Hospital, Baltimore.

Lasting Distributors, Inc., Baltimore, Martin Rankin, president.

Allied Public Relations, Baltimore, William J. Muth, president.

Members of the press, radio, and television.

In addition to providing important data, it is especially interesting to note that the program coincides with the directives on Civil Defense issued by President Kennedy more than a month after this experiment was conducted.

The following newspaper article gives further information on this project:

Finally a realistic, positive approach is being taken to the necessity of our Government to make the American people aware of shelter protection against CBR attack.

In a coordinated program originated by Martin Rankin of Baltimore, the Air Force, the office of Civil Defense and Mobilization, Army Ordnance and Chemical Corps demonstrated that military and civilian components of defense can coordinate their efforts in a joint project designed to make scientific and informational facts available to the American public.

Miss Sara C. Rafter, R.N., University Hospital, shown above [illustration not printed in RECORD] emerging from a Lasting Blast and Fallout Shelter, is being greeted, left to right, by Maj. William S. Kiser, 628th U.S. Air Force Hospital Reserve Unit, Baltimore, Col. Arthur H. Shreve, director, Civil Defense, Baltimore, Capt. Jean F. Davis; and Sherley Ewing, director of Civil Defense, State of Maryland.

When asked what she thought had been accomplished by her 7-day stay in the shelter at the Baltimore Home Show, Miss Rafter answered that these things will have to be evaluated and reduced in form by Dr. Arthur A. Woodward and the medical staff of the 628th along with the civil defense officials, but "in my opinion Mr. Rankin and Mr. Knight, executives of the Lasting Distributors, have made a definite contribution to the shelter and civil defense program for which our people should be everlastingly thankful."

Profit Limitation Called a Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has laid before Congress many proposals of a socialistic nature, such as Federal aid to education, public housing, complete supply management for agriculture, and medical care for the aged. It now seems evident that some of the proponents of bureaucratic controls of the economy are looking at control of industry—not from the point of view of restraint of trade or price fixing, but from the point of view of limiting profits. If this step is taken, we can immediately ask if the taxpayers will be asked to pick up the tab for those years when industry sustains a loss.

It would also seem to follow that if profits are to be limited by Federal decree, wage rates, being the largest single item of industrial expense in most cases, would also have to be limited.

We are living in a new age, it is true, but I believe few people who listened to Candidate Kennedy during his campaign interpreted his plans for moving ahead faster as being one of applying positive Federal controls of profits. Some people try to make profit a dirty word, but for anyone who has invested his work, sacrifice, ability, or savings in his own enterprise or that of someone else, profit is the reward of thrift. This has been

one of the greatest attributes of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an excellent article by David Lawrence, entitled "Profit Limitation Called a Hazard," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of September 11, 1961:

PROFIT LIMITATION CALLED A HAZARD—KENNEDY LETTER TO STEEL INDUSTRY STIRS FEAR OF FEDERAL REPRISAL

(By David Lawrence)

The Kennedy administration has crossed the Rubicon. It has decided to make war on conservative economics and embark on a course of radical economics. It is ignoring the risk that it may plunge the country into more unemployment within the next 18 months and bring about perhaps the worst recession since the 1930's.

For President Kennedy has determined to put certain limits on business profits and the return on investments that stockholders have hitherto expected when putting their savings into private enterprise. The net result could be the gradual collapse of the private enterprise system in America and the beginning of that era of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has predicted will inevitably lead to communism in another generation in the United States.

President Kennedy's crucial step came a few days ago when he openly threatened the steel industry with reprisals by Government unless it agreed to forgo any price increases at this time. Mr. Kennedy vaguely promised that next year, when the unions ask for still higher wages, he would urge moderation. He didn't define the term. But the entire business world noted that Mr. Kennedy significantly refused to ask the unions at this time to forgo the additional wage increases scheduled for them at the end of this month under a contract signed early in 1960 after a long strike.

The steel industry thus far has absorbed a 10-percent rise in labor costs since 1958 without a price increase. Fairplay would seem to require that, since the steel industry has already absorbed this large increase in wages without a price rise, the least that Mr. Kennedy might have done was to ask labor to cancel its increase scheduled for October 1 this year.

But the Kennedy administration has sitting in the Cabinet, as Secretary of Labor, the man who was general counsel of the biggest steel union in the country. Had there been a Secretary of Commerce in a Republican administration who had previously been a leader in the steel industry—either as president of a large company or as its principal negotiator just a few months earlier during a major strike—the howl that would have gone up about "conflict of interest" would have been heard from coast to coast.

Industry has no voice in the Kennedy Cabinet. The Secretary of Commerce is afraid of his shadow and allowed himself to be influenced by the radicals in the administration when he ordered the virtual suppression of the Business Advisory Council which had existed for decades as a means of communications between business and the executive branch of the Government.

President Kennedy's procedure in writing a letter to 12 steel companies and in immediately making it public is the subject of sharp criticism. He did not invite these steel executives to come to Washington beforehand to give their side of the issue. He took them by surprise as he issued his letter and threatened restrictive measures if they didn't obey.

This is one of the most surprising moves any President has made in recent years, and it is small wonder that it is being regarded as the beginning of a series of hostile acts to throttle American enterprise and to pave the way for nationalization or socialization of the larger industries in America.

Mr. Kennedy himself has never been regarded as a radical, but he has surrounded himself with advisers who sincerely believe in Government ownership. In giving their advice, they can hardly refrain from advocating a philosophy which could eventually mean the end of private capitalism in America. Every one of these advisers hates communism and all that Mr. Khrushchev stands for, but, as is the case in Britain with the Socialist-Laborites who favor nationalization of industry, they don't always realize the ultimate consequences of current action.

Mr. Kennedy is not himself an economist. He finds himself lost in economic jargon and economic arguments, and tends to follow what seems to him a plausible policy. His economic advisers concede that it is a "most hazardous undertaking" to estimate future output and profits in steel, but they did it just the same and took no account of the need of different companies to buy new plant and equipment or to continue to earn a proper return on investors' money. Instead, a blanket order was favored that would cut profit margins and let labor have its October 1 increase just the same.

Meanwhile, the Department of Justice is engaging in a crusade against large business enterprises by brandishing antitrust suits in their faces almost every day. It is interesting to note that the executives of the 12 companies which got the President's identical letter are virtually forbidden to discuss it with each other, since the subject is price-making. The steel companies could be hauled into court for price collusion if they as much as sat down together to discuss what kind of replies they should make as an industry.

Indeed, the future of all trade associations in America may well be in jeopardy if the Kennedy administration cries out "Price fixing" every time business leaders go to an annual convention of their industry to discuss common problems, including threats coming from foreign competition. The annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute had, for instance, long been scheduled for this week, but it was canceled for fear that any meeting of steel executives at this time would be misunderstood. And all this happens in free America.

The Fabulous Faber Industries of Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article in the 1961 issue of one of the Goodyear publications—Business on Wheels—published in the interest of America's truck fleet operators. "Their Work Is Waste," is the story of Faber Industries, Inc., of Peoria, Ill., the largest city in my district.

Arthur C. Faber has certainly built an impressive empire and I am very proud that Goodyear has seen fit to salute him and his team. Taking what Illinois meatpackers and butchers do not want, the amazing Faber family of industries has built a highly successful but little known enterprise that markets its products internationally.

Waste material is processed by Faber into four major products. Protein, for one, is used as an important supplement by the manufacturers of livestock feeds. Ground bone material finds a ready market in manufacturing feed ingredients, and bagsful of this product are shipped to all corners of the Nation. A byproduct produced in the greatest quantity is rendered grease used in a wide variety of industrial processes. Animal hides comprise a major facet of the firm's operation, even though it has been separately established as the Delph-Faber Hide Corp.

The firm's founder and board chairman, Arthur C. Faber, is obviously a very resourceful man and the saga of his success is most fascinating.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

THEIR WORK IS WASTE

(By Arthur Hemingway)

Rumor around the world has it that America is a Nation of wastrels. But the rumor is quickly reduced to myth for anyone taking a tour of Faber Industries, Inc., of Peoria, Ill. For Faber has built an impressive empire solely by turning unwanted leftovers of one industry—the meatpackers and butchers of the neighboring corn-and-cattle country—into products clamored for by dozens of industries.

It turns the wastes of "harvested" animals into valuable concentrates used to raise the protein content of animal feeds to desired levels; into pure greases for infinite industrial uses; and processes discarded hides for the fine leathers of the world.

One relatively small company has done all this with an efficiency of organization, processing and transport that any industrial giant might well envy. In the process, it has become a recognized leader in an industry which annually produces 3.36 billion pounds of animal proteins and 3.5 billion pounds of animal fat.

The Faber story could start at any one of its efficient affiliates—the Faber Extraction Co., headquartered at Mason City, Ill.; the Delph-Faber Hide Corp., at Springfield; or the Faber Transportation Co., based in Peoria, which owns and operates a fleet of Faber-specialized trucks.

Or the saga could start at any one of five rendering plants at Galesburg, Streator, Springfield, Hillsboro, or Decatur. At these points the material is rendered into tankage ready for toting by semitrailer to the Mason City plant for further processing.

Or it could start at the Mason City plant itself, or even at the docks at Havana, Ill., where one could follow Faber barges loaded with greases down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the 5-million-pound-capacity Faber storage at Marrero, La., and on to Faber's industrial customers. At Havana, Faber's huge grease tank trucks disgorge their cargoes into the waiting barges. A barge weighted with 2,400,000 pounds of Faber grease heads south from Havana every 5 weeks.

A logical place, too, to start the Faber tale would be its ultramodern headquarters office in Peoria where a competent corps of executives keeps the flow chart running smoothly.

But there is really only one proper place to begin the story—and that is with Arthur C. Faber. Now board chairman, Faber is an executive's executive. Confident of his staff's capabilities, he now spends much of his time in Mexico overseeing other business interests. Company Secretary John Paulsen

says, "He never hesitated to take the big chance if OK'd by his own judgment and that of the men under him. He delegates responsibility to a carefully chosen executive, then holds him accountable—and creditable—for everything."

TOOK THE BIG CHANCE EARLY

Faber started taking the big chance when he was scarcely out of college in 1920. He inherited a struggling hide business in 1921 from his father, Jacob J. Faber. (The company's roots actually date back to 1865, when an earlier Faber bought and sold the pelts of beaver, mink, and muskrat taken by coonskin-capped trappers tending their lines along the Illinois River.)

Young Faber's first executive decision came in a hurry. He was caught with carloads of calf hides when they dropped from $1 to 4 cents a pound. Many another young man might have unloaded his legacy and thrown in the sponge. Not young Arthur. In 1929, he took the big chance, got out of the hide business, borrowed $50,000 and started out as a meatpacker. In 1944, he reversed his field. Caught under price ceilings without Government contracts that would have kept marketing costs down, he sold out to a company which did have the coveted contracts. This enabled him to concentrate his talents full time on the by-product business which he entered in 1936 by buying a site at Galesburg and setting up a reduction plant there.

Succeeding Faber as president is A. C. Boldon, quiet, scholarly, and with a sensitive finger on every phase of the company's diverse operations. Boldon joined the firm as office manager in 1929 after 2 years with a large meat packer.

Heading the hide end of the business, with headquarters in Indianapolis, is Vice President Merle A. Delph. He does all the selling for Faber Industries, supervises 14 hide warehouses scattered around the country.

Secretary John Paulsen is in charge of all buying. He rejoined Faber in 1949 after a 5-year sabbatical with various meat packers, where his connections now stand him in good stead. He first joined Faber in 1937, with a background in livestock and by-products dating to 1907. Paulsen is proud of his company and its achievements in processing animal proteins "so that what is growing can use what has passed on."

A key role in the company's recent rapid rise has been played by R. D. "Dick" Dischert, general manager of Faber Transportation Co. A man with a bear-trap mind, Dischert never misses a fact or mislays a figure. He came to Faber in 1957 to set up the transportation company after heading up all Government-owned transport at the huge Joliet Arsenal.

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

Rounding out the executive staff are Treasurer Lew Ziegler, who is in charge of all rendering operations; Fred Bisplinghoff, general manager of the feed division and the main Mason City operation: John Swanson, who serves with Dischert, handling all grease operations—buying, selling, transporting; Bud Chumley, who tends 23 scrap routes, buys all raw hides, bones and fat; and Robert Ballantyne who also oversees the operation of an additional 40 trucks.

Directed by this close-cooperating management team, Faber plants, processes, and transport are inseparable partners in the company's progress. With the Mason City plant as the hub, and the five rendering plants the spokes, coordinated transport keeps the wheels rolling.

The material is rendered into tankage at the five outlying plants. Part of their output is sold directly to animal feed companies, but most of it is trucked in big Faber semitrailers to the plant at Mason City. Because of their nature, Faber raw materials and products are no cargoes for common carriers—hence, the specialized fleet of trucks and barges.

Recently, the company began to make its own stainless steel box bodies. Production was assigned to Dischert, who, in addition to being a traffic-trained expert in transport, is a trained architectural draftsman. This was a specialty that no outside manufacturer could handle to specifications as well as the company itself. The boxes must be leakproof, odorproof, dependable.

With one eye on his box-body manufacturing operation, Dischert is as busy as a hummingbird in a lilac bush, zipping from one Faber plant to another, smoothing the way for his already smooth-functioning fleet.

When the giant tandems unload their cargoes at the Mason City plant, a miracle of automation and chemical magic takes over. A network of conveyors inbound and out, joined by extractors, blenders, solvent reclaimers, operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, processing 30 to 40 tons of tankage every day, and turning out 60,000 pounds of tallow and proteins each day. Three regular shifts tend production at a central control panel where the entire operation can be pinpointed. Extraction is so fully automated that it requires the services of only one operator and one assistant per shift.

Basic secret to both quantity and quality of Faber output is heptane, a solvent that forces that fat out of the tankage fast and effectively. Faber was a process pioneer, and the only one to use heptane today in this type of equipment.

The tankage trucked to the plant and fed to its three extractors via conveyor is as high as 35 percent in fat content until it is penetrated by heptane vapors under high pressure and goes through a 2-hour washing cycle in fluid heptane. Live steam then washes out the heptane, which is reclaimed for reuse by evaporation.

Grease products go directly to storage. But the cracklings, the protein product, are emptied into a hopper and carried by screw conveyor to intermediate storage for cooling prior to grinding, blending, and bagging. A fourth of the plant's output is feed products, about two-thirds inedible greases, and another 10 percent are hides.

FINEST PLANT IN UNITED STATES

The entire process, so seemingly simple because of the minimum manpower required but tremenodusly complicated in its inner workings, is in the capable hands of Extraction Superintendent Dave Broadhurst, a chemical engineer, who tells you flatly: "We've got the finest extraction plant in the United States. Eight men can handle the entire heptane plant instead of the 16 required by less efficient systems. And we get grease content down to 2.5 percent rather than the 12 percent maximum efficiency of other methods."

But proud as they are of their mechanization and methods, the Faber forces are even prouder of their products. They've taken discarded wastes and made them useful. They've earned the thanks of countless customers. And they've led the way in reducing the national "waste-line."

Regaining a Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial appearing in the New Orleans States on September 6, 1961, in support of my bill, H.R. 640:

REGAINING A VOICE

In the case of the American businessman, the right of free speech is considerably abridged.

If he spends money to spread his opinion before the public and this effort is viewed by the internal revenue service as an attempt to influence legislation he can't deduct the expense as an ordinary expense of doing business.

More than a year ago, Representative HALE BOGGS saw the inequity of the situation and introduced remedial legislation in Congress. Meanwhile it continues to gain strength.

Now the second district lawmaker says he is hopeful the bill will be enacted in this Congress.

That the privilege of speaking out should be subject to tax restriction is certainly not in the American tradition. Extension of the discrimination could even muzzle a free press by holding that editorial opinion is taxable.

All the while, Government-operated business which pays no tax is free to spend more and more to influence legislation—frequently legislation which aims at encroachment on the business community.

As a matter of basic justice the Boggs bill deserves passage, restoring free speech to the businessman.

In Secretary Ribicoff's Great Speech Before the American Educational Theater Association He Called for a Federal Arts Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in a great speech before the American Educational Theater Association, meeting in the Waldorf Astoria hotel in New York City on August 29, 1961, Secretary Abraham Ribicoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare declared:

There has never been a time when interest in the arts at the seat of government has been so high. The Kennedy administration would like to see the establishment of a National Advisory Council on the Arts—a group of eminent citizens from the arts whose duty it would be to cultivate and encourage our artistic resources and heritage.

The bill setting up the Council has been favorably acted upon by the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now awaiting House action. I have urged the Congress to enact this bill. Under it, the Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States; propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts; cooperate with local, State, and Federal departments and agencies to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts in the best interests of the Nation; and strive to stimulate greater appreciation of the arts by our citizens.

I include Secretary Ribicoff's significant statement on the arts as part of

my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

THE THEATER AS TEACHER

(Address by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is legend at the Players Club that the god of all the arts once whispered into the ear of young Edwin Booth, and this is what he said:

"I shall give you hunger, and pain, and sleepless nights. Also beauty and satisfactions known to few and glimpses of the heavenly life. None of these you shall have continually and of their coming and going you shall not be foretold."

You whose lifework is the theater—and the introduction of young people to the theater—you have known the sleepless nights, as well as the satisfactions and "glimpses of the heavenly life" your art offers.

You will appreciate the answer one of my favorite critics gave me the other day when I asked him why he prefers the theater to the rest of his amusement-page beat.

"That's simple," he said. "In television, the people are diminished. They are thumb-sized. In the movies, the people are enlarged. They're bigger than I am. But in the theater, the people are just my size. When I watch them, I can even forget where I am."

How right he is. Other art forms can be wonderful indeed. But the theater mirrors life in scale. In the theater, you lean forward for fear you will miss something—you are drawn ahead—you are carried out of your seat by the live people on the stage.

There is an immediacy about a good play that is irresistible. It is an extension, an illumination of our experience. It satisfies our appetites for further experience, for fascinating language, for the chance of meet interesting people. This is true of plays that truly entertain and truly enlighten.

The best plays are more than diversions. They are great teachers. They convince us that what is happening on the stage—however far removed in time or in geography—is not very different from what is happening in our hearts and in our everyday lives. And so we learn from them.

You members of the American Educational Theater Association know the effect such plays have on an audience. You know too the hunger that audiences have for the theater—the theater that delights the eye and ear and enriches the mind and heart.

If anyone doubted this hunger for a minute—and we in public life frequently hear the excuse that the public isn't ready for or doesn't appreciate this or that fine art—such doubts should have been erased by the long queues that formed this summer to see "Much Ado About Nothing" in Central Park.

You know these things. For a quarter of a century, they have been your concern and your vocation.

On this, your silver jubilee celebration, you have chosen as your theme "The Theater and the Human Bond." "A group of strangers," you say, "becomes one living unit in the darkened house when the curtain opens—all over the world, at all times, and at all ages."

On this, your silver jubilee, then, I think it is appropriate to ask how you teachers of the theater can help strengthen this human bond.

Yours is a tremendous opportunity. More of our youngsters are enjoying college and university education than ever before. In the next years their numbers will, we all hope, increase even further. Community theater and children's theater groups mushroom across the land. This means that out of all the people in the theater, you members of the American Educational Theater Association are the ones who have the chance to touch young—and not so young—minds.

Your first challenge is to teach so creatively, so imaginatively, that you will convey the best of our dramatic heritage, experience, and taste to a new generation, and to adults as well—that you will strengthen the ties that bind our civilization to the great civilizations of the past.

There is no greater opportunity than the teacher's, and our national tragedy is that we have not made full use of it.

Asked what the theater had given him, the actor, Howard Lindsay, answered:

"It has been my education. Where else could I have traveled so far? I have been in the streets of Corinth when Jason and Medea were throwing harsh words at each other. I was at Aulis when the Greek fleet sailed to Troy. I was in Mycenae when Orestes came back to kill his mother Clytemnestra. I have been in the drawing rooms of Lady and Lord Windermere of London. And I shouldn't forget to say, I have ridden into Western towns with the James brothers. Where else could I have done things like that?"

Where else indeed?

Can you teachers of the theater take your students to these—and further places? Can you give them the sense of continuity, the depth and breadth of vision that a deep knowledge of your art conveys?

Can you give them something more? Many of our young people have lost the satisfaction of the craftsmen of old—the satisfaction of doing a job carefully and lovingly—the fulfillment of work well done. They go to school—they graduate—they get jobs to support themselves and their families.

You can help them find this satisfaction. For the theater is a place where people share responsibility—where they labor hard together—where they have such fun that they even forget they are learning and working. If you give this experience to youngsters and to amateur community players, you will truly have taught well, you will have strengthened the ties that bind human beings, one with another.

You have a further responsibility—a further challenge. It lies waiting to be seized.

There are only, I am told, about 70,000 commercial theater seats available to the public in the United States. Some 30,000 of these are in New York City, and their number is diminishing. There are many reasons for this—you are all aware of the problem; I will not go into it today.

But Americans want to go to the theater. They flock to see great plays. When stripped of its social pretensions—what Prof. Eric Bentley calls its "amazingly upper class mores and extraordinarily inconvenient prices and schedules"—the theater is a tremendously popular attraction.

Bentley speaks of the "social apparatus" that used to stand between the public and the enjoyment of good music. "Opera and symphony," he says, "were addressed to dowagers. The workingman didn't have the right clothes for the occasion, or the right accent, or the right kind of chitchat. Invited to a concert he could hardly be expected not to feel a pariah. Much the same is true of theater."

He goes on to point out that in the cultural revolution that is underway all over the world, the theater could play a leading part because it is "more accessible to the new untrained audiences than perhaps any other high art whatsoever." * * * And this fact "gives it a certain responsibility."

This is the responsibility you theater educators shoulder today. This is your challenge: to strengthen the bond between the theater and diverse communities throughout the land.

The word "educate" comes from the Latin verb "lead out." This is what you can do—lead people out of themselves and into the common meeting place—where they can share their art with others. Your theater groups do not fulfill their purpose if they confine themselves to a series of exercises—if they do not reach all the audiences that are anxious to be reached.

Some of your members have of course served their communities with notable success. They have done so in their own cities, and they have traveled abroad in many lands, delighting their audiences and creating great good will and friendship for our country.

They have truly given of themselves to strengthen the bond between human beings throughout the world. They have set a standard for us all.

Will you join them?

I think—I know—you will.

Just as it plays a role in bridging the gap between different segments and groups and countries in our society, the theater can play an important role in bridging the gap between what C. P. Snow has called "the two cultures." We are all concerned about the wall that divides the humanities from the ever-expanding physical sciences. We are all anxious to do what we can to further our scientific achievements. We are not "antiscientists," who deplore the discoveries of science in favor of the beauties of art. Far from it. We know there is great beauty as well as hope in the giant revolution which has taken place in man's knowledge of himself and of the world.

But we know that if we are to act constructively, we must tap our magnificent artistic resources imaginatively and diligently. A broad and deep awareness of the arts enriches the scientist as well as the nonscientist and is indispensable to the full life of all mankind.

We live today in one of the crucial eras of world history. The impact of man's new power upon man himself is the stuff of real drama—and through drama as well as other arts could man better understand his place in the new world that he is creating.

There has never been a time when interest in the arts at the seat of government has been so high. The Kennedy administration would like to see the establishment of a National Advisory Council on the Arts—a group of eminent citizens from the arts whose duty it would be to cultivate and encourage our artistic resources and heritage.

The bill setting up the Council has been favorably acted upon by the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now awaiting House action. I have urged the Congress to enact this bill. Under it, the Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States; propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts; cooperate with local, State, and Federal departments and agencies to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts in the best interests of the Nation; and strive to stimulate greater appreciation of the arts by our citizens.

Further, it could act as a coordinating group between private and governmental activities in the arts, pointing out where it believes official encouragement might be helpful, yet always sensitive to the need for the fullest possible freedom of creativity.

For in fostering and encouraging the arts, we must have it strictly understood that the Government cannot and does not wish to speak through the arts. The arts must be free and not an official mouthpiece. A play is not a state paper. The only test for an actor or a director or a painter or a musician should be the excellence of his endeavor before the judgment of his peers.

In this crucial moment when the currents of history are swift and changing, we who bear the responsibility of Government seek to build. We know that the old ways alone will not do—that we must seek new ways and find new means.

And all segments of American society are responding. Each is examining its role and

its potential. Each is dedicating itself to constructive action for the common good.

You whose lifework is the arts—you whose lifework is education—you too are examining your role and your potential.

I ask you only to do your best, to achieve the high levels that you yourselves value, and to inspire in your students an appreciation of the enduring and the beautiful.

I ask you to strive to reflect the times in which we live—to understand them—to teach from them—to improve upon them. We must work to make our arts so rich—so exciting—so inventive—that they mirror our life together as did the arts of the Greeks and of the Elizabethan Age.

Then we will have met our challenge. Then we will have done our part to strengthen the human bond.

Address of Congressman Fernand J. St. Germain, of Rhode Island, at the Centennial of the Death of Taras Shevchenko, Soyuzivka, N.Y., Sunday, August 27, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 27, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. ST. GERMAIN, visited the Catskill area of New York to deliver an address to an assembly of people of Ukrainian origin. The address is notable not only for its subject matter and context but also because it was delivered by Mr. ST. GERMAIN in Ukrainian dialect. Our most versatile Member is fluent in French, most eloquent in English, and now demonstrates his command of this most difficult language. We are truly fortunate to have him among us.

The text of the speech follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN, OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE CENTENNIAL OF THE DEATH OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, SOYUZIVKA, N.Y., SUNDAY, AUGUST 27, 1961

"Bury me, be done with me,
Rise and break your chain,
Water your new liberty
With blood for rain.

Then, in the mighty family
Of all men that are free,
May be sometimes, very softly
You will speak of me?"

My friends, wherever the people of the Ukraine can gather in freedom, even if it be the freedom of their own minds, they remember Taras Shevchenko. The poetic words of Shevchenko echo now, as they did a hundred years ago, the past, the present, and the future of the Ukranian peoples. His sentiments, his hopes, his fears are present today as they were in his day and age. The same fears that gripped the hearts of the Ukraines of the 19th century grip the hearts of the Ukraines of the 20th century. The love of freedom which found its expression in the lines of Shevchenko is echoed by those same lines today. The flame which began to burn in the 19th century is still burning and is growing ever hotter while those who would suppress that love of freedom try to stamp it out.

A part of my heritage brings me to your lovely estate, here in the Catskills. My maternal grandmother left the Ukraine in 1907 to find freedom in this country. She brought with her the love of God, the customs, traditions, heritage and language of the Ukrainian people. She has been, to me, a reflection of Shevchenko's words: "* * * in your own house lies your righteousness, your strength, and your liberty."

My mother carried on the customs of her native land. We celebrated the Ukrainian Christmas and had the traditional caroling and the foods which are so much a part of that season in the Ukraine.

In my childhood, no one could deny the existence of a Ukrainian language. I learned of my heritage in the tongue of that heritage. I learned the folklore, customs, and hopes of the Ukraines in a tongue which was more than simply a peasant idiom, as the language of the Ukraines was once called. The Ukraines have a proud history and can stand shoulder to shoulder with the other great peoples of our globe.

The survival of Ukrainian lore and language is a testament to the will and strength of the people of the Ukraines. The story of your homeland, and it is partly mine, is a tragedy which reflects the sufferings of all areas which have been strapped by oppression. In "The Dream" Shevchenko vividly described a people under the thumb of the oppressor. The clothing is stripped from beggars and the poor must provide shoes for the feet of princes, widows are pummeled for their taxes and the sons are taken off to the army only to die in the mud and filth which dictators and oppressors provide for their belabored armies who fight because of force rather than because of ideals. He points to the forced labor for which the people receive no compensation except the scorn of the masters for whom they dig the gold which is poured down the throats of the greedy.

Does this sound familiar? It is the Ukraine dominated by the Russian czar, it is Germany under Hitler, it is the Jews under Egypt, it is the Russians under communism, it is Europe under the barbarians, it is the Ukraine under Stalin and now under Khrushchev. Oppression has not changed whether it be in the times before Christ or 1,961 years after Christ. I doubt it will ever change just as man's desire for freedom has never, and will never, change.

In a blazing indictment of oppressors of the Ukrainian people Shevchenko wrote:

"Our souls yield not to grievous ills,
To freedom march our stubborn wills
Through waves of trouble o'er us roll
The waves move not the steadfast soul
Our living spirit is not in chains
The word of God in glory reigns."

The Ukraines began to find their modern identity in the 19th century. The publication of Kotlyarevsky's "Eneida" in 1798 is the beginning of modern Ukrainia. This poem revived the patriotism and pride of heritage that had been sleeping in the breasts of the people for almost a century. It came after various attempts, attempts that were almost successful to end the Ukrainain identification. By the mid 18th century the czars of Russia had destroyed all Ukrainian political forms and began to Russianize the culture of the people. The name Ukraine was abolished, the area was called Little Russia, the language was abrogated and the customs strangled. As America emerged a free and independent entity, the Ukraine began to sink beneath the swell of oppression and lose her identity.

The Ukraine needed an impetus for it to emerge as an identifiable and dynamic nation. It needed a genius who could transform the smoldering emotions of the people to words which could be written, spread, heralded throughout the world. It was Shevchenko who emerged as that genius. Through the medium of the Ukrainian written word he brought to the fore the yearnings for liberty, the sufferings under oppression, the hopes for a brighter future, of a great people. In the passage I quoted a few moments ago, he told the world that even under the hand of a tyrant the spirit of the people was unbroken and the people have kept their faith in themselves and in their God. It is to God that they look for hope and salvation.

Shevchenko did not delve into political prophecy. He did not try to predict the future course of Ukrainian events nor did he think the old system would return to his people. His loyalty was to the mother country; he wanted her free, independent, and under a just system of government.

Shevchenko used the vernacular Ukraine language, for it was by way of this vehicle that the hopes and wishes of the people could best be expressed. Because of political circumstances he could not come forth directly with his sentiments but had to use allusions and vagueness. His poems are rich with the folklore and history of the Ukraine. It is the use of the tongue and heritage of the people that has endeared him to the Ukrainians for a century.

Shevchenko was a reflection of the tragedy of the Ukrainians in his personal life as well as in his poetry. He typified the sufferings of his native land and the hardship which all the sons of the Ukraine had to undergo. In him we can see embodied the past of the Ukraine but in him we can also see the fires of the future. He spoke for the future as well as the past, a future of liberty and freedom.

Of his 47 years, only 9 were spent as a freeman. He was born a slave and remained so for 24 years; for 10 he was a prisoner in Siberia and for 3½ he was under police supervision. He lived as his country lived, under oppression, tyranny, and enforced guidance. Clarence Manning, a great scholar of Shevchenko's work, poignantly described his work as the "poetical synthesis of national aspirations."

"Our cause shall rise
Our freedom rise
Though tyrants rage."

And, rage the tyrants did. His early works tell of the people under serfdom and the precarious life of the peasants. He tells of social injustice and the debauchery of the masters in a land ruled by the lords and their henchmen. Although his words are of despair and sadness during the exile in Siberia, he has a message of hope as in the lines just quoted. Oppression may slow and restrain the cause of freedom but it cannot stop the will of people to be free. This was as true in the 19th century as it is today in the mid-20th century

Great poetry is timeless. It is composed of lines wherein people may find themselves whether it be at the time the poem is written or a century later. Shevchenko's poetry is in such a category. It has as much meaning today as it did when it was written. His words are as vivid in 1961 as they were in 1861 because the Ukraines, and millions of other freedom-loving peoples, are under the yoke of a new tyranny. It is a new tyranny in name only, for communism is as old as tyranny itself. It is not new for the mind to be blocked from the knowledge of truth, for the will to be dominated, for the present to be controlled and the future planned without the free reasoning of the people

involved. The only thing new is the name "communism."

"Arouse ye, be men.
For evil days come.
Quickly a people enchained
Shall tear off their fetters;
Judgment will come.
Dnieper and the hills will speak."

Shevchenko foretold the rising of his people. He knew then, as we know now, that a free people will bear the chains only so long and then they shall tear off their fetters. The tsar and those who aided his tyranny would be overthrown for

"They harness the people
With heavy yokes.
Evil they plough
With evil they sow.
What crops will spring?
What harvest will you see?"

The Communists, in this centennial year of the bard of the Ukraine, are using Shevchenko's poetry in an attempt to convince the people of the Ukraine that their beloved bard was predicting the Communist social revolution. In order to reap this message from the lines of Shevchenko, the Communists have "adjusted" his poetry to eliminate any counterrevolutionary doctrines which he might have expressed. Parts of his poems have been eliminated, new words and ideas have been substituted for the original lines, meanings have been slurred and references to God and religion have been left out. It is this new Shevchenko which is fed to the people of the Ukraine this centennial year.

Why have the Communists been compelled to give recognition to Shevchenko? They have been compelled to do so for the same reason that their new Shevchenko has failed. The people of the Ukraine, remember Shevchenko whether they be free, as those here today, or enslaved as they are in the homeland. They remember his glorification of their past, his presentation of the tragedies of his day and his hopes for the future. Those ideas were not passed from generation to generation by books and magazines. The words of Shevchenko, his hopes and ideals, were and are still being, spread by the people to their sons and grandsons. Pravda may broadcast the new Shevchenko but the people know the real Shevchenko, the true reflection of their sentiments and ideals.

Because he is so loved and revered by his people, the Communists must honor him, and because his ideals are known to the people they heed not the new Shevchenko.

Shevchenko wanted freedom, justice, and dignity for his people and his words utter the same cry today for the people of Russia, of China, of Eastern Europe and of Cuba. The bard did not want his people to go from the tyranny of the czars to the oppression of the commissars. Shevchenko foresaw a long, hard struggle to gain the ideals he held so dearly but the final victory would come; a cold war, a hot war, a lukewarm war—freedom will out. He saw freedom as the victor for:

"Fear not to fight, you'll win at length
For you, God's ruth,
For you is freedom, for you is strength,
And Holy Truth."

The truth and freedom are partners and those who would deny them to their people are doomed to failure, are doomed to lose the loyalty of their people, are bound to be caught beneath the waves of justice and dignity to which all people aspire.

The people of the Ukraine, because their heritage and their knowledge of Shevchenko is handed down from generation to generation, are not fooled by the Communist line. God is a part of Ukrainian life, as it was for Shevchenko. Religion has played a great role in the lives of the people. Freedom was the cry not slavery, be it of the serf or Communist variety.

The people of East Berlin, until barbed wire and Russian troops made it impossible, echoed the thoughts of Shevchenko when they chose freedom over tyranny, liberty over oppression, democracy over communism. Throughout the world people watch Russian moves with care and concern; they remember Budapest and the savagery with which the freedom fighters were crushed. I hope we do not again see such brutality but as long as people desire peace and are kept from it such scenes will occur. The fetters will be broken unless those who rule with the iron thumb relax the grip and let the people determine their own destinies.

"Why freedom grew up with us
Bathed in the Dneiper
Rested her head on our hills
The far-flung Steppes are her garments."

Has anyone said better than Shevchenko that the Ukrainian people have been free, want to be free and will be free? The Ukraines have a history that is one of an oppressed people reaching for freedom and their history has done much to keep their faith in God that freedom, liberty, and justice might come to their people.

Marketing Program for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I am glad to join with a number of my colleagues from wheat-producing areas of the United States in today introducing legislation to establish a marketing program for wheat. At the same time, we are urging the Secretary of Agriculture to develop, under the procedures provided by the Agricultural Act of 1961, recommendations for a comprehensive, long-range wheat program, embodying the principles of this legislation, in sufficient time so that the Secretary's recommendations can be submitted to the Congress by January 1962.

Basically, this is a simple program. Instead of wheat acreage allotments as we know them, each producer would be assigned a quota in bushels which he can sell into the market for food and export. The total quota for all producers would be established somewhat less than the total wheat requirements, with the balance needed to come out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

In order for a producer to receive a marketing quota, he would retire at least 10 percent of his historical wheat acres. This will prevent the shifting of the burden of overproduction to other commodities.

This program has many advantages over the present allotment program. Most important, I believe, will be the effect on quality of wheat produced. Under the present program a farmer can dispose of all the bushels he can raise on his allotted acres. Thus, his incentive is to grow the most bushels possible, regardless of the quality of wheat. Under the legislation I have introduced today, since the farmer can sell only a limited number of bushels for food and export, he will want to produce the highest quality possible in order to receive a premium for this limited quantity. As a result we will have a higher quality of wheat for domestic consumption as well as an improved quality in our wheat exports.

Another important feature of this program will be an orderly reduction of Government stocks to a desirable level. By this approach the Government will be able to reduce its stocks each year without disrupting the market. This will result in a tremendous saving to the taxpayer.

As compared with the wheat program in effect in 1961, this new approach could save the Government at least $200 million the first year and up to $500 million by the end of the third year. This saving would be due to the disposition of Government stocks plus the savings in storage charges as a result of the reduction in inventory.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Agriculture will support this meaningful and workable program, which also deserves the support of the Congress.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram Questions the Hanford Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram is one of the leading newspapers in Texas. In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of the views of that newspaper concerning the Hanford project, I include two of its recent editorials.

They follow:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Aug. 14, 1961]

A GOOD TURN

The American people, preoccupied with the various foreign crises, may have paid little notice to the 235-to-164 House vote that killed a proposal to build an atomic electric plant at Hanford, Wash. The action was of tremendous importance to them, however. Not only did it save them a significant amount of cash, but it kept public power advocates from throwing open the door to a project that would have been costly in terms of both money and principle.

The proposed plant would have cost $95 million. It would have been used to utilize steam from the new plutonium production reactors of the Atomic Energy Commission at Hanford.

As Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, said in opposition to the project, it would have taken "every cent paid to the Government this year by 430,826 taxpayers." The resulting plant would have been, not a new and promising method of producing electricity, but an "old-fashioned steam generator."

The worst is, however, that the Hanford project was reported to have been designated as a springboard from which a whole network of public powerplants, with lines lacing the Nation from coast to coast, was to have been built. The plan reportedly was discussed recently in the office of Secretary of the Interior Udall at a meeting attended by several known advocates of public power development.

Representatives HOSMER, and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, who led the opposition, and others who joined them in defeating the measure, are to be congratulated for their alertness in foiling this new effort at Federal encroachment into a field where private enterprise has demonstrated competence and efficiency in serving the public interest.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Sept. 9, 1961]

THE ATTEMPT TO SAVE A PUBLIC POWER SNEAK

Liberals in Congress haven't given up in their effort to sneak a public power program in the back door by disguising it as an economy measure attached to the Atomic Energy Commission's increased appropriations. Conferees on the AEC bill have just recommended the adoption of a watered-down version of the so-called Hanford project. In a House vote taken after the project was exposed as a device for further entrenching the Federal Government in the power-generating business, the whole proposal was rejected by a vote of 235 to 164.

The plan originally called for a $95 million appropriation to build generators that would utilize the steam from the AEC's new plutonium production facility at Hanford, Wash. The conferees whittled it down to a $58 million fund for construction of one 400,000-kilowatt generator.

None of the four advantages named by the conferees would justify the project. These were: 1. All the electric power produced at the facility will be used for national defense purposes at the AEC's Hanford works. 2. Since the electric power production is limited to the AEC installation, the question of whether or not AEC would be in the commercial power business is completely eliminated. 3. The trimmed-down plant still would be the world's largest atomic power-plant operating from a single nuclear reactor. 4. Economic studies indicate that the entire cost of the generating plant would be paid for with interest in 9 years.

Each of these arguments is refuted in the minority statement issued by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania. He notes that while all the power produced by the plant might be used for the Hanford works, it is not needed and would create a power surplus in the area. It has been proposed, he further revealed, that the surplus would be fed into the Bonneville power grid supplying California and would thus amount to an increase in Federal power offered to the public. He also pointed out that the construction of another "old-fashioned" steam generator at a place where it was not needed, though it was the world's largest, would not enhance the U.S. position in the nuclear power race and that Federal power advocates had to try three times before they could come up with a study supporting the economic feasibility of the plant.

Aside from these logical counter-arguments, however, it stands to reason that nobody would be making a do-or-die effort for the Hanford project on the grounds stated. The opportunity it poses for a great leap forward in public power is the only explanation for such zeal on the part of the liberals. Taxpayers should instruct their Congressmen to reaffirm their opposition to this flank attack on private enterprise.

The Berlin Problem Evaluated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the major trouble spot confronting us today in the bitterly cold war going on between the Communists and the free nations of the Western World in Berlin. Not since the beginning of the cold war, in fact, have we been confronted with such an explosive and dangerous situation as we now face over the tragically divided German city.

In a series of two articles, the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, has evaluated the developments in the Berlin crisis since President Kennedy met with Premier Khrushchev at Vienna in June. He has discussed the problems confronting us in negotiations and he has pointed out some of the avenues of action available to us.

These are pointed and revealing articles—they are articles which go a long way toward enabling us to see this very complex problem in perspective—and I urge my colleagues to give them their close attention.

The articles follow:

SINCE VIENNA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last June at the meeting in Vienna the President realized how seriously Mr. Khrushchev meant business about Berlin. A Western policy had to be formed at once and measures had to be taken before the end of the year. However, it is apparent now that while the Vienna conversations alerted and aroused the President, they did not provide him with the practical working basis of a policy. In order to have a policy he needed to know not only that Mr. Khrushchev would move on Berlin, but how he intended to go about it.

Not knowing this, the President and his advisers supposed that Khrushchev in 1961 would repeat what Stalin had done in 1948, that he would try to conquer West Berlin by blockading it. Thus far, the assumption has proved to be wrong. As a result, the Western allies were caught unprepared to deal with the actual, as distinguished from the supposed, Soviet strategy, which is revealed by the action of August 13. For instead of blockading West Berlin, Khrushchev sealed off East Berlin.

The administration had failed to take into account the fact that Khrushchev could act powerfully, but with measures short of war, to reduce the Western position in West Berlin. It has long been known that an embargo was a possibility. But the preoccupation of the President's advisers with the memory of Stalin's blockade in 1948 prevented them from preparing adequately for the formidable measures short of war which were available to Khrushchev.

The effect of the miscalculation has been far reaching. It led the administration to concentrate its energy on convincing Khrushchev that the West would fight if he interferred with physical access to West Berlin. This is true. It will fight if he interferes with Western access to West Berlin. It was a prudent precaution to make this plain to Khrushchev. But it should not have been sold to the American people and to the world as a policy. The exclusive and excessive preoccupation with proving our will to fight a blockade left us unprepared to deal with the actual embargo. On August 13 we had no policy, and there is reason to ask whether we are on the way to having one now.

By concentrating so exclusively on deterring another blockade, the President found himself accepting the advice which came to him from Paris and from Bonn and in Washington from the veterans of Stalin's blockade. He was told that if he stood firm, he could stand pat. Khrushchev was bluffing and if the President did not flinch first, Khrushchev would flinch first, and would once more retreat, as he did in 1958, leaving everything as it is. Until it was swept away by events, this pipedream clouded the vision and narcotized the will to face the realities of the German situation.

On August 13 Khrushchev went into action. He used a very different strategy than the one which this country had been told to prepare for, and so the test of wills turned out to be not a wrestling match but jiujitsu. By the embargo, which was illegal and cruel but was a measure well short of war, Khrushchev struck a deep and damaging blow at the Western position in West Berlin and West Germany.

His highly sophisticated action could not, I think, have been improvised in the few weeks after the President had called for a degree of mobilization. The sealing off of half a city is a highly technical operation. The action had all the marks of long deliberation on how to strike most surely and most accurately, without the risk of war, at the Achilles' heel of the Western position. Moreover, only if we assume that the plan has long been in Khrushchev's mind can we explain why he has been swearing that he would get the Berlin bone out of his throat this year and at the same time that he would do it without a blockade and a war.

The Achilles' heel of the Western position is that the morale of the West Berliners, their will to stay in the city and to resist pressure and blandishment, depends on their faith in the Atlantic alliance. They have to believe that they will live to see the alliance bring about the unification of the two Germanys and the restoration of their own city as the German capital. This belief is what Khrushchev struck at on August 13. Without attacking West Berlin, he raised a wall which was designed not only to stop the refugees but also to prove to the Germans that the Western allies were unable to reunify Germany. The Germans understood this at once. But so unprepared was Washington for the reality of the German question that days passed before it realized how momentous a change had been brought about. Washington had no policy to deal with what actually happened—unless sending the Vice President and General Clay to West Berlin can be called a policy.

For a true measure of what has happened, we may take an official statement, made in 1959, by Dr. Grewe, who is Dr. Adenauer's Ambassador in Washington. He was writing about the previous Berlin crisis. "West Berlin cannot, in the long run, be held," he said, "if its population must come to the conclusion that the West has in fact accepted the division of Germany." Why? Because if Berlin cannot again become the capital of Germany, many of its people, particularly the younger ones, will drift away to the West and others will make their peace with the East.

We are now in the preliminary stages of those negotiations which both sides have declared they want. The negotiations will begin with the stark fact that Khrushchev has forced the Western allies to acquiesce in, to acknowledge tacitly, the partition of Germany. He is, to be sure, some distance from his full objective which, in the current campaign, is to bring about what he calls the "codification" of the German settlement,

that is the formal and legal recognition that World War II has ended with the partition of Germany. But during this summer he has put himself in the position of negotiating from the accomplished fact that the partition has taken place and that it has not been opposed. He holds in the iron grip of the Red Army the thing on which negotiation will turn.

With the division of Germany a physical fact, the significance of West Berlin has been greatly reduced. Berlin is no longer the escape hatch from the East. It is very much less than it was before the entry point of Western propaganda and intelligence. Its economic expansion is throttled down, and almost certainly its working population will decline. Above all West Berlin is no longer the visible symbol and tangible pledge that the communism will be pushed back of the Oder-Neisse line, perhaps back of the Vistula River. What is left is a human and moral commitment, which will be honored, to protect the physical basis of the way of life which people of West Berlin now enjoy.

There is no denying that our bargaining position has been diminished. It will take a very high order of statesmanship to repair it. Such statesmanship does not come cheaply. Besides insight and imagination it will need the kind of moral courage which is very rare, the courage to tell the people hard and unpopular truths which it has long been thought inexpedient to speak about.

In another article I shall attempt to describe some of the problems of negotiating about Berlin.

ON NEGOTIATING ABOUT BERLIN

(By Walter Lippmann)

As we get ready to negotiate about Berlin we need to know concretely what is our commitment. A month ago the answer to this question was plain enough. When we said we would defend the freedom of West Berlin, we meant, to be precise, that people and goods must continue to move freely along the air corridors, the turnpikes, the railroads, and the canals. If access on these routes is open, West Berlin will have the physical basis of its freedom, freedom to elect its government, personal liberty, and economic freedom as part of the West German economy. This physical basis of West Berlin's freedom is what we are committed to defend, if necessary, by war.

But while this commitment is still in full force, the Soviet action of August 13 in sealing off East Berlin has raised a new problem. It is whether the half-city can continue to flourish, whether it will not wither on the vine. Dr. Adenauer's Ambassador has said that Berlin will wither if the physical partition of Germany, which was consummated on August 13, becomes an accepted and established fact. So we can no longer say that if the access routes are kept open, this in itself will make secure the future of West Berlin.

If the half-city is to continue to flourish its people must be given reason to believe that they have a function to perform in the future of the German nation. It is not easy to give them that belief, and while, as Vice President JOHNSON has said rather too imprecisely, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor are pledged in West Berlin, we are in fact pledged to protect access. But we are not and cannot be pledged to a guarantee of the prosperity of West Berlin. All we can promise is to try, provided the West Germans cooperate, to negotiate a status for West Berlin which will give its inhabitants a sense of security and confidence in the future. This cannot possibly be done merely by standing firm and standing pat.

The President will now have to decide whether his objective in the coming negotiations is merely to keep open the access routes or whether he will try for a wider objective—not only for the physical freedom of West Berlin but for its dignity and prosperity. This is a hard and complicated decision.

If he concentrates on this narrow objective, he can probably achieve it by standing firm on the decision to resist if the access routes are closed. For while the Soviet Union will still have great opportunity to harass the access routes, it does not have a vital interest in blockading them. But not to interfere with access, or not to interfere very much, will not be sufficient. The Allied rights of access must be reconfirmed in some kind of contract. For otherwise, the people of West Berlin will be left in a dangerous and demoralizing uncertainty. The Soviet price for a reconfirmation of the rights of access will now have to be explored.

Assuming the best, that the price is moderate and honorable, the outcome will leave West Berlin free. But after the action of August 13, Berlin, however free, will be a doomed and dying city. To keep West Berlin not only free, but alive and flourishing, it will have to be given a significant and attractive function to perform in the years to come. If this can be done at all, the coming negotiations will have to go far beyond freedom of access. There will have to be a new attempt to negotiate a wide settlement in Germany and in Central Europe.

Our position today would be far stronger if, last June instead of conceding the initiative to Khrushchev, we had launched a campaign for a wide settlement. But as events have shown Americans, in the West European opinion, have not been prepared by their leaders for any such big diplomatic adventure.

A wide settlement is inconceivable unless West and East agree on some arrangement which opens the door to the eventual reunion of the two Germanys. The difficulties of reaching such an agreement are enormous.

There is, of course, the Soviet opposition which is now embodied in the physical partition of Berlin. But we must not forget how strong is the Western opposition to German reunification. It is not an open opposition. But it is much stronger than has been fully appreciated in this country. The two chief Western European institutions are NATO and the Common Market. In both there is a basic assumption that in fact Germany will remain divided. There is no place for East Germany in NATO—not unless we suppose the inconceivable which is that the Soviets would permit East Germany to join NATO. And there is no place for East Germany in the Common Market as long as it is a Communist state and its main economic powers are with the Soviet bloc.

Although it is never openly avowed, the whole of Europe, West and East, from France to Poland and Czechoslovakia is deeply committed to the partition of Germany. As for the Bonn Republic, its attitude is ambiguous. It does not countenance partition but it has learned to live comfortably without reunification.

This would seem to argue that there is an all-European consensus. In considerable measure there is, and that is why there is no crusading spirit in Europe to reunify Germany. But in France and in Germany the key to policy is not that they object to the fact of partition. It is that they fear the effect of acknowledging it.

Why? Because if the partition were signed, sealed, and delivered—which is what Khrushchev is after—the interests of the West Germans in the Atlantic Alliance may be weakened.

Both Dr. Adenauer and General de Gaulle fear greatly what the Germans would do then. Might they not come to believe that they must deal not with NATO but with Moscow? Dr. Adenauer and General de Gaulle are haunted by the fear that one of Dr. Adenauer's successors may do once again what the Germans have so often done in the past—make a deal with the Russians at the expense of the West.

The men charged with German affairs in Paris and Washington are predisposed to think that, all things considered, the status quo is better than anything which can be negotiated. The wider objective, which is to work out a future for West Berlin, has few official supporters. In the calculus of risks it seems too venturesome.

It is venturesome. But nothing ventured, nothing gained. It will probably be the opening of what the President might call a new frontier in European politics, beginning with a recognition of the fact that there are two German states, and that unless, and until they reunite, West Berlin must be held in trust as an international city. Moreover, in order to stabilize this divisional arrangement there almost certainly would have to be an agreement on controlled nuclear disarmament and reduction of conventional armament from, let us say, the Rhine to the Vistula.

A philosopher of history can say that the world is still too primitive to construct rationally such a solution. But he might add that if catastrophe is averted, some such settlement might gradually come into being.

If this solution is premature, then negotiation will have to turn on the narrower objective which would be a contract concerning physical access to West Berlin. Without such a contract the Germans and the rest of us will have no relief from permanent apprehension and anxiety.

The President himself cannot negotiate such a contract with Mr. Khrushchev. The critical decision to be taken in the West is what price to pay for the contract. This decision must be made with the firm cooperation of the West German Government. After the German election, Bonn will have to nerve itself to face the fact that unless there is a very wide central European settlement, the partition of Germany will become frozen as an accomplished fact.

Help Khrushchev Avoid a Dangerous Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the magazine, Nation's Business, for September 1961, contains an editorial which I believe is most timely and which presents a commonsense point of view. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

As the moment of truth in Berlin comes nearer, the American people are solidly with the President in facing up to Russia. They have accepted willingly—perhaps eagerly—whatever peril or sacrifice a firm position in this crisis requires.

They will, as the President predicted, bear "the burdens which must be borne if freedom is to be defended. Americans have willingly borne them before and they will not flinch now."

The world will be spared much misery if our enemies accept this Presidential analysis as accurate. The danger is that, like others before them, the Communists may make what Mr. Kennedy has called "the dangerous mistake of assuming that the West was too selfish and too soft and too divided to resist invasions of freedom in other lands."

Unfortunately, this dangerous mistake is not unreasonable. Anyone might make it after listening from a distance as Washington catalogs the urgent needs that our people are reportedly unable to meet for themselves.

Such a listener could justifiably believe that, without Government prodding and support, Americans were too flabby to educate their children, build proper houses, clean up their cities, care for their aged, or show compassion for the unfortunate. He could believe that even our diversions are so decadent that a Cabinet officer must concern himself officially with the hiring practices of a professional football team and a Government agency must bring Federal standards to our television shows.

As reported from Washington, the American people are poorly educated, ill housed, out of work, badly entertained, and facing a bleak old age. This is hardly a picture to deter a determined aggressor.

In the interests of peace and a true picture of American fiber we should tell our foes about Indianapolis, where the people have long met their own problems without Federal subsidy; of Davenport, Iowa, which is on record as opposing Federal money for schools; of Carlsbad, N. Mex., where the school board has stated it wants no Federal intervention in local schools and the city council has refused to ask $500,000 in Federal funds for a sewer system;

Of Italy, Tex., which preferred to rebuild itself rather than accept Federal funds after a tornado, and a lengthening honor roll of other localities which stand ready to resist invasions of freedom, not only from foreign governments but from their own as well.

Our President can make his warning to Mr. Khrushchev more convincing by pointing out that we can have whatever defense we need, along with sound money, and a stronger economy simply be restricting the Federal Government to its essential duties.

This isn't even austerity. It's merely commonsense.

The Real Chip on Kennedy's Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the continuing tension over the Berlin crisis is a source of great concern to all our citizens. We support the President in the moves he takes to uphold the cause of freedom there. Yet from time to time, we hear occasional doubts about this position.

One of the finest statements of the crucial and critical issue posed at Berlin appeared recently in the column of William E. Bohn in the New Leader magazine. I think it deserves the attention of all Members of the House and I submit it for the RECORD now:

THE REAL CHIP ON KENNEDY'S SHOULDER

(By William E. Bohn)

I have just received a very short letter from a very old friend about a recent column "The Old Men and the Smart Boys: Who Has the Right Slant on Berlin?" New Leader, July 31–August 7. The point of my little sermon was that some of our newspaper columnists seem to be afraid of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threatening posture, while some old men I know are not at all unnerved by the Berlin crisis. My aged cronies were 100 percent in favor of supporting the firm policies of President Kennedy.

Suddenly came a jolting letter from the Pacific coast, written by my long-time friend, Ira D. Cardiff. Now Cardiff is a talented writer and he is a representative of that very group of men over 80 for whom I was speaking. Here is what he had to say:

"I have just read with interest your column of August 7. * * * I am going to ask you to be good enough to write me at once one or two good reasons why the United States should have any military contingents at all in Berlin at the present time. I read the President's speech carefully, but all he said was Berlin is a chip on my shoulder and I dare you to knock it off."

Cardiff knows as well as I do that 16 years after the war's end, no German peace treaty has yet been signed. Consequently, Germany remains occupied, and is theoretically still an enemy country. He knows too, that Soviet troops occupy East Germany. If the Western Powers withdrew their forces, the Russians, who now have enormous contingents encircling Berlin, would probably march into West Germany and take over the entire country, as they have in other places—Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc. As long as U.S. troops occupy Germany and a treaty has not been signed, we have the right to participate in the conclusion of the peace and perhaps to create conditions which will make it possible for the German people to protect themselves against Russian attack.

But I have a feeling that my correspondent failed to put to me the main question which was on his mind. The chief point in our present foreign policy is not Berlin. Cardiff might well have asked: Why does the United States regard Russia as a probable enemy? Why do we spend $50 billion a year for defense? Why do we scatter billions over the world to persuade other nations to line up with the West? Why, in short, are we engaged in a gigantic struggle in favor of democracy and against dictatorship?

Cardiff does the President a grave injustice when he suggests that his great July 25 speech on Berlin was a chip-on-the-shoulder affair. In his statement of the differences between East and West, Kennedy got down about as close to bedrock as a man can get:

"We cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin, either gradually or by force. For the fulfillment of our pledge to that city is essential to the morale and the security of Western Germany, to the unity of Western Europe, and to the faith of the free world."

These words put the struggle over Berlin in the perspective of the great world conflict. I cannot here undertake to explain to Cardiff what communism is or why it is locked in an unceasing battle against democracy. The war between East and West, between dictatorship and freedom, has been partly military and partly political, social and intellectual. (I think, incidentally, that the West has made a tragic blunder by underrating the propaganda aspect.) But no matter what its character, it has never stopped.

The followers of Marx have resorted to any means to gain an advantage in their drive for world conquest. No country is safe. With each nation that is allowed to fall to the Communists, the safety of the remaining free nations shrinks. That was what the President was discussing in his address to the Nation. That was the chip on his shoulder.

Free peoples create governments according to their taste and fashion their lives according to their individual dreams. To put it in the simplest terms, they want to spend their time, energy and money as they please, whether collectively or individually. Dictatorial governments operate in a manner which produces the opposite results. At the heart of each dictatorship—and especially at the center of the great Communist complexes, Russia and China—a small corps of bosses directs government, business, education and, eventually, every subject's private life.

Khrushchev and his cohorts openly declare that they are bent upon the conquest of the world and that any means is justifiable in reaching that end. No tyrant in the history of the world has been more ruthless and cruel than these. What I am coming around to, Mr. Cardiff, is that the battle of Berlin is a part of the struggle for the world. If we stand up now with the best means at our disposal, we have a chance to win. Tomorrow may be too late.

Blank Cartridge Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times during recent months that the American people are ahead of their leaders in supporting a policy of firmness toward our enemies.

I believe this is true.

By the same token, I believe this provides the opportunity to rally united support for such firmness.

Recently I received an excellent article written by a constituent of mine, Mr. M. J. Woodward, of Charlotte, Mich., expressing his views on the current national and world situation, including our "blank cartridge" diplomacy.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include this statement by Mr. Woodward:

In the following, I indict not the individual, but, rather, the weakness of the American body politic, where lust for power and personal ambition has led our national administrators to surrender honor, justice, and integrity to total political expediency and abandon the principles of true statesmanship.

In following the god of total political expediency, there being no right way to do a wrong thing, our national leaders have demoralized themselves.

Total political expendiency has prompted jockeying for public favor and attempts to subjugate a strong, rugged, freedom-loving people to bureaucratic controls.

Total political expediency tried to remove nine old men and pack the U.S. Supreme Court with members of its own political faith, but it was this demoralization that stood adamant for unconditional surrender, prolonging the war and sacrificing thousands of lives, and then infamously giving away our advantages in Germany when victory came.

Through demoralization, we allowed the captive nations to be drawn behind the Iron Curtain, when a firm no could have stopped it. We had all the mechanics. In Korea we were not allowed to win. We paid homage to Red Russia in idealistic speeches.

Our planes were shot down, citizens stranded, property confiscated, and our flag trampled in the streets. We replied with a protest, sometimes.

America witnessed the struggling of imprisoned people in Hungary and Cuba, for

release from bondage, but, we the merchants of truth about liberty and freedom passed by on the other side.

We founded a Captive Nations Week in 1959 and that should have made our Goddess of Liberty blush with shame. We fail as a nation to stand for something, because our leaders haven't the courage to stand firm against anything.

Total political expediency can, and will, subvert us to zero as completely as communism, and we, us, the Americans, and our representatives can live a long time to regret the courage we didn't have to resist the things we knew were wrong from the beginning.

This Nation's imperative need is for her political leaders to come out of their respective corners, so bristling with patriotism they will not hesitate to throw the war harness on America and gird her to "run with patience the race that is set before her."

That official Washington will come out, bristling with patriotism, in the face of the waves of liberalism and intellectualism that are constantly eroding the shores of its judgment is unlikely, yet we will have hope for men to rise in extremity as they have been known to do in all history.

Peace is impossible and practically inconceivable with Russian communism, whose mills grind out inexorably the pattern and plan for world enslavement. We can count that day lost (and an asset to the enemy) whose sun sets without systematic harassment of Russia and exploitation of her every weakness, thus putting terror in her joints and marrow.

It is time, if we are not dedicated to become "Vanishing Americans," to stop this blank-cartridge business. Our efforts for 15 years at peaceful, liberal diplomatic negotiation with Russia have brought us to this crisis.

We can go ahead now with deadly intent to preserve the liberties we still possess, or wait and exercise the blessed complacent privilege of looking back at the day when we could have.

Development Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the foreign-aid bill, my distinguished colleague from Iowa, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, called my attention to an interesting and informative letter he had received from Dr. James A. Robinson, assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Northwestern University. At the request of my colleague, under unanimous consent, I am inserting Dr. Robinson's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my comments on the important points he raises in his letter on the subject of the development research program authorized in the foreign-aid legislation.

Dr. Robinson's letter follows:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., August 14, 1961.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: I am writing you about a provision in the Act for International Development. Title V woud authorize $20 million for "development research." This is an encouraging move by the administration toward using and promoting research in economics and the other social sciences in the hope of making foreign economic assistance a more successful instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Although the amount is small compared to the total foreign-aid request, and although this provision has not received much attention compared to the more controversial features of the bill, a modest amount for research might do more to help improve the effectiveness of foreign aid than many other more expensive provisions.

My interpretation of the presentation materials by the Department of State and the ICA is that this money would be used for "contract research" with universities and private study groups. There is, of course, ample precedent for contract research as a means of gaining new knowledge and applying it to practical governmental problems. The various branches of the armed services have long had offices of research which subsidize private groups and universities by contracting for special studies. Compared to the amount of money and effort which have previously been devoted to the evaluation of our mutual security programs and for research to improve them, $20 million is a significant sum.

I hope that discussion on the House floor will elicit from the committee and other Representatives that it is the intent of Congress that this provision be interpreted broadly enough that it will allow for research in addition to what is sometimes narrowly conceived as "developmental economics." That is a very vital subject in understanding and helping with the modernization of new nations. Other disciplines also have significant knowledge to contribute to policy-making and execution. For example, cultural anthropology is relevant to determining what kinds of projects will be best received among different kinds of people. Research in public administration might reveal why our aid programs sometimes do not reach the people for whom they are intended but instead support unpopular, corrupt, and decadent regimes. There are many examples of how scholarly research by several academic fields could help AID better achieve its ends. I hope that Congress will intend that AID adopt a broad interpretation of development research.

The State Department presentation indicated that these sums could go toward contracting with existing research institutions or establishing new research programs. A broad interpretation, which would result in contracting with a wide range of research centers, seems to me necessary for two further reasons. First, the Government should not inadvertently discriminate against research in some fields of social inquiry relevant to this problem at the expense of other fields. Many people have lamented that the NDEA favors science and language while neglecting the humanities. Similarly, I think it would be unfortunate to exclude social studies other than economics, especially a particular branch of economics, from this provision. Second, a broad conception of development research will tap a wide range of different persons and institutions and assure Congress that the Government will not be limited to a small number of sources for research and ideas.

The language of the bill is quite adequate, so far as my nonlegal reading indicates. What counts is its interpretation. An amendment is not necessary, and at this date would be impracticable. However, I hope that the House debate will establish a legislative record to guide the administration in the interpretation and implementation of the act.

This is a significant step forward, and whatever the outcome of the more controversial features of the act, this provision already makes it a better bill than those of previous years. A broad interpretation of title V will further strengthen the values which new research can give to foreign aid.

Cordially,

JAMES A. ROBINSON,
Assistant Professor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is always helpful for us Members of Congress to receive such pertinent and well thought out recommendations on pending legislation. I am particularly pleased to comply with the request of Congressman SCHWENGEL to comment on Dr. Robinson's letter and I wish to state that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has devoted much time and study to the Executive branch presentation of data in support of the Development Research Program. I believe the following comments will help to assure Dr. Robinson that the program will be based on soundly conceived lines; and that many of his suggestions will be followed in its implementation.

The role of the proposed development research program can be described in terms of the nature of the research to be encouraged and the primary functions to be performed:

(a) Nature of research to be supported: The Development Research Program will focus on scientific investigations of benefit to the U.S. program of development assistance. The test of relevance to be applied will be the degree to which a given research effort gives promise of providing results which can be usefully applied in the assistance program itself. The research program will, therefore, emphasize applied research. However, desirable basic research on many issues or subjects may be, the program will not be prepared to sponsor such activity unless this test of usefulness is met. However, either basic or applied research may in some instances require a long period to produce fully mature results. Where the probable usefulness to development assistance is established, we must be prepared to support sustained research efforts.

The research to be undertaken must often cut across traditional classifications of scientific knowledge. This is one of the characteristic features of the development process and of the research that is needed to support it. It is more useful for this reason to categorize the research to be done in terms of the developmental problems and opportunities it is addressed to than by the areas of knowledge involved. Many different kinds of knowledge will need to be enlisted, and communication between the different areas will be highly important. Generally, the research will be in four broad categories:

1. The identification and modification of the factors in a society that determine the success or failure of economic, social or technological innovation;

2. The collection or development of scientific information that has been bypassed or fallen into disuse in our own society, but is needed to advance modernization elsewhere;

3. The simplification and adaptation of technologies to fit conditions in the less developed countries; and

4. The selective support of basic research.

(b) Functions to be performed: The development research program will perform three main functions:

1. A liaison function, by which research being carried out through other governmental programs or under private auspices is reviewed and examined so that results useful for the aid program are uncovered and used to the maximum extent. This implies

a clearinghouse activity which can be of help in guiding the growth of the community of research facilities as well as of benefit to the assistance program itself.

2. A support function, by which problems or requirements encountered in development assistance programs that can be usefully made the subject of research are identified and research on them is encouraged and supported. This implies a readiness to strengthen existing facilities where they are weak, and to establish new ones as needed.

3. An execution function, by which the results of relevant research application are made available to operating staffs and personnel in usable form and are placed in operation where feasible. This will involve serious attention to the large issue of training future generations of personnel qualified to work in development assistance. It will also mean a feedback of actual field experience to the people engaged in continuing research projects.

In Defense of Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to read in the Washington Post of September 8, 1961, that an unnamed "high ranking International Cooperation Administration official" is apparently raising objections to any further Government support of the American mercy ship *Hope* and has been quoted as regarding the vessel as "showcase democracy."

It is particularly difficult to square this published point of view with the formally signed statement of Assistant Secretary of State Brooks Hays, dated March 8, 1961, in which Mr. Hays informed the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that "the Department welcomes and supports this proposed congressional commendation of this project"—referring to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, commending Project Hope.

The Department of State's official report to the Senate Committee continued to point out that the U.S. Government has provided substantial assistance to Project Hope, including $2.7 million of mutual security program funds to place the surplus Navy hospital ship in operating condition, and an additional $500,000 of mutual security program funds as an interest-free loan—supplementing hundreds of thousands of dollars in private American contributions for the project, collected all over the country.

In the words of Assistant Secretary Hays:

> The Department has been impressed by the cordial reception accorded in Indonesia to *Hope I* and its fine medical and dental staff. We fully expect that the response in future ports of call will be equally favorable.

There can be little doubt, Mr. Speaker, of the enthusiasm of Assistant Secretary Hays of the Department of State for the accomplishments of the hospital ship *Hope* thus far. Since his report specifically refers to Bureau of the Budget clearance, it should certainly be clear that Mr. Hays was speaking for the administration when he addressed the Senate Committee in March.

Shortly after receipt of this report, the Senate formally passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, and I have been informed by Chairman Morgan that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs expects to consider it soon.

In view of the assurance given on the floor of the House during debate of the foreign assistance bill, only a few weeks ago, it seems clear that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regards Project Hope in a highly favorable light and fully expected that funds authorized in title II of that measure would be available for support when needed. Specific reference was made during that debate to the availability of section 211 funds for *Hope*, and this was assuredly a factor of some importance in the support of the measure in the House.

Now we read, in a Washington newspaper, that some anonymous ICA official has doubts about the project's value, questioning such policies as flying the American flag and paying U.S. maritime wages to its crew. Furthermore, a special assistant to the President is quoted as saying that "The President has reached no decision in the matter."

Mr. Speaker, I have no personal doubt that the President, on review of the facts, will conclude that the job being done by Project Hope is an outstanding example of American achievement in the continuing effort to build good will throughout the world, and to bring the people of the world closer together in a bond of mutual trust and friendship.

When the unknown critic of Project Hope told the Washington reporter that "working together is better than showcase democracy," he gave convincing evidence of his ignorance of procedures aboard the hospital ship in foreign ports.

One of the most important features of the *Hope's* mission has been the cooperation of its staff with local professional people in every port visited.

In Indonesia, for example, *Hope* records show that more than 200 Indonesian doctors and 300 Indonesian nurses participated in the joint medical program of training and treatment.

In Vietnam, more than 200 Vietnamese nurses took part in shipboard training and treatment programs, and teams from the *Hope's* staff worked ashore in clinics, in 6 civilian hospitals and in Saigon's military hospital.

Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project Hope, has consistently emphasized the importance of partnership with local doctors and nurses in the foreign countries visited by the ship, and has stressed working together with local people in both the training and treatment programs.

In Indonesia, Project Hope reports that more than 18,000 patients were treated by the joint Indonesian-American committees, and 700 major operations were performed. In Vietnam, there were more than 10,000 patients, and more than 500 major operations.

Mass inoculations of children with training of local vaccination teams in Vietnam; more than 800 lectures and seminars in Indonesia; the introduction of oral surgery for the first time in Vietnam; the provision of more than 8,000 books and medical journals for hospitals, clinics, and libraries in the two countries; substantial medical supplies in both—these are some of the substantial achievements of the effort so lightly described as "showcase democracy."

Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to understad why the "high-ranking official" quoted in the Washington Post elected to remain unnamed.

If mail from home is any indication of public sentiment, the people are overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the good ship *Hope* and its mercy mission abroad. I am sure they will continue to support it with voluntary contributions, in increasing sums, as they learn of its good work and its need for their support.

I am equally sure, Mr. Speaker, that the relatively modest sums of American tax dollars which go into this project—to help send an American vessel under our own flag on its mercy mission abroad—will have far greater support at home than will many of the projects conceived by our unknown official in ICA.

This certainly does not mean there is no merit in his reported suggestion that some of our surplus hospital ships could be made available to friendly nations, for their own operation to relieve distress and spread medical knowledge. Without doubt many countries could operate hospital ships at a lower cost than we do, and be of great help to their people.

But surely it is no sin to have an American flag flying proudly above such a vessel, and to pay American wages to the seamen who sail her, and to invest a very small percentage of our foreign-assistance funds in such an undertaking.

Children Handicapped by Deafness

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill which will establish a program of grants in aid for the training of teachers of the deaf. The problem of the deaf and the hard of hearing is one of the least understood, and most neglected, of all of the growing health problems that face this country. It is national and international in scope. A greater number of babies are born each year afflicted with this tragic, lonely handicap of deafness.

Medical science has not yet discovered the cure for deafness at birth. But the life long handicap that results from deafness—that forever isolates the deaf child or person from all other human beings, that forces a segragation of its own just as demoralizing as any other kind of segregation—can be overcome. The enactment of H.R. 9011 is one way to begin.

It would give us, in greater quantity and quality, the indispensable weapon against the handicap of deafness—trained teachers.

In the 86th Congress and again in this Congress I introduced legislation which would reflect a national response to the national problem of providing Federal funds to train teachers of those handicapped by deafness. I did so with some knowledge of the extent of the problem and an awareness of the enormous waste, in terms of the capacity of deaf persons to be useful and productive members of society, caused by the disaster of deafness. It is a disaster, I assure you, that can strike any home, any parent, any child.

There are in our midst today some 30,000 deaf children of school age with an expected increase of 400 every year. The number continues to rise while the number of specialists dedicated to train these children to take their rightful place in our society, with full opportunity to make their own way, is woefully small, and diminishing in relation to the mounting need.

To train these children, we need some 500 specialists annually. At the moment, there are only 177 such teachers in training in the special teacher training centers. In June 1959 only 127 such teachers were graduated. These figures alone manifest the critical shortage of trained personnel in this field.

From a study of the reports supplied me and conversation with informed sources, I am convinced that 80 percent of these handicaps are remediable. I have seen what can be done for these children if proper training is afforded them. Let me give you two examples of the kind of thing that can be done in this field.

In my own congressional district in Manhattan are located the largest public junior high school for the deaf in the country—Junior High 47, and the country's best known private school—primary and secondary—the Lexington School for the Deaf. In these remarkable schools I have seen the miracle of the deaf child's transition from the silent world of the deaf to the other world of communication, language and speech. After all, the chief thing that elevates human beings above all other species is an intelligence that enables them to communicate by speech.

The Lexington School happens to be a private school, but it charges no tuition and it receives most of its support from the State. It takes children beginning from age 3 or 4 up and gives them a high school education. Many go on to college. By the time they are finished they are equipped to lead normal lives in the adult world and to communicate with others.

The teachers in this school, and in junior high 47 must have very special qualifications. Not only must they have all of the qualifications of high school teachers in the normal school, but they must be specially trained to communicate with the deaf. The young men and women who make this their lifework must, after having met all the other standards for high school teaching, take specialized postgraduate courses, and pay tuition for this purpose. The Lexington School has a postgraduate training school of its own, which is well known around the country and abroad. Most of the teachers in training here have to borrow the funds in order to pay the relatively modest tuition. On top of this, they have to live and, in big cities where the problem is most acute, moderate- or low-income housing is not available. The Lexington School is in a position to provide living accommodations for many of these dedicated persons. But food, clothes, and other costs of living must be borne by them.

Most schools cannot even afford living accommodations. Then when these teachers are finished and are qualified to take on the task of teaching the deaf, they are often paid less than the high school teachers in the regular school system.

Can this be right? Is there any wonder that there exists such a shortage of teachers in this field? And we must remember that teaching the deaf requires a personal dedication and a steadfastness that few other specialized professions require. It is the hardest possible physical work. In addition to personal dedication it requires a persistence and a patience that most people do not have, including most teachers. Why then should we permit conditions to exist that make the cause of these young teachers and hopeful teachers so much more difficult than it has to be?

A properly staffed school specializing in the teaching of the deaf, if adequately supported, can become the laboratory for the advancement of teaching techniques in every school and at every educational level the country over. If methods can be devised, and they are already in process, for the advancement of learning in specialized schools such as Junior High School 47, and the Lexington School of New York City, they will have general application. After all, the essence of education is to teach students to teach themselves—to give them the necessary tools with which to build their own intellectual houses. The job of the teacher is to communicate with the student. Therefore, the development of methods and techniques for communication between the teacher of the deaf and the deaf student will certainly be of immeasurable benefit also to the teacher who is seeking to establish lines of communication between students with hearing, but who still do not hear.

What I am suggesting, is that one of the soundest investments we can make toward the advancement of learning in the United States is to multiply 100-fold our effort in educational laboratories such as the two I have mentioned by adequately staffing them with specially trained teachers.

The specific Federal approach adopted in this bill now before the House is but one step. This is a modest proposal, calling for Federal assistance through a $3 million, 2-year program of grants-in-aid to accredited public and nonprofit institutions of higher education which are approved training centers for teachers of the deaf. I am pleased beyond measure that the House is at long last taking definitive action of this bill. The more I examine this problem, the more I wonder why we have delayed as long as we have.

No California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the beloved and respected Leo Carrillo a lot of California passed away with him. Leo Carrillo represented California both past and present like no one else could. He came from the dignified and proud dons of early California. Yet lived to see his native State become the second largest in the Nation and he gave his talents, energy and ability to make California great.

He was a respected and loved friend of mine for many years.

The following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner and News article tells of his contribution to California and of his proud and glorious past:

LEO CARRILLO

One of the last and most admirable ties of our community with a chivalric past was dissolved when Leo Carrillo took his last leave of the country and the people he loved so well.

By profession a fine actor, by nature a true gentleman, Mr. Carrillo personified to generations of Angelenos the unaffected grace of our California forebears.

He was gifted with gaiety, warm in comradeship, untouched by malice, fertile in resource.

The void he leaves can be filled only by grateful memory of the mission he gave himself to fulfill: To forge an indestructible link of friendship between the two great peoples who gave form and spirit to our civic home.

LEO CARRILLO, DESCENDANT OF DONS, DIES OF CANCER

"Mr. California" is dead.

Pudgy, lovable Leo Carrillo, a movie star more than 30 years and as familiar a sight at Rose Tournament parades as the roses themselves, played out his final scene at 5:55 p.m. Sunday in his ranchhouse in Santa Monica Canyon.

Unconscious since Thursday, the 81-year-old descendant of Spanish dons was a victim of terminal cancer complicated by a failing heart.

He had fought cancer for 8 years, keeping the nature of his ailment a closely guarded secret, and had undergone several operations in the battle, the latest surgery having been performed September 1.

At his bedside in the old Carrillo homestead at 639 East Channel Road when the last curtain was rung down were his daughter, Antoinette, who had resided there with him for many years, and two friends of many years' standing.

They were Jack Tolbert, foreman of Leo's Vista ranch, and Owen E. Meehan, Jr., former FBI agent. One of Leo's brothers, Ottie, arrived a few minutes after death came for the veteran actor.

Time of a rosary service and requiem mass at St. Monica's Catholic Church will be set when another brother, Jack, arrives from Grant's Pass, Oreg.

The twinkling-eyed Carrillo, best known of the younger generation as the adventurous "Pancho" in the movie and television "Cisco Kid" series, had been fighting both heart disease and cancer in the months before his death. However, he remained active almost to the end.

In August 1959, while making one of his many personal appearance tours, he suffered a ruptured blood vessel and internal hemorrhage while aboard a plane in the East.

After recovering in a Pittsburgh hospital, the actor returned to California and September 1, 1959, underwent major surgery at Santa Monica Hospital.

Carrillo bounced back—like the Leo of old. He continued to serve as a member of the State parks commission until last February 15 and then he resigned that post only so he could devote full time to helping promote New York's 1964 World's Fair and doing what he could to strengthen the relations of the United States with Latin American countries.

Last year he made a 20,000-mile tour of Latin America as a good-will ambassador from the United States.

Carrillo was a tireless worker for the betterment of his State and Nation.

No native Californian ever worked harder in civic affairs and no professional politician expended more energy toward a political campaign than did Leo Carrillo.

When campaigning for former Governors Merriam and Warren, he took time off from his own busy affairs to attend rallies and meetings, make speeches, tour the State and take the stump for the men and principles in which he believed.

He was no dilettante statesman, no dabbler in politics for purposes of amusement, self-aggrandizement or personal publicity; rather, he was motivated by idealism.

"I love my State," he would reply when asked why he worked so hard for its improvement. "I want it to have the best government and the finest leadership we can possibly give it."

Few if any living Californians can point to the wealth of family tradition, the far reaching background of historical ancestry that were Leo Carrillo's.

His great-grandfather was Carlos Antonio Carrillo, first provisional governor of California in 1837. The parents of Carlos were married by Father Junipero Serra with a script from the King of Spain authorizing the wedding.

Carlos' brother, Jose Antonio Carrillo, was the first alcalde of Los Angeles in 1828 and one of the great early political figures of southern California.

Leo's great-grandmother and her two sisters made the flag which Commodore Stockton carried into Los Angeles. His grandfather, Pedro Carrillo, was the first judge in Los Angeles and served in the State legislature.

The actor's grandmother was Dona Josefa Bandini, daughter of Don Juan Bandini, owner of the vast Jurupa Rancho where the city of Riverside now stands.

Leo's father, John Jose was the first city marshal of Los Angeles and the first mayor of Santa Monica. That city is part of the old 38,000-acre San Vicente Rancho which the Carrillo family bought for $1 an acre.

Leo's great-aunt, Arcadia de Baker, gave the land on which the Veterans' Administration home in Sawtelle is situated.

Leo was born August 6, 1891, in an old family home on Aliso Street. He attended grade school in Santa Monica, then was graduated from old St. Vincent's College.

After that he went to work with pick and shovel for the Southern Pacific Railroad at $1 a day. A little later he landed a job on the San Francisco Examiner as cartoonist and waterfront reporter at $10 a week.

His merry laugh and ready quips prompted the famous drama critic, Ashton Stevens, to suggest Leo try the stage. Leo did, and clicked at the Orpheum Theater in San Francisco.

He went to New York then, and landed a role in "Fads and Fancies," after which he appeared in the play "Twin Beds" and became a star. Hollywood beckoned, and Leo soon was earning $5,000 a week.

Such hit plays as "Upstairs and Down," "Lombardi Ltd.," "The Bad Man" and "Hell Bound," and early-day films like "Mr. Antonio," "Viva Villa," "Gay Desperado," "Girl of the Golden West," "Lillian Russell," "Bowery to Broadway" and a host of others followed, until Leo became the familiar Pancho in "The Cisco Kid."

But Leo's stage, screen, radio, and television work never was arduous enough to keep him from throwing himself with characteristically limitless energy into civic, political, and charitable work.

So familiar had his famous twinkle, resonant voice, and Spanish accent become that, in 1938, he was seriously offered the Democratic nomination for Governor of California. His countless supporters and well-wishers were disappointed when at length he decided against running and turned his efforts toward electing Earl Warren.

During the decades of public appearances he made there seemed to be an unwritten law which demanded his presence at fiestas, civic celebrations, police shows, American Legion extravaganzas and similar gatherings.

Riding his famous Palomino horses, he became a familiar figure at Rose Tournament parades, in more than one of which he served as grand marshal.

He served two 4-year terms as a member of the State park commission, during which time he fought tirelessly against the defacing of public beaches by oil drilling or other industry.

In February 1959 the actor was commended by the city council for his worldwide good-will trips on behalf of Los Angeles, the State, and the United States. He then toured Spain, Egypt, Turkey, and the Near East, singing the praises of his native city, State, and land.

His wife of 40 years, Edith, died July 25, 1953, at the age of 60.

Mercy Flight for Sumter Child Made by Guardsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the State, Columbia, S.C., of September 8, 1961:

MERCY FLIGHT FOR SUMTER CHILD MADE BY GUARDSMEN

A 2-year-old Sumter Negro child is in a Denver hospital as the result of an August 29 mercy flight from Columbia to Denver.

Charlie, the child, was admitted August 11 to the program of the Crippled Children's Division of the South Carolina State Board of Health. He had a very serious physical condition for which he was hospitalized in Columbia for a few days. But since the local hospitals did not have the proper facilities for adequate care for this type of case, it became necessary to look elsewhere.

The National Jewish Hospital at Denver, a charitable institution supported entirely by contributions, upon learning of the nature of the case and the lack of local facilities, immediately approved admission.

The National Jewish Hospital at Denver is a free, nonsectarian medical center which accepts patients regardless of race, religion, or place of residence. Its beneficence is well exemplified by its motto: "None may enter who can pay—None can pay who enter."

Transportation then became the problem. It was not feasible to transport this child by rail, and commercial airlines could not transport the case because of the nature of the child's illness. In view of this, the State Board of Health then turned to the adjutant general of South Carolina for assistance.

General Pinckney immediately gave full cooperation by authorizing a mercy flight through air transportation by a South Carolina Air National Guard plane. The trip was made as a direct flight from the Congaree Airbase to Denver, the patient being accompanied by a physician and a nurse from the State Board of Health.

Upon arrival in Denver, the Colorado Air National Guard gave immediate cooperation by furnishing ambulance service directly to the hospital.

It is anticipated that this child will be a patient at the National Jewish Hospital for at least several months.

This is not the first mercy flight provided by the South Carolina Air National Guard in cooperation with the South Carolina State Board of Health. Comparable flights have been made when necessary to New York, Delaware, and previously to Denver.

Need for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, August 30—Black Wednesday—a majority of my colleagues, by the votes they cast, decided that Federal aid for school construction was so unimportant that they did not even want to talk about it.

In this connection I include in my remarks a news item taken from the Washington Post of September 12 which is self-explanatory:

TWENTY-FOUR HURT IN SCHOOL FLOOR COLLAPSE

CORINTH, MISS., September 11.—Twenty-three students and an instructor were injured today when a floor collapsed at an aging high school building.

The ground floor gave way during a break between classes at Kossuth, 12 miles south of Corinth.

The students and Assistant Football Coach Roland Atkins fell 8 feet to the ground with the debris and a row of four soft drink vending machines.

Appendix

Plight of Small Towns Must Be Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article appeared in the Bowie County News, published in New Boston, Tex., J. E. Laney, Jr., editor, recently, entitled "Industry and the Small Town Dilemma." This article raises the question of whether it is "inevitable that some small towns will ultimately pass into the limbo of the unknown." I think this is a basic question—one that has been disturbing me for some time. I firmly believe that this "dire prophecy" is not inevitable, provided we, the people, recognize the problem and work to improve the conditions in our small towns.

Small towns are the backbone of America. Living conditions are much better in many ways in small towns than in our crowded metropolitan areas. There is not the congestion and the exaggerated pace of life in the small towns. Small towns have many advantages for older people; and if opportunities are provided, they are better places for young people to work and raise their families.

The Bowie County News spells out the way in which the introduction of new industry to small towns benefits the whole community. It points out that "an industry employing 25 workers will bring approximately $150,000 additional personal income into the community. This new money has a considerable impact upon the business in a town with 2,000 to 3,000 people. Assuming that 60 percent of this income is spent locally it means an immediate increase in retail trade of $90,000 to $100,000."

The article goes on to show how these benefits spread throughout the community, affecting all lines of business activity, and concludes with this statement:

The first step is hard but, once accomplished, forward movement becomes easier. Many small towns have found this to be true.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the complete article on "Industry and the Smalltown Dilemma" into the RECORD at this point:

INDUSTRY AND THE SMALLTOWN DILEMMA

The small town today is a victim of circumstances. It was born in response to a need, a need which is fast passing. No longer must a market center be within 10 miles to serve farmers—they can jump into a car and in 30 minutes be as many miles away to shop in stores of their choice. The result is a shifting of trade to those towns which have grown enough to support modern stores. The other towns wither, at least relatively—some even pass out of the picture.

Unfortunately, towns do not die overnight; rather, they suffer a lingering decay over several years. Vacant buildings become conspicuous while their neighbors appear dilapidated and tired looking. Taxes must rise in order to maintain civic functions, taxes which become increasingly burdensome. Paradoxically, property values must be kept rising but taxpaying ability falls. Young people leave as soon as possible to seek more attractive livings.

Is it inevitable that this dire prophecy must come true? It appears inevitable that some small towns will ultimately pass into the limbo of the unknown but not all. The survivors will be those that provide for increased community income.

During recent years many small towns in Texas have secured industry; in fact, there are relatively few small towns that do not have one or more industries. In 1956, for example, of approximately 150 new manufacturing enterprises registered in Texas, 17 were located in towns of less than 10,000 population.

Smalltown industrial enterprise normally employ relatively few workers. Nine of the new 1956 firms in small towns employed less than 25 workers, and of the entire group 83 percent were in this employment range. Small industries are considered highly desirable in the small town because they fit readily into the economy of the area. If the industries are of varied types the town is particularly fortunate; economic changes do not affect all equally and greater stability is achieved.

Some of the economic benefits of small industry in the small town can be readily demonstrated. Extensive research has indicated, for example, that an industry employing 25 workers will bring approximately $150,000 additional personal income into the community. This new money has a considerable impact upon the business in a town with 2,000 to 3,000 people. Assuming that 60 percent of this income is spent locally it means an immediate increase in retail trade of $90,000 to $100,000.

Who benefits from increased business activity in a community? Although it is impossible to trace every dollar of increased personal income there are several groups that are definitely benefited. With 74 more people living in the community it is obvious that more groceries will be sold (approximately $20,000 would be the case in New Boston) will increase building material sales and demand for more carpenters. Automobile dealers can expect to sell approximately 25 additional cars, which, of course, will increase service station, garage, and accessory demands. Clothing and dry goods stores should experience increased sales of about $25,000 while bank deposits increase by about $65,000. It thus appears that nearly all business establishments in the community are benefited.

One additional thought should be noted in passing: one industry attracts others. Frequently, supporting industries find opportunity and locate near the original industry. In any case, the original industry demonstrates the suitability of the community from an industrial point of view, thus making it easier to attract other nonrelated enterprises. The first step is hard but, once accomplished, forward movement becomes easier. Many small towns have found this to be true.

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these times of contest between freedom and communism, we need to make a continual effort to crystallize mose cleanly the ideas and ideals of freedom and their significance to our people and the world. All of us, of course, believe in and adhere to the concepts of freedom. Unfortunately, however, the real meaning and significance—to a great many people—is still at best hazy.

Recently, the American Can Co. published a series of articles by Harold Fleming, entitled "The American Achievement." The first of the articles is entitled "Freedom." Contributing to a better understanding of the development and significance of a free way of life to the American people and to the political history of the world, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM

THE MATERIAL ACHIEVEMENT

Everybody knows the tremendous material advance this country has made since World War II. Nearly everybody knows it by having shared in it. The current of energy that flows through American work and play has increased fast in 15 years.

But these postwar economic gains are only the latest installment of an American achievement that has been underway for the U.S. Constitution, the American economic system has been growing at the same rate as in the last decade and a half.

And as these economic gains have been adding to each other, decade after decade, like compound interest, the result has been more material progress in 170 years than in the previous 1,700 years.

When this all began, everyday life in American towns and cities was not much different from everday life in the towns and cities of the Roman Empire. The similarity was even greater on the farm, where most people lived. Tools and methods had changed little in 2,000 years. Then, rapidly, they began to change.

THE POLITICAL ACHIEVEMENT

With this material progress, we have also had our political freedom—the greatest of

let this heritage be swallowed up and we, too, shall have been guilty of killing it.

Makers of the laws should be especially interested in the classics. Our laws owe a debt to the classical world, as the medallions above testify. Out of the classical world came this great heritage of democracy and the tradition of the freedom of man. If the tree of democracy is worth preserving, so are its roots.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 1726 AND H.R. 6774

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
HUNTER COLLEGE IN THE BRONX,
New York, N.Y.

The American Philological Association, a nationwide organization of scholars and teachers in the field of classical studies, recommends that S. 1726 and H.R. 6774 be amended so as to provide that, wherever the words "modern foreign languages" occur in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, and title VI (sec. 611), the word "modern" be deleted, so that all languages which are widely studied in the United States may receive the impartial support of the act. The purpose of this amendment is to have the classical languages included in the act's provisions on a par with modern foreign languages and English.

Fact: The most recent census of foreign language teaching in the public schools of the United States discloses that Latin accounts for nearly one-third (32.2 percent) of all foreign language enrollments. (Source: Wesley Childers, "Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools," fall 1958; research conducted by the Modern Language Association of America for the U.S. Office of Education). The proportion is even higher in private schools.

We submit that: (1) since one-third of our children receive a substantial part of their language learning in Latin classrooms, it is vital to the success of our entire national language teaching program that this instruction be of the highest possible calibre, and that the teachers of Latin be encouraged to improve their materials and their methods to take advantage of recent developments in the area of classical language teaching; (2) by omitting the classical languages from provisions of S. 1726 and H.R. 6774 which now cover all modern foreign languages and English, the Federal Government would be using its influence and public moneys to support a program of language study which would be badly balanced, and would result in a lopsided language curriculum throughout the Nation; (3) Latin and Greek are the prime instruments for attaining a firsthand knowledge of some of the most important documents in our humanistic tradition; (4) the classical languages provide a valuable introduction to general language study. Latin in particular is a sound basis for a full and sensitive understanding of various modern foreign languages, especially the Romance tongues which are Latin's direct descendants.

Supporting statement: We present herewith, as an unbiased evaluation made by experts in a kindred field, the official statement of policy on the teaching of the classical languages declared by the Modern Language Association of America, as set forth in section II of the report of Mr. Donald D. Walsh to the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages at its 1960 meetings, appearing on pages 23 and 24 of the conference's 1960 supplementary reports.

HARRY L. LEVY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MAY 1961.

P.S.—We have just been informed that the American Council of Learned Societies fully endorses our recommendation as set forth in the first paragraph above.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM—EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF DONALD D. WALSH

I. FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENT

The only questionnaire that has produced any reportable results so far is that on foreign language enrollments in the high schools. Returns from 33 out of 50 States show encouraging overall gains between 1954 and 1958. In 11 of these 33 States there is an increase of 50 percent or more in total foreign-language enrollment: Alabama, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and Tennessee. I hasten to point out, before some of my listeners do, that several of these States could make a 50-percent gain because they started with a very low percent of foreign-language enrollment. But I am none-the-less impressed by the improvement. In the Northeastern States, where there has always been a much higher percentage of foreign-language study, startling gains are harder to make, but seven States in this region for which we have comparative statistics show solid improvement: Connecticut, up from 40 to 43 percent; Delaware, up from 29 to 37 percent; Maine, up from 26 to 34; New Hampshire, up from 31 to 39; Pennsylvania, up from 27 to 32; Vermont, up from 28 to 37; the District of Columbia, up from 29 to 34; and, most pleasantly, our host State, New Jersey, with the highest percentages, from 39.4 to 43.7 percent.

II. THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

Note that the above percentages are for all foreign languages, not just modern foreign languages. The Modern Language Association, though constitutionally limited to a concern with English and other modern languages, believes firmly in the importance of Latin, Greek, and other ancient tongues and cultures. One of the official statements of policy of the association states this concern unequivocally: "The steering committee for the foreign language program of the Modern Language Association of America believes that the obvious relevance of modern language study to modern life should not blind educators of the American public to the importance of our having more citizens who know ancient languages. It is not only that our Western civilization is more intelligible to those who can directly read its origins and development in our heritage from Greece and Rome; there is also the urgently modern fact that our children and grandchildren are going to have to understand this Western heritage in relation to the cultural traditions of the East.

"Accumulating evidence shows that a first foreign language can most readily be learned in childhood and learned primarily as spoken language. Unless Latin is taught in this way, we believe that study of an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech. Hence we recommend that the study of Latin as a second foreign language be vigorously promoted in our secondary schools, and we further recommend that administrators, counselors, and teachers of modern languages in our colleges and universities take practical steps to encourage more students to learn ancient Greek, Hebrew, classical Arabic, Chinese, and Sanskrit.

"Latin is the parent language of French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. It has also, with Greek, furnished nearly the whole of our English intellectual vocabulary. Its literature is the key to many basic concepts that we have modified to create what we tend to think of as our uniquely modern political, esthetic, and intellectual life. Ignorance of this cultural heritage is a dubious preparation for cultural advance. Ignorance of one's linguistic heritage is, moreover, a dubious basis for informed and effective use of either English or a modern Romance language. We view the decline of Latin in American education as an unfortunate result of radical and shortsighted efforts to 'modernize' the curriculum and make education 'practical.'

"The curriculum of the future, if it is designed to meet problems of the future, will recognize that the classical languages—Eastern as well as Western—have a claim to the attention of educated men and women who would, through language study, know the significant past at firsthand. This is an essential contribution of the humanities, which the modern languages—whose own past is steadily lengthening—share in, but cannot monopolize."

Long Look at Past Shows Drift in American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce for inclusion in the Appendix an editorial taken from the Georgia Poultry Times of September 6, this year. In it Mr. John F. Yarbrough, editor and publisher, pinpoints what I believe to be the danger of any Federal intervention into private enterprise.

I have frequently made the point that either we have freedom from Federal control, or we do not have: that there is no such thing as accepting a little bit of Federal help without an accompanying loss of freedom. Mr. Yarbrough's article, which traces the first big intrusion of Government into agriculture in the 1930's, conclusively proves this is so.

This point has been my contention throughout the 87th Congress and in my assignment to the Committee on Agriculture. There I have consistently opposed the philosophy of a little more Federal intervention into agriculture in return for a little supposed security, although this belief has been advocated by two of our Nation's highest leaders, Secretary Freeman, of the Department of Agriculture, and his adviser, Dr. Willard Cochrane.

Like Mr. Yarbrough points out, controls, no matter how well intentioned, spell out the death knell of the poultry industry. By that same reasoning they also spell out the death knell of all free agriculture. I sincerely hope that my colleagues read Mr. Yarbrough's article and ponder its significant truth.

[From the Georgia Poultry Times, Sept. 6, 1961]

LONG LOOK AT PAST SHOWS DRIFT IN AMERICAN IDEALS

(By John F. Yarbrough)

DEAR FOLKS: There is no denying the grief and frantic desperation which beclouds the thinking, hopes, and aspirations of thousands of poultrymen during this period of economic disaster.

You can't expect a man to smile or even sit down and think about the philosophy on which he has built his business life when he sees his investment being chopped away in the alarming chunks each week. And it is equally difficult to get him to think about tomorrow when he isn't sure he will last out today.

Nevertheless, we believe it is pertinent and appropriate to look deep into the past and dredge out some of the events that put us where we are and set the stage for where we may be going.

One completely exasperated poultryman put his case to us thusly:

"The Government tells me what to pay my workers and how long they can work;

"The Government tells me what I have to pay for corn, soybeans and some of the other ingredients that go into my feed;

"The Government tells me what I can use in my feed to fight disease;

"The Government tells me what chickens I can process and what chickens I must throw away;

"The Government tells me what I have to pay for moving my ingredients to the mill and my products to the market;

"When I make any money, the Government tells me how much I can keep and takes the rest;

"I might as well let the Government tell me how many chickens I can grow and how much profit I can make."

The series of operating conditions which this poultryman describes is not the result of one overt act by a dictator or master politician. It is the net result of years and years of the drip, drip, drip of those insidious acids of complacency, lack of determination, greed, indifference, and pseudo social reform that have worn away the bedrock foundations of freedom, ambition and the desires for and joy of self determination.

Though some poultrymen now see "controls" as the only salvation for the industry, these same "controls" most likely represent the death knell for American agriculture.

The livestock and poultry segment of the agricultural economy has long been the last stronghold of the free. But as itemized by the poultryman mentioned above, this freedom has for at least the past 30 years been slipping out of our grasp.

Governmental management of the social-economic structure of our way of life began in innocuous form. A destitute Nation reached out for a crumb of socialism when the little pigs were slaughtered, the cotton pulled up and plowed under, the potatoes piled mountain-high to rot in the depression of the thirties. (Just a small chunk of a future generation's rights mortgaged by deficit spending wasn't so soul searing.)

Just a little bit of social security—maneuvered, manipulated and managed by Government—didn't seem so bad when it was offered to a troubled segment of our populace. At the moment it mattered not that this "security" was being purchased at the price of the individual's responsibilities to himself.

Each outstretching grasp of the tentacles of that philosophy of big government and little people was rationalized by the false belief that "well, we have got to get out of this jam and then we will put Government back in its rightfully insignificant place and go back to the positions of our forefathers when people and price were paramount and independence was the driving force in our Nation's bid for progress.

Each weathered stone of resistance has been dissolved as crisis was heaped upon crisis and expediency superseded reason.

The bright shades and hues of liberty and freedom are overcast with somber shadows of despair and desperation but the lightning of reawakened reason can strike—we hope it does—and soon.

Operation Copperhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago those words might well have been "dirty words" north of the Mason-Dixon line. During the Civil War copperhead designated a northerner sympathetic to the southern cause.

Animosity no longer exists north or south of that once famous line. Recently friends and neighbors from both sides gathered to stage a hunt for the creeping species of copperheads. Success in any endeavor requires cooperation. In this instance hunters cooperated beautifully. The hunted and the weatherman did not. A great deal of advanced publicity had been given and someone suggested the copperheads apparently had read the newspapers.

The speaker attended as a guest, but refused to become friendly with the specimens brought in alive.

Those of you interested in similar projects in your area might find useful information in the account which appeared in the York Dispatch:

Get your clubs ready, ladies and gentlemen, copperhead snake hunting is on the agenda again this Saturday at Muddy Creek Forks.

The copperheads were as snug as a bug in the rug in their cozy dens last Saturday while it rained cats and dogs down in Muddy Creek Valley. But even so, 10 copperheads met their waterloo when a throng of 224 dripping wet hunters invaded the picturesque valley.

Mike Zidic, of Lebanon, Pa., was declared the 1961 roundup champion of York County, but it was Clifford Hickernell, of Reinholds R.D., Lancaster County, who got the biggest copperhead—36½ inches. Zidic captured two reptiles alive near Castle Finn. He saw three, but one got away. His largest measured 34½ inches, and the other 32½ inches.

Harry Allaman, general chairman for the roundup sponsored by the Conservation Society of York County, said "most of the hunters want to go out again next Saturday and we'll oblige." Dale Leiphart, vice president of the society's fish and game division, echoed his approval, and said that prizes will be awarded this week instead of trophies. "Zidic and Hickernell," Leiphart pointed out, "are still our champions until next year."

COUNTIAN RUNNERUP CHAMP

Only one York countian won a trophy. He is young Joseph Kline, of York Haven, who is the runnerup champion catcher. His snakes measured 26½ and 30½ inches.

Actually three men killed two snakes each. The other was Richard Sassaman, of Emporium, Pa., whose snakes measured 35 and 25 inches. However, he shared the runnerup honors for the largest snake killed or captured with Francis Kelly, of Owings Mills, Md. Kelly's single snake, taken alive, also measured 35 inches.

All the snakes captured or killed, with the exception of Hickernell's, were taken along Muddy Creek.

George Crowl, a director of the society, who served as guide at Camp Donegal, near Sunnyburn, said one copperhead got away from Hickernell, who hunted only in the morning. However, the copperhead posse let several more escape during the afternoon roundup at Camp Donegal. Says Crowl: "We're going back to the camp Saturday. It's important that we get those copperheads out of there for the safety of those young campers."

Crowl, who is also a neighbor of Camp Donegal, is the only one permitted by camp officials to take a posse into the camp.

Dr. J. A. Hunt, Delta physician and a director of the society, wants the hunters to leave their shooting irons at home next Saturday. In briefing the group last Saturday at the James C. Keiser general store in Muddy Creek Forks, Dr. Hunt said he expected more people to suffer from gunshot wounds and fractures than from snake bites. Fortunately, he said later, there were no casualties.

WOMEN JOIN SAFARI

Hickernell, a State highway department worker in Lancaster County, who was "rapped" once by a rattlesnake, said hunting copperheads is a new experience for him although he has often headed for the bush hunting rattlesnakes. "You can be sure I'll be back," he said. "This is great sport."

Nine women joined the safari. While none bagged a copperhead their enthusiasm wasn't dampened by the rain. Mrs. Peggy Leiphart, wife of Dale Leiphart, and Paul Martin, county fish warden, missed the same copperhead. And, Mrs. Ruth Marshall, widely known in entertainment circles, missed one in the afternoon at Camp Donegal. Her husband, Robert, failed to flush a one.

Allaman said they were tempted to call off the hunt Saturday, because of the heavy rain, but with so many hunters showing up despite the weather, and many of them coming so far, it just wouldn't have been fair to postpone the event. As it is, we'll have another roundup this Saturday and if the weather is more favorable we should have a good catch.

During the briefing given by Allaman and Dr. Hunt between 7 and 8 a.m. Saturday, it was raining, but at the conclusion the hunters took off in all directions, and by then it was raining hard. And it didn't stop until after 1 o'clock.

It was explained that copperheads, like people with the exception of possibly snake hunters, do not like to get wet, and so they find the driest place and relax, coming out only when it is dry enough to travel or to warm themselves in the sun. "It never did get dry enough," Leiphart said, "but we did get some sun in the afternoon when the roundup was almost over."

Kenneth F. Kauffman, of 747 Florida Avenue, was the only one who got one in the sun, and his specimen was the smallest, 24½ inches. Dennis Becker, of 603 Third Street, Hanover, was another lucky hunter. His measured 33 inches.

CAMERA HIS WEAPON

H. L. "Bill" Consley, York's noted big game hunter, who has killed at least one of every large animal in the world, said this was his first real snake hunt although he did look for a python in South Vietnam last year. Consley was armed only with a camera, and he got some good pictures.

James Raby, of Ore Valley, a retired real estate broker, was perhaps the oldest hunter—73. Like most of the others, he intends to go out again this Saturday. Raby is no "greenhorn" in snake hunting. Years ago he hunted snakes successfully in South Africa.

Congressman GEORGE GOODLING and State Assemblyman John Hope Anderson were on hand for the afternoon activities. Both are

nonmaterial, spiritual values. In this country's history, more people have been free to mind their own business, and have had fewer people to mind their business for them, than in almost any other place or time in human history. Millions of Europeans came here, not in search of material wealth, for this country at first had little of it, but because this was a land of liberty and of opportunity.

We Americans are inclined to take for granted this combination of material progress and of personal liberty. But the assumption that they go together is being challenged today all over the world—and even in this country. The contrary idea is spreading, helped by the Russians, that economic progress and political freedom cannot go together. A new fashion of thinking says that nations must make a choice between the one or the other—progress or freedom. The idea is that the two are incompatible—that a nation cannot have both at the same time.

The new theory goes still further. It says that economic progress must come first, and freedom later; that, in fact, it is only material economic progress that can lead to freedom. The Russians, for instance, say that they will outgrow us in economics, meaning that after that (perhaps) they will have political freedom. And some of the underdeveloped countries say that they are too poor to enjoy freedom of enterprise (or in some cases even freedom of speech).

This is diametrically opposite to American experience and history.

The United States started as an underdeveloped country. It had no net capital. It was heavily in debt and operating on borrowed money. It had no railroads, no factories, no steel mills, nor any other kind of sizable capital accumulation.

In fact it had only one real asset of any importance. And this was not an economic asset at all, but a political one. Many other countries were far ahead of us in the major economic assets of the day—ships, roads, machinery, skilled labor, coal, iron, gold and silver. This country's almost unique asset was the idea of a meticulously limited government. It was written into the Constitution. It was put most briefly in the Bill of Rights. It was a reverse English on the European idea that a "government knows best." It was the idea of freedom from not only George the Third's government, but from any government.

THE INVENTION OF FREEDOM

The idea of individual freedom, as a general good in itself, on which this country was founded, and from which the American achievement started, was an invention. It was as new in its day as the telephone, the gasoline engine, or the metal container were in their day.

It was the product of many men's thoughts and struggles. Its invention was a long story, and, for us, a lucky historic accident. The final breakthrough came only after centuries of trial-and-error. We have the English largely to thank for it.

Historians trace the river of our forefathers' ideas about freedom back at least seven centuries, to the English Magna Carta of A.D. 1215. This was a written statement of rights against the Crown, which the feudal barons exacted from King John at Runnymede, up the Thames River from London. Its most famous clause was that—"No freeman shall be imprisoned, or dispossessed, unless by the lawful judgment of his equals, or by the law of the land."

These words had the same meaning then as if, in the 20th century, they had been forced upon Germany's Hitler, Russia's Khrushchev, or Cuba's Castro.

And the rights thus written down came to be known as the immemorial rights of Englishmen.

The feudal barons were later replaced by national governments in Spain, France, and England. And these governments, as is the nature of governments, took to economic planning. Under the mercantilist idea, they tried to regulate everything they could control—exports, imports, wages, production, prices, etc. They granted monopolies and supported privileges.

To our everlasting fortune in this country, the English Government was the least efficient and least determined of these governments. Queen Elizabeth, the Cal Coolidge of her day, answered most economic problems by doing nothing about them. Charles I's pretensions got him beheaded. Cromwell's absolutism ended the Commonwealth. James II's programs got him exiled. Magna Carta was revived.

Meantime, colonizing the New World became the growth industry of its time. And, true to form, the Spanish and French Governments tried to run their colonies as government ventures, but the less ambitious English Government gave its colonists little more than a charter and its blessing. The English colonies were private ventures, free to sink or swim on their own.

And on their own, they soon began to swim mightily. They had put 3,000 miles of the Atlantic Ocean between them and the European hodgepodge of feudal-inherited, or government-protected, privileges, monopolies, customs, and restrictions.

In the New World, the farmer no longer had to live in town and decide next year's planting program in committee. He could move out, live in the middle of his farm, and run it as he pleased, raising such crops as he chose, either for himself or for the market. The English-born workman in the New World was free to move about, to charge what wages he could get, or to set up his own shop. And the colonial merchant was free to buy and sell wherever, whenever, and at whatever prices he saw fit. These were new and heady freedoms.

After the colonists began to thrive, the British Government began trying to fit them into its economic plans. They didn't fit very well. George III came to the throne in 1760. He was conscientious and German in his planning for his subjects. Among other things he decided that the American colonists should not move over the Appalachians. Eventually the colonists revolted, not as Americans but as Englishmen. And up came Magna Carta again. For instance the Massachusetts Assembly in declaring the Stamp Act void, said that it was "against Magna Carta and the natural rights of Englishmen, and therefore, void."

Thus the "immemorial rights of Englishmen," transplanted to the edge of the wilderness, became the natural rights of Americans, against the Crown.

These rights were sometimes separately defined, as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of movement, and freedom of property. But their histories all ran parallel. And by the time of the Revolution, they were recognized as interrelated and as essentially all the same thing—freedom from government interference. Thus free men recognized what all totalitarian governments recognize, that the rights of conscience, association, speech, and property, rise and fall together. A government that can shut a man's mouth can also take his property, and vice versa.

Until this time, in all Western history, the basic political idea had been that the government should have all rights except those specifically granted to citizens. But now, for the first time, this idea was inverted. Citizens should have all rights except those specifically granted to the government.

This was such a historic breakthrough that Tom Paine, the voice of the American Revolution, wrote in his "Common Sense" pamphlet: "We have it in our power to begin the world over again. A situation, similar to the present, hath not happened since the days of Noah until now."

And the Founding Fathers wrote this unprecedented, upside-down idea of government into the U.S. Constitution. They framed the weakest government they thought could fill the barest essential needs for a government.

THE "BUSINESS END" OF THE CONSTITUTION

Into this Constitution, the authors put an assurance that a man could own his own inventions and writings for a limited time (art. 1, sec. 8); that the States should not issue paper money (art. 1, sec. 10); that the States should not pass any law abridging the obligation of contract (art. 1, sec. 10); that this Nation would be a common market (art. 1, sec. 10); and that (echoing Magna Carta) no person should be deprived of his property without due process of law (art. 5, Bill of Rights).

These are the so-called "business clauses" of the Constitution. They opened the way for the free enterprise which has produced the American economic achievement. They led to economic adventure, competition, obsolescence, and sharing.

Needed: A Big Stick Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry has suffered greatly during the past several years by reason of excessive textile imports. This condition is primarily due to the fact that the executive department of our Government has failed to take action to protect our domestic textile industry and other basic industries so necessary for our survival and economic well-being.

One of the countries which has enjoyed to a great extent an open textile market in the United States is Japan. We have been very lenient with Japan and have gone out of our way to insure that she had a fair share of the American textile market.

I was sorry to learn recently, therefore, that a New York trade group representing Japanese textile interests has filed a protest with the OCDM over the American textile industry's request that protection be afforded our domestic textile industry under the defense clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. My concern over this matter is shared by many of my constituents whose livelihood depends on a thriving textile industry. They are at a loss to understand why Japanese textile trade interests would be so presumptuous as to advise the United States with respect to what is necessary for our national defense.

The Southern Textile News for September 9, 1961, carried a very excellent editorial regarding this matter. I know that my colleagues in the House share my concern over adequate protection for basic American industry, and I believe that they will find the Southern Textile

News editorial to be very interesting. With that thought in mind I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEEDED: A "BIG STICK" POLICY

America has come a long way since the days of bemustached, bull-like Teddy Roosevelt.

Teddy's famous "speak softly, but carry a big stick" doctrine has been split asunder.

Today, America is doing the soft speaking—while certain other nations of the world, wielding an economic "big stick," are clobbering the daylights out of us.

We are referring specifically to the attitude of Japanese interests in formally opposing the American textile industry's request for import restrictions. Japan, it seems, is determined to decide for itself just what and how much of its textile and other products it will unload on the United States. This, perhaps, is to be expected.

But, when a foreign power—Japanese or otherwise—begins to offer advice on what is and is not good for the defense of our country, that is something else.

A New York trade group, representing Japanese interests, has objected to the industry's request to the OCDM for restrictions under the defense clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

It has urged the OCDM to either dismiss the petition outright, or send it back to the domestic industry sponsors for additional information. This petition, which calls for import curbs on the ground that foreign shipments are seriously injuring an essential defense industry, was filed with the OCDM by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and 10 other groups representing various elements of the U.S. textile industry.

We have seen, along with an increasing dependence upon Uncle Sam for financial handouts, a growing tendency among other nations of the world to want to run the affairs of this country, internally and externally.

We have been instructed on how to allocate our foreign-aid moneys. We were told how not to punish Caryl Chessman, the sickening "red light bandit." We have had to soft-pedal Cuba. We have had to abandon expensive airbases in France in order to pacify a questionable ally. We have been requested not to resume nuclear testing. We have had to go to other countries and ask them to please not ship things into our country that would be in competition with our own products.

But last week's request from the Japanese trade agency that the domestic industry's petition to OCDM be dismissed bears the crowning touch. It reflects the stark truth in the ancient maxim that "if you give a man an inch, he will take a mile."

Craig Smith, of Avondale Mills, in expressing his amazement at the agency's action, has at the same time expressed our sentiment in these apt words:

"Our Government and our industry may need advice from the Japanese on some matters, but surely the adequacy of our national defense needs is not one of them. I can hardly imagine any group of U.S. citizens injecting themselves into a determination concerning the defense needs of any friendly foreign country."

How long will we yield to pressure from foreign legations and embassies in Washington and from every itinerant potentate who visits the White House? How long will we allow Communist-inspired mobs overseas to dictate whether our President shall visit a foreign country * * * or influence the administration of justice in our country? How long will we allow low-wage textile exporters to decide for themselves what and how much they are going to dump upon our shores?

We don't have the answers. We doubt if anyone else does.

But of one thing we feel quite confident: If we had more of the "speak softly, but carry a big stick" type of leadership in our Government today, rather than apathy, indecision, and vulnerability to outside manipulation, we would be a whale of a sight better off than we are at present.

Foreign Language Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, had the parliamentary conditions permitted, I would have offered an amendment for the deletion of the word "modern" from "modern foreign languages" in H.R. 9000, the National Defense Education Act, when it was extended last week, so that all languages which are widely studied in the United States would receive the support of the act.

The purpose of my proposed amendment was to have the classical languages—Latin and Greek—included in the act's provisions.

It is not a very great change—it will not visibly alter the course of world or national events; but I ask you, my colleagues, to look around you:

As you look around the top of this Chamber at the 23 relief portraits in marble of men noted in history for the part they have played in the evolution of what has become American law, you will note that six of these great lawgivers are from the classical world:

First, Lycurgus, author of the laws of Sparta; second, Solon, the great Athenian lawgiver; third, Gaius, the celebrated Roman jurist; fourth, Papinian, a juridical genius; fifth, Justinian, the emperor who published the Corpus Juris Civilis; and sixth, Tribonian, the able lawyer who codified Justinian's laws.

In addition, although not really part of the classical world, many medieval and Renaissance lawgivers wrote in the Latin language; among these:

First, Gregory IX, who maintained the remnants of Roman law; second, Innocent III, who also preserved the remnants of Roman law; and third, Hugo Grotius, author of the first treatise on international law, De Jure Belli Et Pacis.

The mace at the front of this Chamber is a true and exact replica of the Roman symbol of authority which graced the presence of their magistrates.

The Speaker's words which we hope to hear soon, "sine die," are Latin, as well as many others with which you are all acquainted.

On a larger scale, the entire city of Washington is a great collection of classic-style Roman and Greek monuments and buildings, such as the National Archives Building, where the treasures of this Nation's freedom are stored.

It is clear that we owe an incalculable debt to the classical civilizations. The Graeco-Roman languages and civilizations lie at the heart of the American way of life.

But, there are also some very down-to-earth considerations for this amendment. Language professors—members of the American Philological Association—point out that:

By omitting the classical languages from provisions of H.R. 9000 * * * the Federal Government would be using its influence and public moneys to support a program of language study which is badly balanced, and would result in a lopsided language curriculum throughout the Nation * * *.

This is what the professors themselves say, and they are the ones who should know. One professor, in a letter to me, said:

What concerns me is that by giving generous fellowships to all other languages the ancient languages * * * are left at a decided disadvantage in attracting graduate students. Throughout the country there is a rising demand for teachers of classical literature and history.

But this is not all.

The language professors claim that "the classical languages provide a valuable introduction to general language study. Latin in particular is a sound basis for a full and sensitive understanding of various modern foreign languages, especially the Romance tongues which are Latin's direct descendants."

In addition, a furthering of classical studies in this country can have tremendous impact and prestige-value abroad. Dr. Michael H. Jameson, a Greek professor at the University of Pennsylvania, made front-page headlines in the New York Times in June 1960 with the report of his discovery of a decree of Themistocles at Troezen, in Greece. This past spring, Dr. Jameson's work received national publicity in the magazine, the Scientific American. In a letter to me, Dr. Jameson says:

"Our fostering of classical studies has considerable effect on our status abroad, on both sides of the Iron Curtain. At the risk of immodesty, I have mentioned that the American discovery of the decree of Themistocles, and its quick and thorough publication, has raised our cultural prestige a great deal. I have had requests for a semi-popular article for an East German magazine and a Czechoslovakian extravaganza called 'Laterna Magica,' combining movies and live actors, asked at once for material to use for one of their productions on the Persian Wars."

Finally, the most important reason for the adoption of this amendment is, perhaps the easiest overlooked. Latin and Greek are the prime instruments for attaining a firsthand knowledge of some of the most important documents in our humanistic tradition.

Nevertheless, there still may be some doubt as to why we should chose to preserve the languages of civilizations written off as dead letters over 18 centuries ago. However, the purpose is not to emulate the past, but to achieve an awareness of the past. For if we should lose our past, we shall have lost the future. If we are to build a sound future, the past must be continually re-evaluated. And what better way is there to do this than with the original materials—a firsthand investigation.

Totalitarian societies burn books and distort history. But there are acts of omission as well as commission. We can

let this heritage be swallowed up and we, too, shall have been guilty of killing it.

Makers of the laws should be especially interested in the classics. Our laws owe a debt to the classical world, as the medallions above testify. Out of the classical world came this great heritage of democracy and the tradition of the freedom of man. If the tree of democracy is worth preserving, so are its roots.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 1726 AND H.R. 6774

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,
HUNTER COLLEGE IN THE BRONX,
New York, N.Y.

The American Philological Association, a nationwide organization of scholars and teachers in the field of classical studies, recommends that S. 1726 and H.R. 6774 be amended so as to provide that, wherever the words "modern foreign languages" occur in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, and title VI (sec. 611), the word "modern" be deleted, so that all languages which are widely studied in the United States may receive the impartial support of the act. The purpose of this amendment is to have the classical languages included in the act's provisions on a par with modern foreign languages and English.

Fact: The most recent census of foreign language teaching in the public schools of the United States discloses that Latin accounts for nearly one-third (32.2 percent) of all foreign language enrollments. (Source: Wesley Childers, "Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools," fall 1958; research conducted by the Modern Language Association of America for the U.S. Office of Education). The proportion is even higher in private schools.

We submit that: (1) since one-third of our children receive a substantial part of their language learning in Latin classrooms, it is vital to the success of our entire national language teaching program that this instruction be of the highest possible calibre, and that the teachers of Latin be encouraged to improve their materials and their methods to take advantage of recent developments in the area of classical language teaching; (2) by omitting the classical languages from provisions of S. 1726 and H.R. 6774 which now cover all modern foreign languages and English, the Federal Government would be using its influence and public moneys to support a program of language study which would be badly balanced, and would result in a lopsided language curriculum throughout the Nation; (3) Latin and Greek are the prime instruments for attaining a firsthand knowledge of some of the most important documents in our humanistic tradition; (4) the classical languages provide a valuable introduction to general language study. Latin in particular is a sound basis for a full and sensitive understanding of various modern foreign languages, especially the Romance tongues which are Latin's direct descendants.

Supporting statement: We present herewith, as an unbiased evaluation made by experts in a kindred field, the official statement of policy on the teaching of the classical languages declared by the Modern Language Association of America, as set forth in section II of the report of Mr. Donald D. Walsh to the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages at its 1960 meetings, appearing on pages 23 and 24 of the conference's 1960 supplementary reports.

HARRY L. LEVY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MAY 1961.

P.S.—We have just been informed that the American Council of Learned Societies fully endorses our recommendation as set forth in the first paragraph above.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM—EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF DONALD D. WALSH

I. FOREIGN LANGUAGE ENROLLMENT

The only questionnaire that has produced any reportable results so far is that on foreign language enrollments in the high schools. Returns from 33 out of 50 States show encouraging overall gains between 1954 and 1958. In 11 of these 33 States there is an increase of 50 percent or more in total foreign-language enrollment: Alabama, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and Tennessee. I hasten to point out, before some of my listeners do, that several of these States could make a 50-percent gain because they started with a very low percent of foreign-language enrollment. But I am none-the-less impressed by the improvement. In the Northeastern States, where there has always been a much higher percentage of foreign-language study, startling gains are harder to make, but seven States in this region for which we have comparative statistics show solid improvement: Connecticut, up from 40 to 43 percent; Delaware, up from 29 to 37 percent; Maine, up from 26 to 34; New Hampshire, up from 31 to 39; Pennsylvania, up from 27 to 32; Vermont, up from 28 to 37; the District of Columbia, up from 29 to 34; and, most pleasantly, our host State, New Jersey, with the highest percentages, from 39.4 to 43.7 percent.

II. THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

Note that the above percentages are for all foreign languages, not just modern foreign languages. The Modern Language Association, though constitutionally limited to a concern with English and other modern languages, believes firmly in the importance of Latin, Greek, and other ancient tongues and cultures. One of the official statements of policy of the association states this concern unequivocally: "The steering committee for the foreign language program of the Modern Language Association of America believes that the obvious relevance of modern language study to modern life should not blind educators of the American public to the importance of our having more citizens who know ancient languages. It is not only that our Western civilization is more intelligible to those who can directly read its origins and development in our heritage from Greece and Rome; there is also the urgently modern fact that our children and grandchildren are going to have to understand this Western heritage in relation to the cultural traditions of the East.

"Accumulating evidence shows that a first foreign language can most readily be learned in childhood and learned primarily as spoken language. Unless Latin is taught in this way, we believe that study of an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech. Hence we recommend that the study of Latin as a second foreign language be vigorously promoted in our secondary schools, and we further recommend that administrators, counselors, and teachers of modern languages in our colleges and universities take practical steps to encourage more students to learn ancient Greek, Hebrew, classical Arabic, Chinese, and Sanskrit.

"Latin is the parent language of French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. It has also, with Greek, furnished nearly the whole of our English intellectual vocabulary. Its literature is the key to many basic concepts that we have modified to create what we tend to think of as our uniquely modern political, esthetic, and intellectual life. Ignorance of this cultural heritage is a dubious preparation for cultural advance. Ignorance of one's linguistic heritage is, moreover, a dubious basis for informed and effective use of either English or a modern Romance language. We view the decline of Latin in American education as an unfortunate result of radical and shortsighted efforts to 'modernize' the curriculum and make education 'practical.'

"The curriculum of the future, if it is designed to meet problems of the future, will recognize that the classical languages—Eastern as well as Western—have a claim to the attention of educated men and women who would, through language study, know the significant past at firsthand. This is an essential contribution of the humanities, which the modern languages—whose own past is steadily lengthening—share in, but cannot monopolize."

Long Look at Past Shows Drift in American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce for inclusion in the Appendix an editorial taken from the Georgia Poultry Times of September 6, this year. In it Mr. John F. Yarbrough, editor and publisher, pinpoints what I believe to be the danger of any Federal intervention into private enterprise.

I have frequently made the point that either we have freedom from Federal control, or we do not have: that there is no such thing as accepting a little bit of Federal help without an accompanying loss of freedom. Mr. Yarbrough's article, which traces the first big intrusion of Government into agriculture in the 1930's, conclusively proves this is so.

This point has been my contention throughout the 87th Congress and in my assignment to the Committee on Agriculture. There I have consistently opposed the philosophy of a little more Federal intervention into agriculture in return for a little supposed security, although this belief has been advocated by two of our Nation's highest leaders, Secretary Freeman, of the Department of Agriculture, and his adviser, Dr. Willard Cochrane.

Like Mr. Yarbrough points out, controls, no matter how well intentioned, spell out the death knell of the poultry industry. By that same reasoning they also spell out the death knell of all free agriculture. I sincerely hope that my colleagues read Mr. Yarbrough's article and ponder its significant truth.

[From the Georgia Poultry Times, Sept. 6, 1961]

LONG LOOK AT PAST SHOWS DRIFT IN AMERICAN IDEALS

(By John F. Yarbrough)

DEAR FOLKS: There is no denying the grief and frantic desperation which beclouds the thinking, hopes, and aspirations of thousands of poultrymen during this period of economic disaster.

You can't expect a man to smile or even sit down and think about the philosophy on which he has built his business life when he sees his investment being chopped away in the alarming chunks each week. And it is equally difficult to get him to think about tomorrow when he isn't sure he will last out today.

Nevertheless, we believe it is pertinent and appropriate to look deep into the past and dredge out some of the events that put us where we are and set the stage for where we may be going.

One completely exasperated poultryman put his case to us thusly:

"The Government tells me what to pay my workers and how long they can work;

"The Government tells me what I have to pay for corn, soybeans and some of the other ingredients that go into my feed;

"The Government tells me what I can use in my feed to fight disease;

"The Government tells me what chickens I can process and what chickens I must throw away;

"The Government tells me what I have to pay for moving my ingredients to the mill and my products to the market;

"When I make any money, the Government tells me how much I can keep and takes the rest;

"I might as well let the Government tell me how many chickens I can grow and how much profit I can make."

The series of operating conditions which this poultryman describes is not the result of one overt act by a dictator or master politician. It is the net result of years and years of the drip, drip, drip of those insidious acids of complacency, lack of determination, greed, indifference, and pseudo social reform that have worn away the bedrock foundations of freedom, ambition and the desires for and joy of self determination.

Though some poultrymen now see "controls" as the only salvation for the industry, these same "controls" most likely represent the death knell for American agriculture.

The livestock and poultry segment of the agricultural economy has long been the last stronghold of the free. But as itemized by the poultryman mentioned above, this freedom has for at least the past 30 years been slipping out of our grasp.

Governmental management of the social-economic structure of our way of life began in innocuous form. A destitute Nation reached out for a crumb of socialism when the little pigs were slaughtered, the cotton pulled up and plowed under, the potatoes piled mountain-high to rot in the depression of the thirties. (Just a small chunk of a future generation's rights mortgaged by deficit spending wasn't so soul searing.)

Just a little bit of social security—maneuvered, manipulated and managed by Government—didn't seem so bad when it was offered to a troubled segment of our populace. At the moment it mattered not that this "security" was being purchased at the price of the individual's responsibilities to himself.

Each outstretching grasp of the tentacles of that philosophy of big government and little people was rationalized by the false belief that "well, we have got to get out of this jam and then we will put Government back in its rightfully insignificant place and go back to the positions of our forefathers when people and price were paramount and independence was the driving force in our Nation's bid for progress.

Each weathered stone of resistance has been dissolved as crisis was heaped upon crisis and expediency superseded reason.

The bright shades and hues of liberty and freedom are overcast with somber shadows of despair and desperation but the lightning of reawakened reason can strike—we hope it does—and soon.

Operation Copperhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago those words might well have been "dirty words" north of the Mason-Dixon line. During the Civil War copperhead designated a northerner sympathetic to the southern cause.

Animosity no longer exists north or south of that once famous line. Recently friends and neighbors from both sides gathered to stage a hunt for the creeping species of copperheads. Success in any endeavor requires cooperation. In this instance hunters cooperated beautifully. The hunted and the weatherman did not. A great deal of advanced publicity had been given and someone suggested the copperheads apparently had read the newspapers.

The speaker attended as a guest, but refused to become friendly with the specimens brought in alive.

Those of you interested in similar projects in your area might find useful information in the account which appeared in the York Dispatch:

Get your clubs ready, ladies and gentlemen, copperhead snake hunting is on the agenda again this Saturday at Muddy Creek Forks.

The copperheads were as snug as a bug in the rug in their cozy dens last Saturday while it rained cats and dogs down in Muddy Creek Valley. But even so, 10 copperheads met their waterloo when a throng of 224 dripping wet hunters invaded the picturesque valley.

Mike Zidic, of Lebanon, Pa., was declared the 1961 roundup champion of York County, but it was Clifford Hickernell, of Reinholds R.D., Lancaster County, who got the biggest copperhead—36½ inches. Zidic captured two reptiles alive near Castle Finn. He saw three, but one got away. His largest measured 34½ inches, and the other 32½ inches.

Harry Allaman, general chairman for the roundup sponsored by the Conservation Society of York County, said "most of the hunters want to go out again next Saturday and we'll oblige." Dale Leiphart, vice president of the society's fish and game division, echoed his approval, and said that prizes will be awarded this week instead of trophies. "Zidic and Hickernell," Leiphart pointed out, "are still our champions until next year."

COUNTIAN RUNNERUP CHAMP

Only one York countian won a trophy. He is young Joseph Kline, of York Haven, who is the runnerup champion catcher. His snakes measured 26½ and 30½ inches.

Actually three men killed two snakes each. The other was Richard Sassaman, of Emporium, Pa., whose snakes measured 35 and 25 inches. However, he shared the runnerup honors for the largest snake killed or captured with Francis Kelly, of Owings Mills, Md. Kelly's single snake, taken alive, also measured 35 inches.

All the snakes captured or killed, with the exception of Hickernell's, were taken along Muddy Creek.

George Crowl, a director of the society, who served as guide at Camp Donegal, near Sunnyburn, said one copperhead got away from Hickernell, who hunted only in the morning. However, the copperhead posse let several more escape during the afternoon roundup at Camp Donegal. Says Crowl: "We're going back to the camp Saturday. It's important that we get those copperheads out of there for the safety of those young campers."

Crowl, who is also a neighbor of Camp Donegal, is the only one permitted by camp officials to take a posse into the camp.

Dr. J. A. Hunt, Delta physician and a director of the society, wants the hunters to leave their shooting irons at home next Saturday. In briefing the group last Saturday at the James C. Keiser general store in Muddy Creek Forks, Dr. Hunt said he expected more people to suffer from gunshot wounds and fractures than from snake bites. Fortunately, he said later, there were no casualties.

WOMEN JOIN SAFARI

Hickernell, a State highway department worker in Lancaster County, who was "rapped" once by a rattlesnake, said hunting copperheads is a new experience for him although he has often headed for the bush hunting rattlesnakes. "You can be sure I'll be back," he said. "This is great sport."

Nine women joined the safari. While none bagged a copperhead their enthusiasm wasn't dampened by the rain. Mrs. Peggy Leiphart, wife of Dale Leiphart, and Paul Martin, county fish warden, missed the same copperhead. And, Mrs. Ruth Marshall, widely known in entertainment circles, missed one in the afternoon at Camp Donegal. Her husband, Robert, failed to flush a one.

Allaman said they were tempted to call off the hunt Saturday, because of the heavy rain, but with so many hunters showing up despite the weather, and many of them coming so far, it just wouldn't have been fair to postpone the event. As it is, we'll have another roundup this Saturday and if the weather is more favorable we should have a good catch.

During the briefing given by Allaman and Dr. Hunt between 7 and 8 a.m. Saturday, it was raining, but at the conclusion the hunters took off in all directions, and by then it was raining hard. And it didn't stop until after 1 o'clock.

It was explained that copperheads, like people with the exception of possibly snake hunters, do not like to get wet, and so they find the driest place and relax, coming out only when it is dry enough to travel or to warm themselves in the sun. "It never did get dry enough," Leiphart said, "but we did get some sun in the afternoon when the roundup was almost over."

Kenneth F. Kauffman, of 747 Florida Avenue, was the only one who got one in the sun, and his specimen was the smallest, 24½ inches. Dennis Becker, of 603 Third Street, Hanover, was another lucky hunter. His measured 33 inches.

CAMERA HIS WEAPON

H. L. "Bill" Consley, York's noted big game hunter, who has killed at least one of every large animal in the world, said this was his first real snake hunt although he did look for a python in South Vietnam last year. Consley was armed only with a camera, and he got some good pictures.

James Raby, of Ore Valley, a retired real estate broker, was perhaps the oldest hunter—73. Like most of the others, he intends to go out again this Saturday. Raby is no "greenhorn" in snake hunting. Years ago he hunted snakes successfully in South Africa.

Congressman GEORGE GOODLING and State Assemblyman John Hope Anderson were on hand for the afternoon activities. Both are

members of the sponsoring conservation society. GOODLING and Ruth Marshall obliged the many photographers on hand to handle a copperhead—a dead one.

Perhaps the proudest man on the hunt was Marty Arnold, who termed himself a native guide. He took Sassaman below Woodbine in the afternoon where the Emporium youth got his pair.

Representatives of the Baltimore Zoo admitted they expected to come to Muddy Creek Forks to see a farce, but they returned to Baltimore after praising the conservation society for staging a well conducted roundup.

The hunters will meet at Keiser's Store at 8 a.m. this Saturday. Allaman and Leiphart both joined Dr. Hunt in urging the hunters to leave their firearms at home. A garden hoe is the most practical weapon for the new hunter to use, Leiphart said, "because it will not only kill a snake, but is an excellent tool for overturning rocks."

Allaman said he expected about 100 hunters with a catch of perhaps 30 to 40 snakes if the weather had been clear Saturday. But, he said, "I was amazed when more than 200 showed up in that kind of weather. I was even surprised that we got 10 copperheads."

James Keiser, who operates the general store, said he sold more shirts Saturday than he had all summer. Mr. Lidie Stewart and Mrs. Mamie Keiser were cochairmen for the refreshment stand and they did a good business. The stand was "manned" by Mrs. Stewart and four of her daughters, Rose, Lynn, Kay and Peggy, plus Mrs. Birdie Manifold. Other farm women within a 15-mile radius baked pies for the hunters. At the close of the day, Mrs. Stewart presented $70 to the conservation society.

James A. Stewart, chief game observer for the society, said he now wonders if this argument will start: "Which is the most sporting to hunt, a rattlesnake or a copperhead?"

It was pointed out that a rattlesnake hits harder, is generally a larger snake, but it usually gives a warning that it is nearby, whereas the copperhead lies there deadly and silent. "The hunter must be all hunter," Stewart said.

Allaman said he was pleased that nine women joined the safari. He noted that one was a nurse, two or three were secretaries, one a banker and several others, housewives. "You can bet," Allaman said, "that at least a few of the lassies will be telling their experiences today of their snake hunt down in Muddy Creek Valley."

"I hope more of them show up this Saturday," he concluded.

Judges for the hunt were W. W. Britton, chief law enforcement officer for the Pennsylvania Fish Commission, Dr. Thomas W. Brown, president of the Conservation Society of York County; John Ogden, southeastern Pennsylvania supervisor for the State fish commission; Paul Martin, fish warden for York County; and John Martin, game warden for York County.

Leiphart said the public-spirited Maryland & Pennsylvania Railroad loaned its motorcar to transport some of the officials and cameramen along the railroad.

Address by Mr. H. Leslie Hoffman, President of Hoffman Electronics Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading a pamphlet entitled "Reliability—Whose Responsibility?" It contained a reprint of an address delivered under the above title by Mr. H. Leslie Hoffman, president of the Hoffman Electronics Corp., at the Seventh National Symposium on Reliability and Quality Control, on January 9, 1961, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia.

Mr. Hoffman, who is also the founder of the Hoffman Electronics Corp., in addition to being its president, has guided the company from a pioneering west coast firm to its present stature as a corporation of national importance within a period of less than 20 years. The phenomental growth of this company to its present position of leadership in the electronics industry reflects sound management policies and a truly cooperative team-operation throughout the entire organization. Its home office is located at Los Angeles, Calif., with many branch offices and plants in various parts of the country.

Mr. Hoffman is not only a pioneer in the field of electronics, but he has also demonstrated leadership and pioneering spirit in the field of solar energy, which is first beginning to emerge as a major source of power in the future. He has developed a solar powered radio receiver which has great potential as a communications device. It is known as CLEAR, for "community listening, education, and recreation."

As a businessman with vision and as a pioneer in electronics and solar energy, Mr. Hoffman's thoughts and ideas on these subjects are of paramount importance. It is for this reason that I am inserting his address into the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. The address reads as follows:

RELIABILITY—WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

(By H. Leslie Hoffman)

I wish to open my remarks this morning by thanking Mr. Kuehn and his program committee for the honor of making the keynote address before the Seventh National Symposium on Reliability and Quality Control. I wish also to extend my congratulations to all the symposium committees for the manner in which they organized this conference. The large attendance anticipated over the next 3 days reflects this effort as well as the depth of interest in reliability and quality control by many segments of many industries.

I interpret my invitation as being rather unique. I have been asked to speak about the AGREE reliability program at Hoffman Electronics. I assume the program committee thought you would be interested in learning particularly about our problems and successes in applying AGREE procedures and standards to building the complex airborne portion of Tacan. I must also assume that you will want to know about the impressions and conclusions we have gained from this pioneering experience.

It may interest the audience to know that there was a certain amount of irony involved in our applying AGREE procedures for the first time in the electronics industry. At the time I was president of EIA, in 1955, the term "reliability" was being used widely, but with little understanding. It meant many different things to many different people. We needed both a quantitative and qualitative means of defining and measuring reliability in a given equipment.

In characteristic association style, I appointed a committee made up of experts in the industry and the services to make a study of reliability for electronic equipment, define reliability, and develop a method of measuring it. The outgrowth of its work was the AGREE report. Jim Bridges and his people in the Defense Department were the first to recognize the benefits that could be derived from a concentrated drive on reliability and gave substantial support to the industry's activity.

Although I had something to do with starting the ball rolling on the AGREE concept as we know it today, the role of guinea pig for the program was not one we actively sought. It all started with the Air Force requesting a transfer of the procurement authority from the Navy to the Air Force for their TACAN requirements. This request was given a thorough analysis by both services and the Defense Department. It was pointed out by the Navy that they had established substantial procedures and facilities to insure the reliability of this equipment. They had accumulated considerable data and knowledge regarding the reliability of TACAN and they were concerned that in its transfer to the Air Force there would be no way of monitoring the reliability of the redesigning equipment. Meanwhile, the procurement was being processed by the Air Force. Subsequently, the Defense Department recommended that AGREE reliability procedures be incorporated in the proposed contract, first, because of the data accumulated by the Navy, it would be a good test case for AGREE, and second, it was insurance for the Air Force getting reliable TACAN equipment.

The AGREE procedures were then added to the contract requirements.

At the time, this action was considered primarily a good resolution of a rather stickly technical interservice problem. Few recognized it as the initiation of a major and brandnew method of procurement.

When we bid the job our people were cognizant of the 75 to 136 hours between failures on the Tacan equipment established by the Navy tests at Johnsville and verified by field tests in Alaska. Consequently, the 150 hour-mean-time-between-failure required by AGREE did not appear too formidable. Unfortunately we were unable to evaluate the effect of the additional environmental stresses placed upon the equipment by the AGREE procedures. Nowhere in industry was there reference material upon which to make such an evaluation. We gambled more than we knew on the unknown and, consequently, grossly underestimated the magnitude of the job to be done.

Prior to the present contract three manufacturers, including Hoffman, had built 25,000 of these equipments. The equipment had established a good reputation both for performance and reliability, although the basic performance specifications had never been met completely. Certainly by this time, it was reasoned, we should know how to build quality into an airborne Tacan equipment and have it give reliable performance, and the magnitude of the upgraded reliability did not seem excessive.

Time did not permit checking out our current equipment against AGREE reliability standards and procedures prior to the submission of our bid. It was a considerable shock to us to find out later that the equipment that had been built for over 7 years had an MTBF of only 17 hours, on the basis of AGREE, and our target was 150 hours. The severity of the AGREE environmental stresses becomes quite apparent when these figures are compared with the rating by Johnsville of 75 to 136 hours on the same equipment.

It is my hope that, even though most of you are competitors, none of you are involved in meeting AGREE specifications with the pressures that existed on this contract. It seemed as if the situation dictated that we do everything the hard way.

Please do not interpret my remarks as containing bitterness against the procuring

services. Why should I blame the customer? The Air Force faced the same problem we did; namely, a lack of data and experience to evaluate the magnitude and effect of the AGREE procedures. The service people knew they wanted more reliable equipment and they hoped that AGREE specification would give it to them.

I think you would be interested to know some of the requirements of this contract:

1. Eliminate some 15 waivers that were applied to previous equipments under the old contract.

2. Improve equipment sensitivity and spectrum. This meant changing the front end from 42 crystals to 126. Reduce the weight, which we did by a factor of 25 percent. Raise the operational environment from 50,000 feet at half power to 70,000 feet at full power, without pressurization.

3. Make all of these modifications within the same physical configuration of the original equipment so that whenever possible the new modules or books would be interchangeable, physically and electrically, with the old modules.

4. Take the basic design and incorporate it in a different configuration for B–58's, T–38's, and F–104's.

5. Meet AGREE specifications for 150 hours MTBF. As I have previously indicated, this was nearly a ninefold improvement.

To further compound the difficulties, we were to produce the equipment at a price lower than the previous contracts and begin deliveries 9 months after the award.

Only an extreme optimist would claim that this task could be done in the time and cost allowed, and others would read into the above requirements a note of commercial suicide.

In order to prevent the audience from assuming that we at Hoffman were intellectually underprivileged by actively soliciting such a contract—and with a fair amount of pride—I hasten to report that all of the objectives cited have been met, although with a moderate delay in the shipping schedule. I must admit that in accomplishing these objectives we invested more of the company's money than I had contemplated. We now have a substantial investment in our reliability know-how.

The impact on our people was significant. After all, it is people—their attitudes, their capabilities, their desires, their team spirit—that determine success or failure. A tough job requires a level of performance from individuals and organizations over and above the norm. It is a great screening process. So it was with us. We found where our real strength existed both in people and procedures.

The Tacan-AGREE program forced a complete realinement of our internal procedures. While we were supposed to be working on a production contract, circumstances required us to simultaneously combine research and development with production. In addition, these twin efforts made us realine our concepts regarding both our procedures and relationship with our suppliers.

The heart of AGREE reliability procedure is fundamentally an accelerated test of both components and end equipment under extreme environmental conditions coupled with a precisely organized remedial action program indicated by the mathematical interpretation of the test results.

Starting with components, our first task was to determine their reliability in the equipment. This was done by taking our own field reports on the performance of the airborne Tacan and analyzing the component failures. We then secured data from our suppliers. Our next step was to project these against the TR–1100 Curves. The objective of this composite analysis was to establish the reference failure rate per 1,000 hours for each component category in terms of both present experience and the achievable reliability level.

The equipment contains 1,015 electrical components classified into 10 major categories. To illustrate our problem, let me use vacuum tubes as an example. Previous history indicated an average failure rate for vacuum tubes of 25 percent per 1,000 hours. This rate had to be reduced to less than 3.8 percent per 1,000 hours to meet the AGREE reliability requirements—and there are 58 dual type tubes in this equipment. Saying it another way, we needed to reduce the number of tube failures over the entire equipment lifetime of 2,000 hours from 29 to 4.

It is interesting to note that we unintentionally inherited a job of educating some of our suppliers on how to test their components for reliability. I would like to pay tribute at this point to the generally fine cooperation we received from most of the companies in the components industry. In spite of this fact, it was necessary for us to change approximately 85 percent of our suppliers. This is not a reflection on the level of parts reliability in the components industry. The components suppliers were meeting the existing military specifications. But, these specifications were written before the AGREE procedures and were not adequate for components or equipments being tested under the AGREE stresses.

It is significant that the Darnell report, aimed at establishing comprehensive component specifications to meet the AGREE reliability levels, was released last May—nearly 18 months after we started our work—and is now being cussed and discussed by the industry. Our reliability director advises me that this report has considerable merit but does not go far enough on stress levels. From a timing viewpoint, our contract will be completed and very stringent stress levels will have been met well in advance of the time adequate component specifications are established at an industry level.

Fortunately, the Air Force project engineers, in the early phases of the contract, became aware of the complexity of this job. Regular coordination meetings were held to jointly work out the problems as they developed.

I must point out to you that the technical people, in most instances, were much more sympathetic than the contracts people. This is understandable because one group understood the complexity of the problems and the time needed to solve it, while the other had a different slant based on contract costs and schedules.

Solving the problems, however, required a close coordination and the utmost in teamwork among our suppliers, the Hoffman people and our customer. Without it we wouldn't be talking about a success story today.

Fortunately, our company was large enough to withstand the impact of a program such as this and yet small enough to keep the lines of communication short. Top management was tied directly into each major problem to not only facilitate decisionmaking but to establish policies and procedures so that responsibilities could be implemented and delegated. In that way our major energies could be devoted to solving the day-to-day problems within general programs and policies previously established.

Throughout the course of this contract we had many interesting revelations. For instance, only 19 percent of components in the ARN–21C accounted for 81 percent of its failures. It is significant to note that the lowest failure rate occurred in components that had been in production for some time. Special components required to improve equipment performance and which had a low level of production experience, gave us the maximum failure rate.

It was necessary, therefore, to develop new inferential test methods. As an example, in addition to the usual electrical and environmental tests given potted components, we weighed them to make certain they had their proper amount of potting compound.

We had instance after instance when it was necessary for our people to convince our suppliers that their established practices were not adequate to insure top level components, and this was not always a pleasant affair.

The task in our own plant was formidable to meet the requirement of no more than 2 workmanship failures out of 123,000 operations; which means that in assembling the 1,015 electrical parts (including 58 tubes and 56 semiconductors) and over 5,000 mechanical components, we are allowed one workmanship mistake per 10 completed equipments. This required a substantial upgrading of our own workmanship.

Early in our production period, we started new and intensive training classes for our line workers. Even the screening techniques for new employees were modified. It is interesting, and perhaps significant, to note that only 1 in 20 job applicants passed the screening test that we established. By the same token, it was necessary to transfer some of our regular employees to less critical jobs. Even some of our supervisors who could not completely face up to the problems realistically were placed elsewhere.

So far, I hope I have been able to give you some feeling for our Tacan-AGREE experience. My comments this morning are necessarily aimed at the management and policy level. The technical details of our program are to be covered in another session today by Dr. A. L. Floyd, director of reliability for our company, and one who did a yeoman's job in accomplishing the results that we obtained. Mr. Griffith Lindsay, I am advised, will also participate in this meeting and recount the Air Force's analysis of its experiences. Lindsay is another important member of the manufacturer-supplier-customer team and was most helpful to us in working out the day-to-day problems.

I have outlined the historical background of our experience, commented on some of the peculiar problems involved in the building of airborne Tacan according to AGREE procedures and touched on some of the major problems we have encountered.

This has been a significant experience to us and, I think, not only adds to the sum total of our knowledge but can be of equal value to the industry if it is utilized. From this viewpoint I would like to outline some of our observations, conclusions, and definition of responsibilities.

1. The AGREE reliability procedure based on pretesting of components and end equipment is effective for upgrading the reliability of electronic equipment. This has been further confirmed by actual flight-test experience.

2. Reliability costs money initially but it will reduce the total cost of the equipment and its usage to the Government. As a matter of fact, in this particular contract on 10,000 equipments, we were advised by the Air Force that the savings on maintenance and supply exceed $125 million without any credit being given for the decreased aborted missions. I must add, we have had difficulty convincing the Air Force that they should share some of these savings with us.

3. The application of the AGREE procedure must be varied based on the quantities of equipment involved, as well as the past experience on the particular equipment.

4. Reliability is a growth process in which there is no substitute for experience. Reliability can only be obtained by doing. It is the maturity of design after rugged testing, preproduction, and production experience.

5. Reliability must first be designed into equipment, then quality workmanship built into it. Inspection and testing are only verification procedures. Design people should give full consideration to the producibility, maintainability and reliability of both components and end equipments. They should recognize that this is their responsibility and that production cannot correct improper design. I would quickly add that design should not be blamed for poor workmanship. Consequently, it is the function of testing and quality assurance to not only verify design capabilities, but to monitor workmanship in components and end equipment as well.

6. Any manufacturer who is considering a contract containing AGREE reliability requirements must critically examine his procedures and his personnel. Both must be capable of meeting a very special kind of challenge. He will also find that an effective inplant education program will have to be developed to achieve these objectives.

7. A clarification of Defense Department policies regarding reliability specifications on an overall basis is badly needed. At the present time only the Air Force has indicated its intention of applying AGREE procedures on a broad front. This lack of uniformity of reliability requirements among the three major services is resulting in increased costs and considerable confusion, in both the component manufacturers' and the end-equipment manufacturers' plants. We need, and need badly, a national reliability policy applicable to all types of military electronic equipment and comprehensive enough to not only include the component specifications but to recognize the operational use of the end equipment.

8. This reliability policy, once established and initiated with all services, must be supported and recognized by the contracting officers at the point of the original bid.

9. The Defense Department should also establish an equitable policy regarding the expensive environmental test equipment required by component supplier and end-equipment manufacturer to meet the AGREE reliability procedures. At the present time, this is being financed on a project-by-project basis, but many inequalities are developing from this approach. Many competent manufacturers will be excluded as qualified suppliers if they are not included in certain of the favored reliability projects now in existence.

Our own experience was gained on a fixed-price contract, with no such consideration. Other manufacturers are on a CPFF contract, and with full consideration. This is equity? Perhaps the Defense Department should consider Government-owned environmental test facilities in key geographical areas that are available equally to all parts of the industry.

10. Finally, the factor of the extra time required for processing the AGREE procedures should be taken into consideration at the time the original delivery rate is established.

The title of my talk today is "Reliability—Whose Responsibility?" and I think by this time I should get around to answering this question directly, if I have not already done so indirectly.

In my opinion the leadership for establishing a higher level of reliability in military electronic equipment should come from the Defense Department in a combined program with the services. They are the customers of industry, and in our country the customer is king. And no matter how severe the requirements, industry somehow always finds a way to meet them if it knows what the customer wants and if he is willing to pay for it.

The joint program developed by industry and the Defense Department and identified as AGREE, has considerable merit. As our experience indicates, DOD must now decide where and how to apply it and resolve the various technical, contractual, and organizational problems with the individual services.

Today we are concerned more than ever with the high cost of military equipment. If our experience of saving $125 million on a $40 million contract can serve as an index, what would be the saving on $10 billion in procurement?

And, dollars are not the prime consideration and complete consideration.

This should be a real incentive to the DOD and the armed services. The next step is to establish an incentive for industry rather than trying to force the program through directive.

These, then, are my observations on AGREE reliability and my conclusions, except for one. We, at Hoffman, are somewhat like the college freshman who has just completed the fraternity hazing and has survived. We think it's a fine idea and more people should have the experience, but we are certainly happy that we have it behind us.

Seriously, our company has been pioneering ever since we envisioned an electronics industry on the Pacific coast—in 1942—when 15 companies could be classed as manufacturers. We always enjoy the challenge of trying something new. This particular experience has added much to our knowledge of our people and by our people. We feel that we are much better qualified, after this experience, to build sophisticated military electronic equipment with a high degree of reliability for our customers. And I would predict that anyone else taking on such an assignment will end up with the same conclusion.

You may not agree with AGREE, but you must agree that it works.

Write "Ugly Russian" and Land in Jail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from a recent edition of the Pasadena Star-News which contains what I believe are some very timely and noteworthy comments on the subject of self-criticism.

The editorial follows:

[From the Pasadena Independent and Star-News, Aug. 7, 1961]

WRITE "UGLY RUSSIAN" AND LAND IN JAIL

My old friend Jack McDonald, head of Investors S. & L., which rings the chimes, did a piece for his house organ the other day that I think everyone should read.

It reminded me of the time John Anthony Brown, Oxy vice president, said it's time for Americans to quit looking in the mirror—reparting their hair and rouging their cheeks—in the hope other people will like us.

We're just too introspective for our own good, he implied.

Well, Jack said this in a different way:

"We Americans are much given to self-analysis, and we conduct our self-analysis publicly through the press, radio, TV, and magazines as well as in clubs, classrooms, and social groups. We criticize ourselves freely and having set the example, are freely criticized by others.

"We should keep in mind, however, that the press and public of many other nations would be as critical of official action as we are in this country if such criticism were permitted.

" 'The Ugly American' can become a best-seller here, but 'The Ugly Russian'—if it could be printed—would at best earn a cell for its author.

"During the two great holidays—Independence Day and Labor Day—we should keep in mind, as we listen to the speechmakers, that criticism need not only cover the faults but should also extol the virtues.

"For America, there is much to be said on the good side. We are, for example, one of the few countries in the world that takes to heart the welfare of citizens of other countries. Not in the entire history of the world has another nation contributed so much time and money to alleviating the distress caused by earthquakes, volcanoes, wars, and famines as Americans. And the most vociferous detractors of America have frequently been the recipients of American aid.

"Nor is America ungenerous at home, for we spend more than $25 billion a year in social insurance benefits, veterans aid and for those in need of public assistance. Almost 35 percent of our national budget goes to public welfare and educational projects. Thus we feel it is good to remind ourselves once in a while that while America is not always right, it is not always wrong either. On the whole, we have a country we can all be proud of."

I like to hear a guy speak up like this. We talk so much about teaching kids patriotism in school, yet we adults go around grousing and grousing without pausing to take a good, appreciative look at this great country of ours. When we do—when we quit looking in the mirror and decide to be ourselves—then indeed do we see why we are so proud just to be what we are, American.

Suspending the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is discouraging when constitutional provisions which we know are essential if we are to have freedom and prosperity as well as opportunity are ignored.

It is heartbreaking when a Congress, whose Members take an oath to uphold that document, repeatedly support legislation which will ultimately destroy constitutional government; that is, when we delegate to a President power given exclusively to the Congress; go a step farther and authorize him to redelegate those powers to individuals chosen by him.

This applies not only to the foreign aid legislation, to many other laws which have been enacted, but to a bill which was before us recently—H.R. 7763—which grants to the President power to select those who will manage the World's Fair in New York—obviously a political move.

Until a recent decision by Recorder's Judge John A. Ricca, sitting in Detroit, few realized just how far the trend has gone.

In that case, an employee seeking to cross a picket line on the way to his job was beaten and, when his assailant came before Judge Ricca, he, in substance, said that the would-be worker had assumed the risk when he lawfully attempted to cross the picket line; hence, had no remedy in court. The judge discharged the assailant.

An editorial from the Detroit Free Press of July 12, 1961, gives us the facts:

RICCA LIMITS PROTECTION

By dismissing an assault and battery case against a union business agent, accused of beating up a strikebreaker, Recorder's Judge John A. Ricca set forth a startling new legal concept.

Refusing even to hear all the testimony, Judge Ricca threw the case out of court and freed the defendant with the statement that "if people want to break strikes, they will have to take their chances."

We know of no statute which permits open season on a strikebreaker. We're not entirely sure that the plaintiff who was punched several times in the face before a witness was a strikebreaker in the accepted definition of that term.

If this new legal principle which Judge Ricca has promulgated is permitted to stand, we can't help wonder where it eventually will lead.

If a strikebreaker has to take his chances without the same protection of law that any other citizen enjoys, must he risk having his house burned, or being murdered?

One of the functions of law is to help maintain peace and order, and to prevent individuals from taking the law into their own hands.

Judge Ricca seems to have revoked that age-old principle which up to this time, the courts were expected to sustain.

An Unfair Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported out a bill, described by the press as a compromise, which would raise postal rates but which would place the burden on first-class users. Much as I might agree that our postal service should be placed on a more efficient and businesslike basis, I cannot agree that first-class users should bear so much of the load. The amount of "junk" mail reaching congressional offices could be weighed by the ton in 1 week alone. If we are to have an increase in postal rates, I believe all users should be required to contribute.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Newark Evening News entitled "An Unfair Bill," from the September 10, 1961, edition, be printed in the Appendix:

AN UNFAIR BILL

After months of temporizing, the House Post Office Committee has revived a compromise measure that would increase postal revenues by $528 million. Though Congress has little time before adjournment, it is now an even bet that we may be pasting 5-cent and 8-cent stamps on first-class and airmail letters, respectively, after January 1.

The committee-approved measure actually is a compromise on a compromise. To overcome an annual Post Office Department deficit of nearly a billion dollars, President Kennedy originally asked for a $741 million increase in rates, as did his predecessor. When this plea fell upon deaf committee ears, Mr. Kennedy shaved his request to $592 million.

Postmaster General Day made it known that the committee's bill is not the administration's doing. But a half loaf is better than none and Mr. Kennedy doubtless will accept it. Nonetheless, the proposed rate increase is inequitable.

The boost in first-class rates are those recommended by the administration. But its proposals for increases in second- and third-class rates are sharply reduced. Thus the responsibility of making the Post Office Department a going business is distributed unfairly.

According to the Department, first-class and airmail are paying for themselves at present rates; second-class (publications) and third-class matter ("junk" mail addressed to "occupant," and unsealed greeting cards) are being carried by overburdened mailmen at a loss. This is hardly a businesslike arrangement.

Need Tax Relief on Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune on September 4, 1961, in support of my bill, H.R. 640:

NEED TAX RELIEF ON FREE SPEECH

While the courts busy themselves with upholding the right to free speech, the Internal Revenue Service is collecting taxes on a lot of it. This is not as facetious as it may sound.

Up until 1959, the IRS recognized as tax deductible those expenses incurred in supporting or opposing legislation or governmental action. Since that time, the IRS has disallowed such deductions for tax purposes. It even insists on taxing membership dues on organizations that engage substantially in researching and publishing their views on governmental and legislative matters. Money spent in advertising in defense of business rights or of a political position can be taxed. The ruling acts as a gag on free speech which is the only weapon available to many people in their defense against unfair governmental imposition.

The penalty to business, in particular, has been exorbitant. As the magazine, Editor & Publisher, pointed out recently "* * * many businesses in this country are in competition with the Government itself * * *. The electric power business is a case in point. In the issue of private power as opposed to public power, proponents of the latter attempt to muzzle their private competitors by this tax penalty."

Just why IRS could not lift the restriction just as it imposed it—by administrative process—is obscure. But if Congress specifically directs such action, the IRS would have to comply. That is the basis of a bill by Congressman HALE BOGGS (H.R. 640) which has been twice endorsed by the House Ways and Means Committee. The last time it did not reach the floor before Congress adjourned.

It begins to appear that the measure will have to receive a decided push at this time if it is to be voted on in this session. Surely an administration so vocal in its interest in the business climate can spare a little support in this area.

Sugar Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture on Thursday, September 7 adopted three resolutions relating to the operation of the Sugar Act, which is one of our most important and most successful agricultural programs. These resolutions have a bearing upon our domestic production of sugar and upon our imports of sugar from other countries.

For the information of the House, I am inserting these resolutions, along with other matter relating to the sugar program, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The resolutions follow:

Whereas Public Law 87–15, extending the Sugar Act of 1948 to June 30, 1962, conferred on the President the authority to withdraw the sugar quota assigned to Cuba and to obtain that sugar elsewhere; and

Whereas the law provided that after reassigning a portion of the former Cuban quota pursuant to specific directives in the act, the balance was to be obtained from any other country "except that special consideration shall be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities"; and

Whereas in the calendar year 1961 more than 1.3 million tons of sugar was purchased under this discretionary authority, with the preference directive above quoted applying to all such sugar so purchased after March 31, 1961; and

Whereas the legislative history of Public Law 87–15 made it clear that the preferential purchase directive was meant to apply to offers which were made by potential supplying countries to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities in addition to their previous or normal purchases; and

Whereas several countries were prepared to or did actually make such offers but not one of such offers was approved; and

Whereas those officials to whom the President had delegated this authority under the act not only failed to carry out the intent of Congress to secure additional exports of U.S. agricultural commodities in connection with the purchase of such sugar but indicated that the making of such offers would be discouraged and that actual preference would be given to those countries not making any such offer: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be requested to instruct those in charge of this aspect of the sugar program that the clear intent of Congress is to be carried out and that in making any such purchases of sugar for the

calendar year 1962 clear preference is to be given those countries which offer to buy a reasonable quantity of U.S. agricultural commodities in return for our purchase of their sugar.

Whereas it has come to the attention of this committee that certain officials in the executive branch of the Government are reported to favor the adoption of a "global quota" system for the importation of sugar into the United States; and

Whereas the existing system under which specific import quotas are established by law has for many years operated effectively to protect domestic sugar production, assure consumers of ample sugar supplies at fair and stable prices, and to promote the export trade of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas such as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives that in allocating the sugar tonnage necessary to supply the domestic "growth factor" the Secretary of Agriculture should make allocations to new mills so that this new tonnage can support the development of the sugar industry in new areas in anticipation of the passage of legislation revising the Sugar Act in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, on August 3, I announced on behalf of the House Committee on Agriculture that, since the Department of Agriculture was not then ready to submit its recommendations on future sugar policy, the consideration of new sugar legislation would be postponed until the 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes in January. I stated that sugar legislation then would be given preferred treatment. I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of the news release issued at that time, as follows:

ACTION ON NEW SUGAR LEGISLATION POSTPONED

Upon receiving word from Secretary Freeman that the Department of Agriculture is not now ready to submit recommendations for new legislation relating to sugar, Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture announced today postponement of Committee consideration of such legislation until the 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes in January.

"Sugar legislation will be given preferred treatment when the Congress returns in January," Mr. COOLEY said.

"Early this year we extended the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962. It was the committee's intention to consider long range legislation when we completed work on the general farm legislation which was finally approved by the Congress today. We have been awaiting recommendations from the Department, which administers the sugar program, on new legislation to extend the Sugar Act further and deal with the long-term problems of sugar production and supply.

"Today I received a letter from Secretary Freeman in which he says 'it appears inadvisable to present such recommendations before the beginning of the next session of Congress', primarily because world production and marketing of sugar are undergoing realinement and the situation has not yet stabilized."

The Secretary's letter follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in response to your inquiry about recommendations from this Department for amending and extending the Sugar Act.

"For several reasons it appears inadvisable to present such recommendations before the beginning of the next session of Congress. World production and marketing of sugar are undergoing realinement and the situation has not yet stablized. This fact coupled with other uncertainties in the international field lead us to believe it wise to reserve judgment for the present about some of the major issues respecting sugar import quotas.

"Within the domestic sugar industry there are also important unresolved issues. These issues, too, may require long and difficult hearings by your committee and the Senate Finance Committee as well as study by the executive agencies.

"I know that you, as well as we, wanted to get the Sugar Act extended at this session. However, because of the heavy workload in connection with the general farm legislation, work on specialized legislation, such as the Sugar Act, had to be postponed. It appears doubtful that sufficient time would be available to get new sugar legislation enacted during the remainder of this session."

Mr. Speaker, for the further easy and ready reference of the Members, I believe this report should embrace also that part of the statement of policy by the managers on the part of the House, in the conference on S. 1643—H.R. 8230—the Agricultural Act of 1961 relating to sugar.

This statement follows:

Exchange of sugar for surplus agricultural commodities: The committee of conference deplores the fact that the responsible departments of the Government has not taken the opportunity in purchasing ex quota sugar (that bought from nonquota countries as the result of withdrawal of the Cuban quota) to sell additional quantities of agricultural commodities.

In the law extending the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962, the Congress provided that "special consideration" in the purchase of ex quota sugar should be given to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities. In spite of this requirement, not one pound of surplus commodities has been sold under this provision.

Authority to administer this provision of law was delegated by the President to the Secretary of Agriculture in Proclamation No. 3401 in these words:

"Do hereby continue the delegation to the Secretary of Agriculture of the authority vested in the President by section 408(b)(2) and section 408(b)(3) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, such authority to be continued to be exercised with the concurrence of the Secretary of State."

In spite of this clear delegation of authority, the Department of Agriculture did not establish any regular procedures or method for receiving proposals to exchange sugar for agricultural commodities and it appears that the part played by the Department of State has been substantially larger than the "concurrence" required by the President.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee, an Assistant Secretary of State asserted that he did not agree with the directive of Congress with respect to the exchange of sugar for agricultural commodities, that he considered this to be poor policy, and assumed full responsibility for turning down specific proposals for such an exchange which have been made by delegations from foreign countries.

This position was reiterated by another Assistant Secretary of State in a letter to a Member of Congress in which he said:

"From the foregoing considerations, it was decided that proposals to make allocations of sugar quotas conditional, upon purchases of surplus wheat or other commodities or products, would complicate administration of the sugar program and would be contrary to sound commercial trade policy. This view was made known to officials of the Brazilian Government when they requested a discussion of the matter."

Obviously some subordinate officials in the Department of State not only frown upon the clear intent and meaning of legislation which has been enacted by Congress, but arrogantly and deliberately refuse to execute the laws enacted as Congress has clearly indicated such laws should be administered.

While these officials and representatives of the executive branch of the Government might not be guilty of malfeasance they very well may be guilty of misfeasance of office.

Apparently every roadblock that can possibly be arranged and devised has been provided to obstruct and to delay the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities except for foreign currencies. Certainly strategic materials vital in our own economy are worth far more to our Government, in exchange for our agricultural commodities, than are foreign currencies of doubtful value. We still need many strategic materials in our stockpiles, yet those who are administering our programs seem to prefer stockpiles of these currencies of doubtful value which have accumulated and are being accumulated in many nations around the world.

If these programs which Congress has initiated and authorized are not honestly and fairly administered and executed, only representatives of the executive branch of the Government can be blamed. In no one of these programs has Congress written mandatory provisions, but on many occasions Congress has indicated that strategic materials or sales for dollars or dollar credit, are to be preferred to sales for foreign currency. Notwithstanding we continue to accumulate these currencies instead of strategic and vital materials. If some drastic action is not taken by the executive branch of the Government the disposal of our agricultural commodities will be retarded and the taxpayers will bear the burden of the storage costs involved.

Educational Problems in the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in representing the second largest federally impacted area in the State of New York, I can attest to its problems in providing proper education for the thousands of children in the Rome-Utica-Oneida, N.Y., region.

Employing nearly 13,000 individuals, Griffiss Air Force Base rivals Idlewild International Airport in size. Although possessing assets conservatively valued in excess of $110 million, this installation pays no local real estate taxes. Therefore, for those affected school districts, Federal assistance in lieu of taxes is fully justified. For over a decade, the Federal Government has recognized this responsibility. Therefore, Public Laws

815 and 874 should be extended without delay.

Moreover, it is equally important to continue the provisions of the National Defense Education Act whereby qualified young people receive the opportunity for higher education despite lack of funds. During my service in the Congress, I have been glad to make information available on this program to all high school graduates in my district. In this age of rapidly expanding technology, education has received increased recognition as one of our Nation's foremost assets. It would be tragic to permit either or both of these worthy programs to falter because of an attempt to use them as a political gimmick to enlist support for massive Federal aid to education. These measures deserve favorable consideration by the Congress and should not be jeopardized in any way because of pressures for new and uncharted programs in areas of questionable responsibility.

P. E. Jordan, Follansbee's No. 1 Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article concerning the first annual award to the former mayor of Follansbee, W. Va., the Honorable Preston E. Jordan, as the leading citizen of the Greater Follansbee area:

P. E. JORDAN, FOLLANSBEE'S NO. 1 CITIZEN—FIRST ANNUAL AWARD GOES TO FORMER MAYOR AT LABOR DAY CELEBRATION

Preston E. Jordan of Eldersville Road, former mayor of Follansbee, was announced as the first winner of a newly instituted award to the leading citizen of the Greater Follansbee area. It is expected a similar award will be announced each Labor Day at a community celebration.

The award is being made by Tom Johnston Cox of the City Loan & Finance Co., Inc., The area included in the award is Follansbee, Hooverson Heights, Eldersville Road, Mahan's Lane, and Cross Creek Road.

Jordan was mayor of Follansbee from 1948 to 1952. During his terms as mayor a gross sales tax ordinance was adopted, allowing substantial raises in city employees' salaries, maintenance and operation of the community park and a balanced budget. Garbage collection fees and a sound collection system were started during his tenure as mayor.

Other major and lasting improvements were done or started during his time as mayor, including paving a number of streets and alleys, stronger enforcement of laws against drunkenness, raids against places where slot machines and other gambling devices were in use, new mercury vapor street lights, lights in the park, and other work for the city and park commission.

At present he is assisting in purchasing, engineering, and installing a new filter for the swimming pool and preparing a sunbathing area and parking area. He has served as a consultant and adviser to the park commission since 1959.

He is a member of the Follansbee Sanitary Board, and has visited the State health board to secure an extension of time for construction of the sewage plant and has consulted with five engineering firms in preparation of selection of one to design and supervise construction of a sewage plant by late in 1964.

Jordan was born 63 years ago at Alabama City, Ala. He attended schools in Alabama and received the bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering at the University of Alabama in 1927, and master's degree in 1928.

True Report on South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, and was reprinted in the Gaffney (S.C.) Ledger on September 7, "True Report on South":

TRUE REPORT ON SOUTH

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON'S article for the New York Times Sunday magazine, published in response to his challenge to the Paper Curtain press to present the South fairly before the country, carries the unassailable strength of truth.

To anyone familiar with the facts, his account of the background of the current controversy over race is accurate. While naturally the viewpoint is sympathetic to the region which he represents in Congress, Senator JOHNSTON does not deviate for the sake of emphasis from the well-known history of reconstruction and recovery.

The News and Courier commends Senator JOHNSTON for his journalistic competence, and the Times for giving him space to tell the story. We have no doubt the article will draw replies, perhaps attacks. Some readers of the Times are so conditioned by years of misrepresentation that they will automatically discount Senator JOHNSTON'S statements. Many of them, however, have fresh personal experiences and observations that they may give them a clearer approach to the South's biracial problems.

For this reason Senator JOHNSTON'S exploit in piercing the Paper Curtain is especially timely. He has skillfully avoided some of the irritants that in the past have reduced the effectiveness of Southern arguments. If any good thing is to come out of the dreary discussion of race that has filled the columns of the American press, including the News and Courier, it is a better understanding of one another in the South as well as in the North.

As Negro citizens progress in economic, social, and cultural channels, they will be able to participate more fully in the rewards by their own accomplishments. Also, they may find doors opening more willingly than they do under the pressure of force. Many of the demands being aired nowadays in the press are so unrealistic that the public becomes hopelessly confused. The school integration issue itself is largely false. Negro children are not being denied education. They receive public schooling geared to their needs and taught by members of their own race. Disciplinary problems that plague integrated schools in the North simply do not exist in Southern classrooms.

White and Negro families dwell in harmony in communities all over the South so long as they are not disturbed by deliberate agitation. Senator JOHNSTON has performed a public service to both races and all regions in his intelligent report.

How Can We Save Ourselves and Our World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, recently delivered a most interesting and thought-provoking speech at the Publications Banquet of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

Mr. Meeman spoke on "How Can We Save Ourselves and Our World?" This is of course a vital subject and Mr. Meeman's remarks are very enlightening. They were considered so important that the speech has been reprinted in the magazine, Vital Speeches of the Day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include Mr. Meeman's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN WE SAVE OURSELVES AND OUR WORLD?

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, delivered to the Publications Banquet of University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., May 18, 1961)

How can we prevent the destruction of life on earth in an atomic war? How can we prevent the destruction of civilization? How can we prevent the destruction of freedom in the world? How can we prevent the destruction of our Nation, or its conquest and enslavement? How can I work with my newspaper to find the answers to these questions? How can you choose and find the job on a newspaper or elsewhere, in which you will be best fitted to make your personal contribution to the answers?

These are the most important questions with which we can deal, so let us deal with them tonight, together. I do not like to think of a speech as one man talking at a group of people, but rather as a conversation between the speaker and the group. So as I make the opening statement in this conversation, think about the subject with me, and make mental note of the comments you wish to make or the questions you wish to ask. I hope that, in that discussion period, someone will ask: How do you get a job on the Memphis Press-Scimitar? For I consider that I have no more important responsibility than to fit the right person to the right job on the newspaper of which I have the priceless good fortune to be the editor.

How did we come to this greatest crisis in earth's history? Crisis is both danger and opportunity. By fearlessly facing the seriousness of the threat, and the facts involved in the danger, we can find opportunity which is also there. How did the enemy become so strong that it could create this crisis, and why did he find us so weak that we have allowed him to do it?

The enemy is strong because he has faith and a program.

We are weak because we do not have a faith and a program.

I shall describe the enemy's faith and program.

I shall offer a faith and program for the free world.

This is the enemy's faith: that capitalism is an unjust system in which the workers do not own their own tools, the means of production, and are robbed of the product of their toil by those who do own them. That capitalism is a decaying system. That the future belongs to communism, under which all things will be owned in common, and earth will be a workers' paradise. That capitalism is so bad, and communism is so good, that any means—lies, terror, torture, murder—should be used to end the one and bring in the other. The doctrine of course is false. Communism, instead of abolishing classes, has brought the sharpest class division the world has ever seen—on the one hand a handful of men who run the government and actually own everything—all means of production, all property, even the lives and bodies of the workers—and on the other hand millions of slaves without property or rights.

But the faith is nevertheless fanatically held. The active who lead impose their faith on vast masses by withholding the truth, even the facts of news events, from them, and imposing lies through propaganda. The few who see through the fraud and dissent are forced into silence, or if they dare speak, are quickly purged.

It is an evil faith. It is an evil program. Nevertheless the enemy that is the effective leadership thereof, does have positive faith and a positive program on which they are sufficiently united and have become so strong that they at this moment threaten to destroy our free world.

The free world is weakened by doubt and torn by disunity. Freedom breeds the inquiring mind, which brings a destructive skepticism. Certainly we should inquire. We should inquire boldly. But our inquiry should be aimed to establish our faith by seeing how we can do mighty works which prove the power of God and fulfill the great destiny of man.

We have seen civilizations rise and fall through the deadly cycle which has been so aptly expressed by the words: faith, freedom, folly, fetters. Civilization starts with a plain living, agricultural people who have religious faith. This faith leads to freedom and democracy. This vital democratic society builds the city with great engineering and architectural works. In freedom rises an intellectualism which becomes divorced from the mind of God. This intellectualism turns on faith and destroys it. Without faith the urban civilization turns to the follies of materialism and excessive luxury. In the ensuing demoralization, the dictator takes hold, and slavery returns. In the dark night of slavery the slaves turn to the light of faith, and the cycle begins again: faith, freedom, folly, fetters.

We can break this cycle of doom. Our civilization is now in the folly stage. We have listened to those intellectuals who have told us our faith is vain. They lie. Our faith is founded on truth and facts. It comes to us in the revelations of great teachers who have in prayer gone to the heart of the universe and found union with God himself, and seen with the eyes of their own souls, the reality of the world of the spirit.

Have these relevations been disproved by the discoveries of modern science? On the contrary, they have been corroborated. The airplane, the radio, television, the splitting of the atom, the imminent conquest of space—these discoveries enlarge the dominion of man over the earth which was declared by the inspired writer of Genesis. We need only turn wholly to God, and become God-like men, truly reflecting His intelligence, love, and power, so that we will be worthy to exercise the dominion He has so generously given us.

The discoveries of modern phychology have been falsely interpreted. Psychology shows the emotions and errors of the human mind, but we should not conclude that man must be pushed about by these emotions and errors. On the contrary, knowledge of them enables the divinity which is in every man to reign in order, harmony and beauty over the inner space of his own being.

The free world is torn by class divisions—owners and managers on the one hand and workers on the other. There is conflict between them as to how they shall share the products of the machines. The workers think the owners don't give them enough and they turn to giant labor unions and to government to give them a larger share. Our freedom will not be secure until that basic conflict is resolved. It can be resolved by making the interests of owner-managers and workers identical.

The free world must have a faith and a program. It must be a faith deeper than that of the enemy to which we will adhere with a more complete devotion. It must be a program so complete and practical that we will carry it out with boundless enthusiasm and energy. Let us state such a faith and program.

The faith: that God is wholly good and has provided an infinite universe which contains all things for the fulfillment, activity and enjoyment of man. Man is not a beggar or pensioner at the court of heaven. He is the son and heir, reigning over the world with the Father, who shares all things with the son, even his very dominion. He is the expression of God's being. He is as necessary to God as God is to man; without man, God would not be completely expressed. Therefore man has a sure place in the universe and is, of course, immortal.

There is no real conflict between the parts of the Universe, all of which coexist harmoniously. There is no necessary conflict between man and man, no real divergence of interests. What is good for one man is good for all. There is a seeming conflict but it is only in the human mind and emotions. The problem of human life is to give up this human mind, the carnal mind of which the psychologists have given such an unflattering picture, and replace it with the divine mind, the perfect intelligence which comes from God, replace the disastrous negative emotions with the positive emotions of love and joy. If an emotion cannot be put under the classification of love or joy, it is not legitimate and should not be entertained—it is negative.

When we make the divine mind and emotions ours, we give up nothing good. We do not give up worldly and practical success, we assure it. We do not give up the joys of human bodily life. All we give up are the limitations and sufferings which the human mind creates and imposes on itself. We give up only that which separates us from God and our fellow man. We take to ourselves all the rich gifts of that generous Giver, whose good pleasure it is to give us the kingdom. We are ready now to save the world and build a better one.

Out of such a faith a program naturally emerges. It is a program of plenty for all.

If we are to frame a workable program of this age we must face the problem of science, technology and the machine.

The machine is diabolical if it overworks and enslaves man; if it produces more goods than he knows how to use and makes him poor in the midst of plenty.

It is diabolical if its speed obsesses man and he kills himself or his fellow man in traffic.

It is diabolical if airplanes crash or rain death from the skies.

It is diabolical if printing presses turn our newspapers, magazines, and books, and if radio, movies, and television offer programs which constitute a vast antieducation system which cancels the work of our schools and colleges, our churches, and our philanthropies and social work.

The machine is heavenly if it is operated by man expressing his divine nature, which is intelligence and love. Then the machine blesses mankind. It then becomes a miracle for which we should praise God who has given such power unto men. We should stand in awe of its complicated performance which leads to the sure and simple accomplishment of a particular service to man, whether it be to whisk him from place to place or to turn out magically all manner of products for man's glory and enjoyment. Man should stand before the machine and pray to the giver of all good: make me worthy of the work of my hands.

The Communists looked at the machine and said: "They are too big for one man or a few men to own; let the government take them over. It was the wrong answer. We have seen that under this program instead of the machines being owned by the many they came to be owned by one man, the dictator who is head of the Communist government.

There is a right answer to the problem. The worker should have a direct stake in the productivity of the machine. It should be our program to sell corporation stocks to workingmen—stocks of the corporation for which they work or of other corporations. Thus workers will become property owners.

It will be a long process, however, to get widespread ownership of stocks by individual workers. There is an immediate method by which workers can be given a direct stake in the capitalist system. That is by profit sharing. That is a method whereby a share of the profits is distributed to the workers over and above their regular wages. More than 700 American corporations are now listed in the Council of Profit Sharing Industries. They find that profit sharing gives workers a feeling of partnership in the business, improves employer-employee relations and brings increased production. Profit sharing is right, because profits flow from enterprise, and in business, the enterprise is not only that of the owner and manager, but of the workers. Profit sharing removes the conflict of interest between the owner-managers on the one hand and the workers on the other.

Communists say that capitalism is a decaying system. That is false. Capitalism is not suffering from decay but from immaturity. The logic of capitalism always required profit sharing. If profit sharing had been introduced in the early days of capitalism, Marxism would never have got started, much less dominating a large part of the world as it now does. But better late than never. Today profit sharing is spreading fast, and the smartest and most practical of businessmen, as well as idealists, are responsible for this trend.

If we are to have a continuance of the property system, the vast majority should be property owners. Human dignity is best secured when the individual has the responsibility of owning property and has the freedom that comes from its use. When a man owns private property he can obtain his education where he pleases, work where he pleases, or quit a job, or move about as he pleases. He is not dependent on the resources and will of others. Communism is retrogressive when it would make men dependent on the government. There is nothing wrong with the property system except that some acquire property unjustly, and use it irresponsibly, and too few own property.

We cannot keep the private property system, we cannot continue to have a happy,

prosperous country, we cannot maintain our civilization, unless we prevent world war. That is our supreme task. What must we do?

A look at the past gives the answer. There was no world war between the fall of Napoleon and the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

There was a reason. There was a preponderant power in the world, Britain's rule, which kept order and enforced peace. Britain's rule was not ideal, was not untinged with self-interest, but the world was better run in that period than in any before or since. It was a century of peace and progress, a century of universal hope. Behind the shield of the British Navy, our young country grew to greatness, while Britain was big enough to let us think it was our mere declaration of the Monroe Doctrine which kept aggressors out of our hemisphere.

During the 1930's a correspondent of the New York Times was covering the meetings of the League of Nations at Geneva. He saw a strutting dictator, Mussolini, the ruler of a poor little country, successfully defying the rich and powerful democracies of Europe. Newton observed the falling of the apple and discovered the law of gravitation. This newspaperman, this American genius, Clarence Streit, observed what was happening at Geneva, and discovered the reality that governs international relations. He discovered that a league does not work because it can be broken up at any time. The United States would not have succeeded if the Founding Fathers had not made it a nation one and indivisible, and if Lincoln had not made it stick.

Only a permanent federation will make the free nations strong enough to stand against the threats of the totalitarians which now press upon them.

In the thirties Streit in the first edition of "Union Now" issued his call to the free nations to unite, lest divided they fall. Had it been heeded, Hitler would never have dared to strike, and World War II which made possible the triumph of communism in Russia and China, would have been averted.

In a new version of "Union Now," Streit issues his call for federation again. It is the last call. It is now or never.

But does this not mean we would lose our sovereignty? We have already lost our sovereignty in the old sense of the word. Our national actions are being dictated by the enormous threat of the Communist empires. We are no longer free to do as we please. The day of the nation-state is past. We can regain our freedom and security only through a permanent association with other free, self-governing, democratically controlled nations—those that meet this test: that their press is free and uncontrolled. Only thus, can we have an "under God new birth of freedom."

It is not national sovereignty that should concern us.

It is the sovereignty of the individual—that you and I should continue to choose our occupation, to have the right to know, without the concealments of censorship, to read, think, speak, write, and publish as we please. That sovereignty of the individual over his own life can be secured only by erecting a new preponderant power to protect freedom and enforce peace.

Disarmament is a delusion. It cannot, should not come. War cannot be prevented either by armament or disarmament. Only world law, enforced, can give assured peace. The first step toward world law is federation of the self-governing democracies.

We need to disarm our minds. History in the making stands before us and sternly demands, "Give me your prejudices or your life."

We cannot cling to our economic prejudices. We cannot have the world all under private ownership, considerable socialism is here to stay. All we can ask, and that we should ask, is that socialism, coexisting with private ownership, compete on equal terms of wages and hours. Have we not ourselves proved in our own TVA, that Government ownership can work, if it is not set up as a bureaucracy with a deadening civil service, but as a Government corporation with an efficient personnel system.

We cannot cling to our national and racial prejudices. They are handicaps which spell defeat in today's fast moving world.

We may not cling to our religious prejudices. All men who believe in God and/or the dignity of man must unite their hearts and minds to this great common cause, and in intimate fellowship and action preserve the precious faith they hold in common, together putting that faith in daily practice.

Most of us in this room are connected with writing and publishing. Let us face and write the truth. We cannot beat something with nothing. We cannot beat communism without a faith and a program. Let us dedicate ourselves and our written word to finding that faith and that program—and make it dynamic.

As for me, I will advocate a union of the free, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will not perish from the earth.

Dilworth on Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia and the new president of the American Municipal Association, offered the following testimony in support of H.R. 3326, the Urban Mass Transportation Act, when he appeared before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. His remarks provide excellent material on the problem of mass transportation in our major cities. I urge every Member to read his testimony:

I am Richardson Dilworth, mayor of the city of Philadelphia, and I come to speak to you today as representative of the American Municipal Association, which I serve as vice president, and for the city of Philadelphia. I strongly support House bill 3326 which would provide some Federal assistance to cities, both large and small, in meeting their transportation needs.

No one doubts the importance of adequate transportation to the development of any city, whether small town or great metropolis. The provision of highways has long been a governmental function, since nearly the beginning of our country, and the Federal Highway Act of 1956 has greatly expanded the Federal program which had its beginnings around the time of the First World War. Today the freeways on the Interstate System, being built with 90 percent Federal funds, are shaping parts of nearly every major city in this country. In molding the development of the city, however, these great highway programs are also furthering the decline of mass transportation, thus bringing heavy burdens along with their undoubted advantages. Mass transportation, whether by grade-separated rail transit or by high-quality bus, is an integral part of the transportation system in every city. This is the most efficient way in our society to provide transportation for schoolchildren, trips for the aged or disabled, and work trips for the poorer people and for those who want to have the burden of only one automobile on the family budget. Most of these riders pay a substantial share, most of the cost, of the services which they use, but few transportation companies are making an adequate profit on their investments. Consequently, service is deteriorating, riders are leaving the system for automobiles, thus creating further congestion, a need for more highways, added burden on the Federal and State highway programs and on the city street services. We firmly believe that it is time that mass transportation services be given an adequate place in both the planning processes of a city and in the transportation programs of city, State, and Federal Governments.

Records of the American Transit Association indicate that 300 cities, towns, and boroughs, mostly smaller ones, have lost all transit service since World War II. It is impossible to imagine the economic activity that has been displaced by the absence of this service, the trips not taken, the shopping not done, the entertainment and cultural activities unvisited. But, unfortunately, the transit service has deteriorated even further. Some of you may have seen the Carmichael cartoon in a recent Times-Mirror syndicate showing the disconsolate citizen leaning on a bus stop sign, with the legend: "Oh, they still run buses—it's just the service they've discontinued." Too many citizens firmly believe that this is the condition of our mass transportation system, and I'm certain it is.

Why a Federal interest in transportation? Why can't the cities and States carry it alone?

The cities cannot carry it alone. First, there is the competition of the automobile and the vast highway program financed by unoppressive taxation on gasoline, which is directly related to the amount of use of the street system obtained by the motorist or trucker. Secondly, there is a lack of taxing power in all cities. If the cities increase the burden more rapidly than the neighboring cities or the States in areas which are enticing industry away, jobs vital to the city's economy will be transferred to areas where the burden of services has not been built up because there has not been organized labor, or where adequate social services have not been met by Government. Thirdly, there are many metropolitan areas which are bistate or tri-state in coverage, and this alone complicates the investment of public funds; in addition, many metropolitan areas in single States find the suburbs controlled by one party, the central city by another, so that the reaching of harmonious decisions in regional transportation investments are often close to impossible. Fourthly, the scale of investment in transportation facilities is extremely large in comparison to the city budget, yet very small compared to the total spent in the region.

For example, the city's budget in Philadelphia is only $250 million a year. Expenditures for transportation in the metropolitan area, of which Philadelphia composes fully half, is $1.4 billion per year, and the capital which should be invested in transportation facilities each year is in the order of $150 million. It is obvious that a city budget can never carry investments of this scale without a drastic change in the taxing system which would earmark substantial amounts of the gasoline tax for city purposes. This is not possible in most States. Even where the States are collecting substantial sums of money for transportation, the rural dominance of the legislature often does not permit an equitable expenditure of these funds in urban areas, compared to the more rural countryside. And, finally, it's impossible politically, regardless of the party, for the poor city to subsidize the

wealthier people who have moved to the suburbs to escape problems, to get more space, or to find less crowded schools. And yet, extension of service beyond the city limits is a necessary part of the transportation program. We believe that some mechanism must be found to get all people into the transportation picture.

A Federal program can help bridge the gap between the poor city and the suburb. Annexation is not possible in many States, and perhaps not even desirable, particularly in the older States of the East where the suburbs have themselves been incorporated for generations. The Federal funds offered as grants can encourage local investments not only by the cities which are prepared to meet them, but by many of the suburbs which haven't yet acknowledged a concern for transportation. And the Federal program can help develop the transportation system with the lowest net public cost by finding means of utilizing some capital in transit rights-of-way rather than provide expensive new rights-of-way, broader in width for the automobile.

The second reason for Federal help is the tremendous importance of urban areas to the Nation. This is true in peacetime because, as I noted above, three-quarters of our citizens will soon be living in metropolitan areas, but it is even more true in wartime because such a tremendous percentage of materials useful to the armed services come from our urban areas. In these times, too, should we have conventional wars instead of atomic holocausts, the shortage of petroleum alone may put such a burden on our cities that a transit system operated on electrical power, developed out of coal could mean the difference between a tolerable standard of living or an intolerable one and greatly affect the quantity of the material provided the armed services.

What types of Federal programs should be evolved? It seems clear to us that the following are the most important aspects of any Federal assistance to mass transportation.

(a) It should be tailored to fit the needs of cities throughout the country, and therefore should include buses, as well as transportation running on rails, whether high-speed transit or commuter railroads.

(b) It should provide assistance for the development of bus stops and interchange points on freeways where the express bus proves to be the desirable type of transportation because of the economics of the situation or the smaller number of riders.

(c) It should provide assistance by capital grants, and I'll come back to this later because it is so very important.

(d) It should provide demonstration grants to show what can be done and how much more economical it is to provide transit services for those who are willing to use it than to merely assume that everyone wants to have an unlimited number of cars driven an unlimited number of miles, undoubtedly at great expense and with a tremendous waste of time which could be used for more productive activities.

(e) It should provide assistance for operating subsidies or support as an interim measure until longer range solutions can be evolved.

(f) Ultimately, tax relief may be considered to a greater degree than at present. However, this probably is more a city and State concern than a Federal concern.

(g) It should help and assist in support of imaginative administrators, whether in private companies or Government, to get that in many ways it is more desirable than the apparent convenience of the automobile.

(h) And finally, it needs to help operators develop the public understanding by means of the appropriate public relations to advertising, news stories, editorial attention and by other avenues where an energetic operator can develop new business, rather that suffer the steady erosion which has been the lot of too many transit companies.

Philadelphia has demonstrated that adequate service, properly priced, can attract new riders to the extent of 20 percent increase in 9 months of experimental service or, in one case, as much as 400 percent in the last 2 years. Fortunately, Philadelphia had a good rail network on which to build, but we have taken only halting steps in revamping our transportation system because of the differences between city and suburbs and the heavy burden of social services on the city budget.

I believe, therefore, that every city will have to make changes which the transit or commuter railroad systems cannot finance because of Federal taxes on corporate incomes and because of archaic layouts and distrust between labor and management. Here are some of the things which ought to be considered: relocating some stations to points where massive parking lots can be obtained between the built-up areas; abandoning some lightly used stations; providing sensible shelter structures for citizens waiting for service (often this will mean replacing obsolete stations; in other cases, shelters would have to be provided for the first time); extensions of commuter service along existing rights-of-way. In the case of rail rights-of-way, this will require capital for fixed facilities which cannot be generated within the company. In other places or in the case of bus transit, this may mean the purchase of new rolling stock which the transit operator cannot finance and where the city itself is unable politically to invest its money in service for wealthier suburbanites. In the case of the very large city or metropolis it may mean the purchase of rail transit or commuter railroad cars.

Finally, in the case of Philadelphia, which is blessed with a widespread and well located set of commuter railroads, we believe it means the tying together in the center of the city of the two separate rail networks into a unified system, which means the provision of a subway of about 1½ miles in length. This will provide great operating economies, but far more important to the region, it will reduce the demand for expressways literally by hundreds of millions of dollars. It will eliminate the consequent demand for parking spaces which require both private and public capital and remove existing productive structures not only from the tax base, but more important, from the economic base. And finally, it will attract a great deal more riding because every rail passenger would have the choice of all four downtown stations, rather than one or two as at present. The city cannot finance this alone. The railroads cannot even consider it, but with the partnership of all of us, with demonstration grants for capital projects from the Federal Government, together with funds that we can raise and support that we can get from the carriers, this truly superior commuter railroad system not only can be preserved; it can be greatly enhanced.

Encouragement of comprehensive planning as called for by many of the bills before you and by the President's letter to the Speaker of June 19 is not enough. Philadelphia has had an overall transport plan since 1955; it has had a comprehensive development plan since early in 1960; and it is participating actively in a regional comprehensive transportation plan, under the direction of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, to be completed next year. We have had commuter railroad experiments since 1958 and are now ready to operate in several areas. Other cities also are well along in transportation planning. In order to stop further decay of mass transportation services in those cities where the need can be demonstrated, capital assistance is vital.

I plead with you to realize that the cities, where three-quarters of our population will soon be living, cannot continue to be served by the automobile alone and that transit and commuter railroad services will be with us only a few years longer, unless the Federal Government begins to meet its share of the problems which it is causing, in part, through its massive highway program.

Financing School Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its real interest, I should like to include in the Appendix an article by Mr. Walter H. Steel which appeared in the American Banker of August 29, 1961. Mr. Steel is vice president of the Investment Bankers Association of America, and a general partner in the investment banking firm of Drexel & Co.

While we may not agree with all of Mr. Steel's conclusions, he does furnish us with food for thought.

The article follows:

RECORD ON FINANCING OF SCHOOL FACILITIES TERMED ADEQUATE BY INVESTMENT BANKER

(By Walter H. Steel)

Advocates of Federal aid for public primary and secondary school construction take the position that such aid stemming from a centralized source is essential if we are to provide adequate classroom facilities for primary and secondary schools. Any opposing statement is likely to be dismissed as being opposed to education in general. Before falling in step with this line of thought, it is well to examine the facts.

In calendar 1960 well over $2.1 billion in new issues of school bonds was actually sold by States and municipalities for elementary and secondary school purposes.

The total for 1959 was only slightly less, while that of 1958 exceeded the 1960 total. The result is that in 3 years State and local governments have sold over $6.4 billion in school bonds for elementary and secondary school facilities, and the pace continues at record levels.

Sales of new issues of school bonds in January 1961, were the largest amount of such bonds ever sold in a single month and during the first 4 months of 1961 aggregated over $937 million, more than $60 million above the amount sold during the same period in 1960.

SEVENTY THOUSAND CLASSROOMS PROVIDED

Over each of the past 5 years, approximately 70,000 classrooms have been provided through such financing. This amounts to total classrooms of about 350,000, exceeding by 50,000 the need for additional classrooms as estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1955.

Voters at school bond elections have continued to approve a large percentage of the issues, approving over 81 percent by value of issues submitted at school bond elections in 1960. Furthermore, the classroom problem is relieved by the fact that the rate of growth is decreasing in public primary and secondary school enrollment.

All of the foregoing is proof positive of the ability of States and municipalities to provide needed classroom facilities through pledge of their own credit. Stated another way—there is no evidence that construction

of classroom facilities has lagged because of any inability of States and municipalities to borrow the necessary funds in the open capital market.

The American people want good schools and the best education for our children and are willing to pay for them; but it has not yet been demonstrated that for the achievement of those objectives the central Government can determine our local needs or spend our tax money more effectively than American citizens voting in local elections.

ONE OF SEVERAL TYPES

Federal aid for classroom construction is one of the several types of proposals which would shift to the centralized Federal Government responsibility for financing functions which traditionally have been the responsibility of State and local governments, and which have been financed through investment bankers without Federal assistance. Another type of such proposals is Federal loans to municipalities for public facilities at low interest rates.

The community facilities loan program, as amended under the Housing Act of 1961, authorizes $500 million for Federal loans to municipalities for public facilities presently at an interest rate of 3⅝ percent.

This makes available a large volume of loans which municipalities would otherwise obtain through investment banking channels, thus substituting Federal financing for financing which is readily available from other sources at reasonable rates.

No additional building or construction is provided through such substitutions and it should be noted that the loans would be made at rates less than those afforded by comparable maturities on Federal Government securities in the open market.

The investment banking industry has produced an adequate supply of capital for needed community projects. The records show that during the past 3 years, 1958–60 inclusive, new issues of State and municipal bonds to provide long-term financing for the construction of public facilities have aggregated over $22.1 billion.

Present indications are that this sum will be augmented during calendar 1961 by at least another $8 billion.

A public official recently was heard to propound the theory that money for a facility then being discussed should be borrowed from the Federal Government if that could be done at a lower rate of interest than obtainable in the open market.

This notwithstanding that the credit rating of the borrower is nearly tops, and the necessary funds could easily be obtained through competitive bidding from investment bankers at highly satisfactory rates. Thus, this one official at least would place the Federal Government and the investment banker in direct competition in supplying funds for public improvement.

WHAT IF CARRIED TO ULTIMATE?

What chance has a vital private business of survival if such a philosophy is adopted and carried to its ultimate? By the same reasoning, what chance has the community of maintaining control of its local needs if it depends more and more on the central Government as a source of funds?

A case in point recently captured the attention of the investment banking fraternity.

In response to published invitation, seven syndicates, representing 50 or more bankers from various sections of the country, competed through sealed bids on July 31, 1961, for the purchase of an issue of $4 million city of Charleston, W. Va., sewer revenue bonds.

Earlier, the mayor of the city went on record with prospective bidders that the recent flood in no way endangered the city's ability to meet debt service on its bonds. It is known that the group submitting the best bid, and probably other groups as well, disregarded the flood in appraising the city's financing and credit standing.

EXAMPLE OF CHARLESTON CITED

Following the opening of bids, a representative of the Community Facilities Administration reportedly informed the city officials that because of the flood the city could qualify as a distressed area and sell its bonds to the CFA at a rate of 3⅜ percent, contrasted to that of 3.9453 percent offered in the competitive free market.

The city thereupon rejected all bids in order to put itself in a position to take advantage of this very low manufactured rate. During the approximately 24 hours between receipt and rejection of the bids, the bonds had been reoffered by the underwriters and a substantial portion of them placed with investors.

Purchases in large blocks were made by some of our outstanding insurance companies who obviously had no fear of Charleston's finances as a result of the flood or knowledge that the city might be classed as a distressed area.

The city had not sought the loan in advance and apparently was entirely unaware that it could qualify. The Federal Government through the representative of its Community Facilities Administration appears to have injected itself into the picture after it had been clearly demonstrated that the credit and borrowing ability of the city of Charleston had in nowise been adversely affected by the very thing that seemingly justified the distressed classification.

CONFUSION GENERATED

As a result of this, confusion and uncertainty were generated among those who in good faith complied with the published particulars of the city's invitation to bid, as well as among those who considered that they were investing in the city's securities at the going rate provided by a free market.

Under the community facilities program, funds supposedly are to be made available only to those communities that cannot otherwise find financial assistance on reasonable terms.

If the Federal Government is put to extremes, such as the Charleston instance, to find loan applicants and intends to compete in the open market for the purchase of public securities, then a reexamination of the program is very much in order.

The Investment Bankers Association of America has strongly opposed Federal aid for community facilities loans, where such aid merely supplants financing which would otherwise be provided by private industry.

Such opposition, supported by factual research, was recorded in a letter to every Member of the House of Representatives on June 19, 1961. This letter in its entirety was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 21.

No words can be found better to conclude this than by quoting from the Investment Bankers Association statement to the House Banking and Currency Committee opposing the community facilities loan program.

"In this country where we speak so proudly of our free enterprise system and where so much attention is focused on demonstrating the superiority of our system over an alien system based on governmental ownership, we are compelled to protest that the Federal Government in the community facility loan program is taking over a function of private industry when the interest rates at which it will provide financing are set so low that the result is simply to substitute Federal financing for financing that is readily available from other sources at reasonable rates."

The Very Reverend John A. Flynn, C.M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the class of 1942 of St. John's College and the class of 1951 of St. John's Law School, Brooklyn, N.Y., I share the view of many of our alumni that what success we gain in life is owed, in large measure, to that institution.

I take this occasion to pay personal tribute to a great educator, the Very Reverend John A. Flynn, C.M., who has been president of St. John's since 1947 and who has now been transferred to St. Joseph's College, Princeton, N.J.

His dedicated administration as the 12th president in the 91 years of St. John's existence has raised her to the foremost ranks of America's Catholic universities. In the true pattern of freedom in educational choice the doors of St. John's have been open to students of all races and religions. The expansion of the university, the "miracle at Hillcrest" has increased the opportunities for advancement of thousands of students who are now enabled to pursue higher education in the best equipped and most modern facilities to be constructed in the East in many years.

In addition to the physical expansion of the campus, the dimension of faculty, student enrollment, scholarship, alumni participation, have all grown abundantly under the guidance of Father Flynn. We of St. John's, and all the members of our community, will be forever in his debt. No honor we might now confer would be commensurate with the gift of self he has made.

Not only at St. John's has he been recognized. I recount some of the honors and accomplishments which are a part of his full biography.

A native son of Philadelphia, Pa., he was born in 1900 to Michael and Elizabeth Hudson Flynn now deceased.

He attended and graduated in 1918 Philadelphia Roman Catholic High School; attended St. Joseph's College, Princeton, N.J., 1918–19; St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown, Philadelphia, for philosophical and theological studies 1919–26.

The bachelor of arts degree was awarded to Father Flynn on the completion of his studies at St. Vincent's by the State of Pennsylvania. Graduate work in theology at the Collegio Angelico in Rome, Italy, for 2 years—1927–28. Received the doctor of sacred theology degree there on June 13, 1928.

The honorary degrees accorded him include: doctor of laws, Manhattan College, New York, June 8, 1948; doctor of laws, St. Francis College, Brooklyn, June 4, 1950; doctor of humane letters, Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N.Y., June 10, 1951; doctor of laws, Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y., June 7, 1958.

He began his religious life on May 29, 1919, when he entered the novitiate of the Congregation of the Mission—Vincentian Fathers. He was professed in the community on May 29, 1921. On May 29, 1926, he was ordained to the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church by the late Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, archbishop of Philadelphia, in the public chapel of St. Vincent's Seminary, Pennsylvania.

Thereafter his appointments included:

Professor of dogmatic theology, St. Vincent's Seminary, Philadelphia, 1928–33—January.

Professor of dogmatic theology and patrology, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N.Y., 1933–35—January.

Professor of logic, ethics, and the history of philosophy, Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N.Y., 1935–36.

Professor of sacred scripture, St. Vincent's Seminary, Philadelphia, 1936–38.

Professor of psychology, St. John's College of St. John's University, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1938–42.

Dean, School of Education, St. John's University, 1942–47.

President, St. John's University, September 1, 1947—the 12th president of the university.

His interests and influence have been manifested in many important educational and civic associations. His memberships have included:

New York Academy of Public Education, American Catholic Philosophical Association, Catholic Theological Society of America, National Catholic Educational Association, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Association of American Colleges, presidents council of the American Institute of Management, board of trustees, Metropolitan Educational Television Association—since 1953—executive committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, executive committee of the Commission on Nontax-Supported Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, legislative committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, council on higher education, State Education Department, Albany, N.Y., board of directors, the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City, member of the executive committee—college and university department—of the National Catholic Educational Association, the Academy of Political Science in the city of New York.

As an author he has to his credit:

"Transubstantiation," dissertation for doctor of sacred theology degree, published in Rome, 1928.

"Teaching Education Courses in Catholic College," eastern regional unit of the National Catholic Educational Association.

"The Christian Teacher Studies," Christian Education Journal, February 1952.

As a major interest he has been an ardent student of psychology in which Father Flynn has devoted much time in trying to reconcile the principles of scholastic psychology and the findings of experimental psychology.

Among other positions of honor and responsibility he has held are the following:

President of the Conference of Catholic Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, 1948–50, chairman of the 1951 administrative board of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges, on February 29, 1952, appointed member of the Teacher Education Advisory Council of the State Education Department, Albany, N.Y. Reappointed to a 5-year membership on October 1, 1954. On March 26, 1952, appointed a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.—term expired December 30, 1954. Chairman of Board, 1954. On December 2, 1955, decorated by the Italian Government with the dignity of "Commendatore" in the order of "Al Merito della Republica." A vice president general of the National Catholic Educational Association. Provincial prefect of studies, Congregation of the Mission, Eastern Province.

Perhaps the best summation of the career of Father Flynn at St. John's is the record of the testimonial given in his honor by the faculty and staff of the university, an account of which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet on August 5, 1961, to which I direct the attention of my colleagues:

FACULTY HONORS FATHER FLYNN—BISHOP PRESIDES AS ST. JOHN'S PRESIDENT ENDS SERVICE

Very Rev. John A. Flynn, C.M., who is leaving St. John's University after 14 years as president, was honored by over 350 members of the faculty and staff at a testimonial dinner in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel July 27.

Presiding at the event was Most Rev. Bryan J. McEntegart, bishop of Brooklyn and chancellor of the university. Most Rev. John A. Boardman, auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn and an alumnus of St. John's, was also present.

BISHOP M'ENTEGART'S TALK

In his address Bishop McEntegart referred to "the miracle of Hillcrest" and said Father Flynn was "the man who has presided over that miracle." Describing Father Flynn as the father of a great family His Excellency commended him for his ability and accomplishments. The text of the bishop's address appears below.

The dais list also included Very Rev. Edward J. Burke, C.M., the new president of the university, and Rev. William B. Church, Cornwall Heights, Pa., and brother to the guest of honor.

Serving as toastmaster was Dr. Charles W. Lacaillade, professor of biology, who was recently named the outstanding teacher at the university.

ATTAINMENT OF HIS GOAL

The testimonial citation, which was read by Dr. Blaise J. Opulente, assistant to the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, stated: "Like his beloved St. Vincent, he (Father Flynn) also carried in his head two mental maps: one manifestly administrative; the other—the constant concern of his heart—to make St. John's the outstanding Catholic university in America."

All the participants hailed Father Flynn for the many, varied and important intellectual and educational developments which he has championed during the past 14 years. The citation further stated: "the vast intellectual growth of the university, the inauguration of several scholarly institutes, the innumerable education services rendered to the community, the annual professional service programs; the ever increasing list of distinguished alumni—all those evidence the attainment of his goal."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence H. Bracken, pastor of St. Brigid's Church, Brooklyn, an alumnus of St. John's and a close personal friend of Father Flynn, delivered the evening's principal address. Monsignor Bracken cited the fact that in his graduating class of 1908 there were 10 members. Today St. John's is a university numbering more than 10,000 students.

He compared the qualities of Father Flynn to those of St. Vincent de Paul:

"It was a characteristic of St. Vincent de Paul that he was never impulsive, never impetuous. There was, however, an insistency and a rapidity in everything he undertook. Once an operation was begun, he brooked no resistance, opposition or hesitation. Quickly, relentlessly, with every determination, it was developed and crystallized into a pattern.

"But before this there were months and even years of thorough investigation, minute planning, constant review, all unseen before the final decision. And that decision never came until the hours were spent with our Blessed Lord in the silence of the chapel.

"And thus a work was done which has stood firm for centuries. This is also the spirit of Father Flynn. The future needs, trends and goals of education were deeply and broadly viewed and investigated. The part that could be played by a greater St. John's was carefully sounded and just as carefully elected. The buildings as they appeared were not the fulfillment of a dream, but rather the realization of a thoroughly grasped reality; and once begun, they have never ceased to grow. In this, we have a new St. Vincent de Paul in our midst."

PHYSICAL, INTELLECTUAL GROWTH

Stressed throughout the evening's program was the fact that along with the physical expansion of the university. Father Flynn's presidency has been marked by an ever-increasing and far-reaching intellectual growth. Today some 58 research projects in the areas of biology, chemistry, physics and pharmacy are being conducted in St. John's Science-Pharmacy Hall at the Jamaica campus.

The programs of the colleges of liberal arts and sciences have been coordinated and integrated; the college of business administration has added a graduate division; the school of education has introduced many worthwhile programs including the "learning for leadership program"; and the graduate school of arts and sciences has expanded its operations to include the philosophy of science institute, the Asian studies institute and the freedom institute—all these under the inspiration of Father Flynn.

St. John's has increased both the quantity and quality of faculty, introduced a number of new courses and published many scholarly tracts. Father Flynn received an award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, for St. John's, for the scholarly volume, "Concept of Freedom" published by St. John's faculty members a few years ago.

Father Flynn was presented with a handsomely bound pictorial history of his 14 years as president at St. John's; two oil paintings, one of St. Vincent de Paul and a second of the St. John's coat of arms, a silver medallion with a replica of the late Pope Pius XII, a purse and other mementos.

"Those who have lived with the sons of St. Vincent and those who have been educated by them know better than to say goodbye to any Vincentian who has been changed. Sooner or later they return to teach their classes and to renew abiding friendships and ties of yesterday. This is the most precious thought that fills our hearts, minds and

hopes tonight, Father Flynn, that you will soon be back with us and the sooner the better," Monsignor Bracken concluded.

TEXT OF ADDRESS

There is no need, my friends, for me to stand here tonight and tell you, the family of St. John's University, what Father Flynn has done for St. John's.

You, who teach and serve there, are the life of the university, as the faculty is the life of every university, and the teacher in the classroom is the life of every school. Surely you, above all, know the miracle of Hillcrest, and you know the man who has presided over that miracle.

From my own experience, I can tell you that it is no derogation from the high professional status of a university president to say that he is like the father of a great family. If he is a good president, he will have the virtues of a good father. Father Flynn has been a good president, a good father of the great family of St. John's, whose loyal sons and daughters are now spread all over the world, performing such significant and useful deeds in the service of God and the national welfare, and for the enduring good of human society.

QUALITIES OF A GOOD FATHER

Let us take a brief glance at the qualities of a good father. A good father is hard-working; he is provident; he has a sense of family tradition; he is wise; and he is devoted to his family.

1. To say Father Flynn has worked hard is to understate the case. For all these 14 years—morning, noon, night—late and early, he has given himself. In good health and in poor health, he has given himself unsparingly in the great, self-sacrificing tradition of the Vincentian community. No effort was too much, no demand too great, because in his eyes the cause he served—the cause of Catholic higher education in our great urban community—was worth all that he could give it.

2. He has been a provident father. He certainly has provided rich and abundant sustenance for his university family. Surely, the family's "standard of living," and all that the term might include when the family is a university, has risen graphically under his benevolent regime.

But he has been provident also in the sense that he has looked to the future and provided guidance for his family. He saw ahead of time the development of American university life, and the need for St. John's to grow, if it was to play a significant part in the educational community. He laid plans for that future and made provision for it at a time when it was difficult to do so; when, perhaps, not all in the university could see the needs that he foresaw.

And so, his family has grown with the times, and in tune with the age; and, as it continues to grow, as indeed it must, it will do so upon the foundations he has laid and within the vast framework he has labbored to construct.

3. Like a good father, he has kept and fostered a sense of tradition. In the larger sense, he has been concerned that the ancient wisdom—the philosophia perennis—which has survived through the ages as the educational legacy of the Catholic Church—he has been concerned that this wisdom should be handed down in new and living ways at St. John's.

He has also shown a sharp awareness of another tradition that is more local and yet part of the history and the glory of St. John's. Under his presidency, the traditional relationship of friendliness with the clergy of the Diocese of Brooklyn has been preserved and fostered.

Moreover, under his presidency, while broadening its services to the professional, legal, educational, and industrial community, St. John's has continued its service to that vast segment of its loyal alumni, the religious—Sisters, Brothers, and priests—who teach in the great elementary and secondary school systems of our diocese.

And, when new and expanded programs have created problems for the religious communities, with their old, and sometimes inflexible, practices, Father Flynn has been aware of these problems and has worked them out to the best advantage of both the religious and the university.

4. Like a wise father, Father Flynn has provided the best for his children. He has been vitally concerned with the quality of education at St. John's. Theology and philosophy have been given their rightful prominence in the intellectual life of the university, and Father Flynn has searched far and wide to bring to St. John's the finest possible staff.

5. Finally, and above all, Father Flynn has been devoted to his university family. With unswerving purpose, wholehearted and religious dedication and single-minded interest, Father Flynn has made St. John's and its welfare his supreme concern and sole preoccupation for all these years.

WILL BE REMEMBERED

As we pray tonight that God will reward him for such generous service, and strengthen and bless him for the new tasks to which he is now called, we can assure him that his contribution to St. John's and to Catholic higher education has been very great, and that it will endure for generations to come.

On July 29, 1961, the Brooklyn Tablet took note of the great record of Father Flynn and also congratulated the new president of St. John's, the Very Reverend Edward J. Burke, C.M., on his appointment as the 13th president. I enclose a copy of that editorial and am delighted for this opportunity to pay homage justly due to Father Flynn and promise my sincere devotion to the continuing cause of St. John's under the administration of Father Burke:

TWO PRESIDENTS OF ST. JOHN'S

We wish to congratulate Very Rev. Edward J. Burke, C.M., on his appointment as the 13th president in the 91-year history of St. John's University and to offer him our most sincere best wishes for success during the years of his adminitration.

With the announcement of Father Burke's appointment came the accompanying statement that Father John Flynn, St. John's president for the past 14 years, will now assume duties at St. Joseph's College, Princeton, N.J. He will be missed not only by St. John's but by the entire diocese of Brooklyn.

The growth of St. John's University and the career of Father Flynn have become so interwoven that you cannot consider one without the other. Father Flynn brought with him to his manifold duties as president of an expanding university a background as a scholar and a philosopher as well as a teacher and an administrator. The vigor with which he attacked the problems of postwar education in 1947 became dwarfed by the continuing zeal with which he attacked the problems of erecting a great campus as a monument to St. Vincent de Paul and to all of St. Vincent's dedicated followers who have labored so long and so industriously in the service of St. Vincent, St. John's and the diocese of Brooklyn.

Father Flynn has exemplified the wisdom of the philosopher, the dedication of the scholar and the practical devotion to duty of the experienced teacher to make earlier daydreams for St. John's become realities. Today, physical expansion at the Jamaica campus, increased student enrollment, vast intellectual growth, and continuing educational service to the community give ample evidence of the important role which St. John's now plays in educating the youth of our diocese. This role will become even more important with the increased flow of Catholic high school graduates from our new schools.

The role of dedicated men such as Father Flynn has become even more important today when the value of Catholic education is assailed on every side and a fight for its very existence is underway. Father Flynn has become a State and National spokesman for Catholic education and his opinions on current events are constantly sought by public and private educators alike. He has been active in the National Catholic Education Association and as a member of the Council on Higher Education of the New York State Department of Education has served as a watchful guardian of the rights of Catholic education.

Being president of a great university is a difficult job. Father Flynn has set a high standard of leadership as he passes the burdens of his office on to Father Burke. We salute them both.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in the VA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 87-97 provides, effective January 1, 1962, that the Veterans' Administration shall make findings of fact and conclusions of law when the Board of Veterans' Appeals renders a decision in each individual veteran's claim. This law flows from the long-time dissatisfaction which the committee has had with both the quality and technical sufficiency of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Recently the Committee on Veterans' Affairs requested the Veterans' Administration to have summaries of individual cases prepared in 100 cases—10 cases in 10 different regional offices. Following receipt of these individual summaries, 10 of the 100 cases were submitted to law students in law schools located throughout the country—Universities of Michigan, Florida, Colorado, California, Harvard, Yale, and Georgetown. These students had no training in this field of law and they were simply furnished the summaries and a copy of title 38, United States Code, containing the text of veterans' law.

The committee has found the findings of fact and conclusions of law prepared by the various law students very helpful and in rather sharp contrast to the decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals. Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks one individual case printed in three separate columns to indicate the subject matter involved.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

SUMMARY OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

Issues

1. Restoration service connection for otosclerosis.

Military medical record

August 7, 1942: Induction examination: Hearing less than the minimal requirements for class IA. Hearing right ear 5/20; left ear 10/20—placed on limited duty.

January 13, 1943: Defective hearing, bilateral, cause undetermined. AD 5/20; AS 6/20 EPTI.

August 25, 1943: Separation examination—veteran stated his bilateral nerve deafness was EPTI. Hearing examination right ear 1/20; left ear 1/20.

August 27, 1943: Veteran separated because he did not meet the minimal standards for induction.

Veterans' Administration medical record

October 23, 1943: Service medical records received.

June 12, 1944: VA examination: Hearing right ear 0 feet, left 2 feet. Chronic otosclerosis.

September 4, 1945: VA examination: Auditory canals negative; tympani dull, not retracted. Bilateral conductive deafness.

March 17, 1947: VA examination: Deafness, mixed type, bilateral. Hearing AD 0/20, AS 2/20.

March 15, 1948: VA examination: Bilateral deafness AD 0/20, AS 1/20.

April 9, 1948: VA examination: Bilateral deafness 0/20 both ears.

June 21, 1949: NP VA examination: Anxiety reaction chronic, manifested by tension and worry over hearing loss with accentuation of his sensory deficit at time of stress. This examination was conducted at the request of veteran's service representative.

July 13, 1949: VA examination: Tympani thickened, scarred, retracted. AD 0/20, AS 2/20.

February 3, 1953, to March 6, 1953: Boston VA Hospital report: Hospitalized for duodenal ulcer. It was also noted that the veteran had "Almost total deafness."

July 23, 1954: VA examination: Audiogram average pure tone decibel loss bone conduction right 52, left 52.

Adjudication actions

October 26, 1943: Compensation claim filed for "aggravation of condition of ears."

July 4, 1944: Compensation claim considered. Veteran granted wartime service connection 50 percent for chronic otosclerosis, hearing right 0 feet, left 2 feet.

April 24, 1947: Claim reviewed on basis of VA examination of March 17, 1947, which showed corrected hearing with hearing aid. Evaluation for otosclerosis, chronic deafness, reduced from 50 percent to 40 percent.

January 25, 1950: The Central Disability Board, Washington, D.C., corrected the type of service connection for bilateral ear disability from service incurrence to aggravation by service on the basis of decrease in hearing between induction and sparation from service. Service connection also granted 0 percent for chronic anxiety reaction, as due to and proximately the result of service-connected deafness, (Degree of disability at induction noted as 10 percent.)

August 23, 1954: Review of compensation claim on basis of VA examination of July 23, 1954, increased evaluation from 40 percent to 50 percent for deafness; 0 percent for anxiety reaction was continued.

July 30, 1958: Reviewed under Deputy Administrator's Letter of December 14, 1954 (nationally authorized review). Found that service records showed right hearing 5/20 and left 10/20 and no intervening injury or disease and no treatment in service. It

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS,
May 8, 1961.

Appellant represented by: Disabled American Veterans.

The issue

The appeal was timely filed, and is properly before the Board, from the rating action of the regional office at Boston, Mass., which severed service connection for defective hearing with anxiety reaction. It is contended that defective hearing was aggravated during service, and that service connection for the psychiatric disorder should also be maintained as a secondary disability.

The evidence

(The veteran) served from August 1942 to August 1943. At induction he was accepted for limited duty because of defective hearing which was reported to be 5/20, right, and 10/20, left. The veteran was hospitalized because of a cold in January 1943 and hearing was 0.5/20, right, and 6/20, left. On examination for discharge from service hearing was 1/20 in each ear. Anxiety reaction was not demonstrated in service.

A claim for compensation was submitted in October 1943. When examined in June 1944 hearing was 0 feet, right, and 2 feet, left; the diagnosis was otosclerosis. Other postservice examination and hospital reports are of record and diagnoses include conductive-type deafness, mixed-type deafness, tinnitus and nonsuppurative otitis media. In June 1949 (the veteran) stated that he was particularly worried over a possible reduction in force; he described his psychiatric symptoms as restlessness, palpitation, a feeling of constriction in the chest and abdomen and pain in the skeletal musculature. He had always felt conspicuous, foolish, and inadequate. Anxiety reaction, manifested by tension and worry over hearing loss, was diagnosed. In December 1955, air conduction loss was 72 decibels, right, and 63 decibels, left; bone conduction loss was 45 decibels, in each ear.

Service connection was granted for defective hearing with anxiety reaction, but on later review such action was held to be clearly and unmistakably erroneous and service connection was discontinued.

The law and regulations

Service connection is warranted for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty during active service (38 U.S.C. 310).

38 U.S.C. 353 provides that a preexisting disability will be considered to have been aggravated if there was an increase in disability during service, unless the increase was due to natural progress.

38 CFR 3.310 provides that service connection may be granted for disability which is proximately due to or directly the result of a service-connected disability.

38 CFR 3.105 provides that service connection, once granted, may not be severed except on the basis of clear and unmistakable error.

Disscussion and evaluation

Defective hearing was noted at induction, but the service record shows progressive loss of hearing commencing in January 1943. Otosclerosis was diagnosed subsequent to service; however, the clinical findings also reveal a definite nerve-type deafness, which may not be said to be due solely to otosclerosis. The worry over loss of hearing was only one symptom upon which the diagnosis of anxiety reaction was made, and the anxiety would have been present even though the hearing had been normal.

Findings of fact

1. Defective hearing existed prior to service.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

Issue

Restoration of service connection for otosclerosis, defective hearing, and anxiety reaction.

Findings of fact

(1) Claimant veteran was inducted August 7, 1942, placed on limited duty, and sep-

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

SUMMARY OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

was proposed that the grant of service connection for deafness was clearly and unmistakably erroneous and therefore should be severed.

August 7, 1958: Case referred to the Director of Compensation and Pension, Washington, D.C.

March 2, 1959: Director of Compensation and Pension remanded the case to obtain record of claimed treatment in service at the Station Hospital, Fort Banks, and the Boston Dispensary. It was pointed out that the proposed severance of service connection did not include anxiety reaction. On receipt of the above mentioned records, the case was to be reviewed locally and resubmitted to the Director, if in order.

March 24, 1959: Additional service records requested.

April 6, 1959: Additional service records received showing treatment January 13, 1943, to January 18, 1943, for nasopharyngitis, catarrhal, acute, bilateral. Defective hearing, bilateral, AD 0.5/20, AS 6/20 EPTI. Because no change in the ear condition was noted, it was again proposed to sever service connection. It was further proposed to sever service connection for the anxiety reaction.

May 11, 1959: Case again submitted to the Director of Compensation and Pension.

May 29, 1959: The Director administratively reviewed the case and concurred in the severance of service connection for defective hearing bilateral, also diagnosed as otosclerosis; and anxiety reaction.

September 16, 1959: Claim reviewed and the severance of service connection for otosclerosis and anxiety reaction was effected on the ground that the grant of such service connection had been clearly and unmistakably erroneous.

September 21, 1960: The veteran, through his representative, the DAV, filed an appeal from the decision of the Veterans' Administration severing service connection for his deafness and anxiety reaction. The issue: restoration of service connection for otosclerosis, defective hearing, and the anxiety reaction, directly due to and secondary to the otosclerosis.

Decision of regional office after review of appeal and evidence

Evidence of record does not warrant restoration of service for otosclerosis, defective hearing, and the anxiety reaction, directly due to and secondary to the otosclerosis.

Approved as correct by service representative.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

2. There was an increase in defective hearing during service which was not clearly and unmistakably, as distinguished from difference of opinion, due to natural progress.

3. Anxiety reaction clearly and unmistakably was not demonstrated during service.

4. Anxiety reaction clearly and unmistakably was not due to defective hearing.

Conclusions of law

1. Service connection for defective hearing was not clearly and unmistakably erroneous, within the meaning of 38 CF 3.105, and should be restored.

2. Service connection for anxiety reaction was clearly and unmistakably erroneous within the meaning of 38 CFR 3.105 and may not be restored.

Decision

The appeal is allowed to the extent indicated herein.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

arated on August 27, 1943, for failure to meet minimal standards for induction.

(2) Veteran suffered from bilateral defective hearing EPTI; the degree of this disability at induction was later noted as 10 percent by the Central Disability Board.

(3) Veteran's deafness increased between the time of induction and time of separation; his deafness increased further after separation.

(4) Veteran's condition was diagnosed as chronic deafness, resulting from otosclerosis, on several occasions: June 12, 1944; March 17, 1947.

(5) Veteran was granted wartime service connected disability of 50 percent for chronic otosclerosis on July 4, 1944; this grant was later reduced from 50 to 40 percent in 1947 after hearing aid showed corrected hearing, and in 1950 the type of service connection was corrected from service incurrence to aggravation by service.

(6) Veteran also suffered from chronic anxiety, due loss of hearing; this condition was first reflected in a VA examination on June 21, 1950.

(7) Service connection was severed September 16, 1959, on the ground that the grant of such service connection had been clearly and unmistakably erroneous. The error was not specified.

(8) The record reflects no specific finding that the increase in disability either during or after service was due to the natural progress of chronic otosclerosis.

Conclusions of law

(1) Veteran's claim is governed by the provisions for wartime disability compensation (38 U.S.C. 101(8), 310).

(2) Veteran is presumed to have been in sound condition at the time of his induction except for defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of his induction examination (38 U.S.C. 311). Partial deafness, noted at the time of the induction examination, must be presumed to have been aggravated by active service in the absence of a specific finding that the subsequent increase in disability was due to the natural progress of the disease (38 U.S.C. 353).

(3) Under the regulations issued by the Administrator, authority to sever service connection, upon the basis of clear and unmistakable error, is vested in regional offices. The burden of proof of the propriety of such severance is upon the Government (38 CFR 3.9(d)).

(4) There appears to have been no change in diagnosis, so as to require certification of error in the prior diagnosis (38 CFR 3.9(d)). It is not suggested that the presumption of service connection arising on the facts from the foregoing statute and regulation is not rebuttable, although any reasonable doubt which arises regarding service connection will be resolved in favor of the veteran (38 CFR 3.63(a)). But certainly the mere conclusion that a grant of service connection was "clearly and unmistakably erroneous" is not sufficient to overcome the statutory presumption in the absence of any specification of the nature of that error. In the words of the Administrator's own regulation, claims founded upon these statutory presumptions can be "denied only on the basis of evidence which clearly and unmistakably demonstrates that the disease did not originate in service, or, if increased in

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

SUMMARY OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

service, was not aggravated thereby" (38 CFR 3.63(d)).

(5) Since the claimant veteran's condition existed prior to service, but increased in severity during service, service connection must be presumed and stands unrebutted on this record. It follows that service connection should be restored. Since a finding was made, which also stands unrebutted, that the veteran's chronic anxiety reaction to increasing deafness was related to the service-connected aggravation of his condition, service connection should also be restored for the chronic anxiety reaction (38 CFR 3.101).

"Improving the Urban Environment"—Address by Senator Williams of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no member of this body has contributed more to legislative progress on urban matters than the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He is the author of two outstanding legislative breakthroughs written into this year's housing bill—one launching a new program of aid to mass transportation, the other a new program of assistance to local communities in the preservation of open space.

At the recent conference of the American Municipal Association in Seattle, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] delivered an address which is a cogent and penetrating analysis of some of the current dilemmas facing urban America. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

(Address by Senator Harrison A. Williams, Democrat, of New Jersey, to the annual conference of the American Municipal Association, Seattle, Wash., August 28, 1961)

I regard my task today as rather formidable, as a layman charged with the task of telling this assemblage of the Nation's foremost body of expert practitioners how to improve the urban environment.

But if I may, I'd like to plunge ahead and say that if there is one characteristic that stands out about our cities and towns it is our general complacency toward them.

I think we would agree that most of our cities do not fulfill our conception of our own private Brasilia. In fact, when you get right down to it, they leave much to be desired. Slums, traffic congestion, city crime, minority group ghettos, suburban sprawl, polluted air, roadside slum towns, neon nightmares—most of our cities are scarred with them.

Yet so few people ever seem to complain about the ever-present eyesores in the urban environment. As a nation of mostly urban people, we seem to have become almost insensate to the staggering ugliness and squalor surrounding us.

A commentary on our times can be seen in the scholarly books that are being written, jam-packed with statistics on urban living, that project the statistics into future and usually disturbing trends. But notice how often you see a statement in the preface of the book that says: "The conclusions or projections made in the succeeding chapters are based on the assumption that no significant public policy changes will occur from those public policies of the present."

At the other end of the scale from the disinterested chronicles of our urban perdition are the urbane critics.

For example, Frank Lloyd Wright, who when asked to come to Pittsburgh and look at its problems, is said to have replied to the city fathers: "Gentlemen, there is only one solution. Abandon it."

I think, however, that we wouldn't be here today if we didn't have hope for the urban future of America. Certainly the task presents the greatest challenge that any of us could ask for. I think that in a very real sense the mayors and officials charged with the development of our urban and metropolitan areas are on the frontlines of the cold war battlefield.

When you stop to think that the metropolitan areas account for 75 percent of the Nation's economic productivity, it becomes apparent that the decisions affecting the growth of development of these areas have a major impact on our ability to meet the grave international challenges of the sixties.

I would like to talk today about several important but more or less random problem areas that loom large in our efforts to improve the urban environment.

HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

The first is housing and urban renewal. A decade ago we made a national commitment to eliminate our slums, to replace them with new housing and a better environment. It was a great and inspiring idea, and after a slow start, we are now ready for full-scale action, with the new authorization of the Housing Act and with a new and determined administration.

For this reason, I think it is appropriate for us to stop a moment to review our past accomplishments. We have produced a great deal that has had good and lasting value, but at the same time, we have all seen mammoth public housing projects that look more like penal institutions than homes for people. We have seen months and years of enormous effort result in a vapid, almost sterile civic centers and urban renewal projects.

I think the moral we can draw from our past experience is that money isn't everything.

Now that we have $2 billion to work with, thanks to the Housing Act, I think it is of greatest importance to redouble and reemphasize our concern for the esthetic and human values involved in any program to rebuild our cities.

For a long time I think it is fair to say that we scarcely even recognized that there even was a problem in reconciling the old and the new. But the storms of protest over the destruction of treasured buildings that had a flavor of charm or history have made us more conscious of this problem.

Perhaps some of you saw the dramatic photograph not too long ago of the group of Greenwich Villagers who painted the white crosses of demolition in their eyeglasses. It was a haunting sight.

Fortunately, under the able new leadership of Dr. Weaver and as a result of the 1961 Housing Act, I think we will begin to see a much more vigorous exploration of the potentialities of rehabilitation and restoration. The dividends—both financial and esthetic—can be considerable, as you can see from a walk in Georgetown, in the Nation's Capital.

However, there is no getting around the inherent conflicts involved in reconciling the old and the new. In some cases, good sound buildings may have to give way for the sake of the overall design of the urban renewal project.

As Dr. Weaver said in a speech not too long ago in New York, "Where there is an occasional sound structure in a sea of hopeless ones, it is not feasible—or in my opinion desirable—to destroy a redevelopment plan by an inflexible application of sound principle."

And then there is the problem that arises when we do try to preserve and restore existing structures in an urban renewal project.

This is the design problem of making the new harmonize with the old. Sometimes the contrasts of old and new are quite effective. Other times they strike a jarring and discordant note.

The other day I saw a photograph of a new high-rise apartment that was developed privately on Beacon Street in Boston. While I haven't seen it in person, the picture struck me as one of the best reconciliations of old and new that I have seen in some time. The staid four-story townhouses on the street feature prominent bay windows, and the apartment building, rising next to them on the street carried out this bay window effect by constructing the front walls and windows of each apartment on prow-shaped angles, thereby giving a bay window motif to the whole face of the apartment building.

Philadelphia has also been giving great attention to the design problem of blending old and new. Its Washington Square East renewal project, which includes the very historic area of Society Hill, put five developers into competition not only on the inherent merit of the architectural designs, but also on the extent to which they fit

into and enhance the surrounding environment. The competition was taken so seriously that the five developers spent some $260,000 on their own on the site and architectural plans.

Similar kinds of problems can be seen in the area of public housing.

I was struck, for example, by the renewal program for southwest Washington. In one of the blocks that has been completed, there is a high-rise apartment separated by a mall from a series of rather high-priced townhouses, painted in various pastel colors. Directly across the street from these townhouses is a similar series of attached public housing units, with a uniform and rather drab brick facade. And of course wire fences around each small backyard.

What pains me about this above-average-looking public housing project is that for only slightly more money, the appearance of this project could have been made every bit as attractive—and as much of an asset to the whole area—as the luxury townhouses right across the street.

I have been disturbed by the legislative restrictions written into the public housing law requiring maximum economy-type construction. In other words, keep the housing bone bare, no matter how much of a community eyesore is produced.

Added to this are regulations that have accumulated like barnacles over the years. They are enough to sap the initiative and imaginative energy of the most dedicated housing official. I knew that the new Public Housing Commissioner, Mrs. McGuire, is determined to breathe new life and imagination into this program, and I am confident that we are going to see wholehearted encouragement of better public housing from now on.

The Housing Act also provides $5 million for demonstrations in low-income housing, which could be of great help in putting a better face on a very important program.

Not too long ago the New York Times carried a front page article reporting on a recommendation made by Elizabeth Wood of Chicago that we start building English-style pubs in our public housing projects, the way they do in England and the Scandinavian countries.

Of course I can hear someone asking whether the tenants of public housing in this country would care for darts and warm beer. But the principle behind this proposal is an important one—to provide a convivial meeting place where people can gather to enjoy themselves, rather than feed in isolation on their miseries or frustrations.

Obviously this is but one of many possibilities of dealing with the social as well as the physical aspects of public housing.

OPEN SPACE

Closely related to housing and urban renewal is the problem of open space, both in the cities and at the suburban fringe.

As a part of the Housing Act, Congress passed the major provisions of the open space bill I had introduced earlier this year, providing up to 30 percent in grants to State and local governments for the acquisition and preservation of open space. We now have a program of $50 million for this purpose.

I think it goes without saying that we need much more open space in our cities, and we need open space of all kinds—parks, playgrounds, recreation areas, intimate islands of green, stately malls, shop-lined plazas, wooded pathways, and cloisters—to meet the multitude of human needs in a city.

I recognize that providing open space in cities means a loss of tax ratables. But I am convinced that open space in our cities can be not only esthetically rewarding, but good business too.

For one thing, if well placed, open space can materially enhance adjacent property values, and curb the spread of deterioration and decay. As my good friend from East Orange, Mayor Kelly, is fond of saying: "When the amenities go, blight moves in."

Business and community leaders are also beginning to realize that commercial attractions alone will not lure many suburban housewives, if they must continue to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous annoyance in the downtown areas. Kalamazoo, Mich. has done it, San Francisco has done it, and I earnestly hope more and more cities will begin to explore the possibility of converting some of their tension-filled thoroughfares into tree-lined malls for exclusive pedestrian use.

Open space at the fringe is equally important, for the onrush of urbanism is gobbling up more than a million acres a year. Thus each year we push nature's horizon farther and farther away from more and more people.

Some people seem to think that this is mostly a problem for the heavily populated eastern seaboard—that megalopolis of 31 million people stretching from New Hampshire to Newport News.

Indeed it is a problem for us in the East. But there is a real opportunity for the many smaller rapidly growing urban areas all over the country to acquire open space out beyond the fringe at reasonable cost so that when the growth and development and expansion does come, the open space will be there as an integral part of the total community.

And we need the open space for a variety of reasons—for recreation needs that cannot be met by the backyard or a weekend drive to the country. We need it to prevent the spread of gray areas, to enhance adjacent property values, to provide relief from the monotony of continuous suburban development, to serve as buffers to keep communities from merging into an indistinguishable blob, to protect stream valleys, forest preserves, flood plains, and prime agricultural land.

We influence land use patterns when we preserve land for open space; we influence it when we decide to subdivide the land for residential development.

One problem that I don't think has received sufficient attention is the nearly total commitment of nearly all our suburban communities to uniformly low-density residential development.

We seem to have given very little thought to the fact that low-density sprawl means greater costs for more schools, more roads, more public facilities of almost every kind, and less open space. Then, of course, there will be the repair bills to pay when all these relatively new facilities begin to wear out.

A very revealing illustration of the comparative costs of different types of land use can be seen in the proposal of a developer to cluster some 250 homes on 6 percent of the 516-acre Whitney estate in Old Westbury, Long Island. The land was zoned 2-acre, which means with conventional development the entire tract would have been taken up by the 250 houses, and the land development costs, for earthwork, street paving, drainage, sewers, utilities, landscaping and so forth, would have been $2.7 million. By clustering the homes on only a small part of the tract in a series of two- or three-family town houses, each with a private patio, the land development costs for the same facilities would have been $1.1 million—a saving of $1.6 million. And 94 percent of the very lovely land would have remained in its natural state—to the benefit of the residents and to the benefit of the town which would have gained from the enhanced value of the adjacent property.

I am sorry to report that this proposal did not gain the approval of the town fathers, but I think it illustrates the important economic implications that lie behind the zoning ordinance.

I am sure all of you have experienced occasions where prime industrial land needed for the future development of your area has been nibbled away by residential development because funds weren't available for acquisition on the land. Then there is the problem of acquiring land for highways, which could be done in advance at tremendously less cost, but usually isn't because of lack of funds or statutory authority.

Edward Higbee, in his informative book, "The Squeeze," described the costs involved in building a highway through a small community out on Long Island. Just before the suburban development was built in the early 1950's, he writes, the land "might have cost between $2,000 and $4,000 per acre. Once it had been covred with split-levels, the condemnation charges had risen to perhaps $50,000 per acre—and it takes 60 acres per mile to build a modern expressway. To cut a 10-mile swath through settled communities, in order to make roads leading to other newer communities beyond, can cost as much as $30 million."

At $4,000 an acre 10 years ago, the land for the same 10 miles of highway would have cost only $4 million.

I think it is fair to say that the subject of urban land use is overripe for serious study at all levels of Government.

It might interest you to know that I had the pleasure of introducing an administration proposal, in conjunction with my open space bill, which would have provided loans for the acquisition of land for future public or private development. Unfortunately, this proposal received no serious consideration, largely because there were so many other things to talk about during the hearings on the housing bill.

This proposal was directed toward the kinds of problems I have mentioned—the need for land for future industrial development, for future highways, schools, parks and so forth. I think we ought to be giving much more thought to this problem than we have been, and I hope some consideration will be given next year.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Finally, I would like to touch on the problem of urban transportation. I don't think I will be saying anything to cause the rocks to fly, but I will say that someday we—all of us—have got to start coming to grips with that wonderful and infernal thing we call the automobile.

It is one of the great paradoxes that the invention that gave more people more physical freedom than anything else in our history is now on the verge of tying almost all of us into paralyzing knots at least two times a day.

Probably no one has ever devised a more cunning device of human torture—in peacetime at least—than the traffic jam.

And its economic implications are staggering. Each year we lose more than $5 billion in traffic jams, through wages lost, lower retail sales, higher costs for moving freight, overly rapid depreciation of vehicles, and so forth. The cost of accidents is even greater, estimated at about $6 billion a year.

This problem of traffic congestion in our larger urban and metropolitan areas manifestly cannot be solved by highways alone, as the President noted in his housing message to Congress.

But even if we were willing to take the tax increases in an effort to meet all our transportation needs with an urban highway program averaging some $10 million or more a mile, there is every possibility that the remedy would only succeed in killing the patient—by replacing valuable tax ratable property with nontaxable concrete and asphalt, by creating huge downtown parking

demands which would further remove land for commercial and cultural purposes, and by slowly carving away the very activities that created the demand for access in the first place.

I don't think there is any question that we need limited access highways to meet urban transportation needs that can be met in no other way.

But improvement of inherently more efficient and less space-consuming forms of modern mass transportation is an absolute necessity if our cities are to survive the onslaught of the automobile and continue as viable structures for human existence and enterprise.

The only alternative is a massive decentralization of our metropolitan areas, which, if pursued, could easily cover every square mile of land in the country with developments within a few hundred years, given our present population growth rate.

Even the short-range future gives cause for concern. The urban population today is over 100 million, and 90 percent of our national population growth will occur in and around our urban areas. The number of vehicles on the road today is around 70 million. By 1975, that number is expected to climb to well over 100 million.

At the same time, we have been suffering a serious decline in ridership on all forms of mass transportation. Since 1950, the decline has been 38 percent. More than 300 smaller towns have lost all forms of public transportation completely, despite the fact that half of our population is not able to drive: the young, the old, the infirm, and those too poor to own an automobile.

Because of these trends, there has been a tendency to assume that this is a dying and unnecessary service, not worth preserving.

But it is important to point out that most of this decline has occurred in off-peak hours and on weekends. The decline in rush hour use has been much smaller, and in many areas is showing an upturn.

But we have tended to overlook the fact that if we allow this service to go under, the alternative costs would be staggering. For example, your own organization has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose just their rail commuter service, it would cost $31 billion with 30-year, 4 percent financing to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people.

The trouble is that this loss in passenger revenue, combined with rising operating costs, is making it harder and harder for the railroad and bus companies to stay alive, without taking retrenching action, which merely makes the service less desirable.

Despite the almost total lack of imaginative effort in this field, there are some illustrations of the potential for progress if funds are made available.

Several years ago, the Boston and Albany Railroad, down to about 3,000 riders a day on its Highland branch line, was petitioning strenuously to eliminate all its service. The Boston MTA took over the 11-mile line, linked it up with the subway system, turned it into rapid transit-type service, and is now pushing the figure of 30,000 riders a day, despite the fact that it isn't really rapid service operating on an exclusive right of way.

Philadelphia entered into a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad to provide more frequent service at lower fares on a line running out to Chestnut Hill. The experiment proved so successful, increasing ridership by some 30 percent and reducing by 400 the number of cars coming into the downtown each day, that the program is being expanded to other lines, and now the counties are so interested that they plan to enter into a compact with the city to improve rail transportation for the region as a whole.

Chicago can point to two significant developments. The first being the almost unprecedented phenomenon of a railroad making money on its commuter service. Not much money, to be sure, but in the black. That railroad is the Chicago and Northwestern, under the aggressive, far-sighted leadership of its chairman, Ben Heineman, who is providing modern, clean and courteous service to the commuters.

The second is the rapid transit system operating in the median strip of the Congress Street Expressway. This line is operating at only about 25 percent of its capacity, but it is already carrying more rush-hour traffic than the 8-lane highway, which is operating at full capacity. The value of this transit line is immeasurable, when you think of what would happen if the transit riders were forced to their cars on this already crowded highway.

Many other cities are far advanced in the planning stages, and with the acceptance by the Federal Government of its proper responsibility in this problem of national concern, and with the full efforts of our State and local governments, we should begin to get the creaking wheels turning again.

As I stated in the beginning, I have chosen just some of the problem areas that concern me. There are many others, from water pollution to family relocation.

In discussing these particular problems, I should stress that they are inter-related and, indeed, inseparable problems. It is my hope that the Housing and Home Finance Agency will begin to coordinate its programs more effectively in the future, so that they help to complement one another, rather than conflict with each other as they sometimes do. Creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs should go a long way toward providing that coordination, and I hope that someday we will see all our Federal aid programs geared into comprehensive, area-wide plans for the urban and metropolitan areas—plans for the people, of the people, and by the people whose lives are being affected by them.

If this planning and coordination is achieved, I think we will have a fighting chance of becoming the masters of our urban destiny, rather than the victims of it.

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, this year the 75th anniversary of Yeshiva University will be celebrated. This great institution of learning is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

It is now engaged in a $30 million development program to meet the unprecedented challenge facing higher education. The concept of the broadening of its educational facilities is embodied in the ideals of a Yeshiva University City. On this subject, President Kennedy said as follows:

With the past 75 years as a foundation, the next 75 can only be an era of outstanding achievement for the university and for the Nation. The ideal of a Yeshiva University City is appealing and I wish you every success.

This year a $3 million five-story classroom and administration building will be opened at the university's main center in Manhattan's Washington Heights. It will be followed by another men's residence hall and gymnasium-recreation center. Eight of Yeshiva University's 17 schools and divisions are located at the main center, which is bounded by West 184th and 187th Streets, Audubon Avenue, and Laurel Hill Terrace. Here, on ground hallowed by Revolutionary War conflict, American Jewry is manifesting its belief in the Nation's democratic heritage by helping to expand its educational structure as well as to assume increased responsibilities in the areas of research and community service. The Washington Heights development program will cost $6 million and will be a major factor in enabling the university to accommodate the expected doubling of enrollment.

A 10-year program to create an entirely new campus area, at a cost of $24 million has been blueprinted as part of the Riverside-Amsterdam slum clearance project on Manhattan's West Side. In an area flanked by West 83d and 86th Streets, Amsterdam Avenue and Broadway, the center will house the graduate school of education, school of social work, and graduate school of science. Also scheduled for construction are a classroom building and residence hall for Stern College for Women and Teachers Institute for Women.

Herman Wouk, the distinguished American author, has set forth the basis for the educational and physical expansion of Yeshiva University in an article appearing in the New York Times on September 10, 1961.

The article follows:

Ever since the Jewish people began their history by crossing the Red Sea dry-shod, they have met their crises with acts bizarre, sweeping, and more or less miraculous. The fantastic rebirth of the state of Israel was their answer to the nearly mortal blow of the Nazi holocaust. The creation of Yeshiva University, and the new kind of education is symbolizes, was their response to a blow no less staggering. Though the blow was diffuse and unmarked by bloodshed, it almost ended Judaism. It was the delayed impact of the Renaissance and the age of enlightenment.

This blow struck like thunder about 1800 with the fall of the ghetto walls. Mewed up in the grim muddy stockades, the Jews had preserved their religion almost unchanged for 500 years in forms and terms of the middle ages. One day they were studying basic works which were encyclopedic and profound, but medieval in temper. The next day, so to speak, they faced Copernicus, Newton, Hume, Voltaire, Rousseau, Darwin, and Marx. The wonder is not that Judaism underwent a racking intellectual convulsion. The wonder is that Judaism lives.

It not only lives, it has risen to the challenge in a way that nobody could have predicted even 50 years ago.

The academic achievements and the physical scope of Yeshiva University are imposing enough: 17 schools, 5,000 students, ever-mounting honors. But the symbol of what the Jews have achieved in this school is the chief thing. A great world religion, the

source of the Western idea of God, faced death under the onslaught of the naturalism of modern times. It seemed without resources to hang on and recover. It had no apologetics to keep step with the march of thought. It had been unaware of the intellectual changes that had thrown the Bible down as the source of final truth, discredited the posture of faith, and put all the dignity of intelligent opinion behind naturalistic reason.

The "yeshiva" was the place where for two millenia the Jews had studied. It was a sort of divinity school, except that one learned all subjects under its roof. Its main instrument of study was the Talmud, a record of the great debates of seven centuries of sages. The Talmud debates had closed around the year 500. After that there were classical commentaries and philosophical works within the Talmudic frame, at their most daring introducing some of the thoughts of Aristotle and Plato. As an instrument for education in the world of today, the yeshiva seemed utterly outmoded and eclipsed by the modern university. Indeed students streamed out of the yeshivas into universities as soon as the Jews were set free.

Yeshiva University, early in the 19th century, took under the roof of the old yeshiva, and made into required study subjects, the entire curriculum of modern Western culture; the very culture which seemed to prove that the yeshiva was done for. In so doing, its far-sighted founders crystallized a pattern for Jewish education which is rapidly becoming a new norm.

This act would have been less daring if the textbooks and teachers of the Western curriculum had undergone a careful policing to be sure that all the conflicts were reconciled, smoothed over, or censored. The founders of Yeshiva University did no such thing. To this day, one learns in this university the withering skepticism of modern philosophy, the unsettling concepts of physics and biology, as one learns them at Harvard or Columbia: straight, with no punches pulled, with no special terminology and no special books. At the same time one learns as an undergraduate (to the extent that one is able) the majestic Talmudic curriculum. The strain on the mind of the student is terrific.

One would expect an institution founded in such a tearing tension—the essential tension of the modern day, the tension between the dusty, bleak, threatening answers of the physical sciences and the hunger of men for God and for peace—one would expect such a school, I say, to explode from its inner contradictions. The growth of Yeshiva University has not been a serene affair. Its atmosphere is often stirred with pioneering conflicts. But the university has grown steadily and amazingly, has shown the fullest vigor of any educational institution ever created by the Jewish people, and stands now as one of America's major school plants, and the strongest center of learning that world Jewry possesses. But it is not stopping there. Its new plans for expansion will make it such a powerful instrument of service to New York City and State, to the United States, and to the Jews of the world, that it will be one of the glories of Hebrew history.

In many of the graduate and professional schools, religion is not part of the curriculum. At the great Albert Einstein College of Medicine, for instance, students are admitted and faculty members appointed without regard to their religious background. The business in hand is healing, a concern of all human beings, not a religious preoccupation. At the college, however, where one's view of life takes shape, students who are deeply religious, or only questing for religion, or even very skeptical of it, encounter the full range of Jewish thought and practice, together with the liberal arts and sciences.

American Jewry at the present hour is divided and uncertain in its theological views. Yet Yeshiva University has been created and sustained not only by committed religious Jews, but by this whole powerful, active, and largely secular Jewry. For the instinct to survive, and to continue the life of the Jewish spirit, lives in the heart of the American Jewish community. Even the most skeptical see in the university an instrument for survival, a crucible in which the Judaism of the 21st century can be forged. If the skeptics are right, the Judaism that is coming must change radically from the faith of our fathers both in thought and practice. The traditionalists believe that this is a hasty and wrong guess; that the Mosaic Torah which lived through Babylon, Greece, Rome, and the European ghetto has its ground in an inspired vision of human nature and will endure, revitalized. In any case, the true form of the future religion can only rise from a total confrontation of the old and the new. That confrontation is Yeshiva University. It is the very name of the school.

There are people, some of them quite persuasive and sure of themselves, both within Jewry and without it, who hold that Judaism has come to the end of the line; that the state of Israel is an ephemeral accident of modern nationalism; that the Jewish people have nothing more to contribute to mankind; that the curtain is about to fall on the long drama of the House of Abraham. To such people, Yeshiva University is a quixotic undertaking.

But the builders of the university believe that these pessimists misread history. Yeshiva University is dedicated to the proposition that the mission of the eternal people stands, and that the Bible, read with new understanding in the light of all men have learned in the brilliant modern era, remains the first source of guidance for man's conduct. The study of Scripture, and its halo of lore in the long literature of Judaism, is viewed as a discipline of the highest value.

In the state of Israel, the House of Abraham is proving itself equal to the harsh stresses of modern politics. In Yeshiva University, the old house has undertaken to master modern knowledge in the light of its Torah, its ancient law, and so to continue serving mankind as God's witness in history. The school is a noble enterprise. It has already had remarkable success. In its future success may lie more hope than one dares put into words.

The Role of Freedom in the American Achievement—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, among the many major industrial firms in my district is the American Can Co., which operates a plant in Washington, N.J.

This company, of necessity, has plants located throughout the country in order to serve the needs of food processors and the many other industries which merchandise their products in metal containers. As a matter of fact, the container industry no longer is confined merely to metal containers, but its knowledge and techniques have also been applied to plastics in the form of squeeze tubes manufactured by their Sun Tube division and paper cartons of every form and description.

Recently, a prominent writer, Harold Fleming, wrote a series of articles on the contribution of American business to our economy. He cited the achievements of the American Can Co. and its adaptations to our changing economic and social scene as an example to illustrate his basic thesis. All of these articles were published in a pamphlet entitled "The American Achievement."

Mr. Fleming is a native of Salem, Mass. He was graduated from Harvard College in 1920 and has specialized in history, government and economics. At one time he served as an economist and statistician for former President Hoover in connection with the American Relief Administration in Europe, and subsequently he spent a period in Russia and China. During the past 20 years, Mr. Fleming has served as a weekly commentator for the Mutual and later the NBC networks. He has also been a correspondent for the London Sunday Times, the London Financial Times, and the Gothenburg Handels-Tidningen, a Swedish newspaper.

There are few individuals who are as well qualified to appraise the achievements of an outstanding American firm in terms that will be understood by our citizens who are the principal beneficiaries of every industrial organization through their role as consumers.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first chapter of "The American Achievement," entitled "Freedom":

FREEDOM

THE MATERIAL ACHIEVEMENT

Everybody knows the tremendous material advance this country has made since World War II. Nearly everybody knows it by having shared in it. The current of energy that flows through American work and play has increased fast in 15 years.

But these postwar economic gains are only the latest installment of an American achievement that has been underway for more than 150 years. Since the signing of the U.S. Constitution, the American economic system has been growing at the same rate as in the last decade and a half.

And as these economic gains have been adding to each other, decade after decade, like compound interest, the result has been more material progress in 170 years than in the previous 1,700 years.

When this all began, everyday life in American towns and cities was not much different from everyday life in the towns and cities of the Roman empire. The similarity was even greater on the farm, where most people lived. Tools and methods had changed little in 2,000 years. Then, rapidly, they began to change.

THE POLITICAL ACHIEVEMENT

With this material progress, we have also had our political freedom—the greatest of nonmaterial, spiritual values. In this country's history, more people have been free to mind their own business, and have had fewer people to mind their business for them, than in almost any other place or time in human history. Millions of Europeans came here, not in search of material wealth, for

this country at first had little of it, but because this was a land of liberty and of opportunity.

We Americans are inclined to take for granted this combination of material progress and of personal liberty. But the assumption that they go together is being challenged today all over the world—and even in this country. The contrary idea is spreading, helped by the Russians, that economic progress and political freedom cannot go together. A new fashion of thinking says that nations must make a choice between the one or the other—progress or freedom. The idea is that the two are incompatible—that a nation cannot have both at the same time.

The new theory goes still further. It says that economic progress must come first, and freedom later; that, in fact, it is only material economic progress that can lead to freedom. The Russians, for instance, say that they will outgrow us in economics, meaning that after that (perhaps) they will have political freedom. And some of the underdeveloped countries say that they are too poor to enjoy freedom of enterprise (or in some cases even freedom of speech).

This is diametrically opposite to American experience and history.

The United States started as an underdeveloped country. It had no net capital. It was heavily in debt and operating on borrowed money. It had no railroads, no factories, no steel mills, nor any other kind of sizable capital accumulation.

In fact it had only one real asset of any importance. And this was not an economic asset at all, but a political one. Many other countries were far ahead of us in the major economic assets of the day—ships, roads, machinery, skilled labor, coal, iron, gold and silver. This country's almost unique asset was the idea of a meticulously limited government. It was written into the Constitution. It was put most briefly in the Bill of Rights. It was a reverse English on the European idea that a "government knows best." It was the idea of freedom from not only George the Third's government, but from any government.

THE INVENTION OF FREEDOM

The idea of individual freedom, as a general good in itself, on which this country was founded, and from which the American achievement started, was an invention. It was as new in its day as the telephone, the gasoline engine, or the metal container were in their day.

It was the product of many men's thoughts and struggles. Its invention was a long story, and, for us, a lucky historic accident. The final breakthrough came only after centuries of trial and error. We have the English largely to thank for it.

Historians trace the river of our forefathers' ideas about freedom back at least seven centuries, to the English Magna Carta of 1215 A.D. This was a written statement of rights against the Crown, which the feudal barons exacted from King John at Runnymede, up the Thames River from London. It most famous clause was that "No freeman shall be imprisoned, or dispossessed * * * unless by the lawful judgment of his equals, or by the law of the land."

These words had the same meaning then as if, in the 20th century, they had been forced upon Germany's Hitler, Russia's Khrushchev, or Cuba's Castro.

And the rights thus written down came to be known as "the immemorial rights of Englishmen."

The feudal barons were later replaced by national governments in Spain, France, and England. And these governments, as is the nature of governments, took to economic planning. Under the "mercantilist" idea, they tried to regulate everything they could control—exports, imports, wages, production, prices, etc. They granted monopolies and supported privileges.

To our everlasting fortune in this country, the English government was the least efficient and least determined of these governments. Queen Elizabeth, the Cal Coolidge of her day, answered most economic problems by doing nothing about them. Charles I's pretensions got him beheaded. Cromwell's absolutism ended the Commonwealth. James II's programs got him exiled. Magna Carta was revived.

Meantime, colonizing the New World became the growth industry of its time. And, true to form, the Spanish and French governments tried to run their colonies as government ventures, but the less ambitious English government gave its colonists little more than a charter and its blessing. The English colonies were private ventures, free to sink or swim on their own.

And on their own, they soon began to swim mightily. They had put 3,000 miles of the Atlantic Ocean between them and the European hodge-podge of feudal-inherited, or government-protected, privileges, monopolies, customs and restrictions.

In the New World, the farmer no longer had to live in town and decide next year's planting program in committee. He could move out, live in the middle of his farm, and run it as he pleased, raising such crops as he chose, either for himself or for the market. The English-born workman in the New World was free to move about, to charge what wages he could get, or to set up his own shop. And the colonial merchant was free to buy and sell wherever, whenever, and at whatever prices he saw fit. These were new and heady freedoms.

After the colonists began to thrive, the British Government began trying to fit them into its economic plans. They didn't fit very well. George III came to the throne in 1760. He was conscientious and German in his planning for his subjects. Among other things he decided that the American colonists should not move over the Appalachians. Eventually the colonists revolted, not as Americans but as Englishmen. And up came Magna Carta again. For instance the Massachusetts Assembly in declaring the Stamp Act void, said that it was "against Magna Carta and the natural rights of Englishmen, and therefore * * * void."

Thus the immemorial rights of Englishmen, transplanted to the edge of the wilderness, became the natural rights of Americans, against the Crown.

These rights were sometimes separately defined, as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of movement, and freedom of property. But their histories all ran parallel. And by the time of the Revolution, they were recognized as interrelated and as essentially all the same thing—freedom from government interference. Thus, freemen recognized what all totalitarian governments recognize, that the rights of conscience, association, speech and property, rise and fall together. A government that can shut a man's mouth can also take his property, and vice versa.

Until this time, in all Western history, the basic political idea had been that the government should have all rights except those specifically granted to citizens. But now, for the first time, this idea was inverted. Citizens should have all rights except those specifically granted to the government.

This was such a historic breakthrough that Tom Paine, the voice of the American Revolution, wrote in his "Common Sense" pamphlet:

"We have it in our power to begin the world over again. A situation, similar to the present, hath not happened since the days of Noah until now."

And the Founding Fathers wrote this unprecedented, upside-down idea of government into the U.S. Constitution. They framed the weakest government they thought could fill the barest essential needs for a government.

THE BUSINESS END OF THE CONSTITUTION

Into this Constitution, the authors put an assurance that a man could own his own inventions and writings for a limited time (art. I, sec. 8); that the States should not issue paper money (art. I, sec. 10); that the States should not pass any law abridging the obligation of contract (art. I, sec. 10); that this Nation would be a common market (art. I, sec. 10); and that (echoing Magna Carta) no person should be deprived of his property without due process of law (art. V, Bill of Rights).

These are the so-called business clauses of the Constitution. They opened the way for the free enterprise which has produced the American economic achievement. They led to economic adventure, competition, obsolescence, and sharing.

I intend to discuss these results in the chapters that follow.

Economic Problems of the United States—Labor Day Address by George M. Harrison

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on Labor Day Mr. George M. Harrison, vice president, AFL–CIO, and grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, delivered an address over the CBS radio network. This recognized labor leader, labor statesman, and fine citizen in his address touched upon some of the vital problems relating to the position of the United States in world affairs and also to some of the very pressing economic problems, particularly as they bear upon the working people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. HARRISON, VICE PRESIDENT, AFL–CIO, AND GRAND PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CLERKS, CINCINNATI, OHIO, OVER CBS RADIO NETWORK, SEPTEMBER 4, 1961

My fellow Americans, the American people, including members of the trade union movement, approach this Labor Day with mixed feelings.

In one sense, we can look back upon the last year as a period of progress. The new Congress, led by the new administration, has enacted a considerable amount of constructive legislation in such fields as minimum wages, housing, social security, and area redevelopment. Obviously we are better off, both in spirit and in substance, than we were a year ago.

In this same context we can reasonably expect additional gains. There is an encouraging amount of nonpartisan and bipartisan agreement on the need for better schools, better medical care, stronger measures to insure equal opportunity for all citizens and many other long-deferred domestic improvements. Both complacency on the

one hand and defeatism on the other have given way to a revived determination to attack the imperfections in our American way of life.

That is the bright side of the picture. But as we all know, there is another side as well.

Every citizen must now be aware of the immediate threat to our country and to all free nations that is posed by the Soviet Union. Our Nation is taking the necessary steps in military terms to meet that threat. We are wisely strengthening our Armed Forces as a deterrent to Communist aggression. We hope that these steps will serve their purpose, so that the horror of atomic war can be averted.

Yet, assuming that we succeed in avoiding open warfare, we must still face another challenge to our survival. Premier Khrushchev has said, again and again, that he will "bury us", not by bombs, but by economic force—by the success of the Soviet Union in its industrial development and in its appeal to the peoples of other nations.

I want to discuss with you, for a few minutes, this particular challenge—the economic challenge.

Let us begin by considering the basic purpose of any social or political organization of mankind. Since the dawn of history, societies have been organized for only one reason—the advancement of those who are a part of that society. At first, in the primitive times, the purely selfish motive was predominant. Everyone outside the group, the tribe or clan, was an enemy; and even inside the group, there were struggles to the death for power and preference.

Slowly, as the centuries passed, the true meaning of the Christian message grew stronger in its influence on society. Men learned that each society must be measured by its benefits to all its members, not just to a few; and that the vitality and real power of a society grow as it more nearly provides the greatest good for the greatest number.

This principle has been proved in war and peace, time after time, by many peoples—the British, the French, the Scots, the Irish, often by citizen warriors who overcame apparently insuperable odds by the strength of their convictions, by their fierce defense of a society that offered them hope, if nothing more.

It is against that background that we must look at our own society, in the face of the Communist challenge.

Despite the progress I mentioned earlier, we have in our country more than 5 million persons who are ready, willing and able to work—but for whom no jobs are available.

That number is likely to go up, not down, with the passing months—even though there's a continued increase in economic activity and the general level of business activity.

We will have more and more people out of work for two reasons: The continuing increase in our population, and the rapid rate of our technological progress which in turn reduces employment opportunities.

Let's look at these two factors separately.

Over the last decade, that is 1950 to 1960, we had a net increase of about 820,000 a year in our labor force each year. Taking all the youngsters who came in from school, and subtracting the old folks who retired or died, the increase in the labor force amounted to about 820,000 a year, as an average.

We haven't done a very good job of absorbing these new workers. Since the end of the Korean war, unemployment has gone up from less than 2½ percent of the work force to about 7 percent.

Beginning this year, and for as many years as anyone can see, the average net increase in the work force will be not 820,000 a year but at least 1,300,000. That's an extra half million a year.

Where are they going to find work?

Now take the second factor, technological progress.

In my own industry, railroads, at least 500,000 workers have been eliminated in the last 15 years by technological changes. Yet the railroads are carrying more goods—more miles.

We find the same thing in auto, in steel, in almost every manufacturing industry—greater output, fewer workers. Taking the country as a whole, there are fewer full-time jobs for workers right now than there were 8 years ago.

This question of jobs would be serious even in a peaceful world. It is doubly serious when our whole concept of a free society is challenged by an arrogant and aggressive tyranny.

Therefore I say, on this Labor Day, that our No. 1 need is for an expanding economy that will fully use our industrial resources and provide jobs for all. It is our No. 1 need to refute the propaganda of the Communists; it is our No. 1 need to insure the healthy society that is the best defense against all forms of totalitarianism.

We need more Federal leadership to promote that end. We need less caution and more optimism about our future—about the future of freedom, about the ability of a free society to fulfill its destiny. I say we need more Federal leadership. We now hear from those who are opposed to social progress. They say we cannot afford to do the things that need to be done in this area because of our expenditures for our military needs. I say we cannot afford not to do these things that are necessary to the full utilization of our resources.

We also need statesmanship from industry; a revival of the old willingness to take a risk on a good product at a low price, a revival of the genuine competitive capitalist spirit, if capitalism is to effectively serve our society.

What we don't need, surely, is an increasing concentration of ownership through corporate mergers to eliminate competition and to preserve rigged prices that bear no semblance to the cost of production with a fair profit.

I mention this point with special feeling. In the railroad industry, over the last few years, we have had an unprecedented series of merger proposals, some of which have already been carried out.

We in the railroad unions are not opposed to mergers in themselves, any more than the AFL–CIO as a whole is opposed to mergers in other fields that promise to serve the public interest. Neither are we opposed to technological changes—even those that eliminate jobs—as long as they really increase efficiency without cutting down on the safety of railroad operation, but we do insist that the railways do have an obligation to protect the workers against undue burdens and hardships. But too often, unfortunately, we find employers in many industries too intent upon built-in profits, regardless of volume—to fulfill the real promise of the private-enterprise system.

Many of the prospective railroad mergers are based upon the objective of reducing public service and increasing profits. There is a rail line serving a famous seashore area which—according to its management—is a liability. I would suggest that a proper investment in air-conditioned coaches, clean cars and good service would take thousands of automobiles off the highways to the profit and comfort of all. Yet as things are now going, the line may well be doomed and so may be the jobs of many hundreds of workers.

But let me return to the general problem.

We in these United States are the showcase throughout the world for human freedom, personal liberty, social justice and economic decency. While we hold high the light of freedom we must demonstrate that we are concerned about the welfare of the individual. We must demonstrate that our political and economic system produces a better life for all and advancement for every American regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

We must, in short, hold high the banner of equal opportunity for all.

Surely, these ideals are as appropriate for Labor Day as for Independence Day. The trade union cause is inseparable from the cause of human freedom for it is truly the cause of mankind as a whole.

I said at the start that all Americans reach this holiday, this special memorial to the workingman, with mixed feelings. Now let me add another thought.

In a democratic society, like ours, our destiny is truly in our own hands. We can rise to the challenge of our time as our forefathers rose to the challenges of the past. We can have an economy of abundance—full use of our resources and full employment if we are determined to reach this goal. We have the material resources, skills and financial strength but we must be willing to use them.

I suggest that our society must meet and solve the unemployment problem for the well-being of America and the cause of economic decency, so, on this holiday dedicated to working men and women, I hope that all Americans—employers, professionals, government leaders as well as wage earners—will, in turn, dedicate themselves to the achievement of this American opportunity for all.

Nation's Small Businessmen Strongly Oppose Free Delivery of Communist Propaganda

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business regularly polls its membership of over 170,000 on key issues before the country.

The NFIB Mandate No. 268 recently contained the question: "Should the Post Office carry Communist propaganda free?"

The results, forwarded to me by Mr. George P. Burger, vice president of the NFIB, show 90 percent opposed to this distribution of Communist propaganda. Only 7 percent favored the distribution and 3 percent indicated no opinion.

This is graphic evidence of the support in the Nation for legislation such as that I introduced, H.R. 9004, which would ban from our mails any material found by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

I am pleased to report also that a number of our colleagues have joined me in introducing this legislation, including the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the mutual security or giveaway bill was before the House, listening to some of its supporters one would think a tornado of support for a continuation of this program was sweeping the country.

Not knowing the sentiment in other district or States, except from letters written me, it is impossible to make an accurate evaluation of the overall sentiment of our people.

From the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, notwithstanding the clamor of a few who habitually insist upon what they call a liberal program and who sometimes advocate the disbursement of other people's money—not their own—and from the Sturgis Journal, a daily published in St. Joseph County, comes this editorial published on the 8th of September, last. Permit me to read:

ARE WE AMERICANS OR ARE WE MICE?

A recent cartoon in the New Yorker Magazine showed a newspaper vendor making his pitch for business by shouting "get your bad news here." While most of the news in recent weeks has been ominous there have been a few bright spots.

One was a news dispatch stating that Czechoslovakia has joined Russia in demanding that the United Nations be moved out of New York and reestablished in Europe.

Well, what are we waiting for? Let's take advantage of the proposal before they change their minds. By relocating the United Nations in Europe we would be rid of one of the worst hair shirts a nation ever devised for its own discomfort.

Another news report disclosed that Congress has approved an appropriation of $32,204,000 to pay this country's assessment for the U.N.'s efforts to establish peace in the Congo. Has anybody heard of any peace in the Congo? The United States has no troops there, but as usual we are footing most of the bills.

It seems, too, that the United Nations has some delinquent members who refuse to pay their dues (assessments). Among these free loaders are Cuba, Russia, and France. Many of the smaller newly formed African nations enjoy preferential status and pay only token assessments. This is understandable and justifiable. They just don't have the dough, but it is significant that, when the chips are down, they vote against the interests of the United States.

In private clubs and organizations members who fail to pay their dues and assessments are warned and if they fail to pay up in a reasonable length of time they are kicked out. Instead of expelling such delinquents as Cuba, Russia, and France, how does the U.N. handle the problem? The United Nations keeps them in good standing by dipping into its general fund and paying their assessments for them. And where does the general fund come from? You guessed it. The United States contributes 32 percent of it and to that extent we are subsidizing the recalcitrant nations and furnishing them with a sounding board to spread their poisonous anti-American propaganda. It should be explained that France has discontinued its payments in disgust over the Bizerte incident. Russia never has supported the U.N. except as a means to further its plans for communizing the world. Now the Soviet Union, a fellow member of the U.N., has resumed testing its bombs and is threatening to scorch us to death. Will the U.N. take any action against the world's bully?

It is true that it would be a hardship on some of the delegates who have been living it up in New York in a style they never dreamed of back in the jungles of Africa, to be deprived of their luxurious living and forced to return to their tribal customs and fare but at least they would be out of our hair and off our backs.

Isn't it time that Americans stand up for the interests and dignity of their own country?

M.P.H.

As to how some other countries or, perhaps more accurately, some of the people of other countries, appreciate our help is indicated by the following from the U.S. News & World Report, dated September 18, 1961. Permit me to quote:

TWO MEN REPORTED EATEN BY CANNIBALS

LONDON.—Two white men were killed and eaten by cannibals in Katanga Province of the Congo, a London newspaper, the People, reported.

The victims were said to be a South African officer and a wounded British Army private who was being driven to a hospital by the officer.

The newspaper said the South African's father had verified the story in a trip to Katanga.

Not Very Uncommitted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Sukarno of Indonesia arrived here as a representative of the unalined nations which attended the Belgrade Conference recently. I remember when he visited here last spring as Chief of State of the guided democracy of Indonesia.

Since that time the position of President Sukarno toward the Soviet bloc is clearer than ever before in light of his tragic silence on Russian nuclear testing and the pronounced anti-Western character of his Belgrade Conference statements. At Belgrade Sukarno spoke boldly of Indonesian socialism and proclaimed, "We drew scientific socialism from Marx."

Dr. Sukarno is not very uncommitted, as the Puget Sound Mail, a weekly newspaper published at La Conner, Wash., would say. I fear there are other leaders of unalined nations who fall in the same category. On September 7, 1961, this oldest existing weekly newspaper in Washington State published an editorial which I believe will interest the Members of this body. The editorial follows:

NOT VERY UNCOMMITTED

Good for a sarcastic snort is the "uncommitted nations' label tacked to the recent Belgrade Conference. Some of those nations are as uncommitted as a jealous suitor in the springtime. We note that the conference took a crack at the United States continuing on at its Guantanamo Navy base in Cuba under treaty right. They also took cracks at colonialism. But said nothing about their own border disputes, their own minority group troubles, or the Communist bloc domination of subject states. Some of them are a bunch of sanctimonious hypocrites.

K.'s Larger Aim: Neutralized West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond is of real importance and significance. It appeared in the Washington Post of September 13.

Mr. Drummond looks ahead, and what he sees is alarming. It seems to me that at least he is seeing face to face, and not just looking through a glass darkly, and seeing what he wants to see.

The United States has got to face up to facts, however unpleasant, and wake up to reality before it is too late:

K.'s LARGER AIM: NEUTRALIZED WEST GERMANY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BONN.—As has happened so often in the past, Nikita Khrushchev is looking farther ahead than the Western Allies.

While we have our eyes and our hopes on West Berlin, Khrushchev has his eyes and his plans fixed on West Germany. We see the coming negotiations as a means of saving what is left of Berlin.

To Mr. K., the Berlin negotiations are not the end, they are just the waymark on the road to a much larger and—to us—calamitous objective. It is increasingly evident his purpose is to use gradual detachment of West Berlin from Western protection and influence as the means of detaching the whole of West Germany from the Western Alliance.

West Berlin is not the main prize that the Soviet Union is after. An unarmed, intimidated, neutralized West Germany is the prize.

This is really the stake in the Berlin negotiations and if we see the stake as anything else, we will find ourselves helping Khrushchev to win his own game—to our undoing.

What is the prospect and what are the means by which the Soviets can reach this shattering objective?

Obviously it is not sure for Mr. K. by any means, but such a result could well come about unless we are totally aware that this is what he is after. What makes it a serious possibility is that the events in East Germany and Berlin in the past 3 weeks have thrust new and powerful political weapons in his hands.

Most of the preliminary steps to beginning the long-range drive to unhinge West Germany from its Western alliance have already been taken.

East Berlin has been annexed to East Germany, locked body and soul behind the Khrushchev wall.

The Soviets have swallowed up East Germany and are now in the process of rapidly digesting it into their Eastern European satellite empire.

West Berlin has been snuffed out as a free world show window behind the Iron Curtain and has become little more than a geographical location—no longer symbolizing the hope of a united Germany.

The prospect of German unification has now completely vanished before the very eyes of the German people who, though knowing in their hearts it had become a dream, can now no longer cherish even the dream.

What we have to realize is that the openly visible, permanently decisive division of Germany, which the Soviets will seal with a separate "peace" treaty soon, can have far-reaching political consequences in West Germany which can be only faintly foreseen.

What would the American reaction be if we had lost the war and the Japanese had occupied a third of the United States for 16 years and established an iron-heeled, iron-willed regime run from Tokyo with a puppet capital in Denver?

We would yearn and hope and strive to reunite the Nation—and would rely on our friends to help do so. But what would our feelings be if, in the end, the Japanese signed a treaty with its obedient Japanese regime in western America and annexed it formally?

That is what the Soviets have done to a third of Germany and right now inevitably there will be many German people and not a few German leaders asking: "Have we misplaced our trust in the Western alliance? If only the Russians can give us a united nation, even if it has to be a totally disarmed and neutralized Germany, may not this be better than to live permanently divided?"

The Adenauer government believes no such thing. But what of the next German Government, and the next? Mr. K. is not thinking of next month or next year; he can wait—and work—in the hope that the Germans can be tempted to take his bait.

This is Khrushchev's aim in the coming Berlin negotiations—to begin to neutralize West Berlin in order to begin to neutralize West Germany.

Communist Slogans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a significant radio editorial was presented earlier this month over the Mutual Radio Network, an editorial which I believe all of us should read. Through the courtesy of Mr. Robert Hurleigh, the text of the editorial follows:

The Communists, throughout their existence, have been adept at coining slogans and phrases to exploit themselves. Now they have come up with a new and dangerous one.

More and more we keep hearing: "Better Red than dead." It has caught on in many places, particularly in England, where it has replaced the last Communist propaganda slogan: "Ban the bomb."

The idea behind "better Red than dead" is to make people accept the ultimate victory of communism and tell them they have two choices—become Communists or they will be killed.

It is as false a slogan as it is dangerous. The Communists are not going to win the struggle for men's minds, and the only alternative is not communism or death.

Right now the choices are freedom or slavery. Perhaps we need some slogans on our side. We know we have to keep militarily strong to meet the Communist menace. In connection with that we can say: "Better to keep ahead than become a Red."

And the West Berliners looking over the wall at their fellow Germans in East Berlin can say: "Better free than like he."

But perhaps Khrushchev should most of all remember this about us: "This nation of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Tribute to David Sarnoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 30 it was my privilege to be a guest of my Senate colleagues Senators AIKEN, MAGNUSON, PASTORE, JAVITS, and KEATING as tribute was paid to Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. The occasion of the tribute was the 55th anniversary of General Sarnoff's participation in the field of electronics.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the introductory remarks of Senator AIKEN in presenting General Sarnoff to the assembled guests at this luncheon gathering and the text of the general's response be printed in the RECORD.

It has been my pleasure to hear many outstanding speeches by our Nation's leaders and I do not know that I have ever been more moved than I was on this occasion as I listened to David Sarnoff. It is with pride I present his remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY SENATOR AIKEN

General Sarnoff, Mrs. Smith, gentlemen, we are not proceeding according to plan. Some considerate person has insisted on a live quorum over in the Senate and that necessitates a change in our plans.

Twenty-one years ago, I attended the World's Fair in New York as part of the Governor's Conference of the United States. While we were there we had a demonstration of something new. It was new to all of us—and it was called television. I don't remember what the program was but I think the Governors themselves were part of the program. What I remember best about it is that the receiving set was upstairs and the transmitting equipment was downstairs, with a floor between us. Now that seemed like a whale of a distance in those days to transmit a picture. It isn't so far now. But I didn't know at that time that the man responsible for that new and promising innovation would be honored by the Members of the Senate as their guest here today. But it certainly is appropriate that he should be.

I'm not going into his background, which is known not only to everybody here in the United States, but all over the world as well. At the age of 15 he got into his only good suit and went out and got a job. Twenty-four years later, and several suits later, he became president of the RCA and then chairman of the board. But I do want to call attention to one thing. He was first educated in a public school, but thereafter he attended the Sarnoff school—which is the best in the world, scientifically speaking—and he plans to attend that school for many years to come. Even though his formal education ended with the public schools in New York, he has been honored by receiving 21 degrees from the best colleges in our country.

Now that is a record for men, I guess. But I want to tell you, General, that you're in the presence of a champion here today because our colleague, Senator SMITH from Maine, has 36 degrees, or she did have 36 the last time I counted them. So I'm sure that you are honored by having a world's champion at this luncheon today.

This is the occasion of General Sarnoff's 55th anniversary in communications. He has been honored by scientific, industrial, military, civil, cultural groups, and now I think it's a great privilege that we Members of the U.S. Senate also honor him at this luncheon. We had planned to have my colleague, the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate, introduce some of the Senators who then would be called upon for brief remarks. However, we know what the Sergeant at Arms does to us when we don't answer rollcalls and, in order to keep us all out of jail, or out of what correspondents to jail in the Senate, I'm going to ask General Sarnoff to speak to us right now instead of later, had we gone through with the program as planned. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY DAVID SARNOFF

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate. I am unprepared for this sudden projection into the arena, and there are times in one's life when the tongue is a little dry and the mind a little overwhelmed. In the language of my profession, that makes for a poor transmitter—and that describes me at this moment. However, I am comforted by the knowledge that your receivers are unimpaired and in good tune. Therefore I would like, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, to transmit for a few minutes on the frequency that originates in the heart, without interference from that of the mind.

During the years I have spent in the electronics industry, which is worldwide in its scope, I have had to travel widely both at home and abroad. Of all my trips, four stand out in my memory and they will remain with me as long as I live. I would like to say a word or two about each of these four trips—not because I would presume upon your patience to indulge in reminiscence, but because I think that these trips, together, symbolize the spirit, the meaning, the purpose, and the opportunities of America.

My first trip was made in 1900 when I left with my mother and two brothers the country of my birth, Russia. I was then 9 years old and the oldest of the children. We sailed across the Atlantic Ocean in a small and slow ship. We traveled in the steerage and it took us more than a month to arrive in the United States—the wonderful new land of opportunity. When I arrived in New York, I was unable to speak or understand a word of English. I was in a new world, in a new society, a new people. However, it didn't take me very long to reap all the advantages of America's fine and free public school system—nor did anybody interfere with me when I worked as a newsboy before and after school hours, in order to help support myself and my family.

That was trip No. 1 in my memory.

Trip No. 2 came only 9 years later. As a boy of 16, I sailed on the S.S. *New York* of the American Line, from New York to Southampton, England. This time I traveled as the Marconi wireless operator on the ship. I was the only operator aboard, for it wasn't until the *Titanic* disaster in 1912 that a law was passed by the Congress requiring each

passenger ship to carry a complement of wireless operators who could serve around the clock. So there I was, 9 years after arriving in this country, serving as the Marconi wireless operator on a first-class passenger liner, with a first-class cabin all to myself, with a uniform and gold braid, classified as a ship's officer, messing with the captain and the other officers, and entertaining and being entertained by the first-class passengers.

That was another trip for my memory.

My third trip, 20 years later, in 1929, was on the SS *Aquitania*. I left New York for Paris as an assistant to Mr. Owen D. Young, who was Chairman of the U.S. Reparations Commission. In addition to Mr. Young, I accompanied Mr. J. P. Morgan, Mr. Thomas Lamont, and Mr. Nelson Perkins, all members of the Commission. Our mission was to reach final agreement with the Germans on the debts and other problems left by World War I, and to replace what was then the Dawes plan with what later became the Young plan. In the company of these financial and industrial giants, and working as Mr. Young's assistant, I was selected to negotiate on behalf of our allies with Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, who represented the Germans. I carried on these negotiations with Dr. Schacht for some 6 weeks. Of course, we thought then we had solved the pressing problems of that time but we found out very soon thereafter that our plans and our hopes were all dashed to the ground by Adolf Hitler who repudiated the agreement that was signed in Paris.

However, the impressive and human part of that trip to me was not only the companionship of these important men, who were much older and wiser than I, but the fact that I was a member of that group, and that we were met at Cherbourg by high officials of the French Government. This time, no passport problems, no baggage problems, no customs problems. Our reception was conducted with the pomp and protocol that the French are so expert in providing. We were taken from a special tender to a private train supplied by the French Government which whisked us to Paris and the comforts of the Ritz Hotel.

I shall never forget the moment, during this third trip, when I stood on the deck of that tender, reflecting upon this novel experience. The picture that flashed through my mind then was my first crossing of the Atlantic in the steerage. I thought of the contrast between the two trips and the fact that this could happen only in America. For it is as true today as it was then, that no other country in the world provides such vast opportunities to develop and to express whatever talents an individual may possess. On that occasion, I remember saying to myself, "God bless America." Surely I am no exception for there are many, many others in the United States who have also developed, advanced and prospered. I have tried to convey this message to the rising generation of Americans and to point out to them that in my view there are more opportunities in our country today than there were when I arrived in New York in 1900. There are more people in the world, more wants to satisfy, and more resources and tools to employ today than there were then. No American boy or girl needs to weep with Alexander that there are no more worlds to conquer.

Now I come to my fourth trip, and that has occurred only today. From New York, I have come to the Capital of this Nation to be received and honored by the distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate—the greatest deliberative body in the world. I am not sure that any man deserves so great an honor as you are bestowing upon me, but I do want to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your distinguished colleagues, how deeply moved and profoundly grateful I am for the friendship you have shown me, for this handsome tribute and this wonderful reception.

I will not presume further upon your time, because I know that you must respond to the Senate rollcall. So I simply say, with all my heart, thank you and God bless you.

CLOSING REMARKS BY SENATOR AIKEN

And now, General Sarnoff, in order that you may have something with which really to remember your visit here today, it is my privilege to present you with this scroll and to read its inscription: "55th anniversary testimonial to David Sarnoff in commemoration of his dedicated service and outstanding contributions to the advancement of communications and electronics in the United States." [Applause.] And so that there may not be any anticlimax to the general's response, we will consider the meeting adjourned.

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—II: The Four Dimensions of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place into the RECORD a most significant statement by Dr. Samuel Belkin, who is the president of Yeshiva University, located in the 21st Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

The article follows:

In less than half a decade, a silent revolution has shaken the American mentality: the field of education has suddenly become a matter of great concern, not only to scholars but also to laymen. This rather startling reversal is due to the spreading realization that knowledge is important not only for the continuance of our cultural heritage, but, indeed, for the preservation of life itself.

Today many Americans are deeply concerned lest our sudden awakening to the need for increased scientific study, in itself a blessing, may cause us to overtip the balance and press the study of the sciences at the sacrifice of other disciplines. We find ourselves pondering what educational policy we should pursue which will advance our cultural heritage and at the same time promote our national security. The most significant questions we must face are: What, in the final analysis, constitutes an educated man and what branches of knowledge must a man master if he is to be truly knowledgeable? What, indeed, should be the ideals and goals of a university education and how can we best educate a man so that he not only acquires book learning but also becomes a moral and useful citizen?

It seems to me that there are four major dimensions, each with its own particular specialization, into which all human knowledge naturally falls. These four dimensions may be called the four studies of man.

The first of these is a study of the world into which we are born. For countless thousands of years, men have attempted to discover the mysteries and secrets of the cosmos. It is in the very nature of man to search so that he may better understand the divinely inspired laws of nature. The more deeply man studies the essence of the universe, the more he is able to discover things in nature which remained hidden from previous generations. The man who is interested primarily in basic research and makes theoretical discoveries is the real scientist. The late Albert Einstein, the greatest scientist of our age, did not invent anything practical in his life. He was far removed from the field of applied science and concerned himself only with the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge.

The study of the world in which we are born we designate as the study of the natural sciences, encompassing such branches of knowledge as mathematics, physics, and astronomy.

The second dimension of human knowledge we may characterize as the study of the peoples among whom we are born. We are interested in achieving a better understanding of the people among whom we live, as well as of the people who live and have lived on our globe throughout history. We pass the history of civilization through our modern sieves, seeking to determine the cultural contribution different races and civilizations have made to our contemporary world. We endeavor to appreciate better the experiences, trials, and tribulations of generations gone by, to comprehend more fully the causes of wars and the achievements of peace. We carefully study the rise and fall of empires and nations; their cultural origins and their decadence; their laws and their mores; and finally, their lasting contribution to world civilization. This study we label social science.

The third phase of knowledge we may designate as the study of man himself. The study of man is a study of his abilities and disabilities; his strength and his weaknesses; his mental anguish and his physical pain; his body and his mind; his conscious and his unconscious; his integration and his final unavoidable disintegration. From time immemorial, man has sought a better understanding of the human organism, with the ultimate aim of bringing peace of mind to the mentally disturbed and good health to the physically sick. The biological sciences, insofar as they are dedicated to the alleviation of human suffering, fall into the third dimension of human knowledge.

There is yet another dimension of human knowledge which is essential if we are to meet the fundamental requirement for decent living.

All the things which are created through the ingenuity of the human mind man can use for his advantage or for his disadvantage, for his benefit or for his destruction. To use the Biblical metaphor, the tree of knowledge bears knowledge of good and evil alike. A great mathematician or physicist or chemist may use his knowledge to benefit his neighbor, but he can also use it to harm him.

Knowledge, in all of its branches, can bring the greatest benefit to mankind only if man recognizes a unifying principle for his creative ingenuity. This fourth dimension of human knowledge concerns itself with the moral and spiritual purpose of life. It is, in the true sense of the term, a science of living and gives human existence a moral raison d'être.

Recognition of the moral law is of paramount importance for the survival of mankind. This moral and spiritual purpose of life in no way conflicts with the three branches of knowledge discussed above. On the contrary, it complements and supplements the knowledge man has acquired through centuries of living and thinking.

Above all, we must remember one thing: Only when human knowledge is integrated with a high moral purpose and spiritual ideal can knowledge become a blessing to society.

Commodore John Barry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

COMMODORE JOHN BARRY

I beg the indulgence of the House for a few moments in order to pay tribute to one of the great heroes of American history, and one of the stoutest sailors who ever bestrode a quarterdeck. John Barry, "the fighting commodore," was born in the tiny village of Tacumshane, County Wexford, Ireland, in the year 1745, the exact date of his birth being unknown. Those were the days when all Ireland groaned under the oppressor's heel and the lot of the genuine sons of the soil was foredoomed from birth. There was but one hope for the enterprising: to quit their native land and seek their fortunes under more clement skies, under kindlier governments. More than half a million Irish are said to have emigrated during the first half of the 18th century alone, the greater part to take service as foreign mercenaries. There was plenty of fighting going on in those days, and battle is a milieu in which an Irishman always feels quite at home.

To young Barry the sea, lapping at his door on Wexford Harbor, sent an imperative call; the lad heard and answered, and thenceforth, to the end of his long life, the sea remained his first, last, and enduring love. At the age of 10 he shipped as cabin boy on a merchantman, carrying with him, his biographer tells us, "hatred of the oppressors and recollections of the misery and want of his childhood years, which stayed with him throughout his life." And to the end of his days his purse was ever open to his poverty-stricken kindred from the old country.

By the year 1770 he had settled in Philadelphia, discovering in America, we are told, "the land of his desire." The outbreak of the Revolution found him with the certificate of master mariner, married to an American wife and a well-known and respected figure in the city of his adoption. He hastened to offer his services to the State and country which had taken him in and whose hospitality he was so richly to repay. Placed by the Continental Congress in command of the brig, *Lexington*, one of the first ships of the infant American Navy, Barry captured, on April 17, 1776, the small auxiliary ship *Edward*—the first capture, in actual battle, of a British naval vessel by a regularly commissioned American warship. On August 10 following, Barry was placed by resolution of Congress seventh in order of commission on the list of captains. Incidentally, it might be pointed out that, contrary to popular belief, Barry never attained the rank of commodore save by courtesy. By the end of his active career, however, he had become the senior captain in the U.S. Navy and bore, by common consent, the courtesy title of "Commodore" until his death. Whenever, in the years following the establishment of independence, the word "commodore" was heard in American naval circles it could mean but one man. Again, as his able biographer, the naval historian, William Bell Clark, observes, "John Barry was not 'the first officer appointed to the first vessel purchased' by the Continental Congress. His initial service was far more important—he outfitted the first Continental Fleet. He was never the senior officer of the Continental Navy, but his record through the Revolution was consistently finer than any of his naval contemporaries save John Paul Jones. And he can be classed on a par with Jones." "He was not," writes Mr. Clark, "'the Father of the American Navy' in the sense of being its founder, but his devotion to that navy, whose first ship he launched and equipped, coupled with the fact that he trained many of the lads who later added glory to its history, entitles him to the appellation in the modified form it was first bestowed upon him in 1813."

I cannot, of course, in this brief talk enter into a discussion of the brilliant engagements which starred Barry's brilliant career in the Revolution and the two unofficial wars against the Algerine pirates and the French which followed. Suffice to say that his ships, notably the *Raleigh*, the *Alliance* and the *United States*, shine forever luminous in the pages of American naval history.

He died full of years and honor on the 13th day of September, 1803. He sleeps in old St. Mary's Churchyard in the city and country of his adoption, which he so faithfully and nobly served. A contemporary poet wrote of him:

"There are gallant hearts whose glory
Columbia loves to name,
Whose deeds shall live in story
And everlasting fame.

But never yet one braver
Our starry banner bore
Than saucy old Jack Barry
The Irish commodore."

Saving Rail Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving Rail Passenger Service", published in the Christian Science Monitor of September 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1961]

SAVING RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE

Nothing less than an impending crisis could have caused the usually cautious Interstate Commerce Commission to utter aloud that politically taboo word "subsidy" in connection with saving the American passenger railroad system.

An impending crisis there certainly is. The New Haven bankruptcy is its advance guard. Discontinuances, deficits, merger scrambles, poorly maintained equipment, and bad service on other eastern American lines suggest its future extent.

But Federal subsidy would be at best only a temporary answer. The ICC statement optimistically declares that Federal aid should be just large enough to assure continuation of adequate passenger service, but not so large as to perpetuate unneeded service or promote management laxity. That this delicate state of balance could be reached without the ICC controlling more management decisions is questionable.

And, even granting that the proposed subsidies would help the eastern passenger lines to live on in a state of shabby equilibrium, is that enough? Barring breakthroughs in helicopter or vertical-takeoff plane service, short- and medium-haul train service should be more important than ever in the future.

To preserve it the Federal Government should extend incentives to communities and States to reduce their heavy tax burden upon the railroads. (Rail property taxes average about eight times as much as those paid by other transport lines.) The taxable life of rail equipment should be shortened. While preserving competition in each region, the ICC should take steps to permit formation of transportation companies, in which rail, truck, and bus service might be combined for sensible freight and passenger use. In this process improvements in passenger service (e.g. bus-train-bus through baggage) might lure commuters and medium-haul travelers back to rails.

There is more to be done, surely, than just subsidizing the status quo.

Kinzua Dam Project—Treaty With Seneca Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on July 12 and August 30, I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from New Jersey newspapers expressing concern about the Kinzua Dam project, which, if completed, would violate our treaty of 1794 with the Seneca Indians. I have expressed my own views on the responsibility of Congress to explore any reasonable alternative to this project and to weigh the great moral questions involved in abrogating a treaty.

Further evidence of concern by thoughtful citizens in this matter is provided by a column by Brooks Atkinson, published in the New York Times of September 5, and an editorial from the Jersey Journal of August 11, entitled "Keeping Faith." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have both these items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 5, 1961]

CRITIC AT LARGE—CONSTRUCTION ON KINZUA DAM A CASE OF U.S. MORALITY LOSING TO EXPEDIENCY

(By Brooks Atkinson)

In a sympathetic letter to Basil Williams, president of the Seneca Nation of Indians, President Kennedy has declined to halt the construction of Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania. When the dam is finished in 1965, it will drown the heartland of the reservation assigned to the Seneca Indians "forever" in a treaty during George Washington's administration in 1794.

Mr. Kennedy's decision is probably decisive. The most the Senecas and their friends had hoped for was intervention by Executive order. But the moral issue remains unanswered. Only a little while ago Vice President JOHNSON assured West Berliners that we pledge "our sacred honor" to de-

fend them. Our honor is not so sacred as it was when Jefferson wrote those words into the Declaration of Independence.

During recent months, when this project has been a matter of concern to many private citizens, the moral issue has been dissimulated in a number of plausible ways. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has pointed out "the people and communities who need the protection and clear water that Kinzua will give, also have moral rights." No one has questioned their rights to physical protection. The project further north, called the Conewango-Cattaragus alternative, would provide that.

Other people have assumed that legal authorization by the U.S. courts satisfies the moral obligation. Answering a question at a press conference last spring, Mr. Kennedy seemed to share that point of view. But the courts have decided only that Congress has a legal right to break the treaty.

Other people believe that paying the Senecas for driving them off their lands and helping to resettle them eliminate the moral objection. In a moment of euphoria, Senator CLARK has said that the Senecas might be better off when they are resettled; that they might capitalize on the recreation facilities that will be developed around Kinzua. Souvenir stands and hotdog concessions will be small compensation for the loss of the site of the Senecas' Long House religion.

People who are bored by this long controversy disparage the friends of the Senecas as "bleeding hearts" and "ultragoodies." This is a little like the storm of scorn and abuse that was heaped on Douglas Johnson of Los Angeles last spring when he returned to the Brinks Armored Car Co. the $240,000 he had found in a lost bag in the street. He was denounced as stupid.

The national morality has deteriorated into expediency. Since the Army Corps of Engineers, acting on orders from Congress, is already working on the earthfill at Kinzua, since the State of Pennsylvania has fallen heir to a $114 million project, since no politician likes to upset a public works project in another politician's State, it is expedient to go ahead with something already started and long overdue. The Senecas are numerically few and, in the words of one of their representatives, "we are weak now, and no one need fear us." They can be expediently pushed aside.

The moral issue and a convenient solution can be quickly stated. The Senecas agree with the State of Pennsylvania that it is essential to preserve life and property in Pittsburgh and other places that suffer from floods in the Allegheny River. Allegheny floods could be controlled and Allegheny water could be stored by building the Conewango-Cattaragus alternative without scrapping the treaty. There is a difference of opinion about the cost relative to Kinzua. But cost does not affect the moral issue, which is to honor a treaty signed with the Senecas in 1794. It said: "The United States will never claim the same [the lands] nor disturb the Seneka nation."

Nothing could be more specific.

[From the Jersey Journal, Aug. 11, 1961]

KEEPING FAITH

Chief Cornplanter never used the expression "unilateral abrogation," but he was as skeptical of the United States in 1794 as this country now is of Khrushchev and Berlin.

The term "unilateral abrogation" is how diplomats describe attempts by the other side to abolish a mutual treaty. We accused the Russians of just that when the Red dictator announced he would sign a separate agreement with East Germany.

How does Cornplanter, a Seneca Indian chieftain dead for over 150 years, fit into the current Berlin crisis?

Cornplanter does not, but the treaty he signed with the U.S. Government is related. The chief's descendants are fighting—with lawyers instead of lances—an arbitrary decision by the Army engineers to build the Kinzua Dam and flood 9,000 acres in western New York which were forever 'secured and guaranteed' the Indians by the treaty of 1794.

New Jersey's dealings with the American Indians were fortunately much better. The cooperation between the early settlers and their predecessors, the Indians, will undoubtedly be well publicized 3 years from now when the State Centennial celebration is held.

Meanwhile the Federal Government goes ahead with plans to walk out on our oldest operating treaty with the Senecas, while beefing up the Armed Forces in case the Russians try the same tactics in Berlin.

It would be ironic if the Berlin crisis is solved peacefully, and we wind up using our combat-ready troops to displace the Seneca Indians from the Allegheny Reservation which President Washington assured them "the United States will never claim."

It Takes More Than Words To Impress Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KENNEDY'S MANY WARNINGS ABOUT BERLIN FAIL TO DETER KHRUSHCHEV

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Undeterred by our President's insistence that we won't yield at Berlin, unmoved by his almost pathetic offers of negotiation, unstirred by his repeated requests for a continuation of the moratorium on atomic testing, Nikita Khrushchev moves steadily toward a showdown on Berlin. Obviously, he intends to push his brinkmanship right to the edge of nuclear war—or until the West capitulates.

Instead of listening to our President, Nikita overtrumps him. The United States moves a few troops to West Berlin and alerts a couple of National Guard divisions. The U.S.S.R. steps up its forces in East Europe by what some estimate at 850,000 men. Nikita announces he already has, and intends shortly to test, a 100-megaton bomb.

Obviously, the czar of all the Communists does not believe that the United States, still less Britain or France, will go to war over West Berlin.

Why should he?

The President has talked too much. Ever since his fruitless and unnecessary meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna, administration spokesmen have been warning the Russians. One warning would have been impressive. Fifty mean less than nothing, especially when undercut by all sort of contrary or alternative talk.

Since Khrushchev wants a change in Berlin, he should have been made to ask and pay for negotiations. Charles de Gaulle made this clear to J.F.K. But the frightened British and the President's advisers knew better. They allowed newsmen to speak of the possibility of safe concessions to the Russians. Some have followed Ambassador George Kennedy in considering the idea that United Berlin be made the seat of the United Nations.

A high official of the U.S. Information Agency, Dr. Ralph K. White, tells the American Psychological Society, as a private citizen, that the Soviets and the United States are much alike; that Khrushchev wants only to stabilize the situation at Berlin—how the hell does he know?—that our essential U–2 flights over the U.S.S.R. and support of the Cuban invaders were wrong; and that we overestimate the evil of the Soviet dictators.

Obviously, Senator TOM DODD, of Connecticut is justified in demanding Dr. White's expulsion from any Government job, but that will hardly eliminate Khrushchev's belief that White spoke for a lot of equally brainwashed Americans.

Two leading American newsmen gratuitously open their columns to Mr. K., thus giving him particularly good platforms from which to continue his intimidation. Other leading newsmen hint broadly at a coming Western retreat.

At Stowe, Vt., American scientists and other peace-minded American professors meet once more with Soviet political and scientific stooges coached for the occasion in an atmosphere of good will and amity. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall honors the final dinner by attending.

Finally, just to clinch Khrushchev's conviction that the United States—as the Chinese Communists have said since Panmunjom—is a "paper tiger," President Kennedy asks and the U.S. Senate votes overwhelmingly for a separate governmental disarmament agency to bring about the general and total world disarmament Khrushchev insists he wants.

DISARMAMENT IMPRACTICAL NOW

Obviously the world would be better off if nuclear and atomic weapons had never been made. Obviously, too, some real arms control to prevent surprise attack would be welcomed by most human beings. But general and total disarmament, short of a world authority, is a dream of impractical scientists whose success in technical fields has made them believe themselves omniscient. For not only could the Soviets not survive total and universal disarmament but disarmament is not primarily a technical problem. It is one of conflicting purposes. Communism needs nuclear weapons and the control of outer space in order to conquer the earth. Once political differences are settled disarmament will be no problem. Until then its discussion is a waste of time.

In fact the creation of the new disarmament agency by the United States may be positively harmful. It shows that the American administration misunderstands both the problem and the nature of the Soviet Union (like Dr. White). It has no effect on the nonalined who respect only active force. And it misleads the American people into further make-believe and weakens their will to defend Berlin. This was apparent to the 14 U.S. Senators who voted against the new agency. Senator RUSSELL of Georgia commented sharply that such a move today would be more likely to provoke a new war than to prevent it. So if President Kennedy fails to convince Khrushchev that he means business, it will be largely his own fault.

Public Works Appropriation Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9076) making

appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my gratitude to the Appropriations Committee for approving an item for $50,000 for study and planning of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. Although I had hoped that the committee would approve the full budgeted amount of $195,000, I am grateful for what was allowed and I hope before the legislation becomes law it may be for the larger amount. In any event, I feel that we should bear in mind that this project is not only of value to our country because of its economic values but also and in fact primarily because of its defense values. There is in war times no other practical way to move petroleum economically from the western oil producing areas to the eastern consuming areas. This is of great vitality to our national defense and we should get on with the construction of this canal for this defense reason if none other.

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—III: The Day the Lady's Lamp Was Lit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is of further interest to the American public concerning the 75th anniversary celebration of Yeshiva University.

The article follows:

It was a glorious day in New York that Thursday, October 28, in the year 1886. There was that mammoth parade with more than 70 marching bands and all those high-stepping drum majors in their fancy uniforms * * * and just about everywhere you looked, there were flags on proud display—you didn't have to count the stars on them to know there were 38. Some people were predicting there'd be even more someday. After all, the national population was up to almost 60 million already.

The big event of the day was to take place on Bedloe's Island out in the harbor, but unless you were somebody important you'd have to take a ferry to Governor's Island and watch the goings-on from there. Of course, you wouldn't be close enough to hear any of the speeches, but you could see pretty well.

Late that afternoon, as the enormous veil was pulled away, you caught a glimpse of her and a tremendous roar of approval echoed through the harbor. Everyone agreed that she was truly magnificent.

Like so many of those on hand to welcome her, the Lady had come to America from Europe, the gift of the people of France to the people of the United States. She was placed in the harbor to be the first to welcome the millions who would follow her to the New World.

A little over a month before the Lady's debut—on September 15, to be exact—an event of a very different nature took place in New York. This incident didn't even inspire enough interest to justify a mention in any of the New York newspapers. Many decades would pass before a link between the two events became discernible.

The earlier, unheralded event was the establishment by a small group of Eastern European immigrants of an all-day school which would combine Jewish studies with a general education on the elementary level. Located in squalid quarters on New York's lower East Side, the little school was given the name "Yeshiva Eitz Chaim." The Hebrew term "yeshiva" denotes a school for the traditional study of the Torah, Talmud, and other sources of Hebraic culture. Eitz Chaim means "tree of life," signifying the vital importance of the Torah for the Jewish people.

In 1886, there were approximately 350,000 Jews in the United States. Immigration had begun as early as 1654, and by the time of the American Revolution there were some 3,500 Jews living in the Colonies. The greatest influx of all began in 1881—between that year and 1914, more than 2 million Jewish immigrants would arrive on American soil to begin a new life.

They came to this great melting pot from many countries, speaking many languages. Three things, however, were shared by most of them: extreme poverty, an innate dedication to the Book—to learning, and a determination to get ahead. They brought with them few material possessions but, having survived the persecutions of Eastern Europe, just being alive was cause enough for gratitude.

Life on the lower East Side, home for many of them, was always hard—sometimes brutal. The tenements that sprang up to house this mass of humanity were a breeding ground of sickness and tragedy.

And yet, through all the chaotic turbulence, many immigrant Jews retained and practiced the faith of their heritage. The little money that might be left over after the landlord and grocer had been paid helped to support their synagogues and their Yeshiva Eitz Chaim.

In Europe, many of these Jews had been denied the right to attend their countries' schools, and they brought to America their pent-up thirst for general knowledge. How often immigrant parents, weary to the point of collapse, would seek to reassure one another by saying " * * * at least for our children it will be better. They'll go to school * * * maybe even to college. It is good we have come to America." This was their goldene medina, and it mattered not that the streets weren't golden just so long as the opportunity and hope were.

The school that these immigrants founded and maintained struck its roots ever deeper in American soil and continued to grow upward and outward. There was a constant search for new quarters to accommodate the rapidly increasing enrollment. In 1915, Yeshiva Eitz Chaim merged with the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, which had been chartered by New York State in 1897, and the foundations for a high school, teachers institute, college, and graduate schools were established by the first president, Rabbi Dr. Bernard Revel. In 1928, the institution opened the Nation's first liberal arts college under Jewish auspices, and 1 year later moved into a splendid home in Washington Heights constructed at a cost of $2,500,000. More departments were added and new buildings constructed to house them. By 1945, Yeshiva was a full-fledged university, and 10 years later it opened America's first medical school under Jewish sponsorship. A historic 10-year, $30 million development program was begun in 1960 to fulfill the university's promise of service to the Nation and the Jewish community, and Albert Einstein College of Medicine launched a $27,500,000 expansion effort to further medical education.

The great lady who took her place in New York Harbor just 43 days after Yeshiva Eitz Chaim was founded is still there * * * and she'll remain, her torch held high, for millennia to come. She represents the dream nurtured in the human mind almost since time began, a dream of freedom—freedom for a man to worship as he chooses * * * freedom from tyranny and oppression * * * freedom to say or write what is on one's mind or in one's heart * * * freedom to better oneself.

Yeshiva University—with its 5,000 students and 1,200 faculty members—is one example of the ultimate realization of that dream.

Wisconsin: No. 1 Papermaker in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, Wisconsin has been known largely as the Nation's No. 1 dairy State. Our people, of course, are truly proud of the unparalleled record of products of high quality in the dairy line to feed people not only in this country but around the world.

However, the Badger State, too, has created firsts in other fields.

Today, for example, our Badger State is the No. 1 papermaker in the country. The high rank has been attained through creative research diversification and plain hard work.

On July 16, 1961, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an article entitled: "Wisconsin: No. 1 Papermaker in the Nation." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN: NO. 1 PAPERMAKER IN THE NATION

Wisconsin, top papermaking State in the Nation, earned its rank the hard way—through meticulous research and wide diversification.

The diversification bodes well for the future of the industry in the State, and is a tribute to the ingenuity of the early Wisconsin papermakers—many of whom were almost put out of business when cheaper Canadian newsprint was permitted to enter the United States tariff free in 1911.

At present there is no newsprint production in the State.

LARGE FIRMS HERE

Two of the largest paper manufacturers in the country are Kimberly-Clark Corp. of Neenah, founded in 1872, and Marathon Division of American Can Co. Marathon was founded at Rothschild in 1909 but now has its executive offices at Neenah.

Kimberly-Clark makes coated and uncoated printing papers, business and writing papers, industrial papers and wadding, sanitary napkins, facial tissue, towels, table napkins, bathroom tissue, barber towels and

neckstrips, interior packaging, filter materials, and nonwoven fabric.

The Marathon line includes packaging materials, towels, and napkins, toilet paper, facial tissues, waxed and many others.

The first papermill on the Wisconsin River, built in 1887, is now known as the Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Co. of Port Edwards. Nekoosa-Edwards specializes in fine writing and business papers and specialty food papers and wrappings.

CONSOLIDATED THIRD

Consolidated Water Power & Paper Co., now Wisconsin's third largest paper company, was originally organized in 1894 to consolidate several small waterpower firms on the Wisconsin River at Wisconsin Rapids. It completed its first papermill in 1904 at Wisconsin Rapids and now has additional operations there and at Biron, Whiting, Appleton, and Stevens Point.

Consolidated, specializing in enamel book paper, also produces waxing papers, paperboard, paperboard products, and Consoweld laminated plastic.

The strength of the Wisconsin paper industry is not concentrated in these few major corporations. It also is found in the strong position of the smaller companies with their multivaried line of highly specialized products.

Rhinelander Paper Co. is the largest producer of glassine and greaseproof papers in the world.

Wisconsin's largest specialty mill, the Thilmany Pulp & Paper Co., was founded in 1883 at Kaukauna as a kraft mill.

SPECIALTY PAPERS

Thilmany still is a kraft mill, but whereas kraft was once the end product, today Thilmany takes kraft paper and works it into an almost endless variety of specialty papers.

The first mill west of the Alleghenies exclusively devoted to fine writing papers was Gilbert Paper Co., Menasha founded by William Gilbert in 1887.

Today one of the country's leading manufacturers in the 25 percent and 100 percent cotton fiber grades, it is also a large manufacturer of currency papers for foreign use.

Another fine "home grown" manufacturer is the Bergstrom Paper Co. of Neenah. Founded by D. W. Bergstrom in 1904, the company has grown rapidly and produces a variety of book papers, offset and office printing papers and sensitized safety papers.

Wausau Paper Mills Co. at Brokaw specializes in a variety of fine bond, index, offset, mimeo, duplicator, ledger and text papers for writing, printing and general business consumption.

One of the largest manufacturers of sanitary papers for home, institutional and industrial use is Charmin Paper Products Co., of Green Bay, a subsidiary of Procter & Gamble.

Green Bay also boasts the famed Northern plant of Marathon, whose tissues are nationally known.

The Marinette Paper Co. at Marinette and the Falls Power & Paper Co. at Oconto Falls, both Scott subsidiaries, produce a good share of Scott's familiar sanitary products such as facial and toilet tissues, paper towels and napkins.

Variety of papers made by smaller Wisconsin mills is also quite impressive.

As an example, Badger Paper Mills, Peshtigo, works from tree to finished product, manufactures watermarked bond, mimeo and duplicator papers, manifold (or second sheets) and waxed papers in both bread wrappers and household rolls.

Riverside Paper Corp, of Appleton manufactures sulphite bond, mimeo, ledger and duplicator papers, plain and watermarked—white and colored. In addition, Riverside makes and converts a complete packaged line of school papers.

SPECIAL PAPERS LINE

The Nation's leading manufacturer of colored and specialty coated papers is in Appleton.

The Appleton Coated Paper Co., using the "off-the-paper-machine" method of coating, produces standard stock lines of white and colored coated book, cover, label, box covering and kraft papers, bristols and tough check, both for letterpress and offset printing.

The company's specialty products include NCR. (No carbon required) papers made for the National Cash Register Co., white and colored coated tag for the tag manufacturers, aluminum coated reflective insulation paper and special grades used in making dry cell batteries.

SHIFT WOOD

A new and noteworthy trend in Wisconsin is toward greater use of local Wisconsin species such as aspen and hardwood—considered almost worthless only a few years ago. For example, the Green Bay Paper & Pulp Co. has pioneered a new process for these species, manufacturing container board which is converted into corrugated boxes in the company's associated Green Bay box plant.

Owens-Illinois Glass Co.'s Mill Division, in Tomahawk, is one of the Nation's leading producers of semichemical corrugating medium which is used in the manufacture of corrugated boxes and shipping containers.

By far the largest of the three southern Wisconsin plants is the Cornell Paperboard Products Co. ,formerly the Hummel & Downing Co., Milwaukee. It makes paperboard for containers.

Cornell depends heavily on wastepaper for its raw material, and this also is the case with U.S. Paper Mills at De Pere.

Side by side with the paper industry another important business has developed in Wisconsin—the building of machinery and other equipment for the paper and pulp mills.

The oldest and largest of these firms, founded at Beloit in 1858 as the O. E. Merrill Co. and closely identified ever since with the Wisconsin paper industry, is the Beloit Iron Works.

Two Percent Can Hurt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, increases in the cost of living may be relatively imperceptible at any given point in time. The damage is cumulative, as we have seen in the past. We also know that policies of our Government do contribute to or lessen the pressures of inflation. We must be alert today to the economic impact of programs which will cause increases in living costs some years hence. Complacence about the effects of processes we are setting in motion now will insure great damage for those who are attempting to provide for their own future security.

I want to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the thoughtful observations about the long-term effects of inflation which appeared in an editorial in the Marietta Daily Times of Marietta, Ohio, on September 5, 1961.

The editorial is as follows:

TWO PERCENT CAN HURT

We are told that, according to "informed opinion," the current price rise will probably level off after September and that at the end of the year the Government's price index will be within the range of 1.5 to 2 percent ahead of what it was at the end of 1960. And this, according to "authoritative judgment," is "reasonable stability."

The price index crept up a mere fourtenths percent in July. What cost $12.76 in June could still be bought for $12.80 in July. Just a difference of 4 pennies. The same market basket of commodities would have cost $10 on the average in the 1947–49 period.

A price rise of around 2 percent a year is hardly noticed—that is from year to year. Some economists believe that a little bit of inflation is even good for the country; it spurs the economy.

Of course it will not be noticed, if your wages go up comparably and if you spend your income as fast as you get it. That little bit of inflation only hurts people on fixed incomes, or when money that has been put aside for a few years loses its original buying value, or when your income is reduced somewhat—as for instance, when you retire on pension, savings, and social security.

At an average annual rate of inflation of only 2 percent a year, prices would just about double during a person's working career. And then during retirement he would see his savings and all forms of annuities dwindle in buying power year by year.

Actually, the consumer has not been losing as much in recent years as he did in an earlier but not forgotten period. If inflation can be kept to an average annual increase of 2 percent during the next 20 years, the young person just now starting to save will be better off at the end of that period than is the older person of today who has been saving for the past 20 years. For the dollar lost 52.6 cents of its buying power in the 20 years between 1940 and 1960—21.8 cents through 1945, 26 cents from 1945 through 1953, and 4.8 cents from 1953 through 1960.

However, a little inflation has a tendency to build on itself. The economic advisers around President Kennedy have thus far shown little indication that they intend to apply the brakes.

Death Takes Distinguished West Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I advise the House of the death of the Honorable Clarence W. Meadows, a former Governor of West Virginia, who died at the young age of 57 of a heart attack in Clifton Forge, Va.

I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy to his grieving widow and children.

Governor Meadows served as the chief executive of our State from January 1945 until January of 1949.

His career as a lawyer and a public servant was distinguished.

The District of Columbia Government Seems To Rely Entirely on Public Urban Renewal Programs Supported by Taxes, and Has Discouraged Renovation and Restoration of Commercial and Residential Property by Private Owners by Immediately Raising Taxes on Such Improved Property, Says Kalorama Citizens Association President

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Kalorama Citizens Association, G. M. Koockogey, has written to me in part, as follows:

Our District of Columbia government seems to rely entirely on public urban renewal programs, supported by tax money, and has discouraged renovation and restoration of commercial and residential property by private owners by immediately raising taxes on such improved realty. Your House Joint Resolution 532 would correct this inequity by a reasonable tax adjustment that would encourage private redevelopment without the use of public funds.

Georgetown is an outstanding example of private restoration that didn't cost the taxpayers 1 cent and greatly increased the taxable basis. Another private restoration showcase is our own Kalorama triangle area, where over half a million dollars has been spent on more than 50 houses and apartments in less than 2 years.

Other citizen groups and the Federation of Citizens Associations have joined us in endorsing your idea of reasonable tax abatement to encourage private restoration of commercial and residential property."

The Washington (D.C.) Post reported that the contest-winning design for residential development of an 8.4-acre urban renewal site in southwest Washington will provide rental apartments up to $325 a month.

Since the urban renewal program was designed by the Congress to rehouse slum-dwellers, it would be helpful at this time if the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, told us how slum-dwellers in the Nation's Capital are able to afford apartments renting up to $325 a month.

A letter published in the Washington (D.C.) Post on September 13 comments tellingly on these $325-a-month apartments which the New Frontier is providing in Southwest Washington with the aid of $70 million in Federal tax funds:

Once upon a time I was naive enough to believe that the southwest redevelopment plans would include housing I could afford. However, I see by the Washington Post that still another high-rise luxury apartment project is now off the drawing boards.

I'm not rich enough for the apartments now available in Southwest, and I'm not poor enough to qualify for one of the housing projects.

A new approach to urban renewal in the District of Columbia is long overdue, and I am pleased that the able and distinguished gentlemen from New York [Mr. MULTER], Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], and Iowa [Mr. KYL] have joined with me in trying to develop a new, far less costly, and more human approach to the renovation, restoration, and rebuilding of our cities.

I include here the text of the measure introduced by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I include, in addition, the letter from Mr. Koockogey, president of the Kalorama Citizens Association, to which I have referred, as well as a letter published today in the Washington (D.C.) Post:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1961.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Kalorama Citizens Association, of Washington, I wish to express our deep appreciation of your leadership in introducing the most constructive urban renewal legislation in the past decade; I refer to House Joint Resolution 532.

Our thanks are due also to Congressmen MULTER, Democrat, of New York, KYL, Republican, of Iowa, and McDOWELL, Democrat, of Delaware, for introducing similar bills.

This new bipartisan approach to urban renewal puts private renewal efforts in the District of Columbia on an equal basis with public urban renewal projects, which is as it should be.

Our District of Columbia government seems to rely entirely on public urban renewal programs, supported by our tax money, and has discouraged renovation and restoration of commercial and residential property by private owners by immediately raising taxes on such improved realty. Your House Joint Resolution 532 would correct this inequity by a reasonable tax adjustment that would encourage private redevelopment without the use of public funds.

Georgetown is an outstanding example of private restoration that didn't cost the taxpayers 1 cent and greatly increased the taxable basis. Another private restoration showcase is our own Kalorama Triangle area, where over half a million dollars has been spent on more than 50 houses and apartments in less than 2 years.

Other citizen groups and the Federation of Citizens Associations have joined us in endorsing your idea of reasonable tax abatement to encourage private restoration of commercial and residential property.

The fact that other Members are joining you in this legislation shows that it is of national importance to put private redevelopment all over the Nation on an equal footing with public urban renewal. This could save the taxpayers many millions of dollars and do the job in much less time.

Respectfully,

G. M. KOOCKOGEY,
President, Kalorama Citizens Association.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

HOUSING COSTS

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Once upon a time I was naive enough to believe that the Southwest redevelopment plans would including housing I could afford. However, I see by the Washington Post that still another high-rise luxury apartment project is now off the drawing boards.

I'm not rich enough for the apartments now available in Southwest, and I'm not poor enough to qualify for one of the housing projects.

Is there to be no end of these overpriced new projects? Is there no hope for persons in my income bracket who would like to live close by in a place that is new and clean? Not everyone wants an air-conditioned efficiency, or a larger unit in which to double up with another salaried member of the middle class. Some of us have only one income in our family, and are old-fashioned enough to want a more conventional home that is not in the suburbs.

SUZANNE T. COOPER.

WASHINGTON.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 6 of the Act of August 14, 1894 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–705), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 6.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any increase in the value of the tract or lot of real property on which the taxpayer's personal residence is located (or of the improvements thereon) which is the result of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration of such residence shall be disregarded in making the valuation of the property under subsection (a) for the fiscal year in which such repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration is completed and for the four succeeding fiscal years. As used in the preceding sentence, the term 'taxpayer's personal residence' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, alteration, renovation, or restoration involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their person residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to repairs, alterations, renovation, and restoration completed in fiscal years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3(a) of title III of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1557b(a)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(16) EXPENSES OF HOME REPAIR, MAINTENANCE, ALTERATIONS, AND ADDITIONS.—In the case of an individual, the expenses paid during the taxable year for the repair and maintenance of, or alterations or additions to, the personal residence of the taxpayer. The deduction under this paragraph shall be allowable only to the extent of the aggregate of such expenses actually paid by the taxpayer, and in no case shall it exceed $2,000. Such deduction shall be applicable only to expenses which are not otherwise allowable as deductions in computing net income under section 1 of this title. As used in this paragraph, the term 'personal residence of the taxpayer' means real property which is owned by the taxpayer or his spouse or both at the time of the repair, maintenance, alterations, or additions involved and is occupied by them or either of them as their personal residence at such time or within six months thereafter."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to expenses paid during taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–706) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) housing (including both residential and commercial structures) which are not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and

"(2) the owner of any substandard structure (residential or commercial) which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition in a project area shall be encouraged

and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such structure shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring the structure, shall itself provide for such rehabilitation or restoration whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate and shall dispose of the structure so rehabilitated or restored at such time and on such terms and conditions as it may determine to be in the public interest."

SEC. 4. The Act entitled "An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-413 et seq.), is amended by redesignating section 17 as section 18 and by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"SEC. 17. The provisions of this Act shall apply to chanceries and other business-type buildings of foreign nations in the District of Columbia, so as to conform with the general practice among nations of requiring the observance (by countries with which they maintain diplomatic relations) of their laws and zoning regulations in the location of such buildings; and the Zoning Commission shall accordingly include in its regulations under the first section of this Act such provisions as may be necessary to insure that such buildings are hereafter located only in areas appropriately zoned for such purposes."

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—IV: In the Nation's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is of further interest to the American public concerning the 75th anniversary celebration of Yeshiva University.

The article follows:

Yeshiva University is but one of the 1,800 colleges and universities in the United States which today share responsibility for solving the most critical and awesome problems to challenge this Nation.

Higher education has ceased to be a luxury. Our very survival—and that of the free world—depends largely upon America's educational resources. Higher education means trained leadership.

There are urgent shortages that must be met—of teachers, social workers, spiritual leaders, scientists, physicians, and psychologists. With the expected doubling of college enrollments in the next 10 years, the situation is critical. Here is what Yeshiva University is doing, in part, to fulfill its role.

This year, the graduate school of science, under grants from various scientific and military departments of the National Government, is conducting vital research in mathematics and physics. Physicist David Finkelstein has created a series of efficient atom smashers. His colleague Leon F. Landovitz turned from the microcosmic atom to the macrocosmic universe and devised a method of weighing the milky way.

Since its establishment in 1955, Albert Einstein College of Medicine has developed a vast, highly diversified laboratory for health research. At Yeshiva College, microbiologist Moses D. Tendler and others continue their pursuit of antibiotics which may contain antitumor properties. Equally significant studies are underway at other schools of the university.

In 1960, Yeshiva University received more mental health grants than any other institution in New York State. With over half of all the hospital beds in the United States occupied by patients with mental disorders, this problem is clearly of major proportions.

In addition to the work conducted by the psychiatric departments of the college of medicine, the graduate school of education is carrying on a program to train teachers of emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded children. The school of social work emphasizes the preventive aspects of mental health by preparing personnel to serve with social service agencies. Rabbinical students at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary are participating in a three-faith, 5-year program to provide clergymen with the psychological background required for pastoral counseling. Other universities engaged in this pioneering project, under a $425,893 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, are Harvard (Protestant) and Loyola (Catholic).

In 1957, the graduate school of education, with the help of a grant from the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, launched its highly successful teaching fellowship program at many public and private schools in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut—an effective means of preparing liberal arts college graduates for careers as teachers and school administrators.

Two graduate schools have joined forces to offer special courses of study for experienced high school and college teachers in the fields of mathematics and science. The in-service institute for high school mathematics and physics teachers is maintained by a grant from the National Science Foundation. A summer institute for secondary school teachers of modern Hebrew has been designed to increase the language proficiency and teaching ability of the Nation's secondary school Hebrew teachers.

Students, faculty, and alumni are in the vanguard of original research and experimentation, but the primary concern is a sacred and dedicated devotion to all disciplines. Both in the undergraduate colleges, where students are exposed to the rich treasures of Hebraic literature, and throughout the graduate and professional schools, there is a serious regard for freedom—freedom to learn and to transmit knowledge to future generations. The university has developed a tradition of scholarship which provides, in the swelling ranks of alumni, a reservoir of leadership for the Nation and the entire American Jewish community.

At Yeshiva College and Stern College for Women, all students pursue a dual program emphasizing both their future profession and their religious heritage. Among the graduates of the university are more than 1,000 rabbis, 800 teachers and administrators in Jewish schools, the heads of 12 major Jewish organizations, and untold numbers of scholars.

Since its founding, Yeshiva University has changed and developed in many ways to meet the exigencies of the times, but it has never wavered in the obligation to fulfill the needs of the Jewish community which brought it into being.

In all of its endeavors, Yeshiva University functions in the true spirit of American democracy. It is our firm belief that in order to be spiritually better Jews, thus better citizens, it is a sacred duty to sustain our own intellectual and spiritual towers of strength, our own schools of higher learning in which we may give expression to our inner selves, direction to our moral lives, and contribute our share to the democratic way of life. In this way, together with other groups, Jewry can help nourish the glorious achievement that is America. In Yeshiva University, the American Jewish community has translated this belief into a monumental reality.

Educationally, this institution stands in the image of the Nation's greatest universities, stressing a foundation in the liberal arts and sciences as the basis of a college education. Traditionally and spiritually, Yeshiva University also is strengthened by those unique characteristics it has inherited from the yeshivot—a sacred regard for knowledge and a devotion to the high moral and ethical values of Judaism. Both dynamic heritages run together, forming a river of purpose with which we strive to serve the multiple needs of a 20th century society. (Dr. Samuel Belkin, president.)

A Down-Under Once-Over of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following excerpt from a recent speech by Sir Howard Beale, Australian Ambassador to the United States:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 1, 1961]

A DOWN-UNDER ONCE-OVER OF US

(By Sir Howard Beale)

(Sir Howard, the Australian Ambassador to the United States, was recently admitted to the livery of the Worshipful Co. of Coopers in London. These excerpts are taken from his speech.)

I am here today because of an old family link with London and the company. My great-great-grandfather was admitted to the livery of this company and to the freedom of the city in 1782; and his son, and after him his son, my grandfather—who emigrated to Australia in 1838—were also Coopers. Some may say that the family went downhill after that because my father was a clergyman and I became a barrister-at-law, a Cabinet Minister, and an Ambassador; but, if so, your action in admitting me to the livery today restores my family's respectability.

I thank you, too, for the gift of this elegant silver cup, engraved with the coat of arms of the company, a replica of the others I see around this table. You may be sure that I shall treasure it as a momento of today's occasion. In return, I should like to mark this day by making a gift to the company. In considering what I might give, I felt that a piece of silver would be appropriate, for I understood that much of your silver had been destroyed in the blitz. At first I thought of a Georgian piece, bearing a date which would have some relation to my ancestors or my country.

But then I had a better idea, and I chose this silver bowl made in America. It is a modern piece, hand-wrought and fashioned with loving care by a well-known craftsman named Ericson of Massachusetts. I present it to you as an example and symbol of America at her best.

I am afraid the impression which many people have of the United States—especially those who have never lived there—all too often is not a good one. This perhaps is America's own fault for—to use the modern jargon—she tends to project a bad image of herself. It is a sort of self-inflicted wound caused by such things as vulgar movies, crude and moronic TV shows, sensational journalism, and exaggerated advertising with its persistent emphasis on money and material values.

These things irritate the foreigner and often cause him to make wrong judgments as to what America is really like and what she stands for. I suspect, by the way, that our irritation is the greater because, through imitation, the same sort of things are taking place in our own countries—a kind of Gresham's law by which the bad drives out the good.

The point I want to make—and I am sure you will agree with it—is that it is quite wrong to judge a nation or a people solely by its faults or idiosyncrasies. The America I know after living there for 3 years is a very different place altogether. It is, first and foremost, a country of hospitable and generous people.

It is also a country whose people truly desire that men shall be free everywhere and that justice and right shall prevail in the world. This is part of the American dream, and in order to help to make the dream a reality Americans have made and will continue to make enormous sacrifices. (The $90 billion and more of foreign aid which has come from the pockets of American taxpayers simply cannot be explained on any other basis.)

Then again, it is a country of magnificent industrial and scientific progress resulting in great national wealth and a very high standard of living. Americans are very proud of all this; and so they should be, because it did not fall into their laps or just happen—it was worked for laboriously by generations of people. I think there are folk in both my country and yours who could well take a leaf out of America's book in the matter of hard work.

Last but not least, America is a country of many cultural and artistic achievements; of scholars, writers, singers, painters, and craftsmen who have labored with mind, pen, voice, brush, and hand to create beautiful things. This graceful bowl is a product of one of them and a reminder of all of them.

Taken together, these things comprise what I would call the real America. It is good that we should know about it because knowledge promotes good will, understanding, and friendship. In my view it is essential to the peace of the world that the British people—mannerly and stable, experienced in international matters and possessed of much intuitive political wisdom derived from their long and perilous history—should collaborate and combine in close friendship with this generous, vigorous, and idealistic nation across the Atlantic, whose people like yours and mine—

"Speak the tongue that Shakespeare spake,
The faith and morals hold that Milton held."

The American Achievement—Chapter 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today America is attempting to crystallize its ideas and ideals, reevaluate its principles and standards, and create in our citizens a greater sense of responsibility to meet our problems and challenges.

Generally, the purpose is twofold: First, to better enable our citizens to understand and utilize the tools of freedom for further progress; and, second, to meet the competition posed by the Communist system.

Yesterday, I was privileged to bring to the attention of the Senate the first of a series of articles by Harold Fleming on "The American Achievement." Reflecting further upon the kind of progress, as well as the pioneering spirit which has created this country, I now ask unanimous consent to have chapter 2 of this series, entitled "Adventure," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVENTURE—CHAPTER 2

ONE GROWTH INDUSTRY AFTER ANOTHER

The ink was hardly dry on the U.S. Constitution in 1787, when the country began to see such a rapid flowering of the industrial arts as had never been seen before in human history.

The new political ideas of the Founding Fathers promptly began to pay off like the research ideas of a growth industry. It was as though a switch had been thrown, and a current of new energy introduced into the American circuit.

For generation after generation of Americans, the progress that followed was much like the progress we have seen in the last 2 decades. Each generation was as astonished as the present one by the changes it saw. There was as much excitement 150 years ago about steamboats as there is today about travel in outer space; and as much turmoil 100 years ago about new methods of packaging food as there is today.

The new Nation began to develop a series of growth industries. They were based on new inventions. The first such growth industry was cotton-raising. Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin in 1793; within a decade cotton production had multiplied 10 times. Then, as growth industries, there came in succession steamboating, railroading, farming, textile manufacturing, and steel production. Each, for a time, grew tremendously.

INVENTORS IN ODD CORNERS

These industries started from inventions and combinations of inventions. The inventions generally grew out of the ideas of eccentric thinkers, working long hours in obscure places on odd ideas. Most of these men were of what 18th-century Englishmen would have called lower-class origin. Thus—

Alexander Graham Bell was a speech teacher to a deaf mute pupil, and his first financing was from her father, a shoe manufacturer.

Thomas Edison started as a railroad newsboy, and was once thrown off a train for setting it on fire with a chemical experiment.

Henry Ford failed in business twice before the Ford Motor Co. began to succeed.

Orville and Wilbur Wright ran a bicycle shop.

And the first American to seal processed tomatoes in tin cans was a gardener, H. W. Crosby.

Yet many of these men's names are great in American history. In the history of most nations, the famous names are those of kings, ministers, generals, and noblemen. The United States Constitution says that "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States." But here are some of the most noble names in American history: Whitney, Du Pont, Fulton, McCormick, Case, Deere, Morse, Lowell, Colt, Pullman, Gatling, Borden, Westinghouse, Bell, Remington, Underwood, Eastman, Edison, Ford, and Wright. Inventors all.

And here are some of the more important inventions during the middle of the 19th century:

In the 1830's—the mowing machine, the reaper, the harvester, the revolver, the magnetic telegraph, and vulcanized rubber.

In the 1840's—the turret lathe, the sewing machine, the rotary printing press, and the safety pin.

In the 1850's—the ice-making machine, evaporated milk, the mason jar and the pullman car.

In the 1860's—the machinegun, the typewriter, and the railroad air-brake.

In the 1870's—celluloid, the gasoline engine, barbed wire, the telephone, the phonograph, the disc cultivator, the incandescent lamp, and the cash register.

In the 1880's—the trolley car, the fountain pen, the linotype, the electrolytic process for making aluminum, the safety bicycle, and the kodak.

THE FINANCING OF INVENTIONS

The marvel of the new economics was not (and is not, today) that so many things got invented, but that so many inventions reached the public. Free men are naturally inventive; but there never before was such a followthrough. Previous history is full of lost inventions. The ancient Greeks measured the circumference of the earth and invented a steam engine over 2,000 years ago. In renaissance Italy, Leonardo da Vinci is credited with 21 inventions. But until modern times most inventions were soon forgotten unless, like gunpowder, they were put to military use. There was nobody to risk the money on financing them.

One reason for the outburst of inventions was the patent system—itself an invention. It gave the inventor, in exchange for publicly explaining his idea, 17 years of full property rights.

More important—nobody could legally stop the inventor, or his backers, from puting his idea on the market. He need not go before an official board, which might turn thumbs down on his idea, either because it "wouldn't work," or because the board feared it might work all too well and so put somebody out of business or out of a job. Through previous history, this had been a major hazard to inventors, that they might be stopped because their ideas might endanger existing jobs or investments.

But the main reason for the flood of newly invented products was that, with this temporary property right in ideas, a profit might be hoped for from pushing them. If the inventor had no money—and he generally hadn't—others could put up the money and share in the hopes. The unique new force was not invention, but private venture money or "risk capital."

In former centuries, well-to-do people had never had such opportunities to risk their money in new ideas, except, in some cities, in shipping ventures. Profits had been frowned on. Contracts had had little legal support. Government might obstruct such ventures, or take the winnings. And it was considered beneath a gentleman to go into trade. So wealth had gone into conspicuous consumption—lace cuffs, servants, castles, and fountains.

But, as freedom was the major economic breakthrough of the 18th century, so the financing of new ideas was one of the chief developments of the 19th century.

When James Watt, in 1769, was working on an improved reciprocating steam engine, he had plenty of ideas, but no money. But a Matthew Boulton, going into partnership with Watt, put up, eventually, the $150,000 needed. And ever since then, the cost of getting inventions to market has been met

by various kinds of cooperation between inventors and moneyed persons. One of them was the arrangement by which the American Can Co., in 1908, brought its financial and engineering resources to the aid of the financially embarrassed Sanitary Can Co. in developing the latter's revolutionary new idea for a metal container.

It was a long way from the Watt and Boulton partnership to the story of the Sanitary Can Co. During the 19th century, all kinds of new financial devices were worked out to enlist "adventure capital" in new ideas. One of the earlier sources of money was the "merchant banker." A later source was the joint stock company, which raised money by selling its shares and bonds to a growing investor public.

Among others, a new man appeared on the scene—the promoter, or "entrepreneur," as later economists called him. He made a business of bringing inventions, capital, and customers.

The late Wendell Wilkie once told me how this worked out in one typical growth industry—electric power. He said:

"In the beginning there was the development by Edison of the incandescent lamp. No official set him at it and none passed on it.

"Then he issued licenses to use it. They were taken up by men in private enterprise. Ambitious fellows, who couldn't sleep of nights, took it out to the towns and tried to raise money to install it. For 25 years they hoped, risked, made and lost. The early story of the utility business is that it was started, nursed, got going, and then made to grow, by men willing to risk their own money, who took their enterprises to bed with them and stayed awake nights thinking up where to find money to feed the business, products to bring to the customer, and customers to replenish the till."

In all these ventures, the hope of profit was the driving force. It may not have inspired the inventor, but it inspired the people who put up the money. The result has been called the profit system. But it is better called the hope-of-profit system, or the profit-and-loss system. For the road was strewn with failures. Only a fraction of the new ideas paid off.

MASS PRODUCTION FOR THE MASSES

Among the new devices were power drives (first waterpower and then steampower) and interchangeable parts. And so, as machines got better, mass production followed.

Mass production began with guns and clocks. The first big mass production was in textiles, where cheap waterpower was available along the fall line of the Atlantic coast rivers.

Mass production required two things. One was mass markets, which naturally meant with the masses. The other was large amounts of risk capital.

The rise of mass production, however, also depended on the development of what is now one of the basic economic principles of American business. This is the principle of larger total profits, from smaller unit profits. It is sometimes called the reach for volume. It might be explained as follows:

A company has a new product, and the managers are figuring how to make the most money out of it. They think:

1. "With a small plant, our engineers think we could make 1 million pounds of this product a year for 50 cents a pound. And our market research people estimate we could sell this 1 million pounds for $1 a pound. Result: annual profit of 50 cents a pound on 1 million pounds, equals $500,000."

2. "But our market research people think that if we could get the price down to 40 cents, we could sell 10 million pounds. And our engineers estimate that with a plant big enough to make that much a year, they could get the cost down to 20 cents a pound. Result: annual profit of 20 cents a pound on 10 million pounds, or $2 million, or four times the profit at 40 cents as at $1."

This is much oversimplified, but it expresses the principle that has been followed in great areas of American business. The most famous example was that of Henry Ford, who cut the price of a new car from $950 to $500, and eventually to $290, raised wages, and still made great profits. The same principle has been followed in such leading American businesses as electric power, gasoline, food distribution, chemicals, and canmaking.

But success in this reach for volume is not simple. It involves large risks with large amounts of money. Many firms have gone bankrupt this way. Nineteenth-century Socialists used to think that the new factory owner merely figured his costs, added a markup for profit, and then roped in the money. But the joker in that view is shown above, in such pharses as "our engineers think" and our market people estimate." Every plant is built on nothing more than educated guesses.

Nor does the above show all the pitfalls in capital investment for mass production. Another is that if the company builds too large, the excess or unused capacity will eat up the profits, in interest costs, depreciation, maintenance and other unproductive overhead costs. A big plant, like a horse in a stable, eats whether it works or not.

Still another important calculation must be made before one builds a plant. How long will the market last for its product? Will the customers want something else before your plant investment can pay for itself? A recent example was in containers for liquid detergents. The American Can Co. had no sooner got liquid detergents from glass into metal than it had to switch to putting them into plastic.

HOW TO KEEP MAKING MONEY

The ideal way for a company to keep up in a free economy is for it to keep finding new products to make what people want, or new uses for existing products; and then to figure, somewhere nearly correctly, how many of the new products or applications it can sell, at what cost, and for how long (before they are outmoded).

This is one main reason for the enormous growth in recent years of research and development.

It is a fantasy of European origin that profits are normally made by hiring people cheap and selling their products dear. In a limited way, and in certain circumstances, this can be done. There will always be sweatshops. And it is true that many successful 19th-century employers and promoters were about as "social minded" as a Maine coast lobster. But the one who made "real money" did not do it by "squeezing the faces of the poor." They did it by bringing to market new ideas, new machines, new products, or new services. They were adventurers and innovators. But the key to moneymaking is judgment as to what the consumer will want, at what price, and for how long.

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—V: Profile of a University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is of further interest to the American public concerning the 75th anniversary celebration of Yeshiva University.

The article follows:

Yeshiva University, America's oldest and largest university under Jewish auspices, comprises 17 schools and divisions, 8 on the preparatory and undergraduate levels and 9 graduate and professional schools. Courses of study lead to 19 different degrees and diplomas in the arts and sciences and Jewish learning.

It is chartered by the State of New York, accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and specialized professional agencies, and is a member of the college entrance examination board.

The preparatory and undergraduate schools—for men and women—are unique, providing in one program both general and Jewish studies. Courses in Jewish learning are geared to the student's level of preparation and designed for the student's particular aims.

The graduate schools are nondenominational and mostly coeducational, offering programs of advanced study and professional preparation in many fields. Curriculums are strengthened by the cooperation of leading educational, welfare, and health agencies.

As the foremost expression of the Jewish community in American higher education, Yeshiva University has two major purposes: to serve the Nation and the Jewish community. The university fulfills these objectives through its extensive educational, service, and research programs, and the journals and books published for the scholastic world.

The university spans New York City with six teaching centers in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. The Main, Midtown, and Bronx Centers have dormitory and dining facilities.

Five thousand students from all parts of the United States and several foreign countries include many national scholarship winners and honor graduates of leading schools. They are preparing for positions of leadership in education, social work, the rabbinate, medicine, mathematics, physics, psychology, and other fields of endeavor. Each school maintains a warm, friendly atmosphere.

Currently, the heads of 12 major Jewish communal and educational organizations are alumni of Yeshiva University. Other graduates are serving as department heads within other major organizations, attesting to the university's role as the fountainhead of Jewish leadership.

More than 1,000 rabbis occupying pulpits and other key positions in the American Jewish community are alumni of the university's Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, the foremost center of Torah learning in the world.

Ninety-seven percent of the young men and women who graduated from the university's two colleges of arts and sciences (Yeshiva College and Stern College for Women) last year were accepted for advanced training by the Nation's outstanding graduate and professional schools. Twenty-five percent of this year's freshmen in those colleges, were recipients of State, national, industrial or community scholarships for their high school attainments.

Fourteen auxiliary services and special projects focus the university's extensive resources on the needs of the Jewish and general communities.

The university publishes four scholarly journals and a series of books which are universally esteemed wherever advanced study in Jewish learning and higher mathematics is pursued.

The outstanding faculty of 1,200 includes renowned scholars who have gained distinction in research, government service, and the world of scholarship.

Nine libraries, five of them major, include collections of specialized professional interest and cover all branches of the arts and sciences and Judaica.

Vital research projects are conducted in such diverse areas as the purse sciences, medicine, psychology, and education through significant grants from governmental agencies, foundations, and industry.

Yeshiva University has always been a pioneering institution. Outstanding "firsts" to its credit include: the establishment of the first academic high school in the United States under Jewish auspices; first college of liberal arts and sciences in the Nation under Jewish auspices; first American university under Jewish auspices; first liberal arts college for women in the Nation under Jewish auspices; first medical school in the United States under Jewish sponsorship and first university-based school of social work under Jewish auspices.

One of the university's greatest contributions has been the development of educational opportunities for women. Little more than a decade ago, women could not acquire a combined academic and Jewish education after elementary school. Today, Yeshiva University offers such programs at its two high schools for girls, Teachers Institute for Women, and Stern College for Women, which graduated its first class in 1958. Coeducational programs are offered also in most graduate and professional schools. Women now comprise 30 percent of the total student body.

Among the outstanding honorary alumni of Yeshiva University are: Bernard M. Baruch; Supreme Court Chief Justices Harlan Fiske Stone and Earl Warren, and Associate Justice Benjamin Cardozo; Dr. James B. Conant; Prof. Albert Einstein; Herbert H. Lehman; Richard M. Nixon; Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Adlai E. Stevenson; Dr. Selman A. Waksman; U.S. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS; Abba S. Eban; and Dr. Jonas Salk.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 years a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is chairman, has been holding hearings and issuing reports in an endeavor to establish the practice of requiring the executive departments to disclose to congressional committees, and perhaps Congressmen, information which is necessary to determine whether new legislation is needed, and, if needed, the type of legislation which will best serve the public interest, and also to learn the effect which existing legislation had, or is having, upon the general welfare.

This issue is as old as the Government itself.

In my humble judgment, the Congress, through its committees, and perhaps individual Congressmen, is entitled to be informed by the executive departments of all information needed to enable the Congress to adequately serve the people.

Several times, as the only Republican on the special subcommittee, it has been suggested by me that the subcommittee or its counsel frame a series of questions calling for information vitally needed to enable the Congress to properly execute its legislative functions.

Those questions should be submitted to the Department and, if refusal is made, then the subcommittee should report to the full committee, which should in turn call the situation to the attention of the House, and if, in the judgment of the House, the questions were proper, the refusal to answer not justified, the issue should be referred to the Attorney General for contempt proceedings, or the House, itself, should cite those responsible for the denial of information to appear before the House and make defense to a contempt charge, or submit to whatever procedure the House might determine to be necessary.

The matter could then be brought before the U.S. Supreme Court, whose function it is to determine disputes between the legislative and the executive departments.

The special subcommittee has been highly critical of the past administration. When a new administration came into power, the same position as to the disclosure of information by the executive departments which was established when the issue was first presented to our first President was adhered to.

In fact, the Kennedy administration went further in its refusal than perhaps did the previous administration.

Still more recently, the Secretary of Defense has taken a firm position that certain information on which the disciplining of General Walker was based would not be disclosed.

In my judgment, the limitation or the extent of the right of the legislative branch to information in the hands of the executive departments will never be determined until the Supreme Court has made a decision.

Has Success Phased Out Supply Single Managers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently a great deal of emphasis has been placed, by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, on the single supply concept for the military services. I am pleased that the Secretary has recognized the importance of this effort and intends to carry on with progress made thus far.

Since this is a subject of considerable interest to all of us, I believe it might be well to reflect on some of the background.

In 1949, H.R. 321 was introduced by my predecessor in Congress, the Honorable Jack Z. Anderson, of California. This bill directed the establishment of a single cataloging system, and to quote from House Report No. 1838 of the 82d Congress, "for the first time, undertook to fix responsibility for its establishment."

Extensive hearings were held and the Department of Defense indicated a willingness to cooperate in the establishment of a program. Subsequently, the Congress adopted a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a Federal cataloging system should be established.

In 1951 Congressman Anderson introduced H.R. 1033 calling for the establishment of a single supply catalog system. Upon referral of this bill to the Special Subcommittee on Procurement by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a study of the development of the single supply cataloging program ensued. After extensive hearings and investigation, a new bill (H.R. 7405) was reported out by the subcommittee, which was enacted into Public Law 436 of the 82d Congress, providing for an effective supply management organization within the Department of Defense through the establishment of a single supply cataloging system.

I think it is significant that today's major effort toward producing economy in supply management would not have been possible except for the legislative authority in Public Law 436. For a report on progress which has been made in this field during the past 5 years, I call your attention to the following article appearing in the September issue of the Armed Forces Management magazine:

HAS SUCCESS PHASED OUT SUPPLY SINGLE MANAGERS?

(By Col. Charles C. Case, U.S. Army, staff director, commodity single manager division, OSD (I. & L.)

(The author, Col. Charles Case, is considered by his superiors to be one of the real experts on single managerships. His article relates the history of supply single managerships, their success, and the imminent reorganization that will replace them. Colonel Case was formerly assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (S. & L).)

Five years have now passed since the first four Single Manager Supply Agencies were established by Department of Defense directives in 1956. The creation of these agencies was a marked departure from traditional concepts of military logistics. The changeover was not an easy one.

Nor has it met with complete success in every instance. Auditors, inspectors, and agency personnel themselves still unearth occasional instances of erroneous data, faulty requirements, imprudent buys, or other wasteful actions. Viewed in proper perspective, however, the single managers attainments by far outweigh their mistakes.

Major credit for the success of the single manager plan belongs to enlightened and objective leadership given the agencies by the executive directors and their staffs during the trying formative period and to the military department officials who backed them with assistance and resources. Fortunately, the leaders who directed the single manager agencies had the objectivity and breadth to set aside parochial interests in favor of a defensewide viewpoint.

These men, still more fortunately, had the boldness to experiment and innovate and the

wisdom to discard persistent but antiquated ways.

If any technical factor can be singled out as contributing to their success in converting an untried and unpopular idea into a proven, accepted, and expanding reality, it was ADP. The role of ADP will be even more decisive in the future, for now the single managers have invaded the complex technical commodities. The responsive and efficient management of these commodities would be next to impossible without ADP.

At present, there are approximately 3,700,000 items in the military supply system. The first four agencies to be established (subsistence, clothing and textiles, medical supplies, and petroleum) brought some 40,000 common-usage items under integrated management. While the percentage is small in relation to the total number of items in the supply system, the items under these four agencies are responsible for the largest number of individual transactions and for significant dollar value in sales, procurement, and inventory.

Last year four new agencies were set up to handle general supplies, construction supplies, industrial supplies, and automotive supplies. When they become fully operational, they will boost the total number of items under single management to over 700,000. If an integrated management assignment is made for the electrical-electronics commodity—a possibility by press time—integrated management coverage may well reach 1,200,000 items or about one-third of our present item spectrum.

Estimates of cumulative savings by the single managers now range over half a billion dollars dominated by inventory drawdown. Some of this money is now being plowed back in as starting-up costs for the new agencies, but eventually they will amortize this and pay dividends themselves.

It is always possible to achieve economy by compromising efficiency. Such has not been the case with single manager operations, however. Their normal rate of effectiveness has been about 95 percent, and in emergencies they have reacted with a discipline and sense of urgency becoming a military organization.

At the time of the Lebanon crisis the Navy-managed Military Medical Supply Agency met large requirements 100 percent within 48 hours of demand. To reprovision the fleet, the Military Subsistence Supply Agency made huge deliveries around the clock within hours of the asking. The Military Clothing and Textile Agency delivered Marine Corps last minute requirements right to shipside. MPSA arranged tanker movements 138 percent of normal, positioned floating reserves in the Mediterranean, and held the line on prices.

Action to support Project Mercury with medical items began within an hour of the Pentagon decision. Requisitions were prepared and financing arranged later. Every item made the deadline.

In July 1960 the Military Subsistence Supply Agency was called upon to furnish 100,000 rations for the support of U.N. forces in the Congo, a task complicated by the fact that the rations had to be pork-free in order to conform to the dietary laws of the Moslem units in the command.

The call was received on a Friday. By the following Tuesday, the 38 separate items making up the 25-man modules were ready for packaging. Subsequently, MSSA furnished 375,000 more "Congo pork-free rations" on the same basis.

Such a situation is made to order for ADP systems. In responding to the Congo crisis, MSSA puts its IBM 650 system to work over the weekend. Requisitions were fed into the computer and edited against stock levels in the various depots. The computer determined the best place to ship from, and prepared shipping orders that were then sent out by transceiver.

The combined use of ADP and a transceiver network has also demonstrated its value at the Military Clothing and Textile Agency. In its first 4 fiscal years of operation, M.C. & T.S.A. reduced its inventory from $1.9 billion to $1.4 billion. At the same time, its efficiency increased enormously. Supply effectiveness rose from 75 percent (items shipped on time) to a relatively stable 95 percent. Unfilled orders, or "duesout" at M.C. & T.S.A. dropped from an alarming peak of 40,000 to a level of about 1,000 by the end of fiscal 1960.

Prior to the establishment of M.C. & T.S.A. the four services stored clothing and textiles at 58 locations throughout the country with duplication and overlap of facilities and distribution areas. Material was backhauled and crosshauled between depots and customers. Material stores were controlled from 13 separate points.

From the 58 existing facilities, M.C. & T.S.A. selected 13 as distribution deposits and backup points for mobilization reserve stocks. The number of control points was reduced from 13 to 3. A transceiver network was set up linking storage locations and control points with M.C. & T.S.A. headquarters at the Philadelphia Quartermaster Center.

At Philadelphia, M.C. & T.S.A. employs an IBM 650 tape-RAMAC system. Operating on a transaction reporting basis, balances affected by each updating are compared with programed stock levels. If a reorder point has been reached, the computer automatically kicks out a "Supply Control Study" for evaluation and decision. The system also supplies control studies on demand whenever needed by stock analysts in their evaluations.

The lower operating cost of second generation—transistorized—computers has been illustrated in the recent establishment of an ADP system for the Military Construction Supply Agency. In starting up this new Single Manager Agency at an existing Army inventory control point at Columbus, Ohio, the doubling of supply data-processing workload called for the augmentation of ADP capability. A new Honeywell 800 is being installed to perform the combined missions of the ICP and the Single Manager with a resulting net equipment rental reduction of approximately $100,000 annually predicted.

To manage an anticipated spectrum of over 100,000 items and $350 million of inventory on a highly centralized basis, MCSA must rely heavily on ADPS.

All Single Managers employ ADPE of varying manufacture and capability. The Military Automotive Supply Agency, integrated with Ordnance Tauk Automotive Command, is programing for a new RCA 501 system to supplement the ADPE used by OTAC for several years. The Military Medical Supply Agency has installed an IBM 1401 which is in full operation covering all major programs. MGSA has just installed a large-scale, transistorized IBM data-processing system and M.C. & T.S.A. plans to put in a comparable installation shortly.

The Military Petroleum Supply Agency, unlike the others, does not have to process a large number of daily transactions. As the world's largest buyer of refined petroleum, however, MPSA has to solve an extremely complex set of variable factors whenever it awards its bulk-procurement contracts. In determining the least-cost bids on some 2 billion gallons of jet fuel twice a year, for example, MPSA must consider 90,000 variables such as unit price, method of transportation, distance, destination, terminal capacity, small business priorities, and many other factors.

This formerly required 7 weeks of manual computation. By redesigning its management system and adopting linear programing to apply the variables properly, MPSA has been able to shift a major portion of its evaluation workload to a combination IBM 704/7090 system. This has shaved 2 weeks off the evaluation operation. Savings due to the increased accuracy of the program are expected to come to $5 million a year.

MSSA is also studying the application of linear programing and computer evaluation to the myriad of variables which complicate subsistence procurement.

The Military Industrial Supply Agency will eventually manage 480,000 line items. To assist in this staggering management job, the agency will employ RCA ADP equipment. By adapting the format of its catalog to the readout of an RCA 501, MISA, among other things, saves a half railroad carload of paper when it goes to press.

Impressive as these savings in time and money may be, the ease with which single manager operations lend themselves to modern ADP techniques has paid other dividends that may, in the long run, be more important than dollars and cents savings. As one agency spokesman pointed out recently, "Top level supervisors can now devote more time to the development of better management decisions instead of massaging papers and computing statistics.

Already the results are beginning to show. Phantom numbers—line items with no demand, no stock, and no history of either have been spotted and eliminated. Commonality of usage among the four services has been increasing. For example, before MC & TSA was established only about 14 percent of the clothing and textile items were in common use. MC & TSA has more than doubled this percentage and has reduced its item range 18 percent at the same time. MISA recently secured service agreement to standardize on paints and to eliminate 24 percent of the paint items from this system. MGSA, meanwhile eliminated 72 percent of the items in one of its Federal classes.

Next July two standardization developments will go into effect that will further extend the capabilities of the single-manager ADP systems. First is a standard priority system that will replace the separate priority classifications now used by the individual services. Second, and more revolutionary is a uniform requesition system. The 16 present systems by which DOD's estimated 750,000 transactions per day are handled will be reduced to 2 standard systems—a requisition system and a shipping invoice system.

The uniform requisition system, and other uniform methods now under development, will certainly hasten the day when computer talks to computer and ADP systems take over more and more of the routine responsibilities of our complex supply organization. As a step in this direction, a rapid data transmission system has been in operation between the Armed Forces Supply Support Center and all major inventory control points since 1959. At present, improvements are underway with the first installation of the IBM 1944 paper tape transceiver.

FUTURE TRENDS

These developments are an encouraging beginning to a huge task still ahead. The requirements of military readiness—far more urgently than the dictates of economics—demand greater integration, cohesion continuity, and compatibility in our supply system if it is to satisfy the criteria of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and be immediately responsive to all our military forces worldwide. More comprehensive and cohesive emphasis on integrated system design is needed in high priority, particularly at the inventory control point level. Common data elements, code structures, terms and procedure are needed to facilitate communications among the elements of our system and between the

system and supported forces. Supply and financial procedures must be simplified and brought into consonance. Computers must talk to computers across service, command, commodity, and functional barriers with less reaction and leadtime.

By the time this article appears, the Secretary of Defense may have made a decision as a result of Project 100 which will consign the single manager plan to the archives as another passing episode in the chronology of logistics unification. Single managers may be superseded eventually by a defense supply agency, a joint logistics command, a fourth—or as the Marines prefer to say—a fifth service.

Or they may be given a new lease on life with greater emphasis on unified system design. It is not appropriate to discuss the merits of these alternatives here. Whatever the outcome of Project 100, the progress made by single managers will be preserved and built upon. Their contribution toward a responsive, compatible integrated supply system has been substantial.

How Can the Neutrals Follow American Leadership Unless the United States Is Willing To Lead?—Communist Toughness Wins Respect—American Timidity Loses Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on the Belgrade conference of neutral countries, some of which are nonalined only because they cannot find strong consistent leadership to follow on the part of the United States:

LET'S AIM FOR WORLD RESPECT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

Imagine how an orchestra would sound if the conductor were so concerned with each player's own views of how the music should be played that he hesitated to lift his baton and lead the band.

That certainly wouldn't make for a very forceful performance, would it?

It seems to me that an international alliance is somewhat like an orchestra because affiliated nations have points of view likely to be as conflicting as the oboist's and cellist's. The conductor is up there to lead the orchestra to unity, and no alliance can have unity unless it too is led.

I can't help thinking that Uncle Sam, who never sought the lob of leading the Free World but is stuck with it as the historical consequence of coping with global aggression in nearly half a century, resembles that hesitant conductor.

To get off the musical metaphor, I think that this country has been too sensitive to "world opinion" for our own good or for the world's.

Worrying about what everybody might think of us has far too often kept us from exercising the strength upon which not only we ourselves must rely, but upon which the freedom of the other nations depends.

Instances of Uncle Sam letting international kibitzers call the play are unfortunately many. A classic example was the Korean war, where our Air Force was leashed to conform with Allies' qualms, and the resulting stalemate built up Red China as a world power.

"World opinion"—with special attention to hemispheric neighbors—has caused the United States to sit still for establishment of a Communist beachhead almost within whistling distance of Florida, when we could have stamped out Castro's regime at any time and all the Americas would have been better off.

Possibly the largest concession we have made to world opinion has been the voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests. With no guarantee that the Soviet had ever stopped tests, we have let our own testing lapse for nearly 3 years. Meantime we have sat through years of stalling in negotiations for a test ban which the Soviet never intended to bear fruit.

And when the Soviet was ready—in its own interests—to resume testing openly, it did so this past week without anybody's by-your-leave. This might appear at first glance to be thumbing the Khrushchevian nose at world opinion.

But just what is world opinion, anyway?

Surely it is obvious that world opinion is as diverse as the French horn and the English horn in that orchestra I mentioned before. Twice recently, trying to be liked by everybody, the United States was caught in an indecisive swivet at the United Nations—in the African-Portuguese quarrel over Angola and the French-Tunisian quarrel over Bizerte.

What world opinion did we succeed in winning those times?

One trouble is that we confuse world opinion with a popularity contest. But more important is world respect, which can be won only by strength and never by weakness, no matter how much good will we demonstrate and no matter how much helping hand we give the rest of the world.

That's a mistake the Russians don't often make. Cynically they figure that world opinion will swallow the brutal self-interest of Soviet nuclear tests as it accepted the brutality of the Hungarian massacre of 1956.

By Soviet reckoning, world opinion respects the show of Red force. Quite a case can be made for their logic if you go by the way so many small nations sass us and kowtow to the Russians.

Khrushchev has been adept at using our fear of world opinion. Remember the way he screamed to the heavens when he thought he had President Eisenhower embarrassed over the U–2 spy flights? But he controlled himself neatly and didn't take off a single shoe to pound when President de Gaulle—who cares very little for world opinion—fired a nuclear test shot down the Sahara range while Khrushchev was visiting France, of all places.

I think the United States could very well emulate General de Gaulle's view that "world opinion" is virtually meaningless unless it is based on respect for strength.

Reverting to the analogy with which this piece began, you might suppose that Conductor Khrushchev would have quieted the brasses of the Communist bloc symphony and called for sweet music from the strings and woodwinds while the Belgrade meeting of the unalined nations was getting under way.

But, instead, Khrushchev gave the boys in Belgrade a howling blast from the Brandenburg gate concerto in his announcement about resuming tests, and as this is written many of the delegates are still quivering from shock.

This was evident when the Conference opened Friday, but it was also significant that in most instances the seething resentment against Russia was kept on the back of the stove, without direct identification of the Soviet Union as the cynical betrayer of the hopes of mankind for peace.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic was the only one to come out and say the Russian decision "shocked me just as it shocked world opinion." Tito, although reportedly boiling mad, confined himself to a warning of world war III without mentioning Russia at all.

If you run a finger down the list of the 24 nations at the conference, and reflect on their records, there is nothing surprising in this. The preponderant majority is neutral-against-the-United States.

The most flagrant example so far is President Nkrumah of Ghana, who had a lengthy talk with Khrushchev at Sochi on the Black Sea just before he flew to Belgrade.

He was in effect Khrushchev's messenger boy, carrying the Russian propaganda package to the conference, and so blatant was he that a number of other leaders there considered him Mr. K.'s spokesman.

I would hope that the administration is keeping score on people like Nkrumah and will refer to it when the time comes to dish out more foreign aid.

It is a hope not backed up with a great deal of expectation. For the said fact has been that the boys who play both sides of the street between the East and the West are those who wind up with the taxpayers' gravy.

In fact, I suggest it would be a good idea for all of us to keep score on what goes on at Belgrade.

If you do, keep in mind the various background motivations. Some of the nations are fairly honest neutrals. Some are greedy neutrals. Some carry an unconscious bias against the West from memory of the time of Western colonialism, and therefore are blind to the fact that the Soviet Union is the world's greatest colonizing power today.

But all of them, you can bet your hat, are motivated by self-interest.

We could use a lot more of the same right here at home.

The 75th Anniversary of Yeshiva University—VI: Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the following statement is of further interest to the American public concerning the 75th anniversary celebration of Yeshiva University.

The article follows:

Albert Einstein College of Medicine—a graduate school of Yeshiva University—was established as a contribution of the American Jewish community to medical science and human welfare. Grounded in our Nation's democratic traditions, the college is a nonsectarian institution, with students and faculty drawn from all races, religions, and creeds.

As the first new university medical center to be opened in the metropolitan area since the turn of the century, Einstein College is the heart of a rapidly developing $160 million medical city of training, research, and healing. On the college campus are a 10-story teaching-research building, library, auditorium, residence, and activities center for students. Two municipal hospital centers, with a 1,500-bed capacity, serve as the clinical teaching center for the medical

school. Presently under construction are a $70 million psychiatric hospital by the State of New York and a school of nursing and nurses residence by the city of New York.

Although a comparatively young school, Einstein College has won wide recognition as a major medical teaching center. Here, in an atmosphere of freedom and fellowship, students are prepared for careers as doctors * * * gifted scientists carry on basic research in the cause and cure of disease. Three graduating classes have already joined the ranks of American medicine as interns and residents in communities from coast to coast. In addition, nearly 750 Einstein-trained scientists and specialists in every area of medicine are serving with distinction throughout the United States and abroad.

And now, the college has broken ground for a bold new venture designed to help translate the promise of modern medicine into the reality of longer, healthier living. Its "Blueprint for the Future" envisions the construction of a diagnostic center-university hospital, which will make available the most advanced facilities for medical care to patients from all over the land. A modern research center for health sciences is also being built, to enable Einstein College scientists to keep pace with today's breathtaking advances in medicine.

When the college first opened its doors in 1955, John F. Kennedy voiced the hope that the fledgling institution would become "a monument to happiness and health." The college's inspiring achievements and challenging perspectives are heartening evidence that his high hopes are being fulfilled.

Feeding the Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 my very able and respected colleague, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, performed a valuable service to all Members of this body in bringing to our attention a number of shocking facts regarding our export control program with particular reference to controls on trade with the Soviet Union. This was in connection with House consideration of House Resolution 403, creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts.

The concern of the Congress in the continued U.S. export of goods to Communist-dominated countries is testified to in the division vote in passage of House Resolution 403 of 90 yeas to 1 nay.

In further regard to this situation, I believe the Members will be interested in some additional facts revealed recently during a hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a bill to prohibit any exchange of articles between the United States and Cuba, except those destined for U.S. military use at Guantanamo Naval Base. Although a partial economic embargo was imposed on Cuba by the United States in October 1960, trade with Cuba today is being carried on as though relations between the two nations were nearly normal.

Under the restrictions, no U.S. goods are supposed to be exported to Cuba unless they can be classified as foodstuffs or medical supplies. However, according to committee testimony, exports to Cuba from the United States for the period January through March 1961, exceeded $6.9 million, of which $3.6 million consisted of lard. Lard, Mr. Speaker, is vital to the manufacture of nitroglycerine. Other exports include $400,000 in machinery and vehicles. Just last month, as an example, U.S. shipments to Communist Cuba included 42 diesel engines adaptable for military tank use.

At the same time, incoming shipments are appearing almost regularly at U.S. ports in Eastern and Gulf States, even though public indignation is so high that trucks transporting these commodities are masking their insignia to avoid public identification.

Although our Government has officially branded Cuba a clear and present danger to the security of this hemisphere, and the Congress has adopted a resolution recognizing the Communist affiliation of the present Government of Cuba, the executive branch has failed to invoke various means available for curtailing Cuban trade. Hesitation and inaction by the State Department and other offices of the administration only further serve as evidence of the executive branch's inability to combat Cuban communism in the forceful manner preached by Candidate Kennedy.

The State Department witness opposed the bill, H.R. 8459, apparently because it would weaken the flexibility of the State Department. This witness also seemed of the opinion that current shipments to Cuba are not of great consequence and therefore would not be worth the repercussions of a total economic embargo.

Other testimony before the committee brought to light the rising tide of congressional vexation against the Cuban dictatorship and determination of Members of the House to take action unless the administration does something soon.

The sponsorship of H.R. 8465 by Members of the majority party, the action of the Florida State Legislature in endorsing the resolution, and the support of the bill by Members on both sides of the aisle in this body gives testimony to the fact that the Congress, as are all Americans, is growing impatient with the administration's wait-and-see attitude regarding Cuba.

Although for humanitarian reasons, Mr. Speaker, certain organizations such as the Red Cross should be allowed to provide medical supplies to Cuban hospitals, we must refuse to continue to bolster Cuba's Communist economy. We must take a strong and decisive step as a symbol of leadership to other nations of the free world. Under present circumstances, how can we ask our friends to do what we do not do ourselves? How can we be critical of Canadian trade with Red China when we trade with Communist Cuba?

In instances such as this, I believe that when the administration refuses to take positive action, the Congress has every obligation and right to take the initiative.

How Can People in Our Government Still Believe That Trading With the Communist Enemy Will Convert Him Into a Friend?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Schulz from the National Review of August 26, 1961:

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY
(By William Schulz)

On several occasions during his campaign, John Kennedy promised to revise what he considered the sterile negative concepts that governed free world trade with the Communist bloc; and he has kept his word.

Within 6 months, Mr. Kennedy has drastically altered American policies on trade with the enemy, so quietly that few realize the magnitude of his actions. He has created "an entirely new atmosphere" (as one State Department minion puts it) in which commerce between East and West is actively promoted to ease world tensions.

The President has successfully pushed through the Senate several radical amendments to the Battle Act facilitating trade with the Soviet Union and its satellite empire; the Defense Department has been persuaded to overturn an earlier ruling that precision machine tools could not be exported to the U.S.S.R.; the Treasury Department has lifted its ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat; and a legal reinterpretation by Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges has opened the door for sale of below-cost surplus farm commodities to Iron Curtain nations.

LICENSES APPROVED

The atmosphere at Commerce is remarkably changed. Under the regimes of Lewis Strauss and Frederick Mueller, American manufacturers found it difficult to get licenses for export to the Soviet Union and its satellite empire. In 2 days recently, however, the Department approved 41 licenses for the sale of goods to Red bloc nations: 13 granted permission for export to the Soviet Union; 11 to Czechoslovakia; 9 to Yugoslavia; 4 to Rumania; 2 to Hungary; and 1 each to Poland and Bulgaria.

Ruled nonstrategic in nature, and therefore approved for export, were all ball-bearings, machine tools, power transmission systems, aircraft and automotive spare parts, electrical machinery, geophysical instruments and other "industrial products and chemicals."

American firms are now being urged to import from the Red bloc, a matter of some concern to several old allies. It is known, for instance, that the Russians wish to export to this country asbestos, furs, lumber, pulp and paper, ferrous metals and alloys. Worried Canadians point out that the list reads almost like a rundown of Canada's main exports to the United States.

COLD WAR WEAPON

The administration seemingly refuses to recognize that the Soviet Union has long used trade as a major weapon in its cold war arsenal. During the early thirties, for instance, when Soviet trade reached an all-time peak, Russian imports from Estonia (then a free nation) almost overnight shrank to 4.12 percent of the previous average. This unexpected cessation of almost all Soviet purchases was meant to crush Estonia's national economy. It was due only to the exemplary discipline of the Estonian people that the Kremlin did not succeed in its aggressive plans at that time.

In 1947, famine raged in a great many sections of Russia, but the Soviets sent shiploads of grain to Italy and to France to bolster Communist revolutionary activities in those countries. And several years ago the Soviet Union sent tens of millions of dollars worth of war material, clothing, and medicine to Egypt for no other reason than to create disturbances in the Middle East and to disrupt the flow of oil and general trade through the Suez Canal. And in 1953, when Pakistan appeared ready to sign a military treaty with this country, Communist China put on the screws by cutting its purchases of Pakistani cotton from $84 to $7 million in 1 year.

It was more than a realization that commerce as used by the Kremlin is a weapon, however, that led the Eisenhower administration to reject regularly Soviet trade overtures. There was the hard fact that much that the Russians want is strategically valuable. In June 1958, for instance, Premier Khrushchev wrote President Eisenhower asking for $100 million in credits to buy American chemical equipment and processes of a nature so secret that many American firms were unable to obtain them. Among them were processes for making polyurethanes, used in insulation for missile controls, and acrylonitrile, which is basic to plastics, synthetic fibers, and manmade rubber. Many of the chemicals had direct uses in radar, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

U.S. industry had devoted 10,000 man-hours to just 5 of the 16 processes the Russians were after. The offer was turned down on the grounds that there was no gain for the United States in any such deal, that Russia could copy all that she bought, then flood world markets with chemicals produced with Western knowledge. Further, there could be no guarantee that the Reds would keep their promise to pay. Deputy Premier Mikoyan told State Department officials 2 years ago that his country had no intention of paying its World War II lend-lease debt.

The Communists have by no means distinguished themselves as traders. In recent years Czechoslovakia, for instance, has swung a number of deals to export machine tools and other machinery. Customers are now complaining that delivery dates for the tools are lengthening. Some small tools can be supplied from stocks, but for medium tools there is a delay of 5 to 8 months, and for heavy tools about 18 months; for special tools the delay can be up to 3 years.

But to the bright young men who surround the President there are no two ways about trade with the Communist bloc. "What you can't realize," commented one recently, "is the effect these policies have on world tensions. It was time for us to take the initiative and we have. You can see the results yourself." And so you can.

High Holy Day Message of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to make part of the permanent archives of our Nation the tremendously significant High Holy Day message of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

The message follows:

WHERE DOES THE WORLD START?—AT YOUR FINGERTIPS

Do you say:

"There's nothing I can do about the problems of the world."

Nothing?

This is a common mistake, for there isn't a world problem which does not begin where you are.

And always you can diminish or add to it.

Not to be aware of this—not knowing the difference you make—is in itself one of the biggest of world problems.

Consider these three major issues of our time: ignorance, poverty, oppression.

1. We often think the world problem is ignorance. Yet the real problem is our unwillingness to learn.

In talking to our family, to our neighbors, to business associates or to the peoples of the world, we're often so busy thinking of answers to give them, we don't really hear what they have to say to us. We want to teach when our need is to learn.

No one can fight ignorance this way. Only when we're ready to listen to others can we hope they will learn with us and from us.

When we do this, when we concern ourselves with listening and learning, we diminish ignorance in the world, right where we are.

2. We often think the world problem is poverty. Yet the real problem is our shortsightedness.

We tend to believe the best way to secure our well-being is to accumulate more and more goods, even if this is at the expense of others. That is no more than an animal does.

And the long history of man has shown repeatedly that ethical wisdom and practical wisdom point to the same truth:

No one surrounded by poverty can be rich.

Certainly, no accumulation of possessions can preserve our well-being except when those around us share in our wealth, too.

The man willing to share his responsibilities and his opportunities to create wealth can never be crushed by them.

And he does not find his security undermined by the needs and hungers of others.

We can be sure that to share what we have will reduce poverty in the world, right where we are.

3. We often think the world problem is oppression. Yet the real problem is the rejection of our neighbors.

We see people all around us trying, in their pride, to lift themselves up, not by their own growth but by lowering others.

They engage in an endless empty attempt to raise their status by leaving others out.

And sometimes we find ourselves among them.

Here, too, we fail to recognize how much the ideal and the practical are the same.

For the simple fact is: each of us belongs inalienably to the family of man. There are no strangers left on earth.

We are all alike in that each of us is different, yet all of us are neighbors.

That's why we have the power to reduce oppression in the world. We do so whenever we make welcome a neighbor of whatever race or creed or color; whenever we make him feel at home in our community.

This is where the world starts.

We must understand how much we can do in the world, in yet another way.

We not only receive the world from the generations of the past. We also pass it on to those who come after us.

And we are descendents of great men who recognized their obligations to fight ignorance, poverty, and oppression everywhere.

We must do no less.

For we are a generation to whom greatness of heritage and opportunity have been given.

So, each of us faces these questions:

How shall we pass on our inheritance: will it be diminished or increased?

Will we be the grandfathers—or only the grandsons—of great men?

This is why it was said:

"God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob" and not "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."

It was to let each generation know that, while we inherit a tradition, we must still achieve our own understanding and meet our own responsibilities in what we owe to life and God.

God Was Bored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us here remember—many years ago—the words of a great American during a time of severe domestic crisis:

We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

The situation developing in the world today has placed us in the peculiar position where we can destroy ourselves through this very mechanism of fear. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson which appeared in the New Republic of September 11, 1961.

We must learn the lesson from Thucydides or we will surely suffer the fate of Napoleon.

The article follows:

GOD WAS BORED

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

A friend, not critical, merely curious, writes that he has seen in this place recently more than one reference to Thucydides. Then in a commencement speech

that Adlai Stevenson wrote for Amherst—he never delivered it because he was suddenly dispatched to South America, but it was printed—he found a pair of quotations from Thucydides; and he wonders why people have this old Greek writer on the brain these days.

What Mr. Stevenson may have had in mind is unknown to this observer of the superficial aspect of things; but if Thucydides has slipped into this page from time to time it is because his book applies to our present situation to an extent that raises the hair on the back of a thoughtful American's neck.

It is apt even in being incomplete. We do not learn from Thucydides how it all came out; for that, we must turn to Grote, or some other historian of ancient Greece. We do not know how our own very similar situation is going to turn out, and there is no Grote to inform us. If we undertake to guess on the basis of the facts in hand we find no comfort in the process.

Thucydides' theme is the Peloponnesian War in the first phase of which Athens was as triumphant as the United States was in 1945. Sparta was prostrate, but the inspired leader of Athenians, Pericles, was dead and to replace him the democracy turned to a general who by genius or luck had made a good record in the war, and was universally regarded as an honest man.

This was bumbling Nicias, who saw what ought to be done, but never had quite enough vigor and resolution to do it. Incapable of coping with Cleon, he allowed that demogog to undermine the morale of Athens even more than McCarthy did that of America. The so-called peace of Nicias was actually a cold war, which drifted inevitably into a hot one because nobody knew how to organize a genuine peace.

When the hot war was launched with the Syracusan expedition, worse bungled than the anti-Castro raid on Cuba, Athens, although powerfully armed, was psychologically incapable of waging successful war. At a critical moment the one general of some real capacity, Alcibiades, was yanked out of the theater of war by the Un-Athenian Activities Committee. Since it was known of all men that anyone summoned by that outfit was already as good as hanged, Alcibiades defected to the enemy. And so it went. Nicias contrived to lose both the fleet and the army in an operation as insane as would be an American invasion of Laos.

It is about there that Thucydides quits, but Grote continues the dismal story. By frantic efforts Athens managed to raise a new army and build a new fleet, dragging out the war for years. She even recalled Alcibiades, who did brilliant work for a while. But it was all to no avail. Cleon had done his work too well and the city was morally disarmed. There was no such thing as confidence and trust in Athens. Everybody was suspected as a traitor, and if a man had lived an honorable and useful life for many years, that only showed what a shrewd deceiver he was. Athens' state of mind was that of the John Birch Society, and ruin was the inevitable result.

True, her conquerors profited little. Sparta was so weakened by the 27 years' struggle that she was easily smashed by Thebes; and presently both were overwhelmed by Macedon—all the while lurking in the background, the Red China of the ancient world.

Is it necessary to draw a diagram to show why Thucydides is horrifying reading for a modern American? Athens, the one great democracy of the ancient world, was a suicide, driven to self-destruction by fear. Yet she had faced and beaten the overwhelming power of Persia. She had defeated Sparta. She had won more small wars than the United States won against the Indians. She had been unchallenged mistress of the sea, her land forces were formidable.

But she died of fear—not of fear of the Persian, or of the Spartan, or of any barbarian. It was fear of the Athenian. Even as the John Birchites, taking their cue from McCarthy, howl that the real enemy is the enemy within, so Cleon howled against any man of real ability in Athens until it came to pass that the only reward for conspicuous public service was to be regarded as a subversive character. Only the stupid were beyond suspicion, only the dull could be entrusted with command.

Naturally the story chills any American who lived through the McCarthy affliction and who had hoped that McCarthyism died with its originator, but who now finds it revived in a more pestilential form under the name of a brainless character who got himself shot for no purpose at all. Napoleon collapsed, said Victor Hugo, because "God was bored by him." But a nation afraid of itself is a greater bore even than Napoleon.

The Role of Adventure in the American Achievement—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second chapter from the pamphlet "The American Achievement," entitled "Adventure":

ADVENTURE

ONE GROWTH INDUSTRY AFTER ANOTHER

The ink was hardly dry on the U.S. Constitution in 1787, when the country began to see such a rapid flowering of the industrial arts as had never been seen before in human history.

The new political ideas of the Founding Fathers promptly began to pay off like the research ideas of a growth industry. It was as though a switch had been thrown, and a current of new energy introduced into the American circuit.

For generation after generation of Americans, the progress that followed was much like the progress we have seen in the last two decades. Each generation was as astonished as the present one by the changes it saw. There was as much excitement 150 years ago about steamboats as there is today about travel in outer space; and as much turmoil 100 years ago about new methods of packaging food as there is today.

The new Nation began to develop a series of growth industries. They were based on new inventions. The first such growth industry was cotton raising. Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin in 1793; within a decade cotton production had multiplied 10 times. Then, as growth industries, there came in succession steamboating, railroading, farming, textile manufacturing, and steel production. Each, for a time, grew tremendously.

INVENTORS IN ODD CORNERS

These industries started from inventions and combinations of inventions. The inventions generally grew out of the ideas of eccentric thinkers, working long hours in obscure places on odd ideas. Most of these men were of what 18th-century Englishmen would have called lower class origin. Thus—

Alexander Graham Bell was a speech teacher to a deaf mute pupil, and his first financing was from her father, a shoe manufacturer.

Thomas Edison started as a railroad newsboy, and was once thrown off a train for setting it on fire with a chemical experiment.

Henry Ford failed in business twice before the Ford Motor Co. began to succeed.

Orville and Wilbur Wright ran a bicycle shop.

And the first American to seal processed tomatoes in tin cans was a gardener, H. W. Crosby.

Yet many of these men's names are great in American history. In the history of most nations, the famous names are those of kings, ministers, generals, and noblemen. The U.S. Constitution says that "No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States." But here are some of the most noble names in American history: Whitney; DuPont; Fulton; McCormick; Case; Deere; Morse; Lowell; Colt; Pullman; Gatling; Borden; Westinghouse; Bell; Remington; Underwood; Eastman; Edison; Ford; and Wright. Inventors all.

And here are some of the more important inventions during the middle of the 19th century:

In the 1830's: The mowing machine, the reaper, the harvester, the revolver, the magnetic telegraph, and vulcanized rubber.

In the 1840's: The turret lathe, the sewing machine, the rotary printing press, and the safety pin.

In the 1850's: The icemaking machine, evaporated milk, the mason jar and the pullman car.

In the 1860's: The machinegun, the typewriter, and the railroad airbrake.

In the 1870's: Celluloid, the gasoline engine, barbed wire, the telephone, the phonograph, the disc cultivator, the incandescent lamp, and the cash register.

In the 1880's: The trolley car, the fountain pen, the Linotype, the electrolytic process for making aluminum, the safety bicycle, and the Kodak.

THE FINANCING OF INVENTIONS

The marvel of the new economics was not (and is not today) that so many things got invented, but that so many inventions reached the public. Freemen are naturally inventive; but there never before was such a followthrough. Previous history is full of lost inventions. The ancient Greeks measured the circumference of the earth and invented a steam engine over 2,000 years ago. In Renaissance Italy, Leonardo da Vinci is credited with 21 inventions. But until modern times most inventions were soon forgotten unless, like gunpowder, they were put to military use. There was nobody to risk the money on financing them.

One reason for the outburst of inventions was the patent system—itself an invention. It gave the inventor, in exchange for publicly explaining his idea, 17 years of full property rights.

More important—nobody could legally stop the inventor, or his backers, from putting his idea on the market. He need not go before an official board, which might turn thumbs down on his idea, either because it wouldn't work, or because the board feared it might work all too well and so put somebody out of business or out of a job. Through previous history, this had been a major hazard to inventors, that they might be stopped because their ideas might endanger existing jobs or investments.

But the main reason for the flood of newly invented products was that, with this temporary property right in ideas, a profit might be hoped for from pushing them. If the inventor had no money—and he generally hadn't—others could put up the money and share in the hopes. The unique new force was not invention, but private venture money or risk capital.

In former centuries, well-to-do people had never had such opportunities to risk their money in new ideas, except, in some cities, in shipping ventures. Profits had been

frowned on. Contracts had had little legal support. Government might obstruct such ventures, or take the winnings. And it was considered beneath a gentleman to go into trade. So wealth had gone into conspicuous consumption—lace cuffs, servants, castles, and fountains.

But, as freedom was the major economic breakthrough of the 18th century, so the financing of new ideas was one of the chief developments of the 19th century.

When James Watt, in 1769, was working on an improved reciprocating steam engine, he had plenty of ideas, but no money. But a Matthew Boulton, going into partnership with Watt, put up, eventually, the $150,000 needed. And ever since then, the cost of getting inventions to market has been met by various kinds of cooperation between inventors and monied persons. One of them was the arrangement by which the American Can Co., in 1908 brought its financial and engineering resources to the aid of the financially embarrassed Sanitary Can Co., in developing the latter's revolutionary new idea for a metal container.

It was a long way from the Watt and Boulton partnership to the story of the Sanitary Can Co. During the 19th century, all kinds of new financial devices were worked out to enlist adventure capital in new ideas. One of the earlier sources of money was the merchant banker. A later source was the joint-stock company, which raised money by selling its shares and bonds to a growing investor public.

Among others, a new man appeared on the scene—the promoter, or entrepreneur, as later economists called him. He made a business of bringing together inventions, capital, and customers.

The late Wendell Willkie once told me how this worked out in one typical growth industry—electric power. He said:

"In the beginning there was the development by Edison of the incandescent lamp. No official set him at it and none passed on it.

"Then he issued licenses to use it. They were taken up by men in private enterprise. Ambitious fellows, who couldn't sleep of nights, took it out to the towns and tried to raise money to install it. For 25 years they hoped, risked, made and lost. The early story of the utility business is that it was started, nursed, got going, and then made to grow, by men willing to risk their own money, who took their enterprises to bed with them and stayed awake nights thinking up where to find money to feed the business, products to bring to the customer, and customers to replenish the till."

In all these ventures, the hope of profit was the driving force. It may not have inspired the inventor, but it inspired the people who put up the money. The result has been called "the profit system." But it is better called the "hope-of-profit system," or the "profit-and-loss system." For the road was strewn with failures. Only a fraction of the new ideas paid off.

MASS PRODUCTION FOR THE MASSES

Among the new devices were powerdrives (first waterpower and then steampower) and interchangeable parts. And so, as machines got better, mass production followed.

Mass production began with guns and clocks. The first big mass production was in textiles, where cheap waterpower was available along the fall line of the Atlantic coast rivers.

Mass production required two things. One was mass markets, which naturally meant, with the masses. The other was large amounts of risk capital.

The rise of mass production, however, also depended on the development of what is now one of the basic economic principles of American business. This is the principle of larger total profits, from smaller unit profits. It is sometimes called the "reach for volume." It might be explained as follows.

A company has a new product, and the managers are figuring how to make the most money out of it. They think:

1. "With a small plant, our engineers think we could make 1 million pounds of this product a year for 50 cents a pound. And our market research people estimate we could sell this 1 million pounds for $1 a pound. Result: Annual profit of 50 cents a pound on 1 million pounds, equals $500,000.

2. "But our market research people think that if we could get the price down to 40 cents, we could sell 10 million pounds. And our engineers estimate that with a plant big enough to make that much a year, they could get the cost down to 20 cents a pound. Result: Annual profit of 20 cents a pound on 10 million pounds, or $2 million, or four times the profit at 40 cents as at $1."

This is much oversimplified, but it expresses the principle that has been followed in great areas of American business. The most famous example was that of Henry Ford, who cut the price of a new car from $950 to $500, and eventually to $290, raised wages, and still made great profits. The same principle has been followed in such leading American businesses as electric power, gasoline, food distribution, chemicals, and canmaking.

But success in this reach for volume is not simple. It involves large risks with large amounts of money. Many firms have gone bankrupt this way. Nineteenth century Socialists used to think that the new factory owner merely figured his costs, added a markup for profit, and then roped in the money. But the joker in that view is shown above, in such phrases as "our engineers think * * *" and "our market people estimate * * *." Every plant is built on nothing more than educated guesses.

Nor does the above show all the pitfalls in capital investment for mass production. Another is that if the company builds too large, the excess or unused capacity will eat up the profits, in interest costs, depreciation, maintenance and other unproductive overhead costs. A big plant, like a horse in a stable, eats whether it works or not.

Still another important calculation must be made before one builds a plant. How long with the market last for its product? Will the customers want something else befor your plant investment can pay for itself? A recent example was in containers for liquid detergents. The American Can Co. had no sooner got liquid detergents from glass into metal than it had to switch to putting them into plastic.

HOW TO KEEP MAKING MONEY

The ideal way for a company to keep up in a free economy is for it to keep finding new products to make what people want, or new uses for existing products; and then to figure, somewhere nearly correctly, how many of the new products or applications it can sell, at what cost, and for how long (before they are outmoded).

This is one main reason for the enormous growth in recent years of research and development.

It is a fantasy of European origin that profits are normally made by hiring people cheap and selling their products dear. In a limited way, and in certain circumstances, this can be done. There will always be sweatshops. And it is true that many successful 19th century employers and promoters were about as social minded as a Maine-coast lobster. But the one who made real money did not do it by squeezing the faces of the poor. They did it by bringing to market new ideas, new machines, new products, or new services. They were adventurers and innovators. But the key to money-making is judgment as to what the consumer will want, at what price, and for how long.

Emergency Feed Grains Bill, H.R. 4510

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the support of my continual plea for less Federal interference in agriculture, and the operation of free marketing system, I would like to offer the following feature story from the September 10 issue of the Kansas City Star. To properly digest the point made by the article it is necessary that I roll back the calendar a bit, specifically to Tuesday, February 21, 1961, when the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains was considering the emergency feed grains bill, H.R. 4510. During that hearing the bill received the complete backing of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Referring to the published hearings on H.R. 4510, serial A, pages 42 and 43, the following colloquy between the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, and me took place. Secretary Freeman was supporting the bill:

Mr. BEERMANN?

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate your position. I am an operating farmer, with five brothers. You have an operation with someone else.

I would like to ask a question: Are we to understand that the Secretary is establishing the price of soybeans at $2.30.

Secretary FREEMAN. It has not been established as of now. This is at present my intention, to so establish it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you.

Now, corn is $1.06 and it is in trouble. Soybeans are $1.85 and they are not in trouble. I fail to understand how raising the price of soybeans to $2.30 and eventually asking me to grow soybeans, which I do not now, and then eventually asking the Government to buy my soybeans, is going to be a solution of our problem.

Secretary FREEMAN. I would only answer that by saying that although the support price is as you represented it, the market price is now about $2.47, and, as I have tried to indicate before, the best estimates we make are that there will be a stronger demand for soybeans and a greater need for them than there will be for feed grains.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you.

The soybean market price is presently strong because of industry promotion and grower ability to produce for a consuming market at a fair price, with a minimum of Government intervention. This is not so with the other feed grains. I do not think that two wrongs make a right. I would not like to see us get soybeans in the same position as feed grains.

I will say here that I do not know how to run your farm; I do not suppose that you know how to run mine, and I do not believe it is within the jurisdiction of this group of people to tell us how to run our farms, which is what is taking place by establishing market prices. I would like to offer for your consideration in all future legislation that when you submit these things, I am asking it simply from a farmer's standpoint, that you do it on the basis of having less Government in farm business instead of more.

I thank you.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you.

The point I was attempting to make in the above colloquy was that by raising the support price of soybeans, the Secretary would create the same problem for the soybean growers and soybean industry that Government intervention had created for feed grains.

I believe the following article indicates that my concern about the action of Secretary Freeman is becoming a reality. I recommend the article to my colleagues who may feel Federal interference is the way to solve agricultural problems:

[From the Kansas City Star, Sept. 10, 1961]

SURPLUS THREAT IN SOYBEAN CROP

(By Roderick Turnbull)

Around Kansas City, across the whole of the Corn Belt and in many other parts of the country, the finest soybean crop this Nation has ever seen is heading toward maturity. The acreage is the biggest ever and the estimated average yield is at a new record.

Everything apparently is lovely except for one thing. Many growers and others interested in the soybean industry are wondering if the yield is going to be so big that soybeans will join the category of crops in surplus. Once a crop is in surplus, usually it's in trouble.

A MIRACLE CROP

With all the difficulties we have had in recent years with overproduction in farm crops it shouldn't be too unusual for another to join the list. However, this is a particular case. Soybeans have been the miracle crop in the American scene in the last couple of decades.

The acreage has grown by leaps and bounds—always in response to a growing market demand. Price supports have been kept below market levels and the crops have moved into consumption with no troublesome surpluses developing for Government bins.

This year, Orville L. Freeman, secretary of agriculture, boosted soybean price supports in a deliberate effort to increase the bean acreage to take some pressure off corn. He got a 14-percent increase in acres and with nature providing almost perfect growing weather, the increase in production now is estimated at 22 percent over last year or 683 million bushels. This estimate was made as of August 1. Many authorities are suggesting the final total will be 700 million bushels or more. The harvest last year was 558,771,000 bushels.

Is this too much of a jump in yield for 1 year? Secretary Freeman and his administrators in the Department of Agriculture express confidence that this year's huge crop will find a market.

They point to difficulties with soybeans in China, where exports are down. Other nations have smaller yields both of beans and other oil-producing crops. Japan is taking more U.S. beans. Thus the market seems to be good. Also, the administration has a big ace in the hole. It always can give more beans or soybean oil away through the Public Law 480 program.

But this is just what the soybean industry fears. The industry has grown on dollar sales. Industry representatives have gone all over the world selling the American crop.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

They have determined what other nations wanted in soybeans, in variety and in quality. They have taught other nations how to use soybeans and have convinced them in many cases that soybean oil is as good or better than other vegetable oils. The result has been a huge increase in the export trade. Nearly all bean sales have been for dollars although considerable of the oil has moved under Public Law 480 deals. The Department of Agriculture has cooperated with the industry in these efforts.

The soybean industry as represented by the American Soybean Association and the Soybean Council of America has been extremely proud of the record of the crop in the market. When Secretary Freeman boosted the price support this year from $1.85 a bushel to $2.30, the soybean association along with the American Farm Bureau protested that this was too high, even though bean prices at the time were still higher. Soybean prices on the market last winter hit $3 a bushel—after most of the 1960 crop was out of farmers' hands.

RESPONSE TO PRICE

The high price last winter definitely indictated a bigger acreage this year, but a guaranteed price (Government) usually is more of a stimulus to greater production than prospects of a higher price on the market.

Farmers are using their own judgment when they increase production in response to prospective demand. They win or lose. The Government is guiding production when it sets a price support high enough to induce a larger acreage. If there is a surplus, it becomes the Government's responsibility. But surpluses hurt farm prices in Government hands or otherwise.

At the recent convention of the American Soybean Association in Indianapolis, Charles V. Simpson, president of the group, in his annual address said the major problem facing soybean farmers is to avoid expanding production faster than they can build markets for the crop.

"Let us not allow ourselves," he said, "to be priced out of world markets by those who mean well, but fail to realize that we wish only to use support prices as a means to bring the soybean crop to market in an orderly manner."

MUST FIND PLACE

George M. Strayer, the association's executive vice president, said, "I sincerely hope we can, through united efforts of industry and Government, find a place to utilize the 683- to 700-million-bushel soybean crop. It is going to take concerted effort on the part of all concerned."

Strayer also commented that in raising price supports this year to $2.30, the U.S. Government had announced to the remainder of the world that it was, in effect, holding a price umbrella over the production of peanuts and palm kernels, sunflower seed, rapeseed and mustard seed, cottonseed, copra and all others in the long list of oilseeds and oil-bearing materials.

The association commended the Department of Agriculture and the soybean industry for "untiring efforts in the sales and trade promotional programs for soybeans and soybean products" and urged continued efforts on these programs. It also thanked Secretary Freeman for implementing the use of fats and oils in the oversea church and charity relief feeding program.

Soybeans are called America's miracle crop because of the remarkable growth in production in recent years. In 30 years the crop has come from a $10 million one to the billion-dollar class.

In the mid–1920's 1½ million acres were planted in soybeans; this year the acreage is 26.4 million. The yield has jumped in the same period from 5 million bushels to the prospective 683 million.

Many reasons may be given for this big increase in production, but the main one has been the growing demand for soybean meal as a protein feed for livestock and for soybean oil.

The crop first came into prominence in this country for use as hay and green manure. There was quite a buildup during the 1930's when the AAA encouraged the use of soybeans as a soil-building crop—to be turned under as green manure. In fact, up to 1941, over half the soybean acreage was for hay, grazing or green manure.

SUPPLIES CUT OFF

Before World War II, the United States was a net importer of oilseeds, fats and oils for both food and nonfood uses as well as livestock feed. Hostilities cut off many of our Far Eastern supplies at the same time a huge demand was building for them. The mixed feed industry called for great amounts of protein for livestock rations. Vegetable oils were in demand for shortening and for margarine which was replacing butter to a large extent. This demand was the springboard for soybeans. The acreage increased from 10.1 million acres in 1941 to 14.2 million in 1943 and averaged 12.8 million through the war.

Significantly, the big increase came after the end of the war. The demands for protein feeds and oils continued and expanded. Millions of acres which had been taken out of wheat, corn, and cotton under Government production control programs were diverted to the soybeans. A huge acreage once in oats also went to the beans—the oats, once needed for horses, were less in demand. During the 1950s, when every other major crop was showing a reduction in acreage, the soybean acreage jumped 124 percent—always in answer to market demand.

During this period, soybean growers actually asked that price supports be kept low enough to permit the crop to move to market.

Soybean authorities are convinced that peak has not yet been reached in demand for the crop and its byproducts. Longrun prospects suggest that within the next 10 to 15 years a billion-bushel crop may be utilized. But they wonder if the market can take in 1 year the big increase that is coming with this harvest.

BOOST FOR FARMERS

The 26 million acres in soybeans is a wonderful thing for American farmers. In a time when we have tried to cut plantings of other crops, think how much greater our troubles would be if we did not have soybeans.

I wonder how this new crop could have developed in this country if we had had in the past production controls that specified how each acre was to be used. Where is the man, in Government or out, who could have said in 1935 that we would need 26 million acres in soybeans in 1961? Where is the man who can tell us today the acreage that should be allotted for some new crop in 1980?

Howard Lawrence Schneider, of Brooklyn, Wins Masonic Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following essay written by my constituent, Howard Schneider. Mr. Schneider, a graduate of Lafayette High School in Brooklyn, has won an essay contest sponsored by the Youth Committee of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York.

More than 1,000 essays were received and judged to determine the winner of

the Frank M. Totten Scholarship. The lucky winner is proof again that stressing juvenile decency pays off.

The essay follows:

THE PRESENT AGE

(By Howard L. Schneider)

The present age is characterized by a revolution of rising expectations. Our times are the first since the birth of civilization in which man has dared to believe it feasible to make the advantages of an advancing culture available for all humanity. This fact should always be borne in mind in evaluating events happening around us.

Currently, many of the neutral nations of the world hold the balance of power in the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. It is interesting, although disheartening, to note that most of these countries are underdeveloped. Sometimes, a lust for their material improvement assumes the form of fierce Communist-inspired revolts that nullify considerations of moral, humanitarian, and democratic ideals, thereby defeating the goals for which these uprisings were supposedly conceived.

Since the forces of poverty, hunger, and disease breed rebellions that jeopardize world peace, it is imperative that these evils be eradicated.

Clearly, scientific technology is of vast importance in fulfilling the peaceful needs of man. However, that same scientific method has suspended above our earth a Sword of Damocles, in the form of potential nuclear destruction.

The present age must avoid this abyss for the sake of the survival of all humanity; there is no margin for error. The blessings of a universal and everlasting peace can be achieved only by joining together, in an unbreakable bond, the principles of science and the moral, ethical values of life.

Bills With Price Tags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the July–August edition of the Tax Foundation's "Monthly Tax Features" sheet, reference is made to a very interesting and promising experiment which has been tried in two States and seems to be gaining in favor in others. This experiment is that of requiring any legislation involving the expenditure of funds to be accompanied by an estimate of the cost of the program being advocated. Missouri and Wisconsin now have such a procedure in operation and the article on the experiment makes note of the experience of these States. I should like to place the Tax Foundation's article on "Price Tag" laws in the RECORD at this point:

PRICE TAG LAWS HELP FIX BILL COST

This year, with 47 of the 50 State legislatures meeting to enact thousands of new laws and consider a vast array of proposals for spending, attention was drawn again to a new legislative "price tag" trend, says Tax Foundation, Inc.

Two States, Wisconsin and Missouri, have already adopted procedures which aim to eliminate guesswork on how much a given piece of legislation will cost.

Under the systems adopted by these States, each measure introduced for new or increased spending must have incorporated in it, or attached to it, an estimate of the cost of the bill. Enactment of "price tag" legislation was approved by one chamber in New Jersey's Legislature this year, but the other house failed to act before a summer recess.

Missouri proponents of the idea noted that "it is essential that legislators not only weigh the merits of proposed new and expanded services, but that they also weigh the value of these services in relation to the costs involved. Information on cost is essential to the formation of judgments by all who must evaluate pending legislation."

Moves to effect "price tag" legislation began in Wisconsin in 1953 and laid the foundation for what are now called the State's fiscal notes.

Here is how the proposal works in Wisconsin where it is required that, at the end of all measures involving either spending or revenue, there must be printed an estimate of the dollar effect of the proposed legislation:

The legislative bill drafting division sends bills affecting spending or revenue to the State budget department. That department gets from the agency or agencies having the appropriate information, an estimate of the fiscal effects of the legislation.

The drafting division turns over the drafted bill, complete with cost estimates, to the legislator who asked that the bill be drawn.

The procedure does not delay enactment of legislation, in Wisconsin's experience. For example, of 731 proposals in 1957 on which these fiscal notes were obtained, it took an average of 6.7 days from drafting agency to legislator.

Wisconsin found that 40.8 percent of the bills with fiscal notes became law, while 49.6 percent of those without notes became law.

The Role of Competition in the American Achievement—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third chapter from the pamphlet the American Achievement, entitled "Competition":

COMPETITION

FREE MARKETS

The business of America depends on free and open markets. The Nation's economic life could not go on without them, except with tremendous waste and delay.

There are hundreds of these markets, big and little. Some of the best known and largest ones, like the New York Stock Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade, handle a huge volume of bids and offers that come in constantly by telephone and telegraph. They operate like continuous auctions, and in fact many such large markets are called auction markets.

But there are hundreds of smaller and slower markets. Some are called over-the-counter markets. Some are merely telephone markets. Some are quoted markets. There are local markets as well as national markets. There are specialized markets for scores of such commodities as 92-octane gasoline, cadmium, platinum and polyethylene. Open most trade magazines, and you will find they carry a special page on the Current Markets.

Only three things are required to make a market. One is that buyers and sellers have contact. They needn't be present in person in a marketplace; but they must have some means of knowing the course of prices, even if it is only by telegraph or in a trade paper. A second is that the market is open to any would-be buyer or seller. The third, and most important, is that prices are free to move up and down without restraint. If prices are controlled, the market is destroyed; and buyers and sellers then turn to a black market.

Market prices constantly adjust supply to demand. If there is too much supply, buyers back away until the price drops. If it drops too low, buyers come in again, but suppliers drop out. This keeps the goods moving from where they can be most cheaply produced, to where they are most wanted. Free prices work as a valve, or governor, on production and consumption.

In contrast, when prices are controlled, supply and demand promptly get out of adjustment. We have had plenty of examples of this in recent years. During the war, the price of such things as sugar was held down by Government control. The result was to discourage and slow down supply, but to increase demand. This led to a shortage, which led to rationing.

On the other hand many farm prices have been held up in recent years by Government action. The result has been to stimulate production, but to discourage consumption. This has led to billions of dollars' worth of surpluses, which eat up storage charges and finally have to be given away or "dumped" abroad, at prices even lower than they might have brought in a free market.

FREE COMPETITION

Free markets imply free competition. The two are really one and the same thing. Competition must be unobstructed by attempts at monopoly, conspiracy, or restraint of trade, with or without Government blessing.

The Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 prohibited conspiracies to restrain trade, and monopolies—or attempts to monopolize.

Many people assume that it is vigilant enforcement of this act that makes American business competitive. But this is so only in the same way that policemen keep us honest.

Free competition is one of the heritages of the American economy. It was one of the goals of the Founding Fathers. Monopolies and trade restraints, imposed on the American colonists, were one of the principal causes of the Revolution.

And Americans have always had more faith in open hard competition than Europeans. This is still so today.

HORSE-AND-BUGGY COMPETITION

Competition has been increasing in this country for 150 years. It has increased particularly with every advance in communication and transportation. Each of these has widened the markets to include more and more sellers as well as more and more buyers.

At first, competition was slow. Markets were local. In frontier communities, monopoly of a sort was inevitable. There was only one cobbler, one blacksmith and one general store, just as in some towns today is only one movie and one weekly newspaper. Goods didn't move far. Perhaps the first important competition was that of the early traveling peddlers, cobblers and tinsmiths.

It was turnpikes, canals, steamboats and railroads that first widened markets and spread competition. The new manufacturing companies began to send around drummers who traveled by rail from city to city and beat the drum for their employers' goods.

Then came the mail-order houses and the department stores.

AMERICAN BUSINESS TRIES MONOPOLY

From 1860 to 1900, mills and factories were springing up all over the northeastern United States. The leading growth industry was steel, using the new Bessemer process. But scores of other industries were growing rapidly out of the handicraft stage, through invention and machinery, into a heavily competitive stage. One of these was canmaking.

As the competition in these industries got tougher and rougher, it often threatened to wipe out profits altogether. Even railroads sometimes cut tariffs competitively to the point of bankruptcy. Members of many industries tried to put a stop to this strenous price competition. They used various devices. The most popular was to set up a trust, controlled by a small board of directors, into which competitors would put the controlling stocks of their own companies.

To cope with this, Congress passed the Sherman Act in 1890. But there was little machinery for enforcement, and in 1897 the Supreme Court made the now strange-sounding decision that a monopoly in production was not necessarily a monopoly in sale and distribution. This seemed to give a green light to another anticompetitive device—the putting together of competitors into a single company. By 1901 scores of such combinations were put together, with names such as National Biscuit Co., International Lead, United Shoe Machinery, United States Steel, and American Can. These companies combined from 60 to 90 percent of the manufacturing capacity in their respective industries. The American Can Co., for instance, had 90 percent—and many of the canmaking firms who sold out to it promised not to go back into the business for 15 years.

When the historic smoke had cleared, it showed few successes among the expensive attempts at monopoly. Within 20 years it was obvious that competition could not be so abruptly choked down. Some of these companies kept on trying to restrain trade, and were broken up by the courts. Of the others, many failed financially. The rest, including American Can, survived to rank among the Nation's most successful corporations. But they did so only by efficiency and first-class management, and by trying to keep ahead of the competition, not to restrain it. The supposed benefits of monopoly proved a mirage. Even the successful survivors rapidly lost ground to competitors, and ended up with 25 to 40 percent of the business, instead of 70 to 90 percent.

COMPETITION IN NEW DIMENSIONS

In the last 25 years, competition in American industry has intensified far beyond anything known in the 19th century. There have been several causes for this.

1. Competition between industries: Years ago, competition was still largely inside particular industries. Cotton mills competed with cotton mills, steel mills with steel mills, and can manufacturers among themselves.

But in this century, the progress of the industrial arts has swept like a rising tide over these industry compartments. Cotton competes with synthetic fibers. Oil and natural gas compete with coal. Steel competes with aluminum, copper, plastics and cement. You can have your house built of wood, metal, compositon, plastics or prestressed concrete. No manufacturer knows where the competition may come from next.

Even legal monopolies have lost ground to this interindustry competition. The telegraph has lost to the telephone and the air mail, the streetcar to the bus and the private car; and the railroad to the highway truck and the commercial airline.

2. Research and development: The inventions of the 19th century came out of woodsheds and workshops. In 1928 American industry spent only $100 million on research and development. By 1945 it was spending nine times as much, and by 1959, 45 times as much. "R. & D." is a "fighting competitive weapon" that may be used both defensively and offensively. As defense, it protects a company from technological surprise. As offense, it may lead a company into entirely new territory. For it follows no conventional industry lines. Thus Canco's R. & D. may easily get into some other industry's field. And somebody else's R. & D. may get into American Can Co.'s field.

Also, manufacturing methods have improved to where it is sometimes said that "anybody can make anything." During World War II Canco made torpedoes and gyroscopes. Today it could doubtless make textiles, missiles or motors. But by the same token, there is no telling what firms might in 10 years learn to make cans. There are no longer any sheltered industries. It is no longer of important advantage to be a big fish in a small pond.

3. Discretionary income: Fifty years ago, most families had to scrape to house, clothe, and feed themselves. They had little discretion in their budgets, and most manufacturing competition was in supplying these families with the necessities of life. But today's working families can afford a wide range of purchases beyond the bare necessities. So manufacturers of such varied things as garbage disposal units, hi-fi and stereo, camping equipment, outboard motors, and do-it-yourself kits are all in competition for these discretionary dollars. They are also in competition with the savings bank.

4. Nonprice competition: As the American standard of living has risen, American business has turned more and more to providing something over and above standard goods at the lowest possible prices. To straight price-competition it has added competition in quality, service, reliability, diversity of product, packaging, and so on. This adds a further dimension to competition.

GOVERNMENT RESTRAINTS OF TRADE

The American free economy started as a revolt against monopolies and other restraints on competition. And through the decades the competition has naturally become more keen.

But history shows that monopolies and restraints of trade have a strong appeal. They are the framework of most economic systems outside ours. They are turned to, particularly, when the competition gets severe.

I have related how American business tried to restrain its own competition around the turn of the century—and how the attempt wasn't successful. In the 1930's Americans again turned toward restraints on competition. This time it was with the support of Government, and it was more permanent in its effects.

In the beginning, it was partly the doing of business itself. As the great depression deepened in 1931, business groups appealed to President Hoover for some officially-protected system of holding prices. He refused. But in 1933 this idea became the germ of the National Recovery Act. NRA exempted business groups from the Sherman Antitrust Act if they would sign code agreements with the Government on minimum prices and wages.

NRA was thrown out by the Supreme Court in 1935, and by that time was breaking down anyway, as individualist businessmen refused to toe the price lines. But the spirit of controls was in the air. During the long hard times of the 1930's, Congress extended the force of Government to many programs to protect various groups in the country from the force of free competition.

These programs worked precisely contrary to the spirit of the Sherman Antitrust Act. What the antitrust laws made it illegal to do, these laws made it illegal not to do.

Today two major results are clear. One is that one such restraint of trade leads politically to another. When one group has protection, another wants it. And so, just as without Government protection, restraints of trade eventually defeat themselves, so with Government protection, they multiply.

The other obvious result is that such Government-enforced programs to hold up prices, continually raise as many problems as they seem to solve. The Government spends billions, with one hand to buy up useless production, and with the other to pay producers not to produce.

In brief, a nation that turns to using its government to protect certain groups from the hardships of competition, is like an alcoholic, for whom "one drink is too much, and a thousand drinks are not enough." The process is a one-way street. Such protection creates vested interests against the rest of the community. If everybody were protected, adventure and competition would end. So would progress.

Educational and Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Congress enacted an important bill—the Educational and Cultural Exchange Act. I was pleased to have been one of the cosponsors of this legislation in the House. The subject is one to which I have devoted a great deal of time and attention over the years. This bill pulls together the best of existing programs and makes important additions, each of which I discussed on the Floor of the House at the time.

Recently, I received a very good and very interesting letter from a friend and constituent of mine who spent some time this summer in Africa—Mr. Edward S. Cabot, of New York. Mr. Cabot is a strong advocate of the educational and cultural exchange program. He and I worked together on this subject at some length 2 years ago when he was a temporary member of my staff. Based on his observations in Africa, Mr. Cabot has made some very constructive suggestions about the educational exchange program and I should like to include his letter in the RECORD. I am asking the Department of State to take special note of it and to give me their comments:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *September 1, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I have recently returned from a 3-month tour of Africa in which I visited seven African States and territories in the eastern, southern, and western areas of the continent. The primary focus of my trip was a study of the emergence and development of African nationalism, but because my work with you on educational and cultural exchange had

stimulated my interest, I determined to devote a part of my time in Africa to this important subject. From contact with members of ministries of education and other interested persons, including political, business, and labor leaders, a number of principles emerged which it seems to me would be useful guidelines in the formulation and administration of our educational and cultural exchange program.

First, all of those to whom I talked agreed that exchange programs with the United States could be of immense value to their countries. Perhaps David Kiano, former Minister of Education in Kenya, put it best when he said, "There is only one thing the African wants more than education, and that is political freedom." A wisely planned and judiciously administered exchange program should have the dual purpose of helping African countries to develop the skills needed for progress, and of promoting a better understanding among Africans of American democracy and among Americans of Africa's problems.

In establishing an effective exchange program, proper criteria for selection of those to be exchanged is of primary importance. Because of the difficulty of comparing African with American secondary education, and because of the importance of nonacademic qualities of character in selecting those African students who would profit from an American education, we must necessarily rely heavily in our selection upon persons in the African countries involved.

Thus most exchange programs have made their selections after consultation with prominent Africans with a knowledge of and special interest in this field. Particular care should be taken in this regard lest American aid come under the exclusive control of any one faction or individual. (Such a situation threatened in Kenya, where, at one time, Tom Mboya had a disproportionate influence in selecting students for the "airlift" to America.) The danger here is that our aid should become patronage to be doled out on a political basis. To avoid the bitterness to which such a situation would give rise, advisory committees composed of a broadly representative cross section of prominent Africans should be set up in each of the countries.

The recently publicized plight of hundreds of African students stranded in the United States without sufficient means to continue their studies dramatically points up this need. In the future, students must have reliable information as to the extent of their scholarships, the cost of living in the area of the United States to which they are assigned, opportunities for outside jobs, etc. Africans are willing to make great sacrifices to study in the United States, but they should be fully informed about prevailing conditions. The U.S. Government might act as a conduit and coordinator of information in this regard.

The exchange of leaders in all fields is, in my view, equally if not more important than student exchange. Our system is one that cannot be understood from afar. While it is important that our ideas reach the students, the leaders of tomorrow, first priority should be placed upon reaching the leaders of today. Prominent individuals in education, business, labor, government, journalism, and other fields can have immense impact in spreading knowledge of American ideas of democracy. When I visited University College in Accra, I was impressed by the quality of learning in most departments. There was, however, no course on American Government or society because there were no men with the experience required to teach it. A course on marxism was open to all students. One American professor on that campus might have made a great deal of difference. Conversely, every African leader with firsthand information about the various aspects of American life can have far reaching influence upon his countrymen. Though the number of those exchanged will of necessity be comparatively small, it should be remembered that the educated elites in African countries are small and often closely knit. Thus communication within the group is facilitated.

There is, however, a danger in assuming that Africans, once brought to the United States, will, if left to their own devices, arrive at realistic conclusions about the nature of American society. Experience has shown that this is not necessarily the case. The idea of American pluralism is complicated and largely alien to the African's way of life. Unless informed persons and agencies take the iniative in providing African visitors with all the facts, they are likely to form incomplete or inaccurate notions about how American democracy really funtions. This was brought home to me most dramatically in an extended conversation with a high level Ghanian diplomat in Accra. This gentleman, generally known as being violently anti-American, characterized our system as being laissez-faire ("dog eat dog") capitalism. He knew nothing of social security, private health insurance, and the various union and management welfare programs. He was visibly impressed when I explained these to him in detail and told him that they had been in operation for many years. Such misconceptions are the rule rather than the exception in Africa, but they were shocking in this case, as this diplomat had made two visits to our country. The difficulty was that he was dealing with what was to him a totally new idea: that institutions other than government could be used to advance the welfare of the people. Quite frankly, Africans need help in understanding this revolutionary idea. It is impossible to reach them all, but we must make certain that we do not fail to reach those who have actually visited the United States.

It seems to me that some Government agency should be given the responsibility of seeing to it that every visitor from the underdeveloped countries is given the opportunity to see our institutions in operation at first hand. Such an agency could act in conjunction with private information services to arrange visits to American businesses, labor unions, Government agencies, and other institutions. Individuals would take advantage of such opportunities in varying degrees, but it is imperative that we take the initiative in providing them.

Sincerely,

EDWARD S. CABOT.

The Disappointing Assembly at Belgrade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Mr. Robert Spivack which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 10, 1961.

Mr. Spivack's suggested reappraisal is something that has been on the minds of many of us recently. We had better do it now.

The column follows:

"N": FOR NOTHING

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—The time has come for another reappraisal of American foreign policy and it may really be agonizing.

At a moment when the czar of Soviet Russia is engaged in an all-out assault on our freedom, we also are in the uncomfortable position of having to reexamine the problems posed by the so-called neutral nations. Their dismal performance at Belgrade requires us to take a new look.

To do otherwise would be an invitation to further disasters for those who put political freedom high on the list of man's priorities.

The neutralists moralize and talk of high purpose. But when the opportunity was presented to exert an important influence for world peace, against nuclear testing and for the rights of self-determination for all people (including Germans) their "leaders" fell back on the same stale, outworn cliches that once were applicable toward the colonial powers but now are obsolete.

When the neutralists neglected to speak out against the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing they lost their claim to neutralism and nonalinement. It is not hard to imagine their indignant statements had the United States unilaterally broken the test ban.

Their indifference has caused some to recall John Foster Dulles' comment that neutralism "has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception."

Certainly the critics of the self-styled neutralists are right when they assert we would have been excoriated. The heights of their righteous wrath are infinite when something goes wrong in this country. If we had started the nuclear blasts undoubtedly their sense of outrage against the West would have been boundless.

But I would suggest that their failure to speak out emphatically against Khrushchev's behavior is only a part of the story. It seems to me they really showed that they are frightened, small-time politicians, interested only in their own welfare and unmindful of the problems of others, when they failed to speak up on Berlin.

Events have moved so quickly that we may have already forgotten what happened at Berlin. Yet it is there that the moral issue was first posed. I speak not merely of Khrushchev's deliberate action in stirring up that turbulent city, but of the Khrushchev-Ulbricht decision to close down the border between the Eastern and Western sectors to stop the flight of the refugees.

Where was neutralist Nasser, who cries so plaintively for the welfare of the Arab "refugees"? Where was Nkrumah, who speaks so eloquently of the rights of independence for Africans? We know, alas, of Nehru's blundering observation that legally the Soviets were right. But what of Tito, who demands self-determination for Yugoslavs?

Are the people of Berlin not entitled to civil rights? Are we in favor of equality only for our dark-skinned brothers? The time for the neutralist to have spoken out was when the barbed-wire barricades went up and East Germany was transformed into a vast concentration camp.

When they failed to do this it was too much to expect that they would have the courage to defy the official opening of the Soviet Union's new reign of terror.

We do not ask that the neutralists overlook our imperfections, or that they join us if a shooting war begins tomorrow. We do not ask repayment of our so-called mutual aid funds. We ask only that they cease the hypocrisy of one standard for the U.S.S.R. and another for the United States.

In asking this perhaps they will also understand that we are obliged to look anew at our relations with them. The principal argument for neutralism has been that they do not feel it is in their national interest "to take sides." Some who are less tolerant of this viewpoint will say they are really just playing one side off against the other.

Whatever their motives we also have an interest in freedom which we must protect.

To put it forthrightly we are obliged to ask whether it might not be better to let some of these nations flounder for themselves, or even turn to the Soviet Union for financial aid. They seem to be quite slow in learning the lessons that those thousands of refugees who have been part of the exodus to the West are teaching all of us.

If the "neutralists" are hellbent for self-destruction there may be very little we can do about it. Perhaps it is true that each generation and each new nation must learn for itself the folly of trying to do business with dictators.

The Role of Obsolescence in the American Achievement—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fourth chapter from the pamphlet "The American Achievement," entitled "Obsolescence:"

OBSOLESCENCE

PART 1—JOB DISPLACEMENT

Least talked about

Of all subjects in economics, obsolescence is the least talked about. People talk about the weather but don't do anything about it. They have to do something about obsolescence, but they don't talk much about it. For it is an unhappy subject. It means throwing away good household equipment, doing without the skills of good workmen and scrapping machinery that still has years of useful life. The trouble with all these things is not that they are of no value, but that they are of comparatively no value. Progress has outmoded them.

So it isn't strange that about the only people who really like to talk about obsolescence, at least in print, are the machine-tool builders, who have been advertising for a generation that "You pay for better tools, whether you buy them or not. For if your competitors buy them, it will cost you more than if you bought them yourself."

"Obsolete" is a 20th century word. Even economists weren't using it in 1899. The nearest common term is the womenfolk's phrase, "out-of-fashion," but this is not quite it. A better synonym is "outmoded." Anyway, obsolescence has had more meaning in this country than anywhere else, and in this century more than ever before. Here is an example:

In 1935 a man bought a new car for $2,000. He never drove it. He put it on jacks, and spent the necessary money each year to keep it in mint condition. Yet now, after 25 years, how much is it worth? Somewhere perhaps between $100 and $500; dealers' books don't go back that far. The car is hopelessly outmoded. (Meantime, his $2,000 at 3 percent would have compounded to $4,180.)

But while the value was drained almost entirely out of this modern vehicle in 26 years, consider, in contrast, what was perhaps the most famous of all 19th century vehicles, celebrated by Oliver Wendell Holmes in his poem about "The Deacon's Masterpiece":

"Have you heard of the wonderful one-hoss shay
That was built in such a logical way
It ran a hundred years to a day?"
—OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES (1809–94).

Or take a more familiar example. Our 1935 car-buyer's wife in 1947, bought a $350 television set. Today it wouldn't be worth replacing a picture tube. In 14 years, it has been pushed clear out of date.

Obsolescence is the other side of economic progress. The faster a nation's progress, the faster its obsolescence. If you stand in the front of a train, with the engineer, you see progress. If you stand at the rear of the train, you see what's being left behind.

The train moves faster today than ever before. But even in the 19th century, when it had got under way, economists hadn't realized the importance of obsolescence. I have a dictionary of political economy, published in 1899, consisting of three volumes of about 700 pages each. The word "obsolescence" is not in the index.

Obsolescence appears in three forms—consumer-goods obsolescence; job obsolescence; and machine- or plant-obsolescence.

Consumer obsolescence is the car, television set, icebox, rug beater, and crystal set that nobody wants. It is "the stuff in the attic" that some people find so hard to throw away. It is the "perfectly good" refrigerators that go to the dump.

Job obsolescence is what has been happening for 150 years, at increasing speed, to such trades as spinning, weaving, flatboating, teamstering, blacksmithing, and harness making.

Plant obsolescence is what has happened to almost all the factories, mills, railroad lines, airplanes, and machine tools that were ever built—at least in this country and until the last 25 years.

Job displacement

There is no job displacement in a static society; but it is always going on in a progressive society. Neither technological unemployment nor automation are new. Automation is only a new word for the mechanization that has been going on for a century.

Consider, for instance, some of the names of people you know—(Smith, Taylor, Shoemaker, Potter, or Wright). These are trades. But most of these trades are gone. There are no more blacksmiths, wainwrights (wagon-builders), or wheelwrights.

Or consider what has happened to farming. Once 8 out of 10 Americans were farmers. Now it is 1 out of 10. And within 2 miles of where I live in New Hampshire there are a half dozen "cellar holes" in deep woods—all that is left to show where farmhouses once stood, whose owners finally quit when the railroads opened up the West to grainfields more efficient than New England hillside farming. In fact this hill on which I live is named for a Captain Patten who, with his wife Deborah, raised 10 children on a farm that is now only "pasture-pine." They moved away in 1800. In present-day Washington talk, this was then a "depressed area." So, apparently, the captain on his hilltop decided.

Practically all the skills involved in 19th-century canmaking have passed away, and practically all the jobs in present-day canmaking have been created by the technological advances of the last 100 years.

There are many possible causes for job obsolescence. Sometimes they are labor-saving devices, as, recently, in coal mining, steelmaking, railroading, and automobile manufacture. But sometimes customers turn away from whole industries. Grandpa used to go to vaudeville, even when there were silent movies. But sound movies ended the jobs of thousands of vaudeville troupers—and of theater musicians. Some of the actors and musicians then found work in radio. Then television dealt a heavy blow to both movie and radio jobs.

"Stop the machines"

From the earliest days of the free economy, new machines have periodically wrought havoc with jobs, sometimes in whole areas. For instance, a century ago they hit particularly hard in England, which was not growing as this country is and where workmen did not have the mobility or get-up-and-go that Americans have. The early English textile machinery ended the jobs of whole counties of spinners and weavers. The plight of these depressed areas was far worse than anything we know today in this country, for the displaced craftsmen lived close to starvation anyway, and there was practically no available relief. So they rioted, and broke up many of the new machines. So the government put down the riots and protected the machines.

But this was not the first time that machines were destroyed for their efficiency. A hundred years before Fulton's steamboat sailed the Hudson, a steamboat on the upper Rhine in Germany was destroyed by Rhine River boatmen. And in fact from the days of Rome, inventions had failed of acceptance as much because they would destroy jobs as because they lacked development capital.

It is only in the last two centuries, and only in this country, in Great Britain, and in countries that have followed these two nation's principles, that the government and public opinion have sided with the right of inventors and investors to put their products on the market even though this caused consumers to switch away from higher-cost handicraft products.

Canmaking has had its stop-the-machine violence. Cans were originally made at canneries. Mechanization of canmaking got underway around 1870. As invention followed invention, one skilled canmaking job after another was outmoded. There were riots. Machines were smashed. Canneries were burned.

But if the machines hadn't come in, cans would still be being made by hand, at the canneries; and there certainly never would have been an American Can Co.

New jobs—where and when?

Technological progress can only outmode jobs by first creating new ones. It can only make jobs, machines, or whole industries obsolescent by first creating new jobs, machines, or industries.

The new jobs may not at first be as many as the old ones. But eventually progress creates more jobs than it leaves behind.

A case in point is the history of canmaking in the last hundred years.

In 1840 an expert canmaker, with hand tools, and his own muscles, could turn out about 60 cans in a 10-hour day. But between 1870 and 1900 a long series of inventions began mechanizing canmaking. By 1901, when the American Can Co. was formed, machines could turn out about 300 cans an hour—and they were a good deal better cans.

In this evolution, practically all the old skills were outmoded. But sales increased. And so did the total of jobs in canmaking.

By 1961, however, machines could turn out over 600 cans a minute. And again, these were far better cans than those of 1901.

In brief, today's machines are several thousand times faster than the expert canmaker of a century ago. But the result has been more, better, and higher paid jobs in canmaking, as a result of more and better cans being available for consumers.

The same thing has happened in the development of every mass-production industry. In fact there never could have been any mass-production industries if jobs had been uniformly protected.

However, industries do not keep on growing to the sky, and there sometimes comes a stage where an industry, by continued mechanization, automation, etc., provides steadily fewer jobs. There are, for instance, hundreds of thousands fewer jobs today than 25 years ago in steel, automobile-making, coal mining, and railroading.

On the other hand, there are hundreds of thousands more jobs today in such recent growth industries as electronics, television, books and education, aircraft, travel, and the service industries. In fact there are twice as many jobs in canmaking today as in 1935. At that time the can business employed about 40,000 persons. It now employs about 80,000.

To hear some people talk, one would think that technological unemployment was a cumulative thing. If it were, there would be hardly anybody working today. But the fact is that an economic system so progressive that is constantly outmoding jobs is also constantly creating them. And if it couldn't do the first, it eventually couldn't do the second.

If this Nation ever changes from a progressive economy to a static one, it won't be because a progressive economy is too hard on living standards, but because it causes so much job obsolescence. President Kennedy has said, "With a really healthy rate of growth, this country can have full employment for all who want a job." But this is a dream. Healthy growth means change Change means the end of some jobs as well as the creation of others. And no power on earth can assure that the new jobs will come along at just the right time, and rate, and place, to take up the workers displaced from the old jobs.

The perspective

This, I admit, is a high-level view. It isn't very cheering to a displaced workman to tell him that it was progress that cost him his job, and that progress is meantime creating new jobs some place else. There are pockets of chronic unemployment and distress in the country. There always have been. Whose responsibility is it to find these men and women new jobs? First, naturally, it is their own. (The West is studded with ghost towns whose source of income played out and whose people moved away.) But when the old American principle of self-help won't solve the problem, then the equally old American principle of "my brother's keeper" comes into play. If the man cannot move to a job, perhaps the community can bring a job to the man. And the employer can often help men adapt their skill and experience to new work opening up on the same premises. It's to the employer's advantage to do what he reasonably can to help modernize talents as well as tools because he has a big investment in both. While this is first an economic problem, it is also a social and political problem, to which many men have devoted much thought and effort.

In the last analysis it is the customer who is responsible for technological unemployment. It is he, or she, who has switched buying from one product to another, or to products made cheaper by new machinery and methods.

However, the employer is usually in the same boat with the workman whom he lets go. Wherever a job is outmoded today, it is fairly safe to assume that some rather expensive plant or machinery has also been outmoded. And if the employer doesn't do something about it, he too will eventually be out of a job—that is, out of business.

PART 2—VANISHING VALUES

Investor beware

Wherever a job is outmoded today, it is fairly safe to assume that some expensive plant and machinery has also been done for.

In fact all the plant and equipment built in the 19th century, and a good part of what was built in the 20th century has lost all value, and for the most part has been demolished.

This is not because it wore out, but because it went out of date. It could no longer be used effectively in competing for the customer's dollars.

In one way, property rights are carefully protected in the United States. The Constitution prescribes in articles 5 and 14 that no one may be deprived of his property except by "due process of law." That means that the Government may not take a man's property except for a legal purpose and at a fair price.

But property values in this country have normally no defense against competition. Nowhere so fast as in the United States can the value of a man's property be invisibly drained away from him by the progress of the industrial arts.

These two rules are diametrically opposite to the rules of most economic systems in the past. In most countries, for most of human history, property values have been vulnerable to government but protected against competition. In this country they have been protected against goverment but vulnerable to competition.

Yet this is as it should be, if we are to have economic progress. It is a basic rule of a process, sometimes called "creative destruction," which brings us steady economic gains, but in doing so, steadily wipes out invested values.

The immediate causes of plant and machine obsolescence are varied. Their product may be out of date; a third of what people spend today is for products unknown in 1940. Or the machine may be outdated because, as machinery makers keep warning, competitors may have installed more efficient, lower-cost machines. Or the customers may have moved, or the nearby raw materials been used up. The best-designed and best-located plant is built for a particular combination of raw materials, transport costs, and customers. If and when the circumstances change, the plant may have no more value than a prima donna's pitch in an empty theater.

Horse-and-buggy finance

Businessmen in the 19th century were unfamiliar with obsolescence. They only vaguely realized that the capital values they could build up in their generation could be wiped out in the next. Nor did they get any help from the economists. These men too had the hopeful notion that when a "capitalist" invested $100,000 in brick and stone, he had $100,000 of durable value, from which he could reasonably hope for a "reward," or profit, indefinitely, of so and so much per cent.

In fact the classical economists tended to see the capitalist as a sort of economic Flash Gordon, or Superman, who took plenty of risks, but always came out with a profit. (The Socialists, who didn't like the capitalist, accepted this picture—but with one change. They took off the wings and put on horns. This made him look like the Devil.)

One big reason why businessmen and economists used to overlook the importance of obsolescence was the business cycle. For 10 or 20 years nearly everybody seemed to be making money. Then would come a depression and panic, as in 1837, 1857, 1873, and 1893. All the firms that were obsolete but didn't know it would go broke. But the cause seemed to be the panics.

Caution incorporated

Modern business corporations can hardly be understood at all except against this background.

Limited liability: To begin with, the modern corporation has "limited liability." This is the most important grant in its charter of incorporation. In fact English companies, in their titles, use the word "limited" or "ltd.," instead of "incorporated." The words mean the same. They do not mean that the firm is limited in its operations, but that the shareholders' liabilities are limited to the amount they have invested in the company. If the company fails, the stockholders cannot be sued individually for its debts, as members of a partnership can be.

This limitation became necessary when corporations became larger than private fortunes, and it made it possible for companies to offer their shares to strangers. The limited liability protected would-be shareholders against the financial perils mentioned above—chiefly of obsolescence.

Cash reserves

John D. Rockefeller is generally credited with being the first to build up the next corporate protection against obsolescence and the business cycle. The original Standard Oil Co. was a refining company. Oil refiners were chronically being moved down by insufficient cash. Rockefeller began building up cash reserves in good times in what seemed to most refiners quite unnecessary amounts. But as a result Standard survived panics and depressions. The reserves were largely built up by the plowing back into the business of profits that otherwise would have been paid out in dividends.

Other financial precautions

Compared to 19th century firms, modern corporations generally keep on hand far more working capital in proportion to their business. Working capital consists of the excess of cash, inventories, and accounts receivable, over debts that will come due soon.

Modern corporations also maintain more conservative "debt ratios." If a company has a net operating income of $1 million and owes only $200,000 of interest on its bonds, its debt ratio is 5:1. If the million can be reasonably counted on each year, the ratio is conservative. But if the $1 million of earnings this year may be followed by $1 million loss next year, the ratio is not conservative; for 2 or 3 bad years could slay such a company financially. Bondholders have to be paid interest, but stockholders don't have to be paid dividends.

The purpose of such policies is to protect the corporation against financial hazards. Essentially they are designed to enable it to outlast its existing machinery, products, and markets.

Conservative accounting

The same conservatism is also expressed in modern corporate accounting.

Most modern corporations periodically publish elaborate financial statements, in the form of a balance sheet and an earnings report. The purpose is to inform stockholders and creditors, as fairly as possible, of what the company has, and how it is doing—in terms of dollars.

These figures are meticulously checked. They are reviewed by independent auditors, who determine whether they "present fairly" the company's position and operations "in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles on a consistent basis." Then, if the company's shares are listed, the stock exchange also has a go at the figures, and so does the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington.

Accounting has come a long way in this century, and there could be no better evidence of it than the difference between Canco's financial report for its first year and that for 1960.

The report for 1901 showed no earnings statement at all—only a balance sheet. The balance sheet carried the company's properties at close to the inflated prices that had been paid to get their original owners to join the combine. The stock declined in market value for 3 years. And in those years,

the company scrapped two out of three of these highly overvalued plants.

In contrast to 1901, Canco's 1960 year-end balance sheet shows the company's plant account at original cost, less a substantial amount for depreciation. And its earnings statement for 1960 shows a substantial deduction for depreciation before arriving at net income.

Depreciation versus obsolescence

Depreciation and obsolescence are two different things, and rarely do they come to the same amount. A depreciation charge is supposed to reflect the wearing out of a property. One way to figure it is to assume the property will last, say, 20 years; and so then to mark its value down each year by 5 percent.

But at the end of 20 years, a property may with good luck still have considerable earning power. But it is more likely to be quite out of date. Many a single-purpose plant has been outmoded in 5 years. In fact, in fast-changing industries, plants are sometimes out of date by the time they are built.

It might be asked then, why a company doesn't change its books to make candid annual obsolescence chargeoffs instead of depreciation write-downs of plant value.

Perhaps the best answer is that obsolescence is far too unpredictable to be reduced to any "generally accepted accounting principles." The best management in the world can only guess where obsolescence may come from next, and how soon.

For this reason alone, if for no other, the most conscientiously prepared financial statement falls short of telling the whole story of how a corporation is doing and is likely to do.

Management in an era of progress and obsolescence

"The king was in his countinghouse, counting out his money." So runs the old nursery rhyme. He seems to have been rich—in cash, at least. But his cash balance wouldn't show the state of his kingdom. Nor does a corporate cash balance show the company's prospects. Strong corporate reserves may combine with overcautious policies to foreshadow a company's eventual downfall. Competitive business is still a matter of adventure in a changing world.

In the last analysis, corporate financial strength is only a means to an end. A strong balance sheet, showing ample working capital, is of value to a corporation chiefly as a means for managerial versatility in action.

With products and markets constantly changing, the management whose firms keep up are those that look most steadily ahead, and have the best answers to such questions as—"What new products can we make?" "How much capital can we risk in making them?" "How long will they sell?" and "What shall we make after that?"

The author of "Alice in Wonderland" wrote:

"In our country," said Alice, still panting a little, "you'd generally get to somewhere else—if you ran fast for a long time as we've been doing."

"A slow sort of country," said the Red Queen.

"Now here * * * it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place."

It is usually said that companies are in business to make a profit; but in our lively American economy of today, it is equally true to say that they strive to make profits so as to stay in business.

An incidental result is that good business management is one important answer to the threat of technological unemployment. A strong and lasting corporation is about the nearest thing to job security that can be found in a progressive economy.

Minshall Again Brings Traveling Office to District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years, it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. As a Representative of this outstanding district, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of the opinions of the people through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies and departments. To help accomplish this, I maintain on a year-round basis a congressional office in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally during trips back to the district when my official duties permit. While I am in Washington, a competent staff is in charge of the Cleveland office.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents a concise accounting of events and opinions on Capitol Hill.

During my service in the Congress, I have considered it of primary importance to be present at the Capitol whenever Congress is in session in order to participate in committee work and to vote on important legislation. This year with Congress in nearly continuous session, I have not been able with intervening committee work to return to Cleveland as much as I should have liked. Therefore, in accordance with the practice I initiated 7 years ago, I am bringing a traveling office to the various communities in the 23d District. This method of meeting with the public has been tremendously popular and it gives me a wonderful opportunity to discuss and learn at first hand the opinions and individual needs of the people.

With the understanding that Congress will not be in session during the early part of December, I will again this year from December 4 through December 8 follow the same procedure and have a series of conference meetings so that every resident of this suburban district can conveniently meet with me. These are not group meetings but office conferences for the individuals which will enable them to discuss their views and problems personally. No appointments are necessary and I urge individuals to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient. Every resident of the 23d District is cordially invited to talk over problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems they might have with the Federal Government, or just to chat and get better acquainted. The knowledge thus obtained will better enable me to represent the residents of the 23d District in the Congress of the United States.

I am most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

Following is the schedule for these office conferences:

Community	Location	Date	Time (p.m.)
Bay Village, Westlake	Bay Village City Hall, 350 Dover Center Rd.	Monday, Dec. 4	2 to 4:30.
Lakewood	Lakewood City Hall, 12650 Detroit Ave.	do	6:30 to 9.
Fairview Park, Rocky River, Parkview, Brookpark, River Edge, Linndale.	Fairview Park City Hall, 20785 Lorain Ave.	Tuesday, Dec. 5	2 to 4:30.
North Olmsted, Olmsted Township, Olmsted Falls, Westview.	North Olmsted City Hall, Dover Rd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Brecksville, Independence, Seven Hills, Brooklyn Heights, Cuyahoga Heights, Valley View.	Brecksville Town Hall, 49 Public Square.	Wednesday, Dec. 6	2 to 4:30.
Berea, Middleburgh Heights, Strongsville, North Royalton, Parma Heights, Broadview Heights.	Berea City Hall, 47 East Bridge St.	do	6:30 to 9.
Warrensville Heights, Warrensville Township, Woodmere, Orange, North Randall.	Warrensville Heights City Hall, 4000 Warrensville Center Rd.	Thursday, Dec. 7	2 to 4:30.
Shaker Heights, Beachwood, University Heights, Pepper Pike, Hunting Valley.	Shaker Heights City Hall, 3400 Lee Rd.	do	6:30 to 9.
Bedford, Bedford Heights, Maple Heights, Walton Hills, Oakwood, Glenwillow.	Bedford City Hall, 30 South Park	Friday, Dec. 8	2 to 4:30.
Chagrin Falls, Moreland Hills, Bentleyville, Solon.	Chagrin Falls Village Hall, 21 West Washington St.	do	6:30 to 9.

Employment Opportunities in Television and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I became a bit perturbed over the prospect of a decline in employment in the radio broadcasting field. My apprehensions were predicated on the changeover, particularly by the radio networks, from the program presentations requiring actors, actresses and specialized directors to news and music—with radio relinquishing this form of entertainment to TV.

Since then, however, I have learned in reading various newspapers and broadcasting trade journals that at least one radio dramatic series, "My True Story," remains on the air and that not only is

it providing daily employment for actors and actresses each week, but that it is also gaining widespread acceptance by local stations due to its being carried on the lines of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

I have learned, too, that the program is also embarked on a local public service campaign that merits attention.

A line by TV Columnist John David Griffin in the New York Daily Mirror, of July 31, indicates the potential brightening of the employment situation due to this program's daily broadcast. This columnist wrote—

> The big hope of New York actors and actresses is Ted Lloyd, who employs an average of 50 thespians a week on his "My True Story" show on Mutual Broadcasting System.

Two other publications, Variety and the New York Times indicate the widespread acceptance of this program plus the sponsor backing needed to keep it on the air—and continue to provide employment in the radio field. Both the Variety article of July 5, bylined by Bill Greely, and the New York Times piece of Sunday, July 9, bylined by Richard F. Shepard show how local sponsors are supporting the "My True Story" presentation.

In checking I find now that the show also has a basic public service campaign underway which I believe merits the attention of all Congressmen, for what this program is doing is to translate into community terms the kinds of public service spotlighting for which it has received innumerable network awards in its 20-year broadcasting history. In much the same manner, though with less emphasis on documentation, that TV's "Circle Theater" dramatizes public interest and public service themes for the viewing audiences, "My True Story" clarifies major aspects of similar themes for radio audiences through the impact of a drama based on a personal experience. Here is a radio program that demonstrates that it can preach antijuvenile delinquency—without resorting to dramas of violence. That can detail the values of charitable and noteworthy causes—by pinpointing salient factors within the framework of an appealing and listenable drama.

Now, upon investigation, I have determined that Mr. Lloyd has adapted the network formula into one whereby each and every radio station carrying the program can translate a national public service campaign into terms of community interest and community activity. It was pointed out to me the adaption was not his personal idea, but was actually done by a station owner regularly airing "My True Story." I obtained a copy of a closed circuit Mr. Lloyd delivered regarding this adaptation to all stations on August 7, last. I believe his own words tell the story in much better manner than I can and present it herewith.

Again, this proved technique demonstrates that public interest and public service programing does not necessarily have to be stodgy and stuffy and lack listening and viewer appeal. Both "Circle Theater" which does this regularly on TV and "My True Story" on radio prove such necessary broadcast services can be accepted within the framework of intriguing and dramatic plots.

The speech of Ted Lloyd delivered August 7, 1961 at the conference call follows:

Today in our industry, when two or more men meet either at lunch or on Madison Avenue, or Main Street, U.S.A., the conversation invariably concerns the latest ruling from Washington.

You will hear, as I have heard, that Mr. X is having a tough time getting his license renewed. They're holding up Mr. Y's license renewal, or Mr. Z is having trouble getting approval of the sale of his station. The trade papers are reporting regularly that temporary license renewals are granted while further investigation takes place. With this preamble to what you and I know is happening today I'd like to tell you that the other night I met with a V.P. in charge of a group of stations who was in New York. As I said, invariably the discussion goes to what's the latest out of Washington. It was, as a result of this conversation, that I asked for the opportunity to talk directly to you, the owners, managers, program directors, and public affairs directors listening to this conference call. This will be of particular interest to the station carrying "My True Story" via closed circuit and perhaps will be much more interesting to those stations who are presently working on their schedule for the fall—you stations who could not start with "My True Story" because of baseball commitments, etc.

Anyway, getting back to the conversation which prompted this conference call, the man turned to me and said, "Ted, do you realize that "My True Story" on many occasions has been logged by us as a public service program?" Like you, I was surprised, and inquired further. He then explained that since the program is fed to his station the day before broadcast, when we had done a program about juvenile delinquency, adoption, a religious theme, the old age problem, etc., he would eliminate the 5 minutes which we have allowed local stations for insertion of their commercials and contact a prominent "Figure in the Community"—I would like to repeat that if I may, he selects a community figure, the head of an organization—the police commissioner, a representative of the clergy, etc., and by using the 5 minutes of local commercial time at the end of the program, he would have the prominent community personality, speak on the program—commending the station for the dramatization which was just heard on "My True Story."

Naturally, there was a written letter added to the station's file, from the local organization serving the community on a local level, which the station then sent on with its license renewal application.

He then asked me if there wasn't some way we could notify him in advance, when these programs were scheduled, so that more time could be spent for preparing and publicizing a particular show. "My True Story" had received plaques and citations from: American Cancer Society, Cerebral Palsy, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, World Day of Prayer, and Red Cross, and letters of commendation from: The Salvation Army, CARE, Heart Association, American Legion, Mental Health Association, Radio Free Europe, Lighthouse (association for the blind), Veterans' Administration, and TB and Health Association, but these were all given to the program on a national level. This man, however, has turned this national program into a big production for a local purpose.

At the same time, I checked with several key cities and found that since they have carried "My True Story" through this closed-circuit feed, their ratings have increased 50 percent and in many instances the show became No. 1 in a highly competitive market.

Because of this conversation and investigation, I asked for the opportunity to put forth this plan which we will inaugurate immediately after Labor Day, and here is the plan:

"My True Story" will continue its high production standard, story level and fine actors which for 20 years has made this a hallmark in radio. However, one out of every five shows each week will be devoted to a public service theme. This particular show, instead of running 55 minutes—allowing you 5 or 6 minutes for local commercials—will only be a 50-minute program—still giving you the local commercial availabilities for insertion of announcements, but also by shortening the program by 5 minutes, you will have the opportunity of contacting a local organization directly concerned with the story we will be dramatizing. If you wish you can invite some person representing the organization to participate on the program during the extra 5 minutes made available to you.

The production, I repeat, will be the same as the other 4 days—a production which no local station cannot afford to do themselves, today.

I am sure that you will know what to do with the community figure who speaks on your station. You will know what to do in terms of getting the necessary records for logging purposes.

All stations today, as well as in the past, have contributed a great deal of their time in delivering messages of public service. Our industry has certainly done a mammoth job during times of emergency, answering calls for blood, shelter, and other forms of relief to the community. Thank God that this need is not a constant one. However, to schedule a regular public service program for any length of time does curtail one's audience acceptance, but with this plan regarding "My True Story" you will not be losing, but in many cases increasing your audience as attested by the stations who have found this to be a fact, but you will be doing something else—diversified programing. Yes, "Diversified Programing." You will be serving the segment of the community who had dramatic programing broadcast to them on a daily basis for 30 years or more but only recently have found the radio spectrum devoid of such drama with the one exception of "My True Story." As a matter of fact, only last week, I read in one of the trade papers—which I am sure you must have seen by now—that one of the networks which was the last to give up dramatic programing has lost its previously held strong position in the audience surveys. Here's an opportunity for you to grab, inherit, or reinterest the local community population who have had to go to another medium to get their dramatic programing.

To sum up, you have the public service aspect, where one out of every five shows each week on "My True Story" will be devoted to a public service theme which you, the local station will be able to carry with a local community figure as a public service, and log it as such. Secondly, from the record among stations who are currently carrying "My True Story," their ratings have increased, and you will be filling the need of a segment of your community who still want drama but cannot find it anywhere in your city unless you carry "My True Story." If time were available I would love to read you some of the letters which we have received from all over the country from listeners, which station managers have forwarded to us, telling us how delighted they are to be able to listen to a dramatic show again. Some sales managers have reported they have been able to get local advertisers with pre-

mium rates because of the fact that they are not selling subliminal advertising, but concentrating it into what they refer to as a talk program.

Because we are now beginning our next 26-week cycle—and I am happy to say we are sold out in the network portion—it is imperative that Herb Cutting, here at Mutual, receive a wire from stations who are not currently carrying "My True Story," as to whether or not you will clear time for the program. Immediately upon hearing from you we will start sending you a schedule of these public service themes and the dates of broadcast.

Because of the urgency and importance of what we plan doing, I would appreciate your sending Herb Cutting a wire immediately, of your acceptance.

Thank you again for the opportunity of talking to you. I am sorry it was long but I don't know of another way to have gotten this message to you in a shorter form. Thank you.

Forewarned Is Forearmed Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the sovereign grand commander of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, Mr. Luther A. Smith, published in the New Age, presents considerable food for thought. We are constantly searching for ways to combat the encroachment of communism, and in this article one of the most natural and surest ways is brought to light. It is my belief that if people know the full story of communism, they cannot possibly accept it:

THE GRAND COMMANDER'S MESSAGE—EDUCATION IN COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

(By Luther A. Smith)

One of the strangest and most inexplicable oversights of our time is the failure of the educators of the United States to devise and set up in our public schools a course of study in the aims and purposes of the international Communist conspiracy which for more than 40 years has openly and brazenly proclaimed its intention to destroy every one of the basic concepts upon which our Republic was established. Not only have its vicious aims against us and all liberty loving people been publicized throughout the world, but it has prosecuted them with grim determination and has achieved colossal success, until more than half of the peoples of the world are now behind the Iron Curtain and under the yoke of communism.

The recent shocking encroachments of the Russian Communist dictatorship upon what is left of the so-called free world have at long last stirred some of the leaders of thought in the field of education to start work on devising a course of instruction in public schools for the enlightenment of our children as to what the Communists are doing to our world, and particularly what their plans are for America, and its free institutions. Much time has been lost because of the complacency of all of us and a lack of understanding of the horrible conspiracies, lies and frauds of communism, but recent events have finally shaken us into a realization of the fact that the light must be turned on communism, its activities and purposes, so that its horrors may be seen and understood.

The old admonition about knowing your enemies is of compelling importance in our present situation. Our country and our way of life are face to face with the greatest scourge that has ever cursed the earth. Its purpose is to crush freedom and enslave mankind. A look at the map of the world points to the disturbing fact that the United States is the only nation that has the strength to thwart the designs of the Russian dictator. With its subjugation would go the hopes of freemen everywhere.

We have relied with great confidence upon our public schools and other educational institutions to keep our citizenship replenished with trained intellects to guarantee our growth and prosperity as a nation. We must now train our educational guns upon these Communist tyrants, "Masters of Deceit" as J. Edgar Hoover 33°, calls them in his book bearing that title, and let our fellow men and especially our children see their evil designs on us and our heritage of freedom. To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

I fraternally suggest that action should be taken by our Scottish Rite members to bring this subject to the attention of superintendents of education and trustees of public schools and to urge upon them the necessity of taking prompt action to institute a program of instruction in Communist objectives and a study of its history during the past 40 years in destroying freedom in all the many countries it has conquered, also a study of comparison of American history and ideals with that of communism.

I find that something has been done in a few places to supply this deficiency in our educational processes. The State of Louisiana by legislative enactment has required such a course to be put in the high schools. Shelby M. Jackson, 32°, State Superintendent of Education, at Baton Rouge, La., has very kindly furnished me with some of the material they are using. Those who care to do so may write him for information. Brother J. B. Higginbotham 32°, KCCH, chairman of the State committee in Louisiana for our Supreme Council's education program in Americanism, whose address is 3430 Oswego Street, Baton Rouge 5, La., is cooperating with the State's program. He and his wonderful organization are doing a splendid job. He will also be glad to answer inquiries.

If I can help please let me know.

Let the Scottish Rite keep in the vanguard of those who labor for our country and the survival of freedom.

The Role of Sharing the Gains in the American Achievement—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fifth chapter from the pamphlet "The American Achievement," entitled "Sharing the Gains":

SHARING THE GAINS

THE PRINCIPLE OF SHARING

Several times in recent years the American Can Co., after having achieved important savings in the cost of making cans, has publicly announced that it would "share these savings with customers."

These were commendable announcements, particularly to customers. But they were by no means novel. For they expressed a basic principle of our economic system. It has such broad application that it might be called a general "law of economics."

This basic principle is that "all economic gains must be eventually shared."

This is not socialism. It is the essence of the free economy. Nor is it redistribution. It is plain distribution, or diffusion of wealth.

It works this way.

1. All business is done by agreements of some kind.

2. The agreements are voluntary.

3. Nobody agrees to anything unless he finds it in some way to his advantage.

These add together to make the essential reason why economic well-being is wider distributed in the United States than it ever has been in any other country.

For in a free economy, everybody gets a share of the values other people have to offer. But they also have to share a part of the values they themselves have to offer.

A million deals, agreements, trades, contracts, and bargains are made every day in this country. They are all voluntary, and go on the same principle as that of the most primitive barter between Indians and fur-traders. Both sides gain, or think they gain.

This is the difference between ours and the Communist system—or any army system. (The Communists, in fact, seem to feel that a deal is something like matching coins. One man's gain must be another man's loss.)

But because of this principle of sharing, or letting the other fellow make a profit too the free economy is one of history's greatest mechanisms for the diffusion of wealth.

WHAT PULLS UP WAGES

This principle of sharing applies to all markets, including the market for labor. The workman with labor to sell has been for 150 years the most consistent gainer from this sharing principle. This is because, though labor is a commodity, the price of which is subject to supply and demand, it is a unique commodity. It enters into every kind of production, and as productivity increases, the workman shares in the increase.

The hope of profit in new and growing industries forces employers in those industries to bid up for labor. This force has caused them to bid millions of people from off the farms, from out of depressed areas and out of domestic service, and even from across the Atlantic. The best and the most new jobs are normally found with the most optimistic employers who have the strongest hope of profit. And it is such labor markets that over the decades have steadily lifted wages.

The point where the workman repeatedly benefits from the sharing principle is in the wage bargain. It is the peculiar nature of this bargain which benefits the workman. What the employer buys is time. But what he sells is units of product (or service). So as fast as he can get more units of product per hour of the time he buys, the time gets more valuable to him, and he can, and eventually will, one way or another, share the gains with the workman—even though the increased productivity may be due in large part to better machinery and management.

This is because if he doesn't, then even more successful and ambitious employers will outbid him in the labor market. His rate of qualified applications will go down, and his quit-rate will go up. If then he can't afford to meet the (rising) market for workmen's time, he is on the way to going out of business.

This is the "magic formula of productivity," which class-conscious European

economists and employers failed to grasp. It is what Henry Ford meant when he said "There is no conflict, in a machine economy, between low costs and high wages." This is why the world's highest-paid labor (per hour of workman's time) can be and often is the world's lowest-cost labor (per unit of output); whereas in some parts of Asia and Africa, labor is so expensive, in output or productivity, that it is the lowest paid in the world, and in some cases scarcely worth any wage at all.

This is also why labor is a unique commodity, the market for which is normally quite different from that of all other commodities. The result of the productivity formula is that, in a free and progressive economy, and particularly in manufacturing industries, the price of an hour of labor normally and indefinitely tends to rise, while the price of manufactured goods normally and indefinitely tends to fall (or tends toward better goods for the same price).

But, it might be asked, "Why doesn't the employing manufacturer's net return on sales also keep rising indefinitely?"

Obsolescence and competition are the combined reason. They are the two blades of the shears which keep clipping away the employer's gains. While the tide of increasing productivity continually works to increase the value of the workman's time, it continually pushes against the value of the employer's investment. For example, he builds a new plant, with new machinery, to market a new product. It is a more productive plant, and he pays more for labor, accordingly.

But in time this employer, or a competitor, or a competing industry, builds a still more productive plant, and bids for people to man it. This notches up the labor market. But there is no such market for the outmoded plant. It is on the way to the scrap heap.

Perhaps this story might be criticized as skipping too easily over the problem of technological unemployment. It might be said that workmen can't move that fast, and labor is not that mobile. But they can move. Their time still has value. Outmoded plants can't move. It has no more than scrap value. There is no market today for steam locomotives except with the wreckers—nor any market for the shops that built these locomotives. But there is still a market for the time of the men who used to build and drive steam locomotives—though it may have taken them some time to find it.

THE "IRON LAW OF WAGES"

The forces that in a free economy normally tend to push up wages were wholly overlooked by most 19th-century economists. A century ago the still prevailing theory of wages, particularly in England, was called the "iron law of wages." The notion was that wages could not rise above what it took to keep the "working class" at a minimum of subsistence; the rest inevitably went to employers.

This unhappy theory of "capitalism" has long proved wrong in the free world, and I mention it for only one reason. It was swallowed whole by the intellectual father of communism, Karl Marx, and it is still, today, fixed Communist and Socialist dogma. Marx called what employers were supposed to naturally get, a surplus value. He called this supposed surplus value the product of "the capitalist system of communal slaveholding."

Then, from this mistaken and bitter premise, he made what is probably the most mistaken economic forecast ever published. In 1848 he wrote angrily in the Communist Manifesto:

"Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labor * * * the workman * * * becomes an appendage of the machine * * *.

"The lower strata of the middle class * * * all sink gradually into the proletariat * * *.

"The modern laborer * * * instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth * * *"

It is a colossal irony that today the only economic system in Europe that in any way resembles Marx's notion of "communal slaveholding" is that of Soviet Russia. If "pauper" means "one who takes what he gets and 'likes it,'" the Russian workman and farmer have been pauperized under an iron law of wages behind an iron curtain—the "surplus value" of their labor being expropriated by an iron government.

THE NATURAL BRAKES ON WAGE IMPROVEMENT

While wages naturally keep advancing in a free economy, there are natural limits on the rate of advance. They cannot simply spurt ahead at the wish of wage earners.

It is sometimes felt that they should advance with the general advance in national productivity. But this is far too broad a basis on which to justify particular wage advances in general; and it is proving hard to apply in specific cases. This is probably because national productivity does not increase "in general" but only by the particular advances of particular industries and firms. When we come down from the heights of overall national statistics, we see that ability to pay higher hourly wage rates varies sharply from industry to industry and from company to company.

Wage rates, like all other prices, are always competitive with something. The most immediate and visible competition to the price of an hour's labor is the cost of labor-saving machinery. The least visible competition is from other companies and industries.

Employers naturally check comparative costs on wages and on wage-saving machines. Hourly costs on machines are as easily figured as hourly direct-labor costs. And there can come a point, in the advance of hourly wage rates in a particular industry, where the employer, particularly under competitive pressure, may find it necessary to cut costs by "replacing labor with machinery." This point has been frequently reached in recent years in the automobile industry, where both automation and unemployment have been increasing side by side.

The competition less visible to the individual workman is that of other companies and, still further over the hill, of other industries. For instance one reason why the steel industry in 1959 was so reluctant to raise wages, and why it did not then advance prices, was the growing threat of aluminum, plastics, and prestressed concrete.

If wages are pushed beyond their natural rate of growth, they will cause a change in employers' investments, in two ways—both meaning less jobs. Excessive wage increases will needle the employer to put his money into more job-reducing automation, and less job-producing expansion. As a result, high, nonseasonal, chronic unemployment in an industry may mean that its wage rates have been pushed too high, or above their "natural market." Such unemployment, or surplus of labor, is analogous to the surpluses of farm products which result from Government support of crop prices above what consumers are willing to pay. The results may be fine for those who still have high-paying jobs, but not so good for those whose labor has been priced out of the market.

PROFITS

The Bible says in three places "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." Moses said it once (Deuteronomy 25:4) and Paul said it twice (I Corinthians 9:9, and I Timothy 5:18). Both lawgivers meant the same thing. The Biblical ox, like the modern employer, figured to pick up some grains of corn while treading out his job. This is a pretty good analogy for the modern corporation. It has to eat, too, but will sometimes work on gleanings.

Employers labor to proclaim the importance of profits. They call them the tonic, the sparkplug, and the energizer to our economic system, and the seed corn for our future growth. I would rather say that the hope of profit is the pituitary gland that regulates growth in the economic body, or the electronic tube or transistor that multiplies effects. But every man to his own figure of speech.

In any case two things are certain: First, no hope of profit, no jobs. And second, the more the hope of profit, the more and better the jobs. What is left to the employer, in any wage contract, is money invested for the employee, in future job security. If this isn't so, he's in the wrong industry, or working under the wrong management.

SOME TROUBLED THEORIES

During the last 30 years some pretty doubtful theories of wages have come into vogue.

One is an American version of the "iron law of wages." It runs to the effect that wages tend normally downward unless they are forced upward. It is that the rapid rise in wages since World War II has been due, not to the normal upward pressure on wage rates of a free economy, but to unions and Government.

This isn't very impressive. The very large 1945–60 wage-hour increases were obtained by nonunion as well as union members. The only important difference between the two was that the advances to the nonunion people, over the years, were gradual, like the rise in a ramp, while the advances to union members were in steps.

Another teaser in wage arguments has been the "mass purchasing power" theory. This says that as employers pay higher wages, they increase their own markets. It is as though a job applicant said, "Pay me more because then I'll buy more of your products." It seems to assume that what the employer doesn't pay out in wages, sticks in his hands—or stops dead and isn't purchasing power in the other channels to which it goes—raw materials, plant expansion, and dividends. It assumes that the purpose of wage negotiations is to increase the national demand for goods and services. If this were so, the employer could make a still better purchasing-power argument. He could say, "Every dollar of increased earnings of this company will probably trigger $3 of increased investment in the company." But neither argument can be carried very far.

Another questionable wage argument has been that labor should get all the benefit of increasing productivity. This is the basic Marxian theory. Pushed through with consistent success, it would soon mean, "no private employers."

A two-edged argument revolves about another theory, that of the wage-price spiral. According to this theory, unions force up wages, making employers put up prices. But does it work this way? Some economists says it works the other way—that inflationary influences pull up prices, which pull up wages. This sounds more reasonable. Perhaps no one likes to settle the argument, because the answer would cut both ways. Unions would like to appear strong, but not that strong. Some employers would like to argue that unions don't really push up wages, but that they do cause the "wage-price spiral."

One thing is fairly sure. If wages are negotiated too high, too soon, they will either (1) cause higher prices in an inflation era, or (2) cause unemployment in a stable-price or a deflationary era. Timing is of the essence. Even the fast-growing

American economy can move ahead only so fast, and its gains must be shared.

COMMON INTERESTS

The workman and the employer have common interests. This seems particularly true in Canco, which is squeezed between its raw material suppliers and its potential do-it-yourself customers, with its competitors lurking in the background.

It seems obvious that the company, the employees, and the unions must work together. The more each contributes to the joint pie to be cut, the more each can hope to gain—just as the more a man contributes to his job, the more persuasively he can argue when he asks for a raise.

The Role of Economic Growth in the American Achievement—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth chapter from the pamphlet "The American Achievement," entitled "Economic Growth":

ECONOMIC GROWTH

A new word has become internationally fashionable in politics—"growth." The Russians especially like it. Khrushchev has threatened to outgrow us. And so, many Americans have put a "rush" label on growth in this country.

There are several things that seem odd and curious about this new growth talk. One thing, of course, is that preaching growth to a nation with our record, seems somewhat like trying to teach grandma to spin. We already know how to grow. Another odd thing is how the Russians have crashed the argument. While our growth record has been tops, theirs, certainly since the Bolsheviks captured the Soviets in 1917, has been near the bottom of the league.

STATISTICS AND STATISTICS

Statistics are hard to follow anyway. We have the world's best economic statistics, but it still takes a statistician to read them. A recent change in the Federal Reserve Board index of production took 10,000 words of explanation. But Russia has the world's worst economic statistics. I know, because I worked in Moscow in 1922 as a statistician for the American Relief Administration.

The fashionable statistical comparisons between this country and Russia are loaded, in several ways.

One is as to time. They are based on certain years since World War II. In these years, Russia was recovering from the German invasion. Of course, they came back faster than we did, from the war. But let's take a longer and more representative period. Our statisticians say that in the 43 years between 1913 and 1956 (and this covers most of the Communist era in Russia) our productivity went up 2.3 percent compounded annually, while on a comparable basis theirs went up 1.3 percent. These figures look small, by the year. But ours is 70 percent faster, and in 40 years this adds up.

There's another way in which the figures are loaded even worse. The fashionable comparisons are based on certain key industries such as steel, coal, and oil. In Russia these are still growth industries. But the Communists don't care about such things as automobiles, refrigerators, or washing machines. And so those things don't go into the statistics. When it was pointed out to Khrushchev on his 1959 visit here that the United States then had 59 million cars and Russia only 1 million, he said they planned it that way. If Russians had that many cars, he said, the Russian Government would have to build highways for them, and that would be a great waste of the nation's resources.

When you hear that "Russia will outgrow us," here are three items to keep in mind.

1. Russian farming today is not as productive as it was under the Czars. (Communism and good farming don't mix.)

2. The average Russian city-dweller has less living space than he had 45 years ago. The Russian Government plans to increase this, by 1965, to 80 square feet per person—about as much as an American penitentiary cell. And as to quality, Russian city housing is, by American standards, practically all slum.

3. Russia has now reached the same output of canned goods as this country reached in 1915—though Russia now has more than twice the population we had then.

COMMUNISM—ECONOMIC SELF-DEFEAT

Those of us who resent the defense costs that Communist Russia imposes on us might get some solace from thinking how much communism costs the Russians.

If the Communists would let Russia grow the way this country naturally grows, Russia might perhaps outgrow us economically. But that would be the end of communism—and we would then need have no fear of Russia. Free peoples are not aggressors.

But to stay in power, the Communists have to enforce Communist economics from top to bottom of Russia. They cannot let up. They cannot stand free argument, free elections, a free press, free enterprise, free competition, or free anything. So the Russian economy cannot grow naturally, but only in the twisted ways permitted by its Communist government.

For Russia, I believe this is bound to mean at the worst, slow economic suicide, and at the best, a permanent second place. Here are some reasons I think so.

1. Communism demands conformity. It is built on the organizational man. It has no place for critics, eccentrics, Edisons, Fords, or Einsteins. Nor for small businessmen. Such people are politically dangerous. So a Communist-run economy can obtain its new ideas almost solely by imitation—and even then only if these ideas have no political slant. (This is why Moscow recognizes no patent laws.) The only inventors to whom the Kremlin is open-minded are those who can contribute to Communist military power. Outside of the fields of military or propaganda value, the Russians are bare-faced imitators; and under communism, they will always have to be.

2. Communism means top-down planning. This is just no good as economics. It takes everybody to know everything about supply and demand, and the composite answers appear as the prices in free markets. But communism and free markets don't mix. The result, under communism, is bound to be shoes in the wrong places, and shirts of the wrong sizes in what stores there are. Top-down planning, wasteful by nature, can't ever seem to work except where people are so short of everything that they take what they can get and like it.

3. A Communist government has to divert a good part of the energy of its people into the show business. Such a government has to mix politics heavily with economics; and this means going strongly into spectaculars. So Russia goes for impressive (but expensive) hydropower plants ahead of (less expensive) steam powerplants; and for commercial air fleets while country roads are still mud sloughs in the spring, dust traps in the summer, and mere sleigh tracks in the winter.

Such an economic system wastes its people's energies by ignoring the most elementary figuring used by American business. A typical result is the Moscow subway. It is the world's most ornate, and highly impressive. But meantime the largest food stores in Moscow don't have refrigeration. Freezers wouldn't be so impressive.

THE REAL COMMUNIST MENACE

Khrushchev's promise to outgrow the United States is old stuff. The Communists have been making the same promise for 40 years. I heard it many times from Russian officials in 1922. They will probably be saying the same thing in the year 2000. The permanent theme of Russian communism is "Sacrifice now, freedom comes later." But freedom would mean the end of communism. Does that mean the Communists expect to eventually abdicate? It's unlikely.

But this does not mean that the Soviet system is no threat to us. The Communists have a huge disposable income or surplus value taken out of the hides of 200 million Russians and all the satellite peoples the Communists can lay their hands on. With these resources they are as large and constant a threat to us as the Indians were to our frontier forefathers. The more we prosper, the more they will hate us. This is human.

In the last two centuries, autocratic Russian governments have been a threat successively to the Swedes, the Germans, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, the Greeks, the Turks, the British, the French, the Finns, and the central European Slavs. We inherit these threats.

GROWTH BY GOVERNMENT

But in addition to its phony emphasis on Russia, the new-fashioned talk about growth has something else funny about it.

The American invention of freedom as a general principle released not only economic freedom, but the freedom to criticize. And the early achievements that came from economic freedom produced a revolution of rising expectations. The expectations were always ahead of the results, and no matter how fast things improved, the critics always said, "Not enough. Higher wages. Shorter hours. More. Faster." The new growth talk wraps this all up in one comprehensive chorus of "faster."

But not one word about "how." The talk seems to be all about results—not methods. It is that we should have 5 percent growth each year, instead of the 2 or 3 percent growth of recent decades. But the chapter on "How?" is blank. It is like the old saying, "If we had some ham, and some eggs, we could have some ham and eggs."

But while there's no chapter on how we're to get this growth, it's quite clear between the lines. You can find it by running through all the things the new growth people are for, and checking what these proposals have in common. Among other things they are for more foreign aid, more schools, more medical aid to old people, and more natural-resources development. But whatever it is, it invariably means, more federal government.

For Americans, historically, as moviegoers say, "This is where we came in." The U.S. Constitution was based on a plan for minimum government. George III and his ministers had plans for a maximum government.

THE NEW ECONOMIC PURITANS

While the new growth talk means growth-by-government, another new fashion in economic ideas leads indirectly toward the same result. It is the new cult of economic puritanism. It has two key words. It attacks waste (by citizens) and calls for sacrifice (by citizens).

Little words can have big meanings, and today's ideas are often tomorrow's laws.

The new economic Puritans don't hesitate to mind other people's business by charging that Americans are affluent and opulent and waste national resources on such things as tailfins and modern packaging (with a goodly swipe at beer cans). They complain that manufacturers persuade customers to buy things the customers don't need.

This isn't the first time writers and speakers have gotten themselves heard by lambasting other peoples ways of living. The outstanding example in American history was that of the people who put through the Volstead amendment in 1919, legally drying up the country for 14 years. But I also remember how this kind of people said in 1915 that if you gave slum-dwellers bathtubs they would put coal in them; in 1920 that if steelworkers were paid too much they would squander it on silk shirts; and in 1925 that the newly-popular radio carried, after all, mostly trash.

Most of such ideas, fortunately, used to blow away, in a free country (though prohibition lasted 14 years). But today they have a more sinister possibility. Today they are one side of a pair of shears, of which the other side is the growth-by-government idea. The sacrifices of citizens are to pay for the growth of government.

THE IDEALLY WISE, STRONG GOVERNMENT

It might be imagined that, even without the Russian military threat, a wise Federal Government, with far greater powers than today, would make for a stronger nation.

Such a government might in imagination do many things hard on individuals but desirable for the Nation. It might prevent private waste by heavier taxation, and then use the tax receipts for such worthy purposes as better schools, highways, and cities, and medical care for its old people. These would not all exactly mean greater strength against Russia, as the growth-by-government people imply. For greater strength against Russia would mean lower wages, longer hours, and shorter shrifts for veterans, farmers, and the old, the poor, the sick, and the unemployed, in the Russian style. But, anyway, such a government might, in the public interest, cut down on Americans' expenditures on second cars, country clubs, and water skiing, and use the proceeds better.

But there is no such government—nor ever will be. The idea of government knows neither freedom, adventure, competition, obsolescence, or voluntary sharing. Instead it is built on the opposite of all these—namely, on controls; on routine; on monoply; on conservatism; and on forced redistribution. Big government is essentially the deadening and wasteful business of minding other peoples business. While competitive private business is adventure "or else," government business is protected.

RUSSIA'S GAME, RUSSIA'S ADVANTAGE

We have to outmatch the Communists in war power, no matter the cost. This is a first rule of American survival. Their system is based on war; ours, on peace. But because we need an economy powerful for defense doesn't mean we need a busy government. A busy American government can never mean anything as single-minded as a Communist government. It can only mean a government far more wasteful of American energy than a free economy under limited government. Meantime the Communist government imprisons or starves the people it considers unnecessary to its single-minded purpose of arming and extending its power. And so if we try to match government with government against them, we will lose. We will weaken what we have, without matching what they have. We will be then the imitators.

CONCLUSION

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The American economic system has released more energy, and brought more prosperity than any other economic system in human history.

It has done so not only while its members had their political freedom, but because they had their political and economic freedom. It was the very spirit which led Americans to call this the land of the free and sweet land of liberty that brought the progress. An Englishman once said that the best society was one that provided "the greatest good for the greatest number." This Nation started with a system calculated to provide the greatest opportunity for the greatest number.

When this unique experiment got underway, it turned out that the new opportunities for inventors, investors, and risktakers soon led to a luxuriant growth of material products and services for consumers, and then to better and better jobs for more and more millions of men and women. Yet the principle of freedom was not abandoned. It is still with us, as freedom of conscience, of speech, of markets, of competition, and of business enterprise.

And if this principle of individual liberty—that "man is the measure of all things"—is not forgotten, the American achievement will go on, to show as astonishing progress in the future, as it has shown in the past.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

International Payments Imbalances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks apropos the minority views expressed by myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS,
New York, N.Y., September 14, 1961.

The Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have called my attention to your separate views on the 1961 report of the Senate Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments dealing with international payments imbalances.

Confidence is the touchstone of currency. With it a currency weak when measured in orthodox terms may survive. Without it, a strong currency can be toppled like a house of cards.

As in many fields of human endeavor, room for improvement exists in methods available to meet imbalances in foreign payments. It is commendable that serious study is given to this problem by the subcommittee and others knowledgeable in this field.

Procedures proved worthy of reliance in intranation history deserve close scrutiny as a foundation of devising successful measures for handling adequately international balances of payments. But they undoubtedly require suitable adaptation to take into cognizance the differences between economic and political factors within a single nation and those prevailing in dealings among nations. As history has demonstrated, patriotism can be a most powerful force in dealing on the intranational plane, but its value is dissipated when transactions move into the international field.

In our lifetime considerable experience has been had with voluntary organizations working in the field of international relations. Evolutionary improvement rather than revolutionary panaceas appears to point the way to such success as has been achieved in this area. Such an approach seems also least likely to disturb that confidence upon which international monetary success depends.

Therefore the note of caution expressed in your individual views on the subcommittee report is worthy of careful attention. Your position seems to envision not a do-nothing policy, but a do-it-right policy.

I am forwarding the report to NAMSB headquarters with the suggestion that the substance of your views be invited to the attention of the NAMSB membership. For certainly as to the mutual savings banking industry, if confidence fails in our monetary system, the industry cannot survive.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKENNA,
Director-Counsel.

Residual Oil Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles F. Avila, president of the Boston Edison Co., together with letters which that company directed to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization concerning the residual oil problem:

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., September 12, 1961.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: I enclose for your information copies of letters sent by Boston Edison Co. to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization concerning the residual oil problem.

In our letter of July 20, 1961, we also endorsed the joint statement filed by the New England Council and the Oil Users Association—a clear, factual, and convincing presentation of New England's case. The letter dated August 18, 1961, is our rebuttal to statements made by those who favor import controls on residual oil. As you are aware, these quotas impose an unfair economic penalty on the people of New England as well as other areas of the country.

Thank you for your active support on this issue. I hope that your continued efforts will result in the removal of these costly restrictions.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., July 20, 1961.

Mr. FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: Boston Edison Co. endorses the statement filed jointly by the New England Council and the Oil Users Association on the question of residual oil and national security. This letter is a supplement to that statement. Its purpose is to emphasize the particular problems faced by this company, one of the largest public utilities in the Nation serving a population of over 1.5 million.

Boston Edison Co. is a large, normal user of residual oil. Its use of this fuel in large quantities started in 1950 when residual oil accounted for 85 percent of its fuel requirements. During the 12-month period ending June 30, 1961, this company used in excess of 7 million barrels of residual oil for the production of electricity distributed in 40 cities and towns in the greater Boston area and for steam for space heating in downtown Boston.

Increases and decreases in the cost of fuel directly affect the bill of each customer. Oil price increases resulting from restrictions have cost our customers almost $2 million. Greater damage to them is threatened by continuance of present governmental policies.

Nowhere and in no way is this fact of threatened damage more starkly evident than in the effect of present import restrictions upon the company's commercial relationship with its fuel suppliers. A critical problem—and one basis for the company's strenuous objection to these restrictions—is that, wholly because of such restrictions, the company is prevented from changing from one supplier to another as economy or best business practice might at any time indicate. We are denied such flexibility no matter how harshly we might at any time be treated by a supplier with regard to price or service. Suppliers hold import quotas by virtue of their customers' use of oil as recorded for the year 1957. This effectively prevents us from turning to new sources of supply even if indicated by prudent business policy. Such a restriction and elimination of choice is actually a clear restraint of trade.

Allocations of residual oil by any method, and particularly the one now in effect, have caused a dislocation in the amount of oil available to various regions of the country. Eight out of ten integrated companies recently granted increased allocations as newcomers do not market residual in New England. The concurrent reduction in supply to traditional New England suppliers, it is estimated, will result in a 5-million-barrel supply deficit to New England by the third quarter of 1961.

Restrictions are a deterrent to the industrial growth of the area we serve. If this extensive and important area is to grow industrially, to provide a steady increasing number of jobs for its expanding population and to meet the requirements of a time of national emergency, it must be assured of an ample and certain supply of fuel, a supply available at the lowest possible cost.

Our case on this issue is also the case for New England.

No useful consideration or assessment of our national security is possible without equal attention and study being given the needs, the problems, and the resources—or the lack of them—of the Nation's several geographical regions. As the whole is no greater than the sum of its parts, so the Nation's strength is no greater than the particular strength of each such region.

The statement and its documentation filed by the New England Council places full emphasis upon the national security aspects of this critical problem. Although pertinent reference is made throughout to the New England aspects of that problem, it is most important that this statement be received and considered as reflecting equally New England's stake in an amended policy.

New England has no indigenous fuel production, has found 20 percent of its entire energy consumption deriving from residual oil (a percentage increasing each year), has

been forced by the limitations established to pay unjustifiably high prices for its fuel, has seen such prices steadily rise higher in the New England region than elsewhere, has found its people and industries forced to needless and costly expenditure of millions of dollars per year, has in this, as in many other instances, been victimized by transportation cost differentials, has questioned the validity of each of the arguments advanced in behalf of the coal industry, not alone from the standpoint of excessive costs to New England consumers but as regards national security as well, submits that the national security is never better served or even well served when one of our country's principal geographical regions finds its millions of residents forced to needless expenditure, its vital industries compelled to compete unfairly and thereby become less productive, and its economy steadily weakened by such drains upon it.

The case for New England—the case for the Boston Edison Co.—deserves the most careful and comprehensive study by those authorized, to eliminate a problem that present policy has created.

Thank you for your consideration of these views.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., August 18, 1961.

Mr. FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: We would like to comment on some of the statements made to you in support of import restrictions on residual fuel oil.

The National Coal Association has advocated a policy of severely restricting all imports of residual oil primarily on the basis that foreign fuel supplies, particularly from the Caribbean, are unusually vulnerable to interruption and would be cut off in time of war.

Such a policy, we submit, would actually result in the dissipation of our economic and industrial strength; reduce our chances of winning the present cold war; would alienate some of our closest allies in the Western Hemisphere, namely, Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, and the West Indies, and would be a great handicap in any future war.

The residual oil import restriction program has caused shortages and increased costs to residual oil users by $174 million annually. To that extent the ability of the United States to produce goods and services at low cost has been unnecessarily weakened. The cold war is a war of economic survival. We cannot win such a war by acceding to the narrow interest of individual industries, by adopting an isolationist philosophy, or by hurting friendly nations.

Our foreign trade, foreign investment, and military strategy are based on an interdependent world. We helped organize NATO and SEATO. We have military bases throughout the world and are committed to a global defense strategy and not "head in the sand" defeatism. To argue that under any war assumptions that we cannot keep our sea lanes open is contrary to the mobilization planning of those responsible for the defense of our country and repugnant to a nation which is spending over $45 billion a year for defense purposes.

Global warfare requires foreign supplies of strategic materials such as residual oil. The greater the number of sources and supply routes that exist the greater are our chances of victory. It makes little sense to propose that the best way to assure open supply lines in time of war is to dry them up in time of peace.

The NCA concept of a submarine blockade assumes that tankers carrying residual oil will be targets in the next war. No mention is made of colliers, tankers carrying crude and other products, military supplies or troops. Neither is any recognition given to improvement in antisubmarine warfare techniques which have kept pace with the growth of foreign submarine fleets.

Certainly, if tankers cannot get to New England, Florida, and Hawaii, neither can colliers. If tankers are stopped from making the trip from the Persian Gulf to the United States, our slow moving colliers now carrying coal to Europe will be unable to continue to do so. Furthermore, in the guided missile age, dispersion of fuel supplies and a large tanker fleet offer a greater guarantee of fuel supply continuity than coal coming through fixed-target rail bottlenecks at Hampton Roads or Mechanicsville, N.Y., the rail junction connecting New England with Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

The NCA has also made claims of financial distress in the coal industry but has not submitted any conclusive evidence that this is so. The table on page 34 of its statement combines both profits and losses for individual companies. Any evaluation of the financial successes of the industry would have to show the performance of the leading producers. Financial data for these companies for the years 1959 and 1960 are available. This data should be analyzed as these producers are the ones which would benefit from any increased use of coal. Residual oil is not in competition with coal produced by marginal mines.

On page 44 of its statement the NCA offers the thesis that residual is injurious to the coal industry because they are in competition for the same general type of market.

Residual oil has been marketed ever since oil has been refined and no one will argue that it is not in competition with other industrial energy and fuels including gas, electricity, coal, hydropower, and the atom. We observe, however, that competition and injury are not synonymous; that injury does not necessarily follow from competition. The improvements in efficiency that the bituminous industry has achieved have been the result of competition.

There is little evidence that residual imports have had a material effect on the domestic oil industry. The Independent Petroleum Association is primarily concerned with the fact that removal of import restrictions on residual might result in large quantities of this product being used as refinery feed stock. It would seem that this could be adequately provided for under the import program even if restrictions on residual used as fuel were removed.

Standard Oil of Indiana, a large quota holder, anticipates that with removal of restrictions the price of residual would drop to such a low price that it would greatly accelerate installation of conversion units in refineries with a resulting reduction in domestic residual production. It is hard for us to understand the logic of this argument since many refiners have profitably made these installations both before and after import controls as is shown by the continuous decline in the domestic yield. We do not understand how the price of residual with controls removed could drop more than the amount it has risen since controls were instituted.

We in New England are fully aware of the plight of some segments of the railroad industry. Distress where it does exist results from loss of revenue to other forms of transportation and not to loss of coal revenue. It is surprising to us that the coal-carrying railroads would make an argument for a product they themselves no longer find economical to use. Are we seriously to consider the proposal that New England, Florida, and Hawaii be forced to burn an uneconomical fuel but not the railroads, so that the coal-carrying and oil-burning railroads can improve their operating results?

In conclusion we would like to draw attention to the following:

1. The coal industry has mechanized itself to its economic advantage.
2. The railroad industry has turned from coal to diesel fuel to its economic advantage.
3. The domestic refiners have reduced the yield of residual oil to their economic advantage.
4. Our allies in Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean have increased the production of residual to their economic advantage.
5. Industry in New England, Florida, and other parts of the country has turned to residual to its economic advantage.
6. All of these developments taken together have strengthened our Nation's economy and security.

And now under the guise of national security, coal, and the coal-carrying railroads want oil users to reverse course to their economic disadvantage.

We again urge that OCDM consider the great damage the restriction program has caused to areas which have adapted themselves to the use of residual oil in order to offset real geographical disadvantages. We respectfully recommend that the present program be rescinded.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES F. AVILA.

Business-Education Cooperation and Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an increasingly complex age, research plays a key role in progress.

In business, industry, farming, science, technology—in all fields—the formulas for forward steps come to a great extent from the laboratory.

Unfortunately, research is very expensive. For this reason, it has become necessary to find ways in which to minimize the cost, for example, by spreading it among interested parties.

In Wisconsin, we have a splendid record of research between business and our educational institutions. At the University of Wisconsin, for instance, a splendid record of such cooperation has been established. Recently the Milwaukee Sentinel published a fine article on the way in which such cooperation is helping to create breakthroughs in a great many fields. Reflecting a fine example of the kind of cooperation that can speed progress elsewhere in the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY BACKS UW RESEARCH

MADISON, July 15.—Research in engineering and commerce and related fields at the University of Wisconsin has been and is of great value to industry and business of Milwaukee and of Wisconsin and the Nation.

Of so much value that industry and business of the Milwaukee area, of the State, and

of the Nation have liberally rallied to its support.

And the research covers a wide variety of fields, ranging from basic studies in chemical kinetics, thermodynamics, and spray drying, to a study of Great Lakes ports and shipping and research on the economic influences of Latin American countries.

Much of the research being done by members of the faculty and staff of the University of Wisconsin College of Engineering and School of Commerce is supported by grants and awards by industry and business foundations and by private industry and business.

Some of these grants and awards are purely for research. Others are to support fellowships and scholarships in advanced research studies. All are very helpful to the advancement of knowledge and the training of young researchers in engineering, commerce, science and allied fields.

GIVE OVER $2 MILLION

During the 1959–60 fiscal year, the latest for which figures are now complete, industry and business throughout the Nation contributed $2,034,855 to research and education at the University of Wisconsin, of which leading Wisconsin industrial business contributed $198,082.16.

Among the largest Wisconsin industry-business supporters of advanced research and education at the University of Wisconsin in 1959–60 were Oscar Mayer and Co., Madison; the Johnson Foundation of Racine; the Wisconsin Utilities Association; the Wisconsin Mutual Insurance Alliance; Baker Laboratories, Inc., East Troy; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., West Allis; Nekoosa-Edwards Foundation, Inc., Nekoosa, and the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Allen-Bradley Co. and the A. O. Smith Corp., all of Milwaukee.

What are their grants of funds paying for in research and education at Wisconsin's university?

START OF INDUSTRY

Take a look at engineering, for example.

Basic research in chemical kinetics, thermodynamics, heat transmission, gas absorption and other fields have resulted in the saving of many millions of dollars in, process design and years of time in pilot plant development for many chemical industries, both in Wisconsin and throughout the world.

The dry cell industry in Wisconsin grew out of original work by C. F. Burgess in the university's chemical engineering department, as did the hot nickel plating bath—which was given outright to industry by its inventor, Prof. O. P. Watts. This latter discovery is now universally used, and the plating industries have officially acknowledged that the savings to them total millions of dollars.

For the first time, chemical principles controlling reactions between melting-furnace atmospheres, the metal charge, combustion gases, certain slags, and the molten metal have been quantitatively established. These principles have given chemical analysis control during melting a scientific and engineering basis that is practiced wherever these alloys are melted. Principles defining the properties of molding sand aggregates and, in addition, principles of molding methods have been worked out and the information has been distributed by the Department of Mining and Metallurgy to foundries throughout the United States.

Research in the University of Wisconsin Department of Mining and Metallurgy on the workability of brittle materials has opened the way for industrial applications in the fabrication of cermets (ceramic-metal combinations) which are the ultrahigh temperature structural materials of the immediate future. It is also possible that this research will provide a new and easy method of producing large crystals of transistor materials.

The initial cost of the University of Wisconsin's network calculator, about $240,000 was borne entirely by the Wisconsin Utilities Association.

Engineers within the several power companies use the calculator to study their systems periodically to insure adequate capacity in advance. Various alternative means for expanding capacity can be studied economically and the less desirable alternatives eliminated. The result is improved power service to the State.

INDUSTRY UTILIZES FINDINGS

An internal combustion engines project in the University of Wisconsin Department of Mechanical Engineering, originally begun in the 1930's, is concerned with combustion in compression-ignition, spark-ignition, and jet engines. Findings of the project have been utilized throughout the industry. They include data obtained during studies of ignition, duration of combustion, flame temperatures and pressures, vaporization of fuel, cylinder wall temperatures, and rates of heat transfer.

Jet engine studies have dealt with the effects of preheating the fuel, determination of rate of vaporization of single fuel droplets, and studies of drop sizes and drop distribution in sprays.

Many students dating from as early as 1916 have been concerned with air movement within many types of buildings, including infiltration, ventilation, air distribution, temperature gradients from floor to ceiling, characteristics of various types of air inlets and outlets, and the performance of turning devices and grilles. This research at Wisconsin has contributed significantly to improving building construction, reducing costs, and increasing comfort of occupants.

A spray drier designed and built on the basis of research conducted over the past several years in the engineering experiment station is providing much information of value to the agricultural experiment station scientists, who are advising commercial manufacturers of dried milk products and other dried foods.

The drier installation, some 50 feet high, gives scientists an opportunity to expand their research in this field from pilot-model to large-scale operation, and promises to be highly effective in aid of the milk processing industries.

Or take a look at research in the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce.

A study of "The Adequacy of the Retirement Program from the Viewpoint of the Old Worker," supported by a $250,000 grant by the Ford Foundation, is considering pensions and other financial aspects, job opportunities, and mobility of the aged worker.

A center for productivity motivation was recently established under a $100,000 grant by the Johnson Foundation, Racine. The center is investigating the factors, other than improved technology, affecting productivity in business and industry.

HANDLE WBA PROJECT

Then there is research in supervising projects in the area of life insurance securities and management of bank resources.

The research on valuation requirements for life insurance company security holdings, supported by a $100,000 grant from the Life Insurance Association of America, is nearing completion. A second study, undertaken in association with the Wisconsin Bankers Association, will aid banks in planning solvency and liquidity in management of resources.

The university has recently published a series of 11 vacation-recreation studies which provide evidence of the significance of the various phases of the tourist industry and its impact on the economy of the State. The studies are financed by a $25,000 appropriation by the 1959 State legislature.

A U.S. Labor Department program on "Manpower Challenges the 1960's" is underway. Community and statewide meetings of businessmen, educators, and personnel men will relate national manpower and labor prospects in the 1960's to what is happening on the local level.

A "Symposium on Workmen's Compensation Insurance in a Dynamic Society" was held at the university last May in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the first legislation in the area of workmen's compensation insurance by the State of Wisconsin. Leaders from business, industrial commissions, insurance, labor, medicine, and the National Safety Council participated in the symposium.

The Great Lakes general cargo ports within the State, Green Bay, Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Superior, are being studied along with Chicago through a questionnaire inventory of the facilities, estimate of the tonnage capacity, and the potential cargo traffic by 1965.

Development for Wisconsin administrators of a program of the National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, in cooperation with the college of agriculture, is supported by a Kellogg grant of $800,000.

Other research includes a study of economic influences in the Latin American countries, a new field of international trade in the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce; a study of financial controls, supported by a $10,000 grant by General Electric; operations research, and a highway study.

Major publications by the University of Wisconsin Bureau of Business Research and Service released during the past year include "Property Taxation and the Wisconsin Tax System," by the Wisconsin Business Research Council and the Committee for Economic Development; a report of an extensive study for the U.S. Senate subcommittee which investigated insurance regulations and practices; "The Second Midwest Newsprint Survey"; and the first two of five volumes consisting of papers delivered at the "Symposium of Insurance and Government" held at the university last September.

Khrushchev Another Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor, in yesterday's Washington Daily News, embarrassingly reveals the double standard the "agrarian reformers" around President Kennedy use in their approach to Dictator Khrushchev. As Mr. Taylor states, there really is no difference between dictators despite the fact that one wears a brown shirt and the other wears a red shirt. When this similarity is admitted by those around the President, perhaps we can approach our problems with the Russian tyrant in the way that made the United States the country that it is—no appeasement.

Here is the article:

A PROFOUND DISSERVICE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

President Kennedy voiced a note of injury and surprise, as did his chief negotiator at Geneva, when the Kremlin broke its word and resumed bomb tests. His tone left millions discouraged who never should have been encouraged in the first place.

When will our public be permitted to know that it is only our officials who put some store in such talkathons, not the Communists? Communists always behave like Communists, and thus have no intention whatever of reducing world tensions or dropping their toolkit of threats to mankind. And even if they did make a salutary agreement about anything, they would break it 10 seconds after it had served a Red purpose.

Somehow we never seem to realize where the Devil keeps his tail. Once more we lost much weight in Russian eyes by allowing them to toy with us like a dancing mouse at Geneva. We should have halted the fandango months ago when the Russians made their indifference crystal clear instead of pleading and pleading with them to keep talking.

We failed to carry our flag correctly because, once more, we failed to face up to realities and because our officials prize so highly the appearance of success in their negotiations even when none exists or is reasonably possible.

This preoccupation with appearances instead of realities is a profound disservice to America's world position and, therefore, to our security and world peace, because it dulls our public's understanding of Communist implacableness and at the same time whets the Reds' appetite for greater and greater demands. We are laid open to the same tactics that Hitler used which led to Munich.

This dangerous and immature behavior is rooted in the lingering and fatuous idea that somehow we can make a safe accommodation with the Communists whereas we realized such was never in the cards with the Nazis. This is a way to volunteer our neck for the hangman's noose.

It is utterly mystifying why many intellectuals and Washington officials who saw nazism's menace early and clearly and reacted intelligently are thrown off the track now that the Soviet Union is involved in the same practices. A child should be able to see the brown shirts have merely been dyed red. Hitler and Khrushchev are Siamese twins, but notice how differently our policy treats one from the other.

Had President Roosevelt even suggested sound agreements could be achieved with the Nazis he would have been castigated for giving us a dangerously misleading interpretation of the true nature of the Nazi menace. Countless organizations would have called for his scalp, he would have dangled in effigy in a dozen towns, and his political future would have disappeared like butter in a blast furnace.

Yet, today Washington officialdom often behaves as if the Communists are different. Then, right on schedule, Khrushchev pulls the rug out from under us each time and, once more, our officials are "disappointed" or "surprised" when he does it.

Aid for Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the consideration of our international economic policies, stress must be placed on the encouragement of exports and assistance to our businessmen. The program of the Department of Commerce functions in this area in such promotional activities as trade centers, fairs, missions, surveys, and commercial intelligence operations.

L. Edward Scriven, Director of the Office of International Trade Fairs, described these services in an address to the Tulsa World Trade Committee, Tulsa, Okla., July 26, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELL ABROAD

(Address by M. L. Edward Scriven, Director, Office of International Trade Fairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, before the Tulsa World Trade Committee, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla., July 25, 1961)

I've been barnstorming around the country, telling businessmen of the advantages to be gained by working with the Office of International Trade Fairs. They can be summed up in two words, "more sales."

It's surprising to me that American businessmen don't know more about our program. When I was in business, if someone had walked into my office and said he'd help me find new markets and sell my products, I'd have sat him down in the best chair in my office and given him a cigar and then taken him to lunch.

But I'm not asking for that—although I do appreciate the fine lunch you've served here. What I'm asking for is 25 minutes of your time to tell you what your Government is doing to help you sell overseas.

MORE AMERICAN COMPANIES NEED TO LEARN ABOUT INTERNATIONAL TRADE

First of all, consider the fact that only about 12,000 of America's 300,000 manufacturers are now exporting their products. Then consider the vast new markets that are opening up right now—in Africa, in the Middle East, in the Pacific, and a revitalized Europe.

These are terrific markets, gentlemen. And if we Americans don't sell them, someone else will.

The British, the Germans, the Japanese—not to mention the Russians and the Communist Chinese—are all conducting hard-hitting trade promotion programs.

We are too, and I'll tell you more about our program in a minute.

But first, let me give you a quote from President Kennedy's message urging businessmen to recapture the spirit and vitality of the traders of old. He said: "New frontiers lie beyond our borders that must be explored and developed by all energetic and resourceful businessmen. New markets for our goods and services are emerging in the developing areas which are now joining the world community for free nations. Also, the traditional foreign markets offer challenging opportunities as a result of their growing economies and elimination of restrictions affecting American goods."

The point I'm trying to make here today is that we're not in this export business for profits alone, but for survival.

The sooner all of us realize that the economic front is one of the hottest fronts in the cold war, the better off we'll be.

NEW COUNTRIES—NEW OPPORTUNITIES

For instance, take the newly emerging West African country of Ghana. We'll be holding our first trade exhibition there in November. We want their business, sure. And we think there's plenty of business potential there, from building block factories to Go-Karts. But more important, we want their friendship. And the history of the British Empire has taught us that trade ties lead to international cooperation, and mutual respect.

SOLID SALES RESULT

Take another example. We produced a trade exhibition 2 months ago in Helsinki, Finland, a country with which I'm familiar because I lived there for several years. My Finnish friends told me that the people there were delighted that we came—delighted because it showed them that the United States is taking a continuing friendly interest in their country and their future.

Besides friendship, Helsinki gave us something else—$3 million worth of solid sales, sales that mean jobs for Americans, and sales that help keep our gold balance on an even keel.

The same story has held true elsewhere. An exhibitor at an OITF exhibition early this year in Colombo, Ceylon, said it was: "A dramatic and forceful way to bring the truth about America to this small island nation, but at the same time promote our foreign commerce." The man could have added that he sold three complete commercial laundry and dry cleaning shops as a result of his participation.

A midwestern manufacturer of machine tools tells us that since he participated in a series of OITF industrial exhibitions in India, he is getting across-the-board orders from that part of the world.

If manufacturers can get results like these from U.S. trade fairs, why don't they enter the program? First—and this is something we in the Commerce Department are trying to do something about—not enough businessmen know about the trade fairs program. Second, as a New York businessman said to me not long ago, perhaps we're not hungry enough.

In the last year and a half, only one Oklahoma business has participated in the trade fairs program. The Phillips Petroleum Co. of Bartlesville displayed a sampling of its large petroleum and petrochemical product line in fairs at Izmir, Turkey, and Casablanca, Morocco.

WE WANT TO HELP SMALL BUSINESSES

We in the United States are proud of our vast petroleum and petrochemical industry, which has produced so many products contributing to our high standard of living. But we are especially interested in encouraging and helping smaller companies who have yet to learn the possibilities of international trade.

We'd like the people of other nations to see the advances that have been made in the United States. Many of them have started in Tulsa—perhaps in this room. And while we're showing the people of the world what Oklahoma businessmen have done, we'd like to help many smaller Oklahoma businesses sell.

WHERE FUTURE FAIRS ARE SCHEDULED

While I'm here, I want to mention some of our prospective 1962 fair sites. Tripoli, Baghdad, Mexico City, Casablanca, Izmir, Damascus, and Cairo—these are places well-known to oilmen. They're the commercial centers for areas which have vast underground oil deposits. And, as we've found in the past, many of them are lively, expanding markets for other products. Having heard part of our future schedule, I'm sure you start to see why we hope Oklahomans will be interested in the trade fairs program.

YOUR GOVERNMENT WILL HELP YOU

Now let's see what you'd get if you decided to participate in a U.S. pavilion overseas:

First, you would get the advantage of professional display designers.

One of the people in my office says they are like a combination of Walt Disney, Thomas Alva Edison and P. T. Barnum. He is joking, of course, but it is true that they come close to being magicians in creating attractive shows in varied climates, and under varying conditions.

We provide American manufacturers with an animated "showcase" which generally is the hit of the fair. This means crowds—crowds of foreign businessmen and everyday people who will see your products in the best settings that can be devised for them.

Second, your products will be demonstrated by bilingual college students from the host country. Dressed in specially-designed costumes, the demonstrators are themselves sales features. They prove to their countrymen how easy it is to learn to operate American-made machines.

Third, our veteran exhibition managers take complete care of those pesky problems which may arise on the site—utilities, security, maintenance, and so forth.

Finally, we assign a world trade expert from the Department of Commerce to each U.S. Pavilion. Making use of descriptive literature and promotional materials provided by the exhibiting firms, this man answers questions and actively seeks buyers for American-made goods. All leads are turned over to the manufacturer and he is further advised and assisted on any necessary paper work.

These services comprise what you might call the OITF "package." But as the people who make Cracker Jack found out long ago, it's often advantageous to put a package within another package. And so it is with us.

THERE ARE MANY OTHER IMPORTANT AIDS AVAILABLE

The "trade fair package" is just a part of a larger package, which embraces all the varying services which the Commerce Department will put at your disposal if you're looking for foreign markets.

You can begin your approach by finding out whether the products you manufacture can be sold in foreign markets. Each commerce field office—the nearest one to Tulsa is in Dallas—has statistics on the export of almost every commodity to all foreign countries. The field office can provide you with a list of importers of products like yours.

Then our Commercial Intelligence Division in Washington can supply you with a fairly specific report indicating what competition can be expected from local products, and what countries currently supply competitive imports. These trade lists also contain the names of firms you may want to approach as potential distributors or agents for your goods.

You should keep in mind the fact that you also may face competition from U.S. producers operating subsidiaries or branch factories in the countries where you are seeking markets.

CHECK EVERY WEEK FOR ACTUAL SALES LEADS

Another quick way to find out whether your goods are wanted abroad is to consult the World Trade Leads section of Foreign Commerce Weekly, another Commerce Department publication. There you will find scores of inquiries from firms in other countries who are looking for products like yours.

Incidentally, one of your local newspapermen produced an excellent story 2 months ago by taking a list of these inquiries from Australia and personally inquiring of Tulsa area manufacturers whether they would be interested in starting negotiations.

This was on May 13, while an excellent World Trade Conference was under way at the University of Tulsa's College of Business Administration. I have a note here that a great deal of credit for the organization of the conference goes to Bill Sallans of Petroleo Interamericano, and I congratulate him.

YOUR TRADE CONFERENCE WAS GOOD

I hope that the chamber of commerce will find it possible to continue these conferences on a yearly basis, because I know that the contributions made by some of your local manufacturers to greater knowledge of export trade in your area should stimulate new business in many ways.

Getting back to our big Commerce Department "package", I should call your attention to a series of brochures called "World Trade Information Service." These give you everything you need to know about the economy of the foreign country you're interested in—as well as related reports on tariffs and regulations, customs duties, taxation policies, and money exchange.

CHECK ON YOUR FOREIGN AGENTS

When you receive an inquiry from a prospective foreign distributor or agent, it would be good thing to get a World Trade Directory report from the Department of Commerce. It will tell you about the foreign agent's nature of business, importance and general reputation, so that you will be guided in starting the negotiation of sales or agency agreements.

We have some fairly comprehensive handbooks on about 20 foreign countries which will give you almost all you need to know to become informed on each country as a market for your products.

THE NEW TRADE CENTERS ARE A SUCCESS

When we opened our first U.S. Trade Center in London on June 26, we had been able to provide most of the 61 exhibitors of housewares with agency connections, obtained in advance through our trade contact surveys.

Almost half of the housewares manufacturers showing in London had not done any selling in the United Kingdom before. Several months before the show opened, we sent their catalogs and other information ahead to the American Embassy in London. The Embassy's staff contacted appropriate agents and distributors, and a number of the exhibitors were ready to have their agents actually man the exhibits by the time the show opened. Most of the 61 exhibitors have reported excellent sales in the United Kingdom.

This new and novel overseas sales technique is to be repeated. At the request of the President, we are taking steps to add four more trade centers. One is under preparation in Bangkok; another in Lagos, Nigeria; and a third in Japan. A South American site will follow shortly.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE WILL GIVE YOU INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE

Returning once again to the Commerce Department package, let's consider a section we might call person to person or, more properly, businessman to businessman.

When you're planning to go overseas to look at potential markets or to confer with potential agents or distributors, let the Commerce Department know in advance. We will have the commercial officers in the appropriate Foreign Service posts alerted of your visit so they can be more helpful to you.

HOW TRADE MISSIONS CAN HELP YOU

We are planning to send out about a dozen trade missions to various countries of the world; the first will go to Nigeria on September 14, 1961.

These missions will include four or five businessmen, plus a director from the Commerce Department. They will travel from city to city in each of the mission countries meeting with business people, chambers of commerce, trade associations and government officials, discussing export-import questions and arranging joint ventures and licensing agreements.

If, for example, you are interested in doing business in Nigeria, write us a letter setting forth your proposal and we will arrange to have the trade mission take it along and discuss it with interested business people in that country.

There are many places in the world to which you can now export your goods which were not opened as markets until recently. I suggest that you recheck the possibilities, and not assume that markets closed 2 years or even 1 year ago have remained closed.

A few months ago I saw a cartoon in one of the magazines. It showed a young scout from one of the new African countries talking to his chief. The scout said: "There's a fellow outside who just flew in on a DC–6B. Claims he's white god or something."

The joke was funny, but the butt was the fellow from the DC–6B. He'd come thinking he could operate under a sort of Stanley-and-Livingstone mystique, but he found that the tribesmen had gone modern, leaving him to fill the role of anachronism.

The point is the same, whether it's made by a cartoonist or by me: The world is moving ahead fast, building its markets and its allegiances as it goes. We've got to build with it, to adapt ourselves to its needs, to lead its aspirations.

You can be leaders in America's great world trade awakening. I hope you will.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. I'll be glad to answer any questions you may have. We want to help you sell abroad.

Fidel and the Catholics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on September 13, 1961:

FIDEL AND THE CATHOLICS

Fidel Castro's Kremlin-serving dictatorship has reacted with characteristic viciousness to the demonstration just staged against it in Havana by several thousand Roman Catholics—men, women, and children—taking part in a religious procession that has long been a traditional feature of Cuban life.

The procession—honoring Our Lady of Charity, regarded by Cuba's overwhelmingly Catholic population as the country's chief spiritual patroness—had been derided and declared illegal in advance by some of the Castro regime's noisiest and most noxious spokesmen. As a result, when the event took place, tension was high, and some of Fidel's militiamen started shooting at the participants, reportedly killing at least one, and wounding dozens of others.

Apparently this latest example of the tragic and evil nature of Castroism must be attributed to the fact that some of Fidel's mobsters—who have been indoctrinated with the virulent idea that any criticism of the Soviets is counterrevolutionary and therefore a thing to be smashed—felt justified in using guns and clubs to cope with the situation. After all, the processionists had persisted in shouting "Cuba si, Russia no," and "Long live Jesus Christ."

In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the Castroite bully boys (whose mental capacity probably leaves much to be desired) swung into action as they did. Dictator Fidel, however, although he purports to be a Catholic himself, has not apologized for their atrocious violence. On the contrary, his sleazy little Red tyranny has condemned the religious-minded marchers for having had the temerity to cry out against atheistic communism as a liberty-destroying thing

poisonous to the mind and spirit of men everywhere.

Indeed, turning the truth upside down in typical Red totalitarian fashion, the Havana dictatorship has issued a special communique accusing Cuba's Catholic nuns, priests, and bishops of plotting against "Doctor" Castro in an around-the-clock effort to overthrow and destroy him. To that end, according to the accusation, even the good sisters appear to have been conspiring—with the help of their primary-grade pupils—to hide guns in church and school basements in preparation for counterrevolutionary action against Fidel.

There seems to be a note of slightly desperate shrillness in all of this, as if the Castro despotism were beginning to feel real opposition from the rank and file in Cuba. In any event, the people of the country are predominantly Catholic, and that is a fact that may yet be Fidel's undoing as he ties himself tighter and tighter to the Kremlin and godless communism.

Freedom To Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. John Lampl, of Valparaiso, Ind., who is active in farm program and farm management, recently wrote a review of former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson's book entitled "Freedom to Farm." Because of Mr. Lampl's experience with and knowledge of farming, I believe that he has the authority to write such a review.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Lampl's review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM TO FARM

(Book by Ezra Taft Benson, reviewed by John E. Lampl)

Some of the first chapters of this book should be enjoyed by readers with a farming background as the author recalls boyhood experiences, both nostalgic and refreshing, of the good old days around his home in Idaho in the early 1900's. After reading his book the reader will have no doubt that Mr. Benson has a wealth of knowledge of farms and farming in this country. Otherwise, his book is a long and weary one man's opinion of what he thinks should be done about the so-called curse of overproduction and surplus confronting American agriculture.

The author is trying to convey to the general public his 8-year attempt to bind the modern farmer to the supply and demand agricultural economy that prevailed during the early 1900's and especially from 1920 to 1933. He fails to explain or reconcile the incompatible complexities between freedom to produce and the dilemma confronting the farmer at the market place. For example: at the present time, the farmer receives 8 cents a quart for whole milk while the consumer pays 24 cents a quart for the same product in a bottle at the retail grocer's. Freedom to farm; yes. Freedom to barter and market; no. He points out to the American consumer that the cost of food products is high; but he does not point out that as that cost has soared during the past 7 years, prices paid to the producer have steadily declined. He does not justify effectively the reason for high consumer food prices coming in the wake of the technological revolution in American agriculture. The farmer with his ingenious skill and dedication to his ever increasing scientific profession must be penalized, ridiculed, and subjected to lower prices and lower standards of living while his food products are prohibitive from a cost basis to a great many Americans and starving millions the world over.

Mr. Benson goes to great length reviewing past congressional actions and devotes entirely too much time in defending his own farm policies. His slanted and politically partisan views of the farm dilemma should be read with an open mind. A more authentic and less biased economic and political history of American agriculture can be found elsewhere.

Plea for a Green Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation needs to undertake more realistic, creative and far-reaching programs for the best utilization, preservation and, if possible, replenishment of our out-of-door heritage—if it is to meet the needs of the future.

How can this more effectively be done? Recently, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall published an article in the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Plea for a Green Legacy."

In my judgment, the Secretary makes some astute observations and recommendations that deserve not only the thoughtful consideration of Congress but of the American people. As pointed out by the Secretary:

The challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of man and the handiwork of nature. However, the sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

Reflecting further upon the way in which conservation is a responsibility not only of Congress but of the people, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 11, 1961]

PLEA FOR A GREEN LEGACY

(By Stewart L. Udall, U.S. Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON.—With all the weight of his world leadership responsibilities upon him, the contemporary American is rushing at a headlong pace to expand his scientific technology and to develop his land and its resources.

Our capacity to alter the world of nature is truly awesome. Population pressures and the requirements of commercial expansion and urban growth are constantly at work enlarging the manmade portion of our environment and diminishing the natural.

Indeed, the challenge to conservation statesmanship in our time is the achievement of balance between the works of men and the handiwork of nature.

Admittedly, we must move ahead with the development of our land resources. Likewise, our technology must be refined. But in the long run life will succeed only in a lifegiving environment, and we can no longer afford unnecessary sacrifices of living space and natural landscapes to "progress."

The sad truth is that development tends to outrun planning in our society. More often than not, the bulldozer's work is done before the preservationist and the planner arrive on the scene.

BROADER PLANNING URGED

If we are to maintain man's proper relationship to the land, it is plain that we must insist that our developers be more conservation minded, and we must broaden the role of resource planning in the management of our national estate.

The American continent has, from the very first, been hospitable to humankind. Its glory has always been its spaciousness and solitude. But the good earth will remain good only if we make it so. In our haste to build new factories and roads and suburbs we must take care that man's need to refresh himself in his natural environment is not foreclosed.

President Kennedy has called for one last great effort in the 1960's to finish the conservation work begun by Theodore Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt counseled Americans to "set apart forever for the use and benefit of our people as a whole rich, forested lands and the flower-clad meadows of our mountains.

"To skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them," Mr. Roosevelt warned.

CAPE COD TO INDIANA DUNES

This same spirit motivated the first major conservation accomplishment of President Kennedy's administration—the creation of a magnificent National Seashore Park on the ocean sands of Cape Cod.

A few days ago I climbed to the highest of the Indiana dunes along Lake Michigan to view a race between industrial development and conservation. In 1916 Stephen Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, hiked to the same promontory and urged that a great national park embracing 26 miles of dune shoreland be created for the populous Midwest heartland—the only area of the United States which has no major unit in the National Park System.

But Mather gathered too little support, and now one of his friends pointed to the remaining isolated tracts of this unique shoreland and said to me:

"You are 40 years too late."

At every hand near our growing centers of population similar opportunities are slipping through our fingers. Once land development has begun it is invariably too late, for land prices quickly soar beyond the public purse.

AGGRESSIVE PROGRAM SOUGHT

What strategy, what plan of action, will save enough space for all of our people? Leadership from our public men is, of course, indispensable. Federal action is needed to round out our national park and wildlife refuge systems and to develop fully the recreation potential of our forestlands.

We must also have aggressive State park expansion programs—such as those in New

York, California, and Pennsylvania—to reserve new parklands before they are preempted. Municipal leadership, too, is essential if we are to provide adequate city park systems and enough fringe open space to permit our cities to expand gracefully.

We also need—and here the burden falls heaviest on local leadership—creative and farsighted use of zoning regulations and land-use plans to compel the speculator and developer to put people first and insure that adequate space is allotted to playgrounds and parks.

Government can provide the main thrust, but individuals must play a creative role if we are insure an adequate heritage for all Americans.

PHILANTHROPISTS NEEDED

Above all, the cause of conservation needs a new generation of outdoor philanthropists. Philanthropy comes to our vocabulary from the Greek, and describes an attitude of loving mankind.

On looking back over the history of conservation it is surprising how much of our total accomplishment is attributable to quiet men from private life who at crucial moments have provided the needed inspiration and wherewithal.

The towering redwood tree of the conservation forest has been, of course, John D. Rockefeller, Jr. His natural and historic philanthropies span our continent. Every American who loves the out of doors owes this man a debt.

His saving work has benefited such far-flung and poetic places as Acadia National Park in Maine, Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, Hudson Palisades in New Jersey, and Williamsburg, colonial capital in Virginia. Mr. Rockefeller also used his generosity to evoke generosity in others.

When decisions hung in the balance, he inspired the States of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia to put up the matching gifts that led to the establishment of Great Smoky Mountains and Shenandoah National Parks. Now his son, Laurance, is carrying on his tradition, and it was he who gave to the people of the United States our newest national park in the Virgin Islands.

POETRY OF THE LAND

"The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poems," Walt Whitman once wrote. And those conservation philanthropists who have caught Whitman's vision have acted so that the poetry of our land might be sung by nature for all men of all ages.

Today foundations and individuals are sponsoring a variety of conservation projects. The Avalon and Old Dominion Foundations of the Mellon family have financed studies of our vanishing shorelines—and have underwritten much of the initial cost of our first national seashore at Cape Hatteras.

In Virginia the Old Dominion Foundation, under the inspired leadership of Paul Mellon, is surveying and purchasing secluded wilderness spots of riverbank, marsh, and forest. These are being saved both as scientific laboratories of life in its natural balance, as well as, in the words of Old Dominion's Monroe Bush, "for the people who will live 25 years from now."

Philanthropy has many pathways. How many Americans know of Mrs. Louis Bruguiere's gift of the Vanderbilt Mansion; the National Geographic Society's gift of Russell Cave to the national park system; the largess of former Maine Governor, Percival P. Baxter, who acquired Mount Katahdin and nearly 200,000 surrounding acres of magnificent mountain wilderness and endowed his native State with one of the largest and finest State parks in the Union?

MANY WAYS TO HELP

Who recalls the Princeton professor and his wife who donated the lovely Herontown Woods as a nature sanctuary, or the man in Lincoln, Mass., who volunteered to have his woods and fields zoned to remain always in their native state?

All these people acted from a shared conviction that the private citizen must play a vital role in preserving an environment that renews and sustains human life.

Every city, every State, every region should have its foundation, its citizens' band with the motives and zeal of the Save-the-Redwoods-League (California) or the Sudbury Valley Trustees (Massachusetts) working to preserve threatened native grounds. Enlightened pioneers in land conservation have already fashioned the tools. The opportunities for their use are present at every hand.

Let us never have to say, in sorrow, as did Plato: "There are mountains in Attica which can now keep nothing but bees, but which were clothed, not so very long ago, with trees."

The individual who wishes to contribute to conservation has numerous options. He may donate land or money to State or Federal park agencies such as the national park trust fund. He can give his land, his money, or his time to a private organization such as the Nature Conservancy.

ORGANIZATION'S WORK DESCRIBED

Mettler's Woods, in New Jersey; the entire watershed of Elder Creek in northern California; Mainus Gorge in Westchester County; Battle Creek Cyprus Swamp near the Delaware Water Gap, and Holly Ridge in Missouri are only a few of the unique natural areas preserved through gifts made to the Nature Conservancy.

On the other hand those who wish to use their land for life, can, by will or testament, add to the public estate and to the enjoyment of all. Close to Metropolitan Washington, in the fields of rural Maryland, rises Sugarloaf Mountain, a landmark for miles around. The entire mountain was once owned by the Strong family, who left this lovely estate and its gardens, as well as the forested mountain, for perpetual public use.

The individual who wishes to make a lesser, but no less significant, gift can voluntarily zone his property and dedicate a scenic easement that will maintain in perpetuity the present character of his lands. In Monterey County, Calif., over 4,000 acres have been pledged to such scenic easements—including some of the incomparable coastline of the Big Sur.

Conservation may also serve a duel purpose. In seeking to honor their heroes men often have turned to monuments of stone or bronze.

EXAMPLE OF A MEMORIAL

Shortly after the passing of Theodore Roosevelt, his friends saved a lovely Potomac River island which was marked for conversion into a utility storage depot and gave it to the country as a nature memorial to a man who had a lifetime love affair with the out of doors.

Many of us in Washington regard this "wild little island" in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial as perhaps the most fitting of our monuments—and the one that would accord the greatest pleasure to the man it honors.

The conservation philanthropy needed today must come from all of us who during our lives have made withdrawals from nature's bank and want to restore the balance with a corresponding conservation deposit. This work of restoration and renewal is worthy of our highest efforts, and even those who lack wherewithal can become the organizers and supporters of groups that will give new dimensions to our conservation effort.

Few of us can hope to leave a work of art, or a poem, to posterity; but together—if we act before it is too late—we can set aside a few more great parks, and round out our system of refuges for wildlife. Or, working at other levels, we can reserve a marsh or meadow, or an avenue of open space as a green legacy for other generations.

By a series of such acts of conservation we can do much to save what Thomas Jefferson called the face and character of our country.

If we do this, surely those who follow, whether or not our names survive, will remember and praise our vision and our works.

The "Communist Manifesto" and Russian Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues of the Congress may have an opportunity to read them, excerpts from a speech made by Dr. James D. Bales, Harding College, Searcy, Ark., to the Harding Academy on September 12, 1961:

THE "COMMUNIST MANIFESTO" AND RUSSIAN TOTALITARIANISM

Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation accept the "Communist Manifesto" as a Socialist document, but they maintain that it is not related to Russian totalitarianism. In a "Socialist Reading List" currently circulated by the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, we find the following: "Marx's 'Communist Manifesto' has been misinterpreted by Communists and capitalists alike as the prophecy of the totalitarian system in Russia. It should be read carefully by any modern reader concerned with the Socialist movement, for it is probably the single most classic document of the Socialist movement."

These Socialists are denying that the Communists in Russia are basically following the key concepts in the "Communist Manifesto," Russian totalitarianism, they are saying, is not the outcome of an effort to follow the "Communist Manifesto." The implication is that if the "Communist Manifesto" were applied, socialism, not Russian totalitarianism, would result.

As a matter of fact, what is taking place in Russia is not a violation of the letter or the spirit of the "Communist Manifesto." What is seen in Russia is not simply Russian totalitarianism but Communist totalitarianism which will inevitably flow from any serious attempt to implement the "Communist Manifesto."

Let us consider some of the doctrines in the "Communist Manifesto" which show that it should be easy to see that communistic totalitarianism must issue from any serious attempt to follow the "Communist Manifesto."

Communism has always been an international movement. "Workingmen of all countries, unite" are the closing words of the manifesto. It presents the concept of proletarian internationalism, which concept is adhered to by the Communists today. The

proletariat, according to the manifesto, should place its so-called interests above the interests of the nation, and join hands in an international movement to overthrow capitalism. The Communists are trying to do this very thing today.

The manifesto presents the idea of the Communist Party as the elite group who guide the proletariat to victory. They "bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality * * * they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole." (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957, p. 71.) This same concept is stressed by Communists today.

The manifesto maintains that irreconcilable antagonism exists between the proletariat and the capitalists and that this class struggle is present everywhere (ibid., pp. 46–48). The Communists today maintain that war to the death must take place between capitalists and the proletariat.

The manifesto teaches that the proletariat will destroy the capitalists. "But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians." (Ibid., p. 58.) So teach the Communists today.

Violent revolution is also taught in the manifesto. "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite." (Ibid., p. 112.) Communists teach that violent revolution is essential to the establishment of communism, under most conditions, and they practiced violent revolution when they came to power in Russia, in China, etc.

The manifesto teaches not only the violent overthrow of the capitalist state, but of all social conditions. In other words, they maintain that all our social conditions and institutions are the outcome of our capitalistic society and with the overthrow of the capitalist society there must also ultimately be the overthrow of all present social conditions and institutions. The revolutionary remaking of man is a doctrine of the manifesto and it is also a doctrine of the Communists today.

The manifesto teaches the doctrine of economic determinism, although Communists sometimes deny that they teach it. "Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property * * * social forms spring from your present mode of production and form of property-historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production" (ibid., pp. 78–79). "Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?" (ibid., p. 83). This doctrine is accepted by the Communists in Russia and they are endeavoring, among other ways, to make a new Soviet man through changing the economic system. It is of interest that their idea of communism has led them to try to remake the economic system, instead of their idea being the result of a change of the economic system. This is one of the contradictions within communism.

The manifesto maintains that the family as we know it must be abolished (ibid., pp. 79–82). The efforts of some of the Communists, when they took over Russia, to abolish the family, and the efforts of the Chinese Communists to undermine the family in China, are not something which is foreign to the letter and spirit of the manifesto.

The manifesto in its concept of class, and class struggle, implies the doctrine of dialectical materialism. It is also bound up in the concept of economic determinism as set forth in the manifesto. Dialectical materialism is taught by the Communists today.

The manifesto teaches that the capitalist's concept of morality, law and religion are but a means of protecting his class interests. "Law, morality, religion are to him (the proletariat, J.D.B.) so many burgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests" (ibid., p. 67, see also pp. 78–79). The class concept of morality is held by Communists today. In line with the manifesto they view morality as but a means of promoting class interest, and as their class is diametrically opposed to ours their moral system is not only different but in actual opposition to our moral system.

The manifesto teaches the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy" (ibid., p. 85). Communism today teaches the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat seizes all power—economic, social and political—by despotic means. "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class. Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production" (ibid., pp. 85–86). This includes the seizure of all land, abolition of the right of inheritance, confiscation of the property of those who do not go along with them, state monopoly in banking, communication, transportation and labor. "Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture." (ibid., pp. 86–87). Russian Communists have been doing all of this or intended to do all of it.

The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat after a classless society has been established, is taught both in the manifesto (ibid., pp. 87–88) and in Russia today.

The "Communist Manifesto" teaches that all revolutionary movements should be supported in their effort to overthrow the existing order. "In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things" (ibid., p. 111). This is done in order to help bring about the communistic revolution and takeover of society (ibid., pp. 109–112). The famous January 6, 1961 speech of Khrushchev emphasized this idea when he said that the Communists support the so-called national-liberation wars, such as the one in which Castro rose to power in Cuba.

In view of the identity between such doctrine as these in the manifesto and in current communism, we cannot accept the assertion of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation that the "Communist Manifesto" is not a prophecy of Russian totalitarianism. Any serious effort to follow the manifesto must result in a brutalitarian dictatorship.

Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post on September 14, 1961:

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

In the September issue of Reader's Digest, Mr. James Daniel tenders an interesting explanation for high unemployment. The unemployment rate which recently stood at 6.9 percent, he says has been manipulated upward by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to push Uncle Sam into new spending programs and new controls. These propositions are supported with a wealth of detail about new definitions of unemployment and new sampling techniques, all designed to produce more statistical unemployment, and about discrepancies among different sample survey results and census counts.

If the author had carried his research a little further, he would have discovered that it is not the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but the Bureau of the Census, which until very recently was in charge of these statistics and still continues to produce them. He would also have discovered that there are ways of analyzing the sources of error when discrepancies appear, such as recourse to the separate body of data on unemployment covered by compensation. And if he had consulted his political judgment, he might have wondered why the Eisenhower administration should have been so eager to juggle the statistics and increase the pressure for public spending. There is no reason for inventing a devil theory of unemployment.

It is true that American methods of counting unemployment yield very much higher results than British and continental methods. We obtain our data through a monthly sample survey of 35,000 households, and count everyone who is looking for a job. The British count only those who are registered with official employment exchanges. If they used the American system, their unemployment rate would double. Consequently it would be a great mistake to make direct comparisons between the American and foreign unemployment rates. But there is every reason to think that the American is the better method.

What kind of statistics the Government collects must depend on the use it wants to make of them. Under the Employment Act of 1946, the principal function of the unemployment statistics is to give an idea how close the economy is to full capacity operation. For this purpose, the statistics should be as comprehensive as possible, and should include all who are seeking to work, regardless of how badly they need or do not need a job. From this point of view, perhaps one ought to include in total unemployment the time lost through involuntary part-time employment. This has been proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, but there are statistical difficulties. Some of these data are now stated separately.

If the data are to be used as a guide to social conditions, then a single total such as 4.5 million unemployed, and a single ratio such as 6.9 percent, will not do the job.

Such figures overstate the extent of distress. Unemployment of a teenager during vacation time, of a social security pensioner, of a housewife with an employed husband, does not mean the same thing as unemployment of a family main breadwinner. Unemployment for less than 5 weeks, which accounts for about two-fifths of the present total, does not compare with long-term unemployment, nor unemployment covered by compensation with uncovered joblessness. The Bureau of Labor Statistics supplies detailed breakdowns on these and other facts. Perhaps they should be stressed more, and the large aggregates deemphasized. But in no case is there justification for trying to make things look better by tampering with the statistics, instead of dealing with the problem of unemployment itself.

Tribute to Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a splendid editorial appearing in the Gaffney Ledger, of Gaffney, S.C., on Tuesday, September 12, 1961, entitled "Congressman HEMPHILL."

This editorial is a tribute to the distinguished Congressman, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth District of South Carolina, for his active, able, and loyal service to the people of his own district and the rest of South Carolina in Washington.

It is my personal pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

To the tribute paid by this editorial I would like to add my praise of BOB HEMPHILL's outstanding representation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL

Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth South Carolina District, has informed friends in Washington he plans to seek reelection for fourth term next summer. That is good news.

Mr. HEMPHILL, who lives at Chester, has made the Fifth District, and the Nation a first-class Congressman. He is active and energetic in looking after the interests of his area and section but he is not provincial in his attitudes. He studies problems from a national viewpoint when that seems to be required, as in the case of textile imports. He is a genuine Democrat who bases his actions on a reasonable balance between liberalism and conservatism. This enables him to make South Carolina's Fifth District a topnotch Representative in Washington.

Some of Mr. HEMPHILL's friends sought to persuade him to run for Governor of South Carolina. That is a flattering suggestion, naturally, but Mr. HEMPHILL has come to the conclusion he can best serve his constituents in Washington. The Ledger concurs in that decision, and wishes Mr. HEMPHILL continued success in his present position.

Judge E. C. O'Rear, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 12, Judge E. C. O'Rear died at his home in Woodford County, Ky.

Judge O'Rear was Kentucky's most distinguished citizen, and no one lives in our State who can take his place. Born in 1863, his life and that of his pioneer father, Daniel O'Rear, who was born in 1796 at Boonesboro, Ky.—a settlement established by Daniel Boone—spanned the terms of every President of the United States, beginning with George Washington.

Judge O'Rear was an outstanding lawyer and served as chief justice of the court of appeals, Kentucky's highest court, from 1908 to 1911. He was a political leader in its highest sense, and in 1911 he was the Republican nominee for Governor. I shall always remember, as one of the memorable experiences of my life, meeting Judge O'Rear in the law office of my father in my hometown of Somerset, and hearing him speak, when he came there as a candidate for Governor.

He was a profound scholar and by force of his brilliant mind, his eloquence, and his character, he influenced thought and action in Kentucky during his entire life.

I know that I express the feeling of the people of Kentucky when I say that he was a noble man, and that he represented the best qualities of our State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that two recent articles about Judge O'Rear be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE E. C. O'REAR DIES; WAS "MR. KENTUCKY COLONEL"

VERSAILLES, Ky.—Former Court of Appeals Judge Edward C. O'Rear, whose snow-white hair and goatee earned him the title of "Mr. Kentucky Colonel," died at 2 a.m. today at his home, Ashley House, on the Midway Road. He was 98.

A native of Montgomery County, Judge O'Rear was a former county judge and chief justice of the appellate court, serving on the State's highest tribunal from 1908–11.

O'Rear, oldest practicing attorney in the State, was for years chief counsel in Kentucky for the Consolidation Coal Co. He resigned the position last year.

WAS GOP NOMINEE

He was the unsuccessful Republican nominee for Governor in 1911 when he was defeated by the late James B. McCreary.

Still regarded as a topflight lawyer, Mr. O'Rear had slowed a little in recent years. He was a Woodford County gentleman farmer and looked the part with the neatly trimmed goatee of a typical Kentucky colonel.

Less than a year ago, he spoke at the dedication of Montgomery County's new courthouse at Mount Sterling.

His appearance recalled the legendary story about Camargo University, which the judge dreamed up on the spur of the moment more than a half-century ago.

As related by him, he was attending a banquet in an Eastern city with other distinguished judges when each was called upon to arise and state his name and college.

Mr. O'Rear had never attended college, but he had received his early education in a little country school in the village of Camargo, about 5 miles east of Mount Sterling.

READ LAW

After that he "read law" in the office of a Mount Sterling attorney to gain his legal knowledge.

When it came time to introduce himself, O'Rear arose solemnly and said, "I am Edward C. O'Rear, University of Camargo." Then he resumed his seat.

Mr. O'Rear was the 14th child in a family of 15. He was born in Camargo in 1863. His father, Daniel O'Rear, was born at Boonesboro in 1796 while George Washington was still serving as President.

Thus, the elder O'Rear's lifetime and that of his son spanned the terms of every President of the United States.

The jurist described himself as "self-educated to a great degree."

He was a member of the St. John Episcopal Church here.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Mabel Taylor O'Rear; 3 sons, retired Col. John T. H. O'Rear, San Francisco; James B. O'Rear and Prentice O'Rear, both of Frankfort; 2 daughters, Mrs. William Scruggs, Frankfort, and Mrs. William E. Bradley, Woodford County; 7 grandchildren; and 16 great-grandchildren.

The body is to be taken to the residence from the Miller-Blackburn Funeral Home.

Services have tentatively been set for Thursday. Burial will be in Mount Sterling.

JUDGE O'REAR DIES AT 98—A SCHOLAR, WIT, AND GENTLEMAN

(By Allan M. Trout)

FRANKFORT, KY., September 12.—Ed C. O'Rear, lawyer, jurist, and scholar, died early Tuesday at his farm home in Woodford County at the age of 98 years 7 months and 10 days.

Despite his advanced years, O'Rear had been active until he sprained an ankle in February. He had been bedfast since June.

One year ago he journeyed to Mount Sterling to dedicate a new courthouse replacing the one only 3 years old when he was elected Montgomery County judge in 1893.

Two years ago, at 96, he brilliantly delivered the annual lecture at Boone Day ceremonies of the Kentucky Historical Society in the old statehouse at Frankfort.

PRAISED BY COMBS

His great mind had remained normally active until sapped by his last illness. Of magnificent physique, he needed only the aid of a cane for walking until he sprained his ankle.

Governor Combs, at Lynchburg, Va., issued this simple tribute when advised of the death:

"The entire Commonwealth will miss Judge O'Rear. Besides being a distinguished member of the bar, and noted for his sharp mind and keen wit, he was an outstanding example of the Kentucky gentleman."

AN EMINENT CITIZEN

Chief Justice Robert B. Bird of the court of appeals had this to say of O'Rear's death:

"The court of appeals deeply regrets the passing of one of its most illustrious former members. The courts of Kentucky have lost a valued friend and the Commonwealth has lost an eminent citizen."

The career of Edward Clay O'Rear was a record of distinguished attainment. It was the old, yet ever-fresh, record of the self-taught boy who rises from poverty to riches.

In public service, he was judge of the court of appeals from 1900 to 1911. He was the Republican nominee for Governor in 1911, but lost to James B. McCreary.

RAN FOR CONGRESS

He was county judge of Montgomery, his native county, in 1894–98, the only Republican ever to hold that office. He once ran for Congress in the old 10th District, but was defeated. In World War II, he was State chairman of the salvage drive.

O'Rear was an effective spearhead of opposition, through the years, to change in 1890–91 the constitution of Kentucky, either by convention or amendment.

He had been a brilliant practitioner of the law since 1886, with offices in the same third-floor suite of the McClure Building here since 1912.

OWNED 1,800 ACRES

O'Rear was one of the key figures in opening legal ways to develop the vast coal and timber resources of east Kentucky. Since 1912, he had been chief counsel in Kentucky for Consolidation Coal Corp., the biggest coal mining operation in the world.

O'Rear shrewdly invested in land part of the fortune he earned as a lawyer. He owned perhaps 1,800 acres of choice bluegrass farmland in the counties of Franklin, Woodford, and Fayette.

Since 1943, he had lived in baronial splendor at Ashley House, the seat of his Woodford County farm on the pike between Versailles and Midway. Before then, he had lived in gracious affluence at Glen Ary, the historic county seat near Jett Station, just east of Frankfort.

SUPERB RACONTEUR

But it was in the long life of his stout body and great mind that O'Rear touched the stars.

In him was the rare combination of the judge's lawyer and the jury's pet.

In oratory, he was master of the mellow metaphor, and disarming gentleness. And when he whirled for the kill, his rapier thrust of satire, while always felt, seldom drew blood.

His was a hearty Kentucky appetite for the best of viands and drinks. He was a fine host, a superb raconteur. He had an astounding knowledge of the arts, the classics of world literature, the Scriptures and, of course, the law.

STRAIGHT AS A RAMROD

Even as a nonagenarian, O'Rear's person vibrated with the vigor of robust good health. A trim goatee, bushy eyebrows, and iron-gray hair accentuated the ruddy, unwrinkled glow of his face. He was straight as a ramrod, steel-eyed as an eagle. He always groomed himself meticulously in carefully tailored attire.

He had no particular rule for longevity, although the rare ability to relax did not hurt him. The truth is, O'Rear was made of tough stuff, as was his father before him. Daniel O'Rear begat him at age 67, and was to sire two more before his death.

His father was born in 1796 inside the stockade at old Fort Boonesboro, near Richmond. That was the last year of George Washington's second term as President. Thus the father and son, together, spanned every President of the United States, a record now probably without parallel elsewhere in the Nation.

O'Rear was born February 2, 1863, at Camargo, the 13th of 15 children. His mother was widowed shortly after the birth of the last. With so big a brood, she was compelled to put the boys to work. Schooling was out of the question.

O'Rear's first job was as news butch on the train between Mount Sterling and Louisville. Then he mastered the trade of printer at the Sentinel and the Democrat, both at Mount Sterling; the Outlook, at Owingsville, and the Sentinel, at Flemingsburg.

RODE FOR 2 DAYS

It was as a printer, therefore, that O'Rear went to West Liberty, at age 17, to run the Mountain Scorcher. Capt. John T. Williams, a Confederate cavalryman of Morgan County, had brought a herd of horses to the Mount Sterling market. He sold all but one nag and his own saddle horse.

It was that nag O'Rear rode back to West Liberty, in company with the redoubtable and loquacious old rebel. It took them two long and hard days to ride the 56 miles.

Publisher of the Scorcher was John Tom Hazelrigg, one of the ablest mountain lawyers of his day. Hazelrigg, the scion of a British general and Member of Parliament, allowed the young editor-printer to read law in his office.

O'Rear not only mastered there enough law to be admitted to the bar, but wooed and won the daughter of his mentor, Virginia Lee Hazelrigg. That marriage ended in divorce in the early 1930's, after which O'Rear married the former Mabel Taylor, Frankfort.

O'Rear went back to Mount Sterling and hung his shingle in 1886. He was defeated for Congress in 1888, supervised the U.S. census in the 10th district in 1890.

SOUTHEAST LAND BOOM

His big chance came with the land boom in southeast Kentucky in the 1890's. E. H. Patterson, Pineville, employed him to abstract titles to hundreds of thousands of mineral-rich acres in the upper valley of the Cumberland, and the headwaters country of the Kentucky River.

This assignment took O'Rear abroad three times. But of more importance, it won for him the acquaintance, then the confidence, of eastern capitalists ready to spend millions to tap the billions of wealth in the Kentucky mountains.

It was an up-and-coming barrister in his early prime, then, who was elected to the court of appeals in 1900. There, for 11 years, his extraordinary mind surged far out and beyond the limits observed by ordinary jurists.

FOUR OPINIONS RECALLED

Of all his gemlike opinions, four stand out as having touched the lives of millions of Kentuckians in four decades. And their importance is embellished by his scholarship.

His historic opinion of 1909 that legalized parimutuel betting, for example, traced the relationship between man and horse to the dawn of recorded history.

Another of the classic four upheld the Cammack Act of 1906, making the county the voting unit in local-option elections. This was the legal device by which prohibitionists dried Kentucky before national prohibition of World War I, and were well on their way to dry it again before a 1948 act made the county seat one unit, the rest of the county another.

WROTE DAY OPINION

In this opinion, O'Rear traced the county as a unit of government to pre-Magna Carta days in England.

It was O'Rear who wrote the opinion upholding the Day law of 1904—the law that compelled segregation of the races in Kentucky schools until the Supreme Court nullified it in 1954.

In this opinion, O'Rear summarized a vast store of anthropological findings on both the cross-breeding and in-breeding of races.

But his greatest stroke as a jurist was to write the learned opinion clearing legal uncertainty from land titles in east Kentucky. This doubt had beclouded them since enactment of the Virginia land grant law before Kentucky statehood in 1792.

OPENED STATE'S EAST

For decades, the general assembly had been trying to nullify the compact by which these old Virginia land titles had been carried forward into Kentucky law. At last the 1906 session wrote a law that the court of appeals, and later the supreme court could uphold.

This monumental dissertation by O'Rear, found at 127 Ky. 667, traces title law in the Appalachian region from the chaos of the early 1900's, to the simplicity of crown grants in the late 1600's.

His opinion literally opened East Kentucky to safe investment in secure land titles. Without that assurance, outside capital had been reluctant to pry open the mountain treasure house.

RESIGNED FROM COURT

O'Rear had been reelected to the high court in 1908 for another term of 8 years. But he resigned in 1911, after his defeat for Governor, and began the private practice in Frankfort ended by his death.

As a lawyer, however, O'Rear did not cater altogether to the big stuff. He'd take just about anything that walked through his door. While he commanded lush fees at the top, he'd do this run-of-the-mine practice for the fees his humble clients could afford.

He never got too old or too big to raise his experienced voice in neighborhood affairs.

HONORED BY SCHOOLS

Despite his lack of formal education, honorary doctorates of law were conferred upon him by University of Kentucky and Kentucky Wesleyan. In 1959, Gov. A. B. Chandler conferred upon him the Governor's Medallion for distinguished public service.

O'Rear is survived by his second wife; 5 children from his first marriage, Col. John T. H. O'Rear, San Francisco, James B. O'Rear, Prentice O'Rear, and Mrs. William Scruggs, all of Frankfort, and Mrs. William E. Bradley, of Woodford County; 7 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren.

Imports and Our Economy—The Relationship Between Aid and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, from the 21st District, at the Mining Congress Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., on September 11, 1961, on the subject of imports and our economy:

IMPORTS AND OUR ECONOMY—THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AID AND TRADE

(By the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania)

Patience sometimes is said to be the legislator's greatest virtue. With patience and conviction we can sometimes accomplish a great deal by way of amendment.

Three months after I became a Member of Congress, I became convinced that major changes must be made in our thinking and

planning in both foreign aid and reciprocal trades.

This past month a small, but significant change, was made in foreign aid legislation by way of the amendment I've sponsored since my first awakening to the inseparable relationship between "aid and trade."

This amendment, although not in the absolute form I presented, still lays down the principle that Americans should not be taxed to put themselves out of business, out of jobs, and into industrial oblivion.

Simply put, the Dent amendment means that no American taxpayer's money can be spent to build production facilities, factories, mines or agricultural developments abroad if the country receiving the aid exports the products of these facilities back to the United States.

It was a bitter pill to swallow for the out-and-out internationalists, both in as well as out of government.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee under the able and conscientious leadership of my friend and neighbor from Fayette County, the Honorable TOM MORGAN, helped me save the amendment by having a senior member of the committee, the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, amend the original, allowing the foreign country to ship back 10 percent of the production before becoming disqualified for foreign aid. This saved at least 90 percent of the practical portion, and 100 percent of the principle involved.

The real fight was put on in the conference committee, when the State Department pulled out all stops to kill the Dent-Zablocki compromise. It was the bitterest fight of all the issues at stake in the House/Senate conference. In order to save the principle of the amendment, the House conferees had to accept an additional 10 percent by allowing the aid-receiving countries to ship 20 percent of their products back to the United States.

Without both MORGAN and ZABLOCKI being members of the conference, the amendment would have been killed by State Department officials, especially the Foreign Trade Department under Under Secretary George Ball. No one deserves more credit than the chairman, "TOM" MORGAN, for standing pat on the principle involved.

Conviction has taken us this far; patience will get us all the way. The day must come when we realize that unless we protect our home economy, we can't help the underdeveloped nations or anyone else, including ourselves.

The one point that seems to have been missed by many of our colleagues is the fact that the relationship between free aid and free trade is finally admitted by Congress and our Government.

The Washington Post was very critical of my amendment. It protested our attempt to save jobs for Americans by limiting the aid-receiving countries in their exportations to the United States of competitive products at prices below the cost of manufacture in America.

We weren't stopping aid to needy peoples, we were trying to stop exploration of underprivileged peoples who are forced to work for as low as 5 cents an hour, under the most heartbreaking inhuman working conditions, in order that a few families and officials can get richer by shipping their low-cost items into the American market at fabulous profits because of the great volumes consumed by the American public.

As an example, a few years ago, Japan shipped a few thousand cigarette lighters to the United States. In 1958, Japanese low-wage employers shipped 42,600,000 lighters to the United States. This represents over $50 million in the American marketplace, and yet, the free traders in our midst say this is made up by selling Japan $50 million worth of cotton. What we really traded was American jobs. For every job we gained picking cotton, we lost at least 20 making lighters.

This is true in almost every phase of our economy. We sell Germany certain types of steel plate. We buy back Volkswagens. No one seems to figure how many less jobs it takes to make a half ton of steel as against an automobile ready for the road with glass, tires, seats, battery, engine, springs, ignition, lights, and the many components that make up a modern car.

By starting to close the foreign aid loophole (the Dent amendment), in our trade agreements, we at least will protect the American worker and investor against the exploiters both here and abroad from using his tax money to put him out of work.

Helping a needy neighbor is charity. It stops being charity when you buy back from your neighbor the help you gave him in the first place—it then becomes supidity.

If it were plain stupidity we could worry a little less because sooner or later we would outgrow it. It's more than that. It's mixed up with enormous profits, exploitation of workers, international moneychanging, so-called global diplomacy and plain one-world favoritism by men of such stature, their wishes are almost law.

These are the dangers. Little peoples have protection only through elected representatives and with the combinations of power, press, politics, professors, and public figures, the congressional prestige in this field is almost nonexistent. The registered lobbyists, the representatives of foreign countries, importers, and exporters in and out of Government is the greatest group of talent ever assembled in our Capitol.

As chairman of the committee studying the effect of imports and exports upon American unemployment, I can assure you all that this Nation is in deep, serious trouble unless we put more hard, commonsense and less theoretical planning into our trade and aid "deals." Let's call them deals, because stripped of their high-sounding names, that's all they are.

My committee has heard from many areas of employment. No responsible witness has said jobs are created by our policy, except in the field of foreign aid. Any 8-year-old kid knows that if you give away $4 billion, and you buy 80 percent of the goods from yourself to give away, you'll have to have some people to make the goods to give away. This isn't funny, we actually count the goods we give away or sell for foreign counterpart (funny) money as exports in our trade balance.

We're told that we must trade to make our country prosperous. This is only true, however, when we buy what we need and sell what we don't need.

We do it differently. We sell cotton and buy shirts; we sell logs and buy plywood; we sell hides and buy leather; and now we even go so far as to sell or give away wheat and buy macaroni and bread.

We're becoming a supplier of raw materials and a buyer of consumer products. The real victim is the American worker, looking for a job that's been exported.

Did you know that right now we are buying bread to the extent that hearings have been requested by both the bakery companies and their workers?

We have testimony from macaroni manufacturers showing that the short supply of Durum wheat necessary for the making of good macaroni products has been sold to competitive nations, while the American plants either shut down or make an inferior product. In either case, it helps foreign traders.

This is also true of hides. Our tanneries are either shut down or working part time because foreign buyers are grabbing raw hides at high prices and using their own cheap labor for processing, ship back leather and leather goods below American costs of production.

This way, the American taxpayer gets it both ways, coming and going. He loses his job because we export the raw material, and then he is forced to buy cheap foreign-made goods to stretch his reduced income which in turn takes his neighbor's job.

You can't win in a game with marked cards and dealt by professional gamblers. Foreign traders are professionals. There's one consolation, the shirt we're losing is imported, either Japanese or "Hongkonganese."

These are just the minor disturbances in the field of trade and aid, as we practice these so-called diplomatic acts.

We've covered a few products, now let's take a look at the ore picture. Slowly, but surely, our mineral-producing areas are being forced into the same governmental controls as their wheat-producing neighbors. With the coming subsidies for lead and zinc, we are stepping up the control of our Government over prices, wages, and profits. This may be good, it may be desirable, it may even be the ultimate goal of the professional planners. All we can ask is that if this is so, let's be told about it, straight from the shoulder and not be hiding behind a serious and ever-present threat of war and devastation.

Two recent events ought to shake the complacency of the everyday citizen. First, Congress (the House) passed a subsidy for iron and zinc ranging from 1½ cents to 3 cents, at present market prices, per pound. The miners (owners and workers) protested. They did not want Government subsidy. They wanted and begged for Government protection against imports. They ask for one-half-cent-a-pound increase in tariffs; they would have settled for half a loaf and accepted just part of our own market by allowing foreign producers a quota of our needs. The answer was an emphatic "no." Instead of the traders paying the one-half cent tariff, the American taxpayer will pay 3 cents. It won't help a bit; it will cost us money, but the records show that there is no bottom in the selling price of foreign low-wage produced goods and apparently no ceiling on subsidies from our Treasury. So now we have the miner joining the farmer in the stockpile business.

The second event followed within a week of House action on subsidies for lead and zinc. The State Department negotiated another of its classic deals. There is a shortage of wheat in Canada and Australia because of adverse weather conditions, so they can't supply their domestic and world (full price) markets.

We have a "lotta wheat," so we make a deal with these two countries—$10 million worth of our subsidized wheat for $10 million worth of lead and zinc (100,000 tons). It doesn't seem to matter that we have lead and zinc coming out of our ears, stockpiles so high we have to subsidize our mines to keep our mines working because of the surplus of lead and zinc being dumped into this country by foreign countries, including both Canada and Australia.

One of the outstanding authorities of mines and minerals is the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, from the State of Colorado. In an appearance before my committee studying the impact of imports on American jobs, he had this to say:

"You will recall, Mr. Chairman, last week on the floor of the House when a bill was being considered for assistance to small producers in the lead and zinc industry, I detailed for the House the steady decline in employment in the lead-zinc industry. I think you will agree, after I have reviewed these details, that this job loss to American

industry is a direct result of our imports policy. Put another way, we have sacrificed our American jobs on the altar of our international trade policies.

"In 1952 there were 42,705 persons employed in the lead-zinc industry. The United States produced 390,162 tons of lead and 666,000 tons of zinc, for a total of 1,065,162 tons of lead and zinc; and consumed in the United States 1,130,795 tons of lead and 852,783 tons of slab zinc, or a total of 1,983,578 tons of lead and slab zinc. By 1956 domestic employment had been reduced to 33,706 Americans in a year when our domestic mine production had fallen off to 895,166 tons of lead and zinc, but our consumption rose to 2,218,507 tons of lead and slab zinc. It is important to note that the greatest decrease in employment (8,645) was in the mines and mills.

"By 1960, 20,000 jobs had been lost since 1952 in the lead-zinc industry overall with the mines and mills suffering the most. General imports of lead in 1960 amounted to 359,917 tons, or approximately 145 percent of the U.S. mine production of 246,669 tons; and general imports of zinc at 571,000 tons were 131 percent of the U.S. mine production of 435,427 tons.

"Although, as I have demonstrated, the lead-zinc industry has suffered a loss of employment in the United States because of import policies and practices, the Department of Defense, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has dismissed the industry as not needing assistance because there are now only 'a small number of miners' involved.

"Finally, I point out, although I am sure I do not have to remind you, that the effects are felt beyond each immediate industry, as for example, shutdowns of mines affects supply houses which also employ people; unemployment of miners affects those who sell consumer goods in mining areas; and the importation of the metals of foreign origin produced under adverse labor conditions acts as an excuse by which American employers seek to deprive American labor of benefits in this country in order to seek a competition position on the market."

That's not all. We give the wheat at subsidized prices, and at the same time we arrange to sell it through American grain brokers to world markets. Why? Simply because this will give the two foreign countries American gold credits and we will probably pick up foreign counterpart (foreign money). It may not be so, but it wouldn't surprise anyone.

Why couldn't we sell the wheat to the nations that needed it? Why do we buy lead and zinc to add to our already overloaded warehouses and stockpiles?

If you can get an answer to these questions (honestly), you can get the blue ribbon and go to the head of the class.

A few years ago, under our foreign-aid program, we aided Korea by setting up a glass manufacturing plant. Recently, our committee heard of the results of this great help to our friends. The glass is being sold in Clarksburg, W. Va., while the Pittsburgh Plate in Clarksburg is laying off workers, and begging for tariff increases in Washington.

Apropos of this situation, the Tariff Commission, after years and years of pleading from the glass industry recommended that the tariff rates be increased. Not just a token increase, but rather a full retreat. After all the arguments over these many years, it recommended a tariff rate set up under the old Smoot-Hawley tariff law of over 30 years ago.

What happened? The normal thing in our world trade actions: Belgium, a large exporter to the United States, protested loud, long and effectively. They said they may be forced to retaliation; they said that their sound economy was based upon controlling a certain share of the American domestic market for glass. The State Department jumped into the deal and you can guess whose side they took. They said we couldn't afford to raise tariffs on glass, we couldn't afford to offend Belgium right now because of the Berlin crisis.

The result: The President refused to accept the increased tariff recommendation by sending it back for further study.

Meanwhile, glass keeps coming in, workers get laid off their jobs, taxes increase and foreign aid builds more glass plants in Korea, Formosa and other needy nations.

This is just one example of building plants abroad with taxpayer's money and then taking the taxpayer's income away from him by importing the products from the plant his money built.

Someone said lately there are three ways now, instead of two ways, to get rich. They advise: Marry a rich woman, inherit a fortune or get the Government to build a factory for you overseas.

Recently, when we had a few days' strike at the docks, we were threatened with a gasoline ration because of the shortage of imported oil. For years, we've been importing so much oil that our exploration and production of American supplies has been drastically reduced.

Let's see what our own oil producers have to say about this situation:

"In Austin, Tex., members of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association (TIPRO) are set to meet tomorrow on the 'muddled' oil imports situation. TIPRO's president, J. F. West, in announcing the meeting hit the administration's current crude oil policy.

"He said: 'The recent maritime strike and the Kuwait crisis have once again forcibly demonstrated that a country that allows itself, through neglect or through planned policy, to become dependent on water-moved sources for vital raw materials has weakened its national defense posture.'

"* * * He also commented that 'at the same time, we realize the necessity of subjecting to the closest scrutiny any export proposal which might result in large volumes of crude oil or natural gas liquids entering U.S. markets at the expense of U.S. domestic production.'

"In the IPAA letter to Secretary Udall the association also called on the Interior Department to reverse the OIAB action which raised the crude oil import quota for Texaco, Inc., on the west coast."

In case of war, where will we get the ores, coal, oil, raincoats, watches, binoculars, typewriters, lighters, chairs, dishes, and on and on and on. This Nation is becoming a dependent nation upon others for its way of life.

We ask Congress to pass trade and aid bills in the name of making foreign countries independent and at the same time, we are making ourselves a second-rate producer of the necessities of life in this country. We are ourselves becoming dependent upon others not alone for our well-being, but perhaps for our survival.

We admit we cannot live alone in this complicated and troubled world. We must also admit that we can't live dependent upon others in this world complicated, troubled or otherwise.

As a fledgling nation, we had our troubles, our crisis, our one worlders, two worlders and no worlders. What did we do? We rebelled against being a colony providing raw materials and being used as a market by the mother country for the goods produced, from these raw materials.

We valued our markets, our industries, our labor, our farms, our institutions, and above all, our economic independence.

We protected ourselves against the destruction of our production facilities and jobs by every means available including tariffs, treaties, quotas, embargoes, and statesmanship. Not the least of which was statesmanship.

One thing you can be sure of: If we had taken the same stand then as we have in recent years, there wouldn't have been any country or industry or jobs or farms to argue about.

Compare, if you will, the situation we have today with that of yesteryear. In growing years we protected American industry from foreign industry. Today we are busy protecting American industry from American industry.

Here's a classic example:

"An almost incredible drama—even in the present stage of development of our welfare state—is going on in bureaucratic Washington.

"One of the Nation's railways—by typical American ingenuity—has discovered a profitable way to effect a drastic reduction in selected freight rates * * * but the U.S. Government, at least temporarily won't give it permission to do so.

"Southern Railway has developed a superduty 100-ton aluminum freight car * * * suitable for hauling grain efficiently and economically.

"Using this new equipment in multicar shipments, Southern can effect sizable economies in basic transportation costs, loading operations, terminal and transit switching, routing, paperwork, etc.

"As a result, the old rate of $10.50 per net ton for grain movement from St. Louis to Gainesville, Ga., for example, can now be lowered to $3.97, $4.07, or $4.17, depending on volume; and the railroad will still show a greater ton-mile profit than its present average on general freight movement.

"When the new rate was filed with the ICC, a lusty clamor arose from unregulated carriers adversely affected by such 'unfair competition.'

"Loud in support of their protests was the TVA which has spent $200 million in making the Tennessee River navigable for barges carrying grain and other products.

"This taxpayer-endowed project has been of material assistance in putting the railroads out of the grain-carrying business.

"Now, when the railroads—with their own funds—attempt to fight back, TVA officials complain that any such cut in rates would 'disrupt efforts to create a Tennessee River common-carrier industry.'

"The new rates, which were to go into effect in August of this year, were filed by Southern with the ICC, but the Commission ordered that the reduction be suspended until March 1962, pending an investigation, on the grounds that the rates may be found to be 'unjust and unreasonable,' constituting 'unfair and destructive competitive practices.'

"Free enterprise made the United States the greatest, most powerful, most fruitful nation on earth."

This is labeled "unfair competition" because it is between American competitors while at the same time our markets are being flooded with every type of product and produce from every foreign shore at prices that don't even meet our cost of production. In fact, sometimes it doesn't even meet the cost of the raw materials and certainly never meets our labor costs.

When are we going to realize that trade is a profit-seeking venture? No person outside of dreamers and persons in Government-protected jobs without responsibility for creating jobs or production believes trade, internal or external, to be other than a greedy, mercenary, profiteering enterprise.

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I was delighted to see in the Washington Evening Star of September 13, 1961, an article by Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army retired, which points out the need for firmness in our dealings with the Communists. General Clark is well known for his exploits during World War II and the Korean war and presently serves as president of the Military College of South Carolina, The Citadel, in Charleston, S.C. He speaks as one who has had many dealings with the Communists, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria, as deputy to the Secretary of State in London and Moscow in 1947, and at the Panmunjom negotiations. General Clark has served his country with distinction in these varied capacities and speaks with convincing authority. Our officials would do well to pay heed to these words of wisdom. I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing with Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army (retired))

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet Armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the Mozart Express, when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and, as usual, he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon, of our military police, shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me the President said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

The Family Fallout Shelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTIS G. PIKE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully call the attention of the Members to what I hope will set a precedent for the towns and villages across our land. Through the urging of August Stout, town supervisor, the town of Brookhaven, Long Island, N.Y., has provided a typical family fallout shelter on the grounds of the Town Hall, built for general demonstration from specifications drawn up by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and fully equipped as recommended by that agency.

At 2 o'clock next Monday, September 18, one of our local townsmen will start demonstrating its livability to the public at large through radio broadcasts during his week's tenancy, in which he will describe his reactions while living there, closed off from the rest of the world and dependent entirely on the food and equipment he finds therein.

Since the beginning of September we have been appalled by the insane irresponsibility of the Soviet Union in setting off one atomic blast after another, spewing radioactive debris into the atmosphere with complete disregard for the future of the human race. Today's newspapers carry the latest poll on what the American people feel their chances of survival in allout nuclear attack are, demonstrating their grim realization of the extreme dangers involved, and of their limited hopes for survival.

Walter Lippmann writes in his column:

Though nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction,

where only violence can relieve its feelings. * * *. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable * * *. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

My mail is beginning to reflect the growing concern of the American people. One constituent tells me he is going ahead with his own fallout shelter. "This," he tells me, "I believe is the true American way. The Government is there to support, but not to substitute, for individual initiative."

We all share the nightmare feeling that we are hurtling toward total oblivion at an ever faster pace. Let us hope it is only a nightmare from which we will awaken. But meanwhile let us give our families every protection we can; let each community show its inhabitants how to construct a fallout shelter, as the town of Brookhaven is doing.

The Consequences of Nuclear War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, all-out nuclear war would bring not only death and destruction but an end to the world we know. Mr. Walter Lippmann in his column published in this morning's Washington Post states simply and logically what the consequences of such a war would be, and how different it would be from any other war fought in the world's history. But, Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann's sobering essay needs no interpretative remarks from me or any one else. The message which he delivers should be heard by everyone on this earth. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment, and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summitry began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered, the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any "alternative to peace."

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defense, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the prenuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a 100 million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smoldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes war, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the U.S. nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood, no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work, because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is, and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation and, therefore, of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there are no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

More Jobs Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most interesting editorial which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Item on September 11, 1961:

MORE JOBS NEEDED

Massachusetts needs more jobs to support her expanding population.

Instead of the 723,000 manufacturing jobs we should have at this time, latest figures show only 678,960 persons employed—a shortage of 44,000 jobs in one category alone.

Instead of rising employment, there has been a net loss of 5,200 jobs in private employment between June 1959, and June 1961.

A drive to find new investment funds must begin immediately if this trend is to be reversed, in the belief of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

Executive Vice President Robert A. Chadbourne, addressing a recent seminar at Amherst, said at least 90,000 new manufacturing jobs need to be created. And these jobs can be created only through new industrial investment.

To carry the picture further, new investment money can be secured only with a drive for sound, responsible financing of the State government, a taxation spread over a broad base and minimum government regulation of business.

There are all sort of opportunities for imaginative, bold people in the field of manufacturing, but they must be assured that their efforts won't be choked and harassed by government practices that discourage rather than encourage industrial initiative.

City of Hartford Resolution on Gambling Syndicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution forwarded to me by the clerk of the city of Hartford, strongly supporting the series of proposals recently submitted to the Congress by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to combat syndicated gambling offenses.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY OF HARTFORD, SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

This is to certify that a meeting of the court of common council held September 11, 1961, the following resolution was passed by rollcall vote.

Whereas lack of public information and understanding of the serious and threatening nature of the well-organized, illegal, professional gambling syndicates enables them to continue their criminal activities which undermines community stability and welfare; and

Whereas the Hartford Courant's recent excellent series of articles on syndicated gambling, written by Mr. Irving Kravsow, focused public attention on the cancerous influence of these activities on the life of our city, State, and Nation; and

Whereas these articles point up loopholes which exist in State and Federal laws which permit masterminds of these syndicates to avoid State and Federal prosecution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the court of common council hereby goes on record as commending the Hartford Courant and Mr. Kravsow for this timely and important series; and be it further

Resolved, That this council goes on record as supporting the series of proposals recently submitted to Congress by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to combat syndicated gambling and directs the town clerk to so advise all Members of the Congress from Connecticut.

Attest:

ROBERT J. GALLIVAN,
City Clerk.

The West Needs Steady Nerves as the Russians Play With Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently an editorial appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, entitled "The West Needs Steady Nerves as the Russians Play With Fire."

I ask unanimous consent to have this thought-provoking article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Aug. 25, 1961]

THE WEST NEEDS STEADY NERVES AS THE RUSSIANS PLAY WITH FIRE

Just as it appeared that the Russians were going to permit an easing of Berlin tensions which would have smoothed the way for negotiations with the Allied Powers, the tensions are again increased, this time to a dangerous degree. The attempt of the Communist military leaders in East Berlin to control the conduct of West Berliners near the boundary of the Eastern sector was in itself highly provocative. But the latest Soviet note, hinting at possible Communist efforts to restrict or cut off allied air access to Berlin, bears far more serious implications.

The allied powers cannot afford to be unduly influenced by the obvious implications of the Russian charge that the air-access routes to West Berlin are being used to carry "spies and provocateurs" to the city. They cannot afford to show the slightest weakening in their insistence on their rights, conceded by the Russians in the agreements of 1949, to unrestricted access. And it is inconceivable that they would agree to give the Soviets the right to say who shall and shall not be carried on planes traveling between the city and West Germany.

To do so would effectively cripple air travel to the city from the West, and that the allies cannot afford. Indeed, the most disturbing aspect of the Russian note is its implied threat that the Russians may be preparing to interfere with our use of the specified air corridors between West Germany and West Berlin. As the British point out, this is the first time that the Russians have challenged Western rights to use of the corridor, or the right to decide who shall use it. And there is a possibility, which must be considered, that the Russians are preparing to attempt a closing of the corridor on the pretext of clarifying the legal aspects of our access rights.

A FRIGHTENING PROSPECT

This is, as the British appreciate, a frightening prospect. For if we can be cut off from air access to West Berlin, it will be an easy matter for the Russians to find that the highway needs drastic repairs, that the roadbed of the railroad is unsafe for transit and that the water routes must be shut down for overhaul. As we found in the instance of the airlift of 1949, only the air does not lend itself to physical blockade short of actual shooting. And if the air routes can be closed, West Berlin can be effectively isolated, and our position made desperate. It is quite likely, as the British fear, that we would be obligated to fight our way through the corridor rather than surrender it.

It is difficult to believe that it is the Russian intention to force us into this position. More likely, it seems that their latest move is primarily intended for propaganda purposes, for the neutral nations are aware of the Soviet fears concerning West Germany, and to maintain the tensions in Berlin. The object of this is, of course, to make Berlin a nuisance, and such a potentially dangerous nuisance that the Western Allies will be glad to settle for Khrushchev's demands that East Germany be recognized, along with its present borders, and that Berlin be made a free city.

It is not likely to succeed if Western nerves hold steady, and all indications from Washington, Paris, and London are that they will. As a propaganda move, however, the threat may have been more effective, as indicated by Indian Prime Minister Nerhu's suggestion that the Western rights of access were not unlimited. The Russians could use a propaganda victory at this time. Their Berlin Chinese Wall has proved a serious propaganda handicap throughout the neutral world, and an admission of weakness that has left the Russians and their East German puppets smarting.

MORE PRESSURE TO COME

They will undoubtedly now attempt pressures to force the West to negotiate its present rights of air access, with a view to forbidding transport of West Germans into West Berlin. If this, and their desire for continued tensions, is the only reason for this threatening move, the position of the West and the danger represented by Berlin is unchanged. But the willingness of the Soviets to move so crudely into such sensitive and potentially explosive areas indicates the constant danger of Berlin, the danger that someone may blunder, that some accident may spark the fatal clash. It is a time for steady nerves, and calm preparation for negotiation.

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker Denied Right of Self-Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a great injustice has been done to a real American, Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker. This man who has dared to speak for what America stands for has, in effect, been charged with an unpatriotic deed, and at the same time, denied the opportunity to fully refute the charges made against him in the press. This injustice must be corrected. The Kennedy administration must allow this great American to defend himself.

There appeared in the September 12, 1961, issue of the New York Mirror, an editorial concerning this injustice to General Walker which I think should be

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Members of Congress to see. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE WALKER CASE

Daily the excitement over the General Walker case attracts more attention and every time anyone in the Pentagon issues a public release on the subject, it becomes clearer that someone blundered and the coverup is inadequate.

As a matter of fact, there need be no coverup. No matter how it is sliced, General Walker seems to have committed the crime of being excessively patriotic, of preferring his own country to Soviet Russia, and of finding the Communist system offensive to the ideals of an American.

A newspaper, published for American troops overseas, particularly in Germany, resented General Walker's problue program of pro-American indoctrination. The Pentagon got excited, relieved General Walker from his command, gave him a reduced position and, in effect, reprimanded him.

As it stands, it looks as though a reputable officer is being sacrificed to some absurd policy. It can develop into as great a blot on the Kennedy administration as the Cuban fiasco. And probably the same doctrinaire amateurs are responsible.

General Walker is entitled to a trial by his peers, properly a court-martial, preferably in public. He is entitled to defend his honor and his integrity. Every American is entitled to that. Congressional committees would like to give General Walker a hearing but the Pentagon keeps him away from this country.

It is cruel and un-American to charge a soldier with a felony or a misdemeanor or even bad judgment without giving him a hearing. General Walker has had no hearing.

Teachers as Recruiters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of our country's greatest problems today is the shortage of qualified teachers for our schoolchildren. In order to fill these vacancies, there is a vital need for developing interest early among the young people as to the opportunities that exist in the teaching profession.

The State education commissioner, in the State of New York, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., has advanced a nine-point program to meet this shortage. I concur in the observations made by the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., in a recent editorial which follows:

TEACHERS AS RECRUITERS

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., State education commissioner, gave Buffalo teachers this week a nine-point program for overcoming the statewide shortage of qualified teachers. Topping the list was a plea for more intensive recruitment efforts to seek young people with potential teaching talent and to attract them into the profession.

Systematic recruiting obviously must be backed up by the other items Dr. Allen ticked off—strengthening teacher courses, improving certification standards, removing unnecessary barriers to potentially gifted teachers, promoting material rewards, encouraging more efficient use of teaching time, etc. But just as obviously, such steps can't produce more teachers unless the youngsters coming up through the high schools get every encouragement for teaching as a career.

For that reason we are glad that Dr. Allen bore down hard on the "constructive efforts" teachers themselves must make to advance their profession. For who, after all, is in a better position to promote the teaching career among teenagers than teachers themselves?

They have vast opportunity to nourish youthful enthusiasm for the profession they chose by upgrading it at every chance, by taking pride and accenting the positive in their mission as molders of character and communicators of culture.

By the same token, nothing more surely can sour students on a teaching career than a negative attitude in the classroom, or by harping on the "downtrodden" refrain that teachers aren't moving up rapidly enough in material rewards. In a State whose minimum salary scales have advanced markedly in recent years—with most teachers in this area well above the prevailing minimums throughout the salary scale—no teacher need be bashful about portraying the educator's career in positive terms.

Niel J. Bulger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with profound regret I report the recent death of an able newspaperman and close friend, Mr. Niel J. Bulger, editor of the Waterbury (Conn.), Sunday Republican and author of a widely read column, "The Yankee Pedlar."

Mr. Bulger, who devoted his entire life to the newspaper profession as a reporter and editor, was a strong influence for progress in the areas served by his newspapers. His untimely death leaves this area infinitely poorer at a time when we can ill afford such a loss.

I met Niel during the first few days that he was in Waterbury and we were firm friends from that time until his death. His passing is a personal loss.

He had a wide and devoted public following and his influence was strongly felt because he always looked for and fostered the first rate in journalism, in literature and in politics.

Although he assumed something of the drawling diction in the caustic wit of the Yankee Pedlar for whom his column was named he was truly warm hearted and generous. And one is overwhelmed on looking back over the years to realize the good causes that he espoused and the number of civic projects he worked wholeheartedly for.

With unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sunday, Sepember 11, edition of the Waterbury (Conn.), Republican which is an able and well-rounded portrait of Niel Bulger:

NIEL J. BULGER

(The late Sunday editor of the Republican was a discerning chronicler of the engrossing bustle that went on around him and a kindly one.)

The essential quality of a good newspaperman is a keen interest in life and in people. Niel Bulger had that interest to a marked degree. Among members of his craft he stood out because of a never-flagging curiosity as to what makes people and things tick. He was forever digging into the why and the how of events, and the fascinating puzzle of personalities. Because of his long observation of politics, government was for him the center of life's three-ring circus and he was thoroughly at home in caucus, convention, and little smoke-filled rooms—in legislature and board meetings. But the other rings engrossed him, too. The whole range of such human behavior as would be newsmill grist attracted him. And this broadened interest was reflected in the fine account he gave of himself when a highly competent reporter was converted into an equally able feature editor.

There is supposed to be the seed of cynicism in the kind of backstage look that an observant reporter gets at the frailties and pomposites of public life, and of life not so public. But although Niel knew occasions for exercise of his always healthy skepticism, there was a warmth, a friendliness, a constant desire to be helpful in his contacts with people which made him a veritable host of friends. There was no mean bone in his body. In community service and on the State boards he played the part of good citizen and among his friends and fellow workers there was no better companion.

Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed a questionnaire to registered-voter households in the 30th Congressional District of California. Over 100,000 questionnaires were sent out, and I am pleased to report that nearly 20,000 completed questionnaires were returned.

In my opinion, the folks back home in my congressional district, or any other congressional district in the country, are way ahead of Washington in their thoughts on the important issues facing the Nation. The results of this questionnaire confirm this premise.

A close analysis of the response to the 16 questions submitted to my constituency reveals clear and precise opinions on matters vital to the future of the United States.

I am very proud to submit herewith the tabulated results of my annual legislative questionnaire:

Questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Should Red China be admitted to the U.N.?	10	87	3
2. Should Red China be recognized diplomatically by the United States?	16	80	4
3. Are you willing to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents to mail a letter to help end the postal deficit?	69	27	4
4. Do you favor Federal Aid to Education for—			
(a) School Construction?	40	44	16
(b) Teachers' salaries?	23	59	18
(c) Areas only which are "impacted" by defense activities?	42	35	23
(d) None at all?	11	34	55
5. Should the farm price-support program be scrapped entirely?	66	27	7
6. Should the Geneva nuclear test ban talks be ended?	61	34	5
7. Should the social security law be amended to include medical care for the aged?	49	48	3
8. Should there be a withholding tax and interest on savings accounts and on corporate dividends?	18	78	4
9. Should the United States resume testing nuclear weapons underground?	86	9	5
10. When you first heard President Kennedy was going to Vienna to talk with Khrushchev, did you think it a good idea?	38	59	3
11. Now that the Vienna talks have occurred, do you think the outcome was—			
(a) More favorable to the United States than the U.S.S.R.?	8	30	62
(b) More favorable to the U.S.S.R. than the United States?	23	15	62
(c) About even?	24	13	63
(d) Nothing accomplished?	42	26	32
12. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining business?	82	14	4
13. In general, do you feel there are enough laws restraining labor unions?	11	87	2
14. How would you vote on the following recommendations President Kennedy made to Congress in his May 25 speech?			
(a) Send a man to the moon and back by 1970 and spend an additional $7,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 during the next 5 years toward doing it	44	51	5
(b) Boost foreign aid program by $535,000,000, to bring total foreign aid spending to $2,650,000,000 for the next year	21	74	5
(c) Triple spending on civil defense (fallout shelters, warning measures, food stockpiles, etc.) to about $312,000,000	56	38	6
(d) Spend $121,000,000 next year for the U.S. Information Agency to disseminate information overseas	57	35	8
(e) Increase Army and Marine Corps strength to meet brush-fire situations; increase nonnuclear firepower and guerilla training	89	7	4
(f) Establish a strengthened and enlarged U.S. Disarmament Administration	20	68	12
(g) Give the President a $250,000,000 contingency fund for flexible response to new, but as yet unknown, crises and opportunities occurring overseas during the next year	39	56	5
15. Is the United States in a nonmilitary war with communism which could end in total victory for either side without ever firing a shot? (If you answered "yes," please answer the following:)	85	9	6
(a) Do Americans generally realize we are fighting it now?	22	68	10
(b) Is our Government organized to fight it effectively?	8	78	14
(c) Are we putting enough skill and effort into it?	4	84	12
(d) Are we winning?	4	79	17
(e) Does winning possibly involve higher taxes and foregoing for a while some desirable domestic programs?	70	17	13
16. Do you favor sending armed forces to Cuba to get rid of Castro without waiting any longer?	64	30	6

Defense Department Ignores Economies of Using the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I called attention to a communication that was made by the Midwestern Senators to Secretary of Defense McNamara.

Today there came to my desk from H. C. Brockel, municipal park director of the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, an article entitled "Defense Department Ignores Economies of Using Seaway," which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal under date of September 11, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT IGNORES ECONOMIES OF USING SEAWAY

As a huge oversea shipper—12 million tons last year—the Defense Department still astonishingly ignores the economic advantages of the St. Lawrence Seaway. All 12 Senators from Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin are now pressing this point upon Secretary McNamara.

Defense, they object, persists in its old shipping pattern of Atlantic, gulf, and west coast transportation commands. Though millions of tons of its oversea cargo originate in the great industrial midcontinent, it moved only 70,000 last year—less than six-tenths of 1 percent of its total—through the adjacent ocean ports on the Great Lakes.

It continues this slow dribble even though it acknowledged saving $638,000 on a 91,000-ton seaway movement in the very first season, 2 years ago. In contrast to that $7 a ton, the Senators base their case on a very modest savings estimate of $1 to $3.

Bigger military shipments would be a boon to Great Lakes ports, but this is no pork barrel. The Senators are not asking for more gravy to be spread among their home States. They simply want cold, hard business done with the Nation's tax money. The Senators merely ask McNamara to put the matter to the test, and see for himself. Create a separate Great Lakes transportation command. Route a specified minimum tonnage—say, 500,000—through Great Lakes ports next season at fairly proportional rail rates. Study comparative costs of shipments to and through the ports in all four transportation commands.

Certainly the seaway would thereby prove itself the most economical outlet for a great deal more military cargo than now goes through it. To the fullest extent of this proof, it should thereupon be used. Could anything make more obvious sense?

Is Anticommunism Now To Be Considered Anti-Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some strange new developments are indeed taking place in the administration's position toward those who dare to speak out to help identify communism for the pagan, international conspiracy that it actually is.

First, we witness the severe punishment of General Walker and next we note the official censorship of a career official in the U.S. Forest Service by name of Don Caron. After 15 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Forest Service, Caron was confronted with the alternative of discontinuing to speak and write educational articles against communism or resigning his position. As a patriotic, courageous American more interested in his country's survival than his personal welfare, Caron resigned. Thus the voices of Walker and Caron have been silenced in the crusade against communism but the perils provided by the activities of Communists at home and abroad grow greater and more alarming.

Nationally recognized columnist and writer, George E. Sokolsky has taken recognition of this unfortunate and untimely effort of officials in the Kennedy administration to drive into silence those who feel impelled to speak out against the evils of communism. He discusses this development cogently in a column entitled "It Starts Again" which I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

I sincerely hope the anticipated investigation by the Senate Armed Services Committee under the able leadership of Senater RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, will get to the source and the reasons for this new era of censorship. In these perilous times we need a greater rather than a lesser understanding of the true

scope and nature of the Communist menace. We shall not win the cold war nor avert a hot one by turning our backs to the fire and burying our heads in the sand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT STARTS AGAIN

(By George Sokolsky)

There can be little doubt but a strong investigation into anticommunism is developing in the U.S. Senate. The General Walker case will not down, and either the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, or a public court-martial is essential to clean it up. Secretary of Defense McNamara's defense of the removal of General Walker from his post was insufficient because it avoided the central issue which is that pro-Communists are beginning to move about freely again.

It is interesting that the leader in the present battle against the pro-Communists is Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina. Senator KARL MUNDT has joined but that is to have been expeccted because he has been active in anti-Communist movements since he has been in the Congress.

The General Walker case is arousing interest because he has been accused of a crime which is not recognizable as such. The accusation is that his pro-blue program of patriotic indoctrination was excessive. It is impossible to define why he should have been accused of impropriety without being given a public hearing.

By avoiding a public hearing, the Defense Department has got itself into an untenable position. An organization, "The Friends of General Walker," has come into being which is circulating publications, mimeographed and printed, on the subject. Although generally the press has not paid too much attention to the General Walker case, the pamphleteers have been busy, and they note the silence of the press.

It is my experience that the suppression of a story can build it up to explosive proportions. This seems to be best pointed up in Senator MUNDT's weekly report. MUNDT is a Republican; THURMOND is a Democrat. Nevertheless, MUNDT uses THURMOND as his authority when he says:

"In the August 17 discussion on the Senate floor concerning the memorandum submitted by Senator FULBRIGHT to the Defense Department and the subsequent directive aimed at stopping anti-Communist seminars, Senator STROM THURMOND said: 'I think our people in uniform should not speak promiscuously on all subjects, but they are entitled to tell the civilian population the aims, the methods of operation, and the dangers of the enemy. The enemy today is communism. I feel there is a censorship now being placed upon our military people with regard to expressing themselves concerning our enemy, communism.'"

Senator MUNDT attacks the censorship of public speeches by military men:

"Thus, the full impact of the recent Pentagon directive is now being felt. The muzzling of the military, first appearing as an innocent attempt to stop war talk by such distinguished military leaders as Adm. Arleigh Burke, becomes an all-out attack to discredit highly successful anti-Communist seminars and to eliminate any reference to the menace of communism because it is interpreted as being of a political nature."

This is the beginning of a movement and those who ignore it do not understand the strength and depth of popular movements. It is easy to ridicule the John Birch Society, but it is not easy to justify the removal of General Walker from his post in Germany on the grounds of excessive patriotism.

The excuse can be that the balance between the United States and Soviet Russia, between war and peace, is so fine that only the most elevated officials should speak on policy matters. That would be President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. But we listen to others on lower levels discuss policy questions and they are not muzzled.

There seems to be a misunderstanding of roles and responsibilities. If no one but the President and the Secretary of State are to speak on policy, then let everybody else be silent. It is doubtful if the country would long tolerate such a one-sided silence.

Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column by Richard Starnes which appeared in the Columbus Citizen-Journal on Monday, September 10, 1961.

It is my thought every Member of Congress should have the benefit of the views expressed by Mr. Starnes:

LEADERS

(By Richard Starnes)

NEW YORK.—Every epoch of human history is taught us by the symbolic shorthand of heroes, until it is possible to defend the proposition that no civilization ever achieved greatness without producing great leaders.

When we think of the awakening of England and its first tremendous strides toward world dominion, we think of Elizabeth I. And, of course, when we think of the sad remains of that nation, we think of Elizabeth II, a dowdy, foolish woman who perfectly symbolizes the emptiness and lack of purpose of her people.

The fall of France was plainly foreshadowed by the incredible bankruptcy in her leadership. The salvation of Britain was Churchill. The mad genius of Hitler was the catalyst that revitalized Germany.

What sort of symbolic shorthand will historians of the future use to tell unborn generations what sort of people their midcentury ancestors in the United States were?

If, as I suppose they will, these unborn scholars continue to use the same sort of historical shorthand we use, I am afraid our generation of Americans will come off rather poorly. The sad truth of the matter is that we are almost bereft of any useful leadership, much less any leadership of flashing genius, or even the sort of low utilitarian cunning such as Khrushchev possesses.

The United States last presidential campaign was an unexampled convulsion of mediocrity. The winner won principally because he was a young man of startling physical beauty while his opponent always managed to look like a used car salesman with a bad hangover.

I am not sure the crisis of America is entirely a crisis of leadership. It is at least partly a crisis of slothful, egocentric, materialistic population that is pitted against a people who are young, tough and hungry.

Every magazine that comes to hand is full of "explanations" of the disaster we met in the Bay of Pigs, but the real explanation is simply that we lacked the moral courage to go ahead with an unpleasant task. We could not get on with the surgery necessary in Cuba, the rationalizers insisted, because the seething, unwashed masses in the world wouldn't like it.

I don't give a damn what any heathen dwelling in a foul-smelling mud hut thinks. One free American is worth any number of surly, unclean, wife-beating, daughter-selling peasants in any "emerging" nation, and it is time we began to understand it.

If we are destined to be the people whom history will indict for letting the torch of freedom fall from our nerveless fingers, so be it. But can't we summon one last echo of our past and do it like men?

The Christian Faith and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a commission of the National Lutheran Council recently made a statement prepared after 2 years of study on the subject of "The Christian Faith and Foreign Aid." The council, which is an agency of six Lutheran groups with 5½ million members went on record as favoring increased foreign aid, with long-range realistic planning, and with special attention to the roles of the United Nations and private investment. Because their statement embodies so many of the ideas and thoughts expressed in the foreign aid measure recently passed by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON FOREIGN AID

(A) In the conviction that God, in the outpouring of His love, unites mankind in common responsibility; calls each person to serve his neighbor with the abilities and means which have been given to him; seeks for all nations and peoples the opportunity to develop their God-given potentialities under conditions favorable to their wholesome development;

In recognition of the pressing need for aid and cooperation in the less developed areas of the world among peoples striving for economic, social, and political development; the demonstrated effectiveness of governmental programs of economic and technical aid in furthering the wholesome development of peoples and nations; the conviction that responsible, self-reliant initiative and enterprise are expected of men and nations and that long-continued dependency impoverishes; and

In light of the beliefs and conditions set forth in the preceding text, the national Lutheran Council recommends to its participating bodies that by appropriate means they point out to their members that economic and technical aid to less developed areas is essentially a demand of justice and in harmony with the Christian faith; help their members to study the subject of mutual aid among the nations and thereupon to express themselves as responsible Christian citizens with respect to these programs, making their views known to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, their Senators

and Congressmen, and to other leaders and agencies; challenge their qualified members to undertake dedicated and competent service in the less developed areas of the world as a part of their Christian vocation, and guide their youth to see these opportunities and to become qualified for such service; evaluate current studies on the problems of areas of rapid social change and make feasible plans to insure that through the necessary insights, personnel, and funds the churches and their agencies play their part in dealing imaginatively and creatively with the opportunities and difficulties that emerge through the impact of rapid social change; and encourage their members and agencies to participate in "exchange of persons" programs of the church, other voluntary agencies, and Government, in particular welcoming such persons who come into their communities

(B) Recognizing the expressed desire for aid and cooperation in economic, social and political development in many countries;

Recognizing the moral imperatives binding especially upon people and nations with great resources;

Gratified that the U.S. Government and the United Nations have shown that they can effectively provide help to the less developed nations; and

Convinced that the interests of the peoples and nations of the world are inextricably intertwined, and that wholesome developments in any nation are beneficial to all peoples; the National Lutheran Council:

Expresses the judgment that increased governmental activities planned in long-range perspective which seek realistically to deal with problems of ignorance, poverty, ill health, and inequality of opportunity among the peoples of the world, would bring great benefits to all countries;

Believes it desirable that the United States continue to work for more adequate and effective assistance programs by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, coordinating its own programs with and channeling its resources through these agencies whenever this accomplishes their fundamental purposes more effectively;

Regards as commendable the efforts of the U.S. Government to encourage private enterprise, including investment capital, in the less developed areas, and its efforts to establish programs to protect the private investor against loss due to expropriation, war, and inconvertibility of currency;

Favors the continuation of a reciprocal trade agreements program;

Heartily endorses the U.S. Government's programs of international exchange of persons, which so effectively promote understanding among peoples and expresses the hope that the Government will continue these programs, together with regular substantial support of the exchange programs of the United Nations;

Believes that a comprehensive approach in projecting development programs is needed so that the emphasis on economic and social development in the light of legitimate political considerations is kept in balance and that military considerations are not unduly emphasized; and

Regards it desirable that the objectives of providing assistance to foreign nations be clearly stated in positive terms in the authorizing legislation so that the following purposes will be reflected:

(a) To promote the mutual security of nations;

(b) To foster wholesome economic, social and political development; and

(c) To express the concern of Americans for the well-being of other peoples.

Adopted by the National Lutheran Council, Atlantic City, N.J., February 4, 1960.

Research Triangle of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, we in North Carolina are proud of progress we are making in education, industry, and agriculture. We are proud, too, of the fact that more and more people in other areas of the United States, and indeed all over the world, are finding that North Carolina is an ideal place to work and live.

The big attraction today in the field of industrial development is research and brainpower. We in North Carolina have this, and more too, in areas of pleasant living that appeal to scholars as well as to machine operators.

Mr. William D. Snider, in his column in the September 7, 1961, edition of the Greensboro Daily News discusses the Research Triangle area of North Carolina and the potential it holds for our State and our area of the Nation.

In order for the Members of the Congress and the public to know more about the work we are doing and the plans we have for the future, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Snider's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEASANT PLACE

John Fischer, editor of Harper's, is a trifle late discovering North Carolina's Research Triangle, but we'll pardon his ignorance and commend his excellent advice for industry seekers.

In the "Editor's Easy Chair," Fischer expounds the theme of pleasant environment and great universities as enticing bait for today's "nice" industries:

"The exciting growth industries—electronics, for instance—", he declares, "aren't interested in cheap labor. They need highly skilled men and are willing to pay almost any price to get them—as anyone can see by glancing at the help-wanted ads in 'Scientific American' or the Sunday New York Times. Neither are they much interested in low taxes, because low taxes mean poor schools. Such schools can't turn out the kind of brains these industries need; moreover, the men they seek aren't willing to settle in communities where their children will be doomed to a second-rate education."

But the new industry tycoons are terribly interested in the cultural, social and intellectual environment: "They like to live in a community of scholars—historians, writers, sociologists, even an occasional artist—and they enjoy being near good libraries, good orchestras, good art galleries. If you plunked them down in Spearfish, S.D., they would go out of their minds with boredom; no amount of money could persuade them to stay there."

And that brings up North Carolina's Research Triangle. It was founded for the very purpose Fischer emphasizes—to emulate the stunning success of the industrial complexes around Boston (MIT, Harvard, Boston University, Brandeis) and Southern California (Caltech, Stanford, University of California).

Both places, incidentally, also offer pleasant living areas—rolling hillsides, unspoiled countryside around Boston and good climate and rugged outdoors in southern California.

Fischer mentions North Carolina—in fact the very location of the research triangle—but then fails to name it:

"In North Carolina, for example, the area between Chapel Hill and Durham looks like a natural for such an enterprise. Both are pleasant towns. They are surrounded by unspoiled (well, all right, not hopelessly spoiled) countryside; it could be handsomely developed—at a profit—by public purchase and zoning. The Blue Ridge Mountains are an easy drive to the west, the Cape Hatteras Beach about the same distance east. In sum, a potential for the good life as promising as anything Massachusetts or California can offer.

"And here are two of the best educational institutions in the South: the University of North Carolina and Duke. Around this nucleus the State could—if it made a determined effort—build up a truly great intellectual center. It might become not just the best in its region, but one of the best in America. Inevitably it would give North Carolina the educational leadership of the South—and as a consequence, leadership in modern industry as well.

"It would cost money, of course. A doubling of teachers' salaries, new buildings, urban renewal, parks and landscaping, a long-range, well-thought-out regional plan: All of these would have to be financed somehow. (The big national foundations and the tobacco industry might both be eager to help.) But in the end the investment ought to pay off bountifully."

Agreed, John Fischer.

But fully three-fourths, perhaps more, of the job you mention has been done. The research triangle is a going concern. The Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation is building a $2½ million polymer research facility; Chemstrand, a $5½ million fiber research laboratory; and the research park shortly will have a $300,000 administrative building. "Like Boston's Route 128," says the research park's executive vice president, James B. Shea, Jr., "only without manufacturing."

All this is only a beginning, but a good one. Governor Sanford has sponsored a statewide education program lifting teacher salaries by almost one-fourth. Urban renewal projects are underway in major Tar Heel cities. Statewide planning is a vital part of the Sanford administration.

Like the outdoor camper who asked us please not to ruin Cape Hatteras through too much publicity, we have a suspicion that the Chapel Hill-Durham region might be spoiled if too many big industrialists and research foundations discover its charms.

But thank you, John Fischer, for making your point emphatically: A pleasant place to live and a cultural environment will win more industrial dollars than all the shoddy come-ons of cheap labor and tax gimmicks.

Why Not Medical Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I would like to

place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the AFL–CIO News of September 9, 1961.

This editorial decries the lack of logic in the actions of a Congress which evidences its commitment to aiding the aged by generally increasing benefits and coverage under the social security laws, but stops short of substantive, specific aid in meeting the largest expenses of the aged—medical care.

As the editorial points out, Mr. Chairman, what the Congress has done so far is valuable, laudable, and commendatory. But valuable as it may be, it is not enough.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT MEDICAL CARE?

The September social security checks delivered to millions of older citizens in the week beginning Labor Day reflect for the first time the increases in various benefits voted at the current session of Congress.

The changes in eligibility and other provisions have also resulted in nearly three-quarters of a million new applications for benefits by persons previously outside the scope of the law or drawing very limited benefits.

The millions drawing higher benefits and those drawing benefits for the first time must be somewhat mystified by the logic of lawmakers who are willing without so much as a murmer to provide broaders benefits and badly needed increases but express grave doubts about simple legislative proposals to help these same social security beneficiaries, on sharply limited budgets, meet the increasing cost of medical care.

There is little doubt that the extra dollars in the new benefit checks will be used in many cases to help pay medical care bills. Perhaps that's why the American Medical Association did not launch a violent campaign of opposition to the social security increases.

But increasing benefits a few dollars every few years does not meet the major medical care problem confronting our older citizens. If anything, it accentuates the problem and the need, a need that can only be fulfilled by providing medical care for the aged under the social security system.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the August issue of American Heritage magazine, Bruce Catton points up eloquently the importance of the Civil War Centennial. He regards the observance as a time for contemplation of the fact that freedom is a magnificent possession and an undying responsibility.

The article was called to my attention by Rev. William S. Warford, of Quincy, Ill., chairman of the Quincy Civil War Centennial Commission. It deserves the attention of all thoughtful Americans.

Here is the text:

LEST WE FORGET

(By Bruce Catton)

If the tone for the entire centennial period is to be set by parades, sham battles, and a general recreation of a swords-and-roses atmosphere designed to amuse the tourist and slake our thirst for romance, we are simply going to stultify ourselves. When we show Americans firing on the American flag and doing their best to destroy the American Government, let us at least do it because we finally learned something from those desperate endeavors and not simply because it makes an amusing spectacle. Few people, to be sure, are entirely immune to the appeal of a spectacle; human nature being what it is, most of us have had moments in which we wish, illogically, that we might just have had a glimpse at some of those struggles which, now that they are suitably remote in time, are seen through a romantic haze. But we do need to be very clear about what it is that we are trying to do.

Precisely what—to begin with—do we think we are commemorating? When we undertake to recreate, these vignettes from the past, how do we make our selection? There are some events that do not quite lend themselves to proper staging. Will we, for example, reenact the starving of the first prisoner of war? Should the New York draft riots be reenacted? Or Sherman's march to the sea, the devastation of the Shenandoah Valley, or even the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, with the accompanying hangings?

No doubt we shall draw the line somewhere, because the point of these reenactments is entertainment, and there were things in the Civil War which, even a century later, just are not very entertaining to contemplate. But that is precisely where the trouble lies. We are in serious danger of taking the most significant anniversary in American history and using it as a means of giving ourselves a bright and colorful holiday. How the Civil War soldier fought his battles is no doubt worth examining, but infinitely more important is a consideration of why he fought and what he accomplished. Lay on the sentiment, the romance, and the dramatic appeal heavily enough, and we shall presently forget that the war was fought by real living men who were deeply moved by thoughts and emotions of overwhelming urgency. To lose sight of the cause that was fought for and the dedication with which it was served is to dishonor the sacrifice, for victor and for vanquished alike.

The centennial does demand our remembrance, but the act of remembrance demands something of us.

It calls first of all for an attitude, a frame of mind, a brooding awareness of the immensity of the tragedy that once befell our country and an honest attempt to understand the far-reaching results which grew out of that tragedy. It calls upon us to be fully adult in our approach to it, so that we can make ourselves familiar with the hot passions and the human blindnesses that led up to it and grew out of it and can realize that greatness went hand in hand with meanness, that men caught up in a tide too strong for them to resist did somehow accomplish more than they meant to accomplish, that the whole of the terrible process did in the end mean more than the sum of its parts. We need to realize that although we are never going to reach a complete understanding of the war, it is not wholly incomprehensible; that it was infinitely more than a needless catastrophe, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

All of this has little to do with parades, reenactments, and the serving of refreshments by bright young women in hoopskirts and ruffles. It has to do with the real value of the centennial; with the unfinished business which the Civil War left to us, the living. What we are today grows directly out of that war; what we mean when we are at our best is rooted in it. It left us not just something to remember but something to live up to. It began a process that still is not finished and that will be our continuing responsibility as long as we live.

"For in its blind, brutal, and all but unendurably expensive way, the Civil War did accomplish something.

It created one nation, destined for world leadership, and it once and forever expanded the dimensions of American freedom. It brought Negro slavery to an end; doing that, it left us with no conceivable alternative to the task of creating, perfecting, and defending a one-class citizenship in our fair land. The fact that this task is a long way from being finished is beside the point. The commitment was made for us, and we cannot either escape it or forget it. Under everything else—the remembrance of the valiant things done by men long dead, the bright pathos of the Lost Cause, the continuing endeavor to heal the deep wounds which the war inflicted—this is implicit in the Civil War centennial. The centennial years are hardly less solemn than the years they commemorate.

We have had reenactments, parades, and flowery speeches, and we shall doubtless have more. They are all to the good, so long as they are not all that we see or hear or think about. But we shall lose something we must not lose if we make these centennial years simply a time of soft and forgetful sentiment; if we hesitate to stress the final meaning of the war because we are afraid to "stir up controversy" or touch some present-day issue which might leave thorns in our fingers. We are a grownup people by now, or at least we think we are, and we do not need to go through this anniversary on tiptoe.

Somewhere in these centennial observances there must be a time for sober reflection; for contemplation of the fact that freedom is a magnificent possession and an undying responsibility; for rededication to the ideal that came to its first flowering in battle smoke and agony. The centennial is not to be approached lightly. It means either nothing at all—or everything.

Good Family Discipline and Good Family Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Dick D. Heller, Jr., editor of the Decatur Daily Democrat, recently wrote an editorial entitled "For Parents Only." Because this editorial speaks so well for all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR PARENTS ONLY

The touchy world situation has led a number of families to revaluate their own way of living.

Many of us seldom think about the changes that would be necessary if we were engaged in another world conflict. But perhaps we should.

Two things will be absolutely essential—good family discipline and good family health.

Now, it will be too late to start thinking of these things when war is declared, or an invasion of the United States starts, or a

bad storm leaves the entire family terrified. Right now, this very minute, you can prepare for such things—but when they happen, it will be too late if you have not prepared in advance.

Good family discipline, obedience to parents, is rapidly disappearing from American family life. It is understandable. Families are so busy indulging in the individual pleasures of each member that they have no time to think of themselves as a family, getting along together, growing together.

But what will happen when the first bomb falls, the first invader comes to Decatur, or a tornado wipes out the town?

Will your family respond to the central discipline of the father and mother, then oldest son, and so on? Or will they break up, terrified, into worthless individuals, each fighting, clawing, and losing his fight for existence?

Our President has asked each of us to get in physical, mental and moral shape to win the war, declared or undeclared, against Godless communism.

This means many things to the family. Dads and moms have to keep themselves in physical shape, and be well enough instructed in emergencies to know what to do for themselves and their families.

It means that grade school and high school children should be encouraged to walk and ride their bikes, rather than drive to school.

Athletics should be encouraged, as well as good eating habits, and good family discipline.

Family worship should be strengthened. The time may well be coming when a strong personal faith, and immediate, unquestioning obedience to parents, and those in charge, will be absolutely necessary for survival.

Clarifying the Reemployment Rights of Certain Persons Entering the Armed Forces

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman will take a minute or two to explain this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to explain the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the existing reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to clarify and remove any doubts that might arise with regard to the reemployment protection to be accorded certain persons who leave their jobs to enter the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense.

In the month of August this year the Congress passed a law giving the President the power to extend the period of service of persons on active duty and the power to call individuals and Reserve organizations to active duty without their consent. The purpose of this bill is to extend the reemployment rights for the same period of time it is possible to extend involuntarily the period of service or to extend those reemployment rights for the same period that a person volunteers for active service, provided that additional service is no greater than that to which he could have been involuntarily called.

If America Has Muscles Left, Time To Flex 'Em Has Arrived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the so-called unalined nations at the recent Belgrade conference has shocked the American people. Even those who were so optimistic as to think that Communist Yugoslavia and the self-styled neutrals were alined on the side of the United States have now come to the realization that the billions of dollars we have spent overseas have not bought us friends.

The Shelby Daily Star, published at Shelby, N.C., had a very fine editorial on September 13, 1961, with reference to the fiasco at Belgrade. I believe my colleagues will find the Star editorial to be most interesting, and I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

IF AMERICA HAS MUSCLES LEFT, TIME TO FLEX 'EM HAS ARRIVED

The failure of our foreign policy of the last 15 years was so plainly spelled out in Belgrade that even free thinkers in the new State Department could hardly miss the message.

As charted in the current issue of U.S. News and World Report, the 24 so-called nonalined nations between the end of World War II and March 31, 1961, had received a total of $6,051,000,000 from the United States in economic, technical and military aid.

In case figures bore you, that's over $6 billion.

What did we purchase? A slap in the face from the 24 nations, who shivered before Khrushchev's exploding nuclear bombs and came out with a weak-kneed plea for the Russian leader and President Kennedy to talk it out.

During the conference, Yugoslavia's Dictator Tito commented that U.S. aid to his Communist nation should have been twice as much. This Communist nation, incidentally, led the list of all 24 by receiving two billion, 81 million dollars in the period mentioned above.

Yes, Tito, led the so-called neutrals in naming the western allies for criticism in the current world crisis while the Communist bloc was not even given a slap on the wrist.

The opinion will be immediately voiced, "You can't buy friends." That's true, but it's no reason to establish a policy of fattening the enemy or toadying to nations whose leaders are too gutless to take a stand on freedom's side.

Our policy has been to play down our military potential, to never speak in anger to the uncommitted nations and to make almost unlimited funds available from the coffers of the U.S. Treasury.

This policy has not produced friendship, but more important it has not produced respect from these nations who wobble between Moscow and Washington.

Who appointed Tito as chairman on the nonalined? Who gave India's Nehru license to peddle his spineless philosophy on his knees before Khrushchev?

One positive result must come from Belgrade. The leaders represented there do not deserve the deference they have received from the United States.

While we polished the apple and oiled the palm of one so-called neutral leader after another, Russia adopted an opinion-be-damned policy of Muscovite muscle.

This obviously produced results, because the predicted propaganda victory for the United States when Russia announced resumption of tests faded to nothing in the mute cowardice displayed at Belgrade by leaders of nations which are free because America made them that way.

It is high time for America to withdraw the money and extend the muscle. No longer can we hope to gain anything by utopian schemes to transform the world by walking on tiptoe with a bag of goodies.

From now on we must adopt a policy that there is no such thing as a neutral nation. We must recognize our friends, resist our enemies and studiously ignore those we cannot identify as either.

That's a policy the world will understand. And respect.

The South Carolina Student Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, by an act of our State legislature in 1957, the South Carolina State Student Legislature came into being. This legislature is composed entirely of students from the various college campuses in our State. This student legislative body functions exactly the same as any other legislature. Each campus elects congressmen and senators to represent it at annual sessions in our State capital, Columbia. Also elected are a governor, a lieutenant governor, a secretary of state, and an attorney general. Committees are formed, and other officials are appointed by the governor including a treasurer, a press secretary, and so forth. The procedure observed in conducting business is the same as that of our regular legislative process.

The governor is the official spokesman for the student legislature. The present governor, Mr. William L. Schachte, Jr., is a student at Clemson College in my congressional district. Mr. Schachte is doing an outstanding job in bringing to the attention of South Carolinians and citizens of the Nation as a whole the importance of their program. His able lieutenant governor, F. Glenn Smith, of Charleston, has also contributed much to the success of this body.

Mr. Speaker, the honor and pleasure of addressing this worthwhile organization was afforded me last year. Thus I can say, firsthand, that the South Carolina State Student Legislature is the finest of its kind and the most beneficial student organization I have seen—from the standpoints both of the students directly involved and the other citizens of our

State. Not only does this organization constitute a practical educational experience for these young people, but it also serves in an advisory capacity to our own South Carolina State Legislature in that almost all bills passed by this student body have been enacted verbatim by the State Legislature. These students seriously and conscientiously accept responsibility and respond with unbelievable results. They are aware that the world is not going to wait on them, that both foreign and domestic problems are more complex than ever before, and that they must be prepared and willing to meet the challenge now.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly recommend that all States join South Carolina in adopting a similar student legislature. We are extremely proud of our young people and the fact that they have proved they can accept responsibility. Therefore, I join my distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in introducing the following concurrent resolution today:

Whereas the South Carolina State Student Legislature was created by State statute in 1957; and

Whereas all colleges and universities in the State of South Carolina are afforded an opportunity to participate in the South Carolina State Student Legislature and most do so participate; and

Whereas the purpose of the South Carolina State Student Legislature is to provide an opportunity to learn the fundamentals of government by duplicating all functions of the State government; and

Whereas the State Legislature of South Carolina has been impressed by the legislative actions of the South Carolina State Student Legislature since its inception: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extends its congratulations to the South Carolina State Student Legislature and expresses its belief that this type of organization provides an excellent method for combining theoretical knowledge and practical experience in teaching the fundamentals of democratic government, and is one which could well be adopted by all States.

Polish-German Relations and the Polish-German Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War, the council of the Polish societies and clubs of the Delaware chapter of the Polish-American Congress issued a bulletin which included a sampling of the opinions expressed in free world Polish journals and magazines.

Since the views expressed in the bulletin may be of interest to my colleagues, I include the text here as part of my remarks:

[From Polish Affairs, London, May 1961]

THE PROBLEM OF THE POLISH-GERMAN FRONTIER

Recent development in Central and Eastern Europe have stressed, once again, the paramount importance of a decision by the Western Powers, which would confirm the Polish German frontier. We give below the text of a memorandum of the executive committee of the Polish Council of National Unity, which sets this problem in a wider perspective:

"European unity in the shape of a political union or confederation of states as one of the pillars of a wider Atlantic Community is the one shining beacon of hope for the oppressed peoples of Europe, for the white race and indeed for the whole Western civilization. Substantial progress toward achieving this goal was made since the Second World War, to a large extent thanks to the generous and farsighted help of the United States of America. The Coal and Steel Community, the Euratom and more recently the Common Market were established by six continental European states. These agreements are likely to be extended soon to more Western European countries. At the root of this progress lies the newly established Franco-German understanding. The possession of Alsace-Lorraine by France is no longer questioned by Germany, and the city of Strasbourg has been chosen by common agreement as the first seat of a European political institution.

"The prestige of Europe has grown considerably together with its prosperity in consequence of well devised and well executed steps on the road leading to unity. A picture gradually emerges of the future shape of Europe: a free society, multilingual, multidenominational, democratic, firmly link to America by ties of kinship and common interest in many domains including that of security. To the appressed peoples of Europe the emergence of such a society symbolizes their hope of ultimate deliverance.

"Whatever the progress achieved so far, however, the future of Europe is by no means secure yet. The emerging structure is exposed to blast from the outside world and to tremors from within.

"Their causes are multiple. Among them most dangerous is militant nationalism still the greatest force in contemporary human society appealing to our noblest sentiments but also to the most brutal instincts of human nature. This is what befell Germany at the time of the Third Reich. The cry for frontier revision at the expense of Poland had never stopped in Germany in the interwar period. It undoubtedly favored the advent of Nazism. Today it threatens the unity of Europe. It is no doubt in awareness of this serious danger that President De Gaulle recently gave his views on the permanence of the present German-Polish frontier. His statement conveyed the following warning to the German people: France is ready to join hands with Germany in the cultivation of a common European garden. But only on condition that Germany will give up quarrels and feuds as to the garden's boundaries. Europe cannot be expected to espouse Teutonic national feuds.

"De Gaulle's statement was that of a friend. It may have caused some heartburning in Bonn, but it can only help to clarify the situation and in the long run make the task of the German Government easier. However, the De Gaulle statement has not, up to the present moment, found corroboration in Washington and London.

"Meanwhile, there is more than one reason why events should not be allowed to drift. The German Federal Republic has in fact to choose between a constructive collaboration with her Western neighbors, the goal of which is European unity as a prerequisite of peace, and the pursuit of narrow nationalistic aims. The latter policy would inevitably ruin the chances of a European unification. It would increase the danger of war. It would, moreover, bring the Federal German Republic within the orbit of Russian hegemony. There is evidence to show that the Adenauer government is aware of this dilemma and that it shrinks from the pursuit of a Bismarckian policy which might have exerted an irresistible attraction in the 19th century at a period of unrestrained competition among European national states but which today is fraught with great danger. But it is subjected to mounting pressure from within, particularly at the time of elections. Besides, the Bonn Government can hardly be expected to show prudence and restraint beyond the advice of its NATO partners.

"Let us now in turn look at the vital European stage with the eyes of Germany's eastern neighbors: the Poles and the Czechs. These nations belong to the European family on geographical, historical, and cultural grounds. Their participation in a future European organization, together with that of the other now subjugated countries of Europe, would be of advantage to all concerned and contribute to Europe's political equilibrium and economic strength. In present circumstances they cannot apply for membership either in the existing European institutions or in any all-European organization. However, as soon as this becomes possible they are sure to be no less eager than the citizens of what is today the German Democratic Republic to join the European circle. But only on condition that their territorial integrity is not called into question.

"Thus the final sanctioning of the Polish-German frontier and the respect of the Czechoslovak-German frontier is one of the essential prerequisities for the setting up of a united Europe and the peaceful unification of Germany. Much will depend on the line taken by the German Federal Republic, one of the main potential beneficiaries of a successful European settlement, on the moderation and clearness of vision of the Federal Government. But surely the moment has now come for the great democracies to speak plainly so as to clarify a situation, the confusion of which can serve but the interest of those who seek to promote discord."

[From the Polish American Congress, Chicago, Ill.]

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Adopted by executive officers and the board of directors of the Polish American Congress at the meeting held in Chicago April 14, 1961.

We note with growing apprehension that the Government of the Federal German Republic is allotting increasingly larger sums of money to irredentist organizations whose sole purpose is to create revisionistic, anti-Polish turmoil and propaganda in Western Europe and in United States.

It is our considered opinion, based on many authorities on international law, French, English, American, and even German, that the cession of the territories east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers to Poland at the time of peace preliminaries at Potsdam, is a historic and accomplished fact which cannot be reversed, except by a new war.

The permanency of this cession rests in the fact, that the Allied Powers ordered removal of German population from the territories in question.

No responsible statesman would even contemplate summary removal of several million people from one country to another if he did not have in mind permanent solution of the Polish-German boundary line.

There are no more Germans in Polish Western territories and one-third of its present population of nearly 8 million, has already been born there of Polish parents.

In view of these facts, German renewal of revisionistic propaganda can be regarded as too obvious an effort to intimate the Polish Nation and force it to unwanted dependence on the Soviet Union, as the sole guarantor of the Oder-Neisse boundary.

To bring this needless and at the same time dangerous friction to an end, it is necessary for the Western Powers to recognize the Oder-Neisse line as the final boundary between Germany and Poland.

All that is needed is an acknowledgement the jure of the situation which has already been in existence de facto for the past 16 years.

[From the Mysl Polska, London]

CRISIS REACHES DEEPER

The editorial of "The Polish Thought," published in the Polish language in London put forward a thesis, that, considering the recent setbacks in the Western World and the nature of the Russian pronouncement on the Berlin question, the Soviet Union is ready for a political move, no matter what the risk connected with it. "Polish Thought" continues:

"Such a move will have, undoubtedly, far-reaching consequences. No matter what the Western countries will do, this will put the German problem on the precarious balance. If they will preserve their present standing to uphold their rights in the western Berlin and nonrecognition of the German Democratic Republic, this will open a wide field for conflicts with the administration of this Republic about the access to the city. This tension will grow more serious, considering, that the Democratic Republic is an alliance with the Soviet Union and that the Red Army will continue to stay on the Elbe River.

If, however, by threatening with war, Moscow is able to push the Western Powers out of Berlin and to consolidate the Soviet rule up to the Elbe, this will not remain without any influence on the attitude and policy of the German Federal Republic and will weigh clearly over the future of NATO.

It appears, that any outcome of this situation, even in the form of the most ingenious compromise in the Berlin problem, will not change the fact, that the time for the solution of the German question is near, without which the establishment of peace in Europe is extremely difficult.

Western Powers, if they do not want to be defeated over this question, should have a clear plan for its solution and a firm policy aiming at it. The nature of the German problem in the light of the German revanchist policy and Soviet attempt at hegemony, is of that kind, that it cannot be solved otherwise but in the framework of a wider reconstruction of Europe. The map of the postwar Germany must remain the basis of this reconstruction, the result of the Second World War and a main guarantee against the regeneration of the German eastern policy, always being the first step for attempts at the domination of Europe. The second condition is the liberation of Poland from the Russian supremacy.

In spite of the fact that this is really a central problem, nothing positive was done up to now for the solution of this important European question, and this is: strong and free Poland separating Germany and Soviet Russia. Poland which for 150 years of her enslavement—writes Der Europeische 'Sten—"showed such a deep love for her native land, since 15 years has resisted with courage the Soviet penetration. If the Polish nation did not present this resistance against Soviet influence, the nations of the Western Europe would not be able to defend their freedom."

We are quoting this voice of the German monthly as an example, how, even in the German eyes, is regarded the Polish problem, when looked upon from the standpoint of security and freedom of Western Europe. Although this voice is at odds with the German revisionist tendencies, it does not fail to be an expression of obvious truth, forced upon everyone, who seriously thinks about the future of Europe and searches for the elements of her stable construction.

The developing Berlin crisis brings this problem indirectly upon the agenda of the Western policy. As it is getting deeper, its consequences growing, and—finally—in relation to the problem of disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union, which Khrushchev called in his Moscow speech as "the most important world problem," which obviously cannot be solved by mechanical limitation of armaments without strengthening security and without political balance on our continent—the problem of the reconstruction of Europe will become more pressing and more understandable for the world.

One should hope, that the logic of facts, and that of the political situation will break the low spirit of the leaders of the countries and the ignorance of the public opinion. It will direct the destiny of the policy of the West on the proper road in searching for stability and permanent security of Europe."

AGREEMENT BETWEEN POLAND AND GERMANY IS POSSIBLE

Orzel Bialy, published in England, discusses the tactical and real agreements between nations and concludes that some vague attempts of the Bonn Government on establishing fragmentary diplomatic relations with Poland belong to the former kind. Orzel Bialy writes:

"Accepting two premises: (1) That the Polish-German agreement would remove from the heart of Europe a very dangerous and flammable spot, which forces striving for violent revolutions can use as a starting point for setting up a universal fire, as this happened in the last war; (2) that both nations—not only Polish but German as well, as it was already clearly proved—in the final analysis, the results of the existing between them flammable situation must write off as losses.

"We can state, without any doubt, that the agreement between the two nations lies both in the interest of themselves and the whole world. Moreover, in the name of such an agreement the obliteration of the memory of the past could be attempted, which, however would not mean that its lesson was forgotten or the necessary prudence neglected.

"But, relating to the above, only a real agreement can be desired, which can yield permanent fruits. Tactical agreement is useless as being unsincere and lasting only up to that moment, when one side—in this case German side—could in the favorable situation turn it down as an unnecessary mask."

Orzel Bialy further continues:

"Therefore when we deal with the possibility of the Polish-German agreement—and many reasons looked for it—we have, first of all, to ask: And what is about German recognition of the Polish western boundary? And here, the history of the German policy, as in the period between world wars, repeats itself with a frightening accuracy, possibly, being even more distinct now. We say more distinct. And this is really so. Germany is closer to the West after the Second World War than between the two wars, but at the same time they emphasize more emphatically revisionist aims in the East. Differentiation between their relations toward the eastern and western frontiers, which Germany presented in Locarno, looks quite innocently by comparison what we see today. In addition, from a certain time, the revisionist policy of the Bonn Government grew stronger. The members of the government do not hesitate to deliver revisionist speeches. They stopped also to use the cover that their aim is only to revise the Polish-German boundary and claims are pronounced going even further than the German possessions in 1937. Recently large funds were given to the German refugee organizations for the propaganda of the German revisionist demands abroad, mainly in the United States.

"We have therefore to state: The policy of the Bonn Government in relation to Poland is exactly the same as it was in the interwars period. We know how this policy ended. Assurance, that Germany would not use force, means as much as the previous assurances. Germany knows very well that they cannot use force today. Assurance, that one will not hit somebody while his hands are bound and when the attempted assault would be of the worst consequences for the offender, does not cost a lot. This only gives a testimony of what kind of nonchalant attitude Germans have not only for Poles but toward foreign diplomacy as well, if they think that this assurance can be taken seriously as basis for trust.

"Polish German agreement? Obviously yes, the most emphatic, yes, however not the tactical agreement which masks other purposes and which serves for a kind of chloroform before the operation, but a real agreement which could be an aim in itself. What matters is the real and permanent and not only a verbal change of the German policy toward Poland. The test case is the recognition of the boundary."

The Blackburn Plan: A Lesson in Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very interesting article about Blackburn College, which was distributed as a U.S. Information Service feature.

Blackburn College is unique in that it has a self-help program, which has worked successfully for nearly a half century.

Blackburn is located in my hometown of Carlinville. This institution has produced many students who have attained high positions in society.

The article is as follows:

THE BLACKBURN PLAN—A LESSON IN SELF-HELP

In the low, flat farm country of southern Illinois, some 40 miles from the State Capital of Springfield, nearly 400 students live and work and study in the dozen buildings that make up the campus of Blackburn College in the town of Carlinville. They come from cities and farms, from the east coast and the Western States, from all over the world.

At first glance, Blackburn seems typical of many small colleges in America. Handsome new buildings stand near those wearing the patina of time, and a good, basic liberal arts education is the goal of every student. Yet Blackburn is unique.

It was built, brick on brick, by the students themselves.

In what has become known to educators as the Blackburn plan, students are expected to work their way through Blackburn

in a partnership with each other and with the college. Every student devotes 15 hours a week of labor.

They construct the buildings, install plumbing and electrical wiring and pour the cement for the sidewalks. They paint the walls and keep those walls scrubbed clean. They do the laundry and landscape the campus ground. Some of them serve as secretaries, librarians or faculty assistants. Corn and other foodstuffs at Blackburn are raised by students, and students cook, serve the meals in the college dining room, and clean up afterward.

Graduates come back to Blackburn today and point with pride to the wall of a dormitory or classroom building and claim, "That's my wall. I laid those bricks."

Many American college students take part-time jobs to earn part of their expenses, and at a few colleges classes are alternated with work experience. The Blackburn approach is to help students work their way through college and to keep operating costs at a minimum by utilizing student labor. This unique work plan was born of economic necessity 48 years ago.

Blackburn College had been founded by a Presbyterian minister and chartered in 1857. It continued as a very small, liberal arts college, open to those of any religious denomination but largely local in its influence, until 1912. That year marked the beginning of Dr. William M. Hudson's 33-year-tenure as president of the college and of Blackburn's phenomenal growth.

There were only 35 students at the end of that year and the school was in great financial difficulty. In one of his imaginative innovations to save the school, Dr. Hudson started the work plan as an aid to bright students who otherwise could not afford to attend college.

This brought more students, and it also brought more financial bequests. Many men who had been too poor to finance a college education for themselves were eager to share the wealth of their own success with a college dedicated to helping the needy and with students willing to work their way to an education.

The work plan was so successful that it became the distinctive mark of the college and one which shows no signs of being abandoned. In this day of spiraling education costs, Blackburn officials are proud that they are able to keep tuition comparatively low by means of the work plan. Parents, trying to finance college educations for their children, welcome the plan. And the students discover a new dimension to college education.

For the spirit at Blackburn is like that of a family whose members work together to build and keep their own home. All students cooperate in a dynamic community effort, sharing the joy of production and the pride of achievement.

There are no social walls, although today's students come from all kinds of homes, rich as well as poor. No sororities or fraternities build a favored class, and working bears no stigma because everyone works. Campus heroes are not the football players or the socially poised, but those who best discharge their responsibilities to the college community.

In addition to the faculty, there are only nine professionals on the Blackburn staff to do all the work of building and maintaining a college. The rest is done by students.

The work plan is directed through a "work committee." This is made up of two or three faculty advisers, two student work managers—one for men and one for women—and eight student "work heads." Each work head is in charge of tasks to be done in one of eight areas: kitchen, dining room, laundry, heating plant, student center, construction, and men's and women's janitor service.

The student work heads and managers must ensure that students fulfill their work schedules and obtain substitutes if they are ill or absent. They also are responsible for maintaining a high quality of performance, and three times a year must grade students who work in their areas.

Members of the work committee are chosen each spring by a competitive system of tests and tryouts. Before the opening of school in the autumn, every Blackburn student makes three choice of jobs to which he would like to be assigned. The committee then has the gigantic task of matching nearly 400 students to jobs.

Consideration is given first to academic schedules, then to previous work experience and student preference. If a student finds later that his job interferes with studying or is one for which he is not qualified, he may request a change.

But few adjustments are needed. Most students discover great satisfaction in working together, learning new skills and uncovering latent abilities as well as the true meaning of the dignity of labor. They gain a self-reliance and a sense of real values that are priceless.

Although Blackburn is known best for its work plan, it maintains a balance of study-work-play for its students. Many recreational and extracurricular activities are offered but the greatest emphasis is on scholarship.

The college is fully accredited and its students score high in nationwide college examinations. A bachelor of arts degree is given in 10 different areas of the humanities, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the college offers preprofessional training in law, medicine, religion and education. Approximately 8 percent of its graduates enter the professions or enroll in universities for graduate study.

In its academic program and much of its social program Blackburn is comparable to similar colleges, but in the eyes of students and faculty alike the work plan enriches the students' whole educational experience.

Blackburn gives a liberal education in personal responsibility and community effort that trains hands in skill, reveals executive ability, and stresses the spiritual value of shared work. This way of learning is a way of life, and it is based on the philosophy that "What's worth having is worth working for."

Pesticides Are Good Friends, but Can Be Dangerous Enemies if Used by Zealots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I introduce into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 2, 1961. The editorial is a warning of clear and present danger in the overuse, or careless use, of pesticides.

The editorial tells of the death of millions of birds, fish, and small game directly traceable to the use of chemicals designed to eliminate harm done by insect pests. It also lauds the establishment of the Government's new Federal Pest Control Review Board, created by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

I strongly hope that this new agency will do much to make the advancements achieved by modern science in control of insect pests less of a mixed blessing than they now are.

The article follows:

PESTICIDES ARE GOOD FRIENDS, BUT CAN BE DANGEROUS ENEMIES IF USED BY ZEALOTS

Although chemical sprays for trees and crops have been essential to agriculture for more than two generations, the indiscriminate use of certain insecticides in recent years is disturbing. Today there are hundreds of powerful preparations on the market which too often are scattered broadside by airplane in vast quantities and without due care.

One of the workhorses of the insecticide group is DDT, which does a remarkable job in killing off bugs and worms. It also kills birds, fish, and small game. Some chemists are wondering out loud whether the stuff really is as harmless to the human system as claimed, and the Federal Government will not allow milk to be shipped interstate if it shows any trace of DDT. Tests have shown that once DDT is ingested into the human body, it never leaves. It is indestructible.

A special study done on the Michigan State University campus at East Lansing, by Dr. George J. Wallace, professor of zoology, was revealing. In an area that had about 370 robins in 1954, only 15 could be found in 1957, after 3 years of intensive spraying for elmbark beetles and mosquitoes. Hundreds of dying robins, jerking and trembling, were brought to Dr. Walter Nickell, at the Cranbrook Institute of Science, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., but he was unable to save a single bird. The robins had ingested the poison when they ate earthworms, which had picked it up from decayed leaves that had fallen from the sprayed trees.

Robins are not the only birds to suffer from the sprays. Bluebirds have been decimated in many places. Chickadees, warblers, nuthatches, woodpeckers, titmice, blue jays, thrashers, grackles, flickers, and other varieties have suffered alarming declines in numbers.

Perhaps one of the worst examples of misused insecticides can be seen in Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana, where a massive extermination program is being carried out against the fire ant. The fire ant is undoubtedly a miserable pest to have around, but it is doubtful that the program justifies the slaughter or millions of birds, fish, and small game.

For all these reasons it is encouraging that the Federal Government is setting up a special Pesticides Coordinating Committee to look into the whole matter. One of the group's first tasks will be a close look at the operation of the fire ant program.

The sad thing about all this is that the new chemicals, properly used, are a tremendous boon to the farmer. Without them our bountiful agricultural plant would be 25 years behind the times. But there is no doubt that these new pesticides are not meant to be broadcast from the air willy-nilly on every hamlet that is bothered with mosquitoes.

According to the not exactly complacent Dr. Wallace, "the current widespread and ever-expanding pesticide program poses the greatest threat that animal life in North America has ever faced—worse than deforestation, worse than market hunting, and illegal shooting, worse than drainage, drought or oil pollution, and possibly worse than all of these decimating factors combined." If the programs are not curbed, he

adds, "we shall have been witnesses, within a single decade, to a greater extermination of animal life than has occurred in all the previous years of man's history on earth."

Genesis of the World's Greatest Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clifford D. Owsley, a resident of Arlington in my Virginia congressional district, has presented to me a copy of an original study he has completed on the role played by a letter of invitation in shaping the great Gettysburg Address delivered by our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Owsley is a writer with the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, heading a branch of Special Reports, Press and Writing. He has been a newspaper reporter, editor, and columnist and has acted as writing consultant to the Air Adjutant General and editorial director, Publishing Division, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. He is a graduate of Emory University and has done graduate work at George Washington University and American University.

I have been both fascinated and impressed by Mr. Owsley's study, and believe my congressional colleagues will enjoy the opportunity to share it with me. I therefore under unanimous consent insert the article in full in this RECORD.

GENESIS OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST SPEECH

(By Cliff Owsley)

Four score and 18 years ago a prominent lawyer in Gettysburg, Pa., wrote a letter inviting a man in Washington to make "a few appropriate remarks" at the dedication of a cemetery. Most interesting and revealing is a comparison of that invitation with the famous speech it brought forth, the Gettysburg Address.

David Wills, the lawyer who wrote the letter, is surely due credit for helping shape one of the world's greatest speeches, perhaps the greatest. Could we say that Mr. Wills planted the seeds? Perhaps that would be giving him too much credit, since a seed contains the basic elements of that which develops from it. Obviously the speech contains elements not found in the letter; beyond question, the plant which took shape and flourished was the product of Abraham Lincoln's high talents and deep convictions. But from a close comparison of the two documents, it is also clear that the letter was the starting point of the speech and a liberal source of ideas for it.

It's true too, that the comparison is nearly all in Lincoln's favor. Yet, when this is conceded, the conclusion is inescapable that David Wills' influence on the speech is little short of amazing. If he didn't plant the seeds, he prepared the seedbed. He prodded the soil of greatness, causing it to bestir, making the seeds that were there germinate and grow into the noblest flower of human expression.

A germ of the central theme is there in the letter; so are several of the ideas and some of the key words that showed up in the speech. In fact, practically everything in the letter served as raw material for the address. The significance, though, is in what Lincoln did with the raw material. For here we find the prime example of his uncanny ability to take an ordinary thought and clothe it in extraordinary language; to enlarge and enoble an idea and express it in immortal words.

This great talent of Lincoln's amounted to genius. Throughout his life the ideas he dealt with were not new, but when he finished with them they were in shining words fit for the ages. Few, if any, men have possessed that talent in the degree that Lincoln did; none have excelled him at it.

Observe the letter and speech:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY, A. Lincoln
President of the United States:

"SIR: The several States having soldiers in the Army of the Potomac, who were killed at the battle of Gettysburg, or have since died at the various hospitals which were established in the vicinity, have procured grounds on a prominent part of the battlefield, for a cemetery, and are having the dead removed to them and properly buried.

"These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose, by appropriate ceremonies on Thursday, November 19. Hon. Edward Everett will deliver the oration.

"I am authorized by the Governors of the different States to invite you to be present, and participate in these ceremonies, which will doubtless be very imposing and solemnly impressive.

"It is the desire, that after the oration you, as Chief Executive of the Nation, formally set apart these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks.

"It will be a source of great gratification to the many widows and orphans that have been made almost friendless by the great battle here, to have you here personally, and it will kindle anew in the breasts of the comrades of these brave dead, who are now in the tented field, or nobly meeting the foe at the front, a confidence that they who sleep in death on the battlefield, are not forgotten by those highest in authority, and they will feel that, should their fate be the same, their remains will not be uncared for.

"We hope you will be able to be present and perform this last, but solemn act to the soldier dead on this battlefield. I am, with great respect, your Excellency's obedient servant,

"DAVID WILLS, *Agent*,
"A. G. CURTIN,
"Governor of Pennsylvania, and acting for all the States."

"THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Three areas in the comparison are worth examining. First but least important is the curious fact that the invitation and the speech are exactly the same length, each containing 272 words.[1] Second, certain words and phrases in the letter carry ideas that Lincoln used but extended in scope while compressing them into his own inimitable style. Third and most important is the theme of the speech, dedication, suggested by Wills and magnificently enlarged upon by Lincoln.

The fact that the invitation and speech are the same length is an interesting curiosity. Its significance, if any, may be in noting that Lincoln could make a speech, and a very great one, with the same number of words it took to invite him to make it. But who at this point, knowing its end result, would say that David Wills' letter should have been shorter? After all, it served its purpose superbly.

Now to our second area of comparison: words and ideas from the letter that were converted into the address. While most of the letter in one form or another is to be found in the speech, it was truly transformed by the magic of Lincoln's touch. In passing through the mill of that superior mind it came out far different, far nobler, and distinctly Lincoln's. Each idea is either changed in some way, compressed into fewer and simpler words, or broadened and elevated intellectually and emotionally.

The one instance where the President used more words than Wills to say the same thing is in the word "cemetery." Lincoln reverted to a euphemism here and called it "a final resting place."

Consider this part of the long first sentence of the letter: "The several States having soldiers in the Army of the Potomac, who were killed at the Battle of Gettysburg, or have since died at the various hospitals which were established in the vicinity * * *." These 33 words became in the speech simply "those who here gave their lives * * *." Six short words.

Lincoln accepted Wills' word "consecrate," used it twice, but gave it a new and larger meaning. After saying it was "fitting and proper" to dedicate the cemetery, he turned the idea around and said that "in a larger sense," it could not be done because those who had fought there had already "consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract."

This phrase from the letter, "* * * the comrades of these brave dead, who are now in the tented field, or nobly meeting the foe at the front," came out in the speech as "The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here." Nine words doing the work of 21.

In his fifth paragraph, David Wills took 97 words to tell the President what his appearance there would mean: "a source of great gratification" to the widows and orphans of those killed there; that the battle's survivors would feel better for knowing that "they who sleep in death * * * are not forgotten by those highest in authority * * *." Lincoln rejected this idea as it was stated, but reshaped it. While characteristically dismissing his own role as unimportant, he greatly enlarged the scope of the dedication to say that it had meaning not merely to widows, orphans, and veterans of the battle, but to the whole world. As he said: "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

[1] The text of the letter contains 272 words, while the 5 versions of the address written out by Lincoln varied by a few words in length, up to 272.

In that sentence, incidentally, we all know that Lincoln's prophecy was wrong. To err in such humility only adds to his stature. With his enobling words he undoubtedly made certain that the world would forget neither what was done or said there.

"The soldier dead on this battlefield," in the letter's last paragraph was converted in the speech to the three eloquent words, "these honored dead."

Finally we come to the most interesting and important part of the comparison, the theme of the speech: "Dedicate." It was suggested by Wills' letter but the word was not used. The letter said "These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose," and in another place, "formally set apart these grounds." Lincoln compressed this into the one word "dedicate," used it six times, and greatly expanded and exalted the idea. Here he added the great, new dimension.

Incidentally, the use of the word "dedicate" shows an interesting, point about Lincoln's writing: he never hesitated to repeat a word if it served his purpose. An even more striking example of this can be seen in the word "here"—found eight times in the speech.

One might say the use of this word "dedicate" was most natural, something anyone would have done, since the reason for the occasion was the dedication of a cemetery. Quite true, yet David Wills had not used it, and Lincoln's use of it, as we shall see, is far from the commonplace.

Mr. Wills said only that they were going to set apart a cemetery. But observe how in Lincoln's hands the theme became a much larger and nobler concept. No longer is it limited to setting apart a cemetery and its dead, but embraces a whole nation and its living, "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Lincoln not only dedicated a cemetery; he dedicated a nation to the eternal cause of freedom throughout the earth: "It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced * * * that we here highly resolve * * * that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Thus a theme that had its genesis in the prosaic setting apart of a burial ground ended magnificently embracing the earth and man's ageless struggle for freedom. How much further could an idea be extended? Who else has taken such ordinary clay and molded a masterpiece that will survive the centuries?

Whither Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, some years back Leo Durocher, who was never very concerned during his long baseball career over his "public image", but very much concerned with winning, commented that: "The nice guys finish last".

It certainly looks as if we, with our policy of being nice to everyone for fear of stepping on someone's toes, are in danger of finishing last insofar as the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations are concerned. Certainly, we seem to have failed to make a hit with Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia, who arranged the recent Belgrade Conference and, himself, followed the Red line throughout its deliberations. One cannot help but wonder what his tack would have been if it had been the United States instead of the Soviet Union that had announced, just before the opening of his conference, that it was about to commence atmospheric nuclear testing once again.

I think it is time that we again started formulating our foreign policy on the basis of what is good for America, and to get over what appears to be our obsessive fear of the opinion of the rest of the world. I also think it is time we tried to sort out the bad guys from the good guys in the so-called "neutralist" camp too, and it is, therefore, most gratifying to note the fact that President Kennedy, on signing the recent foreign-aid authorization bill, said that, from now on, "* * * we should give great attention and consideration to those nations who have our views of the world crisis".

As evidence that this problem has caught the attention of the Nation, and that the President will have its support in any more-realistic distribution of our largesse than heretofore, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the following two excellent editorials on this subject, the first from the Evening Press of Binghamton, N.Y., and the second from the Sun-Bulletin, also of Binghamton, N.Y., both of which editorials appeared on the same day, September 8, 1961:

[From the Evening Press, Binghamton, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1961]

HOW NEUTRAL THE NEUTRALISTS?

Leaders of the 25 nonalined nations meeting at Belgrade have completed their sessions after finding much fault with the United States and little with Russia.

The Titos, Nehrus, Nassers & Co. long have known they can verbally blast the United States to kingdom come without loss of U.S. foreign aid. As a matter of fact, the more violent their condemnations of the United States the more U.S. aid they can expect.

These neutralist power boys exemplify more constraint in their judgments of the acts of Russia. At the recent Belgrade meeting, there were wordy abstractions about the disaster of war. The United States was called upon to abandon its naval base at Guantanamo Bay as a threat to the sovereignty of Castro's Cuba.

The neutralists, not so neutral, offered aid to the Algerians in their struggle with France. They talked endlessly about colonialism, but there was nary a word about Russian colonialism, about Russian domination of eastern Europe, about Red Chinese invasion of Tibet, nor about India's refusal to permit a plebiscite in Moslem Kashmir.

Amid the Belgrade babble, not a word was spoken in condemnation of Russian aggression. Most words spoken followed and supported the Khrushchev propaganda line. Nehru has said that Khrushchev was justified in barricading East Berlin from West Berlin.

No voices were raised at Belgrade in support of the principles of peace and international justice. There was no marshaling of moral forces against those out to destroy all human freedom.

Why should anything be expected from the meeting of power politicians at Belgrade? They were not true seekers after peace. They were not men upholding principles. They were men seeking aggrandizement of personal power and advantage in the international arena.

The neutralists, playing both sides of the street and loyal to no principles, are willing to take anybody's money. And Uncle Sam is a ninny to think he can buy their friendship.

President Kennedy put the issue in true perspective this week when he said: "It is my belief that in the administration of these funds (foreign aid) we should give great attention and consideration to those nations who have our view of the world crisis."

Nehru, neutral on the side of Moscow, and Tito the Communist should be booted off the U.S. foreign aid gravy train. So should others of the "nonalined" who know no principles beyond striving to be on the winning side.

Neutralism is a psychological contradiction in this or any other world. There can be no neutralism between right and wrong—between communism and freedom, between slavery and human decency.

[From the Sun-Bulletin, Binghamton, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1961]

NEUTRALISM

The trouble with neutralism is that it is an empty philosophy.

There are two powerful ideas in the world today. One is the Communist idea, which promises material rewards in the nebulous future and operates within the framework of authoritarian discipline. The other is the idea of freedom, which considers the individual more important than the state and which has proved, in some countries, that it can offer great material well-being right now.

One is a bully, which can start and stop wars at the whim of a ruling clique, which can heedlessly poison the air with radioactive fallout on a moment's notice, which can distort ordinary means of communication and human understanding into weapons of imperialism.

The other is a system which enjoys the strengths and weaknesses of freedom, which operates well only when the solemn pledge is honored and the law of nations observed, which must move slowly within an atmosphere of argument and controversy, which can react strongly in self-defense but is often weak on the offensive.

To say, as the neutralists do, that these two ideas are equal, and that some nations can be magnificently disinterested in whether one or the other survives, is either to confess moral bankruptcy or to help the bully.

The best proof of this came in the neutralist appeal to the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate their differences. The United States has always been willing to negotiate on burning issues. So has the Soviet Union. The difference between the two great nations is that the United States usually enters such negotiations with a genuine desire for a successful conclusion of the negotiations. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, considers negotiation to be an end in itself, another weapon in its struggle to rule the world.

Look at what happened to the meetings in Geneva, which were supposed to bring about an agreement to end nuclear testing once and for all. No agreement was reached, because of Soviet intransigence. Indeed, when the United States went very far to meet the original Soviet demands, the Kremlin welshed on its own demands and wound up announcing that it would resume nuclear testing.

The Belgrade appeal would have been a more serious document if it had recognized that in international affairs, as in human affairs, there is a difference between right and wrong, between good and evil. Instead, the doctrine of noncommital appears to mean that the neutralists continue to take no sides in the conflict between good and evil. This is not exactly the most valuable contribution to the cause of humanity.

Donated by the People of the United States Under the Kennedy Catholic Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a column by Miss Dorothy Kilgallen, which is thought provoking.

Many Members have expressed an interest in the contents of this article and the accuracy of the information supplied to Miss Kilgallen.

I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with Miss Kilgallen and, based on the information supplied, I am convinced she accurately reported the information as supplied to her.

Further comment on this matter will be submitted at a later date.

The article follows:

COBWEB POISONING STRIKES STAR OF SPOOK FILMS, ENDS HER TOUR

(By Dorothy Kilgallen)

Barbara Steele, the Liz Taylor of the spook films, has had to cancel her personal appearance tour on behalf of "The Pit and the Pendulum." She flew back to Hollywood from Chicago with a temperature of 104. Jim Nicholson, president of American-International Pictures, arrived in New York from Europe and dashed to the west coast immediately, greatly concerned over his star's condition.

The first doctor to examine Barbara after she complained of not feeling well diagnosed her illness as "cobweb poisoning," believe it or not; in other words, she'd inhaled too much of the spray used to make cobwebs on movie sets. At any rate, her 22-city tour is off.

Communique from a seaman whose identity is withheld for obvious reasons: "I have just returned from South America and north Africa. Giveaway flour and wheat to Colombia, Morocco, Libya, and others—tons of it—doesn't seem to be reaching the needy.

"In Colombia, the people were storming the ship's garbage cans. In Casablanca, hungry men and women were stopped by armed police from scooping up grains of wheat on the wharf. I asked scores of people in Buenaventura what happens to the wheat down there—donated by the people of the United States under the Kennedy Catholic aid program marked on each bag. To the hospitals? No. To the schools? No. Then where does it go?"

It might be worth finding out since an American flagship carrying this bounty costs $3,000 to run. The trouble about these international transactions is that those who know do not speak and those who speak do not know. But if even a portion of the giveaway stuff is falling into the most deserving hands there is no doubt that the Americans are receiving more kicks than kudos for it. Ask any American seaman—he needs a bodyguard in most places.

It reminds me of what Churchill said in 1941 when his chief of staff told him that so-and-so hated the P.M. "I can't think why; I've never done him any favors."

Both Audrey Hepburn and Shirley MacLaine were saddened by the news of the sudden death of writer Cameron Shipp. The well-known magazine profiler had recently completed assignments as unit publicity man for their latest films, "Breakfast at Tiffany's" and "My Geisha," and their admiration for him was boundless.

Ted Williams spent the day at the Lido on Long Island with glamor girl Neva More, and went almost completely unrecognized. He was in disguise, for him—he wore a necktie.

Freddy Wittop, who will design the costumes for the Broadway musical "Subways Are for Sleeping," has lived in New York for 20 years but took his first subway ride last week because of his new assignment.

Report to the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I take pleasure in introducing into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "A Report to the AMA." The article was written by Mr. Frank Getlein, the art critic of our Washington Evening Star, and comes from his forthcoming book, "A Modern Demonology."

I introduce this article, Mr. Speaker, partly for the amusement of my fellow Members of Congress. Our is a serious business, and it is all too infrequently that such a delightful treatment of an issue with which we are all concerned comes across my desk.

But I urge my fellow Members to give this article a second reading. As is the case with many spoofs of the special interests which we are, from time to time, called upon to deal, there is a great amount of truth among the entertainment.

The article follows:

A REPORT TO THE AMA

(By Frank Getlein)

Today, gentlemen, medicine faces its gravest crisis since the rise of chiropractic. Once again we are surrounded by demons. They are stronger than ever. They come at us from all directions. And, there is no use kidding ourselves, in recent years they have gained much ground and from these gains they are in a much better position to press their attack to its logical conclusion, namely, the death of organized medicine as we know it today.

The cry today is for medical care for the old folks. But you know and I know that medical care for the old folks will be but the prelude to universal health insurance for all, or socialized medicine.

On the odd chance that there are among you some who doubt the inevitability of this sequence, let me remind the convention of my own humble and, I regret to say, futile part in warning the members against the early signs of the dread disease when first they appeared. The first symptoms, you will recall, centered on the request for prepaid group insurance for hospital care. The whole thing was said to have no relationship at all to doctors but merely to be a helpful budgeting device for potential patients. Many in the profession, I am sorry to have to recall, were deceived by this plea and went along with the request. For myself and a few others, as soon as we spotted the word "group," we knew we were in the presence of socialism. We said so at the time, we have said so ever since, and we say so today. Anything that casts even the slightest shadow over the sacred relationship between the doctor and his patient's finances is socialism.

As we predicted, it was not long before the next stage set in: The impertinent demand that doctor fees too be insured against, as if we were a kind of natural disaster. Over our protest, the profession again acceded to the socialist demons. Rate schedules for doctors were set up, like those for air travel or Caribbean cruises. Doctors were paid, not by the patient, but by the group, as if a group ever had consumption, vapors, or tired blood.

The key point, however, was that fees were known in advance. We were deep in trouble, but there was worse to come. The rate of progress of the disease became terrifying. First, there was treason within the profession. Young doctors, motivated by a false idealism, joined together in group practice. Even as the British rose to Benedict Arnold, demoniacal labor unions embraced these traitors. Unions built their own hospitals. They formed their own groups and pushed the whole insurance scheme into preventive medicine. Worst of all, they laid rough and untrained hands upon the very heart of the science of healing; they began the first study by outsiders of medical costs.

Now the disease has reached its climax. Socialized medicine—under various more palatable names—is the avowed goal of wide areas of the population and even the Government. If it comes—and we cannot be optimistic that it won't—the profession will be ruined. Bureaucrats will demand a fixed scale of prices. The frontiers of free enterprise will be fenced in. The advance of medicine will grind to a halt. I, for one, freely predict that, if we are socialized, many of the profession's brightest lights will return, in sorrow, to the mother trade, barbering, where at least they'll get tips.

One of our greatest problems is communicating our concern to our patients. "After all, what difference does it make?" is a question asked by people of good will and small brain. "Look to England," they go on, "surely the citizens there are better off medically than they used to be?"

Well may they say, "Look at England." Look at her. Every tatterdemalion lounger and loiterer in London sports a wig and a set of false teeth, while the empire's gone glimmering after Babylon and Tyre. That's what socialized medicine's done for England.

What we have to get across to patients and to voters is the fundamental connection between the fee system and the march of medicine. Without fees, and big ones ,too, there would have been no wonder drugs, no antibiotics, no tranquilizers, no Paul de Kruif. Once upon a time, you know, we had socialized medicine. When we were all barbers, we were thoroughly socialized, employees of the State in military or courtly service. What did you get then in the line of treatment? You get leeches and bloodletting generally. You got herbs and rare earths. You got the water cure. You got the phases of the moon. You got cysters of simply enormous sizes. The best thing a doctor could do for you then was to give you a shave and a haircut.

Two bits.

Just about what the treatments were worth. This system continued basically right into this century, with the doctor a kind of community functionary, handing out folk remedies to the folks and taking his pay in chickens and parsnips, much like the parson.

Abruptly, everything changed. The march of medicine began. We cured syphillis, typhoid, bubonic plague. We discovered aller-

gies and psychoanalysis, two of the most fruitful fields a man can enter. Geriatrics, pediatrics, gynecology, and many others came out of the nowhere, and mankind climbed steeply toward a new era of tranquillity. What brought all this on?

In a word: Cash.

When America moved from the country into town, people no longer had the poultry and produce they used to pay their doctors with. They had to pay cash. Doctors moved from the lower middle class to the middle middle class to the upper middle class. They got rich. And, as in every other breakthrough on the frontiers of free enterprise from the spinning Jenny to the singing commercial, the benefits filtered down from those on top, the entrepreneurs, to those on the bottom, the customers. For example, we have been so successful in fighting infant mortality that we've had to go in for birth control. Other beneficiaries are the oil-well business, the modern-art business, and the travel business.

This has happened because the fee system is solidly rooted in Nature herself. I daresay there isn't a doctor in the house who hasn't said to his patients, "We don't cure you; we only cooperate with nature."

Nowhere is that cooperation more direct and more effective than in the therapeutic application of fees, based as they are on the patient's ability to pay, with just a touch added on top of that ability. It is precisely that touch, calculated with exquisite delicacy and applied with the inexorability of doom, that has made America the healthiest Nation of its size in history. The constant presence of that touch activates nature, and nature, deep in the patient's subconscious, keeps him healthy most of the time and gets him healthy fast when he does fall sick.

We tamper with nature at our peril.

However clear this fundamental rule of healing is to us, we must admit that the general public does not understand it and the Members of Congress understand it least of all. It must therefore be our constant concern to get the point across. I have nothing but commendation for those doctors who, for the last several years, have been prefacing each consultation with little sermonettes on socialized medicine and the sanctity of the patient-doctor relationship. Medical research has shown these to be extra effective when given as anesthesia is taking hold just before a major operation.

It is vital, of course, to keep up your payments to the emergency fund in Washington. We have for long had the largest lobby in town, but we must increase our staff and increase our efforts. The population explosion and the creation of new States of the Union have been sending new Members of Congress to the capital yearly. Our people must meet them all, carry their bags, get them a cab, and in general show them that doctors are their friends. Naturally, this takes financial support; I can assure you that there is no better investment and, like most of you, I'm something of an expert in the investment field.

Some imaginative freedom fighters have combined these two techniques. Heavy givers to the emergency fund, they have prorated their donations among their patients and explained, by a sticker on the statement, that the surcharge will cease when the socializing threat ceases. The sticker also has room for the name of the Congressman to write to. For anyone wishing to join the effort, a stack of statement-stickers will be found, appropriately, in the lobby.

But whether, as an individual practitioner, you adopt these new medical techniques or just continue in the invaluable, day-in, day-out campaign of doubling all fees when groups are involved, I urge eternal vigilance and renewed dedication to the professional ideal expressed in the chorus of the Hymn to Hippocrates:

Don't let them take it away.

Israel: A David in a World of Goliaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report of September 18, 1961, has published a most timely statement on the great spiritual, economic and governmental progress of the State of Israel.

It is my opinion that there is enough significance attached to this article to have it become a part of this RECORD.

The article follows:

ISRAEL: A DAVID IN A WORLD OF GOLIATHS

(At a time when great nations are worrying about survival—look at tiny Israel. Here is what is being done by a country of few people, with almost no natural resources—and surrounded by enemies.)

As a nation, Israel is only 13 years old. In area, it is smaller than Massachusetts. It has only 2.1 million inhabitants—about the same number as the city of Philadelphia.

Yet Israel already has entered the space age. It fired a solid-fuel rocket 50 miles into the ionosphere last July 5, and now is aiming at higher altitudes.

Israel long has been in the atomic age, with one big uranium reactor in operation and with a larger reactor under construction.

In developing solar energy, Israel is among the world's leaders. For 6 years it has been marketing solar water heaters and is now developing solar refrigerators and air conditioners. An experimental plant is producing steam power from solar energy.

Located in a part of the world that is mostly underdeveloped and scientifically backward, Israel has established itself among the most advanced nations of the world in technology.

MILITARY POWER: IMPRESSIVE

Surrounded by hostile Arab nations, which outnumber Israelis many times in manpower, Israel has built a military force that twice has proved more than a match for its Arab foes.

The Israeli Army is recognized as one of the strongest in the Mideast.

Military equipment made in Israel is being exported to Europe. The Dutch Defense Ministry recently placed a substantial order for Israel's "Uzi" machine pistols. Israel produces its own jet trainer planes and soon will enter the field of commercial aviation with a twin-engine jet aircraft design and built in Israel.

Although there is a shortage of almost all kinds of natural resources, Israel is economic self-sufficiency from its barren soil.

With a shortage of native iron ore, Israel has pioneered in developing a structural concrete which require a minimum of steel, and has become one of the world's leading exporters of concrete. In Israel, tall buildings—up to 20 stories—are built with hardly any steel girders.

Although the young nation's land has no diamond mines, Israel has become a world leader in diamond cutting and polishing.

Israel has no timber, yet is a large producer and exporter of plywood, made of lumber imported from Africa.

INGENIOUS WITH WATER

Water is seriously short in most of Israel. So the Israelis have developed a number of ingenious ways to overcome that shortage. This country's agriculture is based on irrigation. The entire country is criss-crossed by a gird of underground pipelines. The Jerusalem area gets all its water through pipes from the costal plains. Plans for settling the Negev Desert area call for piping water into that arid region.

Schemes to desalinate sea water are far advanced here. Brackish water is already being made usable for agriculture economically. Water is soon to be taken from the Red Sea for both drinking and irrigation.

Well over 80 percent of Israel's consumer goods are home manufactured. Such things as record players, radios and refrigerators are even exported. Automobiles, trucks and buses are assembled here, with many of their components manufactured here. Israel has to import its wool and leather, but the nation produces all its own clothing and footwear.

In scientific research, Israel scientists frequently come up with original discoveries that are sold abroad.

ONLY SURPLUS: TALENT

The only natural resource that Israel has in abundance is its supply of engineers, scientists, doctors and skilled technicians. In many of these fields, Israel has a surplus.

So now Israel is exporting its technical know-how to many of the less-advanced nations that surround Israel in Asia and Africa.

Some of this export is aimed at winning friends among Israel's unfriendly neighbors. Even Arab countries that are openly hostile to Israel are accepting the help of Israel experts and technicians.

In all, more than 700 Israelis are working in 35 countries, helping them to modernize their industries, economies and even their armed forces.

When Israel declared itself an independent nation in 1948, the odds seemed high against its survival.

Now Israel is being watched by old as well as new nations around the world as evidence of what a determined people can do against great odds.

Tribute to a Wise and Farsighted Police Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ralph McGill, one of the most distinguished of American newspapermen, that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 10, 1961. Let us hope that Atlanta's example will inspire other cities and communities in this country to do as much good with as much dignity.

The article follows:

THE COPS WROTE THEMES

(By Ralph McGill)

Add notes on southern scene: A somewhat bored reporter, on the third day after Atlanta's calm and incident-free desegregation of high schools said, as he prepared to quit the city: "Get Bruce Catton to write this. Let him call it A Stillness at Atlanta."

Perhaps the best behind-the-scenes chapter of this story of southern people at their best is that of Police Chief Herbert Jenkins. His origin was rural Georgia. He worked hard, was self-taught, and has been a churchgoing man.

The finest tribute paid him was by one of his own officers. Two days after the quiet,

well received process of desegregation, one of his sergeants said, in conversation with a newspaperman:

"You know, I found myself out there at one of the schools all keyed up to do my job as a policeman. There was a time to wait and I found myself thinking that I was surprised at myself. I really have been opposed to desegregation. I have had maybe the usual southern attitude about Negroes.

"It was not more than 3 or 4 years ago," he continued, "I was surprised to find myself saying Negroes instead of niggers—as I had grown up to say. I guess maybe I wish even now that things were the same. But what puzzled me was that on the morning the desegregation was to take place I was dead determined that the thing would go off without any hoodlums or fanatics, especially the juvenile punks, doing anything to harm the children who were coming to school. And I found myself admiring, somewhat to my astonishment, the Negro kids. I wondered what they and their families had felt and talked about the 2 or 3 days before school. I admitted to myself they had courage.

"You know why I felt like this—as well as a lot of others on the force? It's the chief. He has been having us read things issued by the Government and sources we believed in. He saw to it we studied what happened at Little Rock, New Orleans, Birmingham, Anniston, and Montgomery. Maybe the worst was in Alabama. Maybe you saw what that judge said about the Montgomery police force. A cop has pride in being a cop. It made you ashamed to read about those in Alabama.

"But the chief did something else. He had us do homework. We had to write themes. My boy sure kidded me. There I was, at home, trying to write a theme. And all the rest of us doing the same. Imagine, sweating over a theme. The chief had given us a factual report on law enforcement in southern cities where there had been trouble. We each had to write 300 words of evaluation on it. You reckon there is another police force in the Nation where the officers have to write themes? A lot of the boys didn't like it. Not at first. But later they all took a sort of pride in it. A cop is a human being. And the chief was, in effect, saying to us, 'Look, study this. You are not dopes. Write what you think about it.'

"So, we did," he said. "We came to see what had happened in other cities. The worst are the teenagers. I guess they need psychiatric help. But, a cop has to contend with them when they are what they are. Whatever it was that got them off on the wrong track and made them problem kids happened before the cop meets with them. He is not a contributing factor. He is confronted with a teenager who has a grudge against life or who is one of those who says, after he has killed someone, or maimed someone, he guesses he was seeking a thrill. Or, he is one who has been paid $5 to create an incident. He has a knife, or a gun, or he will pick up rocks or a stick and slug schoolchildren or teachers. The cop must act. The loss of a minute and the damage has been done.

"In all these other cities the teenage problem crowd was the hard core of the mobs and the rioters. The chief impressed on us that we could think what we liked—but that we were the arm of the law. Enforcement of the law is our job. Also, in our study, we got a new pride in our town.

"Anyhow," he said, "there wasn't any trouble. I saw the young Negro kids come in, well dressed and polite as the others. And I decided this couldn't really be so wrong. So, pretty soon school was out and everyone seemed glad that at last the long-anticipated day had come and gone. But we couldn't have done it without the chief. He is a teacher as well as a chief. My boy keeps asking me when I am going to have some more homework."

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues the following brief pamphlet published recently by the National Farmers Union. Its message is the most human of all: technological advances in agriculture have now—for the first time in history—made it possible to feed adequately the whole of the vast multitudes of the world.

The burden of this responsibility lies with America and food for peace is, perhaps, the most noteworthy contribution we can make to the settlement of the world's problems.

The text of the pamphlet follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE

The hunger of human beings is among the oldest and most compelling problems of man's history. For thousands of years, human conflict and pestilence have stemmed in large part from man's inability to wrest from the soil enough food to satisfy his needs.

In our own day, the cold war feeds upon this same failure of food supply. Frequently the titanic struggle between totalitarian and the free worlds focuses upon the simple question: "How can we get bread?"—a query asked with new insistence by millions of fathers and mothers all over the world.

The question is old because hunger, acute and chronic, is an ancient reality. But the accent and insistency are new because the fact of vast abundance in some nations and the possibility to secure sufficiency for all nations are the glad tidings and new promise of our age.

For the first time in history, the capacity now exists to wipe out starvation and its attendant evils in the entire human family. Today's imperative is to so distribute current abundance that it not only feeds the hungry but, along with other worldwide efforts, promotes technical development and economic growth.

This abundance is a blessing. The power to produce more abundantly is a greater blessing still. Instead of viewing our good earth and her hundred-fold fruits as paralyzing perplexities, we must give thanks to God and we must apply our full powers to fulfill His will for all the human family.

Only to preach peace and freedom as Judeo-Christian principles to people still held by hunger, at a time when we have abundance to remove their bonds, is hypocrisy. The living word must give life to deeds. Abstract justice and charity are not enough. These virtues by themselves cannot teach how best to work the land. They cannot turn waste areas into fields of plenty. They cannot instruct millions of mothers in choosing a rounded diet. Justice and charity become lifegiving through laws and programs, agencies and projects, staffs and tools.

Food and fiber, combined with well-coordinated programs of technical and economical assistance, can be used to build a better economic foundation for emerging nations. Long-range commitments of food and fiber can act as a basis for their overall programs of socioeconomic development.

Men who obtain enough food for themselves and their families will readily devote their energies and intelligence to achieving new and betters ways of life through education and application to economic activity.

Great strides have been taken in recent years by the technically advanced nations in helping to raise standards of life in developing areas of the world. But much work needs to be done.

Roughly three-fourths of the people in the developing nations are engaged in agriculture. Still, they do not produce enough to feed themselves. They do not harvest enough variety to provide their people with nutritious diets. Many of our neighbors are still using primitive tools, and applying ancient farming methods. Frequently, prolonged drought and other natural catastrophes destroy much of the already meager harvest. Disease often wipes out livestock in wide areas.

A beginning has been made to make available to needy nations the kind of food which more nearly meet the requirements of a health-giving diet. Donor nations might well encourage their farmers to grow more of the foods rich in protein and convert more of the starchy foods into meats and fats. A contribution of such foods would be vastly more beneficial to the people of the developing nations.

Token technical assistance to date demonstrates what can be done. A program of the Food and Agriculture Organization has made an attack upon rinderpest, for years the greatest killer disease of livestock. An English doctor with a simple serum, used widely in advanced nations, stopped the spread of the disease among the food animals of Thailand. The disease had killed virtually all the animal life in some sections of the country the year before.

Instruction in conservation and the use of fertilizer has already doubled the harvest in some regions. More than a third of the earth cannot be put to effective use because lack of rainfall makes it difficult, if not impossible, for plants, animals, and men to survive. The arid zone research jointly engaged in by FAO and UNESCO is reclaiming land for productive use as fast as research can be applied to actual programs. The construction of dams, reservoirs, and irrigation ditches has already turned some desert lands into productive fields in parts of Africa and the Middle East.

But mankind has only begun to utilize the productive potential of the earth. He has only begun to rejuvenate the soil of the tired old earth.

Much machinery is already available to bring technical assistance to developing nations. Some Western countries, working individually, have initiated aid programs on a small scale. Through the United Nations and voluntary organizations, advanced nations have joined together for a combined effort.

The FAO of the United Nations is working in many ways to improve farm production and distribution of food and fiber throughout the world. Improved land use and tenure, vaccination, and crossbreeding of animals, and nutritional diets, are just some of the provinces in which the Organization is concerned. Through its new freedom from hunger campaign, it is alerting people everywhere to the need for national action programs seeking to free the world from hunger by means of increased production and improved distribution. UNICEF and the World Health Organization (WHO) are working to distribute food and improve diets of undernourished peoples.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) brings together farm leaders and farm organizations throughout the world. IFAP has long worked for progress toward an international food policy to be subscribed to by the governments of IFAP member organizations, and the emerging nations as well.

CARE, CROP, the Heifer Project, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish relief services, agricultural missions, and other church and lay programs are making significant voluntary efforts. These agencies, however, are

working with limited budgets. Other major steps have been proposed and are needed. Among these is a proposal for a World Food Board, including an international food and fiber reserve. Such a food "bank" could make possible effective distribution from areas of abundance to areas of need. The Food for Peace program of our own Government is doing much and, with an increased understanding among the American people, can accomplish vastly more to make meaningful use of our tremendous productive capacity applied to the food needs of hungry people.

The long-range effect of all such programs, however, will depend upon the immediate distribution of world abundance where it is needed, in workable ways that will not disrupt or harm the economies of the receiving countries. Most developing nations cannot afford to import commercially the food and fiber they need. What some nations do import is usually purchased at the expense of other programs, such as schools, hospitals, and irrigation and drainage systems.

A great obstacle to the development of nations stems from the fact that much of their manpower is tied up in agriculture. Commitments of food and fiber, coupled with technological assistance, can free more of the working force for industrial development, increase the social services, and serve to implement improved production techniques in agriculture. These developments, in turn, would provide jobs and income for more people, bringing the economy of the Nation as a whole into better balance.

To assure maximum benefit from our American abundance, programs of social and economic assistance should be entirely separated from defense or security projects. Our food and fiber are tools for peace.

As citizens of the United States, we particularly commend our food-for-peace program, currently receiving new impetus. This great demonstration of the American people for the hungry of the world conforms to our moral responsibilities and demands our continuing support.

This is the promise and the challenge of today. Free nations are preparing the soil for peace rather than war. The seeds of peace are being planted in the fertile soil of advanced nations as the product of the fields is applied to needs of the human family.

Can we nourish these seeds more rapidly than the seeds of war growing now in far-flung fields of underdeveloped nations?

There can be no enduring peace and freedom with half the world enslaved to hunger. There is no more compelling a master.

The free nations of the world spend billions each year for protection against war. We still spend so little for peace.

We, the undersigned, impelled by our religious convictions, are determined to strive for real peace within the human family, peace where there is no hunger or poverty.

The food-for-peace program is endorsed by the following:

From the Protestant community:
Rev. Norman J. Baugher, Elgin, Ill.
Prof. John C. Bennett, New York, N.Y.
Rev. James R. Bullock, Jackson, Tenn.
Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Howard A. Cowden, Kansas City, Mo.
Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Purd Dietz, St. Louis Mo.
Dr. Harold C. Fey, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. George Forrell, Maywood, Ill.
Rev. Luther A. Gotwald, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Shirley E. Greene, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Cameron P. Hall, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Reginald Helferich, St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Fred Hoskins, New York, N.Y.
Dr. F. Ernest Johnson, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Benson Y. Landis, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Arthur C. Lichtenberger, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Edgar A. Love, Baltimore, Md.
Rev. Kenneth L. Maxwell, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Edward O. Moe, Lansing, Mich.
Rev. Ira W. Moomaw, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Ray Newton, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Paul C. Payne, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Clarence Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, San Francisco, Calif.
Rev. Clyde Rogers, Columbus, Ohio.
Rev. W. Harold Row, Elgin, Ill.
Mr. Mervin G. Smith, Columbus, Ohio.
Dr. James E. Wagner, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mr. Lloyd C. Wicke, New York, N.Y.
Rev. Willard M. Wickizer, Indianapolis, Ind.
Rev. Herman Will, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
From the Catholic community:
Most Rev. Leo A. Pursley, D.D., Episcopal adviser, NCRLC.
Most Rev. Joseph M. Marling, D.D., president, NCRLC.
Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, D.D., executive director, Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.
Rev. Anthony J. Adams, S.J., Pueblo, Colo.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Urban Baer, Eastman, Wis.
Rev. Francis A. Candon, Fairfield, Vt.
Rev. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., New York, N.Y.
Rev. Michael P. Dineen, Milwaukee. Wis.
Rev. Edward Duff, S.J., St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. Roy Figlino, Brighton, Colo.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. F. Frommherz, Ottoville, Ohio.
Rev. Joseph B. Gremillion, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Washington, D.C.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. George J. Hildner, Villa Ridge, Mo.
Rev. Joseph Hylden, Grafton, N. Dak.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi G. Ligutti, Vatican City, Europe.
Miss Julia F. Maguire, Topeka, Kans.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. McCarthy, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Mary Jean McGrath, Madison, Wis.
Rev. Frederick McGuire, C.M., Washington, D.C.
Miss Margaret Mealey, Washington, D.C.
Mr. F. Robert Melina, New York, N.Y.
Rev. George M. Nell, Island Grove, Ill.
Mr. James J. Norris, New York, N.Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D.C.
Rev. Edward W. O'Rourke, Des Moines, Iowa.
Miss Betsy Phelan, Kansas City, Mo.
Rev. Francis J. Phelan, Eagle Grove, Iowa.
Dr. Paul Sacco, New Orleans, La.
Mr. Martin Salm, Chilton, Wis.
Dr. Elmer L. Sauer, Champaign, Ill.
Rev. Wilfred J. Schuster, Madison, Wis.
Mr. Edward S. Skillin, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Paul C. Taff, Ames, Iowa.
Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., Washington, D.C.
Rev. John George Weber, Des Moines, Iowa.
Mr. Donald Willette, Delavan, Minn.
Mr. Martin H. Work, Washington, D.C.
From the Jewish community:
Judge Emil N. Baar, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Samuel Belkin, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Rochester, N.Y.
Mr. Norman Cousins, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Herbert Ehrmann, Brookline, Mass.
Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Irving Jay Fain, Providence, R.I.
Mr. Moses Feuerstein, Lawrence, Mass.
Dr. Louis Finkelstein, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Nelson Glueck, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Mr. I. Cyrus Gordon, Rockville Centre, N.Y.
Rabbi Harry Halpern, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Adolph Held, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Charles Hymes, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Morris Iushewitz, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Bernath Jacobs, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Irving Kane, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mr. Label A. Katz, New Orleans, La.
Mr. Philip M. Klutznick, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Isaiah Minkoff, New York, N.Y.
Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Theodore Norman, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Jacob Pat, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Joachim Prinz, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Bernard Segal, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Albert Vorspan, New York, N.Y.
Mr. Lewis H. Weinstein, Boston, Mass.
Dr. Samson Weiss, New York, N.Y.

Nuclear Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the dimensions of the problem now confronting us over Germany have never been more sharply or dramatically stated than by Walter Lippmann in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. Lippmann has correctly pointed out that the destructiveness of nuclear weapons—weapons which can easily destroy our world as we know it today—leave us with no historical precedents with which to deal with our present crisis.

He has clearly explained that while nuclear war would be lunacy, it is a possibility if one side miscalculates the breaking point of the other, and he has described some of these critical areas.

Recognizing these factors, Mr. Lippmann has stated in ringing terms a paramount rule of international politics in this nuclear age "that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation."

This is a penetrating and timely article, Mr. Speaker, which comes at a moment when our country stands in great peril. I urge my colleagues to give this essay their close attention:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom, to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter

over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summitry began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism, but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the prenuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a hundred million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smouldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes wars, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the United States nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely it is an ever-present possibility, Why? Because, however, irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there is no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

Surplus Properties for YM and YWCA's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

My bill would broaden the eligibility of recipients of surplus property under the law to allow certain tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare and recreation agencies to take advantage of surplus properties being disposed of by the Government. Under the present law, these properties may be donated only to schools, colleges, civil defense organizations, medical institutions, health centers, and related institutions.

These agencies, which would be added to the eligibility list to receive donable surplus property, contribute significantly to our society and our way of life. These agencies, the YM and YWCA's, religious groups of all denominations, boys clubs, and the like are a valuable asset to our Nation. They deal with the bodies and souls of our citizens and make contributions to their betterment.

The donation of surplus properties to these agencies will enable them to expand their programs. Every little help to these agencies is valuable to them, and the people they serve.

The spirit of charity, which prevails in America, has spurred outstanding activity in the field of privately supported welfare and recreation agencies. This bill seeks to enable these agencies to take advantage of surplus material to expand their program. I urge prompt and favorable committee action on this measure.

Progress Report on National Milk Sanitation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the September 11, 1961, Capital Times, Madison, Wis., which reviews the progress that has been made on national milk sanitation legislation. My colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, is the author of this bill and has been working hard for the past 5 years to secure its passage and enactment into law. While I was not a Member of Congress when he introduced his first national milk sanitation bill in the 85th Congress, I was glad to join him in introducing and supporting this very important and worthwhile measure in the 86th and 87th Congresses.

The editorial follows:

DAIRY FARMERS IN STATE GET BOOST FROM FREEMAN

Dairy farmers in Wisconsin and other Midwestern States have just been given a big boost by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who has recently come out in favor of a bill to eliminate unrealistic barriers that hamper the interstate flow of milk.

The bill is sponsored by Congressman LESTER JOHNSON (Democrat, Black River Falls). JOHNSON tried in vain for several years to get Agriculture Department support for the move from Ezra Benson. With a change in administrations, and a change in philosophy in the Department, JOHNSON stands on the verge of success. Now several

Congressmen—including many Republicans—from the Midwest have climbed on the bandwagon.

At present there are scores of State and local sanitary rules and inspection requirements which serve as a wall holding back the free flow of milk. JOHNSON and his supporters—now including the Secretary of Agriculture—want a uniform national code for milk sanitary standards. They believe this code will give consumers ample protection and at the same time treat all dairymen alike.

As the Midland Cooperator points out, the bill would not be a cure-all for the Midwest dairymen. Many difficult problems will remain. Nevertheless the bill would be a step in the right direction.

The Agricultural Law Research Program at the University of North Dakota School of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, the School of Law of the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks has embarked upon a new program of agricultural law research.

Under the direction of Dean O. H. Thormodsgard, of the school of law, Prof. James P. White as director, and Richard H. Skjerven as research associate, have completed the first of their studies "A Survey of Laws Affecting Farm Tenancy in North Dakota."

With the cooperation of Prof. Laurel D. Loftsgard, of the Department of Agricultural Economics of North Dakota State University, as coordinator of this research at that institution and others, these gentlemen have conducted a very thorough study of the laws affecting farm tenancy. They are to be congratulated for the forward step they are taking in this field.

I am pleased to present to you the following excerpt from the North Dakota Law Review, volume 37, April 1961, which outlines this program:

[Reprinted from North Dakota Law Review, vol. 37, Apr. 1961]

THE AGRICULTURAL LAW RESEARCH PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF LAW

In the past several decades various law schools in the United States have become increasingly concerned with activities and concurrent legal problems resulting from their particularized environmental location. Consequently law schools located in areas of industrial development frequently accord specialized consideration to legal problems resulting from this industrialization,[1] while law schools in the Western States have undertaken research in mining law, oil and gas law, and water rights.[2] Law schools in urban areas have been increasingly occupied with various legal—economic—sociological aspects of urbanization.[3] Thus also have law schools in agricultural areas become occupied with problems of agricultural law.[4] North Dakota is located in the most productive agricultural region of the United States. In contrast with the entire Nation, where only 6 percent of total income received by individuals originated in agriculture in 1958, the percentage of agricultural income in North Dakota in the same year was 38 percent.[5] In the same year there was a greater unbalance in North Dakota between income from agriculture and income resulting from manufacturing.[6] North Dakota has tremendous contemporary investment in farmlands and in farm equipment and machinery. Rising land values, greater mechanization of the farming operation, the cost of mechanization, the resulting growth in the average size of farms, and the increasing complexity of the farming operation have created many legal and policy matters about which the University of North Dakota School of Law as a State institution should be concerned and to which it should perform its best service. Service can be performed which will be of great value to members of the legal profession in North Dakota and to their farm clients. There are undoubtedly many aspects of the total farming operation which could be assisted by consultation with and enlightened advice by members of the legal profession.

The School of Law of the University of North Dakota has commenced a program of interdisciplinary research with the North Dakota State University which has for years served the farmers of North Dakota in matters of agricultural science. This program has been designated as the agricultural law research program and was commenced in the 1960–61 academic year. It is most apropos that the University of North Dakota through its school of law and the North Dakota State University through its department of agricultural economics cooperate in furthering legal research which will prove of benefit to agriculture. It is hoped that this program may render public service to the agricultural interests in this State by delineating, through research and writing, the methods in which existing laws may be utilized and new laws may be formulated to further agriculture. It is part of the constructive program of the law, in which legal planning and competent legal advice may prevent unnecessary difficulties and provide the way for more effective action.

Prof. James P. White of the School of Law of the University of North Dakota has been designated by Dean O. H. Thormodsgard as director of this program. Prof. Laurel D. Loftsgard of the Department of Agricultural Economics of North Dakota State University is coordinator of this research at that institution. During the current academic year, Mr. Richard H. Skjerven, a senior in the school of law, has served as research associate in the program at the University of North Dakota School of Law.

With the agricultural law research program established, it will be possible to obtain grants from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, The Farm Foundation, State governmental agencies, and charitable and educational foundations for special research in the agricultural field. Several projects have been completed in this agricultural research program. The study on North Dakota farm tennancy appearing in the current issue of the North Dakota Law Review is the latest study in this continuing program. Former projects completed under this program have been "Family Farming Incorporated,"[7] by Laurel D. Loftsgard and H. W. Herbison; "Taxation of the Family Farm Corporation and Partnership: Variations on a Theme."[8] by James P. White and "Land Purchase Contracts in North Dakota,"[9] by Shelley J. Lashkowitz and Charles L. Crum. Other articles will be forthcoming.

Woodrow Wilson has suggested that "social service is the high law of duty, and every American university must square its standards by that law or lack of its national title."[10] The Agriculutral law research program at the University of North Dakota School of Law is a manifestation of the concept of public service by a university suggested by Woodrow Wilson, by its service to the people of North Dakota. The program envisages and is currently undertaking further cooperative-interdisciplinary studies in legal-economic research. Further areas of contemplated research and exploration exist in the areas of water law and water rights study, further study of farm corporations and farm partnerships, estate planning for the farmer, country rural zoning, fences, weed control, conservation and waste, farm trusts and others. These subjects might be explored and made more meaningful to the North Dakota lawyer and farmer. It is contemplated that during the 1961–62 academic year a legal institute will be held on the campus of the University of North Dakota discussing the relations of law and agriculture in North Dakota. Faculty and staff participants of the Agricultural Law Research program will be and are available as speakers, not only to bar associations but to all segments of the North Dakota State community.

Thus the new agricultural law research program at the University of North Dakota is twofold. The first and most important aspect is sound and basic legal research in the area of agricultural law. The second aspect of the program is public service based upon this research. Both of these functions will be accomplished as postive programs in assisting the progress of North Dakota.

---

[1] An example is the studies of labor-management arbitration at the University of Southern California School of Law. Studies in International Business Ventures at Columbia Law School and the Law—Economics Studies at the University of Chicago.

[2] An example are studies on oil and gas law at the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Southern Methodist University School of Law and the Water Research Institute and the Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation at the University of Colorado.

[3] As an example the Institute of Legal Research at the University of Pennsylvania has recently been studying the operations and legal status of the Philadelphia Tax Review Board and the Law-Medicine Research Institutes of Boston University's School of Law.

[4] The College of Law at the State University of Iowa was the pioneer in this area of inter-disciplinary cooperation. (See 38 Iowa Law Review 10 (1952)). Programs of agricultural research have been instituted in the law schools at the Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Florida, and South Carolina.

[5] "Survey of General Business" (August 1959), table 70 at 24. See also Koenker and Fisher, "Tax Equity in North Dakota" (1960), esp. pp. 2–12.

[6] "Survey of General Business" Ibid.

[7] Circular A–321 January 1960), North Dakota Agricultural College Extension Service, Fargo, N. Dak.

[8] North Dakota Law Review 87 (1960).

[9] 36 North Dakota Law Review 159 (1960), "This article was contributing study in a north central regional research project NC–15, financial support for which was provided by regional research funds."

[10] Stannard and Dodd, "The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson" (6 vols., 1925–27), College and State I, at 457.

Governor Rockefeller's View of State Responsibility in Its Relationship With Its Own Citizens and With the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, recently the 38th Annual American Municipal Congress, sponsored by the American Municipal Association, met in Seattle, Wash., and was addressed by the distinguished Governor of the Empire State, Nelson A. Rockefeller. We in New York are justly proud of the administration and leadership which has been given to our State by Governor Rockefeller. Several examples of the Rockefeller administration's handling of State affairs are included in the Governor's speech and I am sure that his additional remarks concerning the role of State governments and their responsibility to the citizens of the State without constant recourse to Federal assistance will be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

I include the text of Governor Rockefeller's address:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT 38TH ANNUAL AMERICAN MUNICIPAL CONGRESS SPONSORED BY AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION, OLYMPIC HOTEL, SEATTLE, WASH., AUGUST 28, 1961

I am delighted that "Intergovernment Cooperation" is the theme of this conference. No subject could be closer to my heart as a Governor, no subject could be more important to the future growth and development of America.

Let me speak first of the elements of the Governor's relation to municipal government, for the matter to all the entities of local government within the State.

The basic requirement in this relationship is that the Governor and the State recognize and assume their full responsibilities. This requirement is of overriding importance, and it involves four principal elements:

1. Understanding, knowledge and respect for the structure of government and the basic concept of home rule—for the function and roles of the respective entities and levels of government.

2. Close cooperation between the Governor and the legislature to provide the legislative framework within which the municipalities and all forms of local government can function most effectively, and also to provide the specal legislation needed to meet the wide variety of individual problems of local government.

3. Fiscal integrity on the part of State Government to insure a favorable climate for economic growth and to insure adequate financing for State services and State aid to localities.

4. State coordination and leadership in regional planning—in anticipating emerging problems and in fostering intergovernment cooperation which, as your conference theme indicates, is the key to the solution of these problems.

Now let us look at some of the major problems of concern to municipal government in which the State has an important share of the responsibility—finances, education, housing, youth delinquency, commuter transportation, recreation, sewage disposal and highways. If you will forgive me for stressing the problems of one State, I shall deal with these problems on the basis of my personal experiences in New York because I would rather speak in terms of specific action rather than in theories or broad generalities.

First, municipal finances—the vital and increasingly important role of the State in its financial relationship to municipalities is underscored in New York by these facts:

1. New York State aid to localities has increased 500 percent in the past 15 years—having increased from $250 million in 1946 to 1 billion and a quarter dollars in the current fiscal year—a billion dollar increase.

2. State aid to localities is 600 percent greater than Federal aid to localities in New York State—contrary to popular impression.

3. State aid provides, on the average, about one-fourth of all municipal revenues.

In view of the important role that State aid plays in local government finances, the magnitude of its responsibilities to the municipalities is clearly evident. And it is basic to meeting this responsibility: that the State keep its own financial house in order so it can meet its full responsibilities, and that the formulas by which State aid is distributed shall reflect changing local conditions.

Therefore, my first act as Governor of New York was to restore the State's fiscal integrity on a basis of pay-as-you-go financing. With fiscal integrity restored, the result was that the State has been able (for instance) to increase State aid to local public schools by over a quarter of a billion dollars annually, in the past 3 years, out of current revenues.

Another important aspect of fiscal integrity is its effect on economic growth. Just as a fiscally irresponsible family or business cannot prosper, neither can a State or its communities prosper and grow in a climate of fiscal irresponsibility. Economic growth through business and industrial expansion is essential to provide increasing and improved job opportunities as well as sources of increased revenue to meet the demands of a growing population on all levels of government. Improvement of the business climate in New York State has been one of my major objectives, to overcome the problems of unemployment. However, this obviously cannot be accomplished by the State alone but requires the cooperation of all levels of government.

In addition, we have recognized that the time has come to take a fresh look at the State aid formulas themselves. Currently under study are the formulas for both State aid to elementary and secondary education and the amount and formula for per-capita State aid to municipalities.

Second, education—The quarter-billion-dollar increase in State aid to local public school districts brings our total school aid to $800 million a year—more than the cost of the entire State government and its services.

New York State is now paying over 42 percent of the total local public school expenditures in the State.

The basic school aid equalization formula, based on local real estate values (and adopted when Al Smith was Governor) under today's conditions militates against the big cities—with their new and mounting difficulties. A special commission on school financing established by the legislature is therefore conducting a complete review of the formula and, is expected to present recommendations for revision of the legislature next January. The new formula will undoubtedly result in further increases in State aid to elementary and secondary education, particularly in the cities.

At the same time, the commission is also studying possible new sources of revenue for the local school districts, which are presently limited to local real property taxes. I am confident that State and local government, working together, can solve the school-financing problem on a basis of close cooperation, imagination and making hard decisions.

But there is another phase to the problem. The rise in elementary and secondary school enrollment in New York State is now moving on to the field of higher education and producing there a crisis in terms of adequate facilities. To meet this problem, we enacted this year a far-reaching plan for financial assistance to higher education which included: a new program of scholar incentive payments to approximately 120,000 individual students annually; doubling the number of State scholarships to a total of 17,000 annually; providing increased student loans with no interest for the first 5 years; 10-year expansion program of the State university facilities; and a half-billion dollar lease-purchase plan for the Campus Building Construction Authority.

The State's goal is to double higher education facilities (public and private) in the next 10 years, and to triple them in 25 years.

The resulting impact on the cities of this State of assistance to higher education is well illustrated by the fact that the State now puts up almost 45 percent of the expenses of the University of the City of New York. The City University provides free education for 97,000 students. In addition the State will also be directly helping an additional 50,000 students in New York City going to primarily private universities through scholarships and scholar incentive aid.

This clearly illustrates the magnitude of the State's role in meeting one of the major problems of our municipalities—namely, education.

And the State's role in education was further dramatically highlighted last Monday when we had to step in (with unprecedented action at a special session of the legislature) to lift the public school system in the city of New York out of the clutches of local corruption and politics and assure fresh, high-calibre leadership.

I called the special session of the legislature on behalf of the 1 million New York City public school children and their 40,000 dedicated teachers, upon the professional advice of the commissioner of education and the board of regents, in whose hands the State constitution places responsibility for education in the State. This action was made neecssary by a failure of local leadership to do anything of significance in response to repeated disclosures of maladministration, graft, inefficiency, favortism and atrocious neglect of school repairs. The publice had lost confidence in school leadership, and the quality of instruction was threatened. Therefore, the State had to act.

The legislature passed a bill almost unanimously (only a total of seven dissenting votes in both houses) to supersede the existing school board; to create a permanent panel of distinguished educational, professional, and civic leaders to select nominees for new school board members from which the mayor will appoint the board members; to give the new board temporary emergency powers; and at the same time to end political appointment of the 53 local school boards within the city.

Now let me turn to the third area, housing. The problems of housing and urban renewal

are among the most urgent faced by all our municipalities.

In this field, middle-income housing is perhaps the most neglected area. Therefore, to help meet the financial aspect of this need headon, the State created last year a new State housing finance agency, with a bond authority of over half a billion dollars as a start. To date, 41 projects providing 17,400 apartments have been approved under the State's middle-income housing program. Mortgage commitments for these projects total $195 million. And 10 percent of the apartments in each project are set aside to take care of our senior citizens. We are now developing some new ideas which we hope will greatly accelerate this middle-income housing program.

In the field of urban renewal (a vital ingredient in the development of better housing) New York State now pays half the local share of project costs—and does so on a pay-as-you-go basis out of current revenues.

In addition, while most States depend on the Federal Government entirely for loans and subsidies to provide low-income housing, New York State since 1939 has provided $960 million in loan funds and $42 million in annual subsidies for low-income housing, most of which has been used by the city of New York.

The State has an important obligation to help the localities in the housing field, and it is our feeling in New York that the State can act as a catalyst and coordinator in the realization of effective action in this field. The same is true for the urban renewal and low-rent housing programs. In my opinion, the Federal Government should modify its programs to recognize State administration wherever the machinery exists to handle such a delegation of authority. It certainly would be in the interest of efficiency and coordination of effort.

Fourth, youth delinquency. Here, again is a field of major concern to the administration and residents of our municipalities.

In New York State, to assist in meeting this problem, I requested and the legislature established a division for youth, which has undertaken a program embracing advanced concepts which we believe to offer exciting new possibilities not only for the rehabilitation of delinquents but for the prevention of delinquency.

Under this division for youth we are setting up youth training camps to which youths in danger of becoming delinquent because of environment may be referred by appropriate social agencies with family consent, and other camps to which juveniles may be referred by the courts for rehabilitation in lieu of sentencing to reform school. This program also includes a large number of State-operated short-term adolescent retraining centers, and homes for youth needing an improvement environment.

These new programs are in addition to the State's sharing in financial support of the care of juvenile delinquents in local facilities. The division for youth also provides State aid to localities for youth recreation and related projects.

Thus State expenditures to serve youth and combat juvenile delinquency have been stepped up sharply to $24 million this year. We believe this work is of major importance to the future as well as essential to meeting the State responsibility in assisting municipalities with their share of this serious problem of delinquency. Further expansion of this program is contemplated.

And here, once again, we see the broad vistas for State leadership and participation in the handling of problems at the community level.

Fifth, commuter transportation—Here is a critical field of municipal concern, a problem the magnitude of which has been growing by leaps and bounds.

In New York, the State has taken the leadership in effective intergovernment cooperation both at the local and interstate levels:

1. At the 1959 session of the legislature, the State worked out and shared with the localities a program of general tax relief for the railroads amounting to $15 million. Unfortunately, even this drastic action did not remove the threat of bankruptcy from two of our principal commuter roads.

2. Therefore, during the recent 1961 session, we had to take further action, working out cooperative steps with Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, the city of New York and the county of Westchester to reduce further the local tax and other financial burdens on the New Haven Railroad. While unfortunately this did not prevent the railroad's ultimate bankruptcy, it did create improved conditions for continuation of its commuter service under the present trusteeship.

3. In addition, within New York, we worked out a plan whereby the State picks up half of certain additional tax concessions by the localities, and the additional tax relief was made contingent upon improved as well as continued commuter service. To assist the railroads in meeting this stipulation, the State is backing a $100 million Port of New York Authority bond issue to finance lease-purchase of new commuter cars by the railroads.

4. At the present time, I am working with the Governors of Connecticut and New Jersey to establish a tri-state agency to study the entire transportation picture in the New York metropolitan area—with the objective of regional action to achieve major improvement of the whole commuter situation.

And 2 weeks from today, I will be in Washington with the mayors of more than a dozen cities, testifying concerning railroad mergers which vitally affect the economic well-being of the State as a whole, its respective municipalities and the Port of New York in particular.

In this entire field of railroad transportation and commuter service, the State has provided initiative in seeking to meet squarely the growing crisis—which afflicts not only New York but metropolitan areas throughout the country.

Sixth, recreation: In municipalities throughout the Nation, parks and recreational facilities have become an essential ingredient for growth and development—not only for youth but for the entire community.

As in most States, the advance of urbanization is a major problem in New York with respect to assuring adequate park and outdoor recreation facilities for our rapidly growing population, now and for the future. We came to the conclusion that we must act rapidly if we were to acquire and preserve for public use the necessary sites for camping, boat landings, fishing, swimming, water sports, parks and other recreation facilities before they were swallowed up forever or could be obtained only at prohibitive costs.

Therefore, at my request last year, the legislature authorized a $75 million program to purchase such areas. The bill provides State aid to localities for this purpose at a ratio of $3 in State money for every $1 provided locally. This anticipation of the future's needs has met with enthusiastic response from local communities throughout the State, even beyond our expectations. All but 15 percent of the funds has already been committed.

This, again, illustrates the possibilities for far-sighted cooperative action on the part of the State in working with municipalities and other entities of local government to meet new and emerging problems.

There are two other areas of concern to municipalities which entail tremendous financial obligations and vitally affect the lives of their people, namely, arterial highways and sewage disposal.

For example, in New York State the local communities are already faced with the prospect of identified expenditures totaling $1.5 to $2 billion for sewage disposal plants—and the meeting of these expenditures would in many instances involve exceeding the total debt limit of the municipality. At the present time, the State's office for local government is undertaking a major study as to the means of financing these requirements.

As far as arterial highways are concerned, the State is responsible for the engineering, construction, and a major portion of the financing of these roads—and these roads, probably more than any other single factor today, are shaping the future growth and development of most of our municipalities. The magnitude of these projects in terms of money can well be illustrated by the fact that the legislature has authorized arterial highway changes in connection with the 1964 New York World's Fair alone, which will cost a total of $97 million, of which the State's share will be close to $40 million.

Therefore, whether we like it or not, the State finds itself right in the middle of municipal and metropolitan area planning in all its phases relating to transportation, housing, industrial development.

It became clear to me 2 years ago that New York State was neither adequately equipped to coordinate the plans and programs of the various State departments affecting local governments or to integrate these State's plans and programs with those of the local communities. Therefore, to meet this urgent need, I set up in 1959 an office for local government and this year an office for regional development.

The office for local government has fostered joint action among local governments in solving mutual problems, served importantly as a clearinghouse for legislation affecting local government, and as a central point of information. It informs and assists the Governor as to local government problems and the formulation of policies to utilize and coordinate State resources for the benefit of local governments. It also conducts annual workshops on the problems of local government which have importantly stimulated thought and the interchange of information on solutions to these problems.

The new office for regional development, with the guidance of its planning coordination board made up of a commissioner from within the executive branch of State government, has these major functions:

1. To bring about a conscious interrelation of the planning and development activities of the various State agencies;

2. To relate state planning and development to local planning and development and to Federal activities;

3. To spur all levels of government within the State to comprehensive planning and development on a regional basis.

4. To facilitate local planning and development activity by State action.

To my way of thinking, the real challenge of the future in meeting the problems of the metropolitan areas is not to set up some super-structure that would wipe out existing entities of local government. Rather the challenge is to develop a legislative framework and the means for effective cooperation between existing entities of government, with the State assuming its full responsibilities for coordination and leadership as well as financial support.

My own experience of the last 3 years convinces me not only that this can be done but that it must be done if we are to meet our problems within the traditional American framework which holds to the belief that the best government is that government which is the closest to the people.

I am convinced that State government must take a stronger leadership role and is the logical leader of intergovernmental cooperation in the solution of urban and re-

gional problems. I support Federal assistance programs based upon need and the equalization of opportunities for all Americans in pursuit of national objectives. The important consideration in the relationship between the three major levels of government is that each level shall fully meet its own responsibilities and not pass them on to another.

We hear much these days about the decline of State and local government and the concentration of power in Washington. The best way to stop this decline is for those of us who are the heads of State and local government to have the courage to assume our full responsibilities. In New York, governments at all levels are working together in an effort to solve our own problems without constantly throwing up our hands and turning to Washington. Frankly, I think that's a pretty good objective for any State, or county, or municipality.

However, this does not mean that I am opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the Federal Government. As a matter of better organization in Washington, it would make sense to coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems. But it would be a tragedy if such a new department or agency were merely to become a handy instrument for the surrender of local responsibility, the bypassing of State government, or a substitute for courage and for making difficult decisions back home.

It is easy to ask for Federal money but it takes courage to raise adequate revenues at State and local levels to meet State and local responsibilities on an economical, pay-as-you-go basis. Those who really believe in home rule and who want to preserve local control have got to have the courage to raise a substantial share of the funds from local sources. Otherwise—let's not kid ourselves—the Federal Government will ultimately dictate the terms and conditions under which the programs shall be carried out.

We who have the privilege of serving in that Government which is closest to the people have a duty to meet their needs with efficiency, with courage, and with warm human understanding. But we must do so within a framework of fiscal integrity and local responsibility which a true concern for the best interests of the people demands.

It is a hard road—but it is the only road that will preserve the true vitality of democracy. It is the best road for the municipalities, the best road for the States, the best road for America.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., Dedicates New Post Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the speech which I was privileged to deliver at the dedication of the new post office building at Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks at this dedication ceremony follow:

MURFREESBORO, TENN., DEDICATES NEW POST OFFICE BUILDING

(Address by Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee)

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Postmaster Byrn, Mayor Todd, my colleagues Senators Kefauver and Gore, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, it is a great pleasure to join with you in celebrating this occasion and to participate in this dedication ceremony.

Certainly, this is a banner day for Murfreesboro. I know it is a day you have looked forward to for a long time. It is a day that brings to realization a hope and a dream that the people of Murfreesboro and the surrounding communities have had for many years—the dedication of this splendid new post office building here in Murfreesboro.

On my visits here over the past years, and in communication with many of your citizens, I have been repeatedly made aware of the great need, interest and desire of the people for a new post office building to be built on a site close to the heart of your progressive community—for a facility which meets all of your present needs and is adequate to your present needs for many years of future development.

I commend and congratulate Postmaster Charlie Byrn, Mayor Todd, Judge Threet, and many others. In fact it seems most all of the citizens have made this project the No. 1 Federal project with the highest priority.

All are to be commended—all are to be congratulated.

The completion of this building is a fine example of your local enterprise and Federal Government participation and cooperation.

The fact that this building stands here at last is a tribute to your persistence. You have brought about this result by putting into practice a basic rule of achievement as it was once defined for me in memorable fashion by a great Tennessean, the late Judge Cordell Hull, whose memory we all cherish.

One day during my first term in the Congress, I was feeling a little impatient in my efforts to overcome some of the redtape that seems inevitably to clog the wheels in the vast machinery of our great Government. It was at this time that I took occasion to call upon and visit with Judge Hull, who had just retired as Secretary of State.

Judge Hull was most kindly and friendly and helpful, and he gave me some good pointers and sound advice. He stated that there were many qualities needed to become an effective Representative, but among the qualities most important he particularly stressed as absolutely necessary were the qualities of patience and perseverance.

"Be patient," he said, "and keep plugging for results."

I know today that this was about the best advice I ever received, and this new post office building in Murfreesboro is one more impressive confirmation of the wisdom and truth of Judge Hull's maxim on stick-to-itiveness. Certainly it has taken a lot of patience and a lot of perseverance on the part of everyone concerned to bring this dream to realization.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

This building was erected under the Post Office Department's new commercial leasing program, whereby the Federal Government leases the facility from the private firm which holds possession of the grounds on which it stands and which contracted for the construction work.

This building is one of many presently being constructed throughout the country—as we are now moving forward in a greatly expanded Post Office modernization and replacement program. This marks an important advance for Murfreesboro to be provided with more adequate space, modern working conditions and better facilities to take care of the worsening mail resulting from growth of business and industry, generally, and the growth of our population in particular.

The commercial leasing program is the outgrowth of an experiment which started about 8 years ago, when the 83d Congress adopted a new method of handling the building of public buildings, and especially post offices, through what was then known as the lease-purchase plan. It provided that the buildings would be erected with private capital and funds, and the Federal Government would lease needed public buildings and pay for them over the years through the rental payments.

Disappointingly, that program never got underway or off the ground. After some 4 years, only two post offices were built under the Lease-Purchase Act and meanwhile all over the country more and more post offices were becoming outmoded and inefficient because of lack of space and lack of facilities to handle the increasing load expeditiously.

In 1954, I was honored by an election by my colleagues to membership on the Committee on Appropriations, which, as you know, appropriates the funds for all activities of our Federal Government. After our committee had looked into the operations of the lease-purchase program, it became obvious to Members of the Committee that this program was not working. Therefore, the committee moved to revert to our traditional system of building public buildings with appropriated funds. We had a pretty big fight about this in the committee and on the floor of the House, but in the end the House adopted our committee's recommended policy. The Senate went along and thus the Congress once again returned to our traditional policy of appropriating funds for the construction of public buildings where authorized and needed—and also to permit buildings being constructed under lease-purchase—either plan to get the needed job done.

Congress moved to put new life in the post office modernization and building program, by authorizing certain projects and appropriating the funds for them, but the Bureau of the Budget tied up the funds and refused to release the money so construction could be started.

I know we have all heard about Washington bureaucracy, but I can assure you that you do not know what bureaucracy is unless you have had some experience with Budget Bureau bureaucracy as developed particularly by the last administration. A small group of people in that Bureau operate as a type of supergovernment, trying to run the country according to their own ideas and often regardless of the policies established by Congress.

We have certainly had our difficulties—and our delays with a divided Government—a Democratic Congress and a Republican executive branch of the Government. Now we have a new administration—unified policies and we are moving forward.

Our new commercial leasing program, as it has been developed by the new administration, combined with the affirmative direction and efficient management seems to be the effective answer to the problem. Successful implementation of this program requires the constant and careful supervision by the Congress. Regardless of how much we improve our methods and techniques, we will always have to keep plugging away to get action on specific projects, which is only natural in an immense country such as ours where so many urgent tasks press for consideration all at once. We are mov-

ing ahead, but it takes perseverance and patience such as Murfreesboro has shown in bringing into being this splendid new post office building.

POST OFFICE SYMBOL OF TIE BETWEEN PEOPLE AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There was a time many years ago when the postman was about the only Federal official or Federal employee that our local citizens knew or came in contact with. However, over the years, as we all know, there has been a great growth in Federal programs and Federal activities, and today the Post Office Building stands even stronger and more boldly as the link between people in the local community and the Federal Government—as a symbol of the strength of our great Federal Government.

Here will be housed the activities of the Post Office Department, including city delivery service, rural mail service, air mail service and all of the varied services and programs of the Post Office Department.

In addition, this building will serve as a center of information on matters of national defense, civil service, selective service, our county agricultural programs, and information on all other Federal activities is channeled directly through the post office.

Experience has demonstrated that our citizens want these services. No, my friends, our citizens do not want these programs curtailed or discontinued. They want service continued and expanded.

SYMBOL OF FAITH IN GROWTH OF A GREATER MURFREESBORO

We do not build fine new buildings such as this facility unless they are needed and unless the future of the city promises to justify the cost. So in meeting to dedicate this building we are also recognizing the growth of Murfreesboro and affirming our confidence and faith in this expanding community's future.

The Post Office Department, by providing this modern building with its many efficient facilities for handling the mail, evidences its confidence in the future of Murfreesboro. More than that, it has made a significant contribution to the further progress of this city—to Murfreesboro and Rutherford County.

This new postal facility will not only benefit the citizens of the community by providing better and more efficient postal service. The construction of this building has made the old post office building available for another public use.

As you know, I was pleased to work with the General Services Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with city and county officials to see that the old post office building as surplus Federal property was turned over jointly to the city and county to be used for the Linebaugh Public Library. Thus the old postal facility—although inadequate for present required postal service needs—will continue to provide an important service to the community. It adds to your community establishment a facility that currently is valued at around $90,000—well suited for a public library.

We are happy that both of these public improvements and services could be accomplished.

CONCLUSION—DEDICATION

So this new post office building stands as a symbol of service to our people. As we dedicate this building to the service of a greater Murfreesboro let it stand as a symbol of the Federal Government and strength of our country—a government which should be and is the servant of our citizens and not the master of our people.

As we dedicate this new post office to the service of the people of Murfreesboro and Rutherford County, it is well also that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of purpose and to the determination to cooperate and work together in forwarding the great principles and ideals of our country that we may each contribute to making ourselves more useful in preserving liberty, justice, and democracy, and our cherished American way of life.

A Strange Policy That Muzzles Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the martyrdom of Gen. Edwin Walker may serve one useful purpose if it awakens the American people to the dangers inherent in administration policy which muzzles patriots while giving free rein to any critic of our free way of life. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune gives food for thought on the handling of truth by administration spokesmen:

VARIABLE TRUTH

Secretary of Defense McNamara admitted before the Senate Armed Services Committee that it had been the policy of the Kennedy administration to restrain military officers and Government officials from making strong anti-Communist statements. The gag was applied directly upon President Kennedy's inauguration. It was maintained through his meeting in Vienna with Khrushchev in June. It is still in effect as relates to utterances of military men.

Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, the principal opponent of this form of censorship, has compiled a representative selection of expressions and phrases stricken from proposed speeches by the Kennedy administration's censors on the ground that they might prove offensive to Communists.

It was taboo, for example, to say that "the Communist conspiracy was directed toward absolute domination of the world"; or that "Soviet infiltration is menacing this Nation and extending throughout the far corners of the globe"; or to refer to "the steady advance of communism," "the Communist challenge," or the "insidious ideology of world communism"; or to say that "socialism thrives" on Marxian theories, or that communism encompasses "Marxism, Fabian socialism, and socialism," etc., etc.

Mr. McNamara did not defend the suppression of such statements on the grounds that they were untrue; he defended their suppression because the administration considered it inexpedient to given utterance to them at a given time, or in certain circumstances. For instance, Mr. Kennedy was seeking the release of some American flyers held prisoner by the Soviet Union. Ergo, don't roil Moscow by calling a spade a spade. Or Mr. Kennedy was going to Vienna to see if Khrushchev wouldn't be reasonable about Berlin. So, until Khrushchev demonstrates that he is as unreasonable as always, don't stir him up.

McNamara's dissertation on the political elasticity of truth was offered in explanation of why Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was removed from command of the 24th Division in Germany after he was accused of taking a hard anti-Communist line in a troop indoctrination program.

Lt. Gen. Frederic Brown, who was commissioned by the Pentagon to investigate Walker, submitted, among other findings, this extraordinary judgment:

"General Walker is a sincere, deeply religious, patriotic soldier, dedicated to the Nation and to the Army. He is an eccentric and is not only violently anti-Communist but has been for years, working at it with a passion, studying, lecturing, and reading all literature available on the subject."

Therefore, it is "eccentric" to be anti-Communist, especially "violently" so, and to have been that way for years, and it is particularly eccentric to be anti-Communist on the basis of informed reading and study of the methods, tactics, strategy, and objectives of communism. And in the further opinion of General Brown, who happens to command the V Corps on the potential firing line against communism in Germany, it is some form of aberration that a commander who faced the ever present possibly that he would have to lead his division into action against Communists should have worked at his anticommunism "with a passion."

Well, perhaps this makes General Walker eccentric, but most of his countrymen will probably feel that the eccentricity lies with his critics in the Kennedy administration. When Khrushchev is waving around 100-megaton bombs and demanding surrender on pain of nuclear annihilation, is it eccentric to think that he and his imperialist system are menaces to the United States?

Apparently it was during the Kennedy moratorium on truth, in which the administration was governed by the doctrine that what is absolutely and eternally true is not necessarily true today, tomorrow, next week, or next month, though it may again be received as truth the month after that, depending on the administration's humor and Mr. Kennedy's latest purposes.

Peterson Adamantly Opposed to the Admission of Red China Into the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, to clarify my opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an exchange of letters to the editor of the Ogden Standard Examiner between Mr. A. L. Petersen of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, Utah, and me, on this very important question. Mr. Petersen's original letter to the editor was based upon an article in the Ogden Standard Examiner wherein I stated that Red China would probably gain admission to the United Nations and that a program should be launched immediately to condition the U.S. mind to this possibility.

It was my privilege to again join my colleagues in the House on August 31 in overwhelmingly voting against diplomatic recognition by the U.S. Government of the regime of Communist China and against its admission to the United Nations. This is the second time Congress has been called upon for an expression of sentiment since I have been a Member of Congress, and the second time I have voted against the admission of Red China into the U.N.

The letters in question, as printed by the Ogden Standard Examiner, follow:

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner, July 14, 1961]

ATTITUDE OF DEFEATISM

DEAR SIR: I read the interview of Representative M. BLAINE PETERSON, Democrat of Utah, in Monday evening's Standard-Examiner with more than a little displeasure. Since when do the minds of the U.S. people have to be conditioned to defeat—somehow this just doesn't seem right. It sounds as if we have "quitters" representing us in high places.

If the nations of the world are now viewing the admission of Red China more favorably, it would seem to throw more weight on a rather basic fact, that one does not buy true allegiance nor friendship. I wonder if our foreign aid hasn't been too heavy in goods and too light in information. Perhaps, instead of launching a program to condition the minds of the U.S. citizenry, our so-called "leaders" ought to launch a program to educate the minds of those who are succumbing to Communist propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. PETERSEN.

[From the Ogden Standard Examiner, Aug. 7, 1961]

MISUNDERSTANDING

EDITOR: Obviously a clear understanding of my reasons for opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations is necessary as a result of the letter to the editor of Mr. A. L. Petersen, of 1485 Marilyn Drive, Ogden, based on your report of an interview when I was in Utah recently. I am glad to see Mr. Petersen's concern. Similar interest has also been expressed in letters directly to me.

I went on record as opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations shortly after I came to Congress when I signed the petition and become one of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I would be proud to vote my conviction if I were a member of the United Nations, but, as you know, the only vote the United States will have on this important question will be cast by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

In June of this year, Ambassador Stevenson discussed the China situation with us and, at that time, it was his judgment that we do not have the votes in the U.N. to prevent the seating of Red China in the General Assembly when they meet this fall. This was most certainly not an attitude of defeatism as such, but was an indication and expression of the Ambassador's deep concern based on a careful and continued study of this matter, plus his experience in foreign affairs over a period of many years.

Distasteful as the facts may be to those of us who are opposed to the seating of Red China, let us look at the record.

Last fall only 42 of the U.N.'s members voted for the moratorium to postpone the subject of the admission of Red China. Thirty-four nations were favorable toward consideration of the subject. Twenty-two nations abstained, but of these 22 it is important to note that they were mostly from the newly independent African States. They were frank to state that their newness to the U.N. controlled their decision, but that they expected to vote to consider the China question this year. Proof of their intention is positive in that many of them have since declared themselves in favor of China's admission, the most recent example is to be found in the declaration for China's seating of Pakistan's President who just concluded a visit to this country.

A recent publication on U.N. affairs entitled "War/Peace Report" is reputed to have polled 96 of the 99 members on the China question. More than three-fourths, the report states, said Communist China should have a seat in both the General Assembly and in the Security Council. Unquestionably, this spells double-trouble for the United States.

The European countries are looking to the United States to make the first move. Should we act to extend the present moratorium, we can expect sure defeat and an immediate vote on whether Communist or Nationalist China has the proper credentials to sit. This could very possibly result in a twin China recognition. In other words, a dual China situation could possibly mean admission of Red China in the General Assembly and leave Nationalist China in the Security Council. Perhaps Red China and Russia are dealing these cards intentionally.

Marquis Childs, a journalist of national renown, recently made this a subject of his article in connection with the future responsibilities of Chester Bowles and, among other things, said this:

"The obscure outlines of another decision, still shrouded in top secrecy, is currently involved. That is whether to try to make any change in China policy in view of the fact that the United Nations General Assembly will almost certainly vote Red China into the U.N. in the fall.

"Should a 'two Chinas' policy be advanced by the United States? Should Outer Mongolia be recognized as a practical way of asserting independence of Chiang Kai-shek's veto over American policy? Should the American public be educated to the need for a change lest when the U.N. vote comes with a shock of surprise, it will lead to a perhaps irresistible demand to take this country out of the world organization?"

The reaction of Mr. Petersen to your report on our interview is healthy, and I hope more people will consider the seriousness of the decisions that are facing President Kennedy as our Commander in Chief and of the State Department.

I have long subscribed to the adage, "to be forewarned is to be forearmed," and I hope that this rather detailed explanation will foster additional concern and interest because we have a problem in the Red China situation that demands the combined intelligence, faith and prayer of every loyal American who shares my determination that the United Nations must not become Communist dominated.

Sincerely yours,

M. BLAINE PETERSON,
Member of Congress.

"Who Is Mr. America?"—Feature Article Appearing in the Bellflower (Calif.) Herald Enterprise, Thursday, September 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared on the front, feature page of the Bellflower Herald Enterprise newspaper in the important city of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif., on Thursday, September 7, 1961:

WHO IS MR. AMERICA?

(The following item is reprinted, without need for further comment, from the current Bellflower Kiwanis Club bulletin.)

Doc Wes Helzer, member of the public and business affairs committee, is offering this statement to our membership:

"Arsonists caught in the act of burning down a building are prosecuted by law and punished.

"The Communists have, and are in the act of overthrowing our system of Government, and destroying all that you and I stand for.

"We are now outlawing this Communist party, in the State of California, with State bill No. 1263, and after 30 years it's about time.

"When will Mr. America display some of the intestinal fortitude that he inherited from his colonial and frontier forefathers?

"You, sir, and I, are Mr. America."

Negotiations With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of the Military College of South Carolina, is worthy of consideration by Congress and all leaders of our country during this Berlin crisis. This splendid article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, September 13, 1961:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, retired)

(The author, formerly U.S. high commissioner in Austria, and later commander of all United States and United Nations forces during the Korean conflict, has first-hand experience in dealing with Soviet-manufactured "Berlin-type" crises. General Clark now is president of the Citadel, a South Carolina military college.)

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. high commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet high commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistics agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria, all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian-occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed, and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the "Mozart Express," when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and as usual he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our train.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon of our military police shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me President Truman said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President Johnson and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

A Creed for American Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include one of the finest pieces of writing it has been my privilege to see in some time. A "Creed for American Leadership" was written as a letter to the editor of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner by David McQuiddy, Jr., and reprinted in the Cody (Wyo.) Enterprise.

A CREED FOR AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

(We reprint below a creed for American leadership, expressed by David McQuiddy, Jr., in a letter to the editor of the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner:)

"I am an American. I fear God, but because I am free, I fear no man. I am dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal in the eyes of God and the law, but in nothing else. I ask only to be left alone, unhindered by bureaucratic limitations, to develop my God-given talents to their highest degree. I am content with only my best efforts, deploring mediocrity in myself and others. I accept personal responsibility for my decisions and for my provision. I neither want nor expect others to think or provide for me. I desire to be rewarded in accordance with my ability—not my needs—believing that that which is earned ennobles and that which is given enslaves. I expect to earn my own way, paying my just debts, but not the debts of others. I work to provide for myself and those I love, but for none else except by my own choosing. It is my right to keep that which I have earned and to dispense it as my own conscience dictates.

"I prize my own self-respect above all things, preferring it to slavish conformity and the plaudits of the mob. I believe there is a distinction between intolerance and an honest indifference of opinion. I honor those with whom I disagree when I know them to be honest and sincere in their beliefs, but I reserve the right to take issue—both publicly and privately—with all whom I believe to be in error—I would go the extra mile to help him who would help himself, but I want no part of him who would live by the sweat of others.

"I believe that America represents the last best hope of mankind to live in freedom and individual dignity. I am willing to defend with my life the principles of our Constitutional Republic against those who would destroy us from without, but I am conscious that history has dramatically proven that more citadels crumble from within than are taken by siege or assault.

"The call to battle has sounded, the lines are drawn, and the hour grows late. An aroused citizenry must rededicate itself upon the altar of self-sacrifice to restore that sense of patriotism, moral courage, and individual initiative which has served us so well in the past. As a mass dedicated to mediocrity and peace at any price, we are doomed. As freemen, glorying in our individuality and sustained by a firm faith in ourselves and our God, we are united in the only true way.

"I am an American. You are an American. Let us be Americans together."

Addresses of Vincent P. Hoparco, Outgoing National Commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the 26th Annual Convention of the Organization in Utica, N.Y., on August 25 and 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of two outstanding addresses delivered at the 26th Annual Convention of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in Utica, N.Y., recently by the outgoing National Commander of that great organization, Vincent P. Hoparco, of Syracuse. The first address was delivered at the session on August 25, and the second at the banquet on August 26.

My dear friends, since 1776, we, our country, that is, have been faced with many crisis and dilemmas. They were met and, ultimately, victory was ours. Today, we are challenged by a much more cunning, powerful, and conniving adversary than ever before. Deception in its worse form has been thrust at us, and the other countries of the free world, by a glib tongue from which flows an everlasting stream of lies. Premier Khrushchev is a supreme master in this field. In fact, so much so, that the gap between him and his nearest rival, Fidel Catsro, is likened to the distance to the Moon. Khrushchev, this man of many and varied moods, hold the balance of war in his fat palms. He knows it, and so does everyone else in the world.

You can imagine what a stunning blow was dealt to the ego of this warmonger,

when President Kennedy announced to Russia and the world, on that memorable evening of July 25, that we had gone far enough. Our President laid it squarely on the line. Without a doubt, the Soviets were made to understand, quite clearly, the position of the United States. Two definite and clearcut statements were, "we do not want to fight—but we have fought before," and "we seek peace—but we shall not surrender."

The leaders of both parties have acclaimed the remarks of the President. Also, our allies had words of praise for this straightforward attack toward a possibility of Russia swallowing another portion of the world without any objection.

We have been undergoing some embarrassing diplomatic fumbles in Africa, Laos and, of course, that thorn in our side, Cuba. The time had to come when we, as the greatest nation in the world, and the strongest advocate for peace for all people in the universe, had to draw that line in the dirt. Do you recall as a youngster, how two boys would have some words? One boy would bend over and draw a line in the dirt, and challenge the other to cross the line. Childish? Not today it isn't. Especially with the nuclear instruments of death and destruction in the possession of Soviet Russia and the allies. The Russians know where we stand now, and repercussions are coming from East Germany. Communist newspapers disclose a fear of war by the East Germans and they are blaming the Soviet Union for the situation. The flow of refugees to West Berlin give proof of the unrest caused in East Germany by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threat to sign a peace treaty that will end Western rights in Berlin. If the people of East Germany continue to show disapproval to this possibility of bloodshed of Germans, the blackmail attempt of the Communists would have failed.

Now the Russians have introduced another form of strategy. A barricade has been erected at the Berlin border by order of Khrushchev. Why? Could it have been to stop the obvious discontentment of East Germans with Communist rule? Also, could it have been to halt the ever increasing bad example, from his point of view, on his other satellites—Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia? Would you say then that people flee from a happy, contented life? Of course not. When people leave their homes, loved ones and their jobs, they act in desperation to escape domination of will for something better—freedom. Khrushchev speaks of "Soviet grandeur", but yet, thousands have risked death to escape this glorious life. Even to the point of East German soldiers crossing over the barrier. How red faced can Khrushchev get? If that is possible?

We, as veterans, are very familiar with this shadow beclouding the horizon, since not too long ago, a somewhat similar atmosphere enveloped the world. I wish to impress upon you one reason, and the strongest, in my way of thinking, for supporting the President's action toward Berlin.

Many of us, either, have boys who are of draft age, or in their teens. Visualize, if you will, the outcome of their future if President Kennedy had not declared this solid front of determination to uphold the mandate of the peace treaty after World War II, relative to the responsibility allocated to Great Britain, France and the United States in overseeing the welfare of the citizens of West Berlin. Instead of being called into service to increase our manpower strength, they would be called to be sent overseas as reinforcements for a shooting star. Khrushchev cannot risk entering into battle for fear of repercussions in his own country. Do you thing for one moment that the Russian people would risk the ravages of a nuclear bombardment of their homeland and the slaughter of their countrymen just to acquire the other half of a German city, which could develop into a Trojan horse? They are a free people in West Berlin—not slaves of the Russian Communists—and they intend staying that way.

Consider another dangerous possibility which confronts Russia. Communist China, at one time, was a protegé of Russia. Today, many are wondering just how fearful Russia is of China. Chinese Communist Chairman Mao Tse-tung and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev plainly do not see eye to eye since Mao's attempt to overshadow Nikita, with his threats to the Western Allies, and, anyone else in general, who have opposed China's overrunning of that harmless country of Tibet. Then, too, their failure to be recognized by the United Nations. Don't think for one moment that Khrushchev hasn't considered the fact that in the event of a shooting war with the free world, China might enter the picture by attacking Russia from the back door. What basis can we have of this? Only this—China places herself as an equal with the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France. Now then, thinking along these lines, what would become of her if Russia did start a shooting war and accomplished her aim of conquering the free world? She would be next. Therefore, if she helped us down Russia, we would not attack her, ever, and thus leave her to herself. Not so—Russia. Of course, the great statesmen of our country and our allies have other reasons to add. The more, the merrier, thus insuring a peaceful coexistence with strictly a cold war—nothing else. But, the world knows that the decision to fight or back down rests on Khrushchev's shoulders. Therefore, we and our allies, must stand firm in Berlin.

In closing, let me say that if we appreciate living in this wonderful and great country of ours, support the President, whether it be Kennedy, now, or, future Presidents, in times such as these, and always. We know what we have—let us not lose this freedom of ours.

My dear friends, the headlines of our newspapers focus our sight and thinking to the West Berlin situation. A situation where a freedom-loving people wish to remain free, opposing a tyrannical and totalitarian system of government in which the word freedom has been stricken from its vocabulary. A decision was made by our President, John F. Kennedy, to hold the line in West Berlin. Apparently, it must have been the proper one, since all the leaders of the free world, together with the leaders of our own major political parties, have acclaimed this action. This was a resounding blow to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, and, it was totally unexpected. The tentacles of Communist control are stretching out to embrace this community, but President Kennedy's stinging thrust has caused consternation in the Russian Kremlin. Premier Khrushchev's hot and cold behavior following this climactic announcement, showed evidence of the deep concern he had of our President's charges and declaration. His latest action of blocking the Berlin border strongly indicates a restless thinking, on his part. As in chess, the next move is his.

Grave concern is ours in West Berlin, but, what interest do the people of these United States have relative to the rising problems right here on our doorstep? The Monroe Doctrine, in over a century, has withstood all types of infiltration of the boundaries of the Western Hemisphere. We can see, however, that a toe has been inserted into an opening, holding the door ajar. You say, "Oh, you must be talking about Cuba? We've been keeping our eyes on Castro and he's simmered down a bit." My answer is that we had better take stock of ourselves and see if we are like the herdsman who was protecting the herd of sheep, only he was blind in one eye and could not see out of the other. Let us wake up, my friends, Cuba, only 90 short miles away from our Florida shores, is a much more serious threat to our way of life than you are making yourselves believe. What would you say if I told you that Cuba is erecting missile launching stations at this very moment? Would you believe this to be true? Well, you had better believe it.

The Soviet scientists, engineers, and technicians, in Cuba now, are not there to improve their health, or on an extended vacation from Russia. They mean business.

If this weren't enough to give us cause for concern, the spread of that infectious disease, communism, is spreading to South America, danger zones are developing in British Guiana, Brazil, and Venezuela, British Guiana, for example, has gone the way of Cuba, and Fidel Castro, at its general elections on August 21. A Hindu dentist, Dr. Cheddi B. Jagan, educated in the United States, was elected prime minister. An interesting, and disheartening, fact here, is that Jagan's wife, the former Janet Rosenberg, is Chicago born, and a Communist. He married her in 1943, while still a student, and promptly was converted to communism, since she was a member of the Young Communist League in Chicago. They are very friendly with Castro. In fact, Castro contributed $4 million toward the election and another conquest for communism.

In Brazil, the new president, Janio Quadros, seems to be leaning toward communism since his declaration of renewing relations with the Soviet Union to boost Brazil's trade. Also, he intends to establish contacts with Red China. Would you call this action as another form on an alert to the "handwriting on the wall" as concerns the western hemisphere?

The picture is slightly different in Venezuela. Here, turmoil exists within its own Government through economical and political problems. From the economical troubles stems an apparent upheaval of political stability. The Democratic government of President Romulo Betancourt has evaded disaster thorugh some shrewd political maneuvering. A shift in governments would place the powerful Communist Party in power.

Need I state what would happen again? Apparently, the main problem facing Brazil and Venezuela is economic. Assistance from the United States through the foreign aid program would minimize this Red infiltration of our neighboring countries of South America.

Let us awaken to the danger of this nearness of communism to our shores.

Let us inform our Government of our concern to keep the Americans free.

Let us drive this menace back to where it came from—Russia.

In other words—it's getting too close for comfort. Contact your Representatives in Congress, expressing your views, to halt this danger before it is too late. Act now.

Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein articles from the Washington

Post, the Washington Daily News, the Selma Times Journal, and the Evening Star about the death of our beloved, mutual dear friend, Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd. Mr. Speaker, this article speaks for itself up to a certain point, but there is no newspaper or anyone else that could tell the world about the wonderful things that this fabulous, wonderful woman has done for all mankind down through the years.

Mr. Speaker, Pauline Byrd has not been here as long as you, and of course, nobody has. But I want to tell you, she has been here over a quarter of a century. Thirty long years, Mr. Speaker. Everyone that has even known Pauline Byrd here, back home or over in Virginia, or down in Louisiana, or anywhere, and especially here in the Capital of the United States, just loved and respected Pauline Byrd for the great work she did for all mankind.

You will notice in this article that Pauline Byrd was the first woman president of the Alabama society. Mr. Speaker, she has practically always been president of the Alabama society. She looked after us just like a mother and father look after their children. At our congressional receptions, she would just take charge when we would go down to the ballroom to meet and greet our wonderful constituents from all over Alabama and many other States. She would put us in line, and would tell us how and what to do. She pinned the orchids on all of our wives and visisting ladies and on every Governor's wife from Alabama, ever since I could remember. She was just everywhere and she was so sincere. She was a great church member and she helped there. There was nothing that she could not do just a little bit better than most anyone else. She tried so hard to help us, and she certainly did help us.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Ocllo, reminded me the morning that Pauline went to heaven of something. Of course, I had never forgotten it either. But, when we lost our beloved son, Frank, Jr., Pauline Byrd was here. We lost our son back home in Alabama. She drove 900 miles, nearly 2,000 miles going and coming, to be there to help comfort my wife. That is the sort of person Pauline Byrd was.

Well, I want to tell you Mr. Speaker, as this article says, she was with the Social Security Administration in Birmingham and she did a good job there. I have had letters, not one, but hundreds of them, telling us about how she helped down there. I also have hundreds of letters from veterans, as she joined the Veterans' Administration as congressional liaison officer and worked in this position from 1945 until 1958. She was a widow of a great lumber executive, E. Roy Byrd, who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928.

Last but not least, she reared her daughter, beautiful Betty Byrd. I remember the wonderful wedding. I gave Betty away to one of the finest men I have ever known, the Reverend Edward E. Tate, of Virginia, who has a church now in Dallas, Tex., but who will go to Atlanta, Ga. That is a little bit nearer to our State of Alabama. Pauline belonged to the Alexandria Women's Club and to Immanuel-on-the-Hill Episcopal Church there in Alexandria, Va. She lived on Wellington Road.

Mr. Speaker, when we went out to the beautiful church where her daughter was married and where her husband was the pastor, there they all were. I saw people that I haven't seen since Betty Byrd married Ed Tate a long, long time ago. Some of these friends flew from not only down in Montgomery, Ala., the Capitol of our great State where Jeff Davis was born, but they flew from North Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, and just all over. It was a great gathering. But, I did not sorrow for this wonderful person who went right direct to Heaven because I know Pauline Byrd will not have the troubles that the rest of us will have, as she had been good all of her born days. She was a thoroughbred here and I wish I could remember a poem that goes something like this, "If you will be a thoroughbred here, you will be a thoroughbred there." Pauline was a thoroughbred here, and I wish I had the remarks of our Senators and our nine Representatives. Every one of them was at this funeral we had Wednesday with the exception of the ones that were out of the city. We all loved Pauline Byrd.

We are having a wedding in our family. One of our granddaughters is getting married down in Mobile, Ala., next month. Pauline Byrd who helped look after Ocllo Boykin Smith since she was the Cherry Blossom Princess, meant a great deal to Ocllo Smith. Ocllo and her mother, Frances Boykin Smith, were crying over the telephone to us last night.

Well, I do not know how I am going to get along without the help of this great woman, but you and I know this Mr. Speaker, God does not take us home until we have finished the work here on earth that he has given us to do. Well, we have a lot that Pauline Byrd could do, but she has done her share and she has gone to her reward, and we will all be seeing her sooner or later. But, all of us will miss her very, very much. I know you will remember Pauline Byrd and will say with all of us, God bless Pauline Byrd, and her loved ones that she has left behind. Not only her daughter Betty and her son-in-law Ed, but the two beautiful grandchildren and I know God will take care of them until they, with us, join Pauline Byrd up yonder.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 30, 1961]

PAULINE BYRD

Services for Pauline V. Byrd, of 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria, Va., widow of E. Roy Byrd, a lumber executive who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928, were to be held at 11 a.m. today in the Immanuel Church-on-the-hill in Alexandria. Mrs. Byrd worked with Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, from 1958 until her retirement this year. Earlier she had worked as a congressional liaison officer in the Veterans' Administration. She died Sunday.

[From the Selma Times Herald, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. BYRD PASSES

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd, the first woman president of the Alabama State Society around 1950, died here Monday after a heart attack.

Mrs. Byrd, formerly of Monroeville, Ala., had worked here for many years. She retired some time ago from the Veterans' Administration and had worked for a while for Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. BYRD, ONCE AID OF REPRESENTATIVE BOYKIN

Pauline V. Byrd, a retired member of the staff of Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama, who worked in several Government agencies, died Sunday at George Washington University Hospital after a heart attack.

Mrs. Byrd worked with Representative BOYKIN from 1958 until her retirement this year. She was a native of Alabama and the first woman president of the Alabama State Society here.

Mrs. Byrd first came here in 1933, when she began working for the Department of Agriculture. She returned to Alabama in 1938 as an office manager for the Social Security Administration in Birmingham.

In 1945 she joined the Veterans' Administration here as a congressional liaison officer and worked in that position until 1958.

She was the widow of E. Roy Byrd, a lumber executive who was killed by Nicaraguan rebels in 1928.

Mrs. Byrd belonged to the Alexandria, Va., Women's Club and Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill, Episcopal. She lived at 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria.

Surviving is a daughter, Mrs. Edward E. Tate, of Dallas.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 30, 1961]

MRS. PAULINE BYRD, SERVED UNITED STATES IN SEVERAL POSTS

Mrs. Pauline Vann Byrd, a Federal employee for 25 years, died Monday at George Washington University Hospital after a heart attack.

A native of Monroe County, Ala., Mrs. Byrd came to Washington in 1934 to work for the Agriculture Department. She later returned to Birmingham to serve as district manager for the Social Security Administration there.

She also worked as congressional liaison for the Veterans' Administration here, retiring 2 years ago. Mrs. Byrd also had been on the staff of Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, of Alabama.

She was the first woman president of the Alabama State Society and a member of the Secretaries Club on Capitol Hill. She belonged to Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill, Alexandria, and was active in the altar guild there. She lived at 3208 Wellington Road, Alexandria.

Her husband, Roy E. Byrd, died some years ago.

She leaves a daughter, Mrs. Edward E. Pate of Dallas, Tex., and two grandchildren.

Services were scheduled for 11 a.m., today at Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill, 3606 Seminary Road, Alexandria, with burial in Kentwood, La.

The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill or the Heart Fund.

Timely Warning to Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune is a forthright statement of the position of the free world. Let us hope there will be no second thoughts by the administration, as has been true in the past, and that we will not retreat from a policy of firmness and strength in the face of Communist aggression and blackmail. Any sign of appeasement or apparent weakness will only invite disaster. Let us hope that Khrushchev clearly understands the American will to resist the Communist conspiracy for enslavement of the world and will not load the camels back with the final straw.

The editorial follows:

THE CAMEL'S BACK

The U.S. Government, in two new and solemn warnings, has given notice to Khrushchev that any interference with Western allied rights in Berlin will result in war, and that in all likelihood war will bring recourse to thermonucear weapons. Britain and France have joined in the warning. There should be no doubt in Khrushchev's mind that the West has yielded all that it will.

Notice has been given Moscow in a well-reasoned and well-written joint notes on rights through the Berlin air corridors. This document is scarcely concerned with diplomatic niceties. It discusses Khrushchev's resort to upside-down propaganda language with cold finality. It dismisses with contempt his contention that everything will be changed as soon as he signs a one-sided peace treaty with his creatures of the East German Communist puppet regime.

The second warning is even more direct. It was voiced by Paul A. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, in an address before the Association of the U.S. Army, an unofficial organization of officers, in Washington.

Nitze said three things. He said, first, that "there eventually comes a point where one more straw will break the camel's back of [American] forebearance. Any interference with our essential rights in Berlin must be viewed as the straw that breaks the camel's back."

He said, second, that the American build-up of conventional forces will make "more credible to the U.S.S.R. the certain prospect that we will back our nonnuclear forces by use of our strategic capabilities should that be necessary." In other words, the Russians must expect that nuclear strategic weapons will be used if they start a war.

Nitze said, third, that any interference at Berlin would bring retaliation not necessarily confined to that local sector of operations but on "terms other than those selected by the Soviets." This was interpreted as a threat of action on a far broader scale than that of the doctrine of "massive retaliation" to aggression at places and timing of western choice—a doctrine dating from the period of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

"Soviet tanks across the autobahn to Berlin," said Nitze, "would interpose at only one of the many points throughout the world where the important or vital interests of the Soviet empire are vulnerable."

The warning could hardly be clearer, and it is reinforced by the concluding passage in the joint note on the air corridors, for the United States therein states that it "wishes to repeat in the most solemn terms the warnings already given" in two previous declarations dealing with the threat of Soviet interference with flights to West Berlin.

The note offers a reminder that there is today free and peaceful movement of persons and goods by air between West Germany and West Berlin, but that "any change in this situation will be the result of aggressive action against established rights by the Soviet Government, and the East German regime." Aggression, it is plain, will be met with retaliation.

If Khrushchev chooses to load the last straw upon the camel's back, he had better give thought to whose camel is going to collapse. It is the confidence of the United States and its allies that it will not be theirs.

The Serious Condition of Our Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the serious condition of our Nation's railroads, and with the need for constructive legislation to remedy that condition. In that connection I have proposed legislation to help the railroads by granting them a measure of tax relief. My bill, favorably reported on by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is still pending before the great committee on Ways and Means of this House.

Recently I was much impressed with an article that I read in the Christian Science Monitor analyzing in some detail the problems which our railroads face, especially those in the great eastern section our country, and proposing some concrete recommendations for alleviating them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Christian Science Monitor:

FILLING THE EMPTY SEATS—AMERICA'S HUGE TRANSPORT NETWORK NEEDS TO BE SENSIBLY CONDENSED, WITH ITS BASIC COMPETITIVENESS PRESERVED

The greatest single transportation system in the world appears to be headed for trouble in several departments in a way that might be called typically American.

It is suffering from too much capacity.

It is unbalanced by too much fragmented competition.

It is partially frozen by the very government regulation that was expected to keep it from becoming rigid under monopoly ownership—private or government.

Despite the fact that the heavily used New Haven Railroad is now bankrupt, that busy Capital Airlines was consumed by deficits, that standing-room-only commuter travel is encountering discontinuances, that common-carrier trucks are being challenged by producer-owned trucks, and that the eastern railroads are in a gigantic battle to preserve their skins through mergers, the situation does not yet amount to a crisis. The Kennedy administration was probably wise to defer sending Congress its "transportation crisis" message this year.

But the lawmakers should be preparing to take action next session. For much public and private money, as well as travelers' and shippers' anguish, can be saved by moving ahead of crisis conditions.

The automobile is responsible for a good part of America's transportation overcapacity. While trains once carried some 83 percent of all passenger traffic, the individual car now carries 88 percent. And with an average of less than two persons per six-passenger car.

RAILROAD DEFICITS; MISSING PASSENGERS

Today, Government provides rights-of-way for air, water, and road travel—three of the four major transport systems. The result is a rush of buses, trucks, barges, and planes to use the Government-built "tracks."

But railroads have shrunk little in carrying capacity. So seats—and boxcars—are often empty.

Between 1946 and 1957 the passenger deficit of U.S. rail lines increased from $139,776,000 to $723,670,000. Only liberalized Federal regulation permitting abandonment of little used lines has let this drop back to $485 million in 1960—still far too much red ink for the financial health of lines needing money for new equipment and better service.

It is estimated, furthermore, that freight operations are so far below capacity that an additional 75 percent could be handled.

Buses, which have been generally holding their own, have also had to contend with an uneconomic increase in empty seats.

Even the bustling, expanding airlines suffer from this problem. There has been an increase in empty-seat-miles flown from 1,580,000 in 1946 to 16,642,000 in 1959.

For years some rail lines were able to keep their net income steady by deferring maintenance and replacement of equipment. But the chickens have begun to come home to roost.

FRANCHISE FOR THE VICIOUS CIRCLE ROUTE

In the Doyle transportation study group's comprehensive report to the Senate Commerce Committee this year note is made of how this process has become a vicious circle. With less freight traffic, the railroads have condensed service. Trains are then run on a tonnage basis rather than a schedule. They are longer. Yards cannot handle them easily. Delays increase. Business decreases further. Borrowing in financial markets costs the railroads more because they represent a greater financial risk.

Even some of the airlines are now on the borderline of what is called debt financing as compared with equity financing. The equity value of their planes and equipment does not cover their debts.

The higher cost of borrowing, of course, serves only to add to the problem of declining net income. (Railroad nets dropped 40 percent between 1955 and 1959.) This is a hard circle to break out of.

Obviously when the railroads in general—and eastern railroads in particular—are having such problems they are no longer the kind of monopolistic octopus that the Interstate Commerce Commission was originally designed to fight. Already some 150 trains have been discontinued, and 9,859 miles of track were abandoned between 1946 and 1959.

But in any solution of the present problem the railroads must remain a key ingredient. In the fields of long distance freight and short distance passenger commuting there are tasks that only the railroad, with its large capacity and unhindered rights-of-way, can perform well.

The Kennedy administration's deferred legislative program would take care of some of the immediate inequities. It reportedly would permit faster tax writeoffs on rail equipment. It would allow tax deferment on reserve funds if these were used within a reasonable period to purchase needed new equipment. It would seek to have State and local tax overloads on railroads reduced.

These are logical steps. They amount to a form of support that does not just subsidize the status quo but aids a sensible modernization.

SUBJECTS CONGRESS OUGHT TO ACT UPON

But in addition a much more far reaching—and delicate—legislative threshold must be crossed if the transportation system of the Nation is to continue an efficient evolution. Congress ought to be asked to take steps covering the following:

Mergers: The lawmakers should instruct the ICC to consider all current merger requests as a whole, making certain that each major region is served by strong, competing systems as a result of mergers. Quite understandably, current mergers tend to involve only matings of the strong and profitable with the strong and profitable. Weak links need to be integrated, too.

Joint routes and rates: Congress should make clear its intent that the ICC use its power to force rail, truck, air, and ship lines to give shippers rates for joint routes. Such a policy strictly enforced might begin to end the rivalries that force shippers to use only one medium of transport when good sense would demand that a shipment start, say, by rail and be transshipped by truck.

Common carriage: When a meatpacker buys his own fleet of delivery trucks and then begins to pick up orders of fruit in them for the return run, private carriage begins to challenge the position of common carriage. Private carriage is not controlled under the strict rate and route decrees that the ICC imposes on common carriers. The result is that unregulated private truck use increased 350 percent between 1946 and 1959.

Common carriage is vital to the Nation's economic health. A balance between private and common carriage must be preserved. Therefore the administration's recommendation that private carriage be placed under some regulation makes sense—if only to assure that ballast runs charge going rates and don't cheat common carriers of business.

MORE VIGOR NEEDED IN RAIL MANAGEMENTS

Transportation companies: The logical next step beyond joint rates and routes is the formation of transportation companies, firms operating trains, trucks, buses, and barges. These would have to be as firmly policed by the ICC as the powerful railroads were early in the century.

They should be allowed to coalesce only where fair competition in the public interest will clearly be preserved. But they seem inevitably a part of the future in an integrated America.

At present there would appear to be few firms ready for such crossbreeding. But Congress should consider instructing the ICC to give them a go-ahead on an experimental basis as soon as any applicant appears.

The Doyle committee report recommends, wisely, that if such a go-ahead is given the combine be licensed for only 3 yearrs. This would permit periodic review to make sure competition is preserved.

Many other steps need to be taken within the transport industry itself. Railroad management needs to be shaken into more vigorous salesmanship and active recruiting of young executives. Labor must cooperate in trimming out unneeded personnel. There is sense in suggestions that major lines set up an independent subsidiary management to deal exclusively with passenger service.

The experience of the North Western, which overhauled its Chicago commuter operation and is now making a profit, is encouraging. So is the determination of Erie-Lackawanna to do the same thing in New York.

Increases in population and business volume mean that the current overcapacity of American transportation will eventually disappear. But careful research as to the pattern of this growth, plus more forward-looking Government regulations, are needed to prevent the adjustment from being wasteful and costly.

Jersey Meadowlands Owners' Association Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the public works appropriation bill, recently passed by the House, contains a $50,000 item to study the Passaic River, Hackensack River, Newark Bay, Elizabeth River area in New Jersey. The so-called Jersey Meadows are covered by this worthwhile study. Some of the most potentially valuable land in the world is located here. The titles to many of the privately owned parcels lying in this area have been placed in serious question by New Jersey Superior Court and Appellate Division decisions having to do with the riparian rights of the State to many parcels. The owners of most of the parcels in question have understandably formed an incorporated group, the Meadowlands Owners' Association, for the purpose of protecting their proper interests.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of policy by this association. This policy statement has been sent to me by Donald MacKay of Rutherford, N.J., executive secretary of the association:

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE MEADOWLANDS OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, A NONPROFIT CORPORATION

In a memorandum made public August 16, 1961, Mr. Peter J. Gannon, chief of the Bureau of Navigation, Department of Conservation and Economic Development, State of New Jersey, listed 1,078 parcels of meadowlands "in which the State of New Jersey appears to have an interest in title because of tidal waterways."

This list includes meadowlands in North Bergen, Secaucus, and Kearney in Hudson County, and in Carlstadt, Little Ferry, Moonachie, Wood-Ridge, East Rutherford, Rutherford, Lyndhurst, and North Arlington in Bergen County.

The policy of the Meadowlands Owners' Association, according to Donald MacKay, executive secretary, always has been directed toward clearing of titles to lands which have been owned for centuries by private interests, and on which taxes have been paid by many of the present owners for 40 years or more.

This same land was sweetwater land and never inundated by tides. However, in 1911 the Erie Railroad Co., was permitted by the War Department to build a canal connecting Berrys Creek and the Hackensack River. Then in 1915 the New Jersey Mosquito Commission was authorized by the State to eradicate breeding places for mosquitoes, which require fresh water. Deep ditches were dug in the meadowlands to remove the fresh water. The result was that there was continual flooding of the land at normal high tide. This flooding by tidewater killed off cedar groves and growing hay in the meadowlands.

The State's claims to lands which it has caused to become subject to tidal waters has created a situation which amounts to expropriation of private interests that have endured for centuries. It is hardly the right of any State to flood and drain lands and then claim these lands because they are flooded and drained.

The New Jersey Superior Court and Appellate Division decisions were not based on normal high tide, but on an entirely new concept of 6 inches above normal high tide. Obviously on low level land this difference could encompass a vast acreage.

There is considerable doubt as to whether the meadowlands are flooded by water draining off the upland, or by tidewater. If these lands are only flooded by fresh water, or by a combination of fresh water and tidewater, then the State's claim is invalid. Only if the normal tidewater is above the land is there any authority for the State's position.

Nothing has been done to clarify the situation, although the Meadowlands Owners' Association has urged the Governor, the legislature, and the department of conservation and economic development to clarify the matter.

In reply to a letter from Secretary MacKay, Chief Gannon has agreed to have a topographic or contour survey made of a portion of the meadowlands to determine which are subject to tidal flow. Now the question arises of what bench mark will be used, what elevation above mean sea level will be the criterion? A variation of even a fraction of an inch might affect large acreage.

When it is understood that in the 11 municipalities already affected nearly $100 million in property is involved, and that there is in the meadowlands a potential of at least 10 times that amount, it can be seen that a very serious situation has arisen.

Although not intending it as such, Chief Gannon has supported the contention of the Meadowlands Owners' Association. In his memorandum he raises the question of what interpolations were made with reference to mean sea level for setting the tide gage at Berrys Creek.

He further says: "The lowlands in between (the ridges east and west of the Hackensack River) becomes a natural drainage area for storm water and other waste water from surrounding municipalities and industries. There also may be springs in the meadowlands.

"The piercing of the meadowlands with mosquito ditches in order to drain off surface water and thus frustrate incubation of mosquitoes is an indication that most sections of the meadowlands were above high tide; if not, why the need of ditches? If these ditches contributed to the general dampness of the area, it would not become State's property because of man-made construction.

"It cannot be generally accepted or agreed that the word 'meadowlands' is tidal lands and thus State property. It has been my experience in the Hackensack meadows area of Jersey City that in the summertime the meadows would be dry, and it was a common occurrence that meadow fires would develop during the summer season when the land and weeds were dry. Yet high tide occurred twice a day.

"However, in rainy seasons or during the winter with snow and rain, the meadowlands would be damp and mushy. This is a further indication that this entire meadowland is a drainage basin for the surrounding countryside."

Address of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the 26th Annual National Convention Banquet of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States in Utica, N.Y., August 26, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was my privilege to be present for the annual banquet of the 26th annual convention of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States. In fact I had the honor to be one of the speakers at that banquet.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most forceful and outstanding speakers of the evening, as well as its very able toastmaster was the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Dr. Edward D. Re of New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of Dr. Re's outstanding address:

THE SPIRIT OF MOUNT MCKINLEY

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, at the 26th annual national convention banquet of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, convention headquarters, Utica, N.Y., Saturday, August 26, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and honored members of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, it is a great honor and a real privilege for me once again to have the opportuinty of addressing this honored patriotic organization of American veterans of Italian extraction. As all of you know, I am not a stranger among you. I bring with me the best wishes of your many friends in New York and Washington for your continued success and well-deserved recognition and prosperity.

At this happy gathering tonight which brings to a close a wonderful convention, it would be difficult to refrain from pointing out the significant contributions of countless Italians to the American way of life down through the years. It would also be difficult to refrain from pointing out the contribution made by Americans of Italian extraction to the Armed Forces to preserve the heritage of this country. And, finally, it would be difficult not to mention the significant advances that this organization itself has made in the past, as well as its present and recent successes in making our total contribution one of ever-increasing importance.

As an American of Italian heritage, ladies and gentlemen, I feel justifiably proud that many Americans of either Italian birth or extraction have made lasting contributions to our American way of life. The extent to which our great Nation has been able to reap the benefits of so many different cultures and heritages and in the process create a heritage of its own—a heritage of freedom, liberty, and equality of opportunity—is truly remarkable.

We are all familiar, from history, with the well-known contributions of great Italians in the fields of art, music, culture, science, and government. Many of us, however, tend to forget that this contribution continues in an ever-flowing stream right up to the present day. I not only refer to the Italian Americans who served this country honorably in the Armed Forces during the great wars. Nor do I refer only to the emergence of great leaders and statesmen in prominent positions in our Government and abroad. Nor do I refer only to the great forward movement of Italians and Americans of Italian extraction in the professions, the arts, and the sciences; or the significant role this very organization tonight has played in these advances.

My remarks tonight, ladies and gentlemen, concern an achievement of a different nature, but one which represents to me, all the same, a historical landmark of equal significance.

Within the past month, something happened in this country which has never happened before. Mount McKinley, the highest mountain peak on the North American continent, and one of the most rugged peaks in the world, was conquered by man. And, yes, it was a team of native Italians, led by an Italian mountaineer, that successfully answered this insuperable challenge.

The physical importance of this feat alone has earned these brave mountain climbers a lasting place in American history. But to my mind, ladies and gentlemen, this conquest of Mount McKinley is also of great symbolic and spiritual meaning. For to me it symbolozies the perseverance, the hard work, the ever striving upward, and the eventual triumph of every Italian—and Italian American—in this country. To me it signifies in present times the spirit of the people, as they move through perilous and difficult times, to a hard-earned and well-deserved eventual victory—a victory of free men in a free nation.

The indomitable spirit displayed by the team which conquered the highest peak in this country has many parallels. It aptly signifies the long struggle of our forefathers to assert and maintain the inalienable and God-given rights embodied in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. For us, it also signifies a new spirit of rededication to the principles and freedoms that these documents so solemnly proclaim. They proclaim the American ideal: equality before the law and equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed.

The American ideal—like the lofty crest of Mount McKinley—represents the highest and most noble achievement of this continent. Like the mountain, however, the way of attainment is difficult and calls for great sacrifice. Yet this is the American creed and the cornerstone upon which stands the reality of America's proclamation of equality of opportunity for all. It is this equality of opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, that permits an Italian to climb Mount McKinley, that permits a Negro to attain high office, that permits an American of Italian extraction to be Governor of one of our great States, or any American, regardless of his religious faith, to be President. This is the American heritage. It represents the fulfillment of man's most noble earthly aspirations. It represents the establishment of a country founded upon ideals of freedom and equality. It was the answer of peoples of all races to the hate, bigotry, persecutions and class distinctions of an Old World.

These people did not have a common country or origin. They were not all of the same religious faith, nor did they have a common language. But woven together by common purposes and ideals, they founded the greatest nation known to history. It was neither race, nor color, nor creed that gave it unity and strength to surmount strife, economic crises and global war. Rather, it was the common ideal and the desire to preserve the American way of life. It was the spirit that conquered mountains.

Yet this American way of life must be a reality for all Americans. No one is to be deprived of the right to live, work, and share the blessing of liberty on account of his race, color, religion, or previous national origin. Untold harm results to our prestige abroad and to our dignity at home if we preach equality and lofty ideals and practice discrimination and bigotry with arrogant indifference or even with pious resignation.

And it is also well to remember that it is by our ideals, and the genuineness of our efforts to attain them, that we are to be judged as a nation, and not by scientific and technological achievements alone. Indeed, the advances of science cannot be regarded as true progress unless they are used to achieve our great national purpose. This purpose scorns both cynicism and despair. It reawakens all Americans to a realization of the spirituality of man and exhorts us to extend to all others those rights and privileges which we ourselves take so easily for granted.

Let us as Americans all strive to conquer prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry as that fateful Italian team strove to conquer the jagged rocks and crevasses of that inconquerable mountain. Let us ascend with our fellows to that higher level. Much ground has already been gained in the onward march toward the attainment of this American goal. Complete and total achievement lies with us. It lies in our hearts and in our willingness to practice the moral principle inherent in the Golden Rule. As creatures of God and as Americans we cannot fail.

Like the climbers of Mount McKinley, we are summoned to extraordinary personal responsibility and sustained effort in the national interest. We are inspired in our struggle against injustice and intolerance.

This is the spirit of Mount McKinley. For us it has a double significance. First, it represents the cornerstone of this country's ideal: equality of opportunity for all. Secondly, it represents the hope and the inspiration that only from perseverance, struggle, and dedication, can we succeed in the attainment of our national goal as Americans.

Once again I congratulate you for your efforts in helping to keep the Italian heritage alive in a wholesome and patriotic way. Your organization helps us live and breathe the spirit of Mount McKinley.

How Socialized Medicine Works in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following discussion, in the AMA News, of how Britons fare under socialized medicine. Perhaps we had better think carefully before tampering with our own medical system which has provided the best medical care for the most people in the history of man:

BRITONS SHORTCHANGED?

Evidence has been accumulating in bits and pieces in recent years that the people of England have been shortchanged in the quality and quantity of medical services they have been getting from Britain's experiment in socialized medicine.

A considerable amount of this fragmentary evidence has now been pulled together into a single document well worth thoughtful study by every American—particularly Members of Congress who are being pressured to thrust upon this country the beginnings of a similar experiment.

Oxford University Prof. John Jewkes and his wife, Sylvia, are well qualified to judge the benefits and shortcomings of the British National Health Service. Professor Jewkes, whose field is economics, served on Britain's Royal Commission on Remuneration of Doctors and Dentists, and his wife has collaborated with him on a number of published articles on social affairs.

When they suggest, as they do in "The Genesis of the British National Health Service," that the system adopted in England 13 years ago may have "positively hindered the growth of British medical services," their observation merits close attention on this side of the Atlantic.

Those in the United States who are striving with every means at hand to persuade Americans to accept, and to force Congress to adopt, a system of Government-controlled medicine for the aged may argue that this has little to do with this country since nothing so drastic is proposed here.

Americans should not be disarmed. The plotters of Government medicine admit they desperately desire passage of the King bill to create a foundation upon which can be erected a more grandiose scheme than limited medical care for the elderly.

The Jewkes' report, therefore, is both a challenge and a warning to the United States.

The Jewkes concluded that "the average American now has more medical services than the average Briton" and "the gap between the two has been widening" since inception of the National Health Service.

They raise the provocative question: "How, it may be asked, can a medical system which is progressively creating despondency and frustration among the doctors be regarded as fundamentally sound in conception?"

They point out with cogent argument and statistical evidence that socialized medicine has been far from a smashing success if it were designed to eliminate long delays in hospital admissions, to improve and expand hospitals and to effect a more equitable distribution of medical services. Hospital waiting lists have grown more common and larger, no spectacular changes have occurred in distribution of medical services, and few new hospitals have been built.

In addition, the Jewkes observe that medical research in England has been starving, progress in certain kinds of medical education has been discouraged and centralized government control of medical services has resulted in increasing administrative delay and confusion.

There are striking parallels between the United States today and England before socialized medicine which may arouse some suspicion in the minds of thoughtful Americans.

We are told here, for example, that people over 65 are deprived of medical care because they can't pay for it and the Federal Government, therefore, must assume control of medical services for this group.

In England it was argued as justification for imposing the National Health Service scheme that the aged and poor were being deprived of medical care.

The Jewkes recite statistical evidence that this appeal was "far from the truth" in England.

Are the advocates of Government medicine for the aged in this country prepared to prove now with valid, defensible statistics that they are not exaggerating the problem here?

The British Government has engaged in a constant struggle to restrain the people's demand for medical services and what was touted as "the best possible medical service free for all" has emerged into a system more accurately described as "first come, first served."

More and more Britons, according to the evidence presented by the Jewkes, are seeking medical care outside the National Health Service. They say there is no mystery why these people are willing to pay the tab for the National Health Service, which is compulsory, and pay additionally for private care.

These people are simply "ready to make sacrifices in other directions in order to enjoy prompt hospital and specialist treatment, free choice of consultant and private accommodation."

And the Jewkes point out that if there are considerable numbers willing to make this sacrifice, there are even larger numbers of the dissatisfied who are not yet prepared to do so.

The British Medical Journal has taken note of the Jewkes' work. Declaring that it is "a treat to have the fresh opinion of independent minds," the publication adds: "And so the Jewkes come in with a quiet voice and to state some facts in the situation that could be read with benefit by medical men and medical politicians on both sides of the Atlantic."

Finally, this husband-wife team suggests that Britons who boast that the National Health Service is one of the most remarkable ventures in this century may be guilty, as foreign critics say, of "the kind of pretentious claim likely to be indulged in by a power which finds its place in the world slipping, does not relish it, and seeks compensation in national daydreaming."

The 30th Armored Division Commended at Smithville, Tenn., Armory Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the remarks which I was privileged to make at the dedication of the new National Guard Armory ceremonies, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

THE 30TH ARMORED DIVISION COMMENDED AT SMITHVILLE, TENN., ARMORY DEDICATION

Thank you General Giles, General Nunnally, Mayor Smith, Judge Foutch, Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, members of the Tennessee National Guard, ladies and gentlemen, my homefolks, and friends, certainly, I am pleased and delighted to be privileged to attend this ceremony and to participate in the dedication of this splendid new armory—the National Guard Armory—of which all are justly proud.

When Major Dyer, Captain Wilson, Sergeant Vickers and others invited me some weeks ago to participate in these dedication ceremonies I anticipated that the Congress would be in adjournment by Labor Day. I thus accepted as I wanted to be in attendance at this significant occasion. This is indeed a great day and an occasion that many of you—all of us—have looked forward to for a long time.

Today we are not only celebrating an accomplishment, but we are celebrating a victory for the Army National Guard of Tennessee and this means that we are celebrating a victory for everyone in the land.

The action which finally cleared the way for the construction of this armory has been a part of a nationwide struggle, over a period of several years, to prevent the crippling of the National Guard Establishment.

There have been those who have felt that our National Guard units could be cut down and reduced—and that the building of additional armory facilities was not needed, essential or necessary.

We have thus experienced a period of retrenchment—a time when an effort has been made to cut back—to cut down and reduce the home guard.

Our local MP battalion certainly has been in the very midst of this proposed retrenchment. There was a time when some felt that we would lose our local unit by consolidation with another organization.

We have thus won a victory not only for this new armory—but also for the 30th MP Battalion.

It is significant that we are thus dedicating this armory at a time when the effort to reduce the size of the National Guard has been checked and reversed, and at a time when active duty alerts and orders are going to many National Guard units—as our Nation girds itself for an eventuality in the world crisis which has been precipitated by the threat of Communist expansion.

This armory was planned several years ago by those with vision—men who believe in strength and preparedness and in keeping our country strong.

This armory represents the work of many citizens cooperating and working together to bring this armory to Smithville and our county. Certainly, Maj. Bill Dyer, editor of the Smithville Review, and Sgt. Jimmy D. Vickers, unit leader, led the charge that gained for us this armory.

Major Dyer and all the men of his command contracted members of the county court and secured their assurance of cooperation.

They preserved and obtained approval of a matching fund grant from the adjutant general of Tennessee. This called for a similar grant from the National Guard Bureau and cooperation on the Federal level to assure final approval, authorization and appropriations.

Congress appropriated at this time $45 million for an armory construction program throughout the Nation. Of this amount, only $15 million was released by the Bureau of the Budget for a limited construction program—the $30 million remainder was impounded and withheld.

At this time only two National Guard armories were approved for construction in Tennessee—one at Nashville and this one at Smithville.

The combined efforts and cooperation of all citizens at all levels of Government were successful in securing the construction of this splendid and modern facility.

Our city, county, State and Federal officials certainly have performed front-line duty in this cooperative action.

I know that General Nunnally, our State's fine adjutant general, will approve of my giving a full measure of credit to his predecessor, former Adj. Gen. Joe W. Henry, Jr., who gave notable assistance in furthering this armory project at a time when we were trying also to keep and maintain a guard unit here in Smithville.

In a personal way, I want to say that whatever I may have been able to do in

helping to push this project to completion has been indeed a "labor of love."

I am proud and happy to salute, commend and to congratulate the men of the 130th MP Battalion—our local home guard unit—and all the officers and men of the famed 30th Armored Division. I wish every man of this command "Godspeed" in the future as you drill and train and prepare for any and every eventuality on the home-front or wherever you may be called—as you continue your patriotic service to our country.

This armory and the guard unit that maintains its headquarters here are a part—a very significant and important part—of our national strength. We regard this armory and the 130th MP Battalion as a bastion of strength here in our midst in De Kalb County.

This unit is composed of volunteers who exemplify the finest spirit and tradition and patriotism of the Volunteer State of Tennessee.

The officers and men of the 130th MP Battalion are men of the highest sense of duty and patriotism. They are our neighbors and friends and we are proud of them—every man—every member of this unit.

They have won this armory and established for themselves a place in our community as they have won a place in the hearts and affections of all our citizens.

This achievement of this armory in a very real way illustrates what we have been doing in the present session of the Congress. The Congress has completed 8 months of continuous session—now into the ninth month. The Congress has been considering and working on one of the biggest and most extensive legislative programs in more than a decade. In the main, three major buildups are now underway:

1. Buildup of our national strength—national defense; $46.5 billion has been appropriated for this purpose. This means a bigger Army, a stronger Navy and the most modern and powerful Air Force in any nation's history. It means a bigger Marine Corps and new and modern weapons. It means greater military strength for our country.

2. Buildup of our economic strength—the building of interstate highways, the building of hospitals, great housing programs, great programs of conservation, the building of dams, and defense installations. All these projects are capital investments in America and they strengthen our economy.

3. Buildup of our friends—allies around the world.

We know and recognize now that the Marshall plan in 1948 strengthened Western Europe against communism—and we know today that some form of foreign aid or mutual assistance is necessary. It is a part of our national defense—and defense strategy.

Some aspects of the program have been badly managed and costly, but all recognize that some form of proper assistance to strengthen and help our allies and ourselves is necessary and essential at this time to help stem the tide and halt Communist expansion and aggression.

These are the three big buildups underway.

Certainly our National Guard is a very important part of our defense posture for strength.

The greatest insurance for peace is to remain militarily strong.

We are proud of this great division—the 30th Armored Division. Again, I salute you and congratulate you—all the men of this command. I know that I express the high sentiments of all when I say that we are proud of every man of this command—all volunteer patriots of Tennessee.

As we dedicate this splendid new Armory, let us dedicate it as a symbol of strength—strength at home, strength for our State and strength for the Nation.

It is also appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to a spirit of unity of national purpose and cooperation as we join hands and march forward—each contributing his part to defending, preserving, promoting and perpetuating our freedom and liberty and our cherished American way of life.

Let Us Learn From History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, recorded history can be useful only if we learn its lessons. Man can learn from past experiences and he can better his lot if he guides himself so as to not repeat the mistakes of earlier days.

With that in mind, I urge every American to read the following article which appeared in the September 1961, issue of the National Jewish Monthly published by B'nai Brith.

Dr. Samuel H. Dresner is rabbi of Beth El Temple, Springfield, Mass., the editor of Conservative Judaism, and author of "Prayer, Humility, and Compassion" and several other books. Rabbi Jack Riemer is spiritual leader of Temple Israel, Swampscott, Mass., and a department editor of Conservative Judaism.

The article follows:

THE MAIN REASONS WHY ROME FELL—AND A COMPARISON WITH LIFE TODAY

(By Samuel H. Dresner and Jack Riemer)

In 1787 mankind stood upon the threshold of the new age. In France the first faint rumblings of the French Revolution could already be heard. In England life was beginning to alter its pace and character under the impact of the industrial revolution. And across the seas in America, a new country called the United States was just beginning its rise to power. A spirit of change and excitement was in the air.

In that same year, in London, after 28 years of intensive research, one of the greatest books in the history of scholarship was finished: "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," by Edward Gibbon. Why did Gibbon write it?

Because he wanted to know how it happened that the Roman Empire, which was built to last forever, should have crumbled into the dust—and how it was possible for the empire which had the mightiest army, the wisest legal system, the most powerful organization, the finest roads, and the richest culture of all antiquity, to have collapsed. How had a hoard of barbarian Huns been able to overthrow it? Gibbon wrote this book because he felt he had to know the answer to this question, for the sake of the record, and also for the sake of the new age that was being born. He studied every facet of Roman life. And when he was finished with all his research, he reached this conclusion:

DEFEAT CAME FROM WITHIN

Rome was not defeated by the barbarians. By the time they came, her granite walls had already fallen from inner decay.

And in the last chapter of his fifth volume, Gibbon summarizes his conclusions by listing the five main causes of the collapse of Rome:

1. The first cause was the corruption of its commerce.

2. That led to even a greater degree of corruption and immorality among the civil servants, the military leaders, and the Government officials.

3. The spending of more and more public funds on amusements and luxuries instead of essentials. The public became evermore distracted by the chase after pleasure.

4. The rapid increase in marital infidelity and divorce brought about the destruction of the home and the family as basic units of society.

5. The decay of religion as a serious factor in the lives of the people.

APPEARANCES DECEPTIVE

One hundred and seventy-five years have gone by. The new age, which was just beginning when Gibbon wrote his book, is now in full flower. Let us, therefore, look at this age of ours carefully with an eye on Gibbon's notes, make a few comparisons, and perhaps learn a lesson.

In many ways, our age is far superior to the Roman Empire.

They built roads which stretched for hundreds of miles. We build rockets that reach to the moon.

They had a powerful infantry. We have weapons which make their spears and swords look like toys.

They had circuses at which a hundred thousand people could be entertained at once. We have television stations that can beam out one program to a hundred million people.

And yet, as we read Gibbon's book, and follow in his pages the unhappy description of the gradual decay of the glory that was once Rome, we cannot help but make a comparison between the Roman age and our own.

Gibbon said that the first cause of the collapse of Rome was the corruption of its commerce. How does our society stand in the area of business morality? There is a new book called "The Operator," a study of American business practices. Here are a few typical selections:

According to the U.S. Better Business Bureau, $5 billion, which is 1 percent of the total national product, changes hands each year in bribes, kickbacks, and payoffs.

According to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, $2½ billion was collected last year from people who tried to cheat on their income tax. The amount uncollected is astronomical.

According to the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, there have been twice as many actions against companies misrepresenting products in 1956 as in 1950.

The above statements include such famous cases as:

The New Jersey company that tripled its price and then gave 15 percent off.

The Michigan concern which sold second-hand tires as new.

The Pennsylvania gas station that put regular gas into the pumps market premium.

The case of the Swiss watches that were made in Hoboken.

The wonder drug that turned out to be ordinary aspirin.

"The Operator" lists thousands of such cases, cases beyond the law and cases just within the law. It claims, for example, that $75 million a year is spent in the campus buying advance copies of exams, hiring people to write dissertations, or manufacturing fake academic degrees.

Not long ago the entire country was shaken by the television quiz show scandals. But within a few weeks the shock was over, the country quickly adjusted, a few people were

made public scapegoats, and life went back to normal.

WAS ROME WORSE?

One last example from the book will summarize the moral climate of our society:

Three men were having lunch together in a very good restaurant. When the bill came, each insisted on paying for it.

"I'm in the 80-percent bracket," said one. "It will cost me only 20 percent."

"Don't be foolish," said the second. "I'm in the 100-percent excess profits bracket, and it won't cost me anything."

"I'm on a cost-plus contract," said the third as he picked up the bill. "I'll make money."

Could it have been worse in Rome?

The second factor that brought about the fall of Rome, according to Gibbon, was the corruption of the civil servants, the military leaders, and the Government officials. How does our society stand in this area?

Two events occurred in the past year which were enough to answer the question of how our society rates in public integrity.

In January 1960 the Chicago police scandal broke wide open. Now scandals in Chicago are like the barnacles on a ship: unpleasant, but unnoticed. This one, however, really shook it up. It was revealed that a number of Chicago policemen had planned and participated in hundreds of burglaries, that uniformed patrolmen had served as watchmen and as safecrackers, that the loot had been taken out in squad cars and stored in police stations, and that 175 policemen were involved. To cap the matter, when those accused were brought before the judge, he dismissed the case for insufficient evidence.

In May 1960 the highest government official of the Borough of Manhattan confessed under oath that he had accepted gifts, loans, and favors from a real estate executive who did business with his office. When the real estate man was asked whether he thought he had done anything wrong, his only answer was, "After all, isn't everyone doing it?"

Yes, everyone is doing it. And everyone was doing it in Rome—until the walls fell.

The third factor that undermined Rome, according to Gibbon, was the spending of public money on luxuries instead of essentials. What are the facts today?

The facts are, in terms popularized by John Kenneth Galbraith, that we believe in private luxury and public poverty.

We are fierce balancers of the budget. Every penny must be accounted for and whatever cannot be defended as an absolute necessity is scrapped when it comes to such unimportant commodities as defense, education, public health, city planning and religion—even though the church and synagogue are frightfully understaffed, third-rate teachers staff many public schools, our cities are filthy and transportation poor, and Russia passes us in scientific and military achievement.

But how different is the atmosphere once we turn from public needs to private pleasures. Nothing is too good for us when it comes to our own little joys. We live on a fantastically high economic level, devouring our income through the nonsense which the hidden persuaders make us believe we need. The national average wage of bartenders is twice that of schoolteachers. Americans spend twice as much each year on vacations as they do on schools. The sale of comic books in this country was seven times higher this year than the sale of all textbooks.

Perhaps the best symbol of our times was the sign that I saw at an airport. Northeast Airlines is advertising its new luxury flight to Miami, and its new credit plan. There is a big sign with four words on it: "Enjoy Now—Pay Later."

The fourth factor which Gibbon lists is the breakdown of family life. What is the state of family life in America today? Let me present two facts:

Last year, it is esitimatd, 1 million illegitimate births occurred in this country.

From 1 to 2 million Americans are estimated by public health authorities to have contracted venereal diseases in 1960—a rise of 72 percent over 1959 and 58 percent over 1958—more than one-fifth of whom were teenagers.

Unbelievable figures, difficult for parents to accept. More unbelievable by far must be the factors that have contributed to a state of affairs so shocking as to challenge the very institutions of marriage and the family, already considerably shaken by the divorce mortality of one out of every three marriages (which does not mean the other two-thirds are successful).

An easy attitude toward sex.

The weakening of basic moral standards.

The impending collapse of family life.

A colleague of ours, in response to an essay question, "What do you want most in life now?" received this answer from the majority of his confirmation class:

"More than anything else we want our parents to join the country club."

The last cause that Gibbon found for the breakdown of Roman society was the failure of religion. When religion degenerated into mere empty form, when it lost its power to serve as a check on the desires of men, when it became a tool for social climbing and an instrument of vanity, Rome was finished.

What is the state of religion in our land today?

In one sense, things have never been so good. More people are joining synagogues and churches today than ever before. Impressive buildings are going up all over the country. It is now socially acceptable, and even socially necessary, to be affiliated with some religious group.

But, if everything else which we have said above, so far, is true, if this is the moral climate which exists in business, government, and home life, then religion has never been weaker than it is today; for religion is evidently unable to serve as a brake on the chase after pleasure, unable to shame the greedy, humble the ambitious, or frighten the arrogant. Religion appears to be too easy, too comfortable, too popular to be of any real help in the moral crises. When the majority of Jews who attend synagogue on the high holidays are rarely seen there the rest of the year, when even leaders of the synagogue can absent themselves the rest of the year and remain leaders, then religion has little power.

What, then, should be the task of religion in our time? The answer, I believe, is found in a comment about Rome found in the Talmud.

Once Rabbi Akiba went with a delegation of five rabbis on a mission to Rome. It was at the beginning of the second century and Rome was still in its full power. His hosts took him on a tour of the city. They showed him their bridges and their bathhouses, their art galleries and their circuses, their museums and their military outposts, their statues and their palaces. Then they said to him proudly:

"Are you impressed?"

Akiba replied: "No." They were shocked.

"When we were walking in the square," Akiba explained, "we saw a splendid statue of the Emperor. And as we went by it began to rain. I saw the slaves who were on duty guarding the statue take velvet robes and cover it so that it would not get wet, and I saw that the slaves were wearing rags. I am not impressed with Rome. For a city in which statues wear robes and human beings wear rags cannot long endure."

This, in one sentence, is the task in religion in our time:

To remind a world gone mad of the true values.

It must prevent America from becoming another Rome.

Keith Worthington's History of Nephi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the community of Nephi, Utah, is making elaborate preparations to celebrate its 110th year of settlement by the early Mormon pioneers later this month.

Nephi is the county seat of Juab County situated on the sloping southwest buttresses of Mount Nebo and is surrounded by dry land wheat ranches and farms.

History records that one David Broadhead, who owned a farm near Nephi, testified in court in the middle 1880's that "of course wheat can be raised without irrigation," and was indicted for perjury. Thereafter, we are told, he returned to his farm, hung up a sign "perjury farm," and for many years was one of the biggest growers of dry land wheat in the State.

But Keith Worthington has done such a splendid job of telling the history of Nephi in a series currently being run in the local newspaper, the Times News, that I refer you today to the earliest articles of the feature:

NEPHI'S 110 YEARS

(By Keith Worthington)

SETTLEMENT OF NEPHI

Introduction: 114 years ago our Mormon pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley; 110 years ago in September, settlers came to Juab Valley.

Try to imagine what this valley would have looked like in that long ago—no houses, no streets, few trees—no irrigated fields and abundant gardens; no schools, no churches, and few people. Through diaries, journals, records, and stores we get an idea of what it was like. It is to these that I would like to constantly refer to give an idea of what our pioneers had to endure.

As Mormon explorers such as Parley P. Pratt and George A. Smith brought back word of the fertile valleys to the south of Salt Lake and Brigham Young personally visited the valleys, new settlements were soon established, and faithful saints left their comfortable homes in Salt Lake City for further colonization experiences. Nephi in Juab Valley was one of the early areas to be settled. Nephi obtained its name from a Book of Mormon prophet. The name is derived from the Egyptian meaning "good."

In the Sixth General Epistle of the Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, dated September 22, 1851, Brigham Young said:

"We decided on locations for settlement on Salt Creek, in Juab Valley, and Corn Creek in Parowan Valley, between this and Iron County, and companies will leave immediately after conference to form these settlements."

No time was lost in carrying out Brigham's orders, for in the latter part of September the first settlers entered Juab Valley. Charles and Guy Foote, their father, Timothy Bradley Foote, his wife and two other children were the first permanent settlers to arrive at Salt Creek. Next came Levi Gifford. During the month of October 1851, Zimri H. Baxter, Charles Sperry, Charles H. Bryan, William Cazier, John Cazier, Josiah Miller and Israel Hoyt arrived and after looking over the ground, selected building lots, put up five loads of hay and settled down to make Nephi their permanent home. On November 17 of the same year, Isaac Grace Sr. and family, Thomas Tranter and John Davis, enroute to Parowan reached Nephi after an accident to one of their party necessitated a temporary halt. After looking the place over they decided to stay. Thus, we see that there were 17 families that spent the first winter in the little settlement. There were 75 persons, all told.

Joseph L. Heywood had been commissioned to by Brigham Young to lay out the city and with the help of Jesse W. Fox they did this on September 25 and 26, 1852. They laid out a townsite one-half mile square divided into square blocks, and surveyed a field 1 mile long (Journal of Martha Spence Heywood).

The Journal of Martha Spence Heywood, wife of Joseph L., contains a rich history of Nephi. She tells in great detail of the difficulties and uncertainties of that first winter.

"September 23—Wednesday 1851: Arrived here on Monday evening at half past 6 o'clock. Found the brethren on the ground in good spirits—delighted with the valley, had some corrals made. Brother Baxter invited us to supper, of which we partook, and immediately after Mr. Heywood called a meeting to commence the organization of the people. Meeting opened by Father Gifford, after which Mr. Heywood made some appropriate remarks in reference to the necessity of having a watch, as the little property we had in cattle and horses was our all and could not be very well risked and by strictly guarding the settlement in a way it might save a great deal of trouble with the Indians. He called for an expression of the brethren on the subject, a few of which spoke in favor of establishing the watch, whereupon a vote was taken and also a vote appointing Brother Foote the captain of the guard and also to have an oversight in reference to the brethren having firearms and in good order with the privilege of calling them out for examination and drill when he thinks suitable.

"Tuesday we all enjoyed ourselves as new settlers remarkable well and the more the brethren explored the ground the better pleased they were."

On October 3, Sister Heywood recorded the anxiety and fear that filled the hearts of the women who were yet living in wagons in that Indian-inhabited country.

"Friday: Monday morning Brother Baxter started in company with one of the Gifford boys for the canyons to get out some house logs and remain one or more nights. Tuesday Mr. H. and Brother Fox with Theodore started for Sanpete to get lumber and a wagon box made. Also Brother Miller with his company started for the city to be there in time for conference, so that we had but two men and three boys left to take care of us women folks if the Indians should happen this way. Toward night the mail carrier arrived, which strengthened our party."

October 22 she wrote: "Thursday: As a company we are very few indeed, there being only two men, four women, three boys, and three children. If the Indians were known to this our cattle would be in danger."

The first white child born in Nephi was Joseph Neal Heywood, the son of Joseph L. and Martha Spence Heywood. He was born on November 18, 1851. Sister Heywood recorded in her journal, dated January 1, 1852:

"It is now over 2 months since making any record, in which time my darling boy was born on the 18th of November about half past nine forenoon in the wagon. Was first taken sick on the night of the 15th. Suffered much unnecessary pain and distress from taking a wrong position as also from the smallness of the wagon and its openness. Sister Ann, a Gifford, was all the assistance I had and after my sweet one was born was left pretty much to myself, having taken all the care of my baby from the time he was first dressed."

On April 1, 1852, Harriet Ann Grace Pyper, daughter of Isaac and Elizabeth Grace became the second child and the first girl to be born in the little community.

In late November, the Saints were still living in their wagons, but they had a road made into the canyon and were hauling logs out rapidly so that they could build their homes (Journal History of the Church, Nov. 25, 1851, p. 1).

Sister Heywood felt that the brethren were the right kind of people to make a settlement and "with little exception they are united in effort to build up the place."

FIRST BUILDINGS

Individual homes were the first buildings to be constructed in the valley. On December 13, 1861, Joseph L. Heywood wrote the following description of Nephi to the Deseret News:

"About 12 houses have been erected: viz 3 built of adobies, 2 of willows, plastered inside and out, 1 two-story house built of 4-inch plank, and the balance of logs obtained from distance of 10 miles.

"Our roofs and flooring are principally of lumber cut at Hamilton A. Potter's mills, San Pete Valley, distant about 30 miles from Nephi."

By the turn of the new year 18 houses had been constructed, three of adobe, the remainder of logs. The public corral was nearly finished. In a letter from Dr. Willard Richards to Wm. Clayton in April 1852, he states:

"There are several beautiful settlements on the road to this point, among which perhaps, Springville may rank the first, and Nephi the second. At both of these places the spirit of energy and industry is almost without a parallel. All of the houses look clean and neat, fences in good order, and evertyhing shows that saints live there.
The city of Nephi was commenced in September last. There are now 20 good homes, a splendid corral for cattle, and a good quantity of land under cultivation."

After the homes, the meetinghouse was built. This was completed in 1852. Not only were religious meetings held here but also school, and many parties and entertainments. This building was located on Main Street where the Nephi City Hall now stands. In 1854 this building was torn down.

In 1853 a small fort was built to protect the settlers from the Indians. The fort occupied the two blocks upon which now stands the Juab County courthouse and the First Security Bank, and extend one block west. Later a larger fort was built that was three blocks square and afforded much greater protection. This will be covered in greater detail later.

In 1854 a tithing house was built on the northeast corner of Main and Center Streets, where the present post office stands. This was 30 by 20, three stories high, basement included. The adobes for the outside were made from clay hauled from the bottoms, some 3 miles distant. This old building was torn down in September 1931 (the Times-News, Sept. 13, 1931).

As the town grew the old social hall was constructed to take care of their needs. This building was located at 170 East Center Street. Many parties, dances, plays, reunions, and just plain fun were had in this old building before it was torn down at the turn of the century.

Nine years after the pioneers first entered Nephi, the Juab Stake Tabernacle (then called Nephi Tabernacle) was begun. This church building was completed and dedicated in 1865. This served as the meeting house for the Nephi Ward and for Stake conferences. Few other buildings were built during this early period.

PIONEER LIFE—EARLY OCCUPATIONS

The chief occupation of the people of Nephi was farming. They raised wheat, oats, barley, and even the first year they produced potatoes, peas, beans, melons, squash, and corn from seeds they had brought with them. Gradually they acquired some livestock. (Nephi centennial jubilee, 1851–1951, p. 8.)

In the spring of 1852, Zimri H. Baxter obtained some apple seedlings from a Salt Lake City nurseryman. In 1855 the grasshoppers robbed the trees of all their leaves and even some of the bark. In 1856 Mr. Baxter replanted all he thought would grow, giving the rest to David Cazier, who succeeded in raising some trees and who was the first to pick apples in the valley (ibid. p. 9).

In the same year, 1852, Charles Bryan planted some peach stones, but they winter killed, except for a few which produced fruit in the year 1858.

After the Belliston brothers obtained honey in the eighties, the people of Nephi enjoyed honey.

For Juab Valley in Utah territory, the following horticultural statistics were given for the year 1866: 12 acres in apples, 7 acres in peaches, 2 acres in grapes, and 10 acres in currants (Journal History of the Church, Jan. 18, 1868, p. 6).

Even in the very earliest period there were occupations other than agriculture. Apostle Ezra T. Benson and Seth M. Blair, who were making a missionary tour through the southern settlements, visited Nephi and held meetings with the people. Elder Benson writes:

"On the 12th (November 1852) we set out for Nephi, Juab Valley, and reached it about 5 o'clock p.m.; preached in the evening to the saints and had a season of rejoicing; found 26 families of the fall emigration at this point and Nephi begins to extend her borders and assume quite a village appearance and is truly situated in the heart of a valley capable of sustaining thousands. The brethren are erecting a grist mill and a saw mill is much needed" (Journal History, November 1852).

Andrew Love, in referring to this mill, says:

"The new frame grist mill, built by Mr. Joseph Birch, is expected to run in a short time; this mill is situated near the mouth of Salt Creek Canyon; the owner is building as a protection against hostile Indians, around the mill, a stone wall 12 feet high; this fort will in case of an attack from the Indians, be quite a protection, for with long-ranged guns the mouth of Salt Creek Canyon might be guarded" (Journal History, 1859).

Brough says that the above mill was never finished, for at the advice of Brigham Young it was moved into town where it would be more safe against Indian attacks (Franklin Keith Brough, "Freely, I Gave" p. 63).

Love tells of many of the early occupations. Adambs, Grace and Baxter were nail manufacturers, and in 1859 he records that their business had grown to such an extent that "they are going to erect more extensive buildings." This same year he records that "Messrs. Gardner and Andrews are putting their saw mills in good order."

In 1863 Love wrote "Among the trades here is a hat shop conducted by Mrs. Job Sidwell. Brother Love also told of the fine nursery that Brother Baxter had started (Andrew Love's Journal).

In a letter to the Deseret News from Samuel Pitchforth, dated July 23, 1864, he writes:

Mr. John Hague's new grist mill is doing a good business, as also the tannery owned by Messrs. Andrews and Boswell.

In the spring of 1870 William Garrett, a pioneer brickmaker of Davis County, moved his family to Nephi and again engaged in the brickmaking business. He continued this work for 5 years with his sons helping him (the William Garrett family of England, p. 3).

The midwife played a big part in the early days of Nephi. When doctors were scarcely known, midwives were depended upon to see the women "through their difficult time." Mrs. Eliza Chapman Gadd and Gerusha Boswell were two of the earliest ones. Together they brought more than 3,000 babies into the world. A later midwife who has delivered a great number of babies is Ann Leavitt Stephenson.

The telegraph line came through Nephi in 1866, and gave employment to many young fellows of the day. William A. C. Bryan stated that he put the Nephi office to work about Christmas day, 1866. The telegraph office was in the home of Charles H. Bryan, his father. After the "boys on the line" had been working a few months, President Young called on them to take up classes and teach young women the art. Mary Ellen Love Neff reminisced about their training:

"In the summer of 1867 Miss Elizabeth Parkes, Miss Elizabeth Ann Claridge, Miss Hetty Grace and myself were called by the ecclesiastical authorities of the ward to study telegraphy. Our teacher, Wm. A. C. Bryan, had been called to study telegraphy under Professor Clowes. He made a good record and was installed operator in charge of the Nephi Telegraph Office as soon as it was opened in the late fall of 1866.

"We girls had a happy, busy time that summer and enjoyed our study and practice of telegraphy so that the time passed swiftly."

She continues saying that after they learned to be telegraphers they were assigned to various offices, Lizzie Parkes being put in charge of the Nephi Telegraph office. (Susa Young Gates "Memorial to Elizabeth Claridge McCun"; Missionary, Philanthropist Architect, pp. 74–78).

Mr. Bryan was an efficient telegrapt operator in Nephi for years, Elizabeth Parkes becoming his wife and first assistant. On October 18, 1844, Mr. Bryan was honored for his early work as a telegraph operator by Western Union, during the Centennial Celebration of the first American telegraph line.

Certainly many other occupations existed such as the cobbler and the blacksmith, but stores and business districts as we know them today were nonexistent in this early pioneer period. It remained for the coming of the railroad to bring about this change.

EARLY GOVERNMENT

During the very early period of Nephi the church was the government. It cared for the welfare of the saints, gave the necessary leadership, settled the differences, as well as giving spiritual help.

It wasn't until the spring of 1852 that civil government was organized. Joseph L. Heywood, writing to the Deseret News in September 1852, lists the following officers.

Mayor, Josiah Miller. Aldermen: Timothy B. Foote, Charles H. Bryan, John Carter, Isaac Grace. Councilors: Amos Gustin, John Cazier, David Webb, James Crabb, Cleon Elmer, Levi Gifford, Ichabod Gifford, Thomas Tranter, and Miles Miller. Recorder, Assessor, and collector, Z. H. Baxter. Treasurer, Wm. Cazier. Marshal, Israel Hoyt. Supervisor of streets, Charles Sperry.

At first there was very little for the civil authorities to do, for the church had everything well in hand. The gradual transition from church leadership to civil government brought some problems. One such incident occurred in March 1853. Jacob G. Bigler was presiding as bishop of Juab County. Brother Heywood was president of the Nephi Branch. George W. Bradley was probate judge of Juab County, and the city had a full staff of officers with Josiah Miller as mayor. Each of these men had responsibilities over the people. But there were only a few people and soon there were some differences among the officers, particularly Brother Heywood, Judge Bradley, and Bishop Bigler. It was decided that on March 13 a conference would be held in which all the people would vote as to whether they wanted to sustain the present officers. A Brother Sly and a Brother Foote voted against President Heywood and Judge Bradley; some did not vote; but the vast majority voted to sustain the present officers. (Journal of Martha Spence Heywood.)

There were no doubt many misunderstandings, but usually they were settled in a spirit of fair play and without the characteristic rowdyism and lawlessness of most western frontiers. (Brough, p. 66.)

Juab County was organized March 3, 1852, and in 1866 Nephi was designated as the county seat. Nephi City was not incorporated as a municipal corporation until 1889.

Resolution Adopted by the Regular Meeting of the Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district, held on Sunday, April 30, 1961, in the Polish Community Home, Utica, N.Y., and unanimously ratified at the special meeting of its board of directors, July 30, 1961, in the Polish National Alliance Home, Schenectady, N.Y.:

RESOLUTION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC., OF CENTRAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK STATE AUGUST 18, 1961

Whereas it is a historical fact that the western borders of Poland included the Rivers Oder and Niese centuries before there was the Bismarck's State of Germany; and

Whereas the German Nazis attacked the western lands of Poland during the fall of 1939 bringing with them the havoc of war; slaughter of human individuals; perpetrating rape on women; robbing; burning and killing and causing other destruction and devastation; and

Whereas the people of Poland throughout their history prove that the predominant purposes of their existence are to worship God, establish freedom, liberty, justice and peace throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That for aforesaid reasons the American Government adopt as part of its foreign policy restoration of the western lands to Poland to the Rivers Oder and Niese; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Governor of the State of New York, the U.S. Senators and Congressmen representing the New York State and the national headquarters of the Polish American Congress.

Reevaluation of Value of Appropriations for Moonshot Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we should be spending our money wisely in the development of the most modern and practical defense weapons, it seems to me Congress should carefully reevaluate the importance of the President's proposal to spend billions in an effort to reach the moon. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune states the case most clearly:

MOONSHOOT

It's too late to do anything about it at this session of Congress, but next year there should be a reconsideration of President Kennedy's moon project.

So far as we can discover, the only technically competent people who believe it is worth what it is expected to cost are those who have been dreaming of a moon shoot for years. Many other scientists whose opinions are entitled to consideration think the stunt, even if it succeeds, is only a stunt and that the Nation will not be rewarded adequately for the enormous outlay.

Of course, no one can say for sure that a landing on the moon and a return to earth will be altogether fruitless. It might yield some knowledge that cannot be obtained through instruments. As a sporting event, it would surpass the world's series, the Kentucky Derby, the professional football championship, the Olympic games, and the Davis Cup finals rolled into one and multiplied by

a hundred. But it would still fall far short of being worth what the achievement would cost if present estimates of between $10 and $40 billion are not exceeded.

President Kennedy proposed the excursion to the moon immediately after the first of the Russian orbital flights. He seemed to think that the Russians' achievement would remain in the forefront of men's minds for months and years to come and we were, therefore, justified in going to almost any length to cap their triumph with a far more startling one of our own. Congress agreed and voted $300 million for a start.

Now, only a few months later, the world has not forgotten the orbital flights but it surely is not obsessed with them as it was for a few days. Khrushchev's resumption of atom bomb testing in the atmosphere is now preoccupying public attention. Tomorrow and next year it will be something else.

There are other and better ways of demonstrating that this is a great nation than by sending an expedition to the moon at staggering costs.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Apprenticeship Figures Offer Substantial Proof of Worth of Bridges-Randolph Apprenticeship Act of 1946—District of Columbia Leads Country in Ratio of Apprentices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, information has come to my attention which would indicate that there may be some effort in this Congress to amend or repeal the Apprenticeship Act of 1946, for the District of Columbia, authored by Senator STYLES BRIDGES and myself, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I do not know whether such information is authentic or not, or if it is, from whence an attack would come. But I do know that any effort to abolish Public Law 387 of the 79th Congress would be most ill-advised and would be detrimental to the development of skilled labor in the District of Columbia.

As a rule the members of the State apprenticeship councils are among the most enlightened and responsible leaders from management and organized labor. They counsel together in the cooperative effort to provide at State and local levels a sound foundation for apprenticeship training. The Apprenticeship Council of the District of Columbia is no exception in this respect; it is an exception only in that it has placed the District of Columbia in first position among the 50 States, the District, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in the ratio of skilled labor apprentices to the general population.

In this regard, it is noteworthy that the District of Columbia, with virtually no industrial activity, has an apprenticeship ratio more than three times that of such large industrial States as Michigan and Illinois, neither of which has an apprenticeship council. Nor is this merely an accidental relationship. The crucial importance of an apprenticeship council in stimulating the increase of registered apprentices is revealed in a report published by the Wisconsin Industrial Commission this year.

In this report, the District of Columbia, with 2,267 registered apprentices, leads the Nation with a ratio of 1 apprentice for 336.9 members of the general population. Among the next 4 States—Arizona, Nevada, Connecticut, and Hawaii—each has an apprenticeship law which has been in effect two decades or more, and among the top 21 States, all but one has such a law. The evidence is overwhelming, Mr. President, in support of the validity of our State apprenticeship laws.

At a time when our technology is placing increasingly heavy demands upon skilled labor, it would be most foolish and ill advised to begin nibbling away at one of the means by which the supply of skilled labor is maintained and increased. I hope such an effort will not be launched by this Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a table adopted from the Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961 ranking the several States in the ratio of apprentices to population and showing the date of enactment of State apprenticeship laws.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ratio of registered apprentices to population—Adopted from Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961

States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population
1. District of Columbia	(1946)	763, 956	2, 267	336. 9
2. Arizona	(1941)	1, 302, 161	2, 582	504. 3
3. Nevada	(1939)	285, 278	527	540. 3
4. Connecticut	(1938)	2, 535, 234	4, 358	581. 7
5. Hawaii	(1941)	632, 772	1, 054	600. 3
6. Washington	(1941)	2, 853, 214	4, 064	702. 0
7. Rhode Island	(1942)	859, 488	1, 172	733. 3
8. California	(1939)	15, 717, 204	21, 219	740. 7
9. Minnesota	(1939)	3, 413, 864	4, 559	748. 8
10. Oregon	(1931)	1, 768, 687	2, 345	754. 2
11. Vermont	(1939)	389, 881	513	760. 0
12. Alaska	(1946)	226, 167	284	796. 3
13. Montana	(1941)	674, 767	838	805. 2
14. Utah	(1949)	890, 627	1, 094	814. 1
15. Wyoming	(None)	330, 066	378	873. 1
16. Colorado	(1937)	1, 753, 947	1, 939	904. 5
17. Wisconsin	(1911)	3, 951, 777	4, 229	934. 4
18. Ohio	(1939)	9, 706, 397	9, 808	989. 6
19. Florida	(1938)	4, 951, 560	4, 967	996. 8
20. New Mexico	(1945)	951, 023	935	1, 017. 1
21. New York	(1941)	16, 782, 304	16, 331	1, 027. 6
22. Michigan	(None)	7, 823, 194	7, 366	1, 062. 0
23. Delaware	(None)	446, 292	417	1, 070. 2
24. Illinois	(None)	10, 081, 158	9, 183	1, 097. 8
United States	(1937)	179, 323, 175	161, 128	1, 112. 9
25. Alabama	(None)	3, 266, 740	1, 978	1, 145. 9
26. Missouri	(None)	4, 319, 813	3, 264	1, 323. 4
27. Massachusetts	(1938)	5, 148, 578	3, 881	1, 326. 6
28. Tennessee	(None)	3, 567, 089	2, 662	1, 340. 0
29. North Dakota	(None	632, 446	462	1, 368. 9
30. Indiana	(None)	4, 662, 498	3, 403	1, 370. 1
31. Maryland	(None)	3, 100, 689	2, 165	1, 430. 3
32. New Jersey	(1953)	6, 066, 782	4, 177	1, 452. 4
33. North Carolina	(1939)	4, 556, 155	3, 105	1, 467. 3
34. Louisiana	(1938)	3, 257, 022	2, 096	1, 506. 2
35. Oklahoma	(None)	2, 328, 284	1, 521	1, 503. 7
36. Iowa	(1936)	2, 757, 537	1, 783	1, 546. 5
37. Pennsylvania	(1939)	11, 319, 366	7, 129	1, 587. 7
38. Maine	(1942)	969, 265	606	1, 599. 4
39. Nebraska	(None)	1, 411, 330	878	1, 607. 4
40. Virginia	(1938)	3, 966, 949	2, 467	1, 608. 0
41. Idaho	(None)	667, 191	391	1, 706. 3
42. Texas	(None)	9, 579, 677	5, 457	1, 753. 6
43. Georgia	(None)	3, 943, 116	2, 196	1, 795. 5
44. Arkansas	(None)	1, 786, 272	943	1, 894. 2
45. Kansas	(1941)	2, 178, 611	1, 144	1, 904. 3
46. South Dakota	(None)	680, 514	356	1, 911. 5
47. Kentucky	(1940)	3, 038, 156	1, 557	1, 951. 9
48. Puerto Rico	(1947)	2, 282, 000	1, 107	2, 061. 4
49. Mississippi	(None)	2, 178, 141	1, 003	2, 171. 6
50. West Virginia	(None)	1, 860, 421	820	2, 268. 8
51. South Carolina	(None)	2, 382, 594	878	2, 713. 6
52. New Hampshire	(1941)	606, 921	210	2, 890. 1

The Peace Corps

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide for a Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the vote yesterday on the creation of a Peace Corps was one of those occasions when heart and mind conflict.

Many eloquent speakers, none more so than the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] for whom I have the highest regard, talked of the good will Americans would earn by sending young men and women to live with and teach the people of underdeveloped nations. They pointed out that our massive foreign-aid programs have little effect upon the people in the villages of Asia and Africa.

Others spoke with equal conviction concerning the futility of sending a few hundred Ameircans to improve conditions among hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa. They spoke of how blunders would react against us. They predicted

the new agency would become another superbureaucracy and lose sight of its idealistic origins.

My heart is with those who believe that young Americans are both practical enough and idealistic enough to accomplish the objectives of the Peace Corps.

My experiences inform me of the dangers and pitfalls, and that we should not embark upon this kind of program as a permanent agency of Government until experience permits us to evaluate its operation and effectiveness.

We are getting such experience now. President Kennedy used authority under the Mutual Security Act to establish and finance a temporary program. Volunteers are being trained for service in Africa and Latin America. There appears no need to rush into establishment of the permanent Peace Corps agency.

I voted "no," not against the idea or the purpose of the Peace Corps, but to delay a decision until we know whether the experiment now underway is a success. I sincerely hope that it will be.

Why Is It Bad News When Khrushchev's Serfs Revolt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of September 16, 1961, is very timely:

WHY IS IT BAD NEWS WHEN KHRUSHCHEV'S SERFS REVOLT?

It is impossible to predict as this is written just what course the Berlin crisis will take. It is likely to drag along for many inconclusive months. However, Khrushchev's ability to retain the initiative, despite worsening conditions throughout the Red empire, undoubtedly received encouragement from a number of events in the West.

Even the President's military gestures could not have disturbed the Kremlin too much. The emphasis on conventional military and naval forces, coupled with our failure to order prompt resumption of nuclear tests could have led the Soviet dictator to believe that the West was not expecting serious trouble. He can hardly believe that the West is thinking in terms of limited war in which Khrushchev, with his superiority in numbers, would have the advantage. Talk of massive retaliation is not considered cricket these days. However, in 1959, when we had a Berlin crisis, President Eisenhower had only to ask the question: "With 175 Soviet divisions in that neighborhood, why would anybody dream of fighting a ground war?" Despite the Presidents remark that he didn't see how nuclear war would free anything, Khrushchev got the word. He didn't want nuclear war then any more than the Committee for a Sane Nuclear policy does. Nor does he today.

More disturbing have been the signs of funk over what should have been regarded as good news, the rush of refugees from East Berlin and the consequent disorders. Instead of general rejoicing over the appearance of cracks in the Communist wall, there were widespread expressions of alarm. Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggested on a radio and television program that this country would be willing to "negotiate" the closing of escape avenues from East Berlin, presumably lest the flood of refugees create disturbances which could lead to war. The New York Times reported from Washington that "the policy of the United States and its allies continues to be that nothing will be done to encourage a rebellion in East Germany and nothing will be done to assist if one should erupt because of the danger of a clash with Soviet forces." In support of this policy, the Times stated editorially on August 16 that "we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Certainly nobody demands military action in these circumstances, but the question arises: How long will our own citadel of freedom survive if the Kremlin is always to be free to shore up tottering Communist regimes with the tacit encouragement of the free world? Liberals, especially in England, console themselves with the thought that the flight of so many from East Berlin has served its purpose because world opinion is now convinced that people don't like communism. Well, that was made plain by earlier revolts in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Whatever would opinion may have learned from those tragic events, the Communists still control East Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Despite Vice President JOHNSON'S reassuring words in Berlin, the fact remains that Khrushchev had already bottled up the East Berlin escape hatch with no interference by the West. The danger to world opinion is that the bystanders will conclude that the West does not desire an end to the Communist threat earnestly enough to take any risks.

If we are going to shudder with fear every time internal discontents erupt into action in the Communist empire, and what is worse, if we actually are going to attempt to throttle the discontented to save our own skins, our eventual fate can be charted. That course would not save our skins but would hasten the day when, having lost our allies within the slave empire and weakened our own morale by false hopes and avoidances, we faced the ultimatum: Surrender or die.

Summer Commencement Address at Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University in a recent summer commencement address at the university asked that we look again for the meaning and spirit behind the values of true freedom.

In the face of crises, propaganda, and policy changes from the Soviet Union, he said, "We are running scared, instead of remaining poised." Yet freedom is made up of discipline, not whim, Dr. Case points out. Panic or hasty improvisation cannot substitute for steady research and development on the problems of making democracy work with integrity.

I feel Dr. Case's words are particularly valuable for us today at a time when the President, Congress, and the Government are under constant provocation from at home and abroad to do something about the problems being forced on us by Mr. Khrushchev and others. We must always remember the value of patience in times such as these. We must remain strong, but we must also be careful not to abuse this strength and use it hastily in the face of provocation.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Case's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1837, Ralph Waldo Emerson, speaking in a time of acute depression and of widespread confusion, counseled Harvard graduates "not to quit their belief that a popgun is a popgun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom."

Since we have a vocal group of doom peddlers in our time, we shall do well to heed Mr. Emerson's advice. It is difficult, at best, to maintain balance in a society swinging past the center, to the far extremes of right and of left. In fact, the favorite strategy of the Soviets is to change policy and propaganda frequently, to force their competitors off balance.

Poise invites reflection and tells us that the greater the volume of propaganda and the more extreme, the more clear the evidence of trouble in the realm of the propagandamaker.

So, the achievement of the Russian scientists in launching Titov into orbit, and his success in 17 circuits around the earth and a self-controlled landing, tempt us to frantic efforts through crash programs to catch up in the space race.

But when the print is barely dry on reports of this Russian exploit, they close the Brandenburg gate and string barbed wire, mount machineguns and fire tear gas, to seal off Germans who are unfortunate residents in the east side of Berlin from access to their jobs, relatives, or supplies on the fortunate west side of that city. Thus, communism is exposed before all the world—the emerging peoples and the sophisticated nations—as a failure in its attempt to win the loyalties of thoughtful people.

To be sure, tomorrow may produce a report of a Russian moon landing. But the next day will bring another haunting demand for freedom from oppression and forceful coercion. Meanwhile, we should maintain poise.

I speak today for the reinterpretation of the meaning and the re-animation of the values of true freedom.

The paramount goal of this Nation was stated at the outset of our history, as follows, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was a great conviction.. Its soaring hopes launched a new nation. The people bound themselves by the declaration that each person has infinite worth. What majestic progress has been made toward the realization of that high aim. Lofty living standards, a comprehensive educational system, an expanding economy, vital religion, decent communities, honorable citizens, loving families—much has been accomplished.

More, much more, remains to be done, in racial integration, improvement and expansion of education, extension of medical care, assurance of decent government, but enough has been achieved to make this Nation the envy, the dream, and often the resentment, of all other nations.

Shall we desert this utopian hope? When others wish for our living level, shall we deplete our energies, and deaden our idealism? Never, in the long trek from primitive existence to modern convenience, has any nation been given such an opportunity as ours.

I believe that one of the chief causes of our confusion at this time is that we do not understand or believe in our own tradition.

"Democracy," says Henry Wriston "is the political aspect of the assertion of the supreme importance of the individual. It is predicated upon the measureless riches that arise from the variety of his inventiveness. In freedom, each thinker and doer has the right to self-expression in vocation and avocation. Liberty puts the maximum upon self-discipline."

But the East-West struggle has assumed such proportions and has become so grim, that we are "running scared," demanding more fallout shelters, bigger bombs, and matching military forces. It would be foolish to deny that strength of arms is a likely deterrent to a dictator. But it would be equally short-sighted to hope that war, either of the "brush fire" size or of the nuclear-bomb extent, can substitute for intelligent negotiation. Nor will panic or hasty improvisation substitute for the steady pulsebeat of brilliant research and development. Our supreme task is to make democracy work with integrity, and to provide such resources for spirit, mind, and body for all of our citizens, plus cooperation with other nations for their good, that the stubborn faith of depressed peoples will sweep all tyrants of the right and of the left, out of power.

To this end, let us remember that freedom is not listlessness, but discipline. It is not made up of whim, but of keen thought. It is not designed to gratify one individual at the expense of another, but rather to provide each of us with the urge to inner control for the well-being of all.

The cultivation of innter directedness is, therefore, the central problem for the educational forces in a free society. Responsible thought and behavior are not cultivated by absence of rules or restraints, by hidden persuaders, by inflation of material wants, or by news emphasis on the violent or the tragic. Rather, it is attained when the mind and the emotions are disciplined and produce responsible action.

A man is not mere intellect. Some of the worst citizens have been brilliant. Man is not mere emotion. Feelings are never reliable, unless curbed by mind.

"The sense of responsibility from which self-control is to spring is rooted in a disciplined life of mind as well as of emotion, a balanced grasp of frequently conflicting values; it is rooted in a sensible, realistic picture of the nature of man," says Dr. Harry D. Gideonse. He summarizes Emerson's statement on man, saying, "man is not a professor, an engineer, a farmer, a garment worker. Man is whole. He is minister and scholar and statesman, and parent and lover and soldier."

Wholeness in man, if there is to be wholesomeness in conduct, is basic. Any drive toward increased productivity, toward applied science and technology, toward specialized, conveyor-belt production, is a sharper drive toward increasingly specialized use of only a small part of man's whole personal endowment. For man has a body and a mind, glands and a brain, and free man requires disciplined emotions and a disciplined mind.

Healthy feelings, trained imagination, the significance of rhythm, the value of tradition and richness of ceremony, the cultivation of skills in evaluation, are basic to the goals of each person.

Since the importance of specialized competence in science, in technology, and in administration is beyond debate, I suggest that our educational forces deliberately set about to enrich the social sciences and the humanities, the reflective and valuing experience, the arts in the curriculum and in the entire climate of learning.

In New England, we should know that while skills are important, they are not very reassuring. Textiles can change to electronics within one generation, and skilled men and women revert to unskilled laborers overnight.

Rather, we should think more and more of the total of the formative influences brought to bear on our youth. It is not radical to suggest that profit and loss may be excellent criteria of material productivity but questionable guides for cultural achievement, where quality alone is the proper standard. When, for example, profit controls the choice of programs in communications, violence becomes television's primary curriculum. Why we allow this, when we are expending so much for positive character values in the education of our children, I cannot understand.

I am trying to say to you that only if we are as effective in the achievement of the aims of our free society as the Soviets are in the achievement of the aims of a collectivist society, can we succeed. To this end, we must make stern self-discipline attractive, then recognize and reward it. We must cease to allow our cultural values to be muddied by a beatnik attitude, or made tired by the claptrap of political orations. Instead, they must be the springs of human behavior; each one of us must resolve to be a useful human being in a changing world, constantly probing, reading wisely, thinking deeply, evaluating idealistically, behaving wisely. We must again echo the words of an ancient writer, "now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three, and the greatest of these is love." In the Judeo-Christian ideal this is not a sickly, sweet, sentimental heartthrob, but the probing microscope of a scholar, the intelligent negotiation of a statesman, the cutting edge of a surgeon's knife, the wise decision of a judge, the affectionate discipline of a parent, or the demanding academic standard of a professor.

Let us be done with self-pity, with small talk, with jive language, with meaningless activity. We face a moral challenge, and we can meet it only by reemphasizing the moral, spiritual side of our nature and of our society. If we do this effectively, rigorously, and wisely, we can compete, we can balance our budgets, and we can reveal to the world the best way yet conceived for men to live together on this planet.

So, I urge you, not to lose your conviction that a problem is a problem, though the raucous and the reactionary proclaim it to be the crack of doom.

John E. Erickson, Retiring National Commander, Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an excellent and well deserved editorial in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, on September 14, 1961.

JOHN E. ERICKSON, RETIRING NATIONAL COMMANDER, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

To the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, as you and your auxiliary partner meet in Dallas, Tex., for your ninth annual convention, the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes extend to you greetings and best wishes for a successful convention.

With your national headquarters domiciled in the same building as the National Tribune, naturally we have had a close and pleasant association with your national officers and the affairs of your group. We have been eyewitnesses to most of their deliberations and have been impressed with the devotion, sincerity, and the dedication to duty with which they are instilled.

On the legislative front it seems to us that definite progress has been made. The appearance of your national commander and legislative representatives before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee was a signal success and brought forth many expressions of respect and admiration from Members of Congress. It appears fairly certain that the House committee will meet in executive session and give consideration to the pleas voiced by your representatives, although this may not take place before the present session of Congress adjourns.

From many, many communications received in this office, it appears that there is an admirable spirit of unity and harmony within the organization. The 11-point program sponsored by National Commander John E. Erickson has been well received at various department conventions held throughout the country and a large number of State organizations have endorsed it in its entirety.

Your national commander has been an able and eloquent advocate of the aims and objectives of the organization. He has been tireless in his devotion to his buddies. He has received splendid cooperation from those who were named to serve with him at Miami, Fla., last year.

With respect to membership in the organization, a new milestone was reached last month when the 200,000th member was recruited. There has been a significant increase in overall membership over the past year, new departments have been added and certified public accountants have attested to the financial stability of the organization.

We are well aware that no program can be fully completed within a year's time but it is a source of satisfaction to this newspaper and to your entire membership that much has been accomplished in the past year and a solid groundwork has been laid for future action.

As in the past, the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes will continue its active efforts to advance the program of your society because we believe in you and what you are endeavoring to do for your less fortunate buddies and their dependents.

May you continue to prosper.

"College News Conference"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to be associated in the remarks made by several of my colleagues in welcoming

Ruth Hagy's "College News Conference" back to the national airwaves this fall.

The Peabody Award-winning program will begin its 10th year in late October over some 58 stations of the National Education Television and Radio Center network (NET), plus Metro Media, Inc., in New York and Washington.

Throughout the years, "College News Conference" has been an instrumental forum in acquainting, analyzing, and presenting to the American public the great issues and events of our time. The program has made an outstanding contribution in the field of public service broadcasting. Miss Hagy tells me that "College News Conference" is planning a new series format this year, and I for one am looking forward to the program's resumption.

In connection with the program's announcement, I ask unanimous consent that a press release from National Educational Television be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"College News Conference," the Peabody Award winning series, will begin its 10th year this fall on a new network, National Educational Television (NET).

Guests on the weekly series of half-hour programs during the 1961–62 season will include Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff, and USIA Director Edward R. Murrow. They and other distinguished persons will be interviewed by panels of selected college students.

The announcement that NET had acquired the series was made today—Wednesday August 23—by John F. White, president of the National Education Television and Radio Center, headquarters and programing agency for the network of more than 50 noncommercial TV stations across the country. "College News Conference" formerly was presented by the American Broadcasting Co.

In his statement Mr. White said "We are happy to welcome "College News Conference," a series with a distinguished history on commercial television. It joins a long list or other fine series that have established NET as a fourth national network offering outstanding news and cultural programs at prime time."

Ruth Hagy, producer and moderator of "College News Conference," said, "I have been delighted with the cooperation of National Educational Television and am very pleased to announce that NET will give us the opportunity to take our cameras to the people and events making the news. I have long felt that television should be doing more of this sort of thing."

The first program, to be seen on NET stations in November, will be a study of the Peace Corps in action in Colombia. Miss Hagy recently returned from a series of talks with Government officials in that nation. The program will include films of Corps members training in the United States, receiving on-the-job training in Colombia, and at work there, as well as interviews of Peace Corps members by outstanding Colombian students.

Donald S. Hillman, executive producer of public affairs programs for NET, said arrangements are being completed to produce a program in Berlin.

As part of the series' new format, "College News Conference" programs this year also will originate from cities throughout the United States. For example, the facilities of the NET station in Denver, KRMA-TV, will be used for a program on space and development with space expert Gen. Bernard Schriever and students from the Denver area.

The program with Senator GOLDWATER may be shot at the Senator's home overlooking Phoenix by a remote crew from KAET, the NET station in that city.

According to Mr. White, NET also will make the series available, for broadcast by commercial stations on a sustaining basis.

"College News Conference" and Miss Hagy have been cited by numerous civic and youth organizations. The series has been on the air since 1952.

World's Best Place for Moon Rocketry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 23, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as progress is made in our country's efforts for the conquest of space, the time approaches when a decision must be made as to the situs of the launching of the moonshot.

The case thus far for my State of Alaska is ably expressed in an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily Times of September 13, 1961, and makes such interesting reading that I hereby submit same for the enjoyment and edification of my colleagues:

WORLD'S BEST PLACE FOR MOON ROCKETRY

A new range for launching space probes is being sought by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The search has extended to many odd and distant points but it is not believed to have yet been focused on Alaska.

Alaska should be considered. There are impressive physical, geographical, scientific, and strategic factors that make this State a logical area for serious attention.

NASA is trying to locate at Cape Canaveral, Fla. But even if ideals are compromised and huge sums of money are spent on facilities there, the outlook for future development, expansion, and utilization is bleak.

The new generation of space rockets will be different from the present ones. They will generate sound waves that will shatter windows at 20 or 30 miles. In Florida there is only a 10-mile buffer zone between the launching pads and dense population areas.

The main attractions of Cape Canaveral are that it is already an established scientific center, is accessible and reasonably close to supply sources and firings eastward are over water.

Alaska's attractions may overshadow those of Cape Canaveral and perhaps all other places under the American flag. They are certainly worthy of study.

Eight factors that distinguish Alaska are:

1. Land. Congress is being asked for $60 million for the purchase of 80,000 acres in Florida, and condemnation proceedings may be involved. In Alaska there are dozens of places where NASA could have twice as much land at little or no cost, with assurance of more land for expansion as moon rocketry and new scientific developments evolve.

2. Separation. The Florida location has an inadequate separation from dense population centers. NASA will be faced with the continual liability for broken windows, and perhaps the responsibility for clearing people from large areas—a costly and difficult program. In Alaska there need be no such problem. There are thousands of square miles of wilderness that would provide adequate buffer areas at no cost and involving inconvenience to no people.

3. Overwater shots. In Florida they must be made in one direction. From Alaska they can be made in any of several directions. By firing to the northeast, a rocket can go around the world without passing over a populated area. Boosters can fall into the water almost anywhere along the route. The only land area on the route is northern Alaska, northern Canada, and Antarctica. Another route for overwater shots could be to the southeast. The rockets could go 20,000 miles past the coast of continental United States, the tip of South America, Africa, and into the Bay of Bengal near India. The only land area on the route is Antarctica.

4. The Van Allen radiation belt. Scientists have discovered this hazard to space travel is at a minimum in the Arctic areas. Launching facilities in Alaska would take advantage of this.

5. Accessibility. Boosters manufactured on the U.S. west coast could be delivered by water, probably cheaper than by railroad across country to Florida. Ocean delivery would also solve the problems arising from the increasing size of rocket components. There would be no railroad tunnels too small, turns too sharp or other physical limitations on the route of delivery.

6. Climate. Booster rockets are known to function more effectively in cooler climates than in hot. Electronic components function more reliably in areas of even temperatures.

7. Tracking. Rockets launched from Alaska would take advantage of the tracking facilities and capabilities already available in connection with the DEW line across Canada, and the missile range of the South Atlantic Ocean. The rockets would pass near stations equipped for telemetering and with good communications tied in to Norad.

8. Strategic value. Facilities located in Alaska would be available for quick conversion to military use if the need should arise. Missiles launched here would have all major targets of both China and Russia within their range.

Business week magazine for September 2 said that NASA is trying to adapt Cape Canaveral areas to the big rockets after looking at many Pacific islands for better sites.

There was no indication that the space agency leaders had studied Alaska. Inasmuch as their decision will guide the expenditure of between $2 and $4 billion before the first lunar shot, it is essential that no area be overlooked.

Florida has some advantages but falls short in important categories. Alaska has attractions that might involve fewer compromises on the idea situation and installations would have longer use.

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for the gentleman from New York, it was not possible for him to vote

on the Peace Corps legislation which passed the House on Thursday, September 14, due to the fact that I was asked to attend a meeting of Congressmen with President Kennedy late that afternoon.

I would have supported the legislation by voting in the affirmative had I been present, because I think the Peace Corps represents a true indication of the idealism of the American people and their eagerness to help those peoples of the underdeveloped countries abroad.

Some feel that the Peace Corps will not attain the objective or function with the effectiveness that is desired. On the other hand, the motivation supplied by President Kennedy, together with the eager and enthusiastic administrative support given by R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., leads me to believe that much good can be accomplished along the lines prescribed by the organizers of the Corps.

History has shown that great works can be done by dedicated missionaries of various types and there is reason to believe that even in the field of world affairs, much can be done if the aims are sound and the proper support is rendered.

The Peace Corps is a nonpartisan undertaking, and intelligent men from both sides of the aisle have given it their endorsement. The world will be watching the efforts of the men and women of the Corps, and from what I have observed they are a dedicated and patriotic group who will serve the interests of America well.

The Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Welcome, Stranger," published in the education section of Time magazine of September 8, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME, STRANGER

U.S. colleges this month turn to a duty that has grown to critical national importance: educationg students from new and developing nations who passionately seek U.S. knowledge. It is a task full of promise. "Students want to come to the United States," says Philip H. Coombs, the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. "This is an asset we should be pretty thankful for. We couldn't buy it."

Last year U.S. colleges enrolled 53,107 foreign students, up 46 percent since 1956. Included were 19,222 Asians, a 12-percent rise in 1 year, and 2,831 Africans, a 44-percent rise in 1 year. Last June U.S. colleges produced 20,000 foreign alumni, nearly twice as many as the graduates of all Ivy League colleges; 7.4 percent of Harvard students were foreigners. This year U.S. colleges will probably enroll at least 57,000. By one estimate, the United States in 5 years may have 200,000 foreign students.

Foreign students are still only 1.3 percent of U.S. college enrollment (against 12 percent in British universities, 30 percent in Austria); yet the record far exceeds Russia's. The 39,500 students attracted to the United States from underdeveloped areas last year compared with 3,600 in all the Communist-bloc countries. Despite the lure of Moscow's Patrice Lumumba (formerly Friendship) University, the Russians hooked a mere 441 Africans, 186 of them from Guinea. The Russians' total Latin American catch: 200 students, half from Cuba. In the Middle East, they recruited 664 students mostly Iraquis. "Many Soviet scholarships are going begging in Africa and the Middle East," says Coombs.

MAKING FRIENDS

The U.S. Government itself is confined to a surprisingly small share of student exchange. Last year it provided only partial sponsorship for only about 5,000 foreign students. The rest are left to the kind of private effort that Coombs calls "the people's branch of foreign relations." He means that making U.S. friends out of foreign students is almost entirely a challenge to individual Americans, from the college president who selects sanely and sets up solid orientation to the family that feeds and houses foreign students with courtesy and discretion.

Unhappily for people dealing with foreign students, there is no stock model; Congolese differ from Kenyans as much as Belgians from Britons. But there is at least a statistical average. The foreign student in 1961 is probably a male undergraduate studying engineering (with social sciences favored among Africans). He is far poorer than his often rich predecessors, and he is culturaly more remote from U.S. life. He needs more financial help, more guidance, and more understanding than ever.

One of his basic psychological problems is an almost invariable loss of self-esteem after arrival; he feels uprooted and hence resentful. He is shocked at the meagerness of his money; U.S. scholarships do not usually cover living expenses or summer vacations as do Europe's. He finds astonishingly diversified colleges with unpredictable standards. He finds rude waiters, Jimmy Hoffa, demanding children, and kind old ladies who ask Africans if they live in trees. He rarely finds anyone who knows the location of Mali, Gabon or Dahomey, or even of their existence.

UHURUL

The more backward his country, the more elite the foreign student—and the greater his pique that no one recognizes it. "When you're dealing with an African student," says Coombs, "you may be dealing with a fellow who will be prime minister in 5 years." Yet if his skin is colored, the future prime minister is certain to encounter discrimination, not only in the South's segregated colleges, but also in northern restaurants, barberships, and off-campus housing.

None of this weighs heavily against the promise of power and affluence that a degree guarantees. Education is synonymous with Uhurul (freedom). Kenyans deluge the United States with thousands of scholarship applications, some of them so misinformed that mature men have applied to a girls' boarding school. Says one British diplomat: "These people are going to get across the Atlantic by hook or by crook, and they are going to survive. They can't face their villages unless they return in triumph."

Until now, African students have mostly got to the United States on their own and with enough disorganization to damage their studies. Kenya's passion, for example, led to the pell-mell African airlift originated by politician Tom Mboya that got so much publicity in the U.S. presidential campaign when the Kennedy Foundation beat the Eisenhower State Department to the punch with $100,000 air fare. (Coombs used State's $100,000 last spring to bail out the same 289 Africans flown in by the Kennedy Foundation; having arrived with sparse shillings and small scholarships, they were in dire straits.) A typical example was the Kenyan wih a $200 scholarship to a Midwestern university who learned that he also owed $1,000 in fees, not to mention the support of his six children. Applying the self-help theory, which Tom Mboya favors, some students frantically begged for money everywhere. "Please help me," one wrote to the British Embassy, "because I'm beginning to smell."

DEODORANTS AND DISHES

In tidy contrast is a new program, developed by Harvard's Dean of Admissions David D. Henry, which this year will bring 250 students, mostly from West Africa, to some 150 U.S. campuses. Coordinated by the African-American Institute, the "Henry Program" includes a rigorous selection system, transportation, 4-year scholarships and all living expenses (paid by the International Cooperation Administration). A key feature is solid orientation. Many of the students recently spent 8 days on a transatlantic steamer, endlessly discussing everything from segregation to deodorants and the news (to Africans) that U.S. men sometimes have to wash dishes; one androcratic African man even sat down at a table next to a woman for the first time in his life. At Pennsylvania, Lincoln, and Atlanta universities, the newcomers soberly studied everything from dating to telephone terminology, even took model exams to get the feel of U.S. classrooms.

Secretary Coombs thinks that there is rom for both Henry's and Mboya's methods. Coordinating the two approaches through the Institute of International Education, he has put another $100,000 into a better screening and scholarship system in East Africa. But foreign-student aid is not fully organized and there is obvious need for a really extensive foreign-students admission system with State Department help all over the world. This is one of Coomb's top priorities should Congress approve a pending revision of the 15-year-old Fulbright Act that would unify and expand all U.S. exchange programs into what Senator FULBRIGHT calls "a positive instrument of foreign policy."

AMICABLE ALUMNI

Organization and funds will solve most of the quirks in student exchange, notably the money worries that help embitter visitors. But these problems do not seem to have cost the United States much prestige, to judge from the students who finish their schooling and go home. What they say, in fact, reflects singular credit on U.S. education.

Argentines admire college spirit and practical lab work in U.S. schools; their own universities have no campus life and few professors who answer questions. Middle Easterners thirst for the technical training that their own classical universities lack, and praise the pragmatic way of American life because it refuses to accept the status quo.

Of the 140 known U.S. alumni in Ghana, for example, the only West baiter is Lincoln University alumnus (1939) President Kwame Nkrumah—although he may outweigh the others. More typical are such friendly U.S. alumni as India's Under Secretary for External Affairs, the director of the Iraqui Atomic Energy Commission, Colombia's Minister of Mines, and Venezuela's Minister of Finance. What seems significant is the Argentine pattern of students who leave for

the United States, as rabid anti-Yankees, return emphatically pro-United States.

"Everything I've done so far I owe to my American schooling," says the head of a major Turkish advertising agency who went to the University of Wisconsin. The story is familiar to Mandayam A. Sreedhar, 35, one of India's most brilliant engineers. What he learned at the Universities of Syracuse and Pennsylvania (1953) was warm belief in the "basic American view that two fellows can start a business in a garage and build it into a multimillion-dollar concern. I have never since found it difficult to understand an American."

Background Berlin, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial appearing in the Somerset Daily American on September 14, 1961. I believe this editorial to be timely because of the increased attention focused on the Berlin situation and thought the other Members of the House would like to have the benefit of the views in this editorial:

APOLOGY IN ORDER

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has advised former President Eisenhower that the State Department did not mean to criticize his role in the Second World War capture of Berlin.

A State Department pamphlet entitled "Background Berlin—1961" pictured General Eisenhower as having made the decision which prevented the Allied forces from taking Berlin before the Russians did.

The decision for the partition was made at Yalta in spite of the fact that General Eisenhower sent his chief of staff to Yalta to argue against the plan.

If we were to stop with the above statement, we might come to believe that Joseph Stalin was the architect of the division. If he was, he had a disciple on this side of the Atlantic who did his best to sell the bill of goods to the American people.

The same year that Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin met in Yalta (February 3–11) a book was published by Sumner Welles, who until the previous year had been Under Secretary of State. It was entitled "A Time for Decision" and in one part of it outlined a division of Germany which was the basis for the plan followed when the three heads of state met in Yalta.

The book was not the fly-by-night variety. It gives every evidence of extended research. The author backs his arguments with historical evidence. This means it must have been written before the Yalta meeting.

There can be no doubt about the influence which Mr. Welles had on those who partitioned Germany. It was not Russia but a united Germany which he felt would be a threat to the peace of the world in the years ahead.

To avoid this threat, Mr. Welles planned for a Germany which would be divided into three parts. His reason was to avoid the reestablishment of an all-powerful German general staff which could again plunge the world into another world war.

Another reason given for the division was the danger posed by those trained in the Hitler youth programs.

He did not believe that this group would be ready for a democratic type of government. Here is the way he puts it: "There is no proof which can be offered, worthy of credence, that the history of the German people during the past 25 years holds even a spark of promise that democracy would become a true, or predominant, force within Germany so long as the tragically poisoned German youth of the Hitler years remain a majority of the German people."

If Sumner Welles could see West Germany today, he would be forced to admit that he was wrong. It is too bad that he did not realize that the predictions which he made concerning the future of Germany would apply only to the eastern sector.

This must be said, however, Mr. Welles did believe that the dangers which he attributed to the German general staff would thrive in a Communist-dominated regime. It was his hope that the United Nations would prevent Communist domination of East Germany.

The democracy which he predicted couldn't become a reality in Germany did come to pass, and with it came the union of two of the sectors which he wanted to keep as separate and distinct entities.

The third, however, has been a constant threat to the peace of the world. The reason is simply this: The Kremlin leaders are pressing for the kind of division which Sumner Welles outlined, with Berlin well within the boundary of East Germany.

"The Time for Decision" is a book which should be read by any who wish to understand the background of the present Berlin crisis. It is a more important book today than it was when it was first published 17 years ago.

Wisconsin Apprenticeship Program—A More Realistic Approach to Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a leader of the world—charged with great responsibilities—we also face a great need for a mature thinking and outlook in our domestic life.

Among other fields this is particularly true in the labor-management field.

In the past, the interests of labor and management have been too much considered antagonistic, rather than mutual. However, constructive efforts are underway to correct this attitude.

In Wisconsin, for example, mutual responsibility between employer and worker is the guiding principle of our statewide apprenticeship program.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published an article on this constructive effort to create a more realistic approach to labor-management relations.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRENTICE PROGRAM HAS RESPONSIBILITIES

(By John Lindop)

Mutual responsibility between employer and worker is the guiding principle of the statewide apprenticeship program.

Under the guardianship of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, the program to train skilled workers in Green Bay is administered by the School of Vocational and Adult Education.

At the head of the nerve center of the area program, which works with some 100 business firms to provide them with carefully screened apprentices, is veteran Vocational School Administrator Glenn Fiedler.

LONG ON EXPERIENCE

A dedicated, energetic man who easily slips from the lingo of the shop to that of the educator, Fiedler has been with the Vocational School for nearly 40 years and is one of the prime developers of the apprenticeship program in this area.

The aims of the program, Fiedler explains, are twofold: "To assist in the development of better trained workers for the trades and to act as a protective measure for men entering the trades."

The apprentice relationship is based on a contract between the worker in training and his employer and is under the supervision of an advisory committee consisting of 12 men, 6 employers, and a like number of skilled workers in a particular trade.

GUIDED BY CONTRACT

The contract stipulates the length of apprenticeship, the pay the apprentice shall receive, his duties, and the type of training the employer is responsible for giving him.

Currently, there are 16 advisory committees in operation in Green Bay, representing a similar number of trades.

A prospective apprentice usually, but not always, will undergo 1 year of training before he is indentured to an employer.

He also will take a battery of aptitude and skill tests which takes into consideration everything from personality to ability before he is recommended to an employer.

LOW DROPOUT RATE

"Because of this careful screening our dropout rate is less than 1 percent," says Fiedler.

A prospective apprentice must first find an employer. He can either accomplish this through his own efforts or through the facilities of the vocational school.

Both the employer and the prospective worker are then called before an advisory committee.

The employer is then interviewed but at this point not told of his prospective apprentice's test results.

"We don't want the test results to be the only criteria upon which a man is hired," explains Fiedler.

Both the employer and worker are then interviewed and the committee then either approves or rejects an apprenticeship contract.

HOLDS VARIOUS JOBS

During the apprenticeship period the trainee can be shifted from shop to shop by mutual agreement of all parties concerned.

His starting pay rate will be about 50 percent of that of a journeyman's and will rise to 90 percent during the last 6 months of apprenticeship.

While normally during the past few years there have been some 300 apprentices working in the Green Bay area, this has dropped to only 97.

Fiedler explains the loss as a result of an economic slump which he claims has hit the entire State.

But Green Bay, he says with a confident smile "is still the bright spot in the whole statewide program."

SEES JOB SECURITY

To Fiedler the important thing about the program is that it will give the worker job security.

In Fiedler's words "after an apprentice has completed the program here he can work at his trade any place in the world."

In addition to the training an apprentice receives on the job, he also agrees to attend courses at the Vocational School.

As an example, in the tool and die trade the trainee agrees to attend 1 entire day of school every 2 weeks until he has accumulated 400 hours. He also agrees to attend school 1 night each week.

EMPLOYER ALSO GAINS

The program, however, is not a one-way street. The employer, too, gains an advantage.

One Green Bay firm, the Lindquist Machine & Tool Corp., of 314 South Pearl Street, has trained 13 apprentices.

Headed by two graduates of the area apprenticeship program, Roy Lindquist, 41, and Maurice Anderson, 43, the firm first opened its doors in 1946 as a one-man shop. Today the two partners employ some 50 persons.

Both men graduated from the area program in 1936.

Lindquist started the firm in September 1946, and Anderson joined him about 4 months later.

Lindquist says he would rather hire an apprentice with only 1 year of schooling than some experienced men.

"We know they are trained well and have good characters," the tool company head says.

CONFIDENCE IN TRAINEE

"We have confidence in a man who will put out the effort to go to school and learn his trade," says Lindqust.

A look at the firm's record shows that not one apprentice has been fired from the firm. Currently there are two in training.

Summing up, Lindquist points out "training is becoming of increased importance in the tool and die trade and through an apprentice program we know we can get skilled, reliable men."

Postmaster Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster John L. Sullivan, a beloved and highly valued citizen of Ridgefield, Conn., recently died with tragic suddenness. His loss was a great blow not only to his family but to his community and his large circle of friends. In tribute to him and in sympathy to his family, I respectfully submit the following editorial from the Ridgefield Press, which beautifully sums up the feelings of those who knew and admired Mr. Sullivan:

POSTMASTER SULLIVAN

The tragic death of our postmaster, John L. Sullivan, in the prime of life and at the peak of dedicated and able service to the people of his community has spread a pall of gloom over his native town.

Mr. Sullivan, member of a family which has made numerous contributions to our fair town in the past half-century or more, devoted his life to the postoffice, a service of no mean importance to every one of us. He did this quietly and efficiently with an occasional show of firmness which underscored his knowledge of his job and his understanding of its importance.

We join the community in sorrow for the loss of a fine fellow and we extend our sympathy to his loving wife and his children, to his good mother, and to the other members of his family.

Straight Talk to Russian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to all observers that the Soviet propaganda mill is deliberately and fantastically distorting the issues involved in the latest international crisis, not only in their statements directed for world consumption, but in what they give their own people. It is also apparent that we must get across our message to the people within the confines of the Soviet Union, despite the rigid censorship imposed over their news media.

Columnist David Lawrence, in a commentary that appeared Friday, September 8, 1961, in the Chicago Daily News, effectively pointed out the circumstances that face us, and made some very practical suggestions in coping with the problem.

I feel that these suggestions have a great deal of merit and are deserving of serious consideration. Under unanimous consent, I include this article entitled "Straight Talk to Russian People":

STRAIGHT TALK TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

(By David Lawrence)

Everyone in America would back up almost any effort President Kennedy might make to avert another world war and to bring about a reduction in the current cost of peacetime armaments.

But, as so often happens when governments get bogged down in the rituals of diplomacy, the obvious is overlooked. Reliance is too often placed on strong talk to the Kremlin about bigger and better weapons or the mobilization of armies. But this doesn't reach the Russian people.

Today the most obvious fact staring the whole world in the face is that a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union which lies to its own people by completely distorting and misrepresenting the viewpoint of the Western countries. This is not an academic matter for the Russians, either. For if war comes, millions of them will lose their lives.

Yet the U.S. Government is falling down badly in communicating its views to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The excuse usually offered is that it is hard to penetrate Communist-controlled areas and that radio broadcasts can be "jammed." This is partly true, but there are ways of reaching into the Soviet Union if a massive effort were made by the United States.

It seems incomprehensible that in a country like America, where publicity and advertising have reached such a high degree of effectiveness, the Government itself should be fumbling and bumbling in presenting its views to the world. President Kennedy has an alert mind, and he fully understands the art and value of publicity in domestic politics. It is a mystery why he has allowed the publicity of the U.S. Government abroad to be neglected.

It is not a question of which individual should manage the U.S. Information Agency or how much staff the Voice of America itself should have for its broadcasting operations. There is need for a vigorous and aggressive policy with a powerful directive from the President of the United States which would authorize direct appeals to the people of the Soviet Union. The bureaucrats may oppose it, but they are not realistic in view of the threat that faces the world.

The existing directives, for instance, are based on a "pussyfoot" policy of forbearance. They provide that care should be taken not to seem to be dealing with internal affairs in Russia. So broadcasts are made in vague and abstract jargon, designed mostly to reach so-called "intellectuals." "Highbrow" lectures are offered to such an audience, when simple truths need to be stressed to publicize the current behavior of Nikita Khrushchev.

Today, when the world faces the possibility of a nuclear war, is not the time to handle America's viewpoint with tenderness or politeness. It is a time for straightforward and plain speaking by the American people to the Russian people.

The United States, moreover, need not hesitate to tell the Russian people that Nikita Khrushchev is threatening world peace, that he is suppressing the truth about his own nuclear tests, and is following a dangerous course which can lead to a war that neither side really wants.

Facts about the suppression of the truth and the enslavement of hundreds of millions of human beings behind the Iron Curtain—these are matters which need emphasis over the air waves everywhere. They must be repeated persistently, day in and day out, so that the whole world will have a basis for condemnation of real tyranny and real colonialism.

Nor is there any good reason to ignore the nonalined or neutral nations either. Their peoples, too, should be told the truth. In many of these countries, which profess the virtues of their neutralism, censorship of the press and radio is maintained, so that the American viewpoint doesn't become known or is deliberately misrepresented. Many Americans are beginning to ask why billions of dollars of their tax funds are being given away in "foreign aid" to such nations while virtually nothing is being spent by America in those countries to give directly to the people themselves the truth about American policies.

A gigantic job of publicity is imperative. It will require not just the $140 million which Congress has planned to appropriate for information services abroad, but at least $1 billion. Congress would provide the funds quickly if there were a constructive policy and a comprehensive plan. This could, moreover, save the world from a costly war and make unnecessary some of the huge expenses being incurred by this country with its military budget of more than $46 billion.

When will the administration stop overlooking the obvious? Time is running out. Officialdom has sidestepped the problem for the last 15 years. It is not a political or partisan question. It is a simple matter of directly telling the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc, in their own languages, that the West is truly interested in peace and that the Soviet leaders are playing with fire and can bring on a nuclear war.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Can Automation Take Your Job?" carried in the September 2, 1961,

issue of Family Weekly. I understand that something over 15 million persons probably read this excellent article relating to the problems of automation.

The article is by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, as told to Larston D. Farrar, and graphically points out the challenge facing the Nation's workers in the coming years—necessarily both a governmental and an individual challenge.

Mr. President, Secretary Goldberg has packed into the article a great deal of information about automation which can be helpful to the thinking of Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN AUTOMATION TAKE YOUR JOB?

(By Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Secretary of Labor as told to Larston Farrar)

As a nation, we are fond of catch phrases easier to remember than the facts underlying them. Automation is such a word. It's a phrase especially significant this Labor Day.

Two recent news items show why this phrase has become so important. One told of the opening of a new, fully automated mill, employing only three skilled men. These three—with a mass of machinery—will do the work which required hundreds of employees two or more decades ago. The other news item told of the abandonment of an entire steel mill, employing 1,500 persons, in Pennsylvania. The company announced that "technological developments" had made continued use of this plant "impractical and uneconomic."

Naturally, such stories prompt questions. Will automation and new techniques replace workers? Will they take away my job?

To find the long-range answer, we must look ahead—say, to 1970.

We find first that the expectation is for an increase of about 25 million in the population of the United States over the next 9 years—equivalent to adding a city the size of Chicago to the country about every 18 months. This expansion is expected to generate advanced demands for additional consumer goods, housing, highways, and considerable capital investment.

Second, we project about a 50-percent increase in the amount of goods and services we produce by 1970. This assumes, of course, that output per hour worked will continue to increase at the rate it has up to now.

These developments call for an additional 13 million jobs by 1970.

An important question is: What changes in our occupational structure will these 13 million additional jobs bring? And the question for you is—am I prepared for such changes?

One of the most impressive areas of growth is represented by the professional worker. If previous trends continue, our projections show that professional personnel may reach close to 8 million by 1965, accounting for a little more than 1 of every 10 workers. This is more than double the 1910 figure.

Taken together, the white-collar occupations actually have reached a historic position. This year they represent the single biggest group in the labor force, and they will be well ahead by 1965 and 1975.

Another important group which we expect will expand are the industrial workers at the craftsmen (skilled) and operative (semi-skilled) levels.

So you see, the job outlook for the trained man or woman is excellent. The job outlook in the service industries is also encouraging.

The crux of the question, then, is not whether automation will take away jobs, but whether the individual worker, white or blue collar, will be able to withstand the forces of change in the techniques or operations of his job.

Every working person should reexamine his qualifications for the future job market. He must ask himself if he has enough education and training to meet future demands.

A command of arithmetic, for example, is essential for the office worker, who may be called upon to master a new bookkeeping machine, or for the skilled worker, who may be put to work on a machine utilizing numerical controls.

High school students have a special need to prepare themselves well. A high school diploma today is an elementary requirement for entry into most jobs. Employers are seeking workers who have the potential to learn the new skills and techniques that are appearing every day in their businesses and factories.

No one is sure today where these swift technological changes are taking us. Both industry and labor are making efforts to train and retrain workers in these fields to meet the new job demands. It is obvious that the skilled worker with better education and training will be prepared best for the job opportunities and changes that are inevitably coming.

President Kennedy and his administration also are trying to find ways to help. In the past few months an Office of Automation and Manpower has been organized in the Department of Labor to find some of the answers.

Through the Office of Automation and Manpower, we are using three strategic approaches to the challenges of automation.

First, the development of an "early warning system," so that employees, union, and management can be alerted as far as possible in advance of technological changes.

Second, softening the impace of automation for hundreds of thousands of long-term unemployed workers through legislation based on the findings of our new Office.

Third, the retraining of those workers who still are ablebodied and capable of moving into other fields, where their skills may be in demand.

In the meantime, the President has proposed several legislative programs to help train the American worker for the new types of jobs which are, or will be, available.

At this juncture we are sure of one thing: The skilled worker must have flexibility, maneuverability, and adaptability. To have these three qualities he must improve his skills constantly.

All I have said amounts to this: Automation will not take your job away if you are properly prepared educationally, constantly alert to changes that are taking place in your field of work, and ready and willing to study and retrain for the new opportunities and jobs coming up.

An Era of Law Ended With Judge Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in our form of democratic government under our Constitution it is the duty of the court to determine what the law is, not what they would like for it to be. The following article by James E. Clayton in the Washington Post of September 10 is very timely on this subject:

AN ERA OF LAW ENDED WITH JUDGE HAND

(By James E. Clayton, staff reporter)

When the teletypes clacked out the message on August 18 that Learned Hand was dead, they described him as one of America's most distinguished judges. They should have added another sentence: When Hand died, an era of American law ended.

The era to which Learned Hand belonged and which he personified as did no other American living in the seventh decade of this century was an era which was over, in large part, 25 years ago.

It was an era marked off from the rest of America's history by a unique group of judges. These judges—Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Hughes, Sutherland, Stone, Hand—left a long imprint on history.

They were the men around whom turned the disputes of the twenties and thirties over the power of Congress. They were the men who laid out the arguments and the issues upon which debate still runs today—the proper role of the Supreme Court, the extent of congressional power over economic matters, the reach and content of the Bill of Rights.

But these were also men who gave America two great heritages. One is a heritage of judicial excellence to which many judges aspire but few attain. The other is a heritage of philosophy—not philosophy in the narrow sense of legal theories but a broad philosophy of the values Americans hold dear.

This imprint and these heritages began to be built at the turn of the century. It was 1902 when Oliver Wendell Holmes was appointed to the Surpreme Court, 1909 when Learned Hand was named a Federal judge in New York and 1914 when Benjamin Cardozo first sat on New York's highest State court.

In the years that followed, Holmes was joined on the Supreme Court first by Charles Evans Hughes and then by Louis D. Brandeis, George Sutherland, Harlan Fiske Stone and Cardozo. Only Hand in this group never shared their title of Mr. Justice. But Hand won the title of 10th Justice because of the quality and quantity of his work on a circuit court of appeals.

What was it about this group of men that marked them off as framers of an era in American law and as major participants in American history? Perhaps more than anything else, it was their intellectual and cultural achievements, their deep and reflective thinking and their ability to express themselves precisely and yet eloquently.

These traits, which separate giants from mere men, appear from time to time on the American scene. But seldom has the Nation had such a group of men possessing them who devoted their efforts to one topic as this group did in the '20s and '30s.

The standards of excellence these men set will long remain with American law. They looked and acted like the wise men Americans expect their judges to be. Their dignity and decorum were above reproach. They were (and are) widely respected even by those who disagree violently with what they said and did. They brought to their task of judging that which Hand said a judge needs when he wrote:

"I venture to believe that it is as important to a judge called upon to pass on a question of constitutional law to have at least a bowing acquaintance with Acton and Maitland, with Thucydides, Gibbon, and Carlyle, with Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton, with Machiavelli, Montaigne, and Rabelais, with Plato, Bacon, Hume, and Kant, as with the books which have specifically been written on the subject."

Hand went on to explain why judges who interpret laws and rule on their constitutionality need this background. He said:

"For in such matters everything turns upon the spirit in which he approaches the questions before him. The words he must construe are empty vessels into which he can pour nearly anything he will. Men do not gather figs of thistles nor supply institutions from judges whose outlook is limited by parish or class.

"They must be aware that there are before them more than verbal problems; more than final solutions cast in generalizations of universal applicability. They must be aware of the changing social tensions in every society which make it an organism; which demand new schemata of adaptation; which will disrupt it, if rigidly confined."

This is not to say that all those who brought to the bench the wisdom and knowledge that Hand said judges need agreed on a basic philosophy or agreed on solutions to the problems of the Nation. There can be no sharper disagreements than those which arose between Sutherland and Brandeis or Sutherland and Stone.

But all these men had within their grasp that which Holmes once described as the joy of the thinker—knowing that "a hundred years after he is dead and forgotten, men who have never heard of him will be moving to the measure of his thought."

Take, for example, the question of how much power the Constitution gives Congress to regulate economic affairs. This was a crucial question in the twenties and thirties because on the answer to it turned social legislation of the 20th century. It was here that Sutherland and, to a lesser extent, Hughes parted company with Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and Hand.

They fought the battle daily in the courts until it was settled in favor of broad congressional power. But the arguments and barrages which Holmes and Sutherland exchanged in the twenties provide the underpinning of today's discussion, which assumes that broad power exists but questions the wisdom of using it.

In the same manner, the arguments put forward by Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and Hand are the basic statements used today when the meaning of the Bill of Rights is debated.

This issue now sharply divides the Supreme Court and many Americans. It turns on whether the guarantees of freedom of speech, press, religion, etc., are absolute bars against congressional power or whether they can be balanced against the need of the Nation for security.

The former position is that taken by Justice Hugo L. Black and the latter that of Justice Felix Frankfurter. Each man argues that his view reflects most accurately that of Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone.

Thus the influence of the men of the twenties and thirties invades the sixties and is likely to go into future decades.

The overlap, of course, is great. Frankfurter's influence was felt in the heyday of Hughes, Cardozo, and Stone. Hand's presence was felt when the day of Holmes and Brandeis was just beginning and it continued long after they were gone. But since the midthirties, only Frankfurter and Black, and perhaps Robert Jackson, have approached the standards of excellence and philosophy left by their predecessors.

Perhaps the best way to demonstrate those standards is to recall some of the philosophy of Hand, the last of the group. This philosophy, while close to that of Holmes in many respects and while joining that of Stone upon occasion, was not shared by all the others. But it serves to show how their minds probed deeply and well into the basic problems of mankind.

At the height of the McCarthy era, when suspicion was being cast upon many, it was Hand who said:

"Risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and uintimidated inquiry.

"I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation without specification or backing takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists, to win or lose."

To Hand, the greatness of America was marked in its belief in liberty and moderation. The spirit of moderation, he once said, "is the temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens * * * which recognizes their common fate and their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual."

Of liberty, he said:

"What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes.

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no courts to save it. * * *

"What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

Not all the judges of the twenties and thirties would have agreed with all these thoughts, although most of them would have. But these are representative of the quality of thought and literature which that unique group of that era produced.

Those judges—Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Hughes, Sutherland, Stone, Hand—were men who lived out their lives so that they met the test Hand outlined for all men when he spoke 9 years ago at a celebration of his 80th birthday:

"We can live without dishonor, and to live without dishonor is to live with a high heart and in such fashion that we shall not wince when we look back upon our part."

Suing for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of September 14, 1961:

SUING FOR PEACE

When President Kennedy met Premier Khrushchev in June, it could hardly be called a summit conference in the usual sense of a big-power bargaining session. As both men have indicated, it was little more than an attempt to size each other up. From the U.S. viewpoint, the meeting could certainly be justified on that basis.

Now, though, there is increasing talk of, and increasing pressure for, a summit presumably designed to resolve such dangerous questions as Berlin and the nuclear arms race. The leftist-inclined neutralists Sukarno of Indonesia and Keita of Mali have just been appealing to Mr. Kennedy to undertake such a meeting. Already speculation is rife as to whether Britain's Macmillan and France's De Gaulle would be included in any such session. The U.S. Government at the moment seems disinclined to be stampeded into the thing, but it has been pressured before.

Surely all this is way off base. To see why, it is necessary only to recall briefly just what we are up against. Khrushchev is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin. He has resumed nuclear tests partly to apply terrorism to that end, and partly out of what he considers his own military necessities. Negotiations are unlikely to deflect him from either course, for he has made it abundantly plain that he has no interest in real negotiations but only in extorting settlements on his terms.

Indeed, going through the motions of negotiation can serve Khrushchev's purposes, and is as intended; to the Soviets, negotiation is a means of waging the struggle, not of trying to end it. In the foreign ministers' conference on Berlin 2 years ago, the West finally did offer a series of concessions—not enough to satisfy Khrushchev, but enough to indicate the dangers of negotiations. And it is now clear how the latter stages of the test-ban talks were used to stall the West so that the Soviets could make their elaborate secret preparations for the current series of nuclear explosions.

Obviously, then, the United States should be wary of negotiations at any level, foreign ministers or summit or whatever. In addition, there is a further important consideration: This incessant talk in the West about negotiation, even about being the first to propose negotiation to the Kremlin, throws the whole picture out of kilter and tends to weaken the appearance of the Allied position.

It is one thing to be prepared to listen to anything Khrushchev may want to say, in the improbable event he should have anything to say worth hearing, and we can certainly do that without a summit; in today's circumstances a summit is about the last kind of conference anyone should be thinking about. But what is needed more than communication is more iron in the Western spine, iron that shows in our whole attitude rather than just displays of increased military power.

We have seen again, in the scared-rabbit reaction of the Belgrade conference of neutralists, how much headway we are making with world opinion. We have seen, over too many dismal years, just how useful it is to negotiate with the Soviets.

Khrushchev, after all, is the criminal of the world, not the West. Khrushchev is the potential murderer of peace. Khrushchev and Khrushchev alone hangs the pall of nuclear war over the globe. If the barbarian wants to sue for peace at the bar of civilization, let him do so. It is not befitting the strength of the Western position, it is not befitting the dignity of the defenders of civilization, to appeal to the outlaw to be good.

Blackwater Falls State Park of West Virginia Praised as Year-Round Vacation Retreat by Travel Editor of the Washington Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, now that we are moving toward the adjournment of a long and productive but sometimes tiring and tedious session of Congress, it would seem appropriate that I bring to the attention of my colleagues information regarding a relatively nearby resort in West Virginia where the tired body may be refreshed and lagging spirits may be restored.

In the September 10 issue of the Washington Star, there is a highly perceptive article by the travel editor, Jack Jonas, describing the facilities, the charm, and the natural scenic values of West Virginia's Blackwater Falls State Park.

As indicated in the article, Blackwater Falls offers excellent modern lodge and cabin accommodations, boating, swimming, hiking, and horseback riding in the summer and skating and skiing in the winter.

I commend the material to the attention of the Members of this forum and suggest that during the recess they take the occasion to visit one of the finest of West Virginia's State parks, and thus to return to the second session, in January 1962, revivified in body and spirit.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETREAT IN WEST VIRGINIA

(By Jack Jonas)

The vacation world has been beating a path to the door of Blackwater Falls State Park.

Increasing interest in this year-round recreation area near Davis, W. Va., has, this fall at least, cut sharply into a popular package foliage tour out of Washington.

In falls past, Trailways Bus System has taken several busloads on week-end jaunts through the hills of Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia, overnighting at Blackwater Lodge in the park.

But this year, because of advance reservations at the lodge, Trailways had had to limit its foliage weekends to one bus each, and there are standbys waiting hopefully for cancelations.

Key to its popularity is that it is a wilderness retreat with modern plumbing.

The 1,679-acre State park lies in the mountains of Tucker County, 4 miles from Davis, at elevations ranging from 2,500 to 3,400 feet.

Focal point of the scenic attractions is Blackwater Falls, from which the park takes its name. This spectacular steppingstone cataract drops 63 feet. For close viewing, there are steps leading down to the base of the falls.

AMBER, NOT BLACK

Blackwater River (the water, incidentally, is amber, not black) snakes through a rocky gorge which is another scenic attraction of the area. At its deepest, it dips to 500 feet.

In winter, this has been a prime target for Washington area skiers. At Canaan Valley, 12 miles away, privately operated ski areas at Cabin Mountain and Weiss Knob offer such facilities as tow lifts, ski instruction, warming huts, ski rental, and snackbars.

Another winter sport is ice skating, usually possible on Pendleton Run Lake and on Mallow's Maple Lake. The winter sports season runs from December to March.

There is a large variety of summer activities, including a supervised program led by a recreation leader-naturalist and taking in guided hikes, illustrated lectures, movies, and square dancing.

Other summer activities include swimming in Pendleton Lake, boating with rowboats available for rent, also on Pendleton Lake, 5 miles of hiking trails, 3 miles of bridle trails, with horses available for rent, a picnic area on the north rim of Blackwater Canyon, and a variety of games in a court area near Pendleton Lake.

Trout fishing in Blackwater River is reputed to be good.

GOOD ACCOMMODATIONS

Overnight accommodations are excellent, but advance reservations are a virtual must.

Blackwater Lodge, located in the park at the south rim of the canyon, is as modern as a city hotel. It has 55 guest rooms, with rates ranging from $7 for a single to $15 for four persons in a room with two double beds. There is a dining room accommodating 250, a snackbar, gift shop, recreation rooms, and lounge.

Nearby are 25 cabins, also of modern decor and furnishings, and of varying sizes, accommodating 2, 4, 6, or 8 persons, with one-night rates at $12, $20, $28, and $36 respectively. After the first night, rates drop to $5.50, $7.50, $9.50, and $11.50.

The cabins are outfitted with cooking utensils, dinnerware, blankets, and linens. Heat is by forced air heater and stone fireplace.

Applications for reservations at Blackwater Lodge should be made directly to the lodge, and for advance cabin reservations, to Conservation Commission, Division of State Parks, State Office Building, Charleston 5, W. Va.

HOW TO GO

How to get to Blackwater Falls State Park:

By auto: Try a circle route, going through Maryland and returning through West Virginia and Virginia. The route is north on Route 240 to Frederick; west on Route 40 to Keyser's Ridge; south on Route 219 to its junction with State Route 32; turn off at Davis, W. Va., for the park. On the return trip retrace Routes 32 and 219 to Route 50, and follow Route 50 east to Washington.

Farm Legislation in the 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, for the excellent leadership he has given our committee during the discussion of the important legislative matters which have come before us during this session of Congress.

The first important bill passed by Congress, which was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, was the feed grains bill. This measure proposed a 1-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in 1961, and thereby make it possible for the farmer eventually to receive more for his production, and to lower the holding of grains which now amounts to nearly $4 billion. It is believed that this program will add around $750 million in 1961 as compared with 1960 to the income of the producers of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley, and soybean producers. In addition, it will relieve the Commodity Credit Corporation from assuming the storage costs of hundreds of millions of bushels of grain. This, of course, will result in a tremendous decrease in expense to the taxpayers. The major provisions of the 1961 feed grain program provided for payment in cash or in kind for retiring 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage—or up to 20 acres, whichever is greater, on individual farms. Eligibility for price support for corn and grain sorghum was contingent upon participation in this diversion of 20 percent of acreage or 20 acres.

The second provision included payment in kind for retiring an additional 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage. However, this additional acreage diversion would not be required as a condition for price support eligibility.

The third feature provided an increase in the price support level for corn from $1.06 to $1.20 a bushel, an increase in the supports for grain sorghums and other feed grains. It also provided for an increase in the support level of soybeans, intended to divert at least 2 million acres from corn and grain sorghums.

The next important piece of legislation reported by the Committee on Agriculture and passed by Congress was the Agricultural Act of 1961. This act instituted for 1962 a wheat program similar to the feed grain program, setting the 1962 wheat support at a national average of $2 a bushel, or 83½ percent of parity. The feed grains program is extended for 1 year, 1962, with some minor changes. The act added certain commodities to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and extended the National Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1966. The omnibus agricultural bill liberalized agricultural credit, extended the school milk program for 5 years through June 30, 1967, extended the veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs for 3 years through December 31, 1964, and extended the Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971.

The Committee on Agriculture reported the sugar bill which extended the Sugar Act from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962. This bill was passed by Congress, and it is the committee's intention to give sugar legislation preferred treatment when Congress returns in January.

Other committee bills which were reported and which have become law are measures to provide a ceiling increase

for the Farmers Home Administration loans; to extend time for application of the 1959 amendment to the Federal Nematocide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; to amend title I of Public Law 480 and to provide $2 billion additional authority during 1961. This is the law by means of which we trade our agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies. Congress passed laws, reported by our committee, which permitted the transfer of cotton acreage allotments from flooded areas, emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve acreage in drought areas, emergency livestock loans extension, and surplus grain sales in disaster areas.

I wish to comment on three of my bills which have become law. The first of these measures was H.R. 1022, a bill to provide for the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments. The life of this bill is for 2 years, and it provides that both farmers involved in the lease and transfer of these tobacco acreage allotments must be in the same county, and the lease must be filed with, and approved by the county committee. If the normal yield of the farm to which the allotment is being transferred exceeds the normal yield of the farm from which the transfer is being made by more than 10 percent, the transferred allotment will be adjusted downward in the same ratio as the difference in yields. Not more than 5 acres of allotment may be leased and transferred to any farm. Only farms already having tobacco allotments for the same kind of tobacco are eligible to lease allotments. The acreage is considered as having been produced on the farm from which the allotment is transferred for purposes of future allotments and referendum voting rights.

The second bill is H.R. 1021, which extends for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and which permits the planting of peanuts for boiling purposes without coming under the provisions of acreage allotments. There are now about 3,500 acres of peanuts planted for this purpose, and we have a new industry being developed in Florida as a result of this legislation.

The third bill is H.R. 7694, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. Identical language to that in my bill was passed by Congress and we now hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will soon be able to institute a program which we hope will save our livestock producers approximately $50 million a year which is now the estimated cost of this dreaded disease of cholera.

I am finishing 7 years of service on the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have enjoyed associating with my colleagues on this great committee. I sincerely believe that we have made tremendous progress in solving some of the agricultural problems of America. Let us remember that agriculture is still the greatest system of private enterprise that we have in America, and that as a result of the efficiency and productivity of the American farmer, we are far ahead of the Soviet Union in this important field of feeding our people and having enough food and fiber left to render tremendous assistance to our allies throughout the world.

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was delighted to see in the Washington Evening Star of September 13, 1961, an article by Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army retired, which points out the need for firmness in our dealings with the Communists. General Clark is well known for his exploits during World War II and the Korean war and presently serves as president of the Military College of South Carolina, The Citadel, in Charleston, S.C. He speaks as one who has had many dealings with the Communists, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria, as deputy to the Secretary of State in London and Moscow in 1947, and at the Panmunjom negotiations. General Clark has served his country with distinction in these varied capacities and speaks with convincing authority. Our officials would do well to pay heed to these words of wisdom. I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing with Reds," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army (retired))

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet Armies in East Germany.

In 1947 I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as Deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict, when I was commander in chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set up and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshal Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the Mozart Express, when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and, as usual, he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon, of our military police, shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned, including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me the President said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang on to those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences

of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

Tribute to Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a splendid editorial appearing in the Gaffney Ledger, of Gaffney, S.C., on Tuesday, September 12, 1961, entitled "Congressman HEMPHILL."

This editorial is a tribute to the distinguished Congressman, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth District of South Carolina, for his active, able, and loyal service to the people of his own district and the rest of South Carolina in Washington.

It is my personal pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

To the tribute paid by this editorial I would like to add my praise of BOB HEMPHILL's outstanding representation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL

Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Representative of the Fifth South Carolina District, has informed friends in Washington he plans to seek reelection for fourth term next summer. That is good news.

Mr. HEMPHILL, who lives at Chester, has made the Fifth District, and the Nation a first-class Congressman. He is active and energetic in looking after the interests of his area and section but he is not provincial in his attitudes. He studies problems from a national viewpoint when that seems to be required, as in the case of textile imports. He is a genuine Democrat who bases his actions on a reasonable balance between liberalism and conservatism. This enables him to make South Carolina's Fifth District a topnotch Representative in Washington.

Some of Mr. HEMPHILL's friends sought to persuade him to run for Governor of South Carolina. That is a flattering suggestion, naturally, but Mr. HEMPHILL has come to the conclusion he can best serve his constituents in Washington. The Ledger concurs in that decision, and wishes Mr. HEMPHILL continued success in his present position.

Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a firm believer in the ability and the right of State and local communities to meet problems within their jurisdiction, I feel that the editorial in the Wednesday, September 13, edition of the Chicago Tribune points out the effects of the administration's latest farm program manipulation. This editorial is a penetrating analysis of the situation, and I place it in the RECORD as an example of the great abuse by Secretary Freeman's Agriculture Department. The editorial is entitled "Here We Go Again:"

HERE WE GO AGAIN

To conform with Federal Food and Drug Administration standards, the State department of agriculture has lowered the required minimum butterfat content of ice cream sold in Illinois from 12 to 10 percent, although there is nothing to prevent manufacturers from keeping the butterfat content higher than the minimum. In announcing the change, Ralph S. Bradley, State agriculture director, said he was clearly against it because it will result in an estimated additional 3 million pounds of butter on the already congested State market.

Mr. Bradley's concern about a butter surplus is commendable, for there is little doubt that a surplus of dairy products is building up again, reversing the downward trend of the last 2 years. However, Mr. Bradley, a Democrat who had a prominent role in President Kennedy's election campaign, should direct his protest not to the Food and Drug Administration, whose action will have a relatively negligible effect on the surplus, but to Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Milk production this year probably will rise more than 1 percent above the 122.9 billion pounds produced last year when there was certainly no shortage. In terms of milk equivalent, manufacturers' stocks of dairy products increased 2.4 billion pounds between January 1 and June 30, compared with an accumulation of 1.7 billion pounds in the same period a year ago. In addition to the sharp upturn in commercial inventories this year, Government purchases of dairy products under the price support program in the first 7 months have been equivalent to 5.3 billion pounds of milk, or 2.3 billion pounds above a year ago.

Volume of Government-owned stocks of surplus dairy products on July 31, not including those designated for sale or donation, was 29 percent above those of a year ago. On that date the surplus totaled 133 million pounds of butter, 34 million pounds of cheese, and 247 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. A year ago Government surplus stocks included only 34 million pounds of butter, no cheese, and 287 million pounds of nonfat dry milk.

Government purchases of surplus dairy products declined after price supports were lowered in 1958, and it is more than coincidence that the upturn in the surplus in the last year accompanied three increases in price supports. The first occurred a year ago this month. At that time, Congress, with the forthcoming election in mind, enacted a bill boosting price supports on butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk, which President Eisenhower reluctantly signed into law.

This year Mr. Freeman has used his administrative powers to grant two additional price support increases on cheese and nonfat dry milk.

The present Federal program to support prices of manufacturing milk and cream has been in operation about 12 years. Net losses to the Government have amounted to well over $1 billion. In addition, more than $1 billion has been spent for dairy products used in foreign and domestic donations, transfers to the armed services and veterans' hospitals, and consumption under the special milk program for schools.

It is economic folly to raise price supports to levels that stimulate excessive production of commodities for which there is no real consumer demand at the higher price. Mr. Freeman could halt the surplus buildup by lowering supports, but he has demonstrated that taxpayers can expect no relief from him. Instead, they will be expected to provide many more millions of dollars to buy and store the surpluses, and then to dispose of them through subsidized sales and giveaway programs, so that the Kennedy administration can further its scheme to control the economic destiny of American agriculture.

Castro Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has recently written a guest column for Mr. Holmes Alexander entitled "Castro Must Go." This column appeared in the September 11, 1961, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., and a number of other newspapers across the country which carry Mr. Alexander's column. I am very much in accord with the viewpoint expressed in this column and have had a number of constituents write me commending this column to my attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO MUST GO

(Holmes Alexander has left on a brief European vacation. During his absence a number of prominent and interesting guests will contribute columns.)

(By Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas)

The political columnist is a singularly influential force in American politics and none

is more forceful than Holmes Alexander. His invitation to be guest columnist is an opportunity no man in public life would turn down lightly. I accept with pleasure. If his regular readers will bear with me, I shall use this forum as a sounding board for some "Thinking out loud" on United States-Latin American relations; a subject which is at once most critical and absorbing.

The peak in a whole range of mountainous problems concerning our foreign policy in Latin America is the Castro government in Cuba. Anyone who does not recognize Castro for what he is—a Kremlin puppet—is gullible and naive. Having accepted that reality, the first order of business is to dispose of him and to reinstate freedom and self-determination for the Cuban people.

During the past few weeks I have discussed Castroism with many American citizens experienced in Cuban and Latin American affairs. These included businessmen, journalists, and government officials. I have received hundreds of letters from people all over the United States, and a surprising number from Mexico and South America, offering opinion and advice. I have heard Castroism analyzed by prominent citizens, officials and ex-officials of Latin America, including Cuba.

While some did not wholeheartedly endorse my position that the United States must take military action against Castro in cooperation with other Western Hemisphere nations if possible, but unilaterally if necessary, none had an alternate suggestion—but all agreed that Castro must go.

My studies convince me beyond any doubt that Cuba under Castro is a staging area for Communist imperialism in our hemisphere. The primary threat is against Latin America, but the overall threat is against all of us.

The military build-up in Cuba has now progressed to the point that any invasion of that island will be bloody and costly. But it will be infinitely more difficult within a matter of weeks. Six months hence, it will have to be a major military undertaking. A year from now Castro will have weapons and the capability of launching a major counterattack against our southern cities.

In the meantime, Castro's police-state grip on the Cuban people is choking off both their means to resist and any potential uprising which might otherwise be counted on to aid invasion forces.

Clearly this is a time for action, not soothing words to the American people, not interminable negotiations in the United Nations or elsewhere, not further attempts to buy friends in Latin America—but quick, hard-hitting and decisive military action.

Attempts to strengthen Latin American ties are premature pending the disposition of Castro. Once that is done, we can move forward.

In my judgment political stability is the key to lasting freedom and resistance to communism in Latin America. This cannot be achieved while tolerating Castroism. It cannot be bought with dollars although dollars, wisely spent, can help.

The $20 billion aid program presently being promulgated by the Kennedy administration may fool some of our own people into thinking that we are effectively fighting communism in Latin America, but I can assure you that it is not fooling Latin Americans.

Due to political instability in those countries, capital is fleeing Latin America at a faster rate than we are dumping it in. So long as this instability prevails, much of our money is going to support Socialist schemes, opportunistic regimes, and the established state of political unrest. It will drive out more capital. It will strengthen the very-rich, very-poor social structure which is the basis of political instability.

The achievement of such stability will not come quickly. It will be accomplished over a long period in hard but quiet bargaining sessions, with a maximum of persuasion and a minimum of bribery.

Once political stability is achieved, our money will help tremendously, and I will favor a carefully drawn aid program.

But first, Castro must go.

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Before House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, August 23, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on August 23, on the subject of H.R. 127.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 23, 1961

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740–742 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

We are a national organization composed exclusively of individual, directly supporting, smaller, independent business and professional people. We are the largest business-professional organization in the country. As of August 11, 1961, we had a net membership of 170,194 (an 11,007 increase since January 1, 1961), and are continuing to grow in size and support.

Our members directly determine our stands on legislation, through their majority votes in polls we take among them in our publication the Mandate. We take such polls about once each month. In each poll we state the issue, and offer the strongest factual arguments on both sides of the question, ourselves remaining neutral, and permitting members to make up their own minds. Our members receive their Mandates through the mails, read them, and then vote and sign their ballots in the privacy of their homes and offices. We do not see or touch these ballots at any point. Members channel them to their Congressmen through their district chairmen, who are local federation members they select to head up each chapter. At the same time that chairmen forward the signed ballots to Congressmen, they report the overall results to us. The sum of tabulations received from chairmen in our more than 2,500 chapters across the country determines our stand. The methods used in our polls, requiring submission of actual signed ballots to Congressmen themselves, assures the validity of opinions stated. Verification of national summaries reported can be made by consulting the files of signed district chairmen reports we maintain at our headquarters in Burlingame.

Our members are found in all but a very few congressional districts throughout all 50 States. They are engaged in all vocations and at all levels of independent enterprise, ranging from operators of rabbitries and diaper services to doctors, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and local bankers. The size and distribution of our membership provide a basis for a true cross section of independent enterprise opinion and needs.

Speaking for our members, I want to thank you for your kind invitation to appear before your committee today to advise on the thinking of our members on H.R. 127 (I will touch on H.R. 1233 in a separate statement to be filed with you), which has been introduced into the Congress with the announced intention of strengthening the antitrust protections available to all in our Nation, including those in the independent business vocations.

In our Mandate No. 263, mailed to our members on February 2, 1961, we polled on H.R. 127 as follows:

H.R. 127: Curb "loss leader" abuses * * * Prohibit businessmen from selling goods below their costs when such sales promote monopoly and unfairly injure competitors.—(Representative PATMAN of Texas).

In line with our policy of remaining neutral in making these polls, and to assist our members in intelligently appraising the issues involved, we furnished our members the following comments pro and con on H.R. 127:

1. Argument for H.R. 127: Sponsors say this bill would eliminate the twin evils of loss-leader selling and cut-throat price competition which giant firms have used so viciously in driving small competitors into bankruptcy. It would operate the same as many State "antiloss-leader" laws do, by prohibiting any merchant from selling at prices which are below his buying costs plus a minimum markup to cover overhead. Also, the bill is expected to protect consumers from being victimized by misleading "bait-type, cut price" ads.

1. Argument against H.R. 127: There's real question if this bill would do any good. It must be enforced by Federal agencies whose effectiveness is questioned even by the bill's sponsors. Second, it involves more questions of accounting than there are drops of water in the seas. For instance, you'd have to pin down buying costs, item by item and firm by firm. You'd have to establish "overhead," which is another variable. Take a case to court under this bill, and the arguments could go on for years and years with no conclusion.

As reported in the Mandate No. 264, in thousands of votes cast, signed and mailed to their Congressmen, 70 percent of our members who exercised their ballot franchise called for enactment of H.R. 127, 27 percent opposed the legislation, and 3 percent registered no opinion either way.

Why did this vote run thus? Let's answer the question this way: To further improve our polling procedures for independents and their Congressmen, in December of 1960 we instituted a second surveying procedure that supplements the information derived from our the Mandate polls. We have been and are conducting this second surveying procedure through the attached "Independent Business and Professional Men" folder (sample, marked "A"). The purpose of this survey is to get a greater view in depth into the primary problem areas of independents, and a greater view in depth into the trend of thinking on these problem areas. Copies of this are mailed to each of our members immediately prior to a call by one of our field representatives, in his regular reports each year. This enables the member to collect his thoughts before the field representative calls, for possible discussion, and also in-

sures a reminder followup to get responses in.

We have distributed approximately 60,000 of these folders to members during the first half of 1961, and have received an approximate 65-percent response.

It is significant to note that in point of problem areas checked, that of unfair competition (co-ops, etc.) was checked about twice as frequently as the next most often mentioned area of difficulty. I attach a State-by-State breakdown of the actual responses to this poll (marked "B"). This will give each and every committee member a chance to study reaction not only nationally, but in his State as well. For your information, we have the actual signed ballots underlying this report on file at our California headquarters for your inspection, should you desire.

Along this line, a great number of our members who answered this poll took the time to write additional comments on their responses. Here is a representative cross section of some of the remarks made on the subject of "loss leaders":

General merchandise, Florida: "I have heard many complaints within the past 30 days that the loss leader was soon gone, and that the customers could not buy as advertised."

Camera shop, Illinois: "Big problem is loss leader selling at cost or below."

Meatdresser, Michigan: "Chainstores using dressed fryers for leaders, selling below cost, is killing our business.

Gasoline dealer, Minnesota: "Unfair chain operations re loss leaders, advertising, etc., is our big problem."

Business line not indicated, Missouri: "Need legislation to prevent loss leaders, but not to prevent genuine closeout of seasonal merchandise."

Flower shop, Montana: "Chainstores are using our items as loss leaders."

Music store, New York: "Unfair competition from discount houses, record clubs. Some of this starts at the manufacturer level, and results in use of loss leaders below anybody's cost."

Business line not identified, Ohio: "Our biggest headache is the discounters selling merchandise at practically cost as loss leaders. They take a well-advertised line and drag it through the mud so far as prices are concerned. When they have finished their dirty work, they take on another line and run it down. The legitimate merchant who is the backbone of American business cannot compete, and it will only be a matter of time before the manufacturers of these lines will find their profit squeezed to the vanishing point by demands of the discounters for still lower prices."

Food market, Pennsylvania: "Loss leaders are big problems with us."

Sporting goods, Utah: "Cutrate drugstores that make leaders out of other dealers' regular line of merchandise are our main complaint."

Variety store, Washington: "Loss-leader items in supermarkets big problem with us."

Motor and implement dealer, Wisconsin: "State laws of retailing at not less than 5 percent above total cost should be enforced—manufacturer promotion of quantity sales at no profits to retailer should be curtailed."

Gentlemen, there are few better, truer, final teachers than experience, and believe me when I say that these independents who have made these remarks know what they're talking about. You can be sure that small businessmen generally practice economy, especially when answering polls. These independents did not write for the sheer pleasure of putting a pen on paper. I submit that their reaction in Mandate polls, plus their votes in the special poll, plus their direct remarks about loss leaders all add up to a total that compels the following conclusions:

1. That "loss leader" practices do present a real and pressing problem of unfair competition, and

2. That whatever laws there are now on the books on this subject are inadequate, and that, therefore

3. There is need for immediate congressional enactment of this bill, or other measures, to correct this problem.

I would say, however, that the independent businessmen of this Nation are getting mighty sick and tired of the lip service that is being paid their cause in many quarters. They want action. Thus, if the Congress in its wisdom decides to enact this or similar legislation, as we fervently hope it will, then the Congress must follow through with all the means at its command and make sure that the Federal Trade Commission—which will be charged with enforcement—uses the laws to their fullest extent in making the needed corrections.

Why do I say this? First, because I know personally that a set of fair trade practice rules was drawn up about 1936 for the tire industry, and enforcement set with the Commission. These rules contained a clause prohibiting sales below the seller's cost where the effect was to promote monopoly. In the almost three decades since that time, despite the presence of cause for invoking these rules (including the prohibition against sales below the seller's cost), the Commission has never used them in any effective manner. Second, because shortly after the Supreme Court knocked out the Miller-Tydings Fair Trade Enabling Act, about 1950, Mr. George Frates, then Washington representative for the National Association of Retail Druggists, and I, representing the federation, conferred with a high official of the Commission and urged, as stopgap protection against unfair pricing, that the Commission enforce that part of the Clayton Act which permits action against sales below the seller's cost where the effect is to injure competition. We were told the Commission had never used this section of the act because it was considered, as I recall, unworkable.

Please understand, I am not being personal in these remarks as to any Commissioner or employee of the Commission, past or present. Over the years many fine men have held posts high and low in the agency. Many do today. But the fact is that over the years, through succeeding administrations, independents have heard many hope-inspiring declarations, have seen many encouraging starts, and growing accomplishment * * * but at the same time, and underneath it all, have witnessed a constant drag of delay, indecision, and confusion on many important matters, including that of action on sales below the seller's cost. Perhaps it is the system itself. Perhaps it is an attitude ingrained in the agency. Perhaps it is that the Congresses and the administrations have not wanted FTC to exploit its corrective powers to the full. I do not know exactly why. But I do know what has happened. And I do know that Congress has the key needed to unlock the solution to the problem.

Finally, our members were pleased to see the quick decisive action the President took on the Berlin situation, and to read how quickly the Congress mobilized to give him the tools needed to check communism abroad. But let's not forget that we're going to need a sound economy at home to support these programs. Let's not forget that we can't have this economy without flourishing small business opportunities and increasing numbers of small firms, to supply the production economically, to provide the payrolls and jobs and profits that produce the taxes.

Fair competition is the life of trade. Through this all segments of our economy are helped. Unfair competition, which seems prevalent today more than ever in our economy—not alone existing in the distribution field but at the same time in the production field, if allowed to continue unchecked will end up in the complete ruination of independent business, and finally, the public at large will also be the victims.

The situation is serious and it's our hope the committee will report favorably on this bill.

Censorship of Communist Fighters—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while the controversy raging around the continued muzzling of the military in an effort to prevent uniformed officers from engaging in educational campaigns exposing the excesses of communism grows increasingly heated throughout the country, we now learn of another Department of the Kennedy administration setting up its own censorship code.

Is it possible that the "better Red than dead" appeasers who have done so much to weaken British and European resistance to communism are gaining a foot hold somewhere in our own Government in Washington?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorial comment from the press of Oregon which deal with the forced resignation of Forest Ranger Don Caron, a Federal employee who refused to be gagged or censored so courageously that he resigned his 15-year-old assignment with the Federal Government rather than repudiate his convictions and silence his actions against communism and the conspiratorial campaign it carries on here in America.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM FIGHTER RESIGNS FOREST SERVICE

An Okanogan professional forester who once was told he had "a bright future" with the Forest Service, resigned from the Service late last week rather than be muzzled in his fight against communism.

Don Caron, Conconully district ranger who has spent 15 years with the Forest Service in the Okanogan district, submitted his resignation after the Portland regional office, supported by the local administration of the Okanogan forest, directed him to discontinue writing educational articles against communism which appear weekly in the Okanogan Independent.

In being directed to stop his articles on communism, by Regional Forester J. Herbert Stone, Caron was told he was writing on a controversial matter that could cause "alienation of groups or individuals." The directive to Caron added: "The editorials reflect a zealous and almost fanatical patriotism, and an active effort to awake the public to the danger of communism. The opinions, views and attitudes expressed have much in common with those, as reported by the press, held by the currently controversial John Birch Society."

Caron, one of the founders of the Okanogan County Anti-Communist League, denied an affiliation with the John Birch Society, or using any of that group's material for his writing. He said he had been studying communism for 2 years, and uses material for his weekly discussion of communism from the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Other sources include the American Legion, the American Bar Association, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," Caron added.

Caron denied any violation of the Hatch Act forbidding political activities by Government employees, saying, "A recent decision by the Supreme Court has specifically placed communism outside the realm of politics."

His resignation, dated August 24, is effective September 1, and was tendered after his request for permission to continue writing his educational column was denied by the regional office.

One of the prime reasons given in denying Caron's request for permission to continue his column is the demand upon an employee's time by the forest service. "We do not feel you can do justice to both causes," the letter stated.

The denial was recommended by Okanogan Forest Supervisior F. J. Moisio because Caron's writings were controversial. His performance as district ranger was termed as "very good" by Moisio, who said the deposed ranger had not been doing his anti-Communist work on Government time "that I know of."

In his letter of resignation Caron stated: "I do feel that your decision is an infringement upon my rights as a citizen in that it will not allow me freedom of speech during my nonworking hours. The fact that I am a Government employee should in no way change my status as a full citizen."

CITIZEN PRINCIPLES

An Okanogan man pounded 15 years' public service down the drain and hammered the stopper over it last week—all because of principle and his devotion as a first-rate citizen of his country.

Elsewhere on this page is a story of the resignation of Don Caron from the Forest Service, a sad and deplorable ending to the years he has devoted to this work, all on the Okanogan Forest. He started with seasonal work at Chelan while going to college at a time when that area was included as a part of this forest, and since becoming a full-time professional forester, has continued on here in various capacities. Most recently he has been ranger on the Conconully district.

Caron resigned. He was not fired. Why then the tears?

Readers of the Okanogan Independent are aware that he had been contributing a weekly column to the paper discussing communism. This column has not been political in nature, but educational in concept, prepared from information by Government agencies, investigating committees of Congress, the FBI, and like groups. All of his background material is a matter of public record. But recently his superiors in the Forest Service sought to clamp a muzzle on Caron and a directive from the Portland regional office told him in effect to cease and desist his columns. Why?

A variety of reasons were given—all of which leak like a sieve—especially in the light of documented proof of the Communist threat to the United States.

First Caron was told he was in violation of the Hatch Act forbidding political activity by Federal employees. He was no such thing. Next he was told that the subject of communism is controversial and he shouldn't be mixed up in it.

The final reason given in asking him to stop his fight against communism was the demands which the Forest Service places upon its employees, and the fear that it might take too much of his time. This is preposterous nonsense aimed at a forester whose annual "report cards" have been highly complimentive of the devotion and skill with which he has handled his assignments.

What are the real reasons, then, for directing Caron to stop writing his articles? We wish we knew. It is difficult to think that Forest Service objectives for our country could differ greatly from those of any sincere and dedicated citizen. The esteem in which many hold the Forest Service may suffer because an employee is refused the right of free speech on his own time in performing a service to his country and its people, and reduce his status to less than that of a full citizen.

For 2 years Caron has been reading about, and studying communism. As an upshot of the knowledge he has gained, he was among many prominent people here who formed the Okanogan County Anti-Communist League. From this educational organization has grown many study groups of people who wish to learn more of the methods and evils of communism that they might more effectively fight this cancerous philosophy. We cannot think they are all ignorant peasants.

Caron is not asking for his job back. We are not asking that his resignation be refused. As his letter of resignation said, "* * * if the columns were stopped tomorrow for other reasons, my decision would be the same * * * they are only one phase of the total activity."

We wonder who pulled the strings.

KEEP IT HONEST

Repercussions are still being heard over the resignation of Don Caron from the Forest Service last week after he was refused permission to continue writing educational articles on communism for the Okanogan Independent.

Along with this, there has been a goodly amount of misinformation about the work Caron was doing, and at least one daily newspaper that comes into this area saw fit to slant its news story of his resignation to make Caron look bad. Is this good journalism?

To keep the record straight, this forester was not fired, nor was he requested to resign. He simply quit because he was denied the right of patriotism and free speech as guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States. For any news media to deliberately print erroneous information simply because a writer had differed in opinion with Caron and had his ears trimmed for it, is inexcusable.

To again set the record straight—Caron's articles were not in the form of a letter to the editor on a "controversial" subject. They have appeared on a regular, weekly basis for many months with only one object in mind—to educate people and give them the benefit of his 2-year study of communism.

The Forest Service instructed Caron to stop writing his articles because they were controversial. Since when has patriotism and dedication to God and country become controversial?

With whom is it controversial? It has been said that you should judge a man by his enemies.

This is certainly intended as no mass indictment of Forest Service people, but a few in high places should have provided better answers than they have come up with so far. A. E. Spaulding, deputy regional forester who signed the letter denying Caron's request to continue writing, has not spoken the truth, if Associated Press has quoted him correctly.

In a September 1 dispatch with a Portland date line, AP quotes Spaulding thusly: "The Forest Service in a letter to Caron asked him to consider not writing on controversial issues * * *." Spaulding's letter to Caron of August 21 said: "* * * your request is disapproved."

The same AP story quoted Spaulding as saying: "I can't say yet why he resigned." Yet, this officer announced Caron's resignation on August 31 after it had been written to him in a letter dated August 24.

If the Forest Service higher-ups feel they have done the right thing, then why tell half-truths about it?

It takes a big man to admit he was wrong.

Neutral's Stand Perils Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously pointed out, I feel that it is time we paused to ponder some of the recent actions of the so-called neutral nations who have been benefiting from our financial generosity.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor of the Hearst newspapers, has very appropriately described the situation in a recent editor's report entitled "Neutral's Stand Perils Peace."

The editorial is very timely. I hope my colleagues will read it. It follows:

NEUTRAL'S STAND PERILS PEACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

What with the cold war world series getting hotter by the day, isn't it about time we took a closer look behind the masks of some of the self-appointed "umps" who call themselves "neutral?"

No question about it, these would-be arbiters have been making some strange calls—most of them impartial against the United States.

Any time "Lefty" Khrushchev curves a low one 'way outside, they call it a strike. And no matter how fair our side hits it, these "neutrals" call it foul.

That's pretty rankling to Americans when we recall that most of these "neutrals" have been or are being rescued from economic misery by Uncle Sam—and with no strings attached.

I think a good rule for future foreign aid would be that neutral is as neutral does. A really neutral nation is the Swiss variety—it sticks to the meaning of the label and minds its own business.

There has long been sentiment in Congress for restraining our compulsive largesse toward foreign regimes which show their gratitude by habitually kicking Uncle Sam in the pants. Rumblings from the White House indicate parallel thinking there.

Naturally it would be better for the world if all nations were to recognize that the Communist Empire respects no neutrality and violates it whenever that course is useful to Moscow and/or Peiping. However, it is not altogether practical to fault weak and fearful nations for trying to stay out of a fight even though their course is shortsighted.

But that certainly does not go for such as Tito of Yugoslavia, Nkrumah of Ghana, Toure of Guinea or lesser fry who did their commie best to steer the just-closed Bel-

grade Conference of neutral nations into anti-U.S. positions. It got so bad that India's Nehru and Egypt's Nasser found themselves forced to shy away from the bad company they were in.

I am inclined to go along with those who believe that the Belgrade circus cost Tito a lot of influence among nonalined nations and added some stature to Nehru.

After all, peace is the name of the game for a sincere neutral, and support of the Soviet collision course on Berlin is bound to work against peace, not for it.

For the record, let's review U.S. aid toward a couple of the most arrantly anti-American neutrals—Tito and Nkrumah. Ed Edstrom of Hearst Headline Service's Washington Bureau reports:

Aid to Tito's Yugoslavia since 1950—$2.2 billions of which $693 million has been military aid.

Aid to Nkrumah's Ghana—$6.6 millions since 1956, all economic, largely in the form of food.

U.S. aid has boomed Yugoslavia's economy and greatly bolstered Ghana's. Both countries have had their hands out for bounty from the Red side, too, but Soviet aid is harder to pinpoint, being mostly in barter or project-building that can bear big "Made in U.S.S.R." tags.

As a force in the world struggle, the "neutral" nations sold themselves short at Belgrade. They had a big chance when the Soviet chose their meeting time as the occasion to resume nuclear testing.

But just deploring nuclear tests without condemning the Soviet action was meaningless.

The same goes for resolutions against colonialism which failed to mention the Soviet as the biggest colonial power of our time.

However well-meaning Nehru was in carrying the "neutral" peace plea to the Kremlin, all he has gotten is the back of Khrushchev's hand. Perhaps President Kennedy can be more polite to Indonesia's Sukarno and Mali's Keita, who arrive Tuesday on a similar errand, but at least he can tell them they've come to the wrong address.

It is not the United States that now or ever has threatened to break the peace.

In any case, it wouldn't be a bad idea to let them know that anti-United States "neutrality" no longer means open sesame to Uncle Sam's purse.

Any consideration of the worth of recipients of American taxpayers' money must give high priority to the nations of Latin America. As I have said before and doubtless will say again, this should be the most important area in the world to us.

With the exception of Cuba, the Pearl of the Caribbean which Khrushchev now wears in his necktie, our neighbor nations have first claim on our help. But this does not mean dishing out the $20 billion earmarked for the alliance for progress with spendthrift affability.

Here also the administration ought to be guided by realism. If we spend our money on the principle of "See what the boys in the back room will have"; the boys are apt to call for double slugs of the same.

In brief, we have got to find some way of making as sure as we can that our money benefits the people for whom it is intended, and is not used

1. To bolster corrupt and greedy bureaucracies, or

2. To perpetuate the intolerable division between the very rich and the very poor.

It is almost redundant to point out that either of these consequences would give aid and comfort to communism.

A case in the news at the moment is Brazil. The fourth largest country in the world and one which could be a tremendous ally in the cause of hemispheric freedom is emerging from political chaos brought on by the irresponsible conduct of former President Janio Quadros—and let's hope he remains "former."

Quadros resigned suddenly and inexplicably August 25. A couple of days ago the influential Rio newspaper Tribuna Da Impresna said he was sure he would be called back to the Presidency with dictatorial powers and further accused him of being involved in a Communist plot.

It is certainly true that as President, Quadros was a political Jekyll-Hyde. He was becoming more and more pro-Moscow and more and more anti-Washington, and yet at the same time in his economic policy he was an austere conservative. He tried hard to pull Brazil from the quicksand of inflation, which plunged the Cruzeiro from 20 to the dollar to more than 220 to the dollar. To give you an idea: A 1961 Chevrolet fetches a black market price in Rio of $12,000.

The one thing we can be firmly thankful for so far is that Brazil seems to be coming out of the crisis provoked by Quadros without devastating civil war. The rest is no more than hopeful conjecture.

The new President, Joao Goulart, for example (a very rich man, by the way), has shown disturbing Communist leanings. As Vice President he was exchanging pleasantries with Mao Tse-tung when Quadros resigned.

It is possible Goulart is more opportunist than Communist. At one time he looked with sympathy on the Fascist Peron regime in Argentina.

Under the amendment to the constitution just voted, the powers of the President are sharply restricted. Most authority will reside in a Prime Minister.

Two questions still hanging are:

Will President Goulart try to chisel through the restrictions built around his office?

How economically sound and politically forceful will the Prime Minister be?

Until they are answered, there is no sense in rushing to the new capital of Brasilia, saying, "Please take our taxpayers' millions."

We certainly don't want to contribute to bumping the black market price of a Chevy to—perhaps—"twenty grand."

The Voice of America Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished newspaper writer and columnist, Mr. Constantine Brown, who has been living in Rome, Italy, for some months now, has had an excellent opportunity to get a look at United States policies through the eyes of the average European. The Washington Evening Star published on September 14, 1961, a column by Mr. Brown entitled "They Look to United States and Wonder: Voice of America and USIS Statements Called Disheartening to Little People." This is a most interesting column and points up the bad effects which the Voice of America and USIS broadcasts are having on Europeans who want to see the United States take a firm stand against the aggressive tactics of world communism. As Mr. Brown points out, they cannot understand why these broadcasts speak of soft appeasement policies while the United States increases its armaments during the Khrushchev-created crisis over Berlin. I think this column serves to emphasize the need for having more backbone in our resistance against Communist methods and tactics in all governments and at all levels of government.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY LOOK TO U.S. AND WONDER—VOICE OF AMERICA AND USIS STATEMENTS CALLED DISHEARTENING TO LITTLE PEOPLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism. That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the air waves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring dis-

cussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalanche of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well gotten up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war," (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in Unita, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy on disarmament as put forth by the USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

Our Wayward Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Blairstown Press, a newspaper published in my home district in New Jersey, calls attention to the evils inherent in one segment of the press, and in so doing performs a service to the press and the Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial, "Our Wayward Press," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR WAYWARD PRESS

Traditionally, the press has been a firm bulwark of liberty. And because people had that idea about it, the press has become a sort of a sacred cow.

We don't think we are revealing any deep secret when we point out that the press is made up of ordinary, everyday human beings. Some of them have been to college but that doesn't necessarily mean that they have any more sense than those who haven't been exposed to the dubious advantages of so-called higher education. In fact, the big words many newspapermen learn in college saves them the effort of thinking and they never do get around to learning how.

College-trained newspapermen today, with the exception of the oldsters whose numbers grow fewer every year, have been subjected to the influence of teachers who are Socialists, in fact if not in name, which explains why so many of them accept Socialist doctrines under various fancy labels without question or dissent. And since socialism is the bridge to communism, as no less an authority than Joseph Stalin once said, it also explains why some newspapermen are dedicated Communists.

It's hard to detect a newspaperman who is a dedicated Communist because he acts and talks like a Socialist or a leftwing Democrat, or a leftwing Republican for that matter, since we are bringing politics into the discussion.

A dedicated Communist is exposed only when he pleads the fifth amendment before a congressional committee, usually after a defector from the conspiracy has sworn under oath that he is. He pleads the fifth amendment to avoid prosecution for perjury by denying the allegation and for no other reason.

The fingers of leftwing and Communist newspapermen tremble when the disgusting task of typing the name of that horrible reactionary Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is thrust upon them by harsh circumstances. And they abominate Richard Nixon, not for his faults—and he has developed a few since he was a hard-hitting Red-hunter in the Congress—but because he dragged the arch-traitor Alger Hiss down from his high place. For that terrible sin Richard Nixon will never be forgiven.

They love Owen Lattimore, Dean Acheson, John Stewart Service, Philip Jessup, and other fellows like that. They admit of no compromise with the Hitlers and other Fascists, and insist that they be destroyed. But they declare that the only sensible thing you can do with a Khrushchev, a Tito, a Mao, or a Castro is to negotiate with him. Negotiation with Khrushchev to them means giving him anything he wants because, they say blandly, a nuclear war is unthinkable.

As the Archbishop of Canterbury once declared, quite bluntly, there are other evils even more unthinkable than nuclear war.

Some newspapermen feel that these of their fellows who are various shades of pink and red should not be criticized in any way because, they are, after all, in the lodge, as it were.

We disagree. Newspapermen, who are loyal to their country, should criticize and criticize loudly those reporters who apologize for Communists, run around with them and, generally, play the Communists' game to the hilt.

That is why we applaud the editorial dissent of the Sentinel-Star, an Orlando, Fla., newspaper to the markedly hostile account by the Associated Press of the recent death of Whittaker Chambers, which the paper's editorial director, Wilson C. McGhee, sent to Frank J. Starzel, general manager of the Associated Press, with a covering letter to further protest.

The editorial said in part:

"The staid, powerful Associated Press handled the news of Whittaker Chambers' death in a peculiar way. Chambers, you may remember, was a $30,000-a-year senior editor of Time, who, in 1948, put the finger on Alger Hiss, the State Department spy, who lost his job, his reputation, and his health. The only reason we can think of is patriotism. He made a clean breast of everything; he wanted to atone for his mistake by warning the United States.

"The AP's handling tends to indict him for being loyal to the United States. The AP calls him a 'turncoat Communist.' Turncoat is a despised appellation, and the inference is that anyone who turns from communism should be despised. The AP says that Chambers 'tattled.' Telling the truth is honorable but, from childhood, we are taught that tattling is unworthy. The AP says that Chambers 'recited' to a 'congressional spy-hunting committee.' Here the inference is that he merely repeated a cooked-up story, and that spy-hunting is not a serious matter.

"Whereas the AP calls Hiss 'brilliant,' it kisses off Chambers as being 'pudgy, short and fat,' and says he 'lived with a woman outside of marriage.' This was before he married a woman to whom he was devoted for 30 years until his death.

"We are living in peculiar times, gentlemen of the Associated Press, when patriots are maligned."

We can't help but wonder who wrote that particular obit for the AP.

Mamaroneck Celebrates 300th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 23 of this year, the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., will mark with appropriate ceremonies its 300th anniversary.

Few communities anywhere in our great country are blessed with more physical assets and finer people than the town of Mamaroneck. Its very name means it is located where the fresh waters meet the salt, and it has enjoyed superb climatic conditions for many years. Centuries ago, it was a haven for New York people of means who could journey there by carriage conveniently and thus escape the heat and rigors of city life.

Many prominent persons have contributed much to the history of the town. Squire Rushmore, Mr. DeLancey, Mr. Caleb Heathcote—mayor of New York in 1711—James Fenimore Cooper, the renowned author, and a host of other prominent Americans have contributed to the lore of the community.

Today the town, in addition to its unincorporated section, embraces two villages, namely the village of Mamaroneck and the village of Larchmont. Ample recreation facilities exist in both villages, and Mamaroneck's harbor provides a beautiful beach for the residents of the community as well as boating facilities for multitudes of yachtsmen.

On the occasion of the celebration of its 300th anniversary, the destroyer U.S.S. *Brownson* will be anchored in the harbor. Three hundred bearded citizens of Mamaroneck, whose hirsute adornments have been cultivated over a period of weeks to properly mark the celebration, will parade along with their ladies in gingham and cottons, reminiscent of colonial times. Bands will render stirring music and floats will remind people of the history of this famous area. A parade of yachtsmen will also be in evidence, and, all in all, it will be a great day for Mamaroneck.

The people of the community are indebted to Judge Charles M. Baxter, Jr., prominent citizen of the community, and to William G. Fulcher, famous historian of the town, for the work they have done to properly commemorate the occasion. The merchants of the community and the chamber of commerce have cooperated fully to help make the affair a success.

Learning the Evil Nature of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the startling events of the recent past must have brought home to even the most gullible of Americans the clear truth that we are today engaged in mortal combat with communism. No amount of fuzzy or wishful thinking can disguise the fact that the Communists seek today, as they have consistently sought for some 40 years, to defeat and destroy us. Yesterday by duplicity or treachery, today by subversion or blackmail, tomorrow by negotiation or force of arms—at all times, the Communists will not deviate from attempting to reach their goal of conquering the Western World. If we are to prevail in this great struggle, our Nation must develop swiftly a knowledge of the aims, tactics, and strategy of communism. This, plus a genuine will to win, will assure final victory to the free world. Knowledge of the enemy, then, is essential to ultimate success. This is the compelling message of a recent editorial in the September 12 issue of the Lock Haven, Pa., Express, "Young Americans," and indeed all Americans, "should know the truth of the Communist philosophy, which makes promises it cannot fulfill, uses chicanery and falsehood as its everyday tactics, and openly undertakes to conquer the rest of the world by means of terror, blackmail, and force." Because of the clarity and compelling reasoning of this editorial, I call the entire composition to the attention of my colleagues:

TEACHING THE YOUNG ABOUT COMMUNISM

We have finally swung from superstition to intelligence in our attitude toward teaching the young people of the United States what communism is. It is now proper to help them understand the greatest issue of their times, the fateful rivalry between the beliefs of a Communist and those of the citizens of a free democracy.

The idea of teaching a course in the high schools of our country, to familiarize pupils with the ideas and practices that go with communism has received growing acceptance. Only a few years ago, even in this community, a teacher ran the risk of criticism, even suspicion, by attempting to explain what communism is all about.

The superstitious approach to any danger is to shy away from it, to avoid learning anything about it, to shun knowledge as if it were contamination. This may be one way to avoid a poison ivy itch, or a contagious disease—but we should not forget that what we know about avoiding and curing these ills has been the result of study and research.

The person who can recognize the demure leaf of the poison ivy plant is safer than the person who can't tell it from Virginia creeper. We learned to control smallpox, not by running away from it, which people did for centuries, but by learning how to make ourselves immune to it.

This is what the study of the history, ideas, and practices of communism will do for anyone who has reasonable intelligence. Learning these things does not make communism attractive; on the other hand such knowledge reveals its weaknesses, its falsity, and its complete negation of all human values.

What the student of the history of communism learns first is that the basic "principles" of this ideology were carpentered together by an egotistical German who had learned a lot of philosophy but knew nothing whatsoever about economics.

Karl Marx invented communism, literally, because he could not hold a job. His delusions of omnipotence were gratified by the hodge-podge of arbitrary theories he threw together in his embittered attacks on the capitalism of Europe in the middle of the last century. There was a lot wrong with the way Europe was being run in 1848, but Marx's panacea was not based on any economic, political or social truths.

Why, then, did it take hold? The student who pursues the study of how communism was foisted on the Russians, and how it has been forced down the throats of the Soviet satellites, will be dense, indeed, if he does not see how the Communist conspiracy hoodwinked first hundreds, then thousands, then millions of people, not with their own consent, but through taking advantage of their helplessness.

The student of communism will soon learn the difference between the American Revolution, fought for the principle of freedom through representative government, and the bloody butchery of the Communist revolutions, fought to prevent freedom and curb the gropings of common men and women for the right to live free lives.

Students of communism will learn, too, that the principles set forth by Marx and elucidated further by Lenin and Stalin, are not a set of moral truths, but a cynical philosophy of power-grabbing by whatever means can be used. They will learn that Lenin counseled the use of lies, treachery, and doubledealing, and that Stalin twisted the words of Marx and Lenin to suit his own dictatorial needs. They will learn that Khrushchev, too, has declared not once but many times, and in many different variations, that the goal of communism is to conquer and enslave the world—although in his doubletalk he says freedom when he means slavery.

Young Americans should know the truth of the Communist philosophy, which makes promises it cannot fulfill, uses chicanery and falsehood as its everyday tactics, and openly undertakes to conquer the rest of the world by means of terror, blackmail, and force.

They should know the enemy we face, because they, too, must fight that same enemy. If we do not have to fight with arms, we must not think there is no fighting to be done.

Khrushchev already has made it plain that he does not expect to have to win with weapons. He has served notice that he expects communism to find its way into the life of the free nations until they wake up to find themselves communized. If we are to foil this program, it will have to be done by letting every young American learn the whole ugly truth about communism as soon as possible.

Communism on the Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the American Freedom Academy, located in my congressional district, has prepared a unique analysis of the film strip "Communism on the Map."

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the academy's analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

COMMUNISM ON THE MAP

We have been disturbed by the fact that criticism of the film strip, "Communism on the Map" continues, and apparently the criticism is being accepted as factual by some people. As you know, it remains only to repeat a lie often enough, to establish that lie as fact in the minds of those who will not investigate for themselves.

Thus, a committee of four members of the American Freedom Academy met and viewed the film strip critically. We sat for 4 hours, viewing each of the 231 frames of the film, and listening to the narration. Each frame and the verbal comment was discussed individually, and a careful analysis made.

First, we feel it is important to note that "Communism on the Map" is a factual narrative of history. It carefully documents the spread of communism across the face of the earth. So far as we can determine, it does not overlook a single major instance in which the cancer of communism has spread.

Since we, as Americans, Christians, and believers in the free enterprise system, oppose communism, we must therefore be critical of the conditions under which this expansion of communism has been possible. Therefore, we must be critical of the foreign policy of America during this period. The identity of the party in power or the President in office at the time of each communistic gain is incidental; the fact of the gain remains as a historical fact, inescapable.

Of the 231 frames, we found 33 that might be termed critical of the Franklin Roosevelt-Harry Truman regime. It is possible that this fact might occasion the idea that "Communism on the Map" is an attack on the administrations of Messrs. Roosevelt and Truman.

On the other hand, there were 22 frames that could be interpreted by Republicans as critical of the Eisenhower administration. Let us note, by the way, that in many cases, the frame judged critical of either regime, was ruled so only because a certain incident occurred on a certain date, whereas there is no direct allusion to any President or administration.

There were 176 frames adjudged as completely neutral; not critical of either party.

It should be realized that the Democrat New Deal-Fair Deal regime was in power for 20 years of the period covered by the film strip. The Eisenhower regime was in power for 8 years, a ratio of 5 to 2.

The aforementioned count (33 to 22) establishes a ratio of 3 to 2.

Thus, if the Republicans were as sensitive as are the Democrats, they would have better ground for protest on the basis that there are 22 critical frames covering a period of 8 Republican years, whereas there are only 33 frames critical of 20 Democrat years.

And when one analysizes the supplementary material supplied to bring the film strip up to date—all prior to the inauguration of the Kennedy administration—the balance is thrown even more heavily against the Eisenhower regime. In this supplementary, there are mentions of such events as the South Korean student riots, the Turkish riots, the Japanese riots, the Congo unrest, the Loas rebellion, the destruction of Trujillo, the rise of Castro, the defection of the American scientists Mitchell and Martin, and the student riots in San Francisco—all of which happened during Eisenhower's 8 eventful years. There are 13

paragraphs, designed to be read by the moderator at each showing of the film strip. All could be considered as to cast unfavorable reflection on the American foreign policy during the Eisenhower administrations.

Taking these into consideration, one might logically readjust his scoring as follows: Roosevelt-Truman regime, 20 years, 33 unfavorable mentions; Eisenhower regime, 8 years, 35 unfavorable mentions.

However, it is only fair to mention a suggested statement for use in the introduction of "Communism on the Map":

"This filmstrip documents some grevious mistakes and blunders made by various agencies and institutions in the United States which aided world communism and did injury to the security of our Nation.

"However, nothing in the filmstrip is intended as a reflection on the patriotism, loyalty and integrity of any agency of Government, the Nation's press, or any other institution. Some of the documentation does reflect on the vulnerability of individuals and institutions to the cunning Communist propaganda and to the unseen, insidious and powerful influences being brought to bear throughout our society by Communist intrigue and fifth column penetration."

We feel that the filmstrip, "Communism on the Map," is a faithful outline of the fateful years that saw communism grown from infancy into the major foreign threat to our great Republic. We feel that apathy toward this godless monster is the greatest internal threat to the future of our Republic. We feel that this filmstrip should be shown to every American serviceman and every American public servant.

We feel that the only person who has been maligned, through innuendo, by the filmstrip is former Vice President Richard Nixon, who is pictured with the butcher Castro as the narration tells how some Americans (such as Ed Sullivan and some New York Times reporters) inaccurately evaluated the rise of Castro. Mr. Nixon, according to columnist George Sokolsky, interviewed Castro (when the picture was taken) and warned President Eisenhower of the strong possibility that Castro would prove himself a Communist.

We, the undersigned, respectfully submit to you this analysis of "Communism on the Map," with the suggestion that the filmstrip be used more, instead of less, in the battle against communism.

WILLIS WATERMAN.
REV. EVERETT AUGER.
HOMER GREENE.
DONALD T. CARPENTER.

The Peace Corps

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide for a Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, during the foreign aid debate, we heard a great deal of discussion of reported failures in our Foreign Aid program, and they have been many and grievous. If you examine them, most were not because of failure to provide adequate funds or to provide adequate numbers of personnel. It was not the amount of our aid that was at fault. More often it was the maner in which it was given. The most important requirement for success generally is not how much, but how.

We have done extraordinarily well with the tangible things, providing calories, kilowatts, dams, fertilizer plants, steel mills, food, and all the rest.

Too often we have failed in the intangible. Too often some of our people have alienated the people to whom they went because they acted according to their own fixed ideas. We Americans have the imperialism of efficiency and it can be a cruel and resented imperialism. We knew what they should do; we could do it better than they could. We embarrassed them by exposing too bluntly their backwardness in their own country. They had to take our aid, but then resented it. We paid more attention to plans and papers than to people. We did not win their confidence and good will.

Some of us have long urged that we pay more attention to the intangibles, to the things in which we and other peoples are alike, rather than where we are different.

I saw the Chinese Communists make their gains in China. They did not talk about communism or appear to be working for Russia. They talked about helping the Chinese people down at the grassroots.

They said "We are here to help you solve your land problems, your educational problems, your health problems." They gave the appearance of great concern not for the Soviet Union or, for world communism, but for the common people of China.

Oftentimes we, however unintentionally, have given the impression that we were helping other countries only as part of the cold war and because they were useful to us in that struggle. To that extent we failed.

This is the essence of the reason why we need the openmindedness, the dedication, the enthusiasm, and the optimism of youth—the willingess to go into country areas and work on a simple basis with ordinary folks, trying not to promote some big world program, but to help people who are in need. When friendly persons come from abroad and help somebody meet his real needs, it cannot be misunderstood or misrepresented. It is recognized as genuine concern, and it is welcomed.

Most of these less developed countries have never known good governments, whether outside governments or their own. All governments are suspect. They are big and powerful and impersonal. Governments are rigid. The accounts have to be gone through by a general accounting office, and only previously authorized expenditures can be made. There is little room for flexibility and use of imagination. By its very nature government has these handicaps. But when a voluntary agency goes over, its people can be imaginative and flexible in their approach. They have no axe to grind, no ulterior motive. The people recognize the genuineness of the effort, and they responded.

Mr. Chairman, most of us older people have acquired more or less fixed attitudes, even prejudices. We are sure our way is best. Without intending to, we tend to try to impose our will. But youth are less set; they are more willing to accept folks as they are and to work with them, more than for them.

Mr. Chairman, it is such considerations as these which have made some of us unhappy for years that the foreign-aid program has not made more use of the special qualities and enthusiasms of our own youth.

Last year in our committee report on the foreign-aid program we had a section on this, and I want to read part of it which I wrote myself:

> It would be of very great value not only in creating a favorable impression of the United States but also in promoting sound and basic improvements in economic development if more places for such young people were found in oversea operations.

This followed discussion of some of the good projects which we had seen in southeast Asia being done on a voluntary basis by the young people of America, and to which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] referred yesterday.

We further said:

> The committee believes that the United States is failing to utilize one of its important assets by not developing a program for using such services. If young Americans with farm backgrounds and adequate technical training, who are willing to live in villages and share in the daily work of the people and who would serve with only a minimum salary and subsistence allowance, could be carefully selected and sent to the less-developed countries, they could be unusually effective representatives of the United States.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the sound rationale of the Peace Corps. But I must add that I was sorely disappointed when the bill to establish it was introduced. Too much of the emphasis in the bill was not on the plain hard work that is to be done or the people to be served. Too much of the emphasis—I am sure it was not intentional, but it gradually developed that way—was on the workers and the measures to protect and to serve them. It was not so much what they could do for their country, but what their country would do for them—while on the job and afterward. It emphasized the separateness of this particular group of Americans, their superiority, and so forth. As one of its sponsors wrote to me:

> This separate approach has had special enthusiastic response from colleges, universities and voluntary agencies that have not found it feasible to work in partnership with existing aid programs, for various reasons.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps will stand or fall in the end on the kind of work done in the field, not on the initial response in the colleges or elsewhere. It is performance that will count, not public relations.

So, when the bill came to our committee its preoccupation seemed to be with

the benefits that were going to come to these lads, rather than the service that they were going to render. I felt that was more likely to reduce than to improve their chance of doing the kind of job that is so urgently needed, and the committee made substantial changes in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, not for one moment do I want to discriminate against these volunteers. But I think it is equally a mistake to discriminate in favor of them. Some say, Why should they not have all the same benefits as our foreign service personnel? Or our GI's? Or teachers here at home? Or even some special privileges, as I shall point out in discussing amendments I hope to offer? Well, I think this Peace Corps will succeed in considerable degree in proportion to the privileges the youth do not have. Asians respect men more for what they deny themselves than for what they gain for themselves. We must not do anything to kill something of the genuineness, the purity of motive, the voluntary idealism, the sacrificial spirit that must be the essence of this project, if it is to succeed in full measure.

Mr. Chairman, people often ask what gives the Communist youth their incredible drive and determination. May I read to you the first paragraph of the address given by Stalin in 1924 at the funeral of Lenin, and you will see why the Communists have been winning. He called them to nothing but hardship, and he promised them nothing but the honor of serving in a struggle to change the whole world.

Comrades, we Communists are people of a special mold. We are made of a special stuff. We are those who form the army of the great proletarian strategist, the army of Comrade Lenin. There is nothing higher than the honor of belonging to this army. There is nothing higher than the title of member of the party whose founder and leader was Comrade Lenin. It is not given to everyone to be a member of such a party. It is not given to everyone to withstand the stresses and storms that accompany membership in such a party. It is the sons of the working class, the sons of want and struggle, the sons of incredible privation and heroic effort who before all should be members of such a party.

Departing from us, Comrade Lenin enjoined us to hold high and guard the purity of the great title of member of the party. We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we shall fulfill your behest with honor.

No wonder they had stars in their eyes and have worked so contiguously and so successfully.

Mr. Chairman, we underestimate our American youth, and we do them a grave disservice if we fail to call them to equal "privation and heroic effort." They are willing to give their all including their lives if necessary for so much nobler and higher a cause. They want to do it. Let us not cheapen it by emphasis on benefits now or later. They will be so much better able to serve our country when they come back, as well as to serve the countries to which they now go.

Restoring of Rate Ceiling on FHA-Insured Mortgages to 5½ Percent Considered by Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of September 14, 1961, under the heading "Restoring of Rate Ceiling on FHA-Insured Mortgages to 5½ Percent Considered by Kennedy."

Mr. Speaker, this article is self-explanatory. It is apparent that the administration in its endeavor to reduce mortgage rates only succeeded in increasing discounts that have to be paid on FHA-insured mortgages. No wonder the FHA is not making a better performance, particularly in view of the ultraliberal, and I might add, unsound, housing bill passed by the Congress this year.

The article follows:

RESTORING OF RATE CEILING ON FHA-INSURED MORTGAGES TO 5½ PERCENT CONSIDERED BY KENNEDY

(By Arlen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is considering whether it should restore to 5½ percent the maximum interest rate permitted on mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

The rate was cut to 5¼ percent in May, and administration economists and housing officials frankly concede the reduction has not been accepted by the private mortgage market. Unless mortgage lenders begin making more 5¼-percent loans in the weeks ahead, and discounts narrow on these mortgages, the administration may decide to restore the ceiling to its pre-May level of 5½ percent. Through a discount, an investor lays out less than the face value of the mortgage, but stands to be repaid the full amount, this increasing his yield above the stated interest rate.

The administration's decision on whether to return to 5½ percent could be a painful one. Officials from President Kennedy on down have been trying for months to force home borrowing costs lower. A cancellation of May's cut in the FHA rate ceiling would amount to an admission that the administration pushed lenders further than they were willing to go. Also, officials worry that the mere announcement of an FHA rate boost might be wrongly regarded by businessmen as a signal for a Government return to "tight money" policies that could hamper the economic recovery.

But administration men also worry over the result of leaving the 5¼ percent rate unchanged in the face of rising interest rates on non-FHA mortgages and other long-term securities. This, it's feared, would hurt the whole FHA mortgage insurance program and put a greater cash requirement on home buyers.

TREND OF MORTGAGE RATES

Housing officials insist they're not yet convinced that mortgage interest rates are headed inevitably higher in the weeks ahead—a trend that would about insure a return to a 5½ percent maximum FHA rate. But evidence abounds that mortgage lenders are cool toward the present 5¼ percent maximum.

Three examples:

FHA noted yesterday a slight decline, the first in more than a year, in the average price quoted for its insured maximum-rate mortgages on the secondary, or resale, market. This price movement halted a long, steady decline in the actual investment yields received by secondary-market buyers of FHA mortgages.

FHA's role in the housing market has been declining in recent months, indicating more mortgage lenders are shunning the agency's insurance programs. Last January, FHA insurance programs covered 20 percent of the nonfarm homes started that month. This share had dropped to 17 percent in June and to about 15 percent in July.

More owners of FHA-backed mortgages are trying to sell them to the Federal National Mortgage Association, rather than to private buyers on the secondary market. Officials regard this as a sign that Fannie Mae prices are becoming more attractive than the reduced prices being offered by such private buyers as insurance companies. Lower resale prices usually reflect a firming of the investment yields demanded by private mortgage buyers.

ONE GAGE OF TRENDS

Secondary market prices for FHA-insured mortgages provide one measurement of trends in mortgage interest rates generally. Sellers of such mortgages usually are original-lender mortgage companies wanting to convert them into cash for relending. The buyers are insurance companies or other institutions wanting mortgages for long-term investment.

Buyers in recent years have consistently been paying prices below face value for FHA mortgages.

FHA said the national average price paid for its insured 5¼ percent 25-year mortgages edged down to $96.50 per $100 of outstanding mortgage amount on September 1. This was down from the August 1 quotation of $96.60. FHA officials said the amount of decline for 1 month was fractional, and within the margin of statistical error. But they did attach significance to the failure of the price to rise—a sign that the secondary market was not adjusting to the late-May interest rate reduction.

Secondary market prices behaved much differently following the Kennedy administration's first cut in the rate, to 5½ percent from 5¾ percent in February. Just before the February reduction, FHA's 5¾ percent mortgages were bringing an average of $98.10 per $100 of face value on the secondary market. Assuming repayment or disposal of the mortgage in an average of 12 years, this price yielded the buyer an actual return of 6 percent—a rate roughly comparable to that received by lenders on conventional mortgages not backed by Government repayment guarantees.

After the reduction to the 5½ percent rate, the secondary market price on March 1 dropped to $97.10 for mortgages carrying the new rate. This was the market's way of compensating for the formal rate reduction in an effort to maintain the former level of actual yields. But the initial price decline was only half as big as that needed to maintain the former yield. By June 1, steady increases in the secondary market price had restored the quotation on 5½ percent loans to an average $98.10, the same level that prevailed for the old 5¾ percent mortgage. To FHA officials, this confirmed the mortgage market's agreement that the 5½ percent rate was in line with market demand.

The failure of similar price trends to develop following the May reduction to 5¼ percent is causing concern among administration officials. For one thing, the wide discount margin of secondary prices below face value may tend to put upward pressure on home prices. FHA regulations forbid mortgage lenders to require the home buyer to

make up the discount directly. But this cost is often borne by homebuilders who arrange financing for their customers, and some builders have recouped the expense by adding it to the original price of their houses.

If yields on competing non-FHA mortgages and other long-term securities show signs of weakening in the weeks ahead, the 5¼ percent rate may start looking more attractive to lenders. This would take the administration off the hook by allowing it to leave the 5¼ percent rate where it is.

Use for Cultural Purposes of Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, several days ago I had the pleasure of talking with Mr. Marvin D. Myers, assistant to the director of Purdue Musical Organizations, Purdue University, who came to me with what I think is an excellent idea.

Since the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater is now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, Secretary Udall has asked for proposals of ways in which the amphitheater could be used for cultural purposes. Mr. Myers has suggested that a certain time be set aside each summer during which various school and community music groups could perform at Carter Barron in a summer music festival. The groups would be chosen from among the numerous talented musical organizations which we have in the United States.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter from Mr. Myers to Secretary Udall which more fully outlines the proposal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALL OF MUSIC,
PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
West Lafayette, Ind.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On a recent business trip to Washington I had occasion to confer with several Members of the Congress, and in the course of conversations about various matters, learned that the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater is now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and that the Secretary is desirous of receiving suggestions as to the possible use of this fine structure for the cultural arts.

By way of introduction, I am now, and have been for the last 14 years, assistant to Dr. Albert P. Stewart, Director of Purdue Musical Organizations, and am also assistant in agricultural extension music in the State of Indiana. In 1949, Mr. Stewart and I were appointed by the National Capitol Sesquicentennial Commission to promote and stage a program of festival music in the 1950 sesquicentennial program in Washington. In this connection, we became very close friends to Mr. Barron, and immediately on hearing of his death, wired the Commission and suggested that the amphitheater being constructed in Rock Creek Park be named in his memory.

During the year 1950, we were successful in bringing to Washington over 6,000 participants in various musical and cultural organizations which performed in a temporary shell erected on the Capitol Grounds. Included were high school bands and choruses such as the male high school band and chorus from Louisville, Ky., and the Keokuk, Iowa, band from Keokuk, Iowa. Community groups included the famous York Pennsylvania Band with the singing Yorkmen and Yorkwomen. Also the Iowa State Women's Chorus of 400 voices, along with more than 2,000 singing Hoosier women from the Indiana State agricultural extension choruses. We also included a presentation of the North Carolina Grass Roots Opera Co. which thrilled an audience of over 7,000 at Watergate on the Potomac. The barbershop singers, under the direction of Washington's Dr. Harmon, also attracted a huge crowd. The Interdepartmental Auditorium was filled to overflowing when the Purdue Glee Club, under direction of Dr. Stewart, gave their concert on the eve of their departure for a good-will tour of German universities.

The above groups are indicative of the many more which came to Washington during the sesquicentennial to add their talents to a great American festival of academic and community music.

The success of this program has always remained in my mind as, not only a great memory, but an inspiration that someday this type of program could be repeated in Washington, not only once, but on an annual basis. After seeing the beautiful structure, the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater in Rock Creek Park, this desire became greater than ever.

Certainly it would be a great inspiration to American school and community music if, each year, the best of these groups could perform in their Nation's Capital. Furthermore, I am confident that an exchange program could be worked out with such oversea festivals as the one conducted at Llangollen, Wales. Our Purdue Glee Club has participated in this festival on two occasions and in 1953 met the famous Obernkirchen Children's Choir, which we were instrumental in bringing to America on their first tour in 1954.

The many loyal State societies in Washington would surely work for, and cooperate with such a program, especially in presenting talent from their respective States. I have heard such sentiment expressed by many people in the various societies. I have followed the efforts of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, in his efforts in the cultural arts exchange program, and more recently with the efforts of Representative MCDOWELL, of Delaware, also Representative HAYS, of Ohio, and Senator VANCE HARTKE, from our State of Indiana. I am sure that these gentlemen would all give support to such a program along with many others.

I would suggest, Mr. Secretary, that the Carter Barron Memorial Amphitheater be used for a specified length of time each year for the presentation of a festival of American school and community music and related arts. I would further suggest that a committee, or commission, be established to work in accord with the Department of the Interior and the Secretary in establishing such a worthwhile program in freedom's great Capital, Washington, D.C.

I humbly present these thoughts and will appreciate your comment.

Sincerely,

MARVIN D. MYERS,
Assistant in Extension Music.

Should the Secretary of the Interior look with favor on this proposal, and should such a program be established, I believe that the cultural life of our Nation's Capital and of the Nation would be greatly enriched.

Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the New York Times, in its September 15 editions, carried an article on Denver written by Gladwin Hill, one of its senior western correspondents. Mr. Hill, visiting Denver in the midst of the American Legion's national convention, drew a swift, impressionistic, and amusing verbal portrait of my home city which conveys its unique tempo and flavor at this heady moment in its history. He has managed to impart the bustling sense of forward motion, the friendliness, and the optimism which characterize Denver today; and, equally important, he has captured the essence of what makes Denver different from other bustling, friendly, and optimistic cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, headlined "Boomtime in the Rockies," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1961]

BOOMTIME IN ROCKIES

(By Gladwin Hill)

DENVER, September 14.—Some fallout, supposedly from the Soviet atomic tests, raised radiation readings in this capital of the Rocky Mountain empire Tuesday. But it did not dampen a boom atmosphere surpassing that of the bonanza mining days. The mile-high city may get excited about small things such as where it is going to get $13 million a year for public improvements or how to achieve a thoroughly honest police force. But the big things do not faze it.

This week brought forth, along with the American Legion convention, official approval of a 30-story $12 million skyscraper; groundbreaking for a University of Denver sorority house (Gamma Phi Beta) costing $175,000; and, under the gilded dome of the downtown State Capitol, further plans for punching a 2-mile vehicular highway tunnel through the nearby Continental Divide in the Rocky Mountains overlooking the city.

The new skyscraper will have plenty of company. A forest of monolithic modern buildings is already extinguishing the traditional brownstone character of the era when the capers of H. A. W. Tabor, the mining leader, and his much-sung girl friend, Baby Doe, kept Denver vibrant. Even the fabled Brown Palace Hotel now has a 22-story modernistic annex.

Yet the frontier ebullience remains. To test whether Legionnaires had gone sedate, the Denver Post in an echo of its yeasty days under the legendary Tammen and Bonfils, sent out its prettiest girl reporter at-

tired in shrieking red to see if she could vamp any delegates. ("I've gotten more attention from a troop of Boy Scouts," she reported.)

While Denver's heart is urban, its pocketbook is geared to the hinterlands. There's joy over a moist season that has produced the best rangelands, for Colorado beef, since 1957 and helped crops.

Farmers seem to be winning in all ways. Sugarbeets will be big, and wheat farmers got the good news the week that the Government was figuring on easing the surplus by trading it abroad—for sugar. Thus emboldened, the grain men scorned proposals for a nationwide bread price increase as something calculated only to put them in the middle.

But all is not perfect.

The annual Denver Open golf tournament last week, won by Dave Hill, was a financial failure, drawing only 3,500 spectators while 15,000 had been expected.

The lack of interest was ascribed to an abundance of events. Sports fans had their choice of major league baseball and football on television and in-the-flesh quarter-horse races, greyhound races, or even Dick the Bruiser and Killer Kowalski on the wrestling mat.

And Denver has the common affliction of tax trouble. The city already has a 1-percent sales tax on top of the 2 percent States sales tax. Still short of money for basics such as fire stations and streets, it is afraid that additional city sales taxes would drive business to the suburbs.

Its neat solution—now in hot controversy—was to have the legislature create a Metropolitan Capital Improvements District comprising Denever and three counties. The area will vote September 26 on a 2-percent districtwide sales tax designed to equalize the burden.

Denver's other major civic worry at the moment is its police department, tarnished by the alleged involvement of a dozen officers in a burglary ring. Los Angeles' Chief, William H. Parker, known for the quality of his force, was diverted from Legion convention duties by city officials as an adviser.

Only once this week did Denver find its traditional hand of friendship rebuffed. At the Legion's arduous 6-hour parade, a citizen stepped forth to succor an equestrian, costumed as one of General Custer's ill-fated men, who seemed to be fainting in the hot sun.

"Leave me alone," the rider muttered. "I'm supposed to have an arrow in my back."

They Look to United States and Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Americans and the attitude of people toward America is a subject to continuing discussion, and I feel the article by Columnist Constantine Brown should be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and does not need further mention on my part. The article entitled "They Look to United States and Wonder," follows:

THEY LOOK TO UNITED STATES AND WONDER

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist agression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations, and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism. That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the airwaves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring discussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator, Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalanche of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well gotten up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war" (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva Conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in Unita, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

Kennedy Acts To Counter Red Trickery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article bearing a Washington dateline of September 14.

Again the managers on the part of the New Frontier have insulted the intelligence of the American people. Under terrific pressure from the frustrated public over the anti-anti-Communist drive that is now going on, the White House has attempted to soften this feeling by announcing the appointment of four advisers in psychological warfare. This would be fine if the President would appoint such people as Mr. Edward Hunter, America's outstanding person in the field of psychological warfare; Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker, another expert in psychological warfare; Adm. Chester Ward, and other equally talented personnel in this field.

However, he appointed his brother, Bobby Kennedy, who knows as much about psychological warfare as I do; Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, a brilliant labor attorney but certainly untrained in the field of psychological warfare; Mr. Alexis U. Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; and for window dressing, Gen. Maxwell Taylor. This, then, is the Advisory Committee on Psychological Warfare and constitutes another step down the road to peaceful surrender to the international Communist conspiracy.

The article follows:

KENNEDY ACTS TO COUNTER RED TRICKERY

WASHINGTON, September 14.—President Kennedy has set up a Cabinet level group to give him a blueprint for psychological and political warfare planning and strategy.

The group is composed of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the President's brother; Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, military representative of the President, and Alexis U. Johnson, Deputy Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs.

The Communists' ability to repress world reaction unfavorable to them, and to dominate the news as they choose with demonstrations that seem spontaneous, led to the creation of the new study group.

TAKE REDS APATHETICALLY

When the Russians resumed nuclear testing and many nations accepted the news apathetically, administration officials specu-

lated on what would have happened throughout the world if the United States had broken the moratorium. U.S. Embassies, they surmised, would have been picketed, perhaps stoned, and the demonstrations would have appeared to be spontaneous.

The seal of East Berlin at its western boundary aroused no world protest. On the other hand, if a U.S. Ambassador visits a foreign nation and is jeered or threatened by a mob, the mob action, in the opinion of Kennedy, dominates the news of the day, and the purpose, point, and accomplishments of the Ambassador's trip become submerged.

Government officials are aware that the Communist apparatus spark these demonstrations in foreign lands. Neutrals and nonaligned nations have remained silent in the face of Soviet nuclear explosions.

SEEKS TO COUNTER TACTICS

The President believes that someway must be found to combat Communist techniques in cold war psychological tactics.

The informal group—Kennedy prefers not to call it a committee—was set up to find the answers. No Government agency now has the responsibility to conduct psychological warfare or to make broad policy and plans in that area.

Kennedy's four-man group is not an operations unit. It is understood to have held one, perhaps two meetings, and has little or no staff. Its assignment is to advise the President on what needs to be done, feasible ways of getting it done, and who should bear the responsibility.

Censorship of Military Officers' Speeches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, always in the forefront and ever vigilant in the fight for good government, and opposing communistic infiltration, is one of the most prominent businessmen of our Third District of Ohio, Mr. Loren M. Berry.

On September 11, 1961, Mr. Berry sent President Kennedy the following telegram:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Armed Services, White House, Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully urge you to set up a policy of commendation rather than penalties for the military for instructing their men as to the destructive forces of communism. The troops must know and understand that the threat to our freedom today is international communism and its dedicated aim of world domination.

I hope you will not hesitate to reaffirm the precepts which underlie our American way of life, freedom under God and justice under man. There should be no uncertainty in the American mind as to where the United States stands. Surrender and appeasement are not our heritage.

That same day, Mr. Berry also sent the following telegram to each member of the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House:

I respectfully urge you to support the investigation concerning censorship of military officers' speeches and instructions to troops. The Communist cause has advanced greatly because so many citizens have been indifferent or complacent and even some of our soldiers do not know or understand the policies we have pledged our lives and fortunes to protect. A military man, under oath to defend his country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, should be commended rather than penalized for informing his men as to the menacing and massive global forces that are threatening to destroy our constitutional Republic.

There should be no uncertainty in the American mind as to where the United States stands. Surrender and appeasement are not our heritage.

LOREN M. BERRY.

The Reverend George W. Johnson Nominated for Office of National Chaplain, VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Miami Beach, Fla., from August 20 to August 25, 1961, the Reverend George W. Johnson, oversea veteran with the U.S. Navy during World War II, and an ordained Protestant minister, was nominated for the office of national chaplain by commander of New York State VFW, Joseph Carl Thomson.

This nomination marked a turning point in national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as the Reverend Johnson was the first member of the Negro race to be nominated for national office in the 62 years of national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Comrade Johnson—all members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are called comrades—stayed with his fellow comrades from New York County at the headquarters hotel, the Fountainbleau, at Miami Beach. He attended all meetings of New York County as well as the New York State meetings. He was also present at all meetings of the national convention and had his meals with his fellow comrades at the Fountainbleau Hotel.

All the rest of this Nation can take an example from the Veterans of Foreign Wars whose ties are based on service performed on foreign soil during time of war in the armed services of the United States of America. Race, color, or creed have no bearing whatsoever on eligibility for membership, or for election to any office from the post level up in the national organization. Delegates are elected directly from their own post and any member can run for any office on any level provided he has a paid-up membership card.

The Reverend Johnson's nomination was received with applause and acclaim by the delegates from all over the country. When the Reverend Johnson learned that it had been the VFW custom for years to rotate the office of national chaplain among the various faiths and that the chaplain for the preceding year had been a Protestant minister, he went to the microphone on the convention floor and declined to run for office in favor of Father Brown—a Catholic priest from the Midwest—amid the cheers of all the delegates on the convention floor for his display of comradeship which is so much evident among the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *August 29, 1961.*
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: As author of the bill, House Resolution 211, please accept my most sincere congratulations. Never, has our beloved Republic faced a crisis, remotely as critical as the present battle to hold back the Red tide.

There can be no greater service than keeping alive the hopes for freedom of enslaved people the world over and offering courageous statemanship to we, who yet enjoy freedom.

Be assured that a great tide is boiling up in great surges to bulwark the tremendous stand, people such as you have taken in holding at bay and fighting down those engaged in the most insidious attack on civilization in the history of mankind.

May God bless you.

Cordially yours,

DONALD W. KILLIAN, Sr.

WAHPETON, N. DAK., *August 30, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We wish to commend you for authoring House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. We are also writing of our approval to our Congressman SHORT.

Sincerely yours,

RUBY and ELMER BERTHON.

ARCADIA, CALIF., *August 26, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We read with great interest and appreciation a copy of your recent speech on the Manion Forum.

We commend you most sincerely for introducing House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. We have noted a tremendous increase in grassroots interest and concern over the Communist menace in just the past few weeks, and feel your resolution is indeed timely and will receive popular support as the information concerning it spreads.

We are urging Mr. ROUSSELOT'S full support of your bill. His record of integrity and courage has made his constituents feel very proud, and we are sure he will join with you in this effort.

Yours sincerely,

MARGARET S. BOHNSTADT.
CHARLES M. BOHNSTADT.

AUGUST 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD:

Wish to give wholehearted approval to your House Resolution 211.

This is a wonderful way to fight for free people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. C. JOHNSTON.

TEMPLE CITY, CALIF.,
August 29, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your House Resolution 211 which would provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations, is a fine gesture.

We congratulate you for bringing forth this humanitarian piece of leigslation. We wish you all success in its passage.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. MARJORIE L. SCHWEITZER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I approve 100 percent of House Resolution 211. I have written my Congressmen and urged their emphatic support.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. OBENSCHAIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, which should be of interest to you.

I have been deeply delighted with the success of the response to your House Resolution 211, creating a Captive Nations Committee.

I think it is shocking that the administration has dallied, or even attempted to discourage such a resolution.

What in the world does it take to get some of these people at our own "summit" moving?

Keep up your great fight for the Captive Nations Committee. I was greatly heartened by your condemnation of our abject conduct in the Panama Canal a couple of years ago; and pleased to read your communication to then Secretary of State Herter on that problem. We need more men with your courage in Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. SHARP.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 25, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: It is my understanding that House Resolution 211, calling for creation of a Captive Nations Committee, is and has been "bottled up" in the Rules Committee since its introduction in March of this year by Congressman FLOOD.

Surely this is one of the more urgent items on the agenda at this time. I cannot imagine a greater morale booster for the anti-Communist world, especially in view of the defensive position we are in on Berlin. We need a move that will show the world we take the plight of the captive nations seriously.

It is especially distressing to read that the President has discouraged consideration of this measure. In fact, it is hardly believable, and I will appreciate your informing me as to the truth of this statement, which has been printed in a reputable publication.

In view of our repeated concern for minority groups in this country, I think it would be a politically significant move on the part of the President to give this resolution his backing. These various nationality groups in this country would respond tremendously, to the passage of House Resolution 211.

I am deeply concerned over the axis of appeasement that runs through this administration like a yellow streak, and intend to do all I can, with my friends, to see that public officials who appease communism or turn their heads from its aggression, are not returned to Congress next year.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES L. SHARP.

FORT WORTH TEX.,
August 30, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I am interested in your House Resolution 211. Could you give me some information concerning its purpose and how it would operate.

Thank you.

ANGELO BENEDICT NASCHE.

Lunacy in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, dated September 15, entitled "Lunacy in Katanga." It expresses the position that I have taken ever since the United Nations moved into the Congo. It is another example of the United Nations, whose military commander is a Russian Communist, delivering, or attempting to deliver, a free and independent province now in the hands of a pro-Western friend into the hands of pro-Communist Gizenga.

The article follows:

LUNACY IN KATANGA

The issue was in doubt yesterday in Katanga. Counter-attacking forces, loyal to the government of President Moise Tshombe, threatened to reverse the earlier decision at arms which looked like a victory for the United Nations wrecking crew in the Congo.

Through the haze of reports from Elisabethville one thing was certain: The Kennedy administration had sought to achieve a crowning lunacy by paying the lion's share of the bill so that the U.N. mercenary army could conquer the only peaceful, orderly, and pro-Western place in the Congo and turn it over to communism.

The U.N. force struck treacherously before dawn—in violation, according to Tshombe, of its pledged word, given the night before, that it would not move against the Katanga Government or seek to disarm Katanga's Army. After shooting up the center of the city and butchering resisting Katangese, the U.N. force issued the smug announcement, "The Katanga seccession is over. Katanga is now a Congolese Province."

But, as Secretary General Hammarskjold of U.N. arrived in Leopoldville, all smiles, the Katanga army and police smashed back under the leadership of Belgian and French officers U.N. had sought to expel. The fighting spread elsewhere throughout the Congo, and it remained to be seen whether U.N. could make its decision stick.

It was suicidal folly that the Government of the United States should ever have placed its support behind a venture to knock out the only regime in central Africa which supported the West against Communist ambitions. While anarchy prevailed in the rest of the Congo, there was no violence against westerners in Katanga. Its economy functioned and stability and order prevailed.

The U.N. excuse for its policy of disintegration was that it had acted at the request of the "central" government in Leopoldville to prevent civil war. So it went to war on its own motion to make the Congo safe for communism.

Senator DODD, of Connecticut, has warned that the U.N. effort to foster a so-called coalition government in the Congo is "so heavily weighted in favor of the Communists that the outcome is virtually a mathematical certainty." The Prime Minister, Adoula, is, by reputation, a neutralist. Gizenga, his Vice Premier, is a cadre Communist, while the key post of Minister of the Interior has been awarded to Gizenga's most notorious henchman, Christophe Gbenye, a Communist trained in Prague.

As soon as initial reports of the U.N. triumph reached Leopoldville, the Adoula-Gizenga regime promptly moved in one of Gizenga's agents as its gauleiter in Elisabethville. This man, Egide Bochely-Davidson, had been Gizenga's high commissioner of state in Oriental Province, the stronghold of the Communist followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, first Premier of the "united" Congo.

Senator DODD has recounted that the U.N. to date has spent $100 million in the Congo, and that the United States has paid half the bill. "I cannot understand why or how the U.N. has converted itself into an instru-

ment of Communist policy in central Africa," said Senator DODD, "and why the United States should be supporting and footing the bill for the United Nations military and police state operations against the anti-Communist government of President Tshombe."

No more can we, for if, as the Senator says, the Congo goes Communist, "it will not be because of Soviet intervention but because of intervention by a United Nations army, created by American policy and paid for by American money."

The British Government has demanded an accounting from Hammarskjold about what has motivated his course, and has sent a government officer to the Congo to investigate on the scene. A similar investigation of the Kennedy administration's policy, as suggested by Senator DODD in proposing the immediate creation of a select committee, is in order in Washington.

Anti-American Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the excellent editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the September 10 issue of the Hearst newspapers, is most timely and makes sense. I doubt whether our Department of State will take kindly to his suggestions. The editorial follows:

NEUTRALS' STAND PERILS PEACE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

What with the cold war world series getting hotter by the day, isn't it about time we took a closer look behind the masks of some of the self-appointed umps who call themselves "neutral"?

No question about it, these would-be arbiters have been making some strange calls—most of them impartial—against the United States.

Any time "Lefty" Khrushchev curves a low one 'way outside, they call it a strike. And no matter how fair our side hits it, these "neutrals" call it foul.

That's pretty rankling to Americans when we recall that most of these "neutrals" have been or are being rescued from economic misery by Uncle Sam—and with no strings attached.

I think a good rule for future foreign aid would be that neutral is as neutral does. A really neutral nation is the Swiss variety—it sticks to the meaning of the label and minds its own business.

There has long been sentiment in Congress for restraining our compulsive largesse toward foreign regimes which show their gratitude by habitually kicking Uncle Sam in the pants. Rumblings from the White House indicate parallel thinking there.

Naturally it would be better for the world if all nations were to recognize that the Communist Empire respects no neutrality and violates it whenever that course is useful to Moscow and/or Peiping. However, it is not altogether practical to fault weak and fearful nations for trying to stay out of a fight even though their course is short-sighted.

But that certainly does not go for such as Tito of Yugoslavia, Nkrumah of Ghana, Toure of Guinea or lesser fry who did their Commie best to steer the just-closed Belgrade Conference of "neutral" nations into anti-U.S. positions. It got so bad that India's Nehru and Egypt's Nasser found themselves forced to shy away from the bad company they were in.

I am inclined to go along with those who believe that the Belgrade circus cost Tito a lot of influence among nonalined nations and added some stature to Nehru.

After all, peace is the name of the game for a sincere neutral, and support of the Soviet collision course on Berlin is bound to work against peace, not for it.

For the record, let's review U.S. aid toward a couple of the most arrantly anti-American neutrals—Tito and Nkrumah. Ed Edstrom of Hearst Headline Service's Washington bureau reports:

Aid to Tito's Yugoslavia since 1950—$2.2 billion of which $693 million has been military aid.

Aid to Nkrumah's Ghana—$6.6 million since 1956, all economic, largely in the form of food.

U.S. aid has boomed Yugoslavia's economy and greatly bolstered Ghana's. Both countries have had their hands out for bounty from the Red side, too, but Soviet aid is harder to pinpoint, being mostly in barter or project building that can bear big made-in-U.S.S.R. tags.

As a force in the world struggle, the nuetral nations sold themselves short at Belgrade. They had a big chance when the Soviet chose their meeting time as the occasion to resume nuclear testing.

But just deploring nuclear tests without condemning the Soviet action was meaningless.

The same goes for resolutions against colonialism which failed to mention the Soviet as the biggest colonial power of our time.

However well-meaning Nehru was in carrying the "neutral" peace plea to the Kremlin, all he has gotten is the back of Khrushchev's hand. Perhaps President Kennedy can be more polite to Indonesia's Sukarno and Mali's Keita, who arrive Tuesday on a similar errand, but at least he can tell them they've come to the wrong address.

It is not the United States that now or ever has threatened to break the peace.

In any case, it wouldn't be a bad idea to let them know that anti-U.S. neutrality no longer means open sesame to Uncle Sam's purse.

And consideration of the worth of the recipients of American taxpayers' money must give high priority to the nations of Latin America. As I have said before and doubtless will say again, this should be the most important area in the world to us.

With the exception of Cuba, the Pearl of the Caribbean which Khrushchev now wears in his necktie, our neighbor nations have first claim on our help. But this does not mean dishing out the $20 billion earmarked for the alliance for progress with spendthrift affability.

Here also the administration ought to be guided by realism. If we spend our money on the principle of "See what the boys in the back room will have," the boys are apt to call for double slugs of the same.

In brief, we have got to find some way of making as sure as we can that our money benefits the people for whom it is intended, and is not used (1) to bolster corrupt and greedy bureaucracies, or (2) to perpetuate the intolerable division between the very rich and the very poor.

It is almost redundant to point out that either of these consequences would give aid and comfort to communism.

A case in the news at the moment is Brazil. The fourth largest country in the world and one which could be a tremendous ally in the cause of hemispheric freedom is emerging from political chaos brought on by the irresponsible conduct of former President Janio Quadros—and let's hope he remains "former."

Quadros resigned suddenly and inexplicably August 25. A couple of days ago the influential Rio newspaper Tribuna Da Imprensa said he was sure he would be called back to the presidency with dictatorial powers and further accused him of being involved in a Communist plot.

It is certainly true that as President, Quadros was a political Jekyll-Hyde. He was becoming more and more pro-Moscow and more and more anti-Washington, and yet at the same time in his economic policy he was an austere conservative. He tried hard to pull Brazil from the quicksand of inflation, which plunged the cruzeiro from 20 to the dollar to more than 220 to the dollar. To give you an idea: A 1961 Chevrolet fetches a black market price in Rio of $12,000.

The one thing we can be firmly thankful for so far is that Brazil seems to be coming out of the crisis provoked by Quadros without devastating civil war. The rest is no more than hopeful conjecture.

The new President, Joao Goulart, for example (a very rich man, by the way), has shown disturbing Communist leanings. As Vice President he was exchanging pleasantries with Mao Tse-tung when Quadros resigned.

It is possible Goulart is more opportunist than Communist. At one time he looked with sympathy on the Fascist Peron regime in Argentina.

Under the amendment to the constitution just voted, the powers of the President are sharply restricted. Most authority will reside in a Prime Minister.

Two questions still hanging are—

Will President Goulart try to chisel through the restrictions built around his office?

How economically sound and politically forceful will the Prime Minister be?

Until they are answered, there is no sense in rushing to the new capital of Brasilia, saying, "Please take our taxpayers' millions."

We certainly don't want to contribute to bumping the black market price of a Chevy to—perhaps—20 grand.

Talk of Disarmament Can Lead to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed at the present time to H.R. 9118, which would establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. There should be little question in the mind of any Member in this House, or in the minds of most of our citizens, that this proposed Agency for disarmament represents a repetition and a duplication of existing agencies. Again, we are asked to do something which we are already doing in many other fields. Or let me say this, if we are not doing it in these other fields as I think we are, it is an inexcusable thing indeed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the creation of this Agency not only because it is a duplication, but because I believe strongly it is the wrong thing to do at this time. Since the beginning of our country, we have always been a peace-loving nation. We have never sought an

acre of territory, nor an economic concession from waging war. The world knows this. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our peace-loving nature has often drawn us into war, and I am certain that an examination of our history will show that.

Look all the way back to the War of 1812 for a minute. We were drawn into that war simply because the British thought we would not fight it and that they could get away with their tactics.

Look again at World War I. Somehow we sold the Kaiser on the theory that we were too proud to fight, or that we would not fight in any event. We boasted then, as we do now, that we are a peace-loving nation. In fact, our President, at the time of World War I, was elected on the basis that he would keep us out of war.

And what happened in World War II? Again we proclaimed to the world our peace-loving nature. In fact, everyone in this room can remember our President at that time running for office for his third term, and telling the world, "I hate war." Obviously, we were not ready for war at that time and when it came, the Germans, Italians, and Japanese knew that we were not ready.

The Korean war? It is so fresh in our minds that I should not have to remind you of it. It was one of the major issues of the 1952 presidential campaign. Obviously, if the North Koreans, and the persons in the Kremlin who masterminded their strategy, thought that we would have stepped in to defend South Korea, the war would never have been fought. But our administration at that time gave the impression that we would not fight and, in fact, we had virtually written it off. So again, because we gave the impression that we would not fight and because we are so known to be a peace-loving nation, we were drawn into war. This war, incidentally, cost us some 50,000 American lives, and all because the Communists did not think that we would fight.

I was interested last night to read in the Evening Star the article "They Look to United States and Wonder" by Constantine Brown, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be included following my remarks. The article discusses the questionable content of the material coming out of the Voice of America broadcasts. The author makes one point clear:

> The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical. Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

Are these people going to be strengthened and heartened in their determination to be free to see and hear us talking about disarmament in the face of the greatest acts of bullying and the greatest show of strength that the Communists have dared to display? I think not. Do you think for one minute that we can convince the people of Europe, and Mr. Khrushchev, himself, that we intend to be firm, when we appear to stress disarmament? Let me further ask this. Is there anyone in this room who for one minute would place any reliance upon any agreement by Mr. Khrushchev to disarm, after the insincerity and hypocrisy we have witnessed in the talks concerning the resumption of nuclear tests? I do not see how we can. More important, however, I believe this is the type of action that again tries so hard to stress our peace-loving nature to the rest of the world, that it also misleads our opponents with respect to the firmness which we will display. It is inconceivable to me that we should support such a program at this time in view of the peril we face. It is wishful thinking that will mislead not only our friends, but our opponents as well.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 14, 1961]

THEY LOOK TO UNITED STATES AND WONDER—VOICE OF AMERICA AND USIS STATEMENTS CALLED DISHEARTENING TO LITTLE PEOPLE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The free world wants to defend itself against Communist aggression; the enslaved peoples want to be free; the citizens of Berlin want to remain free. All these millions look for their salvation to America. And what they are looking for is strength, both moral and physical.

Americans who go about their daily lives earning a living, bathing the baby, marketing for dinner, going on vacations and reading the sports pages and ads in the newspapers, have no conception of the importance of every word spoken from Washington to the citizens of the rest of the world. Every policy adopted by the Executive, every speech on foreign affairs in Congress, and even the Voice of America, have a direct bearing on their fate.

I have seen in Seoul, Korea, people standing four deep reading the newspapers posted on the bulletin board outside the publishing building. The issue then was whether the United States would remain firm in the face of the Red Chinese threat to Quemoy.

I have watched people in Paris sitting in the cafes reading a speech by the then freshman Senator John F. Kennedy in which he sided with the FLN Algerian rebels against French colonialism, That he was at the time a young Senator whose opinions carried little weight among his colleagues was immaterial to them. To the French (as well as the Algerians) he represented America speaking.

I have only recently returned to Rome from Germany. On that warm, placid Sunday when the concrete wall and barbed wire went up every single German was listening to his radio for word from America.

War and threat of war have made the world's little people experts on foreign affairs and those able to read their papers scan more than the headlines. Others may hear of the latest Washington policy from friends owning radios.

And the question uppermost in the minds of all, from the peasant tending the rice paddies to the mechanic working in a Berlin factory is: Will America stand firm?

For the past 3 months this reporter has tried to analyze and understand the effects on Europeans as he listened to the Voice of America broadcasts and the propaganda spewed from behind the Iron Curtain in many languages. The latter varies from sharp attacks against American imperialism, American vested interests, and American warmongers to attacks on our strong anti-Communist allies such as Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, and others. I have yet to hear any defense of these allies coming from the VOA. What comes across the airwaves are full lectures on social science, interviews with unimportant foreign-born Americans, rebroadcast discussions by liberal Members of Congress and uninspiring discussions on current topics by the VOA's senior commentator, Raymond G. Swing.

Besides conducting the VOA programs, the USIS issues an avalache of printed propaganda which is being distributed to newspapers all over the globe. The Rome office issued recently a well-gotten-up brochure entitled "The Nuclear Ban Treaty; Gateway to Peace." After some platitudes such as "since the beginning of history the life of man has been shadowed by the fear of war" (a historically questionable statement), the author went on to say that now the hopes of mankind have increased because of the Geneva Conference.

One cannot place any blame on the USIS for our unrealistic policy on disarmament and the nuclear test ban conferences. But the reminder to the peoples of Europe that we are stressing disarmament at this time can cause a drop in European morale as well as American prestige.

There are many more students of communism in Europe than in the United States. And one wonders what goes on in the mind of an Italian editor who reads not only of Washington's emphasis on disarmament in the present crisis, but who finds the same words used in the USIS handouts that he finds in Unita, the Italian counterpart of the Worker. I have been asked pointedly by one of the local editors whether it is the announcement from the White House for increase in American conventional forces or the policy on disarmament as put forth by the USIS which represents the real Washington policy. Surely, he said, a government cannot support both armament and disarmament.

U.N. Guilty of Savagery, Briton Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article dated London, September 14, via the Reuter News Agency telling the story of the savagery committed by the United Nations mercenary troops against the people of Katanga and again bears out the futility of considering the United Nations an instrument of peace:

U.N. GUILTY OF SAVAGERY, BRITON SAYS

LONDON, September 14.—A British newsman covering the United Nations takeover in Katanga tonight accused U.N. forces of brutal savagery.

Richard Williams, a correspondent for the British Broadcasting Corp., said in a report from Salisbury, southern Rhodesia, that the U.N. action was a terrible miscalculation.

Williams, wounded in the foot yesterday during the fighting in Elisabethville, said the U.N. miscalculation had in effect developed into a national war.

POST OFFICE A FORT

Williams said that U.N. troops "have turned the Elisabethville post office into a fortress, partly surrounded by the Katangan Army."

"United Nations machineguns on the terrace and balconies of the Red Cross hospital 60 yards away were firing heavily all morning," he added.

"This morning, when a group of journalists approached the hospital, they were greeted by a long burst of machinegun fire from armored cars manned by Irish troops," Williams said.

STREETS DESERTED

"The streets are deserted. Anything that moves is shot at. Armored cars stand menacingly at street corners.

"Few people slept here last night. Heavy machinegun fire spat at the hidden enemy. Mortar bombs burst around us and bazookas tore into offices and private houses when Katangan troops tried to retake the post office."

Williams said that this morning a white-painted, clearly marked Red Cross ambulance stalled in the middle of the main square of the capital. The driver and stretcher bearer got out.

"Indian troops in the post office immediately opened fire at almost pointblank range," he said. "They (the ambulance men) collapsed on the road seriously wounded.

"This is the second time in 24 hours I have seen United Nations troops fire on a Red Cross vehicle."

OBSERVERS APPALLED

"All the rules of war have gone by the board in this campaign. This morning the Belgian head of the Red Cross told me he had asked Brig. Singappa Raja, the United Nations commander, to remove all machineguns from the hospital.

"He was told they would stay there. The hospital was a strategic post. It would not be abandoned.

"All foreign observers are appalled at the unrelenting severity of the United Nations assault. I am sorry to say that I have personally seen Indian troops act with brutal savagery which is quite indefensible."

Good Jobs, Schools, Fairplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Herald, Winnsboro, S.C., of September 14, 1961:

GOOD JOBS, SCHOOLS, FAIRPLAY

Most Negroes, survey after survey has indicated, are primarily interested in better job opportunities, improved educational facilities, decent homes, fairplay on all fronts. Few, we believe, are concerned about so-called social equality, whatever that may mean, or even mixed schools, for they realize they may have much to lose in any such drastic changes.

A commentator on the local front, in a broadcast some weeks ago, came up with similar conclusions. And a well-known newspaper columnist, whose opinions appear in a string of southern journals, recently emphasized the job opportunity angle, saying the Negroes stand to gain immeasurably if they hew to the economic line and avoid radical and controversial commitments.

W. D. "Bill" Workman, who would generally be listed among Columbia conservatives, quoted some Carolina tycoons on this topic earlier this month, among them being Jackson E. Spears, a vice president of Burlington Mills, and Charles E. Daniel, head of one of the Nation's top 10 construction firms (we trust he'll be doing some construction in Fairfield ere long). Mr. Daniel, a former U.S. Senator, who has been quoted in the News and Herald anent this same subject, said in part:

"We have a definite obligation to increase the productivity of our Negro citizens; to provide them with good jobs at good wages; and to continue to assure them of fair treatment. By raising their educational and economic status, we would raise the whole economy." That from one of South Carolina's (and the Nation's) leading industrialists. Or, as Mr. Workman succinctly puts it, "hard commonsense tells the white Southerner that he can't sell shoes to people who go barefoot or books and newspapers to people who can't read—or automobiles to people who can't drive. Commonsense should also tell whites and Negroes they can spend separately the money they earn together. Working together is one thing. Socializing together is an entirely different matter." For in the latter area, personal and private choice—and commonsense, again—should prevail.

Or, as a nationally known educator observed many years ago, "you cannot keep the Negro in the ditch without getting in the ditch with him." Or, as Gov. James F. Byrnes declared a decade ago, in regard to equal but separate educational facilities: "We should do this because it is right, and that, to me, is good and sufficient reason. We should also do it because it is wise."

In a county like Fairfield, where the nonwhites are so numerous, we must constantly strive to raise the economic level of all the people, remembering that the Negro is often a more consistent buy-at-home body than some of the more prosperous potential customers who look across the borders at pastures that only seem greener.

But, of course, this is not a one-way proposition. As the Negro, largely with the aid of the whites—some of whom are not very economically secure themselves—endeavors conscientiously to improve his financial status—he or she must perform a good job where he is, meantime enlarging his capabilities, practicing restraint, and, in some caes, mending his manners (and at one time politeness was among his greatest assets). Or, again, as Booker T. Washington advised, "no race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem."

Gradually, by taking thought, we can advance economically, remembering that while money isn't everything, a minimum amount of it is essential to oil the wheel of progress in other areas.

Lunancy in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are conflicting reports filtering to us from the Congo, but from the least we can observe the U.N. is acting in a manner beyond its jurisdiction; beyond the intent of its responsible members, and definitely working to facilitate the steady growth of the Communist struggle in the chaotic Congolese situation.

These circumstances are very accurately expressed in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which I ask leave to place into the RECORD. The editorial is entitled "Lunacy in Katanga":

LUNACY IN KATANGA

The issue was in doubt yesterday in Katanga. Counterattacking forces, loyal to the government of President Moise Tshombe, threatened to reverse the earlier decision at arms which looked like a victory for the United Nations wrecking crew in the Congo.

Through the haze of reports from Elisabethville one thing was certain: The Kennedy administration had sought to achieve a crowning lunacy by paying the lion's share of the bill so that the U.N. mercenary army could conquer the only peaceful, orderly, and pro-Western place in the Congo and turn it over to communism.

The U.N. force struck treacherously before dawn—in violation, according to Tshombe, of its pledged word, given the night before, that it would not move against the Katanga Government or seek to disarm Katanga's army. After shooting up the center of the city and butchering resisting Katangese, the U.N. force issued the smug announcement, "The Katanga sesession is over. Katanga is now a Congolese province."

But, as Secretary General Hammarksjold of U.N. arrived in Leopoldville, all smiles, the Kantanga army and police smashed back under the leadership of Belgian and French officers U.N. had sought to expel. The fighting spread elsewhere through the Congo, and it remained to be seen whether U.N. could make its decision stick.

It was suicidal folly that the Government of the United States should ever have placed its support behind a venture to knock out the only regime in central Africa which supported the West against Communist ambitions. While anarchy prevailed in the rest of the Congo, there was no violence against Westerners in Katanga. Its economy functioned and stability and order prevailed.

The U.N. excuse for its policy of disintegration was that it had acted at the request of the central government in Leopoldville to prevent civil war. So it went to war on its own motion to make the Congo safe for communism.

Senator DODD of Connecticut has warned that the U.N. effort to foster a so-called coalition government in the Congo is "so heavily weighted in favor of the Communists that the outcome is virtually a mathematical certainty." The Prime Minister, Adoula, is, by reputation, a neutralist. Gizenga, his vice premier, is a cadre Communist, while the key post of Minister of the Interior has been awarded to Gizenga's most notorious henchman, Christophe Gbenye, a Communist trained in Prague.

As soon as initial reports of the U.N. triumph reached Leopoldville, the Adoula-Gizenga regime promptly moved in one of Gizenga's agents as its gauleiter in Elisabethville. This man, Egide Bochely-Davidson, had been Gizenga's high commissioner of state in Oriental Province, the stronghold of the Communist followers of the late Patrice Lumumba, first Premier of the "united" Congo.

Senator DODD has recounted that the U.N. to date has spent $100 million in the Congo, and that the United States has paid half the bill. "I cannot understand why or how the U.N. has converted itself into an instrument of Communist policy in central Africa," said Senator DODD, "and why the United States should be supporting and footing the bill for

the United Nations military and police state operations against the anti-Communist government of President Tshombe."

No more can we, for if, as the Senator says, the Congo goes Communist, "it will not be because of Soviet intervention but because of intervention by a United Nations army, created by American policy and paid for by American money."

The British Government has demanded an accounting from Hammarskjold about what has motivated his course, and has sent a government officer to the Congo to investigate on the scene. A similar investigation of the Kennedy administration's policy, as suggested by Senator DODD in proposing the immediate creation of a select committee, is in order in Washington.

National Milk Sanitation Legislation Will Have Senate Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the September 13, 1961, Dairy Record that tells of the Senate hearings which have been scheduled on national milk sanitation legislation. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced this bill early in the 87th Congress, and the measure is being cosponsored by his Minnesota colleague, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and by Wisconsin Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE and ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Senate bill is identical to the national milk sanitation measure I have introduced in the House and on which hearings are being held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. These hearings will be continued in January.

I am pleased that Senator HUMPHREY has been successful in obtaining Senate hearings on our national milk sanitation proposals, which would greatly benefit consumers and the bulk of dairy producers. The article from the Dairy Record follows:

SENATE TO HOLD HEARINGS ON SANITATION BILL

WASHINGTON.—Hearings on the National Milk Sanitation Act will be held in January 1962, before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, advised Dairy Record, Wednesday of last week.

According to Senator HUMPHREY, the chairman of the committee, Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, had assured him that adequate time would be provided for all witnesses to be heard and that prompt action on the bill would be taken by the committee.

It was also announced last week by Representative LESTER JOHNSON, Democrat of Wisconsin, that Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, had advised him that more hearings will be scheduled in January by his committee on the bill.

At the present session, the House committee held 2 days of hearings on the legislation but time did not permit listening to the testimony of many who had been scheduled as witnesses.

Representative JOHNSON, who has spearheaded the drive for the bill in the House, expressed renewed hope that Congress will pass the legislation in 1962. He stated that it will be a tough fight, but many Congressmen who had previously opposed the measure are now indicating that they will support it.

The Task for Free World Business Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more and more the tendency grows not only in our own country but also in wide reaches of the world to stress the contribution by government to the well-being of the individual and to downplay, ignore, or downgrade the relationship of private effort to the general good.

Many of us in the Congress and throughout the American system have been laboring mightily to redress the balance, knowing that in unbridled governmental power rests the danger of extinction of human liberty; and knowing also that in a continuation of competitive free enterprise rests our best hope of keeping America and other nations free and economically strong.

Just the other day, on September 11, Mr. Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower, and chairman of the board of the Proctor & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, served as chairman of the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco. At the conference were business leaders from some 60 nations, gathered to consider, together, the opportunities of private initiative to speed the progress of free peoples everywhere.

The fact that many of us personally know Mr. McElroy and esteem him highly is beside the point; the point is that this business executive has on a number of occasions, both in and out of government, demonstrated the kind of statesmanship which I think most of us would agree befits the industrial community of our country. I say this because I was present during his testimony this year before the House Committee on Ways and Means in respect to the President's tax recommendations and was there reminded once again of his broad gage approach to the current problems of our day. I mention this now because I have just seen an outstanding address by Mr. McElroy delivered at the San Francisco conference which I just mentioned—an address which once against emphasizes the critical role of responsible business enterprise in keeping freedom alive in the world. Because of the excellent way in which this point is developed by Mr. McElroy in his address, and because of the basic importance of the viewpoint he has expressed in our grim struggle with imperialistic communism throughout the world, I insert, under unanimous consent, the address of Mr. McElroy at this point in my remarks so that the Congress and the public at large may have the benefit of its message:

THE TASK FOR FREE WORLD BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

It is a great pleasure to join in welcoming you to this Conference. The environment of the city in which we meet, on its record, is conducive to accomplishments of historic importance.

San Francisco, as you know, was the meeting place of the international Conference which drew up the Charter for the United Nations, 16 years ago.

It was in this city, a decade ago, that 48 nations joined in signing an enlightened peace treaty with Japan.

And 4 years ago, business leaders of the free world closed ranks in this same city in which we are gathered as they met in a dramatic International Industrial Development Conference.

That Conference proved to be, in the words of a distinguished participant from India, "one of the most portentous events in the history of world economic cooperation."

The Stanford Research Institute, which cosponsored that meeting, has joined with the National Industrial Conference Board in making arrangements for the Conference we are opening here today. Those who have planned this program and arranged the Conference are due the thanks of all of us. They have made possible an occasion for business statesmen from 60 nations to meet to consider, together, the opportunities of private initiative to speed the progress of free peoples everywhere.

There is a common purpose among us that can produce more than the individual gains we shall make through a free exchange of ideas and information. This exchange is a desirable end in itself; but beyond it, this Conference holds the seed for a new vitality among free institutions that can decisively affect the course of world affairs.

From our meetings there will come no proclamations or ringing manifestoes. We shall not leave here agreeing with each other on every matter we discuss. But we shall leave, I am confident, better prepared and more deeply inspired to meet successfully the momentous common problems we face.

The great, overriding opportunity afforded us here is to strengthen the alliance for the progress of the whole free world.

We cannot overstate the importance of this high objective. For we have far more at stake than the improvement of our individual enterprises, our individual national economies. At stake is the survival of the kind of society in which our enterprises and our economies are possible. We are at a crucial juncture in time when the abilities of our economies to stand separately depend on our willingness to work mightily together for their defense and their growth.

We face the fact that we have in the world today two strong political and social philosophies moving mankind in the opposing directions.

One is the Communist philosophy, which embraces the gospel of state-dictated decision with respect to the public and private affairs of its citizens. A fundamental political determinations of international communism is that free nations must be subverted to communism or be destroyed.

The other is the philosophy of the free world, which holds that free choice is the right of all men and that the purpose of the state is to serve individual opportunity and freedom.

On the one hand, we see totalitarianism set out as the price that must be paid for economic progress. On the other, we have the promise that human freedom is not only compatible, but interdependent, with the

raising of standards of living on a great world scale.

It makes no difference what may be the form of the political organization of our free world countries; it matters not whether your or my country is committed or uncommitted, a developed or a developing country. We are united in the resolve that we shall not permit the domination of the world by international communism or any other superstate. And in support of that issue, we are locked in a vast struggle over virtually the entire face of the earth.

We must accept the likelihood that we shall be engaged in this contest for decades to come. The totalitarian leaders are set in their course. We are dedicated to ours—to the determination that all men are entitled to the blessings and opportunities that only a free society can supply.

As we have come to grips with these differences, we have faced many crises. Without question, we shall be tested by many more, not of our making, but as a result of consistent aggressive action by the Communist world.

Today the critical focus is on Berlin. The situation the Soviets have chosen to create there is, of course, cause for grave anxiety. I do not discount it in any way.

But I would point out that the contest between the two major social philosophies is not concentrated in a single location or type of endeavor. It is with us, without pause, in many forms and in many places throughout the world.

While Berlin at the moment may be uppermost in our minds, we must give our continuing attention to the overall demands which this massive competition places upon us.

Of course, the most apparent is the opposing confrontation of military power. The development and maintenance of such awesome weapons of destruction as we know today is not something that moral men would desire if they could choose. But, for the free nations there is no choice, if independence is to be preserved.

Our very maintenance of great deterrent power is the world's best assurance that this struggle will not be settled by resort to force.

If we nations of the free world continue to combine our defensive strength in a solid front, and if we have the wisdom and steadfastness to keep our weapons in tune with our rapidly advancing scientific capabilities, our opponents are not likely to risk combat as the route to decision.

The outcome, then, will be decided in other ways.

The fact is that the Communists—most recently in the draft program of the Soviet Communist Party, prepare under Mr. Khrushchev's direction—have expressed confidence many times that freedom can be defeated by nonmilitary methods, notably subversion and economic competition. And there is no lack of evidence of the diligence with which they propose to move in these fields.

Our ability to carry the struggle of economic competition will underlie all of the factors that determine the ultimate course of events. Equally, let us agree that this is the field of competition we should most welcome.

There is ample empirical evidence that a free society has the inherent potential to give its people far greater economic benefit than the state-directed economy of a totalitarian society.

The contrast between West Germany and East Germany is an example standing vividly before the eyes of the world. Any traveler who goes from prosperous West Germany to dispirited, dull East Germany sees it immediately.

Since 1949, more than 2½ million people have left their homes in East Germany to take up new lives across the border. These people represent one out of every seven citizens formerly under Communist East Germany's rule. Until passage between East and West was forcibly halted, they continued to pour across into West Germany at a rate of more than a thousand a day.

What are their reasons for wanting to leave East Germany? It is not only that their spirits revolt against the police state. It is that the free society offers them genuine economic opportunity. Across from the stagnant, regimented routine of East Germany is a bustling, productive, rewarding society in which they can earn a good living for themselves and their families while working in dignity and without fear.

In the two parts of Germany, we clearly have a demonstration of the superior drive and productivity of a free as compared with a Communist economy.

Each of our nations, of course, must decide for itself how it intends to build its economic strength. But this fact should not obscure an equally essential one—that the continued freedom of each of our nations to make individual national decisions will depend on our willingness to make them in the interest of our common effort.

Unsolved differences between any parts of the free world complex will represent a weakening of our total position. Any rationalization of our problems will serve to strengthen it.

We are meeting here to consider specific problems and opportunities in our international business relationships. The subjects on our agenda are well designed to give us maximum results in these considerations.

But along with the subject matter, pervasive questions almost surely will be present in every meeting—every exchange of views—every expression of conviction—between us.

What can we do, as businessmen, to strengthen the free system the world over? How can we work more effectively to strengthen man's faith in freedom by furnishing him the opportunity to develop and maintain his own dignity and to work toward his own personal aspirations? How can we best help to reduce the starvation, disease and illiteracy that are stifling the majority of the earth's population?

For centuries these afflictions were endured because they were accepted as a natural state of being. Great sections of the world were isolated from progress. But today men everywhere know that a better way of life not only exists, but is attainable.

To millions upon millions, this knowledge is coming to motivate every judgment, every act. Nor is it difficult to understand such motivation when we consider that over half of the world's people live where the average per capita income is less than $100 a year.

The Communist strategy is to take advantage of the discontent that occupies men's minds when they conclude that their existing society cannot meet problems which keep them in hunger and despair.

The Communist tactic is to win not by dissolving this discontent but by agitating it until even the surrender of liberty seems a bearable price to pay for the promise of a better lot.

The record shows, of course, that a better lot, in terms of standards of living, is far easier for the Communists to promise than to deliver.

Even in relatively promising Communist economies, the direction has been backward. Throughout the satellite empire in Eastern Europe, food shortages are chronic. In China, the Red regime has only intensified the threat of famine that stalks the Chinese people.

Nevertheless, the burden of proof is on the protagonists of the free society. We cannot succeed simply by pointing to the pitfalls of the police state. If we are to win the minds and loyalties of men, we must lead the way in causes they will support. The greatest cause to the greatest number of the world's people is elimination of the grinding poverty that enevlops their lives.

This is not a task that can be achieved solely by our governments. It is a need that, in the ultimate, calls for large measures of the skill, the daring, and the resourcefulness of private initiative.

Working with cooperative government, business enterprise is the most dynamic force on earth for employing the constructive energies of men.

If we apply this force more massively to the erasure of poverty and the raising of living standards, we need have no fear of exhausing our resources in the process. On the contrary, over the long term, the goal of lifting standards of living the world over is compatible with the essential business goal of profitable operation—profits to be reinvested in greater opportunities to benefit more people.

What greater incentive for market development could there be than the potential represented by that half of the world's population striving now to find the means to become effective consumers in the market place?

The problem on which I am touching is perhaps the most complex and most difficult with which mankind is concerned. It is fraught with imponderables and discouragements. But it nevertheless demands urgent progress toward solution.

I would call your attention to two basic responsibilities that are vital to it.

The first is for each of us to manage our respective functions within our own economics with the greatest proficiency of which we are capable. The productivity of our free society depends on the initiative of its individual units, each putting such demands on itself for improved efficiency that the composite result will outstrip the progress of any dictated efforts of an authoritarian system.

It is management that spells the difference between success or failure for any business enterprise or for any free society. And when I say management, I mean those few men who, by the nature of modern management, give direction to the entire operation. Their direction, if it is capable, contributes in a critically important way to the productiveness of the assets—both personal and material—of the enterprise. It helps to assure vigorous national growth and to produce maximum citizen opportunity.

Ineffective management is a devastating drag on an economy. It wastes important resources in capital and labor and lowers the total capacity of the Nation to provide sufficient jobs and adequate income for its people.

Wise, yet dynamic direction of our individual production and distribution units, then, is at the very foundation of our separate national strengths and our total progress.

Even as we acknowledge that principle, however, we recognize that far more is required of business leadership. We cannot devote ourselves to our business pursuits to the exclusion of other vital national interests.

The political and social determinations of our respective countries are—or should be—matters of basic concern to us. The problems and needs of our governments call for broad participation of business executives. It is essential that business have an articulate voice in the formulating of political programs that have impact on the economy.

Business leadership has reason to be deeply interested also, in the Nation's educational progress. The course of world history is turning as surely upon the relative levels of education among peoples as upon any other factor.

Our influence can be great in the advancement of universal and unfettered education in our respective countries.

As we exert our influence in behalf of better education, we fortify our free institutions, because sound education is essential to sound self-government; it is indispensable to the best development of human and natural resources; it is a matchless builder of individual dignity; it enables a people to appreciate other cultures, and to be more able to evaluate their own loyalties in the historic struggle between totalitarianism and freedom.

Our second responsibility is to plan together, in the most practical terms possible, to assure that our free industrial enterprise will grow in its value as a positive world force.

We businessmen have a long way to go in all of the areas I have noted—in management efficiency, in political and social participation, in advancing better education, and in making a maximum contribution to the alliance of free nations.

All of us here represented have much to offer in terms of cooperation for progress. Let us consider our opportunities together with a new magnitude of imagination, boldness, and pioneer spirit. Let us run the gamut of exploration into those areas of cooperative action that can lead to greater free world economic strength.

We have seen such cooperation cast in dramatic form in the development of great regional marketing programs, such as those in Europe and Latin America. We may well expect that other such developments can be—and will be—worked out in the near future.

Finally, let us keep in mind the importance of how our progress as economic entities looks to other nations, especially the newer nations.

All that we accomplish in friendly and productive cooperation serves as a showcase of the values of a free society to those undecided peoples who ask: Which kind of social and political organizations will produce the better life for us?

The competition most visible to mankind will not be in technology and science in themselves. It will be in the purposes to which these great forces are put.

If each of us in our own countries, and all of us in concert, will demonstrate the clear purposes of our society—the constant improvement of our living standards in an environment which protects all the satisfactions of living, working, worshipping and thinking in freedom—we shall forge decisively ahead.

I join with you in the confidence that we shall make of this Conference another great step forward to that goal.

Soviet Nuclear Blasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from "an alarmed citizen" concerning present world conditions and the Soviet Union's current series of nuclear blasts, and I should like to share with my colleagues this citizen's views, as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: The callous disregard for the safety of all mankind and the United States in particular, displayed by the U.S.S.R. in setting off to date, nine atomic explosions in the upper atmosphere, cannot be considered anything less than outright acts of aggression. Particularly, since the scientists are now fully aware of the consequences of such action.

"With radioactive fallout already settling on American territory, I see little sense in the United States failing to recognize this flagrant conduct as anything other than a violation of our border rights and thus an act of war.

"Since our food as well as the air we breathe is being contaminated, what do we need to awaken us to our peril, the explosion of an atomic missile in our midst? Surely the former is as deadly in the long run as the latter though not mercifully as quick. What more does it take to make us realize that world war III has commenced in earnest—a parade of Soviet tanks down Pennsylvania Avenue?

"Shades of another Democratic President who 'pussy-footed' in 1916—we can't afford a repeat performance of such an attitude in 1961. The stakes are entirely too great—the very existence of every man, woman, and child in these United States is in the balance.

"If the President is reluctant to act vigorously in this matter, I see no alternative than for Congress to grasp the reins before it is too late. This aggressive violation of American territory should be immediately recognized for what it is—an act of war—and Congress should act accordingly.

"Respectively yours,

"AN ALARMED CITIZEN."

Clark Urges Firmness in Dealing With Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, today when many believe that the way to get along with Russia is to yield and vacillate we have before us one outstanding example of a man who did get along with Russia in a superior manner, to our everlasting respect and credit. That man is Gen. Mark Clark, a man with an outstanding, distinguished military record for more than 30 years.

Gen. Mark Clark was one of the most brilliant commanders of World War II. He served as High Commissioner of Austria and later became commander of all United States and United Nations forces in the Korean conflict. His relations with Russia were always fair but firm. His record is one of outstanding success in dealing with Russia.

Following is an article written by General Clark which appeared in the Washington Star for September 13, 1961:

CLARK URGES FIRMNESS IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Gen. Mark Clark, U.S. Army, Retired)

CHARLESTON, S.C., September 13.—My country has given me many opportunities to observe the Communists firsthand.

While I commanded the 5th Army in Italy during World War II, a group of Russian officer observers was attached to my staff. Their political adviser was Andrei Vishinsky, who organized Communist activities in areas that our forces liberated.

At the end of the war, as U.S. High Commissioner in Austria for 2 years, I negotiated with Marshal I. S. Konev, the Soviet High Commissioner, who recently has been placed in command of the Soviet armies in East Germany.

In 1947, I faced Communist negotiators across the conference table in London where I served as deputy to the U.S. Secretary of State, and in the same capacity I sat in the Moscow Council of Foreign Ministers in 1947 with Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State.

Later on during the Korean conflict when I was Commander in Chief, Far East and United Nations Commands, I came to grips with Communist tactics at Panmunjom during negotiations which led to the military armistice agreement for Korea which I finally signed on July 27, 1953.

USED SAME TACTICS

I found the Communists used the same obstructionist tactics everywhere I encountered them.

In Austria, all communications lines from Vienna to the American zone were through corridors set and controlled by the Russians and agreed to by the Allied Governments. The corridors passed through 110 miles of Russian-occupied territory. There was one corridor by air, one by road, and one by rail.

The situation was identical to the present one in Berlin.

The air corridor was narrow between Vienna and our sector. Russian warplanes began crowding us inside this corridor. Sometimes they fired on our planes, and one, a Russian warplane, fired on the airplane in which I was flying. When I found protests to Marshall Konev to be futile, I ordered American planes flying the corridor to be armed, and ordered our airmen to fire on any Russian plane that made a menacing move inside the corridor. I so informed Marshal Konev in writing. Never again did the Russians challenge us inside that corridor.

We had something of the same problem with trains. The Russians often halted our train, the "Mozart Express," when it went through their zone between our headquarters in Vienna and our zone in Salzburg.

I followed the usual pattern of repeated protests to Marshal Konev, and as usual he took no action. Finally, he was warned formally that our military police had been ordered to keep Russian soldiers off our trains.

Shortly thereafter several Red army officers and enlisted men forced their way aboard the train. As a result, T. Sgt. Shirley B. Dixon of our military police shot one Russian officer dead and wounded another who tried to draw his gun.

The Russians violently protested the shooting, but the interruptions in our train service ceased.

These and many similar experiences I had with Communists around the world demonstrated to me the necessity of using unmistakable determination when dealing with representatives of the Kremlin.

An incident involving Danube River barges illustrates, however, that we did not always follow this policy. Shortly after our arrival in Austria, the Russians stopped all shipping on the Danube. About that time I found that all Austrian, Yugoslav-Hungarian, and other river barges had been moved up to Linz by the Germans in the closing days of the war. Therefore, they were in the American zone.

BOUNDARY EXTENDED

The Russians persuaded Washington to extend their boundary to the Danube in the Linz area; so I moved the barges farther up

river to the American zone of Germany for safekeeping. I sensed that they would be an ace up our sleeve in bargaining with the Communists because barges would be essential when river traffic was resumed.

The Communists almost immediately pressured us to return the barges. On a trip back to Washington, I discussed the barges and gained the impression that everyone concerned including President Truman, agreed that we should hold them. At a conference with me President Truman said, "Mark, I heartily agree with you. You hang onto those barges."

Upon my return to Vienna, however, I received a message from the State Department, instructing me to return the Yugoslav barges. I replied that I was under the distinct impression that I had approval for holding the barges as a bargaining point. The Secretary of State said to turn the barges over to the Yugoslavs. I turned them over.

MANY SIMILAR INCIDENTS

There have been many similar incidents in our dealings with the Communists. They demonstrate that strength and determination are two things Communists respect and, skillfully applied, will prevent communism from achieving its goal of world domination that today threatens free people everywhere.

Fortunately, there seems to be a refreshing awakening to this fact. This is indicated by strengthening our military posture, and by the firm stand that President Kennedy has taken on the Berlin issue. His reinforcing our Berlin garrison and his forthright statement concerning the consequences of interfering with free Allied access to Berlin are the kinds of actions the Russians understand.

His sending Vice President JOHNSON and Gen. Lucius D. Clay to bolster the morale of the West Germans and demonstrate our vested interest in Berlin was also the kind of action that will not be lost on the Communists.

It is my hope that this approach signals that America has awakened, and that our country will pursue a courageous policy for firmness. Without such a policy we can never effectively negotiate with the Communists.

Marshal Konev once revealed their frustrating negotiating technique to me at a party in Vienna. After he had a couple of drinks of vodka, I asked him what would happen if the following morning I accepted all the preposterous Soviet demands then under discussion.

He laughed and said he would have 10 new ones to submit to me the next day.

In the face of such truculence, the free world must remain steadfast.

Let us have peace in our time, but not at the price of Communist slavery for ensuing generations.

Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Outstanding Chairman of Civil Aeronautics Board, Speaks on Role of Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to call to the attention of the Members an address recently delivered by the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is one of the clearest and most sincere statements I have ever read by a Federal administrative officer on the subject of the important role a Federal regulatory agency can play in cooperating with and complementing the efforts and goals of State and other local agencies of like responsibilities in accomplishing their objectives.

Alan Boyd is a close personal friend of mine. That my high regard for him as a person and as an administrator is well justified, is borne out by the fact that President Eisenhower tapped him for service on the CAB in November 1959. President Kennedy designated him as Chairman of the Board in February of this year.

Alan Boyd brought a tremendous record of achievement to this post.

He has been a member of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission in Tallahassee. He was appointed to the commission by the Governor of Florida in July 1955. In 1956 he ran for and was elected to a full term on the commission and served as its chairman in 1957–58.

He was born in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1922. He completed his formal education at the University of Florida, and University of Virginia, where he received his LLB degree in 1948.

Mr. Boyd practiced law in Miami. He was appointed by Governor Collins in 1954 as chairman of a civilian committee for the development of aviation in Florida. He also served as general counsel for the Florida State Turnpike Authority in 1955.

Mr. Boyd served as a pilot in the troop carrier command in World War II from 1942–45 as well as in the Korean conflict. He has over 3,000 hours as a combat and service pilot.

The address of Mr. Boyd to the National Association of State Aviation Officials in convention at Miami Beach on September 13, follows:

It gives me great pleasure on two scores to be here wtih you today. In the first place, I am happy to have the chance to meet and address State aviation officials from all over the country. We have mutual interests and problems. That means we should be working together. In the second place, I am glad that you are holding your 1961 annual meeting in Florida because this is my home State. In fact, before going to Washington, D.C., almost 2 years ago, I served on the Florida Railroad & Public Utilities Commission and on the State aviation committee.

To a large extent my working background is akin to yours. Inevitably this makes me sympathetic toward you. I am hopeful that it will make you sympathetic toward me. I want for us to know one another well and to get along together well, not only because it is in our mutual interest, but because I believe that it is in the public interest. In our official capacities we are all servants of the public, whether of a single State or of the entire Nation. The public has a right to expect that we shall cooperate in the furtherance of its interest.

Admittedly, conflicts can develop between State and Federal agencies of like responsibilities at their respective levels. This results from the fact that we in the Federal Government must strike averages. Our policies and decisions of necessity move across State borders. In this respect, they are like the aircraft we regulate. We must follow those aircraft from origin to destination as they do business in interstate commerce. There must be a high degree of uniformity throughout the country if we are to bring order to our national air transportation system.

We must be fair and reasonable to the public of each State. None can be discriminated against or favored. Each must give and take in the development of a healthy national airline network in the interests of our commerce, postal service, and defense. If, on occasion, the Civil Aeronautics Board makes a decision affecting an individual State in a way not completely in accord with that State's thinking, I hope that it will be borne in mind that we have also had to consider the needs and resources and thinking of that State's near and far sister States. In short, I ask you to consider the collective interest, just as we on the Board make allowance for the aviation interests of the individual States in arriving at an overall position.

Although I rarely voluntarily assign titles to my talks, almost invariably I am asked for a title whenever I am invited to speak on occasions such as this. The title I suggested this time is "Effects of National Aviation Policy on Community Interests." Naturally, we would want the effects in all instances to be good, though I am obliged to admit that this is not always the case on the surface or in a narrow context. For instance, in applying our use-it-or-lose-it policy in local service cases, we must sometimes order withdrawal of airline service to a given community or over a given segment. On the surface, that does not look good for one or more communities. In the narrow context of local convenience it looks bad. But by digging below the surface, it will be found that what we have done is in the interest of the taxpayer.

On what basis can subsidized service, at the taxpayers' cost, be provided where public need cannot be shown to justify it? The narrow context of airline service at a given point or over a given segment must be broadened to take into consideration the integrated economy of each company system. We have a duty imposed on us by law to promote those airline systems. If through regulation in the public convenience and necessity we hold system fares and rates down, thus holding profits down to a low and currently marginal level, it is incumbent upon us not to compel carriers to serve unpromising points or segments where public need is not demonstrated under fair and reasonable standards.

The foregoing illustrates how the effects of our policies on a single community or group of communities can look bad superficially, but how in the broader scheme, these policies produce good and sound effects. The bill to the traveling and shipping public and to the taxpayer must be consonant with their resources; service must reflect their needs, and the whole must be consonant with aviation economics. It is not a mere juggling game or a balancing act; it is fairness, reasonableness, and equity for all concerned. It is unlikely that everybody will get everything he wants; it is essential in this vital area that everybody gets everything he needs at fair cost to him.

This question of effects is one that can hardly be tightly circumscribed. I had the pleasure last month to speak before the West Virginia aviation seminar in Elkins, W. Va. I would like to repeat a few thoughts that I expressed there because they are applicable in my opinion in every State. It is exceedingly difficult to isolate any single community or segment from hundreds or thousands of others. Geographically community isolation is obvious, but economically, and our work is in economics, community isola-

tion is impossible of attainment on an airline network or on the national air transportation system. Each airline network is integrated, and each network is integrated into the national system. The effects of our decisions concerning any community or segment in turn affect every other community or segment due to this integration. The function of policymaking for the whole pattern must therefore be centralized, hence the role of the Federal or Central Government in aviation, which is an integral part of interstate commerce. Fare and rate levels and route alinements throughout the country are closely interrelated. This national web has been built to meet the needs of the public everywhere. To disturb it even within a State could produce ill effects far removed from that State's borders. To weaken the economy of a carrier within a State is to reduce that carrier's efficiency outside of it.

Our job must be to improve by regulation the economy and efficiency of air carriers in order that they may improve service to the public. Many of you are beginning to feel the effects of our policy of permitting trunk carriers to abandon service at some points in favor of local service carriers. The benefits of this policy are double. One, the trunk route carriers are relieved of the need to serve short-haul segments when the economics of jet aircraft require medium- and long-haul stages. Two, the local service carriers pick up points which bolster their economies and go toward getting them off subsidy and onto a self-upporting basis. This in turn makes them more attractive to capital, which they need. Their improved financial status will lead to improved services to the communities they serve, whereas obliging trunks to serve loss and unpromising stations to their detriment can lead only to deteriorating service. These are long-range plans, the effects of which on given communities can look bad at the moment, but which should prove good over a period of time. So you are asked not only to project yourselves beyond local places within your State to points outside, but also to project yourselves from the present to the future for a full understanding of the Board's decisions.

We are most anxious that you should have a full understanding of our aims and our decisions toward their accomplishment. We welcome State activity in aviation and look forward to your help. There is much that you can do in the way of insuring that the Board is fully informed on State and community planning, resources and needs. You have information and statistics which can help us arrive at better decisions. You can help expedite formal proceedings before us by consolidation of presentations of a like nature, thereby avoiding duplications from different parties within one State. I should greatly dislike for you to think that the Board would like to see the State aviation commissions go out of existence. The very opposite is the case. We want and need your help. There is no reason why we should be antagonists; there is every reason why we should work well together. In the final analysis, our aims coincide.

In the area of general or noncommercial aviation, you are in a position to do far more than we. Your airports are State, county, city, or community owned. The limitations of our terms of reference from Congress, our budget and our staff, and our preoccupation with commercial aviation make it impossible for us to play the role in the development of private aviation that you can play. Yet it is in the national and public interest that general aviation be promoted. It is good for the aircraft and aero engine and parts manufacturers, makers of navigational aids, builders of airports and airport facilities, suppliers, servicers, workers, in short for tens of thousands of persons whose incomes are derived directly or indirectly from aviation activities.

It makes our people airminded in this age of the air. It trains our youth in aviation, in its mechanics and its operation. We have defended ourselves and our interests well in the past in large part because of our mechanical and operational aptitudes on the ground and on the sea. We have had a great reservoir of talent from which to draw for prosperity and progress in peace, and for our defense in times of struggle. That reservoir must be broadened to include persons trained in and knowledgeable of aviation. Commercial aviation is not big enough to give us the broad base we need. General aviation can be, and I hope you will turn your attention to it, and if we can help you in this endeavor, we will. We are not the leading nation in the world in the merchant marine, but we are the leading nation in the world in the merchant air fleet. We must maintain and improve that position. It can only be done by a public educated to the job and aware of its value. There can be no end to what can be done in the airspace and the space beyond that. Truly, the sky is the limit.

In the near future, we look to a breakthrough in helicopter operation. Development has proved costly and somewhat slower than we had hoped for. Only a few States enjoy sizable scheduled helicopter services but no doubt most of you have contact with nonscheduled helicopter activity. It is an area in which we, and the Congress, as you must know, are most interested. We will happily receive all the information you can supply us on the economics and planning of helicopter operations within your States. In large measure they may provide the answer to the vexing question of adjacent airports served by airline companies. The flying public wants to fly all the way and not drive for miles in the course of a journey by air. We are as sympathetic to this desire as we can be, but it poses serious economic problems for our carriers. As helicopter services become economically feasible, we look for them to close the overland gap in air travel. All that you can do to promote development which will not further burden the taxpayer through subsidization will be a great contribution to aviation. I hope that you will consider this in your airport planning. A place can be made for economical helicopter services, and surrounding circumstances such as regional airport location have a vital effect.

No doubt you have seen recent reports on Project Horizion. If you had no other evidence of our fallibility, you now have some. We are studying the recommendations with great care with a view to improving our own performance. We like to think that we are aware of our shortcomings, but the truth of the matter is that it is good for us to hear of them from other sources which also come forward with sound suggestions as to how we might do our job better.

In my opinion, you are uniquely qualified to serve as our critics. You are best able to understand and appraise our work because of your knowledge of the subject matter and the fact that you, too, are public servants dedicated to the public interest first. Others may know what we know, but they are not public servants. They do not have imposed on them by law the duties which are imposed on us, an imposition we seek and willingly accept. The source of our pride is in our official service to the public. Let us hear regularly from you. The Board is completely sincere in its desire to work closely with its individual State counterparts. We have recently set up a special Office of Community Relations in order to improve contact with the communities that you serve and represent. Regular and informal contact can go a long way to avoid the necessity for expensive and time-consuming formal proceedings. We have long had the machinery for formal proceedings and we are in the course of overhauling and improving it through the reorganization plan submitted by the President and approved by the Congress. We are also streamlining our procedures. Still, if we can accomplish our aims under the law without recourse to expensive and long formalities, we will all be that much more ahead. Your constructive criticisms and help can be instrumental in bringing this about. Your influence, within your own States can be turned profitably to this end.

We ask of you only that we may serve your communities better. We anticipate a closer relationship which will enable us jointly to serve better those interests to which we are primarily dedicated—the interests of the people.

Poor Craftsmanship Said Handicap to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an article by Prof. Edwin T. Sandberg, chairman of the Department of English-Speech-Journalism at Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, entitled "Poor Craftsmanship Said Handicap To United States," has come to my attention. The article presents a moderate point of view on the collective bargaining issue and suggests that caution and restraint are necessary in this vital area.

Mr. Sandberg's view that wage increases can be justified only on the basis of increased productivity is close to the viewpoint which Prof. Henry Wallich presented in his paper "A Standard for Non-Inflationary Wage Increases." I had the privilege of discussing this paper during our series, "Operation Employment."

Under unanimous consent I insert Mr. Sandberg's article which first appeared in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, August 30, 1961:

WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY—POOR CRAFTSMANSHIP SAID HANDICAP TO UNITED STATES

(By Dr. Edwin T. Sandberg)

Much criticism has been leveled at President Kennedy for not being specific about the sacrifices required of the American people if this country is to survive in the war against communism. Such criticism springs from a failure on the part of many individuals to recognize that whatever hampers this country in its all-out struggle must be eradicated, and often this means the restriction of excessive individual gains at the expense of the national economy.

A good example of this is the present competition for world markets. In many areas of the world American goods are difficult to sell because they are priced too high in competition with foreign products. But not only is their price high—their craftsmanship is poor and their quality low. At one time American products were praised for their excellence, and the defective machine or appliance was the exception rather than the

rule. Today, in many manufacturing industries, good quality and craftsmanship are the exception rather than the rule.

In the current labor-management bargaining sessions, President Kennedy's words could well be heeded: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." Labor representatives should not demand any wage raises except those which can be justified on the basis of increased productivity. In some cases this might mean a reduction in wages if productivity has decreased or remained stable while other costs have risen.

In the past labor leaders have not been intelligent or courageous enough to inform their membership that the only raise that means anything is one which will not result in higher prices. They have failed in their essential functions and have fed the fires of inflation. In this respect the Chrysler Corp. proposal that some wages be reduced has merit, but an important addition must be made. Executive salaries are much too high as well, and a corporation that is truly interested in preserving the national interest should begin by paring executive salaries as an indication to union leaders that not all sacrifices are to be one-sided. Many executive salaries are exceedingly high, again adding to the high costs of producing a product. Morever, featherbedding must be eliminated in executive circles as well as labor circles. The country demands that a searching look be made at any economy that can be effected in manufacturing, distribution, and sales.

But, as previously indicated, price is not the only factor in the labor-management problem. The poor craftsmanship of union workers and the planned obsolescence of manufactured products are the joint responsibility of labor and management. If union leaders were doing their job, they would demand better work of their members; they would insist that the worker assume some responsibility for the kind of work he does.

Poor craftsmanship of American products is even causing large numbers of American citizens to turn to foreign products, not always because of lower price, but frequently because of superior quality. Manufacturers, too, should demand better craftsmanship of their workers. They should appeal to the public at large when poor craftsmanship is characteristic of their laboring force; public opinion can often do much to remedy such a problem. And manufacturers should be sure that the materials they use in producing their products are of the highest quality.

Responsible leaders of labor and management should approach a bargaining session with this question uppermost in their minds: "What is best for the country and the public at large?" Selfish personal interests must be subdued and conquered if the United States is to fight a successful economic war against the enemy.

It has been suggested that consumers or the public be represented at bargaining sessions, perhaps under government direction. Such government direction should not be necessary. Labor and management should invite distinguished and competent experts representing consumer interests to attend such meetings, present them with all the facts, including corporation reports, labor proposals in detail, and planned increases in productivity that might justify a noninflationary wage adjustment.

The issue is clear; either such a proposal is considered seriously, and the two parties agree to reconcile their differences in the best interests of the consuming public, or the time will come when a government negotiator will be demanded by the public to protect consumers against indiscriminate, price-spiraling settlements.

Upon the shoulders of labor and management rests the responsibility of demonstrating to the world that the free enterprise system can meet the competition of State industrialization; caution and restraint are the watchwords. To those who ask "What can I do for my country?" here is a simple answer.

Many Thanks to Our Catholic Forefathers of Slovak Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, the largest fraternal organization in the world, held its 34th triannual convention in Pittsburgh from August 27 to 31.

Since I have the honor to represent many whose forefathers were of Slovak descent, I should like to call the attention of the Members to an article which appeared in the souvenir book of the convention:

MANY THANKS TO OUR CATHOLIC FOREFATHERS OF SLOVAK DESCENT

We wish to honor our Slovak forefathers, grandparents, and parents for realizing that we children are dualistic personalities—composites of body and soul—and therefore insisting upon and imparting to us the heritage of and opportunities for availing ourselves of a good and sound Catholic philosophy of education by making it a matter of their conscience and of their pride to send us to Catholic parochial schools, high schools, and colleges.

In doing this they have laid a religious groundwork imperative and useful in our day and age, since we are in the throes of a stagnation effected by the many untenable and empiric philosophies so rampant today. Furthermore, our Catholic forebears of Slovak descent have exposed us to a truly Catholic philosophy of education—a system which has for its purpose the education of the whole man—a system which is the only and most effective means to counteract the seemingly strong bulwarks set up by the Deweys, the Darwins, and the Rousseaus.

It is by this exposure that we can be truly successful educationally and in this success realize the three vital elements of Catholic nurture, Catholic guidance, and Catholic transmission of culture.

We are indebted to our ancestors for channeling our lives in such a manner that, fortified with a Catholic philosophy of education, we can be better equipped as lay apostles to lead back to correct thought the stragglers and those who have strayed away from right reason.

We are thankful that, possessing a Catholic philosophy of education, we are better able to eradicate or at least to make inroads on the rash of juvenile delinquency so much in vogue in our day.

Further, we are in a better position to indoctrinate and reeducate those who have fallen prey to the many unworkable types of philosophy attempting to invade our lives. In addition, we can better cope with the struggles and the pains caused by the ideologies that tend to draw the citizenry of today into fallacious attitudes.

Armed with a Catholic philosophy of education, we can more successfully ward off the evil insinuations of atheism and communism which are riding herd on one country and infiltrating steadily and aggressively into other lands. Possessing a Catholic philosophy of education, we can attempt to reimplant and renourish the standard of morality and religion which these pagan ideologies have erased from the minds of millions.

Finally, we give our parents humble thanks and much grateful appreciation because we fully realize that it is the educated and thoughtful men—those brought up according to the right tenets of a Catholic philosophy of education—who will come to the fore to carry fearlessly and with a clarified certitude the standards and principles of Christ in the successful attempt to make all nations whole again—spiritually, morally, aesthetically, physically, socially, and intellectually.

Conquest Without War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the developing international crisis over the future of Berlin may have some salutary results. The Khrushchev ultimatum—for an ultimatum it is—has obliged us to review our position not only with respect to the divided city, but to focus our attention on the deeper meaning of the German question.

For the Communists, and indeed for the early Socialists, including Karl Marx, Germany was the key country of the world revolution. Neither Marx nor Lenin considered it possible that the first Socialist revolution could be victorious in an underdeveloped country, such as Russia of the czars. Industrialized Germany, with its educated working class, organized into trade unions, and in a powerful Socialist Party appeared as the logical battlefield of class warfare. Even after the Soviet revolution, Lenin and his followers believed that only if the Germans followed the Russian example could the revolution spread to Europe and the rest of the world.

Although the Soviets have tried to export their anti-Western feelings to the former colonial countries, Khrushchev, no less than Lenin, knows that the future of Soviet expansion depends less on the minds of the Asians and Africans than on the productive capacity of the Soviet empire. And this productive capability would be immensely enhanced if Khrushchev could add to the Soviet bloc the huge potential of Western Germany in the West and of Japan in the East.

Lenin spoke of a revolution in Germany. But even in the early twenties he offered the German Republic an alliance. Rapallo allowed the Germans to test weapons prohibited by the Versailles Treaty; the Berlin Pact of 1926 established solid economic relations between the Weimar Republic and the U.S.S.R.; and I hardly have to mention the Hitler-Stalin pact.

In spite of his threats, even while holding the possibility of extinction over their heads, Khrushchev again talks of a mutually beneficial alliance with Ger-

many. I would urge my colleagues to read at least some chapters of a new book, "Conquest Without War" published by Simon and Schuster. It is the nearest thing we have which compares with Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and provides an illuminating view of Soviet intentions. The editors of this remarkable work, Nat H. Mager and Jacques Katel, have selected from the words uttered by Khrushchev, particularly during the past few years, pertinent and significant pronouncements and placed them perspective so as to define Soviet objectives and methods in Khrushchev's own words. At this time it is particularly interesting to read a portion which illustrates the philosophy on Germany:

Another German-Soviet pact, like that between Hitler and Stalin, is at least as possible today as it was in 1939. Indeed Khrushchev insists, it is more probable, since a German attack on the Soviet Union would now be suicidal.

Khrushchev made clear to a German audience that such an alliance is exactly what he is looking for.

Chancellor Bismarck, a farsighted politician of bourgeois Germany, once said:

"It is my belief that, provided no irresponsible parties and individuals gain ascendancy in Germany, there will be no conflicts between Germany and Russia. For us, Russia's friendship is most important of all." Bismarck indignantly rejected the attempts by foreign powers to impose on Germany the role of a hound to be unleashed against Russia.

Another distinguished German personality of a later period, Joseph Wirth, former Chancellor of the Weimar Republic, said: "Until Russia and Germany began to quarrel with one another the two peoples lived well in Europe."

These, I think, are very wise words and they should be pondered by those who shape the foreign policy of the Federal Republic.

This echoed the hope of Lenin:

"The principal link in the chain of revolution * * * is the German link * * * and the success of the world revolution depends more on Germany than on any other country.

"A successful revolution in Germany would immediately and very easily have shattered the shell of imperialism (which, unfortunately, is made of the best steel, and hence cannot be broken by the efforts of any and every * * * chicken). It would have brought about the victory of world socialism for certain, without any difficulty, or with slight difficulty—if, of course, by difficulty we mean difficulty on a world-historical scale and not in the Philistine-circle sense."

After the recall of past wisdom * * * the promise of a bright future:

The German people are a very talented and industrious people. They have given mankind many remarkable discoveries and inventions. The German people do not need aggressive campaigns for lebensraum.

What prospect have the German people, then, with their relatively small territory? They have the broadest and brightest prospects. Today, when one-third of mankind is building its life under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the question of territories has been eliminated.

We do not regard the wealth of the Soviet Union as being solely our own wealth—it is the wealth of all the Socialist countries. That, too, is the view of real Communists, Marxist-Leninists, of other Socialist countries, who look upon their countries' wealth as our common wealth, serving the common interests of the people of all Socialist states. And this wealth is so great that it amply provides for the requirements of the peoples of all our countries.

The Soviet people want friendship with the people of the Federal German Republic, the same friendship they have with the people of the German Democratic Republic. Establishment of friendly relations would be a boon to the peoples of the Soviet Union and to the two German states, as well as to all European countries whose interests demand lasting peace in Europe and throughout the world.

We are not competitors. On the contrary, the economies of our two countries complement each other. The Soviet Union possesses inexhaustible raw materials and industrial resources. We have unlimited opportunities for the production of agricultural raw materials and food, and the Germans could cooperate with us. This cooperation would be advantageous to both countries, and the well-being of our peoples would be raised to a new high.

Some political leaders in countries allied with West Germany in NATO candidly and directly say—behind the scenes, to be sure, and not in public: "Believe and understand us, if the Federal German Republic were not a member of NATO, had no army, and spent nothing on armament, it would have great economic advantages over other Western countries, and would become an even more dangerous trade rival." The West German economy is indeed strong and more highly developed than that of other NATO countries, excluding the United States. Thus, for such Western politicians the development of the West German economy—while West Germany is being dragged into NATO and participating in the arms race—is most beneficial. They are not averse to putting their West German competitor in the heavy chains of armaments and large armed forces in order to weaken the Federal German Republic economically, to create better conditions for competing with it in world markets.

The wounds of the past are far from healed: Germany is still a divided country. Khrushchev does not intend to accept reunification unless a reunified Germany would ally itself with the Soviet Union.

We Are Going To Be Taken Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of September 13, 1961:

WE ARE GOING TO BE TAKEN AGAIN

While the so-called astute statesmen of the free world are holding up their hands in horror over Soviet Russia's resumption of nuclear testing, let's not lose sight of Mr. Khrushchev's Pavlovian cleverness.

He announces that because no agreement banning nuclear testing is possible with the United States, Russia will resume testing. Five test shots in a week's time indicate clearly that Russia had been preparing for that week's work for many months.

By the time Russia has completed the tests needed to prove out her new nuclear devices, the upper atmosphere will be so loaded with radioactive materials that good old Khrushchev will act generously to save civilization by agreeing once again to discuss a ban on nuclear testing.

What Russia does with impunity, the United States cannot do at all. The world will be so grateful to Soviet Russia for calling another time out in this desperate game that it will turn with fury on the United States if any suggestion is made that we need to catch up with a few test shots of our own.

The manipulation of world opinion by the Communists has approached the laboratory perfection of Dr. Pavlov and his dogs. When Khrushchev tinkles the little bell of peace, our mouths water. We have been conditioned to forget who beats us on the head because it feels so good when they stop.

It is terrifying to see the Communists so adept in this, but it looks as if we are going to be taken again.

My True Security: The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, a talented young lady in Morrilton, Ark.—Miss Mary Louise Warren—is the author of an inspiring essay entitled, "My True Security: The American Way," which was selected as the best entered in a contest conducted by the junior chamber of commerce of Conway County, Ark. Because this essay contains a real message for all of us, I include a copy in the RECORD:

MY TRUE SECURITY: THE AMERICAN WAY

The word "security" has been used so loosely it flaps. If I am secure I am presumed to be happy, well liked, and something called adjusted. If I am not secure I am incorrigible, defective, or warped—and heaven help me. I am not any of these—I am a teenager working toward my security. Such opinion misleads me into a feeling for what security most decidely is not—that is, wrapping my life up in neatly labeled packages so that I need not bother about it again.

To me, security is a continuous development; and when I realize this fact, I show a mark of feeling secure. I feel I cannot arrive at security in some magical moment and stay there for the rest of my life. To be secure I must be aware of my own readiness as I move from one accomplishment to the next.

Security is not a state I can reach suddenly; it is achieved by wisdom and personal effort. I cannot find security by rules and formulas; neither can I find it through social security, Federal housing, TVA, minimum wage, or subsidies to farmers. Security is a road to a destination. It has, of course, some guideposts giving directions to me. With the help of God, the love of family, and honest labor, I can travel along my path to greater security. I must not be detoured into a "give me, give me, give me," lane used so much today, in the name of security.

Our forefathers had no Federal aids, no public welfare; yet, in spite of this, they had a security in one unified goal—freedom. They built security that warrants our highest praise. I feel that we, as the new generation, must "right about face," and capture some of their grim determination for self reliance, independence, honesty, and self respect—or we will be a lost nation.

"The world is a looking glass, and gives back to every man the reflection of his own face." We need the courage to admit to ourselves that we, all of us, make our own world.

Security comes from within an individual. After I have used my effort and wisdom well to build a character with integrity, foresight, initiative and self reliance—one capable of meeting crises or able to take advantage of opportunities, only then do I possess my true security.

Monsignor McHugh's Crowning Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Connel A. McHugh, P.A., V.F., pastor of St. Mary of the Mount Church at Mount Pocono, Pa., is and has been for many years one of the most outstanding and distinguished priests in the Catholic diocese of Scranton, which includes my congressional district. I have known and on many occasions have been closely associated with Monsignor McHugh during the course of his long and illustrious career as a member of the clergy. I am sure Monsignor McHugh would agree that his greatest accomplishment, among many, was the occasion of the recent dedication of the Pocono Catholic Mission's elementary and secondary school and convent which the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Friday, September 15, 1961, described editorially as "the crowning achievement in the fruitful career" of Monsignor McHugh.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the excellent aforementioned editorial:

MONSIGNOR MCHUGH'S CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT

Dedication of the Pocono Catholic Missions $2 million elementary and secondary school and convent on a 40-acre site in Paradise Township has been quite properly described as the crowning achievement in the fruitful career of the Right Reverend Monsignor Connel A. McHugh, P.A., V.F., pastor of St. Mary of the Mount Church at Mount Pocono and one of the most distinguished priests in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton.

The institution, located 3 miles southeast of Mount Pocono on the road to Cresco, Mountainhome and Buckhill Falls, already is a familiar landmark in the area and in the years to come will be a monument to Monsignor McHugh's zeal.

A priest for 56 years, Monsignor McHugh undertook this tremendous building program at an age when most men of the cloth, as well as members of the laity, are content to sit on the sidelines and watch the world go by. Now in his eighties, Monsignor McHugh shows no diminution of initiative and enthusiasm as he continues to fulfill the vows he took after the turn of the century. The years wear lightly on him, as he maintains a rigorous schedule 7 days a week.

Monsignor McHugh's career is remarkable in that he has labored in rural parishes except for a decade in Scranton as a young curate. Because of his activities and accomplishments as a citizen as well as a churchman, he easily qualifies as the Poconos' outstanding son. His fame has spread far beyond the boundaries of the resort area and the diocese.

A grateful church has conferred on him the ranks of domestic prelate and protonotary apostolic, the highest honors a priest may receive. In the diocese, he has served in such capacities as vicar general, dean, and consultor. He has been on the board of the Catholic Light, chairman of the orphanage building committee, and director of religious work in camps. But it is in his pastoral role that he has best demonstrated his capacity.

Evidence of his stature was indicated at the dedication when he received messages from Pope John XXIII, the apostolic delegate at Washington, President Kennedy, Governor Lawrence, and other notables. Many members of the hierarchy participated in the exercises as a special tribute to him.

Wilkes-Barre always has taken a keen interest in his career because he spent his boyhood at the home of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Ritchie in the North End. It was from this city that he left to study for the priesthood. Ellen and Sara Ritchie of Wilkes-Barre are nieces and Attorney George B. Ritchie is a grandnephew. A part from these ties, he has hundreds of local friends who rejoice not only in his impressive record of service to God and man, but in the knowledge that the final chapter is yet to be written.

Our Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under a unanimous-consent agreement I am pleased to present herewith a splendid article which appears in the September 20 issue of Life Lines.

This article calls attention to the observance of Constitution Week and concludes with the statement:

As long as freedom's light is shining in America, freedom's hope will not die in the hearts of those who do not know liberty.

The article entitled "Our Bill of Rights" follows:

OUR BILL OF RIGHTS

During the coming days, Americans from Maine to California and from the border of Canada to the Gulf of Mexico will be joining in the observance of Constitution Week. One hundred seventy-four years ago, the Founding Fathers gave to America the charter of her liberties.

This is a time for Americans to determine that the sacrifice, the wisdom, and the faith of those who wrote the Constitution shall not perish from the earth. This is a time for Americans to resolve firmly that they will know more tomorrow than they know today about ways and means of insuring the maintenance of the freedom guaranteed by the Constitution.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Gladstone once described the formation of the Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." The American Constitution is perhaps the most successful example in history of a legal instrument that has served both as a safeguard of individual freedom and as a ligament of national unity. Today it is still a living document, meeting the needs of a great, growing, powerful, self-governing Republic.

Today it seems appropriate to read again our Bill of Rights. The following first 10 amendments to the Constitution were all proposed by Congress on September 25, 1789, and were ratified and adopted on December 15, 1791:

"Amendment I—Freedom of religion, of speech and of the press: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"Amendment II—Right to keep and bear arms: A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"Amendment III—Quartering of soldiers: No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"Amendment IV—Security from unwarrantable search and seizure: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

"Amendment V—Rights of accused in criminal proceedings: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

"Amendment VI—Right to speedy trial witnesses, etc.: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"Amendment VII—Trial by jury in civil cases: In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

"Amendment VIII—Bails, fines, punishment: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"Amendment IX—Reservation of rights of the people: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"Amendment X—Powers reserved to States or people: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor pro-

hibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Why is the philosophy of government called a representative republic peculiar to our United States? Until the American Revolution it was accepted that the king or state held complete sovereignty and was the fountainhead of power and the dispenser of privilege. The great feature of the American philosophy of government is that sovereignty resides in the individual citizen. The Founding Fathers held that the rights of freedom of the individual are conferred by God and that these rights are inalienable. To them, governments existed and expressed the will of the sovereign people. They also believed that, when governments fail in this, they no longer have the rights to the allegiance of the people.

A former President of the United States, who was a thoughtful student of American history, said, "The history of human freedom is the history of limitations on the power of government." The men who created our Constitution had suffered from Old World tyranny. To them it was a compelling necessity to sever once and for all time the shackles of the state, and after many weeks of deliberation there emerged "the greatest document ever conceived by the mind of man."

CHECKS AND BALANCES

Our country thus has a degree of local self-government not known in most of the rest of the world today. "We, the people" are guaranteed the authority to set up State, county, city, and township governments, to be rulers in our own right. This provision is our bulwark against an all-powerful, centralized Government in Washington. Our Government belongs to the people, and we must not cease to exercise the claim of ownership.

To make double sure that the Federal Government remained contained, a division of functions of Government was provided, a system of checks and balances in which the legislative, executive, and judicial departments became coordinate branches of the tree of liberty.

Each of these branches was designed to help check and balance the powers of the other branches so that no one part of Government is granted sufficient authority to take over the Government as a whole. Under our Constitution, therefore, the Government is the servant, not the master of the people. In drawing up the Constitution, its authors endeavored to make completely sure that the politicians did not get out of hand. As Thomas Jefferson expressed it: "Do not talk to me about the integrity of public officials. I say, chain the politicians to the limitations of the Constitution itself."

The practical benefits of a Government such as ours is obvious to Americans, who, with their ancestors, have lived and breathed the air of freedom for so many years. Few stop to think, however, that with the establishment of our Constitution there occurred one of the greatest miracles ever to have blessed mankind. The great new freedom created by it unloosed a tremendous drive to explore new frontiers.

"It could only happen in America" is a sentiment that has become commonplace. Men whose ancestors were limited in their ability to earn a living because of class limitations or social restrictions suddenly found that they could work at any occupation which they had the strength and ability to master. Others rose from humble positions to great wealth by virtue of their own initiative, unhampered by Old World restrictions. America was the land of opportunity. The United States was a land where a man could earn and keep for his family the fruits of his labors and call his soul his own. If all these freedoms are endangered today, and we are forced to believe they are, the fault lies not in our Constitution, but in ourselves.

There is much that patriotic Americans can do to save their country even at this late hour. We can make a good start by taking time now to consider the heritage of our Constitution and join with all patriotic Americans in a prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for all the blessings of our Constitution. As long as freedom's light is shining in America, freedom's hope will not die in the hearts of those who do not know liberty.

Mary Cort Schreiner, of Pennsylvania: Civic Leader and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mary Cort Schreiner, Mrs. Samuel A. Schreiner, of 42 St. Clair Drive, Mount Lebanon, Allegheny County, Pa., bravely faced the end of her career on August 3, 1961 at the age of 77 years. The passing of this outstanding citizen of western Pennsylvania should be noted here for future generations, because through more than half a century of active and devoted service to her Nation, church and community, Mrs. Schreiner exemplifies the best in the tradition of voluntary citizenship responsibility, and civic work that has made our great American success in self-government. I compliment Mary Schreiner on her indestructible courage, enthusiasm, and fine personality.

Since Mary Schreiner came to the rural South Hills section of Allegheny County as a bride in 1910, Mrs. Schreiner has proudly listed her occupation as homemaker. She considered it her primary task to create a happy and secure home for her husband and three children. Yet she managed to find time for active participation in a wonderful list of civic enterprises that have helped mold the face of not only her own community, but the entire greater Pittsburgh area.

Mount Lebanon, now one of the Nation's leading surburban communities, with a population of over 35,000 and an assessed valuation of $112 million was little more than a handful of houses, scattered at the foot of a century-old country church, when the township's first organization meeting was held in the Schreiner home on February 6, 1912. In subsequent years, while her husband served as the township's attorney and solicitor, Mrs. Schreiner set about organizing the community's women for civic work and intellectual progress. The first need in those early days of few communications was a way for the women to keep up with intellectual life of the Nation. Mrs. Schreiner was one of the founders and later president of the continuing serious study group, the Women's Fortnightly Review. Later, she was active in helping to organize the present large and active, Women's Club of Mount Lebanon. This club's fine community contributions are numerous over the years. Mrs. Schreiner in her club work was particularly active in the planting program that turned the open cornfields on which Mount Lebanon was built into today's pleasant, tree-shaded top residential area. During her tenure as president, the women's club erected the present large club building which has been a valuable community center for social, civic, and cultural activities.

Mary Schreiner's horizons and activities were not limited to her home community. During both World War I and II, she served her country as truly as any soldier in uniform. In World War I, she was chairman of food conservation and Liberty bond sales for Mount Lebanon. In World War II she took on a full-time job as volunteer executive head of the Allegheny County block plan for war services under the Office of Civilian Defense—a task which involved the recruitment, training, and direction of 10,000 women. In addition, Mrs. Schreiner was Allegheny County vice chairman of the Material Conservation Committee for which service she was cited by the Pennsylvania State Council of Defense and Gov. Edward Martin. These wartime jobs were so demanding of Mrs. Schreiner's time and energy that her husband once ruefully remarked, "I have only one wife to give for my country."

After the war, as a member of the first committee on Smoke Control of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, Mrs. Schreiner became one of those concerned citizens whose efforts have brought about a clean, pleasant city and county in the once smoky and smog-covered Pittsburgh area. Concerned as much about human interests as environmental problems she was an active member of the Allegheny County Civic Club, the Blood Bank Committee of the Red Cross, and the board of the Volunteer Bureau of the Health and Welfare Federation.

Mrs. Schreiner was obviously endowed with a great capacity for leadership. Vibrant, articulate, and tireless, she worked for her convictions and for countless civic and charitable programs. She believed that no democratic society could function without citizens who were well informed and intelligently partisan. In pursuit of the first objective, she worked with, and served as president of the Legislative Council of Western Pennsylvania. In pursuit of the latter, she was a guiding spirit and served as president and a leading member of the Mt. Lebanon Council of Republican Women.

Mary Schreiner's citizenship was, in fact, such an integral part of her personality that her pastor, the Reverend Dr. Cary N. Weisiger III felt moved to include the following statement in his message at the time of the memorial service for her at the Mount Lebanon United Presbyterian Church:

> Mary Cort Schreiner had a strong conviction about civic righteousness, and, as you all know, expressed that conviction clearly. She was a member and supporter of many organizations. She was a booster of good causes. She was a patriot. She cared about her community and country. She had strong political views which were passionately held and freely expressed.

Mary Schreiner's life well serves as an inspiration and a model for the future

and for these days so critical that the President has issued a call upon all Americans for more self-sacrifice and service. By making civic duty a daily task and enthusiastic responsibility throughout all her active years, Mrs. Schreiner points the way toward keeping our Republic in order, and making civic progress a challenging, rewarding and successful enterprise for all of our citizens.

Mary Schreiner believed in civic integrity and public virtue and gave her friends and fellow citizens her sincere conviction that it is all worth while. She was a stout supporter and was on the firing line quite frequently. Her cheerful spirit and enthusiasm, her hearty willingness to work, her civic endeavor and accomplishments are a lasting legacy to our community, State, and Nation.

Suggestion for the Breast Beaters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, if the arguments of the liberal proponents of Federal aid to education were no better before President Kennedy's sweeping school-aid measure was soundly trounced than are their post mortem bleatings, it is small wonder the Congress handed the Kennedy administration such a stinging defeat.

Despite these reactionary predictions of dire things ahead of our school pupils, the Congress, in voting down the Kennedy proposal, acted responsibly and followed the dictates of the majority of Americans.

There is a big job ahead for all of us, to be sure, by way of improving our public school education. It is on this that an editorial in the Washington Daily News of September 15 would have us concentrate.

The editorial, entitled "Suggestion for the Breast Beaters," follows:

SUGGESTION FOR THE BREAST BEATERS

Something to behold are the breastbeating laments of the Federal-aid-for-education advocates—as Congress prepares to go home after having driven nail after nail into the coffin of President Kennedy's broad school aid proposal.

From what is being said, one would think an unheeding Congress was condemning the Nation's children to virtual illiteracy, and that nothing whatever was being done to improve our system of public education.

"If the Monroney amendment shall be agreed to," shouted Federal-aider Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, on the Senate floor the other day, "we shall have sold the boys and girls of America and their educational system down the river."

A majority of Senator CLARK's colleagues put down this typical remark for what it was—pure demagoguery—and adopted the amendment offered by Senator MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma. This merely continued for 2 years two expiring Federal education programs—aid for areas with nontaxpaying Federal installations and Government loans for needy students, involving about $900 million. The Federal-aiders bitterly opposed extending these programs for 2 years because it would lessen chances of reviving the big Federal-aid proposal next year.

The point missed by the Federal-aiders, in our opinion, is that the large majority of the fathers and mothers of America feel no need for the pouring out of Federal billions for the education of their children—billions which would eventually, as certain as night and day, mean Federal control over the public school systems of America.

And all the evidence—the increasing percentages of children going to high school and college—points to the vital interest of parents in the education of these children. If these parents really felt Federal billions were needed, they would be forthcoming pronto from a responsive Congress.

Much needs to be done to improve our public schools. But much also is being done with hundreds of new school buildings being opened this fall for the first time and more hundreds under construction. A survey of 19 cities by the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers showed no teacher shortage in the areas checked, though New York had a big percentage of substandard substitutes. Other areas reported teacher surpluses.

The Federal-aid advocates, with Congress so obviously reflecting the wishes of the citizenry, should stop stewing over how to get Federal aid. They should concentrate their energies on improving the educational system and raising the necessary money at the local and State levels. They might be surprised how much they could accomplish.

New Recovery Program of Air Force Wins Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which pays deserved tribute to the new recovery program of the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

The writer of the letter is Lawrence F. Mihlon, national and industry affairs editor of Factory, a magazine published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

His letter presents a most encouraging report on the success of the recovery program as initiated and carried out by the Air Force Reserve.

Mr. Mihlon's letter follows:

MCGRAW-HILL PUBLISHING CO.,
New York, N.Y., September 14, 1961.

Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI,
House of Representatives, 423 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: This letter concerns a matter of considerable importance to Congress and the people, especially in light of the present international situation. It deals with the U.S. Air Force Reserve. And more specifically, the new Air Force Reserve recovery program.

I direct your attention to our meeting in Washington early this year. During our conference I expressed concern over the inefficient use of nonflying Air Force Reserve officers and airmen. I complained that in so-called individual training units airmen were given little opportunity to develop esprit de corps and military skills. In these units reservists had no more to do but attend lectures—in subjects generally not germane to their skill classifications. As late as June of 1961, the majority of the Reserve units were of this type. At your suggestion I agreed to explore the matter further and report back. We agreed that certain action might be undertaken by the Air Force to improve this situation.

Since our meeting the Air Force has put into effect a new Reserve training program called recovery. Congress and the people of the Nation should know about this important change.

In June of 1961 I was transferred from an individual training unit into the 8308th Air Force Reserve Recovery Group, Newark, N.J. I have had the opportunity and pleasure to observe intimately the character and readiness of this unit and others like it.

I am impressed, proud, and encouraged by what I have seen. At last the Air Force reservist has a mission—a mission vital to the Nation in time of tension and conflict.

Recoverymen are the minutemen of the aerospace age. Their job is to provide auxiliary airstrips and facilities for U.S. aircraft and airmen returning from a nuclear strike. More specifically, their job is to "get them back to the battle" as soon as possible.

A recovery system will eventually be set up in every State. It will provide a network of Reserve airbases. These bases give the United States strategic striking force the "bullpen" it must have to deter aggressors and wage a winning war, if it comes.

Under the able and inspired leadership of reservists like Col. Gerald A. Garafola, commander of the 8308th and regular Air Force advisers like Lt. Col. Richard H. Purrington, the recovery program is moving ahead rapidly. Working out of available civilian airports recoverymen represent the Air Force to countless communities throughout the Nation. Since emergency is the recovery mission, a minimum of full-time equipment is purchased and maintained by each unit. Instead reservists appeal to their fellow citizens in local government and business for donations of necessary equipment on a part-time basis. This could include everything from control tower equipment to bulldozers, to firehose. In an emergency, and during certain training sessions, this equipment is pressed into service for use by the Air reservists. Civilian cooperation has been splendid—a compliment to the willingness of the American people to stand their ground against any enemy.

Summing up: With the recovery program underway there is no doubt that Air Force Reserve manpower is at last being used for its highest purpose. The Air reservist has a new and vital mission. Skills are being perfected and readiness sharpened. It is a mission vital to every American.

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE F. MIHLON,
National and Industry Affairs Editor, Factory.

The Harsh Facts of Life in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, an article by Walter Lippmann appeared in the

Washington Post yesterday which I feel is of vital importance and should be brought to the attention of Congress. Mr. Lippmann has performed an invaluable service by relating the harsh facts of life in the nuclear age at a time when there are so few willing to face them:

NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Never before have any chiefs of state been in a situation like that in Germany today. For this is the first encounter on vital issues between great nuclear powers, and there are no historical precedents, there is no accumulated experience and wisdom, to guide them. Khrushchev and Kennedy possess what are for all practical purposes equal and absolute weapons. Khrushchev and Kennedy, Macmillan, de Gaulle, and Adenauer are working under conditions as different from World War II as flying a jet is different from running a steam locomotive. None of them has been taught how to conduct diplomacy in a nuclear age. All of them have to guess and to improvise, to experiment and to hope.

There has been a revolution in the military situation since the previous encounter over Berlin with Stalin in 1948. Then the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But beginning with the late fifties the Soviet Union with its nuclear weapons and its rockets has become an equal nuclear power. During the critical fifties Churchill and Eisenhower learned what was happening to the balance of power. Then the era of summitry began. At the beginning of this era Eisenhower made the statement for which, it may well be, he will be remembered the longest. It was not sentimentality, idealism, or pacifism but the grim truth about the hydrogen bomb which caused President Eisenhower to say that there is no longer any "alternative to peace."

Modern weapons have not merely magnified and multiplied the violence of war. They have revolutionized the nature of war by introducing into it a new order of violence. Always until now, war and the threat of war, whether aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments for the national purpose. They were usable because wars could still be won or lost. In the prenuclear wars the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. The damage, though great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union. But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean a hundred million dead, the devastation of the great urban centers, and the contamination of the Earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery. The damage done would be mutual, there would be no victor, and for all practical purposes the ruin would be irreparable.

American nuclear power can reduce Soviet society to smouldering ruins and leave the wretched survivors shocked, starving, and diseased. The Soviet Union can, it is coolly estimated, kill between 30 and 70 million Americans. Such a war would not be followed by reconstruction. It would be followed by a savage struggle for existence as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

It used to be said of the British naval commander in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the war in an afternoon. Khrushchev and Kennedy can do that now. In a few hours Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the achievements and the promises of the Communist economy; Kennedy can lose the Constitution and the free enterprise system and the American way of life, and along with them all the frontiers, old, and new. I do not think that this is overstated. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred since man appeared on this planet. In saying this my object is not to add to the general creepiness. But we cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter unless we remind ourselves that nuclear war is not just another war as history describes wars, but a wholly new order of violence.

Because the destructiveness of the new armaments is equal and virtually absolute neither of the two chiefs of Government can threaten the other with such a war. As long as each has kept his own armory of weapons in order, neither can or need believe the nuclear threats of the other. If, for example, Khrushchev has resumed testing, not for technical military reasons but for terrorization, he will not and cannot terrorize President Kennedy. For this testing cannot remove the awful retaliatory power of the U.S. nuclear weapon systems.

In cold blood no government can, no government will, start a nuclear war with an equal nuclear power. Only a moral idiot would press the button. The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea what they are talking about. They have not been able to imagine and realize what a nuclear war would be like. But the governments know quite well what a nuclear war would be like. That is why there is bluff at the core of any threat to initiate a nuclear exchange. There is also a wishful belief that the bluff will work because it will not be called.

Nevertheless, though a nuclear war would be lunacy and is unlikely, it is an ever-present possibility. Why? Because however irrational it may be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to a point where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings.

This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. It is as much a reality as a megaton bomb, and in the nuclear age it must be given weighty consideration in the calculation of policy. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which the reactions are uncontrollable. The governments must know where that line is and they must stay well back of it. Here lies the greatest danger of miscalculation, and therefore of war.

Both sides, we had better realize, are capable of miscalculating where that line is. Khrushchev, who has no sufficient experience of a state whose speech is free, is prone to think that Kennedy can and should control an explosion of popular feeling. The fact is that there is a limit to President Kennedy's ability to lead public opinion, and he is in sight of that limit. Mr. Khrushchev must make no mistake about this.

For our part, we are prone to suppose that because speech is strictly regimented in the Soviet Union, that there is no irresistible internal pressures on Khrushchev. This can be a very dangerous illusion.

In both countries there is a line which it is not safe for the other to cross. It is the line where compromise will be regarded as humiliation and surrender. This line will have to be made precise in the negotiations. Blockade of the access routes is such a line for this country. For the Soviet Union such a line would be the giving of nuclear arms to West Germany. These are lines of provocation which cannot be crossed without provoking uncontrollable, indeed suicidal, reactions.

This being the nuclear age it is the paramount rule of international politics that a great nuclear power must not put another great nuclear power in a position where it must choose between suicide and surrender. And the corollary of this rule is that no great nuclear power must put itself in a position where it has made such absolute and such rigid stipulations that it can no longer negotiate an honorable and tolerable accommodation.

South Georgia Beach Resorts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the session, there have recently been numerous calls to my office from my colleagues and their staff members asking about the fabulous beach resorts in south Georgia, more specifically in the Eighth District which I am proud to represent in the Congress. I refer to St. Simons Island, Sea Island, and the new Jekyll, Georgia's year-round beach resorts. Under leave to extend my remarks, to answer these several requests I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress, as well as the Nation, some descriptive information about these historic areas.

ST. SIMONS ISLAND

With its woodland drives, St. Simons, near Brunswick, Ga., arched by massive live oaks fringed with Spanish moss is unequaled in America in quiet beauty, historical memories, legends and dramatic events. It is truly an Eden, with its mild climate, wide white beaches, flowers and sunshine.

Visitors to St. Simons may enjoy various kinds of recreation—golf, tennis, bowling, shuffleboard, pool or surf bathing, aquaplaning, boating, horseback riding, skeet shooting and dancing.

Some of the finest year-round fishing in the South is found in the salt rivers and creeks around the island. In the sounds and offshore, larger fish, sea bass, drum, trout, sheepshead, blue fish, bonita and tarpon provide excellent sport fishing.

Fort Frederica, a national park, where General Oglethorpe and the early Georgians turned back the Spanish in the Battle of Bloody Marsh, is one of the most historically interesting places in the United States and is well worth anyone's time for inspection.

SEA ISLAND

Further up the beach from St. Simons is Sea Island with its beautful Cloister Hotel which was owned by the late Howard E. Coffin, promoter of this seacoast resort. Architectural cue for the hotel follows the island's Spanish background. You will need reservations in advance as Sea Island is considered one of the finest resorts in the land. Created for those who expect the ultimate in gracious living, Sea Island is a resort of distinction.

JEKYLL ISLAND

Advertised as the pride of the Empire State of the South, Jekyll Island, off the coast of Brunswick, was once the private

playground of a hundred of the Nation's millionaires. Because of its beauty and mild climate, Jekyll Island was purchased by the millionaires from the descendants of the Du Bignon family who had owned it from colonial times. It became nationally known as the Jekyll Island Club.

Purchased by the State of Georgia in 1947 and now managed by the Jekyll Island State Park Authority, Jekyll is the perfect place for a full vacation, a long weekend or that family day outing. After picnicking in the shady, breeze swept nook with breathtaking beauty at your elbow, you may rest, relax and return home with new peace of mind, and new pep in your step.

Jekyll's 9 miles of snow-white beaches flanked by ancient oaks and stately palms are unparalleled in beauty. Jekyll is proud of its golf course, built for and by men who knew and played the best. For conventions and meetings, a spacious 850 seat air-conditioned combined auditorium and aquarama has been recently completed. Museums, a sun drenched surf, picnic grounds, the best fishing grounds, historical sites, hotels, motels and restaurants, you'll find everything at the vacation resorts in the Eighth District.

Come by car, by train, by plane or by boat—but definitely you want to come. There is plenty of warm weather remaining down in the friendly south, and these Golden Isles of Georgia just off the coast of Brunswick provide everything for your enjoyment at reasonable, moderate, and the ultimate in expenditure.

Pattern for a Red Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Is the present U.N. armed intervention in Katanga setting a pattern for a Red Africa? That is a question very many Americans are asking these days as they contemplate the news reports of carnage, violence and political chicanery in the Congo.

On what logical basis do armed, aggressive U.N. forces intervene in behalf of possible pro-Soviet, pro-Communist, anti-American and anti-free world leadership in Katanga to replace a leadership which, whatever its merits or demerits, is lined up solidly on the side of free enterprise, democratic principles, anticommunism and warm friendship toward the West.

The money of this Nation and the American people is being used to finance reportedly about one-half of the total cost of the current U.N. military operations in Katanga. Thus, American money is being used to oust our friends and install our potential enemies in positions of leadership in Katanga.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that there should be deep concern in this country about this aggressive, violent program, the most likely net result of which, may well be to put radical, pro-Communist, anti-American leaders in control of the rich, productive state of Katanga. Is there no other way, a way short of putting pro-Communists in power by which the U.N. can establish order and peace in the Congo.

How soon will this pattern spread or be applied to other African States? Is it not very likely that this policy will ultimately turn all Africa Red? Do we remember China and the harmless agrarian reformers?

I think it is high time for our State Department and our U.N. delegation reappraised the entire African situation in the light of these ominous developments in the Congo. Speed and prompt, effective action is imperative to offset the Red anschluss in Africa.

Is It a Question of Pure Milk or Not-So-Pure Monopolies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's firm and forthright endorsement of milk sanitation legislation which would make the U.S. Public Health Service's milk code the quality yardstick for milk moving in interstate trade, has brought squeals of protests from the sections of the country which are now misusing their health regulations as trade barriers to protect their local milk monopolies. New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has taken a stand against consumers, including those in his own State, and against the bulk of dairy farmers in order to defend the milk regulations of his State, which are so written to insure that New York dairymen will have a virtual monopoly on the New York milk market.

As my good friend and neighbor from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, pointed out in a speech in the Senate, the New York Governor is "a protectionist at home, but a free trader abroad," a man less concerned about imports of Japanese textiles than of milk from Wisconsin. Senator HUMPHREY is leading the fight for enactment of national milk sanitation legislation in the Senate, with the able support of his Minnesota colleague, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, and Wisconsin's Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE and ALEXANDER WILEY.

When testifying in favor of my national milk sanitation bill in hearings held before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, both Secretary Freeman and Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, cited the results of a study made by the U.S. Public Health Service at the request of House Health and Safety Subcommittee of the differences between the Public Health Service milk code and the regulations of States which have adopted other types of milk standards. This study revealed that the majority of the 14 States with regulations differing from the code have sets of standards which are far less stringent and less thorough than the code of many fundamental sanitation requirements applicable both to dairy farms and pasteurization plants and to inspection and laboratory procedures.

A detailed comparison of the code with the milk sanitation regulations of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania revealed many instances where the sanitary standards of those States are less specific and less stringent than the code. This information is particularly interesting in light of the fact that all four of these States refuse to accept out-of-State milk unless it is inspected by their own inspectors to see that it meets State milk sanitation standards.

The Eastern and Southern States which are opposinng national milk sanitation legislation always claim they are doing so to protect their consumers against impure milk. However, this argument does not hold water when you consider the fact that the milk regulations of these States are not as good as those provided in the U.S. Public Health Service milk code, which, under the provisions of the national milk sanitation legislation, would be the quality yardstick for milk moving from State to State.

This entire controversy is summarized in an excellent editorial published in the September 13, 1961, Dairy Record. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD:

FREEMAN'S SUPPORT OF SANITATION BILL STIRS MAJOR CONTROVERSY

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman stirred up a hornet's nest in his testimony for the National Milk Sanitation Act (Dairy Review, Sept. 6). The controversy was barely started before politics entered the issue.

In his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in which he strongly supported the legislation, Secretary Freeman singled out 14 States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee, North Dakota, and California—on which the U.S. Public Health Service had made a comparison of State milk standards as compared with the USPH model sanitation code. His testimony pointed out places where the State standards allegedly were inferior to the USPH code.

His statements brought an immediate reaction from officials in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, plus attacks by Members of Congress, and a stout defense by proponents of the milk sanitation act in the Senate.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER ATTACKS FREEMAN

New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller charged the Secretary with "pushing (milk) legislation favoring his home State of Minnesota and its immediate neighbors at the expense of the rest of the country."

The Republican Governor said the proposed milk sanitation law supported by Secretary Freeman would "open the milk markets of New York's dairymen to a periodic flood of surplus milk from the upper midwest." Such a development, he added, would mean "disastrous results for our dairymen."

Democratic Senators from Minnesota and Wisconsin unloaded on the Governor the following day. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, in a Senate speech called the New York Governor "a protectionist at home, but a free trader abroad," a man less concerned about imports of Japanese textiles than of milk from Wisconsin. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota, said Governor Rockefeller's position was against the interests of dairy farmers in the Midwest and consumers in New York and other eastern States—a "horse and buggy" attitude. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, told the Senate that Governor Rockefeller, a likely candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964, had thrown away any chance he might have to win the Wisconsin primary.

The next day, Republican Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, both of New York, rushed to Rockefeller's aid. Senator KEATING said Senator HUMPHREY apparently did not care about the health of New Yorkers and said that "now that the presidential campaign is over, he is exclusively Minnesota-bound."

DENIES OHIO REGULATIONS LAX

Raymond K. Davis, chief of the Ohio division of food and dairies, denied that Ohio's milk regulations are lax. He said there has not been "the first documented incident of anyone being ill from drinking Ohio milk."

"Perhaps the folks in Washington are not aware we have two agencies which regulate the milk industry in this State—State laws and those set up by county and city health departments," he said. The USPH report submitted by Secretary Freeman said that Ohio's milk regulations were too "broadly written" and that they "lack specificity with respect to important items."

William L. Henning, Pennsylvania secretary of agriculture, likewise issued a statement denying that his State's milk regulations allow production of inferior milk. He added that it is absurd to think that a few men operating under the U.S. Public Health Service code could do the job in Pennsylvania which now requires about 500 men.

Establish a U.S. Arm Control Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. I am confident that the majority of my colleagues in the House will approve the establishment of this important Agency. In recent weeks the majority of our free American press has overwhelmingly endorsed the idea. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include herewith two editorials—one from the Baltimore Evening Sun of September 2, and one from the Sunday Sun of September 10, which I believe fairly and dispassionately bring the problem into proper perspective. It is my feeling that these views should be called to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 2, 1961]

PERSISTENT FAITH

Russia, with a calculated swiftness, has followed up its revocation of the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests with the explosion of a "nuclear device" in "the atmosphere." This has given rise to a new surge of alarm among the neutralist countries and widespread political and technical speculation. Is Premier Khrushchev committing himself to the tactics of terrorization? Was the "device" something new, or perhaps a component of a superbomb, or possibly some kind of superior warhead for its ballistic missiles? Moscow has announced that combined fleet and rocket military exercises will be held later this month, presumably with the emphasis on the rockets.

In such a context it is easy to regard any concern with disarmament as the idlest of futile exercises in irrelevancy. Yet the administration, which is certainly not neglecting our defensive power, is pushing to get its proposals for a permanent coordinated U.S. disarmament agency before the Senate. President Kennedy is reported ready to name Arthur H. Dean a negotiator, if another disarmament conference is held. And, in fact, John J. McCloy, the President's chief adviser on disarmament, will renew his preliminary conversations with the Russians on Wednesday. Is all this wasted time and effort? Not at all.

To repeat what the Evening Sun said not long ago, where great projects are at stake it is the responsibility of statesmanship to look beyond immediate events to permanent goals. There have been times in the past when American policy's chief fault was too great preoccupation with today's needs to the exclusion of tomorrow's. All that is happening now underlines the pressing fact that, whatever comes, mankind at some point in its history will have to learn to control, if not abolish, its instruments of destruction. That may be far in the future but the administration is wholly right to try to prepare for it, and deserves sympathy and support in doing so.

Moreover, there is an immediate purpose to be served as well. The response of the nonalined countries at the Belgrade meeting to what Russia is doing suggests how eagerly they would welcome all actions expressing confidence in an ultimate limitation of arms. The continuing interest of the United States in striving to achieve that end contrasts sharply with the Soviet's recent actions. And whatever Premier Khrushchev may think, opinion in the long run is a decisive element in the shaping of world affairs. Men will not fail to remark that even in this time of crisis the United States is not abandoning long-range disarmament planning, nor will men fail to draw comfort from our persistence in that endeavor.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 10, 1961]

ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

In a narrow sense it may be called ironical that Senate approval of a permanent U.S. arms-control agency should coincide with the Soviet Union's rejection of a ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Never has effective arms control seemed more remote than at this moment. The merest mention of the subject sounds, if narrowly taken, like irrealitsic dreaming.

If we were to assume that the present course of events will lead straight and inevitably to the disaster of a great war, then indeed to plan for arms control would be idle. But that is an assumption of despair. It is an assumption no responsible government can make. A responsible government must gird itself for threats to the national security as they arise, and at the same time continue to look beyond each crisis to the future.

The Senate has seen this, and has voted overwhelming approval (73 for and 14 against, with Senators BEALL and BUTLER commendably among the majority) of a bill to set up an agency for research and planning in techniques of arms control that might promise reductions in war-making potential, while protecting the security of nations.

The Senate understands that the agency if created could perform nothing in the faintest way miraculous. But at the same time its Members in majority reject arguments that to move the measure ahead at this time would indicate national weakness, and suggestions that the whole proposal is a mere move in a popularity contest for world opinion.

As to the first, if we are that frail we are lost—and we are not lost. As to the second, this is a deeply considered approach, far from the token gestures in the days when the hapless Harold Stassen was given disarmament as a sop: and President Eisenhower himself before he left office recognized genuine planning for arms control as a governmental duty. Advocates of the present propoasl included such toughminded men as Thomas S. Gates, Jr., a Defense Secretary under Mr. Eisenhower, John J. McCloy, and General Lemnitzer.

The proper designation in arms control, Senator CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, performed a service in getting that phrase inserted in the title of the agency. It is now called the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security: a cumbersome title, but useful in emphasizing our concept of a safe gradual system of control leading toward disarmament, and in making it plain that this is distinctly not a gesture toward Mr. Khrushchev's notion of a quick, unpoliced, and mortally dangerous general disarmament.

The Senate has done well. It is now up to the House, in committee and on the floor, to act with matching soberness and responsibility.

National Observance of 175th Anniversary of Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a statement I made before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, in behalf of House Joint Resolution 475, introduced by me in July, to amend the joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States:

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. BYRNE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of Subcommittee No. 4, in early July of this year it was my privilege and honor to introduce House Joint Resolution 475 to amend the joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

There is little need and even less time for me, now, to dwell upon the importance of a celebration such as has been proposed and adopted by the Congress. The current Congress received, in June, the report of a duly appointed commission created to recommend plans and an adequate program to assure a proper and fitting celebration of the Constitution. The work of the commission, under the terms of the joint resolution of July 14, 1960, was to expire with the appointment of a permanent commission instructed to carry out or execute complete arrangements under terms of enabling legislation to be enacted by this present Congress. Such legislation, it was recommended, should provide for an appropriation of at least $500,000. That, in essence, is the matter to be discussed in detail by this subcommittee.

The plans recommended by the initiatory commission are quite comprehensive. Basically, the work of a permanent commission to execute the proposed plans must be in the area of public relations. Sound, sensible, consistent, and persistent publicity disseminated in every type of communications media must be pursued.

There can be no doubt, even in ordinary times, of the need for and value of such a celebration as has been proposed. But we are living today in extraordinary times. It is no exaggeration to say that in this perilous hour the very preservation of our Union is at stake. It is threatened not merely by forces beyond our national lines, but, indeed, even by insidious dangers lurking within the confines of our national boundaries. And it is this latter evil which must be recognized and corrected.

I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of what appears to be a widespread apathy on the part of our citizens. Far too many of our numbers seem to have the attitude that "nothing can happen to us." Far too many are indifferent to the widening perils that are closing in upon us. These fears which I voice are not mere figments of an overworked imagination. They are very real. It is imperative that we, Members of this Congress, take the initiative in changing this very serious threat and I can think of no more effective course then getting our people back to a study and a love for that precious document that is the guardian and guarantor of our precious liberties—the Constitution of the United States.

While I hesitate to belabor the issue or to encroach too greatly on the valuable time of the members of this subcommittee, I feel that I cannot emphasize too much the need to alert the people to the beauty of the great document we plan to honor. The people of the Nation should be encouraged to get reacquainted with the basic law of the land. It would help them to understand the purpose and the meaning of this great national charter that is the best guarantee of our security, and the welfare of the Nation.

America is passing through perhaps the most trying period in our history as a nation. It is imperative that our people be awakened to the very real dangers that confront the Nation and to recall to the public mind the endless "blood, sweat, and tears" that have gone into the fabrication, the molding, and creation of this great country. We dare not, as a people, become indifferent to the lessons and the safeguards found in the Constitution.

America must awaken, without delay. Americans must shed any tendency to the lethargy which has been manifest all too often in recent years.

In the last quarter of a century we have gone through a second World War, warfare in Korea, and a seemingly unending cold war that has persisted since 1945; man has emerged into an age of scientific wonders that finds mankind literally reaching for the stars; our population has increased by nearly 50 million persons, and we have thrived materially beyond all previous hopes and dreams.

But, meanwhile, we have been living alongside a Godless, communistic dictatorship, a devouring political ogre, holding virtually half the world in slavery, challenging our bright hopes of a world of peace and justice in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Now, more than ever before, we need to renew our birthright at the wellsprings of faith and patriotism; we need to renew that spirit of old which moved the founding fathers to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Let us, indeed, get back to the constitution and there find the sustenance that will move us to present our example as a free people for all the world to behold—and follow. The constitution is a wonderful document and the story of its formation and adoption is equally marvelous and delightful.

Mr. Chairman, let us not miss this opportunity to bring the message of the Constitution to the very hearts of our people and thus assure our continuance as one nation united under God for the good of all mankind. Now is the time to kindle patriotic fervor in our people.

Perhaps I have been somewhat verbose in my plea to have you pass favorably on this joint resolution before you, but, like every Member of this Congress, and countless millions of our people, I feel most strongly about the constitution of the United States and I do look with some real concern for the future of our grand country.

Much of this fear may be dissipated by the action this body takes upon this resolution today. I earnestly request that you recommend that a permanent commission to direct this celebration be created and given the sum of $500,000 to carry out the program as planned.

Steuben Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, September 30, 1961, the fourth annual Steuben Parade will be held in the city of New York. This parade is sponsored by the German-American Committee of Greater New York and is an outstanding event. It honors Major General von Steuben who played such an important part in the Revolutionary War as a member of the staff of Gen. George Washington. This year's parade will have about 50 floats and more than 50 bands will be in the line of march, which will also include delegations from 8 large German cities, and German-American groups from all parts of the United States.

One of the groups coming to the United States to participate in the Steuben Parade is the Dusseldorf Fanfarenkorps. The Dusseldorf Fanfarenkorps has an interesting history which I would like to review here.

This magnificent ancient drum and trumpet corps traces its ancestry back to medieval times. Musically, the use of trumpets and kettledrums was reserved for the nobility and it is safe to assume that when Dusseldorf was elevated to the rank of a town by Count Adolf of Berg in 1288 the trumpets and drums heralded this significant step forward. The town of Dusseldorf suffered severely in the Thirty Years' War and in the War of Spanish Succession, but recovered its prosperity under the patronage of Elector John William of the Palatinate, a true patron of the arts, who dwelt in his castle, the Schloss Benrath, until his death in 1716.

Music in Dusseldorf was encouraged during the Middle Ages. The Turmer—tower men—sounded their horns at specific intervals during the day. It is also interesting to note that it was considered a great honor by the trumpeters and kettledrummers of Dusseldorf to be accepted by the Royal Trumpeters & Kettledrummers Guild, with the Elector of Saxony as its hereditary patron. Members of this guild did not receive their diplomas until they had passed their required tests after a minimum of 4 years training.

The continuity of the existence of the trumpeters and drums of Dusseldorf was broken by the severity of World War II. However, with the emergence of the new Dusseldorf which, due to its strategic location on the Rhine—situated between the Ruhr coal and steel area and the new Federal capital of Bonn—has become the industrial and banking center of Western Germany, interest was once again centered on the proud history of its Fanfarenkorps. In 1953, the streets of Dusseldorf once more resounded to the ancient music of medieval times. Attired in authentic costumes of the Middle Ages, 22 young men of the city of Dusseldorf, proficient in the art of drumming and trumpeting, reinstituted their Fanfarenkorps. This rebirth occurred in 1953. Since that time, this Fanfarenkorps has made history with its authentic medieval music. It has traveled throughout Europe demonstrating this ancient and royal art with great success.

We, in New York City, are most happy to welcome this group to the United States, and I am sure that the people of the entire United States join this welcome. My congressional district is being honored by having the Dusseldorf Fanfarenkorps participate in the concert being given by the Seuffert Band, George Seuffert, conductor, at Forest Park, Queens County, N.Y., on Sunday afternoon, October 1, 1961.

Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted by the Affiliated Young

Democrats, Inc., of New York City at their 29th annual executive committee meeting held on Tuesday evening, July 18, 1961, at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City. Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, presided at this citywide executive meeting:

The approaching 1961 elections in New York City have caused us once again to focus attention upon our municipal government.

It is a requisite for responsible people and groups to assess all facets of municipal government and make an earnest effort to develop program and policies and retain for New York City the well-deserved title of "Capital of the World."

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York City, therefore, without being hampered by narrow partisan advantage, has for an extended period been analyzing and evaluating the multivarious policies and problems that confront the present administration and will confront future administrations.

It is therefore with a profound degree of mature reflections and serious consideration that the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., as it has done for almost three decades of dedication to the concept of good government, respectfully submits herewith its platform for the 1961 municipal elections.

1. HOME RULE FOR NEW YORK CITY

No honest examination of the problems of municipal government can stop at the city line. It must go up the Hudson to Albany, for it is there that the ultimate powers lie, in the hands of those inimical to the interests of the city of New York and its people. The Republican leadership which controls the legislature and through it dictates to communities in the State, has never given the city of New York home rule. It has instead given it a straitjacket under which it imposes mandatory major expenditure upon the city, and denies the city of the means with which to provide the funds for such expenditures.

There are major problems in the government of the city of New York, but a major share of the responsibility for the existence of those problems, and for the inability to resolve them, lies in Albany on both floors of the capitol and can only be resolved by home rule for New York City.

2. CHARTER REVISION

It is manifest that it is of acute necessity to revise the charter of the city of New York. We favor this policy and recommend that such revision be made at once with sufficient time and notice given to the general public to enable the public to analyze and examine carefully the recommendations submitted by the committee, and thereby make an intelligent and enlightened decision regarding such provision to be presented to the voters on November 7.

We favor redistribution of the voting power in the board of estimate, by endowing the vote of the mayor with greater weight than it presently has, thereby giving the duly elected executive officer greater control over the programs and policies of his administration.

We urge the retention of the borough presidents office.

3. EDUCATION

We favor an exhaustive study be made with the purpose of examining the budgetary structure in order to determine whether a more attractive salary schedule is feasible for teacher's salaries, thereby serving as an inducement to young people of ability to enter this most vital profession.

We urge the establishment of a municipal medical college under the auspices of the newly organized city university, in order to train more physicians and researchers that are so vitally needed to insure the health and welfare of the public at large.

We urge the establishment and extension of incentive scholarships to deserving and gifted students, together with the establishment of special schools and programs for the teaching of these gifted youngsters.

We advocate changes in the board of education which would provide for a full-time, salaried board, whose members would be elected at elections every 6 years.

4. TAXES

We urge more equitable return for the city from the State of New York in State aid, in such manner that is more representative of the contribution of the city of New York to the State funds.

We favor a referendum permitting off-track betting in the city of New York under the supervision and control of a municipal authority.

5. HEALTH AND WELFARE

We favor expansion of public health facilities and call for the reopening and restaffing of the closed municipal hospitals.

We favor improved care of the mentally ill with more adequate space.

We urge more hospital services for the aged.

6. TRAFFIC

We urge an exhaustive study of the traffic problems that plague the city and recommend serious consideration of the prohibition of nonessential and noncommercial vehicles from specified districts within the city during certain periods of the day.

We favor the establishment of municipal garages in areas that have acute parking problems under the supervision and control of a parking authority.

We further favor more stringent enforcement of the no parking and no standing regulations.

7. MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

We favor a study of the budgetary structure to determine whether it is possible to establish a salary scale for municipal employees that would be more realistic and equitable.

8. RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

We favor the continuation of rent control until such time that such a program is no longer necessary. We further favor the closing of existing loopholes, thereby preventing windfalls and exploitation of slum properties.

We call for a more careful inspection system of slum housing and a more vigorous prosecution of offenders.

9. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

We favor the retention of the 15-cent fare.

We further call for an exhaustive study of the entire subway and surface transportation complex to ease the prevalent transportation and commuting problems.

We urge more down to the earth changes that will make better service; schedule of trains and connections; better heating, lights and ventilation; keep people informed of changes; and do the little things that will make travel more comfortable.

10. LABOR

We favor action to concert with State and Federal agencies and guarantee the legitimate labor organizations do not become prey to racketeers and are kept free from exploitation.

11. PUBLIC UTILITIES

We favor the establishment of a municipal authority to operate, supervise and control in conjunction with Consolidated Edison, the powerplants that service the transportation and all other facilities that have such a wide impact on the lives of the people of the city of New York.

12. YOUTH

We favor greater assistance to youth and a study of our youth board to help bring it in line with modern times of the nuclear age.

We favor the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

We urge a committee be set up by the city to help teenagers to find employment where under no circumstances do they desire to remain in school.

We urge more counseling and in some cases more stringent enactment of the laws that will unify the present laws with less entanglement by the Federal and State laws.

13. AIR POLLUTION

We favor a law that will make automobile manufacturers install a device in all automobiles to help control auto exhaust gases. The control of these crankcase fumes is most important to the health and welfare of our people.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Do Americans Know About United Nations in Africa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the clumsy attempt of the United Nations special force to use a military coup d'etat to eliminate the duly elected President of Katanga Province in the Congo causes me to wonder just how much the United States knows about U.N. operations in this bloody African country.

A few weeks ago the U.N. troops attempted to purge the Belgian, French, and British officers from the Katanga Army. A few days ago, they attempted to throw out Moise Tshombe, the Katanga President, who is decidedly pro-Western. And what is more alarming, Tshombe's successor appointed by the Central Congolese Government is regarded as pro-Communist. The new Premier the U.N. force is attempting to force upon the Katanganese is Jason Bochley-Davidson, a follower to slain Patrice Lumumba.

I would like to know if Ambassador Stevenson approved in advance the removal of the pro-Western officers from the Katanga Army. Did he also approve the attempt to remove Mr. Tshombe? Did he approve the selection of a pro-Communist to succeed him?

I want to point out that the United States is paying more than half of the cost of the U.N. Congo operations. And if Mr. Stevenson was not aware of these actions, why not? If he was, why is he going along with actions that further Communist interest in the Congo? If Mr. Stevenson has gone along with these inhuman attacks, he is making another in a series of tragic mistakes in Africa.

I have just come into possession of a letter that pinpoints one of the addled acts that weaken the entire NATO alliance and threatens the security of the United States. The letter was written to Mr. Stevenson by Robert D. Murphy, the former Deputy Under Secretary of State who served so ably under both Democratic and Republican administrations. Mr. Murphy was dismayed by Mr. Stevenson's vote in the United Nations Security Council last March, supporting Soviet Russia against our NATO ally, Portugal, on the question of Portuguese Angola. Mr. Murphy wrote this letter March 28, but to my knowledge, its contents have not been revealed before.

This letter represents the opinion of a respected and experienced diplomat who served most of his adult life in the U.S. Foreign Service. He was awarded a distinguished service medal by President Roosevelt, served as an Ambassador under President Truman, and was Assistant Secretary of State and Deputy Under Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. Mr. Murphy has a distinguished record of brilliant service to his country. His opinions on foreign affairs carry great weight.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the letter from Mr. Murphy to Ambassador Stevenson in the RECORD:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON NATO, INC.
New York, N.Y., March 28, 1961.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Representative
to the United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR ADLAI: I have noted with dismay the development of the situation in the United Nations concerning Angola and our NATO ally Portugal. I refer more particularly to the treatment by your delegation of the Security Council resolution proposed by Ceylon, Liberia, and the United Arab Republic on March 14, 1961.

The spectacle of the United States voting in alignment with the Soviet Union and against our principal NATO allies obviously is a matter of deep concern to anyone valuing the Atlantic Alliance as an instrument of Western security.

It is rash, I know, for someone who is outside the immediate orbit of the United Nations mechanism to judge adequately the reasons behind a vote in the current complex. Yet there are certain basic concepts which, regardless of tactical considerations or psychological pressures, must not be lost sight of unless we are to damage our basic position.

I think you should know that there is apprehension that in eagerness to accommodate African and Asian sentiment, we discount the European. There are those who recently have discovered Africa and seem inclined to frenzied action in favor of objectives which at times have a nebulous character. I believe I met you first in North Africa in 1943 and I know that for you Africa is not a late discovery.

The purpose often seems to be concession to local acts of sheer terrorism on a theory that the Soviet Union will champion the agitations if we do not.

I believe that the domination of the African scene is a Sino-Soviet objective, as is every world area. But I also believe that attack on our European allies for "colonialism" in Africa is really an indirect form of attack on Europe per se.

For Europe remains the prime Soviet objective. If it is achieved, Africa will be a relatively easy conquest.

Thus I deplore a situation where the United States finds it necessary to treat a member of NATO, Portugal, in what seems an ad hoc cavalier manner; to ignore appropriate consultation in NATO, and to vote in the Security Council against our valued NATO allies and with the Soviet Union.

Your task is most difficult and I certainly do not want to add to those difficulties. But this apparently hasty action, it seems to me, has done harm to the structure of an alliance to which you, I know, attach value.

With warm regards, I am
Sincerely,

ROBERT D. MURPHY,
President.

A Multiplicity of Uses for the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, policies for management of public domain lands are of special interest to residents of the Western States. An astute review of some of these policies and their relationship to conflicts over land use was recently presented by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver at the American Mining Congress Convention.

I was favorably impressed by Mr. Carver's description of the overworked phrase "multiple use." From what he said, it is apparent that in this administration there is an understanding of the fact that natural resources have a multiplicity of uses, but among these a primary use predominates. As Mr. Carver points out:

You simply cannot put a mule, a miner and a picnicker on the same square foot of ground at the same time—unless it's a case of a mule-headed miner on a picnic.

I ask consent to include excerpts from Mr. Carver's address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1961, AT THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS CONVENTION, SEATTLE, WASH.

Both as an expert—we'd probably call him a consultant if he were around today—and later as the President, Jefferson had clear ideas about what was then virtually the prime national resource: The land to the west. Then, as now, there were differences as to how we should manage the public domain. Jefferson stood with those who considered it vital to the infant Nation's growth that the West be opened to settlement by outright gift or sale at nominal prices to those who would clear and settle the land. Arrayed against this social objective was the narrow self-interest of the propertied few which sought, and successfully, to use public land sales as a source of revenues—the 19th century version of avoiding taxation to pay the national debts.

The wisdom of Jefferson's view was not long in being proved.

The pioneers looked upon the undeveloped land as a free gift from a beneficient Providence. Subjugation of the wilderness was to them an act of patriotistm. In their pragmatic view the superabundant wilderness had no value until it was tamed by the axe and the plow. Why, then, should they have to pay for a thing of no value?

Jefferson spoke of the right of each individual to appropriate to himself such lands as he found vacant, and he argued that accupancy carried title. With him, possession went beyond nine points of the law in this regard and took in the 10th point, too. Before the Revolution, Jefferson had come to understand the pioneer spirit of America as few except the settlers themselves understood it, and as even fewer have comprehended it in the intervening century and three-quarters.

The very first Congress squabbled about whether there should be one price for all land—public land, we're talking about—or should it be graduated to fit the quality; about the peril of speculation; about the merits of selling for cash or on credit; of selling in big or little bits; or having one land office or several. Hamilton's plan to sell the land to pay the public debt was adopted in 1790, but it never worked, as Jefferson had warned.

A hundred years ago our country had 31 million people and a billion acres of public land. Now we have about six times as many people but less than half as much public land. The ratio of public land to people is decreasing. We have left behind forever the era when new States could be created through settlement of new land.

Our laws, despite all the years that have passed, still don't reflect these changed circumstances.

All through our history, the country as a whole has seldom faced up to the need for broad policies of managing our lands and their resources. Even more seldom has the country taken action on it.

The conflict between Jefferson and Hamilton went the wrong way, but temporarily. Passage of the Mining Law of 1872 was a more limited policy determination, but still highly significant. The reservation of Yellowstone as a pleasuring place for the people was the forerunner of our National Park System, and a decision to set aside for present and future generations some of our irreplaceable natural wonders and historic sites.

After a great Secretary of the Interior, Carl Schurz, hollered for years about the vast waste of national timber, the country at long last woke up and in 1891 launched the effort to preserve what are now our national forests. Schurz, by the way, also had to talk the Congress into giving him enough money to pay the salary of Yellowstone's first superintendent.

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 was a milestone. The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 was a broad-gaged approach to the conservation of a wide segment of the public lands.

Everyone agrees that our public land laws are outdated. They are a hodgepodge, often ill-designed to accomplish their stated purpose when they were enacted, and many positively archaic in today's era of urbanization of much of the West.

There are still outstanding scrip rights, vestiges of legislation for military bounty. Ten million acres of land were transferred from public to private ownership under the Timber Culture Act, which gave settlers a quarter-section of land in the lush Prairie States if they would plant 40 acres of trees. No forests whatever remain as monuments to this act, and the land commissioner said he didn't believe that one timber culture filing in a hundred was made in good faith.

And the Timber Culture Act was by no means the only big umbrella under which thousands of opportunists took shelter. I need hardly remind you that some contend that upwards of two-thirds of all mining claims are filed for some purpose not connected with mining.

In the same manner, desert land entries and homesteads and the related agricultural land laws were subjected to abuses in their early years. But they accomplish much social good.

The United States discovered, some say it was very late, that agricultural entry laws were used to perpetrate vast frauds in the alienation of valuable coal and oil lands. Those frauds, and the national awakening early in this century to the need for conserving certain mineral resources for the people as a whole, caused the authorization in 1910 of the withdrawal of the mineral entry privilege.

Successively, lands with phosphate, potash and certain other minerals were added to coal and oil lands as not being subject to the basic principle of the mining act of 1872, which held that the public domain shall be free and open to exploration and occupation for mining. Of course, Congress subsequently passed legislation which permitted the leasing of lands containing these minerals.

A couple of Congresses ago your industry won "modernizing" legislation which allowed you to count geophysical and geochemical expenditures, of a sort undreamed of in 1872, as "work" in compliance with the requirement of a hundred dollars a year annual assessment work to keep a claim alive.

Legislation which restricted the use of mining claims for nonmining purposes called attention of a lot of people to the mining law itself, and the outcries which accompany the administration of that act, particularly on forest lands, are loud and potent.

Even the 1872 Mining Law isn't invested with the permanence of the laws of the Medes and the Persians. I am not suggesting drastic changes in the mining laws, and I don't think the Department of the Interior is. But the Department is a mansion of many rooms. A lose confederation of Bureaus, I've called it.

I am responsible for the proper functioning of the National Park Service as well as the Bureau of Land Management. Since I do have responsibility in both of these areas, I hope you will let me make a few mild observations on some of the pressures I feel, and which the Administration feels, which may have at least some tangential relevance. "Pressure," here, is not a dirty word.

It's no news to you that the American people are demanding, and are going to get, national attention to urban sprawl, polluted rivers and lakes, a vanishing shoreline, overcrowded parks, disappearing open space, and exploitation of the few remaining portions of this country's wilderness.

The dwindling opportunities for an outdoor experience are cause for national concern. Early Americans tested themselves against the outdoors, and they were better people for it, just as we are better people because of what they willed us. The outdoor experience, or the experiencing of wilderness, has a profound influence upon our national character.

Thus, unyielding opposition to a wilderness bill on the ground that it is an infringement upon a precious right of old prospectors to ply their romantic trade, or as a "lock up" of mineral resources, is, in my view, short-sighted and of debatable wisdom.

Today Congress is filled with representatives of people who are voters in States once empty of people, and these voters cannot find a place to camp for a weekend within a day's drive of their home. These people love their national parks, and they want more of them; they yearn for an undisturbed shoreline where they can look at waves of water and not waves of other people. They yearn for a wilderness, and they take comfort in the existence of these places, even if they never get there.

As our cities grow more and more crowded there is going to be less and less persuasiveness in the argument that we found the last word in mining needs in 1872, or in our park system with the establishment of Grand Teton in 1929.

But I am not saying that your opposition to the wilderness bill, or any other legislation, ought to be quelled or even muted, if you feel it is against your interest or your view of the national interest. I do think, however, you ought to be giving more thought to how your own interests and these other interests can be accommodated, honestly and fairly. We had to secure such accommodations in the handling of some of the nonmetalliferous minerals.

Lest you receive the impression that I think the Interior Department ought to be a final arbiter in these policy matters, let me hasten to come to the point I set out to make in the beginning. That is that you can't have a revision of the public land laws simply through the mechanical effort of legislative draftsmanship. Before intelligible and workable laws can be written in the public land area, we will have to sit down and work out policy decisions.

These policy decisions are made by the Congress, which is as it always has been, and should and will continue to be.

The problems relating to land use and management stem from the conflict resulting, on the one hand, from the desire to use land reserves for immediate economic gain, and on the other hand, from the continuing need for conservation management.

These differences are reconciled by intelligent multiple use. But let me stop right here and stress that multiple use is not truly a descriptive word, in my lexicon. I learned in high school physics that two different bodies couldn't occupy the same place at the same time. The use that will prevail on any given land in the event of a conflict is the primary use; all other uses are auxiliary to some degree, and no amount of semantic doubletalk will change this fact. You simply cannot put a mule, a miner, and a picknicker on the same square foot of ground at the same time—unless it's a case of a mule-headed miner on a picnic.

Certain general principles have, it seems to me, come now to be accepted by the general public, regardless of whether the principles are expressed in written law.

For example, I think no one today thinks that ultimate disposal of the public domain should be a sound objective in our management plans. On the other hand, vacant and unreserved public domain lands ought still to remain open for selective, I repeat selective, entry and appropriation. And there are other Federal lands that ought to be disposed of to non-Federal public agencies and to private owners.

We have taken some steps, within the existing statutory authority which amount to policy changes. For example, public land is being made available to States and municipalities at reduced prices for public recreational usage for all the people.

We are paying close attention to the application of user charges for public lands and resources. This is a field in which President Kennedy is especially interested. He noted in his special message to Congress on natural resources that at some Federal sites fees and user charges have been imposed wholly inconsistent with each other, with value received and with public policy. Our goal is to bring user fees and charges much more in line with values received. Value, of course,

cannot always be expressed in dollars and cents.

As matters now stand, the crazyquilt patchwork of public land laws, altered and mended and embroidered to meet the exigencies of the moment, does not add up to a national land policy and program.

To look at the problem as one of repairing a broken piece of machinery isn't enough. You have to decide also what you want the machine to do, and which way you want it to go.

You can't confine your association's attention to improvements of the Mining Act of 1872, or the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. You have a stake also in the reform of outmoded agricultural entry laws; in improved land use programs; in better cooperation with State and private owners; in land classification. You have a stake, too, in recreation. To oppose a Wilderness Bill, or the creation of a national park or monument as inimical to mining may save you, temporarily, the privilege of doing more prospecting—at the expense, perhaps, of another straw of ill-will to the principle of the 1872 act and your profession generally.

So we are all involved in the reexamination of our land policies. Let's try to see the issue as broadly as we can, as generously to the interests of others, as consistently with standards of fairness and equity. Let's not shrink from the hard questions, or try to conceal our indecisiveness in fine language or meaningless terminology.

We won't come up with a truly national land policy, because we never have. But we can do better.

I ask your help in the effort.

Lowell Sun Industrial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last year, the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, inaugurated a unique and valuable forum to explore industrial opportunities and, hopefully, help solve industrial problems in Northern Middlesex County. Last week, the second annual industrial dinner was held, once again in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Congress. I was among those privileged to hear an outstanding address by our distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges. In order that I may share his remarks with my colleagues, I, under unanimous consent, include Secretary Hodges' speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SUMMARY OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES TO SECOND ANNUAL INDUSTRIAL DINNER, LOWELL SUN PUBLISHING CO., VESPER COUNTRY CLUB, TYNGSBORO, MASS., SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

I appreciate, Mr. Connors, your invitation to come to Lowell, and I am delighted to join all of you at this annual Lowell Sun industrial dinner.

You know, about 100 years ago one of Lowell's most famous sons—James McNeill Whistler—came down to Washington and went to work for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which is now part of the Department of Commerce. Whistler didn't stay too long—the truth is he got fired in 3 months—but I thought I might lend a footnote to local history by telling you his career was not without impact.

For one thing, Whistler had a habit of embellishing his coastal charts—sketching in sea serpents, mermaids, smiling whales. This had two effects: 1) it enfuriated his scientific superiors; 2) it gave us some of the first Whistler etchings, which Coast and Geodetic cherishes to this day.

Less enduring, but of even greater imprint at the time, were the drawings Whistler did on the hallway walls. These were mostly caricatures of his bosses, which he would change to suit his mood or his current opinions about them. I gather none of the bosses insisted on the preservation of this work.

Finally, Whistler made his presence felt—and I think few have ever matched him here—by his conspicuous absence. Not only did he arrive late for work, he ducked out as soon and as often as he could. He used to keep a second hat on his coat tree in the hope that his boss would think him somewhere in the building when he was, in fact, down the block, relaxing in a saloon.

Whistler so often appeared for work at noon or later that, at one point, the Coast Survey assigned another draftsman to get him in on time. It gave up the scheme, though, when both men arrived in the middle of the day.

Years after he left, Whistler got around to diagnosing his problems at the Survey. The trouble, he said, "was not I arrived too late in the morning, but that the office opened too early."

I spent 30 years in the textile industry—all my adult business life—so I know a fair amount about Lowell. I can remember when it was called "the Spindle City," and was the greatest cotton manufacturing center in the United States. I can remember, too, back in the 1920's, when the mills began to leave, shifting southward in a migration that was to last through three decades; that was to affect woolens, worsteds, as well as cotton; and that was to change forever the economic base of this area and, indeed, much of New England.

A generation is, perhaps, too short a time for any community or region to recover fully from having its legs knocked from under it. Yet Lowell has rallied strongly, and, with more help, it might have turned the trick completely.

It has sought and won new industries and has diversified its economic structure. True, textiles are still the area's largest single manufacturing employer. But they now account for only about 12 percent of all nonfarm jobs, compared with 29 percent in 1950, and nearly all nonfarm jobs, except for service operations, 40 years ago.

Most manufacturing jobs today are in new industries—electronics, footwear, ordnance, food processing, printing, apparel. And there are more jobs than there were a decade ago. Despite the loss of 7,600 textile jobs since 1950, total nonfarm employment in the Lowell area has increased slightly in the last 11 years. Only unemployment remains implacable; since 1954 it has ranged from about 7 to 11 percent of the labor force and has not once dropped to a tolerable level.

William Knudsen used to say that "when a woman is naked, she learns to spin." But I think there is more than force of necessity to Lowell's comeback, for otherwise all mill communities would have done as well.

Here, obviously, there has been special effort, an added measure of energy, cooperation, and intelligent planning that has made a difference. Long ago you set up a Development and Industrial Commission and backed it with funds to promote industrial employment and the construction of new plants. Some of your businessmen cooperated by forming the private, nonprofit New Industrial Plants Foundation, which built and sold three new plants with funds partly subscribed by individuals. All told, through cooperative action, you helped bring more than 50 new companies into the area, creating about 8,000 diversified new jobs to help fill the gap left by the textile industry.

I know what this effort has taken—in time, energy, and money. I know the sacrifices that have been made and I applaud you for them. By your work, you have strengthened Lowell's economy, and, just as important, the Nation's too. I think we often overlook this point—that local industrial development does contribute to the Nation's health, that the whole is made up of parts, and the whole can be no greater than the sum of those parts.

In the 8 months it has been in office, the Kennedy administration has attacked the problem of unemployment on two fronts: first, it has sought broadly to increase jobs by stimulating economic recovery and laying the basis for long-term growth; second, it has taken special steps to combat pockets of unemployment which have persisted through recession and recovery alike.

I don't mind telling you that most of us have been surprised by the vigor of the economic expansion these past few months.

Last winter, you may recall, most people figure there would be some sort of business recovery this year. But the general feeling was that the climb would be gradual and slow—saucerlike, the phrase went. Instead, we have had a sharp upturn in economic activity, a comeback that has been more V-shaped than a sensible saucer would dare to be.

What has happened shows most dramatically in the gross national product, which is the most comprehensive measure of the country's economic state. Between the first and second quarters of 1961, GNP rose nearly 3 percent, from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $501 billion to $516 billion. This $15 billion gain was bigger than any of the increases in the initial quarter of the three previous recoveries. What is more, it carried GNP to a new record, topping the 1960 high by almost $9 billion in current dollars, and shading it even after correction for price changes.

Other figures—you can pretty much take your pick—confirm this recovery as probably the strongest since the war. The outlook now is that the economy will be running at an annual rate of $540 billion gross national product by the end of the year, and at such a level, we should eat sizably into unemployment. In fact, I think we can hope for a national rate of 5½ to 6 percent by year's end, compared with the near 7 percent we have been registering. This will still leave a way to go—even to our temporary target of 4 percent—but we will be moving in the right direction.

The surprising strength of this current recovery is largely the result of three forces: (1) A halt in inventory liquidation, which has brought production requirements more into line with consumption; (2) a rise in consumer durable purchases, particularly of autos, from the low first quarter rates; and (3) increased Government purchases of goods and services.

In addition, the Kennedy administration has stepped up the release of already authorized spending for highways and other construction, extended unemployment compensation, increased the distribution of surplus food, and speeded the payment of tax refunds and dividends on Veterans' Administration insurance. These steps were designed specifically to combat the recession, to ease the misery of unemployment and stimulate demand for consumer goods, inventories, and capital items by adding to the incomes of individuals and business firms. Their impact was felt in Lowell, just as it was in all parts of the country.

To deal with specific pockets of unemployment—areas where the rate of joblessness

has been high and long-standing as in Lowell, the President proposed both area redevelopment legislation and a manpower retraining program. Congress in May passed the Redevelopment Act, and it is now being administered by the Department of Commerce through the new Area Redevelopment Administration. The manpower development and training program, which would provide $655 million over 4 years to train unemployed workers in new skills, is still awaiting final congressional action.

I understand that, just in the past few weeks, Lowell secured State approval of an overall economic development plan, which is the first step in qualifying for aid under the redevelopment program. I want to assure you now that this plan will get our prompt and careful consideration in the Department of Commerce.

The area redevelopment program, I believe, is the most significant step ever taken by the Federal Government to deal with the problem of structural unemployment—the displacement of workers that stems from technological change, industrial migration, and basic shifts in the relative importance of industries in our economy. It will be a valuable endeavor, not only for its stimulation of specific areas, but for its test of our ability to make adjustments to changing technology and shifts in marketing patterns. This sort of program has already been carried out successfully in several European countries.

To date, 663 areas—comprising all or part of 864 counties—have been designated as "redevelopment areas." Economic development plans of 25 of these areas have been submitted and approved by ARA. In addition, one community—Gassville, Ark.—has already had final approval of loans and grants totaling $160,000 to finance part of a new water system needed to help bring a new business into the area. Others will be announced shortly.

As you may know, Congress made available $300 million in loans to redevelopment areas over a 4-year period. The money is to be used to expand existing businesses, start up new plants and commercial operations, and install public facilities needed for these growth projects. In addition, the program provides grant money for public facilities and funds for the retraining of workers, subsistence payments, and technical assistance to communities.

What I want to stress here is that this program is by no means a handout. Its basic reliance is on local initiative, local enterprise, local investment. To be eligible for aid, communities themselves must prepare their overall economic development program, a step-by-step proposal of how they plan to restore permanent job opportunities. The plan must be approved by State authorities.

When it comes to loans to help industries get started or expand, communities must participate, too. Of the Federal funds, $200 million must be loaned only on a participating basis, with ARA contributing no more than 65 percent of the total cost of the projects. In actual practice, ARA's share will be considerably less than 65 percent.

In short, the redevelopment program is designed specifically to help communities, such as Lowell, that prove willing to help themselves. Further, and this is equally important, it is a program to create new employment opportunities. It does not seek to solve the problem of unemployment in one area merely by shuffling industry—and thus creating different pockets of economic misery. It is an attempt to generate added jobs, over and above those existing in the economy today.

In its new role as the "City of Diversified Industries," Lowell, I think, has great opportunities—not just to reduce employment, not just to get back on center, but to grow and absorb right here the thousands of new people who will be coming into your labor force in the next decade.

Right in your front yard, along Route 128, you have had a spectacular example of growth. In a speech in Kansas City a few weeks ago, I pointed out that much of the boom along 128 stemmed from science-oriented industry which has been drawn to the area partly because a strong science community existed in this corner of New England. I emphasized that research and development are, and will be, increasingly powerful forces in industrial development, both in terms of research laboratories and new plants. In fact, sometime during the sixties, we can expect that most capital expenditures will be by new product industries.

With your improved highways, such as Roue 3 and Interstate Route 495, you should, in the future, share more fully in this science-oriented growth. Meanwhile, to the extent we are able to improve the demand for American goods by offering new products, better products, cheaper products both here and abroad, your existing industries should expand. And this includes textiles, which this adminstration has pledged to help under a seven-point program.

Now in these closing minutes let me say just a few things from my own experience in industrial development.

I think that never before has management been so interested in the health and welfare of its employees and in the human aspects of industrial location as it is today. Few businesses, indeed, will settle in a new community unless it has good schools, good recreational facilities, pleasant homes, and, in addition, is a good place to do busness.

Edward M. Clark, president of Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., has said that "it doesn't do much good to have good working conditions within your plant if you don't have good conditions in which your employees exist at other hours."

This is the first thing I learned—that to attract industry communities must have and enforce good planning, provide adequate public facilities, maintain a clean city, physically as well as morally. And the second thing I found is that they must provide a good business climate.

What is a good business climate? One large company defines it to include honest and efficient government, fair taxes, a sound working relationship between employers and employees, wage rates which are fair to workers and which, at the same time allow manufacturers to compete efficiently, and community progressiveness—in short, most of the things we think of when we say this place or that is "a good town."

Finally, let me stress that there is no magic formula for building a community, a State, or a nation. It's mostly hard work, mixed with some planning, a healthy attitude, and cooperation on the part of all the people—government leaders, businessmen, labor leaders and workers, professionals, the whole rank and file of the community.

The top men must be sincerely interested, must be active, must participate—this means your mayor, your Senators and Representatives, your Governor, your State legislators, city councilmen, county leaders, your social organizations—in fact all your groups.

And you must never forget attitudes and hospitality, nor stop believing in your product, which is your city and State.

Above all you must be proud, proud and confident of Lowell, of your county and State, of this great America of ours.

Thank you for letting me be with you.

Competition in Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American people—if we are to meet the challenge of our system posed by communism—must better understand the workings of our system. In the contest with the Reds, we will depend largely—if war can be averted—upon a strong, creative, forward-striding economic system. Why? Simply because this system must provide the materials—in effect the wherewithal—to support progress in almost all fields.

For this reason, I consider it useful to bring to the attention of the Senate chapter 3 of a series of articles by Harold Fleming, entitled, "The American Achievement." Reflecting upon the basic principles of our competitive economy, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPETITION

FREE MARKETS

The business of America depends on free and open markets. The Nation's economic life could not go on without them, except with tremendous waste and delay.

There are hundreds of these markets, big and little. Some of the best known and largest ones, like the New York Stock Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade, handle a huge volume of bids and offers that come in constantly by telephone and telegraph. They operate like continuous auctions, and, in fact, many such large markets are called auction markets.

But there are hundreds of smaller and slower markets. Some are called over-the-counter markets. Some are merely telephone markets. Some are quoted markets. There are local markets as well as national markets. There are specialized markets for scores of such commodities as 92-octane gasoline, cadmium, platinum, and polyethylene. Open most trade magazines, and you will find they carry a special page on "The Current Markets."

Only three things are required to make a market. One is that buyers and sellers have contact. They needn't be present in person in a marketplace, but they must have some means of knowing the course of prices, even if it is only by telegraph or in a trade paper. A second is that the market is open to any would-be buyer or seller. The third, and most important, is that prices are free to move up and down without restraint. If prices are controlled, the market is destroyed and buyers and sellers then turn to a black market.

Market prices constantly adjust supply to demand. If there is too much supply, buyers back away until the price drops. If it drops too low, buyers come in again, but suppliers drop out. This keeps the goods moving from where they can be most cheaply produced, to where they are most wanted. Free prices work as a valve, or governor, on production and consumption.

In contrast, when prices are controlled, supply and demand promptly get out of adjustment. We have had plenty of examples of this in recent years. During the war, the price of such things as sugar was held down by Government control. The result was to discourage and slow down supply, but to increase demand. This led to a shortage, which led to rationing.

On the other hand many farm prices have been held up in recent years by Government action. The result has been to stimulate production, but to discourage consumption. This has led to billions of dollars' worth of surpluses, which eat up storage charges and finally have to be given away or "dumped" abroad, at prices even lower than they might have brought in a free market.

FREE COMPETITION

Free markets imply free competition. The two are really one and the same thing. Competition must be unobstructed by attempts at monopoly, conspiracy, or restraint of trade, with or without Government blessing.

The Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 prohibited conspiracies to restrain trade, and monopolies—or "attempts to monopolize."

Many people assume that it is vigilant enforcement of this act that makes American business competitive. But this is so only in the same way that policemen keep us honest.

Free competition is one of the heritages of the American economy. It was one of the goals of the Founding Fathers. Monopolies and trade restraints, imposed on the American colonists, were one of the principal causes of the Revolution.

And Americans have always had more faith in open "hard" competition than Europeans. This is still so today.

HORSE-AND-BUGGY COMPETITION

Competition has been increasing in this country for 150 years. It has increased particularly with every advance in communication and transportation. Each of these has widened the markets to include more and more sellers as well as more and more buyers.

At first, competition was slow. Markets were local. In frontier communities, monopoly of a sort was inevitable. There was only one cobbler, one blacksmith and one general store, just as in some towns today there is only one movie and one weekly newspaper. Goods didn't move far. Perhaps the first important competition was that of the early traveling peddlers, cobblers and tinsmiths.

It was turnpikes, canals, steamboats, and railroads that first widened markets and spread competition. The new manufacturing companies began to send around "drummers" who traveled by rail from city to city and "beat the drum" for their employers' goods. Then came the mail-order houses and the department stores.

AMERICAN BUSINESS TRIES MONOPOLY

From 1860 to 1900, mills and factories were springing up all over the northeastern United States. The leading growth industry was steel, using the new Bessemer process. But scores of other industries were growing rapidly out of the handicraft stage, through invention and machinery, into a heavily competitive stage. One of these was canmaking.

As the competition in these industries got tougher and rougher, it often threatened to wipe out profits altogether. Even railroads sometimes cut tariffs competitively to the point of bankruptcy. Members of many industries tried to put a stop to this strenuous price competition. They used various devices. The most popular was to set up a "trust," controlled by a small board of directors, into which competitors would put the controlling stocks of their own companies.

To cope with this, Congress passed the Sherman Act in 1890. But there was little machinery for enforcement, and in 1897 the Supreme Court made the now strange-sounding decision that a monopoly in production was not necessarily a monopoly in sale and distribution. This seemed to give a green light to another anticompetitive device—the putting together of competitors into a single company. But 1901 scores of such combinations were put together, with names such as National Biscuit Co., International Lead, United Shoe Machinery, United States Steel, and American Can. These companies combined from 60 to 90 percent of the manufacturing capacity in their respective industries. The American Can Co., for instance, had 90 percent—and many of the canmaking firms who sold out to it promised not to go back into the business for 15 years.

When the historic smoke had cleared, it showed few successes among the expensive attempts at monopoly. Within 20 years it was obvious that competition could not be so abruptly choked down. Some of these companies kept on trying to restrain trade, and were broken up by the courts. Of the others, many failed financially. The rest, including American Can, survived to rank among the Nation's most successful corporations. But they did so only by efficiency and first-class management, and by trying to keep ahead of the competition, not to restrain it. The supposed benefits of monopoly proved a mirage. Even the successful survivors rapidly lost ground to competitors, and ended up with 25 to 40 percent of the business, instead of 70 to 90 percent.

COMPETITION IN NEW DIMENSIONS

In the last 25 years, competition in American industry has intensified far beyond anything known in the 19th century. There have been several causes for this.

1. Competition between industries. Years ago, competition was still largely inside particular industries. Cotton mills competed with cotton mills, steel mills with steel mills, and can manufacturers among themselves.

But in this century, the progress of the industrial arts has swept like a rising tide over these industry compartments. Cotton competes with synthetic fibers. Oil and natural gas compete with coal. Steel competes with aluminum, copper, plastics, and cement. You can have your house built of wood, metal, composition, plastics, or prestressed concrete. No manufacturer knows where the competition may come from next.

Even legal monopolies have lost ground to this interindustry competition. The telegraph has lost to the telephone and the airmail, the streetcar to the bus and the private car; and the railroad to the highway truck and the commercial airline.

2. Research and development: The inventions of the 19th century came out of woodsheds and workshops. In 1928 American industry spent only $100 million on research and development. By 1945 it was spending 9 times as much, and by 1959, 45 times as much. Research and development is a fighting competitive weapon that may be used both defensively and offensively. As defense, it protects a company from technological surprise. As offense, it may lead a company into entirely new territory. For it follows no conventional industry lines. Thus Canco's research and development may easily get into some other industry's field. And somebody else's research and development may get into American Can Co.'s field.

Also, manufacturing methods have improved to where it is sometimes said that "anybody can make anything." During World War II Canco made torpedoes and gyroscopes. Today it could doubtless make textiles, missiles, or motors. But by the same token, there is no telling what firms might in 10 years learn to make cans. There are no longer any sheltered industries. It is no longer of important advantage to be a big fish in a small pond.

3. Discretionary income: Fifty years ago, most families had to scrape to house, clothe, and feed themselves. They had little discretion in their budgets, and most manufacturing competition was in supplying these families with the necessities of life. But today's working families can afford a wide range of purchases beyond the bare necessities. So manufacturers of such varied things as garbage disposal units, hi-fi and stereo, camping equipment, outboard motors, and do-it-yourself kits, are all in competition for these discretionary dollars. They are also in competition with the savings bank.

4. Nonprice competition: As the American standard of living has risen, American business has turned more and more to providing something over and above standard goods at the lowest possible prices. To straight price competition it has added competition in quality, service, reliability, diversity of product, packaging, and so on. This adds a further dimension to competition.

GOVERNMENT RESTRAINTS OF TRADE

The American free economy started as a revolt agains monopolies and other restraints on competition. And through the decades the competition has naturally become more keen.

But history shows that monopolies and restraints of trade have a strong appeal. They are the framework of most economic systems outside ours. They are turned to, particularly, when the competition gets severe.

I have related how American business tried to restrain its own competition around the turn of the century—and how the attempt wasn't successful. In the 1930's Americans again turned toward restraints on competition. This time it was with the support of Government, and it was more permanent in its effects.

In the beginning, it was partly the doing of business itself. As the great depression deepened in 1931, business groups appealed to President Hoover for some officially protected system of holding prices. He refused. But in 1933 this idea became the germ of the National Recovery Act. NRA exempted business groups from the Sherman Antitrust Act if they would sign code agreements with the Government on minimum prices and wages.

NRA was thrown out by the Supreme Court in 1935, and by that time was breaking down anyway, as individualist businessmen refused to toe the price lines. But the spirit of controls was in the air. During the long hard times of the 1930's, Congress extended the force of Government to many programs to protect various groups in the country from the force of free competition.

These programs worked precisely contrary to the spirit of the Sherman Antitrust Act. What the antitrust laws made it illegal to do, these laws made it illegal not to do.

Today two major results are clear. One is that one such restraint of trade leads politically to another. When one group has protection, another wants it. And so, just as without Government protection, restraints of trade eventually defeat themselves, so with Government protection, they multiply.

The other obvious result is that such Government-enforced programs to hold up prices, continually raise as many problems as they seem to solve. The Government spends billions, with one hand to buy up useless production, and with the other to pay producers not to produce.

In brief, a nation that turns to using its government to protect certain groups from the hardships of competition, is like an alcoholic, for whom "one drink is too much, and a thousand drinks are not enough." The process is a one-way street. Such protection

creates vested interests against the rest of the community. If everybody were protected, adventure and competition would end. So would progress.

New Frontier Is Caving in Economy of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article by Henry J. Taylor which appeared in the Columbus Citizen-Journal for the attention of the Members:

NEW FRONTIER IS CAVING IN ECONOMY OF UNITED STATES

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The New Frontier is by any reasonable definition a labor-socialist government, and it is teaching us in three easy lessons how to cave in the economy of the United States.

Lesson 1: Irresponsible spending that whirls inflation through the whole structure like a centrifugal pump. It is downright silly to debate the ultimate results in the face of the long-term Soviet threat to us and no amount of economic doubletalk can spare us from these unless the reckless folly is checked.

Only a healthy America can be a helping America. And if such a performance is healthy, so is potassium cyanide. The New Frontiersmen are simply racing toward a known finale of alibis and excuses on a par with that of the man who said he did not know the gun was loaded.

Lesson 2: Veiled or open attacks on the profit needs of industry and the fundamental workings of the entire free enterprise system. This is a lesson in how to cure heart trouble by extracting the patient's heart and throwing it away.

In President Kennedy's recent 12-page letter telling the steel industry his idea about prices, the risk for, and trend of, profits is brushed off like a pigmy at a pole vault. This vital factor in industrial life, and therefore in employment, is twisted to fit the welfare-state fantasy that higher wages always can be paid from "profits," as if profits are guaranteed and automatic. That this cannot be done is certain because it is impossible. The President shows no thought of enterprise as a job-giving factor. The enterprisers' reward is ignored. For whose good? In simple truth, this is the voice of Walter Reuther and the other Fabian Socialists who dominate the New Frontier.

Yet, the Government takes in taxes more than half the profit of all corporations, and spends it. Who is to pay the New Frontiersmen's bills when they apply to business the old frontiersmen's idea that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian."

If our free competitive enterprise is weakened, our most effective weapon in the cold war is sabotaged, our biggest advantage lost, and the whole balance of world power is tilted to the side of the Communists.

In our economy the Government can only create the surrounding conditions. The people must create the wealth. Therefore, our Government must not only at times lend its powerful support to our economic system but must be equally sure that it does not crush those individual and corporate efforts that are the only source of wealth and security.

That it is easy to be generous with another's goods was a proverb even in the days of Rome. And the political chant of "soak the rich" as a lure for votes, designed to gain love among the uninformed, is as old as the invention of the soapbox itself. But there is only one real question in today's time of terrible peril: Is this the way to keep America prosperous and strong?

Lesson 3: A "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" alliance with the Nation's trade unions, which unbalances the economy and helps price products out of the market both here and abroad. Again, the roots of this are political. They are bedded in the 18 or 20 industrial areas where the union leaders' political strength put the New Frontiersmen in power and is needed again to win the next election. This represents an exchange of commitments and results in class legislation and a flagrant favoring of the organized element. It is, in fact, a coalition between the unions and the New Frontier fully as binding as in Britain under the labor-socialist government, even though all particulars are not identical.

This alliance and exchange of rewards from it is accepted by the New Frontiersmen, from the President on down, as being in the nature of the administration, and they proceed accordingly. Yet, an administration which did not run for election as a labor party or a socialist party and is in office by less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the majority has no mandate whatever for such performance. And for our Government to be captive in this way is as unsound as it is immoral.

Who Represents You Overseas and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since Washington is a city of protocol, politics, and precedents, it is understandable that certain rules of representative behavior should prevail both at home and abroad.

In this connection, an editorial writer for the Omaha World-Herald, highly regarded Midwestern newspaper, has undertaken some independent research or has engaged in some subjective reflection. In all events, whatever his procedure for arriving at his conclusions, he has come up with an interesting observation concerning the protocol now being followed by the Kennedy administration in determining who should represent the interests of the United States in the various foreign conferences and meetings which appear to be occurring with increasing regularity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial appraisal under the heading of "Why They Really Take Those Trips."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THEY REALLY TAKE THOSE TRIPS

We mean to check with Morrie Ryskind on the accuracy of our observation, but the way diplomacy is practiced in the Kennedy administration seems to go something like this:

If the matter is important, the President flies to the scene.

If it is less important but he wants to pretend it is big stuff, he sends LYNDON JOHNSON.

If it involves the simple chore of giving away billions, he sends Treasury Secretary Dillon.

If the matter doesn't amount to much, he sends Dean Rusk.

If he just wants to get somebody out of the country so we all can have a breathing spell, he sends Chester Bowles or "Soapy" Williams.

UNESCO Renounced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, established by an act of Congress, supposedly acts in an advisory capacity to the U.S. delegations to the General Conference of UNESCO and to the U.S. Government in matters relating to UNESCO.

However, the views expressed by one member of the Commission, in submitting his resignation, cast serious doubt as to whether few members are, in fact, ever called upon to give their advice.

In a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, dated September 6, 1961, Mr. John M. Larson, of Washington, D.C., explains in detail his reasons for resigning from his appointment to membership on the Commission. Also, he offers some rather revealing observations about UNESCO itself.

I believe the views expressed by Mr. Larson should be made public, and I include his letter to Secretary Rusk as part of my remarks. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 6, 1961.*

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 2, 1959, I was, upon the recommendation of the executive board of the Association of International Relations Clubs, appointed to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). I was to fill the unexpired term of my predecessor and like him I was informally to represent the Association of International Relations Clubs, one of the sixty voluntary organizations which have been invited to accept membership on the Commission.

In good faith I accepted the appointment because I felt that the position would afford opportunity for constructive participation in meetings and activities of the Commission, its committees and its regional and/or national conferences. I also thought that it would provide experience through association and close working relationships with members of the Commission and the UNESCO Relations Staff of the Department of State. I had hoped that through frequent and active service I might give assistance and possibly contribute something of genuine value to deliberations of the Commission and one or more of its committees.

I have been a member of the Commission for approximately 2 years and I can state my general impression in these few words—increasing disappointment and discouragement at the disparity between words and deeds. This disparity is noticeable in the use which the UNESCO Relations Staff makes of the Commission member (not vice versa) and in UNESCO literature which contains information and claims regarding the functions, programs, projects, and activities of UNESCO.

The constitution of UNESCO adopted in London on November 16, 1945, makes provision in article III for the following organs of this international organization: General Conference, Executive Board, Secretariat. In article VII it also provides for "national cooperating bodies" or "national commissions" to be established within member states. These organizations were to be composed of persons from the national and local governments and from principal institutions within member states, which governments and institutions were to be invited to work closely with UNESCO on educational, scientific and cultural matters relating to the "establishment of peace in the minds of men."

Public Law 565, the enabling act which gave life to the U.S. National Commission, makes provision for the U.S. representatives to the General Conference of UNESCO in Paris, for funds for the National Commission and its composition and functions, and for the cash contributions to be made annually by the United States. The law is complex but its essence (in addition to the authorization for annual appropriations) lies in two brief statements: Section 1 which authorizes the President of the United States to accept membership for the United States in UNESCO; and the final sentence in section 3 which reads, "The Department of State is authorized to provide the necessary Secretariat for the Commission." This Secretariat is an office of the Department of State with the title "UNESCO Relations Staff."

While you are undoubtedly familiar with this legislation, I am summarizing portions of it in order to make the following point: While much effort is made to give each National Commission member "the feeling" that his participation is meaningful and effective, and indeed that he or someone who has been similarly appointed can eventually assist actively in deciding matters of policy, in reality the National Commission member is designedly as ineffective as possible. This impotent position can be realized when one studies the organizational and functional structures of UNESCO, the National Commission, and the UNESCO Relations Staff. Also, it can be felt that when one tries to participate and make constructive contributions.

Being a resident of Washington, D.C., and, therefore, only a short distance from the offices of the UNESCO Relations Staff and the conference rooms where many meetings, discussions, and conferences normally are conducted, I have been available for service at all times. Even though I made known such availability (volunteering to serve at any time), I was invited to no discussions or conferences and only on one occasion was I invited to attend a meeting. I was anxious and eager to attend and participate in any meetings, discussions, and conferences—no matter what the subject; however, notices or invitations were not extended to me—a member of the Commission. Quite often I read or heard of such events only at a later date.

My experience and observations while in attendance at a meeting of the Technical Committee on Social Science, normally an annual meeting, were rather illuminating. The proceedings indicated unusually detailed preparations and the control and direction of the meeting rested in the hands of the UNESCO Relations Staff, with overbearing assistance and voice from persons not known to me to be members of the Commission. I gained the impression that a Commission member of the Committee was merely an observer who would be called upon to approve the measures presented to the Committee by strangers.

At this point I should like to quote the more pertinent portions of my letter, dated August 1, 1961, which I submitted to the Executive Director of the Association of International Relations Clubs, and in which I notified him that I could not in good faith remain as the representative on the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO:

"WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 1, 1961.

"Mr. IRWIN S. KERN,
Executive Director, Association of International Relations Clubs, New York, N.Y.

"DEAR IRWIN: I received the distinct impression that Commission members were 'to be seen and not heard;' that is, that is was their job to be at the beck and call of the Secretariat of the National Commission but not to try to do too much; that, in fact, the Secretariat had become master instead of servant of the National Commission. I say 'become' in spite of the evidence that from UNESCO's inception the Secretariat of the National Commission was designed to govern the National Commission. In this connection see Public Law 565, section 3 (last sentence), wherein it is stated that the Department of State will provide the necessary Secretariat for the National Commission. (Public Law 565 can be found in a pamphlet issued by the U.S. National Commission entitled 'Basic Documents.')

"I am not resigning merely because I am in disagreement with the Commission, for I also agree with you that one should not leave an organization because of disagreement but should try to stay and change things. This reaction was, in fact, my first one when a good many months ago I first became aware of those 'things' which have, after much study and thought, led to my resignation. My reasons for feeling that I cannot in good conscience remain a member of the National Commission have their roots in UNESCO's philosophical foundations and orientation, its structure and functions and the purposes of the various national commissions. When all is said and done, it becomes apparent to a member of the National Commission that UNESCO is structured from the top and designed to give one the appearance of effective participation and, therefore, no matter how sincerely one of the members of the Commission attempts to change things, his efforts are destined to failure because in reality the organization is so set up that Commission members, unless allowed by those in charge, are kept as ineffective as possible.

"Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. LARSON."

With respect to UNESCO literature, it has very little substance, and what little it does have appears overtly or covertly to be slanted away from the spiritual and political beliefs and traditions of the United States of America toward the sterile conceptions of a nebulous one world government or federation which is to be built upon atheistic foundations. For instance, I received the distinct impression as I read much of it that international understanding was being equated with responsibility and loyalty to a world community conceived in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, a good number of the UNESCO publications which came into my possession appear to be prepared consciously so as to create confusion, diversion, and distraction in the minds of the readers. I found grave errors of omission and distortions of perspective with respect to historical trends and events and to the growth and development of certain ideas. For these reasons it is important to analyze what UNESCO does not present and proclaim, as well as what it does present and proclaim, in order to gain an understanding of what its aims are.

Activities and programs of UNESCO, the UNESCO relations staff and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO cause one to expend efforts and energy needlessly in support of an independent international agency which lacks in authority, power, and general relevancy to real problems, when such efforts and energy should be expended upon local, State, and National institutions and governments, all of which are far more reliable, better equipped, and responsible to the people.

I must confess that I was quite disturbed to learn that UNESCO literature was being disseminated by the U.S. Information Agency. I strongly oppose any such activity and urge that responsible officials of the Department of State take the steps necessary to preclude any such activity.

Peoples today are interested in achieving some sort of peaceful solution to the conflicts present in the world. The question is: On what foundation will the edifice of peace be built? UNESCO claims to supply this foundation but when its claims are investigated they are found to be empty as well as a convenient cover of propaganda for its real activities.

The foundations of UNESCO are atheistic and materialistic. For it, man is the highest product of nature rather than one created in the image and likeness of God. This view of God and man dictates UNESCO's methods and can be seen in them. Rather than being genuinely concerned with the intellectual and moral development of men through education, UNESCO makes cynical use of those whom it professes to be serving and helping; rather than assisting people to grow and accept responsibility, UNESCO preys upon those with whom it comes in contact and is more than glad to assume covertly or overtly all responsibility.

UNESCO is as synthetic creation—an independent international specialized agency, enjoying autonomy, responsibility only to itself and existing upon the cash contributions received from member states. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO purportedly responsible to the American people and guided by the efforts of citizens serving on it, is a Commission carefully instructed and led by UNESCO, the UNESCO relations staff, and a relatively small number of members of the Commission. It operates in such manner as to distract those members who wish to act upon the real issues at hand and to entice them into diffusing their energies into a vacuum.

There appears to be little prospect for a member to originate, present, and gain acceptance of his proposals; and, for a member to lend his support in hopes of so doing is to engage in self-deception. Since there is very little else for him to do except mechanically to accept and disseminate UNESCO's empty slogans, he can make more effective use of his time and talents elsewhere; for mechanical acceptance and dissemination of these slogans, no matter how appealing they might be, are worthless endeavors which do not relieve one of responsibilities and obligations to his community, State, Nation, and church.

Therefore, I am constrained to resign from my appointment to membership on the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, effective upon date of this statement of resignation dated September 6, 1961, and I do hereby request that your records do indicate resignation on such date.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. LARSON.

Significance of Labor to U.S. Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this month observances of Labor Day elicited new thought-provoking evaluations of the significant role of labor in our country's progress.

The event offered an opportunity also to create a greater understanding, appreciation of, and respect for the unique, indispensable role of workers—and of work itself—to the Nation's progress.

Fortunately, my home State of Wisconsin has benefited, not only from an ample, capable labor force, but also for the most part from realistic, responsible, hard-working, forward-looking leadership.

Recently the La Crosse Union Herald published a Labor Day message by officials of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO, including George A. Haberman, president; John W. Schmitt, vice president; and George W. Hall, secretary-treasurer. Reflecting upon problems and challenges confronting not only our workers, but all Americans, I ask unanimous consent to have the message printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE AFL–CIO—GEORGE A. HABERMAN, PRESIDENT; JOHN W. SCHMITT, VICE PRESIDENT; AND GEORGE W. HALL, SECRETARY-TREASURER

Once again on labor's great annual holiday, it is time to pause and take stock of ourselves, our achievements, our goals, and our challenges. The past year has not been a pleasant one for the average worker or his family. The recession which struck our economy with such force a year ago is far from over. Unemployment is still far too high as thousands of newcomers to the job markets compete with the thousands of older workers idled by no fault of their own.

Here in Wisconsin, we have been hard hit as our heavy machinery areas found themselves in the labor surplus area and these cold statistics were transformed into thousands of individual cases of hardship and suffering.

If we look closely at the reasons behind these mass layoffs, we can find cause for alarm and anxiety for the glaring fact emerging from this unhappy picture is that many of the jobs from which workers were laid off have simply vanished—disappeared, gone forever.

For many years the organized labor movement of this country has been sounding a grim warning that automation was becoming an even greater peril and that the entire economy would be honeycombed with weak spots as more and more wage earners found their source of income dried up.

The average American worker has not asked for too much—a decent income to provide a modest living for himself and his family—an opportunity to put in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

But now it appears as if even this opportunity has been taken from mounting thousands of this group. Not a day passes but we read of some new labor-saving device or automatic machine or complex robot whose inventor boasts will displace human workers.

Labor does not object to labor-saving devices as such. It does not oppose technological changes which if properly applied, can and should result in more leisure for the great bulk of our citizenry.

But labor does insist that the rights and dignity of the individual human being should be placed ahead of huge temporary profits to be made by a shortsighted industry through the use of automation without any thought to the welfare of the displaced worker.

The year 1961 has brought the problem of the displaced worker into the sharpest focus it has ever been as a result of the recession and the disappearing forever of many jobs. The year 1961 has shown that the warnings of labor about the effects of automation have gone unheeded by industry and Government.

Drastic action is imperative on two fronts and that action must begin at once.

First, workers laid off must be given adequate unemployment benefits for as long as they are genuinely in need. Second, a greatly accelerated training program must be put into effect to teach workers new skills or to adapt their old skills to related—and still existing—crafts. And, of course, labor's long-standing goals of shorter workdays and shorter workweeks must be employed at no loss of earnings.

There has been much talk and many vague promises about what must be done. The time for talk is over. The time for action is here.

On a broader front, labor today is deeply concerned with the bleak international situation and the growing storm clouds. As the largest single segment of our economy, workers have the biggest stake in the maintaining of international peace as well as a prosperous domestic front. The loyalty and the patriotism of the organized labor movement during previous wars has been as unquestioned as it has been complete and all out. Likewise, its support and backing for a strong fearless stand by our Government for what it believes right follows in its historical tradition. Labor is cognizant of its responsibilities and duties—both to its country and to its members—and it will continue to uphold those principles of freedom and democracy despite the threats and machinations of those who would destroy our way of life.

Labor has a tremendous challenge ahead of it as we point toward Labor Day of 1962. We must keep our economy strong and healthful and we must be ever alert for those dangers—apparent and hidden—which threaten not only our labor movement but our great country as well. We must continue our fight to protect our members, their jobs, their opportunities to share in those technological improvements which are increasing our Nation's wealth. We must fight to win new gains on the social front—adequate health care for our aged, better social security, higher minimum wage, more educational opportunities, and as stressed earlier unemployment pay and new training programs for our displaced workers.

And, in addition, we must work to keep America strong—strong against her enemies within and without—enemies who would foist their isms, their hatreds, and their despotism on us. We must guard against the extreme right, such as the John Birchers and against the extreme left, such as the Communists.

Yes, on this Labor Day, 1961, organized labor faces a great challenge—a challenge to be the leader in a greater, stronger, safer, and more prosperous America.

We are confident we are equal to that challenge.

Our Strength Still Depends Upon Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the big spenders and social planners look forward to the budget for the next fiscal year, it may be well to heed the warning in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal concerning the necessity of preserving a sound dollar as a basic feature of our economic strength:

THE SINEWS OF STRENGTH

On the eve of World War I the annual expenditures of the Federal Government amounted to less than a billion dollars, $735 million to be exact. That war lifted them to a peak of $18.5 billion, which is to say they were multiplied almost 25 times.

On the eve of World War II the Government's annual expenditures amounted to $9 billion. That war multiplied them more than tenfold, to a peak of $98 billion.

What would happen to the Government's budget in the event of a modern war is anybody's guess. But merely a tenfold increase of the present budget would mean an annual cost of $877 billion, and in a war against so formidable a foe as Soviet Russia even this astronomical figure might be beggared by the event.

Indeed, it is plainly evident that without an actual war the necessary buildup of our defenses will continue to add unmeasured billions to the Government's cost. Some $6 billion have been added this year alone, with more already in sight for next year.

These figures are not noted just to raise a specter of higher taxes or of more inflation, although it should be evident to anyone that we face the prospect of one or the other, or both. Nor will there be any objection in these columns to spending what we must to safeguard the country. That is the Nation's first priority.

But the figures from our past two great wars are a reminder that one of the sinews of war is the reserve a nation has to meet the demands that a great war thrusts upon it.

Neither in 1916 nor in 1941 did the United States gird itself without strain. We had to multiply our taxes and, even so, see the dollar erode as the Government found itself unable to meet the whole cost out of taxes and was forced therefore to resort to inflation. The country was, however, able to multiply its taxes because its taxes were low. It was able to absorb large quantities of inflation because the dollar, on the eve of each of these wars, was both stable and sound.

How much, today, can we multiply taxes? Our very lowest rates take some 20 percent of the poorest man's labor. The taxes on the richest man cannot be increased very much when the rate is already 91 percent.

How much new strain, today, can the U.S. dollar absorb when the Government finds itself unable, even with confiscatory rates, to raise the sums it will need to raise for any kind of modern war? At home we tread such a narrow line that a few cents-an-hour increase in the pay of auto or steel workers raises fears of a wage-price spiral. Abroad, the dollar is in such low estate that the shift of a few millions in our gold reserves sends nervous chills all over the world.

This is the real penalty of our past financial imprudence. It is not that the easy spending, and the flirtation with a little inflation, by themselves threaten to wreck the country. This is a big, rich country, and it can take an awful lot of mismanagement. But as with any family, the penalty of living it up is a lesser ability to meet the shock of new crises.

What is past, regrettably, may be past undoing. But now that the President and his aides are at work on the next budget they had better face the future honestly. It is precisely because national defense is the first priority, and because we can see the weight of that burden, that the other burdens must be reduced.

Let us pass over completely any argument about whether the huge spending of the Federal Government on nondefense items, present, and proposed, goes for desirable things. However desirable any such projects may seem to even the most liberal politicians, they are of second priority. What in other times might be debated by philosophy must now yield to necessity.

That necessity is a hard and lean economy in nondefense spending. We cannot continue to have everything at once. If we try, we will sap one of our main sinews of strength.

Dr. William J. Burns, Chairman of the Oratorical Contest Committee of the American Legion, Department of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the privilege of extending remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD affords us the opportunity, from time to time, to pay tribute to men and women of our country who contribute materially to our way of life.

Today, I should like to pay such a tribute to Dr. William J. Burns, of Albany, N.Y., who is serving his 18th year as chairman of the Oratorical Contest Committee of the American Legion, Department of New York.

On two occasions, during the last 8 years, the New York Department winner has gone on to become the national champion. This year the national champion is Robert J. O'Connell of St. Helena's High School in the Bronx. There were 350,000 high school students in this year's event.

Dr. Burns wrote to me and asked that some reference to the accomplishment of young Mr. O'Connell be inserted in the RECORD, which I am happy to do.

"We are, of course, real proud of our new national champion," he wrote.

I am very sure that the young man in question will forgive me if I startle the man who wanted to honor him by inserting in the RECORD that we, in Albany, "are real proud of Dr. Burns."

Countless hours of his time have been consumed during the last 18 years in helping these young people and, through them, the Nation. I think Dr. Burns is typical of so many quiet, hardworking American citizens who give of themselves without blare of drums or sound of bugles, happy in the satisfaction of doing something for others.

Mr. Speaker, we need desperately these days young Americans who not only think straight but who are articulate enough to impress their sound thinking upon others.

The American Legion has reason to be proud of its annual speaking contest. Incidentally, the 1941 national winner was Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho.

But, the Legion knows that its program is brilliantly successful because its managers include fine Americans like Dr. Burns. He has served his country well, in war and in peace. I am proud that he is a citizen of my hometown.

Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] for his outstanding contribution to our legislative processes during the past decade.

His keen mind, his penetrating judgment, and his skill as a legislator, have earned him the respect of his colleagues.

Through his work on the important Committee on Ways and Means, he has contributed materially to the shaping of legislation in the field of taxation, foreign trade, and many other areas.

But over and above his concern with issues falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, THAD was always deeply interested in the whole range of problems affecting our domestic and foreign policies. In the latter area, our country's relations with the people of Poland, and of other Communist-dominated countries, always received his immediate and thorough attention.

A person with so many and diverse interests, and such outstanding capabilities, will always leave an imprint of his personality and his efforts on legislation considered in these Halls. This our friend THAD has done, and in doing so he has rendered a service to his district and to our entire Nation.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that many of us will miss him after this session, when he will leave the Congress to become a member of the Federal bench. We realize however, that he will continue his career of public service in the judicial branch of our Government, and we are happy for him.

I would like to congratulate THAD on his appointment to a Federal judgeship, and to extend to him my best wishes for the future. I hope that he will come and visit us here from time to time, when his duties will permit him to do so. We will be glad to see him.

The ICC and the Public Interest in Railroad Merger Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress from all sections of the country in recent months have expressed themselves as being strongly opposed to pending railroad merger proposals as they are being handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Their remarks in the RECORD have incorporated many statements which have originated with, and express the opposition of, shippers, local communities, State public utility commissions, organized labor, transportation experts, and other railroads. Some railroads have stated that, if present merger proposals are approved by the ICC, they will be adversely affected so severely that they will be forced into bankruptcy and vitally needed rail services would not survive.

My own concern over the seriousness of the problem presented by the inadequate protection of the public interest existing under the present national policy governing railroad mergers was first expressed last March when I introduced House Joint Resolution 355, a resolution to temporarily suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties. My purpose in proposing this legislation was to give Congress time to take a new look at the problem in the light of the changed situation which has come about since 1940, when the present law was adopted.

It is certainly clear that many basic and fundamental changes have occurred in the railroad industry since Congress last looked into this problem more than two decades ago and drastically amended the historic national policy with respect to railroad consolidations by placing the initiative for them solely in the hands of railroad management. Previously, our national transportation policy had always made it clear that the public interest was paramount. Under the Transportation Act of 1920, there was a clear requirement that railroad mergers should be permitted only when they would promote the public interest, preserve competition and the existing routes of traffic, and, in general, strengthen the industry as a whole. Recent decisions of the ICC under the amended policy adopted in the Transportation Act of 1940, however, show that the Commission has not given adequate consideration to the adverse effects of mergers upon competing railroads.

One railroad which has been particularly outspoken against the way in which decisions on railroad consolidation proposals are being handled by the ICC is the New York Central, which formally petitioned the Commission asking it to postpone action on pending merger pro-

posals until it had looked at their impact on the future of railroad service. This request, which seems to me to be so necessary an ingredient of any intelligent action to protect the public interest that it should have been undertaken as a fundamental first step by the Commission in developing its policy toward railroad mergers in general, was, I regret to say, rejected by the Commission on grounds that the present law neither requires nor permits it to take such a long-range view.

Following the introduction of my resolution, which has since also been introduced in a similar form by several other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, Chairman OREN HARRIS of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce asked the Commission to report upon it for the guidance of the Committee. Under date of May 4, 1961, ICC Chairman Everett Hutchinson replied setting forth the Commission's views. This letter analyzed my resolution in detail, expressed opposition to it and then indicated that the Commission felt that the resolution was unnecessary because the timetable of the Commission was such that its action on all but two pending merger applications most likely would not be completed "prior to the close of the second session of the present Congress in 1962." Mr. Hutchinson's exact words were as follows:

> Considering the present status of the described applications, it is unlikely that a decision will be reached by the Commission prior to the close of the second session of the present Congress in 1962 upon any such applications, except possibly the two last mentioned involving the Lehigh Valley and thee Central of Georgia railway companies. Thus, it would appear that Congress will have adequate opportunity to review the situation before any of the major proposals may be made effective.

Since House Joint Resolution 355 and the other similar resolutions propose to suspend the authority of the Commission to approve mergers until December 31, 1962, it was implied that this timetable made such legislative action unnecessary because the ICC did not intend to take action on pending merger applications, with but two exceptions, until almost that time in any event.

In the 4 months since Chairman Hutchinson expressed this view, however, the Commission has proceeded with its handling of the various merger applications before it at what I can only describe as an almost frantic pace. One of the most shocking evidences of this was the Commission's flat rejection of a request by the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice for a few weeks additional time to prepare its case for the public interest in the Seaboard-Atlantic Coast Line Merger case. After several months of field hearings and a record of hundreds of exhibits running to many millions of words, the Antitrust Division requested the Commission to grant it until 30 days after the last hearing closed to permit it to study this mass of evidence and file its statement and exhibits on behalf of the public. When it is remembered that the railroads seeking merger approval had spent several years in the preparation of their case, the request of the Antitrust Division, as the agent of the general public, was extremely reasonable in my view, and clearly should have been granted. Nevertheless, the Commission turned down the Antitrust Division's request and granted it only until June 5 to prepare its case. This, as the Antitrust Division told the Commission, was obviously too short a time to permit it to examine and analyze the mass of conflicting testimony and exhibits developed at the field hearings. The result is that the record of this important proposed railroad merger—which involves the abandonment of more than a thousand miles of railroad track, the disruption of the lives of thousands of people in scores of communities, and, as the Southern Railroad has charged in its statements in opposition, the creation of "a vast monopoly" of railroad service which will adversely affect many other railroads' ability to compete—is now closed.

The Commission on other occasions recently has apparently shown a similar indifference to the needs of adversely affected railroads and others for adequate time to prepare their case in the pending proceedings. I must therefore assume that such undue haste and lack of adequate concern for full development of the public interest viewpoint in opposition to railroad mergers is a true reflection of a basic ICC policy.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there have been other new developments brought to light in connection with railroad mergers now pending before the Commission which cast further doubt upon the adequacy of Commission procedures at the present time. In his comments upon House Joint Resolution 355, Chairman Hutchinson in his letter of May 4, 1961, made the following comment concerning the resolution's assertion that there is currently in progress a "struggle between dominant regional railroad corporations" to gain control of other such properties without due regard for the public interest:

> To the extent it might imply that overt action has been taken by one or more railroads resulting in the power to control others, attention is called to the fact that the Transportation Act of 1940 greatly strengthened the powers of this Commission to investigate, either upon its own motion or upon complaint, any transaction which might result in the acquisition of control or the power to control one railroad by another, and its powers to enforce these provisions by ordering such action as necessary are extremely broad. The Commission has been keenly aware of the increased interest of railroad officials in possible mergers and you may be sure that it will continue to keep informed of any situations which might progress beyond mere negotiation and discussion into the realm of the power to control in violation of section 5(4) of the act. If and when this occurs, or appears to have occurred, the Commission will not hesitate to act to prevent any unlawful control.

This statement, which conveys the impression that the Commission is now diligently policing the stock purchases of various railroads, must, I think, also be questioned in view of the evidence which is now part of the official records of pending proceedings. The fact is that although, as Chairman Hutchinson says, the ICC does have considerable powers to act to prevent illegal acquisition of control of one railroad by another, the record of the proceedings in both the C. & O.-B. & O. merger proposal and in the struggle between the Southern Pacific and Santa Fe for control of the Western Pacific shows that such illegal action has been going on, even at the very time Mr. Hutchinson's letter was being written The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has made formal charges before the Commission in these two cases that the railroads involved have violated the Interstate Commerce Act by actually acting to acquire control through stock ownership without first obtaining ICC approval as the law clearly requires. Although I am advised that the Commission is now considering these alleged illegal activities, it certainly has been tardy in policing them. It is evident, too, from other reports of recent railroad stock purchases widely reported in the daily press that this provision of the law is being openly ignored by other railroads as they struggle to protect themselves in the mad scrambling for railroad control between rival financial interests which the current railroad merger movement has stimulated.

All recent official studies point to the need for a great expansion of our transportation capacity over the coming decade, if the needs of the national economy are to be met. No less responsible a group than the Corps of Army Engineers has estimated that the Nation will need at least double our present freight carrying capacity by 1980 and that it is probable that we will have to double this capacity again by the year 2000. With such warnings—quite different from those of the 1930 depression which shaped the thinking of the Transportation Act of 1940—it seems clear to me that the time has come when we must reappraise our present policy of encouraging a shrinkage of the Nation's railroad network through mergers as was advocated when an excess capacity existed temporarily in a depressed economy more than 20 years ago. All the evidence now points to the fact that, rather than a contraction of transport capacity through mergers, we must act swiftly to take steps to expand such capabilities if we are not to be caught dangerously short of adequate rail transportation within a comparatively few years. Moreover, we must remember that real shortages of rail capacity during World War II showed conclusively that, if the railroad mergers advocated in the 1930's had been put into effect, our Nation would have had a near disastrous lack of rail capacity during the war years. Today's tense international situation makes the lesson to be gained from this past experience all the more significant.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can allow the present clearly inadequate handling of the railroad merger problem under present law to drift much longer without doing irreparable harm to our national future. Because of the developments since my resolution was introduced, as I have

cited them here, I am now all the more convinced the need for immediate action by the Congress to protect the public interest in this vital matter. In order that the Congress may better understand the nature of the problems arising from the present railroad merger movement, I include, under unanimous consent, the full text of House Joint Resolution 355 in the RECORD at this point as a conclusion to my remarks:

Whereas under existing law the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have adequate authority to protect the public interest in the matter of consolidation, unification, or acquisition of control of railroad properties, since it is without power to make such developments conform to any pattern for the most efficient development of our national railroad network or to the long-range future needs of our Nation for economic expansion, national defense, and overall continuing transportation needs; and

Whereas there is now an intensive struggle between dominant regional railroad corporations to gain control of other strategic railroad properties in order to strengthen and extend their position in traffic interchange and in access to traffic producing areas without consideration of the effects of the elimination of competition and curtailment of railroad services resulting from such consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control on the small and weaker railroads, or on the welfare and convenience of the general public, small business establishments, shippers and industries in the respective areas; and

Whereas members of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been actively encouraging consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisition of control on any basis, however fragmentary and without regard for their effect upon the long-range transportation needs of the Nation; and

Whereas the Commission recently rejected an appeal from the New York Central Railroad for a suspension of mergers until it had undertaken a study to establish a proper pattern and policy for such unifications and acquisitions of control that would adequately protect the competing railroads who are now being adversely affected, or are threatened with adverse effect, if the current unification process is allowed to proceed without proper planning in the public interest; and

Whereas the comprehensive study of our national transportation problems which has just been completed by a special study group for the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, while favoring further mergers in the industry, has nevertheless warned that the process should be halted temporarily until a proper overall plan is evolved lest irreparable damage be done to our existing railroad network; and

Whereas, consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisitions of control already accomplished and proposed reveal the problems of greater difficulties for weaker railroads, elimination of competition for traffic, curtailments of railroad facilities in the respective areas, and a fragmentary, negative, and adequate approach to the necessity of adjusting our railroads to the needs of a dynamic, expanding economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide Congress with time to review the problems arising from the present railroad merger movement, the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve future consolidations, unifications, mergers, or acquisition of control of railroad corporations is hereby suspended until December 31, 1962, and during this period of suspension of the Commission's authority in this area, the operation of provisions of antitrust laws applicable to mergers or consolidations shall again be in full force and effect.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9169) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations bill which we passed yesterday contained an appropriation to pay an award rendered by the Indian Claims Commission for the Miami Tribe of Indiana. Payment of this claim will satisfy the terms of a treaty made 107 years ago. There is no question but what this is a just and due claim against the Government. The Indian Claims Commission, the U.S. court of appeals, and the U.S. Supreme Court have so directed.

The Miami Indians of Indiana are now few in number. They reside as peaceful, integrated citizens making contributions to the society of my district and the area surrounding it. I represent 10 counties of Indiana, the finest farmland in the world. All of my district once belonged to the Miami Indians Over a period of years, through several treaties, the land was granted to the U.S. Government.

The claim which is finally settled in this appropriation represents final payment of moneys granted in the treaty of 1854. This treaty capitalized the annuity granted to the tribe by earlier treaties. In paying the debt, the Government's per capita allotments over the years fell short of the treaty price by the sum of this appropriation and grant.

It seems unusual to many people that a representative from Indiana would have Indian constitutents. Indians are thought of as living in reservations out West. I am proud to have some 1,500 Miami Indians in my district. I am ashamed at times when I review the dealings our government has had with them.

Under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Great White Father of the American Indians finally became the Good White Father, as far as their relations were concerned. He and his successor, President Truman, approached the several Indian problems with a spirit of kindness and justice and they earnestly attempted to treat the Indians with honor. I believe the Kennedy administration is restoring this philosophy of Indian affairs.

I have reviewed, however, several of the claims made by these Indians of my home State and I find the governmental actions with regard to them leaves much to be desired. It seems that the cases were handled with the philosophy of stalling and appealing. This case, for example, was in litigation for more than 12 years. Other cases have been pending for an equally long period of time. Despite consistently unfavorable decisions, the Justice Department has filed appeal after appeal, with only hopes of stalling or discouraging the litigants.

This case is happily concluded. The manner in which the case was handled by the government has not left a good impression on the Indians. There are many other cases, pending, some instituted by my constituents, many by other tribes and bands. I hope that the proper authorities will proceed in a spirit of cooperation on these cases, so that the American Indians can look to the Federal Government as a friend.

There are many important problems which face the American Indians. These cases are all a part of the past, a past which is not filled with good memories. Let us get these matters cleared up with justice so that we can look to the future and proceed with the Indians toward a better and more rewarding life for them and a still greater contribution by them to the American society.

I am happy that we have the opportunity of closing the books on the Treaty of 1854. I am happy that the Miami Indians of Indiana are to realize the justice of the American juridical process.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following "Letter to the President," which appeared in the editorial column of the September 5, 1961, issue of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent:

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

SIR: My neighbor, who is on relief, has been telling me about the welfare state that is being planned in Washington. I am very interested in what my neighbor had to say about this, but would like to get some answers to question about the parts I don't understand.

Is it true that I won't have to work to draw money from the Government to support myself and my kids? How about the other people, will they have to work? If so, please send me the name of the person who will decide who works, as I want to have a long talk with him about myself.

If I am to be one of those who have to work, will I have to change jobs? I have a good job now as a printer, and I sure wouldn't want to start plowing corn. I hope you will let me know the name of the person who will say who gets the easy jobs. I would like to talk to him, too.

I hear that under a social welfare state, the Government will run all the farms and businesses and that the worker won't need any money anymore. Is this true? Please advise at once on this, for I have saved up a little money which I would like to spend before the Government sends it all to other countries or whatever will be done with it.

Will everyone get the same kind of home and car? If not, I need to talk with someone before this is decided. I like waterfront property and would rather have one of the big cars.

Will I have to work to have these privileges? I already have the chance to work for these now, and I sure wouldn't want someone to make me work hard just to live in a dump like those people have who are on welfare now.

The hardest thing for me to understand is what happens if none of the people want to work. Does the Government plan to make them work? Will they be punished if they don't work? I don't see how I am going to get food and have a fine car from the Government if someone doesn't work.

Will the people who run the Government get more than the rest of us? This is important to me, for I may want to be a Government man. Who would I see about this?

In case you decide to have one of the Government men answer this letter, please give it to one of them who knows what the plan is for the welfare state and will be in Washington after the changes are made. He probably never heard about me and won't know my name. So I am giving you my social security number. Please ask him to make sure he doesn't get the wrong number.

Respectfully,

303-07-1281.

P.S.—Will we vote on this change? If so, please send me the names of the Congressmen who favor the welfare state, so I will know who to vote for.

Power of the Private

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the individual citizen in the maintenance of our way of life has never been greater than it is today. It will take the best efforts of each American to face the threats of today and come through with our honor and our freedom unimpaired.

In this connection I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the September 12 issue of the Martinsville (Ind.) Daily Reporter:

POWER OF THE PRIVATE

Superficial people are prone to look down upon one without rank.

In looking through some correspondence, the writer of a letter, in referring to a private soldier, said a member of his company, though a graduate of Harvard and of another noted institution of higher learning, had not advanced beyond the rank of a private.

This is a curious attitude to take.

If not in pay, honor, and recognition, in fact the effective private is the important man in the Army. It is for the private the Army exists. The fact that his number must be many should not hide that fact, nor detract from the honor which is his due.

A Martinsville minister not long ago was introduced as "the head" of his church, an impromptu honor which he denies with considerable embarrassment, as the conception of the church is that we are members one of another and that Christ is the head.

The analogy of the importance and power of the private in the Army and in other bodies may be applied to our citizenship.

It is not the exclusive function of elected or appointed officials to be effective in the fight against communism.

In testimony before a Senate committee, Edward Hunter said:

"We should take great encouragement from the fact that the anti-Communist movement in America was a spontaneous development, in the American manner, out of needs and worries felt locally."

It is because the Reds recognize the effectiveness of the power of private citizens that they are fighting it with such desperation.

In some respects, rank is a disadvantage, and in some ways all are private soldiers. A general is a soldier. A general is a citizen.

The effort to muzzle some of our military men in coming out against communism, therefore, cannot be regarded as exclusively a question of keeping the military out of politics, because the battle with the Reds is not ordinary politics. This is an oversimplification.

Under whatever guise, when the Reds are able by maneuver to silence one private soldier, they have weakened our defense.

In an election, one vote counts as much as another.

In war, the private soldier carries the power that prevails.

In a war against tyranny, it is obvious that it is only the individuals who count, and we are individuals. We cannot win by being neutrals, uncommitted, cowards.

The 21,000 Plus Knowledge Plus Experience Equals Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, throughout this session of Congress I have urged continued production of our only proven long-range jet bomber, the B–52. The Congress overwhelmingly has expressed itself on the matter of keeping production lines open for manned bombers by appropriating $514,500,000 in the 1962 fiscal year for additional B–52 jet bombers.

Present orders of B–52's will be completed by this time next year. While the Air Force has requested permission to proceed with additional procurement of this key weapon in the arsenal of the Strategic Air Command, the Secretary of Defense apparently remains reluctant to approve the request.

One of the prime reasons, I believe, that we should not permit the production lines for this bomber to close down is the availability of a thoroughly trained and experienced working force at the Wichita-Boeing plant. While planned modification programs on the B–52 will require a sizable working force after present production expires, we can expect thousands of skilled working men and women to move into other areas and to seek new work opportunities.

Most of the experienced Boeing production team would be dispersed should the Department of Defense 1 or 2 years hence decide to order additional B–52's.

The skill and experience of the Wichita aircraft construction team is very ably described in the following article written by Mr. Darrell Bartee in the September issue of The Boeing magazine. I urge my colleagues to read this most pertinent presentation on the 21,600 men and women who are currently engaged in the production of this Air Force weapons system:

THE 21,000 PLUS KNOWLEDGE PLUS EXPERIENCE EQUALS SKILL

So far as the men who make her are concerned, a B–52H ballistic missile bomber is of course new, interesting and power packed. But more important to them is the fact that she represents still one more chance to exercise the knowledge gained on one, two or a dozen different models they've helped build before—a new airplane, requiring skills distilled in experience and ripened by time.

Their reasoning is understandable: Wichita division production teams bring to the current project impressive records of service—hence, skills which can be learned in schools but can be polished only by months, years, or decades of doing to job.

The Kansas plant has developed one of the most experienced aircraft construction teams in the Nation, with an average service tenure of 8.54 years among the 21,600 people now employed. In an industry only a little more than four decades old and with large scale employment during only the last 23 years, this record stands out. The Wichita division's average period of employment is a third as long as the mass-production history of the entire industry, a fourth as long as the total time the Wichita plant has been open.

Importance of the record is increased by the fact that Wichita now is the Nation's single-source development and production center for the advanced Stratofortress weapon system. Thus the skill and stability of its employees are of concern not only to the Strategic Air Command which gets the big, now bombers, but to the free world which depends almost exclusively on them for worldwide aerial retaliation power in being.

This dependence falls on no Johnny-come-latelys. More than 8,000 Wichita workers have been employed 10 years or longer, and 73 percent of the sun-tanned Kansans have been on the job at least 5 years. A select group of 364 employees have work records of 20 years or more, and experience ranges up to 35 years.

Many long-tenure employees also have a special usefulness to the Nation because of their know-how on a wide variety of defense products. On-the-line experience with the continually updated products of the past 3 decades provides seasoned skills for the varied demands of tomorrow.

For example, tool fabrication superintendent H. J. Haley (who has acquired eight grandchildren during his 31 years of service with Boeing) started work in 1928 on the pioneer 3-place open biplane, the Stearman C–3B. Today his work involves hardware components for the Minuteman missile.

Meanwhile Haley has been through programs on all the early Wichita mail-and-passenger airplanes and primary trainers, plus the B–17, B–29, B–50, and B–47, down through the years to the B–52H. He also is familiar with the KC–135 Stratotanker and the Bomarc missile through his work on assist programs. His command of efficient

and economical tool fabrication is not easily matched.

Many of the Boeing veterans become advanced specialists in one line of work. For example, engineer Wendell Fehring has for the most part concentrated on preliminary design work during 25 years with Boeing. This experience has ranged from designs for the Model 299, forerunner of the B–17, to those on Bomarc and the B–52.

Wichita records show hundreds of such specialists in varied phases of engineering, flight test, quality control, modification and other departments.

Appropriately, the top-ranking figure among the Wichita veterans is the general manager, C. B. Gracey. The Boeing vice president quietly celebrated his 35th anniversary with the company on July 12. Since he began his Boeing career at Seattle in 1926, Gracey has served throughout the entire range of Boeing-Wichita activity.

Since the Wichitans have a strong tendency to "stay put," they and their families become factors in civic and cultural life.

Eldon Coberly, for example, is a 20-year man who is busy in his community, and will now be busier because the members of the Boeing Good Neighbor Fund have just elected him to their board of trustees. He also serves as vice chairman and secretary of his church board and is associate advisor for a local Boy Scout post. In line with his work in the materiel department, Coberly serves as vice president of the local purchasing agents organization.

The trend reaches deeply into political and civic life of the region. Frank Riddle was elected as State legislature representative from his district. Ual Baker was named mayor of a nearby town. Bill Williams was elected county clerk. When employees like their work and stay with it, they make sound contributions to political life.

But most of all, the 21,600 members of this team are making a vital and knowledgeable contribution to the security and peace of the free world.

Inflation Is Not a Cause for Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to warn about the dangers our economy is facing through reckless spending and deficit financing, I would like to include herewith the following editrial from the Wall Street Journal:

OPTIMISM OUT OF PLACE

Since the Secretary of the Treasury is the man most directly concerned with the people's money, you might suppose he would be especially alert to the threats to that money. Secretary Dillon, however, goes to considerable lengths to pooh-pooh any danger of inflation—and in the process leaves some doubt as to how well that subject is presently understood in Washington.

In the Dillon view, the prospective $6 billion budget deficit this fiscal year, coming on top of a hefty deficit in the last period, is not inflationary. Why not? He explains: "In view of our high rate of unemployment and the unused plant capacity in nearly every industry, I see no present danger of inflation in the classic pattern of too many dollars chasing too few goods."

This strikes us as a somewhat strange assessment. Of course, an inflation can be spurred by an excessive money supply coupled with a shortage of goods. But the essence of an inflation is the first part of the equation: Too much money. And that is what the policies of the Kennedy administration are calculated to create.

The kind of deficit financing being practiced has the effect of creating money where none existed before. The administration's bias toward artificially cheap money aggravates that effect. The fact that these policies have not yet been reflected in general price rises means nothing at all; inflation customarily takes some time to produce its evil results.

The important thing is that inflation is being created now, a pool of excessive money from which can flow, almost regardless of supply conditions, the wage-price spiral the administration professes to fear. As a harmful side effect, there is also being created an inflation psychology which can lead to speculative excesses in the stock and other markets.

All that adds up to a situation that is far from healthy, and no amount of official optimism will make it healthier. The responsibility for protecting the value of the dollar is the Government's and the Government's alone. The last thing the Nation needs to hear about inflation are Pollyanna words from Washington.

Legislation To Protect Consumers From Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a matter of compelling importance. Today I have introduced legislation designed to eliminate labor union monopolies. This legislation embodies amendments to the Sherman, Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia and National Labor-Management Relations Acts.

It is the duty and responsibility of the Congress of the United States to lay down the rules governing the conduct of labor as well as management—rules that will provide adequate protection to the long-suffering consumer and that will outlaw excessive concentrations of economic power that can and have been used to the detriment of the progress of our Nation.

Governmental control must be maintained at that minimum level which will, on the one hand, permit the forces of free business and free labor to work out their own individual and unique problems and, on the other hand, prevent excesses through massive concentrations of economic power by either labor or management.

Treatment of monopolies in the United States is nothing new. While we have recognized the perils of monopolistic interests, we have been slow to safeguard the public against them. Monopolies do exist, and legally so, in our social and economic framework. But those monopolies, and I am now referring to the broad public utility area of activity, are not permitted to run rampant; they are regulated monopolies, and properly so. The basic purpose of this regulation has been the protection of the consumer who, alone, is powerless.

I make this comment, Mr. Speaker, because the legislation I have just introduced is aimed at the objective of insuring adequate protection for the consumer, of guaranteeing redress and due process, of initiative and incentive, of action taken voluntarily by freemen in a free society, and of returning a balance between organized labor and management in the conduct of their business.

I am opposed to any monopoly of any sort. I am as opposed to a business monopoly as I am to a union monopoly, a farmer monopoly, a political monopoly, or any other kind of monopoly. Unless an activity has been enfranchised by the state—and protected or guarded by the state—to discharge a public service which otherwise could not be provided, the power that gives rise to monopolies should have no place in our society and should be dispersed.

Essentially my bill would extend the principle of protecting the public from restraints of or interference with trade by labor unions, as that principle now applies to other organizations.

I believe we must enact my legislation if we wish to prevent monopolistic fixing of wages, production or prices and if we wish to preserve the freedom of the employer and his employees to contract on wages, hours and conditions of employment. This is an antiabuse and not an antilabor or antimanagement approach.

We must measure my proposal in proper perspective. It is a further step in a long line of legislative enactments bearing on the problem. We should be perfectly clear as to what I am proposing; and there should be no misunderstanding as to the full implications of this proposal.

As I have indicated earlier, my bill would amend the Sherman Antitrust and the Clayton Acts. Why?

The Sherman Antitrust Act was adopted in 1890. It says that "every contract, combination or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States" is illegal (26 Stat. 209 (1890); 15 U.S.C. 1) and as passed, did not distinguish between combinations of businessmen and combinations of unions. The law was the product of public fear of the coercive and unrestrained power of large industry and massed capital.

Today, it is mainly concerned with the preservation of legitimate competition by maintaining free markets and by the control of trusts and monopolies which are in restraint of trade. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to secure injunctive relief against any violations and secure criminal prosecutions and any person who suffers injury as a result of the violation of the law by others can maintain a civil suit to recover triple damages against violators of the act.

LABOR UNION IMMUNITY DEVELOPS

As originally passed, the Sherman Act contained no exemption for labor union

activity. Prior to its passage, however, organized labor had requested a specific exemption—see Holmes' unanimous U.S. Supreme Court opinion in *Loewe* v. *Lawlor* (208 U.S. 274, 301). The fact that this request was not accepted indicates that Congress at that time intended the law to apply to all monopolistic combinations. It therefore follows that the law was meant to cover all people and all combinations, including unions, if their activities interfered with the free flow of goods or created a monopoly resulting in restraint of trade.

While passed in 1890, it was not until 1908 in the Danbury Hatters case (*Loewe* v. *Lawlor*, 208 U.S. 274) that the U.S. Supreme Court considered its application to labor unions. In that case, the union attempted to win a strike by engaging in a national "don't buy" boycott, which had the effect of interfering with the sale of hats by a Connecticut firm to dealers and customers outside that State.

In interpreting the Sherman Act, the Court established the principle that labor unions were subject to the act if the intent to interfere with interstate commerce is proven, and if the reduction in commerce is unreasonable.

Organized labor then sought exemption from the Sherman Act. In 1914, Congress responded by passing the Clayton Act (33 Stat. 731, sec. 6, 20 (1914), 15 U.S.C. sec. 17 (1952), 29 U.S.C. sec. 52 (1952)). Although this act was widely hailed by labor unions as exempting them from the Sherman Act, it merely declared that labor organizations were not unlawful per se, and that they were not forbidden from "lawfully carrying out" their "legitimate objects."

But in a series of subsequent decisions, the U.S. Supreme Court reviewed the Clayton Act and held that unions that engaged in secondary boycotts or sympathy strikes departed from "normal and legitimate objects" and were subject to antitrust laws—see *Duplex Printing Co.* v. *Deering*, 254 U.S. 443 (1921); *American Steel Foundries* v. *Tri-City Central Trades Council*, 257 U.S. 184 (1921); *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters Assn.*, 274 U.S. 37 (1927).

These decisions led to wide use of injunctions in labor disputes. Congress reacted by enacting the Norris-La Guardia Act (47 Stat. 70, 71 (1932), 29 U.S.C., sec. 101, 105 (1952)). The act virtually prohibited injunctions by Federal courts in labor disputes. It thereby legalized union conspiracies to violate the Sherman Act.

The U.S. Supreme Court in two decisions then affirmed labor union immunity from application of the antitrust laws. These were *Apex Hosiery Company* v. *Leader*, 310 U.S. 469 (1940), and *U.S.* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U.S. 219 (1941).

In the Apex case, the High Court held the antitrust laws did not apply to an organizational "sit-down strike" when the union seized the plant and tried to eliminate non-union-made hosiery from moving in interstate commerce. The union refused to ship hosiery destined for out of State. The company sued for treble damages. The Court said there was no "restraint" of interstate commerce since no suppression of competition for the employer's product was shown.

In the Hutcheson case, the Court said that the Clayton and Norris-La Guardia Acts must be construted as exempting unions from the antitrust laws. This case stemmed from a jurisdictional dispute between the Carpenters and Machinists. The Court found the union did not violate the Sherman Act, regardless of the "wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means."

Other decisions following the Apex and Hutcheson cases show the clear immunity unions enjoy under the antitrust laws. Thus, in *U.S.* v. *Corrazzo* (137 F. Supp. 191, Affirmed 313 U.S. 539 (1941)), the Court held lawful the action of a labor union in requiring contractors using ready-mixed concrete to employ the same number of men as would be needed if the concrete were mixed by hand.

In *Hunt* v. *Crumboch* (325 U.S. 821 (1945)), the Court held that the Sherman Act was not violated by a union which, because of a past dispute with an employer, refused to supply him with workers or admit to membership anyone who worked for him, thus destroying his business. Justice Jackson in his dissent in that case put it in a nutshell:

> This Court now sustains the claim of a union to the right to deny participation in the economic world to an employer simply because the union dislikes him. The Court permits to employees the same arbitrary dominance over the economic sphere which they control that labor so long, so bitterly and so rightly asserted should belong to no man.

The sole exception to union immunity is when a union acts with a nonlabor group, as for example a group of employers. (*Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Local 3, IBEW*, 325 U.S. 797 (1945).)

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

In sharp contrast with the broad labor union immunity is the strict but proper application of antitrust principles to management. I have cited instances of the union immunity. I now must cite instances of virtually similar management activity which has been held illegal.

The double standard is illustrated in the case of Hunt against Crumboch, referred to earlier. There, the union was freely permitted to destroy an employer's business. Yet, precisely the same conduct by an employer or a group of employers is prohibited by the antitrust laws and has been so held in a series of Supreme Court cases. See *Eastern States Retail Lumber Dealers Assn.* v. *United States*, 234 U.S. 600 (1914); *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *F.T.C.*, 312 U.S. 457 (1941); *U.S.* v. *Women's Sportswear Mfrs. Assn.*, 336 U.S. 460 (1949).

I noted earlier that unions are permitted free rein to prevent new techniques and to increase an employer's costs as illustrated in United States against Corrazzo where extra but unneeded men were required to be employed to make ready-mixed concrete. Yet, if employers combine to prevent others from using new techniques in their industry and thus maintain an artificial level of high prices, they are subject to antitrust violations. See *Hartford Empire Co.* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 386 (1945).

Also, a union may try to force a manufacturer to work only with goods produced by union members, but the same conduct by a manufacturer, along with other manufacturers, which would exclude competitors, would be unlawful. See *American Tobacco Co.* v. *U.S.*, 328 U.S. 781 (1946).

Again, if unions divide up geographical areas for organizational purposes, there is no violation of antitrust laws. But if a group of employers agree not to compete in certain areas, a violation would exist. See *Timken Roller Bearing Co.* v. *U.S.*, 341 U.S. 593 (1951).

UNION PRACTICES REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I have recounted the manner in which labor union immunity has developed under our law. And I indicated how a double standard has developed.

Let me cite additional reasons why my bill should be adopted.

A list of union activities which necessitate this control are headed by featherbedding and union restrictive practices. The Federal rule still appears to be that time-saving devices may be legally resisted by unions if those new techniques reduce employment. Thus, a union was able to prevent the use of paint sprayers without violating the antitrust laws. See *U.S.* v. *Bay Area Painters and Decorators Joint Committee*, 49 F. Supp. 733 (1943). See also Labor Management Relations hearings, part 6, 1953, House Labor Committee pages 2225–2226) for details on restrictions on spray painting, rollers and paint products.

Other instances of restrictive practices include the refusal by the musicians' union to permit its 140,000 members to make phonograph recordings or electrical transcriptions. This had the effect of destroying manufacturing and distribution businesses, restricting labor-saving devices, and compelling radio stations, recording studios, and others to maintain obsolete or inefficient methods, but was held nonetheless not to violate the antitrust laws. (*U.S.* v. *American Federation of Musicians*, 47 F. Supp. 304, Affirmed 318 U.S. 741 (1942). Also see *NLRB* v. *Gamble Enterprises, Inc.*, 345 U.S. 117 (1953).

More recent illustrations which point up the fantastically broad hindrance placed on the American economy include the useless crew positions on railroads which are estimated to cost $500 million per year. See Railway Age, January 25, 1960, page 42. In the printing trades, the practice of setting bogus type amounts to unneeded and expensive production. See *American Newspaper Publishers Assn.* v. *NLRB* (*345 U.S. 100, 1953*).

Payment for time not worked, excessively large crews, and union-set limits on production were recent steel industry work practices brought to public light. See "Showdown on Featherbedding," Engineering News-Record, July 30, 1959, page 74. Limits placed on production

techniques in the entertainment industry are well known.

The recent New York tugboat strike involving the number of men to man the boats and the employers' freedom to decide crew size tied up almost the entire eastern railroad network and is one indication of the vast power only one small segment of labor may exert on the entire economy.

In recent trucking industry contract negotiations, James R. Hoffa's Teamsters got Midwest truckers to agree that after February 1, 1962, they would begin paying his union a flat $5 fee for every trailer they load on a railroad flatcar. By penalizing truckers financially for engaging in piggybacking, the Teamsters count on stifling the use of railroads.

Let us look for a moment at the factual situation in 1961. Most industrialized areas are dominated by unions. The major industries are organized; nonunion members are indeed few.

What are the possibilities?

Bear in mind the possibility of a single national transportation union capable of halting the movement of everything.

Consider also the contract between the United Mine Workers signed in 1958 and the major coal companies which cut off nonunion mines from their markets by forbidding unionized companies to buy coal from them.

Add the continually increasing practice of pattern wage settlements in collective bargaining under which a wage increase in one industry is inevitably followed by similar wage increases in many other industries.

Recognize that in the automobile industry substantially identical agreements are insisted upon; in steel the identical is not only true, but most bargaining agreements expire at the same time.

Consider the power of the large international union to dictate the conditions under which all competing employers in an industry must operate, thus seriously undermining competition among employers, arresting new technological developments and hampering, if not eliminating, the stimulus for greater efficiency in production, which would result in lower prices and thus be beneficial to our American economy.

If more is needed, think seriously—very seriously—for a moment about UAW Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey's remarks advising union presidents to order slowdowns of work if striking steelworkers were ordered back to the jobs by a Taft-Hartley injunction in 1959. See Wall Street Journal, October 15, 1959, page 6.

Remember the strike against a Government arbitration decision by the airline engineers union causing an impossible burden on employers and the public.

From this recital, it is absurd and indefensible to continue the exemption from the antitrust laws.

Subjecting unions to antitrust principles will not impede their ability to bargain collectively, to strike or to continue their national organizations. It would simply mean that unions could no longer restrain trade or create monopolies to the detriment of the public. Union leaders will doubtless claim this proposal is antiunion. But is the Sherman Act antibusiness? Is it right for unions or any other segment of our country to be free to combine and conspire so that competition is rendered meaningless, and trade—supposed to benefit all—is restrained for the advantage of a few?

INDUSTRYWIDE WAGE FIXING

Mr. Speaker, permit me now to address myself to the second major aspect of my proposal.

Under my bill, a union may represent only the employees of one employer so that the jurisdiction of one would be as large as that particular employer. Dictation or control by internationals over local union affiliates as to wage and other bargaining matters is prohibited.

The problems which I am seeking to reach arise from bargaining practices which have developed in recent years under which national, area, regional or other substantial and large segments of an industry bargain with a single union.

Where bargaining in these industries fails to produce a settlement, the industry concerned can be throttled by a single large international union—and sometimes even by one person, the president of that union. This is the situation which has normaly produced the national emergency strikes of the past several years. Where agreement is reached between the one union and management, not infrequently, prices of products sold by these employers are raised.

Requiring a union to bargain with one employer will be a boost to the economy. It will permit independent and responsible local action in bargaining activities. It will recognize differences between employers, their locations and circumstances. It will tend to discourage national emergency strikes in those industries which now practice what in effect is national or regional bargaining. These include the trucking, shipping, shipbuilding, automobile, steel, anthracite and bituminous coal, construction, railroad, and pottery industries.

What protects the public today?

Before industrywide bargaining or its modified forms, the self-interest of an employer in holding down overhead costs—which included wages paid to his employees—was a built-in protection for the public. The public could be reasonably assured that excessive union demands would be resisted and prices would not be uniformly raised. Contrast the situation today.

Bargaining on a broad industrial or geographic front is the process of setting uniform wages in a particular industry so that the overhead cost of wages on each employer is the same. Each employer is certain that his competitors will be forced to make concessions equal to his and his extravagance will not subject him to competitive disadvantages. Should a wage increase later cause him to raise his prices, he is reasonably sure his competitors will be in a similar situation.

The country should correct this problem quickly. It is an economic absurdity to discipline prices through the competitive process and, at the same time, encourage inflationary wage increases through unrestricted concentration of union power.

The public is painfully aware of the national emergency strikes caused by industrywide bargaining. My bill will reduce the national impact of a strike. Where a union bargains with one employer it may strike, but his competitors may be likely to have a different labor contract expiration date and thus remain in normal operation. The public will not suffer as it does today because an entire industry is stopped.

Industrywide bargaining stifles the growth of various regions. Differences in the growth of regions are not due only to wage levels. Our great United States is comprised of areas which are different. Some areas are more accessible to markets, transportation; others have more raw products, skilled craftsmen, climatic attractions, etc. Imposing uniform wage scales by industrywide bargaining will not contribute to growth.

The objective of a national antimonopoly program should be to maintain workable competition in product markets and to restrain the development of undue concentration of power in the labor market. It is a balance of antimonopoly policy which is desirable. This bill will provide this balance, help the United States to have a competitive and able economy, and will protect the consumer from monopoly power of whatever source.

What is the future of free labor-management relations in the light of recent actions and manifestations by the administration which intervenes in a tugboat strike, establishes, by executive order, a missile launching base committee to supervise no-strike, no-lockout pledges, announces that the Nation cannot stand interruptions in the vital air transportation industry—or the auto industry, and purports to conduct settlements of all disputes through the Secretary of Labor?

What will be the next form of intervention? Compulsory arbitration? More and more "fact finding" which really is a not-too-subtle way of dictating? Unless we reverse our trend, I believe the end of free collective bargaining is not very far away, and this is something which neither management nor organized labor wants.

In conclusion, let me repeat that my sole interest is in the preservation and strengthening of our free, democratic institutions. Our Nation will grow stronger only as our internal affairs are kept in order. We cannot tolerate concentrations of power at home any more than we can condone them abroad.

With responsibility fixed clearly for the conduct of both labor and management, we can provide the catalyst that will harness our strength to pull together to meet the challenges of the years ahead.

Columbia Treaty Jeopardized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the situation covering the United States-Canada treaty for joint development of the Columbia River is pointed up concisely in the following editorial from the September 11, 1961, edition of the Seattle Times:

COLUMBIA TREATY JEOPARDIZED

The United States-Canadian treaty for joint development of the Columbia River today stands jeopardized by the ambitious but not yet entirely clear power policies of British Columbia's Premier, W. A. C. Bennett.

If Bennett continues along his present course of delay, there seems to be little or no hope that the treaty, already ratified by the U.S. Senate, ever will go into effect.

In this connection, we wonder if the British Columbia public in general is fully aware of the sizable benefits that would accrue to Canadians under the treaty.

Secondly, we wonder if the British Columbians realize fully that—if Bennett (pardon the phrase) sells the treaty down the river—the United States could turn to alternative projects which, for roughly the same cost, would provide the same amount of flood control and about 75 percent of the power that would result under the Canadian treaty.

Total cost to Canada for all treaty benefits—including more than 2 million kilowatts of power and considerable flood control—would be about $400 million. This includes transmission costs within Canada.

Total cost to the United States for the initial phase, to be completed by 1970, would be about $450 million. A second phase, to be completed by 1985, would cost Uncle Sam an additional $300 million.

Without going into detail which space does not permit here, it may be pointed out that, under the treaty, the United States would pay Canada about $64,400,000 for flood control benefits derived from Canadian storage dams.

This would enable the Canadians to build the Arrow Lakes and Duncan Lake storage dams for only $27 million of their own money.

From the increased downstream power generation in the United States under these two projects, the United States and Canada each would receive 916,000 kilowatts, plus substantial flood-control benefits.

Mica Creek, the third storage dam which Canada would be required to build under the treaty, would be largely Canadian financed, but equipment to generate in excess of 1 million kilowatts could be installed there.

In a nutshell, the treaty promises British Columbia flood-control and electric-power benefits at bargain rates. And in the early future, it would provide work for many unemployed British Columbia workers.

When Bennett talks about developing the Peace River and selling its power in this country, he is ignoring American flood-control needs which can be obtained only by further development of the Columbia.

If the Columbia Treaty is dumped or seriously delayed, this country would be forced to turn to the alternatives available to it.

Under the treaty, the United States would obtain necessary flood control and about 2 million kilowatts of power at an eventual cost of $750 million.

From seven alternative projects in the Pacific Northwest, this country could get the same amount of flood control and about 1,400,000 kilowatts—for $720 million.

Admittedly, it would take a number of years for the alternative projects to be authorized and completed. But the alternatives are available.

It is to be hoped that our British Columbia neighbors will not lose sight—through Bennett's dazzling dreams and maneuverings—of the kilowatt-and-flood-control "bargain" offered them by the Columbia Treaty.

Progress Is Made Under Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a reminder that man's greatest economic progress has been developed through private enterprise, I would like to include, as a part of my remarks, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

SOCIALISM IN THE SKY

If along about the turn of the century some dreamers had come forward with a plan to put one of these new-fangled telephones in every home and hook together every city and hamlet, they might well have concluded that this was beyond the resources of private industry.

After all, as late as 1880 there were only 34,000 miles of telephone wires on the whole continent. There were a host of little telephone companies, many using different kinds of equipment. Some cities had two or more telephone companies that couldn't connect. Nowhere in sight was there the capital necessary, nor the organization, to carry out such a fantastic dream.

Only government itself, so it might have seemed, could take on a job of such magnitude in money and planning. Indeed, in a great many countries the job was taken on by governments and, to this very day, the telephone systems are run by the government, like the postal services.

But fortunately this country lagged the rest of the world in socialistic economics; our telephone system was allowed to grow in free soil. And it would be laboring the obvious to point out that here the dream has not only come true but has been surpassed. The contrast between our phone system and those operated by governments is a dramatic one to anybody who has spent even a few vacation weeks abroad.

Yet, curiously, we are being told now that further expansion of this communications system, using relays in the sky, is too formidable a job for private enterprise. Its magnitude in money, planning, and effort is so great that we must have it done by Government.

Thus there is a concerted campaign under way in Washington to get President Kennedy to reverse his very wise decision in favor of private development of the satellite system for intercontinental communications. All manner of arguments are marshalled. At one and the same time it's said private industry would create a great monopolistic combine but that it's too big for private industry.

Most of these arguments are windowdressing. Private capital is not lacking to build and operate a communications satellite; nor does it involve insurmountable operating difficulties. As for the combine threat, there are workable proposals to make it a cooperative effort of many companies, large and small, with adequate regulatory safeguards to protect the public interest.

What has actually happened is that in socialistic economic philosophy Washington is no longer laggard. As in the public power arguments, the bias is simply that such enterprises ought to be Government enterprises just because they "ought." That being the basic attitude, the so-called practical arguments are made to fit the bias.

For instance, it's said there will be a "fatal delay" in waiting for private enterprise. But why is there any delay at all? Simply because government delays final authorization. Again, if it's pointed out that the danger of a combine is resolved by having many participating companies, the reply is that this opens a "Pandora's box"; it would "splinter" ownership. How is anyone to grapple with such slippery reasoning?

There is only one way. That is for the President to realize that such arguments are irrelevant, and to stick by his original decision because it is the right one.

The point here is not merely that private enterprise capital will save the Federal Government large sums of tax money, though that is no small consideration. It is, rather, that a private system will simply give us a better communications system, more economically operated by the very demands of making a private profit and more efficiently operated by the absolute necessity of satisfying the customers.

If you doubt which system is the better—government or private—pick up the telephone, phone your local postmaster and ask for more mail service. And see how far you get.

Enough Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this session of Congress, I made a public statement which appeared in the press as being opposed to any resolution which would enlarge the number of Members in the House.

I wholeheartily agree with the editorial which appeared September 14, 1961 in the Buffalo Evening News:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

Although it has taken an unconscionably long time to do it, we're glad that the House Judiciary Committee has finally put to death some 20 bills to increase the size of the House to accommodate States losing seats due to the 1960 census. This means, presumably, that the membership—temporarily raised from 435 to 437 when Alaska and Hawaii were admitted to statehood—will revert (after the 1962 elections) to the 435 seat total that has been the stand for 50 years.

The enlargement proposals ranged all the way from 3 to as many as 39 additional Members. And each was as faulty as any other because once Pandora's box is open there could be no point more logical than any other at which to close it. For on a strict population basis, there will always be one more State whose claim ranks just below the last one accommodated. New York, for example, loses 2 seats in the current reapportionment—but to save 1 of them it would be necessary to add 10 Members to the House, and to save the other 14 more Members would have to be added. Yet this

State's interests are obviously just as well served by 41 Congressmen in a House of 435 as by 43 in a House of 459.

In terms of the national interest, it is obvious that the House is already so big as to be unwieldly, so on this count a better case could be made for reducing it than enlarging it. And even if there were a case for enlargement, it would be absurdly late to begin it now. For most of the States gaining or losing seats have long since gone through the wrenching political process of reapportionment, and those that haven't (like New York) have plans well advanced for doing so. It would be no service to any of them to force them to junk these efforts and begin all over again. So, on every count, the Judiciary Committe has acted wisely, in putting an end to the enlargement nonsense.

The William G. Goudy Elementary School of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the William C. Goudy Elementary School of Chicago, one of the many fine schools of which we of the 12th District of Illinois are so very proud. The W. C. Goudy School is taking part this weekend in the Freedoms Foundation Valley Forge Pilgrimage to Valley Forge, Pa. There, Mrs. Helen van Bramer, Goudy School principal, Miss Nancy Banks, teacher, and Miss Melinda Moonahan, student of Goudy, will receive for Goudy School the George Washington Honor Medal for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life. This award was 1 of 27 given to schools in the United States as winners of the highest school award of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The recipients of the George Washington Honor Medal were chosen as a result of the following procedure:

First. Each year Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge accumulates from throughout the Nation's schools outstanding expressions projects, and programs which help build better understanding of the American way of life.

Second. The Freedoms Foundation selects through a nonpartisan independent awards jury the most effective and inspiring works of schools.

Third. The Freedoms Foundation then spotlights especially useful works and selects award recipients.

Fourth. Freedoms Foundation publishes and distributes programs and ideas that help in the struggle of freemen for their personal liberty and for their personal dignity against totalitarian and tyrannical forces.

I think special recognition should be given to Mrs. Hyacinth Drechney, for, as I understand it, even though Mrs. Drechney has retired, she had much to do with this outstanding work in patriotism at Goudy School. Mrs. Drechney has previously made the Valley Forge pilgrimage on two occasions when she won this honor during the time she was principal of the Frederic Chopin School and again as principal of the Minnie Mars Jamieson School.

New Wheat Program Is Punitive in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have maintained that the mandatory 10-percent acreage reduction for wheatgrowers in the Agricultural Act of 1961 will be punitive to Pacific Northwest wheatgrowers because the Soft White wheat grown in the region does not contribute to the national surplus. Further, our summer fallow practices, in effect, result in a 50-percent acreage reduction over other wheat areas which do not summer fallow.

These remarks are made, Mr. Speaker, as preface to the following open letter to President Kennedy, sent to me by Mrs. Harold Hall, of Colfax, Wash. I feel that all Members of Congress should be aware of what Mrs. Hall has to say. The letter follows:

COLFAX, WASH., *September 12, 1961.*
THE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish you could come to this part of the country, Whitman County, Wash., and listen and see the desperate situation that has fallen into our laps since the new farm bill passed. When is someone—anyone—going to come and see that the farmers here are ruined?

It's been coming on for several years, but this new bill has really finished us. Granted there are a few wealthy farmers—there are wealthy men in every profession—but with all the misleading newspaper articles, such as Farmer Smith who bought the Cadillac, and misrepresentation, we farmers are getting the horse laugh for getting paid for doing nothing. Not until the Farm Journal arrived did anyone know the real facts about Smith.

The general opinion of all city people for years has been, "The farmers are rich and can buy anything." In a way, that was fine, because we absolutely could not have survived this long without credit. But, because the general public has been so misinformed and uninformed and the farmers finances so exaggerated, we are ridiculed and cursed for being lazy clodhoppers.

Let me show you what this new bill has done, and we are just one of the many, many who are in the same miserable mess.

We have three children, two boys, ages 7 and 14, and one girl, age 16. Our ages are 36 and 37. We have leased this same farm for 14 years, proving we are good farmers. This is dryland farming here, wheat, peas, and barley are the main crops. We lease 550 acres. The owners get 38 percent of all the crops.

According to the new bill, we must leave 232 acres idle—no cash crop allowed on this idle land. We are allotted 165.6 acres of wheat and 168 acres of barley. By adding the two together, you see, we can't even plant our allotment. We will get paid for 60 acres left idle which will amount to approximately $950, our share. Our income next year will be, approximately, at an average 40 bushels per acre for the wheat, $7,774.80. If the barley doesn't freeze out, it should yield a ton per acre. That amounts to $3,906. The total income will be $12,630.80. Now the deductible expenses, averages out, using the past 2 years, as $8,423, plus income tax and social security, $1,276.94. That leaves $2,930.86 for our family of five to live on. Can you budget that amount so we can live decently for another year? It looks like, that from 550 acres, a person could eke out a living, doesn't it? We used to, but no more.

Now the farmer who cropped his entire farm, year after year will receive a good payment on his idle land. But the farmer who honestly tried to build up his land, keep down the Canadian thistle, morning glory, nightshade, etc., by summer fallowing, and in turn hold down the grain surplus, are the ones who are suffering this hard knock. It's unbelievable, we don't ask for anything more than a decent living, we don't want to look or live like peasants either.

It isn't possible that one bill is good for all farmers. The big farmer naturally benefits, but there are thousands of small farmers like us—just plain human beings—that need consideration also. Can you figure out how we, as typical farmers are going to live on this kind of a program?

It doesn't stop with us. Just check on the implement dealers, fertilizing companies, the bankers, they'll tell you about the farmers here. Someone has just got to do something soon. When the farmer goes broke, I don't think I need to tell you what will happen next.

There are several places I'm sending this letter (our Representative and the Post magazine) in hopes someone will be interested enough to start investigating this serious situation and arouse enough interest to do something about it. The farmer has always been the little guy, not enough of them to be heard above a whisper, but enough to be ridiculed and laughed at.

We actually thought that help was coming at last, after listening to your campaign speech in Spokane. We did not dream our whole life would be ruined so fast. Farming is all we know—what do we do now?

Yours truly,

Mrs. HAROLD HALL.

Citizenship Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, September 17, has been designated as Citizenship Day, and it will be observed by native and naturalized citizens all through our country. A special bulletin has been issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice for the celebration of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week. This department provided 5,000 copies of the bulletin for use by chapters of the Federal Bar Association and for other

organizations cooperating with the Association in promoting Citizenship Day.

I am sure that many cities of our country made plans to observe Citizenship Day, commemorating the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, and honoring our newly naturalized citizens and our native-born youths who have recently reached their majority.

I congratulate the Federal Bar Association and its officers for playing a leading role in the observance of a day which is so important in the lives of American citizens.

Education for Migrant Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the major legislative problems before the Education and Labor Committee, and one in which I have been particularly interested, is the question of providing some opportunity for a decent education for the children of migratory farmworkers. Like many other States, the State of Oregon has been doing what it could to meet this need—a need that is made the more urgent because so many of the migrant workers travel from State to State. Mrs. Leonie Brooke, of Sandy, Oreg., has written an excellent article for the March 1961 issue of Oregon Education, describing what had been done up to that time in helping to meet these needs at the State level. Her article reflects deserved credit upon Oregon, but it also highlights the continuing need for Federal action in this field:

EDUCATION FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

(By Leonie N. Brooke)

Many of us who within recent months saw on TV the highly dramatic pictures, "Bitter Harvest" and "Harvest of Shame," are certainly more aware of the plight of the children of migratory workers than heretofore.

Some communities more than others in Oregon have felt the impact of the army of migrant families without always fully realizing their true value to our economy. They are needed in many crops in many parts of the State.

Migrant families entered 14 Oregon counties during the regular 1958–59 school years, and their children attended 81 schools here, according to a report to the Oregon Board of Education last October by Ronald G. Petrie, State administrator of the migrant children's educational program.

Although 1,900 migrant youngsters attended these 81 Oregon schools, in reality, a total of 4,000 to 5,000 were eligible for schooling. Those that did go to school had an average attendance of 47 days; yet most of them are in Oregon 140 to 170 days, including the summer months.

TRAINING NEGLECTED

Many school districts are doing fine work in providing for the education of migrant children. Other schools are doing nothing, according to Petrie's report. Most schools are ill equipped to meet the special problems. They place the children in classrooms and hope for the best. Many school districts that cannot afford extra teachers, books and extra supplies, have not been overly enthusiastic about enforcing attendance laws, so far as these children are concerned.

The thousands of migrants coming to Oregon each year to help in the various crops and migrant children, educationally retarded as they are, need special help in language arts, arithmetic, health, and social development.

SURVEYS MADE

The 1959 Oregon Legislature took several steps toward improving the migrant's lot. With the allocation of $50,000 a study was made of the migrant education problem during the regular school year There was a census of migrants in Oregon during the summer to determine numbers of children and how long they remain in Oregon; five pilot summer schools on an experimental basis were tried out. Last, recommendations were made to the 1961 legislature as to a permanent migrant education program.

As a result of this and at this writing, there is Senate bill 80 relating to the education of migrant children and appropriating money therefor. Introduced by the committee on education at the request of the department of education, it was one of the legislative proposals included in the OEA digest of issues for "Lights on for Education."

While the passage of Senate bill 80 remains in the balance, the plight of migrant workers needs the close attention of each of us.

An Injustice to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of September 8, 1961, entitled "An Injustice to the Philippines."

I also wish to include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of September 12, 1961, entitled "An Honest Debt."

Both of these editorials refer to H.R. 8617, a bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act. This legislation has been reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a rule has been requested on it by the Committee on Rules. To date, however, the Committee on Rules has refused to clear this bill for floor action.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Committee on Rules will see fit to grant a rule on this important legislation, so that the Congress may proceed to settle this long-overdue debt to the people of the Republic of the Philippines.

The editorials which I mentioned read as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1961]

AN INJUSTICE TO THE PHILIPPINES

For more than a decade the United States has failed to make good on an obligation to the Philippines for unpaid damages arising out of fighting on Philippine territory during the Japanese war.

An appropriation by Congress in 1946 fell short by $73 million of meeting the total amount of damages. Since 1950 efforts have been made to get congressional authorization for the unpaid portion; but year after year, for one reason or another, Congress has failed to complete the necessary action. This year, as a result of obstruction in Representative HOWARD W. SMITH'S Rules Committee, the same old story has been repeated once again.

There is a majority in both the Senate and House for a measure sponsored by Representative ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, authorizing the $73 million; the White House and the State Department are emphatically for it, but Representative ZABLOCKI has been unable to get the bill out of Rules. In the recess fever now affecting Congress, the bill has once more been prevented from getting to the floor of the House by an adverse Rules Committee vote.

Philippine patience is justifiably wearing thin. What seems a small matter in this country is a serious cause of national irritation in the Philippines. An aid appropriation is not involved. The most committed and friendly ally of the United States in Asia is simply asking for a sum that we have promised and which is long overdue. Congressional negligence on this matter contrasts sharply with the prompt payment recently by the Philippines of the final $20 million installment on funds advanced by the United States to the Philippine defense forces during and after World War II.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 12, 1961]

AN HONEST DEBT

Ninety billion dollars is the latest official figure on our foreign-aid spending over a 15-year period ending June 30, 1960.

Foreign aid is one thing—basically a gamble on keeping the recipients from joining the Communist bloc. A bona fide debt is quite another thing—no gamble about it, no lofty sentiment, just a simple obligation.

In this latter category falls the $73 million we owe the Philippines in unpaid compensation for damages done to their country by our having to fight a war there. The Congress of 1946 decided such claims were justified and passed the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

But the appropriation then approved was $73 million short of meeting the total amount of damages. Despite repeated polite reminders from the Philippines, the sum has been dangling ever since. A measure introduced this session by Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, authorizes payment, but it is still in the freezer of the House Rules Committee.

This is inexcusable, especially in the light of the Philippines' own prompt repayment to us of the final $20 million installment on funds we lent for their military buildup. It's no way to treat a demonstrated friend, while pouring out billions we don't owe to such dubious states as, say, Communist Yugoslavia. Even in the few days remaining of this session, the House with a little resolutness still can act on this measure and underscore our ties of more than a half-century with the Philippines.

Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in tribute to

the Honorable THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ.

I have many reasons for rejoining at his elevation to the exalted position of district judge in the courts of the United States of America. He attended, and in a sense is a product of the University of Chicago, located in the district I am privileged to represent. He has served with the highest distinction as a Representative in this body from the State of Michigan, which is the State where I was born. He was born in Poland, as were so many of the men and women who with their descendants have contributed so mightily to making Chicago the first city of the world in neighborliness and in practicing democracy. But, over and above all, I rejoice because THAD MACHROWICZ has all the attributes that a judge should possess.

I predict for him an outstandingly brilliant career as a judge in the Federal courts.

He will leave this body with the admiration and affection of all his colleagues.

Beware the Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the administration will not again be swayed by fear of world opinion and pressure of unalined nations and encourage further international blackmail by the prince of thieves, the ruler of the Communist conspiracy. The delegates assembled at Belgrade left no doubt that unaligned means only that they are unaligned with the free world and that there philosophies, their sympathies and their attachment is to the Communist dictator. It is apparent that Congress has not yet had its fill of the phoney world of the neutrals as we have just voted to send more millions of dollars from the pockets of the hard-pressed American taxpayer in order that they may become stronger and give more dedicated service to the Communists. At least, let us hope that we will prevent them from forcing us into adopting a sniveling foreign policy which will ultimately lead to our destruction. We ought to send any future so-called emissaries of peace from these countries packing and let them know that we intend to win the fight against communism and if they want our continued friendship and support, they had better take an honest position on the side of freedom. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune sums up the situation in clear language:

WHITE HOUSE CALLERS

Mr. Kennedy's "decent respect to the opinions of mankind," sometimes seems overstrained, especially when he is dealing with "neutralists" who profess to speak for three-quarters of a billion people. He therefore attended in person, rolled out the red carpet, put on a troop inspection, and sounded off an appropriate number of guns when a pair of fakers came calling with their prescription for peace at Berlin.

These itinerant peddlers of the doctrine of coexistence through Western suicide are Presidents Sukarno of Indonesia and Modibo Keita af Mali, which used to be known as the French Sudan, if you don't place it. They were fresh from a convention in Belgrade of 25 so-called nonalined countries which may be defined as not being alined our way, but Moscow's way. Castro's Cuba, Communist Yugoslavia, such inveterate Soviet stooges as Guinea, Ghana, and Indonesia, are among them, not to mention Nehru's India.

After 2 days of attending to these doubtful friends, Mr. Kennedy promised to send Secretary of State Rusk into a huddle next week at the United Nations meeting in New York with Khrushchev's agent, Andrei Gromyko, to explore solutions to the soviet demands in Germany. He implied that, given encouragement, he would not resist a summit meeting with Khrushchev. He also said that there was no need for either side to use force, which Khrushchev may choose to interpret as a sign of American weakness, for he has been flexing atomic muscles and issuing threats on a wholesale scale.

Mr. Kennedy's accommodating spirit drew a patronizing reference from Sukarno that he had shown himself "a man of peace." Nobody seemed to be worrying about what Khrushchev had shown himself to be, for the obvious purpose of the Washington visit was to persuade Mr. Kennedy that it was up to him to make the concessions, inasmuch as Khrushchev would not.

As we have recounted, Khrushchev went out of his way to intimidate and affront the conferees by announcing 36 hours before they when into session that Russia was resuming nuclear tests, after which he exploded 10 nuclear devices in succession to contaminate the atmosphere beyond anything of that kind managed in the palaver at Belgrade.

There is nothing in the declaration emanating from the Belgrade Conference to suggest that any of the participants fail to see matters in the light in which Khrushchev would wish them to be seen.

For example, the statement condemned imperialism and colonialism specifically in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but it had nothing to say about Eastern Europe, where Russia has extended its slave empire to the heart of Berlin, throwing up a wall so that no captive can escape.

The reference to Latin America can only be interpreted as an implied crack that the United States pursues colonialist and imperialist policies in that area, and, if the hint is not clear, the nonalined gentlemen go out of their way to condemn the retention of the American base at Guantanamo, Cuba. They also condemned, by name, America's allies in NATO, France and Portugal, while refraining from any suggestion that 22 Soviet divisions in East Germany and elements of the Red army overrunning most of Eastern Europe might be trespassing on anybody's sovereign rights.

But, after American foreign aid handouts approximating $6 billion, the nonalined looked forward to the United States repaying all the courtesies directed its way from Belgrade with much more of the same. In fact, American handouts were not to be considered an expression of generosity, but a moral duty which the nonalined had every right to demand. This duty was "to remove economic imbalance inherited from colonialism and imperialism."

When the ambassadors of the "Hungry 25" came rapping at the door, Mr. Kennedy could have done worse than send back word by an usher that the Government of the United States is only at home to its friends.

Financing of All Domestic Programs Should Be Under Annual Appropriations Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past session of Congress, a continuing fight has been made in the House of Representatives against the financing of programs by back-door borrowing from the Treasury and thereby bypassing the constitutional procedure of an annual justification and review by the Congress.

In February, a bipartisan effort was made to clarify the House Rules so that the Committee on Appropriations would have jurisdiction over bills with language providing Treasury borrowing authorizations. This anti-back-door spending campaign failed, but it pointed up the issue of congressional lack of control over expenditures and resulted in focusing public attention on the controversy.

Finally, after a number of defeats, such as with the Housing bill, the first victory for sound fiscal procedures came with the airport aid bill, which terminated advance control authority and supplanted that back-door device with multiyear appropriations.

The final victory of the opponents of Treasury borrowing came with the foreign aid authorization bill.

Next session, Mr. Speaker, I hope further progress can be achieved toward a return to front-door, doublecheck financing by the legislative branch. As the Christian Science Monitor of August 31, 1961, suggests, Congress might well be consistent and apply the appropriations procedure to other domestic programs where it has authorized back-door financing in the past.

Mr. Speaker, many Members like myself will return next January with the full resolve to carry on the fight against forfeiting constitutional legislative responsibility in connection with Federal spending. I know other Members of Congress will do the same.

Herewith, under leave to include extraneous matter, I offer the thoughtful editorial from the Monitor which prompted these remarks:

AID: FRONT-DOOR PLANNING

The foreign aid bill hammered out in a Senate-House conference committee looks like a workable product. Indeed judging by the favorable comments from all sides one might wonder what all the fighting over this measure was about. Were the central objectives of both sides really irreconcilable?

Those chiefly interested in assuring effective long-range planning of the development loan program did not want Congress to cripple it by suddenly cutting off appropriations. Those mainly interested in preserving for Congress its constitutional authority over appropriations did not want to surrender its right to check annually on aid projects.

Both purposes appear to be reconciled in the bill which emerged from the conference committee. The back-door financing device desired by the President has been barred. This would have permitted the administration to get the money in advance by borrowing from the Treasury. The bill also cuts the 5-year program by $1,600 million. But it authorizes a 5-year program. And specific language has been inserted to permit the President to make commitments on a long-range basis where necessary.

This arrangement which might be called front-door planning is very similar to that proposed by this newspaper and appears practicable in essentials. It represents another victory over groups which oppose foreign aid in general. And it retains for Congress a check on finances which lies at the heart of the representative system of government.

Under back-door financing Congress would not have lost all control but in practice would have found it difficult to get the detailed facts to warrant halting a specific program. As the bill stands the executive department (which has more staff) will be responsible for yearly reports justifying continuation of projects. This is not unreasonable. And if Congress wishes to be in any way consistent it should apply the same procedure to a good number of domestic programs where it has authorized back-door financing without as cogent reasons for long-range planning as exist in handling foreign aid.

Religious Doctrines and Communist Doctrines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER L. McVEY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am baffled by some members of the clergy who have apparently confused their religious doctrines with Communist doctrines. Whether by purpose or accident, they are helping the Communist cause in America by preaching from their pulpits pleas to admit Red China to the United Nations, and also their opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This must please the Communist leaders, who disavow any belief in God, that they have succeeded in tricking God's ministers to convert about 95 percent of their audiences into believing that Red China should be recognized in the world organization.

It is significent that if these ministers are successful in both instances, they will not only open the door to Red Chinese domination of world politics, but they will also destroy one of America's greatest instruments now being used to defend itself against Communist subversion.

Ironically, communism and a belief in God are diametrically opposed to each other; but, the Communists are adept at using naive and misguided persons for their own purposes. Fortunately, the majority of our ministers have white and blue in their blood and are aware of the struggle going on today to gain control of our churches.

Perhaps the basic error in the thinking of many members of the clergy and intellectuals lies in their faliure to realize that the evil of a tyrant is simply that he is a tyrant. Intellectuals are prone to ascribe good motives to tyrants on the left hand of political philosophy, and to ascribe bad motives only to tyrants on the right, when in fact, they are all evil for they seek to deny freedom to the peoples of the world.

From time to time, I receive correspondence from ministers in my district concerning this insidious subversion. In reply to one such letter from a Presbyterian minister, I stated that I was encouraged by the individual members of the clergy who are beginning to speak out in favor of American patriotism, and I made it clear that I do not wish to condemn the vast majority of the clergy who are loyal to their faiths and their country. On the other hand, I voiced my distress at the actions of the Presbyterian Church in advocating the admission of Red China to the United Nations, as well as the recent action of a Methodist youth group in my district denouncing the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

My letter was forwarded to the Board of Christian education of the United Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, and subsequently, I received a very strong reply from Mr. H. B. Sissel, associate secretary, office of church and society, on the letterhead of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. I shall enclose the full text of his letter below, but for the moment, let me state that Mr. Sissel wrote a long letter defending the position of his church in the familiar pattern long used by the so-called liberals by resorting to such terms as "McCarthy era," "professional anti-Communists of the John Birch Society" and attacking the film "Operation Abolition." Also, he included an explanation of his church's stand on the admission of Red China to the United Nations in the context of the Cleveland World Order Study Conference sponsored by the National Council of Churches.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am setting forth herein the full text of my reply to Mr. Sissel which clearly states my thinking on this general subject. It is followed by Mr. Sissel's letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1961.

Mr. H. B. SISSEL,
Associate Secretary, Office of Church and Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. SISSEL: I have given considerable thought to your recent letter before replying.

It was not I who said that "Communists may be attempting to infiltrate the clergy." This was the statement of a very fine bishop of the church, and frankly I do not understand how you can take issue with the bishop's statement. Everyone who comprehends the operation of the Communist apparatus knows that it is constantly attempting to infiltrate every institution of American life, and in some measure, it has been successful.

I don't believe the clergy has been infiltrated by actual Communists to any appreciable degree. The records of the congressional investigating committees, so I am informed, indicate that only three members of the clergy have been identified as one-time members of the Communist Party. One was a Methodist minister and the other two were Presbyterians identified by witnesses under oath. I am informed, however, that many members of the clergy have supported and also have been members of numerous Communist-front organizations and causes. Probably the majority joined and supported these organizations unwittingly.

I am concerned about the large number of members of the clergy who are constantly out in the frontline attacking anti-Communist organizations and congressional investigating committees.

The attitude of the congressional investigation committees concerning the Communist attempt to infiltrate religious institutions is best expressed by GORDON SCHERER, a member of that committee, during the hearings on the Air Force Manual. I am enclosing a copy of those hearings, and you will find Mr. SCHERER'S statement on page 1317.

You speak of the McCarthy era and professional anti-Communist groups. I realize that Senator McCarthy made some mistakes, but I also know that his mistakes were distorted and exaggerated beyond belief by his enemies and the leftwing crowd. The charge that he smeared innocent people's reputations and careers, as you put it, has become a "general charge without being specific" for investigations disclose that many of the so-called innocent people whom McCarthy has been accused of smearing have turned out to be just what he said they were * * * security risks.

Extreme anti-Communist groups exist largely because many people in the labor movement, in the field of entertainment, in the clergy, and in our educational institutions have associated themselves with Communist-front organizations and have loaned their names and prestige over the years to these Communist-front organizations. Many of those who now speak out against the John Birch Society and other anti-Communist organizations have remained strangely silent about the Communist-front apparatus in the United States.

A fairly prominent Protestant clergyman told me not long ago that it was his feeling that some of his colleagues were soft on communism and Communist-front operations because the Communists were giving the Catholics such a hard time. He said to me that these colleagues of his who took this position did not understand that while for the present the full fury of the Communists was directed toward the Catholic hierarchy, because of its universal control and discipline over the masses, all churches would eventually feel the intensity of the Communist lash.

You say that the Presbyterian Church is only "going along with a policy of considering" the recognition of Red China. Doesn't the church know what is happening in Red China? Red China is controlled by a clique of atheistic amoral murderers seeking to destroy all churches.

The Presbyterian clergy and all other clergy for that matter, should be out in the frontline, fighting all efforts to recognize and put the stamp of approval of the Christian church on this evil monstrosity of our time. Jesus didn't debate as to whether the evil moneychangers should be allowed in the temple. He drove them out.

The last matter you discuss in your letter of July 24 is the film "Operation Abolition." I am literally appalled that the Council of Churches and the Presbyterian hierarchy, in particular, should have injected themselves into this cotroversy and published material against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the film "Operation Abolition." No one's fooling anybody. The leadership in the National Council of Churches and some of its constituent bodies have shown disapproval of the Committee

for years, and apparently they have jumped into this fight to discredit the committee and the film in the spirit of "get even."

Over the years the House Committee on Un-American Activities has identified and exposed many Communist-front organizations. Unfortunately, too many prominent individuals in the leadership of our churches have supported, belonged to, and given their names, money, and prestige to these front organizations. The identification of these organizations by the committee has made some of the church leaders look bad, but it wasn't the committee that pointed out the clergymen who belonged to these front organizations. Rather it was laymen within the Protestant church who became sick and tired of the support of Communist-front organizations and causes by the professional leadership of the Protestant church, and it was they who put the finger on those in church leadership supporting these front organizations.

In attempting to discredit the exhaustive investigations and eyewitness accounts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning the San Francisco riots, you have pointed out that the Hoover report stated that "one of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence," etc. You say the Hoover report lied in this respect because the young man was acquitted and, therefore, you repudiate the whole report. The fact is, however, that the incident is recited to have taken place in the FBI report. Many times persons are acquitted who are actually guilty of the offenses charged. Occasionally, persons are found guilty who did not commit the acts charged. One of the greatest trials in all history, with which you are no doubt familiar, is that of our Savior before Pontius Pilate. I believe you would be the last to say the Jesus actually did the things with which he was charged, yet he was found guilty and crucified.

It would seem that the most reliable witnesses as to the authenticity of the film would be those individuals who were present and not identified with either side of the controversy. Would you doubt the voluntary statements of the seven ministers, who attended and were witnesses as to what took place, and who said that the film was authentic and that the charge that it was a forgery or distorted was a manifest lie? Reverend Nims, who was on the Board of the Regional Council of Churches, resigned from that board in protest of the action taken by the National Council of Churches with respect to this film. The full statements of the seven ministers and that of Reverend Nims are set forth in the attached speech from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, entitled "Yellow Journalism," as well as the testimony of the mayor of San Francisco and other eyewitnesses.

One of the documents which the National Council of Churches is sending out in an attempt to discredit the accuracy of the film says that the demonstrations on May 12 did not take place while the committee was in session as indicated by the film. This statement is definitely not true. The committee was in session. The National Council of Churches' document says no member of the subcommittee was in the hearing room except Congressman SCHERER who was standing at a window in the hearing room looking outside. Well, the fact is that on that date, Congressman SCHERER was incapacitated in Cincinnati, 2,000 miles away. He didn't arrive in San Francisco until Saturday morning, May 14. As long as we are talking about distortions, I thought I might comment on this little matter in one brochure of the Council of Churches.

The evidence is conclusive that the film of the San Francisco riots has hurt the Communist conspiracy within the United States as nothing else has done in many years, and it has set back their timetable for destruction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; therefore, the Communists have tried to divert the attention of the American people from the real issues and discredit this film. For one thing, I do not know why the Council of Churches, except if it were to get even, as I pointed out above, has entered this controversy. I am shocked that they have inferred that members of the clergy who were eyewitnesses to this rioting, are not telling the truth as to the accuracy and authenticity of the film. The National Council of Churches is most certainly helping the Communists in their attempt to discredit this film and they are doing so without any justification whatsoever.

I know hundreds of laymen who are disgusted and disheartened with the policies of our church leadership and are of the opinion that we had better return to preaching basic morality in the churches, sermonizing on the goodness and omnipotence of God and man's relationship to God and his fellow men, instead of doting on so-called social justice and trying to get our people to follow a left wing political philosophy, and becoming involved in a brawl over a Communist-inspired riot, again finding ourselves in bed with the agents of the Kremlin.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. MCVEY,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—Shortly the Committee on Un-American Activities will release a document on the various issues raised over the San Francisco hearings and the film. I will see that you get a copy of the same and I would then appreciate your further comments.

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 24, 1961.

The Honorable WALTER L. MCVEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCVEY: It has come to my attention that you have voiced your concern that "Communists are (or may be) coming into the ministry," and that you are distressed by "the action of the Presbyterian Church in advocating the admission of Red China to the United Nations."

Of course, for any group to "prove its innocence" of the charge that it has been, or is being, infiltrated by Communists is impossible (and ought to be unnecessary in our society) unless the general charge is made specific and leveled against particular individuals. Even this listing of particular persons, when it has occurred, has been particularly irresponsible, tending to "identify" a person on the basis of his support of particular causes or organizations engaged in legitimate (and, to be honest, in some cases highly questionable) causes.

This country was able to weather the sowing of suspicion and dissension in the McCarthy era at considerable cost to several innocent people's reputations and careers. Today we are apparently to be subject to a similar season of suspicion, much of it sponsored by the "professional anti-Communists" of the John Birch Society and other similar groups. I am not, believe me, suggesting that you are affiliated, or even sympathetic, with such organizations (and if you were, that would be your privilege), but it is distressing to me as a clergyman and as an employee of the United Presbyterian Church U.S.A. to hear of a Congressman repeating even in a mild way the general charge of communism among the clergy. As one who went through 4 years of seminary, I can say unequivocably that it would be impossible for a Communist agent to endure one semester, let alone 3 years, the intellectual and spiritual discipline of theological training without either getting flunked out, laughed out, or giving up the effort as a waste of his time. I once stayed up half the night arguing with a Paris-trained Stalinist and found him both clever and rigid, but like a Pavlov's dog on certain subjects (for example, he could not endure any criticism of the Soviet Union), he reacted predictably and without imagination.

So please, Mr. MCVEY, if you know of Communists among the Presbyterian clergy or in theological training, name them to this church with evidence, and give their names also to the FBI. But do not dishonor us with voiced general suspicions or fears that they are somewhere in our midst.

In this same vein, I am enclosing a recent action by our general assembly last May on "The Communist Conspiracy and American Freedom," which seeks to delineate rather precisely between real and imagined threats from the Communists, and which I hope you will read.

On the second subject you raise, the alleged action advocating the admission of Red China to the U.N., I can only conclude that you were refering to an action taken by our general assembly in 1959, which I quote in its entirety:

"INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS—CLEVELAND CONFERENCE

"Noting that the National Council of Churches for many years has, through its various departments, held study conferences on issues of public policy;

"Noting further that these conferences consist of delegates from constituent denominations and agencies of the National Council of Churches, and that the delegates and conferences speak only for themselves through statements designed to stimulate further study and free discussion in member denominations and churches;

"Observing that, among the recommendations coming from the Fifth World Order Study Conference held in Cleveland, one concerning the diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China by the United States and its admission to the United Nations has provoked not only responsible discussion but also irresponsible censure; and

"Acknowledging the validity of arguments on both sides of the Red China question, considering that immediate recognition of that government may not be feasible, and yet looking toward the day when diplomatic relations with the mainland government may be both feasible and desirable;

"The 171st General Assembly commends the National Council of Churches for holding its Fifth World Order Conference and dealing courageously and honestly with vital issues which were controversial;

"Urges United Presbyterian churches to resist and reject unconsidered reactions to the Red China recommendation of the Cleveland conference; and

"Calls upon the church to engage in responsible study of the reports of the Cleveland conference in connection with the interdenominational coordinated emphasis on international affairs in the program year 1959–60."

You will see that it does not advocate the admission of Red China, but in the context of the Cleveland World Order Study Conference sponsored by the National Council of Churches (and which spoke for itself only), urges Presbyterians to study the question responsibly. I understand that a similar study has been going on in the State Department for many months now, looking toward the day when the question may be decided with or without our approval at the U.N. And incidentally, while recognizing the serious repercussions that would take place among the non-Communist countries (not to mention among the American public) if and when Red China is recognized, I must say that I hope that any disarmament agreement that may be reached among the great powers has Red China as a signatory to it, with adequate inspection made mandatory.

Finally, on the subject of "Operation Abolition," it would be in bad taste for one to argue with Mr. Hoover of the FBI concerning the role played by Communists in the student demonstrations in San Francisco in May of 1960. It can be said, however, that these demonstrations were considerably more complex than either "Operation Abolition" or "Communist Target—Youth" suggest. As a matter of fact, at least three different demonstrations were taking place, and two of them would have happened anyway had there been Communists present or not. Perhaps the enclosed confidential study made by this office will cast a different light on these demonstrations for you, or at least raise questions you have not yet had brought to your attention. Certainly it goes without saying that the behavior of the students, questions of Communist influence aside, was particularly unruly and unjustified. At the same time, the assertion made by Mr. Hoover that "One of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence. Leaping a barricade that had been erected, he grabbed an officer's night stick and began beating the officer over the head." (P. 8, "Communist Target—Youth"), has been called into question by virtue of the fact that Robert Meisenbach, the student here referred to, has been acquitted of that charge. The fact that no one was convicted of rioting or inciting to riot suggests that the terms, riot and violence (which are used verbally several times in the film but never shown on the film) are perhaps somewhat more vivid than the events and subsequent investigation warrant.

If this letter seems longer to you that it ought to be, it is because this office has been receiving heavy mail from all over the country from clergymen and laymen asking us how to respond to general charges of Communist infiltration in the major denominations and the National Council of Churches. Dealing with these, in my opinion, irresponsible charges is consuming an unconscionable amount of time and energy among churchmen that might well be devoted to more constructive tasks necessary to the maintaining of a free church and an open society—both of which are our best domestic bulwarks against the very real and dangerous Communist conspiracy.

Respectfully yours,

H. B. SISSEL,
Associate Secretary,
Office of Church and Society.

Let's Not Bargain With Outlaws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to bargain about in Berlin. The American people recognize this, if some of our administration spokesmen do not. Every time a statement comes out of the White House or the State Department indicating that we may be willing to negotiate, Khrushchev is encouraged to further pursue the criminal course upon which he is embarked. How stupid it is to bargain with a thief, after he has held you up at gunpoint, to give his act a cloak of legality and to assure him that we approve of his action. Yet, this is exactly what negotiations over Berlin will amount to. In this connection I would like to call attention to an editorial, "What's To Negotiate," from the Chicago Daily Tribune, and another, "Suing for Peace," from the Wall Street Journal. Both editorials follow:

WHAT'S TO NEGOTIATE?

Nikita Khrushchev is seasoning his usual threats to the West with exhortations to negotiate. In a speech at Volzhsk last Sunday, he welcomed "the solution of controversial questions by peaceful means, by negotiations and not by force of arms."

But, as Khrushchev has already made plain that the negotiations he recommends would be restricted to ratification by the West of his designs for East Germany and for the future status of West Berlin, there is little opportunity for give and take, which alone give meaning to negotiation.

Awareness of this fact prompted former President Eisenhower to tell a group of Republican Congressmen visiting him at Gettysburg, "I don't think there's much to negotiate about."

Mr. Eisenhower has been through President Kennedy's present Berlin headache during his own term in office. In an interview published last week in Life magazine, he recalled that Khrushchev originally advanced his formula for dealing with Germany on November 27, 1958. The Soviet boss declared then that he would sign a peace treaty with his Communist puppet government in East Germany and that the West had 6 months to leave Berlin.

The 6 months passed without issue, and Khrushchev, having meanwhile wangled an invitation to visit the United States, met with Mr. Eisenhower at Camp David September 25–27, 1959. Khrushchev reiterated the Soviet intention to sign a separate treaty with East Germany. Eisenhower responded that he could not prevent Khrushchev from making any treaty he wished with the East Germans, though he conceived that any such treaty would be strictly one sided.

"Only this," the President added. "Don't try to interfere with our rights in Berlin."

Khrushchev protested that there would be no Western rights once his treaty was signed.

"We won't accept that," Eisenhower said curtly.

The President's firmness served to stop Khrushchev in his tracks. It was understood that the line had been drawn, and that invasion of Western rights in Berlin would mean war.

This is the situation as it remains today. Mr. Kennedy and his allies need concern themselves no more with bargaining away their rights than Mr. Eisenhower was disposed to do. They must simply repeat, "We won't accept that." If they won't accept it, Khrushchev has no option except to withdraw his demands or to attack.

The risks of war are no greater now than when Eisenhower faced them 2 years ago. What Khrushchev wants is to get the West to hand him everything he seeks on a silver platter. If the West is not that foolish, he must either shut up or expose his empire to being blown up. We doubt if he has any more stomach for that gamble than the next person.

SUING FOR PEACE

When President Kennedy met Premier Khrushchev in June, it could hardly be called a summit conference in the usual sense of a big power bargaining session. As both men have indicated it was little more than an attempt to size each other up. From the U.S. viewpoint, the meeting could certainly be justified on that basis.

Now, though, there is increasing talk of, and increasing pressure for, a summit presumably designed to resolve such dangerous questions as Berlin and the nuclear arms race. The leftist-inclined "neutralists" Sukarno of Indonesia and Keita of Mali have just been appealing to Mr. Kennedy to undertake such a meeting. Already speculation is rife as to whether Britain's Macmillan and France's De Gaulle would be included in any such session. The U.S. Government at the moment seems disinclined to be stampeded into the thing, but it has been pressured before.

Surely all this is way off base. To see why, it is necessary only to recall briefly just what we are up against. Khrushchev is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin. He has resumed nuclear tests partly to apply terrorism to that end, and partly out of what he considers his own military necessities. Negotiations are unlikely to deflect him from either course, for he has made it abundantly plain that he has no interest in real negotiations but only in extorting settlements on his terms.

Indeed, going through the motions of negotiation can serve Khrushchev's purposes, and is as intended; to the Soviets, "negotiation" is a means of waging the struggle, not of trying to end it. In the foreign ministers' conference on Berlin 2 years ago, the West finally did offer a series of concessions—not enough to satisfy Khrushchev, but enough to indicate the dangers of negotiations. And it is now clear how the latter stages of the test-ban talks were used to stall the West so that the Soviets could make their elaborate secret preparations for the current series of nuclear explosions.

Obviously, then, the United States should be wary of negotiations at any "level," foreign ministers or summit or whatever. In addition, there is a further important consideration: This incessant talk in the West about negotiation, even about being the first to propose negotiation to the Kremlin, throws the whole picture out of kilter and tends to weaken the appearance of the allied position.

It is one thing to be prepared to listen to anything Khrushchev may want to say, in the improbable event he should have anything to say worth hearing, and we can certainly do that without a summit; in today's circumstances a summit is about the last kind of conference anyone should be thinking about. But what is need more than communication is more iron in the Western spine, iron that shows in our whole attitude rather than just displays of increased military power.

We have seen again, in the scared-rabbit reaction of the Belgrade conference of "neutralists," how much headway we are making with world opinion. We have seen, over too many dismal years, just how useful it is to negotiate with the Soviets.

Khrushchev, after all, is the criminal of the world, not the West, Khrushchev is the potential murderer of peace. Khrushchev and Khrushchev alone hangs the pall of nuclear war over the globe. If the barbarian wants to sue for peace at the bar of civilization, let him do so. It is not befitting the strength of the Western position, it is not befitting the dignity of the defenders of civilization to appeal to the outlaw to be good.

Kennedy Is Regular Cape Cod Commuter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Frances Lewine, en-

titled "Kennedy Is Regular Cape Cod Commuter."

It is difficult for me to understand the lack of consistency on the part of those who were so quick to criticize President Eisenhower when he took Mrs. Eisenhower with him on some of his trips to the west coast and dropped her off at her mother's in Denver, or at the Elizabeth Arden Guest Ranch.

For 12 consecutive weekends, President Kennedy has been flying to Hyannis Port, Mass. Of course, he has a perfect right to do this, even though during the campaign he announced that he would be consistently in the White House. According to his statements, we have been in a state of unprecedented crisis during most of this time, and some of these weekends have lasted from Thursday until Monday night. The Presidency is a mankilling job, and he is entitled to any relaxation which he can get. I do, however, question the propriety of taking a load of hitchhikers and freeloaders with him on these weekend jaunts and then having the White House trying to fool the public as to the cost of these trips. The attached article indicates an hourly cost of $270.86. This figure, of course, is ridiculous.

Last year when President Eisenhower and a group of Congressmen flew in this jet to Los Angeles for a political meeting, we paid at the rate of $3,000 an hour to cover the full cost of operation. This amounted to $27,000. The old bureaucratic dodge that the pilots and crew are on the payroll anyway is prominent in this article. The argument that it costs no more to take a full load than a half load is also ridiculous. The food and beverages served to these freeloaders who accompany the President is paid for by the taxpayers. It is another case of the President playing Santa Claus with the taxpayers' money, and I hope this article will be read and that protest will be filed for this wanton abuse of taxpayers' money.

KENNEDY IS REGULAR CAPE COD COMMUTER

(By Frances Lewine)

By this time, most summer commuters have called it a season but not President Kennedy and his jet plane weekend special to Cape Cod.

For the 12th weekend in a row, the President is expected to board a huge $5.5 million Air Force jet at Andrews Air Force Base to leave muggy Washington, still caught in summer heat, for the cooling breezes of Hyannis Port, Mass.

And, along with him will go those members of his personal and official family who want a hitch to the shores of Cape Cod.

The Presidential commuter special obviously is the best and fastest way to travel from the Capital to Cape Cod these days. With so many Harvard and Massachusetts men in his official retinue, there are many potential hitchhikers.

Friends, children, and business-bent officials have climbed aboard the Presidential plane for playgrounds on the cape this summer.

IF SPACE IS AVAILABLE

Would-be passengers simply make reservations through Mr. Kennedy's secretary, Evelyn Lincoln, or his special assistant, Kenneth O'Donnell. The Presidential military aide, Maj. Gen. Chester V. Clifton, gives them "space available" priority.

Government officials, Congressmen, staff members, friends, and family all ride free. "We don't charge them," explains Assistant White House Press Secretary Andrew Hatcher, "the plane goes up anyway—it's just a question of whether we have room."

No figures have been made public on how much the plane trips cost the taxpayers. But a couple of years ago the Air Force said the hourly operation cost of such a jetplane was $270.86, which did not include depreciation or maintenance.

The Air Force has pointed out in the past that the crew would be paid anyway, whether assigned to the Presidential plane or other duty.

AMONG THE RIDERS

Among the most frequent of the President's hitchhikers have been his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, and his two brothers-in-law in Government, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver and Stephen Smith, who has a State Department post. Their families take summer residence in or near the Kennedy compound on the shore of Nantucket Sound.

High-ranking members of the Kennedy official family, who have been devoted Presidential jet riders, include White House Advisers Jerome B. Wiesner (science) and Arthur Schlesinger (foreign affairs).

En route, the President often confers with these men in his comfortable, private forward compartment, taking advantage of the trip for after-hours advice.

Among several youngsters who have had this exclusive ride are the two children of David Hacket, Chairman of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, Robert, 1 month old, and Louisa, 4, made the trip one August weekend with their mother, and the President came over to chat, especially with little Louisa. Shyly, she didn't have a thing to say while Mr. Kennedy was in sight, but when he left she declared: "I like that President."

Government officials have boarded the weekend jetplane for a multitude of errands.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, rode the big jet on a mission to complete negotiations on the sale of his summer home in South Chatham. He and his wife then drove the 510 miles back to Washington.

NINETY MINUTES, DOOR TO DOOR

Mr. Kennedy's commuting is something any city-to-country traveler could well envy.

Door to door, Mr. Kennedy can join his family at the seashore in less than a hour and a half, including helicopter hops to and from the airbases. Near Hyannis Port the plane lands at Otis Air Force Base.

In the air soft music is wafted through the compartments. The plane is decorated in pleasant tones of gray, blue, and silver, with walls decorated with outline imprints of some of the world's most famous buildings.

Stewards serve afternoon coffee and soft drinks, chewing gum, candy, and snacks. The President usually prefers soup or munches an apple en route. On the way home, usually Monday morning, a light breakfast of fruit juice, sweet rolls and coffee is substituted on the menu.

In the rear section, the President's VIP hitchhikers get luxury accommodations.

Maritime Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Robert F. Rife, master mariner, for many years has been a keen student of seapower and its influence on world history. One of his articles recently appeared in the Herald American newspaper serving Los Angeles County. Capt. Rife's excellent article, pointing up the need for maritime power as an element of power for peace reads as follows:

[From the Lakewood Herald American, Aug. 17, 1961]

MARITIME POWER SEEN KEY TO PEACE

(By Capt. R. F. Rife)

History records that war has prevailed 90 percent of the time, and peace 10 percent.

But the desire for peace on earth and good will continues in our hopes. What are our chances for realizing our desires?

One way to gather a clue is to examine people's actions in the past. The past is dead and gone to be sure, but the past was peopled and war is between peoples. Each generation of people is but a continuation of humankind. The inherent motivations of humanity remain a constant.

During 1959 the United Nations General Assembly approved a resolution calling for speedy agreement on measures to achieve general disarmament under effective international control. Negotiations have bogged down including the nuclear test ban negotiations which now appear to have been scuttled.

The United Nations sponsored peace negotiations are now headed on the same ill fated course followed in 1934 by the now defunct League of Nations peace negotiations. They collapsed in disagreement and brought on a crushing armament race followed by World War II.

At least twice before in the present century (1899 and 1907) peace conferences between the great powers were held. Each has failed to achieve lasting peace with or without partial or general disarmament.

People and their governments cannot bring themselves to voluntarily weaken their defensive powers against known or unknown destructive and offensive forces. Peoples have an acquisitive instinct, a desire for possessions.

FEAR OF LOSING

They have a fear of losing what they believe rightfully theirs. They have a fierce determination for survival. They have a desire for growth. These characteristics overwhelm man's compassion, and they are immutable in mankind.

But to lessen word tensions the United States offered partial disarmament through an atomic test ban with international inspection. The Soviets have balked using the "we want complete disarmament" propaganda as an excuse for declining our offer.

U.S. Secretary of State Rusk was quoted in the press on June 14, 1961, as saying, "we cannot accept a disarmament proposal which would leave our people as either dupes or victims." On the same day at the United Nations, Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Valerian A. Zorian is reported to have listed disarmament as the No. 1 international issue.

He dismissed as rubbish, a published report that the Soviet Union had reached an agreement with Communist China not to sign any agreement now on ending nuclear tests.

COMPETITIVE MANKIND

Competitive mankind has not yet found a way to abolish war by gentlemen's agreement either verbal or written. No amount of wishful thinking or talking can erase the competitive character of humankind.

Worldwide trade and commerce is the basis of expanding wealth and improving living standards in each of the various parts of the world, regardless of the political complexion of those various parts. The great and continuing world issue at stake is control of the avenues of trade and commerce.

The chapters of history prove no single political system can rule the entire land mass of the world, but the pages in those chapters prove that a single maritime power can control the use of the oceans.

The United States has that power in being right now. The wisdom to judge it correctly and the will to use it effectively must be demonstrated by our leaders soon if our Nation is to remain foremost in the world and our living standards high.

Small Business Administration Action Responding to Catastrophe of Hurricane Donna—1960 Receives High Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 1960, Hurricane Donna swept across the Florida Keys. Donna was no lady. She packed a devastating punch with flattened homes and business buildings alike, played "jackstraws" with house trailers, tossed boats like matchsticks, tore up shrubbery, trees and landscaping, and her winddriven waters ruined machinery, equipment, household furnishings, personal belongings and whatever stood in her way. The main force was directed at the Keys from Key Largo to Marathon, but her side effects of wind, rain and water were felt from North Miami Beach to Key West.

After leaving the Keys, Donna roared across Florida Bay, struck full force at Cape Sable, followed the coastline north through Everglades City, Naples, and Fort Myers, then turned inland following a path over Arcadia, Wauchula and northward through the center of the State until finally on September 10 she turned out to sea just north of Daytona Beach.

In Donna's wake was the most costly destruction of property in Florida history. The stories of heroism and actions beyond the call of duty are legion. The Highway Patrol, the Sheriff's Department, the Red Cross, Civil Defense, the Navy, the National Guard, private individuals and public services all played dramatic roles in helping restore order and livability in the midst of chaos and destruction.

But this is not a story of Donna's force or the determination of the people whose homes and businesses were destroyed. Rather, it is the factual account of one Federal Agency, the Small Business Administration, which without hysteria or heroics, went about its business of helping disaster victims build back to normal so that today, 1 year later, practically no visible scars of Donna's rampage remain.

The Small Business Administration is charged with the responsibility of making long-term low-interest loans to victims of natural disasters so they can restore or rehabilitate their destroyed, lost or damaged property. Almost before Donna's hurricane winds died down, SBA representatives from the Miami Branch Office under the direction of Manager James Carpenter, flew to the storm area to survey the destruction. On Sunday, September 10, while Donna still roared up the center of the State, the Keys and the lower west coast were being investigated. On Monday, the 11th, the path was followed northward, then eastward to where Donna put out to sea. On Tuesday, September 12th, it was determined what special disaster offices would need to be opened to interview victims and process the deluge of applications which were sure to come. Loan examiners and clerical assistants were recruited from all over the Southwest, the East, the Middle West and the South.

From Atlanta, Birmingham, and Knoxville they came; from Philadelphia and Cleveland; from Detroit, Chicago and Minneapolis; from San Antonio, Dallas and New Orleans. Supplies were assembled and field offices opened in Daytona Beach, Tampa, Fort Myers, Naples, Marathon and Islamorada. The nerve center was Miami with Miami personnel directing operations statewide.

In Marathon an office was set up in trailers alongside the Marathon State Bank 4 days after the storm. SBA workers took their own water from Miami because the Keys aqueduct had been broken. They joined the natives in what housing was available and their crew went to work; interviewing, helping with the application forms, inspecting damage, estimating losses and checking the credit worthiness of businesses and individuals.

Ten days after they received their first SBA loan application, the money was being disbursed for rehabilitation and repair. Donna's destruction spread over a wide area in varying degrees from Key West to Daytona Beach and in overall Florida, SBA officers interviewed 1,769 disaster victims. These were the recorded interviews, but the deluge was so great that many mass interviews were held of which no record could be kept.

In the Fourth Congressional District, which covers Dade and Monroe Counties, SBA received 482 applications, in a total dollar amount of $12,507,731. Many applications were for losses greater than the destruction sustained. Many were for items of a personal nature that were ineligible for replacement, but in this area alone, SBA approved 395 of the 482 applications received and the total dollar amount through July 31, 1961, made available to these victims of this storm, was $5,371,576.

Many persons wanted to wait many months before they determined to rebuild. So, the Miami SBA office continued to accept applications until last June 1. Most loans were for new construction, some not yet completed, so the SBA is still closing and disbursing loans in the Keys.

Donna may be just a memory to many of the services who did a job for the disaster victims, but to the SBA Miami office employees it remains very real. In many instances, they'll be servicing the loans for 20 years to come and each month they will be reminded of the heartbreaking devastation right after September 9, 1960.

Small Business Administration Administrator John E. Horne, was formerly Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration, the predecessor agency of the SBA, and was for many years Administrative Assistant to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

In this position, Horne assisted in the development of many legislative measures designed to aid small businesses, and gained wide knowledge of the programs which have been instituted to foster and strengthen the Nation's small business economy.

Mr. Horne's grasp of the problems of small business was demonstrated immediately by his action in assisting the residents of south Florida following Donna.

The Small Business Administration and Administrator John Horne have the heartfelt thanks and gratitude of the people of Florida for a job well done.

A Great Man Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, early this month Dallas lost one one of its great men and one of its most valued citizens with the passing of Lynn Wiley Landrum, for many years a columnist on the Dallas Morning News. Lynn Landrum was not only an outstanding newspaperman, one of the old school, with a deep sense of integrity and honor, he was a close personal friend from whom I drew inspiration and knowledge. His was a full life with many accomplishments and though his passing will be mourned in Dallas for a long time, we take comfort in knowing that our city is a better place because he was there.

As a part of this small tribute to Lynn Landrum, good citizen, great American, man of God, I would like to include an editorial from his beloved newspaper, the Dallas Morning News.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 2, 1961]

LYNN WILEY LANDRUM

The bus driver made his usual stop in front of the News Thursday afternoon and asked: "How is Lynn Landrum?" We didn't know the answer then. Now we do. Lynn Landrum is all right. He has found, as he knew he would, that the way of the cross leads home."

He has gone where he lived that he might go. With unswerving faith, he walked this earth in righteousness and good will, for he wanted this day to be one of victory, not of sorrow—a day of reunion with a heavenly host whose lives had always guided his.

His death is a grievous loss to this institution, with which he had been associated as an editorial writer and columnist 40 years. No man was more loved or respected in his personal and professional life.

In journalism, the expression of editorial opinion is a special technique. It is an art. Mr. Landrum was a genius. He had a God-given talent, polished with practice, of provoking thought and inciting action. With one phrase he could evoke a tear. In a single paragraph he could analyze an issue with incredible clarity and logic.

In the history of southwestern journalism, only a few have equaled in quality and influence his nearly four decades of printed comment that remained, through the final editorial and thinking out loud, models of editorial vigor.

This talent, however, was not his only journalistic instrument. Even more important was the man himself. God was his leader, the Bible his guide, his wife and home the sturdy and abiding roots of his love.

Unbending in personal belief, his distinguishing characteristic—that which overshadowed everything else—was an unshakable conviction.

When he believed that something, or somebody, was right, that was it. There was no changing him. He never angered at those who disagreed; on the contrary, he loved them.

When the newest addition to the News editorial staff had struggled through his first week a few months ago, Mr. Landrum poked his eye-shaded head into the man's office: "Been here a week? How do you like it? Fine. You are doing a good job." And he left, before heartfelt words of gratitude could reach his partly deaf ears.

That was Lynn Wiley Landrum, a friend of man, a man of God, a master of words to whom editorial leadership in the right direction was the highest of challenges.

Friends who worked beside him may recall the words that Mr. Landrum, himself, once wrote about the late G. B. Dealey of the News: "There was no worker on the News who had not known the greatness and kindness of that heart * * * the marks of the man are all over the institution into which he poured all that he was and all that he dreamed." The marks of Lynn Landrum are here. He loved this institution. And it loved him.

The Greatness To Be Humble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, to attain the love and respect of those about us is, after all, the ultimate in success. Robert Gross, the great Lockheed chief, had attained that success. This tribute from his employees and associates speaks for itself:

[From the Lockheed MSC Star, Sept. 5, 1961]

THE GREATNESS TO BE HUMBLE

When Robert Gross died last Sunday, a piece of all of us died with him.

For Robert Gross was part of all of us. He was a part of Lockheed. He founded it, he built it, he sutained it. He sustained us. His strength became our strength. His vision became our vision. Those of us who knew him only by reputation, admired him. Those of us who knew his warmth and spirit personally, loved him.

Robert Gross was a dreamer and a doer. He was fond of describing himself as a person of hope and courage—and he was. He was a man who, almost by instinct, saw the faith of the future clearer than most. He walked toward tomorrow with hope and a high heart. And such was his vision that the rest of us followed him, confident and unafraid.

He was basically a simple man. His strength came from his sure grasp of the simple virtues. "Our great task," he said, "is to guard in all this maelstrom of our scientific world, the true, true values, the simple little acts of daily love and friendship, the readiness to share and help, the courage to speak the truth, and the greatness to be humble."

"The greatness to be humble." Surely this was his. During his lifetime he won fame and honor—more than most men. And this was right because he achieved more than most men.

He wore his fame lightly. He valued his achievements and was pleased with the recognition that came with them. But even more, he valued the things of the heart and the spirit and these he breathed into everything he did.

Robert Gross built his own monument. The walls of Lockheed are his legacy, tens of thousands of airplanes his adornment, the age of space itself, part of his vision.

But his greatest monument he built in our hearts and minds. His greatest legacy was a legacy of hope and courage. It is a legacy we will cherish—a legacy of service and honor we will build on as he would wish.

There can be no doubt of our future with a heritage like this. All the same, we shall miss him sorely.

Long View on Arms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as we are about to consider legislation in the House to establish an Arms Control Agency, the summary set forth in the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of Tuesday, September 12, 1961, is worthy of study. The Senate bill is considerably different from the House proposal and it would appear the price paid to secure the big rate in favor of the bill may have been rather heavy. If we could reduce armament costs by only one-half, we could increase public facilities and our standard of living tremendously without any increase in taxes. Lack of arms control is something the world cannot afford either in terms of risk of loss of life or waste of resources and it is hoped there will be nonpartisan consideration of the bill. Following is the editorial:

LONG VIEW ON ARMS CONTROL

With nuclear tests exploding again, amid the arms buildup accompanying the dangerous Berlin crisis, the forward-looking Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 17 to 0 to recommend passage of the administration bill to establish a permanent Disarmament Research Agency.

Then the Senate passed the bill 73 to 14.

This willingness to plug away at a long-term approach to a problem so full of failures and discouragements is highly commendable. President Kennedy had personally appealed to congressional leaders earlier last week, saying the administration still wants the bill.

The Senate committee did amend the bill by putting in tighter security provisions and requiring Senate confirmation of the Agency's advisory committee as well as top staff.

In the hearings before Senate and House committees, several legislators had expressed concern that the Agency should not become a haven for unilateral disarmers. They also wanted to set up safeguards that it should not go off on policy tangents of its own, but be firmly under the control of the President and Secretary of State.

That has been the administration's intention from the first. The bill makes the Agency nominally independent, to give it status, so it can attract and hold genuine experts, but the director is to bear the title of Under Secretary of State and be responsible to the Secretary as well as the President.

The bill grew out of a conviction shared by President Kennedy and others that part of the difficulty about disarmament negotiations has been that the U.S. position has so often been improvised at the last moment by hasty consultation among amateur disarmament officials and professional military and Atomic Energy Commission experts.

What the President—and the Senate—want is a high-grade research group to do a scientific job, drawing on the knowledge which already exists in the Defense and other Departments, but not wholly dependent upon them. Generals can hardly be expected to be enthusiastic about arms cuts.

The agency would include physicists, meteorologists and other scientists who would study technical methods of policing an arms control agreement, for example methods of detection of nuclear explosions. It would include lawyers and political scientists who would study the legal and political problems involved in any international control system for armaments. It would include economists who would study the effects of arms limitations or reductions on the Nation's economy, as well as the economic effects of various arms policies on other countries.

The Senate committee wants the new Agency to be integrated into the Government, not barging off on its own as Harold Stassen did when he headed a disarmament group.

The Government of the United States can have only one national security policy. The Disarmament Agency would serve as a staff agency to the President and the Secretary of State to help them in their carrying out of foreign and defense policies. It would not be a policymaking agency or a policy-conducting agency.

Iowa's Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER played an important steadying role in the Foreign Relations Committee work on this bill.

Discouraging as the disarmament picture looks right now, this is no time to be cynical or despairing. The urgency is greater than ever. There is beginning already to be a small but solid body of research and original thought about how to get past the old deadlocks over controls. The new Agency would make it possible to concentrate some first-class brains on the task, with a direct channel to the President and the Secretary of State.

The Search for William E. Hinds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, a distinguished professor of the University of

Texas, nationally known teacher, author and historian, has written a most remarkable article, "The Search for William E. Hinds," which appeared in the July 1961 Harper's magazine and reappeared in digest form in Reader's Digest of August 1961.

When you have read this story by Dr. Webb I am sure you will agree that it is a challenging and highly moving one about the encouragement and assistance a man gave to a youngster whom he never saw to obtain an education.

Dr. Webb has been described by Time as "his generation's foremost philosopher of the frontier, and the leading historian of the American West." Most of his honors came late in life. When he was 70 years old, in 1958, he was elected president of the American Historical Association, received a $10,000 award from the Council of Learned Societies, and was made an honorary doctor of laws by the University of Chicago, and was named by ex-students of the University of Texas as one of its four most distinguished living alumni. His best-known books are "The Great Plains," "The Texas Rangers," "Divided We Stand," and "The Great Frontier." Dr. Webb has written many articles for Harper's and for historical journals. He was distinguished professor of history at the University of Texas, Harmsworth professor at Oxford, and Harkness lecturer at London University.

The article is as follows:

THE SEARCH FOR WILLIAM E. HINDS

(By Walter Prescott Webb)

For more than 50 years now—since May 1904—I have been searching for a man I never saw. Though he died 45 years ago, the search grows more intensive as I approach inevitably the time when I can no longer pursue it. The reason I continue this search is that I owe this man a great debt. It would mean a lot to me if I could report to him how a long-shot investment he made in Texas finally turned out.

Since I cannot report to William E. Hinds, I am doing the next best thing by reporting to other people—in hopes that at least some of them may be enriched by the spirit that animated this man. I think this would please him. Once when I tried to express my appreciation, he wrote: "You cannot do anything for me, but if I help you now, perhaps in time you can help someone else." This is the nearest thing to applied Christianity that I know.

He never told me much about himself and I did not inquire because a boy on a small farm in West Texas does not ask personal questions of a mysterious and wonderful benefactor in New York. He died before I had anything to say to him, before there was any return on his investment, of which I was the sole custodian. I knew what I owed him, but for a long time I feared that I might default on the obligation. As the years went by, I prospered in a moderate way and gradually rose in my profession of historian and writer. The greater my success, the greater became my sense of obligation to him. I have to find some way to partially discharge it.

So this is a sort of public acknowedgement of the obligation. It is also an appeal for more information about William E. Hinds. Surely there are some still living in New York who knew him, and there may be others elsewhere who were warmed by his spirit. Before I set down the scant facts I have about him, I must first tell how his life touched by own.

My parents migrated from Mississippi to Texas about 1884, destitute products of the Civil War in search of a new opportunity. I was born in 1888, and 4 years later they moved to west Texas. There I received the childhood impressions that account for the realism in my first book, "The Great Plains." My father was a country schoolteacher, self-educated, and he never had more than a second-grade certificate. He was one of the last fighting teachers, employed to "hold school" in the country schools where the big boys had run the teacher off the year before. It was a rough life in a rough country. My father was usually paid a premium of $10 a month to teach these outlaw schools. He got $50 or $60 a month for a 5-month term—an annual income of $250 or $300, supplemented by what he earned in the summer farming or working at anything that came up, at about 75 cents or a dollar a day.

I learned to read early, and by the time I was ten reading became a passion. Since my father was a teacher, we had books in the house, and both my parents were readers. At that time the most popular brand of coffee was put out by Arbuckle Bros., and you could get 10 pounds of it for a dollar. The beans came in 1-pound paper bags, with Mr. Arbuckle's signature on the side: if you collected enough of his signatures, he would send you a premium. The first book I ever acquired for myself, "Jack the Giant Killer," cost me 10 signatures. It was the first piece of mail that Uncle Sam ever brought to me, and I can never forget the thrill of receiving it at the Lacasa post office, the thrill of reading it on Old Charlie as I rode him home. It was the beginning of a long series of thrills and shocks that have come to me via the post office.

Not only did I read everything in our house, but I scoured the country for 3 miles to come up with files of The Youth's Companion, the Saturday Blade, and the Chicago Ledger. From a peddler I acquired a big file of Tip Top Weekly, which dealt with the doings of Frank Merriwell, who seemed to be running things at Yale. As far as I can recall, this was the first time I ever heard of college. From Frank Merriwell I got the first faint desire to go to college myself but it never occurred to me that I would ever do it.

This reading opened up such a wonderful world that I developed an aversion to the one that lay around me. I wanted to get away from it into the world where the books were.

When I was either 12 or 13, my father homesteaded a quarter section of land—160 acres—in Stephens County. This was about the last of the vacant land, since the open range was fast going under fence. The best land had already been taken, and this place lay back in what was called the Cross Timbers—deep sand with a red clay bottom, covered with scrub oak and blackjack. My father built a plank house in an open glade, and we began opening up a farm, the hardest work a boy can do.

This land had once belonged to Phil S. Lehman of New York, but he had wisely gone off and forgotten all about it. When we had paid the back taxes and lived on it 10 years, that made it ours according to Texas law. We didn't exactly steal it, but we were mighty glad when the 10 years expired. During that time my mother was always apprehensive when a stranger poked his head out of the brush, and it was not until after the limitation had run that we widened the road. From the time I was 13 until I was 17 seems an eternity. When we plowed, we plowed in new, stumpy land, and when we were not plowing, we were making more stumps and more new ground. For at least 2 years I did not go to school at all because my father was away teaching in the winter, and I was the man on the place except on weekends.

Very early in my career, my father made a casual remark that had enormous influence on my life. He said that when I grew up he wanted me to be an editor. Now I didn't know what an editor was, but his remark excited my curiosity. I finally learned that an editor ran the local paper. One day when we were in Ranger, I made bold to go into the office of the Ranger Record, and there was the editor, whose name was Williams, pecking away on an Oliver typewriter. This was the first typewriter I had ever seen, and it fascinated me. I stood looking over Editor Williams' shoulder at this marvel until he suggested that I do something else. By this time I had spied a treasure of untold magnitude, a great pile of "exchanges" which Editor Williams had thrown into a corner of the office because no wastepaper basket was big enough to contain them. Most of the papers were in the original wrappers, and all but the latest ones were covered with dust. I got up my courage to ask if I might have some of them, and the editor said go ahead. I carried off as many as I thought it would be seemly to try to get away with.

Among them were several copies of the Sunny South edited by Joel Chandler Harris and published in Atlanta, Ga. The official records tell me that the Sunny South, a weekly, was "devoted to literature, romance, fact, and fiction."

It was then publishing A. Conan Doyle, Uncle Remus, Gelett Burgess, Will Irwin, and many other good writers, with lavish illustrations. It was wonderful, but the tragedy was that I had only a few copies.

In reading it, however, I learned that for 10 cents I could have The Sunny South every week for 3 months. I did not have 10 cents, and I knew of no way of getting such an amount of money. My father was working hard and I was almost afraid to approach him, though I know now that he probably would have given me the dime had I asked at a propitious time. That winter he was away, and my mother and I often sat up late reading. One night I told her what I wanted, and why. She did not say anything, but I can see her now as she got up from her chair and went diagonally across the room in the yellow light of a kerosene lamp, and extracted from some secret place a thin dime. It may have been the only coin in the house.

That dime is the most important piece of money I have ever owned, for my entire life pivots on its shiny surface. It brought The Sunny South for 3 months, and soon the whole family was in love with it. There was never any trouble about renewing the subscription.

The letter column in The Sunny South was presided over by Mrs. Mary E. Bryan. One day I sat down and wrote her a letter which had one quality dear to an editor—brevity—and perhaps another essential to the writer, a willingness to lay bare something deep in the human heart. I said I wanted to be a writer, to get an education. I mentioned that my father was a teacher, and that he had been crippled in an accident. I signed with my middle name, which I always liked because an uncle who had the name was something of a writer.

The letter was published in the issue of May 14, 1904. My father had come home from school, and we were then plowing corn with Georgia stocks. (A Georgia stock is a kind of one-horse plow.) The corn was less than a foot high. It was late in the afternoon, the time when the sun hangs unmoving in the sky for an incredible length of time. We were very tired and were sitting on the beams of our Georgia stocks letting the horses blow, when my sister came from the mailbox of the new rural route

which ran about a mile from the house and handed me a letter.

Few such letters have ever been received by tired boys sitting on Georgia stocks in a stumpy field. The envelope was white as snow and of the finest paper; the ink was black as midnight; the handwriting bold and full of character, with fine dashes. The flap was closed by dark-red sealing wax stamped with the letter H.

The address was:

"Prescott, Ranger, Tex., care of Lame teacher."

The letter bore a New York postmark, May 17, 1904, but there was no return address. The envelope which lies before me now shows what care I used in opening this letter. It read:

"PRESCOTT,

"Ranger, Tex.

"DEAR JUNIOR: I am a reader of the Sunny South and noticed your letter in the 'Gossip Corner'—I trust you will not get discouraged in your aspirations for higher things, as you know there is no such word as fail, in the lexicon of youth: so keep your mind fixed on a lofty purpose and your hopes will be realized, I am sure, though it will take time and work. I will be glad to send you some books or magazines (if you will allow me to), if you will let me know what you like.

"Yours truly,

"WM. E. HINDS,

"489 Classon Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y."

Now I realize how narrowly I missed this rendezvous with destiny. How did it come about that a letter addressed to "Prescott" reached me? The Sunny South came addressed to W. Prescott Webb, and it passed through the hands of Mr. John M. Griffin, the bewhiskered postmaster who was an ex-Confederate soldier. Since the Sunny South was pro-Confederate, Mr. Griffin got to reading my paper and fell in love with it. He and the rural mail carrier were probably the only people outside my family who knew that the name Prescott was really mine.

Even so, that letter nearly missed its mark. The envelope bears the post office stamp, "Missent," but I have no idea where it went before reaching me.

From that day on I never lacked for something to read—the best magazines in the land and occasional books. Every Christmas a letter would arrive from New York, and usually a tie of a quality not common in west Texas.

These books and magazines fired to white heat my desire for an education. Evidently my father, who was not a demonstrative man, was touched by my fervor. The stumpy farm had expanded and because of my father's love for the soil and his understanding of the principles of dry farming, it became productive. But there was still not enough of it, and we rented additional land from the neighbors. One day when we were clearing land my father asked me a question.

"Do you think," he asked, "that if you had one year in the Ranger school you could pass the examination for a teacher's certificate?"

To that question the only answer was "Yes."

"Well," he said, "if you will work hard, and if we make a good crop, we will move to Ranger for 1 year and you can go to school."

The year 1905 was one of the good years when the rains came. The fields produced bountifully, especially the new ground with the accumulated humus of a thousand years. The Ranger cotton gins ran day and night all fall. I know because I fed the suction pipe on Saturdays and after school. I had to make a sacrifice to go to school. Every boy in west Texas had a horse. Mine was a trim blue mare, close-built, easy to keep, fast, and lovely to look at. I sold her for $60 to get money for books; I got the tuition free by sweeping the school floors.

I pored over my books because I had a contract to deliver a second-grade certificate in the spring. My extensive reading gave me some advantage, but I had rough going with mathematics and grammer. I shall never forget J. E. Temple Peters, principal of the school and a near genius, who spent hours coaching a group of us to pass the examination at the county seat. When the time came, I had developed a severe case of tonsillitis, and my fever must have gone to 103 and over. Peters, who was one of the examiners, fed me aspirin while the fever fired my brain and seemed to sharpen all my faculties. I wrote on the eight required subjects for 2 days far into the night, but when I rose to turn in my papers I staggered in the aisle. There was never any thought of quiting. This was my only chance.

When school ended, I went back to the farm to await the decision of the examiners. Then one day there was an official envelope in the mail box. It was just a second-grade certificate which permitted me to teach in the rural schools, but to me it was a certificate of emancipation. I have acquired a good many parchments of finer quality in my career, but this one outranks them all.

My father not only moved the family back to the farm, but he quit teaching to devote all his time to it. I began where he left off, and through his influence had no trouble in getting an appointment. As a matter of fact, I taught three schools in that year, one for 6 weeks, one for 4 months, and one for 2. My salary ranged from $42.50 to $45 a month, and I saved a bigger proportion of it than I have ever saved since. I had an affair of conscience because of the short hours. I had been accustomed to working from 10 to 14 hours a day, and there seemed to be something immoral about quitting at 4 o'clock.

With the money I saved I spent another year in school, and in the spring I passed the examination for a first-grade certificate. Suddenly I became a success. I was employed at $75 a month to teach the Merriman School which my father had taught 2 years at $60. (Underneath the stony Merriman School grounds and the nearby Baptist churchyard lay a million or so barrels of oil, not to be found for 10 years.) I was getting the maximum salary paid in the county schools. I was wearing good clothes and moving in the highest circles of local society, working 5 days a week and quitting when the sun was from 2 to 3 hours high.

Then in the winter of 1909 everything changed. One cold day, so windy that the pebbles from the playing field rattled like buckshot against the side of the school building, I walked down to the mail box and found a bulky leter from William E. Hinds. It was dated January 9, 1909. Here are the most important paragraphs:

"MY DEAR FRIEND: We have not had much winter as yet but the last few days have been cold and presume we shall have our usual amount before spring. My sister went to Washington, D.C., for the holidays and was at the White House, New Year's. Secretary Cortelyou is our cousin, so she was invited to stay at the White House for luncheon.

"My friend, I wish you would write me what your plans and wishes are for the future. We all have plans and hopes for the future and it is well we have, even if they are not always realized. Come, let us be chums, and write me just what is on your mind; perhaps I can help you and after all the best thing in life is to help someone, if we can. One would count it a great thing (to remember) if they had helped someone, that had afterward become famous or great, say for instance Lincoln or Gladstone or any of the other great ones who were born a hundred years ago this year. And perhaps I can say, 'Why I helped J. Prescott Webb when he was a young man.'[1] And people may look at me, as a privileged character to have had the opportunity; so my boy tell me about your plans and hopes and then perhaps I may be able to help you carry them out.

"Are there any books which you would like? If so say so and let me send them to you. If you don't 'say so' I may send them anyway.

"Your friend,

"WM. E. HINDS."

As an afterthought, he wrote on an extra sheet as follows:

"I am interested in your teaching. How many scholars and are they mostly from the farm or town? Teaching is good training and I know it will benefit you.

"Have you planned going to college in the fall? If you haven't planned it, is it something you would like to do? If so what college have you in mind? Now answer all these questions, please."

At the time the letter came I had not thought seriously of going to college. That was something for the sons of doctors and other prosperous people. Besides I was already a success, and rather enjoying the illusion. The letter faced me about, and made what I was doing insignificant—a means only.

I answered all his questions, telling him that I would like to go to the University of Texas. I had saved some money, for I had been at work 3 months, and I determined to save more. I reduced my social activity, and with some difficulty restrained myself from making a bid for a girl I had a very hard time forgetting. The road ahead was rough enough for one, and too rough for two.

Thus it came about that in September 1909, I boarded the train for Austin and the University of Texas with approximately $200. Our agreement was that I would spend my money, and when it played out, I would notify Mr. Hinds and he would send me a check each month. At the end of the second year, I owed him about $500, and he suggested that I should drop out and earn some money, saying that "I am not a rich man." I send him a note for what I owed, but he would accept no interest. He never did.

In 1911–12, I taught the Bush Knob School in Throckmorton County, $90 a month. I reduced the note and told him I would like to return to the university. He approved, and I can sum it all up by saying that I never started a year at the university that he did not see me through. He never refused any requests I made of him, though I am glad to remember that I kept them to the minimum.

The nearest he ever came to a refusal was one summer when I made a good deal of money as a student salesman. I wrote Mr. Hinds that I would like to come to New York to see him, and that I had the money. He advised me to apply it on my college education. I did, but I have always regretted that I never saw him.

When I took the B.A. degree in 1915 I owed him something less than $500, which was our limit. And here I need to say something about my college career. I was 21 years old when I entered college, and I had no preparation for it. I had skipped too many grades and too many years of schooling. I did not have entrance credits, but because I was 21 the university admitted me on what is known as individual approval. My career as an undergraduate was completely lacking in distinction. I made fair grades in most subjects, but none to make Hinds proud. He never asked a question about grades. He never admonished me to do better.

---

[1] For years he did not get my first initial right, but addressed me as J. Prescott Webb.

But every month the check came. What he saw in me I have never been able to understand—but the fact that he saw something, that he seemed to believe in me, constituted a magnetic force that held me on the road. If I felt inclined to quit, or to go on a binge and spend money foolishly, as my friends often did, I could not do it for very long because there was a mysterious man in New York who trusted me.

Equipped with the B.A. degree, I got a job as principal of the Cuero High School at $133 a month. Then, in the fall of 1915 a letter came saying that William E. Hinds was dead.

The lawyers found my note in his papers, and they began to write me crisp and business like letters. They had me make a new note to his sister, Ida K. Hinds, for $265. It was cosigned by my father and bore interest. Then came a letter from Miss Hinds, who had spent her life as a teacher in the New York schools. She said that she had taken over the note, and that I would not be bothered with the lawyers any more. In the fall of 1916, I married Jane Oliphant, and moved to the San Antonio Main Avenue High School as a teacher of history. Miss Ida Hinds came down to spend a part of the winter at the Gunter Hotel and she was often our guest.

She told me about all I know of her brother; that he had never married, that he had helped other boys, and that he was an importer of European novelties. She implied that he was not intensively devoted to business, was rather casual about it. After his death I received an excellent photograph of Hinds, which is now before me. He had fine features, black hair, blue eyes, fair skin, a thin straight nose, and delicate ears. He wore a black mustache and had a full head of hair which appears to have been unruly.

Why didn't I get from Miss Hinds the information I now seek about her brother? There is no satisfactory answer to the question, as I look back now. From where I stood then, the answer seems reasonable to me. It never occurred to me that I would write this story. At that time there was no story because I had done nothing to justify one, and I was not yet a writer. Even had I thought of it, I would have considered that I had plenty of time, for youth is not conscious of the brevity of life. Moreover, I had just married, and at such a time each day seems sufficient unto itself.

Miss Hinds did not remain in San Antonio very long. It was probably in January of 1917 that she went to Los Angeles and took residence at 1316 South Vermont Avenue. Her first letter was dated February 18, 1917.

Then a letter arrived postmarked Burlington, Vt., April 18, 1918. It marked the end of the trail. Inside was an undated memorandum from her to me, which read: "I enclosed your note in directed envelope so if anything happens to me, it will be sent to you. If you receive this, you will know that I have passed away and you are under no further obligation. Consider the matter closed as there is no one else that would be interested."

The note she enclosed was for $265 with 5 percent interest. Endorsements on the back show that on April 17, 1917, I paid $100 principal and $16.56 interest, leaving a balance of $165 due in 6 months with interest "at 6 or 7 percent." The last endorsement is dated October 11, 1917, with a payment of $90 on the face of the note plus $5.68, leaving a balance of $75.

That $75 has never been paid to anyone connected with Hinds. It has, however, been paid over and over to those who needed it, and it will be paid again in the future as Hinds would have wanted it.

The act of this man is the unsolved mystery of my life. I have never been able to understand what motivated him. I find it easy enough to write a check for some student in temporary need, one that I can see and know, and I have written a good many such checks. But I still cannot understand how a man in New York City could reach far down in Texas, pluck a tired kid off a Georgia stock in a stumpy field, and stay with him without asking questions for 11 years, until death dissolved the relationship.

He did not live long enough to see any sign that the investment he made was not a bad one. In 1918 I became a member of the faculty of the University of Texas. My development there was slow—I have been late all my life—and it was not until 1931 that I published my first book, "The Great Plains." Others followed in due course, but it was not until after 1950 that things began to happen which might have gratified William E. Hinds. When these marks of recognition came, my satisfaction was always tinged with regret that he could not know about them.

William E. Hinds was a great reader, and he probably was aware of Shelley's ironic lines:

> The seed ye sow, another reaps;
> The wealth ye find, another keeps;
> The robes ye weave, another wears;
> The arms ye forge, another bears.

I have reaped where he sowed, and I wear what he wove. Indeed, I keep a part of the wealth he found, but I have tried to keep a little of the spirit with which he used it. His spirit has hovered over me all my life. His name appears in the preface or dedication of my major books. I cannot now better describe what he did for me than I did in "The Texas Rangers":

To the memory of William Ellery Hinds. He fitted the arrow to the bow, set the mark, and insisted that the aim be true. His greatness of heart is known best to me.

This is the end of the story. I appeal to those who read it, for more information about William E. Hinds. I would like to know when and where he was born, where he was educated, and what occupation he followed. If he helped other boys, as his sister stated, I would like to know who they are and what they did. His will might reveal something about his interests and activities.

I have consulted with private detective agencies about making a search, but found them just as vague about what they would do as they were specific about fees. I admit that this investigation should have been made long ago, but it was something easy to postpone. It might have been possible to make contact with the Cortelyou family, but I neglected to do it. While in New York once, I took a taxi to the place where William E. Hinds lived in Brooklyn, and I ran the index of the New York Times in search of his obituary, but could not find his name. In January 1961 I had a bout with the hospital and the surgeons, and came pretty close to losing. This was a warning that I could no longer delay; as soon as I was able, I went to work in earnest.

I now summarize the facts that I have about him. His full name was William Ellery Hinds. For several years after 1904 he lived at 489 Classon Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. He later moved to another address which I do not have. The only relatives he ever mentioned were his sister and some cousins, one of whom was George B. Cortelyou, Secretary of the Treasury under Theodore Roosevelt after 1907. I do not know the exact date of his death, but it must have been in the autumn of 1915 because my note made out to Ida K. Hinds bears the date of January 25, 1916.

The meager results of my search thus far suggest that if I remain silent, William E. Hinds may be forgotten. I want him to be remembered. Finally, it seems to me that what he did may encourage others to follow his example, and thus perpetuate his influence. He would want no better monument.

(Anyone having information about William E. Hinds should address W. P. Webb, University Station, Austin, Tex.—THE EDITORS.)

Security and the Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD D. CLANCY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the Institutum Divi Thomae in Cincinnati, Ohio, is one of the most unique and exclusive graduate institutions of scientific research and study in the United States. For more than a quarter of a century it has devoted its basic activities to finding the cause and cure of cancer. Its discoveries in this field have gained for it worldwide acclaim. Its president, Dr. George S. Sperti, and its dean, Dr. Elton S. Cook, have won wide recognition for their attainments in the scientific world.

On Tuesday of this week the institutum held its 24th convocation and 22nd annual research conference. The following received degrees from Dr. Sperti:

The degree of master of science was awarded to Bernd Kroenberg, of Cincinnati.

Degrees of doctor of philosophy were conferred on Delia Marie Barreto, formerly of the Pasteur Institute, Paris, who will become a research assistant at Oxford University, England; Sister Ida Cosby, S.C.N., Nazareth College, Louisville; Nicolas J. Mamola, Cincinnati, who will join Johns Hopkins University Medical School as a research associate; and Ambrose M. Tokushige of Kyoto University, Japan, who will become a research associate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

I am pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House that our colleague from Ohio, Mr. GORDON H. SCHERER, had conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. SCHERER delivered the convocation address which follows:

SECURITY AND THE SCIENTIST

It is with mixed feelings that I address you today; a feeling of honor—that I have been asked to speak to the doctors and masters, the faculty and directors of one of the most exclusive graduate institutions of scientific research and study in this country; a feeling of satisfaction—that another group of men and women, once tyros in the field of scientific study, have become true doctors and masters of this exacting field of knowledge; a feeling of congratulation—for each one of you for a job well done; a sense of gratitude—for what you will be able to do for mankind with the knowledge and skills developed during your studies at the Institutum Divi Thomae; a feeling of humility—when I think of the scientific knowledge that is yours, singly and as a group; a feeling of pride—that the Institutum has seen fit to confer an honorary degree upon me.

As a lawyer and politician, I should, perhaps, feel something of a stranger addressing a scientific institute. Yet, in this instance, I actually feel, instead, a kind of kinship and

quite at home for, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress of the United States, I have for some years been engaged in work that is, in many respects, quite similar to yours.

There are many killers stalking the earth today. Cancer is one. It causes pain, suffering, death. It eventually destroys human bodies. For years the Institutum has devoted most of its research to finding the answer to the problem of cancer—what causes it, how it grows, how to treat it, how to destroy it if possible, or, barring that, how to immunize its potential victims against its ravages.

There is another killer stalking the earth today—communism. For 20-odd years the Committee on Un-American Activities has been doing research on this cancer of the body politic; What causes it, how it spreads, who and what are its carriers, how its progress can be blocked, how people may be immunized against it.

Cancer kills the human body. Communism kills bodies, too. During the last four decades it has destroyed far more than cancer has. And frequently—which is much worse—it kills human souls. It also destroys other things more precious than mere physical life, things for which countless people over the centuries have gladly died. It destroys freedom—freedom of religion, speech, press, political choice, and freedom of scientific study and research.

We, the Institutum Divi Thomae and the Committee on Un-American Activities, have similar problems. Neither of us has yet found the answers to them. Both, however, live and work in the hope that we will find the answers—and sometimes in a desperate realization that we must find the solution to these scourges of our time.

Cancer research is so exacting in its demands, requiring highly specialized knowledge and skills, that the mere layman can offer you little or nothing toward a solution of the problem it presents. We must leave the complexities of this tremendous challenge to you, the scientists.

Communism is a different kind of problem. While it is no field for the amateur, and while well-intentioned persons who have lacked sufficient knowledge have often impeded the fight against it, yet communism is a problem of such nature that all informed persons can contribute to its eradication, including, of course, the scientist.

Our century at various times has been called the age of science, the air age, the age of electronics, and now we hear it spoken of as the space age. Of all of these, I believe age of science best describes our era—because the development of aircraft and electronics, and now the exploration of space, are no more than varied manifestations of scientific advancement. This term best describes our century, too, because it is science in general that has made tremendous contributions to all phases of our life.

In view of this fact it is not surprising that the scientist is the man of the hour. Business, education, government all want the scientist—and all will pay him well.

Weighing all that the scientist has contributed to our age, the question naturally poses itself:

What has been the scientist's contribution to eradicating the cancerous growth of communism which is slowly but surely strangling our national security and threatening our very survival as a free and Christian people?

In one sense, the scientist has made the greatest contribution of all in this as in other fields. Ironically, however, it is a contribution in which many scientists take little or no pride and of which many are actually ashamed. I am referring, of course, to the development of the atomic bomb.

Granted, this is a horrible weapon of destruction. But think for a moment where humanity would be without it. For years following World War II, the only deterrent to Stalin's Communist hordes sweeping over Western Europe and other areas of the world was the U.S. monopoly of the atom bomb. We had demobilized, cut our forces at a suicidal rate to a suicidal size. Without the bomb we would have been helpless before vastly superior numbers and conventional military forces of the Kremlin. The bomb stopped them.

Translated into human terms, what does this mean? It means that millions are alive today who would be dead were it not for the bomb. It means that nations that are still free, with peoples whose minds and souls are free, would be enslaved.

Should any scientist then be ashamed of the atomic bomb or other nuclear weapons?

What is the purpose of these deadly weapons? Why were they created? Was it to wantonly kill millions? Was it to gain territory or to win domination over other men? No. The primary purpose of these weapons, as developed by scientists of the free world, is to prevent war, to save lives, to preserve nations of freemen from the scourge of Communist enslavement. So it is evident that it is the scientist who has made the greatest contribution to American security.

While this is true, it is also true that a vocal minority in the scientific community has injured and imperiled our national security.

Why and how have they done this?

Some simply because they do not understand the nature and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy. Others because they are Communists and pro-Communists. This latter group, unfortunately, has often victimized the former into serving Moscow's drive for world domination.

These scientists claim that scientific progress in this country has been impeded by a too vigorous anticommunism and a too restrictive security program. These conditions, they assert, have created an "atmosphere of fear" in scientific circles, have deterred some scientists from working for the Government and have led to the dismissal of others. They were promoting this line in 1957, when the Soviet Union beat us to the punch by launching Sputnik I. They are still peddling this line today.

What is the truth about these claims?

1. The Soviet scientists who produced the first sputnik and the missile that sent it into space—and who have since sent man into orbit—have worked under unbelievably strict security measures far more stringent than those existing in the United States. Overall, the Soviet Union is the most totalitarian nation ever to exist on the face of the earth, yet Soviet scientists are achieving results which are the envy of the free world and which are skyrocketing Communist prestige and influence.

If police state security is not impending Soviet scientists, why should strict security measures stifle our men?

2. Certainly the German scientists who produced the V–1's and V–2's which terrorized London during World War II, did not work in an atmosphere of freedom. Yet they were the pioneers in the field of rocketry.

3. The United States was the first nation to produce the atomic bomb. The scientists who made this major breakthrough worked under the tightest security regulations ever used in this country. But these measures did not create a fear complex or psychological bloc which hampered their research and development.

4. In the latter part of 1957, a Presidential Committee, established to inquire into the shortage of scientists and engineers in Government service, found what we might have expected—that it was difficult for the Government to recruit scientists and engineers because other employers were offering them better pay. In the course of its investigation, however, this Presidential Committee also carefully studied the security problem. It asked thousands of scientists in Government and industry if security regulations impeded their work in any way. Ninety-one percent of those in Government service said they did not; 97 percent of those in industry agreed. Only 6 percent claimed that security requirements hindered their progress.

These facts show conclusively that the claim of this vocal minority I have referred to is utterly false. Yet, I regret to say this claim is constantly made by a certain clique of scientists, by certain leftwing newspapers and magazines—and accepted by many people. This false Communist-inspired propaganda, disseminated among the American public, has long been an impediment to the development of a truly effective security program.

What about the claim that U.S. security regulations, whether they impede scientific research or not, are too strict?

Here are some facts which shed light on the answer to this question.

1. Soviet agents stole the secret of the atom bomb even though its development was surrounded by the tightest security regulations ever to exist in this country.

2. Immediately after Moscow launched Sputnik I in 1957 three of the Soviet Union's top missile experts were permitted to tour the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington. They were shown how U.S. satellites were made and tested; they were permitted to inspect the control center for their operation, and given other information concerning our satellite program. Believe it or not, U.S. newspaper reporters were barred from the area because it was restricted.

3. On the other hand, the Pentagon today does not have the right to fire from defense plants persons who, it has good reason to believe, are potential espionage agents and saboteurs. Since the Greene case was decided by the Supreme Court 2 years ago, it is difficult and sometimes impossible to deprive individuals in private industry of access to highly classified scientific information even when the Government has reasonable grounds to believe that they are security risks.

4. At about the time sputnik was launched, and since that time, the Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed that members of Communist-controlled unions are employed at U.S. communications centers handling secret military messages and as key technicians in the conelrad defense warning system; that Communists hold licenses to operate various types of radio and telegraphic equipment that would enable them to sabotage conelrad—and that the Government has no clear-cut power to deprive them of such licenses.

It has further been revealed that security regulations at the super-secret National Security Agency were so completely inadequate that Vernon Mitchell and William Martin, top mathematicians, were cleared for employment even when it could have been easily determined that they were sex deviates. Committee members were astounded when they learned that these men were employed even though behavior abnormalities of one of them were revealed by a polygraph test taken at the time of their employment. It has long been recognized that sex deviates are bad security risks since they can be easily blackmailed into serving the enemy.

These two mathematicians, as you will recall, defected to the Soviet Union last year and among other things disclosed to the

Kremlin that the United States had broken the secret codes of some 40 nations. Naturally these codes were changed, and it is obvious that the United States has been deprived of much valuable information. Of course, the most harmful effect of their defection was the tremendous propaganda victory gained by the Soviets throughout the world when these men, after reaching the Soviet Union, attacked the policies of the United States.

It is significant that, since the committee's investigation began shortly after the defection—an investigation which is still going on—26 sex deviates have been discovered in the National Security Agency alone and removed. Just the other day we got rid of 16 more of them in the International Cooperation Administration.

I realize most of these people are unfortunates and not disloyal but in these times of great peril we cannot afford to have them in sensitive jobs in Government where they automatically become security risks, subject to blackmail.

The National Science Foundation, as you know, was set up by the Congress primarily to aid in the national defense by granting taxpayer's money for advanced scientific study and for grants to universities and other institutions for research and development of special projects for the Government. Within the past few months the Committee on Un-American Activities from its investigations has learned that the Foundation since the time of its formation in 1950 has been making absolutely no security check on persons who receive individual grants. It has made no security check on the individuals who actually do the work for the universities engaged in this Government work. Often it does not even know the identity of the supervising personnel.

I was flabbergasted the other day when I learned that a top scientist, identified as a Communist, and who gave information on the atomic bomb to a Soviet agent during World War II, is now working on a Government project at one of our universities.

Just a few months ago the committee through its investigations learned that one Edward Yellin had been given a National Science Foundation fellowship at the University of Illinois. Keep in mind that, as I have said, the National Science Foundation was created by the Congress primarily to promote scientific study and research in the interest of national defense.

In 1958 the Committee on Un-American Activities, in hearings at Gary, Ind., determined that Edward Yellin, an identified Communist, was a colonizer for the Communist Party in basic industry in the Chicago area. A Communist colonizer of industry is one who misrepresents and downgrades his educational attainments in order to get a menial job on the assembly line where he can indoctrinate his fellow workers with Communist Party policy and stir up dissension.

Edward Yellin was convicted in the Federal court for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions concerning such activities during the hearing of the committee at Gary. In spite of his record and in spite of this conviction, Yellin was granted first a Ford Foundation scholarship and then a National Science Foundation fellowship at the University of Illinois graduate school.

Those at the university who recommended him for the National Science Foundation fellowship felt no obligation to disclose what they knew about Yellin's colonizing activities and his conviction in the Federal court. Of course, there was no excuse for the National Science Foundation not to have known of Yellin's record. But as I have said, no security check is made.

Would you say, while such conditions exist—and I could mention many similar situations if time permitted—that our security measures are too restrictive?

What particularly disturbed the committee in its investigation of the National Science Foundation was the attitude shown by the director when he was questioned about its complete lack of security measures. He stated, in effect, that scientists were different from the average American citizen; that the National Science Foundation would not be able to get some scientists to do even basic scientific research, completely unclassified, under Government auspices if they dared bother them with questions about affiliations with Communist-front organizations and other questionable activities and associations. If the Government wanted the cooperation of American scientists, he intimated, it had to bend over backward in its efforts not to offend their delicate sensibilities by so much as raising the question of security.

He was—I believe and hope—here expressing an erroneous opinion of what scientists are like, rather than actual fact. The 1957 Presidential committee report I mentioned a few minutes ago, I believe disproves his contention—at least as far as the great majority of scientists are concerned. They are willing to work for Government in any type of research, even if it means strict security regulations and careful investigation into their personal backgrounds.

All of us must keep in mind this basic fact—that a Communist, no matter what else he may be, is a Communist first, last, and always. He may also be a scientist, a teacher, a union officer, a writer, or a government official, but dedication to communism and loyalty to the Kremlin always supersede his loyalty to his country and to the principles and ethics of his profession.

I will not repeat here the names of the scientists who were Communists first and who betrayed their country by passing to the enemy some of our most vital scientific secrets. Those scientists and others who feel they are helping humanity by insisting that all scientific discoveries be made available to the Kremlin are living in a fool's paradise. They close their eyes to the fact that international communism uses science and its discoveries not for the people but for the all-powerful, totalitarian state whose ends are evil.

For the last few minutes I have been talking about a decided minority of scientists in this country. Because they are so vocal, however, they have succeeded in leading many Americans to believe that they speak for the majority of scientists in this country. This, of course, has been to the detriment of the loyal majority. It, therefore, behooves this majority, which is often silent on major issues of our day, to speak up more often, and more loudly, to correct the erroneous impression some Americans have of the part being played by scientists in our national security.

Let me give you just one example of the part the scientist plays in our national security. One of the fateful and certainly one of the most difficult and complex decisions of our time involves nuclear testing. While the final decision in these matters is made by the President, we all recognize that his decision results to a large degree from the advice and recommendation of the scientist.

To state the obvious, it is vitally important on which particular scientists the President relies. Something more is required of these men over and above their scientific knowledge and accomplishment. They must have an abiding faith and conviction in our American heritage, and they must also fully understand the nature and objectives of the amoral, atheistic, totalitarian Communist conspiracy.

We must not forget that it was the Communists a few years ago who set in motion an intensified worldwide agitation and propaganda campaign for the cessation of all nuclear testing. We must remember that without nuclear weapons the United States is no match for the Soviet-Sino bloc with its inexhaustible manpower. We were far ahead in 1958 in nuclear weapons. We stopped testing. For almost 3 years the Soviets engaged in phony, deceitful negotiations with no intention of ever arriving at a nuclear test ban agreement. These negotiations were a farce and were carried on solely for the purpose of having the United States stop testing the weapons which represented the balance of firepower between the East and the West.

We never learn. The Soviets have said and written time and time again that there can no more be sincere diplomacy than there can be dry water. They practice what they preach in this respect. They have flagrantly violated almost all of the 1,000 treaties and nonaggression compacts they have made with countries of the free world. They have kept only a handful which suited their purpose.

I am convinced that the Soviets during these past 3 years have been secretly and surreptitiously conducting underground nuclear tests somewhere in the wastelands of Siberia. A few days ago the Communists broke off these farcical negotiations and immediately began testing. They threatened the world with a megaton super bomb equivalent in power to 100 million tons of TNT. People were in a quandary as to why the Soviets should lay themselves open to censure by scuttling the nuclear test ban talks and openly commencing atmosphere testing. To me the answer is comparatively simple. They have now caught up or may have even gone ahead. They were worried that they could not much longer deceive the world and that their cheating would be found out. If this happened, they fully realized that the impact of adverse world opinion would be far greater than the announcement that they were resuming testing.

It is vitally necessary that all Americans, in every field of endeavor, must be absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system. We are not faced merely wit certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of Government. We are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced, an enemy whom we can ignore, appeals, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or face slavery and destruction.

Oceanographic Research Needs in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the complex and fascinating field of oceanography is one whose mysteries are really just beginning to unfold. The Congress has been more than passively interested in oceanographic research because it deals with a vast area of the unknown and the exploration of this area

holds great potential, for, among many things, our national security. To give some indication of the unfinished business in this area of research, I am including an article by Mr. Don G. Groves entitled "Needs in Review," appearing in the July–August 1961 edition of Undersea Technology:

NEEDS IN REVIEW

(By Don G. Groves)

Success of tomorrow's naval missions hinges on a drastic revision of the naval engineering technology state of the art. More and more companies are trying to get into the act, but to date very little has been achieved in terms of a unified approach to solve the problems at hand. This is especially true when it comes to the many diversified yet related problems and needs in the undersea realm. Many of these needs fall within security limits and cannot be discussed. However, several specific marine and naval problems are not affected by security, and it seems in order to briefly list and discuss some of them since they concern every engineer in the U.S. industry.

The list is intended to be representative rather than all-inclusive of recognized (by Navy and segments of industry) problems illustrating as challenging and encompassing to the engineer in the U.S. industry.

For materials and equipments that must operate in the underocean, exposed to sea growth, corrosion, pitting erosion, galvanic action, high pressure, etc., there is a need to—

Develop and improve high strength metals which are easily weldable, yet corrosion and pitting resistant; or develop economical coating or paint that will do same thing.

Develop economical and effective materials and design techniques such as small-diameter, high-strength deepwater mooring cables, underwater vehicles and robots, etc., for emplacement and reclamation of active and passive sonar system and other devices on the deep ocean floor.

Develop more economical and reliable welding (or other pressure-tight joining) techniques for thick metallic sections, including bimetallic joints, for marine use. Special emphasis on deep diving submarine hulls where titanium and/or aluminum may replace steel in whole or in part. New materials concepts should be encouraged.

To aid and abet undersea search and kill, there is a need to—

Improve marine propulsion and auxiliaries bearing size, geometry, and lubrication in order to reduce noise generation and transmission. Special emphasis on thrust bearings for deep-diving submarines subject to high hydrostatic pressure. Partial answer may be in use of sea water or steam to replace conventional oil lubricants. Throughout undersea technology more effort should be made to use the sea ambient environment to improve marine engineering.

Develop small-sized speed reducers of high torque capacity (as high as 65-to-1 reduction) producing minimum of noise in sonic and ultrasonic bands needed for torpedoes and thrust procedures and should be able to handle up to 1,000 shaft horsepower. This technology might enable use of nuclear closed cycle gas turbines driving outboard propulsion system in some vessels.

Develop statis high direct current power electric generators (fuel cell or thermoelectric). Used with specific characteristics static inverters for alternating current power conversion, system would eliminate motor-generator sets (a noise source). Advance in fuel cell technology could result in deadquiet submarine operation. Special emphasis on development of data leading to new techniques and hardware for attenuating or eliminating self noise, machinery noise (mechanical couplings), cavitation noise, and flow noise in ships and underwater mechanisms and installations.

Create precise undersea surveying and navigation devices for reliable, extremely accurate determination of submerged vessel speed with respect to ocean bottom, an important factor in underwater missile launching. Also develop surface ship automatic pilot navigation.

Design of antisubmarine hydrofoil for high-speed surface operation combined with efficient underwater capabilities. This could in effect be a hydrofoil deep depth sonar platform utilizing optimum sonar conditions for search. After search vehicle would surface and proceed to next search area. Phenomenal weight-to-horsepower ratio possible with new powerplants used with lightweight metal hull.

Accomplish breakthrough in generation, propagation, and reception of sound in ocean—or development of new devices—leading to a means of IFF for undersea surveillance. Chief problem today is to determine whether object detected by sonar is friendly ship, a whale, a school of fish, a decoy or other countermeasure, or an enemy submarine. All give sonar reflections. Limitations on transmission in water where temperature changes, coupled with fact that acoustic methods are slow and inexact point to greater emphasis in development of nonacoustic systems such as deep-sea optical maser.

In the field of marine power—main propulsion as well as secondary and auxiliary power—there is a need to—

Investigate the possibility of larger-scale use of solid propellants for rocket underwater propulsion.

Design various imaginative devices to use and convert some of the ocean's thermal and hydrostatic energy. Sea water contains uranium for fission-produced power and deuterium or heavy hydrogen for thermonuclear power. Another possibility is to obtain alternating current or direct current power from shafts turning at 50,000 to 100,000 revolutions per minute. Also needed are systems to transduce main propulsion schemes to secondary and auxiliary power. Novel cryogenic refrigeration (apparatus and dewars built into ship) might provide key to make certain energy-conversion modes possible. Some of these conversion modes are:

Nuclear energy to thermal energy via fission or fusion reactor or ionized plasma fission reactor to electrical energy.

Chemical energy to thermal energy via exothermic chemical reaction or battery or fuel cell to electrical energy.

Thermal energy to mechanical energy via diesel or turbine.

Thermal energy to electrical energy via thermal-electric devices.

Mechanical energy to electrical energy via generator.

Electrical energy to acceleration of a water column and propulsion via magnetohydrodynamic device.

Electrical energy for electric motors for propulsion and auxiliary power.

Thermal energy to acceleration of a water column and propulsion via hydrojet, or rocket.

Mechanical energy to acceleration of a water column and propulsion via reduction gearing propeller, etc.

In addition to the problems listed above there is also an urgent need for further development and improvement in the following specific marine engineering problem areas:

Nuclear propulsion reactor shielding.

Coating material to reduce frictional drag (especially for underwater craft).

Water-resistant grease.

Underwater television and photography.

Image intensification enhancement devices.

New device to replace submarine periscopes.

Underwater countermeasure devices and techniques.

Surface and subsurface ship hull and propulsion design.

New communication systems through the air-sea interface.

Higher reliability, reduced maintenance, lower cost, and unattended systems program related to the electronic, electrical, mechanical, etc., systems of ships and crafts including aircraft.

Life sciences associated with human tolerance to unusual environments.

Anechoic engineering and application of viscoelastic materials.

Increased use of solid state devices in practically all marine vehicle design.

Hydrodynamic innovations—boundary layer control concepts.

Sensors in acoustic and nonacoustic devices not limited to ASW detection, for use on merchant ships, submarines, aircraft, etc.

Ambient sea noise research. Possible evolvement of detection techniques akin to those used in cosmic ray astronomy.

Natural science programs to study bird, fish, and animal features which might be adapted for man's use.

Inland waterway icebreaker craft, possibly powered by water reactor and turboelectric drive.

Redesign of special submarines, ships, and aircraft for oceanographic purposes.

More and better equipment for simulation of ocean environments.

Less expensive, more effective overhaul and repair methods, particularly for nuclear submarines and naval aircraft.

Small-size, broad-band sonar transducers.

Aside from the specific needs dealt with so far, the marine and naval engineering society is faced with a series of problems in general key areas with bearing on military as well as commercial interests. Again there is lack of a unified approach from industry's side, in spite of the benefits to be gained.

In these general key areas there is a need to—

Establish an underwater commercial mining and salvaging technology to harvest some of the raw materials in the vast ocean. It is estimated that 1 square mile of ocean floor surface contains cobalt and manganese modules worth $0.5 million. Other commodities are oil, chemicals, and food. Emphasis is on development of inexpensive methods to bring these to the surface.

Develop underwater shipping and storage techniques as well as logistical underwater and midocean support base systems.

Apply aircraft practices and vast pool of aerodynamic research to ship design. Ship shape and speed have not changed significantly in the past 50 years. There is tangible, translatable similarity in the disciplines of: Hydrodynamics (hydrofoils) and aerodynamics (airfoils); meteorology and oceanology; sound energy through temperature gradients and electromagnetic energy transmission in the ionosphere, and many others. There is also the applicability of space technology to marine engineering (navigation, communication, weather prediction, and reconnaissance satellites).

Increase hydrographic and oceanographic research. Despite much recent work in these fields results have not been applied or coordinated to utmost advantage. Perhaps this will be remedied through Government's increased financial support of oceanographic research. Collected data is of no real value unless translated into devices, instructions, or practical rules.

Establish fundamental data for predicting such things as metallurgical performance with respect to fatigue, locked-in stresses, creep, ductility, notch effects, etc. Also for possible reappraisal and working coordination of ideas related to mechanics, energy

conservation, electronics, etc., all of which point toward new material and design developments. Marine design and engineering requires the skills and cooperation of many specialists. So far the individuals have generally worked in separate groups with little real interchange. Growing awareness of need for interaction between groups will benefit the entire marine engineering field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the main this unclassified information has been gathered from several sources both oral and written. The written record consists largely of the following:

"Navy Research and Development Problems," Department of Navy, Washington, D.C., "Underwater Engineering," volume 1, No. 3, "Military Marketing Data Committee Report of Electronic Industries Association."

Bill Huebner Discusses Fallout Shelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, an unusual piece of journalistic enterprise, as well as practical foresightedness, has been taking place in Windsor Locks, Conn., and reported in the Hartford Times.

Bill Huebner, who is a reporter with the Times, determined to build a civil defense fallout shelter for himself and his family in his home, stock it and then test it. This experiment is now underway.

I have the utmost admiration for his determination to see for himself what problems would be faced by anyone who proposed to take the steps advocated by his Government as part of our total preparedness. I have followed his articles with interest and I offer for the RECORD the first in the series he plans to write about living in the shelter. I also offer an editorial in the Times which discusses his resolution and the purpcse of his experiment.

No one can overlook the recent Soviet tests scattering fallout over the globe. Distasteful as it may be, the need to recognize this threat and be prectical about it is vital. I am happy to note that the Department of Defense, following the instructions of the President, has already begun a program to locate, evaluate, and mark community fallout shelters throughout Connecticut.

In an atmosphere of tension, we must look coldly at what we have and what we must do. I want to commend Mr. Huebner for an outstanding contribution to public understanding of this problem.

The articles referred to follow:

HUEBNERS MOVE SPEEDILY TO SEAL SELVES IN SHELTER

(By Bill Huebner)

We're in.

Windsor Locks Civilian Defense Director Richard E. Stanton pulled a "Pearl Harbor" on the fallout shelter project at 8 p.m. Thursday.

Actually, according to the project we were not supposed to take up quarters in the shelter until Sunday evening.

I had just come home from a golf game when he drove in the driveway. We exchanged the usual greetings.

Then he walked over to his car, took out a CD director's helmet and said:

"As project director, I have received information that nuclear weapons will be dropped on Westover AFB in Chicopee, Mass., and other parts of the country. You and your family have 15 minutes to enter the shelter."

"You can't do that," I objected. "We're not supposed to go in until Sunday. I haven't got it completely furnished as yet."

"Let this be a lesson to you and everybody. These things don't happen on schedule," he countered.

"But Stanton, this is only a project to show a fallout shelter can be built. The occupancy part is secondary."

"You have already spent 4 minutes arguing with me, Bill. If you and your family are not in that shelter in 11 minutes I'll declare that you have received an overdose of radiation and the project will end here and now."

That was it. I've known Stanton for 10 years and CD is a part of his life. He doesn't fool. He had this planned all in advance.

"Ten minutes to go Bill. You've read the survival books. Remember what they said and do it," he said.

Survival, survival—what to do in an emergency. Take all the canned food off your shelves.

OK. My wife started. The two girls, who were getting ready for bed started hauling bags of food to the shelter.

Nine minutes left—no sanitary toilet. The book said use a 20-gallon refuse can, fill half with water, pour motor oil on top, empty newest can possible—in garage for oil. Unscrew toilet seat in house lavatory—everything down in the shelter.

Fill bottles with drinking water—3 minutes left—photographers arrive. Stanton had this planned, too. RADIAC crew pulls up—radiation being measured by crew—hurry—what else can we take?

Two minutes—we grab everything—books, pans, chairs, blankets ripped off beds.

One minute—we're in, surrounded by a pile of blankets, cans of food, chairs, books—everything.

"You may now turn to the Windsor Locks CD frequency on your battery radio we supplied," yelled Stanton through the shelter walls. "This will act as your conelrad for the next 5 days. Good night folks."

Oh Stanton, before you leave pal, will you shut off the water in the kitchen? We think we left it running.

GOOD LUCK, BILL

Last night our reporter Bill Huebner sealed himself (his wife and their two small children in a 7- by 8-foot fallout shelter he has built beneath his house in Windsor Locks. He intends to stay there 5 days to test the living conditions of the shelter and the family's ability to adjust to the confinement.

Mr. Huebner is no crackpot. He is a respected citizen of his community, an experienced and reliable newpaperman, and a member of many civic organizations, including the State Police auxiliary force. Though his experiment is being watched with interest by State and local CD officials, he is interested first of all in preserving the lives of his family in the event of wartime attack. All the rest of us are interested, too, and his experience will furnish guidance to others.

Incidentally, the experiment may be hardest on Mr. Huebner's wife. Her husband took along an accordion on which he is a decidely inexpert player and intends to while away the time by practicing. Imagine being cooped up with a beginner on the accordion.

We wish Bill well and hope the children don't feel too cramped. And if Mrs. Huebner calls on the emergency telephone for a pair of earplugs, we'll understand why.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Belgrade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two interesting articles from the September 9 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal regarding the Belgrade Conference.

The first is an article by Mr. Edwin Roth, Courier-Journal special writer, and the second is by Mr. M. S. Handler, of the New York Times News Service.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELGRADE.—When India's Prime Minister Pandit Nehru, by far the most important participant of the Belgrade Conference of nonalined states, walked down the steps from his aircraft at Belgrade Airport, he stumbled and slipped. For a moment it seemed he would fall all the way down the steps and hit Yugoslav soil head first—but he managed to grasp the banister rail. Steadying himself, he walked into the wide open arms of Tito, who embraced and kissed him.

Nehru's slip on the plane steps as he arrived for the Belgrade Conference was what psychologists call a Freudian slip. He was most unenthusiastic about this conference, and accepted the invitation from its organizers, Tito and Nasser, only because to refuse it would have caused offense. But he made clear that he would do everything to prevent the formation of a third power bloc.

As the conference got under way, Nehru—though not surprised—became increasingly impatient as he watched it develop into an orgy of personal and national vanities, frustrations, inferiority complexes, and resentments. There were all the burning, bitter resentments of poor barefooted people against those people who not only have shoes, but even motor cars.

Much of the time, the conference saw displays of incredible megalomania.

Speaker after speaker set down the precise conditions under which his country would be willing to accept financial or economic aid—and gave his views of what this conference should tell John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev to do.

Gamal Abdel Nasser, dictator President of the United Arab Republic, claimed that the nonalined countries (and, by implication, Nasser personally) had caused Kennedy and Khrushchev to meet in Vienna.

But even that was surpassed by Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah. With perspiration glistening on his black face, he cried passionately.

"Imagine half a dozen hydrogen bombs, each one the equivalent of 100,000 tons of TNT, dropped on Accra, New Delhi, Cairo, London, New York, and Moscow."

It did not seem to occur to Nkrumah that even if nuclear war broke out, the first hydrogen bomb would not be dropped on the Ghanian capital Accra—and that perhaps neither Eastern nor Western military planners consider Accra worth a hydrogen bomb in any circumstances whatever.

NO CONDEMNATION

Although this conference met under the shadow of the mushroom cloud and under the fallout of Russia's new nuclear explosion, the delegates here hesitated to condemn it.

Some delegates, notably Nehru, have said how shocked they are that Russia ended the suspension of nuclear tests and exploded another H-bomb. But these polite expressions of incredulous shock are very different from the howls of rage and abuse let loose by the very same men against the French explosion of a much smaller atom bomb.

In his ranting, rambling cliche-riddled hour-long speech Nkrumah demanded the formation of a power bloc of nonalined states at the United Nations which, he said, should be reorganized according to the so-called "troika system"—with Assistant Secretaries General from the East bloc, the West bloc, and the nonalined bloc.

He read out the immense figures which the United States, Russia, and Britain spend on armaments, and suggested that they should instead give this money to the nonalined underdeveloped countries.

Like many others at this conference, and in stronger words than most, Nkrumah demanded the full acceptance and recognition of the East German Communist State. But in the very same breath (he was summing up his demands), he also demanded the end of all colonialism.

Curiously, Nkrumah does not consider East Germany to be a colony, any more than he would look upon Hungary or Czechoslovakia as colonies. At this conference, colonialism and imperialism (two words used countless times in every session) mean only the domination of colored people by white people, and not the domination of white people by more powerful white people.

FACT OF LIFE

Nehru, too, suggested the recognition of East Germany, though he made it clear that he did so only because he considered the East German Government to be one of the facts of life.

This caused some West German observers to remark with cynical bitterness that West Germany got very little in return for the millions of hard West German marks spent in aid to underdeveloped countries.

Nehru's big speech brought the first refreshing note of cold realism into a conference which until then had seemed to take place in Alice's lunatic wonderland behind the looking glass. As Nehru is the democratically elected leader of some 450 million people and represents more than half the total number of people which this conference claims to represent, he has no need to overcompensate any inferiority complex. Speaking immediately after Nkrumah, he tore Nkrumah's speech to shreds.

Tito, Nasser, and Nkrumah are trying hard to create a power bloc of nonalined states. But no common denominator can be found between men who hate each other as much as Nasser and Bourguiba, Nasser, and Kassem, or Nkrumah and some of the other African leaders.

How Did We Get This Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Sunbury Daily Item, Sunbury, Pa., on Saturday, September 16, which I would urge every Member of the Congress to read as well as the officials of the United States of America who will represent our country at the opening the United Nations General Assembly in New York tomorrow.

This frank and intelligent editorial is captioned "How Did We Get This Way?" Each and every one of us should ponder well the soul-searching words of this fine and factual editorial:

HOW DID WE GET THIS WAY?

How did we get this way—hanging on the words of a ruthless, bloody-handed dictator and living in hopes of cajoling him into smiles rather than tantrums in a summit conference? A look at the record may help answer the question as the moment of truth approaches in the world struggle for freedom.

The cumulative effect of all the mental stress and strain to which the American people have been subjected since the launching of the first sputnik is a major factor in what Robert Kazmayer, world traveler and lecturer who has appeared many times on rostrums in the Sunbury area calls an excellent brainwashing job that we have been doing on ourselves. We have conjured up a myth of Russian superiority, beginning with a clamor against our educational system and demands for a multibillion dollar program to produce scientists in a hurry—for no better reason than that Soviet scientific resources were concentrated on a limited number of spectacular accomplishments for obvious terroristic propaganda purposes. The various branches of the U.S. armed services, following their usual line, have stressed supposed Russian strength while downgrading our own power.

Politicians advocating the welfare state for America have come up with an imposing list of our shortcomings creating the unmistakable impression—even among ourselves—that without Government prodding we are too flabby to educate our children, build proper houses, clean up our cities, care for our older citizens or show compassion for the unfortunate. And as a result, having come to doubt our own capacities, it is small wonder that "neutralist" nations look at us askance or that the unholy Kremlin crowd underestimates our will to resist threats and even outright trampling upon our rights.

How far downgrade we have traveled is indicated in many ways. We have been instructed from abroad how to allocate the foreign aid moneys on which a number of dependent nations increasingly lean. We have had to soft-pedal Cuba. We have had to abandon expensive airbases in France to pacify a questionable ally. We have been

pressured not to resume nuclear testing and have been maligned by British pacifists for creating with our tax money the instruments for protecting them, along with the remainder of the free world. We have been told by beneficiary nations not to ship our goods to areas in which they wish to cultivate trade and at the same time to import unlimited quantities of these same nations' products at the expense of American jobs.

And we are asked in a news release this week from the Canadian consulate general in New York City "whether the Western nations should risk war over West Berlin." This line of appeasement from our nearest neighbor, major supplier of Red China and Communist Cuba, reasons thus: "The question is asked as to whether the Western nations are courting war over a rubberstamp by their refusal to accept at checkpoints en-route to Berlin passes signed by East Germans instead of by Russians." So reasoned British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain at Munich in 1938 and Adolf Hitler was given the nod for conquest of Europe and World War II.

Fuzzy thinking, wavering leadership and an inclination to sell America short on all counts has taken us a long way down the road to confusion bordering on hysteria.

Dedicatory Address by Representative Hemphill, of South Carolina, at National Guard Armory, Clover, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Citizen-Soldier: Backbone of the Nation's Strength" delivered by Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL of the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District at the dedication of the National Guard Armory at Clover, S.C., September 10, 1961, 3 p.m.

Congressman HEMPHILL in this address has given relevant and informative information concerning the role of the citizen soldier in the defense of this country through the history of this Nation. He portrayed the important part the members of the militia, the National Guard and the Reserve have played in the defense of our Nation. The distinguished Congressman from the Fifth District is to be commended for this splendid address, and I hope as many people as possible will take occasion to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN-SOLDIER: BACKBONE OF THE NATION'S STRENGTH

Maj. Gen. Pinckney, Maj. Gen. Godfrey Colonel Harvey, Captain Murphy, distinguished platform guests, members of the Clover, S.C., National Guard unit, ladies and gentlemen, here today, in the shadow of Kings Mountain, we cannot but feel excitement and pride that our heritage is so great, our obligation to the citizen soldiers of the Revolution so strong, and our purpose so patriotic that we meet here today to carry on for those who died on yonder hills that we might be free. Gathered among us, I am sure, are the spirits of those brave men of another day, and if we were not true to those of our heritage, how fruitless would be our efforts, how empty our ceremony, and how disgustingly shallow our accomplishments: We, too, should use the gifts we have been given for the preservation of freedom.

And now let us turn to the business of the day.

This armory is more than a building of cold, hard stone. It is a living thing. It symbolizes the determination of all of you here as well as the determination of the American people, to sacrifice their time, their fortunes, and even their lives in the struggle for freedom. We arm for liberty, not tyranny. That we have always built our forces on the citizen-soldier stands as testimony of our deep and profound love for peace, order, and freedom. The National Guard is the instrument of the citizen-soldier—and a mighty weapon it has been in our Nation's history.

You will remember that the fight for independence against British colonial domination was carried forwarded by the militiamen of the 13 colonies. These were the now famous Minutemen who have been justly heralded in every American history book. They fought bravely and honorably for American independence. Without their efforts, we still might be under the power of foreign influences. They shed their blood at Saratoga, at Concord, and at Lexington. They also fought and died in the swamps of Georgia and the woods of the Carolinas. They were hardy men, providing us with an example which we can well follow. This armory is built and is dedicated in the spirit of these militiamen—the forerunners of the National Guard.

No less a person than Gen. George Washington, the father of our country, paid tribute to the indispensable role which the militia played in the Revolutionary War. It was largely through his untiring work that a well-regulated militia was made the basis for the Nation's national defense. In his "Sentiments on a Peace Establishment," Washington wrote: "It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owed not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently the citizens of America, from 18 to 50 years of age, should be borne on the militaia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them, that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice.

Following Washington's suggestion, Congress passed the Militia Act of 1792. It laid the basis for a truly national militia system that was to endure for over a hundred years until the passage of the Dick Act of 1903. Each State was empowered to enroll every free, able-bodied male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45 years into a State militia which was to be ready to serve in times of State or national emergency.

This was wise legislation. It provided the framework through which the States and the Nation could muster sufficient military manpower to cope with foreign and domestic adversaries. When the War of 1812 began, Army strength stood at about one-fifth of its authorized level of 35,603. The State militias were asked to make up the difference and to expand the Military Establishment in the war against England. The Congress requested 30,000 volunteers and 80,000 men from existing militia units to carry the war to the enemy. With characteristic vigor, thousands of militia men—our first reservists—responded to the colors. They fought gallantly until the invader was driven from our shores. Who can forget the impressive victory which Jackson won at New Orleans? Many of the troops which battled behind the cotton bales he stacked across the port area of New Orleans were militia soldiers from a cross section of the States of the Union.

The next challenge to American security and independence occurred in 1846. On May 11, 1846, President James Polk sent a message to Congress which stated that "After reiterated menaces, Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory, and shed American blood upon the American soil." Congress quickly responded to the President's recommendation to declare war on the Mexican Government because it knew where it could secure the men and military tools to force the aggressors from Amereican territory. It was certain that the State military units would be ready and willing to fight for the honor of the Nation. When General Winfield Scott marched triumphantly into Mexico City, there were hundreds of militia men among his conquering troops. The citizen-soldier had again displayed the courage and fortitude that had marked his service during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Again in 1860 the State militia made ready for battle. Now, however, State was divided against State; brother against brother. Instead of joining their strength into an unbeatable combination, Confederate gray opposed Federal Union blue. Both President Abraham Lincoln in the North and President Jefferson Davis in the South appealed to the States under their command for troops to fight for their respective causes. The great Civil War which we commemorate this year was fought in great part by militia men brought into the service of Confederate and Union Armies. As before, these men on both sides of the fighting lines demonstrated that rare quality of courage and devotion to duty which is the distinguishing characteristic of the citizen-soldier. For 4 painful years, the strength of the Nation was sapped in a bloody contest for noble political objectives. Although the South laid down its arms at Appomatox, it could still honor its honor high. Its brave soldiers had performed well in the cause of the So[illegible]—no less than the courageous men of [illegible]n the North.

For almost 40 [illegible] the Nation tended its wounds suffered in the great battles of the Civil War—at Gettysburg, at Bull Run, and at Antietam. Those wounds healed slowly, but they healed firmly. When the Nation went to war against Spain in 1898, a united Nation joined against the common foe. Yankee and southerner stood shoulder to shoulder against the Spanish Army. Every State of the Union contributed troops. In a very few months, the war was over. The militia system had proven adequate to the task of war.

With the advent of the 20th century, many military officials saw the need for more, not less, reliance on the militia during times of national crisis. To achieve an efficient peacetime establishment, Congress passed the Dick Act in 1903. It was designed "to promote the efficiency of the militia." This act marked a milestone in the development of the militia. The Militia Act of 1792 was now left behind, and the Nation entered the modern era with the development of the National Guard.

The Dick Act provided that the militia was to consist of every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 45, and that they were to be divided into two classes: the Organized Militia to be known as the National Guard of each State or territory, and the Reserve militia which was to be the remainder of the manpower pool of the age group. Annual drill, instruction, and target practice were required. The Secretary of War was authorized to issue arms and equipment for the State National Guard units within his charge and to provide facilities for encampment, maneuvers, and field instruction. Inspec-

tion of National Guard units was also prescribed and the Secretary of War could detail Regular Army officers for duty with the Organized Militia, subject to revocation by the State Governors. The Dick Act was further strengthened by the National Defense Act of 1916 which provided for Reserve officers and offered more assistance to the States to develop effective guard units. These laws made the National Guard the first line of the Nation's defense. Washington's dream of a well-organized and efficiently administered national militia force had become a reality. In the words of President Woodrow Wilson: "We must depend in every time of national peril, not upon a standing army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms."

These words were prophetic. The National Guard now fully supported by the Federal Government, again was equal to the challenge during World War I. Thousands of National Guard men from every corner of America entered their country's service to fight the hated central powers. They distinguished themselves at Chateau Thierry, at St. Mihiel, and at Meuse-Argonne. When the Armistice was declared on November 11, the Nation briefly understood the value of the National Guard once more.

Unfortunately, between 1920 and 1940, the Nation quickly forgot its debt to the National Guard. Public opinion poorly supported the efforts of fighting men in every State of the Union to keep the military strength of the Nation at peak levels through the maintenance of a strong National Guard. Despite years of budgetary famine, many farsighted men gave their energies to the preservation of the guard. The Nation was grateful for their unselfish work in behalf of the guard. National Guard units were the first to fight against the Fascists powers in World War II. Even before America's entry into the war, National Guard men had been activated and deployed in foreign bases throughout the world. They were ready for the Japanese when they landed in the Philippines; they were prepared for the massive Japanese assault against Corregidor. Men like Roger Young of the Ohio National Guard gave their lives so that America could live. Such modern minutemen gave the Nation the time it needed to organize its human and material resources in the crusade for freedom.

Sadly history repeated itself after the Second World War. The Nation quickly demobilized its great military machine composed of over 12 million men and women. Again, farsighted men who saw the necessity for a trained and ready guard were ignored. The postwar era were lean years for the National Guard. Without financial aid or moral comfort, guardsmen continued to train and make themselves ready to defend their Nation in any future conflict. Thank Heavens they were not submerged by a complacent public opinion. During the Korean war, the National Guard and Reserve forces formed the basis for a swift remobilization of our Military Establishment.

The American people finally learned their lesson. Today the guard is the most efficient reserve organization in the Nation's history. Note that President Kennedy turned to the guard for help to meet the Berlin crisis as well as the other Communist military threats to the free world's security. Over 75,000 reservists—men who in many instances have already served their country in two wars—have responded with characteristic enthusiasm to the President's plea for aid. These men do not like war, nor do they honor the killing and wounding of other men. They want peace and justice, and are ready to fight for these goals when the Nation calls upon them.

This armory which we dedicate today is a tribute to the millions of guardsmen who have fought to preserve the freedom and independence of the Nation in every war in which the Nation was involved. It is an indication of our firm purpose to stand against the new tyranny which has arisen in Europe and which extends its blood-stained hands across the globe. This armory is our answer to the Communist challenge. When freemen combine against tyranny it cannot prevail. The armory will prepare men for the fight. It will give them the tools they will need to win the struggle. Let there be no doubt of the outcome. The citizen-soldier will prevail.

Farm Quarterly Editor Discusses Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the productivity of America's farmers is the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of the free world. Our farmers provided the arsenals of food in World War II. They produced the food that forestalled starvation in the battle-torn world in the postwar era. I believe that America's farms saved Europe from communism. I believe that the abundance of food and fiber from these broad lands of ours should used in the cause of freedom, in the crucial struggle for world peace.

America has made food for peace a reality around the world. This is a great humanitarian program. It is a symbol of the spirit of brotherhood in the free world. This program is ably directed by our former colleague in the House, Hon. George McGovern.

Mr. McGovern recently called my attention to a penetrating and forceful article on the place of food in the struggle for peace, written by Mr. Grant Cannon, editor of the Farm Quarterly, and appearing in the fall 1961 issue of that publication. It occurs to me that what Mr. Cannon has to say deserves broad attention. Therefore, with the permission of the House, I am inserting the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE

(By Grant Cannon)

In the Congo, where the balance between democracy, communism, and utter chaos is most precarious, 300,000 Baluba tribesmen were driven from their homes and into south Kasai, whose normal population is a million. The bloodshed and turmoil this great mass of starving humanity could have caused was all too apparent. The Communists would have asked for nothing better. President Kennedy ordered food shipped. Within 2 weeks, stores of dried milk from California, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; wheat from Kansas and Oklahoma; corn and beans from Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana had been assembled, shipped and were being fed to the people. During the next few years we will continue to send our surplus food and fiber to the Congo and to over 90 other nations, to feed hungry people and to support the growth of freedom. So important is this program in the minds of its administrators, they say if we did not have a surplus we should grow one for this purpose.

One of President Kennedy's first appointments—even before he selected his Secretary of Agriculture—was that of George McGovern to direct his newly created Food for Peace Agency.

"As long as there is acute hunger in the world, and as long as we have the capacity to make a contribution in reducing human hunger, we ought to meet that opportunity and responsibility," McGovern said recently. "I think food too important a resource from the point of view of our foreign policy objectives and our moral responsibilities, for us to restrict production to the point where we are incapable of providing some food assistance abroad."

There seems little likelihood that McGovern will be called upon to defend his position, since surpluses will be with us for many years, but his statements do show his attitude toward the program. Emphasis, he feels, should be on the constructive use of our food abundance, rather than upon surplus disposal. It is his plan to push vigorously the use of our agricultural wealth to strengthen the free nations of the world. As he said, "I am convinced that if Khrushchev had our agricultural abundance, he would be using it with great vigor and imagination to try to promote his cause in those nations which are struggling for greater economic development. We have the food and we should use it."

When he makes this statement, this quiet, thoughtful, rather handsome man, who was formerly a professor of American history and political science, and also a Member of the House of Representatives Agricultural Committee from South Dakota, is speaking for the President. He also, curiously enough, is voicing the sentiments of most members of both political parties, since the law he administers was passed in 1954 under a Republican regime by a Democratic Congress, at the urging of the Republican Secretary of Agriculture.

The question has not been, "Should we use our rich agricultural surplus to strengthen the free world?" but rather, "How can we use the surplus in this way, without ruining the farmers of such friendly nations as Canada, Australia, Argentina, and France, who are also exporters? And how can we use this surplus without wrecking the farm market in the countries we are trying to assist, and so bringing disastrous prices to their farmers?" Public Law 480 is our legislative answer by which we hope to solve this difficult problem.

The law is not, as many think, a pure give-away program. By far the greatest amount of materials shipped on Public Law 480 authority has been paid for either in the currency of the importing country or by barter of strategic goods which the United States is stockpiling. A much smaller amount has been outright gifts, either from our Government, or through some 57 voluntary agencies which serve humanity overseas.

In terms of actual dollars we have shipped abroad a total of $28,500 million worth of agricultural products since 1954. Of this amount, $19 billion worth was our normal exports paid for in dollars. Four and a half billion dollars worth was sold for foreign currency (often referred to as soft currency). One billion dollars worth was given to the needy by our voluntary agencies and another $600 million was given on a government-to-government basis. Barter deals amounted to around $1,300 million worth of goods during this same 7-year period.

Another way of looking at these figures, and one which McGovern is happy to explain, is that each year we have shipped around 12 million tons of surplus goods which would have cost us some $75 million to store the first year, and $45 million every

year thereafter. Though McGovern does not emphasize the surplus disposal aspect of this program, incidentally, he has increased shipments during his brief period by around 10 percent.

HARD SELL FOR SOFT MONEY

The sales for foreign currency are far from simple. They are, as a matter of fact, about as complex as the formula for a new insecticide.

In making the sale, we agree to accept the currency of the buying country without converting it into dollars. The way such a nation earns dollars is to export goods to the United States and other hard-currency markets. Since most of the emerging countries have not yet developed dollar earning power, dollars are in short supply—hence the agreement not to convert their currency and reduce their dollar credits. This enables them to continue spending their dollar credits for their normal importation of American agricultural and other products. We also agree just how the money paid for our goods will be spent in the buying country.

In making such a sale, our negotiators must be assured that the sale will not displace any normal commercial agricultural sales being made by us or by other friendly exporting nations. They must also determine that the sale will not disrupt the economy of the receiving nation by breaking local farm prices. In addition, the negotiators must secure an agreement against the reexport of the commodity, and also that the added food will not increase the availability of a similar product to the Soviet bloc. They must also decide the rate of exchange which will be used to determine dollar value of the commodity.

Perhaps the giant Indian agreement, which involves $1,300 million worth of wheat and rice to be purchased over a 4-year period, illustrates how such sales are put into actual effect.

With the basic agreement negotiated, the Indian Government put their American Purchasing Mission to work. This mission is housed on Massachusetts Avenue, Washington's embassy row, in a stately white building guarded by two carved elephants, and is staffed with Indian nationals. The actual buying is done by men like L. M. Joshi, the deputy director, who combines the quiet, placid approach of a Hindu mystic with a sharp, agile mind that would do well in the Chicago grain pits.

"We continue to purchase with dollars the 400,000 tons of wheat which, historically, we have always bought from the United States," Joshi said, in explaining the purchases his mission makes. "Over the 4-year period which the agreement covers, we hope to buy under Public Law 480 a total of some 16 million tons of wheat, a million tons of rice, and a small amount of cotton, corn, sorghum, and tobacco. In buying and shipping such wheat, one of our major problems is to schedule the shipment so that our port facilities and distribution system can handle it. We must also take care our purchases don't arrive at the same time our own crop is being harvested, and overload the mills.

"The mechanics of buying are these," he continued in his soft voice with its rather British accent. "Our government notifies the United States that deposits of rupees have been made in an Indian bank to the credit of the United States. All of our purchases go through regular commercial channels. We wire the American exporters type and quality of grain we wish to buy, and the port from which we wish the grain shipped. The exporters make bids. We analyze these bids on the basis of our knowledge of crop outlook, export demand, futures market, the farm policies of your government, and other such matters as affect price. The bids, of course, are all made on the basis of the international wheat price, which is not the same as your domestic price. Usually it runs 66 to 75 percent of the domestic price. We will bargain for as little as a quarter of a cent. Every penny we save can send an ounce of food to India."

L. M. Joshi paused to emphasize his remark. His fine-boned face which combines both youth and maturity looked thoughtful, then he continued, "Once we have established a price, we buy as much grain from the lowest bidder as he can handle, and then offer to buy from other bidders at this same price. The seller agrees to have wheat ready at the port between certain dates. We guarantee to give 10 days' notice of the availability of a boat. Part of our agreement with the Government of the United States is that at least 50 percent of the grain will be shipped in American ships and paid for out of 480 funds. The Indian Government pays the other half of all shipping costs."

Since unconvertible rupees deposited in a Bombay bank have little appeal for American grain exporters, still further steps must be taken before the sale can be considered complete. When the Indian Government deposits funds to the account of the U.S. Government in Indian banks, the CCC makes dollars available to pay the American exporter. In addition to this cash export price, the seller takes the bill of lading to the CCC and receives the export subsidy, which amounts to the difference between the international price and the domestic price at which he must make his purchase. This subsidy, which runs about a quarter of the world price, is paid in wheat from CCC stores, with the proviso that this wheat must be exported. The way this works is that when an exporter wishes to ship wheat, say 10,000 bushels, he buys the grain on the regular, commercial market and ships it. He then receives some 2,500 to 3,300 bushels from CCC, the exact amount depending on the export subsidy at the moment. This wheat he may use to fill his next foreign order—it cannot be sold back onto the American market.

When the grain arrives in India, it is put through commercial channels by the Indian Government. "This does not affect the marketing of our own wheat, which is raised in the northern part of the country," Joshi said. "We have a price support program on our wheat, and the grain which we import under Public Law 480 does not affect that price. As a matter of fact, because of cost of transportation, the wheat which we get under this program is somewhat more expensive than ours, so we actually subsidize it to get it onto the market."

With the exporter paid in dollars and in kind, the deal as far as he and the Indian Government is concerned is completed; but what happens to the rupee?

The rupees paid for our products remain almost entirely in India to be spent and loaned in various ways. A part of it goes toward the maintenance of our Embassy and various missions in India—or in any country buying under this program. One of the largest uses of these soft currency funds is for loans at 4-percent interest to the government which just paid them to us. Close to $3-billion worth of foreign currency have been loaned in this way. These loans are usually for a 40-year period, though some—one to Japan and one to Austria—have already been repaid. The greatest purpose of such loans is for industrial and mining development. In India a large loan was made for the great river valley development projects. Some loans should affect our future farm trade. These include money for building and improving ports and road systems, and for building grain storage.

Some of this nonconvertible money is used for loans to American commercial firms for such purposes as hotel building, steel mills, corn products mills, bakeries, dairy plants, and soft drink establishments. Some of the soft money is used for exchange students and for scholars studying overseas on Fulbright scholarships. We also spend a sizable amount in promoting commercial dollar sales of farm products. This is done by straight advertising, promotional contests, and all the razzle-dazzle we use here including cotton queens, wheat queens, and maize maids. More basic are training classes for bakers and millers to teach them the difference between our wheat flours and theirs; home economic demonstrations to promote the proper use of our food exports; and research grants for studies to increase use of grains, cotton, dairy and meat products, and oils.

BULGOR WHEAT

One effort to adapt our export products to the food habits of Far Eastern nations was started last May when we began the export of Bulgor wheat. Bulgor wheat is a wheat product that is hulled and broken into hard pellets and partly cooked. It does look a little like small brown grains of unpolished rice and is thought by some to be a rice substitute. A more candid view was given by an official who said: "If you're a lover of rice, you would hardly call this a rice substitute; but if you dislike wheat and cannot get rice, Bulgor wheat is better than nothing." It may also be a transitional food in helping to broaden the Far Eastern eating habits from rice alone.

The Secretary of Agriculture and George McGovern believe if Congress extends 480 and endorses other long-term agreements like the one negotiated with India, sales for foreign money will amount to around $1½ billion a year during the next 5 years.

Second to sales for foreign currency has been the barter program. Under this program, we have bartered our surplus wheat, cotton, corn, and other farm products for such strategic materials as antimony, beauxite, manganese, chromite, and tin. This exchange was started by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1948. To begin with, stockpiles were built up at around $400 million a year. During the last 4 years, this program has decreased to around $150 million a year.

In addition to barter and the soft currency, huge quantities of our surpluses are given away to nations in need. One way is through voluntary agencies such as CARE, the Catholic Relief Services, the Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ, Lutheran World Relief; Mennonite Central Committee, Salvation Army, American Friends Service Committee, Heifer project, and others. These agencies must be accredited by the Government and must supervise distribution to make sure the goods are actually put into the hands of the needy. Mother and child feeding set up by these organizations has lowered infant mortality in such areas as northeastern Brazil from a staggering 80 percent to around 10 to 15 percent.

The Government, too, will give to meet a temporary emergency or to set up a program which will gradually be self-supporting. Here, too, we insist a United States mission supervise the distribution to be sure food actually reaches the needy.

Huge tonnages of food have been shipped to fight famines. The 1960 earthquakes and fires in Chile left great numbers of people homeless and without food; typhoons swept the Ryukyu Islands in the fall of 1959; locust swarms crawled and flew across Ethiopia during the past 3 years; droughts in Egypt destroyed crops and brought hunger which we were able to alleviate with rice and wheat. The refugees who form a constant stream into the free world from behind the Iron Curtain, and those who fled the disorders of Algeria into Morocco and Tunisia, were fed with our surpluses.

Gifts have also been made to foreign governments for the establishment of a school lunch program. Often this food provides

the kids with the only square meal they get. In Italy the school lunches are gradually being turned over to the Government. In Madras, India, a new agreement was recently signed which will feed a half-million children and be administered by CARE. The Madras lunches, largest in the Far East, will consume 6,250,000 pounds of dried milk, 3 million pounds of vegetable shortening, 3 million pounds of cornmeal, 2,600,000 pounds of Bulgor wheat, and some rice.

The first school lunchroom program for a Latin-American country was signed May 12, 1961, with Peru. As with all of these projects, the receiving government will gradually take over.

FOOD FOR PAY

To many observers the most promising and sensible use of our food gifts is the food-for-pay program. This was started as an experiment to meet the tremendous unemployment which was creating chaos in Tunisia in 1958. With some U.S. financial help, men were put to work on large public projects, receiving half their wages in cash and half in wheat.

This combination of food and cash pay seems to have met one of the most serious problems faced by a nation developing itself industrially. Sixty to ninety percent of the population work and live on farms. If large groups of them quit farming and work on jobs which do not immediately produce food or usable goods, inflation results. The food supply diminishes, the demand increases as more money becomes available. Food prices skyrocket. This problem has been very neatly solved by food for pay.

Public works and food for pay also have the great advantage of helping toward self-sufficiency. In Tunisia, for example, some of the major projects were soil conservation, reforestation, drainage, and land reclamation, irrigation, and canal building. These will also help solve Tunisia's food problem.

George McGovern said, "I believe the most direct and lasting rewards will come from integrating our food with economic efforts. I talked with President Bourguiba and other Tunisian officials when he made his state visit here. I discussed this at great length with the U.S. mission chiefs in Tunisia and other officials close to the project and I have yet to find a single person, either on the American or Tunisian side, who isn't enthusiastic about this project. We now have a similar food-for-pay operation going in Morocco which employs some 200,000 workers. Ethiopia is negotiating another work program which will use grain sorghum—12,000 tons of it—in preference to wheat to pay workers, on dams, roads, and reforestation. Five other nations—Dahomey, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, and Taiwan—are negotiating with us for similar programs, and 20 other African, Asian, and Latin American countries are most interested."

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great loss when I learned this morning of the death of a friend, the chairman of my committee. He indeed set an example that will be one for the rest of us to follow. As chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics he can well go down in the history of this Congress and this country as having done the most to really put the United States into the space age. His dedication and devotion to duty have been unexcelled.

I wish to extend my sincere and deepest sympathy to his family on their great loss. I know the void will be felt in the House of Representatives for many years to come. He was, indeed, dedicated not only to his country but to his beloved State and to his beloved family.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my other colleagues in this sad hour in extending to his family our prayers of comfort.

Marquette University Environment Study Vital to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the dynamic expansion of urban centers has created a great need for better understanding of how environmental factors affect human attitudes; economic outlooks; scientific and cultural achievement; and generally the level of accomplishment of a community.

Because of this, Marquette University of Milwaukee, Wis., is undertaking a 10-week seminar opening September 27.

Designed to probe the influence of environmental factors upon shaping the future of Milwaukee and its metropolitan area, the study is also expected to shed new light on the subject of urban growth all over the country.

Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel published an informative article by Ed Francis, entitled "Marquette University Environment Study Vital to United States." I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT STUDY VITAL TO UNITED STATES
(By Ed Francis)

Men create environments. But environments, in turn, create different kinds of men. This retributive cycle, often vicious and destructive, is both the most important and most ignored basic force affecting man's destiny.

It will no longer be ignored.

On September 27, Marquette University will begin a 10-week seminar to probe some of the key environmental forces shaping the future of Milwaukee and the metropolitan area.

The seminar, called basic urban dynamics, is actually the first organized attempt to analyze basic environmental forces in a major community.

It now seems certain that this 10-week seminar will evolve into a full scale science of urban-kinetics (the study of environmental forces in motion and environment changes influencing human attitudes).

Brother Leo V. Ryan, C.S.V., director of continuing education at the university described the Basic Urban Dynamics seminar as a "course exploring urban-kinetics and probing environment problems underlying community development."

An imposing array of experts in various essential fields will put this historic seminar into high gear. Such authorities as Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel; Police Chief Howard Johnson; Prof. Willard Downing; Dr. Elan McElroy; Dr. Arthur Else; and Dr. Jack Curtis, eminent sociologist, will participate in one or more of the programs.

Mayor Maier and officials of suburban communities will participate in some of the seminar programs. Some top names from the business field will also look at local environment conditions, notably John Lobb, former chairman of the Metropolitan Study Commission, and F. S. Cornell, both vice presidents of A. O. Smith Corp.

The importance of this seminar is obvious to those who know community problems.

And now that 85 percent of Americans live in cities, the influence of urban environments over human attitudes becomes a matter of urgent concern.

In Milwaukee and other American cities, negative environment forces predetermine the level of community growth, job opportunities, welfare costs, tax rates, crime, and health levels, intellectual and cultural attainments, and the quantity and quality of living conveniences and recreation sites.

Nationwide, negative environment forces predetermine the limits of national strength, economic growth, scientific and intellectual achievement, and even world stature.

On an international level, the world is now suffering the consequences from hundreds of years of negative environmental conditions in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Negative environments have spawned communism and other despotic ideologies, triggered riots, rebellions, bloodbaths, persecutions, and political upheavals.

These things demonstrate the awesome meaning in that harmless sounding word "environment."

Marquette's 10-week basic urban dynamics seminar starting September 27 could pave the way for a whole new era of environment improvement in Milwaukee and the metropolitan area. It is the Nation's pioneer venture into the new science of urban-kinetics.

Count Our Blessings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the devastation caused by the recent hurricane Carla has disturbed all of us, and our sympathies and prayers are with all its victims. It left many people homeless, many injured, and some deaths.

We, in Buffalo, N.Y., also have some drastic changes in the weather about which we often complain. Likewise, in many regions throughout the world, complaints about the weather never cease. But we should feel fortunate indeed that we have been treated so kindly by Mother Nature.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 14, 1961, which can well apply to those of us who have not met with such weather disasters as the hurricane Carla:

COUNT OUR BLESSINGS

Buffalonians wouldn't be Buffalonians if they didn't complain about the weather. Yet whenever Mother Nature goes on her worst rampages, this area can usually count its blessings. It is true that our winters sometimes seem rather long and snowy. But that is about the worst that nature visits upon us.

We need have little fear of hurricanes like Carla, or earthquakes such as visit California, or the lethal tornadoes that plague parts of the Midwest. In spring our basements and streets may take water at times, but we are spared the ruinous floods that bring misery and disaster to other parts of the country. We have known drought and water shortages, but have never been a dust bowl and we have only to tap Lake Erie for all the good water we need.

Instead of complaining about the occasional inconveniences to which the weather puts our region, we should be thankful for the catalog of serious problems—and outright disasters—which nature spares us.

Reopening the National Service Life Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from Louisiana has been making a valiant fight to give World War II and Korean veterans a second chance, for a limited time, to take out national service life insurance. He points out that under what is now generally known as the Long amendment some 16 million veterans could be potential beneficiaries, most of whom were at one time covered, but that these veterans allowed their policies to lapse following separation from service, partly out of ignorance that the program was to be suspended and partly out of economic necessity.

In a recent memorandum the junior Senator from Louisiana described the situation as follows:

The act of April 24, 1951, which terminated the NSLI program, went into effect immediately upon enactment, without giving these veterans any warning that the program was being ended. It had been the intention of an undeterminable number of them to reinstate their insurance at some future time, when their responsibilities and financial ability were more nearly commensurate with doing so. The measure would cost the Government relatively little, since the administrative costs of the new policies would be borne by the new policyholders themselves. The element of Government competition with commercial insurers is negligible; many insurance people feel that reopening the NSLI prorgam for a limited period might well stimulate a hiterto untapped insurance market.

Incidentally, if Members of Congress will briefly review the advantages of Government insurance which they have provided for themselves and other Federal employees, with an added benefit occasioned by their former wartime service, they will find it difficult indeed to subscribe to the argument that veterans, having once failed to take advantage of a Government insurance opportunity, should be forever foreclosed. For a Member of Congress, for example, his period of active military service is added in arriving at retirement benefits. He is not required to pay anything at all for this additional coverage and benefit. Any Member of Congress who did not take advantage of retirement insurance available to him may pick it up even unto this day.

If it can be regarded as evil for a person to have Government insurance as a result of his connection with the Federal Government, why do we provide so much of it for ourselves? Incidentally, veterans' insurance is less than 1 percent of the volume of Government insurance for death, disability, and retirement benefits.

The foregoing and the many other arguments advanced are very persuasive. And the junior Senator from Louisiana does not stand alone. The other body adopted the Long NSLI amendment five times in the past without a dissenting vote. When added to the bill, H.R. 879, on July 17 of this year, the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 75 to 0.

Now, I understand that members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs entertain different views. Mr. Speaker, that does not surprise me at all. I have been a lawyer for 35 years, a State senator, and a Member of this body for quite a spell of time. I have long since found out that except for the Ten Commandments there are usually two sides to every argument.

But to those standing on the side, so to speak, it is difficult to make an intelligent decision until the views of the contending parties are unfolded in debate. In this instance, however, it has not been possible to listen to the usual process of arguments in the House on both sides of the issue. This has been due to an unfortunate impasse of long duration between the two Houses of the Congress.

Without rehashing what took place previously, I think it might serve a useful purpose to say a few words about the action thus far taken in this session concerning the legislative effort on behalf of these veterans.

On June 5, 1961, the House passed a disabled veterans' compensation measure, H.R. 879, and the Senate added the Long NSLI amendment to it. This bill, H.R. 879, as amended by the Senate, has been lying on the Speaker's desk for quite sometime.

Some time ago the House also passed the bill, H.R. 856, designed to permit certain veterans who already hold national service life insurance policies to convert them from term to some other forms of life insurance. In addition to adding the Long amendment to H.R. 856, the Senate Finance Committee also added as an amendment the substance of H.R. 879, the disabled veterans' compensation measure above referred to. In fact, the amendment to H.R. 856 contained the same provisions as the original House-passed H.R. 879. The junior Senator from Louisiana points out that the net result was that H.R. 856 as it passed the Senate became something of an omnibus veterans' bill. The provision relating to optional conversion plan for outstanding NSLI policies was amended to include the veterans' pension increase as that proposal had passed the House, as well as the Long NSLI proposal. This broad bill, H.R. 856, has also been lying on the Speaker's desk.

Then, on September 6, the House, rather than acting on H.R. 856 with the two Senate amendments, or H.R. 879, as amended, suspended the rules and added the substance of the veterans' pension bill, H.R. 879, to the orphans' education bill, S. 2051. Only a very careful reading of the RECORD on that date would reveal that the compensation amendment had been added. It was not labeled as a compensation increase. The fact that the compensation measure had been added was ascertainable only by a close reading of the entirety of the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it emphatically clear that I am not being critical of anyone who might disagree with the junior Senator from Louisiana. I am simply outlining the various parliamentary situations which have developed during this session of the Congress with regard to his proposal.

In fact, as indicated, maybe the junior Senator from Louisiana is wrong. And maybe the other body was wrong five times in agreeing with him. But then maybe they are right. The only way to find out would be to bring up the proposal on the floor of the House for consideration and I very much hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for whom I have the highest regard and warm personal affection, will see fit to reconsider his position and lend his aid in seeing this logjam untangled in a democratic fashion by debating and voting upon each of the several proposals, including the Long NSLI amendment, on their merits. We still have time to resolve these problems during this session of the Congress. Let us bring up the Long amendment, let us debate, and let us vote on it on its merits.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating the memory of our colleague, OVERTON BROOKS. I came to know OVERTON during my first years in Congress and then became more closely associated with him during the time I have served on the Science and Astronautics Committee of which he was chairman.

OVERTON was one the most dedicated men I have known, and perhaps it was this dedication that may have contributed to his untimely passing. He was an inspiration to all of us on the committee, and I hope that his family and his friends may find comfort in the reflection of the kind of a life he lived.

I wish for his family every comfort that comes from an abiding faith.

Leadership of Former President Hoover in Massive Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the September 11 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal written by Mr. William L. Ryan, Associated Press news analyst, entitled "Hoover Hits Red Lie on 1923 Program."

I hope this article will be read by all Members of the Congress and by thousands throughout our country and the world.

It is the story of the development under the leadership of former President Herbert Hoover of the massive aid program, provided by the people of the United States in the years 1921–23 from public and private sources, to save from starvation and disease 20 million people of the Soviet Union.

This aid was requested by the Soviet regime, and in 1923, Leo Kamenev, then head of the Council of Commissars, said that the Soviet Union, "will never forget the help given by the American people." Today typically, the Soviet Union leaders deny that the United States provided aid so critical for the survival of millions of Russian people.

Mr. Hoover, who directed this humanitarian effort, as he did for many other countries and peoples following World War I, tells the story of American generosity in volume I of his "An American Epic."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER HITS RED LIE ON 1923 PROGRAM

(By William L. Ryan)

NEW YORK, September 9.—Former President Herbert Hoover, in a penetrating postscript to history, accuses today's Soviet leaders of cynical lying about the massive U.S. effort hailed by the Kremlin 38 years ago as the salvation of 20 million Russians from death by starvation.

The Soviet Union, Kremlin leaders in 1923 said, "will never forget" the work of Hoover's American Relief Administration (ARA) in saving "millions of people of all ages" from one of history's most terrible famines.

Today's Soviet leaders not only choose to forget, but also have so distorted events of the time that they depict the man who saved those millions as a conniving capitalist—even a murderer.

DESCRIBED IN BOOK

Hoover's dramatic story of how American generosity saved millions in the Soviet Union, and how U.S. efforts saved other millions in devastated countries around the globe after World War I, is told in volume III of "An American Epic" (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, $6.50), which will appear in bookstores Monday.

This is the detailed history of the battle against starvation undertaken by the American people at the end of World War I. Volume IV is to tell the story of U.S. activities during World War II when more than 800 million were involved in acute food shortages or famine.

WAS IN THICK OF IT

Hoover was in the thick of it all, first under President Woodrow Wilson, then under President Warren G. Harding. He accuses present-day Soviet leaders, including Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's righthand man, Frol R. Kozlov, of deliberately lying.

"The greatest ill that I have suffered from the Communists' perfection in the art of the big lie," he writes, "is that I have been compelled to elaborate this narrative of the relief of Russia so that this lie can rise again only in Communist minds."

Hoover, now 87, has set down a parade of staggering statistics which leap to life with dramatic force as he tells of the struggle against starvation in 45 nations four decades ago. His account of what went on in hungry, strife-wracked Russia is a study in American persistence and Communist cynicism.

Hoover, destined to become 31st President of the United States, had known Russia before World War I as a practicing engineer. As the war ended he became head of the ARA, which successfully battled famine in nation after nation. But in Russia—in the grip of civil war after the Soviet Communist seizure of power—death and pestilence stalked the land.

"The conscience of myself and my loyal colleagues in the relief administration told us that we had to do the best we could where 20 million people were about to die," he writes.

SIGNED AGREEMENT

ARA and the Soviet regime signed the Riga agreement of 1921, under which public and private U.S. aid could be hurried to Russia. In a matter of 3 weeks ARA was feeding starving Russian children.

"Our best estimate was that relief was given to about 14 million adults," Hoover writes. "Adding the children the total number of individuals who at one time or another were furnished the necessary margins to preserve life was estimated at more than 20 million."

ARA also battled pestilence in Russia. Hoover called it the greatest foreign peacetime medical crusade ever undertaken and said its record stands as a monument to the whole American medical profession.

HARASSED BY AGENTS

Despite the massive effort, ARA was harassed by Kremlin agents, who interfered with relief work to such an extent that the Americans threatened to call it all off. That brought the Russian leaders around.

Even in the United States there was harassment from Communists who set up their own camouflaged organization, collected funds and used most of the money to seek propaganda for communism from the relief effort.

But the job was done. By June 1923 a good Russian crop had come in. The Soviet Government was effusive in its public praise of Hoover and his organization. Said Leo Kamenev, then head of the Council of Commissars:

"The Soviet of People's Commissars, in the name of the saved millions and the whole toiling people of Soviet Russia * * * considers it its duty to express before the whole world to this organization, its head, Herbert Hoover * * * its profoundest gratitude and to declare that the people populating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will never forget the help given by the American people through the ARA."

The Communist leaders echoed the theme over and over. But Hoover writes, "The Communists soon began to realize that an expression of gratitude to a free nation was a violation of the primary tenets of communism."

Hoover quotes a U.S. observer as describing an article in the official 1956 Soviet encyclopedia as one which "converts Hoover into the murderer of millions of Russians instead of the savior of millions from starvation."

Hoover sharply denounces Kozlov, now a top-ranking Communist secretary, for saying during a 1959 U.S. tour that the Americans forced the Russians to repay the relief in gold. That, he said, was "the big-lie" technique.

"I have documented and cited statistics extensively in this narrative and I have given a detailed description of events because this huge American undertaking in compassion has been minimized," Hoover says, "and finally, even in publications of the Soviet Government and by Soviet officials throughout the years."

The Lowell Story of Private Endeavor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my hometown of Lowell, Mass. I am proud of the way my fellow citizens have overcome the economic difficulties which afflicted our community, so long dependent upon textile manufacturing for its source of livelihood. I think the Lowell story of private endeavor working closely with local, State and Federal governmental units is a truly inspiring one, which holds out hope to other industrial areas. Our distinguished and dynamic Governor, John Volpe, at an industrial dinner held recently under the auspices of the Lowell Sun and the Massachusetts Department of Commerce, did an outstanding job of telling this story:

I commend the Lowell Sun for its efforts in promoting this industrial seminar—your second one—to display the accomplishments of your city and its foresighted leaders. It is a pleasure to be here in Lowell with you tonight—where a dynamic spirit has been on parade for the past decade, a beacon to laggard communities.

Whether you lived through them here in Lowell or not. I'm sure all of you remember the grim twenties when Lowell—having reached its heighth in the textile industry—known throughout the country as the "Spindle City"—suddenly lost its textiles to the South and went into a decline.

Where once residential areas stood proud and attractive, blight reached in and began its ravaging work.

The lines of unemployment grew long—the welfare rolls went up. Many who watched the sad disintegration thought

Lowell was done—that it would become a ghost town.

For a long time, Lowell staggered under its economic blow. It could easily have become a ghost city—except for one thing: Its spirit of resourcefulness and initiative.

The city had suffered severely, but it did not die. It followed the old adage of "God helps those who help themselves" and in the 1950's began a remarkable comeback—pulling itself up by its bootstraps and revitalizing its economy.

Although Lowell is still considered a distressed area—and just a week ago, we approved certification making you eligible for aid under the area redevelopment program which will provide many new jobs, train workers in new skills and provide money for plant development and urban renewal—still, you have come a long way in the last decade.

When I consider the number of new industries you have attracted here through your initiative—more than 50—and the number of plant expansions, it makes me proud to have the city of Lowell in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It makes me want to hold you up as a model for other cities to follow—for you have overcome odds as great, if not greater, than most cities have to contend with.

You have replaced your lost textiles, for the most part, with electronics: your workers have become versatile in other fields. Your population stopped leaving home—and new people came. Most people are unaware, I'm sure, that greater Lowell had a population jump of 50 percent in the last census—while the metropolitan area increased 16 percent. Few industrial areas in the country matched this.

You had many assets to offer new industry, not the least of which was a pool of skilled labor with a responsible attitude toward their jobs and their employers.

You made your 176-acre industrial park where new facilities could be built to attract industry.

You had a foresighted city planner, and city manager. You had, and have, businessmen with keen civic consciousness.

And industry came. How was it possible for the newcomers not have faith in a city which had such dynamic faith in itself?

You have good schools and good housing, good health facilities and Lowell Tech, which has grown in size and prestige. But we will not pretend that all is well yet.

Though you have a total labor force of 50,000, you have about 5,000 unemployed. It is this factor that makes you eligible for the Federal aid which will provide many new jobs and training for unemployed.

It is estimated that in the next 9 years, Lowell will have to find jobs for a total of 25,000—this need follows your burgeoning population growth.

With your resourcefulness and the aid of private sources as well as the area redevelopment fund, I believe you'll do this. I have been quite impressed with your accomplishments already in the field of urban renewal. You are now completing your second urban renewal plan of 100 acres—when many cities in the State have not even yet begun.

The area redevelopment program will make possible the completion of your urban renewal in five more major areas—your slum areas will eventually fall before your purposeful planning.

An attractive, spruced up community is one of the best selling aids in bringing in new industry. Success breeds success in economic development.

I believe overall planning is a vital factor in renewing our communities and our State. Without integrated planning we have the wasteful situation of agency working against agency. We have lethargy and erosion.

I have proposed a department of economic development and community renewal which is now being studied by the legislature. This would integrate all aspects—transportation, urban renewal, adequate relocation and public housing coordination of economic and community development for the entire Commonwealth.

Our economy has changed so radically in the past two decades that it is no longer possible to plan wisely on the basis of a single community any longer. Planners must consider their communities are interdependent—just as you have recognized that fact in Lowell, realizing your market extends to 19 towns outside Lowell. We must mobilize our forces along regional and metropolitan cooperation.

The department, I proposed, would fight against blight and create a favorable climate for job—creating industry in our State. It recognizes that the industrial base in Massachusetts incorporates not only manufacturing and research, but also vacation travel, finance and commerce and small business.

The maintenance of a balanced economy remains a prime objective of our program.

Through our program, we can tap the available resources of the Federal Government as in the depressed areas legislation, expanded housing, renewal, transportation, and economic development. Massachusetts taxes will support such programs.

As an encouragement to regional planning, I recommend that the Commonwealth reimburse half the local funds expended in each regional planning district up to an annual limit of $20,000. Each community participating in regional planning districts would be reimbursed for one-half the cost of their local planning activities up to an annual amount of $5,000.

Without proper planning, our maps of the future will be a crazy quilt—without direction—just one vast confusion. We cannot have this. We must know where are going and how we are going to get there.

While I am proud of the accomplishments of Lowell, I am sorry that the record of our cities and towns falls far short of the pressing needs to revitalize our communities.

It has taken us abut 60 months in Massachusetts to complete the suvey and planning stage of a project as compared to a national average of 31 months.

We cannot allow our communities to continue to forfeit their share of this Federal and private investment. The State is a partner in aiding the cities to recapture their economic health. As the cities flourish, so will the State.

Our assets and economic strength are urban in character. Since pioneer days, Massachusetts has been identified with industry.

Bay State genius invented the cotton gin, telephone, sewing machine, vulcanized rubber, quickfreeze foods, and many other things which enrich American life.

We have one of the world's greatest centers of science and technology—Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, your own Lowell Tech.

A State which offers all these advantages must recapture the pride and excitement of rebuilding its communities and moving firmly forward.

Though I advocate State aid, I do not advocate State interference. Urban renewal ought to be a local responsibility and the role of the State should be that of a supporting rather than a controlling partner.

Lowell has done much alone; it will do much more with State and Federal aid. You have proved that we do have a favorable business climate in Massachusetts. What you have done here in Lowell, I am sure other enterprising communities can also do if only they will call on the same spirit and pride which moved you toward success.

By the joint effort of citizens on all levels—business owners, workers, Government leaders, our system of free enterprise will flourish proving to the world that communism can never wipe out our way of life.

I thank you.

Kentucky Candidates for Title of "Miss America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the September 3 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "Two Daughters of Bluegrass Are in Running for Miss America."

The people of Kentucky are very proud of Miss Lee Willis Grigsby, who represented Kentucky, and Miss Myrtis Lee Conn, who represented New Mexico in the Miss America Pageant at Atlantic City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO DAUGHTERS OF BLUEGRASS

(By Sarah Landsell)

When the parade past the judges' posts starts Monday in the Miss America Pageant at Atlantic City, two daughters of Kentucky will be entered in the race for the raves and the trophies.

Luck—and the great American tendency toward changes of address—will have two native Bluegrass Staters matching talents and looks in the annual meet to choose a new Miss America.

Besides willowy, auburn-haired Lee Willis Grigsby of Bardstown, Kentucky's official titleholder in the beauty-and-talent stakes, another native Kentuckian also will be looking pretty for the judges and spectators.

Green-eyed Myrtis Lee Conn, who was born while her family lived at Crestwood, will be parading as Miss New Mexico.

Myrtis Lee, who usually answers to "Sug" (pronounced "Shug") went West several years ago, after first going South. She's a senior at Eastern New Mexico University at Portales and commutes to school from Clovis, N. Mex., 18 miles away.

Besides beauty, talent, and a name, Myrtis Lee has at least one other thing in common with Lee Willis. Both are equestriennes with an eye for smart horseflesh.

From Crestwood, strawberry-blonde "Sug" moved with her contractor father, William Conn, and family to Shelbyville. She showed her own mounts on the Kentucky horse show circuit and explored Oldham County riding trails.

When the Conns moved to Miami, Sug hung up her saddle and became a regular on the modeling staff of a leading department store. She also trod the boards in leading roles in school plays.

Now a drama major at Eastern New Mexico University, "Sug" won the title of Miss Clovis last spring, and later the State title. (In the finals, "Sug" managed to look lovely in spite of a sudden crisis. Her mother, flying out from Miami to see the contest, was aboard the Miami-to-Dallas plane hijacked

and flown to Cuba. Mrs. Conn arrived in New Mexico 3 days late.)

Also at Atlantic City will be brunette Kathy Burke of Terre Haute, the Hoosiers' reigning beauty with the title of Miss Indiana. She's an artist and fashion designer who turned the State-contest judges' heads with a one-woman fashion show.

With a three-way entry in the running, Kentuckiana is likely to be a favorite in the brains-and-beauty stakes.

A Noble Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, several days ago this House, by a sizable majority, voted to establish a Peace Corps. Private comment indicated this was not a positive vote but rather a long-shot gamble that it might serve some useful purpose.

This was, you will recall, supposed to be a pilot program, but it has now developed into a $40 million venture and that amount is merely a starting figure.

While I supported the Peace Corps venture, I did so with reservations and grave misgivings.

An article in the current issue of National Review is thought provocative and appears to present a sane approach to what all know is a difficult problem. I commend it for the reading and study of all present.

A PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE?
(By David N. Rowe)

The Peace Corps, reputedly a pet project of President Kennedy's inner circle adviser Walt W. Rostow, plans to send considerable numbers of American teachers, technicians, etc., to work in foreign countries during the next several years. These individuals, recruited from the ranks of recent graduates, will be briefly trained in the United States in the language and cultural background of the host nation. Once abroad, they will be required to live and work as close to the level of the local population as possible, although just how this will be done in each area has yet to be seen. This scheme, depend on it, will cost a great deal of money.

The hoped-for results of the Peace Corps could be achieved at much less expense and with far greater efficiency by other means. For the talent is available in the persons of the many foreign students who have been brought here since the war to be trained in just the skills and techniques the Peace Corps is meant to provide. There are literally thousands of these trainees here. Only a few have returned home at the conclusion of their course of study to help their countries achieve cultural, economic, and political advances.

FOREIGN STUDENTS STAY HERE

To understand what this means to their countries of origin we must remember that the students who have come here from Asia and, with increasing frequency today, from Africa, are the intellectual cream of their societies. Competition for education is very sharp, the academic discipline in many Asian countries very severe, and the graduates, whatever the character of their curriculums, do represent the very highest levels of qualifications available.

It is usually the ambition of the overwhelming majority of these graduates to go abroad for further study. So by allowing most of these trainees to stay here we are depriving their countries of their best intellectual resources. Asian students are naturally attracted by the high standard of living in the United States. In addition, they have found that they can successfully compete with Americans for jobs. American research and educational institutions, hospitals, business, and technical enterprises are glad to employ them. With the aid of friendly and interested Americans, these foreign students are able to circumvent laws which require their return home. This is not too difficult. The student may simply not conclude his study program. He will, for example, encounter delays in completing a dissertation. Time limits for completion of graduate work are not enforced in many graduate schools. Some students enlist the sympathy and assistance of their professors, many of whom are anxious to keep them on as research workers.

The student from abroad can also marry an American girl, and thus place a real obstruction against the rules requiring his departure. His position is still stronger if he has a child born in this country who, under our laws, is entitled to American citizenship. Other students, less in demand in the professions, simply go underground, taking jobs as waiters, photo laboratory workers, etc., in large cities.

Much of the financial support of these students is provided by the U.S. Government and by private and public American foundations and agencies, with the object of helping to train an intellectual, cultural, economic and technical elite for poorer nations. Instead of seeing to it that these trained young men and women are in fact returned to our friends and allies abroad, we allow them to remain.

On a recent trip to Asia I found American cultural workers there keenly aware of this problem. How could they help get the student from Asia to return home? Most of them urged sharp curtailment of recruitment and support of Asian students for study in America if a clear answer to that question is not forthcoming.

In face of this, the proposed Peace Corps of young Americans appears to many abroad as a laughable and totally inadequate expedient. Why teach a few Americans a little of some difficult language, and give them a smattering of knowledge of a particular local culture, when we have here in the United States available for such work thousands of natives of those countries who are (whether our bureaucrats know it or not) thoroughly conversant in their own languages and cultures.

RESTITUTION

Part of the money we are now planning to spend on the Peace Corps should be used to send home foreign students we have trained; we could help provide them with better job opportunities, and perhaps even contribute something to their immediate local environment so that they will better readjust to the change.

The U.S. Government has invested large sums in training Asians here. It is preparing to spend more, and is being pressed to do so. But if the practices of the immediate past are to be followed still further, this will only result in great loss to the countries we are attempting to help.

It is high time we stopped raiding the intellectual resources of our friends and allies. We should begin to make restitution, by returning every possible trainee or extrainee now in this country who has either completed his training or has been here a certain specified length of time. We might decide to accept from any given country each year only as many new trainees as there are students from that country who have returned from the United States during the previous year. But to do this, we must tighten the enforcement of regulations now on the books, and add such new rules as the situation may require.

We can thus put an end to the Peace Corps in reverse that foreign student trainees in this country now constitute.

The Peace Corps: American Pioneers of Today

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide for a Peace Corps to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps is the first original and promising idea in the field of foreign relations that gets to the heart of the situation. One serious lack in our diplomacy, and in our foreign aid programs, has been the failure to establish people-to-people communication and practical helpfulness.

The bill passed by the U.S. House of Representatives to establish a Peace Corps to assist the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower, is inspired by our consideration for people in backward areas and our desire to help them improve their standard of living.

There are no strings attached to the Peace Corps. Our sole purpose is to assist other people so that they will share in progress. Such efforts will be constructive, in the material and the spiritual sense. For by working with the people of undeveloped or backward areas, we have the opportunity to build the confidence in one another, born of overcoming problems together * * * that opens the road to peace.

There are few precedents to guide us. There will be failures from which we will learn, but the practical idealism of the young men and women who sacrifice the comforts and conveniences of life in the United States for the purpose of helping underprivileged people elsewhere to learn the basic skills that will make them self-reliant, is the spirit of freedom and human dignity at its best.

The $40 million budget will enable the Peace Corps to have 2,700 men and women in services overseas or in training by the end of fiscal year 1962, and will enable the Peace Corps to enter into training contracts with universities to train additional volunteers during the summer of 1962.

Training for each project will take from 3 to 6 months, most of it spent in the United States, but some of it provided in the country to which the volunteer is sent. Each candidate will re-

ceive a thorough medical examination as well as psychological and psychiatric tests. He will be screened by the FBI. He will engage in 60 to 66 hours of work a week on concentrated intellectual and physical effort. Included in this program will be training in such subjects as nutrition, personal health and sanitation, disease prevention, self-care and mental hygiene.

The volunteer will receive living allowances while on the job, but no pay. He will live at a level generally similar to that of his host country counterpart.

In the words of Director Shriver, the Peace Corps volunteers will show the world that "the American revolution is on the move again" by demonstrating that young Americans have "the stamina, the curiosity, the sympathy, and the responsibility to become working representatives of the United States abroad."

Sometimes they may serve under conditions of hardship, but in helping others they will promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served, and a better understanding of other peoples, on the part of the American people.

The Peace Corps volunteers represent the often-frustrated pioneering spirit of most Americans. They will be starting out on a bold adventure to faraway and sometimes primitive places, where they will show how free men and free women work for progress and humanity.

The Peace Corps will encourage that people-to-people communication which is essential to world order, world well-being, and world understanding.

War's Greatest Sufferers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from Gist by Mr. Frederick Burdick. Members of the Congress are familiar with his dedicated service to the cause of peace and his message has special meaning in these perilous times.

WAR'S GREATEST SUFFERERS
(By Frederick Burdick)

A Gist poll of people prior to the November election showed that the vast majority of voters were more concerned about world peace than any other issue. One woman said that the next President would win lasting fame by bringing the world lasting peace.

Being nonpartisan, the Gist sent memos to both presidential candidates informing them of the poll results and the thinking of the people.

In his November 5 address in New York City, John F. Kennedy said: "I want above all else to be a President known as the one who not only prevented war but maintained the peace—as one of whom history might well say, he not only laid the foundation for peace in his time, but for generations to come."

The universal desire for a lasting world peace was interestingly and poignantly stated by the only woman head of a nation, Premier Sirimano Bandaranaike of Ceylon, when she said at the recent meeting of neutral states: "I speak as a woman and a mother who can understand the thoughts of those millions of mothers in this world who are deeply concerned about the preservation of the human race."

Without doubt mothers are the principal sufferers from armed conflict. When their boys go to war there begins a period of agonizing fears and suspense. And in cases in which messages of killed in action, wounded or missing are received all can sympathize with the lasting grief of relatives, and of mothers in particular. Veterans' hospital visitors learn to hate war. The fact that in a modern war all might be casualties emphasizes the imperativeness of preventing a world war III or the millions who lost their lives in World Wars I and II and Korea will indeed have died in vain. It is not too late to turn the present tide toward war instead to peace.

Tax-Sheltered TVA Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benjamin Strong, president of the United States Trust Co. of New York, a leading institution in the field of trust administration and investment management, on July 24, 1961, addressed the following letter to the President of the United States relative to the great tax advantages enjoyed by the Tennessee Valley Authority power consumers.

Mr. Strong notes that to make TVA's so-called yardstick a true comparison with free enterprise, TVA should collect from its customers and remit to the U.S. Treasury and to local taxing authorities an additional 15 percent of its revenues—about $26 million based on 1960 operations. He suggests that "the Congress remove the TVA's Federal tax shelter so that all electric consumers could stand on an equal footing as regards to taxation."

I wish to call your particular attention to the chart at the conclusion of this letter which points out that one investor-owned electric company producing approximately 5 percent of the number of kilowatt-hours as TVA pays slightly more taxes than this Federal agency while another company producing about 32 percent of TVA's total kilowatt-hours pays 9½ times as much in taxes. I recommend that all Members of Congress take time to read this excellent and informative letter of Mr. Strong's and give serious consideration to his recommendations:

UNITED STATES TRUST CO.
OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., July 24, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your recent reference to new electric rates of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a yardstick for the electric rates throughout the country seems unjust. It is virtually impossible for any investor-owned electric utility to contend with the rates of the TVA system with its Federal appropriations, subsidies and tax-free benefits.

The United States Trust Co. of New York is a leader in the field of trust administration and investment management of funds for individuals, families, and educational and charitable institutions of all kinds. Among the holdings of these customers of ours are many millions of dollars worth of stocks and bonds of investor-owned electric power companies. Many families and institutions depend on the income from these investments. When a cloud is cast upon these companies and they are discriminated against unfairly by the Government we feel duty bound to call the facts to the responsible officials.

Major differences between TVA and investor-owned electric utility companies are:

[In millions]

	TVA	Investor-owned utilities
Federal income taxes, 1960	None	[1] $1,100
Other taxes and payments in lieu of taxes, 1960	$17	1,000
Appropriated funds (net for electric plant after repayments to the Treasury since 1933)	1,200	([2])
Private investor funds (total capitalization at book value)	[3] 100	[4] 34,300

[1] Based on compilations of the FPC for all class A and B investor-owned electric utilities for 1960.
[2] Not applicable.
[3] Sale of TVA revenue bonds to the public.
[4] Based on preliminary figures for Dec. 31, 1960, of the Edison Electric Institute.

These figures highlight the discrimination by TVA and other public power against the users of about 76 percent of the electricity in the United States. As seen above, the investor-owned electric utility industry paid $1,100 million in Federal income taxes in 1960. These taxes were raised out of the operating revenues from electricity consumers in areas served by the private segment of the industry. TVA, on the other hand, has paid no Federal income taxes during its existence and actually has received subsidies amounting to over $1,200 million from the Federal Government.

It seems inequitable that consumers of 76 percent of the electricity generated in the country should have to pay higher rates so that consumers of TVA may enjoy lower rates.

In 1959 Congress passed legislation to enable TVA to issue revenue bonds up to $750 million to the public. This act removed from the Treasury the responsibility of providing TVA with annual funds needed for increased and more efficient generating, transmission, and distribution facilities. In the past year the Authority has successfully offered two bond issues of $50 million each. This legislation, together with the public investor confidence in TVA's management which we strongly share, assures that the financing needs of the Authority can be provided without further tapping the Treasury.

To end the tax discrimination, the Congress should now enact legislation requiring TVA annually to collect from its customers and remit to the Treasury and to local taxing authorities an additional 15 percent of revenues (about $36 million based on 1960 TVA revenues) derived from the sale of electricity. This would make TVA's so-called yardstick a true comparison with the performance of investor-owned electric utilities. Furthermore, it would provide additional funds for the Federal and local government at a time when large amounts of money for national defense and other important requirements are so anxiously being sought.

Attached is a chart showing by means of statistics certain of the discriminations already mentioned. Kilowatt-hour sales in 1960 for each of the investor-owned electric utilities surveyed were less than half those of TVA and yet each of these companies paid out more taxes than TVA.

It would be very much in the public interest for the Congress to remove the TVA's Federal tax shelter so that all electricity consumers could stand on an equal footing as regards taxation. Your inclusion of legislation to accomplish this as a part of your legislative program would be most influential in securing its enactment and consistent with your objectives for the interests of the entire Nation.

Very respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN STRONG,
Chairman of the Board.

Company	Total revenues	Kilowatt-hour sales	Federal income taxes [1]	Other taxes	Total taxes	Revenues paid out in taxes	Average cost per kilowatt-hour (all customers)	Kilowatt-hour produced	Total taxes paid
								Relative to TVA	
Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)	*Thousands* $242,385	*Millions* 59,343	*Thousands* 0	*Thousands* $16,616	*Thousands* $16,616	*Percent* 0.9	*Cents* 0.41	*Percent* 100.0	*Percent* 100
American Electric Power	338,078	27,206	$28,265	29,387	57,652	17.1	1.24	45.9	347
Commonwealth Edison	469,430	22,171	57,444	57,096	114,540	24.5	2.11	37.4	690
Consolidated Edison	656,300	18,900	39,400	119,800	159,200	24.3	2.79	31.9	950
Florida Power & Light	172,680	6,943	31,804	12,827	44,631	25.8	2.49	11.7	269
General Public Utilities	203,734	9,846	23,737	13,459	36,196	17.8	2.09	16.6	219
Houston Lighting & Power	115,837	8,965	22,707	7,645	30,353	26.2	1.29	15.1	183
Kansas City Power & Light	67,738	3,003	8,583	8,584	17,167	25.4	2.25	8.1	103
Middle South Utilities	214,574	8,978	24,219	22,325	46,544	21.2	2.06	15.1	280
New England Electric System	179,939	6,263	13,287	22,372	35,659	19.8	2.43	10.6	468
Southern California Edison	305,799	17,440	33,350	44,390	77,740	25.2	1.75	29.4	217
Southern Co.	319,162	22,759	33,071	23,834	56,905	17.8	1.40	38.4	343
Texas Utilities	201,576	11,054	39,756	17,701	57,457	28.4	1.83	18.7	346
Virginia Electric Power	100,588	8,100	20,899	12,852	43,751	27.4	1.81	13.7	264

[1] Based only on taxes actually paid. Excludes deferred taxes resulting from the use of accelerated depreciation and amortization.

Mainly About Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial in the New York Daily News of September 15 which I believe every Member of this body should read—particularly every every Member on the Republican side of the aisle. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, entitled "Mainly About Money," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MAINLY ABOUT MONEY

Congress has authorized the President to spend $4,253 billion on foreign aid during fiscal 1962 (began July 1, 1961).

Last week, the House got up the courage to cut $596 million off this figure, in a bill to provide the money for foreign aid.

Day before yesterday, the Senate Appropriations Committee restored $533 million of the House's cuts—including $334 million in proposed giveaways to new, busted, and probably ungrateful, nations.

The money bill comes on for a Senate vote today. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, an enemy of extravagance, says he will fight for a slash of $250 million, but his prospects of victory don't look bright.

Apparently the Senate, like the President, still thinks we can buy friends around the world, despite all our long, sad, and costly experience to the contrary. Taxpayers, tighten your belts.

Well, at least there is some vague talk in administration circles about tapping Red Poland and Yugoslavia lightly on their hairy wrists because of recent unfriendly gestures of theirs toward the United States.

Yugoslavia's Tito kicked Uncle Sam around in a speech at the recent Belgrade convention of neutral nations, and Poland's U.S. Ambassador is shooting off his face in Washington about how the Western Allies will have to surrender to Khrushchev on West Berlin.

So the administration is talking, not about cutting off aid to these two countries, but about slowing down delivery of further aid. That'll show 'em, eh; and isn't that Kennedy a tough one, though?

The direction in which all this squandering, abroad and at home, is taking the Nation was indicated Wednesday in a Senate speech by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia—another longtime enemy of Government extravagance.

HEADING FOR $106 BILLION

Keep spending at the present rate of increase per year, said Senator BYRD, and by 1965 the Federal budget will hit $106 billion, as against the estimated outlay of $87.7 billion in fiscal 1962.

BYRD does not object to spending every dime we need to spend on national defense—nor does anybody else that we know personally. What alarms him is the Kennedy administration's insistence on huge domestic giveaways and handouts as if there were no cold war.

Where the money is to come from, BYRD doesn't know. He says taxes can't be raised much higher; that in some areas they are already running afoul of the well-known law of diminishing returns.

Yet the President has started a tough-talk campaign to keep the steel companies from raising prices to offset the big wage increases scheduled for October 1. This has led Roger M. Blough, as president of United States Steel, to ask Mr. Kennedy publicly whether he is thinking of eventual peacetime price fixing by the Government.

If he is, he is thinking of a system which will choke down production and shrink tax revenues, as the Nation learned when President Truman hung stubbornly onto price controls after World War II.

Doesn't all this offer some valuable suggestions to the Republicans for campaign material in their fight to win control of Congress in 1962 and the White House in 1964?

A group of northeastern Republicans met at Hartford, Conn., yesterday, for a 2-day huddle on plans for 1962 and 1964.

FIGHT THE BANKRUPTERS

A good deal of talk was heard about getting an early start, building strong organizations from the grassroots on up, and making special efforts to increase GOP strength in the large cities.

That's fine, and we hope the talk will be followed by determined and persistent action.

But it looks to us as if the best single issue the Republicans can raise, now and for years to come, is the issue of economy in government. Kennedy's economic advisers seem determined to spend the Nation into bankruptcy. The GOP, it seems to us, can best serve the people and itself by awakening the voters to this peril and keeping them awake.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our departed friend and colleague, the admired and esteemed OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, first chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

It was a shock to me as it was to all the Members of the House to learn of his sudden passing. As has been stated, we had been advised that he was recuperating from a recent operation, and it was our hope and expectation that he would rejoin us here on the floor this week.

OVERTON BROOKS possessed in full measure those personal qualities of honor, integrity, and patriotism, of which our colleagues have heretofore spoken. He was a leader and a statesman and his work in establishing our Armed Forces Reserve and the Committee on Science and Astronautics on a sound basis is well known to everyone.

However, I would like to address my brief comments at this time to another quality, that of conscientious devotion to duty. OVERTON BROOKS spent all his working life in taking care of the needs of his district, his committee, and the Nation. He literally worked about a 20-hour day, 7 days a week. He was a man of temperate habits who diligently de-

voted attention to the best interests of the Nation. He took the time and effort to thoroughly brief himself on matters within the jurisdiction of his committee. As a committee chairman, I am in a position to know what a big task this is. Members also know that in launching a new committee—the Committee on Science and Astronautics, OVERTON devoted himself completely to the task. As its first chairman he established a record of achievement for that committee which will stand the test of time. He paid a great deal of attention to our space program and he is responsible, I believe, in large measure, for the speedup of the program. His death is a loss to the Nation, to the House of Representatives, but his achievements will stand as a monument to his patriotism, devotion to duty, and his integrity in the years to com.

I extend to his family and to his many friends in Washington and Louisiana my condolences and deepest sympathy.

Forecast Come True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in an illuminating editorial, J. Dwight O'Dell, president and editor of the Humboldt Beacon, Fortuna, Calif., sheds light on the current maneuvering in the propaganda war over Berlin. We can be grateful for this kind of searching analysis which has aroused widespread local comment. I commend it to those seeking a clearer picture of the true state of affairs in this troubled zone:

FORECAST COME TRUE

A prophetic private conversation about Berlin took place in California last month between the West German Defense Minister, Dr. Franz Joseph Strauss, and a newspaper friend of ours who also had just returned from Germany.

Dr. Strauss at that time asked that his prophecy be kept confidential until it proved true or the reverse.

The first phase of what the German defense chief foresaw has now come to pass, and our newspaper friend has told us about it.

The great and basic point at issue, in the view of the man who has to stand responsible for the defense of his nation, is whether or not the Kremlin can maneuver the West into negotiating on Berlin alone.

The situation in Berlin has been a tremendous natural advantage to the West. Although the Berlin military protocols when the war ended and the Potsdam treaty which formalized them now seem to have been totally unnecessary Western giveaways to the Communists, nevertheless, by a series of unforeseen developments the advantage in Berlin swung steadily to the West.

The comparison of the capitalistic system as evidenced by prosperous West Berlin, 110 miles inside the Iron Curtain and in immediate contrast to the gray and drab poverty, resulting from the Communist government of East Berlin, was more than the Communists could stand.

Forty thousand East Berliners a day went to West Berlin to work, because of a labor shortage in the capitalistic city and economic poverty in the Communist city. These men went to and from their jobs by subway; all day long they saw the well-filled stores of the Western half of their city, the new cars and homes of their fellow workers. At night they related these conditions in their shabby, cold, and unpainted homes in East Berlin.

The result was defections at the rate of over 1,500 workers a day to the West, through Berlin alone. This was paralyzing the economy of East Germany by bleeding it to death of its working force.

The Kremlin had to stop this but didn't dare risk a war, because its supply lines from Moscow would run through Poland, which is ready for revolt, and through East Germany, which is sick to death of the Russian military invaders anyhow.

So the Kremlin wanted to negotiate on Berlin alone. With the West having practically everything it wanted in Berlin, enjoying an ideal situation with nothing more to gain, negotiations confined to Berlin could only result in appeasement and backing up—the West once more giving way to the Soviets.

The West's initial position was an offer to negotiate the whole German problem, not to permit the Berlin phase alone to be taken out of context.

This the Kremlin cannot stand, Dr. Strauss told our friend, for a peace treaty with both Germanys, or with one unified Germany, necessarily includes popular vote of the people.

In such a vote, the defense minister said, the Communists could not possibly muster 10 percent of the total vote in East Germany alone, and practically zero in West Germany.

So the Communists will have to obscure this issue, Dr. Strauss said last month in this private briefing, and cause the American people to lose sight of the fact that the Western objective is to stand before the world for a plebiscite in Germany and a peace treaty with the German nation.

Accordingly he predicted a highly professional propaganda campaign to confuse American thinking and substitute Berlin for Germany in planning international negotiations.

If the Kremlin could get the West itself to propose a meeting on Berlin, the Soviets would have it made, Dr. Strauss said.

And he added:

Then you will see the Committee for Fair Play for East Germany, or whatever title is selected by that everyready group of leftists who unfailingly manage to line up with the causes of communism, begin running advertisements in the New York newspapers applauding negotiations on Berlin alone and warning of the deadful dangers of atomic war if the Reds do not get what they want.

That conversation was in July, at Bohemian Grove.

Now in August, Washington dispatches indicate that the West is about to invite the Kremlin to negotiate on Berlin alone, with only De Gaulle of France standing out.

And on August 29 there appeared in the New York Times an advertisement headed: "West German Rearmament with Nuclear Weapons Is the Main Issue in Berlin," asserting in effect that the Khrushchev position is reasonable and bespeaking trust in the stated Soviet proposal to establish a demilitarized city."

It was signed by the Greater New York Peace Groups.

Our newspaper friend says, "Here we go down the garden path once more. Gullible's Travels all over again."

Commendation of Secretary Freeman's Action Against Meatpackers and Food Chains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it unfortunately is a fact that condemnation and complaints are far more often heard than commendation. That is why I am, indeed, pleased to commend the action of the Honorable Orville S. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the able leadership of Secretary Freeman, the Department of Agriculture brought prompt action against seven meatpacking companies, three national food store chains, and two lamb dealers for violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

Many persons have wondered why lamb prices which have understandably disturbed lamb producers have not been reacting to marketing conditions during the last several years. It appears that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has the answer.

One mighty reasonably ask why are actions such as the one just instituted of such importance. An examination of the statutes discloses the fact that in providing for the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, it was clearly specified that the Federal Trade Commission shall have no power or jurisdiction relating to any matter which by that law was made subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture except when he should request the Federal Trade Commission that it make investigations—7 U.S.C. 227.

The release of the Department of Agriculture, dated September 14, 1961, regarding the proceedings mentioned, is worthy of note by all Members of the Congress. It is evidence that high officials of President Kennedy's administration are dedicated to act in the public interest. The release is as follows:

SEVEN MEATPACKERS, THREE CHAINS, TWO LAMB DEALERS CHARGED WITH VIOLATING PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Seven meatpacking companies, three national foodstore chains, and two lamb dealers today were charged with violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced.

The complaint was filed with U.S. Department of Agriculture's hearing clerk by the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service, which administers the act. The charges are against packers James Allan & Sons (San Francisco), Armour & Co., Goldring Packing Co. (Los Angeles), John Morrell & Co., Rath Packing Co., Swift & Co., and Wilson & Co., food chains American Stores Co., the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., and Safeway Stores; and dealers Dwight L. Heath (Lamar, Colo.) and Perry Holley (Ogden, Utah).

Allan, American Stores, Armour, Goldring, Rath, Swift, Wilson, Heath, and Holley are charged with:

1. Failing to conduct their lamb buying operations in competition with, and independently of, each other.

2. Making arrangements or agreements that they would not compete against each other in buying lambs in certain producing areas.

These courses of action, the complaint charges, were followed with the purpose or with the effect of manipulating or controlling lamb prices, and restricting competition in lamb buying.

The complaint also alleges that on each large volume purchase of dressed lamb by A. & P. from packers Armour, Morrell, Rath, Swift, and Wilson, and by Safeway from packers Armour, Goldring, Swift, and Wilson:

1. All or most of the packers share in furnishing the chain's total requirement.

2. All or most of the packers sell the lamb to the chain at the same prices.

3. The packers commit themselves to sell the chain specific amounts of dressed lamb at the same price, prior to the time the packers buy lambs to fulfill their future commitments.

These practices, the complaint charges, have the effect of manipulating or controlling prices of lamb.

"These are gravely serious charges," Secretary Freeman declared, "against several organizations—packers, dealers, and retailers—who are important factors in the distribution of a vital food from our farmers to our consumers. If the allegations are proved, they will explain in part at least why lamb prices have not been reacting to marketing conditions during the last several years. This situation has understandably disturbed lamb producers, and we are investigating it thoroughly. Our investigation is continuing, and is looking into other aspects of lamb marketing. If the facts warrant, complaints may be filed against other persons.

"Unfair trade practices in the long run destroy competition and restrain trade," the Secretary said. "They have never in history resulted in benefit to the public interest. On the contrary, they have for the most part been symbolic in the end of low prices to producers, high prices to consumers, and large profits to those who indulged in unfair trading.

"We cannot allow such practices to be tolerated in the marketing of our food supply, and we will not," Secretary Freeman said. "Our responsibilities to our farmers, to the great majority of food marketers who do business fairly, and our continuing and growing responsibilities to consumers demand that we take prompt, vigorous action on such matters.

"That is the way we have dealt with this matter," the Secretary said, "and that is the way we are going to administer the Packers and Stockyards Act."

Aggressive administration of the act, he declared, will:

1. Assure livestock and poultry producers of true market values, reasonable marketing costs, accurate weights, adequate marketing services and facilities, and financial protection of proceeds.

2. Prevent and eliminate unfair, deceptive, fraudulent, discriminatory, restrictive or monopolistic practices in the meatpacking industry, and in the marketing of livestock, poultry, and meat.

Secretary Freeman said he has directed the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service to initiate immediate action in these six areas:

. 1. Conduct an extensive educational and enforcement program among the many market agencies and dealers recently made subject to the act, so that all will know what is required of them. Conduct a similar program for livestock producers, so that they will know the protections the act gives them, and the procedures they should follow in filing reparation and other complaints.

2. Make an intensive examination of packer buying practices, to determine whether undue concentration of buying power has resulted in restraints of trade, restrictions of competition, or manipulation of prices. Also, make an investigation of feeding operations of packers and food chains to ascertain if they violate the act.

3. Determine the legality, and the appropriate administrative action, regarding such current livestock marketing problems as bonding adequacy; prompt payment; pencil shrink; dual operations of stockyard operators, market agencies and dealers; service or yardage charges at concentration buying points; and failure of buyers to compete.

4. Give greater emphasis to scale testing and check weighing of livestock, and closer scrutiny to existing rates and charges and stockyard services provided.

5. Revise and modernize existing regulations to take into account recent changes in the marketing system. As part of this modernizing, issue a series of interpretive statements to inform the industry as to whether certain existing practices are permissible or are in violation of the act.

6. Schedule periodic meetings with representative industry groups to establish closer industry-Government relationships, and to keep the Department abreast of marketing practices and needed program changes.

"This is an ambitious program," Secretary Freeman noted. "But it is an essential one, and we intend to move forward on it just as fast as our resources will permit. We have recently strengthened our enforcement agency for the act—the Packers and Stockyards Division. We stand solidly behind the employees who are engaged in this activity, and we ask the industry to give us their full cooperation and support."

Issuance of the complaint against these packers, dealers, and retailers does not prove they have violated the act. A USDA hearing examiner will hold a hearing on the charges, or respondents may waive the hearing by admitting the charges or failing to answer the complaint. USDA's judicial officer then determines whether the evidence substantiates the allegations. If he finds the firms have violated the act, he can order them to stop further violations.

Until the judicial officer makes this decision, the Packers and Stockyards Division by policy does not (except in the proceeding) comment or elaborate on charges made in its complaints nor discuss the evidence on which they are based.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the feeling of shock at the loss of our friend and colleague, OVERTON BROOKS.

It was my good fortune to serve with OVERTON on the Select Committee on Space which was created in the shadow of sputnik in 1958 and later to serve under his chairmanship as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee. I know of his deep concern for America's position in the space race and his determination to make America first in this important field.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish also to comment upon his deep devotion to America and his strong support for the full and complete development of its natural resources, as is evidenced by his long service as an officer of the Rivers and Harbors Congress. He spared no effort in his support of programs for the building of America and those of us in the West shall ever be grateful for his support for the great water projects which have been so vital in building that part of our great country.

OVERTON BROOKS leaves a void in this body which will not be filled. I extend to his family and to his many friends in Louisiana my deepest sympathy on the passing of this great American.

Remarks of Archbishop John F. Dearden Before the Delegates to the Conventions of the National Catholic Social Action Conference and the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address of the Most Reverend John F. Dearden, archbishop of Detroit, which was delivered at the banquet of the joint convention of the National Catholic Social Action Conference and the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, on Friday, August 25, 1961.

I feel that it contains significant counsel for those who will study, interpret, and apply Pope John's social encyclical. I hope that the Members of the House of Representatives and the general public will find these remarks most interesting and timely:

COMPLETE TEXT OF ARCHBISHOP DEARDEN'S ADDRESS AT JOINT CONVENTION

For the first time the National Catholic Social Action Conference and the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice are meeting in joint convention. It is significant that Detroit is the site of this meeting.

This city has traditionally held a position of national prominence in the field of labor-management relations. In more recent years, it has come to be recognized also for its position in the field of race relations.

For these reasons we are doubly happy that Detroit has been chosen as the city in which these two important national conferences meet in common convention to advance through discussion and study the pursuit of related aims.

It is natural and proper that much that has been discussed in the convention has drawn its inspiration from the encyclical released only a few weeks ago, "Mater et Magistra." This most recent expression of the church's social doctrine will naturally capture the attention and hold the interest of

those who are gathered in this convention. In your many discussions, you have drawn copiously from the wealth of content that is found in this newest encyclical of our Holy Father. It will continue to be a source of study and discussion for a long time to come.

It is important to bear in mind that an encyclical letter such as this is an expression of the teaching office of him who bears, before all others, the commission to teach. As such it enjoys an authority that is unique. It lays upon all of us the obligation to plumb to the depths of its rich meaning and to work toward making a social reality what it teaches in the name of Christ.

It surely need not be said to this audience that the social teaching of the church is more than a fringe that ornaments her body of doctrine. In the new encyclical, Pope John XXIII has stated expressly: "We reaffirm strongly that the Christian social doctrine is an integral part of the Christian conception of life."

The place of the social teaching of the church could scarcely be defined with greater clarity than this. It is of the very core of Christian doctrine that our faith opens up to us a unique conception of life. The life that has come to us from God is raised to a participation in His own life through the redemptive action of His divine Son. We are to live as befits the sons of God.

If then Christian social doctrine is an integral part, as our Holy Father has stated, of this conception of life, then we cannot be true to our Christian heritage nor are we leading a complete Christian life unless we know and make our own the church's social teachings.

In this convention you have had occasion to broaden and deepen your knowledge of the social teachings of the church. At the same time you have had occasion to discuss many of the techniques through which these principles can be brought into practice. This is in accord with the recommendation of our Holy Father himself. "But it is indispensable, today more than ever, that this doctrine be known, assimilated, and translated into social reality in the form and manner that the different situations allow and demand."

You who have a better understanding of this field than most persons have need to play the role of teacher. Through your efforts these doctrines can be brought to the knowledge of others.

In this matter of teaching, however, I think that a prudent counsel should be offered to you. In your presentation of this content to others make a careful distinction between those principles that are an indispensable part of the content of Christian social doctrine and those particular, specialized, contingent applications that may be a matter of controversy. The principles must be held by all. The relating of these principles to certain particular instances may be open to a variety of interpertations. If we make the error of proposing that which is debatable with the same cogency as that which is above debate, we end by confusing those whom we would inform. The end result is that they come sometimes to look upon a substantial part of the content of Christian social doctrine as being only conjectural in its force. There is need here for prudence—the sort of prudence that preserves essentials intact and yet does not hesitate to formulate prudential judgments that point directly to sound Christian action.

Do not think for a moment that I am an advocate of the caution that hazards nothing. Progress must be made. And with all forward movement there is risk of a misstep. But just as we must not allow people to close their eyes to the social teachings of the church neither must we set forth as part of the teaching that which may rather be our own personal application to a very contingent situation.

Against the background of your discussions over the past 2 days, there should have emerged a recognition of the obligation that rests especially upon the laity, both as individuals and as members of associations to bring the church's social principles into every day economic and social life.

We cannot allow this doctrine to remain suspended in a vacuum. The very fact that it is social in character means that it must be brought into the marketplace, into the shop, into the office, into the home. And precisely because the opportunities to do this are most fully possessed by the laity, it is to them that the church looks for action. If the impact of the teachings of the church is ever to be felt in our society, it must come from those who are most completely and most broadly a part of that society, the laity. This is not simply a corporate obligation, it is an individual obligation. It must be recognized as such and accepted in the same light.

In recent months there has been a growing awareness of a weakening in the moral fiber of our social structure. Some good and true things have been said about the need of reexamining our ethical standards in private and public life. The cancer of moral illness is only too evident in many areas of our national life. It is all the more timely, therefore, to set ourselves with renewed dedication to master and to live the social teachings of the church. They have a direct relevance to the problem.

I know that your very presence here tonight is an indication of your strong persuasion of the importance of a well-rounded, complete Christian life. A life that is wanting in its regard for justice and decency and charity toward our fellow men falls short of the ideals and the teachings of our faith. And yet the task to which we set ourselves is a positive one.

We are not to be content with protests against injustice; we must set ourselves positively to the practice of justice in every field of endeavor that is open to us. To protest against want of charity toward our neighbor may at times be necessary; but it is of paramount importance to exercise toward our neighbor the charity that is part of the very fiber of our faith.

Tensions and misunderstandings and injustices can be resolved and must be resolved. The driving force that will make that possible is a single one—a love of God that brings with it an unqualified love of neighbor.

Democracy's Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N.H., Thursday, September 14, 1961, entitled "Democracy's Language":

DEMOCRACY'S LANGUAGE

It would have been foolish to expect that the neutral nations, at their Belgrade meeting, would fully uphold the principles of democracy as we understand them. Free speech, free press, freedom from search of one's home, the right to fair trial by a jury of peers—these and other rights are regarded by Americans as inalienable. We tend to forget that to perhaps a third of the world's people such things are unknown, and difficult to comprehend.

Even such a fundamental concept as majority rule never has occurred to the minds of vast numbers, some of whom have never even learned to count. For that matter the Russians, who were aware of the idea of majorities, had such a vague understanding of the principle that it meant little to them when communism deprived them of it.

It has been only a century since we outlawed slavery, and thousands upon thousands still exist under some form of human bondage. It is hard to make such people even understand the evils of dictatorship, of secret police, of a state's power to take human life at will and similar practices shocking to us. They simply do not know what we are talking about.

Democracy's appeal to mankind is a lofty thing. But democracy may have to save itself on a less lofty plane. It must learn to speak a language the backward peoples can understand.

Hero or Martyr?—Let's Have the Truth About General Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every controversy. General Walker is a case in point. A person accused is either innocent or guilty. Apparently a muzzle has been applied when a loudspeaker might be appropriate. The general is human and subject to making mistakes. Several accusations may seem irregular but by what stretch of the imagination, and since when, has it become a crime to speak out against communism.

The editorial appearing in the September 16 issue of the York (Pa.) Dispatch raises some serious questions that deserve answers:

LET THE GENERAL TALK

The treatment being handed out to a patriotic American, Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, is alarming.

Defense Department officials are releasing piecemeal information on the Army's investigation of Walker pro-blue troop information program for his former infantry division in Germany.

At the same time, Walker is not being permitted to defend himself. In short, it appears he's been muzzled.

Among other things, it is charged that Walker made some political recommendations to his troops, namely, that they consult a publication commending the conservative voting records of certain Congressmen.

As a result of an Army investigation, Walker was relieved of his command. But he has not been tried, apparently because the Army thinks it can't make the charge stick.

In the words of the investigating general: "It is obvious that any trial for such violations would be a most difficult and prolonged undertaking, fraught with intense and emotional publicity, certainly unfavorable to the Government, at least in part.

"A conviction would by no means be a certain result, and even if a conviction were obtained the sentence probably would amount to no more than a reprimand in view

of General Walker's brilliant combat record and sincerity of purpose in attempting to fight communism."

As we see it, Walker's case is not isolated. The question of censoring the anti-Communist speeches of military officers is now being debated in Washington.

Are we getting to the point where uncompromising patriotism is a characteristic to be frowned upon? Are high-ranking officers to be punished without justification, or trial?

These are serious questions, and deserve serious examination. If there is any one agency of the United States where diluted patriotism is abhorrent, it is in our Armed Forces.

Transfer of Functions of Air Materiel Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force has just announced its decision to centralize the cataloging and interchangeability functions at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. This means the transfer of at least some personnel from 10 other air materiel areas located in various parts of the United States.

The Air Force claims this will result in greater efficiency and certain economies. Information at my disposal indicates that it would be more efficient and more economical to keep these functions decentralized, as they are at present.

In support of this position, I am including herewith a copy of a memorandum to the commanding generals of all AMA's, dated May 19, 1952, when the Air Force decentralized these functions and placed them at the various air materiel areas throughout the United States. It seems to me that in this document the Air Force has made a very strong case against its present action. I sincerely hope this decision will be reconsidered.

The memorandum follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
AIR MATERIEL COMMAND,
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO,
May 19, 1952.

To: Commanding generals, all AMA's, commanding officers, all other AMC installations.

Subject: Civilian personnel letter—AMC decentralization plan.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of this letter is to present a complete summary of the personnel plan which has been established to accomplish the decentralization program of the Air Materiel Command. By means of this letter members of civilian personnel officers of all Air Materiel Command stations will be made acquainted with the reasons and advantages for decentralization of selected Headquarters Air Materiel Command functions, the manner in which the personnel transfers will be carried out, some of the problems with which they will be confronted and generally as a subject of interest and concern for all. It is very important that civilian personnel officers take particular notice of the contents of this letter and impress upon members of their staff the importance of rendering full support and cooperation.

2. THE REASONS FOR DECENTRALIZATION

(a) There are many advantages to be gained from decentralization from the headquarters point of view. To state a few of these should be sufficient to convince everyone of the absolute necessity for this undertaking. The Air Force has 36,000 employees who are living in the communities surrounding Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, most of whom are involved in administrative as opposed to production type of work. Such a large number of people engaged in substantially a paperwork operation causes many difficult administrative problems.

(b) The traffic on approaches to the work areas is tremendously heavy. Parking of vehicles on the base renders a great inconvenience to many employees because of the distance that they are required to walk. The communication systems are heavily overtaxed by the volume of telephone calls, teletype messages and pieces of mail in and out of the headquarters. For example, a million and a quarter pieces of mail and 46,000 teletypes were received during the month of April 1952. Housing facilities in the commuting area are so overburdened that many persons are required to live long distances away from their place of employment. Inadequate cafeteria and restaurant service has made it necessary to extend the lunch periods and the workday, thereby resulting in further employee inconveniences.

(c) Management analyst groups have pointed out ways and means of effecting huge economies by decentralizing activities of the headquarters to the location of related field activities, thereby eliminating costly timelags, reducing correspondence, and at the same time, increasing capacity and capability for rendering a greater service to other Air Force components.

(d) Aside from the reasons of efficiency and economy of operations, there is a strategic danger in having so much of the nerve center of research and logistical operations of the Air Force in a single location.

AMC DECENTRALIZATION AS IT AFFECTS CATALOGING

(Published by authority of the Secretary of the Air Force)

BASIC CONCEPTS OF AIR FORCE CATALOGING AND DECENTRALIZATION OF OPERATIONAL-TYPE CATALOGING FUNCTIONS

The responsibility for maintaining the Air Force cataloging system is assigned to the Air Materiel Command. This responsibility assignment applies to the executive management of the system as well as to operational-type functions incident to cataloging of Air Force items.

There was a time when both the executive management and all cataloging operations were performed by Headquarters, Air Materiel Command. This was before the Air Force had grown into the size it is today. As the number and complexity of items in the Air Force supply system grew, it became more and more evident that it may no longer be practical to perform functions of both executive management and large-scale operations at one single point, that is, at Headquarters, Air Materiel Command. This not only applies to cataloging but other logistical functions such as maintenance-engineering, materiel control, and others as well.

And so the concept of decentralization was born in 1952. It meant that certain operational type functions heretofore performed by Headquarters, Air Materiel Command, were to be transferred to the various AMC prime depots. As for cataloging, among others, the responsibility for preparing and submitting item descriptions for newly procured items was transferred to the prime depots. As time passed, the effectiveness of decentralized cataloging operations has been repeatedly reviewed in light of practical experience and it was soon realized that additional functions could and should be transferred to the depots.

Not to increase the impact caused by current transition (conversion) to the Federal cataloging system, it was decided to make the additional decentralization a gradual process. Broadly speaking, by this gradual process it is meant that transfer of additional operational-type functions for a given commodity area (defined in terms of Federal supply groups or classes) normally is effected after items in that area have been converted to the use of Federal identification data and stock numbers and published in a USAF stock list. Hence, current decentralization of additional cataloging operational-type functions has been geared to the Air Force conversion schedule.

However, the Air Materiel Command is aiming—whenever possible and feasible—to decentralize additional cataloging functions prior to the effective conversion date established by the Air Force conversion schedule. In other words, the Air Materiel Command intends to fully decentralize a given Federal supply classification group or class just as soon as the initial (basic) USAF stock list for that group or class is released for printing action. Whether decentralization can be effected in such manner, it largely depends on the ability of the affected prime depot to absorb the additional workload at a specific time and still carry out normal cataloging operations, and on the percentage of items converted through the initial (basic) USAF stock list published by Headquarters, Air Materiel Command.

America, Awake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the junior chambers of commerce in Roanoke, Salem, and Vinton, Va., have launched a campaign of public education which deserves the attention of America at large. Entitled "America, Awake," it is designed to dramatize the nature and extent of the Communist menace and to implement "the people's right to know their enemies."

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. WALTER JUDD, recently addressed the first public forum. The success of that forum is reflected in the following editorial extracted from the September issue of the Roanoke World News:

Jaycees of Roanoke, Salem, and Vinton deserve the highest praise for the overwhelming success of their anti-Communist rally staged in the Crossroads mall last Saturday night. It was one of the finest public meetings ever held here.

Disregarding the loud rattling of dishes from an overhead cafeteria and the constant movement of shoppers, more than 2,500 people sat spellbound listening to the exhortations of the noted counterspy, Herbert A. Philbrick and Representative WALTER H. JUDD.

The prolonged applause and rising tribute to both men testified to the mounting public realization of the enemy faced by the United States within and without. There is no

telling how many other thousands listened by radio.

The rally laid the groundwork for a coming detailed attack on communism through holding public classes in how to deal with this insidious foe of freedom.

A year ago—possibly even 6 months ago—such a meeting would not have drawn more than passing interest. The cry: "America, Awake" did not catch local people napping.

What can the average man or woman do?

The Jaycees intend to tell them in the days ahead.

The Real Criteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a subject involving the expenditure of some $60 million, our prestige abroad and, more importantly, perhaps our national security and survival, should obviously be one far removed from political considerations.

It is for this reason that I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an excellent editorial from the pages of the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger on the location of the proposed moon flight center. It is titled "The Real Criteria," and rightfully points out that the selection of a site for the multimillion-dollar NASA project should be made with only one factor dominately in mind—that such a site would be best suited for the job to be done, and, consequently, best for the national interest.

While I am personally confident that Massachusetts is ideally suited for the space flight center and is the logical choice, I will, of course, applaud the Space Agency's choice of some other area if its is evident that the selection was made in the national interest alone, and not governed by political considerations.

The editorial follows:

THE REAL CRITERIA

From the way some politicians are talking you'd think the proposed moonflight center was just another pork-barrel project.

Apparently some of the men who are engaged in political infighting over the center need to be reminded that the security and standing of the United States are involved. At no time during the preparations for putting a man on the moon should that be forgotten.

Yet people are talking about what the center can do for this or that local economy. They are urging that it be put in one location or another because of all the new jobs it would bring into the area.

These things are just plain irrelevant. What matters is serving the national interest by finding the place best suited for the job to be done.

The only good choice will be based not on politics but on the criteria spelled out by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We have given the NASA's criteria a good deal of thought and we sincerely believe that the land now held by the U.S. Government in Hingham fills the bill better than any other site. But if there is some other site that better meets the specifications, we would certainly agree that that's where the center should be.

The NASA in its list of essential criteria issued on August 17 ticked off the items that would be needed:

Water and land transportation facilities able to carry large, cumbersome space vehicles;

Communications including access to main routes of the long line telephone system;

Existing industries capable of supporting a highly scientific and technical research project and of building pilot models of large spacecraft, and a good supply of contractors and construction labor;

Nearness to a culturally attractive community to make it possible to recruit and retain scientists for the project; also nearness to a well-established institution of higher education, preferably one specializing in science and research;

Ample electric power up to 80,000 kilovolt amperes;

Water supply that can deliver 300,000 gallons of potable water and 300,000 gallons of industrial water daily;

An area of 1,000 usable acres including areas for low-hazard and nuisance installations-requiring some isolation, and a suitable adjacent area for further development;

Mild climate permitting year round, ice-free water transportation and permitting out-of-door work for most of the year to facilitate operates, reduce facility costs, and speed construction.

In addition to the essential criteria, the NASA listed several desirable criteria. These considerations are an area's ability to absorb the increased population, the costs of development of the site, operating costs at the site, and availability of temporary facilities for the use of as many as 1,500 people in the same general area as the site.

It seems to us that this set of requirements could be most nearly met in only two States of the Union: California and Massachusetts.

A number of States could offer satisfactory transportation and communications facilities, adequate water and power, sufficient land area and a favorable climate. Only Massachusetts and California, however, have well-developed industrial centers, educational and research centers, and culturally attractive communities all within a comparatively small area.

California is out because the moonshot project has already been established as an east coast operation.

So Massachusetts looks like the logical site, and Hingham looks like the logical location. Be that as it may, we will welcome any site provided the NASA makes it clear that the best site was chosen and that the national interest, not petty politics, governed the decision.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with deepest regret that I learned of the death of our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. In paying tribute I join with those Members who knew him better than I, but I am grateful for the opportunity of serving with him for the past 3 years. I shall always remember his warmth and kindness. He extended to me, as I am sure he did every new Member of Congress, the benefit of his many years of experiences in this House.

The degree of admiration and respect which was felt for OVERTON BROOKS has been manifested by the tribute paid him today. But his outstanding contributions have been long recognized by his colleagues and leaders. His most recent and important assignment was as chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, where he played such a crucial part in planning the flight of the first American astronaut. He will be remembered as one who helped move America forward in the field of space and science. It is gratifying to note that only recently he was named as the outstanding Congressman of the Year for Science.

To Mrs. Brooks and to other members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mary J. Herrick an Inspiration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, national attention today is focused on education. Constantly we are regaled with statistics which prove the shortcomings of our educational systems.

Meanwhile our classroom teachers, the backbone of any system, work with dedication and unselfishness giving their best, despite handicaps too numerous to mention, to give us intelligent American citizens.

Too often, the work of the classroom teacher is taken for granted. He or she is never glamorized, usually blamed when things are not all we expect or demand.

On May 7, 1961, at McCormick Place in the city of Chicago, a fitting tribute was paid to Mary J. Herrick, a Chicago schoolteacher, whom I am proud to count as one of my constituents. Former students who have gone far in many fields and fellow educators joined with the people of Chicago in expressing the gratitude they felt for 40 years of dedicated work which Miss Herrick put into the lives of Chicago's children.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to call attention of my colleagues to some of the tributes paid to Miss Herrick, as reported in the May 1961 issue of the Chicago Union Teacher, as follows:

DUSABLE ALUMNI COUNCIL HONORS A GREAT TEACHER

In an unusual testimonial dinner, held at McCormick Place on May 7, 1961, the DuSable Alumni Council honored Miss Mary J. Herrick. The council described Miss Herrick as "more of an inspiration and a motivating force in more lives at DuSable than any other person known to them."

The biographical sketch in the program for the affair stated in part, "Miss Mary Herrick, social science teacher at DuSable High School for the past 26 years and public school teacher for 40 years, made a daily effort to inspire her students with the rights and duties of good citizenship. She has taken a personal interest in her students and aided in their success in various professions and businesses. She has rendered effective service also as a very active member on numerous committees, boards, and commissions."

Both the invocation and benediction were ably given by the Reverend Edsel Ammons, 1941, Minister of the Ingleside-Whitfield Methodist Church, who is the first Negro minister to be received into full membership of the Rock River Conference of the Methodist Church. Mrs. Bernadine McGee Washington extended greetings and most capably acted as mistress of ceremonies. Remarks were made by Dr. A. John Brinkman, principal of DuSable High School; Raymond Harth, 1946, of the law firm of Rogers, Rogers, Strayhorn & Harth, president of the alumni council; John M. Fewkes, president of Chicago Teachers Union; Timuel D. Black, teacher, Hyde Park School, representing DuSable Alumni; and Miss Kaffie Pickens, president of the DuSable Student Council. Vocal solos were rendered by Albert Logan, 1940, and Geraldine Glover. Presentation of a gift to Miss Herrick was made by Mrs. Eloise Cornelius, program chairman, supervising social worker, State of Illinois.

Space does not permit our publishing the remarks of all of those who had a part in the program. We are including the following which are representative:

Miss Kaffie Pickens, president of DuSable Student Council: "J. B. Priestly in one of his recent addresses made this statement: 'We all need love, admiration, and hope.' If we think of these three needs in connection with our guest of honor today, we can honestly say that many hundreds of young men and women are leading fulfilled lives now because of her guidance.

"After knowing Miss Mary Herrick as a teacher, we feel that this is the secret of her success with students. She inspired us to do that little bit more than was ordinarily required, but at the same time she encouraged us and loved us.

"We are all here today to pay tribute to Miss Mary Herrick. It is my singular honor to be chosen to represent the DuSable High School student body. Miss Herrick, to you, our sincere and heartfelt thanks for your years of dedicated service to young DuSableites. We shall never forget you."

"Dr. Earl S. Johnson, emeritus professor of the social sciences, University of Chicago; at present, visiting professor of secondary education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: "I wish to tell you, first off, that I asked to speak here today. I asked to be on this program—not because I think I am important but because Mary Herrick is and I wish to tell you why I think so.

"Because it is difficult to crowd into a few minutes what is in my mind and heart about Mary Herrick from whom I have learned much that is wise and good, I shall have time to share with you an account of only some of her gifts and contributions.

"Parenthetically let me observe that when, 2 years ago, I was through with my term of service in a certain institution in this city, I was through! When Mary Herrick is through here, she isn't through which shows that she's a better woman than I am a man.

"Like Mary Herrick, I have been in and out of a good many social studies classrooms in the last 40 years. But I have been in none in which love and reason were so well mated as in Mary Herrick's; I have been in none in which students were treated with such decency and dignity; I have been in none in which the teacher sought more to make her students independent of her; I have been in none in which there was, and rightly, so little attention paid to the book and so much attention paid to the world of affairs. Mary Herrick is, thus, a true disciple of Montaigne, the great 16th century schoolmaster, who said that "bookish competence is a poor paltry competence" and that "whatever we see is sufficient book." Mary Herrick believes in students' seeing the thing, rather than merely seeing words about it.

"Mary Herrick comes closer than any teacher I know to understanding and practicing John Dewey's idea that, in order to have reliable social knowledge—social science—we must have social experiments. That, said he, is the way we developed our natural science knowledge and it is the only genuine way to a social science, to reliable social knowledge.

"Mary Herrick's students come as close to Dewey's idea as the classroom permits which is by the richest and most real social experience—living and doing democracy. Her classroom is a workshop in democracy.

"When this grand lady talks of social experiments—or social experience, for the difference is only one of shade and degree—she knows whereof she speaks. Her voice has been heard in city council chambers (sometimes uninvited), in State legislative halls (sometimes uninvited), in national welfare councils, and in the deliberative assemblies of the American Federation of Teachers—locally and nationally.

"In this latter assembly not only has her voice been heard, her pen has been at work and her words have been read. Many of you have, I am sure, read a brochure on "Discipline" done under the auspices of the federation and sold by thousands of copies. It is the most scholarly, insightful and useful analysis of the problem of discipline of which I know. You want to know something? It was written by Mary Herrick but her name appears nowhere in it. This is the Mary Herrick we all know—the selfless, untiring, patient, devoted, wise, and loving teacher, public servant, and professional leader.

"Her teaching has been dedicated not to her students remembering something—soon to be forgotten—but to doing something: resolving some issue, personal or social; relieving some anxiety about self or community; fulfilling some desire hitherto only vaguely felt but now known; satisfying some curiosity which was caught from her.

"In its largest dimension, her teaching has helped young people—hundreds at DuSable alone—to inquire into the nature of their own minds and purposes, which they learned to do by learning what is good and wise to mind and to purpose.

"I know no teacher who has, better than Mary Herrick, enacted the counsel of the poet, Ruskin:

" 'You do not educate a man by telling him what he was not, but by making him what he was not. The entire object of education is to make people not merely do the right thing, but enjoy the right thing; not merely industrious but to love industry; not merely learned but to love knowledge; not merely pure but to love purity; not merely just but to hunger and thirst after justice.'

"And now, I trust not in anticlimax, I wish to work a little parliamentary magic. We hear a good deal, these days, about the teacher of the year. I wish now to move that Mary Herrick be named the teacher of this quarter century. Are you ready for the question? The "ayes" have it—the motion is carried."

Mrs. Eloise H. Cornelius, program chairman, in presenting Miss Herrick with a gift symbolizing what this great teacher meant to DuSable students, spoke as follows:

"Miss Herrick, we of DuSable alumni are aware that you would not consent to any tribute being paid to you from which you would derive any personal gain. We are also aware that you would not accept any grand gesture in presenting you a gift. We, however, feel that inasmuch as you have not just been a teacher routinely performing your job but have always added the extra personal touch that meant so much to us, it is only fitting and appropriate that on this occasion, we should add the personal touch through a gift to you.

"We do not know what the craftsman who designed this pin had in mind. It is in the form of a shaft of wheat. We consider this fitting inasmuch as wheat is the grain from which we get bread, the staff of life, and you have given us life in helping us to accept the dignity and worth of ourselves as human beings. We are also reminded of the Biblical reference to wheat, wherein the wheat and tares are together but the wheat is symbolical of the right and good. You also have stood for the right and good. As you wear this pin, wear it not just as a pin, but as a token of our love, admiration, and esteem."

In his brief remarks, Raymond Harth announced that the Mary J. Herrick Scholarship Fund was being established by the DuSable Alumni Council. This would be set up initially as a $1,000 Scholarship Fund which would be replenished each year by at least $500. The purpose of the fund would be to assist needy students already in college or those about to enter college. (Incidentally, anyone interested in contributing to the fund can still do so by contacting Mr. Harth at 69 West Washington—RA. 6-9626.)

Miss Herrick in responding to the many tributes said in part, "I am pretty much of a heretic. I believe you should use any methods you can—like Gabriel's horn—to get your message across * * *. I have never had serious disciplinary problems in class because I expect the students to behave, and they do. I expect them to learn things; and if they don't, I tell them why they've got to. * * *"

CHICAGO TEACHERS UNION PRESENTS CITATION

At the 21st annual education conference of Chicago Teachers Union, Miss Mary J. Herrick, vice president of American Federation of Teachers and a charter member of Chicago Teachers Union, was presented with a citation honoring her for her long years of service both to education and to teachers unions. In presenting the award to Miss Herrick, President Fewkes stated in part that Miss Herrick could well be called Miss Union Teacher. Mr. Fewkes reviewed some of Miss Herrick's accomplishments through the years not only as an outstanding citizen but as a superior teacher who has long been a union teacher and who has worked hard for the union teachers' cause, in the Federation of Women High School Teachers, the American Federation of Teachers and the Chicago Teachers Union. President Fewkes made the point that Mary Herrick is an excellent example of the fact that one can be a superior teacher and at the same time be a union teacher. He implied also that a teacher's success is measured by the lives he influences. Therefore, Mary J. Herrick has been a great teacher.

Inscribed on the citation was the following:

"Chicago Teachers Union honors Mary J. Herrick for a lifetime of exceptionally constructive service to the public schools and to the teacher-union movement; for her courageous professional leadership and sound research not only in the crucial, early days of the American Federation of Teachers and during the formation of the Chicago Teachers Union, but also throughout the years; for her continuous productive activity in many civic organizations; and for the inspirational guidance she gave to the children she taught.

"JOHN M. FEWKES,
"President.

"MAY 27, 1961."

Mission Radio Moved to Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the World Radio Missionary Fellowship, which operates radio station HCJB in Quito, Ecuador, has recently moved its headquarters to Miami, Fla.

This organization, which established HCJB 30 years ago as the world's first missionary station, has over the years done an outstanding job of presenting music, news, educational and religious broadcasts to peoples around the world.

In addition to HCJB, the World Radio Missionary Fellowship operates station HOXO in Panama; is buying a station in Uruguay; and has just received a television license in Ecuador.

We, the citizens of Miami, Fla., are indeed happy and proud to have the headquarters of the "Voice of the Andes" now located in Miami.

The work of the fellowship is not limited solely to the broadcasting field as the organization operates two fine hospitals in the city of Quito.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the following article from the Miami Herald, dated September 16, 1961, which details the story of the World Radio Missionary Fellowship:

MISSION RADIO MOVED TO MIAMI

The North American headquarters for what is probably the world's most famous missionary radio project has been moved to Miami.

The World Radio Missionary Fellowship, which operates station HCJB in Quito, Eucador, has opened offices at 2741 NW. 75th Street in a shift from Talcottville, Conn., near Hartford.

Dr. Joseph Springer heads a staff of eight who will man the offices for the "Voice of the Andes."

He will tell of the work of HCJB at a coffee at 10 a.m. Thursday at Sylvania Heights Baptist Church, 5859 SW. 16th Street, and explain how the move to Miami will facilitate the shipping of materials to mission posts and make it easier to direct the missionaries themselves into and out of the United States.

Dr. Springer said the organization's Call of the Andes magazine will be distributed from here and this will become the financial center for the work.

HCJB will be 30 years old this Christmas, he said, and was the first missionary radio station ever set up. Now there are 29 in operation around the globe and several others are in the process of being built.

The World Radio Missionary Fellowship now also operates station HOXO in Panama in conjunction with the Latin American Mission and is in the process of buying another station in Uruguay. In addition, the organization has been seeking for the past 5 years to get a license in Europe.

Dr. Springer said HCJB already is heard around the world and work is underway to step up the transmitter from 50,000 watts to 100,000 watts with the completion of the mission station's new hydroelectric plant.

The station has 34 hours of programing a day, he said, since it is both short and long wave and sometimes has different programs on the different wavelengths.

Broadcasts are in nine languages—including Russian. Last year the station received 43,000 letters from 100 countries and the mail is running about 50 percent ahead of that this year, he said.

In the last 5 years, 1,726 of those letters have come from behind the Iron Curtain—including Russia.

The programs offered on the station include good music, news, and many educational courses—ranging from farming to English—as well as religious broadcasts, Dr. Springer said. The station has achieved semiofficial status as a disseminator of Ecuadorian culture, he said, and broadcasts from the presidential press room or from the Chamber of Deputies and follows the President to ceremonies.

Dr. Springer is convinced that the popularity of HCJB is one of the reasons Ecuadorans had the warmest welcome of all Latin America for both Adlai Stevenson and former Vice President Richard Nixon on their tours of the continent.

The programing is effective in rural Ecuador because of the mission station's 11-year-old project of building small radios which can be tuned only to HCJB.

More than 4,000 such radios are in use and the pace of production is being stepped up to 1,500 sets a year this year with cheaper, easier to assemble transistor sets.

Dr. Springer himself worked in the programing end of the station for the 8 years he was in Ecuador and he plans to go back next year. He sang and his wife, Betty, played piano and organ for some of the broadcasts.

The couple will be featured in a musical program at 7:45 p.m. Sunday at Calvary Baptist Church, 226 SW., 17th Avenue.

Dr. Springer began his gospel singing career with the late Percy Crawford in his hometown of Philadelphia. He was bass soloist for the Crawford radio broadcasts while he was attending King's College, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Eastern Baptist Seminary.

He got interested in HCJB when he was a pastor in Cleveland. One of the guests for the missionary conference sponsored by his church was Clarence Jones, the president and founder of HCJB.

Already interested in radio and missionary work in general because of his background, Dr. Springer then joined the staff of HCJB in 1951. He taught in the high school for mission children in addition to doing programing for the station.

Dr. Springer noted that the work of the World Radio Missionary Fellowship is not limited to broadcasting. He said, for example, that the organization operates two hospitals in Quito.

But broadcasting is the main effort and it will be expanded soon because HCJB has just received a television license in Ecuador.

The Honorable Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] and others in paying tribute to our good friend, TAD MACHROWICZ, who is leaving us to join the Federal bench. Parting is often sweet sorrow. All of us here in the Congress have the highest regard for TAD, and we hate to see him leave. "To have a friend you must be a friend," as the old bard of Concord, Ralph Waldo Emerson, said. You have been a friend through many years. You have been one of my closest associates here in the Congress. I am only too happy to join the others in wishing you God speed. A noble, erudite, learned son of Michigan, we wish for you and Sophie and Ted and Don all the success that we know will come by reason of your high position.

Let me say this to you and to your fine sons, Ted and Don, so that it will be on the record:

If they ever come to Washington, or if they meet an old friend or a neighbor who, looking at them will say, "like father, like son" then they will know that they have been a success.

Good luck to you, TAD.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, my feeling of regret and sorrow is exceedingly deep and keen at the death of one of my most loyal and best friends, OVERTON BROOKS. To know of the grief of his wife, Molly, and his daughter, Ann, is to live again that tragic time which many of us have experienced. I also know that the many expressions of sympathy help to ease the pain and the sorrow that comes with so great a loss.

OVERTON BROOKS was a fine man, a stalwart man, and a Christian gentleman—one whose ear and heart were attuned to the needs of his fellow man; one who was always anxious to serve the best interests of his country.

OVERTON BROOKS was a man of high ideals and principles, and a man of unquestioned integrity. He brought to the office of Representative from the Fourth District of Louisiana a wealth of knowledge and experience, ability to lead, and an insatiable thirst for information. He was constantly in search of new methods of furthering technological assistance to his beloved United States.

Congressman BROOKS has made a secure place in the hearts and memories of those with whom he served in the Halls of the Congress. His courtesy and thoughtfulness to his colleagues was unfailing.

His innate sensitivity to the needs of those close to him was demonstrated most forcefully to me and to my office staff when sorrow came our way. OVERTON came over to the office and offered his assistance in many ways. None of us will ever cease to love him for his thoughtfulness and his kindness.

To Molly, his beloved wife, and Ann, his adored daughter, may I say that your wonderful memories of many happy

years with OVERTON will help you over spots which are made rough with sorrow and loss. You have my deepest sympathy, in which my daughter Judy joins me.

To those of us who had the good fortune to know Congressman BROOKS as our friend, we are indeed made richer by this friendship, and better men and women for his having passed our way.

To Prohibit Shipment in Interstate or Foreign Commerce of Articles Imported From Cuba

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the bill to cut off trade with Cuba, which has passed the House unanimously, I joined all of my colleagues in support of this bill. At the same time, I want to state that the people of my district, especially the cigar workers of Tampa, who will be affected by such an embargo, are willing to make any necessary sacrifices; however, they insist on the President backing them up by giving the firmest possible leadership in the fight to rid Cuba of Communist Castro. They were shocked and dismayed at the abortive Cuban invasion failure, because of the lack of air coverage support. They were likewise shocked and dismayed at the tractors-for-prisoners blackmail deal. They want all aid, directly and indirectly, to Cuba cut off, the present ominous military buildup stopped, and all available pressures brought to bear against communism in Cuba and elsewhere in this hemisphere as well as throughout the world.

To this end, and because I believe it voices the sentiment of all Americans I have written a letter to the President concerning their wishes, and I include it in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to see:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you undoubtedly know, the House unanimously passed H.R. 8465, intending to cut off all trade with Cuba, and, as is evidenced by the hearings, the area in this country most adversely affected is the great Tampa Havana cigar industry, which employs some 6,000 people, and which is reliant upon the import of Havana tobacco for its continuation. The families of many residents of my district have been employed in the cigarmaking industry for generations past, and the largest part of this trade embargo against the present $30 million a year remaining imports is Havana tobacco.

As I said, the bill passed unanimously, and thus obviously with my support. The purpose of this letter is to tell you, Mr. President, that it is my belief that all the people of my district, including those employed in the cigar industry, are willing to take any needed calculated risks and make any necessary sacrifices to end this Cuban Communist threat some 90 miles from our shores—far too close to Tampa itself.

I believe, likewise, that the people of Florida and of the entire Nation are willing to make any sacrifices and take any necessary risks, if called upon by their President and their Congress to do so. Should this bill become law, and the people of Tampa thus be called upon by the Nation to make this sacrifice, then it is my hope that this expression of what I believe to be their willingness to do so, as evidenced by my vote, will at this critical time give you the needed strength and fortitude in the knowledge that America is willing and anxious to support a strong anti-Communist drive against Castro in Cuba.

This bill, along with other unanimous action taken by the House this session, calling for firm and resolved leadership in opposition to Communist Castro, and as evidenced by the amendments passed to the foreign aid bill and the anticommunism in the Western Hemisphere and Cuba resolutions passed, should leave little doubt in your mind of the unqualified willingness of the people of the United States to back you up as our President in marshalling every available force against Castro now before it is too late—before we have Communist imported missiles on Cuban launching sites aimed at Florida and our Nation.

I, in joining all of my colleagues in support of this bill, state the people of my district are willing to make any necessary sacrifices, but, at the same time, they insist on you as our President backing them up by giving the firmest possible leadership to this fight. They were shocked and dismayed at the abortive Cuban invasion attempt, because of the lack of air coverage support. They were likewise shocked and dismayed at the tractors-for-prisoners blackmail deal. They fortified by the action of the House on the foreign aid bill, want all aid directly and indirectly to Cuba cut off, the present ominous military buildup stopped, all available pressures through the Organization of American States and the United Nations brought to bear against communism in Cuba and anywhere else in this hemisphere, full support of the Cuban exiles in forming a Cuban government in exile, and the proper encouragement of them toward an eventual takeover, as well as an end to all available dollar sources to Castro, including the $5 million annual drain from the Guantanamo base payroll being stolen by Castro right outside the gates when his bank forces the exchange of worthless pesos for valuable dollars.

As a matter of fact, such leadership could conceivably result in the overthrow of Castro even before the stockpiles of Havana tobacco are exhausted, assuming this bill becomes law.

I trust that the expression of willingness on the part of many citizens of my district of very moderate income—many of whom it would be almost impossible to retrain for other jobs—to make a substantial sacrifice on their part, as evidenced by my vote for this bill, will have the effect of further fortifying you in your determination to evolve a much needed effective program to rid this hemisphere of Castro and to oppose all other Communist threats throughout the world—fortifying you in the knowledge, as evidenced by this willingness of some 6,000 citizens of my district to make this substantial sacrifice if needed, that all America likewise stands ready to back your administration in such efforts. I trust that such an effective anti-Communist Cuban program will be forthcoming in the near future—as well as worldwide firmness in dealing with the threat of atheistic communism.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

Creating Balanced Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit for reprinting in the RECORD a speech presented by Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at a banquet meeting of the Armed Forces Chemical Association at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, in Washington. This was an outstanding and well attended meeting of leaders in the field of science and in research and development. Some of them are prominent in business, some in the Armed Forces of the Nation. All of them are dedicated Americans who enjoyed, as I did, General Eddleman's impressive speech.

CREATING BALANCED MILITARY POWER

(Remarks by Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at a banquet meeting of the Armed Forces Chemical Association, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, September 15, 1961)

It is a pleasure and an honor for me to have this opportunity to be with you this evening. The leaders and the members of the Armed Forces Chemical Association can take justifiable pride in the contributions your organization has made over the years in improving the combat capability of our Nation's Armed Forces. Advances in technology, largely the product of your imagination and ability, have been accelerated by the free and rapid exchange of information made possible through your association.

Advanced technology not only has contributed to the effectiveness of our military forces but, in so doing, it has added a multitude of complex problems in equipment, organization, training and tactics. As a result, the Armed Forces have become progressively more and more dependent on American industry for aid in solving our many diverse problems. Such interdependence demands an effective industrial-military effort which can be achieved only by mutual cooperation and understanding. Your association has made a significant contribution in this field of which the Army is proud to be included.

Our mutual recognition of the need for balanced national military power is adequately emphasized by the theme of your conference; therefore, I shall touch only briefly on that important point. I will, however, cover some of the practical problems now confronting us in creating that balanced power—particularly as the Army is involved—and I will outline some of the methods for their proper solution.

The unstable world in which we live contributes inordinately to the multiplicity of national security problems which now face us. It is a world with an accelerated population growth; with millions of underprivileged people hungering for a better way of life; with nationalism rampant in numerous new nations; and with an exploding technological revolution which has already projected four men into outer space. Small wonder it is that the status quo will be denied to us for many years ahead.

The Berlin crisis is but one part of a broader challenge we face today in this dynamic and unstable world. For the past 15 years the menacing attitude and actions of Communist leaders, who are obsessed with

their own ideology, have been a source of world tensions. The powerful armed forces maintained by the Communists throughout this period have provided their leaders with an enormous political flexibility of which they have taken full advantage. Based on past performances and the current pattern of events, we are forced to conclude that their ambition for world conquest remains unabated and that the free nations of the world will continue to be confronted with threats ranging from nuclear annihilation to economic demoralization.

Thus we find ourselves faced with threats which are economic and political as well as military; threats which transcend the purely military task. In short, we must maintain, in addition to our already enormous military effort, our productivity on the farm, in the laboratory and in the factory. We must have a balanced defense against this threat in all of its forms; a defense backed by a strong national will and a renewed dedication to defend our cherished freedom. We must be able to defeat any challenge with the full mental, moral and physical resources that the free world is able to muster; and to do so under U.S. leadership.

Recently I heard a prayer which expresses our needs today very clearly. In part, it said, "Grant us strength, fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men and nations." Unquestionably we need that kind of strength now. We can develop it by renewing our faith in America and by devoting to her service the means necessary to retain our national strength.

With a full realization of the multiple crises facing us worldwide, the Congress, upon the recommendation of the President, has recently made provisions for the rapid improvement in the balance and flexibility of our military forces. These measures will enable us to oppose more effectively the threats of aggression in all of its forms and wherever it may occur. Also, they will enable us to create a better balance between our conventional and our nuclear capabilities, thus providing our national leadership with much greater political flexibility in the international arena.

Under the aforementioned measures, the authorized strength of the Army will increase from its present 875,000 to a total of 1,008,000 by the end of this fiscal year. This action recognizes the importance attached to the role of Army forces in meeting the numerous and varied military threats arising around the world today. There is no surer deterrence to aggression, in any particular locality than to have first-class, combat-ready military forces in being on the ground. Where we lack such forces, we must be able to reinforce promptly our allies, located in the area, with the necessary strength to defeat actual aggression or deter threatened incursions.

Today, confronted with a potential military threat along much of the Communist periphery, we must either have military forces "there" or be able to deploy them there in time with enough force to insure preservation of our vital interests and those of our allies.

We in the Army have taken cognizance of the problems facing us in meeting these threats in various areas of the world—areas ranging from the highly industrialized complex of Western Europe, through the jungles and forests of southeast Asia, across the arid but oil-rich wastes of the Middle East, to the strategic northern approaches of the frozen Arctic.

These problems—inherent in the wide variety of operational circumstance in which we must be prepared to fight—have caused us to create a flexibility which has never existed before in the Army in the degree now required. Quite obviously we would not use the same types of equipment in all areas of the world. We would not require the same amount or the same types of transport, nor would we use the identical battle formations. We have adopted recently a new division organization which we are confident will meet our requirements for far greater versatility.

Our principal objective is to produce a capability flexible enough to respond to the variety of situations which may occur anywhere in today's turbulent world. While primarily organized for either nuclear or nonnuclear conflict, our new divisions are particularly adaptable to meet the limited war threat. Nonnuclear firepower is increased; tactical mobility (both ground and air) is improved and is tailored to the operational environment—and a new building-block concept is incorporated in which the types of combat maneuver elements are readily interchangeable. We are creating fully mechanized divisions—for the first time in the Army's history.

Using the building-block concept of organization, variable numbers of infantry, tank, and mechanized combat maneuver battalions will be added to a fixed division command and support base, to form armored, mechanized or infantry divisions tailored for particular missions. Airborne divisions will have a similar capability for rapid and variable tailoring.

Application of this concept will permit increased armored and mechanized strength in the divisions in Europe. For the divisions in the Pacific and other oversea areas, and those held in strategic reserve in CONUS, composition will differ markedly. These units will be tailored to their missions and the operational environment in probable areas of employment.

The building-block structure will be extended to the units of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. This concept, coupled with new training and equipment programs, will facilitate much more rapid callup of our high-priority Reserve units.

I cannot overemphasize how significant it is to us that the readiness of our Reserve units today is so improved. Late last month, as you know, the President announced that Army units composed of some 46,000 reservists would be called into active service this year. I am confident that these units, with only 30 days' notice, will move right in and pick up their missions in our expanded Army without any loss of time or effectiveness. We have Reserve readiness plans that will reduce even further the time required for callup and deployment of our Ready Reserve units. The attainment of these reorganization and readiness objectives will make a significant contribution to our combat capability for both general and limited war.

In addition to improving our division organization, the Army has increased emphasis on special forces, those highly skilled specialists who are trained for paramilitary operations and unconventional warfare. We are not only doubling the numbers of our present forces, but we are accelerating research and development of highly specialized equipment for their use. By so doing we are improving our own capabilities in this field and at the same time we are making a major increase in the training, assistance, operational advice, and equipment to our allies worldwide. These increased efforts in support of our allies will be important in assisting them to combat subversion and guerrilla warware which—in many countries—continue to threaten seriously their internal security and political stability.

None of these organizational innovations, alone, will produce the required readiness for modern combat. Inasmuch as we do not hope to compete on a man-for-man basis, we depend on technological supremacy to compensate for numerical manpower inferiority. We must have more competent leadership, be better organized, more adequately trained and with equipment superior to those who would employ military force against us. We need weapons and equipment—the most modern that our ingenuity and technological skill can devise. It is as necessary to move forward in materiel modernization as it is to continue our emphasis on training the world's most versatile and capable soldiers and units.

Therefore, a parallel program for modernization of materiel is essential. These new divisions and their nondivisional support units must be provided with the very best in equipment if their full combat capability is to be realized. Specifically, improved aircraft, armored personnel carriers, self-propelled howitzers and other forms of conventional firepower, as well as the latest innovations in communications equipment—are necessary.

We must improve the basic efficiency of our equipment, but also, we must design it for all reasonable types of combat to be encountered in a wide variety of operational environments. There has always been a need for simple, rugged, lightweight weapons; man-portable, reliable sensors which can detect movement, including that of humans, under varying conditions of weather and terrain; and simple, secure long-range communications systems. These needs are even greater today.

These are just examples. There are many others, and the problem never seems to be solved. Technological development is—and I hope will continue to be—a dynamic process which will keep promising new, improved weapons as long as combatants require them.

Keeping up with such dynamic materiel requirements poses an extremely difficult problem for the military planner—but he can find solace in the fact that one of our most valuable assets—a leading source of strength in America—is our great industrial capability. This capability spans the gamut of science and industry—from basic research, through engineering design, to production and distribution.

We in the Army are fully mindful of our dependence on your imagination and talents to help us solve our material problems. Because of your technical competence, I hesitate to suggest areas which we might emphasize with mutual profit. Nevertheless, I value our close relationship so highly that I believe it worthwhile to mention a few points that warrant emphasis.

First, each of us must do our utmost to insure that the important technological breakthroughs of the future becomes ours—and not those of our potential enemies.

Second, it is important that we provide our troops with equipment which is qualitatively superior to that of our enemies. We should never require American soldiers to enter combat with less than the best we can provide.

Third, both industrial and military research and development should devote increased effort in the exploitation of the new frontiers found in basic research. I know that industry has advanced many highly imaginative proposals to the Army. In consonance therewith, our military planners are attempting to provide proper guidance to industry's research and development community on the Army's needs for new weapons and equipment. This exchange of ideas among military planners and our teammates in industry is vitally important to our military preparedness.

Last, we must continue to work together in reducing overall lead time to the absolute minimum. This factor is particularly important in the present era of scientific and technological growth—a period in which we cannot afford to lag behind in translating

good research ideas into functioning military hardware.

Gentlemen, in closing I should like to restate my pleasure for this opportunity to meet with you. Because this year is a critical one in our Nation's history, each of us has a personal responsibility to see that our national will and sense of purpose are reaffirmed and channeled to meet the challenge which faces us.

You—the leaders of industry—and we in the military must continue our close association to insure that our military forces are fully adequate to the tasks ahead. Our national security depends as never before upon your imagination and boldness.

I assure you that the Army and the other Services are doing their utmost to provide the balanced military posture needed. I am confident that each member of the Armed Forces Chemical Association is also doing his part.

Thank you.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s Record Discussed by Father Henry Beck in American Church News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, American public opinion and the Nation's press need men and women who search out the truth and present it with conviction and courage. It is strange therefore that some of the very persons who are doing the most in the field of personal journalism are subject to the meanest personal attacks on the part of those who usually claim "smear" whenever an unpleasant fact is revealed. One of those men who has been given the "treatment" during recent years by the superliberal left wing part of our society is Fulton Lewis, Jr. Usually a brave newscaster just has to sit and take it. So I found it rather refreshing and encouraging to read that an intelligent church publication had decided to find out firsthand what manner of man Mr. Lewis really is. The Reverend Henry C. Beck has been a skilled journalist all his life. Before he was ordained a priest, he wrote many outstanding secular news stories. Now he gives his talents to the Episcopal Church and serves as editor in chief of the American Church News issued monthly by the American Church Union, located at 347 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Father Beck is still the author of a regular Sunday column in the Newark Star Ledger, and is the author of a recent book about the State of New Jersey, the subject of his weekly column. He has carefully studied the career and writings of Fulton Lewis, Jr. He has talked to friends and foes alike, to his priest and confessor, to his staff, and to other thoughtful persons in Washington. Now after prayerful meditation, he shares with all of us his findings in the September issue of the American Church News entitled "Fulton Lewis, Jr., Churchman at Work". Because of Mr. Lewis' many contributions to the welfare of his Nation and his church, we are all indebted to Father Beck for all the time and energy he spent getting this constructive article together. I think it merits the careful attention of my colleagues and the press, as well as all faithful church-going persons:

FULTON LEWIS, JR., EPISCOPALIAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—There is a technique as old as the Christian cause. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ did not know it as "the smear" but that is what it was. In short, it is character assassination. Wondering if such a technqiue was not being used in relation to the forthright and always documented statements of Fulton Lewis, Jr., churchman and an Anglo-Catholic, the editor of the American Church News gave a day from his schedule to go to Washington and seek the truth. The following is a report of that day and of the man who emerged from its routine.)

(By Henry C. Beck)

If you should take the word of some of the bishops and councils in circles of the church, you just might associate the name of Fulton Lewis, Jr.—he uses a small "j"—with such other names as those of Gerald L. K. Smith, William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of the National Review, and Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

For, as long ago as last January Bishop Pike, one of four Episcopal bishops in California, declared that McCarthyism was once more on the rise, that it was a grassroots movement without a leader, but even so a movement with many would-be leaders, naming names and describing their owners as "small fry" from among whom might come someone of whom "we all can be fearful."

Friends of Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio news commentator whose voice is an American household commodity every weekday evening, were sure there must be some mistake. Beyond that, they were certain that those who so glibly had dropped Fulton's name among reported "publicans and sinners" did not know that the man is an Episcopalian, a vestryman of St. David's Church, Washington, D.C., and that he has been long respected in Christian and Hebrew congregations where his work as a force for what he thinks is right has made him more than a voice.

I wanted to know the facts and so I arranged to talk with Fulton, to spend a day in his office, at his broadcast and in his home, and to meet the members of his staff and his family. Above all, I wanted to meet Father Albert E. Taylor, rector of St. David's, and to learn about Fulton Lewis, Jr., as he really is.

VETERAN OF RADIO

Fulton Lewis has been in radio since 1937 and is currently heard Monday through Friday on more than 500 stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System. It has been established that Lewis serves more individual sponsors and is heard in more individual localities than any other news commentator on his own or any other network. He is the one who evolved the system whereby small town radio stations can afford to handle national news programs at whatever cash outlay their local advertisers can bear—local stations cut in spot announcements for some local insurance agency, some local store, or even some local cause worthy of support.

Over the years listeners have prevailed upon "Mr. L.," as members of his staff spoke of him to me, to make printed copies of his daily broadcasts available on a subscription basis, a service in operation since July 6, 1959—the mailing list now is in the thousands. In addition there is a daily news column, Washington Report, published in over 100 newspapers, and a weekly newsletter, Exclusive. Lewis is strictly controversial and he is proud of it. A vigorous proponent of positive opinion, he gathers his own news and he writes his own copy—he is the last, or at least one of the last, of the commentators working that way.

Much of this is known to most people—although I did not know all of it. Until I went to Washington, Fulton Lewis, Jr., to me was a voice, picked up on my car radio as I drove from Princeton station to my home after a late day in the New York office. I did not know that Fulton wrote many musical compositions during his college days, one of which is the University of Virginia's football rallying "Cavalier Song." I did not know that Fulton worked his way through that university by playing the organ at the Lafayette Theater in Charlottesville. I did not know that Fulton Lewis, Jr., gives at least his Saturday mornings to building pipe organs—he built one for a Methodist church at Hollywood, Md., where his children's choir became famous, another for St. David's, and still another and even larger one for the Washington Hebrew Congregation. In short, I did not know very much about "Mr. L."

FATHER TAYLOR SPEAKS

First I wanted to know what Father Taylor, the rector of St. David's, thought of Fulton. The priest, among those who had suggested a closer look at one of the last exponents of what has been called personal journalism, had this to say:

"I first met Fulton Lewis, Jr., many years ago when his daughter, Alice Elizabeth, was confirmed at St. David's. I did not see much of him after that because he was living in the country and my only contact was listening to his broadcast every night. Looking back over the years of my listening, as well as more recent personal contacts with the family's return to Washington, I have found that Fulton has been so often right in his broadcasts that it is truly startling.

"Mr. Lewis is no banner carrier—no radical, shouting doom. He is a real and true American, interested in the welfare of his country, and intensely interested in its future—and, because of this, is quite naturally disturbed when things happen in America which will upset and affect America's people. Fulton Lewis is 100 percent sincere and this I well know.

"In 1955, when we were completing St. David's Church, one Sunday morning his daughter, Betsy, said to me, 'Why don't you ask Daddy to build you an organ?' I replied, 'Why don't you ask him?' 'All right,' she said, 'I will.' Within an hour of the 11 o'clock service Mr. Lewis was at the church and took all kinds of measurements. Over the years the organ was built and now St. David's has one of the sweetest instruments in the entire area. * * *" I told Father Taylor I wanted to hear the organ as well as see the church, St. David's, and I soon agreed to all that he had said about them both.

"Since the Lewis family came back to Washington they are regular worshippers at St. David's," the rector told me later. "They never miss—never. I have known Fulton Lewis to be on a speaking engagement in Texas or California but he always has managed to catch a plane to make one or more of the services Sunday morning. Mr. Lewis is a most interested and helpful member of the vestry and Mrs. Lewis is a devoted member of the Altar Guild. Fulton Lewis, I know, is proud of being an Episcopalian and shows it in his devotion to his God, his church, and his rector."

FULL DAY'S SCHEDULE

This was but the start of a long day in Washington, begun with a frank appraisal by Father Taylor, continued with members of "Mr. L's" office staff—a kind of ecumenical

movement all by itself—across-the-desk small talk with Fulton as he prepared to write and rewrite copy timed for 15 minutes, and dinner with the Lewis household, moved up so that I could make a 7:30 train home. All of this was the best way, I soon found, for this was to be no ordinary interview: the big man across the big and littered desk, adorned with its customary glass of ice water, did not explode or even talk about himself.

The workshop of Fulton Lewis is a suite on the third floor of the Sheraton-Park Hotel but it is still a workshop and the man whose very being goes with the voice arrived without notice. I knew him at once, even in the lobby, although no one ever had described him: This, clearly, was the owner of the well-known signature, "That's the top of the news as it looks from here."

There is a remarkable staff, efficient and businesslike without any of all that sticking out—Barbara Walker, an Episcopalian and recent convert from Methodism; Cleo Giannopoulos, still a Methodist and a graduate musician who later took me to see St. David's and played its beautiful organ; Bill Schultz, researcher, detail man, and a Roman Catholic, and Ted (Theodore) Lit, who is a Hebrew and the kind of aid you envy for the thorough documentation on which Fulton Lewis, Jr., insists for every statement he makes on the air. Ted's special assignment is the Fulton Lewis Newsletter which often has more meat than a 15-minute broadcast permits.

Not because it makes any material difference but because you ought to have a description, unbiased, of the news commentator himself, let me quote from "Praised and Damned: The Story of Fulton Lewis, Jr." by Booton Herndon, edited by Gordon Carroll and published in 1954—it is more than accurate: "The man exemplifies his voice. He is tall, carries his head and shoulders back, moves quickly, confidently, with obvious enthusiasm and tremendous energy. His face is usually rigid with concentration, his blue eyes piercing. When his face breaks into a smile, and he gives a half-laugh, half-chuckle, his humor is all the more friendly for its startling suddenness."

When this was written it was also reported that Fulton was paid well beyond $350,000 per year, much of which he put right back into his program. Thus is Fulton Lewis, Jr., more than a crusader in American terms, perhaps one of the last practitioners of the courageous art of sticking the neck out.

BUILT METHODIST ORGAN

In the few moments in which Fulton Lewis, Jr., was able to desert his demanding copy stint of the day, I told him that some people told me they were sure he was a Methodist. He chuckled. "That," he told me quietly, "was because while we were living in the country, in an area where there was no Episcopal church, I built an organ for a little Methodist church, and, on the insistence of the kids, trained the choir. I always make my Christmas Eve broadcast a Christmas program—and so I put the choir on the air."

The exchange, as I look back, became notable for what Fulton Lewis did not say. He did not tell me that his family home in the country had been burned mysteriously, that because a new pastor had made veiled remarks from the pulpit and that because members of his family were threatened because of his exposure of conditions in the schools, he had decided to return to live in Washington, a short distance from where he prepares and makes his broadcasts at the Sheraton-Park. I had to read such details in the books that have been written about him.

In the preliminaries before luncheon during which Fulton Lewis stayed at his desk, working and reworking his broadcast—4:15 p.m. for stations going off the air at sundown and taped for the later broadcast at 7 p.m.—the man who builds and tunes organs on Saturday mornings had only mild and the forthright American's comment on bishops who seem to speak for the church when they do not at all and the decisions made by the National Council of Churches. "It should be remembered," he said, "that the National Council of Churches doesn't speak for me, or Mrs. Lewis, or members of my family. Why, sometimes far-reaching decisions and pronouncements of that body are made by no more than 15 people."

I offered no loaded questions as to why someone in authority did not speak out against a voice assuming official tones and accents of the church, or why a minority opinion can become a majority rule. I could have but I was content to listen and observe. Fulton Lewis was concerned with allowing those who knew him well to speak for him for he had copy to write, rewrite, check with the teletype reports once again and, even then, boil down. Above all else the owner of "The Voice" had become a careful craftsman, the captain of a team who worked merely as a member of the team, a loyal group of men and women that allowed me to ask and look and listen as if I were a member of the family.

At lunch I saw Irving Ferman, vice president of the International Latex Corp., an attorney from New Orleans long identified with America's fight against communism, and a member of the Washington Hebrew Congregation for which Fulton Lewis has built a tremendous organ, judging from the specifications I saw. I had hoped to meet another friend of the newsman, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, but I had come too late and the rabbi was in Europe.

DEDICATED, TOLERANT

"It is impossible to present Fulton Lewis apart from his broadcasts, his personality, and politics," Irving told me. "I met him first in 1953 and I have found him a dedicated person and a tolerant friend. He has a deep sense of pluralism about people. His is the life of a cultivated man and such a one can never be a monster. Go to his home where the mighty have been honored guests and where the lowliest is treated as a colleague and you will see what I mean."

Irving Ferman continued to speak quietly, observing, not preaching. His words summed up the opinions of all those to whom I spoke in an effort to supplement my own conclusions. "The polarism of Fulton Lewis was never better demonstrated than at the services of our temple which he attended," he told me, reiterating details of an offer to design and build the temple's organ. Time and time again we were interrupted, for it seemed that Irving knew almost everybody and almost all wanted a word or two with him.

Later Barbara Walker, who serves Fulton as his manager, cited many cases in which the broadcaster has "gone to bat" for the civil liberties of individuals whose causes, without him, might have gone unheard. The feeling in Washington seems to be that the discerning mind of Fulton Lewis, Jr., trained in the atmosphere of a hub of the world in an age of unease, is needed more than ever, even as much as the voice that speaks it at expected times. Someone at dinner, happily rearranged to meet deadlines which the office family and the Lewis family at home understand equally well, said this: "There are too many people who have concluded that opinion is all right if it coincides with their own."

Betsy Lewis is to be married shortly at St. David's and, beyond the customary part that a father will play, the organ that Betsy's father, Fulton Lewis, Jr., built will have its own importance in the ceremony. There will be something else, too, part of the thoughtfulness of Fulton Lewis, the churchman, for those attending who are not Episcopalians, and may not be accustomed to a nuptial eucharist: A little book has been prepared with the marriage service complete so that those unfamiliar with the prayerbook won't let lost—and may be won.

Educational and Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, with events in countries all over the world becoming more and more serious, it is vital that we make use of every possible means to give a favorable impression of ourselves to all other nations of the globe. Every citizen of the United States has an obligation to see that the 50,000 foreign students visiting America have a correct understanding of our country and our ways. We cannot afford to allow these students to leave the United States with wrong or biased viewpoints. It is vital, therefore, that we create a dynamic program to make sure that these students have a favorable impression of the people and policies of the United States.

Recently a study was made of 500 foreign students attending the University of Pennsylvania as a means of learning their experiences in the United States, as well as their impressions of our country. Though this study was limited to students at Penn, the authors, John F. Melby and Elinor K. Wolf, indicated that problems faced by this institution are closely related to the problems the Nation's schools face as a whole. This study brought out several specific problems which need to be exposed. It is my belief that the Federal Government must supply the initiative if we are to meet and realistically solve these problems.

First of all, the orientation program which the foreign student receives, if any, is not equipped to be the helpful program it should be. This need is especially critical when the foreign student first arrives in the country. When the student's mind is most likely to be open to all points of view, we fail miserably. This is the time when the student should be told that all Americans do not drive convertibles; that all Americans do not live in a sprawling ranch house; and that all Americans do not live by the creed of equal rights for all. Unfortunately, the student is left to find out himself. Of the 500 students at Penn, only 25 percent had any kind of orientation course, and of this group only 7 persons had an extended course over several weeks, which has proved to be the most successful type. Thirty-five percent of the group had never even known that such a course existed. The remaining part of the group pleaded lack of time or felt no need for such a course. The report stated:

It is clear, however, that a great majority of students wanted and would have

profited from the right kind of course as indicated by their own statements.

Had the money been available a much larger orientation program would have been conducted for the foreign students.

Secondly, it is pleasing to note that, except for a language problem in English, the foreign student does acceptable academic work. It is vital, however, that the student have a working knowledge of English if he is to succeed in his college work. Almost invariably the study points out a relationship between poor grades and poor English. In addition, the problem is further complicated by the fact that most of the students believe that they have a good understanding of English. Consequently, many students are not aware of their English deficiencies until it is too late. Thus, it is extremely important that we have a plan that can cope with these needs. If we are able to enact a program along these lines, we will be doing much to alleviate this problem. It is quite necessary that additional English courses be sponsored so that all foreign students will have an equal chance to be successful in their work. It can certainly be assumed that those with the greatest ability in English will have the best chance to understand the ideas and customs of our country.

Thirdly, we must enact some kind of program to aid the foreign student in finding adequate housing. Because of overcrowded dormitory conditions, 80 percent of the students were forced to seek shelter off campus. The study describes the student as being hungry, confused, and on the verge of panic because he did not know how he was to be housed. An article in the New York Times which appeared on June 3, 1961, describes the dilemma faced by the foreign student in the area of housing. When the student is able to find housing, it is usually in subpar neighborhoods. I might add that only 27 percent found their accommodations through the university; the rest located their living places through various means. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, it is completely illogical to expect the foreign student, a guest of our country, to gain a favorable viewpoint of the wealthist and most advanced Nation in the world. If anything under present conditions, seeds of hate will begin to grow within the student from the moment he arrives.

Fourthly, the study indicates that many foreign students are unable to see many of our cultural sights, because of the great cost involved. Specifically, 80 percent of the students wanted to see more works, in music, the theater, and the arts, but were unable to do so because of financial difficulties. It is vital for these young men and women to see more than just a college campus while in the United States. It is paramount that we make sure these students see our historic shrines, our theaters, galleries, our movies, in other words our American way of life. We are on trial before these ambassadors from all over the world. It is important that the facts are presented before them, so that they can make a fair and objective decision. Let no foreign student be able to say that he was confused and uncertain about the United States, because he saw too little of it.

There are many ways we can seek out and attack this problem if we so desire. We could form contracts with theaters, whereby the Federal Government would pay for part of the admission. We could supplement college programs already providing such a service though on a far too limited scale. We could set up summer employment programs so that the students could pay the costs themselves. I might add that in the study 40 percent of the students were unable to find jobs when they applied. Indeed the problem is not in helping these students; it is to make ourselves interested enough to provide the means we already have to supply the help. When 78 percent of the students said they would be willing to take an extra course, completely unrelated to their regular course, on some aspect of American life, we need not fear whether they are interested.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and most important of all, the foreign student has many confusing and conflicting ideas on American policy. A lack of general knowledge on the official policy in such controversial areas as race relations, business activities, capitalism versus socialism, and foreign affairs is a source of much concern to the foreign student. It is here that we must concentrate our most diligent efforts to correct this situation. We have a tremendous opportunity to present our side of the picture to the world. Moreover, we must not forget that every student when he returns to his native land will fan out his impressions of the United States to hundreds of his fellow countrymen. We cannot afford to allow one of these students to distribute ill feelings about the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to mislead my colleagues. I am not advocating a huge Federal agency to solve this problem; that is wholly unnecessary. All that is needed to relieve this unsatisfactory situation is to supplement with Federal funds the programs already in existence in colleges and community centers, and make sure that these programs are effective. In a day and age when we speak of billions in foreign aid, we can certainly afford to allocate a minimum amount of money to further the true image of America.

Since the conference report on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 has been approved, the administration and Members of Congress can seriously consider the suggestions contained in this statement.

UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the September issue of the American Mercury magazine. I feel that this information must be brought to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of all the American people. The present time is one in which we must all be as well informed as is humanly possible on events taking place, and the trends and proposals being advanced for and within this country:

GREATEST SUBVERSIVE PLOT IN HISTORY

(A report by the American Flag Committee, documented evidence of a malignant plot against the future of this country and its children's children.)

UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) is a subversive association. It is consciously furthering a campaign calculated to pervert the teaching profession in this country, and so destroy the worth and integrity of America's first bulwark of freedom—our tax-supported public schools.

Strong words? Yes, but not strong enough to alert you and the American people to a proper understanding of the UNESCO menace, which, unless met squarely and eradicated by the concerted action of parents, teachers and the general public, may shortly transform our schools into laboratories for the systematic destruction of all sense of national allegiance and loyalty in the minds and hearts of America's schoolchildren.

UNESCO's scheme to pervert public education appears in a series of nine volumes, titled "Toward World Understanding," which presume to instruct kindergarten and elementary grade teachers in the fine art of preparing our youngsters for the day when their first loyalty will be to a world government, of which the United States will form but an administrative part. The booklets bear the following individual numbers and titles:

"I. Some Suggestions on Teaching About the U.N. and Its Special Agencies."

"II. The Education and Training of Teachers."

"III. A Selected Bibliography."

"IV. The U.N. and World Citizenship."

"V. In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age."

"VI. The Influence of Home and Community on Children Under 13 Years of Age."

"VII. Some Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography."

"VIII. A Teachers' Guide to the Declaration of Human Rights."

"IX. Some Suggestions on the Teaching of World History."

These booklets are cheaply priced for maximum distribution and are printed by Columbia University Press, New York. This seems appropriate, considering the role Columbia's Teachers College has long played in developing new methods for radicalizing and internationalizing public education in this country. The institution has become well known as a hotbed of British Fabianism, that peculiar type of creeping socialism which sired the present Labor Government which has reduced England to a fourth-rate power and a star boarder in the European section of America's world charity ward.

UNESCO's booklets read like the propaganda put out by United World Federalists, Inc., which has been denied tax exemption because of its specifically political nature.

They begin by advancing the totally un-American doctrine that the prime function of public education in the United States must be that of capturing the minds of our children, at the earliest possible age, for the cause of political world government. The teacher is urged to devote every classroom minute to this end, and every subject taught must serve, or be revised in such

manner that it is made to serve, this same central objective.

The program is quite specific. The teacher is to begin by eliminating any and all words, phrases, descriptions, pictures, maps, classroom material or teaching methods of a sort causing his pupils to feel or express a particular love for, or loyalty to, the United States of America. Children exhibiting such prejudice as a result of prior home influences—UNESCO calls it the outgrowth of the narrow family spirit—are to be dealt an abundant measure of counter-propaganda at the earliest possible age.

Following this same line of attack upon patriotism and its parental encouragement, the same booklet, on pages 58–60, goes on to further poison the minds of our teachers by adding:

"As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism. Education for world-mindedness is not a problem that the school can solve within its own walls or with its own means. It is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with the requisite authority.

"We thought with cautious optimism that educators could also try to influence public opinion. Certain members of our group thought that educators might now besiege the authorities with material demands in the manner of a trade union. In our opinion, it is essential that, on the one hand, a children's charter should secure for all children such education as is summarized in this report, which alone can create the atmosphere in which development of world-mindedness is conceivable, and that, on the other hand, a teacher's charter should secure for all members of the teaching profession the liberty to provide such an education by the means they decide upon, as well as the right to access to commissions and councils responsible for the organization of public education."

Aside from encouraging the public school teachers to make war upon the ideals of patriotic national devotion which UNESCO sees as infecting our children in the home, precisely what kind of instruction would the authors of these UNESCO booklets introduce by influencing public opinion, besieging the authorities with a trade union, and by pressing for material demands in the manner of a children's charter and a teacher's charter; which refer to instruments prepared in treaty form, making UNESCO principles the supreme law of the United States? Let's see.

First of all, teachers are urged to suppress American history and American geography, which might enhance pro-American sentiments which UNESCO wishes to sterilize. Here is how booklet V, on page 11, treats the problem as it affects children aged 3 to 13 years:

"In our view, history and geography should be taught at this stage as universal history and geography. Of the two, only geography lends itself well to study during the years prescribed by the present survey. The study of history, on the other hand, raises problems of value which are better postponed until the pupil is freed from the nationalist prejudices which at present surround the teaching of history."

Translated into less abstruse phraseology, the teacher is instructed to purge American geography from the elementary school classroom, by divorcing it from its national element, and to completely ignore the teaching of history until the pupil enters high school, since this subject cannot be similarly internationalized, and so is too risky to advance until the youngsters' patriotic spirit has been thoroughly emasculated. Parents who take a bit of time to investigate may find (as we found in eastern Pennsylvania) that a number of elementary schools have already dropped American history as a standard, required subject.

Logical and orderly teaching methods are also to be discarded if found to obstruct UNESCO's program for de-Americanizing the minds and hearts of little children. Discussing the usual method of teaching geography, booklet V, page 11, continues:

"One method much in use now is to teach geography in a series of widening circles, beginning with local geography (i.e., the classroom, the school building and its surroundings, the village, the country) and proceeding to a study of the nation and the continent. Only when that routine has been accomplished is the child introduced to the rest of the world."

Booklet V, on page 9, advises the teacher that: "The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but can also prepare the child for membership, at about the age of seven, in a group of his own age and habits—the first of many such social identifications that he must achieve on his way to membership in the world society.

"This progress from the particular and the immediate to the general and the remote may be logical, but does it serve our purpose?"

The booklet goes on to conclude that it certainly does not, since it is found that this manner of presentation will lead pupils to the mistaken conclusion that what is nearest to them is the most important and vice versa.

UNESCO-indoctrinated teachers must therefore reverse the procedure, upset the rule of logical sequence, and begin by teaching the 8-year-old child about the distribution of land and water, of air and sea currents, hydrography, climate, occupations, etc. But, even before this, and certainly before the youngsters are given any kind of formal study of their own country, every opportunity should be taken to enlarge the child's imagination and encourage him in an interest in all that is remote and strange. This is accomplished by occupying the impressionable mind of the very young child with the games, occupations, tools, domestic animals, etc., of foreign lands. The purpose of this is not simply to teach our kindergarten and elementary pupils about alien peoples, but to cause them to identify themselves in their imagination with people different from themselves.

Truth, like orthodox and reasonable teaching methods, is to be suppressed wherever and whenever it stands in the way of glorifying those things which are foreign above those which are particularly American. On page 14, booklet V, there appears the following advice:

"Certain delicate problems, however, will arise in these studies and explorations. Not everything in foreign ways of living can be presented to children in an attractive light. At this stage, though, the systematic examination of countries and manners can be postponed, and the teacher need seek only to insure that his children appreciate, through abundant and judicious examples, that foreign countries, too, possess things of interest and beauty, and that many of them resemble the beauty and interest of his own country. A child taught thus about the different countries of the world will gradually lose those habits of prejudice and contempt which are an impediment to world-mindedness."

And there you have the UNESCO instructions on geography and history: Suppress American studies in these fields; accentuate, by abundant and judicious examples, all that is especially worth while and attractive in foreign modes of living; but as soon as the point of unfavorable reporting seems to be approaching, simply postpone further study, leaving the children with the false and truly prejudiced notion that the nations of the other continents are paragons of virtue, beauty, and overall perfection.

What else does UNESCO's teachers' guides recommend that our little ones be taught? For one thing (booklet V, p. 16), "the methods for putting the resources of the glove at the disposal of all people," which reads like a passage from Marx' Communist manifesto. Following the same line, page 51 of the same work proposes an international anthem for American classrooms (and tomorrow (for) all the inhabitants of the world.)

It is interesting to note that the booklet we are reviewing was prepared in 1949, and that a United Nations anthem was previewed by the U.N. in 1950, being presented to the public on October 1 of that year in California's giant Hollywood Bowl. The anthem describes how things will be when its flag (the spiderweb banner of the U.N.—editor) waves over every land.

We have quoted extensively from booklet V, because it contains the most flagrant of UNESCO's anti-American propaganda, and develops it the most extensively. Now, in the space left us, let's quote from other volumes in the series:

Booklet IV, on pages 13–14, sympathetically deals with the various methods for converting the United Nations into an actual world state. The original concept of the U.N. as an assembly of delegates representing free and sovereign governments is being challenged, teachers are informed, in an effort to break up the concentration of political power in the hands of national governments, especially the great-power governments, which includes the United States of America.

These are two alternative proposals. The first, to elect popularly U.N. representatives; the second, to appoint representatives who will be organized specialists in limited fields. The latter proposal follows the Facist ideology which developed the corporate state of Italy, under Benito Mussolini. UNESCO is not perturbed on this score, however, since "it would be a beginning of functional world government based on transnational rather than international cooperation."

Booklet VI contains a series of research suggestions which indicate an intention to stimulate ultimate classroom expeditions into the field of detailed sex education. Here are a few samples of the type of questions which UNESCO, which is heavily subsidized by the tax dollars of many Americans who feel that sex training rests within the domain of the home or of the tenants of their own particular religious faith, propounds for our public-school teachers:

"Are there devices * * * for limiting the family?" "What are supposed to be the typical feelings of pregnant women?" "Do parents undress before the child?" "What is he (the child) told about where babies come from?" A sense of propriety prohibits us from quoting the even less modest projects which appear with the above.

This brief analysis should serve to alert the citizen to the menancing nature of UNESCO's activities. Once alerted, then, it is his job—your job as a loyal American—to take the next step. Contact your friends and neighbors, show them this article, ask them to join with you in forming a local committee to obtain further data and fight this danger.

Prepare your own report and submit it to your local school board. Introduce the matter before your parent-teacher association. Interview the teachers in your community and ask their assistance in obtaining action. Write your Congressman, demanding that he introduce and support legislation withdrawing our Government from UNESCO membership and terminating its activities in this country. Many other ways will occur to you, in which you can

help safeguard our American system of public education from infiltration and undermining by UNESCO's American last propagandists.

One further word remains to be added. Several of the booklets discussed in this article bear a preface which states that the views expressed are those of their authors, and that they do not represent the official views of UNESCO. If this weak-kneed attempt to avoid responsibility is brought to your attention by a UNESCO apologist, tell him that one who administers poison to a Nation's youth is guilty of a crime, whether the prescription is official or other.

Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

RALLY 'ROUND THE FLAG, BOYS

Our principal partner, the administration, has started the mechanics of military manpower mobilization. The extent of this call and recall is not known, but it is quite apparent that the Nation's civilian physicians again will be associated actively with military medicine.

World War II found the regular military medical administration almost totally unprepared for the influx of the "feather merchant" doctors. There were many assignments that placed physicians in an unreasonable duty station. Medical manpower was abused. Internists in foxholes were trying valiantly to decide which end of the scalpel to put the blade on. Trained surgeons were recruiting Coast Guard prospects in Kansas.

Recent discussions with the local military men of medicine have been encouraging. The administrative officials are expected to sort out the square holes and the round pegs. These present leaders were in the other big fiasco plus the Korean incident and, undoubtly, are better equipped to make proper use of the physicians' capabilities. There always will be individuals who will have unsatisfactory duty. Possibly, an obstetrician will wind up in the Burma jungles with all male troops. Now, that's a real challenge.

The Navy Medical Corps learned, a little late, that the rotation system for combat medical veterans increased morale and decreased complaints. The Army did not and it had units of medical personnel on stations from 2 to 4 years without relief and without promotion. In New Guinea, the field hospital personnel sat through the great war treating each other's jungle rot. The U.S.S. *Solace* evacuated a hospital in Milne Bay, where the principal diversion had to do with the chief of surgery chasing the executive officer down a muddy lane firing a GI .45 with serious intent and poor aim. It was something to do about a ration of potables.

It is hoped that, if and when we are asked to return, there will be a minimum of "lost" men and "lost" battalions. A feasible plan, which never matured, would place all military medicine under one command. This would reduce the need for surplus medical manpower. The Navy, the Army, and the Air Force would have access to this pool as the need arose. They could just as well fly in an airplane, wade with GI Joes, as to paddle in a boat. Let's hope the Secretary of Defense will consider this practical plan. If nothing else, it would reduce the number of flag-rank officers and centralize military medical thinking.

The present military organization prefers to have happy personnel and will strive to attain this status for the civilian physicians who join the ranks.

If the call comes, who will go? Each individual physician will have to evaluate his own problem. Who will serve himself and his country best; the young, the old, the craven or the bold? Some will be denied and some will be forced. To accept whatever destiny prescribes should and will be a privilege.

Stand by to up anchor.

PAUL P. PICKERING, M.D.,
Associate Editor.

Glen Rock Woman Raps Progressive Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the quality of our public school education and how best to improve it has occupied the attention of educators and other interested citizens for years. It has been the subject of much debate in Congress in recent weeks.

There is much room for improvement, however, and I cannot think of a better place to start than with reading. For of all subjects taught in the schools, reading affects most materially all others. And a mastery of reading is so important to the success of the individual.

Learning to read intelligently has suffered a severe setback through the application of the "look-say" progressive method of teaching reading. For years I have been appalled and dismayed at the inability of many students of the progressive-reading school to read understandingly. But progress has been made where the "progressive" method has been scrapped and replaced by the old-fashioned but tried and time-proven Carden "phonetic" method.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I claim Miss Mae Carden, author of the Carden method, as a constituent. Miss Carden has devoted many years to exposing the weaknesses of the progressive method, and to teaching the Carden method to both teachers and her own pupils. A recent feature article in the Saturday Evening Post has focused national attention on Miss Carden's work—and none too soon. The Sun News-Clarion, a weekly newspaper published in Paramus in the Seventh New Jersey District, carried a news account of the Saturday Evening Post feature, and under unanimous consent I bring this important message to the attention of my colleagues:

GLEN ROCK WOMAN RAPS PROGRESSIVE TEACHING

An unprepossessing little lady from Glen Rock has thrown a bombshell into the hit-or-miss progressive reading methods which she and many educators claim have created havoc among so many pupils in public schools.

Miss Mae Carden who makes her home at 619 South Maple Avenue, Glen Rock, advocates and teaches a return to the phonetic approach to reading as opposed to the look-say progressive method.

She began her one-woman revolt against progressive methods over 30 years ago and today more than 125 school systems employ her system. About 90 percent are public schools in New York and New Jersey but others extend across the country all the way to California. Among Bergen County school systems using the Carden method are Paramus, Westwood, Hillsdale, Park Ridge, Montvale, Lodi, South Hackensack and Dumont.

Miss Carden doesn't sell her method or her services. She doesn't have to. School systems and educators must come to her. She and her method were the subject of a recent full length feature in a nationally-known publication and before a week had passed, Miss Carden said, she was literally snowed under with mail and phone calls for assistance.

Reading and spelling go together in Miss Carden's opinion. In most of the large cities, she said, surveys have shown that almost half of senior high school pupils cannot read or spell beyond fourth or fifth grade level. As many as 7 out of 10 students entering college must be tutored in remedial reading or spelling—in other words, taught sixth grade work.

Modestly referring to herself in the third person, she said, "Miss Carden's method of teaching is considered unorthodox, but her children do learn to read. The slow child may know delay, but he need never know defeat."

In the Pequannock schools which have used the Carden method for 10 years, most pupils are 2 to 3 years ahead of the national norm. Dr. Stephen Gerace, superintendent of schools, says, "Even the slow child can learn. Children with IQ's as low as 75 are able to read capably."

The Carden phonetic method relies mostly on the techniques which enabled most Americans over 40 to learn to read so effortlessly that they can't remember when they began. Although beefed up with linguistics to fit the age of the child being taught the basic idea remains the same.

In contrast to the progressive look-say method, which turns alphabetical English into a language of pictures and configurations like Chinese, the Carden method still relies on the basic. A for apple, B for boy, and C for cat. "By the phonetic system," Miss Carden insists, "children learn comprehension as well as learning to read and spell at the same time."

In a recent identical test given to a progressively taught Denver class and a Carden-method-trained Garwood class, the Garwood class misspelled 7 percent of the words, while the Denver class missed 63 percent.

Miss Carden points with pride to the fact that no top school administrator who has ever introduced her method into his schools, has ever dropped it. So wide has the demand become that Miss Carden herself cannot keep up with the demand. She has been forced to parcel out most of the country to her disciples while she concentrates on putting her method into Eastern schools.

Teaching teachers is one of the most gratifying aspects of her work, Miss Carden says. In order for instructors to teach her method, it has been necessary to unteach most of them. Teachers who have entered the profession in the last last 20 years know little or nothing of the phonics method.

Veteran teachers of the Carden method are now instructing classes of teachers, administrators and private school faculties all over

the country. Even in some school systems which refuse to adopt her method, teachers are "bootlegging" the Carden method.

Miss Carden decried a system which, like New York City, required hiring 200 remedial reading teachers because seventh grade students couldn't read fourth grade books. "It's not only a deplorable system," she said, "but tragic to the children."

We Must Go on the Offensive To Win Against the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to appease the Communists only at the peril of losing the war in which we are engaged, a war which will end in victory for freemen everywhere or the complete destruction of the United States and slavery for mankind. In this conneciton I would like to call attention to the thoughts expressed in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

MORE SOVIET DECEPTION

The United States accuses the Soviet Union of bad faith in its participation in the recent Geneva conference to work out an international system of banning nuclear testing. Even on the face of newspaper dispatches, there is evidence that this is true. For example:

Recently, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission said that there was no reason for President Kennedy's rushing to a decision on resumption of atom-bomb tests because the United States had few bombs to test until some were manufactured. But Russia's decision to resume testing has been followed by such a rapid succession of explosion that the world has been astounded.

This is string evidence that the Soviet Union, during the entire time of its abidance by the ban on testing, was going ahead full steam with the manufacture of bombs.

Russia's sudden and surprising decision to resume testing was not geared to any aspect of the international negotiations for a permanent ban but entirely to its own secret bomb-production program.

The net result of all the negotiations and the temporary ban on testing is that Russia has been given time to forge ahead in the field of bomb laboratory experimentation and production. It is a part of the Communist strategy of deception.

President Kennedy has defended the United States in its decision to resume testing by pointing to some of these facts.

For some reason beyond the power of commonsense to fathom, a number of nations are appealing to the United States not to resume bomb testing. Japan has made an official request. A Gallup poll a few days ago indicated that the people of both Great Britain and India want the United States to stand still regardless of what Russia does.

It is time for the United States to shape its course in accordance with its own future defense and witthout so much sentimental regard for what every African or Latin American country wants us to do.

If world war III comes, it will be the United States that will do most of the sacrificing in defense of world freedom. In fact, world conditions today give renewed validity to several old-fashioned maxims for defense of the country. Two of them are "Speak softly and carry a big stick" and "Trust the Lord and keep your powder dry."

President Kennedy has been on the defensive since his Vienna talks with Khrushchev. He ought to go on the offensive. Where national security is concerned, delay and indecision are suicidal. We are dealing with thieves and cutthroats.

Figures on Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the importance of meaningful facts on unemployment as a foundation for sound legislation on that subject can hardly be overstressed. The discussion of this by Mr. George Minot, managing editor of the Boston Herald, in his column of Sunday, September 17, 1961, will be of interest to Members and others. I include it with these remarks.

EVEN DEFINITIONS FUZZY

Last week, in this space, there was exposed—and effectively, too, if you do say so—the ridiculousness of Government claims that "reasonable price stability" has been achieved. This week, you are going to take up some Government figures about the number of unemployed in this country, and show that the Labor Department, also, doesn't know what it is talking about.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics issues a report every week or so, and every set of figures is just as discouraging as the last. The faster Congress passes emergency spending bills, the faster our defense expenditures grow, the more roads we build, post offices we put up, urban redevelopment schemes we start, the higher the unemployment lists are—so the pencil pushers in Washington will tell you.

IT'S ONLY AN ESTIMATE

Today's figures—and they may be worse tomorrow—show that just under 7 percent of the labor force in the United States is idle, and that about 5,050,000 persons are out of work here.

This, you understand, is only an estimate, and to make it more unreliable, the professors can't agree on terms.

Once upon a time, a man was listed as "unemployed" only if he was out of a job and looking for another. Now some count youths out of high school and waiting to enroll in college, married women who work part time, loafers who wouldn't take a job if one was staring them in the face and persons of independent means who don't have to work if they don't want to.

That isn't the worst of it. The statisticians only guess. They take five or six hundred part-time enumerators who visit between 30,000 and 35,000 homes considered to be representatives of the hundreds of thousands of others. They ask their questions, determine how many in those families work or don't work. Then they multiply each answer by 1,400 to correspond with the U.S. population.

Nobody knows who devised such a system, but it has been in effect for some time now and never fails to produce the discouraging figures the people in Washington seem to like. You would think it easy to determine just who is "employed" and who isn't, but it doesn't work out that way.

JUST WHO ARE THE EMPLOYED?

There are some 9 million business proprietors, grocers, farmers, barbers, professionals doing business for themselves and others who are on their own. Perhaps they are building their own home, putting in a new bathroom, following good advice and putting up an air raid shelter. They do not count. Nor does a wife who works in her husband's market, or a youth working on his father's farm. Obviously, the counters don't include the housewife at home, who works harder than any of the others. She's not one of the employed.

In every one of the listed classifications there are part-time workers. Some want to work more than others, some less. They are borderline cases. Sometimes they are counted as employed and sometimes as unemployed. In either case it isn't simple to decide just how to list them.

It's even more complicated when you try to find out who the unemployed are. The label now covers a host of categories in which the unemployment rests on personal choice. A man who quits his job to get a better one, one who is out because of a labor dispute, a young person trying to find work as a babysitter to help for her college education, 150,000 married women looking for part-time jobs so they will have something to do.

They are listed as unemployed. Each month there is an argument about counting, or subtracting, teenagers who never have worked before, and older persons on social security who work sometimes, and sometimes they don't.

LOTS OF TROUBLE HERE

Married women give the statistician much trouble. So do the 3 or 4 million persons who hold two jobs part of the time and only one the other part. One-fifth of all the employed persons in the country, believe it or not, are women with husbands. They are more than half of all employed women. They accounted for more than half the increase in employment during the fifties.

In August 1961 there were around 900,000 married women unemployed. There were 350,000 unmarried women without jobs. Some never had held one, some were waiting around to get married, some were seeking part-time, and some full-time jobs. They all combined to make a gloomy picture to those who wanted to make it so. Anyway, it was unreliable.

Now there are those in Washington who look at the whole business differently. Some in the administration want to do something about it. They point out, and rightly, that two-thirds of those out of work in the United States are those in the very lowest paid brackets, among men and women with little or no education beyond the grade school.

WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

Many of the others are those who have been displaced by technological change. There is underway a concerted effort by the administration, labor and business to retrain workers who lose their employment in one section, and a widespread advertising campaign has been started this summer to induce young persons to stay in school. These cures are long, drawn out processes and the chances of success are slim, but they are worth trying.

As a matter of fact, if you read the papers with any care, or see those in a number of cities, you will discover that there is a shortage, not a surplus of many kinds of labor in the country now. Every Sunday there are thousands of columns of "help wanted" advertisements in papers from one coast to the other. There is an acute shortage of skilled workers in a score of cities and teachers, technicians, nurses, garage mechanics, laboratory workers, electricians, engineers are among those in demand, no matter where you look.

If the Government would spend more time matching up the "manless job" with the "jobless man," and less in moaning about the problem, we might get somewhere. Improved machinery for retraining workers and educating youth for the jobs of the future is just a start. Right now we spend more time providing unemployment relief than we do in working to prevent unemployment. That could be reversed, too.

Indiana's Governor Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD a very eloquent speech delivered by the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of Indiana, at a statewide Democratic rally, sponsored by the Rhode Island Democratic State Committee and the Rhode Island Young Democrats at Rocky Point, R.I., on September 17.

Governor Welsh very adequately points out the role of America in the fight for freedom today. We join with him when he says, "Let us say to all the world, here we stand, for as long as God and history give us the heart and strength, we can do no other, for we are the Americans."

The following is the text of the Governor's speech:

Governor Notte, Senator Pastore, Senator Pell, Congressman Fogarty, Congressman St. Germain, Chairman McWeeney, distinguished guests, friends, it may seem that I have come a long way to be with you today. And perhaps I have, but Indiana is not as far from here as the map indicates, if we are to believe your neighbor—Connecticut.

For early in the history of our Nation, Connecticut claimed the northern fourth of Indiana, along with a sizable portion of other States en route to us. Had this claim been accepted, I would not be here today—at least not as Governor—for we would not now have the Democratic strongholds of Gary, East Chicago, and South Bend. And in Indiana and the Midwest, a Democrat has very few votes to spare.

But I did not accept your invitation in order to discuss partisan politics with you—as enjoyable as that may be here in a solidly Democratic State. Your State is noted for its zealous protection of individual rights and freedoms.

And in a very real sense, America's liberty began here in Rhode Island. Your forefathers declared their freedom from British rule 2 months to the day before the 13 colonies jointly proclaimed the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia. If liberty was born in the City of Brotherly Love in Pennsylvania, it was conceived in Rhode Island.

Since the days of Roger Williams, Rhode Island has been noted for its hospitality to those not in the majority: The Quakers, the Jews, the Catholics, and the Baptists—whose first church in America was built at Providence—and the Irish and Italians. Since its founding, Rhode Island has stood for the individual's right to be free for his freedom of conscience, freedom to worship God as he sees fit, freedom to think and speak and write as he chooses, and freedom to act.

These freedoms are being challenged today by the Communist conspiracy abroad and attacked at home by those who direct their venom at their fellow countrymen and see treason in differences.

Whether the challenge is a Communist thrust in the Congo, a revolution 90 miles off our shores, a tottering regime in Laos, or desperate peasants in Brazil—the basic issue remains the same freedom—the inalienable right of a man to be free.

Yet in this struggle, when the choice of the uncommitted is between the Soviet Union and the United States as the spokesman for freedom. * * * America has not been the overwhelming selection. Why has this been so? I do not pretend to know, but it is obvious that these nations do not see us as we see ourselves.

Are we today less able or less willing to advance the cause of liberty than were our forefathers who fanned the flickering embers of freedom into a roaring blaze that less than two centuries ago cast its first light throughout the world?

Do we today have any less the sense of mission, of urgency—yes, even of destiny—than did those men at Providence who declared Rhode Island free of British tyranny and backed up their words with action?

Today marks the 174th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States by the convention at Philadelphia. * * * the Constitution which has served as a bulwark of freedom and a model for many peoples seeking to protect their rights against the tyranny of the past.

While Rhode Island was the first of the colonies to declare its freedom, it was the last to accept willingly the yoke of a new government. * * * its reluctance perhaps founded on fear for the rights of the individual citizen. * * * a fear of trading the devil it knew, for the devil it didn't. This skepticism was good and healthy.

We now know, whether we live in Rhode Island or Indiana or Hawaii, that the choice was right—that through law, through our Constitution, through an orderly conduct of society not subject to the capricious whims of temporary leaders, lies our best guarantee of freedom.

And this is why we are so much concerned with methods and means, with procedures of law. For history has taught us, if it has taught us nothing else, that man's bitter and bloody struggle to be free is for the most part a battle for freedom from oppressive methods and means.

Justice Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court has enumerated a bare handful of these procedures around which have swirled the age-old battles: the right to be free from torture and hated oaths; the right to trial by jury; the right to confront the accuser face to face, and the right to know the charge and have a fair opportunity to defend ourselves.

And the Justice points out that our principles, our articles of faith, include our freedom to speak and to write freely, to worship God as we chose, the sanctity of conscience, the right to be let alone, and government only by consent of the governed.

These rights, these procedures, were hammered out on the anvil of time in the blistering heat of the forge of war. Are our arms now less strong, our eyes less keen, and our hearts less willing to defend these rights at home, where we won them first, or abroad, where the challenge is more open?

Almost three decades ago, one of the free world's greatest and most respected leaders. Franklin Roosevelt, said "To some generations, much is given. From some generations, much is expected. This generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

Those words are truer now than when our President first spoke them to a Nation reeling under the impact of economic collapse and desperate with fear and doubt. For today we are engaged in the terminal struggle with those who would destroy individual rights in the name of a higher good.

But make no mistake about it, while international communism in whatever guise it may appear is our principal and strongest antagonist, there are others here in America and scattered throughout the world, no less destructive of individual rights and freedoms. It is the evil attacking the rights of man that we have opposed throughout our history, and that we opppose so violently today, not the label it wears.

The howling jackals of suspicion who talk big and think small, who accuse of treason Americans with whom they disagree, and who slander their neighbors with cowardly whispers of disloyalty, are no better than the Communists they oppose vocally. And they are equally a menace to human rights and freedom. For they are within our gates, they walk among us in trust, and yet would destroy the shield of freedom that protects them as well.

These men and women go by a variety of names, and band together in packs sometimes public, but quite often secret and semisecret. They see our struggle with the ideology of the Communist world in the terms of a schoolyard fight, and they urge solutions unrealistic and oversimplified as their premise.

That they have a right to their beliefs and the full expression of them, we cannot and would not deny, so long as their advocacy is not destructive of the freedom of others.

Yet a leader of one of these organizations has announced publicly that his group will use every device and trick of the Communists, every front organization possible, to attack those whom in his belief are disloyal to his ideals. Germany and Italy have gone through such said experiences with these so-called superpatriots who pervert the ideals of a great nation to the mean and twisted fantasies of a fanatic fringe.

A policy advanced in good faith by officials is attacked as part of the Communist conspiracy. Departments of Government are labeled as untrustworthy and leading us into the hands of Communists. Not content to differ and discuss as honest men can, they seek to destroy the advocate rather than what he advocates.

Not satisfied with discharging their vicious venom, they seek to destroy the reputations of those who dare to differ. The libelous letterwriting campaign to impeach the Chief Justice of the United States for his opinions is a prime example of this activity.

But why should I spend these moments describing this small but cancerous growth within our own society, when the greatest menace by far is the closed, slave coalition controlled by the Soviet Union. I do this for the deliberate reason that we must recognize what we oppose, not the label it wears.

We have been menaced before, although never so seriously. A generation ago it was by the Fascists, now by the Communists. We personify our political devils. We convince ourselves that when the evil of today has been defeated we can return to our own affairs content that freedom is once more made secure.

Unhappily this has never been so, and unless mankind undergoes a most remarkable change, there always will be those who seek to enslave others, or restrict their rights. Rhode Island was founded because some colonists in Massachusetts were not content with their own freedom, but had to attempt to force their beliefs on others—on freemen who refused to accept beliefs as chains.

This description of the internal enemies of freedom and the rights of man, may help to focus our attention on America's true role in the world—a role we have had for almost two centuries. While it is today

more dangerous and more arduous to fulfill, it is not different.

For we are the leaders of the world revolution for the rights of man as an individual. We are the opponents of slavery of body or mind in whatever form and whatever found. We are the enemies, the first successful enemies, of colonialism whether it was British, Russian, or any other imperialism. We are the Nation that through generations has aggressively fought the battle for freedom * * * and on every continent of the world.

We have learned through the years that political freedom cannot stand by itself in the world. Empty stomachs do not form a solid foundation for human freedom. We know that destitute, starving peasants, uncivilized, illiterate natives of the jungle, and frightened, impoverished workers in the rice paddies on the borders of Red China see freedom in different terms than we. But they do see and yearn for freedom.

Throughout the world today there are the stirrings of millions of people submerged for centuries in grinding poverty, disease, and starvation. They look for help and guidance wherever they can find it, and if they are careless in the selection of their friends, who can blame them.

All of our national leaders, but perhaps most keenly of all, President John F. Kennedy, are alert to our need to meet the global challenge to freedom in all its aspects. They have the sense of urgency, of mission, and of destiny that we Americans must find again. Our leaders see our mission and plead with us to understand. But are we less concerned with freedom than our forefathers? Are we now content to drift into the backwaters of our times?

We bicker and quarrel among ourselves. Our leaders are attacked as being in league with the enemy. We doubt our mission and our resources to fulfill the challenge of history. We exaggerate our shortcomings and ignore our accomplishments. We seek to shop for freedom as though it were something to pick up at the bargain counter.

But freedom is not cheap. The price is high. And the question remains: Are we willing to see in time what is demanded of us and do it?

We believe in freedom, in democracy, in peace, and in that order. Let us then dare to do that which is required of us as Americans.

To support the friends of freedom wherever they may be—in West Berlin, in Latin America, in Africa, in southeast Asia. Let us have the willingness and courage to give full aid to those peoples and those governments which respect the dignity of man as an individual, which have the conviction that the rights of each citizen must be protected. And let us give active leadership and encouragement, as well as material help, to those emerging peoples who have not yet caught the full vision of freedom for themselves.

President Kennedy's bold programs for peace must have the support of all of us, not as Democrats but as Americans.

Further, and equally important, let us oppose those who would subvert freedom, wherever they are, at home or abroad. In this we can make our most direct and personal contribution. For whenever the full rights of any American are restricted or attacked, the image of America before the world is blurred and marred.

This is true whether these restrictions are because of color, or religion, or because self-appointed vigilantes seek to judge the loyalty of their neighbors. Here at home we can oppose every attack and every pressure on the fullest right of each American to speak, to write, to think and to worship as he pleases.

Let us say to all the world: Here we stand, for as long as God and history give us the heart and strength, we can do no other, for we are the Americans.

Berlin: The Tragic Legacy of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Berlin is today the focal point of the anxiety and aspirations of the entire world. It is there that we of the free world are being most sharply threatened by totalitarian communism. A tremendous political mistake placed us in our presently perilous position in Berlin. If we are to avoid the inevitable conflict that will follow similar political mistakes, we must resolve that firmness will prevail over the desire of some to accommodate the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to receive a communication concerning this subject from the Honorable Robert F. Rich, the beloved former Member of Congress who for so many years represented my district in north-central Pennsylvania with such great distinction. Bob Rich enclosed in his remarks a copy of a recent editorial appearing in the September 13 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, suggesting that its content would be of interest to the American people and to the Members of Congress in particular. I heartily concur—and I therefore offer the editorial for the consideration of my colleagues:

THE TRAGEDY OF YALTA

Secretary of State Rusk's apology to former President Eisenhower, for a State Department brochure that blames him for the isolation of a divided Berlin deep inside Soviet-controlled East Germany, helps belatedly to bring into perspective the enormous errors in Allied policy before the end of the Second World War.

The plain truth of this tragic chapter in history is that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the threshold of death, was so gravely ill in the early months of 1945 that he should have been in a nursing home instead of in conference with the crafty Josef Stalin at Yalta.

It is a thoroughly documented fact that Stalin, taking full advantage of the situation, emphatically insisted that his disastrous plan for the division and isolation of Berlin be accepted. F.D.R. too tired to resist, weakly approved.

The upshot of the monumental blunder at Yalta was that the Allies were sold down the river and the Western alliance remains burdened—16 years later—with the bitter fruits of a terrible mistake from which the cause of world peace may never recover.

History's sorry record from Yalta to the present day makes it painfully evident that Mr. Roosevelt, instead of grimly holding onto the Presidency, should have stepped aside so that stronger men could have taken the firm action necessary to translate the military victory of the Second World War into a victory for peace and freedom in the postwar years.

An amazing and shocking aftermath of this pitiful episode is that many persons who pretend to be well informed have continued over the years, and particularly during the political campaigns of 1952 and 1956, to twist the facts of history so as to make it appear that the Berlin debacle was the fault of General Eisenhower.

As the former President stated this week at his home near Gettysburg, and as he made clear in his book "Crusade in Europe" published in 1948, the fate of Berlin was a political decision made at Yalta, not a military decision of the Allied commander.

Secretary's Rusk's apology does not undo damage done by publication of the State Department brochure. This travesty of truth and justice should be withdrawn from circulation immediately and should continue to be withheld until appropriate corrections are made.

It seems to us that the State Department ought to be more concerned about finding solutions to the immediate and highly dangerous problems of Berlin instead of embarking on detours of historic distortion.

One need not go back 16 years to see the sad mistakes of Yalta. They are all too visible in the present Berlin crisis.

Isolating a divided Berlin far inside Communist territory is the basic error that still cries for remedy.

It is at this point, with this harsh truth in mind, that the West must approach the thorny task of negotiating a Berlin settlement. Pretending that a mistake was not made, or trying to push off the blame on the wrong party, is no help.

Perhaps one constructive result of the present controversy over who was responsible for the division and the isolation of Berlin will be a vigorous effort to correct the mistake within the framework of peace and freedom.

Resolution by Air Pollution Control Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, an acute problem which affects so many Americans and which has been mounting steadily is the matter of air pollution. Although considerable progress has been made to control this menace, there is dire need for national leadership if it is to be successfully conquered. Most important toward this goal is the need for coordination of the great technical and scientific advances that have been made in this field and to bring the best brains in the Nation together in a collective, all-out effort to reach a solution to this ever-growing problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Pollution Control Association, the national technical society in this field, has passed a resolution calling for a National Conference on Air Pollution this year or next. I strongly feel that such a conference, called by the President, will lend enormous significance and success to an effective air pollution control campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues in this House to back the objectives of the association's resolution and to join in urging the calling of such a conference. I commend my colleagues to this resolution:

Whereas the contamination of our Nation's community air supplies have become an important national problem; and

Whereas many public and private groups and associations are conducting activities directed toward the solution of this problem; and

Whereas a better common understanding of the goals, requirements and problems of

these many groups and communities would facilitate a more rapid solution to the basic problem; and

Whereas the Air Pollution Control Association has long supported all constructive efforts to further understanding of the causes and dimensions of the air pollution problem, and to provide an effective exchange of views and opinions relevant to its solution; and

Whereas these purposes were served in an outstanding fashion by the 1958 National Conference on Air Pollution, convened by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the Air Pollution Control Association does hereby urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Surgeon General to convene another National Conference on Air Pollution during the year 1961 or 1962.

2. That the Air Pollution Control Association extend its cooperation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the development of a suitable program.

Institute of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from a recent edition of the New York Times, entitled "Wide Scope Urged for Law Schools."

This article cites and describes the proposals of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School to establish several institutes of law to conduct research into a broad range of problems.

Dean Griswold referred to the problems of automobile accidents, of crime, of juvenile delinquency, of fair trial, of public service and of standards of the bench and bar. He also advocated establishment of an Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law.

There can be no question but what Dean Griswold's enumeration of certain extremely difficult problems should be carefully considered and acted upon by the Congress.

This Nation prides itself that it operates under the rule of law. Yet our efforts to improve the functioning of our system, our legal procedures and the development of proper organization and facilities to make the law more meaningful, effective and fair in its various legal, social, and economic aspects would seem to be feeble and unrealistic.

There are two schools of thought regarding the functions of the modern law school, one believing that it should train lawyers for practice, and the other feeling that it should give more attention to research and the training and development of legal teachers and possibly judges. There is logically no reason why our law schools, in the same sense, could not perform both functions.

Dean Griswold has pointed to several fields where, clearly, much research and work need to be done in order to implement programs designed to remedy and improve certain definite shortcomings in meeting the problem of world peace in its legal and procedural aspects, as well as in substantive terms.

For example, little or no emphasis is placed in current international relations upon setting up and utilizing truly justifiable methods of handling disputes between Nations.

All too often, we tend to give lip service rather than heart service to proposals to improve the very vital, judicial, international institutions which should be the real hope of the world for substituting the civilized instruments of argument, debate persuasion and use of legal and equitable principles and procedures for the present haphazard negotiation processes which are practically devoid of suitable guiding principles having to do with providing broader instrumentalities for achieving justice that should be readily available and usable by contending parties.

In this respect, the rule of law which we are supposed to cherish and develop to maximum usefulness is swept to one side in favor of rather superficially prepared and inadequately implemented personal negotiations leaving to individual or group negotiators functions that could best be performed by judicial or quasi-judicial bodies.

The same is true of automobile accidents, crime, juvenile delinquency, fair trial, public service, the standards of bench and bar, and other vital problems to which much study has been given with practically no discernible, organized effort to try to solve these great problems by the development of additional, effective legal and judicial procedures.

Most of these problems relate to social well-being as well as political and economic rights. The question of fair trial is of primary importance as is the question of fair hearing, whether before the courts, administrative bodies or congressional or other official committees.

The Congress is very properly giving great attention to certain medical and health problems designed to enable us to make more effective attack upon killer diseases and other physical, mental, or nervous ailments presently causing untold suffering, premature death, anxiety, and high expense and huge social costs.

As the dean points out, it is important to tackle these problems with some reference to the impact of law upon them and to develop effective instrumentalities for coping with many challenging social and economic conditions which are hampering peace settlements, promoting all kinds of confusion, delay, bewilderment and injustice in our relationships, both national and international.

I hope the Congress will give its attention to this proposal for creating and supporting several institutes of law which has been suggested by Dean Griswold and give encouragement and support, assidously and comprehensively, in several important fields where some improvement is so strongly indicated.

It is an ironical fact that the Soviet Government, through its Institute of Law of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, is working in these fields and this Nation cannot afford to be behind efforts made anywhere to try to step up the effectiveness of our own rule of law and system of justice.

Admittedly, the Soviet system does not see eye to eye with the free world on basic questions relating to personal liberty of the individual and the general question of freedom.

However, this is all the more reason why we should make sure that our system of justice, that our law schools and other agencies, working in the legal field, should be given every help in developing the new techniques needed to render more effective our entire system of dispensing justice.

I am deeply interested in Dean Griswold's proposals and hope that some program along the lines he suggests can be developed and supported by the Congress:

WIDE SCOPE URGED FOR LAW SCHOOLS—GRISWOLD CALLS FOR INSTITUTES ON SOCIETY'S PROBLEMS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School believes that American lawyers have a "restricted and self-centered view" of society's problems.

To counteract this, he has urged in his annual report, several institutes of law should be established in the United States to conduct research into a broad range of problems. He mentioned the maintenance of peace and ways of combating automobile accidents and crime and delinquency.

He also advocated establishment of an Institute of Foreign and Comparative Law, and suggested that the Harvard Law School was well equipped to operate such an institute.

Dean Griswold asserted that by concentrating almost entirely on the teaching of common law, American law schools contributed to what he called the United States isolation from the rest of the world.

LEGAL CENTERS CITED

He noted that a number of law schools "have come to call themselves legal centers."

But he declared that nothing short of institutes of law, doing research comparable to that being conducted in the natural sciences and medicine, could counteract the "great pressures in our law schools today toward a life which is more narrowly oriented."

Dean Griswold said that little was known in this country about Moslem or African law.

He said that this was also true about the law of India, Japan, Indonesia, and China, "particularly Communist China." Even though contacts may be limited at present, he said, "a university should be planning for the future."

He pointed to the Russian Institute of Law of the Soviet Academy of Sciences as an effort to deal with broader problems.

Last year, Dean Griswold said, the United States spent $8,400 million for scientific research, including defense research. In the same period he said, about $840,000 was spent by the Nation's law schools on legal research.

While concentrating on preparing their students for the severely limited number of clerkships in law offices, he charged, the Nation's law schools neglect both the practical needs of society and the student's idealism. Serving private clients, though important, is too much in the forefront of goals in the present American law school, he said.

He said that the problems of automobile accidents, of crime and juvenile delinquency,

of fair trial, of public service and of "standards of the bench and bar" were neglected.

"The problems of automobile accidents and of crime are surely as important to society, and no less difficult, than the problem of cancer," Dean Griswold wrote.

He asked whether, in addition to the thousands of persons devoted to the essential maintenance of defense, there should not be "at least a thousand working in and out of the Government in the manifold problems of the maintenance of peace."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 16, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

As adjournment nears, Congress adopted the usual procedure of pushing through, in record time, a backlog of critical legislation. This is not good government. There is danger of passing legislation without adequate debate and careful consideration. This 1st session of the 87th Congress has been marked by an unusual lack of direction and purpose. The House has met only eight Fridays since January. This week marks the first Saturday session. The Rules Committee fight held up the organization of committee assignments for weeks. The Federal fiscal year ended June 30 and here, at the middle of September, Congress has not yet cleared all the appropriation bills. Then on one day (Wednesday of this week) the House took the following action: (and this is only a partial list of Wednesday's business) approved the conference reports on military construction appropriations; State, Justice and Judiciary appropriations; Atomic Energy Commission appropriations Federal Assistanct to Airports Act; amending the Immigration and Nationality Act regarding alien orphans; expand and extend the saline water conversion program, and others. In addition the House passed a Public Works Appropriation bill in the amount of $3,662,548,500 and carrying increased public power projects, amended the Universal Military Training and Service Act, granted additional authority to the Export-Import Bank, amended the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, and on Wedesday and Thursday debated and approved the Peace Corps. Responsible government calls for responsible leadership in Congress and the orderly conduct of the peoples' business.

One victory was chalked up for the advocates of free enterprise. For the third time the House refused to approve appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission to operate the Hanford atomic energy project for the production of public power. The Senate amendment to include the public power facility was rejected 251 to 155. I voted against it.

The fight on the Public Works Appropriation bill was marked by efforts to expand public power facilities. An attempt to reduce funds for the Upper Colorado River basin and eliminate construction of transmission lines for the development of public power was defeated, 224 to 182. I voted to reduce the funds and eliminate the transmission lines. On final passage I opposed the whole bill. This is no time to be spending millions on public works projects when it is necessary to spend so much on military preparedness to meet the Communist plans for aggression.

Most ill-advised action of the week was approval of the Peace Corps (H.R. 7500) with a budget of $40 million for fiscal 1962. Two very disturbing elements in connection with this bill (1) the absence of guidelines for carrying out the purpose of the legislation and (2) in the 50-page bill Presidential power is outlined in 63 instances. This unlimited power given to the Executive is further depletion of the constitutional authority of Congress and moves us just a little closer to dictatorship (all decisions and actions controlled by one man). Example—on just one page the bill provides "That the President may waive, such provisions of the act as he determines to be necessary (including provision for loyalty oath) the service of a volunteer may be terminated at the pleasure of the President * * * the President may enroll in the Peace Corps * * * volunteer leaders." Additional startling examples of delegations of power: "The President is authorized to carry out programs in furtherance of the purpose of this Act, on such terms and conditions as he may determine * * *. The President may exercise any functions vested in him by this Act through such agency or officers of the U.S. Government as he shall direct * * *. The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination of Peace Corps activities * * *. The President may enroll * * * qualified citizens * * * under terms and conditions * * * which the President may prescribe * * * volunteers shall be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing, as the President may determine to be necessary," and so on and on and on. Congressman GROSS (Iowa) summed up arguments against the bill eloquently: "We have before us today a shining example of that for which Congress is becoming notorious—legislative approval of a pig in a poke * * * this latest international gimmick was spawned some 15 months ago on the basis of a $10,000 appropriation for a study of the feasibility of establishing a Youth Corps * * * today, this latest international boondoggle, without benefit of permanent legislation, without Congresssional scrutiny of program or plan, has already spent and initiated projects costing some $17,500,000."

The Peace Corps was approved, 287 to 97. In my opinion, we may regret the action. The project was too hastily planned, without adequate study, gives far too much power to the President, and no provision is made for adequately training and equipping personnel for the awesome responsibility we are asking them to assume.

In spite of my efforts to include funds for the Dallas Federal Building (approved by Public Works Committee—newsletter August 12, 1961) in the deficiency appropriation bill, the House leadership failed to do so. I will do all possible to have the funds put into the regular appropriation bill next year.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in my 21 years of membership in this body, today marks the first day I have ever served without having OVERTON BROOKS as my colleague. I am still shocked by his death.

Down through the years I learned to know him as a tireless, diligent, and devoted Member who always gave his fullest. Eventually he became chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, one of the most important posts in the free world.

Thus he was to leave this world as it stands at the threshold of the most exciting and meaningful challenge to man in history and this is a challenge that OVERTON shared.

I am not unmindful that his death has touched closely many, many others and accordingly I join with the other Members of the Louisiana delegation in expressing my deepest sympathies to his fine wife, Mollie, and to his lovely daughter, Laura Anne, as well as to the other members of his family.

Service on the Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am serving my 19th year on the Appropriations Committee. Believe me, service on the committee is quite an experience.

We hold hearings from 10 each morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, with an hour off at lunch—practically every day of the session. We attend to our other duties before and after, and by interruption.

Many of our constituents write us to obtain appropriations for public works projects and many other programs and, in the same mail, write us not to appropriate money.

Even our colleagues come before our committee, ask for appropriations in huge sums, and some frequently file a carbon copy of their statement with the committee, send the original to the press; then if we appropriate the money a news release is issued as to what appropriations our friend got and, of course, anything not obtained was the fault of that "old Appropriations Committee." All of this is OK, of course, under the rules of the political game. After all, those of us on the committee are no different. We, too, like to provide for those things in which we believe, especially when our people agree with us.

Actually, sometimes the inconsistencies are lots of fun to watch. A few years ago the Denver Post berated the committee for refusing to appropriate $2 million to eradicate bark beetles which plague that area—and in the same paper severely criticized the Appropriations Committee for "spending the Nation's money far too liberally."

I wrote the editor that while most people were for saving money, every section

had its "bark beetles" and when you added up the cost of meeting all of them the total greatly exceeded the national income.

Incidentally, when the justification for these funds was later based on protecting the watershed, instead of the almost valueless timber, funds were appropriated.

In my own area, perhaps the best example came when I made the successful motion to override the President's veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill in 1959. Most of the leadership of both parties were opposed to my motion, though for different reasons. After standing up to about a 2-hour fight within the Appropriations Committee, my motion to override the veto carried by a vote of 19 to 17. The Greenville Harbor project was saved; so were the Pascagoula and Memphis projects, along with about 60 other new starts.

When the House approved the action, the press carried smiling pictures of those leaders who had opposed my motion; and in the areas where I hoped for big headlines about my successful efforts, the press stressed the fact that in saving these projects funds for many other continuing projects had been slightly reduced, listing by name those which were reduced.

With all of that, I would not trade my place on the Appropriations Committee—where we take some beatings and where money is often appropriated for programs in which I do not believe—for any in the Congress. My membership on the committee which controls the purse strings means I am in the middle of the show and have a real opportunity for service. Certainly, my membership on this committee has contributed greatly in my own State to the Boll Weevil Laboratory, the Poultry Laboratory, the Soils Laboratory, the many flood control and watershed projects, soil conservation, REA, Extension and 4–H Club programs, the Greenville and Pascagoula Harbor projects, the Agricultural Conservation Program, and many others which I have been able to promote.

It may be that it is the President who makes appointments within the limits of the Civil Service law; it is the Congress, however, which makes appropriations and says what the money shall be used for.

I know my long-time membership on the Appropriations Committee has enabled me to help keep up our investment in our own country—before others give everything away in foreign aid. After all, our own country is the base on which all these other commitments must depend.

This year I am proud to say we provided increased funds for watershed protection and flood prevention, for domestic public works—including $70,725,100 in funds for the lower Mississippi, increased funds for the Big Sunflower, provided for additional surveys, increased funds for other Mississippi projects and kept work on harbor development going forward.

Whoever may get the credit, this investment in the development and protection of our country is absolutely sound. We must put our own country first.

H.R. 4333, a Bill To Amend the So-Called Lanham Trademark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by this opportunity to speak on my bill, H.R. 4333, to amend the so-called Lanham Trademark Act, and I urge its passage today.

This bill represents some 13 years of painstaking effort and experience in conjunction with the administration of the Lanham Act. The bill has wide support throughout the country among trademark owners, lawyers and associations of the bar including the U.S. Trademark Association, the American Bar Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Philadelphia Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers Association, and the Bar Association of the City of New York.

The purpose of this bill is to first, correct various typographical errors that appeared by inadvertence in the present act; second, clarify the meaning of several provisions whose language is inconsistent or obscure; and third, introduce some changes in procedural details that experience has shown to be desirable.

At this point it might be well to relate some of the history of the trademark laws of the United States which led up to the legislation now at hand.

Following the enactment of the Trademark Act of 1946, usually referred to as the Lanham Act, there appeared need for some revision in the statute. That was to be expected as its administration got underway. Work toward necessary revision began in 1948 when a group of lawyers, representing various bar associations, and the U.S. Trademark Association formed a group which was known as the Coordinating Committee. It consisted of representatives of some 26 associations. This committee held numerous meetings in Washington, Chicago, and New York and achieved substantial agreement on appropriate changes in the law. A bill, including proposed changes, was introduced in the 82d Congress as S. 1957. It became the subject of considerable study and of further suggestions from individuals, associations and Government departments. On July 31, 1953, a bill representing many such suggestions was introduced in the 83d Congress. That was S. 2540, and it was the subject of hearings before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on March 25, 1954. That bill was passed by the Senate, but no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

S. 215 of the 84th Congress was substantially the same as S. 2540. No action was taken on it.

S. 2429 was introduced in the 86th Congress on July 23, 1959. It was similar to the previous bills but did not cover all of the features contained in them. It was referred to as a "housekeeping bill" and was considered to be substantially noncontroversial. The various Government departments interested in the subject matter of the bill submitted reports of their views and, with the exception of certain technical amendments, there was no objection by the departments. S. 2429 was favorably reported on June 24, 1960. It passed the Senate but no action was taken by the House of Representatives.

My bill, H.R. 4333, is exactly the same as S. 2429 as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and passed by the Senate in the 86th Congress. The bill would make numerous amendments to the Trademark Act, none of which is considered to be of a substantive nature.

Subcommittee hearings were held on this measure on August 16th and no substantial objections to the merits of this bill were filed by any of the executive departments concerned. The full Judiciary Committee unanimously ordered this measure to be favorably reported to the House.

At this point I should like to express my appreciation to Mr. James F. Hoge, a distinguished New York attorney, well known in the trademark field. Mr. Hoge served as chairman of the bar association coordinating committee.

Mrs. Daphne Leeds, of Washington, D.C., has also been of enormour assistance to us. Mrs. Leeds is also a distinguished trademarks attorney and has written widely on the subject. She has served as Chief Administrator of the Registration provisions of the Lanham Act.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, it is the opinion of the proponents of this legislation that the bill does not affect the substantive provisions of the Lanham Act or of the trademark law generally. I realize that the word "substantive" is subject to definition and some possible disagreement, but the amendments are advocated as being procedural or administrative and corrective. They are commonly referred to as "housekeeping" amendments and they are designed to be just that.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying a tribute to the memory of OVERTON BROOKS, who departed from us no more than 2 hours ago.

OVERTON BROOKS was my friend throughout the period of my service here.

One only had to know OVERTON BROOKS a short while to realize that he was deeply dedicated to his country and to his district, and that he was wholly committed to their service.

The people OVERTON BROOKS served so long will miss his consecrated concern for their problems. The United States will miss the devotion which he paid her.

An Address Delivered at the Supreme Convention of the Order, Sons of Italy, in Washington, D.C., on August 18, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1961, at the supreme convention of the Order of the Sons of Italy, held in Washington, D.C., Dr. Joseph L. Lichten, director of the foreign affairs department of the Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, delivered one of the finest speeches I have heard on the subject of discrimination against minority groups in the United States.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE SUPREME CONVENTION OF THE ORDER, SONS OF ITALY, IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON AUGUST 18, 1961

Thank you very much Mr. Marcello, for your kind introduction.

Monsignor Pallotta, worthy supreme venerable, Dr. Manganaro, officers and members of the supreme lodge, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, friends, I come here to the supreme convention of your distinguished Order to bring you fraternal greetings from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Let me assure you that this is one of the most pleasant assignments ever given to me—not only because I am quite familiar with your worthy goals and effective activities, not only because the relationship between our two organizations is a long-standing and continuous one—I am happy to be here today also because during those years of contact and cooperation between our two organizations I was able to establish many new, valuable friendships and coming to Washington to address this gathering gives me the most comfortable feeling that I am visiting with friends. These friendships are most valuable because they have sprung from, and are dedicated to, a mutual understanding of our respective philosophies and objectives—to working together as two separate units, but toward many similar ends and with equal determination.

We believe in the principle of cultural pluralism, which assumes that each racial, religious, and ethnic group of Americans plays an important role in American culture. As a philosophy, cultural pluralism denies the assumption that there is one white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon American culture, fixed once and for all by our colonial ancestors. It assumes that our culture is variegated and dynamic, and that all immigrant groups have contributed toward its enrichment.

From this concept derives another one, which we in the ADL have learned from our experience of half a century. It is not possible to work successfully, to achieve positive results, for the benefit of one group only, whether racial, religious, or ethnic. Working for democratic principles in a democratic society, it is important to remember that every breach, every rent in this democratic fabric, sooner or later will react to the detriment of one's own group.

The Anti-Defamation League was established 50 years ago mainly to combat the anti-Jewish stereotypes, mostly on the American stage. Today, we are ready to join forces with and work for the benefit of any legitimate group, victim of prejudice and discrimination based on religion, color, or ethnic origin.

The concept of cultural pluralism as a theoretical basis and its practical expression in the desire and determination to assist those whose civil rights are endangered bring us nearer to the realization of the fact that we must work together for the common good of society. One of the most formidable barriers in our times has been the lack of appreciation of the common good as it applies not only to a single group but the community of groups which form the American society. The troublemakers in our society must finally learn that, above their petty, pseudo-common goods, exists the true common good, so clearly defined by Pope John XXIII in his recent encyclical, "Mater et Magistra." We are partners, therefore, in our work—sometimes even in our fight—for the good of the community, for the common good.

I hope that it is no secret to anyone now that the OSIA and the ADL will do battle together against the forces of prejudice and the evils arising from stereotyping and generalizations.

Once again, the issue of stereotypes and the defamation of minority groups in the mass media has become a source of aggravation and controversy. This is a question of not one television program, one book, one magazine article, or one column in a daily newspaper. The good name of the Americans of Italian extraction is being smeared, defamed by practically every medium available to those who, for a profit big or small, or for doubtful publicity, would not hesitate to do injustice to the Italo-American community. To quote a noted psychiatrist, it is a high time to learn from the clinic and from history that violence in fiction and in fact are not two totally separate worlds. Sparks may fly from the one to the other. Violence is not strength. If democracy does not do away with violence, violence may do away with democracy * * *. And the chief ingredient of some television programs is violence. Violence is being smuggled into our lives and the lives of our children.

With great satisfaction and relief we can state here today that, thanks to your ceaseless efforts, definite progress has been made in the fight against the unfavorable image of the Italo-American presented in television programs. Mr. Epstein, our national director, and I were present at the conference with the leaders of the major television network. We know that the situation has improved considerable since then. We can only admire and praise most highly the devotion and the skill of your leaders and your representatives.

Similar progress is underway in the newspaper field and, in view of your spectacular successes during last year, I am optimistic about the future.

But I know that this is only the beginning even in the TV and press areas. And prejudice in mass media represents only one aspect of the situation. You will probably soon start to survey the general community's attitudes and behavior toward the American of Italian descent, with an Italian-sounding name, in the field of education and employment, in resorts, clubs, and other places of social contact.

I have very strong doubts that the results of such surveys will satisfy you and me, who are engaged in fighting defamation and discrimination.

Our immigration legislation still belongs in the class of unfinished business. We see this when we compare the Italian annual quota with the British, Irish, or German one. Emergency measures are only palliatives—we demand a change in the basic law, which will treat justly each and every immigrant, regardless of the place of his origin. Above all, I am not certain that we were able to dissolve in the minds of some gentle people of prejudice the myth of the existence of a mafia and everything which goes with it—the dubious romantic connotations of a mysterious society of gangsters, dope merchants, and bootleggers. And all this creates an atmosphere of generalizations about and blame of the whole Italo-American community for the crimes of a few individuals, with inferences that Italians are all cut from the same mold and that individual differences among them do not exist.

We know that several studies have proved that proportionately Americans of Italian descent have committed fewer crimes than any other group of Americans of foreign stock. (Lawrence Frank Pisani in the Italian in America). We know "that the acts of the few have nothing to do with the basic character of the group or individual Italians, Jews, or whomever."

But do they know?

I have often wondered why this "foolish and distracting myth" returns again and again, in every generation, as an instrument of slander and prejudice against our co-citizens of Italian extraction.

Exactly 70 years ago in New Orleans the great controversy which has divided the community for such a long time started over the alleged activities of the mafia, and it seems that the lapse of seven decades was not sufficient to eradicate forever from the mind of every American the ridiculous assumption of the existence of the mafia in the United States. Perhaps more education, more information about the Italo-American community is needed to promote the change, different behavior and different attitudes. Perhaps vigorous action against the "villains of generalization and stereotyping" should be accompanied by an equally energetic program to disseminate information in order to create a proper understanding of the background, the history, and the present status of Americans of Italian descent—a program geared not so much toward the irrationally biased who instigate the practice of discrimination, as aimed toward those who follow the lead example because they don't know any better.

They don't know, for instance, that the Italians are not necessarily "new" immigrants to the United States, though they are described as such even in sociology books, that many came at a much earlier period, though not identified as Italian since the concept of an Italian state is of more recent vintage. Father Marco da Nizza came to this shore exactly 430 years ago, and after him Father Eusebio Chino, Enrico Tonti, and countless others.

Nor do they know about the tremendous contributions of the Italian immigrant as a builder of America. Even the great hero Garibaldi when he lived in this country worked as a simple laborer in a candle factory, owned by another Italian immigrant.

Permit me, however, to speak for a short while about more recent developments, within the memory of our generation—to speak about a topic again relatively unknown to the American masses. I feel that, speaking as the representative of a Jewish organization, I have a special obligation not to forget about the behavior of the Italian

people toward the Jews during the biggest tragedy in the history of my people, during the Nazi holocaust. This is especially important since I speak only a few days after the Eichmann trial has ended in Israel, revealing atrocities and brutalities committed not by one man only but by the whole Nazi gang. Our history in recent years has been too full of disillusionments and disappointments for us to fail to appreciate these manifestations of good will and brotherhood which the Germans termed ironically "their Christian and Catholic conception as it is inspired by the Vatican," although I fail to see even a trace of irony in it.

At a time when most of Europe lay under the German heel, when 6 millions of Jews were perishing in concentration camps and gas chambers, certain parts of the European continent were miraculously transformed into a place of refuge for the Jewish people. These parts were under the Italian jurisdiction. It was the Italian people who were responsible for this friendly treatment of the Jewish refugees; it was the Italian people who showed a sense of fairness and humanity toward the Jews.

Quoting a historian of that period:

"The credit is that of the Italian people, which is at bottom a humane and Christian people. From the simple gendarme to the general in command of a division, from the police agent to the head of a ministry, it was this Italian national character that made them put up a stubborn resistance against the orders which Germany tried to impose on them."

If one were to ascribe traits of personality which are more common to Italians than to other groups, if such traits exist at all, they are more likely to be found in the stubborn and noble refusal of Italy to act in accordance with the German regulations which meant annihilation for the millions of innocent Jewish victims—than in the slanderous television programs, gangster movies, stereotyping books, magazine articles, and newspaper columns, in the mythical and nonexistent mafia and mafiosi, in generalizations whereby a whole community is held responsible for the crimes committed by the few.

I enumerated at the beginning of this address some of the reasons why I am happy to be with you today, ladies and gentlemen, at the supreme convention of your order. There is an additional reason—to pay tribute to the great heart of the Italian people, known to us here in the United States so very well, because for the most part the relations between the Americans of Italian descent and of the Jewish faith have been excellent.

With the greatest of pleasure I have observed the growth of the order, the many new, admirable projects being added to your program, and the unusual vigor of your members and your leadership.

I read your newspapers, from the social news in your Philadelphia organ to Al Marcello's "Records in Review," in the OSIA News, despite the fact that I know very little about music. But Al Marcello, even in his musical column, promotes brotherhood and intergroup understanding. I have in mind his recent review of Myron Cohen's stories.

Naturally, I am biased in favor of your supreme venerable and your national committee on public relations because Mr. Gorassi was always present and helpful when problems important to all of us were discussed. On the other hand, the activities of the committee on public relations are closest to my personal and professional interests.

The accuracy and frankness with which the OSIA News reports to the order are, at least to my knowledge, without precedent and represent a real case of democracy in action.

I want to wish you a speedy success and to assure you that the ADL is ready to work with you until the last trace of this moral cancer, the prejudice against the Italo-American community, is eradicated from the life and mores of our country.

Mark Twain was once asked his opinion about a social group. Permit me to paraphrase his response—"Italians are human beings. Better than that I cannot say about them."

And I mean my paraphrase as the highest compliment to you.

Thank you.

Sgt. Andrew Miller: World War II Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last May I had the honor of speaking at the dedication of the Andrew Miller Memorial U.S. Army Reserve Center at Manitowoc, Wis.

This center bears the name of a Manitowoc County Congressional Medal of Honor winner, S. Sgt. Andrew Miller who made the supreme sacrifice fighting the Nazis during World War II.

The courage, devotion and love of country displayed by Sergeant Miller, who rose above and beyond the call of duty, should serve as an inspiration to us all in these perilous times when freedom is again under attack from a powerful foe.

Sergeant Miller was born in Manitowoc in 1916, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Miller. He entered service from the city of Two Rivers, Wis., in June 1941 and married the former Miss Mayme Jansky of Tisch Mills, Wis., in June 1942. He was transferred to England in August 1944 and participated in the invasion of France. He saw 36 days of continuous action with Company G, 377th Infantry Regiment of General Patton's 3d Army as it marched into Germany.

Sergeant Miller was awarded this country's highest honor for a series of heroic and almost superhuman deeds during 13 days of fierce front-line infantry fighting in France and Germany from November 16 to November 29, 1944. During this period Sergeant Miller personally silenced or wiped out six enemy gun emplacements and captured at least 29 prisoners in bitter house-to-house fighting.

On the first day, this valiant patriot was leading a rifle squad in France when his unit was pinned down by crossfire from two enemy machineguns.

Ordering his men to remain under cover and disregarding his own safety, Sergeant Miller crept into the building housing one of the machineguns and forced the five Germans manning the gun to surrender at bayonet point. He then advanced and tossed grenades into the midst of the seven-man crew of the second gun, killed two of the Germans and wounding three more. The remaining two decided to give up to this one-man army.

The next day when his platoon retreated under heavy fire, Sergeant Miller fearlessly remained behind. Seizing an automatic rifle of a fallen comrade, he ran into the fire of a blazing machinegun and exchanged bursts until the enemy weapon was silenced. His action gave his platoon time to reorganize and carry on.

"That was our closest call and that was Andy's bravest deed," a platoon member later said.

Two days later, after having crossed the Moselle River into Metz with great difficulty and heavy casualties, Sergeant Miller's company found itself without cover on a small strip of bridgehead as murderous mortar and machinegun fire rained down on them from a six-story enemy barracks directly ahead.

Sergeant Miller and three of his men pushed a wagon below a window in the barracks. Sergeant Miller was boosted through the window whereupon he promptly captured the six German riflemen in the room.

The rest of the company followed Miller through the window and, going from room to room, captured 75 prisoners while a number of Germans fled.

A little while later the very same day, Sergeant Miller volunteered with three comrades to try to capture the Gestapo officers who were preventing the surrender of the German troops in another building. After running a gauntlet of machinegun fire, Sergeant Miller was again lifted through a window. As he crawled inside, he found himself staring into the muzzle of a machine pistol, but, displaying remarkable coolness at such a dangerous time, he persuaded the four Gestapo men confronting him to surrender.

Early the next morning, the intrepid Sergeant Miller, who was often referred to by his men in a respectful and awesome tone as "Half-a-Platoon," once again took on the now familiar task of destroying a well-placed machinegun nest.

Although he was knocked down by a rifle grenade at one point in his advance, he climbed onto the roof of a nearby building and, despite this dangerously exposed position, he cooly took aim with his bazooka and scored a direct hit, wreaking such havoc that scores of Germans surrendered.

The following day he silenced another enemy machinegun and captured 12 more prisoners.

On the last day, Sergeant Miller's company, advancing up a hill, was pinned to the ground by surprise enemy fire. Sergeant Miller, however, stood up and with his squad pressed ahead.

Inspired by his leadership, the rest of the platoon followed, and one by one other platoons rose to meet the attack. As the citation reads: "The enemy position was smothered but at the cost of Sergeant Miller's life."

Capt. Herbert H. Hardy, commander of Sergeant Miller's company, said:

The German officers seemed able to give only one type of order, "Go ahead." Most

American officers and NCO's say "Let's go." But Miller invariably started things moving with "I'm going," and his men would follow his electric leadership without the slightest hesitation.

It is my fervent hope that Sergeant Miller will not have died in vain, and that all of us will take renewed courage and determination from the example of a hero who gave the "last, full measure of devotion" to the cause of freedom.

Mount Vernon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a letter which I have today written to the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, and chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, expressing my interest and concern regarding legislation which has been introduced in both bodies which will assure protection for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the home of George and Martha Washington.

Also included are copies of editorials which have appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin and the Westerly Sun on this subject, as well as several letters I have received from Rhode Islanders expressing their views on this legislation.

I am certainly hopeful that favorable action will be taken on these measures to protect the national shrine of Mount Vernon before this Congress adjourns:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express to you my deep interest and real concern in pending legislation, House Joint Resolution 459 and Senate Joint Resolution 97, which will assure protection for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the Home of George and Martha Washington.

As you know, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources has launched a nationwide campaign in support of these resolutions. I think you will agree with me, as a visitor many times to Mount Vernon, that it would be a shame to allow the obstruction of this view that has been preserved for so many years. I hope that you will do everything you can to have this resolution reported to the Senate and passed at this session of the Congress.

With warmest personal regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Member of Congress.

A SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANT OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON?

The fight to preserve open space in this country against misguided urban sprawl grows more sharp every day. Seldom are the terms of the conflict stated more clearly than in the struggle to preserve the magnificent vista from Mount Vernon on the Potomac from a further ugly and unnecessary intrusion of urban sprawl.

The immediate issue is a plan to construct a large sewage treatment plant on the Maryland shore of the river across from Mount Vernon. In itself, such a plant would be a monstrous intrusion on relatively unspoiled countryside. But its construction will open square miles of land to a rash of residential plats.

Pressing for the plant is a group of real estate developers. Now there is nothing wrong with the business of developing real estate to the profit of dealers and, presumably, to the long-term benefit of families which will move into the plats. And certainly, Washington and its satellite communities are growing fast.

But we simply do not believe that the need for housing in the Washington area—the Capital is about 16 miles from the site—is so great that it must be built at the expense of a magnificient national heritage, the vista from Mount Vernon which is as much a glorious part of the shrine as the home itself.

The trouble in the immediate situation is that the developers are pressing for a start on the plant. The Maryland agency involved is the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and the developers want it to use its power to condemn land to acquire the site opposite Mount Vernon for the sewage treatment plant.

Three bills are pending in Congress to enable the Government to acquire by gift or purchase about 1,180 acres opposite the home and to confirm deed restrictions on an additional 1,410 acres. But unless the bills are passed, there is every chance that a start will be made on the treatment plant.

The fight to get the bills passed is being led by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, which has owned Mount Vernon since 1858 and has maintained the structure as an historic shrine, a major target of tourists from all over the world. The association is wholly private, a public service organization.

The association has support, of course, including "sympathetic letters" from the members of the Rhode Island congressional delegation. But it needs the massed support of every American, particularly those who have been to Mount Vernon and know firsthand what damage would be done by the propsed development across the river.

These are difficult days in Washington as Congress tries to clear its docket of business and as the tensions of the cold war tend to distract public attention from issues of lesser size than the Berlin crisis. It is this kind of situation which is tailormade to the interests of the proponents of the treatment plant.

It is our earnest hope that every Rhode Islander who is concerned with preserving the national heritage will write to members of our congressional delegation, asking them to do whatever they can do in committees and on the floors of both Houses to get action on the three protective bills.

It will be an unhappy day for the Nation if the bills fail even to get to the floor. It is a shameful kind of progress which would destroy a significant part of the national heritage. Can't this Nation preserve from change in the name of "progress" a few hundred acres of land along the Potomac River?

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
August 11, 1961.

DEAR SIR: One more vote for passage of three bills: for the Government to acquire by gift or purchase 1,180 acres opposite Mount Vernon and to confirm deed restrictions on an additional 1,410 acres.

KATHERINE W. O'LEARY.

CHARM OF MOUNT VERNON ENDANGERED

Gen. George Washington, the first President of the United States, certainly had an eye for a good view when he acquired the land where Mount Vernon now stands. Located on the Virginia side of the Potomac River below Washington, it overlooks a vast expanse of river frontage and the green hills of Maryland beyond.

Mount Vernon has been preserved by the American people and for the American people as one of the Nation's greatest shrines. A walk around the grounds, among the gardens, and through the mansion itself takes one back to early historymaking years of our country. One can just imagine "honest George" and wife Martha, sitting on the wide front veranda enjoying a view unparalleled anywhere.

But this magnificent view—as much a part of Mount Vernon as the grounds themselves—may be doomed, unless the American people wake up to their possible loss and act immediately. A mammoth sewage disposal plant is planned for the opposite shore.

Maryland real estate promoters wish to develop this land into housing units for rapidly growing Washington and all its governmental agencies. This requires a large sewage treatment plant—plunk in the middle of Mount Vernon's view.

While the real estate men are exerting pressure for the purchase and development of this land through the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, there are three bills before Congress to enable the Government to acquire part of this land and restrict deeds on other land opposite Mount Vernon. Involved in either a gift transaction or an outright purchase by the Government are 1,180 acres of land across the Potomac from Mount Vernon. An additional 1,410 acres will have deed restrictions confirmed.

Many national shrines have been preserved throughout the United States. Others, such as Cape Cod, have recently been added to the list of beauty spots of America. Mount Vernon must be preserved with its peaceful charm of the 18th century.

It can be preserved—if all of us do our part. We suggest letters, telegrams, and postal cards to the various Representatives and Senators in Congress—particularly your own from Rhode Island and Connecticut—requesting prompt action on these bills now before Congress. We cannot afford to let the international situation pigeonhole these land purchase measures.

Write to your Representatives and Senators. Do it today.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., *August 1, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: As vice regent for Rhode Island of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, and its former Regent for over 10 years, I am writing to you to urge you to use your influence in all possible ways in support of the resolutions introduced in the Senate (and the House) for the conservation of the Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon, the home of George and Martha Washington. Senate Joint Resolution 97 (introduced by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Chairman, Senate Interior Committee) and House Joint Resolution 7852 (introduced by Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, House Interior Committee) are shortly I believe to be under subcommittee discussion.

The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Dr. Ira Gabrielson, chairman, has launched a nationwide campaign in support of these resolutions.

At present the view from the mansion across the Potomac is uninterrupted and

much as it was in General Washington's lifetime.

I beg your support in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HOPE PEARL HARKNESS.
Mrs. Albert Harkness.

THE RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
Providence, R.I., August 3, 1961.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was shocked to hear that Mount Vernon is threatened by a proposal to construct a huge sewage-treatment plant across the river which could be seen from Mount Vernon and from the parkway approaches to the property. I understand that it would also destroy the archaeological evidence of one of the most important Indian villages in the East.

I hope that you will support House Joint Resolution 459 introduced by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR and H.R. 7852 introduced by Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior Committee.

As director of the Rhode Island Historical Society and as a citizen of the United States I cannot believe that we have come to the place where we cannot protect the property which the ladies of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association have struggled so long and faithfully to maintain. I know that you will do your best to keep Mount Vernon a spotless shrine.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD P. MONAHON,
Director.

WESTERLY, R.I., *September 11, 1961.*

Representative FOGARTY, of Rhode Island,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to prevent a sewage disposal plant opposite our beautiful heritage, Mount Vernon.

Thanking you,

N. H. ANDREWS.

American Taxpayer Has No Rich Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, unlike the prodigal son who repented of his extravagance and returned home to be welcomed by his rich father, the U.S. taxpayer must continue to dig into his own pocket to support the extravagances of his Government. I am sure that most Americans will agree with the thought expressed in the advertising copy of the following advertisement by Warner & Swasey Co. in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report.

WHAT THIS COUNTRY NEEDS IS A COURSE IN ARITHMETIC

For years we have been pouring our billions all too casually all over the world, without even the most ordinary commonsense demand for reasonable commitments in return. We give vast sums to country A, who spends it not in America but in country B, competing with American firms and workmen. We "lend" countless sums to country C, and then forgive an important part of the loan.

We continue to pour millions into the laps of nations grown rich years ago, and only now timidly suggest they might pay their own bills—and almost apologize when they refuse. We give away billions and let those who get it decide how they want to spend it, knowing that much of it will be wasted or stolen, but being careful not to say so, for fear we would "hurt their pride."

And all of a sudden we're terribly surprised that we're almost broke. When you give away and waste more than you take in, what else can happen? Even the prodigal son knew that. But he had a rich father to go to—we don't.

We have been careless, prodigal, wasteful—and now we talk about raising taxes again, so that we can continue it.

What we need is not new commissions to tell us how to spend money, but some Government employees patriotic enough to save it.

Every American who reads his tax bill understands arithmetic—all too well. We'd better give a stiff course in it to the people who don't—the people who make that bill necessary.

The Betrayal in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial of the Charleston News and Courier titled "The Betrayal in Katanga."

Mr. Speaker, this editorial accurately depicts the latest in the continuing betrayals to which the United Nations is a dangerous participant. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Senator DODD, has called attention to the Nation of what is happening to our friends in Africa and elsewhere by Prague-trained Communists who are representing the United Nations in an effort to subdue the Christian, pro-Western leader of Katanga and others. It will be remembered that recently Tshombe was decoyed to a meeting in the Congo for a so-called conference where he was imprisoned in an effort to subdue his independence. The Communists in the United Nations know full well what it means if Katanga, with all its riches, is allowed to be free. It is no accident that the United Nations forces fighting Tshombe are made up, among other groups, of Nehru's Indians. Nehru has yet to give this country aid and comfort in the United Nations, despite the fact that he has not only requested but has received over $3 billion from the coffers of the U.S. Treasury. The tragic part, Mr. Speaker, of the U.N. conquest in Africa, is the guise under which the so-called United Nations expeditionary force was sent to Africa. This expedition was allegedly dispatched for the purpose of keeping order; instead, it embarked on a bloody expedition of terror, pillage, plunder, and murder. This action, with the blessings of Hammarskjold has brought the bitter denunciation of the Irish, the British, the French, and others. America's lone voice is quiet. Mr. Speaker, America cannot exist if we continue to liquidate our friends in this manner. The Congress of the United States should know now once for all that our national policy is reaping the whirlwind of defeat by a close adherence to the program of the United Nations in its effort to destroy every government who attempts friendship with America. Mr. Speaker, this is enigma in its ultimate:

[From the News and Courier, Sept. 16, 1961]

THE BETRAYAL IN KATANGA

One of the most tragic series of photographs to be published in a long time appears in Life magazine this week. It shows European officers being herded at bayonet point aboard U.N. planes at Katanga. Life scornfully refers to these Europeans as mercenaries in the pay of Premier Moise Tshombe.

So some of them are hired soldiers. Weren't the Flying Tigers, the American airmen who fought against Japan before the United States went to war, also mercenaries? And what were the U.S. citizens who enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force in 1940 and fought the Luftwaffe?

Americans should look past the smear word "mercenary" to see what is happening in Katanga, the pro-Western state in the Congo area. What's happening there is what's been going on since the end of World War II—the betrayal of the interests of the United States and its Western allies.

In the accurate words of U.S. Representative DONALD BRUCE of Indiana, the U.N. has "actively, by the use of force, been attempting to crush the independent state of Katanga led by the pro-Western, Christian, Moise Tshombe."

The ghost of pro-Communist Congo leader Patrice Lumumba must be laughing. Ghanian and Indian troops, operating in the name of the U.N. and financed by the United States, are busy destroying the only anti-Communist, pro-Western new African nation. They are strengthening the Leopoldville regime of Premier Cyrille Adoula, who openly declares he is not on the Western side.

"Our State Department supports this U.N. policy," declared Congressman BRUCE, "and so once again, we see the spectable where our money is used to destroy a leader who is Christian, pro-Western, and pro-freedom—in our camp—to build up and support a leader whose own words prove him to be in the pro-Soviet camp."

The Katanga, with its vast mineral riches, is a tempting morsel for the Soviet Empire. It is no wonder that the Communists are determined to put it under the central Congolese Government which they expect to fully control in the near future. Their expectations are grounded in reality. After all, the bulk of U.N. troops in the Congo are Ghanian troops. And only last month Dictator Nkrumah of Ghana spoke in Budapest stating his loyalty to the world Socialist ideal.

How will the United States win the war in which it is engaged with the Communist enemy when friends are alienated and betrayed, when aid is given the enemy at every turn? We do not know the answer to that question. We do know that the policy planners of the U.S. State Department make decisions that better serve the enemy than the American Republic.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our colleague, Hon. OVERTON

BROOKS, we have lost a statesman of rare foresight and stature. And my personal loss is indeed great.

OVERTON BROOKS was not only a valued friend, but a neighbor. For a quarter of a century he represented the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, which borders on the Texas district which I have had the honor to represent over a period of time. Our geographical proximity gave us many common problems. I know that OVERTON BROOKS represented his constituents with great consideration for their welfare and the welfare of the Nation.

OVERTON BROOKS was a man of vision. He gave up his position as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, which, as we all know, is one of our extremely vital committees, to become chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. This committee, under his leadership, has proved to be one of our most important committees. In recognition of his many contributions to the works of this committee, Mr. BROOKS was this year chosen as the Congressman of the Year in Science.

OVERTON BROOKS was a pioneer in space technology and we can honor him by carrying on the great work he began, continuing the battle to keep America first and strong.

It is with a deep sadness and loss that we mark the passing of our esteemed colleague and devoted friend.

First Catholic Slovak Union Votes Quarter Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada, with a membership of 103,000 held its 34th national convention during August 27–31, 1961, at the Hilton Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pa. The organization showed its great charity by voting over a quarter of a million dollars to religious institutions.

Fraternalists from my district were elected to supreme offices, namely, Edward Minarchak, West Mifflin, executive vice president; John A. Puhalla, North Braddock, supreme auditor; also, Paul C. Kazimer, Homestead, supreme auditor. John Sabol, supreme secretary since 1926 is a former McKees Rocks fraternalist. John Novotny, Joseph Wargovich and many others served on committees. Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., pastor of St. Michael's Church, known as the Steelworkers Church, Munhall, Pa., is chaplain of the Pittsburgh district of this largest Slovak organization in the world.

I am happy to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following article by John C. Sciranka from the Bethlehem Bulletin of September 1, 1961, setting forth the charitable deeds of this well known fraternal organization.

FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK UNION VOTES QUARTER MILLION

(By John C. Sciranka)

The 34th national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union held at a Hotel in Pittsburgh voted $125,000 to erect Sorrowful Mother Chapel at the National Shrine of Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C., and $10,000 for the Institute of SS Cyril Methodius in Rome to train priests for Slovakia. Five thousand dollars for the Slovak Benedictine Fathers and $20,000 for other religious orders making the entire total of quarter million dollars voted at the convention.

The 34th national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States and Canada was opened with pontifical mass at St. Paul's Cathedral, with Most Rev. John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh dioceses as celebrant. Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, DD., bishop of Gary, Ind., preached the sermon in the Slovak language. Over 500 delegates were present.

After the mass Bishop Wright was guest of honor at the luncheon tendered in his honor, where John Sabol, supreme secretary, presented him with the plaque honoring his great services to the American Slovaks. Over 1,500 attended the luncheon.

Bishop Wright responded by making a plea for the Institute of SS. Cyril, and Methodius in Rome, Italy. The institute is to train priests for future work in Slovakia, of which Bishop Grutka is sponsor and protector. Bishop Wright stated that inasmuch as "the national administration has sponsored a so-called Peace Corps as one of the most imaginative of its projects, such Peace Corps can do great good and we should pray earnestly for it as for all other idealistic ventures of our Government." Bishop Wright continued that "for centuries the church has sponsored the greatest peace corps in human history through its missionary program. Now comes the need for bringing back to the old world, including Slovakia, the faith one they gave us. Clearly divine providence gave us our blessings of political freedom not only so that we could keep the faith and practice it ourselves, but also so that we could share it with our kinsmen once the iron curtains melt and the ancient land of Slovakia is free again."

"We must cooperate," continued Bishop Wright "with the divine providence by generous giving of our sons and daughters as future priests and religious, but also of charitable gifts to the education program needed to prepare for the day when faith and freedom enter into their day again."

Bishop Wright pointed out very optimistically how the great-grandchildren of the Slovak pioneers in America will visit Slovakia as tourists or pilgrims to seek more information on their ancestry. "But we must train priests and help to establish the Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in the Eternal City," emphasized Bishop Wright.

Bishop Wright was given great ovation and Bishop Grutka thanked him for his enthusiastic endorsement of this great charitable move in the honor of Slovak apostles, whose 11th centennial will be observed in 1963.

The convention is planning for the observance of its diamond jubilee which will be in 1965.

John A. Sabol, supreme president, Phoenixville, Pa., thanked Bishop Wright.

On Tuesday evening Bishop Wright was guest of honor at the convention banquet attended by some 2,000 people. It was one of the greatest banquets in the history of the organization, which held its convention in Bethlehem in 1922 and was founded in 1890. John A. Sabol, supreme president, was master of ceremonies.

Joseph Demjan extended welcome on behalf of the Pittsburgh district. State Senator Leonard C. Staisey brought a message from the State senators, particularly those of Slovak and Slavonic extraction and those who have wives of this extraction. Senator Staisey is an American of Serbian extraction and he announced that he will give two scholarships to two students who are members of the organization.

Bishop Wright recalled that his predecessor, Bishop Phelan, was honorary president of the union and evaluated the program of the organization since 1891, when it held its second convention in Allegheny City, now North Side Pittsburgh, under humble conditions and circumstances. He then commented on the subsequent conventions in Braddock, Homestead and McKeesport, followed by the convention in 1918 and in 1940. The constant rise in assets and membership are to be commended.

Bishop Stephen Kocisko, auxiliary of the Pittsburgh Byzantine Rite diocese brought greetings from the exarch, Bishop Nicholas T. Elko, and praised the pioneers for their sacrifices.

Bishop Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., of Gary, Ind., who is of Slovak extraction was the principal speaker. His address was in Slovak and he reviewed his experiences in Slovakia, which he visited after ordination in Rome. He thanked Bishop Wright and American bishops for their support of Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome and pointed out that it will be a lasting monument of the American Slovaks and repayment of their debt to the country of their ancestry, which supplied priests to the first emigrants in America.

Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania John Trimarchi brought greetings from Governor David L. Lawrence, who was unable to attend.

During the banquet Pittsburgh Opera singer Roman Niznik and Miss Ruth Cotton gave operatic selections and the audience joined in singing popular Slovak folk songs.

All American Slovak fraternal organizations were represented. The organization is preparing to celebrate in 1965 its 75th anniversary. From the 103,000 membership over 55,000 reside in Pennsylvania.

On Monday morning Most Rev. William Connare, bishop of Greensburg diocese pontificated at St. Michael's Church, Munhall, where Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., extended greetings.

A large delegation attended the convention from the county. Joseph J. Krajsa, Allentown, is vice president for the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolution on VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution pointing out the value to rural and farm families of the Very High Frequency television channels—channels 2–13—through the wide-area service they deliver.

I have asked that no action be taken by the Federal Communications Commission to require any VHF facility to change to the ultra high band, and, thereby, deprive farm and rural families of high quality dependable service. In the State of Alabama many thousand rural and farm families in central and south Alabama would be deprived of all television service if the FCC requires Channel 12 in Montgomery to change from VHF to UHF. There would be far more deprived of information from the State Capital if this action were taken.

I have introduced this resolution in the sincere hope that more careful consideration can be given this measure and so that the Commission, in light of protests from central and South Alabama, will abandon its proposed intent to deprive the citizens of our State of their use of channel 12.

This resolution suggests that the Federal Communications Commission not take any action at this time until they have a chance to hear the results of the UHF experiments in New York for which the Congress authorized $2 million. And as a Member of Congress from a rural district, I oppose the Commission's taking this television service away from the farm families.

Clear-Cut Foreign Policy Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following timely editorial from the Indianapolis Sunday Star. I hope the United States can adopt a foreign policy designed to protect our own land before it is too late.

The editorial follows:

TIME HAS RUN OUT

Time has run out for the United States. The Soviet decision to resume nuclear testing has shown the bankruptcy of our foreign policy. President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk can no longer depend on the weak United Nations to solve America's problems. It has no major accomplishment to its credit, nor will it have under present conditions. It cannot resolve the Berlin crisis, except in our ignominious withdrawal. It cannot achieve nuclear or any other kind of disarmament. It has made a mess of the Congo, and promises to repeat the process elsewhere in Africa.

The United States must take the offensive in the cold war. It cannot do so if its hands are tied by its allies and if its course of action is blocked by the fear of offending the neutralists. We must abandon the pious hope that the Soviet Union will agree to a lessening of world tensions. We must forget the fantastic belief that Khrushchev will listen to world opinion.

Today we are confronted with brutal, ruthless power that will yield only to superior power. The United States has that superior power. We can destroy the Soviet Union, and Khrushchev knows it. We must call the Soviet Union's bluff on making Berlin a free city. We must match the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing by renouncing our own foolish ban against testing. We must stop attributing to the Communists the same ethical and moral values that dominate our own thinking.

Above all we must stop the upside-down policy of claiming our defeats are victories. It was no victory when we humbly sought negotiations on Laos, but we talked as though it were. Cuban patriots valiantly died on the beach of the Bay of Pigs while air cover was denied them, but the landing was a bitter failure—and we should have learned our lesson instead of glossing over our mistake. We were told the Communists were admitting a great defense when they sealed the borders of West Berlin, but the world saw only Communist strength in that illegal action.

When the Soviet Union announced it would resume atomic testing, Secretary of State Rusk said the Soviet disregard of world opinion "should sink in hard everywhere." Of course, the news reports are full of neutralist dismay over the Soviet action, but none of the neutralist countries has the strength to oppose Russia. Neutralist and world opinion won't help us and it won't hurt us. But our own failure to act as a great Nation will certainly destroy us if we continue on our present course long enough.

If we preserve the United States we will preserve the free world, and the neutralist nations as well. If we permit timidity and fear and the ideological beliefs of other nations to dictate our foreign policy, Communist victory is inevitable. And if we continue to dissipate our material wealth and economic strength in hundreds of unimportant places, instead of concentrating on the real enemy in the Kremlin, we shall lack the power as well as the will to stand up to Khrushchev.

Time has run out. We must act now. Not next year or next month but now. The United States must abandon its wavering, excuse-making, mawkish policy dictated by countries too small or too fearful to stand up and be counted. The time for President Kennedy to adopt an American policy is now.

Buckeye, Ariz., Approves $305,000 for a Demineralizing Plant for Water Supply Without Aid From U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the town of Buckeye, Ariz., has always been noted for its old frontier spirit of independence. It is a town made up of people from every economic strata; some quite well to do, some quite poor, many in between. It is a town with a great deal of civic pride and old-fashioned get-up-and-go. It is a town that loves to have a good time, as witness its anual Hellzapoppin Rodeo, which is one of the finest of its kind in the country.

Recently Buckeye has distinguished itself in a way which might seem unique to those who do not know the people of Buckeye. Because of the implications involved in the latest exploit of the people of Buckeye, I include herein a letter setting forth the salient facts from Mr. Ted Mauntz, editor and publisher of the Buckeye Valley News. This is a story which should be an inspiration and a challenge to all of the people of the United States:

SUNLAND PRESS,
Buckeye, Ariz., September, 13, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. RHODES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: This letter is written to bring to your attention a happening of outstanding significance (in my view) that probably has not reached you through the normal channels of news transmission.

Yesterday (September 12) the qualified voters of Buckeye approved by a 2-to-1 vote the town council's request for permission to issue $305,000 in water revenue bonds to finance construction of a demineralizing plant for the town's water supply.

The vote is of unusual significance for three reasons:

1. This is one of the very few occasions—if not the only occasion—in recent years that a community in the United States has undertaken a major civic improvement without asking Uncle Sam for a handout, or at least, partial financing. (The sum of $305,000 is as big to Buckeye's 2,300 residents as several millions would be to the average town of 25,000 to 75,000.)

2. Completion of the demineralizing plant (which will utilize the electrodialysis process) next spring will make Buckeye the first community anywhere in the United States to have its entire water supply desalted in a processing plant. This is of importance in view of the fact that the Federal Government has already spent several millions to build "test" or "research" demineralizing plants such as the one opened recently in Freeport, Tex., (wonder what Hurricane Carla did to it?) and others either under construction or projected at San Diego, Calif., and Webster, S.Dak. None of these, with the possible exception of that at Webster, is expected to process the community's entire water supply.

3. The bond election here brought out a record 95 percent of the qualified voters, 405 of a possible 428 having cast ballots. The vote was 268 for and 137 against. Under Arizona laws, voting in the bond election was limited to those persons who have resided within the town limits for 6 months, were taxpaying property owners, and were duly registered voters. That is why only 428 of the town's estimated 2,300 residents were qualified to vote.

At a quick glance, it appears that the ruggedly independent citizens of Buckeye may, by undertaking to bear the costs of a commercial desalting plant themselves, have put themselves in a fair way toward proving the value and feasibility of demineralizing saline water without resorting to Federal aid and at a cost much, much lower than the Government research plants built and a-building around the country.

I thought you might be interested in these facts and observations.

Yours sincerely,

TED MAUNTZ,
Editor and Publisher, Buckeye Valley News.

Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1961, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Will Maslow of the American Jewish Congress to the editor of the New York Times. This letter, which appeared in the Times of May 21, 1961, urged the ratification of the Genocide Convention of the United Nations and deplored the fact that while 64 Nations have ratified the convention, the United States has not. I am in full agreement with Mr. Maslow's position.

Genocide has always shocked mankind, but warnings have not been heeded. With the weapons that modern science

has placed in our hands, we have come to a time when the ratification of the Genocide Convention is imperative. No longer can we procrastinate. A man sat recently in a glass booth in an Israeli courtroom. Had the booth been a mirror, rather than clear glass, the man could have seen his own reflection and known that the crime of Adolf Eichmann was the crime of mankind. For the first time in history, the means exist to help wipe out the scourage of genocide; the Genocide Convention must be utilized.

On December 11, 1946, the United Nations declared genocide to be a crime under international law and established the right of intervention in behalf of minorities destined for destruction. The United Nations Resolution No. 96 also called for a "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." Although the United States did become a signatory state on December 11, 1948, we still have not deposited any instrument of ratification. The Genocide Convention has been in force since January 12, 1951, 90 days after 20 Nations had either ratified or acceded, as provided by the convention. Since then, 44 other Nations have ratified the convention, including the Soviet Union. The United States now occupies a conspicuously poor position as regards the convention.

Many criticisms have been hurled at the provisions of the convention, but under careful analysis they do not stand up. Perhaps the most frequent criticism concerns the Constitution and the treaty-making powers of Congress. Oliver Schroeder, a faculty member of the Western Reserve University School of Law has done extensive research on this question. He concludes:

The Genocide Convention does satisfy the constitutional requirements as a proper exercise of the treaty-making authority: Its subject matter is international, it does not clash with any specific or fixed provision of our Constitution; it merely redefines the highly flexible boundary between Federal and State jurisdictions * * *; it rests on the judicial and legislative precedents of many decades which permit Federal protection of human rights including security from violence.

He further states:

Article I, section 8, grants constitutional validity to a Federal statute providing for trial and punishment, domestically and internationally, of persons accused of the new world crime of genocide.

It is hoped that Mr. Schroeder's research will allay any fears still lingering concerning the effect of the ratification on our Constitution.

The Convention received Executive endorsement when President Truman stated in a letter to the Senate on June 16, 1949:

America has long been a symbol of freedom and democratic progress to peoples less favored than we have been and * * * we must maintain their belief in us by our policies and our acts. By the leading part the United States has taken in the United Nations in producing an effective international legal instrument outlawing the world-shaking crime of genocide, we have established before the world our firm and clear policy toward that crime. By giving its advice and consent to the ratification of this convention, which I urge, the Senate of the United States will demonstrate that the United States is prepared to take effective action on its part to contribute to the establishment of the principles of law and justice.

President Truman has considered in this letter two important points which must be recognized. The first is that the United States took a large part in the drafting of the convention during the United Nations sessions; yet, when it came time to ratify the convention, the United States was conspicuously absent. The second point, and most important, is that the United States must play a leading role if genocide is to become extinct.

The United States must accept the obligation of taking the lead in furthering principles of freedom and justice. As Dean Rusk, then Deputy Under Secretary of State, said in 1950:

It is an inescapable fact that other nations of the world expect the United States to assert moral leadership in international affairs. The United States has a record of humanitarian diplomacy beginning with the early days of the Republic * * * prevailing international conditions make it imperative that the United States continue to play this role. We all know too well that millions of human beings are still subjected to the domination of ruthless totalitarian regimes, and that the spector of genocide still haunts mankind. It should be made clear to such governments that the United States and other civilized countries do not condone such conduct now any more than in the past.

Rusk's speech is as timely today as it was in 1950.

The ideas of Dean Rusk were also the conclusions of Robert B. Patterson, a member of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations Genocide Convention. He asserts the following principles:

The mass destruction of human beings according to groups on lines of nationality, race, or religion has been an abominable evil, an evil that has shocked the conscience of mankind. That it is of grave international concern because it is the concomitant of aggression against other nations; because it arouses the most deep-seated resentment in members of the group that are persecuted; and because it causes wholesale dislocations of people and the problems of caring for those people by neighboring states. That it calls for collective action by the family of nations. And that it calls for leadership, moral leadership, on the part of the United States.

Peoples of all religions lend their support to the ratification of the Genocide Convention. Jacob Blaustein, president of the American Jewish Committee testified in 1950:

First, and dwarfing all other considerations, is the fact that genocide is the most appalling crime in all recorded history. It was practiced in centuries prior to the recent excesses of the Nazis, and can occur again. Second, genocide destroys economic, cultural, and spiritual values and debases mankind. Third, genocide is a threat to the peace of the world. Fourth, the present convention, when ratified, will serve as an effective deterrent. Fifth, the Genocide Convention not only fills a gap in international law, but is fully consistent with international legal precedent and with American constitutional principles. Sixth, there is need for prompt U.S. action on this question in order to discharge our responsibilities as the foremost advocate of international morality.

The Catholic Association for International Peace endorsed ratification saying:

The position which the United States holds in the world affairs today, and in particular our belief in the good and the right, obliges us to take whatever steps we can in the defense of humanity. This occasion to ratify a convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide is a unique opportunity for us to act upon the principles by which we claim to live.

At the same time the Provincial Elders Conference, executive board of the Moravian Church in America, stated:

We further believe it is the duty of the United States to take the lead wherever possible in upholding the highest ethical and moral standards for national and international conduct.

The labor movement also came out for the ratification of the Genocide Convention. In a letter to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1950, James Carey, then secretary-treasurer of the CIO wrote:

Mass destruction of national, racial, and/or religious groups shakes the conscience of mankind and inflicts great loss on humanity. Labor suffers from this crime whether it is inflicted by Nazi, Communist, or Fascist regimes. The term applied to these sufferings is genocide. We have urged and shall continue to urge Senate approval of the Genocide Convention adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

It is difficult to contemplate something so shocking as the crime of genocide. Genocide grows like a poisonous fungus, pulling man down to the level of mere animals. God has endowed man with the ability to think; but it is man's responsibility to use this gift. We cannot shirk our responsibility; we must use it to destroy a blight which casts a shadow on the face of mankind. I urge each Member of this body and each citizen of the United States to give careful consideration to this most urgent matter.

Decisions in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the RECORD of September 13, 1961, page A7197, the Veterans' Administration will be required, pursuant to Public Law 87-97, effective January 1, 1962, to make findings of fact and conclusions of law when the Board of Veterans' Appeals renders a decision on a veteran's claim. The committee, in obtaining the services of law students, was trying to get a fresh and different approach to this entire question. I think Members will agree our purpose has been accomplished in this regard and at the very nominal cost of $15 for each opinion. The committee is indebted to these students and the various law schools for their cooperation.

Under unanimous consent I include as part of my remarks one individual case in three separate columns to indicate the subject matter involved:

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

STATEMENT OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

Issue

1. Restoration of service connection for thrombophlebitis, left leg.

Military medical records

July 6, 1942: Induction examination shows varicose veins, lower abdomen and scar, appendectomy.

March 19, 1943: Admitted to station hospital following examination for oversea service, with a diagnosis of thrombophlebitis, chronic, femoral vein, left, with partial obstruction and varicosities, abdominal veins, lower, severe.

April 27, 1943: Veteran given CDD from Army by reason of thrombophlebitis, chronic, left and varicosities, lower abdominal veins, severe, on basis of history given by veteran that he had developed a thrombophlebitis following appendectomy. Service department held that the conditions existed prior to service and not aggravated by such service.

Veterans' Administration medical records

April 24, 1945: Initial examination by the Veterans' Administration for compensation: History given of having developed phlebitis after appendectomy. Veins in abdominal wall became much larger after induction into service, veteran stated he had had no treatment since discharge. Examination revealed mild residuals thrombophlebitis of left leg and moderately varicosed veins, abdomen, nonsymptomatic.

October 21, 1946: Veteran reexamined in connection with his claim. He complained of swelling in left leg, after standing or walking for 1 to 2 hours. Examination of the left lower extremity showed diffuse enlargement, mild due to hyperplasia of subcutaneous tissues secondary to chronic thrombophlebitis, sequel to appendectomy. There was some tenderness to pressure over medial aspect of the left thigh, along the course of great saphenous vein. No cyanosis, discoloration, ulceration, or induration. He was also shown to have varicose veins of the abdomen, with evidence of collateral circulation as the result of obstruction of the left femoral vein.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS,
May 8, 1961.

Appellant represented by the American Legion.

The issue

The appeal was timely filed, and is properly before the Board, from the rating action of the office at St. Petersburg, Fla., which severed service connection for thrombophlebitis of the left leg and continued the denial of service connection for varicose veins of the abdomen. It is contended that the disability of the left leg and the varicosities were aggravated during service.

The evidence

(The veteran) served from July 1942 to April 1943. An appendectomy scar and varicose veins of the lower abdomen were noted at induction. He was hospitalized in March 1943 for observation as a result of an examination for oversea duty. It was reported for clinical purposes that a few days following an appendectomy, 6 years prior to service, the veteran developed pain in the left leg which was associated with chills and caused him to remain in bed for 1 month; when he became ambulatory the left leg became swollen and then some time later he noticed marked enlargement of the veins of the lower abdomen; his civilian physicians had advised him to avoid all possible trauma to the abdominal area; he had had no symptoms in service and had carried out all his assignments except commando training, which he avoided through fear of trauma. On examination there was slight pitting edema of the left leg, without varicosities, and large varicosities of the lower abdomen. Because of possibility of injury to the exposed area, he was discharged on a certificate of disability on account of thrombophlebitis with some obliteration of the left femoral vein, held by the service department to have existed prior to service and not to have been aggravated thereby.

A claim for compensation was submitted in February 1945 and reference was made to phlebitis and varicose veins prior to service. When examined in April 1945, the veteran stated he had phlebitis, from which he never completely recovered, prior to service. On examination the left leg was slightly enlarged and mild residuals of thrombophlebitis of the left leg was diagnosed. The varicose veins of the abdomen were described as being nonsymptomatic and moderate in size. Another postservice examination report is of record.

George Seiken, M.D., performed an appendectomy prior to service, which was complicated by phlebitis of a lower extremity and incapacity for a period of time.

Service connection, by aggravation, was granted for thrombophlebitis of the left leg, but on later review such action was held to be clearly and unmistakably in error and service connection was discontinued. Service connection has been denied for varicose veins of the abdomen.

Laws and regulations

Service connection is warranted for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty during active service (38 U.S.C. sec. 310).

Volume 38, Code of Federal Regulations, section 3.105 provides that service connection, once granted, may not be severed except on a basis of clear and unmistakable error.

Discussion and evaluation

Varicose veins of the abdomen were noted at induction and no symptoms thereof were reported during service other than a description as to their size. The notation at induc-

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

This is a proceeding instituted pursuant to VAR 1105(D) to sever service connection for thrombophlebitis of the veteran's left leg. The issues for decision are: (1) Whether the regional office used the proper regulation for these proceedings; (2) whether the evidence establishes that service connection for the veteran's preservice thrombophlebitis, on the basis of aggravation, is clearly and unmistakably erroneous.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Decision of regional office after review of appeal and evidence

1. The evidence or record does not substantiate the veteran's claim that service connection by way of aggravation of thrombophlebitis, left leg should be restored.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

tion, the recorded clinical data during and after service, the statement of Dr. Seiken and other evidence of record clearly and unmistakably establish the existence of thrombophlebitis of the left leg prior to service. Other than slight swelling of the leg no symptom was reported during service. The disability did not interfere with the veteran's performance of military duties and was discovered on routine examination for oversea shipment. It is also noted the veteran was discharged from service because of possible trauma to the abdominal area which would have aggrevated the preexisting disability.

Findings of fact

1. Thrombophlebitis of the left leg clearly and unmistakably existed prior to service.
2. There clearly and unmistakably was no increase in severity or aggravation of the thrombophlebitis during service.
3. Severance of service connection, by aggravation, for thrombophlebitis was not based on a difference of opinion.
4. Abdominal varicosities existed prior to service.
5. There was no increase of severity or aggravation of the abdominal varicosities during service.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

Findings of fact

After consideration of all the evidence of record, I hereby make the following findings of fact:

The veteran was inducted for military service on July 6, 1942. It was noted in his induction examination on the last-mentioned date that the veteran had varicose veins on the lower part of his abdomen and that he had a scar from an appendectomy. The veteran was not examined again until he was asigned for oversea duty. Following this examination, he was sent to a hospital, where on March 19, 1943, an examination revealed that he was suffering from chronic thrombophlebitis in his left leg, with partial obstruction, and from severe varicosities of the lower abdominal veins. Because of this condition, the veteran was discharged from military service on April 27, 1943. During the discharge proceedings the veteran stated that he had developed a thrombophlebitis condition following an appendectomy prior to service. On the basis of this evidence, a military service department concluded that the thrombophlebitis condition and varicosities had existed prior to service, and therefore, were not aggravated by military service.

After his discharge the veteran filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration for service connection of his condition on the grounds of aggravation during military service. The veteran submitted with his claim a statement of his private physician, in which it was said that the veteran had had an appendectomy prior to service, and that the operation was complicated by phlebitis of the lower extremity. On April 24, 1945, an examination by the Veterans' Administration revealed thrombophlebitis of the left leg and varicosed veins in his abdomen. On the last-mentioned date the veteran stated that the veins in his abdominal wall had become much larger after his induction. On the basis of this evidence, the regional office granted service connection for thrombophlebitis on the basis of aggravation of that condition during military service; the disability rating given was 10 percent.

The veteran was examined again on October 21, 1946, at a Veterans' Administration hospital. He complained of swelling in his left leg after standing or walking for 1 to 2 hours. Enlargement due to hyperplasia in the subcutaneous tissues in his left leg were found as a result of the thrombophlebitis. Otherwise, the findings in this examination were the same as previously noted on April 24, 1945.

The regional office in November 1959 proposed severance of service connection for the veteran's condition, pursuant to VAR 1105(D). It was determined in the proposal that the thrombophlebitis condition existed prior to service and had been diagnosed by the veteran's physician as having been a part of and a residual of an appendectomy performed prior to service. The central office concurred in this proposal and the veteran was informed of the proposed action.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

When the veteran submitted no additional evidence to show aggravation, the regional office, pursuant to VAR 1105(A), severed service connection for the veteran's thrombophlebitis on September 30, 1960.

On January 4, 1961, the veteran brought this appeal from the decision of the regional office.

Opinion

The principal issues for decision in this case are: (1) Whether the regional office used the proper regulation for these proceedings; (2) whether the evidence establishes that service connection for the veteran's preservice thrombophlebitis on the basis of aggravation is clearly and unmistakably erroneous. The issues will be discussed separately.

(1) Regulations: The applicable Veterans' Administration regulation, initially applied by the regional office, to determine whether service connection of the veteran's disability should be severed, is VAR 1105(D) quoted in the margin.[1] However, when the veteran failed to submit additional evidence, the regional office took action under VAR 1105 (A).[2] The veteran contends that since a difference of opinion is involved in all questions of aggrevation, and since the opinion of the rating board differed from the opinion of the board which originally granted the veteran service connection, the proper regulation, which should have been applied, is VAR 1105(B).

As I interpret these regulations, VAR 1105 (D) is the proper section for severance of service connection, previously granted. That section specifically states the requirements which must be met before service connection may be severed. VAR 1105(A) is applicable to issues which have been previously determined in a decision which is now final; although this section states that it is applicable to service connection, this is to be interpreted as meaning issues of service connection, other than severance, which is clearly provided for in VAR 1105(D). However, the fact that the regional office took final action under VAR 1105(A) was not prejudicial to the veteran. These proceedings were instituted under VAR 1105(D) and the veteran, as provided in that section, was given the opportunity to submit additional evidence. Also, under both VAR 1105(D) and VAR 1105(A), clear and unmistakable error must be shown in order to sever service connection of the veteran's disability.

I hold, therefore, that the proper regulation be applied in this case is VAR 1105(D), and that although action was taken under VAR 1105(A), no prejudice to the veteran

---

[1] VAR 1105(D). *Severance service connection:* Service connection will be severed only where evidence establishes that it is clearly and unmistakably erroneous (the burden of proof being upon the Government.) A change in diagnosis may be accepted as a basis for severance action if the * * * proper medical authority certifies that, in light of all accumulated evidence, the diagnosis on which service connection was predicated is clearly erroneous * * *. When severance of service connection is considered warranted, a rating proposing severance will be prepared setting forth all material facts and reason and submitted to the central office for review without notice to claimant or representative * * *.

[2] VAR 1105(A). *Error:* Previous determinations on which an action was predicated, including decisions of service connection * * * will be accepted as correct in the absence of clear and unmistakable error. Where evidence establishes such error, the prior decision will be reversed or amended * * *.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

resulted. In view of the foregoing, it is unnecessary to discuss the veteran's contention concerning VAR 1105(B).

(2) Severance: The induction examination of the veteran revealed that he was suffering from varicose veins in the lower abdomen, and the veteran admitted that he contracted a thrombophlebitis condition prior to entering service. Thus, the presumption of sound condition, provided for in title 38, United States Code, section 311, is inapplicable to this case. Also, there is no evidence that the regional office obtained a certification of a change in diagnosis of the veteran's physical condition as grounds for severance. Thus, the issue for determination is whether, pursuant to VAR 1105(D), the evidence of record establishes that service connection for thrombophlebitis upon the basis of aggravation [3] of a preservice condition is clearly and unmistakably erroneous.

The regional office determined that service connection for the veteran's disability on the basis of aggravation was clearly and unmistakably erroneous because the veteran admitted that he contracted thrombophlebitis several years prior to his induction, as evidenced by the testimony of his private physician. The veteran, on the other hand, contends that since thrombophlebitis was not noted in his induction examination, and that since he went through the usual rigors of military training, his preservice thrombophlebitis was aggravated during military service. He also points to the fact that any varicosities which he had upon the time of induction were not considered disabling, whereas, after 9 months of service, he was suffering from a disability for which he was discharged. I turn, therefore, to a consideration of the evidence of aggravation.

In defining aggravation, title 38, United States Code, section 353 provides—

"A preexisting injury or disease will be considered to have been aggravated by active military * * * service, where there is an increase in disability during such service, unless there is a specific finding that the increase in disability is due to the natural progress of the disease."

The evidence clearly establishes that there was an increase in disability during the veteran's military service. In his induction examination the veteran was diagnosed as having only varicosities of the lower abdomen, which apparently were not disabling. Then, 9 months later, a condition of phlebitis of the left leg was diagnosed, for which the veteran was discharged.

Whether this change in the veteran's condition was due to aggravation of his preservice phlebitis condition during military service or to natural causes is not the determinative issue in this case. The question is whether the evidence of record establishes that service connection of this condition on the basis of aggravation is clearly and unmistakably erroneous. There is substantial evidence upon which a finding of aggravation of the preservice condition during military service could reasonably be made. The veteran's condition increased in 9 months from a nondisabling varicosis to a disabling condition of chronic thrombophlebitis. During this period the veteran apparently went through basic training, and it is well established that prolonged standing and heavy work will aggravate conditions of varicose veins and phlebitis.[4] In this respect, it was noted in an examination on October 21, 1946, that the veteran complained from swelling in his legs as a result of standing for a few hours.

---

[3] For compensation on the basis of aggravation, see 38 U.S.C. 310.

[4] See 2 Gray, "Attorneys Textbook of Medicine," secs. 75.01 and 187.33 (3d ed., 1960).

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Conclusions of law

(1) Service connection for thrombophlebitis of the left leg was clearly and unmistakably erroneous, within the meaning of 38 C.F.R. 3.105, and may not be restored.

(2) Service connection for varicose veins of the abdomen is not warranted under the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 310.

Decision

The appeal is denied.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

Evidence on the other hand establishes that the veteran contracted phlebitis after an appendectomy performed prior to his entering service. The veteran also stated at the time of his discharge that he had previously, before his induction, suffered from thrombophlebitis.

In view of the conflicting evidence of the cause of the increase in the veteran's thrombophlebitis between the time of induction and 9 months thereafter, I cannot agree with the regional office that the evidence establishes clear and unmistakable error in continuing service connection of the veteran's disability on the basis of aggravation during military service. I consider significant the fact that no condition of phlebitis was diagnosed in the veteran's examination and the probability that physical training during military service aggravated the veteran's condition. I conclude that the regional office was in error in determining under VAR 1105(D) that service connection was clearly and unmistakably erroneous on a basis of aggravation. The evidence as a whole does not support such an ultimate finding.

Conclusions of law

After consideration of all the evidence of record, and in view of the foregoing, I make the following conclusions of law:

(1) That the applicable regulation to determine whether service connection of the veteran's disability should be severed is VAR 1105(D), and that the veteran suffered no prejudice as a result of the regional office's taking action under VAR 1105(A).

(2) That the veteran was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and that the veteran at the time of his induction was suffering from varicosities, phlebitis, and thrombophlebitis.

(3) That there was an increase in the veteran's condition of thrombophlebitis during military service, and that there was substantial evidence upon which the agency, which first considered the veteran's service connection claim, could reasonably make a finding of aggravation during military service of the veteran's preservice condition.

(4) That in light of the conflicting evidence, the Government has not sustained its burden in proving that service connection of the veteran's disability is clearly and unmistakably erroneous.

(5) That, therefore, the regional office erroneously severed service connection for the veteran's thrombophlebitis, 10 percent disabling, and that service connection of that condition should be reinstated.

Appendix

Administrator James E. Webb, of National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Provides Inspired Leadership; Addresses West Virginia Kiwanis Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was the good fortune of the West Virginia Kiwanis Convention last night to have as the annual banquet speaker at beautiful Blackwater Lodge the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The program, with stimulating speakers and wholesome group participation, ended today for the 421 Kiwanians and their wives who were registered for the convention. They represented 52 of the 58 clubs of West Virginia having a total membership of over 2,850.

J. Kenton Lambert, of Parsons, is the capable district governor for the clubs of the State. He was active in carrying out the successful convention. Dr. Vernon Duckwall, of Elkins, was the effective convention chairman. Arnett Baughman, of Phillippi, was the busy program chairman. My cherished friend and fellow townsman, Gordon Barrick, was among the many persons who contributed and cooperated for the worthwhile event.

The "We Build" motto of this service organization is truly practiced by the men of Kiwanis in West Virginia. Their civic projects and their public affairs efforts, including constructive community activities, are reflected in an awakened and responsive citizenry.

Mr. Webb spoke without benefit of text and therefore, to my regret, I am not able to include his remarks in the RECORD. However, from his wide and varied experience as a business leader, as an educator, and as an administrator, the diligent and gifted Oklahoman delivered a most thoughtful and stimulating talk on administrative problems in general and on some of the specific challenges which confront our space exploration program. I was most impressed, as was his audience, which gave him a standing ovation at the conclusion, by Administrator Webb's insight and comprehensive grasp of the problems in his agency. I have every confidence that under his inspired leadership America will achieve and maintain a commanding position in the fields of space science and technology.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the appendix to the RECORD, my remarks in introduction of James E. Webb.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING HON. JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, WEST VIRGINIA KIWANIS CONVENTION BANQUET, BLACKWATER LODGE, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1961

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 gave to its created Agency a wide mandate, encompassing in part the following missions: the expansion of knowledge of atmospheric and space science; the development and operation of space vehicles and improvement of aeronautical and space vehicles; the preservation of U.S. leadership in aeronautical and space science and technology, and in the application of such knowledge to peaceful activities; interchange of information between civilian and national defense agencies; study of potential benefits to be gained for mankind through space activities; and the "cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in work done pursuant to this act and in the peaceful applications of the results thereof."

Shortly before his inauguration, President Kennedy received from his task force on space policies an appraisal of the extent to which these goals were being fulfilled. The report was critical of many aspects of our space operations, suggesting that there was too much emphasis on the man-in-orbit project, too many competing programs, lack of adequate central direction in the setting of priorities, and not enough "vigorous, imaginative, and technically competent top management people in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

The appointment of James E. Webb as Administrator was one of the President's first affirmative steps to correct the situation, and one which has been widely applauded within the scientific community. The wisdom of the President's choice has been confirmed by the vigorous administration of Mr. Webb, which has brought new energy and coherence of planning to what is probably the most varied and extensive research and development program ever undertaken by any government.

The NASA program of basic research embraces the physical, chemical, biological and aeronautical sciences, and it ranges from materials testing, and laboratory experiments in the life sciences to deep space probes at vast distances from the earth.

In aeronautics, NASA is—among other activities—conducting the X–15 program for high speed, high altitude flight in cooperation with the Air Force, the Navy and industry, while also doing research and supporting development on vertical takeoff and landing aircraft and steep takeoff and landing aircraft.

The space research program involves at present some 14 different space vehicles, each carefully planned for specific research functions, ranging from the original Vanguard with an initial thrust of 28,000 pounds to the projected Saturn (C–2), for flights in the vicinity of the moon, with an initial thrust of 1,500,000 pounds. To carry on this program, Congress appropriated over $950 million for research and development for fiscal 1961, more than twice that of the preceding year, and $1,220 million for NASA research and development in fiscal 1962.

This, fellow Kiwanians, is the very sizable task of administration undertaken by Mr. Webb; and behind every headline of a new satellite launching there is an intricate and involved web of operations which was not even conceived 10 years ago. The next decade will provide even more exciting revelations, and if the history of scientific development is any guide, we may safely assume that many of these discoveries have not yet been envisaged.

For this reason, the task of NASA Administrator requires not only a person of scientific knowledge and administrative abilities, but also one who can conduct our space program so that it is more than merely an adjunct to the cold war. Jim Webb is such a leader. Of all the fields of science, this is the one which should impress us with the unity of mankind, or to quote one of America's leading spokesman of science—Eugene Rabinowitch:

"If there is a field of science in which mankind as a whole is facing the universe and in which the division of mankind into different political and ideological units becomes a minor irrelevancy, it is the exploration of the earth as a whole and of the cosmic space around it. A clear understanding of the disproportion between the narrow ambitions of the various fragments of humanity and man's confrontation with the immensity of the universe could become an important step toward the realization of the common origin, common fate and common aspirations of all mankind" (Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, vol. XVII, No. 5, p. 171).

I am grateful that President Kennedy appointed a man with the imagination, the knowledge and the wisdom to lead America's space explorations in this direction. We are fortunate that this convention program features his address at tonight's banquet. It is our privilege, then, to present to this West Viriginia audience, our honored guest speaker—James E. Webb.

World TV by Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative article which recently appeared in Show Business Illustrated magazine and written by George J. Feldman, of New York City.

Mr. Feldman was Director and General Counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, of which committee I had the honor of being chairman. Because of the great importance and timeliness of the space age which is now upon us, George J.

Feldman's article is of great importance and I commend it to all:

WORLD TV BY SATELLITE—THE GREATEST TRICK OF THE CENTURY, IF ONLY WE CAN MAKE IT WORK

(By George J. Feldman)

"Gunsmoke" on the screens in Irkutsk, the Paris opera coming over to viewers in Rio, a Soviet movie on the late show in Manila—this spectacle of freewheeling international television is barely 5 years in the future. Advances in space technology now make the lofting of communications satellites mainly an engineering proposition. Whatever method is decided upon—orbiting satellites with transmitters, a system of many stationary balloons reflectors, or a scheme using three synchronous satellites orbiting at the same speed as the Earth itself—it requires only a definite, estimable amount of planning and construction to end forever the limitation hitherto placed on television transmission by the curvature of the Earth's surface. International TV can be a reality. It will constitute, along with other electronic uses of the communications satellites, the greatest single payoff yet realized from man's exploration into space.

But, this great communications revolution is already posing far more problems than the old scientific roadblocks that it shatters. Organizational problems alone are prodigious. International frequencies must be determined, bandwidths must be set. Arrangements must be made for sharing channels. Equipment must be standardized. European sets, for example, use finer and more numerous lines on their screens. Then there are the larger political implications. With the transmission of Soviet movies will unquestionably come the propaganda speeches of Nikita Khrushchev and even more direct appeals for subversion in various areas. How much will the directors of the Paris opera charge Brazil for the privilege of seeing their latest production? And along with "Gunsmoke," the Irkutsk viewers will doubtless be offered a selection of discussion groups and perhaps some USIA commercials. How long would Moscow stand for that?

In fact, making international TV work, politically and socially, will be the greatest trick of the century. It also holds great hopes. Of itself, this sort of communication might finally soften the hardening lines of the cold war.

The technology of the communications satellite systems is by now well explored. The first system to be suggested was of the passive reflector type, that is, it involved a great many orbiting objects, bearing no electronic equipment.

A far more promising system would be that of three or more synchronous satellites, placed in orbit at 22,300 miles and timed to rotate with the earth, thus fixing their positions in relation to it. These few synchronous satellites would be active, that is, capable of receiving, transmitting and amplifying signals. They could place the entire world within the range of a single broadcast from any point on the earth's surface. The synchronous system, however, will take the longest time to activate.

The most feasible system at present is one of active electronic satellites fixed at a lower altitude, orbiting at a height of 7,000 feet over the poles. To be effective, the system would demand some 50 satellites in orbit, so that one would always be within range of every ground station.

This system could easily be realized by 1965. Next year the United States will launch four experimental communications satellites with such a medium-range system in view. The first is scheduled to be fired into space on April 17. It and the others will orbit at an altitude of about 3,000 miles. This is far short of the 7,000-mile height necessary for an efficient world-wide operation, but it is enough for experimental purposes—the first 125-pound test satellite will be able to bounce television pictures from this country to Europe.

The significant thing about this first satellite is that it will be operated by a private company, A.T. & T. No less than six other corporations have also outlined programs for satellite systems to be used both for telephone communications and TV. After much soul-searching the Kennedy administration approved this plan for private development of the satellite systems, thus establishing an important basic principle.

Of course, the degree of Government cooperation and regulation here must necessarily be great. So must the cooperation between the corporations ultimately involved. Not only does the magnitude of the job almost enforce such a cooperative effort, but the antitrust lawyers in the Justice Department would undoubtedly start orbiting their court actions, if one colossus like A.T. & T. proposed to do the job alone.

Many authorities feel that the only real answer for the satellite system is some type of Government ownership and private operation. For one thing, the communications satellites and their ground stations would no doubt have to be organized on a worldwide basis, inevitably with some form of joint international control. It would hardly seem feasible to have the intergovernmental decisions involved in this control made by a private corporation.

There has already been one meeting to discuss plans for international use of the communications satellite network. It was attended by representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and France. As quickly as possible, these preliminary discussions should be converted into a permanent international body, probably affiliated with the International Telecommunication Union, that can be the forerunner of workable control agency.

In Washington, the communications satellite program needs strong direction from the Executive and all the funds which Congress can be prepared to allocate for it. Like the missiles and the man-in-space program, it has suffered from more than its share of delays. But here, at least, the broad-gage research done in our satellite program has given the United States a position of leadership, a position which must be devoted to international good. The initial expenditure for setting up a communications satellite system would probably approach $500 million. This is not large considering the ultimate gain to be realized. In savings to the world's overburdened telephone communication network alone, this investment would pay for itself within 20 years.

The costs of an international TV network have yet to be estimated. But it is surely not too early to start a joint planning effort in the television industry, which might at least consider some of the problems involved. The American television industry is the logical leader in any program of worldwide TV. Technically, there is no question about this: Both the educational and the entertainment advantages of a world linked by television are immense. This single medium could do more than all the world's statesmen to forge the peaceful one world which all peoples now crave.

All of which raises a question, which it is outside of my sphere to discuss here. What kind of programs should we plan for this international network? It is a prospect which the TV industry's leaders should start pondering right now. Will they understand our situation comedies in the Congo? And do we really want to send "Gunsmoke" over to those hungry viewers in Irkutsk?

Tribute to Dr. George M. McClure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by him, together with an article published in the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal of September 17, 1961, written by Gerald Griffin, in tribute to Dr. George M. McClure, distinguished educator and benefactor of the deaf.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Yesterday, Dr. George M. McClure, Sr., an outstanding Kentuckian, celebrated his 100th birthday. Dr. McClure is a most distinguished educator and benefactor of the deaf known nationally for his work among the handicapped.

As a part of my remarks I submit for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gerald Griffin which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, September 17. This article summarizes the life service led by this great man and pays tribute to his many noble qualities.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Sept. 17, 1961]

EDITOR-COLUMNIST HONORED NATIONALLY—DANVILLE EDUCATOR-BENEFACTOR OF THE DEAF, DR. MCCLURE, MARKING 100TH YEAR TOMORROW

(By Gerald Griffin)

DANVILLE, KY., September 16.—A lone candle, denoting the beginning of his 101st year, will grace the birthday cake of Dr. George M. McClure, Sr., at a family dinner Monday.

And most of the guests will convey their congratulations to the distinguished educator and benefactor of the deaf by means of the sign language. For Dr. McClure hasn't heard a word in 90 years.

It hasn't bothered him a bit, either, nor interfered with his career of teaching and writing. Nor has he ever felt sorry for himself because of the deafness which came after an attack of typhoid fever when he was 10.

In fact, he considers that his deafness has been helpful to him in his understnding of the problems faced by deaf-mutes.

NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED FOR WORK WITH DEAF

Recognized nationally for his work in educating the deaf, Dr. McClure taught mathematics and other subjects at the Kentucky School for the Deaf here for 57 years, then for 5 years edited the school publication, The Kentucky Standard. Even after his retirement he continued as editor emeritus, contributing a column to every issue until he broke his hip in a fall last April 23.

The injury was followed by a severe siege of pneumonia, since which he has been confined to a wheel chair or hospital bed except during the morning hours, when his nurse brings him home. It is a lovely old home, a white-pillared brick mansion on a tree-lined avenue near the heart of Danville.

That's where he lives with his son, Dr. George M. McClure, Jr., and his daughter-in-law, who bow to his every wish.

Although not a college graduate, Dr. McClure holds honorary degrees from two institutions of higher learning. Centre College made him a doctor of literature in 1934 and Gallaudet College conferred on him a degree of doctor of pedagogy in 1951.

The latter degree was presented to him by his old friend and fellow townsman, the late Fred M. Vinson, who was Chief Justice of the United States at the time. Both of them had attended a school in Louisa.

Another of Dr. McClure's personal friends was Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the telephone, whose wife, like Dr. McClure, was deaf. He still has many letters written to him by Bell.

Dr. McClure is an institution at Danville and is looked on as a patron saint at Kentucky School for the Deaf, which he entered as a student in 1879, remained as a teacher, and retired as head of the department of mathematics.

CONTRIBUTED PAPERS TO AMERICAN ANNALS

Aside from his work as a teacher, he has helped to organize and carry on the societies and associations that care for the interests of the deaf in Kentucky. He has contributed papers to the American Annals for the Deaf and has delivered many addresses at schools for the deaf throughout the United States.

Many honors have been conferred on the white-haired, white-mustached old gentleman of courtly manners, but the one he cherishes most was awarded to him only a few weeks ago.

It is a plaque, the Edward Allan Fay Award, for his outstanding literary contributions to the education of the deaf. It was conferred on him, in his absence, at a joint meeting of the American Instructors of the Deaf and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf in June at Salem, Oreg.

It was one of his great disappointments that he was unable to attend the meeting, which was held after his accident. His doctor son said that before his injury the old gentleman was "one of the finest specimens of manhood I ever saw."

For the past 30 years, the young—still he's a grandfather—Dr. McClure said, every time his father had a birthday members of the family would come rushing home expecting that it would be his last, "but he's still going strong."

The elder Dr. McClure heads four generations of George M. McClures and, he joked, "each generation is an improvement on the one before."

Until recently he was an expert lipreader but, since cataracts have dimmed his sight, he must rely on the sign language, mostly from his son and his daughter, Mrs. Elbert G. Sutcliffe, whose home is Glengary, a Boyle County farm.

MRS. M'CLURE ALSO TAUGHT AT KSD

That's no hardship for the son and daughter, as they learned the language early in life. That was necessary for them as both their father and their mother, no longer alive, were totally deaf and such was their only way of communicating with their parents except lipreading.

The late Mrs. McClure also was a teacher at KSD for many years.

A native of Lawrence County, Dr. McClure grew up on a farm near Louisa, where he attended a private school operated by an uncle who had graduated from the University of Virginia. After he became deaf he decided to learn the printing business, having visions of becoming an editor with a paper of his own.

After 3 years of work on a weekly paper at Louisa he came to Danville to further his education, having found that his pay as a country journalist wouldn't take him very far.

To reach this Boyle County center of learning he traveled from Louisa to Cincinnati by steamboat and on here by way of the Cincinnati Southern Railroad, which had been completed only the year before and was quite a novelty. Great crowds, he said, gathered at each station to see the train come in.

Until his eyes dimmed, Dr. McClure, was an omnivorous reader—history, biography, poetry, and fiction. The first $100 he ever earned, he said, he spent for books, and "I liked them all. I have them yet and I opine that, while possibly I could have done better, I am sure I might have done a great deal worse."

QUOTES LIBERALLY FROM MANY SOURCES

Possessing a remarkably retentive memory, Dr. McClure can quote liberally from the Bible, from Shakespeare, and from the poets—Kipling, Burns, Tennyson, and Browning—and admits to a sneaking fondness for Byron.

One of his favorite quotations, from Kipling, just about sums up the elder Dr. McClure, his son said, and it goes like this:

"He scarce had need to doff his pride or slough the dross of earth
Ben as he trod that day to God so walked he from his birth in simpleness and gentleness and honor and clean mirth
So cup to lip in fellowship they gave him welcome high
And made him place at the banquet board and strong men ranged thereby
Who had done his work and held his peace and had no fear to die."

Resolution of the New York State Association of Letter Carriers in Support of an Increase in the Membership of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the New York State Association of Letter Carriers assembled in Buffalo, N.Y. in August 1961, which I am sure Members of the House will find of interest to them.

The resolution follows:

SUPPORTING LEGISLATION INCREASING NUMERICAL REPRESENTATION IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas the present membership in the U.S. House of Representatives consists of 437 elected Congressmen, and

Where these Representatives are elected by districts alined according to population basis, and

Whereas the phenomenal growth of our country has made it necessary to reduce this population basis, in order to afford all our citizens better representation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention of the New York State Association of Letter Carriers, assembled in Buffalo, N.Y., in August 1961, do hereby strongly endorse pending legislation to increase the numerical quantity of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to every Member of Congress from New York State.

Concepts of Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the column of George E. Sokolsky carried in this morning's edition of the Washington Post is devoted to a richly deserved tribute to one of the greatest Americans and truest patriots ever to serve in this body—the honored and respected senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. Sokolsky recounts the Virginia Senator's recent words to define true conservatism and to differentiate between it and diehard reaction. He points out that the conservative "believes in fundamental principles and attempts to fit progress within the margins of those principles" and characterizes the reactionary as one who "is opposed to progress in any form and so closes his mind that he never countenances the development of man."

Mr. Sokolsky has done a great service to those of us who pride ourselves upon being conservatives in making this distinction and he does the cause of conservative thought great honor in equating it with the dedication, vision and statesmanship of the senior Senator from Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Sokolsky's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCEPTS OF CONSERVATISM
(By George E. Sokolsky)

These days one hears much about conservatism that sounds strange to the ears of an old conservative. Just as a conservative would not submit to the authoritarianism of the Communists, so he will not submit to the pressures of any particular group of conservatives who demand monolithic principles.

Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, a consistent conservative, each year holds a picnic in his apple orchard at Berryville, Va. On that occasion, he usually delivers an address. This year's address was devoted to his concept of political conservatism.

It seems as though Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, a liberal, has said that Senator BYRD should be purged as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee because the Virginian would not support the platform written by Chester Bowles and adopted by the Democratic Convention.

Senator BYRD replied to this:

"In reply I stated publicly that I was unalterably opposed to nearly everything in the platform; that I intended to fight everything inimical to the best interest of this country, in or out of the platform, and that I challenged him to take his fight to the Senate floor.

"I said, as a Member of the Senate, my first allegiance was to the people of Virginia, and I recognized no outside control over my vote. The Virginia delegation to the convention opposed the platform."

This is a correct position. The Constitution holds that each State should be represented in the Senate by two Senators. A Senator therefore represents his State and is obligated to the people of his State.

Such liberals as Senators CLARK and JAVITS do not regard themselves as representatives of their States but as national officials, which they are not, under our system of government.

In these days of political opportunism and confusion, it is satisfying to read a defense of the American system of government without any apology for it and without any attempt to find a compromise with some Marxian concept or some attempt to discover a new system of law and life.

This Nation is constitutionally a confederation of sovereign States. The trend in recent years has been to forget the federalistic characteristic of our political system and to assume that the Government in Washington possesses inherent rights. It does not. It posseses delegated and designated authorities, obligation, and limitations, carefully stipulated in the Constitution and in the amendments thereto.

Senator BYRD defines conservatism as follows:

"Conservatism means to accept responsibility for preserving and protecting our basic principles and institutions while exercising the privilege of using and developing them.

"What are these basic principles? There are others, but foremost I list States rights, and the independence of the three separate but coordinate branches of government. This combination provides the check and the balance to insure against concentration of power which, by experience, we have learned to fear.

"These, and others, are the principles on which we achieved our liberty and our freedom for the pursuit of happiness. They are the base of our greatness."

It would be interesting to see this statement of American idealism contested. This is no conclusion of a reactionary who fails to recognize the need for human progress or the value of orderly process of law. Reactionaries are not conservatives, because they exclude development and growth from their program. They desire what once was to be eternal. Senator BYRD makes the distinction:

"Virginians are not reactionaries. We do not turn back the hands of the clock. We do not necessarily defend the status quo. But neither do we assume that change is necessarily progress. We want progress, but we want sound progress."

This is the wisdom of the experienced idealist. The conservative idealist does not seek a pragmatic method to solve all problems; he believes in fundamental principles and attempts to fit progress within the margins of those principles.

The reactionary is quite different; he is opposed to progress in any form and so closes his mind that he never countenances the development of man. The conservative lives by historic memory; the reactionary lives by taboos and prejudices, by unhistoric tittle-tattle.

Efficient Mr. Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have many reasons to be indebted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great director, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover.

They have a special reason to admire and respect Mr. Hoover for the enemies he has made. The Dearborn Press, of Dearborn, Mich., on August 24 of this year carried an excellent column regarding current sniping against Mr. Hoover, written by Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include this article by Dr. Benson:

EFFICIENT MR. HOOVER

(By Dr. George S. Benson)

Every now and then somebody starts a rumor that high officials close to the President want to get rid of J. Edgar Hoover. These whispers are more puzzling and annoying than truthful, apparently, for one of the first acts of President Kennedy upon his election was to notify the Nation that he had asked Mr. Hoover to remain at his post with the FBI. This action of the incoming administration attested the high esteem generally held toward Mr. Hoover and his effectiveness as the Nation's top law enforcement officer.

It is not difficult to trace the general source of Mr. Hoover's detractors. One comes soon to the political far left, to those who like to warn of "facism" when they tilt with conservatives. Many of the so-called "liberal" political schemers, with their supporting writers and organized groups, hate Mr. Hoover with a vengeance, even as they hate anybody who warns of the Communist menace. They realize that Mr. Hoover with his FBI fights Red subversion where he finds it and never fails to put America's security first. This is just too much for them. They itch for his scalp.

AUTHORITY ON REDS

Through the years since 1919, Mr. Hoover has understood communism as few Americans have. He has followed its fortunes, its shifting positions and meandering "lines." He has observed its underground, watched its party at work, caught its spies, and investigated its intellectual hirelings. From time to time he has made important revelations about its dangers to America, and all the while he has enjoyed the confidence of presidents of both parties. He has always encouraged anti-Communist activities; his own book, "Masters of Deceit," is our best popular study of communism in action.

Mr. Hoover is primarily a law-enforcement officer. He is not a politician. As a G-man he is tops in integrity, in patriotic idealism, in belief in the necessity of preserving the American heritage. Typical of Mr. Hoover's viewpoints is the statement appearing in his regular cover letter addressed to law-enforcement officials in the FBI Bulletin for July:

IDEALS FOR OFFICERS

"It is the responsibility of law-enforcement officers to aid in building our country into a strong and respected republic, just as they have historically led the battles against other threats to our safety and security. The law-enforcement officer should be respected by both adults and young people alike, and by his example of physical sturdiness, incorruptible morals, and high regard for the principles of our free land, he can do his part in preventing any dangerous trend toward a national weakness. He owes it to his country, his community, his family, and himself."

A recent news release from the Department of Justice showed new alltime highs in accomplishments of the FBI. In the past fiscal year, fines, savings, and recoveries in cases investigated amounted to $1.34 for every dollar appropriated for the Bureau. Of persons brought to trial by the FBI, 96.6 percent were convicted, most of them from guilty pleas. The Bureau's Laboratory answered requests for assistance that resulted in 244,183 scientific examinations. Fingerprint cards were added to the file at more than 21,000 daily.

REDS DISLIKE FBI

The report mentioned continuing, vigorous investigation by the FBI of those elements endangering America's internal security. Because of these services the Department of State has been enabled to take action against Soviet-bloc officials who have engaged in activities beyond the scope of their official assignments in the United States; and the Department of Justice has been enabled to institute prosecution against persons engaged in espionage activities.

The Communists do not like Mr. Hoover, that is clear. But it is difficult to imagine an American citizen so misguided, ill informed, and unpatriotic as to suggest his dismissal. I would like to urge that readers of this column write the boss of J. Edgar Hoover [not Mr. Hoover himself] and commend the Department of Justice for the fine work of the Bureau, under the direction of Mr. Hoover. His boss is Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is most distressing news to know about the untimely death of my very close congressional neighbor and longtime friend, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Shreveport, La.

Since January 1939 I have known well Representative BROOKS. His Louisiana District and the Texas District I have the honor to represent join. We have had many mutual problems legislatively and frequently have discussed ways by which the people of our general area could be benefited.

Representative OVERTON BROOKS has been one of the hardest workers I have ever known. He was a real leader in many lines of congressional effort. No man could have been more loyal to the people of his district, his State and his Nation and to causes destined to endure than Hon. OVERTON BROOKS.

Prior to and during World War II, Congressman BROOKS as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs shouldered a heavy responsibility as America and our allies came from behind in our state of preparation to defend ourselves and then to win in record time the greatest of all wars. The contributions to this overall effort by Representative BROOKS were great indeed.

For many months he has devoted a great deal of time and thought to his duties and obligations as a chairman of one of the most important committees in Congress, the Science and Astronautics Committee. He discharged his duties as chairman of this committee in a highly successful way and no one doubts that the progress we now are making in this realm of activity is due in a large measure to his insight and his active and constant endeavors as the chairman of this very challenging committee.

We all shall miss OVERTON in many ways. May God sustain and comfort his wife and daughter, his other relatives and his many friends in the great loss suffered by them, by us, his colleagues in

Congress, and by the people of our Nation.

Philipsburg Mont., Has New Timber Industry To Replace Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on September 22, Philipsburg, Mont., will celebrate the opening of a new industry and in so doing it will be commemorating another example of America's system of free enterprise in operation.

It is with particular pleasure that I welcome Montana Forest Products Inc. and its new sawmill to Montana. In a very small way I was able to make a modest contribution, but to others belong the real credit. Two of the officers of the firm, Mr. Duane Autzen and Mr. Henry Buehner, of Portland, Oreg., both experienced lumbermen, decided that Philipsburg looked good to them. It had the combination of location and resources, both forest and human, to make it an attractive site.

A great deal of planning went into the location and there was consultation and cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service. The people of Philipsburg were especially helpful.

One thing that intrigued me about this operation was the thoroughness with which it was planned. In the fall of 1959 the principals of the operation, knowing that they would be working in a different type of timber than is found in Oregon, decided to go to Sweden to study the operation there because they use the same type of timber as it found in the Philipsburg area; namely, a small but high quality grade tree.

They came to the late Senator Murray, Senator Mansfield, and me to see what could be done in order to assure a maximum benefit for all concerned by this trip to Sweden.

Senator Murray, as was his characteristic, gave them all the assistance possible. He assigned a staff member of his committee to make the arrangements through the Swedish Ambassador here in Washington, and also arranged for this committee man to go to Sweden with the group along with one of the top men in region 1 of the Forest Service, Ernest Grambo.

The group spent 2 weeks in Sweden as guests of the Swedish Government and a private association of timber owners and operators, seeing every type of forest products processing plant and woods operation.

When the group returned to the United States, the company officials went ahead with the design and construction of their modern plant falicities at Philipsburg.

Montana national forests can accommodate this new plant, and in fact could well accommodate another 10 mills of equal size.

The timber is there. The plant sites are available and a capable labor force exists.

The national forests, dedicated to supplying timber on a sustained yield basis, along with the other multiple uses of this great public resource, will provide the logs to make the mill go. The ingenuity of private enterprise will convert the logs to lumber for all America.

I welcome Montana Forest Products to the Treasure State and wish them every success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Philipsburg Has New Timber Industry to Replace Mines," which appeared in the September 13, 1961, issue of the Great Falls Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Sept. 13, 1961]

PHILIPSBURG HAS NEW TIMBER INDUSTRY TO REPLACE MINES

The old town of Philipsburg is planning a celebration for September 22–23 to rival any held in its scenic valley when silver was queen. Festivities will celebrate the opening of the million and a half dollar Montana Forest Products sawmill and processing plant, Philipsburg's newest industry.

In the first half century of its history, Philipsburg settled in 1866, celebrated many rich ore strikes, and the area experienced many booms and declines relating to the ups and downs of the silver market. In 1867 the St. Louis Mining Co. built the first silver mill in the State to process the free milling ores of the "bedded" deposits of the area. In the 1880's and 1890's Philipsburg and the nearby mountaintop town of Granite were the greatest silver producers in the Nation.

In the last few decades Philipsburg has been known mainly as the center of a popular recreation area, dotted with ghost mining camps. The new lumber and timber processing industry is well worth celebrating. It is the type of industrial development particularly fitted to the community which lies in the heart of the source of supply. The new mill will use timber from both private lands and forest service areas.

It will provide increased employment and payrolls and boost the economy of this area which has been relatively in the doldrums in recent years due to the shutdown of mining operations.

Some Cotton Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include some brief communications and some cotton statistics:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TEXAS ASCS STATE OFFICE,
College Station, Tex., August 18, 1961.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: As requested in your note on our letter of August 11, we are listing below the counties in Texas which reserved no acreage for establishing new farm cotton allotments in 1961:

Andrews, Bandera, Baylor, Blanco, Brewster, Carson, Chambers, Cottle, Crockett, Crosby, Culberson, Dallam, Deaf Smith, Donley, El Paso, Foard, Glasscock, Hardeman, Hartley, Haskell, Hemphill, Hudspeth, Irion, Jeff Davis, Jefferson, Kendall, Kent, Kerr, King, Kinney, Loving, Lubbock, McMullen, Martin, Matagorda, Maverick, Midland, Moore, Oldham, Parmer, Potter, Presidio, Randall, Reagan, Real, Reeves, Roberts, Schleicher, Sterling, Sutton, Swisher, Terrell, Val Verde, Ward, Winkler, and Yoakum.

Our previous correspondence with you is being returned as requested.

Very truly yours,
W. LEWIS DAVID,
State Administrative Officer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1961.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of July 7, to the Secretary of Agriculture, regarding an inquiry you received from Mr. A. C. "Dutch" Harris, Box 364, Kilgore, Tex., about a cotton allotment for his farm in Upshur County.

There is provision under the applicable law and regulations for establishing cotton allotments for new cotton farms which, in the case of 1961, would be farms on which cotton was not planted or regarded by law as having been planted during base years 1958, 1959, and 1960. The allotments for such new farms are derived from acreage reserved for this purpose by the ASC State and county committees. We point out, however, that although both the ASC State and county committees are authorized to reserve acreage for new farm allotments, they are not required to do so and many do not. The enclosed statement briefly sets forth the eligibility requirements for new farm allotments for 1961 and explains generally how and under what conditions they are established.

We point out that the latest date that an application for a new farm cotton allotment for 1961 could be filed in Texas was February 15, 1961, as this was the closing date set by the Texas ASC State committee for filing such applications.

If Mr. Harris is interested in a new farm cotton allotment for his farm in 1962, we suggest that he communicate his desire to his local ASCS county office well before the planting season and inquire as to the eligibility requirements applicable to 1962 new farm allotments. He should do this before the closing date for filing such applications in 1962 which date cannot be earlier than February 15, 1962.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH H. RAPER,
Acting Director, Cotton Division.

DEAR LINDLEY: How could we have cotton acreage on our farm in Upshur County?

Thanks for your literature you sent Ralph and me.

A. C. "DUTCH" HARRIS,
Kilgore, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1961.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is in further reply to your request of January 30, 1961, for certain information concerning commodity allotments on a county basis.

We stated in our letter to you of April 21 that the information requested would have to be compiled. The data requested for cotton has now been compiled and is set forth on the enclosed photostatic copies.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary.

Cotton production and other specified data, 1960

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Alabama:							
Autauga	1,021	9,880	8,900	$1,423	9.7	8.7	$1,394
Baldwin	724	2,377	940	150	3.3	1.3	287
Barbour	1,585	13,970	7,000	1,120	8.8	4.4	707
Bibb	1,575	3,567	2,400	384	6.2	4.2	668
Blount	3,158	18,824	15,350	2,455	6.0	4.9	777
Bullock	771	8,431	4,310	689	10.9	5.6	894
Butler	1,477	9,539	6,130	980	6.6	4.2	664
Calhoun	1,205	7,044	3,960	633	5.8	3.3	525
Chambers	1,011	8,338	4,160	665	8.2	4.1	658
Cherokee	1,821	22,385	20,000	3,199	12.3	11.0	1,767
Chilton	2,044	8,836	5,350	856	4.3	2.6	419
Choctaw	1,533	6,450	3,420	547	4.2	2.2	357
Clarke	1,500	5,351	2,230	357	3.6	1.5	238
Clay	1,101	3,507	930	149	3.2	.8	135
Cleburne	631	2,439	750	120	3.9	1.2	190
Coffee	1,965	18,655	11,830	1,892	9.5	6.0	963
Colbert	1,591	22,510	17,300	2,767	14.1	10.9	1,739
Conecuh	2,144	11,924	6,280	1,004	5.6	2.9	468
Coosa	496	1,664	510	82	3.4	1.0	165
Covington	2,379	15,447	10,000	1,599	6.5	4.2	672
Crenshaw	1,343	8,667	4,610	737	6.5	3.4	549
Cullman	6,363	34,584	33,200	5,310	5.4	5.2	835
Dale	1,099	8,548	5,230	836	7.8	4.8	761
Dallas	1,474	26,950	21,450	3,431	18.3	14.6	2,328
De Kalb	5,398	34,784	33,750	5,398	6.4	6.3	1,000
Elmore	1,636	15,056	11,850	1,895	9.2	7.3	1,158
Escambia	1,374	10,602	8,200	1,311	6.1	4.7	756
Etowah	2,228	12,676	8,750	1,399	5.7	3.9	628
Fayette	1,760	9,674	7,750	1,239	5.5	4.4	704
Franklin	2,184	13,547	9,750	1,559	6.2	4.5	714
Geneva	2,024	21,198	16,700	2,671	10.5	8.2	1,320
Greene	901	13,240	7,350	1,176	14.7	8.2	1,305
Hale	1,400	15,343	12,100	1,935	11.0	8.6	1,382
Henry	1,255	15,262	9,650	1,543	12.2	7.7	1,229
Houston	2,478	26,743	20,850	3,335	10.8	8.4	1,346
Jackson	3,396	25,427	23,450	3,750	7.5	6.9	1,104
Jefferson	737	4,049	2,290	366	5.5	3.1	497
Lamar	1,802	10,504	5,800	928	5.8	3.2	515
Lauderdale	3,381	28,654	20,250	3,239	8.5	6.0	958
Lawrence	2,905	41,203	35,600	5,694	14.2	12.3	1,960
Lee	873	9,266	5,940	950	10.6	6.8	1,088
Limestone	3,159	53,624	48,100	7,693	17.0	15.2	2,435
Lowndes	780	10,466	7,650	1,223	13.4	9.8	1,568
Macon	1,448	16,384	11,250	1,799	11.3	7.8	1,242
Madison	3,512	60,288	61,300	9,804	17.2	17.5	2,792
Marengo	1,775	15,079	10,350	1,655	8.5	5.8	932
Marion	2,509	13,708	11,200	1,791	5.5	4.5	714
Marshall	4,830	30,990	32,000	5,118	6.4	6.6	1,060
Mobile	692	2,751	1,170	187	4.0	1.7	270
Monroe	1,914	18,385	16,300	2,607	9.6	8.5	1,362
Montgomery	1,005	10,778	7,300	1,168	10.7	7.3	1,162
Morgan	3,619	29,352	24,200	3,870	8.1	6.7	1,069
Perry	1,088	11,106	8,700	1,391	10.2	8.0	1,278
Pickens	1,728	14,619	9,300	1,487	8.5	5.4	861
Pike	1,470	14,515	7,050	1,128	9.9	4.8	767
Randolph	2,136	8,544	2,830	453	4.0	1.3	212
Russell	779	10,127	5,100	816	13.0	6.5	1,047
St. Clair	1,079	5,767	3,180	509	5.3	2.9	472
Shelby	626	6,326	62,50	1,000	10.1	10.0	1,597
Sumter	1,183	13,817	8,700	1,391	11.7	7.4	1,176
Talladega	1,606	12,487	7,050	1,128	7.8	4.4	702
Tallapoosa	935	6,409	3,180	509	6.9	3.4	544
Tuscaloosa	1,900	16,190	10,450	1,671	8.5	5.5	879
Walker	1,829	5,959	2,710	433	3.3	1.5	237
Washington	706	2,063	1,010	162	2.9	1.4	229
Wilcox	1,207	11,615	7,600	1,215	9.6	6.3	1,007
Winston	1,517	7,699	5,800	928	5.1	3.8	612
Total	119,775	996,163	756,000	120,909	8.3	6.3	1,009

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Arizona:							
Cochise	417	17,500	28,250	$4,280	42.0	67.7	$10,264
Graham	318	11,721	20,510	3,108	36.9	64.5	9,774
Greenlee	96	2,092	3,110	471	21.8	32.4	4,906
Maricopa	1,855	148,919	326,170	49,423	85.2	175.8	26,643
Pima	137	27,252	52,690	7,984	225.6	384.6	58,277
Pinal	788	161,417	309,140	46,841	204.8	392.1	59,443
Santa Cruz	19	1,962	3,465	525	103.3	182.4	27,632
Yuma	677	35,444	74,175	11,239	52.4	109.6	16,601
Total	4,307	406,307	817,510	123,871	94.3	189.8	28,760
Arkansas:							
Arkansas	860	10,151	7,200	1,113	11.8	8.4	1,294
Ashley	819	26,120	21,400	3,307	31.9	26.1	4,038
Baxter	24	60	23	4	2.5	1.0	167
Bradley	829	6,110	2,150	332	7.4	2.6	400
Calhoun	483	4,177	1,640	253	8.6	3.4	524
Chicot	1,371	30,624	32,200	4,976	22.3	23.5	3,629
Clark	435	4,648	2,650	409	10.7	6.1	940
Clay	3,081	44,888	42,600	6,583	14.6	13.8	2,137
Cleburne	797	3,554	810	125	4.5	1.0	157
Cleveland	652	5,151	1,770	274	7.9	2.7	420
Columbia	1,726	12,517	2,910	450	7.3	1.7	261
Conway	802	6,264	4,600	711	7.8	5.7	886
Craighead	3,457	91,560	85,600	13,228	26.5	24.8	3,826
Crawford	38	385	340	53	10.1	8.9	1,395
Crittenden	1,589	101,677	110,400	17,059	64.0	69.5	10,736
Cross	1,310	38,361	36,900	5,702	29.3	28.2	4,353
Dallas	348	2,146	850	131	6.2	2.4	376
Desha	1,259	44,283	48,500	7,495	35.2	38.5	5,953
Drew	1,192	14,237	12,550	1,939	11.9	10.5	1,627
Faulkner	1,704	13,457	4,200	649	7.9	2.5	381
Franklin	65	552	380	59	8.5	5.8	908
Fulton	292	1,020	380	59	3.5	1.3	202
Grant	243	617	145	22	2.5	.6	90
Greene	2,985	43,010	38,700	5,980	14.4	13.0	2,003
Hempstead	992	10,246	5,400	834	10.3	5.4	841
Hot Spring	117	428	85	13	3.7	.7	111
Howard	266	2,334	1,420	219	8.8	5.3	823
Independence	726	6,504	4,600	711	9.0	6.3	979
Izard	576	2,686	1,070	165	4.7	1.9	286
Jackson	1,434	42,220	38,600	5,965	29.4	26.9	4,160
Jefferson	1,323	73,767	83,700	12,934	55.8	63.3	9,776
Johnson	60	1,069	1,160	179	17.8	19.3	2,983
Lafayette	696	14,431	11,600	1,793	20.7	16.7	2,576
Lawrence	1,420	20,812	18,500	2,859	14.7	13.0	2,013
Lee	2,035	57,748	53,200	8,221	28.4	26.1	4,040
Lincoln	1,056	37,190	38,100	5,888	35.2	36.1	5,576
Little River	320	5,386	3,770	583	16.8	11.8	1,822
Logan	213	1,784	1,130	175	8.4	5.3	822
Lonoke	1,976	55,189	50,700	7,835	27.9	25.7	3,965
Marion	16	65	8	1	4.1	.5	62
Miller	663	10,440	8,050	1,244	15.7	12.1	1,876
Mississippi	3,301	206,047	210,000	32,450	62.4	63.6	9,830
Monroe	1,468	37,893	35,100	5,424	25.8	23.9	3,695
Montgomery	29	38	7	1	1.3	.2	34
Nevada	635	4,135	1,470	227	6.5	2.3	357
Newton	13	56	13	2	4.3	1.0	154
Ouachita	420	2,944	1,180	182	7.0	2.8	433
Perry	177	1,111	540	83	6.3	3.0	469
Phillips	2,250	81,111	82,700	12,779	36.0	36.8	5,680
Pike	61	439	145	22	7.2	2.4	361
Poinsett	1,778	87,372	81,700	12,625	49.1	45.9	7,101
Polk	14	32	8	1	2.3	.6	71
Pope	348	3,163	2,170	335	9.1	6.2	963
Prarie	875	10,722	7,200	1,113	12.3	8.2	1,272
Pulaski	531	17,477	13,450	2,078	32.9	25.3	3,913
Randolph	843	10,215	9,000	1,391	12.1	10.7	1,650
St. Francis	1,637	66,143	62,400	9,643	40.4	38.1	5,891
Saline	43	110	17	3	2.6	.4	70

Scott	53	197	83	13	3.7	1.6	2[illegible]
Searcy	50	181	85	13	3.6	1.7	260
Sebastian	52	311	155	24	6.0	3.0	462
Sevier	167	624	105	16	3.7	.6	96
Sharp	532	2,853	1,100	170	5.4	2.1	320
Stone	64	151	62	10	2.4	1.0	156
Union	546	2,507	580	90	4.6	1.1	165
Van Buren	293	1,297	130	20	4.4	.4	68
Washington	1	4	7	1	4.0	7.0	1,000
White	3,353	23,554	8,300	1,283	7.0	2.5	383
Woodruff	1,118	37,925	35,500	5,486	33.9	31.8	4,907
Yell	449	6,536	5,800	896	14.6	12.9	1,996
Total	61,351	1,453,016	1,338,998	206,213	23.7	21.8	3,373
California:							
Fresno	4,751	249,075	515,000	78,035	52.4	108.4	16,425
Imperial	905	61,964	163,400	24,759	68.2	180.6	27,358
Kern	1,875	233,664	499,800	75,733	124.6	266.6	40,391
Kings	1,697	123,428	218,000	33,033	72.7	128.5	19,466
Los Angeles	9	219	285	43	24.3	31.7	4,778
Madera	1,211	57,713	91,500	13,865	47.7	75.6	11,449
Merced	540	36,505	65,700	9,955	67.6	121.7	18,435
Riverside	492	24,577	57,150	8,660	50.0	116.2	17,602
San Benito	5	187	210	32	37.4	42.0	6,400
San Bernardino	30	589	210	32	19.6	7.0	1,067
San Diego	10	313	600	91	31.3	60.0	9,100
Stanislaus	19	116	145	22	6.1	7.6	1,158
Tulare	4,152	185,119	327,000	49,549	44.6	78.8	11,934
Total	15,696	973,469	1,939,000	293,809	62.0	123.5	18,719
Florida:							
Calhoun	138	789	375	57	5.7	2.7	413
Columbia	211	395	80	12	1.9	.4	57
Escambia	380	1,690	715	110	4.4	1.9	289
Gadsden	126	265	40	6	2.1	.3	48
Hamilton	367	1,421	490	76	3.9	1.3	207
Holmes	1,119	5,250	2,680	414	4.7	2.4	370
Jackson	2,166	8,460	4,045	625	3.9	1.9	289
Jefferson	393	1,546	425	66	3.9	1.1	168
Lafayette	164	336	54	8	2.0	.3	49
Leon	268	1,028	120	18	3.8	.4	67
Madison	784	3,121	1,225	189	4.0	1.6	241
Okaloosa	330	1,496	590	91	4.5	1.8	276
Santa Rosa	838	6,974	4,380	678	8.3	5.2	809
Suwannee	452	819	185	29	1.8	.4	64
Walton	566	2,346	900	139	4.1	1.6	245
Washington	341	1,027	340	53	3.0	1.0	155
Total	8,643	36,963	16,644	2,571	4.3	1.9	297
Georgia:							
Appling	947	4,797	3,370	534	5.1	3.6	564
Atkinson	280	1,136	770	122	4.1	2.7	436
Bacon	549	2,672	1,930	306	4.9	3.5	557
Baker	352	3,277	1,680	266	9.3	4.8	756
Baldwin	343	2,295	820	130	6.7	2.4	379
Banks	684	2,923	1,310	208	4.3	1.9	304
Barrow	736	5,486	1,790	284	7.5	2.4	386
Bartow	1,012	17,633	11,570	1,835	17.4	11.4	1,813
Ben Hill	426	5,044	3,580	568	11.8	8.4	1,333
Berrien	769	3,891	3,090	490	5.1	4.0	637
Bibb	141	1,219	420	67	8.6	3.0	475
Bleckley	557	6,564	4,380	695	11.8	7.9	1,248
Brantley	30	64	20	3	2.1	.7	100
Brooks	1,249	9,230	6,820	1,081	7.4	5.5	865
Bryan	74	271	75	12	3.7	1.0	162
Bullock	1,546	14,827	11,960	1,897	9.6	7.7	1,227
Burke	1,239	36,572	24,720	3,920	29.5	20.0	3,164
Butts	394	4,331	1,630	163	11.0	2.6	414
Calhoun	311	5,210	4,400	698	16.8	14.1	2,244
Candler	540	6,534	4,720	748	12.1	8.7	1,385
Carroll	1,740	9,056	3,230	512	5.2	1.9	294
Catoosa	349	1,393	830	132	4.0	2.4	378
Charlton	10	31	10	2	3.1	1.0	200
Chatham	12	25	15	2	2.1	1.2	167
Chattahoochee	35	167	20	3	4.8	.6	86
Chattooga	657	5,573	2,060	327	8.5	3.1	498
Cherokee	220	730	160	25	3.3	.7	114
Clarke	336	1,899	690	109	5.7	2.1	324
Clay	290	3,599	2,330	369	12.4	8.0	1,272
Clayton	200	984	260	41	4.9	1.3	205
Clinch	70	166	60	10	2.4	.9	143
Cobb	262	792	160	25	3.0	.6	95
Coffee	1,122	7,339	5,930	940	6.5	5.3	838
Colquitt	1,643	22,262	18,800	2,982	13.5	11.4	1,815
Columbia	347	2,000	650	103	5.8	1.9	297
Cook	687	4,097	3,720	590	6.0	5.4	859
Coweta	814	6,359	1,830	290	7.8	2.2	356
Crawford	268	1,700	690	109	6.3	2.6	407
Crisp	587	9,422	8,670	1,375	16.1	14.8	2,342
Dade	173	520	320	51	3.0	1.8	295
Dawson	61	103	30	5	1.7	.5	82
Decatur	714	4,465	2,120	336	6.3	3.0	470
De Kalb	135	486	110	17	3.6	.8	126
Dodge	1,096	13,437	7,610	1,207	12.3	6.9	1,101
Dooly	959	19,761	16,390	2,599	20.6	17.1	2,710
Dougherty	167	1,970	950	151	11.8	5.7	904
Douglas	241	820	160	25	3.4	.7	104
Early	1,021	12,782	9,120	1,447	12.5	8.9	1,417
Echols	32	100	30	5	3.1	.9	156
Effingham	328	1,671	1,030	163	5.1	3.1	497
Elbert	1,216	9,262	4,280	679	7.6	3.5	558
Emanuel	1,280	16,200	9,590	1,521	12.7	7.5	1,188
Evans	385	2,655	2,160	343	6.9	5.6	891
Fayette	513	3,791	1,270	201	7.4	2.5	392
Floyd	766	7,140	3,260	517	9.3	4.3	675
Forsyth	553	1,904	540	86	3.4	1.0	156
Franklin	1,376	7,402	3,140	498	5.4	2.3	362
Fulton	415	2,097	540	86	5.1	1.3	207
Glascock	327	4,720	2,250	357	14.4	6.9	1,092
Gordon	1,220	11,522	7,860	1,246	9.4	6.4	1,021
Grady	796	4,188	2,310	366	5.3	2.9	460
Greene	507	2,805	640	101	5.5	1.3	199
Gwinnett	815	4,028	1,150	182	4.9	1.4	223
Habersham	161	347	90	14	2.2	.6	87
Hall	490	2,097	650	103	4.3	1.3	210
Hancock	808	8,584	4,250	674	10.6	5.3	834
Haralson	643	2,416	450	71	3.8	.7	110
Harris	313	1,574	510	81	5.0	1.6	259
Hart	1,578	11,913	5,990	950	7.5	3.8	602
Heard	476	2,421	720	114	5.1	1.5	239
Henry	1,014	9,676	2,520	400	9.5	2.5	394
Houston	486	5,160	2,880	457	10.6	5.9	940
Irwin	805	9,510	6,920	1,097	11.8	8.6	1,363
Jackson	1,240	9,491	2,940	466	7.7	2.4	376
Jasper	303	3,562	980	155	11.8	3.2	512
Jeff Davis	558	2,568	1,690	268	4.6	3.0	480
Jefferson	1,020	20,066	13,020	2,065	19.7	12.8	2,024
Jenkins	631	11,566	7,200	1,142	18.3	11.4	1,810
Johnson	802	15,239	9,120	1,446	19.0	11.4	1,803
Jones	117	501	90	14	4.3	.8	120
Lamar	346	2,027	500	79	5.9	1.4	228
Lanier	214	778	420	67	3.6	2.0	313
Laurens	1,953	27,715	15,150	2,403	14.2	7.8	1,230
Lee	331	3,731	2,570	408	11.3	7.8	1,233
Liberty	70	183	45	7	2.6	.6	100
Lincoln	348	2,128	600	95	6.1	1.7	273
Long	171	553	270	43	3.2	1.6	251
Lowndes	811	3,697	2,020	320	4.6	2.5	394
Lumpkin	30	91	15	2	3.0	.5	67
McDuffie	475	6,232	2,780	441	13.1	5.9	928
Macon	602	11,192	7,400	1,174	18.6	12.3	1,950
Madison	1,549	10,465	4,560	723	6.8	2.9	467
Marion	320	3,766	1,550	246	10.2	4.2	665
Meriwether	896	10,400	4,840	767	11.6	5.4	856
Miller	626	5,727	3,990	633	9.1	6.4	1,011
Mitchell	1,039	12,119	7,100	1,126	11.7	6.8	1,084
Monroe	222	1,232	240	38	5.5	1.1	171
Montgomery	501	3,952	2,540	403	7.9	5.1	804
Morgan	718	13,484	6,010	953	18.8	8.4	1,327
Murray	638	3,681	2,010	319	5.8	3.1	500
Muscogee	36	204	90	14	5.7	2.5	389
Newton	656	7,137	2,050	325	10.9	3.1	495
Oconee	657	8,027	4,320	685	12.2	6.6	1,043
Oglethorpe	926	7,340	3,250	515	7.9	3.5	556
Paulding	532	2,596	740	117	4.9	1.4	220
Peach	199	2,389	1,530	243	12.0	7.7	1,221
Pickens	121	528	190	30	4.4	1.6	248
Pierce	583	2,551	1,510	239	4.4	2.6	410
Pike	488	5,745	3,240	514	11.8	6.6	1,053
Polk	876	6,662	3,900	618	7.6	4.5	705
Pulaski	519	8,421	6,010	953	16.2	11.6	1,836
Putnam	225	1,441	280	44	6.4	1.2	196
Quitman	144	1,400	450	71	9.7	3.1	493
Randolph	460	5,721	4,310	683	12.4	9.4	1,485
Richmond	217	2,310	740	117	10.6	3.4	539
Rockdale	389	2,602	670	106	6.7	1.7	272
Schley	253	3,680	1,550	246	14.5	6.1	972
Screven	1,124	16,412	11,420	1,811	14.6	10.2	1,611
Seminole	478	4,076	2,530	401	8.5	5.3	839

Cotton production and other specified data, 1960—Continued

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Georgia—Continued							
Spalding	289	1,946	550	$87	6.7	1.9	$301
Stephens	282	750	230	36	2.7	.8	128
Stewart	318	2,920	1,330	211	9.2	4.2	664
Sumter	727	10,381	8,130	1,289	14.3	11.2	1,773
Talbot	330	1,522	390	62	4.6	1.2	188
Taliaferro	274	1,451	340	54	5.3	1.2	197
Tattnall	899	5,622	4,130	655	6.3	4.6	729
Taylor	489	6,987	5,010	795	14.3	10.2	1,626
Telfair	735	4,905	2,380	377	6.7	3.2	513
Terrell	595	11,593	10,060	1,596	19.5	16.9	2,682
Thomas	795	6,096	5,060	802	7.7	6.4	1,009
Tift	788	6,927	5,750	912	8.8	7.3	1,157
Toombs	860	7,852	5,890	934	9.1	6.8	1,086
Treutlen	384	3,345	2,020	320	8.7	5.3	833
Troup	348	1,594	590	94	4.6	1.7	270
Turner	588	7,995	5,830	924	13.6	9.9	1,571
Twiggs	460	3,454	1,870	297	7.5	4.1	646
Upson	257	890	170	27	3.5	.7	105
Walker	732	2,648	770	122	3.6	1.1	167
Walton	1,312	20,380	9,300	1,476	15.5	7.1	1,125
Ware	384	1,067	500	79	2.8	1.3	206
Warren	540	10,687	5,480	869	19.8	10.1	1,609
Washington	1,086	17,620	10,660	1,691	16.2	9.8	1,557
Wayne	435	2,558	1,680	266	5.9	3.9	611
Webster	238	1,709	630	100	7.2	2.6	420
Wheeler	483	3,439	1,880	298	7.9	4.3	680
White	204	371	150	24	1.8	.7	118
Whitfield	565	2,384	870	138	4.2	1.5	244
Wilcox	809	10,742	7,170	1,137	13.3	8.9	1,405
Wilkes	617	3,859	1,160	184	6.3	1.9	298
Wilkinson	389	2,548	520	82	6.5	1.3	211
Worth	1,244	18,729	15,660	2,483	15.1	12.6	1,996
Total	87,618	859,457	505,000	80,079	9.8	5.8	914
Illinois:							
Alexander	243	1,968	965	145	8.1	4.0	597
Pulaski	259	1,419	535	80	5.5	2.1	309
Total	502	3,387	1,500	225	6.7	3.0	448
Kentucky:							
Ballard	9	23	6	1	2.6	.7	111
Calloway	162	197	20	3	1.2	.1	19
Carlisle	45	74	6	1	1.6	.1	22
Fulton	434	7,408	8,650	1,311	17.1	19.9	3,021
Graves	192	278	60	9	1.4	.3	47
Hickman	393	1,376	750	114	3.5	1.9	290
McCracken							
Marshall	48	42	5	1	.9	.1	21
Total	1,283	9,398	9,497	1,440	7.3	7.3	1,114
Louisiana:							
Acadia	1,158	11,520	7,500	1,158	9.9	6.5	1,000
Allen	228	572	190	29	2.5	.8	127
Ascension	204	339	9	1	1.7		5
Avoyelles	3,400	28,581	23,900	3,690	8.4	7.0	1,085
Beauregard	141	151	29	4	1.1	.2	28
Bienville	752	4,152	1,340	207	5.5	1.8	275
Bossier	928	20,269	18,700	2,887	21.8	20.1	3,111
Caddo	1,011	35,639	35,000	5,403	35.3	34.6	5,344
Caldwell	440	7,986	8,000	1,235	18.1	18.2	2,807
Catahoula	899	12,868	12,000	1,853	14.3	13.3	2,061
Caliborne	1,115	5,839	1,450	224	5.2	1.3	201
Concordia	600	10,006	10,800	1,667	16.7	18.0	2,778
De Soto	1,106	7,580	2,900	448	6.9	2.6	405
East Baton Rouge	351	734	56	9	2.1	.2	26
East Carroll	734	28,400	33,200	5,125	38.7	45.2	6,982
East Feliciana	635	2,820	690	107	4.4	1.1	169
Evangeline	1,769	18,237	14,900	2,300	10.3	8.4	1,300
Franklin	2,198	58,310	46,500	7,178	26.5	21.2	3,266

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Louisiana—Continued							
Grant	211	4,283	4,715	$728	20.3	22.3	$3,450
Iberia	349	1,366	305	47	3.9	.9	135
Iberville	119	284	144	22	2.4	1.2	185
Jackson	318	828	170	26	2.6	.5	82
Jefferson Davis	113	284	43	7	2.5	.4	62
Lafayette	1,801	14,987	10,300	1,590	8.3	5.7	883
La Salle	116	485	385	59	4.2	3.3	509
Lincoln	511	3,299	690	107	6.5	1.3	209
Livingston	203	195	25	4	.9	.1	20
Madison	645	20,644	25,300	3,906	32.0	39.2	6,056
Morehouse	1,096	33,144	32,400	5,002	30.2	29.6	4,564
Natchitoches	1,171	24,342	21,300	3,288	20.8	18.2	2,808
Ouachita	615	14,476	14,800	2,285	23.5	24.1	3,715
Pointe Coupee	856	7,743	4,070	628	9.0	4.8	734
Rapides	1,130	19,845	25,500	3,937	17.6	22.6	3,484
Red River	538	10,198	8,770	1,354	19.0	16.3	2,517
Richland	1,764	50,607	40,200	6,205	28.7	22.8	3,518
Sabine	421	1,150	465	72	2.7	1.1	171
St. Helena	814	2,026	405	63	2.5	.5	77
St. Landry	3,731	38,613	33,800	5,218	10.3	9.1	1,399
St. Martin	1,343	8,062	3,730	576	6.0	2.8	429
St. Tammany	143	306	37	6	2.1	.3	42
Tangipahoa	776	1,463	132	20	1.9	.2	26
Tensas	639	20,745	23,600	3,643	32.5	36.9	5,701
Union	836	5,542	2,610	403	6.6	3.1	482
Vermilion	819	4,437	1,850	286	5.4	2.3	349
Vernon	452	1,124	370	57	2.5	.8	126
Washington	1,277	4,644	2,030	313	3.6	1.6	245
Webster	780	5,414	2,460	380	6.9	3.2	487
West Baton Rouge	146	865	440	68	5.9	3.0	466
West Carroll	1,895	28,067	22,100	3,412	14.8	11.7	1,801
West Feliciana	7,250	1,731	475	73	6.9	1.9	292
Winn	234	882	215	33	3.8	.9	141
Total	43,781	586,084	501,000	77,343	13.4	11.4	1,767
Mississippi:							
Adams	310	1,913	620	96	6.2	2.0	310
Alcorn	1,823	14,375	13,500	2,092	7.9	7.4	1,148
Amite	1,631	6,319	2,570	398	3.9	1.6	244
Attala	1,954	14,389	11,250	1,744	7.4	5.8	892
Benton	940	12,080	11,100	1,720	12.9	11.8	1,830
Bolivar	1,918	128,394	135,500	21,002	66.9	70.6	10,950
Calhoun	1,539	17,082	15,800	2,449	11.1	10.3	1,591
Carroll	1,288	16,093	15,000	2,325	12.5	11.6	1,805
Chickasaw	1,408	15,028	13,500	2,092	10.7	9.6	1,486
Choctaw	1,135	3,217	2,550	395	2.8	2.2	348
Claiborne	621	4,364	2,850	442	7.0	4.6	712
Clarke	1,428	3,750	1,210	188	2.6	.8	132
Clay	983	8,196	6,820	1,057	8.3	6.9	1,075
Coahoma	755	100,372	118,400	18,351	132.9	156.8	24,306
Copiah	1,701	5,870	3,360	521	3.5	2.0	306
Covington	1,854	8,242	5,180	803	4.4	2.8	433
DeSoto	1,476	35,219	34,900	5,409	23.9	23.6	3,665
Forrest	401	1,058	515	80	2.6	1.3	200
Franklin	441	1,062	205	32	2.4	.5	72
George	424	1,008	400	62	2.4	.9	146
Greene	476	1,040	425	66	2.2	.9	139
Grenada	753	11,775	12,000	1,860	15.6	15.9	2,570
Hinds	1,959	23,648	14,600	2,263	12.1	8.5	1,155
Holmes	1,829	37,875	42,800	6,634	20.7	23.4	3,627
Humphreys	822	52,492	58,000	8,990	63.9	70.6	10,937
Issaquena	336	12,516	14,600	2,263	37.2	43.5	6,735
Itawamba	1,967	10,182	7,100	1,100	5.2	3.6	559
Jasper	1,768	5,238	2,590	401	3.0	1.5	227
Jefferson	732	4,215	1,810	281	5.8	2.5	384
Jefferson Davis	2,062	13,910	9,000	1,395	6.7	4.4	676
Jones	2,205	6,283	2,910	451	2.8	1.3	204
Kemper	1,507	10,034	4,670	724	6.7	3.1	480
Lafayette	1,517	17,742	14,150	2,193	11.7	9.3	1,446
Lamar	978	2,753	1,210	188	2.8	1.2	192
Lauderdale	1,336	5,122	1,700	263	3.8	1.3	197

Mississippi—Continued							
Lawrence	1,421	5,668	2,180	338	4.0	1.5	238
Leake	2,641	15,520	10,950	1,697	5.9	4.1	642
Lee	2,144	26,968	20,500	3,177	12.6	9.6	1,482
Leflore	835	84,762	98,000	15,189	101.5	117.4	18,190
Lincoln	1,474	3,284	885	137	2.2	.6	93
Lowndes	1,546	16,487	11,650	1,806	10.7	7.5	1,168
Madison	2,064	31,821	21,200	3,286	15.4	10.3	1,592
Marion	1,995	8,467	4,300	666	4.2	2.2	334
Marshall	1,777	35,734	31,900	4,944	20.1	18.0	2,782
Monroe	2,504	30,275	24,150	3,743	12.1	9.6	1,495
Montgomery	1,074	8,262	7,650	1,186	7.7	7.1	1,104
Neshoba	2,644	11,551	5,470	848	4.4	2.1	321
Newton	2,056	6,169	2,460	381	3.0	1.2	185
Noxubee	1,123	16,262	11,950	1,852	14.5	10.6	1,649
Oktibbeha	1,057	3,911	2,170	336	3.7	2.1	318
Panola	1,976	40,807	41,900	6,494	20.7	21.2	3,286
Pearl River	143	261	83	13	1.8	.6	91
Perry	589	1,408	630	98	2.4	1.1	166
Pike	1,550	4,000	1,190	184	2.6	.8	119
Pontotoc	2,526	20,705	18,400	2,852	8.2	7.3	1,129
Prentiss	1,972	17,643	15,700	2,433	8.9	8.0	1,234
Quitman	1,030	64,162	70,500	10,927	62.3	68.4	10,609
Rankin	1,582	8,092	5,260	815	5.1	3.3	515
Scott	1,839	9,009	5,420	840	4.9	2.9	457
Sharkey	392	31,319	38,300	5,936	79.9	97.7	15,143
Simpson	2,018	9,591	4,990	773	4.8	2.5	383
Smith	1,867	6,856	4,360	676	3.7	2.3	362
Stone	89	115	32	5	1.3	.4	56
Sunflower	1,461	134,780	130,000	20,150	92.3	89.0	13,792
Tallahatchie	1,309	66,085	68,400	10,602	50.5	52.3	8,099
Tate	1,298	24,360	24,500	3,797	18.8	18.9	2,925
Tippah	1,985	16,441	14,450	2,240	8.3	7.3	1,128
Tishomingo	1,743	10,193	7,600	1,178	5.8	4.4	676
Tunica	516	51,986	54,200	8,401	100.7	105.0	16,281
Union	2,016	18,362	17,300	2,681	9.1	8.6	1,330
Walthall	1,893	8,957	5,000	775	4.7	2.6	409
Warren	460	6,482	5,600	868	14.1	12.2	1,887
Washington	1,250	94,676	95,900	14,864	75.7	76.7	11,891
Wayne	1,390	4,508	2,180	338	3.2	1.6	243
Webster	1,259	8,622	9,500	1,472	6.8	7.5	1,169
Wilkinson	572	3,425	920	143	6.0	1.6	250
Winston	1,999	12,182	7,850	1,217	6.1	3.9	609
Yalobusha	1,058	12,083	12,000	1,860	11.4	11.3	1,758
Yazoo	1,122	44,478	41,600	6,448	39.6	37.1	5,747
Total	109,536	1,649,585	1,541,975	238,996	15.1	14.1	2,182
Missouri:							
Butler	2,645	19,351	20,000	3,070	7.3	7.6	1,161
Dunklin	3,084	98,037	103,000	15,812	31.8	33.4	5,127
Mississippi	1,090	30,411	35,000	5,373	27.9	32.1	4,929
New Madrid	2,265	101,725	113,000	17,347	44.9	49.9	7,659
Pemiscot	2,373	109,984	128,000	19,648	46.3	53.9	8,280
Scott	847	19,648	19,600	3,009	23.2	23.1	3,553
Stoddard	2,431	46,844	51,500	7,906	19.3	21.2	3,252
Total	14,735	426,000	470,100	72,165	28.9	31.9	4,898
Nevada:							
Clark	5	86	100	16	17.2	20.0	3,200
Nye	19	3,453	6,700	1,083	181.7	352.6	57,000
Total	24	3,539	6,800	1,099	147.5	283.3	45,792
New Mexico:							
Chaves	596	39,855	52,500	8,109	66.9	88.1	13,606
Curry	82	1,649	490	76	20.1	6.0	927
De Baca	63	545	430	66	8.6	6.8	1,048
Dona Ana	1,796	43,301	79,603	12,295	24.1	44.3	6,846
Eddy	583	31,932	47,625	7,355	53.8	81.7	12,617
Grant	9	96	150	23	10.7	16.7	2,556
Hidalgo	136	8,055	17,100	2,641	59.2	125.7	19,419
Lea	482	28,256	21,400	3,305	58.6	44.4	6,857
Luna	275	17,177	33,070	5,108	62.5	120.3	18,575
Otero	67	1,891	2,145	331	28.2	32.0	4,940
Quay	162	2,772	840	130	17.1	5.2	802
Roosevelt	863	21,316	15,400	2,379	24.7	17.8	2,757
Sierra	149	2,951	4,807	742	19.8	32.3	4,980
Socorro	158	2,590	2,520	389	16.4	15.9	2,462
Valencia	2	26	20	3	13.0	10.0	1,500
Total	5,423	202,412	278,100	42,953	37.3	51.3	7,921
North Carolina:							
Alamance	70	54	10	2	.8	.1	29
Alexander	574	717	215	34	1.2	.4	59
Anson	1,771	14,044	5,660	899	7.9	3.2	508
Beaufort	724	1,771	800	127	2.4	1.1	175
Bertie	1,522	7,111	3,840	610	4.7	2.5	401
Bladen	1,714	4,403	1,730	275	2.6	1.0	160
Brunswick	273	424	195	31	1.6	.7	114
Burke	56	80	5	1	1.4	.1	18
Cabarrus	772	3,957	1,600	254	5.1	2.1	329
Caldwell	22	31	5	1	1.4	.2	45
Camden	137	422	215	34	3.1	1.6	248
Carteret	35	75	30	5	2.1	.9	143
Catawba	996	2,015	595	94	2.0	.6	94
Chatham	361	602	165	26	1.7	.5	72
Chowan	627	3,045	1,600	254	4.9	2.6	405
Cleveland	3,384	36,016	13,500	2,144	10.6	4.0	634
Columbus	1,431	3,287	1,570	249	2.3	1.1	174
Craven	342	597	275	44	1.7	.8	129
Cumberland	2,129	13,659	5,690	904	6.4	2.7	425
Currituck	164	368	200	32	2.2	1.2	195
Davidson	608	739	285	45	1.2	.5	74
Davie	1,031	1,642	660	105	1.6	.6	102
Duplin	1,120	4,653	2,230	354	4.2	2.0	316
Durham	69	175	40	6	2.5	.6	87
Edgecombe	1,342	12,368	7,820	1,242	9.2	5.8	925
Forsyth	110	137	30	5	1.2	.3	45
Franklin	2,423	10,063	5,270	837	4.2	2.2	345
Gaston	835	3,124	1,060	168	3.7	1.3	201
Gates	893	2,640	1,430	227	3.0	1.6	254
Granville	224	437	220	35	1.9	1.0	156
Greene	823	4,912	1,810	287	6.0	2.2	349
Guilford	81	46	20	3	.6	.2	37
Halifax	2,782	26,356	18,600	2,954	9.5	6.7	1,062
Harnett	2,808	15,736	8,470	1,345	5.6	3.0	479
Hertford	1,030	5,093	3,650	580	4.9	3.5	563
Hoke	910	14,373	8,010	1,272	15.8	8.8	1,398
Hyde	99	291	125	20	2.9	1.3	202
Iredell	2,856	8,301	3,450	548	2.9	1.2	192
Johnston	4,454	23,205	11,050	1,755	5.2	2.5	394
Jones	184	396	175	28	2.2	1.0	152
Lee	568	1,389	845	134	2.4	1.5	236
Lenoir	670	2,734	1,120	178	4.1	1.7	266
Lincoln	1,551	7,526	2,960	470	4.9	1.9	303
Martin	641	3,253	1,430	227	5.1	2.2	354
Mecklenburg	1,115	6,135	2,010	319	5.5	1.8	286
Montgomery	265	2,034	1,100	175	7.7	4.1	660
Moore	616	2,792	1,510	240	4.5	2.5	390
Nash	2,402	14,872	9,370	1,488	6.2	3.9	619
New Hanover	10	21	5	1	2.1	.5	100
Northampton	2,304	20,823	12,800	2,033	9.0	5.6	882
Onslow	127	366	115	18	2.9	.9	142
Orange	80	71	15	2	.9	.2	25
Pamlico	111	232	85	13	2.1	.8	117
Pasquotank	216	343	150	24	1.6	.7	111
Pender	314	458	165	26	1.5	.5	83
Perquimans	594	1,430	575	91	2.4	1.0	153
Person	2	4	5	1	2.0	2.5	500
Pitt	1,653	8,802	3,500	556	5.3	2.1	336
Polk	434	1,434	375	60	3.3	.9	138
Randolph	58	61	15	2	1.1	.3	34
Richmond	965	6,788	2,070	329	7.0	2.1	341
Robeson	4,456	48,550	23,450	3,723	10.9	5.3	836
Rowan	1,500	5,220	2,070	329	3.5	1.4	219
Rutherford	2,115	9,901	2,820	448	4.7	1.3	212
Sampson	4,233	26,989	13,650	2,168	6.4	3.2	512
Scotland	834	18,318	9,020	1,433	22.0	10.8	1,718
Stanly	681	1,544	410	65	2.3	.6	95
Tyrrell	164	311	145	23	1.9	.9	140
Union	3,516	15,944	7,220	1,147	4.5	2.1	326
Vance	1,153	3,730	2,680	426	3.2	2.3	369
Wake	1,794	6,424	3,200	508	3.6	1.8	283
Warren	2,142	8,774	4,610	732	4.1	2.2	342
Washington	314	833	415	66	2.7	1.3	210
Wayne	2,254	12,643	5,520	877	5.6	2.4	389
Wilkes	77	82	25	4	1.1	.3	52
Wilson	1,768	9,756	4,230	672	5.5	2.4	380
Yadkin	66	56	10	2	.8	.2	30
Total	83,549	478,008	232,000	36,846	5.7	2.8	441
Oklahoma:							
Atoka	353	2,289	715	98	6.5	2.0	278
Beaver	8	83	6	1	10.4	.7	125
Beckham	1,873	63,445	33,700	4,637	33.9	18.0	2,476

Cotton production and other specified data, 1960—Continued

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Oklahoma—Continued							
Blaine	1,079	13,137	6,050	$832	12.2	5.6	$771
Bryan	1,588	17,618	7,100	977	11.1	4.5	615
Caddo	3,080	47,798	34,300	4,720	15.5	11.1	1,532
Canadian	1,106	13,878	9,150	1,259	12.5	8.3	1,138
Carter	256	1,695	690	95	6.6	2.7	371
Choctaw	613	4,285	1,640	226	7.0	2.7	369
Cleveland	196	1,913	1,170	161	9.8	6.0	821
Coal	325	3,278	1,530	211	10.1	4.7	649
Comanche	1,006	13,976	3,700	509	13.9	3.7	506
Cotton	1,025	19,825	6,850	943	19.3	6.7	920
Craig	32	123	10	1	3.8	.3	31
Creek	389	2,723	530	73	7.0	1.4	188
Custer	1,285	25,227	19,700	2,711	19.6	15.3	2,110
Dewey	796	8,757	3,150	433	11.0	4.0	544
Ellis	102	802	181	25	7.9	1.8	245
Garfield	15	86	25	3	5.7	1.7	200
Garvin	679	5,865	3,950	544	8.6	5.8	801
Grady	1,472	18,135	13,000	1,789	12.3	8.8	1,215
Grant	7	45	20	3	6.4	2.9	428
Greer	1,171	39,639	23,800	3,275	33.8	20.3	2,797
Harmon	954	47,097	32,100	4,417	49.4	33.6	4,630
Haskell	296	3,157	495	68	8.0	1.2	172
Hughes	841	5,708	1,150	158	6.8	1.4	188
Jackson	1,619	56,538	46,800	6,438	34.9	28.9	3,977
Jefferson	808	17,779	5,700	784	22.0	7.1	970
Johnston	325	3,648	1,340	184	11.2	4.1	566
Kay	65	405	75	10	6.2	1.2	154
Kingfish	258	1,758	225	31	6.8	.9	120
Kiowa	2,070	56,471	33,100	4,554	27.3	16.0	2,200
Latimer	67	268	35	5	4.0	.5	75
LeFlore	349	2,413	400	55	6.9	1.1	158
Lincoln	345	1,850	475	65	5.4	1.4	188
Logan	395	2,874	1,380	190	7.3	3.5	481
Love	638	8,316	3,310	455	13.0	5.2	713
McClain	835	9,023	5,500	757	10.8	6.6	906
McCurtain	535	6,048	4,250	585	11.3	7.9	1,093
McIntosh	1,454	12,464	2,760	380	8.6	1.9	261
Major	357	2,616	580	80	7.3	1.6	224
Marshall	282	4,414	1,480	204	15.7	5.2	723
Mayes	120	826	113	16	6.9	.9	133
Murray	50	428	280	39	8.6	5.6	780
Muskogee	1,636	19,088	7,200	991	11.7	4.4	606
Noble	179	1,000	285	39	5.6	1.6	218
Nowata	99	1,050	180	25	10.6	1.8	253
Okfuskee	847	6,258	1,350	186	7.4	1.6	220
Oklahoma	57	477	265	36	8.4	4.6	632
Okmulgee	1,212	10,928	2,120	292	9.0	1.7	241
Osage	228	3,207	1,530	211	14.1	6.7	925
Pawnee	434	3,417	1,540	212	7.9	3.5	488
Payne	447	2,916	1,780	245	6.5	4.0	548
Pittsburg	634	5,603	1,350	186	8.8	2.1	293
Pontotoc	197	1,285	365	50	6.5	1.9	254
Pottawatomie	201	1,068	250	34	5.3	1.2	169
Pushmataha	161	763	75	10	4.7	.5	62
Roger Mills	1,085	21,205	8,500	1,170	19.5	7.8	1,078
Rogers	153	930	200	28	6.1	1.3	183
Seminole	361	1,938	225	31	5.4	.6	86
Sequoyah	127	1,781	1,140	157	14.0	9.0	1,236
Stephens	561	6,141	2,290	315	10.9	4.1	561
Tillman	1,840	72,500	50,100	6,893	39.4	27.2	3,746
Tulsa	139	1,672	840	116	12.0	6.0	835
Wagoner	1,227	9,967	3,730	513	8.1	3.0	418
Washita	2,527	80,077	60,100	8,269	31.1	23.3	3,209
Woodward	78	639	65	9	8.2	.8	115
Total	45,699	802,633	457,995	63,019	17.5	10.0	1,379
South Carolina:							
Abbeville	1,135	7,947	4,020	653	7.0	3.5	575
Aiken	2,024	19,918	12,250	1,990	9.8	6.1	983
Allendale	549	8,992	6,950	1,129	16.4	12.7	2,056
Anderson	3,286	26,730	13,250	2,152	8.1	4.0	655
Bamberg	1,094	12,192	7,900	$1,283	11.1	7.2	$1,173
Barnwell	1,018	13,922	8,200	1,332	13.7	8.1	1,308
Beaufort	660	1,483	480	78	2.2	.7	118
Berkeley	2,096	9,498	4,850	788	4.5	2.3	376
Calhoun	1,052	15,651	11,800	1,917	14.9	11.2	1,822
Charleston	702	1,624	270	44	2.3	.4	63
Cherokee	1,560	12,267	4,020	653	7.9	2.6	418
Chester	1,090	10,025	5,150	836	9.2	4.7	767
Chesterfield	2,731	31,018	13,000	2,111	11.4	4.8	773
Clarendon	2,546	33,358	26,700	4,336	13.1	10.5	1,703
Colleton	1,737	9,729	5,250	853	5.6	3.0	491
Darlington	2,069	29,399	19,400	3,151	14.2	9.4	1,523
Dillon	1,324	21,578	9,700	1,575	16.3	7.3	1,190
Dorchester	1,686	9,797	6,150	999	5.8	3.6	592
Edgefield	934	9,571	6,500	1,056	10.2	7.0	1,131
Fairfield	761	4,420	1,110	180	5.8	1.5	237
Florence	3,765	31,541	16,400	2,664	8.4	4.4	708
Georgetown	962	3,161	1,100	179	3.3	1.1	186
Greenville	2,531	14,149	3,600	585	5.6	1.4	231
Greenwood	593	3,746	1,430	232	6.3	2.4	391
Hampton	1,043	8,082	5,900	958	7.7	5.7	919
Horry	3,101	10,453	4,150	674	3.4	1.3	217
Jasper	801	3,071	1,050	171	3.8	1.3	213
Kershaw	1,848	19,518	8,850	1,437	10.6	4.8	778
Lancaster	1,180	7,645	2,790	453	6.5	2.4	384
Laurens	1,624	16,877	6,450	1,048	10.4	4.0	645
Lee	1,536	34,435	27,750	4,507	22.4	18.1	2,934
Lexington	1,714	11,149	5,450	885	6.5	3.2	516
McCormick	472	3,544	1,390	226	7.5	2.9	479
Marion	1,388	11,548	5,250	853	8.3	3.8	615
Marlboro	1,184	37,714	28,900	4,694	31.9	24.4	3,964
Newberry	1,095	6,657	3,070	499	6.1	2.8	456
Oconee	1,546	6,086	2,440	396	3.9	1.6	256
Orangeburg	4,975	57,498	45,000	7,308	11.6	9.0	1,469
Pickens	1,314	5,255	1,270	206	4.0	1.0	157
Richland	1,189	6,936	4,200	682	5.8	3.5	574
Saluda	1,095	6,710	3,340	542	6.1	3.0	495
Spartanburg	3,759	21,190	5,000	812	5.6	1.3	216
Sumter	2,695	39,419	32,100	5,213	15.2	12.4	2,000
Union	632	5,183	1,470	239	8.2	2.3	378
Williamsburg	3,654	33,603	22,900	3,719	9.2	6.3	1,018
York	1,518	15,140	5,800	942	10.0	3.8	620
Total	77,268	709,429	414,000	67,240	9.2	5.4	870
Tennessee:							
Bedford	626	1,789	610	96	2.9	1.0	153
Benton	911	3,181	1,850	290	3.5	2.0	318
Bradley	436	1,018	265	42	2.5	.7	103
Cannon	31	52	12	2	1.7	.4	64
Carroll	3,191	20,472	21,500	3,375	6.4	6.7	1,058
Chester	1,320	10,966	11,900	1,868	8.3	9.0	1,415
Coffee	675	1,835	1,035	162	2.7	1.5	240
Crockett	2,020	31,082	38,500	6,043	15.4	19.1	2,992
Davidson	7	18	4	1	2.6	.6	143
Decatur	848	3,856	2,630	413	4.5	3.1	487
De Kalb	30	52	12	2	1.7	.4	67
Dyer	2,327	32,495	37,000	5,808	14.0	15.9	2,496
Fayette	2,063	41,955	40,900	6,420	20.3	19.8	3,112
Franklin	1,432	5,999	4,800	753	5.8	4.7	730
Gibson	4,795	45,561	53,900	8,460	9.5	11.2	1,764
Giles	2,165	9,776	5,110	802	4.5	2.4	370
Grundy	97	207	104	16	2.1	1.1	165
Hamilton	282	772	160	25	2.7	.6	89
Hardeman	1,883	21,050	20,900	3,281	11.2	11.1	1,742
Hardin	1,575	9,288	7,150	1,122	5.9	4.5	712
Haywood	2,241	40,799	43,500	6,827	18.2	19.4	3,046
Henderson	2,175	17,345	17,900	2,810	8.0	8.2	1,292
Henry	1,966	6,010	3,210	504	3.1	1.6	256
Hickman	18	31	16	3	1.7	.9	167
Humphreys	14	28	16	3	2.0	1.1	214
Lake	439	23,746	29,300	4,599	54.0	66.7	10,476

Lauderdale	2,044	35,286	42,200	6,624	17.3	20.6	3,241
Lawrence	3,330	20,460	12,300	1,931	6.1	3.7	580
Lewis	146	410	123	19	2.8	.8	130
Lincoln	2,002	13,329	10,700	1,680	6.7	5.3	839
Loudon	7	15	4	1	2.1	.6	143
McMinn	436	830	170	27	1.9	.4	62
McNairy	2,562	19,278	18,600	2,920	7.5	7.3	1,140
Madison	2,796	31,991	35,100	5,510	11.4	12.6	1,971
Marion	98	361	180	28	3.7	1.8	286
Marshall	222	493	210	33	2.2	.9	149
Maury	115	269	65	10	2.3	.6	87
Meigs	325	805	212	33	2.5	.7	102
Monroe	184	310	45	7	1.7	.2	38
Moore	51	108	25	4	2.1	.5	78
Obion	1,823	11,087	10,800	1,695	6.1	5.9	930
Perry	73	213	60	9	2.9	.8	123
Polk	228	883	240	38	3.9	1.1	167
Rhea	20	28	10	2	1.4	.5	100
Rutherford	922	4,496	2,360	370	4.9	2.6	401
Shelby	3,309	42,163	41,500	6,513	12.7	12.5	1,968
Tipton	2,661	44,368	53,600	8,412	16.7	20.1	3,161
Van Buren	28	46	10	2	1.6	.4	71
Warren	395	700	165	26	1.8	.4	66
Wayne	929	3,404	1,960	308	3.7	2.1	332
Weakley	3,034	12,243	10,020	1,573	4.0	3.3	518
White	58	88	6	1	1.5	.1	17
Williamson	88	172	30	5	2.0	.3	57
Wilson	39	98	4	1	2.5	.1	26
Total	61,492	573,317	512,983	91,509	9.3	9.5	1,488
Texas:							
Anderson	1,799	10,021	1,850	259	5.6	1.0	144
Andrews	57	3,984	1,500	210	69.9	26.3	3,684
Angelina	450	3,397	470	66	7.5	1.0	147
Aransas	19	1,452	270	38	76.4	14.2	2,000
Archer	93	1,998	460	64	21.5	4.9	688
Armstrong	99	1,925	770	108	19.4	7.8	1,091
Atascosa	726	8,854	1,700	238	12.2	2.3	328
Austin	1,430	20,726	7,100	994	14.5	5.0	695
Bailey	1,266	107,231	82,000	11,481	84.7	64.8	9,069
Bastrop	832	11,899	2,900	406	14.3	3.5	488
Baylor	548	18,359	10,000	1,400	33.5	18.2	2,555
Bee	615	16,172	6,600	924	26.3	10.7	1,502
Bell	2,598	72,925	20,000	2,800	28.1	7.7	1,078
Bexar	371	3,798	1,200	168	10.2	3.2	453
Blanco	12	53	5	1	4.4	.4	83
Borden	200	18,690	11,100	1,554	93.4	55.5	7,770
Bosque	727	11,550	1,920	269	15.9	2.6	370
Bowie	799	9,177	4,360	602	11.5	5.4	753
Brazoria	520	14,338	7,400	1,036	27.6	14.2	1,992
Brazos	353	20,213	19,800	2,772	57.3	56.1	7,853
Brewster	2	99	65	9	49.5	32.5	4,500
Briscoe	506	26,355	24,100	3,374	52.1	47.6	6,668
Brooks	190	2,255	200	28	11.9	1.1	147
Brown	579	4,906	570	80	8.5	1.0	138
Burleson	1,095	27,669	21,900	3,066	25.3	20.0	2,800
Burnet	240	3,432	360	50	14.3	1.5	208
Caldwell	685	22,931	8,000	1,120	33.5	11.7	1,635
Calhoun	376	19,139	6,200	868	50.9	16.5	2,309
Callahan	540	8,124	1,700	238	15.0	3.1	441
Cameron	5,896	169,483	122,000	17,082	28.7	20.7	2,897
Camp	416	2,320	170	24	5.6	.4	58
Carson	119	1,117	370	51	9.4	3.1	429
Cass	1,383	8,336	1,100	154	6.0	.8	111
Castro	1,004	58,666	56,000	7,841	58.4	55.8	7,810
Chambers	8	74	20	3	9.2	2.5	375
Cherokee	1,932	12,522	1,750	245	6.5	.9	127
Childress	824	53,013	28,800	4,032	64.3	35.0	4,893
Clay	383	10,301	3,950	553	26.9	10.3	1,444
Cochran	648	75,015	50,000	7,001	115.8	77.2	10,804
Coke	244	7,168	1,050	147	29.4	4.3	602
Coleman	1,079	30,528	7,100	994	28.3	6.6	921
Collin	3,258	88,630	30,000	4,200	27.2	9.2	1,289
Collingsworth	1,071	63,943	34,600	4,845	59.7	32.3	4,524
Colorado	811	10,293	3,400	476	12.7	4.2	587
Comal	35	240	20	3	6.9	.6	86
Comanche	1,054	5,919	700	98	5.6	.7	93
Concho	378	31,813	13,000	1,820	84.2	34.4	4,815
Cooke	587	7,392	2,100	294	12.6	3.6	501
Coryell	1,045	21,752	5,100	714	20.8	4.9	683
Cottle	555	51,944	30,100	4,214	93.6	54.2	7,592
Crosby	1,020	123,356	113,200	15,850	120.9	111.0	15,539
Culberson	47	5,505	6,250	875	117.1	133.0	18,617
Dallam	6	51	20	3	10.2	3.3	500
Dallas	1,239	35,426	11,600	1,624	28.6	9.4	1,311
Dawson	1,575	205,541	167,000	23,384	130.5	106.0	14,847
Deaf Smith	607	11,801	7,300	1,022	19.4	12.0	1,684
Delta	1,065	39,015	12,900	1,806	36.6	12.1	1,696
Denton	1,117	22,689	8,600	1,204	20.3	7.7	1,078
DeWitt	1,291	13,987	2,850	399	10.8	2.2	309
Dickens	804	51,359	28,860	4,032	63.9	35.8	5,015
Dimmit	56	2,373	1,650	231	42.4	29.5	4,125
Donley	718	28,849	9,450	1,323	40.2	13.2	1,843
Duval	829	12,610	1,050	147	15.2	1.3	177
Eastland	671	3,598	210	29	5.4	.3	43
Ector	5	189	160	22	37.8	32.0	4,400
Ellis	2,899	149,211	47,400	6,637	51.5	16.4	2,289
El Paso	1,426	28,263	49,200	6,889	19.8	34.5	4,831
Erath	985	5,960	670	94	6.0	.7	95
Falls	2,456	78,182	23,400	3,276	31.8	9.5	1,334
Fannin	2,903	70,494	21,900	3,066	24.3	7.5	1,056
Fayette	2,406	29,818	8,250	1,155	12.4	3.4	480
Fisher	1,330	79,700	56,500	7,911	59.9	42.5	5,948
Floyd	1,419	104,564	116,000	16,242	73.7	81.7	11,446
Foard	324	13,119	7,100	994	40.5	21.9	3,068
Fort Bend	2,146	78,792	33,100	4,635	36.7	15.4	2,160
Franklin	397	3,570	710	99	9.0	1.8	249
Freestone	1,723	17,728	3,900	546	10.3	2.3	317
Frio	260	5,937	5,000	700	22.8	19.2	2,692
Gaines	810	80,420	56,000	7,841	99.3	69.1	9,680
Garza	480	38,818	30,800	4,312	80.9	64.2	8,983
Gillespie	106	620	110	15	5.8	1.0	141
Glasscock	106	9,732	13,100	1,834	91.8	123.6	17,302
Goliad	288	4,580	1,050	147	15.9	3.6	510
Gonzales	1,016	13,393	2,700	378	13.2	2.7	372
Gray	215	3,705	740	104	17.2	3.4	484
Grayson	1,776	36,168	11,800	1,652	20.4	6.6	930
Gregg	220	1,531	240	34	7.0	1.1	155
Grimes	1,037	15,917	6,500	910	15.3	6.3	878
Guadalupe	1,169	20,148	6,200	868	17.2	5.3	743
Hale	2,148	177,855	185,000	25,904	82.8	86.1	12,060
Hall	973	91,060	58,100	8,135	93.6	59.7	8,361
Hamilton	847	10,682	2,550	357	12.6	3.0	421
Hansford	72	1,043	340	48	14.5	4.7	667
Hardeman	713	33,999	18,300	2,562	47.7	25.7	3,593
Hardin	11	25	10	1	2.3	.9	91
Harris	243	4,571	1,300	182	18.8	5.3	749
Harrison	1,637	11,992	2,400	336	7.3	1.5	205
Hartley	7	134	35	5	19.1	5.0	714
Haskell	1,821	116,644	65,000	9,101	64.1	35.7	4,998
Hays	252	7,718	1,850	259	30.6	7.3	1,028
Hemphill	90	1,715	750	105	19.1	8.3	1,167
Henderson	1,211	8,082	1,220	171	6.7	1.0	141
Hidalgo	7,788	202,324	160,000	22,404	26.0	20.5	2,877
Hill	3,073	138,700	36,300	5,083	45.1	11.8	1,654
Hockley	1,769	184,325	147,100	20,597	104.2	83.2	11,643
Hood	390	2,712	420	59	7.0	1.1	151
Hopkins	1,572	26,401	5,200	728	16.8	3.3	453
Houston	1,820	26,400	5,600	784	14.5	3.1	431
Howard	802	72,127	39,200	5,489	89.9	48.9	6,844
Hudspeth	152	20,678	28,250	3,955	136.0	185.9	26,020
Hunt	2,954	93,722	32,600	4,565	31.7	11.0	1,545
Irion	20	900	510	71	45.0	25.5	3,550
Jack	128	2,302	600	84	18.0	4.7	656
Jackson	642	22,462	7,000	980	35.0	10.9	1,526
Jasper	165	459	15	2	2.8	.1	12
Jeff Davis	6	346	600	84	57.7	100.0	14,000
Jim Hogg	69	1,382	140	20	20.0	2.0	290
Jim Wells	781	23,856	7,500	1,050	30.5	9.6	1,344
Johnson	1,107	40,839	11,300	1,582	36.9	10.2	1,429
Jones	1,894	109,589	44,000	6,161	57.9	23.2	3,253
Karnes	1,307	25,895	4,250	595	19.8	3.3	455
Kaufman	1,689	56,438	13,900	1,946	33.4	8.2	1,152
Kent	320	19,571	11,500	1,610	61.2	35.9	5,031
Kerr	5	98	4	1	19.6	.8	200
Kimble	25	231	30	4	9.2	1.2	160
King	89	9,011	5,320	745	101.2	59.8	8,371
Kinney	8	121	70	10	15.1	8.7	1,250
Kleberg	302	8,614	3,100	434	28.5	10.3	1,437
Knox	978	57,237	41,100	5,755	58.5	42.0	5,884
Lamar	1,613	55,792	18,800	2,632	34.6	11.7	1,632
Lamb	2,360	203,495	185,000	25,904	86.2	78.4	10,976
Lampasas	197	1,309	200	28	6.6	1.0	142
LaSalle	115	3,249	1,400	196	28.3	12.2	1,704
Lavaca	2,667	34,218	9,700	1,358	13.1	3.7	521
Lee	1,048	10,541	2,400	336	10.1	2.3	321
Leon	924	9,364	2,600	364	10.1	2.8	394
Liberty	294	3,005	980	137	10.2	3.3	466
Limestone	2,220	67,912	10,900	1,526	30.6	4.9	687
Live Oak	648	18,580	4,300	602	28.7	6.6	929
Llano	37	125	30	4	3.4	.8	108
Loving	8	477	370	52	59.6	46.2	6,500
Lubbock	2,602	231,059	242,300	33,927	88.8	93.1	13,039

Cotton production and other specified data, 1960—Continued

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total acreage allotted	Number of bales produced	Total computed value of cotton produced	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average computed value of cotton per allotment farm
				Thousands			
Texas—Continued							
Lynn	1,488	185,664	136,000	$19,043	124.8	91.4	$12,798
McCulloch	517	17,195	3,400	476	33.3	6.6	921
McLennan	2,968	89,533	25,500	3,570	30.2	8.6	1,203
McMullen	51	913	95	13	17.9	1.9	255
Madison	555	6,632	2,550	357	11.9	4.6	643
Marion	401	1,359	160	22	3.4	.4	55
Martin	700	86,584	61,100	8,555	123.7	87.3	12,221
Mason	176	1,165	450	63	6.6	2.6	358
Matagorda	705	21,621	7,200	1,008	30.7	10.2	1,430
Maverick	214	4,811	2,900	406	22.5	13.6	1,897
Medina	179	2,070	930	130	11.6	5.2	726
Menard	70	918	180	25	13.1	2.6	357
Midland	284	25,826	21,700	3,038	90.9	76.4	10,697
Milam	1,583	53,291	22,000	3,080	33.7	13.9	1,946
Mills	219	2,757	570	80	12.6	2.6	381
Mitchell	948	67,684	34,500	4,831	71.4	36.4	5,096
Montague	349	4,675	1,610	225	13.4	4.6	645
Montgomery	187	1,400	220	31	7.5	1.2	166
Moore	27	440	220	31	16.3	8.1	1,148
Morris	305	1,388	100	14	4.5	.3	46
Motley	479	33,926	19,400	2,716	70.8	40.5	5,670
Nacogdoches	881	5,642	710	99	6.4	.8	112
Navarro	2,979	112,022	24,800	3,472	37.6	8.3	1,165
Newton	216	895	25	4	4.1	.1	19
Nolan	723	45,042	26,600	3,724	62.3	36.8	5,151
Nueces	1,689	116,823	80,000	11,201	69.2	47.4	6,632
Ochiltree	20	536	320	45	26.8	16.0	2,250
Oldham	20	130	50	7	6.5	2.5	350
Palo Pinto	232	3,936	1,010	141	17.0	4.4	608
Panola	1,243	7,814	1,250	175	6.3	1.0	141
Parker	364	3,659	570	80	10.1	1.6	220
Parmer	1,159	49,182	38,000	5,321	42.4	32.8	4,591
Pecos	211	25,383	44,790	6,271	120.3	212.3	29,720
Polk	361	3,513	770	108	9.7	2.1	299
Potter	6	131	50	7	21.8	8.3	1,167
Presidio	113	3,090	4,970	696	27.3	44.0	6,159
Rains	510	8,045	1,920	269	15.8	3.8	527
Randall	208	2,213	1,500	210	10.6	7.2	1,010
Reagan	24	1,095	1,400	196	45.6	58.3	8,167
Red River	962	25,638	9,400	1,316	26.6	9.8	1,368
Reeves	322	55,673	96,400	13,498	172.9	299.4	41,919
Refugio	307	15,192	6,200	868	49.5	20.2	2,827
Roberts	14	240	130	18	17.1	9.3	1,286
Robertson	613	27,491	27,900	3,906	44.8	45.5	6,372
Rockwall	538	19,749	7,800	1,092	36.7	14.5	2,030
Runnels	1,618	94,279	45,500	6,371	58.3	28.1	3,938
Rusk	1,761	11,834	1,750	245	6.7	1.0	139
Sabine	349	2,478	520	73	7.1	1.5	209
San Augustine	672	5,956	870	122	8.9	1.3	182
San Jacinto	498	4,050	760	106	8.1	1.5	213
San Patricio	1,261	91,954	66,500	9,311	72.9	52.7	7,384
San Saba	483	6,168	1,200	168	12.8	2.5	348
Schleicher	142	9,772	4,900	686	68.8	34.5	4,831
Scurry	1,079	67,765	30,000	4,200	62.8	27.8	3,892
Shackelford	175	4,950	1,500	210	28.3	8.6	1,200
Shelby	1,246	7,491	540	76	6.0	.4	61
Smith	1,345	6,899	440	62	5.1	.3	46
Somervell	135	1,071	175	$25	7.9	1.3	$185
Starr	1,024	26,253	10,400	1,456	25.6	10.2	1,422
Stephens	114	1,079	140	20	9.5	1.2	175
Sterling	14	406	30	4	29.0	2.1	286
Stonewall	508	26,620	11,400	1,596	52.4	22.4	3,142
Sutton	1	16	25	4	16.0	25.0	4,000
Swisher	1,138	56,854	57,000	7,981	50.0	50.1	7,013
Tarrant	305	10,072	2,950	413	33.0	9.7	1,354
Taylor	1,023	35,241	13,600	1,820	34.4	12.7	1,779
Terry	1,269	141,506	125,000	17,502	111.5	98.5	13,792
Throckmorton	426	11,817	4,350	609	27.7	10.2	1,430
Titus	504	2,846	200	28	5.6	.4	56
Tom Green	828	63,077	36,000	5,041	76.2	43.5	6,088
Travis	1,072	40,046	9,400	1,316	37.4	8.8	1,228
Trinity	613	4,335	390	55	7.1	.6	90
Tyler	95	471	130	18	5.0	1.4	189
Upshur	604	2,823	50	7	4.7	.1	12
Uvalde	63	1,516	1,150	161	24.1	18.3	2,556
Van Zandt	1,752	23,154	4,600	644	13.2	2.6	368
Victoria	922	28,406	9,600	1,344	30.8	10.4	1,458
Walker	712	6,655	1,500	210	9.3	2.1	295
Waller	374	5,486	1,900	266	14.7	5.1	711
Ward	81	11,365	650	92	140.3	8.0	1,136
Washington	1,950	22,830	7,800	1,092	11.7	4.0	560
Webb	51	1,700	1,050	147	33.3	20.6	2,882
Wharton	2,341	87,196	34,900	4,887	37.2	14.9	2,088
Wheeler	827	27,343	11,200	1,568	33.1	13.5	1,896
Wichita	269	7,223	2,800	392	26.9	10.4	1,457
Wilbarger	1,140	55,130	34,500	4,831	48.4	30.3	4,238
Willacy	1,457	96,298	59,000	8,261	66.1	40.5	5,670
Williamson	3,111	123,507	42,200	5,909	39.7	13.6	1,899
Wilson	628	5,616	1,500	210	8.9	2.4	334
Winkler	3	24	16	2	8.0	5.3	667
Wise	319	2,638	580	81	8.3	1.8	254
Wood	764	3,401	250	35	4.5	.3	46
Yoakum	370	33,642	19,700	2,758	90.9	53.2	7,454
Young	503	11,539	3,310	463	22.9	6.6	920
Zapata	91	2,237	1,600	224	24.6	17.6	2,461
Zavala	177	10,132	9,800	1,372	57.2	55.4	7,751
Total	198,284	7,328,409	4,322,700	605,246	37.0	21.8	3,052
Virginia:							
Brunswick	1,235	2,199	1,050	158	1.8	.8	128
Dinwiddie	196	281	120	18	1.4	.6	92
Greensville	1,016	4,749	3,100	465	4.7	3.1	458
Isle of Wight	193	366	150	23	1.9	.8	119
Lunenburg	124	245	100	15	2.0	.8	121
Mecklenburg	818	2,055	1,120	168	2.5	1.4	205
Nansemond	754	1,973	880	132	2.6	1.2	175
Norfolk	16	33	5	1	2.1	.3	63
Prince George	62	78	20	3	1.3	.3	48
Southampton	1,246	5,224	2,850	428	4.2	2.3	343
Surry	12	16	5	1	1.3	.4	83
Sussex	695	1,787	990	149			
Total	6,367	19,006	10,390	1,561	3.0	1.6	245

The Federal Budget in a Time of National Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. David Bell, delivered an address to the Can Manufacturers' Institute, meeting in New York. I believe the speech deserves wide distribution and attention. It is a clear exposition of the Bureau's position on the question of Federal expenditures. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET IN A TIME OF NATIONAL DANGER

(Address of David E. Bell, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, at the board meeting of the Can Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N.Y.)

I would like to talk to you today about some of the major issues concerning the Federal budget in this time of national danger. These are issues which have necessarily been at the center of attention of the Kennedy administration in these first few months. They are of obvious concern to all of us as citizens and taxpayers.

At a time when we are increasing the Nation's readiness for military action, should that prove necessary, and are attempting to increase our effectiveness in international affairs, we all want to be sure that our public finances are on a sound footing. So far as the budget is concerned, I take it this means meeting two tests: First, are we spending the right amount—neither too little nor too much—to provide for vital national needs, and, second, is the relationship between revenues and expenditures correctly devised to contribute properly to economic stability and growth? At present, as you know, there are some who say that we are spending too much, and that we are running too large a deficit. I hope I can shed some light on both assertions.

I

Let me first clear away some misconceptions. There is no doubt that in an absolute sense the Federal budget is large. The most recent estimate of expenditures in the present fiscal year is nearly $88 billion. (That figure, incidentally, will have to be revised shortly to take account of recent congressional actions and other factors. For present purposes, however, it is sufficiently accurate.)

The Federal budget is not only large; it has been growing rapidly. Budget expenditures in 1949 and 1950 were about $40 billion, less than half today's level. An even more startling figure: Federal expenditures in the eight budgets administered by President Eisenhower were $182 billion higher than expenditures in the eight budgets administered by President Truman.

What conclusions can we draw from these facts? Do they demonstrate that President Eisenhower was a much looser man with the Federal purse strings than President Truman? Do they demonstrate that the Federal budget is a vast juggernaut, eating up larger and larger shares of the national product? Are we "spending ourselves into the poorhouse"?

Not at all. Any such conclusions would be very misleading.

Let us ask the question—not how big are Federal expenditures in absolute terms, but how big they are relative to the total output of goods and services of the country? The answer gives us an entirely different—and far more useful—impression of the size of the Federal budget and its growth.

Budget expenditures for the present fiscal year (1962) will be in the neighborhood of 16 percent of the national output of goods and services. If you look back over the recent years, you will find that this percentage has not varied substantially since the end of World War II. The low point, 13.4 percent, was in 1948. The high point, 20.6 percent, was in 1953 under the impetus of the Korean war. In 11 of the 16 fiscal years since World War II, the percentage has been in the range 15 to 17 percent of gross national product. The conclusion is that the general level of Federal expenditures, while rising sharply in absolute amounts, has not risen significantly as a proportion of the gross national product over the past decade and a half.

I do not argue, needless to say, that a proportion of 16 percent of gross national product is in some sense correct. Quite the contrary, I will proceed shortly to argue that we must consider Federal expenditures on their merits and not in terms of arbitrary amounts or proportions. The only point I wish to make now is that there is no reason to consider that Federal outlays have been increasingly burdensome on the economy. The fact is that the burden has remained substantially constant since the end of World War II.

Let me add one other point here. Some of you may have noted a speech made last week by Senator BYRD, in which he predicted that Federal expenditures will rise to $106 billion in fiscal year 1965. At first glance that seems like a very large figure. But in terms of a reasonable estimate of what the gross national product might be in 1965, assuming reasonably high employment, Senator BYRD's prediction turns out to be about 16 percent of gross national product—a figure exactly in line with recent experience and in fact lower than the actual percentage in 8 of the past 10 years.

The Kennedy administration has not made any predictions about what Federal expenditures will be in 1965. But I take it a fair comment on Senator BYRD's prediction would be that if we as a nation decide that we need to spend $106 billion in 1965 through the Federal budget, we will be able to do so at not greater relative burden on the economy than have been the budgets of the last 10 years.

What I have said thus far has principally been intended to eliminate some possible false impressions, and reach the real heart of the question how large should Federal expenditures be. I take it we cannot answer the question by reference to absolute or relative comparisons of budget totals. The question is one of need. If we don't have to spend so much, 16 percent of the gross national product is too much. If we need to spend more, we could clearly spend much greater sums. In 1944 and 1945 we spent more than 45 percent of the gross national product through the Federal budget—and I don't believe, looking back, that anyone would argue that we had reached anything like an absolute limit.

My conclusion, therefore, is that there is no refuge in overall totals or in percentages of GNP. We must face the hard question: What does the national interest require us to spend through the Federal budget for public purposes?

II

In order to approach this question, it is helpful to separate the elements of the Federal budget into major segments. For simplicity here today I will use a three-part classification. The first is the expenditures in the budget for national defense and international activities—the combined set of activities including the cost of our own Defense Establishment, our military and economic assistance to other countries, the atomic energy program, and related activities which are intended to advance the objectives of peace and freedom in the world. Together these expenditures are costing at the present time about $54 billion of the total of $88 billion, or 62 percent. This is obviously the largest proportionate share of Federal budget costs. The cost of our Defense Establishment alone is more than half the total budget. It is not too much to say that the level of the budget has been essentially determined by the judgment of the President and of the Congress as to the appropriate devotion of national resources to these national security purposes.

In addition to these direct outlays for national security, the costs of interest on the debt, about $9 billion a year, and of veterans' services and benefits, about $5 billion a year, both of which are essentially related to the costs of the Nation's past wars, account for about 16 percent of the budget. Thus, more than three-quarters of the total Federal budget stems essentially from costs of previous wars and of our attempts to prevent another war.

This leaves some $20 billion as the share of budget expenditures which are going to other purposes—education, research, the space program, natural resource development, aids to business and to agriculture, etc. As a proportion of the total budget, these items are by far the smaller share, although they receive the bulk of the attention of the Members of Congress during the annual budget season and also perhaps of the general public in considering budget matters.

With respect to each of these parts of the budget—national security, fixed charges for interest and veterans, and domestic programs—there are two major questions to be asked, by the executive agencies, by the President, by the Congress, by anyone, in short, who wants to consider any element of the budget intelligently. The first question is, What is the type and extent of Federal action, if any, which should be undertaken in a given field? The second question is, Assuming some Federal action is to be undertaken, how can we make sure it is conducted efficiently and at minimum costs?

Let me indicate briefly how these questions apply to the decisions President Kennedy has made with respect to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 which he inherited from President Eisenhower. First, with respect to the question whether action should be undertaken by the Government, since January 20, President Kennedy has proposed to the Congress a number of changes in the budget for the fiscal year 1962 which he inherited from his predecessor. The bulk of the changes proposed by President Kennedy have been in the fields of national security and space. In comparison to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 submitted by President Eisenhower in January, the present estimate of expenditures is about $7 billion higher. Something over $4 billion, or 60 percent of the increase, has been in the fields of national security and space—over half the increase in the Military Establishment alone.

These increases reflect the conviction of the Kennedy administration that the national security of the country was not adequately provided for in the budget of the previous administration—and it also reflects, of course, judgments based on international developments since the preceding administration left office. If it were in office today, that administration might also have recommended larger defense outlays.

The increases recommended by President Kennedy in the national defense field have

been aimed to give us more strength in both strategic and conventional warfare—more Polaris submarines and Minuteman missiles, on the one hand, and more Army and Marine divisions on the other. I have not heard any serious challenge of the necessity for spending these additional amounts for defense. And it is worthy of note, I think, that the Congress—led by the senior Members who have dealt with defense for many years, men like RUSSELL and VINSON, of Georgia, and MAHON, of Texas—have not only approved all of President Kennedy's recommendations, but in fact appropriated several hundred million dollars more than he requested.

In addition to changes directly related to national defense and space, President Kennedy has recommended a number of budgetary increases in other fields—which are expected to raise expenditures in the present fiscal year around $2 billion. These items cover such fields as education, scientific research, housing, agriculture, natural resource development, and a wide range of other activities. While I cannot discuss each of these items in detail, I would like to say two or three things about them in general.

First, it would be easy but erroneous to think of this nondefense side of governmental spending as wholly unimportant and capable of being eliminated or cut down drastically at will. There are in fact major elements of this nondefense spending which are at least as important to the longrun strength of our country as are direct military outlays. Any competent scientist will tell you, for example, that Federal expenditures for basic research, provided through the National Science Foundation or the National Bureau of Standards, are essential for the scientific and technological progress of our country and our future military strength. And similar comments could be made about many other programs in such fields as education, transportation, natural resources, and so on.

Moreover, I would call your attention to the fact that the nondefense side of the budget has been growing steadily for years, under Republican and Democratic administrations alike. If you eliminate national security, interest, and veterans' costs, the so-called "civilian" or "welfare" expenditures of the Federal Government (both serious misnomers, of course) rose from $8.2 billion in 1954, President Eisenhower's first budget, to $16.9 billion in the budget he proposed for 1962, an increase of about 100 percent in 8 years.

I suggest that an important conclusion may be drawn. This is that nondefense expenditures of the Federal Government are rising not primarily because of differences in attitudes of the two political parties, but mainly in response to the underlying needs of the Nation, needs that stem legitimately from the growth in population, the growth in urbanization, and similar accompaniments of modern civilization which result in heavier demands upon governmental services. If I may say so, much of the discussion of budget matters, which seems to imply that any additional Government spending for civilian purposes is inherently wrong, seems to me to overlook this fundamental fact.

My second general comment on this nondefense side of the budget is to strongly agree with the view that in times like these we must be doubly careful to make sure that each proposal is in fact necessary. This has been the policy of the President from the beginning of his term. Each addition to the budget has been proposed to the Congress by the President only after the most careful and deliberate consideration, and because he felt it was of sufficient importance to the Nation to warrant an allocation of resources in a time of national danger.

The increases in nondefense spending proposed by the President fall into two main groups. Close to a billion dollars is related directly to the recession. This includes temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits, aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, distribution of surplus food, and so forth. Of these amounts, half a billion dollars or more will be repaid in loan repayments or future unemployment taxes. I think qualified observers are agreed that these various programs have been worth their cost in contributing to economic recovery and the alleviation of distress.

This leaves something over $1 billion worth of proposed increases to strentghen old programs or start new ones. This includes all the increases for science, for education, for natural resources, for transportation, for housing, and so on. These, in the President's judgment, are necessary to the growth and development of the country.

There are obviously questions of judgment about particular programs on which there can be differences of opinion, and I would be the last to assert that the particular judgments this administration has made are impeccable in every instance. I do believe, however, that it is incumbent on those who would like to see expenditures reduced, to consider the budget in some detail and to propose specific items which in their judgment can be reduced without detriment to the national interest. This, in my opinion, is the only basis on which there can be a sensible debate over budget issues.

All that I have been saying relates to the question of whether specific Federal activities should be undertaken. Let me repeat that there is another relevant question. If we do decide to undertake an activity, we should obviously carry it out with maximum efficiency and at minimum cost. This is a matter with which the Budget Bureau is deeply involved. I have no time today to discuss it as I should like to do. Suffice it to say that this administration takes this responsibility very seriously, and we hope we are making progress in this regard. Let me cite two examples, one specific, one general. The first is the establishment of a central Department of Defense supply agency intended to end the costly duplication of separate staffs, redundant facilities, and conflicting standards and methods of procurement, storage, and disposal. Experts for years have been urging that this step be taken—dating back at least to the first Hoover Commission in 1949. The second is the installation of a clear-cut philosophy of administration based on the concept that responsibility for planning and action must be centered in individuals and not in committees. The President intends that there be accountability—precise, identifiable, and enforcible—at every stage in the conduct of the public business.

III

Let me now turn, finally, to a brief discussion of the question whether we should be seeking to balance the budget in the current fiscal year.

Here the Kennedy administration has taken a position which is in contrast with that espoused by some members of the previous administration. The Kennedy administration's view is that it is not only unnecessary, but unwise and improper, to attempt to balance the Federal budget each year. To do so would, in fact, contribute to making recessions worse and inflationary booms higher, and would have a destabilizing effect on the national economy. The viewpoint of this administration is that it is correct and proper to have a deficit in periods of recession, and a surplus, not simply a balance, in years of boom and potential inflationary pressure.

You will note that this view is not radical or unusual. It is fully accepted by economists of all varieties of political judgment. Moreover, this view is espoused by the Committee for Economic Development, which 10 years or more ago began to promote what it called the stabilizing budget policy.

I do not belive, therefore, that the basic policy of planning for budget deficits in recessions and for surpluses, during boom periods can be effectively challenged on rational grounds. On the other hand, I would certainly agree that the application of this policy is subject to differences of view, and that those differences of view might well produce a somewhat different answer to the question of specific budget policy at any particular time.

At present, we are running a deficit, currently estimated to be in the neighborhood of $5 to $6 billion. We are, some point out, starting to recover from the recession of last winter. The economy is beginning to revive vigorously. We can look forward to steadily increasing output and income. Are we running some danger of stimulating an overrapid advance in the economy and of a period of dangerous inflation?

The views of the administration are quite clear. We regard the present deficit as moderate, proper, and defensible. It is worthy of note that it is in the neighborhood of half the deficit for the fiscal year 1959, which was precisely the same year in relation to the last business cycle. That year, like the present one, was a year of basic recovery in the economy which was not fully reflected in Federal revenues owing to the built-in lag in collections.

Unemployment is still high—only slightly below 7 percent—and there is much slack and unused capacity in the economy. While these conditions pertain, we are clearly not running a significant danger of inflation stemming from the classical increases in the money supply and in purchasing power. There is, of course, another kind of danger of inflation, relating to the interplay of costs and prices in collective bargaining and industrial markets, but this is not a matter which is so closely related to Federal budget policy.

Another test of the appropriateness of the deficit is to ask, What will come of it? If we were anticipating a further deficit in the fiscal year 1963, when we can expect the economy to be more fully employed, and when we expect to approach quite a high level of employment, then the administration would agree there would be reason for concern. As matters stand, however, recognizing the limitations on our foresight and barring further defense requirements, it appears likely that the Federal budget will come into balance in the fiscal year 1963 at the present tax rates, as the continuing economic recovery results in higher incomes and higher tax receipts to the Government.

I should add that these conclusions are necessarily impermanent and that they will be reviewed this fall by the President as the shape of budgetary decisions becomes clear and the pace of the economic recovery can be more accurately gaged. In any event, it is the President's firm intention to present a balanced budget to the Congress in January.

IV

In summary, I have suggested that the Federal budget, while large in absolute terms, is not alarming relative to the national product; that the correct focus for budgetary debate should be the need for expenditures in particular fields—military, space, housing, education, and all the rest—and, finally, that the present budget deficit appears appropriate to the present stage of economic recovery and consistent with a balanced budget for the next fiscal year.

I cannot close without referring to the somber developments abroad and to the demands which might consequently be placed upon us. We are living in the shadow of a potentially most serious situation. If in fact international conditions were to become more difficult in the months ahead, it might

well be necessary for the President to ask the Congress to devote a much larger share of the national product to national security purposes. I think we can take some comfort from the fact that we have a tremendous flexibility in our economy to support such an action if and when it became necessary.

Let me again refer to the fact that only 16 percent of the national product is now being devoted to the Federal budget. In the closing years of World War II, that percentage reached a level between 45 and 50 percent of the national product—and it could surely have been higher, at least in shortrun periods, had that become necessary.

As we consider, therefore, the possible demands that might be levied upon us, it is well to remember that we have a highly elastic and adaptable economic system, which could produce enormously greater resources for national security use if that became necessary, without significant longrun harm to us as individuals or to our system of free institutions. The real danger to our lives, to our freedoms, to our well-being, lies in the possibility of war itself, not in the necessity of devoting whatever resources may be required to assure that such a calamity is not visited upon us.

Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Michigan lost an outstanding Representative in Congress when THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ resigned last week to accept an appointment as Federal district judge.

Of course, all of his friends congratulated him on his elevation to the Federal bench and agree that his appointment was a well-merited reward for his outstanding public service in various city, State, and national offices during the last 30 years. THAD and his family can indeed be proud of his record as a World War I soldier in the Polish Army of American Volunteers; as a technical adviser to the Polish Government in 1920–21; city attorney, Hamtramck, Mich., 1934–36; legal adviser of Michigan Public Utilities Commission, 1938–39; municipal judge of Hamtramck, 1942–50; and his service in six sessions of Congress since January 3, 1951. He has rendered exceptional service as a member of the important Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

During the 82d Congress, I had a firsthand opportunity to recognize his outstanding abilities as a expert on international affairs when he was a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. As chairman of that special congressional committee, I also had the opportunity to observe during our hearings in this country, London, and Europe, his wide acquaintance with leaders of other nations and especially the high regard and esteem he was held by officers and members of the Polish in exile; and also, former leaders of other nations which are now behind the Iron Curtain and fighting for their freedom and independence from Communist enslavement.

We all hope that his duties as Federal judge will not prevent him from continuing his activities in international affairs and especially use his prestige and influence in Polish organizations to keep alive the fight for not only Poland's freedom but also the restoration of self-government in other satellite governments now under the Communist yoke.

The gentleman from Michigan, Congressman MACHROWICZ, is highly qualified for his new work in the judicial branch of our Government. He is an outstanding lawyer and he possesses the temperament to sit on the Federal bench and successfully dispense justice and interpret the law impartially to the satisfaction of all litigants and petitioners who seek fair and honest interpretation of legal problems presented before the Federal court.

I wish THAD and his family a long period of health, happiness, and success in their new assignment and service to their State and Nation.

President James A. Garfield Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many citizens in this Nation have taken a personal interest in campaigns to keep our sense of American history sharp. They have raised funds for markers at historic sites, staged pageants to re-create specific events, and sponsored publication of great numbers of studies and books. Without such effort, we would have lost our link with many significant events and persons from our rich past.

Occasionally, too, an individual stages his own personal campaign to fill a gap. One such campaign was successfully concluded by Bruce Frankel, of Wanamassa, N.J., last week. He unveiled a plaque in Long Branch, N.J., to memorialize President James A. Garfield. The President, wounded by an assassin's bullet in Washington, died at his summer home in Long Branch. Bruce had the help of several other citizens, including one of his teachers. Bruce's example may serve to encourage others, including many other teenagers who are learning about local history in their schools.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "A Double Tribute: Monument Is Achievement for Boy, 12," written by Michael Schneider, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DOUBLE TRIBUTE: MONUMENT IS ACHIEVEMENT FOR BOY, 12

(By Michael Schneider)

LONG BRANCH.—A 12-year-old boy with a sense of history will conclude a 4-year struggle Tuesday to memorialize President James A. Garfield.

Bruce Frankel, of 901 Darlene Avenue, Wanamassa, will unveil a granite monument to President Garfield in ceremonies marking the 80th anniversary of his death here.

Garfield, the Nation's 20th President, was taken to his summer home—now 6 Garfield Place—after he was shot July 2, 1881, in Washington.

"I think people will be interested in the monument," Bruce said, "especially around Monmouth County, because this is a pretty historical place."

The youngster became interested in such a monument after noticing that the site of Garfield's death was marked only by a weatherbeaten wooden plaque put up as a temporary memorial 30 years ago by the Monmouth County Historical Association.

"I didn't like that sign. It was ugly and old, and I wanted to see something better," he said. "I put in my 50 cents allowance for a few months and then some of my friends and some parents gave some money."

Bruce collected about $60 for the monument in 1958 and turned the money over to a trust committee led by James R. Barbour, president of the New Jersey Trust Co. of Long Branch.

But the youth had to persuade a number of people that his project was worthy. "I thought it wouldn't take too long to get the monument finished," he said, "but it actually did take a couple of years."

After beginning his fund drive, Bruce wrote several monumentmakers to find out how much such an undertaking would cost. Two firms became interested in his project and donated the materials and services necessary for the monument.

SLAB DONATED

The Barre (Vt.) Granite Association donated the 2- by 3-foot wide granite slab which will stand on an 8-inch base. Daniel A. Ardolino, president of a West Long Branch monument company, heard of Bruce's efforts and arranged to have the stone engraved.

Bruce's project received a boost last year from Herbert Buehler, a social studies teacher at the Ocean Township School where Bruce is in the seventh grade. Buehler obtained permission to erect the monument from Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Fischer, who own the site where the Garfield cottage once stood.

With the monument set in place and the project completed, Bruce now is concerned over what to do with the $60 he raised which became surplus funds when material and labor were supplied free of charge. "I'm not sure what to do with the money. I'll have to wait and see," he said.

Bruce already has been rewarded for his efforts by a letter of appreciation in 1958 from Abram Garfield, who was then the only living son of the 20th President. Bruce has also had a book on Garfield, "Gentleman Jim," by Hazel A. David, dedicated to him.

FAVORITE PRESIDENTS

Although he campaigned for the Garfield memorial, Bruce nominates two other Presidents as his favorites. "I really like Jefferson and Franklin Roosevelt the best," he commented, "although I enjoyed working for this monument."

Despite his studies of Presidents and his love of American history, Bruce has other plans for the future. "I'd like to become a major league ballplayer," he admits with a broad grin, "probably a relief pitcher, because I can't hit as well as I'd like."

The youth has been encouraged by his parents, Charles and Dorothy Frankel, to continue his investigation of Americana. He is the second eldest of the Frankel children, Paul, 24; Bruce; Mark, 10; Craig, 8; and David, 4.

Businessmen Don't Know Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following observations of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which appeared in the September issue of Dun's Review:

BUSINESSMEN DON'T KNOW POLITICS

All last year American business flooded employees with shiny, expensive brochures on citizenship and voting. At least 100,000 business people participated in the political action course of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates another 25,000 persons took its political course. And such industrial giants as General Electric ran political programs which covered more than 5,000 employees.

What kind of return did business get from this investment in good citizenship? A very poor one, believes James A. Farley, chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. "Businessmen," says he bluntly, "botched the job."

If any man is qualified to make that harsh judgment, it is Jim Farley. Now a top official of an organization with 1,750 bottlers and distributors in 110 countries, Farley made his name as the political wizard who managed two presidential campaigns for Franklin D. Roosevelt and in 1936 made the brilliant prediction that FDR would carry every State "except Maine and Vermont."

From the vantage point of his two highly successful careers, Farley easily sees why businessmen trip in the political arena. "By and large," the former Postmaster General contends, "they just don't understand the rules of the art of politics. And most of those few who do have an inkling of the rules don't play by them. That is why businessmen in politics have failed to become an effective influence."

Ironically, businessmen have never tried harder than today to become an effective influence in politics. Many executives feel uneasy about the growing political power of massive unions. Others fear the gradual erosion of the present capitalist system.

For all their fears, Farley contends that businessmen have been able to do very little about them. The minute the executive enters politics, notes the former Democratic chieftain, he breaks its most basic rule. Surprisingly, it is one that also applies to business: that you can best learn your trade by starting at the bottom. "A businessman," says Farley, "must realize that to get active in politics he cannot start at the top. You get into politics by affiliating with an organization and working with it. The businessman might not have to ring doorbells and distribute flyers—but why not? It would do him good, and he would have a real chance to get out and sound out public opinion."

The reason why he does not, of course, is obvious. High salaried and respected in his community, the executive usually feels that his status in business enables him to enter politics on its very highest levels. "Even worse," adds Farley, "many businessmen won't participate in politics on any level. They start by trying to get out of jury duty, then complain about 'justice' if their companies are defendants in court."

Not only that, Farley goes on, the businessman compounds his error by trying to make the new field conform to the rules of business. Tried in industry or not, those rules simply do not apply to politics. "In business," Farley points out, "a decision can be made, and you have the satisfaction of seeing it implemented. In politics, all is compromise. The doctrine that 'half a loaf is better than none' is fundamental."

POLITICAL SUICIDE

Worse, Farley has observed that the businessman often goes on to advocate political measures which, however sincerely inspired, can only lead to political suicide. True, most of the business community would like to see taxes lowered. But many businessmen politicians also call for the repeal of, say, social security, a move which Farley believes immediately makes the businessman and his entire program unpopular with the broad mass of voters.

"It may seem courageous," notes Farley, "but to call for a step like this is to ignore the realities of national sentiment and political possibilities. The politician must know what is possible and what isn't."

Yet to reach high rank in the corporation of today is no easy task. It requires drive, astuteness and more than ordinary intelligence. Why, then, does this sophisticated, intelligent businessman usually dig his own political grave?

Farley's answer: because he has spent a lifetime talking to himself. His political thinking has been conditioned at his job, the country club, conventions and business functions. Here, though, he talks only to other executives. They all agree with his political thinking. Seemingly, there is no opposition to the programs he advocates.

Yet he and his fellow executives have not talked to the truckdriver who believes that Jimmy Hoffa can do no wrong, the widow living on social security or the unemployed coal miner who distrusts all big business. "Businessmen shouldn't kid themselves," says Farley, "that they have plumbed public opinion because the consensus among businessmen is this or that, you learn a lot more about grassroots opinion in a barbershop than you do in a businessmen's club."

Can the businessman hope at all to succeed in politics? Yes, says Farley—provided he follows its rules.

Take, for example, that rule about working up the political ladder. "Starting at the bottom," says Farley, "might involve running for a local office, learning new relationships with people, as opposed to the hierarchical relationships of business, and a willingness to suffer criticism. Criticism, even insults, are part of politics—one should never be bitter about them."

Once the businessman has that firmly in mind, he then can seek out such groups as labor unions and civic and fraternal organizations. Always anxious for speakers, groups of this type are only too willing to give a hearing even to the neophyte political campaigner. Moreover, the businessman himself benefits. He receives his chance to proselytize, and he becomes exposed to opposition views, thus getting a chance to learn that all-important element of politics—the art of compromise.

LOBBIES FOR BUSINESS

Not to be overlooked, of course, are other forms of participation in government. Working to influence legislation is Washington, for example. If a company is going to be affected by a forthcoming piece of legislation, Farley urges that it testify either for or against the bill. As he points out, Congressmen will welcome the opportunity to hear its views. After all, the businessman votes just like everyone else, and every politician well knows that he can be a prime source of campaign funds as well.

Farley points out another way of influencing legislation, one comparatively unknown to the average businessman. That is, presenting briefs on pending legislation. Bulky documents composed of an opinion backed up by facts and figures, these briefs are read and studied by the staffs of the various congressional committees. Usually, these staffs are made up of experts on a given subject, who present the salient points to the committee.

Trade groups also can be used to influence legislation. In fact, Farley believes that these groups often are better able to accomplish specific political objectives than are corporations and individual businessmen. They can, for example, present a more smoothly structured case. But the businessman can influence and guide these groups simply by playing an active role in them.

THE SPECTER OF RETALIATION

As a businessman, though, Farley argues that one other weakness of business-in-politics is very much its own fault. "Too often," he notes, "businessmen are afraid to get involved in politics because of the specter of retaliation within the company. They fear that if they participate in Democratic politics, and their boss is a Republican, their careers in business may be jeopardized. Where this is true, business should take steps to clean house."

That, in turn, brings up another Farley criticism. Though the business ranks include such prominent Democrats as Richard Reynolds and Frank Pace, the overwhelming mass of businessmen feel comfortable only in the Republican Party. Needless to say, the former national chairman of the Democratic Party resents this attitude. "The Democrats aren't bad for business," he snorts, "and anyone who thinks they are is simply myopic. The Nation's economy was saved by the Democrats in 1933, when the banks were insolvent and the insurance companies virtually bankrupt. Strong programs by FDR, Truman and now Kennedy all helped business."

But whether they function as Democrats or Republicans, Farley believes businessmen should keep in mind an important fact about politics. That is, that they must keep working away at it. "Politics," says Farley, savoring the word, "is a year-round affair. Its art, like any other, can be learned only through practice."

Yom Kippur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, at sundown today the Jewish people will celebrate Yom Kippur. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of an editorial on the MBS network presented by its president, Mr. Robert F. Hurleigh:

The sound of the ram's horn echoing through temples and synagogs throughout the world last night summoned Jews for the start of the high holy days.

For American Jewry, this is a period of reflection and soul-searching. It is a time for giving thanks for the blessings they have received in this country.

Ironically, in the Soviet Union where Jews like all other religionists have been persecuted, thousands defied the authorities to worship in Moscow.

Never before has the hand of God been more needed behind the Iron Curtain. Nothing is more feared by the Communist leaders than religion. They know the power of God

and what it can do to them. The very existence of a Jewish people after more than 5,000 years is proof of that.

All of us join in hoping this coming year on the Jewish calendar, 5722, will be a happy and peaceful one.

The Dutch Remember Liberation of Eindhoven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by him, entitled "The Dutch Remember," together with an editorial entitled "The Dutch Have It," published in the Kentucky New Era, of Hopkinsville, Ky., on September 15, 1961, dealing with the commemoration of the 17th anniversary of the liberation of Eindhoven and its neighboring communities by the 101st Airborne Division in 1944.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DUTCH REMEMBER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Last week many of us were privileged to meet a gracious young lady who came from the people of Eindhoven, Holland, in order to express to us their lasting friendship for the people of the United States.

I am sure that those who met her will agree that Gerardina van Lieshout, 19-year-old daughter of a member of the Eindhoven Town Council, was an effective spokesman for her people in the various ceremonies in the United States commemorating the 17th anniversary of the liberation of Eindhoven and its neighboring communities by the 101st Airborne Division in 1944.

As many of you know, Miss van Lieshout and her official escort and friend, Wallace Daczkowski, past president of the 101st Airborne Association, continued to Fort Campbell, Ky., where fitting ceremonies were held under the direction of Maj. Gen. Charles W. G. Rich, commanding general of the 101st. The most important of these was the planting of 10,000 Dutch tulip, hyacinth, and daffodil bulbs as a living memorial to the 101st and to us. This was the gift Gerry brought to be placed in a special plot near Fort Campbell's World War II Memorial, where this valiant division's dead are honored.

Perhaps the most important thing about Eindhoven's special remembrance of the 17th anniversary of the gift of freedom which this Nation restored to them is the simple fact that the Dutch remembered. This, I believe, is the type of people-to-people understanding which may help us most in difficult days.

So that Senators may have an understanding of the wonderful greeting given this young lady and, through her, the people of Holland by General Rich and Fort Campbell, I submit an editorial, entitled "The Dutch Have It," from the September 15 issue of the Kentucky New Era, Hopkinsville, Ky., for printing in the RECORD at this point:

"THE DUTCH HAVE IT

"Maybe the man who told his son, 'If you're looking for appreciation, you'll find the word in the dictionary,' was not entirely correct.

"On rare occasions there is evidence that some people in scattered parts of the world do not take for granted the favors done for them and are capable of showing their appreciation, not only at the moment but for years to come.

"Such an example is the relationship between the people of the Netherlands and the 101st Airborne Division of Fort Campbell. The 101st came to the aid of the Dutch once, and the good people of The Netherlands apparently have no intention of lapsing into ungratefulness.

"On September 17, 1944, the men of the old 101st participated in the heroic airdrop into the Eindhoven sector of the Netherlands and thereby launched the liberation of the Dutch people from Nazi occupation. After 17 years the September 17 date is still observed annually by the Dutch with a celebration in Eindhoven's Liberation Square.

"On three occasions, in 1954 and then in 1959 and 1960, members of the 101st have been invited and some have been sent to Eindhoven to participate in the anniversary celebration.

"This year the joint participation in the observance of the date will take a new and pleasant turn. This time the grateful Eindhoven will send a representative to the United States and to Fort Campbell to take part in first September 17 ceremony to be held at the home of the 101st.

"The Dutch ambassador will be 19-year-old Miss Gerardina van Lieshout, who will plant the first of 10,000 tulip, hyacinth, and daffodil bulbs destined to be set out at Fort Campbell as the anniversary gift of Eindhoven and the Netherlands.

"The first bulb will be planted Sunday in a special plot between Fort Campbell's World War II memorial and the post flag pole, fronting headquarters of the 101st. The ceremony begins at 10 a.m.

"The unusual relationship between the Dutch people and the members of the 101st is important not only because it shows that a sense of appreciation can make even a brief friendship last a long time but also because it indicates that people who do not even speak the same language can learn to respect and like one another if they really try to find a basis for understanding.

"Difference of language and customs is no barrier to understanding between peoples who share a love of freedom and respect the rights of all men."

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sadness I learned of the passing of my very good and able friend, OVERTON BROOKS. We have lost an able colleague and dear friend. To those of us who knew him well and shared his friendship, his death carries with it a sense of deep and personal loss.

He was highly respected and genuinely admired by all who knew and worked with him. It was my privilege to serve with him while he was a member of the Armed Services Committee and until he was appointed first chairman of the important Committee on Science and Astronautics.

He was a man who dedicated his life to the service of his district, State, and Nation. He was a hard, conscientious worker and on all problems he responded with a willingness to be helpful in any way that he could.

He had an abiding faith in the principles and ideals of our Government. In all things it can be said he was an outstanding citizen and a great American and his one ambition was to hand on to posterity and the generations of tomorrow, a better America than was handed to him.

Upper Colorado Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, following the debate and House action on the Colorado River storage project recently, I have had many inquiries relative to this issue and requests for basic information dealing with this subject. A brief background prompts me to point out that this project was authorized in 1956 for the purpose of developing the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, the main purpose being water storage for irrigation and for municipal needs; also flood control. Power is incidental to the aforenamed objectives. This, of course, has always been the criteria on which these projects are approached as set forth in the original law.

When this project came into being, it was widely supported in the five-State area. Private utilities joined with all groups in support of this project. The plan at that time was that the Government would construct necessary transmission lines connecting these installations, and the utility companies agreed to wheel the power to the preference customers under contract with the Department of the Interior. At the time that this project was authorized, the House Interior Committee stated:

The proposal by the power companies seemed entirely reasonable to the committee. The proposal is consistent with the policy expressed by the Congress for many years in appropriation acts and elsewhere. The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power preference laws are compiled with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected.

This briefly states the intention of Congress when this act was authorized, and if the utility companies' proposals are in keeping with this declared intention it would seem sensible to negotiate contracts which would eliminate the

need for the Government building these lines. At the same time the preference customers would be protected with a supply of power, as these wheeling contracts would deliver power to the preference customers in keeping with the wishes of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the development of the resources of our country. I have long been interested in the rural electrification program and many of the transmission lines, including the line to Granite Falls in Minnesota and into my State of Iowa. I personally took a hand in bringing these bills to final action in the Congress of the United States. I do, however, feel that where private enterprise can be harnessed to work with the rural electrification program, the municipalities and the Government, such an objective is entirely desirable. I believe that sort of a plan could be worked out and should be worked out in the five-State area involved in this controversy. It becomes crystal clear to me that the public ownership enthusiasts will never settle for a partnership of any kind, no matter how desirable the terms may be. It would also appear a very likely possibility that the time will come when the same public ownership crowd will absorb the rural electrification installations throughout the country as their end objective is to be realized.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter that I sent to the membership of the House and my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], joined me in circulating this letter, which contains all the pertinent factual information necessary so that the public may know the facts surrounding this case:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1961.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

DEAR COLLEAGUE: One of the most controversial issues of this session involves the question "Will private enterprise or the Federal Government build the transmission lines for the Colorado River storage project?" As members of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, we have examined voluminous testimony on all sides of this subject, and have come to the firm conclusion that private enterprise, which has stood the acid test of time, can do this job better and cheaper for all concerned. In this issue a very basic principle will be put to the acid test on the floor of the House of Representatives. This is most definitely a case of Federal versus private power.

Just to keep the record straight we are sending this letter to every Member of the House. At the proper time an amendment will be offered to delete the funds for the controversial transmission lines and we urge your support for the amendment.

The present controversy has now been clearly revealed as one of ideology rather than economics, engineering, or even concern about the burden on the already overburdened taxpayers of the Nation. Insistence on construction of the all-Federal system—in the face of a greatly superior alternative proposal by the five electric companies presently serving the area—also indicates an apparent disregard for the fiscal solvency of America. Approval of the companies' offer would save $135 million in Federal construction funds over the next few years, which could be spent more properly on vital defense programs in this period of national crisis.

Other major benefits would accrue from the companies' offer. To highlight just a few:

1. It would produce at least $61 million in Federal taxes and $107 million in State and local taxes over the 50-year payout period. These would increase to a total of $105 million in Federal taxes and $184 million in State and local taxes over the Bureau's 86-year study period.

2. It would pay out the project 7 years sooner than the all-Federal proposal, thus providing necessary funds earlier for more irrigation assistance.

3. It would deliver power to preference customers at the same price as the all-Federal system, and in many cases the power would be delivered at points far more convenient for preference customers than under the all-Federal grid.

4. The integrated five-State company proposal would have greater capacity, greater stability, and greater efficiency to meet the present and future power demands of all customers in the area.

Just a few days ago on September 1, the Upper Colorado River Commission—the organization recognized and approved by an act of Congress in 1949 to supervise the regulation, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the upper Colorado—passed a resolution endorsing the companies' offer over the all-Federal scheme. This Commission, representing four sovereign States, is in a better position than any other group to know which plan would be best for all concerned.

Officers of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers from the project area representing several thousand taxpaying union members appeared before our subcommittee in opposition to the all-Federal transmission system.

The American Farm Bureau Federation representing 1,600,000 farm families throughout the United States has taken a firm stand against construction of the all-Federal transmission system of the Colorado River storage project as being wasteful, uneconomical, and unnecessary.

It has been intimated that construction of these lines by private utilities would cause a tollgate to be established which would be against the interests of the preference customers. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The administrators of Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration all testified before our subcommittee that the wheeling arrangements and resultant coordination of the Federal and private power systems in their respective areas have worked extremely well and to the benefit of all concerned. Let us have the same type of partnership for this region.

The general arguments made by proponents of the all-Federal transmission grid concerning perpetual rent, yardstick, utilities' control of the project, and so forth are misleading and are charged with emotion rather than reason. Any fair and well informed person can plainly see these arguments are intended to hide the grand design for an all-engulfing federalized giant power grid completely covering the Nation. The threat of a federalized giant power grid is not a figment of imagination; it is here; this is a major leg of it.

We are sure you will agree that if federalization of the electric utility industry comes, then federalization of farming, retailing and all other businesses in America cannot be far behind.

If it were possible to put this proposition fairly and squarely to the people of the region affected, there is no question in our minds but that the people would overwhelmingly be against the all-Federal transmission system.

The issue of Federal versus private power is crystal clear. The offer of the five taxpaying electric companies is indisputably much more beneficial for all taxpayers, preference customers and irrigators.

Therefore, we sincerely urge you to join us in voting for the amendment to reject the all-Federal transmission grid when the Public Works Appropriation bill is considered on the floor of the House.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.
JOHN J. RILEY.

Seapower in the Sixties: Deterrent and Determinant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in viewing the revolutionary changes in world policy since the end of World War II, one is increasingly impressed by the strategic significance of the Indian Ocean, long recognized by such far-visioned strategists as Homer Lea as of crucial importance.

In the July 1961 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Anthony Harrigan, distinguished author and editor, now director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Charleston, S.C., reexamines the problem of the Indian Ocean in the light of post-World War II power changes and weapon developments.

To make Mr. Harrigan's latest contribution more widely known, I quote it together with an accompanying biographical sketch as part of these remarks:

SEAPOWER IN THE SIXTIES: DETERRENT AND DETERMINANT

(By Anthony Harrigan)

(The Communists recognize this conflict as a war on all fronts, using every method available, under any circumstances, and with no holds barred.—Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.)

Significant changes in the world order, plus a quantum leap forward in naval capabilities, plainly indicate that if a U.S. victory is to be achieved in the cold war, there must be a vast increase in the use of seapower.

The successful undersea firing of a Polaris rocket from the submarine *George Washington* last July presaged a tremendous expansion of the missions assigned U.S. naval forces. The proving of a revolutionary sea-based weapons system, however, for all its great significance, was merely a technical breakthrough that happily met a requirement suddenly imposed on the United States—namely, that its strength be deployed in new regions of the world where land bases are not available.

This requirement arises from the need to project American power into areas of the globe where, until recently, Western interests were guarded by European nations. In the last half century, since the rise of the United States as a major world power, U.S. military commitments have been largely restricted to the North and mid-Atlantic, the Pacific, the Caribbean, and the Mediterranean. The Atlantic and the Pacific fleets were sufficient to carry the principal defense burdens for the American Republic. Now, in the wake of the withdrawal of the Euro-

pean states from their former colonies in Africa and Asia—and with the sudden explosion of Latin nationalism, a power vacuum has been created in territories bordering the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans.

If the forces of international communism are not to fill this vacuum, American power must be brought to bear. The inability of the United States to obtain adequate land bases in these troubled zones, let alone the questionable feasibility of such bases because of complicated political factors, makes it imperative that the new projection of American power be at sea where no hard-to-negotiate treaties are required and no difficult regimes need be dealt with at high cost to U.S. taxpayers.

Now the planning upon which our national Defense Establishment has been based since World War II involves certain assumptions both as to available weapons and the world order. For years, it was widely believed in this country that Soviet aggression against the United States and its allies would be direct aggression—a massive air and/or missile attack followed up by a ground sweep into Western Europe utilizing the Soviet strength in armor. Secondary strikes by the enemy into the oil-rich Near East also were contemplated by those strategic planners with the greatest influence.

Now, however, it is evident that this type of aggression is highly unlikely. One of the principal reasons why an all-out nuclear attack is unlikely is the growing American deterrent strength. In building this strength, seapower has a role of rapidly increasing importance.

One-half of the U.S. naval effort in the next decade necessarily will be concerned with furnishing a ballistic missile deterrent at sea. As the Polaris fleet increases in size, the threat of direct Soviet attack will diminish. Thus, on the nuclear war front, the United States and the Communist world will be in a condition of stalemate. This means no more than that there will be stalemate at a single point on the spectrum of war. Indeed, such a stalemate would increase the probability of conflict at other points on the spectrum. It would mean that a wide variety of forms of limited war—from Koreas to Cuban-style war by subversion—would present opportunities for new acts of aggression by the Communists. They can be expected to take advantage of such opportunities.

As a matter of fact, the last 2 years have witnessed a marked increase in this sort of indirect aggression on the part of the Russian and Chinese Communists. This, then, almost certainly will be the big war waged by communism—a big war made up of many relatively small actions.

The cold war situation in which Americans find themselves today, and which threatens the national security, was well-described in an editorial in Life, February 18, 1959. Said Life: "Neither the Red army nor straight Marxist propaganda, with all their power, could alone have created student riots * * * frustrated the parliamentary system of Italy, won an election in the most literate state of India * * * dazzled the opening mind of Africa, or poisoned strategic corners of press and university opinion from Paris to Tokyo."

Clearly, the force at work was political warfare—warfare that represents a new type of conflict between nations. Be that as it may, someone may say, what has it to do with the role of seapower in national defense? Seapower, such commentators may observe, has to do with certain classic missions—the destruction of enemy fleets, the protection of sealanes, and the safeguarding of conventional amphibious operations.

To limit seapower to these activities, however, is to refuse to recognize the changing nature of naval forces and of their relation to world conflict.

Naval participation in the political war of our times is no more of an unorthodox idea than a Navy's involvement in nuclear deterrence. Who, 15 years ago, envisioned a substantial part of the U.S. Navy serving as undersea rocket bases around the Soviet heartland? This mission, which is now understood throughout the Navy, violates many of the conventions of warfare that prevailed only a decade ago.

In the long view, of course, seapower as a political deterrent is as old as the gunboat or the landing party. But while the use of seapower as a political deterrent has historical precedent, there are no precedents for the new counterrevolutionary measures that naval commanders must employ.

It is clear that the United States must outthink, outplan, and outperform the Communist enemy in the use of military power for political ends. This is the survival issue facing the defense leaders of the United States. It is not the nation that has the most missiles that will win the cold war, but the nation that finds new ways of using its military power short of all-out war. The Soviets have proved to be most resourceful in this respect. They armed the North Koreans who fought against the United States. At present, they are helping the Red Chinese build a submarine fleet. Red army tanks have been turned over to the United Arab Republic. Military advisers from Soviet satellite countries are in Guinea. Communist adventurers are in the Cuban Government. Communist instructors in guerrilla warfare have aided the Algerian rebels. Anti-West forces are being stirred up and bolstered by Communists in Laos and Vietnam.

American traditions make it hard to adjust to the cold war techniques of the enemy. In years past, the United States has laid heavy stress on separation of military and political action. This was possible in the less complex days of the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries. But lack of political preparation resulted in serious morale problems among U.S. servicemen who were prisoners of war in Korea. The United States must face up to the new close relationship between military conflict and political warfare.

It also is important to realize that the Communists deem themselves capable of putting pressure simultaneously on Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It would be a grave mistake for Americans to regard their missile strength, especially that part of it which is based on land and therefore exposed to a sudden sneak attack, as an effective Maginot line. The enemy is unlikely to take the biggest of all chances when he has an opportunity to outflank the U.S. deterrent with a political war campaign launched from many points at once. Just as Adolf Hitler found the exposed area north of the Maginot line a suitable line of advance, so Moscow and Peiping look to political war in underdeveloped countries as the ideal flanking move.

In preparing to counter Communist war by subversion, the United States must formulate plans as bold and original as the plans of the enemy. Conventional approaches to the enemy's unconventional warefare will not do.

Precisely, then, what is the U.S. Navy's role within this national objective of unconventional, counter-revolutionary warfare? Let us consider one of the areas where communism is mounting a massive attack—the lands bordering the Indian Ocean.

This is the area of the uncommitted nations. Only Australia is absolutely and irrevocably allied with the West. Ties of ancestry, religion, and civilization make that faraway English-speaking nation a natural ally of the United States. Burma, India, Ceylon, Pakistan, Malaya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, and various emerging nations, on the other hand, all are exposed to threats and pressures from communism. Some of the Indian Ocean countries already are heavily infiltrated by Communist agents. Others are neutralist because of fear of the Red colossus.

Of especial concern is the east coast of the African Continent. Along this coast are a variety of peoples emerging into nationhood or, as some observers say, into chaos. These people are moving rapidly from a Stone Age culture into the perils of the atomic age. Influences on them range from tribal fears to Communist propaganda.

Here is a land and a situation where no clear-cut victory can be obtained overnight, but where defeat for the West could come rapidly if communism is allowed to gain and consolidate a hold on primitive peoples. Red China, if allowed to intervene in Africa, would not hesitate to employ the brutal methods it has used to establish communes. The United States must be prepared to exert a continuing beneficial influence and guidance on the new African nations. The task is to prevent harmful political combinations, thwart Communist designs, and help friendly regimes. The United States also must insist that seas be kept open so ships of this and allied nations will have freedom to trade.

The stability which America rightly seeks in Africa amounts to a bar on Communist control of the natural and human resources of the continent. The United States must have a flexible strategy that will keep pace with change in Africa. The job before the United States—and before the U.S. Navy—is to see to it that change in Africa does not benefit Moscow and Peiping.

U.S. forces in the Indian Ocean area must be able to counter what is referred to as "salami tactics." This is the steady cutting away of Western influence, slice by slice, until nothing is left.

Eric Hula, writing in the volume, "Alliance Policy," has well analyzed the need for interventionist plans that thwart the "salami tactics" of the Communists:

"The right to request and render assistance against domestic subversion, recognized in general international law, is today, even more indispensable than it has been at other periods, since indirect aggression plays an exceptionally large role in the current international struggle for power. In a revolutionary age like ours, domestic subversive forces are more often than not supported, if not instigated, by foreign governments bent upon extending their dominion or at least their influence. Nor is it reasonable to argue that governments that are threatened by domestic subversion and possible indirect aggression should rely exclusively upon collective protection by the United Nations instead of resorting to the traditional methods of seeking the assistance of a friendly power. For the United Nations is hardly less problematical as an instrument for dealing effectively with indirect aggression than with direct aggression."

Examining the overall pattern of U.S. responsibilities in the Indian Ocean area, it is evident that this Nation needs the following:

1. Seapower sufficient to protect Western shipping against submarine attack, defeat surface attacking forces, and destroy an invasion fleet.

2. Displayed might adequate to cancel out threats of nuclear blackmail of weak countries by means of missile submarines.

3. Battle-ready ground forces capable of carrying out a Lebanon-type landing operation.

4. Facilities for air supply of friendly regimes.

5. Broadcasting and printing facilities for intensive information programs during deterent exercises or actual intervention.

6. Show-the-flag forces adequate to impress key nationalist leaders with knowledge

that the United States has the strength and flexibility to aid its friends and deter its foes.

7. The capacity to wage unconventional warfare that includes both guerrilla and psychological warfare operations.

Obviously, what is needed are floating American bases in the Indian Ocean. Carriers are the basic instrument for meeting these needs.

Because the United States is without land bases in the Indian Ocean, except for facilities made available by Australia, it is very important that the Navy aim at creating a nuclear-powered task force for that ocean. Moreover, the carriers assigned to the region must be of the largest type, for they would have to cover vast distances. If required to engage in war operations, the need for a sizable air group would be very great.

An effective Indian Ocean fleet with a political war capability would probably include a nuclear-powered carrier, a nuclear-powered cruiser, a nuclear-powered submarine (perhaps with the dual capability of casting ship, a helicopter carrier for Marine launching an air-breathing missile and of acting as an ASW submarine), a radio broadcasting ship, a helicopter carrie for Marine landing forces, a seaplane tender and seaplane squadron, a squadron of destroyers, including one missile-armed ship; and a command and communications ship.

The task of this fleet would go far beyond guarding against naval attack or smothering a brushfire war. Its commander would be called on to develop ways of exploiting weaknesses and vulnerable points in the Communist political offensive along the shores of the Indian Ocean, to keep the enemy off balance, and to impose on the enemy those problems that an active agency of freedom can create.

Through the instrumentality of displayed seapower, the fleet would aim at saturating the Afro-Asian world with reminders that the United States is possessed of enormous force and intends to keep history going its way. Lands bordering the Indian Ocean should be assured, by the presence of the fleet, that the United States stands ready to help all those who have the courage to resist Communist aggression, and also is active in hindering the schemes of the enemies of freedom. In short, the fleet would operate in terms of offensive rather than defensive action.

For the first time in its history, the United States must develop and maintain a capability for waging political warfare on a grand scale. It is not enough to have fleet units off the African coast. The people of every nation with a shoreline on the Indian Ocean must know about that U.S. fleet. They must not be allowed to forget its presence. Therefore, such a fleet would have as its primary task, not the sinking of enemy ships, but rather the influencing of opinions, attitudes, and political behavior of uncommitted peoples in such ways as to advance the high national aims of the United States.

The U.S. Government has been moving steadily toward a heightened awareness of the importance of political warfare in relation to the Armed Forces. As far back as 1953, the President's Committee on International Information Activities said: "In reality, there is a psychological aspect or implication to every diplomatic, economic or military policy and action. Every significant act of virtually every department and agency of the Government has its effect, either positively or negatively, in the global struggle for freedom." Thus a fleet in the Indian Ocean would have the mission of helping to lower or destroy the morale and efforts of the enemy's forces in that region and helping to sustain the morale and implement the efforts of U.S. diplomatic forces and friendly regimes.

Now what of specific acts and programs that an Indian Ocean fleet might be called upon to undertake?

First, it is highly important that show-the-flag missions be carried out vigorously so that the maximum number of influential Afro-Asians view the fleet and gain an understanding of its striking power in war situations. This means a continuing program of visits in the fleet by prominent individuals who are opinion makers in their countries, as well as a program of air and sea exercises in proximity to large population centers. Rescue and relief operations also afford opportunities for the people of new nations to realize that American seapower is readily available and is well-intentioned toward them.

By arranging flyovers for friendly leaders and visits to seaports that provide opportunities for spectacular demonstrations before the public, and by engaging in joint sea exercises with the navies of nations on good terms with the United States, a number of salutary changes in Afro-Asian opinion should be effected. The present climate of political neutrality in that part of the world undoubtedly can be attributed in large degree to the lack of on-the-scene American might available for friends pressured by Communists.

The fleet's broadcasting facilities should maintaining a continuing information program directly geared to specific political targets determined by the President and his advisers. Programing, designed to sway audiences to a particular line of action, rather than to serve merely as a source of information, should be directed by the fleet commander and advisers named by the President.

These broadcasting facilities are essential inasmuch as the fleet would be engaged in naval operations designed primarily for their psychological impact. The fleet commander would have the mission of influencing political situations in which force or threats of force are involved. The techniques of blowing hot and cold, of alternating confusing signals, are basic to this type of warfare. Thus the fleet commander, by movement of his ships, by air and sea exercises, by visits to trouble spots and by other actions, would endeavor to set up stresses in pro-Communist countries or countries in danger of going Communist. Protracted stress, leading to a condition of disorientation and weakened will, is something the Armed Forces of the United States can and must create as they seek to prevent expansion of international communism in areas where the will to resist the Communists is not strong.

Beyond this, the fleet outlined here would be the heart of all interventionist actions in the Indian Ocean area in the years ahead. Among the needed units would be landing teams of marine counterguerrillas, not only able to deal with the type of revolutionary forces the Chinese Reds organized in Viet Minh, but also able to organize, train, and direct native counterguerrilla groups many times their own size. An Indian Ocean fleet would have to include officers and men qualified to move into a country as advisers or technicians rather than as members of full-scale units in uniform.

Other war situations might arise in the area requiring a completely conventional amphibious operation. An Indian Ocean fleet would have to possess both a conventional and an unconventional war capability.

Many of the practices that the fleet commander might have to put into effect have been experimented with by the French Army in recent years. Several years ago, Brig. Gen. Paris de Bolladiere, a zone commander in Algeria, abandoned orthodox military organization in order to achieve results against terrorist bands. He broke up the conventional army units into small detachments of 8 to 10 men. These units went into the hinterland with orders to attach themselves to loyal native groups and form the hard core of resistance and control for a region. The United States may need to employ such methods in certain trouble areas, and the Marine Corps is the logical force to carry out these antisubversion missions.

Of course, the Marine Corps had that mission a generation ago. In Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Nicaragua, the Marines made possible public order and the minimum of stability needed for community life. As a result of its tremendous role in the amphibious campaigns of World War II and Korea, the Marine Corps no longer has the mission of semipolitical policing. Yet who else but Marines can undertake this task? For the kind of sensitive missions ashore that such shock troops would encounter, the superbly trained and indoctrinated marines are the ideal force. The Marine Corps, as the Nation's most flexible combat organization, must rise to the challenge of the new types of conflict on the spectrum of war—in particular, to the counterguerrilla operations of political warfare in underdeveloped lands.

In the long struggle against communism that lies ahead, it is tremendously important that uniformed leaders never lose sight of political objectives. It also is important for all involved to bear in mind Mao Tse-tung's statement that "the power of the gun" is the ultimate political factor. This "power of the gun" must be utilized in new ways to counter an imaginative and resourceful enemy.

David Sarnoff, board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, recently touched on this need. A strategy of victory, he said, "would not reject courses of action simply because they are unconventional. We would no longer disdain to use against the enemy some of the weapons used against us. Having finally acknowledged that the struggle is decisive and therefore as real as a 'real' war, we would not hesitate to fight fire with fire."

In truth, as one considers such a fleet as discussed here—a fleet which would practice political warfare and would include trained countersubversives, broadcasting ships, helicopter carriers for swift intervention, and missile ships for the most modern type of naval conflict, it is evident that seapower is entering a new era of importance undreamed of even 20 years ago. On the U.S. Navy will fall the responsibilities of carrying the major burdens, not simply of guarding but of advancing actively the interests of the free world in areas of the globe where American power was unknown before World War II. To paraphrase an old British saying, the sun never sets on units of the U.S. Navy. A host of new nations have come into being, nations as weak as they are inexperienced in the affairs of government. They will stay on the side of the free world only as long as American seapower is an effective determinant of political action. Vast areas of the world are vulnerable to Communist penetration. Only the great gray ships of the U.S. Navy, and its sailors and marines and fliers, offer a barrier that can prevent total conquest by communism.

Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following very truthful editorial regarding the late Secretary General of the United Nations, which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post on September 19, 1961:

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary General of the United Nations, is dead. The tragedy must afflict personally all who knew him; but that private tragedy is overwhelmed and eclipsed by the public tragedy that has taken place. The dimensions of that tragedy at the moment cannot be known. The world now knows only that he is dead; it will not know for many months how much of the United Nations died with him.

Private grief may be felt that he died far short of the span of years of useful life that might have been his; but it will be swallowed up in the sense of public calamity that he died far short of the fulfillment of his purpose at the head of the United Nations.

To say that a public man is irreplaceable and indispensable is a commonplace of the language of bereavement so often used as to be divested of much of its import, but this may be said of Dag Hammarskjold in full truth and with all accuracy. His whole service to the United Nations was marked by dedication to the spirit and letter of the charter and he uniformaly conducted his high office with an appropriate regard to the long shadow that his every act would cast across the future conduct of international affairs. There would have been an enormous sense of loss at his departure from the United Nations at any time; but that loss is multiplied manifold by the nature of the unsettled issues that presently envelop the United Nations.

First, and most immediately, there is the Congo crisis that led to the death of the Secretary General. For the first year in the Congo, the United Nations, in Hammarskjold's own words, "refused to permit the weight of its (U.N.) resources to be used in support of any faction so as to thereby prejudge in any way the outcome of a choice which belonged solely to the Congolese people." It was as Secretary Hammarskjold said "a thankless and easily misunderstood role for the organization to remain neutral in relation to a situation of domestic conflict." But he thought it "the only manner in which the organization can serve its proclaimed purpose of furthering the full independence of the people in the true and unqualified sense of the word."

This policy, however, he intimated in his introduction to the annual report of the Secretary General, was binding "up to the point when parliament reassembled and invested a new national government" with power. Since then, the United Nations has edged toward the use of power, at the request of that government. The conflict in Katanga is the result. Hammarskjold died in the midst of this policy transition, with events still to settle the effectiveness or justice of the change.

Second, and even more ominous, is the larger issue of the character of the United Nations itself. As the Secretary General pointed out, the charter contemplated an executive that is the servant of no national power and one beyond instructions by any member state; but the Soviet Union projected a very different kind of United Nations—a sort of continuing international conference with a secretariat representative of member states, inferentially responsive to their instructions. This fundamental conflict might have been put off until the end of Mr. Hammarskjold's term in April of 1963. Now it becomes an immediate order of business. To attempt the compromise of these two views is to attempt the reconciliation of irreconcilables. It will be difficult, if not impossible for the Security Council to find a Secretary General who can subscribe at once to these two views of the United Nations executive. Perhaps some sort of interim caretaker executive may be the only way out. A more awkward time to settle the basic conflict hardly could have been picked.

The greatest tribute that can be paid to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is to say that at his unhappy juncture no man's loss could have more diminished the world's already declining hope for peace.

New Communist Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lyle C. Wilson from the Washington Daily News of September 18, 1961:

NEW COMMUNIST FRONT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

American Communists are winding up this week to throw their Sunday punch at, no less, the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., is organizing a new Communist front. Its name: The National Assembly for Democratic Rights (NADR). This front is to be born in a New York mass meeting scheduled for September 23–24. The purpose: to establish a mass movement for the penetration of political, labor, racial, religious, educational, professional and other organizations in the United States.

If the Communists can get their show on the road, they hope to influence all such penetrated organizations to join in a nationwide movement to reverse anti-Communist decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Communists want to reverse last June's decisions by which the Court sustained the Smith and McCarran acts relating to control of subversion in the United States.

This is a life or death matter with the party. If the two acts are enforced, the Communist Party may have to go out of business in this country. NADR is the biggest mass movement launched by American Communists since they rallied public opinion some years ago seeking to prevent the execution of the Rosenbergs, a pair of commie spies.

Patriotic Americans were bewildered by the massive propaganda launched and sustained for weeks in behalf of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg. The Communists attracted thousands of non-Communists to their cause. They must have the assistance of thousands of non-Communists to make a mass propaganda operation function. The non-Communists become a front or screen behind which the hard core party members operate to manipulate public opinion.

The party rather confidently expects to persuade thousands of soft-headed Americans to support this newest campaign to get the party off the hook of the McCarran and Smith acts. Within a week of the September 23–24 mass meeting in New York, local organizers of National Assemblies for Democratic Rights will pop up all over the United States.

Local mass meetings will be set up where the people are fat-headedly ignorant of what is going on. These mass meetings will adopt resolutions patterned on the resolutions to be adopted this week in New York. If the Commies can bamboozle enough suckers they might, maybe, stir up enough fuss to persuade the Court to reverse its decisions. Both were by 5 to 4 scores.

Failing that, the Communists would hope to persuade Congress to repeal the Smith and McCarran acts, of which there is not much chance. The Communists would fall flat on their faces in this effort if the preachers, labor leaders, racist politicos, educators, and all others would greet the local organizers with a mighty heave out the nearest window or door.

The American Communists got such a heave-ho as World War II was ending when they attempted to set up a mass penetration operation in the name of the Win That Peace Conference. Newspaper publicity killed that before it got going. Here's some more of the same.

Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, realizing the mood of Congress in recently approving a strong resolution against the seating of Red China at the United Nations, I insert for the RECORD a similar stand taken by the Northern Minnesota District of the American Lutheran Church. The patriotic dedication and Christian faith which the resolution defends so emphatically is most commendable and I know of interest to all Members of Congress.

According to Mr. A. L. Oelschlager, secretary of the group, the resolution was unanimously adopted by the 146 laymen and 112 pastors attending the Northern Minnesota District Convention at Crookston, Minn. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the hope which the Christian Church holds out to the world is a vital Christianity and not the organizations of men; and

Whereas we believe that Christian people have responsibility to work with and for those organizations which honestly seek peace and justice among the nations as well as to speak against all forces which threaten peace, freedom, and justice; and

Whereas as Christians we are conscious of our sins and failures to carry out wth zeal and sacrifice our Lord's missionary command, thus helping to create the condition we now deplore, but on the other hand, conscience-bound to point out the dangers which reside in international communism; and

Whereas the Government of Red China, totally committed to atheistic communism and therefore anti-Christian in its philosophy and goals, guilty of the merciless extermination of millions, ruthless in its destruction of the Christian Church, liberty and human decency, and opposed to the spirit of the United Nations' Charter, presents an unmistakable menace to the world and the Christian Church; and

Whereas admission of the Government of Red China to the United Nations can be construed as condoning its acts, accepting its tenets and overlooking its crimes, as well as weakening the moral and spiritual fiber of the West in its fight against communism; and

Whereas we recognize that sincere Christians differ on the matter of the admission

of the Red Chinese Government into the United Nations, and that those who advocate this for what seem to be valid reasons, must not be labeled as pro-Communist: Nevertheless, be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the Northern Minnesota District in convention assembled, declare our opposition to the admission of the Government of Red China to the United Nations.

Senator Barry Goldwater: A Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, among the better newsletters written in America is widely read and highly regarded "Things To Watch and Watch For," by Robert Kazmayer, of Rochester, N.Y. His newsletter for September 1, 1961, contains an interesting and informative piece about the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, BARRY GOLDWATER.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that this Kazmayer newsletter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT, THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

(By Robert Kazmayer)

BARRY GOLDWATER is the most surprising, and in some quarters, the most disturbing personality in U.S. politics today. So far neither political theorists nor old pros know quite what to make of him.

Whether avidly for him or rabidly against him, we may as well face these facts: He could be as politically dead as the hoolahoop 3 years from now, or he could be President, or we may be witnessing beginnings of a growing, authentic, conservative force that will continue for years.

Most people are aware that he's much in the news these days. What isn't generally recognized is the extent of the attention he's getting: Except for J. F. K., GOLDWATER is most talked of, written about man in Washington. Judged by wordage in U.S. magazines as listed in Readers Guide to Periodical Literature, he's getting twice the attention of any other U.S. legislator, more than any Washington figure except President Kennedy.

On average day between 700 and 800 persons write him. During same period 25 or more organizations write, wire, or phone his office wanting him for lecture dates. Recent poll of delegates to last year's Republican convention showed bare majority still for Nixon, while B. G. was up from nothing, to over 25 percent. His "Conscience of a Conservative" is in its 12th printing with approximately 800,000 copies sold. His thrice-weekly newspaper column is syndicated in 104 newspapers. Recently elected Senator TOWER, of Texas, ran as "Goldwater Republican" with GOLDWATER'S active help campaigning, and won, first Republican Senator elected in Texas in 90 years.

At present GOLDWATER is both potent and growing political force.

What makes GOLDWATER mystery to analysts and political pros is that he fits no current political pattern. His popularity has come without benefit of any sensational Senate committee chairmanships. He hasn't been TV spotlighted investigating crime or cracking down on drug industry, a la KEFAUVER, hasn't made wild charges of communism in high places in McCarthy manner, hasn't had MCCLELLAN'S publicity turning up gangsters in labor rackets. Nor does he have slick, high-powered personal publicity organization operating behind scenes a la buildups for Kennedy, Rockefeller, etc.

Goldwater assets? What gives him attention he's getting, influence he increasingly wields?

First. Probably most important, BARRY GOLDWATER is something not seen in national politics for some years now, an all-out, 100 percent conservative. There are other conservatives in Congress, but B.G. is of one piece, consistent conservative on every score, says, "I'm a conservative and proud of it. I don't like to see Jack Kennedy trying to nationalize America." These terms liberal and conservative, left and right, are relative. But GOLDWATER is just about as conservative, as far right, as one can be in the United States at present. He's sometimes referred to as "today's Taft." He isn't; he's right of Taft. Taft sponsored bills for public housing, aid to education. B.G. doesn't believe Federal Government needs to be in these fields.

Second. GOLDWATER is a personable, likable, gracious gentleman, an effective salesman—selling conservatism. Among liberals it's popular to call him a demagog, rabble-rouser, Republican edition of Huey Long—these terms are mild compared to names, innuendos that'll be used on him in months ahead for he's now becoming important enough for big guns to zero in on him. Smear-GOLDWATER campaign hasn't started yet, but will. But GOLDWATER is no demagog; he isn't even a great speaker; fully half the men in the Senate are better. GOLDWATER approaches an audience informally, fields his questions easily, seems to give opponents benefit of every doubt, even suffers fools willingly. He's persuasive.

If he's master of the tough, vicious, infighting jabs effectively used by J.F.K., Nixon, Dewey, F.D.R., I've never heard him resort to them. Unlike the dour, pedantic Taft, the clipped, tense Kennedy; the hard-swinging Nixon, GOLDWATER appears quietly relaxed—consequently more sure of himself. He smiles easily. In an after-meeting question period I heard someone ask him what he thought were serious mistakes in Nixon campaign? He started with a laugh, "Well, we don't have all night."

Third. GOLDWATER is working at the job of selling conservatism. Whenever Senate duties will permit his being away, he hits the hustings, talks to businessmen's associations, fundraising dinners, colleges, women's clubs, conventions, tours factories. B.G. is as busy at grassroots today as J.F.K. was 2 years ago. At 52, apparently in perfect physical shape, he's not cramped by lack of energy. Reporter recently told me of sitting down with him for an interview in Dallas at 11 p.m. at near end of a day in which he had flown from Washington, made three speeches, held one press conference and had a newspaper column yet to write; reporter reported, "To me at least, he seemed as fresh and ready to go as he had when I'd seen him at a breakfast meeting at 8 a.m. that morning."

Another important Goldwater asset, his sincerity. Even his enemies do not—so far, anyway—accuse him of trimming his sails, riding the changing tides of public opinion. One commentator, one who is pro-Kennedy, anti-GOLDWATER, told me, "I'll say this for the ——— if he ever leads America, America will go the way he's going; he won't turn around in order to be in front."

What does GOLDWATER stand for? What's he preaching? Essentially his program is outlined in "Conscience of a Conservative," and in just about every speech: Reverse trend toward ever-increasingly large, more powerful, more highly centralized government. Cut Federal spending and Federal taxes. Don't give Federal Government power to do anything that can be done by States, handle all problems at lowest possible level, at that of individual, community, village, county, or city wherever practical.

Re foreign policy, B.G. would reevaluate foreign aid with eye to cutting out large chunks of it completely, cutting back drastically on remainder. As regards Russia, he'd withdraw diplomatic recognition of Soviet, blockade Cuba, resume nuclear testing immediately, encourage captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain to revolt—in short, he proposes toughest policy anyone has suggested so far, says, "We'll have to be prepared to fight if Kremlin wants a fight."

GOLDWATER'S weaknesses: He's not a legislator of Taft's skill, experience—nor even Nixon's. He talks in terms of directions in which we're traveling, about ultimate goals. So far he's not had opportunity nor responsibility of spelling these out in specific legislation.

Second. So far he has no strong political organizational following such as Taft commanded. He's no right-down-the-line Republican; he broke with Ike on spending policies in 1957; Ike's middle-road followers regard him as too far right—many businessmen might like to go along with him but fear he's too conservative to be elected. Republican pros hesitate to hop on his bandwagon for same reason.

Third. B.G. has no really big money immediately available to be used privately and at his discretion. He's no farther from the Presidency than J.F.K. was at this time 3 years ago. But he doesn't have a Kennedy fortune behind him. It's often reported he's a millionaire. He isn't. He gets income from one-third of Goldwater merchandising interests in Arizona; his share amounts to $15,000 annually. In addition, he gets $25,000 salary as Senator. He estimates that as Senator he spends about $50,000 a year. What he gets in royalties on his book, income from his column, from lecture dates, I haven't heard. He's stated that to remain in Senate, carry on present activities, he's gradually liquidating life insurance.

GOLDWATER'S future is, of course, bound up with, dependent upon what happens to, in Republican Party, what happens re J.F.K.'s political fortunes. GOLDWATER'S statements indicate he faces future pretty realistically, says his only plans are for running for Senate again in 1964. Same time he is certainly not slamming any doors that might open presidential nomination to him. Also, he acts as much like a candidate as a man can without his hat in the ring.

As it looks now big three in 1964 Republican Convention will be Rockefeller, Nixon, GOLDWATER. Latter's strength will be in South, Middle West, and Mountain States. He will be weak in New England, on Pacific Coast and along North Atlantic States * * * all areas with large electoral votes. Of these Rocky will control the East, Nixon the West. But if B.G. continues at his present pace he will have large enough following to dictate what will go into party's platform—and if he takes himself out of race—he will have what it takes to dictate party's nominee.

Meantime, GOLDWATER'S concentrating on 1962; as chairman of Senate Republican Campaign Committee he's talking about, working to elect Republicans next year, says, "Either we gain in 1962 or we're done for in 1964." In that little statement he is of course everlastingly right.

Whether it's 1962, 1964, or 1968 BARRY GOLDWATER will be a force to be reckoned with in national politics. More, because we've been going down the road to socialism for so long that a lot of people can't even

remember the old principles and virtues that made us great, GOLDWATER's influence is badly needed and GOLDWATER, in turn badly needs active support of all conservatives who for so long have felt themselves without any articulate voice on the national scene.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the weekend I was privileged to discuss topics of significance, not only to Wisconsin, but to the Nation, in a broadcast over a network of radio stations in my home State.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, annually, you and I—as American taxpayers—are being hit with higher and higher taxes. In 1960, for example, we—and business and industry—"shelled out" $113 billion alone in State and Federal taxes. This represents a sharp increase above the $99 billion for 1959.

Laboring under such a gargantuan tax load, we have a right to ask: "Are we getting our money's worth in governmental protection and service?"

Now it is true that the development of a more complex economy; a fast expanding population; and changing national and world conditions; have resulted in extensions of governmental services.

Unfortunately, however, such expanded activities have, too often, suffered from serious deficiencies.

For this reason, a 12-man bipartisan commission, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, was created in 1953. The purpose was to make a top-to-bottom study of the operations of government and recommend ways in which to improve and streamline its activities.

The objectives included efforts to: Sharpen up the tools of management—often found deficient; cut redtape; put greater stress on accountability for stewards of public trust; stop waste; streamline operations to prevent duplication and overlapping of services; and, generally promote greater efficiency and economy in government.

Over the years, the Commissions' recommendations have resulted in estimated savings of $3 to $4 billion annually.

With ever bigger and bulgier Federal budgets—estimated at $88 billion for 1962—however, there is a need for a still more watchful eye on Federal spending. Consequently, I believe we need a permanent Hoover-type watchdog commission to serve as a guardian of the purse-string.

The objectives would include cutting out waste and duplication; stopping unnecessary competition among Federal agencies or services; eliminating activities that are nonessential or that could better be performed by State and local governments, or private enterprise; and generally, to promote greater efficiency and economy.

I have urged, therefore, that during the congressional recess, the Senate Committee on Government Operations consider and prepare recommendations for the establishment of a permanent watchdog committee to protect the interests of the taxpayer.

If no useful recommendations are forthcoming, I shall introduce such a bill in the next session of Congress.

EXPANDING SHIPMENTS OF MILITARY CARGOES THROUGH THE SEAWAY

Now, I want to turn to another topic of interest to Wisconsin and all the other Great Lakes States: That is, increasing the flow of trade and commerce on the Great Lakes and on the St. Lawrence Seaway. For what purpose? To create more jobs, to stimulate business, to create great demands for service, and to generally "spark" new economic life.

The Seaway—completed in 1959—provides a less expensive route to the ports of the world. Following its opening there has been a substantial annual increase in traffic. However, there is, in my judgment, still a need for further revision of shipping patterns—both governmental and nongovernmental—to take advantage of the opportunity for savings offered by the Seaway.

Because of this, for example, I—joined by fellow Senators from the Great Lakes—recently urged the Defense Department to reexamine its transportation pattern and route more military cargo, headed overseas, through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Until now, this less expensive water route has been largely neglected. In 1960, for example, the United States shipped about 12 million tons of military cargo overseas. Of this tonnage, only about 70,000 tons (less than .6 of 1 percent) was routed through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway—despite the fact that about 40 percent of U.S. production—including great amounts of military goods—are manufactured in areas adjacent to the Great Lakes.

The jointly sponsored recommendations to the Defense Department included:

1. A new look at transportation policies to assure the most economical service;

2. A program of "test shipments" by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway to determine how much can be saved for the taxpayers;

3. A review of shipping standards to protect Lake ports against discriminatory regulations in comparison to Gulf-Pacific-Atlantic ports;

4. Establishment of a Great Lakes Transportation Command—similar to such Commands on other coasts—for shipping military cargoes overseas.

In my judgment, larger volumes of cargo should be shipped through the Seaway.

According to estimates, $1 to $3—or more—per ton could be saved for the American taxpayer by utilizing this less expensive route to destinations around the world. This could amount to millions of dollars.

This week, I received a reply from Secretary McNamara, indicating that a task force has been established to study the proposal. Among other things, it will examine freight rates, routing procedures, terminal operations, availability of shipping and all other considerations involved in moving cargo from production plants to destinations overseas.

According to the Secretary, this comprehensive study would require about 90 days. Regrettably, this would prove too late for change during the 1961 shipping season. However, a revision of shipping patterns for military cargo—which I believe should be forthcoming from the study—would mean an increased volume of traffic for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway System for the 1962 season.

SEAWAY TRAFFIC: A TWO-WAY STREET

We recognize, of course, that there are additional steps needed to increase trade and commerce through the Seaway. These include constructive efforts to: assure fast, smooth handling of shipping through the Seaway itself—eliminating bottlenecks and expediting traffic; speed up completion of port and harbor development projects, to enable ports to expeditiously handle available traffic and larger volumes of trade and commerce for the future; enlarge research efforts to find markets for the wide variety of products of the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest—the greatest in the world; encourage greater cooperation among Lake States in the development of trade and commerce.

Trade, of course, is a two-way street. Consequently, we need to constantly try to improve our competitive position.

For this reason, I have also urged a "new look" at U.S. trade policies.

ENCOURAGING FAIR RATES ON OCEAN SHIPPING

We, in this country, are accustomed to the idea that each part of a round-trip ticket costs the same. But this apparently is not the case in ocean shipping.

I am deeply concerned, for example, about the disparity in shipping rates between what is charged to American exporters, on the one hand, and what is charged to foreign exporters of the same products, on the other hand.

Normally, international conferences—attended by the United States—are held to help establish rates on ocean-shipped commodities.

Unfortunately, however, the United States, too often, comes out on the "short end."

In probing the situation, such vast discriminations as follows, were discovered:

On cheese shipped to Mediterranean ports, the rate amounts to $6.38 per hundredweight; by contrast, rates on such commodities shipped to this country amount to only $3.84 per hundredweight—or about half the cost.

Similar unjust rates apply to shipments of electrical equipment, farm machinery, and other commodities.

Because of this unfair situation, I have urged a complete new look at our international rate-setting policies; particularly, I have urged a stronger more realistic effort to serve and protect the interest of U.S. farmers, shippers, and others by our U.S. representatives to the rate-setting conferences.

Another Democratic Club in Los Angeles County, Calif., Adopts Resolution Supporting House Un-American Activities Committee—Los Cerritos United Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a resolution of the Los Cerritos United Democrats, Los Angeles County, Calif., which I received this day from Sheila K. LaTourette, of 4357 Studebaker Road, Lakewood, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities now for about 14 years, I am pleased to state that to my desk is more and more frequently coming either resolutions or other document from Demo-

cratic committees, clubs, councils, and organizations commendatory of, and in strong support of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The one following from the Los Cerritos United Democrats is typical thereof:

Whereas the Long Beach Young Democrats in a resolution sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation stated in part that they "affirm our opposition and repugnance for communism and the activities of Communist sympathizers"; and

Whereas we are in accord with their opposition to communism; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities is an official investigative body of Congress duly authorized each and every year since the 1938 unanimous vote of said U.S. Congress for the purpose of investigating the infiltration of Communists and others of their ilk into the working order of the United States and have over the years been a great service to the country and security thereof; and

Whereas this investigative body of Congress has been attacked and vilified by groups of subversives and their propaganda carriers: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Los Cerritos United Democrats, condone, praise, and openly profess an admiration for the work, activities and legislation that this committee has been responsible for putting into effect for the protection and security of this Nation and that their work should be continued and expanded.

Tribute to Hon. Overton Brooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary that I return to my home in Louisiana last weekend and I was deeply shocked and saddened to receive a telephone call from my Washington office around noon on Saturday telling me of the passing of my beloved friend and colleague, Overton Brooks, dean of our Louisiana delegation in Congress. I had visited him in the Naval Medical Center a few hours after he underwent surgery there 3 weeks ago and each time I had inquired about this condition afterward, I received the report that he was improving, so I was unprepared for the sad news of his death.

It was my privilege to know Overton before coming to Congress and to serve 9 years in Congress with him. I felt he was my sincere friend. He was a good man—always kind, understanding, and helpful when I needed his counsel and assistance in any problem. He was a man of high principle and of great talents, not only in his work as Congressman, but in the personal qualities that make life better for those with whom he came in contact. He was deeply sincere and always ready and willing to help anyone who came to him for help.

Overton was conscientious in the discharge of his duties and I have known no one who was more dedicated and gave more of himself to serving his people, his State, and the Nation. He was a patriotic American and a great American, and his country will miss his great devotion and statesmanship. He served in a manner that reflects the highest credit on himself and his family. An example of his great talent and devotion is his work as chairman of the House Space Committee.

Day after day he worked long hours with his colleagues and staff members on important matters which came before the space committee and in 2½ years, under his tireless and enthusiastic leadership, this committee has come to be one of the most important committees of the House. I feel that through his work on the committee, he contributed much to whatever achievements our Nation has made or may make in the field of space. I am confident his work will live long after him.

He will be greatly missed by his colleagues in the House and Senate and by the host of other friends in Washington and in Louisiana who mourn his passing. My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. Brooks and Ann and to the other members of his family.

Address By Senator Carroll Before National Child Welfare Commission of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, my home city of Denver recently played host to many thousands of members of the American Legion and its auxiliary and allied organizations. One of these was the National Child Welfare Commission of the American Legion, which invited me to discuss the current situation in the field of juvenile delinquency, because of my interest in the problem and my membership on the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

Unfortunatly, a conflict with important committee meetings, in addition to adjournment legislation on the floor of the Senate, made it impossible for me to deliver this talk in person, but these remarks were delivered in my behalf by Mr. Lawrence M. Henry, U.S. Attorney for Colorado.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my address, delivered on September 8, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN A. CARROLL, OF COLORADO, TO NATIONAL CHILD WELFARE COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, SEPTEMBER 8, 1961

I am grateful for the opportunity to impart a few thoughts about the current situation in juvenile delinquency. My only regret is that the pressures of time in the closing days of this important session of Congress prevent me from appearing before you in person and exchanging views with you on this important subject.

As members of the National Child Welfare Commission of the American Legion, you probably have heard and read many statistics on juvenile delinquency. Let me recite just a few:

Juvenile delinquency in the United States increased by 177 percent from 1948 to 1959. It is continuing to rise at a frightening rate. There were 773,000 cases reported in 1959, the last year for which complete statistics are presently available. It has been estimated that by 1967 2 million young people will be arrested every year for offenses against the law. Types of offenses involving juveniles are steadily growing more antisocial and more violent. A few years ago juvenile crime was, typically, theft, vandalism, or joyriding in a "borrowed" automobile; now it may be assault with the deadliest kind of weapons; murder, rape, and mutilation.

The Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I have been a member for several years, has conducted studies in cities across the Nation. In New York City, where the general crime rate rose by 4.5 percent in 1960, the rate of offenses for those between the ages of 16 and 20 increased by nearly twice as much—by 8.9 percent. And this is the pattern in most places. In California, Attorney General Stanley Mosk says 61 percent of all arrests for auto thefts are juveniles, and 44 percent of all burglary suspects arrested are juveniles. Many are repeaters.

It is true that the big, congested cities are the ideal breeding ground for this malignant social illness. But juvenile delinquency is spreading to the suburbs, and into rural and semirural communities. Early in 1960, the Senate passed a bill to provide Federal aid for training and research into means of combating juvenile delinquency. During the debate I urged the Senate to consider the recent report of the Colorado Legislative Council, titled "Juvenile in Trouble," which said:

"Juvenile delinquency in Colorado is not concentrated primarily in urban areas. Many of the smaller counties had a higher incidence of delinquency than the larger ones."

The recent annual report of our Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, formerly headed by the late Senator Tom Hennings, of Missouri, and now ably led by Senator TOM DODD, of Connecticut, made the same point. It showed that the largest percentage of increase in the juvenile crime rate was away from the cities, in areas which used to be substantially free from serious juvenile misbehavior. Just one statistic: In suburban Montgomery County, Md., which has one of the highest per capita incomes of any county in the United States, nearly 55 percent of all arrests for major crimes during 1960 were juveniles; and this represented an increase of 36 percent over the previous year.

Our Nation has no corner on juvenile crime. There have been serious increases in Great Britain, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Germany—both East and West—Austria, Greece, Yugoslavia, France, Sweden and Finland. And in Soviet Russia. But that is cold comfort to us.

How do we halt this trend? Some people contend that the problem has been studied to death, and that now we need action. Others say that you cannot hope to cure a disease unless you can define it and diagnose it rather precisely. And this, no one can yet claim to have done.

I think both schools of thought are essentially correct. We must act now—and we must continue to study the root causes, and also evaluate the effects of the remedies we are trying out.

Some of the reasons for delinquency are perfectly obvious. Others are still in the realm of theory. We know, for example, that there is no human factor as potentially explosive as a teenager youngster with nothing to do, no place to go, no job, no hope, no future in sight. There are many thousands of these young people in the big cities of our land—and in small towns and rural areas too. This is essentially a problem of poverty. What about the middle class, which makes up the much larger group of Americans?

We know that family and community life in America have undergone a revolutionary change in the last generation. There used to be a well-defined social circle—a big and close-knit family, a familiar neighborhood, the church, the school, the stores where the shopkeeper knew you by name. Everybody within the circle knew everybody else, and knew him pretty well. The father was the breadwinner and the source of authority. Divorce was uncommon. Supper was on the table at a certain hour and everybody was expected to be there.

The family was the keystone of this arch. A big part of a growing youngster's world consisted of his grandparents, his uncles, aunts and cousins. They may have gotten in each other's way sometimes, but they afforded a great sense of security, of belonging.

Now, people are infinitely more mobile. Families move more frequently, and instead of moving a few blocks away they may well move across the continent. Fathers hold down two jobs to give their families more comforts. But they are sadly missed at home. More mothers work, and return home tired. Transportation is easier and faster, so the old hometown or the city neighborhood do not mean as much as they used to. Suburbs are growing rapidly, but many families still cannot sink permanent roots there. Television is a powerful new factor in leisure. Broken homes are much more common now.

Violence and threats of violence are part of the picture too, and not just on television. When whole nations behave like international gangsters and seem to get away with it, young people who are only beginning to evaluate their role in the world may be confused about moral values.

It is quite clear that the old patterns are gone. New ideas and new approaches must be tried to deal with a fast-changing situation.

The primary responsibility is—and always will be—on the parents of young children. They can do more than any government or any group of private agencies to impress on their children the need for moral standards. They must offer the example. They must take the time to show responsibility, authority, sincerity, sympathy, and understanding to their own children—no matter what the inconvenience and the temptation to slough off the burden on someone else. This is a hard fact. It calls for personal sacrifice and self-control. But it is a moral and patriotic duty as well as a grave personal responsibility.

Churches and private civic groups are a great asset in battling delinquency. They have proved themselves highly adequate and they are more concerned now than ever before with youth and its problems. And I want to take this particular occasion to commend the American Legion and its child welfare commission for their splendid work in this field.

The public institutions have their responsibilities too. The schools do their best, I think. They are trying to cope with huge enrollments and new challenges too. They will move just about as fast as the parents and the community want them to move.

Local governments carry a major share of the burden of juvenile delinquency control. Most of them have problems too—problems of taxation, leading to inability to pay good people to work with juveniles, and inability to pay them the salaries they need to support their own families. But many cities and counties are doing magnificent work in spite of this handicap. Denver's own Judge Philip Gilliam of the juvenile court has achieved international recognition for outstanding work. I include in my praise many police departments which have dedicated groups of men assigned to the juvenile detail.

State government action is relatively new in this field, but under the strong and enlightened leadership of Colorado's Governor Steve McNichols the States have now begun to make intensive studies and I look for major contributions from the States in the years ahead. Incidentally, Colorado has had excellent people working in the child welfare field. State representative Elizabeth Pellet, of Rico has headed a bipartisan committee of the Colorado Legislature which spent several years of quiet, patient studies leading to some important changes in the State laws governing child welfare.

Finally, the Federal Government must offer some assistance, in the view of the Kennedy administration and most Members of Congress. Juvenile problems are national in scope. Since the Federal Government has preempted most of the sources of revenue, it owes the local and State governments some help with juvenile delinquency.

What should the Federal Government do? Our President, John F. Kennedy, feels strongly that there is a responsibility to share the burden and lead in the attempts to find solutions. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has assumed personal responsibility for efforts to help the States and local governments. So has the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, former Governor of Connecticut.

We in Congress have launched several major legislative attacks on juvenile delinquency. In fact, we have been trying to get bills passed for several years now. This year we are getting creative leadership from the White House.

One of these measures would set up a limited program of Federal aid, to be matched on the State and local levels, for training professional workers in the field of juvenile delinquency—caseworkers, policemen, juvenile probation officers, and other specialists who are making youth and its problems their career. There is a severe nationwide shortage of these people. Miss Charline Birkins, our Denver director of welfare, wrote me some months ago, and I quote, "It is a sad commentary that there are fewer trained child welfare workers in the departments of public welfare in Colorado than there were some years ago." And this is true in many areas. Even where there are more workers, the need for still more is growing acute.

In the same measure there would be provision for pilot projects in a few specially selected localities to determine the best ways of dealing with specific problems of juvenile behavior, such as identifying potential delinquents at an early age, so they can be steered away from trouble.

I am happy to report that the House, only last week, passed a bill which would provide a modest 3-year program to accomplish these goals of pilot projects and Federal aid for training juvenile workers. The Senate, earlier in the year, had passed a similar bill, endorsed by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and I am proud that it carries my name as a cosponsor. A conference committee will soon be ironing out the differences between the House and Senate versions. This bill is known as S. 279.

A further possible solution may lie with another bill I am cosponsoring—or with one of several alternative measures now under consideration and backed by the Kennedy administration. This would establish a Youth Conservation Corps of young men, nondelinquents, who would volunteer to train and work under professional conservationists for enrollment periods of 6 months or more, at a modest pay plus subsistence.

Most of us remember the Civilian Conservation Corps of the Roosevelt administration years. Colorado has been permanently beautified, and its natural resources conserved and enhanced, by the CCC. Better still, thousands of young men who might otherwise have become hoboes or criminals were given a new outlook, a new horizon by being put to work in God's great outdoors doing hundreds of tasks which might never have been done. And I do not mean leaf raking or shovel leaning. I mean such permanent and necessary things as reforestation; the stabilization of streambanks for water conservation; the improvement of timber stands; reseeding of eroded lands; control of insects and other pests; development of small watersheds; construction and rehabilitation of outdoor recreation areas. There is a great backlog of needed work to be done now in the national parks and the national forests.

The benefits of this program would be twofold. Young men between 16 and 21 would be offered a chance to get off the streets of crowded cities and out of the doorways of tenement buildings. They would be introduced to the dignity and the fulfillment of physical work in the clear air and strong sunshine of the National and State parks and forests. I think this approach can change many lives for the better—and, incidentally, help to protect our priceless natural resources.

With the backing of this administration, I think we have a good chance of enacting such a program into law during the 87th Congress.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that Colorado is already moving ahead with a State program of its own. The McNichols administration has set up a new position of State youth services director. It is hoped that the legislature will authorize youth camps for rehabilitation of boys who have already had some trouble with the authorities. They would do forestry and range management work. Later the program could be expanded to include those who have not yet fallen into juvenile delinquency.

The Federal Government can and must also tackle the problem of expanded vocational training for youth. The House is now working on a bill which would deal with the fact that young people between the ages of 16 and 22 make up one of the groups in which hard-core unemployment exists. They have not had an opportunity to learn many useful skills. Present apprenticeship programs are not broad enough to include great numbers of young people who have left school. Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg has suggested a combined private and public attack on this training problem. The House bill, H.R. 8354, would set up more on-the-job training, similar to the GI legislation of the 1940's; it also would provide Federal aid to State and local governments to encourage them to provide worthwhile job opportunities for youth, in schools, hospitals and other public institutions. This appears to be a realistic effort to help young people pull themselves out of the mire of street life, out of the unorganized futility which breeds bitterness, apathy and antisocial behavior of all sorts. We as a Nation cannot afford to waste the potential talents of this group of unskilled but willing young people.

These are only a few ways we can help combat juvenile delinquency. We must continue to look for new solutions, even while we take action along the lines I have mentioned. I have heard it said that juvenile delinquency is costing the taxpayers of the Nation $3 or $4 billion a year. This probably is true, but I think it may be a mistake to put the problem entirely in such material terms. Even more important is the

human tragedy, the loss of useful labor, the blighted hopes of hundreds of thousands of young people, their parents and friends.

A child is a wondrous creature. He wants very much to do things, go places, be somebody—to become a vital part of our common life as a great Nation.

Each of us as individuals, and all of us as a people, owe it to youth to help provide the opportunities, the idealism, the challenges, the wholesome stimulation which our young people need. If we can harness this unlimited source of energy to useful, hopeful, constructive purposes, we will be doing the work for which God placed us on earth.

Persecution of Catholic Clergy by Cuban Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, one of the sure signs of a Communist dictatorship is the persecution of Catholic priests. Any doubts about the political direction in Cuba should have been dispelled long ago. But if anyone still feels that Cuba is not under the Communist thumb, they should read the article in yesterday's New York Times concerning the heartless deportation of 136 Catholic priests from Cuba.

Castro is not interested in freedom of religion or in the spiritual care of his people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1961]

HAVANA DEPORTS 135 PRIESTS AND ACCUSED BISHOP TO SPAIN

(By Richard Eder)

HAVANA, September 17.—Bishop Eduardo Boza Masvidal and 135 other Roman Catholic priests were expelled from Cuba today aboard a Spanish liner.

Among those expelled were 46 Cubans, including the bishop. The Spanish Minister Miguel Cordomi Escorihuela, has protested to the Cuban Government over its action in forcibly sending Cuban citizens to Spain without obtaining visas or entry permits for them.

Besides the 46 Cubans in the group, there were 5 Canadians, 4 Dutchmen, 1 Venezuelan, 1 Italian and 1 Hungarian. The others were Spaniards.

Minutes before the ship, the Covadonga, left, Bishop Boza was taken to the vessel. The railings were crowded with passengers, including the priests who had been put on board during the last few days. Accompanying him were members of the Government's political police, who have been holding him since Tuesday.

The expulsion of the priests—close to half the clergy that remained in Cuba—represents the Government's most vigorous reaction so far to a large protest demonstration that erupted a week ago in front of the Church of Charity.

Bishop Boza, who was rector of Villanueva University until the Government closed it, was pastor of the church. The demonstration occurred after a projected procession in honor of the Virgin of Charity had been canceled.

When the Bishop, dressed in a white soutane, went aboard, both passengers and the crowds on the dock cheered him. At the top of the gangplank, he turned and made the sign of the cross.

As the black-hulled liner moved slowly out of the harbor, bound for La Coruña, a port in northwestern Spain, passengers and the crowds along the seawall exchanged salutes with handkerchiefs that fluttered in the bright sunshine. Many of those ashore looked for relatives aboard and called out when they fancied they had spotted them.

At one point, a jeep filled with soldiers sped by. Its occupants called out derisively. Two women, one near tears, the other weeping openly, watched them.

"That is the satisfaction I will not give them—letting them see me cry," said the first.

"What do I care?" said the second.

CITY IS QUIET

Elsewhere in Havana, the city was quiet. The churches held a reduced schedule of services because of the lack of priests. Perhaps as a result each Mass was crowded. Members of the Neighborhood Committees for Defense of the Revolution carefully watched all those going in, but no incidents were reported.

An anti-Catholic campaign has been building up this week in the press and radio. It is expected to go into full swing next week, when Premier Fidel Castro will make two speeches, one to a mass rally of all the city's Committees for Defense of the Revolution.

These committees, whose membership is said to be almost 500,000, constitute a block-by-block surveillance apparatus.

The new campaign is expected to continue to distinguish between what is labeled here authentic religious sentiment and what is called counterrevolution disguised in a soutane.

However, with the exodus of clergy after the rebel invasion at Playa Girón last April and today's expulsions, Cuba now has only about a quarter of her priests left, and it appears unlikely that anyone will take the distinction seriously.

DIFFERENCES IN DEPARTURES

There were two important points of differences between today's expulsions and last April's departures.

Although many priests were threatened with expulsion in April and others were jailed, there was never any formal expulsion order. In the weeks that followed the landings, the jailed priests were gradually released, although the antireligious campaign continued. About 300 priests, almost all foreigners, left. Many belonging to religious orders were withdrawn by their superiors.

There has been some feeling here among certain members of the hierarchy that some of those who left should have tried harder to stay. While not denying that in many cases the pressure brought to bear was intolerable, these members have expressed the opinion that in other cases the priests should have remained with the parishes as long as was physically possible.

This time, however, the priests had no choice. They were arrested, taken to jails in Havana, and from there put on board the ship.

The second difference is that this time there were many native Cubans in the group. One, pushed up the gangplank Friday by the police, called out angrily:

"You can put me in jail or shoot me, but I am a Cuban, and you have no right to put me out of my country."

EXECUTIONS REPORTED ASKED

WASHINGTON, September 17.—Cuban exile leaders said tonight that death sentences had been asked for three more foes of the regime in Cuba in the continuing series of counter-revolutionary trials.

Eleven persons were executed within the last week following sentences imposed by the military revolutionary tribunals of the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

Exile spokesmen said that the death sentences had been asked for Jorgé Horstman, Guilfredo Burgos, and Joaquin Meso Llada and that 30-year prison sentences had been requested for 11 other persons, including 1 woman. The 14 have been on trial before the Camaguey Province revolutionary tribunal. Sentences are expected tomorrow.

All 14 appear to have been connected with the anti-Castro underground people's revolutionary movement.

Specialists in Cuban affairs here said that the Castro regime seemed to be determined the smash the resurgence of active opposition that in recent weeks has been taking the form of new underground operations, public demonstrations, and uprisings by small rebel groups in the mountains in different sections of Cuba.

The mass trials of captured or suspected opponents of the regime appear to be designed to discourage such activities. A simultaneous campaign against the Roman Catholic clergy is believed to be aimed at destroying the inspiration for antiregime moves provided by the church.

Last month, a large group of rebels caught in the mountains of Oriente Province received heavy prison sentences. Their leader, Pedro Alberto Muller, a student, won a reprieve from a death sentence following appeals from a number of Latin American governments.

Yesterday, Castro foes were shot in Havana, Pinar del Rio, and Santiago. In Santiago, one of the executed men was a former Castro army captain, Anibal Rodriques, accused of participation in a murder plot in July against Maj. Raul Castro, the Premier's brother, who is Minister of Armed Forces. Exile leaders said today, however, that Rodrigues had been in prison since February.

New Frontiers for Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there appeared in the Providence Visitor of September 15, 1961, an excellent editorial concerning the present crisis in Berlin. This editorial sets forth most cogently a series of views and proposals with respect to the U.S. course of action in dealing with this difficult problem.

I believe that the editorial has done a great service in focusing the attention of its readers on the Berlin problem. The paper also demonstrated its fairness by printing in full my own ideas concerning Berlin, although my proposals do not coincide completely with those of the Providence Visitor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FRONTIERS FOR BERLIN

Senator PELL's proposal before the Senate that, together with other measures, we concede temporary recognition to East Germany and start negotiations on a wider basis of settlement in exchange for assurances of peace has, apart from the worth of his suggestions, the merit of loosening our thinking on the Berlin crisis and bringing the terms of solution more in proportion with the gravity of the situation—though we do not believe, as he, that the situation is impossible. That Mr. Khrushchev's present diplomacy of terror is not a new version of his old technique of negotiation by bluff is not at all certain. But even if all the Senator's suggestions were wrong—and they are not—he is to be accredited with giving new impetus to the discussion on a national as well as local level. His proposals deserve prolonged consideration.

Yet if it is important to recognize the value of his proposals, it is more important again to detect whatever weaknesses they may have. With Mr. Khrushchev always set to impale us, we cannot afford weaknesses in our armor.

It would be an error, in first place, to consider the recognition of East Germany, temporary or other, as a matter concerning the Russians, the Germans, and ourselves alone. Such an action would have to be studied not only in its effects on these principal parties to the situation but upon our allies everywhere. It should be studied in view of our reputation among some of our allies for backing down in the clutch, as it has been graphically put. Our allies on the frontline of Soviet containment are not forgetful of our half-hearted support of Chiang Kai-shek, our inaction in Hungary, our punch pulling in Cuba, our bewilderment in Laos, and our delayed reaction in the Berlin wall episode. A spontaneous proposal from us now to recognize East Germany would without doubt be tantamount to serving notice on all nations defending freedom and opposing communism that they cannot count on us when the going gets tough, that Russian bluster is always enough for us to abandon an ally or a commitment.

For the United States to recognize East Germany after so heavy a commitment to the contrary would probably in the long run spell the end of West Berlin as a city regardless of guarantees, and it would tend to undermine NATO and other anti-Communist alliances. The free world's resistance to communism would dissolve into either a frightened isolationism or a through-going neutralism. There are already evidences of a weakening of the will to resist not only in Europe but in West Germany itself. Our own indecision has eroded the spirit of freedom of these peoples, who have looked to us for strong leadership. As for the neutralists, the Belgrade meeting has shown how much we fail to impress them.

This does not mean to say that we may not finally have to make concessions, even that of recognizing East Germany. It means that in making our decision we must study well the less obvious and future repercussions our action might have, and the possibly irreparable damage these might inflict on our long-range interests. We must entertain the proposition that Mr. Khrushchev's primary aim in his present pressure on Berlin is purely and simply the destruction of Western unity by imposition of humiliating terms on the United States in negotiations.

Though Senator PELL's proposals are valuable in opening new vistas for negotiating on the Berlin crisis, one may ask whether they go far enough. Are they the last alternative to reverting to the narrower frame of the status quo? Must realism close our eyes to something more advantageous for the United States? Must we deal more in concessions than in demands? Is the vigorous presentation of a massive plan of U.S. demands supported by every sanction short of war entirely out of the question?

Let us outline a few of the possible demands that could be presented:

1. Insistence on the right of self-determination in East Germany by free elections, a right promised by Stalin at Yalta and Khrushchev in Geneva in 1955;

2. Self-determination and free election among all captive nations;

3. A renewal of the proposal of a rollback of the Russian army from not only East Germany but also Poland;

4. A large scale step-up of military preparations in West Germany and in West Berlin by United States and NATO forces;

5. Serious discussions on the advisability of granting nuclear power to West Germany;

6. The strengthening of West Germany as a free and independent state, or the reinsistence on German reunification.

It would be foolhardy to think that Russia would concede all or most of these measures. The point is that, if we could find the moral strength to press for them, this in itself would be a moral and psychological victory of no small consequence. That Mr. Khrushchev dominates the Berlin scene and every other critical scene in the world is plain to be seen. His domination resides in the very energy and determination with which he presents his exorbitant demands. We have a greater funds of demands at our disposal than Mr. Khrushchev. Have we his energy and determination?

Could we, for example, find enough to back up a list of strong demands with a deadline and with any sanction short of war in case of inaction? Sanctions might comprise anything from a wholesale embargo on East-West trade to incitement to rebellion in captive nations. With the very survival of the free world at stake, are such proposals excessive? It may be argued that they are out of harmony with the character of America and the Western democracies. We may wonder whether, if this is so, is it because of high principle or of timidity? Has Mr. Khrushchev's strength hypnotized us and injected an unconscious defeatism in our national psyche?

Or must our weakness be attributed to lack of unity? Our country is divided between the liberal and conservative political thinkers, between realists and idealists, between those who want a get-tough-with-Russia policy and those who prefer to keep negotiating until peace is obtained. Perhaps it is this state of affairs which puts President Kennedy at a disadvantage Mr. Khrushchev never suffers. Is this weakness by divided opinion an inevitable part of our national security?

Senator PELL's proposals are more realistic and more likely to go into negotiations in a Berlin parley than anything suggested here. Perhaps merely by asking why this is so, we may learn much about the state of the Nation.

The Arab Refugees: Tragic Pawns of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following comprehensive and, I believe, objective report on the history and present status of the Arab refugees. It is most unfortunate that these people have been allowed to continue as instruments of politics. Let us hope that the United States will take the initiative in the United Nations to end this shameful situation in the very near future.

The appended report is from the August 1, 1961, Near East Report:

THE ARAB REFUGEES

NEW INITIATIVE—THE ISSUE IS ON THE NEXT U.N. AGENDA—FOUR APPROACHES TO A SOLUTION

The Arab refugee issue may reach a showdown at the coming session of the United Nations.

A high level envoy—as yet unnamed—will soon visit the Near East to make a new survey to enable the Palestine Conciliation Commission to report before the October 15 deadline set at the last session.

There are four major approaches to the refugee issue:

A. Resettlement and compensation

Proponents believe that it is in the best interests of Arabs and Israelis alike to resettle the refugees in Arab countries which have room and need people and where the refugees would live with their own kin.

The Israelis would pay compensation for abandoned Arab property. They contend that:

1. Since the Arab refugees have been taught to hate Israel for the last 13 years and the avowed aim of repatriation is to destroy Israel, any returning Arabs would menace Israel's security.

2. Israel has accepted 1 million Jewish refugees, almost half of them from Arab countries.

3. Israel's Arab population has already reached 230,000—including about 48,500 refugees who filtered back or who were repatriated under the reunion-of-families program.

B. Repatriation, resettlement, compensation and migration

Under this package plan, Israel would accept a specified number, most of the refugees would be compensated for their property and resettled in Arab countries and the balance would emigrate to other lands. This would mean an overall settlement, and proponents argue that both parties should make a contribution to it.

Success of any such plan depends on one major factor. Would the Arabs agree to a general settlement in which they would accept the bulk of the refugees? Obviously, Israel would be unlikely to accept "X" number of refugees unless there were assurances that the problem was solved, once and for all, and that she would not be confronted with renewed repatriation pressures in the future.

C. Let Arabs have the choice

Arabs contend that the refugee have the right to choose between repatriation and compensation and the option must rest with them.

This has led to the doctrine, espoused by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and some State Department experts that the initiative for solution of the refugee problem must be taken by Israel. They argue that if Israel would agree to permit the Arabs the right of choice, very few—perhaps less than 10 percent—would elect to go back to Israel and the great majority would then feel free to accept property compensation and resettlement in Arab countries.

Critics contend that the refugees would not be free to choose between repatriation and resettlement because they would be under duress by their leaders to insist on re-

patriation. Israel would then face an invasion by hostile Arabs.

Proponents of this plan believe that the Arabs are primarily interested in "face" and are not really eager to go back to Israel. However, this evaluation ignores what the Arabs themselves have been saying. The Arab leaders have made it clear, in speeches and in formal declarations, that the refugees must be allowed to go back, not to become citizens of a Jewish Israel, but to establish an Arab state in her stead.

Israelis, whose survival is at stake, take the Arab threats seriously and are not disposed to brush them aside.

D. Absorption

Many observers believe that nothing is gained by any of these proposals because the Arabs will be satisfied with nothing less than Israel's destruction. They argue that ultimately the Arab refugees can be absorbed in the Arab countries, as they irrigate their lands and develop their economies. But progress toward that goal is actually retarded by political initiatives which whet Arab appetites and strengthen their resistance to resettlement. In the meantime, it is widely believed that the United States must continue to contribute to the care of the refugees. Some believe, however, that it may soon be necessary to jar the Arab States back to reality by ending the U.N. administration of the refugee camps and offering development assistance to Arab States that are ready to treat the refugees as people rather than a weapon.

Where does the United States stand on the issue?

The United States has insisted that it has no plan of its own. President Kennedy discussed the refugee problem with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel and has written to the leaders of the Arab States. It has been widely reported that Mr. Kennedy advocated a three-way approach—repatriation, resettlement, emigration.

But in his letters to Arab leaders, the President referred to "repatriation or compensation," and did not refer to resettlement as such. More recently, Assistant Secretary of State Phillips Talbot told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the Department of State intends to "encourage the Palestine Conciliation Commission to explore new possibilities for progress in implementation of paragraph 11 of the 1948 U.N. resolution dealing with repatriation or compensation for the Palestine refugees." This implies that the United States may be committed to the freedom of choice doctrine.

Why does the United States feel the need for action at this time?

At the last U.N. session, Arabs succeeded in putting through a U.N. resolution calling on the PCC to report back by October 15 on steps taken to implement paragraph 11.

In Washington it is believed that unless there is some evidence of progress the Arabs will offer a new resolution at the U.N. to scrap the PCC, which now includes the United States, France, and Turkey, and to add representation from the Soviet and neutral blocs.

What are the prospects for progress?

They are dim because Western diplomats and Arab diplomats are talking different languages.

Western diplomats regard the Arab refugees as people who are a humanitarian responsibility of the world community. Arab leaders regard the Arab refugees as a political force, the citizens of a future Arab state. They are now hoping to create a Palestine entity—which would evolve into an Arab government-in-exile.

Last fortnight, Arab military leaders created the Palestine Liberation Army, to be recruited from the refugee camps.

Two units of the new army marched in the UAR's anniversary celebration on July 23.

And on July 17, a Palestine Arab delegation opened offices in New York to work for this cause at the coming U.N. session.

Thus, any proposal to settle the Arab refugee problem is viewed suspiciously in Arab capitals. Arab leaders have already charged that President Kennedy is seeking to liquidate the refugee problem. For them, settlement of the refugees would be, not a blessing, but the loss of an indispensable political instrument.

During his 13,000-word anniversary speech on July 23, President Nasser once again referred to Israel as "a base created by imperialism to destroy Arab nationalism."

Nasser said he would soon reply to President Kennedy's letter. He took issue with Premier Kassem, who declined to reply because he regarded the Kennedy letter as interference in Arab affairs and a reply would mean accepting "negotiations regarding the fate of the Palestine people."

Nasser asked whether it was reasonable to "let Ben-Gurion go to America and France * * * explaining, arguing, and convincing the people that he is right and that we are wrong" * * * and then refuse to give his opinion when asked.

"We too must try to convince him (Kennedy) verbally that we are right and that the establishment of Israel is wrong." Nasser said.

On July 10, Al Gomhuria, Cairo government daily, frankly declared:

"The return we seek is the free return to Palestine, not to Israel * * * not to live in Israel, but to live on its ruins, in a country whose sovereignty belongs to us alone."

It is a dismal footnote to this discussion to record that the word "peace" is never mentioned in any of these debates. No one summons the Arabs and Israelis to direct negotiations to settle their differences and to reach a peace settlement. The Arab war against Israel is now taken for granted and "stability" is the limited objective in the area.

WHY THERE ARE REFUGEES * * * ARAB WAR AGAINST U.N. RESOLUTION FORCED EXODUS

Arabs contend that the Jews drove the Arabs out of Palestine in 1947 and now bar their return in violation of a U.N. decision. The historical record contradicts this claim.

In 1947, the U.N. General Assembly voted to recommend partition of Palestine into two states—one Arab, one Jewish.

The Jews accepted the U.N. resolution. The Arabs went to war against it. That war created two refugee problems—one Arab, one Jewish.

Some 600,000 Arabs left what is now Israel, crossing into Arab territory.

Almost 500,000 Jews, facing discrimination and an uncertain future in Arab countries, left for Israel.

It must be emphasized that there would not have been a single Arab refugee if the Arabs had accepted the 1947 U.N. resolution. And it is the Arab refusal to make peace with Israel which needlessly and cruelly prolongs Arab displacement.

The record of responsibility is clear in the official U.N. journals.

On the day the U.N. voted, the Arab Higher Committee called for a holy war against the Jewish community of Palestine.

On the following day, seven Jews were killed. Roads were mined and blocked, convoys were ambushed, settlements were isolated. By the end of the first week, 105 Jews had been killed. The violence spread. An apartment house in Jerusalem was blown up at night and more than 50 men, women, and children were murdered. The Jewish Agency in Jerusalem was bombed. Thirty-five young Hebrew University students and 70 Hadassah Hospital doctors, scientists, and nurses were massacred on roads outside Jerusalem. There were retaliations against Arab villages where Arab guerrilla fighters were based. Arabs surrounded, bombed, and besieged Jerusalem, cutting off its water and food supplies.

On February 6, 1948, the Arab Higher Committee cabled to Lake Success:

"The Arabs of Palestine made a solemn declaration before the U.N., before God and history, that they will never submit or yield to any power going to Palestine to enforce partition."

The U.N. Partition Commission reported on February 16 that it could not go to Palestine because "powerful Arab interests are defying the U.N. resolution."

Despite the Arab resistance and the U.N.'s failure, Israel proclaimed its independence on May 14, 1948.

Arab Armies invaded from Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq in what Azzam Pasha, Secretary General of the Arab League, proclaimed as "a war of extermination and a momentous massacre."

Despite heavy casualties, Jewish citizens held their ground.

But most of the Arabs left Palestine in escape from the conflict.

Today, Arab leaders try to disavow responsibility for the Arab flight. They attribute the Arab exodus to Jewish atrocities. The truth is that Arab leadership stimulated the mass flight because they wanted to arouse the entire Arab world into a holy war against the Jews. Moreover, they expected a quick victory and promised the departing Arabs that they would soon return to reclaim their property and that of the Jews as well.

The exodus began with the departure of wealthy Arabs who preferred to wait out the war in Cairo and Beirut. The masses quickly followed their example. Their departure was accelerated by the Arab radio at Ramallah. When a small force of 200 Jewish soldiers overcame Iraqi volunteers in Haifa in April 1948, some 60,000 Arabs left the city.

Jamal Husseini, spokesman for the Arab Higher Committee, told the U.N. Security Council on April 23, 1948:

"The Arabs would not submit to a truce but they rather preferred to leave their homes in the town * * * and leave the town, which they did."

The London Economist later reported the most potent factors influencing their decision were the announcements of the Arab Higher Executive urging all Arabs in Haifa to quit.

The reason given was that upon the final withdrawal of the British, the combined armies of the Arab states would invade Palestine and drive the Jews into the sea and it was clearly intimated that those Arabs who remained in Haifa and accepted Jewish protection would be regarded as renegades.

The Arabs failed to crush Israel and the separate Arab state never came into existence.

THE U.N. RESOLUTIONS CALLED FOR PEACE, BUT THAT IS IGNORED

On December 11, 1948, the U.N. adopted a resolution creating a Palestine Conciliation Commission to negotiate an Arab-Israel peace settlement.

Paragraph 5 of that resolution called on the parties for "agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly, with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them."

It was hoped that a quick solution of the refugee problem would be found in the context of a peace settlement. In an effort to win Arab support for the resolution, the Assembly declared in paragraph 11:

"The Assembly resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss or damage to property which, under principles of international law

or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible;

"Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations."

It will be noted that the resolution does not recognize an unconditional right of return. This is a major point in dispute. Arabs have insisted that the refugees have a right to go back to Israel by virtue of this clause. The clause does not speak of any rights. Moreover, the paragraph makes the return of the refugees conditional on peace, for it speaks of refugees wishing to live in peace with their neighbors. It should also be pointed out that the paragraph talks of resettlement, as well as repatriation. But this is rarely quoted.

The U.S. representatives told the U.N. political committee, on December 3, 1948, "It was recognized that the bulk of the refugees could only return in peaceful circumstances."

All Arab States voted against that 1948 resolution. Nevertheless, paragraph 11 has become the central theme of their propaganda, while paragraph 5, calling for an Arab-Israel peace settlement, is always ignored. And so are the qualifications in paragraph 11.

Early in 1949, the U.N. negotiated armistice agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

It opened negotiations at Lausanne in May 1949. But the Arabs refused to meet the Israelis, and the PCC was reduced to bargaining with the parties separately.

The Arabs insisted that Israel yield the territory won in the 1948 fighting and agree to the repatriation of the refugees.

The Israelis told the Commission that the return of refugees depended on the conclusion of peace.

But Israel did make a substantial repatriation offer during these negotiations.

It said it would accept 100,000 refugees in a general settlement of the refugee problem. It was hoped that each Arab state would make a similar contribution. This offer was rejected.

In 1950, there were off-the-record exploratory peace discussions between Israel, Jordan and Egypt. The talks with Jordan reached the stage of initialed agreements.

On April 1, 1950, the Arab League adopted a resolution forbidding its members to negotiate with Israel. The following summer, hope for an Isarel-Jordan peace was cut down by an assassin's bullet which took the life of King Abullah, the one Arab ruler who had not wanted war against Israel.

The PCC made another effort to bring the parties together in 1951, but finally gave up. It reported:

"Since any solution of the refugee question would involve important commitments by Israel, she could not be expected to make them unless, at the same time, she received reasonable assurances from her neighbors as to her national and economic security."

INFLATED ROLLS—MOST REFUGEES ON U.N. LISTS NEVER SAW ISRAEL

The number of the Arab refugees has been vastly inflated. According to the 1960 UNRWA report, the total is 1,120,889; 849,634 are receiving rations.

The number who actually left what is now Israel could not have exceeded 600,000.

Prior to 1922, when the British accepted the League of Nations mandate, Palestine was a neglected and desolate part of the Turkish Empire. It was a country of Arab emigration. In 1922 there were 557,000 Arabs in all of Palestine, and about 186,000 Arabs in the area of what is now Israel.

But the Arab population increased rapidly because of the new opportunities created by Jewish settlement.

At the time of partition, the Arab population in what is now Israel was estimated at 747,300.

About 160,000 Arabs remained in Israel, despite the war and the mass Arab exodus. This means that the total number of bona fide Arab refugees who left Israel was about 587,000. Of these, 20 percent have found permanent homes and resettlement in the Arab world, according to Dr. John W. Davis, the Director of UNRWA. This means that the number of bona fide refugees from Israel stands at about 480,000.

What accounts for the discrepancy?

There are a number of reasons.

When the 1948 fighting ended, many Arabs living in the Arab territory occupied by Jordan claimed that they were entitled to U.N. relief because they had been rendered indigent by the war. Although many had never lived in Israel, they were now given the status of refugees.

The U.N. Economic Survey Commission reported on December 28, 1949, that the number of nonrefugees on the lists was as high as 160,000.

Padding of U.N. rolls has been notorious. Deaths have not been reported and Arab governments have resisted rectification of the lists. U.N. ration cards are valued as currency.

In 1952, UNRWA reported:

"Whereas all births are eagerly announced, the deaths wherever possible are passed over in silence, so that the family may continue to collect rations for the deceased."

For this reason, UNRWA denied rations for children born after 1951.

In 1959, Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, and GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, charged that the rolls were padded by 150,000. Even the U.S. Embassy chauffeur held a ration card. As a result, Congress last year insisted on a purge.

(In May of this year, Jordan finally acceded to demands for a cleanup. The administration has informed Congress that 5,783 names had been deleted; 3,118 dead, 1,290 rehabilitated, and 1,385 high income earners and false ration card holders. Some 2,226 children were added to the rolls.)

More than one-third of the total Arab refugees—437,818—are under the age of 15. When the astronomical figure of 1,200,000 is used, it should be borne in mind that most of them have no recollection of Israel at all. Less than half actually came out of Israel and virtually all of them left Israel before the state was established. They were never citizens of that country and owe it no allegiance.

UNRWA'S HARD TASK—REFUGEES HAVE HIGH HEALTH AND EDUCATION STANDARDS

After the breakdown in the PCC negotiations, it was widely recognized that the logical solution of the refugee problem was rehabilitation and resettlement. This led to the U.N.-sponsored Blandford program. Some agreements on work projects were reached with Jordan and Syria. But very little was spent and very few were resettled.

Attention was focused on two major projects. There was an Egyptian plan to tunnel Nile waters under the Suez Canal and to settle some 60,000 refugees in the Sinai Peninsula. But it was abandoned by Cairo. Ambassador Eric Johnston obtained technical agreements on the Jordan Valley plan to irrigate 225,000 acres and settle 200,000 refugees but the plan was rejected for "political reasons" at a meeting of the Arab League in October 1956.

The United Nations has had a hard and thankless task in its efforts to care for the Arab refugees. No collective group of refugees was ever treated with so much solicitude and concern by any international agency.

UNRWA made every effort to improve their material conditions and to put them to work, but the Arab Governments long refused to cooperate in any program which might integrate the refugees where they happened to be.

For years UNRWA encountered obstacles and resistance. It was refused diplomatic recognition, its operations were impeded by duties, taxes, and restrictive regulations. Thus, in 1957, the Beirut daily L'Orient wrote:

"The responsibility of the Arab Governments is very great. For 8 years these governments have been applying to the refugees an abstract and inhuman policy. Under the pretext of cultivating in the refugees the longing for their homes in Palestine, and for the purpose of maintaining a menacing population on the frontiers with Israel, these governments have systematically rejected all attempts at organization and employment for the refugees."

But, UNRWA overcame many obstacles and today the Arab refugees live far better and longer and learn more than the Arabs who live in the squalor of the villages in the hinterlands of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq.

UNRWA camps have been converted into small villages, with their own schools, shops, motion picture houses, workshops, etc. Housing accommodations have improved. In 1950, there were 30,580 tents and only 10,930 houses. By 1960, the number of tents had been reduced to 149, while the number of houses had increased to 103,616.

In Jordan, the refugees are citizens and allowed to work.

The Government has been trying to absorb growing numbers in its economy, although its resources are limited.

But in Gaza, refugees are denied freedom of movement. The refugees have no citizenship. They are not permitted to leave the area to take employment outside and have been compelled to turn down emigration offers overseas to Canada and other countries.

In Lebanon, most of the refugees are actually working but their integration into the country is discouraged because authorities fear they might upset the Christian-Moslem balance.

In Syria, almost all the refugees have obtained work.

Health and educational facilities are relatively high in UNRWA centers. The number who received medical services in 1960 was 1,039,557, and they made a grand total of 5,116,674 visits to UNRWA and subsidized clinics. There are 71 hospitals—government, private and UNRWA—available to the refugees, in addition to 11 maternity centers and 2 medical detention posts.

Educational facilities and standards are under the combined supervision of UNRWA and UNESCO. The number of refugee children attending elementary schools is 103,632. The number of refugee children receiving secondary education in UNRWA, government and private secondary schools is 84,195—a high percentage of the population.

In addition, 371 refugees are studying under scholarships at universities.

There is new emphasis on vocational training. Experience has shown that skilled refugees quickly find jobs and a new program will increase the number to receive vocational training from 600 to 2,500 annually.

Thus, as a class, the Arab refugees are becoming the best educated of any group in the Arab world. Unfortunately, however, one of the themes is hatred for Israel.

Officially refugee schools are under the direction of UNESCO. But most of the teachers are refugees. But the textbooks are supplied by the host countries.

In 1959 UNESCO published a booklet by Robert Faherty describing education in the refugee centers. Everywhere he went, he

found the inevitable map of Palestine with such legends as: "The Holy Land, which was lost cheaply, will not be restored without bloodshed of the new generation."

"We shall never forget Palestine."

"We shall never accept any other national home."

"I am going to fight for my country."

These slogans are mild compared with the incitements of the daily press and the radio. And there is hatred in the textbooks.

A first-grade reader published in Syria in 1953 depicts a child raising a flag and declaiming, "The Jews are enemies of the Arabs. Soon we will rescue Palestine from their hands * * *."

A third-grade reader, published in Cairo, shows an Egyptian soldier bearing a submachinegun and stationed near the Gaza strip. He is preparing for the holy war against the enemy.

A secondary school reader, published in Cairo in 1955, calls Jews "the refuse of the world."

Land, water, people: Precious assets are going to waste

Arab league	Area in square miles	Population	Density per square mile	Number of refugees Jan. 1, 1960—			Oil revenues 1959	Aid from United States 1960	Average yearly gift to UNWRA
				In centers	Out of centers	Total			
Iraq	171,500	6,952,000	40.5				$242,359,000	$600,000	0
Jordan	37,500	1,636,000	43.6	184,018	420,218	604,236	900,000	55,700,000	$99,259
Kuwait	6,000	219,000	36.5				398,500,000		0
Lebanon	4,000	1,550,000	387.5	57,544	77,025	134,569	4,650,000	8,700,000	33,493
Libya	679,000	1,172,000	1.7					33,600,000	1,000
Morocco	172,000	10,780,000	62.7					81,600,000	1,527
Saudi Arabia	870,000	6,036,000	6.9				309,271,000	Unavailable	74,019
Sudan	967,500	11,459,000	11.8					12,800,000	14,820
Tunisia	48,300	3,935,000	81.4					61,300,000	0
UAR:									
Gaza	135	360,590	2,671.0	144,950	107,026	251,976			23,676
Egypt	386,000	25,365,000	65.7						339,794
Syria	72,000	4,539,000	63.0	22,711	90,238	112,949	20,750,000	78,700,000	85,891
Yemen	75,000	4,500,000	60.0					6,100,000	
Total	3,488,935	78,503,590	22.5	409,223	694,507	1,103,730	976,430,000	339,100,000	673,479
Israel	8,000	2,105,000	263.1					48,400,000	25,655

This table shows that the Arab League States have the land and oil resources to resettle the Arab refugees.

With a territorial expanse of 3,488,935 square miles, their population density is only 22.5 people per square mile.

There is an over-concentration of people in Egypt, Jordan and the Gaza strip. On the other hand, there is room for many times the number of Arab refugees in countries like Iraq, Syria and the Sudan.

The figures show that the majority of Arab refugees are not in UNRWA centers but are scattered—and to some extent absorbed—in the host countries.

Figures on oil revenues do not include Near East countries outside the Arab League. Their revenues boost the total by about $350 million a year.

The oil-rich Arab countries have the fewest Arab refugees and contribute little to UNRWA. There were no contributions from Iraq or Kuwait, and only nominal amounts from Qatar, Libya and Bahrein.

The table shows the average annual contribution of the Arab States to UNRWA over the 10-year period to 1960. During this span, UNRWA's total income was $327,863,498—most of it from Western governments, none of it from the Soviet bloc, and $6,734,790 from the Arab States. The U.S. contribution during the 10-year period was $222,291,189.

The United States gave or loaned the Arab states $339,100,000 in fiscal 1960. That was beside the U.S. contribution of $23 million for the Arab refugees, which brings the total to $362 million for 1 year.

NEED FOR REALISM—RESETTLEMENT HAS BEEN SOLUTION FOR WORLD'S REFUGEE PROBLEMS

After World War II, there were some 40 million refugees throughout the world: Koreans, Vietnamese, Jews, Hindus, Sikhs, Moslems, Chinese, and Germans.

In every case, resettlement—not repatriation—proved to be the answer.

"No large-scale refugee problem has ever been solved by repatriation," the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace observed in a refugee report in 1957.

The refugees found a welcome in new lands and usually among their own people and, in most cases, the international community did not have to pay the cost.

The one exception is the Arab refugees. Yet for them, too, statesmen have repeatedly declared that resettlement is the logical—and easiest solution.

Beginning in 1950, U.N. resolutions speak of the "reintegration of the refugees in the economic life of the Near East, either by repatriation or resettlement."

In 1954, the U.S. delegation to the U.N. urged the Arab Governments to recognize that "the eventual solution of the refugee problem lies in a new and stronger economy for the Arab countries."

This view has been echoed by many U.N. delegations although the Soviet bloc always identifies itself with the Arab "freedom of choice" doctrine.

On August 26, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles announced that the United States would be willing to lend Israel funds to enable her to pay compensation and thus facilitate resettlement.

There have been many strong reports by congressional committees, all stressing resettlement:

Smith-Prouty House subcommittee, 1953: "The United States should serve notice that it will not support the return of the Arab refugees to their former homes within the boundaries of Israel under existing conditions."

Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 1955: "A permanent solution of the Arab refugee problem can only be found through rehabilitation and resettlement and the committee has repeatedly expressed its deep concern over the lack of progress in this direction."

Senator HUMPHREY report, 1957: "Resettlement in Arab lands with compensation for property left in Israel is, in fact, the only effective and realistic way of solving the Arab refugee problem. The fact is that the Arab states have for 10 years used the Palestine refugees as political hostages. Nothing has been done to assist them in a practical way lest political leverage against Israel be lost."

Hays-O'Hara-Church House subcommittee, 1958: "Unlike refugees in other parts of the world, the Palestine refugees are no different in language and social organization from the other Arabs. Resettlement, therefore, would be in familiar environment."

The Democratic platforms in both 1956 and 1960 called for resettlement in countries "where there is room and opportunity for them."

But while logic argues for resettlement, there are psychological road blocks:

1. Many refugees want to go back to Israel to secure compensation for their property and they resist resettlement because they believe it might jeopardize their claims. It has not been made clear to them that Israel has, in fact, offered compensation.

2. Most of the refugees now have a higher standard of living than that of the average Arab villager, because U.N. rations and services have supplemented the income of those who work.

The fact is that the Arab refugees do want work and settlement and most of them have seized opportunities which have opened up for them in the host countries—Jordan, Lebanon and Syria, as well as in distant oil fields.

After its failure to make any headway to secure an Arab-Israel settlement, the PCC made a study of Arab property claims inside Israel. There was a preliminary valuation of $300 million.

Arab figures on this subject are wildly exaggerated. Early this year, the Arabs proposed the appointment of a U.N. custodian to act as trustee over abandoned property. This proposal, based on the assumption that the Arabs still own the property and have a continuing right to its income, was rejected by the U.N.

For its part, Israel has offered to pay compensation for Arab property and has declared that such payments need not wait for a peace settlement. It has pointed out that many Israelis have left property in Arab countries, which would have to be taken into account.

Israel has released the blocked accounts of the Arab refugees, exceeding $8 million.

In 1959, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold surveyed the refugee problem and reported that the refugees could ultimately be absorbed in the economy of the region. He said that the refugees should be regarded not as a liability, but as an asset—as a reservoir of manpower, which in the general economic development could assist in the creation of higher standards for the whole population of the area.

Mr. Hammarskjold estimated that the refugees could be absorbed at a cost of $3,300 each—or $1,770 million over a 10-year period, to be financed through oil revenues and external assistance.

The Arabs attacked the Hammarskjold report because of its emphasis on resettlement.

At that U.N. session, the Arabs scored a propaganda gain when they persuaded the Assembly to shelve the constructive Hammarskjold report and persisted in their demands that all the refugees should return to Israel, in order to convert it to an Arab state.

Nevertheless, while the Hammarskjold report was rejected, the ideas he presented are taking on reality in the Arab economies. Refugees are being absorbed as the Arabs develop their land, water, petroleum and industrial resources.

POPULATION EXCHANGE—TWO REFUGEE PROBLEMS

Long before Israel was created, world leaders advocated a population exchange between Jews and Arabs. Thus, in 1945, former President Herbert Hoover proposed that the Arabs of Palestine be resettled in Iraq, to allow room for the Jewish survivors of the Hitler concentration camps in their own national home.

A similar view was expressed by the British Labor Party at its 1944 convention. It said:

"Here, too, in Palestine, surely is a case, on human grounds and to promote a stable settlement, for transfers of population. Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out, as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land, and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed. The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales."

It was recognized that the Jewish state would have to absorb not only the survivors of the concentration camps, but also many from the lands of Asia and Africa and particularly from Arab countries where they had suffered discrimination.

The proposal for a population exchange was never advocated before the United Nations during the Palestine debate. Instead, the U.N. decided on partition. If the Arabs had accepted partition, there would have been a substantial number of Arabs living both in the Arab state and in the territory alloted to Israel.

Many Jews came out of Arab countries before 1948. Since then, the figures are: Morocco, 150,000; Iraq, 125,000; Yemen, 45,000; Egypt, 36,000; Libya, 33,000; Syria, 6,500.

The exact figures are unavailable, but emigration from Tunisia, Aden, Algeria, and other Moslem lands in Asia and Africa brings the total to 507,000.

SENATORS QUESTION POLICY

Three U.S. Senators questioned the direction of the administration's policy on the Arab refugees, in speeches in the Senate on July 20.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, said that omission of the word "resettlement" from President Kennedy's letter to Arab leaders was "difficult to understand" and added that "in the sensitive Near East atmosphere," such an omission could lead to "distortion and false illusions about a softening of U.S. policy."

He asserted that the Arabs had "regularly refused any plan for the solution of the refugee problem short of the dismemberment and destruction of the State of Israel. What they could not accomplish by military action, they now seek to win by persuading the free world nations to exert the pressure they themselves are unable to bring against Israel."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said that the only way to solve Arab-Israel problems was through negotiations between the parties, but, he said:

"It is beginning to appear as if the United States were making a series of piecemeal concessions to the Arab States in the hope that they will, as a result, be inclined to more conciliatory policies vis-a-vis Israel. I do not think that an American policy of concessions here and there will have the desired result."

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, said there was no valid alternative to resettlement and asked whether the President's messages to the Arab leaders represented repudiation of former policy.

"I am aware that some people in the State Department think that an offer of repatriation should be made to the Arab refugees. * * * I do not think that a majority of Congress shares this view. * * *

"It constitutes a moral threat to a friendly democracy. This we cannot countenance."

On August 4, 1961, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs again stressed resettlement as the solution for the Arab refugee problem. The committee, which is headed by Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, reported to the House:

"The committee regrets that only limited progress has been made to solve the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees. Some progress has been made within recent years because refugees who have acquired skills have found employment and have been absorbed in the local economy. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency now plans to expand the vocational training program in order to stimulate employment of the refugees, and part of the funds included in this years' authorization for the U.S. contribution to UNRWA are to be used for this vocational training program. Nevertheless, progress toward a final solution remains regrettably slow. The only favorable developments during the past year were (1) real progress in the rectification of UNRWA relief rolls and (2) an expanded program of vocational training. While the committee continues to support the program, it is of the opinion that more vigorous action is needed to bring the refugee problem to an acceptable and early solution. The committee believes that the vast majority of the refugees will eventually have to be resettled in lands where there is room and opportunity for them."

U.S. PRECEDENT

Israel's rejection of the Arab repatriation demand is not unique. Few countries welcome return of former residents who fought against their independence. There is precedent in our own history. The U.S. Congress refused to sanction return of Tories who sided with the British in the Revolutionary War.

On November 26, 1782, Benjamin Franklin wrote Richard Oswald, the British negotiator:

"Your Ministers require that we should receive again into our bosom those who have been our bitterest enemies, and restore their properties who have destroyed ours and this while the wounds they have given us are still bleeding."

Longevity Step Increases for Postal Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill to provide a more equitable method of granting longevity pay increases to postal employees. I believe that it is important that the postal longevity benefits be made to more closely correspond to the civil service classification system benefits.

The employees of our postal service are important members of our Government. To many in our Nation, contact with the Post Office Department is the only regular contact they have with their Government. The dedication and the spirit of these employees has long been a valuable public relations asset to the entire Federal Government.

It is important that we make the postal service attractive. The Post Office Department must be a good employer if it is to attract and hold the type of men and women which will compliment it and the Nation. The bill S. 1459 makes a step forward in this area. I support it and I urge that we pass it.

Italy's Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, yesterday's issue of the New York Times had an excellent article on the economic progress being made by the great nation of Italy. In a nation which has long been afflicted by poverty, great strides have been made in the last few years including a 6-million-ton increase in steel capacity and a 33-percent increase in wages. It is interesting to note that the rate of economic growth in Italy last year was double that of the United States.

Italy still has many economic problems, especially in the South. But the Italian people are determined to provide a better life for themselves and their children.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Italy Enters the Age of Affluence but Continues to Battle Poverty," by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1961]

ITALY ENTERS THE AGE OF AFFLUENCE BUT CONTINUES TO BATTLE POVERTY

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

TURIN, ITALY, September 11.—An age of affluence has dawned in Italy, a land whose poverty is as old as its history.

It is a land where eyes and ears confirm the statistics—where expansion and growth are palpable.

Italy was so far behind that even 10 years of very rapid growth have still left her by every test the poorest of the advanced countries of Europe.

The 250,000 automobiles that have further crowded the roads in the first half of this year, for example, still leave Italy with only half as many cars in relation to the population as Britain, France, and West Germany.

But a start has been made. No visitor can fail to be dazzled, and sometimes annoyed, by the flashy apartment buildings in and around almost every town, the modern factories already built or in process of construction, the multitude of trucks on the roads, the Atlantic City atmosphere of Lake Maggiore and the northern Adriatic coast

or the spectacular new superhighways through the mountains.

The burst of energy is perhaps most striking in Milan, which seems to have more opportunities for sidewalk superintendents than any other city in the world.

The beginnings of the age of affluence have meant a better life for the majority of the 50 million Italians and a tremendous improvement for some. But thus far, for various reasons, Italy's economic miracle has found expression more in new physical assets than in the things that most closely affect the everyday life of the workingman and his family.

A labor union official in Rome put it this way:

"Of course wages have gone up and unemployment has come down. But in this classic—and belated—capitalist investment boom, I'm afraid the social side has been left behind."

He was alluding not only to the relative slowness with which Italian wages have risen, despite the steep rise in production. He was well aware, too, of such pitiful sights as occur in Turin and Milan when people from the south arrive by train to seek jobs in these boomtowns. The newcomers carry all their possessions in a cardboard box, find homes only in a form of southern "ghetto" and face difficulty even in making themselves understood by the northerners.

Because discontent at such conditions is still widespread, nearly a third of the Italian voters continue to support the Communist Party or its leftwing Socialist allies.

Part of the explanation for this is plain tradition among the workers. Part, officials say, is a result of inadequate education, which is almost universally regarded as Italy's greatest problem. Part stems from the Communists' ability to persuade their adherents that the economic improvement that has taken place is a result of their efforts.

BENEFITS EXPECTED TO SPREAD

But none of these things changes the fact that the "miracle" is occurring. The fruits, judging from all past evidence in other countries, will spread increasingly.

What, then, is the Italian story? What brought about the great advance? What has it meant to the country and its people?

A good place to begin is the tremendous and expanding Fiat automobile plant here in Turin. Its 30,000 workers are already turning out 2,500 cars daily, a third for export, and its capacity will reach 4,000 daily in a few years.

None of the men working the endless rows of machines is entirely "typical," but a composite man might add up to the following:

The chances are slightly better than even that he was born in a rural village rather than in Turin. His presence here is evidence of what is by far the greatest social consequence of Italy's boom—a rapid migration from farm to city that has brought social strains with economic advances. Italy still has 31 percent of her labor force on the farm—compared with only 20 percent in the rest of rich Europe—but it was 50 percent in Italy a generation ago.

CASH FOR DEPENDENTS

A machine operator classified as semiskilled earns a basic salary of 65,000 lire ($104) a month. In addition he gets about 6,000 lire ($10) for each dependent. Assuming he has a wife and two children, he thus gets a monthly paycheck of 83,000 lire ($136), which is only a little higher than the weekly check of his counterpart in Detroit.

He lives in a fine new apartment built by Fiat with the aid of a special state housing fund. It has two bedrooms, a bathroom and a kitchen and the rent is 19,000 lire ($31) a month. All his medical needs are provided free under a company program.

The worker probably owns a motor scooter, and may perhaps have a baby Fiat that he was able to buy for just under $1,000. He has a television set. He still eats meat only ever other day, subsisting mainly on inexpensive spaghetti and bread. His clothing is cheaper than his counterpart's in the United States. This man is the prince of Italian workers. The scale ranges downward from him.

He and other italian industrial workers have seen their paychecks—all special benefits included—rise by slightly more than one third since 1953, with the biggest jump in the last 18 months. The national average is now a little under 50,000 lire ($80) a month, according to the latest estimates.

COST OF LIVING UP

But the cost of living has risen, too, in the same period, by 17 percent. Thus real wages have gone up only 15 to 20 percent in the 8 years, while industrial production has doubled.

A bank section manager expresses a fairly widely held view:

"Miracle? What miracle? After 11 years in this job I'm getting 90,000 lire a month. The rich get richer, the Government is as crooked as ever, and all I see of the miracle is a traffic jam."

The main reason for the relative slowness of wage increases has been unemployment, which has exercised a strong restraining effect. Now, in the industrial region of the north, there is very nearly full employment and wages are starting to rise more rapidly—about 8 percent last year, with the same pace apparently maintained this year.

By far the greatest human benefit of the miracle has been the reduction in unemployment. There are two different sets of statistics on this, one based on registrations at State employment offices and the other based on a representative sample of the population, as in the United States.

The sample now shows unemployment at about 700,000, while the registration figure puts it twice as much. Informed opinion puts true unemployment at 800,000 to 900,000, or well under 5 percent of the labor force. This compares with a probable true figure of about 1,500,000 at the beginning of the last decade. Thus unemployment has been nearly cut in half, and the insoluble problem of the early postwar period is on the way to being solved.

It is the man who has found a job after not having had one for months or years and the man who has moved from near poverty on the farm to a paying job in the city who have seen their level of life improve most. The biggest jump in personal incomes and consequently in consumption has been among these men rather than among men already working in the cities.

The incomes of those longtime city workers are still anything but high. Consider the cash incomes of the following Romans:

Steel salesman, 41 years old, 11 years in job, equivalent to $176 monthly.

Bus conductor, 38, 14 years in job, $137 monthly.

Clerk in Ministry of Aeronautics, 27, $96 monthly.

Woman insurance company typist, 41, 7 years in job, $128 monthly.

EXPRESSION OF LATE START

These incomes are an expression of the fact that Italy started so far behind the parade. For the first 40 years after reunification in 1861 the country scarcely grew at all—the same period when much of the rest of Europe and the United States were roaring into the industrial age.

Then, at the beginning of this century, Italy's latent industrial genius began to show itself. Men like the great Giovanni Agnelli of Fiat and Guido Donegani of Montecatini were adventurous business entrepreneurs on the grand scale. Northern Italy in general caught the industrial spirit of the times and began to show consistent economic advance.

By the outbreak of World War I mechanical industries already had 1,500 factories though they employed only 210,000 workers. The industrial tradition was established and there had never been any doubt of the ability and willingness of Italians to work.

But World War I was a setback. After a period of fairly rapid growth in the twenties the great depression, followed by the "autarchy policies" of the Mussolini regime, which protected nearly all industry from foreign competition, left the country as poor as ever.

WORLD WAR II TOOK TOLL

World War II dealt what seemed to be the coup de grace. The sheer physical destruction was enormous. One of Italy's three steel mills, for example, was completely destroyed.

It was after World War II that the miracle began. How did it happen?

Men like Vittorio Valetta, the dynamic head of Fiat, and Luigi Einaudi, world famous economist, who was President of Italy until 1954, deny that there has been any miracle at all.

Signor Einaudi, now 87 years old but still writing economic articles, says with a snort:

"Miracle? It has all happened before in other countries. All it took, really, was an act of will in 1947 and 1948 to get the money under control by refusing to give credit to everyone who wanted it—in effect by stopping the printing press."

His basic premise—and that of others—is that the great expansion reflected the classic operation of the profit motive, once U.S. Marshall plan aid had covered Italy's immediate recovery needs.

THREE STAGES SEEN

Signor Valetta divides the postwar period into three stages. In the first, Italian industry was still afraid. In the second, beginning about 1950, first efforts at investment and expansion were getting underway. Then by 1955 everyone was getting on the bandwagon.

Since 1956 new fixed investment has represented the astonishing proportion of about 24 percent of Italy's gross national product, most of it private investment. This is one reason why the consumer has seemed to benefit comparatively little—though he will benefit later.

Others, including Emilio Colombo, brilliant young Minister of Industry, add as a major cause of the nation's economic growth the rapid liberalization of imports from other countries in Europe, although tariffs remained quite high. Italian industry had to modernize or go under and foreign trade expanded rapidly.

Finally, Signor Colombo and others stress the important role played by investments of the state, particularly in the early years of the last decade. There were ordinary public works. There was a big development plan for the south. And perhaps most important, there was the bold investment policy of state-owned industries—particularly in the state-owned part of the steel industry and in the oil and gas operations of Enrico Mattei, controversial chief of the state oil concern.

On all sides much credit for the great expansion of the Italian economy is given to plain hard work. The Italian genius in design and engineering and construction, together with aggressive salesmanship at home and abroad, obviously played a major role. But Italy was never lazy, only backward. The conditions of the last decade have been the first in which her innate industrial ability has had a sustained chance to show itself.

Italy also got one important stroke of good luck. A major reason for her lag behind the rest of the industrial world was her lack of coal and iron for steelmaking, to say nothing of other natural resources.

But a major change has occurred in the European steel industry.

Lower freight rates, cheap American coal and new iron ore deposits in Latin America and Africa have suddenly made it possible for Italian mills built on the coast to produce steel almost as cheaply as the mills of the Ruhr or of northern France.

A huge new mill is being built by the state-owned steel concern, Italsider, at Taranto, on the coast in the south. By 1965 Italian steel capacity will be up to 12,500,000 tons compared with 8,500,000 tons now.

GROWTH RATE RISES

Out of it all has come a rate of economic growth that rivals that of West Germany for the most rapid in Europe—far faster in percentage terms than that of the United States in recent years. In the decade ending in 1960, the gross national product in real terms—that is, after allowing for price increases—rose by 5.7 percent yearly, far higher than in any other period of Italian history.

This compares with just under 7 percent for West Germany and with 3 percent for the United States.

Italy now turns out more than 700,000 cars a year, and domestic sales jumped last year alone by a third. There are now 2,300,000 cars on Italy's still inadequate road system, not to mention the trucks. Consumption of durable goods—the ultimate badge of affluence—has doubled since 1953.

Yet Italy still has almost 40 percent of her people living in the south, Sicily and Sardinia in conditions often close to poverty. Overall she will have to grow for another decade at the present rate to catch up with the present level of incomes, production and living standards of the rest of industrialized Europe.

Cooperation in Saving Human Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, there appeared in the Anderson (S.C.) Independent newspaper on Friday, September 15, 1961, a heartwarming story of the cooperation of the Crippled Children's Division of the South Carolina State Board of Health, the National Jewish Hospital at Denver, Colo., the South Carolina Air National Guard, the South Carolina Adjutant General's Office, and the Colorado Air National Guard, in an effort to save the life of a 2-year-old Negro child from Sumter, S.C.

Mr. President, it is refreshing in these times of tremendous racial agitation and disruption to read such an account of harmony and cooperation between different racial and ethnic groups and State organizations. Unfortunately, it is rare that such instances of efforts of one racial group on behalf of another make the news.

Consequently, I take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD this editorial, which gives a full account of the mercy mission, along with editorial comment.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Sept. 15, 1961]

CHILD IN PLIGHT AND MERCY FLIGHT SHOW SOUTH CAROLINA IN TRUE LIGHT

Charlie is a 2-year-old Negro child from Sumter.

Early in August he was admitted to the program of the Crippled Children's Division of the South Carolina State Board of Health.

His condition has been extremely serious.

For a few days he was hospitalized in Columbia but the hospitals there lacked adequate facilities for coping with the type of disease that had stricken little Charlie.

Board of health officials looked elsewhere because the child's life was at stake.

They knew of one very fine place—the National Jewish Hospital at Denver, Colo. This is a charitable institution supported entirely by contributions.

Informed of nature of the case and lack of facilities in Columbia, the admission of Charlie was approved immediately.

A free, nonsectarian medical center, the National Jewish Hospital's purpose is summed up concisely in its motto: "None may enter who can pay; none can pay who enter."

To get the tiny Negro child from South Carolina to Colorado as quickly as possible was the next problem, since nature of his illness barred transportation by rail or commercial airlines.

The South Carolina Board of Health turned to the South Carolina adjutant general's office which quickly authorized a mercy flight utilizing a South Carolina Air National Guard plane.

Accompanied by a physician and nurse from the board of health, Charlie was rushed to Denver in a direct flight from Congaree Air Force Base, Columbia.

There the Colorado Air National Guard quickly took over and furnished ambulance service to the hospital.

Word from South Carolina Board of Health officials is that Charlie probably will be a patient at the National Jewish Hospital for at least several months.

This is not the first mercy flight undertaken by the South Carolina Air National Guard.

But in these tense times at home and abroad it provides a brief view of what could be if this Nation and a weary world could be rid of professional mongers of hate and war.

Exploded again is the vicious myth cultivated by paid Negro racists and exploited by politicians and press outside this region that South Carolinians and all other southerners "hate Negroes."

The real record of relations between the races in South Carolina—a record running back deep into history of the State—is exemplified by Charlie's case.

This is not the first time nor will it be the last that full resources of State government have been used to save the lives and alleviate tragedy affecting Negroes, young and old.

In untold thousands of instances—every day, every year—white persons assist Negroes meet problems, large and small; and history shows also that when they can help white persons, Negroes reciprocate.

This record cannot be obliterated by today's peddlers of hate, either white or Negro, whose interest is in pay and pelf and not in the timeproven fact that peaceful relationships based upon school and social segregation is necessary if Negroes are to achieve good education, new skills, and better standards of living. But the professional agitators, stirring strife, threaten to cost the race all of its peaceful gains.

They would rather forget about the case of little Charlie, since it spotlights the fact that compassion and concern and not mass "hatred" of a race is the prevailing atmosphere in this or other Southern States. Every attack upon necessary segregation by NAACP and CORE chips away such compassion and concern, to the detriment of all Negroes.

If segregation is wrong why is it that there is daily demonstrated more racial hatred in any given block in New York or Philadelphia or Chicago than in the whole State of South Carolina?

The case of 2-year-old Charlie and the all-out effort to save this little Negro boy is a story of race relations in South Carolina that will be ignored by agitating northern politicians and press, but it will get through to Charlie's folks and other Negroes of good will in the Lord's good time.

The real truth has a way of breaking through even the strongest tissue of "paper curtain" distortion and lies.

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations while on a Congo peace mission is the saddest and most portentous tragedy that has occurred, in my judgment, since World War II.

Hammarskjold knew full well that if the United Nations was to be a positive instrument for peace and an effective counterforce against Communist direct or indirect aggression, the executive powers latent in the organization had to be strengthened and used. Toward this end, Hammarskjold, by creating precedent, was writing history, and indeed it was the most encouraging history of modern times. His tragic death is a loss to mankind and most of all to the millions of people the world over who search for freedom.

The future will not be easy. But we have youth and strength on our side and now is the time to roll up our sleeves and go to work.

One of the finest tributes to the work of Dag Hammarskjold that I have seen appeared in the New York Times this morning, and with the permission of the House I should like to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues the two lead editorials of Tuesday, September 19:

THE U.N. IN CRISIS

As the General Assembly prepares to meet for one of the most critical sessions in its history, the whole United Nations has been plunged into a grave crisis as a result of the tragic death of Secretary General Hammarskjold, its dedicated and energetic chief executive, who was leading it to new horizons and died a martyr in the cause for which it stands.

The still unexplained plane crash in an African jungle that took his life leaves without a head the whole executive machinery of the United Nations at a moment when it

is called upon to play a major role in solving many problems involving the dread issue of peace or war, including the Congo and even Berlin. What is more, his untimely death confronts the United Nations with an especially crucial problem on the proper solution of which will depend its very existence and certainly its effectiveness as an instrument for international peace and security and the suppression of aggression.

This is the problem of Mr. Hammarskjold's succession. It was not due to arise till the end of his term, in April 1963. Now it is bound to come to a head with explosive force. For the Soviets have now a decisive opportunity to intensify their war against the United Nations and their campaign to rule or ruin it by attempting to abolish the office of a Secretary General entirely and to replace him with a three-man directorate, ostensibly representing the West, the Communist bloc and the "neutralists" who did not prove themselves so neutral at Belgrade, each director being endowed with a veto. In addition the Soviets would pack the Secretariat with new members subject to the orders of their own governments.

This "troika" plan, launched by Premier Khrushchev in a shoe-pounding performance at the Assembly session last year, has been quickly recognized for what it is—an effort to paralyze the United Nations in taking any action the Soviets do not like while reserving it as an instrument for actions the Soviets do like. For that reason it has already been rejected by all but the Communist members, and the United States has threatened to use its first veto to kill it.

But the Soviets have now a special lever. Under the charter the Secretary General is appointed by the General Assembly, but only on recommendation of the Security Council, and there the Soviets have a veto to prevent the election of anybody, thus paralyzing the United Nations in any case. As for packing the Secretariat, the charter specifically provides for an international civil service the members of which are forbidden to seek or receive instructions from any government or any authority outside of the United Nations.

In his latest annual report to be laid before the General Assembly, Mr. Hammarskjold, whom the Soviets were already boycotting, specifically warned that the adoption of the Soviet plan would mean the collapse of the United Nations. The first step in dealing with the situation is now up to the Security Council. But it is the smaller nations in the Assembly, especially the "positive neutralists" who want to play a role in world affairs, who must now rally around the United Nations and help to save an institution that is their best shield and protection and far more important to them than to the big powers, who can take care of themselves.

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

But for the patient, indefatigable leadership of Dag Hammarskjold, the United Nations might not exist today. Quietly, shrewdly, persistently he labored to maintain it against heavy odds and to enhance its effectiveness in a world that teeters on the brink of catastrophe.

Mr. Hammarskjold established his office and the United Nations as instruments of a code of moral law. If humanity survives the menace of a nuclear holocaust that he strove so valiantly to avert, history will surely mark his career as one of the great forces for a better world.

He began his tenure at the United Nations modestly, the epitome of a devoted international civil servant. By displaying absolute neutrality and fairness, by showing absolute discretion in keeping confidences, he gained the trust of all parties and built up his role as peaceful arbiter.

Such successes as his quiet negotiation of the Arab-Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza strip, the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force to keep the peace there, and his handling of the confused Congo situation are outstanding examples of his diplomatic and organizing abilities. In these and other moves he based his authority on the spirit of the charter and a liberal interpretation of United Nations instructions which he often inspired. This enabled him to act with independence in the pattern of the responsible leader of a world parliament.

Mr. Hammarskjold's death is an incalculable loss. He had built himself and his office into one of the great hopes for world peace. He came to represent what was honorable and rational in a chaotic world full of hate and suspicion. There could be no better tribute to him than to bring his body back in state and bury it in United Nations ground under a fitting monument to remind all men of the values for which he lived and died.

Reserve Readjustment Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of September 16 of the Navy Times, appeared an editorial which pays significant tribute to a Member of the House, and to the record of this body for which he is largely responsible.

This editorial, prepared by Mr. John Slinkman, one of the outstanding journalists in the service press field, refers to the arduous and painstaking work by the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Reserves of the Committee on Armed Services, in drafting a greatly needed measure to improve the status of the Reserve officers serving on extended active duty in the Armed Forces.

We all know that this outstanding legislator has given a great deal of his valuable time, and his considerable abilities, to this problem during the past 4 years. He has recognized the insecure status of these reservists for what it is—a deterrent to morale and to the effectiveness of the active forces, in which a majority of the officers are reservists. No one has sought more vigorously, and persistently to correct a situation which cries out for justice. Twice within the past 3 years, Chairman RIVERS has brought carefully written bills to this House; both times the House has, without a single dissenting vote, followed his recommendations and passed these bills. The bill which this House passed on August 29 now is before the other body. I hope that before the Congress adjourns this session, we have agreement between the two Houses and obtain enactment of this badly needed legislation.

One other observation in Mr. Slinkman's editorial I would also like to endorse—and that is the role of the Reserve Officers Association in connection with this legislation. ROA's national staff is composed of professional military men, some Reserves, some Regular, who are particularly experienced in the personnel field. These officers are highly respected by all in this House who know them. I know that they have been of great help to us in our desires—and in our efforts—to improve personnel practices in the armed services.

The editorial follows:

RESERVE READJUSTMENT PAY

By the time this is read, the Senate Armed Services Committee probably will have finished its work for this session of Congress. As of this moment, there is grave doubt that the committee will have taken up the bill putting reserve severance pay on the same basis as regular severance pay. That is, with some qualifications, released Reserves would get two months' pay per year of service.

We hope we are wrong about the Senate. With reserves being recalled for the third time in 20 years, the assurance of this bill—passed unanimously by the House—is badly needed. And be it noted that the bill before the Senators is very similar to one they themselves voted a year ago as a substitute for the term-retention bill.

If this better deal for reserves is voted, it will be due almost entirely to the work of Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS and the Reserve Officers Association. It was the South Carolina Democrat who got a bill from Defense and who persuaded his colleagues to improve it and to approve it. It was the ROA which, by well-reasoned arguments, helped sell the bill to the House and is now working hard to convince the Senators of its merits.

Every member of the Senate Armed Services Committee is familiar with this subject. It should not take them long to act on this very meritorious and very important bill.

Guantanamo Naval Base in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over many months I have repeatedly stressed in addresses in and out of the Congress the necessity for our Government to stand firmly with respect to maintaining its exclusive control of the naval base at Quantanamo and the necessity for retaining the Connally amendment unimpaired.

It is encouraging to note that Dr. Robert Morris, former counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and now president of the University of Dallas, on September 9, 1961, spoke out strongly along the same line in words of warning that should be heeded, and which I shall quote:

EXCERPT OF REMARKS OF ROBERT MORRIS, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS, BEFORE THE DELTA KAPPA GAMMA SOCIETY, OF ELLIS COUNTY, AT THE ELLIS COUNTY WOMEN'S BUILDING, WAXAHACHIE, TEX., ON SEPTEMBER 9, 1961

The so-called neutralist resolution proposed by Soviet Cuba and passed at Belgrade this week calling for the United States withdrawal from its Guantanamo Naval base,

is one of the most ominous of developments in international councils. It goes a long way toward confirming Castro's boast of last year that he would receive Guantanamo through the international tribunals.

This action should cause the leaders of our Government who have been champing for us to yield more of our sovereignty and of our responsibility to the international agencies, including the World Court, to pause and reflect upon the consequences of such a tendency.

Goals of the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has been one of the most hard-working and productive sessions during my 20 years of service in the House. Under President Kennedy's vigorous leadership, we have already made significant progress toward the goals of the New Frontier, as outlined in our 1960 Democratic platform.

In his nomination acceptance speech in Los Angeles on July 15, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy outlined the scope of the New Frontier:

It is time for a new generation of leadership—new men to cope with new problems and new opportunities.

All over the world, particularly in the newer nations, young men are coming to power—men who are not bound by the traditions of the past—men who are not blinded by the old fears and hates and rivalries—young men who can cast off the old slogans and delusions of suspicions.

For I stand tonight facing west on what was once the last frontier. From the lands that stretch 3,000 miles behind me, the pioneers of old gave up their safety, their comfort, and sometimes their lives to build a new world here in the West. They were not the captives of their own doubts, the prisoners of their own price tags. Their motto was not "every man for himself"—but "all for the common cause." They were determined to make that new world strong and free, to overcome its hazards and its hardships, to conquer the enemies that threatened from without and within.

Are we up to the task—are we equal to the challenge? Are we willing to match the Russian sacrifice of the present for the future—or must we sacrifice our future in order to enjoy the present?

That is the question of the New Frontier. That is the choice our Nation must make—a choice that lies not merely between two men and two parties, but between the public interest and private comfort—between national greatness and national decline—between the fresh air of progress and the stale, dank atmosphere of normalcy—between determined dedication and creeping mediocrity.

All mankind waits upon our decision. A whole world looks to see what we will do. We cannot fail their trust, we cannot fail to try.

HISTORIC DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

Mr. Speaker, on four separate occasions Democratic leaders in this century have arisen in times of national peril to guide our Ship of State through troubled waters. Each, in his own way, has rallied the American people to greatness from the depths of despair by devising a dramatic program to deal with the grave problems of his time.

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the New Freedom and the Democratic Congress subsequently enacted far-reaching economic and social reform measures.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal programs of the depression-ridden 1930's saved the Nation from economic self-destruction. Democratic Congresses enacted the Social Security Act, the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Rural Electrification Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the National Housing Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and many other important measures which have stood the test of time.

Harry S. Truman's Fair Deal programs of the post-World War II years brought forth the Marshall plan, point 4, the Housing Act of 1949, an increase in the minimum wage, liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act, and an updating of other reform measures of the Roosevelt administration.

President Kennedy's New Frontier program continues in this long-established Democratic tradition. Never before in our history have we faced such tremendous challenges in the world. As he expressed it in his inauguration address:

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

During the past 9 months, we in the Democratic 87th Congress have taken the first steps forward toward the New Frontier. Some objectives have already been reached. Others will be reached next year in the second session. The record of accomplishment thus far is truly remarkable:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

We have strengthened our national defense to meet the renewed aggressive challenges of the Soviet Union in Berlin and elsewhere in the world.

The Kennedy administration has labored tirelessly to rebuild our military strength and to restore our prestige abroad.

Congress has responded by providing new programs to aid the peoples of Latin America and to establish a more efficient, long-range, comprehensive type of mutual security program to strengthen our allies, newly emerging nations, and the underdeveloped areas of the world.

We have established the Peace Corps, a dramatic new program to which our young people have rallied.

We have resumed underground nuclear testing, after making every possible effort to reach a workable test ban agreement with the Soviets in Geneva that would extend the moratorium, while adequately safeguarding our national security.

We have moved steadily ahead on our space exploration program.

We have taken the first steps toward establishing a realistic civil defense program.

We are making new progress in our efforts to achieve some type of international arms control with foolproof inspection systems to save our civilization from the horrors of nuclear war.

SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC PROGRAMS ENACTED

Mr. Speaker, on the domestic front Congress has enacted a series of major legislative proposals recommended by President Kennedy to stimulate our lagging economy, to promote sound economic growth and development of our human and natural resources, to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, and to promote the well-being of all Americans.

The Democratic 87th Congress has liberalized the Social Security Act, providing $780 million in new or increased benefits during the first 12 months to an estimated 4,400,000 persons.

We raised the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extended coverage to 3,600,000 new workers in interstate retail establishments—the first new coverage since the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938.

We enacted a new Housing Act, the most comprehensive program in 12 years, providing Federal loans and grants for urban renewal, college housing, farm housing, public housing, elderly housing, "open space" development, and a new program for moderate-income families.

We have enacted area redevelopment legislation—twice vetoed during the previous administration—to assist chronically depressed urban and rural areas to bring in new industry, retrain unemployed workers to new skills, and to rebuild their local economies.

We enacted farm legislation that has reversed the trend toward the accumulation of bigger and bigger surpluses in feed grains and wheat by encouraging acreage reduction, thereby raising farm income, stabilizing consumer prices, and resulting in huge savings in storage costs.

The food-for peace program has been expanded, as urged by President Kennedy during the campaign, to make possible the greater use of our farm surpluses to help feed many more undernourished peoples throughout the world.

We extended temporary unemployment insurance benefits for another 13 weeks to aid unemployed workers and their families who had exhausted their benefits. We enacted a law to help States care for dependent children of the needy unemployed.

We enacted legislation to deal with the growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

We enacted important measures to curb interstate crime and airlines hijacking.

We extended the VA guaranteed and direct home loan programs for veterans of World War II and Korea.

The Democratic 87th Congress enacted legislation to keep the interstate highway system on schedule for its 1972 target completion date.

We stepped up the saline water conversion program, established the first national park since 1947—the Cape Cod National Seashore, and provided funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to build transmission lines to connect power-generating facilities in the upper Colorado River storage project.

We created 73 long-needed new judgeships to help expedite the huge backlog of cases now before Federal courts.

We extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. President Kennedy also issued Executive Order No. 10925 on March 6, 1961, to establish the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, "to promote and insure equal opportunity for all qualified persons without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin, employed or seeking employment with the Federal Government and on Government contracts."

We have established a community health facilities program to broaden local public health services and to construct needed nursing homes.

We extended the Federal impact school programs under Public Laws 815 and 874 and the National Defense Education Act.

We expanded the Federal aid airport program.

Hearings were held on the President's plan to provide comprehensive medical care to retired persons under the social security system. I am hopeful that this measure will be enacted into law in the next session.

Many other important proposals such as the wilderness bill, the manpower training bill, the higher education bill, and the youth employment opportunity bill were partially acted upon this year and await final approval next year.

RULES COMMITTEE ENLARGEMENT

In discussing the record of this session we must certainly recognize the importance which the procedural fight over the power of the House Rules Committee has had on the output of good legislation this year. For many years a handful of Members on the Rules Committee prevented the majority of the House from working its will on major legislation such as housing, aid to depressed areas, minimum wage legislation, and other important measures.

This January, a determined fight led by our beloved Speaker, succeeded in breaking the Rules Committee bottleneck. An increase in the size of the committee has made it responsive to majority leadership and has made possible the consideration and eventual enactment of many important parts of President Kennedy's legislative program which had been killed by the committee in the past.

ANTIRECESSION ACTIONS

Mr. Speaker, by administrative action, President Kennedy acted swiftly to assist the millions of Americans suffering from the recession last winer. As his first official act after taking office, he ordered a step-up in the distribution of surplus food to needy Americans. The food stamp plan has been put into effect in the most distressed parts of the Nation. The school lunch and school milk programs were meanwhile expanded by Congress.

The President also ordered a series of actions to help reverse the downward economic trend brought on by short-sighted fiscal policies of the previous administration. He advanced the VA insurance dividend payments. He stepped up income tax refunds. He lowered the interest rate on FHA-insured loans to stimulate the homebuilding industry. He ordered a step-up in U.S. Employment Service operations. Small Business Administration loan activity has been sharply increased. Effective action has been taken to halt the outflow of gold, thereby stabilizing our balance-of-payments position.

RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the 1st session of the 87th Congress ar.d still have another year to go. Usually, the first session of any Congress—particularly in a new administration—is less productive than the second because of the many bills which must first be considered in committees and the time it takes before they can reach the House floor for debate and vote.

This first session, however, has moved at a rapid pace. We have already enacted into law about three-fourths of President Kennedy's major legislative recommendations. Of course, Congress in its wisdom has exercised its judgment as to details. Certain modifications have been made on the original proposals. Certainly, no one can say that this has been a rubber stamp Congress.

We can be proud of the significant record of achievement which we have made. Congress has responded to the energetic leadership which President Kennedy has provided and has faced up to the great challenges of the 1960's. We are moving ahead at a steady pace to meet these challenges and goals of the New Frontier, both national and international.

The Democratic 87th Congress, working in harmony with our courageous Democratic President, will continue to move ahead toward the full realization of these goals, so vital to the security and well-being of the American people and to peoples throughout the world.

A New Urgency in Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has just made public a new appeal to all Americans "to do everything they can do to protect themselves against the danger of fallout in case of atomic attack, and to do this at once in order to strengthen the Nation for the dangerous days now confronting us."

In his letter, reprinted in this week's issue of Life magazine, the President has pointed to the Government's present survey of all public buildings, and the program of marking all such buildings possessing adequate shelter for 50 persons or more. He has also recommended the establishment of food reserves and is pressing development of improved warning systems that will provide an additional margin of safety for every family.

While these measures are moving forward, it is imperative that every citizen do all in his power to safeguard his own family and to be prepared to the limit of his ability. In the words of President Kennedy:

> The ability to survive coupled with the will to do so therefore are essential to our country.

While the facilities of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD do not make possible the reproduction of the home fallout shelters pictured helpfully in Life for September 15, 1961, the text of the message in this edition of Life provides much helpful information for any family considering installation of a shelter. Because of the timeliness and need for information of this kind, a major portion of the Life article is being incorporated as a portion of these remarks.

I hope this message can be brought home to every American in the near future.

The partial text of Life's splendid article on "How You Can Survive Fallout" follows:

A NEW URGENCY, BIG THINGS TO DO—AND WHAT YOU MUST LEARN

The President's letter to all Americans—printed on the preceding page—emphasizes the urgency which could be felt across the Nation last week. As the warlike rattle rolled out of Moscow and as small amounts of fallout from the daily successions of Soviet nuclear tests flooded over the United States, the people woke up to the fact that they ought to be doing something to protect themselves.

This was a new idea. For years, most people have had the fatalistic idea that it was no use trying to do anything about protection against a nuclear bomb. If the blast did not kill them, they felt, radiation certainly would. The man down the street with a backyard shelter was considered odd. But he is actually a solid, sensible man—and a responsible citizen.

If the enemy attacks, he will probably aim first at military targets like missile and SAC bases. Large cities and industrial centers, which do not have the capacity to strike back, will be secondary targets. If a military objective attack should come now to an unprepared Nation, 45 million Americans—a fourth of the population—would die. Some would die in the blast. But the greatest danger to by far the greatest number would come from fallout, the deadly cloud of radioactive dust and debris which would blow across the land.

Hundreds of miles from the target, people would come into contact with destructive fallout, which they could not necessarily see, touch, or smell. They could get enough on their skin to cause burns and sickness Fallout might also contaminate their food and water and damage their vital organs.

But if Americans took precautions against fallout the mortality could drop sharply. About 5 million people, less than 3 percent of the population, would die. This in itself is a ghastly number. But you have to look

at it coldly. Unprepared, there is one chance in four that you and your family will die. Prepared, you and your family could have 97 chances out of 100 to survive.

Basically, fallout protection consists of covering your body, food, and water so the radioactive particles cannot contaminate them. If you have sufficient shielding between you and the fallout you are safe. You should be prepared to take cover for at least 2 weeks.

Obviously, this will not always be easy to do. What if you are in a city like New York? Though some notable steps have been taken, most cities are far behind in their preparations for fallout protection. People must know instantly where to go. But your chances of surviving fallout in a big city would be good. If you are in a large apartment house or office building you could either go to the basement or stay in an inner corridor on one of the middle floors.

A subway system or any city tunnels offer an excellent shelter. Wherever you live or work, you should try to keep a portable supply of water ready. You can live for several weeks without food, but not without water.

It is likely that any attack will come at night while you are at home—so the enemy will have daylight to prepare for the retaliation. (When it is midnight in New York, it is 8 a.m. in Moscow.) If you own a home, you can build a family shelter there. No civilian shelter will stand up against a direct or nearby blast. And the 97 percent survival figure is the optimum, based on good protection and some warning. There is no guarantee that any of your defenses—or even the Nation's defenses—will be adequate if the enemy attacks all-out with complete surprise. But they will increase your odds. And every family shelter will contribute to the Nation's total deterrent. For if the United States is so well prepared that it cannot be knocked out, the enemy may never attack.

Fallout preparation will take effort, money—and time. On these pages, Life shows practical ways in which you can protect yourself and your family and a rundown on what to do in an attack. If you want a rudimentary shelter, you can dig a cave in a hillside or build wooden double walls in your basement, filling them with earth. But good shelters can be built at modest expense. The next 6 pages give detailed plans for three types, based on information in official civil defense publications.

SIMPLE ROOM IN BASEMENT BUILT WITH CONCRETE BLOCKS

One of the simplest and least expensive ways to build a shelter is to wall off part of the cellar with concrete blocks. First, you pick a corner where there are no windows, mark your dimensions on the floor and put down a layer of wet mortar at least three-eighths inch thick to hold the first row of cement blocks. Build up layers, consulting a how-to-do-it book or manufacturer's pamphlet on best way to apply mortar. Use a level diligently to keey layers straight and even. Leave four ventilation holes in second layer. Stop when you are within 16 inches of the ceiling to leave room for shelter roof. Build baffle wall (next to the garbage cans above) to the same height as other walls. Baffle will stop most radiation, which behaves like light and does not go around corners, from entering the shelter door.

Place three upright 4- by 4-inch posts against one basement wall. Nail a 4- by 6-inch beam across the top of them. When mortar is dry lay the ceiling joists on edge with 12½ inches between their centers and with one end of each joist resting on the beam and the other end resting on the block wall, 4 inches from the outer edge. On remaining 4 inches, put blocks laid on edge to form top layer of walls.

Nail the first planks of 1-inch sheathing across the beams. Stack two layers of concrete blocks, unmortared, on top of sheathing. Move forward a foot or two at a time, adding sheathing and blocks until the roof is completed.

The materials for this shelter should cost no more than $200. It offers no protection against blast, but it would reduce radiation to at least one one-hundredth of what it is outside. The shelter requires no air blower, since the family would breathe air circulating through a fairly well-protected basement. In periods of safety, which would be announced over the radio, the family could dash out of the shelter for extra water cans (next to ping pong table above) or to use the pails outside. The large one is for garbage, which should be wrapped in thick paper. The smaller pail is for human waste, which should be deposited in cans or plastic bags and sprinkled with disinfectants and deodorants until it can be buried. A camping toilet can be bought for $8.95.

One word of warning: if a nuclear warhead should hit within 10 to 15 miles of you, the house might catch on fire or be blown down around you. For this reason some people prefer to place their shelter outside, as far from the house as possible. Aside from that possibility, the shelter above is a good one. The materials listed at right are measured for this shelter. Any change in dimensions will require some new measurements.

BIG PIPE IN THE BACKYARD UNDER 3 FEET OF EARTH

If you have no basement—or decide not to use it—you can dig in outside and construct a reinforced concrete bunker in the ground, then cover it up with earth. But reinforced concrete requires the services of a contractor since it must be mixed, poured and cured with precision to make it safe. An easier and less expensive backyard shelter * * * consists of a section of galvanized corrugated steel which almost any steel distributor can provide because it is of a standard type and size used in road underpasses. The pieces for the hatchway would have to be cut to order. The shelter should be closed in at both ends with steel bulkheads and fitted with the entrance before being buried. A wall of cement blocks jutting more than halfway across the width of the shelter serves as a shield against any radiation which might get in through the entrance hatch.

Although you can do much of the work on this shelter yourself, you will probably want to hire a contractor to dig out the hole in your yard with a bulldozer and to cover up the shelter when you are ready. You will also need the services of a welder to seal up the ends and help construct the entrance. Materials for this shelter cost approximately $700. The fees for the welder and the bulldozer might run to another $150. The completed shelter would reduce radiation to less than one one-thousandth of what it was outside. And it would even give fairly good protection against nuclear blasts several miles away.

You can bury a fallout shelter like this as deep as you want—completely underground, or only part way. A high water level or the presence of rocks on your property might prevent you from digging deep. You should pile at least three feet of earth on the shelter which will act as a shield and absorb radiation. The shelter should be watertight to keep out seepage from any rainfall which might have become contaminated by fallout. One way to do is to bury a thick sheet of polyethylene plastic over the shelter to drain away seepage. Then place earth over and around the shelter, tamping it well. Plant the top with sod to keep it from washing away in a heavy rain and exposing the shelter to radiation.

As in any outdoor shelter, you must be more self-sufficient than you would be in a basement. You must provide your own fresh air and take pains to see that it is not contaminated. The best way is to install an air intake pipe at one end of the shelter and an exhaust pipe at the other. A hand-powered blower—the electricity might go out—is attached to the intake pipe to pull air in. Vents on top of both pipes should be topped by screens to filter fallout. Both pipes should have at least one elbow bend in them to keep out radiation.

The hatch * * * should be sealed as soon as everyone is inside to keep the pure air in and the contaminated air out. The entire family can take turns working the blower. A family of six sealed up inside a shelter will need a minimum of 18 cubic feet per minute. With an average blower capable of providing 60 cubic feet per minute, they need turn the crank only a few minutes at a time every hour or so. Motor-run blowers are available, but your power may go out.

A DOUBLE-WALLED BUNKER FOR SAFETY ABOVE GROUND

In rocky or watery areas where you cannot dig down far enough to sink a metal shelter, this shelter provides a good solution. It is put together from double walls of concrete blocks built on a footing of reinforced concrete. The gap between the walls is filled with well-tamped earth or gravel. The roof supports a 28-inch pile of bank-run gravel which should be packed down tight and can be topped off with a layer of grass. Sheets of roofing felt, set in tar, line the top and walls of the roof, turning it into a pan which will catch water and drain it off at the corners through small pipes.

Here again a baffle wall forms a corridor between the outer entrance of the shelter and the safe inner sanctum. The outside corridor is stocked with some of the family's needs—closed cans of drinking water, emergency tools and tightly sealed pails for garbage and human waste. Extra concrete blocks should be stacked up in the corridor to help block the outside door against radiation. A blower mounted near the commissary shelves sucks in fresh air, and a pipe jutting up at the far right serves as an outlet.

Except for the concrete floor, the shelter could be built by any enterprising do-it-yourself family. The blocks can be hollow to save effort in laying them. But the cores should be filled with mortar, sand, or plain dirt to add to the shielding. There are a few other tricks to know. The blocks should be laid two or three layers at a time to make it easier for you to tamp down the earth which fills them. Steel ties should be placed between the two walls at regular intervals while the mortar is still soft to hold them together. Take care when tamping the earth or gravel that you do not crack the mortar. You should tamp the fill down about 4 inches at a time. If you use gravel fill, tamp it down in 8-inch layers. In cold climates, where fill might freeze and crack walls, make entire wall from blocks.

The materials needed for this shelter, which provides almost complete protection against fallout, run to about $700. Contractor's fees would run the cost higher if you decide not to build it yourself. One contractor in Florida, for example, is building a similar model, complete with bunks, shelves, a blower, and a chemical toilet for a total of $2,195.

A $700 PREFABRICATED JOB TO PUT UP IN 4 HOURS

U.S. manufacturers are hitting the market with all kinds of survival gadgets, including prefabricated shelters. Some are ill-conceived models which might be both unsafe and uncomfortable. There is one good check on fly-by-night shelter engineers: you can get an FHA-insured loan for your fallout shelter—with no downpayment—provided it meets civil defense specifications. One shel-

ter which does is designed for the basement and is consists of 73 prefabricated steel sections which can be delivered to your home for under $700. The Kelsey-Hayes Co., of Detroit, which thought it up is now turning out 5,000 copies of it per month, and Sears, Roebuck & Co. will make it available in some stores this fall.

Choosing a shelter and putting it up is only part of your problem. Next comes the question of what to put in it. A variety of equipment is on the market. A plastic suit to protect your skin and clothing from radioactive dust sells for $21.95. But you do not have to buy any of them. All you really need is a 2-week stock of covered, nonperishable foods—canned goods are best—and a supply of water. The water must be covered to keep it safe. It would form algae if stored in bottles, but you could tap the hot-water heater if you ran out. And you can buy water in cans, too.

RUNDOWN OF THINGS TO REMEMBER IN CASE ATTACK SHOULD COME

The standard civil defense signal for an alert is a steady 3- to 5-minute blast of a siren or whistle. The warning to take cover is a 3-minute period of short blasts or a wailing siren. If an attack should come, however, the first warning you may get could be the flash itself. Your first move should be to close your eyes and bury your head in your arms or clothing to block out the light. The flash may last for several seconds, so keep covered until it begins to dim.

The shockwave will come next. Take cover so you will not be knocked down. If you are in a car, roll down windows to avoid flying glass and lie on the floor. Try to count the seconds between the flash and shockwave. This will help you estimate how far away the bomb has hit and how long you have to find better cover before the fallout can reach you. To get the distance of the blast in miles count the seconds and divide them by five. The fallout would travel at a minimum speed of a mile in 3 minutes.

Wherever you are, try to reach a radio—preferably a battery radio since the electricity may be out—and tune it to 640 or 1240 on your dial, which are the Conelrad frequencies for emergency instructions. If you have a shelter, go to it immediately. If there seems to be time, you should turn off all electrical appliances so they will not start a fire if subsequent blasts damage your home. Close windows and doors. Shut off your furnace or heaters and gas lines. Close your chimney dampers to keep out dust. Turn off the inlet valve to your water heater so that the water supply will be cut off before it becomes contaminated. Fill available tubs and utensils with water. Water from underground reservoirs and deep wells will be safe, uncontaminated by fallout. Remember that water will probably be needed not just for drinking but for washing off fallout dust.

Rogers Cannell, civil defense expert at Stanford Research Institute, emphasizes the importance of having you and your family ready with a rehearsed plan for survival so that each member knows exactly what to do. Unless advised to do so you should not try to evacuate, for you may only move from a relatively safe area to one where fallout is greater. Your children should remain at school—unless they are advised to the contrary—and comply with the school survival plan rather than risk exposure by heading for home.

If you have no shelter and there is an hour or so left before the fallout is due to reach your area, you can block up the windows of your basement with 1 foot of earth, and take shelter there under tables on which you have piled books and magazines for extra shielding. You should also get together a supply of food and water and take it to the basement with you.

If you think you have been contaminated by fallout, remove all your clothing as soon as possible and wash off your skin and especially your hair. You may eat canned or packaged food (after washing off the container) and even fresh fruits and vegetables, provided you peel them first. The best first aid for radiation sickness—whose symptoms are nausea, fatigue and fever—is to take hot tea or a solution of baking soda to combat the nausea and aspirin for the fever. You can recover from a mild case of radiation sickness just as you recover from a cold. It is not contagious.

Radiation loses its deadliness rapidly. It is only one-tenth of its original strength 7 hours after an attack. After several days you may be able to leave your shelter to pick up extra supplies of food and water. In any event, before your family leaves the shelter you should wait for official instructions over the two conelrad frequencies.

Procurement Assistance to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure all of my colleagues are well aware, I have, for many years, been doing my utmost to promote, protect and foster the interests of the small business community of this Nation and to save that segment of our economy from the constantly increasing depredations of the monopolistic giants, who are becoming bigger and stronger with each succeeding year. Since 1942, when the Smaller War Plants Corporation was created, upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt, we have been struggling to keep the small businessman alive and to preserve the free competition upon which this country was built and which must be maintained if our present mode of life and form of Government are to continue without change into a socialistic or communistic state.

Today, more than ever before, the champions of small business are most fortunate in having advocates in the Small Business Administration who are dedicated to the maintenance of the competitive enterprise system and to the strengthening of the position of the little man in his never-ending fight for survival. These men, who have all had long years of experience in coping with these problems, are making constant progress in their determined and expert efforts to improve the position of the small business community. Among the most qualified of them is Irving Maness, Deputy Administrator of the SBA for Procurement and Technical Assistance, who served for many years as counsel for the House Select Committee on Small Business. On September 18, 1961, Mr. Maness made a most informative address before the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, Long Island City, N.Y., which was aimed, primarily, at the efforts of the SBA to secure additional opportunities for small businesses to obtain more Government contracts and procurement. With the thought that Mr. Maness' speech will be of great interest and assistance to my colleagues, I wish to insert the address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY IRVING MANESS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FOR PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE BOROUGH OF QUEENS, LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y., NOON LUNCHEON MEETING, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1961

It is a privilege to meet today with the members of the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens.

This meeting provides me a welcome opportunity to meet again with several long-standing friends and associates and to make many new acquaintances.

It also offers me an excellent opportunity to discuss a program that has been of great interest to me for a number of years. I refer to the Small Business Administration's program of assistance to small businesses seeking to obtain Government contracts.

Since February I have served as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration for Procurement and Technical Assistance and in this position I have had to come to grips with a great many of the problems of small businesses in all sections of the country.

It is always pleasant to return home, but to be invited to return home to meet you and report on what I have been doing as SBA Deputy Administrator is a signal honor.

As some of you may know, I have been closely associated with the work of the Small Business Administration since 1955 when I was named Counsel to the House Select Committee on Small Business; Chief Counsel to the House Subcommittee on Government Procurement Loans and Disposal, and Chief Counsel to the House Subcommittee on Foreign Trade and Basic Metals.

The problems of small business are not new, and to put things in better perspective I think it is well to review some of the events that led to the establishment of the Small Business Administration.

One of the forthright undertakings of legislative and business leaders of the Nation under the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt was to initiate and bring into being a program that would give recognition to the basic problems of small business; one that would assist small business concerns to hold their competitive position among the industrial giants; one that would permit small business to take its rightful place in the national economy. I refer to the passage of the Small Business Act of 1942 that created the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

President Truman and his administration continued to nurture this program. It was given added stature and prestige in the passage of legislation creating the Small Defense Plants Administration. The SPDA was the nucleus and foundation for the establishment of what is now known as the Small Business Administration which carries out the national policy of the Congress that "the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

It has been a real sense of satisfaction to witness the positive progress the SBA has made in such a short time under the present administration and to see this official Government agency spokesman gain for small business the future stature and recognition it justly deserves.

Yes, I have long been concerned with the problems of small business and I assure you that as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration I share with Administrator John E. Horne a determination to make our programs of assistance to small firms as effective as we possibly can.

Today, as perhaps as never before in our history, the small businessman who is content to stand still, who is satisfied with the training and experience he already has, may soon find that competitors have left him far behind. These small businesses represent over 95 percent of our business population. There are some 7 million owners and managers of small business. Obviously then, small businesses and small businessmen have always been and are still the cornerstones of our free enterprise system.

This shrinking world of time and space has brought new complexities to our business operations, to those of us who are citizens of our great State of New York and those of other States of our country. To the businessman, large and small, it has meant new and more serious problems of administration and operation affecting not only himself, his employees, his sources of supply, but his customers as well.

I am no stranger to the numerous problems which businessmen are facing today. I have every confidence that by working together—the Federal Government, your State and local government, and officials and the business and civic leaders such as represented here today—substantial progress can and is being made toward building a more vigorous economy.

We are all aware, of course, that in the short time available to us this noon, we are not going to chart a program that will automatically put everything right. No one would expect such results. All would agree, I am confident, that we can discuss some important steps; some that are being taken by President Kennedy and his administration and by SBA.

In clear and unmistakable terms President Kennedy has called for a bold new program for small business and to help restore the depressed areas to the economic vigor they must have if our country is to reach its full potential.

The President's new program has now taken shape in the Congress and I am confident that your Government in Washington will continue to pursue and strengthen the broad programs of assistance to all business including small, particularly in the distressed areas.

In his state of the Union message, the President said: "We cannot afford to waste idle hours and empty plants while awaiting the end of a recession. We must show the free world what a free economy can do—to reduce unemployment, to put unused capacity to work, to spur new productivity, and to foster higher economic growth within a framework of sound fiscal policies and relative price stability."

I agree completely with his aim, and to the best of my ability will use the resources of SBA to help achieve the President's goal.

Two of the major programs of activity of SBA are providing small business concerns with financial assistance through business loans and by making loans to local and State development companies to help provide financing and facilities for small business. It is my purpose, however, to confine my discussion to the program under my immediate administration—the SBA procurement and technical assistance program. If you desire to learn more about a business loan or investment financing may I suggest that you get in touch with the Regional SBA Office in New York, located at 42 Broadway.

As SBA Deputy Administrator for Procurement and Technical Assistance it is my job to make this program as effective as we possibly can, and I assure you that we have the full support of the Kennedy Administration and of the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

These are the major ways in which the Small Business Administration is working to carry out this congressional policy:

The SBA and the principal Government buying agencies cooperate in setting aside suitable Government purchases to be made exclusively from small business concerns.

The SBA and agencies which are disposing of Government property set aside a fair share for small business concerns.

Through its certificate of competency service, the SBA offers an appeal procedure for the small firm, small business production pool, or group of small firms jointly engaged in research and development, whose low bid on a Government purchase, sale, and lease is rejected because of a question of financial or productivity ability.

The SBA provides small firms information on Government buying and selling methods, items being bought by the Government, property being disposed of by the Government, and related matters.

The agency's regional offices maintain inventories or listings of the productive facilities of small firms in their areas, and use them to refer prime contract and subcontract opportunities to firms which can furnish the needed products or services.

The SBA's field offices serve as a meeting point for Government prime contractors and other business concerns in need of subcontractors and small firms which have the required facilities.

The SBA helps small business concerns to undertake research and development work, including work for the Government, and to obtain the benefits of research and development.

As many of you gentlemen know, one of the basic and continuing problems of small business is that of securing a fair share of Government purchases. This is important. When one considers that total Government procurement expenditures amount to $29 billion a year—that the U.S. Government is by far the largest single consumer of goods and services in our economy—then it readily becomes apparent that it is important for small firms to have an opportunity to share in this continuing investment in our national security.

The Small Business Administration has developed cooperative programs with the major Government purchasing agencies under which purchases are set aside to be made from small business, and bidding for the contracts is limited to small business concerns. As a requirement for such a set-aside there must be reasonable expectation that a sufficient number of small firms will bid on the purchase to result in a satisfactory price for the Government.

All or part of a purchase or class of purchase may be set aside for small business in this way.

The SBA has arranged cooperative small business set-aside programs with the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Post Office Department.

Small Business Administration representatives are assigned to the larger purchasing offices of these agencies to review proposed purchases with their purchasing officials and to reserve suitable ones for award to small business. The decision to set aside for small business all or part of a purchase, or class of purchase, is made jointly by the SBA and the purchasing agency.

Small firms that want to sell to the Government should obtain listing on all appropriate bidders lists in order to gain the opportunity to bid on purchases set aside for small business.

An important service of the Small Business Administration is that of referring prime contract opportunities to small firms. Under this program the SBA arranges with Government purchasing offices for its field offices to receive bid sets of many procurements which are susceptible to participation by small business concerns.

The Small Business Administration notifies small business concerns which have come to it for assistance in selling to the Government, of the bidding opportunities usitable to their facilities. This service is provided until the firms have time to obtain placement on bidders lists of the procurement offices suggested by the SBA. Notices of future purchases are then received direct from the purchasing installations involved. This procedure enables the SBA to bring bidding opportunities to the attention of many small business concerns of which they otherwise would be unaware.

Subcontracting assistance to small business concerns has become increasingly important as the changing nature and method of defense procurement have made it more and more difficult for small business concerns to obtain a fair share of military prime contracts. For one thing, defense procurement has shifted toward highly complex weapons and material which cannot be produced in their entirety by small business concerns.

For another, the trend now is toward a weapons system type of procurement, under which the prime contractor furnishes all the components for end items. Under previous purchasing methods, the Government frequently purchased the components and supplied them to the producers of the end items as Government-furnished equipment, with many of the Government contracts for components going to small business.

In its subcontracting assistance program the Small Business Administration guides small business concerns in obtaining subcontract opportunities. It also develops subcontract opportunities with prime contractors and locates small business concerns that are qualified and wish to participate in such opportunities.

In July of this year, the SBA held a meeting with large prime contractors, industry association representatives, and Government officials to explore ways of increasing subcontract awards to small concerns. A joint industry-Government task force was established to develop necessary measures for increasing the small business share of subcontracts. The work of this task force is now underway. I believe it will result in very positive accomplishments whereby small firms will have greater participation in Government subcontracts let by the large prime contractors.

Our programs are bearing fruit; this is reflected by the accomplishments measured during the past 7 months. More than 26,000 contracts amounting to almost $1 billion were awarded to small firms as a result of our setaside program. This was 74 percent greater than for the 7-month period of January through July 1960.

All in all, SBA set aside nearly 25,000 proposed Government purchases totaling almost $1.2 billion to be bid on solely by small business during this same 7-month period or 78 percent more than the previous 7-month period last year.

For the period January through July 1961, certificates of competency were issued to 153 small businesses for contracts totaling $63.5 million. This is double the number issued

for the same period last year. It is of interest also to note that the savings to the Government as a result of these certificates amounted to $4.1 million. The savings is based on the difference between small firms' low bids and those of the next lowest bidders.

In fiscal year 1961, SBA and cooperative agencies made 120 set-asides of timber in Federal forests for sale to small business. These involved approximately 228 million board feet of timber valued at $4.5 million.

Other recent actions include revision of the definition of a small concern in the forest products industry to make certain that logs purchased in small business set-aside sales will go largely to small firms when resold; agreement with the Department of Defense on set-asides of Government-owned timber from military reservations, and development of a program of loans to small loggers and sawmill operators to help them meet the access-road financing requirements of Government timber sales contracts.

In the field of surplus personal property, SBA has registered approximately 14,000 firms to receive regularly, information concerning sales of specific property in which they are interested when such property is advertised for sale. This referral system has enabled SBA to provide tangible assistance to a substantial number of small business concerns during the year. During the month of June some 250 firms received such assistance. This type of assistance makes available to small firms needed property at a favorable price to the small firm.

SBA is also cooperating closely with the Maritime Administration to assure the availability of Liberty ships for scrapping purposes by small firms. In like fashion, SBA is developing procedures with Defense Materials Service, GSA, to assure small firms a fair share of materials being disposed of from the national stockpile.

Another program that has been initiated by the administrator of SBA and which has been placed under my direction—a program long needed for small business—is to assist small firms in greater participation in foreign trade. This program has been tailored to the particular needs of small business concerns engaged in, or seeking entrance to, the foreign trade field. An extensive and widespread campaign should be conducted to alert small business concerns to their oversea opportunities, to encourage them to explore such opportunities and to instruct them in the methods to be followed in setting up a successful export business.

With these considerations in mind, I have established with SBA an Office of Foreign Trade. It may be of interest to the committee to know that the two ranking members of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senators SPARKMAN and SALTONSTALL, urged such action following my testimony before that committee on June 21.

SBA's new Office of Foreign Trade has the following specific duties:

1. Sponsor, in cooperation with universities, chambers of commerce and other local trade groups, a series of conferences in cities throughout the country to attract the attention of small business concerns to the opportunities offered by participation in foreign trade and to the various forms of Government assistance available.

2. Sponsor, in cooperation with selected colleges and universities, short courses to instruct small businessmen in the techniques of exporting.

3. Provide small exporters with individual counseling service.

4. Prepare and publish a list of all businesses engaged in various aspects of export trade—such as freight forwarders, marine insurers, banks with international departments, etc.

5. Compile a list of small manufacturers interested in developing export markets, so that trade opportunities can be referred to them.

6. Prepare and publish management aids covering aspects of foreign trade which are of special significance to small exporters.

7. Extend research into those aspects of foreign trade which are of particular interest to small business.

8. Encourage small businesses to exhibit their products at trade fairs and trade centers at home and abroad and encourage small businessmen to participate in and take advantage of trade missions abroad.

9. Establish and maintain such liaison with the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Export-Import Bank and other agencies of the Government as will further the functions of the office.

These programs will be, of course, carried out in cooperation and coordination with the Department of Commerce and other appropriate agencies of Government to avoid duplication of activity.

I have touched in brief on SBA's several programs that are available to small business, through which small firms can obtain help to bid on Government contracts and to receive information and guidance to keep abreast of production and management techniques.

There is little doubt, as the few statistics I have given you show, that a good solid start has been made toward our goal of making our programs really effective. The revitalized Small Business Administration and our positive approach to helping small firms help themselves offers a great potential for sound economic growth.

I should like to emphasize that our free enterprise system is our strength and the strongest bulwark against communism. A vigorous and thriving small business economy is basic to a truly free, competitive enterprise system.

Bear in mind also the importance of small business to our national security. Our productive capacity must be maintained and expanded for peace and for possible war, as well. Our larger plants would be the first targets for an enemy aggressor. The smaller plants might well have to bear the burden of our productive needs in such times.

We must be strong—militarily, morally, and economically. These are challenges that confront us on all three fronts. I have faith that we can and we will meet these challenges and, in the words of President Kennedy, "move forward." This administration is pledged to fulfill the promise of the future. To keep pace with this future, America's small businesses need no subsidy. Small business asks only that it be given its equal opportunity to pull its share of the load.

The President's goal—which is our goal—can be achieved.

For my part, I pledge that the SBA will work ceaselessly with and give full cooperation to all businesses, large and small, to the end that enterprising small producers will always have a chance to devote their ingenuity and their energies to helping build a stronger America.

History of Vending in the United States, 75th Anniversary of the Industry—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second part of "A Concise History of Vending in the U.S.A.," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of Vend, the magazine of the vending industry, to commemorate the occasion of the 75th anniversary of vending in this country:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING

Perfume vending, which had a vogue again in the 1940's and 1950's, was introduced in the United States and in France in 1893. Again Scientific American, whose editors must have followed the development of vending closely, took note of the perfume dispensers:

"For a few weeks past there have been remarked at the doors of stores, and in theaters, concert halls, etc., small metal bottles of various colors provided with an enameled plate. These are new automatic distributors, which are distinguished as much by their pleasing form and the simplicity of their mechanism as by their practical utility as retail vendors of expensive perfumes."

After an extensive description of the workings of the device, the report continued: "Mr. P. Leoni, the inventor, has another application in view that we must call attention to. It is well known how earnestly our great physicians are at present recommending, under all circumstances, the use of antiseptics and disinfectants. It is, despite everything, difficult to have their prescriptions put up. The automatic distributor, widely disseminated, would permit of diffusing the use of antiseptics either gratuitously or in exchange for a small coin. The question is now submitted to the study of the sixth commission at the municipal council of Paris. This apparatus, in fact, exciting the curiosity of the public, would certainly obtain great success. It is permitted us, moreover, to judge of it by the apparatus already installed in large numbers in Paris. A great number of persons are always to be seen congregated around the distributor. Some examine it and seem to wish to divine the internal mechanism, while others cause it to operate and receive the odoriferous liquids on their handkerchiefs."

By 1895 Germany had at least one automatic restaurant, similar to the Automats, in operation; cigar vending machines were being manufactured in Chicago by M. B. Mills Manufacturing Co.; book vending was being done on a large scale in Belgium, and an enterprisng law firm in what was still the "wild and wooly" West hit upon a brandnew idea for the vending principal—the automatic divorce machine.

For a while at least, divorce papers—entirely legal—were service items which one could buy from a vending machine in Corinne, Utah. Any citizen bent on obtaining a divorce could insert $2.50 in half or silver dollars, pull a lever on the side of the machine, and pick up his papers from a delivery drawer which popped out cash register fashion. Then the papers could be taken to the local law firm, whose name was imprinted on the form, where the names of the divorcing parties were appropriately written in and witnessed.

In the more mundane East that year, designers were working on a new, fully automatic gum vending machine which was to be introduced in 1897 by the Pulver Co. Patrons needed only to insert their coin in the machine and a stick of gum dropped automatically into the delivery tray. By 1900, Pulver added mirrors to the face of their vending machines thereby beginning a trend which persisted for another half century.

In 1898, M. B. Mills sold his 3-year-old cigar vending company to his son, H. S. Mills, who changed the name to Mills Novelty Co. Mills went to work on a penny machine which would deliver a present amount of peanuts, in bulk. The machine was introduced 3 years later, in 1901, at the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo, and Mills would be a

name to conjure with for inventiveness and ingenuity for a good many years to come.

About this time, two factors with long-range consequences for the vending industry were singled out by reporter R. I. Clegg, writing in the September 14, 1899, issue of American Machinist. The factors were a growing tendency on the part of some early vending inventors to combine an element of chance with their merchandise machines, and the growing menace of slugs and other assorted methods of making the machines perform without depositing a lawful coin:

"That class of machinery in which you deposit a coin and obtain in return your correct weight, a sight of some model working, hearing a popular air, get a stamped envelope, your photograph, liquid refreshment, kinetoscopic sights and photographic results, etc., etc., has had a remarkable growth," Clegg wrote. "In the earlier period of its history the purpose of the makers was blameless enough, but in these later days the machines have been adapted to cater to the wants of those who enjoy the taking of chances. Accordingly, a numerous family of this type has come into being, and has flourished and fattened on the public's purse, or, at least, the funds of that section of the public which needs considerable legal intervention and guidance to protect it from itself.

"The coin-operated gambling machines are, of course, more numerous at those holiday resorts where the festive public enjoys recreation, and just as I write the papers are full of the doings of an industrious band of operators who have made the round of the slots and fed chunks of lead to the greedy mechanism, which was thereby induced to give up, eventually, its nickels in return."

Clegg was not firing the opening shot, at least not intentionally, against gambling machines. This was simply a preamble to a very technical discussion of a device which would prevent people from cheating vending machines with slugs and the like. Clegg had apparently done rather extensive research into the problem and describes at some length the ways the public had devised of cheating:

"A nickel with a hole in it for a string was occasionally employed, not only to work the machine without recompense at the sweet pleasure of the operator, and sometimes, too, the ingenious fishermen baited the coin with a coating of adhesive gum, or some other sticky substance, and thus armed, fished for the contents of the till."

Later in the same report, Clegg wrote: "I have been told of an individual who tackled an automatic weighing machine, and is said to have weighed his entire family and himself on a single fare. First, he got on and was weighed; then, in rotation, the others got on and the heavier stepped off the platform. The descending needle on the scale would lock at each temporary increase of weight, but still moved and stopped to indicate the lighter weight left on the machine.

"The fight between the manufacturers and those who struggle to get something at their expense is very much akin to the efforts of the ordnance experts who meet the improved gun with still better armored targets, and so on; and the story, in extenso, of the designers in both camps would be a long one indeed."

The struggle, of course, was and is a long one, but the perfection of the slug rejector during the 1930's, and Federal legislation aimed at slugs in 1944, made the vending machine a less attractive target for larceny.

Gambling machines, too, were to plague the vending industry for a good many years to come. As time went on, the companies which made vending machines—with the principal exception of Mills Novelty, later Mills Industries—did not make gambling machines. Nor did those companies which installed and maintained merchandise vending machines also install and maintain gambling devices. But for many years the feeling persisted that vending machines were somehow slot machines and the men who built and operated them were suspect. Not until the industry began a long-range public relations program under the guidance of National Automatic Merchandising Association was the problem attacked head on. This program, started as recently as 1945, was augmented in the following years by the growing number of vending companies who placed their stock on the market. With the publication of quarterly and annual reports, much of the mystery went out of vending. A stenographer-stockholder in one of the listed companies was in position to know information which a few years earlier had been held in strictest secrecy. As the mystery and secrecy were removed from vending, so, too, was much of the suspicion.

In June 1902, U.S. vending took a giant step forward when the Horn & Hardart Baking Co. opened its first automat at 818 Chestnut Street in Philadelphia. For nearly a decade prior to this, automatic restaurants had been in operation in Europe, principally in Germany. But the opening of the automat created a sensation. By 1903, Horn & Hardart had invaded New York. Scientific American apparently decided the automat was here to stay and dispatched a writer to describe its marvels for the citizenry in the hinterlands:

"The man who walks into the automatic restaurant with the idea that he can sit down at a table and order what he likes from a waiter will be sadly mistaken. There are no waiters in the usually accepted sense of the term. The two or three white-aproned men who nonchalantly roam around without apparently much to do are there not to serve meals, but to remove the empty dishes. You must serve yourself. You buy your portion of meat or soup, your glass of beer or wine, or your cup of coffee, and you carry what you have bought to your table. If you are in a hurry, you may stand and eat, and enjoy what is popularly known as a perpendicular meal."

Government Growth and the GNP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Monthly Summary of the August issue of the Union-Tribune Index, the publication of the San Diego Union and Evening Tribune which summarizes business activity and economic trends in the San Diego area and nationwide, contains an interesting commentary on the growth of the expenditures in the public sector of the economy and the effect of this growth on the economic data set forth in the gross national product. I am placing this commentary in the RECORD for I believe it deserves the attention of all who are interested in the understanding of our economy:

ECONOMIC POTENTIALS

Congress has approved a substantial increase in military spending to meet the most recent threat of the Communists in Berlin. The issue of "war or peace" has pushed aside for the moment the problem of "recession or recovery," but the final outcome will not be known until there is some definite turning point in the present situation.

Also present, however, is a widely held opinion that this rise in Government expenditures will automatically stimulate general economic activity; and, through this process, create a more favorable business climate. This thesis demands a more critical examination. Even if it can be assumed that GNP will reflect this higher level of Federal spending, this would not tell us much that would be of value.

We are not concerned here with the "military necessity" of the additional appropriations which now total about $3.5 billion. Instead, this is an effort to measure the economic implications of still another increase in the level of Government spending. Specifically, the change in fiscal policies will have some influence upon:

1. Wage and price levels in both the public and private sectors of the national economy; i.e., it has certain inflationary implications;

2. Government deficits and the possibility that higher taxes will be required to cover the new spending programs;

3. Individual living standards (personal consumption), and the level of corporate profits;

4. Interest rates and private as well as public investment programs.

If the additional military appropriation of $3.5 billion were the only change in Government fiscal affairs, its long-term effect would be comparatively insignificant. But this new program represents an addition which follows other substantial increases. For example, nondefense Federal expenditures during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, were up $5.9 billion over the preceding fiscal year.

Stated another way, Federal spending has doubled during the last 11 years and will probably exceed $100 billion per annum within the next 5 years as compared to $39.5 billion in 1950 and $76.5 billion in 1960. In the fiscal year just ended, the Federal Government spent $81.5 billion against receipts of $77.6 billion—a deficit of $3.9 billion.

A substantial deficit, totaling perhaps $5 to $7 billion, is a near certainty during the current fiscal year when Federal spending will climb to an estimated $88 billion under presently approved programs. It is the prospect of this huge outlay of Government funds which seems to account for the widely held opinion that business is moving toward another boom.

Money was the most abundant commodity available during World War II when Government spending rose to an alltime high of $98.4 billion. But in the same period, ration stamps were worth more than currency. And, even with both items, it was not possible to buy a new home, a new car, a new washing machine, and a long list of other items which are a part of the U.S. standard of living.

One analyst has defined the problem this way: "It has become a popular practice in recent years to measure the Nation's economic progress in terms of the rise in gross national product or expenditure which includes 'purchases of goods and services' by Federal, State and local governments. Increases in the latter add to the GNP and therefore to our 'growth rate.'

"Since 1950, the public sector has almost tripled while the private contribution has expanded only 60 percent. Thus, Government activities have accounted for almost 40 percent of the growth of GNP during the past decade."

A three million increase in the number of Government workers accounts for one-half the net gain in total employment since 1947. Today, every seven private jobholders must support one public worker as compared

to a ratio of 15 to 1 in 1930. Some 30 million people now receive checks from the U.S. Treasury and tax receipts amount to 31 percent of national income.

Hence, it is not likely that recent additions to the level of Government spending will have a favorable effect on business profits or individual living standards. Instead, the coming boom may offer a challenge more intense than the minor problems encountered during the recent recession.

In an economy dominated by a rising tide of Government expenditures, neither "excess plant capacity" nor "higher taxes" will be completely effective in curbing inflation. Moreover, each advance in the level of prices will create further imbalances in the economy, such as the loss of buying power by individuals on fixed incomes, that will tend to damage the prospects for real economic growth.

Help for the Textile Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the first tangible results of the Kennedy administration's program to "help" the domestic textile industry were made public on September 13, 1961. On that date the Department of State issued a press release announcing that U.S. negotiators had agreed to an increase of from 7 to 8 percent in U.S. imports of cotton textiles from Japan.

In 1956, following extensive negotiations, the Eisenhower administration worked out an agreement by which Japan agreed to impose "voluntary" quotas on textile exports to this country. My information is that this agreement has worked very well and that the textile industry has been satisfied with it. Now it appears from the State Department announcement that representatives of the Kennedy administration have agreed that Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States may be increased next year by 7 to 8 percent over the total imports during calendar year 1960. For an industry already hard pressed to compete with a flood of textile imports produced by low-cost countries abroad, it is somewhat difficult to see how a 7- or 8-percent increase in textile imports from Japan should be expected to help the domestic textile industry.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the press release issued by the Department of State on September 13, 1961, and copy of the draft agreement which was attached to the press release, as follows:

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE BILATERAL TEXTILE AGREEMENT

On September 8, 1961, representatives of the United States and Japan concluded negotiations for a bilateral cotton textile agreement as permitted by the Geneva cotton textile arrangement dated July 21, 1961 (text appended). The final text of the draft agreement is now under review for approval by the two governments. The draft agreement which covers cotton textile exports from Japan to the United States for 1962, is to go into effect beginning January 1, 1962, replacing the arrangement existing between the two countries during the past 5 years.

The chairman of the U.S. delegation was Warren M. Christopher, special consultant to the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State. Members of the Delegation were: Avery F. Peterson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Economic Affairs, Department of State; Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, Department of Commerce; Philip H. Trezise, Minister-Counselor for Economic Affairs, U.S. Embassy, Tokyo; and Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor.

DRAFT ARRANGEMENTS FOR 1962 BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING THE EXPORT OF COTTON TEXTILES FROM JAPAN TO THE UNITED STATES

In accordance with the provision in the arrangements regarding international trade in cotton textiles done at Geneva and dated July 21, 1961 (Geneva arrangements), permitting "mutually acceptable bilateral arrangements on other terms," the Governments of Japan and the United States adopt the following arrangement for the 12 months beginning January 1, 1962:

1. The purpose of this arrangement is to maintain orderly marketing of Japanese cotton textiles in the United States by avoiding excessive concentration in any particular period or on any particular item and by continued efforts to achieve broader diversification of cotton textile exports from Japan to the United States.

2. To achieve this purpose, the Japanese Government shall maintain, for the period of 12 months beginning January 1, 1962, an aggregate limit on cotton textile exports to the United States, and limits on major groups and on certain categories within those groups.

3. (1) If Japan considers that, as a result of ceilings established under this arrangement, a third country is being afforded an inequitable opportunity to increase its exports of cotton textiles to the United States, the Japanese Government may call for consultation with the U.S. Government, and the U.S. Government will take appropriate remedial action such as (a) reasonable modifications of this arrangement, (b) a request, pursuant to section I.A. of the Geneva arrangements, to the third country to restrain its exports to the United States, or (c) action against the third country to prevent circumvention or frustration of the Geneva arrangements or of this arrangement.

(2) The Japanese Government will take appropriate action to prevent the circumvention of frustration of this arrangement by transshipments of goods to the United States through third countries, by substitution of directly competitive textiles for cotton textiles, or by other means.

4. Wherever a specific ceiling has been established, the basis for control will be the number of units (e.g. square yards, dozens, pieces, pounds, etc.) established as a ceiling. The conversion into equivalent square yards is for the purpose of providing a common statistical basis for measurement of the overall program. Wherever pounds are mentioned, the conversion shall be at the rate of 4.6 square yards per pound. The parties will consult with each other to establish a basis for the conversion of other units to square yards, if necessary.

5. Exports from Japan to the United States of particular items shall be distributed equally by quarters as far as practicable and as necessary to meet seasonal demands.

6. The overall limit for Japanese exports of cotton textiles to the United States shall be 275 million square yards in the 12 months beginning January 1, 1962.

7. The overall limit shall be subdivided into five major groups as follows:

Group:	*Million square yards*
I, cotton cloth	125.5
II, made-up goods, usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven goods production	35.0
III, woven apparel	90.5
IV, knit goods	14.0
V, miscellaneous cotton textiles	10.0
Total	275

8. Within the overall annual total, the ceilings for groups I, II, III, IV, and V may be exceeded by not more than 5 percent, provided that this provision for "flexibility" shall permit an increase only in the "other" categories referred to in paragraphs 9, 11, 13, and 15, and in group V.

9. The following limits shall be applicable within the total of 125.5 million square yards for group I, "cotton cloth":

	Million square yards
1. Ginghams (including gingham stripes)	46.2
2. Velveteens	2.75
3. All other fabrics	76.55

Within the category of "All other fabrics," the total of which shall not exceed 76.55 million square yards, the following specific limits shall not be exceeded:

	Million square yards
(a) Sheeting	30
(b) Shirting (80 by 80 type)	20
(c) Other shirting	32
(d) Twill and sateen	39
(e) Poplin	30
(f) Yarn dyed fabrics (except ginghams)	29

10. The following additional provisions are applicable to the cloth distribution in paragraph 9:

(1) Within the overall limit for group I, any shortfall with respect to ginghams or velveteens may be transferred to category 3—"All other fabrics."

(2) Within the limit of 76.55 million square yards, for fabrics other than ginghams or velveteens (i.e., fabrics (a) through (f)), the total exports of fabrics made from combed warp and filling shall not exceed 33 million square yards.

II. The following specific limits shall apply within the total for group II, "Made-up goods usually included in U.S. cotton broad woven production":

	No.
1. Pillowcases (plain) (1,000 doz.)	450
2. Dish towels (1,000 doz.)	840
3. All other made-up goods (1,000 lbs.)	5,573

Within the category of "All other made-up goods," the total of which shall not exceed 5,573 million pounds, the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	No.
(a) Handkerchiefs (1,000 doz.)	1,260
(b) Table damask (1,000 sq. yd.)	11,375

12. Within the overall total for group II, any shortfall in categories 1 and 2 may be transferred to category 3, "All other made-up goods."

13. The following specific limits shall apply within the total for group III, "Woven apparel":

	No.
1. Blouses (1,000 dozen)	1,575
2. Sport Shirts (1,000 dozen)	787.5
3. Shorts and Trousers (1,000 dozen)	7,000
4. All Other Woven Apparel (1,000 pounds)	6,642

Within the category of "All other woven apparel," the total of which shall not ex-

ceed 6.642 million pounds, the following specific ceilings shall not be exceeded:

	No.
(a) Raincoats (1,000 dozen)	60
(b) Dress and Work Shirts (1,000 dozen)	315
(c) Brassieres and Other Body Supporting Garments (1,000 dozen)	800
(d) Dressing Gowns and Robes (1,000 dozen)	70

14. Within the overall total for group III, any shortfall in categories 1 through 3 may be transferred to category 4, "All other woven apparel."

15. The following specific limits shall apply within the total for group IV, "Knit goods":

	No.
1. All men's and boys' T-shirts (1,000 doz.)	643
2. Knit shirts—other than T-shirts (1,000 doz.)	809
3. Gloves and mittens (1,000 doz.)	472.5
4. All other knit goods (1,000 lbs.)	397.4

16. Within the overall total for group IV, any shortfall in categories 1 through 3 may be transferred to category 4, "All other knit goods."

17. Within the overall total for group V are included, among others, such categories as cotton floor coverings, fish nets and netting, cotton thread, etc.

18. To avoid excessive concentration, it is understood that whenever there is excessive concentration of Japanese exports in any particular cotton textile items except those for which specific quotas and ceilings are established and such concentration is causing or threatening disruption of the U.S. domestic market (or if there are other problems, e.g., possible problems resulting from an excessive concentration of exports of end items made from a particular type of fabric, such as the use of gingham in the manufacture of an excessively large portion of exported blouses, sport shirts, etc.), the U.S. Government may call for consultation with the Japanese Government to determine an appropriate course of action. In determining such appropriate course of action, imports from third countries and the degree of impact of imports on the industries concerned at the time of consultation shall be taken into account. Pending agreement on further action, the Japanese Government shall hold the exports of the items in question at 110 percent of the exports of such items during the 12 months prior to consultation."

The Supreme Law of Our Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article published by Life Lines to be released September 18, 1961, entitled "The Supreme Law of Our Land." This article is quite timely since September 18 marks the beginning of Constitution Week.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should put a great article like this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which goes to every library in America and most of the rest of the world, especially the free world, and to every beat in the United States, without saying something about the man who makes Life Lines possible. I am speaking of someone who everybody that really and truly thinks and does things and works knows or should know. I am speaking of a genius in many ways, a man with a brilliant brain, an understanding heart and with a world of energy, and surely God must have His hand on his shoulder or he would not have succeeded as he has. I am speaking of your friend and my friend, the great and good giant, H. L. Hunt, of not only Dallas, Tex., but of all Texas, and that is a big spot and a big part of this great earth of ours, and he has not only helped the people in Texas, but in practically every State in this Union, and what he has done maybe has helped him and his family a little, but it's certainly helped all mankind. How I wish H. L. Hunt had a newspaper in every big city and little city and every county in this Nation. It would do so much good. Now, I think this Life Lines publication is great, but it seems the people will not read unless there are pictures and all kinds of wild rumors about the accidents and terrible things that go on in this world. Well, H. L. Hunt is trying to help just everything go the right way, the same as you and I and so many other people are doing, but I did want our readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I wish all others could read Life Lines and know H. L. Hunt and the men and women who make this great paper possible.

Since you are home, now, Mr. Speaker, near Dallas, where Mr. Hunt has his beautiful home, overlooking that beautiful lake, I hope you two can get together. You both have had so much experience and have been here on this earth a good long time and can do something that will be very helpful and right at this time, I think we need the brains and ability of men like you and H. L. Hunt and hundreds of other men and women more than we have ever needed them before.

THE SUPREME LAW OF OUR LAND

Since today marks the beginning of Constitution Week, we want to bring to you excerpts from a sermon delivered more than 40 years ago by one of the great speakers, preachers and educators of this century, N. B. Hardeman.

"In the year 1774, when patience could no longer withstand the tyrannical hand that was bearing down upon the American colonies, the colonists began to devise ways and means to rid themselves of the yoke of oppression which was then upon them. This eventually culminated in that wonderful document known as the Declaration of Independence.

"After that we entered into a mighty conflict with the mother country and as a result of several years' fighting, freedom from the yoke of England was gained in 1781 at Yorktown. It had indeed been bought at a great price. The entire land was seemingly drenched and baptized in the precious blood of our sires. Two more years rolled on until the treaty of peace was formally fixed and signed and thereafter the colonies set out to direct their own course of action. They had a system of government known as the Articles of Confederation, which lacked executive power. They could make whatever laws they wished and could pass upon the violation thereof, but there was no power to carry into effect the executive part thereof, and hence, failure was the result.

"In the year 1781 the people sent their respective delegates to a general convention, the object of which was to revise the Articles of Confederation and make them adequate to the demands of the Colonies in general. After a good deal of discussion someone said, 'Since these articles cannot be made adequate to our needs, let's wipe out the whole thing, clean the slate and, commencing at the foundation, let us adopt a Constitution for the United States of America.' Four months were spent in discussion, investigation, and deliberation. Naturally, there were many different sentiments regarding the Constitution, but they gradually narrowed down until there were just two contending forces.

"One of these forces was championed by Alexander Hamilton and the other by Thomas Jefferson. The difference was this: Mr. Hamilton's conception was that the States should sacrifice their powers and form a strong Federal Government. Mr. Jefferson said 'We have just fought, bled, and died in order to get rid of a monarchial form of government. Let the States retain their powers, let the doctrine of States rights prevail, not yielding too much to the Central Government, not giving too much to the machinery at our Capital City.' These two ideas were thoroughly discussed and various compromises were suggested until finally, on the 17th day of September 1789, the Constitution was adopted.

"Soon after the machinery of the new Government had been set in motion, it was made known that the country was woefully and deeply in debt. Alexander Hamilton had a master mind along those lines. He secured the passage in Congress of a bill which would assume all of the debts incurred by the war. It was his chief ambition to start the Nation solvent and to continue out of debt. And the Government was launched under the policy of pay your debts and assume your obligations.

"Just after that step had been taken Hamilton proposed that the Government go into the banking business. He insisted that the Government establish a national bank in which it should be the chief stockholder. Just at that point, Thomas Jefferson interposed certain objections. The first significant fight in our new Government began with these two giant champions on either side. Mr. Hamilton argued, 'Upon what ground, Mr. Jefferson, do you object to a national bank and the Government's going into the banking business in competition with private enterprise and banks?'

" 'Well, it's plain and easy as any schoolboy knows,' Jefferson said, 'the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and while, indeed, it is not an infallible document, as is admitted by provision being made for its amendment, yet if we launch our ship of state on the Constitution we have adopted, we cannot establish a national bank because there is no provision in it for a national bank.'

" 'On the other hand,' Mr. Hamilton said, 'There is nothing in the Constitution prohibiting the establishment of a national bank. There is not a line in it that says, "Thou shalt not establish a national bank and have the Government engage in the banking business." '

"These two ideas laid the foundation for the two great political parties which were known as the Federalist and the anti-Federalist. Mr. Hamilton's party came to be known as 'Loose Constructionists'; that is, to construe the Constitution loosely on the grounds that we are at liberty to do anything that it does not specifically prohibit. Jefferson's party was known as the 'Strict Constructionists'; that is, they proposed to be governed strictly by what was written and they declared there was danger in assuming any power not specifically granted by the Constitution.

"At first, Mr. Hamilton's idea prevailed and John Adams, a Federalist, was elected the second President. But Mr. Jefferson

continued to preach the doctrine of respect for the Constitution and to hammer it into the people that we would not be correctly guided unless we regarded the supreme law of the land, unless we respected our Constitution. When the election for the third President rolled around, Jefferson, an anti-Federalist, was elected.

"Until recent years Jefferson's idea that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land continued with little variation. Recently, however, the Constitution has been interpreted so broadly that our very freedom is endangered.

WHAT IS OUR OBLIGATION?

"The need to return to a strict national Constitution parallels an even greater need to return to the constitution of every Christian, the Holy Bible. Jesus Christ has legislated and announced to the world a great constitution, God's Word, and has given it unto mortal man. It, unlike the Constitution adopted by our fathers, is not subject to amendment. It, unlike the one accepted by them, is an infallible constitution, one that needs no general assembly, no Congress, no Supreme Court to add thereunto or to point out its imperfections. What shall be my conception of the Word of God Almighty? Do I look upon it as the law granting me the liberty to do anything not specifically forbidden therein? Or, on the other hand, have I accepted God's constitution? Do I propose to be governed by what it says, rather than by what it does not say? We have drifted into the idea that the Bible is a book of broad, general principles that, in the main, ought to be respected only as a general proposition and guide. From this loose constructionist idea, we now have many so-called Christian religions or churches who do not believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Today, from pulpits of so-called Christian churches across this Nation, we hear that Jesus was a great man but that He is not the Son of God. How shall we construe God's book and heaven's constitution? Shall we be loose constructionists? or does God want us to be strict constructionists? Shall I believe what the Christian constitution says, or shall I be free to disregard God's word in religious matters? Jesus was what He claimed to be or He was the greatest fraud that ever walked the face of the earth. There is no middle ground with the Lord, just as there is no middle ground with being a Communist. You can't be a part-time Communist. You can't withhold from the Communist Party anything of your time, your energy, your enthusiasm, your money, or your thinking. You must give all.

"My obligation toward the Bible, therefore, is the obligation Mr. Jefferson felt toward the Constitution; that is, that it is the supreme law of my life. I must do what the Constitution said, not presume to go beyond it. The only safe course in life for me is this: Take God at His word, believe what He says, become and be just what God requires, and with His word still as my guide, let me live as He directs. God has given to his children a great Constitution. He has given to all mankind the freedom to accept it or reject it. To those who accept it He has said, 'Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish aught from it.' From the Bible, we understand the source of our freedom. God created us free to make a choice between good and evil. From the Constitution of the United States, so long as it shall stand and so long as time is ours, we are guaranteed the freedom to make our own choice. It is the same choice which was given to Adam and Eve long ago: simple, loving commands given for our own best interest, understandable to everyone to whom they apply. When God-loving people everywhere are willing to accept God's Constitution, to speak where it speaks and be silent where it is silent, then there will be Christian unity."

ONE MEANING OF PEACE

One of the powerful weapons used by the mistaken in their unending war against freedom is the word "peace." They use it effectively because of the deep-seated yearning for peace that is inherent in people everywhere.

But if the time ever comes when the mistaken prevail in America, we will realize all too well that their definition of peace is far different from ours. The kind of peace they seek would mean surrender of freedom, for it would deprive people of the right to think their own thoughts, to go where they please, to worship as they choose, to own property—in fact, it would deprive people of all their rights as individual human beings.

If anyone doubts these statements, let him look upon the slave masses living in any of the countries already taken over by the mistaken world hoodlums.

WHAT IS HEAVEN LIKE?

There is probably no subject about which there is more speculation among men than the subject of life after death. Many of us read the words of the Apostle Paul, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain," without really grasping the nature of the gain. In the Psalm of Life (Psalm 90) we are told, "The days of our years are threescore and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength, labour, and sorrow; for it is soon cut off and we fly away." But even if a Christian doesn't reach these advanced years and death occurs early, his fellow Christians have comfort in the words of the Book of Revelation that through death the believer is released from all sorrow and is translated into a most intimate relationship with God.

John was given a preview of heaven in a miraculous way. While he was viewing these wonders, one of the elders asked the question: "What are these arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?" The answer given was: "Sir, thou knowest. These are they which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the lamb." At death, all faithful Christians take comfort and consolation in knowing that God will forgive the sins of His children if we seek His forgiveness. "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow, though red like crimson, they shall be as wool." At death the Christian receives the white garment of righteousness, cleansed by the blood of our Saviour. At death the faithful Christian knows, "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst anymore, neither shall the sun light on them nor any heat." (Revelation 7: 16)

Truly the brief preview of Heaven given us in the Holy Bible is a beautiful and inspiring thing. At funerals people are inclined to weep. Sorrow comes upon us especially if a loved one has been called away. But the loved one who is a Christian has gone where there is no more sorrow, gone to a home where "God wipes away all tears from our eyes."

We sometimes ask ourselves: Do we really know anything about the situation as it prevails for a believer after death? Jesus says, "Here in Heaven their angels do always behold the face of My Father." John tells us: "Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve Him night and day in His temple; and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them." (Revelation 7: 15) "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them and shall lead them into living fountains of water." (Revelation 7: 17) When the Christian dies, he is in close association with his Savior. Together with all the saints, the Christian is in intimate relationship with Jesus.

WAYNE POUCHER.

Voice of President Ghosts for Reporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an article by William Edwards printed in the September 17, 1961, issued of the Chicago Sunday Tribune which discusses clandestine efforts on the part of the Kennedy administration to make the American people think that President Kennedy has already established himself as this country's greatest President. The article shockingly speaks for itself. I am sure there are Members of Congress who would want to read it. Therefore, under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"VOICE" OF PRESIDENT GHOSTS FOR REPORTERS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—Theodore (Ted) Sorensen, special counsel to President Kennedy, was an hour late but 30 newspaper men awaiting his arrival in a private Washington home last Thursday night did not complain.

Drinks were plentiful, and the conversation spirited. When the tall, slightly stooped figure of Sorensen appeared, he was hailed jovially. Peering through his horn rimmed glasses, he flashed a boyish grin, then got down to business.

He was not really prepared, the President's closest adviser remarked, but he did happen to have with him some information of value. He dug into his brief case, pulled out a stack of three page mimeographed statements, and distributed them.

MANUFACTURED NEWS

"This is for your information in writing your stories," Sorensen warned. "It is not to be attributed in any manner whatever to the White House or the administration. It is to be used by you as your own without any hint as to its source."

The statements, it developed, claimed that President Kennedy had far outperformed former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower in their initial encounters with Congress. The famous "100 days" of FDR's first year in 1933 were comparatively unproductive in comparison with Kennedy's dazzling list of accomplishments.

WON'T SWALLOW THE BUNK

Many of those present accepted his assertion respectfully. The guests had been carefully selected. Carefully excluded from the briefing were representatives of such newspapers as the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, the Kansas City Star, the Dallas News, and other presumably resistant to administration propaganda.

But some recalcitrance developed. One correspondent, as Sorensen delivered a running commentary on his thesis, kept interrupting with rude questions.

"Do you expect us to swallow this bunk"? he kept demanding.

Another reporter, representing the Wall Street Journal, found himself suddenly under attack by Sorensen. He was accused of writing "the worst story" of the year in a recitation of Kennedy's relations with Congress which carried the heading: "On Balance, the New Frontier Is Still Far From Opened."

To the credit of a number of newspapermen present, they later disclosed reactions

ranging from irritation to disgust at what they frankly labeled a brainwashing session. It is upon their accounts that an uninvited reporter bases this narrative.

FRAUDULENT RESEARCH

So-called background briefings for the information of the press are not uncommon in Washington. A prominent administration official holds off-the-record sessions with a group of reporters on the understanding that he will not be quoted.

The candid purpose of such briefings is to spread a point of view without pinning responsibility upon one individual. Newspaper stories based upon such interviews carry such terms as, "high administration officials think," or "the administration is known to believe."

The Sorensen briefing advanced the propaganda technique one step beyond what has hitherto been attempted. Under the rules he laid down, the material he supplied was to be presented as the product of the writer's own research. Its White House source was to be concealed.

The guests at this latest briefing were Washington correspondents covering Capitol Hill. One of the routine duties confronting them in the near future is the writing of a survey of congressional accomplishments during the 1961 session now nearing adjournment.

PICKED HIS BROADCASTERS

In such summaries, the success or lack of success of the President in obtaining approval of his program is always a prominent feature.

Sorensen arranged to meet the newspapermen after some reports appeared that indicated President Kennedy hadn't done too well. Sorensen expressed a desire to counteract these misleading dispatches, privately, off the record, and under conditions guaranteeing secrecy.

A local newspaperman offered his home for the meeting and agreed to select the guests. Associated Press and United Press International reporters were invited, together with about 28 correspondents from New York City, Washington, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, the South, and the west coast, with the exceptions noted above.

Lawrence F. O'Brien, special White House assistant and congressional liaison man, was present to lend Sorensen a helping hand, when needed.

EVERY ONE'S A MAJOR BILL

Here is what Sorensen urged the reporters to write in summarizing White House achievements of the congressional session:

President Kennedy recorded 33 major legislative accomplishments in the 1961 session. He thus proved himself three times as persuasive as President Roosevelt, who got only 11 major measures from Congress in 1933, and equally superior to President Eisenhower, who obtained only 14 major bills when he started his term in 1953.

This claim created some astonishment among certain listeners, who demanded a list of the 33 accomplishments. Sorensen solemnly listed creation of the Cape Cod National park in Kennedy's home State of Massachusetts as a major accomplishment, noting that it was the first major addition to the national park system for 14 years.

HE LISTS ALL OF THEM

Another major accomplishment negotiated by Kennedy, Sorenson said, was the passage of a bill limiting American tourist spending abroad to $100, instead of the $500 previously permitted. Another was the creation of an international travel agency to attract foreign tourists to this country. These were powerful measures in combating a balance of payments deficit and a gold outflow, he contended.

To pad the list of major accomplishments, Sorenson listed the Peace Corps, a juvenile delinquency bill, anticrime bills, and a measure creating 73 new Federal judges. A 2-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission, the only fragment left of a big civil rights package, was listed as a major feat.

MORE MAJOR STUFF

Other major accomplishments listed by Sorensen included increased funds for a project to land a man on the moon, legislation to speed up saline water conversion, and a farm bill which has produced the "best farm income year since Korea."

The addition of $6 billion to the military budget and authority to call up reservists to active duty added two more items to the list. Even a bill to keep the national debt ceiling at a record $298 billion was recorded as a major accomplishment.

Sorenson also listed temporary unemployment compensation increases, the depresesd areas bill, social security amendments, a housing bill, water pollution control, a hike in the minimum wage, and community health measures to get this total.

IT IS MAGNIFICENT

The Kennedy record was magnificent, Sorenson asserted, in view of the mathematical situation in Congress. Any talk about the preponderant Democratic majorities in Congress [64 to 36 in the Senate and 260 to 174 in the House] was ridiculous.

The potential Republican-southern Democratic strength in the House was 280, he said, and the same coalition could muster 57 votes out of 100 in the Senate.

"We presented on March 24 a budget for fiscal year 1962 strictly balanced in view of the previous administration's revenue estimates," Sorenson told the reporters. "The deficit is now estimated to be $5 billion because of an increase in defense spending and a decrease in revenue because of the 1960 recession."

THE UNEXPECTED DID IT

"In short," Sorenson wound up, "the effects of the new challenges in national security and space, and the effects of the recession more than account for the entire deficit—without them, all the increases in agriculture, unemployment, and other domestic programs would have not caused a deficit.

"This deficit does not compare unfavorably with the Eisenhower administration, which incurred the largest peacetime deficit in history, $12.4 billion in 1959, and spent $182 billion more than the Truman administration did."

The reporters were told that they could use these statements as their own and again warned not to attribute them to White House sources.

Sorenson brushed over the failure of the administration to get action on some of its major requests: Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, tax proposals, Treasury borrowing to finance a 5-year foreign-aid program, the original farm program, retraining of unemployed workers, and a new Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the death of my esteemed and respected colleague from Louisiana, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, who for more than 20 years has been my dear personal friend and who has represented the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana with distinction.

Everyone who knew Representative BROOKS was impressed with his great ability, sincerity, and dedication to the best interests of the people of the United States. As a Member of Congress he has been the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and since 1959, he has been chairman of the influential Committee on Science and Astronautics. In each of these important capacities as a Member of Congress he has exerted tremendous influence upon the affairs of our Nation and I can say without fear of contradiction that had it not been for his outstanding service in Congress we would be less able to meet the challenges of the future than we are today.

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS was a native Louisianian. He graduated from Louisiana State University with honors having completed his law school curriculum in 1923. Until his election to Congress in 1936 he was a highly successful attorney and he served for a time as U.S. commissioner as well as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS lived a life of dedicated service to his fellow man. He was possessed of courage and integrity and indeed he was the kind of Representative in Congress who is desperately needed at this important and critical time in our history. It will be difficult to fill his place.

Not only was Representative BROOKS a patriotic and distinguished American but he was personable and kind—a devoted husband and father—and in every act of his official and private life he was revealed as a deeply religious man.

He is survived by his lovely wife, Mollie; his fine daughter; his wonderful mother; and his devoted brother, Lawrence, who is an outstanding attorney in Baton Rouge, La. I join with his many friends in Louisiana and with my colleagues from Louisiana and from the other 49 States in expressing deep bereavement on this occasion. Yet we know that OVERTON BROOKS, in joining his Maker, will have a special place in the great beyond as he always will have in our hearts.

I am grateful for the opportunity that was given me to serve in the House of Representatives with my distinguished colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, and I extend to his family and loved ones my deepest sympathy on this sad occasion.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing us at this time is the right to work. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 13, 1961, contained an excellent editorial on the subject and I wish to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

If there is a basic right in the democratic system, it is that every capable citizen should have the same chance to work as any other, regardless of color or creed. This certainly is not true in a tremendous number of cases for the Negro job hunter.

Because many unions, especially craft unions, refuse to accept Negro apprentices in training programs, the Negro is barred from much skilled and semiskilled work.

He is denied opportunity and the higher pay that other citizens may enjoy—simply because his skin is taboo.

This is rank discrimination, a shameless policy of racism, an unquestionable roadblock to dynamic industry in a period when automation is throwing many unskilled laborers out of jobs and opening new fields for skilled workers. Not, however, for the Negro.

In St. Louis, which has an unemployment rate of 8.4 percent, Negro unemployment is 20 percent.

Obviously this is not all due to the unions' bar against Negroes; some of these jobless are drifters, migrants. But some are thoroughly able to do skilled labor—if they could just get the chance.

Recently Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of St. Louis alluded to this moral and economic evil in a comment on the floor of the House. He referred to a statement by Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which Mr. CURTIS rightly termed "significant." Mr. Hill appeared before the House Committee on Labor and Education last month.

While covering the whole national scene, in discussing union discrimination against Negroes, Secretary Hill said of St. Louis:

"There are no Negro apprentices in the following (union) training programs—electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, carpentry, masonry, cement finishers, lathers and painters.

"There is one Negro apprentice at a nonunion Negro-owned sheetmetal company. It is estimated there are 14 Negro apprentices in St. Louis: six bakers, one bricklayer, two machinists, one sheet metal worker and four meatcutters."

Representative CURTIS showed this data to John I. Rollings, president of the Missouri State Labor Council AFL–CIO, and "he stated that this was entirely accurate."

The new report by the Missouri Advisory Committee to the Federal Civil Rights Commission said Carpenters have now let down the bars against Negro membership, as well as the Bricklayers, Meatcutters and Machinists Unions. Howere, the Urban League, quoted in the Federal report, declared skilled and semiskilled Negro workers have had to be "content with token gains."

Undoubtedly other areas of employment, where union organization does not obtain, also discriminate, although the Advisory Committee asserted during the last decade Negro job opportunities have improved in the shoe and auto industry, downtown stores, the Public Service Co., McDonnell Aircraft and a few other areas.

The color lid on many craft union memberships remains clamped tight. This policy not only is un-American and hurtful to the general economy—which needs much more skilled labor than is available—but it imposes heavy costs in relief and unemployment compensation, which have to be borne by taxpayers and industry.

Integration cannot be realized overnight in all categories, no matter how just it is, how immoral race cruelty may be. But deliberate rules, banning work opportunity because of a man's color, are one of the most inhumane obstacles to freedom and justice among our own people.

We talk with loud, charged words about self-determination, liberty and the dignity of man, when confronting the Red threat from the Moscow-Peiping axis. Shall we continue to ignore our own sins against fundamental freedom?

Address by E. Sherman Adams Before the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, at Rutgers University, June 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address, "The Broadened Responsibilities of Bankers," delivered by E. Sherman Adams, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, and formerly director of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, before the student body of the school, at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., June 21, 1961:

THE BROADENED RESPONSIBILITIES OF BANKERS

If an interplanetary commission from outer space were to visit the United States to study American banking, what would its findings be? Would the visitors rank American bankers as being the best all-around bankers in our solar system? Or would they report back to their home planets that we still have a long way to go by cosmic standards?

They would doubtless report certain favorable items. They would find bankers well mannered and well domesticated. And if they were to come here to the graduate school, they would even see some who are at least in the process of becoming well educated.

But how would they grade American bankers from the standpoint of overall performance? How fully are we living up to our manifold responsibilities in this rapidly changing, highly dangerous atomic age?

THE SETTING HAS CHANGED

You have doubtless pondered this subject from time to time and heard it discussed on various occasions. However, I make no apology for discussing it again because the nature of this problem has changed. History has speeded up. Today's world is vastly different from yesterday's and in this new world, bankers' responsibilities have broadened. Have our thinking and our actions kept pace? We need continually to take a fresh look at this question in the light of new conditions.

In addition, this matter has now assumed far greater urgency. We are all aware that this Nation is engaged in a struggle for survival with a powerful and ruthless enemy. The outcome will depend upon how well democracy performs over the years ahead.

It therefore behooves all citizens to think deeply about their responsibilities to society. And this applies particularly to bankers because there are so many ways in which they can contribute significantly to strengthening the sinews of democracy.

NEW BANKING PROBLEMS

Our day-to-day banking responsibilities are familiar to all of us—serving our customers, extending credit on a sound basis, making our banks good places in which to work, developing capable personnel, and keeping our institutions strong and profitable. These obligations are so obviously important and so immediate that there is little danger that bankers will neglect them.

Yet even here many of the problems confronting us are changing. One basic change is that, after two decades of abnormal liquidity, banks have fast been approaching a fully loaned position. Over the years ahead bank loan-deposit ratios will in all probability remain high and may well go higher than they are today.

This calls for thoroughly rethinking bank management policies. Our primary emphasis must shift from developing loans to developing deposits. Since we cannot plan to expand all types of loans as freely as in the past, we must adapt our lending standards and rationing techniques to this situation and also develop appropriate rationing policies to achieve optimum distribution of our loans. In doing this we must searchingly analyze our responsibilities to provide various types of credit to various categories of borrowers—public and private, individual and corporate, local and nonlocal, large and small. We may also need to reexamine some of our old rules of thumb with respect to our liquidity and capital positions.

Moreover, the nature of the bank earnings problem is changing before our eyes. For many years we have been sailing along with highly favoring winds—a rising trend of interest rates and rapid load expansion. Now these winds are shifting and bankers will have a more difficult course to steer to maintain good earnings over the years ahead.

Are bankers doing the forward thinking and forward planning needed to protect their future earning capacity? American industry annually spends enormous sums,

billions, for research. Banking does not. The amount of research in banking you could put in your eye. True, banking does not lend itself to research as obviously as many industries do. Nevertheless, the contrast is striking. It makes you wonder.

REVAMPING OUR PRODUCT LINE

One reason for wondering is that banking has been losing ground in competing for financial business. For many years other financial institutions have been growing at a much faster pace than commercial banks. Some bankers blame this on tax inequality, monetary policy, whatnot. But do these answers suffice? One cannot help wondering whether banking has adequately adapted its services to meet the changing needs of the American economy. Does our product line need to be revamped?

To be sure, some new banking services have been introduced in recent years, but more innovations may be needed. We should also critically examine some of our old-line services to see whether they need to be modernized.

Time and savings deposits are an outstanding case in point. In this area most commercial banks have been catering almost exclusively to the small saver. They are not competing effectively for large savings accounts—what might be called investment savings—nor for the excess funds of corporations. Yet these may be the most promising avenues of potential future growth for commercial banks.

This clearly constitutes a major problem and tax equality is by no means a complete solution to it. This is the kind of problem to which bankers should be giving careful, thoughtful study.

IMPORTANCE OF OUR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

However, I am not here to talk shop, tempting though this is. Indeed, most of us are in danger of becoming so engrossed in our shopkeeping problems that we give inadequate attention to our broader public responsibilities.

This would be the worst mistake we could make, even from a strictly self-interest point of view. I say this not merely because what is good for the economy is good for banking, for this is true of most businesses. But the situation of bankers is unique because they are in a position to contribute so significantly to the public welfare—and what is more, the public has some awareness of this fact. The spotlight is always on banking. If bankers fail in their public responsibilities, their failure will be conspicuous.

Also, banking has now become highly dependent upon the goodwill of the public. Banks formerly served only certain classes but now they serve the masses. We find ourselves operating today in a market where the patronage of the public is all important and one in which we face aggressive, formidable competition from other types of financial institutions. In addition, the attitude of the public now has a decisive influence upon legislation and public policies which affect banking.

To a far greater extent than in the past, therefore, banking needs the good regard of the public. This means that bankers must serve the common good to the best of their abilities. And the public will not be fooled on this matter. Over the years the attitude of the public toward banking will depend most upon how well bankers contribute to the general welfare. To be enduring, public esteem must be earned.

But it would do you men an injustice to appeal to you only on grounds of self-interest. None of you is ruled simply by materialistic motives. Each of you has a deep desire to play well your part in the human adventure, to make a success of your relationships with society. A career in banking offers unusual opportunities to do just that—and indeed, this is doubtless one of the chief reasons why you are attracted to banking.

Moreover, most bankers are imbued with a strong sense of responsibility. Most of us feel that banking partakes of the nature of a public trust. Since he serves all groups in the community, the banker is more aware than many of the interdependence—the mutuality of interest—of the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and the consumer. He appreciates the privilege of being a member of our free American society. He sees how important it is that he should contribute to the common enterprise—not as a matter of noblesse oblige but simply as his plain duty as a member of the society to which he owes so much.

OUR HOMETOWN DUTIES

All this is readily apparent when we look at our local communities. Every banker knows from firsthand experience that the growth and prosperity of his institution are inextricably tied to the growth and prosperity of the area he serves. He knows that he can make important contributions to his community, and that people's appraisal of these contributions will be critical and discerning.

Most bankers are therefore keenly aware of their hometown duties. It is normal to find them in the forefront of civic activities. Bankers bow to no group in the matter of civic spirit.

Yet, here too, the nature of the problems is changing. Many communities are today faced with serious problems of urban blight. The needs for community planning and rehabilitation and for improved community facilities are urgent. They will doubtless continue to constitute a major problem for many years to come.

Some bankers are taking a leading part in urban renewal programs and they shall reap rewards both in heaven and in their operating statements. Others have not yet become involved. Their reluctance is perhaps understandable, but is it wise?

Regional development and resource utilization present similar problems. Here again bankers are in a position to provide constructive leadership and many are doing so. These activities are time consuming, to be sure, but they are clearly important to the long-range welfare of your communities and your institutions.

Another aspect of community relations is the matter of political participation. This is a subject to which you men at the graduate school have been fully exposed so I shall comment on it only briefly, as follows: I know that many of you agree that banks should do more to encourage their people to participate more actively in various types of political activity. Some banks have made important strides in this direction in recent years. This is clearly an area in which there is much more to be done.

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Closely related is the matter of economic education. In this democracy of ours, public economic policies are now determined chiefly by Joe Public. Fortunately, Joe has a remarkable endowment of commonsense, and when he is adequately informed about a problem, he usually adopts a sensible attitude toward it. Unfortunately, Joe has little understanding of the economic facts of life. Even among our own bank employees, the rate of economic illiteracy is appallingly high.

This is a dangerous situation and one which should be of concern to bankers. Here again some banks have made some progress in recent years, but most have not. Many bankers still feel that the economic education of the public, or even of their own employees, is not their proper concern.

Does this attitude make sense? Demagogs and pressure groups are busily spreading misinformation and fallacies and taking advantage of the public's ignorance in economic matters. This theatens the future welfare of our entire economy, including the welfare of banking. Bankers who have ignored, or merely deplored, this situation should carefully reconsider whether it is really no concern of theirs.

This does not imply, of course, that bankers should try to assume responsibility for all aspects of economic education. Far from it. To a large extent the banker's role should be one of lending support to the efforts of professional educators. They can also encourage and make it easier for their own staff people to gain a better understanding of economic issues.

THE BANKER-EDUCATOR

Nevertheless, there are some areas in which bankers do possess special competence; namely, banking and finance. The general public and even most bank employees know very little about the banking business and its role in our economy. This is clearly our own fault. We bankers give a great deal of attention to the selling of bank services but very little to the selling of banking as an industry by explaining its functions. And if we do not tell the public the story of banking, no one will do it for us.

Another area with which bankers are particularly concerned is monetary management. Bankers are not always happy about the effects of Federal Reserve policies on the banks but that is beside the point. They know that the Federal Reserve has made and can continue to make an important contribution to the stability of our economy. They therefore have a unique responsibility to contribute to public understanding and support of sound monetary policy.

Take interest rates. Here is a subject of vital concern to bankers and one on which many people harbor dangerous illusions. During recent years the ancient fallacy that cheap money is the cure for our economic ills, has been gaining renewed popularity. Many people, including some in high places, seem to have a notion that it is desirable always to keep interest rates low and that this should be one of the goals of public policy.

This is a threat to banking, clearly, and equally a threat to the public interest. Bankers should have a clear understanding of the role of interest rates in our economy and should do what they can to share that understanding with the public.

This is no easy assignment; indeed, it is one of the toughest. Just try explaining to your wife or to your next-door neighbor why it is important that interest rates should be permitted to rise at times as well as decline at other times. And these, presumably, would be receptive listeners, willing to give you some benefit of the doubt. But the general public is not. It is skeptical, quick to assume you are motivated solely by self-interest. It will listen only if it becomes convinced—against its natural instincts—that bankers really have genuine concern for the common good.

BANKERS AND PUBLIC POLICY

This brings us to another major aspect of a banker's public responsibilities: his role with respect to national economic problems. Clearly bankers should be nation minded as well as community minded. Also, the public image of banking is greatly colored by what bankers do—and fail to do—on the national stage.

I think we should face up to the fact that this image leaves much to be desired. Bankers take pride, and justly so, of the record of public service of members of the banking fraternity such as Joe Dodge, Randy Burgess, and Jack McCloy. This is all to the good but it is not good enough. Many people think of bankers as being generally unen-

lightened and perhaps even antisocial. They have the impression that bankers oppose most progressive measures and are interested chiefly in legislation which will directly benefit the banks. Nor are they too favorably impressed by traditional banker exhortations to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and cut governmental expenditures.

I do not for a moment suggest that bankers should modify their views on public finance simply because they may be unpopular. Indeed, perhaps our first responsibility in national affairs is to work for fiscal sanity. Bankers, more than most groups, understand the importance of sound public finances and this imposes special obligations on them to support sensible monetary and fiscal policies.

On the other hand, even in financial matters, we must beware of being doctrinaire. Lincoln's words of almost a century ago apply today: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

NEED FOR A BROAD PERSPECTIVE

Moreover, there are other aspects of public policy with which bankers should be more concerned than they have been. Sound finance is by no means the only ingredient in economic progress nor is it the only one in which bankers should be interested. We should give more attention to other important ingredients—the need for expanding our investment in education, for example. In short, we should strive to develop a broader perspective on national and also international problems.

Take foreign aid. A recent symposium of distinguished scholars and public affairs leaders agreed that foreign aid will be the most important economic problem confronting the United States over the next 20 years. Bankers know full well that as a nation we can and must afford to help strengthen the economies and defenses of other free nations. In the words of former President Eisenhower, "The impoverishment of any single people in the world means danger to the well-being of all other peoples." Bankers should be just as concerned with the adequacy of our foreign aid programs as they are with tax reform.

Similarly, most bankers have a good understanding of other elements of foreign economic policy. They appreciate the importance of a liberal trade policy not only to this country but to the entire free world. They know that the United States cannot exercise moral leadership among nations if we preach one thing and practice another with respect to tariffs, quotas, domestic price supports and the dumping of products in foreign markets. Unless we demonstrate to uncommitted nations that they can trade with us and that it is in their interest to do so, they will trade with Russia and our relucant grants will do little good.

Bankers have a clear obligation to give their full support to enlightened policies in this area—to such things, specifically, as the reciprocal trade agreements program. Some do speak out on these subjects from time to time, but many are silent, largely because they regard these issues as not really being their concern. Yet this is an area in which bankers could make significant contributions. If they fail to do so, they fail in one of their major responsibilities.

DON'T JUST BE A BANKER—DO SOMETHING

Most of you men, I am sure, are in general sympathy with most of my comments thus far. Nevertheless, you may feel that they do not apply directly to you as an individual at the present time, for two reasons: first, you are up to your ears in bank work for which you are directly responsible. Second, you may feel that these public responsibilities we have been talking about devolve primarily upon organized banking—bankers' associations—rather than upon you as an individual.

Well, let's look at these points. Of course we are all busy with our day-to-day duties. That's the kind of business we are in and one of the reasons we like it. Nevertheless, every one of us could make the time, if we wished, to discharge our public responsibilities. Each of us could learn more about public affairs, participate in political or civic activities, serve on the school board or the local planning commission, write our Congressmen, teach at the AIB or speak at the local service club. In short, don't just be a banker; do something.

Moreover, regardless of your present duties in the bank you will sooner or later have many opportunities to make suggestions or at least cast your vote with respect to the policies of your own bank in these areas. When these opportunities arise, be prompt with your suggestions and your votes, and unabashed in debate with those who pride themselves on being hardheaded—and are.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE ABA

Secondly, this matter of your individual responsibility versus that of organized banking. Obviously there are certain things which bankers can do more effectively on a cooperative basis, through their associations, than they can acting alone. This is universally recognized. But what is not so widely recognized is the equally obvious fact that the effectiveness of cooperative efforts depends upon the cooperation received from the individual bankers who comprise the association.

It is an illusion to think of a bankers association as somehow having an independent existence of its own. I speak with strong conviction on this point, having been, as you know, for many years a member of the staff of the American Bankers Association. As any ABA staff member can tell you, the success of any association program depends entirely upon the cooperation of individual bankers throughout the country. In the last analysis, the responsibilities of organized banking are the direct responsibilities of its members.

By the same token, this implies that the standards and objectives of the ABA should be very high. They should represent the collective responsibilities of bankers everywhere. They should reflect the finest in American banking.

Obviously the ABA does not presently measure up to these high standards. And now that I no longer have any official connection with the association, I should like to comment briefly on this point. Let me say first that bankers have much to be proud of in the record of the ABA, far more than most of them realize. Few bankers appreciate the devotion to the cause of banking which has been expended over the years by staff members and by bankers who have participated in the ABA's activities. This graduate school is certainly not the least of the ABA accomplishments.

But if we set our standards as high as we should, the ABA has serious shortcomings. It falls far short of what it could be doing. To my mind, its budget is woefully inadequate. There are countless things that need to be done, or done much better, for which funds are not in the budget.

But please don't infer that increasing membership dues in the ABA would solve the public responsibilities of bankers. It most assuredly would not, not unless individual bankers throughout the country are willing to lend leadership and support to forward-looking policies. The shortcomings of the ABA are the shortcomings of its members and no one else. Its potential accomplishments are also those of individual bankers willing to contribute their time and energies to them.

NEEDED: A SENSE OF DEDICATION

In short, gentlemen, the responsibilities of bankers consist of the obligations of each of us as individuals. Every banker has an important part to play. If we perform our parts as we can and should, we can help to strengthen the fabric of our society.

Banking has come a long way since the doghouse days of the great depression. But we still have far to go. We need further to broaden our concept of the banker's role in society and achieve standards of conduct which will set an example for other groups to emulate. We need to cultivate the habit of thinking in terms of the public interest. We need to deepen our social consciousness. This is not Sunday school stuff; it is the first law of modern survival.

Let us remind ourselves again, and frequently, of the grim urgency of our situation, of how much is at stake. The ordeal of the 20th century is far from over. The Communist menace may confront us for generations. This is a global life and death struggle, one in which there is no prize for second best.

It is imperative that we keep our economy strong and help to strengthen free nations everywhere. We must match the fanatical zeal of the Communists with an abiding devotion to our ideals. We must be willing not only to fight for freedom but to work for it, year in and year out. Our leadership in the world will depend upon how well be use our freedom.

These are not lofty abstractions far removed from matters of daily living. To the contrary, they should provide framework and guidance for what we do from day to day. They constitute a challenge to each of us. They offer to each of us an opportunity—to broaden our horizons and to expand our spheres of influence. Will we have the intelligence, the courage, the maturity, and the sense of mission, needed to fulfill these obligations? Will we have the vision and steadfastness—in short, the dedication—required to live up to our broadened responsibilities as bankers?

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in rendering a heartfelt sympathy with the family of the late Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, a most dedicated servant of the public and this Nation.

As his neighbor in the House Office Building, I shall always remember his friendliness, and respect and admire him for his contributions to the functions of the House of Representatives.

During the past several years he has concentrated a supreme and successful effort to effect technological advancement in the field of space. His leadership as first chairman of the major Committee on Science and Astronautics was both brilliant and talented, and reflected his deep concern for the future of the United States.

Though long hours were spent on this work, this 13-times-elected Representative found time to investigate and plan

the development of natural resources, and become the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Through all his responsibilities as have been noted here by my other colleagues, Congressman BROOKS was a fine Christian, a temperate judge, and a patriot of highest degree. He was a man of honesty, integrity and rare imagination in his ability to project upon the present scene his desires for an even better Nation of tomorrow.

Few men, upon their passing, can lay claim to a fuller life of concern, faith and friendship toward their fellow man as did this gentleman from Louisiana. The vacancy left by our colleague will, indeed, be felt by all who knew and worked with him.

History of Vending in the United States—75th Anniversary of the Industry—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith offer the third part of "A Concise History of Vending in the U.S.A.," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of Vend, the magazine of the vending industry, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of vending in this country:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING

For a brief time later, Horn & Hardart operated an automat in Chicago. But this was closed and the company concentrated its attention on New York and Philadelphia. In a very real sense, the automat of 1902 was the forerunner of the automatic cafeterias which now provide complete food service for millions of industrial workers, for hospital staffs, in colleges, and office buildings.

In 1905, the U.S. Post Office took official cognizance of the vending machine. Plagued with inventors and manufacturers who wanted the Post Office to grant them exclusive royalty contracts (such as existed then as now in some European countries), the Department appointed a committee to investigate the merits of the machines. But the conclusion was unfavorable.

In his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, Postmaster General George Von L. Myer (who had just issued a directive to produce stamps in rolls that could be used in machines) wrote as follows: "This method of selling stamps is in use in other countries and the proposition to consider its adoption in the United States has excited no little interest. The use of machines has become so universal and popular in other fields that there seems every reason why they should be adapted to the sale of stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards, provided machines can be built which combine the necessary features of moderate expense and absolute accuracy in operation."

Accordingly, the Post Office Department examined a dozen stamp-vending machines. With considerable diplomacy, the Department later reported that nine of the machines had "unquestionable merit" but all failed to measure up to the Department's exacting standards. In 1908, the Department examined 25 different stamp machines and thought enough of 6 of them to conduct tests at New York, Washington, Baltimore, Indianapolis, and Minneapolis. Since none of the machines was slugproof, the project was abandoned. But the publicity surrounding the tests was such that the principal manufacturers—notably Schermack in Detroit, U.S. Automatic Vending Co. in New York, and the Brinkerhoff Co. in Sedalia, Mo.—began to develop public locations for the machines. That year, too, the Post Office finally began the manufacture of coils containing 500 stamps suitable for use in the machines.

While most vending companies were concentrating their efforts on the design and manufacture of machines, a few hardy pioneers who saw the need for service and maintenance began the Nation's first operating companies. In April 1906, the Franco-Swiss Chocolate Co. was incorporated in New Jersey. It was a holding company with five subsidiaries whose principal business was the installation and maintenance of candy vending machines. Then, as now, packaging posed special problems and Franco-Swiss had to set up its own packaging department to box the candies for sales in the machines.

In Chicago in 1906, 14-year-old Bert Mills, the youngest of M. B. Mills' 13 children, quit school to go to work at his brother's Mills Novelty Co. At that time, Mills was building a variety of vending machines as well as gambling machines which the company catalog called "trade stimulators." Bert Mills, who went on to found a corporation which bore his name and helped pioneer the hot coffee vender, recalled that one of his brother's machines was a 10-selection soda pop vender. The pop was dispensed from 10 5-gallon bottles which were mounted behind a cabinet built in the shape of a barrel.

"In those days, of course," Mills said, "they didn't use paper cups. There was a long trough running along the front of the machine and they had glasses sitting on the trough. At either end of the machine were tanks of water. If you felt like it, you picked up a cup and rinsed it off in water before you used it. But most people didn't bother."

The device was not refrigerated, but "the man who operated the machine put cracked ice on top of the bottles in the morning. In a couple of hours, the ice melted and the drinks got warm. Believe it or not, they sold a lot of drinks."

Doctors, public health officials and some of the public were concerned with the sanitation aspects of the common drinking cup, and in 1908 a company was formed to do something about it. The Public Cup Vendor Co. of New York that year introduced a vending machine which vended an individual drink of water in a paper cup. The price was a penny. Later the company became the Individual Drink Cup Co. and still later the Dixie Cup Co. After a few years, the combination water and cup vender was replaced with a penny vender which sold only cups, but this was the first ancestor of the modern hot and cold drink vending machines.

In 1908, too, R. M. Richardson formed the R. M. Richardson Co. with Zeno chewing gum venders, and thus became the first gum venders, and a match vender and thus became the first vending operating company on the west coast.

The following year, the late Emerson Bolen founded the Northwestern Corp. in the little river town of Morris, Ill. Bolen was typical in many ways of the imaginative mechanic-turned salesman, or salesmen turned mechanic if you prefer, who pioneered vending. Born on a farm near Newark, Ohio, Bolen moved as a young man to Marion, Ind., where he graduated from high school and then became a traveling salesman.

Just before the turn of the century, having convinced himself and others of his salesmanship, Bolen packed his satchel and his sample case and sailed off for south Africa as the sole representative on that continent of the Fireless Cooker Co. and of a firm which made illustrated blackboards. He spent 3 years in Africa, once got himself drafted protestingly into the British Army, came home mostly to persuade his childhood sweetheart to become Mrs. Bolen,

Back in the States, with a new wife, Bolen saw a chance to build a kind of vending machine no one else had hit upon. In those days the saloons provided free kitchen matches for their customers. But the customers were so free and easy with the supply, grabbing up a handful to take along with them, that the matches were eating into many a saloonkeeper's profits. At least, that was the opinion of a friend of Bolen's who ran a saloon in his hometown of Marion.

Why not, Bolen thought, find some way of providing free matches and yet gracefully keep the customers from stuffing their pockets? Out of this thinking came a small, bar-top device, not coin activated, while Bolen called the Yankee. You opened the top of the Yankee and loaded it with 100 or so kitchen matches. Then the top was was locked on. When you pushed a lever down, about an inch of matchstick popped out of an opening in the top of the device. You grasped the matchstick and pulled, and as you pulled the match head struck itself against an abrasive and emerged lighted and ready for us. The end of the lever likewise contained a cutter to nip off the end of a cigar.

On August 12, 1909, Bolen and two associates put up $3,000 to form Northwestern and to market the Yankee. In 9 months they built and sold 100,000 Yankees, at a retail price of $2, with a 100-percent markup. But the handwriting was on the wall: the kitchen match was giving way to the safety match so that in 1911 Northwestern brought out a penny matchbox vending machine—the first in a long line of venders to bear the company's trademark.

While Bolen was getting Northwestern started, a Dr. Emil Luden, who had been traveling abroad, arrived back in the States with a coin-operated lock he had discovered in Germany. Luden took out U.S. patents on the device and, in 1909, formed the Nik-O-Lok Co. After failing to sell the locks to the outlets where they would be used in washrooms, Luden became discouraged and sold his mechanism to C. C. Van Cleave who became the first president of Nik-O-Lok. The company decided to place its toilet locks on a service and commission basis, and has since grown to be one of the largest vending service organizations in the world.

The years just before World War I were a busy time for the vending machine manufacturers, and an increasing variety of merchandise was being sold in machines. In 1911, the Doehler Die Casting Co., New York, developed machines like the Hoff vender for Wrigley penny gum and for Life Savers; drink cup vending machines for the American Paper Goods Co.; a small counter vending machine, designed to look like a gasoline pump, which dispensed lighter fluid; Sani-Servs paper towel machines and a sanitary napkin vender distributed nationally by West Disinfectant Co.

Early operating companies were busy, too, and there was some tendency toward mergers and consolidations. In 1911, Franco-Swiss and its subsidiaries were absorbed by the Autosales Gum and Chocolate Co. which then controlled 32 merchandise vending operations. This consolidation gave Autosales an estimated 100,000 vending machines.

By the end of World War I, and the beginning of the twenties, the idea of operating companies was well established. The companies would own and service vending machines and pay a commission to the outlets

where they were placed. In Dallas, Tex., trolley cars were fitted out with gum and candy venders, operated with apparent success until a per-machine tax drove them out of business.

A real case study of how vending machines could open new markets and create demand for a specific product came in 1921 through the British Wrigley Co. and its managing director, S. L. Murison. Wrigley had two obstacles to overcome in England: The British were not addicted to gum chewing and British wholesalers and retailers were unwilling to undertake to educate the public. Murison set out to distribute some 500 penny gum vending machines among key British retailers. The retailers were simply to see to it that the machines were kept filled. Wrigley's vending program not only opened a new market for that company, it converted the British to gum chewing as well.

About this time, inventors of vending machines began to think seriously of selling cigarettes through automatic machines. In 1925, three machines were developed which were to have a profound effect on the growth of the U.S. vending industry. All three of the machines were built to sell cigarettes: One by National of St. Louis, another by William Rowe in Los Angeles, and a third by Smoketeria in Detroit. The cigarette vender was the first serious attempt to sell quantities of products at prices in excess of a nickel. At the outset, few people took the cigarette vender seriously and a good many shrewd merchandisers were sure it would fail.

Hymen Goldman once recalled the day Gordon Macke walked into Goldman's tobacco and candy wholesale company in Washington, D.C. Macke had met William Rowe on the west coast, became enthusiastic about Rowe's cigarette machine, and was setting out to establish a cigarette operating business in Washington. Macke came to Goldman as a logical and convenient source of supply for the cigarettes he proposed to vend.

"He told me," Goldman recalled, "that he was going to sell cigarettes through his machines for 15 cents. At that time our retail customers were selling cigarettes for 11 and 12 cents, and I thought he was crazy. No one would pay that much more. But he said they would because the machines were more convenient. I was sure he was wrong and we refused to sell him cigarettes."

Macke, not easily discouraged, arranged to buy cigarettes from some of the wagon jobbers, subwholesalers, whose source of supply was Goldman's wholesale house. Some years later, when Macke had proved his point by installing more than 100 cigarette machines, Goldman purchased the Macke operation and thus started what is now the Macke Vending Co.

In 1926, the first Sodamats, forerunners of the modern soft drink cup machines, appeared in New York and New Jersey amusement parks. These machines were not self-contained devices because they did not contain in a single unit the coin mechanism, cup dispenser, refrigeration system, carbonator and sirup tank. Instead the Sodamats were installed in batteries built into a wall. The units in the battery were fed by one compressor, one carbonator and one pump at the rear, the attendants worked behind the scenes keeping everything in working order. Batteries of Sodamats were installed in Cony Island, Asbury Park, Atlantic City, and New York where they continued to pump out soft drinks long after World War II.

As the 1920's drew to a close there was another wave of mergers and consolidations within the industry. The Autosales Corp., which had been reorganized at the end of World War I, acquired additional subsidiary companies; manufacturing interests were combining their resources, and a new holding company—Consolidated Automatic Merchandising Corp.—appeared on the scene. CAMCO was the first attempt to establish a truly diversified national operating organization. It was the brainchild of Joseph J. Schermack, who is generally credited with building the first practical postage stamp vending machine.

Schermack left school to begin work as a mechanic in Freeport, Ill., when he was 13 years old. In 1900 he started his own business as a manufacturer of mailing machines, the first of which was placed in Marshall Field & Co., in Chicago. In 1910, Schermack brought out his first profit-sharing stamp vender, a machine which sold either four penny stamps or two 2-penny stamps for a nickel. Until this time, postage stamps had been vended at face value, the idea being that the retailers who owned the machines were providing a service for their customers.

At first, Schermack sold his stamp venders outright to the stores in which they were placed. Schermack formed the Sanitary Postage Service Corp. in September 1926 to install and operate stamp venders. By 1928, Sanitary had some 20,000 of the machines in operation, and a year later claimed to have 30,000. The machines were placed in such well-known establishments as United Cigar, Schulte, Liggett, and other chainstores, as well as in thousands of independent outlets.

In August 1928, with considerable fanfare in the public press, Sanitary became a division of the newly formed CAMCO. Schermack was named president, while Financier A. J. Sack became chairman. The board of directors of CAMCO, which immediately announced plans to distribute its stock to the public, included such famous names as the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. CAMCO announced that it was entering complete vending service. In addition to Sanitary Postage, CAMCO controlled the General Vending Corp. of Virginia, Automatic Merchandising Corp. of America, Schermack Corp. of America, and Remington Service Machines, Inc. CAMCO management announced it was operating 36,000 penny weighing scales, 30,000 stamp vending machines, and 25,000 nut venders and that it was moving quickly into candy and cigarette vending. Within 5 years, the company's prospectus told potential investors, CAMCO would have 1,500,000 machines and would be making fantastic profits.

The best known of CAMCO's installations was a battery of 15 cigarette machines, with 3 changemakers, installed in the United Cigar Store at 33d and Broadway in New York. Later the machines were fitted out with phonograph devices which repeated "Thank you" after customers had inserted their coins.

The idea for CAMCO sounds amazingly modern since the organizers intended to attract other large vending companies to merge and intended likewise to integrate manufacturing of equipment and operating.

Mr. A. Granat, vice president of United Cigar and one of the organizers of CAMCO, said in an interview in 1929: "After we got the company started, we began to discuss the probability of consolidating the different aspects of our business, namely, the manufacturing, the servicing, and the selling. Therefore, we formed the general organization we now have, which overshadows all of the companies which heretofore have been engaged in the business of vending merchandise by machines."

After the corporation was formed, as Mr. Schermack later told a reporter, "It was then our good fortune to meet Mr. F. J. Lisman, of F. J. Lisman & Co., a banker who had been a member of the New York Stock Exchange for over 30 years and who, together with excellent maturity of judgment, preserves a wonderful, youthful attitude toward new ideas." With Lisman's help and guidance, CAMCO prepared a 4-page prospectus, projecting a rosy picture of sales and profits into the millions of dollars. In the dark depression days of 1933, CAMCO went into bankruptcy. Some of its holdings were sold off, others were simply liquidated.

In Chicago, in 1929, a 44-year-old automotive parts manufacturer named Nathaniel Leverone got on a penny weighing scale while waiting for the elevated train at Wilson Avenue. Leverone, who prided himself on his trim appearance, blanched at the reading on the scale: 200 pounds. He took out another penny, walked to the end of the platform and got on a second scale. The reading: 70 pounds. Many years later, Leverone said this experience prompted him to get into the vending business. "Why in the devil, I thought, haven't some honest men seen the opportunity in these things?" That same year, Leverone and 11 associates put up $5,000 each to start Canteen Co. Later, they put in another $5,000 each.

A Letter to Look Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to enclose a letter which I wrote to Look magazine:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

Mr. CHESTER MORRISON,
Look Senior Editor,
Look Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: This letter is with reference to your article on the John Birch Society published in the September 26 issue of Look. This is to advise you that I am not now nor have I ever been a member of the John Birch Society. It would have been perfectly simple for you to have determined this by a telephone call to me. However, you appear to be so dedicated to carrying out the anti-anti-Communist program of Gus Hall, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America, that true facts are of little consequence to you.

In August 1960, I wrote a letter to Mr. Robert Welch telling him that some of his intemperate statements would open the John Birch Society to a massive attack.

I fully support the patriotic goals of the John Birch Society but I do not agree with the statements made by Mr. Welch in the Politician.

At the last convention of all of the Communist Parties held in Moscow on December 10, 1960, formal recognition was taken of the damage which the anti-Communist organizations were inflicting on the international Communist conspiracy and that the program for 1961 was to be the total destruction of these anti-Communist organizations. Gus Hall, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America, was to implement this program in the United States and he found many willing transmission lines through the public media to do this.

Because of some of Mr. Welch's statements, the John Birch Society was vulnerable and became the first target of attack, and I am not too surprised to find Look to be a willing helper in this program.

I herewith demand a retraction of that part of the article which named me as a member of that society.

Yours very truly,

JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress.

U.N. Brutality in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, we all know about the current war in Katanga between the Katangans and the United Nations. I wonder if we are all aware of the brutal savage-like efforts of the U.N. to subdue Katanga and make her part of the Congo.

I read in the September 15, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune a news item which reports actions of the U.N. in Katanga which are utterly shocking. In this report, Richard Williams, a correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corp., tells of an instance where U.N. forces fired point blank at a Red Cross ambulance, wounding the attendants in the ambulance. The U.N. is supposed to be an organization of peace-loving nations whose goal is to achieve peace and tolerance among nations. The actions of the U.N. in Katanga cause one to wonder if the U.N., in fact, is furthering man's inhumanity to man.

In my opinion, every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read the news item to which I refer. I, therefore, wish to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

U.N. GUILTY OF SAVAGERY, BRITON SAYS

LONDON, September 14.—A British newsman covering the United Nations takeover in Katanga tonight accused U.N. forces of brutal savagery.

Richard Williams, correspondent for the British Broadcasting Corp., said in a report from Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, that the U.N. action was a terrible miscalculation.

Williams, wounded in the foot yesterday during the fighting in Elisabethville, said the U.N. miscalculation had in effect developed into a national war.

POST OFFICE A FORT

Williams said that U.N. troops "have turned the Elisabethville post office into a fortress, partly surrounded by the Katangan army."

"United Nations machineguns on the terrace and balconies of the Red Cross hospital 60 yards away were firing heavily all morning," he added.

"This morning, when a group of journalists approached the hospital, they were greeted by a long burst of machinegun fire from armored cars manned by Irish troops," Williams said.

STREETS DESERTED

"The streets are deserted. Anything that moves is shot at. Armored cars stand menacingly at street corners.

"Few people slept here last night. Heavy machinegun fire spat at the hidden enemy. Mortar bombs burst around us and bazookas tore into offices and private houses when Katangan troops tried to retake the post office.

Williams said that this morning a white painted, clearly marked Red Cross ambulance stalled in the middle of the main square of the capital. The driver and stretcherbearer got out.

"Indian troops in the post office immediately opened fire at almost point blank range," he said. "They [the ambulance men] collapsed on the road seriously wounded.

"This is the second time in 24 hours I have seen United Nations troops fire on a Red Cross vehicle.

"OBSERVERS APPALLED

"All the rules of war have gone by the board in this campaign. This morning the Belgian head of the Red Cross told me he had asked Brig. Singappa Raja, the United Nations commander, to remove all machineguns from the hospital.

"He was told they would stay there. The hospital was a strategic post. It would not be abandoned.

"All foreign observers are appalled at the unrelenting severity of the United Nations assault. I am sorry to say that I have personally seen Indian troops act with the brutal savagery which is quite indefensible."

A Review of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1961 issue of Fortune magazine there is a very thorough report about what happened during the recent Cuban affair. The journalist who researched the material for this article for many weeks and who wrote this comprehensive study is Charles J. V. Murphy, the senior editor of Fortune magazine in Washington. The editors of Fortune have stated that they are publishing this account "Cuba: The Record Set Straight," for one purpose—to set the record straight for concerned Americans. In this spirit we should carefully study the many facts and anecdotes which Mr. Murphy has so thoroughly pulled together.

Regretfully, President Kennedy has said about this article:

> This is the most inaccurate of all the articles that have appeared on Cuba (August 30 press conference).

It is unfortunate that the Kennedy administration attacks the integrity of the author instead of dealing factually with the matter in hand. I believe that issues and studies are more important than name-calling and play on personalities. I would like to say about Mr. Murphy that he is one of the most experienced, thoughtful, careful senior journalists writing in Washington today. For 20 years his articles, reports, and books have been most highly valued by thoughtful individuals. He is an acknowledged expert in the fields of military strategy, economic policy, and foreign affairs. He has traveled all over the world obtaining material for his writings. His firsthand experiences include accompanying Adm. Richard Byrd on some of his Antarctic expeditions. He has been decorated by the U.S. Government. Three words have always characterized Mr. Murphy's career as a journalist, regardless of whether one agreed or disagreed with one particular aspect of an article. These are integrity, scholarship, and courage.

Because Mr. Murphy's finding about Cuba deserve the closest study by legislators and editors, I submit this article for the RECORD:

CUBA: THE RECORD SET STRAIGHT

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Not long ago, at President Kennedy's daily staff meeting, the special assistant for national security affairs, McGeorge Bundy, opened the proceedings by noting, "Sir, we have four matters up for discussion this morning." The President was not in a zestful mood. "Are these problems which I inherited?" he asked. "Or are they problems of our own making?" "A little of both," was Bundy's tactful answer.

The exchange revealed a new and saving humility. Some days after this incident, Kennedy addressed the Nation on the subject of Berlin. The ebullience, the air of self-assurance that marked his first months in office had gone. He spoke earnestly to his countrymen but his words were also aimed at Premier Khrushchev, who up to this point had appeared not to be listening. This time Kennedy did get through to Moscow; and any lingering doubt about the American determination to defend Berlin was dispelled by the response of the American people. The President's will to stand firm was clear, and the Nation was with him.

Nevertheless, in any full review of John Kennedy's first months in office, there must be reported a failure in administration that will continue to inhibit and trouble American foreign policy until it is corrected. Ths failure raises a fair question: whether Kennedy has yet mastered the governmental machinery, whether he is well and effectively served by some of his close advisers, and whether they understand the use of power in world politics. The matter is of vital importance; in the crises that will inevitably arise around the world—in the Middle East, in Africa, in the Far East, in central Europe—the U.S. Government must be in top form, and possibly even, as Kennedy himself suggested, act alone.

Administrative confusions came to light most vividly in the Cuban disaster. That story is told here for the first time in explicit detail. It is told against the background of the U.S. reversal in Laos, which in itself should not be underestimated: Laos, once in the way of becoming a buffer for its non-Communist neighbors, is all but finished; now, in South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, a stout friend of the United States, is under murderous attack by Communist guerrillas; the U.S. loss of face is being felt from the Philippines to Pakistan, and in the long run the damage may prove to be even more costly than that caused by Cuba.

Let us turn back then to the train of events, beginning with Laos, that culminated in the disaster in the Bay of Pigs. Fortune is publishing the account for one purpose—to set the record straight for concerned Americans.

Kennedy, from the day he took office, was loath to act in Laos. He was confident that he understood the place and use of power in the transactions of the Nation, but he was baffled by this community of elephants, parasols, and pagodas. Then, too, he brought to office a general surmise that our long-range prospects of holding the new and weak nations of southeast Asia in the Western camp were doubtful in the extreme. In this respect, he was leaning toward the Lippmann-Stevenson-Fulbright view of strategy. This school holds that U.S. power is overcommitted in southeast Asia, and that the proper aim for U.S. diplomacy there should be to reduce local frictions by molding the new states as true neutrals.

The U.S. position in Laos had become acute while Dwight Eisenhower was still in

office. Eisenhower must therefore bear a considerable part of the blame for the U.S. failure; he let a situation go from bad to worse, and indeed he apologized to Kennedy for leaving "a mess," and that it might take the intervention of U.S. troops to redeem it. There had been a moment when the struggle in Laos had turned in favor of the pro-U.S. forces under General Phoumi Nosavan, the former Defense Minister. In a series of small but decisive engagements, more by maneuver than by shooting, Phoumi eventually took the capital, Vientiane, early in December, but at this point the Russians intervened openly on the side of the Communist faction, the Pathet Lao. In concert with a large-scale push by well-trained troops from North Vietnam, they introduced a substantial airlift into northern Laos (an operation that still is continuing).

The collapse of the Royal Lao Army then became inevitable unless the United States came in with at least equal weight on Phoumi's side. One obvious measure was to put the airlift out of business. The job could have been done by volunteer pilots and the challenge would at least have established, at not too high an initial risk for the United States, how far the Russians were prepared to go. Another measure would have been to bring SEATO forces into the battle, as the SEATO treaty provided.

In the end, Eisenhower decided to sheer away from both measures. The State Department was opposed to stirring up India and the other Asian neutrals. Secretary of State Christian Herter agreed in principle that the independence of Laos had to be maintained, yet he was unable to bring to heel his own desk officers and the policy planners, who were apprehensive that even a limited military action would wreck the possibility of some kind of political accommodation with Moscow. The policy shapers, especially in State, hung back from any sequence of actions that might have committed U.S. policy on the central issue: that Laos was worth fighting for. Even the modest additional support that the Defense Department tried to extend to Phoumi's U.S.-equipped battalions in the field during the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration was diluted by reason of the conflict between Defense and State. Under Secretary of Defense James Douglas was later to say, "By the time a message to the field had been composed in Washington, it had ceased to be an operational order and had become a philosophical essay." And a vexed Phoumi was to exclaim that the reasoning of the American Ambassador, Winthrop Brown, was beyond his simple oriental mind. "His Excellency insists that my troops be rationed to a few rounds of ammunition per man. He tells me that I must not start a world war. But the enemy is at my throat."

After the responsibility passed to Kennedy in January, Phoumi's position was still not completely hopeless, if he had been able to get adequate help. But early in March a sudden Communist descent drove him off a position commanding the principal highway in northern Laos. That unfortunate action was the turning point in his part of the war. For the relative ease with which it was done raised in Washington the question of whether Phoumi's troops had the will to fight.

By then Kennedy was committed to the Cuba operation. He therefore now had to reckon with the very real possibility, were U.S. forces to become involved in Laos, of having to back off from Cuba.

At this juncture Kennedy's foremost need was a clear reading of Soviet intentions. For this he turned to his "demonologists," the New Frontier's affectionate term for its Soviet experts. The most influential among them—Charles E. Bohlen, State's senior Sovietologist, and Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson at Moscow—were agreed that Khrushchev personally had too much respect for U.S. power to stir it into action, as Stalin had carelessly done in Korea. Yet, while Khrushchev was plainly indulging his preference for "salami" tactics it was impossible to judge how big a slice he was contemplating, or whether he was being pushed by Mao Tse-tung. The only reading available to Kennedy was, in a word, ambiguous. Maybe Khrushchev was moving into a vacuum in Laos just to keep out Mao. If so, then the least chancy response for the United States was to assume that Khrushchev would be satisfied with a thin slice in Laos, and to maneuver him toward a compromise—a neutral government in which, say, the Pathet Lao would have some minor representation.

This course was urged by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and also was being pressed by Prime Minister Macmillan in London. It came to be known as track 2. It was intended to lead to a cease-fire followed by negotiation. Oppositely, the Joint Chiefs of Staff still believed, as they did under Eisenhower, that the military challenge demanded a military showdown: action by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under which a mixed allied force, including Americans, would move into Laos and take over the defense of the important cities, thereby freeing the Royal Lao Army to move into the field without risk of being sapped by subversion in the rear. This option was labeled "track 1," and it was favored as well by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his Deputy Roswell Gilpatric.

While Kennedy favored track 2 and supported a conciliatory note that Macmillian sent to Moscow, he decided he also had to make a show of starting down track 1, in case the political gamble failed. He permitted himself a dramatic gesture. At his televised press conference on March 23, he addressed himself somberly to a map of Laos—a country "far away" but in a world that is "small." Its independence, he went on, "runs with the safety of us all," and in language that all but told Khrushchev that he was in for a fight, he implied that the United States was preparing to go to its defense. There was, meanwhile a tremendous deployment of U.S. forces in the Far East, involving the 7th Fleet and Marine combat units on Okinawa. The Army's strategic-strike units in the United States were made ready. A belated effort was made to buck up Phoumi's forces with an increased flow of fighting gear. U.S. military "advisers" went into the field with his battalions. Against this background, on March 26, Kennedy went to Key West and met Macmillan, who was on a visit to the West Indies. The Prime Minister made it clear that Britain considered Laos hardly worth a war, and wanted no part in a SEATO action. (De Gaulle, in a separate exchange, had told Kennedy flatly that France would not fight in Laos.)

From that point on, the idea of a military showdown in Laos looked less and less attractive to the President. He did issue one warning to the Russians that might have been construed as having a military tone. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko called at the White House and Kennedy took him into the rose garden, beyond earshot of his staff, and said, "The United States does not intend to stand idly by while you take over Laos." But that was the last run along track 1.

By then, Rusk was in Bangkok for a meeting of the SEATO powers, still hoping to extract from the meeting at least a strong statement that would condemn the Soviet intervention in Laos and reassert the determination of the SEATO powers to defend the new nations of southeast Asia. In this mission Rusk failed. None of the ranking Democratic Congressmen, or Republicans spoke up in favor of intervention. Moreover, when Kennedy pressed the military chiefs for specific recommendations, he got divided answers. Gen. Thomas White, then Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, were both confident that the Communist penetration could be defeated and Laos saved. They said that since the Communists would throw far more manpower into the battle, the U.S. war plan would have to include the possible use of tactical nuclear weapons on a limited scale. They maintained, however, that a clear U.S. resolution to employ nuclear weapons, if there was a need, might in itself discourage further Communist penetration. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, had much less confidence in the U.S. ability to stop the Communists. Lemnitzer expressed the apprehension that U.S. military action in Laos might be matched by Red China and Russia in a fast reopening of the war in Korea. Two such wars, by his calculation, might require no fewer than 20 U.S. divisions, more than the Army had in its entire order of battle, as well as general mobilization to support them.

"In effect," Kennedy demanded, "you're telling me that I cant do anything—without starting a nuclear war?" This, he swore, he'd never do, which by itself was a startling reversal of a fundamental premise of the Eisenhower strategy: that U.S. forces would have recourse to nuclear tactical weapons on whatever scale the pursuit of U.S. objectives required. The White House, while conceding to the Communists the option of uninhibited escalation, would not tolerate even a limited escalation on the nuclear side by our own forces. Any military move in Laos therefore seemed hopeless.

The fear of the nuclear escalation factor became the sanction for the policy that was pursued thereafter. In light of this, the scene of Kennedy addressing himself to the map of Laos, in his first public appearance as Commander in Chief, is now memorable for its fleeting revelation of a spirited man who was eager to present himself as a strong President, but who all too quickly turned unsure of his principal resource of power.

The Chiefs, although they took different views of the risks of the Laos situation, were fundamentally agreed on a central point. And that was that the United States had to be prepared to employ tactical nuclear weapons. But Kennedy and his civilian strategists, moving away from the nuclear base of the Eisenhower strategy, read into their professional differences a bankruptcy of means and doctrine. The low esteem in which Kennedy began to hold the military leaders whom he inherited from the Eisenhower administration has not been concealed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara is rewriting the Eisenhower strategic doctrine, in collaboration with the political scientists at the White House and State. The backing away from nuclear strategy, which ended in the U.S. retreat in Laos, is now being formalized by McNamara. (His prescription will call for a conventional base for NATO strategy in the defense of Berlin.)

So there was, by early April, even as Laos was slipping farther and farther below Kennedy's horizon, a breakdown of communication between the political and the military sides of the Government, and this would contribute largely to the failure of Kennedy's next venture.

The Cuban affair has been called the American Suez. In the sense that Suez, too, was an utter fiasco, the bracketing is wryly accurate. There is, however, a clear difference between the two operations. Ill-managed as it was, the Suez invasion would have succeeded had not Eisenhower used the influence of the United States to bring three allies—

Britain, France, and Israel—to a humiliating halt. (It should be recorded that neither Britain, France, nor Israel made any critical comment on the U.S. excursion in Cuba.) In Cuba the defeat was wholly self-inflicted. Even as the expedition was creeping into the Bay of Pigs, just before midnight of April 16, the political overseers back in Washington were in the process of knocking out of the battle plan the final, irreducible element needed for victory.

If the U.S. military are without a peer in any one technique of warfare, it is in putting forces ashore across a hostile beach. For the Bay of Pigs, all the necessary means were at Kennedy's hand. It was, by the standards of Gen. David M. Shoup's Marines, an elementary amphibious operation in less than battalion strength. And, indeed, as a tactical exercise, it was well devised and daringly and successfully led. But after the strategists at the White House and State had finished plucking it apart, it became an operation that would have disgraced even the Albanians. When Kennedy looked around for the blundered, he found him everywhere and nowhere. Practically everybody in his inner group of policy movers and shakers had been in on the planning. Only after the disaster was upon them did he and his men realize that a venture which was essentially a military one had been fatally compromised in order to satisfy political considerations. One not unfriendly official who also served under Eisenhower was later to observe: "Cuba was a terrific jolt to this new crowd because it exposed the fact that they hadn't really begun to understand the meaning and consequences of action—the use or misuse of power, in other words. They had blamed Ike's apparent inaction on indecision and plain laziness. Cuba taught them that action, any kind of serious action, is hard and certainly no safe business for amateurs."

The idea for the invasion had taken root during the early summer of 1960. By then, thousands of defectors from Castro's Cuba were in the United States. Many of them were professional soldiers. The job of organizing and training them was given to the Central Intelligence Agency, as the Government's principal mechanism for mounting covert operations of this sort. It became and remained to the end the specific responsibility of one of the CIA's top deputies, Richard M. Bissell, a former economist who is also a highly practical executive. Among his other first-class accomplishments, Bissell had masterminded the U–2 operation, which was, until it finally missed, as one day it had to, the most economical and comprehensive innovation in espionage in modern times.

Training camps for the exiles were set up in a district in western Guatemala offering some privacy. The original idea was to feed the recruits back into Cuba, to reinforce the several thousand anti-Castro guerrillas already established in the mountains. Toward the autumn, however, a more ambitious and riskier project came under tentative consideration. Castro was organizing large formations of militia and was obviously bent on crushing the counterrevolutionary movement before the Cuban populace caught fire. With a view to saving the movement, it was proposed to build up an invasion force big enough to seize and to hold on the Cuban shore a beachhead sufficiently deep for the expedition to proclaim a provisional government, and so provide a rallying base for the discontented. By this time, too, the rudiments of an anti-Castro air force were in training nearby. The planes, however, were all obsolete—mostly propeller-driven B–26's, twin-engine bombers of World War II vintage that had been redeemed from the Air Force's graveyard. Associated with them was a troop-carrying squadron with which a small detachment of paratroopers was training.

During the summer and fall of 1960, Eisenhower from time to time personally reviewed the scheme. In late November, the last time it came up for his comprehensive review, an operational plan had not yet crystallized; no timetable for action had been set. Across the Potomac at the Pentagon, Under Secretary of Defense Douglas, who was charged with quasi-military operations under the noncommittal category of collateral cold war activities, was keeping a watchful eye on the project, and releasing such military talent and gear as the CIA requisitioned. Neither he nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff (whose connection with the project remained informal at this stage) believed that much good would flow from an attack made by Cubans alone. For one thing, the resources then available permitted the training of only 300 men or so, and the air unit had but a dozen planes. This was hardly enough to bring down a tough, well-armed regime, and Douglas repeatedly counseled more realism in the planning. Indeed, it was taken for granted by Douglas and the others directly concerned that a landing in force could not possibly be brought off unless the expedition was shepherded to the beach by the U.S. Navy (either openly or in disguise), and covered by air power in whatever amount might be necessary. Eisenhower, the commander of Normandy, understood this well enough.

YOU MAY HAVE TO SEND TROOPS IN

It became obvious toward the end of 1960 that Ike would be out of office well before an effective force would be ready. So the decision as to how big the show should be, and how conspicuous should be the U.S. share, and in what role, was no longer his to make. Given the relaxed attitude at the White House, the military chiefs also relaxed; military concern for the enterprise sank to the "Indians"—from the four-star level to the colonels on the Joint Staff who had been advising the CIA in such matters as training and tactics. Bissell was encouraged, on the one hand, to go forward with preparations for an invasion, but he was cautioned to be ready to fall back to the more modest objective of simply generating a supply of reinforcements for the anti-Castro forces in the mountains.

Before Eisenhower was fully rid of his responsibility, however, a number of disquieting developments combined to impart to the enterprise an air of emergency. It was established that Castro was to start receiving, early in 1961, substantial deliveries of Soviet jet fighters, and that pilots to man them were already being trained in Czechoslovakia. From all indications, these would provide him, by early summer, with an air force that would be more than enough to extinguish the last chance of a successful invasion by Cuban exiles; it would be by all odds the most powerful air force in Latin America. Two other developments were scarcely less worrisome. Castro was making progress in his systematic destruction of his enemies in the mountains, upon whose cooperation the invasion counted, and there was no way, save by an over air supply, to get guns and ammunition to them. The stability of the exile movement itself was, moreover, coming into question. Warring political factions threatened to split their ranks, and men who had trained long and painstakingly were impatient over the failure of their American advisers to set a sailing date. The feeling took hold of them and their American sponsors that it was to be in the spring or never.

After his election, Kennedy had been briefed fairly frequently on the Cuban situation, along with that in Laos. As his hour of authority approached, the question of what to do about Cuba was increasingly on his mind. The problem had a personal angle. In his fourth television debate with Richard Nixon, he had sharply blamed the Eisenhower administration for permitting communism to seize a base there, "only 90 miles off the coast of the United States." He discussed Cuba, along with Laos, at length in both of his preinaugural talks with Eisenhower, and by his stipulation. Ike was inclined to rank Cuba below Laos in terms of urgency, but Cuba clearly worried him. In their second conversion Ike said: "It's already a bad situation. You may have to send troops in."

THE FIRST NECESSITY: CONTROL OF THE AIR

On taking office, Kennedy at once called for a detailed briefing on the condition and prospects of the U.S.-fostered operation. This information was supplied by Allen W. Dulles, the Director of the CIA, and by Bissell. After Kennedy had heard them out he decided that he had to have from the Joint Chiefs of Staff a technical opinion of the feasibility of the project. It is at this point that the locus of responsibility begins to be uncertain.

The operation was not a Department of Defense responsibility. Only once before, in early January, had the chiefs formally reviewed the plan, at Eisenhower's invitation. Now they were asked only for an appreciation of its validity. The enterprise, moreover, had expanded considerably in scope and aim in the past few months. With more than 100,000 Cuban refugees in the United States, recruiting had stepped up, and the organizers were at this point aiming at a landing force of about 1,000 men. An operational plan for a landing on the south coast of Cuba, near the town of Trinidad, was finally beginning to jell. There the country was open, with good roads leading into the Escambray Mountains and the needed link-up with the indigenous guerrillas. Also cranked into the plan were ingenious schemes—a barrage of radiobroadcasts from nearby islands and showers of pamphlets from airplanes—intended to galvanize the anti-Castro Cubans in the cities and villages into demonstrations as the invaders struck. It was never explicitly claimed by the CIA that a general uprising was immediately in the cards; the intention was to sow enough chaos during the first hours to prevent Castro from smashing the invasion on the beach. Once the beachhead was consolidated, however, and if fighting gear went forward steadily to the guerrillas elsewhere in Cuba, the planners were confident that a mass revolt could be stimulated.

Finally, the plan still assumed that U.S. military help would be on call during the landing. Castro's air force consisted of not quite two-score planes—a dozen or so obsolete B–26's, plus about the same number of obsolete British Sea Furies, also slow, propeller-driven airplanes. But in addition there were 7 or 8 T–33 jet trainers, the remnants of an earlier U.S. transaction with the Batista government, so the force was not the pushover it appeared at first glance. Armed with rockets, these jets would be more than a match in a battle for the exiles' B–26's. The scheme was to destroy them on the ground in advance of the landing, by a series of attacks on Castro's airfields; should the T–33's escape the first surprise blow, there would be ample opportunity to catch them later on the ground while they were being refueled after an action. In any event, a U.S. carrier would be close by, below the horizon, and one or two of its tactical jets could presumably supply whatever quick and trifling help might be required in an emergency.

It stood to reason that, considering how small the landing party was, the success of the operation would hinge on the B–26's controlling the air over the beachhead. And the margins that the planners accepted were narrow to begin with. The B–26's were to operate from a staging base in a Central American country more than 500 miles from Cuba. The round trip would take better than 6 hours, and that would leave the planes with fuel for only 45 minutes of

action, for bombing and air cover, over Cuba. In contrast, Castro's air force could be over the beachhead and the invaders' ships in a matter of minutes, which would increase his relative air advantage manifold. Hence the absolute necessity of knocking out Castro's airpower, or at least reducing it to impotence, by the time the ground battle was joined.

This, in general terms, was the plan the Chiefs reviewed for Kennedy. The assumptions concerning the possibilities of an anti-Castro uprising not being in their jurisdiction, they took these at face value. They judged the tactical elements sound and, indeed, they accorded the operation a high probability of success. They were allowed to appraise the training and the equipment of the forces. A team of officers was sent to Guatemala. On the basis of its report, the Chiefs made several recommendations, but again their assessment was favorable.

Late in January, Kennedy authorized the CIA to lay on the invasion plan, but he warned that he might call the whole operation off if he had a change of mind as to its wisdom. D-day was tentatively fixed for March 1 but this proved impossible to meet. For one thing, it took some time to organize the quarrelsome exiles in New York and Miami into a workable coalition that would sponsor the expedition. For another, it was decided that a battalion of about 1,400 men was needed to secure a beachhead, and that the force, which called itself the Cuban Brigade, should be beefed up generally. In consequence of these developments, the target date kept slipping until it finally came firm as April 17.

It has since been reported that the President was inwardly skeptical of the operation from the start but just why has never been clear—whether he judged the force too small to take on Castro, or because he was reluctant to take on so soon a nasty job that was bound to stir up an international ruckus, however it came out. Some of his closest advisers, in any case, were assailed by sinking second thoughts. What bothered them was the "immorality" of masked aggression. They recoiled from having the United States employ subterfuge in striking down even so dangerous an adversary as Castro, and they were almost unanimously opposed to having the United States do the job in the open. Even with the best of luck, there would certainly be a flutter among the six leading Latin American States, which, with the exception of Venezuela, had refused to lend themselves to any form of united action against Castro. And the repercussion would scarcely be less embarrassing among the neutralists of Asia and Africa, whose good opinion Kennedy's advisers were most eager to cultivate. And so the emphasis at the White House and State began to move away from a concern with the military considerations—the things needed to make the enterprise work—and to become preoccupied with tinkerings they hoped would soften its political impact on the neutral nations.

THE DISMEMBERING BEGINS

The "immorality" of the intervention found its most eloquent voice before the President during a meeting in the State Department on April 4, only 13 days before the date set for the invasion. (Stewart Alsop told part of the story in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.) The occasion was Bissell's final review of the operation, and practically everybody connected with high strategy was on hand—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, General Lemnitzer, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, as well as Bundy, Paul Nitze, Kennedy's specialist on strategic planning at the Pentagon, Thomas Mann, then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, and three of Kennedy's specialists in Latin American matters—Adolf Berle, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin. There was also one outsider, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who had been Kennedy's favorite choice for Secretary of State, and whose support he wanted. After Bissel had completed his briefing and Dulles had summed up the risks and prospects, FULBRIGHT spoke and denounced the proposition out of hand: it was the wrong thing for the United States to get involved in.

Kennedy chose not to meet this issue. Instead, he quickly noted certain practical considerations and then, going around the table, he asked various of his advisers whether they thought the operation should go forward. Without exception, the answer was "Yes." Berle was particularly outspoken. He declared that "a power confrontation" with communism in the Western Hemisphere was inevitable anyhow. As for this enterprise, "Let 'er rip" was his counsel. Mann, who previously had been on the fence, now spoke up for the operation. Rusk, too, said he was for it, in answer to the President's direct question, but as would presently be manifest, he privately had no heart for it. Two other men among the President's senior foreign policy advisers, not present at the meeting, shared FULBRIGHT'S feelings: Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, and Adlai Stevenson, with the United Nations in New York, who soon came to know in a general way that something distasteful was afoot. In deference to these views, Kennedy—either at the meeting or soon afterward—made two separate rulings that were to contribute to the fatal dismemberment of the whole plan. First, U.S. airpower would not be on call at any time: the obsolescent B-26's flown by "our" Cubans would be on their own. Second, the B–26's could be used in only two strikes before the invasion—first on D-minus-2-days (April 15) and again on the morning of the landing. Although these limitations clearly lengthened the risks, Lemnitzer did not dispute them, nor did Bissell's own military advisers; they were confident that if the B–26's missed the T–33's on the first go, they would surely catch them on the second.

During the few remaining days, Kennedy drew his circle of advisers more tightly around him. Apart from Bundy and Rostow, the only White House advisers who remained privy to the development of the operation were the Latin-American experts—Adolf Berle and Schlesinger. Lemnitzer and, of course, Allen Dulles were in and out of Kennedy's office. But the doubts of Rusk and FULBRIGHT and of others were all the while imperceptibly converging on the President and, bit by bit, an operation that was marginal to begin with was so truncated as to guarantee its failure.

The embarkation of the expedition was scheduled to start on April 10. This was, in itself, quite a job. Some half-dozen small steamers were collected for the first movement, together with a number of tactical landing craft. The takeoff point was a port on the Caribbean, several hundred miles from the training area in Guatemala, and the transfer of the Cuban brigade was done by air and at night, through 4 nights, in the interest of secrecy. The gear aboard the ships was enough to supply the landing force through 10 days of battle, and also to equip the thousands of guerrillas expected to be recruited after the beachhead was gained.

Only a week before the embarkation, and indeed only a day or so before the last go-around at the State Department, another serious change was made in the invasion plan. At the insistence of the State Department, Trinidad was eliminated as the target landing area. State's reasons were complex. Rusk decided that the entire operation had to be kept unspectacular and minimize the overtness of the U.S. role as much as possible. That required shifting the attack to a less populated and less accessible area, where Castro's reaction might be slower and less effective. Rusk and his own advisers were also anxious to be rid at all possible speed of the incubus of responsibility for mounting the operation in Central America, anxious that the B–26's should be based as rapidly as possible on Cuba. The only vulnerable airfield capable of taking the planes was one in poor condition near the Bay of Pigs, on the Zapata Peninsula, about 100 miles to the west of Trinidad. Here the countryside was quite deserted and, to succeed at all, the invaders had to seize and hold two narrow causeways leading across a swamp that was impassable on either side. These actions did not end the last-minute curtailments directed by the White House. Even the arrangements for arousing the Cuban populace and trying to stampede Castro's militia with leaflet raids and radio-broadcasts were struck from the plan, and again because State was afraid that they would be too obvious a showing of the U.S. hand. On April 12, while the convoy was heading north, Kennedy was impelled to announce at a press conference that the United States would not intervene with force in Cuba. Rusk made sure the idea got home by repeating the same guarantee on the morning of the invasion. The effect of this was to serve notice on the Cubans in Cuba, who were known to be waiting for an encouraging signal from the United States that whatever they might be tempted to try would be at their own risk.

THE POLITICIANS TAKE COMMAND

Clear to the end, Kennedy retained tight control of the enterprise. As each new sequence of action came up for his final approval—the go signal for the embarkation, then for the preinvasion air strike on the morning of April 15, he came to his decisions quickly and firmly. All the way, however, he reserved the option to stop the landing short of the beach. He kept asking how late the enterprise might be reversed without making it look as if Castro had called an American bluff. He was told: noon on Sunday, April 16, when the invasion force would be 11 hours of steaming from the Bay of Pigs. The Sunday deadline found Kennedy in the Virginia countryside, at Glen Ora; only then did he raise his finger from the hold button. As he did so, he noted with relief that no other unfavorable factors had materialized. He was mistaken. At dawn of the day before, by the timetable, the B–26's, having flown undetected through the night from their Central American staging base, appeared over Cuba and bombed the three fields on which Castro's ready air was deployed. (The attack was, on the whole, highly successful. Half of Castro's B–26's and Sea Furies, and four of his T–33 jets were blown up or damaged and so removed from the imminent battle.) The story was put out that Castro's own pilots, in the act of defecting, had attacked their own airfields. This was a gloss, to say the least; the attackers were indeed defectors from Castro, but they had defected long before. Later that afternoon, at the United Nations, after the Cuban Foreign Minister, Raul Roa, had charged that the attack was "a prologue" to a U.S. invasion, Adlai Stevenson arose and swore that the planes were Castro's.

From this hapless moment on, Stevenson's role becomes unclear. There was a subsequent published report that he intervened to block the second strike. Stevenson has flatly denied, and continues to deny, that he even knew about the second strike, let alone that he demanded that it be called off. But there was little doubt about his unhappiness over the course of events in the Caribbean and he conveyed these feelings to Washington. Before Sunday was over Bundy was to fly to New York, to see Steven-

son (Bundy said) and still wearing in his haste to be off, sneakers and sports clothes. This sudden errand followed a shattering order that went out to Bissell.

It was Sunday evening, only some 8 hours after Kennedy had given "the go-ahead." In the first dark, the expedition was even then creeping toward the Cuban shore. In Bissell's office there was a call on the White House line. It was Bundy, being even crisper than usual: the B–26's were to stand down, there was to be no air strike in the morning, this was a Presidential order. Secretary of State Rusk was now acting for the President in the situation. If Bissell wished to make a "reclama" (federalese for appeal), it could be done through Rusk.

Bissel was stunned. In Allen Dulles' absence (he was in Puerto Rico), he put his problem up to CIA Deputy Director Charles Cabell, an experienced airman. Together they went to the State Department to urge Rusk to reconsider a decision that, in their judgment, would put the enterprise in irretrievable peril. Cabell was greatly worried about the vulnerability to air attack first of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. The ships, he suggested, could unload and retire to the open sea before daylight; as for the troops ashore being unduly inconvenienced by Castro's air, it had been his experience as a colonel in the Burma theater, he told the visitors, that air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear: military considerations had overruled the political when the D-minus-2 strike had been laid on; now political considerations were taking over. While they were talking, Rusk telephoned the President at Glen Ora to say that Cabell and Bissell were at his side, and that they were worried about the cancellation of the strike. Rusk, at one point, put his hand over the mouthpiece, and asked Cabell whether he wished to speak to the President. Cabell shook his head. Perhaps that was his mistake; it was certainly his last chance to appeal to a lamentable decision. But Bundy had made it clear that Rusk was acting for the President, and Cabell is a professional military man, trained to take orders after the facts had been argued with the man in command.

On their return to the office, Bissell flashed orders to the B–26 commander at the staging field, more than 500 miles from the Bay of Pigs. The force got the changed orders shortly before midnight, only half an hour or so before they were scheduled to depart; the bomb bays were already loaded and the crews were aboard. Meanwhile the planes carrying the paratroopers had taken off, and the first assault barges, still unobserved, were even then approaching the beaches.

TUESDAY, THE TURNING POINT

Past midnight, in the early watches, Bissell and Cabell restudied the battle plan, while signals of consternation welled up from their men far to the south. At 4 o'clock, less than an hour before first light on the Cuban shore, Cabell went back to Rusk with another proposal. It was manifestly impossible for the brigade's small force of B–26's (only 16 were operational) to provide effective air cover for the ships from their distant base against jets that could reach the ships in minutes. Cabell now asked whether, if the ships were to pull back of the 3- or 12-mile limit—whichever distance U.S. legal doctrine held to be the beginnings of international water—the U.S.S. *Boxer*, a carrier on station about 50 miles from the Bay of Pigs, could be instructed to provide cover for them. Rusk said no and this time Cabell finally took advantage of the reclama that Bundy had extended to Bissell. The President was awakened. Cabell registered his concern. The answer still was no.

Shortly after that, on Monday morning, April 17, Brig. Gen. Chester Clifton, the President's military aide received word that the Cuban Brigade had landed. They had little chance. They were without the ranging fire power that the B–26's with their bombs and machineguns had been expected to apply against Castro's tanks and artillery as they wheeled up. Castro's forces came up fast. He still had four jets left, and they were indeed armed with powerful rockets. He used them well against the ships in the bay. Before the morning was done, he had sunk two transports, aboard which was the larger part of the reserve stocks of ammunition, and driven off two others, with the rest of the stock.

Now Kennedy and his strategists became alarmed. About noon on Monday, Bissell was told that the B–26's could attack Castro's airfields at will. Orders went to the staging base for a major attack next morning. But the orders came too late. Most of the pilots had been in the air for upwards of 18 hours in an unavailing effort to keep Castro's planes off the troops and the remaining ships. That night a small force was scratched together. It was over Cuba at dawn, only to find the fields hidden by low, impenetrable fog. Nothing came of the try.

Tuesday, the second day, was the turning point. The men ashore had fought bravely and gained their planned objectives. They had even seized and bulldozed the airfield. But they were desperately short of ammunition and food, and under the pressure of Castro's superior firepower and numbers they were being forced back across the beach; three B-26's trying to thelp them were shot down.

Two small landing craft had made rendezvous with two remaining supply ships and taken on ammunition and rations; but from where they were, they could not reach the beach until after daybreak, at which time Castro's jets were certain to get them. There remained still one last clear chance to make the thing go. *Boxer* was still on station. The release of a few of its jets simply for air cover should see the two craft safely to the shore.

"DEFEAT IS AN ORPHAN"

That night Kennedy was caught up in a White House reception, a white-tie affair, for Congress and the members of his Cabinet. He was informed by an aide that Bissell wished to see him. The President asked Bissell to come to the White House. Calls went out to the other principals—to Rusk, who had been entertaining the Greek Premier at a formal dinner at the State Department, to McNamara, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke.

They gathered in the President's office shortly after midnight. One of the participants recalls: "Two men dominated that singular occasion—the President and Bissell. Bissell was in the unhappy posture of having to present the views of an establishment that had been overtaken by disaster. He did so with control, with dignity, and with clarity." Bissell made it plain that the expedition was at the point of no return; unless U.S. airpower was brought forward, the men on the beach were doomed. In substance, he asked that the *Boxer's* planes be brought into the battle to save the operation. Rusk still would not have this. Several others were also opposed, including the President's personal staffers. Burke vouched for the worth of Bissell's proposition. The discussion with the President lasted until 2 a.m. Its outcome was a singular compromise. Jets from the *Boxer* would provide cover next morning for exactly 1 hour—from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m., just long enough for the ships to run into the shore and start unloading, and for the remaining B–26's to get in a hard blow.

Next morning, through an incredible mischance, the B–26's were over Cuba half an hour ahead of schedule. *Boxer's* jets were still on the flight deck. But Casto's jets were ready. Two of the B–26's were shot down; others were hit and forced to abort. That was the melancholy end. At two-thirty that afternoon, Bissell received word from one of his men abroad a ship in the Bay of Pigs: remnants of the landing force were in the water and under fire. There was a final message from the gallant brigade commander ashore to this effect, "I have nothing left to fight with and so cannot wait. Am headed for the swamp." Bissell went to the White House to report the end. Kennedy gave orders for a destroyer to move into the bay and pick up as many men as it could. It was no Dunkirk. Only a few men of the 1,400 were saved.

"Victory," Kennedy noted some days later, "has a hundred fathers, and defeat is an orphan." Yet, for all Kennedy's outward calmness at this moment of defeat, he was never, after it, quite the same. Speaking before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, a grave President said, "There are from this sobering episode useful lessons for all to learn."

Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey: Naval Officer, Aviation Pioneer, Industrialist, and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, now that more than 15 years have passed since the end of World War II, the memory of that momentous struggle, which is passing rapidly from the public mind, is being momentarily recalled with increasing frequency through the obituary notices of important war leaders.

The latest such story was that about Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey, who as Naval Aviator No. 45, was a pioneer in the development of the modern Navy, and rose, after a distinguished career to the high and responsible positions of Vice Chief of Naval Operations, 1946–47, and commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, 1948–49. It was my privilege to have known this eminent naval officer.

Though the obituary accounts of his services list many of his important assignments, there is one highly significant contribution to contemporary U.S. history made under his direction, which is known only to those who have delved deeply into interoceanic canal questions, which I have attempted to do.

The tour of Admiral Ramsey as Vice Chief of Naval Operations coincided with the 1946–47 drive for a sea level canal at Panama, which grew out of the hysteria following the advent of the atomic bomb. To aid those conducting the studies for the modernization of the Panama Canal authorized under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, with respect to navigational planning, Admiral Ramsey was a leader in setting up in the Navy Department what is known as the Panama Canal Liaison Organization. An experienced navigator, who had made many transits

of the Panama Canal, and a student of its problems of operation, he strenuously opposed the idea of a canal at sea level as being justified on the alleged basis of hypothetical security and always urged the best operational canal practicable of economic achievement by means of what has become known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan. Also, it should be recorded that when the 1946–47 Naval Isthmian Canal studies were underway, Admiral Ramsey kept in close touch with the leaders in the Congress and high officials of other Government agencies concerned with the canal question, authorizing on various occasions full presentations on the operational aspects of the canal problem.

In order that a suitable record of Admiral Ramsey's distinguished career, as well as his experienced judgment on the Panama Canal modernization question may be suitably recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote the following obituary notice as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1961]

DEWITT CLINTON RAMSEY DEAD; ADMIRAL LED U.S. PACIFIC FLEET—VETERAN OF 37 YEARS RETIRED IN 1949—AVIATION OFFICER COMMANDED THE "SARATOGA"

PHILADELPHIA, September 7.—Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey, former commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, died today in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital at the age of 72.

At his retirement in 1949 he also was High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Admiral Ramsey lived in Washington. He leaves his wife, the former Juanita Holmes of Louisville, Ky.

WAS AVIATOR NO. 45

Admiral Ramsey was an airminded officer during his nearly 40 years of naval service.

He was born in Whipple Barracks in Arizona where his father, an Army captain, was stationed. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1912.

As a midshipman, he ranked high scholastically and won letters in track, baseball, basketball, and football. Soon after being commissioned in 1912 he turned to flying. One of the pioneer aviation officers at the Pensacola Training Station in Florida, he was designated aviator No. 45 in 1947.

During World War I, the future admiral saw duty in France and England in naval aviation, followed by three tours of duty as fleet aviation officer on the staff of commanders in chief of the fleet.

After the second tour he was assigned for 3 years as commanding officer of the training squadron at the Naval Academy. In 1924 he was back in Pensacola, as superintendent of flight training.

He was navigator of the aircraft carrier *Langley* from 1926 to 1928 and later executive officer of the *Wright* and of the carrier *Saratoga*.

Admiral Ramsey completed the senior course at the Naval War College in 1937. He became head of the Plans Division of the Bureau of Aeronautics, and later assistant chief of the bureau during the buildup of American power before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Early in World War II, Admiral Ramsey was commanding officer of the *Saratoga*, which took part in the battles of Coral Sea and Midway and in the first offensive against the Solomon Islands in August 1942.

As a rear admiral, he was Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics from 1943 to 1945, in charge of aircraft design and production. He was then made Chief of Staff of the 5th Fleet, serving under Adm. Raymond A. Spruance until November 1945.

Admiral Ramsey next was deputy commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas until January 1946, and Vice Chief of Naval Operations for the next 2 years. He then filled his final assignment as commander of the Pacific Fleet.

Among his citations and decorations were the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with Gold Star and the Mexican Service Medal. He was also honorary member of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences.

Upon his retirement, Admiral Ramsey was elected president of the Aircraft Industries Association of America, composed of top executives of leading manufacturers of aircraft. He served in this post until 1957. Later he became vice chairman of the association's board of governors.

Berlin Crisis and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include No. 188 in a series of editorials prepared and delivered by Jesse Helms of Raleigh, N.C., expressing the viewpoint of television station WRAL–TV on current issues. This particular editorial is of significance today in view of the current crisis over Berlin. The editorial recalls some recent history which should not be forgotten by those who believe that the free-enterprise system offers the best hope for economic growth. I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress and to all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

This may sound a bit strange, coming from us, but if anybody wants to suggest that free enterprise was at least one of the causes of the current Berlin crisis, we will simply nod in agreement.

What's more, we confess the hope that free enterprise will continue to cause anguish in the Communist camp, just as it has done in Berlin.

It all began 10 years ago, when the West German Government decided to stop taking economic advice from the United States. Instead, the West Germans installed an absolute free enterprise system, in complete disregard for the advice given by so-called economic experts from this country.

As a result, business began to boom in West Germany; it wasn't long before there were more jobs than there were workers; production went up; salaries increased. West Germany enjoyed a boom such as it had never seen before.

Meanwhile, the people of East Berlin continued to struggle along under the controls and restrictions of the socialist regime, controlled by Russia. While the people in West Germany rapidly improved their standard of living—with complete freedom, to boot—the people of East Berlin stood virtually still in their misery.

It wasn't long, of course, before the people in East Berlin saw the light, and began slipping into West Berlin.

Day by day, week by week, month by month, the movement continued, until the Communists in East Berlin were in trouble. A shortage of skilled labor became apparent. Finally it reached the crisis stage. Then was when Khrushchev began to string the barbed wire. He had to use force to stop the flow of humanity into West Berlin.

The Berlin crisis, almost everyone is now agreed, holds little likelihood of war. This Nation has shown its intentions to stand up for the position of the free world. Mr. Khrushchev's bluff has been called.

So, Berlin stands as the modern world's best example of the difference between liberty and virtual slavery, between the free enterprise system and the socialist system of government, operating in East Berlin under the sponsorship of Moscow.

But if we are to benefit from the comparison, or the contrast, we must first understand it ourselves. Ten years ago, this Nation sent a team of economic experts to West Germany to insist that the same sort of governmental system now in operation in East Germany be adopted.

The chairman of that team of experts was Alvin H. Hansen, a professor of economics at Harvard, who had earlier proclaimed that the American Government could preserve its economy only by massive programs of taxation and spending. He offered the same advice to Germany. A top member of that team was Dr. Walter W. Heller, whom President Kennedy recently appointed as Chairman of his own Council of Economic Advisers.

But in 1951, West Germany's Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard was in no mood to continue to accept the sort of advice his government was getting from the United States. He threatened to resign, if he were forced to accept the advice. Therefore, West Germany turned its back on the advice from the United States, and moved forward on a free enterprise program of sound currency, balanced budgets, elimination of government controls, reduction of taxes, and encouragement of private business.

This was one of the most dramatic and successful governmental decisions in history. The story of how Germany emerged from the ruins and ashes of World War II to become the strongest nation in Western Europe is more than a tribute to the initiative and hard work of the people of West Germany; it is all the evidence that any thinking person should need to understand the importance and the potential of the free enterprise system.

But there is an irony in the situation. America, which has economic problems of every description, seems intent upon ignoring what has happened in Germany. Indeed, our President's top economic strategist, Dr. Heller, is the same man whose 1951 policies were repudiated by the West German Government.

It is to be hoped that President Kennedy will grasp the real significance of the Berlin crisis, for West Germany has shown the world not only that it is possible to be free—but that it pays to be free.

Review of Claims in the VA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in my remarks previously, in the RECORDS of September 13 and 18, 1961, page A7197 and A7398, the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs has found the study performed by the law students on VA claims most helpful.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks one individual case in three separate columns to indicate the subject matter involved.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

STATE SERVICE OFFICE,
ST. PETERSBURG VA REGIONAL OFFICE,
February 9, 1961.

Memorandum to Adjudication Division.

As the veteran's accredited representative we are in agreement, in the main, with the facts as stated in the case for appellate review.

We feel, however, that insufficient consideration has been given to the microscopic report of the eye, dated July 31, 1945, which shows chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi, and the probability of existent infection to the eye, which should concede to aggravation.

A. W. KRUEGER,
Assistant State Service Officer.

STATEMENT OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

ISSUE

1. Restoration of service connection for blindness and removal of left eye.

MILITARY MEDICAL RECORDS

December 18, 1942: Entrance examination vision left eye nil, degenerated left eye.

April 9 to 15, 1943; HR tonsilitius acute follicular bilateral.

October 8 to 11, 1943: H febricula mild.

November 5, 1943: Routine classification examination left eye blind; phthisis bulbi, left.

May 19 to June 21, 1945: HR, phthisis bulbi, left, result of old injury incurred when cap exploded and struck in eye. Examination shows gradual change in appearance of iris and gradual recession of eyeball; enucleation done May 24, 1945. Transferred to McGuire General Hospital June 21, 1945.

June 21 to July 9, 1945: HR ophthalmosteris left eye.

July 29, 1945: Discharge examination enucleation O.S. left eye had been injured prior to entering service. Began to give more distress in Iran, therefore it was removed. Form 53–55 discharge shows veteran served EAM ETO leaving United States June 5, 1943, arrival August 26, 1943; departure February 1, 1945, arrival United States, March 12, 1945.

July 31, 1945: Microscopic report of eye shows chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL RECORDS

July 29 1959: VA examination shows enucleation left eye, healthy socket. History of mucous discharge from left eye which clears up in a few days. Anophthalmos left vision right 20/40.

ADJUDICATION ACTIONS

September 17, 1945: Rating by Regional Board No. 4, St. Petersburg, granted service connection with evaluation of 10 percent for residuals of removal left eye with entitlement to statutory award on account of anatomical loss of one eye from July 30, 1945. Rating indicated blindness left on entering service. Begun to give distress in Iran and therefore it was removed. Service connection established by aggravation for removal of left eye.

October 10, 1946: Rating by Regional Board No. 2, Miami, Fla., reviewed case under paragraph 9, Public 182–79C and the 1945 Statute. Confirmed and continued prior rating.

August 2, 1948: Rating by Regional Board No. 2, Miami, Fla., additional clinical records received and rating of October 10, 1946, was confirmed and continued.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS,
April 7, 1961.

Appellant represented by: Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

THE ISSUE

The appeal was timely filed, and is properly before the Board, from the rating action of the regional office at St. Petersburg, Fla., which severed service connection for residuals of removal of left eye. It is contended that the heat and/or sand in Iran aggravated the left eye and necessitated its removal. It is also contended that microscopic report on the eye indicates an active disease of the eye during service.

THE EVIDENCE

(The veteran) served from Deecmber 1942 to July 1945. He was overseas approximately 21 months and departed for the United States in early February 1945. Degeneration and complete loss of vision of the left eye were noted at induction. Left phthisis bulbi was reported in November 1943, when the veteran was examined for reclassification. He was seen at the dispensary in May 1945, and it was reported he had sustained an injury to the left eye at age 7; phthisis bulbi and a band-shaped keratitis were noted; X-ray revealed calcific densities of the left eyeball. During hospitalization later in the same month, it was reported for clinical purposes that since the eye injury there had been a gradual change in the appearance of the iris and recession of the eyeball. Reference was not made to any complaint or symptom of an infectious process or injury of the eye during service. The left eye was enucleated and microscopic examination revealed "chronic keratitis; chronic uveitis; calcified cataract; detachment, gliosis, and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi." At time of discharge from service, the veteran stated that his eye started bothering him in Iran.

A claim for compensation was submitted at time of separation from service. When examined in July 1959 (the veteran) stated that occasionally there was a mucous discharge from the left socket, which cleared within a few days. On examination, the socket appeared healthy.

Service connection was granted for residuals of removal of the left eye, but on later review such action was held to be clearly and unmistakably in error and service connection was discontinued.

THE LAW AND REGULATIONS

Service connection is warranted for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty during active service (38 U.S.C. 310).

38 CFR 3.306 specifies that the usual effects of surgical intervention for correction of a preexisting disability, including a poorly functioning organ, will not be considered to be service connected unless the disability was otherwise aggravated during service. It also specifies that, in determining aggravation, due regard will be given to the places, types, and circumstances of service, with particular consideration being given to combat duty and other hardships of service.

38 CFR 3.105 provides that service connection once granted, may not be severed except on the basis of clear and unmistakable error.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

Degeneration and complete blindness of the eye were noted at induction. The service records contain no reference to the occurrence of any eye disease or injury during service. The phthisis bulbi reported in November 1943 represents a descriptive variation of degeneration noted at induction. The intraocular hemorrhage reported on

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

ISSUE

Restoration of service connection for blindness and removal of left eye.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

September 14, 1959: Rating with jurisdiction review DA letter December 14, 1954, under proposal to sever service connection under VAR 1105(D) for residuals removal of left eye and for statutory award for anatomical loss of left eye. It was held that there was no evidence of superimposed disease, trauma, or other condition referrable to eyes in service and that aggravation was not shown and held that in accordance with old VAR 1063 I service connection was not in order.

June 29, 1960: Administrative review by Director, Compensation and Pension Service, concurred in proposal to sever service connection for residuals for removal of left eye and entitlement to special monthly pension on account of anatomical loss of only one eye.

July 11, 1960: Letter to veteran notified of proposal to serve service connection.

September 23, 1960: Rating by regional board No. 4, PAGRO under VAR 11105A denied service connection for absence left eye.

October 17, 1960: Letter to veteran advising that compensation will be discontinued effective November 1, 1960.

November 7, 1960: Communication from veteran's representative for personal hearing.

October 27, 1960: Statement from veteran 8-4138 stating he was blind when he entered service and at that time eye was almost as large as right eye; that when he returned from overseas the eye had deteriorated so he could only open eyelid halfway and that Captain Rosen suggested removing the eye stating the operation was necessary. Said deterioration caused by execssive heat in Iran. He said he objected to the removal but was advised operation was absolutely necessary for his health's sake.

October 27, 1960: Veteran's representative, VFW, submitted 1-9 appeal, stating that most of veteran's overseas service was in desert country with deterioration of same and requests reinstatement of service connection by aggravation. Hearing was scheduled for December 13, 1960, but veteran did not report for hearing. Scheduled for January 17, 1961. Form 1-646, statement of accredited representative, sets out the facts in the case requesting thorough consideration be given to the question at issue and statement of veteran submitted with appeal.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

microscopic examination was occasioned by the operative procedure; the other findings reported on that examination pertain to chronic conditions resulting from an old injury, and no findings relative to an acute infectious process were reported. The veteran served overseas for approximately 21 months without any pertinent complaint of the eye being reported, other than an examination for reclasification, and did not report to the dispensary for another eye examination until more than 3 months after he departed for return to the United States. In the absence of service trauma or disease, aggravation of an eye disability is determined by the difference in acuity at induction and that existing at discharge, and not by the mere fact that an eye was enucleated during service for some other reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Degeneration with complete loss of vision of the left eye existed prior to service.

2. Microscopic examination in service did not reveal evidence of an active or progressive infection, but did disclose residuals of old traumatic and infectious processes.

3. The absence of the left eye demonstrated during service clearly and unmistakably was the usual result of surgery for correction of a preexisting disability.

4. There clearly and unmistakably was, otherwise, no increase or aggravation of the preexisting disability of the left eye during service.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Service connection for residuals of removal of the left eye was clearly and unmistakably in error, within the meaning of 38 CFR 3.105, and may not be restored.

DECISION

The appeal is denied.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

FINDINGS OF FACT

(1) Induction examination December 18, 1942, revealed claimant veteran was totally blind in the left eye, and that the eye was degenerated.

(2) During service veteran was stationed in Iran from August 1943, to February 1945. There is some opinion evidence of record tending to show that excessive heat in the desert area in which veteran was stationed caused further deterioration of the eye.

(3) Examination May 19, 1945, revealed a gradual change in appearance of the iris and gradual recession of the eyeball. The eye was enucleated May 24, 1945.

(4) Discharge examination July 29, 31, 1945, showed chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi. There is no showing that these conditions are normally incident to a degenerated eye or to enucleation.

(5) Service connection was granted September 17, 1945, with evaluation of 10 percent for residuals of removal of left eye, with entitlement to statutory award on account of anatomical loss of one eye.

(6) VA examination July 29, 1959, revealed enucleation of the left eye, healthy socket. Veteran gave a history of mucous discharge from the left eye which clears up in a few days.

(7) Service connection was severed September 23, 1960. The reason is not specified.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

(1) Veteran's claim is governed by the provisions for wartime disability compensation (38 U.S.C. 101(8), 310).

(2) Since total blindness of the left eye was noted at the time of the induction examination there can be no question of service connection with blindness of that eye, either on a presumptive or factual basis (38 U.S.C. 311). It was manifestly erroneous to grant service connection for purposes of the statutory award for blindness of one eye, since the statute, with respect to loss of one eye, refers only to blindness and not to anatomical loss (38 U.S.C. 314(k). Any other interpretation of this statute would require that it be read so as to refer to "anatomical loss or loss of use of * * * blindness." Since it is absolutely clear from the record that blindness itself did not result from any service connected disability and that blindness of the eye was not itself such a service connected disability, the only question of service connection relates to that disability arising from residual effects of enucleation.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

(3) There is evidence of record indicating that, although the veteran's left eye was degenerated at the time of induction, his service in a desert area caused further deterioration of the eye. In the absence of a specific finding that such further deterioration was due to the normal progress of his condition, this increase in the severity of his disability must be presumed to have been aggravated by service (38 U.S.C. 353; 38 CFR 3.63(1)). It is true that the mere fact of enucleation will not establish aggravation, but since service connection depends in such cases on whether the cause of enucleation was service incurred or aggravated, and since the places of the veteran's service are relevant considerations in determining aggravation, service connection for the cause of enucleation must be conceded even though such service connection for blindness would be erroneous (38 CFR 3.63(1)).

(4) It follows, therefore, that the statutory award for anatomical loss of the left eye was clearly and unmistakably erroneous on these facts, and service connection in this respect was properly severed. But service connection for any residual effects of enucleation itself must be conceded.

Nancy Bean, the Sunshine Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, little or no explanation is needed in connection with the editorial I submit to you today from the September 7, 1961, edition of the Sun Advocate, of Price, Utah.

The faith and courage of this 19-year-old heroine, Miss Nancy Bean, is an example that each of us might well emulate.

This resolute young lady has remained undaunted throughout one crisis after another and has borne pain and disappointment these past 10 years in a fashion not unlike the great Joan of Arc.

My hat is off to Price's "Girl of Courage." I hope and pray that her future will reciprocate with some of the sunshine and happiness she has brought to those who have had the privilege of knowing her.

The editorial follows:

A GIRL OF COURAGE

Price's "Girl of Courage," Miss Nancy Bean, has battled her way through another crisis and is recovering at the home of her mother, Mrs. Catherine Bean, at 1139 South 13th East in Salt Lake City, following 2 months at the L.D.S. Hospital.

The courage label was pinned on Nancy long ago, and on various members of her family who have assisted the 19-year-old girl through 10 long years of fighting a battle for health, following paralysis from her waist through her legs after complications which occurred after a sickness with measles.

Nancy's newest experience included treatment before and after the amputation of both legs which will eventually enable her to sit up again in a wheel chair. For nearly 3 years she was confined to her bed, lying on her stomach and the latest operation will give her more freedom with bodily movement.

Hospital attendants called Nancy "The Sunshine Girl," and her friends locally know that her kind attitude and ready smile could earn that title. Nancy visited other patients to encourage them in their illnesses toward recovery.

Plans for the future include courses at a Salt Lake City high school, a great deal of physical therapy and plenty of determination to become as self-sufficient as possible.

With Nancy and her mother in Salt Lake City is a sister, Miss Annette Bean, who is employed in the city.

Word of Nancy's release from the Salt Lake City hospital was recovered in Price by her grandmother, Mrs. Nettie Sax, who has stood by Nancy through every phase of her long ordeal.

The courage of this youthful girl through her many painful trials and tribulations is a lesson for all of us who sometimes feel the cards are stacked against us just because we suffer setbacks in our business or private lives. Nancy has suffered one setback after another but through it all she has maintained a calm cheerfulness that makes others wonder if they could have withstood the suffering.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the memory of that fine gentleman and esteemed friend, OVERTON BROOKS, whose untimely passing we all regret.

Since coming to Congress, I have had the great honor to serve with OVERTON BROOKS on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. It was here I had an opportunity to observe Mr. BROOKS as a friend, as a Member of Congress, and as a leader of men. In addition to being dedicated to the best interests of the citizens of his district—his first allegiance—he was the first chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee and perhaps the one person most responsible for alerting the Nation and working for a truly effective national space effort.

The people of this country shall be forever indebted to him for the outstanding service he rendered to his Nation. His contribution shall live long after all of us have passed to our eternal reward. And it shall stand as a living monument to OVERTON BROOKS, the man, the friend, and the tireless patriot.

I wish to extend my profound and most heartfelt sympathy to his family on their great loss. His untimely passing will leave a void that will be felt in their home and in the House of Representatives for many years to come.

Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Hon. John E. Horne, recently issued a semiannual report covering SBA's operations for the first 6 months of 1961. This report outlines the increasing role SBA is playing in the economic life of the Nation.

But one section in Mr. Horne's report is alarming. The figures given in that section make possible an opportunity to compare the state of the economy in the small business sector during the first

6 months of 1961 with the similar period in 1960. The following excerpts from the report are quoted in order to show this comparison:

BUSINESS INCORPORATIONS

Figures on business incorporations also provide a measure of small business growth, since about half of all new, and primarily small businesses, choose the corporate form of organization.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., business incorporations were 5 percent lower in the first 5 months of this year than in the same period of 1960. This year, there were 77,600 incorporations; in 1960, there were 81,441.

BUSINESS FAILURES

Business failures, which also relate primarily to small concerns, have continued at a high level. Through the week ended July 13, Dun & Bradstreet reported 9,568 failures this year, compared with 8,356 in the same period of 1960. If failures were to continue at this same rate throughout the remainder of the year, the total would be nearly 18,000. In view of the recent business upturn, this high a total seems unlikely. Nevertheless, the number apparently will be greater than in other year since the end of World War II.

An Arms Control Agency Should Not Be Established at This Critical Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on this bill to establish an Arms Control Agency with concern and deep misgivings as to its real purpose and benefit to our country and to our allies.

The bill proposes that an agency be established with no definite authority or actual responsibility, but to act only in an advisory capacity under the jurisdiction of the President and the Secretary of State.

Arms control for whom? For the United States of America only and for no other nation on earth, including Russia of course.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the U.S. Congress does not and cannot legislate for any other nation on earth, friend or enemy.

True, every nation on earth is willing to accept our dollars by the billion and with few strings attached, but they will control their own armed might, weak or strong, whether we like it or not, which has been proven time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be a party to passing a bill such as this to place another agency between our able, experienced military experts and the President of the United States, present or future. The last April Cuban fiasco should have cured us of delegating additional war or peace recommendations to the State Department, which this bill does in just so many words.

We have the United Nations organization, with headquarters in New York City. That organization was established primarily to keep the world at peace. Russia is a member of the United Nations, and was in 1951. But that did not stop her from marching on Korea. Is anyone nieve enough to believe that they will now follow suit if we pass this bill and that they will make any attempt to control their armed might and even if they agree to do so, why of course they will not, but to the contrary. The Communists will build stronger their armed might, while word will go out to our Western Allies that the United States is actually preparing to reduced its armed might by establishing this so-called Arms Control Agency, and so again, we lose prestige around the world at this critical hour when we should be showing the kind of firmness the American people expect.

Prayer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the hearts of men are filled with the hope and prayer for peace, it is fitting and proper that we invoke the divine guidance and the help of the Prince of Peace. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have secured the permission of the House to include in the RECORD the following prayer for peace, a prayer of the Crusade of Prayer for Peace to be conducted on September 17 to October 29, 1961, under the auspices of the Archdiocese of Washington, with the closing exercises to be held on the Washington Monument grounds on Sunday, October 29, 1961:

PRAYER FOR PEACE

O Divine Savior, who has given us the perfect example of wisdom and simplicity, grant us the wisdom to recognize injustice and untruth in our world today.

We beseech Thee, O Compassionate Redeemer, to give in our time that peace based on justice which the human race has ever sought. Grant consolation to the peoples who groan under the yoke of godless oppressors, and hear their cry for deliverance. Pour forth Thy grace into the hearts of all people, who earnestly and sincerely desire peace, that they may embrace Thy truth and spread its prevading influence over their lands.

We pray especially for our President, that his inspired leadership may give hope to a world threatened daily by war and that the heavy burden of responsibility in these critical days, may not rest too heavily on his shoulders.

We pray for the members of the Cabinet, the Members of Congress and for all who are entrusted with the burden of Government in these days, that they may seek above every other consideration peace with justice in our own country and in every nation.

We earnestly beg Thee, O Prince of Peace, to hasten the coming of that day when all nations will live in harmony under Thy law, and every human being will worship Thee in freedom. These great favors we humbly ask, trusting in Thy goodness, and uniting with those millions who even now courageously suffer for love of Thee and who fervently yearn for the coming of Thy reign of peace. Amen.

Recognition of the Republic of Outer Mongolia Will Outrage Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress is rapidly drawing to a close and I view the coming adjournment with mixed emotions. Like most of my colleagues, I am anxious to return to my home district and State, but if certain events, as prophesied, come to pass during adjournment, I for one, will sincerely regret the final fall of the gavel.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the persistent rumor that the State Department is only awaiting adjournment to put in motion a plan involving diplomatic recognition of the Republic of Outer Mongolia. Recognition of this Russian satellite is of course only a prelude to Outer Mongolian membership in the United Nations.

I understand that Owen Lattimore, whose advice was so helpful to the success of the Communist takeover in China, and who recently returned from an extended visit to Outer Mongolia, has informally reported on his findings to high sources in the Department of State. In this connection, I believe it only fair to assume he has also made informal recommendations.

Remembering that Mr. Lattimore officially recommended in the strongest possible terms recognition of this Communist country only a few short years ago, it is not hard to imagine the nature of his present views on this subject. At that time, he stated that as in the case of the Communist Chinese, the political leaders of these people were actually agrarian reformers and patriots, and in view of the revolutionary beginnings of this country, deserved U.S. understanding and sympathy.

The argument advanced by the Department of State, that we need this listening post in the middle of the Gobi Desert, falls on deaf ears as far as I am concerned. Rather, I would regard diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia as another in a long list of appeasement gestures to an ideology which regards these gestures merely as signs of weakness and is in no way placated by them.

International communism will of course accept every concession the United States is willing to make; concessions, incidentally, which are one-sided. The Communist conspiracy, like the monster it is, has an insatiable appetite for these "giveaways" and its strength is increasingly augmented by every fresh compromise at the conference table.

In the name of commonsense, I urge the State Department architects of this

nefarious plan to reconsider, bearing in mind that those responsible will be held to a strict accounting by an aroused public as well as many Members of Congress, who, like myself, will deeply resent any under-the-table dealings such as this during the coming adjournment.

The Meaning and Purposes of Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa sponsored a speech contest. Miss Ann Lage, a senior at North Scott High School, Eldridge, Iowa, won the top award with her entry entitled "The Meaning and Purposes of Farmer Cooperatives." Because she has done such a good job with this subject and because I think there is some valuable information here that all Members of Congress should know about, I wish to have a copy of her speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE MEANING AND PURPOSES OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

Small children, especially 5-year olds, often have strange conceptions of institutions in the adult world. I can still remember when, as a small girl of 5, I made my first trip to Eldridge. Arriving in Eldridge I became very excited, for before me rose what, to my small eyes, resembled a giant milk carton. Impatiently I tugged at my father to tell me what that was. In the casual manner adults have with children, he replied, "Oh, that's the Co-op."

"Co-op, that's a funny word," I puzzled. But it did sound important, and I was so proud of seeing it that the first thing I did when I got home was to tell my mother that I had seen a co-op. For many months after that, every tall building I saw was a co-op.

Of course that oversized milk carton I had seen was our local cooperative elevator. However, in seeing the elevator, had I really seen the co-op? Is the elevator itself the cooperative? Behind the elevator are aims and purposes that make it more than just another place of business and different from the corporation.

In most business corporations the operation of the plant for profit, is the sole purpose of the business. However, in a cooperative the plant is just the instrument used by the cooperative to carry on its aims and purposes. Cooperatives can be distinguished from privately owned enterprise by this and other features.

The first successful consumer cooperative was started in Rochdale, England, in 1844, by a group of 28 poor weavers who saved $140 for the purpose in establishing their store they adopted certain basic principles, today called the Rochdale principles. Their ideas proved so successful that they have served as a guide for cooperatives ever since. These principles are:

1. Anyone may join.

2. Each member has only one vote regardless how many shares he owns. In private companies, owners vote according to the amount of stock they hold. In cooperatives all members have an equal voice.

3. Goods and services are sold at the going market prices. This makes for fair competition with private business.

4. When all expenses are paid, the profits are returned to the members in proportion to their patronage in the form of patronage refunds or dividends.

To clearly understand the meaning and purposes of cooperatives we must first understand these basic principles.

There are many types of cooperative organizations that use these principles. When people join together to buy goods for their own use, they form consumers' cooperatives. When farmers unite to sell what they raise, they have a marketing cooperative. If they unite to buy needed farm supplies such as feed, seed, and fertilizer, they have a purchasing cooperative.

Although each one of these cooperatives has its specific purpose, there are basic purposes that apply to all cooperatives. Their basic purpose is to jointly carry out certain of the members business activities so the members can operate their own businesses more effectively.

A further purpose is to enable the members to provide for themselves, at their own expense and risk, certain goods and services essential to conducting their own private business. Many of these essential services are ordinarily provided by "middle men" or dealers. Naturally these people are interested making a personal profit from the service they render.

Cooperatives enable the members to provide the services for themselves, under their own control. The additional expenses that usually go to the middleman as his profit, now becomes the profit of the cooperative. At the end of the year these profits are returned to the farmer in proportion to his patronage of the cooperative. Doing this enables the member to carry on his own business with more profit.

This brings out another of the main objectives of cooperatives. Their purpose is not to operate a business firm for profit to itself, but to operate a firm that will reduce the expenses or increase the net income of its members.

In defining the purposes of cooperatives, they can in some respects, be compared to the United Nations. The United Nations is an association of countries united for a common purpose—world peace. The countries join voluntarily and retain their sovereignty. The United Nations hold on its members and they are free to withdraw at any time. The purpose of the United Nations was not to take over control of countries, but to help them have a fair advantage in world affairs.

Like the United Nations, cooperatives are also associations of sovereign members, united for a common purpose. In this instance the purpose is to strengthen the economic position of the members. Like the United Nations, cooperatives do not take over control of their members' private business, for the purpose of cooperatives again, is not to operate a new business solely for profit, but to give members larger returns from their present business through the patronage of the cooperative.

In our fast moving modern economy of big business and industry, the lone farmer is caught between the rising cost of operation and the lowering of farm prices. The individual farmer is a small unit when compared with the powers of big business. Alone against such forces he is unable to improve his situation, for he lacks their strength and bargaining power. His earnest plea for his fair share of the consumer's dollar goes unheard.

Aesop said, "Unity gives strength." One other purpose of cooperatives is to unit farmers in their common cause and give them the strength needed to gain their deserved higher place on America's economic scale. By united action through coops, farmers gain the advantage of collective bargaining and their demands are given strength.

"United we stand—divided we fall." When John Dickenson wrote that phrase in the "Liberty Song" in 1768, he meant it in relation to the thirteen colonies and their struggle with Britain for freedom. Today that same phrase may well be applied to the American farmer and his struggle for existence. As I have said, alone the individual farmer has very little power and will inevitably fall. However, when firmly united in cooperatives, following the purposes I have outlined, they gain the strength to withstand the forces pushing them out of business.

The purposes of cooperatives are manifold, and they all serve to give the members a united stand in increasing the gains from their individual businesses.

Commendation to Ellis J. Pickett and St. George Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. George, Utah, recently celebrated a very successful centennial under the expert guidance of General Chairman Ellis J. Pickett and his most efficient committee comprising A. K. Hafen, A. Karl Larson, H. L. Reid, Neida Hutchings, Vernon Worthen, Mary Phoenix, and Charles M. Pickett.

This distinguished group—at great personal sacrifice and effort—planned and prepared a celebration that will always be cherished by the people of St. George and the throngs of former residents and visitors who returned to see and visit friends and loved ones. Mr. Pickett and his committee deserve only the highest commendation and I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to them.

It was impossible for me to mention each and every person who contributed to the establishment and progress of St. George in my original remarks before the House on August 28, 1961. To be sure, many of the people who were the very backbone of the community are unsung heroes—history has failed to record their valuable presentations of public service.

One such frontiersman was Brigham Jarvis who was associated with the history of irrigation from the time he reached St. George in 1861 and found a deep swamp between the south end of the east black ridge and the Virgin River. Later he developed this swamp into a farm and rolled down the rushes and washed in sand with the water from the Virgin Ditch, preparing the way for the road and doing away with a breeding place for mosquitoes.

Brigham Jarvis, the promoter of the project known as Jarvis Ditch, was an untiring worker in the various irrigation

projects of that area. Under his administration as a councilman, history records, work was begun and completed on Cottonwood Ditch. He and the mayor were named to select a route from the gulch to the city. By the end of his term as councilman, the work was completed and the water entering the valley over the red hill to the north. This provided a water supply for the establishment of a city water system later; a system equaled by few and surpassed by none.

To the fathers of St. George—past and present—I rise in respectful appreciation and commendation.

Understanding More Important Than Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by Ralph W. Loew which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 18, 1961, entitled "Understanding More Important Than Popularity."

I wholeheartedly subscribe to Mr. Loew's theory that people today are too much concerned with being popular rather than understanding the basic mission of mankind. He gives us much food for thought in his article which follows:

UNDERSTANDING MORE IMPORTANT THAN POPULARITY

(By Ralph W. Loew)

TRAPPED

Have we been trapped by our desire to be liked? We Americans especially demonstrate this trait, as though we were insecure and needed to satisfy our hunger for applause. Our public relations experts develop methods by which our laudable qualities can be properly cataloged and praised. Newcomers to our country are eagerly asked how they like us, and we await the compliments as though we were little children yearning for praise.

Foreign aid too frequently is debated on the basis of how many friends such assistance will bring to us instead of carefully examining the needs to be met. We want to be understood.

In this kind of a world crisis it isnt necessary to be understood. It is necessary to understand.

DO WE UNDERSTAND?

Think of the tawdry confessions of naive embezzlers, listen to the poignant stories of young people involved in gambling episodes, hear the explanations of the deeds of youthful rioters or their elders who do nothing and in almost every instance there will be a haunting question. "You do understand, don't you?"

In the current nuclear crisis too many official statesmen have been justifying the resumption of the testing on the ground that this necessity has been forced. So the Communists say in effect, "If you understand us as people of peace you would understand what we are doing." To which a startled and shocked world can only ask, "Do any of us really understand to the full what we are really doing?"

THEY UNDERSTOOD

Now look for a moment at the prophet Amos. He didn't care a fig for popularity. He had a burning message and he was a man with a mission. He stood before the authorities of his day, condemning their rottenness, and pointed them to righteousness.

Or here is John the Baptist. He lived in a time when he saw the rulers winking at morality and defiling all that he knew was the way of righteousness. This he wanted men to understand.

Jesus was able to say with utter candor, "I am not mad. I am honoring My Father and you are trying to dishonor Me. But I am not concerned with My own glory; there is One whose concern it is, and He is the true Judge." There was a fact to be understood; beyond this it wasn't necessary to be understood.

WINNING FRIENDS

Robert Louis Stevenson who knew much about loneliness and kept his personal integrity unsullied could write, "To do anything not because the thing is good or kind or honest in its own right but because others are doing it, is to resign all moral control and captaincy upon yourself and go post haste to the devil with the greatest number."

Perhaps this has been our problem. We've wanted to win friends and influence people. We thought that we could do it by pretense, tricks of the trade, slick-paper advertisements. Sometimes that seems to work. Most of the time it boomerangs. It only tricks ourselves. Then when a man hardly knows who he is, he suddenly feels lonesome, wondering whether anything has been worth while at all.

POPULARITY DRUG

It's nice to be admired. It's fun to be applauded. It's satisfying to be appreciated. It's rough to be criticized. Yet the worst fate of all would be that of throwing away God-given opportunities in the search for truth and a righteous peace, simply because we were absorbed with the narcotic of being popular.

We really aren't in the world to be loved; we are here to love.

We really aren't here to be served; we are here to serve.

We really don't need to be understood; it is utterly important that we understand.

History of Vending in the United States: 75th Anniversary of the Industry—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the fourth and concluding part of "A Concise History of Vending in the U.S.A.," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of Vend, the magazine of the vending industry, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of vending in this country, is herewith presented to my colleagues in the House:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING

Canteen went into candy vending with a nonselective magazine built by Fairchild Manufacturing Co., Kalamazoo, Mich. Later, Canteen contracted with Blue Bird Manufacturing Co., Kansas City, for 4,000 nonselective candy venders. For a time, Canteen sold only the candy bars then produced by Curtiss Candy Co. But, as Leverone recalled, "people just got tired of eating candy made by the same manufacturer. So we went to Hershey, but Hershey refused to sell us at first because he said he didn't want to get us into financial trouble." Hershey Chocolate Co. had attempted its own vending operation in the 1920's but regarded the business as a failure. Certainly the Hershey-owned Chocolate Vending Co. was losing money when Leverone and Hershey executives talked.

William F. R. Murrie, then president of the Hershey company, was the man who suggested that Leverone build a candy machine which would offer customers a choice of bars. Canteen went to International Register Co. whose chief engineer, Ed Richmond, later vice president of Automatic Canteen Co. of America, designed a five-column machine with a capacity of 60 bars. The selective candy vender set a pattern in the vending industry as well as launched Canteen on its way to a multi-million-dollar vending organization.

During the early 1930's, manufacturers and operating organizations were formed in the Middle West in great numbers: National Rejectors was organized in St. Louis to make coin rejectors; National Vendors began production of a nine-selection candy machine; Coan Manufacturing, started in Chicago and later moved to Madison, Wis., built a successful "endless chain" candy vender. In 1931, Automatic Sales Co. of New York installed periodical vending machines in some 75 eastern cities. These were used by Curtis Publishing Co. to vend the Saturday Evening Post and Ladies' Home Journal, but gradually the machines were withdrawn because of mechanical defects and high operating costs.

That same year, 1931, N. Robert Harvey, who had been in the grocery business in Pennsylvania, installed a battery of vending machines in a room of the main floor of the Beaux Arts Apartments in Manhattan. Harvey called his battery the Delamat (delivers automatically), and his idea was to provide the apartment house residents with a 24-hour delicatessen. The insertion of a coin and the turn of a knob started an electric motor which brought the displayed item down to a delivery window by means of a flat tray attached to a conveyor chain. The machines held 30 different items in cans, glass jars, cartons, and paper bags, and included such staples as coffee, sugar, canned vegetables, fruit, and ginger ale, always a big seller in this prohibition period. Harvey installed a vending mechanism in the box of a General Electric refrigerator to vend such foods as butter, eggs, packaged lamb chops, steak, and squab. This was the first attempt to refrigerate and vend foodstuffs. The project failed when Harvey found the operation unprofitable.

One year later, using a general purpose merchandise vender built by the National Sales Machine Co. of St. Louis, another attempt at apartment house vending was undertaken in Los Angeles. This early take-home vending project was the idea of Charles O. Johnson, a distributor for the St. Louis company. Johnson called his venture the Automatic Commissary. The machine he used vended nickel and dime items which were held in tiers in a series of six vertical compartments. The merchandise was protected by a shutter or door which covered the face of each compartment. A glassed section displayed a sample of the item offered in the compartment. When a coin was inserted and the operating handle pulled, the shutter dropped down to expose the compartment in one tier. Johnson's automatic commissary utilized seven of the national units, four stocked with canned goods, one with bakery products, two with

bottled beverages. The automatic commissary included a cigarette and a candy bar vending machine. The automatic commissary failed because it could not provide change, housewives found the 10-cent sizes of grocery items uneconomical, and because the machines were unable to compete with odd-penny pricing in the grocery stores.

While the automatic commissary was a failure, another west coast venture, launched in 1931, successfully opened a new facet of vending. M. T. Zeigler, general manager of the Central Ice & Cold Storage Co., Los Angeles, hit upon the idea of combining two new merchandising trends, packaging and vending, to give new life to his ice business. Zeigler's plan, known as Serv-Ice, had 25-pound cakes of ice sealed in wax-coated manila paper. The ice was trucked to big outdoor vending stations (12 feet high and 8 feet square) where they retailed at 15 cents. The first of these outdoor ice vending stations was installed in Los Angeles in July 1931. By the end of 1932, Zeigler had 24 Serv-Ice machines in operation in Los Angeles and San Diego. Variations of the ice vending device were being built in Maryland, Texas, and by other manufacturers in California including that built by S. & S. Vending Machine Co., San Jose, established in 1932 by two engineers, Leslie Scott and Ernest Smith.

Always a hotbed of invention, California witnessed the first attempt to clean clothes automatically. A machine called the Val-A-Vac was built in San Francisco in 1932. Nickel-operated, it incorporated an electric vacuum which its inventor said would pull the dust and dirt from clothes and hats. It was supposed to be used in restrooms and for service on Pullman cars, but at that time it failed to displace the old-fashioned whisk-broom. Not until the 1960's would coin-operated drycleaning establishments, a sophisticated extension of the Val-A-Vac idea, come into their own.

With the country deep in the throes of the depression in 1934, Chicago's Lincoln Park Zoo was the test site for the first self-contained, cup-type soft drink vending machine. The machine was designed and built by Leslie Arnett, who earlier had many years' experience in the soda fountain field. Arnett also developed the self-contained fountain carbonator which was to revolutionize the manual service of individual cold drinks. After testing and revising his drink machine during the summer of 1934, Arnett placed it permanently for public use in a W. F. Monroe Cigar Store in Chicago during April 1935. In 1936, the group with which Arnett worked formed the Vendrink Co., and so began an entirely new phase of the vending industry. In 1937, the Vendrink machine was taken over by Stewart & McGuire, Inc. When Stewart & McGuire stopped building the unit in 1939, it was taken over by a group headed by C. Russel Feldman, who organized the Frigidrink Corp. in New York. This group had the machine redesigned and built by Brunswick-Balke-Callender Co.

In 1936, J. P. Seeburg Co., Chicago, brought out its Masterdrink, a single-flavor, 200-cup capacity machine similar to the Vendrink. This machine was sold in 1938 to Spacarb, organized that year as a Delaware corporation to operate vending machines on a large scale. In 1937–38, Bally Manufacturing Co., Chicago, produced the first practical premix cup drink vender which dispensed the drinks from tanks already carbonated. Meantime, in 1937, W. W. Bowman of Dallas, Tex., had developed the Frostidrink machine, first as a single flavor machine then as a two-drink vender. Spacarb became interested in the Frostidrink, and in 1939 and 1940 had about 20 three-selection drink venders built. Later, Spacarb acquired Frostidrink, and still later Spacarb was acquired by Rowe which in turn was acquired by Automatic Canteen.

While the vending companies in the early and middle 1930's were concentrating on developing candy and cigarette vending, the big sirup producers, notably The Coca-Cola Co., were encouraging their bottlers to enter bottled soft drink vending. An ex-real-estate man, Elmer F. Pierson, and three associates, formed The Vendo Co. in Kansas City in 1936 to market a vending top for existing reach-in Coca-Cola coolers. By the time production of bottled drink machines was halted in 1942, tens of thousands of bottled soft drink machines were a familiar sight in service stations, grocery stores and other outlets. In 1938, Coca-Cola purchased a number of cup drink machines from Spacarb and secured a limited license from Spacarb on certain cup machine patents.

Considerable controversy raged in those days just before World War II between the proponents of cup drink machines which served only one kind of drink and proponents of machines to serve two or three different selections. In the thick of the battle in those days, as might be expected, were the major sirup companies who—like Curtiss Candy and Hershey Chocolate a decade earlier—saw all kinds of possibilities in vending machines which were exclusive outlets for their particular brands.

In 1938 Beverage Dispensers introduced a new single drink cup machine designed by Carl Hollinger who had been with Vendrink. This machine developed into the Thirst Quencher. In 1939, Albert Cole organized the Coledrinx Co. in Chicago to build a single-flavor, postmix vender with a capacity of 350 cups. Sodamat Co. built a self-contained machine which failed to reach the market. Snead & Co., Jersey City, saw the Sodamat machine and began developing its own machine which reached the market in October 1940. Snead built 110 machines, about 70 of which went to Automatic Canteen, when the Government on April 30, 1942, ordered that all production of coin-operated machines be halted.

The 1930's were productive years which laid the groundwork for the tremendous expansion of the vending industry following World War II. Many of the developments of the thirties had to await the conclusion of the war to come into their own. The coin-operated laundry store is a good example. During the depression, it was common for some appliance dealers and utilities to attach coin metering devices to such major appliances as stoves and washing machines. When the user deposited coins to operate the device, he automatically made the payments which some day in the distant future would make the appliance his own. A few enterprising entrepreneurs discovered they could attach coin meters to washing machines, place the machines in apartment houses, and get a good return on their investment. Then, in 1936 in Buffalo, N.Y., an Easy washing machine dealer named Lars Hedstrom hit upon the idea of putting a number of coin-operated washing machines in a single store. He called his store the Launder-Ur-Own Station, and thus gave rise to a whole new kind of automatic service business.

During the 1930's it was likewise established that the vending operating company was an integral and essential component of the industry. Until the late 1920's, although there were numerous attempts to start organizations which resemble the modern operating company, vending machine manufacturers often as not sold their creations direct to the outlets where they were to be used. Not, indeed, until the operating company became a well-established factor did the business of manufacturing vending machines settle down and develop along substantial and profitable lines.

The necessity for presenting a solid front against legislative attacks caused a dozen vending industry leaders to meet in New York on September 14, 1936. At the conclusion of that meeting, National Automatic Merchandising Association had been formed with six of the dozen men present as the association's charter members: W. G. Fitz-Gerald, International Ticket Scale Co.; W. R. Fowler, F. & W. Products Co.; Robert Z. Greene, Rowe Manufacturing Co.; Nathaniel Leverone, Automatic Canteen Co. of America; E. V. Morava, Mills Automatic Merchandising Co., and A. Schlafler, Peerless Weighing & Vending Co. Present also was Clinton S. Darling, a professional trade association manager, who was to become the association's first manager and to guide it for the next quarter century.

When the War Production Board suspended the manufacture of vending machines in April 1942, the vending industry consisted for all practical purposes of machines to vend candy, cigarettes, gum, and soft drinks. The manufacturers of vending machines turned to the production of material for the Armed Forces, while the operating companies, numbering less than 3,000, struggled to keep going. Then as the war effort deepened, the challenge to the operating companies was intensified: Industrial plant managements, who had been at best tolerant of vending before, suddenly discovered that the vending machine was an invaluable tool for keeping workers on the job. Where once industrial management had feared the installation of vending machines would cause workers to dawdle on the job, they found men and women could work 10, 12, or longer hours at the job if they were refreshed occasionally with a candy bar or a soft drink. The demand for vending services was more than the industry could satisfy, either with machines or merchandise. This condition persisted throughout the war and after it.

After the war, the cycle of invention and promotion so characteristic of vending's very early days repeated itself. Perfume and cologne machines came on the market with considerable fanfare. A machine was introduced which vended ice cream cones. Shoe shine machines, invented many years earlier, were hailed as a brand new creation but failed to win acceptance when customers found their hose liberally covered with polish intended for the shoes.

In Chicago, Bert Mills, with a shock of gray hair now, but still as astonished by vending as he had been years ago when he was a schoolboy, brought out a machine which served coffee automatically in a cup. In Philadelphia, two young ex-servicemen, Floyd Rudd and K. C. Melikian, formed a company to make and operate a hot coffee vending machine they had invented and perfected. All of this was in 1946 and 1947, and at first a good many old hands at vending refused to take Rudd, Melikian, or Mills seriously. But the public did, and coffee vending was born. Then in the early fifties, Leslie Arnett, who put that first self-contained cold cup drink machine in Lincoln Park Zoo, unveiled the first vending machine which made coffee from coffee grounds rather than liquid concentrate or instant dry ingredients.

Nathaniel Leverone had his picture taken at Midway Airport in 1946 alongside of a new electronic marvel: A machine built by General Electric which would cook before your eyes a hot dog and deliver it so hot you couldn't hold it. The machine didn't work out. But the imagination of dozens of inventors and thousands of operators was captured and the industry began thinking seriously of vending complete meals.

In St. Louis and in Rockford, Ill., at National Rejectors and at ABT Manufacturing, engineers were struggling with mechanisms which would accept and identify and make change for paper currency. By 1960, the paper money changemaker would be a practical fact. Literally hundreds of small manufacturing companies came into being between 1945 and 1955, and some made lasting contributions to the industry. Eastern Electric, for example, which introduced in 1946 the first electrically actuated console cigarette vending machine and was subsequently sold to the Seeburg Corporation.

Refrigeration and heat were added to vending machines so that hot and cold foods could be vended. Coin mechanisms were perfected so that machines could accept all popular denominations. Changemakers were introduced—first as service machines, then built in as part of the machine itself until the changemaker is now a standard piece of equipment on most major vending machines.

In 1946, total vended volume amounted to $600 million. By 1960, this had grown to $2,586 million. The number of operating companies had increased from 3,500 in 1946 to 6,250 in 1960.

The improvements and inventions which always moved vending ahead continued: The multi-selection cigarette machine was built to accommodate the vastly changed preferences in cigarette brands. Apco revolutionized the cup-drink business with a machine which not only served the drink automatically but added ice as well. Wittenborg, a Danish firm, introduced the all-purpose vending machine to the U.S. industry, and the door was opened for vending batteries to replace mobile carts, snack counters and manual cafeterias in thousands of industrial plants, office buildings, colleges, and similar outlets.

As the business grew, it changed. Manufacturing companies, once family-owned enterprises, usually run by the inventive genius who started the company, merged with one another and marketed their stock to the public. Operating companies, who began the forties offering their customers one or two product lines, diversified so that they offered the customer a complete vending service. As they moved into automatic food service, some moved also into manual catering, or merged with established catering organizations or brought out catering organizations.

In 1946 the Automatic Canteen Co. had its stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the first vending company so listed. Then ABC Vending was formed and its stock was marketed publicly. Many major vending companies, operating organizations as well as manufacturers, now sell their stock through the exchanges or over the counter.

Vending had come a great long way since Thomas Adams installed his gum machines on the el platforms in New York City in 1888.

But the shape of things to come, the new applications of the vending principle are almost as big and broad as they were in Adams' day: Automatic restaurants and drive-ins for the public as well as many more automatic cafeterias for industry and institutions; automatic departments in grocery stores and drugstores, perhaps fully automatic stores or store branches in outlying areas; apartment house vending, a practical fact now with milk, perhaps extended tomorrow to other food lines. Each day, the vending machine provides needed services for millions of people. And each day the level of public confidence in the idea of vending is heightened and strengthened providing that necessary ingredient of public acceptance which stimulates growth and expansion.

Edward Clayton Sherman, 1877–1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many leaders of note in the field of engineering have lived in my native State of Pennsylvania, including some who made important contributions in the design and building of the Panama Canal.

Among these was Edward Clayton Sherman, who was born January 11, 1877, at Kingston, Mass., and died on February 28, 1961, at Tyrone, Pa.

A vignette of him by Benton MacKaye, published in the September 1961 issue of the monthly Bulletin of the celebrated Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C., supplies concisely stated facts that could have been written only by one who knew Sherman and his background well.

The great work of Sherman's engineering career was the design of the Gatun and Miraflores spillways, key structures of the Panama Canal.

Arriving in the Canal Zone in 1909 as the result of an offer and appointment by Chief Engineer George W. Goethals, Sherman devoted all his tremendous capacity to his assigned tasks of designing these two major features in the canal project. Though he arrived on the isthmus later than other designers, he finished first and departed to take up other tasks, and thus became one of the unsung heroes of the Panama Canal.

Among the young engineers who worked under him was William R. McCann of Hopewell, Va., who supervised the installation of the machinery to operate the spillway gates at Gatun.

The spillways designed by Sherman have now been tested by nearly half a century of intensive operation, which has included periodic floods of the Chagres River, and have proved eminently satisfactory.

The vignette follows:

EDWARD CLAYTON SHERMAN, 1877–1961

(By Benton MacKaye)

"So you are joining our family, are you?"

These, the first words I ever heard from Ed Sherman, were said to me one late September afternoon in 1895 in Cambridge, Mass. Such his warm welcome to the ample mansion of No. 1 Berkeley Street: here my family was joining his for a sojourn together during the coming winter. They were five: father, mother, daughter, two sons; we were three: self, mother, and sister. I recall just how Ed looked: a smiling 6 feet of him; beside him another 6 feet of smiling elder brother.

It was classic Cambridge of the mid-Gay Nineties—twilight of the heyday of the interwar period, with the noncognizant 60's far behind and the unsuspicioned Spanish War ahead. So when Ed showed up at the Cosmos Club 3 years ago it was like a transfer to a sphere where life was life and not a crisis. Berkeley Street, short and shaded, hard by the "Washington Elm," was typical of time and town. Along it there strolled leisurely together, on that salubrious afternoon, President Eliot and Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Later on we would see, of nights, the cab of historian John Fiske returning him to his home at the farther end of the street.

I was preparing to enter Harvard the next year. Ed was already in MIT. So we were quasi-college mates. But our main contact was that of the family circle. Our two stocks, plus some close friends (including my brother Percy at Harvard), made a sort of spontaneous club. Indeed, we so dubbed ourselves—the "Tactless Club."

It was the day of charades. Home life was still biologic. Gadget worship was yet unknown; not even a radio to usurp conversation. Buttons were pressed to shed light but not laugh. Laughter was impulse and not import; and it was our winter's main occupation. Fun was a potent force and not a pickled article. About once a fortnight we'd put on a home show. I recall Ed imitating the antics of a then renowned baseball pitcher (Andy Highlands of the Harvard Varsity); his long arms swinging the winding up whirls; his long legs outstretched, first one and then the other; his head cocked at first base; and then the climactic throw at the diamond.

I could give more but space forbids. It was off and on that I'd see Ed during the last pentad of the century. He would visit my room in college, and we'd take long walks together in the then real rural outskirts of old Cambridge.

His first job after graduation in 1898 was up on the St. Lawrence, wherefrom he'd return and recount his doings. From this experience he got an early look-in on the then far-future (now extant) Great Waterway. Later he had a real hand in the other continental surgery—at Panama. But I cannot relate, at firsthand, his engineering experience. Not since college had I seen him long enough for a real talk till 3 years ago. Then in a few brief meals we endeavored to cover the decades. Ed's daughter, Mrs. John W. Newlin, of Tyrone, Pa., sends a thorough account of her father's career. Here are the highpoints:

In 1877 (Jan. 11): Born at Kingston, Plymouth County, Mass. (With him I visited his old home there, imbibing the spirit of the famed South Shore and "Maritime Massachusetts.") He was son of Eben and Lucy (Burgess) Sherman.

In 1898: Graduated from MIT, bachelor of science in civil engineering. After St. Lawrence, assistant engineer, Charles River Basin Commission, designing works that now compass the famous enterprise of the Charles River Basin. (I recall his telling me about this. It was before either of us could see ahead far enough to appreciate the significance of this project in future American metropolitan planning.)

In 1907: Married Katharine Buck, of Bramwell, W. Va., daughter of Stuart M. Buck, a prominent mining engineer and mine operator.

In 1909: With the Isthmian Canal Commission. Of this Mrs. Newlin writes: "The offer and appointment came from Col. George W. Goethals, chairman and chief engineer, and was especially complimentary to Mr. Sherman's ability as it had not been sought or applied for by him. He was placed in charge of the designs of the Gatun and Miraflores spillway dams and was located at Culebra, C.Z.

In 1912: Returned to Boston and entered private practice, including work for two important commissions—Merrimack Valley Waterways and Massachusetts Railroad. Became first editor of the Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers.

In 1917: With the U.S. entrance in World War I, in Navy Department, designing engineer, Bureau of Docks and Yards, Washington. Promoted to project manager, wherein he continued until retirement in 1936.

In 1918: Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve Force. Later given the Silver Star citation by the Secretary of the Navy. Decorated also with the French Medal, Officer de l'Instruction Publique.

After retirement (1936) continued residence in Washington, with much traveling in Europe, United States, and Canada. During World War II took active part in naval service and on rationing board.

In 1952: Mrs. Sherman died. Edward moved to Tyrone, Pa.

In 1961 (February 28): Edward died in Tyrone, at the home of Mrs. Newlin (1400 North Avenue). Mrs. Newlin writes: "He is survived also by one son, Edward C. Sherman, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., and by seven grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Interment was in the National Cemetery, Arlington, Va. Mr. Sherman was a member of the Cosmos Club in Washington (October 7, 1918). He was a Fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers."

Ed was not among "the brass," or among many of the headlines. Headlines were made by such as "St. Lawrence," "Charles River Basin," and "Panama." When reading these one wonders who are the men behind them. One of them was Edward Sherman.

Chickens Do Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of 1960 and early in 1961 we heard a great deal about getting America moving, when many were of the opinion it had not slowed to the extent pictured. The one thing which definitely has moved—upward—is our national debt.

An editorial which appeared in the September 18 issue of the Wall Street Journal agrees in retrospect with doubts raised in my mind and expressed on numerous occasions when the housing, depressed areas, and minimum wage bills were under discussion. The most rabid proponent would probably admit—secretely—that the silver lining has not appeared to the degree anticipated.

Assuming the following editorial is correct, I can at least say, "I told you so":

ON GETTING MOVING

Of the many explanations being offered for the Kennedy program's decidedly mixed performance in Congress, it seems to us the most persuasive is simply that the White House misjudged the temper of the times.

Here was an energetic young President who had campaigned on a pledge to "get America moving," surrounded by eager young men presumably full of ideas about that motion, supported by majorities of his own party in both Houses of Congress. Not surprisingly a lot of people expected to see a flurry of legislative activity reminiscent of Franklin Roosevelt's first Congress. Yet the upshot, as the 87th Congress trudges toward the end of its first session, is something far less sensational.

To be sure, Congress, gave Mr. Kennedy some of the highly dubious things he asked. Apart from relatively noncontroversial military spending boosts, his notable successes were the housing, depressed-areas and minimum-wage bills.

These were no victories for the Nation. The wildly extravagant, hodgepodge housing measure is, among other evils, inflationary. The depressed-areas bill can be expected to have results contrary to those ostensibly intended. The minimum wage increase and expansion of coverage is causing fresh unemployment. Along with some lesser projects, the housing and depressed-areas laws add to the deficits, debt and inflationary danger which are so rapidly burdening the Nation.

Still, these actions, damaging as they are, are not dramatic new departures; rather they are expansions of programs already in existence or long under discussion. Where the President signally failed to achieve his aims, as Mr. Novak observed in an article on this page recently, was in his attempts to wrest prerogatives from Congress and in his attempts to take the country into new and unexamined ventures.

Thus Congress refused to abandon to the President its responsibility for annual appropriations, in this case for foreign aid. Congress refused to transfer to the executive branch its responsibilities in the field of farm policy.

And Congress refused to sanction some of the more extreme Kennedy proposals for moving the Government into new areas of control—in particular the program for compulsory medical care of the aged, an item of unimagined scope, and the sweeping school-aid bill, so costly in terms of money and loss of local discretion.

Now it would seem plain that if Congress shared Mr. Kennedy's campaign view of the dismal state of the Nation, it would be prepared to do almost anything he said was necessary to get moving. But how could any sensible person, in or out of Congress, conclude that the American economy of 1961, the envy of the world, was in some kind of desperate shape?

Anyway, what did the administration have to offer in the way of remedies for such ills as exist? Nothing but the worn-out prescriptions of the thirties: More Government spending, more Government control. It seems that the bright young men in Washington today are not, after all, full of bright new ideas.

Inevitably, a distrust of such simple solutions has been developing in the country over the years. There has been a growing realization that the springs of economic growth and sound prosperity lie not in Government but in the freest exercise of individual choice, and that this trend toward constantly extending the blanket of Government is not a liberating development, but a stultifying one. This revulsion against the Federal solution for everything has been reflected in the mood of the present session.

Congress, we believe, has little reason to be proud of those actions producing more spending and statism. But at least Congress has displayed some ability to stop, look, and listen. And when one weighs the Kennedy program against the congressional result, it is clear that the country could be moving in much worse ways.

A Peace Corps in Reverse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the National Review of September 23, 1961, contains the following item which I am sure provides not only a workable, but also a worthwhile plan:

A PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE?
(By David N. Rowe)

The Peace Corps, reputedly a pet project of President Kennedy's inner circle adviser Walt W. Rostow, plans to send considerable numbers of American teachers, technicians, etc., to work in foreign countries during the next several years. These individuals, recruited from the ranks of recent graduates, will be briefly trained in the United States in the language and cultural background of the host nation. Once abroad, they will be required to live and work as close to the level of the local population as possible, although just how this will be done in each area has yet to be seen. This scheme, depend on it, will cost a great deal of money.

The hoped-for results of the Peace Corps could be achieved at much less expense and with far greater efficiency by other means. For the talent is available in the persons of the many foreign students who have been brought here since the war to be trained in just the skills and techniques the Peace Corps is meant to provide. There are literally thousands of these trainees here. Only a few have returned home at the conclusion of their course of study to help their countries achieve cultural, economic, and political advances.

FOREIGN STUDENTS STAY HERE

To understand what this means to their countries of origin we must remember that the students who have come here from Asia and, with increasing frequency today, from Africa, are the intellectual cream of their societies. Competition for education is very sharp, the academic discipline in many Asian countries very severe, and the graduates, whatever the character of their curricula, do represent the very highest levels of qualifications available.

It is usually the ambition of the overwhelming majority of these graduates to go abroad for further study. So by allowing most of these trainees to stay here we are depriving their countries of their best intellectual resources. Asian students are naturally attracted by the high standard of living in the United States. In addition, they have found that they can successfully compete with Americans for jobs. American research and educational institutions, hospitals, business and technical enterprises are glad to employ them. With the aid of friendly and interested Americans these foreign students are able to circumvent laws which require their return home. This is not too difficult. The student may simply not conclude his study program. He will, for example, encounter delays in completing a dissertation. Time limits for completion of graduate work are not enforced in many graduate schools. Some students enlist the sympathy and assistance of their professors, many of whom are anxious to keep them on as research workers.

The student from abroad can also marry an American girl, and thus place a real obstruction against the rules requiring his departure. His position is still stronger if he has a child born in this country who under our laws is entitled to American citizenship. Other students, less in demand in the professions, simply go underground, taking jobs as waiters, photo laboratory workers, etc., in large cities.

Much of the financial support of these students is provided by the U.S. Government and by private and public American foundations and agencies, with the object of helping to train an intellectual, cultural, economic, and technical elite for poorer nations. Instead of seeing to it that these trained young men and women are in fact

returned to our friends and allies abroad, we allow them to remain.

On a recent trip to Asia I found American cultural workers there keenly aware of this problem. How could they help get the student from Asia to return home? Most of them urged sharp curtailment of recruitment and support of Asian students for study in America if a clear answer to that question is not forthcoming.

In face of this, the proposed Peace Corps of young Americans appears to many abroad as a laughable and totally inadequate expedient. Why teach a few Americans a little of some difficult language, and give them a smattering of knowledge of a particular local culture, when we have here in the United States available for such work thousands of natives of those countries who are (whether our bureaucrats know it or not) thoroughly conversant in their own languages and culture.

RESTITUTION

Part of the money we are now planning to spend on the Peace Corps should be used to send home foreign students we have trained; we could help provide them with better job opportunities, and perhaps even contribute something to their immediate local environment so that they will better readjust to the change.

The U.S. Government has invested large sums in training Asians here. It is preparing to spend more, and is being pressed to do so. But if the practices of the immediate past are to be followed still further, this will only result in great loss to the countries we are attempting to help.

It is high time we stopped raiding the intellectual resources of our friends and allies. We should begin to make restitution, by returning every possible trainee or ex-trainee now in this country who has either completed his training or has been here a certain specified length of time. We might decide to accept from any given country each year only as many new trainees as there are students from that country who have returned from the United States during the previous year. But to do this, we must tighten the enforcement of regulations now on the books, and add such new rules as the situation may require.

We can thus put an end to the Peace Corps in reverse that foreign student trainees in this country now constitute.

Complex Problems of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry today is confronted with a multitude of complex problems. In the night of this confusion, the textile industry, nonetheless, persists in looking for a star of hope and listening for a rustle of encouragement.

In view of our Government's persistently erratic and uncertain trade policy on textiles, one cannot help but wonder just how long this patient and long-suffering industry is going to have to watch, wait, and listen for the arrival of something positive in the way of textile trade relationships.

Mr. Speaker, pertinent to this comment I insert into the RECORD two articles, one from a September 25 publication of the U.S. News & World Report and the other from the September 16 issue of the Portland Press Herald:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 25, 1961]

BUSINESS AROUND THE WORLD

In an arrangement that made nobody really very happy, the United States and Japan have just agreed on a 7- to 8-percent increase in Japanese exports of cotton fabrics and apparel to the United States in 1962.

Japanese textile interests wanted a 30-percent increase.

U.S. textile interests have objected to the present level of imports.

The Japanese have restricted textile exports to the United States since 1956.

During the last 3 years, Hong Kong's textile exports to the United States have been skyrocketing. In other words, the Japanese share of the U.S. import market has been shrinking. This situation has made the Japanese furious. United States pressure on Hong Kong to curb their exports has been unavailing thus far.

Textile manufacturers in the United States have clamored loudly at the increasing competition from low-wage countries such as Japan and Hong Kong.

However, the U.S. industry has managed traditionally to export more cotton fabrics than were imported. Exports, for example, in the first 6 months this year more than doubled imports into this country.

Imports of certain types of cotton clothing from the Far East have been very heavy in the last 2 years and have glutted the U.S. market.

Squawks from U.S. clothing manufacturers have been persistent. Labor unions affected also have become perturbed at the volume of imports.

The Kennedy administration would like to see both textile imports and textile exports climb to higher levels—gradually, under controlled conditions.

At the same time, it's clear that administration officials are impressed with the British Government's approach to a similar textile problem.

The British Government has forced a contraction of the textile industry, closing down the least economic units that were unable to compete with foreign production. Government loans eased the transition of both workers and plants to other lines of activity.

Washington officials are tossing around similar ideas for subsidizing a sweating down of the U.S. textile industry, as well as other lines that develop extreme difficulty in competing with foreign production.

This concept ties directly into administration strategy for securing congressional authority next year to negotiate sweeping tariff reductions.

Access to the European Common Market is a necessity. Especially will this be true if Britain and other nations join the Common Market.

But the Common Market will be discriminating increasingly against outside goods, including American products, for a number of years. That's because the internal tariff walls between member countries are reduced well before the common exterior tariff is lowered. Result could be a decline of 10 percent in U.S. exports to Western Europe within a very short time.

So, in order to bargain with the Common Market for lower tariffs, the United States must be prepared to make substantial tariff cuts on imports—perhaps on virtually all imports from the industrialized Common Market countries.

Extensive tariff cuts will undoubtedly hurt some U.S. industries. Hence a multi-billion-dollar plan will be proposed to subsidize industries injured by tariff cuts. This is the sop now being considered to assuage protectionist interests in the Congress, industry, and the ranks of labor.

The tariff fight next year is expected to be knockdown, drag out.

[From the Portland Press Herald, Sept. 16, 1961]

NEW TRADE POLICY COMING, NORTHERN TEXTILE MEN TOLD

POLAND SPRING.—Assistant Secretary of Commerce Hickman Price, Jr., said here Friday that as a result of the international industrial revolution of the last decade, a new foreign trade policy is emerging in this country.

Price spoke to over 400 members and guests attending the 107th annual meeting of the Northern Textile Association.

Steps to implement the policy for the textile industry have been taken through the Geneva agreement last July and a recent agreement with Japan, Price told the group.

"It will be the policy of the United States to maintain the level of cotton imports during the year ending next June 30 at, or close to the level of imports for the year ended June 30, 1961," the speaker said.

New long-term agreements should be concluded before next June, he said, "which should provide an orderly development of world textile markets that will preserve for the domestic industry the markets which through effective promotion they themselves have created and deserve."

President Charles F. Phillips, of Bates College, told the association foreign aid can do little to help countries which fail to institute basic economic and social reforms.

"We are in the early stages of a vast new program of financial aid of Latin America," Dr. Phillips said. "In fact, the proposed program may easily involve $30 billion over the next decade.

"But even this huge sum will do little to aid the people of Latin America unless these nations institute a number of essential reforms. Too many of these countries are operating with unbalanced budgets, so that inflation is rampant. In Brazil, for example, the cost of living has advanced 26 percent in the past year."

Dr. Phillips pointed to other examples of necessary reforms; an end to discrimination against outside capital, more equitable tax laws, widespread ownership of land, better educational systems, improved roads and ports. Countries not undertaking these essential reforms should be denied foreign aid, he said.

"Finally, we know that a free society is rooted in a private economy. Hence, we should immediately withdraw aid from any country which uses our funds to develop socialism instead of encouraging the expansion of private enterprise."

A meeting of the Wool Manufacturers Council Friday morning opened the day's program.

George A. Door, Jr., of Guild, N.H., was reelected chairman of the council. He presided at the breakfast session and led the discussion on: "The Current Situation in Imports of Wool Textiles."

Roger M. Grimade of Charlton, Mass., presided at the general morning session. Richard R. McNabb, secretary of Machinery & Allied Products Industry, Washington, D.C., was moderator of a panel discussion on the "Promise and Problems of Automation."

Speakers were Dr. L. H. Hance, president of the Institute of Textile Technology, Charlottesville, Va.; James R. Bright, professor of business administration, Harvard University, and James R. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

At the afternoon session, a panel of experts on textile manufacture discussed, "Modern American Built Textile Machinery."

J. B. Goldberg, New York textile consultant, was moderator.

Members of the panel were J. Woodward Hubbard, vice president, Saco-Lowell Shops, Easley, S.C., who discussed preparatory and spinning equipment; William K. Child, executive vice president, Draper Corp., Hopedale, Mass., who covered progress in weaving machinery; and James H. Hunter, president, James Hunter Machine Co., North Adams, Mass., who presented the paper on modern finishing techniques.

Berlin Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we face renewed Berlin crises, of necessity our thoughts must run back to their origin; namely, the wartime agreements which brought about this situation. The Washington Evening Star, of September 15, contains an editorial of special significance in that it very calmly reviews some of the history relating to the creation of the Berlin dilemma. Comprehension of the present and the future depends to a great degree on an understanding of the past, and therefore, I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this time the editorial entitled "Berlin Background":

BERLIN BACKGROUND

There certainly was ample reason for the annoyance with which former President Eisenhower is reported to have received word of a State Department publication picturing him as responsible for the decision to let the Russians capture Berlin in World War II. For this, to say the least, was a grossly distorted version of history, and Secretary of State Rusk was well advised to disclaim any intent to criticize the wartime role of General Eisenhower.

Some day, presumably, the whole story of the Berlin decision—a decision which confronts us now with a monstrous dilemma—will become public property. As of today, however, only some of the facts are known.

It seems clear that General Eisenhower, as the war was drawing to its close, did not consider Berlin to be a major military objective, and advancing American forces were held up at the Elbe some 75 miles from the capital of Nazi Germany. Under political agreements previously made, however, our troops would have had to pull back even if they had taken Berlin.

The original agreement was negotiated in London in September 1944, by the European Advisory Commission, consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia. Our representative was the late Ambassador John G. Winant who, some 3 years later, took his own life.

It was this agreement which established the zones of occupation in conquered Germany, with Berlin 110 miles inside Communist-held territory and with no guaranteed routes of access. But who was responsible for this monumental error of judgment, later ratified by the chiefs of state at Yalta? It is hardly credible that Mr. Winant, at the level of Ambassador to the Court of St. James, made this decision on his own responsibility. He must have acted in consultation with or with the approval of his superiors in Washington. But the public record on this point reveals little or nothing. All that one can be sure of is that the political decision of 1944, based apparently on a naive trust in Russian good faith, leaves us today faced with what is probably the gravest crisis in our national history.

Protecting and Promoting the American Way of Life in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 29 of this year, Dr. James T. Ralph, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, addressed a meeting of ASC committeemen in California. In his speech, he analyzed the recently considered administration farm proposals and congressional action in the context of an analysis of the farmers' economic position.

Dr. Ralph's speech, which follows, is a noteworthy contribution to present thinking about the farm problem:

PROTECTING AND PROMOTING THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, members of the State and county ASC committees, fellow employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it is my pleasure to bring you the personal greetings of Secretary Freeman. The Secretary shares fully my appreciation and admiration for the great contribution you are making to the administration of farm programs.

Your meeting is important to the future of California agriculture. And there are many subjects I could use in talking to such a distinguished group.

I could review for you the history of our system of farmer-elected committees, but you have been a part of that history and know it better than I.

I could review the record of the Kennedy administration in agriculture in the first 8 months—the first Executive order signed by by the President was the move to distribute our abundance to the needy—the first major piece of legislation was the feed grain bill—the first appropriation bill enacted by the 87th Congress was for agriculture—and the first long-range plan passed by the Congress was the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Agriculture is in the forefront of the Kennedy administration.

I could talk to you about the tremendous team President Kennedy has put together in the Department of Agriculture.

Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, a man whose dedication is surpassed only by his energy for the task. An outstanding administrator who is determined to correct the misdirection that has been given to thinking on agriculture in recent years. A leader who would cause us to think of our capacity to produce in terms of an asset rather than a liability. And a Secretary of Agriculture who has repeatedly recognized and complimented the outstanding job you have done in the front lines of our action programs.

Charles Murphy, of North Carolina, a distinguished lawyer skilled in the ways of government. A man whose sagacity, administrative ability, and soundness of judgment are unexcelled anywhere in the top echelons of Washington.

John Duncan, former president of one of the finest farm organizations in America—the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation—a relatively large farmer who is completely devoted to the cause of assisting smaller farmers to share in America's abundance.

Frank Welch, dean of two agricultural colleges in his time and probably the outstanding man of the land-grant college system of America.

John A. Baker, a hill-county boy from Arkansas who has long served farm people in Washington. A great humanitarian who brings to his post as Director of Agricutural Credit a matchless measure of sympathetic understanding for the problems of farm people.

Willard Cochrane, a great economist who as Director of Economic Research has shown the rare capacity to shed light while absorbing heat where the basic problems of agriculture are concerned.

I could talk to you about our distinguished corps of career men in the Department many of whom you know personally including some outstanding native sons of California. We have the finest staff of any department in government, noted not only for their intelligence and ability, but more so their dedication, their pride in the industry they serve, and their complete loyalty to the cause of American agriculture.

I could take my whole time on your program today talking about career men who worked up from the ranks to positions of responsible leadership. Men like Horace Godfrey, Red Jacobs, Tom Miller, and many others who bring to their offices a wealth of knowledge, experience, and seasoned judgment seldom found in the higher posts of any organization.

But I want to talk to you about something dear to all of us and something closely connected with our mission of stabilization: Protecting and promoting the American way of life in agriculture.

A. WORLD'S BEST SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM

When our forefathers began this country they embraced a social and economic system based on two principles. These were:

1. Widespread ownership of productive resources and,

2. Private enterprise with competition.

The wisdom of our forefathers has not been disproven over the years. Our way of life has given us a higher level of goods and services to enjoy than has been enjoyed by any civilization in mankind's history. Even the average workingman in America today enjoys a more comfortable life than the upper classes of many other areas. Yet along with an abundance of goods and services our people have time left over for the spiritual and cultural activities of their choice.

B. A REBELLION AGAINST OTHER SYSTEMS

Our Founding Fathers did not chance upon this way of life by accident. They came here from other areas and had observed other systems. In Europe, at the time our ancestors departed, all land and other resources were owned by only a few families. The fathers of our republic knew of the stifling effect this feudalistic pattern of ownership had upon individual initiative. They had experienced an economic system called mercantilism. In mercantilism the reason for all production was to increase the wealth of the king or other potentate. Such a system smothers both incentive and invention. No man will give his all to his work unless he and his family get a fair share of the fruits of his labor.

The founders of our republic had been exposed to the idea of a Scotsman named Adam Smith who maintained that, if every man is allowed to pursue his own selfish interest he will produce more goods for the good of all. This is not only the rationale of private enterprise but it is the reason our system has worked so well. Every man has an opportunity to better himself and his family.

C. THE DANGER TO THE SYSTEM

We believe in this system. Its merits are self-evident. But we are concerned. Our system is not only endangered by alien philosophies from without but it is endangered by imbalances within. That segment of our people which has made the greatest contribution toward our economic well-being is not sharing equitably in the bounty they have created.

I speak of the efficient commercial family farmers of America. Our farmers through hard work, thrift, and investment have made possible the economic progress we enjoy. By continually becoming more efficient American farmers have released labor and other resources to other industries to produce the other goods and services we enjoy.

Farmers are not receiving a fair share of what they have made possible. In other industries producers and consumers alike share the benefits of our great system but in agriculture a major portion of the benefits have accrued to the consumer.

The simple fact is that while we as consumers get our foods and fibers at a lower relative cost in America than in any other country—efficient producers in agriculture are not receiving a return on their capital, their labor, and their management consistent with returns being earned by efficient producers in other industries.

D. WIDESPREAD OWNERSHIP IN AGRICULTURE DIFFERENT FROM OTHER INDUSTRIES

Private enterprise leads to efficient production by emphasizing individual initiative and the profit motive. Widespread ownership insures the popularity of the system by having the maximum number of citizens share the entrepreneural or risk taking function. Large numbers of property owning citizens gives us stability and our great social strength. (Political and social stability is essential for economic progress in any system.)

Although widespread ownership in agriculture—the family farm system is the strongest thread in our system it also creates problems for farmers. Thousands of independent farmers are unable to regulate production and marketing of their product to obtain a fair price in the marketplace.

E. INDUSTRY AND LABOR HAVE ENABLING ACTS

Other industries also have widespread ownership. But it creates no serious problem. This is partly because other industries sell nonperishable products. But mostly because other industries can organize efficiently into a small number of firms. Few enough not only to regulate supply but in many cases to administer prices. This is possible only because they have enabling acts.

The corporation laws of the States and the Securities and Exchange Commission Act are enabling acts for industry. If the organizing of corporations were not regulated and if the Securities and Exchange Commission did not supervise the sale and exchange of securities then it would be impossible for the organizers of industry to amass the capital necessary to operate firms of the size which dominate most manufacturing industries. The thousands of investors (widespread ownership) in American industry would lack the confidence to invest if these acts did not regulate the formation of corporations and the sale and exchange of securities; and if industry could not secure the capital to organize into a small number of large companies they could not control either the total supply or the price of their products.

Even our laboring people have enabling acts. The Wagner Labor Relations Act and other laws concerning organized labor give skilled and unskilled workers the right to organize together into unions and to bargain collectively for a price on the services they sell.

Many of our trades and professions have enabling acts to allow them to regulate the quality or supply of the services they offer. The medical profession, for example, has many restrictions to regulate the quality of the service they offer. Regulation of quality also restricts supply and thereby raises the rates that may be charged. Most States require bar examinations of anyone who would practice law. This examination tends to improve quality but it also limits the number of lawyers. Even barbers have secured laws to require licensing and sometimes schooling to practice their trade.

All laws which allow a business or profession to regulate itself are enabling acts. Practices which tend to reduce supply also tend to raise incomes. Other business and professions in America have done well by themselves. The economic tools they employ are: (1) Promotion to increase demand for their product both on a brand and industry scale; (2) research to find greater uses for their products; (3) quality control to cut down on the supply of goods or services and at the same time increase confidence in its use; (4) surplus diversion to divert part of a product to a lower price market or hold a quantity for marketing at a later date; (5) marketing quotas to avoid the creation of a surplus.

Why not allow farmers to copy these methods.

F. GOVERNMENT ACTION PROGRAMS TO EQUALIZE BARGAINING STRENGTH

Since 1929 the Government has attempted to stabilize agriculture. Programs were operated only for the basics because only in basic crops could we produce a supply greatly in excess of demand. Since 1938 farm prices have been supported by means of nonrecourse loans.

Government-action programs have worked well when designed well. They have accomplished their purpose when administered by a friendly administrator.

We believe these programs were and are justified. We believe that efficient producers in agriculture are entitled to as good a return on their investment, management, and labor as efficient producers in other necessary industries; and we believe Government should give farmers the tools to obtain a fair share of the bounty they create. Government action programs are, however, subject to several dangers. First, an unfriendly administrator can prevent such programs from working as intended by Congress.

Second, during the past few years an increasingly urban public has become less sympathetic toward the problems of agriculture. As the people of our cities get more and more generations away from the farm, they have less and less sympathy for the problems of the farmer. This expresses itself in a growing reluctance on the part of the Congress to appropriate funds for price stabilization programs.

A third factor, and one often overlooked is that we are attaining the ability to produce more and more farm products in excess of what the market will take at a profit. Therefore, greater and greater demands upon the resources available to the Department of Agriculture to stabilize farm prices may be forthcoming. Already many industries which do not have price support programs and which maintain they do not wish price support programs are asking for greater utilization of section 32 funds. At the same time many agricultural industries are asking for high tariffs to protect them from import competition. And with increasing development of the developing nations of the world we can expect a great drive to export food products to the American market.

The need for an enabling act to give farmers tools to self-regulate themselves was never greater.

G. BILL OF RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURE

The Kennedy administration proposed just such an enabling act in the Agricultural Act of 1961. We asked for a "Bill of Rights for Agriculture." Allow farmers to self-regulate themselves as other industries are self-regulated. To have research, promotion, quality control, surplus diversion or marketing quotas.

One tool enjoyed by many industries was not proposed for agriculture. That is the ability to administer its prices.

H. THE ACT OF 1961 AS AGREED TO BY CONGRESS

The administration's long-range farm program has been enacted by the Congress. Some have the impression that this program was pretty well taken apart. We did not get all that was asked. But we got most of it. This is a tremendously important piece of legislation. It will lead to more effective action to promote and protect American agriculture. Provisions of the Farmers Home Administration credit program were liberalized. The school milk program was continued, Public Law 480 was extended, and two highly significant commodity programs were enacted. Our feed grain program with minor changes was extended, and a similar program was adopted for wheat.

We achieved a breakthrough on a long-range plan for agriculture. A plan for farmers to set up and operate their own stabilization programs. The Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 has not been substantially amended since it's passage 24 years ago. This self-help law was changed in two respects. First, promotion and resarch were recognized as economic tools available to farmers. Second, additional commodities not before eligible for self-help programs were added in this bill. Cherries, apples, turkeys, turkey hatching eggs, peanuts, cranberries, seed crops, and others.

Due, I believe to a great amount of misunderstanding, lambs, honey, and other commodities were stricken from this bill. Some thought that this bill would set up production controls. This was not the case.

Production controls were not proposed. Even marketing quotas were stricken from the bill early in its consideration.

Others failed to understand this act would not set up any program for any industry. The procedures of self-help are not generally understood. Marketing orders are always initiated by the industry concerned. They are always designed by industry committees. They can become effective only after public hearing and a referendum of all producers affected. Even after this no action can be taken until a producer nominated board or a committee is selected and recommends action. Therefore, the administration did not propose a program for the producers of any agricultural commodities. What we did propose was that they have legal authority to adopt a program if they wished to do so.

I. PROCEDURE PROVIDED FOR ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

The Congress recognized possible need for additional authority and wisely provided a procedure.

Subtitle A of title I: "Consultation on Agricultural Programs"—is the most significant provision of this act.

Farmers and farm groups may call the Secretary of Agriculture to form a committee to consult and advise on additional legislation or administrative programs.

The Department is authorized to pay expenses of commodity committee members.

Committee recommendations will be submitted to the Secretary and to Congress if additional legislation is suggested.

The Congress has not said that additional authority will be provided. But a procedure has been established for industry to initiate action.

The door is wide open. We are prepared to consider any request received from a representative commodity group.

J. MISLEADING CRITICISM

Although this act would have farmers themselves develop farm programs it has been criticized by some who maintain they represent farmers.

1. It was said this proposal would give the Secretary too much power. The Secretary already had more power than this act gives him. The Secretary had the power to support the price of any agricultural commodity at somewhere between 0 and 90 percent of parity unless the range is further circumscribed by other legislation and the Secretary may exercise this power without consulting anyone in the industry or the Congress. This act dilutes this power and gives producers a larger measure of responsibility for program development.

2. This act is said to delegate legislative power to the Secretary of Agriculture. This does delegate some legislative power to the Secretary. But power no greater than he now has. Secretaries of Agriculture have had considerable legislative power delegated to them since the Smith-Hughes and Smith-Lever Acts were passed.

3. It has been said that producers through a producer board are enabled to exercise legislative power. This is the heart of our plan. Producer boards would be delegated legislative power through the Secretary of Agriculture. Producers boards have exercised such quasi-legislative power under Federal marketing orders for 25 years and they have done an outstanding job.

4. It has been suggested that this program would cost billions of dollars. This program would cost less than the present price-support programs. We cannot say how much, but we can definitely say it would cost less. First, it gives the Secretary more realistic methods of adjusting supply under the wheat and feed grain programs. Second, more commodities are allowed to operate and pay for their own program. As more commodities adopt self-help under this act, the cost of stabilization will go down. Taxpayers cost of running 80 milk marketing orders and 42 fruit and vegetable orders is insignificant compared with cost of the soil bank and price-support programs.

5. It has been suggested that this would regiment agriculture. If and only if other industries, trades, and professions are regimented, then this act would indeed allow farmers to regiment themselves. There is nothing compulsory in this law. It merely gives more farmers the right to organize and if they wish, to run (by a producer-handler board) and pay for their own program. If copying the methods used in the remainder of the American economy is regimentation, then farmers would be allowed to regiment themselves.

6. This program has been criticized because it threatens to raise farm income. We accept that criticism as valid.

Under the self-help provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1961, farmers would earn their income from what they do rather than what they failed to do. This does not provide farmers a tailor-made solution to their economic problems. It only gives them a license for hard work. The hard work of designing, initiating, securing approval, voting in, and administering and paying for their own economic stabilization.

This act of 1961 proposes a conservative rather than a liberal approach. It seeks to conserve and protect the existing way of life in American agriculture and to do so by copying methods proven by other industries rather than be designing new methods.

We believe this is a practical program. We believe it easier to give farmers, who are 9 percent of our people, the power to copy other industries than to attempt to reform the other 91 percent of our economy.

The task of changing 91 percent of our economy staggers the imagination.

To think of reforming the other 91 percent is impractical. The self-regulation they have is sensible and workable. We have no criticism of other industries. They have designed a workable system of self-regulation. We believe the best approach to stabilization in agriculture is to give farmers the legal power to join the mainstream of the American economy by acting as other industries act.

I submit to you that anyone who is in favor of more economics and less politics in agricultural stabilization; anyone who believes in representative democracy in agriculture; anyone who has faith that farmers can run their own business if given the legal tools to do so should be in favor of this program.

Our system of private enterprise with widespread ownership has proven its worth. The wisdom of our forefathers has been demonstrated. The need for preserving this system is self-evident.

If we would protect this system we must continue in business as many individual entrepreneurs in agriculture as is consistent with economic efficiency. The greatest danger to our private enterprise system is to have too few people personally connected with it. By giving our independent farmers and handlers in agriculture the bargaining strength to maintain themselves in business, we are insuring a greater number of people with a connection with, a kinship to, an interest in and, therefore, an affinity for the private enterprise capitalistic system itself.

Our farmers have achieved for us the dream men have sought throughout the centuries. To be able to produce more food than is needed. American farmers produce not only enough food and fiber for our own needs but also vast quantities to help supply the needs of millions throughout the world. This is an achievement of far greater consequence than putting a man in space. Meat, milk, poultry, fruits and vegetables in the hand are far closer to man's basic needs than a star in the sky. There is no better propaganda in all the world than the success story of American agriculture.

I suggest to you that our greatest defense against communism or socialism is to preserve, to protect, to promote this wonderful system of efficient commercial family farms we have in America. This system is the strongest thread in the fabric of our society. The Agricultural Act of 1961, by giving farmers the tools to obtain equal bargaining strength with other segments in our society, is a long step forward in preserving our system.

Peace Corps Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was considering the question of appropriating money for the operation of the Peace Corps, an editorial appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat commenting on several of the salient points of the proposed program. At the time I read it I intended to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the rush of a session closing caused me to overlook it. Nonetheless, the tenor of the editorial and the observations it makes are still of value and I believe that it will serve well to have this editorial made available for the Congress through the RECORD. For this reason I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 10, 1961]

PEACE CORPS BOONDOGGLE

The House of Congress will be asked, probably this week, to spend $40 million to put the Peace Corps in business. The best thing the House can do is turn down the request and strangle this misfit in the cradle.

It is our bet that the Corps is as much an embarrassment to President Kennedy as it is to the rest of us. It should be. He proposed it in an unthinking moment during the campaign, and now it has come back to haunt him, and us.

It is obvious that the Corps has no real job to do that isn't being done better already, by someone else. For example, under its point 4 program, this country is sending abroad many technicians to impart their skills to untrained foreign workmen.

Point 4 is far more useful in conveying useful skills and information to backward peoples than the Peace Corps can ever hope to be.

The United States spends millions of dollars every year on the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency to create a good public damage of this Nation all over the world.

A Peace Corps, composed largely of immature college men, is more likely to blacken that image than brighten it.

Turn 2,700 of these youngsters loose to go native and there will be more "Ugly Americans" creating ill will for us abroad than a multimillion dollar public relations program will ever be able to erase.

In addition, our Federal agencies help pay for an ambitious exchange program. They send Americans overseas, to teach or study, and bring many African, Asian, and Latin American students or teachers to our colleges and universities.

Our exchange program is doing more to convince the world of our peaceful progress and intentions than the Corps could ever accomplish.

Finally, as it was pointed out on the floor of the U.S. Senate, there are some 135,000 dedicated American missionaries, among them doctors, nurses and other technicians, of all faiths, who are healing the sick, conforting the afflicted, sheltering the widow and orphan, all over the world.

Yet, even they have not yet won the world to work for a society of peace and order. What can 2,700 corpsmen do?

In fact, the Peace Corps threatens to become simply a boondoggle, for bureaucrats and beatniks. Under the bill, approved in the Senate, to spend $40 million on the Corps next year, the Corps would be topheavy with well-paid headquarters brass in Washington.

The Corps is authorized to employ 275 full-time executive personnel in Washington, plus special "consultants" and "country representatives." Ten would be in a pay bracket up to $15,030 a year; 25 in the $15,030 to $19,000 class.

As of late August, the Corps had 121 chiefs in its Washington office, and only 462 volunteers taking field training. Also, although corpsmen will get only $75 a month as pay, they will be provided with many other comforts of home—their keep, health care, clothing and other amenities of Government service.

Worse still, some evidently look on the Corps as a way to duck military service. Director Sargent Shriver encouraged this, perhaps inadvertently, when he promised

that everyone will "get a deferment from the draft while you are in the Peace Corps."

The Senate stopped that by adopting an amendment which states that service in the Corps will not be, in itself, grounds for deferment.

The Senate also tacked on other amendments in an attempt to make the Corps less likely to be a wasteful boondoggle—a sort of exotic, oversea CCC for college boys.

But the Senate stopped short at what many Members knew was the right thing to do: Kill it, before it backfires and does the country real damage abroad.

That task, we hope, the House will take care of.

Senate Blocks Veterans Compensation Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the following item from Paraplegia News, September 1961 issue, should be of interest, I am sure, to all veterans:

SENATE BLOCKS VETERANS COMPENSATION INCREASE

One of the major pieces of legislation introduced in the 87th Congress was H.R. 879 which would increase compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. The bill as originally introduced would have permitted a 60-day grace period before any reduction in aid and attendance for the totally disabled and provide an increase in the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 to 7 years. The bill was passed by the House and referred to the Senate.

SENATE CUTS BILL

Winding up ultimately in the Senate Finance Committee, the bill was amended by decreasing compensation benefits for the 10, 20, and 30 percent disabled veterans. It was amended to delete the section which would have extended the presumptive period for those afflicted with multiple sclerosis and a rider was attached by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana, which would open national service life insurance for a period of 2 years. The bill as amended was passed by the Senate and referred back to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Any move to reopen national service life insurance is unacceptable by both the committee and the administration. Because of this opposition, the bill will probably remain on the Speaker's table and will not be called up. Mr. TEAGUE made a personal appeal on the measure to all representatives. The committee also met in executive session and voted to table all veterans insurance legislation until the next session of Congress.

NSLI FOR THOSE OVER 65

About the same time, the Veterans' Affairs Committee favorably reported to the House H.R. 856 which was merely a bill which would modify the national service life insurance to make it easier for veterans aged 65 or over to continue an insurance program. This bill was passed by the House and referred to the Senate Finance Committee. There it was amended to include the provisions of H.R. 879 concerning compensation increases, but again the Long amendment opening national service life insurance was appended. We have just learned from Dixon Christian of the Virginia chapter that if the bill is introduced on the floor of the Senate, Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON intends to introduce a motion to remove that part of the bill referring to national service life insurance. If this move is successful, the bill will be acceptable to the House and may yet pass Congress during this session.

Does the Washington Post Report the News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly told that the Washington Post is a great newspaper. To my mind, a great newspaper reports news truthfully. A report which appeared in the September 18, 1961, issue of the Washington Post concerning the meeting scheduled for September 17, 1961, between Katanga's Moise Tshombe and Dag Hammarskjold, which never occurred, causes me to wonder if the Post does make a real effort to report news truthfully. I am sure other Members of Congress will be interested in the report. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

U.N. CHIEF, TSHOMBE IN CONFERENCE—FIGHTING REPORTED CONTINUING AS TWO TALK IN RHODESIA

U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold was reported discussing a Congo cease-fire with Katanga President Moise Tshombe yesterday.

They conferred for more than an hour at Ndola in Northern Rhodesia and then drove to Kitwe, 30 miles northwest of the city, for what informants said would be the crucial phase of the talks, the Associated Press reported.

As the two discussed extension of a truce the U.N. reported it achieved in Jadotville on Saturday, there were conflicting reports on the military situation in Katanga where U.N. and Katanganese forces have been fighting since Wednesday.

GARRISON SURRENDER REPORTED

The Katanga Government claimed the 150-man garrison at Jadotville had surrendered, Reuters reported in a dispatch from Elisabethville. The garrison was reported being held hostage.

Reuters also reported that fighting had broken out again at Elisabethville and that a Katanganese plane had bombed the U.N.-controlled airport there.

Tshombe, who has vowed to fight the United Nations action to the death, flew to Ndola from Kipushi, accompanied by Denzil Dunnett, British consul at Elisabethville, the Associated Press reported. His plane was escorted by Rhodesian Air Force bombers.

Tshombe was met at the Ndola Airport by Lord Alport, British High Commissioner for the Rhodesian Federation, United Press International reported.

TSHOMBE WAITS

Tshombe and Alport waited for Hammarskjold for 4½ hours in the airport control tower, which was under strict security guard.

Hammarskjold flew to Ndola from Leopoldville in a chartered DC-3. He was seeking at least a temporary peace in the breakaway Congo Province that fought so bitterly to keep its 15-month "independence."

After talks at the airport the leaders drove to Kitwe for further discussions at a residence known as the Queen's House. As the motorcade left, Rhodesian police blocked all roads from the airport, preventing reporters from following.

The conference came in the fifth day of warfare set off by U.N. efforts to force the mineral-rich province back under the rule of the Central Government in Leopoldville.

Hammarskjold, who had been on his third visit to the Congo, took a personal hand.

But even as hopes rose for a general cease-fire in Katanga there were reports that the U.N. garrison at Jadotville had been "overwhelmed."

MESSAGE FROM M'KEON

The Irish Government Information Center in Dublin reported it had received a cable from U.N. headquarters in Leopoldville saying fighting had broken out again between Irish and Katanganese troops at Jadotville, United Press International reported.

The cable said the 155-man garrison had been "overwhelmed by drastically superior numbers." The message came from Gen. Sean McKeon, Irish U.N. military commander in the Congo.

Earlier reports from Jadotville said Irish and Katanganese troops, who were locked in battle for 4 days, were patrolling the area side by side. It was at Jadotville that the U.N. claimed a cease-fire Saturday and that Katanga forces had revolted against their white officers and fraternized with the U.N. soldiers.

At Elisabethville, U.N. armored cars were patrolling the streets and sporadic fighting was going on, Reuters reported. A dispatch from Frederick Ungehur said U.N. headquarters in the capital were being desperately defended following a heavy Katanganese mortar attack.

A French-made Katanga Fouga jet bombed the Elisabethville Airport. No casualties were reported but a U.N. DC-3 was hit, Reuters said.

KAMINA IS BATTLE CENTER

A U.N. DC-4 troop-carrying plane was reported shot down in Albertville, the Reuters dispatch said. The report from Katanganese sources said the plane was attempting to fly men to the Kamina base in Katanga. It also said several other U.N. planes on similar missions were forced to return to Luluaborg in Kivu Province.

Heavy fighting was reported at Kamina. A U.N. spokesman said the garrison at the huge base had withdrawn into a smaller perimeter. The spokesman said no troops had been withdrawn.

The Associated Press reported that fighting persisted for control of Kamina.

In Elisabethville, some 8,000 whites offered prayers for the end of fighting. They have been trapped in Elisabethville since Wednesday, and food supplies for civilians have reached dangerously low levels. Residents lined up for bread and milk.

Voters Should Learn Candidates' Views Before—Not After—Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a letter which went out to in-

quiring and complaining constituents who protested excessive taxes follows:

A TIMID SUGGESTION

When candidates seek office, make them tell you before you vote, just where they stand and their reasons therefor on questions in which you are personally interested, on issues which affect the national welfare.

ON THE ROAD TO RUIN

On August 16, 1961, from the well of the House, Mr. CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, a Democrat from Missouri, said: "We are spending, and we have been spending during this entire year, every hour, $1 million more than we are taking in. Ever since this session began we have been spending in the red at the rate of $1 million every hour, day and night."

Inasmuch as the Congress continues to make appropriations calling for money which we do not have and can borrow only at an ever increasing rate of interest, thought you might be interested in the above.

Ruinous spending is one reason why my vote is so often no on desirable, but, when war threatens, unnecessary legislation.

Sincerely,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Genuine Cooperation Will Be Most Difficult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of the sincere and highly respected Secretary General of the U.N. makes all future negotiations more difficult. Considered fair and impartial by all but the Soviets—two words they do not recognize—they will undoubtedly attempt to block confirmation of any one with similar qualifications.

An editorial appearing in a recent issue of the York (Pa.) Dispatch outlines pretty clearly the philosophy of the Godless leaders of communism and why in the days ahead the United Nations stands at the crossroads:

"DRY WATER, WOODEN IRON"

Partners in any enterprise must be perfectly frank with one another. They must not lie, they must not cheat. They must cooperate.

In short, partners must have the same set of human values.

This is true whether applied to marriage, business or international relations.

Our difficulties with Russia today stem not from a clash of political or military interests, but from a clash of values.

In the United States, government has been instituted by the people to protect their welfare in accordance with the God-given dignity of man. In the Soviet Union, government was instituted by a group of revolutionaries who deny God and consider man a vassal and a tool of the state.

If man has no rights, then life under the Communist state becomes the survival of the fittest. This accounts for the political purges not only in Russia, but in other Communist-run nations. Such a philosophy of life carries over in Red bloc relations with other countries.

Communists intend to win the world. Their philosophy of life does not provide for cooperation with other men, but for the conquest of other men.

That is why life is so difficult today. Where Communists are weak, they maneuver for position and power. Where they are strong, they bully and bluster. Never do they lose sight of their goal: The overthrow of all other existing social conditions.

The solution? We do not profess to know.

One vital fact is apparent, however. The free world must be prepared to defend its philosophy of life by force of arms if necessary.

And we must be extremely wary of diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin. For it is the Communist's view, voiced by Josef Stalin, that "sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

Only a sense of values can make diplomacy sincere. When the Reds come to value truth and justice, peace will reign.

American Enterprise Leads the Way to Progress and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, because of my committee responsibilities as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and previously as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had the responsibility during the past several years to visit a number of foreign countries and observe firsthand the existence of military, economic, and governmental affairs in those countries. These trips have given added conviction to my belief that America's greatest contribution to international friendship and understanding stems primarily from the activities of American private enterprise operating throughout the world. Our governmental endeavors on the international scale are important in terms of governmental relationships but are not as influential as private enterprise activities in improving human living conditions, strengthening the cause of liberty, and advancing American objectives toward peaceful progress shared by all.

This importance of private enterprise in the global scheme of things is one of the reasons why I was so concerned over the administration's tax recommendations made earlier this year to impose more stringent tax restrictions on the endeavors of American free enterprise to participate competitively in international trade. I believe that the Congress has acted wisely in laying aside these administration recommendations that would impair the ability of our free enterprise system to operate effectively as America's best good-will ambassador in foreign countries.

One of America's outstanding industrial statesmen, Mr. Morse G. Dial, chairman of the board of Union Carbide Corp., wrote an article which was published in the September 12, 1961 New York Herald Tribune which was caption "Private 'Foreign Aid'." Mr. Dial very eloquently describes the way in which American industry has been working to enhance American prestige and influence throughout the world by improving the well-being of mankind while at the same time strengthening America's industrial capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in Mr. Dial's excellent column because the Union Carbide Corp. is an important employer in my congressional district. This excellent American enterprise maintains a plant at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. I know firsthand the excellent community record that Union Carbide has as an employer and as a corporate citizen of my home community. The Union Carbide Corp. recently joined with the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie to observe an anniversary of more than 60 years of a carbide facility operation in Sault Ste. Marie.

I would like to commend Mr. Dial for the very perceptive understanding that he has evidenced in his column of our free-enterprise system and its proper role in world affairs. I will at this point include Mr. Dial's article as a part of my remarks. I will also include an editorial from the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News commemorating the carbide anniversary to which I referred. These two newspaper articles demonstrate the outstanding contribution that the Union Carbide Corp. is making to progress at home and abroad as well as to freedom for mankind everywhere:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 15, 1961]

PRIVATE "FOREIGN AID"

(By Morse G. Dial)

Early this year, Mr. Manubhai Shah, India's Minister for Industry, inaugurated a new Indo-American chemicals and plastics plant near Bombay. He took the occasion to say: "I would like to welcome all the countries of the world and all the technology they have developed to come and help us in this great endeavor of industrializing this vast country of ours."

These remarks point up an aspect of our country's "foreign aid" that perhaps has not been given the attention it deserves. I am referring, of course, to the exporting by American industry of its technical know-how.

This is enabling some of the lesser developed countries abroad to benefit from the cumulative knowledge and experience gained by American companies over many years.

The particular Indo-American enterprise that the Indian official was helping to launch is a good illustration of the extent of our technological collaboration.

The new plant was built by an Indian company in which Union Carbide Corp. with which I am associated, has a substantial investment.

The plant is based essentially on process information and equipment designs that evolved from research laboratories and operating experience here in this country.

Indian engineers came to the United States to work with their American counterparts on the plant design, to make sure that insofar as possible the new plant would be suited to the conditions under which it would operate in India.

These engineers also received a broad basic training in chemicals and plastics plants op-

erated by Union Carbide in the United States and Canada.

Finally, an experienced group of engineers and operators drawn from Union Carbide plants in the United States was sent to India to guide newly recruited Indian operating personnel during the startup phases.

The operation of an integrated chemicals and plastics plant of this type is highly complex since it involves extremes of heat, cold, vacuum, and pressures. It takes not only considerable knowledge and skill, but also the caution born of an awareness of what could result if a slip occurred.

The increasing participation of American companies in overseas chemicals production can be attributed to several factors.

In the first place, many businessmen in this country have come to accept the fact that they must take a global approach if they expect to face up to today's challenges.

Also, what to do to help underdeveloped nations modernize their economies and raise their standard of living can profoundly affect the outcome of the political conflicts brewing throughout the world.

The fundamental incentive for American business is, of course, the size and growth potential of the international market. In 1959, the total value of the chemicals produced throughout the world outside of the United States was about $40 billion—about a third more than our domestic market.

In the years immediately following World War II, many American chemical companies were shipping a significant proportion of their output overseas.

However, as oversea markets expanded, foreign companies and investors entered the field and undertook local production of chemicals that were previously imported.

Now, competitive and restrictive factors abroad make it almost impossible for an American exporter to compete with an internal producer overseas at least as far as many of the major commodity-type chemicals are concerned.

Naturally, American industry would like to continue to share in the growth of the world chemical industry, and to see foreign business contribute in a reasonable way to overall company profits.

Consequently, a number of American companies have been building chemical plants overseas either by themselves, in partnership with well-established local companies, or through affiliated companies in which the American company has a significant interest but with a widespread public ownership of stock as well.

For instance, Union Carbide recently extended its polyethylene manufacturing interests to Japan and Sweden by establishing partnerships with substantial local companies in these countries.

Current investment abroad by American companies is estimated to be more than $1.5 billion. Aside from the substantial monetary return, there is the incalculable return that results from this opportunity to demonstrate to countries abroad some of the benefits of our free enterprise system.

[From the Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Evening News, Sept. 15, 1961]

CARBIDE RECOGNITION

Carbide Recognition Day, an event long overdue in the Sault Ste. Marie area, serves to focus the thinking of the area on two members of long standing in the community.

The present and predecessor plants of Union Carbide Olefins Co. and Carbide Power Co. have stood since the turn of the century as a landmark on the skyline of Sault Ste. Marie. The fortunes of calcium carbide and the community have been intertwined through the years; the horseless carriage's gaslight and miner's lamp gave way to the increased industrial use of acetylene gas and finally to its rise as an important building block in the mushrooming chemical industry.

A concentration on the world of tomorrow has made Union Carbide a world leader. From its small and relatively simple beginnings in the pioneer plants like Sault Ste. Marie, it has grown into a progressive major American enterprise known the world over.

This tribute to forward-looking management is only part of the story. The Sault Ste. Marie has long known firsthand of the advanced policies of Union Carbide Co., toward the men and women who are members of its production teams. Every 2 years, the savings plan is announced, and its participants share in the fruits of this unusual arrangement. Extended vacations for long-service employees have long been in effect and others are only now beginning to gain this social benefit. The safety programs for the benefit of its employees have always been outstanding. These are but a few examples.

Most important of all, Carbide people have always been intimately associated with the broad spectrum of community life. The entire roster of the two plants represents friends and neighbors who share in the community's hopes and aspirations, contribute to its social, governmental, economic and religious life. They raise their children, maintain their homes, and devote their working lives to the production of this vital basic product.

For some, Carbide has become a father and son tradition. Because of its fruitful early association with Union Carbide Co. in its fledgling years, men who spent their youth or some of their years on the banks of the St. Mary's River have gone on to greater places within the ranks of Union Carbide. Their old friends who have stayed behind speak with pride of their contributions and accomplishments.

It is with a sense of deep and abiding appreciation that the people of Sault Ste. Marie and surrounding area pause on the eve of September 16 to pay tribute to these industrial good neighbors, Carbide Power Co. and Union Carbide Olefins Co. In a way, the occasion is a salute to the past vision which brought calcium carbide through its initial pioneering pains to its present status in the chemical world; but at the same time, it is a community's best wishes for continued progress in the search for the world of tomorrow in "the exciting universe of Union Carbide."

National Poison Prevention Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Senate has passed House Joint Resolution 358, which was approved by this House on September 6. Inasmuch as this resolution, authorizing the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the third week in March as "National Poison Prevention Week," has the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as indicated in a letter from Secretary Abraham Ribicoff to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, it is anticipated that the resolution will very shortly receive the approval of President Kennedy.

The importance of this resolution is indicated in the letter to Chairman CELLER by Secretary Ribicoff, who in noting the large number of cases of accidental poisoning, particularly of children, stated:

Almost all of these could have been prevented. We believe that the designation of a National Poison Prevention Week with the concentration of attention from the press, radio, television, and other media will bring some of these precautions to the attention of the public and will result in an appreciable reduction of accidental poisonings.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that a resident of the 10th Congressional District of Missouri was responsible for the inception of the idea of a National Poison Prevention Week, and that Missouri was the first of several States to recognize the great good that can come from the designation of a week in which attention can be centered on the hazard that exists and the means which can be taken in saving lives.

To Mr. Homer George, a small city pharmacist, who operates two prescription pharmacies in Cape Girardeau, Mo., should go most of the credit for this worthwhile movement. It was he who recognized not only the problem, and set about to do something about, first the treatment, but more important, the prevention of unnecessary poisoning. More than any other one individual, Mr. George has been responsible for the establishment of poison control centers in hundreds of hospitals throughout the United States. Generously, contributing both his time and his own money, he has appeared before conventions and other meetings throughout the length and breadth of this land, calling attention to the great dangers, and counseling as to how best to meet the problem, both through prompt treatment, and also through prevention. In this effort, he has had the wholehearted cooperation of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the American College of Apothecaries, which have applauded his efforts through the adoption of resolutions, both in State and national conventions, endorsing the establishment of a National Poison Prevention Week.

It was almost 3 years ago that Mr. George convinced me of the desirability of Congress taking cognizance of this problem, and at the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced a resolution which would have requested the President to designate such a week. For three successive Congresses I have endeavored to secure approval of such a resolution and it was only this year that our efforts have been successful.

There are still many people who will regard this effort as an idle gesture and will presume that National Poison Prevention Week is just another of many designations of certain days or weeks that have no particular importance. However, I am predicting that with the information that will be disseminated during the third week of March next year that we will begin to see the great good that can come from this action of Congress. I believe most sincerely that with the passing of the years those who have had only a small part in this effort will appreciate and be proud of the co-

operation which they gave to the passage of House Joint Resolution 358.

In tracing the development of this idea, I am presenting herewith an article, prepared by Mr. Homer George, which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association which gives the history and background of National Poison Prevention Week, up until that time. It does not, of course, mention the failure to secure passage of the resolution introduced last year, nor does it mention House Joint Resolution 358, which has now been approved by Congress.

POISON PREVENTION WEEK

(By Homer A. George)

Countless deaths have occurred annually due to accidental, suicidal, and industrial poisonings. Many of these deaths could have been prevented had certain individuals recognized the inherent dangers of some of our common household items or if there had been adequate information and treatment readily available. There has been a great deal of activity recently in establishing poison control and treatment centers and the author as chairman of the special committee of the American College of Apothecaries has been responsible for the establishment of various centers. However, the problem is not primarily one of treatment but—of more importance—one of prevention.

If the public could be alerted to the fact that many cases of poisoning could be prevented by the simple expediency of practicing a few definite precautionary measures, the problem of treatment would be greatly reduced.

The public must be educated in "poison prevention." Last year nearly a million people were poisoned accidentally. Each day about 1,000 children under the age of 3 years are poisoned accidentally and the public apparently is quite indifferent to the problem. It is amazing how unaware the public is of the dangers of accidental poisoning in the home.

There have been isolated efforts by pharmacists to reprint various antidote charts and distribute them to the public, but this approach does not reach enough people. I felt that there must be some way to alert the public in a more definitive manner. The cost of any extensive program would be high and I tried to figure who would benefit the most from the type of educational program that had to be launched. Finally deciding that next to the posion victims and their families the insurance companies should be the most concerned, I contacted the president of the Cape Girardeau County (Missouri) Association of Insurance Agents and explained the problem. An invitation to address the group was forthcoming and a program of parental education was outlined. The need for presentations before all types of civic service and religious groups was indicated and it was proposed that this might be centered around the establishment of a "Poison Prevention Week."

The following day, I visited the mayor and told him that there was a National Pickle Week and a National Mother-In-Law Week and as far as I knew neither had ever killed anyone, but poisons were going at it every day and indicated a real need for a Poison Prevention Week. He was most impressed and proclaimed the week of October 12–18 1958 as "Poison Prevention Week." The following is the text of the resolution:

"Whereas, it seems needful that all of the people of our community become thoroughly acquainted with the dangers of careless handling of poisons, and whereas, there were 1,000,000 persons poisoned in the United States last year, and each day 1,000 children under the age of two years were poisoned by their parents, through careless handling and storage of medicines, insecticides, and chemicals, and whereas, there exists a great need for the education of parents to prevent such poisonings, by keeping out of the reach of children all household preparations, coal oil, furniture polish, etc., rat, fly and roach sprays, cosmetics, medicines of all kinds, especially aspirin; now, therefore, I, Walter H. Ford, Mayor of the City of Cape Girardeau, Mo., do set aside the week of October 12 to October 18, 1958, inclusive, as Poison Prevention Week, and I call upon all citizens to assist in every way possible to become educated to prevent such dangers."

A copy of this was sent to the Governor of Missouri requesting him to make a similar proclamation. In a very short time a document was received, seal and all, and Gov. James T. Blair of the State of Missouri became the first Governor in the United States to declare a statewide Poison Prevention Week. The proclamation was almost identical to that of the mayor's.

Enthusiastic with the success achieved, I wondered just how far this could go and so a letter was sent to President Eisenhower. Four days later a reply was received from Frederick Fox, special assistant to the White House, commending this worthwhile endeavor. He explained, however, that such a national proclamation would require an act of Congress and suggested that our sales representatives be contacted. I was about 10 days ahead of him and had already spoken with Congressman PAUL JONES, of Missouri, who had agreed to present a bill at the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This bill was introduced in January, 1959, given the number House Joint Resolution 57 and assigned to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

The American College of Apothecaries at its annual convention in May 1959, APA at its annual convention in August 1959, and many State pharmaceutical associations adopted resolutions urging passage of this bill. Many individual pharmacists, manufacturers, and the public indicated their approval of the measure by letters to their Congresmen. I was privileged to appear on the NBC nationally televised "Today" program and discuss the concepts of poison prevention and the intent of the bill with Arlene Francis. The bill was unanimously reported out favorably by the House subcommittee but the full Committee on the Judiciary tabled it on August 25, 1959. A new bill—House Joint Resolution 592—was introduced by Congressman JONES on February 1, 1960, at this 2d session of the 86th Congress and it is hoped that with proper interest displayed by various public health groups that it will be adopted. Although the original bill called for the second week in October, it was felt that a week early in spring would be more desirable. Therefore, House Joint Resolution 592 has deleted specific recommendations on the week to be so designated. The complete bill reads as follows:

"H.J. RES. 592, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

"Whereas almost 500,000 persons are accidentally poisoned in the United States annually; and

"Whereas daily almost 1,000 children under the age of 5 years are accidentally poisoned by consuming household products containing harmful chemicals; and

"Whereas household products sometimes are not adequate marked so as to warn of their poisonous properties with the result that they sometimes are not stored out of the reach of children; and

"Whereas there is a great need for the education of the American people as to the dangers of accidental poisonings and of the need to keep from the reach of children all household products which contain harmful chemicals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designing the — week in ——— as National Poison Prevention Week, to aid in encouraging the American people to learn of the dangers of accidental poisoning and to take such preventive measures as are warranted by the seriousness of the danger."

A proclamation is useless if it doesn't bring results. It is hoped that National Poison Prevention Week will focus attention on this most serious problem and that it will aid in eliminating this tremendously wasteful loss of human life. The pharmacist can be most helpful in publicizing this problem.

Following our local proclamation we attempted to create public interest. Window streamers were designed and distributed by our local auxiliary police. These were displayed in every store in town. The proclamations and ads were published in the local newspapers. Spot ads were placed on local TV and radio stations making the public aware of Poison Prevention Week.

Two days before the opening of the campaign, I was allotted 25 minutes on our local TV station to explain the dangers of and methods of preventing accidental poisoning in the home. The station had partial coverage of a five-State area and a receiving audience of more than 1 million and we felt the message was getting across.

These efforts have been continued and presentations have been made to more than 50 groups in at least 15 States. In addition, with the cooperation of the American College of Apothecaries, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. was contacted and arrangements were made to distribute, through pharmacies, an excellent pamphlet entitled "Caution, Babies Learning." Many hundreds of pharmacies availed themselves of the opportunity to distribute these and we estimate that several millions of people were reached with the message.

However, the surface has just been scratched and the cooperation of each and every pharmacist is needed if the full potential of the public health value of this effort can be realized. Each pharmacist should contact his legislator and urge adoption of the bill proclaiming a National Poison Prevention Week. In addition active programs of public education should be initiated by the pharmacist. Such efforts will most certainly result in providing the community a tremendous public health service and should afford the pharmacist a great deal of self-satisfaction.

(Currently the operator of two prescription pharmacies in Cape Girardeau, Mo., Homer A. George has had a long career in pharmacy. He began working in a retail pharmacy when he was 11 years old and entered the St. Louis College of Pharmacy in 1926, becoming a registered pharmacist in 1929. The year 1936 saw the opening of his first prescription pharmacy in Cape Girardeau, a small city on the banks of the Mississippi. In 1949, after just 10 weeks of operation, his second pharmacy was leveled by a tornado and had to be rebuilt. Following in his footsteps, one of George's sons is a registered pharmacist and the other is attending the St. Louis College of Pharmacy. George is a regional assistant director of the American College of Apothecaries.)

President of University of Dallas Warns of Communist Infiltration of Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, American colleges and universities are among the prime targets for Communist infiltration. Our greatest weapon against this subversion is renewed faith in our own system of free enterprise, our pride in old-fashioned Americanism. Nowhere has this been said better than on the "Manion Forum" recently by the president of the University of Dallas, Dr. Robert Morris. The transcript of this fine broadcast follows:

Dean MANION. How serious is Communist infiltration of American education? At the annual meeting of the Harvard University Alumni Association on last commencement day (June 15), Harvard president, Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, read a recent letter from a Harvard alumnus criticizing the university for promoting measures "leading to totalitarianism."

President Pusey then called upon all Harvard alumni to help him answer this kind of criticism. Some of the Harvard graduates who responded sent copies of their suggestions to me. How can Harvard or any other American university meet the fairly common charge that it is teaching economic and political doctrines that are subversive of time-honored American principles?

One of these Harvard correspondents suggests that, as a first step, all university presidents should courageously weed out of the faculty those teachers who make a habit of ridiculing people who attack communism. He thus advises university administrators to be on the alert for the anti-anticommunism that Senator STROM THURMOND told us about over this microphone 2 weeks ago (Manion Forum broadcast No. 361). This is not the complete answer, of course, but it is good advice nevertheless.

For many years, communism, internal and external communism, has been a clear, present and constantly increasing menace to the United States. Here and all over the world communism centers its attack upon educational institutions.

Many university administrators have failed to recognize that obvious fact and Communists have used the facilities of those universities to brainwash thousands of Americans into the fatal conviction that communism, at its worst, is a harmless political philosophy and, at its best, a hopeful promise for the peace and security of mankind.

In our presently precarious deadlock with communism it ought to be fairly obvious that American university presidents must thoroughly understand the vast dimensions of the Red conspiracy, as a prerequisite to the patriotic execution of their important responsibilities.

My guest at this microphone now, Dr. Robert Morris, president of the flourishing University of Dallas, acquired his understanding of the Communist conspiracy during the years when he was investigating Communist subversion as chief counsel for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate.

For the exciting and frightening documentation of that experience, I refer you to his book "No Wonder We Are Losing" (Bookmailer $2.50, Box 101, New York City 16, N.Y.). But now, let me refer you to him. Dr. Morris, are you enjoying your new responsibility as president of the University of Dallas?

Dr. MORRIS: Yes, I am, Dean Manion. Being president of an academic institution, at a time of great crisis for our country, is a real challenge, and I think that this is a challenge that I am trying to live up to.

Dean MANION. Doctor, I am sure you will agree that the best antidote for the poison of communism is a firm and friendly understanding of Americanism. Are you convinced that, generally speaking, our institutions of higher learning are doing all that they can or ought to do to develop an adequate understanding of Americanism?

Dr. MORRIS. My answer to that, Dean Manion, would be no. My feelings are basically these: Americanism, and by that term, and with that term, I equate patriotism, is an important virtue and a great national and international asset. I identify with this term, Americanism, all the wonderful things that the United States of America stand for—freedom, liberty, and all their glorious corollaries.

Our Constitution with its wonderful balance of powers, its Bill of Rights—these are tremendous assets. In fact, this Americanism, describing it as I am here today, is a great treasure box, the envy of men of all lands and of all history. We should prize these blessings so much that we should take the position that we would like these extended to men of all lands.

Now, I find, Dean Manior, in many academic institutions and generally throughout the land, an ascendant force. This force is a powerful one. You can find it in many parts of the land. It is entrenched in many of our educational institutions. This force would extinguish Americanism and all that it stands for and substitute instead a shabby, dreary variation of socialism that would gradually strip us of our incentive and, after that, our liberty and freedom. This force is also causing us to rely not on our tremendous resources, our national strength, our wonderful institutions, but rather on growing international agencies. Now, it is ironical that these international agencies, even though they are supposed to provide us security, are giving us no security at all. What they are doing is simply depriving us of the freedom of movement, the freedom of decision that is necessary to ward off a very, very aggressive dictatorial type of movement—the Soviet international movement.

WORLD INFLUENCE OF COMMUNISM RAPIDLY DEFEATING AMERICANISM

It is also ironical that the more these same institutions, these international agencies are taken over by the forces of slavery, and that is what Khrushchev's forces are, the more we are entrusting our power and our responsibility to them. This is one of the great ironies of our times.

Therefore, Dean Manion, my answer to you is this: American institutions, American educational institutions, are not recognizing the heart of the problem that confronts us. By casting aside and minimizing Americanism, patriotism and the strength of the United States of America, they are actually enervating us and making it easier for these brutalizing forces to extinguish our liberty.

Dean MANION. What are you doing at the University of Dallas to correct this situation?

Dr. MORRIS. Dean Manion, we are trying to educate the young men and the young women who come to our university in the fundamentals of education. We feel that education should provide not only skills, learning, not only an understanding of history and all the sciences, but an implementation to all these things that will enable the beneficiary of this type of education to live in the world of the 1960's.

If education cannot be translated into the actualities of our times, then we feel that we are not being successful in our various programs. Accordingly, we are stressing the fundamentals, the history of Western civilization.

Strong courses in American history, courses in the study of the Constitution of the United States and all our political institutions; courses, naturally, in all the natural sciences, and in all those aspects of education that are really essential if anyone is going on to specialization in the various fields of endeavor.

But, at all times, we are very mindful of the fact that the young men and women at the University of Dallas, in a few years, will be the leaders of tomorrow. And, unless they understand the brutalizing forces in our society today, unless they comprehend them, unless they comprehend the nature of the great threat of our times, they will only be supernumeraries in the great challenge that the life ahead offers.

For all these reasons, Dean Manion, we are trying to be fundamental, and we are trying to inculcate and instill the realities of our times.

Dean MANION. Dr. Morris, let us get away from institutional education for the moment. I observe that you continue to do a lot of good speaking on the subject of communism and American foreign policy. Are you satisfied now with the response that our country is making to the Communist challenge?

Dr. MORRIS. Well, Dean Manion, I am certainly not satisfied. I think that we are losing our heritage—our wonderful heritage is slipping away from us and that we, as a Nation, are not responding.

HOW CAN WE SAVE FREEDOM BY PROMOTING COMMUNISM?

My solution would be simply this: Let us stop aiding communism all over the land. Now, this may strike you as a curious approach, but the history of the last 15 years will incontrovertibly demonstrate that we have been creating communism throughout the world.

I was the counsel to the Senate committee that made the damage survey in China. We created Chinese communism—that was created here in the United States. We created Fidel Castro. Today we are creating communism in the Congo.

There a coalition government, fabricated by the United Nations and ourselves, is now gradually taking over the treasure box of Africa. We are today, in our foreign aid, giving money to many Communist countries. Guinea is a Communist country. We are financing them even though they are building a naval base and Soviet Mig strips.

We are aiding communism in Yugoslavia, in Poland, and in many other countries of the world. I think that for the first year—the next year or so—the great advantage would accrue to us if we once stopped aiding and financing communism around the world.

The second solution would be for us to eliminate from their entrenched positions in all the bureaus of Washington those specialists who, for the last 10 or 15 years, have been devising one program after another leading to surrender, concession, and retreat.

I think that any kind of a damage survey, taken over the last 15 years, would indicate that these people, these bureaucrats, have been conducting a foreign policy that is the complete antithesis of the lofty expressions of our Presidents and the lofty sentiments of our elected Representatives in the Senate and the House.

Our policy seems fine when you read it, certainly it seems wonderful during campaign time, but then when you come around to implementation, you find people doing exactly the opposite to what the lofty professions promised.

I think that, if you have these two things, Dean Manion, have them both in mind—one, stop aiding communism; two, get a new cast of characters in Washington to implement the various policies, and then, if you can

summarize the thing, try to take the essence of our wonderful political institutions and offer them rather than the gross materialism that we are offering now the people in all lands. They will gravitate to us as steel gravitates to a magnet. This is what the world thirsts for and, yet, we are not striking this posture.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Dr. Robert Morris, president of the University of Dallas. I hope that every college president in America will soon receive a copy of what you have just said. Meanwhile, the best of everything to you in your new assignment and a patriotic salute to the University of Dallas.

Machrowicz Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit for the RECORD the following article by J. F. Ter Hortst, which appeared in the September 17, 1961, issue of the Detroit News about the successful career of our esteemed colleague, Thaddeus Machrowicz, who has resigned to accept an appointment as a Federal judge.

While I want to take the occasion to publicly wish my good friend the best of luck and a long and successful term in his new office, I want also to cite this story as a typical example of what an individual can accomplish in a free Nation and a free society such as we enjoy in this great land of ours.

The article follows:

MACHROWICZ SUCCESS STORY—FROM POLAND TO U.S. BENCH

(By J. F. Ter Hortst)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The Senator from Colorado looked at the immigrant from Poland and remarked:

"It took three generations before President Kennedy reached the top. It has taken you only one."

The lawmaker was Senator CARROLL, Democratic member of the Judiciary Committee. The American by choice was Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Democratic Congressman from Hamtramck. The occasion was the hearing to confirm Mr. Kennedy's choice of Machrowicz for a lifetime Federal judgeship in Detroit.

WINS APPROVAL

Less than 90 minutes later, on the motion of Senator THOMAS D. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, Machrowicz' appointment whisked through the Senate. For the first time in 20 years, a U.S. Representative has become a Federal district judge.

For this, the lifelong goal of "Thad" Machrowicz and the dream of almost every lawyer, the six-term Congressman is resigning from the House of Representatives on Monday.

He had, by any reckoning, come a long way from Gostyn, Poland.

"It's strange," Machrowicz mused, "the way life takes its turns. As much as I hoped it would come through, I'm going to miss this place."

The place is not Washington, but the Capitol Building. In the 11 years, Machrowicz rose to a senior on the Ways and Means Committee, which writes the Nation's tax laws.

DOOR WAS OPEN

His office door was open to friend and foe, his words were frank and blunt and his courtesy was Old World. Newcomers to Congress found him a haven of good counsel. Reporters found him a valuable guide to what was going on.

He was a Midwest Democrat whip for Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas. In turn, he had access to RAYBURN'S inner sanctum. He was, as one close colleague put it, "a liberal with both feet on the floor."

Machrowicz' journey from Poland to Congress to court is not a miracle. But it could happen, as author Harry Golden might say, "Only in America."

The new judge was 2 years old when his mother gathered the family to follow her refugee husband, Boniface, to a new life in the United States in 1901. Machrowicz father, a jeweler, had made the mistake of nurturing Polish nationalism in a part of Poland then under the rule of the German empire.

MOVED TO CHICAGO

The family moved first in Chicago, then Milwaukee, then back to Chicago. At 12, Thad acquired U.S. citizenship with his father's naturalization. The elder Machrowicz, still a fighter for Polish causes, sent his son to Alliance Academy in Cambridge Springs, Pa., where the language was taught.

In 1917, Machrowicz entered the University of Chicago. But his mind was not on books. The war was raging in Europe and the old ties tugged. He enlisted at 16 in the Polish army of American volunteers and went overseas to fight.

Among other things, the teenage second lieutenant was one of the first Yanks to battle the Communists. It was the historic gates of Warsaw battle, one of the 10 most decisive battles in Polish history. And the Reds lost.

WORKS FOR POLAND

After the war, the young American joined the American technical advisory committee to the Polish Government, serving as interpreter, liaison officer, and adviser. He might have stayed on, but the fatal illness of his mother drew him back to Chicago in 1921.

Then came a good piece of fortune for the big Polish community in Hamtramck and Detroit's East Side. The Polish Government decided to open a consulate in Detroit in 1923. It seemed natural to ask Machrowicz, then 24, to join the staff.

By 1924, Machrowicz had obtained a law degree from the Detroit College of Law. He left the consulate's employ and became secretary to the mayor of Hamtramck.

By 1928 he was in love with government and an accomplished pianist named Sophia Jara. He made his first bid for political office as Republican candidate for State representative and lost by two votes.

NAMED CITY ATTORNEY

After that, Machrowicz concentrated on building up a legal practice. But he could not forget politics or Miss Jara. In 1934 he was appointed Hamtramck city attorney. In 1935 they were married. In 1938, as a reward for working in the Democratic campaign of Gov. Frank Murphy. Machrowicz was appointed legal director for the Michigan Public Utilities Commission at Lansing.

Two years later he resigned to run as a Democratic candidate for the State senate. He lost again. Undaunted he ran a few months later for the municipal judgeship in Hamtramck. This time he made it, and for two successive terms after that.

For all he knows, Machrowicz might still be a Hamtramck jurist except that former Representative George Sadowski, a 14-year veteran in the First District, made the mistake of daring him to run for the seat in 1950.

CANNOT STAND DARES

"I can't stand dares," Machrowicz said. "So I took him on."

The issue was communism and its inroads into Hamtramck's Polish community. Machrowicz spoke wherever he could find two or three gathered together, lambasting Sadowski for his hand-off attitude.

Sadowski looked like an easy winner in the primary. But the Korean war broke out. When the tallies were counted, Machrowicz was in by 178 votes.

Two years later, he snuffed a Sadowski comeback attempt by a 2 to 1 margin. In the years since, no one has ever come close.

But in all those years, Machrowicz never lost his love for the bench.

WANTED TO TEACH

"I once wanted to be a schoolteacher," he said. "I liked the law even better. There was great satisfaction in being municipal judge. Even here, where the years have been good to me, I found myself wishing."

Machrowicz had been boomed for a court appointment during the Eisenhower administration, but the White House had a policy of selecting no one from Congress. Mr. Kennedy had no such qualms.

So Detroit's new Federal judge takes up his duties October 2. There will be a swearing-in ceremony. Machrowicz will need a robe but not a gavel. The rest of the Michigan delegation here, Republicans and Democrats, gave him one the other day. A token of their esteem.

Air Pollution Control Association Calls for a National Conference on Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution recently adopted by the Air Pollution Control Association calling for a National Conference on Air Pollution and offering its assistance and cooperation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the development of a suitable program. The importance of doing something about air pollution in this country increases every day and it is hoped that recognition of that importance will be extended at the earliest possible time.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the contamination of our Nation's community air supplies have become an important national problem; and

Whereas many public and private groups and associations are conducting activities directed toward the solution of this problem; and

Whereas a better common understanding of the goals, requirements, and problems of these many groups and communities would facilitate a more rapid solution to the basic problem; and

Whereas the Air Pollution Control Association has long supported all constructive efforts to further understanding of the causes and dimensions of the air pollution problem, and to provide an effective ex-

change of views and opinions relevant to its solution; and

Whereas these purposes were served in an outstanding fashion by the 1958 National Conference on Air Pollution, convened by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved

1. That the Air Pollution Control Association does hereby urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Surgeon General to convene another National Conference on Air Pollution during the year 1961 or 1962.

2. That the Air Pollution Control Association extend its cooperation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the development of a suitable program.

History of Vending in the United States—75th Anniversary of the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "A Concise History of Vending in the United States," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of Vend, the magazine of the vending industry.

This concise history of vending by Mr. Schreiber is really a great tribute to the enormous growth of the industry during its 75 years of existence as an organized industry in the United States. This is the 75th anniversary of the vending industry in this country and all signs indicate that the industry, while big and lusty and growing, merely is on the threshold of its greatest growth.

It seems hard to believe that vending, which represented only a small total business only a few decades ago, today enjoys a business running into several billion dollars, gross, each year. As noted, all signs indicate that it is merely on the threshold of enormous and unparalleled growth and service.

I believe that Vend magazine, and its alert editor and publisher, G. R. Schreiber, perform a real service to the industry and to the Nation by distributing such authoritative information about the industry as is embodied in this material.

The material is as follows:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING IN THE UNITED STATES

(By G. R. Schreiber)

Part and parcel of the 20th century revolution in retailing is the vending machine—the silent salesman with built-in cash register which annually moves billions of dollars of goods and services to consumers in the United States and around the world.

The practical impact of the vending machine on our economy was not generally recognized prior to the middle and late 1940's. But the idea of selling things from machines is nearly as old as recorded history, and the beginning of the modern vending industry came in the last half of the 19th centry.

In 215 B.C., the mathematician Hero produced a book entitled "Pneumatika," in which he described many of his own inventions and the inventions of his teacher, Tesibius. Pupil and teacher lived and worked in Alexandria during the golden age of Greece.

Hero's original manuscript is lost, but it was copied and in 1587 the copy was translated into Italian with illustrations. In "Pneumatika," Hero described and illustrated a coin-actuated device to be used for vending sacrificial water in Egyptian temples. The device was completely automatic and was set in operation by the insertion of "a coin of five drachmas," equivalent in modern money to approximately 75 cents. Whether the holy water vending machine was the invention of Hero or Tesibius cannot be determined from the manuscript. Nor is there any evidence that the device was widely used.

From the time Hero wrote his book until its translation into Italian, nothing is known to indicate that other inventors tinkered with selling machines. It could be that the translation of Hero's "Pneumatika" revived interest in the idea of vending since snuff and tobacco boxes, activated by the insertion of coins, appeared in English taverns and inns during 1615. Actually, the 17th century tobacco and snuff venders were less sophisticated than Hero's invention and left considerably more to the honesty of the customer.

These tobacco and snuff venders, made of polished brass, operated on the old English half pence, a coin somewhat larger than a quarter but smaller than a half dollar. When the coin was inserted in the top of the device, it flipped a trigger which caused the lid covering one half of the top to fly open. The customer could then reach in to retrieve a pinch of snuff or to fill the bowl of his pipe. After each purchase the innkeeper or barmaid pushed the lid shut and moved the vender on to the next customer. The device was small (9½ inches long, 4½ inches wide and 4 inches deep), had a handle for carrying, and held approximately a pound of tobacco.

A number of these early vending machines were brought to the Colonies, and a few survive in museums and as the property of private collectors.

The first attempt to vend a product other than snuff or tobacco also came in England, at the beginning of the 19th century—a 100-year period which would see inventors and promoters produce or promise an astounding variety of automatic selling devices.

In 1822, an English freethinker and bookseller named Richard Carlile constructed a vending machine he hoped would baffle the police and censors. This was at the time when a courageous handful of booksellers and publishers were struggling to establish freedom for the English press. Carlile and some of his employees had been jailed for selling works such as Thomas Paine's "The Age of Reason." To prevent such arrests, Carlile conceived the idea of selling books by machine so that the seller could not then be legally identified.

The Republican, a newspaper published by Carlile, described the device to prospective clients:

"Perhaps it will amuse you to be informed that in the new Temple of Reason my publications are sold by clockwork. In the shop is the dial on which is written every publication for sale. The purchaser enters and turns the hand of the dial to the publication he wants, when, on depositing his money, the publication drops down before him."

Unfortunately, the courts held Carlile responsible nevertheless and convicted one of his employees of selling blasphemous literature through the device. Whether the device was truly automatic cannot be established today, but it was clearly an application of the vending principle.

Thirty-five years later, in 1857, one Simeon Denham was issued a British patent for a vending machine. This appears to be the first automatic selling device covered by patent law. The Denham machine was a postage stamp vender which fed a single stamp out upon the insertion of a penny. It was a crude device and did not get beyond the idea stage until some 30 years later when inventors began an all-out assault on the problem of selling stamps automatically.

In England, the Scandinavian nations, France, and Germany, inventors intrigued with the vending principle built or designed numerous models of coin-operated weighing scales, tobacco, gum, and candy machines. As long ago as 1867, the German inventor-engineer Carl Ade built models of machines to sell handkerchiefs, cigarettes, and confections. Many of the inventors took the precaution of patenting their devices throughout the world—in India, Luxembourg, Spain, New South Wales, Tasmania, Cape of Good Hope, South Australia, Canada, New Zealand.

The first U.S. patent issued for a vending machine went in 1884 to W. H. Fruen for an "automatic drawing device." Fruen's patent (No. 309,219) bears a close resemblance to Hero's holy water dispenser, but the machine was never produced in quantity.

One year later, in 1885, a group of New York promoters introduced the penny weighing scale to the United States. Imported from Germany, the scale was a massive machine weighing some 600 pounds. The workings were enclosed in a mahogany cabinet which was liberally decorated with intricate carvings.

In 1886, a group of patents, some for original machines and some improved models of earlier inventions, were applied for at the U.S. Patent Office. The inventors—Percival Everitt, Chas. H. Russell, Frederick C. Lynde—were Englishmen.

Everitt had patented his invention in 1885 in England and had been granted patents around the world. Some indication of the trials and tribulations of the early vending machine designer (and, for that matter, of their successors in the years to come) is contained in Percival Everitt's patent application.

Everitt observed that his patent (No. 374,297) was an invention improving an earlier patent dated July 28, 1885. "It has been found in practice," Everitt's application said, "that although the apparatus is misused articles such as paper, orangepeel, and other rubbish have been maliciously placed in the slit provided for the admission of the coin, and that in consequence the channel provided for the passage of the coins from the slit became blocked."

Thus it was that early in the development of the vending machine the American public came to regard the silent salesmen as fair game—to "beat" the machine or, failing that, to stuff an orangepeel down its innards to put it out of commission. Reckoning with this perversity is still a mighty challenge for designers and engineers.

Some indication of the early progress automatic vending made abroad, and was to make in the United States, can be gathered from the fact that on November 25, 1887, the Sweetmeat Automatic Delivery Co., Ltd., was registered in England—the first company organized to install and maintain automatic vending machines as its principal business.

The real beginnings of practical vending in the United States came in 1888 when Thomas Adams, founder of the Adams Gum Co., subsequently the American Chicle Co., had machines designed to sell his Tutti-Frutti gum on New York City's elevated platforms. From the outset, Adams' gum machines could be counted successful and, from that day to this, the vending machine has been a considerable factor in the marketing plans of American chewing gum manufacturers.

Just what prompted Adams to turn to vending, and to make his first installations on the El platforms, is a matter of conjecture. But the same thought struck other pioneers in other parts of the world. In 1889, for example, commercial vending was introduced in France to raise money for philanthropy. The Society of the Stores for the Blind, a charitable organization, installed 10-centime chocolate and bon-bon machines in the railroad stations along the Paris-Marseilles line and their success led to the rise of French vending industry.

The last decade of the 19th century witnessed a rash of new vending machine inventions, the formation of dozens of early vending companies (some, like the Watling Manufacturing Co., Chicago, still survive), and the development caught the fancy of the American press.

In its June 28, 1890, edition, Scientific American took note of the invention in England of an automatic picture-taking machine. "It is proposed," the magazine told its readers, "to erect automatic photographing machines, corresponding in a general way to the other machines of this class for weighing, selling candy, etc., with which the public is now familiar."

In Paris that same year, the city government adopted a law which forebade the drivers of horse-drawn cabs from using charcoal burners to keep their passengers' feet warm. As a substitute for the burners, a number of hot water vending machines were set up in street-corner kiosks. The machines delivered 9 quarts of boiling hot water when the proper coin was inserted and hackdrivers used cans of hot water as a substitute for their charcoal burners. The machines likewise served as a source of supply for some of the city's poor who had no other source of hot water in their homes.

Putting a voice in the silent salesman was tried for the first time in New York in 1890. This, as we shall see, was an idea which keeps recurring in the development and expansion of the vending principal. The first talking vending machine was a penny scale which incorporated a crude phonograph. When a patron inserted a coin, and while he read his weight on the dial, the phonograph played a brief passage from some well-known opera or popular tune. It developed, however, that the public wanted accurate weight rather than entertainment and the talking scale faded from the scene.

France seems to have taken to vending with great gusto once the bonbon and chocolate machines began popping up in numbers. Naturally enough, the French quickly conceived the idea of extending the vending principle to the nation's most famous product. A report in Scientific American for December 26, 1891, describes in considerable detail the rise of the "automatic fountain" in Paris and other French cities.

"In the automatic distributors of which we speak," Scientific American's reporter wrote, "It suffices to put a coin, say a 5-cent piece, in a slot, when a tube placed beneath the money box allows a small glass of malaga, a large glass of beer, etc., to flow. The apparatus operates with perfect regularity, and the quantity of liquid is always accurately measured, its volume varying with its nature. There are distributors of this kind that serve hot liquids (such as coffee) or iced ones. A series of different types is at present installed at the Exposition of Labor at the Palace of Industry. Our Parisian readers will there be able to observe the regularity with which these automatic apparatus operate. Several bars provided with them are installed in different parts of Paris."

An illustration accompanying the text showed a bar in Montmarte with dozens of barrel-shaped automatic "distributors." So far as is known, this was the first time numbers of vending machines were arranged in a bank or battery, a practice continued off and on until the great depression and revived during the 1950's in the United States.

Scientific American viewed the development of automatic vending with good favor. The publication told its readers that vending machines were a boon to both the consumer and the producer.

"To the consumer, the automatic distributor offers the advantage of immediately delivering for a moderate sum, and without any loss of time, an accurately measured quantity of a hot or cold beverage furnished directly by the producer. The latter, selling his merchandise directly, can deliver it at a very low but remunerative price, and, through the aid of the apparatus with placards, circulars, etc., put at the consumer's disposal, can obtain the best of advertisements."

These arguments on behalf of the vending machine are still used, and still convincing. Scientific American's reporter did indicate, however, that these machines were not without their detractors as witness the following:

"In fact, these automatic distributors of liquids already have, for natural enemies, all the manufacturers whose indifferent or unwholesome products cannot undergo the decisive test of previous testing.

"We cannot dwell," the periodical continued, "upon the numerous applications to which the automatic distributors of liquids may be put outside of the simple establishments of consumption. In railway stations, public gardens, etc., it will be possible to utilize these apparatus, either with the charitable object in view of furnishing the poor with wholesome and strengthening beverages (such as milk, bouillon, etc.) at a low price, or with the simple motive of making a new product known and appreciated."

In the United States, meantime, the postage stamp vending machine was coming into its own. Early attempts had been made by Automatic Machine Co., Chicago, and Postage Stamp Service Machine Co., New York, to launch operations of stamp venders. But the first successful large scale operation of stamp venders were undertaken in 1891 by the Automatic Machine Company of Buffalo, N.Y. The Buffalo company used a penny stamp vender invented by William Dutton, and the machine was hailed in the newspapers of the day as an "honest slot machine" because it sold a penny stamp for a penny.

In 1892, John Williams, of Manchester, England, invented and patented a ticket vending machine. Once a coin was inserted, a bell rang and a ticket was automatically issued. A register on the device indicated how many tickets had been dispensed.

James Angell Hardman, Editor and Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last week one of the leading editors and publishers of smaller daily newspapers in the United States died, bringing to an end a life of true public service. Not only did James A. Hardman publish the North Adams Transcript, but he was a civic leader in all of the northern Berkshires of Massachusetts.

During his 81 years he labored for the Red Cross, struggled to explain and promote liberty loan war bonds during World War I, and was instrumental in the perennial success of the North Adams Community Chest. James Hardman used commonsense to determine when his newspaper should speak out for public causes to benefit the entire community. His accurate judgment earned him the respect and love of all who knew him.

Almost alone Mr. Hardman rescued the North Adams State Teachers College from economic obliteration and put it back on its current stable basis. The force for civic betterment that a daily newspaper can become is well exemplified by the modern hospital that stands in North Adams today. The fundraising campaign of the Transcript was a major factor in the building of that hospital, and the Transcript's publisher was one of its trustees. James Hardman was long a director of the chamber of commerce, one of the first members of the Rotary Club, the only honorary life director of the North Adams National Bank, and a pioneer in the communications media of radio.

But what did his fellow newspapermen think of him? The honor and respect of those in his own profession has evidenced itself in life as well as death. I include below the memorials of two of his nearest neighbors, the Transcript-Telegram of Holyoke and Berkshire Eagle of Pittsfield.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, Sept. 16, 1961]

SO FAR AND NO FARTHER

The death of James Angell Hardman, editor-publisher of the North Adams Transcript for half a century, just about closes out a chapter in western Massachusetts newspaper life. When he came out of Williams College to join forces with his father in the management of the fine North Adams paper, established in 1843, he found himself moving into a notable circle of newspaper men holding top positions in the newspaper field in three of the four western counties. Those men were his own father, Kelton B. Miller, of the Berkshire Eagle in Pittsfield, Solomon P. Griffin of the Springfield Republican, Henry S. Gere of the Hamphire Gazette and William G. Dwight of the Holyoke Transcript. They had established a school of newspaper thought and management despite the fact that all were individualists to the core.

Their lines of thought merged into a common highway much of the time. Mr. Griffin still clung to the lares and penates of the House of Bowles and rated the whole wide world as his realm for report and suggestion. But on more than one occasion he would suggest that it was not for him to advise how things be run in Boston, Washington or London until, and unless, something was done to better conditions in Springfield, Mass.

As for the others, their home communities were both their primary and secondary interests. What was good for the community was good for the newspaper in the long run and they had inherited from their ancestral lines the ability to take the long look ahead.

By the time Jim Hardman had been elevated to full control of the North Adams Transcript that famous quartet was moving off into the shadows but their teachings still had force to guide their successors, even to the second and third generation. The belief

that there is a permanent place in the American picture for smaller newspapers to provide something that larger newspapers cannot possibly provide, and that their special mission is to put their shoulders to the wheel of progress, at the same time holding to the established truths in human experience, is the source of their general success.

Personally Jim Hardman was of the type to which the word "lovable" can be safely attached. But with that form of love went a deep and abiding respect for built-in something that he had which said "so far and no farther" to anything that he did not believe was the better way for his community and his newspaper code.

[From the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle, Sept. 14, 1961]

JAMES A. HARDMAN, RESPECTED EDITOR

North Adams has lost one of its first citizens in the death at 81 of James Angell Hardman, but it has received from him a rich heritage. The North Adams Transcript, which he served as editor and publisher for so many years, is a responsible and highly respected institution largely because it reflects the qualities with which his leadership imbued it.

That Mr. Hardman was the key factor in the Transcript's emergence as a first-rate small newspaper is a matter of record. At the time he left Williams College to join the family business in 1901 the Transcript was a venerable but struggling enterprise engaged in an uphill fight against strong local competition. Under his direction it grew in both prosperty and prestige, becoming in 1924 the only surviving daily in northern Berkshire.

But Mr. Hardman was much more than a good businessman. Because he believed strongly in the basic principles of enlightened journalism, he was able to make the Transcript into an effective voice that was listened to and respected. Quiet and unassuming as a person, he was not given to table pounding and shrill crusading as an editor. But his firmness in espousing what he felt was good for North Adams and good for the Berkshire was unshakable, even when the cause was not always popular.

To most of the employees at the Transcript, Mr. Hardman was known as "the skipper"—a nickname reflecting the warm respect in which he was held by those most closely associated with him. A newspaperman first and last, he was deeply rooted in a community which he served with understanding and affection. The affection was mutual.

Those Glen Canyon Transmission Lines—Some Facts and Figures on a Bitter Dispute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives voted to appropriate sufficient funds to commence construction of the backbone power transmission lines of the upper Colorado River storage project, by the Bureau of Reclamation. My distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL] prepared for distribution a statement discussing the above matter. I feel it in the general public interest that his statement be made available to all those interested in this issue. For that reason I now insert his statement in the RECORD:

THOSE GLEN CANYON TRANSMISSION LINES—SOME FACTS AND FIGURES ON A BITTER DISPUTE

(A special report by Representative MORRIS K. UDALL)

Since I came to Congress in May, my office has been flooded with more mail on one single issue than the combined total dealing with Castro, Berlin, Aid to Education, and foreign aid. Many writers, it soon became apparent, did not have complete or adequate information about the issues or facts involved in this dispute. The matter has now been resolved by the House of Representatives, and it occurs to me that many Arizonians might want a background paper on the facts and issues as they appeared to me. I earnestly hope that those who have criticized my stand will be willing to take a look at the other side of the story—for it has received little attention in the Arizona press.

It is always sad to see a falling out among reputable and important Arizona industrial groups. In these past months we have witnessed a fierce struggle which has divided two important segments of the Arizona electrical industry. For many years Arizona Public Service Co. (APSCO) and such public or consumer-owned utilities as city of Mesa, Salt River Valley Water Users Association, the electrical districts, REA co-ops, etc., have worked harmoniously solving the electrical needs of a growing State. Since early 1961, however, APSCO has been locked in deadly combat with the other groups. Charges and countercharges have filled the air.

The largest part of my mail has directly resulted from a very large, expensive (and most effective) public relations effort by APSCO, working in close cooperation with the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette. Speakers for APSCO have fanned out from its hearquarters into every county courthouse and to hundreds of service clubs and civic groups.

Let me hasten to add that I bear APSCO no ill will. It has every right to present its case to the public in any legitimate fashion. As far as I know, its extensive lobbying and public relations programs have been conducted with propriety and are above reproach. Its representatives have treated me with courtesy and friendliness, and I have carefully listened to their arguments. No threats, reprisals, or pressure tactics have been directed against me.

On the other hand there is a strong case to be made for construction of the lines by the Bureau of Reclamation as I shall outline below. The many Arizonians who favor this approach have not been as well organized or financed as APSCO, and they have had meager newspaper support. For these reasons their contentions have not been widely heard or understood.

BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSY

The most important single factor in the growth and economic success of Arizona and the West has been the Federal reclamation program which Theodore Roosevelt began in 1902 with the authorization of the Salt River Valley project—a model multipurpose reclamation job. This was followed by Hoover, Davis, Parker and other dams.

These projects—and future ones like Central Arizona, Buttes Dam, Charleston Dam—may be the key to our future. All of them have been attacked by their opponents as unsound waste of tax dollars; yet every project has been so designed and planned that it would be completely self-liquidating over the life of the project.

The latest chapter in reclamation was written in 1956 when Congress authorized the Colorado River storage project. This project calls for construction of four large dams:

1. Glen Canyon, Page, Ariz.
2. Flaming Gorge, on Green River in northeastern Utah.
3. Curecanti, on Gunnison River in western Colorado.
4. Navajo, on San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico.

In addition the 1956 law authorized more than 35 participating irrigation projects. These will eventually be constructed in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The plan Congress approved provides a financing system which will return to the taxpayers—over an 86-year period—the full cost of these dams and participating projects. While the project is designed principally to promote irrigation and water control, it has important recreation and other byproducts. But electricity is the key, for most of the revenue to "pay out" the cost must come from sale of the electric energy produced by the dams. The Federal Government will own and operate the dams and generators, and will sell the energy to (a) publically owned and consumer-owned utilities, and (b) to private utilities. The public and consumer-owned groups are designated by law as "preference customers," meaning that they have first right to buy available power. Any power not claimed by the preference groups is sold to private utilities. This is the identical arrangement under which the Bureau of Reclamation sells energy from Hoover, Davis and Parker Dams to APSCO, Tucson Gas Electric Co. and to various preference customers. The Bureau has never delivered power to homes or businesses. It sells only to utility companies.

The preference cusomers in Arizona include cities like Mesa, Safford, and Thatcher which own their own electric system; irrigation districts like Roosevelt Water conservation District in Maricopa County; REA co-ops like Trico, Sulphur Springs Valley, Graham County, Mohave, and Navopache; and electric districts such as the four which serve the farmers of Pinal County.

The 1956 act directed the Bureau of Reclamation to build the dams (as it is now doing at Glen Canyon), install the necessary generators (now on order) and "construct, operate, and maintain * * * powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works." In addition, section 7 of the act provided that "the hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by the act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates."

The 1956 Arizona delegation to Congress (Hayden, Goldwater, Rhodes, and Udall) unanimously supported the bill. APSCO and other utilities favored and urged the project.

When Glen Canyon Dam was begun Interior Secretary Seaton undertook to plan and design a "backbone" transmission network which would (a) interconnect the new dams, as well as the one in Green Mountain, Colo.; and (b) move the power to population centers in Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming where it could be sold.

In 1959 and 1960 five large private utilities (Arizona Public Service Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Co., of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Utah Power & Light Co.) in these five States undertook a campaign to persuade Secretary Seaton that he should build some of the Federal lines contemplated, but not all of them. They offered to build certain lines—including two from Glen Canyon to the dis-

tribution point at Pinnacle Peak north of Phoenix. They offered to make wheeling agreements under which they would transmit the Government's power over private utilities' lines for a fee or wheeling charge.

Secretary Seaton studied the offer, sought private consultant's advice, and, just before leaving office, rejected the offer. Seaton contended that acceptance would result in (a) higher power costs, and (b) would fail to produce the revenue necessary for the whole project to pay out, and build the participating irrigation projects.

In early 1961 the new Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, was urged by the utility companies to review this decision. After a careful review and another opinion from private consultants, he confirmed Seaton's findings and decision.

BATTLE MOVES TO CONGRESS

The power companies then carried their fight to the Congress. The 1961 public works appropriation bill contained an item of some $5 million for first-phase construction of the Federal "backbone" lines. The utilities asked the Congress to delete this item. This would have left the Bureau of Reclamation without funds to build the Federal system, forcing it to negotiate wheeling agreements with the five private utilities.

The House Appropriations Committee in early September 1961, after full consideration and lengthy hearings, defeated 27 to 17 an amendment to remove this item from the appropriation. When the bill came to the House floor on September 12, Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, offered an amendment to delete the $5 million item. After a thorough debate the House voted 134 to 114 in Committee of the Whole to retain it. After passage of the bill, Representative JENSEN moved to recommit the entire public works appropriation bill to the committee with instructions to delete the money for these lines. This motion was defeated 224 to 182. I voted with the majority.

The APSCO proposal had been fully debated in the House. The utilities had had their "day in court" and had been defeated. I felt with many other Congressmen that the motion to recommit would only reopen a controversial matter which had been settled, would probably throw the entire matter into the 1962 session—thus delaying and threatening the timing of this gigantic project—and would imperil about $3.6 billion of other important public works projects financed by the bill.

Among the projects which would have been delayed were the Camelsback Reservoir near Safford, $800,000; planning for the Tucson diversion channel, $149,000; Colorado levee system near Yuma, $1,590,000; Gila project in Yuma Irrigation District, $800,000; and Glen Canyon Dam construction, $19,895,000.

THE NUB OF THE DISPUTE

In the framework of this background let me now try to summarize the basic problem as I approached it:

1. At the outset I recognized that the Colorado River storage project (CRSP) is an irrigation and reclamation project. Electricity is secondary, important only as the source of revenue to build the reclamation works.

2. If (and this is the big argument) APSCO and its partners could build the particular lines and wheel power for the Government without endangering payout of the dams and irrigation works, I would favor giving them the job.

3. On the other hand, if handing these profitable lines to APSCO and its associates would drain the project basin fund of revenue to pay out and develop water projects as intended in the act, the Bureau should build the lines.

Since May I have spent hundreds of hours reading the contentions of the two factions. I have attended more than 10 briefing sessions sponsored by one side or the other. Dozens of Arizonians have come to my office to present their views, and hundreds more have written. These expressions have been considered. I listened to every word of the House debate.

Both sides have impressive figures. Both can't be right. Someone is wrong:

(a) APSCO presented beautifully documented brochures and charts which analyzed its proposed construction of lines and wheeling charges. Its figures, if correct, proved that the wheeling arrangement would not result in increased power rates for the preference customers, and would permit the Bureau of Reclamation to pay out on schedule.

(b) The Bureau of Reclamation and the public and consumer-owned utilities present beautifully documented brochures and charts which analyzed the results under Federal construction as against the wheeling arrangement. These figures, if correct, prove that the APSCO proposal would result in either higher power rates for consumers, or deficient pay out funds, or both.

The House Appropriations Committee, after extensive hearings found the Bureau figures more persuasive. The committee's decision was supported by the House of Representatives. This seemed the safe course to a substantial majority of my colleagues from other States. If APSCO's proposal had been accepted—and if its figures turned out to be wrong—irreparable damage would have been done to a billion-dollar project. Reclamation—never a popular subject with eastern congressmen—would have been discredited. Substantial appropriations would be required to bail out an unsound project. Future projects for Arizona and other western States would have been imperiled.

On the other hand, everyone has agreed that payout would be guaranteed under the Federal system. We have a large enough Federal deficit without gambling on the return of this $1 billion investment.

PARTICULAR ARGUMENTS DISCUSSED

In the balance of this memorandum I will briefly discuss under 15 headings some of the major arguments dividing the disputing forces, and some of the important conclusions which I have reached.

1. APSCO's proposal would discriminate in favor of Maricopa County

In making my decision on this issue I have sought a solution which would distribute impartially within Arizona the benefits of this important project. In my judgment, the APSCO proposal would have given one large private utility in the Phoenix area distinct advantages over other utilities in other parts of the State. These advantages would have included the privilege of integrating Government power into the APSCO system and borrowing it in times of greatest need. This could result in reducing APSCO's construction costs for generation facilities—all to the advantage of APSCO stockholders and its electric customers. Southern Arizona and the Second Congressional District should not suffer at the expense of Phoenix. The Arizona Power Authority, as our State's independent broker in delivering Colorado River power, has made a proud record working in cooperation with both private and public power interests. If the Glen Canyon energy were controlled not by the Arizona Power Authority but by APSCO, the result, in my judgment, would have been a tremendous disadvantage to the electric consumers in Pima, Cochise, Santa Cruz, and Pinal Counties who now receive through the APA a proportionate share of the Hoover-Parker-Davis energy. I was most anxious that my congressional district not be discriminated against in the distribution of this power or the benefits and I became convinced that APSCO's proposal might well have this result.

2. Construction of the Federal "backbone" transmission system is the traditional, accepted pattern of reclamation projects

Historically, the Bureau of Reclamation has always constructed its own transmission lines connecting large dams in an area with each other and with the population centers where the power is delivered. The Government has never gone into the business of selling power to consumers. It has never constructed steamplants but develops power from water sources only. It builds only the backbone or skeleton transmission systems. The flesh and muscle lines are filled in by private and public utility companies. This pattern has been followed with power generated at Parker, Hoover, Davis, and other dams in our area. This Bureau of Reclamation power has been sold to APSCO, Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co., and other Arizona utilities. The lines from the dams to population centers were designed and built by the Bureau of Reclamation, but the United States is repaid in full with interest from power revenues over a period of years.

3. APSCO proposal would not save taxpayers money

It has been broadly claimed that APSCO, by building the lines, would save U.S. taxpayers some $175 million. This is true only from a short-range standpoint. The money to build the Colorado River storage project dams and lines will be fully repaid with interest to the taxpayers in the same fashion as other reclamation projects. In addition, these projects will generate new business and new wealth which will create, as the Salt River project created, large new tax sources. More importantly, however, we should note this: the utilities do not offer to build the lines and transfer the electricity free of charge for the Federal Government. They are asking the Government to pay them every year for the life of the project a wheeling charge. The House Appropriations Committee staff estimates that the Federal Government would pay APSCO and its partners over the life of the project $575 million in wheeling charges. These moneys would have to be appropriated every year and paid by the taxpayers to these utilities. Thus the U.S. taxpayer ends up with a drawer full of rent receipts rather than a revenue-producing asset owned by the Government. True the U.S. taxpayers might make an immediate saving of $175 million by letting APSCO and the other companies build the lines, but will pay the private utilities $575 million for wheeling services. This does not seem like any bargain for taxpayers, and explains why the private utilities can speak so generously about the taxes they will pay.

4. The APSCO proposal would give it control of a $1 billion taxpayer investment

The taxpayers of the United States will have an investment of $1 billion in the dams and works making up the Colorado River storage project. APSCO and its partners proposed to spend about $100 million building the key transmission lines. Yet these lines would effectively control the whole system. The unfairness of this argument was noted in a recent Herblock cartoon in the Washington Post where the private utilities were shown telling the U.S. taxpayer "We generously let you pay for the cow—all we ask is that you let us take the cream."

5. APSCO would have the Government build isolated unprofitable transmission lines

One single important fact has been almost entirely overlooked in all of the controversy. APSCO and its partners have never said to the Government, "Let us build all of the lines you will need for this system." On the contrary, they have always urged that Uncle Sam must and should build many of the transmission lines required to properly interconnect the system. Many of these lines are under construction now. APSCO

asks to build only the profitable key lines which are vital to control of the whole system. For example, APSCO still urges Congress to appropriate taxpayers' money to build a line from Glen Canyon to Four Corners. This line runs across the most desolate parts of Arizona, where electrical consumers are as scarce as parking meters. On the other hand, APSCO demanded the right to build the Glen Canyon-Phoenix line because it is the single most profitable part in the system. If it is right for APSCO to build one line, it ought to be willing to build the other.

6. APSCO's proposal would endanger participating projects

As noted above, the Colorado River storage project was primarily intended and designed to finance reclamation and irrigation works in the Upper Colorado Basin States. The officials of these States strongly objected to the APSCO proposal on the grounds that their participating projects could not be financed. It was estimated in the House debate that the basin fund which pays for the participating projects would be $273 million short if the wheeling arrangements were to be made. The Water Conservation Board of the State of Colorado (the official agency of that State in matters pertaining to reclamation development) made an intensive study and took a strong stand for Bureau of Reclamation construction of the lines. Gov. Steve McNichols, of Colorado, urged Governor Fannin and every member of Arizona's delegation to oppose the APSCO proposal. Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, of the House Interior Committee, a man with more knowledge of reclamation than any other Member of the House, said in the course of the House debate that he had been confused by the conflicting claims and had undertaken to obtain the advice of an independent engineering consultant:

"On the basis of his study, the dollar amounts which would be received as net revenues in the basic fund and available for development of participating projects * * * would be about $117 million more under an all-Federal system than under the private utilities proposal, and the financial advantage of the all-Federal system after the year 2049 would be about $4.8 million per year. Again I point out that this is based upon using the utilities' figures. The Bureau's study comparing the utilities' proposal with the so-called modified system, shows a difference in favor of an all-Federal system of $275 million over the same period."

7. APSCO proposal might result in higher power rates for thousands of Arizona city consumers, farmers, and REA users

One of the major difficulties I had in making a decision was the completely contradictory claims made by the two sides. APSCO strongly claimed that its wheeling proposal would not result in higher rates for customers of the municipally owned systems, of Salt River project, of the REA co-ops, and of the electrical districts. On the other hand the organized consumer groups directly affected expressed deep concern over this prospect and had figures tending to support their views. I have had hundreds of letters from consumers in Mesa, in Pinal County, and elsewhere expressing these fears. For example, Paul Pearce, mayor of Eloy, said in a telegram: "As a farmer in Eloy area firmly believe Federal construction of Glen Canyon Dam transmission system is only method to retain present cheap power rates for irrigation pumping. Suggest and urge your leadership in coming days."

8. This is not a private enterprise versus socialism issue

APSCO and the other private utilities have raised the cry, "Let free enterprise do the job," and all of us can support this slogan as a general proposition. However, this is an emotional argument which bears little weight because APSCO is not engaged in free enterprise as we ordinarily understand it. It is a regulated monopoly with no competitors, with a guaranteed rate of return to its stockholders. Its investments are subsidized in part by quick tax writeoffs. APSCO and its partners did not ask to build the dams; indeed they urged the United States to build them in order to promote the economy of these Western States. They did not cry "socialism" or "Government handout" when the Government built Glen Canyon Dam, nor when it undertook to purchase and install the huge generators there. Socialism became the issue only when the Government undertook to build all of the transmission lines needed to sell the electricity to pay for the dams. The Colorado River storage project is a related, interconnected series of dams, generators, lines, and irrigation works. It seems hardly logical to split off one small, profitable part of an integrated whole and give it to a regulated monopoly in the name of free enterprise.

9. Bureau of Reclamation has an excellent record. It does not seek to dominate private enterprise

We hear many criticisms of our Federal Government and of "bureaucrats," yet Arizonans have nearly always placed the Bureau of Reclamation above criticism. It has an international reputation for building such dams as Hoover, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, et cetera, and its hard-working personnel have constructed more dams and transmission lines than any organization in the world. Interior Secretary Fred Seaton and President Eisenhower thoroughly considered the arguments of APSCO and rejected their proposal. Certainly Mr. Seaton, a prominent Republican Nebraska businessman, has a belief in free enterprise and an opposition to socialism which are beyond question. His decision was made on a nonpartisan basis and it was reaffirmed when the present Democratic administration and the present Interior Secretary reached the same conclusions.

10. The Federal "backbone" system is no threat to APSCO and the private utilities

APSCO and its partners have made extreme charges in the heat of battle, going so far as to contend that the Bureau of Reclamation is trying to dominate the electrical industry throughout the United States. I would fight such an effort if it were ever made, but the argument ignores the facts: when all the dams in the Colorado River storage project are fully operating, they will generate about 1 million kilowatts. APSCO in a booklet filed with my office estimates that the five private utilities involved in this controversy will generate and sell in 1980 a total power load of 20 million kilowatts, or about 20 times the capacity of these dams. I cannot understand how anyone can seriously claim that the power production of these dams could be any threat to private enterprise. The tail will not wag the dog. In the United States more than 80 percent of all electrical customers are served by private power, and this is as it should be. The Bureau of Reclamation now has harmonious interconnection arrangements with APSCO in other Arizona areas. Even under the all-Federal system, there will be particular phases were wheeling arrangements will be made with private utilities in the Upper Colorado Basin.

11. What about the $750,000 in taxes APSCO would pay Arizona?

APSCO has aroused many leaders in northern Arizona by holding out the bait of an estimated $750,000 in taxes which it claims it would pay if it constructed the proposed lines. The estimate is highly exaggerated, according to independent sources, and is nothing more than a guess. Even Representative RHODES, who has supported the position of the private utilities in this controversy, could not accept APSCO's claim that it will pay $750,000 in taxes to Arizona. He placed the figure, in a report to his constituents, at "somewhere between $350,000 and $450,000 annually." In any event, this money was not offered as a charitable contribution from the generosity of APSCO. This tax money would have come from utility charges paid by consumers located principally in Phoenix and southern Arizona. These proposed lines would not have been located in Maricopa, Pima, or any of the large population centers. For the most part, they would have traversed remote, mountainous areas where there are no cities, or crowded school districts with high tax rates, mostly on Federal lands. Taking average taxes for the Phoenix area and applying them to improvements in remote areas is absurd.

Furthermore, APSCO is already building two new generating plants at Four Corners and Joseph City, and is already underway with definite plans for a large transmission line from Four Corners to Phoenix. These lines will pay taxes, even though they don't carry Federal power.

12. The House vote was decisive and bipartisan

The decision by the House of Representatives against the APSCO proposal was decisive and bipartisan. Five States were directly concerned: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. These States have 11 Congressmen. Ten of the eleven voted for the Federal transmission system: Republicans HARRISON, of Wyoming, CHENOWETH and DOMINICK, of Colorado, and Democrats ASPINALL and ROGERS, of Colorado, MORRIS and MONTOYA, of New Mexico, KING and PETERSON, of Utah, and UDALL, of Arizona. It is probable that Colorado Basin Senators will vote likewise with the exceptions of Senator GOLDWATER and Senator BENNETT, Republicans of Arizona and Utah.

In the House these Republicans, in addition to those named above, voted to reject the APSCO plan: ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; CUNNINGHAM, MARTIN, and WEAVER, of Nebraska; ELLSWORTH, MCVEY, and SHRIVER, of Kansas; HORAN, MAY, and TOLLEFSON, of Washington; MERROW, of New Hampshire; MOSHER, of Ohio; O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; REECE, of Tennessee, REIFEL, of South Dakota; STAFFORD, of Vermont.

13. Many prominent, intelligent Arizonans oppose APSCO plan

From some of the newspaper publicity, one might conclude that APSCO's proposal was opposed only by a few bureaucrats and misguided liberals. This is not the case.

My office has received hundreds of communications from prominent, intelligent and sincere business, farm, and civic leaders who favor Bureau of Reclamation construction.

Here is a sample of their comments and a cross section of the prominent leaders who support the Bureau of Reclamation position:

Mayor E. J. Brown, Mesa, commenting on appropriation committee action including funds for the Federal grid: "We are sure that the committee has made the move after full consideration of all the factors involved. We commend the committeemen for their action."

William T. Elliott, chairman, Electrical District No. 4, Pinal County: "The directors of Electrical District No. 4 individually and collectively urge your support for Federal construction. We believe this is the only salvation for our members."

Dewey Farr, Navopache Electric Co-Operative, Inc., Lakeside: "Relative to the transmission lines connecting the various Bureau hydroelectric generating plans, I think that those already constructed should remain the property of the Federal Government and that the Federal Government should continue to construct those facilities, for the purpose of transmitting power from generating plants to the points of distribution."

Paul H. Jones, prominent insurance executive, Tucson: "I believe that it would be a mistake to reverse the thinking of the current and past administrations by turning this over to the private power companies. I am a great believer in private enterprise, but I question the advisability of using large amounts of Government funds to build a project and then turn it over to private industry, particularly one who has not always worked completely in the public interest."

Among others who have written to support the Bureau plan are Mayor Don Hummel of Tucson; Mayor C. W. Kirtland of Safford; H. S. Hansen of Coolidge; A. O. Bicknell, Tucson, president of Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Arthur J. Faul, chairman of Electrical District No. 2, Pinal County; Edward J. Farrell, chairman, Electrical District No. 3, Pinal County; and Edward Pretzer, chairman, Electric District No. 5, Pinal County.

14. Leading national newspapers favored the "backbone" system

Many of the Nation's leading newspapers, far removed from the West and local pressures, supported the Federal transmission system.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said in an editorial: "The controversy over the upper Colorado project is, as we see it, not an ideological one of public versus private power. The question is how to develop most fully the power resources in which public funds are invested for public purposes. If the Federal Government is able to invest nine-tenths of the total cost to build the productive plant, it is certainly able, and has the obligation, to invest the remaining one-tenth for transmission lines to make sure that the product best serves the broad national purpose of resource development for which it was created."

The Washington Post declared: "There is no objection to private companies tying in marketing lines for consumers in the area. But should private companies be allowed to cream off the chief advantage of a public investment by acquiring control of the basic power grid? The plan approved by Congress in 1956 certainly did not provide for such an arrangement; instead it followed the existing pattern of Federal construction."

Similar comments were made in other sections of the country.

The Mesa Tribune, an independent daily in our own State, said: "Official actions of the (Mesa) council and of the (Salt River) project's governing board support public ownership of the lines. * * * The power at Glen Canyon will be produced by publicly owned utilities be allowed to establish a toll-gate for delivery of that power? Federal ownership of the power lines is in the best interest of the whole Nation as well as this area, when the long-range is considered."

Later, the Mesa Tribune added:

"Mayor Brown * * * took issue with statements of leaders in several northern areas of the State regarding the possible tax losses that political subdivisions in that section may incur because of Federal ownership of the lines. He pointed out that the lines will be built across nontaxable publicly owned lands for the most part and he also questioned the $750,000 figure that has been widely quoted as the amount of taxes that would result from the lines being under private ownership."

CONCLUSION

I hope that those who have read this memorandum will better understand the complex factors which led me to vote as I did. Now that it is settled, let all Arizonans, including APSCO and the consumer-owned utilities, resolve their differences and unite in support of reclamation measures which will promote a successful future for our State.

Keith Worthington's History of Nephi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Nephi, Utah, settled in 1851, was named for the patriarch who in the Book of Mormon came with his family from Judea to the Americas in the time of the Babylonian captivity.

Nephi was fortified with a moated wall and its most important early event was the making of peace between Brigham Young and Chief Walker. Historians tell us that according to S. N. Carvalho, who was present, Young, accompanied by 50 mounted men and 100 wagon loads of curious settlers, came to Walker's camp. After a day of preliminary oratory and gifts, Walker began plaintively:

Sometimes Wakara take his young men and go far away to sell horses. When he is gone, Americats come kill his wife and children. Why no come fight when Wakara home?

But he concluded:

Wakara no want fight Mormonee. If Indian kill white man again, Wakara make Indian howl.

There was consistent peace until 1865 and Mr. Keith Worthington, of Nephi, Utah, picks up his next series of articles with the Walker war. These articles, printed by the Times News of Nephi, for the upcoming 110th anniversary, are as follows:

THE WALKER WAR

Following the early Indian skirmishes in 1849 at Battle Creek, now Pleasant Grove, peace prevailed among the Mormons and the natives. The Indians were learning to support themselves and the settlers were helping to support them until they could learn the ways of the white men. Both Martha Spence Heywood and W. A. C. Bryan tell of the friendly relations that existed between the saints and the Indians. Several of the Indians were baptized and became active members of the church. This friendly feeling was not to last, however.

In the early summer of 1853, trouble began to brew. Chief Walker and his braves began to attack the settlements. Quite a number of white people and many Indians were killed in these skirmishes. Several small settlements were broken up, among them the neighboring towns of Santaquin in Utah County and Spring City in Sanpete County. This made the citizens of Nephi on edge and necessitated strong guards being established and caused some hardship to the citizens. "We had to tear down some of our houses and move into closer quarters" said Bishop Bigler later, "It was necessary to do all our work in companies" (Brough, p. 70).

George A. Smith was given military power to put all the communities in order as he moved south. Nephi was put under military law on July 19, 1853. Maj. George Bradley was commanding (Mary Henderson, "Historic Sites and Landmarks," p. 167).

On this same day, the Deseret News reported: "On the 19th of July the Indians attempted to surprise the settlement on Pleasant Creek (Mount Pleasant) in the north part of Sanpete County, and stole horses and cattle at Manti and Nephi."

These actions brought on the fort-building era in Utah. It was not long until the Nephites were also planning stronger and larger fortifications. This will be covered in detail later.

The Deseret News of October 1, 1863, told of the following encounter with Indians at Clover Creek (Mona) 9 miles north of Nephi:

"An the 10th inst. at 20 minutes past 10 a.m. the Indians commenced firing on a party of 10 men, under command of Lt. R. Burns, who were encamped on Clover Creek, in Juab Valley, and continued firing until 40 minutes past 11, slightly wounding Isaac Duffin in the knee, killing 2 horses, and wounding one horse and several calves. In the morning Lieutenant Burns' party judged from the signs that they had killed two Indians, and wounded three."

As these depredations continued many people became vexed and wanted Brigham Young to retaliate through the Nauvoo Legion, which was the State militia, but Brother Brigham said:

"How many times have I been asked in the past week, what I intend to do with Walker. I say let him alone severely. I have not made war on the Indians, nor am I calculating to do it. My policy is to give them presents, and be kind to them, instead of being Walker's enemy. I have sent him a great pile of tobacco to smoke when he is lonely in the mountains. He is now at war with the only friends he has upon this earth, and I want him to have some tobacco to smoke." (I Cecil Alter, "Utah, the Storied Domain," vol. 1, p. 159).

Even with Brigham's advice to leave the Indians alone some few deviated from the course, much to the regret of the majority. Martha Spence Heywood tells of one such instance:

"The Saturday after Mr. Heywood left (for Salt Lake City) the San Pete brethren arrived here on their way to the city to attend conference and brought with them the bodies of three murdered brethren, by the Indians, out of four who started from Sanpete the day before the company did. They had not obeyed counsel in camping where they did that night. They were very much mutilated and the other one was found and brought in the next day.

"This barbarous circumstance actuated our brethren counseled by Father Morley of Sanpete (who no doubt was much excited in the time of it) and President Call of Fillmore, to do quite as barbarous an act the following morning, being the Sabbath. Nine Indians coming into our camp looking for protection and bread with us, because we promised it to them and without knowing they did the first evil act in that affair or any other, were shot down without 1 minute's notice."

Most of the Nephi people treated the Indians very well, however. Chief Walker seemed to have a lot of confidence in some of the Nephi brethren, particularly Father Cazier who gave Walker a patriarchial blessing and told him that if he learned of the Mormons, and to do as they did to cultivate the earth, etc., he would be blessed.

Sometime in the very early years of Nephi an Indian farm was established. Sister Heywood records, April 16, 1854, that: "Brother Jeremiah Hatch has located with us to supervise the Indian farm by appointment." On May 3, 1854, Sister Heywood records of a blessing being put upon the Indian farm by Father Cazier.

In May 1854, Chief Walker appealed to Brigham Young for peace. Jaub Valley became the scene of the peace treaty at Chicken Creek (Levan). Daniel H. Wells gives an interesting account of the peace meeting:

"When we approached them, Walker was in his wickiup; he had fastened it down to within 4 feet of the ground, and we had to crawl to get in and out. I remember our having a good laugh at him because of this. He sat in this 'arrangement' like a

prince and never rose at all. He remarked through our interpreter that Brigham Young was a big chief and Walker was a big chief. Suiting the action to the word, he put his thumbs up to indicate that he was as big a chief as Brigham, and that Brigham was as big as he. In the treaty the Indians agreed to give up the stolen horses—at least all they had of them in their possession. Walker would not talk. He had a sick child. If this child died, someone else he thought, might die, and it was a long time before we got him to talk. He asked us to administer to the child (through prayer and laying on of hands) which we did. President Young asked him what he wanted in the way of presents. He said 'I don't know. You talk.' I think he was afraid he would say something less than President Young would give him. After this treaty, Walker became very friendly. He traveled with us to Cedar City and camped with us that night. He did this for our protection, featuring some of his Indians who did not know of the treaty might make a raid on us. We enjoyed good peace after that for several years (Bryant S. Hinckley, 'Daniel H. Wells').

BUILDING OF THE FORT WALL

As was mentioned in an earlier article, not long after Nephi was settled the people commenced to build a fort so that they would have protection from the Indians. This fort no doubt served the citizens very well until hostilities broke out with Walker. Then in 1853 a larger fort was started and for a time progressed very well, but just prior to the Walker Peace Treaty, the lack of Indian activities had lulled the Nephites to negligence. In fact, they ceased to work altogether.

Early in May, President Brigham Young and some of the brethren arrived in Nephi. They held a meeting in the schoolhouse and Brother Brigham reprimanded the people for not having better protection against the Indians. Sister Heywood says of this meeting: "Brother Brigham spoke and one of his remarks was that if the people did not obey council in building their fort and wall and securing themselves they would get their throats cut."

This spurred the people on in their building activity, but there was a difference of opinion as to whether they should build a fort or a wall or both. Many of the citizens objected to Brother Heywood and his counsel that they should only build a wall. They insisted that Brigham Young's counsel had been to build a fort and a wall.

A public meeting was held, and the people asked that Brother Heywood be removed from office and voted down his plan. Brother Andrew Love records in his journal:

"Sat. May 20, 1864: The house was full of spectators who all voted to sustain the council. At a public meeting held at 10 o'clock Bro. Heywood called for a vote of the people to sustain him in carrying out Pres. Young's plan in building a city wall, but he was voted down as the question was unfairly put. There was a little squabbling and cross firing in the afternoon and considerable division in camp."

Even after this there was no unanimity as to what they should do so another meeting was held. Four of the members of the quorum of the Twelve Apostles were there and listened to both cases. Hinckley records:

"After due consideration [they] decided that each party had gained their case and that constable should pay the costs. The Twelve counselled that the people should forgive Brother Heywood and that he also forgive the people who were asked to reinstate him and all begin anew."

Before the apostles dismissed the hearing, they discharged all the old committees and a new one was appointed. It consisted of Timothy B. Foote, Jacob G. Bigler, David Webb, Joseph L. Heywood, and George Kendall. Under the advice and counsel of Brigham Young they built a wall around three square blocks, 12 feet high; 6 feet wide at the base tapering to 2 feet wide at the top. This was to be completed in 3 months. The area surrounded extends from second south and first west to first north, thence to second east, thence second south and then to the beginning at first west street.

For a time Walker objected to the wall and this slowed down the building considerably, but by November 20, 1854, it was reported that the city wall was "most of it up to 12 feet high, and the remainder about 9." The gates were hung, and had been locked on the night of the 18th, and the guards had been dismissed (The Deseret News, Nov. 20, 1854).

On November 30, 1854, the settlers appointed a day of feasting and merrymaking to celebrate the completion of the walls. Truly they had accomplished a great task.

The saints continued living inside the fort until 1860. In 1863 Love records that President Young had given instructions to level the fort wall:

"At 5 o'clock we assembled for a meeting in the new social hall where a full house was addressed by President Young and Kimball and Elders John Taylor and Lorenzo Snow. The instruction given was invaluable, advising the people to level down their old fort wall, enlarge their lots, beautify their homes, improve their orchards, and pleasant walks and still continue to add to their public improvements until a fine city should adorn the present site" (the Deseret News, Aug. 18, 1855).

By 1920 only a few traces of the wall remained, but in this year the four corners of the wall were marked with concrete monuments (McClune, "History of Juab County," p. 70). In 1935 the remaining piece of the wall was given a proper monument and is now preserved at the Nephi City Pioneer Memorial Park for all to see (the Times-News, Nov. 21, 1935).

RECREATION AND ENTERTAINMENT

We who enjoy the many modern inventions of today have a hard time visualizing the conditions which those early pioneers lived under. Their first light was the blaze of the fireplace, their first floors were often dirt, their water was obtained from the creek and irrigation ditches. Traveling was slow and arduous, the people having to go by horse, covered wagon or stagecoach. While the men worked on their farms and in the mountains, the womenfolk washed, carded, spun, and wove wool, making all their own clothing. They colored the cloth with sagebrush, dogwood, indigo, and perhaps other herbs. The stockings were knit. Rag carpets were made. Many of the farm implements were devised and made by the menfolk. Most everything worn or used was made and provided by these industrious people. A man of that day and age had to know how to do many things.

Probably one of the saddest parts of pioneer life was the lack of medical aid that they experienced. When someone became sick, no trained professional doctors or nurses were there to help. The people had to use the home remedies they had learned and hope for the best. Martha Spense Heywood gave a good description of the type of remedies that were used. When her little daughter was sick she gave her some saffron and sage tea. Then she bathed the child with saleratus water to bring out the rash. When her breathing became difficult, the child was given castor oil and annointed with consecrated oil and given some inwardly. Lobelia was also given to aid her breathing. When the breathing became much worse, Sister Heywood put onions under the child's arm and oiled her well. In spite of all this the child died.

Even though the pioneers who came into Juab Valley were very busy wrestling a living from the soil, they found time to provide recreation and social activities for themselves. As early as March of 1852 Martha Spence Heywood mentioned a party and ball that she attended where mince and custard pies and fried cakes were served.

In December 1852, Sister Heywood records that "they had the first dance for this season on Friday night as a reward for getting the schoolhouse repaired."

In pioneer times people found it necessary to provide their own recreation, even though it had to be mixed up with more productive activities. Thus, if a housewife wished to make a quilt she would invite her neighbors to a "quilting." The guests would do the sewing and she would provide the food. In the evening after the men finished they would join the ladies in a dance.

Dancing was one of the most popular forms of recreation for the early settlers of Utah. At first the leaders discouraged anything but square and round dancing, but gradually other dances were introduced.

Housewarming parties were in order when new homes were completed. It answered two purposes: It offered a chance for an enjoyable visit among friends while the dancing helped to smooth the rough floorboards ("Nephi's Centennial Jubilee," p. 16).

In the winter, sleigh riding was one of the most pleasant pastimes for young and old. Young people would put a wagon box on a pair of "bobs," fill it with straw, blankets, themselves, and then with sleigh bells tinkling go speeding over the snow. Sometimes they would race with one another for excitement. In the summer, hay racks on wagons took the place of sleighs (ibid.).

Celebrations were a highlight in the pioneer's life. Even the hardest workingman in town would take time off to celebrate the 4th and 24th of July. A parade featuring all the dignitaries of the city, talks given by leading citizens, games for the youngsters, a banquet, and dance usually were the main features of the day.

After the social hall was built, drama became an important part of the community. Some of the early dramas played there were "Damon and Pythias," "Macbeth," "Merchant of Venice," "King Lear," and "Othello." We of today might do well to emulate this.

Music played a very vital part in the community. In 1853 William Minshall Evans was called and set apart by President Brigham Young to organize and conduct a choir. He served from that date until his death in 1877, with the exception of 1 year's leave of absence. There was no organ, so the choir sang a capella. Later violins furnished the accompaniment and in 1870 the first organ was purchased ("Nephi's Centennial Jubilee 1851–1951," p. 12, 13).

In 1857 the Deseret News wrote "There is an excellent choir at Nephi and the saints are justly proud of it." Often the choir was invited by President Young to accompany him on his trips to Sampete County and to southern Utah.

There is a discrepancy as to when the first brass band was organized in Nephi, the dates varying from 1854 to 1861, but there is no disagreement as to the quality of the band. It was one of the outstanding bands in the territory of Utah.

In 1865 a Deseret News correspondent traveling with Brigham Young's party as he journeyed to Salt Lake City, said of the band:

"A few miles south of Nephi the Presidency were met by an escort, and as we halted in front of Bishop Bryan's residence, an excellent brass band, number 12 intelligent-looking persons and led by Mr. Hawkins struck up a lively air, which cheered our spirits and made us forget somewhat the fatigue of 40 miles travel" (The Deseret News, June 25, 1865).

The journal history records in 1865:

"At a meeting in Payson, the singing and music were beautifully executed by four good

choirs, from Springville, Spanish Fork, Payson, and Nephi and the excellent band from Nephi which accompanied the President on his southern trip last summer, and afforded so much harmonious gratification to the company and settlements through which they passed" (Journal history of the church, June 10, 1865).

Fairs, trials, baseball games, and debating societies were some of the other pastimes and activities that the early pioneers participated in and enjoyed.

SCHOOLS

Education for the children of the settlement was one of their first considerations—even before they had fully established their homes. Martha Spence Heywood wrote this description in her journal on May 2, 1852:

"Sunday. Had a meeting to regulate about the school and it was decided that school would commence forthwith engaging Candace Smith to teach at the rate of $5 a week and board herself."

This woman was the first schoolteacher in Nephi. Other articles list Martha Heywood as the first teacher. This is in error, however. She soon was to become the second teacher. She explains it this way.

"To our great surprise we found that Candace left for Manti vacating her position after 6 weeks trial of it; she being somewhat dissatisfied with some of the people and the people being generally dissatisfied with her management as schoolteacher."

In another few weeks Sister Heywood was persuaded to teach the children the basic of an education. She had about 17 students.

There is not space to recount all of the schools that were set up in this early period, suffice it to say, many schools were established, most of them in homes or small buildings. As the valley grew in population larger schools were established and at the end of the pioneer period most children could obtain a good education to the eighth grade.

The journal history for the church gives the following statistics for Juab County in 1869 of which Juab Valley was the only inhabitated area of any consequence:

"Juab County: 4 districts in county, 3 districts reported, 4 schools; 4 male teachers, 207 boys in county between 4 and 16 years, 239 girls in county between 4 and 16 years, 88 male scholars enrolled, 100 female scholars enrolled, 197 total enrolled; 44½ percent of names enrolled, 141 average daily attendance, 37½ percent of population actually attending school; $1,200 paid to male teachers. Also total amount paid to teachers, 8½ months school has been taught during the year; $1,000 building fund raised." (The Journal history of the church, February 19, 1869).

Surplus Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 15, the Honorable WALLACE BENNETT, Senator from Utah, spoke on the floor of the Senate concerning the distribution of surplus foods and inserted in the course of his remarks an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal. This article contained many references to the city of Corsicana, Tex., located within my congressional district. There were inferences of a widespread malpractice within the city under the program.

The Honorable Kenneth Douglas, county judge of Navarro County of which Corsicana is the county seat, wrote a letter to the President concerning this matter, and also wrote to an individual in New York City who had written to the city officials of Corsicana as a result of the article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include these letters and I trust they will help to clear up much of the misunderstanding and remove some of the clouds of doubt which have been cast over the city of Corsicana by a number of zealous newspapers and their reporters:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Much publicity has been given recently to the curtailing of the surplus food program in Navarro County. No doubt you have heard something about this, and I thought that you might be interested in the following explanation.

A few weeks ago, the commissioners court of Navarro County, voted to reduce the number of recipients on the surplus food rolls, as a result of a local problem. The court felt that due to the fact that the farmers needed workers in the fields, it was necessary for a time, to curtail the number of recipients. Mention of the fact was carried in the local paper. The Dallas Morning News then mentioned it in their paper. Others, including the Wall Street Journal, took up the story and much of the article was distorted facts. We are Democrats and are very much in favor of this program and feel that it is a very worthwhile one, but during the summer when some of the farm laborers were needed so badly on the farms, we had to do something to ease the situation for the farmers. It is strictly a local affair and we did not desire nor did we dream that there would be any publicity given to the action. As a result, we have had inquiries, one of which was made by a representative of a nationwide manufacturing plant, who asked if the statements made in the Wall Street Journal were accurate. A copy of the letter which I wrote him is attached to this letter. Only the name and address of the addressee have been removed, as a courtesy to him.

Actually it is our opinion that this publicity is not written as a news story, but more as a slap at the Kennedy administration. Therefore, even though you are now going through a very trying time with the critical world events, it is my feeling that some of this publicity has reached you and I wanted you to know the facts as they are and not as they have been reported.

I might further add that politics has never extended into the surplus food program in Corsicana, but if there was an occasion for Navarro County's problem to be mixed in with politics, most of the members of the two organizations that originally asked us to enter into the program, are generally classified as conservative in their political philosophy.

I appreciate the fact that you are busy but because we do feel that you are putting forth every effort to help the needy, and because we are in sympathy with your program, I wanted you to have this explanation.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. DOUGLAS,
County Judge, Navarro County.

Your plant manager and a good friend of mine, and I had a cup of coffee a few days ago and ——— advised me that you had inquired with reference to the accuracy of an article in the Wall Street Journal recently. I asked ——— if he objected for me to write you explaining the circumstances and also explaining that part of the article that is true and that part which is not true. I would like to give you all of the facts and I hope that you have the time to read them.

Primarily, the responsibility of taking care of the people who are unable to take care of themselves, is the responsibility of each individual county in our State. Navarro County is very fortunate in this respect because we have several charitable trusts with assets of several million dollars. These trusts are used for the betterment of this county and the funds are also used to take care of many who, for various reasons, become unable to take care of themselves. This is true—not only for food, lodging, clothing, but also for their medical needs when needed. The Family Service is a Community Chest organization operating exclusively inside the limits of Corsicana. This is an organization composed of 29 board members with 1 full-time employee and with 5 volunteer workers, who investigate applicants for their funds and do extensive investigation for the above charitable trusts. The Salvation Army does the same service outside the limits of Corsicana that the Family Service does inside. Our Salavation Army has a local board consisting of 20 members.

These two organizations, along with church groups and other local associations, had always taken care of the food for the needy until the early part of this year. During the latter part of 1960 and the early months of 1961, the economic situation in this county was comparable to the economic situation of the United States as a whole. During the early months of 1961, the Commissioners Court of Navarro County, the administrative agency for the county, met with the boards of directors for the two above-mentioned organizations for the purpose of discussing the surplus food program and the possibility of Navarro County entering into the program. Each of the two organizations were being hard pressed for money and each felt that if there was a way that the county could relieve them of the responsibility of purchasing food for the needy, then each organization could utilize their funds for the other necessities. It was felt at the time that the general economic situation would change later to where most people in need and physically able to work, would be able to secure work and the program could be curtailed. Later a formal public meeting was held by the court, at which time members of the two boards appeared before the court and publicly sought its help in setting up the surplus food program. The court did vote to enter into the program but agreed that we would reexamine the program at the end of the first 3-month period. Later there were some complaints about the program, such as the one by Mr. Allen, as stated in the Wall Street Journal. There were a few other complaints similar to this one but certainly none that would justify the national publicity that was given to Navarro County, as a result of the court's changing the requirements for the recipients of the surplus food.

I might add that I talked to one farmer with extensive cotton acreage who told me that he was having trouble in getting farm labor. I talked to another the same day whose cotton acreage is as extensive and who was experiencing no trouble. Certainly, I cannot explain the difference, however, I am sure that in Navarro County, as in other places, there are a number of people who would not work when there is work avail-

able. I am of the opinion that Navarro County has no more of these people than does any other area, on a percentage basis.

It was felt by the commissioners' court, which is composed of the county judge (which is me) as chairman and four men—all of whom have been elected by the county and each commissioner representing a different section of the county—that the economic situation in Navarro County would justify, at least temporarily, the cutting down on the surplus food until at least October or until that time when most of the farmwork has been completed. The commissioners' court actually anticipated no particular publicity as a result of this move, but it is my opinion that the Dallas Times Herald actually brought about all of this publicity—whether adverse or otherwise.

Our daily newspaper carried the story. An abbreviated version of same was carried in the Dallas Morning News—but the Times Herald carried the story on its front page with an excerpt which compared this curtailment to the Newburgh, N.Y., story. The Dallas Morning News then sent a reporter here, who wrote the story on same which was, in my opinion, generally accurate. Then the Wall Street Journal sent a reporter to Corsicana. There are more statements untrue in the account in the Journal article than there are true statements. I am looking at a copy of the story now and will give you my honest opinion on each of the paragraphs.

Paragraph 1 is completely false. We are not necessarily a small cotton country town. We may appear to be so to some outsider from the neighboring community of Dallas, Tex. You are probably well aware of the fact that Corsicana has several industries and even though a large part of the income here is from agriculture, a great percentage is from business and industries that are located in the county. Agricultural labor is no longer in demand as it was in former years. The farming in this county is highly mechanized. We Corsicanans feel that we have a very fine city and we certainly do not feel that we are a small cotton town. Business is no better and no worse than it is in any other community of similar size in the United States. I have lived in this county all of my life and it is very seldom that by 9 a.m. our streets downtown are choked with honking cars—but I wish that by 9 a.m. of every day the second sentence of paragraph 1 would be true.

However, in paragraph 2, that sentence is connected to the surplus food program and how any reporter can possibly hope to verify that statement that I made when applying it to the surplus food program—is more than I can understand. I have seen traffic around the warehouse where the commodities are distributed and I have seen the lines of hungry people who are waiting their turn. This warehouse is located away from the main streets of Corsicana and there is plenty of parking space nearby. Even though we are issuing commodities to some 3,200 people, there were no 3,200 people standing in line waiting for those supplies. The 3,200 people would represent probably some 500 to 600 families at the most. Two days were set aside for issuance, so there would probably be some 300 people in line each of the 2 days. I am at a loss to understand how this could take all of the parking space in the city of Corsicana.

"Mr. Kennedy's mule and goober grease" are words never heard in Navarro County, at least by me, until I read the Wall Street Journal. I told Mr. Moffett of the Journal that in my opinion, the rapid spurt in the number of persons receiving free food was not attributed to the fancier fare provided by the Kennedy administration but the reason for this increase was because more people were learning that they were eligible. I do not believe that any Navarro County official made the statement, and I quote "that this beef and gravy deal has been nothing but a headache since it started." However, there have been numerous problems connected with the program as there would be with any new program public or private.

I did not say that we are attempting to reduce future food distribution to about 1,000 persons per month. Navarro County voted to remain in the program for the fiscal year, beginning September 1, 1961, and it was necessary that we use some figure, because we are required to pay 30 cents per person per month. We used the figure 1,000 because it was a nice round figure, however, we later cut that figure down to 750 recipients.

The statement that Federal officials have not protested is, in my opinion, simply a statement made to make it appear that our Federal officials are trying to tell us in Navarro County how to handle our county's business. I do not think the Federal Government would even think of protesting and what Federal official would make the protest—should one be made?

I have been unable to verify the statement attributed to Mr. L. B. Avery, a farm laborer. I have not as yet been able to find anyone that knows Mr. Avery. He is not on the rolls as a recipient of surplus foods. I do not know to what he was referring when he said "people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of the cotton because we ain't going to do it"—because the farmers did get the grass out by the farm laborers in this county. I did not know that any of our merchants had gone into the business of selling cardboard boxes. Anytime that I need a cardboard box, for any reason, all that I do is to go to the rear of some business place and pick up a discarded box.

Actually, the reporters that have discussed this matter with me seem to think that the problem in Navarro County is a similar problem that exists all over the United States. This may or may not be true but the way the surplus food program is handled, especially here in Texas, it is the responsibility of the individual county to make its own rules and regulations and what may be good for one county may not necessarily be good for another. The Federal Government does set a maximum limitation on income and resources, but the minimums and the maximums as set by each county may be far below that set by the Federal Government. It is my opinion that Navarro County and Corsicana are very fine places in which to live and we are quite proud of them. We are also very proud of all our industries located in the county that contribute to the economic well-being of the county. We are particularly proud of the part that —— plays and we certainly hope that the feeling is mutual. We object to any false publicity that casts a degrading reflection on the county or the city, however, we have no control over what any newspaper reporter may say in order to prepare his story. I would think though, that a reporter should attempt to be fair, impartial and objective—but Mr. Moffett with the Wall Street Journal evidently does not believe in this type of reporting.

I trust that this answers the question that you asked of —— and even though the answer is lengthy, I felt that it was necessary to answer in this manner rather than to give a "yes" or "no" answer.

Thanking you for taking the time to read this explanation, I am,

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. DOUGLAS,
County Judge, Navarro County, Tex.

Fiftieth Anniversary of New Jersey Jewish Welfare Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Jewish Welfare Board had served our Nation in many ways for many years. Its work is well known to hospitalized veterans and servicemen; it has helped organize or guide more than 350 Jewish Y and community centers in the United States.

In my home State, the New Jersey section of the National Jewish Welfare Board is now celebrating its 50th anniversary. Our State unit actually antedates the national organization; it has achieved a magnificent record of accomplishment since 1911.

An article in the September 10 issue of the Newark Sunday News describes its achievements. In doing so, it provides a valuable record of the work done by a vital, growing, and essential organization in New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY JEWISH WELFARE UNIT OBSERVES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Audrey A. Fecht)

The New Jersey section of the National Jewish Welfare Board, dedicated to serving hospitalized veterans and servicemen as well as the young and old at home through Jewish community centers, celebrates its 15th birthday this year.

The milestone is being observed at founders' night programs at YM-YWHA's and community centers throughout the State during the year. An essay contest, which closes October 10, also is being conducted for teenagers on what they receive and give to their Y's and centers.

The State group is actually a senior citizen in service compared to the national organization. The forerunner of the New Jersey section was founded in 1911 as the Young Men's Hebrew Associations of New Jersey, according to Sigmund Taft, Jewish Welfare Board field secretary.

In 1913 the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations was organized by leaders of American Jewry, including such outstanding New Jersey residents as Louis Bamberger and Felix Fuld, Newark businessmen, and Abram I. Elkus of Red Bank, onetime U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. He also was the father of Mrs. Katharine Elkus White, acting State treasurer and chairman of the New Jersey Highway Authority.

FORMED IN 1917

The National Jewish Welfare Board itself was formed in 1917 to meet the World War I religious and welfare needs of Jews in the Armed Forces. It merged with the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations 4 years later.

Thus since 1921 Jewish Welfare Board has served the double functions of giving leadership and direction to the Jewish Y and com-

munity centers and of helping members of the Armed Forces and hospitalized veterans both in war and peace. In connection with its work for the Armed Forces, Jewish Welfare Board also is a member of the USO.

Through its national and field staff of experts Jewish Welfare Board provides technical help and guidance to more than 350 Jewish Y and community centers in the United States which are financially autonomous. In New Jersey more than 90,000 persons of all ages, from preschool children to senior citizens, participate in the many cultural, educational, athletic and social programs of Y and community centers. Under the New Jersey Section of Jewish Welfare Board summer camps also are operated for boys, girls and teenagers at Milford, Pa., with a special camping period assigned to senior citizens.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAMS

The purpose of these programs, Taft explained, is to meet the varied needs of the individual, whether he's a rambunctious child, a talented teenager seeking a means to develop leadership qualities and special skills, or a lonely and forgotten oldtimer. Whatever the age group and activity involved, Taft added, Y programs are practical democracy in action.

To achieve its objectives highly trained professional personnel are needed, Taft observed, and most staff members of New Jersey Jewish Y's and community centers have master's degrees in social work. Jewish Welfare Board also sponsors a program of scholarships, fellowships and work-study grants to foster the increase of qualified personnel.

At East Orange and Lyons Veterans' Hospitals and military installations throughout New Jersey, Jewish Welfare Board volunteer workers are familiar figures. For hospitalized veterans they give ward parties, sponsor outings and perform a variety of personal services.

The aim of Jewish Welfare Board service to members of the Armed Forces and their families is to make them feel they are part of the community where they are stationed and to make certain they are not forgotten by their hometowns, Mrs. Srager added.

Through its chaplaincy program the organization also provides for the religious needs of servicemen and hospitalized veterans.

Jewish Welfare Board ships a variety of articles, ranging from books, records and films to religious items, to chaplains at isolated bases in this country and abroad for distribution to servicemen.

"Ham" Operator Ends Long Vigil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable performance of Mr. Julius J. Saucier, "ham" radio operator of Pineville, La., is related in the September 13 issue of the Alexandria, La., Daily Town Talk. The article follows:

"HAM" OPERATOR ENDS LONG VIGIL

Julius J. Saucier, Pineville amateur radio operator, ended a 100-hour-long vigil at 10 p.m. Tuesday after helping dispatch over 500 emergency messages about Hurricane Carla.

He had just shut down his 1,000-watt transmitter at 1 p.m. Tuesday when he was asked to control traffic pertaining to the tornado in Hodge. Emergency work was completed at 10 p.m.

Saucier operated the control station located in his Wardville home at 119 Hickory Street for a network of over 100 amateur stations (ham radio stations) from 3 p.m. Friday until Carla had lost much of its punch Tuesday afternoon and normal communications facilities had been restored for emergency work.

He logged over a thousand stations in a five- or six-State area, working mainly with Texas and Louisiana stations.

His station, W5GKT, also cooperated with news gathering media in bringing firsthand reports from areas hit by the storm. Weather bulletins were rebroadcast regularly throughout the watch to keep all areas advised of what to expect.

During the period from 3 p.m. Friday until 1 p.m. Tuesday, Saucier only managed 7 or 8 hours of sleep.

His wife, also an amateur operator with her own radio station, spelled him on several times but caring for their five children did not leave her much time for radio work, Saucier said today.

Almost voiceless after the ironman vigil, Saucier said, other Alexandria-Pineville hams came to help him Tuesday evening easing the burden of handling tornado traffic.

Washington's Farm Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the September 20, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I am placing this commentary in the RECORD for I believe it deserves the attention of all who are interested in our farm economy.

WASHINGTON'S FARM WONDERLAND

The wonders of the administration's new farm program are beginning to unfold. And to at least some farmers it undoubtedly does seem like a wonderful racket.

To wit: With mandatory acreage reductions for corn and other feed grains, Secretary Freeman figured this year's output at around 125 million tons down from about 156 million tons last year. Since that would be less than demand, the Government could make up the difference from its bundle of surplus feed grains, estimated at 75 million tons, and thus finally make a dent in the mountainous excess.

Unfortunately for Mr. Freeman, good weather and farmer ingenuity are conspiring to boost yields perhaps as much as they would have been without the acreage cuts. Hence it looks as though the $750 million he—that is, the taxpayer—is paying farmers to reduce acreage of corn and sorghum grains will be for nothing.

So far, it's a fairly familiar tale of nature and human nature outwitting the farm experts in Washington, but that's not all. With some groggy notion of further "stabilizing" prices, the Department is offering surplus corn at the market price, which has been around $1.04 a bushel, while the price-prop payment is $1.20 a bushel.

This means the farmer can put practically his whole corn crop into the Government bins at the higher price and buy Government surplus corn at the lower price. You can't hardly beat that.

Oh yes—a couple of other interesting little ramifications. The cheap corn for the farmer may well lead to a new glut in hog production with the possibility of a big slump in livestock prices.

And already the abundance of cheap feed is causing cows to turn out more milk—now about 5 percent more than the record output of a year ago. Since the public couldn't drink all that without floating away, more and more milk is going into butter and cheese which are going into (three guesses) the Government surpluses. Just from last April the Government bought 189 million pounds of butter, compared with 82 million pounds in the like previous period, and 63 million pounds of cheese, compared with only 165,000 pounds in the previous period.

So you can readily see how wonderful it is when our masters in Washington start stabilizing things and getting them all straightened out for us incompetent citizens.

Storm Over the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New York Times, Wednesday, September 20, 1961, entitled "Storm Over the U.N."

STORM OVER THE U.N.

The United Nations General Assembly met yesterday under the dark shadow of the tragic death of Secretary General Hammarskjold that left this world organization like a ship without a captain in a storm-tossed sea of a double crisis—its own and that of the world. Its first task is to organize itself, to find some way to fill the gaping void in the top command post, in order that it may proceed with the business at hand. This business includes all the great issues of world politics, the conduct of the war in the Congo—that is not going too well for the United Nations—and the problem of finance that threatens the United Nations with bankruptcy.

In these circumstances it is doubly welcome that President Kennedy has decided to go before the Assembly in person and in his role as spokesman for the Western World to do three things. The first and foremost is to pledge to the United Nations our continued and unwavering support in this time of trouble so it may continue to work for peace and for the suppression of aggression and thus save future generations from the scourge of war.

The second is to give renewed backing to the appointment of a single Secretary General to succeed Mr. Hammarskjold and to warn all members, especially the "nonalined," against the Soviet "troika" plan of a veto-laden three-headed directorate which, as the late Secretary General said in his last report that has now become his testament, would mean the collapse of the United Nations. The third is to lay before the Assembly a new and comprehensive American plan for general and complete disarmament, including a nuclear test ban, under effective control with "neutralist" participation.

But, as Foreign Minister Gromyko makes plain, the Soviets are determined to take

advantage of Mr. Hammarskjold's death to precipitate an immediate battle for their "troika" plan. This would require an amendment of the charter which he also couples with the prior admission of Communist China. The assembly thus faces an immediate conflict which would not only delay action on the other nearly one hundred items on its agenda but would also becloud the projected talks between Mr. Gromyko and Secretary Rusk on the burning problem of Germany and Berlin.

One hopeful ray to pierce the prevailing gloom is the resumption of truce talks between President Tshombe of Katanga and a United Nations delegation now headed by Mr. Khiari of Tunisia. As another Tunisian, Mongi Slim, is slated to be elected President of the Assembly and is also being boosted as temporary Acting Secretary General, Tunisia is suddenly confronted with great responsibility in guiding the United Nations through the storm.

Washington Correspondent, Samuel Shaffer, Finds Beauty and Enjoyment in Family Vacation in West Virginia—Predicts State's Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has often been my responsibility to bring to the attention of this body some of the more distressing aspects of economic life in West Virginia, in order that corrective action be taken.

At other times I have had the occasion to point to the underlying values of a positive nature—the strength of our people, the rich natural resources of our State, and the unparalleled beauty of the scenery of West Virginia. This is such a time, when I can offer the unsolicited testimony of an experienced traveler and observer who is known personally to most of the Members of this body—Samuel Shaffer, the congressional correspondent of Newsweek.

Mr. Shaffer has recently returned from a month's vacation with his family in the State parks of West Virginia, and his praise for our "land overlooked" is so eloquent and heartfelt that I would do his comments an injustice were I to paraphrase them.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Samuel Shaffer's unsolicited letter to me and my letter in response.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSWEEK,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1961.
The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator, West Virginia.

DEAR JENNINGS: Thanks to your suggestion my family and I have just spent the most enjoyable vacation of our lives—a month in the State parks of West Virginia.

To be candid with you, the beauty of the parks, the excellence of the accommodations, the dedication of duty and the courtesy to visitors displayed by park personnel far, far exceeded my expectations.

In driving along back country roads, selected almost at random, I beheld breathtaking vistas for which I was wholly unprepared by imagination or description by others.

It is unfortunate that West Virginia is linked in so many minds with poverty and distress. I think the time will surely come when Americans will think of the State as one of the most beautiful in the Union, as it unquestionably is.

West Virginia has a great future in tourism. It can become, and deserves to become, the playground of the Nation. And certainly the Nation could take pride in a people who could build such beautiful parks for its citizens to enjoy and to share with others.

Sincerely,
SAMUEL SHAFFER,
Congressional Correspondent.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1961.
Mr. SAMUEL SHAFFER,
Congressional Correspondent,
Newsweek,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: Thanks so much for your good letter of September 12. I characterize it as good because you are so right about the potentials in West Virginia for becoming a national playground and a center of outdoor recreation. I agree most heartily that tourism holds great promise as a major factor in an invigorated economy in our State.

Personally, I am delighted that the Shaffers had a rewarding vacation in our scenic and historic State—a land overlooked too often by the tourist traveler. It is satisfying and stimulating, Sam, for work-weary folk to exchange for a few days or weeks their tedious tasks for the exhilarating journeys which refresh physical bodies and renew lagging spirits.

I'll wax philosophic for a paragraph by saying that a change of scene works wonders for those men and women whose day by day assignments become so deep they seem like dungeons. Schedules, which are like straitjackets, are ripped away as we open wide the doors to the roads beyond. On cushioned tires, over singing rails of steel, in sturdy ships at sea, on graceful wings of flight, I bless those happy travelers who return to their journalistic endeavors and their homes with minds and souls restored.

Best to you always.

Sincerely,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

General Eisenhower Reminds Us of the Difference Between the Republican and Democratic Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, too often there are those who try to sell the country on the idea that there is no difference between our two great political parties. Such a theory is harmful to both parties and to the country. There is a basic difference between the two parties and we should lose no opportunity to make this difference clear so that the people may always have a choice in philosophies. Our former great President, Dwight Eisenhower, said it all in one statement last weekend in Chicago, the basic difference is that the Republicans have "faith in the individual." The following editorial comment from the Christian Science Monitor brings home the importance of the statement:

FAITH IN THE INDIVIDUAL

Republicans, casting about for central ground on which to tackle the 1962 election, could well consider the basic tenet urged by Dwight Eisenhower in his speech to the Dirksen dinner in Chicago. "Faith in the individual" is the basis, he said.

The man who drew support from so many sections of his party declared that this "simple faith" could unite Nixon, Rockefeller and Goldwater Republicans. Indeed he insisted that for those holding it doctrinal differences became as "ripples in a cup of tea compared with hurricane * * * waves of conflict" creating cleavages among Democrats. He supported this estimate with the failure of a heavily Democratic Congress to carry through much of the administration program.

The Democratic divisions are very visible—especially between presidential elections. But Republicans will not safely overlook the fact that several major Kennedy bills carried in Congress only because a decisive handful of Republicans gave them support. Much remains to be done to hammer out in party councils a working formula for applying faith in the individual to specific issues.

There is vitality in the faith, and it is directly related to the appeal Mr. Eisenhower made for rededication to "justice, individual liberty, and human dignity"—ideals on which the Nation's spiritual strength was built. This task is the responsibility—and opportunity—for each citizen, of whatever party.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Proclamation 3429 of the President of the United States on General Pulaski's Memorial Day, October 11, 1961:

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT—PROCLAMATION 3429—GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY, 1961, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the 182d anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski during the American Revolution brings to mind the heroic contribution of that great Polish patriot to the cause of our freedom and independence; and

Whereas General Pulaski's brilliant leadership and courage at Brandywine, Charleston, and Savannah deserve the everlasting admiration and gratitude of our Nation; and

Whereas our country owes much also to the loyalty and enterprising spirit of millions of our citizens of Polish descent; and

Whereas it is fitting that we acknowledge our debt to General Pulaski and his country-

men and honor the memory of the gallant Polish patriot:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Wednesday, October 11, 1961, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate officials of the Federal Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day.

I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of General Pulaski and the noble cause for which he gave his life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of September in the year of our Lord 1961 and of the independence of [SEAL] the United States of America the 186th.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:
CHESTER BOWLES,
Acting Secretary of State.

The Penalty for Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1961:

THE PENALTY FOR ILLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly will begin its meetings in the somber atmosphere generated by the death of Secretary General Hammarskjold. Whatever one's disagreements with him, he worked indefatigably, by his lights and within the structures of his office, to ease the world's chronic troubles. Not the least tribute to him is that in doing so he earned the enmity of the Soviet Union.

Yet Mr. Hammarskjold's death, however tragic, should not obscure the deeper crisis in which the United Nations finds itself; the symptoms may well start showing up in this session. In particular it is imperative for the United States to start facing the facts about the U.N., for the U.N. is turning into a threat to U.S. interests.

The organization was founded on the gigantic illusion that the Soviets would cooperate in the construction of a peaceful world. No sensible person could believe that myth for very long, but it has bedeviled the U.N. from the beginning. Today, moreover, other illusions have piled up in the East River edifice, and they too are potentially dangerous.

There is, notably, what might be called the illusion of parity. According to this fantasy, every nation is the peer of every other nation; an African area with less people than a good-sized American city, and without even the minimum qualifications of nationhood, has just as much voting power as the United States.

Such an approach to world problems has no basis in fact. In the real world, a nation must earn the right to influence international affairs. It may do so by coercive development and brute force, as in the Soviet Union; or it may do so by free economic and spiritual development, as in the American tradition. But in any case, a nation should not become an arbiter of world events simply by proclaiming itself a nation.

The practical consequences of upside-down thinking about the U.N. are rapidly becoming clear. For one, the United States gets swept into—and must bear the financial burden for—enterprises of questionable merit. Is it in the U.S. interest for the U.N. to attack pro-Western Katanga, which incidentally was not about to attack the central Congolese Government? Is it in the U.S. interest to have pro-Communists cropping up in responsible positions in the Congo?

More basically, there is the ugly situation confronting the United States in the General Assembly. For years we enjoyed an almost automatic majority in these deliberations; today, with the influx of all these newly-independent nations, with their professedly neutralist stance, we are increasingly in danger of being in an almost automatic minority.

The most striking current illustration is Washington's confession that it can no longer be sure of staving off discussion of the admission of Communist China. Suppose that in due course the Assembly votes that regime in; what then does the United States do? How much good is a Security Council veto if the weight of Assembly "opinion" is against the United States?

Or to consider the even more immediate question of a successor to Mr. Hammarskjold, what guarantee can there be that the new Secretary General will be tolerable to the United States, or that under his aegis we will not be pulled into still worse adventures? In its present frame of mind, the U.S. Government might not even veto the recommendation of some neutralist or worse for the post. It is not difficult to foresee many other situations where the U.N. can menace U.S. interests.

With such a prospect, the United States in time may well be forced to consider whether it can remain in the organization. Short of that, the United States must, we believe, begin refashioning its thinking about the U.N. It must seek to use its power within the U.N. to effect its objectives, and it must steer clear of U.N. activities counter to those objectives.

The United States must finally abandon any sentimental notion of the U.N. as an inherently noble institution to which we are committed no matter what. In this connection, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the schools to stop teaching our children to believe in that falsehood.

What matters is the preservation of the United States, not the United Nations. If the two are becoming irreconcilable, we had better realize it. In the real world of power politics, the penalty is heavy for building a storehouse of illusions.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, came as a blow to all of us. Having served with him for many years on the House Armed Services Committee, I learned to appreciate his keen understanding of the many ramifications of our national defense problems. He always had a contribution to make in efforts to solve difficult problems that arose. His handiwork is reflected in many legislative acts that are vital to the defense and security of this country. More recently he served with distinction on the Committee on Space and Astronautics, of which he was chairman.

OVERTON BROOKS was a man of high ideals and possessed those sterling qualities of leadership and courage which marked his career. He was indeed an able man, and he served his country well.

I join with my colleagues in this expression of deep sympathy for his family in their bereavement.

Labor Sunday Address by Representative Rhodes, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues' attention the inspiring Labor Sunday address by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, to the Kuendig Memorial Bible Class in St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church in Reading, Pa., which was broadcast over Reading station WEEU on September 3, 1961. On that occasion Mr. RHODES spoke with clarity and insight concerning the unfinished business and goals of the American labor movement, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR SUNDAY MESSAGE

Ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity on this Labor Sunday to speak on a matter of great importance to all who are concerned about the dangers that surround us and about our responsibilities and our duties as citizens of a free society.

These are serious and challenging times, as we all can agree. We live in a land of great opportunity. We are divinely blessed as a Nation with great wealth and great natural and human resources. Vast surpluses and abundance of food and other essentials of life offer more than enough for all. As a Nation we have great productive power. We have the know-how to do the things that should be done.

Yet we face in this country of ours serious shortages in such important areas as school classrooms, hospital beds, highways, conservation, recreation, sewer and sanitary systems, health centers, and other public services.

Over 5 million citizens are unemployed in our country, despite all the work that needs to be done. Over the years, this heavy unemployment represents untold billions of dollars in lost productivity and a waste of human and natural resources that is too staggering to estimate.

Many of our most talented youth are being denied educational opportunities for the lack of school facilities or because their families cannot afford to pay for a college education. This terrible waste of brainpower is unjusti-

fiable, particularly because it is so important to our Nation's security and survival that we develop the best talent in our youth.

Many of our fellow men in these United States are in distress. Many are in need, despite great surpluses and waste. One-fifth of our population, about 30 million people, live on incomes that are below a decency level. In our own Berks County there are 10,000 jobless who seek employment in vain. It is the aged, the handicapped, and racial minorities who suffer most. But the victims of unemployment include many who are strong and healthy. How in good conscience can we ignore their plight? These are matters of much concern to labor people. Labor unionists are close to this problem and are constantly seeking legislation to correct this condition.

These problems also concern the church, for all over the Nation today on this Labor Sunday the country's major religious faiths are urging a cooperative approach to these problems.

Enlightened and dedicated leaders of both labor and management join in recognition of the need for mutual understanding, good will and the application of Christian principles to labor-management relations, and to the social and economic problems which confuse and divide us.

True, there are basic labor-management problems such as organizational rights, union security, collective bargaining, strikes, lockouts, and violence, over which there is much controversy and conflict.

In recent years, however, much progress has been made in collective bargaining and in avoiding lockouts and strikes. But much remains to be done. Strikes are very costly to both sides. Often many persons who are only indirectly involved are adversely affected. Major strikes often result in public inconvenience and at times affect vital public services. No one likes strikes, least of all those directly involved. The only remedy is good will, mutual trust and cooperation between labor and management.

The right to organize is universally recognized, yet it is the denial of this right which is responsible for much of the violence and strife in labor-management disputes.

Industrial conflict is a sort of civil war which we can ill afford today when the whole world seems to be on fire. Our own security and survival calls for cooperative effort between labor and management and a recognition of the common interests we all share in an enlightened, united and prosperous nation.

It is, however, on social and economic problems, and proposals for their solution where organized labor groups come into sharpest conflict with organizations of management. It is labor's influence for social and economic reform that causes management groups to object to political action by labor unions.

It is a conflict of political philosophy which fundamentally has to do with the distribution of our national wealth and income and how well and how fairly the average citizen shares in our Nation's productivity and wealth. It is the glaring inequities and the wide gap in incomes that lead to most of our troubles.

This was recognized in the first Labor Sunday message issued for use in Protestant churches back in 1917. Since 1950, Labor Sunday has been sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States. Labor Sunday messages have made a valuable contribution to better understanding and good will, and have strengthened our free way of life. These messages have given renewed moral and spiritual strength to working people and to labor and management leaders.

On this Labor Sunday, in messages from leaders of the three major religious faiths in our country, comes again the recognition of this problem. These religious leaders have again called for a cooperative approach to the problems that beset labor and management—problems in which government also shares a vital interest, and problems which directly or indirectly affect us all.

There is much similarity between the objectives of the church and the social and economic programs advocated by labor. I am sure that every sincere, honest, and dedicated union member can subscribe to the statement adopted by the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America made back in 1944.

The church proclaims Christian principles that provide a complete and perfect solution for labor-management problems which are really human problems. It recognizes serious tensions in the field of human relationships. The Lutheran 1944 statement, presented these principles, commending consideration particularly by labor leaders, industrialists and all those directly responsible for the well-being, prosperity and peace of our Nation.

Let me quote a few of these basic principles as pronounced by the Lutheran Church in its statement on labor.

God's moral order recognizes no class system. In His sight, all men are of eternal worth. He is no respecter of persons.

In God's sight every calling, however high or humble, which contributes to human welfare, is sacred and has His blessing.

God has abundantly provided the resources of the earth, primarily for human benefit. Possessions are a sacred trust to be used not for selfish materialistic ends, but for human betterment, today, and in future generations.

God expects all to share the burdens of daily life. He requires the strong, the privileged and the able to help the less privileged and the weak.

On duties and rights, the Lutheran message on Labor proclaims it is the duty of all men to work. It is the duty of all Christian men to so organize their relationships that everyone may have an opportunity for gainful employment.

It is the duty of every man to provide an adequate living for himself and his dependents. It is the duty of Christian men to so order their economic relationships that, in a world where God has provided "enough and to spare" for all, every man who is worthy and willing to work may obtain an adequate living for himself and his dependents.

The social order should be so organized as to secure and protect every man in the rightful possession and enjoyment of the fruits of his industry.

It is the duty of every man to develop to the maximum, through education and training the abilities with which God has endowed him. It should be the goal of a Christian social order to provide maximum opportunities for the education and training of all its members.

It is the duty and right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The social order should guarantee to every man complete freedom of worship.

It is the duty of every man to cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of Government so that maximum civil liberties may be enjoyed by all with equal protection for all under the law without discrimination as to race, color or creed.

It is the right of every man freely to set up and to maintain, in cooperation with his fellow man, such forms of health and accident insurance, provision for medical care, unemployment relief and insurance, and old-age pensions as will provide security against the hazards of life.

According to the Lutheran message this is what the church must do to insure the performance of these duties and rights in human society. It says the church in a practical way should:

Champion the just cause of every man, regardless of his social status.

Advocate that service to society be regarded as the standard of social worth.

Proclaim always that the only cure for human selfishness and greed which are the common sources of industrial controversy is the Christian spirit of sacrifice for the greater good, growing out of love for God who desires men to live in a spirit of unselfish brotherhood.

Insist that democracy in industry is the only foundation for economic well-being.

Seek to develop in the church and community mutual understanding and good will between various groups.

Protest the use of force, violence, and sabotage by either labor or management in industrial disputes.

Encourage the promotion of community clinics, and such other cooperative enterprises as are conducive to human betterment.

Encourage the strong to share the burdens of the weak.

Think more about duties and less about rights. If men understand and do their duty, rights will follow, and problems will be solved.

Confront all men with the message of Jesus Christ, which alone satisfies the deeper human needs.

These basic principles and objectives expressed in the statement by the United Lutheran Church are a blueprint not only for Christian conduct and living but the only effective answer to our domestic problems and to the challenge of crass materialism and Communist tyranny.

Every well-informed working man and woman can sincerely subscribe to those high ideals and noble objectives.

Enlightened representatives of management also accept them, not only in the interest of good labor-management relations, but as a matter of intelligent self-interest and a recognition of the common interests we all share in a prosperous economy, a nation morally, spiritually and economically strong and united.

I have always believed that a labor union must be much more than an economic weapon to gain advantage for its members, important as this may be. It must be a force for social and economic justice, not only for union members, but for all working people and for all citizens. It must be an influence for community betterment and for promoting the public welfare.

Labor union members, like other folks, are generally good citizens. As a group, they have the same good qualities and the same human weaknesses that are found in all other groups in our society. This is equally true in management.

There are wide differences in labor and management views and interests. But in each group, most individuals are dedicated, sincere, and honorable men and women. On each side it is but a small minority who betray the thrust and confidence of their associates for illicit personal gain.

A major obstacle to good labor-management relations is the lack of trust and confidence in each other and the failure to apply commonsense principles and the Christian approach to our problems.

Neither labor nor management has a monopoly on virtue or sin.

But the very nature of labor unions has made them an effective force for the advancement and enactment of programs like social security, unemployment insurance, housing, education, workmen's compensation, and many laws that have contributed to the security and well-being of all workers, union and nonunion, and of all American citizens.

It is labor's political efforts for such legislation which offends conservative manage-

ment groups which have historically opposed social reform programs sponsored by labor organizations.

It is quite evident that organized workers played a major role in every important economic reform and social advance made during the past century.

It must also be said that among the leaders in great forward movements in the United States were men of great wealth. Thomas Jefferson is a shining example.

Today, as in the past, the application of Christian principles of brotherhood, social justice, and good will, is the answer to pressing human problems and the dangers that confront us.

We must intelligently and justly solve these difficult domestic and internal problems if we are to successfully meet the challenge of communism and the threat to human freedom around the world.

Only by national unity and by examples of social justice can we show the world that democracy, with its recognition of moral, spiritual and human values offers hope for future peace and progress.

It has been our lot to live in a time of great social upheaval. The world has been made smaller by progress made in the fields of communication and transportation. Exploding populations have added to the world problems. In many parts of the earth people live in poverty and without hope. Tonight more than a third of the world's children will go to bed hungry.

Feeding on hopeless and impoverished people, communism continues to grow. The whole world fears the threat of Communist slavery and the catastrophe of nuclear war.

The world crisis dwarfs our domestic problems. Yet we cannot intelligently disassociate domestic policies from foreign affairs. What we do in our own country, whether good or bad, affects our prestige and influence in other lands, and is a factor in the cold war between the free world and Communist tyranny.

On this Labor Sunday, let us all rededicate ourselves to the application of Christian principles of social justice, good will, mutual understanding and higher ethical, spiritual and moral standards.

There is no other answer to solve our problems at home if we are to keep our country strong and free.

There is no other answer if we are to keep the world free from Communist dictatorship and totalitarian slavery. There is no other answer to the threat of atomic and nuclear war which even for the victors would mean mass suicide and desolation.

Yet the application of Christian principles for the solution of our social and economic ills is not an easy task. You will hear powerful voices opposing necessary action to end the waste of unemployment and the waste in human and natural resources.

You may be tagged as a do-gooder, as if there were something wrong in doing good. Even your loyalty may be questioned. The road ahead is not an easy one.

Widespread confusion grows with false fears that our country cannot afford to do what is essential for its own strength and survival. We drift on with unfilled human and public needs while great machines and millions of men stand idle.

Yet we need not be without hope and faith in the future. In the world crisis time and history are on our side, on the side of right and freedom. No tyranny can long survive, for the spark of human freedom burns deep in human breasts. It can never be extinguished. However low it may sometimes burn, it will again burst into a flame.

With you, I subscribe to the principles pronounced by the United Lutheran Church as a solution of labor management problems and our Nation's social and economic ills.

Let us together again dedicate ourselves to these objectives as a service to our fellow man, to our country, and to God.

Private Timber Empire Open to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, long before there was any talk about the Federal Government's taking huge hunks of land to set aside as recreational areas for an out-of-doors-conscious public, private timberland holders in the State of Maine put out the welcome mat to citizens seeking fun in a natural setting. And so it still is today, with the privately held timberlands of Maine being made available to all who care to use and not abuse them.

This multiple-use concept is one that has been used with a high degree of success by the U.S. Forestry Service in the administration of our national forests, a multidimensional approach which utilizes all the resources of a natural area toward the end of maximum benefits.

An article appearing in the September 12 issue of the Bangor Daily News treats appropriately of this unselfish conduct on the part of Maine's private timberland holders, pointing up how the "no trespassing" sign has been something that has been long passing in the privately held timberlands of Maine:

[From the Bangor Daily News, Sept. 12, 1961]

PRIVATE TIMBER EMPIRE OPEN TO PUBLIC

(By Earle Doucette)

During the vacation season that is coming to an end tens of thousands of persons wandered at will throughout Maine's magnificent forest areas, the greatest east of the Rockies. They traveled by car, by plane, by outboard motor, and by canoe, enjoying the myriad lakes, streams, rivers, mountains, and woodland trails. Among them were campers, hikers, canoeists, and fishermen, and if there was even one of them who didn't have the time of his life in these wondrous regions we haven't heard about him.

Those of us who are Maine folk take in stride this privilege of wandering in the woods wherever our fancy leads us. We are used to going where we wish, because with minor exceptions we have always had the run of the forests. To our visitors, however, it is a never-ending miracle that this is so, because they know that our forests are privately owned, and but for the forebearance of the owners we could be barred from them.

There are solid reasons why free access to our forests must be a matter of concern not only to the owners, but to all of us. They are our bread and butter, our greatest resource by far. Our giant pulp-paper mills, and our hundreds of wood-turning factories and other wood-using industries are our largest employers. Our power companies, that also employ many hundreds, depend upon the forests to retain the rainfall, doling it out through the year, thus eliminating the danger of freshets on one hand, and dangerously low water levels on the other. Realizing all this, our fear of the carelessly started fire that could destroy in a twinkling what nature has created in half a century, or more, is real, and ever present. And if anyone thinks that this fear is overexaggerated he has failed to read the papers recently. Awesome forest fires that have swept through Newfoundland killed at least for the balance of this century that Province's hope of expanding its pulp-paper industry.

But though they are thoroughly aware of the ever-present danger of fire, those who own the forests, or operate therein, continue not only to allow us to visit them as we wish, but actually encourage us to do so. There are no public roads that penetrate deep into the forest regions, but we are welcome to use the excellent private roads that are used for the hauling out of the wood, and for other purposes. We are also welcome to use other facilities and conveniences, in fact some have been constructed solely for our use. The threat of fire has been met as best it can by asking us to please be careful, and by the acquisition at considerable expense of the latest and best firefighting equipment.

What is most significant in all this, we think, is that it is an object lesson in how our system of free enterprise can work for the good of all. We have put into practice the theory of multiple-use of forest lands. They are ever producing so that they will forever yield us employment, and they are also a permanent playground for all of us, free of cost.

If there is anywhere in the world where this multiple-use principle is more successfully employed we are unaware of it. You might think that in the so-called, but misnamed, "people's" governments the worker would be allowed to use the forests freely, because in theory they are his very own, but he isn't. That privilege is retained for party leaders.

Recently a group of nationally known outdoor writers was in Maine studying the multiple-use of our forest lands. What they will write about it will undoubtedly influence an accelerated growth of the idea in other States. If so, we can chalk up another first for Maine, one that has grown because of the wisdom and generosity of forest landowners and operators on the one hand, and the gratitude and cooperativeness of those of us who like the outdoors on the other.

Tribute to the Late Gilbert Forbes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of a tribute to the late Gilbert Forbes, veteran Indiana newscaster, which I have recorded for radio station WFBM and television station WFBM–TV in Indianapolis, with which he was associated.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GILBERT FORBES

I personally, and all of those in Indiana who have listened to him on radio and watched him on television, have lost a treasured friend in the death of Mr. Gilbert Forbes, one of Indiana's pioneer newscasters.

Gil Forbes died in Indianapolis Monday night after a year of lingering illness.

Mr. Forbes, a native of St. Louis, had been an adopted Hoosier since he first came to radio station WFBM in Indianapolis in 1937. His newscasts became a habit with those of us who maintained a deep interest in local, national, and international affairs.

Some have called Gilbert Forbes a commentator. To me, he was a radio reporter of the highest type because he held always to his inviolable rule of objectivity in the presentation of the news.

In the early days of telecasting in Indiana, Mr. Forbes became the first new voice in that vast new media of news dissemination. He remained active in the field until his last illness. Few people knew that he was also an accomplished musician.

While Gilbert Forbes as a voice has been stilled, his memory as a fine newscaster, a leader in civic affairs and a fine gentleman will remain with those who knew him personally and over the airwaves.

Conferences Between American and Argentine Industrialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, people-to-people efforts can take many forms. The Peace Corps and individual groups like CARE are helping representatives of our Nation to understand the hopes and problems of people in less developed nations.

Many businessmen, I am sure, have wondered how they can participate in other efforts to help achieve understanding among free peoples. How can their talents be used?

Recently a New Jersey businessman joined other men who shared their executive know-how with fellow company directors in Argentina. The precedent-setting mission was planned by our State Department. Mr. Fred D. Herbert, Jr. of Upper Montclair, N.J., said he had never worked harder in his life, and he added: "It was one of the most inspiring experiences of my business career."

Mr. President, the lessons of this recent seminar in Argentina should receive wide discussion among the business community. I believe that the State Department will welcome suggestions and comments on similar missions. A recent Newark Sunday News article describes the visit in some detail. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE AID FOR ARGENTINA—NEW JERSEY MAN SHARED MANAGEMENT KNOW-HOW AT PARLEY

WEST PATERSON.—"I'm no different from most Americans—I'm against communism, but I had no opportunity to do anything to fight it, personally. This was just such an opportunity."

That was how Fred D. Herbert, Jr., president of the Kearfott Division of General Precision, Inc., explained his speedy acceptance of a State Department invitation to take part in a precedent-setting mission to Argentina last month.

Herbert, who lives at 35 Glenwood Road, Upper Montclair, was one of three presidents of medium-sized American companies sent to Argentina for a weeklong conference with 15 presidents and directors of Argentinian companies. Their assignment was to explain successful American business practices and techniques on the top level, and give ideas to the Argentinian presidents for improving their own practices and increasing production.

"Communism is a real threat in Argentina," he said, "and the company heads that I met are well aware of it. The reason for the trip was to help these Argentinian industrialists get their companies on their feet, convince them to act to improve the living conditions of their employees and the population in general, and in that way fight communism."

CONFERENCE MEMBERS

Taking part in the conference were Herbert, 53, whose father founded Kearfott; H. Thomas Hallowell, Jr., president of the Standard Pressed Steel Co. of Jenkintown, Pa., and Harold Scherr, president of the Juvenile Manufacturing Co. of San Antonio, Tex. Moderator and organizer of the trip was Edward D. DeLuca, Pittsburgh management consultant.

The Conference was held from June 19 to 23 in Mar Del Plata, resort city outside Buenos Aires, arranged by the Council for International Progress in Management under sponsorship of the State Department's International Cooperation Administration and Argentina's leading management association.

"I was afraid it might be a boondoggle, a waste of time, a junket," he said. "It turned out to be anything but that. I never worked harder in my life. I did homework every night, and so did all the 15 Argentines."

The 5-day seminar, Herbert said, "one of the most inspiring experiences of my business career," was a full round of uninterrupted formal and informal discussions. An important part, he said, was centered upon the relationship between management and employees.

WIDE GULF

"Traditionally, here has been a wide gulf between Argentine company management and the worker," Herbert said. "Our neighbors to the south have not enjoyed the close relationships and mutual benefits which result when good comunications exist within an organization. I feel that our discussions on this subject were enthusiastically received by the Argentines, and will help them to understand why our country as a whole has benefited from the private enterprise system."

Herbert said that during his talks he explained his awareness that American and Argentine business heads face different problems. However, he emphasized the need to "sell" the companies—"facilities, products and importance to their well-being"—to all employees through better communications, supervision, and employee training.

Other points he stressed, Herbert said, included:

The importance of making foremen a part of management. He said presently the post of foreman is the highest a worker can attain in Argentina.

The desirability of higher wages and more liberal fringe benefits. He said these fringe benefits, so much a part of the American business scene, are all but nonexistent in Argentina.

Determining what employees really want, through questionnaires and surveys.

PROGRAM IN SAFETY

Improved safety devices in plants and publicize these achievements.

A vigorous public relations program to tell the people of the country of the accomplishments of industry and the capitalistic system and its importance in their future welfare.

Greater delegation of authority by top management.

Discontinuance of the practice of staying aloof from government. Express views personally and through their industry and management groups directly to their government representatives.

Strong support for universities, financially and otherwise, to increase the supply of engineering and business-oriented graduates and drive out the strong communistic cells and influences now felt there.

Herbert said he found the Argentine executives very receptive to the recommendations of the American business heads. "They are aware that they have the responsibility of doing something to arrest the spread of communism," Herbert declared. "I did get the feeling of urgency from them. They know it will be their heads if Argentina goes Communist."

FILM IMPRESSES

Herbert said he found time to visit only one plant in Argentina, but explained he learned quickly that there is very little internal communication in companies there. "There are few company publications or training programs," he said. "We stressed the need for these."

He said a movie depicting Kearfott operations so impressed the Argentinians that they asked him to leave the film for additional showings.

The idea of delegating much authority, Herbert said, also had a strong impact. "It isn't done very much there," he said. "They (company heads) work like mad, signing papers and checks and doing so many other chores that they don't have the time to think of things like employee relations."

Herbert emphasized the American company heads were careful not to "talk down" to the Argentinians. "They have pride," he said. "They don't want U.S. money. They want aid, through technical training and programs like that."

Herbert said he would welcome an opportunity to return to Argentina, or take part in similar seminars in other countries. "This is the most effective way a businessman can help in the war against communism," he said. "I never spent a more fruitful, effective week of hard work in my life."

Red Setback in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N.H., Monday, September 18, 1961, entitled "Red Setback in Japan."

RED SETBACK IN JAPAN

Nikita Khrushchev's efforts to loosen United States-Japanese ties have been a resounding flop. The Soviet boss has been told by Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda that his country will not be weaned away from its alliance with this country and its links with the free world.

Ikeda, who recently returned from a trip to the United States in which he was warmly received by President Kennedy, implied that the Japanese resented Russia's meddling in their affairs. He informed Khrushchev that if he wants a peace treaty with Japan all he has to do is return the Soviet-held South Kurile islands.

Khrushchev can thank not only himself for this rebuff but his first Deputy Premier, Anastas Mikoyan, whose recent visit to Japan was a bungling display of indiscretion and lack of diplomacy. In his attacks on the United States, Mikoyan grossly overestimated anti-American feling in Japan. His bluster failed to awe or impress Japanese businessmen and officials.

This instance of Soviet fumbling should be reassuring. Too many people have the notion that the Russians are Machiavellian connivers who never make mistakes.

Goals of the New Frontier—Action for Prosperity, for People, for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when John F. Kennedy became President on January 20, 1961, he faced a wide range of urgent problems which had been swept under the rug by the previous administration:

A deepening recession: The third serious economic slowdown in 6 years. In January 1961, 5.4 million American workers were out of jobs; business failures were at the highest levels since the depression of the 1930's; housing starts were at the lowest levels since 1949; we were using only about half our steel capacity; dozens of American communities had been suffering major unemployment continuously for years; our gold supply was rapidly disappearing abroad; farm incomes were critically low; our overall national economic growth was too slow to meet our needs.

Neglected public needs: We had been falling behind in meeting the needs of our rapidly growing population for schools, roads, housing, parks, power, public facilities of all kinds.

Neglected human needs: While, happily, most Americans were living well, millions of older people, the unemployed and their families, people in depressed areas—were often getting barely enough to live on.

A deteriorating defense: While the United States still had the most powerful Armed Forces in the world, our position had been slipping in terms of relative strength compared to that of our principal opponents, especially in the critical areas of ballistic missiles and capacity for limited war.

A powder keg world: All over the world we faced explosive situations which had been neglected or patched over until all of the choices still left open to the United States were almost equally undesirable. The Congo, Cuba, Laos, Berlin, headed the parade of inherited crises. Our relations with our allies were shaky in many cases. We had only begun to face up to the challenge of the dozens of new and economically underdeveloped nations. Soviet and Chinese communism were becoming increasingly bold and aggressive.

Here is the story of some of the specific things that have been done in the first months in office of the new administration to meet these problems.

ACTION FOR PROSPERITY

President Kennedy moved swiftly to halt the recession and help meet the long-term economic problems of the United States by:

Putting more money in circulation to make more jobs: Tax refunds and VA life insurance dividends were speeded up; defense and other Government contracts were accelerated; housing interest rates were lowered; legislation to extend unemployment compensation benefits was proposed by the President and passed by Congress.

Improving farm incomes: Price support levels for many crops were raised by administrative action; an emergency feed grain program was drafted by President Kennedy and passed by Congress and farmer participation is exceeding all expectations.

Helping depressed areas: A rounded program to help depressed urban and rural areas attract new industry, provide needed public facilities and retrain workers was proposed by the President and passed by Congress.

Aid to business: Special aids to small businesses have been stepped up; an overall tax revision plan to encourage business modernization has been proposed and is under consideration in Congress.

Stopping the gold outflow: A vigorous program to restore confidence in the dollar and increase U.S. export earnings was launched.

RESULTS

The recession was licked. While unemployment is still serious, all economic authorities agree that the U.S. economy is heading upward toward new levels of overall prosperity.

Business is better. Housing starts were up sharply; business failures down; steel production and many other business indicators up.

Farm incomes are up. Total farm income was running at a rate $1 billion a year higher in 1961 than in 1960.

The gold outflow has been stopped. As early as March the U.S. supply of gold actually increased after 18 months of steady decreases.

ACTION FOR PEOPLE

To help meet neglected human and public needs, President Kennedy launched a wide range of new and expanded Government programs. Among other important measures, he acted to:

Feed the hungry: On his very first day in office, President Kennedy issued an Executive order making more and better surplus foods available to more needy families throughout the Nation.

Improve social security benefits: The President proposed and Congress has passed legislation increasing minimum social security benefits; reducing the optional retirement age for men to 62; and broadening coverage. Over 3 million of the neediest people in America, including many needy children, will benefit from these changes.

Increase and expand minimum wages: The President has proposed and Congress has approved an increase of minimum wages from $1 to $1.25 an hour and extension of minimum wage protection to millions of additional workers—the first major extension of coverage since this law was passed in the 1930's.

Help provide better homes in more livable communities: A $4.9 billion 4-year overall housing and urban redevelopment bill was proposed by the President and passed by the Congress. It provides much-needed help for low and medium income housing; aid for urban planning and redevelopment; improved urban transportation; new help to communities to secure parks and other open spaces.

Broaden civil rights: President Kennedy has put the great power and resources of the Presidency and the executive branch of the Government into the long struggle to achieve full and equal rights for all Americans—in voting, in jobs, in education, and other spheres of national life. In a recent poll of Negro leaders, an amazing 81 percent responded favorably to a question on whether they felt the new administration had "lived up to campaign promises" in this field.

ACTION FOR PEACE

In the complex and vital interrelated areas of national defense and international relations, President Kennedy took the following constructive steps, among many others, in his first months in office:

Strengthening our defenses: The President acted swiftly to step up our missile capacity as part of our nuclear deterrent. For example, our Polaris submarine program has been accelerated so that there will now be a full fleet in commission 3 years sooner than under previous plans. At the same time special steps have been taken to improve and increase our capacity for resisting aggression in brushfire and guerrilla-type warfare. Immediate troop carrier plane procurement has been stepped up by 150 percent and training of special forces in guerrilla tactics has been substantially increased. New plans have been set forth by the President to build up U.S. and Allied strength to meet any contingency in connection with the Berlin crisis.

Strengthening the free world: We have cemented relationships with our traditional allies by strengthening NATO; joining the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and engaging in continuous consultation with Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, and other leading allied nations at all levels, including personal visits by President Kennedy. We have opened new doors in our relationships with the dozens of new and less developed nations in the free world by launching a new kind of foreign aid program, stressing political and social reform as well as economic and military strength; setting up the Peace Corps to enable Americans to help these countries on a firsthand basis; identifying ourselves with the ambitions of colonial peoples for independence;

mounting an expanded food for peace program, and many other measures.

Being firm but not belligerent in our relations with the Communist bloc: President Kennedy has made it perfectly clear to Premier Khrushchev that the United States will not yield on the freedom of West Berlin and its people, come what may. In facing Communist efforts at penetration in other areas—from Cuba to Laos to the Congo—we have sought to stiffen free world resistance by all means short of direct U.S. military intervention. Some of these situations had deteriorated so far that we have not been able to achieve our objectives. In others we have been more successful. As President Kennedy has emphasized to the American people, this is a long-term many-sided struggle in which there are no quick and easy solutions.

AMERICA IS ON THE MOVE AGAIN

Behind and beyond the many specific achievements that have been mentioned in this pamphlet—and many others of which space has prevented any mention—lies a basic new spirit and new approach which is the real essence of the new Kennedy administration.

This new spirit is one of vigor, of courage, of imagination, and of realism. It is the spirit of a young America with young leadership, facing up to its problems with a clear eye and a strong and steady hand.

This new approach is one of action. As President Kennedy himself said over and over during the 1960 campaign: "This country must move again." And as the New York Times summed it up: "The President is not content to say 'something ought to be done'—he does something."

President Kennedy has appealed to all Americans to participate in the challenges of the New Frontier—to work and sacrifice as may be necessary to achieve the great goals of our Nation at home and abroad. And Americans have responded enthusiastically to his call.

President Kennedy has said "Let us begin," and we have indeed begun. This country is indeed "on the move again."

If Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer for the Newark (N.J.) Evening News on September 19 made a very concise and clear statement of the problem of Federal spending and I submit it to my colleagues for their earnest consideration:

IF NECESSARY

Few could have been surprised by Treasury Secretary Dillon's weekend assertion that with increased military expenditures, tax reduction next year is improbable. The mounting deficit and the Berlin crisis long ago made that pretty obvious.

Nor, on the other hand, will many accept too confidently Mr. Dillon's assurance that a tax increase will not be necessary if defense spending does not exceed expectations. Besides defense, there are all sorts of programs in the works that will push up Federal costs.

In the crisis that confronts the Nation most Americans probably would cheerfully pay still higher taxes if necessary to assure adequate national defense and enable us to deal with our enemies from a position of strength. But this willingness needs assurance that the sacrifices Mr. Kennedy has called for will be shared by all, and that waste and nonessential spending be pruned rigorously.

Wiley Looks to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in planning and working toward an ever-better future, my home State of Wisconsin is making a most commendable effort to mobilize its human and natural resources to better serve its people and the Nation.

This is being done by effective action to meet the needs of the people now as well as projecting plans for the distant future.

Recently, Mr. David Carley, head of the State department of resource development, offered some guidelines to—and predictions on—developments in the years ahead. Reflecting upon possible trends of progress not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE FOR WISCONSIN ECONOMIC RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN BY CHIEF OF STATE DEPARTMENT

(By David Carley)

MADISON.—In the development of Wisconsin's human and natural resources some advance picture of the next two or three decades is necessary to give dimension and offer guidelines to the critical job of the wise use and development of our assets.

What trends in our governmental, social, and economic institutions now seem apparent? I think the following are some of the things we will see by 1985.

1. Wisconsin population very close to 5½ million people. The present trend toward concentration of population in urban areas will continue with metropolitan areas stretching out to engulf still more farmland and smaller communities. Suburban growth will be even more accelerated than at present; in part, it will be at the expense of the central city.

2. New forms of governmental systems at the local level—systems that will be developed with the problems caused by great masses of people living in urban communities stretched out over great areas.

3. A revival of urban mass transportation systems to accommodate increased population growth and to provide better city traffic control.

4. Electric automobiles, as a health measure to stop air pollution as well as to save petroleum resources. These cars will be lighter, more durable, simpler and cheaper to own and operate. On the highway these cars will be controlled electronically, moving from city to city at speeds up to 150 miles per hour and on highways with capacities 100 times greater than at present.

5. Much more rigorous controls by the State and local governments over use of natural resources. Water use in particular will be one of the most important concerns of State government.

6. Local and State governments will increase control on land use—zoning power will be extended to include design of building as well; also the rate and time of new building to be guided by local authorities.

7. The great problem of Wisconsin finance, that of adequate revenues for municipalities, to be settled in favor of local units with the right given to them to raise funds independent of State government.

8. Annual State budgets and annual sessions of the legislature; State government agencies to be geratly decentralized geographically in an attempt to stay "close to the people."

9. Regional transportation centers, particularly airports. Commercial aviation terminals to become less in number but with fast transportation to those centers from areas 40 to 50 miles away.

10. At least two more major universities in the State—and both secondary and higher education in Wisconsin on a year-around schedule.

11. Year-around activity at all Wisconsin ports on the Great Lakes. Ice-blocked harbors a thing of the past with the installation of already-designed "bubblers" which keep harbor water in constant movement.

12. Development of independent household methods of waste disposal; through use of deep nuclear power or other methods, devices for quickly disposing of sewage, waste paper, garbage, and trash; great savings in sewer and sewage disposal plant construction costs and trash and garbage pickup, but most importantly the elimination of the largest source of water pollution.

13. A greatly accelerated program of private investment in recreation facilities in Wisconsin as recreation time and opportunities increase. This means private development of hunting and fishing areas near metropolitan centers, de luxe camping areas, ski and snow developments, and day-use recreation areas for picnicking, hiking, fishing, etc., near urban centers.

Announcing an Addition to the Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[H.R. 8, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

In the House of Representatives, September 5, 1961. Mr. and Mrs. David S. King (Utah) introduced the following resolution which was referred to the Committee on Internal Affairs:

House resolution announcing an addition to the family to perpetuate the reign of Kings.

Whereas on the 5th day of September 1961, Rosalie King brought forth a 7-pound 5-ounce boy; and

Whereas said child measured 20½ inches from the top of the head to the sole of his foot; and

Whereas said child has a swatch of blond hair atop his crown: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the child shall be known as Christopher Henry King, the eighth child of this family.

(This was printed at the expense of the boy's father.)

FCC's Proposals To Shift VHF Television Station to UHF Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a companion bill to H.R. 9267, which was introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] on September 16. I wish to endorse the remarks that he has previously made in the RECORD concerning this matter, for I, too, am seriously concerned by the FCC's proposals to shift VHF television stations to UHF channels.

One shift of a VHF station to UHF already proposed by the FCC affects WREX–TV, which now operates on channel 13 in my hometown of Rockford. I understand that if WREX–TV is forced to shift from channel 13 to UHF it would not be able to serve about 6,000 square miles of the area it now serves. If this shift to UHF is ordered, about half of my district would no longer be able to receive television on channel 13. Especially important is the fact that a large number of the people in my district who would lose their channel 13 service would be left without any television at all if channel 13 is taken out of Rockford. Those who would still get television from some station would not have the choice of programs they now have. It would not be in the public interest to take television away from these people, and I must oppose as vigorously as I can any proposal to do so.

The FCC's plan to shift VHF stations to UHF is going to hurt the rural dwellers, the farmers, and the people in the smaller towns in my district most of all. Yet these folks have a greater dependence on and need for television than any of our citizens. The outlying areas simply do not have available the other facilities for entertainment, information and education that are found in larger communities. Thus, the FCC's proposals would take television away from those who need it the most.

The people in my district know from experience what will happen if channel 13 is lost. We already have a UHF station in Rockford which operates on channel 39. A very substantial part of my district which can get channel 13 cannot get channel 39 at all. Other large parts of my district which can get some channel 39 service do not get as good service from channel 39 as from channel 13. This is not to say that the channel 39 service is not wanted or is not useful. We are glad we have it and we hope we keep it. The point is we need to keep channel 13 to operate right along with channel 39. It seems to me the most reasonable way to bring this about is to solve the receiver problem and to give no further consideration to "deintermixture."

I believe it to be my duty to do everything I can to protect the people in my district against the loss of their channel 13 television service. The FCC has indicated that it intends to take their channel 13 service away from them. If this is the case, we in the Congress must step in to make sure that such a tragedy does not occur.

In this regard I want to emphasize an important point that cannot be overemphasized. The FCC's UHF proposals are not limited to just a few places. They affect the whole country. In addition to the eight cases already started, of which Rockford is one, the FCC has said it contemplates other cases later on and that, indeed, it is looking toward an eventual move of all, or almost all, television from VHF to UHF. Therefore, the FCC's proposals pose a serious threat to the people throughout the country and are of serious concern to every Member of this House.

Highway Safety Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared, at my request, by Mr. Duane Carter, of Speedway, Ind., whom many of you will recognize as one of the leading veteran race car drivers in the United States.

I do so because Mr. Carter and another Hoosier, Gene Hartley, are now engaging in one of the most effective highway safety programs in the country in these days when the demands for effective safety programs are at a premium.

The program was presented last year in more than 30 Indiana high schools as part of a nationwide effort to reduce the terrible traffic toll. U.S. military services have recognized its value and have sought and received the cooperation of the Champion Spark Plug Co., sponsor of the programs, in presentations hoped to improve the highway safety records of the thousands upon thousands of military vehicles.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM

In a serious effort to combat the mounting death toll upon our Nations' streets and highways, J. R. "Dick" McGeorge, public relations director of the Champion Spark Plug Co. caused to be initiated in 1955 a highway safety program, aimed at the teenage or beginner driver. This is an educational program put on in the Nations high schools at their general assemblies. The idea being to make these new drivers safety conscious in the initial stages of their driving careers. The Air Force requested this program in 1957 for their personnel, and today it has now been utilized by all branches of the service, both at home and overseas.

It has been recognized by educators, law enforcement officers, civic leaders and the military as a most timely and worthwhile public service program. The National Safety Council has awarded the Champion Spark Plug Co. its public service award. Editorial praise from many newspapers and publications has also been recorded.

The Champion Spark Plug Co. utilizes the services of the Nation's leading automobile racing drivers to present this unique safety program, namely the veteran drivers who have competed in the famous Hoosier classic and who have completed the full 500-mile Memorial Day race at Indianapolis with an average speed in excess of 100 miles per hour without relief.

Hoosiers Gene Hartley and Duane Carter are members of the eight-man driver-lecture highway safety team sponsored by Champion, now currently touring the country putting the program on for the military, high schools, service clubs, and civic organizations of the United States.

U.S. Self-Interest May Demand Our Withdrawal From United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the events of the next few days may well determine the course of mankind. The untimely death of Dag Hammarskjold and the announced Soviet intention to insist upon their plan for operation of the United Nations makes it imperative that we take a second look at our participation in that organization. We are badly outvoted in the U.N. by a combination of outright Communist nations and the so-called unalined countries which have shown great partiality to the Soviet ideas. It may well be that the time has come for us to leave the United Nations. Certainly, if it is to become merely a propaganda forum, for which we pay the whole bill, for the spread of Communist doctrines, or if it is to be used to make ineffective any move against Communist aggression, then, by all means, we should make it clear that we will have no part of it.

But what is happening? The administration is already committing us to turning even more of our sovereignty over to the U.N. The following news story in the Wall Street Journal of September 19 and an editorial from the same paper, indicate the lengths to which the administration is going even before we know under whose control the United Nations will function. Mr. Speaker, I say the American people are concerned about this headlong rush to further weaken our position in the world and we had better make clear our position that we can and will withdraw from the United Nations if, in so doing, we are

protecting the freedom of our own people.

THE U.N.'s FUTURE—UNITED STATES SEEKS TO GIVE IT WIDER POWERS DESPITE HAMMARSKJOLD'S DEATH—KENNEDY MAY SUGGEST BERLIN DISARMAMENT ROLE; CONGO EVENTS POINT UP RISK—THE PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The African plane-crash death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is adding a new note of agonizing uncertainty to a bold U.S. gamble to expand the peacemaking powers of the United Nations.

The gamble was big even before Mr. Hammarskjold's death. Besides its floundering in the Congo, the U.N. has been swollen almost unmanageably by an influx of new neutral members and it has been menaced by Communist takeover efforts. But in the face of the increased uncertainty, the United States yesterday was sticking to this strategy already in the works for the U.N. General Assembly session opening in New York this week: More—not less—U.S. encouragement for the world body to plunge into major peace and security missions of the sort the current Congo-Katanga exercise started out to be.

Support for a greatly strengthened U.N. executive arm to permit more varied jobs as cold war conciliator, mediator or inspector. Assignment might range from settling minor irritants such as the Austrian-Italian hassle over Italy's Tyrol to controlling outer space. They also might include watchdog activities on frontiers punctured by guerrilla infiltration and on-the-spot probes of subversive activities in lands like South Vietnam.

Redoubled U.S. backing and participation in U.N. activities all along the line, including some specific U.S. proposals for a big United Nations role in the Berlin and disarmament issues, and for further boosts in economic development activities under U.N. auspices.

THE QUESTION OF A SUCCESSOR

So heavy are the uncertainties now overhanging the world body that the whole tenor of this approach could alter drastically in a matter of days or in months ahead. The major question now, of course, is Mr. Hammarskjold's successor. In the proud, tireless Swede, the United States had perhaps the U.N.'s most arden advocate of a powerful, active executive for the world group; his just-published report to this week's Assembly hammers that point. If his effors at even-handedness miffed some Westerners, they drew forth Nikita Khrushchev's wild rage.

Yesterday few of the stunned delegates on hand were betting on a successor. Tunisia's diminutive foreign minister, Mongi Slim, an old U.N. hand and key figure in Congo policy-making, was one name cropping up. But guessing centered on still more "neutralist" figures from the growing and pivotal Afro-Asian bloc. With nominations subject to Security Council veto, a long deadlock may ensue. And Russia may seize upon this opportunity to push again for a three-headed secretary-generalship, based on the so-called troika principle, and made up of a Communist, a Westerner and a neutral, each armed with a veto. The effect, U.S. authorities figure, would be total paralysis.

Such paralysis could set in quickly if the Russians stand fast on their troika demand and veto all candidates to succeed Mr. Hammarskjold. As far as Western officials can see, there's no existing machinery for automatic succession or for picking an acting U.N. executive, though lower-level secretariat officials can continue to run their own departments. A permanent Secretary General is elected by the General Assembly after a recommendation—in effect, a nomination—by the Security Council. To be nominated, a candidate needs seven votes from among the 11 Security Council members; however, the 5 permanent members, including Russia, have veto power and could block any prospect not to their liking. "We're in a jam," says one U.N. man, "if the Russians want to be tough."

But the United States is counting on pressures from small nations that form the bulk of U.N. membership to prevent its wallowing in disarray. It's reasoned little lands have a vital self-interest in keeping the organization working. With small-nation backing, U.S. officials hope at least they can arrange some makeshift leadership that would last for months if necessary.

Even if a successor to Mr. Hammarskjold suitable to the United States can be elected, the Katanga chaos adds yet another major question mark; collapse of the U.N. effort there would hand the organization a damaging black eye. Meantime, before the 16th Assembly winds up, some 3 months hence or longer, the United States could suffer some stunning reverses on Red Chinese membership, on a related dispute over admitting Communist Outer Mongolia, on disarmament, or on any of a host of other issues.

STICKING TO STRATEGY

With the crisis in Katanga already fanning congressional criticism of the U.N. and with some key European allies looking increasingly askance at the world group, the threat of still further setbacks for this country's U.N. policy would seem to argue loudly for a highly cautious approach for now. Yet chats with key officials yesterday revealed no disposition to alter the basic strategy already agreed upon: That the best defense of this country's interest in the turbulent world group is a powerful offensive to make the U.N. more effective and a good deal more active.

In fact, Mr. Hammarskjold's death figured heavily in President Kennedy's decision yesterday to address the General Assembly early in its new session. At the least, he will stoutly reaffirm U.S. support for the U.N. If influential policy makers prevail, his address will crackle with headline-catching new U.S. proposals for U.N. initiatives.

Among them:

1. A disarmament proposal, still secret but billed as far reaching, that would bid for neutral support by giving so-called unalined nations a role in inspecting any general disarmament schemes East and West may be able to work out. While the United States will avoid trying to match Russia's sweeping, propaganda-oriented plans for general and complete disarmament, it will embrace the principle, with heavy emphasis on inspection techniques, officials say.

2. A plan to give the United Nations broad police powers in outer space in an effort to remove the heavens from cold-war conflict—from any use as a base, for example, for missile-launching platforms. Extra-terrestrial bodies as well as the great open spaces would be added to the U.N. beat. "The idea would be to apply the Antarctica approach to space, with nobody claiming sovereignty over the moon or whatever planets may be reached in coming years," says one administration planner.

INTERVENTION AND INSPECTION

3. A batch of peace and security proposals to enlarge the United Nations capacity to intervene in Congo-style crises or wherever local governments are threatened by subversion or revolution sponsored from outside their borders, i.e., from Moscow, or Peiping. U.S. officials contend there are anywhere from a dozen to 20 possible variations for carrying out these proposals, including such existing United Nations machinery, rusty with disuse, as a conciliation panel for refereeing disputes. Officials talk excitedly of rapporteurs or inspection commissions that would simply keep an eye on things and issue regular reports, as is now done by U.N. officials in Jordan and along Arab-Israeli truce lines.

"Think of the impact," exclaims one authority, "if every time the Reds assassinated an anti-Communist figure in South Vietnam there was a big uproar about it in New York."

4. Increased American financial backing for a host of U.N. economic aid activities, including a Special Fund, under the direction of veteran U.S. foreign-aider, Paul Hoffman, which engages in what he terms "pre-investment investment" to determine what resources a young nation may have that are worth aiding. There also would be more U.S. technical aid to teach new lands how to plan long-term development programs, as well as to spread industrial and agricultural know-how. With its heavy accent to self-help by recipients of U.S. aid, the Kennedy administration looks warmly upon these and other U.N. activities.

THE MATTER OF BERLIN

One topic Mr. Kennedy is likely to touch on only glancingly, if at all, is Berlin. But this is no more than a reflection of the touchy state of that crisis as Secretary Rusk seeks to sound out Russia's Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko this week on prospects for negotiating a settlement. In the back of the mind of Mr. Kennedy's Berlin planners is a significant role for the United Nations both before, and perhaps as a part of, any Berlin deal.

If the crisis erupts into shooting incidents threatening wider war, or even if negotiations simply break down, the United States might welcome a United Nations airing of the issues in order to pressure the Russians. A talking point that U.S. authorities think might be telling with the Afro-Asians in New York: The West's main aim in all the Berlin haggling is simply self-determination for the Germans.

But the U.N. might also figure in a Berlin settlement. Talk grows here of assigning the U.N. to inspect Berlin access routes under any new agreement guaranteeing Western access to the city. There's interest, too, in giving the encircled city an important role as headquarters for at least some of the myriad United Nations agencies. Because U.S. officials are fearful that West Berlin, under some new arrangement with the Reds, might still be vulnerable to harassment of access routes or economic squeezes, they talk, too, of asking the United Nations to schedule more international meetings there. This would provide tourist income, for one thing. And with the world's diplomats shuttling in and out at frequent intervals, a clampdown on access might prove more embarrassing for the Reds.

Though there's been some mention of it, officials here tend to dismiss an even more ambitious scheme—that the United Nations pick up and move to West Berlin, abandoning its concrete-and-glass structure in New York. Only half-jestingly, one official notes the precedent that would be set: If the U.N. got in the habit of moving in bodily to damp down crisis spots, the cost, as well as the confusion, might become prohibitive.

REVIEW OF U.S. PROPOSALS

Yesterday, Kennedy administration planners were intensively reviewing the timing and phrasing of their U.N. proposals in the light of Mr. Hammarskjold's death and the Congo confusion. At a late hour, there was no clear indication how much Mr. Kennedy may decide to unveil himself and how much he may leave to Secretary Rusk to unfold.

But the thinking behind the U.S. buildup for the U.N. is firmly fixed in basic Kennedy philosophy. Repeatedly, the President has sounded a call for new techniques to cope with current fashions in cold-war fighting: Undeclared guerrilla wars and subversion by the Communists. To a lot of administration strategists, the U.N.'s inspection and policing powers make it the ideal instrument for this.

A second Kennedy tenet has to do with the difficulty of great-power intervention in economic and political affairs of emerging lands. The U.S. record of failure in Laos is rated a striking case in point; but international bodies, it's reckoned, can poke deeply into a nation's internal doings without arousing anything like the same resentments. "Intervention in the name of nonintervention" is the way one U.N. partisan describes the idea.

Men like U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affair, Harland Cleveland, and others are convinced their plans for widening U.N. peace-making authority can win strong support from smaller lands. These countries, mostly poverty stricken and powerless, see in the international group the only place they can bring their collective influence to bear, these officials maintain.

The Reds, of course, can use Security Council vetoes to block quick action by the U.N. But it's noted that the Russians went along with at least three Security Council resolutions last year authorizing the organization's Congo role, though Mr. Khrushchev subsequently went out of his way to tell Mr. Kennedy in Vienna that the Congo operations of the U.N. had worked against Red interests. Besides, officials note, Security Council vetoes can be overridden in the General Assembly.

"The Russians can't stop us if everybody else wants it," declares one U.S. diplomat at U.N. headquarters.

THE PENALTY FOR ILLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly will begin its meetings in the somber atmosphere generated by the death of Secretary General Hammarskjold. Whatever one's disagreements with him, he worked indefatigably, by his lights and within the strictures of his office, to ease the world's chronic troubles. Not the least tribute to him is that in doing so he earned the enmity of the Soviet Union.

Yet Mr. Hammarskjold's death, however tragic, should not obscure the deeper crisis in which the United Nations finds itself; the symptoms may well start showing up in this session. In particular it is imperative for the United States to start facing the facts about the U.N., for the U.N. is turning into a threat to U.S. interests.

The organization was founded on the gigantic illusion that the Soviets would cooperate in the construction of a peaceful world. No sensible person could believe that myth for very long, but it has bedeviled the U.N. from the beginning. Today, moreover, other illusions have piled up in the East River edifice, and they, too, are potentially dangerous.

There is, notably, what might be called the illusion of parity. According to this fantasy, every nation is the peer of every other nation; an African area with less people than a good-sized American city, and without even the minimum qualifications of nationhood, has just as much voting power as the United States.

Such an approach to world problems has no basis in fact. In the real world, a nation must earn the right to influence international affairs. It may do so by coercive development and brute force, as in the Soviet Union; or it may do so by free economic and spiritual development, as in the American tradition. But in any case, a nation should not become an arbiter of world events simply by proclaiming itself a nation.

The practical consequences of upside-down thinking about the U.N. are rapidly becoming clear. For one, the United States gets swept into—and must bear the financial burden for—enterprises of questionable merit. Is it in the U.S. interest for the U.N. to attack pro-Western Katanga, which incidentally was not about to attack the central Congolese Government? Is it in the U.S. interest to have pro-Communists cropping up in responsible positions in the Congo?

More basically, there is the ugly situation confronting the United States in the General Assembly. For years we enjoyed an almost automatic majority in these deliberations; today, with the influx of all these newly independent nations, with their professedly neutralist stance, we are increasily in danger of being in an almost automatic minority.

The most striking current illustration is Washington's confession that it can no longer be sure of staving off discussion of the admission of Communist China. Suppose that in due course the Assembly votes that regime in; what then does the United States do? How much good is a Security Council veto if the weight of Assembly opinion is against the United States?

Or to consider the even more immediate question of a successor to Mr. Hammerskjold, what guarantee can there be that the new Secretary General will be tolerable to the United States, or that under his aegis we will not be pulled into still worse adventures? In its present frame of mind, the U.S. Government might not even veto the recommendation of some neutralist or worse for the post. It is not difficult to foresee many other situations where the U.N. can menace U.S. interests.

With such a prospect, the United States, in time may well be forced to consider whether it can remain in the organization. Short of that, the United States must, we believe, begin refashioning its thinking about the U.N. It must seek to use its power within the U.N. to effect its objectives, and it must steer clear of U.N. activities counter to those objectives.

The United States must finally abandon any sentimental notion of the U.N. as an inherently noble institution to which we are committed no matter what. In this connection, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the school to stop teaching our children to believe in that falsehood.

What matters is the preservation of the United States, not the United Nations. If the two are becoming irreconcilable, we had better realize it. In the real world of power politics, the penalty is heavy for building a storehouse of illusions.

Neutrals Are Set Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days President Kennedy has been host to two neutralist visitors—President Sukarno, of Indonesia, and President Keita, of Mali. President Sukarno is here as a spokesman for the Belgrade unalined nations. He is also a champion of anticolonialism. His wish is to have the Algerians determine their own future. He further stresses that the peoples of Africa and Asia should determine their own future in the world.

Then why the double talk? President Sukarno is opposed to the same decision for Germany. What is wrong with self-determination by the Germans? The West is eager to have the people of Germany decide in a free election what their desires are. It is the U.S.S.R. who, as always, fears these free elections.

If President Sukarno is true blue, he must favor self-determination for Germany.

We must compliment President Kennedy on his firm stand on Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I am very pleased to include in the RECORD an article by Mr. William S. White which appeared in the September 18, 1961, issue of the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y. The article follows:

NEUTRALS ARE SET STRAIGHT

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—For all its great dangers, the Berlin crisis may be producing one good and wholesome byproduct.

The world's neutrals have at last been told by President Kennedy, in adequate politeness but also in adequate firmness, that the United States is fed up to the eyes with the kind of "neutralism" which is ready to denounce us on all occasions and the Soviet Union on no occasion at all.

This is the word particularly to those nations which are "neutral" in favor of the Soviet Union—Yugoslavia, Indonesia and the like.

And the message has not stoped with this. Poland, to which heavy assistance has been given in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, has been told that its latest request is in a pigeonhole marked "indefinite." The aid request of Tito of Yugoslavia likewise is going to get indefinitely lost here. While we won't try to use aid as a club, we also won't go on extending aid without any regard to the attitude of recipients.

This chill in Washington has been caused by a number of factors, not least the recent meeting of nonalined nations in Yugoslavia. The "nonalined" have managed to look the other way at all Russian sin. They looked the other way at Khrushchev's breaking of the armistice on nuclear testing, which has now thrown up 10 new blasts to contaminate the air.

They looked the other way at Khrushchev's brutal closing of the escape hatches to freedom by sealing the East-West Berlin border. They wound up by solemnly dispatching neutralist leaders to go calling on Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy with what amounts to appeals to the burglar. Khrushchev, to take it a bit easier and to the victim, Kennedy, to cease his unseemly struggles in self-defense lest there be a war in which the neutralists might get hurt.

(A foreign diplomat who is far from naive told this correspondent: "Yes, people (the neutral leaders) can get that cynical; but how on earth can they do it without at least grinning?")

This correspondent, who had never been convinced of the total sanctity of the "neutrals," was among those who thought we were lucky to get off at the Yugoslav meeting as well as we did, considering who was there and that it was held on Communist territory.

For taking into account the incredible mentality of the neutralists to date, the mere fact that they did not declare outright that we and not Khrushchev were to blame for Khrushchev's barbed-wire wall in Berlin was actually a small net gain. Even this highly relative restraint exposed the fact that while they would never admit it, they were at last aware of who was really disturbing the world's peace.

The President, at all events, was by no means pleased, as he has just shown here to his neutralist visitors, President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali. He was nice to them, as the saying goes, but they left here knowing he has reached his sticking point. He had gone to great length

to get along with the neutrals. A most happy day has now arrived: hereafter, it is their job to get along with him, for a change.

Their bottom purpose here was to try to talk him into not doing anything to annoy Khrushchev. And his official reply, at the end, is as interesting as what was said privately in the meantime. For the first substantive sentence of that reply was its heart: "I have made it clear that the position of the West and of the West Berliners will be defended."

Then was added the long-known fact that the United States always stands ready for honorable negotiation—without appeasement—if Khrushchev really wants that kind of negotiation. At minimum the neutralists had hoped that a Presidential promise to negotiate would dominate and flavor the conference. What dominated it, instead, was a promise to fight, if fight we must.

Financing of Badly Needed Hurricane Flood Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today the second major hurricane of the season rampages up the Atlantic coast, bringing with its high winds and 20-foot waves a serious threat to life and property. And, while plants shut down and homes are evacuated in many areas of New York and New England, there could be no more appropriate time to urge the Federal Government to take cognizance of the severe damage that can result from the tidal flooding that accompanies such storms, and to recognize at the same time that much of it could be prevented—if a more realistic attitude is taken toward the financing of badly needed hurricane flood control projects.

The industrial city of New Bedford, in my district, which today braces itself for Hurricane Esther, suffered some $27 million worth of damage when Hurricane Carol struck in 1954. That figure does not include wind damage, lost man-hours or lost profits—just destruction from tidal flooding. The Federal Government shared in this loss, because most of it was in the industrial area of the city, which meant shutdowns, machinery destroyed, capital losses and, as a consequence, lost Federal revenue from taxes. Corporate taxes lost in such a storm could be as high as $10 million or more in a single industrial area.

The city of New Bedford and the Federal Government could be saved countless millions in future years if a hurricane protection plan already advanced beyond the preliminary engineering stages was implemented in the immediate future. Congress has authorized the construction, appropriated $1,300,000 for planning costs and in the current session has approved the expenditure of another $500,000 to initiate construction. The project is being delayed and the city denied protection because the local government cannot afford its 30-percent share of the building cost—which would total nearly $8 million.

The city cannot afford this amount because of serious economic problems, problems that would only be worsened if another storm was to hit. It is predicted by the engineers that a maximum-force hurricane could inflict as much as $100 million damage in the New Bedford area. The city could be left an industrial ghost town. Even the threat of a storm costs money. One prominent manufacturer has estimated that the 35 or more industries on the waterfront in New Bedford and neighboring Fairhaven spend as much, or rather loose as much, as $100,000 in preparing for a storm that may hopefully turn out to sea and not, after all, hit the city.

Conscious of the city's plight and the plight of similar areas, such as New London and Providence, I joined early in the session with the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH, in filing legislation that would provide for the reduction of local contributions to hurricane flood control projects, when the locality already suffers economic hardships.

My bill, H.R. 20, which was referred to the Public Works Committee, would provide such a reduction in local contributions when the flood control project is located within a recognized labor surplus area, as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Instead, then, of a 30-percent contribution, the local interest would be required to put up a contribution, equal to that required by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936; this would mean a saving to the city of New Bedford of approximately $1,500,000.

However, action, even consideration, of my bill—filed January 3—has been delayed because the committee has not been furnished the necessary departmental reports.

This is a matter, literally, of life and death to New Bedford, and could be equally important to other towns and cities along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf of Mexico.

This bill is proper and just and would be extremely beneficial not only to New Bedford, but to the Nation as a whole. However, I know that the committee and Members of the House are hampered in their consideration of this legislation by the absence of needed reports.

In view of the disastrous effects of Hurricane Carla in Louisiana and Texas and the impending threat of the current storm, I trust the administration will provide us with the reports as soon as possible, so that with the reconvening of Congress in January, the proposal can be given the prompt attention I am confident it deserves.

Shifting of TV Channels Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, several bills and resolutions have been introduced in opposition to the FCC's recent proposals to shift VFH television stations to UHF channels. Among these bills and resolutions are House Resolution 450, House Resolution 457, House Resolution 469, H.R. 9267, H.R. 9277, H.R. 9291, and H.R. 9293. I have introduced H.R. 9293, a companion bill to H.R. 9267, which was introduced on September 16, 1961, by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. Like my distinguished colleagues, I, too, am seriously concerned by the FCC proposals.

The FCC is proposing to shift WIS–TV on VHF channel 10 in Columbia, S.C., to a UHF channel. This switch, if allowed to happen, would deprive our State's capital of the only VHF channel assigned there. If this only VHF station in Columbia is forced to switch to UHF, I am told that an area of at least 6,000 square miles will lose the good television service it now receives from WIS–TV. Should this happen, thousands of families would not be able to receive WIS–TV as they now do. These people are, for the most part, families living in the rural and small towns, many of them in my district.

WIS–TV, broadcasting from Columbia, is the only television service that these people have from our State capital or from a South Carolina station. They depend on it for State and regional news, weather, crop reports, civil defense information, and many other types of necessary programs to keep them informed and alert to important events affecting their State. If this service is destroyed or deteriorated by switching WIS–TV to UHF, then these thousands of families would have to rely on television service from stations in other States bordering South Carolina. It would mean that their only source of information from their State capital would be lost to them and in its place would be substituted a television service designed to fit the needs of the people in the surrounding States. These services would not be oriented to the needs of the people of South Carolina as is WIS–TV's service. It would definitely not be in the public interest to allow this to take place, and I am going to vigorously oppose any such shift to UHF. As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is concerned with the activities of the FCC, I intend to make my opposition known both in the hearings that this committee plans to hold early next session and in the deliberations of the committee.

In its proposal on deintermixture of eight markets to all-UHF, the FCC makes it quite clear that the ultimate goal is to switch all, or almost all, television to UHF. Today we in South Carolina face the prospect of seeing over 6,000 square miles denied service from Columbia's one VHF station. Tomorrow you, too, will be faced with such prospects, for the FCC has said that other cases are contemplated later on and that they look for all, or almost all, television service to be switched from VHF to UHF.

UHF and VHF can operate and grow together. One of the problems that has held back this UHF growth is the lack of

television receivers capable of receiving both UHF and VHF. I believe, as does the FCC, that it is very necessary to insure that all sets shipped in interstate commerce have the capability to receive all channels. I strongly support such a proposal and have also included this in my bill.

All of us in this House are dedicated to serving the best interests of the people in our districts and at the same time to protecting the public interest of all the peoples of our country. The FCC's proposals on deintermixture seriously threaten these public interests nationwide. Every Member of this House should be seriously concerned with the immediate and ultimate effect it will have on the good television service now available and enjoyed by millions of families throughout our country.

Golden Jubilee of the Julius Slowacki Society, Group 1356, Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with all due personal and professional pride, it pleases me to commend to the attention of my colleagues the Golden Jubilee of the founding of the Julius Slowacki Society, of Adams, Mass.

Organized in September 1911, this venerable group has had an honorable record in its hometown of Adams, Mass., for the past half century. Started with 13 members as a fraternal benefit organization, today it numbers 552 members. Like its parent organization, the Polish National Alliance, the society has a history of dedicated community service. Since 1925, the date of its incorporation, the list of contributions to the city of Adams, Mass., is impressive and seemingly endless, ranging from the annual sponsorship of a drum corps to the sponsorship of an English course for displaced persons preparing for U.S. citizenship. Even in times of emergency and need the Julius Slowacki Society found time to help those still living in the motherland by sending packages of food and clothing to those in distress and suffering from the effects of war.

The society is proud of this record, and justly so. Their fraternal efforts have been responsible for much of the success of their peoples in their respective professional fields as well as in their Americanism.

There is one outstanding phenomenon about the people of Poland, which holds true of the Julius Slowacki Society and those wonderful people of Polish origin or descent residing in Adams, Mass., and that is their incredible ability to maintain a national purpose and integrity against odds which would make others despair. Their fierce love for the ideals of liberty and their steadfast will to keep it alive, have produced great fighters for our efforts at independence in the persons of Kosciusko and Pulaski.

During World War II 93 members of the Julius Slowacki Society served their country in the Armed Forces attesting to their loyalty to their new land. Those not able to don the uniform contributed to the war effort by their purchase of war savings bonds in significant amounts. Today members of the Julius Slowacki Society rank high among the donors of blood so vitally needed by the sick and infirm in their community.

The world will long remember the works of Conrad, Chopin, Marie Curie, and Ignace Paderewski, to name but a few of the great personages from Poland, the mother country of many of the members of the Julius Slowacki Society.

In commemorating this gala occasion, I think it proper for us here in the Congress, to recall the contributions made to the world by these natives of Poland, and to pay tribute to the members of the Julius Slowacki Society for their proud heritage.

Labor, Management, and Person in the Common Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh, at the Labor Day mass and observance on September 4, 1961, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

LABOR, MANAGEMENT AND PERSON IN THE COMMON GOOD

SERMON

But Peter began, and said, "Now I really understand that God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation he who fears Him and does what is right is acceptable to Him."—Acts 10:34–35.

The text which I have chosen seems especially appropriate for a gathering brought together in the spirit which characterizes this historic and remarkable Labor Day observance.

It is common enough for the representatives of management to meet in council or conference to consider the things conducive to management's best interests, to the common good of management. It is not less common for the representatives of labor similarly to meet in convention to explore ways and means to labor's best interests, to the common good of labor. But today's gathering has been made remarkable and will, one prays, prove of historic influence, because it has brought together men dedicated to the welfare of their respective groups but aware of a wider good than that of any special interests.

Here in Pittsburgh men devoted to the cause of labor and men devoted to the cause of management have come together in recognition of the reality and claims of a common good which all parties share in a decent society, the common good which is the mutual bond of men who realize that the shared things which are ours are always more warm and sometimes more important than the things which are described by those frozen words: mine and thine (frigida ista verba, meum et tuam.)

Many thoughtful persons, appalled by the extremes of right and left which polarize and split our society, have long been pleading for a vital center at which could meet honest social conservatives and conscientious social liberals, men disposed to work with one another in behalf of the common good rather than to work with extremists who seek only the particular good after which their side of center aspires.

Such a vital center would seek to conciliate the particular goods of the various parties, factions, and interests of our political and economic society; it would seek the promotion of those special goods by the enrichment of that common good which all share; it would coordinate the interests and the efforts of intellectuals plus businessmen, statesmen plus generals, labor plus management, instead of encouraging the so disastrous pitting of good men against other good men in conflicts of management versus labor, generals versus statesmen, businessmen versus intellectuals—all within the same nation and served by the same common good.

This Labor Day observance is, then, a welcome reaffirmation of that common good which cannot be too frequently recalled in times of tension and conflict.

The coming together of representatives of labor and management, thus to meditate on the common good was made possible by our recognition of the truth implied in the words of St. Peter which I quoted as my text. That truth is: that more important than any of the categories to which a man may belong, is the fact that he is a person.

It is more important, because more basic, to be a person than it is to be a citizen, a tradesman, a professional man, a member of any race or class, a worker or a manager. It is better to be a good person, a worthy image of God than it is to be successful in any of the secondary functions and subordinate categories into which persons are divided. This Labor Day observance is inspired by the spirit in which St. Peter, who before had been a bit of a "racist," finally came to understand that God expects us to recognize and cooperate with all honorable persons, whatever the party or class to which they belong. After long debate on the differences between Jew and gentile, the division which chiefly bothered him, Peter finally said: "Now I really understand that God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation (or group) he who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him."

St. Peter's tardy confession asserts that God is not a respector of persons; it also strongly suggests that it is precisely in the goodness and worth of the person, not in considerations of nationality or class or occupation, that we men must find the unifying principle of the good society, the ultimate and positive factor in the measure or the promotion of the common good. This suggests, in turn, that our approach to today's social problems must be in terms not of the worker or the manager alone, but also and especially in terms of the person; our efforts to promote the common good in a decent society must be efforts geared to the good of labor, yes; to the good of management, yes; but, above all, to the good of the person.

In the claims of the common good and of the person lie our best hopes of reconciling the particular interests of groups otherwise destined for perpetual conflict and destructive of the program of the good persons whom God finds and we must honor in every group. Those claims impel us to think of current social problems in terms of labor, management, and persons not of labor and/or management alone.

The saving and sound balance between right and left, between conservative and liberal, must necessarily be based on something other than preoccupation with either management or labor, yet including both. A democratic society is never a society dominated by the champions of the interests of any one class. That is why a society devoted to capitalist interests only would always be undemocratic. That is also why a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat can never be represented as democratic or as a means to democracy. So, too, a truly democratic social order is never rightist or leftist in the sense that it favors management to the disadvantage of labor or labor to the embarrassment of management.

Both Christian moral teaching and democratic social ideas have found the balanced middle terms of reference between management and labor in the common good of which we have spoken, but also in the person. Christian social teaching reduces the rights of management to the rights of persons who own property, and it reduces the rights of labor to the rights of persons who own the fruits of their toil. It demands of the persons who constitute management a just recognition of the equal dignity of the persons who engage in labor, and it demands of persons who constitute labor a scrupulous recognition of the rights, inherent, and acquired, of those who constitute management. It demands of both management and labor that they have a decent regard for the rights of the rest of the community, the persons who, whether we own and operate or whether we work for others, constitute the general public; consumers are also persons and their rights and necessities are not less real than those of management and of labor.

We who live by the Christian revelation and in the traditions of democracy reject the Facist systems because they depersonalize the individual and tend to make him a mere soulless unit in the all-important state. We reject the monstrous pretensions of communism because we recognize that the Communist totalitarian society likewise considers the person as of no importance save in terms of the impersonal collectivity. The Soviet members of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations were quite frank on this point and insisted, in language curiously close to that of Mussolini, that the individual has no existence apart from the group, and no rights save those which he derives from his existence within the group.

Fascist and Communist theories are heresy to Christianity and democracy alike, but something very like them may happen to us unless we supplement and integrate our talk about management and labor by constant insistence upon personality. It is just as easy, and just as tragic, to depersonalize men by identifying them with a class as it is to do so by identifying them with a state.

Persons are inviolable, essential, in a sense eternal. Classes are not. Classes are accidental groupings, constantly changing, both in their character and in their makeup. Persons are the foundations of society, as well as the reasons for society's existence. Society comes into being in response to the needs of personality, and all the subsequent forms which society takes are dictated and determined by the supreme purpose of all society: the service of the person. The person is ultimately greater than the society or the group. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a banker. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a bricklayer. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a professional man. All these other categories have their utility and even their necessity, but they are chiefly justified only when and as they help individuals to be distinct persons, developed personalities.

It will be a sad day for democracy and an eclipse of Christian social idealism if the rights of the person are forgotten in the battle for the rights of the worker or the owner and if individual personality suffers at the hands of a highly regimented, impersonal class system dividing society into two camps: management and labor.

If it be true that the notions of management and labor are in danger of becoming impersonal notions and that these constitute the faceless groupings of our secular society, then the reaffirmation of the Christian democratic notion of personality can again prove the liberating force to save our social system from collectivism. Whenever in western history social systems have tended to freeze, a fresh restatement of the primacy of the person has always corrected the excessive claims of the group and has upset the tyranny of the collectivity over the individual.

Some years ago Life magazine carried a remarkable article on the medieval man. It testified to the manner in which the ancient Christian notion of the immortal person saved the men of the Middle Ages from the tendency in feudal society, as in every society, to absorb and annihilate the individual.

That same concept of the person has, more than once in history, proved a liberating and an elevating force in the interests of the workingman, the soldier and the citizen. It took centuries of patient hammering by the church on the concept of personality and the dignity of the person to undermine the entrenched system of slavery which confronted Christianity in its beginnings. Labor and slavery were practically synonymous in the days of pagan Roman dominion; even the greatest of the Greeks, Plato and Aristotle, thought slavery both the natural and the necessary condition of the laboring classes. Not one of the celebrated writers of antiquity raised his voice against the system of slavery until Christianity come with its reaffirmation of the place of the person in the natural law and in revelation, above all the dignity in the supernatural order of the redeemed person, whatever his vocation or temporal destiny.

Here in America a meeting like this in Pittsburgh today greatly helps the church meet her teaching responsibility. Abroad, even in these desperate times, like religious social institutes are making a valiant effort to bring the liberating principles of moral philosophy to bear on the evolution of a new European order. Thus, in Italy the Italian Catholic Action Group has been militantly defending a concept of industry and of labor based on the declaration of Pope Pius XII that "the origin and essential end of social life should be the conservation, the development, and the perfecting of the human person." The Confederation of Christian Trade Unions, in France, has restated its declaration of principles so as to give a more prominent place to the rights of the person precisely as a person, as contrasted with the rights of the mere worker or the mere manager. The Confederation now asserts in its preamble "that man is the essential element in production, at the same time, its cause and end. For that reason the conditions of production must allow for the development of the human personality by the just satisfaction of his material, intellectual, and moral needs in the individual, family, and social order."

Here in America our problem is perhaps not so grave. We have not suffered the oppressions of reaction which have degraded labor in Europe, nor the excesses of revolution which have often brutalized worker and owner alike in parts of that continent. In the political and social order, however, it is always true that an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure. And so, those concerned with industrial relations do well frequently to check their concepts of management and labor against the ancient Christian and democratic standard of the primacy of the person. Neither management nor labor will be well-served nor long strengthened if the independence of the person, whether owner or worker, is impaired or imperiled. It is a good thing to have power and to be an owner. It is a proud thing to have ability and to be a worker. But it is a better thing to be a free man, a person. That is why both management and labor, in all their proposals and programs, must have for their ultimate purpose to increase the number of owners, to enoble the lot of workers, and to protect, at all costs, the centrality and sovereignty of human personality.

To this desired end, church and state, labor and management, have each mighty contributions to make. God grant that they shall be conscious of their respective responsibilities to the person and conscientious in meeting them. Thus will the "common good" prevail over every partisan good; thus will the human person prosper as good men, in every group, respecting one another, learn to fear God, but only God, and therefore to do what is right so that they may be acceptable to one another—and to God.

Muzzling Our Military Officers Helps Anti-Anti-Communist Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last December the Communist Parties, meeting in Moscow, issued a manifesto part of which declared the purpose of the Communist conspiracy to eliminate and make ineffective the anti-Communist campaigns being waged in the United States. Since that time we have been doing our best, so it seems, to help the Communists realize their goal by silencing those in the United States who dare speak out against the Communist plans to enslave the world. The latest victims of the shortsighted policy of our military leaders are two Air Force officers who dared to show to their troops the anti-Communist film "Operation Abolition." I think it is time Congress and the people make clear to the administration and those responsible for muzzling every patriotic officer who comes out against communism, that it is not our purpose to keep silent while freedom is destroyed. The following news item from this morning's Washington Post, concerning the penalizing of the two Air Force officers, should make every patriotic American realize what is happening within our military:

TWO AIR FORCE OFFICERS PENALIZED FOR FILM SHOWING

The Air Force said yesterday it removed two officers from their jobs and reprimanded them for violating orders by showing the film "Operation Abolition" to a Reserve unit during training hours.

This formal explanation differed from a statement by an Air Force spokesman Monday. The spokesman said Maj. Bob E. Cooper and Lt. Col. Fred W. Holbein were not relieved of duties at the 2648th Air Reserve

Center in Seattle, Wash., for showing the controversial film, but for disobeying orders to do something else in the training program. No disciplinary action was involved, he said.

Holbein was commander of the unit, Cooper director of training.

In its statement yesterday, the Air Force noted a Defense Department directive last March stipulating that "Operation Abolition" would not be prescribed for training personnel, but would be kept in film libraries on an "on call" basis.

It also recalled that the Air Force on April 8 issued its own instructions barring the showing of the film during training hours.

"An extensive investigation has established that 'Operation Abolition' was shown during training hours at two officially prescribed Reserve collateral training meetings held on April 17 and 18, 1961, at the 2648th Air Reserve Center," the Air Force said.

"This showing of the film was a violation of the Air Force instructions."

Establishing a U.S. Arms Control Agency

SPEECH
OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9118) to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must oppose H.R. 9118 to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency.

I use the word regret because I yield to no one in my desire for peace and reduction of armaments, and a vote against the bill might be interpreted by the unthinking as a vote in favor of war and against peace.

My opposition to the bill is that it is completely unnecessary. There already exists adequate authority in the executive branch of the Government, and, specifically, in the Department of State, for the conduct of research, planning, and negotiation working toward international bilateral and multilateral treaties providing for the limitation of armaments. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee during debate conceded that all of the functions of the proposed new Agency could presently be performed by the U.S. Disarmament Agency in the Department of State.

That is where these functions should be performed.

If the personnel of the existing Agency is insufficient, or if the funds for these purposes are insufficient, all the administration has to do is to ask for additional appropriations to strengthen the Agency.

Not only is the establishment of a new independent Agency outside the State Department unnecessary but, in my opinion, it is harmful.

It will further weaken the State Department when it desperately needs to be strengthened. It will fragment and diffuse the conduct of our foreign relations when the need is for a clearer and more definite pinpointing of responsibility in the arm of our Government responsible for conducting our relations with foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, my belief that the State Department needs to be strengthened is one of long standing. During the Eisenhower administration, I vigorously opposed two reorganization plans in 1953 which removed from the Department of State certain functions previously vested in the Department, and created new autonomous, independent agencies with only nebulous, if any, supervision and control remaining in the Department of State. I refer to Reorganization Plan No. 7 creating the Foreign Operations Administration and Reorganization Plan No. 8, which removed the U.S. Information Agency from the Department of State and gave it independent status.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that my position with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 7 has been vindicated. After a few years' experience with the autonomous foreign aid agency, it was returned to the Department of State. I have long urged that the same return to the Department of State be taken with respect to the U.S. Information Agency.

Because I believe H.R. 9118 moves in exactly the wrong direction by splitting off from the State Department one of the most important of its responsibilities in the conduct of foreign relations, and for that reason would impede rather than promote progress toward disarmament and peace, I feel compelled to vote against the bill.

Is the U.N. at the Crossroads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, prior to the untimely death of the Secretary General, grave doubts existed in the minds of many as to whether the U.N. could survive against the inevitable onslaughts of those dedicated to destroy it.

The following provocative editorial was written prior to the death of Dag Hammarskjold, and appeared in the September 18 issue of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily. Certainly the fears expressed have been magnified many times since that unfortunate incident.

May I suggest that if you do nothing more, you at least take time to read the last paragraph of this editorial. In it might well be the formula for survival:

THE UNITED NATIONS

It looks to us as if the session of the United Nations General Assembly which opens tomorrow will be the most crucial in the short history of the world organization. The resumption by the Soviet Union and the United States of tests of nuclear weapons signifies the extent of the crisis, of the wide gap between the increasing destructive strength of the so-called great powers and the constructive strength of the organization which was established in 1945 to secure the peace.

We would think, however, that the breakdown of the Geneva negotiations on permanently banning such tests, their resumption by the Soviet Union and then the United States, makes it very clear that the idea of the United Nations was sound, practical, and wise. Nations, acting unilaterally or attempting to solve their differences face to face, cannot be counted on to stop short of armed conflict. Which is to say that weak as the United Nations may be, it is the only presently conceivable instrument that gives hope of preventing war.

The factors which contribute to the weakness of the United Nations, in our opinion, are the tradition of national sovereignty—which leads some nations, at times when they so choose, to bypass the U.N.—and the ideological conflict between West and East which leads each side to attempt to use the United Nations as a means of gaining special advantage here or there on the globe. The U.N. tactics shortly after entering the Congo brought accusations from the East that the West was employing the international organization to save some form of colonialism in that country. And the subsequent proposals of the East for changes in the U.N. executive structure brought charges from the West that the East was thereby endeavoring to control the United Nations—or at least to get into a position where it could stop the U.N. from doing anything the East didn't like.

That the United Nations has endured strains such as this, and such as the all too numerous occasions when large nations have decided and done things without bothering to consult the U.N., is an indication of a general awareness of its necessity. We would guess that even those nations, which, by their behavior, have helped to weaken the U.N., have a feeling that its existence must be insured. But we also think that unless great nations reduce the strains they have been putting on the U.N., it could well be that it will go the way of other efforts at international cooperation to prevent war.

How could the strains be reduced in the present General Assembly? In two ways, it seems to us. First, by an explicit willingness on the part of all to refer to the appropriate U.N. body any and all international problems that threaten world peace; and the explicit willingness to abide by whatever decisions the U.N. makes. Second, by abandoning national positions that, whatever their real basic intent, convey a strong impression of having been designed to further special national interests. Examples of such positions are the Soviet insistence on a three-member Secretariat which can act only in unanimity—and the 10-year U.S. insistence that the Peoples Republic of China be kept out of the U.N.

Unless the great powers are willing to search for methods of this sort to strengthen the U.N.'s authority, we just do not see how the organization is going to survive. And if it doesn't, neither, in our opinion, will humanity.

Sandy Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Sandy Hook, located at the gateway to New York Harbor, is known to Members of Congress; it also marks

the northernmost part of the New Jersey coastline along the Atlantic Ocean. For a number of years this area has been occupied by the Army as part of the defenses of New York City but other Government agencies, such as the Coast Guard and the Lighthouse Service, also have installations there.

Sandy Hook lends itself to recreational uses and for some time plans have been made, awaiting the release by the Army of sufficient land, for the development of a public park and recently there have been indications that a portion of the area not used by the Army will be made available for that purpose.

On the face of it this is a very worthwhile idea but there are some practical problems which must be solved before the park becomes a reality. The most important one is how land traffic can reach the park without causing serious traffic congestion. Recognizing this situation, the mayor and council of the borough of Rumson, N.J., which is my hometown located nearby, adopted a unanimous resolution dated September 14, 1961, in opposition to the plan for a recreational park which is appended to the conclusion of these remarks. This is a most serious problem to the resident taxpayers of that area and it is imperative that attention be given to the situation complained about before any definite action is taken about opening Sandy Hook to the public.

A copy of the resolution is as follows:

Councilman Halleran offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Whereas the State of New Jersey has made a request to the Federal Government for the acquisition of Sandy Hook for use as a public park; and

"Whereas Sandy Hook exists on the Sea Bright Peninsula where road facilities are inadequate for present traffic; and

"Whereas county route 520, otherwise known as Rumson Road, is the principal access to Sandy Hook from the west and also exists on the Sea Bright Peninsula; and

"Whereas route 520 passes through the full length of the borough of Rumson, is narrow, and is not suitable to handle heavy traffic; and

"Whereas on weekends during the summer months there is at present a serious traffic problem on Rumson Road, especially where it approaches the Sea Bright-Rumson Bridge: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the borough council of the borough of Rumson hereby opposes the use of Sandy Hook as a public park until alternate routes are provided and conditions made suitable for the handling of the heavy traffic which would be approaching and departing from the proposed park; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, State Senator Richard R. Stout, and the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders."

Resolution seconded by Councilman Sundermeyer and carried on the following roll-call vote:

In the affirmative: Councilmen Harding, Banks, Halleran, Cronan, Sundermeyer, and Callman.

In the negative: none.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the governing board of the borough of Rumson, State of New Jersey, at a meeting held September 14, 1961.

A. A. KERR,
Borough Clerk.

Ford Motor Co. Enters Space With Both Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

FORD MOTOR CO. ENTERS SPACE WITH BOTH FEET

(Address of John Dykstra, president, Ford Motor Co., before the National Defense Transportation Association at Denver, Colo., on Tuesday, Sept. 19, 1961)

I am very glad to have the opportunity to address this group. As a member of the National Defense Transportation Association, our company shares wholeheartedly the goal of encouraging understanding and cooperation between industry and the Defense Establishment. In my judgment, the achievement of this goal is one of the paramount needs of our county and can be one of the most important contributions to our national security.

I certainly do not want to imply that Government and industry cannot, and do not, work together. But I do believe that the defense potential of American industry can be realized fully only if industry is looked upon as a permanent partner of the Government in the continuing effort to conceive, design, develop, and produce new and better defense equipment. By the same token, industry has its own duty to seek out ways of making the maximum contribution.

Industry has always been ready to respond when the Government has called upon it in time of war. This no longer is enough. The grave dangers and the great opportunities of today place upon us a more exacting responsibility. We in industry must examine our own companies to determine how our management, our resources, and our talents can best be used to advance the total national effort.

Detroit was once known as the arsenal of democracy. In recent years, we have seen that title begin to slip away from us. Some years ago, Ford Motor Co. decided that in recognition of its obligation to our country, we should become once again a substantial contributor to the defense effort—not merely as a manufacturer, but as a designer and developer of the most advanced kinds of equipment. Because Ford Motor Co.'s history so closely parallels the development and changes in our industrial society since the turn of the century, our experience in coming to terms with this challenge may be interesting and useful to you and others.

Ford Motor Co. now is preparing its bid to manufacture the biggest, most powerful American entry in the space race—the first-stage booster of the giant Saturn vehicle. This is only one sign that we are moving into the defense and space business with both feet. We are determined to be in the vanguard of our country's effort to regain space-age leadership. Our scientific laboratory in Dearborn has become one of the world's leading centers of basic research. Our aeronautronic division in Newport Beach, Calif., is steadily expanding its role in space-age technology. Our special military vehicles operation is now producing the Ford-designed successor to the jeep, and developing new trucks that we believe will surpass their military predecessors by a wide margin.

These particular activities are, perhaps, less important than the decision that lies behind them. A primary goal of Ford Motor Co. is to contribute whatever we can, and as much as we can, to the Nation's space and security objectives. The vast facilities, the scientific assets and the management ability of our company are pledged to this policy.

In discussing this development today, I have two main objectives. Frankly, Ford's role in the space industry is not as well known as it should be, and we would like to improve that. Second, since our past experience is not unique, I hope to arrive at some general conclusions about industrial production in the age of space that may be of special interest to you.

The automobile industry has a long and honorable history as a producer of defense goods. During World War I, we made extensive production and engineering contributions. The most dramatic of Ford's World War II efforts was the Willow Run bomber plant, where we applied the technique of assembly line mass production to the manufacture of airplanes. Aircraft specialists at that time thought that automobile methods were unsuitable for aircraft production but the mile-long Willow Run assembly line reached and then exceeded spectacular bomber production quotas.

During that period, Ford turned out planes by the thousands, and engines, vehicles and other equipment by the hundreds of thousands. But its contribution cannot be measured in volume of units alone. Our engineers found literally thousands of ways to improve the design and assembly of this equipment, changes which improved quality and interchangability, while reducing costs.

During the Korean conflict, we again became a mass producer of military equipment—tanks, tank engines, rockets, and bomber wings. Between 1950 and 1959, our aircraft engine division in Chicago built more than 3,000 Pratt & Whitney 28-cylinder reciprocating engines, and more than 6,000 J-57 turbojets.

Again our own specialists contributed engineering, design and production changes that saved the taxpayer money while improving the quality and delivery rates of these engines.

Other auto manufacturers had comparable production records during these periods of national crisis. Indeed, it is safe to say that world history during the last half-century might have been quite different if our industry had not then been, in fact, the arsenal of democracy. This enormous diversified manufacturing and assembly facilities of the industry, its pool of experienced managers, its network of supplier relationships, its engineering talent and its unequalled ability to mass produce complicated products were ready made for the needs of conventional warfare.

I can think of no other industry with this much depth and breadth of resources.

Ford, for example, in addition to having manufactured military equipment, automobiles, trucks and tractors, is a primary producer of steel, glass, plastics, paints, and electrical goods—to name just a few. In each of these areas—as in many others—we have expert knowledge and capability. In many fields of manufacturing technology, Ford Motor Co. has contributed major advances. It is hard to imagine any problem of engineering or manufacturing that a company of this highly integrated nature would not be competent to tackle.

Today, however, the Defense Establishment needs more from industry than outstanding engineering and manufacturing capabilities. With the cold war gripping the world, the military seeks quickly to translate new scientific knowledge into radically new and better weapons and equipment. There now is a vital need for companies that have the scientific and technological capacity to come

up with new ideas and new designs as well as the management and facilities to carry these ideas through to final production.

Consequently, we at Ford Motor Co. knew that if we were to have as one of our primary goals the contribution of whatever we could, and as much as we could, to the Nation's space and security objectives—if we were to pledge our vast facilities, our assets and our management to this policy—then we certainly would need skills beyond those of mass production. We would need a solid research foundation that would be broader and deeper than our normal product and engineering research. This could not be established overnight.

In our own case, we started building that foundation shortly after World War II. We could see the aircraft industry being revolutionized by jet propulsion. Atomic energy, plastics, and new electronic devices all served to impress upon us the enormous industrial potential of pure research. We were convinced, and still are, that future discoveries in fuels, in materials, in energy conversion, in electronics and in other fields would open up entirely new directions both for our products and our manufacturing technology. In short, we were convinced that the future in our industry, as in others, would belong to companies that could exploit the frontiers of scientific discovery.

The result was the establishment in 1951, of the Ford Scientific Laboratory. In setting up the laboratory, we recognized that science cannot be harnessed full time to specific technological objectives. By definition, scientific research is concerned with the unknown. Where it will lead, what practical benefits it will discover, no man can predict. To tie scientific research down to specific product goals is to limit its potential and foreclose discoveries that cannot even be imagined.

Freedom, therefore, has been the watchword of our scientific policies. Approximately half of our research program is devoted to basic studies in physics, chemistry and metallurgy. Within this area, our scientists follow their research wherever it leads, and no man in the company has the right to divert them. Another way in which we strive to protect the continuity and freedom of research is by placing our scientific laboratory on a 5-year budget which guarantees continuing support of research projects regardless of ups and downs in our business and our earnings. We believe that we were one of the first industrial corporations to place basic scientific research projects on a guaranteed long-range budget.

Our research policies and our new laboratory facilities have made it possible for us to attract some of the world's outstanding scientists.

In stressing our basic research program, I do not mean to imply that we have become a company of eggheads, unconcerned with practical results. On the contrary, half of our scientific research program is devoted to long-range applied research—to the task of discovering practical applications of fundamental new knowledge. The point is that in our scientific research we are not bound by the experience, the traditions, or the inherited men and facilities of the past. We have been able, rather, to start fresh and work toward an ideal environment which encourages creative research and manufacturing innovations.

Nor have we neglected the engineering side of our business. We have expanded our engineering groups, both at the staff level and in our operating divisions, and have created a special manufacturing engineering research center to develop new testing techniques and new tools. As a result of the close cooperation of all these people, we are learning more about the properties and use of various materials than many of the companies that specialize in their production.

But as we move further into the space age, we realized that it was not enough to add new research to our proven production ability if we were to contribute our full share to national security. We would have to go further.

By 1956, we were ready. With the establishment of Aeronutronic, we made our bid to reverse the declining participation of Ford Motor Co. in the defense effort.

Unlike the Scientific Laboratory, Aeronutronic was established with no thought of making a direct contribution to automotive technology, though we do expect its indirect contributions in the years ahead to be substantial. The new member of the Ford family was created, rather, to make important and original contributions to the Nation's space, missile and defense programs.

It is easy to see now how Aeronutronic was the logical outgrowth of our expanded scientific and engineering efforts.

As an automotive company, we have concentrated our research in areas which might lead to innovations in materials; in the sources, storage and conversion of energy; and in electronic control and communications devices.

Simply reciting this list makes it clear that our next step had to be into space and missiles. Our long-run scientific and technological requirements as an automotive manufacturer are virtually the same as the requirements of missile and space development. Tough, light, easily formed, heat and friction resistant materials are equally important to the designer of automobiles and the designer of space vehicles. Likewise, each has a compelling interest in new and better ways of storing and releasing energy and in the multiple uses of electronic devices.

Thus, Aeronutronic was not an alien body, grafted on to Ford Motor Co. It was a logical outgrowth of our needs, and a way of making fuller and more economical use of our existing scientific and technological capacities, as well as a way of increasing our contribution to the Nation's strength and security.

However, we had no illusion that we could enter the space age halfway, or do a useful job with our left hand. We knew that Aeronutronic would have to be set up as an independent entity, quite capable of standing on its own feet.

Starting with a handful of people 5 years ago, Aeronutronic's research and development staff currently consists of 3,000 engineers, scientists, management, manufacturing and support personnel.

Already it is making major contributions to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Aeronautic and Space Administration programs as well as to basic scientific knowledge.

Our defense and space-age activities are strengthened immeasurably by drawing upon the resources of the worldwide Ford organization.

For example, our Dearborn laboratories have developed new techniques for producing superstrong steel and for bonding graphite to metals that will probably find their first applications in space vehicles.

At the same time, the independent research and development activities of Aeronutronic are virtually certain to contribute unforeseeable innovations to automotive technology.

We expect this exchange of ideas to continue and to grow. We also expect that as our research expands into new areas we will make discoveries that will affect great changes in our entire operations.

In addition, as many of you may have heard, Ford Motor Co. last week announced plans to purchase the assets of Philco Corp. Henry Ford II said then that our purpose was to broaden our operations and to make possible a fuller participation by Ford in the national defense and space effort.

What implications, then, does our experience have for others in the defense transportation field?

First, I think we must all recognize the fast-growing importance of scientific research in all our activities. We must support such research to the best of our financial ability. But we must also take advantage of every technological development to improve the usefulness and the quality of our products, our facilities and our tools.

Second, we must stop thinking only in terms of traditional products, materials and methods, and let our research lead us toward new and better ones.

Third, while today most companies concentrate on a group of products closely related in terms of use or manufacturing processes, in the future, a company's product line may be determined more and more by its research.

Thus, in the past, Ford has been a volume producer of automobiles and trucks, and its defense production has been closely allied to its basic business—military vehicles, tanks and engines. Today, it still is a major producer of vehicles, and growing stronger in this field every day. But at the same time our research activities are leading us into additional areas—into electronics, special materials and special fuels. Our future growth can well follow still unforeseen paths. We welcome this challenge.

Finally, gentlemen, I would like to make one more point this morning:

When I started, I said that American industry must be a full working partner of our Government. I feel, and I am sure you will agree, that as industrial citizens we have the same civic obligation as do individual citizens.

But I think we have a further obligation. We must keep ourselves always ready to serve, without notice or warning. As I see it, this means that we must keep our financial muscles strong, our facilities up-to-date and flexible, and our management highly trained.

We hear a lot now about how small the world has grown. Gentlemen, it has grown small only in terms of time and distance. It has grown tremendously big and complicated in terms of its problems and the way these problems can be solved. If we must have a strong Government to lead us through this difficult period, I think we also must have strong businesses to support that Government, businesses with the ability to carry their share of the national burden. Our businesses must be strong in management, strong in production and research ability, and financially healthy to do the big jobs we will be called upon to do in the years ahead.

We must continually expand and improve our plants and our tools, and give our scientists freedom to explore new areas. By the same token, we must be able to make the best possible products for today's market and sell them at a profit sufficient to permit increased investment in space-age programs and facilities.

If we do this, we will serve not only our stockholders, but our broader national duty as well.

West Virginia: First in Rehabilitating the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the latest summary report by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, covering the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, reveals

a notable "first" for the State of West Virginia. For the second year in succession West Virginia ranks first in the Nation in the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons, on the basis of the number rehabilitated in proportion to population.

During the past year an average of 188 disabled persons per 100,000 population achieved rehabilitation, the highest mark ever set by a State and nearly four times the national average of 51 per 100,000 population. Not only did West Virginia lead in per capita rehabilitations, but also ranked fourth in the absolute number of rehabilitations behind the more populous States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Georgia.

An achievement of this kind can only result from determined and meaningful effort on the part of those responsible for administration of the program. I am proud to say that our State government has recognized the value of the rehabilitation program for many years, and has lent it strong support through the appropriation of funds and the encouragement of the staff specialists who actually perform the rehabilitation functions.

I believe recognition should be given at this time to those dedicated staff members of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the West Virginia Department of Education whose efforts made this ranking possible, and particularly to F. Ray Power, director of the division, whose stature as a leader in this most humane of enterprises has grown steadily through the years.

The State program has also enjoyed strong support from among community leaders and solid backing from the medical profession. Not long ago I had occasion to discuss the rehabilitation program with a leading physician, Dr. Ralph H. Nestmann of Charleston, and I was very much pleased to learn of the strong interest of the medical profession in the furtherance of the program. The social advantages are appealing, but I believe too few of us are aware of the solid economic advantages which cause this program to return more than a dollar's worth of net economic gain for the Nation from every dollar invested.

Any dispassionate study of the results which have been obtained must convince a fairminded person of the worth of this program. Not long ago I had an opportunity to read a significant documented work on this subject which I can recommend to all of you. It is entitled "Rehabilitation: A Community Challenge" and was written by W. Scott Allan. The numerous examples cited in this book of persons who were removed from the category of community dependents and transformed into self-sufficient and self-reliant citizens impressed me greatly.

Industrial accidents will always be with us, and some forms of employment will always be very hazardous. Yet, the advances recorded by this program indicate that we can retrain and rehabilitate those who have met misfortune and the record of accomplishment speaks for continued and growing support in the years ahead. Of all of the Federal-State programs for which we provide matching funds there is none which can offer a better prospect for realization of a definite social and economic profit and project a stronger ray of hope to those who are in great need.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPOKANE, WASH., *September 7, 1961.*
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I wish to register my approval of the resolution (H. Res. 211) to provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations which you introduced during this session. I comemnd you for your efforts, and sincerely wish this resolution will be considered and passed. I am writing my Representative urging his support of the measure.

The enslaved and captive nations of the Communist criminal conspiracy will never find the courage and strength to overthrow their oppressors unless they feel the free world stands behind them.

I hope you will continue your courageous efforts in the interests of these millions of oppressed peoples.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. WOLFE, M.D.

FLINT, MICH., *September 9, 1961.*
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

DEAR SIR: Let me extend my heartiest congratulations to you as author of House Resolution 211.

A special House Committee on Captive Nations would inspire the hundreds of enslaved people throughout the world with new hopes for freedom and be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we have not forgotten the captive nations.

I have written to my Congressman, CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN urging his support of a special Committee on Captive Nations.

Keep up the good work; I'm with you.

Respectfully,

ERIC G. PETERSEN.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations for your House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Believe you have a good idea here, something to lend encouragement to the Iron Curtain captive countries and let them know we haven't entirely forgotten them, especially since we were so instrumental in getting the biggest portion of them behind the Iron Curtain and in the predicament they now find themselves in.

Yours truly,

Dr. and Mrs. E. CLARENCE SALTER.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,
September 7, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: We heartily endorse House Resolution 211 providing a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

STUART SMITH.

RICHMOND, IND., *September 9, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You are to be commended for introducing House Resolution 211.

I am certain you will have the support of Congressman RALPH HARVEY.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

G. MERLE JOHNSON.

P.S.—May I have one of your autographed photos?

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
September 1, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: House Resolution 211 would certainly serve as the most systematically organized method of reporting on the enslaved people throughout the world, thanks to your very inspiring efforts to see that this bill is passed.

ALICE PURDUE.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH.,
September 12, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to add my support to House Resolution 211 which calls for the establishment for a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

These people behind the Iron Curtain have been tragically forgotten for many years. They are our true allies as they have a very real understanding of communism. We could only hope that our own State Department understood communism nearly as well as people who have lived under it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Oakland County's very excellent Congressman

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, in the hope that he too will support your resolution.

Very truly yours,

R. J. MCGRATH.

MIRALESTE, CALIF., *September 5, 1961.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD:

You are to be commended for the authorship of your fine bill, House Resolution 211. If there were more time put into such affirmative thinking, we wouldn't be in the governmental mess we are now in.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN L. BARRETT,
A Voter.

The Role of the Christian in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the world of tomorrow will be won through an idea, and no idea can be defeated with military might. Whether our grandchildren will, as Khrushchev has warned, "live under communism" or remain free depends upon the dedication of those committed to win the world. The following article from the Chicago Sunday Tribune magazine points the challenge Christians face in the battle for the minds of men:

CHRISTIANS CAN WIN THE WORLD IF THEY CARE ENOUGH TO TRY

(By Harold Blake Walker, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Evanston)

We are increasingly aware that we are involved in the life of a world community. What happens in the Congo has repercussions in New York and San Francisco. The world has become one world, and we cannot separate ourselves from it. Hunger anywhere is a problem everywhere, and ignorance anywhere is a danger everywhere.

We live in a world neighborhood in which we are mutually dependent on the whole. Henry Smith Leiper, distinguished clergyman, put the truth in a simple and eloquent way when he wrote that if we could compress our world neighborhood of 2½ billion people into a community of 1,000 it would break down in an interesting fashion.

There would be, says Dr. Leiper, 60 Americans in the community and 940 representing the remainder of the world. The 60 Americans would be receiving one-half the total income of the entire community. It could be added that they would be riding in their automobiles on rubber tires, using 90 percent of the rubber produced by the impoverished in their neighborhood.

At their coffee breaks they would be drinking most of the coffee grown by their less fortunate neighbors. On their chocolate cakes and pies and candy bars they would be using virtually all of the cocoa produced by the remainder of the community.

The 60 Americans, Dr. Leiper went on, would have 15 times as many possessions as all the rest of their 940 neighbors combined. While the 60 citizens of the United States would be well fed, comfortably housed, and thoroughly amused, most of the other 940 would be hungry, sick, ignorant, and crowded 10 to a room. The 60 Americans would have food packed to overflowing in expensive storage facilities, toward which the rest of the community looked with both envy and resentment.

More than half the people in the neighborhood never would have heard of Jesus Christ or what He taught and for what He lived and died. On the other hand, more than half would be hearing about Karl Marx, Nicolai Lenin, and Nikita Khrushchev.

If the Christian portion of the community, 36 in the United States and 300 in the remainder of the neighborhood, makes small effort to touch the rest of the world and the Communist half is dedicated to the conversion of everybody, the end character of the community is obvious.

If, on the other hand, the Christians are dedicated evangelists, sensitive to the spiritual and physical needs of their fellows, and concerned for their welfare, the struggle for the minds and hearts of men can end quite differently. It all depends on how much Christians care about their faith and about the beliefs and the welfare of their neighbors.

We cannot live and survive alone, for we are debtors to the whole community. Our science and our industry are linked to the science and industry of the world. Our faith is ours because men and women of other races and Nations gave it birth, and still others cared enough to nourish it through the centuries.

Our knowledge has its roots in Greece and Rome and we are heirs to it. What we have built in our portion of the community was made possible partly because we stood on the shoulders of giants in other lands and times. We are, as Paul said in his day, "debtors both to the Greeks and to barbarians."

Profits Without Honor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence has written an editorial for the September 25, 1961, issue of the U.S. News & World Report which discusses efforts of the Kennedy administration to keep the steel industry from raising prices, yet at the same time, go along with labor's demands for higher wages. Mr. Lawrence points to the adverse effect of the steel industry's ability to satisfy obligations to its stockholders, incurred under the profit system. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROFITS WITHOUT HONOR?

(By David Lawrence)

Profits are getting a black eye these days. Labor's demands are unrestrained. But President Kennedy has set a pattern for industry generally in America as he requests all the steel companies—regardless of their individual obligations—to absorb higher costs of labor without increasing any prices.

These businesses—in which many billions of dollars of other people's money are invested—are supposed to continue to pay debts, buy the products of other industries which today are raising their prices, purchase new plant and equipment, and also pay dividends to stockholders out of diminished earnings.

Not since 1958 have the steel companies, for instance, raised their prices, but they have been forced to grant big wage increases. The President, unfortunately, has not urged the labor unions to forgo the substantial increase they have been scheduled to get on October 1, though he steadfastly insists that the steel companies must not raise their prices.

Why has the Kennedy administration adopted this one-sided course and shown plainly such indifference to the obligations of companies to their stockholders incurred under the profit system?

Everyone who runs a successful business knows that, when wages go up steadily, prices must go up, too, or else profit margins will be narrowed and, in some instances, actual losses will be incurred.

In a free market, the consumer resists price increases that he cannot afford and begins to buy less costly substitutes. No management with a grain of sense ever pushes the price of its products beyond what most of the customers will pay. The tendency instead is to charge a price that will bring sales.

If we are to have in America a competitive system, if a people's capitalism is to continue to compete against the socialism that the Communists repeatedly extol, and if there is to be some kind of balance between need and greed, the less the Government of the United States meddles with the operation of a free market, the greater the chance of building up, rather than wrecking, our whole economic system.

We have had sad experiences with price control in World War I and World War II and during the Korean war. These periods are to no small extent responsible for our plight today. For "wage and price control" by Federal edict is a misnomer. It turns out, as a rule, to be price control without wage control. Labor has enough political influence to get steady increases, while management must pay the penalty for its lack of such influence.

We face this dilemma: Either the private-enterprise system will find a way to impress on each economic group—labor as well as management—that there must be a fair and equitable attitude toward each other and that politics and individual lust for power within unions must not goad the labor leaders to extremes, or else the whole private-enterprise system will be broken down.

There are, regrettably, in the Kennedy administration many advisers and in Congress many influential Members who are obsessed with the idea that the Government must sooner or later run almost everything. So profits are treated as if they were dishonorable. The public is asked to believe that large business pays no heed to consumer resistance and that it will push prices up regardless of the diminished sales and consumer attitudes. This is an indefensible doctrine.

A free-market system can flourish only if every part of it is free. To publicize profits as mere greed, without denouncing the tendency of labor unions to use their collective-bargaining power to extort wage increases to the limit, is sheer demagogery. It can only sow the seeds of serious trouble in the economy.

Profits are not disonorable. Profits are used to pay billions of dollars in taxes for the support of the Federal Government. Without this tax money, our Government would face bankruptcy.

For the system we have in America is not accurately called a profit system. It is a profit-and-loss system. Money must be borrowed to pay for expansion, and this can be paid back to the lenders only if there is a profit.

Responsibility in business is not given its deserved place in our society. Irresponsibility in government is creating a disregard for the whole basis of the profit-and-loss system. Unless checked by a new sense of responsibility among the politicians, including the highest officials of the Kennedy ad-

ministration, we may find the disciples of Nikita Khrushchev someday gloating that his prediction of a socialistic economy in America for our grandchildren did come true.

Let us stop disparaging the profits system and private capitalism. For there is nothing disgraceful about earning money to pay debts or to pay stockholders sufficient rent for their money and thus persuade them to continue to invest their savings in American enterprises. And the simple judgment of what is adequate cannot be made for them by government. It can only be made in a free market. For this is the American way.

Cross-Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been a strong supporter of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Such a canal would supply the missing link to an inland waterway chain that now stretches from Palatka, Fla., up the Atlantic Coast, through the St. Lawrence Seaway, down the Mississippi Valley, and along the Gulf of Mexico coast to St. Marks, Fla., and consequently would benefit the entire eastern seaboard of the United States.

Please bear in mind, also, that with the present emphasis on space exploration and the building of new facilities at Cape Canaveral, this canal would be of tremendous assistance in the transportation of materiel from inland points to the cape.

During World War II, priceless cargoes and innumerable lives were lost in shipping off our Florida coast from attacks by enemy submarines, which might have been prevented if this canal had been in operation.

Recently it was announced that our future military policy would include development of conventional forces and methods of warfare. Assurance of adequate transportation is essential to such a buildup.

The President's budget this year, Mr. Speaker, contained an item of $195,000 for a meager start on this cross-Florida barge canal. Our House Committee on Appropriations refused that amount and allowed only $50,000 for a study. It is my fervent hope that the other body will restore the full amount and the House conferees will recommend retention of the $195,000 for this important project.

Let me say, frankly, that I have a great personal interest in this canal. It will pass through three counties in my district—Levy, Putnam, and Nassau. In fact, all of the counties in my district stand to benefit. Once the canal is built, I feel sure it would open up for development the entire Suwannee River waterway system and would make possible a boom in north-central Florida, which in turn would make its contribution to the economy of the Nation. We need a booming economy to support our vast and costly military defense.

A Need of a Shelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an editorial entitled "A Need of a Shelter." This editorial was written by Mr. Bob Thomas, the editor of the Groveland Press, an excellent newspaper in my home county owned by Mr. and Mrs. Alden M. Drury, whose son Allen is pretty well known on the Hill.

What Mr. Thomas has to say in his editorial is both timely and timeless, and I am sure each of you will find in it food for serious thought:

A NEED OF A SHELTER

It is perhaps apropos that we dwell for a moment on fallout, or disaster, shelters. And this for three reasons: the Berlin crisis, the Cuban situation, and the hurricane season.

From the top, then:

Khrushchev, in Berlin, continues to throw little tests at the West. He watches the reaction of NATO, hopeful of spotting a weakness at which to aim the Red wedge of communism, for it is the aim of communism to divide and conquer.

In Cuba the Red threat sits poised 90 miles from American soil. American military aircraft can travel that distance in 4½ minutes. We would kid ourselves to think Russia does not have planes capable of a like feat. It is commonsense to know Canaveral and Vandenberg, with American SAC bases, would be prime targets in the event of world war III.

These facts alone point to a need for fallout shelters, for most certainly communism does not plan to conquer the West at the conference table.

The question, then, would seem to be is this the hour for fallout shelters?

As for a disaster shelter—your answer would be as good as ours for we are no closer to God than you.

Our humble opinion, for what it is worth, is that America faces a greater threat to its safety than fallout, and that threat is communistic ideology. Around the world communism spreads the vilification that America is a war-hunger nation intent on ravaging all of the earth's souls. It points to America as a country desirous of bringing all peoples to their knees under the capitalistic whip in the hands of the Rockefellers, the Gettys, the Du Ponts, and the Kennedys.

That is the threat of the hour.

What America needs at the moment is not a fallout shelter, but an education. It needs to inform itself in the art of propaganda. It needs to carry the word of democracy and to fight the lies of communism with the truth. Americans need to turn to their neighbors and speak the word of Americanism. Americanism and its heritage should be roared from the rostrum and preached from the pulpit. It should be sung from the steeples.

This, then, would not only be our shelter but our fort.

Where do we begin? We begin at home. We tell our children that they might tell their children, and their children again. We tell them of America's beginning on a rocky coast of New England. We tell them of hunger and privation and of a first Thanksgiving. We tell them of Indian wars and exploration, and of a man named Washington and a winter at Valley Forge.

We tell them of Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and Iwo Jima. We tell them everything. We tell them of the Tea Pot Dome scandal, and what historians permit about Harding, and we tell them of back-door spending. We should not be proud of our shortcomings—but they have not buried us; they have given us more reason to become strong.

You say this is a small beginning? We remind you that it was not too many years ago when communism was the one small voice of Karl Marx. And regardless of the Marxist theory and what his communism has become, there was a time when his voice was alone. Communism, too, had a small beginning.

The truth—to counter lies—this must be our first shelter.

Civil Defense or Civic Intelligence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most important letter sent to me by Henry B. Waskow, executive secretary of the Baltimore Teachers' Union. This letter was written by the union to the Baltimore superintendent of public instruction and is an interesting comment on the proposed civil defense program:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1961.

Dr. GEORGE B. BRAIN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR DR. BRAIN: In your message of greeting to teachers on September 7, you mentioned that a survey is to be made of the amount of work needed to install fallout shelters in each school.

Vigilance concerning the welfare of our children is of first importance. How best to protect them is the concern of all citizens. Teachers have perhaps been more zealous than most citizens in cooperating with civil defense in the past. While guiding students in air-raid drills, crawling under cafeteria tables, taking cover on cement corridor floors a la World War II, many teachers have felt the futility of such methods of dealing with the H-bomb.

We teachers, who will share with our pupils the security of these methods, are convinced that the building of fallout shelters is no improvement.

We call your attention to the statement in his report to Congress of Secretary of Defense McNamara (the Sun, Aug. 2, 1961) that fallout shelters are good only for cities which do not suffer direct hits. It is generally agreed that in case of war Baltimore will be a primary target. The recent articles on civil defense in the Evening Sun demonstrated that Baltimore could be completely destroyed by H-bombs, with devastation spreading for many miles around. Lethal fallout is equally annihilating. Secretary McNamara, in his report, stated further that "a near-miss upwind from a large city would still wipe out the city's whole population, leaving the city undamaged."

We trust that you will keep these warnings in mind in your conferences with local civil defense authorities. The building of bomb shelters in school buildings may create among parents and children a false belief in the physical safety of the students.

But in the nuclear age, our children's physical safety can no longer be achieved

through the physical means of steel and concrete. Knowledge, intellectual ability, and creativity in dealing with the new demands of a new age are the only ways of protecting our children's bodies. It is these capacities of the mind which desperately need fostering and which cannot be fostered by building bomb shelters.

Only by achieving quality education for all our children—only by providing adequate classroom space, reduced class size, and fully qualified teachers—can we realistically meet the nuclear challenge. Those who hope to depend on bomb shelters are dreaming in the past.

Baltimore must choose. Shall we direct our efforts toward illusory civil defense or civic intelligence?

Sincerely yours,

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,
BALTIMORE TEACHERS UNION,
MILTON GOLDBERG, *President*.

Responsible Men Must Set Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I share the hope of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier that an increase in the price of steel can be avoided, but as the Courier properly points out, this determination should not be made in Washington.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues, the following Courier editorial, entitled "Responsible Men Must Set Prices":

President Kennedy has every right to use persuasion in an attempt to prevail upon American steel companies to refrain from price increases this fall. Since steel is such a basic commodity in all manufactured prices, it is more important to maintain price stability in steel than in any other raw material.

But the President has no right to use threats or intimidation in attempting to prevent such price increases. He has been given no authority in law to fix prices. An attempt to use the threat of antitrust action and other governmental procedures to accomplish indirectly what he has no legal authority to accomplish directly would violate his oath of office.

So far, the President has not resorted to direct threats; and he is to be commended for that. But the President has been inconsistent in publicly asking for no price increases in steel while making no similar pleas for no wage increases. He says only that the public interest would be served by a future steel wage settlement "within the limits of advances in productivity and price stability."

Thus the President ignores the fact that steelworkers will automatically get a wage increase of 13 cents an hour on October 1 by the settlement reached, under Government pressure, at the conclusion of the long 1959 strike.

The public obviously will hope that the steel companies can avoid a price increase. But it also realizes that Government price fixing means Government wage fixing and that those things mean the end of a flexible, free enterprise economy. The President cites economic studies which indicate that the companies could continue to make a good profit without a price increase. But if U.S. economists are to be the final authority on prices, then once again we have substituted Government regulation for a free economy. We have such Government regulation in the railroad industry; and the effects of poor judgment by Government officials on the long-range development of the rail network are apparent on every side.

As long as true competition exists, the only final judge of the necessity for a price increase should be the men with the responsibility for running the business. We have adequate steel capacity today because the judgment of those men has been sound. If irresponsible Government regulation is substituted, shortages, poor technological progress, and, ultimately, tax subsidies to pay politically increased wages would result.

Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, September 17 to 23 is Constitution Week. We in the Congress can well pause to reaffirm our faith in the foundation of our Government.

Under unanimous consent, I include a statement on Constitution Week prepared for the Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth by Mrs. E. C. Buchanan, in behalf of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Buchanan is one of the leaders in that organization in Mississippi, as well as in many other worthwhile civic enterprises.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Submitted by Mrs. E. C. Buchanan)

The week of September 17–23 will be honored throughout this country as Constitution Week, celebrating the birth of a concept never before adopted by any people as their governmental philosophy. The framers of the Constitution believed that all powers of sovereignty should forever reside in the people and that the government they were about to establish should be a limited government subject always to the will of the people.

Men pause in contemplation of the meeting of minds that took place in Philadelphia when the 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention met there in 1784. That so large a group of men of integrity and consequence, from 13 States, could subordinate their individual preferences and make mutual concessions, revise, and at last present, this Constitution—our guide for nearly a century and three-quarters—is a remarkable achievement. It was their earnest desire to bequeath to their, and our, beloved country, including all its people, a document that would make and keep us forever free.

But now, with luxuries available undreamed of by the Plymouth pioneers and thinking more of our personal affairs than they did, we find that our Constitution has been chipped away, bypassed, and sometimes ignored. However, the heart of it is still there. May we feel in our hearts a burning desire to preserve, restore, and renew it for ourselves and for those who come after us, knowing that "we are not here to stay." Let there be no delay in our endeavors to have government in accordance with the Constitution as written in 1787 and its later amendments. The standards set up then are still sufficient for all present conditions.

From both the hearts and minds of the men and women of America should come thankfulness and praise to the delegates to the Constitutional Convention: To Madison, the father of the Constitution; to Franklin, "perhaps the greatest American then living"; to Hamilton, master of finance; to Washington, the Father of his Country; for a document of such far-reaching power and protection. The balance of power between departments of government, never more needed than in these strenuous years of anxiety and worldwide insecurity, was provided for with vision and precision to meet the needs of troubled days such as these, as well as those of the young Republic.

A failure on our part to uphold our priceless legacy, the Constitution, not alone in our hearts, but by word and deed, may cause it to become altered or snatched from us, possibly by indirect means.

May we, the heirs of these enlightened framers of the Constitution, be on guard to prevent the rapid centralization of power in our Government which is the last step preceding national decay. Let us rededicate ourselves anew to an adherence to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, in the Federal Constitution, and an abiding faith in God.

Time To Consider Carefully Our Participation in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report shows clearly that the United States and the Western World does not control the balance of power in the United Nations. After reading the reports of the so-called neutralist conference in Belgrade which was predominantly pro-Communist in its thinking, and realizing that many of these same nations make up the bloc which does have a majority of the votes in the U.N., maybe it is time the United States reevaluates our participation in that Organization:

IS UNITED STATES LOSING OUT IN THE UNITED NATIONS?

(To Khrushchev, a meeting of the United Nations is a chance to denounce the United States. Suddenly, President Kennedy has ordered a counterattack.

(This U.N. Assembly is to be the scene of a U.S. challenge to Russia. It's a bold bid for leadership in a spot where the United States looks weak.)

NEW YORK CITY.—Once again delegates of the world's many nations are gathering here for a session of the U.N. Asssembly.

This time the world is on notice from U.S. President Kennedy that a major battle of the cold war is to be fought out on the Assembly floor.

The Kennedy challenge to Khrushchev comes at a time and in a place which, at first glance, appear to many experts to be unfavorable to the United States.

The United States, as the leader of the non-Communist world, at one time dominated the Assembly. This is no longer true.

Instead, under the Assembly rule of "one nation, one vote," the United States and its allies have slipped into a minority position. It is the small nations, the "new nations"

just emerging from tribal societies, which now are the majority bloc in the Assembly.

At the very time when the United States appears to be losing out in the U.N., however, fast-moving events of September headed toward a showdown between the U.S. President and the Soviet dictator.

Khrushchev, as the month began, touched off a series of atmospheric nuclear tests, still underway with a 10th explosion on September 14. Not until September 15 did the United States begin underground tests, which produce no fallout. Through the month, Khrushchev carried on a war of nerves against the United States in Berlin.

What Khrushchev wants, as diplomats here in New York see it, is evidence of Western capitulation to his threats. He wants this evidence before he reports to his Communist Party Congress in Moscow in mid-October.

WHERE KENNEDY STANDS

Now Mr. Kennedy, seizing the initiative, has focused attention on the U.N. Assembly. On September 13, talking to two leaders of "neutral" countries who were in Washington to urge peace, Mr. Kennedy made these points:

A summit meeting with Khrushchev is not likely before October. In November, perhaps. But not now.

Talks can be started, if Khrushchev wants them, at lower levels. Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, can talk with Dean Rusk at the Assembly session this month.

A U.S. drive to seize the initiative from Khrushchev will be staged at the Assembly meeting. Mr. Kennedy himself will keep close contact with the U.S. delegation, directing U.S. strategy.

War, big or little, is not wanted by the United States. But the United States does not intend to retreat before Khrushchev's threats over Berlin or his nuclear-bomb blasts in Russia.

Within 24 hours after the President spoke in these terms to President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali in Washington, Khrushchev moved to accept the Kennedy initiative. Gromyko got orders from Moscow to meet with Mr. Rusk in New York.

SHIFTING OF BALANCE

Question now raised is this: What sort of forum, what sort of court, has the United States chosen for this challenge to Khrushchev? What will be the result?

Here in the United Nations headquarters a check of the roll of the 99 members of the Assembly shows clearly that the voting power in this U.N. body no longer rests with the United States, nor yet with Russia.

The 50 smallest and least-powerful nations of the U.N. could, if they chose to vote as a bloc, control the Assembly. And a major factor in the decisions emerging from this Assembly will be the votes of the so-called "new nations" of Africa and of Asia.

Some of these new nations have a total population less than that of many U.S. cities. Few of them have anything approaching the wealth of any State of the United States.

More and more new nations have been created, as European allies of the United States have set free their colonies. Each new nation sought membership in the United Nations. Most were welcomed into the U.N. by the Soviet Union, eager to cut down the U.S. voting power.

Strange names appeared on the list of U.N. members—Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Gabon, Malagasy, Somalia, the Voltaic Republic. The Congo Republic is listed twice—once for a former French colony containing less than 1 million people, once for an area now in chaos and occupied by a U.N. army.

Each new nation has one vote, equal to that of every other member of the U.N. in the Assembly. Any two nations can outvote the United States. It takes four to outvote Russia, which clings to two extra votes for Ukraine and Byelorussia, ruled as provinces of the Soviet Union.

It is to this Assembly, in which U.S. power in votes stands at a new low, that President Kennedy has decided to take the major problems of the nuclear age.

THE OUTLOOK NOW

Issue by issue, this is what the President expects to get from the Assembly in New York:

Berlin: The Rusk-Gromyko talks here may lay the groundwork for Kennedy-Khrushchev talks later. Assembly action may be limited to a resolution saying, in effect: "Why don't you two leave things as they are in Berlin until you can talk up a settlement?" That would suit Mr. Kennedy. It is Khrushchev who wants to make changes in Berlin.

Germany: Many members of the U.N. Assembly would like to see the Western Powers forget the agreement on a united Germany and face the fact of a divided Germany. That is one thing Khrushchev wants. But no Assembly resolution on this point is in sight.

Disarmament: The United States will hammer hard at the evidence of Soviet bad faith on nuclear disarmament. For weeks, at Geneva, Khrushchev's men stalled the talks on a test ban while Russia prepared for tests. Khrushchev was still testing when, on September 15, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States had a plan for "complete and general disarmament" ready to present to the Assembly.

Colonialism: Portugal, France, the Netherlands, too, all allies of the United States may come in for an Assembly scolding over Portuguese Angola, French troubles in Algeria and Tunisia, Dutch possession of Western New Guinea. U.S. plans, however, call for emphasis on the decline of Western colonialism as Russia builds up her Communist colonies in East Europe, seeks Communist power in Africa.

China: United States, at this Assembly, faces the risk of a debate over whether Red Chinese or Nationalist Chinese of Formosa should sit in China's seat in the U.N. Assembly. If it comes to a vote there is a chance that Red Chinese would be seated over U.S. objections. U.S. officials here say only that they "hope" to hold the line against seating Red China.

Many other issues are certain to rise before this Assembly runs its course. That may take many weeks, even months. Each chief delegate of the 99 member nations has the right to speak on any subject in the general debate opening the sessions. By mid-September a total of 60 speakers were registered at the U.N. for this general debate alone. Debates on specific issues will open new floodgates of words.

RED TARGET—HAMMARSKJOLD

There is one issue threading under all others now before the Assembly. This is the Soviet effort to oust the present Secretary General of the U.N., Dag Hammarskjold, and to undermine the powers of his office. On this issue U.S. officials confidently expect to win a major victory.

Khrushchev, banging his shoe on an Assembly desk top last year, launched the attack on Hammarskjold. Since then Russia has demanded not only Hammarskjold's resignation, but also has asked that his powers be split among three U.N. officials—a Communist, a Westerner, and a neutral.

This Soviet proposal, so far, has made little headway. Neutrals and new-nation leaders are well aware that it was a U.N. army under Hammarskjold's direction which frustrated the Communist plot to take over the Congo in 1960. As a result, there has been a growing opposition among small nations to the Khrushchev plan for weakening the powers of the Secretary General.

A major effort of the U.S. delegation at this Assembly will be concentrated on strengthening the U.N.'s powers to act in a Congo-type emergency.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

Thwarted, so far, in his effort to grab the control of the United Nations through a three-man directorate, Khrushchev has worked at infiltrating the U.N. staff with Communist appointees. In this field the Soviet leader has had some success.

Under Soviet pressure, for example, Hammarskjold has been forced to downgrade his closest adviser, Andrew Cordier, just because Cordier is an American. In addition, two Russians have been given high-ranking U.N. staff jobs. And the U.N. personnel chief has had to recommend that Communists be given 110 of the 188 professional jobs to be opened this year and next.

Khrushchev's Communists have always scoffed at the idea of an international civil service. They force the U.N. to take men named by Russia and other Communist governments. Few Russians are qualified for the jobs they demand and get. Few stay on the job more than a year or so. Sometimes, without even notice to Hammarskjold, one Russian will take another's place on the U.N. staff.

Up to now Hammarskjold has kept Communist employees out of sensitive jobs, out of high staff councils. But an increasing number of U.N. staff members, as a result, must be written off as less than useless to the U.N.

A BATTLE ON THE FLOOR

In the showdown now taking shape in the U.N. Assembly, however, Communist staff members can play little part. U.S. strategy, as now planned, calls for a U.S. campaign against Khrushchev which will be played in the open, on the floor of the Assembly itself.

Kennedy aids here agree that it is difficult to predict how the new-nation delegates will vote in the Assembly contest now beginning. But U.N. membership rates high among the new nations, so high that some small countries hard up for cash have no permanent diplomatic staff abroad beyond their U.N. delegations. As a result, U.S. officials say, U.S. defense of the United Nations is bound to win friends and supporters among the new-nation leaders.

One U.S. official, speaking privately, said this of the President's gamble on the U.N. Assembly:

"What can we lose by tossing all these problems into the Assembly's lap? At worse a few resolutions may go against us. At best we may recapture the initiative from Khrushchev, may stiffen a few neutral spines to stand up against Khrushchev. Above all we can show that we aren't afraid of Khrushchev. And that's worth a few resolutions."

The United States, losing out in U.N. votes, now is seeking to recapture U.N. leadership. That is the "new strategy" of the United States in the United Nations.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened by the news of the untimely death of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS of Louisiana. His passing is in-

deed a distinct loss to this Chamber and to our entire Nation.

Prior to his appointment as chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I was privileged to serve with OVERTON BROOKS for many years on the House Armed Services Committee. I also served under his chairmanship on a subcommittee which was concerned with legislation affecting our National Guard and Reserve Forces. So great was his contribution in this area of our defense program that he was often referred to as "Mr. Reserve."

OVERTON BROOKS was a dedicated American and was untiring in his efforts in behalf of his district, State, and Nation. I join my colleagues in expressing deep and heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter and to other members of his family. May it bring some measure of comfort to reflect on his worthwhile life and to know that countless friends throughout the Nation share their great sorrow.

What Does Federal Aid Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Winnebago (Minn.) Enterprise points up the proposition that there is in reality no such thing as free Federal aid. The editor, Stanley Olson, comments that the Federal Government actually has no money of its own to give and goes on to state:

Whatever money it gives away or spends it first takes away from our earnings in taxes. It is mortgaging the earnings of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren.

This is the aspect of deficit spending which former President Eisenhower said is, in his opinion, not only improper but downright immoral.

I include the editorial from the September 14, 1961, Winnebago Enterprise in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

NO FEDERAL AID

The term "Federal aid" should be deleted from the American vocabulary and the words "taxpayers' aid" substituted. There is no such thing as "Federal aid," for in truth it is taxpayers' aid. Our Federal Government has no money of its own. Whatever money it gives away or spends it first takes away from our earnings in taxes. It is mortgaging the earnings of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren.

It seems that we are obsessed with the Federal aid idea. We can't seem to realize that whatever the Federal Government gives in aid to education, to the aged, to the unemployed, to Laos, to the Congo, to farmers, or to business, is our money, personally earned by us.

This Nation of free people is truly at the crossroads. Down one road lies complete dependency on Government. We can turn over to the Federal Government the care of our old folks, the building of our schools, and the education of our children. We can hand over to Government every one of the individual responsibilities which freemen have always been glad to carry themselves. There are enough people in Washington who will be glad to take care of all these items for us—they believe they can do it better than we can. But let there be no mistaking where this road leads—it leads to total dependency and there is no government on earth which can supply the standard of living which America has achieved through individual effort. If we continue to go down this road, we must give up our freedom. We must give up our self-respect and our integrity. We will end up paying everything we make to Government, and then the Government will return to us just enough to keep body and soul together.

Down the other road there is freedom. The entrenched bureaucrats are not going to give up the hold they already have over your money very willingly. It will take a real struggle to regain the right to take care of our own responsibilities, and the victory can only be won if we are willing to do for ourselves what free people must do in order to remain free. If we are willing to assume the responsibility for ourselves and for the needs of our own communities, counties, and States, if we are willing to insist that our local officials do their duty instead of turning it over to Washington, and if we have the courage to wage a real battle to regain the control of our own money, America will remain free. It can be done, but we are the ones who must do it.

Kennedy Pleased by Record of 33 Major Bills Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cecil Holland, staff writer of the Washington (D.C.) Star which appeared in a recent issue:

KENNEDY PLEASED BY RECORD OF 33 MAJOR BILLS PASSED

(By Cecil Holland)

With Congress getting ready to go home, President Kennedy is looking back on his administration's record in the first session of the 87th Congress with a high measure of satisfaction.

The President feels that the record is about as fine as it could be, and in some respects even better than he had expected.

Thirty-three measures regarded by Mr. Kennedy as important, covering both domestic and foreign affairs, have been enacted by a Congress many thought would be slow to go along with the proposals of the new President.

As viewed by the President and his close advisors, the record is the best of any new administration in 30 years.

To support this view, they say that in contrast to the 33 "important" measures requested by Mr. Kennedy and approved by Congress this year, the 73d Congress in 1933 approved only 11 major bills, all dealing with the domestic economy, for President Roosevelt.

And they say that President Eisenhower in 1953, his first year in office, had only 12 major bills enacted, including extension of the reciprocal trade agreements, foreign aid, a major tax revision and refugee legislation.

Another analysis of President Eisenhower's first year in office, by the independent Washington research service, Congressional Quarterly, credits him with having achieved 32 of his requests of Congress.

MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN DIFFER

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD, of Montana, said yesterday he thought Congress has written a very satisfactory record in this session, but Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said in a separate interview Congress has handed some serious defeats to President Kennedy, the Associated Press reported.

Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey put the administration's record at 32 measures and said this compared with 11 in the first Roosevelt year and 5 in General Eisenhower's first year. It adds up, Mr. Bailey said, to the greatest volume of vital business written into law in modern U.S. history.

While conceding that not all of his requests have been approved this year, Kennedy advisers say the President has suffered only one major legislative defeat—the proposal for a general aid-to-education bill which Mr. Kennedy has described as probably the most important recommendation he has made on the domestic front.

The administration does not consider the failure of Congress to enact any tax or medical care for the aged legislation as a defeat, since Mr. Kennedy is said to have decided not to press for action in these areas until next year.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

The administration regards the following as its major legislative accomplishments in combating the recession:

Temporary extension of unemployment benefits; aid to dependent children of unemployed; area redevelopment providing for Federal assistance to industrial and rural areas with large unemployment; expansion of the Social Security Act, including provision for men to retire at 62 instead of 65.

The following nine measures are classed by the administration in the general category of getting this country moving again.

A comprehensive housing bill; a water pollution control act calling for a 5-year program with grants being doubled to benefit 5,000 communities; an increase in the minimum wage; authorization for an effort to reach the moon and other space explorations; a $75 million, 6-year program for conversion of saline water; a community health facilities program regarded by the administration as the first part of its medical care for the aged package; an emergency feed grain program; an omnibus farm bill calling for expanded use of marketing orders, the school milk program and increased food for peace—estimated by the administration to save the taxpayers $800 million—and authorization of the Cape Cod National Park as the first major addition to the national park system in 14 years.

FOREIGN BILLS ACTED ON

A foreign aid bill calling for 5-year commitments; establishment of the Peace Corps on a permanent basis (now in its final legislative stage); creation of a disarmament administration office in the State Department; adoption of the $500 million alliance for progress program for economic and social work in the inter-American countries, and ratification in the Senate of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development are regarded by the administration as five major accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs.

A $6 billion increase in defense expenditures, or 14 percent more than the late Eisenhower budget; authority to recall reservists and National Guard units to active duty, and a new start on civil defense, providing steps

for the first serious shelter program, are three major accomplishments the administration sees in the national security field.

Other actions regarded as important, if not major, include creation of the Office of International Travel in the Commerce Department in an effort to attract tourists here; reduction of customs exemptions from $500 to $100, and tax incentives to retain assets of foreign central banks—all designed to combat the balance of payments deficit and outflow of gold.

The creation of 73 new Federal judgeships, a package of three anti-crime bills and a measure to combat juvenile delinquency are regarded as important actions in the administration of justice.

The administration considers these six actions important in extending or amending existing programs. Revisions in the financing of the highway program; extension of corporate income tax and excise tax rates; extension of the debt-limit ceiling; an expanded Federal Aviation and Airport Act; extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and reinstitution of the Reorganization Act. The administration remains hopeful of getting a postal rate increase through before Congress adjourns.

For one who recognizes the party role of a President, the results also have been pleasing to Mr. Kennedy. Except on such bipartisan matters as defense and to some extent on foreign aid, the President's program has been enacted against fairly heavy Republican opposition.

The President and his aides are not unduly disturbed by Republican charges of excessive spending. If it had not been for the cost of additional national defense steps and activities in the space program, and the effects of the recession, the administration contends, the budget would be more than balanced. With something approaching full employment the budget will be balanced and a surplus will prevail in the 1962 fiscal year, they believe.

"The American Character," an Address by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr at Meeting on the American Character, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens of the United States is the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, an outstanding theologian and writer whose thinking on religion and on political and social problems has had a significant influence not only on many Americans but on intellectual and political leaders throughout the world.

It was my privilege on June 1, 1961, to be present at a dinner in Washington, D.C., which Dr. Niebuhr addressed on the subject of "The American Character."

The meeting, which was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was in honor of Justice Hugo L. Black of the Supreme Court.

I believe that Dr. Niebuhr's profound address on this occasion deserves to be brought to the attention of Members of Congress and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR AT A DINNER MEETING ON THE AMERICAN CHARACTER AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Black, and ladies and gentlemen, apologies are boring and I am not going to spend time in apologizing for speaking even for half an hour on this tremendous subject of "The American Character," particularly to an audience that is made up of learned scholars and learned practitioners of the political art who, as it were, know American character in the raw. I can only say that we of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions have launched this project this week—our study of the American character—and I hope, though it is precarious and hazardous, that it will succeed and be creative and that my contribution this evening will be valid if it is related to the historical setting.

Let me begin by giving my definition of "character." I think that the character of individuals and of nations is a pattern of consistency that is woven by historical circumstances. The woof is the physical circumstances of life, and the warp comprises the cultural, spiritual, and moral endowments of individuals or of nations.

I think all judgments about character are bound to be speculative and challengeable though they can be partially validated by setting them in a historical context.

WOOF AND WARP OF THE NATION

As far as our great Nation is concerned, we can simply define the "woof and warp" of it. The "woof" is the fact that we were born on a virgin continent. (My English friends remind me that it really wasn't "virgin": there were Indians here, and after we prayed to God we preyed upon them.) Anyway we were on a partially virgin continent and had a tremendous hinterland and could occupy it without let or hindrance under the sanction of "manifest destiny." And the continent was endowed with great natural resources. This is the "woof" of our national character.

The "warp" of it is that we fancied, for obvious but in the light of history not very plausible reasons, that we had embarked on an entirely new beginning for mankind. The settlers of Massachusetts thought they had made a new beginning for a purified church; in Virginia settlers thought they had made a new beginning for a purified political community, because they assumed that if you got rid of the absolutism of monarchy, you got rid of "evil"—as the Communists now think if you get rid of capitalism, you get rid of "evil." There has been, therefore, a note of messianism in our national character from that day to this day. Think of how near hysterical we have been recently about the national purpose, whether we have a national purpose or what the national purpose is. (Obviously our national purpose is to do our duty within the limits of our capacities in the situation in which we find ourselves.)

So we are basically Messianists. The spiritual endowments we have and on which we pride ourselves, are also somewhat dubious, more dubious than we like to admit. The Calvinists of Massachusetts said the proof of our virtue would be found in our prosperity—which was a questionable proposition, because in this great country we were bound to be prosperous, but prosperity would make for self-righteousness.

OUR CHARACTER IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

This was the original woof and warp of our historical destiny. I am going to speak briefly now of how this has worked out in history on various levels of life and in different realms of thought and action. I will begin with the obvious—our character in the international community. All of our thoughts and responsibilities are now suffused with the idea that we are one of the two great imperial powers that control the world; we are engaged with the other imperial power in a tremendous wrestling match on the abyss of a possible nuclear catastrophe.

How did we get this way? It was only a quarter of a century ago that we were isolationists, and rather neurotic isolationists at that. A persistent theme running through our national life was the idea of designing European devils trying to outrage our American innocence and to draw us into the competitions of Europe. For instance, we were—in our own view—seduced into the First World War. But then we emerged out of the Second World War the most powerful democratic nation on earth. I think we have to admit now that we are the leader of the free world not purely by our virtue, but by our power, by controlling—as the Russians control—a vast continental economy.

It is an interesting thing that our isolationism was partly selfish. It wasn't quite what the psychiatrists call a "return to the womb" that we sought—it was merely a grasping after the cradle of our continental security. After technology had overwhelmed this continental security, the original desire for our primitive innocence remained. We had a dark suspicion that power meant responsibility and responsibility meant guilt—the guilt that we are involved in by the evil that we do in order to do good. We are never quite willing to accept that there is evil in our good—that's what makes us rather vexatious partners to our allies.

But we have done fairly well, and now we are in this imperial position, knowing full well that our power spells responsibility, and that exercising that responsibility means that our actions are all mixed with guilt.

POWER: TEMPTATIONS AND FRUSTRATIONS

There are some remaining problems for us. There is, for instance, the problem that we think our own history should point the way to the world how to get out of the nuclear dilemma. Weren't we one of the two nations (with Israel of old) that were formed by a contract? Can't we form a world community by a similar contract? Can't we get rid of all this terrible conflict and competition between two communities by a contract? By a world constitutional convention? I know that I am stepping on the tender toes of some of my intimate colleagues in this vicinity when I say that this is an evasion. I don't see how it is possible to establish a supersovereignty by a pure contract and subordinate the prestige and the power of these two great imperial nations, the United States and U.S.S.R., not to speak of De Gaulle's France.

Another great temptation that we have faced with relative success, is that it is very difficult for us, who believe we are masters of our fate and destiny, to be so frustrated in the day of our great power. Can't we use our power to cut through all these frustrations? But that might entail bringing history to a tragic end by bringing it to a neat conclusion.

Now I don't think I can solve the nuclear dilemma, but I would like to observe that we all hope some kind of disarmament agreement will gradually come—some solution will emerge out of these tortuous negotiations. I assume of course that there is a possibility of some kind of uneasy partnership between these two imperial nations despite the fact that one of them is governed by a very dogmatic utopian and messianic creed.

In regard to adjusting ourselves to an industrial civilization, let me be equally modest and say that I think we ought to realize that not only we but all the West-

ern European democracies had the great problem in the late 19th century of adjusting the individualistic idealism of the 18th and early 19th century to the social facts of an industrial civilization, which is bound to be collective. Here we succeeded as did the West European nations and the British Commonwealth. All of us, therefore, made ourselves immune to the Communist rebellion against democracy.

We succeeded, first, because we had proved on the one hand that there was a real force in equal political power guaranteed by the right of suffrage. And secondly, we established justice by raising up a countervailing power—the strong labor union—against the power of the corporation, which had centralized power by its innate capacities. So we have two quasi-sovereignties today, the "big union" and the "big corporation."

LEGACY OF THE FRONTIER

There is no way to establish a tolerable justice without an equilibrium of power. That is what we have learned and learned it rather tardily. But why were we so tardy? Because, among other reasons, we were a wealthy nation and our social mobility made class resentment less pervasive. The class resentment that for good reasons was the instrument of social change in Europe evaporated among us. And then there was the frontier. You could always solve the vexatious problem of collective justice, or at least put it off, by heeding Horace Greeley's advice: "Young man, go West." So we had the frontier. The frontier established the kind of liberty and equality without revolution that eluded the most radical revolution—the democratic revolution of Europe. But this put a note of sentimentality into all our politics. I don't think there is a question about it, a note of sentimentality. We think all these things are easier than they are: we do not recognize fully the recalcitrance of human nature against the norms and ideals of human history and destiny.

Let me move on to another great question about our national character—racial justice. You remember the distinguished Swedish social scientist Gunnar Myrdal wrote on the American dilemma, how tragic that dilemma is. A dilemma throughout our history. For instance, while Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," Negro slaves were working in his garden. It may be heretical to say anything critical of Thomas Jefferson, but I am going to repeat what John Quincy Adams said—he said that Thomas Jefferson himself wasn't rigorous enough in applying the Declaration of Independence to the conditions of Virginia. Anyway the Declaration of Independence didn't help our Negro friends very much nor were the 13th and 14th amendments of immediate help. Now we are engaged in the agonies of establishing the validity and the honesty of our democratic creed for our Negro fellow citizens.

This is a tortuous process. I must not speak too much about that in the presence of distinguished members of the Supreme Court, because what is involved in it, I think, is a fascinating relationship between the majesty of the law, and the recalcitrance of local mores. I have had some difference of attitudes about the great decision that your Court made, Mr. Justice Black, 7 years ago. Sometimes I thought it was morally the greatest thing; then I thought since it tended to polarize and make the bad people worse and the good people better, it wasn't politically prudent even though it might be morally wise. But now I realize that it was absolutely necessary, because the basic difficulty is that the Negro is guilty of a crime against the rest of us: he diverges so obviously from the white man's God-like image of himself. You cannot get rid of that, either by moral suasion or by law but you have to do it both ways.

UNIVERSAL NORMS FORGOTTEN

And I am glad we are doing it both ways. I am sorry that in this respect the Protestant Church has been so tardy. I say the Protestant Church not the Catholic Church because the Protestant Church has proved itself in this case to be a kind of middle-class white conventicle that has forgotten the universal norms of the Christian faith. But we are making progress here too, so we can be moderately proud and moderately humble about our character as an interracial community.

Certainly, as Henry Steele Commager reminded us during our conference this week, our religious life is unique on account of our pluralism. We have every Protestant sect in America and here every sect becomes a church, and every church becomes a sect. Even the Catholic Church becomes a sect in America—that is, not in their esteem but in our esteem.

We have the largest and most creative Jewish religious minority group of any Western nation. I am particularly interested in this, because the relationship of Christians to Jews is one of the scandals of Western civilization as we all know. When I took the position 5 years ago—I took it 20 years ago but it was not publicized until 5 years ago—that Christians didn't have any business converting Jews, I had three kinds of reactions to my proposal. One was, "You are right, no matter what." The second was, "You're right, but you are heretical." And the third was, "You are wrong because you are heretical."

There is a simple way of solving the third one by saying, "You must have a wrong definition of heresy."

There was this great challenge, a Jewish minority. We haven't begun fully to fulfill our democratic and Christian moral creed in regard to the Jewish minority, particularly with reference to recognizing that the Jews—in my opinion—have a positive ability, not to say genius, for civic righteousness. I could elaborate on that much more but I'll leave it at that.

Another important challenge was the growth of a great disciplined church, the Roman Catholic Church, first by immigration, and then, may I say, perhaps by outbreeding us, they have become more numerous. So all of our defensive reactions as Protestants are engaged in the power of this great church. We had some experience in the last campaign which would indicate that this is not an academic question. The amount of "hate mail" I received from Protestant sectarians—on the whole from the fundamentalist sects—was shocking. They thought that if we elected Mr. Kennedy President, the Pope would run America. At that time I had a little "dialog" with the distinguished Jesuit theologian, Gustave Weigel, and I agreed that he was right in saying that the Catholic Church allows Catholic statesmen to speak for a consensus beyond anything the church might say, but I added what also must be observed, that frequently the Catholic statesman takes more freedom than the church finds convenient.

TRIUMPH OF TRANSITION

I think we non-Catholics ought to appreciate this church that from our standpoint may represent a bit of medieval vestigial remnant. We ought not condescend to it like that, because we ought to recognize that it has two great virtues which, on the whole, individualistic protestantism, or secularism, or what-have-you does not have. I am going to say this in appreciation of catholicism. I hope that Monsignor Lally after I have finished won't say, "God deliver us from our friends." I appreciate the Catholic Church because it was able to do something that I think is quite marvelous and that is, to take a priestly monarchy which at one time in the Middle Ages thought it was going to be the supersovereignty over all the nations, and make it a general instrument of a universal religious community, the only really universal Christian community. Incidentally, I hope that this isn't a "liberal heresy"—but I don't think this can be done without the institution of monarchy. If that be "heresy," make the most of it.

Now the Catholic Church has two great advantages, one is that it never questions the social substance of human existence, that we are not just individuals but individuals who are fulfilled in, and frustrated by, our communities. The Catholic Church has an abiding sense of "community." Its conceptions of "justice" are too fixed for me; they do not care enough about or take enough cognizance of the historical contingencies. For instance, take the "population problem"—the church's prohibition of birth control. But why should I go into this, when I want to appreciate the fact that the Catholic Church supports a natural law that has some relevance to an industrial civilization? I think it is marvelous that a church which I once thought could not extricate itself unaided from a medieval society has done very well in adjusting itself to a modern industrial society—better than most of us. This is one of its great virtues.

It is also a citadel which has guarded by its dogmas, which are probably irrelevant to many modern secular or Protestant Americans, the integrity and responsible freedom of the individual against the hazards of a technical, technocratic culture and civilization. This is a tremendous achievement.

CITADEL FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

I don't say that the Catholic Church is the only one that does this. I think that every institution of learning, and every religious institution ought to do this, but one of the great problems of the American character is, How are we going to come to terms with the pressing problems of a technical society? We define "technique" simply as the mastery of nature, man's scientific mastery of nature, which leaves many questions of human existence out, particularly the question about the individual, and the question about the meaning of his existence. Here is the Catholic Church, which isa very nonindividualistic institution, nevertheless having this citadel for the individual. I think we ought to be grateful that in an open society, there could be this voice about individual destiny that transcends all our social destinies.

What about this strange and pathetic individual, who is so insignificant in the coherences and incoherences of nature and history and so significant to himself and to the people who love him? He is going to die as all the animals die. Though he thinks he ought not to die and hopes that he is not going to die, he would not know what to do with eternity if he had it—what are you going to do with the pathos and incongruity of this individual existence? And what are you going to do if he asks the question: "What is the meaning of my individual and my collective destiny anyway?"

Now, here I must confess another heresy. Being a liberal in politics I have been rather consistently antiliberal in culture because I think it is rather pathetic that this great liberal culture of ours, this Western culture of ours, should interpret the meaning of human existence in terms of two very dubious dogmas, the "perfectibility of man,"

and the "inevitability of progress" in a nuclear age. Certainly, there must be some voice that says "this isn't true," and for my part I am glad that we have an open society in which either the Christian standpoint, or the Catholic Christian standpoint is not annulled or silenced, and where the secular society with all its wonderful scientific disciplines can challenge the inevitable obscurantism of the religious community, which is always involved in obscurantism because it claims that its symbols or its historical facts are more than historical facts. This is, in other words, a problem we are not going to solve, but thank God we have a community in which every one of these answers is still heard. We haven't solved the problem of the meaning of our existence and it has become more unsolvable because we are in conflict, in competition, with a very technocratic society that defines the uniqueness of man by saying that he is a toolmaking animal. We are certainly a little more than that.

I must admit that my friend Sir Charles Snow is right and say we have a particular reason for being somewhat technocratic because all the poor nations of the world are trying to get our technocracy; we are legitimately technocratic, but we ought to have some apprehensions about the preoccupation of man with the tools of life.

THE LIBERAL HERITAGE

I must come to a conclusion. There are many other problems we could consider in the American character. I should say that any of our studies would have to analyze the American heritage in order to show what is perennially valid in this glorious liberal heritage of the 18th century Founding Fathers, and what must be adjusted to the facts of a collectivist society. There, I think it is worth observing that we don't necessarily turn from error—the error of utopianism, messianism, and liberalism and individualism—to the truth of our realism, but that we are turning back to a much richer truth that our Founding Fathers collectively had. You take the idealism of Jefferson, the sober realism of a Madison, and the wintry pessimism of John Adams, not to say the cynicism of an Alexander Hamilton, all have their place in the threshing floor of an open society where truth is separated from error and error from truth. Incidentally, in this open society, we have a place even for those systems which believe that the truth should be guaranteed by authority, religious or political, against error. This is also a great achievement of our free society.

We must look at the past not only because it shows us how finite we are, what creatures of our determinations, but because we are also responsible agents in history, and we must study the past to free ourselves for the future. Freedom is the knowledge of necessity, though not in the way that Hegel and Marx said it was. We must have the knowledge of our finite determinations of the past, in order that we may be free to master our destiny in the future. We must know the past, and then we must not be preoccupied with it.

I must close with a word from one of the greatest statesmen of our age, Sir Winston Churchill. In a memorable address he made in New York after the war, during the Berlin airlift, he said something like this about the past, and the future, and about man's determination of freedom. He said: "Our airlift has won us the hearts of the German people, gentlemen. I hope you won't be offended that I think it important to win the hearts of the German people seeing they did us so much wrong—but, gentlemen, let us only remember so much of the past as will make us creative in the future."

The Forgotten Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, September 14 is a historical date in the city of New Orleans. It is the anniversary of the day on which the carpetbaggers were driven from New Orleans and constitutional government restored in 1874.

Each year on this date the Board of Commissioners of Liberty Place—the name given to the spot on which the battle of September 14 was fought—assemble to pay homage and tribute to those patriots who fought and died there. Each year a prominent person is selected to deliver an address at the annual banquet. This year Associate Justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court Walter B. Hamlin made the principal address.

It has been my privilege to have known Justice Hamlin since childhood when we attend McDonough School No. 17 in New Orleans. He has become one of Louisiana's outstanding jurists. His address before the Board of Commissioners of Liberty Place was of such significance and importance that I thought it fitting and proper to bring it before this body.

The address and the subject matter speaks for itself. Here it is:

ADDRESS BY WALTER B. HAMLIN, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF LIBERTY PLACE, AT ANTOINE'S RESTAURANT, NEW ORLEANS, LA., SEPTEMBER 14, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, I desire to thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight. However, before going further in my address, I believe it is of value to this discussion to call to your attention to the fact that, by a curious coincidence, each time a constitution of Louisiana was adopted has been just before, during, or shortly after wars in which our Nation participated.

In 1812 Congress passed an act authorizing a constitutional convention in the Territory of Orleans preparatory to Louisiana's being admitted as a State. The Mexican War took place about 1845. Our next constitution was that of 1845. The convention met in Jackson, La., and adjourned to New Orleans.

The next constitution was adopted in 1852, while the clouds of the War Between the States were gathering. In 1860 a State convention met in New Orleans and passed an Ordinance of Secession. In 1861 this same convention amended the Constitution of 1852 by inserting the words, "Confederate States" in place of "United States," with a few other changes which were unimportant.

The next constitution was adopted in 1864 during the War Between the States and while New Orleans was lying prostrate with the heel of Silver Spoon Ben Butler of Massachusetts on its neck. It may seem strange, but this constitution was submitted to the people. A small amount of people turned out, and it carried by a vote of 6,836 to 1,566.

The War Between the States ended in 1865. The carpetbagger and the scalawag took control over our State, ruling with an iron hand, also with his heel on Louisiana's neck. These intellectuals were responsible for the Constitution of 1868, which they submitted to the people, and which carried by a somewhat larger vote—66,152 to 48,739.

Six years later, the engagement of September 14, 1874, took place, and the rule of the carpetbagger and scalawag was overthrown. However, it took 5 long years for the free citizens of Louisiana to be able to hold another Constitutional Convention, which was done in 1879. Since that year we have had Constitutional Conventions held in 1898, around the time of the Spanish-American War; 1913, shortly before World War I commenced, and 1921, about 2½ years after the armistice in November, 1918. The Constitution of 1921 is still in effect, but the foundation of its provisions is the Constitution of 1879.

This community is indeed fortunate in having this organization commemorate each year the anniversary of the battle of September 14, 1874.

This conflict took place because the people of this community were tired of a tyrany and an oppression which had deprived them of their rights as individuals, guaranteed to them by the ninth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as well as their other constitutional rights, and they were determined to put an end to this unspeakable situation. They knew that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights had unified the American people, and that they were entitled to the protection they offered.

I submit to you that this battle on September 14, 1874, which was fought to preserve the independence of the people of this community, was just as important as the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, which ended the War of 1812, as there is no doubt that the War of 1812 was the "Second War for American Independence." The affair we are assembled to commemorate may be called a skirmish when compared with other battles recorded in history's pages, but its importance and the bravery of its participants has set a fine example for all time to all men determined to be free.

In times like these it is well for our attention to be called to the fact that our Constitution and the Bill of Rights is a good answer to the violent, turbulent men, both at home and abroad, in their attempts to place might upon the pedestal that others have raised to right.

It is not feasible for me to dwell too much upon the provisions of the Bill of Rights, but I feel that a discussion of the ninth amendment to the Constitution, commonly known as the forgotten ninth amendment (and I refer you to an excellent work with this title by Mr. Bennett Patterson of the Texas bar) is in order upon this occasion. The ninth amendment is very short, and reads as follows: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The ninth amendment is a basic statement of the inherent natural rights of the individual, for which your ancestors fought in the vicinity of the monument on Canal Street. On its face this amendment states that there are certain unenumerated rights that are retained by the people as individuals.

These rights do not owe their origin to constitutions. They existed before constitutions were even thought of. They exist inherently in every man, by endowment of the Creator, and are merely reaffirmed in our Constitution. They are incapable of enumeration, but as they are infringed upon, the individual has the right to apply to the courts for relief and redress.

There are many who possess a richer experience than your humble servant. The

best I can do is to give examples of some—only some—of the unenumerated inherent rights contemplated by the Constitution, in order that this discussion may have practical purpose. The right to establish justice, promote general welfare, secure the blessings of liberty, protect our persons and property from violence, are examples of natural, inherent rights.

Violations of these rights are: No man should be compelled by another to do what the laws do not require; nor to refrain from the acts which the laws permit. A law that makes a man a judge in his own cause; or a law that takes property from A and gives it to B; a law that punishes a citizen for an act which when done was in violation of no existing law—these are examples.

The right "to be let alone" is one of our inherent rights which has been sustained by our courts; the right to privacy is inherent; the right to acquire and own property and to deal with it and use it as the owner chooses, so long as the use harms nobody, is a natural right.

The Declaration of Independence mentions rights to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle all men—among these being life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The Declaration of Independence was a forerunner of the ninth amendment, and when it used the words "nature's God" and "among these," it was careful not to attempt to enumerate those rights. It was careful to admit that liberties and human rights were not man-made and could not be enumerated by man.

Therefore, the door is wide open for the results of research, the proper construction of this amendment, and enumeration from time to time of the rights with which the Government, or anyone, has no power to interfere. Remember—in our own lifetime we have seen, from the stream of history, that human rights are the product of the growth of civilization. The telephone, electricity, automobile, airplane, radio and television, paved roads, transportation facilities, and industry generally being vastly improved, they carry with them inherent human rights.

I feel certain that you will agree with me that the framers of the Bill of Rights looked far into the future and anticipated this growth of civilization, which, to say the least, is not short of being miraculous.

As before stated, the preservation of these rights was involved on September 14, 1874. Those intrepid, militant souls who believed in liberty and were willing to fight for it, wanted to make our land the land of golden opportunity and the meeting place of the world's finest ideas and ideals. It has been made so.

Therefore, we of this generation must, and should, pause now and then to think back upon their bravery and love of community and home. We should also pause to consider, as they did, the fact that as horrible as war is, defeat, with its looting and killing, starvation and pestilence, is worse. I believe that it is time that we became aware that a nation which feeds itself and its rising generations on pacifism is also spooning out defeatism.

Why do I say this? Twice in my lifetime I have witnessed 1 man having the power to set over 400 million men fighting for their lives. And today we are living under threat of the exercise of similar power by a third man. (And it is said that man is a rational animal.)

Twice in my lifetime I have been shocked at the quick desiccation of our wartime armies. The first time was after the armistice of 1918, and the second time was in 1946 and 1947, after a sparsely trained army of 400,000 was turned into a sharp, hard-fighting, brilliantly organized global weapon that numbered 8 million men by 1945. This drying up of our wartime armies is bound to recall the agonizing bloodletting of American soldiers and sailors who had gone to war ill prepared.

I know of no better way to put it than by quoting the words of the late Gen. George C. Marshall: "We have tried since the birth of our Nation to promote our love of peace by a display of weakness. This course has failed us utterly."

We must remain a strong Nation. You descendants of those heroes of September 14, 1874, I know, will uphold their traditions, urge preparedness, freedom from fear and hysteria, and the maintenance of the rights of the individual which are protected by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

A Clear-Cut Policy, Not More Studies, Needed To Win the War Against the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the only way we are going to defeat the Communist conspiracy is to have a clear-cut and understandable policy which will leave no doubt in the mind of Khrushchev that we are detemined to win any war he starts. Month after month we have been waiting for the President to come forth with such a policy, but instead we receive a constant stream of statements from the White House calling for more studies, additional advice, further consideration. The hour is late. Unless we enunciate a firm policy soon, we may find ourselves still studying the world situation when the Communists have already taken over. The latest study group from which the President seeks advice is discussed in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

WHAT'S THIS PROVE?

Mr. Kennedy the other day appointed a four-man board to give him a few answers about why all the propaganda victories go to the Communists and what should be done to wage effective psychological and political warfare. This group is odd in a number of ways.

First, its membership is composed of men he can reach by practically stepping across the hall. His brother, Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, is a member. So is Gen. Maxwell Taylor, presidential military adviser, who is in the White House with Kennedy. So is U. Alexis Johnson, deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and former Ambassador to Thailand. Completing the formation is Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, a puzzler. Maybe his function is to persuade Walter Reuther to lend a few United Auto Worker goons to contribute their talents to the cold war.

It is explained that the Communists' ability to repress world reaction unfavorable to them, and to dominate the news as they choose with spurious "spontaneous" demonstrations, led to the creation of the new board.

Administration officials, for instance, were appalled that many neutralist nations received the news apathetically when the Soviet Union resumed nuclear testing. They figured everybody would have screamed if the United States had done it, and that the Communists would have picketed and stoned our embassies around the world.

Well, we have a few suggestions. The first of them is that the only cold war political and psychological victories that count are those scored directly against the Communists. What the nonalined nations think of things is utterly irrelevant, as Khrushchev demonstrated when he resumed testing in a spirit of utter contempt for their opinion.

The second is that the necessity to create such a board ought to impress Mr. Kennedy with the fact that $4 billion a year in foregin aid and $130 million a year for the alleged propaganda of the U.S. Information Agency is simply money down the drain. If these ventures had the slightest efficacy in winning "world opinion" our way or alienating it from commuinsm, there wouldn't be any need for all this second guessing.

But, as we say, world opinion is of no consequence anyway. Khrushchev doesn't hold his slave empire together by bonds of love, but by terror and force. He doesn't command the respectful silence and even the active support of so many uncommitted countries because he is courteous and considerate, but because he is ruthless and they are fearful of him. He bangs nuclear bombs in their ears and they keep their mouths shut. But if we don't cough up another poultice of foreign aid, somebody wrecks another USIA library or plasters the front of our embassy by throwing bottles of ink.

Strength and purpose are respected in this out-of-focus world. When Mr. Kennedy starts convincing people that he means business and won't let the United States be pushed around, there will be no need for boards of psychological warfare.

An Invasion of American Rights That Must No Longer Be Tolerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1961, I entered into the RECORD a statement on the effects of the Arab League boycott of American business and citizens having dealings with Israel or who happen to be of the Jewish faith. The catalog of boycott actions there set forth was a long and unpleasant one. At that time I urged that this Government do something to end discrimination by these Arab governments against our citizens and our business community. As far as I know nothing further has been accomplished in this area, and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following supplement to the July statement of the Institute of Human Relations:

INVASION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS—SUPPLEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Committee recently published an analysis of the Arab League[1] boycott from the standpoint of its interference with the legitimate activities of Americans—their right to travel abroad without being subjected to indignity, and to serve equally with other citizens in U.S.

Footnotes at end of speech.

military establishments overseas; their freedom to engage in commercial relationships without discrimination on ground of religion. These rights and freedoms are traditionally held inviolate by our Government.

This supplemental document deals with still further aspects of the Arab League boycott which affect American citizens, Christians as well as Jews, who are engaged in business and the professions.

The boycott has interfered with the commercial pursuits of Americans and American companies in many foreign countries. It has subjected American foreign trade to arbitrary restraint. It has obstructed American shipping and visited abuse upon American seamen in defiance of international law. It has intruded upon the professional activities of Americans in the entertainment field.

RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS AND THE PROFESSIONS IMPOSED BY THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT

The Arab League has said in effect that American business an industrial enterprises may trade in Israel or with the Arab countries—not both.

Blacklisting of American companies

Approximately 500 American concerns received warnings during 1960,[2] sent through the U.S. mails from boycott offices in Damascus and Kuwait. A typical example is the following communication, dated August 23, 1960, from the Arab League Secretariat in Damascus to a company in New York:

"1. Do you have branch factories in Israel? and did you undertake any exploration work for oil in Israel?

"2. Do you have assembly plants in Israel?

"3. Do you have, in Israel, general agencies or head offices for your Middle Eastern operations?

"4. Do/did you give the right of using your patents, trademarks, copyrights, etc., to Israeli companies?

"5. Do/did you subscribe in Israeli companies or factories?

"6. Do/did you render consultative services or technical experience to Israeli factories?

"7. Do you represent Israeli firms in your country?

"8. Do you have a branch of yours in Israel? In case you have, please define its position as to your company.

"It is essential to have this declaration duly legalized by your competent authorities and countersigned by any Arab consul in your country.

"Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that this declaration should reach us within a period not to exceed November 31, 1960. If this period elapsed without receiving your reply, we shall regretfully be obliged to ban transactions with you and to blacklist your company in all of the Arab countries.

"Yours faithfully,

"Dr. Abdul Karim El-A'idi,

"Commissioner General for the Boycott of Israel."

By 1961, according to Fortune magazine, the number of American firms on the Arab blacklist had risen "from about 20 in 1957 to nearly 4 times that."[3]

Many companies—including Emerson Radio, General Tire & Rubber, Dow Chemical, and Merritt-Chapman & Scott—have refused to yield to the boycott.[4] Some feel that the Arab market, despite its overwhelming numerical strength, would not compensate for loss of Israeli business. Some have discovered that certain cynical Arab countries are not above dealing with recalcitrant companies whose products are in short supply in the Middle East. Some simply object on principle to threats and foreign dictation.

A case in point is a large company in the Midwest, which is building a $2-million plant in Haifa, to be completed in 1962. An official of the company explains its decision to defy the Arab boycott:

"Our Board was immediately concerned with the threat of boycott of our products by the nations of the United Arab Republic. We did considerable business in these countries and had received threats of the boycott by letter from four of the countries of the Arab bloc. Remember also the population totals—65 million Arab people to 2 million in Israel.

"Despite this, [we] felt that basically most Americans are not in sympathy with the boycott. Our own reaction is one of great distaste.

"The whole philosophy of the Arab bloc—its threat of boycott against people doing business in Israel, its attitude toward the Suez, its general political thinking—is opposed by the Western bloc of nations."

The viewpoint of many companies is summed up by Fortune:

"The growing willingness of U.S. and European investors to ignore Arab threats is, of course, due in part to sympathy with the Israeli cause. However, this factor is of less importance than the Arabs would have the world believe. The fact is that Israel offers economic opportunities which make it worth while for many types of investors to ignore Arab threats. Israel's per capita GNP—$1,050—is 13 times greater than Egypt's.) Indicative of the changed outlook is the attitude of R. A. Hutchinson, a vice president of Studebaker-Packard, which opened an assembly line in Haifa in 1960. Said Hutchinson, 'We deal with all the Arab states. But if they choose to stop their purchases following our agreement here, that's their affair, not ours.'

"Moreover, the capricious manner in which the boycott is applied invites defiance. It is not a crime under the blockade regulations simply to sell good to Israel, but it is considered illegal to invest in Israel, to set up offices there, or to enter licensing and technical agreements with Israeli firms. But some U.S. companies, such as Bulova Watch, which do nothing more than sell their products to Israel, have found themselves summarily placed on the blacklist.

"Faced with such arbitrariness, formerly hesitant investors have apparently decided that they might as well be hung for sheep as for lambs."[5]

Blacklisting of American ships

The Arab League boycott applies as well to American-owned vessels temporarily chartered to Israeli companies, or, as happens more frequently, carrying materials or agricultural or industrial products from the United States destined in large or small part for Israeli ports. The number of ships thus blacklisted varies; as of now, it is estimated that about 35 American-flag vessels are affected, plus an equal number owned by American companies but registered in other countries.

The closing of Arab ports to ships sailing to or from Israel has also subjected American seamen to insult and hardship.

The crew of the freighter *Westport*, entering the port of Suez en route from Israel in the fall of 1959, was held aboard ship for 22 days in violation of international law. The seamen's papers were impounded by the police. The seamen were forbidden to communicate with anyone except through Egyptian officials.[6]

In the summer of 1960, when the *Isthmian* arrived at Aqaba, Jordan, crew members were quizzed as to their religious affiliation and two members were prohibited from taking shore leave because their surnames did not sound "Christian" to the Arabs.[7]

Outraged by "harassment and mistreatment of American seamen in Arab ports," the Seafarers International Union picketed the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* when it arrived in New York in April 1960. The picket line was honored by the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen. Unable to unload its cargo, the ship was stranded in New York for 3 weeks. Efforts by the owners to have the Federal courts enjoin the picketing met with no success.

The demonstration at the dock provoked anxiety in Washington—not because of the grievances which occasioned it, but because it might cause embarrassment.[8] In exchange for the union's agreement to end their public protest, the State Department finally promised to look into the situation "and, through appropriate diplomatic action with the foreign countries involved, to renew its efforts to assure freedom of the seas and to protect the interests of our shipping and seamen now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy."[9]

On July 12, 1961, the president of the National Maritime Union, Joseph Curran, charged that "American seamen still are subjected to indignities and threats of physical violence."[10] He asked President Kennedy to protest to the United Nations against "continued United Arab Republic violations of the principle of freedom of the seas." In a telegram to the President, Mr. Curran warned:

"In the absence of action by governments or by the United Nations to enforce the principle of freedom of the seas, the International Transport Workers Federation representing unions of seamen and other transport workers with a total membership of 6,500,000 in 71 countries will have to consider joint action through its own resources, including boycott."[11]

American shipowners were affronted for nearly 2 years, starting in the spring of 1958, by the Navy's acceptance of the so-called Haifa clause in contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports. In effect, the clause barred U.S. vessels engaged in business with Israel from carrying Navy oil cargoes.[12] In February 1960, when public pressure led the Navy's Military Sea Transport Service to withdraw the clause from its shipping contracts, Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, commented:

"I hope the public protests which greeted revelation of this now discontinued practice will serve as notice to other Government agencies. The American public does not believe a U.S. Government agency should knuckle under to any form of international blackmail."[13]

Denial of entry to the Suez Canal

In closing the Suez Canal to ships of American registry engaging in trade with Israel or stopping at Israeli ports, the United Arab Republic is defying United Nations resolutions and established practice, and violating the convention respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888, by Turkey and eight major world powers. Egypt was then under Turkey's rule; the United Arab Republic, as successor to the Turkish Government in that region, is bound by treaty obligations assumed with respect to the Suez Canal.

The very first article of the convention states:

"The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

"The canal shall never be subject to the exercise of the right of blockade."

The UAR contention that the convention does not apply under conditions of war was clearly anticipated by article XI:

"The measures taken in the cases provided for in articles IX and X [which deal with measures to be taken by the Egyptian Government to enforce the treaty, defend Egypt and maintain public order] of the present

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

treaty shall not interfere with the free use of the canal."

The convention prohibits the erection of permanent fortifications or other impediments to navigation (arts. VIII and XI), and provides for continuation of the treaty beyond the duration of the Acts of Concession of the Universal Suez Canal Company—that is, even when the Government of Egypt should come into direct control of the canal (art. XIV).

On November 2, 1956, during the emergency special session to deal with the Sinai-Suez Canal crisis, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East and urging that "steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation." [14]

The U.S. position was summed up by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1956: [15]

"It seemed to us from the beginning that any solution should take account of two basic facts. One is that an international waterway like the Suez Canal, which has always had an international status, cannot properly be made an instrumentality of any government's national policies so that equal passage may depend on that government's favor. That does not require Egypt to forgo the rights which are normal to it as the sovereign nation through whose territory this international waterway passes. It does mean that Egypt should not be in a position to exercise such arbitrary power, open or devious, over the operations of this international waterway that the nations dependent on the canal will in effect be living under an economic 'sword of Damocles.' That would be an intolerable state of affairs. It would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter requirement that these situations must be dealt with in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

On January 8, 1957, to help defray the cost of rehabilitating the Suez Canal, the United States advanced $5 million to the United Nations. As of July 1961, approximately $3 million had been refunded in three installments, leaving a net of $2 million contributed by the United States. Thus, in submitting to the exclusion of American ships from the canal, our Government is allowing its citizens to be denied access to an international waterway maintained in part out of their own pockets.

The "Freedom of the Seas" amendment to the Mutual Security Act, introduced by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and KENNETH KEATING, and adopted by both Houses of Congress on May 2, 1960, declares that "such procedures as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways" are disapproved by the United States and endanger the peace of the world; the amendment calls on the President to "report on measures taken by the Administration" to insure the application of these principles in granting foreign aid.[16] But the State Department has not acted on this policy statement by the Congress.

Blacklisting of Hollywood and Broadway stars

Numerous American stage and screen stars of all faiths who have performed, or intend to perform, in Israel, or are said to harbor favorable feelings for that country, have been blacklisted by the Arab League. This extension of discrimination to the entertainment industry may well be intended to accomplish something more than appears on the surface—namely, to restrict freedom of expression.

The most publicized instance occurred in March 1961, when the United Arab Republic refused to permit a company of the American Theatre Guild, touring under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of State and headed by no less renowned an actress than Helen Hayes, to perform in Cairo. The reason given was that the company was scheduled also to appear in Tel Aviv. Yet, no military or economic gain would accrue to Israel because of this visit. The cancellation seemed clearly to imply that if well-known persons could be disadvantaged because of their alleged friendly attitudes toward Israel or willingness to appear there, persons of lesser repute might be well advised not to evidence attitudes or make commitments displeasing to the Arab League.

TO UPHOLD THE INTERESTS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Our State Department has repeatedly proclaimed its determination to protect basic American interests which are endangered by the Arab boycott. It has clearly catalogued those interests and its intentions with respect to them as follows:

"The U.S. Government protests as a matter of policy discriminatory actions or practices with respect to international trade which adversely affect U.S. firms, vessels, and citizens. The Department will continue to pursue, by all appropriate and effective means, every avenue whereby private American interests in international trade may be fully safeguarded, and restored.

"As a matter of settled policy, the United States supports the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to foreign ports and facilities. The Department has constantly sought to facilitate the normal pursuit of international commerce by vessels of U.S. registry.

"The U.S. Government has long and unequivocally maintained the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the Suez Canal for all nations. This policy has been publicly emphasized on numerous occasions, and was specifically reiterated by the Secretary of State during his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 17, 1959.

"The Department of State reemphasizes that our Government neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott, which includes the blacklisting of U.S.-flag vessels in part because of prior calls at Israeli ports. Every appropriate opportunity will be utilized, on a continuing basis, to reemphasize this fundamental position to the governments concerned." [17]

But these and other assurances of devotion to principle still remain to be implemented by "effective means"; our Government has yet to move from praiseworthy assertions to appropriate action.

CITIZEN ACTION

The conscientious citizen, who may well ask "What can I do about this?" may find guidance in the State Department's declaration that the Department "gives full consideration to all communications from private American groups with respect to problems affecting the conduct of U.S. foreign relations." [18] In view of this hospitality to the views of private citizen groups, leaders of such groups have the opportunity to address themselves to those aspects of the boycott which are of particular concern to their members:

Business, industrial, and trade organizations can urge that Government departments and agencies, and U.S. representatives abroad, henceforth refuse to cooperate with, or facilitate, those activities of Arab League nations which interfere with freedom of action on the part of American companies in establishing, maintaining, and extending commercial relations abroad. Business and industrial firms can themselves reject threats of boycott or blacklisting.

Labor unions, which have a substantial stake in frustrating the boycott, can continue to express the views already voiced by several spokesmen of the labor movement, emphasizing the need for immediate action to uphold the principles enunciated by the State Department in its official statement of May 6, 1960, to the president of the AFL–CIO.

Religious, patriotic, and civic organizations can articulate their opposition to our Government's seeming toleration of Arab League activities which infringe upon American sovereignty and invade the rights of American citizens.

The mass media can interpret to newspaper and magazine readers, and radio and television audiences, the nature and significance of the Arab boycott, exposing it in its full light as an arrogant effort to dictate to the American business and industrial community under what conditions and with whom commerce and trade may be conducted in foreign countries.

Veterans' organizations can demand that the Armed Forces terminate their accommodation to Arab discrimination against American servicemen and henceforth refuse to make religious distinctions in the assignment of military and civilian personnel to U.S. establishments anywhere in the world.

All citizen groups can urge that Congress reexamine its foreign aid policy, with particular reference to expenditures for grants and loans to those Arab League nations which discriminate among American citizens and boycott American business and industry. All groups can call upon our Government to suit its action to its word, to insist that:

Citizens carrying American passports must receive equal hospitality wherever they may travel;

Ships flying the Stars and Stripes must enjoy freedom of navigation in whatever international waterway they may choose to sail;

Armed Forces personnel, whether military or civilian, must be assigned to oversea service, wherever such service is required, without regard for discriminatory religious criteria invoked by foreign governments in defiance of American law;

American citizens and American-owned companies must be free to pursue their legitimate commercial and industrial interests anywhere in the world without arbitrary interference and restraint;

Countries seeking to maintain friendly relations with the United States must be guided by these requirements.

In short, public opinion can call a halt to departures from principle in America's foreign relations. Public opinion can demand that our foreign policy be extricated from the quicksands of concession to bluster and affront, and restored to the solid rock of self-respect.

Allies are not won nor admiration stirred for our country by willingness to compromise national ideals on the grounds of expediency. The fallacy, indeed the cataclysmic consequence, of such a course has been borne out all too often in the downfall of once-proud nations.

Today, as in the past, America's true course lies in unyielding commitment to the principles that give us strength as a nation and stature as a leader among nations.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The Arab League consists of 11 countries: Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, and Yemen.

[2] "Comments on Points Raised in New York State Resolution 131," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1961, p. 6568.

[3] "The Frayed Arab Noose," Fortune, July 1961, p. 102.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 106.

[6] Seafarers Log, official organ of the Sea-

farers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL–CIO, April 22, 1960.

[7] Ibid., Aug. 19, 1960.

[8] The New York Times, Apr. 24, 1960.

[9] Statement by Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon to AFL–CIO President George Meany, May 6, 1960.

[10] The New York Times, July 13, 1961.

[11] New York Herald Tribune, July 13, 1961.

[12] The Haifa clause: "In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"1. To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port,

"2. To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position,

"3. To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

[13] The New York Times, Feb. 19, 1960.

[14] United Nations Review, December 1956, p. 103.

[15] "The Task of Waging Peace," address before the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas, Tex. The Department of State Bulletin, November 5, 1956, p. 699.

[16] Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–472; 74 Stat. 134), sec. 2, which amends sec. 2(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

[17] Statement of Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, op cit.

[18] Ibid.

The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many people have become very concerned about the connections of certain persons involved in the affairs of the American Civil Liberties Union with Communist front groups. They are asking the question: Does the ACLU really promote adherence to rights guaranteed the individual by the Constitution?

Organizational Research Associates, the address of which is Post Office Box 51, Garden Grove, Calif., has prepared a pamphlet entitled, "The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union," which I believe should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress and to the American public. Under unanimous consent, I include the pamphlet in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

"Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover, page 228: "Fronts probably represent the party's most successful tactic in capturing non-Communist support. Like mass agitation and infiltration, fronts espouse the deceptive party line (hence the term 'front'), while actually advancing the real party line. In this way the party is able to influence thousands of non-Communists, collect large sums of money, and reach the minds, pens, and tongues of many high-ranking and distinguished individuals. Moreover fronts are excellent fields for party recruitment."

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, executive director of the International Christian Anticommunism Crusade, "Communist Legal Subversion," page 75, HCUA: "Any attempt to judge the influence of Communists by their numbers is like trying to determine the validity of the hull of a boat by relating the area of the holes to the area which is sound. One hole can sink the ship. Communism is the theory of the disciplined few controlling and directing the rest. One person in a sensitive position can control and manipulate thousands of others."

One quick way to evaluate the ideology of organizations is through consideration of the statements and claims of their leaders. So it seems necessary for a realistic appraisal of the civil rights policy of the American Civil Liberties Union that we develop the factual background of their prominent officials and leaders.

It has taken us months of painstaking research to prepare this pamphlet; it will take you only minutes to read it. So please read it and then pass it on and inform others of the information you are about to learn.

SECTION I

These are a few of the past and present prominent officials and leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union.

1. Roger Baldwin, founder and guiding light of the ACLU for over 30 years, is now a member of the National Committee of the ACLU. Mr. Roger Baldwin has a record of over 100 Communist-front affiliations and citations (documented in detail, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 26, 1952). In an article written for Soviet Russia Today (September 1934), Roger Baldwin said: "When the power of the working class is once achieved, as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever." "The class struggle is the central conflict of the world, all others are coincidental."

Entry of Roger Baldwin in the Harvard reunion book on the occasion of the 30th anniversary reunion of his class of 1905 (1935), "I seek social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class, and sole control of those who produced the wealth; communism is the goal."

2. Dr. Harry Ward, first chairman of the ACLU. Dr. Harry Ward has a record of over 200 Communist front affiliations and citations listed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA). Dr. Harry Ward was chairman of one of the largest Communist fronts to flourish in this country, "The American League for Peace and Democracy," which was placed on the Attorney General of the United States list of subversive organizations on June 1, 1948. Dr. Ward is the author of "Soviet Democracy" and "Soviet Spirit," two pro-Communist books which clearly show Dr. Ward's love for the Soviet system of government. The California Senate Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, in their 1948 report, page 246, said: "The Communist affiliation of Dr. Harry F. Ward is indicative of the Communist sympathies of the members and sponsors of the "Friends of the Soviet Union."

3. Abraham L. Wirin, chief counsel for the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU, sometimes referred to as "Mr. ACLU."

In 1934 A. L. Wirin formed a law partnership with Leo Gallagher and Grover Johnson (reference: Daily Peoples World, Mar. 5, 1934, official publication of the Communist Party on the west coast). Mr. Leo Gallagher ran for State office on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 and Grover Johnson, when asked by a governmental investigating agency if he had ever been a member of the Communist Party, refused to answer the question on the grounds that he might incriminate himself.

In 1954, A. L. Wirin was a candidate for the executive board of National Lawyers' Guild (reference: Los Angeles Daily Journal, Jan. 13, 1954). The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as a Communist front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) September 21, 1950. (Four years before, Mr. Wirin was a candidate for the executive board.)

4. Dr. Albert Eason Monroe, executive director of the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU:

In 1952, Dr. Albert Eason Monroe, U.S. Navy serial No. 316900, was discharged from the U.S. Navy Reserve under conditions other than honorable.

In 1950, Dr. Monroe was fired from his position as head of the English department of San Francisco State College for refusing to sign a loyalty oath. (The purpose of loyalty oaths is to protect the unsuspecting individual from lending his name to a Communist cause and from becoming a Communist dupe. The requirements of loyalty oaths have multiplied the obstacles to the Communists in recruiting memberships for their front organizations and maintaining discipline over fellow travelers in Government service. Few people will swear to an oath knowing it to be false and knowing that they might be liable to indictment and imprisonment for perjury. This requirement places a most difficult hurdle in front of the Communists attempting to ensnare an unsuspecting recruit into their conspiracy.)

In 1953, Dr. Albert Eason Monroe was listed as being chairman of the Federation for Repeal of the Levering Act (i.e., loyalty oaths), which was cited as being a Communist front organization by the California State Senate Committee on Education in its 1952 report to the State legislature.

5. Rev. A. A. Heist, executive director of the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU in 1952, and Dr. Monroe's predecessor. Rev. A. A. Heist was a signer of the statement to the President of the United States, defending the Communist Party (reference: Daily Worker Mar. 5, 1941). In 1952, the Reverend Heist resigned his position in the ACLU to become director of a new organization which he founded, called the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF). This organization is run by its executive secretary, Mr. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist. At a meeting of the district council of the southern California district of the Communist Party, United States of America, Dorothy Healey, well-known Communist and chairman of the district council, said, "The party preferred public protest meetings against the HCUA to be held by the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms rather than under party auspices because Communists could attend without danger of being exposed as party members." (Reference: HCUA, H. Rept. 259, Apr. 3, 1959, "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party"). The Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms was cited as being a Communist front organization by the HCUA on April 3, 1959.

The Reverend Heist stated in a speech to an audience of high school and junior college students in Pasadena that "the Constitution of the United States is outmoded, outdated, and impotent." (One of the stated goals of the ACLU is to preserve the Constitution.)

In 1948, the Reverend Heist protested the withdrawal of the use of their hall by Occidental College to an identified Communist poet, Langston Hughes, who was to speak on a poem of his entitled, "Goodbye, Christ," which called for "Christ, Jesus, Lord God Jehovah" to "beat it" and "make way

for a new guy named Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, and worker me." (Reference: Hollywood Citizen News, February 26, 1948.) This would not be a strange protest from an atheistic Communist, but when it comes from a Methodist minister?

6. Carey McWilliams, a member of the national committee of the ACLU in 1948, who now figures prominently in the affairs of the ACLU, has been identified in sworn testimony, according to Government documents, as a member of the Communist Party. Carey McWilliams has a record of over 50 Communist-front affiliations and citations. He is the editor of "Rights," the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which has been cited as a Communist front by the HCUA (November 8, 1957).

7. Prof. William A. Kilpatrick, prominent member of the ACLU on the east coast, was for many years head of Teachers College, Columbia University. In his book, "The Teacher and Society," published in 1939, Professor Kilpatrick said that "the revolution by force and violence was probably necessary in Russia, but it would not be necessary in America. Here, the same goals could be achieved by effectuating change within the framework of the Constitution."

8. William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist Party, United States of America, was a former member of the National Committee of the ACLU.

9. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, former member of the National Committee of the ACLU until 1940, is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America.

In the report on "Communist Propaganda in America" (published 1935, A.F.L.) as submitted to the State Department, U.S. Government, by William Green, the late president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green states that:

"During all the years since the establishment of the Soviet regime in Russia, propaganda in the United States has been conducted, not only through agencies directly set up by the Communist high command, but through agencies and organizations in which non-Communists of good standing and repute have been induced to participate. A careful study of these organizations show that they are so related through interlocking directorates that apparently some hundreds of organizations are dominated by an interlocking group of directors numbering not more than 60. Their tactics may perhaps be called the tactics of irritation, since their purpose is to create dissatisfaction as widely as possible and to bring into disrepute the authorities, and the established institutions of the country. As an example, the American Civil Liberties Union may be cited."

To support Mr. Green's statement of "the interlocking directorates," we discovered that when we looked at the record of the top 15 past and current leaders of the ACLU, we found that they had a combined record of over 1000 Communist front affiliations and citations.

SECTION II

What others think of the ACLU

1. Daily Worker, March 22, 1957. In reference to an ACLU meeting (New York chapter) featuring John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, "It remains an axiom of our time, that to defend the rights of Communists is to defend the rights of all Americans." (We as a nation are forced to spend $50 billion a year to defend ourselves from the Communists.)

2. California Senate Fact Finding Committee on un-American Activities, 1948 report, page 107: "The ACLU may be definitely classified as a Communist front or transmission belt organization." "At least 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who come in conflict with the law."

3. House Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, report 2290 entitled, "Investigation of Communist Propaganda": "It is quite apparent that the main function of the ACLU is to protect the Communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the U.S. Government."

4. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, special commission to investigate Communist activities: "The ACLU, with its front of respectability and with its large membership of sincere, worthy citizens, has provided important legal talent and a camouflage of decency behind which Communist forces have agitated and promoted their campaigns."

SECTION III

Odd coincidences

1. The ACLU, long an advocate of unlimited freedom of the press and freedom of speech, asked Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson to withdraw a pamphlet entitled "How To Spot a Communist," prepared by the 1st Army and used by the Watertown, Mass., arsenal (New York Times, June 12, 1955).

2. The ACLU protested the publishing by the League of Decency of a list of movies and books that the league considered to be immoral. (Reference: Daily Worker, Mar. 22, 1957). (It has long been known that one of the primary aims of the Communist Party is to subvert the morals of the American public.)

3. The ACLU, when queried by Columnist Lawrence Fertig as to why "They did not defend the most basic of all civil liberties—the right of a man to earn his living without paying tribute to any other individual or private organization" (right of work laws in various States), replied, "There are no civil liberties grounds on which such statutes should be supported," (reference: Fortnights magazine, July 1955).

4. The ACLU has voiced the opinion many times that "they welcome investigation," but they unleash their vitriolic abuse upon the American Legion and brand the American Legion as a fascist group because they not only investigated the ACLU, but have requested the HCUA every year since 1953 to investigate the ACLU.

5. The ACLU has been the recipient of numerous grants from the Garland Foundation (American Fund for Public Service) which is the notorious bankroll for Communist front organizations. The Garland Fund is characterized by the California Senate Fact Finding Commission, 1948 report, page 247, as "the source of revenue for Communist causes is generally referred to as the Garland Fund."

The Garland Fund has also been cited by the United States House Special Committee on Un-American Activities as follows: "The Garland Fund was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises," (reference: H. Rept. 1311, Mar. 9, 1944).

Among those who have served as directors of the Garland Fund and who were directly responsible for the disbursement of funds to the different Communist front organizations and who were or are now prominent members of the governing body of the ACLU are: Roger Baldwin, Harry F. Ward, William Z. Foster, Robert Morss Lovett, Morris L. Ernst, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Oswald Garrison Villard, and E. M. Borchard.

6. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist and chief hatchet man for the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms in their "Operation Abolition" program, who, so far as we know, is not even a member of the ACLU, seems to be so prominent in the affairs of the ACLU. Also, an odd coincidence that a new organization that has been formed and which calls itself the National Committee to Abolish the House un-American Activities Committee (NCAHUAC) and has eight key members in the organization that have been identified as members of the Communist Party gives its mailing address at 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles 4, Calif., which is also the mailing address of the Citizens' Committee to Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF) and that of the 12 national committee members of the NCAHUAC, eight are currently officers or executive committee members of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (interlocking directorates?).

If any ACLU spokesman charges this report is biased, our answer is that it is biased only on the side of Americanism—that its only fault for those who don't like it is its bias in favor of truth and fact. In our months of investigation we were unable to find one occasion where the ACLU committed a patriotic act; we were unable to find one occasion where the ACLU has something good to say about America. We were able, however, to find many occasions where the ACLU and its leaders had something good to say about Soviet Russia or did something that would benefit Soviet Russia.

In our opinion, the ACLU and its brother organizations have mastered the technique of Josef Goebbels and practiced by the Moscow Communists to the *n*th degree. "Tell a lie, make it big, and tell it often enough so that soon everyone will believe it." They have been spouting forth the statement that "the rights of all Americans are being threatened" so long and so hard that already everyone is looking for the Gestapo FBI, the Fascist police, the minions of that inquisition, the HCUA, behind every bush and every telephone.

Deep down in the hearts of all good Americans we know that this is a lie and if we stop and think of its source, then we can look at it in its true light.

Nicolai Lenin said, "We must build communism with non-Communist hands." Please don't let it be your hands.

A Soviet dialectician's definition of a Communist front

George Dimitrov, "Advice to the Lenin School of Political Warfare," as quoted in the report of the American Bar Association Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22, 1958, page 17719. "As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist Parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation or a retired general are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit."

These Children Love To Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on September 18 in an insertion in the Appendix I called the attention of the House to the outstanding work being accomplished in the field of education by Miss Mae Carden, of Glen Rock, N.J. Today

I am including another article about Miss Carden which was published in the September 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

As this article demonstrates, much of the work in remedial reading would not be necessary if pupils were taught properly in the first place. Miss Carden has, through Carden-trained teachers, in many of our schools, proven by actual experience the effectiveness of her teaching method.

Remedial reading can in large measure be just a palliative for a disease. It does not seek out the cause of the disease. It may be a cure, but it certainly is not a preventive. It is locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

I believe we Members of Congress can give a tremendous boost to our educational system by advocating support of the Carden method of teaching reading. In pursuit of that objective, and under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Saturday Evening Post article:

THESE CHILDREN LOVE TO READ—IN SPITE OF PROGRESSIVE OPPOSITION MISS MAE CARDEN SUCCESSFULLY TEACHES CHILDREN TO READ BY USING THE PHONETIC SYSTEM—HAS THIS OLD-FASHIONED METHOD BEEN UNNECESSARILY MALIGNED?

(By Frances V. Rummell)

Miss Mae Carden, a benign lady wearing pince-nez and the air of a tea-table grande dame, bears little outward resemblance to a lifeguard. Yet she spends her days answering unusual calls of distress. These come from people floundering in a sea of misspelled or uncomprehended words. Most are school officials who are frank enough to admit that bumbling, hit-or-miss progressive reading methods have created havoc among their pupils.

Miss Carden, a formidable scholar fortified by inherited wealth, hustles to the rescue from her Glen Rock, N.J., home in a chauffeur-driven rattletrap. Her feats as an educational trouble shooter are prodigious. Within one grueling week, working a total of 15 hours after classes, she can show an entire elementary school staff how to aid faltering readers, and more important still, how to start beginners in reading correctly.

Before tackling the pupil problem directly, the Glen Rock educator must "unteach" teachers whose college training filled their minds with unworkable notions of how reading should be taught. Her stint done, she leaves her techniques behind, and they are permanent. Still, she likes to recheck occasionally—and when she reenters a classroom, both teachers and pupils have been known to stand and applaud.

But Miss Carden's achievements arouse no applause, or anything resembling it, from the closed ranks of orthodox or "party line" educators. Most top school officials, without bothering to make any on-the-spot checkups, dismiss the results of the Carden method as fantastic and the lady herself as a sort of Baroness Munchausen.

This Miss Carden realizes. With gentle understatement—she is so modest that she refers to herself in the third person—she told me: "Miss Carden's system of teaching is considered unorthodox. But her children do learn to read. The slow child may know delay, but he need never know defeat."

Incredibly, in this confused era when some children fail to master reading at all, Carden schools normally have no nonreaders. This staggers orthodox educators whose classroom tactics have created mass reading casualties among American children. When Dr. Malcolm Robertson, then superintendent of the Morris Township, N.J., schools, told a clinic of such educators that his school pupils attained 100 percent readership during 10 years under the Carden system, they openly hooted in disbelief. Yet, as Doctor Robertson told me, "the records are open to anybody."

In another New Jersey public-school system, at Pequannock, the superintendent, Dr. Stephen Gerace, presents an even more surprising aspect. "One remarkable thing has been that we just don't have disciplinary problems any more," he says. "I assume this is because children no longer feel frustrated. Even the slow child can learn. Children with IQ's as low as 75 are able to read capably."

The reading pace in the Pequannock system, which has used the Carden method for 12 years, is such that most pupils are 2 to 3 years ahead of the national norm—a record that is about par where the Carden technique is used. Some parents have moved into the district largely to obtain this benefit for their children.

Miss Carden began her one-woman crusade to teach children to read 30 years ago in a bold revolt against progressive education. Her movement gradually spread through parent and teacher groups who rebelled against the progressive—and unproductive—reading technique, through administrators and teachers who took the Carden method into new posts, and by the superior performance of her pupils who moved into other schools.

Today the method is officially installed in 105 school systems. About 90 percent are public schools in New Jersey and New York, but others extend across the country into California. And nobody knows how many teachers use her techniques behind closed doors. In any case, all share one big headache: Coping with children transferred from other schools. Invariably they must be put back a year or two.

The massive extent of word jumbling in our average school has led the National Council of Teachers of English to term the situation chaotic and more serious each year. In city after city, surveys reveal, almost half of senior high school pupils cannot read or spell beyond fourth- or fifth-grade level. As many as 7 out of 10 young people entering college these days must be groomed in remedial reading or spelling—which is to say, taught sixth-grade work.

What, then, is the educational magic wrought by Miss Carden and a few other kindred spirits who have broken with accepted reading techniques?

Miss Carden and others like her employ the phonetic approach in teaching. They begin with the alphabet, teaching consonants, then vowels, and their sounds. As English is an alphabetical tongue, this seems sensible enough.

To the guiding lights of Teachers College at Columbia University, however, the phonetic or alphabetical approach is anathema. They virtually heaved it out some 30 years ago, as old-fashioned, in favor of the "look-say" school of teaching. This emphasizes learning whole words at a time, largely by appearance, with little attention to the alphabet and phonics.

Because Teachers College at Columbia pipes its ideas to most other teachers' colleges, professional educators throughout the Nation fell in line like so many drilling West Pointers. Phonetic teaching became almost extinct—except among a few hardy independents like Miss Carden.

The Carden method relies largely upon the technique which enabled most Americans past 40 to learn to read so effortlessly that they can't remember when they began. Although spruced up with linguistics the basic idea remains the same. From the age of two or three, youngsters of a past, luckier era used to learn "A for apple, B for boy, C for cat." They recognized individual letters and said their sounds.

"The alphabet," Miss Carden always tells her teachers, "is one of learning's great laborsaving devices. It takes the forbidding mystery out of reading."

Two criticisms most often leveled at the system are that it is "mechanical" and requires "practice"—words that are poison to many progressive educationists. Miss Carden replies with serenity: "Whether typing or using signal flags, our means of communication have been mechanical since the days of the tomtoms. And even they required practice."

Having mastered the sounds of letters and letter combinations, beginners under the Carden system hold the key for unlocking new words that they meet. As they read by turning letters into sounds, and spell by converting sounds into letters, they become as sure-footed as mountain goats on two pinnacles of learning—reading and spelling.

The big catch in applying the Carden method, especially in educationally ravaged schools, is that children should begin with it. Introduced too late, it can become as labored and mechanical as trying a new way to breathe. Approached early, the phonetic method becomes automatic, free and easy.

Miss Carden begins phonics with kindergarteners. In one of the Carden-method schools, I watched a motherly kindergarten teacher and her pupils make a game of sounding consonants. Having a grand time, they went right on to sounding the vowels in the innards of words. Then, with confidence, they analyzed them on the blackboard and pronounced them—boat, lake, nose, eat, lie. Soon these tots achieved mastery over some 500 similar one-syllable words. Best of all, there was exhilaration in their faces as they recited. Young as they were, they knew they were learning something to last the rest of their lives.

The average beginner under the method learns to read, write and spell 2,000 new words during the first year alone—which, interestingly, is what first-graders in Russia learn. While recognizing that this initial skill-building is essential to the art of reading, Miss Carden's real enthusiasm lies in ensuring comprehension, or "the intellectual character of learning."

Steadfastly she declines to permit children to be distracted by pictures. The textbooks that she designed and published at her personal expense are without any illustrations at all. By present-day florid standards they look flat. This is deliberate. "Pictures," she says, "deprive children of the joy of exercising mental imagery. Make-believe is fun. It is also revealing."

First-graders, reading in their unadorned Carden primers, "I have a pail," love to describe the kind of pail they have. One speaks up, "Mine is little and pink and has a white puppy in it." So far, so good. There is always the child who boasts alarmingly, "Mine is heavy because it is full of snakes." And I heard one child volunteer, "I don't have any pail. My big brother stole it."

Such exercise of imagination tells astute teachers much about the youngsters' emotional makeup. Yet orthodox educators are flabbergasted to see that the method is "child centered." Actually, Carden-trained teachers share an abiding respect for their pupils' desire and ability to grapple with mental work, especially word meaning. Miss Carden invites children to look behind the word. One sixth-grader observed, "I'll bet orchestra is of Greek origin." I asked him why. "Because," he said, "the Greek 'ch' is pronounced 'k.'" Checking in the dictionary, he proved he was right, and went on to list other "ch" words like Christmas and orchid. "Now that," his teacher said, "is comprehension."

By contrast, teachers using the look-say or read-at-sight method show beginners whole words, usually with pictures, and expect them to memorize the word's appear-

ance from the picture association, context, or configuration. Thus monkey ends in a letter "whose tail hangs down." As the letters "C" and "O" always represent wheels, bicycle has two "wheels." Pupils who can't remember words from one time to the next are encouraged to guess. Thus, fish becomes "whale" or "guppy"; cat dwindles to "kitty."

Primers backstop this method by teaching words through repetition, and the child reading "Oh! Oh! Oh! Tap! Tap! Tap! Rain! Rain! Rain!" usually gets the idea that it's wet outside. So much repetition becomes numbing, to be sure. Even the most loyal educationists quip about the primary teacher who wrapped her car around a telephone pole and cried, "Oh! Oh! Oh! Look! Look! Look! Damn! Damn! Damn!"

As for the alphabet and its sound equipment, the look-sayers hold that "laboring with letters" is useless for beginners. Only after children have acquired a basic sight vocabulary do their teachers introduce phonics. Then they introduce them lightly and string them out for 5 or 6 years. Thus the teachers of look-say confidently assure you that they, too, teach phonics. They do—but about as adequately as a kick in the bathtub teaches swimming.

Whatever the look-say method's shortcomings, a good many children do learn to read and spell eventually. But a disgraceful number of bright children never surmount the strained efforts to turn English, an alphabetical tongue, into a language of pictures and configurations, like Chinese. There is too little for the reasoning child to grasp and analyze and too much to confuse him. As one critic sums up, "By the time you teach him three kinds of guesses—picture clues, configuration clues and context clues—what kind of reading do you expect?"

One answer, which stunned much of the teaching fraternity, emerged from an identical spelling test given recently to pupils of a suburban Denver school and to a Carden-taught school at Garwood, N.J. The Garwood students misspelled slightly more than 7 percent of the words. The suburban-Denver pupils, taught by progressive methods, mangled an awful 63 percent.

Such comparisons obviously do not endear Miss Carden to true believers in the progressive system or to her own professional alma mater—of all places, Teachers College of Columbia University. She took her master's degree there after being graduated from Vassar. Then, after 5 years in Europe perfecting her German, French, Italian, Latin and music, this Hawaiian-born daughter of wealthy American parents returned to Columbia to work on her doctorate in education.

At that point, about thirty years ago, Teachers College handed Mae Carden a rude shock. It discarded the alphabet as representing an outmoded "individual discipline." The then-new progressive teaching stressed learning through pupils' group activities and spontaneous interest—and whoever heard of a child born with a hankering to learn the alphabet?

Miss Carden argued politely with her professors. "You would create less havoc in education," she maintained, "if you just quietly junked the musical scale or multiplication tables. Fewer children would be affected." But the Teachers College faculty brushed her aside and spread the new mode nationwide.

Dropping her studies for a Columbia doctorate—"Suddenly it seemed to be without validity," she says—Miss Carden set up her own private day school in New York City. There she organized her phonics system and wrote teachers' manuals for her faculty. Then, like William McGuffey, the Victorian creator of McGuffey's Readers, she prepared readers for every elementary grade and published them at her own expense.

Public-school teachers also sought her guidance to lead them and their pupils from the maze created by progressive reading methods. By 1949 the demand reached the point where Miss Carden closed her school and wholesaled her instruction to entire elementary-school faculties, service free, manuals at cost. Later the teachers insisted upon paying her. She fixed a charge of $15 per teacher for 15 hours, and a little more than a break-even rate on manuals.

In the widespread warring over reading instruction, those favoring Carden have been under fire persistently. Only a resolute minority of school administrators dares to approve the method openly. Most others icily reject all phonics teaching except for the watered-down minimum in the progressive system. The pattern of resistance scarcely varies from community to community. Regrettably it pits indignant parents against obstinate or evasive administrators, leaves classroom teachers humiliated and voiceless and keeps children confused and upset. Miss Carden rising above the din with patient philosophy, admits that each conflict sends her on a hat-buying spree. At least, she says, she is well-hatted.

The controversy in a small western city—let's call it Bartlett—is typical. It began when a survey showed that half of the city's high school students ranked no better than fifth-graders in reading levels. Ten percent, in fact, were down at third-grade level. Parents hit the ceiling. School officials evaded the issue. Many mothers invited Miss Carden to come and instruct them so they could teach their children reading at home.

Some 100 mothers of the community crowded into Mae Carden's course a year ago. To their amazement one lone maverick school official also appeared. An ambitious young reading supervisor, he was new to the Bartlett schools. That fact is now advanced locally to explain his tactical error in becoming a Carden enthusiast. He admitted to the mothers, "She's doing everything we say we do—and better." At his request, Miss Carden stayed on and instructed his primary teachers. The parents were jubilant.

Then without warning thunder rolled. The young supervisor reversed himself and signed a report to the Bartlett board of education terming the Carden method "rigid, authoritarian, and detrimental to children." With the board acquiescing, he directed his teachers to drop it.

The effect was to ignite community indignation. To combat this, school officials sent an S. O. S. to State teachers' colleges and rallied a battery of top reading experts. These calmly assured a mass meeting of 1,500 parents that "reading has never been better taught than it is today." More and more of the parents, taking the issue strongly, are teaching their children to read at home.

Bartlett teachers also have refused to abandon the Carden method. When I visited their city, they swore me to protective anonymity. Then they revealed that they used the method behind closed doors. Their own term is "bootleg." As one attractive bootlegger told me, How can I help it? How can you throw away spectacles you've become dependent upon?" These teachers, whose names are withheld upon request, said their reading supervisor never visited their classes nor consulted them before making his bombshell recommendation to discard the Carden method. They and many parents suspect that his superiors advised him that his earlier enthusiasm for the Carden method was a grave error.

Yet many enlightened school administrators do recognize the importance and validity of the reading crusader's technique. Miss Carden says the greatest impetus behind the spread of her movement is their resolute good will. She also points with understandable pride to the fact that no top administrator who has introduced Carden into his schools ever has dropped it. In her third-person manner of speech she adds, "Miss Carden never set out to put over a method. School people came asking for it."

By now they are asking for it so widely that Miss Carden herself cannot keep up with the demand. She has been forced to parcel out most of the country to disciples while she concentrates on putting her method into more Eastern schools.

One thing that sent the number of calls soaring was a recent hard-hitting best seller, Terman and Walcutt's "Reading: Chaos and Cure," which termed the creator of the Carden method "a genius." Demands for her services poured in from virtually every State.

What is happening in California alone reveals both the extent of the reading emergency and the power of an idea. A veteran teacher of Carden is training private-school faculties in San Mateo and Saratoga and instructing classes of administrators, parents and teachers from San Francisco, Oakland, Richmond, Albany, El Cerrito, Santa Cruz, Sacramento, and Livermore. Last year Miss Carden personally helped Berkeley schools install her method on an experimental basis. Elsewhere, many teachers dissatisfied with look-say are bootlegging Carden.

A few other effective phonics methods are furthering the revival of basic reading. The elementary schools of Washington, D.C., in introducing phonics this fall, are going to use the Phonovisual method of the famed Primary Day School at Bethesda, Md. The Spalding Method of Unified Phonics has been used for years with great success by Catholic schools in Hawaii. Another system, called Hay-Wingo, has long been popular in Illinois. Seattle public schools are observing with interest a private school's achievements with the Beacon Series of Readers. And Los Angeles last year began borrowing from several methods. Fortunately teachers can learn any of the methods in 10 to 40 hours while on the job, and most phonics manuals and wall charts are very inexpensive.

All of this is highly helpful because of a factor that aggravates our reading crisis. Today's children are exposed to mass communications from the time they first hear a radio or toddle in front of a television set, and the gap between the many words they recognize from hearing and the few they can read and spell grows fantastically wide. Often they begin school at the age of 5 or 6 with an aural or recognition vocabulary of 8,000 to 10,000 words. Consequently Miss Carden is appalled that the current first-grade primers confine themselves to a sacrosanct list of only 335 words or so.

Flinging aside such artificial restraints, she believes in letting children learn and read as much as they wish. Her second graders go through perhaps 30 books a year, including ones approved by orthodox educators. At the year's end they possess workable 5,000- to 6,000-word vocabularies—meaning they can actually use these words in reading and spelling—plus, of course, the skills to acquire almost any new word they encounter. Pupils reaching eighth grade under the Carden method are expected to command 20,000-word vocabularies—an all-but-unique goal today.

What children read is as important to Miss Carden as how they read. "If all we have to offer children is repetitive, tasteless trivia, why bother to teach the skill?" she comments. To challenge children to stretch their minds, she introduces imperishable children's classics, beginning with Beatrix Potter's "Peter Rabbit" in the first grade. Older children read Tennyson, Mark Twain, Dickens, and Robert Louis Stevenson in the original versions. Librarians in Carden communities report that their young clients

more than triple their reading volume after Miss Carden calls at their school. What impresses the librarians most is the quality of the children's selections.

In writing, Carden pupils are as much ahead of the look-say, or progressive, products as in reading. Where many schools instruct in reading and writing separately, Carden schools teach them simultaneously. As their pupils read early, this means that they also write early. Even second-graders often dash off letter-perfect compositions. I tested this myself by proposing that students in a second grade write about a cat. Here, flawlessly spelled and aptly phrased, is one story:

"Nancy's cat is naughty and destructive. Monday he broke my mother's vase of flowers. Tuesday he cut Nancy badly. Wednesday he scratched a little girl. Thursday, as Nancy was walking home from school, he scared her. Friday he hopped up on a table and knocked over a little basket of apples. Saturday he messed up the house."

Later I dictated the same story to a university sophomore, the hapless product of look-say and college remedial English. He misspelled naughty (nauty), vase (vace), scared (scarred) and hopped (hoped). While his errors may not be earth-shaking, certainly my young university friend is not at ease with his mother tongue. From kindness I refrained from telling him that he spelled worse than a second-grader. But somewhere along his way through life the sad fact that he has been educationally betrayed will catch up with him. Then perhaps he'll wish he'd had a date with Miss Carden.

Negotiations With Outlaws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, negotiating with international outlaws and gangsters is the easiest road to war and destruction of our civilization. It is the quickest way to lose our remaining respect and prestige around the world.

The following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal, September 14:

SUING FOR PEACE

When President Kennedy met Premier Khrushchev in June, it could hardly be called a summit conference in the usual sense of a big power bargaining session. As both men have indicated, it was little more than an attempt to size each other up. From the U.S. viewpoint, the meeting could certainly be justified on that basis.

Now, though, there is increasing talk of, and increasing pressure for, a summit presumably designed to resolve such dangerous questions as Berlin and the nuclear arms race. The leftist-inclined neutralists Sukarno, of Indonesia, and Keita, of Mali, have just been appealing to Mr. Kennedy to undertake such a meeting. Already speculation is rife as to whether Britain's Macmillan and France's De Gaulle would be included in any such session. The U.S. Government at the moment seems disinclined to be stampeded into the thing, but it has been pressured before.

Surely all this is way off base. To see why, it is necessary only to recall briefly just what we are up against. Khrushchev is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin. He has resumed nuclear tests partly to apply terrorism to that end, and partly out of what he considers his own military necessities. Negotiations are unlikely to deflect him from either course, for he has made it abundantly plain that he has no interest in real negotiations but only in extorting settlements on his terms.

Indeed, going through the motions of negotiation can serve Khrushchev's purposes, and is as intended; to the Soviets, "negotiation" is a means of waging the struggle, not of trying to end it. In the foreign ministers' conference on Berlin 2 years ago, the West finally did offer a series of concessions—not enough to satisfy Khrushchev, but enough to indicate the dangers of negotiations. And it is now clear how the latter stages of the test-ban talks were used to stall the West so that the Soviets could make their elaborate secret preparations for the current series of nuclear explosions.

Obviously, then, the United States should be wary of negotiations at any level, foreign ministers or summit or whatever. In addition, there is a further important consideration: This incessant talk in the West about negotiation, even about being the first to propose negotiation to the Kremlin, throws the whole picture out of kilter and tends to weaken the appearance of the allied position.

It is one thing to be prepared to listen to anything Khrushchev may want to say, in the improbable event he should have anything to say worth hearing, and we can certainly do that without a summit; in today's circumstances a summit is about the last kind of conference anyone should be thinking about. But what is needed more than communication is more iron in the Western spine, iron that shows in our whole attitude rather than just displays of increased military power.

We have seen again, in the scared-rabbit reaction of the Belgrade conference of neutralists, how much headway we are making with world opinion. We have seen, over too many dismal years, just how useful it is to negotiate with the Soviets.

Khrushchev, after all, is the criminal of the world, not the West. Khrushchev is the potential murderer of peace. Khrushchev and Khrushchev alone hangs the pall of nuclear war over the globe. If the barbarian wants to sue for peace at the bar of civilization, let him do so. It is not befitting the strength of the Western position, it is not befitting the dignity of the defenders of civilization, to appeal to the outlaw to be good.

The Bell Versus the Wall: A South Bend Tribune Editorial on Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inspiring editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of September 16, 1961, entitled, "The Bell Versus the Wall," concerning Constitution Week which is being celebrated this week:

THE BELL VERSUS THE WALL

In Berlin, there's a wall.

In Philadelphia, there's an old, cracked bell.

Five weeks ago tomorrow in Berlin, Russian and East German troops began putting up the barricades that sealed off one of the last escape hatches for the half of the globe where men live in slavery.

One hundred and seventy-four years ago tomorrow in Philadelphia, where the cracked bell is now enshrined, a group of determined men signed a document so enduring that it still is an unparalleled symbol of freedom for all men, including those men the Berlin barricades were built to contain.

The document was the U.S. Constitution.

Under a congressional resolution adopted in 1956, tomorrow will be observed throughout the United States as Constitution Day, and the rest of the week as Constitution Week.

In this country, men and women with the image of Berlin's barbed wire still in their eyes and the echo of Russian nuclear bomb tests still in their ears can well afford to pause for a moment from the urgencies of the hour to remember that the piece of paper signed in Philadelphia is a stronger force than all the barbed wire and barricades that ever have been erected—or ever will be.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights are our ultimate answer to the bellowings and rocket rattlings of totalitarian leaders. And they know it as well as we do.

If they didn't, there would be no barricades in Berlin.

Washington's Farm Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, this year, while the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Committee on Agriculture was holding hearings on H.R. 4510, the feed grains bill, I engaged the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman in colloquy. That colloquy was to the effect that the Secretary's proposals, contained in the bill, would not cure present surplus problems in feed grains, in effect, probably would cause others, notably in soy beans.

Later in the year, April 25, and after the emergency feed grains bill had been passed, I again engaged the Secretary in brief debate as part of a full committee hearing on the omnibus farm bill, H.R. 6400. In this debate, I warned the Secretary that his obtaining passage of the feed grains bill, and subsequent dumping of grain on the market to force compliance with it, could encourage hog production. So that next year the hog producers were going to come to Congress and say, "Mr. Secretary, we are in trouble. We want you to help us out in the hog business."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that at least in their major portions, my predictions are seemingly coming true. In evidence, I offer this editorial comment from the Wednesday, September 20, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

WASHINGTON'S FARM WONDERLAND

The wonders of the administration's new farm program are beginning to unfold. And to at least some farmers it undoubtedly does seem like a wonderful racket.

To wit: With mandatory acreage reductions for corn and other feed grains, Secretary Freeman figured this year's output at around 125 million tons, down from about

156 million tons last year. Since that would be less than demand, the Government could make up the difference from its bundle of surplus feed grains, estimated at 75 million tons, and thus finally make a dent in the mountainous excess.

Unfortunately for Mr. Freeman, good weather and farmer ingenuity are conspiring to boost yields perhaps as much as they would have been without the acreage cuts. Hence it looks as though the $750 million he—that is, the taxpayer—is paying farmers to reduce acreage of corn and sorghum grains will be for nothing.

So far, it's a fairly familiar tale of nature and human nature outwitting the farm experts in Washington, but that's not all. With some groggy notion of further stabilizing prices, the Department is offering surplus corn at the market price, which has been around $1.04 a bushel, while the price-prop payment is $1.20 a bushel.

This means the farmer can put practically his whole corn crop into the Government bins at the higher price and buy Government surplus corn at the lower price. You can't hardly beat that.

Oh yes—a couple of other interesting little ramifications. The cheap corn for the farmer may well lead to a new glut in hog production with the possibility of a big slump in livestock prices.

And already the abundance of cheap feed is causing cows to turn out more milk—now about 5 percent more than the record output of a year ago. Since the public couldn't drink all that without floating away, more and more milk is going into butter and cheese which are going into (three guesses) the Government surpluses. Just from last April the Government bought 189 million pounds of butter, compared with 82 million pounds in the like previous period, and 63 million pounds of cheese, compared with only 165,000 pounds in the previous period.

So you can readily see how wonderful it is when our masters in Washington start stabilizing things and getting them all straightened out for us incompetent citizens.

Flynn Rates High Among Former Northeast Ring Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article about Mr. Arthur Flynn, a resident of my home city of Lawrence, Mass., who was an outstanding boxer for a number of years:

FLYNN RATES HIGH AMONG FORMER NORTHEAST RING STARS

(By Peter J. Regan)

Arthur Flynn is a product of the old Shanty Pond district of South Lawrence. He grew up in a neighborhood where boxing gloves were part of every kid's standard equipment and where smokers with assorted types of boxing exhibitions were staged regularly in halls and church auditoriums and other gathering places where there was room enough to erect a ring.

As a kid at Lawrence High School, Arthur Flynn became an active amateur boxer. This was an era not long after World War I. The boxing craze was sweeping the Greater Lawrence community, what with the sensational comeback in the immediate past of that great Yankee Division favorite, Tommy "Kloby" Corcoran. Consequently, there were impromptu boxing bouts nightly in backyards, haylofts, and under street lights. Boxing gloves took top priority over baseball mitts in those days. Week in and week out the Buffalo Club amateur bouts played to capacity audiences of the Old Winter Garden on Essex Street and what with the abundance of gyms everywhere and numerous boxing clubs scattered throughout the State, much talent was developed.

Whereas today's professional boxer enters the ring with little or no previous experience, the boxer of the twenties was an experienced campaigner when he entered the pro ranks, very often having 100 or more bouts with capable opponents.

RECORD RARELY TOPPED

Flynn established a record in the amateur boxing circles that is rarely topped. While a high school student he won every amateur middleweight boxing championship on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, including the New England title twice and the national championship and the Pan American title in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Included in his long line of victories were wins over the Junior National, Canadian National (twice), Middle Atlantic States, New York golden gloves, and the National Intercollegiate champions.

Of the 91 amateur bouts Flynn participated in, he won 90. And while still a student at Lawrence High School and before turning professional, he acted as a sparring partner for Gene Tunney in Stroudsburg, Pa., while Tunny was training for his first bout with Jack Dempsey.

Flynn turned pro in the fall of 1926 under the management of William "Tee Hee" McDonough. He hadn't yet finished high school so he boxed in and around New England. In the spring of 1927 he left high school again to work as a sparring partner for Jack Delaney, who was training in Meredith Neck, N.H., for his bout in the Polo Grounds with Paolino Uzcundun. That summer Flynn received his high school diploma, then he traveled to New York with McDonough to set up camp in New York City.

Under the guidance of Billy Duffy, one of the top boxing figures in the country at that time, Arthur boxed almost on a weekly basis in the leading cities of the country. After a period he returned to Lawrence and on a straight, friendly business deal, McDonough sold his contract to Big Dan Carroll. For the next 4 or 5 years Flynn boxed as a professional around the New England States with occasional trips to Philadelphia, New Jersey, and other such spots.

In his professional career, Flynn took part in approximately 55 to 60 bouts and at different times held the New England middleweight and light-heavyweight titles. He boxed the top notchers in his divisions including such men as Dave Shade, Ace Hudkins, Tuffy Griffiths, Jack McVey, Lou Scozza, Nando Tassi, to mention a few.

They used to say that Flynn boxed every "gorilla" in his divisions, and Dave Egan the late sports columnist of the Boston Daily Record once wrote that Dan Carroll matched Flynn as though he were "mad" at him.

Nonetheless, Flynn wound up his career with a record near perfect. In his last appearance in North Adams against that murderous puncher of that era, Wild Willie Oster, of Chicago, Flynn scored a win. Oster was flat on his back in the 10th round, and the bell sounded at the count of seven, so it was recorded as a decision for Flynn.

BOUT SINGLED OUT

For many years the programs in the Boston Garden singled out Flynns' bout with a belter from Binghamton, N.Y., named Joe Zelinski, as the most sensational fight staged in the Garden.

During those days when Flynn and Andy Callahan would box in the Garden, trainloads of Greater Lawrence rooters would leave the old South Lawrence depot in masses to cheer on their local favorites. And the night of the Flynn-Zelinski bout, which was one-half of the double windup which saw Andy Callahan and Bruce Flowers in the other half, the Boston Garden almost had Lawrencians hanging from the rafters.

Jack Sharkey was at ringside, and Flynn had just returned from the Gus Wilson training camp with him where he had acted as a sparring partner for Sharkey when the latter was training for Tommy Loughran. Consequently, a warm friendship had developed between the two, and at the height of the excitement Sharkey almost leaped into the ring to root Flynn in during the heat of one of the toughest bouts ever staged. With the bout going nip and tuck for five rounds, Flynn finally kayoed Zelinski in the sixth.

Flynn attended Boston University for 3 years and Tufts College Medical School for 1 year. Lack of finances at that time compelled him to give up a potential medical career. While in college, Flynn became a professional wrestler in order to help pay his way, and over a long period of time he took part in more than 1,000 wrestling bouts.

Who Is Afraid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the September 10 issue of the Sunday New Ulm (Minn.) Review-Journal appears an editorial written by Walter K. Mickelsen commenting on Russia. Mr. Mickelsen points out very forcefully the fallacy of believing that Russia is ahead of the United States in agricultural production, industrial production or military preparedness. Most important, he states clearly and without apology exactly the course we Americans must follow in the trying times ahead.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHO IS AFRAID OF THE BIG BLACK BEAR?

Cartoonists have pictured Russia as the big bear which walks on its hind legs. Khrushchev has often been pictured with the claws and teeth of a big black bear. He doesn't object to this caricature because he realizes people generally are afraid of the big black bear.

Who in America is afraid of the big black bear?

Certainly not the American people. Every poll which has been taken shows that the American people are less fearful of Russia than are our Congressmen and Senators.

They are far more courageous than our national leaders as well as those who write books called "Profiles in Courage." Some of our leaders are saying they would rather "be Red than dead" as if they have such a choice.

The American people would rather be dead than Red and they have the courage to know they don't have to be either.

Americans generally know we cannot continue backing up and backing down. They are through fighting retreating operations as we have been doing in Yalta—in Korea—in Laos—in Africa—and in Berlin.

They have the courage to know that we have to stand up for the rights of all people or face the defeat of self-government all over the world.

The time has come when we just have to quit this business of first shaking our fist and then shaking our finger—and then surrendering the position of free people everywhere.

The time has come to make a stand—and God helping us—true lovers of freedom can do nothing else.

This brings us to the next question.

Just what have we to fear of the big black bear? He growls and threatens and blusters as puglies have done all down history.

Hitler tried it and succeeded—for a time—when he had infinitely more behind him than Khrushchev has ever had. He succeeded for a time and if Britain and France had called his bluff when he marched into Austria the world would have been spared a blood bath. We let him frighten everyone until it took most of the world to stop him in World War II.

What is there to Khrushchev's threat to frighten anyone?

Walk down the streets of Moscow or Leningrad or any Russian city and you get the impression of the way America must have looked back in 1950.

The people are poorly clad and wretchedly housed. Women have to do the heavy work because Russia lost 20 million people in 2 devastating wars.

When we look over the vast area of Russia we assume it is composed of productive agricultural land like our own country. Yet five-sixths of Russia is not agriculturally productive. It never has been and never will be.

One more important fact to remember is that almost all the settled areas of Russia lie north of the latitude running through Quebec. Moscow is as far north as the lower end of Hudson Bay in Canada and Leningrad has the same latitude as southern Alaska but without the warm Japanese ocean current. Less than one-sixth of Russian land is arable and forests cover one-third of that. There is no area in all of Russia which can compare with the Corn Belt in the United States.

Russia's basic, unsolvable problem is that almost nowhere is there combined in one place the three necessary ingredients of successful farming—fertile land, enough rain, enough warm weather.

Besides all this Russia's farm methods are primitive. It takes more than half of Russia's entire population to grow its foodstuffs. In the United States it takes only 6 percent of our population—leaving 94 percent free for other activity.

Yes, but what about industrial production? Again we are letting growth statistics brainwash us. Russia's industrial production is increasing at a rate of 10 percent a year while ours gains only 3 percent. It all depends upon the starting point. Ten percent of 10 is 1 percent while 3 percent of 100 may be 3 times as fast.

Steel, oil, hydroelectric power are the basic ingredients of industrial and war production. In all three Russia has just one-third of our production.

Machine tools and precision tools are vital in times of war. Russia is frightfully short of both.

Yes, but what about Russia's war machine and missiles? It is true that Russia has concentrated all their efforts on a huge war machine. She has concentrated upon missiles, rockets, and satellites. They have superior thrust to put machines in the air, but even when she knew our U–2 planes were flying over Russia for months, they could not do a thing to stop them.

No war—in spite of the fearmongers—is going to be won by nuclear blasts alone and Russia knows with our containing bombing fields and Polaris-type ships we can deliver as good or better than we get.

Let's not be frightened by the Red empire either. In many ways the Red empire is more of a liability than an asset. It is made up of approximately 100 million captive peoples. Included are 17 million East Germans, 27 million Poles, 10 million Hungarians, 12 million Czechs, 16 million Rumanians, 7 million Bulgarians, and 6 million Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians who have fierce nationalisms of their own and are tied by history, culture, and religion closer to Western Europe than to Russia. Would Russia trust them with guns to march upon the West? Or would these people use these guns to shoot their puppet leaders and the Russians?

Also—what about Russia itself? Out of the 200 million people in Russia, 90 million are non-Russians. Twenty years ago millions of these people welcomed Hitler's soldiers as liberators and would have fought with Germany except for Hitler's stupidity and brutality toward them. It is quite apparent that Khrushchev has his hands full at home just controlling his people and his slave satellites.

Is Khrushchev planning for war? No. Not at this point. What he is trying to do is to frighten Americans and the people of the West with his threat of bombs and missiles.

He is trying to take the pot with a pair of deuces with nothing wild but Khrushchev.

No, our danger is not war and there is little danger of our being destroyed by war.

Our greatest danger is that we will be frightened by Russia's threats and alarmist talk and our fearful leaders will negotiate us into a false peace of compromise and defeat such as we have suffered from Yalta down through Korea, Laos and down to date.

America has but one honorable course to follow and that is to stand firm and quit backing up. If we do not stand for a principle we will have to stand for everything, everywhere.

We don't want war but we won't be bluffed into a dishonorable, false peace either.

Nearly a half century ago Theodore Roosevelt said it and it is true right down to today. Roosevelt said:

"Only those are fit to live who do not fear to die."

W. K. M.

Sousa's Marches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been fearful that a trend would develop to discredit or ignore the great music of John Philip Sousa. The following editorial indicates and warns of a beginning. I hope it will not become general. John Philip Sousa and his music is just as American as the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Fourth of July.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial is very timely and appeared in the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C., September 12:

IMAGINE BANDS NOT PLAYING ANY OF SOUSA

Attention, band directors in high schools and colleges from Maine to Miami, and from Hilton Head to Caesar's Head. Attention, youthful trumpet and sliphorn players, glockenspiel tappers, bass drum boomers, clarinet tweeters and Sousaphone oomphers.

South Illinois University's 120-piece marching band has announced that it will have no more "Sousa stuff" in its band exhibitions this coming school year.

Donald Canedy, director of the big Marching Salukis outfit, which has a full wardrobe of fancy uniforms, hats, equipments, as well as instruments, announced the other day:

"There will be no more John Philip Sousa stuff. We want strictly a big, open stage band. The entire ensemble effect will be more top, more middle and more botton. It's going to knock people out."

Mr. Canedy evidently knows what he wants. His band will play for many special events, including a half-time show during the Chicago Bears professional game in the Windy City. He no doubt has his music lined up and the drum majorettes all geared up for fancy strutting.

But no more Sousa, no more "Stars and Stripes Forever," no more "Semper Fidelis," "King Cotton March," "The Thunderer," "Washington Post March" and all the other foot-tingling, heart-warming, wonderful marches that have set the world parading for scores of years.

How could Anderson's bands, or any others in this favored area, work up musical perspiration without bearing down on "Stars and Stripes" or another big number by the late great bandmaster?

No more Sousa? One might as well say no more Fourth of July, no more Santa Claus, no more Carolina-Clemson game.

Utopia Is Not in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in honoring Constitution Week, September 17 to 23, the Enterprise Newspapers serving southeastern Los Angeles County have performed an excellent public service in editorially calling attention to the fact the U.S. Constitution still remains the hope and safeguard for Americans living on a troubled planet. The editorial, written by Mr. Ray Ross, is as follows:

UTOPIA IS NOT IN SIGHT

(By Ray Ross)

It is fitting and proper that this country pay tribute to the Constitution which gives us the basic rights and freedoms that set us apart from other nations of the world.

In spite of the fact that the Federal Constitution has been criticized as outmoded, and some claim that it has become passe in the development of modern ideology, no other nation has developed a document which gives more individual freedom and at the same time binds individuals together in the pursuit of happiness.

Yet there are those who say we should be relinquish our liberties and transfer our sovereignty to a world government under which all men would be free.

We admit that it would be a marvelous achievement for individuals of all nations of the world to have the individual freedoms we enjoy, but the time is not yet ripe for this to take place.

Surrendering our constitutional rights at this time would mean that Soviet Russia would have as much to say about our in-

dividual freedoms as would our own country, and at the same time, surrendering our freedoms would not grant individual liberties in the Soviet Union. By no form of idealized rationalization can there be a communism of freedoms. Tyranny and freedom will not mix.

Working toward world peace and freedom on a supranational basis, within the framework of our Constitution, is noble. But to surrender one iota of individual liberty would be a step backward, not forward.

The time may come when we can surrender our sovereignty to a world government, but that time will not arrive until all the major powers of the world have constitutions that equal or better our own constitution.

Such a utopia is not within sight. Until that utopia arrives, may Almighty God grant us the grace and may our U.S. Constitution grant us the rights, to retain the individual liberties we enjoy during Constitution Week, September 17 to 23, 1961.

New Judge Made His Mark in High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished resident of my district, Judge Anthony T. Augelli, was this week confirmed by the U.S. Senate in his appointment as a member of the U.S. district court in New Jersey. The appointment by the President of the United States of this outstanding member of the New Jersey bar was in the best tradition of this high court.

He is not only an extremely able attorney of many years' experience, but he is a man who has the highest regard for the law and a deep understanding of human problems.

I respectfully request that an article which appeared in the Jersey Journal, a newspaper in my district, be included as part of my remarks:

NEW JUDGE MADE HIS MARK IN HIGH COURT

Anthony T. Augelli might be found at his office at any hour of the day or night preparing a case for a client.

"He just keeps going," said a coworker, "and he expects everyone around him to do the same."

Augelli has shown this devotion to his work since his admission to the bar.

He is expected to show the same dedication as a U.S. district judge for New Jersey. He was named to the post last week by President Kennedy.

Nominally a Democrat, Augelli has not been very active in politics. One associate says the only thing he's ever campaigned for was the St. Aloysius Academy building fund. The campaign was a success and the new academy in Jersey City is now in use. Augelli's youngest child, 14-year-old Patricia, is a student at the school.

Augelli's chief relaxation is golf. He sometimes takes a weekday afternoon off to play with his law partners and other friends. He is usually working on the weekends.

Augelli joined the law firm of former U.S. Senator John Milton in the early 1930's after his graduation from New Jersey Law School.

Five years later, Augelli became a partner in the firm, now Milton, Augelli & Kane, with offices at 40 Journal Square. Members of the firm argue cases in all Federal courts, and Augelli has been before the U.S. Supreme Court several times.

It was these appearances before the High Court, in part, that caused one Washington personality to say Augelli was of "Supreme Court caliber."

Augelli is a member of the Hudson County Park Commission. He belongs to several bar associations, the Jersey City Elks Club, and the Carteret Club.

A native of Italy, Augelli arrived in the United States at the age of 1 with his parents. He has lived in Jersey City since then.

He married the former Mary Carroll, of Jersey City. The family now lives at 104 Kensington Avenue.

Besides Patricia, the Augelli children are Kathleen, a North Bergen school teacher, and the twins, Robert and Marie. Robert is a Navy ensign serving aboard the aircraft carrier *Independence*. Marie begins nurse training this fall.

Prince Edward Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 17, the Prince Edward School Foundation dedicated the Prince Edward Academy. This represents a great milestone in the fight of the white people of Prince Edward County to preserve liberty, freedom, and constitutional government in America. They have been waging this fight over many years in spite of many obstacles and, ofttimes, almost alone. I commend them for their determination to preserve for themselves the right to choose their associates and to educate their children as they deem best. They have made a gallant fight and in my opinion, victory is theirs. They have been successful because they were willing to sacrifice, to work hard, and to follow in the footsteps of our Founding Fathers who were willing to sacrifice for the things they knew to be right and in which they believed.

I am fearful that the majority of the people of Virginia fail to realize the importance of the efforts that have been expended by the white people of Prince Edward County nor do they realize the opposition and obstacles that they have faced and finally overcome. I commend these people. I stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

I attended the exercises Sunday and heard the wonderful address of the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, of Richmond, Va., when he expounded high principles and concepts of constitutional government, individual freedom, and liberty. Mr. Andrews is a noble Virginian and an outstanding American. I commend him for the great work he is doing in trying to bring home to the American people the evils of socialistic government and the necessity of maintaining constitutional government in America if we are to preserve our heritage as well as our liberties and freedoms.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the splendid address of the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, which he delivered at the dedication exercises of the Prince Edward Academy this past Sunday, September 17, 1961:

THE MEANING OF PRINCE EDWARD ACADEMY

(Address by T. Coleman Andrews)

This is a historic moment, marking, as it does, the dedication of a school that has been founded upon the solid rock of man's inalienable right to be the sole judge of the environment in which his children will be prepared to use wisely the privileges of freedom and discharge fully the responsibilities that those privileges inescapably impose.

This is a christening, so to speak, of a physical monument to a decade of uncompromising resistance of all efforts to take away that right of unflinching devotion to the conviction that life is not so dear nor peace so sweet, to the people of Prince Edward County, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery.

It is a real honor, therefore, to have been chosen to make the address of dedication on this inspiring occasion.

I say that this is a historic moment. This beautiful building, swelling so with promise, holds for me, as I know it must for you, many meanings:

It is the symbol of a significant victory over the evil of potential, if not actual, tyranny.

It is physical proof that a high sense of principle burns as strongly in you as it did in your forefathers.

It is, as it shall remain, a symbol of events that banded you together as you have not been banded for 100 years.

It is, in fact, a memorial to victory, and to a level of courage that all too often in recent years has been lacking in some who have had the greatest obligation to show it.

Look about you; see what the hands of love, of courage, of devotion have wrought. Look deeper; see what the hands and minds of dedicated teachers give promise of working. Look still deeper; see the spiritual thing you have done for yourselves, for your State, and for your Nation.

You gentle people of Prince Edward stood down the tyrant.

Here, in dedication, is the physical manifestation of your victory.

I say victory, for it is victory; what you sought is what you have: Your school for your children. And no living person, nor government, nor any Meddlesome Nettie of whatever sort, can tell you how to operate it. That is your victory. What was not, now is; you made it so. And I am grateful and proud that you have allowed me to share with you this moment of triumph.

I remember—as I'm sure you remember—that day it all began. Ten years ago your community was chosen to be the crucible in which the strength of our Nation was to be tested. Three years later, in 1954, the fire was stoked and the blow struck. It was a cruel blow, aimed at destroying your culture, at expurgating your mind, at uprooting your deepest convictions. You were struck a blow aimed, really, at changing you from what you had been into something you would not be.

During the ensuing years you fought back with single-minded purpose. There has been no time for reverie. Consequently, it would be surprising if the full significance of the attack has yet come home to you. A man in the trenches thinks only of the fight at hand.

If that be so, my presence here today should serve a constructive purpose. I should do my best, it seems to me, to com-

plete the picture—to lay bare the motives and the methods of those who struck you. I should try to help you to understand that what has happened here in Prince Edward—for all its critical significance for you—is but an element of a grand design. Those who would change your method of schooling your children would also change you totally. They also would change our Nation, totally. They are at work on a thousand fronts, not one.

Now, why was Prince Edward struck? Of all America, why was this quiet rural community singled out? Who did it? What was the motive for the attack?

Part of the answer is simple.

Prince Edward was deliberately chosen because of its superficial appearance. You are a peaceful people, with a patina of culture more than two centuries old. You are neither rich nor poor, nor any special thing except Virginians; you are as normally American as Indian summer, given to churchgoing, bill paying, good works, baby raising, and with something more than passing interest in the price of dark tobacco.

That is why Prince Edward was chosen. For a number of reasons, the prosecutors believed you could be had. They thought you were sleeping. So they tried to put their hand in your pocket.

That was their first mistake.

Had they asked me for an opinion, I would have warned against it. I would have reminded them that the quiet people of Prince Edward are the spiritual descendants of Patrick Henry. I would have told them that the twin marks of Patrick Henry's character—love of liberty and love of learning—are embedded in Prince Edward as deep as thought itself; that it was America's legendary Red Head, no other, who served as a founder of the first magnificent school—Hampden-Sydney—to grace your land.

After Henry, I would have said, came another, a gangling man with a strident voice and of certain convictions on the worth of liberty. His name was John Randolph.

No other community in America, I would have concluded—had I been asked—no other American community the size of tiny Prince Edward, has known two such founding fathers.

Did the transgressors forget? Did they forget your spiritual beginnings? Or did they, in their overweening arrogance, even know, or knowing, care? Did they really believe you are weaklings? Did they really think they could break your spirit? They must have. As I say, that was their first mistake.

In any event, this, your appearance of being malleable, is the reason your county was chosen, of all America, to be the crucible in which the character of our kind was to be tested. Conditions, from their point of view, were just right. So, they struck.

For America's sake, I say they could not have made a better choice—nor a greater mistake. For what they tested, they now know, was not a weakling but a Southside-Virginia Tartar, Lord love us, one of no mean metal. Now, 10 years after, your fight is won. There stands your school.

The second part of my thesis—Who struck Prince Edwards?—is more complex. Go back with me a bit in time. Nearly 30 years ago, there was turned loose in this country an evil so gross, so deeply dyed, as to exceed the understanding of the normal workaday man.

Its root in in communism. But it was not communism, per se, that struck Prince Edwards. Rather, it was a two-headed relative of this worldwide conspiracy; and unless this conspiracy is understood—and being understood, routed out—it will devour us, all of us.

These twin evils—as communism itself—were born in Europe; and they have been injected into our lives with malice aforethought. I speak of the Freudian ethic and Fabian socialism. The first embodies the philosophy, the other the method, of those who struck Prince Edward.

Let's look at these evils one at a time, but in reverse order. Fabian socialism has as its proclaimed end the precise design Karl Marx conceived for communism—destruction of the rights of the individual. Fabianism is not new; it was born in England more than 70 years ago. Its prophets were George Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells. In speaking of the ends sought by the Fabians, Shaw said they meant "to put an end of capitalism by developing the communistic side of our civilization until communism became the dominant principle in society." That is about as plain as anyone could put it, I'd say.

Those who oppose communism are accused of equating that evil with socialism. We do, indeed, for communism and socialism have a common objective—enslavement of man to the state. Isn't that what Shaw and Wells proclaimed?

The only material difference between Fabian socialism and Marxian socialism lies in their methods of operation. Whereas Marx would bring his ideas into being by every conceivable means—principally through violence and bloodletting—the Fabians chose stealth and the theory of gradualism as their modus operandi. Force, with them, is a last resort. They much prefer to skulk.

The Fabian plan of operation calls for infiltration of existing organizations. Once inside, and under the cover of anonymity, they seek, first, to rot, then to destroy. They are from the Trojan horse of communism.

Specifically, their plan is to change our land, inch by inch, little by little, without our appreciating the change—as the drip, drip, drip of water erodes away stone. Then, at long last, when they have brought America to the brink—when there is little difference between our way of life and textbook socialism—then, they hope, we won't consider the difference worth fighting for and we will just roll over and die.

Fabians remind me of nothing so much as a night prowler in a chicken roost. The thief quietly grabs the birds, one by one, tucks the head of each under its wing, and, without a peep from his victim, drops it in his bag—so quietly, in fact, that the hen on the next perch doesn't even know danger is present. Only occasionally does the sneak make the mistake of fingering some doughty, baleful-eyed, old rooster. When he does—forgive the expression—all hell breaks loose.

Today, after 30 years, the Fabians are in every coop we have, and their progress, inch by inch, has been phenomenal. They are in our political parties, they serve as justices of our courts, as voices from our pulpits; they are in our Congress, in our executive branch, in our educational media, in our schools, and in our newspapers and periodicals. In recent days, they have begun the muzzling and "take over" of our Armed Forces—historically the critical phase before the establishment of absolute dictatorship.

Even forest rangers now are forbidden to express patriotic disapproval of communism, lest they cause "alienation of groups or individuals." Alienation from whom, the Constitution-haters who are trying to deliver us into the hands of the Communists?

The Fabians are everywhere. Really. And our laws—those passed by Congress and those proclaimed by the courts—reflect their convictions. One by one, our liberties are being dropped into their bag.

Remember, these men are not necessarily card-carrying Communists. But I hasten to add that neither are they, by my definition, card-carrying Americans. Rather, they are tunnel-visioned people who mean to destroy through stealth the system of government so eloquently, so forcefully, so effectively established for us by the likes of Prince Edward's great men, Patrick Henry, and John Randolph.

Fabians deny their motives, as they deny their ends. Cynically, they proclaim their "Americanism" as they proclaim their allegiance to our flag and to the Republic for which it stands, all the while seeking to destroy our country and our spirituality.

The Fabian Socialists, then, are the people who are destroying the right of self-determination that the Constitution guarantees to you. They hold that the Constitution is outmoded and just so much paper. Their reason for being—their mission in life—is to whittle the Constitution away to nothingness. We must admit, I'm sorry to say, that their score up to now is an alarming one. Calculated subversion and stealthy attrition are powerful weapons against trusting and unsuspecting victims.

And who'll run things after all the common folk have been measured for their yoke of tyranny? Why, the Fabians, of course. They believe that government can manage your affairs better than you can—as long as they are the exclusive governing class. But perhaps there is some consolation for the rest of us in the fact that they apparently have forgotten what happened to Norway's Quisling.

I for one am sick of such people making me do things they say are good for me; and I mean to stand up—as you stood up—and say so. What's more, I shall do every legal thing that comes to hand to make them stop meddling in my private life. I shall fight for the rest of my days to thwart their schemes to deliver my children and grandchildren into bondage.

Are the Fabians sincere? Yes, they are. How, then, do they become convinced of the rightness of their cause, their night prowling? How can they justify attempting to destroy Prince Edward County? How can intelligent Americans justify selling out their Nation, bit by bit, changing the noble concepts we have known into something that approaches the amoral precepts of savages? How do they win so many converts to their cult without ever speaking the words, Fabian or Socialist?

The answer to that question has to do with the other head of their monster, something known to sociologists as the Freudian ethic.

The father of this deformed set was a medical man of sorts whose name was Sigmund Freud. He conceived his idea not long after the Fabians began to function. And because Freud's philosophy dovetails with the ends and methods of the Fabians, it was natural that Freud's followers should become Fabians, and vice versa. To repeat, one espouses the philosophy to justify socialism, while the other is full of the method of obtaining that end.

I shall not try to describe Freud's philosophy. It is enough for our purpose to understand its distilled meaning. Man, Freud contended, is born to a hostile world, against which, as an individual, he cannot successfully compete. Since man does not ask to be brought here, society, therefore, owes him the difference between his capabilities and his needs.

Think about that for a moment. Freud says, in effect, you and I are not capable of taking care of ourselves; therefore, somebody else must take care of us.

Who? Who is going to do it? You? Are you going to take care of me? How can you, if you are not competent to take care of yourself?

Freudians answer this question with an even fuzzier argument. They say that "society" should take care of the incompetents. And who is society? Why, everybody, of course. And who the incompetents? Well, by their own definition, everybody, since we all have been born to the same hostile world. So they would have incompetents taking care of incompetents, the blind leading the blind.

You think that reasoning insane? Does it sound like a fiat the mayor of Gotham might have issued? Whatever it sounds like, it is the reasoning behind the Freudian ethic.

It is, in like manner—if you have ever wondered—the motivating philosophy behind the do-gooder programs: the reasoning that has us labeling this section and that section of America as "depressed areas"; the reasoning that has us underwriting illegitimacy; the reasoning that has us paying foreigners to be our friends; the reasoning that justified to the Fabian mind the uprooting of so gentle a culture as that found here in Prince Edward County. These are some of the "thousand fronts" I spoke of earlier.

And do you know something? If we let them get away with it, if we let them go on telling us when to "gee" and when to "haw," if we continue underwriting a world of immoral people—of cannibals and hottentots—then, I will be convinced, we will have become in fact the incompetents they take us for.

In any event, there are the forces that gave birth to the action taken against Prince Edward County. They would take from one whatever is needed—money, self-determination, freedom of association, anything—for the dubious benefit of another. And since we all are incompetent, they contend we have no right to object, but instead should be grateful to a guardian for making us do right.

All of which is based on the doctrine of force, the antithesis of the Christian ethic, which has charity as its keystone. Too bad some of our latter-day preachers don't understand the anti-Christ elements of their own Fabian-twisted minds.

Yes, they struck you. Why? Were you set upon because of your belief that separate-but-equal facilities is the proper—not the improper—way of living? Was that the real, the essential reason for the attack?

Hardly.

True enough, you do believe that separate-but-equal is the just way of life; you believe that separation is the only hope of compatible living among two races as different as night and day. What's more, to justify your conviction, you have three separate opinions of the Supreme Court that support it—opinions rendered when the Court was still guided by the Constitution.

Nor is Prince Edward the only American community that believes in and practices separation of the races. Our whole Nation, in varying degree, has been segregated since the beginning, and I make bold to suggest it will continue so.

What then is being attacked? Go back with me once more—for only a moment—to the ideology that now governs us.

Those presently in power are, remember, people who are dedicated to the proposition that you are incapable of governing yourself, wherefore you must leave your destiny in the hands of an elite such as they presume themselves to be. Therefore, our Government follows a pattern that has as its inevitable end the destruction of your right of personal decision in personal matters. As an incompetent, you cannot be expected to decide anything wisely, certainly not as wisely as "society." That is what is being attacked: Your right of self-determination.

Now, our charter of liberty, the Bill of Rights that Patrick Henry insisted upon, has self-determination as its first premise; and the Constitution is based on this very thing, your right to make up your own mind.

To be more specific, the traditional, constitutional, American assertion is that man is free to choose, for himself, what church he will attend, with whom he will associate, what papers he will read and what work he will do, commensurate with his ability; or, conversely, whether he will do none of these, not work at all, but starve instead.

As should be patently evident, this concept, the traditional American, self-determination concept, is the opposite of the Freudian-Fabian-Socialist philosophy.

But philosophy without action is not enough; it never is to the remakers of the world. So, they fingered Prince Edward. But with the first touch of a feather that rooster thrust his spurs and the fight was joined.

They couldn't afford to let him go, and he just wouldn't soothe. So, they struck, hard, to kill his spirit. And true to their natures, their act wasn't even a good, clean blow; they fought like the cowards they are.

These footpads hid their motives behind an emotional camouflage. They had seen in this small community—or thought they had—a means to their end. They had hoped to move quietly. But once the fight was on, and since they could not afford to admit to the truth, they chose as their weapon an appeal to the emotions of ill-informed people. (What do Nebraskans know of Prince Edward?)

They accused you not of fighting for your right of self-determination but of misusing one race of people for the betterment of another. And with this unfounded charge as a garrotte, they sought to wring the rooster's neck.

To paraphrase another man: Some rooster. Some neck.

They tried to take from you your right to determine for yourself how your children were to be educated, and you wouldn't let them.

And as long as the doors of this beautiful building stand wide, you will have completely thwarted the Fabians. This is your victory. You insisted on schooling for your children under conditions of your choosing, and that is what you have. I say that is victory.

One day the American people will come to realize that the Prince Edward incident had as much meaning for them as for you. Despite cruel distortions of the truth, our fellow Americans will come to realize that the battered few of this peace-loving land bore a banner that flared for all Americans. And, because of your brave stand, the liberty Patrick Henry cried for, the liberty Washington fought for, the liberty sons of America have died for in war after war did not perish from the earth. The fireball of liberty lit by the American Revolution did not spin into blackness.

Thus, as the school we dedicate today symbolizes your fight, so does Prince Edward's fight for independence of mind symbolize America.

Such is the fundamental meaning of those 10 years of strife, of toil, of trouble, that have culminated in this inspiring institution.

In a darkening world, you people of Prince Edward shouldered not only the burden of preserving your own liberty but the sacred principles of all America as well.

It has been a lonely fight. I know that. Such fights always are. But you are not alone. You never have been. Millions of God-fearing, patriotic, tradition-minded Americans throughout the land have watched and prayed that your strength would last. It did. Thank God, it did.

But let's have no napping. Though this particular citadel is built, and its forces are strong, the Fabians have not conceded. What has been all-consuming to you, has been to them but one facet of the whole. They will come again. It may be by another route or in another guise. But they'll continue the attack; you may depend upon it.

In the meantime, never forget that it has been these self-assumed supermen who themselves have proclaimed their purpose to be to deliver us all into Communist bondage.

The next onslaught against you will come again from the milieu of Fabian subversion and betrayal that has resulted naturally from that purpose. Is your will strong enough to resist that new onslaught? As I look in your faces—as surely as I know God is in His Heaven—I feel that it is. For the crucible has not seared you. It has but given you temper.

You must not fail. You will not. You will continue to stand your ground. For what is the alternative?

The answer, in a polite phrase, is a retreat from truth. The alternative is a compromise for something less than Americans have dreamed of ever since Patrick Henry sat with your forefathers and first lit the lamp of learning here in Prince Edward, there across the hill.

Patrick Henry gave birth to your tradition of learning as he gave voice to your love of liberty.

And though your eloquence may not match his, your convictions are the same. For they are your American birthright. And they must remain so, always. Despite hell and high courts, they must remain so.

Long live the spirit of Patrick Henry. Long live Prince Edward County. And may God bless you for your courage and devotion and continue to prosper your resistance to tyranny.

Foes of Reds Now Must Fight for Life—First of a Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Mowery is currently writing a series of articles on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. These articles are appearing in a number of newspapers throughout the country. Since the Committee on Un-American Activities is under constant attack from the Communists and extreme left-wing, it is my feeling that the Members of Congress should have the benefit of Edward Mowery's findings.

Mr. Speaker, first we should know something about the author of these articles.

Pulitzer Prizewinner Edward J. Mowery is no novice in the field of civil liberties. He has been described by Time as a specialist in the "Story Behind the News."

In the midforties, his documented series on the false conviction of a Wall Street broker became a nationwide sensation, winning redress and vindication for the accused. In the fifties, the writer's articles concerning a man facing a third trial for murder are largely credited with achieving the defendant's acquittal.

And in 1953, after a 7-year fight to prove the innocence of another person serving a life term for murder, Mr. Mowery watched Louis Hoffner walk out of a courtroom—a free man. This crusade brought the writer the Pulitzer Prize and created a new category in the annual awards.

Mowery's exposé of the teenage drug menace led to scores of new laws in the Nation which tightened controls on the illicit narcotics traffic. His defense of the FBI against Communist harassment became a U.S. Senate document.

Among his 14 awards and citations, including honors from three universities, are the American Legion's Four Chaplains' Interfaith Gold Medal and the New York Criminal and Civil Courts Bar Association citation.

The article follows:

(By Edward J. Mowery)

(First of a series)

WASHINGTON.—Back in June 1930 Congress made a decision destined to subject a congressional body to unprecedented harassment, turbulence, obstruction, bitterness, and hostility.

The Bolshevik virus of mushrooming communism had spanned the oceans. Stalin was bidding for U.S. recognition of his motley "government."

And two other totalitarian diseases—nazism and fascism—were recruiting for the parade of subversive forces pledged to prostrate America.

Stalin got his recognition on November 16, 1933, conditional upon a solemn vow that Moscow would never interfere with U.S. internal affairs or plant his stooges on American soil.

Faced with a creeping Red menace in Government, labor, and scientific circles, Congress decided to establish the machinery for exhaustive investigation and exposure of subversion in the United States.

The vehicle: The Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, under the chairmanship of Representative Hamilton Fish, Republican, of New York. It functioned for 7 months.

Two other House committees with a more sweeping mandate to probe un-American activities followed under Democratic chairmen in 1934 and 1938. One received specific instructions to investigate Nazi propaganda.

The third special committee under the unbending direction of Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, blasted its tempestuous inquiries into the full periphery of incipient treason. It made implacable and powerful enemies.

The sensational revelations of the Dies committee through the crucial years of World War II prompted the House to stay in the business of exposing subversion.

On January 3, 1945, the House established the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) as a standing nine-member body to safeguard and strengthen the Nation's internal security.

Through the years, HUAC has functioned as a colossal stage to spotlight anti-American activities, penetrate their objectives and evaluate their progress. It has recorded the testimony of 3,000-plus witnesses, disseminated 6½ million publications and crushed such organizations as Silver Shirt Legion, American Youth Congress, and the German-American Bund.

HUAC has seen 80 of its recommendations embodied in bills introduced and laws enacted by Congress. It has exposed espionage plots involving Alger Hiss, Nathan Silvermaster, and Harry Dexter White.

Members of the committee, regardless of the party in power, have never permitted partisan politics to interfere with their determination to preserve America's freedoms. But to certain elements, HUAC's field of investigation has been unpopular since the committee's inception. A wave of protests has steadily mounted through the years. HUAC has "meddled" in citizens' personal affairs * * * "smeared reputations."

In 1957, the smoldering resentment against the House committee blossomed into an organized, well-financed "abolition campaign" to erase HUAC and vitiate or nullify the legislation it has helped to produce.

The campaign now raging—unprecedented in its intensity and bitterness—centers around a nucleus of 20 groups. It has gained support in student, labor, and "intellectual" circles.

It has sponsored countrywide speaking tours and rallies, engineered assaults on HUAC via newspaper ads, petitions, and radio "forums," and established picket lines at the scene of committee hearings * * * in anticipation of a riot.

One of the most vitriolic attacks on the committee was made on the floor of the House. (Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio Republican, termed the speech of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, "venomous and undermining.")

Torrents of inspired letters are pouring into Congress to abolish HUAC, and pro-HUAC meetings have been harassed by epithet-screaming pickets.

Who's behind the farflung abolition campaign?

The organized aspects of the drive, without doubt, is Communist-conceived, directed, and executed. Resolutions demanding elimination of HUAC were passed at the last two national conventions of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The unorganized or sporadic aspects of the campaign—representing the "gray shadings" of political beliefs—include both non-Communist and extreme liberal factions in churches, education, and the sciences.

Leftwingers, however, are sprinkled throughout anti-HUAC organizations of all hues seeking the committee's destruction.

The campaign has also generated considerable support from Americans uninformed or misinformed concerning the House committee's mandate, origin, objectives, and modus operandi, despite the many TV spectaculars originating in HUAC's hearing room.

Among the most militant groups in the abolition drive are:

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a non-Communist organization of extreme liberals which has defended the constitutional rights of numerous accused subversives. In 1960, ACLU made abolition of HUAC its prime order of business.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) and its west coast adjunct, the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms. Both groups have been officially cited as Communist fronts.

The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (NCAUAC). The single objective of this group, as announced last August in its initial flyer, is: "Abolish HUAC." Seven of the thirteen national officers listed in the announcement have been tagged as Communists before congressional committees, Subversive Activities Control Board, State Department, etc.

Affiliates and branches of abolition organizations are propagandizing against the House committee in scores of cities.

Why abolish HUAC?

Major charges against the committee pivot on its alleged abuse of the Bill of Rights, its handling of witnesses and illegality of its mandate.

HUAC, its opponents declare, violates first amendment rights by probing into political beliefs and associations, it pillories fifth amendment witnesses in the court of public opinion, discourages cultural contacts with certain countries and establishes guilt by association.

The committee also harasses, intimidates and tricks witnesses, misuses its authority, mauls the legal rights of citizens and conducts trial-by-publicity in a circus atmosphere.

HUAC's answers to the major charges:

The Supreme Court has twice upheld the legality of the committee's mandate (to investigate subversive activities) and the extent of its investigatory jurisdiction.

HUAC follows the "principles of procedure" and "standards of conduct" as recommended in 1945 by the world-famous Brookings Institution.

Any assertedly maligned witness before HUAC may request an appearance before the committee to clarify the record.

Committee spokesmen make no attempt to answer such charges as "witch hunting," "character assassination," and "thought control" which fall into what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover terms the realm of Marxist semantic gyrations.

HUAC's millions of supporters include the major veterans' organizations, most of the press, leading churchmen, college heads, military officials and the vast, silent legion of Americans who neither demonstrate nor sign petitions.

(HUAC is currently receiving 2,000 letters each month, 85 percent of which is described as "favorable.")

HUAC's most significant support, however, comes from the House itself which has authorized its operating funds without a halt since the thirties. The House reconstituted the committee this year without a dissenting vote.

And Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), the committee's chairman, was unanimously chosen chairman of the democratic caucus.

WALTER, an uncompromising foe of traitors and totalitarianism, said yesterday that HUAC will continue to pursue its undeviating course of exposing subversion in the best interests of all Americans.

"We in Congress," he declared, "have a sworn duty to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. It is our desire to maintain democratic processes and preserve the freedoms established and guaranteed by the Constitution.

"This rests upon the more fundamental basis of preserving that form of government which makes possible the continued existence of the Constitution and the freedoms established by it."

The Communist movement, WALTER emphasized, is a criminal conspiracy dedicated to destruction of free society, and world domination.

"To achieve these objectives," he said, "it employs espionage, deceit, sabotage and terrorism. These aren't questions of beliefs, dissent, or unpopular views. These are criminal acts * * * no civilized or humane society can tolerate or endure.

"We would be delinquent in our sworn duties should we fail to meet the challenge presented by this criminal conspiracy.

"I don't object to anyone criticizing or attacking HUAC * * * as long as they stick to the truth. This committee is certainly as capable of error as any other committee of Congress.

"All of us can profit by criticism that is intelligent, sincere * * * and based upon truth."

What Can You Do for Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the newspapers in my district so often go beyond the mere re-

porting and commenting on the news of the day. They, on so many occasions, sponsor or participate in significant community and civic projects. By so doing, they become even more a motivating force for good citizenship.

During the past year the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N.J., sponsored several important and very worthwhile activities. These have generally been in the field of education and included such things as Hudson County, N.J., first science fair in which schoolchildren of all grades participated. A countywide spelling bee has been sponsored by this paper for the last 6 years.

These projects are undertaken in an effort to "create a greater interest among youth in the written word, the history of our country, and the frontiers of science."

Particularly significant and timely was an essay contest sponsored this year by the Jersey Journal for high school students of Hudson County. So impressed were the editors of that newspaper with the inspiring message delivered by President Kennedy on the occasion of his inaugural that they proposed and sponsored this contest, with the purpose of keeping alive in the minds of the young citizens of that county and giving greater emphasis to the thoughts so splendidly expressed in that message. These endeavors to spark ever increasing interest in good citizenship, government and history, to assure a greater understanding by our students of the problems of the Nation and of the world and the role we must play as a nation and as citizens, are, in my opinion outstanding contributions above and beyond the primary responsibility of a newspaper in a community.

These programs designed to stimulate the thinking and encourage the students in the schools in Hudson County evidence the personal interest of the editor of the Jersey Journal, Mr. Eugene Farrell, in the youth of the communities which his paper serves.

I respectfully request that the text of the essay contest winner, Justin Camerlengo, be printed as part of my remarks as it appeared in the Jersey Journal newspaper:

"WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY"—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY SPOTLIGHTS CHALLENGE

(Here is the $1,000 prize-winning essay in the Jersey Journal's inaugural address essay contest.

Written by Justin Camerlengo, of North Bergen, an 18-year-old senior at Holy Family High School in Union City, it is based on this quotation from President Kennedy's inaugural address:—"And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.")

(By Justin Camerlengo)

THE CHALLENGE

Throughout American history the citizens of this Nation, it seems, have chosen the leader who best suited the needs of our Nation. Men such as Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt have been elected when their character and strength was essential to our very existence. With these men and their ideals came the words, the warnings, the soothings, the courageous statements that exemplified their administration of the heavily burdened office of the President of the United States.

During his second inaugural address, Lincoln, heartsick at the knowledge of American killing American, brother fighting brother, called on the country to unite again "with malice toward none, with charity for all * * *" words emerging from the blood bath of the Civil War * * * words remembered to this day as those of a truly great leader.

In the years that followed our country went through various phases of prosperity, depression, and war. In 1929, the greatest depression of all time was upon us. The years that followed put us to a great test, but the citizenry of this Nation responded by putting their hope in a man who could lead; the life of our country was placed in the hands of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

After his first term, upon completing measures to prime the pump and revitalize America, Franklin Roosevelt, seeing the horrendous clouds of war looming over the world, in an inaugural address told us "we have nothing to fear but fear itself." No matter what controversy has arisen about the man and his policy, there is no American who cannot agree that those words inspired us to give our all. These words soothed a troubled nation and encouraged us to work for victory.

On January 20, 1961, John F. Kennedy, after having mouthed the words of the presidential oath, went to the podium to speak. His awaited words came forth and, on that cold day, he challenged our country.

He did not plead as did Lincoln. Nor did he soothe and encourage as did Roosevelt. He shook us to our boots when he addressed each individual, saying, "Ask not what your country can give to you, but rather what can you give to your country."

This is a time of comparative peace. This is a time when we live better than the world at large. Why does he challenge us?

Let us examine ourselves. How do we live? A flick of a switch and our toast is done. A push on a button and we hear music and the latest news. The dialing of a phone number and we are served by electricians, lawyers, doctors and repairmen.

The country of wonders in which we live is a boom to society, and yet it can be a plague to our Nation. How honestly are those pushbutton wonders manufactured and retailed? What true values are there in our communications media? Who come to our door with what kind of services?

We must, in our examination, agree that the latest appliances, as recent scandals have disclosed, can be made and retailed under immoral conditions, that television and radio can be a source of decay and there are those repairmen and professionals who think nothing of charging exorbitant prices. We would like to close our eyes to these evils, but by doing so, we would indulge in the greatest evil of all, apathy.

This is what our President attacked. This is what we must beware of. Our forefathers died for the rights of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly and freedom of religion. But not one drop of blood was spilled so that we might sit back and shirk our responsibilities. In that phrase, President Kennedy cautioned us to awake, to know our obligations and to live up to them.

How did America listen? What did America hear? In the best-covered campaign to date we saw a Senator become President. We listened to him and accepted him. Now, however, we cannot afford to close our ears to him. For now he campaigns for the victory of a nation and its people, not of a party. If we heed his request, each in our own way, we can improve our prestige in the eyes of mankind and of God.

When the challenge was made, America was stirred. Questions came from coast to coast, from young and old alike.

"What can I do for my country?" was the cry. "Join the Peace Corps? Join the Army?"

No. We need only to live our lives, but not as the Romans of old, rather to the fullest, knowing and living up to our duties.

If the businessman is more man than business; if the busdriver is more cautious than aggravated in a crowded bus; the teacher is teaching more than math or English; he is giving to his country. For from these people the youth learn.

I am part of America's future, as is each individual youth. But my responsibility is the greatest. It is my duty to God and country to utilize what talents I have and educate myself morally, so that, in the future, no President will have to say be kind to your neighbor, for I shall be kind, fear not for the fear of war shall be gone, nor give, for I shall be giving.

Get Tough With Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was among the first to question the morality of neutralism in a struggle such as the current cold war which involves so many moral values. Just a few days ago former President Truman said:

They ought to take sides with the free world. They're free now because we made them free. The Russians didn't do that. All the satellites they took after World War II are slave states now. You name one that isn't.

On September 12, 1961, in a column in the Montgomery County Sentinel, David Scull discussed the same topic in a thoughtful and provocative article. In an era when foreign policy is the concern of every citizen it is imperative that it should be widely discussed and generally understood from every point of view. I append Mr. Scull's column for the benefit of Members of the House:

GET TOUGH WITH "NEUTRALS"

(By David Scull)

The Belgrade Conference of neutrals has demonstrated once and for all that the basic ingredient of a successful foreign policy must be force. Khrushchev kicked this so-called Court of World Opinion in the teeth by his resumption of nuclear testing and they took it with an apologetic smile and mumbled expressions of "regret." Uncle Sucker and the other "colonialists" came in for a roasting, however, mostly because we are so nice and it is well known that we would never risk antagonizing the uncommitted nations by taking offense. Gracious me, No.

Whether they know it or not, these pusillanimous little hypocrites need us a whole lot more than we need them in the atomic jungle in which we are all living. Their very ability to posture and talk about remaining neutral is dependent upon our holding the Communist bear at bay. If it were not for our nuclear arms, the despots in the Kremlin would have crushed these egotistical annoyances like mosquitoes long ago.

The only thing that gave the neutrals cause for pause at Belgrade was the realization that Khrushchev was really threatening to shoot Santa Claus with his 100-megaton hydrogen bomb. The fear of a hot war by the unalined is not a fear for themselves for they almost all live in the southern hemi-

sphere. What they fear most is an end of the cold war, which has proved so profitable to them in financial aid from both sides. Capital is what the underdeveloped countries need most. Know-how is available in Western books, already translated, but machines and the raw material sinews of industrialization cost money. An end to the cold war should be end of the line for the gravy train. This unthinkable tragedy is what sent Nehru scurrying to Moscow and Sukarno quick, like a rabbit, to Washington.

The Belgrade masquerade was a pitiful performance but it was very revealing. The principal actors cried pietously about the right of self-determination of peoples and yet they ignored the barb wire curtain that has just been thrown around East Berliners, fleeing to freedom in the West. These costumed hams strutted and rallied against the British. They knew that the British have set countless millions on the path of independence and strangely they could not bring themselves to comment on the butchery of freedom fighters in Hungary. These phonies castigated De Gaulle, who is trying hard to give Algerians a government of their own, and piously closed their eyes to the disgusting slaughter of Tibetans by the Red Chinese. Those who took part in this burlesque of a "conference" were not men, they were mice. They stand convicted by their own words of being nothing more than rank opportunists of the weakest sort. Devoid of principle, and lacking even a modicum of courage, they have shown themselves to be less than shadows of their own public relations images. They have swept themselves into the dust bin of history and their opinions deserve no further consideration on our part.

Vigorous action by Western democracies to defend and extend freedom throughout the world need no longer be hampered by such little men. There can no longer be "neutrality" between good and evil. If they are not with us, they are against us, and should be treated accordingly. By means of the Voice of America and economic sanctions, we can go over their heads to the people they represent. These people need and deserve our help, but we on the other hand, must have the loyalty and cooperation of their leaders for we are bearing the brunt of the fight for their right to remain free.

Arch realist that he is, Premier Khrushchev has said, "There are no 'neutral' men." The success of his policies to date stems from the fact that every move he makes is from a position of power and is executed with a ruthless force guaranteed to insure execution. At every juncture, when faced with a "fait accompli," the unaligned "neutrals" have given consent by their silence. The only language they understand is force. This being the case, the time has come to take charge of our own destiny in this perilous world. We can no longer afford to do less than is necessary because of imagined effects on these spineless shadows from the uncommitted world. We must get tough with the "neutrals" and get on with the business of winning the cold war while we still have the strength.

"A Great American for 1961"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Dixie Business, which is published by Mr. Hubert Lee of Decatur, Ga., has selected as its "A Great American for 1961" Dr. R. Minton Wilson, M.D., of Richmond, Va. The announcement of Dr. Wilson's selection follows:

R. Manton Wilson, M.D., who spent 40 of his 81 years as a medical missionary working among the lepers of Korea, has been selected by the editors of Dixie Business as the "A Great American for 1961."

Dr. Wilson went to Korea as a medical missionary in 1908.

A native of Columbus, Ark., Dr. Wilson graduated at Arkansas College and received his M.D. at Washington University School of Medicine at St. Louis in 1905.

The young doctor had been in Korea about a year when, in 1909, Dr. Forsythe brought him a little outcast leper girl for consultation.

There was no room for the leper in the hospital. So an old tile kiln was used.

Thus was started the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony, officially named half a century later in 1958.

"In Korea," Dr. Wilson wrote, "a leper is a very sad outcast and, of all people most miserable; but after receiving Christ I feel they become the happiest people in the world, as seen in the colony. They make remarkable Bible students and it is a real joy to see the miracle that takes place in their lives.

"This home to the leper is like heaven on earth, and one big problem is to get them to go home, even though cured.

"Even though cured, the world fears the leper still, and many Koreans cover their faces with a cloth and refuse to look toward the leprosy colony." Dr. Wilson wrote under date of January 19, 1960, "My home and general hospital was 14 miles away, so it was necessary to train them to carry on their own work.

"A staff of 25 lepers carried on about 90 percent of the medical work, even to major surgery and laboratory work.

"It is a little democracy all to itself. I know Dr. Stanley Topple will enjoy the work for they are most appreciative patients. And now so many can be cured.

"I hope you know Dr. J. Fairman Preston, 401 Clairmont Avenue, Decatur, Ga. We worked together for many years."

Why Dr. R. M. Wilson was named in 1961 "A Great American," instead of Dr. Preston or Rev. E. T. Boyer, or Dr. Jim Boyce, medical missionary who works in Mexico with my own former pastor, Rev. John Wood, evangelist, or any one of a thousand who have heard the call and went out involves a great mountaintop experience.

When the 1960 selections were announced for the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living," Dr. Wilson was on the list.

Dr. Wilson didn't get the most votes in the 1960 poll but here are a few quotations:

Dr. James Ross McCain, president-emeritus of Agnes Scott College, who was named to the honor group in 1951 upon his retirement (one of his sons, Dr. Paul M. McCain, is president of Arkansas College, Batesville, Dr. Wilson's alma mater) wrote:

"Hearty congratulations on 30 years of publishing and of promoting Southern leadership. Your last issue of Dixie Business records some very interesting historical materials.

"I would choose your latest addition as my first choice. Dr. R. M. Wilson is not the best known man on the list, but he has been as self-sacrificing as anyone and probably his name is written as high in Heaven.

"He has done perhaps the most sacrificial work with as little remuneration as anybody. He is also getting old and may not have many years in which to be honored."

Dr. J. Davison Philips, Decatur Presbyterian Church, whose session includes elders Craig Topple and Dr. McCain, wrote:

"Dr. Wilson has begun a work which has been the means of hope for those who have given up all hope. In Korea, lepers are considered outcasts and many starve because no one has any compassion for them. All the elements of greatness are in the vision of Dr. Wilson."

Dr. James A. Jones, president, who was one of the speakers when I gave the late David Owens the Man of the South for 1951 award at the Charlotte Country Club, now president Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., wrote:

"A man who has done what he has done for the sake of the health of sick people deserves every tribute than can be paid him."

When I wrote him of his selection as "A Great American," Dr. Wilson replied:

"I appreciate very much the honor. I am unworthy of all this and wonder just how it comes about.

"We must give the Good Lord the glory for it is only through His Name can real good be accomplished.

"I often wish I might have another try at the past for would like to have done a better job. I am so glad that Stanley is carrying on the good work.

"This old world is in a sad and dangerous state and it is time for God's people to be in constant prayer."

Indians Working With Plans for Major Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recently enacted my bill, H.R. 5235, to authorize the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation to purchase the hot springs resort within their reservation's borders. As I indicated in sponsoring the bill, this proposal is a key part of the geenral plan of economic development on which the Warm Springs tribes have embarked. I believe that my colleagues will find of real interest the following article from the Oregonian on this program. I know that I speak for the Warm Springs Tribes in expressing gratitude to the Congress for its prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WARM SPRINGS GEARED TO "HOT WATER" NOT OIL WELLS—INDIANS WORKING WITH PLANS FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By George Lindsay)

WARM SPRINGS.—The old ways are rapidly giving way to the new for 1,400 members of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs on their reservation, a chunk some 40 miles square in central Oregon.

Here in this unincorporated town, the center of government and education for this Indian country, the tribal council in mid-August took over at a cost of $165,000 the nearby 320-acre Kahneeta Hot Springs Resort.

Now the council is planning a program of modernization and development which may eventually cost $1 million.

Only a few blocks away other events dramatically portray the new role of the Indian in molding his own destiny—a departure from an earlier concept of the red man as a ward of the government.

During the past week Indian and white boys and girls enrolled in Warm Springs

School, newly transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Madras Public School system, district 509–C.

SCHOOL INTEGRATED

Now integrated, the school this fall is providing expanded educational opportunities for 300 children, nearly double the previous enrollment.

About 85 of the pupils live in the dormitories and eat at the cafeteria as in years past. The remainder are from the village of Warm Springs and the immediate vicinity, with transportation provided by school buses.

Heading a teaching staff of 11 is Principal Elton Gregory, who came this fall from 3 years at Madras Junior High School.

Integration includes not only students but faculty members.

Gregory's staff includes his wife, an attractive Hawaiian girl and fourth-grade teacher. Another of his teachers is Louise Jackson, mother of four little Jacksons and the wife of Vernon Jackson, whose role in the tribal council is a triple one—elected member, secretary, and treasurer.

Jackson recently returned to his administrative position on the council after 4 years in Eugene, where he earned a bachelor of business administration degree from University of Oregon.

TRANSITION SMOOTH

Mrs. Jackson, a former Oklahoman, is a member of that State's Choctaw Tribe. She holds the master of arts degree in music.

Of 12 members of the faculty, Mrs. Jackson is the only one with previous experience in the school. The teachers in the Government school which closed its doors for the last time early in the summer went to other Government schools to retain their Federal Civil Service status.

Despite the all-new staff, the transition to public school operation has gone smoothly, Gregory said.

Credit should go, he said, to Jewel Plumlee, retained as a coordinator to assist in conversion of the school to public operation. During the past 2 years she was on the staff of the school, first as assistant principal and last year as resident principal.

When the Federal agency gave up the Warm Springs school, it turned everything over "lock, stock, and barrel" to the Madras School District, including two buses. The district supplied two more buses, and set about renovating the plant, including installation of all-new fluorescent lighting in classrooms.

UNITED STATES PROVIDES FUNDS

A wing was added to the main building for more classrooms, and seven new teacherages for married teachers are under construction with completion scheduled in October. The district obtained financial assistance from the Federal Government for this program under Public Law 815 which provides money for school districts in areas which have no tax base, said Joe Grenier, realty officer for the Warm Springs agency.

Before her connection with the Warm Springs school, Coordinator Plumlee was a teacher in the Indian rural school at nearby Simnasho, now also a part of Madras District 509–C.

The coordinator's duties include supervisor of the dormitories at Warm Springs, together with the school cafeteria, still under control of the Federal Government, she said.

But why the sudden gain in enrollment?

Additional courses of instruction, including Spanish and sixth grade band, drew some of the credit from Principal Gregory. Previously many Indian parents sent their children to school in Madras because of curriculum advantages, he said.

Approximately 50 white children are enrolled this fall. They are from families employed at the Agency, and by the Warm Springs Lumber Co. Formerly all attended grade school in Madras.

Control of the Madras school district is vested in the board of education. A member of the board and former board chairman is Dan Macy, Warm Springs merchant.

Buses take high school students to Madras.

While all these changes are taking place in reservation schools, the 11-man tribal council in its modern wing constructed a year ago on the Agency administration building is firing up its own revolution.

And this governing body for the century-old reservation, created by the Treaty of 1855, is a unique board, with wide powers, said Secretary Jackson. "It's a legislative agency," he said, "but also exercises executive and judicial functions."

Heading this influential agency is a tough, shrewd cattleman, Charles Jackson, the father of the secretary.

Several years ago the elder Jackson retired from his position as chairman and allowed his term to expire. At the insistence of other members, he recently ran for another 3-year term and was promptly elected board chairman.

NEW IDEAS EYED

But the age of Jackson and some other members of the board, all of whom are elected by popular vote except three tribal chieftains who serve for life, is no indication of conservatism.

The council is conducting negotiations to bring electric lights and power to all parts of the 1,600-square mile reservation.

The council controls sale of timber resources, fishing in reservation streams, extending to the middle of the Deschutes, and governmental functions including its own law enforcement program and court.

Return of the Kahneeta Hot Springs to Indian ownership has triggered plans for intensive resort development, which Council Secretary Jackson intimated "might well run to a million dollars." However, he pointed out, extent of the program hinges on recommendations to be made by a special committee to the tribal council and, the council's action.

This board of councilors includes Alan Galbraith, superintendent of the Warm Springs Agency; Realty Officer Joe Grenier; and tribal council members Sam Wewa and Vernon Jackson.

Representative AL ULLMAN's Warm Springs Indian bill authorized purchase by the tribes of the few hundred acres of non-Indian land within the reservation.

FISHING MAY OPEN

Kahneeta originally was a part of the reservation but had been privately owned since early in the century.

The resort is on the Warm Springs River 10 miles north of the Warm Springs Agency. White fishermen have long cast greedy eyes on the tantalizing Warm Springs, which lies wholly within the reservation and is closed to fishing except by special permits, difficult to obtain.

"Opening of the river near Kahneeta to fly fishing for resort guests is under consideration," said Secretary Jackson.

Whether this is being seriously considered was not disclosed.

Improved access roads leading to Warm Springs Agency and also the Wapinita cutoff road, Oregon 216, are under construction with paving slated in 1962.

The hot springs gets so warm that cold water from the river is sometimes added at the pool. The water contains calcium magnesium, sodium, iron and chlorine.

Tentative plans call for year-around operation of the resort with such added facilities as a lodge and golf course, and an eventual staff up to about 25 persons—an ambitious program indicative of the changing status of the Indians.

Economic salvation of the tribes may spring not from oil wells, but from hot water.

Miss Grace Duhagon Commends the Selection of Alfonso J. Zirpoli as a Federal District Judge in San Francisco's Little City News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the notice of our colleagues an article written by Miss Grace Duhagon in the Little City News which I feel accurately reflects the feelings of thousands of individuals concerning the recent Senate confirmation of Alfonso J. Zirpoli to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Al Zirpoli was admitted to practice law in California in 1928. He has served as assistant district attorney of the city and county of San Francisco and has served as assistant U.S. attorney for the northern district of California. He has been a member of the board of directors of the Bar Association of San Francisco and of the San Francisco Legal Aid Society. His work in organizing and serving as chairman of the panel of the Bar Association of San Francisco for the representation of indigent defendants in the Federal courts has in particular earned him the respect of the California judiciary and bar.

With Al Zirpoli's background and experience in the law, with his keen legal mind combined with his respect and deep feeling for his fellow man, I believe I may make one of the safest predictions conceivable: Al Zirpoli will continue to serve his fellow man with great distinction.

The article follows:

Several weeks ago we reported Alfonso Zirpoli would be appointed to a Federal judgeship in spite of the rumors flying high to the contrary. It is now but a matter of time. The FBI has given an "all clear" report. The American Bar Association has given him its highest recommendation.

There are still a few steps to go before official confirmation, such as, recommendation from the Attorney General of the United States to the President. Finally, approval by the Senate.

The thought occurs to me, it must be a feeling of real accomplishment on Al's part to have traveled so far from the time he was a young and unknown attorney. It also occurs to me he has worked hard to have reached this point. Very often, when a person makes his mark in life many overlook the effort poured into achievement and success.

In the years I have known Al, to say the least, he is unusual. He has an air of finesse about him. At times he is outspoken. He has the courage of his convictions. He is not afraid to stand up and be counted even though he may stand alone.

Most of us are aware of this thing called party politics. Al is a Democrat. He has worked hard for his party. We might even

call him a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat. But this is one time a man has been nominated for a high post who has the qualities to meet the responsibilities and make the judgments which will be required of him.

If I know the Italian-American community, plans are already in the making to give him a testimonial. If I have my way about it Giselda Zirpoli will be presented with a brilliant star. It is not easy to be the wife of a man engaged to poltics and the community as Al has been.

No Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am much impressed by the recent Worcester (Mass.) editorial, "The View From Belgrade," which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD.

It sets forth admirably the situation, dilemma, and paradox of the so-called uncommitted nations. I wish that some of its views and principles could be considered and adopted by our State Department, and for that reason I am venturing to forward it to appropriate officials of that foreign policy making agency for their consideration.

It is my thought that the divine aphorism, "If you are not with me, you are against me," is applicable to the position of the so-called uncommitted nations.

What is more, this Nation has rendered many of these nations substantial aid and assistance, and I think we have a right to expect that, if these nations are so willingly accepting our help and support, they should also be willing to aline themselves with us in fortifying the free systems upon which they and the free world must rest their hopes for ordered liberty, if they desire it, and freedom from oppression in the future, if they prefer it to slavery.

It should be clear to all thinking peoples these days that further appeasement of the Communist bloc would merely invite disaster. In fact, we should not forget that appeasement has been largely responsible for our present predicament.

The wise, prudent deployment and use of our strength, a resolute purpose to defend our freedoms, and the sound judgments of experienced leaders in the Nation and the world, are needed more than ever to enable us to avoid terrible nuclear war and maintain the peace.

To allow uncommitted nations to dominate our policies, our thinking, and our action as this time would make a bad situation much worse because their counsel of appeasement, if it be that, could merely serve to embolden the Soviets in its campaign for world domination.

We have a right to expect something better and more constructive from these nations than mushy neutrality in the greatest struggle mankind has ever faced, and gloomy predictions calculated to inspire terror.

It is for these reasons that this editorial is a splendid contribution to contemporary thinking and our efforts to fix American morale and purpose at the high level it must maintain if we are to cope successfully with the great problems of war, peace and freedom.

I include the editorial, as follows:

THE VIEW FROM BELGRADE

Gathered together in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, are leaders of 25 nations. These nations claim to be members of neither the Soviet bloc nor the Western alliance. They call themselves uncommitted or nonalined. Some, such as India and Iraq, actually seem to be as uncommitted as they say they are. Others, like Cuba and Guinea, are far closer ideologically to Moscow than to Washington.

These uncommitted nations represent about one-third of the world's population. They make up roughly a fourth of the membership of the United Nations. Their deliberations are bound to have a profound impact in Africa, Asia, and South America.

During the first 4 days of the Belgrade Conference, it has become apparent that these uncommitted nations have two principal concerns in the area of international politics. They are opposed to colonialism, they desperately fear nuclear war.

Their stand against colonialism has been vigorous. France and Portugal, in particular, have been subjected to bitter attack. The Bizerte incident and the terror in Angola have been major topics for the delegates. Their attacks on colonialism have been voiced publicly and privately without restraint.

Just before the Belgrade Conference began, the Soviet Union announced that it would resume testing nuclear bombs. Two test weapons have been set off, and nuclear fallout now is drifting across Russia toward China and Japan.

In view of the vigor of the uncommitted nations' assault on colonialism, it seems logical that their leaders would be equally strong in denouncing the Soviets' unilateral resumption of nuclear testing. In private, some were. Tito, for example, reportedly described the Soviet action as brutal. But in public, Tito said he could understand the reasons for Russia's decision.

Other statements were almost as weak.

It is impossible to know whether the uncommitted nations are simply terrorized by the Soviet Union or whether they actually fail to understand that the Soviets' goal is greater power. In any case, their panacea for world tension is an appeal to the West to negotiate with Russia. Negotiations, of course, are desirable. But the record of negotiation since 1945 hardly can be a source of great expectations. To think that Russia will negotiate away her plan for expansion—Soviet colonialism—is naive.

The uncommitted nations concentrate on Angola and refuse to recognize the Russian seizure of eastern Poland. They fret about Bizerte and ignore the Russian tanks in Hungary in 1956. They demand freedom for African states and fail to ask for immediate free elections in all Germany. It is almost as if the leaders of the uncommitted nations have read no European history since 1945.

Developments at the Belgrade Conference suggest the size of the task confronting the United States in trying to make clear to the world the danger of Russian-Chinese communism. The danger seems clear to us. But many other nations either don't recognize the threat or seem to think it can be best met by appeasement. Changing these attitudes will require vigorous Western leadership.

Contracts to American Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly alarmed by the apparent trend in the policy of the Defense Department to award contracts to American manufacturers who are low bidders by reason of their processing or acquiring in foreign, low-wage countries all the high-labor content share of the project under construction.

The Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of York, Pa., wired me concerning such a recent incident and I immediately wrote to the President of the United States bringing this situation to his attention.

Mr. Speaker, if further information sustains the position of Allis-Chalmers—that this means a distinct loss in American employment—I shall request the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to hold public hearings some time in October. It is necessary that this matter be probed more deeply.

The wire and my letter follow:

YORK, PA., *September 17, 1961.*

Hon. JOHN DENT,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congressman GEORGE GOODLING has suggested that I bring to your attention, threat to employment in Pennsylvania involved in pending award of contract for 15 very large hydraulic turbines for U.S. Army Engineer John Day and lower monumental projects. Apparent low bidder while based in Pennsylvania proposes to supply major portion of equipment from Japan. We estimate components to be produced in Japan would represent loss of approximately 1,700,000 man-hours of employment for American labor in the factories of the turbine builder and the major material suppliers, principally steel-plate forging and casting producers, mostly located in distressed labor areas in Pennsylvania. Allis-Chalmers, second bidder, have proposed 100-percent domestic materials and manufacture. If you are interested we would be pleased to supply detailed information to you in Washington at you earliest convenience.

D. E. SMITH,
Vice President, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I am in receipt of a telegram from the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of York, Pa., protesting the awarding of 15 very large hydraulic turbines for U.S. Army Engineer John Day and lower monumental projects. The protest is based on the application of the Buy American Act which would allow domestic companies, also from Pennsylvania, to use 50 percent of contract bid for foreign components or equipment.

Allis-Chalmers bid 100-percent American labor, material and equipment. Because of interpretation of Buy American Act, competitors can process or acquire in Japan all high labor content share of project thereby putting American labor and industry at disadvantage in competitive bids. The differ-

ence between the Japanese-produced and American produced equipment doesn't start to cover the loss in taxes, wages and the contribution to the general welfare.

More serious is the apparent disregard of the seriousness of our distressed areas as well as example set by Government procurement which must eventually drive private utilities in the United States to procure oversea equipment based upon price differentials. If this happens, it will make the dependency of the United States for power requirements disturbingly dangerous in time of emergencies. Stockholders of private utilities will be within their rights to demand that their corporate officers purchase foreign-made equipment which can only add to our unemployment and industrial stagnation.

My subcommittee, studying the impact of imports and exports on employment, has heard serious and disturbing testimony in many areas where unemployment is chronic and growing. With the Buy American Act set at 6-percent differential, it is hopeless for a domestic bidder to compete unless he procures high labor content parts and components as well as transportation and tax concessions offered by foreign governments. The record shows private enterprise to be more cognizant of its duty and obligation to the American econmy that tax-sustained Government enterprise. It will take time for all the details to be gathered and I earnestly suggest a delay in the awarding of these contracts.

Previous administration interpretation of the Buy American Act make mockery of the intent of Congress and the needs of the American people. Again, I urge that this matter be delayed for a thorough study of our bids in relationship to the general welfare as well as to the national defense.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Dedication of Our Sunday Visitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, today the third home of the Our Sunday Visitor is being dedicated. Founded nearly 50 years ago in most humble surroundings by the late Archbishop John Francis Noll in Huntington, Ind., the Our Sunday Visitor has grown to become the world's largest Catholic publishing firm. Their principal publication, the Our Sunday Visitor, has circulation of over 1 million and is the largest circulation Catholic newspaper in the United States.

The new OSV publishing plant provides 240,000 square feet of working and storage space. The equipment, from the office furnishings to the printing presses, are the most modern available. The building itself is indicative of the growth and the success of this publishing firm.

Much of the success of the Our Sunday Visitor can be credited to the outstanding talents and dedicated spirit of Archbishop Noll. He founded the Our Sunday Visitor as a weekly news magazine to fill a need he saw for instructive material for the general laity of his faith. A prolific writer and a capable administrator, Archbishop Noll's publishing venture became an immediate success. Within a year, circulation of his weekly paper climbed to 160,000. Archbishop Noll served as publisher of the Our Sunday Visitor, even though his other duties increased tremendously, until his death in 1956.

The present executive staff of the publishing company carries on the high traditions he established. His successor as bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend, the Most Reverend Leo A. Pursley serves as president. Monsignor Joseph Crowley is the editor of Our Sunday Visitor and Francis A. Fink is the managaging editor.

The Our Sunday Visitor is more than a successful and respected publishing firm to the people of my hometown, Huntington, Ind. It is a major employer, known for its high code of labor-management relations. It is a welcomed member of the industrial community and a leading civic force in the city.

The Our Sunday Visitor's significance to me takes on added importance in the manner in which it exemplifies the freedom of the press and the freedom of religion of our Nation. When I pass the publishing plant I think that here is a concrete example of the American way of doing things. Archbishop Noll founded the paper to defend the Catholic Church against atheistic critics. He sought to explain his ideas and his philosophy. The freedom of religion and freedom of the press not only permitted his doing so, they guaranteed him the opportunity. This, to me, is a fine example of the American Constitution in action.

Today, on the occasion of the dedication of the new publishing plant of Our Sunday Visitor by the Most Reverend Egidio Vagnozzi, the apostolic delegate to the United States, I salute the Our Sunday Visitor, its publisher, and employees and I offer my best wishes for continued success.

Springfield Public Schools Follow President Kennedy's Council on Youth Fitness Recommendations for Underdeveloped Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, in his message to the schools on the physical fitness of youth, urged school boards, school administrators and teachers to strengthen all programs which contribute to the physical fitness of our youth.

I am very proud of the achievement in this most important area by the school department of my home city of Springfield, Mass. In line with the President's emphasis on physical fitness, the Springfield school department conducted a summer program for the underdeveloped child.

President Kennedy's Council on Youth Fitness made three specific recommendations for the schools to adopt. The first was to identify the physically underdeveloped pupil and work with him to improve his physical capacity. Second, provide a minimum of 15 minutes of vigorous activity every day for all pupils. And, lastly, use valid fitness tests to determine pupils' physical abilities and evalaute their progress.

The Springfield public schools, under the supervision of Mr. Robert T. Berry, director of health, physical education, and safety, complied with these recommendations in setting up a summer program for the underdeveloped child. Children were selected to participate who scored low on the youth fitness test given last spring. Director Berry informs me that the Springfield schools are extremely anxious to expand this program next summer because of the gratifying results made with a small group this year. And, the school department will continue to follow the recommendations of the President's Council on Youth Fitness during the school year just commenced, giving special emphasis to the underdeveloped child.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Springfield school department, and Mr. Berry, in particular, for the fine program established for the underdeveloped child, thus ensuring the beginning of a sound basic program of physical developmental activity in the Springfield schools.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, since its inception I have been deeply interested in Project Hope sponsored by the People to People Health Foundation, Inc. The more I learn of this very important and effective work carried on and accomplished by private initiative and contributions, the more I realize this sort of program ought to be encouraged in every way possible, since it has so many advantages over Government-sponsored programs of a similar nature. This truly is a people-to-people project that touches at the very heart of our problem of getting to know and appreciate the problems of other peoples throughout the world.

I am inserting a copy of the report on Project Hope, as the world's first peacetime hospital ship came home to the United States after a year of work in southeast Asia. This report, printed in a special issue by Pure-Pak News, documents the "quiet progress" achieved by *Hope* in Indonesia.

I commend to the attention of the Members of the House the TV program entitled "Project Hope," over WTOP tonight, September 20, at 8:30 to 9 p.m., eastern daylight time:

PROJECT HOPE

From the disease infested jungles of Indonesia, Ex-Cell-O Corp. brings you a documentary report of the quiet progress being made toward international friendship and world peace by a group of private citizens active in Project Hope.

Project Hope is a relatively new humanitarian program sponsored by the American people. It is a living example of what each of us can do to help promote social progress and better standards of living in newly developing areas of the world.

Physically, Project Hope is a Korean war hospital ship converted into a floating medical university. On board are a group of dedicated Americans—doctors, nurses, and medical technicians who are sharing their health knowledge with the people of Asia. All are volunteers who have left home and family to serve on this unprecedented mission of mercy.

Idealistically, *Hope's* objective is to train and teach medicine and public health—right in the jungles and impoverished huts where these problems exist to such appalling degrees. Public health is one of the critical problems facing the newly developing nations.

Practically, this idea of sharing knowledge on a people-to-people basis really works. *Hope* goes only where she is invited. The medical society of each host country must contribute as much to the support of the ship during her stay as is possible. This means that *Hope* is never just an American do-good project. The local doctors and governments have more at stake than the *Hope* personnel—for they asked for the help and are contributing to and are active in the project.

Hope's sailing in September of 1960 marked the culmination of months of preparation and hard work by the project volunteers. Spearheaded by Hope's founder and president, Dr. William B. Walsh, this foundation had raised $3½ million needed to finance the first year's operations. Hope is a non-Government, private organization financed by American industry and by gifts from private citizens throughout the country.

At the invitation of the Medical Society of Indonesia, *Hope's* first port of call was the Island Republic of Indonesia. Some of these islands are best known as the Spice Islands; others bear the romantic names of Sumatra, Borneo, Java, and Bali. All the medical people on board the *Hope* wondered what kind of country, people, and health problems they would find.

The Republic of Indonesia is made up of more than 3,000 islands—they are bautiful and fertile. This is the third wealthiest nation in the world in terms of natural resources. Paradoxically, Indonesia faces tremendous problems in developing adequate standards of living and public health for her impoverished people.

Freedom is new to these people, and they are still recovering from the effects of a war for independence and internal struggles for power. Today, the Indonesians are building a new nation, and they are building it with pride. They are educating the young and learning modern ways of doing things. Indonesia has raised its literacy rate from less than 10 percent to over 60 percent in just 10 short years. Much has been accomplished since the Indonesians have gained their freedom, but there is much yet to be done. At least for the present, many must work with primitive tools and machines. Rice is still grown much as it has been for hundreds of years. This primitive agriculture requires many hands, and because more hands are required to grow the food, more mouths are there to consume it.

These growing years are difficult and not too different from the years of struggle spent by our ancestors following the Revolution.

Indonesia's problems are compounded by an ancient culture and many customs which are hard to change. Many people still believe that disease is caused by evil spirits, and this creates problems for the modern doctors and teachers.

As an example, the colorful marketplaces have changed little in hundreds of years. Sanitation is ignored because most people do not understand that sickness can be carried by dirty food or water. As a result, the average life expectancy is only 32 years.

Even Indonesia's capital city of Djakarta must contend with a health destroying lack of adequate sanitation. For generations the canals which flow through the city have been used for transportation, washing, bathing, swimming, drinking and disposal of waste. The streams and rivers are pure at their source, out in the rural areas, but when they have flowed past even one village, they become polluted. Because of this, disease is everywhere.

The Indonesian Medical Society reports there is one doctor for every 100,000 people. But in some places there is only one doctor for half a million people. Diseases which could be cured easily in early stages go untreated until it is too late.

Because there are so few doctors and nurses, most Indonesians must go to the traditional Dukun or medicineman with their problems. The Dukun is a man or woman whose primitive knowledge has been passed down through the centuries. He is doctor, fortuneteller, spirit healer all in one. For every real doctor there are hundreds of Dukuns practicing their ancient calling.

Indonesians are aware of their many problems and are eager to cooperate with people who wish to help them build a strong foundation for their new country.

The only stopover of the SS *Hope* on her 21-day voyage to Indonesia from San Francisco was a 36-hour delay in Honolulu. Here the islanders turned out for a typical welcome and to wish the *Hope*, her staff and her crew aloha. The days on board the ship were spent in readying the hospital and training the staff to work together. Literally, the group worked night and day cleaning and setting up the wards, putting the operating rooms in order, readying the medical supplies and classrooms.

Take the library as an example. Medical schools and people everywhere in the States are donating thousands of medical books. These books have to be cataloged for reference, and duplicate copies set aside to give to Indonesian medical schools which need them badly.

Several hours of each day were devoted to classes where Indonesian culture and ethnic groupings were studies. Language classes were held for all on board to prepare for the teaching and sharing of knowledge that lay ahead.

The architects of the SS *Hope* tried to make the ship self sufficient in every way. The system for making milk and drinking water is one fine example. Every day thousands of gallons of salt water from the Pacific Ocean are pumped into the ship. Big evaporating tanks boil the water and the salt is removed. After filtering the water over and over, pure milk solids are added. Anhydrous butterfat is blended, and the fluid milk is processed and packaged in Pure-Pak cartons. The result—rich wholesome milk that tastes just like something straight from a dairy here at home. The "Iron Cow," as the dairy operation on board is called, can produce thousands of gallons of milk each day. Part of the *Hope* health program is the introduction of better nutrition into the daily diet in areas where the ship operates. As a contribution to this nutrition program, Ex-Cell-O Corp. in cooperation with Dairy Society International and Foremost Dairies, installed the world's first "seagoing dairy" on board the SS *Hope*. All equipment in the dairy was donated by industry suppliers, for which we may all be proud. Foremost Dairies gave the services of one of their top recombining men to operate the dairy and supervise the quality of the milk so badly needed by the patients. The Pure-Pak "Iron Cow" is also used for the convenient packaging of pure water so necessary for use in jungle areas where all local supplies are contaminated. The ship can produce thousands of gallons of milk a day. In the

areas where *Hope* will operate, milk is scarce. A ready supply is needed to help build the strength of the patients and for use in the nutritional programs carried out in the inland villages. The containers are labeled in the local language and English so everyone will know what they are drinking and that it comes from the SS *Hope*. *Hope's* president, Dr. William B. Walsh recently returned from visiting the ship in Indonesia, reported that the dairy is one of the ship's most valuable attractions among the Indonesian people—many of whom had never tasted milk before.

The *Hope's* success in Indonesia is largely due to the concept of sharing, basic to the people-to-people idea developed by President Eisenhower. For every doctor and nurse on board, there are Indonesian counterparts, trained in the same branch of medicine, Indonesians who leave their homes and their jobs to work side by side with the Americans.

After her official welcome in Djakarta, Indonesia's capital, the ship began to accept for treatment the first of thousands of patients. Some were young and helpless, some were frightened and had to be persuaded to come aboard, others were old and near death. They came from the crowded cities and distant jungle villages. All were gravely ill, afraid they would never see their homes or families again. Soon after the first patients were admitted, the ship had a most distinguished visitor—President Sukarno—the leader of his people. President Sukarno freely expressed his gratitude on behalf of his people. He was particularly interested in the main lecture room where, through closed circuit television, doctors and students learn how various operations are performed.

Lectures held every day concern the whole world of medicine. The operating rooms are in constant use from morning to night. Operation follows operation, but they represent far more than just the treatment of the sick. Every doctor knows when a surgeon observes and assists in special operations, he learns how to do them himself. And that's what counts. These Indonesian surgeons will be able to go from here now, do the operations themselves, and most important, be able to teach others, too. Teaching so that the knowledge of one man, one doctor, one surgeon, one nurse, can become the knowledge of thousands.

In addition to the training aboard ship, roving American-Indonesian groups also operate on shore. They prescribe modern drugs for the simple cases and determine which patients will be sent back to the ship for treatment. This onshore work is one of the most important steps in the *Hope* teaching program.

Those on board the ship are privileged to see the dream of Project Hope come true as they watch their patients leave the ship with new sight, new hearing, new speech. Others, in a real sense, have been given a new way of life. In the hearts of these patients, there is gratitude beyond expression. But perhaps of even greater importance is the light of new learning that shines in the eyes of the Indonesians who have trained aboard the ship.

Project Hope is a humble beginning in the war against poverty and disease. It is a grassroots, people-to-people activity—a "peace corps" of immense potential. It already involves many companies, many industries and millions of people. What better job can each of us do for our companies, our industry and for the free enterprise system than to promote this idea of sharing the knowledge we possess with others that they may help themselves and hold their heads erect as freemen. We as a Nation cannot feel secure as long as mass misery is the daily lot of much of the rest of the world. This is a cause well described in President John F. Kennedy's inaugural address: "To these people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists are doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

Senator Bible's Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is always a happy occasion when the skill of some of our young people is shown. It is for this reason that I call attention to an article in the Washington Star of September 17, 1961, entitled "Straight Shooting on the New Frontier," written by Harold J. Flecknoe. This article tells of the marksmanship abilities of Bill and David Bible, 17- and 13-year-old sons of the senior Senator from Nevada and Mrs. Alan Bible. Likewise, it is nice to know that the young people are acquainted with new frontiers, as well as rifle marksmanship.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT SHOOTING ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Harold J. Flecknoe)

There's one thing you can say about some persons on the fringes of the New Frontier: They're straight shooters.

The sons and daughters of Cabinet members, Senators and Representatives, and other high- and low-ranking Government officials, that is, now that they have completed a 4-week rifle instruction course.

Sixty-five youngsters took part in the Saturday classes, all invited personally by the National Rifle Association to its modern indoor range at 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW.

James Day, for instance, is not only the son of Postmaster General and Mrs. Day, he also is a marksman, third class, as a result of the training. And the Bible boys, Bill and David, sons of Senator and Mrs. Alan Bible, of Nevada, both have awards as straight shooters.

These youngsters are typical of the others, ranging in age from 9 to 18, who completed the course. They were well grounded in the theories and fundamentals of good shooting by certified rifle instructors of the NRA, with specialized instruction from other experts of the association.

If the boys and girls let their shooting skills grow rusty over the years, they probably will remember one element of the course—and that's safety. That was stressed over and over by the instructors, by voice, action, and by special instructional films.

Before the youngsters were allowed to shoot their first five rounds, they were given a broad introduction into the course. This was followed by instruction in the guns and ammunition to be used—.22-caliber bolt-action target rifles. Then came safety and range discipline before the youngsters got down to the fun part of the course: shooting.

The fun was controlled, however, by the instructors who roamed up and down the line of shooters, stopping now and then to correct a misplaced rifle sling or straighten the legs of shooters in awkward positions.

Not everyone could shoot at the same time, so youngsters off the line were kept busy studying rifle parts projected by a special machine or watching films on the pleasures of shooting and the dangerous aspects of it. Youngsters with special problems received ready assistance from the many association experts on hand.

The best day of the course was the final one, when the shooters competed against one another in a 10-round match. This was followed by graduation ceremonies and awards.

The New Frontier, riflewise, seems to be in good shape; but we must confess that it is buttressed by bipartisanship, because a few of the straight shooters are the sons and daughters of Republicans.

What Role for U.N. in Congo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the world always feels deeply the loss of any man who works for peace, and the world today mourns the loss of Dag Hammarskjold.

But, it is imperative that as we mourn we do not fail in our efforts to remedy the fault made by the United Nations in the Congo. Mr. David Lawrence, in an editorial column carried the Washington Star of September 19, 1961, comments brilliantly on this matter, and I trust that each Member will read this article.

As Mr. Lawrence points out, United Nations intervention in the Congo was a result of liberating a colony without adequate safeguards that the people of that area were ready for self-government.

The full text of Mr. Lawrence's column is reprinted herein:

WHAT ROLE FOR U.N. IN CONGO?—FAILURE TO KEEP TO ITS TRUE FUNCTION BLAMED FOR HAMMARSKJOLD DEATH

(By David Lawrence)

The tragedy of Dag Hammarskjold's death is not just the loss of a man dedicated to the cause of world peace but the failure of the United Nations to confine itself to its true function instead of meddling in the internal affairs of countries aspiring in their own evolutionary way to achieve independence.

The Secretary General, who was killed in an airplane crash, conceived it to be his duty to impose peace in the Congo. He would not have sought to do the same inside the two Germanys or inside Hungary. But he saw the United Nations as a kind of superstate and felt that when the U.N. passed a resolution and sent him to a troubled area, this would be enough to cause the warring factions to lay down their arms.

Noble as was his purpose, the fact remains that the right of a people to rebel against their own rulers and to determine their own destiny has long been imbedded in international law as a basic principle.

The London Times a few days ago put its finger on the root of the difficulty in the Congo. First it quoted from the resolution of July 14, 1960, when the United Nations authorized the Secretary General to consult with the government in the Congo and pro-

vide it with such military assistance as may be necessary until the national security forces may be able, in the opinion of the government, to meet fully their tasks. Then the Times says:

"Katanga bears most of the marks of a state as understood in international law. By traditional standards Katanga seemed a viable state when the rest of the Congo was a vacuum, and a legitimate successor state to Belgian sovereignty has not emerged.

"But if there is danger of an attack by the Leopoldville government on Katanga, it seems odd to attack Katanga to prevent civil war. The argument is, presumably, that for the legal government to march against a dissident province is not civil war, but for the province to resist is.

"The United Nations action in Katanga looks more like the enforcement of a settlement of Congolese political differences than a simple averting of strife."

So it is apparent that the late Secretary General interpreted in his own way the meaning of the resolution passed by the U.N. Security Council. His purpose was to bring peace by personal negotiation, but he ran up against the bitter opposition of those inside the Congo who simply would not lay down before the Communists.

The Congolese Government is today suspect. Senator DODD, of Connecticut, Democrat, in an impressive speech in the Senate last Saturday, pointed to the Communist leaders inside the Congo Cabinet and warned against the so-called coalition government which the Communists sooner or later are expected to take over. He gave name after name of Communists who are cabinet ministers in the Congo Government today.

Small wonder that in Katanga Province, where the last stand of the anti-Communists is being made in the Congo, they have felt hostile to Secretary General Hammarskjold and the U.N. troops. Since many millions of dollars of valuable property are involved—the mines in the Congo are fabulously rich—there was bound to be a countermove in which, as reported from Katanga, many "white mercenaries" participated. Doubtless there are some former Belgian officers who were acquainted intimately with the Congo and who are risking their lives to back President Tshombe of Katanga.

The United Nations didn't concern itself with the theft of property from owners who had developed the mines with borrowed caiptal. The U.N. seems to be swayed by the emotional outbursts about colonialism which unhappily takes no account of the lack of training of half-civilized peoples to set up a government that will protect individual rights.

It looks now as if the U.N. will have to take a second look at recent events. Is it to be a superstate? If so, the Communists are prepared to take control of the whole U.N. organization. They have for the last few years infiltrated Africa and have managed to corral a lot of the votes of the African states recently admitted to the U.N. which call themselves nonalined.

It is a sad period for the Western governments which not only believe in but practice democracy, and this means they respect property rights as well as human rights.

The Congo mess is the result of a failure to adhere to basic principles—to insist that self-government shall not be granted to "colonies" that are unable to goven themselves and to make sure that when colonialism is abolished there is a real regard for property as well as human rights. The Congo isn't ready as yet for self-government, but inasmuch as the Belgian Government has withdrawn of its own accord, it is up to the Congolese to fight their own battles. If the U.N. has any function there, it is to keep meddling foreigners out—including the Communists.

The Problem of Balancing the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today entitled, "The Theory That Won't Work":

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THEORY THAT WON'T WORK

The Kennedy administration's basic fiscal philosophy is this: You don't have to worry about balancing the Federal budget in any particular year so long at it is balanced over a period of years.

Or, as the President himself expressed this Keynesian concept earlier in the year: "The Federal budget should * * * be in balance over the years of a business cycle—running a deficit in years of recession when revenues decline and the economy needs the stimulus of additional expenditures—and running a surplus in years of prosperity, thus curbing inflation, reducing the debt, and freeing funds for private investment."

So stated, the notion doesn't sound particularly alarming; it sounds almost reasonable. It has just one overwhelming drawback. It doesn't work. How totally it doesn't work, in case there is any doubt about it, has just been demonstrated again by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia.

First, in the past 31 years the Government has run 25 deficits. How's that for balance over a period of years? As for curbing inflation, we have had so much inflation that the value of the dollar has been more than halved in little over 20 years. The Federal debt, far from being reduced, is approaching the historic high of $300 billion.

Then there is the whole business of the business cycle. One of the beauties of this approach, from the standpoint of the numerous Keynesian scholars in our midst, is that it is delightfully vague. They never bother to say whether the business cycle runs for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years, 9 years or what. This frees them from the obligation of explaining how the budget is to be balanced "over the years of the business cycle."

Senator BYRD, however, has taken the trouble to show that, no matter how you slice the business cycle, there still is practically never a budget balance over its span.

Suppose, he says, you start with fiscal year 1950 and figure a business cycle of 3 years. The result: A $3.6 billion deficit for the period. If you figure a 4-year cycle, the deficit is $13 billion; 5 years, $16.1 billion; 6 years, $20.3 billion; 7 years, $18.7 billion; 8 years, $17.1 billion; 9 years, $19.9 billion; 10 years, $32.3 billion.

The Senator carries these careful calculations further; he makes a starting point of every fiscal year from 1950 through 1959, and finds similar floods of red ink. In fact, out of the whole works of 52 possible spans, only one cycle—a 3-year period beginning in 1956—yields even an absurdly tiny surplus. All the rest is deficit.

It's no great mystery why the business-cycle theory of budget balancing fails so resoundingly in practice. Political pressures for greater spending are always enormous, and only the tightest Government rein can hope to hold them in check at all. The only realistic rein is to try for a budget balance every year, short of a period of national catastrophe.

Today, instead, we have an administration which not only bows to the spending pressures but invites them and seeks constantly to think up new ways of spending. It has already added billions, and now the talk is of a $90 billion spending budget next January. As a conservative estimate, Senator BYRD reckons expenditures in fiscal year 1965 (excluding the heavy trust fund outlays) at $106 billion, compared to $81.5 billion in 1961. The bulk of the increase is not for defense, but for nonessential or postponable domestic-civilian programs. That outlook provides precious little prospect of any budget balancing, no matter how piously the administration now talks of doing so in the 1963 fiscal year.

The root trouble, then, with the administration's fiscal philosophy is that it is a flight from fiscal discipline. Saying that the budget needs to be balanced only over the business cycle merely means it won't be balanced at all except occasionally by accident.

No wonder the Senator asks some questions—and in today's irresponsible Washington, his is indeed a voice in the wilderness. He asks:

"How long can the Federal Government continue to spend, tax, and borrow at the present rate? Are we on a permanent deficit basis? When will the breaking point come? How disastrous will it be if we continue inflation-breeding policies—which appear to be on the inerease—when our concern should be for return to fiscal responsibility?"

Mr. Kennedy Has Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body an article appearing in the Salina Journal, Salina, Kans., of August 26, 1961, entitled "Mr. Kennedy Has Point." I think this editorial illustrates the importance of putting foreign aid on a realistic and business basis, and I would like for my distinguished colleagues to have an opportunity to read the article.

MR. KENNEDY HAS POINT

Reluctance of the House of Representatives to grant Mr. Kennedy authority to make long-term development loans to foreign nations is understandable.

While the Marshall plan put Europe on its feet, the results of some of our foreign aid have been discouraging.

For example, we have sent millions to India and now Mr. Nehru, who is part mystic, part senile, and part horsetrade, seems to side with the Reds on Berlin.

We have not found too much appreciation for our efforts, although we should be better psychologists than to expect gratitude.

Some of the aid has gone into the pockets of the politicians and some has been wasted by our own bureaucrats.

Nevertheless, if we are to continue foreign aid at all, and if that aid is to finance major development projects, it is essential for the President to make long-range commitments, rather than be confined to a

year-to-year basis. You can't project a highway, a big dam or any major program if the money for only the first 12 months is certain and it is a gamble whether the job can be completed after that.

As a matter of fact, we may get better results for our money if the President can write the checks as they are needed, while assured of having the total sum required.

The dilemma of aid is that we must be sure we are getting our money's worth while at the same time saving the pride and independence of the beneficiaries. You can't treat friends as beggars and hope to keep them friends.

Another dilemma is that while humanitarianism is part of the reason for aid, our foremost motives are to beat the Russians and to develop our own commerce through the creation of prosperous customers. Recipients know we are helping ourselves and this puts a tinge of cynicism on their gratitude.

This is all the more cause for putting aid on a realistic and business basis. As businessmen know, such a basis must include long-range commitments.

Address by Hon. Tom C. Clark at the 84th Annual Meeting of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a most significant and informative address delivered by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, on August 8, 1961, before the antitrust section of the 84th annual meeting of the American Bar Association at the Statler-Hilton ballroom in Washington, D.C. The address of Justice Clark is most significant by reason of his being a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In addition to calling attention to the challenge that faces the legal profession in the field of monopoly—violation of the Sherman antitrust law—the Justice sharply reminded management of their responsibility. In connection with the challenge that confronts members of the legal profession, Justice Clark said:

The lawyers can and should render a great service in this regard, not only to their clients but to their country. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who has developed a preventive medicine program for his patients.

Justice Clark further said:

Lawyers must adopt the same principle to a preventive law program that will make certain that hard-core violations of the act will at least be eliminated. They can develop a fresh viewpoint on the antitrust laws that would likely reduce to a minimum questionable practices.

The closing remarks made by Justice Clark in relation to management are most significant. While in the nature of a warning, Justice Clark, in fact, was giving friendly advice to management to "Stop, look, and listen."

In referring to "through the good offices of the lawyer, business may, indeed, develop a conscience," Justice Clark also said:

But whether this results or not, it appears to me that one thing is certain: Business must clean up its house of hard-core antitrust violations. If it does not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail, as the Department of Justice officials have indicated. And, what is more, legislative codes or other restrictive statutory measures are not beyond the realm of possibility. The choice is clear, and so is the duty of management and the antitrust bar.

Reference made by Justice Clark to the Department of Justice officials is a quotation in his address from a statement made by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, as follows:

The Justice Department has responsibilities in the criminal field and will meet these responsibilities. But we also have tremendous responsibilities in the antitrust field—where the small businessman is exploited, consumers disregarded, Government defrauded. We intend to be vigorous and unrelenting in dealing with violations.

And also quotation of a statement made by Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, as follows:

It should now be clear that a deliberate or conscious violation of the antitrust laws is not a mere personal pecadillo or economic eccentricity but a serious offense against society which is as immoral as any other criminal act. Conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws is economic racketeering. Those who are apprehended in such acts are, and will be treated as, criminals and will personally be subjected to as severe a punishment as we can persuade the courts to impose.

The warning, which is really friendly advice of Justice Clark, should be heeded.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE CLARK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE ANTITRUST SECTION, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, AUGUST 8, 1961, 12:30 p.m., STATLER-HILTON BALLROOM

This is the 71st anniversary of the Sherman law. In this 3½ score years it has proven to be the one most powerful influence in the development of our free enterprise system. But this was not always true. Sixty years ago before the law was in its "teens," President Theodore Roosevelt had this to say: "When I became President, the question as to the method by which the U.S. Government was to control the corporations was not yet important. The absolute vital question was whether the Government had power to control them at all."

"T.R." was determined to find out. In February 1902 he called in Attorney General Knox and ordered him to file suit against the Northern Securities Co. under the Sherman antitrust law. The action caught the participants in the company as a complete surprise, bringing the comment from J. P. Morgan that the President was not a gentleman. Continuing, he said, "If we have done anything wrong, send your man to my man and they can fix it up." And James J. Hill added: "It really seems hard that we should be compelled to fight for our lives against the political adventurers who have never done anything but pose and draw a salary." The press reflected the repercussions, reporting that "Wall Street was paralyzed at the thought that a President of the United States would sink so low as to try to enforce the law." History left it to Mr. Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion in the case to reflect the real defense, namely, such a policy of enforcement would "disintegrate society so far as it could into individual atoms."

The size of the railroads, he said was but "an inevitable accident in their development and hardly a reason for dissolution. President Roosevelt had a blistering rejoinder in which he is reported to have said of the Justice: "I could carve out of a banana a judge with more backbone than that." Holmes, he added, "Should have been an ideal man on the bench. As a matter of fact, he has been a bitter disappointment." And so he was and continued to be to Roosevelt, but to the world, he became the "great Justice."

This is an old recording—and like the broken record—continues to repeat the same sallies in different words. I dare say that the seven antitrust suits filed by President Harrison, the eight of Cleveland, and the three of McKinley brought forth like criticism. In fact, business looked upon government as a rival operator intent upon ruination of all business interests.

Before long, President Roosevelt, as well as Wall Street, found out that the Government did have power. All that was needed, as Justice Brandeis later said, was a bold and imaginative intelligence. As the great publisher Joseph Pulitzer put it: "If Theodore Roosevelt had done nothing else except to start the great machinery of the Government and the most powerful force and majesty of the law in the direction of the prosecution of these great offenders, he would be entitled to the greatest credit for the greatest service to the Nation."

Up to that time, as George E. Mowry points out, "three of the most cherished powers of private business had been the right to set its own prices * * * the right to maintain its books and records in secrecy, and the right to negotiate with labor without interference by a third party." Theodore Roosevelt himself challenged each of these "rights" and in their place would have set up a moral and legal standard that would free "the corporation that wishes to do well from being driven into doing ill, in order to compete with its rival, which prefers to do ill." In 1905 when he proposed this in his message to Congress, Edwin Robinson reports that there were some businessmen who shook at what they were told. And they shook best who knew that he was right.

There quickly followed the dissolution of the Standard Oil Co. and the American Tobacco trust. President Taft defended his action in these cases saying, "What we believe in is the regulation of the business of the trusts as distinguished from its destruction." Years earlier in Addyston Pipe & Steel he had declared the purpose of the law to be "to get a more genuine social and industrial justice." Although, as Dean Rostow has stated: "These basic decisions served as a powerful negative factor in business affairs. Certain lines of development were denied to ambitious men." Still, as another commentator commented, "Who among them was indicted, fined or punished?"

I now skip over some two score years and ten. I do this for in covering those years, I would be but singing the same old song—the Romans called it "cantilenam eandem canis"—"You are giving us the same old stuff." But in 1961, there began a changed, a new record. For the first time in Sherman law history, reputable, top-level businessmen were sentenced and served a term in jail. Twenty-nine electrical manufacturers and some of their officers were found guilty of price fixing. As one of the top executives described their behavior: "A few

highly placed and highly trusted employees violated the antitrust laws in secret." Three divisions of his 21 division company were involved. He concluded that "there is need for every one of us to reexamine his own standards. No one can set himself above the law." It is interesting to note that for 15 years this same company had conducted with "undiminished vigor" an intracompany campaign "designed to sharpen the sensitivity and awareness of all of our people as to the role of the antitrust laws." Despite this, during the past 2 years this same company has been indicted 19 times on antitrust violations—paid fines of $450,000—and 16 of its employees have been indicted, convicted, and fined. In fact 11 of them drew jail sentences and 3 actually served them. The program hardly could be called successful. Another executive of a second electrical manufacturer described the collusive conduct in these words: "It is the only way a business can be run. It's free enterprise." One of the defendants to the indictment described his plight with "all we got from headquarters was 'get your percentage of the available business up—the company is slipping.'" One of the lawyers in addressing the court at the time of the sentencing of his client stated: "Why punish these men? It is a way of life—everybody's doing it." In sum, he concluded that no one would sentence a reputable businessman to jail with common crooks.

A national magazine, after quoting Robert Frost:

"It's from their having good contrasted
That good and bad so long have lasted"

waged that sometimes the contrast has to be refurbished by the police. Business, it said, has lost the will or the eye to tell black from white. The public had not been told that corporations would deliberately flout the law of the land. The "crooks" in the industry, it said, have set back for years the progress made by the modern corporation.

Attorney General Kennedy announced that the Government had been defrauded of billions—more money than since the days of Teapot Dome. The companies had agreed which one would be the low bidder, the others filing higher ones; they had divided the country by territories and allocated such territories among companies; the companies took turns in a "phase of the moon" formula, all of which was protected by the use of codes, fictitious names, et cetera. The Attorney General thought that such activity resulted from the existing policy as to sentencing. Instead of jail sentences only fines were usually imposed, after which business went on as usual. Indeed, the Government itself often had made E awards for excellence in weapon production to the companies. Nor was the businessman thought to have done anything wrong—just following the accepted practices. Neither the National Association of Manufacturers nor the Chamber of Commerce ever reprimanded an indicted member company. The individuals responsible continued to be received at the country club, the lodge, the civic enterprises and other community gratherings. Moreover, the Attorney General pointed out, in another area, the public likewise failed to show amazement at the rigged TV shows. In truth many saw nothing wrong in them. Corruption had also crept into labor. And he asked his fellow citizens this question: "Are we going to accept these practices as part of the American way of life? That, in the terminology of the quiz show is the $64 question." He answered for the Department of Justice: "The Justice Department has responsibilities in the criminal field and will meet these responsibilities. But we also have tremendous responsibilities in the antitrust field—where the samll businessman is exploited—consumers disregarded—Government defrauded. We intend to be vigorous and unrelenting in dealing with violations."

And his assistant, Lee Loevinger, as an "Amen," has added: "It should now be clear that a deliberate or conscious violation of the antitrust laws is not a mere personal peccadillo or economic eccentricity but a serious offense against society which is as immoral as any other criminal act. Conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws is economic racketeering * * *. Those who are apprehended in such acts are, and will be treated as, criminals and will personally be subjected to as severe a punishment as we can persuade the courts to impose."

I believe that it must be admitted that the Sherman law, as has been said, has allowed "Judges * * * to apply the brakes to a course or trend of conduct that—in its context—looked unhealthful * * * [t]hat antitrust laws in America are never in a state of being; they are constantly in a process of becoming. You can never close the book and say that now we know what we cannot do." But certainly every lawyer and every businessman knew that the conduct engaged in by these electrical manufacturers was a crime punishable by a jail sentence or a fine, or both. It was a hard core violation of the act. Still the companies permitted it to continue for years, in fact, until they and their employees were caught redhanded. In such a situation, as Henry Ford recently said: "There is really only one thing for top executives to do * * *. That is to forget the alibis and the explanations and have the fortitude—the plain guts—to stand up and say: 'This is our failure. We are chagrined and sorry. It will not happen again.'"

Lawyers, I believe, can have a large part in making sure that Mr. Ford's plea, "It will not happen again," does not become a catch phrase but the solemn obligation of industry. There are not enough investigators to maintain a watch over the shoulders of every company and its employees. The lawyers can and should render a great service in this regard, not only to their clients but to their country. They can borrow from the technique of the doctor who has developed a preventive medicine program for his patients. Lawyers must adopt the same principle to a preventive law program that will make certain that hard core violations of the act will at least be eliminated. They can develop a fresh viewpoint on the antitrust laws that would likely reduce to a minimum questionable practices. As the president of the Du Pont Co. has aptly said, industry must be concerned with "obedience even to the unenforcible"; namely, "the things we do, not because they are required but because they are right." Through the good offices of the lawyer business may, indeed, develop a conscience.

But whether this results or not, it appears to me that one thing is certain: Business must clean up its house of hard core antitrust violations. If it does not, more businessmen may find themselves in jail, as the Department of Justice officials have indicated. And, what is more, legislative codes or other restrictive statutory measures are not beyond the realm of possibility. The choice is clear and so is the duty of management and the antitrust bar.

Tribute to the Late Mon C. Wallgren

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform the House of the death of my friend, Mon C. Wallgren. Mon and I had been friends from boyhood days, played golf together many times, and I always thoroughly enjoyed his company.

From March 1933 to December 1940 Mon represented the congressional district which I now have the honor to represent. From December 1940 until January 1945 he was a Senator from the State of Washington and in 1945 he was elected Governor of the State of Washington and served until 1949. During the Truman administration he served as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and then retired from political life.

Mon had many friends in Washington State from all walks of life from both political parties. He will always be remembered in my home town of Everett, not only for his political accomplishments, but for his great storytelling. Mon always brought cheer and laughter wherever he went.

I have lost a friend and the State of Washington has lost one of its most distinguished citizens.

Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very understanding article by the able and respected Walter Lippmann on the late Dag Hammarskjold which appeared in the Washington Post for September 20 be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

(By Walter Lippmann)

Over the years I have often wondered whether Dag Hammarskjold belonged to an age that is passing or to one that is being born. He was a bold innovator in world affairs, and he opened up a future, having carried further than it has ever been carried before the principle of international action to promote peace. Yet he was himself the fine flower of the European tradition of civility which, if it is not dying, certainly is not flourishing today.

He was altogether not the mass man of our times. He could be a very good friend but there was a deep reserve in his character which few if any can have penetrated. In the great public world where the white lights blazed upon him, he lived an inner life of contemplation and esthetic experience that had nothing to do with power and popularity and publicity. His diplomacy had a finesse and a courtliness in the great traditions of Europe. Never before, and perhaps never again, has any man used the ancient art of diplomacy for such unconventional and such novel experiments.

The biggest experiment, for which in the end he gave his life, was to move the international society of the United Nations from having to choose between a very difficult police action in Korea and sole reliance on debate and verbal expressions. He moved the U.N. onto the plane of executive action

without large scale war as in Korea. This movement from words to deeds, from general resolutions to intervention, was best seen during the crisis at Suez, in Palestine, in Laos, and then in the enormous, the infinitely difficult and the infinitely dangerous crisis in the Congo.

I knew Dag Hammarskjold long enough and well enough, I think, to understand why he accepted the risks of opening up new paths in such wild and uncharted country. He was not an innovator because he had an itch to change things. He was a political innovator because there was no decent alternative. He saw no alternative to intervention by the United Nations in a crisis where there was a bitter confrontation in the cold war.

No cautious and timid man would have dreamed of staking the prestige and perhaps the future of the United Nations, as well as his personal reputation and his office, on the attempt to pacify the Congo. But great as were the risks of intervention, the risks of letting events run their course were much greater. If the United Nations now fails in what Hammarskjold inaugurated, the prospects are that the terrible racial struggle between Europeans and Africans will become deeply entangled in the conflict between the Western powers and the Communist powers of the Soviet Union and China.

It was to avert and to prevent this fatal entanglement that Hammarskjold dared to use the powers of the United Nations. The outcome is as yet unknown. But what we do know is that his unprecedented innovation in world affairs has run into fearful resistance both in the East and in the West. Hammarskjold's use of the U.N. to isolate and disinfect the Congo crisis brought on him and the U.N. the implacable hatred of the Soviet Government. At the same time Hammarskjold did not have the full support of the Western powers. In Algeria, in Katanga, in Angola, in Rhodesia, and in south Africa there is bitter resistance to the objectives of the United Nations in the Congo. Those objectives are to protect the transition from white supremacy, which cannot be continued much longer, to African self-government for which the Africans are so unprepared.

There is no doubt that in the administration of the new U.N. policy there have been mistakes, errors of judgment, and failures of personnel. But let us keep it in mind that the cause of the two-sided opposition to the U.N. action is not the mistakes, which are not irreparable. The cause of the opposition from East and West is a determination not to have the U.N. succeed in what it is attempting to do. For if the U.N. succeeds, there will not be a Communist government in the Congo. That is what Khrushchev hates about Hammarskjold and the Secretary-General's office. And if the U.N. succeeds, there will not be a restoration of white supremacy in the Congo, and that is why money, propaganda, and clandestine intervention are being employed to frustrate the U.N.

No one knows today who can come after Hammarskjold, and there are many signs that he is in fact irreplaceable. For Hammarskjold was made Secretary General at a time when the United Nations was really no more than a debating society. Except for the police action in Korea it passed resolutions which aimed at mediation and conciliation but it did not in any important place command executive action.

It is easy to say that the world is not ready for international action to establish peace, and it would be hard to refute such a statement. Hammarskjold, under the fearful pressure of circumstances, resorted to international action. With his extraordinary diplomatic elegance and finesse, he used successfully international action at Suez in Palestine and in Laos. As compared with these the Congo presented a new order of difficulty, and the outcome, now that Hammarskjold is dead, is in the gravest doubt.

If the world is not ready for what Hammarskjold felt compelled to try in the Congo, it is also true, I hate to say, that this present world is not ready for the kind of man Hammarskjold was. He was a Western man in the highest traditions of political excellence in the West. Khrushchev says that Hammarskjold was not neutral in the Congo, and that there is no such thing as a neutral man. Hammarskjold was in fact the embodiment of the noblest Western political achievement—that laws can be administered by judges and civil servants who have their first allegiance to the laws, and not to their personal, their class or even their national interests.

No such political ideal is believed to be possible or is regarded as tolerable in the Marxist world. The ideal is not very well understood in most of the rest of the world, and there is no use pretending that such public servants are not very rare indeed. So there are times, as now in this hour of our grief and shock, when the ideal seems to belong to things that are passing away.

Time Has Run Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, many times during the course of this session of Congress I have spoken here on the floor and in public statement to the effect that what the United States lacks is a definite foreign policy.

That we need such a foreign policy is evident from the staggering losses we have experienced vis-a-vis world communism since the beginning of this year—Laos—Cuba—and now the Congo and British Guiana. How much longer can we expect to last as a free nation if we allow our friends to be plowed under by the ruthless hand of the Communist dictator, Nikita Khrushchev? I believe that Russia's resumption of nuclear tests shows once and for all that communism means business in the game of world domination. To think otherwise at this time would be foolhardy and suicidal. For this reason, I wish to insert at this point an editorial from the Indianapolis Star, entitled "Time has Run Out":

[From the Indianapolis Sunday Star, Sept. 3, 1961]

TIME HAS RUN OUT

Time has run out for the United States. The Soviet decision to resume nuclear testing has shown the bankruptcy of our foreign policy. President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk can no longer depend on the weak United Nations to solve America's problems. It has no major accomplishment to its credit, nor will it have under present conditions. It cannot resolve the Berlin crisis, except in our ignominious withdrawal. It cannot achieve nuclear or any other kind of disarmament. It has made a mess of the Congo, and promises to repeat the process elsewhere in Africa.

The United States must take the offensive in the cold war. It cannot do so if its hands are tied by its allies and if its course of action is blocked by the fear of offending the neutralists. We must abandon the pious hope that the Soviet Union will agree to a lessening of world tensions. We must forget the fantastic belief that Khrushchev will listen to world opinion.

Today we are confronted with brutal, ruthless power that will yield only to superior power. The United States has that superior power. We can destroy the Soviet Union, and Khrushchev knows it. We must call the Soviet Union's bluff on making Berlin a free city. We must match the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing by renouncing our own foolish ban against testing. We must stop attributing to the Communists the same ethical and moral values that dominate our own thinking.

Above all we must stop the unside-down policy of claiming our defeats are victories. It was no victory when we humbly sought negotiations on Laos, but we talked as though it were. Cuban patriots valiantly died on the beach of the Bay of Pigs while air cover was denied them, but the landing was a bitter failure—and we should have learned our lesson instead of glossing over our mistake. We were told the Communists were admitting a great defeat when they sealed the borders of West Berlin, but the world saw only Communist strength in that illegal action.

When the Soviet Union announced it would resume atomic testing, Secretary of State Rusk said the Soviet disregard of world opinion "should sink in hard everywhere." Of course, the news reports are full of neutralist dismay over the Soviet action, but none of the neutralist countries has the strength to oppose Russia. Neutralist and world opinion won't help us and it won't hurt us. But our own failure to act as a great Nation will certainly destroy us if we continue on our present course long enough.

If we preserve the United States we will preserve the free world, and the neutralist nations as well. If we permit timidity and fear and the ideological beliefs of other nations to dictate our foreign policy, Communist victory is inevitable. And if we continue to dissipate our material wealth and economic strength in hundreds of unimportant places, instead of concentrating on the real enemy in the Kremlin, we shall lack the power as well as the will to stand up to Khrushchev.

Time has run out. We must act now. Not next year or next month but now. The United States must abandon its wavering, excuse-making, mawkish policy dictated by countries too small or too fearful to stand up and be counted. The time for President Kennedy to adopt an American policy is now.

On Appointment of Hon. Thaddeus Machrowicz to the Bench

SPEECH
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit this occasion to pass without adding my voice to that of my colleagues in paying a tribute to my close and valued friend and colleague, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ.

THADDEUS MACHROWICZ came to our shores from a people and nation whose

love for freedom is unsurpassed, and he can and does take justifiable pride in his Polish ancestry. He is a man of courage and integrity. He fought for freedom in three armies. He is thoroughly and completely dedicated to his adopted country. Americans can be proud of this great American patriot. He is my valued friend and colleague. The judicial branch will be strengthened by his presence and service there and our democratic form of government will be the gainer.

THAD, I congratulate you and I congratulate the judiciary on your appointment.

A Solution for West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I suppose every American citizen has his opinion about what should be done regarding West Berlin. Some favor standing firm, offer no new ideas, and be ready to back up our position with missiles, men, and might. Others believe we should get out of Berlin and let the Communists have the city. Most of us, I think, share the conviction that we have a basic legal right and moral responsibility to be in, and have access to, West Berlin. I, for one, think we should hold firm and speak from a position of strength in Berlin. However, I reject the notion that we cannot offer new ideas, new proposals, new ways for easing tensions over the troubled city.

Reflecting serious thinking on a solution for West Berlin, a recent editorial from the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram points up the fact that negotiations should not stop and that the West must come up with fresh proposals. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLUTION FOR WEST BERLIN

There is a tendency for Americans to get impatient, even jittery at times, over the Berlin situation.

The American position, at the present stage is that the diplomats of the East and West should first of all be set to work to discover what avenues may possibly be open leading to a peaceful settlement. President Kennedy has instructed Secretary of State Rusk to discuss the subject with Russia's Gromyko at the meeting of the United Nations in New York next week. This is a move in the right direction.

Khrushchev has made a proposal which he thinks should make everybody happy. He would make West Berlin a "free city" but leave it isolated, dependent on the Communist puppet government of East Germany for lines of access to the Western World.

President Kennedy refuses to accept this. Neither does he approve of a "summit" meeting to talk about it.

On both these points the President is right. But negotiations should not stop. They should continue with the idea that Russia may be brought to seriously consider conditions that the West can accept.

To do this the West must come up with proposals of its own to change the present status.

What Khrushchev seems to be angling for is for the recognition of the existing government of East Germany by the West. The West might well grant this if the price is paid. Our price should be the making of West Berlin really free by establishing a substantial corridor to connect it with West Germany.

For this there is recent historical precedent. After World War I Germany was cut in two to establish the Polish Corridor giving Poland the Baltic port of Danzig. This is now an accepted fact.

We are unwilling to sacrifice West Berlin. East Berlin and Germany are, for this generation, lost to Germany but another generation should be left free to work out its own salvation peacefully. The marvelous work of restoration accomplished by both West Germany and West Berlin imposes on the West the duty of protecting that accomplishment.

Another point: If Russia really means its professions about peace and universal disarmament, where could be a better place to start than Germany?

We Must Pay Our Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the world today is in a sorry state. The United Nations is facing one of its gravest crises. The result of the West German elections is not encouraging. Congo is still in great danger despite the cease fire. Our sacrosanct Monroe Doctrine has been breached. Laos is on the verge of falling under communism. Vietnam is under severe attack.

We must muster all our resources to meet the severe stresses that as the leader of the free world we must shoulder. Our people are determined to do their part. Never was the American temper as aroused as it is now.

In marshaling all our resources to fight communism, we must not forget our friends, our true friends, those who have stood by us in our darkest days. Among these are the people of the Philippines. Whenever freedom is endangered, they have stood up to be counted. We must not take them for granted and we must see to it that we do not give them that impression by our failure to give them the consideration that is their due.

That is why I regret that action was postponed on their long-delayed Philippine war damage claims. This is a legitimate obligation that we owe them. They do not ask for economic aid. They want payment of a debt acknowledged by the executive department of our Government. We should not delay meeting it.

I ask for unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks two articles published by the New York Times and by the Scripps-Howard newspapers by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, who we all know has fought for freedom and democracy in peace as well as in war. In this connection I wish to express my regret—which I am sure is shared by all those who are acquainted with his great work in the United Nations—that during these critical days for that organization, the man who was one of its great presidents is not there to give them the benefit of his experience and statesmanship.

The two articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1961]

POSITION OF PHILIPPINES—DISAPPOINTMENT OVER POSTPONED WAR CLAIMS BILL EXPRESSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I wish to thank you for your editorial of September 8 "An Injustice to the Philippines." Your article helps to bolster our faith in America's sense of fairness and justice.

To say that my people were disappointed by the recent action postponing action on the Philippine war damage claims bill is to put it mildly.

When General MacArthur returned to New York after his visit to the Philippines last July he made a statement that I would like to quote to supplement the views you so cogently expressed in your editorial. He said in part:

"My tour of the country was so comprehensive that I could not fail to obtain very definite conceptions. The morale of the Nation is of the highest order and reflects clearly its friendship, its affection and its sympathetic understanding of the United States. We have no ally so completely loyal and devoted.

"There is, however, a strong undercurrent of feeling that in its relative dealings with the nations of the world the United States has tended to overlook to some extent the needs and necessities and even the just claims upon us of the Philippines. The restitution of the damage inflicted by our forces which was, of course, necessitated by the exigencies of war have not received adequate compensation, especially when compared with the lavish grants made to nations proclaiming neutrality and even to the former enemy countries of Germany and Japan."

The feeling mentioned by General MacArthur I have tried to emphasize in Washington time and again. I would not be a true friend of the United States and I would be derelict in my duty as Philippine spokesman here if I did not make as my own and thank you sincerely in behalf of my people for describing so felicitously in one sentence the current feeling of 27 million Filipinos:

"What seems a small matter in this country is a serious cause of national irritation in the Philippines."

CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Ambassador of the Philippines.
WASHINGTON, *September 8, 1961.*

[From the Scripps-Howard newspapers Sept. 20, 1961]

LET US KEEP ALIVE THE PHILIPPINES' FAITH IN UNITED STATES

I thank you for your recent editorial, "An Honest Debt." I am sure my people will appreciate this new token of your continuing friendly interest in the Philippines. It will help strengthen our faith in the sense of justice and fairness of the American people.

The news of the postponement of action on the $73 million Philippine war damage claims bill by the House Rules Committee was received in my country with dismay and disbelief. My people were at a loss to understand why this delay in fulfilling

a 10-year obligation of your Government duly recognized and acknowledged by your executive department. In the hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee Secretary Rusk and other officials testified that this debt is owed the Philippines and must be paid.

When President Kennedy was informed that action on the bill was postponed by the Rules Committee, he said:

"I regret that the bill (H.R. 8617) to compensate Philippine citizens for World War II damage to their property has been held over until next year by the House because of the press of other business.

"We had hoped that this long delayed recognition of the staunch contribution of our Philippine allies, through the satisfaction of their claims, would receive congressional approval this year. However, the administration continues to give whole-hearted support to such legislation and is hopeful that it will be approved by the Congress early in the next session."

In a speech on the floor the other day, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan said:

"The United States is giving away billions to uncommitted nations, many of which, while not enemies of this country, consort with and give aid and comfort to our enemies. In such circumstances it is difficult to believe this Nation would fail to honor its obligations * * * as these deserving Philippine claims. They should be met at an early date, if not from the compelling justice in them, then as a return for the friendship so richly given, without reservation or cavil, by our friends, the people of the Philippines."

Your excellent editorial and statements such as those made by President Kennedy and Representative DINGELL, and by others on the House floor, like Representatives MILLER, JUDD, and BRYAN DORN are refreshing and I must say they are badly needed by my people these days to keep alive the flame of their faith in the United States.

CARLOS P. ROMULO,
Philippine Ambassador to the United States.

Restrictions on Residual Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the present restrictions on the importation of residual oil is of even more concern to all of us today than it has been in the the past. As we move into another winter season, costs are going to go even higher because of the limitations on the use of an economical fuel.

The following resolution expresses the feelings of the New England Governors' Conference on this problem and urges the immediate removal of this means of discrimination against the people and the industry of New England:

RESOLUTION ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS ADOPTED BY THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, KENNEBAGO LAKE, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 11, 1961

Whereas quota imposed on residual fuel in 1959 have brought about a shortage and substantial price increase costing the New England States over $30 million a year in added fuel costs; and

Whereas these restrictions are hampering our regional industrial growth; and

Whereas restrictions on this vital industrial and heating fuel have penalized particularly hospitals, civic institutions; and

Whereas these restrictions on residual oil imports have damaged our international trade relations, thus adversely affecting our national security: Be it

Resolved, That the New England Governors' Conference records its unequivocal opposition to the continuation of these quotas, and applauds the efforts of the New England Senators' conference and of the members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives to have these quota restrictions removed; and that, furthermore, the New England Governors' Conference calls upon the President of the United States, who will receive shortly a recommendation from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to bring about an end to the discriminatory and unfair burden that has been placed on the citizens of the New England States.

Phi Beta Kappa Statement of Policy on Freedom Under the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on "Freedom Under the Bill of Rights," which was adopted by the senate and council of the national honorary society of Phi Beta Kappa at their recent meeting in Salt Lake City, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The statement was drafted by a special committee appointed by Dr. Lawrence M. Gould, who is president of Phi Beta Kappa and also of Carleton College. This committee had as its chairman, Irving Dilliard, of Collinsville, Ill., trustee of the University of Illinois and former editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Other members were Professor Emeritus William T. Hastings, of Brown University, past president of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, and Prof. Edward C. Kirkland, professor emeritus of history at Bowdoin College and former president of the American Association of University Professors.

I commend this excellent statement to members of all the groups mentioned in the statement.

There being no objection, the statement is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON FREEDOM UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The council of Phi Beta Kappa in 1949, at a time of widespread investigations of educational institutions for alleged subversion and of the punishment of individuals by extra legal devices and penalties, affirmed its devotion to "the fundamental concepts of our democratic tradition, including the freedom to teach or publish the results of honest and competent inquiry." In 1958 the council, on the particular issue of desegregation in colleges and universities, affirmed that the question of "equality of opportunity for qualified students regardless of race or color" should be discussed and debated in freedom without imposed restraint or punishment direct or indirect of those who professed minority or unpopular views. In times of crisis, historic freedoms may be manifestly abridged or even submerged. But liberties may also be undermined through an erosion unrealized by a citizenry that is either uninformed or apathetic. There are in American life today forces which seek to restrict freedom of inquiry, thought, speech and action, not only in universities and colleges but throughout our society as a whole. Gains for freedom in some areas tend to obscure disturbing losses elsewhere. Because of these facts, the council of Phi Beta Kappa calls attention to rising dangers and urges all scholarly and professional associations, civic groups, newspapers, courts and officials to inform themselves fully, to appraise the needs, to reaffirm more strongly than ever before the national allegiance to the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and to be active in the practice and defense of the American heritage of freedom.

General Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an article on Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, written by the outstanding military expert, Hanson Baldwin. It is shocking to me that here in the United States our administration adopts a totalitarian system of justice by conviction before trial.

Note particularly the statement by Mr. Baldwin, that General Walker had one of the two outstanding infantry divisions in Europe; that the morale of these troops, so high under his command, had sagged noticeably after his removal.

It's about time the American people woke up to the fact that the Americans for Democratic Action are running our country and Mr. Sylvester, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, who has a reputation for being an anti-anti-Communist, has had a great deal to do with the Pentagon's muzzling of military officers on alerting our country. In these days of international stress, we are being made the laughingstock of the world while our President calls up the Reserves daily, and at the same time contributes to the lowering of their morale by such means as the summary dismissal of one of our great soldiers.

Mr. Baldwin's statement appears in today's New York Times:

ARMY'S HANDLING OF GENERAL WALKER'S CASE DISTURBS TROOPS IN EUROPE—JUSTICE DENIED, CRITICS CONTEND

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

AUGSBURG, GERMANY, September 20.—From high command to private first class, the Army in Europe has been deeply disturbed by the case of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker.

Officers of all ranks, particularly the senior ones, deplore the manner in which the case was handled and feel that some fundamental elements of military justice and fairplay were violated.

General Walker is the former commander of the 24th Infantry Division, which has its headquarters here at Augsburg. He was relieved of his command last April and given an oral admonition because of the methods and material used in an intensely anti-Communist and aggressive troop information program he sponsored.

At the direction of the Pentagon, prior plans to transfer General Walker to a corps command in Texas with promotion to lieutenant general were canceled.

Since April, General Walker has been filling a colonel's billet as an assistant operations officer on the staff of Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Europe, with headquarters at Heidelberg.

In Washington, the Army reported that General Walker was returning to the United States Thursday on leave.

It was said that the general would confer with Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, whose resolution calling for an investigation of the Pentagon's censorship of military officers was approved Wednesday by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The reasons for the Army's intense feeling about the Walker case are several and have nothing to do with the materials General Walker used or the things he said in his anti-Communist program.

SOME TERM HIM ZEALOT

In fact, many officers with whom this correspondent has talked said that General Walker had become too much of a single-minded zealot in his fight against communism. They believe he went too far in his 24th Division problue program, if, as alleged, he used materials of the controversial John Birch Society and characterized a number of prominent Americans as "pinks" or "pinkos."

But the Army has been shocked, first by what it feels is the summary treatment given to a man who is generally regarded as an outstanding leader and soldier.

General Walker at the time of his downfall was a much decorated veteran. He was characterized here as a "soldier's soldier," a division commander who had won the hearts of his men.

Under General Walker's leadership the 24th Division was judged variously by his superiors as the best, or one of the two best, divisions in the European Theater and perhaps in the Army.

When General Walker was relieved from his division, the morale sagged temporarily and many officers and men were disgruntled. The division has since been restored to good morale and high combat effectiveness under General Walker's successor, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel.

HANDLING IS QUESTIONED

In addition to the natural sympathy for General Walker because of his outstanding record as a soldier, the Army has been appalled by the handling of the Walker case by Washington.

In its issue dated April 16,1961, the Overseas Weekly, a newspaper published in Frankfurt primarily for troops which has a long record of friction with the Army high command in Germany, published an article about General Walker. It said he had used materials of the John Birch Society and had described a number of prominent Americans in an after-hours study-group speech to soldiers and dependents as "pinks" or "pinkos."

Army authorities say that General Walker's problue troop information program had been monitored by his superiors for many months prior to the publication of the Overseas Weekly story.

INQUIRY ORDERED

When the Overseas Weekly article appeared General Clarke appointed Lt. Gen. Frederic J. Brown, then a corps commander here in Germany, as an inspector general to investigate the allegations and the entire conduct of the troop information program in the 24th Division. But the Pentagon stepped into the picture and ordered General Walker's relief and transfer to Heidelberg before General Brown had well started his investigation.

This precipitate Pentagon action long before an official investigation had either proved or disproved the truth of the Overseas Weekly article angered most officers here and stunned those in his division.

The original press release, written in Washington, which was to announce General Walker's relief, was couched in such extreme terms, this correspondent was told, that a senior commander refused to publish it. In the words of a subordinate he "blew his stack" because of what he felt was Washington's summary interference in the processes of military law and its interference in the chain of command.

His emphatic objections resulted in the alteration of the press release. Nevertheless, General Walker was relieved and assigned to Heidelberg, pending investigation by General Brown. This subsequently led to the oral admonition of General Walker by General Clarke.

Recently, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, testifying before a Senate committee about the Walker case, ordered the release to Congress and to the press of the voluminous records of General Brown's investigation.

It was in this report that the Army disclosed that General Walker was a member of the John R. Birch Society. Its release further disturbed the Army here. It was, they said, unprecedented in the memory of senior officers here.

The report of an inspector general is usually considered, like the minutes of a grand jury, confidential, and is not released. If the Inspector General's investigation leads to a court of inquiry or a court-martial, the matters dealt with in the inspector general's report can be produced in court by witnesses under oath and subject to cross-examination.

But General Walker's case did not lead to a court; yet the Brown report was declassified, not here, but by Washington. Furthermore, it was made publicly available there, Army authorities say, before even part of it was given to General Walker.

General Clarke felt in fairness to General Walker that a copy of the transcript should be sent to him.

GETS PART OF TRANSCRIPT

General Clarke's intercession resulted last week in the receipt by General Walker of a small portion of the transcript of the investigation, but not all of it has yet been received from Washington.

This led to a statement by General Walker that he felt he was being tried in the press, and that he did not even know what the investigation had alleged.

What the Army here describes as the overriding by Washington of military custom and legal fairness has had even greater repercussions because of a third factor.

There is real resentment among military officers in Europe about some aspects of civilian leadership at high and low levels in the Pentagon. Many officers believe that Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, is primarily responsible for what they regard as the deplorable handling of the Walker case.

What some officers characterize as the absurd and often trivial censorship of senior officers' talks, many of which have nothing to do with communism or politics, has been resented. Particularly resented and often commented upon in the last week is the furor that accompanied the Jack Paar television show in West Berlin.

Col. John M. Deane Jr., commanding officer of the Second Battle Group in Berlin who received an oral admonition because of his part in the Paar show, is universally regarded—as is General Walker—as a top-notch soldier.

Officers believe that Colonel Deane was made the goat because he carried out a Pentagon policy. The Army has been told to cooperate fully with the press, radio, and television and motion pictures.

Officers here have long been irked, particularly in recent months, by what they regard as interference with the chains of command and functions of command even by low-ranking civil servants in the Pentagon.

They say that directives from the Pentagon, even in the Berlin crisis, frequently have been conflicting or indecisive, and sometimes, in their opinions, have been inimical to the U.S. interests.

CENTRALIZATION SEEN

The Army feels, in short, there has been far too much tendency to centralize everything in Washington and to "command squads" from there, and that there is nowhere near enough "loyalty down" from the Pentagon to the field.

Washington officials with the authority to formulate policies in a variety of fields duck responsibility if those policies, carried out by subordinates overseas, result in a public outburst, it is charged.

There is still a fourth reason for the intense feeling here about the Walker case. Sympathy for the general, aroused by the foregoing factors, has been intensified because of the great dislike of many American officers for the Overseas Weekly, which first aired the charges against General Walker.

The Overseas Weekly is a privately owned operation, which, under contract with the Army daily—the Stars and Stripes—is distributed to Army newsstands throughout much of Europe.

Its circulation of some 50,000 to 60,000 is almost exclusively among military men, chiefly enlisted men.

The Overseas Weekly has a history of almost a decade of more or less continuous friction with Army authorities. It was barred briefly from PX and other Army newsstands in 1953, but a combination of congressional pressure and press charges in the United States that freedom of the press was being violated led to its restoration.

FRICTION FREQUENT

Intermittently ever since there have been various instances of friction, and suggestions by various Army commanders that it be barred from Army newsstands. Some Army authorities hold that freedom of the press is not at issue, that the Army has the authority to control its own sales on its own newsstands and that Playboy magazine, for instance, is not sold on Army newsstands here in Germany.

They say, however, that barring of the Overseas Weekly from Army stands would probably result in the cessation of publication. Some officers say that at times the Overseas Weekly has been helpful in revealing maladministration or malpractices that might have not have been detected by official channels.

Recent surveys by the Army of many issues of the Overseas Weekly resulted in the classification of about 150 columns of news as unsavory courts-martial, 46 individual stories as featuring ridicule of military leadership, 22 on the antiofficer, pro-enlisted-man theme, and a total of more than 200 stories dealing with prostitution, rape or other violence, some of them adjudged to be excessively descriptive or lurid.

The Overseas Weekly believes it performs a service to the command by the publication of courts-martial records and by its revelation of service derelictions. But the Army

says the paper was returned to service newsstands in 1953 only after the owner had indicated that the Overseas Weekly desired to cooperate for the benefit of the command and would refrain from publishing "harmful material."

But, according to a recent report, "the editorial policy has been and continues to be one of emphasis upon crime, sex and the maladministration of the military."

Most, but not all of the many senior officers this correspondent has talked to, agree with Secretary McNamara's description of the paper, in congressional testimony, as "personally repulsive."

Because of the nature and history of this paper, which first aired the charges against General Walker, many were prejudiced in his favor.

There had been a history of friction between General Walker and the Overseas Weekly long before the general was relieved.

Matters came to a head on December 28, 1960, after Siegried Naujocks, a writer for the Overseas Weekly, was barred from the barracks of the 24th Division, here at Augsburg and around Munich.

General Walker took this action after Mr. Naujocks allegedly said to some personnel of the division that he had proof that General Walker was suffering from a brain tumor.

General Walker had received a thorough medical examination after he had complained of some headaches, but according to the Army, he showed no trace of any tumor.

Efforts by the Overseas Weekly to have Mr. Naujocks readmitted to the 24th Division area followed. Appeals were turned down by both General Walker and General Clarke. The Army says that representatives of the Overseas Weekly then declared they would have to publish a story dealing with General Walker. The publication on April 16, 1961, of an account of a speech made by General Walker in January 1960—15 months previously—and of other alleged details of the "pro-blue" program followed.

SLUR ON TRUMAN ALLEGED

It was in this speech that General Walker is alleged to have characterized some prominent Americans, including former President Truman, as "leftist," "pinks," or "pinkos."

General Walker's relief followed almost immediately, before the charges were investigated.

A spate of suits and cross-suits has stemmed from the Walker case. The International Media Co., publisher of the Overseas Weekly, sued General Walker in a Frankfurt court because of a statement made by General Walker after the publication of the article linking him with the John Birch Society. General Walker inferentially equated the weekly with communism.

This suit was dismissed on the ground of lack of jurisdiction by a German court after the Army had certified that General Walker's statement was made in performance of official duties.

The former public information officer and other personnel of 24th Division filed a suit alleging slander against the Overseas Weekly. The suit, too, was dropped by the Frankfurt prosecutor, on the basis—in German law—of insufficient public interest to warrant prosecution.

A third suit—a criminal complaint charging defamatory statements—has been filed by General Walker against Siegfried Naujocks, the Overseas Weekly writer who was barred from the 24th Division barracks.

The natural conservatism of Army officers, and their patriotism, plus formal orders to emphasize the dangers of communism to their troops, make them, of course, sympathetic to the objectives General Walker had.

But many of them—including some officers who most admire General Walker as a soldier—believe that what they describe as the general's fervid, intense, some say fanatic, single-minded concentration in after-duty hours and spare time upon anticommunism had destroyed his objectivity.

And most of those this correspondent talked to disagree with the methods used, the materials employed, and with General Walker's alleged statements.

But the great majority, including those who disagree with General Walker, resent the way the case was handled.

Welfare Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the September 1961 issue of the County Officer, the official publication of the National Association of County Officials, contains an excellent and thoughtful editorial written by Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director for the association, entitled "Welfare Showdown."

Mr. Hillenbrand explains some of the frustrations our officials are experiencing in seeking to carry out the programs to prevent want and warns of the serious consequences of failing to fully review these programs and justify the procedures under which these programs are operating.

Every Member will be interested in Mr. Hillenbrand's demand for a thorough national review by people of national stature:

WELFARE SHOWDOWN

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director)

Our national public welfare is a conglomerate hash that defies citizen understanding. It was born in the depths of the depression and has not been rejustified to the American people for more than a quarter of a century. With the exception of the professional social workers, nobody seems able to understand the welter of State and Federal laws and regulations that are a bar to the most effective administration of these vital programs.

One example: the 1935 Social Security Act required that aid-to-dependent children assistance must be paid in money rather than commodities. This is a fine principle, but blind adherence to this 26-year old law leads to ridiculous extremes. A social worker in North Carolina, for example, after first checking with the supervisor in the State welfare office, delivered an ADC payment to a mother in jail charged with public drunkeness. The mother of course used the money to pay her attorney who defended her in court. The money was not used to shelter, clothe, or feed the needy child.

Such cases are the rare exception but they make the news and collectively undermine these fine programs.

We think it is time for a thorough review of the entire welfare program.

We understand that with the financial assistance of the Field Foundation such a review is underway. We also think that this review will be of little value because it is being made exclusively by professional social workers.

This is like asking professional educators to review the education program—or letting soldiers review military expenditures.

There are no finer, more able, more dedicated people in the world than the social workers and herein lies one of our problems.

Their professionalization is such that they tend to think that the lay person and the elected official does not understand welfare matters. They have wrapped the program in so many layers of regulations that it isolates the decision making from the local citizen and the elected official.

Every time that a county official wants to change direction or take a more active part in local welfare administration, he is told that it is illegal and that if he does so, his community will lose Federal aid.

This has led to the tremendous frustration and bitterness that we see welling up in the celebrated Newburgh * * * approach to welfare administration.

This in turn leads to unfair treatment of the deserving in an effort to get the chiseler.

The point is that we need facts and not emotion. We need a thorough national review and rejustification. We think it should be done by men and women of national stature. We would suggest that it be headed by one of our former Presidents or a person of similar status, so that results will carry the prestige that a matter of this tremendous seriousness deserves. Both social workers and elected public officials should be represented but should not dominate such a group.

Clark County Celebrates 42d Birthday This Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH R. HARDING
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, my State of Idaho is in the midst of preparations for its territorial centennial in 1963.

Idahoans are very proud of our glorious history. Just as America is a melting pot of the nationalities of the world, so is Idaho. Ours is a State where the Germans, the Irish, the Welsh, and other nationalities who worship as Catholics, Mormons, Protestants, and other religions, combine to devote their energies to building a great State and a heritage for their descendants.

I would like to include with my remarks two articles about the early settlers of the Clark and Jefferson Counties of Idaho which appeared in the Idaho Post Register earlier this year and were written by a very fine and talented journalist, William Stibal Pettite, who was also the judge of the probate court in Clark County and is an avid historian of this area's early history:

CLARK COUNTY CELEBRATES 42D BIRTHDAY THIS YEAR

(By William Stibal Pettite)

DUBOIS.—Clark County, Idaho's smallest in population, celebrated its 42d birthday in 1961. No celebrations were scheduled by the county but many citizens whose families played a role in the founding recalled the day in 1919 when Gov. David William Davis signed the county into being.

The bill to create the county was authorized by George B. Allen, then a representative

from old Fremont County, Allen, a Spencer merchant, served for many years as the Clark auditor and recorder. His wife, Caroline, was appointed the first recorder and auditor of the new county. He died in 1936 and Mrs. Allen in 1940.

Allen's bill suggested the new county be named Clark in honor of Sam K. Clark. Clark was a beloved settler in the area, coming there in 1896 from the Centennial Valley near Monida. An Ohio native, he had represented Fremont in the legislature and later for many years as senator from Clark county. He was a leading rancher and business figure in Idaho until his death in 1933.

WITNESSED SIGNING

Special guests of Governor Davis when he signed the new bill into effect were a number of county leaders. W. F. Dillon, a Dubois railroad official who later moved to Pocatello, Richard W. Katendahl, city attorney of Dubois and former city attorney of Idaho Falls. Katendahl, an officer in World War I, was also a Bingham county attorney, before locating at Dubois in 1915.

Elmer Davis, a prominent Medicine Lodge rancher, and C. P. Button, newspaper publisher, were also present, along with Sam Clark and George Allen. Davis later moved to Boise and Button moved in 1920 to Nampa, where he entered the real estate business. Button was appointed the first probate judge of Clark County. A native of Wisconsin, he had been associated with newspapers there, in Canada, and at Clark Fork, before moving to Dubois in 1914. He also served a term as U.S. land commissioner.

State officials present, besides Governor Davis, were Lt. Gov. Charles C. Moore of St. Anthony and John K. White of Boise.

Moore, who died a couple of years ago, became Governor soon after. He had helped found Ashton and served in 1903–7 as a representative from Fremont County, and was also a leading banker. He was also credited with placing the industrial school at St. Anthony.

White was then commissioner of public welfare for Idaho. He had served on San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American war of 1898. Before becoming commissioner, he had been secretary to Governors Hawley, Haines, Alexander, and Davis, and to Senator Heyburn.

Governor Davis was from American Falls, where he was a banker. An Iowa native, he had served Idaho as a State senator in 1912 and was defeated for Governor in 1916, but won 2 years later.

COUNTY LEADERS

At the time Clark County was created from the northern and western parts of Fremont County, Governor Davis cited the following as among the leaders for a new county: John W. Hays, William and Frank Pyke, Grant Soule, William A. Patt, J. P. Jacoby, James Denning, J. D. Wood, Frank Hagenbarth, J. F. Reno, J. T. Gayle, J. E. Paul, the Ellis brothers of Medicine Lodge, and E. M. Miller.

Hays, a prominent Democrat, was named the first assessor of the new county. An Iowa native, he was a popular rancher and businessman of the area. His widow, the former Olive Kendrick of Camas, still resides at Dubois.

The first county commissioners were Jacoby, Denning, and Jensen. Jacoby, for whom the Jacoby district is named, was a longtime rancher and civic leader. His daughter is Mrs. H. R. Harn, of Dubois. Christian Jensen was a Denmark native who had settled at Kilgore in 1895. James Denning was a native of Ireland, who had settled at Howe in 1894 and was associated with U.S. Senator W. A. Clark, of Montana. Later Denning, a leader in the Catholic church, was active in ranching in Clark County.

FIRST ATTORNEY

The first county attorney was Grant Soule, who now lives in Clearfield, Utah. Soule was a prominent attorney for many years, being a candidate for attorney general of Idaho at one time. Soule was also elected as the first Clark County attorney, defeating Katendahl and Robert Wedekind.

The first treasurer was Mrs. Bessie Meeker Green, who now lives in Pocatello. Mrs. Green's father was a prominent dentist at Dubois. Earl Main was the first sheriff. His widow, a member of the Idaho Falls Pedersen family, died last year in Chicago. Coroner was William A. Patt, of Humphrey, who settled there in 1897. Capt. Dan T. Murphy was the first surveyor. An engineer, he moved to Dubois around 1913 from Minnesota.

FIRST MAYOR

The first mayor of Dubois was Charles H. Oakley. A Democrat, he served 3 years. Mayor Oakley died in 1938 at 77. A native of Pennsylvania, he first came to east Idaho in 1883 settling at Old Beaver, near Spencer. In 1888 he was operating a hotel and saloon at Camas, moving in 1892 to Dubois. He sold his bar there in 1910 and entered into other business and ranch activities.

While Clark County is but 42 years old, the community of Dubois is some 70 years of age. This county seat town was named in honor of Fred T. Dubois, then Idaho's U.S. Senator. Senator Dubois, who lived for many years at Blackfoot, was also the last Territorial delegate to Congress from Idaho, serving from 1887–90. Dubois served his first term in the Senate as a Republican in 1891–97 and his second as a Democrat from 1901–07.

He was replaced in the Senate by William E. Borah. As U.S. marshal for Idaho from 1882–86, Dubois was in charge of arresting hundreds of polygamous practicing people in east Idaho. He once related that this was what he considered his most accomplished work. He was a native of Illinois, where his father was State auditor. Of French background, he moved to Idaho in the 1870's, and for many years was a high official of the Masonic lodge.

EARLY GERMAN SETTLERS STILL ACTIVE ON FARM

(By William S. Pettite)

ROBERTS.—An alert, but frail appearing, 84-year-old woman—Mrs. Katherine (Jacob) Hochwart—still does her daily housework and chores on the homestead she and her late husband settled on in 1902. In fact, she does her housekeeping in the same home that she and her husband built in 1902.

With a keen mind and a kind word for all, Mrs. Katherine Hochwart is the last adult member of the large German or German background group that settled in force in Market Lake by 1902. By that time, Martin Patrie, the land promoter and Idaho political leader, had sold nearly all of the large and small homesteads in and around the growing community of Market Lake, now called Roberts.

Several years before, Patrie had filled a large segment of the area with homesteads being worked by members of the Czechoslovak background, who had arrived in the main, from Nebraska. Now, he sought a large German group seeking to settle in the new frontier of Idaho, as he called it. Patrie, himself a native of Baden, Germany, found just the group in Wisconsin. Most of the Market Lake German settlers came from Wisconsin, especially from the area of Milwaukee.

ADS PUBLISHED

To obtain these settlers, Patrie, trustee of the homestead land for eastern interests, again placed ads in daily newspapers of Illinois, New York, Wisconsin and Nebraska. (An early German family to move to Market Lake were the Burggrafs, who came in 1897, earlier than most of the other German settlers. The Nicholas Burggraf family came from Minnesota. Another early German family were the O. D. Bells.)

Other families of German background were the Eichinger, Moder, Freiday, Keller, Deahl, Edelmayer, Freuf, David, Gellings, Schmitoz, Thornberg Heckmann, Commiskey, and Wengert families. Most of these families have since moved from their early homesteads, though some of their heirs still farm in the area.

Mrs. Hochwart recalls many early hardships in settling and the removal of many acres of sagebrush for crop planting. She also can remember the construction of the Roberts Catholic Chuch in 1911, which her husband helped to build. Up to that time she stated, mass or church services had been held at various homes. Priests arrived on horseback on their calls. At one time, due to the large number of German and Czech peoples in Market Lake, the Catholic Church was the largest of the two churches in the community; there being a Baptist Church, which had been built around 1904. (The Presbyterian Church was constructed in 1918 and the LDS ward about 10 years later.) Mrs. Hochwart, besides being the last of the adult German settlers is also the oldest member of the Roberts Catholic Church.

CIVIC LEADERS

Mrs. Hochwart also relates that for many years members of the German and Czech groups held many positions of trust in the community and county. She recalls that Lewis Ledvina and William Stibal served as postmasters, that Peter David, Joseph Ledvina, Frank Panek, O. D. Bell, N. Burggraf, Sr., F. E. Freiday, L. F. Deahl, A. Tomchak, William and A. W. Stibal, C. Lapacek, and N. Eichinger, were among those elected to the board of the Butte & Market Lake Canal Co. Panek and Stibal also served as officers of the banks at Roberts.

According to Mrs. Hochwart, William Stibal was the spokesman for the early homesteaders for many years, devoting much time and many trips for the settlers. Deahl operated a large grain business at Market Lake. Miss Kate Burggraf served as county school superintendent. She and her sister, Ann, both taught at Market Lake, too.

BAVARIA NATIVE

Mrs. Hochwart, a native of Bavaria, Germany, came to America shortly before the turn of the century. As Miss Katherine Laurer, she settled in Wisconsin. Her husband to be had arrived in the United States in 1892. He was also a native of Bavaria. In 1901 they were married in Mellon, Wis. Until they moved to Market Lake, Hochwart had been engaged in the tannery business. (Bavaria at the time of their births was a formal country of its own and was not then a part of Germany, Mrs. Hochwart stated.)

The Hochwarts were also related to the Moder and Eichinger families, who settled at Roberts. Mrs. John Moder was a sister to Hochwart and Mrs. Nicholas Eichinger was a sister to Mrs. Hochwart.

STOPPING PLACE

The Hochwart homestead, of now some 240 acres, is located about 1½ miles south of Roberts. Their home was once a stopping place for the many Indians who used to roam the area in the early days. The homestead is now farmed by a son, Hugo, who is active as a member of the Roberts Cemetery District Board. Hugo and his wife, the former Florence Steinke, of Idaho Falls, have eight children. Their home is in the rear of the original homestead.

Though the senior Hochwarts lost two daughters and a son in infancy and a second son in 1946, Mrs. Hochwart feels she and her husband, who were married 57 years, had much to be thankful for. Mr. Hochwart died at 88 in 1958 at the original homestead.

Mrs. Hochwart, who has seen bands of Indians roam by on their horses, now views the rushing cars of the highways zooming past. Much progress has been made in Idaho and Mrs. Hochwart can view the many changes knowing that her family and other hard-working German settlers helped to make this progress possible in Idaho.

New Directions in Gas Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission before the annual membership meeting of the Independent Natural Gas Association meeting at Houston, Tex., on September 19, 1961. Mr. Swidler brings to his new and challenging assignment a fulsome background that will make him, in my opinion, one of the great, if not the greatest, Chairmen of a most important regulatory agency of Government.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN GAS REGULATION

(An address by Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, before the annual membership meeting of Independent Natural Gas Association meeting, Houston, Tex., Sept. 19, 1961)

It is appropriate that I give my first talk on natural gas here in Houston, the heart of the petroleum country and the headquarters of many great pertoleum enterprises. While I am here, I want to meet as many of you as possible so that I can know you and so that you can form your impressions of me. We shall be having much business with each other in the next 4 years, and there is no substitute for personal acquaintance.

Your warm invitation to be here with you today is a testimonial to your charity and breadth of view. The unfortunate men who have responsibility for regulating prices are not likely to be popular. Any price we fix is apt to be too low for the seller and too high for the man who finally pays the bill. If, by any chance, the regulators should satisfy both seller and purchaser, then undoubtedly there would be third parties to say that the wrong method was used, and that the result was illegal. If there was ever a public office in which it was clear that one could not win for losing, this is it.

In all fairness, there are many compensations and consolations. There are enough interesting problems to go around, and to spare. The associations, both within the agency and with the people of the industry, are stimulating and rewarding. Also, if the history of this agency is any criterion one's official life is likely to be mercifully short, and one can look forward to returning soon to the more relaxed life of coaching from the sidelines. Most important of all, I think there is great progress to be made in gas regulation in the next year or two, and great room for innovation and enterprise in developing a sound basis of regulation. I firmly believe that with your cooperation and the cooperation of the other interests concerned, an equitable and generally satisfactory method for regulating producer rates can be found. I am fully aware that this will prove a difficult and complex task. If I have learned nothing else in the almost 3 months I have served on the Commission I have at least learned this much. But the great importance of the task to all the parties concerned makes it necessary that we find such a solution and remove the price uncertainty which has plagued the industry in recent years.

The title of this talk, selected 2 months ago on the spur of the moment for the convenience of the gentlemen who must make up their program long in advance, creates a natural expectation that I have come here prepared to spell out the course of Federal gas regulation in the years to come. I am afraid I cannot live up to the premise of the title, although it was I who suggested it. I do propose, however, to tell you all that I can at the moment about the shape of my thinking on the major gas regulation problems of the Commission. I must caution you that I cannot speak for the Commission, but only for myself. Because my acquaintance with the industry is still recent, my own views are subject to change without notice in the light of additional information and changing circumstances.

I shall want to use this occasion to make some general observations about the problems of the gas industry, but I know that your primary interest is in the developing regulatory pattern for gas producers. I shall speak of that first.

I am fully aware of the great responsibilities of the Commission in the field of producer rates. This year the industry will probably sell something in the order of 13 trillion cubic feet of gas. A difference of a cent a thousand cubic feet is equal to $130 million a year. A cent a thousand difference is the value of the estimated proven reserves is equal to approximately $2½ billion. If we calculate on the basis of the estimates of recoverable gas in the ground in the United States, each cent per thousand is roughly equal to $15 billion. These are indeed astronomical figures, even in Texas, so large that in computing them I checked several times to be sure I was not running in an extra string of zeros. They emphasize that the rate decisions of the Commission have an enormous economic impact, and that they must be made with the most sober care for fair dealing as between producers and consumers. I can assure you the Commission does not take this responsibility lightly.

The problem, of course, is how to apply the rate standards of the Natural Gas Act to producer rates. I do not need to review with this audience the history of the efforts which have been made to regulate producer rates. The principal present vehicles for such regulation are the two area rate proceedings recently instituted by the Commission. I want to discuss these proceedings with you.

On no subject in the gas industry is there more intense interest than in the question of the future course of the area rate proceedings. Into these proceedings have been consolidated hundreds of separate cases that now involve directly prices for the gas produced from two of the Nation's most prolific gas production areas, and which may set a pattern for pricing the entire industry output at the producer's level. Interest has been heightened by the change in the membership of the Commission, which now includes only one member who participated in issuing the area rate orders; by the hearings, themselves, in which many producers have joined in preparing comprehensive studies on an areawide and industrywide basis; by speculation as to the possibility of early Commission clarification of its area pricing policies in response to the parties' requests for such clarification; and, finally, by the report of Chief Examiner Marsh in the southern Louisiana proceeding, which raised explicitly the question whether area rate proceedings were useful ratemaking devices.

My own present view on the last question is that the area rate proceedings will probably prove to be the most important single tool for developing a sound framework of producer rate regulation. They seem to me to be a promising administrative innovation which should be pushed forward with all dispatch and vigor. I say this because I do not believe the production of natural gas lends itself readily to an individual well-by-well or even company-by-company cost-of-service and rate-of-return approach. The man who risks his money to find gas is not like the ordinary public utility, if for no other reason than because under the law he has no public service obligation until he dedicates the gas he finds to the public service. But there are other reasons. The typical utility is a safe industry with a protected investment and consequently limited yield on the investment. The independent producer exemplifies the virtues of the pioneering entrepreneur. He risks his money—and the risk is real—in the hope of a large reward if he is successful. We cannot expect him to continue risking his money exploring for gas at the pace which the national interest requires without offering hope of something more than a return on the money expended at the level which is usual for the largely risk-free investments in conventional utility enterprises.

From the consumers' point of view, the cost-plus formula which is applied to most utilities would deprive consumers of the benefits of the drive toward economy and efficiency which results when each producer reaps the reward for his efforts. While I do not doubt, and I remind you that I speak only for myself, that the Commission could somehow cut through the technical obstacles to an individual cost-of-service approach, area rates, if workable, seem to me to be far preferable for producers and consumers alike.

The two area-rate proceedings for the Permian Basin and southern Louisiana, can be expedited and given more meaning and direction by further Commission orders. For example, the Commission has yet to say whether the purpose of the proceedings is to provide a floor, a ceiling, or a norm, for gas sold within the respective areas. In announcing that it was departing from conventional ratemaking practices, the Commission set standards which opened the door to any evidence remotely dealing with the economics, financing, technology, and history of the industry. The Commission recognized it was breaking new ground and that it would be necessary to issue additional policy statements from time to time clarifying various issues. In the absence of such clarification, the record in the proceedings is apt to be so enormous that it would provide a poor basis for decision and review.

While my present thinking is that the area-rate proceedings are a potentially important administrative device, they can be useful only if appropriate and comprehensive ground rules are put into effect. This has been the consistent cry of all parties. The ultimate responsibility for seeing that these ground rules are formulated is on the Commission. That duty we can neither shirk nor delegate, even though we will require the parties in the proceedings to aid us by giving us their views and suggestions. I assure you that we are hard at work on this task and it is my earnest hope that we will have the answers, or the bulk of the answers, in the near future.

The one evidentiary matter on which the Commission has given a clue to its thinking is with respect to evidence on cost. The major parties to this proceeding have been ordered to complete a questionnaire on costs pursuant to the Commission's order of August 2, 1961. I might say in passing that we have received many helpful suggestions from the producers for clarification of this questionnaire, and we are incorporating them in some revised sheets that will enable us to obtain the needed information in a manner that is more convenient to you. We are also hard at work on an abbreviated questionnaire for the small producers.

The cost questionnaire makes clear the Commission view that area rates cannot be promulgated without a knowledge of at least the overall cost of producing gas within the area. As it happens, I did not participate in the promulgation of the August 2 order requiring the submission of cost data, but this was only because I did not have sufficient background at the time to feel justified in voting on so complex a matter. However, I am in thorough accord with the order and, indeed, I do not see how the area rate proceedings can arrive at any useful conclusion without the cost data called for by the order.

I fully appreciate the difficulty of the allocations necessary in determining the cost of gas, or perhaps more properly, a cost of gas. I cannot believe, however, that any of you conduct your business operations without some concept of costing, and allocations are the heart of costing in this as in many other industries. By the same token I feel you will agree that when we seek to determine a fair price for your product and services we should have a reasonably complete idea of your costs. The Natural Gas Act, the courts, the consumers, and from the indications in your pleadings, you, yourselves, cannot be satisfied with regulated prices which are not somehow related to costs. By emphasizing the necessity of cost information, I do not mean to imply that costs, plus a utility return, should constitute the limit of the price. I fully realize that gas is not available until it is discovered and that there must be an incentive for discovering more and more gas if the industry is to remain healthy. I do not delude myself that simply recovering costs plus a 6-percent return on investment is a sufficient incentive.

I am not unmindful of the extent to which this industry has been haunted by a past in which natural gas was all but a waste to be flared off or sold at whatever price could be had from local users, like the calves' liver which the meat markets of my early years would give away to purchasers of other meats. Natural gas has now emerged as one of the principal petroleum products, much sought after for its own sake. The enormous demand for natural gas requires assigning to it a fair share of the costs of the well and of related exploratory expenses.

I want to assure this group that I do not believe that gas, any more than calves' liver, should be priced on the basis of its market status of a half or even a quarter century ago.

I believe that area prices, to be an effective form of regulation, must be set as ceilings and not as floors. I do not mean to rule out completely the possibility of limited exceptions to area ceilings when such exceptions can be made without substantial effect on the ceiling. However, if every company insists that unless limited by contract it has the right to the area rate as a floor plus anything more it can get in an individual determination, we may as well use an individual cost of service rate base method from the outset. I have been led to believe that many of you feel, as I now do, that such regulation is not feasible for producers. However, some of the recent producer pleadings contend that any area rate decision must include a reservation which would allow marginal, inefficient, or unlucky producers to get a higher price by an individual cost of service showing. These producers seem to believe that rate base cost of service pricing may be workable for raising prices from a floor, although worthless for fixing a ceiling. It seems to me that such a position would make the area pricing approach meaningless.

The basic idea behind area pricing is uniformity of prices and administrative simplicity. If area proceedings are merely to determine rates which each individual company would be free to take or leave, we would accomplish very little. In fact I would then view these cases as a giant step backward. Fixing area prices based on areawide costs and conditions would allow the individual company that is more efficient to reap the benefits of its efficiency. But to allow the company that is less efficient or not so fortunate to have higher rates would, in my judgment, allow the producers both to have their cake and eat it. It would be too much to expect consumers to accept such a heads-you-win tails-I-lose approach. I doubt also that it would meet enthusiastic reception by the courts.

The concept of area rates as a norm, which might be increased for a particular producer on his application and proof of inadequacy, or reduced on the initiative of the Commission or purchasing interests on proof that the area rate was excessive as to him, seems to me to be no better than an area floor. It would not provide producers with the vital assurance they need as to market price before they invest in new drilling ventures. Moreover, a norm would be more likely to be breached on the high side than the low because each producer knows his own circumstances better than do his customers or even the Commission staff. If such a system were to work perfectly, it would be the practical equivalent of individual determinations on a cost basis, which we are all agreed does not conform well to the structure or economics of the natural gas business.

Before leaving the subject of the area rate hearings, let me say that I am impressed by the serious efforts of practically all parties to help make these proceedings a success. I have welcomed the comments of record by a large segment of the producer respondents that these proceedings should be given a fair test before the Commission considers abandoning them. The parties are, I trust, well along in the preparation of their evidence in both proceedings. The Commission staff, I assure you, is working equally as hard. With a continuation of this effort I am convinced that we can bring these cases to an expeditious and meaningful conclusion.

On that note of optimism, I should like to leave the area rate proceedings and speak generally of a few of the steps which we hope to be able to take in the near future to solve some of the procedural problems of natural gas regulation which are giving difficulty to every segment of the industry.

A continuing problem of regulation is to avoid needless uncertainty as to Commission policies. Such uncertainties add to the caseload, stimulate litigation, and waste the time of everyone concerned. I hope that the Commission can turn to the increasing use of policy statements to express Commission policies in a clear-cut and comprehensive way, rather than waiting for policies to emerge fragment by fragment from a mass of decisions in long-drawn-out cases.

I hope also that we can write our opinions in such a way that practictioners can more readily identify the policies underlying the decisions. This is the proper function of an opinion. What we say on a given question should apply generally to all similar cases, so that once the Commission has decided a question it should not be necessary to bring up the question again. We shall attempt to leave no doubts as to the basis for our decisions.

The Commission will continue to give ever-increasing attention to the internal processing of our work. I hope we shall be able to schedule the steps in each important case so that the Commission can know from day to day where any important case stands and at what point it is being held up if it isn't moving. You should not have to come to us to point out that your cases are lagging or need expediting. We should be the first to know it, and before you could come to us to complain of delay we should be hard at work trying to eliminate the bottleneck if one exists.

On one such item we are determined to make progress. I am pledged to do what I can to simplify and expedite our rate investigations. I am hopeful that we can concentrate more on the significant issues and find ways to avoid duplicating your efforts. In turn, may I ask that the industry provide our field staff with every reasonable assistance, including the preparation of requested schedules and statements. The industry applicants can supply this material quicker and at less cost than the FPC men can take off the data from your books. Through such cooperation, we can reduce the time which our representatives spend in your offices as well as the time between the filing of a case and its final disposition.

We are also considering a revision of our procedural rules to require a little more certainty from you at the time of filing as to where you stand and upon what you rely. In reading our regulation for pipeline filings for a price increase, it appears to me that we come close to requiring that you file your case-in-chief when you make your filing. We may find it necessary to say that this is precisely what you are required to file, and that a filing which is not accompanied by all of the facts upon which you will rely will be rejected as an insufficient filing.

By requiring that your cases be fully prepared in advance of filing, that our staff streamline its field investigations, and that intervenors with a common interest pool their efforts, by handing down clear precedents so that settled issues need not be relitigated, by obtaining additional Commission personnel to handle our caseload, and by setting cases for prompt hearing we hope to have a fighting chance of deciding cases within the 5-month suspension period. That is our immediate goal as to pipeline cases and our ultimate goal as to producer cases once the initial area rate cases provide the ground rules. We shall make every effort to clean up our backlog of cases and to try new cases expeditiously. It will take time to get current, but we shall not stop trying until we have done so.

Let me interject at this point that when I speak of setting target periods for the disposition of cases, I am referring to cases in which the applicants seek the earliest possible determination and cooperate fully for that purpose. The provision of the Natural Gas Act which limits any suspension of rate increases to 5 months itself may create an incentive to delay. Obviously it will never be possible for the Commission to close a case within the target period if it must drag reluctant parties through each step of the proceedings.

As you know, there is one source of extensive delay which is in great measure outside of the control of the Commission. I refer, of course, to the delays occasioned by judicial review. The only way in which the Commission can minimize this delay is by taking its postions as soundly as possible and to explain them in well-reasoned opinions. But others may help too.

It is true, I know, that a good deal of the natural gas litigation has been initiated by third party interests who were not confident

as to the Commission's ability to protect the public interest. I hope their confidence will grow and that the Commission's dedication to the protection of the paramount public interest will become so clear that it will not be necessary for third parties to intervene in the future to the extent that they have felt required to do so in the past. I hope also that the parties will feel inclined to abide by our decisions in a much larger proportion of the cases. Being realistic, I will say that I do not expect a decline in natural gas litigation of such magnitude as to decimate the bar.

This is perhaps an appropriate occasion to solicit the fullest possible cooperation from the industry in the Commission's administration of the Natural Gas Act. I have already had the pleasure of meeting a large number of the executives of the industry as they individually paid me the honor of a visit to my office to meet me and to wish me well. To many of them I had the opportunity of saying, as I have said also to men representing the consumers' interests, that I would welcome any suggestions which, from their experience with the work of the Commission, they might wish to offer as a basis for improving and expediting the Commission's work in the natural gas field. I now extend the same invitation to all of you. I can assure you that every suggestion will be fairly considered on its merits.

My acquaintance with the physical base of the industry, limited as it has been, has created in me an enormous respect for the technology of the industry and for the gifted people of many occupations and professions who make the industry run. The thousands of wells, many of great depth, which have been drilled in every kind of terrain and in the ocean itself; the giant pipes which have been laid on high ground, in swamps, across river beds and in deep water; the gathering and compressing stations and stripping plants, some of them many miles out of sight of land; the complex of pipelines which now lay across the whole length and breadth of our country; these are all a tribute to the enormous technological development which has been required in order to bring gas to the homes in virtually every metropolitan center of our country. Because most of these facilities are either buried or are located at great distances from the places where the gas is used, most gas consumers are probably entiely unaware of the engineering genius and the managerial skill, let alone the huge investment, which lies behind the gas supply upon which their comfort and welfare depend. Little does the housewife in Chicago or New York visualize the activities and the investments which underlie the gas supply which comes to her from half a continent away.

As you can undoubtedly see, I am still far from a complete understanding of the natural gas industry. To me it is both fascinating and perplexing, full of puzzles and paradoxes. The greatest of these paradoxes seems to me to be that in this, the fifth largest industry in the Nation, accounting for about one-third of all of the energy consumed in the Nation and serving over 34 million consumers, there is no unified responsibility for supplying the requirements of the consumers. The distributing company, when it needs greater supplies, must depend upon the reserves of producers with which it does not even have direct contractual relations and who are joined with it only through the pipeline company intermediary.

My background in the electric utility field, where integrated operations are the rule, makes me wonder how a system with no unified responsibility could operate efficiently. It seems apparent that there must be more to this system of supply than meets the eye. Thus far, I have heard of no failure of supply to any existing consumers, and the households across the Nation are apparently comfortably confident that the gas they need will be there when they call for it. Upon this consumer confidence that the gas will always be there when the household furnace, the kitchen range, and the water heater are turned on, even, or especially, in the coldest weather of northern winters, the whole success of the industry depends. If this confidence should once be impaired, the damage to the industry would be irreparable. All elements of the industry must work together to instill and maintain a justified sense of complete assurance in the adequacy and continuity of natural gas supply, and at a price which will preserve its status as a fuel which is not only convenient and dependable, but inexpensive as well.

The Federal Power Commission has played a significant role in the development of the natural-gas industry. It has been the forum through which natural gas supplies have been channeled from points of production to points of use. It has provided the consuming public with assurance that adequate gas supplies were available for the new lines which were certificated, and it has provided investors with assurance that the new investments were desirable, feasible, and economically sound. It has provided vital support for the industry's growth from an infant to a giant. The Commission's activities under the Natural Gas Act have not only benefited the industry, but despite the delay in producer rate regulation have also afforded a large measure of protection to the consumer. The Commission has an equally important role to play in the industry's future. I believe that the contribution of the Commission in the years to come will be as notable and constructive as the contribution it has made in the past.

I am frank to say that when a position on the Federal Power Commission was first broached to me, I had my doubts that this was the field of activity or the agency to which I should want to dedicate the next few years of my life. I wondered whether in this area of activity, so traditional in its objectives and so hedged with procedural restraints, there was an opportunity to exercise such qualities of imagination and initiative as I might possess. The last few months have removed my doubts. The work of the Commission is as full of important, live, and pressing problems as one could hope to find anywhere. These are problems which cry for energetic and imaginative treatment. My question is now the reverse, whether it is possible for me to measure up to the challenge and to play my part in the Commission's work of bringing greater order and progress to this vital industry, and greater stability and protection to the consuming public. I can only assure you that I shall never be satisfied until the Commission has developed rules which are fair to all of the elements of the industry as well as to the consumers and which constitute a foundation upon which the men of enterprise who characterize the industry can continue to build.

The Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune to be necessarily absent yesterday during the consideration of House Resolution 393. However, I wish at this time to pay tribute to our colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., whose long and great service to his country is honored in the presentation and acceptance of the sculpture to be placed in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building. It is a fitting remembrance to be paid to one so well respected, yes, revered, as JOE MARTIN.

Although I was not a Member of the Congress during his terms as Speaker of the House, I shall always value his generous help and sound advice when I first came to this august body. His counsel has not been limited to any one group, but it is unselfishly available to all who may seek it. Part of his greatness is this generosity of personal relationships.

JOE MARTIN's 19 terms as a Member of the House of Representatives have been filled with few years of calm and tranquility in our national and international affairs and many periods of crisis and tension. No matter what the order of the day may have been, his evaluation of the situation and his leadership were always primary factors in the ultimate result.

I am deeply grateful to the National Federation of Republican Women for their generosity in appropriately honoring one of the great men of America, our own beloved JOE MARTIN.

Employment Conditions, Spruce Pine District, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the mica producing areas are gravely concerned about the prospects of the termination of the mica program.

Recently agencies of the State government in North Carolina prepared a statement on employment conditions in Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties as related to the mining and processing of mica.

Since mica is such an important commodity in our overall defense planning, I felt that this information would be of interest to my colleagues and, therefore, I include it in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS, SPRUCE PINE DISTRICT, AVERY, MITCHELL, AND YANCEY COUNTIES, N.C.

On July 1, 1952, under Public Law 206 of the 83d Congress, the Federal Government through its General Services Administration began a program of purchasing domestically produced block, film and hand-cobbed muscovite mica. This program is due to expire on June 30, 1962, or when the original quota of 25,000 short tons of hand-cobbed mica or its equivalent is reached. On June 30, 1961, the equivalent of 22,933 tons had been purchased, which leaves a balance of 2,067 tons to be purchased between July 1, 1961, and

June 30, 1962. During the quarter ending June 30, 1961, 629 tons were purchased. At this rate of purchase the required 25,000 tons will be secured and the program will end in May 1962 (exhibit I).

Between July 1, 1952, and June 30, 1961, a total of $23,623,704 was paid for mica produced in the United States. Of this amount, the Mica Purchasing Depot at Spruce Pine, N.C., paid $18,777,317.28 for mica produced in North Carolina. The best figures available indicate that approximately 80 percent of the mica produced in North Carolina comes from the Spruce Pine district of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties. This means that between July 1, 1952, and June 30, 1961, as a result of the mica program, approximately $15,021,853.82 or $1,669,094.86 per year went into the economy of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties—much of which went for payrolls (exhibit II).

The employment value of the mica program to the Spruce Pine district of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, is also shown by the fact that the mica purchasing depot at Spruce Pine paid a total of $3,545,625.03 in wages to mica trimmers between July 1, 1952, and June 30, 1961. This amount, itemized by years in exhibit III, was over and above the amount paid for mica as shown in exhibit II.

The importance of the mica purchasing program to the economy of Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, is further shown by the fact that during its existence, 2,433 miners or miner's representatives have sold mica at the Spruce Pine Mica Purchasing Depot. Today, some 275 miners or miners' representatives are selling mica at the depot. Each of these miners or miners' representatives represent from 1 to 125 persons employed in the mica mining industry. The average is between 4 and 10.

Due to the fact that considerable mica is mined and trimmed by family groups and groups of less than four, which are not covered by the unemployment insurance law, the number of people employed in mica mining and trimming in the Spruce Pine district is not known. However, mining is the chief industry in Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties and it is estimated that in excess of 30 percent of the people employed in mining are employed in mica mining.

The attached letter (exhibit IV) from Mr. David M. Nichols, manager, Spruce Pine office, Employment Security Commission of North Carolina, is important. He estimated that in January 1961 there were 27 persons seeking employment for every 100 employed persons in the area. If to this 27 percent is added the 30 percent of mica miners who will be out of employment when the mica program is terminated, it appears that over 50 percent of the working people in Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties will be unemployed by the middle of 1962.

Since the mica purchasing program is scheduled to terminate by the middle of 1962, the larger companies are no longer exploring and developing new properties, and some of them are beginning to withdraw from the industry and the area. With 27 percent (the second highest in the State) unemployed and another 30 percent facing unemployment by the middle of 1962, the Spruce Pine district of Avery, Mitchell and Yancey Counties is already a depressed area and fast becoming a disaster area. Local citizens are beginning to fear that Spruce Pine may become a ghost mining town, and the mica mines—"ghost mines."

Leaders in the area are doing all they know and can to meet the conditions. A committee has been formed to work through the Spruce Pine Chamber of Commerce. This group is meeting with some success in raising funds for one or more new industries in the area. L. E. Wooten & Co. of Raleigh, N.C., a well-known firm of engineers is being employed to help work out programs to meet employment needs.

However, the task is too great to be met locally in the time available, and it is requested that the mica purchasing program be continued 2 or 3 years in order to give time to work out a new economy for the area. If the mica purchasing program is not continued it will be necessary to find other employment for a large number of loyal people who are asking, not for charity, but for an opportunity to work. It appears that continuing the mica purchasing program may be less expensive than setting up new programs of employment.

Leaders in the area are doing all they can, and are asking help in solving a problem too big to be solved locally.

EXHIBIT I

General Services Administration, Defense Minerals Services—Report of purchases under purchase regulations, June 30, 1961

Regulation: Active program, Public Law 206, 83d Congress, Mica. Termination date: June 30, 1962.

Unit: Short tons hand-cobbed mica or equivalent.

Program limitation (quantity): 25,000.

Purchases during quarter:	
Quantity (tons)	629
Amount	$910,815
Cumulative purchases through end of quarter:	
Quantity (tons)	22,933
Amount	$23,623,706
Remaining to be purchased (tons)	2,067

EXHIBIT II

(Total amount paid at the Spruce Pine depot for mica produced in North Carolina by years, July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1961.)

Fiscal year:	*Amount*
July 2, 1952, to June 30, 1953	$1,394,835.53
July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954	1,331,224.99
July 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955	2,613,211.96
July 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	2,604,077.62
July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957	2,334,692.03
July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958	1,934,545.64
July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959	2,505,179.67
July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960	2,060,098.57
July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961	1,999,451.27
Total	18,777,317.28

EXHIBIT III

Contractors payrolls, July 2, 1952 to June 30, 1961

(These figures represent the actual amount paid in wages to mica trimmers at the Spruce Pine Mica Depot and do not contain any amounts paid as salaries to governmental employees for administrative or overhead expenses.)

Period:	*Amount*
July 2, 1952, to Dec 31, 1952	$28,829.60
Jan. 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1953	85,439.09
Jan. 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954	93,965.04
Jan. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1955	394,154.66
Jan. 1, 1956, to Dec. 31, 1956	465,623.84
Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957	444,034.36
Jan. 1, 1958, to Dec. 31, 1958	664,632.86
Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959	684,753.03
Jan. 1, 1960, to Dec. 31, 1960	434,847.98
Jan. 1, 1961, to June 30, 1961	249,344.57
Total	3,545,625.03

EXHIBIT IV

SPRUCE PINE, N.C., *August 31, 1961.*

Mr. BRAD RAGAN,
President, Spruce Pine Chamber of Commerce, Spruce Pine, N.C.

DEAR MR. RAGAN: In regard to your request for information concerning the total employment in the Spruce Pine office area (Avery, Yancey, and Mitchell Counties), I wish to advise as follows:

1. The fourth quarter report for the Spruce Pine area shows there was an average of 3,631 persons employed by firms having four or more workers, and which were covered by the unemployment insurance law.

2. The unemployment insurance ratio in January showed that there were 27 persons filing unemployment insurance claims for every 100 employed persons, which at that time was next to the highest rate in North Carolina by employment office areas.

In regard to your other inquiry as to the number of workers both in covered employment and noncovered employment who are in some way receiving money from the mica program, we estimate that approximately 1,700 persons would fall into this category.

From the above figures you can see what a financial catastrophe it will be to the Spruce Pine area when the Government mica buying program is terminated.

Sincerely,

DAVIS M. NICHOLS,
Manager, Spruce Pine Office, Employment Security Commission of North Carolina.

The Honorable Thaddeus M. Machrowicz

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to join Members of this body in paying tribute to our esteemed, admired and respected colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, on his appointment to be a Federal judge for the eastern district of the State of Michigan.

I congratulate THAD on his appointment to the judiciary; by the same token, I congratulate the President in his selection of THAD for that position. By ability, training, experience, and temperament I know of no individual who is better qualified for this high and important position, THADDEUS MACHROWICZ has served at all levels of our governmental system in many capacities, and he knows its principles and problems closely and thoroughly. He will therefore bring to bear on this exceedingly important position a lifetime of valuable experience and a broad perspective matched by few individuals. He without question will be a great asset to the judicial branch of the Government. Likewise, his designation to the bench will by the same token be a loss to the House of Representatives. In particular, we regret his loss to the Committee on Ways and Means on which committee we have served together for a number of years. I am aware of the contributions he has made to the matters within the jurisdiction of our committee, particularly with respect to improve-

ments in our Federal revenue and social security programs.

I extend to you, THAD, most sincere congratulations and wish you Godspeed in your new endeavors.

The Embattled Probers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, here follows the second of a series of articles about the House Committee on Un-American Activities written by Pultizer Prize winner, Edward J. Mowery:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Sept. 18, 1961]

THE EMBATTLED PROBERS—HOUSE SPARRING WITH OWN ARRESTS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—On a bitter day in early February 1837, the Speaker of the House handed the Sergeant at Arms a warrant to take into custody the person of Reuben M. Whitney—wherever to be found—to answer charges of contempt at the bar of the House.

Whitney, a recusant (refractory) witness, had ignored a subpena and, by letter, peremptorily refused to testify before a House investigating committee.

The next day, the House learned that Whitney was in custody (in the Capitol guardroom). On the third day, Whitney answered the charge read to him at the bar by the Speaker.

He had not intended to be disrespectful to the honorable the House of Representatives. Whitney declared, and he didn't believe he had committed a contempt.

He had previously testified before another committee, he explained, and answering the subpena would expose him to outrage and violence.

Whitney's trial at the bar of the House began February 15. His cocounsel was Francis S. Key. Five days later, the House released Whitney from custody after witnesses revealed that personal difficulty existed between the respondent and two members of the committee.

The record discloses that the explosive atmosphere in the hearing room at one point hinted strongly at the use of weapons.

Like the forces seeking "abolition" of the House Un-American Activities Committee today, Whitney misunderstood or minimized Congress' implied constitutional power to "preserve itself and deal, by way of contempt, with direct obstruction to performance of its legislative duties."

The House can imprison a contemptuous witness while Congress is in session until he purges himself. And no settled law exists granting the President power to pardon such persons.

What are the rules governing House Un-American Activities Committee procedure, the scope of its mandate and the privileges of witnesses—the major areas of committee conduct under violent attack today?

House Un-American Activities Committee is authorized by Congress to investigate (1) the extent, character and objects of un-American activities, (2) diffusion of subversive propaganda that attacks the form of government, (3) all other related questions to aid Congress in remedial legislation, and (4) to exercise watchfulness over the execution of laws relating to subversive activities and internal security.

House Un-American Activities Committee conducts probes and hearings by express right and duty and its mandate is probably broader than that of any other House committee.

Repeated rulings by the highest courts empower Congress to obtain subversive-activity information. House Un-American Activities Committee makes no charges and issues subpenas only when there is a solid basis for belief that an individual has such information.

Refusal to appear constitutes willful default. Refusal to testify is legal contempt unless the witness expresses fear that his testimony may tend to be self-incriminating.

(The witness who "clams up" or "takes the fifth" is a total loss to the investigation.)

However, no witness may refuse to testify or produce documents on grounds that such actions may disgrace, degrade, or render him infamous.

Are House Un-American Activities Committee investigations haphazard or launched without sufficient valid information?

Committee spokesmen stress that a preliminary inquiry (which may take months) precedes every full-scale investigation which must be authorized by the full committee. Most House Un-American Activities Committee investigators are former agents (FBI, Secret Service, etc.) or police officers with a minimum of 5 years' experience.

A committee majority authorizes (or rejects) hearings after careful reconsideration of all available evidence. Subpenas—issued by the House Clerk—are served to get facts, not to bait witnesses.

Concerning the criticism of procedures at executive (secret) hearings, a committee spokesman said:

"Executive session witnesses are heard when national security might be endangered by public testimony, or the reputation of witnesses (or others) might be unjustly injured.

"Results of executive sessions actually determine the need or advisability of holding public hearings. Witnesses under subpena may confer with committee members before their appearance in session.

"Counsel and witness may confer during sessions but attorneys are not permitted to cross-examine * * * since House Un-American Activities Committee hearings are not court trials.

"And * * * any person adversely affected by testimony before this committee may request an appearance to deny or affirm another witness' testimony that is relevant or germane to the subject under investigation.

"The record should also show that no witness who testified frankly and fully concerning his knowledge of subversive activities has ever been found by HUAC or any court * * * to have committed perjury."

As for witnesses who charge they have been maligned:

"In every case where a witness' protest is that he has been falsely accused, he's either later changed his testimony to coincide with that previously given about him * * * or he has been found to have committed perjury."

A little known but exhaustive study on "Congressional Power of Investigation" prepared by the Library of Congress for the Senate Judiciary Committee explains:

"There are few safeguards for the protection of a witness before a congressional committee."

(The Supreme Court assertedly protects such rights when Congress acts outside its legislative role.)

A witness' treatment, the study reveals, usually depends upon the skill and attitude of committee chairman and members, and the committee is under no compulsion to make hearings public.

And a witness cannot justify his refusal to answer questions on the committee's refusal to keep his testimony secret.

Advice of counsel during interrogation depends upon the committee and is a matter of privilege * * * not a right, the authoritative treatise declared.

In many areas of procedure, the document reveals, the House Un-American Activities Committee extends more privileges to witnesses than is required by rule or precedent.

All witnesses before congressional committees, however, do not arouse the ire of lawmakers by refusing to testify.

The records disclose that in at least one instance a contumacious witness was actually discharged because no beneficial result could be obtained by forcing him to testify.

The witness, it appeared, was * * * a chronic liar.

The Program of the Department of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in including the address delivered by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall at the 48th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors in this city on May 26, 1961:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE 48TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 26, 1961

It is a real pleasure to appear today very briefly—and I am going to be brief—to discuss with you waterbugs some of the things that I see on the horizon as far as water resources and water resource planning are concerned.

Anytime a new administration comes in, you know, you try to get your feet on the ground. So you reach out into industry and also get some of the old retreads from previous administrations and bring people in that you call consultants. Then you have consultants all over the lot.

And we have had our share of water consultants and resource consultants and we are about to come to some conclusion.

One thing that has always disturbed me about the water picture is the fact that there has been such a tremendous lack of coordination: that we are polluting water on the one hand and trying to unpollute it on the other. Oftentimes, the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. It has always reminded me of a story of Senator KERR'S—KERR is a pretty good name, I think, when you are discussing water these days—about the four boys whose father died and they all got together at the time of the funeral and they were sitting down and discussing matters, and they all agreed that the father had been very fine to all of them, that he had provided well for them, and so on. One of the boys suggested, he said, "Well, just to be sure that when he goes over on the other side he takes a little money with him, why don't we all, just as a gesture, put some money in the coffin? Iet's all put in $125 and let's give him something in case he needs it to go on." They all agreed to do this.

So they went out and came back later and went in individually, and the first three boys put an envelope on their father's cof-

fin. The fourth brother, who was a little sharper, came along and took the three envelopes and wrote out a check and put it in.

This, I think, symbolizes sometimes the type of rather poor planning that we do in terms of water.

I certainly think that by now the intentions of this administration should be plain in terms of natural resources. I know this administration is more resource-development conscious than any in some time. The President, on February 23, delivered—the first time in a long time this had ever been done—a Presidential message, a special message—I know you are all familiar with it—on natural resources. It discussed the whole spectrum of resource development and it is the Magna Carta for this administration in all its resource activities.

Will Rogers once made the statement about one President back in the twenties. On one of his trips he said, "He became President at a time when the people didn't want anything done, and he done it."

Well, we have a President now, an administration that wants to do some things in resource development, and I think we are going to do them.

Let me draw a few broad conclusions I have reached after the first 4 months of this administration. I think one of the greatest needs of all is for comprehensive thinking in terms of resource development, for truly national thinking in terms of our plan. I have been delighted in getting around the country. I was down to the TVA area a couple of weeks ago and have been in other areas of the country, to find a kind of broad-base thinking that we have not had oftentimes in previous periods of our history. Altogether too often there are people who are resource minded in various sections of the country—we even have them in the Congress—who take the view that a dam, a water project, a harbor project, in their own area is a fine thing, that it is good for the economy, but they are not much interested in what is done elsewhere.

In fact, some of them think that any project outside of their own immediate area is socialism or is wasteful expanding.

There has been too much of that type of divisive thinking, but I think we are now pulling together our thinking in terms of truly national comprehensive thinking with regard to water planning and resource development planning. I think we need to think in national terms and to plan in national terms.

One of the significant items in the President's special message concerned river basin planning and our setting a target to get all of our river basin plans in and on the line so that we can go forward with development.

I think one of the most significant conclusions of the Kerr committee report, this very excellent committee which made a depth study of our water needs and water problems, was that we need to approach water as a total problem, as a resource and not think in terms of it in bits and pieces, as we have done in the past; that we cannot destroy water supplies here without affecting people downstream and in other parts of the basin.

The time has come when our water abundance has run out in some sections. We have already reached it in some of the more arid sections of the United States. But I think we have been living off the fat of the land. We have been living in a period of water abundance in many areas of the United States, and we are rapidly going down the road and reaching the point where we will be living in a period of scarcity, when we must manage and use our water resources far more wisely than we are at the present time.

There is one other thing that strikes me as a rather significant fact. I checked this just recently.

The total amount that we are spending in our budget today, the national budget—and I dare say this would be somewhat similar at the State level also—in terms of resource development is in the neighborhood of a little over 1 percent. Now, we know and all of you heard the stirring message and challenge of the President yesterday, that there are great demands and great challenges our country faces which must be met. But, at the same time, we can go back to earlier periods in the cold war. In the late 1940's we were spending an amount at that time as high as 5 percent of our national budget, for example, on resource development, and at other periods we have been spending greater amounts.

Some of us have been wondering—and I wanted to leave this with you as a thought—whether the economic growth of this country over the long haul does not rest in part on a properly conceived and properly executed program of resource development. I say that because many of these military expenditures, for example, that are so vital and necessary, they create jobs, yes, but they do not create wealth.

There is one thing that I think is the strongest argument, my friends, that we have for resource development. I think we must refine it, develop it and enunciate it in the Congress, in Washington, and in the country. And that is that sound resource development creates wealth. Where you have a sound project, a soundly conceived and soundly executed project, this adds to the ultimate wealth of the country. If these projects are properly accomplished, this becomes an asset, in many instances, for all time to come. It creates and undergirds the basic wealth of our economy.

I think we have to state that and state it as vigorously as we can.

Now, you know of all the talk that goes on, the planning that is going on, for instance, in terms of distressed areas in this country. Well, probably the worst distressed area in the United States when the depression hit in the early 1930's was what we now call the TVA area, which is in many ways one of the areas, in terms of its basic economic structure, one of the soundest areas today. It has sound economic underpinning. This is a result of sound resource planning.

A week or so ago we celebrated in this city and paid tribute to one of the great resource planners, one of those men, who, although he lived in one part of the country, spent a great deal of his time and made his reputation helping the people in another section of the country. I am referring to George Norris, who is truly one of the great Americans and one of those who saw the value of natural resources and resource planning.

This administration, as you well know, is committed to a systematic program of new starts, a program of sound projects that will add to the wealth and economic base of the country.

The demands of a growing industrial society at home, and commitments to extend and protect freedom abroad, as we know, threaten our Nation and present us with a serious resource gap also. Whether our resources prove adequate to our needs tomorrow will be determined by decisions we make today. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has always had a strong and a healthy influence on national policy in this area and on the management of our basic water resources.

I need not remind you that we are in arrears in water resource management, that we face, imminently in some areas, potentially in others, a water crisis that threatens to jeopardize national security, limit economic growth, and undermine our living standards.

We face a series of such problems. We have the means, however, to anticipate and solve them if we have the will and the determination.

It is already plain, for example, that research is the key to more water and better use of what we have.

I might say in this connection that I am hopeful that in the near future there will be more programs of basic water research launched so that we can be more active in the field and get some of the answers which will help us conserve and wisely use what water falls on the watersheds of our country.

There is weather and streamflow forecasting and control, the program for desalinization of water—it is illustrated right in your room here—watershed management, preventive flood control, evaporation, seepage reduction, more efficient water uses. All of them are important areas of inquiry. We must redouble our efforts in this area. This is another one of the points of the Kerr committee so wisely underscored.

Desalinization is proving a stubborn challenge, but with aggressive action, this program, too, will add more and more water to available supplies at declining cost figures.

As you may know, sometime next month we will officially dedicate and put into operation at Freeport, Tex., the first of the demonstration plants authorized by the Congress. The President has warmly supported our new proposals to augment and speed our efforts in this field. Indeed, he has a very deep personal interest in this program. We are confident that coordinated efforts by industry and the Office of Saline Water will produce significant results in the months ahead.

In terms of water resource development, I might say that if we were to plan our actions properly in this area, we would always have a shelf—which we do not have at the present time—of projects that could be used at such time as our economy encounters difficulties and we need new wealth-creating expenditures in the public area.

On the planning front we need both comprehensive and specific project planning in our river basins. Water management experts tell us that during the next 20 years new reservoir construction will have to provide some 300 million acre-feet of additional capacity. That is more than double the existing capacity.

In general, the Federal Government has plans and programs to accomplish at the present time only a small part of this target. Our river basin plans must be truly comprehensive and must be brought up to date and kept up to date if we are to do this job.

In his special message on natural resources, the President calls for the establishment of river basin commissions on all major basins. This should be a priority objective for all of us concerned with water development.

One of the key questions that I know all of you are concerned with and should be concerned with is the question of project evaluation. This administration is tackling this problem. If we are to expect informed public support for the huge effort we see ahead, we must develop consistent and clearly understandable standards for deciding on the feasibility of various water-development proposals. In evaluation, as in planning, the water-development projects all values must be meaningfully considered. I suspect this has not been the case in the past.

The administration is aware of a fresh look at standards for project evaluation, and an intensive review is now underway for the basic new guidelines for sound future programing. Without prejudging the final re-

sults, I can tell you certain basic recommendations that my own department has made.

We have recommended, for example, that all values receive equitable consideration in project analysis. This is, of course, imperative. We have recommended that the question of reimbursibility be considered separately from cost-benefit ratios, both benefits and costs being measurable in total, whether or not they can be or should be specifically assigned.

Thirdly, we have recommended that we find a way to give weight to effects on outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife values that cannot be expressed in ordinary cost-benefit balance.

I might say here that, of course, one of the tremendous developments in this whole post-Warld War II period has been outdoor water recreation. I think none of us had any idea a few years ago that there would be this tremendous expansion of interest and that this would have such value to the people of this country.

A fourth recommendation has been that electric power be treated in project analysis in a manner fully consistent with congressional directives on public and cooperative power policy.

Lastly, we have recommended that national and regional unemployment patterns be considered in benefit-cost analysis where and when warranted.

Certainly, if a project such as TVA had been calculated solely on the basis of some of our present cost-benefit analyses, the project would never have been built.

The principal objectives of all resource development are to meet existing needs of people and to create conditions that both encourage and make possible economic growth. The new standards should serve these objectives. We would betray the entire water conservation effort, we would destroy public confidence in our efforts if we sought standards that would justify, however, every end to build a dam or a dike or a harbor works. We must be honest and concede that some projects should not be attempted that are not in the national interest.

I think if we do this, if we are honest among ourselves, I think this will strengthen our cause in the long run and enable us to do the maximum job.

As I said in the beginning, I can assure you that my department and its bureaus will move of their own volition in providing genuine leadership in those areas for which we are responsible. I can assure you also that the department is determined to cooperate constructively with other agencies of the Government and with private interests, as appropriate, to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number in water resource development work.

It is high time that we, who are responsible for Federal water resource activities, acknowledge our short-comings in coordination and devote creative efforts toward improving our ways of working together, of avoiding wasteful conflicts and overlapping functions. The Executive Office of the President, in line with his special message on natural resources, is considering the entire matter of improved coordination and control, as you know. The result may require some surrender of sovereignty to the common good.

We can and should defend our respective programs vigorously. We should also recognize the legitimate interests of others and seek means of accommodation wherever possible.

I believe, on the basis of the best advice available, that we can meet our needs for domestic and industrial water, for irrigation, for transportation, for power generation. We can prevent floods, increase yields from watersheds, make saline water sweet.

I believe, on the basis of both professional judgment and strong conviction, that we can and must also protect and enhance the value of our water resources in the other new dimension that I have mentioned. Water is a magic ingredient in the scenic and inspiring national landscape. A wide range of enriching outdoor experience as associated with clean water, is a fundamental part of it. We must be responsible stewards of this means of man's recreation.

I am very happy that you asked me to appear today. I hope that we have a new day ahead of us. I assure you that, as far as my department and my personal function in this whole picture of resource development is concerned, that we are excited by the prospect and that we hope to move down the road toward a new era of resource development in our country's history.

The Negro Consumer Is Getting More Attention From the Big National Advertisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in today's session of Congress, during the regular proceedings, I called to the attention of my colleagues a remarkable address analyzing "The Negro Self-Image" in this present day. Confirming this fact of the Negro's emergence into new status and concept is a highly important article which appeared in a recent edition of the New York Times. On the subject "The Negro Consumer" and the increased attention he is receiving from big national advertisers and businesses, this article presents some little publicized facts about what is actually happening in the business field as a consequence of the growing Negro market and the acumen in bargaining for it of the largest single minority group in this Nation:

THE NEGRO CONSUMER—HE IS GETTING MORE ATTENTION FROM BIG NATIONAL ADVERTISERS—NEGRO POPULATION RISES 57 PERCENT FASTER THAN WHITE; IT'S CONCENTRATED IN BIG CITIES—NEW JOBS FROM BUYERS' STRIKE

(By Ray Shaw)

NEW YORK.—A market with an annual purchasing power of nearly $20 billion—almost equal to that of all Canada—is attracting more attention from U.S. business firms. But they are finding it a market that has its own set of ground rules and one that requires more than the usual amount of advertising delicacy and marketing know-how.

This special group is the Nation's 19 million Negroes. Never before have they been courted so assiduously by people with something to sell. The reaction of Negro leaders, at least in some cities, has been to try to set up fairly rigid standards of corporate conduct for firms that wish to do business with Negroes.

"If an employer has an unfair employment policy, and it's known to Negroes, he can advertise, he can promote, he can do anything he wants to, and he won't sell merchandise," comments Clarence L. Holte, director of the ethnic markets division of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, one of the Nation's largest advertising agencies.

THE PHILADELPHIA STORY

The growing practice by Negroes of making their consumer expenditures work for them to achieve social change is underscored by a series of scantily publicized happenings in Philadelphia during the past year. There 400 ministers have organized a system of sporadic trade boycotts, which they can turn on and off with blitzkrieg speed, against Philadelphia-based companies which they believe are discriminating against Negroes in employment.

Boycotts, of course, are nothing new for Negroes in their quest for social and economic status equal to that of whites. But the success of Philadelphia's "selective patronage program," as the ministers call it, indicates that this form of intermittent shopping pressure soon may spread to other major cities where Negroes make up a sizable part of the population. In Philadelphia, the ministers say, the boycotts have caused a dozen big companies—including Sun Oil Co., Gulf Oil Co., Tasty Baking Co., and Pepsi-Cola Co.—to hire more Negroes. The ministers claim that as a result of the boycotts Philadelphia area companies have added 600 Negroes to their payrolls in the past year—most of them in white-collar jobs.

The boycotts have come as a jarring surprise to some companies that believed they were friends of the Negro or that they were enlightened in their employment practices. Sun Oil Co. and its subsidiaries, for example, are among the largest employers of Negroes in the Philadelphia area, having nearly 1,000 on their payroll. The company says it has employed Negroes for 50 years and reports it puts some of them in white-collar and supervisory capacities; this year Sun's college recruitment program included three Negro colleges.

Nevertheless, early this year a committee of Negro ministers surveyed Sun's employment practices and said it found them wanting. The ministers' suggestions were specific: At least 25 of the company's more than 1,000 Philadelphia officeworkers should be Negroes (it has only 6 at the time, according to the ministers); there should be at least 3 Negro drivers on Sun oil trucks, and at least 1 company salesman should be a Negro. The ultimatum was given to the company on February 16, with a 17-day deadline.

NOT A DROP OF SUNOCO

Sun resisted, telling the ministers that it couldn't justify hiring that many new employees in such a short time, particularly when company employment was falling as a result of the end of the winter heating oil season. The ministers were polite but adamant. On Palm Sunday and again on Easter Sunday the word went out to their congregations: "Until the pastor says so, not a single drop of Blue Sunoco."

The boycott quickly spread. It was endorsed by Negro churches throughout Pennsylvania and in cities stretching from Boston to South Carolina. It passed to Negro Masonic groups and other lodges and social organizations. Finally, early in June, after 2½ months, Sun called in representatives of the ministers' group and gave them a list of new Negro employees. It met the ministers' demands and the boycott was terminated immediately.

Most of the other companies, when confronted with the ministers' "suggestions," came to terms much more speedily, in a matter of a few days, if not a few hours.

Pepsi-Cola Co., for example, held out for only 2 days last fall after the Philadelphia Negroes declared a boycott in connection with a demand that the company's local bottling plant hire more Negroes in truckdriver and white-collar jobs. "We were surprised to be included in the boycotts," says Harvey C. Russell, director of special markets for Pepsi; the company had been active in the

Negro market for 25 years and employed 15 Negro marketing experts in the parent company and company-owned bottling plants. However, the soft drink firm is now apparently back in the good graces of this racial group. Last Christmas Joan Crawford, the actress who's also a Pepsi-Cola director, and Pepsi President Herbert Barnet were guests of honor at a Negro debutantes' ball in Philadelphia. Miss Crawford threw the switch to light the gala's Christmas tree and, with Mr. Barnet, led the cotillion's grand march.

A HUGE MARKET

The growing business awareness of the needs and desires of the Negro consumer is readily fathomable. Not only are Negroes one of the Nation's largest single minority groups, outnumbering the United States 4 million Jews by more than a 4-to-1 ratio, but their number is growing at a rate 57 percent faster than the white population. Moreover, their migration from the South has concentrated Negroes increasingly in large cities of the North and West where they are easily reachable by specialized sales campaigns.

Three out of four Negroes now live in cities of 50,000 or more, and population experts expect the ratio to climb in the future. Already Negroes make up a substantial bloc of most big cities' populations—53 percent of Washington, D.C.; 28 percent in Detroit, Cleveland, and St. Louis; 26 percent in Philadelphia, and 22 percent in Chicago. New York's 1,087,931 Negroes, by themselves, would constitute the Nation's sixth largest city, more populous than Baltimore, Cleveland, San Francisco, or Boston.

Negroes differ from other so-called minority markets on one major count: In contrast to immigrant groups, most notably at the moment to the Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans, they are not likely to be assimilated into the general market in the foreseeable future. "A person can change his language, but a Negro can't change the color of his skin," says Benjamin H. Wright, sales promotion and merchandising manager of Ebony magazine. "That's why the Negro market will remain a separate market for a long time to come."

Companies seeking greater sales among Negroes have discovered that extra advertising and promotion is usually advantageous. "Like rain, general advertising and product publicity cover the Negro market, but it does not do the full job of influencing Negroes to buy unless somewhere along the marketing line a special message is beamed in their direction," says D. Parke Gibson, a Negro marketing consultant in New York.

Today, most important national advertisers prepare special campaigns for the Negro market. Coca-Cola International Corp., for example, underwrites Negro golf and tennis tournaments, and an Atlanta, Ga., sports banquet, at all of them, of course, the brand name Coca-Cola is prominently displayed. Some manufacturers, including the top two evaporated milk producers, Pet Milk Co. and Carnation Co., advertise in Negro movie houses with filmed commercials. Radio Corp. of America publishes a newsletter, Baton, that's sent to Negro opinion leaders. The newsletter carries stories of new RCA products and accounts of the company's use of Negro entertainers in its recording and broadcasting divisions.

SEVEN HUNDRED RADIO STATIONS

Reflecting the increased interest in the Negro market, communications media designed to reach this segment of the population have shown a rapid growth. Twenty years ago, there were three Negro-oriented radio stations in the United States; now 700 stations devote all or part of their sponsored programing to Negroes. Ebony magazine, with a format similar to Life, in 1960 had ad revenues of $2,700,000, up from $1,624,397 in 1955. Circulation rose from 400,000 to 625,000 in this period. Last year the magazine carried advertising of 57 of the 100 largest national advertisers, up from 30 of the Nation's top spenders in 1955.

Surprisingly, Negro newspapers are probably the weakest link in reaching Negro consumers, according to many national advertisers. Only three cities—Atlanta, Chicago and Oakland, Calif.—have Negro daily newspapers. Besides this, one observer comments, "Negro newspapers were founded as a protest medium. You can't kick a company on the front page for not hiring Negro employees, then expect the same company to buy an ad on the inside of the paper. That's why radio stations and magazines like Ebony are so successful—they're the least controversial."

Although advertising is widely used to reach Negro consumers, marketers insist that sales promotion campaigns are equally important. Many of these are beamed at Negro church, lodge and social organizations.

"The habit of belonging to organizations is stronger among Negroes than whites, so we try to use these as a means of reaching the Negro market," says Eyre Saitch, a Negro who directs community relations for F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co., New York. Schaefer maintains a film library to lend films to Negro churches and civic groups. The company also contributes financially to the Urban League, an interracial group organized to improve race relations, and makes certain at least one Schaefer officials attends important functions of the league.

Coca-Cola and Daggett & Ramsdell, New York perfumers, sponsored the National Council of Negro Women's international debutante cotillion in New York last winter. Hamilton Watch Co. cooperates with the National Bar Association, a Negro lawyer's organization, in selecting a Negro "Barrister of the Year." Last year, Hamilton compiled a guide to conventions of Negro organizations and distributed copies of it to Negro leaders.

Advertising and promotion efforts beamed to the Negro often produce stronger than usual brand loyalties. Says John White, manager of Detroit's Gotham Hotel, whose clientele is mostly Negro: "When Four Roses was the only liquor advertised in the Negro paper here, it was the only brand I could sell. One day I got 50 cases of another brand by mistake, and I almost had to give it away."

AN IRRITATING COMMERCIAL

If many Negroes show a greater brand-name loyalty than whites, they also tend to display a high degree of sensitivity to slurs against their race, some of which apparently are made unintentionally by advertisers. One manufacturer of men's toiletries which sponsored a TV sports show that attracts a high percentage of Negro viewers recently advertised an after-shave talc that was guaranteed not to show on the user's face. "Maybe the powder won't show on a white person's face, but it'll certainly show on a Negro's," complains a Negro advertising man. "The company has at least a half dozen other products it could have advertised that Negroes can use."

Not long ago, Jacob Ruppert, a New York brewer, switched emphasis on the name of its beer from Knickerbocker to Ruppert in the East. One reason, says a brewery executive, was that "we were concerned that the name Knickerbocker, when slurred, would sound too much like 'Niggerbocker.'"

One area where Negroes pay scant attention to advertising is travel. "All over Harlem on Sunday mornings you see Negroes dropping travel sections of newspapers into trash cans," says a Negro marketer. "Negroes know darn well they'd better not patronize most of the advertisers in the travel section."

Aware of this situation, American Oil Co. has won widespread approval in Negro communities by distributing a travel guide for Negroes, listing service stations, restaurants, motels and parks at which they are welcome.

AIRLINE RELUCTANCE

Greyhound Bus Lines and a few railroads advertise in Negro newspapers, but airlines have been reluctant to attempt to tap the Negro market. "We don't believe that Negroes have the individual purchasing power or mobility to make them good airline customers," says one airline executive. "Anyway, we're afraid we'd lose an equal number of white customers if we became very popular with Negroes."

Some foreign carriers and resort areas hold a different view of the Negro as a customer. The Bahama Islands are trying to lure Negro tourists through a public relations campaign conducted in the Negro press. Varig Airlines, a Brazilian line, has filmed scenic spots in its country and shows the film to Negro groups. British Overseas Airways Corp. advertises flights to the West Indies in the Negro press. And before this country's relations with Castro's Cuba turned sour, the island government was bidding for American Negro tourists on a "vacation without humiliation" theme.

Logjam on Disability Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued with the remarks appearing on page 18988 of the RECORD of September 19, under the subject "Logjam on Disability Compensation." The puzzling thing about these remarks is that under date of September 1, the Senator had the opportunity to cast his lot with those who favored breaking this logjam. He failed to do this when he did not support the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] who sought to strike the controversial, nongermane out, and totally irrelevant so-called Long rider, providing for reopening of national service life insurance. That is the provision which is keeping the service-connected veterans of this country from receiving a well merited raise.

This matter has been discussed rather fully but so that the RECORD may be kept straight, I will repeat partially what is involved. After the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had consulted with the President, talked with officials of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget, consulted with representatives of all the major veterans' organizations, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had had full and frank hearings on the subject, the bill, H.R. 879, providing for an average 9.2-percent increase in service-connected rates, was reported and passed the House unanimously on June 5, 1961. Thereafter it was referred in the Senate to the Committee on Finance where the reopening proposal was added. The Senate then passed this bill and sent it back to the House where it is lying on the Speaker's table. In passing this legislation the Senate reduced the dis-

ability compensation rates from the 10-20-, and 30-percent disabled and struck from the bill the 7-year presumption for multiple sclerosis which the House had included on the recommendation of a high official of the National Institutes of Health.

Paraphrasing a saying of one of the former chairmen of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the other body then had a "revival of righteousness"—it passed H.R. 856, to which the Long amendment had been added along with the text of H.R. 879 in exactly the same fashion which the House had originally passed it. This was accomplished after the major veterans' organizations had made a plea to the Senate Finance Committee and also to Members of the Senate that the two measures be considered separately and that the service-connected compensation question stand on its merits and Senator LONG's bill be treated in a similar vein. The Senate, however, disregarded this plea on the part of the veterans and apparently was more interested in giving attention to the needs of non-service-connected veterans than it was to the service-connected group. When the bill H.R. 856 was on the floor of the Senate, as I have indicated previously, Senator MORTON, in an effort to get a raise for the service-connected disabled veterans, moved to strike the so-called Long rider from the bill. That motion was defeated by a vote of 50 to 18, with the assistance of the junior Senator from New York who now complains about the lack of action in the House.

I am somewhat surprised at my former colleague who served with such a distinguished record in the House of Representatives, by his reference to the fact that the national service life insurance question has never been considered in the House of Representatives. The operation of Congress, both in the House and Senate, is based on the committee system. Bills get considered on the floor of the House and Senate only after they have been the subject of hearings and have been reported by the responsible and respective committee. Incidentally, the Senate Finance Committee never held hearings on this "Long rider" question until this year and then only after it had acted on the proposal.

The plain fact of the matter is that beginning with the 82d Congress down to and including the 87th Congress, a majority of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in each of the Congresses, felt that legislation to reopen national service life insurance should not be reported to the House. There has never been a discharge petition filed to require or permit consideration by the House of this reopening question and I think these facts speak for themselves. It is simply the truth to say that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has given more consideration to this question in the 87th Congress than the Finance Committee of the Senate has given in the past five Congresses.

Members of the Senate who are sincerely interested in getting increases for the service-connected veterans have a very simple remedy at their command. The bill, S. 2051, is still on the Vice President's desk. Attached to it is the text of H.R. 879, the service-connected compensation increase bill. This bill could be brought up and passed in a matter of minutes—possibly even seconds—and I am assured that if this is the case and the bill is returned to the House with the provisions of H.R. 879, without the so-called Long rider, the House will speedily concur and a raise will be voted for our service-connected veterans. Let those in the other body, who are interested, take appropriate action.

Program Penalizes Hoosiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the passage of the administration's farm bill, and the feed grains bill, we have been hearing claims of victory for the Kennedy administration. As I recall, higher prices for the farmers was to be No. 1 priority on the agenda for this administration. But how do the farmers feel about this program?

As a very good indication of how the farmers in the State of Indiana feel about it, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Hoosier Farmer for September. Indiana farmers, it seems, will be getting lower prices for their wheat, despite claims that these price-support programs will help them. In the recent marketing quota referendum, Hoosier wheatgrowers rejected the Government's plan, but the program was approved nationally, binding Indiana farmers and wheat farmers in 39 States to Government control for yet another year:

PROGRAM PENALIZES HOOSIERS

Hoosier wheatgrowers voting in the August 24 marketing quota referendum wisely rejected the plan. The 11,862, who voted failed to give the quota program the 2-to-1 support needed for approval by favoring it only 63.7 percent.

Nationally, the quota program was approved by 79.4 percent of the voters, binding growers in 39 wheat-producing States, including Indiana, to strict Government dictate for another year.

The quota program places Hoosier producers of Soft Red Winter wheat at a disadvantage in the marketplace and penalizes them heavily. This is because our Indiana wheat is not in surplus and is very desirable and sells for a good price for bread and biscuit making. The quota program only causes Indiana wheatgrowers to have to cut their production and offers them nothing in the way of prices higher than they would get anyhow. Net result, less net income.

It is the producers of Hard, livestock feed wheat, in the high plains of the West who strongly support the Government quota program and voted it upon Hoosiers. Since their Hard wheat is of value for little else but livestock feed, the Government support price of $2 a bushel is about three times their cost of production and is very profitable.

Farmers in Indiana recognize the raw deal they have been getting in wheat programs for the past 9 years and are rebelling.

Lack of farmers voting, and lack of any real choice in the referendum for most producers are the chief reasons quotas continue in effect

At the polls last month, farmers could vote for marketing quotas on their 1962 wheat, with a Government support price of $2 a bushel and a mandatory cut of at least 10 percent in their acreage. Or they could vote against quotas, raise all of the wheat they wanted and, if they stayed within their acreage allotments, receive a Government price support of $1.19.

To the western wheatgrower, there was little choice. He almost had to vote for continuation of the "Government gravy train." The midwestern soft-wheat grower had a choice and opposed the program.

Anyone who still believes that Government allotment and marketing quota programs are voluntary and fair should talk to a Hoosier neighbor who is producing a good product, that is in demand at a good price but who must continually reduce his production under a program voted upon him (democratically) by his fellow wheatgrowers in order that they may continue to produce a vast surplus of a product which is not needed by people—or livestock for that matter. Nothing about the present wheat program makes any sense at all. Indiana growers are to be congratulated upon recognizing this.

THE REAL DANGER

It's nice to have a Secretary of Agriculture who wants to tell the farmers' story to nonfarm people. Yet, it seems that we just can't have a "pure" job. There always seems to be a "catch."

During the spring and summer months of congressional consideration of the "ominous" farm bill, Department spokesmen told urban people many excellent facts about modern farming. These were nearly always followed with the propaganda pitch that this bill offered the only solution to the farm problem of over-production and that it was the farmers' last chance at a solution.

The bill under consideration at that time was the one which would have placed so-called farmer committees (selected by the Secretary) in the position of developing programs which our law-making body, Congress, could only approve or veto.

When Congressmen wisely gutted the bill and preserved their historic right to make our laws, the farm story teller's tune changed. The administration "story" now is that Congress really gave the Secretary all that he was asking, but eliminated all of the restraints which the administration had suggested to guide the Secretary in serving the farmers. This new propaganda is, of course, couched among some facts about farming which farmers would very much like for urban people to understand.

The real danger in this whole mess is that nonfarm people who hear this fabrication of facts and fancy (and who outnumber farmers 10 to 1) may believe it all and urge their Congressmen to support the weird plans proposed by the Secretary in the belief that they are helping farmers.

If this scheme works, farmers will have been sold out by their Secretary of Agriculture, through a program which could have brought this administration the everlasting praises of American agriculture and the support of a well-informed, nonfarm public.

Rice Acreage Increase Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Jonesboro Daily Sun, of Jonesboro, Ark., carried in its columns a splendid editorial on September 15, 1961, entitled "Rice Acreage Increase Needed." The Jonesboro Sun is a leading newspaper in the wonder State and one that so well serves the thriving and growing city of Jonesboro and eastern Arkansas. If any news is worthy of attention, it is found in the Sun.

This newspaper is located in the heart of the rice, cotton, soybean, and industrial area of eastern Arkansas.

The editorial tells why, in this time of international crisis, that sufficient increased acreage of rice be authorized for planting in the crop year 1962. I trust that the membership of the House and Senate will read this fine editorial.

The full text follows:

RICE ACREAGE INCREASE NEEDED

Federal authorities announced last week that the rough rice in storage on August 1 was 7.3 million hundredweight, compared to 7.813 million hundredweight the previous year on the same date.

At the same time, the report said the stocks of milled rice totaled 1,943,000 hundredweight compared to 3,052,000 hundredweight on August 1 of 1960.

These figures mean little to most people—unless you're interested in rice. Then they tell a very important story. The 7.3 million hundredweight of rough rice still in storage August 1 represented only 13 percent of last year's crop. Rice men say that for the Nation's safety and to insure plenty of rice the year around, this total should be about 25 percent—almost double what was in storage August 1.

The milled rice picture reflects even a greater change. The stocks available on August 1 this year were down more than 1,000,000 hundreweight. The situation got so close that the Government was about to dump the short-grain Jap rice into the school lunch program.

This would have been a tragic mistake. The rice industry has pulled itself up by its bootstraps with a tremendous promotion program in which every level of the industry participated. Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana—three of the four major rice producing States, have borne nearly all of the cost and carried the ball in this program.

The rice people have done such a selling job that the cotton people are reported planning to emulate their grassroots program, and more branches of agriculture where there are surpluses should get into the act.

However, much of the benefits of this sales program would have been destroyed by putting short-grain Jap rice, largely from California, into the school lunch program. The people have been sold on longer grain rice and educated on cooking it so every grain stands apart. The shorter Jap rice would have cooked into a mushy goo which the kids wouldn't have eaten and they would have been turned against rice for all time.

The stocks are so low, however, that short-grain Jap rice is going into the surplus commodity dole. Much of this type rice is exported to foreign countries which would just as soon have it because they are accustomed to eating short-grain rice.

In the United States the demand for long-grain rice has been increased by advertising and promotion to the point where rice farmers should be given more acreage on which to increase their production.

These farmers have been operating at far below capacity for a number of years. The Nation got highly concerned when steel production dropped to 50 percent of capacity, but it's been worse than that in the rice industry for a long time.

Last year they talked about giving the rice farmers a 10-percent increase in acreage. This wouldn't be enough now. The rice farmers should be granted a 15-percent increase in acreage for next year in order that they can provide enough rice to supply the Nation's needs, and to serve the needs of friendly nations.

The rice farmer could increase his production 15 percent with very little cost because he already has equipment used just part time, wells not pumping at near capacity and land lying idle for lack of an allotment.

If the Government's control program ever is to work, then segments which wipe out their burdensome surpluses by their own ingenuity must be granted more acreage, as a proof of good faith, if for no other reason. The rice industry, needs, has earned, and should have a 15-percent increase in acreage next year.

New England Governors' Conference Adopts Resolution on Residual Oil Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS ADOPTED BY THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, KENNEBAGO LAKE, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 11, 1961

Whereas quotas imposed on residual fuel in 1959 have brought about a shortage and substantial price increase costing the New England States over $30 million a year in added fuel costs; and

Whereas these restrictions are hampering our regional industrial growth; and

Whereas restrictions on this vital industrial and heating fuel have penalized particularly hospitals, civic institutions and public agencies; and

Whereas these restrictions on residual oil imports have damaged our international trade relations, thus adversely affecting our national security: Be it

Resolved, That the New England Governors' Conference records its unequivocal opposition to the continuation of these quotas, and applauds the efforts of the New England Senators' conference and of the members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives to have these quota restrictions removed; and that, furthermore, the New England Governors' Conference calls upon the President of the United States, who will receive shortly a recommendation from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to bring about an end to the discriminatory and unfair burden that has been placed on the citizens of the New England States.

Crude, Clumsy, and Ruthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, not in many a day has Washington witnessed the brand of ruthless ward politics that is being played by the administration. Civil service status, statutory tenure and loyal competent service mean nothing. They are tossed aside to further the building of the political machine.

A police chief with civil service status learns from the papers that he is to be replaced. And when he stands his ground, he ends up in effect being banished to Guam. A loyal, competent Board member of the Export-Import Bank, a Democrat who was retained throughout the Eisenhower administration because of his competence, is replaced by a former State Governor defeated in the last election. And now we have the latest in the episodes. To avoid any charge of political bias, here is an account of the crude and clumsy procedure followed, as told in a front page story from this morning's Washington Post:

PRESIDENT NAMES NEW COMPTROLLER, BUT CURRENCY POST ISN'T YET VACANT

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Usually, a President of the United States does not appoint a man to high office unless he knows the office is vacant, or is about to become vacant.

But there are exceptions to this sensible procedure.

Yesterday President Kennedy nominated James J. Saxon, a Chicago bank attorney, to be Comptroller of the Currency, a post in the Treasury Department that pays $20,500 a year.

Two hours later the White House announced that it had withdrawn Saxon's nomination from the Senate, where it had been sent for confirmation.

There was good reason. Ray M. Gidney, the man who has been Comptroller of the Treasury since 1953, had not resigned. He is serving his second 5-year term, and this does not expire until 1963.

"It's all news to me," said Gidney when told about Saxon's nomination to succeed him.

Gidney, a 74-year-old former Cleveland banker who lives at the University Club here, said he had not offered his resignation, but added: "The President can remove me if he wants to do so."

The White House referred newsmen to the Treasury Department for an explanation of the strange goings-on.

S. C. Manning, deputy press officer of the Treasury, said that the Treasury Department had sent Saxon's nomination to the White House as the result of "a clerical error" and "a mistake in timing."

Later Manning told the press that Gidney had submitted his resignation to President Kennedy, effective November 15. At that time, he said, Saxon will be named to the Comptroller post.

Manning said he didn't know when Gidney submitted his resignation to the President, but it was lerned that he did so yesterday evening after "somebody had talked to him."

Gidney had been in a bitter policy dispute with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. On three occasions he has approved bank mergers over Kennedy's objections. In each case, the Department of Justice has filed antitrust suits aimed at overturning Gidney's approval.

Ray Gidney needs no defense. He has served the country well and with distinction throughout his tenure as Comptroller of the Currency. He is an outstanding public servant. Again, to avoid any charge of political bias, here is an editorial from the Journal of Commerce—New York—of September 20, 1961. It is of interest in connection with the latest crude, clumsy, and ruthless episode:

GIDNEY'S LAST WORD

Ray M. Gidney, the Comptroller of the Currency, seems likely to retire soon, either because some highly placed people in the Government think he has approved too many bank mergers, or because of his age. So his remarks on consolidations of that kind, appearing in his current annual report, may be considered his last word on the subject, and a very good last word it is: factual, free from distortion and from any laborod self-defense.

As is required by the bank merger law which took effect May 13, 1960, Mr. Gidney has put into his report a concise summary of the findings of the Justice Department, together with his findings, in the case of every approved bank merger between the date mentioned and the end of 1960. In this period there were 56 mergers upon which he had to act. To some of them the Attorney General had no objection on antitrust grounds. To some he had mild reservations. In the case of some 19 he had demurred rather strongly.

Up to now the Justice Department has gone into court to block or have unscrambled five big mergers, after the supervisory authorities designated by the law have found no antitrust barriers to them. So we have the peculiar and quite embarrassing situation of one arm of the Government telling three others that their decisions are wrong and suing to have their ruling nullified. In the case of one New York merger we have witnessed the strange spectacle of the Federal Reserve Board issuing a special statement, ostensibly to defend its own ruling, but inferentially calling the Justice Department's court complaint untrue.

The Comptroller reprints the bank merger law together with all the congressional debates which preceded its enactment and says:

"This legislation left final authority over bank mergers in the banking agencies [his Office, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation] but provided for an advisory report from the Attorney General on the competitive factors involved in each case. It left bank mergers not subject to the antitrust laws except to whatever extent the courts may ultimately hold that the Sherman Antitrust Act is applicable."

Close reading of the law and study of the intent of Congress as revealed in the debates support this temperate statement of the case. The Justice Department, citing both the Clayton and Sherman Acts in its court complaints, makes it clear that it has never conceded banks are exempt from the Clayton Act. As Mr. Gidney infers, the Department has the right if not the duty to obtain, if it can, court decisions under the Sherman Act.

We shall hear many more of these official interpretations of the differences among the three bank supervisory agencies and the Justice Department in coming months, for the Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in their annual reports must do as Mr. Gidney has done—describe in detail both sides of each merger. We hope they will do it as fairly and as concisely as has the Comptroller.

Meanwhile, we feel, as we have said on previous occasions, that much can be done to speed up the period, usually fraught with damage and risk to banks involved, during which mergers are passed upon and challenged. Particularly to be avoided are 11th-hour suits which disturb depositors and stockholders.

As to the eventual solution of the painful public conflict between the Justice Department and the bank supervisory agencies, we can see only two ways out, since the former won't concede the agencies the final word. One is for a court decision which will determine whether the Clayton and Sherman laws apply to banks, and if so to what degree. The other is for Congress to resolve the conflict by making those laws more specific. Since confidence in banks is involved, it is obviously not in the public interest for these supervisory uproars to continue.

City Congressmen, Too, Raise the Question of New Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an extract from an article in the September 1961 issue of Doane's Business Magazine for American Agriculture, the article concerned being entitled "City Congressmen, Too, Raise the Question of New Farm Programs":

In 1962 several farm States will lose some of their Representatives to Congress as a result of population shifts. This makes it even more certain that the votes of city Congressmen are going to be necessary for any important, long-term farm legislation to be approved.

As a followup to last month's interview with Secretary Freeman, we went "up on the Hill" with a tape recorder and talked to some Congressmen from big-city districts to get their views on farm programs. They were very willing to discuss the topic.

Moving over to one side of the political battleground, we talked with Congressman TOM CURTIS of Missouri's Second District, who represents part of the St. Louis area.

Question. What points generally have you felt to be the most objectionable about the previous farm bills that have been submitted, or the programs that have been in effect, and what do you feel is generally desirable in farm programs for the future, from the standpoint of your city and suburban constituents?

CURTIS. Well, I'd say that basically the problem is one of any program. If it's an inefficient program that isn't bringing results, it's not going to appeal to city people any more than it is to anyone else. Frankly, I think the American Farm Bureau's criticism of the farm programs of the past has been very sound. The only distinction I'd say between the city dweller's views on the farm program from that of those who are actually in the agricultural business is that they don't get anything out of it directly, while at least the farmer does get some subsidy. I've been very pleased, frankly, with the criticism emanating from farmers themselves through the American Farm Bureau.

Essentially I'd say an efficient program would appeal to the people of the suburban areas, as well as the city folk. The reasons that they are disillusioned about the farm programs have been their terrific cost and the obvious waste that goes with it. They know that they are paying for that as taxpayers.

Along with that, I'd make these observations: The money really isn't going to the kind of farmer that the proponents of this legislation say they are trying to help. The so-called little family farm doesn't get any of this subsidy; it goes to the larger producers who are, frankly, in a position of handling things themselves. If the Farm Bureau can be looked upon somewhat as their spokesman, and I think it can, they themselves don't want it.

Also, the difference between people in the rural areas and people in the suburban and urban areas is not very great any more. With farm-to-market roads, highways, telephones, rural electrification and the like, the difference between our city dweller and our rural dweller is not very great. They are all pretty much Americans.

Another thing, and I think very basic; we've got to distinguish between what is an agricultural problem and what is a rural unemployment problem. I think that agriculture, as a part of our economy, is doing very well. In fact it's doing so well and has advanced so rapidly in technological aspects that it has created a great amount of unemployment. Now the unemployment problem is the result of agriculture's success. The unemployment problem is somewhat concentrated in rural areas because today one person can produce the food and fiber for our population that it used to take five to produce.

Handling the problem of this technological unemployment is quite a bit different from administering to what might be the economic problems of agriculture. We've got to distinguish between those two. These kind of things I think would appeal to suburbanites and city people, but I think it would appeal to farmers and rural dwellers as well. In other words, I don't think there is any real difference today in the thinking of our people, whether they live in the country or live in the city.

Question. Have you had much complaint from your constituents about the high cost of food?

CURTIS. Yes, and I have written back to them and said, "Look, you are getting a lot more for the food that you buy today." One economist figured out that with frozen food, prepackaging and all that goes in the processing of food that the housewife can now get meals and spend 3 hours less a day in the kitchen. Well, I happen to think the housewife's time is worth something.

The increased cost of food at the market probably reflects a real increase in quality and timesaving for the housewife, so really the cost has gone down, not up. And incidentally, when the complaints come in it usually isn't the farmer they're complaining against; it's the middleman, and the farmer complains against the middleman, too. I happen to think both the consumer and the farmer are not looking at the tremendous services that the middleman has performed in this area. This is real value for our money.

Question. Have you had complaints relative to this high cost of storing the Government surpluses, for instance this million-dollars-per-day storage figure that's been in the news?

CURTIS. That isn't too generally known among the public, but certainly when a news story occurs bringing it out—it does bring

in complaints. I happen to think these complaints are well founded—I think that's part of the stupidity that goes along with a program that just continues to produce more than we know the markets will absorb.

I would make this observation—we asked our farmers back in World War II to plow up more land and to buy the necessary equipment to handle the production then necessary. I felt after the war was over it was very proper that we should not leave them high and dry. But we should have been tapering off so that we would be producing what the normal production would be in peace times. The result was, we never did taper off. There is the error.

Question. Congressman CURTIS, who do you feel should take the lead in trying to draft sensible farm legislation? Who should we look to for leadership here in Washington?

CURTIS. Well, we should be able to look to the leadership in Congress. I'm afraid we aren't going to get it because of the structure of Congress; the structure where we are set up in committees. The jurisdiction of farm matters rests in our committees on agriculture. Regrettably their approach has not been a broad one. In my judgment that's what lies at the base of this. On the other hand, there's been no leadership in this administration.

Question. One other brief question. Do you feel that sectionalism in the farm economy has been a problem here in drafting good farm legislation?

CURTIS. Oh, yes, I think one of the basic economic facts about agricultural economics today is that farming has become so specialized that there is not the similarity that once existed when you could say "a farmer." Today it's either a tobacco farmer or wheat farmer or corn farmer or stock raiser, rice or whatever. And the differences between these various kinds of agricultural specialists are so great and the area of common interest has dwindled so that you can't expect, in my judgment, to see the old farm bloc come into power again. It has gone out of power to a large degree because of this specialization.

I think the various committees on agriculture in the Senate and the House have not updated their thinking to this thing. I find that organizations—again I want to refer to the American Farm Bureau because I am very high on that organization—have made their studies and their attempts to get the pulse of their own people. This has been outstanding and their analysis of these things have been very good. They are bringing the farmers together on the one area where they do have a common interest.

Congressman Latta Schedules Conferences in Fifth Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

My assignment to the select committee investigating sales to Communist nations will undoubtedly require a considerable amount of my time between this adjournment and the reconvening of the Congress in January. However, during this adjournment I expect to be available for conferences and visits with my constituents in the courthouse of each county in the district in accordance with the following schedule:

November 6, Paulding County, Paulding, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

November 6, Van Wert County, Van Wert, 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

November 7, Defiance County, Defiance, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

November 7, Williams County, Bryan, 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

November 8, Henry County, Napoleon, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

November 8, Putnam County, Ottawa, 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

November 9, Fulton County, Wauseon, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

November 9, Ottawa County, Port Clinton, 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.

November 10, Wood County, Bowling Green, 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

No appointments will be necessary. All problems which constituents have with the Federal Government will be proper subjects for discussion.

Should constituents desire to see me at times other than those indicated above, they may do so by contacting my district office at 304 Wood County Bank Building, Bowling Green, for an appointment.

Negro Mental Potential Seen Equal to Whites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I present for the attention of my colleagues in Congress the following article which appeared in a recent edition of the Evening Star:

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 7, 1961]

NEGRO MENTAL POTENTIAL SEEN EQUAL TO WHITES

(By John Barbour)

NEW YORK, September 7.—There is no evidence that Negroes are inferior to white persons in native intelligence, a group of the American Psychological Association says.

Reported differences between intelligence test scores of whites and Negroes tend to indicate an inequality of opportunity for Negroes more than anything else, the group said yesterday.

Given equal opportunity, education, and background, there is essentially no difference between IQ scores of whites and Negroes, a spokesman added.

The group, called the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, added:

"What is equally clear is that no evidence exists that leads to the conclusion that such differences are innate.

"Quite to the contrary, the evidence points overwhelming to the fact that when one compares Negroes and whites of comparable cultural and educational background, differences in intelligence diminish markedly."

DIFFERENCE LESSENS

Furthermore, the statement said, "The more comparable the background, the less the difference."

The group issued the statement at the close of the APA annual meeting, commenting on a recent report by Dr. Henry Garrett, University of Virginia psychology professor and past president of the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Garrett wrote his views in a University of Chicago press publication, "Perspectives in Biology and Medicine."

In this article, Dr. Garrett said that until World War I it was probable that American scientists who gave the matter any thought believed the Negro was natively less gifted than the white.

"Thus, the Negro was generally considered to be less intelligent and more indolent than the white, and to be somewhat lacking in the fundamental traits of honesty and reliability," he said. "This judgment was concurred in by most white Americans.

DIFFER IN OPPORTUNITY

"Social scientists today do not often accept these one-time commonsense judgments. Instead, they hold that racial differences are skin deep: That, whereas the black African differs from the white European in the breadth and depth of his civilization, there are no genetic or native factors to account for these differences; that all races are potentially equal in ability and differ only in their opportunity to achieve."

Dr. Garrett said this has been called equalitarian dogma and that evidence from intelligence testing does not favor this view and in fact seems to contradict it.

He cited a book which covered a period of 44 years from 1913 to 1957 and analyzed some 240 studies to show generally that American Negroes have lower IQ's than American whites, produced fewer gifted children, and more in the feeble-minded intelligence-test category.

The executive committee of the American Psychological Association group said:

"We regret that Professor Garrett feels that his colleagues are foisting an 'equalitarian dogma' on the public. There is no question of dogma involved.

CASTS SERIOUS DOUBT

"Evidence speaks for itself and it casts serious doubts on the conclusion that there is any innate inequality in intelligence in different racial groups.

"Indeed, not until we achieve equal opportunity for all will we begin to understand what the full genetic potentiality is of any group."

In an interview, Dr. Isadore Chein, of New York University, speaking for the group, said that the article suggests that the lack of evidence of equality led Dr. Garrett to the conclusion that there was no equality between the two races.

Studies of 12-year-olds in New York have shown, he said, that the longer the Negro child has lived in New York, the less the difference in intelligence test scores were.

Last Round on "Li'l Abner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of September 11, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter I had written to Mr. Laurence Rutman, general manager and editor of the United Feature Syndicate, Inc., protesting the use of the "Li'l Abner" comic strip to de-

grade the law enforcement officers of our country.

Under date of September 19, I inserted the reply from Mr. Rutman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which Mr. Rutman agreed with my protest and also to do something about it.

Today I am inserting, at the request of the cartoonist, Al Capp, a copy of his letter to me. Perhaps Mr. Capp did not think when he wrote the letter in a purely sarcastic vein, that I would place his letter in the RECORD. I am also inserting herewith, my reply to Mr. Capp and wish to state that every law enforcement agency writing to me from several different parts of the United States all agreed with the position I took and in my letter to Mr. Capp, I have inserted one article from the Texas Lawman which is indicative of other letters I have received.

No further comments are necessary from me on this subject.

The letters follow:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

Congressman FRANK J. BECKER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKER: Your letter attacking "Li'l Abner" inserted by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has been called to my attention. I hope you will be fair enough to insert this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You state that you are appalled that any responsible publisher would expose such cartoons to the American public. I am astonished that a cartoon-reading U.S. Congressman doesn't understand my cartoons as well as the average 16-year-old kid. Every red-blooded Fearless Fosdick fan knows and has known for years, that it is Fosdick, courageous, loyal, and underpaid who represents the average cop—and that the corrupt higher-ups I portray represent only those rotten apples in our police force who make life hard for the Fosdicks.

The story you beef about is a paean of praise for the decent elements in our constabulary, and an attack on the indecent. Why don't you have some kid explain it to you?

Best,

AL CAPP.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1961.

MR. AL CAPP,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. CAPP: In response to your letter of September 18 I am inserting your reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as you request and very happy to do so, together with my reply to you.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the letter from Mr. Laurence Rutman, general manager and editor of the United Feature Syndicate, Inc., which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 19 on page 19148 which you will notice is quite different in acknowledging the problem than your sarcastic reply.

You will also note that your attack in this comic strip on law enforcement officers came to my attention by parents of youngsters reading this strip and was not merely a figment of my imagination.

What you intended to convey in your comic strip is one thing but I think we must agree that the minds of young children are not always mature enough to understand intent and merely understand what they see. I am quoting from a paragraph of an article being published in the Texas Lawman, official publication of the Sheriffs' Association of Texas, Inc., which reads as follows:

"The Texas Lawman most sincerely commends Congressman BECKER for his condemnation of Cartoonist Al Capp, whose antipathy toward law enforcement officers has been demonstrated on many occasions during recent years, both in his syndicated comic strip and in person. This aversion is possibly engendered, as we recall, by his encounter in one or more instances with troopers of the Connecticut State Police in connection with his alleged violations of the traffic laws. Mr. Capp's artistry in the cartoon field and his mastery of satire is well known to 'Li'l Abner' fans everywhere but his irresponsible and scurrilous attacks on the law enforcement profession, whether by design or otherwise, is to be condemned by all right-thinking individuals. Congressman BECKER is to be congratulated for having the courage and fortitude to speak out in defense of the Nation's law enforcement officers."

In closing, I have received a number of other commendatory letters from police enforcement agencies in various parts of the country. So you see, Mr. Capp, I have no hesitation whatever in inserting your reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress.

General Walker Reprimand Deserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the admonishment of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker rages unabated. Emotions are so strong that sometimes the facts of the case are obscured. Yesterday, a number of my colleagues discussed this case on the House floor. I thought a recent special report of mine might be of interest to the Members.

General Walker was commander of the 24th Infantry Division in West Germany last April, when charges were made that his troop education and indoctrination program was following the pattern of the rightwing John Birch Society. He subsequently was relieved of his command following an Army investigation. Since then, charges have been made that General Walker was disciplined because he was a zealous anti-Communist.

Considerable light now has been shed on this case. During the week of September 3–9 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee and answered the questions of Senator STROM THURMOND and other critics of the Army action. From his testimony and the subsequent release of the 973-page transcript of the Army's hearings on the case it now becomes clear that General Walker was dimisssed, not because he was a zealous anti-Communist, but because he engaged in political activity.

Two facts stand out: First that General Walker advised the troops and their families to consult the so-called ACA Index before voting in congressional elections last fall, and second, that General Walker pleaded the military equivalent of the fifth amendment (article 31 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) when questioned about this. This article, like the fifth amendment, may be invoked when one believes his own testimony might "tend to incriminate" him.

For your information, the ACA Index is a voting guide published by one particular faction on the American political scene. It can lay no more claim to infallibility or correctness than the ADA Index, published by the opposite extreme of the political spectrum. For General Walker to urge his troops and their families to consult this guide before voting was to engage in overt political activity in clear violation of the spirit of the Hatch Act, which prohibits Government personnel from participating in politics other than voting.

I think the viewpoint of the ACA is shown by the way it regarded the voting record of President Kennedy when he was a Senator. On the issue of private ownership and against Government ownership Mr. Kennedy was rated zero out of a possible 100 percent. In a category, "for individual liberty and against coercion," he was rated only 11 percent. And he was given another zero on national defense.

The Army investigation brought out other points, as well. For example, the testimony revealed that General Walker is a member of the John Birch Society, an organization whose leader says former President Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, and other high officials of our Government have been Communist agents or dupes. Also, it was revealed that General Walker made public statements which were derogatory of other present and former officials of our Government. Such statements, of course, are wholly out of keeping for a military officer.

Three days before he left office last January former President Eisenhower said in a nationwide television address:

> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

I believe Mr. Eisenhower's warning is pertinent to this situation. In the course of our history we have always maintained civilian control of our Government by elected officials responsible to the electorate. I firmly believe that this must continue.

Everyone will agree, I think, on two propositions: First, that military leaders have a right and duty to indoctrinate their troops in broad, basic principles of American history and government so they will know why they are asked to serve their country and fight for it if necessary; and, second, that military leaders have absolutely no business taking any part in political campaigns or seeking to influence their troops in matters which are partisan or political. One need only look at some of the South American and Asian nations to see that

real democracy and liberty are missing when military leaders participate in elections or political decisions.

A nonpolitical military establishment is one of the most vital, indispensable ingredients of the kind of democracy which distinguishes the United States, Britain, and other nations of the free world.

This whole thing can be seen in true focus, I believe, if we suppose for a moment that the situation had been reversed. Imagine that General Walker had called his troops together to "indoctrinate" them on Americanism. Suppose he had advised them that our country was in great danger of losing the cold war to the Communists, and that we could strengthen our Nation for the future only if we had more Federal aid to education, more urban renewal to eliminate crime and poverty in the cities, larger aid for undeveloped countries, and so forth. These are views which have been expressed by President Kennedy, ex-President Eisenhower, and other Americans whose sincerity and patriotism cannot be questioned. Had this been the case, I think you would have joined me in expressing outrage at such military interference in these political questions. Yet, if what General Walker did is right, another commander holding the views I have mentioned could properly "indoctrinate" his troops along those lines. On the basis of the facts presented I think there can be no doubt that the reprimand given General Walker was warranted.

New Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith additional views to the "New Civil Defense Program" report adopted by the Committee on Government Operations, as submitted for filing on September 20:

NEW CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL VIEWS

While this report is primarily an analysis of the history, status, and plans for civil defense, it also has the effect of promoting the subcommittee's pet project—a nationwide program for the construction of underground group shelters at Federal expense (report, pp. 58, 59).

The committee looks upon the civil defense program announced to date "as a beginning and we assume that it is but a first step in a well-organized, progressively developing civil defense program" (report, p. 6). The report then goes on to state that "the Department of Defense must develop, as rapidly as possible, an optimum shelter plan for the United States." The cost of one such plan is estimated at $20 billion (report, p. 58).

The undersigned do not in any way wish to minimize the need for civil defense and agree with the committee's recommendation that the Department of Defense should develop an optimum shelter plan for the United States.

However, the need for expenditures of the magnitude of $20 billion should be determined in the light of all strategic factors and should be weighed against alternate requirements for defense expenditures.

The subcommittee's suggested example of an optimum shelter plan to partially protect against the effects of known and existing weapons was first proposed in 1956 and may be ineffective against new or greater weapon hazards.

The subcommittee finds it (report, p. 5) "heartening and fortunate that the President recognizes the vital importance of an effective civil defense. His personal messages to the Congress and to the American people have banished, almost overnight, a great deal of public apathy and indifference."

An interesting commentary on this "Presidential blessing" (report, p. 31) is provided by the following Associated Press story which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for Saturday, September 16, 1961:

"TOP OFFICIALS APATHETIC TO HOME SHELTERS

"President Kennedy is spurring Americans on to build home fallout shelters to cut the Nation's losses in case of nuclear war—but to his official family the idea seems to be a yawn.

"Of 14 high officials who sit with Mr. Kennedy on the National Security Council or in the Cabinet, not a single one has yet built a home shelter.

"Postmaster General Day, however, has picked out what looks like a pretty safe corner in his basement and is stocking it with canned goods and other survival items.

"A few others are arranging for shelters, or thinking about it in a nonurgent way, but in most cases the reaction appears to be: 'Who, me?'

"The high officials who are minus shelters aren't explaining, for the most part, but among the lower echelons an air of jaunty fatalism is widespread. One subordinate official said:

" 'If the big bangs begin, Washington will be a prime target. I live in Georgetown, close to the center of things. I'd be vaporized, shelter or no shelter, so why bother?'

"This attitude isn't universal by any means, and quite a few shelters have been built in the Capital, though not by the real bigwigs.

"Here's a rundown on the top-rankers:

"President Kennedy: The White House has an elaborate bomb shelter built during the war. Mr. Kennedy has several secret shelters to go to within 2-hour auto drive or 20-minute helicopter trip from Washington.

"Vice President JOHNSON: He recently bought a French chateau-type home in Spring Valley, but is living in a hotel while the house is revamped. The revamping does not include a fallout shelter, aids said.

"Secretary of State Rusk: He and Mrs. Rusk have been talking over the shelter idea but are undecided yet.

"Secretary of Defense McNamara: He's arranging to have a shelter installed in the big house he rents on Kalorama Circle. He really has to have a shelter to set an example, if for no other reason. Mr. Kennedy recently gave him command of the nationwide shelter program.

"Frank B. Ellis, civil defense director: He rents a house, and is trying to get a shelter designed that can be readily moved if the next tenant doesn't want it.

"McGeorge Bundy, Presidential assistant for national security affairs: No shelter, aids said.

"Secretary of the Treasury Dillon: No shelter.

"Attorney General Kennedy: No shelter.

"Secretary of Agriculture Freeman: No shelter.

"Secretary of Commerce Hodges: He's an apartment dweller and can't have a shelter of his own.

"Secretary of Labor Goldberg: Has two homes, in Washington and Chicago. Doesn't contemplate a shelter.

"Secretary of Welfare Ribicoff: He rents in Georgetown and feels he cannot do anything about a shelter.

"One high official who is really shelter-conscious is Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense. He had two, one at his Long Island home and one at his house at Grasonville on Maryland's eastern shore."

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.
GEORGE MEADER.
CLARENCE J. BROWN.
JOHN B. ANDERSON.

Commencement Address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin Before Student Nurses a Lancaster, Pa., General Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, former Governor Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland delivered an excellent speech on September 10 last, at the commencement exercises of the Lancaster General Hospital student nurses at Lancaster, Pa.

As my daughter is a graduate nurse, I read Governor McKeldin's most interesting address with particular appreciation. It seems to me that it deserves wider attention and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, 1951–59—COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, LANCASTER GENERAL HOSPITAL STUDENT NURSES, MCCASKEY HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, LANCASTER, PA., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1961, 8:15 P.M.

The work of a graduate nurse is of such a character that laymen tend to get sentimental about it. I hope to avoid that, for if there is one thing that a good nurse must steer clear of, it is sentimentality, for what you will have to deal with in your professional career is reality in just about the harshest aspect.

Therefore, I shall lose no time telling you that you are to be ministering angels to suffering humanity. It is true that a first-rate nurse does seem to the patient something like a ministering angel, but she doesn't get to look like that by thinking about it. She acquires that appearance by doing her job in the most skillful and efficient way possible. So the wise nurse is the one who thinks about the job, and if she seems to sprout wings it is pure accident, as far as she is concerned.

It is the fact, however, that the graduate nurse does bear a special relation to the public, and it is of this that I propose to speak. This relation grows out of your profession, but it is not strictly professional. You have had instruction enough in professional ethics, so even if I were qualified to deal with the subject, it would be a waste of time. I have in mind a relation, partly ethical, but largely intellectual, that is borne by every member of society to some extent, but that rests with extra weight upon those

who by reason of their special skill come into contact with a wide range of human types.

The public official is one of these, as I know by long experience. The clergyman is one. The schoolteacher is one. So, to a lesser extent, are the lawyer in private practice, and the journalist. But of all who deal with the public, those who come into closest contact with every possible kind of man and woman are the doctor and the nurse, particularly those who do not specialize, but remain in general practice.

More than that, the science and art of healing bring the practitioner into contact with humanity under circumstances that strip away illusions and pretenses and reveal the essential character. Pain is a reality, perhaps the starkest reality we know. Given even passably good health, a man or woman can, as the saying is, "put up a front" that the shrewdest observer can hardly penetrate; but when one is severely stricken, pretenses collapse and to the doctor and the nurse the personality is revealed as it really is.

To see men and women as they really are is not always a happy experience. Some people are ennobled by suffering, but not all. Some are debased by it. There is a point, as the devilish ingenuity of the concentration camps has showed us, at which extreme suffering can break down any character and dehumanize the sufferer. It is the glory of modern medical science that it can and does prevent suffering so extreme in civilized countries; but there is, and there will always be, enough unpreventable pain to give the doctor and the nurse a highly realistic view of humanity.

This can have a deadening effect. I have no doubt that you have been told many times that yours is among the noblest of the professions. Perhaps you have been told so many times that you are tired of hearing it. Then let me give the statement a different slant—nursing can be, but is not necessarily, among the noblest professions. It all depends upon the attitude that practice develops in the individual nurse. She can see so much of evil, and weakness, and folly that she will come to despise humanity; and there is no nobility in that.

Please understand that I am not talking about the incompetent nurse who scamps her work. There is nothing to be said about her except that she ought to get out of the profession. I have in mind the nurse who maintains the highest scientific standards, whose knowledge and skill are beyond question, and whose reliability is absolute, but whose emotions have frozen into cynicism as a reaction against the ugliness she finds in the world. She may be highly efficient, but she is never the best nurse.

We find the same type among doctors—men who have developed into thinking machines, rather than human beings. Sometimes they are brilliant. They often grow rich and occasionally become famous. But they are never the great doctors whom the world venerates and loves. They are ornaments of the science of medicine, but not of the art of healing; and in the estimation of mankind the healer takes rank over the scientist.

Yet the very same experience that deadens the emotion of some nurses has the opposite effect on others. Their emotions are not deadened, they are merely controlled. Of course, the student nurse who faints on her first day in the operating room must undergo severe discipline, but it ought not to be a discipline that will kill the feeling that overcame her. What she needs is only control, not loss of emotion. For brought under control it will not hinder, but immeasurably help her career.

Of course this is nothing peculiar to nurses. It applies to anyone and everyone who has to deal with people. For instance, in my own profession, a judge who would permit his feelings to get out of control would be a very bad judge. But the judge who is incapable of feeling is also a bad judge. Self-control is the mark of highest attainment in any walk of life.

But in the case of the arts and sciences that have to do with healing, the value of the quality that we call compassion is conspicuous for the very reason that strong forces operate to smother it. Therefore the nurse owes it to herself to be careful above the average not to let those forces prevail.

I said, and for emphasis I repeat, she owes it to herself. She owes it to her profession and to the community, also, but first of all to herself. For she is compelled to observe so much ugliness that she, more than most women, ought to watch for and cherish every gleam of beauty.

I am not talking about physical ugliness, those occasional distasteful duties that a nurse is called on to perform. Most of us can endure physical ugliness if we endure it for a good purposes. I have in mind, rather, the ugly traits that illness often brings out in people—pettiness, bitterness, all the irritating forms of selfishness. These are harder to endure than anything merely offensive to the senses, and much more likely to harden the emotional nature.

But they are offset, and to the woman who is wise, more than offset, by the things that the same experience brings out in other people. For the nurse who is compelled to witness the debasement that pain works upon small souls, is also privileged to witness the splendor that it brings out in great ones. The quiet heroism with which quite ordinary men and women pass through their ordeal; the thoughtfulness for others that in many cannot be destroyed by the sharpest agony; the steadiness with which the humble, and even children, walk into the valley of the shadow of death—these things, too, are before the eyes of the nurse, and they are beautiful with a beauty surpassing the glory of this world, radiant with the light that never was on sea or land.

Psychiatrists skilled in the science of the subconscious assure us that in very many cases the things that we forget are those that we prefer not to remember. On that sort of thing I am not an authority, so I refuse to argue the point. But this much I have learned by observation: there are people whose memory of everything beautiful that they have seen is much more tenacious than their memory of the disgusting, and such people live, or seem to live, unusually rich and happy lives.

Now the nurse in practicing her profession is witness of the reality of human nature; and the beauty of it is as real as the ugliness. That is why I say that she owes it to herself to remember that beauty, to cherish it, and meditate upon it, as much and as often as she can. In so doing she will inevitably overlay and eventually forget much of the other side of things; and in so doing she will enhance the richness and happiness of her own life.

In addition to that, as the years pass and the memories accumulate she will develop a sympathy and an insight into human nature that will reinforce her professional skill to an amazing degree; and in the end she may develop a curious faculty possessed by only a few of the medical profession, but they among the greatest—an ability somehow to stimulate the patient's will to live, which is a curative agent more powerful than any drug the apothecary ever compounded. The woman with that faculty is not merely a good nurse, but a great one.

I congratulate you on having passed the tests that prove your fitness to enter this arduous profession. For although it is severe, its rewards are correspondingly great, not in worldly wealth, but in the intangible values that contribute to inward peace and happiness. For along with drudgery and pain you will often witness the beauty of heroism; and while you remember that beauty, you will possess it, and in time it will irradiate your own life.

Which is, I am sure, what the apostle had in mind for us all when he gave us this advice: "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and there be any praise, think on these things."

J.F.K. Puts K. on Defensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a newspaper editorial that should be of interest to every American that appears to state the exact truth borne out by the facts that must be apparent to the thinking people of the United States:

J. F. K. PUTS K. ON DEFENSIVE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

The curtain rises Tuesday on the big world stage of the United Nations. This time we will be spared "Kobbler" Khrushchev's shoe-pounding routine of last year which was widely considered to be the alltime low in Assembly procedure. Advance notices indicate this fall's show will be on a more serious level.

Certainly there is nothing more serious—for the United States, the U.S.S.R. and all the nations represented—than the drama that moves into the U.N. from Washington, the quickening crisis of Germany and Berlin.

This will start in the wings, so to speak, with offstage dialogue between Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. It will be Mr. Rusk's duty to determine whether there is any chance—and here comes that key word again—of serious talks with Russia that could lead to an honorable solution of the Berlin-German issue.

I give high marks to President Kennedy for seizing the initiative from Khrushchev in setting up the Rusk-Gromyko duet. And the President did this astutely in the presence of two neutral leaders who visited him last week, Presidents Sukarno of Indonesia and Modibo Keita of Mali.

It was the kind of diplomatic finesse that you don't witness very often, particularly, it is sad to say, among our statesmen. For the Kennedy statement, issued at the conclusion of the Sukarno-Keita meeting, and presumably saying in formal language what he told them informally, accomplished these two things:

1. It put Khrushchev on the defensive by challenging him to show at least a semblance of interest in peaceful progress on Berlin and Germany—and to show it by instructing his man at the U.N. to talk with Secretary Rusk in the presence of the world organization.

Naturally the Russians rushed in the next day with an announcement that Gromyko was willing, but it had a hasty me-too flavor.

2. It emphasized to Messrs. Keita and Sukarno that while we would not be pressured into going to a useless summit, we are and always will be ready to negotiate if "differences are approached with full understanding of the rights, obligations, and vital interest of others."

The President made another astute move by handing the two leaders letters to distribute to all those who attended the recent Belgrade conference, expressing the same position and stressing that the United States will not negotiate under the gun of any ultimatum.

Mr. Kennedy was blunt but reasonable. He told his visitors that in Berlin "the position of the West and of the West Berliners will be defended" and he scored a telling point by reminding them it was of the "utmost importance that there will be no unilateral acts (such as Khrushchev signing a separate peace treaty with East Germany) which will make peaceful progress impossible."

Whether this logic will penetrate the illogical, builtin bias of many neutrals against the United States and the West remains to be seen.

It seems to have influenced President Keita to the extent that he agreed a summit meeting with Khrushchev would have to be carefully prepared in advance.

But he still kept his blinders on in holding that Berlin is a "minor problem" and that self-determination for the people of Berlin and Germany is not the same thing at all as self-determination for the people of Africa.

It is this inability to understand the importance of Berlin and of self-determination for all peoples everywhere—and many "neutral" leaders share it with Keita—which leads me to believe there must be more than an offstage dialog between Secretary Rusk and Foreign Minister Gromyko, important as that will be.

I think that President Kennedy needs to take it from the wings onto the full stage by appearing personally before the Assembly as soon as possible. What I have in mind is not a speech of glossy generalities.

I believe the Presiednt can keep and advance the initiative we now hold by spelling out firmly our country's position, the meaning of Berlin and self-determination, and by pointing out the list of "captive nations" which makes the Soviet Union the greatest colonial power in history.

The initiative is vitally worth holding.

Last week this column noted rumblings from the White House which matched my own feelings about U.S. aid to "neutral" nations. The general idea is that now is a good time to count noses of who's neutral on whose side.

Hearst Headline Service's White House correspondent, Marianne Means, detected the first whiff of the administration's change of direction. Her report for our September 6 papers was that President Kennedy was pretty sore about the way some recipients of U.S. handouts backed the Soviet line in the Belgrade meeting of "nonalined" nations.

Yugoslavia's Tito, as No. 1 ball carrier for the Red side at the "neutral" session, was listed as No. 1 candidate for losing his access to the American till, from which he has garnered $2.2 billion so far.

Just to get it straight—for those who are interested—here's how I feel about Tito (every bit of it based on his record):

He is an avowed Communist, for more than 40 years. He was Moscow-trained and for nearly two decades roamed Europe as an international agent of the Kremlin.

The only reason he is a KO-existing Kommie instead of a Moscow puppet nowadays is because he insists on being an absolute dictator in his own country.

He has consistently been anti-U.S. in the cold war, while taking the American taxpayers' money.

He is a bloody-handed murderer. On Moscow's orders (Hitler and Stalin were pals at the time) his troops let Yugoslavian patriots die defending their country against the Nazis in the early days of World War II.

Then, when Stalin switched sides, Tito devoted as much time to fighting anti-Communist Yugoslavs as to fighting the Germans. He captured anti-Red Leader Gen. Draha Mihailovich and "executed" him on phony treason charges.

Worst of all, after the war he shot down two U.S. planes, killing five U.S. fliers.

How many spots can any one leopard change?

Yet, ever since Tito had a falling-out with the Kremlin over who is boss Red in Yugoslavia, our Government—with the muddleheadedness crossing party lines—has been building him up as a "wedge" in the Communist world.

The logic of that has escaped me. I have believed all along that Tito should have been left to work out his own fate without any attempt to buy him for our side. Here are some reasons why:

He had no place else to go. He couldn't move closer to the Kremlin or he'd lose the independence which is the only thing that distinguishes him from any other Red.

Anybody who can be bought by one side can be bought back by the other.

Without our aid, he would have been a glaring case of the economic failure of communism.

Bad as sending economic aid to Tito always was, even worse was giving him U.S. military aid. Why ever give weapons to nations which will potentially use them against us?

That was why, back in the summer of 1956, this column dug up and revealed that Tito was scheduled to get 380 U.S. jet military planes. The Hearst papers raised such a storm of protest that Washington backed down and canceled out all but a few of the shipments.

Which brings me to my personal experience of Comrade Tito. In November of that year, as one of seven Americans who were asked to survey U.S. foreign aid on the scene, I went to Norway, Denmark, and West Germany. My schedule also called for visiting Yugoslavia.

Before I could go there, I was informed that I was "persona non grata"—not welcome—by Tito because of "personal insults."

I sure had to plead guilty to that. In fighting to stop the jets from being sent to Tito, I had referred to him as a Red-handed murderer for shooting down American planes after the war.

In a way that was a real kick. Like anyone else, I had been tagged "persona non grata" at parties and such before. But to be barred from a whole country, and by such an unsavory character as Tito, was kind of flattering.

P.S.—I've never had occasion to change that opinion of Tito. It's nice to see that, as the result of his neutralist conniving, my low estimate of him is beginning to be shared by our Government in Washington.

Down in the Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, September 15, 1961, entitled "Down in the Stockpile."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 15, 1961]

DOWN IN THE STOCKPILE

We knew there were some weird items in the Nation's so-called strategic stockpile of materials critically needed for defense. But we hadn't realized, until Delaware's Senator WILLIAMS made a point of it the other day, that the cache includes considerable quantities of feathers and down.

Mr. WILLIAMS considers the feathers-and-down program another instance of Government waste, mismanagement and stupidity. He is not least annoyed by the refusal of officials to disclose to him just how much of the lightweight stuff the stockpile contains.

As he puts it, "They seem to think Mr. Khrushchev will win the cold war if I am told how many feathers we have in the stockpile. What are we going to do, have a pillow fight over Berlin?"

It's a good question. We can think of a couple of others. What are feathers doing down in a "strategic" stockpile? To put it another way, what are they, horsefeathers? And is the stockpile a stockpile or just another featherbed?

The Herlong-Baker Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester Reporter, Chester, S.C., of September 20, 1961:

THE HERLONG-BAKER BILL

The House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering a bipartisan approach to the tax problem, the Herlong-Baker bill, which would set up a 5-year program for the reduction of both corporate and individual income taxes and effect other tax reforms on a broad scale.

The 52 percent corporate tax rate would be cut 1 point a year to 47 percent in the fifth year. Personal income taxes would be reduced in similar fashion over the 5-year period. The 20-percent rate applicable to the first $2,000 of taxable income would end at 15 percent. In the highest bracket, the present 91 percent on incomes over $200,000 would be reduced to 47 percent in the fifth year.

The scheduled reductions of income tax rates in the Herlong-Baker bill would be made only in those years the Federal budget is expected to show a surplus and can be spread over a 4-year period if this becomes necessary.

"The intent of the legislation," said the sponsors of the bill, "is to give priority for use of the revenue gain to tax rate reform over any and all spending on new or old programs except that necessary for national defense.

"It is long past the time when we should have recognized that we need more capital for more growth just as does the rest of the world. We cannot afford a tax structure which converts job creating growth capital into current Government spending. Until Federal tax rates are reasonable and moderate, further increase in Federal spending

will be at the expense of greater growth in the private economy."

In a very real sense, the Herlong-Baker bill proposes tax reduction in the United States on a pay-as-you-go basis. One year's reduction could so stimulate growth and business that the next year's reduction would be paid for in advance through an increase in tax revenues. It provides for no drastic reduction in revenues in any year.

The Broadened Responsibilities of Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey has reason to take pride in the outstanding graduate training program in banking provided by our State university, Rutgers, at New Brunswick. There is probably no school in the country that has a more distinguished reputation.

The Stonier Graduate School of Banking has been a joint project for many years of Rutgers and the American Banking Association. Requirements for admission are rigid. Applicants for this advanced training must be 30 years old and they must have 8 years of experience in banking. Furthermore, they must also be officers of their bank at the time they seek enrollment.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I take great pride in inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address by Dr. E. Sherman Adams, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York and formerly director of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking. He spoke to the student body of the graduate school at Rutgers on June 21 of this year.

The first part of his address was devoted to the more technical aspects of banking, but I am sure that all of my colleagues will be interested in his remarks which stress the importance of bankers assuming the public responsibilities of good citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from Dr. Adams' address:

IMPORTANCE OF OUR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

(Address by Dr. E. Sherman Adams)

I am not here to talk shop, tempting though this is. Indeed, most of us are in danger of becoming so engrossed in our shopkeeping problems that we give inadequate attention to our broader public responsibilities.

This would be the worst mistake we could make, even from a strictly self-interest point of view. I say this not merely because what is good for the economy is good for banking, for this is true of most businesses. But the situation of bankers is unique because they are in a position to contribute so significantly to the public welfare—and what is more, the public has some awareness of this fact. The spotlight is always on banking. If bankers fail in their public responsibilities, their failure will be conspicuous.

Also, banking has now become highly dependent upon the goodwill of the public. Banks formerly served only certain classes but now they serve the masses. We find ourselves operating today in a market where the patronage of the public is all important and one in which we face aggressive, formidable competition from other types of financial institutions. In addition, the attitude of the public now has a decisive influence upon legislation and public policies which affect banking.

To a far greater extent than in the past, therefore, banking needs the good regard of the public. This means that bankers must serve the common good to the best of their abilities. And the public will not be fooled on this matter. Over the years the attitude of the public toward banking will depend most upon how well bankers contribute to the general welfare. To be enduring, public esteem must be earned.

But it would do you men an injustice to appeal to you only on grounds of self-interest. None of you is ruled simply by materialistic motives. Each of you has a deep desire to play well your part in the human adventure, to make a success of your relationships with society. A career in banking offers unusual opportunities to do just that—and indeed, this is doubtless one of the chief reasons why you are attracted to banking.

Moreover, most bankers are imbued with a strong sense of responsibility. Most of us feel that banking partakes of the nature of a public trust. Since he serves all groups in the community, the banker is more aware than many of the interdependence—the mutuality of interest—of the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and the consumer. He appreciates the privilege of being a member of our free American society. He sees how important it is that he should contribute to the common enterprise—not as a matter of noblesse oblige but simply as his plain duty as a member of the society to which he owes so much.

OUR HOMETOWN DUTIES

All this is readily apparent when we look at our local communities. Every banker knows from firsthand experience that the growth and prosperity of his institution are inextricably tied to the growth and prosperity of the area he serves. He knows that he can make important contributions to his community, and that people's appraisal of these contributions will be critical and discerning.

Most bankers are therefore keenly aware of their hometown duties. It is normal to find them in the forefront of civic activities. Bankers bow to no group in the matter of civic spirit.

Yet here too the nature of the problems is changing. Many communities are today faced with serious problems of urban blight. The needs for community planning and rehabilitation and for improved community facilities are urgent. They will doubtless continue to constitute a major problem for many years to come.

Some bankers are taking a leading part in urban renewal programs and they shall reap rewards both in heaven and in their operating statements. Others have not yet become involved. Their reluctance is perhaps understandable, but is it wise?

Regional development and resource utilization present similar problems. Here again bankers are in a position to provide constructive leadership and many are doing so. These activities are time consuming, to be sure, but they are clearly important to the long-range welfare of your communities and your institutions.

Another aspect of community relations is the matter of political participation. This is a subject to which you men at the graduate school have been fully exposed so I shall comment on it only briefly, as follows: I know that many of you agree that banks should do more to encourage their people to participate more actively in various types of political activity. Some banks have made important strides in this direction in recent years. This is clearly an area in which there is much more to be done.

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Closely related is the matter of economic education. In this democracy of ours, public economic policies are now determined chiefly by Joe Public. Fortunately, Joe has a remarkable endowment of commonsense, and when he is adequately informed about a problem, he usually adopts a sensible attitude toward it. Unfortunately, Joe has little understanding of the economic facts of life. Even among our own bank employees, the rate of economic illiteracy is appallingly high.

This is a dangerous situation and one which should be of concern to bankers. Here again some banks have made some progress in recent years, but most have not. Many bankers still feel that the economic education of the public, or even of their own employees, is not their proper concern.

Does this attitude make sense? Demagogs and pressure groups are busily spreading misinformation and fallacies and taking advantage of the public's ignorance in economic matters. This threatens the future welfare of our entire economy, including the welfare of banking. Bankers who have ignored, or merely deplored, this situation should carefully reconsider whether it is really no concern of theirs.

This does not imply, of course, that bankers should try to assume responsibility for all aspects of economic education. Far from it. To a large extent the banker's role should be one of lending support to the efforts of professional educators. They can also encourage and make it easier for their own staff people to gain a better understanding of economic issues.

THE BANKER-EDUCATOR

Nevertheless, there are some areas in which bankers do possess special competence, namely, banking and finance. The general public and even most bank employees know very little about the banking business and its role in our economy. This is clearly our own fault. We bankers give a great deal of attention to the selling of bank services but very little to the selling of banking as an industry by explaining its functions. And if we do not tell the public the story of banking, no one will do it for us.

Another area with which bankers are particularly concerned is monetary management. Bankers are not always happy about the effects of Federal Reserve policies on the banks but that is beside the point. They know that the Federal Reserve has made and can continue to make an important contribution to the stability of our economy. They therefore have a unique responsibility to contribute to public understanding and support of sound monetary policy.

Take interest rates. Here is a subject of vital concern to bankers and one on which many people harbor dangerous illusions. During recent years the ancient fallacy that cheap money is the cure for our economic ills, has been gaining renewed popularity. Many people, including some in high places, seem to have a notion that it is desirable always to keep interest rates low and that this should be one of the goals of public policy.

This is a threat to banking, clearly, and equally a threat to the public interest. Bankers should have a clear understanding of the role of interest rates in our economy and should do what they can to share that understanding with the public.

This is no easy assignment; indeed, it is one of the toughest. Just try explaining to

your wife or to your next-door neighbor why it is important that interest rates should be permitted to rise at times as well as decline at other times. And these, presumably, would be receptive listeners, willing to give you some benefit of the doubt. But the general public is not. It is skeptical, quick to assume you are motivated solely by self-interest. It will listen only if it becomes convinced—against its natural instincts—that bankers really have genuine concern for the common good.

BANKERS AND PUBLIC POLICY

This brings us to another major aspect of a banker's public responsibilities: his role with respect to national economic problems. Clearly bankers should be nation-minded as well as community-minded. Also, the public image of banking is greatly colored by what bankers do—and fail to do—on the national stage.

I think we should face up to the fact that this image leaves much to be desired. Bankers take pride, and justly so, of the record of public service of members of the banking fraternity such as Joe Dodge, Randy Burgess, and Jack McCloy. This is all to the good but it is not good enough. Many people think of bankers as being generally unenlightened and perhaps even antisocial. They have the impression that bankers oppose most progressive measures and are interested chiefly in legislation which will directly benefit the banks. Nor are they too favorably impressed by traditional banker exhortations to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and cut governmental expenditures.

I do not for a moment suggest that bankers should modify their views on public finance simply because they may be unpopular. Indeed, perhaps our first responsibility in national affairs is to work for fiscal sanity. Bankers, more than most groups, understand the importance of sound public finance and this imposes special obligations on them to support sensible monetary and fiscal policies.

On the other hand, even in financial matters, we must beware of being doctrinaire. Lincoln's words of almost a century ago apply today: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

NEED FOR A BROAD PERSPECTIVE

Moreover, there are other aspects of public policy with which bankers should be more concerned than they have been. Sound finance is by no means the only ingredient in economic progress nor is it the only one in which bankers should be interested. We should give more attention to other important ingredients—the need for expanding our investment in education, for example. In short, we should strive to develop a broader perspective on national and also international problems.

Take foreign aid. A recent symposium of distinguished scholars and public affairs leaders agreed that foreign aid will be the most important economic problem confronting the United States over the next 20 years. Bankers know full well that as a Nation we can and must afford to help strengthen the economies and defenses of other free nations. In the words of former President Eisenhower, "The impoverishment of any single people in the world means danger to the well-being of all other peoples." Bankers should be just as concerned with the adequacy of our foreign aid programs as they are with tax reform.

Similarly, most bankers have a good understanding of other elements of foreign economic policy. They appreciate the importance of a liberal trade policy not only to this country but to the entire free world. They know that the United States cannot exercise moral leadership among nations if we preach one thing and practice another with respect to tariffs, quotas, domestic price supports, and the dumping of products in foreign markets. Unless we demonstrate to uncommitted nations that they can trade with us and that it is in their interest to do so, they will trade with Russia and our reluctant grants will do little good.

Bankers have a clear obligation to give their full support to enlightened policies in this area—to such things, specifically, as the reciprocal trade agreements program. Some do speak out on these subjects from time to time, but many are silent, largely because they regard these issues as not really being their concern. Yet this is an area in which bankers could make significant contributions. If they fail to do so, they fail in one of their major responsibilities.

DON'T JUST BE A BANKER: DO SOMETHING

Most of you men, I am sure, are in general sympathy with most of my comments thus far. Nevertheless, you may feel that they do not apply directly to you as an individual at the present time, for two reasons: First, you are up to your ears in bank work for which you are directly responsible. Second, you may feel that these public responsibilities we have been talking about devolve primarily upon organized banking—bankers associations—rather than upon you as an individual.

Well, let's look at these points. Of course we are all busy with our day-to-day duties. That's the kind of business we are in and one of the reasons we like it. Nevertheless, every one of us could make the time, if we wished, to discharge our public responsibilities. Each of us could learn more about public affairs, participate in political or civic activities, serve on the school board or the local planning commission, write our Congressmen, teach at the A.I.B. or speak at the local service club. In short, don't just be a banker; do something.

Moreover, regardless of your present duties in the bank you will sooner or later have many opportunities to make suggestions or at least cast your vote with respect to the policies of your own bank in these areas. When these opportunities arise, be prompt with your suggestions and your votes, and unabashed in debate with those who pride themselves on being hardheaded—and are.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE ABA

Secondly, this matter of your individual responsibility versus that of organized banking. Obviously there are certain things which bankers can do more effectively on a cooperative basis, through their associations, than they can acting alone. This is universally recognized. But what is not so widely recognized is the equally obvious fact that the effectiveness of cooperative efforts depends upon the cooperation received from the individual bankers who comprise the association.

It is an illusion to think of a bankers association as somehow having an independent existence of its own. I speak with strong conviction on this point, having been, as you know, for many years a member of the staff of the American Bankers Association. As any ABA staff member can tell you, the success of any association program depends entirely upon the cooperation of individual bankers throughout the country. In the last analysis, the responsibilities of organized banking are the direct responsibilities of its members.

By the same token, this implies that the standards and objectives of the ABA should be very high. They should represent the collective responsibilities of bankers everywhere. They should reflect the finest in American banking.

Obviously the ABA does not presently measure up to these high standards. And now that I no longer have any official connection with the association, I should like to comment briefly on this point. Let me say first that bankers have much to be proud of in the record of the ABA, far more than most of them realize. Few bankers appreciate the devotion to the cause of banking which has been expended over the years by staff members and by bankers who have participated in the ABA's activities. This graduate school is certainly not the least of the ABA accomplishments.

But if we set our standards as high as we should, the ABA has serious shortcomings. It falls far short of what it could be doing. To my mind, its budget is woefully inadequate. There are countless things that need to be done, or done much better, for which funds are not in the budget.

But please don't infer that increasing membership dues in the ABA would solve the public responsibilities of bankers. It most assuredly would not, not unless individual bankers throughout the country are willing to lend leadership and support to forward-looking policies. The shortcomings of the ABA are the shortcomings of its members and no one else. Its potential accomplishments are also those of individual bankers willing to contribute their time and energies to them.

NEEDED: A SENSE OF DEDICATION

In short, gentlemen, the responsibilities of bankers consist of the obligations of each of us as individuals. Every banker has an important part to play. If we perform our parts as we can and should, we can help to strengthen the fabric of our society.

Banking has come a long way since the doghouse days of the great depression. But we still have far to go. We need further to broaden our concept of the banker's role in society and achieve standards of conduct which will set an example for other groups to emulate. We need to cultivate the habit of thinking in terms of the public interest. We need to deepen our social consciousness. This is not Sunday school stuff; it is the first law of modern survival.

Let us remind ourselves again, and frequently, of the grim urgency of our situation, of how much is at stake. The ordeal of the 20th century is far from over. The Communist menace may confront us for generations. This is a global life and death struggle, one in which there is no prize for second best.

It is imperative that we keep our economy strong and help to strengthen free nations everywhere. We must match the fanatical zeal of the Communists with an abiding devotion to our ideals. We must be willing not only to fight for freedom but to work for it, year in and year out. Our leadership in the world will depend upon how well we use our freedom.

These are not lofty abstractions far removed from matters of daily living. To the contrary, they should provide framework and guidance for what we do from day to day. They constitute a challenge to each of us. They offer to each of us an opportunity—to broaden our horizons and to expand our spheres of influence. Will we have the intelligence, the courage, the maturity, and the sense of mission, needed to fulfill these obligations? Will we have the vision and steadfastness—in short, the dedication—required to live up to our broadened responsibilities as bankers?

Ships Full of Lollipops in the Wrong Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Robert C. Ruark, entitled "Ships Full of Lollipops in the Wrong Places."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS FULL OF LOLLIPOPS IN THE WRONG PLACES

(By Robert C. Ruark)

BARCELONA, SPAIN.—I am gratified to learn that Secretary of State Dean Rusk aims to broaden our information activities to present a more favorable image of ourselves, and also that he emphasizes that "a nation's most effective propaganda is its actual behavior."

The first statement can be construed to mean that we will spend more money on pictures, pamphlets and battleships full of baby carriages and lollipops, such as recently called on Mombasa in Kenya in the name of peace.

The second harsh, if possible inadvertent truth, is that it is going to take a power of "actual behavior" to reconstruct the image of America abroad.

The image, as I encounter it in my various roamings, is almost universal. It combines something of the softheaded old sugar daddy with the ruthless exploiter of downtrodden masses. It is an amalgam of drunken spendthrift, using the bank's money, with a Scrooge whose only God is gold, and whose efforts ignore the humanities.

It is a combination of the featherheaded doer of misguided good in the wrong places and the timorous giant who so pleads for international affection that it is easy for a midget to abuse it and finally poke a hole in its Cyclopean eye.

Basically, the picture I am constantly receiving is that we have grown so soft and frightened of incurring ill favor that we allow anybody to milk us of our money and still give us the Bronx cheer. We used to conjure up a vision of rawness and crudity, but now we are portrayed as a fat man too lazy to kill his own snakes, and too frightened to chase off his own burglars for fear of rousing the yapping dogs.

It is not a very nice picture, this montage of Suez and Laos, Cuba and Berlin. It is not a nice picture of our big industrialists going to jail for price fixing and assorted graft, and the constant pleas of our President for more money to give more people to waste and steal and misuse in the forlorn hope that we can buy friendship and military strength.

Cuba hurt us possibly worse than anything we ever got mixed up in, because she was, in effect, our own private serpent, and she bit us severely on the heel.

America has always been too big and rich and raw and gawky to be beloved, but until recent years there was always some respect under the gibes we suffered. There was, I believe, some hope that Kennedy's fine speechifying about new frontiers and fibertoughening might mean something, but that hope has largely disappeared as the brave words have largely lacked weight, and the gigantic giveaway show increases its prize money.

Perhaps another $500 million sent here, another billion there, to buy palaces for little dictators and Cadillacs for cousins of politicians in malarial swamps and bankrupt pig-wallow principalities will solve whatever's wrong with the American conscience. But I doubt very much if all the tail-coated delegations to the kraals of recent uncle-eaters and fetish-worshipers is going to reinstate us as a power to be reckoned with instead of monkeyed with.

I have a hunch that the world is weary of our soft-answer-and-easy-handout approach to the solution of tromping on a few toads and shooting the heads off a few snakes. I think the world is waiting for America the beautiful, the bountiful, the bumbling, to get real sore and take a sock at somebody—even if the sock is at a small target. America's hand has been stretched so lovingly of late, to all the world, that the world has forgotten the hand can close into a fist, cramped as it is from writing checks.

Education of Foreign Students Who Come to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a recent article in Time magazine, entitled "Welcome Stranger."

Be it noted that the $100,000 offered by the State Department—an offer which I had helped to obtain—for airlifting African scholarship students was scornfully rejected in certain quarters.

It is interesting to note that this $100,000 was indeed actually used last spring by State Department officials "to bail out the same 289 Africans flown in by the Kennedy Foundation; having arrived with sparse shillings and small scholarships. They were in dire straits.

So the $100,000 which I was criticized for seeking, came in pretty handy after all.

I sincerely hope that African student attendance in U.S. schools will continue to be encouraged by both governmental and private agencies.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME, STRANGER

U.S. colleges this month turn to a duty that has grown to critical national importance; educating students from new and developing nations, who passionately seek U.S. knowledge. It is a task full of promise. "Students want to come to the United States," says Philip H. Coombs, the State Department's Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs. "This is an asset we should be pretty thankful for. We couldn't buy it."

Last year U.S. colleges enrolled 53,107 foreign students, up 46 percent since 1956. Included were 19,222 Asians, a 12-percent rise in 1 year, and 2,831 Africans, a 44-percent rise in 1 year. Last June U.S. colleges produced 20,0000 foreign alumni, nearly twice as many as the graduates of all Ivy League colleges; 7.4 percent of Harvard students were foreigners. This year U.S. colleges will probably enroll at least 57,000. By one estimate, the United States in 5 years may have 200,000 foreign students.

Foreign students are still only 1.3 percent of U.S. college enrollment (against 12 percent in British universities, 30 percent in Austria); yet the record far exceeds Russia's. The 39,500 students attracted to the United States from underdeveloped areas last year compared with 3,600 in all the Communist-bloc countries. Despite the lure of Moscow's Patrice Lumumba (formerly Friendship) University, the Russians hooked a mere 441 Africans, 186 of them from Guinea. The Russians' total Latin American catch: 200 students, half from Cuba. In the Middle East, they recruited 664 students, mostly Iraqis. "Many Soviet scholarships are going begging in Africa and the Middle East," says Coombs.

MAKING FRIENDS

The U.S. Government itself is confined to a surprisingly small share of student exchange. Last year it provided only partial sponsorship for only about 5,000 foreign students. The rest are left to the kind of private effort that Coombs calls "the people's branch of foreign relations." He means that making U.S. friends out of foreign students is almost entirely a challenge to individual Americans, from the college president who selects sanely and sets up solid orientation to the family that feeds and houses foreign students with courtesy and discretion.

Unhappily for people dealing with foreign students, there is no stock model; Congolese differ from Kenyans as much as Belgians from Britons. But there is at least a statistical average. The foreign student in 1961 is probably a male undergraduate studying engineering (with social sciences favored among Africans). He is far poorer than his often rich predecessors, and he is culturally more remote from U.S. life. He needs more financial help, more guidance, and more understanding than ever.

One of his basic psychological problems is an almost invariable loss of self-esteem after arrival; he feels uprooted and hence resentful. He is shocked at the meagerness of his money; U.S. scholarships do not usually cover living expenses or summer vacations as do Europe's. He finds astonishingly diversified colleges with unpredictable standards. He finds rude waiters, Jimmy Hoffa, demanding children, and kind old ladies who ask Africans if they live in trees. He rarely finds anyone who knows the location of Mali, Gabon or Dahomey, or even of their existence.

UHURU

The more backward his country, the more elite the foreign student—and the greater his pique that no one recognizes it. "When you're dealing with an African student," says Coombs, "you may be dealing with a fellow who will be prime minister in 5 years." Yet if his skin is colored, the future prime minister is certain to encounter discrimination, not only in the South's segregated colleges but also in Northern restaurants, barbershops, and off-campus housing.

None of this weighs heavily against the promise of power and affluence that a degree guarantees. Education is synonymous with Uhuru (freedom). Kenyans deluge the United States with thousands of scholarship applications, some of them so misinformed that mature men have applied to a girls' boarding school. Says one British diplomat: "These people are going to get across the Atlantic by hook or by crook, and they are going to survive. They can't face their villages unless they return in triumph."

Until now, African students have mostly got to the United States on their own and with enough disorganization to damage their studies. Kenya's passion, for example, led to the pellmell African airlift originated by Politician Tom Mboya that got so much publicity in the U.S. presidential campaign when the Kennedy Foundation beat the Eisenhower State Department to the punch with $100,000 air fare. (Coombs used State's $100,000 last spring to bail out the same 289 Africans flown in by the Kennedy Foundation; having arrived with sparse shillings and small scholarships, they were in dire straits.) A typical example was the Kenyan with a $200 scholarship to a Midwestern university who learned that he also owed $1,000 in fees, not to mention the support of his six children. Applying the self-help theory,

which Tom Mboya favors, some students frantically begged for money everywhere. "Please help me," one wrote to the British Embassy, "because I'm beginning to smell."

DEODORANTS AND DISHES

In tidy contrast is a new program, developed by Harvard's dean of admissions, David D. Henry, which this year will bring 250 students, mostly from West Africa, to some 150 U.S. campuses. Coordinated by the African-American Institute, the Henry program includes a rigorous selection system, transportation, 4-year scholarships, and all living expenses (paid by the International Cooperation Administration). A key feature is solid orientation. Many of the students recently spent 8 days on a transatlantic steamer, endlessly discussing everything from segregation to deodorants and the news (to Africans) that U.S. men sometimes have to wash dishes; one androcratic African man even sat down at a table next to a woman for the first time in his life. At Pennsylvania, Lincoln, and Atlanta Universities, the newcomers soberly studied everything from dating to telephone terminology; even took model exams to get the feel of U.S. classrooms.

Secretary Coombs thinks that there is room for both Henry's and Mboya's methods. Coordinating the two approaches through the Institute of International Education, he has put another $100,000 into a better screening and scholarship system in East Africa. But foreign-student aid is not fully organized and there is obvious need for a really extensive foreign-student admission system with State Department help all over the world. This is one of Coombs' top priorities, should Congress approve a pending revision of the 15-year-old Fulbright Act that would unify and expand all U.S. exchange programs into what Senator FULBRIGHT calls "a positive instrument of foreign policy."

AMICABLE ALUMNI

Organization and funds will solve most of the quirks in student exchange, notably the money worries that help embitter visitors. But these problems do not seem to have cost the United States much prestige, to judge from the students who finish their schooling and go home. What they say, in fact, reflects singular credit on U.S. education.

Argentines admire college spirit and practical lab work in U.S. schools; their own universities have no campus life and few professors who answer questions. Middle Easterners thirst for the technical training that their own classical universities lack, and praise the pragmatic way of American life because it "refuses to accept the status quo."

Of the 140 known U.S. alumni in Ghana, for example, the only West baiter is Lincoln University Alumnus ('39) President Kwame Nkrumah—although he may outweigh the others. More typical are such friendly U.S. alumni as India's Under Secretary for External Affairs, the director of the Iraqi Atomic Energy Commission, Colombia's Minister of Mines, and Venezuela's Minister of Finance. What seems significant is the Argentine pattern of students who leave for the United States as rabid anti-Yankees, return emphatically pro-United States.

"Everything I've done so far I owe to my American schooling," says the head of a major Turkish advertising agency who went to the University of Wisconsin. The story is familiar to Mandayam A. Sreedhar, 35, one of India's most brilliant engineers. What he learned at the Universities of Syracuse and Pennsylvania ('53) was warm belief in "the basic American view that two fellows can start a business in a garage and build it into a multimillion-dollar concern. I have never since found it difficult to understand an American."

A Strong Offense Best Guarantee We Won't Need Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned lest the American people are being sold a bill of goods through the emphasis on building fallout shelters instead of a policy which would make such structures unnecessary. We have learned on many occasions, on the football field and in war, that very often the best defense is a strong offense. At no time has this been more true than now. The most sure way to prevent world war III and a nuclear holocaust is to let the Communists know that we are prepared to win, if we are forced to fight. We can do this by maintaining a strong lead in nuclear weapons, make sure that Khrushchev understands that any war unleashed by him will result in the annihilation of his homeland, and by serving notice that we will stand for no further Communist aggression against free people anywhere. Rather than to spend $20 to $40 billion on a network of fallout shelters which may be interpreted by the Communists as signs of fear and weakness and invite attack, we would be better advised to use whatever money we have on building our arsenal of modern weapons. We may thus have the best chance of insuring the peace of the world and make fallout shelters unnecessary. In this connection, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points up some facts our national leaders may be overlooking:

GAMBLING ON SURVIVAL

Since Americans are supposedly so apathetic about civil defense, it is interesting to note the new interest many are showing in building their own home fallout shelters.

If there has been apathy in the past, we think it is understandable. It is still difficult, after 15 years of living with the threat, for most of us to imagine a nuclear attack, and we have not been helped by all the confusion that has been spread on this subject over the years. Some of the confusion has come from special pleaders who assert, without scientific authority, that there would be practically no survivors of an attack (so why take any precaution?) or who unscientifically exaggerate the perils and persistence of radiation.

The Government has also contributed to the confusion. At one point it seemed to be vacillating between evacuation and shelters as the recommended plan. Then, after evacuation was pretty well abandoned, there was a lot of talk about the need for the Government to spend $20 billion or $40 billion to build a national network of shelters. This was a numbing outlay for anyone to contemplate on top of everything else; apart from that, few could feel much confidence that such a system was the best answer.

Gradually, however, it has been possible for people to cut through much of the confusion. More reliable information is available about what radiation is and is not, and how its dangers can be reduced. It is becoming understood that basements in apartment and office buildings can provide protection. And the homeowner can see that the problems of building and financing his own shelter in his basement or on his property are not insuperable.

So when Khrushchev began threatening nuclear war again this year, we would guess that more Americans than ever before were able to make a balanced assessment of the chances of survival.

Certainly no one wants this trend to turn into a panicky or despairing feeling that the only hope is to burrow underground—or worse, that the only salvation lies in appeasing the Communists. The best civil defense remains the national strength and determination to deter the aggressor from attacking in the first place.

But failing that, and with survival a scientific possibility, it becomes a matter of prudence to take precautions within reason. If more and more Americans want to gamble on survival and so preserve or recreate our civilization, that is a healthy thing. And it is far healthier for them to take shelter on their own than for the Government to try to force it on them.

For no amount of Government exhortation or spending or compulsion can shake a people's apathy when they are offered no convincing prospect of protection. When they begin to see a prospect of protecting themselves, they are perfectly capable of deciding whether they want to do so.

The United Nations' Mistake—Belief That Soviet Could Be Dealt With as Equal, Law-Abiding Nation Is Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the United Nations session now in progress it is well for us to take a long, sober look at what this organization can or cannot produce and, in turn, what its strengths and weaknesses are. I believe that the article by Columnist David Lawrence is one of the most practical, scholarly, and calm analyses of the problems facing the U.N. that I have read in some time. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert this article, "The United Nations' Mistake," into the RECORD at this point:

THE UNITED NATIONS' MISTAKE—BELIEF THAT SOVIET COULD BE DEALT WITH AS EQUAL, LAW-ABIDING NATION IS HIT

(By David Lawrence)

Internationalism—which seeks at times to impose peace through a league or association of sovereign states—is face to face today with one of its greatest tests. The League of Nations failed in this very task. Will the United Nations now fall down, too?

Theoretically a league of equals could be construed to mean that each nation is prepared to forgo its sovereignty to a certain extent and to bow to the will of the majority in adjusting its external relations.

Whether a league seeks to accomplish this by moral force—which is, of course, more desirable—or by military force as a last resort, the biggest single requirement is that both sides in a dispute shall have absolute

confidence in the integrity of the international organization itself that assumes the role of policeman.

Today the United Nations has lost the confidence of many nations which are members of it. The late Dag Hammarskjold tried an experiment—to use the office of Secretary General of the U.N. as a kind of benevolent policeman. In Korea and in the Middle East and later in Africa the use of military force was authorized by the United Nations itself. Because of the political entanglements of various members of the U.N., not one of these efforts could accomplish any more than a cease-fire or an armistice. The Korean problem, for instance, is still unsolved. The Middle Eastern situation is in a sort of stalemate, without a solution, and the mess in the Congo is still characterized by sporadic fighting.

The original concept of the League of Nations—which was reiterated in the words of the U.N. Charter—assumed that an internal clash might produce external complications, but there was no right to interfere in internal situations.

But, unfortunately, today the sad truth is that the Soviet Government is engaged in a world-wide effort to infiltrate inside other countries and take over government after government for the purpose of winning allies for the cause of international communism. This motive is couched in high-sounding phrases about socialism and people's rights, but, in reality it is the same old story of despotism and lust for the riches of weaker states. History is replete with examples of this same aggression, which sooner or later has plunged the major powers into war.

What has happened since the United Nations was founded in 1945 constitutes a noble effort to organize a set of law-abiding nations who would have respect for the opinion of mankind. But an ogre has appeared in Moscow who overnight brushes aside, for instance, his repeated pledges that he would not resume nuclear tests. He now laughs at the discomfiture of a world which he is sure is helpless to punish him for his misdemeanors.

There is nothing wrong in general with the ideals that gave prestige for a while to the League of Nations and later to the United Nations. But the mistake made in the last few years has been the belief that Moscow could be dealt with as an equal—as a law-abiding partner of a great alliance of nations. When such a deviation occurs, the United Nations cannot get anywhere by the use of military force. Everybody knows that the warring factions in the Congo could not possibly engage in anything except desultory fighting in the jungle—which wouldn't trouble the rest of the world too much—were it not for the help given from the outside. The United Nations has the machinery to expose such interference, but has not done so. World opinion has not been informed of the true culprits in the Congo.

But, above all, the United Nations has not had the leadership it ought to have in the exercise of moral force. The United Nations didn't pursue its case against the Soviets in Hungary. It has acted as if it were afraid to show up Communist misdeeds.

Indeed, there was and is a case for expulsion of the present Soviet Government from the United Nations—it doesn't even pay its share of the expenses—and for an appeal to the people of the Soviet Union to establish a free government that can be a true partner of the other free nations in the United Nations.

Instead, today the U.N. has admitted many African and Asian nations that are not yet capable of governing themselves, and is talking, oddly enough, of admitting Red China, which committed acts of aggression against the Korean Republic and actually fought against U.N. forces, inflicting tens of thousands of casualties.

The theory that every government which is in control of a certain land area deserves admission to the U.N. is one of the biggest fallacies of our times. The U.N. has lost prestige because so many sincere but misguided persons high up in the public life of this country and of other countries, like India, actually want to see Red China admitted to the U.N. The very proposal in the U.N. General Assembly to consider such a move reveals the lack of morals that motivates so many members of the organization.

The time has come to abandon this kind of a United Nations and to build another dedicated to morality. Sovereignty should be respected, and military force should be used for intervention in a troublous area only when the lives and properties of foreign citizens are endangered. It's an old rule but a sound one. Once basic principles are abandoned, chaos follows. That's what has happened to the U.N.

Weeklong Anticommunism Program Slated—Lead Article Appearing in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise, Bellflower (Los Angeles County), Calif., on Sunday, September 17, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to bring to the attention of your distinguished self and the other Members of this august body, another lead article relating to the Pro-American Patriotic Week appearing in the Bellflower Herald Enterprise newspaper, Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif.

The leaders of this fast growing and important community in my great 23d District, and all the participating citizens deserve the compliments of all of us, and all American citizens for taking this important step to become informed about the very dangerous hazards of Soviet communism.

The article follows:

WEEKLONG ANTICOMMUNISM PROGRAM SLATED—SIX TOP SPEAKERS TO APPEAR

Six expert speakers on communism will highlight nightly programs during the Pro-American Patriotic Week which begins tomorrow and concludes Saturday, said Rev. Roy E. Gillaspie, chairman for the area's Anti-Communist Committee.

All programs will begin at 7:30 p.m. The first five are scheduled for Simms Park and the last, on Saturday, at Excelsior Auditorium.

William Teague, vice president of Pepperdine College, will speak Monday night, following an introductory porgram of spiritual and patriotic music.

Mayor Oscar V. McCracken will be master of ceremonies and the national anthem will be sung my prima donna Alma Pedroza. Dr. Ralph Burnight will lead the pledge of allegiance.

A color guard will be provided by Squadron 93, Civil Air Patrol, for each of the six programs with Bellflower American Legion and Somerset District Scouts assisting.

Tuesday's speaker will be Dr. Tirso del Junco, M.D., former schoolmate of Fidel Castro.

Ed Shaheen, anti-Communist chairman for the Southern District of California Real Estate Association, will speak Wednesday night.

On Thursday, the speaker will be Dr. John Lechner, chairman of the Americanism Education League.

Friday's speaker will be William Opie, recently returned from Russia, where he obtained proof that Russia has two propaganda programs, one for the Soviet Union and one for countries outside the Iron Curtain.

Dr. Kenneth Goff, former member of the Communist Party, and one of the first to break away and appear before a congressional committee investigating un-American activities, will conclude the series Saturday.

Revolutions: Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an error in the premise leads to error in the conclusion. To attempt to relate and compare present revolutionary uprisings throughout the world with our American Revolution is a serious error. If any be foolish enough to accept such a premise it could cause gross mistakes in our relationships with the countries in revolt. Revolution for revolution's sake, chaos in the cause of world ferment and disaster, is certainly not the cause that was led by our forefathers.

In an editorial in the August 24, 1961, issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat, published in Flemington, N.J., in my district, this comparison is well developed and forcibly brought to the attention of our people. I respectfully bring this timely message to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

REVOLUTIONS: THEN AND NOW

A popular way to start off a talk about how to relieve world tensions and bring about universal peace is to say that the world's current wave of revolutions stems from our American Revolution in 1776 and that the cure is full stomachs and world government. Thrown in is the categorical statement that the uprisings are not Communist-inspired but motivated by hunger.

One trouble with the foregoing argument is that the American Revolution may have started it all but it was not a revolution inspired by a desire to take care of hungry people. The American colonists were not hungry. They had come here to get away from oppression and to enjoy liberty and they did not propose to have the Crown of England snatch it away again. Their leaders were not upstarts but well-fed gentlemen who had studied government and Christian philosophy and were determined that in America the rights of minorities and of individuals would be protected.

People who take to platforms and unloose the line that the revolutionary leaders, modern version, are inspired by a desire to deliver their fellow countrymen from hunger and want and, therefore, are motivated as were the leaders of the American Revolution, ought to spend some time with the Federalist papers. These papers were written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. Their purpose was to sell the people of the recently independent colonies on the system of checks and balances set up to protect rights of minorities and individuals. A careful study of the background and history of most of the revolutionary leaders and movements of our age fails to bring out desire on their part to do much for minorities or individuals.

Shining examples of this worldwide revolutionary movement which is supposed to give salvation to native peoples and relieve them from foreign dominance are Sukarno of Indonesia, Castro of Cuba and Nkrumah of Ghana. The first two have alined their countries definitely with Moscow. Nkrumah loves to strut and wear fancy uniforms and to ride in big cars like Mussolini. He is now dedicated to the notion that he needs a powerful army, having been sold a bill of Czech-made military hardware. He is looking wistfully at neighboring territory although he has more now than he can possibly handle. These are more or less typical modern revolutionaries.

The point is that there were ideals behind the American revolutionary movement which are lacking in the modern revolutions against colonianism and capitalism. The American Constitution and Bill of Rights guarantee liberties which leaders like Castro and Sukarno take away—liberties such as freedom of the press and assembly and the rights to own property.

To say that the present-day revolutions are not Communist-inspired is to disregard the purposefulness of Communist leaders from the time of Lenin. It is to disregard information such as is contained in the current Saturday Evening Post wherein the authors of "The Ugly Americans" set down in detail what the Soviets are doing with a $2 billion-a-year budget to train and send out experts in creating mob action so that communism can move out and take over the world.

The founders of our Republic were not given to whining that the world owed America a living in a style to which it had never been accustomed. Our Revolution was led and our Constitution hammered out by men like Washington and Hamilton who demanded that this country from the start recognize its obligations, establish a sound system of currency and attract capital by demonstrating willingness to work and to produce. The borrower did not lay down the terms as the Socialist leaders of the new nations are being told they can do by our spokesman like Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles and "Soapy" Williams.

The United States of America has been solvent and able to help the world because the Constitution of the United States recognizes the right to own and to create property as basic to all human rights. Hamilton in the Federalist papers said:

"If the United States observe, with delicate caution, the maxims of credit, as well toward foreigners as their own citizens, in connetcion with the general principles of an upright, stable and systematic administration, the strong attractions which they present to foreign capital will be likely to insure them the command of as much as they want, in addition to their own, for every species of internal amelioration."

World government may be the ultimate answer but it would be suicidal for the United States of America to enter into any compact when the balance of power would be held by new nations, either dominated by the Soviets or socialistic to the point where they cannot possibly attract capital and prosper through free enterprise. If our Government, which is supported through taxes imposed on private enterprise, is going to continue indefinitely to drain off American resources to help revolutionists which have no intention of protecting private investments we are headed for insolvency. From whence comes help after this takes place?

Americans are prone to seek solutions in institutional devices like world government. The world must become quite a different place than it is before we let our wishful thinking deplete our resources and destroy the system that has made us strong and free.

Socialism by Indirection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we realize that political definitions in themselves are somewhat controversial in that the word "socialism" is subject to continual debate on the American political scene. The Chicago Daily Calumet, a local independent daily newspaper in my district, has acquired a well-deserved reputation for frankness and clearness in its editorial comments. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial that appeared in that newspaper on Friday, September 15, entitled "Socialism by Indirection":

SOCIALISM BY INDIRECTION

The following condensation of an editorial appeared in "Service," published by the Kansas Power & Light Co.:

"We live in a wonderful, exciting and highly rewarding country. We have more leisure time than any people in history and we have the freedom to indulge in the personal pleasures of our choice. Most of us take this for granted.

"It's not so much that we are smart. Rather we are just plain lucky—lucky because the heritage of our forefathers included deeply entrenched traits of thrift, initiative, independence and love of justice. We are lucky because some farsighted men met in a little courthouse almost 200 years ago and put words down on paper that shattered the tradition of centuries and released individual men for the pursuit of happiness of their own choosing.

"Today, this way of life is in danger—danger from outside our Nation by the menace of communism, and danger from within by the growing menace of 'creeping socialism.'

"Whenever Government enters a field of business in competition with its own citizens, or extends the scope of an established Government enterprise, our Nation takes another dangerous step down the road to socialism—the road from which there may be no return.

"It is not only Government encroachment in private enterprise that is responsible for this danger, but it is also the growing 'welfarism' and the ever-increasing Federal debt.

"We are firm in our resolution to ward off communism by keeping our national defense strong. This has been expensive but necessary. On the other hand, much of the increased Federal spending on programs is unnecessary and the responsibility should be returned to where it rightfully belongs—local levels of Government and private enterprise."

Redistricting: Protecting a Voting Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a very thoughtful and pertinent recent editorial from the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette entitled "Protecting a Voting Right." This well conceived and splendidly written editorial emphasizes the problem of congressional redistricting and representation, a subject that is of concern at present to many States and the Congress.

I think it should be borne in mind by everyone concerned with this problem, including legislatures of the several States and the Congress, that we cannot afford to allow confusion and maladjustment to intrude upon such an important field of our American form of government as direct representation of the people.

As every Member of Congress well understands, our duties have greatly increased in recent years due to the augmented impact of the Federal Government on the affairs of practically every man, woman, and child in the country. Unless we can have fair, orderly redistricting programs in the several States, there is great danger that the principle of representation by districts followed traditionally by this Nation may be gravely impaired and the system of adequate congressional representation greatly endangered.

Thoughtful leaders everywhere recognize that this is a time above all, to protect the suffrage and representation rights of the American people so as to insure that to the highest degree possible, all our people may be suitably and adequately represented in the Congress of the United States.

The Gazette editorial follows:

PROTECTING A VOTING RIGHT

Nobody is likely to accuse Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, of undue pessimism because he fears that Massachusetts is heading for a deadlock on congressional redistricting. For it will be a political wonder if Republican Governor Volpe and the Democratic legislature can agree on a fair charting of the 12 districts in place of the present 14. The State stands to lose two Representatives in the reapportionment based on the 1960 census.

HUMPHREY has introduced a bill under which the Census Bureau would redistrict those States failing to do the job themselves before January 1, 1962. A similar bill is in the House of Representatives.

The Senator calls his bill a safeguard for the people's traditional voting rights if legislatures do not act.

The Constitution provides that the Representatives shall be "chosen every second year by the people of the several States." It says nothing about districts. But election by districts has become a tradition, as HUMPHREY says.

In the first census, in 1790, Pennsylvania was at the top, with a population of 434,373. Today only 5 of the 50 States have populations smaller than that. Election by districts has long been a practical necessity.

At-large elections not only make it hard on the candidates but also are unsatisfactory after the elections. A Representative has many chores besides attending sessions and committee meetings. He has to do all sorts of things for his district, for his constituents. He could not easily be your Congressman if his district included the whole of a populous State.

It is the responsibility of the Massachusetts Legislature to redistrict, and to do it fairly. If the legislature fails, then the State's voters must look elsewhere for relief. The Humphrey proposal is provocative.

The Half-Free Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Lorenzo W. Lowe, entitled "The Half-Free Free World of 1961." Mr. Lowe is an associate of Dr. Frank C. Laubach. For almost 30 years the name Laubach and the phrase "each one teach one" have stirred the hearts of illiterate millions in approximately 90 nations of the world.

In the article which I am asking to be inserted, Mr. Lowe points out that our real hope of defeating communism lies in our ability to educate the illiterate masses of the still free world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HALF-FREE FREE WORLD OF 1961

(By Lorenzo W. Lowe)

Fact No. 1: The free world is less than half free. One-third of the men and women of the free world grovel under the blight of ignorance—they cannot read and write. Half of those who can read are too undereducated to function as efficient producers and responsible citizens in a democratic type of society. They do not know what real freedom is.

Fact No. 2: No highly productive or progressive nation has a high illiteracy rate. It becomes clearer every day that no illiterate or half literate nation can thrive in this technological age; neither can people of such a nation be truly free. Illiteracy, hunger, and abject poverty are inseparable; a map showing these deadly horsemen will show them dominating the same general areas of the free world.

Fact No. 3: Communist nations are forging ahead in literacy at a tremendous pace. Russia, only 13 percent literate in 1917, is now as literate as we are, and Communist China has leaped from 20 percent to 80 percent literacy in 15 years. Castro expects to free Cuba from illiteracy within the next 5 years.

Fact No. 4: The free world's billion illiterates are hungry and frustrated, desperate to improve their condition. They are "the fodder which the Communists are using for their flames" in a bitter struggle to capture the world. Very few adult illiterates are too stupid to learn. The Laubach efforts have proven this; UNESCO has proven it; missionaries have proven it.

Fact No. 5: Although the job can be done, it has been growing bigger. Despite all free world efforts during the past 30 years, there are more illiterates than ever before. Half of the free world's children have no school to go to—220 million of them are growing into adult illiterates.

Fact No. 6: Military thinking did not save Laos or Cuba. Military defenses do not protect the billion illiterates from the ignorance that enslaves them. The U.S. foreign aid program will be an unending drain on America—until we help the nations overcome illiteracy among their people.

Fact No. 7: Some Americans feel that to help educate multitudes abroad will enable them to outproduce and undersell us in the world market. That is only half the picture; it would increase their incomes so they can pay us for things we produce in surplus abundance. This would help to balance trade between the nations and ease international economic strains.

Fact No. 8: Some economists fear that fundamental education for the multitudes may be inflationary. That is incorrect. Functional education helps production of goods, which absorbs inflationary tendencies in money.

Fact No. 8: We must help to increase the productive ability of the free world's one billion illiterates or continue giving them billions of dollars' worth of free food, for our own protection. It is more practical and far cheaper in the long run, to help educate them. It is a hundred times easier to win their friendship that way, for it lets them retain their self-respect. America should have led a great worldwide literacy effort anyway; now we must do this or we will perish by our negligence.

Fact No. 10: Many do not think the literacy job can be done in time to save more nations from falling to the Communists, as multitudes yield to despair. Because of the shortage of free world educators who are able and eager to solve the huge literacy problem, no Government agency has tackled the job realistically or effectively, or with a sense of its urgency. Our Government agencies have done little more than token work in adult literacy, as compared to free world needs in scores of countries.

Fact No. 11: Educating leaders only in newly developing countries is not enough, for two reasons. First, it widens the gap between the few "haves" and the multitude of "have nots"—a gap which threatens to destroy the world. Second, the hungry billion illiterates are determined to improve their condition now; they will not wait 10 or 20 or 50 years for a trickle of education to filter down to them from an educated oligarchy. The free world cannot endure half free, while the other half grovels under the bitter dictatorship of ignorance. Communists will take the stragglers.

Fact No. 12: Although America has the finest educators in the world, very few of them are helping adult literacy. Possible reasons for this neglect are:

(a) They think it is too costly, or too slow, or impossible. Yet by the Laubach method alone, scores of millions have been helped to learn during the past 30 years—at amazingly low cost per adult.

(b) Few educators have special training or experience in this problem; our public school system has almost eliminated illiteracy. Educators usually do what they are trained to do, and so very few U.S. educators have ever taught one illiterate adult to read.

(c) Adults just learnnig to read are desperately in need of informative books in simple wording. Yet most educators will not discipline their vocabularies enough to write such literature. So, we have failed to communicate the secrets of productivity and health and citizenship to hundreds of millions in the free world who need this knowledge. According to reports, the Communist bloc last year published 3,600 million books; we can be sure these were loaded with Communist propaganda. We dare not turn our backs on this problem.

Fact No. 13: Our educators alone cannot do the world literacy job—it is too big. Literacy experts of proven ability, who know how to make effective use of multitudes of volunteers, must lead the way. Their leadership and actual experience are vital to success in this tremendous enterprise.

Fact No. 14: Mass media—films, radio, TV, recorders, filmstrips—are proving effective in literacy, as in other types of education. Use of these tools will enable the finest teachers to serve the world classrooms. This can make the teaching better, and the cost per person far less.

Fact No. 15: Governments, private and voluntary agencies, and mission agencies can cooperate in many aspects of an all-out free world literacy program. Concerned leaders of all such groups should call a toplevel meeting at once to discuss the problems and make plans for the work to begin. Every person with literacy experience should be invited to help.

Going Back to McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of September 19, 1961:

GOING BACK TO MCKINLEY

The general impression that the Republican Party has abandoned any effort to come to terms with the 20th century and is moving more and more to a "back to McKinley" approach has been recently confirmed in a long, well-documented report in the Wall Street Journal.

The Journal report emphasized that expressions of liberal tendencies within the party, which were heard a year ago, are becoming increasingly faint, as GOP conservatives become increasingly dominant.

The Journal report was headlined: "Shift to the Right." It says in part: "Slowly but surely, the face of the Republican Party is taking on a more conservative cast.

"The party's conservatives are more loudly conservative; its liberals are subdued; middle-of-the-road Republicans appear to be drifting rightward. It is a procession toward conservatism led by grassroots party workers with Members of Congress following.

"Unless events of the next year alter the outlook, this conservative revival within the party will assure that the 1962 Republican congressional campaign will carry a more militantly right-wing message than any national GOP election effort since 1946."

McKinley's time really was the horse-and-buggy age. Automobiles, airplanes, and many other modern conveniences and necessities including automatic machinery, had not been invented or developed when Mr. McKinley was President.

The Ledger doesn't believe the people of Cherokee County, S.C., or the United States favor the kind of conservatism that would put this country back in the McKinley area.

On the contrary, Americans want to go forward.

To Ike, the Wall Rises Between Opposing Ideas of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, of late there has been much controversy concerning the position of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on the Berlin crisis. For 16 years, our great and beloved former President was closer to the entire problem than perhaps any other American. I think it is vitally important that the American people know just where General Eisenhower stands on this crucial matter.

Perhaps the most enlightening exposition of General Eisenhower's opinion on the issue appeared in Life magazine in the form of an analysis of a discussion on the subject between Henry R. Luce and the former President. I commend this article to all thinking Americans:

TO IKE, THE WALL RISES BETWEEN OPPOSING IDEAS OF MAN

(By Henry R. Luce)

To the man who engineered the defeat of Nazi Germany and then dealt with the grinding problems of its occupation for eight years as President of the United States, the issue now in crisis in Berlin goes far beyond cold legalisms.

On the surface, the clash may be simply a juridical question of who has a right to be there upon what terms. But to Eisenhower the question is first moral and spiritual, and only secondarily legalistic. The real issue, epitomized by Berlin, is man's definition of what man is.

Dwight Eisenhower sees in Berlin, on the two side of the barbed wire and masonry wall raised by the Communists, two powerful philosophies which hold precise but opposite conceptions of man. On the East stands a complete philosophy of materialism which defines man as a mere machine, soulless, and therefore fit only to be used as a slave for the glorification of the State. On the West stands the belief that man is a creature of the spirit, possessing an individual soul, born free and in the image of his Creator.

To Eisenhower it is natural that the East, which denies liberty, should proclaim its intention to dominate the entire world. Sharply to the contrary, the idea of world domination by any power is totally repugnant to the West. For the West, believing in freedom, holds that men are and ought to be free to develop in their own different ways, individually and socially.

Thus the struggle which centers in Berlin is seen by Eisenhower as a struggle between the spiritual and the materialistic interpretations of man and his destiny.

When the war in Europe was coming to an end in total victory over Hitler, no man could foresee the depth and breadth of the struggle which today dominates the life of the world. Eisenhower, meeting the Red army in German territory, began to have some premonitions, but failed to discern the full extent of Russian hostility to the West. Last week, still vigorous in the peaceful surroundings of the present, blue eyes alert in his sun-ruddy face, Eisenhower let his memory roam. He thought back over his 20 years in a hard school that taught him the nature of the enemy.

The course began in the hectic first weeks after the United States was plunged into the war in 1941, and Eisenhower was assigned to the Services of Supply. It was one of his jobs to deal with the requisitions of lend-lease to the Allies. Even then, he recalled, though Hitler had Russia almost on her knees and though Soviet survival depended on U.S. aid, the Russian officers he dealt with were not only suspicious but truculent and bullying. Later, as Supreme Commander in Europe, he found the Communists no easier to deal with. As the war drew toward its end, and the Western and Soviet armies rushed toward one another across crumbling Germany, the task of constant liaison to prevent clashes between Allies became vital. But, Ike recalled with remembered irritation, no cooperation could be got from the Russians. Instead he got active belligerence and angry suspicion while the German armies, anxious to stay out of Russian hands, tried to surrender only to the West. Still later, in Berlin after it was all over, he grew accustomed to the Soviets demonstrating fits of pique by suddenly refusing to show up at inter-Allied social functions.

Even before the war ended, he recalled, he had become pretty thoroughly disillusioned about Soviet good faith. And, though it could not come entirely clear under the day-by-day pressures of fighting a war, he began to get a glimpse of what the future held.

In 1944, the European Advisory Commission was working out a plan for Allied occupation zones in Germany. Although Eisenhower's responsibilities were military instead of political, the scheme shaping up disturbed him. In the light of Soviet intransigence he saw the potentiality of trouble.

Eisenhower flew to Washington where he found President Roosevelt in bed with influenza.

"This is my pet," he told the President. "Let's not have separate occupation zones in Germany. Instead let's have joint Allied administration of the whole country."

"Impossible," Roosevelt replied. "I'm already committed."

Eisenhower then urged that, if it was politically necessary to allow the Soviets a separate zone, it would at least be advisable to establish joint Western control of the remainder of Germany. Roosevelt again refused.

Again in 1945, when Churchill and Roosevelt were en route to the Yalta Conference, Eisenhower sent his Chief of Staff, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, to intercept them at Malta and urge that the Soviet zone be restricted and that Soviet promises should not be fully trusted. As he later wrote in his book, "Crusade in Europe," Eisenhower "felt that the Western Allies could probably have secured an agreement to occupy more of Germany than we actually did. I believe that if our political heads had been as convinced as we were at SHAEF of the certainty of early victory in the West they would have insisted, at Yalta, upon the line of the Elbe as the natural geographic line dividing the eastern and western occupation areas."

Berlin itself was in ruins and, not considering it a primary military taget, he did not foresee the paramount political importance it would later have. Seven years after the war, when he came to the Presidency, he found that the question of occupied Germany, with isolated Berlin as its prickly danger point, had become one of his most persistent and troublesome concerns.

A realist could well say that Berlin, 110 miles inside Red territory, was not militarily tenable. But much more than military expediency was now involved. Berlin had become a symbol of freedom and the West was determined to keep it so.

Many contests had been lost to communism in the years since the war, China the greatest. Others were still to be lost or nibbled away by Soviet "salami" slicing. But on Berlin there would be no Western retreat from principle or moral right.

In Eisenhower's second term, the Soviets made their big attempt to "bull through" their own final solution of the issue. It began with Khrushchev's ultimatum of November 27, 1958, declaring that he would sign a separate treaty with East Germany and that the West had 6 months to leave Berlin.

It culminated at Camp David on September 25–27, 1959, when Eisenhower and the Soviet boss sat face to face.

Khrushchev began by fencing. He suggested that the President might want to talk about Red China. Eisenhower quickly disposed of that gambit, saying that if they talked about all the issues involving Red China they would never get around to more immediately useful matters. Briefly, Eisenhower told Khrushchev that the United States could take care of itself in the area of Red China. And that was that.

The two heads of state then went at the subject of Germany. Khrushchev reiterated the Soviet intention to sign a separate treaty with East Germany. Eisenhower replied that he could not prevent Khrushchev from making any treaty he wished with the East Germans even though, personally, he supposed any treaty between Russia and a satellite was likely to be a one-sided affair.

"Only this," he said to Khrushchev. "Don't try to interfere with our rights in Berlin."

Khrushchev, affecting surprise, protested that there would be no Western rights after the proposed treaty.

"We won't accept that," Eisenhower told him flatly. He added that if Khrushchev persisted in his ultimatum the then-proposed summit meeting would never take place. But, more importantly, both Eisenhower and Khrushchev understood that the line had been drawn. Invasion of Western rights in Berlin then meant war. Khrushchev then withdrew what had been an ultimatum and touted peaceful coexistence in the spirit of Camp David.

The so-called spirit of Camp David, Eisenhower recalled, was an optimistic illusion which he, personally, never shared.

Today, as Khrushchev brandishes his bombs and his ultimatums more savagely than ever, Berlin continues to be the focal point of a worldwide struggle.

Eisenhower believes the basic American attitude toward Berlin continues clear and firm. The American determination to defend Berlin was first made manifest in 1948, when the airlift maintained Berlin's access to the free world, and it grew stronger during the 8 Eisenhower years.

The reasons for the Eisenhower and the American stand on Berlin go deep. They are obviously deeper than a quarrel over legalistic terms. Legal rights are on our side, and these legal rights are menaced. But essentially Berlin embodies a moral issue and this is what President Eisenhower emphasizes and spells out. It is morally wrong for the Communists, in dividing Berlin, to separate families. It is morally

wrong to attempt to choke the life out of more than 2 million West Berliners. And what is most of all morally wrong is to imprison the people of East Germany. These are moral issues and these should be emphasized.

In the same way, we for our part have a moral obligation to the people of Berlin. History, Eisenhower points out, is not static, and so Berlin today has become quite a different matter than it was at war's end. Years have passed; there has been no general peace treaty covering all of Germany and meanwhile West Berlin has grown, by its efforts and spirit, into a great commercial and industrial city. Berliners have a right to the life which they have built and, as we have affirmed on many occasions, we intend that their rights to a free and prosperous life shall be maintained.

In these very concrete terms Eisenhower sums up the West's obligation: We must oppose what is morally wrong in Communist actions and we must be faithful to our moral obligations.

In the former President's judgment, President Kennedy has handled well the recent phases of the Berlin crisis. He did well to send Vice President JOHNSON and 1,500 troops into Berlin as assurance to all the inhabitants of that harassed city.

Eisenhower the soldier knows, of course, that in a showdown these 1,500 additional troops would make no practical difference in defending West Berlin. Actually, if the allies had an army of 500,000 men in Berlin, they would first have to fight their way out of Berlin and back to their base of supply before they could turn and fight their way back in.

Eisenhower does not think the United States should seek negotiations with Khrushchev. After all, we are not doing anything to disturb the situation there; Khrushchev is. Therefore it is Khrushchev who should seek negotiations if he has anything constructive to propose.

However, with his ingrained sense of propriety, Eisenhower has no desire to interfere with President Kennedy's handling of the crisis. The burden of responsibility rests with Kennedy; the American people must be energetically united in facing this crisis; they can find unity only in loyal support of the President.

Now, as never before, Ike says with mounting emphasis, we must learn to put first things first. That means we must do everything which the President asks to meet the crisis, including, if he finds it necessary, bigger military expenditures. But, for exactly that reason, Eisenhower would like every American to understand that he is utterly opposed to increased Government expenditures on unessentials. First things first.

And so at home, viewing the Kennedy domestic program, Eisenhower feels no compulsion to treat his successor gently.

Eisenhower took from his desk a long list of new Government expenditures, actual and proposed, covering four or five pages. He ran his eye down the list. One item he came to was water pollution. His administration had been spending $50 million a year to attack this problem. The Kennedy administration proposed to double the outlay. Water pollution, said the ex-President, is a bad thing. But with the essentials of our freedom at stake, we must guard against increasing too much those expenditures which do not directly protect that freedom.

For another example, it is clearly not essential that we should hurry to the moon. To embark just now on a moon program which might ultimately cost $40 billion seems to Eisenhower wholly inappropriate.

What worries Eisenhower is that massive Government spending in all directions will undermine the American economy and thereby serve the purpose and hope of our enemy. The American people are surely serious in their determination on Berlin. The way to show that they really mean it is by practicing self-restraint and self-discipline in their domestic economy. Among the visitors who come calling on him in Gettysburg are many driven by compelling anxieties. The questions most often asked him, he said, are: "Are we going to war?" and "Are we going to go broke?"

One thing is certain: Dwight D. Eisenhower will never give a defeatist answer. The kind of faith animating him refuses any thought of inevitable doom in any quarter. Freeman exists to cope with circumstances, not to be overwhelmed by them.

So, as to the American economy, while he feels the Kennedy administration advocates insupportable spending programs, he would never despair. An aroused public opinion and vigorous political opposition in and out of Congress can halt excessive spending. And a responsible people, aware of how they are challenged on the world scene, will manage their own affairs with prudence and good sense. They will realize that the health of the American economy must be maintained not only for our own enjoyment but as the main physical base of the struggle for freedom and justice throughout the world.

And as to war? No President ever devoted himself more passionately to the cause of peace than did Dwight Eisenhower. He believes that peace can be maintained. The present struggle—the struggle which he sees as turning on "man's definition of man"—is likely to go on for many years. In that long struggle we must honor our commitments, we must be willing to take risks, we must show ourselves both prudent and unafraid. This is the prescription not merely for avoiding war, but for achieving ultimate victory for our cause in the years ahead.

Civil Servant for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the international situation has been intensified by the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. The cause of peace has lot one of its most diligent workers.

The Boston Globe, in a beautifully written editorial, pays tribute to the late Secretary General, and comments on the consequences of the fatal plane crash over Africa:

CIVIL SERVANT FOR MANKIND

Peace has lost one of its most valiant and resourceful of champions in the tragic death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations; and that harassed world organization has simultaneously suffered a loss almost incalculable.

As indefatigable missioner for peaceful adjustment of wrangles among the powers great and small, this extraordinary civil servant for mankind had journeyed across the world again and again, often when members of the United Nations considered his efforts foreordained to failure. Almost as often, by quiet diplomacy and skill at negotiation, he won his point.

In this persistent quest for peaceful settlement of festering quarrels, Dag Hammarskjold transformed the influence of his office during the past 8 years to something akin to that of a great power. Through his efforts, whether in obtaining the release of 11 American fliers in Communist China in 1956, in creating the first U.N. peace force following the Suez dispute a year later, in establishing "the United Nations presence" in Lebanon, he displayed a patient statesmanship that won the acclaim of governments throughout the free world, and, until 1959, even drew occasional praise from the Soviet bloc.

The ideals in forming this great career were stated with admirable clarity only last autumn, during the savage onslaught upon himself and the Secretariat General by Nikita Khrushchev. That attack betokened Moscow's rage when Soviet plans for a takeover of the distraught Congo were thwarted. Dag said that he "had rather see his office break on strict adherence to the principles of independence, impartiality, and objectivity, than drift on the basis of compromise. That is the choice daily facing the Secretary General. It is openly the choice now facing the Assembly, both in substance and in form." The vote of confidence which followed vindicated more than the quiet Secretary General personally; it vindicated anew the basic principles of the organization itself.

Those principles, and indeed the future of the United Nations, face new jeopardies now that Hammarskjold is dead. This is evident in the clouds that envelop the question of selecting his successor. Under the Charter, a successor to his office must first obtain approval in the Security Council, which recommends its choice to the Assembly for ratification.

But in the Council the Soviet Union possesses a veto on any such selection. The policy of Russia, as proclaimed by Khrushchev when he unsuccessfully sought to drive Dag from office, is to destroy the Secretariat General as it now exists and substitute a three-headed monster. Each member of the "Troika" trio Moscow insists on—representing the Soviet bloc, the West, and the "neutrals"—would have a veto on all actions of the United Nations anywhere on earth. Though unlikely to make head, Russian policy accordingly threatens a protracted blockade against a successor to Dag Hammarskjold. In the present juncture of U.N. affairs, when the organization faces the most controversial agenda in its history, the consequences could be grave indeed.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson on the eve of the 16th assembly, has pledged this country's support to the United Nations "through fair weather or foul." Never was that support, wisely marshaled, more urgently needed.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Appellate Review in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is very much interested in the entire question of judicial review of veterans' claims and, as I have indicated in the RECORDS of September 13, 18, and 20, 1961, pages A7197, A7461, and A7398, the Veterans' Administration will shortly be required to make findings of fact and conclusions of law when a case is decided.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks one individual case printed in three separate columns to indicate the subject matter involved:

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

SUMMARY OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW

Issue

1. Restoration of service connection for duodenal ulcer.

Military medical record

May 27, 1944: Induction examination negative.

December 29, 1944: Admitted to outpatient clinic of Camp Gordon Johnston, Fla., with history and complaints of duodenal ulcer. Symptoms at this time of epigastric pain and belching. Given medication for same.

January 1, 1945: Disposition date. Diagnosed as duodenal ulcer, moderate, severe.

January 5, 1945: Admitted to station hospital, Camp Gordon Johnston, Fla., with complaints of duodenal ulcer. Soldier stated he had stomach trouble in 1941 (3 years ago). Had pain in epigastrium, relieved by food. States he was X-rayed at Jefferson Hospital and ulcer was found, was at home sick for 7 weeks on ulcer diet. Has been careful of diet since then. Says that about 5 weeks ago pain returned, has been taking Tums, milk of magnesia. Examination of abdomen reveals tenderness in epigastrium. No distention, no masses. Has been X-rayed once in Army 4 months before admission and was all right; however, symptoms began 5 weeks before admission this time and symptoms have increased.

January 15, 1945: X-ray examination of upper gastrointestinal tract with aid of barium meal shows the esophagus and stomach to be normal. The duodenal cap is deformed with a 2-mm. ulcer crater on the anterior wall of the appendix. Normal gastric mobility suppression, duodenal ulcer.

January 18, 1945: CDD proceedings initialed.

January 20, 1945: On diet and still improving. Was told he must remain on diet and alliate for 18 months. Not able to return to duty and will be presented to CDD Board.

January 26, 1945: Final diagnosis of duodenal ulcer, chronic, cause undetermined. EPTS NLOD, improved.

January 26, 1945: Entry—Station Hospital, Camp Gordon Johnston, Fla., shows diagnosis chronic duodenum ulcer—cause undetermined. Could not obtain proper diet condition—Held EPTS, aggravated by service, reason could not obtain proper diet and under nervous tension of Army life.

Veterans' Administration medical records

January 29, 1945: Medical statement received from Dr. Paul C. Swenson shows he examined the veteran on November 24, 1941, and found evidence of an active cicatricial duodenal ulcer.

September 12, 1945: Records show veteran admitted to USNH, Philadelphia, Pa., on August 20, 1945, and discharged on September 8, 1945. Request made for report of treatment but records not available. Diagnosis of duodenal ulcer, acute, noted.

April 2, 1946: VA examination Philadelphia, Pa., shows veteran is on a strict ulcer diet with occasional episodes of distress relieved by amphogel tablets. Digestive system examination shows slight tenderness of epigastrium. Diagnosis: peptic ucler (quiescent).

April 9, 1946: Examination by designate Dr. I. J. Wessel shows by X-ray an ucler crater visualized at several examinations within the duodenal bulb. Impression: duodenal ulcer (active).

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS,
March 14, 1961.

Appellant represented by: Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

The issue

The appeal was timely filed, and is properly before the Board, from the rating action by the regional office at Philadelphia, Pa., which severed service connection for duodenal ulcer. It is contended that the ulcer was healed prior to induction and reactivated in service, because of worry over inability to obtain emergency furlough upon the death of veteran's brother.

The evidence

The veteran served from July 1944 to January 1945. No pertinent abnormality was noted at induction. He was seen at the dispensary because of abdominal complaints and it was reported that X-ray prior to service revealed an ulcer. During hospitalization in January 1945, because of epigastric pain, it was reported for clinical purposes that the veteran had had stomach trouble since 1941 and X-ray, at that time, revealed a duodenal ulcer; he had remained in bed for 7 weeks and had been careful of his diet since. It was also reported that he had some trouble 2 months after induction and X-ray was said to have been negative; the pain recurred 5 weeks ago. Examination revealed tenderness in the epigastrium. Gastrointestinal series revealed a deformity of the duodenal bulb and an ulcer crater. Neither melena nor hematemesis was reported. No reference was made to any emotional upset or psychic trauma during service. He was discharged on a certificate of disability because of the duodenal ulcer.

A claim for compensation was submitted at time of separation. On administration examination in April 1946, the veteran complained of occasional episodes of stomach distress, which were relieved by amphojel. Slight tenderness of the epigastrium was noted. Gastrointestinal series revealed an irregularity of the duodenal bulb and an ulcer crater. Other official postservice examination and hospital reports are of record. The outpatient treatment records have also been considered.

A report from the Jefferson Hospital refers to a gastrointestinal examination in November 1941: fluoroscopic examination at that time revealed a persistent deformity of the duodenal cap due to a chronic cicatricial ulcer.

Service connection was granted for duodenal ulcer, but on later review such action was held to be clearly and unmistakably in error and service connection was discontinued.

The law and the regulations

Service connection may be granted for a disability which is incurred or aggravated in line of duty during active service (38 U.S.C. 310); 38 CFR 3.105 provides that service connection, once granted, may not be severed except on the basis of clear and unmistakable error.

Discussion and evaluation

The service clinical data and the report from the Jefferson Hospital clearly and unmistakably establish the existence of a duodenal ulcer prior to service. There was no melena or hematemesis during service, nor was there any reference to an emotional upset or psychic trauma. The symptoms noted in service were similar to those which existed prior to service and were due to the preexisting duodenal ulcer.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

This is a proceeding instituted to sever service connection of a duodenal ulcer condition, 20 percent disabling. The issue for decision is whether the evidence of record establishes that it was clearly and unmistakably erroneous for the agency, which decided the veteran's claim initially, to grant service connection of the veteran's preservice ulcer condition on the basis of aggravation.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

January 17–21, 1947: VA examination shows veteran symptomatic duodenal bulb is irregular in contour with stellate scarring. At 3 hours stomach is empty. Summary: chronic duodenal ulcer which appears to be largely healed. Findings at this time are mainly due to scarring.

January 22, 1948: VA examination shows epigastric pain relieved by eating. Mild tenderness on deep manual pressure. Diagnosis: Duodenal ulcer, active by X-ray examination.

February 2, 1948: Medical statement from Dr. Philip J. Hodes and Dr. J. Gershon-Cohen shows considerable distortion of duodenal bulb end postbulbar portion of the duodenum due to diffuse superficial ulceration.

April 11–23, 1949; USNH, Philadelphia, Pa., report shows minimal deformity of duodenal bulb by fluoroscopy and X-ray. Veteran on dietary control. Impression: deformity of duodenal bulb.

March 13–April 8, 1950: USNH, Philadelphia, Pa., report shows stomach emptied into a duodenal bulb, while deformed and showed an ulcer crater. The bulb at no time filled out to a normal size of contour. Impression: Chronic, duodenal ulceration, active. Veteran on dietary control.

January 10, 1952: VA, Philadelphia, Pa., examination shows pains in upper abdomen relieved by milk. Upper GI series shows spasm duodenal cap with deformity and marked contraction near the appendix. Hyperperistolysis is noted and in 20 minutes the barium has reached the lower ileium. Diagnosis: active duodenal ulcer.

February 1–19, 1952: USNH, Philadelphia, Pa., shows duodenal deformity without obstruction with hemorrhage. Continued on ulcer diet and medication.

February 22, 1947–June 19, 1958: OPT folder shows very numerous visits and treatments for chronic duodenal ulcer.

August 8–September 27, 1958: VAH, Philadelphia, Pa., shows veteran hospitalized during these dates because of abdominal pain of 10 years' duration. Tentative diagnosis was alcoholic encephalopathy and peptic ulcer. Upon subsequent laboratory and X-ray findings an established clinical diagnosis of chronic brain syndrome, alcohol intoxication and duodenal ulcer disease, chronic, inactive was made.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Findings of fact

(1) A duodenal ulcer clearly and unmistakably existed prior to service.

(2) There clearly and unmistakably was no increase in severity or aggravation of the preexisting duodenal ulcer during service.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

Findings of fact

Upon consideration of all the evidence in the record, I hereby make the following findings of fact:

The veteran was inducted for military service on May 27, 1944. His induction examination mentions no infirmities found at that time. Sometime during August or September of 1944, X-rays were taken of the veteran's stomach and his abdominal viscera was found to be normal. In the latter part of November 1944, the veteran began having epigastric pains, and when his condition grew worse, was admitted on December 29, 1944, to a military hospital. He stated at this time that he had contracted an ulcer in 1941 and was placed upon a special diet. X-rays taken in January 1945, revealed an active duodenal ulcer, and disability discharge proceedings were commenced. On January 26, 1945, the veteran was given a disability discharge. It was stated in his separation examination that the veteran had a chronic duodenal ulcer, which existed prior to service. The final diagnosis concluded that the veteran's ulcer condition, although the cause was undetermined, had been aggravated by active military service because the veteran could not obtain the proper diet and because the veteran was under nervous tension of Army life. The veteran was at no time engaged in combat with the enemy.

After his discharge the veteran filed a claim with the Veterans' Administration for service connection of his ulcer condition on grounds that the condition had been aggravated while he was on active military duty. The service connection claim on the basis of aggravation was granted in January 1945, as 30 percent disabling. When the veteran was examined in January 1947, the duodenal ulcer appeared to be largely healed, and accordingly, the rating board reduced the veteran's disability rating from 30 to 20 percent. In February 1952, the ulcer became active again, and the veteran was placed upon a special diet. A claim for additional service connection was denied in November 1953.

The veteran's most recent Veterans' Administration examination was made while he was hospitalized from August 8 to Septempber 27, 1958. The clinical diagnosis at this time was that the veteran was suffering from the ulcer condition and alcoholic intoxication. A claim for a non-service-connected pension was denied in October 1958.

The regional office on April 17, 1959, commenced proceedings to sever service connection of the veteran's ulcer condition. The proposal to sever was submitted to the central office, which concurred in the proposal to sever after the regional office confirmed a rating of April 1, 1959, based upon a review of the veteran's medical records from August 8 to September 27, 1958. There is no evidence in the record concerning what information was contained in the rating of April 1, 1959. On September 29, 1960, the regional office severed service connection of the veteran's ulcer condition because there was no evidence demonstrating aggravation during military service of the veteran's ulcer condition.

The veteran has appealed the decision of the regional office.

Opinion

Although the regional office did not state the regulation under which the veteran's claim was severed, I hold that the applicable regulation is VAR 1105(D), quoted in the

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

Decision of regional office after review of appeal and evidence

Evidence in service fails to demonstrate any disease of pathological development, to precipitate aggravation of the preservice existing duodenal ulcer. The symptoms presented was a recurrence of the duodenal ulcer symptoms, which existed prior to service.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

margin.[1] The regional office apparently applied this regulation since the approval of the central office was obtained before the regional office severed service connection. Since there is no evidence that the regional office obtained from the proper authorities a certification of a change in diagnosis of the veteran's health, severance of service connection must be warranted upon the facts of record, as found above, in order to sustain the decision of the regional office. The primary issue for decision, therefore, is whether, as grounds for severance, the Government has sustained its burden in proving that the evidence establishes that it was clearly and unmistakably erroneous to grant service connection of the veteran's preservice duodenal ulcer on the basis of aggravation.[2]

It should be mentioned that the veteran stated, when filing his initial claim for service connection in January 1945 that his ulcer condition began in 1941, and there is substantial medical evidence to rebut the presumption of sound condition upon induction, provided for in 38 U.S.C. 311. I turn now to the issue for decision.

The regional office, as I interpret its decision, concluded that the evidence in service fails to show aggravation of the ulcer condition and held that the veteran's disability while on active duty was a recurrence of the duodenal ulcer symptoms, which existed prior to service. From the evidence it appears that the rating board in the regional office relied upon its rating of April 1, 1959, with respect to the veteran's ulcer condition, in determining that severance was warranted. There is however, no evidence in the record concerning the contents or the findings in the April 1 rating. Since the regional office decided the case only upon the evidence in the record, the appeal must likewise be determined.

In defining aggravation, 38 U.S.C. 353 provides—

"A preexisting injury or disease will be considered to have been aggravated by active military * * * service, where there is an increase in disability during such service, unless there is a specific finding that the increase in disability is due to the natural progress of the disease."

The evidence clearly establishes that the veteran's preservice ulcer condition was

---

[1] VAR 1105(D). Severance of service connection: Service connection will be severed only where evidence establishes that it is clearly and unmistakably erroneous (the burden of proof being upon the Government). A change in diagnosis may be accepted as a basis for severance action if the examining physician * * * certifies that, in the light of all accumulated evidence, the diagnosis on which service connection was predicated is clearly erroneous. * * * When severance of service connection is considered warranted, a rating proposing severance will be prepared setting forth all material facts and reasons and submitted to the central office for review without notice to claimant or representative. * * *

[2] 38 U.S.C. 310. Basic entitlement: For disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, in the active military, naval, or air service, during a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as provided in this subchapter, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

healed at the time of his induction and that there was an increase in the veteran's disability during active military service. The induction examination of the veteran made no mention of an ulcer condition. More important, however, is the fact that X-rays taken in August, 4 months prior to the veteran's admission to a hospital with stomach trouble, showed that the veteran's condition was normal. The first symptoms of ulcer trouble did not occur until after approximately 6 months of active service, from May 27, 1944, to the latter part of November 1944. When the pain from the ulcer became serious, the veteran reported to a military hospital and was admitted on December 29, 1944; X-rays taken shortly thereafter revealed an active duodenal ulcer. I hold that the fact that the veteran did not report to the hospital when the first symptoms of his ulcer condition recurred does not constitute willful misconduct, which would bar the veteran's claim.[3]

As to the cause of the increase in the veteran's disability during military service, the report in the veteran's separation examination stated that the veteran's ulcer condition was aggravated by military service because he could not obtain a proper diet and because he was suffering from nervous tension of Army life.

On the basis of this evidence I am of the opinion that the agency, which first considered the veteran's claim, was not clearly and unmistakably erroneous in finding that the veteran's ulcer was aggravated by military service. Where there has been an increase in disability during military service, as the evidence clearly establishes, 38 U.S.C. 353, quoted above, provides that there is aggravation of the preservice disease, unless a specific finding is made that the increase was due to the natural progress of the disease. The Government, which has the burden of proof in this case, has adduced no evidence upon which to make such a finding; on the contrary, the medical evidence in the veteran's separation examination establishes that the ulcer condition was aggravated in active military service because of the veteran's nervous tension and lack of proper diet. The regional office in its decision fails to consider this evidence.

Although there is some evidence that the veteran's consumption of alcohol might be affecting his ulcer disease, there is in the evidence no certification by proper authorities that the veteran's stomach trouble is now being caused by other factors; VAR 1105(D) requires such a certification for severance upon grounds of change in diagnosis of the veteran's health.[4]

Conclusions of law

In view of the foregoing and of the evidence of record, I make the following conclusions of law:

(1) That the applicable Veterans' Administration Regulation to determine whether service connection should be severed in this case is VAR 1105(D).

(2) That the veteran's ulcer condition existed prior to induction, and that the veteran was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

(3) That the veteran was at no time guilty of willful misconduct which would bar his service-connection claim.

(4) That there was an increase in disability during the veteran's active military service, and that the increase in disability was caused by aggravation in military service.

Conclusions of law

(1) Service connection for duodenal ulcer was clearly and unmistakably in error.

(2) Restoration of service connection for duodenal ulcer is not warranted.

Decision

The appeal is denied.

[3] See note 2, supra.

[4] See note 1, supra.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

(5) That the burden of proof was upon the Government, and that the evidence adduced by the Government does not establish that service connection of the veteran's preservice ulcer condition is clearly and unmistakably erroneous.

(6) That service connection of the duodenal ulcer should not be severed.

Communists at War With American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a very timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the Thursday, September 7, 1961, edition of the Paramount Journal. Paramount, Los Angeles County, Calif., is one of the progressive and important cities in the great 23d District which I represent in this my 15th year in this great legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of this great legislative body, and all who read the contents of this article as appearing in the very important newspaper published in the great 23d District, will compliment those citizens responsible for initiating and carrying forward this timely program announced in the news article, and that in like manner we will all compliment the newspaper upon its donating so much of its most important space to the anticommunism program announced.

Mr. Speaker, truly it is not only encouraging but is in fact inspiring to me to see the dedicated and informed activity of thousands of citizens in the great 23d district, California, who are so energetically supporting our American way of life and constitutional form of government, and so vigorously opposing any further creeping in and infiltrating of the Soviet Communist conspiracy in our beloved Nation.

The above-mentioned article follows:

COMMUNISTS AT WAR WITH AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE, SCHOOL SAYS

Two Paramount High School teachers and a member of the board of education agreed Wednesday night that what they learned from attending the Southern California School of Anti-Communism, held in Los Angeles August 28 to September 1, was "inspiring, enlightening, and frightening," with emphasis on the word "frightening."

The trio of educators who said they were shaken as never before by what they learned about the motives, methods, and meaning of communism which is already at war with us to destroy the American way of life, were Mrs. Marie Mendenhall, board member of the Paramount Unified School District; Russell Ball, assistant principal of Paramount High School, and Mrs. Margaret Bullington, high school teacher.

The three reported their reactions to the soul-jolting awakening which world-recognized authorities on the Communist conspiracy provided the thousands who attended the school.

"The purpose of the school," explained Mrs. Mendenhall, "was to expose the naked Communist, to strip him of his smoke screen, and to show how far communism has progressed toward its goal of world domination and world incarceration."

She described communism as "diabolical, dialectical, diametrical materialism. Diabolical because it is opposed to God; dialectical because it is tricky, ever-shifting even to going back a step before taking two steps forward; diametrical because it opposes constitutional government and private enterprise."

Mrs. Bullington quoted Dr. Schwarz, Australian physician and minister who headed the school and serves as president of the Anti-Communist Crusade, as saying:

"We are at war with communism and losing because it isn't a shooting war. We have been apathetic because we do not understand communism or the vocabulary of the brainwashed Communists."

She explained that the word "peace" is the "golden word of the Communists," but it does not mean the same thing as it does to Americans.

"Peace, to the Communists," she said, "means total and complete conquest of the world by Comunists—a world in which there would be no God, no soul, no heaven, or hell and a world in which life would be no more sacred than that of a worm."

Among the solutions to the growing menace of communism suggested at the school, Mrs. Bullington said, are:

1. Knowledge. We must know our enemy.

2. Faith. We must have faith in our American heritage of freedom of religion, our constitutional government, our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Faith gives hope and courage.

"If our culture," she added, "is producing an over amount of materialism, then we must do something about that too, for materialism is not Americanism, but communism."

Russell Ball, who teaches history at the high school, said he thought he knew something about communism before attending the Los Angeles school crusade, declared that it isn't enough to understand the philosophy of Marx and Lenin.

"The oustanding lesson that I got from the school," he declared, "is the necessity for anticommunism activity. We must, as citizens, be on the offensive instead of the defensive. Although there is said to be only 10,000 real Communists in the United States, their influence is greatly extended through their control of front groups to which many well-meaning Americans belong because of their lack of understanding."

Ball said the fellow travelers who accept the Communist line but are not actual members of the party, are more dangerous and deadly" than other sympathizers because they can do more to advance the cause of communism while still being able to truthfully swear that they are not members of the Communist Party.

Others who give aid and comfort to the Communists, Ball added, are the "do-gooders" who, while perhaps sincere, are used by the commies as are the pseudo-liberals who defend the right to say anything, even if it is to challenge truth and our moral standards.

The three speakers made their reports Wednesday night at the regular semimonthly meeting of the board of education at the school administration building. Only a handful of citizens and teachers were in the audience that heard their keen appraisals of the Communist danger that lies within the United States rather than in Germany.

Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold came as a profound shock to people everywhere who look toward the United Nations as man's greatest hope for world peace and security.

There can be no doubt that for the past 8 years, Mr. Hammarskjold has symbolized the noble purpose and aspirations for which this great world assembly was founded. To the young, newly independent nations Dag Hammarskjold represented a helping hand. He was truly their "big brother" in a world of rising tensions. To the big nations, Dag Hammarskjold represented sincere fairness and impartiality. And to free peoples everywhere, he represented a strong vote for peace in every major crisis since 1953.

In the 8 years as Secretary General Mr. Hamarskjold became one of the world's most traveled men, acting as a troubleshooter for international peace.

In 1954 Mr. Hammarskjold flew to Communist China to seek the release of U.S. airmen. In 1956 he helped to make secure the Israeli-Arab armistice agreements which were shaking under border raids and attacks.

Acting on instructions from the General Assembly, Mr. Hammarskjold quickly set up a U.N. Emergency Force to police the Israeli-Egyptian Gaza Strip border in 1956.

As Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjold made his influence felt in the Suez crisis, and in Lebanon, in Karhmir, in Tunis, and lastly, in the Congo.

Oftentimes, Mr. Hammarskjold provoked the wrath of various members of the United Nations in his efforts toward world peace. The British and French were critical of him in the Suez crisis. And more recently he received the rebuke of France again this summer for his actions in the dispute over Tunisia.

But the gravest and most violent attacks against Mr. Hammarskjold came from the Soviet Union which at first had been one of his stanchest supporters. The beginning of the Soviet animosity toward Mr. Hammarskjold began in 1956 when the Secretary General insisted on trying to force Russia to admit its brutal repression of the Hungarian freedom-fighters to the world body. Unfortunately, Mr. Hammarskjold and the United Nations failed in every effort they made to investigate the uprising in Hungary.

From that point on, the Secretary General was looked upon as a "provocateur" and "enemy of the freedom-loving peoples" to the Russian leaders.

It was the Congo crisis, however, that sparked the all-out efforts of the Soviet Union to oust Mr. Hammarskjold. In July 1960, Mr. Hammarskjold, following Security Council instructions, sent a U.N. force to the Congo to restore order after the Belgians granted independence to their colony.

Russia was at first suspicious, then openly hostile, when Mr. Hammarskjold insisted that Russia stop meddling in the Congo's internal affairs.

For his efforts, the Secretary General was blasted as a "willing tool of Western imperialists trying to reimpose colonialism on the Congo."

Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev then called for Mr. Hammarskjold's resignation and the cry for a "troika" system went forth.

Mr. Hammarskjold arose to the greatest of his challenges with absolute courage and conviction.

"It is not a matter of the man but of the institution," he told the assembly. "I would rather see the office break on the basis of independence, impartiality, and objectivity," he said, "than drift on the basis of compromise."

The following vote of confidence which the United Nations gave to their courageous Secretary General was in effect a significant rebuke to the selfish demands of the Soviet Union.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Hammarskjold will live in history as one of the truly significant peacemakers and international statesmen.

As an idealist, Mr. Hammarskjold dedicated his life to the hope that mankind could learn to find orderly solutions in a world in which war means total annihilation. As Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjold established his office and the United Nations as an instrument of world peace and order.

The death of Mr. Hammarskjold will only exacerbate the increasing problems which are gnawing at the very foundation of the United Nations. Already, the Soviet Union appears to be launching its campaign for the troika plan of administering the United Nations Secretariat. The choice of a successor to Mr. Hammarskjold poses a major diplomatic problem for the policymakers of every nation.

Those of us in America who mourn his untimely death will never forget Mr. Hammarskjold's indispensable contribution to world peace in our time. All of us offer our deepest sympathy to the Secretary General's family and loved ones.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, include with my remarks a tribute paid to Mr. Hammarskjold by the dean of America's political analysts, Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's edition of the Washington Post. I also include articles by Robert E. Baker in the Washington Star and by Drew Pearson in the Washington Post:

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

(By Walter Lippmann)

Over the years I have often wondered whether Dag Hammarskjold belonged to an age that is passing or to one that is being born. He was a bold innovator in world affairs, and he opened up a future, having carried further than it has ever been carried before the principle of international action to promote peace. Yet he was himself the fine flower of the European tradition of civility which, if it is not dying, certainly is not flourishing today.

He was altogether not the mass man of our times. He could be a very good friend but there was a deep reserve in his character which few if any can have penetrated. In the great public world where the white lights blazed upon him, he lived an inner life of contemplation and esthetic experience that had nothing to do with power and popularity and publicity. His diplomacy had a finesse and a courtliness in the great traditions of Europe. Never before, and perhaps never again, has any man used the ancient art of diplomacy for such unconventional and such novel experiments.

The biggest experiment, for which in the end he gave his life, was to move the international society of the United Nations from having to choose between a very difficult police action in Korea and sole reliance on debate and verbal expressions. He moved the U.N. onto the plane of executive action without large scale war as in Korea. This movement from words to deeds, from general resolutions to intervention, was best seen during the crisis at Suez, in Palestine, in Laos, and then in the enormous, the infinitely difficult, and the infinitely dangerous crisis in the Congo.

I knew Dag Hammarskjold long enough and well enough, I think, to understand why he accepted the risks of opening up new paths in such wild and uncharted country. He was not an innovator because he had an itch to change things. He was a political innovator because there was no decent alternative. He saw no alternative to intervention by the United Nations in a crisis where there was a bitter confrontation in the cold war.

No cautious and timid man would have dreamed of staking the prestige and perhaps the future of the United Nations, as well as his personal reputation and his office, on the attempt to pacify the Congo. But great as were the risks of intervention, the risks of letting events run their course were much greater. If the United Nations now fails in what Hammarskjold inaugurated, the prospects are that the terrible racial struggle between Europeans and Africans will become deeply entangled in the conflict between the Western Powers and the Communist powers of the Soviet Union and China.

It was to avert and to prevent this fatal entanglement that Hammarskjold dared to used the powers of the United Nations. The outcome is as yet unknown. But what we do know is that his unprecedented innovation in world affairs has run into fearful resistance both in the East and in the West. Hammarskjold's use of the United Nations to isolate and disinfect the Congo crisis brought on him and the United Nations the implacable hatred of the Soviet Government. At the same time Hammarskjold did not have the full support of the Western Powers. In Algeria, in Katanga, in Angola, in Rhodesia, and in South Africa there is bitter resistance to the objectives of the United Nations in the Congo. Those objectives are to protect the transition from white supremacy, which cannot be continued much longer, to African self-government for which the Africans are so unprepared.

There is no doubt that in the administration of the new U.N. policy there have been mistakes, errors of judgment, and failures of personnel. But let us keep it in mind that the cause of the two-sided opposition to the U.N. action is not the mistakes, which are not irreparable. The cause of the opposition from East and West is a determination not to have the U.N. succeed in what it is attempting to do. For if the U.N. succeeds, there will not be a Communist government in the Congo. That is what Khrushchev hates about Hammarskjold and the Secretary General's office. And if the U.N. succeeds, there will not be a restoration of white supremacy in the Congo, and that is why money, propaganda, and clandestine intervention are being employed to frustrate the U.N.

No one knows today who can come after Hammarskjold, and there are many signs that he is in fact irreplaceable. For Hammarskjold was made Secretary General at a time when the U.N. was really no more than a debating society. Except for the police action in Korea it passed resolutions which aimed at mediation and conciliation but it did not in any important place command executive action.

It is easy to say that the world is not ready for international action to establish peace, and it would be hard to refute such a statement. Hammarskjold, under the fearful pressure of circumstances, resorted to international action. With his extraordinary diplomatic elegance and finesse, he used successfully international action at Suez, in Palestine, and in Laos. As compared with these, the Congo presented a new order of difficulty, and the outcome, now that Hammarskjold is dead, is in the gravest doubt.

If the world is not ready for what Hammarskjold felt compelled to try in the Congo, it is also true, I hate to say, that this present world is not ready for the kind of man Hammarskjold was. He was a Western man in the highest traditions of political excellence in the West. Khrushchev says that Hammarskjold was not neutral in the Congo, and that there is no such thing as a neutral man. Hammarskjold was in fact the embodiment of the noblest Western political achievement—that laws can be administered by judges and civil servants who have their first allegiance to the laws and not to their personal, their class, or even their national interests.

No such political ideal is believed to be possible or is regarded as tolerable in the Marxist world. The ideal is not very well understood in most of the rest of the world, and there is no use pretending that such public servants are not very rare indeed. So there are times, as now in this hour of our grief and shock, when the ideal seems to belong to things that are passing away.

HAMMARSKJOLD'S ROLE AS PEACEMAKER

(By Robert E. Baker)

Dag Hammarskjold was a man who devoted his life to his job—trying to secure peace in the world.

As Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold was flying to truce talks with President Moise Tshombe of secessionist Katanga when he was killed in a plane crash near the Congo-Rhodesian border.

His mission to the Congo was the latest of a series of peacemaking attempts which he began in 1955 with a visit to Peiping to obtain the release of 11 American flyers captured during the Korean war.

The cool and shy Hammarskjold stood up to crisis after crisis during the past 8 years as chief administrative officer and executive of the United Nations and his travels took him to all parts of the world for talks with the leaders of our times. And yet, while Mr. Hammarskjold had many admirers and acquaintances, he had few friends because he lived only for his work and avoided personal entanglements.

This lonely peacemaker was born 56 years ago in a castle in Jonkoping, Sweden, the son of Knut Hjalmar Leonard and Agnes Hammarskjold. He was brought up in an atmosphere permeated with international politics; his father was the isolationist Prime Minister who kept Sweden out of World War I and tried to keep her out of the old League of Nations.

At least 18 members of the family had served their country with outstanding distinction since the first Hammarskjold was knighted by King Carol IX in 1610 for valor in battle against the Danes.

Mr. Hammarskjold, who was to be subjected to attack and vilification in his U.N. position, started taking his knocks early. A brother, Sten, once recalled that he accidentally tossed month-old Dag out of a baby carriage and onto his head, fortunately with no ill effects.

Young Hammarskjold assumed the role of peacemaker early. When boys fought in school, it was Dag Hammarskjold who often tried to patch things up. But even then, he was no softy and could be as firm as a rock when the occasion demanded.

Mr. Hammarskjold attended Uppsala University and the University of Stockholm, getting his bachelor's, master's and law degrees in fast time. He became a political economist and one of Sweden's leading monetary experts.

He was chairman of the board of the Bank of Sweden from 1941 to 1948. During World War II, Mr. Hammarskjold was a courier for the Swedish Government, often carrying out dangerous and difficult assignments.

In the years following the war, Mr. Hammarskjold served his country in a variety of foreign and economic assignments, serving as delegate to the organization meeting of the Marshall plan at the Paris Conference of 1947 and, the next year, as Sweden's Chief Delegate to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

In 1947 Mr. Hammarskjold visited the United States to explain to the State Department the purpose of Swedish bans on imports imposed that year. The Americans got to know him then as quiet, efficient, cool and firm.

It was in 1953 that the United Nations was continuing its 2-year-old struggle to pick a successor to Secretary General Trygve Lie of Norway who had incurred the wrath of the Russians for his insistence on calling the Communists aggressors in the Korean war.

At that time, Mr. Hammarskjold was head of the Swedish delegation to the United Nations. The Russians were engaged in their peace offensive after Stalin's death—and suddenly the tweedy, pipe-smoking, scholarly, shy Hammarskjold was nominated as Secretary General by the Security Council. It came as a surprise to many and Mr. Hammarskjold was called the "darkest of dark horses."

The General Assembly voted him in by a vote of 57 to 1 on April 7, 1953, and Mr. Hammarskjold took office 3 days later.

He said then that he interpreted his election "as a sign of a more cooperative spirit on the part of the Big Five" members, and promised that he would not be a passive administrator, but "active as an instrument, a catalyst, an inspirer."

It was also at this time that Mr. Hammarskjold said: "I have never satisfied a wish to go around the world."

REELECTED IN 1957

In the 8 years as Secretary General—he was reelected unanimously in 1957 to a 5-year term scheduled to end in April 1963—Mr. Hammarskjold became one of the world's most traveled men, probably exceeding the record of the late John Foster Dulles.

His task, and his devotion and dedication to it, took him to Red China in 1954 to seek the release of U.S. airmen; to the Middle East in 1956 to shore up Israeli-Arab armistice agreements shaking under border raids.

Acting on instructions from the General Assembly, Mr. Hammarskjold quickly set up a U.N. emergency force to police the Israel-Egyptian Gaza Strip border in 1956. He made several other trips to the Middle East, 2 visits to southeast Asia, a tour of 21 African countries in 1959, several trips to Moscow and Iron Curtain capitals and 3 visits to the Congo.

PROVOKED SOME NATIONS

Mr. Hammarskjold found that he frequently provoked the wrath of various nations. The British and French were critical of him in the Suez crisis. He received a stiff rebuff from the French this summer in the dispute in Tunisia.

But the gravest and bitterest attacks came from Russia, which at first had been a firm supporter of Mr. Hammarskjold. The turning point probably came in 1956 when the Secretary General insisted on trying to force Russia to admit repression in Hungary to the world; Mr. Hammarskjold and the U.N. failed in their efforts to investigate the uprising in Hungary.

From that point on, quiet, determined, Dag Hammarskjold became more and more a "provocateur" and "enemy of freedom-loving peoples" to the Russians.

It was the Congo crisis, however, that sparked the Soviet Union into an all-out offensive against Mr. Hammarskjold. In July 1960, Mr. Hammarskjold, following Security Council instructions, sent a U.N. force to the Congo to restore order after the Belgians granted independence to their colony.

Russia was first suspicious, then openly hostile, when Mr. Hammarskjold insisted that Russia stop meddling in the Congo's internal affairs.

He was blasted as a "willing tool of Western imperialists trying to reimpose colonialism" on the Congo. Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev demanded Mr. Hammarskjold's resignation, calling for the abolition of the office of Secretary General and creation in its place of a three-member board—one representing the West, one the Communists, one neutral, all with a built-in veto.

Mr. Hammarskjold was angry but, typical of the man once described as having "icicles in his veins," cool and unshaken.

"It is not a question of the man but of the institution," he told the General Assembly. "I would rather see that office break on the basis of independence, impartiality, and objectivity than drift on the basis of compromise."

Thus, Mr. Hammarskjold showed that, while known as a master of compromise to win a point, he held firm against compromise that would destroy a principle.

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Mr. Hammarskjold, given overwhelming backing by the Security Council and General Assembly on his handling of the Congo policies, gave the General Assembly a standing offer to resign any time it felt he should—but he refused to bow to Soviet resignation demands.

Throughout his U.N. career, Mr. Hammarskjold practiced what he called personal diplomacy. It is diplomacy, not speeches and votes, that continues to have the last word in the process of peacemaking," he said

It was his belief in personal diplomacy that sparked his sudden decision last week to make a personal mission to the turbulent Congo, his third within a year. It surprised delegates who were gathering in New York for the opening of the U.N. session.

As U.N. forces went into action against troops of secessionist Katanga Province, Mr. Hammarskjold became the target of criticism from Britain and France, but won support from many Asian-African nations.

But right or wrong, Mr. Hammarskjold was undoubtedly acting as he has always done. "Use whatever words you like," he once told the Assembly, "independence, impartiality, objectivity, they all describe essential aspects of what, without exception, must be the attitude of the Secretary General."

NO. 1 CIVIL SERVANT

Mr. Hammarskjold liked to describe himself as the world's No. 1 civil servant. But the U.N. job had become more than that under his influence. He was turning it into a position of worldwide executive power. Last month, he outlined a picture of the U.N. "as a first step in the direction of an organized international community."

Mr. Hammarskjold never had time for romance and died a confirmed bachelor. A friend who once tried to act as matchmaker between Mr. Hammarskjold and a particularly eligible girl, said, after the venture failed: "Apparently the girl didn't like T. S. Eliot."

The lonely peacemaker enjoyed reading the works of Eliot, Cervantes, Goethe, and Thomas Wolfe and enjoyed mountain climbing which he once compared to the position of Secretary General.

"Perseverance and patience," he said, "a firm grip on realities, careful and imaginative planning, a clear awareness of dangers but also of the fact that fate is what we make it and the safest climber is he who never questions his ability to overcome all difficulties.

And he warned with the last words he wrote that failure of the U.N. to press for peace and human rights would be "treason to the future." The warning was made in an article in the October issue of Together, Methodist Church magazine.

He is survived by two brothers, Bo Hammarskjold, a former provincial governor in Sweden, and Sten Hammarskjold. Another brother, Ake, died in 1937.

HAMMARSKJOLD FOUGHT FOR PEACE

(By Drew Pearson)

Dag Hammarskjold used to sit at an inconspicuous desk in an inconspicuous office of the Foreign Ministry in Stockholm. He was not a very prepossessing man and he didn't have a very prepossessing job. No one had every really heard of him—not even in Sweden.

Then U.N. leaders, desperate to find a neutral the Russians would accept, pulled him out of the Swedish Foreign Office and made him Secretary General of the United Nations.

But Dag Hammarskjold, the inconspicuous little man with mild blue eyes, had a determination born of his Viking forefathers; and that determination became deeper and the

mild blue eyes more intense as Hammarskjold waged his crusade for peace.

He worked Saturdays, Sundays, routed associates out of bed at any hour of the night, concentrated on the U.N. until it had more teeth than any other international organization in history. He set a precedent that the Secretary General must be heard in debate, and have the right to intervene on his own in any crisis. Instead of a mild-mannered, milk-toast civil servant, he became a power.

Came the Suez crisis and Hammarskjold stepped in against his own friends—the French and British. He stopped a war which could have set the world on fire. That time the Soviet Union was on his side. The Kremlin applauded from the sidelines.

Came crisis in the Congo. This time he moved in against the Soviet, thwarted its policy of dominating the wealthy vacuum of newly independent Africa. This was when Moscow came to realize what a bind a strong Secretary General could put it in. This was what caused Moscow to propose its troika plan to thwart such a Secretary General.

QUAGMIRE OF POLITICS

The Congo was a vortex of tribal passions, a quagmire of African politics. Only a man of steel nerves and unflinching dedication would have dared step in. Hammarskjold took the step.

At first he had everyone against him. African leaders who talked glibly about independence from the soapboxes pulled their troops out of the United Nations when they saw Hammarskjold meant business. The French refused to pay their part of the costs. The Russians boycotted and bellyached.

Hammarskjold stood fast; then began to work out peace in the Congo. He got the parliament called back to Leopoldville. He got Antoine Gizenga, pro-Communist Vice Prime Minister, working with Cyrille Adoula, the pro-West Prime Minister. The only thing that remained was to work out peace between them and mineral-rich, Belgian-dominated Katanga.

Adoula and Gizenga were itching to send troops into Katanga—which would have meant bloody civil war. To head off that war, Hammarskjold talked President Tshombe into cooperation, only to find that Defense Minister Munongo had talked him out again. Finally U.N. troops intervened. This was more or less what the Russians had wanted 1 year before.

Only a man with incredible nerve would have done this. Dag never knew whether his friends in New York would support him. He never knew whether the Russians would change their view of him, now that he was backing some of their pro-Lumumba friends against Katanga. He didn't care. He did know, however, that he would get little credit if he succeeded; his name would be mud if he failed.

It was over these steaming jungles, over that vortex of passion, over that quagmire of African politics that he was flying for another meeting with slippery President Tshombe when his plane crashed.

MEMORIAL TO DAG

That spelled the end of the inconspicuous little man who filled the big chair in the United Nations. It will not spell the end of trouble in the Congo. It will not spell the end of trouble in the world.

But it could mark the beginning of better understanding for peace—if the French who boycotted Hammarskjold, and the Russians who tried to undercut him, and the others who sometimes complained about him—would join together in a memorial to Dag Hammarskjold—a new U.N. headquarters in Berlin, making it a city of peace.

The Soviets scored some great achievements in our geophysical year—including the first sputnik. If they worked at peace as hard as they worked at science—and if we joined them—there could be joint distribution of food for peace, joint medical cooperation for peace, joint mental health studies for peace, and various other projects for peace—all emanating from Berlin.

As I tried to tell Khrushchev when I saw him last month, peace is something that comes from working together, not making speeches at each other. It comes from such things as our current American-Soviet cooperation to prevent opium smuggling, our current cooperation for the protection of Bering Sea seals, our recent geophysical cooperation in the Antarctic, and our exchange of students.

This is what could solve the Berlin crisis—by erecting a new "Year of Peace" headquarters in Berlin in honor of a man who gave his life in the sweaty jungles of Africa working and dying for peace.

The 22d Anniversary of Nazi-Soviet Invasion of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the people of Chicago observed the 22d anniversary of the invasion of Poland which launched World War II.

The Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress sponsored a huge memorial service in an effort to recall the barbaric pressure of the Soviet Union and the role the Communists played in launching World War II.

September 17 was selected for this memorial service because it was on that day that Soviet troops occupied the eastern half of Poland, while the gallant Polish Army was fighting stubbornly to resist the Nazi invasion of its western boundaries which had started 17 days earlier in 1939.

There can be no doubt, as we review the events of that last tragic week before Nazi storm troopers plowed into Poland, that the Soviet Union must today assume equal blame for touching off this tragic war.

There is ample proof today that Hitler may well have delayed the invasion and maybe even abandoned his crazed obsession to dominate a major portion of the world if he had not first negotiated the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov pact which gave the eastern half of Poland to the Communists and which assured Hitler of Soviet neutrality if he invaded Europe.

The world should look back at this Soviet treachery 22 years ago so that we today can better understand the full depth of Soviet deception.

The Illinois division of the Polish American Congress is to be commended for taking the position that the responsibility for World War II rests just as heavily upon the treachery of Stalin and his Communist followers as it does on Hitler and his Nazi storm troopers.

Last Sunday's meeting held in Chicago was attended by more than 4,000 people.

I am taking the privilege today to call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution which was adopted at this meeting. I think we can all find a great deal of courage in the resolute determination of our fellow Americans who participated in this memorial service last Sunday and who today stand ready to defend the honor of our Nation and the dignity of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Assembled at a mass meeting of Americans of Polish lineage in Chicago, on this 17th day of September 1961, we solemnly issue the following declaration—in our own names and in behalf of millions of our compatriots, all faithful citizens of the United States:

"1. We take cognizance of the 22d anniversary of the treacherous Soviet invasion of Poland, executed in collusion with Germany, to remind and warn the world, that this German-Soviet pact of infamy formed the basis for world conquest by aggressive communism.

"2. The appeal of the President of the United States to the American Nation for support of his plans to defend the freedom of the United States and the freedom and justice in the whole world, is being taken and understood by us as an order, the implementation of which we earnestly take upon ourselves.

"We realize, that in the dangerous international crisis through which we are now passing, this duty means readiness for boundless sacrifice of our worldly goods and even lives. We realize, too, that only such readiness will safeguard mankind and its leadership from the blackmail of terror which is now being pressured by Khrushchev with a measure of success.

"We deem it our duty to take up positions in the first line of defense and freedom, for, spiritually united with our ancestral homeland, we know, perhaps more than other peoples, the depth of suffering arising from the loss of freedom.

"3. It is not possible to proclaim the principles of freedom sincerely, if, in practical decisions, today's fate of Poland is left out of consideration.

"Peace cannot be achieved in the world through silent acceptance of the enslavement of Poland by Communist invaders.

"Therefore, we appeal to the U.S. Government for immediate and unconditional recognition of Poland's western boundary along the Oder-Lauscetian Neisse Rivers. Such an act of recognition will free Poland from false 'protection' of Khrushchev against the threat of German aggression; it will strengthen centuries-old ties of friendship between the American and the Polish nations. Above all—the recognition of the fact that Western Territories belong to Poland permanently, will constitute a proof of sober evaluation of the part the Polish nation is well prepared to play, due to its vitality and spiritual valor, in future European settlements.

"We ask unanimously that the U.S. Government, in its design for durable world peace, forward a demand that the Soviet Army and administrative personnel be withdrawn from all territories of Poland, and that free and unfettered elections be held there under international control, and that Poland be given U.S. guarantee of its freedom and independence.

"We are ready to die for the freedom and welfare of the United States and the ideals it stands for. We recognize the necessity of sacrifices in the defense of 2 million people in Berlin, with this stipulation, however, that the fate of the 30 million heroic Poles be not forsaken. Such an abandonment of the Polish people would be taken by us as a betrayal of American ideals and as a sign of shortsightedness for which we might be

called to pay with the loss of freedom in the future.

"We do not recognize, and will never accede to Russian rule over Poland nor Russian annexation of Poland's eastern provinces, including the historic Polish cities of Lwon and Wilno.

"4. The well-being of the Polish nation, suffering under the Soviet-enforced Communist regime, is further deteriorating. Particularly, we protest against the persecution of religion—the most powerful mainstay of the Polish nation.

"Under the pretext of the separation of the state and the church, communism is waging a relentless, insidious war against the fundamental right of a civilized society to its religious freedom.

"(a) Religious instructions, already forbidden in schools, are being further restricted and rendered increasingly difficult by the regime, and to all practical purposes, are prohibited in practice, if not in a letter of law.

"(b) Charitable activities of the church, blessed by millions of needy persons, are being canceled by outright confiscations, exorbitant duties and taxes.

"(c) Church property in Western provinces has been taken over by the state, which collect rentals from them, that are out of proportion to their real value.

"(d) All donations to the church are taxed up to 60 percent of their value; arbitrary taxation of churches, convents, Catholic schools, progressively weakens their material foundations, in line with precise Soviet patterns.

"(e) Terrorization of the priests is being renewed by arrests and court decisions rendered under false accusations.

"We remind the world public opinion, that nearly 1 million Poles are still enslaved in Russia. They have been forcibly evicted during World War II and its immediate aftermath. They live there in inhuman conditions, deprived of any possibility and even of hope of returning to Poland and to their closest relatives.

"May this protest of ours awaken those who still remain in a state of numbness or persist in irrelevant quarrels. May it rekindle a faith in the great future of the Polish nation.

"Let us augment our efforts of thoughts and hearts.

"Let us increase our material sacrifices for the struggle for a free and independent Poland, and a free world.

"This is a case of honor, of conscience and of vital interest of the American Nation."

The Peace Corps Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I must, in all consciousness, stand in favor of the Peace Corps Act because I think its far-reaching effects will be felt over the whole world. But this is one of the saddest positions I have ever had to take. I deplore and regret that the other body has seen fit to remove the provision of section 4(e) which was offered and accepted unanimously by the House. That section provided:

The Peace Corps shall not perform services in any foreign country in which, by reason of law or official policy, any member of the Peace Corps is or will be discriminated against because of his race, creed, or color.

We are of little faith if we do not believe those who have offered, at great sacrifice to themselves, to go to the far reaches of the world to bring peace and understanding. In this effort, there should not be discrimination insofar as race or religion is concerned. The people who are to disseminate the principles of our country should be free of any burden of religion, or color of skin, to tell the peoples of other parts of the world the wonders which exist in this Nation of work and enterprise.

It is deplorable that this much-needed bill, a special request of the President, be so stripped of this most meaningful amendment. We are playing into the hands of those whose aims we are striving to overcome; those who would only be happy to see the United States acquiesce to tyrants and despots of certain nations; those who laughingly, behind our backs, take our assistance with one hand, and with the other hand dictate which Americans in the employ of the U.S. Government can enter those countries.

It is ironic that we may find ourselves sending out a Peace Corps which is in effect segregated; which violates the principles of President Kennedy's own policy that we must link social justice and morality with our economic assistance.

I have fought tirelessly and relentlessly for this antibias clause to be included in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1961. I fought for it to be included in the authorization bill. Although a watered-down version was accepted in these bills, I felt that a strong antibias clause in the Peace Corps Act was an indispensable requisite to the administration's principle of linking our assistance with morality and social justice.

Disheartened as I am over this turn of events, I feel that I must approve the main concept of the Peace Corps.

Flight From Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again the Nation is learning, to its dismay, that the President and his advisers simply do not understand economics. The President's theory that annual deficits are of no concern because the budget can be balanced on the basis of cycles just will not work, and a study of the budget over a period of years proves the unsoundness of his position. There is only one way to have sound fiscal responsibility and that is for the Government to live within its income. I have introduced, along with other Members, for the past several years a measure which would force an annual balanced budget. Until we accomplish this, the pet theories of the social planners, the Fabian Socialists, the advocates of the Keynesian concept are merely taking flight from fiscal responsibility. In this connection I call attention to the following editorials from the Wall Street Journal:

SO WHAT?

Predictions that Federal spending may easily hit $106 billion or more by fiscal year 1965 don't bother Budget Director Bell at all.

His reaction goes about like this: If the people want to spend $106 billion a year—an estimate which, incidentally, doesn't count the huge Government trust-fund spending—that's perfectly all right. If the economy grows "as expected," it wouldn't even be any greater relative burden than those old-fashioned $80 billion budgets. What Mr. Bell means is that it would not necessarily amount to a greater percentage of the gross national product.

It's a splendid approach to budgetmaking, we must say. For one thing, increased Government spending can boost the statistical appearance of the GNP, since such spending is included in that measurement. Having jacked up the figures, the Government can then justify still further spending. And so on, and on.

Moreover, this casual attitude eliminates any need for careful scrutiny of the reckless spending desires of the Federal agencies, or for a skeptical eye on the ceaseless spending pressures to which both administration and Congress are subject. On this basis anything goes, because good old economic growth will take care of everything. And if by chance, despite Federal infusions, the economy does not grow as expected, that's all the more reason for more spending.

After all, in these enlightened days, who worries about tiresome things like budget deficits and inflation? Who cares about caring for the people's money?

THE THEORY THAT WON'T WORK

The Kennedy administration's basic fiscal philosophy is this: You don't have to worry about balancing the Federal budget in any particular year so long as it is balanced over a period of years.

Or, as the President himself expressed this Keynesian concept earlier in the year: "The Federal budget should * * * be in balance over the years of a business cycle—running a deficit in years of recession when revenues decline and the economy needs the stimulus of additional expenditures—and running a surplus in years of prosperity, thus curbing inflation, reducing the debt, and freeing funds for private investment."

So stated, the notion doesn't sound particularly alarming; it sounds almost reasonable. It has just one overwhelming drawback. It doesn't work. How totally it doesn't work, in case there is any doubt about it, has just been demonstrated again by Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia.

First, in the past 31 years the Government has run 25 deficits. How's that for "balance" over a period of years? As for curbing inflation, we have had so much inflation that the value of the dollar has been more than halved in little over 20 years. The Federal debt, far from being reduced, is approaching the historic high of $300 billion.

Then there is the whole business of the business cycle. One of the beauties of this approach, from the standpoint of the numerous Keynesian scholars in our midst, is that it is delightfully vague. They never bother to say whether the business cycle runs for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years, 9 years or what. This frees them from the obligation of explaining how the budget is to be balanced "over the years of the business cycle."

Senator BYRD, however, has taken the trouble to show that, no matter how you slice the business cycle, there still is practically never a budget balance over its span.

Suppose, he says, you start with fiscal year 1950 and figure a business cycle of 3 years. The result: A $3.6 billion deficit for the period. If you figure a 4-year cycle, the deficit is $13 billion; 5 years, $16.1 billion; 6 years, $20.3 billion; 7 years, $18.7 billion; 8 years, $17.1 billion; 9 years, $19.9 billion; 10 years, $32.3 billion.

The Senator carries these careful calculations further; he makes a starting point of every fiscal year from 1950 through 1959, and finds similar floods of red ink. In fact, out of the whole works of 52 possible spans, only one "cycle"—a 3-year period beginning in 1956—yields even an absurdly tiny surplus. All the rest is deficit.

It's no great mystery why the business-cycle theory of budget-balancing fails so resoundingly in practice. Political pressures for greater spending are always enormous, and only the tightest Government rein can hope to hold them in check at all. The only realistic rein is to try for a budget balance every year, short of a period of national catastrophe.

Today, instead, we have an administration which not only bows to the spending pressures but invites them and seeks constantly to think up new ways of spending. It has already added billions, and now the talk is of a $90 billion spending budget next January. As a conservative estimate, Senator BYRD reckons expenditures in fiscal year 1965 (excluding the heavy trust fund outlays) at $106 billion, compared to $81.5 billion in 1961. The bulk of the increase is not for defense, but for nonessential or postponable "domestic-civilian" programs. That outlook provides precious little prospect of any budget balancing, no matter how piously the administration now talks of doing so in the 1963 fiscal year.

The root trouble, then, with the administration's fiscal philosophy is that it is a flight from fiscal discipline. Saying that the budget needs to be balanced only over the business cycle merely means it won't be balanced at all except occasionally by accident.

No wonder the Senator asks some questions—and in today's irresponsible Washington, his is indeed a voice in the wilderness. He asks:

"How long can the Federal Government continue to spend, tax, and borrow at the present rate? Are we on a permanent deficit basis? When will the breaking point come? How disastrous will it be if we continue inflation-breeding policies—which appear to be on the increase—when our concern should be for return to fiscal responsibility?"

Maltester Leads Home Rule Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Municipal Association recently held a convention in Seattle, Wash. During the course of this convention, a resolution was offered which would have called for more Federal control in the area of urban renewal.

Mayor Jack Maltester, of San Leandro, Calif., offered the leadership on behalf of municipal interests desiring to emphasize so-called home rule and local self-government. His eloquence, wisdom, logic, and forcefulness convinced the delegates that at least in the area of code enforcement and welfare problems developed from urban renewal, the cities should retain their rightful power.

Mayor Maltester, whose community is in a dynamic and rapidly growing area has a great awareness of municipal problems. He has administered his city well. This fact is reemphasized in the record of a 14th consecutive annual tax cut for the city's property owners.

While the mayor steadfastly defends the right of home rule for his city, he serves as the leader for the Democratic Party in his area. I point this out because there are callous individuals who would mislead the public into believing that big government and increasing bureaucratic controls are synonymous with being a good follower of the tenets of the Democratic Party.

Jack Maltester is to be commended for his outspoken leadership on behalf of home rule for local municipalities and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the stories and editorial from area newspapers which set forth his accomplishments:

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) News, Aug. 31, 1961]

MALTESTER LEADS HOME RULE FIGHT—NATION'S MAYORS REJECT MORE FEDERAL CONTROL OF RENEWAL

(By Edward W. Chew)

The mayor of San Leandro led a floor fight at the American Municipal Association Convention in Seattle, Wash., yesterday, that knocked out several planks of an Urban Renewal resolution which called for more Federal control.

Mayor Jack D. Maltester, San Leandro, was highly persuasive in his defense of "local control" over urban renewal and municipal policies. The Morning News learned by wire last night.

Sighting his targets, Mayor Maltester chipped away at two major planks of the resolution. These had called for (a) legislation to provide Federal grants for code enforcement and related activities on same basis as urban renewal grants, and (b) to permit charging to urban renewal the cost of expanded social welfare and other services caused by redevelopment.

"This American Municipal Association has gone on record in favor of more home rule by American communities, yet of the 21 resolutions before us 11 of these—almost half of them—are resolutions asking for Federal aid. We will never get home rule this way," declared Maltester.

TWO PLANKS

Maltester explained that he was opposed to the first plank because code enforcement is "a police power, and it is something which cities should budget for and expend money for. It is not something that we should ask the Federal (Government) for help."

He told the delegates that he was not in favor of the second plank because he does not believe that the problem of welfare should be tied to urban renewal. "If a city wants urban renewal that's what it should get. The problem of relocating people is something else again," said Maltester.

The planks in the urban renewal resolution were strongly advocated by Philadelphia, Boston, and other eastern cities.

TONED DOWN

Mayor Maltester won immediate support from the delegates of Reno, almost all the California cities, and representatives from midwestern cities. Mayor George Christopher, San Francisco, spoke to rally more support behind the San Leandro mayor.

The American Municipal Association delegates, at the final count, took out the planks opposed by San Leandro and toned down the urban renewal resolution.

"Home rule is something precious to San Leandrans. It is something precious to all American cities. We just can't have it if we keep giving it away to larger political units," said Mayor Maltester.

[From the San Leandro (Calif.) Morning News, Aug. 31, 1961]

SAN LEANDRO POINTS WAY TO HOME RULE

What happened in Seattle, Wash., yesterday, at the American Municipal Association convention, once again shows that the voice of San Leandro can help move Americans to serious thinking about "home rule."

San Leandrans are traditionally independent people, with the urge to do things themselves—take downtown revitalization, take the community library, take the city's boys club. In fact, several years ago the San Leandro chamber was surprised to discover that the "All-American City" title could not be bestowed on San Leandro because citizen participation has always been a city trait.

The All-American City Award was only awarded to cities where citizens have neglected civic duties, and needed the "award" to stimulate new beginings of civic responsibility by citizens.

In Seattle yesterday, at the AMA convention, which is the voice of America's cities, delegates were all set to toss the responsibilities of local government into the lap of the big Federal Government.

On two specific planks, that of code enforcement and welfare problems developed from urban renewal, Mayor Jack D. Maltester, of San Leandro, spoke to the delegates. His eloquence convinced the delegates that at least these two duties were better left for local cities to administer. Against the heavy eastern city delegates, the delegates of America's more independent west rallied and trimmed the two planks from the resolution.

This action, and the report of national interest in San Leandro's 14th consecutive tax cut year, show that San Leandrans are on the right track.

But, it wasn't done overnight. It took years of planning by the city, both elected, appointed, and staff people. It took citizens who are interested in their hometown. That's where home rule moves ahead or falters.

[From the Hayward (Calif.) Daily Review, Sept. 1, 1961]

URBAN RENEWAL—MALTESTER STAND PRAISED

A prominent Alameda County Republican this morning was applauding Democrat Jack D. Maltester's stand yesterday on the issue of home rule in urban renewal discussions at the American Municipal Association convention in Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Donald Field, chairman of the Alameda County Republican Coordinating Assembly, issued a statement commending Maltester.

Maltester, mayor of San Leandro and president of the local Democratic club, blasted a group of resolutions before the convention because more than half of them were requesting Federal aid.

"We'll never get home rule this way," Maltester declared as he led a floor fight against giving it away to larger political units. He was joined by Hayward Councilman Daniel Cooper and San Francisco Mayor George Christopher, both Republicans.

Main target of the trio, a resolution asking the Federal Government to provide funds for building code enforcement in connection with federally aided renewal projects, was defeated.

Field said "Mayor Maltester took a highly commendable stand and did a very courageous thing in taking such a strong and effective position against this ever increasing encroachment by the Federal Government into our local affairs. All San Leandro can well be proud of the leadership its mayor has provided in this very critical issue.

"We have long ago realized the terrible price of accepting Federal aid indiscriminately," Field said. "We in San Leandro are proud to point out the new schools, our very modern library and our very active urban renewal program—accomplished without resort to Federal aid. All this and a decreasing tax rate. Our mayor quite successfully practices the program he advocates," Dr. Field concluded.

Mrs. Sabina Bannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of a beloved citizen of Hudson County, Mrs. Sabina Bannon, of Jersey City, has saddened many. I extend my deepest sympathy to her family. Mrs. Bannon not only was a woman of great courage but one who dedicated her life to easing the life of newcomers to our country.

Mrs. Bannon was the executive secretary of the Jersey City International Institute, an organization which helps people with immigration problems. She taught herself the immigration laws and from then on spent her days and evenings teaching aliens English so they could pass their citizenship examination, as well as helping them in every way possible.

The president of the International Institute described Mrs. Bannon as the visible expression of good will and hope to aliens all over the world.

My district newspaper, the Jersey Journal has written an excellent tribute to a great humanitarian, Mrs. Bannon, and I would like to include it as part of my remarks:

[From the Jersey Journal, Sept. 19, 1961]

HUMANITARIAN—MRS. SABINA BANNON EASED LIFE OF NEWCOMERS

(By Jon Bradshaw)

Mrs. Sabina Bannon was a woman of surpassing courage.

She died of a heart attack yesterday leaving in the fabric of the Jersey City International Institute an irreplacable hole.

She was the institute's executive secretary, one of the top positions in the community fund immigration service agency.

Mrs. Bannon of 2701 Hudson Boulevard, Jersey City, taught herself the intricacies of immigration laws and used her knowledge to help others. She was, according to the president of the International Institute, "the visible expression of good will and hope to aliens all over the world."

One of the institute's functions is to unite separated families and to enable them to become American citizens. Mrs. Bannon was directly involved in achieving that end.

But her task did not end there. There were many other taxing subtleties involved. She helped to bring war brides who had been stranded in Europe back to their husbands. She spurred the passing of a law that would permit tubercular aliens to come to the United States and undergo treatment in American hospitals. She helped to bring many thousands of people here, including hundreds from behind the Iron Curtain.

The huge task was conducted without discrimination to race or creed.

Mrs. Bannon helped the newcomers find homes when they arrived. She helped provide them with jobs and schools for their children. "I have never encountered another like her," said her coworker, Mrs. Manya Levin. "She gave more than work. She gave herself and the strength of her beliefs."

She spent her evenings in teaching aliens English so that they could pass their citizenship examinations.

When she died she was deeply involved with the aiding of refugees from Cuba.

The small, spare woman was born in Jersey City 61 years ago. She became a lifelong resident.

Mrs. Bannon's only formal education was acquired in Dickinson High School. In 1922, she married James J. Bannon, a widower with five children. She had three of her own. Mr. Bannon died in 1946.

She then became a legal secretary for the International Institute, and studying immigration laws in her home at night, she rose to the position of executive secretary.

In this position, she won awards from the Ukrainian people and the Catholic War Veterans for aiding homeless foreign orphans. She was one of three women in New Jersey to be appointed by President Kennedy to make recommendations on social work.

Mrs. Bannon was also a member of the Business and Professional Woman's Club of Jersey City, the Ninth Ward Democratic Club, and the Rosary Society of St. Aedan's Roman Catholic Church.

She followed her quest to the end. "Through her, I got my son returned to me from Poland," said one woman. "I had not seen him in 3 years. She was a great woman and a generous one."

An Evaluation of Secretary McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the August issue of Harper's magazine, Mr. Joseph Kraft has written an interesting and enlightening article evaluating the efforts of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Significantly, the article is entitled "McNamara and His Enemies." This review of Secretary McNamara's term in the Office of Secretary of Defense is of real importance to those who are interested in the course which our Military Establishment is taking. Mr. Kraft, a reporter and author, has done a real service in preparing this report for Harper's. I should like to place this article, "McNamara and His Enemies," in the RECORD at this point:

MCNAMARA AND HIS ENEMIES

(By Joseph Kraft)

(For the first time in years, a Secretary of Defense is really running the Pentagon—with a vigor and decisiveness that have dazzled some military men, infuriated others. He has won the first skirmishes but his battle is far from over.)

One of the issues in the 1959 congressional hearings on the defense budget concerned a choice between two nearly identical projects for knocking down enemy planes. Defense Secretary Neil McElroy acknowledged that he had not made up his mind, and indicated some complex technical questions were involved. He told the Congress:

"As far as I am concerned, it would not bother me if you held our feet to the fire and forced us [to make a choice]."

One of the issues in the 1961 hearings on the defense budget concerned a decision to strike from the Air Force estimates a project for a nuclear-propelled aircraft. In the midst of a long and highly technical discussion, a Congressman gently implied that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara had not been able to give the matter personal attention. By the time the Secretary got the floor back, the imputation had been muted, and he could have lobbed the ball back or let it go entirely. Instead he gave it the hard, overhead smash. He told the Congress:

"I am not accustomed to making recommendations on matters affecting the life of this Nation without personally investigating them to the fullest extent."

The contrast in those two attitudes toward decision—the one passive, not to say reluctant; the other active, not to say eager—exemplifies in little a vast change that has come over the Pentagon. Mr. McNamara, a management-control man from way back, has been moving with systematic determination to impose a coherent, pragmatic logic over the whole Defense Establishment. Backed by a small group of civilian aids, he has forced the pace relentlessly in matters of personnel, procedure, weapons systems, and general strategic doctrine. To some he has become the hero of the new administration. "For the first time," a Pentagon civilian claims, "we have a Secretary who takes questions of national defense as a personal responsibility."

Inevitably, however, the Secretary has penetrated deep into fields once reserved for the military. He has barked shins throughout the country's polity and economy. A stream of complaints has flowed from the Armed Services and their friends and clients. CARL VINSON, the powerful chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has semipublicly warned the Secretary against abridging the independence of the Services and their Secretaries. Virtually the whole press has joined in criticizing McNamara for what the Washington Post has called "The Closed Door Policy of the Defense Department." Blue suits and brown alike have charged that, as the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal put it, "the professional military leadership of the Nation is being short circuited in the current decisionmaking process at the Pentagon." "A Japanese general who got a query like this," one officer has said of one of the Secretary's brisker memos, "would commit suicide."

So far no concerted attack has been mounted on McNamara, and it cannot even be said that a general issue has been squarely joined. He has not lost a major decision, and in the skirmishing he is ahead on points. But in this kind of fight the purpose of the opposition is like the purpose of the opposition to French Premiers in the days before De Gaulle. The aim is not to score a knockout. It is to create a sense of frustration and weakness that ultimately makes compromise and concession inevitable.

KNOWING THE ALTERNATIVES

In February, March, and April of 1924, the magazine Management and Administration carried a series of articles written by Donaldson Brown a Du Pont and General Motors executive, and entitled "Pricing Policy in

Relation to Financial Control." They told the story of how central management, that is to say, Du Pont, had established a tight rein over the farflung General Motors divisions. They taught the lesson that in the management of huge and complex organizations the traditional reliance on experience and intuition was not sufficient. Additionally, there had to be deliberate analysis of all functions; formulation of alternate ways of doing the same thing; and an explicit choice made among the alternatives—if possible, on the basis of numerical data. Management control, Brown wrote, involves "a manifestation of the principles on which any measure or course of action is based, having regard to both the ends aimed at and the measures used to arrive at them."

Though the articles attracted little public attention, they stirred enduring interest among professional students of administration—notably at the Harvard Business School. There in the late 1930's, the articles became known to a bright young Californian who came to learn and stayed to teach. He was Robert Strange McNamara.

Ever since then, McNamara has been weighing, testing, refining, and applying the doctrine of management control. He has been a company man par excellence, repeatedly coming in from the wings to establish the authority of central management over widely dispersed operations. As an officer in World War II, he helped establish a system of Statistical Control that made it easier for the Air Force to keep track of procurement activities spread out in thousands of plants across the country. As a junior executive, before becoming comptroller and then in 1960 president, he helped the Ford Motor Co. develop a cost-accounting system that coordinated production, purchasing, and investment with sales.

The emphasis on management control sets McNamara apart from the other successful men of business (the bankers, Robert Lovett and James Forrestal; the corporation lawyers, Thomas Gates and Louis Johnson; the industrialists, Charles Wilson and Neil McElroy) who have preceded him as Defense Secretary. It is the guideline of his career, and he has made it the ruling principle at the Pentagon. As he puts it:

"I see my position here as being that of a leader, not a judge. I'm here to originate and stimulate new ideas and programs, not just to referee arguments and harmonize interests. Using deliberate analysis to force alternative programs to the surface, and then making explicit choices among them is fundamental."

As a walking advertisement for active management, McNamara knows few peers. Youthful (44) and vigorous (a skier and mountain climber), he works from 7 to 7, 6 days a week, and generally puts in a few hours on Sunday. Speed is a special forte; his rule is to make his own decisions within 7 days, and he has jolted Pentagon staffs with requests for answers within days on complex issues (the future of the aircraft carrier, for example) that they have been arguing about for years. A bug for figures, he once asked a group trying to analyze the specially messy problem of limited war to put tabular boxes in their report even if they couldn't come up with the numbers to fill them: "That way we'll know what we're looking for and can't find." His search for alternatives, in particular, is systematic. "In the old days," a Pentagon scientific adviser recalls, "we'd sometimes have a recommendation kicked back with a request for alternatives. McNamara won't even look at a thing unless the alternatives are there."

In matters of decision, the Secretary is mindful of the value of hedging and of what he calls putting the decision "ahead of me." "He always wants to know," one assistant says, "what the penalty is for failure." He was barely in office when he decided that he would put off for at least a year a decision on unifying the services. At about the same time he explicitly concluded that until he got more experience, he would defer on matters of foreign policy to Dean Rusk and the State Department.

As a nay-sayer, the Secretary can be formidable. Despite pressure from the President, he rejected two political suggestions for appointment: Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as Secretary of the Navy; and Joseph Keenan of the AFL–CIO as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower. Despite great administration emphasis on the need to be able to fight limited wars, despite enormous pressure from the Army for more men, despite a green light from the White House and the Congress on appropriations, the Secretary is still not convinced that the appropriate way to use limited-war strength has been found, and he has recommended only slight increases in the forces—and those chiefly in the Marines.

On the yea-saying end of the decision business, he is hardly an enthusiast. But he walks fast toward meetings about a fighter plane that can be used for all three services. A glint comes into his eye when he speaks of an Army plan for speeding up the readiness of Reserve units. Nothing, moreover, seems to dull his interest. "I never seem to be put off by technical problems of law, or finance, or engineering," he once confided to an associate. "He doesn't know much about painting or literature," one of the few Washington hostesses who has been able to bag the Secretary asserts. "But he really cares. He bounces into the room, and you have the impression he wants to talk to everyone about everything."

By good luck or wise choice (McNamara unabashedly claims the latter and shows a thick personnel card file to back the claim), the Secretary has surrounding himself with persons who—while coming from different backgrounds and having different interests—share his immediate purpose. Of particular help have been the various public and private groups which have been bending their backs over defense problems outside the Pentagon. They offered a reservoir of experienced men who in the nature of their jobs had been searching for alternatives to the traditional ways of the Defense Department and the services. From the group that prepared the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report on defense, McNamara chose his Deputy Secretary, the lawyer Roswell Gilpatric. From the Livermore Laboratory he took his Director of Research and Engineering, the physicist Harold Brown. From the Rand Corp. he took his Comptroller, the economist Charles Hitch. From the Johns Hopkins Foreign Policy Research Center he took his Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, the banker and former Government official Paul Nitze. From the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee he took his General Counsel, the lawyer Cyrus Vance.

Though some components, notably Nitze's ISA staff—which follows some State Department procedures—have fitted awkwardly, common purpose has worn away individual bias to an astonishing degree. As a former Assistant and Under Secretary, Mr. Gilpatric, for example, had been known as an Air Force man. But despite Air Force reservations, he has been one of the sturdy proponents of the tri-service fighter plane. In testimony to a congressional committee last March he could have been McNamara himself: "We don't believe that important decisions * * * can be deferred pending attempts to work out a modus vivendi which will be satisfactory to everybody."

McNamara and his band were hardly in place before they began busting open problems for decision. As a first step, the Secretary named task forces, headed by members of his civilian staff and including important service representation, to study four problems that covered the whole range of Pentagon responsibilities: nuclear war; limited war; research and development; installations and logistics. The task force reports, among other things, identified major subproblems within each area. To tackle these, the Secretary has sent out over a hundred major requests for information and recommendations. The inquiry about the uses of the aircraft carrier is a typical example. Another asked for comments on a plan to merge the Army's Strategic Army Corps with the Air Force's Tactical Air Command in a single limited-war unit. Still a third, of more grandiose proportions, called for "a draft memorandum revising the basic national-security policies and assumptions including the assumptions relating to 'counterforce strikes' (nuclear attack on an enemy's military forces) and the initiation of the use of tactical atomic weapons."

THE PRIME REQUISITE

On the basis of the replies, McNamara has been making decisions at a pace unknown in the peacetime annals of the Pentagon. A whole range of actions flowed from the finding of the nuclear war study that the prime requisite was protection of America's deterrent power against a surprise Soviet attack. In keeping with that emphasis, the Secretary recommended to the Congress: a 50-percent increase, to be achieved by 1964, in the Polaris submarine force—which can be dispersed and concealed in the seas; a 100-percent increase, to be achieved by 1968, in the production capacity for Minuteman missiles—which can be protected and, to some extent, hidden underground; a 50-percent increase in the number of bombers which can be got off the ground on 15 minutes' notice; a $50 million increase in the Skybolt missiles to be fired from attacking bombers; a $60 million increase in the Midas warning system. Because of the step-up in Polaris and Minuteman strength, he canceled out orders for two squadrons of a larger and more costly long-range missile, the Titan II, scratching that rather than the more vulnerable Atlas, because the latter was much further along in production and would fill the gap until the Polaris and Minuteman are ready.

Limited-war studies are still in the works. One version, several inches thick, was boiled down by the Secretary himself to a list of questions only three-quarters of a page long. Even so, the exercise has already indicated that the problem lies less in the number of troops available, than in getting them to the right place at the right time. To this end the Secretary has already recommended a 75-percent increase in the airlift capacity of the Military Air Transport Service; an increase of 15,000 men in the Marine Corps and 5,000 in the Army; and a reshaping of the Reserve organization designed to make available two Reserve divisions on 3 weeks' notice.

The research and development report spotlighted several major programs that were either in duplication with other projects or proceeding so slowly as to be of dubious worth when completed. The Secretary canceled entirely the expensive program for a nuclear-powered aircraft. In the expectation of developing a triservice fighter, he also canceled out, at an immediate saving of $58 million, a program for a new Navy fighter—the Eagle-Missileer. In what may be his most controversial decision, he hedged on the B–70 long-range, supersonic bomber. He maintained the project at the development stage, thus keeping open the option for eventual production. But he held off on advance toward the production stage on the ground that production costs would run into the billions while even at the earliest production date, missiles might make the plane obsolescent.

The logistics and installations report uncovered 73 installations (52 in this country,

21 abroad) that were surplus to the needs of the Defense Establishment. The Secretary has ordered them closed down. He has also set up, for the first time in the Pentagon, an Office of Economic Adjustment, to ease the impact of the closings on the hard-hit communities and, if possible, to find constructive uses for the abandoned facilities.

A QUICK FIX

In addition to these operational decisions, the Secretary has been working out important procedural changes with General Counsel Vance and Comptroller Hitch. Under Vance, there has been set up an Office of Organization and Management Planning. It has a general mission to hunt out organizational changes apt to improve efficiency. For example, it is looking at the idea of placing each major weapon system under a single project boss—the method followed by the Navy in developing the Polaris. It is also considering the possibility of consolidating functions that all three services perform independently—intelligence, for example.

Hitch has been given the green light for two proposals outlined in his much discussed book, "The Economics of Defense in the Nuclear Age." He is putting into effect within the Department the so-called performance budget. Gone are the days of only considering service estimates piecemeal in terms of personnel, procurement, construction, etc. Now the requests are also grouped into major categories that relate to military purposes, or what Hitch calls end-product missions. Thus there is one major category for the nuclear deterrent, followed by a listing of all the different elements, and their costs, that contribute to the deterrent strength. Hitch argues that officials can make more perceptive judgments about the importance to the Nation of these missions than they can make about such items as personnel which could be used for anything.

He has also established a programing office that, among other things, should end the old practice of fitting defense estimates to arbitrary budget ceilings. In the past, the military would make plans—involving billions of dollars spent over many years—without reference to the money that was available. To hold them in bounds, previous administrations established dollar ceilings, and ordered the military to cut their requests accordingly. The result was stretch-out, cutback, and the punishing annual clash between military men and budgeteers that was so prominent a feature of the Eisenhower years.

Through the programing office, Hitch plans to associate budgeteers with the military men early in the planning phase. A rough price tag will be put on all projects, not only for 1 year, but for the lifetime of the project and including development, production, and operating expenses. In that way the military planners will be obliged to consider the financial implications of what they do at all times. "We want," Hitch puts it, "to introduce cost considerations at the right time—when the decisions are first made * * * and not later in the cycle during the hectic stages of some annual budget review."

In looking back over what has been done, the Secretary emphasizes that it is only a first installment—"a quick fix," in Pentagon argot. He also acknowledges that "the changes are not minor." On that there is no argument. Only something major could have called forth, as the McNamara program has, the Defense Establishment's immense, multiform, deep, and abiding capacity to resist.

FRIENDS OF STANDPAT

Three days before he left the White House, President Eisenhower issued a portentous warning to the Nation. His farewell address spoke of the "conjunction of an immense Military Establishment and a large arms industry." It said:

"The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State House, every office of the Federal Government. * * * We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex."

Numerical evidence for that argument is impressive. The armed services, at the heart of the complex, include 2.5 million uniformed personnel. More than a million civilians work directly for the Defense Department. Between 3 and 4 million people support their families on earnings from defense contractors. Half the national budget and about a twelfth of the gross national product go into defense expenditures. A hundred of the Nation's biggest and most powerful companies, many of them entirely dependent upon defense business, do more than $15 billion worth of annual business with the Defense Department. Dozens of major communities depend on defense business and installations for taxes, local commerce, real-estate values, and employment and union activities. In Los Angeles, for example, more than half the jobs come, directly or indirectly, from defense business.

It is dubious—highly dubious—whether the complex as a whole has the cohesion or singleness of purpose to enforce its will on the Nation in any major issue. A strong case can be made that the pluralism of the system—the separateness of the armed services, the spread of defense business and installations—is an almost absolute surety against undue influence of a positive kind. But the whole complex shares, and feels intimately, the experience of life in an age of rapidly changing technology. Each of the constituent elements—and that includes the flyers of the B–70 as much as its makers; the Corps of Engineers as much as the PX manager; the battleship admirals as much as the shipyard workers—lives in the shadow of obsolescence. They are constantly on guard against changes that, rightly or wrongly, they consider a threat. Potentially, they are all Luddites.

The professional military men, moreover, are conspicuous for dedication to the service of the Nation. They are familiar with the country's military posture, and with the deadly menace of potential enemies. They believe strongly and sincerely in what they are doing, and in what their units and services are doing. To fight for these is, to them, a matter of simple, patriotic duty. And they possess, apart from the foot-dragging powers native to all bureaucracies, enormous resources in the press, the Congress, and the general area of public debate.

The press is important because it provides a way for the military to vent their views without the risk of public identification and counterargument entailed in congressional testimony. A large segment of the press—the professional military journals and the trade magazines catering to defense industry—starts off with a friendly bias. More general newspapers tend to line up with the military because the leaks staff officers can supply are usually more intriguing (to reporters, editors, and readers alike) than the official handouts of the Defense Department. A clampdown on leaks, moreover, is especially perilous. It bands the reporters and the military together in embattled defense of the freedom of information—a subject as dear to the press as theoretical argument is to Talmudic scholars, and often with about the same relevance to reality.

The Congress, of course, is heavy with Members who are quite properly concerned to look after the interests of their constituents. Thousands of people in the Fort Worth area represented by Congressman JAMES WRIGHT, of Texas, work in the Convair plant that produces the B–58. If he wants to be re-elected it is a good thing for Mr. WRIGHT to be known—as he is—as the "Congressman from Convair." The North American plants which produce the B–70 affect the whole Los Angeles area. Representatives EDGAR HIESTAND and CLYDE DOYLE from California are not exactly skeptical about the B–70. The electrical workers' union in Brooklyn is concerned lest members be thrown out of work by the closing of the Navy yard there. So, unsurprisingly, is Representative EMANUEL CELLER. The Griffis Air Base and Army Arsenal in Rome, N.Y., are important sources of jobs in a depressed area. SAM STRATTON, the Congressman from that district, is one of the most intelligent young men in the Congress. But he is at a little less than his best when it comes to authorizing Titan missiles that might swell the work force at Griffis. And so it goes, up and down the length and breadth of the country.

In addition, there are the private ties of Congressmen and Senators with one or another of the services. Two score legislators hold reserve commissions—six of them as generals—while hundreds served in wartime. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a veteran of Peleliu and Okinawa gets misty-eyed when the Marines come into question. Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania is pushing the comedy of understatement to extremes when he says: "I have been a Navy man so I may be a little prejudiced." When he is not asking that Polaris submarines be named after vessels in the Confederate navy, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, a brigadier in the Army Reserve, can be found fighting the Army's legislative battles—notably on behalf of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

Even more important are the vested interests of senior legislators holding strategic committee posts. Mr. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, was elected to the House in 1914. He has been chairman of the committee since its inception back in 1947—and of the House Naval Affairs Committee for 15 years before that. He knows the inside and outside of military budgeteering as few men. But he also has a host of friends in the services. His post affords him immense patronage. It is not an accident that Georgia is so heavily laden with bases that, as an Air Force officer once put it, "one more would sink the State."[1] Neither is it an accident that no one has ever accused Mr. VINSON of being a wild-eyed advocate of change. He likes things pretty much as they are.

What lends special force to the standpatters is that they have available for use a collection of talking points, half truths, empty generalities, and red herrings that would fill any arsenal in the country. The so-called great debates of the past have not turned on square, or even soluble issues. On the contrary they have raised such questions as security versus freedom of the press; military discipline versus the right of the Congress to know; Civilian versus military authority; military versus budgetary needs. These are precisely the kind of questions that effective, free societies have traditionally declined to settle—for the very good reason that they cannot be finally settled. The predictable result of such general debates as the admirals' revolt of 1949 is all that their promoters could wish for: a heating up of tempers, ending in a confirmation of things as they were. The great debate on matters of principle, in short, is the ulti-

[1] Georgia has eight airbases, five Army forts, including the huge infantry camp of Fort Benning, and six other installations.

mate weapon of those who would stand pat with the old system.

A WHIFF OF THE GRAPESHOT

The McNamara program, of course, poses a severe challenge to the old system. By its explicit choices on weapons systems and on bases, it runs athwart a wide variety of constituency, contractors, and service interests. In the congressional hearings, the expected resistance came from the expected source. Senator THURMOND, with encouragement from Army spokesmen, proposed a larger appropriation for the Nike-Zeus system. Congressman STRATTON, arguing that the Titan was an "invulnerable missile," moved for "an increase of $25 million to provide for the restoration of the two Titan II missile squadrons that were dropped out by the Department." Congressman WRIGHT, in a special appearance as a witness before the House Armed Services Committee pressed for two more wings of the B–58—"the best bomber we have." On the nuclear plane, one of its prime congressional advocates served up to Gen. Thomas White, Chief of Air Staff, a soft ball, obviously meant to be batted out of the park. This was the exchange:

"Question. In other words, General, you don't think of a nuclear powered plane as a gimmick?

"Answer. No, sir."

Still all matters of weapon choice posed square issues, and Secretary McNamara could argue to the facts. The great body of the Congress was obviously impressed by his presentations. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, veteran chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, told the Secretary:

"I have been listening to statements from officials of the Department of Defense now for almost 30 years * * * and I have never heard one that was clearer, more definitive, and yet more comprehensive than the statement that you have given to this committee."

In committee, the Secretary won every trick but one. The Congress was not convinced by his arguments that by 1970 it would be safe to rely entirely on missile strength, and it has voted $500 million more than the Secretary sought for B–52 bombers. Even that loss can be erased. The administration can, and probably will, refuse to use the money.

What the Secretary does, however, has not been put into question nearly so much as the way he does it. In particular, though the military personnel cannot voice the feeling openly, it is clear that they resent the intrusion of the Secretary and his staff deep into the field of military plans. One general, speaking with obvious sarcasm, told a House committee:

"We read every day about how fortunate we are to have the civilian competency which is being brought into the Government, and as a simple military man I accept these profound decisions as being made in great wisdom."

In similar vein another general declared he was speaking from the "relatively limited point of view of * * * an aviator of more than 35 years' service in flying." The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, obviously sniping at the academic background of McNamara's staff, has run a fable demonstrating what would happen if a general took over a university and began meddling in the curriculum. According to one very well-informed Pentagon correspondent, Lloyd Norman of Newsweek, the brass has been meeting outside the building to keep clear of the civilian leadership. "I wish," one philosophic general, speaking privately of bygone civilian bosses, candidly acknowledges, "we had those dumb bastards back again."

Such feelings provide the stuff of great debates, and preliminary maneuvers have already given Secretary McNamara more than a whiff of the grapeshot. Two cases in point are the affair of the Rusk memo and the affair of the Lemnizter protest.

The affair of the Rusk memo began on February 15, when Secretary of State Rusk sent to Secretary McNamara a memo setting out general foreign-policy requirements for American military power. Among other things, he reiterated the need to have a strong nuclear force available for deterrent purposes, notably in Europe. Some circles of the Air Force, however, sensed in the administration emphasis on limited warfare a trend that might have the effect of favoring the Army and clipping Air Force wings. In the Rusk memo they saw a chance to publicize these fears, and win for their position the backing of the European allies. On February 27, a leaked but badly distorted version of the Rusk memo appeared in the Washington Star. Among other things, it implied that Secretary Rusk favored abandonment of the nuclear deterrent in Europe. The European allies immediately questioned the State Department which denied the story, saying it exemplified "an irresponsible and reckless attitude." Secretary McNamara instituted an investigation of the leak.

A great mass of circumstantial evidence—though not clear proof—pointed to an Air Force officer. He was relieved of his Pentagon duties and posted to the field. "The military," as the London Economist put it, "reacted with an old tactic—overzealousness in carrying out orders." Even on innocuous stories, news sources all over the Pentagon began clamming up. The press immediately went to work on Secretary McNamara. Stories critical of his information policies appeared on the wire services and all the major dailies. An Associated Press story of May 13, for example, acknowledged the need to stop security leaks, and then hauled out one of the press' oldest and most sophistical generalizations:

"There are many people who insist that not enough information has been published. This argument goes that if the American public had been informed of the Nation's true military posture we would not now be short of airlift and sealift, missiles and manpower."

A grudging truce was called only when Secretary McNamara, at a press conference on May 26, issued a statement of information policy. This was how the New York Herald Tribune reported the event:

"Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara shows signs of coming out of his cocoon * * *. After nearly 4 months of isolation and silence, the emerging chrysalis displayed itself at a press conference yesterday."

At the same time there occurred, or, more accurately, there was dragged out, the Lemnitzer affair. It turned on a decision by the Secretary to vest primary responsibility for research and development in space with the Air Force. The directive was an extension of a previous order giving the Air Force responsibility for space boosters. It was worked up by a study group under General Counsel Vance, which included three uniformed representatives of the services, and which consulted extensively over a period of 17 days with service and technical personnel in the Pentagon. A draft was sent to Secretary McNamara on February 23. Next day he sent it out for comment by March 2 to the service secretaries and chiefs, and to Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. On the basis of the comments, notably General Lemnitzer's, the Secretary revised the directive, to assure that the Army and Navy would keep the space projects presently in the works, and that they would have the right to a hearing on any future space projects they felt fitted specially into their bailiwick. On March 8, the directive was issued.

Four days later, on the basis of what was apparently a Navy leak, the Chicago Sun-Times carried an account of General Lemnitzer's comments on the draft directive. It indicated correctly that he had voiced misgivings about the content of the draft and about having to comment so swiftly, and that he had indicated a preference for consultation of the Joint Chiefs as a body, rather than individually by service. But it did not indicate that his comments pertained to the draft, and that some had been acted upon in the final directive. On the contrary, the story gave the impression that the comments applied to the directive, and that General Lemnitzer was questioning the authority of the Secretary. The lead of the story said:

"The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has protested officially that the Nation's leading military men are being edged out of crucial military decisions in the Kennedy administration."

The Defense Department immediately issued a corrective on the story. But the stir attracted the attention of OVERTON BROOKS, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, who is worried and rightly, that the Air Force may gobble up the civilian space agency. Mr. BROOKS called hearings.

That the directive in itself harbored no threat to the civilian space agency was speedily made clear. For the rest, the 5 days of hearings were a forum of discontent. The service secretaries were brought under pressure to show that they were doing their stuff for their respective services. This, for example, was one of the exchanges with Navy Secretary John Connally:

"Question. Am I correct in assuming the Navy resisted this directive?

"Answer. I would not use the word 'resist'; but we resisted it."

One uniformed research chief had a chance to state the claim that, without space, the scientific talent in his service would atrophy on the vine. The committee chairman noted "the difficulty in obtaining the attendance at these hearings * * * of the Secretary of Defense," as well as "a certain foot-dragging in making available the military witnesses. * * *" Besides finding an entree for congressional wit ("You should change the name of the Air Force because there is no air in space"), Congressman JAMES FULTON opened up a fetching blind alley of infinite length. "You must define to me where space begins," he told Deputy Secretary Gilpatric. "Where does it begin?"

Only with the appearance of General Lemnitzer did the cackling cease—and then speedily. He could not ask, he said, for "better working relationships" with his civilian superiors in the Department: "I am constantly consulted. I see them on a daily basis and many times a day on some occasions."

The issue of the directive, he settled in two words. This was the exchange:

"Question. Then I understand from what you say that you are supporting the directive?

"Answer. I am."

UNDULY SURPRISED?

On balance it is clear that the Secretary has come off reasonably well. He has gained a good grasp of his subject. He has demonstrated a rare strength in dealing with the military. He has emerged virtually unscathed from direct challenges to specific recommendations. On the larger political issues, he has at least held his own.

At the same time, important weaknesses are apparent. McNamara has been slow to consult congressional leaders before, rather than after decisions are made known. He has been unduly surprised by the political storms kicked up by issues barren of real content. In dealing with the press, he has not learned how to Hagertyize: the technique of pouring out a flood of innocuous information to the dual end of first keeping re-

porters busy and next rendering them grateful to the source of such abundant news. An artless belief in the powers of persuasion seems to affect at least some of his staff. "If I know more than anybody else," one aid has said, "then I'll be able to impose my views."

All these problems may seem minor. But while they remain unmastered, the Secretary will be vulnerable. For the story of McNamara and his enemies is only beginning.

Administration Elects To Sanction Increased Discounts on FHA Mortgages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 15, 1961 I inserted in the RECORD a story from the Wall Street Journal captioned "Restoring of Rate Ceiling on FHA-Insured Mortgages to 5½ Percent Considered by Kennedy." Today under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I would like to insert in the RECORD two additional articles further treating with this problem. One is from the Wall Street Journal of September 20, 1961 and the other from the Washington Post of September 21, 1961.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 20, 1961]

FHA CHIEF SAYS AGENCY HAS NO PLANS TO BOOST MORTGAGE RATE CEILING

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration moved to kill speculation that it might soon raise the maximum 5¼-percent interest rate on home mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

Federal Housing Administrator Hardy called a press conference to announce the agency has no present plans to change the ceiling. After a meeting of top housing, Treasury and Budget Bureau officials yesterday, Mr. Hardy said the current situation in the money market as a whole offers "no basis to either raise or lower the rate."

Last week, top administration officials were reported to be considering whether they might not have to restore the maximum rate to 5½ percent. Although Mr. Hardy described yesterday's meeting as "part of a continual review of housing credit policies," he conceded that the result of the meeting was being made public promptly to erase speculation that a higher rate was in the offing.

The FHA interest ceiling was cut in February to 5½ percent from 5¾ percent, and was cut to 5¼ percent in May. Administration officials privately have been conceding that the second reduction was not being accepted by the private mortgage market. They have been worried about relatively large discounts being demanded on the new 5¼ percent mortgages in the resale market. A discount permits an investor to acquire a mortgage for less than face value. Because he is entitled to be repaid the full amount, his actual yield is thus increased above the stated interest rate.

Mr. Hardy insisted yesterday that there were "good indications" that the market would accept the 5¼-percent rate. He maintained the discount has been "pretty stable" since May. And of total housing starts in August, he said, 20.5 percent were covered by FHA-insured mortgages, up from 17.7 percent in July.

The discount's "stability" since the May reduction in the interest ceiling is one of the things that has bothered administration experts. After the February reduction to 5½ percent, prices on the secondary or resale mortgage market rebounded to their pre-February level in less than 4 months. But since the late May reduction to 5¼ percent, prices have remained low. The national average for a 25-year mortgage on September 1 was $96.50 per $100, compared with $98.10 on June 1. The absence of a rebound suggested to administration authorities that the mortgage market was not responding to the second reduction.

Asked when there might be another "review" of the interest rate situation, Mr. Hardy said the meetings were not held at any regular intervals.

When administration experts earlier indicated privately that the interest rate was under review, they freely admitted that a decision to raise the rate would be a very difficult one. A return to the 5½-percent rate would amount to an admission that the administration had pushed lenders farther than they were willing to go. Moreover, administration officials worry that a return to the higher FHA rate might be wrongly interpreted by business as a sign the Government was about to adopt a general "tight money" policy, and that this interpretation might hurt business activity.

But they also were—and remain—concerned that the whole FHA program might be badly damaged if its maximum rate remains low while the rate on other home mortgages and long-term securities rises. This would indicate the administration decision to keep the 5¼-percent rate would have to be reviewed again if those other rates rise.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1961]

FHA TO HOLD RATE AT PRESENT LEVEL

The Kennedy administration has announced it will keep the maximum interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages at 5¼ percent, at least for the present.

Commissioner Neal J. Hardy of the Federal Housing Administration called in newsmen to announce the decision, reached earlier at a conference of housing officials and representatives of the Treasury, Budget Bureau, and Council of Economic Advisers.

Hardy acted to quiet speculation that the maximum rate might be increased because of a recent stiffening in long-term interest charges.

Hardy said that in view of the recent softening in short-term rates and the absence of any upward pressure on rates generally, the officials saw no reason to adjust the FHA rate.

When the administration took office last January, the FHA rate stood at 5¾ percent. It was dropped in two steps, in February and May, to stimulate home building and spur the economic recovery.

Hardy noted that the Commerce Department reported that private housing starts dropped 2 percent in August to an annual rate of about 1.3 million units. He said he expects the total for the year to be just under 1.3 million—an increase of 3 percent over 1960 results.

Earlier in the year, Hardy had forecast a 3 to 5 percent rise in housing starts in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the administration is caught on the horns of a dilemma of its own making. If it is to claim credit for administratively reducing the FHA mortgage interest rate to 5¼ percent, then it must also accept the responsibility for the resulting increase in discounts on FHA mortgages. The facts are, according to FHA itself, the national average price on a 25-year FHA insured 5½ percent mortgage on June 1, 1961, was $98.10 per $100 of value. On September 1, 1961, the national average price for a 25-year FHA insured 5¼ percent mortgage was $96.50. The increased discount, namely to 3½ points, roughly approximates the value of the one-fourth of 1 percent reduction in mortgage rate. It is for this reason that I make the charge that this administration has elected to sanction increased discounts on FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the administration will get itself off the horns of the dilemma upon which it is impaled. A general easing in interest rates of course would solve the problem. I hardly find solace in the "softening of short-term rates" referred to by the Commissioner in one of the articles above quoted. That is indeed grasping at a miniscule straw. The facts are that at the auction of 91-day Treasury bills on May 29, 1961, the sale was made at an average interest cost of 2.44 percent which compares with the average interest cost of 2.26 percent for the auction last Monday, September 18, 1961. While this shows a modest reduction in interest cost, this was not the case with respect to 182-day Treasury bills. On May 29, 1961, the auction sale of such bills was made at an average interest cost of 2.59 percent, or slightly lower than the average interest cost of 2.68 percent obtained at the auction sale for such bills on September 18, 1961. More pertinent than the question of what has happened to short-term rates is the question of what has happened to long-term Treasury rates because these are more competitive with long-term mortgage investments. The following tabulation of market offering prices of three representative Treasury long-term issues comparing May and September prices speaks for itself:

	Treasury 4's 1980	Treasury 3¼'s 1985	Treasury 3's 1995
May 26, 1961	102¼	92¼	87¼
Sept. 20, 1961	100⅛	88½	85⅛

Truly the administration is hoisted on its own petard.

Vocation Not Vacation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD the following article from the Peoria Journal Star of September 19, 1961. The story concerns an address by the President of Bradley University, Dr. Talman Van Arsdale, before the all-school convocation:

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY HEAD SAYS SHORTER WORKWEEK "NONSENSE" UNLESS LEISURE "PRODUCES"

A shorter workweek is "nonsense" unless the extra leisure time is spent productive-

ly, President Talman Van Arsdale of Bradley University told students today at an all-school convocation in the fieldhouse.

"Shorten the hours of work, shorten the workweek, shorten the years until retirement—this is nonsense," he said. "One's life will not be happy because it has become a continuous vacation. It will be happy only if it is a vocation.

"A vocation means to have work to do in the world that appeals to one as having value, as having significance to himself and to his fellow men. It means feeling that one is alive when he is working, happy when he is honestly industrious."

He told students on the second day of fall classes that at one time it was necessary to do unimportant, boring work in order to support a family. This happened when the economy of our Nation was sparse in the days of the pioneers and only a few could choose specialized labors. The multitude were forced by necessity to work in field and factory to earn any kind of living.

"Today, thanks to a wide choice of possible labor, there is a kind of supermarket choice of vocations and positions," Van Arsdale said.

"The great gift of rich Americans economy is not leisure, but freedom. One can earn a living in America today doing what he really wants to do. It follows that if one takes time to be certain of his choice of vocation, not only will his working hours be happier, but so will his pleasures be real and not merely a frantic escape from life."

He urged the students to take time to decide what talents "God has given you" to increase and develop and then apply them with all possible energy.

Van Arsdale said he is deeply impressed with the qualifications and the records of the university's faculty. He also said he is impressed with the quality and spirit of the student body.

He said that the true function of teaching is often erroneously assumed to be the dispensing of knowledge while the real function of teaching is to cause learning to take place which occurs clearly on an individual basis.

Americanism Week Starts Tomorrow—Lead Article Appearing in the Bellflower Herald American Newspaper on Sunday, September 17, 1961, Bellflower (Los Angeles County), Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, the lead article appearing in the important Bellflower Herald American newspaper published in Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif., in the great 23d District which I have the honor and responsibility of representing this my 15th year in this great legislative body.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and all the other Members of this great legislative body will be encouraged and inspired by this weeklong patriotic onslaught against communism being carried on by these distinguished and successful business, professional, and clerical citizens of the important city of Bellflower.

AMERICANISM WEEK STARTS TOMORROW EVE AT SIMMS PARK

More than 40 men and women are members of the steering committee which is responsible for a weeklong patriotic onslaught against communism starting tomorrow night in Bellflower. Programs will start each night at Simms Park at 7:30 p.m. except Saturday evening when the program will be held at Excelsior High Auditorium, 7:30 p.m.

The committee includes: Chairman Rev. Roy Gillaspie, Dr. Gerald Sandarg, Mel German, Gail Eagleton, Dr. Ralph Burnight, Dr. C. M. Brakensiek, Dr. Earle Hoggard, Ed Shaheen, Paul Grosshans, James Christo, Bellflower Mayor Oscar McCracken, City Clerk Mary Lewis, City Administrator Carl Berry.

Ralph Jump, Sam Stokes, Henry Moffett, Coy Cleaver, Lucky Baldwin, Vernon Nelson, Les Orr, Ray Howe, Mark Singleton, Jesse Nixon, Sydney Cooke, Edward Goodin, Reynold Johnson, Bob Rymer, John Ravera, R. Mercer, Blaine Ford, Ken Burkhart, John Rallo, K. Hada, Dr. D. A. Warner, Richard Causey, F. O. Berry, J. T. Stumpf, Kent Urton, Carl Suckla, Leo Williams, and others.

Speaker tomorrow night at Simms Park will be William Teague of Pepperdine College following the film "Operation Abolition." These programs are all free and accord all citizens an opportunity to see what is being done about Communism, says Reverend Gillaspie.

Mayor Oscar McCracken will be master of ceremonies while the Pledge of Allegiance tomorrow night will be led by Dr. Ralph Burnight of Cerritos College.

Invocation will be by Rev. Dallas Roquemore, Church of Jesus Christ; while benediction will be by Rev. Ray Thompson, First Brethren Church.

Prima Donna Alma Pedroza will sing the national anthem Monday evening and each night through Friday.

City Councilman Norm Murray will be master of ceremonies Tuesday when "Communism on the Map" is shown on the film screen. Dr. Tirso Del Junco, schoolmate of Castro, is the speaker. Dr. C. M. Brakensiek, Rev. Daniel Fylstra, Rev. Harold Baker, and others are on the program.

Realtor Ed Shaheen is the speaker Wednesday evening with John Corcoran of the Republican Club as master of ceremonies, Rev. Randolph Hahn, Rev. Phillip Calef, James Christo, and others are featured on the program.

Each night there will be official color guards, flag displays by the American Legion and Boy Scouts, singing and other patriotic ideas, it is stressed.

The Herald American on Thursday will feature the final three programs of Americanism Week.

A Significant Factor in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this month a record number of American children were enrolled in schools throughout the Nation—a majority in public schools but a significant number in parochial institutions.

This month also saw devastating setbacks to the cause of world peace in the Soviet Union's irresponsible resumption of nuclear tests, in the tension-ridden crisis in Berlin, in the perilous state of the United Nations.

If ever it was important to recognize the strength of our resources, it is now. And our most important resource is our youth, now being prepared to meet the most difficult challenge that has yet faced mankind.

A nation is no stronger than the care it devotes to the training of its youth—to the assurance that the traditions and knowledge of a great and complex society are passed on to future generations.

The question of Federal aid to education is a perplexing constitutional issue. The educational crisis has pressed this issue to the forefront. I am confident that the problem will be solved in the American way—with due respect for the rights of all concerned. I hope and pray that bigotry is restrained, that a solution will be based on reason and right, not emotion and prejudice.

No matter how divisive the question of Federal aid may be, it has served a useful purpose. As issue such as this serves to bring into focus the various facets of our American educational system. In the deliberations on the subject, the role of public education has been prominently discussed and properly evaluated. It is important, too, to bring the role of our parochial system into proper perspective.

It is the role of Catholic education and its significant contribution to the development of better citizens and a stronger America that I want to discuss today.

There are 6 million students now being educated in private schools, 5.27 million of whom are being trained in Catholic-affiliated educational institutions. In the New York City area alone, there are 482 Catholic-affiliated primary and secondary schools, enrolling 360,033 students. In New York City, 1 out of every 3 school-age children—between the ages of 6 and 18—is being educated in a Catholic-affiliated school.

In properly evaluating the role of education—both public and parochial—it is important to remember that good citizens are made, not born. Through much of the last century and well into this one, American education—public, Catholic and other nonpublic—faced and met the monumental challenge of helping the children of millions of immigrants along the road to good citizenship.

Today, when there is so much ignorance of and hostility to the American ideal of democracy, citizenship training is perhaps a more vital educational obligation than ever before. America's Catholic educators are fully alert to this responsibility.

The Catholic philosophy of education insists on the moral goodness of the individual citizen as a prior condition to the maintenance of a free society. The pupils attending Catholic schools are kept continually aware of duties toward their country and all fellow citizens.

One of the most important of these civic obligations is the tolerance which encourages national harmony and unity in our pluralistic society.

The flag is found in every classroom of a Catholic school. Each school day begins with the pledge of allegiance. National and State holidays are celebrated; essays and speeches are composed by pupils for patriotic events and competitions; outstanding American statesmen and heroes are revered.

American history receives due weight in the curriculum. Social studies make the pupils more community conscious. Respect for human life and dignity, for civil and property rights, is emphasized in ethics courses. Sociologists have noted the interest Catholic students have in social problems affecting international life, labor-management relations, and racial tensions.

Catholic educators strive to work closely with public-school officials in training students in community responsibility. During American Education Week, Catholic schools encourage visits by public-school pupils, and members of more than 4,000 Catholic civics clubs of America are urged to take an interest in public-school activities. Many Catholic-school administrators belong to State, regional, and national educational organizations, where they meet and exchange ideas with colleagues from public institutions. Catholic-school participation in such activities as the safety patrol, Boy and Girl Scouts, Junior Red Cross, and 4–H clubs is widespread.

An important contribution made by Catholic schools to national education is the diversity they help to provide in education, thus safeguarding the basic freedom of parents to educate their children in schools of their own choosing. Also, as Will Herberg and other qualified non-Catholic observers have noted, the fact that the United States has not one but many school systems has preserved a health element of competition.

Educators are fond of the term "outcomes" to describe the final career placement of their graduates. In a sense, the "outcomes" of many American graduates, as far as citizenship is concerned, is finally determined during time of national crisis. A quarter of the Armed Forces in World War II were Catholic. Shortly before his death in the Pacific, Navy Comdr. John J. Shea, of Boston, wrote his 5-year-old son, Jackie: "Be a good Catholic, and you can't help being a good American."

Civil Defense Plan for the White Oak Shopping Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the problems of mobilizing the Nation to the requirements of an adequate civil defense have proven to be formidable. I am encouraged, however, by the fact that in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland there has been an unusual expression of individual responsibility in this matter. Leonard Rudlin and Leonard S. Blondes have recently brought to my attention the results of a planning and study project of the Civil Defense Committee of the Allied Civic Group of Montgomery County, Md. Because of the practicality, ingenuity, and timeliness of the plan, I am appending it for the benefit of the Members of the Congress.

A civil defense plan for a typical shop ping area of Montgomery County—the White Oak shopping center at White Oak, Md.—has been prepared by an ad hoc panel of nuclear-weapons experts. The panel consisted of C. L. Falvey, J. F. Moulton, Jr., J. Petes, L. Rudlin, chairman, and G. A. Young, all employed at the U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory which neighbors the center.

This plan is unique in two ways. First, a civil defense plan has been developed for a shopping area for the first known time in the county. Second, and most important, is the use of the underground bowling alley at the center for a shelter, coupled with the plan to bring survival items at the time of attack to the shelter.

The findings of the ad hoc panel that the emergency use of the bowling alley is practicable, opens a new means of providing large shelters at no cost. This use of existing facilities to provide acceptable shelters which can be equipped for survival at the time of emergency should be explored on a nationwide scale. It should be noted that the structural characteristics of underground bowling lanes vary. Some alleys may provide better protection than the White Oak Alley—OCDM class D–E—others may provide less protection.

CIVIL DEFENSE PLAN FOR THE WHITE OAK SHOPPING CENTER

Summary: The White Oak shopping center has been studied to determine what civil defense preparations for survival could be made at this typical shopping area. This study reveals:

1. The underground bowling lanes of the center will provide a good fallout shelter area for about 1,500 people.

2. Merchandise necessary for survival can be brought by customers and employees of the center at the time of emergency to the shelter area from the surrounding stores.

3. Only two items, an emergency-power generator and radiological monitoring equipment, are missing. If these could be obtained, the center could be prepared for a civil defense emergency.

SUGGESTED BULLETIN TO BE DISTRIBUTED AND POSTED IN EACH WHITE OAK STORE

1. Warning: The manager will tell you that an attack is coming or you will see a brilliant flash of light or feel a tremendous blast wind go by outside the store.

2. Action: Calmly collect the key items from your store (see below). Urge your customers to join in and help. Calmly proceed to the shelter area. You have 15 to 30 minutes to get to the shelter.

3. Shelter: The shelter area is the White Oak Bowling Lanes. Take all your key items and customers here. Your civil defense committee (of which your store manager is a member) will aid you in the shelter to survive the attack.

4. Key items: These should be listed and assigned to each employee by the store manager.

I. Introduction

1. In case of attack: The merchant has two problems in case of a nuclear weapons attack upon the Washington area. What should he do with his customers? What should he do with himself and his employees?

Much discussion has been made of whether people should evacuate or take shelter in case of attack. If there should be a long warning time—at least several hours or days—of an attack, Montgomery County or District of Columbia officials will direct civil defense actions. They may order evacuation or the seeking of shelters. In this case, White Oak merchants would follow the directives of the local officials. This panel, however, is doubtful that this situation will ever occur.

A far more likely situation is that either no warning or possibly a 15 to 30 minute warning time will be available. This means that little or no time will be available to take any sort of protective measures before an attack.

2. No warning: What measures can be taken after the attack? Can anyone be alive to do anything in these days of bombs having the power of millions of tons of explosives—is a question that is often raised.

The answer is "Yes, maybe." Within a region extending out for several miles from the explosion, probably no one will be alive. In this close-in area a surprised population will be killed by blast and thermal effects produced directly or indirectly by the explosion. Few shelters will be able to protect anyone in the immediate vicinity of a megaton-sized explosion. But beyond this close-in region, people will be able to survive the later effects of the explosion—the fallout of radioactive debris from the explosion—if they get into a fallout shelter and stay there.

This fallout is largely stuff that was not burned by the explosion or dirt that was sucked into the explosion, and it takes time to move from the explosion. This time allows people a few miles away to get into shelters, if shelters are ready and waiting. Explosions over downtown Washington will create fallout that will take from 15 minutes to 30 minutes to reach the center—ample time for people in the center to take shelter. The fallout reaching the White Oak area and falling out over the area will be highly radioactive and will remain so for a long period of time. People will have to remain in the shelter area until area until the fallout hazard is gone. This may be 2 or 3 days—or it may be as long as 2 weeks.

3. Warning: If warning does come before attack, people will have about 15 to 30 minutes to get to a shelter area. An underground shelter area will give some protection against the blast from the explosion, complete protection from the heat from the explosion, and some protection from the fallout that will come 15 to 30 minutes after the explosion is over.

In either case: With or without warning time, the underground shelter offers the best, and perhaps the only, chance of survival through an attack.

II. Survival plan

1. Shelter area for the center: An underground shelter already exists in the center: The White Oak Bowling Lanes (see app. II). The bowling lanes are adequate to provide good shelter for about 1,500 people—3 times more than the total expected average population of the center which has been estimated to be about 400 employees and customers.

The entire population of the center can reach the bowling lanes probably within 4 to 5 minutes. There are, however, few items in the bowling lanes that will be essential for

a large group of people for a time period as long as 2 weeks.

These essential items are (with two exceptions: see sec. III. Recommendations) in the center and only need be brought to the shelter at the time of an emergency by the employees and clerks. Since there will probably always be 15 to 30 minutes (unless a bomb falls in the immediate vicinity) in which to get to the shelter, there will be adequate time to pick up essential merchandise and carry this to the shelter.

2. Essential items for survival: The time for the employees of each store to know and to select the essential items for survival is now—decisions at the time of an attack will probably be poor ones. In the following paragraphs general recommendations for merchandise that is vital for survival are made. Each store should make a detailed list and assign certain employees to bring certain merchandise to the shelter.

After supplies in the shelter have dwindled, the fallout hazard may have decreased enough to permit quick raids on the existing stores for additional vital items. The radiation monitors would be able to advise when raids could be made and what could be safely brought back to the shelter.

(a) Food and liquids: (Giant, Acme, High's, Villa Rosa, primarily): Liquid nourishment would be one of the most critical items. The minimum water required for drinking and food preparation is roughly one-half gallon per person per day. Water obtained from hotwater tanks, toilet tanks, and refrigerator ice could be supplemented by fruit juices, soft drinks, canned vegetables, fruits and soups, all of which could be brought to the shelter in grocery-type carts. Canned meat and fish are also easily stored. Frozen foods spoil when defrosted; these should be avoided. Fruits and vegetables that can be peeled are safe after having been wiped off and peeled. Packages of cereals and dried foods, raisins and chocolates are quick sources of energy. Powdered milk and baby foods would be especially vital. Dietary supplements such as vitamin tablets could be brought to the shelter. Liquid-holding waste cans or pails (plastic or metal) could be brought to the shelter (from Strosnider's, primarily) and filled with water until the water source fails. Subsequently, these could be used for waste and garbage.

(b) Drugs: (Drug Fair, primarily): In addition to the routine drugs (such as aspirin, antihistamines, penicillin) and first-aid supplies, attention should be paid to the special medicines (such as insulin, digitalis) which may be required by only a few people—but required desperately. Certain drugs, such as tranquilizers and barbiturates, will be especially needed to ease the emotional turmoil of many. (The druggist on duty at the Drug Fair will be a vital person in the shelter, especially if no physicians or nurses happen to be in the shelter. Some 5 percent of the people in the shelter may suffer major emotional upsets; another 5 percent may become severely ill and require isolation in one of the anterooms of the bowling lanes.)

(c) Miscellaneous merchandise: (Giant, Strosnider's Hardware, Top-Value, Real Cleaners, and Drug Fair, primarily): Battery-powered portable radios (and extra batteries) are extremely important, and special care should be made to bring these. Paper plates, cups, and napkins; cooking and eating utensils; can and bottle openers, pocket knives, matches, toilet tissue, paper towels, personal sanitary supplies, disposable diapers, cigarettes, and soap would be needed. Also needed are paper bags, newspapers or wrapping paper for wrapping garbage, household chlorine and 5 percent DDT for disease control. Miscellaneous items such as candles, clocks, calendars, and waterproof gloves may also be useful. Blankets, sleeping bags, rubber sheeting and special equipment for the sick must be considered. Flashlights (and batteries) will also be especially important, since the power is likely to fail. Spare sets of outer clothing—such as shirts, pants, socks, shoes, gloves, raincoats—would probably be valuable for raiding parties or for contaminated newcomers to the shelter.

(d) Morale items (nearly all stores): Games, books, and toys will be essential for children. Books, magazines, cards, and games will be welcomed by adults. Bibles and religious articles will be especially significant and appropriate. Haircuts and shaves would lift the morale of the men; haircuts and facials would lift the morale of the ladies. Pads and pencils will be useful.

3. Administration: This study only points out what can be done. To set up an effective plan for action, a civil defense committee for the center should be created. Ideally, it would be composed of the managers of the stores of the center. Through this group, lists of key items for each store could be prepared and coordinated, vital information passed on, and—most important—a nucleus for the shelter administration created. This group need not meet frequently, if at all. But it should exist. The chairman could serve as the chief shelter officer.

Administering the shelter for a time of 2 weeks will require skill. People will have to be fed and nursed; communications with the outside world will have to be maintained; medical problems will have to be solved; emergencies will have to be conquered. For these many problems, the civil defense group of the center will be best prepared.

III. Recommendations for the future

1. Needed items and skills:

(a) Radiological monitoring equipment: Equipment for checking the fallout doses outside the shelter and for checking the doses that people have received is vitally needed. This equipment possibly could be obtained from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM) at no charge and stored in the bowling lanes.

(b) Emergency power generator: Electric power is likely to fail during an attack. Ventilation of the shelter area can be maintained by a diesel or gasoline generator (with fuel). The civil defense group of the center should attempt to have such a generator donated (again possibly from civil defense authorities) and stored in the bowling lanes.

(c) Literature: A small amount of literature, such as first-aid techniques (Red Cross), shelter practices (OCDM), and medical techniques (Armed Forces technical guides) should be obtained and stored in the bowling lanes for emergency reference.

(d) Radiological training: Several people should be encouraged to take the technical courses offered by the Montgomery County Office of Civil Defense on radiological monitoring to insure that at least two such trained people will be available in the shelter.

2. Community shelter: The shelter area has capacity for a much greater number of people (about 1,500) than are likely to be in the center at any one time (about 400). Consideration should be given to inviting families within walking distance of the center to use the shelter. The civil defense committee of the center should discuss this community use of the shelter area with the presidents of the neighboring civic associations (such as Burnt Mills Estates and Gardens, Quaint Acres) and establish a shelter assignment plan.

In case of an attack at night, or some other time when the center would be closed, provisions should be considered to make the bowling lanes available to the neighboring community for shelter. The shelter plan for the center provides the only means for survival for most of the families in the immediate area.

3. Test drill: Consideration should be given to running a test drill of the survival plan, probably during a regularly scheduled alert drill in the county. The stores need not be completely emptied (the larger stores would be unable to conduct the usual closing procedures in a few minutes) and guards could be left in each store. The value of such a drill would be primarily in determining customer and employee reactions at the time of an emergency.

APPENDIX I: THE WHITE OAK SHOPPING CENTER

The center presently consists of 11 stores which are listed below. Built in 1959, the center is located on New Hampshire Avenue (extended) at the intersection of U.S. Route 29 and Maryland Route 196 at White Oak, Md., roughly 10 miles north northeast from the zero mile stone in Washington, D.C. Although thousands of people shop at this center during the course of a week, the total number of people (customers and employees) in the center will probably not exceed 400 people at any one time.

WHITE OAK SHOPPING CENTER MERCHANTS

Real Cleaners, 11201 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Springs, Md., manager, Mr. Lou Turkoff.

White Oak Barber Shop, 11203 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Vincent Heaps.

Villa Rosa Restaurant, 11207 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Louis Gallo.

White Oak Bowling Lanes, 11207 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Herman S. Porton.

Beautyland Hairstylists, 11209 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Balfour Greenblatt.

High's, 11211 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Willard Shipley.

Drug Fair Store, 11215 New Hampshire Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; manager, Mr. Jack Fruth.

Giant Food Store, White Oak, Md., manager; Mr. T. V. Perkins.

Top Value Redemption Store, White Oak, Md., manager; Mr. Philip Shepsle.

Stronsnider's White Oak Hardware, Inc., White Oak, Md., manager; Mr. Ervin F. Strosnider.

Acme Store, White Oak, Md., manager; Mr. George Viverette.

APPENDIX II: THE SHELTER AREA, THE WHITE OAK BOWLING LANES

The White Oak Bowling Lanes are located completely underground in the center following the modern construction view. There are 24 lanes with automatic pin-setting equipment. An area roughly 150 feet wide by 110 feet deep comprises the bowling area. An additional area, some 20 feet deep, provides a snack bar, office and storeroom areas, and toilet facilities in front of the bowling area. The ceiling is about 12 feet high—the entire area being beneath existing stores at the ground level. The ceiling thickness is essentially 3 inches of reinforced concrete.

Two entry ways exist: a formal entrance to the center of the area from the ground level through double glass doors which change direction twice, and an emergency exit on the south side of the area to the ground level behind the stores. Approximately 200 seats are located at the front of the lanes. There are no windows in the space.

Based upon an allotment of 10 to 12 square feet per person, shelter space would be available for 1,500 people. Ventilation is provided, under normal circumstances, by forced circulation utilizing electronic purification. If electricity were available at the time of attack to power the ventilation system—either from the regular electric lines or from a gasoline generator stockpiled today—the area would be suitable for use by about

1,500 people for an extended length of time. If electricity were totalling lacking, the size of the shelter is such that about 400 people (the estimated number of people in the center at any one time) could be comfortably accommodated for an extended time.

A total of eight fire extinguishers are normally stored in the area and would be adequate for small fires in the area.

Although the snack bar maintains a small supply of food in the area, this supply would not be adequate for a large group. Approximately 200 gallons of liquid, including as sources the hot water tank, soft drinks and ice, are on hand in the area.

The toilet facilities for a group as large as 1,500 people would be severely strained. In addition, an electric pump is necessary to pump the sewage up to almost ground level. For both these reasons, pails and cans should be brought to the area.

Rubber compound bowling balls, packed in boxes, are kept on hand in sufficient quantity to be be used at the middle level of the entrance stairway as a radiation shield against stray radiation refracted from the upper level of the entrance at ground level.

A Challenge to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 of this year, Mr. Frederick H. Mueller, former Secretary of Commerce, addressed the Industrial Distributors Conference and sounded a note of alert and action to the business community. Believing that a constant attention to the public effect of private activity is one of the criteria of an enlightened free society, and because the views of so eminent a person as Mr. Mueller command respect wherever stated, under the order previously entered, I submit Mr. Mueller's address:

A CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS

(By Frederick H. Mueller, former Secretary of Commerce)

Today we have completed nearly three-quarters of the year 1961—and look forward to the final quarter with great hopes and anticipation.

This crisis-haunted world is constantly presenting new challenges to American business as well as threats to our security.

Probably the latter is foremost in our mind today—with all the saber rattling of the Soviet regime threatening as it does our very lives.

I do not in any way want to minimize the danger of war but it is not my purpose to discuss the imminence of armed conflict.

All of you are aware of the hazard.

Each of you is capable of evaluating the possibility of war over the Berlin crisis and I cannot add one bit of information not available to you.

I prefer, therefore, to analyze the business hazards and opportunities ahead—to scan the horizon in an economic sense.

Our fathers created in free enterprise the foundation of our economic might—unsurpassed anywhere on earth.

How faithfully are we defending that financial heritage?

How well are we educating the public as to its value?

How effectively are we using private initiative in building a better America and a safer world?

Evidence is everywhere of a world fraught with both peril and bright hope. As an example: The human race required 200,000 years to develop the current global population of approximately 2½ billion.

It will only take 35 years at current expansion rate to reach the second 2½ billion.

Just think of this for a moment.

Persons in this audience will see the world's population actually doubled in their lifetime to four billion people.

Of course, in this total will be potential geniuses who will do wonders—and swarms of future customers—who will stimulate fabulous production and sales.

But staggering obstacles to progress will also be present.

A primary need of underdeveloped countries is capital for agriculture and manufacturing.

The race is between hungry stomachs and disease-stricken bodies on the one hand and the utilization of natural resources and the production of goods and services on the other.

One problem is to find investment funds to close the gap—as well as people with the abilities and know-how to implement such investments.

The birth-boom is one of the most significant facts of modern life—directly and indirectly affecting our own economic security and, even more, our future.

For no nation in modern times can isolate itself from international repercussions.

No civilized man can wash his hands of responsibility to the 20th century.

No businessman is keeping on top of his job today unless he keeps tabs on the world—and from this knowledge supports strong, sound statesmanship.

As you read of current events, or listen to world broadcasts you are ever aware of the fact that trouble abroad, even in remote areas, creates problems at home.

The kettle is boiling over in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia and Indonesia—and the scalding drops spatter on distant America.

And I have not even mentioned Castro's Cuba, and other Latin American countries where unrest if not revolution consistantly menaces our equilibrium.

Reports from the United Nations and the Congo indicate the tense situations engulfing the emerging equatorial state of Africa.

In that vast continent are 150 million newly awakened people—speaking 200 different tongues or dialects—chanting the one word "freedom"—

Freedom from colonial rule—

Freedom from the economic roadblocks of the ages—

Freedom from outside intervention—

Freedom to manage or mismanage their own affairs.

Yes; their success or failure will affect you.

If we ever fail to help our hard-pressed oversea friends in those underdeveloped areas through investment and trade, our desertion might create a vacuum tempting Communist penetration.

The hope we will grow tired and keep aloof is the basis of the latest Kremlin policy.

So Moscow is employing a combination of trade-aid technique—baited with poisoned candy and coupled with internal subversion and bomb-rattling blackmail to frighten or induce new nations into their deadly Red cobweb.

In the immediate postwar years the Communist empire devoured scores of once independent nations with populations of over 800 million. In sharp contrast, free nations granted independence to colonial peoples with populations of the same size—800 million.

Equal masses—one emerging in freedom—the other doomed to slavery.

Will the free stay free?

If they do, Americans will have millions of friends, sharing markets—sharing dreams of good will and lasting peace.

If they don't—if the developing nations are too divided—too weak and too despondent to stay free and independent—they are fertile soil for communism.

Sad indeed would be their plight.

But dangerous beyond words would be our fate should their lands, their resources and their manpower be added to the Soviet giant so it could threaten the world with added terror.

You and I know that we have many business headaches today.

But no current domestic problem could approach the magnitude of the cost to business and the difficulties in financing a fortress America with only a few surviving allies should communism break the levees and flood the world.

All the bright plans for the future designed in the Nation's 4½ million independent enterprises could be swept away by the ruin and agony of a nuclear attack.

It is in a setting of this kind of a hazardous world that the business community must operate—and cooperate.

The prospect certainly presents a supreme challenge to the ability and character of businessmen.

Let us take stock of some of our assets to meet this challenge.

Rather than discuss fiscal matters or cite business statistics and indications on the economic state of the Union, I am purposefully passing over to subjects less familiar to some businessmen—yet they embrace new factors of immense power in our economy.

Let's examine briefly the current vital role of science and technology and their impact on our livelihood and on our very lives.

We do confront a decade of record danger—but we do have in science a mighty new instrument to cope with peril—to stimulate economic growth and to create blessings beyond measure.

The swift progress of science is perhaps history's most explosive revolution.

If you and I were to set down the names of all the scientists since recorded history—Galileo, Newton, Einstein, Bush, Lawrence, Teller—we would discover that 90 percent of history's entire roster of scientists are alive and working today.

That fact gives some idea of how modern the age of science really is.

In less than a quarter of a century the number of companies engaged in industrial research has jumped eightfold.

In fact, many of today's research companies did not even exist 10 or 15 years ago.

Since 1940, stimulated by defense needs, the sums spent for research by Government, industry, foundations, colleges, and universities has multiplied 15 times.

Perhaps the most far-reaching change in modern private industry since the development of steam, electricity and petroleum is the application of the science of electronics.

Today the electronics industry is our fifth largest industry—it could become the first in size in the next 10 to 15 years.

It is already revolutionizing industry by presenting the advance guard of the completely automated factory—automatic office and earth controlled space vehicles for communications and weather forecasting.

Electronic devices, maintained by a limited number of skilled operators, release forces that automatically guide machines to perform all kinds of functions—even their own automatic quality control.

We really are living in a Buck Rogers world, one in which the wildest dreams of yesterday in the realm of science fiction become actualities today.

I could go on and on describing at least to the best of my ability some of the marvels of present-day technology.

I could talk about cryogenics, the study of the properties of matter under extreme cold.

I could mention how computers have been taught to recognize and digest pictorial information and patterns.

Electronic brain translators are actually in operation.

I have observed such translation from Russian into English.

Other electronic marvels are constantly being developed and I know are bewildering in their complexity.

But dream world wonders will be as familiar to you and your children in a few years—or sooner—as the automobile and television are today.

Then, productivity will soar to unbelievable heights.

Skilled workers will earn more money with less drudgery and boredom than now.

Increased leisure will spur new recreation, travel, construction and self-improvement.

And new products, as is always the case, will stimulate new byproducts and services and create new jobs.

Science is changing the economic face of America.

But science, itself, would be only a laboratory dream or a printed patent if the private enterprise system did not provide the means for research, investment, production, distribution and customer purchasing power.

No scientist could get very far without the businessman, and without the investment necessary to translate his discoveries into actualities.

The U.S. Government, it is true, has invested tremendous sums of money in utilizing science for the development of economic and military power.

But let me emphasize—the point to recognize and remember is that Government is only an instrument that fosters and promotes science.

THE ACTUAL GENERATOR IS THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Private brains and brawn earn the money for all Government and private research and development which channel inventors' dreams into the contents of factory packages and retail goods.

The public, in using these innovations, develop increasing income which, when plowed back into purchases and investments, keeps expanding the chain reaction of discovery, production and consumption.

And let's not forget that Government is not only "we the people," but derives its wherewithal to promote science and technology from taxes that we all pay.

Such are the limitless possibilities for building a better America through vigorous free enterprise.

But that system can be placed in grave jeopardy by unsound public policies and Government programs.

Of course, it is unnecessary to explain the importance of private enterprise to businessmen.

But I firmly believe it is vital to the health and survival of private enterprise for businessmen to do more to explain it to the general public.

The need for more widespread understanding of economic fundamentals is great.

The lack of such knowledge could prove detrimental to economic stability and growth.

Sometimes people have been led astray by the siren music of radicals and the specious promises of spendthrifts.

Sometimes pressure groups, by forcing deficit spending on Government, have triggered inflation.

Sometimes workers in nationwide industries have been persuaded to embark on unwarranted strikes that cause serious injury to the public welfare and even threaten national security.

The price of liberty from the bondage and burdens of irresponsible government is eternal vigilance.

The champions of free enterprise must not only keep watch on the Potomac, they must become Paul Reveres and spread the alarm where any measures harmful to private competitive enterprise and sound economic growth are proposed in Congress, State house or city hall.

You are experts in your chosen vocation.

I urge you to consider ways and means by which you can go beyond your personal business responsibility and take on a more active, articulate leadership in public affairs.

I offer the following suggestions for you to think over.

Maybe you will find a way to translate them into local actions.

Here is my challenge.

Initiate with all the talent and means at your disposal a selling campaign in your community, first to enlighten, then to mobilize, wide public support for a sound economy, a sound dollar, sound management-labor policies, and sound policies by government.

Do so as a public-spirited individual or through organized effort of company, institution or community organizations like Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, etc.

We can hold inflation at bay and maintain a climate favorable to the progress of our free business system only so long as the American people want it that way and officeholders have evidence that this is the public mandate.

We should heed George Washington's advice in his farewell address in which he said "In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened."

The enlightening of public opinion should be your target.

This should be your opportunity to give your community a deeper understanding of the priceless value of our free enterprise system.

This is your chance to show everyone that our business system creates most of our people's jobs, income, savings, and goods, and that it earns most of the tax revenue to support defense and to finance all of the other duties and benefits of government.

You might wish to use one or more of these methods that have brought enlightment to a wide public.

Corporate bulletins, folders, stockholders' reports, house organs, institutional advertising, radio or TV panels, commercials, news reports, interviews, press conferences, speeches, articles, statements, forums and seminars.

Hunt for other methods and effective ways to present your message: sign petitions, testify at public hearings, brief Members of Congress, phone governors, buttonhole mayors, and speak out at town meetings.

It was the bold leadership of President Eisenhower and the efforts of his supporters in both parties in arousing grassroots understanding of the perils of inflation that started a taxpayers' revolt and halted unnecessary Government spending in the previous 4 years.

That experience is concrete proof of how Americans react when they are made fully aware of their own personal stake in sound economic principles.

Here then is a big job for businessmen, for you:

To defend sound economic principles;

To sell free enterprise;

To circulate the facts that convince people in office, shop and the entire community of the priceless worth of an inflation-free economy.

Thus we shall keep America strong—with a strong economic foundation, to finance our necessary defense and security, and to build a better America now and in the years to come.

A Fantastic Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my conversations with other Members of the House, I find that we are all receiving mail from concerned citizens as to the nature of the coming United Nations session, and the possible results there that might be determined to the best interests of the United States and the cause of world freedom. Many of the letters indicate the wishes of the constituents that Congress might remain in session to serve as a watchdog for possible appeasement actions and policies of weakness that might be undertaken by United Nations Representative Stevenson and State Department officials. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we realize that the Congress does not exercise direct effective control over Mr. Stevenson or the State Department. We are hopeful that the inherent good sense of the American public will be recognized by our diplomats and that they will reflect more traditional American spirit and fortitude than they have displayed in the recent past.

I wish to insert into the RECORD a most timely editorial concerning the possible disarmament agreements that might be developed at the United Nations, which appeared on Monday, September 18, in Chicago's American. It is entitled "A Fantastic Offer":

A FANTASTIC OFFER

According to reports from Washington, President Kennedy is ready to lay before the United Nations this week a new plan for general and complete disarmament in which the so-called neutral nations would be empowered to vote on inspection and control measures. Coming so soon after the neutral leaders had proved how totally meaningless their neutrality is, the idea is a painful shock.

It is understood that the United States will offer to sign a general statement of objectives for complete disarmament, and to grant the nonalined countries a voting role in negotiations for a disarmament treaty. The latter would be a generous concession even if the neutral nations were in fact neutral. Since they have just demonstrated at their Belgrade meeting that they are nothing of the kind, the offer seems to us incredibly fatuous.

The Belgrade performance should have disqualified the neutral leaders permanently from any responsible role in East-West negotiations. For years, they had been shouting their abhorrence of all nuclear testing. Thirty-six hours before the meeting began, the Soviet Union started its series of test explosions in the atmosphere.

There were a few scattered whimpers, but the neutrals still managed to avoid criticizing the Soviet Union. Instead, they punched around the tired old scarecrow of colonialism. In short, they humbly allowed themselves to be kicked by Khrushchev, and salved their dignity by kicking the West.

This contemptible display should have left the neutral spokesmen with precisely no further claim to anyone's attention. Quite plainly the sole principle underlying their policy is that it's safer to attack the West than to annoy the Soviet Union. As referees

in any East-West negotiations, they could be expected with calm certainty to scurry whenever Khrushchev beckoned.

Conceivably, Kennedy is planning this offer on the gamble that the Russians will refuse it—as they have refused every offer toward disarmament—and that it will boost our stock with the neutrals without committing us to anything.

The neutrals' goodwill, though, has been shown to be worth exactly nothing, and gambling 10 cents on it would be too much of a risk. We ardently hope that this fantastic offer will be withdrawn before it's made.

Message From the President of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a message from the President of the United States to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its 48th annual convention here. The president's great interest in waterway and harbor improvement and his recognition of their importance to the Nation's economy are well-known:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 25, 1961.

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate very much this opportunity to offer a message to the 48th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

This administration shares your view that accelerated investment in water resources is essential. In assuring water supplies, in providing energy and low-cost transportation, in production of needed food and fiber, in making saline water sweet, in controlling floods, in maintaining recreation and fish and wildlife values—in wisely managing our water resources, we are meeting the needs of the Nation today and creating the conditions for economic growth to meet the needs of tomorrow. The end of the "no new starts" policy has invigorated the dedication of Federal water development agencies to meeting the Nation's needs in water and water management, use, and control.

The very useful report of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources provided a basis for reevaluation of national policies in the light of threatened future shortages.

The recent National Conference on Water Pollution, inspired by congressional efforts to strengthen the Federal role in the struggle against pollution, made it clear that the people want and are determined to have clean water.

The maintenance of our national strength and our obligation to future generations, will require staying power as well as strength. We must husband and wisely use our resources, following an investment policy that is neither skinflint nor extravagant, but properly balances our interests in water resource development with our interests in other aspects of national development. And it is to this long-term national interest that I ask you to dedicate your deliberations.

I know you will grasp the opportunity with vigor, and that a sense of responsibility to all the people and the future will guide your judgments.

With the enlightened support of public and private agencies and individuals, we can build imaginatively and soundly to provide the maximum benefits from our national water resources.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, as a first-term Member, it was my privilege to know OVERTON BROOKS only for some 8 months. However, I shall forever feel profoundly grateful for the privilege of having known him and of serving on the committee which he chaired.

Despite the great demands upon his time and energy, resulting from the extremely heavy responsibilities he carried as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, OVERTON BROOKS gave friendly and generous attention and sound advice to me as a newcomer on the committee. I am sure that all members of the committee found in him that same generosity and wise attention to them as individuals. We shall sorely miss the courteous fairness with which OVERTON BROOKS conducted our committee sessions.

That sometimes abused phrase "gentleman and scholar" is not at all trite as applied to Chairman BROOKS; I believe it describes him accurately. The intense and intelligent study he gave to the rapidly evolving and enlarging volume of knowledge in the new science of space, and to the other difficult fields of knowledge which came within the purview of his committee, demonstrated his scholarliness. And his gentlemanliness was revealed in the extraordinary traits of character and personality which were combined in him. His was a singularly gentle yet buoyant spirit. I am sure he must never knowingly have hurt another man; I am sure it was his constant wish to be a helpful friend to all with whom he was associated, and he certainly succeeded in that. He was both a courtly gentleman of the old school and a new age leader of great foresight.

It was constantly evident that Chairman BROOKS had a profound sense of the urgent necessity for our Nation's success in its space program. Personally, I have a feeling that his untimely death may be the direct result of overwork. This mission which he felt so strongly drove him to excessive hours and to the expenditure of excessive energy. His was a great personal sacrifice.

I suggest it is to his undying credit that, although he was completely aware of the military significance of accomplishment in the space sciences, he looked well beyond those uses and beyond any mere sense of rivalry with the Russians, to the far broader, more constructive peacetime uses which he foresaw in the understanding of space. He was a great patriot, but, at the same time, distinctly a man of peace.

OVERTON BROOKS' name most certainly will go down in the records as one of the important pioneers in the vast new era of space. It is most unfortunate that he is lost to us just as we stand on the threshold of that era.

Mrs. Mosher joins with me in extending our profound sympathy to the wife and daughter, and to other members of OVERTON BROOKS' immediate family.

Raz Dva, Tri, Chetire, Piat'—The Number Isn't Important, It's the Veto the Communists Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what the Communists cannot control they will destroy. This is part of the mode of operation of the Communist apparatus and we will hear much of it in the next few weeks as the Soviet delegates attempt to either seize control of the United Nations or to reduce it to an ineffective debating society. With the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold, the Soviets have served notice of renewed efforts to foist upon the U.N. their plan for a three-headed—troika—executive. The number is not important, it can be one, two, three, four, five, or in Russian, raz, dva, tri, chetire, piat', as long as even one of them is a Communist with veto power, there will be no opportunity for the U.N. to ever function as an effective organization for world peace. I can see no reason for the United States to either appease the Communists by giving them such control of the U.N. or for continuing our membership in that organization if they, the Communists, do succeed in taking it over completely with some form of "troika" plan. The following news story and editorial from the Christian Science Monitor illustrate the Communist plan and its consequences to the future of the U.N.:

U.N. TEETERS ON SUCCESSION ISSUE—TROIKA TUGS AT FOUNDATION

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The future of the United Nations and of a world order under law has rarely been so clearly in the balance as it is today, U.N. diplomats believe.

Often in the past, the U.N.'s prospects have seemed clouded. In Korea, at Suez, in the Congo, and in many another crisis, men have said, "this will make or break the U.N."

But the present constitutional crisis over a successor to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold presents the issue in the sharpest focus observers can remember.

The issue had been drawn even before the Ndola plane crash. Mr. Hammarskjold himself, in one of his last state papers, warned that the U.N. was at a crossroads as a result of the Soviet Union's demand that the executive power of the Secretary General be destroyed by dividing it among three persons.

HAND STRENGTHENED

Now that same issue has been presented at a time when the post of Secretary General is vacant and urgently requires an occupant.

The new circumstances enhance the Soviet Union's bargaining power, observers point out. Previously, when the U.N. had a popular and effective Secretary General behind whom the strong U.N. forces could rally, Moscow was in a relatively disadvantageous position.

Now there is no such rallying point. An effort to groom Mongi Slim of Tunisia for the role has run into shoal water, though it could still succeed.

And the Soviet Union has redoubled its drive for the "troika," or three-headed executive. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko told newsmen Tuesday that the U.N. must have three Secretaries General. A deputy, Semyon Tsarapkin, told this correspondent "we are very firm" on the issue.

[In Oslo, Trygve Lie, former United Nations Secretary General, said the Soviet proposal for a "troika" with veto powers would reduce the organization to "an institute of opinion," according to the Associated Press.]

Doubts, hesitations, divided counsels, and rival personal ambitions so far have weakened the free world position. With Moscow firm and its opposition divided, the likelihood of early action on a successor to Mr. Hammarskjold seems slight.

CONGO NEED

And yet if the organization is allowed to drift too long without leadership, it is hard for observers to see how the U.N. can survive as anything more than a forum for empty annual debates. This is why the U.N.'s future is such a subject for concern here today.

The Congo is the spot where leadership is most urgently needed. It is symptomatic that the maximum which the U.N. people hope for at the moment is a cease-fire between the U.N. and the Katangan forces. Success in the U.N.'s larger effort to end Katanga's secession and thus to unite the country seems unlikely in the extreme.

If, however, it becomes clear to the Congolese that the U.N. cannot bring Katanga back into the fold, the temptation for Leopoldville to march on Elisabethville may prove irresistible. And that would mean full-scale civil war, with a probable U.N. withdrawal.

ENTHUSIASM LACKING

This is only one case in which effective action directed by an executive at U.N. headquarters is needed if U.N. goals are to be achieved.

There has been, and to some extent still is, hope that the 99-nation U.N. Assembly will rise to the occasion and name an acting secretary-general. Mr. Slim, who was elected President of the Assembly Wednesday, has been a leading candidate.

But the Afro-Asian bloc has not rallied to Mr. Slim with any visible enthusiasm. Some consider him too pro-Western.

Instead, the Assembly held a brief memorial session for Mr. Hammarskjold.

Outside the Assembly, the session was serving as a diplomatic catalyst, as the U.N. so often does. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Britain's Foreign Secretary, Lord Home, conferred at some length in one of a number of private meetings. They discussed Berlin, the U.N.'s succession crisis, the Congo, and a wide range of other subjects.

Mr. Rusk has invited Mr. Gromyko, his Soviet opposite number, to lunch Thursday, and the Soviet Foreign Minister has accepted. It is at this meeting that the two are expected to begin exploring the basis for Berlin negotiations. They also unquestionably will discuss the troika problem.

A MOMENT OF SUPREME TESTING

The first and urgent duty of world statesmanship at this hour is to communicate to the peoples the magnitude of crisis confronting the United Nations. President Kennedy's decision to address the General Assembly session now opening in New York registers American recognition of the U.N.'s great need and present peril.

It should help to convey to "the peoples of the United Nations," as the charter designates them, their stake in preserving the charter. It should help to alert them to think and act from the premise that this is a moment of supreme crisis for the U.N. and for future world peace.

This is true for the Western nations who stand in determined defense of the U.N. concepts. It is true for Communist nations who have been marshaled by Moscow in a broad attack on those concepts. It is true for the cold-war neutrals who appear both confused and frightened in face of recent Soviet terror tactics which were signaled in the last General Assembly by the Khrushchev shoe pounding.

What has brought the nations to this dangerous pass is the combination of Soviet maneuver against the U.N. Secretariat and the plane-crash death of Dag Hammarskjold. The late Secretary General defended the U.N.'s international integrity with an effectiveness more like that of an army than of one man.

The U.N. was in any event heading for crisis. The rendezvous was scheduled for 1963 when the Hammarskjold term of office would have expired. Having been brought suddenly up against the test as the new Assembly session was opening, the world organization finds itself beleaguered with double danger.

First there is the possibility that in the midst of the Congo crisis the U.N.'s helm may remain unmanned, or be entrusted to inexperienced and less firm hands. Second, there is the longer run danger that struggle over appointment of a new Secretary General may give Premier Khrushchev more opportunities for confusing the Secretariat issue still further.

What is now vital to the survival of the U.N. is that the nations newly come to it should profoundly appreciate why, when the charter was being written in 1945, other small nations should have made sacrifices to bring the U.N. into being. The charter, after all, limited their sovereignty as it did not limit big power sovereignty. The veto power in the Security Council could, as they knew, endanger their interests. But they also knew that they needed a world organization for peace more than the big powers needed it.

Moreover, the Western Allies' success in limiting Soviet veto ambitions convinced the smaller nations that the U.N. would be infused with ideals of national equality. Hardly a small nation represented at San Francisco could be bemused today by Soviet designs against the Secretariat. For these are designs which would invade the executive arm of the U.N. with new veto power. And this could strangle any future U.N. operation.

But will the newer members prove as knowledgeable, as alert, as sagacious, despite their briefer experience in world affairs? That they will do so is one of the main hopes for the U.N.'s future, for the security of small nations, for the future of world peace.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Problems of the Wool Manufacturing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, recently the Northern Textile Association held its annual meeting at Poland Spring, Maine. George A. Dorr, Jr., chairman, Wool Manufacturers Council, NTA, and president of the Dorr Woolen Mills, Guild, N.H., addressed the meeting. I ask unanimous consent that his excellent speech, pointing out that in its negotiations with foreign countries the United States must consider all branches of the textile industry, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. DORR, JR., CHAIRMAN, WOOL MANUFACTURERS' COUNCIL, NTA, AND PRESIDENT, DORR WOOLEN MILLS, GUILD, N.H., BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION, POLAND SPRING, MAINE

The Wool Manufacturers' Council, which holds its fifth annual meeting tomorrow, has had an active year. We continue to be concerned with the problems of imports, and many of our members have been most generous with their time and efforts in attending meetings in both Boston and Washington.

During the past year the felt manufacturers have joined the association and we welcome them. Our experience in the wool council will, I hope, be helpful to them. As time goes on we see the increasing value of an industrywide approach to the problems of textiles. The inclusion of the felt group in our association will materially strengthen the NTA and be of great assistance to us all in the future.

The fundamental philosophy of the Northern Textile Association that the textile industry should be a concept encompassing all fibers and systems has been strengthened and confirmed this year in many other areas.

A special Senate subcommittee, under the leadership of Senator PASTORE, with the able assistance of Senators COTTON and THURMOND, recognized this thesis and continue to press toward an industrywide approach to our problems. Early this year the President established a Cabinet-level committee to analyze the problems of the industry and make recommendations on an industrywide basis. We point this out because even with this backing we see evidences in some quarters of attempts at division into segments and to settle problems in one area without reference to another. Certainly we will not be antagonistic to the solving of any problem because one fiber or another is presently being considered, but I would point out that the ideal way is to continue to press for a solution which considers all fibers and includes all textile manufactures.

There is no question that our ability and determination to keep together in this area will be constantly tested. Thankfully our friends in the cotton, wool, and synthetic groups are supporting the philosophy of the NTA.

Probably the Geneva Conference in July was the best demonstration of solidarity we have had. Following conferences in Washington in June, members of all branches of the industry, management and labor, were invited by Secretary of Commerce Hodges and Secretary of Labor Goldberg to participate in negotiations at Geneva. Although the emphasis was on cotton, it was significant that the invitation was extended to the woolen and synthetic group. It was a privilege to be able to be there and although the results are still cloudy, this represents a significant change in the attitude of the Government toward this industry. For the first time we were asked to help U.S. representatives in an international negotiation. The excellent start made there and the continuation of the cooperation in the Departments of Commerce and Labor, with the Department of State, in international negotiations is a pattern we hope will bear fruit in the future.

We have been told that as soon as the administrative details of the Geneva agreement are completed our Government will attack the problem of imports of wool textiles. Although this action does set us apart from the cotton branch, we will cooperate to the fullest with the Government in trying to reach a helpful solution.

A committee of NTA has already been formed and is at work. This special committee believes that the problems of imports of textile manufacturers and apparel can best be handled on a long term basis covering all fibers. We believe that such a program should cover all wool textile manufactures and should be divided by category and by countries.

A piecemeal approach by a single country or on a single fiber product will result in concentrations and further market disruption. Any system should be reasonably permanent to provide the stability and basis for future planning which is now altogether lacking. An analysis of the results of the new tariff on wool which was put into effect last year tends to point out the existence of this very problem.

Whether established unilaterally by the United States or on multilateral basis, any program should be so arranged that the United States could and would administer and enforce the program.

Competition from abroad is keen and is growing. With wages in Europe and the Far East substantially lower than in the United States and with efficiency and productivity steadily increasing in those areas, import pressures upon our home market will continue. With this prospect we must continue to seek solutions by every means at our command to insure the continuance and health of our domestic textile industry.

May I express, at this time, my deep appreciation to all those who have been so helpful during the past year in the work of the wool council and the Northern Textile Association.

Gen. Paul D. Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I learned yesterday that Gen. Paul D. Adams, commanding general, 3d Army, has been recognized by President Kennedy as an outstanding officer and will shortly be nominated for the rank of full general and will command the new Army-Air Force Limited War Command.

While it has not been my pleasure to know General Adams intimately, I do know of the fine work he has done as commanding general of the 3d Army with headquarters at Fort McPherson, Ga.

General Adams has served both in Europe and in the Far East and has been recognized as a valiant infantry officer as well as a qualified paratrooper and has commanded the 18th Airborne Corps, and has had other unique assignments that have had impact on peacetime activities such as flood control and medical research, and so forth.

General Adams has been awarded for World War II services the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Bronze Star for valor, and the Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters for meritorious service. In Korea General Adams was decorated with the Silver Star for gallantry in action against the Communists, and for exceptionally distinguished service while serving as Chief of Staff of the 8th Army, was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. For his leadership while commanding the American Land Forces in Lebanon, General Adams was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal (first oak leaf cluster). His foreign decorations include the French Croix de Guerre with gold star (two awards), the Republic of Korea Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal, and the Colombian Order de Boyaca.

In addition, General Adams has received the Commendation Ribbon with metal pendant, Combat Infantryman's Badge, American Defense Service Medal with bronze star, American Campaign Medal, United Nations Service Medal, Europe, Africa, Mediterranean Service Medal with arrowhead and seven campaign stars, Asiastic Pacific Service Medal with bronze star, World War II Victory Medal, Occupation Medal—Germany, Occupation Medal—Japan, National Service Medal, and the Korean Medal with four campaign stars.

General Adams was born in Heflin, Ala., which is in the district represented by my colleague and good friend, Congressman ALBERT RAINS, and which is very near my own hometown of Piedmont, Ala.

The Evening Star on Thursday, September 21, carried an excellent article on General Adams, which is as follows:

P. D. ADAMS CALLED TOUGHEST IN ARMY

Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, named to be the first boss of the new Army-Air Force limited war command, "is the toughest general in the Army," according to one officer who worked with him, "and the best one for the job."

P. D. Adams rarely smiles, frequently reprimands lazy and blundering subordinates and gets the job done the quick and simple way, say those who have served with him and under him.

"He is a positive, direct, and simple man," said one officer. "Some people say he is the meanest general in the Army, but he's not mean at all. If you carry out your orders and do it right you're in wonderful shape. But the officers who don't produce get clobbered."

HAS RETENTIVE MEMORY

"He's not brilliant in an intellectual way," said another, "yet he has a tremendous memory and he is a real student of military history and operations. He knows more about the fundamentals of good soldiering than any officer I know."

The big, ruggedly handsome general will have the difficult job of welding Army and Air Force limited war units into a fire brigade which can range over the world deterring or fighting small wars.

General Adams does not use the personality or public relations route to do his job. The only touch of flamboyance he has tried, according to his associates, was a brief period of wearing a black steel helmet while commanding the 5th Corps in Europe. He prefers to be a close and thorough administrator rather than a back slapper.

READY THIS YEAR

The bulk of the Army's three "ready" divisions and the Air Force's Tactical Air Command will be assigned to General Adams' organization. The nature of the new command—even its name and location—are still to be decided. It is scheduled to be ready before the end of this year.

Yesterday the White House announced that General Adams will get a fourth star and become a full general, probably in a few weeks.

General Adams was graduated from West Point in 1928. He was born in Heflin, Ala., on October 6, 1906. His service has been largely in the infantry.

LED TROOPS IN LEBANON

During World War II, he led Ranger units in Italy. In the Korean war he served as commander of the 25th Infantry Division and was chief of staff of the 8th Army.

After Korea, he served as a division and corps commander, as commanding general of the Northern Area Command of the U.S. Army in Europe. In that capacity, he led the American troops that went ashore in Lebanon in 1958.

This was a key assignment for General Adams. He did so well that he was given another top post in Europe and then brought home in 1959 to be boss of the 3d Army and a lieutenant general.

His associates say that there are no humorous stories about P. D. Adams—just a long history of solid accomplishment.

Army's Handling of General Walker Case Disturbs Troops in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected military writers in the world, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, has in a recent article set forth a very comprehensive study of the effect the General Walker case has had on the troops in Europe.

It is most important that we in the Congress and all Americans view the admonition of General Walker in its proper prospective. Mr. Baldwin has written a most penetrating article which I commend to the interest of all Americans.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article entitled "Army's Handling of General Walker's Case Disturbs Troops in Europe," published in the September 21 issue of the New York Times:

ARMY'S HANDLING OF GENERAL WALKER'S CASE DISTURBS TROOPS IN EUROPE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

AUGSBURG, GERMANY, September 20.—From high command to private first class, the Army in Europe has been deeply disturbed by the case of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker.

Officers of all ranks, particularly the senior ones, deplore the manner in which the case was handled and feel that some fundamental elements of military justice and fair play were violated.

General Walker is the former commander of the 24th Infantry Division, which has its headquarters here at Augsburg. He was relieved of his command last April and given an oral admonition because of the methods and material used in an intensely anti-Communist and aggressive troop information program he sponsored.

At the direction of the Pentagon, prior plans to transfer General Walker to a corps command in Texas with promotion to lieutenant general were canceled.

Since April, General Walker has been filling a colonel's billet as an assistant operations officer on the staff of General Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, U.S. Army Europe, with headquarters at Heidelberg.

In Washington, the Army reported that General Walker was returning to the United States Thursday on leave.

It was said that the general would confer with Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, whose resolution calling for an investigation of the Pentagon's censorship of military officers was approved Wednesday by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The reasons for the Army's intense feeling about the Walker case are several and have nothing to do with the materials General Walker used or the things he said in his anti-Communist program.

SOME TERM HIM ZEALOT

In fact, many officers with whom this correspondent has talked said that General Walker had become too much of a single-minded zealot in his fight against communism. They believe he went too far in his 24th Division "pro-blue" program, if, as alleged, he used materials of the controversial John Birch Society and characterized a number of prominent Americans as "pinks" or "pinkos."

But the Army has been shocked, first, by what it feels is the summary treatment given to a man who is generally regarded as an outstanding leader and soldier.

General Walker at the time of his downfall was a much decorated veteran. He was characterized here as a "soldier's soldier," a division commander who had won the hearts of his men.

Under General Walker's leadership the 24th Division was judged variously by his superiors as the best, or one of the two best, divisions in the European theater and perhaps in the Army.

When General Walker was relieved from his division, the morale sagged temporarily and many officers and men were disgruntled. The division has since been restored to good morale and high combat effectiveness under General Walker's successor, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel.

HANDLING IS QUESTIONED

In addition to the natural sympathy for General Walker because of his outstanding record as a soldier, the Army has been appalled by the handling of the Walker case by Washington.

In its issue dated April 16, 1961, the Overseas Weekly, a newspaper published in Frankfurt primarily for troops that has a long record of friction with the Army high command in Germany, published an article about General Walker. It said he had used materials of the John Birch Society and had described a number of prominent Americans in an after-hours study-group speech to soldiers and dependents as "pinks" or "pinkos."

Army authorities say that General Walker's Pro-Blue troop information program had been monitored by his superiors for many months prior to the publication of the Queens Weekly article.

INQUIRY ORDERED

When the Overseas Weekly article appeared General Clarke appointed Lt. Gen. Frederic J. Brown, then a corps commander here in Germany, as an inspector general to investigate the allegations and the entire conduct of the troop information program in the 24th Division. But the Pentagon stepped into the picture and ordered General Walker's relief and transfer to Heidelberg before General Brown had well started his investigation.

This precipitate Pentagon action long before an official investigation had either proved or disproved the truth of the Overseas Weekly article angered most officers here and stunned those in his division.

The original press release, written in Washington, which was to announce General Walker's relief, was couched in such extreme terms, this correspondent was told, that a senior commander refused to publish it. In the words of a subordinate he "blew his stack" because of what he felt was Washington's summary interference in the processes of military law and its interference in the chain of command.

His emphatic objections resulted in the alteration of the press release. Nevertheless, General Walker was relieved and assigned to Heidelberg, pending investigation by General Brown. This subsequently led to the oral admonition of General Walker by General Clarke.

Recently, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, testifying before a Senate committee about the Walker case, ordered the release to Congress and to the press of the

voluminous records of General Brown's investigation.

It was in this report that the Army disclosed that General Walker was a member of the John R. Birch Society. Its release further disturbed the Army here. It was, they said, unprecedented in the memory of senior officers here.

The report of an Inspector General is usually considered, like the minutes of a grand jury, confidential, and is not released. If the Inspector General's investigation leads to a court of inquiry or a court-martial, the matters dealt with in the Inspector General's report can be produced in court by witnesses under oath and subject to cross-examination.

But General Walker's case did not lead to a court: yet the Brown report was declassified, not here, but by Washington. Furthermore, it was made publicly available there, Army authorities say, before even part of it was given to General Walker.

General Clarke felt in fairness to General Walker that a copy of the transcript should be sent to him.

GETS PART OF TRANSCRIPT

General Clarke's intercession resulted last week in the receipt by General Walker of a small portion of the transcript of the investigation, but not all of it has yet been received from Washington.

This led to a statement by General Walker that he felt he was being tried in the press, and that he did not even know what the investigation had alleged.

What the Army here describes as the overriding by Washington of military custom and legal fairness has had even greater repercussions because of a third factor.

There is real resentment among military officers in Europe about some aspects of civilian leadership at high and low levels in the Pentagon. Many officers believe that Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, is primarily responsible for what they regard as the deplorable handling of the Walker case.

What some officers characterize as the absurd and often trivial censorship of senior officers' talks, many of which have nothing to do with communism or politics, has been resented. Particularly resented and often commented upon in the last week is the furor that accompanied the Jack Paar television show in West Berlin.

Col. John M. Deane, Jr., commanding officer of the Second Battle Group in Berlin who received an oral admonition because of his part in the Paar show, is universally regarded—as is General Walker—as a top-notch soldier.

Officers believe that Colonel Deane was made the goat because he carried out a Pentagon policy. The Army has been told to cooperate fully with the press, radio and television, and motion pictures.

Officers here have long been irked, particularly in recent months, by what they regard as interference with the chains of command and functions of command even by low-ranking civil servants in the Pentagon.

They say that directives from the Pentagon, even in the Berlin crisis, frequently have been conflicting or indecisive, and sometimes, in their opinions, have been inimical to U.S. interests.

CENTRALIZATION SEEN

The Army feels, in short, there has been far too much tendency to centralize everything in Washington and to command squads from there, and that there is nowhere near enough loyalty down from the Pentagon to the field.

Washington officials with the authority to formulate policies in a variety of fields duck responsibility if those policies, carried out by subordinates overseas, result in a public outburst, it is charged.

There is still a fourth reason for the intense feeling here about the Walker case. Sympathy for the general, aroused by the foregoing factors, has been intensified because of the great dislike of many American officers for the Overseas Weekly, which first aired the charges against General Walker.

The Overseas Weekly is a privately owned operation, which, under contract with the Army daily—The Stars and Stripes—is distributed to Army newsstand throughout much of Europe.

Its circulation of some 50,000 to 60,000 is almost exclusively among military men, chiefly enlisted men.

The Overseas Weekly has a history of almost a decade of more or less continuous friction with Army authorities. It was barred briefly from PX and other Army newsstands in 1953, but a combination of congressional pressure and press charges in the United States that freedom of the press was being violated led to its restoration.

Intermittently ever since there have been various instances of friction, and suggestions by various Army commanders that it be barred from Army newsstands. Some Army authorities hold that freedom of the press is not at issue, that the Army has the authority to control its own sales on its own newsstands and that Playboy magazine, for instance, is not sold on Army newsstands here in Germany.

They say, however, that barring of the Overseas Weekly from Army stands would probably result in the cessation of publication. Some officers say that at times the Overseas Weekly has been helpful in revealing maladministration or malpractices that might not have been detected by official channels.

Recent surveys by the Army of many issues of the Overseas Weekly resulted in the classification of about 150 columns of news as unsavory courts-martial, 46 individual stories as featuring ridicule of military leadership, 22 on the anti-officer, pro-enlisted-man theme, and a total of more than 200 stories dealing with prostitution, rape, or other violence, some of them adjudged to be excessively descriptive or lurid.

The Overseas Weekly believes it performs a service to the command by the publication of courts-martial records and by its revelation of service derelictions. But the Army says the paper was returned to service newsstands in 1953 only after the owner had indicated that the Overseas Weekly desired to cooperate for the benefit of the command and would refrain from publishing "harmful material."

But, according to a recent report, "the editorial policy has been and continues to be one of emphasis upon crime, sex and the maladministration of the military."

Most, but not all of the many senior officers this correspondent has talked to, agree with Secretary McNamara's description of the paper, in congressional testimony, as "personally repulsive."

Because of the nature and history of this paper, which first aired the charges against General Walker, many were prejudiced in his favor.

There had been a history of friction between General Walker and the Overseas Weekly long before the general was relieved.

Matters came to a head on December 28, 1960, after Siegfried Naujocks, a writer for the Overseas Weekly, was barred from the barracks of the 24th Division, here at Augsburg and around Munich.

General Walker took this action after Mr. Naujocks allegedly said to some personnel of the division that he had proof that General Walker was suffering from a brain tumor.

General Walker had received a thorough medical examination after he had complained of some headaches, but according to the Army, he showed no trace of any tumor.

Efforts by the Overseas Weekly to have Mr. Naujocks readmitted to the 24th Division area followed. Appeals were turned down by both General Walker and General Clarke. The Army says that representatives of the Overseas Weekly then declared they would have to publish a story dealing with General Walker. Then followed the publication, on April 16, 1961, of an account of a speech made by General Walker in January 1960—15 months previously—and of other alleged details of the pro-Blue program followed.

It was in this speech that General Walker is alleged to have characterized some prominent Americans, including former President Truman, as "leftist," "pinks" or "pinkos."

General Walker's relief followed almost immediately, before the charges were investigated.

A spate of suits and cross-suits has stemmed from the Walker case. The International Media Co., publisher of the Overseas Weekly, sued General Walker in a Frankfurt court because of a statement made by General Walker after the publication of the article linking him with the John Birch Society. General Walker inferentially equated the weekly with communism.

This suit was dismissed on the ground of lack of jurisdiction by a German court after the Army had certified that General Walker's statement was made in performance of official duties.

The former public information officer and other personnel of 24th Division filed a suit alleging slander against the Overseas Weekly. The suit, too, was dropped by the Frankfurt prosecutor, on the basis—in German law—of insufficient public interest to warrant prosecution.

A third suit—a criminal complaint charging defamatory statements—has been filed by General Walker against Siegfried Naujocks, the Overseas Weekly writer who was barred from the 24th Division barracks.

The natural conservatism of Army officers, and their patriotism, plus formal orders to emphasize the dangers of communism to their troops, make them, of course, sympathetic to the objectives General Walker had.

But many of them—including some officers who most admire General Walker as a soldier—believe that what they describe as the general's fervid, intense, some say fanatic, single-minded concentration in after-duty hours and spare time upon anticommunism had destroyed his objectivity.

And most of those this correspondent talked to disagree with the methods used, the materials employed, and with General Walker's alleged statements.

But the great majority, including those who disagree with General Walker, resent the way the case was handled.

Schedule of Conferences in the Fourth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever officials duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns, I expect to return home and to be available for con-

ferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Allen County, Lima: Tuesday, October 10.

Auglaize County, Wapakoneta: Wednesday, October 11.

Darke County, Greenville: Wednesday, October 25.

Mercer County, Celina: Monday, October 16.

Miami County, Troy: Monday, October 23.

Preble County, Eaton: Wednesday, October 18.

Shelby County, Sidney: Tuesday, October 24.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problems with, or opinions concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

The Indian Program on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, tonight, Senator CHURCH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, will address the 18th Annual Convention of the National Congress of American Indians in Lewiston, Idaho. He has entitled his speech "The Indian Program on the New Frontier." In his address, he develops the theme of the areas of responsibility of the three-sided partnership, the Indian leadership, the Congress, and the administration, toward joining in a common effort to promote the welfare of the American Indian. He reviews the steps that have been taken toward this goal in recent months, and sets the sights for the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address by Senator CHURCH printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIAN PROGRAM ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(An address by Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the 18th annual convention of the National Congress of American Indians)

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that since your arrival at this convention 5 or 6 days ago you have enjoyed the hospitality of the members of the Nez Perce Tribe, and that you have been welcomed by many of our fine citizens of Idaho. You have also met our other fellow Idaho Indians, the Shoshone-Bannocks, the Coeur d'Alenes, the Kootenais, the Kalispels. Now that you are about to conclude your deliberations, I want to add a few words of welcome of my own and express the hope that your stay here has been a memorable event and that you will return to visit our State in years to come.

There is good reason for assuming, though, that I was invited to speak at this banquet not only to welcome you to my home State but also to express to you, in my capacity of chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Indians Affairs, some thoughts on the path we have followed in the field of Indian policy in recent months, and on the direction in which we expect to move in the future.

Before going into details, let me first say a few words about the basic assumptions with which I start as I approach a specific problem in Indian affairs. In my opinion, we must get away from the view that the problems of American Indians can be viewed in a vacuum, apart from the rest of our society. The fact is that Indians are an integral part of our country, and that particularly here, in the West, the welfare and prosperity of the Indian and non-Indian communities are closely intertwined. In dealing with conditions in the Indian country we must recognize that the greatest need is for a comprehensive program of economic and social betterment, a program which will have its beneficial impact on the Indians concerned and indirectly also on the States in which they reside. I am thus in fundamental agreement with the guidelines for a Federal Indian policy laid down by President Kennedy in his message to your convention a year ago. Let me remind you of the President's words:

"During the recent campaign I have expressed my concern over the conditions of poverty and disease which afflict so many American Indians and have made it clear that I am intent on doing something about the matter. I want to repeat, therefore, that I am pledged to a program for the development of the human and natural resources of Indian reservations. Such a program will indeed be an integral part of the total program of my administration. We must raise the sights of our country. We must exercise world leadership and back up our position through a stronger, more productive America. In such an America there is no room for areas of depression, poverty and disease. We want every group which is now unable to make its full contribution to American strength to be given the opportunity to do so.

"It is in this spirit that we shall approach our work on Indian reservations and it is in this spirit, I am sure, that Indians throughout the country will work together for a better life for themselves and thus a stronger America."

If we view Indian policy in this light, we start with recognition of the fact that it is the responsibility of all concerned, the Indian people themselves and the Government agencies which serve them to work together in a program of development of human and natural resources. We must evolve from the static concept of trusteeship, under which a Federal employee manages Indian land and sends the Indian owner a check for the income on his allotment, to a dynamic program of economic growth and opportunity, in which the Federal Government assists Indians in lifting themselves to the level of well-being of the surrounding non-Indian communities.

This development approach is one which the Federal Government has applied in other areas as well. It is reflected in the Area Redevelopment Act, which, as you know, specifically covers Indian tribes. It is also reflected in the development programs initiated by our Government abroad. Let me say that I am a supporter of our Government's worldwide effort to combat Communist totalitarianism through economic development, but let me add that in my view our Indian population, which often faces problems similar to that of underdeveloped countries, should receive not less, but more consideration than any foreign people.

Economic and social development must thus be the keystone of our approach to Indian affairs. Indians must be given the opportunity of a decent homelife, free of hunger and disease, the opportunity of a good education, and the opportunity to work. There is little doubt that our country has the capacity to give them these opportunities.

And lest anyone think that my words are those of a free spender, let me make it clear that, on the contrary, I am interested in saving money for the taxpayer. There are some who add up the annual total appropriation for the Indian Bureau and the Indian Health Service and shrink away from the resulting figure in horror. My word to them is that they shrink too soon; they only have a subtotal. They should add the totals paid in State welfare assistance, aid to dependent children, and the total cost to the States when misery on an Indian reservation leads Indian children or adults to correctional institutions. In my opinion, a program for economic development could cut these costs. It could turn Indian reservations, which now constitute a drain on the economic resources of the Western States, into substantial economic assets.

Against the background of these principles, let me move on to discuss some of the specific developments in the field of Indian affairs since you last met and heard President Kennedy's message. For that message has been followed up by action, action taken by both the Congress and the administration.

Perhaps you wonder why it took so long to get action, why some of the most significant developments have come in the last 2 weeks. I remind you that only 8 months have passed since the present administration was installed in office, a rather short period in the course of human events. During this period, the work of the Congress and the administration has been overshadowed by the issue of peace or war, the issue of the strength and survival of the free world. As a new administration and a new Congress took up their duties, these matters of peace and the survival of freedom, matters affecting every single citizen of our country, had to be given foremost attention.

But this heavy commitment to world problems has not caused us to neglect problems at home. In the short 8 months in which this administration and the 87th Congress have been in session, we have taken some great strides forward in the field of Indian affairs. Their effect will undoubtedly be felt soon. Let me review some of them for you, and let me begin with what I hope is pardonable pride, with the bills which had their start in my own subcommittee.

First and foremost there is S. 1540, the revolving loan fund bill. I am sure you will agree with me that the loan fund provision of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 has proved to be one of the most beneficial items of Indian legislation ever enacted. Many a member of an Indian tribe who is today self-sufficient owes his start to a loan from the revolving loan fund.

Only 4 years ago, you will recall the fund was in danger of being closed down altogether. Under the Indian Bureau policies then in effect, outstanding loans were collected but hardly any news ones were made. The result was that by June 30, 1957, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had $7,945,384, almost $8 million, of idle cash in the revolving loan fund. This was money which Congress had appropriated with the expectation that it would be used for the economic development of Indian reservation areas.

Yet here it was, completely idle. That there was a great need for the beneficial use of that money, that it could have been invested wisely for the benefit of the Government and the Indian people, you know better than I.

After 1957, partly as a result of prodding from the Congress, partly as a result of changes in the Interior Department, new loans began to be made and, by 1960, the total available funds were exhausted. This was the problem with which we concerned ourselves during the present session of Congress and I am glad to say that only a few days ago the President signed the bill we passed, a bill which, for the first time since 1934, increases the revolving loan fund, and which in doing so doubles the existing authorization by raising it from $10 million to $20 million.

I should add that as reported out of my subcommittee and as passed by the Senate the bill called for an increase in the authorization to $35 million. In a conference with the House of Representatives, it was agreed to lower the amount to $20 million, but with the understanding that we shall review this question next year.

In speaking of the use of revolving loan fund money, I have spoken of investment rather than expenditure. I used the term advisedly, for investment is just what it is. The repayment record of loan fund clients has been good. In fact, as a result of accruals, there is more money in the fund today than Congress appropriated. But beyond the benefits apparent from a look at the financial statements, there are those intangible benefits to which I referred before: the benefits derived by a community when families which may otherwise have been dependent on welfare or on odd jobs which keep them ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed becomes self-support and self-reliant.

A second measure which was passed by the Congress and signed by the President within the last few days is S. 200, a bill which increases the annual authorization for vocational training from $3,500,000 to $7,500,000. I am sure you are well familiar with the benefits which many young Indian people have derived from this program over the last 3 years. It has provided many Indian people with the skills and work experience needed for study employment at decent wages.

That the program has been successful is clear. I am informed that 81 percent of the people who have completed their training have found gainful employment. I am also informed that at this time 1,100 eligible applications for admission to vocational training schools under the Bureau's program are pending and could not be acted upon because of the insufficiency of funds. The enactment of S. 200 and approval of a supplemental appropriation will make it possible for these 1,100 applications and an additional 3,500, which are expected to be filed, to be processed, opening new work opportunities for young Indian people to whom such opportunities were closed before.

The training offered to young Indian people in special vocational schools is only one aspect of the vocational program. Another aspect is the on-the-job training program. That program has been used most effectively to attract new industries to Indian reservations. An excellent example, of which you may already have heard, is the fishing tackle factory established by the Wright-McGill Co. on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota. Starting with a few dozen employees last January, the company has now increased the work force to a few hundred. As this manufacturing enterprise establishes itself firmly on the reservation, it may bring a variety of new opportunities to the Oglala Sioux, for the people who are now employed at last have money to spend on the necessities of life. The reservation can, therefore, support more commercial enterprise, which in turn means more jobs.

It is fair to say that Wright-McGill may never have come to an Indian reservation if it were not for the on-the-job training program. After all, in dealing with any group of employees with no previous industrial work experience, a manufacturer takes a serious risk. Most workers will have to undergo a training period, in which they don't really produce efficiently for their company; some will drop out after weeks of training, making it necessary for the employer to start all over again with a new man. By sharing the training cost with the employer through on-the-job training assistance, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has made it attractive for the manufacturers to locate on or near Indian reservations. The beneficiary of this program is in the first instance the Indian who has found employment, then the company which now has a trained worker, and ultimately the State and the Nation whose productive strength has been increased.

There are other development opportunities open to Indians. As our country grows, and as people have more leisure time, more and more persons take to traveling through the United States on vacation tours. Tourism has become an increasingly important business, providing a significant source of income for people in many areas of our country. Just think of the sums which tourists spend in hotel, motel, or even camping-site accommodations, as well as the sums spent on food, on gasoline, and on buying mementoes. Just think how interesting and instructive it would be for them to visit Indian reservations, if there were appropriate accommodations for them. I am told that the White Mountain Apaches have demonstrated how the tourist potential of a reservation can be developed; so have the North Carolina Cherokees. Here in my own State I have followed with great interest the plans for tourist development drawn up by my friends in the Nez Perce Tribe. I am pleased that I was able to enlist the interest of the National Park Service in the plans of the Nez Perce. That Service, which has done such an excellent job in developing attractive tourist facilities in our national parks, sent one of its experts to Lapwai, who, after a tour of the area, found that the ingredients for successful development are most definitely present. I am confident, therefore, that the Nez Perce Tribe, working in conjunction with its neighbors in Lewiston will demonstrate to the country how cooperative endeavor in tourist development can redound to the benefit of an entire area, bringing new employment opportunities for Indians and non-Indians alike.

In the context of economic development, we must also chart a workable land policy. Where land can serve as a resource for economic growth, it should be used appropriately, rather than being frittered away. At the same time, I am sure you agree with me that something simply has to be done with the wasteful and inefficient ownership pattern created by what is known as the heirship problem.

As you may know, I introduced an heirship bill earlier this year, emphasizing at that time that it was merely a vehicle for obtaining a full expression of the views and wishes of the Indian people. I meant what I said. I held hearings on the bill, as well as on a counter-proposal by the administration, at which valuable testimony was received. In the light of the new suggestions received, I intend to introduce a new proposal at the next session of Congress. Copies of the new bill will be distributed to all the tribes and new hearings will be held. At the conclusion of these hearings, I hope, we shall be in a position to report out a bill which brings us nearer to a satisfactory solution of the heirship problem.

Once existing human and natural resources are utilized to provide a solid economic foundation for a reservation area, other services furnished by the Federal Government can be used far more effectively than now in lifting Indian communities to an economic and social level comparable to that of surrounding non-Indian communities. You know, of course, of the fine work done by the Public Health Service, which has accomplished so much in cutting infant mortality and mortality from infectious disease among Indians and has in many ways brought the wonders of modern medicine to the Indian country. Yet the Public Health Service knows the limitations under which it operates. In its comprehensive survey of Indian health a few years ago, it said: "To achieve good health, Indians need more than measures aimed directly at disease prevention and control. They need better general education, vocational training, housing, food, roads, and means of transportation. They also need adequate economic opportunities."

Once we shift from enforced idleness to gainful employment, from malnutrition to an adequate diet, good health care can be far more effective than it is now. Better health, in turn, results in the case of children, in better ability to learn in school and, in the case of adults, in better ability to produce. These again result in better opportunities, better employment, and better income; and so the pump is primed.

In this context, the context of services which may accompany an economic improvement program, we should also remember the excellent sanitation program of the Public Health Service, which is bringing uncontaminated water as well as sewage facilities to Indian reservations. Furthermore, I am told that the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the Federal Government has begun to make its services available to Indians. Here, then, is another door opened to Indian people to better their lives.

So far I have spoken to you largely from the vantage point of a legislator. We in Congress can enact laws for vocational training or the revolving loan fund, for a sanitation program or for housing. But this is where our ability to influence the course of events ends. Whether the programs which we initiate succeed or fail depends ultimately on you, the leaders of Indian tribes, and the Government officials who work with you.

There is thus, as I see it, a three-sided partnership in this field, including the Indian people, the Congress, and the officials in the executive branch. If any one side fails, the entire program fails. And that thought brings me to another question on which I should touch briefly, concerning the relations between you and officials of the executive branch, usually officials of the Indian Bureau. I know that you in the National Congress of American Indians have analyzed organizational problems of the Indian Bureau, such as the role of Area Offices, and the advisability of substituting a Board for a single Indian Commissioner. Such questions can reasonably be discussed by all conscientious students of Government. But it hardly serves any useful purpose to propose that we "abolish the Indian Bureau." You and I know that right here in Idaho it would be a bitter blow to our Indian people if the Bureau were suddenly abolished. It would be an equally bitter blow to the State and the counties containing Indian reservations, which would have to assume the whole burden of the resulting costs at a time when neither they nor the Indian people are ready.

I am sure that, as you reflect on it, you will remember Indian Bureau employees who

have performed their duties well, who have assisted Indian people in their efforts to improve themselves, just as you can think of others, who have drawn their pay and have done little or nothing. Unfortunately, similar patterns can be found in every Government agency and for that matter even in private businesses. What is needed in the Indian Bureau, as it is needed elsewhere, are more employees of the dedicated, competent kind and fewer employees who lack the ability to carry on an effective and progressive program. Ultimate responsibility for the execution of such a program has been vested by President Kennedy in three men who have long been known as true friends of the Indian people, Secretary Stewart Udall, Assistant Secretary John Carver, and Commissioner Philleo Nash. I am sure that you share my conviction that these men have the ability and the desire to fashion the Bureau of Indian Affairs into an agency capable of rendering the kind of assistance to Indian people of which I have spoken to you today.

I have already referred to a three-sided partnership in this development effort and have spoken of the areas of responsibility of two of the partners, the Congress and the administration. The third and most significant partner is the Indian people, and particularly the Indian leadership. A heavy responsibility rests on your shoulders. None of our efforts can succeed without your cooperation. You will have to help develop reservation programs, you will have to screen requests for assistance to determine which serve a useful productive purpose and which do not, you will have to resist pressures to fritter away tribal assets and instead plan on their utilization for maximum economic benefit. All this will be a great challenge to you. I know you will be ready to meet it and I, for one, stand ready to work with you in every way that will genuinely promote the welfare of the Indian people.

The Belgrade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two interesting articles from the September 9 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal regarding the Belgrade Conference.

The first is an article by Mr. Edwin Roth, Courier-Journal special writer, and the second is by Mr. M. S. Handler, of the New York Times News Service.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELGRADE CONFERENCE FALLS FLAT TRYING TO FORM THIRD-POWER BLOC

(By Edwin Roth, Courier-Journal special writer)

BELGRADE.—When India's Prime Minister Pandit Nehru, by far the most important participant of the Belgrade conference of nonaligned states, walked down the steps from his aircraft at Belgrade airport, he stumbled and slipped. For a moment it seemed he would fall all the way down the steps and hit Yugoslav soil head first—but he managed to grasp the banister rail. Steadying himself, he walked into the wide open arms of Tito, who embraced and kissed him.

Nehru's slip on the plane steps as he arrived for the Belgrade conference was what psychologists call a Freudian slip. He was most unenthusiastic about this conference, and accepted the invitation from its organizers, Tito and Nasser, only because to refuse it would have caused offense. But he made clear that he would do everything to prevent the formation of a "third power bloc."

As the conference got underway, Nehru—though not surprised—became increasingly impatient as he watched it develop into an orgy of personal and national vanities, frustrations, inferiority complexes and resentments. There were all the burning, bitter resentments of poor barefooted people against those people who not only have shoes, but even motor cars.

Much of the time, the conference saw displays of incredible megalomania.

Speaker after speaker set down the precise conditions under which his country would be willing to accept financial or economic aid—and gave his views of what "this conference" should tell John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev to do. Gamal Abdel Nasser, dictator President of the United Arab Republic, claimed that the nonaligned countries (and, by implication, Nasser personally) had caused Kennedy and Khrushchev to meet in Vienna.

But even that was surpassed by Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah. With perspiration glistening on his black face, he cried passionately:

"Imagine half a dozen hydrogen bombs, each one the equivalent of 100,000 tons of TNT, dropped on Accra, New Delhi, Cairo, London, New York and Moscow."

It did not seem to occur to Nkrumah that even if nuclear war broke out, the first hydrogen bomb would not be dropped on the Ghanian capital Accra—and that perhaps neither Eastern nor Western military planners consider Accra worth a hydrogen bomb in any circumstances whatever.

NO CONDEMNATION

Although this conference met under the shadow of the mushroom cloud and under the fallout of Russia's new nuclear explosion, the delegates here hesitated to condemn it.

Some delegates, notably Nehru, have said how shocked they are that Russia ended the suspension of nuclear tests and exploded another H-bomb. But these polite expressions of incredulous shock are very different from the howls of rage and abuse let loose by the very same men against the French explosion of a much smaller atom bomb.

In his ranting, rambling, cliche-ridden hour-long speech, Nkrumah demanded the formation of a power bloc of nonalined states at the United Nations which, he said, should be reorganized according to the so-called troika system—with Assistant Secretaries General from the East bloc, the West bloc, and the nonalined bloc.

He read out the immense figures which the United States, Russia and Britain spend on armaments, and suggested that they should instead give this money to the nonalined underdeveloped countries.

Like many others at this conference, and in stronger words than most, Nkrumah demanded the full acceptance and recognition of the East German Communist state. But in the very same breath (he was summing up his demands), he also demanded the end of all colonialism.

Curiously Nkrumah does not consider East Germany to be a "colony," any more than he would look upon Hungary or Czechoslovakia as "colonies." At this conference, "colonialism" and "imperialism" (two words used countless times in every session) mean only the domination of colored people by white people, and not the domination of white people by more powerful white people.

FACT OF LIFE

Nehru, too, suggested the recognition of East Germany, though he made it clear that he did so only because he considered "the East German Government" to be one of the facts of life.

This caused some West German observers to remark with cynical bitterness that West Germany got very little in return for the millions of hard West German marks spent in aid to underdeveloped countries.

Nehru's big speech brought the first refreshing note of cold realism into a conference which until then had seemed to take place in Alice's lunatic wonderland behind the looking glass. As Nehru is the democratically elected leader of some 450 million people and represents more than half the total number of people which this conference claims to represent, he has no need to overcompensate any inferiority complex. Speaking immediately after Nkrumah, he tore Nkrumah's speech to shreds.

Tito, Nasser and Nkrumah are trying hard to create a power bloc of nonalined states. But no common denominator can be found between men who hate each other as much as Nasser and Bourguiba, Nasser and Kassem, or Nkrumah and some of the other African leaders.

AND INDIA'S NEHRU IS ONE WHO SPRANG TITO'S SELF-MADE TRAP

(By M. S. Handler, New York Times News Service)

Wounded in their pride and bewildered by what had happened to their carefully planned strategy, the Yugoslavs are trying to understand the extent of the political defeat they suffered in the conference of nonalined powers, which ended earlier this week.

The planned triumphal march to the headship of the nonalined countries proved to be a self-made trap, and the man who opened the trapdoor for President Tito was the mild-mannered man from India, Prime Minister Nehru.

This deceptive, tough political infighter from India had tried to warn the Yugoslavs and their militant African and Arab friends of the danger of deluding themselves into thinking that their time had come to instruct the great powers in how to conduct their affairs.

The speeches of Tito, President Nkrumah of Ghana and some of the others indicated a trend, if not a determination, to put the Western Powers on trial for the current international crisis and all the evils that beset the world today.

Nehru's advice, though coming from one of the most experienced and successful statesmen in the world, was ignored and the activists proceeded to pillory the West, and play at dictating to the Allies a policy that could have meant only the abandonment of Berlin and Germany, the dissolution of the NATO alliance, and the immediate, liquidation of the remnants of empire in Asia and Africa.

Supported by U Nu of Burma, Madame Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, and Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus, the Indian Prime Minister demonstrated to Tito and his African and Arab friends how a true political master operates in a clinch.

The struggle was transplanted from the open session to closed committee. Nehru proceeded to eviscerate the demands Tito and the Africans and Arabs sought to write into the final resolutions.

Assisted on individual issues by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, Bourguiba of Tunisia and King Hassan of Morocco, Nehru not only demolished the militants but, when he got through with them, they had passed over the German question with brief, noncommital references, endorsed the

Western position on disarmament with inspection and controls, and subscribed to a vague formula on the reorganization of the United Nations Secretariat.

Slovaks of Paterson, N.J., Diocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, under this title, a historical review, compiled by John C. Sciranka, well-known American Slovak journalist, associated with the Slovak Catholic Sokol and the Slovak Catholic Federation of American and other fraternal organizations, appeared in the Katolicky Sokol—Catholic Falcon—and also in a digest form in the Herald News, Passaic-Clifton, N.J., and the Paterson Evening News, as well as the Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd—official publication of the federation, which is celebrating this year its golden jubilee.

After the pontifical mass, celebrated by the Most Reverend James A. McNulty, D.D., bishop of Paterson, N.J., on Sunday, July 21, a banquet was held at St. Mary's Auditorium, Passaic, N.J., where Rt. Rev. Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A., was host. Bishop McNulty complimented the Slovaks for their stanch faith and many sacrifices. He praised the efforts of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an affiliate of the National Catholic Welfare Conference for its recent drive to erect an institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome for the training of priests for the future work in Slovakia.

Bishop McNulty's praiseworthy words received publicity in the Advocate, official diocesan organ, published in Newark and the Catholic News, published in New York City. The bishop's statement and the entire program were beamed to Slovakia by Radio Free Europe.

I was happy to learn that a 50-star flag, which I donated to Monsignor Romanak and his parish, according to the statement by Mr. John C. Sciranka, will be kept as a memento of this pilgrimage for the historical day "when it will fly over the historical city of Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia."

In order to appreciate the spirit of the Slovak pioneers of Paterson, N.J., diocese, I am happy to introduce here their history as compiled by John C. Sciranka:

SLOVAKS OF PATERSON, N.J., DIOCESE
(Compiled by J. C. Sciranka)

On Sunday, July 2, during the pilgrimage of SS. Cyril and Methodius at St. Mary's (Assumption) parish, Passaic, N.J., many, no doubt, will be curious to know the background of the Slovaks and their pioneers, especially in the Paterson (N.J.) diocese.

While the Slovaks of this area are paying tribute to their apostles, who brought Christianity to their ancestors in Slovakia at the behest of Ruler Rastislav, who sought missionaries from Byzantine Emperor Michael mastering the language of his people, present-day generations will want to know about the past, and especially the early settlers in this area.

The social life of Slovaks began in Passaic on December 19, 1879, when Mr. Waterhouse brought seven pioneers to this city. They were: Andrew Pastor, Jan Socha, Jan Kostosin, George Slivka, Jan Pochlod, Jan Salasovic, and Edward Geiger. Six months later Stephen Cherepy and Frank Drombly arrived.

These pioneers were aware of the fact that, prior to them, the Slavonic people already made history in this area and the new country in general. Besides the fact that famous Dalmatians, who are Croats from present-day Yugoslavia, accompanied Christopher Columbus on his voyage to the new world, it is most significant that a year before the *Mayflower* dropped anchor off the New England coast, carrying English immigrants who were to establish a Puritan theocracy in the northern wilderness, Polish and Slovak immigrants were fighting for democratic rights in the young Virginia colony.

SLOVAKS AID CAPT. JOHN SMITH IN JAMESTOWN

Arriving in 1607 to aid Capt. John Smith in building Jamestown, Va., the first permanent English settlement in the new world, these Slavs were employed by British capital to manufacture glass beads for trading with the Indians and as workers in other crafts.

But in 1619, when the House of Burgesses met in Jamestown for the first time, the Poles and their Slav brothers, despite their vital contributions to the maintenance of the colony, were denied the right to vote. Rebellion against this injustice quickly took organized form unless equal rights for all were restored. They won their demands, and "The Court Book of the Virginia Company of London" attests, under the date of July 31, 1619, the record book of the English financial backers of the Jamestown Colony declared:

"Upon some dispute the Polonians resident in Virginia, it was now agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever. And because of their skill in making pitch and tar and soap ashes shall not die with them, it is agreed that some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge for the benefit of the country hereafter."

This is still being carried on unto this day, and the purpose of this year's pilgrimage in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius is to aid the institute named in honor of these two apostles, which is being built in Rome at the behest of the holy father for the training of future priests for Slovakia, now under Communist regime, which already needs over 1,100 priests.

The spirit of training future leaders was always the objective of our pioneers. We can see it from the actions of Peter Stuyvesant, who, 50 years after the Jamestown experiment, as Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York, held out alurements to group of Slavonic pioneers. Augustine Herman, first Czech (Bohemian) in America, was on his board of advisers. Herman later established Bohemian Manor in Maryland and made a map of the State. In 1659 group of Poles arrived and settled near Fort Orange, now New York, where their skill as tillers of soil soon became evident.

During the same period of the Dutch occupation, Dr. Alexander Kuriusz, a Pole whose name has become known to history as Curtius, is credited with having established the first school of secondary education in America, which subsequently became an academy at which pioneers of more than one racial strain received their early education.

MORAVIAN-SLOVAK BAPTIZED INDIANS IN 1676

In the volume of "Passaic and Its Environs" by late Passaic Historian William W. Scott, Rev. Henry Loskiel, a Moravian missionary, was baptizing Indians in 1676 in the vicinity of Passaic. And Moravians were Slavs, who with Slovaks and Czechs formed the Great Moravian Empire, whose ruler Rastislav invited apostles Cyril and Methodius to his domain.

Polish nobleman, Zaborowski, who was an early settler in New Amsterdam, later moved to New Jersey, where he acquired large tracts of land in Bergen County, along Passaic River, now the home of countless Slavs. The family is known as Zabriskie. Poles have settled in Delaware with other Slavs as early as 1650, according to old records. At that time the famous Moravian-Slovak Johann Amos Comenius (Komensky) (1592–1671) was busy organizing public instruction. His high reputation brought him invitations from England, Holland, Sweden, and even the Harvard University.

The leadership of these noted men was a great inspiration to the first pioneers, who sought in the New World to establish their societies and parishes.

Such was also the case of the first Slovak pioneers in Passaic, who 21 in number on November 2, 1884, organized the first Slovak Sick and Benefit Society of St. Stephen the King of Hungary. This was one of the first Slovak societies in America. The beautiful glass windows of St. Stephen and his son St. Emery, the gift of this society, still decorate St. Mary's Church, in Passaic. They later formed St. John the Baptist Society and "Pannonia," National Slovak Society. Pannonia was the birthplace of St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, patron of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, which organization was formed in Passaic on July 4, 1905, by 43 members and now has a membership of 52,000 and assets of $15 million. St. Martin was also a distant relative of St. Patrick, whose father was a Roman soldier in Pannonia, then Roman province, which was then the name of the country of Slovaks.

The Slovaks began to organize their parish on April 1, 1891, in Passaic but due to shortage of Slovak speaking priests, the organization work was delayed. Since the first Slovak pioneers came from eastern Slovakia, where the Catholics of Byzantine rite were in large number, they aided them in establishing St. Michael's Byzantine Rite Church in Passic on November 14, 1891. The first pastor of Byzantine Rite Catholics was Rev. Nicofer Chanath.

FATHER ZBOYOVSKY BORN IN PASSIAC

Their marriages and baptisms were performed in the St. Nicholas Church, of which Father Sheppard was pastor. It was in this church that Father John Zboyovsky, who was born in Passiac on May 6, 1883, was baptized. His grandmother, Mrs. Hlavaty, lived near the site where St. Mary's Church stands. Father Zboyovsky celebrated on May 30 his golden jubilee of priesthood. His family moved from Passaic to Bethlehem, Pa., where his father was a prominent Catholic layman and banker.

The nearest Slovak parish was in Bayonne, N.Y., established in 1889 under the patronage of St. Joseph. Father Samuel Bela administered sacraments to the Slovaks and celebrated first mass for them at St. Nicholas Church on Columbia Avenue and William Streets. In 1893 the St. Mary's parish was established.

The first ushers of the parish, who also performed collections from house to house were: Stephen Tilicky, Anton Kron, Michael Spisiak, Michael Jakub (Jacob), Michael Warovsky, John Skvarla, Michael Kanis, John Liptak, Emery Reicher, Andrew Pastor, John Kadelak, and Michael Soltis.

FATHER SKULIK, FIRST SLOVAK PASTOR

Rev. Bernard M. Skulik was first pastor, who remained in the parish only till the middle of January 1894. In May 1894 the fifth national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union, now numbering over 100,000 members was held in Passaic and Rev. Stephen Furdek, known as "Father of American Slovaks" visited Passaic. His visit did much for the encouragement of the first pioneers. Other Slovak leaders, namely Father Raymond Wider and Father Erwin Gellhoff promised to send a Slovak priest to Passaic. Father B. Kwiatkowski of the Polish parish administered the parish. In September 1894 Father Joseph L. Ligday became pastor. He started Sunday school for children. But after a year he left the parish. Father Shephard continued to be administrator. In April 1896 Father John E. Pollakovich, a very energetic priest assumed pastorate and started a parochial school in the basement of the church with an organist as teacher. He was followed by Father Ignatius Jaskovitz, who is also known as the first Slovak priest to administer to the Slovaks in America in the Philadelphia archdiocese in 1880. Last year was the centennial of his ordination. Father Jaskovitz published the "Katolicke Noviny" (Catholic News), third Slovak publication in America. The first was founded in Pittsburgh on October 21, 1886. Father Jaskovitz remained in Passaic until July 1896.

ERA OF MONSIGNOR HAITINGER

In 1898 Father Emery A. Haitinger became pastor and remained in the parish for 24 years. He built the beautiful St. Mary's Church and eight other churches. Father Haitinger, later a monsignor, aided 10 boys from his parish to be priests and brought 35 priests to this country to serve the Slovak people. Monsignor Haitinger took part in the organizing of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America on February 22, 1911, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and was one of its incorporators. He died 2 years ago as one of three living incorporators of the federation, which in this golden jubilee year of its existence has undertaken to build an Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome.

Father John D. Salamon was pastor of St. Mary's for 21 years until his death in November 1945. He built the new school in 1929, which also served as Pope Pius XII Diocesan High School in 1939. The present pastor, Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A., is the first American Slovak prelate in the East elevated to the dignity of prothonotary apostolic. Monsignor Romanak is also director of Pope Pius XII Diocesan High School.

The following priests served as assistants in the parish: Msgr. Andrew L. Adzima, later pastor in Bayonne; Father John D. Salamon, Father John Miklus, later pastor of Sacred Heart Church in Rockaway and Jersey City, where he died in 1937; Msgr. J. F. Kelly; Father Michael Danczak, who died recently in Hoboken, N.J.; Msgr. Andrew V. Stefan, V.C., pastor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Boonton; Father John F. Pagach, Msgr. John D. Furman, Denville; Msgr. Emil R. Suchon, Rockaway, who will preach on the life of SS. Cyril and Methodius during the pilgrimage on July 2; Msgr. Francis C. Babulik, who is vicar general of the diocese of Nagoya, Japan; Father Joseph Yuresko and the present assistants, Father Bischoff and Father Joseph Nemshak.

The following sons of the parish were ordained to priesthood: Father Charles Radoczy, Monsignor Adzima, Father John D. Salamon, Msgr. J. D. Furman, Father Andrew E. Skvarla, O.S.B., Father Ladislaus J. Petrick, Msgr. Emil R. Suchon, Father Leo G. Zavatsky, Father Joseph Skorupka, S.B.D., missioner in Ghana, Africa; Father Edward M. Matash, Father John Mushinsky, and Father Theodore Kollar.

CLIFTON SLOVAK PARISH

SS. Cyril and Methodius Parish, Clifton, was organized on October 22, 1913. The late Bishop John O'Connor gave his approval on April 1, 1914. Father Anton Gracik, first pastor, took over the parish on September 14, 1914, and labored until December 11, 1920. He was followed by Father John Mikklus, Father Raisy, and Father Anselm Murn, O.F.M., a Franciscan who came on October 15, 1921. The Slovak Franciscan Fathers have cared for the parish since then. The present pastor is Father Francis Vilha, O.F.M., and Robert Valent, O.F.M., is assistant pastor. Father Daniel Novak, O.S.B., Father Jerome Pavlik, O.F.M., and Father Eugene Gasparovic, O.F.M., are the priests sons from the parish. In 1928 the parochial school was established. Mrs. Elizabeth Novak, mother of a Benedictine priest, is the oldest Slovak woman in this area and still active. Andrew Klukosovsky, Stephen Bigos, and Andrew Bekes are the 3 living founders of the original 43, who founded the Slovak Catholic Sokol in 1905.

SS. Cyril and Methodius, Boonton, was founded on June 16, 1907, although organization began in 1905. Father Francis Skutil was its first pastor and labored until his death 28 years ago. Father Skutil was also first editor of the Katolicky Sokol (Catholic Falcon) and founder of the Priatel' Dietok (Children's Friend), both publications are observing their golden jubilee this year. Father Skutil was assisted in the Children's Friend by Father Michael Major, then pastor in Guttenberg (St. John Nepomucene). Later he went to Chicago, where he labored zealously and died there. Msgr. Andrew V. Stefan, V.C., succeeded Father Skutil as pastor.

Sacred Heart Parish, Rockaway, was established in 1923. The late Father John Miklus was its first pastor. He was succeeded by Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A., who labored there for 18 years. Since 1945 Msgr. Emil R. Suchon is pastor and built a new church and rectory. Also a new church was built in Clifton, N.J., during the pastorate of Very Rev. Lawrence Pollak, O.F.M.

Before concluding this story, mention should be made of Father Eugene Dikovich, late pastor of St. Boniface Church, Paterson, who was of Slovak origin and served the early pioneers in Passaic area some three-quarters of a century ago.

In memory of these pioneers and in commemoration of the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Most Rev. James A. McNulty, D.D., bishop of Paterson, will pontificate Sunday, July 2, at 12:30 noon in St. Mary's Church, Passaic, N.J., where the Slovaks of eastern seaboard States will assemble for their annual pilgrimage. We welcome them in the home city of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, which will observe on Tuesday, July 4 its 56th anniversary in preparation for the 20th national slet and gymnastic and track and field meet at Fairfield University, where the pilgrims are invited to come.

Longevity Step Increases for Postal Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to identify myself with those Members of the House of Representatives who supported in overwhelming fashion the passage of S. 1459 to provide longevity step increases for postal employees.

This measure eliminates discrimination against postal employees, a condition which has existed far too long. It provides them with longevity pay increases and salary benefits comparable to those which other Government employees in the civil service have always enjoyed.

This situation has been not only an inconsistency, but a genuine inequity. It has denied the postal workers of the opportunity of moving upward in salary scales. It has resulted in deteriorating morale and we owe it to these faithful and dedicated public servants to correct these inequities to which they have been subjected.

Our postal workers take pride in their work and in their Department. They are entitled to recognition for merit performance and an incentive reward. When implemented, S. 1459 will increase the efficiency of these employees to an extent that I am confident will more than offset any threatened increase in the postal deficit—and certainly that would be in the public interest.

As a friend of the American postal workers, I am gratified that this 87th Congress has been able to eliminate this statutory inequality and removed our postal force from the category of forgotten men and women.

The World Needs Women's Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history of progress—traditionally referred to as the progress of mankind—more and more is bearing the inimitable touch of womankind.

As the foundation of our society, the women of America still serve as the heart of our homelife—as wives, mothers and homemakers.

However, the hands that once only rocked the cradle now are also rotating the wheels of progress in almost every field of human endeavor.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a thought-provoking article by Jane Mary Farley entitled "World Needs Women's Powers." Reflecting the views of Dr. Maria Eschbach—a former German teacher and educational consultant—the article presents informative, thought-provoking views on better utilization of women's power. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD NEEDS WOMEN'S POWERS—EDUCATION FOR FUTURE BEGINS IN FAMILY, EXCHANGE TEACHER SAYS

(By Jane Mary Farley)

By her own admission, Dr. Maria Eschbach is having a few thorny problems with Eng-

lish. Patiently, hesitantly, she picks her way, word by word, through the unfamiliar language as a small child leaps on stepping stones across a wide, deep pond.

But there is nothing uncertain about the grave light in the young visitor's clear eyes and her concern over the future of her sex, her country and the world.

Only a few weeks ago the German teacher and educational consultant left her home and her job in taunt, strained Bonn.

"Many times in Berlin I have seen the barbed wire—terrible to see.

"It is no use to fight against communism. We must have a better answer. We cannot come to a victory with weapons or refrigerators or television. We have before us men who have a faith and who are ready to fight for their ideas. The only hope is that we have a greater ideology," she said, selecting her expressions with care.

OFFERS ANSWER

In the last 15 years as she has studied, written, helped devise new courses and taught young people—particularly young women—in West Germany and throughout Europe, "it has become even more clear to me that the growing threat to the whole free world can only be met by far-reaching teamwork and enlightenment on the widest basis. * * * The essential reeducation and self-education of men and women today is vital no less than the survival and the renewing of all human society," she explained in applying for her current Fulbright exchange assignment.

And it is particularly the education of the modern woman—both back home in Bonn and here in Milwaukee—that the educator chose to discuss one recent afternoon as she began a year's exchange on the faculty of Milwaukee's Alverno College for Women.

EDUCATION BEGINS AT HOME

For the "sound education" the human race needs so badly for sanity and survival begins in a "sound family," the philosopher pointed out slowly, deliberately. "And woman must be the center of the sound family. Her chief task is to educate children * * * under the guidance and domination of God. Then young people will be able to bear and understand the meaning of events which are so troubling."

On the metaphysics of modern woman the visitor speaks with respected authority. For although the lithe Dr. Eschbach looks more like a sun kissed tennis champ than a scholarly professor, Europeans recognize her as an expert on the education of women and their role in the world today, she admitted.

A graduate of the University of Vienna with a doctorate in philosophy, Dr. Eschbach is a dedicated student and advocate of Baroness Gertrud von le Fort, the contemporary philosopher, historian, and poet whose classic treatise, "The Eternal Woman," written in 1934, urges a return to true "womanliness."

In addition to regular high school teaching duties, Dr. Eschbach was requested in 1954 to head the women's parliamentary committee of Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union for several months. "Thus, I was given an insight into the sociopolitical work with women."

CONSULTANT, WRITER

Three years ago the ministry of culture of Northrhine-Westphalia in Dusseldorf gave Dr. Ehchbach a year's leave for work at the Secretariate for European Questions in Strasbourg, where she worked in the office of information on European problems.

Since her return to Bonn she has set up unusual senior high school discussion groups to consider European questions, has helped observe and evaluate aspects of German education and, at the request of the governing body in Dusseldorf, has written a long treatise on European education, she said.

She has also written several analyses of Von le Fort's philosophy, plus two volumes for young women: "You and Life" and a novel, "The Mysterious Phone Call" (to which she is currently composing a sequel). Frequently she lectures throughout Europe on educational questions, especially on the teaching of girls and the education, position, and tasks of women today. She has also published several articles on the subject in professional journals.

The Fulbright teacher believes that woman fails as an educator and "heart" of the home because she has allowed herself to become "defeminized."

"The ideal is lost. Many women have no ideal to stay in the family. They have no insight into the importance of that task," Dr. Eschbach said. "Woman herself is not taking in earnest enough, her task." Besides, the world is pushing her away from it, too.

Woman's unfaithfulness to her "birthright" is not a new psychological problem, but the old struggle between pride and submission magnified in this age of chaos. It always begins when woman starts to imitate man, Dr. Eschbach believes.

NEED FOR SOLITUDE

"This is not good for the spiritual, the intellectual, or the physical. I think, for instance, if European women could have more time for her own meditation it would be better. The American woman, perhaps, too. But they fear meditation. They fly from quiet.

"Yet we must renew the sources of contemplation. This is woman's destiny, ordained by God," the scholar pointed out.

"Man is one-half of the world. Woman is the other half." She groped for an analogy. "And we are not allowed to mingle." By that, she added, she means that by divine design men and women should not usurp one another's role or natures. "Not that they should fight against one another," she said decrying the so-called battle of the sexes.

"But they must find a way together."

It is only with this spiritual richness and equilibrium and "wholeness" that modern woman can educate her children "with her being, her example, her * * *." She paused and leafed through the dictionary. "With her whole personal radiance," she explained in a voice gentle, sweet and unhurried.

WHERE IS ANSWER?

Like the "valiant woman" of the Old Testament, it is only the "valiant" modern woman who can endow her children with selfless guidance, love, care. It is only she who can teach them sacrifice, self-expenditure, virtue, beauty of soul, love.

Even when a woman enters politics, teaching, medicine, she must follow the professions not in the masculine sense, but with a kind of "spiritual motherhood" that is in every genuine woman, the visitor intimated.

And where in today's rush and strife will women learn to renew and restore their "valiant" natures?

"It is the task of the teachers of women," Dr. Eschbach believes. "Modern education has to educate women to be able to bear solitude, to contemplate" to get a better perspective on themselves, the world and eternity and to find the inner joy and peace they need if they are to be the focus of their families, she believes.

SEES HOPE BEGINNING

It is her hope, Dr. Eschbach added, that "a new type of modern woman will result from a unification of all Christian teachers who see women's primary natural tasks, duties, and responsibilities."

In women's high schools and colleges such as Alverno and in schools for young women in Germany and elsewhere, she said, she begins to see hope glimmering.

"I think we are living in an intermediate time. I am not hopeless." In a sense, she admitted, past exaggerations and confusion of the male and female destinies are almost good in the sense that women living and working so much like men have dramatized, the problem.

TO STUDY "HUMANIZING"

"I think young girls are on the way back" to true womanhood, she added. Assured that American college and high school statistics show that coeds are much more interested in homes, marriage, and families than their career-minded mothers and aunts were, she nodded that "it is the same in Europe.

"There is a new interest in the family. And it is a good thing."

Besides her teaching duties at Alverno, she hopes during the coming months to observe the structure of American education and how it is solving many problems of an industrial society. She is particularly interested in its "humanizing" influence on students.

"I am interested to learn of American methods which complete and carry on my efforts for an up-to-date education of the adolescent. I think we must begin early to train this type of woman we spoke of," she said.

Tribute to the Marine Corps Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Marine Band is an integral and a traditional part of the Washington scene. I doubt if there is anyone of us here present who does not regard it as his own. It is known as the President's own but in our hearts I think we feel that he shares it with us. A very fine tribute to this organization appeared in the September 16 issue of the Navy Times. It is appropriate that the attached article be perpetuated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MARINE BAND: 111 MEN AND A GIRL

(By Hugh Lucas)

WASHINGTON.—When 6-foot, 4-inch Drum Major M. Gy. Sgt. Edmond M. De Mar chugs down the street with his 5½-foot baton, the 103 Marine Band musicians behind his back represent not only good music but also:

A well-schooled outfit in which a high percentage have masters' degrees and some are working on doctorates.

At least five different types of music-making goups, ranging from jazz to symphonies.

An organization that has a library valued at $2 million, but actually is priceless, since many of the works are the only ones in existence.

Men who have "rubbed elbows"' with the greats of not only this Nation, but those of most others on the globe.

The Marine Band, though it's old in education is young in years, says Assistant Director Capt. Dale L. Harpham. About half the band has less than 8 years of service in the corps, he said.

However, this hasn't hurt the quality of the music—one British bandmaster has called the Marine Band the "world's best symphonic band" and this thought has been echoed by many others, band officials say.

In fact, many of the bandsmen join top symphony orchestras—several are with the National Symphony among others—or teach in top schools on retirement.

The "President's own" is not limited to symphony music alone. Instead, versatile musicians give it a flexibility envied by some of the other service musical groups. Included in the band is talent for a jazz combo; chamber music; 19-man White House Orchestra led by Harpham, that plays for all state dinners and has a special uniform; show, or Broadway-type band, and 13-man tenor, or hotel, band.

The White House uniform is plain with a high black collar. No belt, ribbons, Marine Corps insignia or collar ornaments are worn, the latter to keep violin players from having troubles.

This, of course, doesn't count the various soloists available when they're wanted by high-ranking officials. The band, said Assistant Director Capt. James B. King, Jr., can play in groups ranging from 1 to more than 100.

Typical of the talent the band can draw on is the leader of the chamber music string quintet, M. Sgt. William D. Rusinak. He attended Eastman School of Music, one of the finest in the country, and had his own hotel band in Minneapolis before joining the Marine Band 6 years ago.

Another one of the top-talent group in the band is M. Sgt. William C. Jolly, the staff arranger, veteran of the World War II Bob Crosby band and one of the 10 best jazz guitarists in the United States, according to some of those in the business. Unlike most of the others in the band, Jolly says he had no formal musical education, just "picking it up" as he went along.

He is now taking courses with Berklee School of Music in arranging. He says jazz is played by technicians today, unlike the thirties when pickup jam sessions were the order of the day. And you have to keep on top of the latest techniques and developments to be successful.

He's putting his knowledge to work right now in the new jazz combo in the band. He formed it along with Gy. Sgt. Donald F. Von Beulwitz. It is the first organized group of this kind in the band.

As a sidelight, Von Beulwitz is a graduate of Northwestern University in public relations. He also attended Midwestern School of Music afterward. In fact, one man in the band, M. Gy. Sgt. Arthur W. Lehman, has a degree in electrical egnineering from Penn State.

Both Jolly and Von Beulwitz are old hands in the business of bigtime music. They were together in Hollywood before coming to Washington, putting on national television and radio shows for the benefit of the Marine Corps.

With two other people, they handled the "Dress Blues" program on CBS–TV. They persuaded singer Monica Lewis to work on the show without salary. And they had the biggest names in the jazz world, such as George Shearing, and dance band leaders, like Les Brown, appear for nothing.

Doris Day was featured singer for 2½ years on the show and Rosemary Clooney worked with them for 3½ years.

CBS estimated that the program would have cost $2½ million dollars if the salaries of the guest artists had been paid. The Marines ran it at a cost of $13 a show—for the tape.

At various times it ran on the 585-station Mutual network, the 185-station NBC tie-up and the five stations of the John Poole network, a west coast organization.

M. Sgt. Anthony F. Matarrese, a percussionist from Eastman, and S. Sgt. David P. G. Wundrow, who attended Wisconsin University, fill out the Marine Band jazz group.

They don't play "way out" progressive jazz, Jolly says. Instead, they stick to the George Shearing-type music, which seems to please more people.

Their playing has not been restricted to social gatherings in the Washington area, area. They have played for a Voice of America broadcast that was beamed in the Far East.

Jolly also arranges the favorite songs of the occupants of the White House. The President is fond of "September Song," he says, while Mrs. Kennedy likes bright, light Broadway show-type tunes for her social gatherings, such as "Sound of Music" and "Gigi." She also likes "Never on Sunday" and "I Love Paris" among others, band officials said.

The tunes arranged by Jolly have a universal appeal as pointed up during the visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to Washington a couple of years ago. Jolly went to the Russian Embassy in Washington to get examples of Soviet music.

A suitable one was found and played during a reception. And the Russian top man stopped the band to applaud their rendition of a festival folk dance.

It's not often, however, that the Band has to go elsewhere to get its music. Among the thousands of scores in the big library at the Marine Barracks are at least 100 that are literally priceless. Most of them are out of print and unobtainable anywhere else.

Included in the collection is the score of the opera Genevieve de Brabant by Offenbach. This includes the aria "Complets Des Hommes D'Armes," which is supposed to be the basis for the Marines' Hymn. The opera premiered December 26, 1867, in Paris.

The band maintains its standards by being very choosy about whom they let in. Every man must audition before he is accepted. Most are top graduates of their schools who ask the Marine Band if any vacancies are coming up. He then is invited to audition by Harpham, who hears brass players; King, who passes on reed candidates, or Band Director Lt. Col. Albert F. Schoepper, who judges string players. Actually, any one of the three can audition any candidate since all play a number of instruments.

But when the three were playing Marine bandsmen themselves, Schoepper played the violin, Harpham the trombone and King the clarinet.

The prospective members are also questioned during the hour-long interview to see if they will fit in with other bandsmen.

If they pass this hurdle they are ready to begin some pretty hard work. Every man must practice a minimum of 3 hours a day on his particular instrument. To insure that he's on time for an engagement, he must leave his home at least 2 hours before normal travel time.

Then he plays for 3 hours or so and it takes him an hour or so to get back home.

This runs into a lot of time since the band performed 1,078 services last year. These included such things besides White House gatherings as the First Lady's luncheon, television shows, Women's Press Club performances, service dances and the like.

Among these performances are three that the Marine band always takes part in—White House, annual Gridiron Club dinner (an exclusive newspaperman's affair which lampoons political figures) and Easter services at Arlington Cemetery.

The band also has its own "recording studio," where music is put on tape or recorded for recruiting shows and films and other government requests. The band hasn't made any commercial records, though it has been asked and some other service units have, because of defense policy.

Next door to the recording control booth is a shop where the band repairs 90 percent of its instruments, even including replating jobs.

Though the bandsmen are in close contact with top officialdom during their work, they receive no special diplomatic training, Harpham said. Instead, the band operates on the idea that kindness is irresistible, he said, and this has worked in every case.

When a group is sent to an event, the man that is best qualified both musically and socially—regardless of rank—is chosen to be in charge of the group. In contrast to the past, no high-ranking conductor is sent along with the units; each has its own playing leader.

Credit for this increased responsibility, not only for the men but for selection of band members by the assistant directors, is given to Director Schoepper. This policy has helped the Marine Band reach one of its highest peaks of excellence in both acquiring and maintaining top talent, officials say. Schoepper took over his job May 1, 1955.

So, the next time you see the Marine Band prancing down the avenue, remember you are viewing one of America's top musicmaking organizations. And if you like what you hear, that makes you and President Kennedy (and President Thomas Jefferson) of the same mind.

There Is No Surplus of Forest Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the rapid depletion of our national resources requires a renewed, conscientious effort to first, avoid waste; and, second, provide better utilization, management and—if possible—replenishment programs.

According to experts, U.S. timber requirements, for example, are expected to double in the next 20 years. Because of this, I believe it is essential that we undertake new efforts to further develop—and, as necessary, expand—local, State, and Federal efforts to conserve our forests; better educate our citizens on the need for conservation and sound utilization practices—particularly in avoiding waste; promote multiple-use policies; and, develop more expansive replenishment programs.

Over the years, my home State of Wisconsin has had a particularly fine record in forest management. The cooperative private—educational—State-Federal efforts have contributed especially to our progress.

Nevertheless, we realize that there are still serious far-reaching problems to be met and resolved.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published a realistic appraisal of the challenges, entitled "There Is No Surplus of Forest Products." Reflecting constructive efforts of Wisconsin to meet the problem, as well as a realistic evaluation of the ever-growing demands on our forest reserves, I ask unanimous consent to have this article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE IS NO SURPLUS OF FOREST PRODUCTS

While some Wisconsin farmers may be plagued with surpluses that is not the case

with the tree farmers. Wisconsin is the leading State in the manufacture of paper and paperboard and thus provides a good market for forest products at the present time and gives every indication of even greater needs in the future.

That is why it is a matter of importance to the entire State that a statewide forestry education program entitled "Busy Acres in Wisconsin" was launched at the 16th annual Lake States Logging Congress here last week.

The program is intended to make the landowner aware of the potential benefits of tree farming and its importance to his welfare, to provide him with the basic knowledge required to put his land under tree management and to make it simple for him to obtain forestry advice which, if carried out, can qualify him for tree farm certification.

The Busy Acres program originated in North Carolina in 1959 and was picked up later by Mississippi and Florida. Last year Texas and South Carolina adopted the program and this year Wisconsin is joining the parade along with Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Arkansas. The Busy Acres program in Wisconsin supplements the Wisconsin tree farm program. It is expected that the program will receive public acceptance and eventually all Busy Acres will become certified Wisconsin tree farms. The U.S. Forest Service and the Forest Management Division of the Wisconsin Conservation Department have cooperated closely in helping the State's forest industries in the successful administration of Wisconsin's tree farm program. The same cooperation may be expected in the Busy Acres program.

To help in the spread of information about the very successful program a 32-page booklet entitled "Busy Acres" has been prepared by the Wisconsin Tree Farm Committee which consists of six industrial foresters and a representative of the forest management division of the Wisconsin Conservation Department. Others cooperating in the preparation of the booklet included the U.S. Forest Service, Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Trees for Tomorrow, Inc. The booklet is briefed and well illustrated. It can be read in a few minutes but it has material which will undoubtedly bring persons interested in tree farming back to review it often.

According to the U.S. Forest Service, Wisconsin has 176,906 owners of 11,431,000 acres of commercial forest land. Of that number 159,776 private owners own 6,304,000 acres, all in plots of less than 100 acres. Thus it is easy to see that if there is to be improvement in timber production, it must come from 150,000 private owners with the small woodlots. Good progress has already been made in Wisconsin for it now has 320 certified tree farms embracing 1,157,889 acres of privately owned taxpaying forest land under sound management practices. This, it is said, is comparable in area to a woodland strip 40 feet wide from Green Bay to the moon or a strip three-fourths of a mile wide from Washington to San Francisco.

Those well-managed acres are the result of 20 years under the American free farm program which is now active in 47 States and consists of 20,903 certified tree farms with 56,036,422 acres of forest lands under management.

But this program is not enough. A survey a few years ago by the U.S. Forest Service reported that there was "conclusive evidence that the productivity of recently cut land is the poorest on the farm and other private ownerships.

"The two groups of forest holdings involved nearly 4.5 million private ownerships which account for 60 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land."

Last year Richard E. McArdle, chief of the U.S. Forest Service, warned pulp and paper officials in New York that further significant reductions in the forest lands should be made only "with full realization such withdrawals may adversely affect future timber supply" and he added: "We are genuinely concerned."

The Busy Acres booklet puts the problem in these words: "Almost two-thirds of Wisconsin's commercial forest land is owned by farmers, other private individuals, and nonforest industries. One-third of these lands are producing wood less than their capability. With the proper attention these woodlands can be placed in top production. Actually trees are just as much an investment as cattle and yield up to 15 or more percent interest depending on the type, and condition of the woodland and how the owner manages it."

The farmer is offered this bit of advice: "With an ever-increasing demand for new wood products, with an ever-growing population which will mean even better markets, it is time to take stock. It is time your idle or lazy acres started working for peak production."

Playing Ping-Pong With the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following text of an address by our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN, prepared for delivery today at the Iowa State Conservation Field Day, Marshalltown, Iowa:

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ANCHER NELSEN, OF MINNESOTA

If you have listened to the so-called experts in agriculture over the years, I imagine you may be as puzzled as I am over how we as farmers can be in all the trouble we are. An expert, you know, is just an ordinary guy away from home.

But as I come here from your neighboring State as the operator of a 280-acre dairy farm in central Minnesota, I do not propose to stand up here and claim to be one of those so-called experts. I want to try instead to apply a little commonsense to a discussion of where we are, and why, and with perhaps a few words on what we ought to do about it.

Over a period of 25 years I have been associated with government in some small way, while at the same time being an active farmer. And I am convinced that there has been too much attention to applause-meter politics in the field of agriculture, with the farmer paying through the nose because there have been too many men who have made use of their alleged knowledge of the subject to make political hay.

Actually, it seems to me the political manipulations in farm discussions have been our worst enemy. Actually, a large part of our troubles are the result of the fancy footwork of some of our so-called friends.

I am sure you may wish to ask, "Why are you still on the farm?" My answer is that I find pleasure and satisfaction in getting out to the barn in the morning to take care of the cows, and I hope that you get a lift out of climbing aboard the tractor and riding the fields as I do, or building or repairing fences. The work is hard, the hours are long, but there is along with the healthy tired feeling at the end of the day a feeling of satisfaction.

And along with all that, I know that you, too, have grown accustomed to the uncertainties of crops, of prices, of weather; the doubts as to whether your year's work will pay off; the doubts as to meeting the loan at the bank; the doubts as to what Congress is going to do to you next week or next year.

Because, my friends, if you don't like all that and the other things that go with modern farming, you are in a rugged business in which most of the odds are against you, whether the odds are man-made or the acts of God, and you can well wonder if it's worth it all.

If you'll just take the time to come up and shake my hand, you'll see that it has had long, hard training on my family size farm in central Minnesota which, I imagine, is not vastly different from the farms which most of you operate. And I happen, as your chairman has said, to be one of those Members of Congress who helps make your life never dull—even if regularly uncertain. So you may safely assume that you are listening to a sympathetic soul.

But—I say, "Thank goodness for the farmer." There surely is nowhere in this land a more essential industry than agriculture. There surely is no industry which has as little to say about its product, its prices, its profits. Did I say profits? We don't really use that term in our business, do we?

There surely is no industry that has so many well-meaning, fighting friends allegedly trying to help us and usually just aggravating the problem. And there surely is no industry that had better be in top shape all the time because our foods and our fibers are the prime essentials of the Nation and the world.

And, let me add, I am sure that you will all agree that we are all determined to do our best to produce as we are permitted to, to provide a good living for our families, to make the farmer's life sufficiently attractive so that our sons and daughters will want to carry on. Because, really, it is a great life, I think, and it is always a satisfaction to me when the duties of Congress permit, to get out to the farm at Hutchinson and help my son do his job.

Just why is farming so difficult? I guess we all know most of the reasons; we are asked to raise great amounts of food for war, and when war ends we all help build up vast surpluses which throw a tremendous burden on all of us, simply because the marvelous performance we have developed carries on while the politicians fight over whether to let us keep on with our job. Farming is difficult because the policymakers fight it out year after year, making the rules of the game more complicated every time they pass a law, and that's usually every year.

In passing, let me give you a couple of illustrations of the problems that a Member of Congress faces when he tries to take a hand.

First, he may be for or against a particular approach for perfectly sound reasons, but he knows full well that his political opponents—and we all have them—will turn and twist his every act to make him sound like an enemy of the farmer. I can give you plenty of examples in my own experience, but I suppose that's all part of the game.

Second, I know you are aware that one of the toughest parts of the business, no matter where you are, is the abundance of farm organizations always ready to tell you what to do. I'm for them, you understand, but it does get a bit confusing now and then if you try to listen to the advice of all of them. So we who serve you in Congress have to take what we can from many ideas and sources and make up our own minds. Let me add that I do not believe a Member of Congress should be a 100-percent supporter of the proposals of any organization, no matter how lofty its purpose. I hope

that we may represent all our people to the best of our ability.

Here are some of the things we as Congressmen—and as farmers—have to deal with: Are price supports to be fixed or flexible? Are they to be high or low? Are they to be used to encourage production or discourage it? Are this year's decisions about parity and support prices going to be any good next year or the year after?

Now let's take a look at the political pingpong game that keeps us all jumping.

We came to the end of World War II having done a great job of producing * * * and with our farms geared to high production and potential surpluses. In 1947 CLINTON ANDERSON, now a U.S. Senator from New Mexico, became Secretary of Agriculture. He advocated a badly needed, long-range farm plan based on flexible supports—if a short supply in a commodity exists, raise supports to encourage production. When surpluses mount, drop supports, but always with a floor to protect the farmer. President Truman supported Mr. Anderson, and Secretary Brannan did, too, for a time when he took over the department.

A year later, in 1948, both political parties stood for flexible supports, but by the spring of 1949, Secretary Brannan scuttled the idea in favor of his own infamous plan, and what chance could there possibly be for agreement on anything except to let the mistakes continue and the surpluses mount.

By 1952 the Republicans stuck with flexible supports and the Democrats, bargaining again for votes, campaigned for high rigid supports, and the administration of President Eisenhower was up against the same old political pingpong game. Thus through the next 8 years the battle was fought and refought to the utter confusion of everyone, and with a surplus problem that became increasingly a headache.

The Kennedy administration next moved in on the scene. They then proposed the Agricultural Act of 1961, known as the omnibus farm bill, which attempted (1) to take over the functions of Congress, and (2) to obtain authority to place into operation the Cochrane theory of supply management over every one of the 256 agricultural commodities produced in America. The Congress was wiser than the controllers. It refused to give this authority. The proponents by the application of their concept would destroy the U.S. marketing system by placing controls over every segment of the marketing system, and thereby destroying the free market.

In the meantime the so-called emergency feed grain bill had been passed and I might say that this program has possibilities, the theory being that land would have to be retired in order to balance supply and demand. But to our surprise, this program—contrary to the political history of its proponents (especially the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, who had criticized Mr. Benson at every opportunity for not supporting high fixed supports at 90 percent)—allows the Secretary to set supports at any level above 65 percent of parity. This is rather confusing.

If 90 percent of parity was supposed to be the answer in 1952, why isn't it the answer in 1961? We were told in 1952 that rigid supports at 90 percent was what the farmers were supposed to get—and what do we get in 1961? You know what we are getting under the new feed grain program: corn supports at 74 percent of parity and the program calls for flexible supports. Yes, they flex all the way up from 65 percent of parity. And under this wide range of discretion vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, where does he set the supports? At 90 percent? At 80 percent? No, not even at 75 percent—he has set supports at 74 percent. I do not necessarily quarrel with the position taken, but I do quarrel with the politics that has been played with it.

So we are right back to where we started from.

It seems pretty clear to me that the political appeal of an issue has been of greater concern to the politicians than an effective answer that will produce proper income to the farmer.

And out of the mistakes of the last 20 or 30 years has developed the toughest problem of all—some $8½ billion in surplus commodities which hangs as a dead weight on the market and our own plans—and which hangs, too, as a tremendous burden on all taxpayers, whether farmer or not, in paying the costs of storage, handling, interest, and transportation to the tune of more than a billion dollars a year. So we can perhaps understand a little when the general public fails to understand or gets critical of farm programs, forgetting that these things have happened because we farmers have done our best to do the job that they, the public, want us to do.

When the emergency feed grain bill was before the Congress, many Congressmen pointed to the fact that farmers were in the midst of marketing their 1960 crop of corn and other feed grains. There was fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the extraordinary powers proposed in that measure to force down the cash price of corn by the sale of tremendous Government stocks on the free market. The Secretary gave assurances that he would not do this. He said as follows: "You may be sure that we will not administer this program so as to reduce the income received by the farmers prior to October 1, 1961, from sales of feed grains from the 1960 crop, below that they would have received if this program had not been enacted."

However, as soon as the feed grain bill became law, the Secretary proceeded to sell tens of millions of bushels of feed grains under the pretext that this was corn "threatened with going out of condition." Between October 1, 1960, and September 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation sold for domestic use over 235 million bushels compared with 105 million bushels in the same period a year earlier.

This action by the price fixers has caused the price of corn to be at least 10 cents a bushel below the level it should be—below what the free market would have paid. As a matter of fact, on the 14th of September 1961 the cash price for No. 2 corn in Chicago was actually 8 cents under a year ago. The price fixers have taken tens of millions of dollars out of the pockets of corn producers.

During the congressional debate on the feed-grains program, the Secretary of Agriculture insisted that he have the authority to dispose of Commodity Credit surpluses at the prevailing market price. Apparently his reasoning was that with this power to control the market he could force farmers into the new program. This is the club that he wanted to use.

When this question came up on the floor of the House I felt that it was not right to give the Secretary of Agriculture this power to club farmers into line. It was my contention that if the program was to be a success it would have to be made attractive so that a great majority of the farmers would find it to their advantage to participate in the sign-up. It was then that I offered my amendment to authorize partial payment in advance at sign-up. The adoption of this amendment would provide two advantages: (1) It would encourage farmers to participate in the program and thus secure the land retirement which is the basis of the whole program. Second, while being beneficial to the program itself, the partial payment in advance would provide the farmer with cash in his pocket at a time when he needed it most—during spring's work when fuel, fertilizer, and seed bills run high.

Fortunately my amendment was adopted and is a part of the 1961 emergency feed grain program and has been carried over into the 1962 program.

I have often wondered how many farmers would have found the program attractive if it had not been for this so-called Nelsen amendment.

But there's another aspect to this situation. As you know, the new feed grain program provides for payment to the farmer by certificate.

Here's how it works: When farmers signed up for the program last spring, they were in theory paid in kind. The farmer had three choices. (1) He could take his certificate and redeem it in grain. (A few actually did this); (2) He could take his certificate and sell it to a third party; or (3) he could take the cash value and return the certificate to the Secretary, who would later market it as the agent of the farmer. (This is what nearly all farmers did.) It had the effect of channeling all these certificates back into the hands of the Secretary—some $680 million worth. This vast sum is clearly enough to give the Secretary a complete corner on the grain market. He can make it go up by withholding sales and he can make it go down by selling. This is a tremendous power. It is too much power for one man. I opposed this grant of power in the Congress. These certificates should never have been allowed to be concentrated in one man's hands. The judgment of thousands of farmers buying and selling in different parts of the Nation would not have this disastrous potential.

The Secretary in this case can drive the market down. Then any speculator could go into the market and buy grain at less than production costs. The speculator could go into the feeding game or dairying in competition with the farmer with fixed costs and break him. You can't sweep your farm under the rug when the assessor comes.

Iowa Congressman JOHN KYL, during the debate asked the question, "Is this bill intended to raise or lower market prices?" He got no answer.

Let us now turn to another commodity, soybeans. This group of producers has been a most farsighted group. They have worked hard on developing a market for their product at a competitive, yet attractive price and in 1960, 23.6 million acres were harvested. These producers asked the Secretary not to raise the price above $2 a bushel—but in spite of this request, the Secretary established a support price 45 cents above the 1960 level and the latest crop reports indicate that there will be 27.1 million acres to be harvested and this represents 114 percent of the 1960 crop. In all probability this will drive the price of soybeans down and the Government will be the purchaser—and the industry may well find itself in the same trouble that other agricultural commodities are in.

I cite these strange maneuvers, but I am frank to admit that neither a program of fixed supports or of flexible supports will work unless a land retirement program is brought into play, and by this method balanced supply and demand.

Recently the Department of Agriculture announced that it would sell surplus corn at market price. It was stated that the purpose in so doing was to stabilize prices, pointing out that in some areas where feed was in short supply fluctuations occurred. In other words, the market price was too high.

First, at what level was the market price at the time of the announcement? As of September 13 the market price for No. 2

yellow corn in Chicago was $1.12 per bushel. This compares with $1.20 a year ago; $1.12 is 69 percent of parity.

Actually, according to latest Government reports the average cash price received by farmers was $1.04 a bushel. This is 64 percent of parity. A good question would be, Are we now being told that 69 percent of parity is too high? Are we now being told that we cannot ever have 100 percent of parity, even if the market will pay it? But instead we are to be satisfied with 74 percent of parity from the Government.

Because of what is known as the Neal Smith amendment, the farmer who is participating in the program will get 74 percent of parity on only his normal production based on his 1959–60 yield. For example, if your yield is established at 70 bushels an acre and if because of good weather and farming practices you are fortunate in having a yield of 100 bushels an acre this year, you will still get the 74 percent on only 70 bushels. The other 30 bushels you will have to sell on the market in competition with Government dumping and noncooperators at a market price depressed by Government action.

In a recent press release the Department announced its intention to sell 650 million bushels of corn during the next marketing year. This is 17 million bushels of corn per week. Certainly if they accomplish this objective, the price of corn would be low. The feed grain/livestock ratio will be high and as Secretary Freeman, himself, has said, cheap feed grain means cheap livestock. The next step could well be taken in the fall of 1962 under those circumstanes where the livestock prices could conceivably and very likely be driven down, and without question a program would evolve to regulate livestock.

It becomes quite clear that if we are to depart on a completely regulated economy that the farmer will find himself in more and more trouble as time goes on. It has been pretty well established by now that many of our problems have been a result of mistakes of big government.

It is not my purpose to appear here as a carping critic—but remember, we have to live with this law. I do wish to point out features of this law and the way it is administered which could destroy agriculture—and I wish to make suggestions as to changes that many of us feel could make this law an effective instrument and increase income for agriculture without breaking the back of the taxpayers of the country or breaking our free enterprise system.

The changes that I would suggest would be these: We have now for years attempted to legislate by dealing with individual commodities—corn, wheat, etc. We reduced wheat acres in the wheat areas by quotas and allotments of acres, only to have production break out in the nonwheat area, by an act of Congress permitting 15-acre plots.

We reduced corn acreage only to find grain sorghums and barley coming into production competing with corn.

I think the feed grain bill approach does have merit. I think it can be improved and in order to work and produce the necessary results a much more general participation is necessary. If that is not accomplished, it will go down as the greatest boondoggle of them all. I would like to suggest an approach to the farm problem on the basis of total tillable acres rather than on the basis of commodity-by-commodity. We would then:

1. Make an overall determination as to the amount of land retirement necessary;

2. Provide incentive compensation by cash or in kind to get the farmer participation to effect the necessary retirement;

3. Provide a system of supports that can be raised or lowered, applying it to commodities in question. In other words, let's not drive the competitive market, but merely guide it when and where necessary. Go back to what CLINTON ANDERSON advocated in 1947.

I should point out that the 1961 feed grain program with its payment-in-kind feature isn't a brandnew idea. If this year's program had approached the feed grain problem on the basis of total tillable acres, it would have been very similar to the proposal which I and several other Midwest Congressmen introduced in the House of Representatives over a year ago. Our proposal, however, would not have restricted participation to 40 percent by individual farmers and we would not have vested in the Secretary of Agriculture a one-man control of the feed grain markets.

It begins to appear that the degree of participation this year has not been high enough to reduce the total supply of corn and grain sorghums. The 40-percent limitation discouraged too many farmers from participating when greater participation was needed. With good crops coming along, it now appears that the limited participation—42 percent of all eligible farms and 23 percent of the corn acreage—will not be sufficient to offset the annual corn production which is now estimated by the crop reporting board as only 10 percent below that of last year.

The one cardinal rule of success for any payment-in-kind program is that the annual supply from both the annual production and the release from storage must not exceed the annual disappearance. This rule is based on the old reliable law of supply and demand. In other words, the total amount of corn available both from this years' production and from Government surpluses are reflected by the payment-in-kind certificates must not exceed the expected disappearance this year in animal feed, seed, food, and export.

Any workable program we might adopt is going to cost money—a lot of money. But if we're going to spend the money, let's have a program that's going to do the job. The alternative is a never-ending problem of surpluses and high costs.

With the corn market 8 cents lower than it was least year at this time, and operating costs increasing rather than decreasing, it becomes apparent that the economic planners haven't found the answer to the farmer's cost-price squeeze. If the planners are going to control the farm markets by depressing the prices, why don't they give some thought to putting planning controls on other aspects of our economy? The Nation's family farmer isn't going to benefit from the present program when the cash price of feed grains is being driven down for the benefit of the speculator feeders and supports higher than the market price work a comparative benefit to the commercial growers. What happened to the so-called champion of the family-sized farm? Meanwhile we find American industry generally being priced out of world markets as a result of high costs of production here at home—those same high costs of production which are putting the squeeze on the Nation's farmers.

So, finally, we arrive at this point: If the farm economy is to be planned and controlled by the so-called experts, then all of American economy must be likewise planned and controlled. And in the end who is going to plan the planners?

So let's profit by the mistakes being made with the new feed grain program. Let's leave political ping-pong out of the farm game; make an honest effort to do what is best and right for American agriculture and the entire Nation's economy. We are living in times when we cannot afford the luxury of politics as usual—we farmers never could afford it and I say now that it is time that the political experts realize that our country can't afford it.

Outside Interference With Integration Problems in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a few days ago I made reference on the Senate floor to a group who came to my home State and attempted to integrate the Jackson, Miss., bus terminal, and as a result were arrested and convicted of violating State law.

An editorial by Hon. Jimmy Ward, editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, reflects the pressures that have been placed upon the people of Mississippi by outsiders who came to the State to violate our laws and create breaches of the peace.

The people of Mississippi, throughout this prolonged episode of so-called freedom riders, have exercised restraint, patience, and good judgment.

The editorial by Mr. Ward, an able editor with a sense of justice and fair-play, points up the problems of this social movement by outsiders. His editorial cites the figures from FBI records to show that States represented by some of those visiting ministers have many serious problems in their own hometowns which deserve attention. Yet they came to Mississippi to "set things aright."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Jackson Daily News of September 15, 1961, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO OUR VISITING MINISTERS: YOUR SHEEP ARE STRAYING

No right-thinking citizen of Jackson will be so vain, so self-centered as to indulge in self-deceit by thinking or proclaiming that this is a perfect community. Jacksonians are proud of the religious, cultural, industrial, business, and racial progress and harmony that have been achieved through mutual understanding by our citizens down through the years. The earnest desire is for continued improvement in all these fields.

And, in a frank confession of our imperfections—individual and collective—any serious-minded citizen will welcome constructive criticism which will add to the community's strength both spiritually and materially.

Humbly recognizing our shortcomings, any sincere, reverent invocations made unto the Almighty in our behalf should and will be met with respect, appreciation, and inward humility from which springs the fountain of understanding and swells the river of individual rededication, the source of America's strength.

In short, Jacksonians do not look upon themselves as Charles Sprague viewed two swallows that flew into the Chauncey Place Church in Boston a century ago and wrote of them:

"Gay, guiltless pair,
What seek ye from the fields of heaven?
Ye have no need of prayer,
Ye have no sins to be forgiven."

Conceit is not man's least evil, but when it is hitched up with arrogance you've got

yourself a wagon that is headed over the cliff of self-destruction.

How does one gage sin, wrongdoing, improper conduct, and immorality?

A healthy conscience can direct an individual in his daily living. A community has laws, customs and traditions for guidance in maintaining law and order; these rules and regulations are mere tools for the protection of human beings in their quest for peaceful relations one with another.

Mississippians see in their midst a group of 15 ministers, men of the cloth who are representing religious orders which are historically coupled with their own laws, customs, traditions, doctrines, declarations, beliefs, dress, mode of worship. These ministers hold their customs and traditions and doctrines sacred as tools—so to speak—of spiritual growth. These beliefs and their tools should be theirs to hold and to keep.

But these ministers are in Mississippi to break civil laws, customs, and traditions, tools of a society to keep the peace.

While the individual conscience can serve as a meter of individual conduct, the waywardness of man in his peaceful or violent existence with his fellowman can be measured by public behavior.

The annual report on crime by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is one of the best measures in determining how and where people in this country best behave themselves in public.

Mississippi's rank as third from the bottom in the Nation on the rate of crime is a source of pride, not of conceit, and all citizens recognize the fact that Mississippi can and will do better in the future.

Some Mississippians might have felt that if 15 ministers from various parts of the Nation could stage such a dramatic pilgrimage into Mississippi that they had succeeded in achieving human happiness, peace and tranquility in their respective communities and were here to pass along the secrets of the abundant life.

A cursory check of the FBI records reveals the following:

Three of the ministers arrested are from Massachusetts, where the crime rate is 758.4 offenses for every 100,000 inhabitants. The Reverends Gilbert S. Avery III, Myron B. Bloy, Jr., and James P. Breeden left a State where the rate of murder last year was 1.5, rape 5, robbery 21.2, and aggravated assault 20.1.

In Providence, R.I., home of the Reverend John Crocker, Jr., the crime rate is 1,438.3, more than three times that of Mississippi. The rate of murder is 1.1, rape 2.8, robbery 15.3, and assault 21.

The Reverend James W. Evans is from St. Clair, Mo., where the State crime rate is 1,095.7, murder 4.6, rape 11, robbery 76.2, and assault 71.6.

Others include the Reverend John M. Evans' Toledo, Ohio: 1,360.8, murder 3.3, rape 7.2, robbery 81, and assault 49.9; Washington, D.C., home of the Reverend Quinland R. Gordon and the Reverend William A. Wendt: 1,186.7, murder 6.9, rape 10.2, robbery 67.3, and assault 183.6.

The Reverend James G. Jones and the Reverend Robert Page Taylor are from Chicago: 1,930.6 (more than four times that of Mississippi), murder 6.7, rape 17.0, robbery 237.5, assault 134.8. The State rate of Illinois, which would take in both Chicago and the Reverend Pierson's Evanston, is 1,440.0, murder 5.1, rape 12.4, robbery 159.7, and assault 94.2.

The Reverend John B. Morris of Atlanta left a city where the overall crime rate is 1,385.5, murder 10.7, rape 8.2, robbery 38.5 and assault 111.3. Wisconsin, home State of the Reverend Geoffrey S. Simpson, boasts a 513.5 rate, considerably lower than most of the States—considerably higher than Mississippi's. The murder rate there is 1.3, rape 2.8, robbery 8.5, and assault 16.9.

Cincinnati, home of the Reverend Vernon Powell Woodward, has a 703.4 rate including murder 3.5, rape 11.6, robbery 32.2, and assault 33.9; while the Reverend Merrill O. Young's Boston has an 844.2 rate, murder 1.8, rape 5.2, robbery 29.4, and assault 28.4.

In light of the foregoing facts and without attempting to penetrate the inward thoughts of the visiting clergymen, it is safe to say that while their invasion of Mississippi might be a conscientious thing for them to do, their individual records of wiping out sin, mayhem and violence leaves much to be desired and their vacant pulpits back in these crime-pocked areas casts a long shadow of doubt over the wisdom of their widely publicized ecclesiastical mission into Mississippi.

Ralph Waldo Emerson might have had freedom riders in mind when he wrote the following lines:

"Oh, when I am safe in my sylvan home,
I tread on the pride of Greece and Rome;
And when I am stretched beneath the pines
Where the evening star so holy shines,
I laugh at the lore and the pride of man,
At the sophist schools, and the learned clan;
For what are they all in their high conceit,
When man in the bush with God may meet."

None Are Free Unless All Are Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Berlin is the focal point of the entire world. Here we rise or fall. There is no turning back, no retreat. Commitments have been made and promises given.

The following editorial appeared in the September issue of the American Federationist. It paints a grim picture, is factual, and pretty largely expresses the sentiments of the American public:

BERLIN—TEST FOR FREE MEN

On a small island of democracy, surrounded by a sea of Communist armed might, 2.5 million people are living bravely, separated by only a few strands of barbed wire from the worst slave society the world has ever known.

They are the West Berliners—the men, women, and little children on the very frontline of the war between freedom and despotism.

They are protected, of course, by a few thousand armed soldiers, but their real defense is the solemn pledge of the United States of America.

The West Berliners are courageous and calm. They are confident, too. They know the day of craven surrender to dictators is over. At the price of millions of lives and suffering too horrible to capture in words, the democratic nations have learned that peace can't be bought by surrendering even a little piece of freedom to a power-hungry totalitarian.

That is the real story of Berlin—the story of free men who have made up their minds to never again be pushed around by a dictator.

It is ironic that Berlin should today be freedom's frontline. Only a few short years ago another evil dictator reigned there and brought chaos to an entire generation.

But the free world has learned a lot since the days of Hitler. The most important lesson it learned is that no man is free unless all men are free; that freemen cannot barter away any man's freedom to insure liberty for themselves.

Berlin is today more than just a symbol of democracy—important as it is in the midst of Communist discontent and failure. It has rightly been called democracy's showcase—the one spot where East Berliners can see the material benefits of democratic freedom in stark contrast to their drab, dismal, desolate life as slaves of communism.

It is more than the hatchway to freedom through which millions have crawled out of the Communist trap. They are the millions who are the most confirmed anti-Communists in the world—for the man who hates communism most is the man who knows it best, the man who escaped.

In a real sense, the free world has already won the battle of Berlin. We won it on August 13, 1961—the day the Communists sealed that escape hatch with barbed wire, proving only their guns will keep those who have known communism's "blessings" inside this "workers' paradise." There will be hours of tension, weeks of nerve-wracking maneuvers and months of danger ahead. The possibility of a fighting war will exist for every moment.

But the first and most important test has been met. The Kremlin knows now it has but two choices—to fight or back down.

And the world knows that behind the new concrete walls men yearn for freedom so desperately that the Kremlin has had to resort to the most extreme measures to keep them in bondage.

The President of the United States has pledged America's resources to the defense of the West Berliners.

It is our destiny to lead the free world in this hour of crisis. And the President knows that in this hour of test he leads a united, determined people—a people who know what human freedom really means.

El Cajon Little League World Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, late in August of this year an expert group of young baseball players from my congressional district participated in the Little League World Series held in Williamsport, Pa. This team was made up of the El Cajon-La Mesa Northern Little League All-Stars and today they are world's champions. We are very proud of these boys.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, addressed the House of Representatives on August 29, 1961, with respect to this memorable event. Unfortunately, our colleague was not fully aware of the fantastic growth in southern California and San Diego County, in particular. So that the record may be straight, I submit herewith an article that appeared in a newspaper in my district which contains very significant statements by Mr. Dick Ferree, manager of the El Cajon Chamber of Commerce. You will note the fact that

El Cajon's population is now in excess of 40,000 people and not 5,418 as my good friend, HERMAN SCHNEEBELI stated in his statement to the House.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith as a portion of my remarks the above-referenced newspaper article:

LITTLE LEAGUERS ARE LAUDED BUT FERREE WANTS THE RECORDS STRAIGHT

EL CAJON.—There's no mistake about it. The El Cajon-La Mesa Northern Little League All-Stars are the world's champs.

But El Cajon Chamber of Commerce manager Dick Ferree would like to set the RECORD straight—the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that is.

Speaking before the House of Representatives August 29, HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican of Pennsylvania, had this to say:

"I was privileged to attend the final game of the Little League world series, held in Williamsport, Pa. The crowd composed of interested spectators from localities throughout the United States and the free world totaled some 16,000 people—much more than the total combined population of the communities represented by the competing teams.

"El Cajon, Calif., from a town of 5,418, won out over the team from El Campo, Tex., population, 6,216, in an exciting contest conducted in the finest traditions of American sportsmanship."

"Of course, these statements hit me like a bomb," Ferree who takes an enthusiastic interest in such things as population statistics, stated. "Congressman Schneebeli obviously was quoting from the 1950 census report."

Ferree added, proudly, that El Cajon's population has soared to 40,000. He granted that perhaps the area from which the Northern Little League All-Star team was chosen has a population of about 5,000.

The Congressman continued: "It is not insignificant that the Little League world championship was decided between representatives of small towns, for it is my contention that small communities constitute the solid, strong and steady foundation of our way of life."

Ferree grudgingly admitted that perhaps El Cajon would be considered a small town, at least by California standards.

"From the moment when a home run sailed out of the park in the seventh inning of the first game, eliminating Levittown—last year's titlist—the California boys loomed as the most dangerous competitors. But El Campo, Tex., also had impressed the spectators, especially in the semifinals when it disposed of Monterrey, Mexico, which twice before had captured Little League championships, Congressman SCHNEEBELI said.

DINGDONG BATTLE

"Thus a dingdong battle, right down to the wire, was expected. And that's just what happened, with a home run by Mike Salvatore in yesterday's final inning sewing up the championship for El Cajon.

"Our warm congratulations to the new kings of Little League baseball—but unstinting praise must go also to all the lads who took part in this thrilling international event."

Voice From the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Evening Star last night was a sign of great encouragement to me. Ever since September 12, when I first brought the Katanga situation to the attention of the House, I have been watching developments in the Congo with increasing alarm.

I was discouraged at the attitude of our State Department in wholeheartedly endorsing the U.N.'s attack on the peaceful Province of Katanga. Now it appears that one of the Capital's most respected newspapers, the Star, agrees with me that to preserve freedom, the West should have supported Tshombe's resistance to communism instead of attempting to force him to rejoin the Communist-leaning government of Léopoldville, set up with the sanction of the U.N.

The editorial follows:

VOICE FROM THE CONGO

In a wild and irrational speech, Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, has blamed the capitalist powers for the death of Dag Hammarskjold. And this "assassination," the Premier said in Léopoldville, "is not the first of its kind perpetrated by the money powers."

While this ranting was going out over the airwaves, eight Russian diplomats, expelled from the Congo a year ago, were moving back to Léopoldville. Doubtless they will be welcomed, if not by Mr. Adoula, then certainly by his leftwing deputy, Antoine Gizenga.

The import of this, it seems to us, is that the Congolese Government, if not already Communist-dominated, is moving in the Communist direction. And if this is the case, why in the world are we supporting the United Nations effort to force Moise Tshombe's Katanga Province back into the Léopoldville fold?

At best, it is extremely doubtful that there was any authority or justification for the use of U.N. troops in the ill-advised effort to end Katanga's succession from the Congo—an effort which now has ended unsuccessfully in a cease-fire. And if Premier Adoula's speech is a fair indication of the shape of things to come, the non-Communist U.N. countries will be cutting their own throats by lending further support to this effort. Whatever may be President Tshombe's faults, it now appears that he had ample reason to resist the attempt by the Léopoldville regime to take control of Katanga. Instead of trying to help subdue him, it may well be that the West, to the extent that it was going to become involved, should have been supporting the Tshombe resistance.

The VHF Versus UHF Television Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Communications Commission has designated eight areas in the United States for deintermixture, the elimination of VHF television stations and the establishment of all-UHF areas. One of these is Binghamton, N.Y., which directly affects my district for there are thousands of people in the rural areas of Wayne, Wyoming, and Susquehanna Counties of Pennsylvania who are dependent on the VHF station in Binghamton for their television viewing.

My office has been deluged with letters and petitions from these constituents, who make the point that if the FCC's proposal is invoked, they will be without adequate television service. Certainly the intention of Congress in approving the Federal Communications Act was to make certain that television and radio service be made available to all the people of the United States.

There is a long history behind this proposal, beginning with the ill-conceived allocation plan for the whole United States. Previous to establishing this allocation plan, the FCC invoked a "freeze" on the allocation of all channels for a few years, and then issued the plan which right from the start was most unsatisfactory.

UHF television, both from the transmitting and receiving standpoint, has been the primary victim of this plan. Enormous sums of money were lost in attempts to put and keep UHF stations on the air in competition with VHF stations. Manufacturers of transmitting and receiving equipment have been loath to expend adequate sums in research and development of UHF because of the comparatively small market.

Now, the Federal Communications Commission and the Congress face a major problem which will beset us all even more in the future than at the present moment. A solution must be found for the further development of UHF in order that the complete usefulness of all channels is made available to the Government, the military, and especially the people of the United States.

I assume that the FCC is attempting to take a step in that direction with this proposal for the deintermixture of the areas. Unfortunately, it appears to be a false step because, for the most part, comparatively rural areas have been selected for the elimination of VHF channels. It is precisely in rural areas that VHF is most needed in order to provide adequate coverage and service for all the people.

Some Members of Congress have introduced bills bearing directly on this subject. I hope the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold hearings on the proposed legislation as quickly as possible.

Protest Against Arbitrary Ruling of Commission To Eliminate Certain VHF Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues from South Carolina and other States who have indicated their grave concern and opposition to recent FCC proposals to shift VHF television stations to UHF. I have introduced H.R. 9322, a companion

bill to H.R. 9267, authored by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Columbia, the capital city of my State, has only one VHF channel assigned to it—channel 10. This channel was granted to WIS–TV, and since November 7, 1953, this station has been providing reliable and good television service to wide areas of our State. The many thousands of families living within the wide service area of this fine station depend on this VHF service for news from their State capital, local weather and storm warnings, crop reports and agricultural news that is vital to their livelihood and to keeping them intelligently informed on matters affecting their State. For a great many of these people, who, for the most part are living in rural and small town areas, this is their only television service from their State capital. If this service from VHF channel 10 is destroyed or deteriorated then this extremely important service will be lost to them and they will have to depend on distant stations, in many cases out-of-State stations, for television service. This, gentlemen, is not in the public interest and I must strongly protest against switching WIS–TV from VHF channel 10 to UHF and thus take away good television service from thousands of rural families who need and depend upon it for education, entertainment, and enlightenment.

I am not unfamiliar with UHF for we have a UHF television station broadcasting alongside of VHF Channel 10 in Columbia. UHF is providing an important service to the city and its immediate environs and I would not want to see this lost. At the same time I am greatly concerned because the change proposed by the FCC would take television service from channel 10 away from about half of the people who now enjoy and need this service. As the elected Representative of many of these people I cannot remain idle and allow this destruction to occur.

The people of South Carolina and throughout our Nation have the right to expect to be able to continue to receive their present reliable and high quality television service. Every Member of this distinguished body should be aware of the serious threats of the FCC's proposal and with such awareness will share the serious concern I have in this important matter.

Address by Hon. Catherine D. Norrell, of Arkansas, Before Veterans of World War I at Dallas, Tex., September 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and great honor to address the Veterans of World War I and the Auxiliary to Veterans of World War I at Dallas, Tex., on Tuesday, September 19, 1961, at their ninth national convention. Under leave granted, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of my address:

Mr. Chairman, National Commander Erickson, National Auxiliary President Mrs. Mort, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, your national commander and the membership of the Veterans of World War I of the United States have honored me greatly by inviting me to be with you this evening.

As the widow of a World War I veteran, who had served in the House of Representatives for more than 22 years, I first became acquainted with the objectives of your organization at the time a congressional charter of incorporation was granted in 1958.

Now I find that your membership has expanded to more than 200,000, with a total of 2,657 barracks located in each of the 50 States, as well as in the Philippine Islands and Ireland. My informant tells me that I may boast that Arkansas has 82 barracks with a membership of 3,919 as of August 29 this year.

This record of continually expanding membership is indeed evidence that your purposes meet with enthusiastic response. More than that, your purpose to participate in our national security in the capacity of civilians constitutes the bulwark of freemen, which no enemy could penetrate.

Your purpose is quoted in these words: "To fight all alien forces, particularly and especially Communists, whose objectives are to deny our very existence as a free people." It is to this purpose that I should like to address my remarks this evening.

In thinking about the subject of my remarks, I was reminded of the recent occasion in the House of Representatives when special orders granted us the privilege of speaking in commemoration of the ratification of the 19th amendment, the woman's suffrage amendment.

There are 17 lone women Members of the House among 420 men. Only five of us had risen to speak before the male Members began a series of requests to speak. Would you believe it: 35 male Members rose to congratulate, elaborate, and enumerate the contributions which the women of America have made to our society since they attained the franchise in 1920.

That record would seem to belie the long-standing accusation that women never seem to know when to stop talking. At any rate, the single hour of special privilege elapsed—with a male Member having the final word.

Within the same 5-year period of our history, there were three events that changed the course of our national life.

1. Perhaps you will consent now that the attainment of the franchise for women in 1920 could be counted as a victory in the field of freedom.

2. During 1917 and 1918, we were engaged in the World War I battle for democracy.

3. And in 1919, international communism began its course of enslavement of human lives. It was then that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was started by a small group of fanatics. Forty-two years later, our own country is its prime target.

Many of our citizens are informed on the nature and scope of the Communist threat, but there is need to see that many others are informed and to broaden the understanding of the extreme differences between the Communist system and freedom under law as we know it.

There is thought to be given by every individual to his responsibility in helping to maintain the strength and vitality of our fundamental principles of democracy and freedom.

The familiar World War I recruitment poster with Uncle Sam pointing his index finger and saying "America Needs You" is equally applicable today. And the symbol of our democracy points directly to every citizen of our land.

There is work to be done.

We must not accept the blessings of freedom that are ours today without at the same time giving of ourselves to help meet the needs of our national purpose. That help could best be given through any one of a number of practical means at the community level. The community is the heart of our American way of life.

Just as surely as America needed you to fight for democracy during World War I, she is in need now of your maturity of thought and experience, and of your productivity. She desperately needs your helping hand in every town and city, in all phases of community living.

Without your help, how could our Nation hope to meet the urgent needs on the home front during this critical period in our history? America's population of living veterans of all wars is more than 22,500,000. Together with their families, they approximate 40 percent of the total population of the United States.

Let us remind ourselves over and over again that our Nation has gained its present position of world leadership, technological advance, and material comfort not alone through the great natural wealth that is ours. The fundamental principles of democratic American thought have provided the structure for this unprecedented development.

Because of our system of beliefs as stated in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed by our Constitution, we are guaranteed certain rights which we believe to be natural and to belong to all men—freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of assembly, and trial by jury.

Let us review the basic concepts of our system of government in contrast to the system under which communism operates.

The United States was the first national government to demonstrate belief in liberty through self-government, and belief in the idea that men are rational enough and reasonable enough to decide whom they wish to govern them and under what form of government.

This is in direct conflict with the Communist system. That system disregards the basic beliefs of mankind. The dignity of the individual is of no consequence, and he is relegated to a position of unimportance except as an instrument of the state.

Our belief in the rights of the individual involves certain duties which he must fulfill. These include obedience to the law and the duty to keep himself informed on current issues and problems. His obligation is a willingness to participate in government and to vote intelligently—secure in the right of a secret ballot.

It is this relationship between the informed citizen and the representative public official which keeps our government dynamic and responsive to the wishes of the people.

Under communism the rulers have supreme power. They dictate policy. And whatever policy is decreed by the rulers, the public must accept. The officials are not held accountable to the public for their actions. They are not, as we, the servants of a public trust.

Our system of government and our economic system of free enterprise are based upon our belief in the dignity of man and opportunity for all. It has been individual self-reliance and initiative under the free enterprise system that has brought about our Nation's tremendous development and material wealth.

Under the doctrine of communism, individual initiative receives no reward. All means of production, distribution, and service are in control of the state. People are told where they may work, and must take such goods and services, and at such prices, as decreed by the state rulers.

The proponents of communism in other countries of the world proclaim that their

doctrine is the best way to produce material progress. In many of the underdeveloped and overpopulated countries—whose people are primarily concerned with raising their substandard level of living—the promise of material progress overshadows the terrible cost in human bondage that is inevitable under the Communist doctrine.

One of the best ways in which we can help these newly emerging peoples of underdeveloped countries is to maintain our own moral, economic, and physical strength that was born of our freedom. We must demonstrate that the economic systems which flourish under freedom can, and will, in every country where they are employed, promote the fullest development of human life, both materially and spiritually.

The challenge of the Communist doctrine in the world today cannot be ignored. The forces of communism are working steadily, seizing and exploiting to the fullest every means to conquest.

Thus it is, I believe, that democracy rests upon the shoulders of each of us as individuals. Its defense is dependent upon the actions of each of us working together as a group.

The well known historian, Charles Beard, had this to say about it: "Democracy is a cause that is never won, but I believe it will never be lost."

As a nation, we are a people with a firm faith in our Creator, and with a firm belief in the highest aspirations of mankind.

With the day-by-day willingness and courage of each of us to share the privileges and the responsibilities of our heritage of freedom, there will come a time when others less fortunate throughout the world will join in upholding freedom under law in a community of nations.

In closing, I should like to speak briefly about our legislative program of interest to veterans. In fact, if I were not to do so, you might be inclined to disbelieve that I am a Member of Congress.

All of our veterans have the assurance that their interests are constantly before us. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been engaged for a number of years in a continuing study of all phases of veterans' programs. Each year we endeavor to amend laws to correct inequities, to liberalize benefit programs, and to provide as generously as a grateful nation is able to do.

A few figures from the appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1962 will give you an idea of how our economic pie was cut. We have appropriated the sum of $4,889,270,500 to be expended by the Veterans' Administration for all programs. Of this sum, $3.5 billion is allocated for compensation and pensions. And $76,250,000 is allocated for the construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities.

There are some 300 Members of Congress who are veterans, and some of us are widows of veterans; so I think you can feel assured of sympathetic consideration of legislative programs in the years to come.

I thank you.

Kadesh Chapel Observes 176th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, when the West Virginia State Legislature rearranged congressional representation, Brooke became one of the counties merged with central West Virginia areas of the old Third District to create the new First District.

Located on a ridge in Brooke County is the Kadesh Chapel Methodist Church, one of the oldest churches established west of the Allegheny Mountains. It is situated in one of the most beautiful spots in the county.

On Sunday, September 17, 1961, Kadesh Chapel celebrated its 176th anniversary. Most of its life the church has existed at its present location.

To the pastor, the board members, and the faithful members and supporters of Kadesh Chapel, I extend my sincere congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include a chronology, taken from the anniversary program, of the origin and progress of the Kadesh Chapel Methodist Church:

HISTORIC NOTES ON THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF KADESH CHAPEL METHODIST CHURCH

In 1764: First Methodist Church in America was built in Maryland by Robert Strawbridge.

In 1785: Redstone circuit was organized in the home of Thomas Haymond's father on the west fork of the Monongahela River between Fairmont and Morgantown, W. Va.

In 1785: Reason Pumphrey, who became a convert of Robert Strawbridge when he lived in Anne Arundel County, Md., moved from Catfish (Washington, Pa.) to Beech Bottom, Va. This extended the newly formed Redstone circuit to its westernmost extremity at the Ohio River and brought Methodism into this area.

In 1786: Francis Asbury and Robert Ayres visited Reason Pumphrey's home on their Redstone circuit-riding trips.

In 1786–1787: Reason Pumphrey's home became a regular preaching point on the Redstone circuit.

In 1787: The Redstone circuit became divided into three circuits. The westernmost or Ohio circuit embraces what is later to become Kadesh Chapel.

In 1788: The first church structure was built, an 18- by 20-foot log cabin on the farm of James Harris.

In 1790: Thomas Haymond was admitted on trial as a Methodist minister.

In 1792: Thomas Haymond was admitted into full connection.

In 1791, 1795, and 1799: Thomas Haymond served the Ohio circuit during these 3 years.

In 1793: A deed was granted by Joseph Hedges for a new Methodist church. Caleb and Nicholas Pumphrey, and William Hamer are the trustees who received the deed. This church was named Kadesh Chapel by Thomas Scott, one of the early preachers. He was a Hebrew scholar and gave the name "Kadesh" which means holy.

In 1799: June 13, Thomas Haymond died in Caleb Pumphrey's home of intermittent fever. This was probably malaria contracted while serving a circuit in the Eastern Shore of Maryland. Caleb is the eldest son of Reason Pumphrey. His farm is now known as the Mariah Milliken farm.

In 1820 (approximate): The log church was replaced by a second log structure.

In 1824: The original Redstone circuit became the Pittsburgh conference.

In 1850: The Ohio circuit was dissolved.

In 1852: Kadesh Chapel Church was rebuilt of hewn timber and frame construction by Mr. John Goudy who kept his workbench under the great elm tree.

In 1885: The building was remodeled after which a Union Sunday School was formed.

In 1895: The Union Sunday School was dissolved over dissatisfaction with a Reverend Monday. The congregation split, Kadesh Chapel remaining as a Methodist Sunday School with Reverend Miller as the preacher.

In 1914: Kadesh Chapel Cemetery Association was formed under local administration in order to care for and properly administer the community burial ground in a business-like fashion. The first officers were: John Andrews, president, John McCord, secretary, and John Hartley, treasurer.

In 1933: Our first Homecoming Day was celebrated instead of having the yearly picnic. This became an annual affair.

In 1936: Electric lights replaced the old oil lamps.

In 1938: A church bell was donated to Kadesh Chapel. This was the Hogg family dinner bell which formerly hung in a church at Pomeroy, Ohio.

In 1940: The Homecoming dinner which formerly was held in the church yard was rained out, and the congregation retired to the Hammond school house. Under the leadership of Rev. T. Homer Smith, the congregation and visitors raised $250 to start work on a church basement. The excavation was completed and a wall erected before winter.

In 1941: The basement was in use and central heating was installed.

In 1955: Water well drilling was donated by Mr. Glenn Shreeves. Labor and materials for hot and cold running water were given by members of the congregation.

In 1957: The oil furnace was installed and the flooring joists covered by a basement ceiling.

In 1958: An electric organ was bought to add to our church services.

In April 12, 1961: A new elm tree was planted, replacing the great elm which marked Thomas Haymond's grave. The original tree was removed in the autumn of 1960.

In 1961: Indoor restrooms were installed.

In September 17, 1961: A plaque was dedicated at the annual homecoming in order to mark the grave of Rev. Thomas Haymond, and to commemorate the efforts of the several other circuit riding preachers who brought Methodist Christianity into the wilderness. Their stopping at Kadesh Chapel made it one of the very early churches west of the Allegheny Mountains.

Editorial Analysis of an International Issue of Paramount Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is filled with insertions of columns by noted writers and editorials from the metropolitan newspapers, but it is well from time to time to bring the attention of the Congress the opinions of those who write for the smaller communities of the United States.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to include an editorial from the Pike County Dispatch, Milford, Pa. This editorial analyzes an international issue of paramount importance:

This is a momentous week for the United States and most of the world as well, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk meets Russia's Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. Secretary Rusk will deliver the allied terms for

starting negotiations on the Berlin crisis, which is the subject which Russia has been using to needle the United States and NATO.

This brings to the front another matter which has just been the subject of considerable discussion here and abroad—the Belgrade Conference of what are known as the neutral nations. This evidently is a scheme concocted in Moscow to line up all the countries which are more or less afraid of the Russian bear. India, Egypt, the Arab nations, and all the little countries just hatched in Africa and Asia, were called to meet at Tito's capital, and the only thing accomplished there was to have these neutrals decide to send representatives to Moscow and Washington to ask for action for peace. The outcome of the gathering of these neutrals is simply an effort to wean away from the United States all the countries which have been the recipient of American millions during the last few years as Uncle Sam shelled out the shekels right and left wherever needed—Poland, India, Egypt, and all the rest of the beneficiaries of the U.S. gold and generosity.

So today we find the United States in a position which calls for the most important action. Will we refuse to further support the nations which have bowed to Russia and abandoned the U.S. obligations? Has Khrushchev scared all our weak friends into dropping off the neutral fence into his dooryard? Just where do they stand now? And how long will the U.S. funds be used to support these Titos, Nehrus, Nassers, et al?

Khrushchev wants at this time to show the teeming millions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, most of whom know nothing of international friendship and help, that the United States and the West will not live up to their commitments, and humilitate the NATO alliance and plans to protect Berlin, and discredit the free nations.

Can Secretary Rusk and his assistants handle the American and free world side against the Russian communistic bloc? It is up to Congress and the President to see that justice is the result.

Happiness Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Happiness Exchange, established "to alleviate human suffering," by Joe Rosenfield, Jr., in New York City, May 1, 1949, is a radio program and a nonprofit, tax exempt foundation. Its creed is "We believe we are our brothers keeper. We believe there is one race, the human race, and we know the one sure way to be happy is by helping those who are less fortunate than we are." Big Joe conducts interviews and gives assistance to individuals and organizations daily and broadcasts nightly over the radio.

Help ranges from carfare, the cost of a meal, to a collective effort currently by all the "Cousins"—as they who participate are called—to raise $1 million to establish an endowment fund for the City of Hope in California, a free hospital and research center for catastrophic diseases.

The Happiness Exchange itself in 1959 received an endowment approximating $1 million from the estate of Cousin May Page, a sightless 85 years young angel, who had listened and wanted the work of the program to continue forever.

The goodwill and many fine deeds that the Happiness Exchange has participated in and accomplished are too numerous to mention. They have helped everyone who sought their help and needed it. They have received many citations and awards for their outstanding achievements and humanitarian efforts.

Some of the work that the Happiness Exchange has done is as follows:

Drug addicts anonymous, providing transportation and rehabilitation, sending 10 drug addicts per month to Lexington, Ky., for cures; fellowship center; a free foot clinic; garden of fragrance for the blind; leprosarium in Philippine Islands; dental clinic in Nigeria; complete refrigeration system in children's home in Puerto Rico; over 200 American children were sent to summer camps in 1959 and 1960; eyes for Asia in honor of Dr. Tom Dooley; orphanage in Haiti maintains 90 abandoned children; vitamin centers established in Haiti; also medical supplies, drugs and equipment, funds to build hospitals; missing persons located; no one be denied his civil rights; Blue Birds, a group of volunteer workers give service and attention to the unfortunates who have no one to care for them; welfare assistance and hospital helping hands; a Youth Town, U.S.A., these youngsters live and work in Youth Town with goals based on standards outlined by President's Council on Youth Fitness, until they feel ready to accept the responsibilities of good citizenship within the home community. Names have been omitted in this resume of the work and achievements of Big Joe's Happiness Exchange Foundation, Inc., because of space limitation. But everything was and is made possible only through the purely humanitarian desire of people in every walk of life to demonstrate that "We are our brother's keeper."

Cold Facts About the American Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article by A. F. Franz, president of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., on the problems facing the American steel industry. This article appeared in the Blast, the company paper published at Pueblo, Colo. I am sure that the observations of Mr. Franz will be of great interest to every Member of the House.

The article follows:

COLD FACTS ABOUT THE AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY

(By A. F. Franz, president, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.)

It's surprising that in this day and age of enlightenment—with newspapers, magazines, radio, and television available to all—that there can be such a misunderstanding about the problems facing the American steel industry in the light of the booming foreign steel growth. This misunderstanding affects you and your job with C.F. & I.

The fact is: American steel is in trouble. Low-priced imports from foreign countries are choking markets for certain types of American steel in this country. American exports are falling off as an ever-increasing number of modernized foreign steel producers woo and win existing and new world markets. American costs are spiraling upward at a dizzy pace. And a new danger, price reduction, has entered the picture.

In the March 27, 1961, issue of the Blast I pointed out this critical situation in an article entitled: "Imports Are Exporting Your Job." The many mentions of the article in newspapers and magazines, the thousands of requests for reprints, and the fact that it has been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD gives you some idea of the importance of the problems facing the American steel industry and the widespread, grave concern over the situation.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Foreign competition is playing particular havoc with the sales and profits of America's little steel companies, like C.F. & I. Companies manufacturing C.F. & I.-type products are particularly hard hit by the imbalance between imports and exports.

The disheartening aspect of it all is that, in June 1961, imports of steel mill products rose to the highest point in 14 months—while exports fell off to half of last year's mark for the month. The following table for the first 6 months of 1961 clearly indicates that very large tonnages of C.F. & I.-type products are arriving in this country every day.

Total U.S. imports and exports of C.F. & I.-type product for the 1st 6 months of 1961

[Net tons]

Products	Imported to the United States	Exported from the United States
Wire rods	177,209	1,965
Concrete reinforcing bars	256,017	5,469
Hot rolled carbon bars	47,427	20,330
Structural and bar shapes	200,497	111,923
Steel pipe and tubing	233,776	99,456
Wire nails	110,656	1,697
Wire fencing	15,262	882
Barbed wire	43,242	418
Wire rope and strand	16,006	4,165
Round wire and steel wire	82,099	3,498
Galvanized and other coated wire	14,365	3,566
Pigiron	69,773	204,981
Total	1,266,329	458,350

The extent to which steel imports have taken over our domestic markets varies product by product, and company by company. Their success has been startling. For example, between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of the domestic use of reinforcing bars produced abroad increased nearly sevenfold, from 3.6 percent to 24 percent; for pipe and tubing, imports increased from .05 percent to 7 percent—14 times the 1950 percentage; and for wire and wire products, imports increased from 2 percent to about 18 percent. During 1960 imports accounted for 31 percent of the American supply of wire rods, 43 percent of our nails and staples, and 53 percent of our barbed wire supply. Companies with this product-mix, like C.F. & I., are being hard hit.

Companies operating sheet and strip mills are faring better—with tonnage exported from the United States much higher than the imported tonnage. Both figures, however, were down considerably from a year ago.

Flat-rolled products, sheets and strip, tin and terne plate, January-June 1961:

	Net tons
Imported to the United States	76,058
Exported from the United States	482,620

But the favorable balance in these products (which, as you know, C.F. & I. does not sell), appears to be short lived. Sheet and strip mills abroad—planned and in process of being built—will soon take a big chunk of these foreign markets away.

Any way you look at it, we are at a definite disadvantage. We are not meeting foreign competition now, and prospects for the future are equally dim—unless constructive, cooperative action by Government, labor and management is taken immediately.

WORLD STEEL PRODUCTION TRENDS

Our troubles with foreign steel producers are only beginning. Already, spokesmen for leading steel industries in Europe are predicting that their combined output will soon be equal to the output in the United States. For example, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe estimates that Japan, Poland, and Czechoslovakia will more than triple their 1955–57 average production by 1972–75. Russia will move than double her production—boasting a 250-million-ton ingot capacity by 1980. This means they, as well as the many other countries that combine to form our formidable foreign competition, will try to take up even more of our markets both here and abroad.

The United States is still the world's leading steel producer. Since 1951, however, we have been losing our front-running position. More of our foreign and domestic markets have been seized by steel from abroad—steel from Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Japan, and elsewhere. Let's take a look at world steel production and where America stands.

Since 1950, steel ingot production in the rest of the world has increased rapidly—much more so than in the United States. The result is that the U.S. share of total world steel ingot production has declined by nearly half, from 46 percent down to 26 percent. What's more, steel export tonnage from the United States declined from 15 percent of world steel trade in 1950 to only 7 percent in 1960, while steel imports into the United States increased from 1½ percent of domestic use to almost 5 percent in 1960. Decreased American steel production means decreased profits.

THE TRUTH ABOUT PROFITS

In the face of this serious predicament of the American steel industry, several groups have taken to tossing rocks at us—and at your job. Your livelihood and future are intimately dependent on the future of C.F. & I. and the steel industry.

There are those in Government circles who say: "The steel companies are already getting a good rate of return on low levels of production." They say we neither need nor deserve higher prices and greater rates of return.

Nothing could be further from the truth. For some steel companies, the profit picture is unfavorable. The combined forces of a recession, our inability to raise prices to offset increases in costs, foreign steel imports, and competition from other materials have taken a toll. Steel profits have slipped badly. Look at the following facts reported by the American Iron & Steel Institute—steel company profits for the first 6 months of 1961 compared to the first 9 months of 1960 and 1959. Profits for 1961 dropped to $270,980,453—half of 1960 profits—and barely one-third of 1959 profits.

Net profits

Quarter	1959	1960	1961
1st	$318,416,351	$352,693,520	$80,393,790
2d	466,116,753	205,362,004	180,586,663
6 months	784,533,104	558,055,524	270,980,453

How does this affect individual companies? Dividends have been cut by some producers, eliminated by others, and maintained by still others even though in some cases their profits did not cover dividends. In reviewing the reports of 19 integrated steel companies, we find that 7 did not earn their regular dividend, some have not paid a common stock dividend for some time, several returned a small and inadequate profit, and 5 of the companies showed an actual loss.

It should be noted that in addition to the sharp decline in steel company earnings shown in the above table, there was a similar drop in Federal income tax revenue paid to the Government by the steel industry, as shown below:

Federal income tax revenue

Quarter	1959	1960	1961
1st	$320,631,208	$360,001,074	$68,184,982
2d	499,991,000	193,640,500	171,949,991
6 months	820,622,208	553,641,574	240,134,973

WHY ARE PROFITS DOWN?

Let's examine the reasons for this poor profit showing. Why are steel earnings so depressed? There are three factors that bear noting:

1. Increased production costs. The last general rise in the price of steel was in August 1958. Since that time, wages and other costs have increased considerably—not counting the cost of plant improvements. So far, in the past 3 years, no price boost has been introduced to compensate for these rising costs—even though steel profits have been shrinking considerably. The steel companies have completely absorbed the last two wage hikes.

2. Declining volume. Since 1951, domestic and foreign markets have been taken over more and more by the foreign steel producers, with a resultant decline in sales. This ever-worsening situation has resulted in an especially low operating rate in America's steel industry for the past months. And, as we all know, lower volume means fewer jobs.

3. Falling prices. In a desperate attempt to meet the pressure of foreign and domestic competition, some companies have resorted to price reductions. The adverse effect of this has already been felt in reduced profits. Price reductions have been centered, unfortunately, in C. F. & I.-type products—reinforcing bars, wire rope, wire products, pipe, and tubing, etc. The following is an excerpt from the U.S. Department of Commerce Bulletin of July 28, 1961:

"The average wholesale price of finished steel, as measured by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Index (1947–49=100), dropped from 186.2 at the beginning of this year to 185.4 as of July 11, the lowest point since August 1958. The peak was 187 in January 1959. The more recent price cuts are not reflected in the price index. This decline in the finished steel price index to its lowest point in 3 years has been brought about by an outbreak of price cutting * * * These reductions were made to meet competition from other steel companies, other materials, and imported steel. There have been no announced changes in prices of the major carbon steel products (plates, sheets, shapes)."

Price reductions can only mean dwindling profits. There is a point at which shutting down a plant completely is preferable to operating at a continuous loss.

WHY PROFITS ARE IMPORTANT

Profit is the one great motivating force in our American free enterprise system. Profit and the expectation of profit distinguish our mode of production and our way of life from those who threaten our very existence. It is the tonic and energizer of American economic lifestream. Profit gives our national security its industrial muscle to resist aggression.

Why, then, when profit is so important to everyone, do so many people criticize and downgrade it? Why is there so much misunderstanding about it? Why do we allow profit to be pinched, squeezed, siphoned away—even slowly destroyed?

Only under the profit system has man attained those ends by which we set so much store: independence, ownership of property, savings, a rational planning of one's own life, and that greatest boon of all, the freedom of choice and the courage to make it. Those outside our country who prophesy that they will bury us will have achieved their ends if profit is ever eliminated from U.S. business. We are willing to go to great lengths abroad to preserve our American way-of-life—we should be equally willing to go to bat for it at home.

Profits are not only the principal means of assuring the economic growth and future of America—but right here at C.F. & I., they provide for three vital elements:

1. Jobs. Without sufficient profits, there can be no job security. The basic result of a lack of profit is unemployment. Profits benefit the entire community. They provide jobs for the people who put up new plants; for those who make the new machinery; for those who work in the plants and at the mines, in offices and warehouses; for the many people who transport the raw materials and finished products, etc.

2. Plant expansion and modernization. Without sufficient profits there can be no progress. Profits must not only be large enough to absorb the day-to-day operating costs, they must also provide for the replacement of equipment—without which there can be no growth. This is especially true in the steel industry, where modern, efficient machinery is a vital factor in competing with foreign producers. A company must expand and increase productivity to keep pace both here and abroad. It can be run over and destroyed by just standing still.

3. Stockholders. Dividends are paid out of profits. Stockholders expect, and are entitled to, a fair return for the use of their money—in the same way a bank expects, and is entitled to, a fair return on the money it lends out.

It is obvious, then, that employees, shareholders and America stand to benefit by any improvement that can be made in our ability to improve profits.

STEEL PROFITS MUST BE INCREASED

To meet rising costs, steel profits must be increased. Only if the American steel industry realizes increased profits can it:

(a) Attract and hold shareholders—and pay them their full share for the use of invested funds.

(b) Build employment and job security.

(c) Reduce industry's long-term debt.

(d) Expand and modernize American plants to compete with foreign steel.

Let's review modernization and what it means to our steel industry.

MODERNIZATION—A COSTLY NECESSITY

We are hamstrung by inefficiency. Many American steel plants—especially the smaller ones—are antiquated and outdated. One of the major reasons foreign steel producers can compete so well pricewise is that they have modern, efficient machinery in modern, streamlined plants—thanks to capital from the United States. We must modernize in order to cut costs and increase productivity and efficiency—so that we can survive. But there are two factors that increase the cost of modernizing and tend to discourage steel companies from doing the very thing that can save them.

1. Depreciation allowances. Obsolete facilities cannot be replaced out of present Government depreciation allowances which are wholly inadequate to cover the price of

new equipment. In a recent Treasury Department survey, 20 steel companies indicated that allowable depreciation deductions averaged only about two-thirds of the cost of maintaining their production facilities, let alone replacing them.

If our Government can shovel out billions of dollars all over the world, how about the administration immediately liberalizing depreciation allowances for the American steel industry? Then we can rebuild our antiquated steel plants and bring about the necessary increase in productivity to meet the challenge of growing foreign competition. That way we will protect and create American jobs and strengthen our own economy.

2. Steel's long-term debt: Without sufficient depreciation and profits to draw upon—the American steel industry must build and modernize on borrowed money. Presently, the industry is investing in new equipment at the rate of $1 billion a year. As a result, long-term debt has risen to a new high—nearly $2.5 billion at the end of 1960. This has more than tripled in a decade and appears to be still going up. Steel companies are paying off this debt to the tune of nearly $100 million a year—that's four times the rate of 10 years ago.

In more exact terms, the annual interest and charges on long-term debt have soared 297 percent while the amount owed by the steel companies has jumped 220 percent. Last year the annual cost of the debt was 12.4 percent of total net income, compared with 3.2 percent in 1950.

Despite rising costs of various kinds, profits must rise so that, in addition to paying the interest on the debt and providing for reinvestment, they can be used to pay off the debt itself.

This rising debt is the price that American steel companies are paying for progress in an era of tough competition. It may also be looked upon as part of steel's contribution to sustaining employment—because, without the money to modernize, your company and others like it cannot stay in business and provide jobs.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO IMPROVE PROFITS AND PROTECT THE AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY?

We must have greater understanding and a more responsible attitude on the part of Government. For example:

1. Foreign governments recognize the importance of realistic depreciation allowances. We need the same recognition. With realistic depreciation allowances we can go ahead at full steam, modernizing our facilities which will bring about lowering of costs—so necessary if we are to compete successfully with foreign steel.

2. Instead of talking about excess profits which do not exist, what is the Government doing to help us recapture lost markets here and abroad?

3. Instead of the artificial ceiling on prices that has been demanded, we need a continuation of the open market place where prices can be set by competitive forces.

4. Reestablish the 25 percent differential whereby the Government awards contracts to American companies over foreign companies so long as our bid does not exceed theirs by more than 25 percent.

5. We must have an honest, accurate appraisal of the steel industry. Let's not apply the same yardstick to big steel as to little steel. Our financial situation is much more critical. When reviewing profits, let's not use big steel earnings as the only barometer. How about a comprehensive appraisal of little steel company earnings—or the lack of them?

If the Government really wants to protect our economy—let it show us how to overcome the big squeeze on little steel.

Pollution, and Another Stream Bites the Dust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, is it not about time we give more than lipservice to one of our most serious domestic problems—pollution of our water supply?

An expanding population and increased industrial demand make pure water conservation imperative. Our water table is dropping annually. Slowly, but surely, our surface streams become useless for many purposes.

The following article appeared in a recent issue of the Waltonian News, the monthly publication of York Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America.

History will record 1961 as being the year the general public did a grave disservice to one of the finest streams, not only in Pennsylvania, but in the entire United States. Read the following obituary, written by a personal friend and a true conservationist:

FISH COMMISSION REPORTS ABANDONMENT OF FISHERMEN'S PARADISE AND ITS SPRING CREEK HATCHERIES BEING CONSIDERED BECAUSE OF POLLUTION BY ANOTHER STATE AGENCY

There is not much doubt the fish commission would like to find an excuse to dump its "trout showoff project" because of the expense involved, but to retreat now in the face of the situation existing on Spring Creek amounts to "an abandonment of the ship," a surrender to the forces of pollution. Here is an out-and-out case of taking over by pollution one of Pennsylvania's foremost outdoor resources, a native mountain trout stream known throughout the Nation * * * and the shame of it that it should happen at the hands of a branch of State government charged with research into ways to abate pollution. That Pennsylvania State University should ever have permitted such a situation to build up within its walls without detection or proper attention certainly calls for a critical look at the operation of this institution of research and learning.

With the surrender of Spring Creek goes the respect for law enforcement of a large segment of very respectable Pennsylvanian, men who love their State for its bounteous outdoors and streams—the fishing fraternity. Here is an inexcusable situation from any point. It lays bare the ineffectiveness of our pollution control efforts. It points up a halfhearted and feeble effort of the State to go through the motions of cleaning up streams while still letting the offenders move in on stream after stream.

Detergents are cited as being the major factor in the problem. Detergents are also reported from communities all over the State as contaminating wells and springs, public water supplies, saturating whole areas causing septic tank failures. How can a manufacturer be permitted to be so irresponsible in the marketing of a product that leaves such an alarming trail of damage and destruction? He has a moral as well as legal obligation to see that his product is safe to use. Use of kitchen waste disposal units have been barred in most areas served by public disposal plants because these installations cannot digest the overload of this type of waste. Detergents should also be barred until they are made safe to use. How can we sacrifice a "Spring Creek" to sales hungry "soap distributors"?

We believe that if we ever entertained the slightest sincerity in stopping the pillage of our streams so that our kids can enjoy and respect this land with which Pennsylvanians have been so bountifully blessed, the time is right now to set in motion the forces that are not afraid to call a full and complete halt to any new pollution that rears its ugly head.

The fish commission should stay in there fighting for the interests of the good Pennsylvanians who support it. The commission should call on the Governor for full support of all departments of the State to find a complete answer to this problem. If we fail here, then we might as well "throw in the sponge" and accept the prediction that designates our streams of the future as open sewer ways.

J. H. C.,
Pollution Committee.

A Tower of Granite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the free world was stunned by the tragic and untimely death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold. Those of us in America who mourn his death will never forget his indispensable contribution to world peace in our time. There is no doubt in my mind that he will live in history as one of the truly significant peacemakers and international statesmen.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Tower of Granite" which appeared in the September 19 issue of the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger. This is the finest editorial tribute to Mr. Hammarskjold that I have seen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOWER OF GRANITE

While the troubles of the world swirled with unremitting fury around his shoulders, Dag Hammarskjold stood like a tower of granite and performed with exemplary application his difficult duties as Secretary General of the United Nations.

Now he is dead, victim of a plane crash which occurred while he was on a peace mission. The plane plunged to earth in central Africa, far from the United Nations building in New York to which the unending succession of world problems had been brought for his attention.

As a conscientious man of high principles and calm courage, he inspired praise and incurred wrath. The Russians had no use for him. He was a moral force standing in the way of their nefarious gangsterism.

As he thought through the perplexing problems with which he had to contend and made the decisions he thought proper, he seemed to stand in the pure air of the mountain top, and yet he was down

there on the hard and realistic earth in the midst of the confusion and recriminations. A man of less stature and strength might have broken under the strain.

Now comes the matter of finding a successor. Sadly, no successor his equal is in sight. Although it was recognized that his life might be lost suddenly during his extensive and hazardous travels, nobody had been generally agreed upon as one who could adequately handle the heavy responsibilities of the office now so tragically vacated.

Throughout yesterday at United Nations headquarters and over the world, there was gloomy speculation that the death of this great man might mean ultimate collapse of the United Nations, at best a weakening of the international forum.

Russia has long contended for a three-man board that would serve in the place of the Secretary General, one member to be chosen by the West, one by the Communists, and one by the neutral nations. This plan which Russia calls the troika plan has been generally frowned upon because it would give Russia greater opportunity to throw obstruction in the path of freedom.

At this grave moment in world history, it is a tragic possibility that the United Nations may collapse because one man has been lost. All who see clearly the seriousness of the crisis can only hope that out of the present shock will come a solution, that adequate, forceful, fair, and generally acceptable leadership can be found to keep open and functioning the best forum for keeping the peace that has yet been devised by the community of nations.

While the feverish effort to find new leadership takes place, the world forces of peace and good will remember with deep gratitude the spirit of dedication with which the stanch Dag Hammerskjold served in his great role of peacemaker.

Increase in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial carried an outstanding editorial in its September 13, 1961, edition which I would like to call to your attention.

The Pine Bluff Commercial is one of Arkansas' leading daily newspapers, which serves a large cotton-producing territory in the alluvial valley.

The editorial points out in an unmistakable manner the underlying reasons to provide the necessary acreage for the 1962 crop of cotton to meet the needs of the domestic economy and for export.

I commend this splendid article to the Members of the House of Representatives. The article follows:

INCREASE IN ORDER

As a world crisis impends, are there dangers in permitting carryover cotton stocks to be depleted?

This question is raised by Senator FULBRIGHT in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Writes Mr. FULBRIGHT:

"In each of the last 6 years we have been exporting and consuming domestically more cotton than we have produced. Based on the latest forecasts for the current season, it appears that upland cotton stocks will be around 6 million bales next August 1.

"This is well under a half-year's supply for domestic consumption and exports. Cotton stocks in the free world are already very low considering the rate of consumption. As a matter of fact, they are lower than in any postwar period except during the Korean emergency.

"At that time the cotton shortage was so acute it was necessary to impose export controls. Cut off from their most important traditional source of cotton supplies, foreign mills had to pay as much as 90 cents a pound for cotton. This triggered an uncontrolled expansion of foreign cotton production which created disastrous conditions in the U.S. cotton economy.

"It was not until the Congress authorized the export program which was put in operation in 1956 that our cotton economy began to recover.

"It is obvious that there will be an increase in demand for cotton next year in view of the mobilization effort and the general recovery from the recession of last year. Our country, of course, exercises a strong stabilizing influence on the world cotton market and it seems to me that in view of the current free world stocks and the prospective increase in consumption, serious consideration should be given to increasing cotton acreage next year."

Senator FULBRIGHT notes that the cotton carryover has been reduced from 14 million bales in 1956, the year the cotton export program was started, to 6,800,000 bales at the start of 1961.

It will be ironic if the crop controls (which are supposed to protect the cotton farmer) result, as they did in the early fifties, in the loss of foreign markets in a crisis period which involves heavy demands on existing cotton stocks.

Still to be determined is the effect of hurricane Carla on cotton production in Texas and, to a lesser degree, in Louisiana.

The situation is remindful that the cotton surplus, often attacked as an evil by politicians from urban States, can prove an ace in the hole when the going gets rough for the United States in international affairs. We think at least a moderate increase in acreage allotments is in order.

They Need To Work but Have No Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of September 21, 1961:

THEY NEED TO WORK OUT BUT HAVE NO PLACE
(By Louis Sossamon)

A study at the University of North Carolina recently disclosed that the favorite forms of recreation are "passive, indoor forms." They are "bull sessions," between meal eating, movie-going, and "sacking out," which was defined as including napping, loafing in bed, and listening to music in a prone position.

This kind of recreation makes for a soft generation. For sometime this column has advocated the construction of gymnasiums for our high schools (Blacksburg and Gaffney). If such structures were provided the youngsters could get the exercise necessary to acquire the physical strength they need.

School principals should stress academic work and at the same time should not neglect the physical conditioning of youngsters in their charge. This is the training in which all physically able students engage. Calisthenics and sports that give the muscles a good workout.

Recent studies have indicated that too many Americans are "flabby" as a result of athletic training. Prominent Americans have advocated physical fitness programs.

When your child comes in to supper tonight ask if he or she participated in any active, organized sport during the day. Ask if the school offered any supervised physical fitness program. Ask him if he would like to receive instruction during school hours in physical fitness.

We have a strong obligation to our children and their needs are being taken care of in many instances; however, until we provide gymnasiums we cannot attempt to render the physical fitness programs so vital to our youth.

Marc Ray Clement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and a newspaper account relating to the death of Marc Ray Clement, one of Alabama's leading citizens and one of my very dearest friends.

There being no objection, the editorial and the newspaper account were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Sept. 16, 1961]

MARC RAY CLEMENT

It is rare when it can truly and honestly be said that a man's death takes away from an entire State and its people someone who will be missed as if the land suddenly had lost its green forests.

This is true in the death of Marc Ray Clement.

An Arkansas youth who came to Alabama for his education and stayed to make his life and career in this State, "Little Fools" Clement—his nickname given in love and affection—knew only one purpose in life: To find fruitfulness in his stay on this earth, and ever to be ready to help others.

This he so demonstrably was—the record is virtually overpowering. The "cause" was not the thing with him—it was the people, the individual human beings the cause, the drive, the campaign, the organization and most importantly the individual could help. He knew that suffering could be remedied, whatever its origin, and that men did less than they were commanded to do if they did not provide remedy.

Foots Clement never wondered what others might be doing, or might do. He only knew what he could do—and he believed in action, swift, thorough, lasting. No such self-assigned task ever was done. Need never ceased—nor did Marc Ray Clement's intent to answer need.

Alabama is so much the poorer with his loss that none ever can properly or adequately set it down in words. A life of loving

and giving is its own best description. And it is this which stands for Marc Ray Clement and ever will.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Sept. 15, 1961]

STATE LOSES GOOD FRIEND, HARD WORKER

TUSCALOOSA, ALA., September 15.—Alabama today lost one of its most devoted civic workers and warmly colorful political figures.

Marc Ray Clement, 53-year-old lawyer and health and industrial leader, died suddenly at his home here today after a long illness.

He died from a heart attack while his wife was driving their two children to school. He had had a heart condition several years.

Known throughout the State as "Little Foots" Clement, he was a brother of "Big Foots" Clement of Alabama All-America football fame.

Only last year, Clement was awarded the title of Citizen of the Year in Tuscaloosa.

Clement's close friends said of him that he probably knew as many or more persons in Alabama than anyone else in the State.

He was a politician, and considered politics his hobby. He worked behind the scenes in this field, working for his friends.

For many years, he was confidante and political advisor for Alabama Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN. He took the lead in setting up State-wide campaign organizations for both Senators.

He remained closely associated with the State's congressional delegation through the years.

"Little Foots" Clement was a lawyer, and a successful one.

Unable to enter service during World War II, he quit his law practice and devoted his full time to heading war bond sales in Alabama.

In his active civic interests, he became a symbol of human kindness. To name a few, his civic interests were in TB work, mental health, Community Chest and Boy Scouts.

He was awarded the William Crawford Gorgas award by Alabama doctors in 1959.

The award, established in 1958, is made for outstanding contributions to the field of health by a citizen who is not a physician.

A son and grandson of country doctors in Arkansas, Clement was cited by the Alabama Association for Mental Health and the Alabama Tuberculosis Association for his work in promoting health legislation.

He served four 1-year terms as chairman of the legislative committee of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, and was credited with playing a major role in promoting the increase of the State per diem allocation for tuberculosis patients from $1.50 to $6.25.

He also helped organize a number of county chapters of the Christmas Seal organization.

In 1954–55, he was State fund drive chairman for the Alabama Association for Mental Health. He directed a campaign that raised $100,000, as compared with a $15,000 average in earlier years.

He served on the advisory board of the Medical College of Alabama.

Clement was president of the Tuscaloosa United Fund campaign in 1955.

In March of 1957, he was elected president of Cotton States Life Insurance Co. and reelected chairman of the board of directors. He also was a member of the board of directors of City National Bank of Tuscaloosa.

He was a member and a steward of the First Methodist Church of Tuscaloosa.

A native of Rover, Ark., Clement was graduated from high school at Arkansas Tech at Russellville. He was an outstanding high school athlete and was named to all-State teams in football and basketball.

He received his law degree in 1934 from the University of Alabama. At the university he was business manager of the 1934 Corolla and was editor and business manager of the football programs for 1931, 1932, and 1933. He was a member of Phi Delta Alpha legal fraternity and Kappa Alpha social fraternity.

In 1935 he joined the Tuscaloosa law firm of Partlow, Lemaistre & Clement. At the time of his death he was senior partner in the firm of Clement, Gewin, Rosen, Hubbard & Waldrop.

A close associate said today after learning of Clement's death:

"Little Foots liked more than anything else just to help his friends and any person in unfortunate circumstances."

The Alabama Legislature, meeting in the last day of a special session at Montgomery, noted his death with regret.

Speaking the Public Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of opposition to the wilderness legislation in many areas of the West. The opposition does not come entirely from those users who have been using the areas which will be affected by the legislation. There are many people who have worked in the conservation program throughout the last many decades who feel that the extreme demands of the advocates of the wilderness legislation are not in the best interests of our Nation.

I have received many letters on this, but one that I received just recently appears to me to state a position that should be effectively made known to those who support the legislation. The letter follows:

SPEAKING THE PUBLIC MIND

EDITOR:

It was refreshing to see a newspaper article (your editorial of September 11) opposing the wilderness area bill.

I am not a stockman, miner, or lumberman, nor am I one of the "vested interests" (whoever they are) so often decried by officials of the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, Isaac Walton League, and others as being against this bill. I am a retired forester who has spent something like 50 years in the study and practice of management of wild lands throughout the United States.

I am against the wilderness area bill because it locks up millions of acres of wild lands for the sole purpose of "preserving a wilderness" for future generations and for the use of a comparatively few people who enjoy a sojourn in country free of manmade noises and structures.

I am against the wilderness area bill but I am not against the creation or maintenance of wilderness areas when combined under the principle of multiple use and kept under the control of Federal agencies such as the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

The time is fast approaching (if, in fact, it is not already here) when the highest value of these wilderness areas is for watershed purposes and I would not like to see any cultural practices prohibited which would be needed for enhancement of watershed values.

In order to prevent the buildup of fire hazard, proper management often calls for livestock grazing or timber harvest.

In order to adequately protect such areas from fire, insects, or disease or needed reduction of game animals in overstocked areas, certain access roads are often needed. As a matter of fact, the isolation of such areas as proposed, together with the accepted practice of suppression of all forest fires, will produce an unnatural condition that in a few years no longer represents the original wilderness.

I think Senator ALLOTT should be commended for his fight to at least make the wilderness area bill workable. Let us hope that our Colorado Congressmen will show the same determination when this bill comes up for consideration by the House next year.

FRED STELL.

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLO.

A.T. & T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an editorial in the State Gazette, of Dyersburg, Tenn., on August 26, 1961, entitled "Too Sensitive," which called to my attention a matter which gives me serious concern.

Last month an official on the lower echelon of the Justice Department told a congressional committee that the Government was considering action to force A.T. & T. to divest itself of its oversea operations. In the next several days A.T. & T. shareholders saw their losses mount to more than $1½ billion.

Subsequent newspaper stories pointed out that the oversea operations of A.T. & T. accounted for less than one-half of 1 percent of the company's operations. But this information came too late for panicky stockholders. The damage had been done and the stock has not yet fully recovered from the scare.

The trouble with this statement is that it subsequently was softened. It was explained that it was merely routine investigation.

Now, the thing that bothers me is this. If these so-called investigations were in order, if there was a reason for them, fine; they should have been carried forward with all the vigor and resources at the Government's disposal.

On the other hand, if they were, in fact, merely routine there should have been no public utterances unless and until something of a concrete nature was turned up.

I want to make it clear that I hold no brief for business, large or small, if that business is guilty of wrongdoing. If there is evidence of wrongdoing, let us have it on the record, fully documented. Also, let us not discriminate against any business because it is large or because it is small. Both are vital parts of our economy.

The mention of big business raises the question of just what is big business. According to a recent article in a newspaper the A.T. & T. Co., is now owned by more than 2 million shareholders with

the largest individual shareholder owning less than one-thirtieth of 1 percent of the stock. When one adds in the families of these shareholders it amounts to a fair-sized percentage of this Nation's population.

An unfair attack on this company is an unfair attack on this large group of our citizens. I feel sure I speak for many Members of this body when I plead for an end to what appears to be personal crusades upon certain segments of our economy.

National Defense Education Act—American Language Teachers in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently the Congress sent to the President a bill providing for a 2-year extension of the National Defense Education Act.

A teacher at one of the high schools in Missouri has written me, commenting on his experience attending one of the foreign language institutes established under the National Defense Education Act. His comments and the benefits which he gained from this experience are of great interest, and give ample evidence of the value and importance of the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Prof. Wallace G. Klein, dated July 28, 1961, and an article by Mr. Klein in the Suburban Educator, February 1961, entitled "Summer Institute in Germany for American Language Teachers Proves Rewarding," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CARBONDALE, ILL., *July 28, 1961.*

The Honorable STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am a teacher of German at University City Senior High School. In 1959 I had the good fortune to be selected as a participant in one of the first foreign language institutes established under the National Defense Education Act, the one at the University of Colorado. From 6:30 in the morning at breakfast until 8 or 9 in the evening—and even on weekends and during other free time, we were surrounded by German. This cultural island, reinforced with excellent instruction in German culture, linguistics, and modern teaching techniques provided an opportunity which most of us German teachers of this generation had not other free time, we were surrounded by German and to study it in a concentrated manner. We left that institute with a feeling of accomplishment and a desire, expressed half facetiously at first, to continue our studies on an advanced level in Germany.

In 1960 the Stanford NDEA Advanced German Institute in Germany made that goal possible. On the basis of my effort and progress at Colorado and my potential as a German teacher, I was one of the 78 teachers selected for the institute at Bad Boll. The opportunity to speak German in everyday relationships, to be with the German people in natural surroundings, to visit German schools (which were still in session), and to see firsthand the historical and cultural sights which I teach about in my classroom was incomparable. In an article which I wrote about my experience in Germany (a copy of which I have taken the liberty of enclosing with this letter), I have also called attention to the many intangible, favorable consequences which this project produced.

I can tell you what attendance at these two language institutes has meant to me: renewed interest in my teaching; a feeling of reassurance about my own language competence and my ability to impart it; a willingness to try the new techniques which I have learned. The results of my training have gone beyond that, however. They have enabled me to create increased interest in my students, to make my classes more effective, to share with my colleagues in University City and throughout the State information about the use of language laboratories and other new methods, and to contribute to the improvement of language teaching in this country.

I am on a committee to revise the foreign language curriculum guide for the State of Missouri; I have participated in a pilot project to test new language materials for the Materials Development Committee of the Modern Language Association; and I am this summer a member of the staff of the NDEA German Institute at Southern Illinois University. As the demonstration teacher of the audiolingual teaching method, as a lab instructor, and as a teacher of methods and materials, I am sharing with the 40 participants what I have learned and practiced in the past 2 years. In this way I hope that I am repaying the country somewhat for the splendid training which I received through the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. (Incidentally, I know of at least six other teachers who have had training similar to mine who are demonstration teachers in summer language institutes.)

To my mind the continuance and expansion of the NDEA are necessary to help prepare teachers to train students in an important aspect of citizenship in today's world. I know that you will give this matter your careful attention when it again comes up for consideration.

May I thank you, as a Member of Congress, for the benefits which I have already enjoyed from this legislation and pledge my continuing efforts to carry out my duties in fulfillment of the spirit and intent of the measure.

Very sincerely yours,

WALLACE G. KLEIN,
Visiting Assistant Professor, Southern Illinois University, NDEA German Institute.

SUMMER INSTITUTE IN GERMANY FOR AMERICAN LANGUAGE TEACHERS PROVES REWARDING
(By Wallace G. Klein, University City Senior High School)

(The author of this article is a teacher of German at University City Senior High School, University City, Mo. In 1959 he attended one of the first modern language institutes under the National Defense Education Act at the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. This year he was selected to attend the Stanford Advanced German Institute at Bad Boll, Germany. Using materials and tapes produced by the Materials Development Committee of the Modren Language Association, he is putting into practice in a pilot class of beginning German the techniques demonstrated at these institutes.)

He's coming. He's here. Four automobiles swung sharply into the courtyard; the local police snapped to attention; cameras clicked in every window. Out of the second car, the one with the eagle pennant on the right fender, stepped a pleasant, smiling white-haired gentleman, Bundespräsident Lübke. After being greeted by the local citizenry, Mr. Lübke was warmly received by the members of the Stanford Advanced German Institute, who had been his guests just 3 weeks before at his official residence in Bonn.

The return visit by the President of the West German Federal Republic was undoubtedly the most exciting of many high points of the Stanford Summer Institute, a history-making venture made possible by the National Defense Education Act. Under the direction of F. W. Strothmann, chairman of the Department of Modern Languages, Stanford University, 78 American secondary schoolteachers of German made full use of an excellent opportunity to practice and improve their command of the language they teach to American students at home. Coming from 24 States, the 78 were selected from over 300 applicants. Because this was an advanced institute, most were graduates of last summer's institutes in Colorado, Maine, Michigan, New York, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

Almost a year of planning by Professor Strothmann and his associates paved the way for the amazingly smooth operation of the undertaking. In addition to classes in applied linguistics, composition, and language-teaching materials and methods conducted by American instructors, we had conversation and pronunciation classes directed by native German instructors. Lectures in German by qualified experts provided material for discussion of such topics as German education, nazism and how it came about, the present German Constitution and Government, and the German picture of America. We teachers were also given an on-the-spot briefing on the Berlin situation during a 6-day stay there which included a visit to the east sector of Berlin (and a warning about which subways and trains not to take to avoid landing in the East Zone of Germany).

The institute enabled us to learn firsthand about the cultural heritage of Germany. Classes were held 4 days a week, and long weekends were devoted to trips which, thanks to the planning of the institute staff, were filled with worthwhile cultural experiences. It would be difficult to say which was the most memorable sight, the hand-carved wooden Marienalter of Tilman Riemenschneider in Creglingen, the medieval cities of Rothenburg and Dinkelsbuhl, or the magnificent baroque Wieskirche, to name a few. Undoubtedly two of the cultural highlights of the trip were the Mozart concert in the charming rococo theater of the Schwetzingen Palace and the Max Reinhardt production of Faust on the church steps in Schwabisch-Hall.

Because the German schools were in session until the latter part of July, it was possible for each of us to visit a school in Berlin and in Stuttgart and to observe the classroom procedure for at least half a day. During these visits we not only asked questions ourselves but were queried by the students about school life in America. Afterward we invited our German teacher colleagues to a boat trip on the Spree, during which we exchanged ideas, language practice, and an abundance of international good will. We found personal contacts such as this exceedingly important. At the Evangelische Akademie at Bad Boll, a well-known German conference center near Stuttgart, we were not only comfortably housed but also had an excellent opportunity to speak German, learn about the German people, and strengthen the ties of German-American friendship. How amazed our German friends

were when we sang German folk songs and frequently knew more verses than they.

At the invitation of the West German Government we traveled to Cologne and Bonn, stopping on the way to see the ruins of the castle at Heidelberg with its view of the Neckar Valley. A visit to the inspiring Cologne cathedral, a viewing of the recent archeological excavations in that city, and a commanding view of the Rhine Valley from the heights of the Drachenfels were among the other tourist attractions we enjoyed. We will certainly remember the gaiety of the evening we sang and danced with German guests under the candlelit, vaulted ceiling of the Gürzenich Keller. (A few of us have the memory of the motherly German woman who was so relieved to have German-speaking guests in her pension that she could not do enough for us and wept when we presented her with a small farewell gift.)

Our first meeting with the German President took place in Bonn. The reception at the Villa Hammerschmidt began with the proper observance of all formalities and protocol, but these soon disappeared as President and Mrs. Lübke mingled with us for about an hour and engaged small groups of us in very friendly conversation. These very cordial, informal chats led to the discovery that the President would be in Stuttgart on a later weekend and would be interested in visiting us at our headquarters and in hearing what we had learned during our 8-week stay in Germany. And so his return visit was arranged and took place as scheduled. After leaving Bonn we traveled part way up the Rhine by steamer, taking in the beautiful scenery, photographing the castles and ruins which dot the landscape, watching for the legendary Mäuseturm (Mouse Tower) and Lorelei rock, and singing Rheinlieder.

A week later the President of Germany was our dinner guest at Bad Boll. Naturally, we felt honored that he was willing to devote so much of his valuable time to our group. In his discussion with us he stressed the importance of the exchange of cultural and spiritual ideas by means of personal contacts as well as through books. He expressed particular interest in our work as language teachers and our desire to stress the spoken language confessing that his early study of English had not been sufficient to enable him to carry on official business without the aid of an interpreter. (Mrs. Lübke, incidentally, is a student of six languages.)

President Lübke sounded us out on our impressions of Germany and, when we praised the scenery and hospitality of his country, insisted that we express our criticisms as well as our likes. He himself pointed out that Germany's amazing economic recovery and ample consumer goods had made many Germans too satisfied with their material well-being and less sensitive to the need for spiritual development and to the problems of the rest of the world. He concluded by asking us to return to our communities as witnesses to the fact that the German people are no better and no worse than any other and that those who are in positions of leadership in Germany are committed to fostering a democratic Germany whose future is irrevocably bound to the peaceful progress of the Western World.

Our students should certainly benefit from the wonderful opportunity we had to practice our German, to learn first-hand about German culture, past and present, to gather useful materials for our classrooms. Equally important, however, is the good will toward America which our visit fostered. Some Germans resent the fact that many Americans stationed in Germany make no effort to learn the language and live almost completely in their "Little America," rather than mingle with German families. Our group acted much to the contrary. One German woman said, "My contact with these teachers has forced me to change all my old ideas about Americans." Commenting on the fact that we even spoke German among ourselves, another German complimented our behavior in a restaurant and said, "I thought you were a bunch of visiting German tourists from somewhere else." Let us hope that these institutes will be continued so that other teachers may have an opportunity to profit from the experience and to contribute to this feeling of international good will.

P.S.—The Office of Education has just announced that another institute will be held at Bad Boll for German teachers and that advanced institutes will also be set up in France and Russia this summer.

W. G. K.

Un-American Activities Committee Has Always Had a Bumpy Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, here follows the third of a series of articles about the House Committee on Un-American Activities written by Pulitzer Prize winner, Edward J. Mowery.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HAS ALWAYS HAD A BUMPY ROAD

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—The current antagonism toward the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) is unprecedented in its scope and organization.

But it's a mild rhubarb compared with the hostility and vituperation plaguing the committee's debut in 1938.

Martin Dies, the Texas Democrat whose House resolution triggered creation of HUAC recalled yesterday that "intimidation, obstructionism and sheer terror" almost doomed the venture before he chairmaned the first meeting.

Obstructionism "from the White House" (which became a 7-year-long vendetta), Dies said, reduced the committee's requested $100,000 budget to a "paltry" $25,000 which spurred a request to the Attorney General for some "competent and reliable" investigators.

"He sent over two men," Dies explained, "but before they arrived I received an anonymous, phoned warning that both men were members of the Communist Party."

Questioned immediately upon their arrival by Dies and the committee, the visitors admitted "facts" which convinced the lawmakers they had Red backgrounds, and that the "Attorney General wanted to plant them on the committee to sabotage our investigation." (The Attorney General in 1938 was Homer S. Cummings.)

"At that moment," Dies commented, "I knew that no effort would be spared to destroy us."

Despite indications of massive hostility to HUAC in high circles, the indomitable Texan and his hard-hitting colleagues amassed their evidence of Communist penetration in unions and Government.

Nearly half of the CIO's executive board, HUAC discovered, had Communist backgrounds. And the vast Federal bureaucracy was "crawling" with Reds.

Dies, armed with evidence that "several thousand" Communists had infiltrated unions—some had been drilled in labor agitation in Leningrad—confronted John L. Lewis in his palatial Washington CIO headquarters. Lee Pressman stood at Lewis' side.

Would Lewis cooperate with HUAC without publicity to purge his unions of Communists?

The burly labor mogul, Dies later reported, angrily banged his fist on the desk and said icily: "Mr. Congressman, we don't need you to tell us how to run the CIO. Yes, we have Communists in the CIO. We also have Baptists, Methodists, Democrats, and Republicans * * *."

Dies went back to the Hill, called in the press, and announced that the committee would begin hearings the next morning "to give the American people the truth." Then came a phone call from President Franklin D. Roosevelt requesting the chairman to come to the White House at 10 a.m. the next day.

F.D.R. was alternately gracious and cajoling. The young Texan had a "promising" future and could go a "long way" by working with the President. But Dies would have to be "loyal."

Dies, still practicing law in Lufkin, Tex., recalled the President's admonition:

"He said, 'I can't work with men [whom] I can't depend upon. You * * * can't go through with this investigation. * * * If you expose Communists in the CIO, the CIO will turn against the Democratic Party. If we lose CIO support in the Eastern States, we cannot win.'"

Benumbed and admittedly "scared," Dies nevertheless refused to bend. F.D.R. became impatient and angry. After 30 tense minute, Dies recalled saying to F.D.R.:

"Mr. President, I have to go, because the committee meets * * * and I must be there to open."

The breach between White House and HUAC widened as the Dies committee rocked the Nation with sensational revelations concerning the Communist conspiracy to strangle the United States. And animosity was quickening.

Among the early witnesses who streamed to the Hill was Walter G. Krivitsky, former confidante of Josef Stalin and head of U.S.S.R. western intelligence, who defected. Krivitsky, sickened at the appalling brutality of the Soviet regime, fled to America in fear of his life. The OGPU had marked him for death.

Krivitsky privately gave the committee a shocking résumé of Soviet espionage in the United States but initially balked at testifying openly because he "would be assassinated in 2 weeks." Dies promised to withhold his identity and afford him protection.

"I tried to get a commitment from officials guaranteeing Krivitsky's safety," Dies said, "but it was apparent they weren't enthusiastic about his testimony. He testified [his name was not divulged] and his revelations were startling."

Shortly afterward, Krivitsky was found shot to death * * * a vicious murder which Dies still attributes to Soviet secret police in the shadow of the Capitol. Two other "valuable" witnesses before the HUAC also paid for their cooperation.

One man, presumably the victim of a heart attack was found, upon closer examination, to have been shot through the eye with a "fine steel bullet." The third witness was mysteriously killed by a hit-run driver in Chicago.

Unruffled by the attempted coercion and terrorism, the committee probed deeper and uncovered 2,500-plus Communists littering the Departments of State, Justice, and Interior.

Dies submitted the documentation to F.D.R. expecting a speedy house cleaning. The President was infuriated. The Texan recalled this conversation:

"He said to me, 'You must see a bugaboo under every bed * * * I've never seen a man with such ideas about this thing. There is nothing wrong with Communists. Some of the best friends I have are Communists.'

(Dies said he related Roosevelt's observation many times during F.D.R.'s lifetime, and the President never denied it * * * "no one sued me for libel." The incident has also been included in Dies' writings, speeches, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1961.)

"The President defied Congress and refused to fire the Communists. They were on the payroll throughout the war * * * when we were working on the atomic bomb. How could Russia have failed to get the secret of the A-bomb with its stooges infesting every department of our Government?"

Dies' third White House visit was at the invitation of the First Lady.

Dies said Eleanor Roosevelt wished to discuss the problems of her asserted protege, Joseph Lash, who was reportedly angling for a naval intelligence appointment with the asserted aid of the First Lady.

Dies recalled that six or eight Communist youth leaders were in a White House anteroom when he arrived. They soon joined Dies and Mrs. Roosevelt at the luncheon during which the Texan showed the First Lady Lash's record.

Returning to the Hill, Dies convened the committee, brought in Lash and asked him why he wasn't in the Army. He had no explanation. But Lash's New York draft board, contacted immediately, had a good one.

"We found he'd been kept out of the Army," Dies said, "upon White House intervention. We demanded his induction. He was inducted."

(Recorded public material on Joseph Lash in HUAC files fill 10 typewritten pages. The report alleges that Lash has been linked with, supported, addressed or contributed to 15 organizations or publications cited as subversive by one or more Federal authorities.)

During this period, Dies said, he received weekly reports from a member of the White House Secret Service detail which revealed that "leading Communists had access to the White House, were going there and using their influence to affect our domestic and foreign policy."

"These incidents," he continued, may give Americans a faint idea of how thoroughly the Soviets were able to dupe us. The President—a magnificent leader during his first two terms—had been completely duped."

Reflecting on current world conditions, Dies said softly:

"Some will say this is all 'spilled milk' or 'water over the dam.' Perhaps it is. But a band of dedicated, deadly radicals—still functioning today—nibbled away at our basic freedoms for an entire generation.

"Millions of our people still have no conception of the methods, tactics and goals of communism, or the extent of its phenomenal success in our governmental and social structure. We're wallowing in a climate of softness toward traitors.

"Pro-Marxist zealots whose primary allegiance is to Moscow are continuing to battle for 'abolition' of HUAC, which crushed the vicious ideologies of nazism and fascism in our midst.

"Today communism—the flaming ideology and new religion based upon atheism and materialims—is our mortal enemy. Any with our actual survival at stake, we can no longer tolerate open treason.

"Every person whose primary fealty is to Russia should face immediate revocation of citizenship. We've passed the point of safe return in quibbling over the precise meaning of political beliefs or guilt by association."

Heat Without Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Glenwood Springs Sage brought to my mind a quotation of one of America's great judges—Oliver Wendell Holmes. He said:

We should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions.

Freedom of thought and freedom of speech, bolstered by education, have traditionally been among the fundamental cornerstones of the American way of life. We Americans stand upon these principles and we are prepared to guard and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Sage calls attention to the fact that we must use our intelligence and our reason, rather than emotion, fear, and hatred, to guide the cause of freedom. I think that this editorial merits the attention of everyone who is interested in preserving our basic principles without hindering our national security.

The editorial follows:

HEAT WITHOUT LIGHT

"In matters of national security, emotion is no substitute for intelligence."

These words, spoken by one of the great Americans of our time, during the hysteria of the McCarthy period, are as true today as in that period of national psychosis. And they are of the utmost importance to everyone concerned with the future of the United States.

They bear an added relevance this week for the people of Glenwood Springs, who yesterday had their first opportunity to see the controversial film "Operation Abolition."

"Operation Abolition" is definitely concerned with matters of national security, for it presents itself as dealing with the action of a subversive Communist Party within the United States.

In regard to this film, it is doubly true that emotion is no substitute for intelligence, as Adlai Stevenson has so correctly warned us.

This film is frankly and openly designed to arouse the emotions of the American people, and to awaken them from an apathy that often covers such areas as Glenwood Springs like a miasmic fog.

That we should be so aroused is, in itself, good, but that we should be so greatly aroused to allow our intelligence to be overridden by our fear and hatred, is extremely bad, and may be tragic for our country and all the principles which America represents.

Wherever Communist subversion may exist in the Government and national community of the United States, it should of course be destroyed. But where there is no subversion, no disloyalty, we must be careful not to persecute, to judge unfairly or blindly.

If we know what communism is, and why it has such a powerful appeal throughout the world, we can fight it properly, through the use of our powers of reason and intelligence.

If our ignorance of the real nature of communism is only equalled by our obsession with its dangers and if our fear of the Communist menace is only matched by our suspicion of innovation and nonconformity, then we cannot attack communism in the United States without smearing all of America's high ideals with our own bigotry.

"Operation Abolition" has several faults. Chief among these is the fact that it is precisely the sort of material which often leads to inflamation without illumination.

By all means let us unite in the struggle against communism, and against the tyranny that accompanies it, but let us not allow our fear and hatred of communism become the pathological condition that is so apparent among the members of the undoubtedly "patriotic" John Birch Society.

There is a Communist menace to the United States, but everyone who disagrees with us is not a Communist. Communism denies the validity of religion. But all agnostics, or even all atheists, are not Communists. Communism preaches the dictatorship of the proletariat, but all who favor the cause of labor, or of unionism, are not Communists. Communism advocates a powerful central state, but all those who favor the strengthening of the Executive are not Communists. Communists are un-American, but all those who disapprove of the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are not Communists.

Let us never lessen our battle against communism, but let us never allow that battle to become a witch hunt designed to enforce conformity with the opinion of the often uneducated majority. In matters of national security let intelligence be our guide and let emotion never blind us to reality.

New Programed Teaching Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present for the information of my colleagues a description of a programed teaching technique developed by the General Programmed Teaching Corp. of which Dr. Robert M. Morgan, professor at the University of New Mexico, is the president. In my opinion, this device shows great promise in the educational field, particularly the teaching of languages. I believe it may well be one of the most important discoveries in modern education.

PROGRAMED TEACHING

The Roman writer Quintillian defined the educational process in terms of a series of rewards to be provided by the mentor in response to correct answers from the students. He called the process a "series of arranged victories." Centuries later, in 1924, Prof. Sidney L. Pressey dusted off the idea and reemphasized the old teacher's remark with the invention of a "teaching machine." Actually, the term "machine" is something of a misnomer. A "teaching machine" is basically a simple device which permits control of the learning process and provides immediate reward to the student correctly responding to a series of questions. The "reward" exists in the form of a statement to the effect that the question has been answered properly. Thus, Professor Pressey's device helped to create the ideal learning condition—a controlled student-tutor relationship. Such an educational process resembles the Socratic dialectical system, replete with encouragement, and, if necessary, correction. President McKin-

ley further defined the process when he spoke of the ideal school as "Mark Hanna on one end of a log and a student on the other."

The importance of the technological advances—the teaching machine, or more precisely, programed learning—can hardly be underestimated in these days of jammed classrooms and intellectually-demanding scientific advance. We no longer have a choice between traditional and streamlined teaching methods. We must move forward educationally out of respect both to our domestic and our international situation. In short, the teaching machine and advanced systems of educational programing are very much to the interests of the United States.

Just how does the teaching machine and programing work? The key element—it cannot be emphasized enough—resides in the employment of an immediate reward or "reinforcement." Just as Quintillian recognized, a response of behavior that has been rewarded is more likely to happen again in subsequent and similar situations. From the youngest child to the design engineer, a participant in programed learning is more likely to learn, and learn more quickly, when he is provided with the reward of a correct answer—a reward constantly emphasized as he progresses through the program.

Conventional teaching methods simply cannot provide such continual reward. For example, in a classroom lecture, the instructor introduces certain concepts which the student may or may not fully understand. The student's perception of the concept may be correct, hazy, or completely wrong. Obviously, the instructor has few clues to determine which students grasp the material, and he has little opportunity to reward or correct any one student's responses throughout the course. What little reinforcement or correction the instructor does provide comes about through classroom discussion. Unfortunately, the student who most needs help seldom takes part in these discussions. The teaching machine and/or program provides an immediate reward or correction by informing the student whether or not his answer is right. This essentially amounts to individual assistance. Thus, the machine and/or program aids the teacher in the implementation of the lesson.

Relatively recent advances in the science of programing have made the process more important than before. Prof. B. F. Skinner's concept of programed teaching goes beyond Pressey's earlier work. Programing in the Skinnerian sense involves a complete analysis of the concepts to be taught in the particular course of study, then the breaking down of these concepts into the basic units of information. These units are arranged in the most easily-learned sequence and require the student to respond actively at each step in the program. The first steps are simple, with subsequent steps building upon them. During its development, the program is student-tested to insure that the learner can proceed step by step without undue difficulty. Any subject can be broken down into small, linear steps that lead easily from one step to another which may be effectively learned by students proceeding at their own pace.

With programed teaching, training time is reduced, and research shows that learning is more easily achieved by the trainee. Further, the quality of learning is typically better than that achieved in the classroom situation, and the instructor's efforts are put to optimum use.

The benefits of programed teaching are generally apparent, but the method of producing programed material is complex. Educators soon found that schools and universities simply were not equipped to produce programs readily. Thus, a number of private corporations were formed in 1960 and 1961, all devoted to the preparation and production of programed teaching material. One such company is the General Programmed Teaching Corp. (GPTC) of Albuquerque, N. Mex. This company was formed for the purpose of developing, testing, and marketing programed learning materials to industries, schools, and governmental agencies.

A number of programs have already been completed by GPTC and other companies like it. Programs on the market include spelling, algebra, physics, French, Spanish, and others. In line with the foreign language applications for programed teaching, a reverse application should be of particular interest.

Up to this time the language programs have been concerned with the teaching of foreign languages to English-speaking peoples. For example, there is available a language program that can teach basic Russian to an English-speaking person in 12 to 18 hours of learning time without the aid of an instructor. The demand for similar programs has been remarkable.

Perhaps of even greater importance, programs can be written in the reverse—that is, from foreign languages to teach English—and at a relatively low cost. The benefits of having our friends around the world acquainted with basic English are implicit. One of the stated aims of President Kennedy's foreign development program is to make individuals throughout the world conversant with the ways of America, and to teach, where possible, basic English.

What method could be employed to teach basic English in foreign countries? Throughout most of the major cities of the world the U.S. Government maintains Education and Information Service libraries, providing foreign populations with books in English. However, many people are denied access to this information source because of their inability to understand English. Such people often carry the balance of power in their countries. They are often the people who riot in Japan and demonstrate apathy toward the United States in Laos. They are the people the Communists find the easiest to sway into their camp. Through the Education and Information Service libraries, would it not be an important and beneficial service, both to foreign countries and to ourselves, to program for an indigenous language to English? Certainly such programing is feasible, whether the language be Spanish, Japanese, French, or Swahili. At the same time that English is being taught, information about our Government, our economy, and our way of life could be woven into the text material.

With the use of programed learning, it is reasonable to assume that programed textbooks could be placed in the hands of thousands—perhaps millions—of people throughout the world, all of whom are potential friends. The distribution could be on a cooperative basis with another country or perhaps directly subsidized by our foreign-aid plan. The idea is one to think about, because never before in our history has it been so imperative that we ourselves be educationally strong and that other countries know and understand us. And never before has the desired goal been so nearly possible as it is with the appearance of programed instruction. We invite your inquiries and further attention to this matter.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad moment for all of us who loved and admired our fallen colleague, OVERTON BROOKS.

I am especially saddened because in the space of a few short years, there had developed a closeness between us. He constantly gave me the benefit of his helping hand as he went about his task in his ever so gracious manner.

OVERTON BROOKS was a modest man. Yet, I know some of the great burden he shouldered. I know how he devoted himself to the task of serving my sister State of Louisiana, and even the entire Southland.

We shall look long before we find another man with his devotion to duty; another man who contributed more of himself to his assigned role in life.

While we shall no longer have this tower of strength to lean upon in our times of trial, we shall always cherish his memory in our hearts.

We have lost a great and a good friend and our prayerful sympathy goes out to his family in this hour of darkness.

Comments of Veterans' Organizations on Board of Veterans' Appeals Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, prior to the publication of the committee study on decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, conducted by a group of law students as explained in the RECORDS of September 13, 18, 20, and 21, 1961, pages A7197, A7398, A7461, and A7570, four of the major veterans' organizations were given an opportunity to review some of the cases presented.

Under previous consent I wish to include as a part of my remarks the comments of the veteran organizations, printed in the order in which they were received:

COMMENTS OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS

AMVETS NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: We have reviewed with great interest the enclosures contained in your letter of July 14, 1961, addressed to Mr. John Holden, regarding judicial review.

Reviewing the three cases covered in the galley proofs, two points stand out clearly. The law students with no prior experience of VA benefits put "teeth" in sections 310 and 311 of title 38 and gave full credence to lay and medical evidence submitted in support of the claims. These two points in particular have been the basis for much of the criticism of the present appeal decisions. It is also interesting to note that in each instance the burden of proof in severance cases was placed upon the Government in their conclusions of law.

In comparing the "findings of fact" and the "conclusions of law" as cited by the Board of Veterans' Appeals and the law students, we find that by comparison that the Board of Appeals citations leave the impression that only sufficient findings and conclusions are cited to support their own deci-

sions. On the other hand, the "findings of fact" and "conclusions of law" cited by the law students leave no doubt as to the facts in the case, the governing regulations, or the reasoning used in arriving at their final decisions.

Assuming that the cases referred to here are representative of the 10 cases studied, then we of AMVETS feel that they constitute a serious indictment of our present system of veterans appeals, and leave considerable doubt that H.R. 866 will accomplish very much toward remedying the situation. In essence, the findings of fact and conclusions of law as contained in the Board of Veterans' Appeals decisions leave much to be desired as compared to the findings and conclusions cited by the law students. AMVETS feel that the results of this pilot project have created a strong argument for the establishment of an independent appellant tribunal.

In closing we might add that the statements of facts as prepared by the regional offices were excellent.

Sincerely yours,

GARRETT J. BOWMAN,
Assistant National Legislative Director.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This has further reference to your letter dated July 14, 1961, forwarding copies of House Committee Print No. 118 for the consideration of this organization and requesting our comments thereon.

Mr. Denvel Adams, DAV director of claims, has advised me as follows based upon the careful review he and his staff made of the decisions involving findings of fact and conclusions of law you have brought to our attention:

"With reference to the copy of Mr. TEAGUE's letter regarding the preparation of decisions on appeal cases, our comment is that the law student in each case apparently has rendered decisions based purely on facts and evidence contained in the briefs; whereas, it appears to me, the VA in their decisions have relied, to a large degree, on opinion which is not borne out by the facts in each case.

"By way of further comment, may we say that we have maintained down through the years that the VA Board of Veterans' Appeals has not given sufficient weight to lay affidavits in arriving at decisions on appeal cases."

I have also heard in this matter from Mr. Sylvester Hoffmann, DAV national judge advocate, who was supplied by me with copies of your letter and print No. 118, and you will please find enclosed herewith a copy of Mr. Hoffmann's letter dated July 25, 1961, which is self-explanatory. I concur in his conclusions.

Sincerely,

ELMER M. FREUDENBERGER,
National Director of Legislation.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 25, 1961.

Mr. ELMER M. FREUDENBERGER,
Director of Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ELMER: Experience of the judiciary and regulatory agencies, alike, has shown that the very act of making separate findings of fact and conclusions of law is a deterrent to decisions unsupported by the evidence, and aids those making the decision to reach a fair and just determination.

Congress has repeatedly required such separate written findings and conclusions by various Federal administrative agencies. In the instance of the CAB, for example, a court of appeals recently remanded a decision to the CAB for further consideration where the findings (which merely followed the language of the act) were not inadequate. A different end result followed, after adequate findings, supported by the evidence, were adopted.

It is true (and a situation which should be corrected) that review of the decisions of the VA Board of Veterans' Appeals by an independent court (such as a court of veterans' appeals) is now precluded, but adequate, separate and complete findings and conclusions may prove helpful in seeking action by that Board to reconsider, as is authorized by 38 U.S.C. 4003, 4004(a), by reexamining its findings and conclusions in the light of the admitted evidence, and determining whether they also meet the clear requirements of 38 U.S.C. 4004(c).

Adequate, realistic findings and conclusions would also aid the veterans who file a new claim, by reason of 38 U.S.C. 4004(b), after disallowance.

The galley proofs submitted (which I return herewith), clearly illustrate that as to those prepared by the Board, it would be much more difficult to demonstrate the fairness of reconsideration, than under the more full and specific findings and conclusions prepared by the law students.

Sincerely yours,

SYLVESTER HOFFMANN,
National Judge Advocate.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: That is an response to your letter of July 14, requesting the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to the sufficiency of the findings of fact and conclusions of law concerning certain enclosed cases.

These cases were referred to our national rehabilitation service and a copy of its response is enclosed. It is hoped this material will prove helpful in implementing the new Public Law requiring findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Thanking you for extending the opportunity to the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be of assistance in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, NATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

Mr. FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, VFW National Legislative Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STOVER: This is in response to the request of Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives of the United States for the opinion of this service concerning the findings and conclusions prepared in each of four cases by law students and by the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

It should be emphasized that any comparison of the comments of the staff of this service concerning the sufficiency of the findings of fact and the conclusions of law by the Board of Veterans' Appeals with our comments concerning the findings of fact and conclusions of law by the law students is fraught with the probability of fallacy for the following reasons:

(1) The Board of Veterans' Appeals presumably studied and considered all of the pertinent evidence contained in the claims folder and the statement of facts prepared by the field station of original jurisdiction while the law students apparently had only the statement of facts available.

(2) Members of the staff of this service have, of course, not been afforded an opportunity to review all of the evidence in the individual cases with the exception of case No. 4 in which the claimant was represented by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

(3) The statement of facts in each case as certified to be correct by the service representative concerned, may be entirely correct. However, with the exception of case No. 4 in which the VFW represented the claimant, I, as director of this service, will not accept assurance of accuracy of the statement of facts in each case. It seems doubtful that each statement of facts is complete. The military record information appears to be adequate, and the recitation of adjudication actions is probably accurate but the information extracted from the Veterans' Administration medical records is of doubtful adequacy. We gained a general impression while reviewing other cases in this group of approximately 100 cases in which field stations prepared summaries, that the statements of fact prepared by field stations were not all complete as to reference to pertinent evidence, and that in some instances descriptive statements of contents of evidentiary documents, especially medical statements and reports of examinations, were not adequate. Concerned service representatives were obviously aware that the Board of Veterans Appeals would consider not only the statement of facts but all of the pertinent evidence in the claims folder and for that reason were probably not as concerned as they might otherwise have been as to completeness of the statement of facts.

(4) The Board of Veterans' Appeals bears the onus for the propriety of decisions and the resulting disbursement of Federal funds predicated on each favorable decision. The law students bore no such burden and perhaps evaluated the cases partly from the viewpoint of their anticipated future vocation as practicing attorneys and the resulting attorney-client relationship. The same general observation would be appropriate if the same cases were referred to service representatives for preparation of separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law. Service representatives do not bear responsibility for decisions and the disbursement of Government funds and are understandably inclined to emphasize that part of the evidence and to advance those contentions which tend to enhance the merits of the claim and the possibility of favorable action by the agency of jurisdiction.

(5) The Board of Veterans' Appeals had available and doubtlessly utilized the knowledge of medical consultants as well as the knowledge of the medical associate members of the sections of the Board to which the cases were assigned. As far as is known, medical consultant service was not available to the law students.

(6) It is possible that the law students did not have available to them all of the pertinent directive publications of the Veterans' Administration.

I shall comment as to the sufficiency of the separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law by the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and also by the law students in each case. Except as specifically indicated, it may be assumed that this service considers the findings of fact and conclusions of law by the law students and by the Board of Veterans' Appeals to be sufficient in scope although not entirely proper in some instances. It is impossible, in my opinion, to adequately and precisely comment on the sufficiency of the findings and conclusions of law without expressing an opinion as to the propriety of the expressed decision in

each case by the Board of Veterans' Appeals and by the law students.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSION

It is noted that each of the four cases involves the question of restoration of service connection previously granted and severed. As service representatives, members of our staff are inclined to be sympathetic with respect to restoration of service connection, especially if the VA reviewed the case several times and maintained service connection after several reviews during a period of many years. Certainly, belated severance of service connection is not justified unless there is no reasonable basis to maintain service connection, and there is a complete dearth of supporting evidence. We were pleased with the enactment of Public Law 86–501 (now section 359, title 38, United States Code).

Frequently, the law students, in referring to the action severing service connection on the ground that the grant of such service connection was clearly and unmistakably erroneous, commented that "error was not specified." The alleged clear and unmistakable error, of course, was the actual grant of service connection belatedly determined not to be supported by the evidence. As service representatives, members of our staff have frequently disagreed with the judgment of concerned VA officials in determining that the grant of service connection was clearly and unmistakably erroneous. Perhaps it would be difficult or impossible to cite the error in a more specific manner, but it is believed that the reasons for concluding that the evidence does not support the original grant of service connection after reevaluation could be more precisely and understandably stated in many cases.

It is presumed that the requested analysis of these cases and the total project involving approximately 100 cases is related to consideration of the possibility of requiring field stations to prepare a summary or statement of facts in each appealed case, and the possibility that the Board of Veterans' Appeals will, in the future, consider only such summaries rather than all pertinent evidence in the basic record in considering questions at issue. While such relatively brief summaries might be a satisfactory basis for final action by the Board of Veterans' Appeals in some types of cases, such as the question of the right to enter training under what was known as Public Law 346, 78th Congress, several years after the individual veteran's delimiting date even for completion of training, we remain wholly unconvinced that such summaries would be satisfactory for consideration by the Board of Veterans' Appeals as a basis for final decisions of that agency in any significant percent of the total cases considered by the Board. The summaries studied by members of the staff of this Service in connection with representation of claimants causes us to believe that many of them are not adequate or complete although probably reasonably accurate. It is conceded that after further instruction, training, and experience of VA field station personnel, such summaries would improve. Certainly, we would not want to represent a claimant without studying the pertinent evidentiary record in addition to any summary or statement of facts prepared by a field station unless we were convinced of the accuracy, adequacy, and completeness of such statement. Such assurance could be gained only by a thorough study of the record and comparison which in itself would involve as much or more effort and time than the study of the record and and representation of the claimant based on analysis of the pertinent evidence without reference to any statement of facts prepared by the agency of original jurisdiction.

Related to this study, and to my comments, is the new Board of Veterans' Appeals decision format which includes separately stated findings of fact and conclusions of law. We believe this to be an improvement and concur in the enactment of Public Law 87–97, directing the use of such revised format by the Board of Veterans' Appeals in all cases on and after January 1, 1962. We further believe that an evaluation of the general and specific results of universal use of this format by the Board of Veterans Appeals would be proper after approximately 1 year of experience, and this service plans to conduct such a study.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN D. JONES,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
REHABILITATION COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Thank you for your letter of July 14, 1961, addressed to our legislative director, Miles Kennedy, in which you furnished partial galley proofs of House Committee Print 118. Mr. Kennedy has asked that I reply to your letter.

Members of our staff, including our legal consultant, have carefully reviewed the material. It is our opinion that the format now being used in decisions rendered by the Board of Veterans' Appeals is a considerable improvement over the old form. Although experience will probably suggest the need for further change, the new approach seems calculated to help produce sound and reasoned decisions.

The sufficiency of findings of fact and conclusions of law in any individual case is determined by a careful review of all of the original records of that case. We are confident that the new format, described in H.R. 866, will help insure sufficient findings and conclusions.

The American Legion is grateful to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for its continuing interest in the adjudication of veterans' claims and the operation of the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. CORCORAN,
Director.

Representative Derounian, of New York, Scores Duplicity in Peace Corps Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release of September 21, 1961:

REPRESENTATIVE DEROUNIAN, OF NEW YORK, SCORES DUPLICITY IN PEACE CORPS LEGISLATION

Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, of New York, shocked by the deletion of a provision of the Peace Corps legislation, which will "materially affect the composition of the groups sent to the Arab and other countries," and pointing to the action as "another indication of the duplicity practiced by the Democratic Party," today wired the President as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C:

I am shocked by the action of the House of Representatives deleting from the Peace Corps legislation the provision that "the Peace Corps shall not perform services in any foreign country in which, by reason of law or official policy, any member of the Peace Corps will be discriminated against because of his race, creed, or color." The deletion of this provision will materially affect the composition of those groups sent to the Arab and other countries. You have repeatedly stated, before you were President and thereafter, that you are against any action of discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Do you intend to approve this legislation?

Respectfully,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Member of Congress.

Belchertown (Mass.) Bicentennial, 1761–1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago in the month of June the little community of Belchertown, Mass., was incorporated. Named in honor of Jonathan Belcher, the Royal Governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire during 11 stormy years between 1730–1741, Belchertown today stands as a typical American community, whose residents are proud of the heritage which is theirs.

Although incorporated in 1761, the actual recorded history of this community and neighborhood goes back much further—as a matter of fact a full century. The region which now includes Belchertown, Ware, and Pelham was originally known as the "equivalent lands," and by the middle of the 17th century bore the reputation of being fine hunting grounds.

The title of "equivalent lands" came originally from a grant of Connecticut territory made by the Council of Plymouth in 1630 to the Earl of Warwick, who presently conveyed title to several English nobles. In 1661 John Mason, as agent for Connecticut, purchased from the Indians all lands which had not previously been acquired by individual towns, and then surrendered them to the colony. The colonists then petitioned King Charles II for a charter confirming their rights, and the King duly obliged by a grant so sweeping that it must have astounded even the land-hungry Puritans. The boundaries were fixed as follows:

All that part of His Majesty's domains in New England, in America, bounded east by Narragansett River, commonly called Narragansett Bay, where the river falleth into the sea; and on the north by the line of Massachusetts Plantation, and on the south by the sea, and in longitude as the line of the Massachusetts Colony, running from east to west; that is to say, from the said Nar-

ragansett Bay on the east to the South Sea on the west part, with the islands thereto belonging.

The only difficulty was that no one really knew where the boundaries lay.

When eventually settlements sprang up in the vicinity of Northampton the highway of travel for these settlers to reach Boston or other eastern towns lay across these "equivalent lands." In what is now Belchertown, near the old Bartlett farm, was a pleasant spring to welcome thirsty travelers, and the name "Cold Spring" was attached to the neighborhood and, indeed, until the town was incorporated and formally renamed, the community was called Cold Spring.

On June 25, 1761, the bill incorporating Cold Spring passed the House of Representatives, was approved by the Council the following day, and received the assent of Governor Bernard on June 30. It was determined to name the town Belcher's Town in memory of the late Governor, now 4 years dead. He had left Massachusetts under a cloud, having been dismissed from office, but it was discovered that various charges made against him were signed in part by forged names.

Later, after a visit to England, he was appointed Governor of New Jersey where he rendered genuine service in helping to found the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University. It was to remedy the injustice done him in Massachusetts that this town was named in honor of his memory.

Like every community in western Massachusetts, Belchertown had its committee of correspondence as the Revolution approached. The day after Lexington and Concord two companies of minutemen marched from the town, under the command of Capts. Jonathan Bardwell and John Cowles—good old Massachusetts names, both of them. They remained on duty at Boston until about August 1. The historian, George Bancroft, writes thus of this period:

The existence of the Army was an indication of the benevolence of the New England people, and its sustenance during May, June, and July cannot be accounted for by ordinary rules. There was nothing regularly established, and yet many thousands of men were supplied. Touched by an all-prevading influence each householder esteemed himself a sort of commissary. There were no public magazines, no large dealers in provisions, but the wants of the Army rung in the ears of the farmers, and from every cellar, barnyard, and field throughout Worcester, Hampshire, and even Berkshire, such articles of food as could be spared were devoted to the camp, and everybody's wagons were used to transport them. But for this, the forces must have dispersed. How it was done, cannot exactly be told; popular enthusiasm keeps little record of its sacrifices; only it was done, and the troops of Massachusetts and New Hampshire were fed without so much as a barrel of flour from the Continental Congress.

Throughout the long and bloody struggle for national independence the farmers of Belchertown did their full part. The town was represented at Bunker Hill, in Arnold's expedition to Quebec, and at the surrender of Burgoyne. Maj. Nathan Parsons, brother-in-law of the Reverend Edward Billing, Belchertown's first pastor, fought in the war from beginning to end and was attached to Washington's army at Morristown. It is a proud heritage that has come down to the men and women of these hills and valleys. The Reverend Payson W. Lyenan wrote in 1911 on the occasion of Belchertown's sesquicentennial:

History is one of the studies which should by no means be neglected. He writes himself down as a man of small mind who scouts it as of little account. All great achievements of the present and of future time must be laid on the foundation of the studies, the discoveries and experiences of the past. Inquire I pray thee, of the former age, and apply thyself to that which thy fathers searched out. Shall not they teach thee and tell thee?

Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere today salute the people of Belchertown as they gather to celebrate the 200th birthday of the community they love so much.

Beyond Mediocrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church here in Washington, delivered one of the most timely and thought-provoking sermons I have ever had occasion to hear. It is entitled "Beyond Mediocrity" and based upon the talents parable of Jesus recorded in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. It is so appropriate for our times and contains such rich food for thought that I believe every Member will be benefited by reading it:

BEYOND MEDIOCRITY

A man going on a journey called his servants and entrusted to them his property; to one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability.—Matthew 25: 14, 15.

The century in which we live has been called the "people's century" or the "age of the common man." Everywhere in our world both individuals and organized groups strive for self-elevation, self-fulfillment, and a place in the sun. It is a time of universal revolution and incipient democracy. But it is a time also when some discerning thinkers are asking whether in the American expression of democracy the process of leveling down is now stronger than the drive for elevation.

Can we have democracy without destroying and stifling excellence and the drive toward superiority?

Are we destined to become a society of mediocre people?

Can we have a high order of life without a spiritual and intellectual aristocracy? Where are the commanding personalities of our age?

How equal do we want to be?

How equal can we be?

Is it possible for a people to achieve excellence if they do not believe anything?

Have the American people lost their sense of purpose and the drive which makes it possible for them to achieve excellence?

John W. Gardner in a notable book on this subject asks, "Can we be excellent and equal too? * * * The 'two souls', he says, in the breast of every American are the devotion to equalitarianism and the attachment to individual achievement, if you say to the average American that all men should be equal, he will say, 'Of course!' And if you then should say that we should 'let the best man win,' he will applaud this as a noble thought. The idea that the two views might often conflict does not occur to him. His sentiments are those of the Irishman who cried, 'I'm as good as you are, and a great deal better too.' In their precise forms the two positions are mutually exclusive."

One hundred years ago, at Gettysburg Cemetery, Abraham Lincoln reminded the world that our Founding Fathers "brought forth upon this continent a new Nation * * * dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." But in the parable of the talents Jesus takes for granted that men, as a matter of fact, are unequal and he attributes this inequality to God.

Jesus' statements runs contrary to the socialistic trend in much of the world today which says: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." This parable says: "To each according to his ability." The current doctrine says "Take from the wealthy in one way or another and thereby raise the level of the poor by various forms of subsidy or dole."

Moreover, in this parable, Jesus renders the terrifying judgment that "To everyone who has will more be given; from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away."

When we have thought it through we must conclude that what Jesus said is pedagogically correct, psychologically valid, and gives the authentic view of stewardship of talents and the achievement of excellence. For what we have is God's gift to us; what we become is our gift to God.

Jesus is saying that men are not equally endowed but that they are equally responsible to God for the endowments they have.

The men in this story did not earn their talents. They were given them by their master—by implication, God. Modern thought confirms the ancient teaching. What we are born with—the given factor, the combination of genes—is more important than anything we acquire after we are born. To educate means to educe—to draw out. Education can draw out what is there. It cannot put in what is not there. This may be comforting to some at examination seasons. We believe this native endowment to be not an accident but the gift of God.

We are not equally endowed. Not all of us have the same talents nor are talents equally distributed. It is sad for some, but true, that those who have more to begin with find it easier to increase what they have.

Modern pedagogy tends to confirm this point. The student with an I.Q. of 140 finds lessons come easily. He excels at them. He tends to do what he excels in; everything he learns makes it easier for him to learn more. The boy nearby finds it all he can do to keep up. His incentive, often is to avoid failure or embarrassment to his family.

There are some whose endowments are such that they succeed academically but are miserably inept in other fields. There are Ph. D.'s who cannot change a tire or tune up a motor. Albert Einstein was a genius in science but when he talked about religion he was a stark novice. Walt Mason could write poetry but he was so poor in mathematics that he mistrusted everybody who could count including his own banker and financial adviser.

Personal endowment is unequal. Those who have, receive more. It is true in social relations. Take the principle of popularity. One person naturally draws people to him. He is outgoing, extroverted, a natural leader. Wherever he sits is always the head of the

table. Wherever he is becomes the center of interest. Another is awkward, shy, introverted. He would like to be something else, but he isn't.

This principle holds in business and the professions. One business succeeds where another fails. The market, which pleases customers, multiplies the number of buyers, turns over its stock more frequently, has fresher produce, and therefore attracts more customers. One doctor's skill, personality and bedside presence is so favorably reported he gets more patients than he can handle. One lawyer turns clients away; another has not enough to be busy. And I suppose even one minister has just the touch that makes him the marrying parson. The expert public speaker keeps lecturing; the ineffective one is unemployed.

From the many talented man much more is expected than from the man of single talent. Jesus makes that clear in the passage in Luke 12: 48: "Everyone to whom much is given; of him will much be required; and of him to whom men commit much they will demand the more." From the able the vigorous, the successful man, the community and the Nation expect more than from the mediocre man or the ineffective one. The more able the man the heavier his responsibilities. But for him there are also greater incentives, because a man tends to measure up to what people expect of him.

Thomas Jefferson was not at odds with Jesus; nor was Abraham Lincoln contradicting Christ's truth.

What Thomas Jefferson was trying to say in the Declaration on behalf of men in his day was that in this New World we reject utterly the Old World Classification of men into Lord and slave, patrician and plebian, the master and the mastered, the ruler and the ruled. All men are equally free under God. All men are equally dear to God. Human personality is the supreme value in the universe. Each man has his own place in God's love which no other can fill. And insofar as we can provide it, each man should have equal opportunities.

We Americans, with our democratic outlook, reject sharp emphasis on class privilege, hereditary position, and the neglect of uniform responsibility. We have replaced the old, aristocratic conception of education by the democratic. From kindergarten to the university, the door of opportunity is open. In spite of all our shortcomings, we believe passionately in this opportunity. More than any other social system, ours has brought equality of opportunity and a high respect for human values.

But equality of opportunity is one thing. Equality of endowment is another. This, no government can give, no educational system bestow. One person enters life equipped with a strong, robust constitution; another with a frail physique, which may be a lifelong handicap. One enters with high intelligence so that learning comes easily, another with such limited equipment that learning comes hard. One girl has a pretty face and attractive spirit, another has not. One man has a permanent foliage on the top of his head, another has a tendency to the baldness of the desert which he can't change. Men seem to get thin on top about the same time they get thick in the middle. And young ladies, you might just as well resign yourselves to the fact that your own prospect, whatever his contours or profile, cannot become a Jimmy Stewart or Gregory Peck. And men need not expect every candidate for a mate to be a Brigitte Bardot or Gina Lollobrigida. And you should thank God it is not so.

The Lord only makes one of each person. That is both the hazard and the glory of human personality. If we had been consulted as to our physical or mental makeup, some of us might have a few changes to order. But we were not. We have to take the hand that is dealt us, and play it as well as we can.

In this parable, the evident inequality is attributed to God. "If I were God," we are inclined to say, "I would give men an even chance." And it is just here that God's wisdom proves to be superior to man's. When we are free from envy, jealousy, and resentment, we know that life is richer because it is the way it is. If everyone were precisely alike, equally endowed, with the same set of skills—life would be drab indeed. We see this truth everywhere. It is better that our organist should play the organ than that the speaker should attempt it. Better that poetic ability be concentrated in Milton, music in Beethoven, and drama in Bernard Shaw, than that there should be a dead level of mediocrity in us all. Better that Pasteur have five talents in science, Edison and Bell their talents in invention, so that all the world might benefit from their labors.

Let it be clear, very clear, that as life really is there are many tasks which require only one talent. And if that talent is not faithfully used, the whole organization breaks down. Let one player on a baseball team fail and the team loses. The crew is as important to the captain as the captain to the crew. Leaderless men in battle are always ineffectual. The man on the assembly line is as dependent on the production manager as the manager on him. Browning in "Pippa Passes" says, "All service ranks the same with God; there is no last nor first."

Look again at the parable. The man who buried his talent was not a scoundrel. He did not embezzle his master's money, nor dissipate it in sensuous living. He simply kept it. He did nothing with it. He lacked imagination to see that his talent was needed. He undervalued both himself and his service. He failed to realize that money is a medium of exchange and that when it is withdrawn from usage it no longer fulfills the purpose for which it was made.

So it is in life. Most of the good things in life are accomplished by ordinary people; ordinary people, who give all they have back to God in loving service. So often the world is moved forward by men of modern endowments who compensate for their limitations by the fullness of their spirit and their whole-hearted dedication. Excellence is achieved by an individual stewardship of talents, the perfecting and multiplying of our talents by usage.

The trouble with most of us is we wish we had larger ability when we are probably not using the ability we have. If we are honest, our difficulty is not that we have so few endowments but that we do not apply the intelligence and imagination we already possess. We seldom use more than 1 percent of our brain cells for thinking, as William James said. Energy drys up in the reservoir of personality if it is not used. We are channels through which energy flows only as it is used. God expects from us no more than our best. If we fail to give that best we are "wicked and slothful servants" according to Jesus.

In this great Christian lesson, judgment is not based upon what we have but upon how we use that which we have. If the third man in the story had brought back his single talent with its hard-earned surplus, he would have received the same commendation as the 5-talented man. He is condemned, not because he has only 1 talent, but because he is too lazy or too timid to put it to use.

Equal fidelity in the use of equal opportunity is equally rewarded. That is the lesson. The reward of fidelity is increased capacity. The man who makes good on a modest assignment fits himself for a larger one and every time we refuse a job which has our name on it we make ourselves less fit for the next one.

There is a penalty for indolence. "From him who has not, even that he has will be taken away." The used muscle grows stronger, the unused becomes flabby. The brain employed becomes sharper. The unused gets duller. The man who does not use his mind will in time have none to use.

Says George R. Harrison, dean of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "The circuits of the mind improve with use and exercise. Thinking brings an increased blood supply and more nourishment to the cells involved." There is a principle of increased returns from increased usage. Reasoning, reflection, judgment, memorization, imagination—all uses of the brain—enhance brain power.

Either you use or you lose your talents. This is true in all aspects of life—in mind, in body, in soul. Let us pray that God may give each of us the strength and the discipline to rise above the tide of mediocrity to faithful use of talents that we may achieve the excellence for which God has given us capacity. God has invested in each of you here today. What you are is His gift to you. What you become is your gift to Him.

Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, RALLY AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK CITY, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961

It is an honor and a pleasure to address the representatives of those nations—and a cross section of the millions of citizens of the United States—who opposed admitting to the United Nations the world's biggest dope peddler; the one nation in the world that has a policy of trafficking in death, that pursues an indiscriminate, particularly vicious type of genocide designed to destroy not only the bodies, but the minds and morals of its enemies.

It was Mao Tse-tung himself—when he headed a relatively small band of Red conspirators in Yenan many years ago—who conceived the Chinese Communist policy of narcotics peddling or "soul poison." Opium, or special merchandise, as it was called, was Yenan's main source of income. Mao used it to demoralize and debauch non-Communist Chinese while, at the same time, he used profits from its sale to finance the subversion of their free institutions.

Today, he is doing the same thing, but on a much larger scale. The distribution and sale of opium and its derivatives, morphine and heroin, worldwide, is close to being a Red Chinese monopoly. This is not by accident. For the first time in history, we are faced with a situation in which a government has undertaken to make itself the narcotics trust of the world. It has been so successful in this that Peiping now has an estimated income of $1 billion annually from trade in narcotics.

Though the use of opium is forbidden in Red China, over 5 million acres of land in that country are devoted to opium poppy

cultivation. The People's Bank of China and Peiping's opium agency have special counters for handling loans and credits for opium growers. Poppy farms are protected by electrified barbed wire fences. Red China's Armed Forces provide guards for opium shipments. The so-called People's Bank bids in the opium poppy at 72 U.S. dollars—and refined heroin at 500 U.S. dollars—per pound.

The records of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs reveal that Hong Kong is swamped with opium, morphine and heroin; that Burma and Thailand are helpless to stop the annual flow of tons of opium which enter those countries from their northern frontiers; and that Red Chinese narcotics, a considerable portion of them openly labeled as such, are sold throughout the world.

During the Korean war, Red China falsely accused the United States of using germ warfare, when it was itself engaged in large-scale "dope warfare" against United States and United Nations troops. Narcotics were peddled at bargain prices by young women pushers near all military installations in Korea. Much of it was of such purity that it made addicts far more quickly than the adulterated type usually sold in the United States.

When the U.S. troops captured Pyongyang, capital of Communist Korea, they found an opium processing plant. In it there was enough morphine in cans to fill several rooms and 300 boxes of opium, each containing 30 to 50 pounds of the drug. In 1951–52, Republic of Korea police arrested over 2,400 North Korean agents who had "gold in one hand and heroin in the other." All Korean heroin was the "Red Lion" brand, known to originate in Tientsin.

Rings pushing Red Chinese narcotics have been broken in Japan, San Francisco, Hawaii and many other parts of the world.

The United Nations knows these things. For years, facts on Red China's trafficking in dope have been presented to its Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Narcotics Commissioner and U.S. representative on the U.N. Commisison, has told it:

"Spreading narcotic addiction to obtain funds for political purposes, through the sale of heroin and opium, is the policy of the Communist government in mainland China. * * *

"This narcotics menace from Communist China is a multiheaded dragon threatening to mutilate and destroy whole segments of populations * * * an unbridled monster."

I need not tell anyone in this audience about the horrors of dope addiction. Our press has been filled with accounts of it. Heroin, Red China's most valuable export, is the most potent and pernicious of opium derivatives. Its victims are practically incurable.

But even while Red China promotes addiction to this revolting drug in every corner of the world, in contravention of the rules and efforts of the United Nations, and of every norm of human rights and decency—making itself unfit to sit in the councils of any body of civilized men—we find certain member nations advocating its admission to the U.N.

What a travesty this is.

Within the past 2 years, Moscow and Peiping have established a beachhead 90 miles from the shores of the United States. Their aim in doing so, is the ultimate destruction of this Nation. It is not, however, limited to this. They also intend to seize control of every nation in Latin America—either before or after conquering the United States—and turning each one of them into a Red satellite.

The Castro regime has given us a foretaste of what this will mean to tens of millions of Latin Americans: mass executions before firing squads, a brutal war against religion, dictatorial control of the press and all media of information, the suppression of liberty in every form—all the horrors the peoples of Russia, China and the satellites have suffered at the hands of Communist Governments for years.

What has been Red China's role in the enslavement of the people of Cuba?

It has given Castro a loan of $60 million with the understanding that he need not pay it back. It has bought 500,000 tons of his slave labor sugar crop. Last February, Raoul Castro said Red China had given the Communist Cuba dictatorship hundreds of machine guns and other weapons "for which we have not had to pay one cent."

In the Spring of this year, when Castro asked Red China's help in putting down any anti-Communist revolution or invasion, Liu Shao-Chi and Chou En-lai pledged Red China's complete support. In another message, Peiping referred to former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy as "jackals of the same lair" and stated that "whatever hapepns" Communist China would take "all the necessary measures in every field" to see that Castro's Communist grip on the Cuban people is never broken.

Shortly after Castro seized power, diplomats in Cuba reported that Peiping's worldwide extortion machine had already gone to work on the 30,000 Chinese there. The Oversea Chinese Returnees Association in Peiping was asking them if they had relatives in Red China and what property they owned in Cuba. Peiping's letters of inquiry bore the correct names, addresses, and even apartment numbers of the addressees—an indication of how thoroughly its international extortion ring goes about its business.

Oversea Chinese in this country and other nations have, for years, been receiving extortion notes from Red China. Many are in our committee's files. The fear created by the Red extortionists among Chinese in free nations, however, is nothing compared to what it is for those who live under a Communist dictator.

Red China's freedom wrecking efforts in the Western Hemisphere have not been limited to Cuba. Two training centers for Latin Americans have already been established in Peiping. One of them is teaching guerilla warfare, an art in which the Chinese Communists excel. The other has already sent 200 Communist agents into various Latin American countries as students and journalists and under other guises.

Through its Sino-American Cultural and Friendship Association, Red China has established binational cultural centers in nine Latin American countries. It has stepped up its Latin America broadcasts to 21 hours per week, and in April 1960, added 10½ hours in Portuguese. Its New China News Agency has an office in Havana and is publishing a slick propaganda magazine for distribution throughout Latin America. In 1960, over 1,000 Latin Americans traveled to Red China at Peiping's expense.

The purpose of all these activities is obvious. It is to destroy freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere by whatever means are possible and impose in its place Red totalitarian regimes.

The United Nations was founded on a noble ideal, an ideal with which no sane person can disagree—the ideal that the peace-loving, decent nations of the world should combine their forces—economic, political, diplomatic, moral, and military—to maintain world peace and protect universally recognized human rights. How? By using whatever of their combined powers were needed—at any given moment and in any given situation—to put down warmakers and violators of human rights.

It is shocking that nations which claim to be dedicated to the ideals of the U.N. and its charter, should be so cynical, so morally callous, so indifferent and blind to their own interests and survival, that they should urge that Red China be granted admission to that body.

Whoever votes for Peiping's admission to the U.N.—on the record—votes for war rather than peace, for international blackmail on a frightening scale, for a world policy of promoting narcotics addiction, for the undermining of freedom in all of Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

They also are voting for the ultimate destruction of the U.N. itself—even while they proclaim their great devotion to it. What is worse, they are making a complete mockery of the U.N., its charter and ideals. They are dragging this international organization, which has been proclaimed the best hope of man, into the gutter of the cheapest and dirtiest kind of international politics. They would have it submit to the blackmail of communism's international narcotics peddler, its trader in the degradation of human souls.

Red China's admission to the U.N. must be fought and defeated at all costs. If we fail in this endeavor, it will be time to leave the organization; not in pique, but in self-respect; not to destroy it, but in an effort to at least uphold its ideals when the organization itself has become nothing but a sham.

No nation that truly believes in the Charter, in human rights and decency, in peace rather than war, could do less.

Remarks by City Council President James H. J. Tate, Barry Day Observance, Independence Square, Philadelphia, Sunday, September 17, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following address delivered by the Honorable James H. J. Tate, president of City Council of Philadelphia, at the Barry Day celebration held at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on Sunday, September 17, 1961:

President Brown, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens, it is my privilege and honor today to participate in this observance conducted by the Society of Commodore John Barry. Your organization is to be commended for continuing this patriotic ceremony. It keeps green the memory of that great Philadelphian—John Barry, the "father of the American Navy."

I salute you on the 29th annual Barry Day observance to be held under your auspices since it was organized in 1933. The fine work of the society has made this a traditional rite officially recognized by our Nation, State, and city, all of whose representatives are here today.

Throughout all these years, this ceremony has never been more meaningful than it is this afternoon. The peril that faces our country is great. Our survival as a free nation, in the face of threats of atomic attack by the Soviet Premier, depends in a large part upon the emulation of our people of the principles of courage, faith, patriotism, and self-sacrifice which marked the man whose memory we honor today.

Now, more than ever before, we must adopt the ideals of this great naval officer and patriot. This applies not only to our

statesmen and military leaders, but to you and me and all of our people.

It is obviously the intent of Khrushchev to destroy the morale of the American people by brandishing his nuclear weapons and predicting the death of millions of men, women, and children in our country in the event of war. If he can accomplish this psychological victory, our democratic way of life will be destroyed.

We will be conquered without attack if our population is terrorized. Standing here at this historic shrine, I know that will not happen. Our people have already shown their courage, and their support of President Kennedy in his firm stand against the Soviet challenge, particularly in the Berlin crisis.

Your and our Commodore Barry died 158 years ago, but I am sure American courage and patriotism were not buried with his body, thank God.

There is another appropriate reason for having this ceremony today. At Independence Hall, our Federal Constitution was signed on September 17th, 1787, just 174 years ago.

We are planning a nationwide celebration of the 175th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, for Philadelphia, which will be commenced on September 17th, next year. I am sure this annual observance of the Society of Commodore John Barry will be one of the highlights of our city's program.

It was typical of Commodore Barry that he became active in the duties of citizenship after his naval service had ended. He was one of the leading proponents of the adoption of the Constitution. In fact, when the general assembly of our Commonwealth was called to vote upon the ratification of that sacred and memorable document, I am told that he personally forced several reluctant members to attend the session so that their votes could be counted—and voted right.

The tomb of Commodore Barry is but a short distance from here, at old St. Mary's, Fourth and Locust Streets. His epitaph, written by Benjamin Rush, a Philadelphia signer of the Declaration of Independence, sums up the life and philosophy of Barry so beautifully, that I feel it should be read each year as a part of this ceremony:

"Let the patriot, the soldier, and the Christian who visits these mansions of the dead, view this monument with respect. Beneath it are interred the remains of John Barry. He was born in the county of Wexford, in Ireland, but America was the object of his patriotism and the theater of his usefulness.

"In the Revolutionary War which established the independence of the United States, he took an early and active part, as a captain in their Navy and he afterwards became commander in chief. He fought often and once bled in the cause of freedom. His habits of war did not lessen his virtues as a man, nor his piety as a Christian. He was gentle, kind, and just in private life and was not less beloved by his family and friends than by his grateful country.

"The number and objects of his charity will be known only at the time when his dust shall be reanimated and when He who sees in secret shall reward openly. In the full belief of the doctrines of the Gospel, he peacefully resigned his soul into the arms of his Redeemer on the 13th of September 1803, in the 59th year of his age.

"His affectionate widow hath caused this marble to be erected to perpetuate his name, after the hearts of his fellow citizens have ceased to be the living record of his public and private virtues."

Down through the years, the patriotic contributions of Philadelphians of Irish descent to the welfare and progress of their city and Nation have been unusually noteworthy. The organization of the Society of Commodore Barry is but one example.

Your society is doing more than keeping alive the memory of the "Father of the American Navy," by sponsoring this annual observance. It is at the same time, calling the attention of the people of our city and the Nation to the historic background of Philadelphia, to the hallowed shrines here which still tell the story of our Nation's birth amid all the progress and modernization of urban renewal.

I am sure all of us will be inspired by this observance today, and that we will here rededicate ourselves to the principles of courage and patriotism so nobly exemplified by the man whose memory we honor.

Will the United Nations Destroy Itself by Admitting Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarkable address given by the Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, at a rally of the Committee of One Million in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on September 21, 1961. Senator DODD in eloquent unanswerable, and moving words portrays the deepest consideration involved in this issue, "If Red China is admitted, * * * it is the U.N. that has lost its life."

Would that every American and every official of every other country who has been beguided into imagining Red China's objectives and behavior can be altered by accepting them into the United Nations would read and ponder this superbly clear and courageous and convincing address.

The address follows:

THE MORAL DEATH OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, delivered before the Carnegie Hall rally of the Committee of One Million, New York City, Thursday, September 21, 1961)

We meet in this city of New York tonight at a time when something is happening across town which may determine the survival or the death of the United Nations. And I speak not merely of the imperfect U.N. that we have known, but of the ideal that we have hoped for.

Two crises threaten the United Nations: the first is an organizational threat, the troika proposal of the Communists, which would rob it of its practical capacity to act; the second is an organic threat, posed by the contemplated admission of Red China, which would rob the United Nations of what is left of its moral authority to act and would call into doubt its very reason for existence.

The moral crisis may well be the more dangerous of the two. True the United Nations has admitted Communist regimes before, to its great discredit and shame. But at least it had the excuse of false illusion, and of hopes that these regimes were prepared to live amicably in the family of nations.

Such is not the case with Red China.

There is no question about the nature of Red China in the eyes of any who seek the truth. It is a government which, by its words and by its deeds, openly and constantly violates every basic principle for which the United Nations stands.

There can be no avoidance of the issue on grounds of ignorance. The argument against Red China has been intensely and successfully waged for a decade and if the U.N. votes to admit Red China now, it can only mark a conscious, deliberate desire to do so.

If Red China is admitted, it will mean that control of the United Nations has passed from the hands of the strong who are concerned with an honorable peace based upon justice, to the hands of the weak who are concerned principally with saving their own skins and augmenting their own influence, no matter how they must abase themselves or debase the United Nations.

The reasons against the admission of Red China are more powerful today than they have ever been, because the nature of Red China is better known than it has ever been.

Its aggression against the United Nations has now been repeated in Vietnam, in Tibet, in Laos, in India, and in Burma.

Its contempt of the United Nations has now been emphasized by continued violations of the Korean armistice.

Its subversion of its neighbors has now been intensified and expanded to nations all over the world, including those in our own hemisphere.

Its pronouncements in support of military aggression to achieve its ends have now been raised to the level of dogma.

Its persecution of its own people has now been made even more horrible since it has been systematized into the dreaded commune system which regiments every minute of every day, carries exploitation and dehumanization to the furthest limit possible, and strikes horror into the hearts of all who have the capacity to feel horror at the destruction of the human personality.

Its criminal acts have now increased to the point where it has even gone into the dreaded and abhorred business of peddling narcotics. Here is a government which many solemnly propose to seat in the United Nations, a government which has made a State industry out of producing opium and other narcotics and peddling these drugs to criminal elements all around the world at an annual profit of several hundred million dollars.

The intent of the Communist nations to rule or ruin the United Nations, which has always been apparent to those with eyes to me, is now unavoidably apparent to everyone.

And so, if the predictions of most analysts are correct, the organization which embarked at San Francisco in 1945 with such noble hopes is now prepared, consciously and deliberately, to embrace the most evil regime in history at a time when its Communist allies are openly seeking, in the most climactic and obvious manner, to destroy its very existence.

If the U.N. goes over this precipice, I do not believe anything can save it.

It shall by its own act forfeit the respect and confidence of honest men everywhere.

It shall by its own will swallow the poison which shall destroy its heart and soul and leave only an empty shell.

The arguments against admission of Red China are so basic and compelling that it seems unnecessary and even frivolous to take up the shopworn litany of shabby cliches advanced in favor of admission. Yet perhaps the larger part of mankind, in public affairs anyway, lives and acts by frivolous arguments and they must therefore be answered.

It is contended, for instance, as though it were relevant, that we cannot ignore one quarter of the human race. This is a peculiar argument to come from those who do ignore one quarter of the human race in the most cruel way possible, by consigning and abandoning them to perpetual slavery.

Certainly we cannot ignore them. We should think about them and plan for their welfare every day of our lives. But our thoughts and efforts should be directed toward their betterment, their liberation, not toward a shameful action that will in a sense legitimize their enslavers and raise them to the status of a lawful government and an accepted member of the family of legitimate governments.

It is said that we cannot ignore the government that rules 600 million people, that we need listening posts, that we need to pay more attention to Peiping for our own good.

Certainly we must pay more attention. More important, we should be ceaselessly devoting our time and energy to ways and means of combating this dread enemy. The Chinese Communists should never be off our minds. The free world should have a million listening posts in Red China. We should know everything they do, and everything they plan to do.

But this is not a job for embassies and U.N. discussions. It is a task for intelligence agents, for thousands of dedicated students of communism who are at the same time apostles of freedom.

It is maintained by India's Ambassador to the United Nations, for instance, that since a Communist regime is in actual control of the mainland it is, therefore, the rightful representative entitled to sit in the U.N.

What a principle of representation this is.

Because the Red regime has succeeded in murdering 30 million of its people and destroying the minds of those who resist it, because it has choked off all dissent and all exchange of ideas, because it has organized a reign of terror and intimidation which has enabled it to maintain its grasp for a decade, we are told by India and others that these actions have somehow legitimized its rule and that the fact of naked power and control is all that is important in deciding representation.

If the U.N. adopts this principle, it will repudiate the ideals upon which it was founded; and having rejected its origin and reason for existence, it will have doomed itself.

Then there is the argument that by bringing them into the United Nations, the U.N. can subject the Chinese Reds to its good influence and thereby bring about their reform. If ever there was an illustration of the Biblical injunction "Pride goeth before a fall," it is here.

For 16 years the Soviet Union has been subjected to the good influence and persuasive powers of the United Nations. At no time throughout that period has it ever consciously conceded any point to the U.N. which inhibited its plan to subjugate the world. And I wonder if those who prattle idly about bringing good influence to bear upon Communist regimes paused at all to reexamine their thinking at the sight of Khrushchev pounding his shoe on his desk last year; or if the present deliberate effort of the Communist bloc to destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations gives them any pause for reflection upon the fruits of their good influence.

The presence of Communists in the United Nations has done nothing to reform them. But their presence has effectively sabotaged the U.N. and now threatens to disrupt it completely.

Finally, our own past folly of recognizing Communist regimes is used against us. People say to us: "You have already admitted Russia, you have already recognized the satellite regimes, why balk now at admitting one more? If Russia is good enough to sit in the U.N., why isn't China?"

Unfortunately, this argument is usually answered by some legalistic evasion or by the explanation that Russia's admittance was essential to the founding of the U.N., or something of that sort.

What we should say is that we were wrong to ever admit Russia; that we were wrong to ever admit any Communist regime; and that having been wrong a dozen times, we do not propose to be wrong the 13th time.

We may say that so far as this admittance question goes, the United Nations has but one flag still flying, one lone flag of honor and of decency, the flag of resistance to Red China and all the unspeakable evil it represents. The U.N. has swallowed a lot but it has refused to swallow Red China.

That flag, floating as it does above the debris of broken hopes and spineless compromises, is in my judgment the last hope, the last chance for a United Nations that stands for something eternal and significant in human history.

If we pull down that flag by voting to admit this worst of all criminal regimes, we have merely turned the United Nations into a sort of arena where thieves and murderers meet on equal terms with the legitimate representatives of the free nations of the world.

No honor can attach to such an organization. No moral authority can reside in its pronouncements. No lasting good can come from its deliberations.

No nation has done more for the United Nations than ours. We have made a home for it here on our own shores. We have financed it. We have repeatedly subordinated our national interest to its wishes. We have compromised our principles in deference to it.

The United States is the greatest friend the U.N. has, and the U.N. cannot survive without the enthusiastic support of our country. But this organization is now apparently on the verge of taking a step which is clearly repugnant and odious to the American people, to the Congress of the United States which has expressed its opposition in a series of unanimous resolutions, and to the administration policy which has prevailed under three Presidents.

If they must have Red China, so be it. But if they take this fateful step, our relationship to the United Nations can never again be the same.

While we can yet prevent this catastrophe, let us do all we can, just as we are doing tonight.

But the United Nations should be told that if Red China is admitted, it is not only the United States that has lost a contest, it is the U.N. that has lost its life.

We might linger uncomfortably in its ranks, but we could no longer look to it for guidance, or submit our vital interests to its handling.

We will have to look elsewhere for that parliament of man which will seek peace along the only path in which it can successfully be sought, the path of honor, the path of justice, the path of principle.

The Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Louisiana delegation and other Members of this body in mourning the loss of one of our colleagues, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. BROOKS on his Committee on Science and Astronautics and had firsthand knowledge of his keen interest in this subject.

Mr. BROOKS always maintained an interest in the Armed Forces of this country since his service during World War I. When he came to the Congress in 1937 he brought this interest with him and put it to work through his service on the Armed Services Committee. In addition he figured largely in the development of water resources in this country.

The State of Louisiana, the Congress and the Nation mourn the passing of this public servant and his leadership will be greatly missed.

It Started at Friendship Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article about the origin of a holiday now celebrated all over the Nation—Memorial Day:

IT STARTED AT FRIENDSHIP CEMETERY

(By Vincent Edwards)

No cemetery was ever more appropriately named than a certain 18-acre burying ground on the outskirts of Columbus, Miss. Today it is known far and wide as Friendship Cemetery. This is the place that really marks the origin of a holiday now celebrated all over the Nation.

How the holiday came about makes a surprising story. Curiously enough, not many people have ever heard the full details, even in these modern times. One must go back nearly a century to the middle 1800's, when for 12 years the Odd Fellows Order of Columbus used that empty field for picnics and a recreation park.

But there was no laughter and hilarity on the sad April day in the year 1862 when a long caravan of wagons came to these grounds. They carried the men who had been killed in the Battle of Shiloh, this spot having been chosen as their last resting place. Altogether, about 1,500 Confederate soldiers and 100 Northern dead were interred under the magnolias.

Four more years passed. The hard-fought War Between the States had been over for a full year, but the women of Columbus had not forgotten the fallen heroes. On another April day—it was the 26th of the month, to be exact—they came to the cemetery with their arms full of flowers. On the graves of the Confederates they laid their blossoms, but they did not stop there—they put flowers, too, on the last resting places of the Union dead.

This may not have seemed an important act to those gracious women at the time. Little could they know how far reaching were to be its consequences. Somehow a reporter got wind of it. Later, by telegraph, the news came to one of the most influential newspapers in the North, the great daily of Horace Greeley's, the New York Tribune. It made only a small paragraph, the dispatch stating that "the women of Columbus, Miss., have shown themselves impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the dead. They strewed flowers alike on the graves of the Confederates and the National soldiers."

This does not sound very startling. But to a nation that still seethed with war

hatred, it brought a healing touch. Northern families who had not had a good word to say about southerners since they had lost precious sons in the fighting felt suddenly ashamed. A wave of reconciliation swept over the land wherever this little item was read.

One of the persons who read it was a lawyer in the town of Ithaca, N.Y. There was to come a time when Francis Miles Finch would sit on one of the highest courts of his State, when he would help Ezra Cornell and Andrew White to found Cornell University in his hometown, and when hundreds would flock to honor him on his 75th birthday. But in the year of 1866 he was still a young practicing lawyer, busy at his profession—and also fighting off the temptation to become a poet.

On one memorable occasion this young lawyer was not able to keep his light under a bushel. That was when he read of what the women of Columbus had done in that southern cemetery. A man of good will, loving all his fellow Americans, Mr. Finch was moved to write a poem. It began:

"By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave-grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment-day;
Under the one, the Blue,
Under the other, the Gray.

"From the silence of sorrowful hours
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers
Alike for the friend and the foe:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment-day;
Under the roses, the Blue,
Under the lilies, the Gray."

And it rose to a haunting climax:

"So with an equal splendor,
The morning sun-rays fall,
With a touch impartially tender,
On the blossoms blooming for all:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment-day;
Broidered with gold, the Blue,
Mellowed with gold, the Gray.

"Sadly, but not with upbraiding,
The generous deed was done,
In the storm of the years that are fading
No braver battle was won:
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment-day;
Under the blossoms, the Blue,
Under the garlands, the Gray.

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead.
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment-day;
Love and tears for the Blue,
Tears and love for the Gray."

Mr. Finch's poem was published in the Atlantic Monthly in September 1867. No sooner had it appeared than it was copied everywhere. It became a favorite piece for schoolchildren to recite in both the North and the South. The poem, too, created better feeling between the two sections, just as that Tribune item had done a few months earlier.

By this time, the example of those Mississippi ladies had so caught hold of popular imagination that a movement was started for a special day on which the graves of the soldiers should be decorated. In May 1868 Adj. Gen. N. P. Chipman, of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Union veterans' organization, suggested that a uniform time be set. As a result, Gen. John A. Logan, the national commander, chose the 30th of that month. So began the nationwide observance of Memorial Day.

It took legislatures to make the day a legal holiday, of course. To this day the States of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi still stick to the date on which those women of Columbus started the memorial decoration 91 years ago—April 26. South Carolina and North Carolina observe it on May 10, and Louisiana on June 3. But all the other States keep to May 30.

And the name so appropriately chosen for the place where the custom of honoring those lost in battle began is Friendship Cemetery, a real symbol of the healing of the wounds of war.

How Bias Robs Negro Vets and GI's of Their Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing practices of racial discrimination against Negro servicemen and veterans simply cannot be tolerated in the face of the disastrous crises confronting America today. Our Nation is in the midst of a period which demands that it be able to count upon the abandoned commitment of every one of its people and that it be able to utilize the fullest potential of every citizen in the moment in which it will be needed in this mammoth effort to sustain democracy and freedom. Yet with this kind of need and all the realities of a darkening situation, the significantly new and broad effort necessary to prepare the way for Negro servicemen and veterans to make the wholehearted and effective contribution our country will need them to make is not presently being made by our Federal Goverment.

The eradication of continuing practices and patterns of racial discrimination in the military services is a matter with which I have been greatly concerned over the years and am now particularly concerned as the United States builds up its military forces and calls up it Reserves and National Guard units. I am in correspondence now with the Secretary of Defense on this issue and have urged that a citizens committee be established to objectively evaluate the present status and effectiveness of the equality of treatment and opportunity Executive order.

Other organizations such as the American Veterans Committee are also concerned regarding not only Negro servicemen but veterans as well. Responsible studies have been made by these groups which clearly indicate the need for an evaluation of the effectiveness of what is meant to be the official policy and practice of the military and of the Federal Government in dealing with veterans.

The following article, "How Bias Robs Negro Vets and GI's of Their Rights," is one which graphically illustrates the gap between policy and actuality:

HOW BIAS ROBS NEGRO VETS AND GI'S OF THEIR RIGHTS

Negro veterans and servicemen do not receive equal treatment and consideration, despite official claims that they do.

Although racial discrimination and persecution is much less now than during World War II, Negroes still are bypassed and cheated in GI benefits and in placements and promotions on military installations.

These are some of the conclusions of the American Veterans Committee's 1960 audit of Negro veterans and servicemen.

The American Veterans Committee (AVC), a post-World War II organization which opposes racial discrimination, sponsored the investigation to determine if there was any basis for frequent reports that Negro veterans and servicemen were deprived of their GI bill of rights.

To conduct the probe, the AVC obtained the official consent of the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration (VA) to visit some 42 Government installations in 14 States (from Alabama to Oregon, California to New York and from Illinois to Massachusetts.

Following are the highlights of the AVC findings:

1. Although defense installations have reduced segregation in a heartening manner, the Negro serviceman still faces many problems because of racial discrimination, particularly off military posts in the South.

2. In the South, the employment of Negro veterans in Federal Government installations is nearly nonexistent. Charges the AVC: "The Government allows itself to be influenced in employment matters by local prejudice."

3. Northern VA hospitals and VA regional officers are completely integrated, in treatment, service, and employment.

4. Southern Negro veterans are too discouraged by economic discrimination to apply for GI home, farm, and business loans.

5. Negro veterans all over the South—and in much of the North—are unable to use GI on-the-job training opportunities because no decent jobs are available to them.

In a detailed, 40-page report, compiled by a committee of some 40 investigators under the supervision of National Chairman Mickey Levine, the AVC specifies military installations and Government agencies where discrimination is rampant against Negro veterans and servicemen.

The report cites two cases of racism involving Negro military personnel in Montgomery, Ala., which could bring pressure to move bases out of the South.

In one case, two Ethiopian officers and two American Negro officers were accosted by Montgomery police and cursed, searched, and abused in a manner which could have had international repercussions. The Ethiopians were Maj. Abera Marian and Lt. Johannes Marian, both attending the Allied Officers School at Maxwell Air Force Base. The Americans were Maj. Denzal Harvey and Capt. Philip Jeter, Jr.

In the second case, Negro Airman O. S. Mays was accosted and beaten in a Trailways bus station by a Montgomery policeman. Air Force investigators found Mays at the police station, brutally beaten, with one eye swollen shut, his lips puffed, face bruised, and three severe cuts over his eyebrow. When base commander Col. C. C. Harris protested to Montgomery officials, they expressed regret.

Negroes stationed at southern bases which do not have schools on the grounds are forced to send their children to local segregated schools. The Federal Government, in these instances, support segregation by paying school boards to admit Negro children to segregated schools, the AVC charges.

Discrimination was found to exist at certain northern installations as well. At the Great Lakes Naval Station in Illinois, for example, an AVC breakdown disclosed no Negro Wave officers, no Negro instructors at all, and merely 1 percent of the students were Negro.

While the AVC team found that southern VA hospitals had made at least token efforts to comply with a 1953 directive forbidding segregation, there remained technical violations and certain stubborn holdouts. The VA hospital in Jackson, Miss., for example, continued to maintain segregated waiting rooms, segregated Negro and white patients on opposite sides of the wards, and provided "white only" and "Negro only" Sunday services in the chapel—the service for whites being first.

The AVC investigation revealed that Negro veterans are stymied in the North as well as in the South in securing housing benefits under the GI bill. The key element here is the absence of home financing funds. Even when many veterans obtain a VA guarantee for a home loan, local banks and financial institutions usually refuse to make the loan.

AVC auditors found that of 413 Negro veterans interviewed in Montgomery, Ala., only 4 had applied for a VA home loan and none for a direct loan. In Tuskegee, only 14 of 70 veterans interviewed had applied for loans, and only 1 had finally acquired a home.

In the area of business and farm loans, the AVC found abysmal discouragement among Negro veterans. Stated the report: "The would-be Negro borrower is dependent on financial institutions controlled by whites. These institutions are even less inclined to loan money to Negroes for businesses and farms than for homes or any other purpose."

Of all the Negroes interviewed by the AVC, only two had persisted in trying to obtain VA business loans in the face of obstacles thrown in their paths. One of these veterans succeeded in obtaining a $7,500 VA warranty for a loan to start a much-needed lumber business but local banks and businesses refused to loan him the money. However, white businessmen, learning of his plans, promptly started a lumber business of their own.

In the other case, the Negro veteran gave up trying to borrow money from the local banks and instead borrowed it from fellow veterans. His business is still flourishing.

The AVC investigating teams learned that Negroes are barred from Federal jobs and on-the-job training opportunities throughout the South in a pattern that is both open and obvious.

A Negro veteran in Montgomery explained the situation as regards job discrimination in Government installations:

"The civil service jobs here parallel the jobs in the civilian economy. Most Negro veterans are given menial jobs as janitors, helpers, aides, and laborers. Veterans are given forms to fill out for the menial jobs as soon as they walk into a personnel office or Civil Service Board Office. They are told that these are the only jobs available that they are qualified for. If they desire to apply for a white-collar job in any of the governmental agencies, they are told by the clerks that they are not qualified, even before being given a chance to be examined."

As for on-the-job training, the AVC report states that "the inability of Negroes to obtain skilled employment automatically rules out upgrading on-the-job training for Negro veterans."

The AVC conclusion: "A Southern Negro veteran finds that his status as a veteran is of no help to him at all in the matters of on-the-job-training and governmental employment."

To help equalize opportunities for Negro veterans and servicemen, and to correct prevailing abuses of their rights, the AVC made the following recommendations to the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration:

1. The GI bill of rights should be amended to protect Negro veterans.

2. The VA should establish teams of VA area representatives to assist Negro veterans in obtaining their legitimate rights.

3. The Federal Government must stop using Federal funds to support segregation and discrimination against Negro veterans and servicemen.

4. The Federal Government should act to end employment discrimination against Negro veterans.

5. The American Veterans Committee should service Negro veterans concerning their lawful benefits on an interim basis.

Rally Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, last night a crowd of alert, patriotic Americans, with representatives of a dozen countries which world communism holds in its cruel grasp, packed Carnegie Hall in New York City to protest the efforts being made by some to seat Red China in the United Nations, and to rally the will of our Government and that of other free governments to prevent such a needless, such a wrong, and such a cruelly self-defeating action.

The opening address was given by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

The Members of this House know well his extraordinary abilities, his judicial mind, and his fearless dedication to the high principles on which alone human freedom and justice can be made secure. But never have I heard him or anyone speak more penetratingly and devastatingly of the threat which communism in the form of Red China presents to us and to all free men—its record of cold criminal perfidy at home and abroad, its cynical disqualification of itself for membership in the family of civilized nations, and the steps which our country must take not in pique, but in self-respect, should a majority of members of the United Nations be so blind or so foolish or so afraid as to vote to admit Red China, thereby spelling the doom of the U.N. as an instrument of justice and freedom and enduring peace.

May I urge all to read Congressman WALTER'S address:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT RALLY AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961

It is an honor and a pleasure to address the representatives of those nations—and a cross section of the millions of citizens of the United States—who oppose admitting to the United Nations the world's biggest dope peddler; the one nation in the world that has a policy of trafficking in death, that pursues an indiscriminate, particularly vicious type of genocide designed to destroy not only the bodies, but the minds and morals of its enemies.

It was Mao Tse-tung himself—when he headed a relatively small band of Red conspirators in Yenan many years ago—who conceived the Chinese Communist policy of narcotics peddling or soul poison. Opium, or special merchandise, as it was called, was Yenan's main source of income. Mao used it to demoralize and debauch non-Communist Chinese while, at the same time, he used profits from its sale to finance the subversion of their free institutions.

Today, he is doing the same thing, but on a much grander scale. The distribution and sale of opium and its derivatives, morphine and heroin, worldwide, is close to being a Red Chinese monopoly. This is not by accident. For the first time in history, we are faced with a situation in which a government has undertaken to make itself the narcotics trust of the world. It has been so successful in this that Peiping now has an estimated income of $1 billion annually from trade in narcotics.

Though the use of opium is forbidden in Red China, over 5 million acres of land in that country are devoted to opium poppy cultivation. The People's Bank of China and Peiping's opium agency have special counters for handling loans and credits for opium growers. Poppy farms are protected by electrified barbed wire fences. Red China's armed forces provide guards for opium shipments. The so-called People's Bank bids in the opium poppy at US$72 and refined heroin at U.S.$500 per pound.

The records of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs reveal that Hong Kong is swamped with opium, morphine, and heroin; that Burma and Thailand are helpless to stop the annual flow of tons of opium which enter those countries from their "northern frontiers"; and that Red Chinese narcotics, a considerable portion of them openly labeled as such, are sold throughout the world.

During the Korean war, Red China falsely accused the United States of using germ warfare, when it was itself engaged in large-scale dope warfare against U.S. and U.N. troops. Narcotics were peddled at bargain prices by young women pushers near all military installations in Korea. Much of it was of such purity that it made addicts far more quickly than the adulterated type usually sold in the United States.

The same was true of Japan. In 1952, Japanese police arrested over 2,000 dope pushers near U.S. installations.

When the U.S. troops captured Pyongyang, capital of Communist Korea, they found on opium processing plant. In it there was enough morphine in cans to fill several small rooms and 300 boxes of opium, each containing 30 to 50 pounds of the drug. In 1951–52, Republic of Korea police arrested over 2,400 North Korean agents who had gold in one hand and heroin in the other. All Korean heroin was the "Red Lion" brand, known to originate in Tientsin.

How does Red China get agents for its international narcotic syndicate? Some years ago, a Japanese seaman who was not an addict signed on a ship trading with China. He was tied, hand and foot, and injected with morphine until he became an addict. He would then do anything to get the drug he craved. By measures such as this, the Red Chinese have created a worldwide army of dope addicts and peddlers who will go to any length—and commit any crime—to obtain narcotics they crave and which they know they will get, as long as they continue to cooperate.

Rings pushing Red Chinese narcotics have been broken in Japan, San Francisco, Hawaii and many other parts of the world.

The United Nations knows these things. For years, facts on Red China's trafficking in dope have been presented to its Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Narcotics Commissioner and U.S. representative on the U.N. Commission has told it:

"Spreading narcotic addiction to obtain funds for political purposes, through the sale of heroin and opium, is the policy of the Communist government in mainland China. * * *

"This narcotics menace from Communist China is a multiheaded dragon threatening to mutilate and destroy whole segments of populations * * * an unbridled monster."

I need not tell anyone in this audience about the horrors of dope addiction. Our press has been filled with accounts of it. Heroin, Red China's most valuable export, is the most potent and pernicious of opium derivatives. Its victims are practically incurable.

But even while Red China promotes addiction to this revolting drug in every corner of the world, in contravention of the rules and efforts of the United Nations, and of every norm of human rights and decency—making itself unfit to sit in the councils of any body of civilized men—we find certain member nations advocating its admission to the U.N. What a travesty this is.

Within the past 2 years, Moscow and Peiping have established a beachhead 90 miles from the shores of the United States. Their aim in doing so, is the ultimate destruction of this Nation. It is not, however, limited to this. They also intend to seize control of every nation in Latin America—either before or after conquering the United States—and turning each one of them into a Red satellite.

The Castro regime has given us a foretaste of what this will mean to tens of millions of Latin Americans: mass executions before firing squads, a brutal war against religion, dictatorial control of the press and all media of information, the suppression of liberty in every form—all the horrors the peoples of Russia, China, and the satellites have suffered at the hands of Communist governments for years.

What has been Red China's role in the enslavement of the people of Cuba?

It has given Castro a loan of $60 million with the understanding that he need not pay it back. It has bought 500,000 tons of his slave labor sugar crop. Last February, Raoul Castro said Red China had given the Communist Cuban dictatorship hundreds of machineguns and other weapons "for which we have not had to pay one cent."

In the spring of this year, when Castro asked Red China's help in putting down any anti-Communist revolution or invasion, Liu Shao-chi and Chou En-lai pledged Red China's complete support. In another message, Peiping referred to former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy as "jackals of the same lair" and stated that "whatever happens" Communist China would take "all the necessary measures in every field" to see that Castro's Communist grip on the Cuban people is never broken.

Shortly after Castro seized power, diplomats in Cuba reported that Peiping's worldwide extortion machine had already gone to work on the 30,000 Chinese there. The Overseas Chinese Returnees Association in Peiping was asking them if they had relatives in Red China and what property they owned in Cuba. Peiping's letters of inquiry bore the correct names, addresses and even apartment numbers of the addressees—an indication of how thoroughly its international extortion ring goes about its business.

Oversea Chinese in this country and other nations have, for years, been receiving extortion notes from Red China. Many are in our committee's files. The fear created by the Red extortionists among Chinese in free nations, however, is nothing compared to what it is for those who live under a Communist dictator.

Red China's freedom-wrecking efforts in the Western Hemisphere have not been limited to Cuba. Two training centers for Latin Americans have already been established in Peiping. One of them is teaching guerilla warfare, an art in which the Chinese Communists excel. The other has already sent 200 Communist agents into various Latin American countries as student and journalists and under other guises.

Through its Sino-American Cultural and Friendship Association, Red China has established binational cultural centers in nine Latin American countries. It has stepped up its Latin America broadcasts to 21 hours per week, and in April 1960, added 10½ hours in Portuguese. Its New China News Agency has an office in Havana and is publishing a slick propaganda magazine for distribution throughout Latin America. In 1960, over 1,000 Latin Americans traveled to Red China at Peiping's expense.

The purpose of all these activities is obvious. It is to destroy freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere by whatever means are possible and impose in its place Red totalitarian regimes.

The United Nations was founded on a noble ideal, an ideal with which no sane person can disagree—the ideal that the peace-loving, decent nations of the world should combine their forces—economic, political, diplomatic, moral, and military—to maintain world peace and protect universally recognized human rights. How? By using whatever of their combined powers were needed—at any given moment and in any given situation—to put down warmakers and violators of human rights.

It is shocking that nations which claim to be dedicated to the ideals of the U.N. and its charter, should be so cynical, so morally callous, so indifferent and blind to their own interests and survival, that they should urge that Red China be granted admission to that body.

Whoever votes for Peiping's admission to the U.N.—on the record—votes for war rather than peace, for international blackmail on a frightening scale, for a world policy of promoting narcotics addiction, for the undermining of freedom in all of Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

They are also voting for the ultimate destruction of the U.N. itself—even while they proclaim their great devotion to it. What is worse, they are making a complete mockery of the U.N., its charter and ideals. They are dragging this international organization, which has been proclaimed the best hope of man, into the gutter of the cheapest and dirtiest kind of international politics. They would have it submit to the blackmail of communism's international narcotics peddler, its trader in the degradation of human souls.

Red China's admission to the U.N. must be fought and defeated at all costs. If we fail in this endeavor, it will be time to leave the organization; not in pique, but in self-respect; not to destroy it, but in an effort to at least uphold its ideals when the organization itself has become nothing but a sham.

No nation that truly believes in the Charter, in human rights and decency, in peace rather than war, could do less.

Hon. Paul Kilday

SPEECH
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, most of you know of the many accomplishments of PAUL KILDAY in the legislative field much better than I. History will record his deeds and people will remember him for those. But, I will always remember PAUL KILDAY for his human kindness, understanding, and patience. When I first came here 3 years ago, like a lot of other new Members, I had many questions and I asked a lot of them of Mr. KILDAY. As I look back now, some of the questions were rather foolish and not very important. But, Mr. KILDAY always had time to answer them. He always had patience and made me feel like these questions were important. It is these characteristics, his great human kindness, which I think make him especially qualified to be a judge on the Military Court of Appeals. It will be our loss in the House, but it will be a gain for the members of the armed services for having Mr. KILDAY on the Military Court of Appeals. To you, sir, the best of luck.

The Old Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the traditions of a free people are an important part of their national treasure. In preserving such traditions we are conserving an important part of the heritage which helps to inspire citizens to wish to stay both free and strong. The Old Guard, the 3d Infantry Regiment, is a unit of the U.S. Army which is mindful of this purpose.

The objectives of the Old Guard were recently stated by its commanding officer, Col. Richard M. Lee to be—

To reacquaint our civilian populace here in this all-important Washington area with its political heritage, the essence of which consists of a continuing struggle for the preservation of individual freedom, equal justice and human dignity; and emphasize the continuing role our Army has played as the servant of the people whenever these freedoms have been imperiled in the course of our history.

We wish to stress that our Army is not a remote force from our people, but a direct expression of its finest ideals of service and sacrifice, and that the sons and daughters of the Nation are its strength and sinew.

Finally, we seek to demonstrate, during this time of active social pressures and tremendous dangers from without, the unity of all our States and people into one indivisable United States.

A brief history of the guard would be of interest to all Americans and I append it herewith:

HISTORY

The history of the 3d U.S. Infantry mirrors the growth and development of the American Nation. Its flags have flown valiantly in virtually every war the Nation has waged. Its 39 well-earned battle streamers attest to its magnificient record of bravery in action.

Older than the Constitution, the regiment has borne on its roll the names of men who fought with Washington at Valley Forge and Yorktown. It has furnished the Nation with a President, and many statesmen and soldier, of note.

The 3d Infantry traces its lineage to the old 1st American Regiment organized under the authority of a "Resolve" of the Continental Congress of 1784, as a measure of protection for the young Nation following the demobilization of the Revolutionary Army. Its complement of officers and men was made up chiefly of those who had seen service in the Revolution.

The muskets of the regiment first spoke in anger in 1794, when, under the command of Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne, they defeated the Indians at the battle of Fort Recovery. It was not until 1815, however, that the regiment finally became known as the 3d Infantry. This was accomplished by the consolidation of the 1st, 5th, 17th, 19th, and 28th Infantry Regiments, each having played an important part in the War of 1812.

There were three fronts in that war: one in the North, one on the Atlantic coast, and one on the Gulf Coast. The 3d's precedent units fought in the campaigns of the Northern front.

For the next 11 years the 3d was stationed along the Great Lakes, garrisoning many frontier forts. Late in 1826 the regiment, while at Camp Miller, Mo., erected the post now known as Jefferson Barracks, and the following year moved up the Missouri River and constructed Fort Leavenworth, so named in honor of the 3d's commanding officer. Thirteen years of frontier duty followed in what are now the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas.

In 1849, the regiment saw arduous duty in the Indian wars, gaining a large part of the credit for ending the second Seminole campaign in Florida. In 1843 it returned to Jefferson Barracks, but 2 years later was again on the move—this time to Texas as a part of the army of observation under the command of its former major, later a general and President of the United States, Zachary Taylor.

In 1847 there followed the war with Mexico, in which the 3d was not exceeded in brilliance and valiant action by any other regiment. Organization day, celebrated by the 3d each year on September 21, commemorates the battle of Monterey in which the regiment led in the assault and capture of this strategic fort.

Because of its gallant and vital part in the campaign resulting in the capture of Mexico City, particularly because of its success in storming the heavily defended heights of Chapultepec with fixed bayonets, the 3d Infantry was accorded the honor of marching at the head of the column when the victorious army made its triumphant entry into the city. As the 3d approached, Gen. Winfield Scott removed his hat and, turning to the members of his staff, said, "Gentlemen, take off your hats to the Old Guard of the Army." It is as the "Old Guard" that the regiment has been known and honored throughout the Army since that time.

From Mexico the 3d went back to frontier warfare, first in Texas, then in New Mexico, and for 10 years battled against the Apache and Navajo Indians.

Back in Texas in 1860, the regiment prepared to return to the North when the clouds of the Civil War lowered in 1861. From Texas to New York the regiment traveled by transport, and five companies arrived in time to participate in the first battle of Bull Run. The regiment, according to General McDowell, "by its gallant conduct, unflinching steadiness, and perfect order in covering the flight of the panic-stricken army, saved the Union." The 3d took part in many battles of the Army of the Potomac, and although reduced in strength to about 200 officers and men, was present at the surrender of General Lee at Appomattox.

Scarcely had the Civil War ended when the 3d was again on the frontier in Kansas, where the Indian tribes had taken advantage of the war to commit depredations. From 1874 to 1877, it was on duty in Missouri and Pennsylvania to quell riots against the civil government. Then came 10 more years of Indian warfare on the Montana frontier.

In 1888 the 3d was ordered to its home station, Fort Snelling, Minn. Thus began a long association with the Twin Cities, the 3d being stationed at Fort Snelling at various times until the outbreak of World War II.

The years of comparative quiet were ended in 1898 by the outbreak of war with Spain and the battle-ready 3d was one of the first regiments ordered to Cuba. The "Old Guard" participated in every important engagement until returning to its home station in September 1898.

At Leech Lake, Minn., the following month, Old Guardsmen were again locked in conflict with their old foe in the final battle against the Indians in the United States.

In January 1899, the 3d left Fort Snelling en route to the Philippine Islands by way of New York. There, for 3 years, it saw strenuous service in the "Philippine Insurrection."

After this campaign the 3d spent 2 years at Fort Thomas and other stations in the Midwest, and then went to Alaska in June 1904. When the regiment returned to the United States in 1906, it was stationed at Fort George Wright and other stations in the vicinity until 1909, when it was again sent to the Philippines. It saw little fighting this time but was engaged in constructing roads, marking trails, building telephone lines, and making some sections habitable.

Orders came to return to the States in 1912. The 3d settled down to 4 years of duty at Madison Barracks and Fort Ontario, N.Y. In 1916, the 3d was ordered to the Mexican border. Here, although it gained little glory, it performed necessary security missions along the Mexican border during the First World War.

In 1920, the regiment left Texas for Camp Sherman, Ohio, and in July 1921, left there for its old home station, Fort Snelling. It marched all the way, 1,100 miles, reaching home in an early November snowstorm. Soon, however, the cold and snow was forgotten in the warm welcome extended by old friends. Here the regiment remained, training large contingents of civilians, Organized Reservers, National Guard units and college students. Over 10,000 of the latter up to 1939 were to become Reserve officers, thus making a great contribution toward the future safety and welfare of our country. The regiment, as if sensing what was coming, participated in extensive peacetime maneuvers as a part of the 6th Division. On June 1, 1941, part of the regiment left the States for foreign duty to occupy a strategic outpost—Newfoundland.

The 3d remained in Newfoundland from July 1942 to September 1943. After its return to the United States, it was stationed at various parts of the country until March 8, 1945, when the regiment departed from Boston for the campaign in Europe.

Late in March of 1945, the 3d, along with the 159th Infantry, was attached to the 106th Division, which had borne the brunt of the German counteroffensive (Battle of the Bulge). The 3d Infantry was further assigned as a reserve for the 66th Division currently holding the Germans in check in the St. Nazaire area. Plans were made to relieve the 66th which might have provided the 3d its chance for action, but orders came through for the 106th Division to move to Germany.

The 106th Infantry Division, composed of the 3d, 424th, and 159th Regiments, and other units, raced across France to corral the thousands of prisoners being taken in the final drive through Germany. Approximately 1,500,000 prisoners of war passed through the processing centers, of which the 3d received a large portion. It was a big job, receiving, processing, interrrogating, and discharging the hoards of vanquished German soldiers.

Following the German surrender, the regiment was deactivated in Germany on November 20, 1946, and remained in inactive status until April 6, 1948, when the unit was reactivated at an impressive ceremony on the U.S. Capitol Plaza. During the ceremony, the colors were presented to the regiment by Maj. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, then commanding general of Military District of Washington.

The 3d was organized with the 1st Battalion and Regimental Headquarters located at Fort Myer, Va., and the 2d Battalion at Fort Lesley J. McNair, District of Columbia.

In an entirely new role for this fighting regiment, the "Old Guard," true to its esteemed tradition and glory, was given the vital and sensitive assignment of guarding the heart of our land, the Nation's Capital. At the same time, the 3d Infantry became the Army's official ceremonial regiment at high-level functions in the Washington, D.C., area.

The 3d also received the coveted honor of acting as personal escort to Presidents of the United States in inaugural parades, and is among the lead elements at annual Armed Forces Day parades. At Arlington Cemetery, soldiers of the 3d participate in wreath-laying ceremonies at the Tomb of the Unknowns by heads of many foreign nations; act as escorts for military funerals; and take part in the honored burial rite of firing the final volleys over the graves of fallen comrades.

Probably one of the most responsible obligations of the regiment is to maintain the best possible worldwide impression of the U.S. Army. The Old Guard receives this opportunity nearly a score of times each year when they act as the Army's official greeters of foreign dignitaries who arrive at Military Air Transport Terminal of Washington National Airport.

On July 1, 1957, a reorganization of the 3d Infantry was effected, based upon the Pentomic concept which consolidated the regiment into the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry, which is located at Fort Myer with the exception of Company A, which is stationed at Fort McNair. The missions of the unit remain basically unchanged.

With the reorganization of the regiment into a battle group, the custodianship of regimental trophies, battle streamers, and historical mementos of the regiment passed to the control of the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry (the Old Guard). These trophies, as well as pictorial exhibits showing the history of the 3d, are on display in the trophy room at Battle Group Headquarters, Fort Myer.

The Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps was organized on March 28, 1960, to provide music for the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry (the Old Guard) at ceremonial functions. The corps' colorful costumes are exact reproductions of Revolutionary War uniforms, and the tunes which they play are taken from authentic music of that period. The corps is also noted for its use of the colonial drill as formulated by Baron von Steuben. The fife and drum corps also performs in the modern blue dress uniform using modern drill techniques and music. The highlight of their many ceremonies was the appearance of the corps in the inaugural parade and at the inaugural ball for the President of the United States.

On organization day, September 21, 1960, Dwight D. Eisenhower, then President of the United States, visited the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry at Fort Myer. He observed the fife and drum corps' presentation of colonial music and drills and the intricate maneuvers of the Old Guard drill team. The men of the 3d Infantry then passed in review for their Commander in Chief.

On January 18, 1961, an old tradition of military pageants at the Fort Myer gymnasium was revived with the premier performane of "Prelude to Taps" by the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry and the U.S. Army

Band. The colorful military pageant featured the "Story of the Stars and Stripes," the "Army Story," the fife and drum corps, the drill team, a Ranger demonstration, and the music of the Army Band and chorus. Subsequent shows were put on in February and April for many more of the civilian and military dignitaries in the Washington, D.C., area.

To honor guard company of the Old Guard is entrusted the singular honor of providing a select detail of sentinels to maintain an eternal vigil at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington Cemetery. Night and day, regardless of weather conditions, the finest example of America's fighting men are placed on public view. Each sentry takes his appointed turn to pace the narrow mat before America's shrine to the Unknowns * * * symbol of those who have fallen in defense of our Nation.

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an article which appeared in the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., of September 18, 1961, written by columnist Bill Bork, entitled "Bill Bork Explains Food for Peace—Says Enough Food for Home and Abroad." I would like for my colleagues to have the opportunity to read this thought-provoking article concerning the disposal of farm surpluses overseas. I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Hutchinson News, Sept. 18, 1961]

BILL BORK EXPLAINS FOOD FOR PEACE—SAYS ENOUGH FOOD FOR HOME AND ABROAD

League of Women Voters met Friday at the Ranch House for its first meeting of the year. Sixteen prospective members were guests.

Bill Bork, Farmers Coop Commission, discussed the annual national topic "U.S. Farm Surpluses as a Tool in Economic Diplomacy." There was a question and answer period following.

In his talk, Bork, who says he is a liberal Republican, pointed to Kansas' prosperity as a result of its one crop—hard, red, winter wheat and he said, "We are well acquainted with surpluses."

He added that most Americans are never hungry. They eat 540 million meals with only 10 percent of the population on farms and production in idle gear. Russia has a food shortage with 45 percent of its population on the farm.

The speaker stated that each American works 1 day per week to provide the cost of food for his family while Russians work 3 or 3½ days to provide food. But Russians do not eat well.

Thirdly, he claimed that no field can match U.S. farm technology and efficiency which has needed both Government and small business to create. (If medicine had progressed at the same rate there would be no cancer.)

There are great surpluses (feed grain, corn, some milo, cotton seed, and soybean oils, wheat.)

The speaker reminded the audience of the reasons why using surpluses has become a weapon in the cold war:

1. Colonialism is disappearing and independent nations are emerging to handle freedom like a loaded pistol.

2. These nations will settle on a system of government.

3. Avowed goal of communism is world domination.

The United States knows she cannot stand as an island of democracy in a captive world. So this is a state of war for men's minds, a war of ideology.

4. People driven by hunger (in these nations) cannot fight. If they are facing famine they will trade freedom for food. They will not trade freedom for automatic appliances, cameras, nor swimming pools.

Thus, food becomes a weapon in the fight for a free world.

5. America is the only country which has this weapon. It is the only weapon Russia cannot match.

Bork explained that the food for peace program is not new. Food for peace is a popular name for the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, nicknamed "Public Law 480" or "P. L. 480."

Its four parts are as follows:

1. Surplus agriculture commodities can be sold for foreign currency.

2. U.S. Government can use surpluses as grants for countries in emergency.

3. Surpluses can be given in the name of private charities (World Relief, Lutheran World Relief, CARE) and surpluses can be traded for strategic materials (Bolivia exchanges tin for food.)

4. Surpluses can be bought with long-term loans.

Bork said that Public Law 480 has been successful but that America has been like Sir Launfal who one day tossed a gold coin to a hungry leper crouched near the castle gate. He didn't stop to realize that money is no use to a leper—and that a "gift without the giver is bare."

Now, Bork claims, America's attitude is changing and food for peace is being administered by a trained corps of men.

He concluded by describing the Devil's thumb on mankind as being starvation, malnutrition—the empty belly. The American farmer has solved the ancient problem. It's time to tell the world about it.

Question: Is there enough surplus to cover stockpiles for Americn emergencies in case of war, and still continue food for peace?

The Answer to a Great Dietary Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTIS G. PIKE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, at this moment 400 food and nutrition experts are meeting in Washington from all over the world under the sponsorship of the Food and Agriculture Organization. The conference is devoted to the use of fish as a food, and today the entire afternoon session is discussing the development and use of fish flour for its high protein content.

The technical papers presented today at this conference include work being done in the production and use of fish flour in Canada, in South Africa, in Peru, and in the United States of America. They show beyond any doubt that the product manufactured in the United States of America is a superior product. It is tremendously effective in any diet based on corn, rice or other protein-lacking cereal. This means that it offers a tremendous boon to all of the major areas of the world where malnutrition is a real problem.

The greatest advantage which the product offers is the fact that it is cheap. Two and a half times the food value of powdered milk can be produced at the same cost through the use of fish flour. There is an opportunity here not only for the creation of a new and thriving American industry, but an opportunity for America to show to the people of the world how they can turn a poor diet into a good diet for just a penny a day.

I am delighted that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] has brought to the attention of the members some of these amazing reports on the nutritional value of fish flour as a food, and that over in the Senate the great potential of this product is being discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH].

The Food and Drug Admministration is opposing the sale of this product in the United States. They oppose it because it is made of whole fish. In the process of making fish flour 83 percent of the whole fish is thrown away. The process is a chemical cooking process which so changes the nature of the fish from which it is made that almost nothing remains but the protein. In no other food-processing operation that I know of is so much of an animal thrown away to get at the food value. Still the Food and Drug Administration says "Ugh," because the product is derived from whole fish.

They say it includes the heads and the tails and the insides of the fish. It certainly does. So do sardines, and so do smelts. Everyone knows what gelatine is derived from. Yet most people eat it. The sad part of the position taken by the Food and Drug Administration is that their objections are based more on witchcraft than on science. Certainly fish flour could be made from cleaned fish—fish which had been beheaded, definned, scaled and gutted. The resulting product would taste no different than the present product—it has no taste. The resulting product would smell no different than the present product—it has no smell. The resulting product would be chemically indistinguishable from the present product. There would be just one way to distinguish it—it would cost twice as much.

No one likes to think that the Food and Drug Administration is interested solely in making it impossible to produce this wonder food cheaply. But their present position would have no other result whatsoever. Can it be that all they are really trying to accomplish is to make this food more expensive? In an age when an exploding world population and widespread hunger demand that new means be found to satisfy the nutritional requirements of the people of the world as cheaply as possible, a reasonable approach to the problem requires a more enlightened answer than the word "Ugh."

Armed Forces Chemical Association Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to submit for reprinting in the RECORD the introductory remarks of Mr. Simon Askin, president of the Armed Forces Chemical Association, at the annual banquet meeting held by that outstanding organization in Washington on September 15. Mr. Askin is one of the Nation's leading industrialists. He introduced the principal speaker, Gen. Clyde Eddleman, and read a letter from the President and one from the Secretary of Defense in his introductory remarks. His statement follows:

REMARKS MADE BY MR. SIMON ASKIN, PRESIDENT, ARMED FORCES CHEMICAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., ANNUAL MEETING AT THE BANQUET HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 1961

Ladies and gentlemen, honored guests, it is my pleasure to welcome you to this dinner meeting tonight which brings to a close our 16th annual meeting. I should like to read two letters of greetings received by the association, one from John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and the other from Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense. They are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. ASKIN: It is a sincere pleasure to send greetings to all attending the 16th annual meeting of the Armed Forces Chemical Association.

The theme of the meeting this year—"Balanced Military Power Through Science and Industry"—is especially appropriate now when all Americans are resolved to demonstrate to the world the kind of achievements possible through our spiritual strength, our scientific and technological genius, and our economic productivity. It is indeed comforting to realize that the Nation can rely on the fund of knowledge and experience represented by your membership.

My best wishes for a successful and profitable meeting.

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington.

DEAR MR. ASKIN: Please extend my greetings to the members and guests of the Armed Forces Chemical Association on the occasion of its 16th annual meeting.

The members of the Armed Forces Chemical Association can be proud of the significant contributions they have made in actively promoting the cooperative efforts of industry, civilian organizations, and the Armed Forces in applying science to the problems confronting the military.

Please convey to all attending my best wishes for a highly rewarding and successful meeting.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

At this time I would like to express my personal appreciation, as well as the gratitude of the association, to those individuals who by their efforts and participation in all phases of this 2-day program contributed to the success of our 16th annual meeting. I particularly want to thank our host, the U.S. Army, and Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Chief Chemical Officer. Also, we appreciate the cooperation extended to us by Col. Peter G. Olenchuk and his fellow military liaison officers. Furthermore, my gratitude to Mr. Carroll W. Hayes, general chairman of the annual meeting committee, and all the chairmen of the various subcommittees who have done such a splendid job in planning and following through the many details necessary for this meeting.

Sixteen years ago we first met in the exultation of victory. Then, in a climate that seemingly augured well for future peace, and in an atmosphere that was not visibly beclouded by atomic calamity, this organization, by its very formation, took its first step toward preparedness.

The events of the intervening years seem to have been almost a rising crescendo to this meeting, and the past 2 days have been a continuation of this program of preparedness.

There can be no question that the creation of our Association 16 years ago, with its subsequent development, was an action of foresight. How well we each do our tasks today and tomorrow, whether engaged in military, Government, or industry service, will determine how much ultimate benefit we will be to our Nation.

All of us, whether we are a part of the chemical industry or members of the defense establishment, must develop particularly the courage, capability and desire to see our Nation's defense and future grow through new chemicals and processing stemming from research.

To this we are dedicated, and thus we will serve.

And now I am honored and privileged to tell you something about our guest speaker and introduce him to you.

Gen. Clyde D. Eddlemen graduated from the U.S. Military Academy and was commissioned in the infantry.

In 1943 he went to Australia as Assistant Chief of Staff, G–3. The general participated in all of the 6th Army's campaigns in the Southwest Pacific and was responsible to General Krueger for the planning and coordination with GHQ, the Navy, and the Air Force of all the 6th Army's campaigns, including the occupation of Japan.

General Eddleman was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Silver Star citation and promoted to brigadier general in the Leyte beachhead.

In 1946 he became the first Deputy Commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College; 1949, deputy commander of the U.S. troops, Trieste, and director general, civil affairs, Allied Military Government; 1950, Chief of Plans Division, G–3, at Washington.

The general assumed command of the 4th Infantry Division, headquarters at Frankfurt, Germany, in 1954, and in 1955 was recalled to Washington to become Commandant of the Army War College. Four months later he became Deputy Chief of Staff, and on July 1, 1958, assumed command of the 7th U.S. Army in Germany. Nine months later he was promoted to the rank of general and assigned as commander in chief, U.S. Army, Europe, where he remained until he became Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, on November 1, 1960.

The foregoing is merely a brief outline of the background and accomplishments of General Eddleman.

Ladies and gentlemen—Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

General Eddleman's speech was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1961.

The President's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that our President makes a strong speech and takes a firm stand when he appears before the United Nations. David Lawrence, in his article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on September 21, discusses this opportunity of revealing the Soviet duplicity:

CHANCE TO REVEAL RED HYPOCRISY—KENNEDY RECITATION OF SOVIET DUPLICITY BEFORE UNITED NATIONS IS URGED

(By David Lawrence)

What an opportunity President Kennedy now has to go before the United Nations and state the case against the Soviet Union. What a chance to enlighten peoples all over the world—including those behind the Iron Curtain—so that hereafter it will be manifest hypocrisy for the U.N. to ignore the aggressive and sinister plotting in which the Moscow government is continuously engaged.

A simple recitation of the facts of what happened from June 1950 on, in Korea could dispose of the effort of the Soviets to gain admission for Communist China as a member of the U.N. It could clarify the same issue in Laos, in the Congo, in Cuba, and in other areas where the Soviet Union is undermining the people's freedom.

For the main issue has been obscured too long. The fundamentals are being ignored today by those nations which, strangely enough, seem willing to reward an aggressor state with a seat in the U.N.

The story begins as an army of 60,000 North Koreans, with 100 Russian-built tanks, invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950. They violated the 38th parallel, which had been established at the end of World War II as the dividing line between Communist-controlled North Korea and the newly created Republic of South Korea.

The Communist plot to seize all Korea failed because of the courageous and timely action of President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson in immediately ordering American forces in the Far East to help the South Koreans. This step was promptly ratified by the United Nations at a Security Council meeting. The force became the United Nations army. Sixteen member nations sent military contingents to Korea to become an integral part of the U.N. force, along with the Americans and South Koreans. Six additional countries sent supporting medical and hospital units.

The part played thereafter by the Soviet Union in actually making war on the United Nations army has never been discussed as fully as it should be. It is a matter of record, however, that the United Nations, on February 1, 1951—by formal resolution—declared Communist China an "aggressor." Shall that aggressor now be rewarded?

It was in February 1953 that U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge said to the political and security committee of the United Nations General Assembly that Russia could stop the war any time if she wanted to do so, but that it was being carried on by arms and equipment supplied to the Communist forces in Korea by the Soviet Union. In his reply to that speech on March 2, 1953, Andrei Vishinsky, Foreign Minister of the Soviet

Government, told the same committee of the U.N.:

"The Soviet Union has never concealed the fact that it sold and continues to sell armaments to its ally, China."

But was it more important to support an ally in its aggression or to honor the obligations of the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union had given its solemn pledge of adherence?

The U.N. unfortunately, took no steps against the treasonable acts of the Soviet Union. No resolutions were adopted formally denouncing the Soviet disregard of the charter. How can any international organization profess to be the friend of small nations, or to be interested in preventing wars, when it closes its eyes to the perfidious behavior of one of its principal members?

President Kennedy need not remain silent on this queston. Many people may perhaps have forgotten what happened in the Korean war. But the parents and relatives of the more than 54,000 Americans who died and of the 103,000 who were wounded in that conflict can never forget. The moral force that is to save mankind from future wars cannot be given impetus and world opinion marshaled if such facts are suppressed or ignored.

The President of the United States is the spokesman of freedom in the world. He need not be concerned with the petty politics of the uncommitted or nonalined nations who are afraid to stand up for basic principles and who pursue instead policies of timidity, if not indifference, toward the crimes of the Soviet Union.

The debate on the issue of Red China's admission to the United Nations furnishes a timely opportunity to proclaim the whole philosophy of freedom against tyranny, free government against autocracy, and the cause of peace as against those who would precipitate war. For the Red China issue in the U.N. is a vivid reminder of what happens when nations not only ignore but, in effect, reward aggression. The fact that there may be a majority of the members of the U.N. who would close their eyes to China's misdeeds and admit the Peiping regime, on the pragmatic basis that it controls a large territory, is a sickening illustration of why the United Nations, itself, is rapidly losing whatever prestige it has had.

There is merit in maintaining a world organization, but not for the sake of a large number of members who believe in ignoring fundamental standards of morality and who think the end justifies the means.

The President of the United States has an almost made-to-order occasion to issue now before the United Nations General Assembly a clarion call for decency, morality, and a sense of justice, so that, if war has to come, the issues will be clear. But it is more likely that world opinion can thereby become truly effective in preserving peace.

Statement of William F. Sullivan, President, Northern Textile Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association, annual meeting, Northern Textile Association, Poland Spring, Maine, September 14, 1961:

A year ago we were in a hiatus between administrations and in a period of depressed business during which imports were climbing at a rate which exceeded a billion and one-third square yards for the year.

There is no need for a lengthy review of events since then. A look at the future is more useful. I foresee considerable promise, in spite of difficult problems. It is a time for boldness, imagination, and courage.

Let me first assert an obvious fact which our critics often accuse us of overlooking. We all recognize the continued need to modernize our mills, techniques, and manufacturing facilities. There is no future for those who fail to keep up. We are not an expanding industry in the sense of increased facilities and employment. We are, however, becoming a more intensive industry with greater output per loom from a lesser number of mills. This technological surge will continue. We know it and know that it is a job for the industry itself to handle. We will not forget in our quest to correct the inadequacies of Government policy to take care of those things which lie within the control of management.

Although we are an old industry in point of time, our opportunities and problems are novel. The changes which are upon us require a high degree of imagination. We must not let the day-to-day harassments which beset us obscure the fact that we are the first large manufacturing industry in the United States to pioneer in global trade problems of this magnitude.

As to our future from a Government policy point of view, it is too early to make final judgments on the outcome of the developments of the last 9 months. We would be wise to be cautious and moderately encouraged. We would be unwise to be depressed, hasty, or emotional.

We are now in a new phase of activities. Since our last meeting, the fiber-textile-apparel complex of the country has been engaged in a common effort never before undertaken. This cooperation has had results. The record speaks for itself, beginning with the Pastore Committee report of last February, followed by the creation of the Cabinet Committee, the extensive discussions in both the Senate and House by over 150 Congressmen, the President's seven-point program of May 2, and international agreements at Geneva and Tokyo.

Having secured a recognition of the problems of our industry, however, we now face a new situation—the working out with Government of practical and realistic solutions. This is a more difficult task and requires an even higher degree of industry cohesion than formerly. To the extent that the industry can think together and work together, it can influence and guide these solutions. If it fails to do so, action will be taken by Government alone or be abandoned.

The main thrust of the President's textile program and related activities is obviously in the foreign trade field. It is an attempt to rationalize and accommodate conflicting domestic interests and philosophies in the context of a world struggle for freedom and economic growth. Much as we might like to have rapid push-button answers and solutions, we recognize that this is impossible and that such answers would probably be impermanent anyway.

We are feeling our way along, step-by-step, and I believe that our Government is doing the same. If we are unable to see the bright fields of prosperity ahead, it is because no one can honestly chart now a foolproof, 100-percent guaranteed course for success.

The next few months will tell us much. One paramount question is this:

Will our Government adopt a policy of permitting a steadily rising level of imports of textile goods over the years, or will it fix limits on imports and thereby encourage a strong domestic industry?

If it is the former, we merely exchange the rapid deterioration of recent years for a slow death in the future. If the latter, we can look forward with confidence.

There are four critical areas in which this can be tested in the next few months.

First is the OCDM proceeding which is a test of whether our Government chooses to enter international negotiations in a strong or a weak position. Because there is some misunderstanding, OCDM's function should be clarified. It involves a simple question of fact which is: Do textile imports threaten to impair the national security?

In 1958 when the Trade Agreements Act was extended, the Congress explicitly enlarged the meaning of national security to require: (a) recognition of the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security, and (b) consideration of the impact of foreign competition on the economic welfare of individual domestic industries with consequent unemployment, decrease in revenues of Government, loss of skills or investment, or other serious effects resulting in a displacement of domestic products by excessive imports.

Now there can be no doubt that imports of textiles which exceeded 1.3 billion square yards last year seriously weaken the domestic fiber-textile-apparel complex and therefore the internal economy of the Nation.

The only function of OCDM is to make a finding of this obvious fact and so inform the President. I say "obvious fact" because both branches of the Congress have recognized this fact and the President has initiated a seven-point program for this very reason.

The OCDM is not involved in making recommendations for remedies or relief to the President, nor does it pass on problems of foreign policy or conflicting domestic interests. Its function is solely to report that the internal economy of the United States is impaired by the surge of imports of textile products and that it will be further impaired if permitted to continue.

A good many pounds of paper have been filed with OCDM in Washington by representatives of many foreign governments pleading special interests, foreign policy considerations, and international trade theories. These matters may well be considered by the President later, but they are irrelevant to the single factual question which the OCDM must answer first.

When the OCDM informs the President that textile imports weaken our internal economy and threaten the national security, the President is then clothed with the broad statutory power which he needs to deal with this threat. The various executive departments are then empowered to work out and determine the proper remedies and act on an industrywide basis in the context of world conditions. Until there is an OCDM finding, the President is without real power or authority to back up that which he requests at the bargaining tables of Geneva, Tokyo, Hong Kong or elsewhere.

There is no objection to the President's program of friendly negotiations with other free nations for the purpose of reaching agreements and arrangements to control disruptive trade in textiles. I respectfully suggest, however, that the international meetings which are ahead should not be exercises in semantics in which the United States is helpless to protect its internal economy and national security.

Our Government should negotiate with the understanding that the United States is in a position to back up its requests—however politely phrased—if necessary and if it so chooses.

In its simplest terms, a finding by OCDM is necessary to the carrying out of point 6 of the President's program as well as to a

solution of the international trade problem in textiles in its broadest sense.

I suggest, therefore, that this matter be watched carefully by you in the next few months. If you find that the State Department or others in our Government oppose our petition to OCDM, you can conclude that they seek to weaken the position of the United States in international negotiations and in the handling of these serious problems.

Let me be more specific. If the State Department, which is in charge of international negotiations, chooses to weaken its bargaining position by encouraging foreign governments and their exporters to oppose an OCDM ruling favorable to the domestic industry, we can conclude that its efforts in negotiations will lack the degree of sincerity which is necessary to a successful outcome. It would then be fair to say that that Department holds the expansion of the foreign textile industry as more important than the preservation of the domestic industry and in turn our economic welfare and national security.

This is the issue of OCDM and this is a test which will give you a specific index of the direction in which we are moving.

The second test which I suggest you watch is this: To what extent and with what promptness will our Government enforce the 1-year Geneva Agreement? In other words, is the fiscal 1961 level of imports to be treated as a floor or as a ceiling on imports for the 12 months beginning 2 weeks from Saturday? I am hopeful in this respect, and perhaps we will hear from Secretary Price tomorrow in more detail on this subject and that some announcement by the President will be forthcoming shortly.

The third issue or test which you should watch has been referred to by Mr. Dorr. Will a unified industrywide approach be pursued by our Government or is an attempt being made to split the industry and buy off certain segments? Personally, I do not think this is the case. I believe in the sincerity of the statements which have been made. But there can be slips, delays, and other considerations. It is up to us in all branches of the industry to insist upon the implementation of this broad policy without delay and on a comprehensive basis. I am not being critical because I know how long and arduously important members of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Labor, as well as the White House, have been working on textile matters for months. There are only about 16 working hours in the day, even for these men. I suggest, however, that this is an area to be watched most closely.

Fourth is a simple question with which we are all familiar. It is this. Will our Government tolerate a differential in raw cotton prices created by it to continue to erode our industry without corrective action? I don't think I need say more about this very important subject.

One additional matter of significance is the long-term arrangement for the global control of cotton textile trade, negotiations for which are scheduled to begin early next month. This will be complicated and lengthy and is not scheduled to conclude before April 30, 1962. I suggest that the thing to watch for in these negotiations is whether they will be designed to protect our national security and internal economy or whether the ultimate arrangement will be an ever-rising level of imports.

In the meantime, we will know whether our Government wishes to enter these negotiations in a strong bargaining position with an OCDM finding, whether it has taken corrective action in the two-price cotton matter, whether it moves ahead on an industrywide basis with wool, silk, and man-made fiber textiles, and whether it is enforcing the short-term Geneva arrangement. If these things are done, I believe that we can all be hopeful and look forward to better times.

I for one am optimistic, and I hope you will be. With optimism and confidence, we can all do a better job in an interesting and pioneering effort.

Railroad Technological Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the present crisis confronting American railroads. This huge deficit-ridden industry is trying to halt its slide toward bankruptcy through mergers and relief from Government discriminatory treatment in order to restore the earnings that once made the railroads one of the greatest industries in the United States.

It is obvious to all that a good, strong railroad system is essential to the future of our country as it has been to the glorious past of this Nation. Just as the railroads have helped to build this country of ours, so, too, we must look to them for assistance in meeting the challenge of the future with our growing population and our increased transportation needs.

In addition to the present personal needs of all Americans, it is essential to the adequate defense of the United States that we have a modern and efficient railway system. Here again, history has shown us that the railroads are essential in the transportation field during times of national emergency.

The present economic ills of the American railroads are well known to all of us. It behooves the Congress to take whatever steps are possible from the Government level to encourage the various railroads of this country to continue and to better their efficient operation.

The railroad industry itself should constantly seek out new methods of decreasing their operating expenses and in this way bettering their competitive position in the field of transportation. Such actions as these come under the heading of self-help and are as essential to the future of this industry as is Government assistance.

One of the most significant revolutionary breakthroughs in the technology of the railroad industry is the recent development of the 200 miles per hour liberty track by the Railroad Permanent Way Products Corp. & Railroad Rubber Products, Inc. of Ashtabula, Ohio. The principle of the liberty track is to provide a stable, sound, and safe foundation for rail travel, with speeds greatly in excess of 100 miles per hour. The new speeds determined by this track structure will be limited only by the type and weight of equipment being operated over the railroad surface. With this liberty track, the American railroads can achieve speeds of 200 miles per hour with their present equipment, if they so desire.

Among the international testimonials to this new technology is the statement of Monsieur Robert Levi, director of fixed installations for the French National Railways, who in 1947 stated "thanks to the use of rubber, we have been able to reduce maintenance costs by 70 percent." Monsieur Roger Sonneville, chief of the research section permanent way department of the S.N.C.F. in France, also stated that the "economic importance of this technique for track construction is very considerable, both as regards the increase in the life of all track material and as regards the tremendous reduction in maintenance costs. Thanks to the use of rubber we have been able to achieve what railway engineers have dreamed of ever since railways started."

This technology is the key to achieving new high speeds, greater safety, service, comfort, and a profitable low-cost operation.

It is my sincere hope that the railroad industry will investigate this revolutionary development and incorporate this technological advancement in their plans for the future. Such action by the industry should go far to lower their costs of operation and return them once again to the profit-making days of the past.

The story of the railroads is the story of the basic and indispensable surface transportation medium of the world and I am convinced that this new perfection by this industry will greatly advance the progress of each nation and its people.

The Honorable Paul J. Kilday

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, while we will sincerely miss the great personality and talent of PAUL KILDAY after his 23 years of distinguished service in this House, I cannot help but think it quite natural that his interest and skill in arriving at the just core of any given situation should lead him further toward service at the core of society, the field of jurisprudence.

His caliber of performance has reflected a much sought-for, seldom-found combination of intellect and intelligence; strength and self-control, and ability to rise above personal concern in his devotion to his country. These are qualities that contributed to his eminent leadership on the Armed Services Committee and Committee of Military Affairs, membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and advisorship to the Conference on Statutes of the International Atomic Energy Agency of the United Nations. These are qualities that are certain to bring credit to his

new post as judge on the U.S. Military Court of Appeals.

While forever acute in his attention to the details and perfection of fairness in judgment on any issue before him, PAUL KILDAY was always available for counsel, explanation, and conversation to his fellow Members.

Thus, I am sure that I speak for my colleagues as well as myself, when I give my wholehearted blessings to PAUL, who, with all due respect and admiration, is a wonderful guy.

United Nations Must Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Synder, editor and publisher of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, elaborates on the real meaning of the United Nations in the world of today:

A QUESTION OF THE INSTITUTION

"It is not a question of the man, but of the institution."

The quotation is from Dag Hammarskjold, killed Monday on a mission to Africa for the United Nations of which he was Secretary General. The "institution" of which he spoke was the United Nations. The statement was made in retaliation to Russian efforts to replace him with a "three-headed" chief of the U.N. Secretariat made up of one Communist, one representative of the West and one "neutral" each with veto power.

Ironically, the death of "the man" who made the statement poses a very real threat to "the institution."

The Soviet bloc, which means the Kremlin, will seize on this personal tragedy to try to force its three-headed—or troika—plan on the U.N. Secretariat. The West, of course, will oppose the effort, knowing that extension of the Soviet veto power from the Security Council to the Secretariat would render it powerless in forcing action where action is necessary to settle a dispute in the interests of world peace. However, the Soviet veto power in the Security Council will make effectiveness of such opposition difficult.

The crisis had been expected a year from now when Hammarskjold's second 5-year term would have expired. It is now upon us.

The world must realize what is at stake.

The United Nations is, of course, an imperfect institution. The ultimate hope is probably for some kind of world government, but that, in the present state of widely different ideologies, education, standards of living and economic possibilities, is in the dream world of the future.

Those who established the United Nations in high hopes at the end of World War II realized those facts and sought to build as a substitute an institution where sovereign states still might exert sufficent pressure on other sovereign states to settle disputes without resort to war.

Those high hopes have become low. They were strained by the pressures involving new states not yet ready for self-government, let alone solution of world problems; they have been weakened by the insistence of old states on the status quo with which they had been used to living; they have been worst dashed by adamant and arrogant Soviet exercise of the veto power.

Still some hope has remained. The United Nations has found a solution to several problems. Its action in Iran, in Korea, in the Suez, in Lebanon, not always wise in our estimation, nevertheless has prevented what might have been the outbreak of world war III.

The fact that nations poles apart in freedoms, ideologies and economics, might still have a place to discuss their troubles in the presence of, and under the pressure of, neutrals has proved valuable.

It is the maintenance of such an organization for debate and for action where necessary that is at stake now.

The so-called neutrals must realize this. If they do it is possible they may be able to exert sufficient pressure to prevent the Soviet bloc from rendering the U.N. powerless through insistence on the unworkable "troika" plan.

Dag Hammarskjold, unquestionably a man of peace though there were times when he in turn irritated the Soviet blocs and the West, has found the peace of death. It may be the only complete peace available to a man. It is not the peace recommended for the institution.

The death of the institution could be followed by the death of the world, for world suicide is a very stark but very real possibility in this era.

Meany Calls on Assembly To Defend United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, a very, very timely and pertinent lead article appearing in the AFL–CIO News for Saturday, September 23, 1961.

It brings before us again the continuing threats by sinister forces to destroy the United Nations:

MEANY CALLS ON ASSEMBLY TO DEFEND UNITED NATIONS—WARNS OF THREATS BY SINISTER FORCES

The AFL–CIO has called on the United Nations General Assembly to defend the world organization from the sinister forces threatening its destruction as the "greatest monument" it can build to the memory of Dag Hammarskjold.

Federation President George Meany declared that the 16th session of the Assembly which opened September 19 can build this monument "by pursuing with unwavering loyalty and redoubled vigor" the late Secretary General's policies for making the U.N. "an even more effective instrument for protecting the smaller and weaker nations and preserving world peace."

"The AFL–CIO sincerely hopes," he said, "that inspired by and loyal to the ideals which animated Dag Hammarskjold, the 16th General Assembly will rally fully and firmly to the support and defense of the charter and organization of the U.N. which he served so devotedly and supported so brilliantly in the face of even the fiercest and most unwarranted attacks."

Meany's plea, directed especially to the smaller and newer nations which would suffer most severely if the U.N. were weakened, came in the face of the Soviet Union's renewed determination to replace one-man leadership of the U.N. with its "troika" concept—three Secretaries General, each with the power of veto, representing the free world, the Communist world, and the unalined nations.

Hammarskjold was on a mission to help a small, new nation—to arrange a truce in strife-torn Congo—when he died in a plane crash in Rhodesia. With the death of "the indomitable and tireless leader" of the U.N., Meany asserted, "the entire liberty-loving world and especially the peoples of Africa and Asia have lost an irreplaceable fighter for peace and human progress."

Hammarskjold in his final report predicted a three-headed directorate would mean the collapse of the U.N. The feeling is shared by the Western World and by many of the unalined nations.

Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko made it plain the Communist bloc would bend every effort to capitalize on the situation growing out of Hammarskjold's death to push for the "troika" plan. The U.N. Charter would have to be amended to permit the shift. Gromyko has coupled this demand with renewal of the Reds' now traditional insistence that Red China be admitted. The United States has seconded New Zealand's motion that the admission question be put on the agenda, though it still opposes the admission itself.

Meany, in a wire to the Committee of One Million holding a rally in New York, restated the AFL–CIO's opposition to the admission of Red China to the U.N.

Meany said that Red China is "completely disqualified" from membership because the regime has been imposed by a foreign power; that the Government exercises control through denying its people fundamental human rights; that it has been found guilty of aggression against the U.N.

Admission of Red China, he declared, would "gravely undermine the U.N. and greatly assist Moscow's sinister schemes to dominate this vital world organization and destroy its effectiveness."

Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is simply no room for appeasement in our negotiations with the U.S.S.R. Constantine Brown, in his article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on September 21, discusses inevitable results of such weakness on our part:

KHRUSHCHEV BERLIN SETTLEMENT?—DEATH OF NATO EXPECTED IF TALKS OF PACT WITH KENNEDY ON SOVIET TERMS IS TRUE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—There is much whispered talk among knowledgeable diplomats that a double K meeting, expected before the end of the year, will result in a settlement of the Berlin crisis (on Premier Khrushchev's terms) and probably in a general disarmament agreement.

An agreement to finalize World War II will have an inescapable consequence in the dissolution of NATO. This coalition was created to prevent further Red encroachments in Western Europe and to maintain the status quo in Berlin. Mr. Khrushchev

now demands negotiation to change that status quo. He insists on recognizing the East German puppet as a de jure government and is determined to transfer to the Pankow regime control over communication lines between the West and free Berlin in disregard of previous solemn agreements.

All other facets of the present conflict would be negotiable. It is obvious that once Mr. Khrushchev has established his basic points, the freedom of West Berlin will be a farce to be ended anytime he wishes. But the illusory freedom of the former German capital is the bait which he hopes President Kennedy will swallow as a face-saving device. This, at least, is the firm conviction of many European diplomats.

If the NATO should liquidate itself, it will not be prompted by anger or annoyance at the American Government's policies but because it will have outlived its usefulness. The Europeans could use the manpower now employed in their armed forces and the money spent on defense for more useful purposes.

American acquiescence, under duress, in the Russian dictator's terms would make, informed sources say, the continuation of the NATO a costly farce. There would not be a single member who would not rush to Moscow to make expedient arrangements for political and economic coexistence.

However, the problems which we and the Europeans face now are not the same as any others in history. If Mr. Kennedy, say many Europeans, agrees to swallow a sugar-coated pill which Mr. Khrushchev has in his pocket it will be the first time in history that a powerful country, well supported by others, has agreed to yield to a weaker force under the pressure of terroristic blackmail. And that does not speak well for America. The other NATO members in Europe have informed us that they are willing to go all the way. If the cunning Mr. Khrushchev wins over us, despite his limited power, it won't be their fault.

With this prospect in mind the Europeans, who have seen worse days, are rationalizing their future policies toward the Soviet Union. There will be changes in the present governmental makeups. But these will merely provide new men to work out economic agreements intended to give the Soviet Union and Western Europe a complete world economic supremacy, backed by much of the gold which was once ours.

Such tendencies are very clear in Italy where the present center government headed by Premier Fanfani is about to fall. Its demise will not have world-shaking consequences. But it will be indicative if the new Government is center-left and includes such men as the leader of the left-wing Socialists, Pietro Nenni, who served his political apprenticeship as a commissar in the Spanish civil war.

In France, General de Gaulle has remained rigid in his determination not to yield to Red blackmail. But his position is difficult. He has on his hands not only the thorny North African problems which he has pledged to solve before the end of the year but also a farm problem which is losing him popular support.

General de Gaulle is no politician. He based his policies toward Moscow on the belief that the United States would never surrender. Should he find things different it is probable that he will return to the solitude of his country estate to write another philosophic-political book on the failities of the mediocrities who are now guiding the destinies of the free world.

And it is not an assumption, but a certainty, that if General de Gaulle relinquishes his office again, there will be drastic changes in Western Germany. In Europe, it is free Germany and France which are the main pillars of NATO. Once they give up, the whole NATO structure will collapse because, as a French diplomat put it to this reporter, "There would be no further reason for its existence."

Salute to Chief Justice Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent edition of one of my hometown newspapers, the Berkeley Daily Gazette, an article appeared which I hope will be required reading for those people from the John Birch Society, their supporters and sympathizers, who write to Members of Congress demanding the impeachment of a genuine, dedicated, and great American—Chief Justice Earl Warren.

This syndicated article by Ralph McGill points out that "the appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice has proved to be one of the great selections for that important position." This is a position which I warmly endorse, and a position which I believe that our future development as a nation will amply justify.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this noteworthy article to the attention of all.

SALUTE TO WARREN

(By Ralph McGill)

Ahead of us stretch years of continuing constitutional and political decisions. These, when finally made, will bring changes to us. Some will be digested by the body politic only with accompanying distress and time.

One must turn back to 1801, when John Marshall, himself a product of rough and ready partisan politics, became Chief Justice of the United States. Through his years on the bench he forged our present concept of law and the Constitution—the idea that the Nation's great document was, and is, resilient and that it means what the Supreme Court says it does.

He, too, imposed the power of his personality and his will on the tremendous shaping decisions which, like sharp-cutting tools, have rough hewed us into the shape we now possess as a government of free peoples, living under law and the Constitution.

Because of John Marshall, Federal Judge Learned Hand, one of the great intellects to grace the bench in our time, said of the Supreme Court Justice's power in dealing with the scope of the Constitution:

EMPTY VESSELS

"The words he must construe are empty vessels into which he can pour nearly anything he will."

Each of the nine Justices has equal voice. But in the private sessions of the Court, when decisions and points of law are argued and discussed, the Chief Justice can, if he be a positive person of persuasive will, exert great influence in creating a judicial climate and philosophy.

In these discussions the Chief Justice speaks first. When the votes are taken, his is the final one.

These two facts, one persuasive, one positive, provide him the mechanics of power, limited only by his abilities in each field.

Within a few weeks, the U.S. Supreme Court will convene for its fall term. Once again there will be vessels to be filled. The Constitution will be called upon to affirm the rights of citizens, to determine what is constitutional and what is not.

BALANCED COURT

We are fortunate to have so well balanced a Court. The appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice has proved to be one of the great selections for that important position. Under him and the Associate Justices the rights of citizens have been strengthened, not weakened.

Not since slavery was abolished has the Court been presented with questions which so closely touch the daily lives, customs, traditions, and liberty of the people.

Chief Justice Warren is a man out of the American mold. His paltry critics still say that when he was Governor he often compromised the political problems confronting him. Since we live and are governed by men who must be elected to office, compromise is the essential ingredient of our form of government. Without it, two opposing factions or ideas lock horns and die, leaving their bleached bones on the hills of anarchy.

PRINCIPLE

But, unlike the politician whose compromises include principle and who has made the good decent word "politician" almost an epithet, Governor Warren never once acted without honor and integrity.

He is a stubborn man. He has a great respect for law.

Most of all, he has a feeling for people and their right under law.

Our Private Enterprise System: Problems of Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the opportunity of addressing the American Assembly regional meeting sponsored by St. Louis University. At this meeting I spoke on a subject which has occupied a good deal of my thoughts and my legislative activity in recent months, that of the tremendous success which our society, and its private enterprise system, have experienced in our recent history and the problems which these successes have caused. This is perhaps the key problem in America today—to meet these problems without destroying the foundations of the progress we are making. Under unanimous consent heretofore granted I insert this speech in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY AMERICAN ASSEMBLY REGIONAL MEETING, AT PERE MARQUETTE PARK, ILL., MAY 11, 1961

PROBLEMS OF SUCCESS: OUR DYNAMIC ECONOMY

It is ironical that the success of the private enterprise system as developed in our American society should be used as a base for its destruction. It has always seemed axiomatic that success bred success and that failure was the basis upon which we sought to change our ways. Yet it seems to me

that both the private enterprise system in economics and the representative system in government are being abandoned by our people because of an alleged inability of these two systems to meet the problems that their successes have created.

I think it is worthwhile to examine into these premises to see: (1) Have we had success by following the private enterprise system in economics? (2) has the success, if it exists, created new problems which this basic system can not meet? (3) are we abandoning this basic system and, if we are, what system are we replacing it with? (4) will the new system enable us to solve the problems that now confront us?

I believe that by any fair standards we say that we have had success in the economic field as a result of following the private enterprise system. What is an economy supposed to do for a people? Essentially, it is to enable them to be freer from the physical laws of their bodies and their environment. Adequate food, shelter, and clothing are mere rudiments. Coping with time and space through the development of transportation and communication facilities enlarges the human horizon. Development of usable power to supplement the human muscles frees us from gravity and other natural laws. Advancement in the field of hygiene and medicine, although it does not extend the limits of the aggregate human life span, enables the time within that span to be extended to its limit and makes that time, freed from the wracking of disease, more subject to the will of the individual. Furthermore, it permits more human beings to be born and to live through useful adulthood. All of these things place more leisure time at the disposal of each person which means more scholarship. (There is much wisdom in the etymology of a word and the Greek word "* * *" meaning leisure time has not been unduly stretched to encompass our modern English words, school, scholar, and scholarship.) From scholarship comes the two ingredients that keep any human system living: (1) Passing on the distilled knowledge from the past to the next generation and (2) searching, exploring, testing to discover new truths.

I have said nothing about ultimate human goals. These goals belong to philosophy and religion, not to economics. They do not enter the discussion unless one is to advance the theory that success in meeting economic goals is wrong, or that too rapid advancement toward success creates philosophical and religious problems which cannot be solved to keep pace with this advancement.

This is real. This is not academic. The Hindu religion is at least apathetic to economic success, if not at variance with it. The story of the tower of Babel and of the Garden of Eden carry deep messages if one wishes to contemplate them. Certainly today many men and women intent on the economics of life are wondering whether the scientific development of nuclear power is not ahead of our religious development.

It is my own belief that economic advancement, as advancement in all fields, comes from search for the truth. The freedom it brings surely cannot be bad.

Has our society had success in the field of economics? I think commonsense, common observation, points out the success we have achieved along the line of all of the economic goals I have set out. Our success is the greatest achieved by any society at any time and at any place in the world.

Perhaps by discussing the first part of my second question, has the success, if it exists, created new problems, I can bring the discussion down to specifics.

Let me take two areas:

1. Employment and unemployment: Surely, a failure to utilize all of our manpower is a problem for future economic achievement as well as a human problem for the men and women who are not being utilized.

2. Cost of living: Surely a failure to enable some of our people to have the purchasing power to meet the cost of living at the standard available in our society is a problem affecting the potential productivity of these people for future economic achievement of the whole society as well as a human problem for these people.

The primary reason for the post-World War II high incidence of employment and unemployment (55.2 million jobs in 1946, 66.7 million jobs in 1960; 2.3 million jobless in 1946, 3.9 million jobless in 1960) is rapid technological advancement. Thirty percent of the goods and services now on the market available for people to buy were nonexistent 5 years ago. Over 30 percent of our manufacturing machinery and equipment is obsolete; 4 percent of the 5.6 percent unemployed are said to be technologically unemployed; this is, their skills are obsolete.

Obsolete skills and obsolete equipment do not exist in a stagnant, a sluggish, or a sick economy. Obsolete skills and obsolete equipment are the direct result of rapid economic advancement, rapid growth, rapid technological advances. The more dynamic the economy, the more rapid its growth, the more obsolescence there will be.

The problems of present day unemployment are the result of success of our economic system, not its failure. The greater its success in this area of growth, the greater the problem of unemployment will be.

Does this mean that the same economic system that creates this success creates human and economic problems of unemployment that it cannot solve? I do not believe so. The evidence before us points to opposite conclusions. Technological advancement creates a demand for more skills, and higher skills for which higher wages and salaries are paid, than it makes obsolete. Again commonsense and common observation reveals this to be true. Take a span of years to check this. Who in 1900 was employed in the aviation industry, chemical, electric power, electronics, automobile, aluminum—you add to the list, but be sure to include not just the manufacturing sector of these innovations. Add to the manufacturing sector the distributive and the service sectors which make it possible for the maximum number of our people to benefit from the new goods and services.

Specific studies of specific innovations reveal that technology indeed creates a demand for more and higher skills than it replaces. One interesting phenomena in the employment sector of our economy during these recent years of rapid technological advancement has been the decline in the employment in the manufacturing sector of the economy, while manufacturing capacity continued to rise as the result of automation and increased productivity. Yet employment in the service and distributive sectors continued to rise, even during the recessions; rather compelling testimony to the fact that goods and services were indeed being more widely distributed to more and more of our people, if we needed such additional testimony. Within the manufacturing sector itself blue collar workers declined in number to such an extent that they offset the rise in employment of the white collar worker in the same sector.

Many people have been misled as to the nature of this economic shift as the result of semantics. I have referred to skills becoming obsolete, as indeed they are. Yet we divide our labor force for the purposes of understanding into skilled, semiskilled and unskilled. The greatest incident of unemployment, around 19 percent, is among the semiskilled and unskilled worker. How can an "unskill" become obsolete through technological advancement? As a matter of fact, technological advancement hits the demand for the unskilled and semiskilled worker the hardest. For example, the cotton picking machine and the ditch digging machine eliminate the demand for the human cotton picker and the human ditch digger. These workers are classified as unskilled. The term, of course, is relative. Perhaps some time in the future we may call what today are skilled workers unskilled.

A test of what is occurring today in the employment area of our economy can be found by reading the help wanted ads in any metropolitan newspaper, column after column of skills in demand going unfilled. All of this heavy demand for new skills is occurring at the same time we have this relatively high incidence of technological unemployment.

What is the solution? It is so obvious that it is a wonder that anyone has to even pose the question. The answer is training and retraining, more vocational education, more industrial education, and more just plain education. The financing of the training and retraining is well within our means. Indeed, many companies have handled the job themselves—Pacific Bell Telephone, Hardware Mutual & Sentry Life Insurance Co., Armour Packing Co.—I just happen to know these as case histories.

A few weeks ago I asked Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles J. Hitch whether our defense had been slowed down at all because of the lack of skilled manpower in some of the defense industries. He said, "Yes." I asked what have we been doing about it. He said in many of our defense contracts we have clauses which provide for the training of the workers in the new skills needed.

For several years now I have advocated tying vocational education and retraining into the Federal-State unemployment system so that automatically as skills become obsolete retraining sets in. This idea is now catching on. The New Frontier is now looking it over. I hope they don't shy away from it.

The second economic problem created by rapid economic growth is increased cost of living. Many people have misinterpreted this phenomena to be inflation—this is increased price for the same goods and services available on the market in the past. Since 1951, the time of the Federal Reserve-Treasury accord, there has been little inflation, but some noticeable increases in the cost of living.

The increased cost of living stems from increased standard of living. This is economic success, economic growth, not economic failure.

It cost people nothing for a television set 15 years ago because there were no television sets. It did not cost people $10 a bottle for a mycin drug 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago $1 probably would buy the best medicine that money could buy.

In 1951 when I first went to Congress it took me over 5 hours time to fly from St. Louis to Washington and I had the choice of two flights. Today I fly nonstop in less than 3 hours and I have a choice of many flights at varying hours. The cost of making this flight is about $10 more round trip than it was in 1951. This is not inflation, this is real value received and then some.

Someone has computed that as the result of frozen and precooked foods (and I would say the self-service technique available in our supermarkets) the housewife spends 2 hours less time a day preparing meals for her family. These foods cost more, but this is not inflation, this is for real value received.

Rapid technological advancement costs money. The more rapid the advancement the greater the cost. The more rapid the innovation the more money that must have been spent in the research and development which produced the innovation. The more rapid the innovation the greater the capital cost of obsolete equipment and machinery

that must be junked, the human skills now obsolete that must be abandoned. (This costs the employer in unemployment insurance as well as the worker in lost pay.) The costs involved in purchasing the new and improved equipment, in training, and paying the higher wages and salaries of the new skills now needed are increased. All of these costs must be recouped in the price charged for the new goods and services now on the market.

Take one area where the costs have risen considerably—medical care—doctors' fees, drugs, hospitals, and special features. It is success, not failure, in the field of medical care which has produced the increased cost. And the increased quality of medical care is well with the increased cost. Who indeed can measure the value of the 10 more years of life we now receive as the result of this great quality improvement in the medical care field, in dollars?

Has this success created problems? Yes, indeed it has. Serious ones. The most serious one, to put it bluntly, is financing the unexpected extra 10 years of life the individual person has. Failure in this field—stagnation in this field—won't create these problems—only success creates these problems.

Are we able to cope with the problem of increased cost resulting from rapid technological advancement under the system that produced the success? I certainly believe so, because technological advancement brings with it increased productivity—more goods and services can be produced and distributed more efficiently and from the efficiency savings we can do three things: (1) Increase wages of the employees, (2) reduce prices (or recoup the cost of the innovation without increasing the price) to the consumer, and (3) increase the dividend to the investor so that more money can be plowed back into research and development and further innovation.

However, we cannot increase wages, reduce prices, or increase investment in research and development more than the productivity increase we have gained. It is the blindness of certain groups in our society to this economic limitation, or greadiness, which causes some of the cost being passed on to the consumer in the price unnecessarily instead of absorbing the increased cost in the savings from productivity.

The success of our economic system does exist. It does create new problems. However, these new problems if properly analyzed can be met under this system to move us on to further success.

The next question I posed was: Are we abandoning our system in the face of the problems success has created and, if we are, what system are we replacing it with.

I am afraid we are abandoning our system of private enterprise in the face of the problems its successes have created. We are doing so because we have not looked at our success. We have looked only at the new problems created and with our eyes riveted on problems called success a failure. We have said an economy which is dynamic and growing rapidly is stagnant, tired, and even sick. The remedy is a simple one in concept, increased Federal spending. It is the Keynesian approach based upon a stagnant economy of scarce goods and services.

In the name of more economic growth which, if it is true growth, will aggravate the problems that already exist, we are setting out to destroy the system which creates it.

The private enterprise system is simply a system which bases its operation on the collective wisdom of the human being acting in his individual capacity as opposed to other systems which base their operation on the wisdom of oligarchies or oligopolies—a select group of human beings either in political government or economics who provide the wisdom for economic decision.

The free market place is the mechanism which permits the individual human being to cast his economic vote. It is more than that, it is the laboratory where any person is privileged to test out an economic idea for its truth and value. This does not mean a wild and unrestrained trial-and-error testing, unless all men in the society are wild and unrestrained in their actions, any more than the existence of the laboratories for the physical sciences mean undisciplined trial and error research. Both democracy and private enterprise depend upon an educated and self-disciplined populace.

Oligopoly or oligarchy, on the other hand, tends to revert to the scolastic method of searching for the truth which we abandoned in the renaissance for the scientific method, of disciplined trial and error research. I do not believe that we as a society have gained enough knowledge or wisdom to abandon the laboratory of the free market place for the ponderings and pontifications of groups of even our very best scholars.

It is the replacement of the decisions reached in the free market place by the decisions of politically chosen Federal bureaucrats (and I use this term in no derogatory sense) that is coming about in our society. The substitution of Federal Government spending for private spending.

The last question I posed was this: Will this new system of political bureaucratic economic decision enable us to solve the problems that now confront us? My answer is, "Yes," to the extent that the problems will no longer bother us. The problems will disappear. They are problems resulting from economic growth and progress—problems resulting from freemen using leisure time to ponder new things. These problems will disappear and very few new ones will arise to take their place. Indeed, we will be stagnant. Study of history and scholasticism then may well take care of things that trouble us because societies in the past have worked this ground over and over again. We can profit by their experiences. There will be nothing new under the sun to dazzle and baffle us.

In the beginning I referred to two social systems, one is in the economic field, the private enterprise system, the other in the political field, the system of representative government.

I have discussed the economic system. I will merely refer briefly to the system of representative government. In political science it is the system that is based upon the importance of the individual human being, just as is based the private enterprise system in economics. In many ways the two systems go together—they rise together, they seem to fall together. Justice Brandeis referred to our 48 State governments as 48 laboratories wherein to test the truth and wisdom of political ideas. I would refer to the thousands of municipal governments in the same way, just as I would refer to the U.S. Congress as no more than a set of procedures, whereby we gather what wisdom and knowledge exists in our society to apply it to the solution of problems that face our society.

The Keynesian economic philosophers would have us abandon the local and State governments in favor of the Federal Government. I can add, though this is not with common knowledge, that they would also downgrade the Federal Congress and abandon it in favor of the executive branch of the Federal Government. But it would require another paper to establish the point. I mention it in closing because I see the importance of the individual rise and fall in the history of all our social institutions; economic, political, educational, and, yes, religious in an equal and similar way.

Billion-Dollar Bust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following editorial from a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune. I am sure that those who read the RECORD will find it most interesting:

BILLION-DOLLAR BUST

Presumably Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, has read his Department's September crop report. It indicates the Kennedy administration's feed grain program has turned out to be a costly fizzle rather than the grand success he has been proclaiming it to be.

Hardly more than 2 months ago, Mr. Freeman was telling Congress that farmers, in return for cash payments and higher price supports, had reduced corn acreage by nearly 19 percent and that the prospective crop for use as grain would be cut 18 percent, or 716 million bushels. Congress was so impressed by his pitch that this was the economical way to reduce the $4 billion surplus of corn and other feed grains that it proceeded not only to extend the feed grain program another year, but to enact a similar program for wheat.

With the latest crop report, however, the program becomes less appealing. Now the corn crop is forecast at 3.519 billion bushels, 10 percent larger than the July estimate and only 10 percent below last year's record crop. The reduction in the crop will be, not 716 million bushels, but only 372 million. Surplus corn stocks, now totaling 2.098 billion bushels, will be reduced by only 83 million.

What happened was that farmers' ingenuity and nearly perfect growing weather combined to upset the administration's program. Farmers took their poorest yielding acres out of production. Then they increased their use of fertilizer and planted thicker to achieve maximum yields from their remaining acres. Result: Yields soared to an estimated record of 60.4 bushels an acre. Ten percent above last year's record 54.5 bushels an acre and the biggest yield per acre increase in a single year in history.

This has prompted Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau federation, the Nation's largest general farm organization, to describe the feed-grain program as a "billion-dollar fiasco * * * the most costly failure in the long history of attempts to fix prices and control production of farm crops by legislation." Not only has the program failed to curtail the surplus significantly, he maintains, but it has hurt farmers economically through the price depressing effects of "unconscionable dumping of Government-owned surplus corn on the market, which Mr. Shuman charges was done to scare farmers into participating in the program and to penalize those who have refused to go along with it.

Mr. Shuman believes the program will cost taxpayers $1 billion, including $700 million or more which will be paid for idling corn and sorghum acreage." Moreover," he says, "new employees by the thousands have been added to the Federal payrolls and Commodity Credit Corporation losses can be expected to mount as higher support prices pull more of the crop into Government bins."

"It would have been far cheaper to buy the grain that is not being produced and ship it to the South Pole," he asserted in an editorial in the October issue of the federation's

monthly publication, Nation's Agriculture. "In addition, the promise of higher support prices for soybeans, plus the restrictions on corn acreage, have generated the largest soybean production of all time. Prices are on the skids and this crop, surplus free until now, will be brought back into the hands of the bureaucrats as millions of bushels pour into Commodity Credit bins."

No Time To Try the Troika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on September 21, 1961:

NO TIME TO TRY THE TROIKA

By dissociating themselves from the tribute all the rest of the membership paid to the achievements of the late Secretary General, the Communist bloc in the United Nations has advertised its central objective for the current General Assembly session. This is to use the Hammarskjold tragedy as an opportunity to disrupt at its heart the organization he served.

There is something humanly indecent and also politically hamfisted in the way the Soviet delegate has moved to impose a three-headed secretariat on the U.N. Surely this troika dance will offend most delegates, including many representing neutrals.

Appointment of a single interim successor to the late Mr. Hammarskjold is, in any orderly view of things, only to be expected. This would correspond with Charter specifications until decision on the relevant profound constitutional questions can be arrived at. In societies dedicated to "peaceful coexistence" (a phrase much used by Moscow) the shoring up of agreed bases of cooperation amid storms of mere accident is usually recognized as a prime defense against disintegration of the society itself.

In the accident which has removed the Secretary General from Charter-based leadership of the Secretariat, however, the Soviets evidently see merely an invitation to pursue their own narrowly nationalistic aims. It does not seem to matter that doing so must add to the dangers under which the world's most important international organization already labors.

Two important U.N. figures have already been mentioned as possible candidates for Acting Secretary General. They are the Tunisian Delegate Mongi Slim, President of the current Assembly session, and the Irish President of the last session, Frederick H. Boland. It may be that cold-war neutrals in the U.N. will come forward with nominations that would be more acceptable to them.

They certainly should be encouraged to do so. The newer members have at this moment a rare opportunity to increase their international prestige and influence as well as to contribute to the U.N.'s effectiveness for defense of their own nationhood. They can exercise it by helping to keep the U.N. out of the bog of East-West argument, which is their acknowledged neutral right as well as their self-assigned duty.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has said that the appointment cannot wait. But it would be better to wait for the appointment of one Secretary General than to accept even a provisional troika which could, for example, throw into doubt the legal authority of key men now dealing with the Congo crisis.

There can be no firm direction from three veto-equipped Secretaries than from no Secretary. The Soviet Union should not count on the neutrals, even from the newest nations, to be gullible about such matters. Nor should Moscow suppose it can offend the ordinary humane susceptibilities of mankind without arousing suspicions about its political motives.

Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to all Members of this body, whether of the free trade or protectionist persuasion, the following article by Mr. John Grimes, of the Wall Street Journal. Happily, it generously avoids the free trade, duty-free-pulp slant, every typical of the major metropolitan dailies:

PROTECTIONISTS GAIN, PERIL KENNEDY 1962 BID FOR MORE LIBERAL LAW

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's free trade drive in 1962 will face a towering obstacle: Congressional protectionist sentiment of a magnitude not seen since the high-tariff twenties.

Well in advance of next year's administration push to extend and liberalize the reciprocal trade law, demands for defense against import competition are swelling mightily. Members of both parties from many parts of the land are responding to home State complaints from industry and labor about real or threatened damage from the rising influx of foreign goods. There are growing rumblings of discontent about the effectiveness of present safeguards. Scarcely a week goes by without a new speech on the House or Senate floor calling for import quotas on some foreign product—a step essentially distasteful to the Kennedy regime.

"You can start with bread along the Canadian border and go all the way down to strawberries on the Mexican border; I don't think you can find many holes in the map where there isn't a complaint from someone about imports," remarks a key House official.

A House Democrat runs through this list of plaintiff industries: "Coal, some steel, pottery, cement, oil, glass, some machinery, lead and zinc, cameras, transistor radios, all kinds of textiles, clothing, baseball gloves, fishing rods; all these and more are howling about imports." And, he adds, "Congressmen are listening now."

PROTECTIONIST RESOLUTION

Sample response: More frequent introductions of the perennial protectionist resolution urging that the Senate and House declare it "the sense of Congress" that no more tariff-easing agreements be negotiated by the executive branch during the remaining life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring next year. This resolution has been introduced more than 70 times this session, compared with some 40 last year.

"This isn't a case of the same old protectionist groups making more noise," cautions a long-time House stalwart for freer trade who has been doing some private sampling. "This time there's more of 'em." An ardent protectionist who has done his own polling cheerfully agrees. "We're the strongest we've been since the first Reciprocal Trade Law in 1934," he enthuses.

A potent combination of political and economic forces underlies this gain in strength. The departure of President Eisenhower, for one thing, has put more Republicans in the protectionist column. "Mr. Eisenhower dragged a lot of kicking and screaming Republicans along with him on trade" asserts a key legislator. "Now that he's gone, they're reverting to type." Senator BENNETT of Utah, who backed Ike on trade legislation in 1958, is urging safeguards now against certain meat imports. Also, almost all of the GOP's 21-seat gain in the House in the 1960 election is counted a plus for protectionism.

SOUTHERN VIEW CHANGES

On the Democratic side, the southerners who began abandoning their traditional free-trade stance as Dixie industrialized are turning more protectionist as foreign invasion of their markets grows.

This year influential Democratic Representative VINSON, of Georgia, engineered a demonstration in which some 70 textile State lawmakers, mostly Democrats, stood up on the House floor and demanded import controls. Senator BYRD is backing away from his traditional support of free trade legislation.

More border State and northern Democrats are heading the same way. Even such liberal Senators as MUSKIE of Maine and MCCARTHY of Minnesota want to require consideration of foreign wage rates in any decision on relief from import competition. Outspoken for more protection is New York's Representative STRATTON, whose upstate district encompasses such import-affected industries as textiles, gloves, and General Electric Co.'s heavy electrical equipment works at Schenectady. More and more northern Congressmen are feeling the heat from local unions, including those of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, even though national labor leaders favor liberalized trade.

Much of this pressure is prompted by the fact that unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis has remained at almost 7 percent of the labor force despite economic recovery. "If you've got any unemployment in your district at all, you have a hard time justifying a free trade position," asserts a midwestern Democrat. Another lawmaker complains: "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

MACHINERY, TEXTILE IMPORTS UP

The incoming tide of foreign goods clearly is increasing in amount and variety. Spurred by economic recovery in this country, U.S. imports jumped in July, the latest month for which figures are available, to the highest monthly level since September 1959. At nearly $1.4 billion, adjusted for seasonal fluctuation, this was 16 percent over the June level and 9 percent above that of July last year. Increases were reported in U.S. purchases of machinery, vehicles, metals, and textile products. Not only is there a rising flow from longtime suppliers abroad, but newly developing lands are seeking out the rich American market. One recently introduced item: tennis rackets from Pakistan.

Obviously the rising winds of protectionism on Capitol Hill portend a major battle against the administration's attempt to extend the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and push into new ground. Rather than trimming back past trade concessions, White House officials are hunting ways to open the domestic market wider to foreign producers. The key aim: to supply Mr. Kennedy with bargaining tools to prevent U.S. goods from being closed out of trading blocs abroad, such as Europe's six-nation Common Market. Instead of the cumbersome item-by-item tariff-cutting authority first handed President Roosevelt and extended 11 times since then, Mr. Kennedy may

seek new powers to slash import duties on a broad range of commodities.

"Unless the present mood of Congress changes completely, any idea that the Administration can get approval of this sort of thing is sheer fantasy," snaps a Southern Democrat.

A TRIP TO HOLLYWOOD

Even now, protectionists are working to build a solid case against trade liberalization next year. Democratic Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, a consistent foe of freer trade, heads a House subcommittee that has collected evidence from far and wide of import damage to U.S. employment. So far, Mr. DENT's group has delved into textiles and cheese and has even taken testimony on the effect of foreign airlines' invasion of the United States on employment of American pilots. In the works: A subcommittee trip to Hollywood to inquire into the effects of foreign film imports on U.S. moviemaking.

Although Congress hasn't had major trade legislation to deal with at this session, significant indicators of increased protectionist power keep showing up in legislative measures. House lawmakers wrote into the foreign aid authorization bill a provision barring loans to nations for building or running any plants that would produce goods in competition with U.S. manufacturers, unless such nations promised to limit exports to this country to 10 percent of annual output. Although a Senate-House conference eased the restriction to 20 percent, the amendment stayed in the measure.

Protectionists claim credit for the pressures that brought insertion of a "stiff-interpretation" into the treaty for U.S. membership in the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Reflecting concern over possible dilution by the organization of this country's control of its own trade policies, the provision specified that U.S. membership would neither lessen nor expand this Nation's sovereign powers.

DEMANDS FOR RELIEF

What many lawmakers want as a price for any support for trade liberalization is some firm assurance of more relief for import-injured industries. Such help could take the form of administration-proposed import quotas for certain products, or simply of greater Presidential acceptance of Tariff Commission recommendations for curbing imports or raising tariffs to protect domestic producers.

Strong words of warning have come from Mr. VINSON, one of the administration's ablest votegetters among southern Democrats: "Unless quotas are imposed that will provide the necessary protection to the textile industry in the United States, I think I can safely predict that at least some of the members who voted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1958 will have second thoughts if a bill to extend the act is presented on the floor in 1962."

Since he spoke, the United States has worked out an agreement with 16 nations to reduce cotton textile imports to this country and reroute some of the flow to other lands. How effective it will be in curbing the competition and relaxing congressional pressure for action remains to be seen.

"This administration has got to recognize that industries are getting hurt," declares a key southern Democrat. "Kennedy can't go on ignoring Tariff Commission recommendations as Eisenhower did."

CURBING PRESIDENTIAL POWER

Of 35 recent cases in which relief was recommended by the Tariff Commission, Congressman STRATTON, of New York, relates, 22 were turned down by the White House—"a sorry percentage," he scoffs. To stop this sort of thing, protectionists would like to make Tariff Commission recommendations mandatory, rather than leaving final judgment up to the President; such a sharp change does not seem likely to be adopted soon, however.

Congress mood is not lost on the administration, in any case. Indeed, some lawmakers suspect Mr. Kennedy has recently been careful to avoid a congressional rebuff on tariffs. He sent back for further study recent unanimous Tariff Commission recommendations for relief for domestic industries against imports of baseball gloves, ceramic mosaic tile, and certain kinds of glass, these Congressmen note. A Presidential "no," they suggest, might have been overridden by a two-thirds vote of Congress—a check provided in the 1958 extension of the trade law.

In both the substance and presentation of its 1962 trade proposals, the administration will strive to anticipate and overcome congressional objections. A key feature of its new program is expected to be a broad new plan to ease the impact of further tariff cuts. Rather than relying on higher tariffs or import quotas to protect domestic industries, the plan would emphasize increased Government help to rehabilitate companies, industries or communities hard hit by imports.

Soon Cabinet officials and their top aids "will start beating the drums" for the new trade approach, promises one official. "Once the President gets into the fight," insists another, "it will put a whole new perspective on things." To help cultivate support for freer trade plans both in Congress and in the business world, Mr. Kennedy has already named a Republican banker, Howard C. Petersen, as a special White House assistant.

The administration's congressional allies won't be idle, either. One administration lieutenant in the House remarks: "I expect to do a lot of talking on this matter between sessions." Democratic Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana, a longtime battler for freer trade, plans public hearings next month by his Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. He expects the testimony will provide much ammunition against the protectionist attack. Mr. BOGGS has also signed up former Secretary of State Herter to help head a study of world economic and trade problems.

Goals of the New Frontier—Juvenile Delinquency Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for quite a few years the Congress has been studying, investigating, and viewing with alarm a steady increase in delinquency among our Nation's young people. This year, under the forceful leadership of President Kennedy, the Congress at last has taken action toward checking this disturbing upward trend in juvenile delinquency.

The act passed by the Democratic 87th Congress will provide Federal assistance and leadership in the fight not only against delinquency by juveniles but offenses committed by older youths. The emphasis in this act is prevention—combatting the conditions which turn our youths into paths of delinquency. But, Mr. Speaker, the act also will provide assistance in developing ways to control the spread of delinquency and youthful offenses which have occurred.

In recommending this legislation to the Congress on May 11, 1961, President Kennedy described with great clarity the effects of delinquency:

Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses diminish the strength and the vitality of our Nation; they present serious problems to all the communities affected; and they leave indelible impressions upon the people involved which often cause continuing problems.

The President, in his May 11 letter, set the goals for this new program when he said:

By means of the proposed legislation, the Federal Government will be able to provide assistance to those dedicated persons in local communities throughout the Nation who are striving in many ways to create the social conditions that will insure the growth of a skilled and resourceful population of young men and women who are firm in character and committed to the development of a democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which the Democratic 87th Congress has passed will provide Federal assistance for projects demonstrating new ways and techniques to prevent and control juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and for training of personnel in this field. The steadily gaining delinquency statistics over the past 12 years is clear demonstration that new methods must be found to reclaim our disturbed, and disturbing, young people. The testimony from agencies, organizations, and officials dealing with these youths all points to an urgent need for more trained personnel to assist them.

The President was not content merely to recommend legislation to assist in combating juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. He has, by Executive order, directed the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor to coordinate their efforts in the development of a program of Federal leadership to assist the States and local communities in their efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of a Democratic administration and with the assistance of legislation passed by a Democratic Congress, the Nation may now move forward in a concentrated attack upon the long-standing juvenile delinquency problem.

Support in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 21. When will we stop this acquiescence—hurting our friends and helping our enemies?

VOICE FROM THE CONGO

In a wild and irrational speech, Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, has blamed

the capitalist powers for the death of Dag Hammarskjold. And this "assassination", the Premier said in Léopoldville, "is not the first of its kind perpetrated by the money powers."

While this ranting was going out over the airwaves, eight Russian diplomats, expelled from the Congo a year ago, were moving back to Leopoldville. Doubtless they will be welcomed, if not by Mr. Adoula, then certainly by his leftwing deputy, Antoine Gizenga.

The import of this, it seems to us, is that the Congolese Government, if not already Communist dominated, is moving in the Communist direction. And if this is the case, why in the world are we supporting the United Nations effort to force Moise Tshombe's Katanga Province back into the Léopoldville fold?

At best, it is extremely doubtful that there was any authority or justification for the use of U.N. troops in the ill-advised effort to end Katanga's secession from the Congo—an effort which now has ended unsuccessfully in a cease fire. And if Premier Adoula's speech is a fair indication of the shape of things to come, the non-Communist U.N. countries will be cutting their own throats by lending further support to this effort. Whatever may be President Tshombe's faults, it now appears that he had ample reason to resist the attempt by the Leopoldville regime to take control of Katanga. Instead of trying to help subdue him, it may well be that the West, to the extent that it was going to become involved, should have been supporting the Tshombe resistance.

The Phony Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by James DeLaurier, editor and publisher of the Hammond (Ind.) Times, classifies the neural nations in their proper bracket:

THE PHONY NEUTRALS

After watching the recent meeting of the 25 so-called nonalined or "neutral" nations at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, the American people can't be blamed for asking themselves "How neutral is a neutral?"

One of the resolutions passed by the gathering before it broke up was a demand that the United States abandon its naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba, which it has held for the last 60 years.

It was part of an attack on what the "neutrals" still term "colonialism," although the United States has rapidly rid itself of whatever colonial empire it acquired in the days of "manifest destiny." England and France, the two prime colonial powers of the Western World, are turning their former colonial possessions into self-governing republics and dominions as fast as they are able.

Nothing was said about Soviet Russia's own brand of colonialism, which involves setting up and fostering of governments behind the Iron Curtain—and making sure they are kept in power through police-state methods that guarantee absolutely no chance of free elections by which the captive people might express a choice.

Nor was Russia served by the "neutrals" with a demand that she give up her naval base on foreign soil in such places as Albania. What kind of neutralism is this?

No action could serve to illustrate more graphically the phoniness of the position maintained by the "neutrals" than this demand on the United States. If the 25 nations desire to be truly neutral, they would refrain from pointing a finger at either side. Certainly they would not go out of their way to pick out the United States as a colonial power.

The truth is, most of the so-called neutrals are either secretly committed to the cause of the Red Star (perhaps through subverted leaders) or else so sacred of what the Soviet Russians imperialists might do that they rush in to kowtow to the Kremlin.

The United States, on the other hand, is the long-suffering "good guy," who turns the other cheek and forgives insults. Therefore we must play the patsy for these phony neutrals as they rush to kiss Khrushchev's foot.

Maybe some of them will wake up now that Khrushchev has resumed polluting their air with radioactive material from nuclear tests. But this is doubtful.

Utopia Is Not in Sight—Editorial by Ray Ross in the Bellflower Enterprise Newspaper on Sunday, September 17, 1961, Bellflower (Los Angeles County), Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the following editorial which appeared in the Bellflower Enterprise, a very largely read and appreciated newspaper published in the important city of Bellflower, Los Angeles County, Calif.

Ray Ross, the name appearing at the bottom thereof, I inform you, Mr. Speaker, is the editor of this important newspaper of which Maurice Harris is the publisher.

I know you and all other Members of this great legislative body join me in complimenting Ray Ross on this lead editorial which points up and so powerfully emphasizes the "individual liberties" we enjoy. And in like manner emphasizes the pertinency of the recently observed Constitution Week, September 17–23, 1961.

UTOPIA IS NOT IN SIGHT

It is fitting and proper that this country pay tribute to the Constitution which gives us the basic rights and freedoms that set us apart from other nations of the world.

In spite of the fact that the Federal Constitution has been criticized as outmoded, and some claim that it has become passe in the development of modern ideology, no other nation has developed a document which gives more individual freedom and at the same time binds individuals together in the pursuit of happiness.

Yet there are those who say we should relinquish our liberties and transfer our sovereignty to a world government under which all men would be free.

We admit that it would be a marvelous achievement for individuals of all nations of the world to have the individual freedoms we enjoy, but the time is not yet ripe for this to take place.

Surrendering our constitutional rights at this time would mean that Soviet Russia would have as much to say about our individual freedoms as would our own country, and at the same time, surrendering our freedoms would not grant individual liberties in the Soviet Union. By no form of idealized rationalization can there be a communism of freedoms. Tyranny and freedom will not mix.

Working toward world peace and freedom on a supranational basis, within the framework of our Constitution, is noble. But to surrender one iota of individual liberty would be a step backward, not forward.

The time may come when we can surrender our sovereignty to a world government, but that time will not arrive until all the major powers of the world have constitutions that equal or better our own Constitution.

Such a utopia is not within sight.

Until that utopia arrives, may almighty God grant us the grace and may our United States Constitution grant us the rights, to retain the individual liberties we enjoy during Constitution Week, September 17–23, 1961.

RAY ROSS.

Arms Control Act of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, late on Tuesday afternoon, September 19, it was necessary for me to leave Washington to observe the high holiday of Yom Kippur. Therefore, I missed the vote on H.R. 9118, the Arms Control Act of 1961, which took place that evening.

Because of my deep-rooted interest in this legislation, I very much regretted the fact that I could not be present for the vote. While I had every confidence the measure would pass, I arranged before leaving Washington for a live pair to record my support of it.

In the opening month of the 87th Congress I introduced H.R. 3351, providing for the establishment of a National Peace Agency. Later, after a conference at the White House with President Kennedy and his special adviser on disarmament, John J. McCloy, and other colleagues of the Congress, I introduced H.R. 7966, to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. On August 10, 1961, I was pleased to receive the following letter from the Honorable John J. McCloy concerning the matter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 10, 1961.

The Honorable HERMAN TOLL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TOLL: As you may know, I just returned a few days ago from Moscow where I spent 2 weeks of discussions with the Soviets preparatory to the resumption of multilateral disarmament negotiations.

I am somewhat delayed, therefore, in sending you this note of thanks for your cosponsorship of the bill to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. It is very encouraging to me to

know of your interest in this vital subject and your willingness to cosponsor legislation affecting it. I believe it is extremely important that the Congress enact the bill this session for it is essential that we prepare ourselves to deal with disarmament problems of the future in an efficient and expeditious manner.

I am hopeful that I shall have an opportunity to discuss this matter further with you. In the meantime, if there is any information I or any member of my staff can furnish you about aspects of the legislation or issues involved in formulating U.S. disarmament proposals, we shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

The bill, known as the Arms Control Act of 1961, H.R. 9118, which was passed by the House of Representatives, has the same objectives as the two bills referred to above, which I introduced.

The Berlin situation has taken attention away from the significant action of the present Congress in the quest for peace. President Kennedy, in urging the passage of legislation to establish a disarmament agency, said:

A disarmament program must take into account the national security, our foreign policy, the relationships of this country to international peacekeeping agencies, including the United Nations, and our domestic, economic, and other policies. It should drive toward the creation of a peaceful world society in which disarmament, except for the forces needed to apply international sanctions, is the accepted condition of international life.

Certainly the establishment of the Arms Control Agency is a big step in the right direction. I sincerely hope that sufficient money is appropriated to make the Agency effective. It could mean the difference between war and peace.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include my newsletter, Washington Report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

SEPTEMBER 23, 1961.

The grave problems facing this Nation have not been and are not being solved. Congress, under a Democratic leadership continuously since 1955, has made little progress in meeting the situations threatening our free way of life. The Kennedy administration, with its emphasis on Federal planning and an expanded welfare state, have aggravated, not moved toward a solution of the problems. To emphasize our failure to meet the challenge of this day, I am reprinting here my newsletter of February 15, 1958, in part. Note, the problems are the same, we have merely moved farther along the road to socialism.

Just where are we, legislatively speaking? New legislation is proposed with too little emphasis on the study, correction or elimination of existing laws. I propose now (too briefly, but there's a space limitation) to mention some problems that won't go away, that must be solved. Yardsticks handy for reference might be twofold: (1) What is the constitutional authority? (2) Is individual initiative, incentive, and freedom fostered or hurt?

To solve problems, first the problems must be recognized:

(1) Taxation: We now have in effect a full-flowered Communist type—a progressively graduated confiscatory redistribution of private property which dampens the desire and ability to save and invest.

(2) The Congress: Delegation of authority to other branches of Government continues, mainly to the executive, the administrative branch.

(3) The Executive: Increasing administrative and executive responsibilities create a man-killing job, terrifically expands administrative personnel, and results in inefficient administration of laws.

(4) The Supreme Court: The Court frequently and erroneously interprets the "intent" of Congress (which Congress then fails to correct) and "reinterprets" the Constitution.

(5) The budget system: The huge growth of Federal Government buries from congressional prying eyes agencies "padding" monetary needs in order to offset anticipated cuts, thus perpetuating growth of the bureaucracy.

(6) The civil service: (a twofold problem): The well-entrenched bureucracy nurtures: (a) Some (many?) Government workers intent mainly, if not only, in self-advancement to a higher rating; and (b) Those who distort administration directives to conform to their own political beliefs.

(7) Secrecy: Confidential information, vital to the U.S. defense effort, when denied Congressmen, upsets the entire system of a representative form of government, a modern dilemma.

(8) Security: We must ferret out "subversives" in a free and complacent society, yet without character damage of the innocent, another dilemma.

(9) Foreign affairs: The conduct of the United States, a sovereign Federal Government of 48 States, (now 50) in world leadership is a balance between "isolationism" and "one-worldism," posing difficult questions of constitutionality in our action.

(10) Foreign aid: The waste, the payment of others' debts and taxes, the subsidizing of socialistic and communistic governments, the failure to convey U.S. ideas by dollars—all remind us this problem can bankrupt us.

(11) Trade: A quandry, lower tariff barriers for free trade, building business and friendship abroad, yet protect domestic U.S. industry with high wage rates which cannot compete with other nations' lower production costs.

(12) Labor: The monopolistic power of labor unions, the dictatorial power of union leaders; the replacement of collective bargaining by legislative fiat, the violence and property damage in strikes and picketing, and the loss of individual protection and freedom—these could ultimately destroy our society.

(13) Socialism—U.S. style: (a) Federal public housing (political housing): Costly to the taxpayer, kills incentive, favoritism (who gets housing or not); (b) Aid to education: Federal aid is followed by Federal control—of teachers, what is taught, and who gets the money (see current bill). (c) Government loans: Favors a select few, at the expense of all taxpayers, competes with and defeats private business, just a few of its many ill effects. (d) Public power development: Again, all pay for the benefit of a few, while private power does a more economical job, arranges its own financing and pays taxes. States rights and free enterprise take a shellacking. (e) Federal reclamation: This program reclaims land (while we're retiring land in the soil bank) through unsound business methods, an unfair burden to the taxpayers. (f) Grants-in-aid: Taxpayers' money from pocket to Washington and back to the State and locality is a form of Federal bribery in exchange for States rights, often abetted by the States themselves (it would be comical if not so dangerous). (g) Agriculture: The farm price supports, controls, and surplus stockpiles hurt both farmer (loses independence) and consumer who pays twice (taxes and at store). Offered as alleged corrective legislation, they further upset the free market and are self-defeating.

Other basic problems: (1) Minority pressure groups: Loss of the viewpoint of the overall national good in favor of special self-interest programs, coupled with the threat of giving or withholding votes in the next election for elected officials, can ultimately bankrupt us financially and morally. (2) Republicans versus Democrats: With liberals and conservatives in each party, party programs are often not clear-cut, real alternative solutions to problems are not presented, instead only different degrees of the same philosophy.

The greatest problem, then and now, is the world war of the Communists against the free nations. In this war we, the free nations, are losing through subversion and infiltration. The United Nations continues to undermine the free nations and the United States, their leader. Militarily, our continuing problem is our failure to recognize that the all-important underlying factor of U.S. strength is our free enterprise economy, any weakening of which weakens our military posture.

The answer to all our problems lies in our own hands—to be solved through knowledge, self-discipline, and courage.

NEWSLETTER INDEX, 1961

For your convenience, in the event you would like to keep a permanent file of my weekly Washington Report, this index is included with the final newsletter for this year. The reports will be issued again when Congress reconvenes.

January 7, 1961. 87th Congress convenes—legislative program.

January 14, 1961. State of the Union message—analysis.

January 20, 1961. Budget message—economic report.

January 28, 1961. Rules Committee change.

February 4, 1961. President Kennedy state of the Union message—analysis.

February 11, 1961. Further Presidential messages discussed.

February 18, 1961. Individual freedom in our society.

February 25, 1961. Unemployment compensation—aid to dependent children.

March 4, 1961. Criticism of unemployment compensation bill.

March 11, 1961. Third supplemental appropriation—Ways and Means Committee schedule.

March 18, 1961. Highway program.

March 25, 1961. New Frontier legislative program.

April 1, 1961. Depressed areas redevelopment bill.

April 15, 1961. Dallas Federal building correspondence.

April 22, 1961. Omnibus judgeship bill.

April 29, 1961. Six hundred million dollars aid for Latin America.

May 6, 1961. First 100 days of Kennedy administration.

May 13, 1961. Toward dictatorship.

May 20, 1961. Freedom endangered by fear.

May 27, 1961. Cuban fiasco.

June 3, 1961. Cuban tractor deal. Senator TOWER reception.

June 10, 1961. Extension Korean war excise taxes.
June 17, 1961. Public Works defeats Federal building. TOWER sworn in.
June 24, 1961. The Housing Act of 1961.
July 1, 1961. Floor debate on Federal building—defense appropriation.
July 8, 1961. Concerns of the Nation on Independence Day.
July 15, 1961. WALTER JUDD against Communist appeasement.
July 22, 1961. New Frontier increasing cost of Government.
July 29, 1961. The Berlin Crisis—President's address.
August 5, 1961. A correct military and economic policy.
August 12, 1961. Policy to defeat communism.
August 19, 1961. Foreign aid.
August 26, 1961. Suicide, not defeat—primer of self-destruction.
September 2, 1961. The enemy without and within the United States.
September 9, 1961. Foreign aid appropriation.
September 16, 1961. Peace Corps approved.
September 22, 1961. Socialism—U.S. style—unsolved problems.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A New Panama?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following article, published on September 17, 1961, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for purposes of future reference. It will be interesting to compare the contents of this article with events that are likely to take place in the not distant future.

The article follows:

PANAMA CEASES HATING THE UNITED STATES

(By Jules Dubois)

PANAMA CITY.—There has been a miracle in diplomacy here. In little more than a year, hate-America agitation has diminished to an occasional small Communist rally.

Two years ago, U.S. troops with fixed bayonets behind barbed wire barricades at the Canal Zone boundary had to repel frenzied Panamanian demonstrators. Americans living in the Canal Zone remained on their side of the line. Panamanians would not venture into the zone.

Now all that is changed. There is continual fraternization on both sides of the lines. The attacks against the United States which used to be daily fodder in some of the newspapers and over the radio have disappeared.

This situation began to take shape last year when President Eisenhower ordered a complete shakeup of the diplomatic and military commands here and directed that a new look in relations with Panama be made a reality.

Chosen for the top diplomatic post was a noncareer Ambassador, Joseph Farland, a Republican. A former FBI special agent, Farland did such a commendable job that the Panamanians persuaded President Kennedy to retain him.

Farland works closely with Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, Governor of the Canal Zone; Lt. Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, commanding the Caribbean Command; Maj. Gen. Theodore F. Bogart, commanding the U.S. Army, Caribbean, and Rear Adm. Richard S. Craighill, commandant of the 15th Naval District.

They have proved to be an unbeatable team in the difficult and delicate task of maintaining good relations with the volatile and highly emotional Panamanians.

When one talks to Panamanians and old-time American residents about the changed situation, two names emerge. One is "Farland" and the other is "Bogart."

Bogart initiated Operation Friendship, his own fraternization plan, when he reported for duty at Fort Amador a year ago. That it has been a success was illustrated by the fact that for the first time, the Newspapermen's Association of Panama honored an American general from the Canal Zone.

Bogart was guest of honor at a reception given at the Panama Press Club. And his hosts invited people from all walks of life in Panama to attend.

Farland has stumped the provinces in shirt-sleeve diplomacy. Mrs. Farland has accompanied him on most of the trips.

There have been other reasons for the improvement in relations. President Eisenhower ordered the Panamanian flag flown in the Canal Zone to satisfy Panama's claim to titular sovereignty over the 50-miles-long, 10-mile wide strip under U.S. jurisdiction.

Panamanians may never be entirely satisfied by this one gesture, but it served to quiet agitation in which Communist agents of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro played a role alongside extreme nationalists here 2 years ago.

The United States has consummated the last obligation under the 1955 treaty by delivering to the Panama Government the Colon railroad station. This completed delivery of $28 million worth of lands in Panama City and Colon that were owned by the Panama Railroad Company.

(President Roberto F. Chiari said last week, however, according to the Associated Press, that he would seek total revision of the treaty at what he called an opportune time. He said the Panamanians feel that the present $1.9 million annual annuity from the United States is not sufficient compensation for the 500-square-mile Canal Zone bisecting the country.)

There is, of course, contention stirred up by Communists, especially in the Panama City Council. Its president is Alvaro Menendez Franco, a Communist.

Panamanians have organized their own group to fight the Communists. Whenever the Reds plan a rally, the anti-Communists show up with a truth squad armed with sticks and iron bars.

How To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am often asked by individuals and organizations "What can we do to help in the battle against communism? What can we do to help defeat the Communist conspiracy that aims to conquer the world?"

Mr. President, it is not always easy to answer this question. But the answer is a tremendously important one because the battle against communism is truly challenging and truly demands the best that every American citizen can bring to it. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix to the RECORD one set of answers to the question, "How to fight communism." These answers are thought provoking and worth consideration by every single citizen, not only of the United States, but of all free-world countries which are struggling to defeat the aggressor. This article appeared in the Rochester Times Union where it was reprinted from the Miami Herald. I believe these two articles deserve real attention.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW YOU CAN FIGHT COMMUNISM

(By Jeanne Bellamy)

America's chance of beating communism depends on you.

"Why me?" you may ask.

Because the strength of any free nation springs from the stamina and patriotism of its people.

There are about 183 million men, women, and children in the United States. Each is like one link in the chain-mail armor of national defense against outside attack and subversion within. Each is like a molecule of steel in a sword, our country's power to overcome its enemies.

National character, like an object, is only as strong as its weakest point.

It's useless to wag our heads and complain that "So-and-so isn't doing his share to combat communism." That way lies the Red trap of suspicion and division among ourselves.

The Communists—if they believe what they say—consider us soft, weak, and corrupt. They think we have lost the spirit which moved Patrick Henry to shout: "Give me liberty or give me death."

Nor do they respect our belief in individual responsibility. They look on 183 million Americans as on their 700 million Chinese slaves—as faceless masses, to be manipulated by clever Communist bosses.

So the finger points to each of us. What are we doing about it? What are you doing?

Each of us must rise to new heights if our country is to stand united and unconquerable.

Here is a little checklist to help you rate the strength of your link in America's defense against today's barbarians:

Are you strong and healthy? Do you eat right, sleep well and get enough exercise to keep a sound mind in a sound body?

Do you give a full day's work for a full day's pay?

Are you honorable in your dealings? Do you shun shady practices in work, business or personal affairs?

Do you keep informed on what's happening in your community, State, Nation and the rest of the world? Do you commend your elected Representatives for good decisions and scold them when you think they have erred?

Do you obey the law?

Have you read the U.S. Constitution lately? Do you know your liberties under the Bill of Rights, and the duties that go with them?

Do you vote in all elections for which you are eligible?

Do you serve on juries when called?

Are you loyal to the United States and proud of it? Do you show respect for the flag and the national anthem, and encourage others to do likewise?

Do you really do unto others as you would have them do unto you, in traffic, at home, wherever you are?

Do you use your right to worship God as you choose?

If your answer to all these questions is "yes," you are doing your part to make America strong.

This is not to say that every American must be superhuman. We can hate, too. Hating evil is as much a mainspring for right

action as fighting for something good. We can do both.

The Communists use hatred to destroy us, cynically fabricating it out of lies and false insinuations. Their wicked doctrine deserves to be hated. All we have to do is tell the truth about communism.

The Reds cannot prevail against 183 million Americans who are incorruptible and live by our national motto: "In God We Trust." That is their undoing—a faith and dedication better than theirs.

You can be sure that communism isn't going to vanish overnight like a bad dream. It is real, entrenched and vicious. Turning the tide against it will be a long, hard job. Are you ready to start?

DO YOU PLAY INTÓ REDS' HANDS? BEWARE OF BOOBYTRAPS

Do you look upon any group of your fellow Americans with dislike or suspicion? If so, watch out. Communists are working to widen every tiny split among citizens of the United States.

Divide and conquer is their aim.

They will use any trick to turn us against one another. They are busy day and night to get us fighting among ourselves.

They use words as dumdum bullets. You may never know what hit you until you're boiling with hate, ready for violence. That's what the Communists want. Then, they figure, they can move in and enslave us all without firing a shot.

Sidestep Communist boobytraps. They can't hurt you when you know they're there. Learn about the tireless efforts of Communists to conquer the United States.

Hope for the Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in these closing hours of this session of the 87th Congress, I would like to briefly call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the distinct turn of the tide with respect to the saving of the Indiana dunes. Recent developments now make it apparent that there is good hope that our long battle to save significant portions of this beautiful recreation and scientific area as a national park may at last be successful.

An editorial in today's edition of the New York Times briefly summarizes the developments which indicate that we are approaching success and it states again the editorial view of this great newspaper that the whole Nation will benefit and be grateful if this irreplaceable and unique area is preserved.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the New York Times for its consistent aid in making clear the national importance of this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1961]

HOPE FOR THE DUNES

The conservationists in the Midwest and in Congress who have waged a long and sometimes discouraging battle to save the Indiana Dunes appear at last to be gaining ground. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and a group of cosponsors have introduced new legislation to establish an "Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore." They borrowed from the Cape Cod and Point Reyes bills, writing in features to meet some of the local opposition but encompassing a larger area than the earlier bills.

There are indications also that a new site may be found for the deepwater port that the Corps of Engineers and some steel companies wanted to see constructed in the midst of the remaining dunes. Representative MADDEN, an influential Congressman, wants the port constructed farther west and favors a plan like the Douglas bill indicating a break in the former opposition of leading Indiana politicians.

If the remarkable scenic, scientific and recreational resources of the Indiana Dunes are preserved for public use, millions of citizens in the crowded industrial areas of northern Illinois and Indiana will be particularly benefited and the whole Nation will be grateful.

A Full-Time Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the public acceptance of the full-time Disarmament Agency is well expressed by Marquis Childs in an article which appeared yesterday in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. I hope that the Members will read this fine editorial:

A FULL-TIME DISARMAMENT AGENCY—PIONEERING EFFORT IN INTEREST OF PEACE BECOMES FACT

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—A ray of hope, thin as it must seem in the encircling gloom, is a possible potent that the storm of conflict will subside and the world will survive. Congress has approved a U.S. Disarmament Agency that will devote itself wholly to the search for peace.

While it is a small olive branch—$10 million provided for administration and research into methods for arms control and paths to agreement on a future peace—this is nevertheless a beginning. The new Agency will be within the Department of State, but nevertheless will have a certain autonomy.

The expectation is that it will be headed by William C. Foster, who has proved his abilities in several difficult negotiating assignments and as President Truman's Deputy Secretary of Defense.

President Kennedy's current principal adviser on disarmament, John J. McCloy, who became in his months in Washington a convert to the desperate need to find a way out of the jungle of nuclear arms, wants to return to New York. McCloy has some able assistants who will be the nucleus of the new Agency.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

Again and again in his campaign a year ago, candidate Kennedy talked about how few people—less than a hundred was the figure he used—in the vast Federal bureaucracy were giving their full time and effort to the search for peace. This was in contrast to the millions of men and women in Government and in industry and the many billions of dollars given over to the multiplication of arms in the defense effort.

A disarmament agency, responsible to the President as well as the Secretary of State, was a campaign pledge on which the President has now made good. So is the Peace Corps, which in a small way—in a sense a token fashion—stands for the kind of sacrifices that as candidate and in his inaugural address the President called for. The 2,700 young people who will go to various countries to contribute their skills are making genuine sacrifices.

Appraisal of the Kennedy record in the session of Congress now concluding is inevitably made against the backdrop of the fearful demands of the moment. Judged by the standards of normal times, these two measures would be considered major steps forward. They are profiteering efforts and with diligence and good luck they can mean much for the future.

PASSAGE A SURPRISE

It was not initially in the cards that the Disarmament Agency would get by Congress. In fact, a combination of indifference and covert hostility seemed likely to kill the proposal. As the measure passed the Senate the President admitted to his astonishment.

"There was a time," he said, "when I thought this had about as much chance of getting by as we have of getting to the moon next week."

He was talking to Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, majority whip of the Senate, who has been one of the President's most loyal and at the same time discreet lieutenants. Both the disarmament agency and the Peace Corps owe a great deal to his efforts.

HUMPHREY'S ROLE

In the long and often-troubled history of Presidential friendships, loyalty and discretion stand high on the plus side. One of the faults for which HUMPHREY was most often criticised in the past was a seemingly incurable gift of gab. He could and would talk 300 words to the minute on almost any subject under the sun.

The Senator now has developed in recent months a gift for silence at the right times, which is part of a maturity that has greatly enhanced his usefulness.

During his trip to Berlin in July, which he took on his own initiative. Senator HUMPHREY made a determined effort to stir discussion of the need for constructive proposals that would not leave the West merely reacting to the action of the Soviets. He worked hard to marshal support for the new disarmament agency.

Among the military witnesses to testify to the need for such an agency was General Eisenhower, who as President for 8 years knew at firsthand how limited and how often hamstrung was the work of the few men delegated to explore the ways to peace.

The Land: God's Greatest Gift to Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the address of the Most Reverend Peter W. Bartholme, bishop of St. Cloud, at the banquet session of Plowville, U.S.A. This national plowing contest was held in my district this year at Melrose, Minn., and Bishop Bartholme's message is indeed a major statement on national agricultural policy.

Bishop Bartholme is a former president of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and episcopal moderator of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Family Life Bureau. He is deservedly recognized as a leading Catholic spokesman in the field of rural life. His genuine interest in agricultural and particularly in the family-size farm and farm family life is manifested in all of his activities. His message deserves the serious consideration of the Congress:

THE LAND, GOD'S GREATEST GIFT TO MAN

(Address by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Peter W. Bartholome, D.D., bishop of St. Cloud, Minn., on Sept. 15, 1961, at Plowville, U.S.A., Melrose, Minn.)

Plowville is a practical demonstration of the interest of people in the land. Each year it attracts national attention and, therefore, it becomes a very important event in the life of the Nation for it draws to the attention of the people of the country the importance of the land in human affairs and, no doubt, inspires those who actively take part, as well as men and women of the Nation who are directly or indirectly engaged in soil conservation, with greater reverence and appreciation for the land.

The land is God's greatest gift to mankind. Everything in human affairs depends on the land. Out of the land the body of man was fashioned and on it man depends for his continued existence in this world. By the land man lives and breathes. For its products he expends his life's energy. Industry and commerce, in all of its phases, depend on the land. The land is basic to all of the activities of the human race. Through the land man is best able to work up to the fullest development of his nature as created by God. On the land man is closest to God's creation and, therefore, is enabled with greater facility to work out his external destiny. At the end of his life, the body of man again returns to and becomes identified with the land. Truly, there seems to be no other relationship so intimate as that of man with the land.

The history of nations very clearly teaches us that the land as land, is the greatest good of the state, the family and the individual. When man fell from grace the land, too, suffered and since that time the land has become an intricate and disturbing factor in its possession. Greed for land has disturbed the peace of the world through history. The varied productivity of the land has unbalanced the economy of nations. The lust for wealth has brought about an inequitable distribution of the land with the resulting depletion of the fertility of the soil. Slavery, as an institution in history, was intimately bound up with the greed of men for the land.

We are living in a very disturbed world at the present time, economically, politically and socially. A good deal of that disturbance is due to the inequitable distribution of the ownership of land. In all of the nations in the world at the present time that are in a state of confusion and who do not seem to be able to reach orderly government, you will find on close observation that their basic trouble is the inequity found in the ownership of land in these countries. In all of the countries south of the Rio Grande the fundamental problem is an agricultural problem. Large land ownership has created serfdom and poverty, depletion of the fertility of the soil. This is true in all of the countries of Asia. We even found this behind the Iron Curtain. Africa's problem is mainly a problem of the land, its ownership and its cultivation. You, no doubt, have noticed that in the past 50 years the forces of communism have recognized this fact and whenever they wish to penetrate into any country to take over its government, their first program which enables them to succeed in these countries is a call for agrarian reform. This happened in Russia, in China, in the countries immediately behind the Iron Curtain. Within the last few years the slogan call of Castro was agrarian reform, promising ownership of land to the poor and downtrodden. This same propaganda is being used in the countries of South America. This indicates quite clearly that the Communists are more alert to the basic problem than to the free Western Nations as to the importance of the land and to the desire that is found in the human heart to possess a few acres for himself. The Communists have never measured up to their promises in any country. Instead of the distribution of the land to the needy people as they had promised, the State became the land holder and owner and the situation went from bad to worse. Our Government is sending money in the million and billions to these nations. It would be much better if the money were earmarked by us to develop the resources of the land in these countries so that people would have enough to eat.

In the United States of America during the past two centuries we found an ideal situation as far as ownership of land is concerned. The family farm which gave life and strength to our Nation, which developed independence, character, and free citizens has been our agricultural pattern during these years. At the present moment, however, there is a danger in our country that we are forgetting the importance of the family farm in the life of our Nation. Farming is fast becoming a commercial venture. Farmers are moving off the land. There are fewer than 5 million farm operators in this country supplying 180 million fellow-citizens with vast unused surpluses.

Our agricultural output is outracing the increase in population. From 1950 to 1960 the population of America went up 19 percent; farm production went up 27 percent. Another factor that is working against the family farm is the greater efficiency in production which, in turn, is due to mechanization, better education, and training in farming. This seems to entice corporations and businessmen and professional men so that we are witnessing at the present time a change of thinking as well as a change in the actual operation of a farm and its ownership.

Farming has, indeed, come a long way in the United States of America in its productive development. Gradually men are beginning to look upon farming more and more as a way of making a living and securing profits rather than as a way of life. In many areas it can no longer be called agriculture but, perhaps, should be called agri-business. Naturally, as the face of American farming undergoes these radical and drastic changes, one must express doubt about the wisdom of these new developments and a few questions might be asked.

Can America afford to destroy the family-sized farm? Can America afford to continue to ignore, in its legislation on a national and State level, the necessity of the family farm in the life of the Nation? I answer these questions in the negative. The future of America and its strength, freedom, and vitality depend in largest measure on the family-sized farm which has made this country strong and great.

As one reads the current literature on agriculture, hardly any mention is made of the family-sized farm. The thinking expressed is that the family-sized farm is doomed to oblivion. In this materialistic world in which we are living, the spiritual and moral values are spurned and the only thing that seems to count in agriculture at the present time is profits, more production, efficiency. That is even the thinking of some soil conservationists.

The land is not a commercial product. It is a living thing, a creation of God, and has qualities and properties and purposes that are not, and cannot be, evaluated in terms of dollars and cents.

Our Department of Agriculture in Washington is not thinking in the terms of the family-sized farm. Our agricultural legislation programs are geared to the materialistic economy of the Nation and the deeper values found in farming are ignored. As a result the legislation that is evolved in most instances is destructive of the family-sized farm.

I recommend that a bureau be set up in the Department of Agriculture that will study the Christian philosophy of the land and through that thinking, which is basic to Christian civilization, laws and programs be evolved that will foster the family-sized farm in the United States of America. I realize that this is swimming against the tide, but there must be a few voices raised that will alert us all to the dangerous trends into which agriculture is falling at the present time.

The soil bank is a glaring example of the way the Government at the present time is ignoring the problem of the land and the family-sized farm. Plowville is being conducted in an area this year where more than 50 percent of the population is actually living on the land, where the family-sized farm is thriving and in existence. I have seen many family-sized farms of 200 acres or so that are productive, efficient, where the family is making money in a moderate degree and where a family is being raised with the dignity, independence, freedom, the spirit of sacrifice—all qualities so necessary in American life today.

Not too far away from Plowville 1961, however, larger land holdings is in vogue. I drove through an area just 2 weeks ago where the farmers owned 500 to 1,000 or more acres. For 15 miles in this area most of the farm buildings were abandoned or, if there were people living in the house, there were no other living things around the yard. All that I saw was farm machinery in the yard exposed to the weather. The one who was driving my car said, "Isn't this a desolate section of the diocese?" I said, "What do you mean? This is the Red River Valley. The soil is rich. The crops are good." Nevertheless, he was right. It was a desolate 15 miles, for there were no living things, living a way of life with dignity and with freedom.

This is what is happening in the United States of America in its agriculture. We might well give pause, for if we do not we will become an industrial nation, pure and simple. Industry has not roots. Industry only is looking for profits and greater production. Industry has no respect for the dignity of man and his rights.

The commercial farmer is interested only in soil conservation because through this means he can increase his profits in the ownership of that land. The family on the farm loves the land. It lives by it and through it. It raises not only products for men to live by but it rears men and women with a sense of responsibility, with a spirit of sacrifice, with adherence to duty, with a love for work, with a deep understanding of God's creation for He is intimately associated with it. These are the necessities of the day.

The greater leaders of nations of the past and of today, the great leaders of industry in many instances, come from the land. A great railroad man of the Northwest, James J. Hill, important in the development of a railroad, is imputed to have said that "land without people is a wilderness and people without land is a mob."

It happens at this particular time that we have in Rome a farmer, a Pope. His brothers and sisters live on small farms in northern Italy. A few weeks ago he wrote a great

letter to the world on the social problems of the human race in the 20th century. In it he devoted considerable space to agriculture. Pope John is a realist. He enumerates the problems of agriculture in the world at large, some of which apply to this Nation, namely, the flight to the city, the low standard of living in rural areas throughout the world, the disproportion of economic recompense for the farmer, the lack of modern conveniences in many rural areas throughout the world—not so much in the United States—the necessity of a larger outlay of capital on the part of the farmer as compared to the city worker, the inability of the distribution agencies, especially in our country, to distribute the produce of the farm, and the gradual disappearance of the family farm. These are the problems he enumerated.

The Pope goes on to say, "It is not possible to determine what the structure of farm life should be because of the diversity of the rural conditions in each political community, not to mention the immense difference obtaining between the nations of the world. But if we hold to a human and Christian concept of man and the family, we are forced to consider as an ideal that community of persons operating on internal relations and whose structure is formed according to the demands of justice and the principles stated above, and still more, enterprises of family size. With these in mind we should exert every effort to realize one or the other, as far as circumstances permit."

Pope John advocates very strongly associations formed amongst farmers to promote their material and spiritual welfare. He recommends that rural workers should feel a sense of solidarity one with another, and should unite to form cooperative and professional associations, which are necessary if they are to benefit from scientific and technical progress in methods of production. They need to organize, he says, to have a voice in political circles as well as in organs of public administration. He advocates an establishment of effective price regulations to protect the prices of farm products. He thinks that this regulation should primarily be the work of the farmer, though he will admit that supervision by public authority is necessary. He strongly recommends an equitable basis for credit for farmers, especially young farmers who are taking on the vocation of farming, so as to make it possible for them to perpetuate the family farm.

Pope John firmly believes that it is necessary for farmers today to have a sense of vocation to farming, to love the soil. He goes on to say in his recent encyclical "In the work on the farm the human personality finds numerous incentives for self-expression, for self-development, for enrichment and for growth even in regard to spiritual values. Therefore, it is a work which is conceived and lived both as a vocation and as a mission. It can be considered as an answer to God's call to actuate His providential plan in history. It may also be considered as a noble undertaking to elevate oneself and others and as a contribution to human civilization."

The soil conservationists of America, in my opinion, know and understand the importance of the land in the life of a nation. They love the land. It is only when we can maintain and understand the dignity of the farmer who deals with the land and the important place that he occupies in the life of a nation that a nation remains strong.

There must never be a monopoly in the ownership of land in the United States of America. If that should ever take place, the land no longer becomes an object of love but of cold exploitation. When there is monopoly in land holding, land is made to produce only for speculation while the people suffer hunger and the national economy becomes exhausted. This perversion of private, rural property is very harmful.

It is very necessary, therefore, that the soil conservationists of America, the farm organizations the Department of Agriculture, keep always in mind in their planning, in their legislation, and in their programs of action the importance of the family sized farm, not merely in the economy of a nation but in the development of its spiritual, moral strength, and in the retention of independence and freedom that we Americans so highly prize.

West Virginia, Land of Scenic Beauty, Is in Festive Mood; and Its "Big Ear" Is Eavesdropping on the Universe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on September 20, 1961, I was privileged to have had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with Samuel Shaffer, the congressional correspondent of Newsweek magazine, who is an experienced traveler and observer.

Mr. Shaffer, in a letter to me following a month-long vacation with his family in the State parks of West Virginia, had written that "the beauty of the parks, the dedication of duty and the courtesy to visitors displayed by park personnel far, far exceeded my expectations." And he had also written that, in driving along West Virginia "back country roads, I beheld breathtaking vistas for which I was wholly unprepared. I think the time will surely come when Americans will think of the State as one of the most beautiful in the Union, as it unquestionably is. West Virginia has a great future in tourism."

Earlier, on September 15, 1961, I received unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a highly perceptive article by Jack Jonas, travel editor of the Washington Star, in which he described the facilities, the charm, and the natural scenic values of West Virginia's Black Water Falls State Park.

Now, Mr. President, I am reminded that the August 1961, issue of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine, features "the trend to weekend vacations," and lists among its featured six weekend tours, Blackwater Falls State Park, W. Va., which it describes as being "from Washington, D.C., a distance of about 215 miles through the wooded Appalachians—perhaps the finest new State park development in the East," and "also lies within 1 day's drive of Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Richmond. Pride of the park is the $1 million Blackwater Lodge ($11 double), which combines modern lodgings, excellent food, and proximity to outdoor wonders. Weekenders here can swim in summer, hike, ride, practice at the golf driving range, fish for trout in the Blackwater River, hunt deer in autumn, ski in nearby Canaan Valley in winter. Few people realize that West Virginia is a region of scenic beauty until they see for themselves. Portions of this highland park, elevation 3,000 feet, are very wild, a botanical region to delight and challenge enthusiasts of nature. The high points are the spectacular roaring cataract of Blackwater Falls and steep-walled Blackwater Canyon, several hundred feet above the river.

Indeed, Mr. President, there are currently in circulation a number of other periodicals in which the lore and the beauties of West Virginia are featured. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Festive West Virginia," from the September 1961 issue of Travel, the magazine that roams the globe; and an article, "The Big Ear," from the August 1961 issue of Ford Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(From Travel magazine, September 1961)

FESTIVE WEST VIRGINIA

(By Charles and Margaret Koehler)

Each fall the little mountaintop town of Kingwood, W. Va., which tallies a normal population of slightly less than 2,000, is beseiged for 3 days by some 100,000 visitors. Prompting this invasion is a unique event—the Preston County Buckwheat Festival, to be held September 28, 29 and 30 this year. The town ladies, all volunteers, are kept hustling from before sunup to way past sundown making and serving astronomical numbers of large, yeasty, light-as-a-feather buckwheat cakes laced with Preston County maple sirup. At the stately old red brick, Kingwood Inn, the white frame Oddfellows Hall on High Street, and in the big Community Building out on the fair grounds, hundreds stand in line at all hours waiting for the chance to buy a ticket, squeeze into an empty seat at a long table, and prove conculsively that even in this era of premix preparations old-fashioned pancakes are just as popular as they were in grandmother's day.

Meanwhile, there are parades, dances, horse shows, the Buckwheat Bowl football game and the coronation of Queen Ceres and King Buckwheat, with attendant festivities. At midnight on the third evening, fireworks cascading bright showers of gold, silver, red, blue, and green high over the heads of dazzled spectators put a giant pyrotechnical period to the festival. The crowds leave, the debris is cleaned up, and the happy citizens of Kingwood settle down—to prepare for next year's fete.

The buckwheat festival is typical of the fiesta spirit that runs rampant in the Mountain State a good 9 months of every year. West Virginians, notably industrious, play just as hard as they work, and they are great for celebrations. The State's annual calendar of events—better than one a week—includes fairs, festivals, shows, and exhibits honoring everything from rhododendrons and black walnuts to the creative arts.

For 15 years now, the West Virginia Industrial and Publicity Commission has been meticulously evaluating its tourist surveys to learn why visitors keep coming from as far as Maine, Alaska, California, Florida, and foreign countries the world around to visit their State. Their conclusion: the unsurpassed scenery which abounds at every turn of the road, and the warm, homespun hospitality of West Virginians. And from the famous Greenbrier Hotel at White Sulphur Springs to the spotless cabins in the State's many mountain parks, you'll find accommodations to your taste. Pleasantly, you'll pay less for your vacation than you would in better known resort areas. Though the

Greenbrier's rates are comparable with luxury hotels everywhere, a beautiful double room for two in the attractive stone lodge at Cacapon State Park near Berkeley Springs can be had for only $11 a night.

Berkeley Springs, incidentally, is the oldest spa in the United States, and was George Washington's favorite watering place. Washington, a local story has it, became enthusiastic about the springs because the water tasted so fresh and pure, completely lacking the medicinal flavor so evident in many mineral springs. He returned to the spa again and again, and prompted Lord Fairfax in 1776 to grant the land around the springs to the Colony of Virginia, with the proviso that the waters were "to be forever free to the public for the welfare of suffering humanity." Washington's "bath tub"—a rectangular hollow in the ground lined with rock and sand—may still be seen.

Festival time in West Virginia may tax the capacity of local hostelries but it is then that Mountain State cordiality shines forth, and local residents open up their homes, renting out rooms and apartments. For example, in Kingwood we rented a spacious top-floor apartment in the home of a local lady during the buckwheat festival for $45 for 3 days. And because she knew that restaurants would be crowded and we had our two small sons with us, she thoughtfully provided china and silver for four, offered us cereal, milk or anything else we wanted from her own pantry, and picked a fresh bowl of garden flowers to welcome us.

The festivals—generally lasting from 2 to 4 days—actually do represent an entire year of preparation on the part of the residents, and they're justly proud of their efforts. Gowns worn by the queens and princesses are made anew each year and the floats—miles and miles of them travel through West Virginia streets each year—are masterpieces of invention and colorful decoration.

Even at that, they can't rival the natural scenery in beauty, for nature dresses the mountains and valleys of this rugged little State with a particularly bountiful hand at each season of the year, beginning in the spring with the pastel touch of dogwoods and redbuds, merging into deeper color as summer comes with azalea and rhododendron, then blazing forth in the fall with the full gamut of an autumn palette.

Autumn in West Virginia is extremely spectacular, and in the vicinity of Elkins each October the fervent annual hope is that nature's timing will bring the color to its brightest for the Mountain State forest festival, biggest West Virginian spree of all, which is scheduled for October 5, 6, and 7.

Elkins is headquarters of the magnificent Monongahela National Forest. For some unforgettable scenery, drive out of the town along U.S. Highway 33, a road which winds through valleys and up and down mountains for 36 miles of constant panorama. The festival is held on the campus of Davis and Elkins College, highlighted by the crowning of Queen Sylvia, and spiced by a series of contests, most of them relating to forests and forest products.

Later in October—the 12th through 14th during 1961—comes the black walnut festival at Spencer, then on November 4 and 5, the big chrysanthemum show at Wheeling, and also in November, the Lewis County glass show at Weston. Glassblowing is at once a native art and a major industry throughout the Mountain State.

December ushers in the winter sports season—and here, too, West Virginia has begun to come into her own. They proudly call Bald Knob, a 3,400-foot mountain near Beckley, the East's most southern ski resort. Here—thanks to a bit of conniving between man and nature—the slopes are open from December until March, a combination of low temperature and some gadgets called Larchmont blizzard snow machines keeping more than 100 acres of mountainside in top shape for skiing throughout the winter season. The snow machines are put to use only when nature isn't quite lavish enough.

Besides the ski area at Bald Knob there are ski resorts at Cabin Mountain, Weiss Knob, Gregg Knob, and Chestnut Ridge, and several ski organizations currently are active. The annual winter carnival, which will be held at Davis during January 26, 27, and 28, sponsored by the Ski Club of Washington, D.C., has become the top winter sport event.

Spring ushers in gala times again, with the creative arts festival held at Charleston in April, followed by the West Virginia area band festivals in May at several different towns, the strawberry festival in June at Buckhannon, the rhododendron festival in June at Charleston, and the poultry festival in July at Moorefield, to name just a few of many. To obtain a complete list of the events in any season, drop a note to the West Virginia Department of Commerce, State Capitol, Charleston, for the latest information.

A quiet time in the mountains should be a part of any West Virginia vacation, and the State now boasts 29 State parks and forests, most of them with excellent lodgings and facilities. In all, they encompass 120,000 acres of virtually untouched primeval forest.

At Cacapon, Blackwater Falls, and Mont Chateau State Parks there are ultramodern lodges, de luxe cabins, and restaurants open all year. Good tent sites nestle in beautiful natural settings at all of the parks, with swimming, and fine fishing at most of them. Reservations for accommodations in the parks must be made through the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources' Division of State Parks at Charleston. From January 15 to February 15, applications are accepted only from West Virginia residents for the months of June, July, and August. But after February 15 requests are processed as received.

A drive which every visitor should experience is the spectacular trip across the 88-mile-long West Virginia Turnpike from Charleston at the north to Princeton at the south. The West Virginians call it their "highway through the clouds" and in many spots it almost literally becomes one. The road crosses the Alleghenies, traversing 76 bridges named for West Virginia war heroes, including Lt. Col. Charles E. Yeager, World War II ace who became the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound. Grades all along the turnpike are gentle.

Charleston, located in the Kanawha Valley region, is a city of some 83,000, and governs the affairs of the Mountain State. Some of the world's largest chemical companies have plants in its area. It is one of the few cities that has an airfield built on a hilltop. Kanawha Airport, 4 miles northeast of the capital, is 350 feet above the valley floor.

For a quick fill-in on West Virginia history, visit the Archives and History Museum in the beautiful State capital. Even better—take time to go by car, bus, train or plane to places such as Harper's Ferry, now a national monument, where John Brown's famous fort stands on the grounds of Storer College, or to George Washington's favored Berkeley Springs.

The past and the present, you'll find, merge in many ways in West Virginia. Indians who were mighty warriors—Cayugas, Cherokees, Senecas, and Susquehannas among them—lived on the land of the Mountain State for a known 8,000 years before the coming of the white man, and their legends are woven, in folklore, in West Virginia history.

Not long after the founding of Jamestown, colonists braved the towering Alleghenies, searching for a shortcut to the western ocean which they never found. In 1641 a scouting party discovered the New River, and in 1671, John Lederer, sent on an exploring mission by Gov. William Berkeley, reached a point near what is now called Harper's Ferry.

Then there were the wars—the early Indian wars and the Revolution, where West Virginia records that the last battle, the attack on Fort Henry, now Wheeling, was fought on Mountain State soil in 1782.

It was with the coming of Civil War that West Virginia broke from its mother State of Virginia to become sovereign, and was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863. Stories of John Brown and his famous raid on the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, and of Union Gen. Jesse Reno and Confederate Gen. Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson—both sons of West Virginia—have become part of West Virginia folklore too.

Then there are the stories of coal mines and the men who work them woven into legend too—and if you've ever wanted to see a coal mine in operation, you'll have your chance. Ask anyone in the town where you're staying to give you directions to a mine. In most places, you won't be far from one.

West Virginia may be a small State—30th in population and 41st in area—but it has a prodigious appetite when it comes to fun, frolic, and festivity.

[From Ford Times, August 1961]

THE BIG EAR—IN THE HUSH OF WEST VIRGINIA'S HILLS THEY ARE EAVESDROPPING ON THE UNIVERSE

(By Charles Harper)

Visit West Virginia's Deer Creek Valley and you find something you thought no longer existed east of the Mississippi—quiet. Then the peaceful lowing of cattle disturbs the tranquil air. You watch them browsing past a quaint old farmhouse into the shadow cast by a fantastic construction that appears to be part modern sculpture, part science fiction.

It is neither. This is the big ear, an 85-foot steerable aluminum dish supported by a base of equilateral triangles and aimed at the stars. It is the first of a group of radiotelescopes to be built at Green Bank, W. Wa., and it is here precisely because this is one of the quietest spots in Eastern United States.

Radio astronomy sprang from the electronic techniques developed during World War II. Radio astronomers do not look at or into something for results. They study charts which are records of electrical impulses raining upon earth from out of the cosmos. With telescopes like the big ear, the7 "see" many parts of the universe that are obscured from optical observation and "observe" physical and chemical actions on a scale impossible to duplicate in a laboratory.

But from the layman's point of view, the observatory's most exciting undertaking is Project Ozma. Aptly named for the queen of the land somewhere over the rainbow, Ozma is an attempt to detect radio transmissions from intelligent beings on other worlds. There are an estimated 100,000 million billion stars in the universe (or about as many as all the grains of sand on all the beaches of the world). Probably 1 in 10 has properties like those of our sun, including a satellite or two, so there are conservatively some 10,000 million billion planets. Many of them, scientists believe, must be capable of supporting life, and some may well have civilizations which equal or surpass ours in radio know-how. If they were trying to contact their distant neighbors, the theory goes, they would most likely use the frequency of 1420 megacycles, same as that of neutral hydrogen. They might guess that other radio-wise worlds had also discovered this

intergalactic wavelength and tuned in on it. We have.

The ideal radio astronomy site must have an extraordinarily low noise level—meaning few people and no electrical interference. Weather and climate must be moderate, yet location should permit observation of auroras and the Milky Way. The place chosen was Green Bank in Deer Creek Valley, only 200 miles from Washington, D.C., but insulated by surrounding mountains and guaranteed against radio interference or industrial development.

The ear, which weighs as much as a light destroyer, is a marvel of engineering and craftsmanship. Its tracking accuracy must be in 5 seconds of arc (place three hairs under one end of a 40-feet steel beam and you create 1 second of arc). The amount of electrical energy falling on the dish is fantastically minute, as faint as a millionth of a millionth of a millionth of a watt. Now under construction at Green Bank is a bigger ear, which will be the world's largest equatorially mounted radiotelescope.

Visitors are welcome at the observatory, reached on State Route 28, 30 miles north of Marlington, 50 miles south of Elkins. On Wednesdays through Sundays, an hour and a half tour starting at 2 p.m. includes a movie and lecture in the exhibit room and a visit to the ear. While there, listen to the silence. Even for big ears, it is hard to find nowadays.

Trade Agreements: A Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a serious look at our trade agreements legislation and particularly its administration.

I am particularly interested in the defense that our industries and workers have against imports when these threaten our market and our employment.

In recent years there has been a great increase in the competitive impact from abroad, for reasons that are already well know, such as the great industrial build-up abroad, the lower wages prevailing in other parts of the world compared with those of this country and the great increase in foreign productivity. This combination has produced relatively low costs and this in turn has led to ever greater penetration of our home market by foreign goods, particularly manufactured items.

The outlook, I am sorry to say, is not for an improvement in this competitive situation, but the opposite. As foreign productivity rises per man-hour as it is destined to do as more modern machinery replaces outmoded methods of production in the industrial countries, their competition will become sharper. Even if we should hold the wage level in its tracks in this country, the advantages would still lie with the other countries.

Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about it: talk about the United States itself joining the European Common Market or setting up a Free World Common Market, is not only unrealistic; it flies in the face of economic realities. Nothing would be more surely calculated to upset the economy of this country than such a move, or even a serious entertainment of it.

Our wages would be driven down; the pressure for automation would be so great that hundreds of thousands of workers would be eliminated from their jobs and the country would soon face a disastrous depression.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, right in the face of the worst competitive struggle that this country has ever faced, proposals are made that would expose our economy to a ruthless onslaught of low foreign costs such as we could not meet without cutting our wages in half. Our national income would drop precipitately; our tax payment to the Federal Government would shrink and we would find more and more of our industries emigrating to foreign shores. The trends is already well established.

Actually what we need is not greater exposure to a kind of competition that would be unlawful if it occurred in this country from domestic sources, because it would be based on wages far below our minimum and because it would involve practices that would reduce competition by running competitors out of business—what we need is not more of this type of foreign competition but an improvement in the domestic long-range outlook so that investment will be attracted into plant expansion, replacement of obsolescent machinery and other capital outlays that will employ more workers.

We do not beget that sort of an outlook when, after having reduced our tariffs, industries that see their domestic market progressively captured by imports, find themselves without a remedy.

What in good sense would induce such industries to expand their manufacturing capacity? Already they have more capacity than is needed to supply the domestic market.

Yet if such expansion is dampened down and discouraged in many industries, who will put to work the additional workers who appear on the scene each year, in the magnitude of about a million? In order to absorb these workers plus most of those who are already unemployed we need a healthy growth of our economy. No one has yet explained how this can be accomplished when industry after industry has become confronted with heavy import competition. Who would be so foolhardy as to expand his plant to manufacture an item when imports are taking an increasing share of the market for it?

Mr. Speaker, this is not all. Some of the previews of tariff and trade policies that are now being shaped indicate that this country will propose across-the-board tariff reductions next year in order to keep us in tune with the Common Market. With this short of prospect staring them in the face, how can we expect our import-vulnerable industries to look with confidence on the future?

These industries are not merely minor industries that we can sacrifice with impunity. Many of them are industries of national standing; and we must not labor under the illusion that industries that have not yet been stricken by imports will forever remain immune. In the past few years we have seen many hitherto import-immune industries come under the hammer. Very few industries can today be sure that they will not soon join the ranks of those that are stricken by import competition.

This is not to say that competition as such is undesirable. In this country of all countries we have taken a number of legislative and administrative steps dating back to 1890, the year of the Sherman Act, designed to assure not only competition but fairness of competition. We have the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act and the wage-and-hour law itself, all enacted for the purpose not only of maintaining competition but of assuring its fairness.

While competition is desirable, its desirability depends on its character. It may be destructive rather than salutary. That is why in the past 70 years we have regulated it.

From the nature of things we cannot legislate for other countries. We cannot pass wage-and-hour legislation for them. We cannot set up minimum wages for them.

All that we can do is to regulate the imports from them as the goods come into this country. We can impose a tariff or an import quota or both. In this way we can create something approaching fairness of competition.

In the past 27 years we have reduced our tariffs by a full 80 percent. The 20 percent that is left is too low to regulate many of our imports. In some instances it becomes necessary to use import quotas to keep imports from taking over the entire domestic market or the greater part of it. In other instances it may be possible to allow a stated volume of imports to come in at a low tariff rate and then putting on a higher rate on all imports above that volume.

What we face today, however, is not simply the question of regulating imports to assure fairness of competition, but a reluctance of the executive branch of the Government to place any restrictions on imports, even when such restrictions are recommended by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause.

It is this reluctance that confronts American industry today as it faces increasingly difficult import competition. If it could be sure of relief when hard pressed by what under domestic conditions could only be described as unfair competition, it could look to the future with confidence. It could expand at least enough to keep pace with rising consumption. Thus it would do its share in employing the jobless and the new workers coming on the scene each year.

In the absence of a remedy the industry is forced to be cautious. Even if its sales are not declining it sees the market increase being absorbed by imports and greatly fears that imports will soon do more than that, as indeed they have in a number of other industries. It will not then expand. It will seek rather to reduce costs. To do so it may let off workers outright or dis-

place them by installing labor-saving machinery. It will not only fail to bear its part of the unemployment load; it will also fail to absorb its share of the new workers. The result will be a double load on other industries to absorb the unemployed and the new workers.

In the past few weeks the Tariff Commission sent four recommendations to the White House proposing an increase in the duty on sheet glass, baseball gloves, ceramic tile and carpets.

Sheet glass is produced in West Virginia and I know the imports have been working havoc. The Tariff Commission found unanimously that rising imports had caused serious injury to the industry. This was on May 17, 1961. It recommended an increase in the duty. On June 30 the President returned the case to the Tariff Commission for further information. To date the Commission has not concluded the supplemental proceedings.

This was one case in three returned to the Commission. The other two were the cases relating to ceramic tile and baseball gloves.

The President asked for information on the pricing practices of the industries involved, including sheet glass. He also asked for profit relationship to investment in plant; for a report on the effect of domestic technological innovations and automation; and, with respect to sheet glass, information on restrictive sales practices by domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out two things:

First. The U.S. Tariff Commission is an agency set up by Congress to perform certain technical and detailed functions for the Congress. It is a bipartisan body, with a set of Commissioners appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Commission is staffed with experts in the field of tariffs and trade. The personnel is drawn from the Civil Service register. Presumably the agency is competent in its field.

The Commission holds public hearings and invites all interested parties to appear and give testimony. If rates of duty are changed as a result of its recommendations recourse may be had by dissatisfied or aggrieved parties to the U.S. Customs Court.

Second. The only statute governing the escape clause is found in the Trade Agreements Act of 1951 as amended and extended. This statute lays down the criteria by which injury or threat of injury to a domestic industry is to be judged. There is no other source of criteria. The President cannot create them without amending or enlarging the scope of the clause. Congress alone has this power; and this power can only be exercised through the legislative processes. Some of the President's questions relate to matters that are not found in the criteria of injury.

It seems inappropriate for the President to return cases to the Tariff Commission in any case. He is given 60 days in which to accept or reject the Commission's recommendations; not to return them. If the Commission fails to do its work properly in the judgment of the President he should take appropriate steps to have changes effected, instead of pressing for findings more suitable to his predilections.

Since the Commissioners are his appointees, returning a recommendation for further data smacks of pressure to alter the findings.

Mr. Speaker, there is much else lacking or positively wrong with the administration of the escape clause. Hanging over the whole undertaking like a pall is a stubborn reluctance of the executive branch to carry out the power delegated to it by the Congress. This unwillingness has manifested itself during the 10 years since the escape clause was first enacted by Congress.

The result has been that the chances of relief by an industry that applies to the Tariff Commission under the escape clause are barely better than 1 in 10. This borders on nullification.

This reluctance centers in the State Department and has been evident in the veto by our President of two out of three recommendations for tariff increases sent to them by the Tariff Commission since 1951.

For this there is no justification.

I shall tell you why.

Every member nation of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—of which there were 22 in the beginning and 39 today, makes tariff reductions on the condition that it has the right to increase any rate on any article if imports increase sufficiently to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing the article.

This is clear enough, is it not? Is there anything obscure about it; anything difficult to understand?

The only question remaining to justify such an increase in the tariff then is: Has serious injury occurred or is it threatened?

That is all. If the conditions are fulfilled by the facts, obviously the country has a clear right to restore the old duty in whole or in part.

Why then all the fear that if we raise a tariff under the escape clause procedure other countries will not like it; they will be moved to retaliation and before long we will find ourselves in a trade war?

These are bugaboos, pure and simple; fabrications of the reluctant dragons, the free-trade philosophers who will move heaven and earth to keep the intent of Congress from being put into effect.

The State Department will undoubtedly continue to advise the President against tariff increases even when all the conditions laid down in the reservation have been met. Mind you, GATT itself has an escape clause.

The Department's reluctance is largely gratuitous and it flows as much from the deep-dyed free trade leanings of its officials as from any genuine fear of causing ill feelings internationally. If the other countries do not wish to have tariffs increased, here and there, after there have been wholesale reductions they should not agree to a reservation that fully justifies them.

If the State Department is opposed to the escape clause, as its operational actions indicate, it should not go before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee and sing its praises, and in fact hold it out as a reason why industry, agriculture, and labor should not be opposed to tariff reductions, since any errors will promptly be corrected.

If the Department does not mean what it says on those occasions, that is, when the Trade Agreements Act is up for extension, it should be reprimanded for its duplicity.

Considering how much is at stake in the industries concerned, such as the glass industry, and what it means to many communities where these industries are located, this is no laughing matter. It is a very serious matter indeed when the State Department testifies to the efficacy of the escape clause before congressional committees in order to help the bill through Congress and then turns around and does all it can to frustrate the positive operation of the clause. This is to trifle with matters that are neither theoretical nor academic, but matters of blood and substance, matters as vital as bread and butter.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the escape clause recommendations that the Tariff Commission sends to the President will be accorded the dignity and stature to which they are entitled. Otherwise there will be no other possible conclusion other than to say the delegation of power to the President under the escape clause has broken down and should be withdrawn at the earliest opportune moment.

Arms Control Agency: Not a Sign of Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and fellow citizens, as I, have served proudly in the defense of the United States during times of war. Some served as I did in the jungles of Burma, others landed on the shores of Normandy, while other Americans marched across the deserts of North Africa. Many of us remember well that fateful December day in Pearl Harbor, while others of us regret the necessity of the atomic destruction of thousands in Nagasaki. We do not cherish these memories nor do we desire more of them in the future.

But our survival dictates that we maintain the most powerful military strength in the world to deter any and all acts of aggression against the United States by those who only respect power. This is why I, as a Congressman, have unceasingly supported every defense request which will maintain our military

superiority over Russia. Likewise, this is why I, as a citizen, proudly serve my Nation as a major in the U.S. Army Ready Reserve alongside so many of my fellow Americans. Next month I will be on active duty serving with the U.S. Army forces in Africa and Western Europe and will become even better aware of the job our American boys are doing today around the world in protecting the security of our people.

However, man has never desired war. War brings only despair and destruction. Developments in the 20th century have made thermonuclear warfare the last alternative if one values the survival of mankind. The nuclear holocaust which would result from world war III most certainly would be ruinous to America and much of mankind. The weapons of destruction which exist today in our defense arsenal are capable of inflicting total destruction. Likewise, little defense is now available to us if similar enemy weapons were to be unleashed upon our homes and industries.

In realization of the nightmare of a nuclear war, President Eisenhower carried on an all-out effort to bring permanent peace to this earth. In a variety of ways the President pursued every glimmering of a hope that an honorable and effective arms control pledge could be negotiated with Russia. The world has grown to respect the Christian ideals which symbolize American actions in the quest for peace out of a sincere concern for mankind. Passage of this bill will make clear beyond doubt that it is the Soviet Union and not the United States which is blocking progress toward control of armaments. The recent unilateral resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing by the Russians multiplies the tensions which exist worldwide today and underscores even more dramatically the compelling necessity for arms control.

Some in America contend that it is inconsistent for our country to be on an increasing military preparedness basis while at the same time studying the issues and technical problems involved in eventual arms control. I do not subscribe to such a philosophy. Our Defense Establishment is the world's mightiest and I will do my part in Congress to keep it strong so that we will never be found in a position of "surrender or perish." But arms control, as well as armed might, is a means to this Nation's goals of security and peace. It is the profound hope of the world that our terrifying military might will never have to be used. You and I alike seek peace, not war, and the establishment of an arms control agency would be an important step toward peace. We cannot expect peace if we do not make every effort to achieve it.

I feel that there is a definite need for an arms control agency and I support this legislation which establishes a U.S. Arms Control Agency. It is important that whatever studies and research are conducted on the ultimate possibility of some degree of weapons control be done in coordination with the aims of our foreign policy. In the long run, we can benefit from a system of arms control which would guarantee protection through international control and checks. While on one hand we maintain a first-rate military posture, on the other we must do the proper spadework in order to lay the foundation for an effective arms limitation system.

It seems to me that the establishment of this agency in the hope for future peace would well be worth the $10 million it will require in contrast to the more than $45 billion being spent on defense. The ratio of these sums is 1 cent in peace for every $45 in defense spending, and I would gladly spend pennies for peace alongside the necessary dollars for defense. It is upon the investment of these pennies today that a peace tomorrow for our children relies. I am hopeful that by coordinating our arms control efforts in this one agency we may some day soon make a meaningful start on an arms control agreement and come one step closer to our universal desire of "peace on earth, good will toward men."

Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get the impression that only people in the metropolitan centers are interested in the United Nations, whereas actually efforts for peace without giving in on principles interest all the people of America.

There have been some excellent editorials on the untimely and tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. One of these may go unnoticed because it was in a newspaper in a comparatively small city; so I hasten to insert it in the RECORD.

The Carbondale Review, Carbondale, Pa., edited by Mrs. James F. Beamish, had the following editorial in its September 21 edition:

[From the Carbondale (Pa.) Review, Sept. 21, 1961]

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

The right-thinking people of the Nation as well as the world rightfully may mourn the death of Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, whose body was found in the smoking wreckage of his United Nations plane in the Copper Belt of Northern Rhodesia. He was on a personal mission to bring peace to the Congo.

A thorn in Khrushchev's side for ever so long because he could not tolerate the dictator's rudeness, the Swedish diplomat had stood for everything righteous that represented the prayers of millions of people.

President Kennedy said, "his name will be treasured high among the peacemakers of history."

"Dag Hammarskjold's dedication to the cause of peace and world order through the United Nations was total," the President said. "His capacity for work to bring this about already is legendary. His patience surpassed the endurance of all but the rarest of human beings."

Unfortunately this has been a tragedy for us and a victory for the Communists, of which, they will take every possible advantage.

May Dag Hammarskjold rest in peace. He will go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen, long remembered for his cool, calm handling of many trying situations.

What Price Patriotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal printed in recent weeks on the subject of keeping "politics" out of the Defense Department. I agree—politics as such has no place in our national defense but certainly Americanism should be foremost. The examples that are particularly well known and publicized are, of course, the case dealing with Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, the film, "Operation Abolition," and the cancellation of an anti-Communist seminar at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. Now a situation has come to my attention that hits home in my own State of Ohio, specifically in Cincinnati, where the radio and newspaper coverage reaches into my congressional district. Once again, it appears that the muzzle has been put on and another true American is being kept quiet. This is a case where a man has a story to tell, but is not permitted to avail the American people of his firsthand knowledge of Communist brainwashing. Is the Defense Department going to pull the reins on another patriotic citizen?

I would like to call your attention to the following alert and thought-provoking editorial printed in the Cincinnati Enquirer on September 20, 1961:

THE PLAGUE HITS CINCINNATI

Thanks to an exemplary kind of public service by the Taft Broadcasting Co., Greater Cincinnatians several weeks ago were enriched by a series of appearances by Maj. William Mayer of the U.S. Army. Radio station WKRC first carried a recorded speech by Major Mayer in which he provided a scholarly, thoroughly responsible account of the brainwashing of American prisoners in the Korean war by their Chinese Communist captors.

More recently, Major Mayer appeared on WKRC–TV to answer questions raised by his recorded address.

As a further step toward acquainting Greater Cincinnatians with brainwashing techniques, Taft Broadcasting made Major Mayer's original radio presentation available in printed form.

Anyone who heard or saw Major Mayer knows that he is no wild-eyed fanatic, no crank, no crackpot. He is, instead, a solemn, thoroughly informed, articulate young physician whose splendid talents led to his appointment as chief neuropsychiatrist in the Army task force responsible for rehabilitating American prisoners in the Korean war. As the result of his service in that capacity, he knew, perhaps better than any other American, the shortcomings and the inadequacies that converted one-fourth of our Korean war prisoners into collaborators and one-tenth into informers on their fellow prisoners.

Many Cincinnatians were looking forward to hearing and seeing Major Mayer again. For this gallant young American, during his last visit to Cincinnati, agreed to return this fall. Specifically, he enthusiastically accepted invitations to speak at Xavier University and Our Lady of Cincinnati College.

But the other day, Major Mayer notified his local friends that he could not appear—either this fall or at any other time in the foreseeable future.

The muzzle that first wrecked the career of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, the muzzle that forced the cancellation of an anti-Communist seminar at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., the muzzle that has denied all our military personnel the opportunity to see "Operation Abolition"—this same muzzle has now touched Cincinnati.

When the Defense Department's order against anti-Communist information programs was involving distant points like Fort Harrison and our military posts in Germany, it was an easy thing, perhaps, for many Cincinnatians to shrug their shoulders. It was an easy thing to believe that perhaps Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT was right in fighting to keep "politics" out of the Army; perhaps the Defense Department was right in its patronizing explanation that General Walker is, after all, something of an "eccentric."

But in the Mayer case, there can be no shrugging. For here was no reckless name-caller; here was no witchhunter; here was no "rightwing radical." Here was a brilliant, dedicated, thoroughly equipped young American with a story that his fellow Americans needed to hear.

That he has now been denied the opportunity to tell that story is an outrage for which "stupid" is too charitable an adjective.

It is inconceivable to me that the Ohio residents or any other citizens of the United States should be deprived of first-hand information on the Communist tactics used to brainwash our own servicemen. Have not the parents of these servicemen the right to know what their boys will be subjected to, particularly in view of the number of Korean war prisoners who were converted into collaborators? This figure is shocking. We should be aware of what they are doing to our youth.

When our boys are asked to fight and the parents realize the risks involved, they know there is a chance that their son might be killed or seriously injured physically, then why should not they be permitted to know that there is also the risk that they will be subjected to brainwashing in an attempt to have them defect to the Communists?

We are all aware of the Communist propaganda gained by an American serviceman defecting, then why should we not know as much as possible about how it is done? Do we not, as Americans, have the right to know? We have the ability to judge for ourselves. As trite as it is, forewarned is to be forearmed.

Every time Khrushchev speaks about the great advances Russia makes in any field, we are all permitted to read and hear about it, and in instances where an American is converted to communism, we are permitted to read and hear about it, then are we to be refused the right to know the basis of the Communist propaganda? Are the vicious methods used by the Communists going to be hidden from us? And how long are the citizens' objections to having these things kept from them going to be ignored?

Will the time come when a true American will be afraid to say anything against communism for fear that he will be reprimanded and termed "eccentric"? What is more American than our servicemen, the representatives we send to defend our country? Will the time come when the people of the United States will be expected to send their sons to fight yet not knowing what they are fighting against or what is confronting them?

I submit that every American must be thoroughly informed and have the opportunity to know who and what our enemy is, and I submit that every citizen has the inherent right as an American to inform his fellowmen of everything that is anti-American regardless of whether he is military or a civilian and without fear of reprisal. The facts should not and must not be kept from our citizens by the Defense Department or any other Government agency.

While we seem to bend over backward to assure the Communists the fullest protection of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, we on the other hand, appear to deny those same privileges and rights to our own citizens. What this country needs in some of its governmental agencies is some good old-fashioned American intestinal fortitude. Why should we fear offending the Communists? Why should not we stand up and point them out for what they are? Why should not we be fully apprised of their unscrupulous methods? What governmental action will now be taken against this patriotic American to assure his silence? What price will he have to pay for his patriotic efforts?

The Eagle, Not the Ostrich, Is the Symbol of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to the excellent and thoughtful editorial appearing in the Ukiah Daily Journal of Ukiah, Calif., for September 12, 1961, which emphasizes the compelling need for continuing public inquiry into alien philosophies, communism, fascism and any others. It expresses thoughts so well that need saying again and again:

ALICE IN WONDERLAND

The desire to preserve our American way of life and the entirely human but somewhat shortsighted notion that what is good for this country is good for all peoples be they black, white, brown or yellow has led to some confused thinking on the part of many well-meaning Americans.

The system of government which works—most of the time—for the people of these United States may be entirely the wrong answer for the black man in his loincloth in the Congo, the Hungarian factory worker, an islander in the Pacific or the Chinese farmer bent over a rice field behind the Bamboo Curtain.

We are engaged, not in a battle to press our American economy on countries of other faiths, other social mores, other traditions, but a battle, wherever possible, to foster the essential elements of a free and open society where the dignity of the individual takes precedence over the demands of the state.

This was one of the main points stressed before a county teachers and trustees institute Friday by Dr. Thomas Lantos, professor of economics at San Francisco State College and a man whose travels have taken him into South America, the Soviet Union, Africa, and the Far East.

A free and open society can take many forms but its essential ingredient is an informed citizenry and an informed citzenry has its beginning in the classroom.

Dr. Lantos hit out at what he termed the "Alice in Wonderland world" of the high school classroom and said he believed there was a dangerous gap between that world and the world as it existed. Here in Mendocino County steps are already being taken to close any gap which may exist in the high school student's understanding of the world in which he lives.

Even before Dr. Lantos brought a few uncomfortable truths home to the teachers of this county, educators and school trustees of 10 high school districts were being approached by the county superintendent of schools' office with a proposal that a new unit in American history be added to their school's curriculum—"The Principles of American Freedom in Contrast to the Tyranny of Communism."

John W. Taylor, county superintendent of schools, summed up the proposal in his foreword.

"The purpose of this publication," said Taylor, "is to aid local school districts in preparing instruction programs designed to:

1. Strengthen and vitalize student concepts of American democracy.

2. To provide accurate information about how Communist governments operate.

3. To create our awareness of the threat of communism to our democratic institutions.

4. To encourage youth to arrive at intelligent decisions and assume the responsibilities of the good citizen equipped with the ability to defend and advance democratic principles whenever and wherever they are challenged.

5. To develop attitudes of respect and enthusiasm for our great American heritage.

These are admirable goals. Their importance is so self-evident that we can only wonder that the material is not already included in the high school curriculum.

"Teaching my child communism," has been the horrified cry of some parents elsewhere where similar programs of instruction have been implemented.

From a strict "leave it alone" attitude, the pendulum gradually is swinging to the belief that Americans must understand communism in order to understand world events—and the classroom is the most proper place to teach about communism.

A recent survey by the Nation's schools showed 6 percent of the school administrators polled were in favor of a specific course in communism being taught in high schools. Under a law passed last May, all Florida high schools must, by September 1962, teach a 30-hour course in "Americanism versus Communism." The Louisiana Legislature this year appropriated $30,000 annually for seminars for high school students on the tactics and strategy of communism. Last month the California superintendent of public instruction appointed an advisory committee to draw up proposals for methods of teaching about communism. The Dallas,

Tex., schools are now required to teach one unit on communism.

One of the points constantly stressed is that school systems incorporating instruction about communism into their curriculum should not neglect the other "isms" that are important to contemporary history—such as nazism, fascism, and other forms of totalitarian government.

Another point is to make sure the classroom teacher knows that he has the support of both the school administration and the community in teaching about communism.

Notice we say teaching "about" communism. There is a world of difference in teaching communism and teaching about communism. We would not send a soldier into battle without a gun—neither can we send our young people out into today's world without the protection of knowledge—knowedge of themselves and their government and what that government stands for and knowledge of other peoples and their governments and the principles for which those governments stand.

In our desire to instill this knowledge, however, we must guard against overselling our product. We have faults both as individuals and as a nation. We have not always been right—and we will not always be right.

We can only attempt to follow in the way that is right—both as individuals and as a nation—and knowledge will lead the way.

The eagle, not the ostrich, is this country's national emblem.

No Ban on Appeasement Seminars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the threats posed to our way of life are well known, and we have spent billions of dollars and devoted much of our resources to bolstering our defenses to meet any threat.

Frankly, I have no doubt but that we have the economic, material, and military strength to withstand any Communist onslaught now or in the foreseeable future. What gives me increasing concern is the fear that some of our people—and some in positions of leadership—have lost faith in America and do not exemplify the spiritual strength which has always been our greatest asset and without which we cannot possibly withstand the dedicated, fanatical drive of world communism.

What inclines Americans to pessimism about our strength? I am at a loss to understand what kind of illness is abroad that paralyzes our will to believe in ourselves.

In the election campaign of 1960 many disparaging and discouraging things were said about this Nation's strength, but surely those charges were recognized as campaign oratory. Even those who made them dropped them immediately after the election. President Kennedy apparently believes in our massive retaliation strength in bombs, missiles, and planes for in his recent request for arms he asked for no increase in these areas. He asked for no new bombers and even cut down President Eisenhower's request for the development of the new B–70 bomber.

And there was concern about our national prestige abroad. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am even more concerned about what some people right in this country think about us. What kind of picture do they have of this Nation when they even suggest that we do not have the potential strength to defend ourselves, that we are not and will not continue to be the leader of the free world, or that we de not hold the fate of freedom and perhaps even civilization in our hands?

Although I have heard pessimism and defeatism expressed all too frequently, I am still disturbed to hear such sentiments. I was deeeply shocked to read of such statements attributed to some gentlemen who now have assumed positions of the highest responsibility in our Government. I refer to the column "Between the Lines," by Edith Kermit Roosevelt entitled "No Ban on Appeasement Seminars" appearing in the Indianapolis News of September 30, 1961, which I submit herewith:

NO BAN ON APPEASEMENT SEMINARS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

While the Defense Department is canceling anti-Communist seminars by the military not a word is said about those seminars where a clique of civilian professors promotes the dangerous myth that we are helpless to stem the inevitable expansion of Soviet Communist power.

This line of defeatist thinking is reflected in the published proceeedings of the Asilomar National Strategy Seminar of April 24–30, 1960, sponsored by the 6th U.S. Army, 4th U.S. Air Force, and the Western Sea Frontier (U.S. Navy). On the Asilomar conference grounds, Monterey Peninsula, Calif., 500 Americans—chiefly Reserve officers—heard Walt W. Rostow, now Deputy Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, predict:

"The role of the United States in determining the outcome of the world's history over coming decades will, of course, be marginal and success cannot be assured."

Quick to echo the prophecy is an activist in mental disarmament circles, Prof. Klaus E. Knorr of Princeton's Center for International Studies, who told the group that while the United States still has considerable counterforce capacity, "it seems probable that it will lose this capacity."

In case any military men or civilians present should chance to identify the enemy as the Soviet slave empire, Dr. Martin B. Travis, associate professor of political science at Stanford University, was on hand to chide them for "continued preoccupation with the false stereotype of the U.S.S.R."

Should our military be so misguided as to develop a "win strategy," James King, Jr., of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research at Johns Hopkins University, informs them of a better way—the way of accommodations and negotiated settlements—which can only lead to another Munich. King contended that "we do not have to take this uncompromising view" of committing American prestige to the defense of Western Europe.

"There is a choice involved, with something to be said on both sides, as in all such choices."

Is it too much to ask that just for once some bias might creep into American foreign policy—bias on the American side?

In view of our impartial attitudes in Cuba, Laos and the Congo, it behooves us to examine the strategic plan set forth by Paul Nitze, shortly before he became Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs. At this Asilomar seminar, April 28, 1960, Nitze proposed "that we accept the improbability that we can achieve a true class A nuclear capability."

Is Khrushchev then to be apprised of the improbability that the United States can develop a technological lead over the Soviet Union in nuclear armaments?

Nitze also proposes that our country disarm unilaterally—"a series of unilateral actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies."

We now see the kind of reciprocal action which resulted when we unilaterally abandoned underground atomic testing for 3 years.

Nitze's final proposal is that we turn over the Strategic Air Command—representing about 90 percent of our strategic retaliatory capacity—first to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and eventually to the United Nations. He further stipulates "that a U.N. order to use them (our SAC bases) will be honored only in event some nation has first used nuclear weapons for purposes other than self-defense in or over its own territory."

Under the Nitze plan one can picture the leveling of a major part of our country within a matter of minutes while a U.N. debating team—largely composed of Communist and "neutral" nations—decides whether to permit us to fight back.

Surely, it is "educational" activities like these—and not the anti-Communist seminars—which are sabotaging the President's vigorous forward strategy as revealed in his inaugural address:

"We shall pay any price, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of our system."

Anticommunism Strategy Seminar, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a summary of an anticommunism strategy seminar which was held at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., on July 27, 28, and 29, 1961. This report was prepared by and sent to me by Mr. Leonard Banowetz, a constituent of mine from Wichita, Kans., who was a participant at the seminar.

It certainly seems to me that these seminars in which so many civilians have the opportunity to take part should be encouraged. It is extremely important that our people understand how communism operates. There should be no repression of knowledge concerning this threat to our way of life.

I believe the Members of the House will find this report prepared by Mr. Banowetz to be of vital interest:

ANTICOMMUNISM STRATEGY SEMINAR, U.S. ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

(By Leonard F. Banowetz)

It was my pleasure to attend an anticommunism strategy seminar at the U.S.

Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., on July 27, 28, and 29, 1961. The seminar itself was sponsored by the Institute for American Strategy and the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. The hosts for the seminar were the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and the Henry Leavenworth Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

It was pointed out by Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, commandant of the USACGSC, that it was not the purpose of the seminar to develop for foreign policy, or for that matter, a recommendation for any particular strategy that should be followed by any of the branches of our Government. Rather, the purpose of the seminar was to provide for the conferees various information that would give them a better understanding of the nature of international communism and to encourage a more thorough study of the subject.

Members of the clergy, press, business, labor, educators, and the professions were all invited. Approximately 250 to 300 civilians attended the seminar. In addition, there were members of not only our own Armed Forces in attendance, but also a substantial number of officers from Allied countries, as well as one officer from Yugoslavia, who, you will be happy to know, although he admitted he was a Communist, declared he was a different kind of Communist than those to whom the subject of the seminar was devoted. This was most comforting.

Actually, the conference might have been better entitled "Know Your Enemy." As I sat through the conference, I recalled my own experiences in World War II. How well I remember the long hours I spent in England with the British learning to identify the silhouettes of their planes and tanks, so I would not confuse them with either the Americans or the Germans. It occurred to me at that time if we could get close enough to the enemy we could always identify him because he had distinctive uniforms and distinctive markings. It was only when he was some distance away that we had to resort to the outline or silhouette.

Then, I recalled in the Bulge the great morale problem we faced when it was discovered that our enemy had violated certain of the codes of war by wearing American uniforms or using captured American tanks and failing to remove the American markings. Part of this was overcome by what we refer to as "Yankee ingenuity," in that soldiers used slang, etc. to make sure that the man in the American uniform was really an American.

Today I think even the most optimistic would have to admit we are involved in a war. Unfortunately, our enemy does not wear a uniform that is easily identifiable. As a matter of fact, they don't even wear lapel buttons on their civilian cloths. As a result, many ignore the enemy because they can't see him, and others can't see the enemy because they ignore him.

Without a doubt, this seminar provided every person attending it with a better ability to recognize and understand our enemy.

The first afternoon of the seminar was optional and provided tours of the fort or films. I spent the afternoon seeing the eight films that were shown. The film selection, I thought, was very good. I had already seen five of the films, but I took the opportunity to see them again. The list of films and their sources is as follows:

"Communist Propaganda," Armed Forces; "The Big Idea," Swift & Co.; "The Two Berlins," National Education Program; "Communist Weapon of Allure," Armed Forces; "The Face of Red China," McGraw-Hill Book Co.; "The Challenge of Ideas," Armed Forces; "Communist Encirclement," National Education Program; and "Revolt in Hungary," Armed Forces.

Certainly there is no one film available that can tell the entire story. On the other hand, I think we would all agree some films are better than others.

As you will notice, four of the eight films shown are Armed Forces film. At these particular showings, most heartening was the attendance of a large group of the wives and children of the conferees.

The film, "The Two Berlins," produced by the National Education Program, probably told the story more graphically than I have ever heard before of why Khrushchev would like to drive us out of Berlin. This is a color film actually taken in West and East Berlin. When you see the starkness of East Berlin compared to the overflowing affluence of West Berlin, you realize what a tremendous piece of propaganda this is for the West and why the Russians want it removed.

The Armed Forces film, "Communist Weapon of Allure," is an excellent tool in better understanding of what draws people to the Communist Party.

Another Armed Forces film, "Revolt in Hungary," is a pictorial record of the Hungarian revolt which has been shown several times on TV. Certainly it is a stark reminder of the moral failure of the West.

The Armed Forces film, "Communist Propaganda," shows many examples of obvious Soviet propaganda. Included in this film are scenes from the Russian English-speaking film, "The Forty-First Bullet," which was pure Communist propaganda. The most interesting comment concerning this particular film was that the Russian film, "The Forty-First Bullet," had apparently appeared on several of the campuses throughout the area without any identification that it was Communist propaganda.

The film I really looked forward to was the Armed Forces film, "The Challenge of Ideas," which was produced, as I understand it, to take the place of film strip "Communism on the Map," and "Operation Abolition." While it is quite a nice film and probably could be included in any series of films on a better understanding of our American heritage as well as the threat to it, I can assure you that it will probably never inspire anyone to do 1 minute of study or have 1 minute of concern. The document of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "Operation Abolition," is certainly needed.

"Communist Encirclement," is an excellent up-to-date graphic presentation of the origin and expansion of Communist imperialism and is an excellent basic tool for better understanding of the nature of our enemy.

The speakers on the seminar were for the most part educators who have spent many years studying the entire Communist apparatus. Many of them have testified before committees of the House as well as the Senate at various times. While I am quite sure that there was probably no one who attended that agreed with everything that everybody said, I did not hear anyone criticize the seminar as a whole. I did not agree with all of the material presented and as a matter of fact some of the speakers didn't even agree with each other. However, the presentations were objective. Facts that are commonly accepted as facts were generally identified as such and the opinions of the individuals were also labeled likewise. I can honestly say that I have never attended any seminar or presentation that could have been more objective.

The presentation of Dr. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, on the history of Communist aggression was a most careful tracing of what has been going on in the past 20 years. It should be required reading in the State Department and the USIA.

Col. William R. Kintner, special assistant to the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, discussed "Communist Subversive, Espionage, and Propaganda Tactics in the Cold War." This was a very factual tracing of the cause and effect of the tactics that the Communists use so well. Colonel Kintner is one of the contributors to the quite excellent publication of the Foreign Policy Institute, "Protracted Conflict." This book and the publication, "A Forward Strategy for America" are excellent tools for the person who is honestly interested in a better understanding of the nature of our enemy and possible ways to win the war.

Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, associate professor of political science, Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., followed with the development of the overall strategy of the Communists. Here again, was presented a tracing of the pronouncements of the Communist International and a matching of the results. Also covered here were their announced plans for us for the future.

These three speakers really presented the foundation for the rest of the program. It was accurate and well documented. The speakers in the afternoon included Dr. Paul M. A. Linebarger, professor of Asiatic politics, Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Francis P. Hoeber, senior economist, Stanford Research Institute, and Mr. Thomas Brimelow, of the British Embassy. They dealt with some of the related aspects and were quite specialized. However, the address of Mr. Brimelow of the British Embassy was most enlightening to those attending, as he pointed out the most documented cases where the Communists have attempted to divide the Western Powers.

That evening, Mr. Eugene Lyons, senior editor, the Reader's Digest, spoke on the strategy for victory. He pointed out the need for zeroing in on the enemy and then a plan to defeat him.

Saturday morning was devoted primarily to an address by the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD on the threat of communism. I could certainly say this: If enough Americans could hear Dr. JUDD's explanation of, "a Communist is a Communist," a great deal of our problem would begin to disappear. His simple approach to describing the nature of a Communist is so understandable that I am quite sure no one left the seminar saying, "Well, after all, there are some good things about communism," or, "If we can just get to the people of Communist countries, they will bring pressure on the Communist government and change it." Any student of history would have to agree with Dr. JUDD because history is on his side. The big problem of course is to stop it from repeating itself.

Dr. Stefan T. Possony, professor of international politics, Georgetown University, discussed the vulnerabilities of the Communists. While his material was probably new to many of the people attending the conference, it certainly received complete agreement by the allied officers who, unfortunately, have a better understanding of the meaning of ethnic groupings and nationalism. To those who preach we must write off certain countries or even certain sections of what we now refer to as the U.S.S.R., this would provide rather sober reading. Indeed, here is a subject completely untouched in most of our current history and geographic courses. That this fierce spirit for self-determination could still exist in some of the countries that have been swallowed up by the Soviet is indeed remarkable. On the other hand, its extension really confirms the Christian belief in the nature of man. It is unfortunate that this is not given greater consideration by our State Department and executive branch.

The civilian attendees participated in small group discussions Saturday afternoon dedicated to trying to figure out how we individually and collectively could help in

the fight against international communism. These were divided up to cover, among other things, education, industry, and the press. Some of the conclusions of the citizens groups were as follows:

1. We must all strive for a better understanding of our American heritage. Unless we achieve this, we will operate in a vacuum, being against communism but not knowing exactly what we are for.

2. To further spread the base for understanding of international communism, how it has worked in the past and how it intends to work in the future.

3. That the press could do a far better job of factually alerting the American people.

In addition to the speakers and films, there was an excellent exhibit on Communist propaganda furnished by Burston-Marstellar Associates, Inc., Chicago, Ill. This exhibit demonstrated how the Communists utilize posters, newspapers, radio, motion pictures, pamphlets, and other communications media for political propaganda around the world, as well as in the United States.

Some of the material that was available to the conferees was "View I," published by Champion Papers; the following articles by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI: "Communist Party U.S.A.," reprinted from Ave Maria, April 30, 1960; "Communist Illusion and Democratic Reality," from article prepared for National Strategy Seminar in Washington, D.C., July 1959, "Communism, the Bitter Enemy of Religion," from Christianty Today, June 22, 1959; "The Communist Menace: Red Goals and Christian Ideals," from Christianity Today, October 10 and 24, November 7, 1960; "America—Freedom's Champion," address, American Legion National Convention, October 18, 1960; "God and Country or Communism," American Legion magazine, November 1957.

These seminars should have the support of every patriotic American. It would, indeed, be a tragedy if they were not continued.

Politics First in the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, news has just broken of the release and resignation of Mr. Donald Willette as chairman of the Minnesota Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee.

The following correspondence clearly indicates the nature of the unsavory situation requiring this resignation and provides still another concrete illustration of the "politics first" character of this administration:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C,

DEAR SECRETARY FREEMAN: I have been informed via reliable sources that Donald Willette, Willette Seed Farms Inc., Delavan, Faribault County, Minn., received through an appeal an increase of 30 acres in the corn base for his farm. Mr. Willette's original base, resulting from actual corn planting history furnished by him, was 219 acres. This, when added to the appeal acres, totals 249 acres. Sixty-four and one-half acres were then diverted under the 1961 feed grain program at respective payment rates of $37.60 and $45.20 per acre for a total approved payment of $2,535. The part of this payment represented by the 30 acres above actual planting history is approximately $1,238.

Mr. Donald Willette is your appointee as State ASC chairman for the State of Minnesota. This is the highest appointive position in the State involving this agency of USDA which is responsible for the administration of the food grain program and numerous other farm programs.

If the committee system is to operate effectively in administering farm programs, high appointive officials cannot take advantage of their position to promote selfish interest and personal gain at the expense of other farmers and the success of these programs. In his appeal Mr. Willette stated that his corn production did not contribute to the surplus because it was largely used for seed. How, then, can he justify a request for additional acres so that his participation in the program will accomplish very little, if any, reduction in corn planting on his farm? In my opinion, this is outright fraud. In this and other counties corn acreage bases for many other farms were arbitrarily reduced below actual history and certainly increases were not made in the same amount or proportion as was done for the Willette farm.

In Faribault County, if each of the 2,303 corn farms had been given a base increase of 30 acres for a total of 69,090 acres, these phantom acres would have exceeded substantially the total intended diverted acreage in the county for the 1961 feed grain program. Available figures indicate a total of 42,217 acres of intended participation in the feed grain program for Faribault County in 1961.

On a State basis, an increase of 30 acres for each of the 126,243 feed grain farmers, for a total of 3,787,290 acres would have been more than double the total intended participation of 1,586,079 acres in the 1961 feed grain program. The use of inflated acres and the promiscuous handling of appeals for selfish and political reasons destroys the effectiveness of any acreage reduction surplus control program. Certainly, the many thousands of unincorporated family farmers in Minnesota would have a right to protest favorite treatment of the farm belonging to the State ASCS chairman and would have a right to question the double standard in the decisions made on this type of appeal.

I visited the Faribault County office on September 7, 1961, for the intended purpose of reviewing the handling of appeals, and base acreage adjustments, in addition to the documents pertaining to Mr. Willette's participation in the feed grain program. Mr. John Hayes, the county ASCS chairman, refused me access to any of these records, which, I believe, unless regulations have recently changed, are public information. Mr. Hayes stated that even if directed by you, the records concerning Mr. Willette would not be made available to me. However, when he was reminded that he, no doubt, was responsible to some authority, he stated that he would give some consideration to a directive from you to open the records. The other members of the county committee were not in accord with this determination. It is my opinion that there has been collusion between Mr. Hayes and Mr. Willette in obtaining this favored treatment for the State chairman.

I have no personal ax to grind with Mr. Willette. It is disheartening, however, as a farmer and former State administrative officer in this WSDA agency, to observe ineffective administration and selfish personal interests which destroy and doom to failure legislation and farm programs designed to improve the status of our farm people.

I feel sure that you, as Secretary of Agriculture, expect these farm programs to be administered fairly and equitably and that you will not condone the type of action involved in this case as indicated by the above information. I would appreciate being advised of your plans to correct this situation in Minnesota.

Sincerely,

E. J. PERSON,
Executive Secretary, Republican Farm Council.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1961.

Mr. E. J. PERSON,
Executive Secretary,
Republican State Central Committee,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. PERSON: The Secretary's Office referred to my attention your letter of last week relative to the State ASC chairman, Mr. Willette, and his participation in the feed grain program.

This particular transaction has been under investigation by my agency and investigators report to me that there is no evidence of fraud and collusion on the part of Mr. Willette as the State ASC chairman. However, I do feel there is an honest mistake of judgment by the operators of Mr. Willette's farms, and Mr. Willette agrees with that conclusion.

Therefore, Mr. Willette has submitted his resignation as State ASC chairman of Minnesota in order that there will be no misunderstanding on the part of the Department's intentions to administer the feed grain program in a fair and equitable manner to all who participate in it.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

Mr. George Etzell, Minnesota Republican National Committeeman, has today called for clear and honest answers from the Department of Agriculture to the following questions:

First. Who filed the Willette appeal for an added 30 acres in the corn base which led to an overpayment of $1,238?

Second. Was the appeal filed in writing and if so by whom was the appeal signed?

Third. Who received the appeal and who passed on the appeal and granted the extra 30 acres in the corn base?

Fourth. What checking procedures or auditing procedures are used to guard against this type of result?

Fifth. How could land with no previous history be granted a corn acreage allotment?

Sixth. Who was the fieldman who Willette said should have caught the violation of Agriculture Department regulations?

Seventh. Why was Mr. Person denied access to the records on September 7, 1961, by Mr. John Hayes, the county ASCS chairman? It is my understanding that these records are open to public inspection. If that is so the fact that Mr. Hayes would refuse to reveal the facts serves to cast a cloud of suspicion over this entire matter.

Surely everyone who is concerned with proper handling of the feed-grain program will be vitally interested in Secretary Freeman's answers.

Review of Activities of Congressman Giaimo in 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, I wish to join with the great number of my colleagues who customarily insert in the RECORD a review of their activities during the congressional session so that my summary will be generally available for the information of my constituents. During the 86th Congress, when I served my freshman term, I innovated periodic reports to the people of my district; these reports were so well received that I am happy to continue the practice.

It is well known that as one continues in Congress, just as it is in other careers, additional experience leads to greater responsibilities. I have been pleased to accept additional committee jobs and responsibilities because I know that each assignment offers new opportunities for serving my district and the Nation. Thus, I am pleased that, in addition to my membership on the Education and Labor Committee, I have been honored this year with an assignment on the House Administration Committee and several active subcommittees of the House, which are cited below.

THE EDUCATION BILLS

When this Congress convened last January, I was again assigned to work with the Subcommittee on Special Education of the Education and Labor Committee where, because of my service during the last Congress, I have become the ranking member of the majority party under the chairman. In this position I had the opportunity to work very closely on the education program which the committee prepared for the House. I am proud of the work of my committee and of the measures it recommended to guarantee our children a school system of quality capable of providing them with the fullest possible preparation to meet the challenge expected in their world of the future.

In his campaign and in his messages to Congress, President Kennedy asked that we greatly increase our investments in the field of education. I am happy to report that my subcommittee worked hard and long to produce legislation that would boost the efforts of our colleges and universities and improve the tried and tested National Defense Education Act. During the unfortunate illness of our subcommittee chairman, I was honored to serve as acting chairman and thus help coordinate committee work on these programs. In the end, the House Education and Labor Committee, by diligent effort, did produce legislation that in every major respect answered the call of the President, the desires of the American people, and the people of my district, as expressed in the elections last fall.

Because groups that ostensibly supported the President's program chose to place self-interest above national interest and allowed themselves to become the pawns of Republican-southern obstructionists, the House was denied the opportunity to discuss any vote upon the program prepared by my committee after many months of work. The shocking truth is that the House never did reject the President's education program because it never was allowed to vote upon its merits. Late in August; a considerably watered down version of the original committee bill was finally offered for debate. The measure provided $325 million in Federal funds for a 1-year emergency program for construction of public school classrooms in areas that have a demonstrated need; a 1-year extension of grants for schools in nearly 300 areas impacted by Federal installations—that is, areas in which Government activities employing Federal workers have resulted in overcrowded schools—and continuance for 1 year of the NDEA college-student loan program, due to expire next June. I considered this "package" to be a bare minimum and a reasonable approach. However, by a vote of 242 to 169, the House refused to even discuss the bill. Voting to block debate were 62 southerners and 160 Republicans. Voting to at least consider the bill were 163 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

Eventually, the House voted to continue the existing impacted areas and the NDEA programs for 2 years. I voted against this action because:

First. I believe certain aspects of the so-called impacted areas program are nothing more than "pork barrel" legislation.

Second. I wanted to demonstrate against those who misled the public by raising States rights, church-state, and other false constitutional issues, but who then proved themselves insincere by voting their own districts Federal money under the so-called impacted areas bills; evidently they were not afraid of Federal control when it meant money for their own school systems.

Third. I believe both the NDEA and impacted areas program need improvement, and my committee made specific recommendations along this line. After the House refused to debate these proposals, I could not vote to continue these programs with all their faults, especially since the NDEA program has another year to go and plenty of time is available next year to improve on it.

Fourth. The need for general assistance to our school systems was recognized by both the Republican and the Democratic Parties in convention; refusal to even discuss legislation that would meet these needs appeared to me to be an abdication of responsibility, and I voted to protest against it.

I believe we can make no sounder investment than to improve the education of America's youth. Therefore, I shall continue to fight for an adequate education program next year. In this regard, I am pleased to report that I have been asked to serve with a five-man congressional task force charged with the responsibility of preparing a program to help college students and our institutions of higher learning. As you know, tomorrow's world will demand greater numbers of college-trained people; we dare not shortchange America by denying the youth of today the opportunity to explore the limits of their academic potential.

EDUCATION AND THE BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS

During my campaign for reelection last year, I described the great importance which I attach to adequately providing for our youth; attention to their schools and the quality of their teachers as well as guidance to direct their latent talents and skills into constructive activities must be provided by this generation if the next is to be prepared to lead America to greater heights. The youth of any nation is that country's most precious resource. Therefore, although our primary interest is with our schools in America, our Nation, as leader of the free world, must also concern itself with the caliber of training being offered elsewhere. On March 13, President Kennedy announced his famous Alliance for Progress program with Latin America, and in his statement he called for increased cooperation between universities in our country and in the countries south of us. Shortly thereafter, Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, and I were commissioned to make a study of higher education in Argentina, and to report back to the Education and Labor Committee. We held innumerable conferences with Latin American educators and Government leaders here in Washington, and during a congressional recess last spring, we visited several campuses in Argentina. It was during this visit that I was made the object of a short but bitter pro-Castro, anti-American demonstration. The report of our visit is now available, and I urge any of my readers who is interested in reading it to write to me in Washington; I shall be happy to send him a copy.

The admonition to know thine enemy is a wise one, and one that will be followed by this Congress. As the people of Connecticut's Third District read this report, I will be visiting classrooms in the Soviet Union. Along with the members of my subcommittee, I will be viewing firsthand the facilities of Russian schools, and I shall be meeting with the men and women who are training the Russian adult of tomorrow. I shall report fully on my visit to Russia when I return at the end of October.

THE ECONOMY

The general pickup in the economy from the doldrums in which it languished last year has renewed worldwide confidence in the economic strength of America. However, what has me worried is the fact that the gain in jobs has been moderate despite booming output. With the Reciprocal Trade Act due for extension next year, special interest groups are already busy trying to pin a scapegoat label on our trade program with the free nations of the world. To fully study

this matter, a new ad hoc committee has been formed to investigate the impact of imports and exports upon domestic employment. Because of the opportunity it offers for me to inform myself about this issue, I am happy that I was selected to be a member of this study group.

After several months of investigation, I have come to the conclusion that our real problem lies in automation and the lack of an adequate program to cope with it. Foreign nations have consistently bought more goods and services from us than we have imported from them. Therefore, although I wholeheartedly believe that certain improvements must be made in our trade policies to adjust for the changes which have occurred in our own and foreign economies, we cannot arbitrarily shut out the products of other countries without inviting retaliation which, in view of our favorable balance in trade, can only hurt us more than it would help. I am convinced that the best way to better our employment problem is to improve the competitive status of our businesses through various tax reforms and industrial redevelopment programs. I supported the area redevelopment bill proposed by the President after proper safeguards to protect New England industry were written into it, and I am pleased that it was adopted. The House Ways and Means Committee has received President Kennedy's proposals for sweeping tax reforms to encourage expansion of business activity and thus create more jobs; I am confident that this program will be acted upon during the early weeks of the next congressional session.

But since American society is a partnership between government at all levels and individual citizens, President Kennedy's call for economic growth will go unanswered unless our businessmen and our labor force are willing to become more efficient. To help our local businessmen compete, I called a districtwide conference last April to which I invited some of the top Government procurement agents in the Northeast. More than 100 representatives of industry in the district participated in a full day of discussions with Government purchasers. The chamber of commerce in the area cooperated magnificently, and I believe a great deal of valuable information was obtained by those in attendance. Our State leads the Nation in per capita sales to the Federal Government, and I want Connecticut industry to retain its excellent relations with this giant customer. My office staff and I stand ready at all times to provide our local businesses with the information they will need to go after and win Government contracts.

Another growing source of profits and jobs is world trade. In this area, also, I intend to cooperate fully with local businessmen seeking assistance in obtaining information about oversea markets and international trade fairs. By aggressively seeking out new business and by developing new markets for our products, we can do much to create new jobs in our community.

The fight to improve the competitive position of industry in the Third District takes many forms. Unfair competition from other regions of the country in the form of substandard wages or unjustified subsidized electric power costs also had my attention during the year. I believe passage of the President's minimum wage program will do much to alleviate the former condition, and defeat of a proposal to allow a federally owned nuclear weapons plant to provide cheap electric power in competition with private utilities to the Northwest will permit private industry there to move ahead and satisfy the power needs of that region as it does in New England. I am in great sympathy with employing public power in areas of our country that are depressed and otherwise incapable of encouraging private industry to provide the power at rates necessary to stimulate development of the region. However, no such national interest was demonstrated to me which would justify the attempt made in Congress to put the Federal Government into the power business at Hanford, Wash.

LEGISLATION

During this past year, two measures which I authored and introduced in the House were passed by the Congress. The first measure was the Practical Nurse Training Act extension, which was passed on April 12. This measure extended until 1965 a Federal-State program of training practical nurses; it authorizes $5 million in annual grants to States which match the Federal contribution. With hospitals becoming more overcrowded and medical costs on the increase, the need for well-trained practical nurses to serve in the home and to relieve the registered nurse for more specialized tasks has become increasingly evident. It is my hope that this legislation will help provide a greater reservoir of skilled nurses to improve the quality of our medical care programs.

Of more direct concern to the Third District is the passage of my bill to expand the facilities and activities of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory at Milford. The scientists working at this Laboratory have made some remarkable discoveries which offer great promise for restoring the once prosperous shellfish industry in Long Island Sound; their work achieved worldwide recognition and may lead to a method of cultivating sea crops as scientifically as we now farm the land. The legislation which I authored provides the Laboratory with $1,325,000 to enlarge its facilities and train commercial shellfish men in the new methods developed by the Milford scientists. This bill was passed by Congress on August 22.

In the table printed below, I have listed the major legislative actions of this session, which I supported in their final form. On February 21, 1961, President Kennedy presented Democratic congressional leaders with a list of 16 priority measures which he hoped could be adopted at the earliest opportunity. Twelve of those 16 have been favorably acted upon; those that have been enacted into law are marked with an asterisk on my table. Several more major legislative items were requested and passed; they also appear on my listing.

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS, 1ST SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

S. 1852, June 21, 1961: Authorizes $12.5 billion additional for fiscal 1962 for construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; continues B–52, B–58 bomber production programs; provides for 2 new nuclear-powered missile frigates; and steps up Polaris submarine production to 29 by 1964, instead of 1967 (Public Law 87–53).

H.R. 5000, June 27, 1961: Authorizes $893.9 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases, provides for 7,000 new housing units (Public Law 87–57).

H.R. 6874, July 21, 1961: Authorizes $1.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1962; includes increases for manned-moon-orbiting project and for research on solid and nuclear propellants (Public Law 87–98).

Senate Joint Resolution 120, August 1, 1961: Authorizes the President to call up to 250,000 reservists and National Guardsmen for active duty of not more than 1 year and to extend training periods (Public Law 87–117).

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

S. 1983, September 4, 1961: Authorizes $4.3 billion program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid and development, military assistance and support, and contributions to international programs; provides borrowing authority for development loans, and a contingency fund for use at President's discretion.

H.R. 6518, May 27, 1961: Effectuates previously authorized Latin American program (Public Law 86–735) by appropriating $600 million; includes $100 million disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of OAS, and $100 million for loans and grants by ICA (Public Law 87–41).

House Joint Resolution 384, June 30, 1961: Provides for acceptance by the United States of agreement with France, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom for establishment of the Carribean Organization to promote the progress and development of the area (Public Law 87–73).

S. 1720, July 20, 1961: Extends indefinitely the President's authority to use surplus farm products to aid the people and economy of underdeveloped nations and permits broadened program (Public Law 87–92).

H.R. 6611, August 10, 1961: Reduces from $500 to $100 value of goods returning Americans may bring back duty free from abroad (Public Law 87–132).

S. 610,[1] June 29, 1961: Establishes a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad (Public Law 87–63).

Treaty:[1] Executive E—Convention of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, signed at Paris, December 14, 1960, by representatives of the United States, Canada, and 18 member countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. (Ratified March 16, 1961.)

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

H.R. 4510,[1] March 22, 1961: Emergency Feed Grain Act: Applicable to 1961 feed grain crop, this law encourages reduction of acreage planted so as to reduce Government-owned surpluses, raise farm income, and assure consumers fair and stable prices for meat, milk, and poultry products (Public Law 87–5).

H.R. 4806,[1] March 24, 1961: Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act: Extends the TUC program through June 30, 1962,

[1] Included in President Kennedy's February 21 16-point list of priority legislation.

providing repayable Federal grants to States to provide 13 weeks additional unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers exhausting their benefits. This new law has helped alleviate the severe hardships of unemployed workers and their families during the recession period, and increases purchasing power to stimulate demand during the recession (Public Law 87–6).

S. 153,[1] April 7, 1961: Reorganization Act Extension: Extends until June 1, 1963, the authority granted to the President in the Reorganization Act of 1949 to submit plans to Congress for reorganization of the executive branch (Public Law 87–18).

S. 1,[1] May 1, 1961: Area Redevelopment Act: Twice vetoed by former President Eisenhower, this new program provides $394 million in Federal loans and grants to assist qualifying urban and rural areas suffering from chronic economic distress and substantial and persistent unemployment (Public Law 87–27).

H.R. 3935,[1] May 5, 1961: Fair Labor Standards Amendments: Extends minimum wage coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act to 3.6 million uncovered workers (mostly in retail trade), the first new coverage approved by Congress since 1938. Raises the minimum wage of workers previously covered to $1.25 an hour in two steps, brings newly covered workers to the new legal minimum within 4 years (Public Law 87–30).

H.R. 4884,[1] May 8, 1961: Aid to dependent children of unemployed parents: Amends Social Security Act to provide Federal matching grants to States through June 3, 1962, to assist dependent children of needy unemployed parents (Public Law 87–31).

S. 912,[1] May 19, 1961: Federal judgeships: Provides for the Presidential appointment of 73 long needed new Federal judgeships (10 circuit; 61 permanent district; 2 temporary district). When filled, they will help expedite the huge backlog of cases now crowding court dockets (Public Law 87–36).

H.R. 6713, June 29, 1961: Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments: Modifies the Federal-aid highway program, authorizing an additional $11.5 billion to keep construction of the 41,000 mile Interstate System on schedule for completion in 1972, providing a new schedule of highway user taxes (Public Law 87–61).

H.R. 6027,[1] June 30, 1961: Social Security Act Amendments: Liberalizes the Social Security Act to provide $780 million in new or increased benefits during the first 12 months to an estimated 4.4 million persons. Reduced the optional retirement age for men to 62 (with reduced benefits); raised the minimum benefit from $33 to $40 a month; increased widow's benefits by 10 percent; raised the earnings ceiling for retired persons, broadened the insured status requirements, and increased the Federal share of State programs for the needy aged, blind, and disabled (Public Law 87–64).

S. 146, June 30, 1961: Special milk program for children: Extended the special milk program for children until June 30, 1962, and raised the authorization from $95 million to $105 million (Public Law 87–67).

S. 1922, June 30, 1961: Housing Act of 1961: The most comprehensive housing measure passed by Congress in 12 years, this new law provides $4.88 billion in Federal loans and grants to cities, towns, and rural areas for urban renewal, public housing, elderly housing, farm housing, college housing, community facilities, "open space park and recreation area development in cities, urban mass-transportation systems, home improvement, a housing program for moderate-income families, and liberalizes the FHA home mortgage insurance program. Similar legislation in the last Congress was vetoed by President Eisenhower (Public Law 87–70).

H.R. 5723, July 6, 1961: Veterans' home loan program extension: Extends the veterans' guaranteed and direct home loan program for World War II veterans until July 25, 1967, and for Korean veterans until February 1, 1975, and provides additional $1.2 billion in authorizations for advances from the Treasury for the VA direct home loan program through fiscal 1967 (Public Law 87–84).

H.R. 6441, July 20, 1961: Water Pollution Control Act amendments: Broadens and extends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to June 30, 1967, increasing the existing $50 million annual authorization for Federal, matching grants to communities for the construction of waste treatment plants to $80 million in fiscal 1962, $80 million in fiscal 1963 and $100 million each in fiscal 1964 through 1967. Strengthens enforcement and extends jurisdiction of Federal pollution abatement authority to all interstate and navigable waters. A less comprehensive bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower in the last Congress (Public Law 87–88).

S. 796, July 20, 1961: Surplus property disposal: Authorizes State agencies engaged in distribution of Federal surplus property to utilize surplus personal property needed to effectively carry out educational, public health, or civil defense programs in the States (Public Law 87–94).

S. 857, August 7, 1961: Cape Cod National Seashore: Establishes, within the national park system, the Cape Cod (Mass.) National Seashore, the first national park to be established in the United States since 1947. Authorizes $16 million for purchase of lands for the park area (Public Law 87–126).

S. 1643, August 8, 1961: General Farm Act: Extends feed grain program for 1962 crop; liberalizes farm credit programs; establishes wheat program for 1961–62, encouraging acreage reduction; extends and broadens food for peace program (Public Law 480); extends National Wool Act, Great Plains conservation program, school milk program, and broadens marketing orders to other commodities (Public Law 87–128).

S. 279, September 11, 1961: Juvenile delinquency control: Authorizes a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $5 million a year for 4 years to finance projects to combat juvenile delinquency.

[1] Included in President Kennedy's February 21 16-point list of priority legislation.

Stockpile of Dairy Foods Protected From Nuclear Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram sent to President Kennedy by William C. Eckles, general manager of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, Fond du Lac, Wis. A copy of the telegram sent to my office is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: Pure Milk Products Cooperative urges that immediate consideration be given to the stockpiling of properly packaged evaporated milk, cheese, butter, and milk powder in cotnainers to protect such from atomic fallout. It would be stockpiled and used in emergencies. Such, in quantities of 30 pounds per capita would insure 2 to 4 weeks supply of the most nutritious and essential proteins, carbohydrates, and fats obtainable.

If not feasible as Government defense project, suggest Government sponsorship of private industry developing such through loans, contracts, etc., for home fallout shelter provisioning.

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE,
WM. C. ECKLES, *General Manager.*
FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Research in the Life Sciences for the Exploration of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, an intensive study is now underway of the organization of research in the life sciences for the exploration of space. Our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] submitted a report on this question to the Committee on Science and Astronautics earlier this year and raised certain questions regarding possible duplication of effort in his research, both within the Department of Defense, and between that Department and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs, chief of the Air Training Command, took note of this background when he addressed a group making a life sciences study at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., last week. The hurricane, incidentally, upset the timetable on this program so that General Briggs was unable to deliver his remarks in person and they were read for him by Brig. Gen. John A. Hilger.

His remarks pay a fine tribute to the work of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] in focusing attention on this problem. I believe real progress is being made in the effort to shape a real national program in this area. As Mr. DADDARIO has consistently urged, the direction of our effort at the moment is toward, I am happy to say, more orderly development of life science research and more efficient use of men and facilities.

I believe General Griggs' remarks are well worth the attention of the House and I offer them for the RECORD:

Gentleman, what I have to say today results from conviction built up during a total of 11 years service in the Pentagon and from 2 years of service with the Air Training Command, which included the formation of the Aerospace Medical Center in that Command. My views have developed after untold conversations, discussions and arguments, if you will, with General Bedwell, his predecessor, General Benson, and with the Surgeon General. I will use medical terms, which I cannot define but about which, as a layman, I can testify to the confusion caused by their use.

One of the most confusing aspects of the research effort which our distinguished guests at this luncheon are examining is

its terminology. Not only are the names often obscure and meaningless to laymen, but they have a tendency to vary from one agency to another.

Here at the Aerospace Medical Center, where studies of the human element in space flight were inaugurated 13 years ago, they have been known from the beginning by the simple and expressive term, "space medicine."

In the Soviet Union, the same branch of science is called cosmic medicine. Both in this country and abroad, sometimes it is known as astrobiology.

On the other hand, some institutions refer to space medicine as bioastronautics. Others use the term "space biology," or "human factors." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration identifies its medical division as the Office of Life Science Programs.

One reason for the present disorganization in our drive to launch man into orbit may be this confusion in terminology. If two agencies have laboratories to investigate the medical effects of interplanetary flight, but one calls it space ecology, while the other refers to it as environment astrobiodynamics, obviously it will be that much harder to detect the possible duplication of programs and facilities.

The field is certainly a large one—as large as the universe itself. There is plenty of room in space medicine for many scientific organizations to make significant contributions. But the recent multiplication of space medical laboratories in the Government, in private institutions, and in the aerospace industry has begun to approach the point of absurdity.

In the U.S. House of Representatives, only 2 months ago, the Committee on Science and Astronautics met to consider an increase in funds authorized for NASA in the present fiscal year, 1962. Among the questions taken up was the proposed expansion of the NASA office of life science programs.

One of the most active members of the committee, the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, inserted into the RECORD an extensive survey which he had made of existing programs and facilities in the field of space biology and space medicine.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] counted at least 20 Armed Forces laboratories which are now conducting major research programs in this field. Besides, he named almost 100 civilian institutions in the United States, and about 70 more abroad, which are performing research under contract for the Air Force in specialized areas related to bioastronautics.

In most cases, the civilian contracts are let because these institutions have professional people and facilities that cannot be found in the Armed Forces, and could not be duplicated at any price. Hence, they represent the most economical means of securing these experimental results.

But in the Government agencies there is a considerable amount of duplication both in facilities and in programs. The trend in recent years has been for this multiplication of effort to increase, rather than diminish, under the impact of the present emergency in space science and technology.

The piling up of parallel programs not only wastes urgently needed money, it also leads to shortages of highly qualified scientific manpower, which is perhaps more urgently needed than money.

The net result of this competition for programs and facilities is to spread our research effort thinly over a great number of laboratories, giving none of them the opportunity to make full use of their creative faculties, their background of training and experience, or their physical equipment. While new research organizations are being built, older ones have often run at less than their maximum capability.

The gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman DADDARIO, recommended that the President direct the National Aeronautics and Space Council to look into this duplication of effort. Further, he recommended that a single authority should be appointed to coordinate all the activities in this field. It would be empowered to combine the most important agencies into a unified organization, and to formulate a comprehensive program for research in space medicine.

As a result of these recommendations by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] the present committee is here at Brooks Air Force Base today.

I would like to make it clear that the Air Force has not been unaware of this situation, or indifferent to it. For some time, we have realized that there was needless competition in bioastronautics research, not only with other agencies of the Government, or between separate branches of the armed services, but also within the services themselves—including the Air Force.

It became apparent, quite a while ago, that our scientific facilities could be managed more effectively if they were brought together under unified direction. For more than a year, a plan has been before the air staff to accomplish a reorganization of the kind suggested by Mr. DADDARIO, within the Air Force.

The difficulty has been that each command, having jurisdiction over an important research activity, which was vital to his own operation, has been reluctant to part with control of it. I can speak on this subject from my own experience. The Aerospace Medical Center is a part of my command. Not only is it an essential research institution. It is also an indispensable facility for training Air Force physicians, nurses, and medical technicians.

As such, it performs a necessary service for the Air Training Command, for the Air Force and for national security, one which is closely related to our other activities, in building and maintaining an adequate force of experienced people to man the advanced weapon systems that we rely on for the protection of our Nation today. I have therefore been—understandably, I think—less than eager to see this fine organization detached from my command.

The research, training, and clinical functions of the center could not be separated, and placed under different commands. It is well understood in the medical profession that these functions complement one another, providing the specialist with a comprehensive background of theory and experience. They have been so closely integrated at this center, throughout its history, that to divide them would be like severing the head of a patient from his heart and his intestines.

So it has come down to the question: Which of these functions is the most vital one in the present crisis that confronts our Nation? I have been reluctantly persuaded that the most vital one at this time is research. As you have undoubtedly heard, it has been decided that the Aerospace Medical Center, with its components here at Brooks and elsewhere, it is to be detached from the Air Training Command and reassigned as the Aerospace Medical Division of the Air Force Systems Command.

It will then have under it the most important laboratories now performing research in space medicine for the Air Force—including the Aerospace Medical Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the Aerospace Medical Field Laboratory at Holloman Air Force Base, and the Arctic Aeromedical Laboratory in Alaska. The transfer is expected to become final within the next few weeks.

So the Air Force already has taken definite steps to consolidate its own aerospace research facilities. They will be centered here at Brooks, under the overall direction of the Systems Command, which is the organization most directly concerned with development of manned vehicles for military space flight. These facilities will continue to be available to any other agency of the Government which is participating in the national space effort.

I have outlined these actions, and the circumstances that caused them to be taken, in order to show the real concern felt by all of us in the Air Force over the wasteful duplication of programs and facilities. These independent laboratories grew up at a time when space flight, as a practical accomplishment, was considered to be far in the future. They arose out of the foresight and the curiosity of research specialists who were primarily engaged in other tasks.

It is only natural that they went their separate ways, along parallel paths, and acquired their own associations and traditions. For many of the people who have been doing this work, it is not easy to reorient their organizational channels and concepts.

But the times have changed. Space operations are no longer a remote prospect for tomorrow, but a present reality, vividly exemplified by the recent orbital flights of the Soviet cosmonauts, Gagarin and Titov.

Under these conditions, we can no longer afford to stand on past associations or traditions or habits of behavior. We have to mobilize all our creative energies, our talents, and our resources for the drive to make America—with its free world allies—supreme in space.

No Government agency that puts its own interests ahead of this national effort can attain a full measure of achievement in the technical competition of our day. I have seen this truth, and have regretfully parted with one of the most valued elements of my command. I hope that every other Government agency—if the situation requires it—may have the generosity of spirit to do the same.

Cuba: Key to Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Cuba militarily is as important to the Defense of the Western Hemisphere as the Panama Canal. In fact, it is of more strategic importance because an enemy can move from Cuba, in this age of modern warfare, in any direction. The following report by Arthur M. Wilcox, assistant editor of the Charleston News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., is a timely and urgent warning:

CUBA: A HAVEN FOR SOVIET SUBMARINES

(By Comdr. Arthur M. Wilcox, U.S. Navy Reserve)

(NOTE.—Commander Wilcox is assistant editor of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier and a specialist on antisubmarine warfare.)

Ever since the founding of the United States, the military value of Cuba to an enemy of this country has been recognized.

Relations between Cuba and the United States have been a series of continuing efforts to keep Cuba out of the hands of an alien power—meaning non-American.

Sixty years ago the great U.S. naval strategist, Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan pointed out at length what it would mean to the United States to have a powerful enemy in command of Cuba. He said it would be ruinous.

Nothing has changed in warfare to render Mahan's warning less valid today. If anything it is more significant than before.

Mahan knew nothing of the ballistic missile submarine. He could not foresee that Cuba would someday be swept into the camp of a powerful and unfriendly Russia.

If he had, he would have said that Russian submarines must be prevented at all costs from utilizing Cuban ports and harbors.

The vast stretch of the Cuban coast is notable for its deep and sheltered anchorages. One of the things that makes cruising the coast of Cuba attractive to mariners is its peculiar hydrography. In some places, particularly in the approaches to important harbors on the south coast, the 100-fathom curve sweeps in to within a stone's throw of the land. For many reasons, including the danger of detection and the hazards to navigation, submariners prefer to operate beyond the 100-fathom curve in deep water.

The south coast of Cuba is made to order for submarines seeking shelter there. They can run deep and silent until they are close to shore. Then, on the surface, they can slip quickly into port. There they can be detected only by aerial reconnaissance. The harbors of Cuba are sheltered by high mountains from observation from the sea. The Spanish Admiral Cervera was able to conceal his whole fleet from American observation within the harbor of Santiago.

The combination of deep water at their entrances and high protecting mountains make certain harbors of immense strategic value in the era of the ballistic submarine—particularly to Soviet Russia and particularly at this moment.

Although the United States is well advanced in the field of nuclear propulsion and submarine missiles, the Soviet navy is taking only its first wobbly steps in this field.

The Reds have a few crude "nukes," probably armed with a medium-range missile. Their chief reliance is upon conventional submarines carrying two or three short-range missiles apiece. Like all conventional submarines, which rely on short-lived batteries or noisy snorkeling devices for underwater cruising, the Soviet missiles subs now operational are limited in range and comparatively easy to detect.

Moreover, the Reds apparently have not yet been able to develop a missile which may be released from beneath the surface like the U.S. Polaris. This means that the launching submarines must expose themselves upon the surface, perhaps for a period of several minutes in order to make a successful launching. During this period, assuming that U.S. defensive forces are normally alert, there is an excellent chance for detection.

Until Cuba fell to the Reds, the handicaps upon Soviet capabilities to launch a successful submarine missile attack on the United States might have been fatal to their effort. The Castro revolution changed all that. Soviet subs which formerly lacked the capacity to remain on station within striking distance of the United States for long periods, have been handed this capability on a silver platter by the failure of the U.S. Government to recognize and halt the drift of Cuba into the Soviet orbit.

Soviet submarines need no longer lie on station in the open sea. They need only moor to a pier in one of a half-dozen Cuban ports within easy missile range of the industrial heartland of the United States.

Assuming that the Soviets possess missiles with a range of 1,000 miles—a conservative estimate in view of what is common knowledge of their abilities as rocket designers—their submarines lying at anchor perhaps partly submerged in Havana harbor can hit U.S. cities as far north as Norfolk, Va., and as far west as central Texas—to say nothing of the U.S. base at Guantanamo, just over the hills to the east and the Panama Canal, a few hundred miles to the south. Not only are they within easy range of a multitude of targets but submarines moored in port have their navigational problems solved for them. U.S. missile subs on station about the Soviet perimeter must rely on expensive and delicate and complex navigational systems to plot their positions accurately prior to launching. But the position of a Soviet submarine in Cuban waters can be accurately fixed in an instant by a mere glance at a chart.

There has been concern that the Soviet Union may be building missile launching sites in Cuba. The expense of such construction would hardly seem justified considering the ability of submarines to serve efficiently as mobile launching sites.

When Cuba was permitted to fall into the hands of the Communists, a service of great strategic importance was performed for Soviet war planners.

Kennedy Charts Course Toward Socialism Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KENNEDY CHARTS COURSE TOWARD SOCIALISM ERA

(By David Lawrence)

The Kennedy administration has crossed the Rubicon. It has decided to make war on conservative economics and embark on a course of radical economics. It is ignoring the risk that it may plunge the country into more unemployment within the next 18 months and bring about perhaps the worst recession since the 1930's.

For President Kennedy has determined to put certain limits on business profits and the return on investments that stockholders have hitherto expected when putting their savings into private enterprise. The net result could be the gradual collapse of the private-enterprise system in America and the beginning of that era of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has predicted will inevitably lead to communism in another generation in the United States.

President Kennedy's crucial step came a few days ago when he openly threatened the steel industry with reprisals by Government unless it agreed to forgo any price increases at this time. Mr. Kennedy vaguely promised that next year, when the unions ask for still higher wages, he would urge moderation. He didn't define the term. But the entire business world noted that Mr. Kennedy significantly refused to ask the unions at this time to forego the additional wage increases scheduled for them at the end of this month under a contract signed early in 1960 after a long strike.

The steel industry thus far has absorbed a 10-percent rise in labor costs since 1958 without a price increase. Fair play would seem to require that, since the steel industry has already absorbed this large increase in wages without a price rise, the least that Mr. Kennedy might have done was to ask labor to cancel its increase schedule for October 1 this year.

But the Kennedy administration has sitting in the cabinet, as Secretary of Labor, the man who was general counsel of the biggest steel union in the country. Had there been a Secretary of Commerce in a Republican administration who had previously been a leader in the steel industry—either as president of a large company or as its principal negotiator just a few months earlier during a major strike—the howl that would have gone up about conflict of interest" would have been heard from coast to coast.

Industry has no voice in the Kennedy Cabinet. The Secretary of Commerce is afraid of his shadow and allowed himself to be influenced by the radicals in the administration when he ordered the virtual suppression of the Business Advisory Council which had existed for decades as a means of communication between business and the executive branch of the Government.

President Kennedy's procedure in writing a letter to 12 steel companies and in immediately making it public is the subject of sharp criticism. He did not invite these steel executives to come to Washington beforehand to give their side of the issue. He took them by surprise as he issued his letter and threatened restrictive measures if they didn't obey.

This is one of the most surprising moves any President has made in recent years, and it is small wonder that it is being regarded as the beginning of a series of hostile acts to throttle American enterprise and to pave the way for nationalization or socialization of the larger industries in America.

Mr. Kennedy himself has never been regarded as a radical, but he has surrounded himself with advisers who sincerely believe in Government ownership. In giving their advice, they can hardly refrain from advocating a philosophy which could eventually mean the end of private capitalism in America.

Hon. Paul J. Kilday

SPEECH
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my Texas colleagues as well as the many other Members of the House in paying tribute to the gentleman from Texas, Hon. PAUL KILDAY.

The splendid service which he has rendered to his district, Texas, and the Nation, is known about very widely. All of us are aware of the great contribution he has made to strengthening and keeping strong America during the period of almost a quarter of a century he has served as a member of the Military Affairs and Armed Services Committees. His leadership has been outstanding and assuring always. Many of the standards and guidelines that must be observed in the Defense Department in order to give us the greatest possible present and future protection as a Nation are results of the patient and earnest endeavor of Representative KILDAY.

The gentleman from Texas, Representative KILDAY, will be missed by all of us. We wish for PAUL and his wonderful family every success and happiness in the years ahead.

Racial Problems Worldwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the Birmingham News of July 7, 1961, appears a very interesting article by Mr. Arnold Beichman, editor of Electrical World, which is a publication of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and who writes as a free lancer for the Christian Science Monitor and the AFL–CIO News. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this interesting article:

RACIAL PROBLEMS WORLDWIDE

(Mr. Beichman is press representative for the New York office of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He is editor of "Electrical World," publication of Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and writes as a free lancer for the Christian Science Monitor and the AFL–CIO News.)

(By Arnold Beichman, Herald Tribune News Service, New York)

The other day, the Ed Murrow shop (as the U.S. Information Agency is called down there) put out a release describing the unfortunate effects which "recent racial incidents in Alabama" have had on the views held abroad of the United States.

"Editorial comments around the world," said the USIA, "agreed generally that resurgence of segregation problems had dealt a severe blow to U.S. stature and might adversely affect its position of leadership in the free world."

Now I don't intend to argue the USIA summary of foreign opinion. What irritates me about the release is the implication that if we don't stop these riots and anti-Negro discrimination in the South, we will lose the hearts and mind of millions of people in the disadvantaged countries and, if for no other reason but the cold war, we ought to live up to the principles we espouse.

It seems to me we ought to lay aside this political nonsense once and for all. Whether we beat up freedom riders or not, whether we integrate or not, whether we turn the South into a biracial utopia, none of this can really affect the fortunes of cold war. Neither Khrushchev nor Mao will be persuaded that we should be allowed to live if harmony were established in Mississippi.

If American democracy is still a matter of doubt to those millions of Asians and Africans after Hungary, the Khrushchev exposé of Stalin's crimes, the East German uprising, Poland, the suppression of freedom in Eastern Europe, Soviet interference in the Congo, Chinese border incursions against India, then let's assume that Asians and Africans, like everybody else, respond to emotional appeals with a fine disregard of logic and fact.

There is a monumental irrelevancy to the theory that if Alabama sheriffs drop their master-race theories, we will win allies, now faint-hearted neutrals, to our side in the battle against Communist imperialism. To me, this demonstrates little understanding of communism and how to win the cold war. It is certainly not done by reiterating fashionable platitudes which leave the ugly implication that if there were no Soviet menace, we wouldn't have to worry so much about racial discrimination and violence.

Let me say quite loudly and not in extenuation of the mistreatment of Americans in the South, that there is as much, if not more, racialism in Asia and Africa as there is here in the South or North. I have seen this racialism and have even heard it defended by at least one Asian statesman, the late S. W. R. Bandaranaike, the assassinated prime minister of Ceylon. Discrimination in Asia and Africa, private or public, is based on caste, color, language, politics, culture, and what's worse there are no biracial NAACP's or Urban Leagues or CORE's which are fighting racialism.

In Ceylon, the large Tamil minority is victimized by the dominant Singhalese majority which makes no bones about its determination to keep the Tamils a subjected people. They even had a racial riot in 1958 which led to the killing of about 200 Tamils. In India, there is every worthy attempt being made to wipe out caste discrimination but progress is painfully slow, as anyone who has visited an Indian village knows.

In Singapore, the Chinese, Malays, and Tamils get along on the surface, but they each have their own private clubs with restricted memberships based on race. Indonesia bars commercial signs in Chinese in its capital, Djakarta. The Pakistani and Hindus would cut each other to pieces if it weren't for the sanity of Nehru and Ayub Khan.

In Uganda, 2 years ago, I saw a boycott going on by Africans against Indians who, by the way, are hated in East Africa. The Senegalese loathe the Sudanese and that's why there is no Mali Federation today. There are 2 million untouchables in Japan, the Eta, an aboriginal people who are forced to live in ghettoes, despised, humiliated, and debarred from normal social intercourse.

I could detail many more examples of the racialism which human beings visit upon each other in a world which, as Santayana once wrote, is always "the contradiction of what it is pretending to be."

I could cite an article by a distinguished Cuban Negro attorney, now in exile, who described in the NAACP's official magazine how Castro has wiped out Negro rights.

WE OUGHT TO DO BETTER

This is no suggestion on my part that because they discriminate, it doesn't matter if we do. On the contrary, regardless of what Asians and Africans do to their own minorities, we ought to do better, not for any putative political rewards but because it is morally right that America's children ought to be treated generously regardless of the color of the parental skin. I hope I have made it clear that I deplore racialism, but equally do I deplore liberalistic cultural pieties which diminish understanding of the political realities in a cold war-ridden world.

Cease-Fire in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, since yesterday, when I inserted in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Evening Star on the situation in Katanga, still another excellent editorial has come to my attention from one of Washington's papers, the Daily News.

Like the News editorial, the United States should have no trouble making a choice between the pro-Communist government of Leopoldville and the anti-Communist government of Katanga.

The editorial follows:

CEASE-FIRE IN KATANGA

Moise Tshombe apparently has held his ground with a cease-fire agreement in the Congo's Katanga province. From reports coming out of the Central Congolese Government capital at Leopoldville, this seems well.

The Soviet "diplomats," who were driven out of Leopoldville a year ago when the army took over, are back. Followers of the late Patrice Lumumba are parading in violent demonstrations and Premier Cyrille Adoula is talking like a Communist. He is quoted as blaming "capitalist imperialism" for promoting the secession of Katanga and for the "assassination" of Dag Hammarskjold. Khrushchev hardly could state it better.

How the fighting between U.N. and Katanga troops came about still is uncertain. It hardly was on direct orders from Dag Hammarskjold, who was on his way to the Congo at the time and lost his life trying to stop it. No one can say how Mr. Hammarskjold might have handled the situation, had he lived; certainly not by waging a war.

Like most other circumstances in the Congo, the relative merits and motives of the principal native characters involved are unclear. But this much we know: As between an apparently pro-Communist regime in Leopoldville and a clearly anti-Communist government in Katanga, we don't have any trouble making a choice.

The United States should have no further part in trying to coerce Katanga into a Congolese union.

Federal Employees' Salaries Now Cost Our Taxpayers Over $15 Billion Annually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, last, the gentleman from New York, Congressman TABER, and the gentleman from Florida, Congressman HALEY, joined me in introducing a bill to reduce the number of Federal employees by the painless method of not filling more than one vacancy in four in certain agencies of Government until a reduction in personnel of 10 percent has been effected.

Several other Members have introduced identical bills. If our bill were made law, over a half billion dollars would be saved annually. Congress is now about to adjourn while our bill still rests peacefully in the files of the House Civil Service Committee. Why? Because the spenders in power so demand.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to help maintain the financial solvency of the Federal Government and to restrict the number of personnel in all Federal executive

agencies and independent agencies except certain defense or other essential agencies or divisions thereof as hereinafter specified, no affected agency shall use any part of any appropriation or authorization presently available or hereafter made available for use in fiscal year 1962 to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1961: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to seasonal and casual workers;

(e) to any employee of: (1) the Defense Department except those engaged in civil works or other non-defense activities; (2) the Internal Revenue Service, the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the Secret Service of the Treasury Department; (3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Justice Department; (4) the Atomic Energy Commission engaged in defense activities; (5) the National Security Council;

(f) to positions the personnel of which are directly engaged in law enforcement:

Provided further, That with the exception of the agencies and functions listed in (b) through (f) above, not more than 90 per centum of the amounts shown in the fiscal year 1962 budget estimates of each agency for personnel services shall be available for such purpose: *Provided further*, That when for each department or agency the total number of personnel subject to this Act has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for such department or agency for fiscal year 1962, this Act may cease to apply: *Provided further*, That the dollar savings resulting from this Act shall not be used for any other purposes but shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1962.

SEC. 2. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Nonessential Personnel Reduction Act of 1962".

The Penalty for Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1961. It is a timely warning about our position in the United Nations:

THE PENALTY FOR ILLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly will begin its meetings in the somber atmosphere generated by the death of Secretary-General Hammarskjold. Whatever one's disagreements with him, he worked indefatigably, by his lights and within the strictures of his office, to ease the world's chronic troubles. Not the least tribute to him is that in doing so he earned the enmity of the Soviet Union.

Yet Mr. Hammarskjold's death, however tragic, should not obscure the deeper crisis in which the United Nations finds itself; the symptoms may well start showing up in this session. In particular it is imperative for the United States to start facing the facts about the U.N., for the U.N. is turning into a threat to U.S. interests.

The organization was founded on the gigantic illusion that the Soviets would cooperate in the construction of a peaceful world. No sensible person could believe that myth for very long, but it has bedeviled the U.N. from the beginning. Today, moreover, other illusions have piled up in the East River edifice, and they too are potentially dangerous.

There is, notably, what might be called the illusion of parity. According to this fantasy, every nation is the peer of every other nation; an African area with less people than a good-sized American city, and without even the minimum qualifications of nationhood, has just as much voting power as the United States.

Such an approach to world problems has no basis in fact. In the real world, a nation must earn the right to influence international affairs. It may do so by coercive development and brute force, as in the Soviet Union; or it may do so by free economic and spiritual development, as in the American tradition. But in any case, a nation should not become an arbiter of world events simply by proclaiming itself a nation.

The practical consequences of upside-down thinking about the U.N. are rapidly becoming clear. For one, the United States gets swept into—and must bear the financial burden for—enterprises of questionable merit. Is it in the U.S. interest for the U.N. to attack pro-Western Katanga, which incidentally was not about to attack the central Congolese government? Is it in the U.S. interest to have pro-Communists cropping up in responsible positions in the Congo?

More basically, there is the ugly situation confronting the United States in the General Assembly. For years we enjoyed an almost automatic majority in these deliberations; today, with the influx of all these newly independent nations, with their professedly neutralist stance, we are increasingly in danger of being in an almost automatic minority.

The most striking current illustration is Washington's confession that it can no longer be sure of staving off discussion of the admission of Communist China. Suppose that in due course the Assembly votes that regime in; what then does the United States do? How much good is a Security Council veto if the weight of Assembly "opinion" is against the United States?

Or to consider the even more immediate question of a successor to Mr. Hammarskjold, what guarantee can there be that the new Secretary General will be tolerable to the United States, or that under his aegis we will not be pulled into still worse adventures? In its present frame of mind, the U.S. Government might not even veto the recommendation of some neutralist or worse for the post. It is not difficult to foresee many other situations where the U.N. can menace U.S. interests.

With such a prospect, the United States in time may well be forced to consider whether it can remain in the organization. Short of that, the United States must, we believe, begin refashioning its thinking about the U.N. It must seek to use its power within the U.N. to effect its objectives, and it must steer clear of U.N. activities counter to those objectives.

The United States must finally abandon any sentimental notion of the U.N. as an inherently noble institution to which we are committed no matter what. In this connection, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the schools to stop teaching our children to believe in that falsehood.

What matters is the preservation of the United States, not the United Nations. If the two are becoming irreconcilable, we had better realize it. In the real world of power politics, the penalty is heavy for building a storehouse of illusions.

The Record of the 87th Congress, 1st Session: Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom since my first election to Congress, I wish to report to the people of my district on my votes and actions as their Representative during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Although I have tried to fulfill my responsibilities to the best of my ability, I know that my work and votes will not satisfy everyone. Nevertheless, I believe that the people of the Fourth District have the right to receive a full accounting of my position and efforts on issues which are of importance to them, and to our entire Nation.

THE FIRST SESSION: AN OVERALL VIEW

The 1st session of the 87th Congress is finally coming to an end. In terms of legislative output, this session broke all records since the early days of the New Deal. For the first time in almost a decade, the Democrats controlled both the Congress and the Presidency, and this teamwork produced many achievements. The bulk of President Kennedy's legislative program was enacted into law. All in all, some 33 major legislative bills were added to our statute books. These and other measures, as well as my position on them, will be summarized in a table which will appear at the end of this report.

It would be impossible to fully review, in this report, all of the measures considered, approved, or rejected during this session. I will, therefore, confine my remarks to major legislation and the main issues.

FIGHTING THE RECESSION

When the 87th Congress met, our country was in an economic slump. Legislative measures designed to combat the recession received first priority. These included, first, temporary extension of unemployment compensation; second, aid to dependent children of the unemployed; third, liberalization of social security benefits, which included proportionately reduced retirement benefits for men at age 62, increased benefits for widows and liberalized disability provisions; fourth, first-to-be-enacted program of aid to chronically depressed areas; and fifth, rapid acceleration of Government procurement and various grants-in-aid programs.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH

In addition to measures which tried to alleviate the human hardships caused by economic recession, Congress approved a number of bills intended to stimulate more rapid growth of our national economy.

The comprehensive, long-range Housing Act contained a major program of middle-income housing—low interest, 35-year loans; first private low-income housing—3 percent downpayment; first

aid to local mass transit systems; and first protection of open spaces in urban areas.

The 5-year Water Pollution Control Act doubled our effort in this important field. We in Milwaukee have a particular problem with water pollution, and this legislation should be of help to the communities in our metropolitan area.

The Minimum Wage Act raised the floor on hourly wages in interstate commerce to $1.25 and—for the first time since 1938—extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers.

The Community Health Facilities Act provided aids for nursing homes for the aged, hospital rehabilitation, and community services for the aged.

The Saline Water Act changed piecemeal, year-to-year effort into a $75 million, 6-year program designed to achieve a breakthrough in our efforts to convert sea water into usable, drinkable water.

The omnibus farm bill included provisions for greater utilization of our farm products and some measures to help us overcome the farm surplus problem.

These, of course, are only the major measures which should help to get our national economy "on the move."

PROVIDING FOR THE SECURITY OF OUR NATION

Forceful measures were necessary to meet the threat of continuing Soviet advances in space, and of the worsening international situation.

The 87th Congress, during this session, increased defense appropriations $6 billion above the Eisenhower budget.

The Polaris program was doubled, missile development and production were increased, and our conventional and guerrilla warfare capacity was strengthened.

A massive space program, including the "moon shot" project, was authorized.

And, finally, the President was given authority to recall reservists to active duty, and the first serious civil defense shelter program was initiated.

A NEW APPROACH IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

When President Kennedy took office on January 20, our foreign affairs were in an unprecedented mess. New leadership and new emphasis in our international undertakings were imperative. President Kennedy brought these, as well as a new spirit, to our continued efforts to attain peace with justice, and freedom, in the world.

With the cooperation of the Congress, the planning of foreign aid projects was placed on a long-term basis, while annual congressional review and control of expenditures were assured.

The emphasis was shifted from military assistance to long-term development loans intended to help the less developed countries become economically viable.

Various independent bureaus were consolidated into a single, overall aid-administering agency.

The Peace Corps was approved and an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established.

New concepts of social reform and self-help will be the basis of our aid programs with respect to friendly less-developed nations.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND VARIOUS DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

As I already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to comment on each and every bill of national importance, approved during this session, without making this report unduly long. The list of such bills, especially of those relating to our domestic affairs, is very long. I believe, however, that a number of them warrant special mention. These include:

Three strong anticrime bills to combat gambling and the transmission of gambling information and paraphernalia in interstate commerce—the first such package to be approved by Congress since 1934;

The first Federal program to aid in solving the problem of juvenile delinquency;

Creation of 73 Federal judgeships, and adoption of the recommendations of the Judicial Conference, to speed up the administration of justice;

Continuation of Government reorganization, with six out of the seven reorganization plans of 1961 being adopted in full or in part;

Extension and expansion of the Federal Aviation and Airport Act;

Amendments to the Interstate Highway Act, to shift greater portion of the cost to users, to restore the self-financing features, and to extend the anti-billboard provisions;

Continuation of the President's Civil Rights Commission for 2 more years;

And many others.

SOME FAILURES—AND SOME UNFINISHED TASKS

The imposing record of the 1st session of the 87th Congress does not change the fact that the administration suffered defeat on some major legislative proposals.

General Federal aid to elementary and secondary education was killed in the House Rules Committee. Personally, I believe that Federal aid for classroom construction should be made available on the basis of need, and without discrimination, to conform with earlier Federal laws providing aid to education.

Tax reform, medical insurance for the aged under social security, creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs, the manpower training bill—these and some other measures are still awaiting final disposition.

Strong opposition of the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition to some of these proposals places in doubt their prospects for the future.

It is expected, however, that the administration will renew its efforts on behalf of these bills when the 2d session of the 87th Congress begins in January 1962.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists the major legislative bills considered during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, shows my position and vote on each of them, and indicates their present status or disposition:

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

Stand	Issue	Status
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	The $600,000,000 appropriation for the Latin-American development program authorized in 1958	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution urging the Organization of American States to impose sanctions against Cuba	Approved, House.
Voted for	Resolution urging the President to establish "University Free Cuba" to aid Cuban refugee students	Approved, House.
Voted for	The revised mutual security program, including long-term loans to less-developed nations	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation establishing the Peace Corps	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress against seating Communist China in the United Nations	Adopted.
Voted for	Aid for resettlement of refugees-escapees from Iron Curtain countries and Cuba	Approved, House.
Voted for	Resolution calling for establishment of Caribbean Organization to promote development of that area	Adopted.
Sponsored	Legislation to pay the balance outstanding under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended	Pending.
Voted for	Extension of the "Food for Peace" program	Became law.
Favored	Legislation to assist U.S. importers and exporters, thereby promoting foreign trade	Approved, Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize guarantees and insurance of certain American business accounts in foreign countries	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission to coordinate and direct U.S. programs relating to that continent.	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service	Pending.
Voted for	Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, including permanent authority for admission to United States of orphans for purposes of adoption.	Became law.
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Legislation to authorize additional funds for construction of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and improvement projects on military bases.	Became law.
Voted for	Increased funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation increasing the Armed Forces by 250,000 men and authorizing the President to call up reservists to active duty for not more than 12 months.	Became law.
Voted for	Fiscal year 1962 appropriations for Department of Defense	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to strengthen the Subversive Activities Control Act and clarify some provisions of the Smith Act	Approved, House.
Voted for	Amendment to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, to include organizations controlled by foreign governments or parties	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to the Criminal Code to permit prosecution for acts of espionage committed outside U.S. jurisdiction	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to the Hiss Act denying retirement benefits to Government employees guilty of offenses against national security, and restoring benefits to persons not intended to be affected by the act.	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY—(continued)	
Voted for	Assistance to U.S. nationals who may be evacuated from abroad in the event of war or crisis	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to coordinate research and development in this field	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence	Pending.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize enlistment in the Army and the Air Force of aliens legally admitted to United States for permanent residence.	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation making "hijacking" of commercial airliners a crime punishable by death	Became law.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Aid to chronically distressed areas and establishment of the Area Redevelopment Administration	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extension of coverage to 3,500,000 additional workers	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers (including railroad workers) who exhausted their entitlement to benefits.	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary aid to dependent children of the unemployed	Became law.
Voted for	Additional funds for the completion of the Interstate Highway System on a self-financing basis	Became law.
Voted for	5-year extension of the Federal Airport Act and Federal grants under this program	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of the current 52 percent corporate income tax and certain excise tax rates	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of the temporary limit of $298,000,000,000 on the national debt until June 30, 1962	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to repeal the special tax on admissions, refreshments, service, and the like	Pending.
Favored	Legislation to establish a 2-year program for the retraining of unemployed workers to develop new skills	Approved, Senate.
Voted for	Increase in the lending authority of the Small Business Administration to make loans to small-business firms	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to require public disclosure of identical bids on Government contracts	Approved, House.
Sponsored	Legislation to strengthen antitrust laws to secure equality of opportunity for small business and to prohibit price discrimination	Pending.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Employment Act to reaffirm the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to promote stability of consumer prices.	Pending.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Social Security Act Amendments of 1961	Became law.
Voted for	Omnibus Housing Act of 1961	Became law.
Voted for	Federal grants for training teachers of deaf children	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid to impacted school districts and an extension of the National Defense Education Act	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide Federal assistance to the States for construction of school facilities on the basis of need and without discrimination.	Pending.
Opposed	Legislation to provide $— billion for public school construction and teachers salaries on the basis of a formula using the total population of each State.	Defeated.
Voted for	Program to aid States and cities to combat juvenile delinquency	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in FHA mortgage insurance authority	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of the school milk program	Became law.
Voted for	Raising the amount of retirement income not subject to personal income tax ($1,200 to $1,524)	Approved, House.
Voted for	Federal grants to States and communities for construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and improvement of services for the aged.	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps	Pending.
Voted for	The Self-Employed Retirement Pension Act	Approved, House.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Pending.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Social Security Act to provide that local agencies may distribute aid to dependent children in the form of commodities and require accounting for such assistance.	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to prohibit discrimination on account of age in hiring by Government contractors	Pending.
	GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Creation of 73 additional Federal judgeships to meet increasing caseloads	Became law.
Voted for	Increased living expense and mileage allowance for governmental employees traveling on official business	Became law.
Voted for	Commission to explore means to combat distribution of pornographic literature	Approved, House.
Voted for	Reorganization of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board	Became law.
Favored	Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing at the Cabinet level	Pending.
Voted for	Legislation to strengthen Federal criminal statutes relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interests	Approved, House.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for transportation of gambling paraphernalia	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for transmission of bets by wire communication	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for interstate or foreign travel, or use of the mails, for the purpose of unlawful activity	Became law.
Voted for	2-year extension of the life of the President's Commission on Civil Rights	Became law.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Constitution relating to the electoral college method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States.	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide supervised residence facility for Senate and House pages	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes, grievances, and complaints in all Federal agencies and departments.	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to permit the sale of surplus U.S. property to local and State governments	Pending.
Sponsored	Resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumer Interests	Pending.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 1, Securities and Exchange Commission	Rejected, Senate.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 2, Federal Communications Commission	Rejected, House.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 3, Civil Aeronautics Board	Became law.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 4, Federal Trade Commission	Became law.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 5, National Labor Relations Board	Rejected, House.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 6, Federal Home Loan Bank Board	Became law.
Favored	Reorganization Plan No. 7, Federal Maritime Commission	Became law.
	NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Expansion of the water pollution control program	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded program for conversion of salt water to fresh water	Became law.
Favored	Creation of a National Kettle Moraine Park	Pending.
Sponsored	Amending Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to limit financial and technical assistance for the drainage of certain wetlands.	Approved, House.
Voted for	Upper Colorado Basin transmission lines	Pending.
Favored	Establishing a national wilderness preservation system	Approved, Senate.
Voted for	Omnibus farm bill	Became law.
Voted for	1-year voluntary cut in acreage and crops of feed grains; price-support payments to participants in various products	Became law.
Voted for	Continuing President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota	Became law.
Voted for	Extending Mexican farm labor program with certain safeguards	
Voted for	Use of additional $2 billion in surplus agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act	Became law.
Sponsored	National milk sanitation program to bring uniformity in milk health regulations, thereby eliminating discriminatory practices in the sale of milk in interstate commerce.	Passed House.
Favored	Authorizing financial assistance for educational opportunities to children of migratory workers	Approved, Senate.
Voted for	Authorizing distribution of feed at reduced price to livestock farmers suffering from drought	Became law.
Voted for	Improving operations and procedures of Farm Credit Administration	Approved, both Houses
Voted for	Authority for Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Direct home loan program for World War II and Korean war veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Payments of special dividends to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance	Became law.
Voted for	Program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and Korean conflict and thereafter.	Approved, House.
Voted for	Increases in rates of compensation for service-connected disability	Approved, House.
Voted for	Veterans Appeal Board to make findings of fact and conclusions of law in each case	Became law.
Voted for	Restoration of rank of general (5 star) to former President Eisenhower	Became law.
Voted for	Study of veterans' problems of elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped veterans	Approved, House.
Voted for	Amendment and clarification of reemployment provisions of Universal Military Training and Service Act	Passed both Houses.
Voted for	Increase in payments to veterans' widows	Became law.

Rollcall record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls [1]
108	53	1	55	6

[1] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

"The West Virginia Story" and "This Is Harpers Ferry" Are Featured in Automotive Periodical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, more and more the Nation is discovering the real West Virginia—the "Little Switzerland of America"—the "majestic Mountain State nestled between the Appalachians and the Ohio River Valley where more than half of the population of the Nation is located within 500 miles of its geographic center, making it the outdoor playground of the East."

For more about "The West Virginia Story," I am privileged to refer my colleagues to this article by Gordon L. Palmer for the August 1961, issue of Dodge News magazine.

And, in this connection, I call attention to historic and scenic Harpers Ferry, W. Va., where converge the beautiful Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers, and where our Government has established and will soon enlarge a picturesque national monument embracing the scene of the historic raid led by John Brown.

Associated with "The West Virginia Story" in the August issue of Dodge News magazine is a worth-reading article under the caption "And This Is Harpers Ferry" by Eloise Engle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the significant articles to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST VIRGINIA STORY

(By Gordon L. Palmer)

West Virginia offers spectacular scenery, famous historic landmarks and outstanding recreational facilities. And by virtue of its varied attractions it has often been proclaimed the "Little Switzerland of America."

The majestic Mountain State is nestled between the Appalachians and the Ohio River Valley where more than half of the population of the Nation is located within 500 miles of its geographic center, making it the outdoor playground of the East.

Much of America's early history was fashioned in large part by the Alleghenies as the way southward for confident settlers and the Ohio River as the main artery to the West. Thomas Jefferson and George Washington were frequent visitors to West Virginia and it was on one of Jefferson's trips to these highlands that he remarked, after viewing for the first time the confluence of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers: "In the moment of their junction, they rush together against the mountain, rend it asunder, and pass off to the sea. The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

From the recorded pages of history and the palette of nature which has created a masterpiece of scenic grandeur the adventurer can enjoy the tranquility of a cool mountain retreat; capture the scent of hemlock, oak, pine or cedar while motoring along forested hills, valleys, streams and waterfalls where rushing waters have formed rugged gaps and towering canyons.

With an average altitude of 1,500 feet, West Virginia is a woodland paradise with primitive scenery. The State offers among its many outstanding facets 20 beautifully developed State parks and nine State forests. Lodgings and their neighboring facilities are unparalleled where vacationing guarantees relaxation and contentment. Vigorous activities such as hiking, swimming, golfing, nature study, boating, horseback riding, fishing, hunting, spelunking, and tent camping are available.

Looming above the Charleston skyline on the banks of the Kanawha River, located in What is often called the "Ruhr Valley of America," is West Virginia's gold-domed capitol, one of the world's superb examples of Italian Renaissance architecture.

A parkland panorama and rendezvous with nature awaits the motoring tourist as he travels east on U.S. 60. Within an hour's drive of the State capital is Hawk's Nest State Park where a spectacular view of New River Canyon is seen by a half million people annually. Andrew Jackson said, "It's worth a month's journey to behold."

In historic Lewisburg just west of world-famous White Sulphur Springs the park tour turns north on U.S. 219 for Watoga State Park near Marlinton, one of the Mountain State's most popular parks. In addition to cabins and Watoga Lake, Brooks Memorial Arboretum provides a place for those interested in trees, shrubs, ferns, mosses, and wild flowers.

South of Marlinton at the town of Hillsboro is Droop Mountain Battlefield State Park, the site where one important Civil War engagement in the State took place. The same hamlet is the girlhood home of Pearl S. Buck, world-famous novelist, who has contributed much to American literature, and only one of the many West Virginians who have distinguished themselves by enriching a part of the American way of life.

Thirty miles north of Marlinton on State Route 28 at Green Bank a National Radio Astronomy Observatory is already in operation, listening to the sounds of the universe. The Observatory is a national center for radio astonomical research, and 60 percent of its program is conducted by visiting astronomers and scientists. A guided tour of the site is conducted for visitors at 2 p.m. daily, except Monday and Tuesday. The Observatory's 85-foot radio telescope is operated for National Science Foundation by Associated Universities, searching the skies for radio signals from outer space.

Less than 100 miles from Washington, D.C., and 41 miles north of Harpers Ferry, a most impressive sight greets the motorist as he approaches Cacapon Lodge, one of the State's three year-round vacation lodges. This modern living lodge with a mountain setting in Cacapon State Park on U.S. 522, 10 miles south of Berkeley Springs, and 47 miles south of the Breezewood Interchange on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, was known to early Americans as Bath. Add to 30 completely equipped vacation cabins the lodge's 50 guestrooms, a spacious air-conditioned dining room, the park's diversity of recreational facilities, and the traveler has everything for a complete vacation.

Traveling southward from Cacapon along U.S. 50 and then on U.S. 220 at Romney one cannot help but admire the countryside and bluish peaks of the Allegheny front whose mountains produce a thousand rippling brooks that flow eastward to form the great Potomac, Cacapon, and other historic rivers.

Turning left at Moorefield on State Route 55 the next stop is Lost River State Park, named for the river which disappears into the nearby mountains only to appear on the other side of the mountain as Capon River, awards for a journey's pause or stay, cabins and a multitude of recreational opportunities. In driving distance of the park are areas for good deer hunting and streams for excellent bass and trout fishing. Horseback riding over scenic trails is one of Lost River's most popular activities.

Twelve miles south of Moorefield at Petersburg U.S. 220 joins State Route 28 then U.S. 33 at Mouth of Seneca. Well-marked highways guide your every mile as you pass through open meadows, broad valleys covered with world-famous orchards, en route to the mecca of the Mountain State park system and another in West Virginia's chain of fabulous lodges.

Approaching the vicinity of Elkins in Randolph County on U.S. 33, the home of the Mountain State forest festival for the past 24 years, the sojourner turns north on U.S. 219, the Seneca Trail, and sets his sights toward Blackwater Falls State Park.

Named for the beautiful falls of Blackwater River this park has become a popular year-round vacation resort. Swimming, boating, hiking, and horseback riding are available for the outdoor-minded tourist. A recreation leader-naturalist is on duty dur-

ing the summer months supervising a well-planned program.

In the winter months the Blackwater section is the most populous ski resort south of the Mason-Dixon Line, and the Washington Ski Club holds its annual winter carnival here each year. For summer or winter pleasure the Blackwater country, high in the picturesque Tucker County mountains, bestows unlimited outdoor adventure and beauty upon vacationers.

Descending from the high elevations heading northwest from Blackwater just 60 miles away near Morgantown, home of West Virginia University, and overlooking the beautiful Cheat Lake, is Mont Chateau State Park. Its main feature is the Mont Chateau Lodge, West Virginia's newest State park lodge with 55 guestrooms each representing one of the State's 55 counties.

This is only a part of the West Virginia story. In 1963 the Mountain State will pause in the midst of a rapidly changing world to recognize its honored past and promising future by celebrating the 100th anniversary of its statehood.

AND THIS IS HARPERS FERRY

(By Eloise Engle)

It's hard to believe as you stroll down the quiet deserted main street of Harpers Ferry that this town had ever seen history shaped upon her river shores, or that she had witnessed life and death struggles between men destined to be national heroes. Traveling up the winding steep High Street to Hilltop House, the town's one hotel, and seeing the view of two rivers and three States with a backdrop of the Blue Ridge Mountains you swear that war and bloodshed had never touched this tranquil scene. Later as you climb the solid rock steps carved in 1810 to see the Robert Harper house, and then continue on to Jefferson's Rock you know that time has not dulled nature's wonders here.

Looking down from this same spot 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson was awed by the beauty of it. "* * * On your right comes up the Shenandoah, having ranged along the foot of the mountain a hundred miles to seek a vent. On your left approtches the Patawmac, in quest of a passage also. In the moment of their junction, they rush together against the mountain, rend it asunder, and pass off to the sea * * * this scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

Yes, nature was kind to Harpers Ferry, situating her between two rivers on a rocky wedge where waterpower, iron, hardwood forests, and a watercourse to carry products to Washington made an ideal spot for Robert Harper to establish a mill and a ferry in 1747, and for the Government to establish a Federal armory in 1796. By 1821 Hall's Rifle Works was producing 1,000 rifles and muskets a month. By the 1850's, the canal had connected Harpers Ferry to Washington and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad linked her to Baltimore. The 1,800 inhabitants were peaceful, industrious and prosperous. The town was growing, flourishing and feeling its importance. There was the uncomfortable undercurrent of the 1850's, but Harpers Ferry was no more, or no less torn by talk of slavery, abolition and secession than other towns.

No one suspected the gaunt stranger from Connecticut who moved into the Kennedy Farm 5 miles out of town to be anything but a "land and cattle buyer," yet secretly he was collecting men, guns and supplies. On Sunday night, October 16, 1859, John Brown, religious fanatic, slave-freeing abolitionist leader of bloody raids into Kansas and Missouri, struck at Harpers Ferry. His plan to set up a free-Negro stronghold in the mountains began with his 18 men seizing the Government arsenal and imprisoning the armory guards. Telegraph wires were cut and parties sent out to bring in slaves and hostages. For some unknown reason Brown allowed an eastbound train to cross the bridge the following morning, and it was the engineer who later telegraphed the alarm.

Meanwhile the fierce battle between the townspeople and Brown's party raged on. His hopelessly inadequate plan failed once the people realized the insurgents were small in number, though large in noise. In desperation Brown and his hostages barricaded themselves in the Government arsenal. The militia arrived from Charlestown 8 miles away, and secured the bridge across the Potomac. By nightfall the survivors of Brown's party and their hostages and slaves had all taken refuge in the fire engine house of the armory. Only five of Brown's men remained unwounded. Two of his sons were badly wounded; one died during the night, the other later.

That night Col. Robert E. Lee and Lt. "Jeb" Stuart arrived from Washington with 90 marines. On October 18, they attacked the firehouse. Of Brown's party 10 had been killed, 5 captured, 4 escaped. On the other side there four citizens, a free Negro, and one marine dead.

It's hard to say what the results of the famous raid would have been if John Brown had been killed instead of just wounded. As it was John Brown was brought to trial in nearby Charlestown. Refusing a plea of insanity he was convicted of treason against Virginia, and for conspiring with slaves to commit treason and murder. For 6 weeks, between his capture and execution, he spoke and wrote so skilfully that northern sentiment actually exalted him. Louisa May Alcott called him "St. John the Just," and Ralph Waldo Emerson said that Brown "would make the gallows like a cross." The southerners saw him as a frightening omen. Smoldering tempers on both sides exploded with the events at Harpers Ferry. Before long, armed soldiers were marching to the tune of "John Brown's body lies a-moulderin' in the grave."

The town itself became a no man's land. Southern forces held it for a while in 1861. General "Stonewall" Jackson whipped his troops into action, and before making their strategic withdrawal wrecked the B. & O. covered bridge leaving only the stone piers. The Virginia Militia had already destroyed the gun factory and the 4,300 rifles and muskets. At one point General Jackson managed to seize 56 locomotives and more than 300 cars on the B. & O. railway. Later multihorse teams hauled 14 of the locomotives to Strasburg. When Union troops removed a large supply of wheat from the mill the Confederates raided the town and burned the mill. A few months later a sniper firing from a building in town killed a Union scout, and in retaliation Union troops burned the entire point section of the water front.

When Lee invaded the north a second time in the 1863 campaign that led to Gettysburg the Union garrison evacuated Harpers Ferry but held their fortifications on Maryland Heights. The Confederates held the town briefly for the last time in the course of Lt. Gen. Jubal Early's raid against Washington in the summer of 1864.

At the end of the war Harpers Ferry lay in ruins. The bridge across the Potomac had been destroyed and rebuilt repeatedly. The engine house, John Brown's fortress, stood alone among the leveled arsenal buildings. Hall's rifle works were no more. Federal Headquarters on Camp Hill were donated to a school for Negroes. Storer College established in 1867 remained active until 1955 when it was closed for lack of funds. The town never recovered. Its industries never resumed. People moved away. Now there are only about 820 residents here.

Yes, nature was kind to Harpers Ferry, but it's a sad kind of beauty she has today a century later. The deserted buildings are crumbling with decay. Empty, dark shells with yawning, ghostlike windows stand forlorn waiting to crumble or be swept away by floods. Vines creep precariously over the fallen, rotting rafters. Wrought-iron balconies sag and groan with weakness and age.

The Federal Government's Mission 66 project is to restore the crumbling buildings. Established in 1944 by Congress, the national monument consists of 515 acres centered on Shenandoah Street where history was made. The visitor's center, built in 1858 for a master armorer, is operated by the National Park service.

Visitors come in increasing numbers. Last year, the centennial of John Brown's raid brought 100,000 to the spot where it all happened so long * * * long ago.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House who have been here several years will recall that on many instances I have brought information to their attention concerning the importance of the distribution of natural gas to our economy.

Not only am I interested in proposed plans to facilitate this distribution and its beneficial effects to the consumer, but I am always intrigued by new proposals that seem to embody several outstanding qualifications.

It has recently been called to my attention that a natural gas pipeline is being proposed to be installed extending from Texas through northern Mexico and into southern California. From all indications, this pipeline will provide millions of homes in southern California with natural gas—and will tap hitherto untouched resources.

I would like to call this project to the attention of the Members of this House. I feel that there are many merits intrinsic in its planning and I trust those that are in a position to make the final decision on this project will consider all of the ramifications in a fair and impartial manner.

This pipeline would stretch 1,600 miles from western Texas through northern Mexico and into southern California. Its purpose is to assure for a generation or more an ample supply of fuel and power to an area fast becoming the Nation's biggest market for natural gas.

The project also seems to have strong overtones that go beyond the theme of satisfying a rapidly expanding requirement for energy fuel. There are the economic, social and political benefits of international cooperation; stabilization of gas prices that have been soaring fantastically, the rewards of increased employment; and, of course, the satisfying of local needs for a steady, uninterrupted supply of industrial power.

From southern Texas, where the pipeline will originate, the proposed route dips south into Mexico and taps a source of gas that is believed to contain the largest volume of uncommitted gas in North America. The pipeline would then proceed 1,200 miles across northern Mexico to the California border and turn north to Los Angeles.

The new line would assure California of sufficient quantities of gas for many years to come. Additionally, it is estimated that it would result in savings of up to $174 million in electric rates over the next 20 years.

California is rapidly becoming the Nation's No. 1 market for natural gas. By the end of 1961, the gas market should total $1 million per day. Within the next 20 years, demand should double. In addition, the costs of natural gas obtained via this route would be stabilized because of the commitment of 20-year service at a firm price.

There is another strong reason for the need for natural gas in southern California. Such a supply would enable electric generating stations to eliminate the burning of fuel oil and thus assist materially in the control of smog.

The service area of the companies participating in this proposed pipeline covers 5 million people. The benefits which will accrue to the consumer are evident.

There is another, highly important aspect to this project: Namely, the advantages to Mexico. Completion of the project would immediately offer the opportunity for large-scale industrial development along the northern border area. This project would be the largest single industrial development in the history of Mexico and would be part and parcel of our concerted effort to improve the economy of our allies in Latin America. Mexican authorities have estimated that this project would stabilize Mexican currency for at least 5 years.

Construction of the Mexican portion of the pipeline would augment the announced aims of the United States to work with Latin America. It would also display to the rest of the hemisphere the advantages that can be accomplished when the free enterprise system is put to work for the benefit of both nations.

That need for such a project exists is undeniable. I trust that the authorities will take all factors into consideration in determining the solution to the problem.

It would seem that the many advantages of this proposal far outweigh any of its disadvantages.

H.R. 8354, a Bill To Provide for Youth Employment Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 87th Congress is convened, one of the items which we will have before us for consideration is H.R. 8354, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act. One section of this proposed bill provides for reconstituting the Youth Conservation Corps, a program which served our young people so well in the thirties under the title of Civilian Conservation Corps.

During the adjournment of Congress, I would like to urge my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to ponder the thoughtful words of a mother of one of the "alumus" of the CCC. This fine lady, whom I am proud to represent, pours her heart out in urging that this Congress enact the Youth Conservation Corps. Read this mother's letter and think of the young people in your own life and I am sure you will agree with me that this is one program we must adopt as soon as possible after the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress:

DEAR BIZZ: No doubt you have heard of the terrible fires we have had around Oroville and northern California. It's been pretty awful. And that brings up the subject of youth camps or CCC camps, whatever they are called. If all of these boys 17 to 20 years of age who are running the streets with nothing to do but get into trouble were in something like this, we would have had more help in fighting these fires and would have saved more if there had been camps for these boys.

The cost of one fire alone would be more than enough to house and train and equip a camp here for one summer, but while these fires were going on, a man was kidnaped, tied to a tree, beaten and robbed of 30 cents by three 18- and 19-year-olds that were bored, broke and just wanted to have some fun. It's all over, not only here, but in the whole State.

Please, can't you do something to make our President realize how badly we need these camps? My son went to a CCC camp. At 17 he was a boy running with a crowd of tough kids. When he came home, he was a man, trained as a mechanic and truck driver. Now he has a fleet of trucks all his own. I thank God we had a CCC camp in those days for God alone knows what would have happened to him. Being a widow with three to support, I was completely helpless to help him into manhood. It could be the same for hundreds of others, getting the same good food and training and above all, our Government can help save countless boys from destruction or a life of crime. With all the millions of dollars in Government surpluses that they sell to army surplus stores all over the Nation, that stuff could be used to equip a CCC camp with a minimum of cost to the Government. Go into any surplus store and you can get anything you need from 10 cents to $25. I bought a first aid kit for $1 that had surgical scissors and everything for a doctor to use in first aid, even scalpel and sutures, that would have cost at least $30 from a hospital supply house.

Now, will you please, for our youths' sake, bring this up in Congress and try to make them realize what a sin they are committing to keep throwing all of that stuff away when it can be used in equipping camps and save our future citizens. They don't mind building new reformatories and prison camps for these boys. Why in the name of God can't they build preventive camps instead and then let them look up to our President instead of down. They are turning to crime. They don't know what to do or how to do it. No place to keep them busy. All they have is the street gangs with time on their hands to beat, steal, and rob, then end up in jail or prison.

Well, sir, maybe I haven't written this letter as it should be, but something has to be done and soon or it's going to be a lot worse. Prison is not the answer, and from my own experience, I know my son was saved and I do know that others can be, too, if the Government and our President thought enough of our youth to help them.

Thank you most sincerely.

MRS. NORA ADAMS.

OROVILLE, CALIF.

To Keep Red China Out of U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our attention is rightfully directed to the problems facing the present session of the United Nations and of more than passing concern to us is the question of Red China's membership in that international organization. In these closing hours of the congressional session, I certainly feel it practical to reiterate the long standing and justified opposition of the U.S. Congress and therefore the people for whom we speak against the admission of Red China to the U.N. I insert into the RECORD an editorial which very effectively sums up the issue at the current time. This editorial appeared in Thursday's September 21 Chicago Sun-Times and is entitled "To Keep Red China Out of U.N.":

TO KEEP RED CHINA OUT OF U.N.

The U.S. House of Representatives, by a vote of 395 to 0, went on record for at least the 19th time August 31 against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This action accurately reflected the opinion of the overwhelming majority of American citizens. They want their Government to remain firm—even militant—against the admission to the world's peace organization of a government that is an outright military aggressor and has talked fast and loose about the necessity for an atomic war to promote the Red cause.

As the United Nations convenes this week another effort to admit Red China to membership will be made. In the past, the United States has managed to get a postponement of any such consideration. But each year the number voting for taking up the issue and debating it has increased. In 1951, the vote against considering Red China was 37 to 11 with 4 not voting. Last year it was 42 to 34 with 22 abstentions. This year, Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. says further delay in putting the Red China matter on the agenda is due to be voted down. Too many nations have come around to Red China's side or to the view that the issue ought to be debated and decided by a definite vote.

Convinced that it can no longer block consideration of Red China, the United States has now changed its tactics. It will now support a resolution that Red Chinese membership be debated by the Assembly.

Although this switch is intended—in the long run—to keep Red China out of the U.N., it gives the appearance of weakening resistance. It is causing apprehension among Americans from coast to coast. In Chicago, the strategy committee of the American Security Council, a business association,

criticized the switch as contrary to the position taken by Congress. In New York, The Herald-Tribune inveighed, "for the Assembly even to seriously debate admission would demean its dignity."

The big question remains: What is the best and most effective way to keep Red China out of the U.N? Changing times demand changing tactics and as anomalous as the new tactic is it has the support of the one nation that is even more opposed than the United States to a U.N. seat for Red China, if that's possible. Tingfu S. Tsiang, U.N. Ambassador from Nationalist China on Formosa, favors debating the basic issue. He thinks the end result will be rejection.

We hope that the ambassador is right. Two earlier gambits by the Kennedy administration, while actually intended to continue the block against Red China, gave the impression of weakening toward the Reds. One involved a two-Chinas-in-the-U.N. scheme that Washington was sure Red China would reject but which implied the United States would accept Red China under some circumstances. The other proposed U.N. admission of Communist Outer Mongolia in a trade for U.N. admission of African Mauritania that was supposed to line up African votes against Red China. These complicated schemes were diplomatic doodling.

Technically, the Assembly could substitute Red China for Nationalist China by merely switching credentials. This would be done by a simple majority vote but it is not likely. This is what Red China wants. Once past this hazard and on the agenda for debate, the admission of Red China becomes "an important question." It then requires a two-thirds vote. Thirty-four nations out of the 99 can block admission. The United States believes it has the 34. It had better. If Red China ever were to be admitted, the U.N. charter for peace would be sullied beyond recognition.

So Shall Ye Be Judged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, an interesting and informative article by highly regarded and nationally syndicated Holmes Alexander, written in conjunction with William F. Rickenbacker, appears in the September 23 issue of National Review. It is entitled "So Shall Ye Be Judged" and involves the tendency of certain Federal judges to exercise authorities without restriction or restraint. I think this matter should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the country and ask unanimous consent that this article appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO SHALL YE BE JUDGED

(By Holmes Alexander and Wm. F. Rickenbacker)

Since 1946, William Loeb has been publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, which has prospered under an editorial policy that is not only conservative but also witheringly direct and honest. William Loeb fears not the mighty, not even when the mighty happens to be a Federal judge on the First Circuit Court.

Back in 1950, Loeb blasted the Dover Group, a collection of prominent Bostonians including Charles Wyzanski, advocating the settlement of the Korean war on the Communists' terms. Not long afterward, Loeb attacked Wyzanski for acting as a character witness for Alger Hiss. In late 1956 and early 1957, Loeb severely criticized Wyzanski, as chairman of the Board of Overseers of Harvard, for permitting J. Robert Oppenheimer to give the William James lectures. And about the same time, Loeb hit Wyzanski again, for running the same act on a different stage: for Oppenheimer spoke at Exeter, of which Wyzanski was then a trustee.

In the autumn of 1957, Loeb was approached with the proposal that he found a competing newspaper in Haverhill, Mass. In the course of time he did establish the paper, but he ran into the organized opposition of 32 New England newspaper barons, who banded together to run him out of Haverhill. Loeb filed an antitrust suit. A counter suit under the antitrust laws was filed against him. Before long (March 1959) Loeb found himself in court, facing his old friend, Judge Charles Wyzanski.

Wyzanski offered to disqualify himself, saying, "I know there has been some Manchester newspaper which has been in the business of attacking me from time to time, and I don't know whether it is the plaintiff or not. I am quite immune from any bias with respect to it because I don't even read this stuff, but I think I ought to say to you that I know that somebody has been doing it, and maybe it is this plaintiff. If this plaintiff regards me as in any way biased, I wish the plaintiff would say so." (Point in rhetoric: is a man unbiased if he refers to material he hasn't read as "this stuff"?)

Acting with the innate chivalry that is a root of his nature, Loeb grandly declined the judge's offer. The case then proceeded, Wyzanski presiding, until late in 1960. At that point Wyzanski, in connection with another case, undertook a one-man investigation of Massachusetts politics. Issuing regular as well as criminal subpenas, Wyzanski finally caught a big fish; William Callahan, a chairman of the State throughway authority. While Wyzanski was off hunting for evidence of corruption, Loeb's reportorial staff was reminded of an earlier connection between Judge Wyzanski and his present quarry. After considerable research they turned up a story that made banner headlines.

EARLIER HISTORY

Some years earlier, while Callahan had been chairman of the department of public works, the State had seized, exercising the right of eminent domain, some property belonging to Wyzanski and his family. Callahan had got up a board of appraisers and had ruled that landowners could refuse the offer made by the appraisers only by going to court. In practice, anyone actually prepared to go to court received a settlement of about $1,000 more than the original appraiser's amount, to avoid the cost of litigation. But there was an exception.

Wyzanski, it appears, complained vociferously that the appraisers hadn't offered him enough. A trial date was set, but then before trial, Wyzanski received a settlement of many thousands of dollars more than the original price. Loeb's reporters could find no other case of a large out-of-court settlement. After the story hit the wire service, Wyzanski flew into court and filed with the clerk a detailed memorandum on his land dealings with the man he had recently subpenaed. The case hallooed across the headlines in Boston, and Loeb's paper, of course, ran a whole series of articles on the situation.

By April of 1961, the odor from Wyzanski's court had reached Washington. Majority Leader John McCormack of Massachusetts entered the discussion of Federal judgeships with an interesting anecdote about Wyzanski. "It happens," said McCormack, "that I have a nephew who is attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Not so long ago, a Federal judge in Boston threatened him with contempt of court in the performance of his official duties. * * * I am going to confine myself to this issue alone," said McCormack, "even though there are other instances of Wyzanski's high-handedness. Here is a copy of the Boston Globe of October 19, 1960. It was only 2 weeks before the election—a poor time for any judge to inject himself into the issues of a political campaign—whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. At that time, my nephew was protecting the interests of the cities and towns of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This particular judge miscontrued a statement by my nephew and this judge from the bench publicly stated that he might adjudge the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in contempt of court—or words to that effect.

"The judge even went further than that. He even stated from the bench, and I will quote the words directly from the newspaper: 'I am not myself quite aware why the Attorney General of the United States chose to further the ambitions of the attorney general of Massachusetts who is a Democrat.' Can you imagine that? What happened? My nephew and a few other attorneys general representing the attorneys general of the United States some months prior to that had a conference with Assistant Attorney General Bicks. * * * Now let me go a little step further and I will quote from this newspaper article again: 'Any statements issued about this case were no doubt given out for political purposes and whoever issued such a statement may well be in contempt of court.' This is not an isolated case I am talking about."

JUDGE AS POLITICIAN

Congressman BURKE exploded in sympathetic detonation, and described his own victimization at His Honor's hand. "He not only injected himself into the affairs of the attorney general of Massachusetts," said BURKE, "but he also injected himself in the congressional fight in my district, tried to smear my good reputation, and made remarks uncalled for, subjected me to a vitriolic attack, an unfair attack that I could not answer. * * * This particular judge, time and time again, has threatened attorneys and members of the Massachusetts bar who had the courage to appear before his court, has threatened them with citations of contempt, has impugned their motives, has besmirched their integrity and honesty; and he has developed such a condition that I would say 85 percent of the attorneys, members of the Massachusetts bar, are fearful to appear in his court. * * * When a judge orders the issuance of a criminal summons 4 days before an election, when all the circumstances called for was the issuance of a regular witness summons, and tries to create the impression in the minds of the people of a Congressman's district that the Congressman was a defendant and not a witness, I say that he has abused his authority, he has violated civil rights, he has violated every decent principle that we can have in our courts; he has violated the code of decency of the court. * * * I question his activities that day; the remarks he made from the bench were entirely uncalled for. If ever a judge was subject to censure it was this particular judge, because he

abused all the privileges of his position, all the authority vested in him by the U.S. Government when he tried to inject himself into that congressional fight.

"This judge has acted in the role of a politician trying to influence the electorate by his intemperate and unfair statements from the bench. His activities on the bench are certainly open to question. The Federal bench is no place for a tyrant or a despot. He is ill mannered, discourteous, uncivil, rude, injudicious, and overbearing. He lacks balance."

EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, testified as a character witness in reverse: "Often the overrighteous can do much evil. This particular judge is overly righteous. He is bold, he is brilliant, but most arbitrary. He thinks he is the be-all and end-all of wisdom. His views cannot be questioned. He is sort of a judicial panjandrum and, therefore, never hesitates to act as judge, prosecutor, and jury, all rolled into one. In a trice, he will on occasion convert his court into a U.S. attorney's office, or something not unlike a grand jury. Numerous complaints have reached me as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary concerning this judge's unusual and untoward conduct."

And CELLER quoted from a decision by the U.S. court of appeals in Boston—a decision that amounts to a formal accusation of misconduct on the part of Judge Wyzanski: "Naturally witnesses can and should be required to explain the words they use. It is hardly necessary, however, to do so with ridicule or caustic criticism, or repeatedly to check a witness' use of words in reasonably common use by reference to the Oxford English Dictionary, or to require strict adherence to the rules of grammar. The bench is not an appropriate rostrum from which to teach the niceties of English grammar and usage. * * * While performance by the trial judge of his function, indeed duty, to see that the truth is elicited ordinarily requires clarifying questions from the bench, and maybe on occasion sharp warnings, it is not his function or duty to take the conduct of a case away from counsel."

After being visited with so voluminous a barrage in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Wyzanski came off his high horse—but just for a moment. He asked Attorney General McCormack, the majority leader's nephew, to attend a public hearing concerning some asphalt companies. At the hearing, Wyzanski actually apologized to McCormack for having threatened him with contempt of court. He also said that in view of the "hullaballoo" (our word: it's not in the Judge's O.E.D.) about the asphalt case, he would withdraw from it. But then he went on to express himself in pointed terms about the case of William Loeb from which he announced he would not withdraw.

Loeb's attorneys made a formal motion proposing that Wyzanski withdraw. Wyzanski refused. They went to the court of appeals, but the court upheld Wyzanski, principally on the grounds that he only sounded prejudiced, but wasn't, really. At this moment Loeb is trying to get a stay of process from one of the Justices of the Supreme Court.

So here is the great big liberal, Charles Wyzanski, conducting his court with a high-handedness which, if it had been Senator McCarthy doing it in his committee room, would have caused Wyzanski to turn off all the lights of Harvard and say: "We've had it," and quietly expire. On top of that, he is determined to judge the man who has now completely exasperated him. "It is just as well that justice is blind," said EMMANUEL CELLER in his résumé, "she might not like some of the things done in her name by Judge Wyzanski."

Republicans Look at the 87th Congress and the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in light of the impending adjournment of Congress, I would include in the RECORD at this point a staff document of the Republican policy committee, House of Representatives, on the record of the 87th Congress, 1st session, and of the New Frontier to date. I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues and of the American public:

REPUBLICANS LOOK AT THE 87TH CONGRESS AND THE NEW FRONTIER

INTRODUCTION

Now that the 1st session of the 87th Congress is in its last throes, the public will be exposed to reviews of its accomplishments in both statistical and analytical forms. In almost every media of communication, appropriations will be summarized and major items of legislation enacted or rejected will be listed. We will not attempt to duplicate these figures on the 87th Congress in this study.

However, House Republicans believe that there is more to a session of Congress than a statistical box score can indicate. Since the White House and the Congress are controlled by the same political party, the actions of either branch of Government strongly affect the other. Also, some summary of trends running through the first 9 months of the New Frontier should be presented to the American public by a committee representative of the minority. This presentation is an attempt to do just that.

We find some threads woven through the fabric of nearly all issues under consideration by the Congress and the administration during 1961. These trends, recurring throughout this report, will be analyzed at length in the summary. They mark departures from what we consider to be policies that serve the best interests of America, and their continuation will, in our judgment, jeopardize the well-being of our citizens, both here at home and in our international relations. Their implications, as we look at subjects like education, agriculture, defense, foreign policy, the economy, fiscal policy and labor, indicate that the overall record of the 87th Congress and of the New Frontier deserves careful and analytical scrutiny.

AGRICULTURE

1. Early passage of an emergency feed grain program showed that the Government's generosity to corn farmers cost almost what the program was supposed to save through acreage reduction. This program now allows farmers to sell their corn for $1.20 a bushel and buy it back from the Government for $1.05. The taxpayer and the consumer lose now—the farmer loses in future instability.

2. Secretary Freeman and President Kennedy recommended an omnibus agricultural bill setting up advisory committees on production adjustment program development, with Congress retaining only a veto power over such programs. The American Farm Bureau Federation testified that this might result in an added $12 to $15 billion annual cost to our taxpayers. The elimination of this machinery in the bill marked a major defeat for the New Frontier in agricultural legislation. It also marked a major victory for the American farmer and consumer.

3. Expansion of the feed grains program under the Agricultural Act of 1961, before the full effects of the feed grains program were known, meant that farmers and taxpayers were bound to the program for another year without knowing its effect or cost.

4. No consideration was given in 1961 to putting the bargaining power of agriculture on a par with other elements of the economy without challenging the farmers' freedom to compete in a market economy. Instead, administration and congressional actions moved agriculture toward greater Government controls. It placed the entire grain market in the palm of the Secretary of Agriculture's hand. As in other bills, the Congress here lumped good programs (school milk, Public Law 480, the Wool Act, etc.) with the bad. The result will continue to be overproduction, high prices to consumers and low prices to the farmer for his crops.

5. The independence and opportunity of the farmer has not been aided by New Frontier recommendations or actions. While the healthiest segments of agriculture today are those free of Government controls, 1961 legislation has gone in the wrong direction. Government regimentation of agriculture has been increased at heavy expense without solving any problems.

LABOR

1. No major piece of labor-management legislation was enacted in the 87th Congress, 1st session. This was a tribute to the way in which the Landrum-Griffin Act is working out. However, a sinister move toward Government regimentation of the labor-management collective bargaining process was revealed in the many occasions in which the Secretary of Labor took it on himself to settle strikes or looming strikes. While in many of these instances the public interest may have been temporarily served, both management and labor should look askance at a situation in which their future interests might be bargained away by such Government intervention. Collective bargaining and its resultant decisions have been an integral part of the private enterprise system which has made our Nation great.

2. On September 23, 1960, then-candidate Kennedy stated at Salt Lake City that "in my judgment, an effective Attorney General, with the present laws that we now have on the books can remove Mr. Hoffa from office." The first 8 months of the New Frontier have seen another term of office given Mr. Hoffa despite the appointment of Robert Kennedy as Attorney General.

3. Millions of American workers could have received a higher minimum wage and in excess of $400 million in increased wages even before the advent of the New Frontier had then-Senator Kennedy been willing to accept a compromise version of the minimum wage bill when acting as a Senate conferee in 1960. Thus, a new bill had to be introduced and enacted in 1961. The House scored a victory for moderation and commonsense in passing a substitute measure, the Ayres-Kitchin bill, but the House conferees disregarded the will of the body in conference deliberations.

4. The resultant bill was not the $1.25 measure promised by the Democratic leadership, but instead calls for $1.15 per hour when it goes into effect. Despite statements to the contrary at the time of floor debate, the bill has already contributed to inflation and has led to higher prices in the Washington area laundries and elsewhere. The bill will contribute to the downfall of many small businesses, and contribute to the unemployment of part-time workers, young

workers, elderly workers, Negro workers, and others. It will especially hurt those without the education and training to compete successfully with others in our labor force. The House Republican Policy Committee, in its study of employment, this year analyzed the result of previous minimum wage legislation and pointed to the dangers of passing unsound bills of this nature purely for political gain.

EDUCATION

1. The Democratic administration here revealed its ineptness at handling and managing an issue before Congress. A bill reported from the House Education and Labor Committee took no account of the dangers of Federal controls over education, made no provision for local effort, demonstrated no need for additional classrooms in the decade ahead, and became enmeshed in a debacle before the Rules Committee due to the enmity it aroused among those concerned with religious, constitutional, and civil rights questions.

2. Rather than pass simple extensions of the National Defense Education Act and the Impacted Areas Act as requested by the Republican leadership, those in control of the 87th Congress became further bogged down with an attempt to change in midstream the whole concept of Federal aid to education. They produced a bill which made no one happy. It was deservedly defeated by a wide margin in the House only after arousing bitter feelings of animosity and after jeopardizing passage of a College Academic Facilities Act which had much bipartisan support.

3. The NDEA and impacted areas extensions were carried out under suspension of rules. This, coupled with the Calendar Wednesday procedure attempted in the case of the Federal aid to education legislation, demonstrated conclusively that bills on which the leadership desires action will reach the floor regardless of the actions of the Rules Committee, which continued to bottle up legislation in 1961 despite its so-called emancipation by the Democrats at the beginning of the session.

4. In contrast to this sorry record, the House Republican policy committee issued a definitive study on "American Education and a Free Citizenry" in late June. Utilizing a background series of study papers prepared by academic and professional experts, their task force group concluded that the advocates of general Federal aid to education have made no successful effort to justify current proposed legislation on the basis of either need or local effort, or both. They concluded that, while the Eisenhower administration wished to aid school districts in true need, districts which had exerted all possible local effort, the New Frontier has equated Federal aid to Federal responsibility for all school districts. They sketched practical alternatives to general Federal aid to education, and positively presented sound proposals for an educted populace as well as a free citizenry.

ECONOMIC

1. After the sound and fury of the election campaign and preliminary pronouncements by administration and congressional leaders about "the depths of the depression" and the firm action that had to be taken to bring prosperity to the American people once more, actual experience proved that the private enterprise system prevailed. We emerged from the recession without the aid of one antirecession measure. Republicans generally supported ADC extension and extension of unemployment compensation benefits as temporary necessities, but otherwise had faith that the economy would emerge of its own volition. We were justified in that contention.

2. The Area Redevelopment Act (depressed areas bill) which passed the House was one of the most ineffective and ill-conceived pieces of legislation emerging from the New Frontier. A Republican substitute was proposed which recognized the need for Government assistance for retraining as the most practical solution of the depressed-areas problem, but this was beaten down in favor of a Democratic boondoggle which used rural surplus labor area assistance vaguely construed as a "sweetener" to southern Congressmen in exchange for their favorable votes. The fruits of this and other economic legislation can be seen by the scandalous conditions in Wink, Tex., where so-called urban renewal and depressed-area funds are being used to "keep the cobwebs in a ghost town."

3. In brief, the depressed areas bill resulted in aid intended for the truly chronic depressed area being dissipated over many other areas of far less urgent need. It tried to do too much for too many areas. The resultant bill contained back-door spending in express disregard of the will of the House. It established no guidelines for occupational training programs. It set up Federal funds to replace financing which the private investment market readily has provided at reasonable rates of interest. It duplicated the existing public facility loan program of the HHFA Community Facilities Administration. It set up plant loan funds where an accelerated tax amortization program for industrial and rural depressed areas would leave the decisions to private enterprise. It limited retraining payments to only about 1 percent of the unemployed workers in depressed areas. Passage of this bill brought bitter disillusionment to most of the unemployed in most of the depressed areas.

4. The 87th Congress enacted into law a housing bill equally expensive and ineffective in its long-range effects. A total of $8.8 billion in back-door spending was written into the bill. The original administration request for 40-year no-down-payment loans on new home purchases would have caused buyers to have no equity for the first 20 years of the life of the loan, thus shifting the entire risk to the FHA. On the one hand, the housing bill enabled State and local governments to act to preserve open-space land to curb urban sprawl and to prevent urban blight, while on the other a new Federal insurance program was launched to convert the same raw land into building sites with FHA insurance up to $2.5 million per site. Generally, other provisions in the housing bill are unsound, most undesirable, and the budget spending authorizations for such proposals as urban renewal, public housing, FNMS, college housing, farm housing and similar measures reached unnecessarily high proportions.

5. In its economic legislation, the 87th Congress consistently trampled traditional concepts of interstate commerce regulation. In several interstate compacts requests for Federal participation and voting were made part of the legislation, despite the fact that of 140 existing compacts previously approved by Congress, not 1 authorized the contribution of funds by the Federal Government and only 1 (the Potomac River Compact, to which the District of Columbia is a signatory) provided for voting or nonvoting membership representing the Federal Government. In the Water Pollution Control Act, the word "navigable" was substituted for "interstate" waters, thus meaning that Federal enforcement jurisdiction will no longer be restricted to waters that flow across, or form a part of, State boundaries. Instead, for all practical purposes, the new Federal enforcement provisions apply to all waters in every State, even though the pollution and its effects are entirely intrastate. In this and similar legislation, the Republican Members of the House felt that the Federal Government should encourage and promote effective State and local enforcement, rather than undermining it by substituting Federal enforcement in purely intrastate and local situations.

6. The difference between the Democrats and Republicans in the House on economic policy can best be seen by the House GOP policy committee study, "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy," which was released by a subcommittee directed by Representative TOM CURTIS in July 1961. While Democrats in Congress and in the administration vied for the honor of being the first to support particular remedies for an "ill economy," House Republicans were more concerned with the long-range, positive aspects of employment in our economy. Emergency fiscal and monetary policies by the Federal Government served the Democrats as an employment stimulant, while Republicans sought to create conditions in which our dynamic economy could function to its optimum potential so that all American citizens could live in true prosperity. Democratic leaders proposed harmful tax change. They turned down suggestions of needed depreciation allowances for our private enterprise sector. Democrats spurned investment by suggestions of withholding dividends and by attempting to solve our unfavorable balance of trade and gold by lowering tourist exemptions instead of maintaining international confidence in the dollar by practicing fiscal responsibility and striving for a balanced budget at home. Basically, House Republicans recommended that our private enterprise system be encouraged and not hobbled by tax policies and wage-price stability.

7. The "Mr. Fixit" group of economists surrounding the administration have been alarmingly similar to those led by Dr. Heller who recommended socialism for West Germany. Fortunately, the Germans guarded wisely the principles which subsequently led them back on the road to industrial greatness. A thread very similar to this has run through the economic thought of our administration in 1961. Steel has been threatened with the statement that "you must pay higher wages but you cannot charge higher prices." Many firms have been forced to choose between charging similar or higher prices than their competitors and being sued under the antitrust laws or charging lower prices and going bankrupt. Business on the New Frontier has been faced with a policy rigged in advance against it—and labor must beware lest the same arbitrary controls make them subject to restriction and ruin.

FISCAL POLICY

The House Republican policy committee, in its study of the first 100 days and in staff documents issued during this session of Congress, has repeatedly warned that the policies of the administration and of the Democratic 87th Congress have led to an expansion of governmental expenditures now and in the future, and that the time has come to take a stand for fiscal integrity. That time has now long since passed. If we continue to neglect the creeping hours of time, our Nation will be faced with the alternative of runaway inflation or rigid governmental controls. Our citizens will be faced with a loss of real purchasing power, and those on fixed incomes will fall to a vicious subsistence level existence. Our children and their children will be faced with their share of our financial burdens, and our taxes in years to come will take an even higher share of our income due to the folly of wild governmental spending. Our dollar will lose the confidence of those here at home and of every nation in the world. The sorry record of the 87th Congress and of the New Frontier in this area can go unchallenged no longer. Reports from American citizens show that bureaucracy, inflation, and high taxes are driving the

average citizen to a sense of frustration—the feeling that his Government is something apart from him.

The struggling American taxpayer, cheered by President Eisenhower's preliminary estimates showing a balanced budget for fiscal year 1962, looked up 9 months later and found that his equity in America had been shaken rudely by the following events:

1. Latest estimates demonstrate that actions of the administration and Congress will lead to an increase of $12.5 billion in new obligational authority (for fiscal 1962 alone) over the estimates of former President Eisenhower.

2. In 11 bills passed by the House, some $19.5 billion in identifiable backdoor spending has been included. An additional $8 billion in public debt borrowing, requested by President Kennedy over a 5-year period for mutual security loans, was authorized but not appropriated by the House.

3. When new obligational authority for fiscal year 1962 ($93 billion) is added to almost $20 billion in back-door spending (which tends to understate the true situation), a total of approximately $113 billion can be estimated as this session's contribution to Federal expenditures.

The cost of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government reached its all-time high at the end of fiscal year 1961. The total annual Federal expenditures for the civilian payroll amounted to $13.6 billion, with no relief in sight in view of an additional 16,700 civilian employees joining the New Frontier in 1 month alone—July 1961.

5. Deficit spending under the Kennedy administration forced an increase in the national debt limitation to $298 billion, in sharp contrast to President Eisenhower's estimates this January 16 calling for a reduction in the national debt to $283.4 billion by the end of fiscal year 1962.

6. The administration and its congressional leaders refused to hold down nondefense spending to compensate for an increase of about $6 billion in the defense budget since January. Instead, they pushed thereafter for the passage of measures dealing with education, foreign aid, public works, and other items of considerable new obligational authority.

7. A projected surplus of $100 million for fiscal year 1961 was permitted to lapse to a deficit of over $3 billion—while a projected surplus of $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1962 now will approximate a deficit figure of between $6 and $7 billion.

8. Action by Republicans and some conservative Democrats has held down spending somewhat. For example, $8 billion requested for foreign aid appropriations under backdoor borrowing was turned down. A $325 million authorization for school construction funds was defeated in the House. A gigantic agricultural bill, already referred to, was estimated to cost some $12 billion annually by the Farm Bureau Federation. It was emasculated in the House.

9. Even with this saving, the total 1961 congressional authorizations for new obligational authority and back-door financing reached $628 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. We view with concern the fact that one session of a Democrat-controlled Congress could commit the citizens of Syracuse, N.Y., for example, to new sepnding of $135 million, or the citizens of Boston, Mass., for almost $400 million. What the taxpayers of these cities could do with this money on a local level gives new directions to the imagination.

The inflationary wheel was started ostensibly to get more money into the hands of the underprivileged. However, the masses of the people who were to have benefited under these plans now find themselves in the grip of rising taxation and rising inflation. The Republican Members of Congress firmly believe that vast Federal expenditures and unbalanced budgets which undermine the value of the dollar result in the destruction of freedom by fiscal irresponsibility.

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Under the Eisenhower administration, we made amply clear the fact that we not only had appropriate weapons of retaliation but also that we would not hesitate to use them if the need arose. Thus we not only had a deterrent to Sino-Soviet aggression but a credible deterrent. Now, however, we find ourselves entering a phase in the cold war in which the enemy has embarked on a series of reckless but carefully calculated adventures designed to test the extent of our will to resist while reaping whatever harvest grows out of any weakness displayed by the West.

2. We all remember the President's ringing declaration in which he pledged that Laos would remain free of communism. Unfortunately, we also remember that shortly thereafter Laos slipped away from a pro-Western position and is today undergoing transformation into a neutrality more neutral in favor of the U.S.S.R. than genuinely uncommitted.

3. Having found us less than decisive in Laos, Khrushchev must have been emboldened beyond calculation when we precipitated an invasion of the Communist bastion in Cuba and then reneged on our commitments and looked on while Cuban youth was left to slaughter on the beaches of the Bay of Pigs or to rot in Cuban concentration camps.

4. Despite the preliminary leaks and trial balloons on Berlin negotiations, public opinion and congressional pressures have assisted our administration in its recently declared determination to hold firm in Berlin. By giving its wholehearted support to this determination, the U.S. Congress has by implication renounced acts of weakness when we know that other nations respect only strength.

5. After once more the winds of public opinion had made their effect known upon the Congress, we saw drastic resolutions on such subjects as recognition of Outer Mongolia, admission of Red China into the U.N., and trading with the enemy. These resolutions illustrate what representatives of both parties can accomplish. If this administration would make amply clear to the world our absolute refusal to accept Red China into the U.N., for example, under circumstances which find that nation in continual violation of the U.N. Charter, the admission of Red China would be prevented indefinitely. It seems strange that the admission of Red China was denied for all these years and that now, shortly after a new administration has taken office, a spate of semiofficial statements and contrived leaks to the press have suddenly indicated that this year the Red Chinese might well make it.

6. We can expect more pressures to build up around the world as the Soviets probe to find our weak spots. We may even expect to find ourselves fighting a series of limited wars since we have now indicated that we prefer limited war to real retaliation. In this manner, we have rendered our deterrent incredible and exposed ourselves to the onslaught of whatever minions communism deems to be expendable.

DEFENSE

1. Under the Eisenhower administration, our Military Establishment was carefully balanced to meet the variety of challenges our enemies could hurl at us. We made clear to all aggressors that we would meet aggression with weapons of our own choosing and at the time and place that best suited us.

2. Today, while Congressmen of both parties would deny no necessary defense funding to the administration, we have retreated from the balanced force concept of former years to a policy openly preferring limited war and disdaining overall deterrent strength. We have retreated from the concept of defense spending for the long haul and have returned once more into the deep valleys and the high peaks of spending geared to the challenges of the enemy. We are merely reacting to Communist actions in our defense policies today and we are not developing an overall strategy geared toward victory in the cold war.

3. By his appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as a superadviser on defense, the President has in effect bypassed the service Seretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff who have so loyally and effectively (and legally, we might add) advised our past administrations about our military establishments.

FOREIGN AID

1. Republicans in the House generally feel that foreign aid, properly administered and justified, can be a valuable weapon in the cold war. However, this session of Congress has been a great debacle in this field because of requests for over $8 billion in long-range development loans through the public treasury with no need for justification of the use of these funds through the customary annual appropriations process. Republicans publicly supported long-range planning of foreign aid in conjunction with annual appropriations. The battle over this principle distracted from the importance of a sound, appropriate, justified foreign aid authorization and appropriation bill.

2. The conferees brought back an authorization bill devoid of a specific amendment which would have forbidden the use of foreign aid in Communist nations. Eventually, over $1 billion was cut by House action from the original fiscal year 1962 Kennedy request for foreign aid because the administration seemed to feel that its request should be approved as a "right" rather than something which had to be proven and explained. As it was, only a Republican amendment restored part of the funds which had been deleted in another defeat for the Kennedy program—a defeat springing as much from their tactics as from the relative merits or demerits of their cause.

INTERNAL SUBVERSION

1. A massive campaign to destroy the House Un-American Activities Committee has gained momentum in recent months. The excellent film, "Operation Abolition," was downgraded by the Defense Department as an effective means of showing to our Armed Forces the real dangers posed by Communist political subversion.

2. The administration has given aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy by "muzzling" the military leaders who have sought to warn of the dangers of communism and Communist infiltration.

3. The administration has given aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy by opening the U.S. mails to a flood of Communist propaganda.

4. It has given aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy by dealing in trade in strategic goods and subsidized commodities with the Soviet Union and/or its satellites.

5. The administration has shown an amazing naivete in dealing with the dangers of Communist subversion.

6. The administration has appointed to the vital and sensitive post of administrator of Security and Consular Affairs in the Department of State a political figure with absolutely no experience whatsoever in the security field.

7. The individual in charge of patronage at the Democratic National Committee has been shown to have had past Communist connections. But the national committee

has defended its employment of him and downgraded the significance of his work.

8. Despite the fact that admission of Red China to the U.N. would strike a blow at liberty throughout the world, the administration has continually procrastinated on the issue and seriously endangered the Nation's position on the matter by ambiguous statements.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER

1. Democratic Congressmen insisted upon the inclusion of a Hanford AEC reactor in the atomic energy authorization bill, and the House, mindful not as much of $90 million as of the principle involved, instructed their conferees to turn down the Senate version including the project.

2. Under the public works appropriation bill, the Federal Government will build transmission lines for the Colorado River storage project. If private enterprise were to do the job, at least $61 million in Federal taxes and $107 million in State and local taxes over a 50-year period would eventuate. The project would have been paid out 7 years sooner. Over $135 million in Federal construction funds would have been saved in the next few years. Power would be delivered to preference customers at the same price as the all-Federal system. The integrated five-State company proposal would have greater capacity, stability and efficiency to meet present and future power demands of all area customers. But, true to the public power mood in the administration and the leadership of Congress, this private enterprise concept became a Republican issue on the New Frontier. The public truly lost in the outcome of this issue.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. The administration jammed through Congress a judgeship bill including more additional appointments than were deemed necessary by impartial bodies. This was especially noteworthy in view of the fact that during 1960 and earlier the Democratic leadership in Congress stubbornly refused to consider President Eisenhower's request for needed judges, even when the President promised to appoint judges on an approximately 50–50 basis partywise. In this matter the majority party used patronage rather than principle in its reversal of policy.

2. Again in 1961, the proposals for medical care for the aged under the social security system were not reported from the House Ways and Means Committee. In its wisdom, the committee (15 Democrats and 10 Republicans) found that the proposals did not have sufficient merit for House consideration. They recognized that the Kerr-Mills bill of 1960 had only begun to go into operation in many States and thus deserved further study. They recognized that the programs of the administration were not actuarially sound. They recognized that, if enacted, the proposals would deny benefits to over 4¼ million of our elder citizens not eligible for social security benefits—truly the neediest of all. In connection with this, it was unfortunate that the Democratic House leadership rejected the Byrnes amendment to the Social Security Amendments of 1961 which would have granted minimum benefits to all aged 72 or more whose jobs were brought under social security too late for them to qualify for benefits, and also would have liberalized the current $1,200 limit on earning allowed social security beneficiaries without loss of benefits.

3. In three instances during the first few months of 1961, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division made completely irresponsible statements concerning plans to split up A.T. & T. His loose talk on August 2 caused A.T. & T. stock to drop over $1 billion in 1 day, causing a loss to over 2 million involved shareholders. His letter of May 8, when made public, caused an additional break of $1.7 billion in the stock. The merits of this case, where many feel that weakening of a big company with big resources would subsequently weaken the position of the United States in the field of world communications, is not the point. The point is that here "loose talk sank the ship," and that subsequent admissions that the investigation was only a "routine check into some complaints received" came too little and too late. This one example of actions in violation of the public trust illustrates graphically the New Frontier's policy of continually sniping at any person or company that does a good job and is a success. Apparently failure and not success is an earmark of advancement in the new administration's eyes, especially when compared to the previous actions of the Eisenhower administration in the antitrust field. This is one area in which even Drew Pearson bemoans the current New Frontier attitudes and inactions.

4. After Democratic-controlled Congresses repeatedly disregarded the well-documented requests of President Eisenhower for postal rate increases, the New Frontier tried to use a "gag rule" to press a rate increase on the first-class mail users who currently ring up a postal surplus by their mailings. Fortunately, the House stalled attempts to make John Q. Public support "junk mail" (so-called) in addition to their own mailings.

5. After the so-called packing of the House Rules Committee at the session's start, the Democrats claimed a new era of letting the House "work its will" would evolve. In contrast to this theory, the Rules Committee has operated in the same way to block conservative legislation and to report liberal legislation in almost every instance. In showing that the main question was, "Whose ox is being gored," the New Frontier has managed to "bottle up" 53 bills and resolutions, has granted 11 "gag rules" and has thus more than ever failed to let the House "work its will".

INSTANCES WHERE PRESIDENTIAL REQUESTS HAVE BEEN TURNED DOWN BY CONGRESS—TO A PARTIAL OR WHOLE DEGREE

Agriculture

1. Provide that programs involving controls over production and marketing shall go into effect when approved by two-thirds of the producers voting under regularly authorized voting procedures unless either House of Congress vetoes a program within 60 days of its submission to Congress.

Education

1. Authorize a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

2. Authorize $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of college classrooms.

3. Establish a 5-year program of State-administered scholarships with an initial authorization of $26.25 million.

4. Improve, expand and extend the National Defense Education Act.

Health

1. Enact a health insurance program under the social security system providing benefits to all persons 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.

2. Enact a Federal scholarship program for medical and dental students.

Housing

1. Amend the FHA system of mortgage financing to make no-down-payment, 40-year mortgages more attractive to private investors.

2. Establish a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

3. Increase the Federal share of urban and metropolitan planning grants to two-thirds and increase the authorization from $20 million to $100 million.

Welfare

1. Repay general expenses on temporary extension of the duration of unemployment compensation by raising the taxable payroll maximum per employee from $3,000 to $4,800 annually.

2. Improve the permanent unemployment compensation program.

Foreign aid

1. Consolidate all foreign aid programs under a new Federal agency, and also provide for military assistance as part of Defense budget—contradictory.

2. Appropriate $900 million for long-term development loans and provide no more than $1.6 billion for long-term loans for each of the next 4 years.

3. Stipulate that all private recruitment and training programs adhere to Peace Corps standards as a condition of Federal assistance.

District of Columbia

1. Provide home rule for the District of Columbia.

Government operations

1. Adopt reorganization plans for reorganization of the NLRB, FCC, and SEC.

2. Close existing gaps and inconsistencies in conflict-of-interest statutes.

Post Office

1. Raise postal rates to provide an additional $843 million in postal revenues.

Taxes and economic policy

1. Enact a major series of tax changes.

The above, together with the preceding descriptive material, illustrate some of the proposed measures passing Congress in a different form or not passing at all, and show that the 87th Congress, 1st session, has fortunately been no honeymoon.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The trends that run through the entire 9 months of the administration are matters of serious concern to all Americans. Briefly stated they reveal a deep-seated distrust of American business and of the abilities of the American people to meet their own problems without ocnstant Government interference.

2. They indicate to a startling degree the mistaken notion held dear by the administration that Federal money, taken from the heavily burdened American taxpayer, is the one and only answer to every problem from agriculture to foreign policy.

3. They indicate a complete disregard on the part of the administration of the traditional congressional prerogatives and show that the administration considers the duly elected Members of the legislative branch to be little more than pawns in the great intramural game of politics to which the administration is so devoted.

4. They reveal a complete lack of understanding of the nature of the Communist enemy on the part of the administration. They reveal a strong and barely concealed penchant for appeasement by many important administration officials.

5. On the domestic scene, they reveal irresponsible spending which inevitably results from the philosophy that all problems can be best solved by a combination of Government control and the earmarking of vast amounts of money without regard for need or the stimulation of local effort. Ever since this session began, we have been spending in the red at the rate of $1 million—every hour of every day and night.

6. They reveal a lack of a clearcut will to resist aggression with all the weapons at our command as was espoused by the Eisenhower administration.

7. In summary, the administration and the Democratic Congress have trod the

primrose path of dalliance in foreign policy. Here at home their spend and lend policy has brought Americans closer to ruin than to prosperity. It is written that "he that diggeth a pit shall fall into it." We of the Republican Party pledge to the American people that by our actions the citizens of this Nation shall escape the pit of bankruptcy at home and of defeat abroad, God willing.

The Championing of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an article written by Mr. Harry A. Bullis, former chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc. It relates to the recent conference at Oxford, England, sponsored by the Council on World Tensions of which Mr. Bullis is the chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Sept. 14, 1961]

UNITED STATES HAS MISSION TO CHAMPION RIGHTS EVERYWHERE, SAYS BULLIS

(The article below was written by the former chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc. It concerns the Aug. 28-Sept. 1 conference at Oxford, England, sponsored by the Council on World Tensions, of which the writer is chairman.)

(By Harry A. Bullis)

The Oxford conference, sponsored by the Council of World Tensions, involved about 70 participants, of whom about 40 came from African, Asian, and Latin American countries, and with a slight preponderance of Africans. The remainder, about 30, came from Europe and North America. The conference at Oxford University brought out these things, among others:

Every nation in the world in 1961 is a "developing country." All countries are evolving, or dying. Science and technology have been exploited in some countries more than others. As the less developed peoples use science and technology, they will become more developed.

In Asia, we see the two largest nations on earth, India and China, introducing science and technology under two different economic, political, and moral systems. Peoples in all lands are watching these two experiments. The future of all nations will be influenced by the results produced under the free-choice system of India with liberty and equality for all, as over against the results produced under Chinese communism with authoritarian equality for all.

Chile illustrates a dangerous trend in Latin America. The wealthy ruling class, which is 10 percent of the population, controls the Parliament and political life generally. The wealthy ruling class is getting richer, and the disparity with the poor increases. Only 1 percent of the college students come from the 90 percent of the population who are poor.

The Latin American experts predict that the small rich ruling class will resist the reforms demanded by the alliance for progress, as advocated in South America recently by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, just as they stupidly have used political, economic, and social pressures to squash Chilean reforms in the past.

This makes the masses believe that parliaments are no good. Parliaments have been used to reject welfare legislation and, therefore, they symbolize in the people's minds an archaic system of land tenure and political feudalism. This is why the masses of the poor in South America want for their nations the things they believe Castro is getting for the Cuban populace. Here is the tragedy: Chile has had 150 years of democracy, and now the masses doubt democracy's efficacy.

If the Latin American danger lies in the ineffectiveness of parliamentary systems with regard to economic righteousness, political honesty, and social democracy, then the United States has a mission to impress South American leaders with their responsibilities to make democracy work. Further, the United States must take the side of those who struggle as individuals for their declaration of independence, believing that all Latin Americans, too, are endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The United States must be concerned with the correction of evils everywhere in this hemisphere because the failures of democratic processes in Latin America jeopardize the continuance of democracy here.

The Latin American experts define Castro in the minds of the poplace of South America as a liberator who freed Cuba from, first Batista, and second, large foreign corporations which controlled Cuba's natural resources and public services. These experts advise the United States not to interfere by trying to unseat Castro, but to let the Cubans manage their own destiny. The only way to stop the spread of Castroism in Cuba is to solve Latin America's problem of undereducation, destitution of the masses, chronic ill health and discrimination against the "outcast" poor.

The Africans, and Americans who know Africa, say that all Africa is moving left, toward welfare states. Various forms of what we label as socialism are evolving, but not Russian communism. Africans are clinging to African traditions so that whatever political, economic, social and spiritual growth develops will be intensely African, not duplications of America, Russia or China.

Kenneth Kaunda, the leader of the blacks who are opposing the minority of whites controlling Northern Rhodesia, spoke in a stirring manner for parity of opportunity. This ebony black man (Kaunda) has a quiet confident gentleness in his spirit; a keen intelligence of mind; a gift of precise speech in perfect English language, and a winning sense of humor that lights up his earnest purpose to liberate his fellow Negro Africans.

Kaunda protests the state of affairs in his native land where a small minority of whites arrange to have two-thirds of the seats in government, all the best jobs, exclusive social customs in public relations, and insist that blacks carry identification papers every hour of every day. Most of all, Kaunda rejects the philosophy of the whites expressed by a Northern Rhodesia white official: "The relations of whites and Negroes is in relation of a rider to a horse." Kaunda's response is that black Africans are not going to serve as the horse any longer.

Again, if in Africa we see new nations going hogwild for socialism in order to increase the speed of their economic takeoff toward industrialization, the United States has a mission to present the case for individual initiative, individual enterprise, individual savings, individual capital, individual ownership. The thesis of values in a free-choice economic system will then be joined with their antithesis of state socialism, and ultimately will evolve into a more reasonable synthesis than otherwise would be the destiny of Africa.

Will Latin Americans and Africans heed such teachings and persuasion? At Oxford the South Americans and Africans praised the Marshall plan for Europe. They would welcome Marshall plans for education, economic growth, and health in their countries. We know that the Marshall plan resulted in a vast resurgence of faith in individual equality of opportunity and enthusiasm for free-choice economic systems adapted to European conditions.

Men like Paul Hoffman, David Zellerbach, John McCloy, and others became effective teaching missionaries of "people's capitalism" as the foreign aid brought prosperity to Europeans. The practice of political democracy became general, too, in countries that might easily have capitulated to authoritarian military dictatorships all across Europe.

A 1962 adaptation of the Marshall plan for Africa and Latin America is now needed, and, if Latin Americans and Africans are assured of their independence, would be welcomed.

At Oxford, there was underlined the ability of mankind today to accomplish almost anything we can imagine. Military defense and space invasion illustrate what imagination, money, science, and engineering can accomplish.

The question was asked, Cannot we develop the imagination and energy on the same scale for economic and cultural well-being? We Americans are spending enormous sums and making giant efforts for scientific research on weapons and destructive power. Why should we not match those large sums and those giant efforts with scientific researches into the nature of man, the nature of the problems of world well-being, and the blocks to peace?

We Can Get It for You Wholesale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I read recently about a meeting in Oklahoma City, to advise the public on how to secure Federal funds. I was somewhat amused but disturbed to think we had come to the point where numerous Federal agencies would band together to promote acquisition and spending of Federal funds. The editor of the western Kansas, Dodge City Daily Globe, shares my views. The editorial "Selling Federal Aid" which appeared in the September 19 issue of that paper follows for your information:

SELLING FEDERAL AID

Seven Federal agencies put on an all-day meeting down in Oklahoma City the other day. The purpose was to advise the public about ways and means to get more Federal aid for various enterprises. The thought seemed to be that if a Federal dollar is lying around, it should not be allowed to continue unspent.

Governor Edmondson, of Oklahoma, in a speech welcoming those at the meeting, is quoted as having said: "Idle Federal funds will be put to work at little cost and involving no Federal appropriations."

We presume, of course, that these idle funds already have been appropriated and that taxes or deficit financing will have to provide the money.

We hadn't believed that it ever would be necessary for Federal officials and local politicians to put on high-pressure sales campaigns to interest local communities in what is known as Federal aid. Of course, the various bureaucrats who handle the funds and impose Federal restrictions and regulations on those who receive the money will be more sure of their jobs if aid programs are expanded.

Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the profit motive is the heart of our economy. It is the heart of our very existence and is the heart and core of our American civilization. We should be proud of our profit system and its accomplishments for the American people and the free world. The following splendid article appeared in the September issue of Reader's Digest.

WHY ARE PROFITS UNPOPULAR?—A LEADING U.S. BUSINESSMAN CHALLENGES WHAT HE CALLS ECONOMIC DISHWATER

(By Roger M. Blough)

What is it that raises buildings tall against the sky, that provides American workmen with the most efficient tools of production in the world, that is the driving force behind our discovery of more useful and beneficial ways of doing things? What is it that provides over 72 million of us in the United States with the thing we need most—a productive job? What is it that gives our national security its industrial muscle to resist aggression; that Communists from Karl Marx to Khrushchev would have liked most to see destroyed in America, the easier to bury us?

In our free society the one great motivating force is the incentive we call profit. It is profit and the expectation of profit that distinguishes our mode of production and our manner of living. It is the tonic and energizer of our economic lifestream.

Why, then, when profit is so important to everyone, do so many people criticize and downgrade it? Why is there so much misunderstanding about it? Why do we businessmen so often apologize for it? Why do we allow profit to be pinched, squeezed, siphoned away, even slowly destroyed?

Almost daily we hear objections raised to profit that we know to be uninformed—yet we permit this economic dishwater to go unchallenged.

A person paying a 10-cent profit on a dollar article wonders aloud why the article can't be sold for 90 cents. He needs to know that profit is not something arbitrarily added to value, but a necessary part of the article's price. It pays the firm's owners for the use of their tools, without which the article could not have been manufactured. It goes into research facilities, which improve the article's quality and brings down the cost of making it. Without profit, or its expectation, the article probably would not have been made in the first place.

Objections to profit come frequently from employees, who see competition cutting into sales and think that trimming profits will improve the competitive position of their product. This is like tearing up the flooring for kindling to keep your house warm in winter. No one needs profits in a business so much as the worker who wishes to retain a job in that business. For out of profit come, among all the other things, the funds that strengthen the company and increase the number of jobs available.

Recently the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. published the 10-year employment record of 50 large industrial companies. The study showed that the 25 most profitable companies had increased employment by 20 percent. During the same period the 25 least profitable companies reduced employment by almost 10 percent.

Why, then, this adverse reaction to profit? It cannot be that profits are rising too rapidly, because, in fact, they have failed to keep pace in our economy. The real trouble in this country today is this: so great is the squeeze on profit that there just isn't enough of it to do all the things that profit should be doing. In 1950 corporate profits after taxes were about 9 percent of national income. By 1960 they had been squeezed down to about 5½ percent.

Among 100 representative corporations canvassed recently by the New York Journal of Commerce, 60 declared that continued profit squeeze will force them to reduce spending for research and development. Henry Ford II, in answering the questionnaire, said, "Let me point out that, of all the major components in the economy, business profits alone have failed to share in the exceptional growth of the past decade." He cited the fact that, while hourly wage rates in all manufacturing industry have gone up 52 percent in a 10-year period, corporation net profits remained approximately the same, despite increased investment and sales.

There are a number of constructive things that can be done. One relates to our taxing policies, and particularly to adequate allowance for depreciation. A report on January 5 of this year indicated that a clear majority of 3,500 companies that answered a U.S. Treasury questionnaire would increase their capital spending if Congress would liberalize the depreciation laws. And this, of course, would mean more jobs, directly, and immediately.

In this connection, a report of the industrial-economics program at Fordham University shows that $95 billion worth of our industrial machinery is outdated now, and that an additional $60 billion worth will grow obsolete by 1970 unless the present inadequate depreciation provisions of the tax laws are changed. That would total $155 billion worth of obsolete facilities which cannot be replaced out of depreciation allowances and will therefore constitute a drain upon profits.

Moreover, we are going to have to provide tools for 13,500,000 new workers in the next 10 years. Since authorities estimate an average need of $20,000 for each worker, that means a further capital investment of $270 billion.

So, there must be more profit, or the lack of it will bring about two things: fewer jobs for new workers, and a less competitive America—less competitive with Soviet Russia and with the world.

Only under the profit system has man attained those ends by which we set so much store: independence, ownership of property, savings, a rational planning of one's own life and, that greatest boon of all, the freedom of choice, and the courage to make it. Those outside our country who prophesy that they will bury us and that our grandchildren will live under socialism will have achieved their ends if profit is ever eliminated from U.S. business.

Proposed Great Basin National Park in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the October issue of Dodge News magazine will feature an article on the proposed Great Basin National Park in Nevada. I have been privileged to read this splendid article, which was written by Elleen Lambert, of Ely, Nev. Mrs. Lambert, who has long been interested in seeing a national park created in this ruggedly beautiful 140,000-acre area in eastern Nevada, is to be commended for her graphic presentation in this widely circulated publication. As an author of the Great Basin National Park bill, I am delighted to see an article which sets forth in detail the importance of this area as a proposed national park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Lambert's article entitled "A National Park in Nevada's Wilderness," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATIONAL PARK IN NEVADA'S WILDERNESS

(By Elleen Lambert)

Sooner or later, the secret was bound to come out. Neveda has fabulously beautiful and interesting scenery hidden away in her barren-appearing mountains, and it takes only a few trips into the back country to convince even the most skeptical that some of this scenic wilderness is of national park caliber.

The Advisory Board on National Parks has endorsed 230 square miles of the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves area in east-central Nevada as being suitable to represent the Great Basin geographic region in the national park system.

The superlative example of the remarkably varied plant and animal life of the region would thus be preserved, along with an outstanding illustration of the distinctive basin-and-range topography representing the geological structure of the vast land between the Rockies and the Sierra Nevadas.

A bill to create a 147,000-acre scenic and recreation playground to be known as Great Basin National Park is now pending in both Houses of Congress, sponsored by the entire Nevada delegation. Speaking to his colleagues Senator ALAN BIBLE commented, "To the uninitiated, Nevada is sometimes pictured as a barren and desolate wasteland * * * a slander that this beautiful national park would effectively destroy."

Secretary of the Interior Udall has given enthusiastic endorsement to the proposed legislation.

Thousands of people have come to the fringes of the proposed park and visited the exquisitely beautiful Lehman Caves (a national monument since 1922). Many have gone a little farther and enjoyed picnics, fishing and camping along Baker and Lehman creeks above the caves where the Forest Service maintains facilities. Until the park was first suggested in 1955, however, relatively few had ventured beyond the ends of the dirt roads into the real wilderness.

Since then, more and more people, including National Park Service men, botanists,

ecologists, geologists and outdoor enthusiasts, have parked their cars and jeeps and hiked up into the rugged back country to be completely impressed with this strange and fascinating "sky island."

Many naturalists claim the several large stands of fantastic bristlecone pine trees found on at least a half-dozen mountain peaks in the area and now believed to be the oldest living things on earth, are reason enough to preserve this region in the park system.

There are fine stands of younger bristlecones (up to a mere thousand years old) in lower, more protected areas, but the oldest and largest seem to prefer to live dangerously and are growing on the most barren and desolate ridges where some of them have struggled against the harshest elements for over 4,000 years. Fierce winds and ice have carved each tree into a masterpiece of weird and wonderful design. Some of these battered "characters" are over 35 feet in circumference and not much taller.

Another feature of this proposed park is the small but active "desert-bound" glacier in the awesome great north cirque high on Mount Wheeler, unique because this remnant of the last glacial age is only 5 airline miles from the desert floor.

Pictures fail to prepare you for the violent and desolate grandeur of this gorge. Towering cliffs rise 1,500 to 2,000 feet on either side of the river of rocks that fills the canyon floor, and Wheeler Park juts up in a sheer wall at the far end of the cirque above the glacier. This fearsome place of ice, snow and desolation is a grim reminder of primeval times.

Those who appreciate nature at its dramatic best will be thrilled with Lincoln Canyon. Here, spectacular white cliffs that have been compared favorably with those in Zion National Park border the narrow green canyon and make a startling frame for a view of the arid desert below.

A huge limestone arch in Lexington Canyon in the southeast section of the proposed park is another outstanding feature. This massive and little-known formation could span a six-story building.

The area has over a dozen inviting canyons, some with fascinating rock formations, some with tree-lined trout streams and each one distinctly different. There are flower-filled meadows, deep and inviting forests and little jewel-like mountain lakes. You could spend a day or a week in this primitive playground and never see another person.

You could leave the sagebrush and cactus of the desert with its foxes, antelope, coyotes, cottontails and jackrabbits, pass through the pinion, pine-juniper belt, through scattered ponderosa pines, mountain mahogany, aspens, white and Douglas firs and Engelmann spruce where you might see mule-deer, beaver, badgers, skunks, elk or even bobcats, cougar or the elusive mountain sheep. At timberline there are knee-high spruce and aspens and bristlecones and limber pines. Above timberline are Geum and moss silene—both typical of the far north. Here in capsule form is a 3,000-mile northward journey in which a fascinating national park interpretive program of flora and fauna may be developed.

A paved road might be constructed, if the park is established, to connect Lehman Caves with campgrounds and picnic spots in the various picturesque canyons. This scenic road could wind through weird bristlecone forests and have viewpoints overlooking the huge arch and the sky-island glacier in the awesome cirque. Trails could take hikers and horseback riders into remote primitive areas, while most of the park would be left as complete wilderness to harbor the wildlife.

Even now, many who enjoy getting away from the more-populated areas can find pleasure and relaxation in the area as it stands. There are limited tourist accommodations at Lehman Caves National Monument and in the little town of Baker just below the proposed park, but don't overlook the ample accommodations in Ely, Nev., 67 miles away.

A Federal Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the quest for additional sources for raising Federal tax revenue, or as a means of replacing methods now in use, there are some who believe this country should adopt a Federal lottery.

Those who advocate such a system must certainly overlook or ignore the deplorable social and moral degradation which such a plan would surely bring about.

An article in the September 1961 issue of the American Legion magazine giving the views of our colleague, Hon. VERNON W. THOMSON, Representative from Wisconsin on this subject, deserves the attention of all thinking Americans. His article follows:

Should this Nation, the leader of the free world, in order to raise revenue, encourage and appeal to the improvidence of its people? That perhaps is the basic question raised by the introduction in this Congress of H.R. 2007 to provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds, to reduce the national debt and to reduce Federal income taxes. The plan is offered as a recognition of the "American urge to gamble as an instinctive and universal human trait." Perhaps the fallacy of this proposal is expressed in that statement by the author.

Gambling is neither an "instinct" nor a "universal human trait." Gambling is simply a manifestation of man's innate desire to acquire money and property. There are two ways to accomplish this objective: First, by industry, that is, by working, saving, investing and creating; second, sometimes the overwhelming impulse to acquire money impels the individual to embezzle, steal, obtain by fraud or other methods which are reprehensible or illegal.

The desire to acquire money and property is natural and legitimate. The method pursued in the acquisition is the critical test. If the effort is productive of social wealth and stability for which the industrious are rewarded, it should be encouraged by the public policy of the Government and its people. If it encourages recklessness with people's resources, produces no real wealth, provides a reward without work or industry, sanctions improvidence to the point of poverty and want, social consequences require it be condemned.

A lottery is a manifestation of the less desirable acquisitive methods of man. The social evils created are so widely recognized that all of the States in the Union prohibit lotteries by constitution or statute. Should our Federal Government impose this scheme in opposition to the moral objections raised against it in every State in the Union? Shouldn't this Congress set a standard which would encourage the more noble aspirations of man, rather than establish a standard which is simply a lure to improvidence? Any program which degrades or stultifies the social conscience or idealism of this Government is unworthy of consideration by this Congress or the people.

Fifth Annual Congressional Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the Congress draws to a close after we have met 273 days, one of the longest peacetime sessions we have had, we are all looking forward to an opportunity to return to our respective States and visit and talk with the people whom we have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of West Virginia is only an hour's time from Washington by air travel. I have returned to my district, even while the Congress is in session, every weekend for the purposes of holding weekly congressional office hours in my district office at Moundsville. This has afforded me the opportunity of working closely with the people of my district, and I have attempted to make myself readily available to them at any time that they might want to discuss with me, matters of importance to their Nation, State, and families. However, as all of my colleagues know, a session of the Congress is very time consuming and this has prevented me from having the opportunity to travel about in my district and State as much as I would like and to talk with persons who have varied interests and difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, ever since coming to the Congress on January 3, 1957, I have made it a practice, following the adjournment of each session of the Congress to undertake an annual tour of my district, which carries me into every community. I have held regular office hours in each community during which time the people might drop in to say "hello" or to inquire of some Federal legislation.

In preparing for these annual visits in each community, I have made arangements with the various courthouses, post offices and civic buildings for office space where it will be convenient to meet and privately confer with individuals who might want to see me.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to announce the schedule of my fifth annual tour of my district, and in each instance, the time shown is the local time for that particular community:

Tuesday, October 24, 1961, Hancock County: 10 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Cumberland; 1 to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Weirton.

Wednesday, October 25, 1961, Brooke County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, mayor's office, city building, Follansbee.

1 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., sheriff's office, courthouse, Wellsburg.

Thursday, October 26, 1961, Ohio County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., fourth floor, post office building, Wheeling.

Monday, October 30, 1961, Taylor County: 10 a.m. to 4 p.m., post office building, Grafton.

Tuesday, October 31, 1961, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p. m., courthouse, Fairmont.

Thursday, November 2, 1961, Wetzel County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Martinsville; 1:30 to 4 p.m., city hall, Hundred.

Friday, November 3, 1961, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, post office, Farmington; 1:30 to 4:30 p.m., city hall, Rivesville.

I should like to note, Mr. Speaker, that I have scheduled no courthouse visit for Moundsville, inasmuch as my district office is situated there and is open to the public 6 days a week, and my constituents from that area and the district as a whole are invited to present any matter which they may have, to me personally at any time in my district office.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them and workers, businessmen, and housewives are urged to drop by the temporary office in their hometown. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as they are.

It is my fond hope that this fifth annual tour of my district will be as successful as it has been in previous years when several hundred people stopped by each day at our office to discuss important matters with me.

As I stated before, I maintain a district office in the Mercantile Bank Building in Moundsville. It is open 6 days a week to serve the residents of the First Congressional District.

If I should be out of the office on official business there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or to assist in every way possible.

I welcome all those who may have a problem of great importance to themselves to meet with me when I am in their community or on this annual congressional tour of our disrtict.

Size, Monopoly Not Synonymous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the administration's shotgun tactics toward bank mergers, railroad mergers and, for that matter, all corporate enterprises, it is well to pause and reflect on some of the factors that go into the effective development and maintenance of our free enterprise system. A most timely résumé on the issue of corporate enterprise appeared in the Wednesday, September 20, Chicago Sun-Times in a column by its editor, Milburn P. Akers. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert this article "Size, Monopoly Not Synonymous," into the RECORD at this point:

SIZE, MONOPOLY NOT SYNONYMOUS
(By Milburn P. Akers)

There was a time when trust busting was an almost certain way to launch a successful political career. More than one politican climbed to fame and position, especially around the turn of the century, by denouncing and sometimes prosecuting aggregations of capital in commerce or industry they contended were monopolistic.

Some of them were monopolistic. And some of them were not.

The Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 was intended as a means by which the Government could break up monopolistic aggregations of capital which were employed in a manner inimical to the public welfare.

The economic boom which followed the Civil War had created aggregations of capital which were sometimes ruthlessly employed, notably in the railroad industry and, to some extent, in the developing petroleum industry. The railroads were among the first to undergo regulation, the first Federal act for their supervision being enacted in 1887.

During the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson trust busting and regulation became the order of the day. They were considerably extended as emergency measures in Franklin D. Roosevelt's time.

Then the philosophy that sheer size was a sufficient criterion for prosecution under the antitrust acts developed, the philosophy that size in and of itself is inherently evil. It was an easy transition from this philosophy to that contained in the fairly recent Du Pont Co. case, in which that company was ordered to divest itself of large holdings in General Motors Corp., not because either those holdings or General Motors itself constituted a monopoly, but rather because those holdings were of a size which, if improperly employed, made monopolistic practices, especially unfair trade practices, possible.

Some of this same philosophy is apparent in the Government's current efforts to stop bank consolidations in New York and Chicago.

The Justice Department seeks to require the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago to divest itself of the stocks, assets, and other properties of the City National Bank & Trust Co., a merger which was previously approved by other Federal regulatory agencies.

In New York City the Department is seeking to block the merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank, a merger which has the approval of the New York State Banking Department and of the Federal Reserve Board.

In neither instance is the contention made that the banks have engaged in monopolistic practices detrimental to the public welfare. Such proof is apparently no longer necessary. Size, and size alone, is the criterion. And in the matter of size, and size alone, the department gets itself into a somewhat ridiculous position. For there are bigger banks in the Nation than either of the two. Neither of the two will be without considerable competition from other banks, as large or nearly as large, in its home city.

But antitrust actions which are directed against sheer bigness and bigness alone, as too many of them appear to be, are no more in the public interest than the monopolistic practices with which the Antitrust Division is supposed to concern itself.

Bigness is a relative term. We have many oil companies today which are bigger than was the Standard Oil Co., which was once judged to be a monopoly. In fact, most of the companies which resulted from the federally enforced division of that company years ago are now bigger than was the parent company which then constituted a monopoly insofar as the law was concerned.

Size and monopoly are not synonymous terms except, perhaps, to the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department.

The Kennedy administration has yet to develop a clear-cut philosophy in this area. Currently, it is filing antitrust suits with about the same rapidity as it is increasing the national debt.

This random action is creating uncertainty and uneasiness in the business community. Once, monopolistic practices injurious to the public welfare were an essential in the bringing of such actions. But no longer. Now size alone is sufficient. The reward for corporate success today would appear to be an antitrust action irrespective of the manner in which the company is conducted.

Bad Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, many of the American taxpayers who are forced to support extravagance abroad are poor people. Many of our friends abroad are poor people. Such conduct as outlined in the following editorial is repulsive and shocking:

LIVING IT UP, AFRICAN STYLE

A few weeks ago, one Arsene Assouan Usher, age 30, moved into a $90,000 house at Lloyd Harbor, a plush section of Long Island. The property includes 8 acres overlooking the water; a 42-room mansion will house the gentleman, his wife, their three small children, and a staff of servants.

And who is this affluent young man? A rising young executive? An heir to corporate millions? Not so. Mr. Usher is the Ambassador to the United Nations from the Ivory Coast, one of the former French colonies that gained its independence a year ago. The estate has been purchased for him out of the same sense of munificence by which the Ivory Coast's President, Mouphouet Boigny, has built himself an $11 million marble palace back home in Abidjan.

Nor is the Ivory Coast the only underdeveloped, poverty-stricken, aid-seeking African republic to set a style of high living to which the leaders of older nations would like to become accustomed. A New York correspondent for the London Sunday Telegraph recently put together an eye-opening account of lavish spending by other objects of Mr. Kennedy's solicitude.

Ghana, for example, is held up as an infant republic than cannot possibly make ends meet on its own revenues. Hat in hand, Dr. Nkrumah is seeking credit where he can find it. His cause is not greatly helped, it might be suggested, by the chartered BOAC airliner that brought him and a party of 34 to a recent session of the U.N. Dr. Nkrumah expected to be in New York only 2 days; he was to make one speech. But his staff, which shortly grew to 70, took 40 suites in the Waldorf-Astoria, where an elegant reception was held.

At that, Ghana's reception in New York was mere tea and scones compared to a dinner the Indonesian Embassy threw in Washington last month for 1,200 guests. We had heard of this blowout before the Telegraph's man brought it up. A goggle-eyed guest, fairly well inured to eating high on the Washington hog, staggered from the affair saying he never had seen anything to touch it. His guess was that the bill, from invitations to tips, ran to at least $35,000 and might have hit $50,000. And Indonesia is broke, too.

It's bad form, we suppose, to raise even an eyebrow at this sort of outlay, but no student of American history is likely to forget the frugal allowances and spartan quarters the infant United States provided her own diplomats 150 years ago. Some American consuls, to hear tell, still are tapping the weevils out of their biscuits. But perhaps styles change in infant nations, as they change in everything else, and one ought not to complain excessively at the insouciant spending of republics seeking foreign aid. After all, easy come, easy go.

Easy come from whom, bub?

Paul Ertzinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Paul Ertzinger is a familiar figure on Capitol Hill. For the past 11 years he has been assigned to duties here and with the White House as a special investigator of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In his work, he has had personal contact with nearly all of the Senators and Congressmen of this era. He has gained their respect and confidence as an able and efficient public servant. More importantly, his personal charm has won their friendship.

On September 8 of this year, Paul completed 25 years of faithful service with the Bureau. Previous to his work with the FBI he had been in the Postal Service in my hometown of Huntington, Ind.

On the occasion of his 25th anniversary, Paul was presented with a number of personal messages from those with whom he works. Among those most cherished are letters directed to him by two of his personal friends, one from the recent junior Senator from Massachusetts and another from the recent senior Senator from Texas. As a belated part of the anniversary tribute to this dedicated FBI agent and anticipating his 50th birthday, Tuesday, September 26, I would like to introduce the letters to Paul from the President and the Vice President of the United States on that occasion:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 1, 1961.

MR. PAUL E. ERTZINGER,
Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: I have been glad to learn that on the 8th of September you will observe your 25th year of service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I am personally most pleased to extend my best wishes to you since I have known intimately of your work both while I was in the Congress and here in the White House. You have been most effective in performing your duties and have been of inestimable help to me and to members of my staff.

I hope that you will have many more years of useful and happy service to your country.

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, August 14, 1961.

MR. PAUL E. ERTZINGER,
Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: I understand that on September 8, 1961, you will celebrate your 25th anniversary with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and your 11th year on your present assignment to Capitol Hill and the White House.

Congratulations to you on this wonderful record. I know of the exacting efficiency required by the Bureau and it is a testimonial to you that you have been able to meet that high degree of efficiency throughout this long period.

Let me wish for you many more years of service to the Bureau and to the Government and that you will continue to enjoy the friendship and affection of your many friends on Capitol Hill.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

A Patent Policy for a Free Enterprise Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic arguments affecting the American system that has been heard in this Congress is in the field of patents, particularly those developing from research and development sponsored with Government funds.

This question is being examined in connection with the patent provisions of the Space Act by a subcommittee chaired by Congressman DADDARIO.

A recent article appeared in the American Bar Association Journal outlining the terms of a moderate and middle-of-the-road patent policy that would best serve the United States and the public interest. I offer it for the RECORD so that it may be studied by all the Members.

In it, I believe Congressman DADDARIO spells out a moderate approach to this issue which reflects the thinking of himself and others who have carefully examined this issue and one that would be in the best interests of the United States:

A PATENT POLICY FOR A FREE ENTERPRISE ECONOMY

(By EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Member of Congress, First District, Connecticut)

(The question who should own the patent rights for inventions produced on projects financed by the Federal Government is a vital one to our national economy—especially since the Government is now spending about $9 billion annually on scientific research and development. Congressman DADDARIO favors a flexible position holding for the Government the rights it needs and taking title only when public policy or the national security dictates.)

During the coming fiscal year, the Federal Government will spend an estimated $9 billion in support of scientific research and development. This sum represents approximately 75 percent of all of the research and development that will be performed in the country during that year.

The fact that this tremendous sum is drawn from the taxpayer, together with the fact that the end product of research and development is becoming almost solely governmental in purpose in such spending, poses a dilemma of Government patent policy which is being debated more strenuously this year than ever before.

What equity, it is being asked, does the taxpayer have in the patentable devices that tax-supported research and development have produced, and what rights should be reserved to the scientist or the inventor whose services produced the item?

This is at the heart of the dispute which has now gone on for many years over Government patent policy. Our Constitution asserts that "The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries." In explaining the inclusion of this patent clause, James Madison, writing in the Federalist Papers (No. 43), stated that: "The utility of this power will scarcely be questioned. The copyright of authors has been solemnly judged, in Great Britain, to be a right of common law. The right to useful inventions seems with equal reason to belong to the inventors. The public good fully coincides in both cases with the claims of individuals." I find it hard to understand that Madison's statement, "The public good fully coincides in both cases with the claim of individuals," should be challenged. It seems to me that the arguments supporting the idea that the Government should own patents developed privately are not convincing. I had the occasion to become closely acquainted with this issue in 1959 when a subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics was established to consider the patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. The subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of Representative Erwin Mitchell, of Georgia, determined that the original restrictive patent policy contained in the Space Act was added to that act following the close of public hearings and modified in the compromise version adopted in conference. Therefore, the patent policy of the original National Aeronautics and Space Act was included without being subject to hearings, and as a result was not given adequate consideration by Congress.

My own sentiments at the start of the hearings held by the subcommittee were generally in the belief that the Government, by virtue of its financial support, was entitled to the ownership of inventions resulting from that research. During the hearings the National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommended an amendment, supported by most of the 42 witnesses who appeared before the Mitchell subcommittee, which would give the Space Administration in each case the administrative determination as to whether or not it was in the best interest of the Government and the public for the Government to take title to patents arising out of research work funded wholly or partially with Federal funds. As a result of the hearings, the subcommittee agreed that the Government should retain a nonexclusive, royalty-free, nontransferable, nonrevocable license for use but that the inventor should retain title to his invention for commercial purposes. The subcommittee also provided a statement of policy as a guideline to the Space Administration for determining what rights the Government should request in patents coming under its purview. The House accepted these recommendations and passed the

amendment by a large majority, after full debate.

Unfortunately, this legislation saw no action in the Senate. This resulted both from the press of business and from opposition to its passage created by a small pocket of feeling that a uniform patent policy, in which the Government took title to all inventions, should be considered.

I am now convinced, after 2 years of study, that we have departed from the original constitutional concepts in the statutes affecting patent policy enacted since World War II. Specifically, the present patent policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Space Act of 1958 depart severely from the original concept of private rights and a free enterprise system as far as patents are concerned.

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT IN MANAGEMENT

We are already leaning too much on Government management. We should not search for a patent policy which would give the Government even more ownership and management which, up to now, hove been in the private sector. Such a policy would be inimical to the free enterprise system. We can and must reserve to the individuals and research teams the product of their scientific research while, at the same time, protecting the Government's legitimate interests.

The search for a Government-wide patent policy has failed thus far to produce results because it has had to grapple with the immense variety of our Government activities today. Each department and agency has its own programs and requirements in contracting for research.

It is interesting to note that industry and the Department of Defense have worked out, as a result of over 20 years of hard give-and-take, a set of regulations on the subject of patent rights which appear in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation. They still are not exactly what the Department of Defense or industry would like them to be, but they represent a workable compromise which reasonably takes care of the needs of both Government and industry. Generally, they provide that the inventor and his assignee retain title to any patents they take out for inventions made in the performance of work under governmental contracts, but subject to a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to the Government, which actually is all the Government needs. This means that the Government is free, under the patents for inventions made under its contracts, to make the developed product itself or to contract with others to do so without royalties, if it does not wish to purchase the product from the inventor.

Doctrinaire opponents of this liberal patent policy start from the premise that monopoly is bad per se. A patent is a monopoly, they reason, and in itself is bad, despite the truth that all monopoly is not bad and that regulated monopoly, including patent monopolies, unedr modern antitrust legislation, has provided a large part of our economic growth, as in the public utilities, postal services, and communications.

Without some form of protection, it is a business axiom that there is little incentive to develop an invention. It may be argued that if there is a demand for a product, business will invest, produce, and market it. But in the complexities of modern business, this is not the case. Risk capital requires some assurances of its own recovery and a fair margin of profit. The lengthy and costly procedure of developing and marketing a new item demands too much capital investment for it to be risked without some semblance of protection. Today, of every 26 new products offered to the public, only 1 survives as a successful venture. Many companies have gone broke bringing out products which either did not touch the public's fancy or appeared at the wrong time. In addition, new products remain new for a very short time. They are quickly succeeded by products of better design and lower price. There are in the history of the growth of the United States thousands of instances where small companies that have started with just a single patent have grown to employ hundreds and thousands of people. In my congressional district alone, two of the major employers began operations within the last half century with but a single patent. A study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston shows that, between the years 1950 and 1955, 85 percent of New England employment gains were traceable to six industries which had allocated the largest amounts of their effort to research and development. In 1955, about one-third of the region's manufacturing employment was dependent on new products introduced in the preceding 10 years.

The free enterprise system assigns great importance to incentive for the individual. The patent clause of the Constitution was intended to grant to the inventor the benefit of his skills, his risks, and his resultant discovery, and to allow him the prospect of reward, so that others might seek to emulate him. It cannot be judged, as many of our opponents of our longstanding patent policies appear to do, on the basis of whether the inventor himself is stimulated to greater scientific effort by Government participation and support.

THE FACTS OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

But it is easy to discuss this in the sense of an individual effort. More difficult are the facts—the facts of scientific research now utilized to produce, in corporate laboratories, innovations. Granted that no team ever painted Raphael's "Madonna" or could have written "Hamlet." The facts are that teamwork did produce the atomic and hydrogen bombs, using the acquired skills later for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, working and building on the knowledge of the past.

Despite arguments to the contrary, the patent system does encourage rapid growth in economic and scientific activity. By requiring quick registration and disclosure, it allows those who keep abreast of this information and have the imagination and initiative to move on from it, a chance to build newer and better devices.

It has been argued that the opposite is true—that unless the Government obtains title to all inventions under its research contracts, vital scientific information is hushed up and technical progress stifled. The record of American economic growth over 170 years does not support that allegation.

The best and most complete disclosure of data comes from the patent process, and where this works imperfectly, it is largely because of an overburdened Patent Office and the statutory deficiencies of the patent code.

I have already referred to the fact that modern technology requires the assembly of skilled teams to apply their talent and know-how to the solution of extremely difficult problems. These teams do not come together easily; they are assembled at great expense and effort so that a combination of individual skills may be directed to the solution of problems important in the national interest.

When the Government, by contract, directs a company to turn this talent loose on a problem, it is hiring a service. It receives the solution for which it pays; it should not then deny that team or that company the right to use the product of its own skill for commercial purposes. To do so could break up these research and development programs through which many of our new products have been developed. These teams are desperately needed at this time to press forward the frontiers of technology. We must make use of all our talent in the scientific and technological skills. We cannot afford a wasteful process casually moving on from each project as if we had used up a campsite or wilderness without thought of conservation. The process of change, the allure of new fields is erosive enough without having the Government remove the incentive to invent. Consider a system in which government would own and manage patents. Would it work well under our democratic system?

It would be difficult to prove that this would work well in this country. It didn't following World War I when few of the patents accumulated in the Office of the Alien Property Custodian were developed on a major scale. Considerable discussion was held at that time in order to find a way in which the Government might allow these patents to be used, many of which were valuable. It could exclude everyone, in which case the patent would be worthless, undeveloped. It could grant an exclusive license to one American citizen against all others. This was not workable. The result was that no workable system evolved, and most of these patents languished.

A recent study has shown the dimensions of this problem of Federal patent policy. In 1953, the Government owned outright a total of 4,061 inventions covered by unexpired patents. At this time, it is estimated that the number of active patents owned by the Government amounts to approximately 14,000. This figure is increasing yearly as the Government acquires more patents under its contracts.

WHAT SHOULD THE PATENT POLICY BE?

Let's return to the basic question—what should a Government patent policy hope to accomplish?

Fundamentally, it should encourage full development of the potential of any invention that can be of use to the American people. It should encourage maximum public benefit. It should protect and encourage the initiative and inventive talent that gave rise to the innovation. It should not be inimical to the American free enterprise system which has provided our people with the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

The Government should stimulate further inventive activity. It should continue to promote full disclosure of inventions. It should maintain a policy which will attract risk capital to develop products for public consumption.

I have introduced H.R. 1934 in the 87th Congress to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to bring it more in line with these concepts. Basically this represents the position the Mitchell subcommittee reached after its long hearings in 1959—after the first study of the impact of these Space Act provisions on the American space effort.

H.R. 1934 would grant to the Administrator of NASA authority to waive the rights of the United States to any invention produced under contract with his agency, but provides that he retain not less than an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license in any event. Such a change would bring the NASA position closer to that of the Department of Defense and mark a step forward toward clearer patent policy in the majority of work done for the Government today.

Further study is planned in the Senate, and probably in the House, where a special subcommittee of which I am chairman will take up the issues affecting the Space Act to explore present circumstances. I am of the opinion that thorny obstacles remain to the creation of a uniform patent policy for 65 Federal agencies with more than 2 million employees. I recognize that any discussion of the Constitution, of business, of

monopoly and of free enterprise is likely to be controversial. But I believe that unless incontrovertible reasons otherwise are produced, we should move to restore a measure of patent protection to the individual on whom we rely for the full exercise of his talents and abilities in the national space effort.

My prime concern is that this country develop a program for the space age which will place us in a position of world leadership. To accomplish this end, we must combine all the particular talents and skills which exist in Government and industry. The system under which we live has always worked out when there have not been overburdening restraints. We can, on the one hand, set our sights on high attainment in these matters affecting national security and still develop those byproducts which will increase our standard of living and maintain our financial and economic strength. Placing our past history in present-day perspective, a proper balance in the field of patents would indicate a policy under which the Government would retain those rights it needs for its own best interests. This would allow the private developer to take his chances in developing and offering for sale consumer products in the public marketplaces. Such a policy would provide the necessary stimulus for the advancement of our scientific research and development programs, both public and private. In this way, the results of our research and development would be available to satisfy both Government and public needs.

Presentation of Gold Medal of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to Gen. Lauris Norstad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the newly elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, recently journeyed to Paris to make a most suitable and fitting presentation to a fellow Minnesotan, Gen. Lauris Norstad.

The presentation was the Gold Medal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—the highest honor which can be bestowed by this great organization of 1,300,000 American veterans of oversea wartime service.

Obviously it was the opinion of the VFW—an opinion in which I completely concur—that the presentation of this supreme award to General Norstad, as supreme Allied commander, Europe, would be a most timely manifestation of the respect and esteem in which he is held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Such a presentation ceremony at General Norstad's headquarters would, furthermore, symbolize the solidarity with which this splendid group of veterans supports General Norstad's endeavors and the firm policy which it is General Norstad's responsibility to carry out.

It is, for me, a matter of deep satisfaction to report that this highly effective action in the interest of United States-European policy was performed by Mr. Robert E. Hansen, the newly elected national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, a resident of South St. Paul, Minn., and a longtime personal friend.

The presentation ceremony took place on Tuesday, September 5. It was according to extensive press reports—in United States, in Europe, and, I am informed, in the Orient—very impressive. The presentation was made on the steps of General Norstad's headquarters beneath the 15 flags of the NATO nations. Among those in attendance were approximately 300 high-ranking officers of the NATO powers.

Commander in Chief Hansen's presentation speech, while short, is noteworthy. It reflected the sincerity of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' support of General Norstad and the policies he represents. I believe, after reading his speech that Members of the Senate will share with me a deep sense of appreciation for this most helpful and timely act taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars through its national commander in chief, Robert E. Hansen, of Minnesota.

Following Commander Hansen's remarks and the actual presentation of the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal and the citation accompanying it, General Norstad delivered his response. General Norstad's remarks deserve careful reading, for he effectively came to grips with the basic issue dividing the free and the Communist world. With well-chosen, but forceful language, General Norstad characterized Mr. Khrushchev's threat to destroy the Acropolis in Athens as an example of Communism's disdain for the symbols and institutions of freemen.

Quite appropriately the citation accompanying the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal stated that it was awarded to General Norstad "for his unselfish devotion to the cause of peace and freedom as a leader and statesman who, as supreme allied commander in Europe, has exemplified the finest qualities of all great American military leaders."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the presentation speech of Mr. Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the acceptance speech of Gen. Lauris Norstad, supreme allied commander, Europe.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF MR. ROBERT E. HANSEN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, ON THE OCCASION OF PRESENTING THE BERNARD M. BARUCH GOLD MEDAL OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS TO GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE, AT SUPREME HEADQUARTERS ALLIED POWERS, EUROPE, PARIS, FRANCE, SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

General Norstad, distinguished officers, ladies and gentlemen, there are few indeed in modern times who have borne the burden of responsibility equaling that of the man we honor this morning. His command mans the frontlines of freedom from the Arctic Circle to the Black Sea. As opposing ways of life confront each other in these troubled times, a major role in the defense of the Western World is the solemn responsibility of Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force, the supreme Allied commander, Europe, and commander in chief of the U.S. European Command.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States had anticipated the pleasure of having you, General Norstad, as a distinguished guest of our national convention, just concluded, in Miami Beach, Fla.

We were looking forward to hearing General Norstad's address at the Veterans of Foreigns Wars distinguished guests dinner. We planned to present to General Norstad, at the opening session of the convention, the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal in recognition of his crucially important services to the protection of freedom and the furtherance of international understanding.

We believed it particularly appropriate that General Norstad's historic services should be recognized by this presentation in the presence of the thousands of delegates, representing the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans who comprise the Veterans of Foreign Wars—many of whom have fought in this area of his command.

However, as we well know, the increasing East-West tensions rapidly came into sharp focus at the barbed-wire barricades dividing the captive and free sectors of Berlin. We were, of course, sorry that the force of circumstance prevented you, General Norstad, from being with your fellow veterans at our convention. Yet our regret over your absence was tempered by the reassuring realization that in these momentous moments of peril, General Norstad was in the command post of the forces of Western civilization.

That you hold this position of trust and responsibility in these delicate and dangerous times is a source of comfort and confidence to all those who love freedom and who are determined to preserve it.

And so, since you could not be with us at our convention, it is my privilege, on behalf of all the oversea combat veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to be here at your headquarters today. I hope that this highest award of the Veterans of Foreign Wars will be accepted as a symbol of the respect which we hold for you, and reflective of the feeling of thankfulness that you are holding the position you do. I hope that this medal will be accepted as a symbol of the solidarity with which the Veterans of Foreign Wars, constituting a great cross section of our citizenry, supports a resolute U.S. policy in defense of the allied peoples of the 15 NATO nations.

By way of background I might mention that this Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal is not a periodic award. In fact it has been conferred infrequently and with great selectivity.

I would like to make a somewhat personal observation: I am additionally privileged to present this Veterans of Foreign Wars Medal to General Norstad because General Norstad and I have something in common—we are both native sons of the State of Minnesota. Speaking as a fellow Minnesotan, General, I bring you also the sincere good wishes of all citizens of that great State who share a mutual pride in your achievements. Also, we are both Americans of Scandinavian heritage. You of Norwegian descent and I of Danish descent know firsthand the ties of kinship that link the NATO nations, as firmly as does the shared will to defend our freedom.

I wish to point out that had it been possible for you to be with us in Miami Beach, you would have received this award from Mr. Ted C. Connell, who was then the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is my privilege to have succeeded him and be with you today and to bring to you and to your entire command his expressions of respect and good wishes.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are well aware that General Norstad's role in these days and years of peril is one of historic and fateful importance. We know, sir, that while you strive constantly for peace among nations, you must also be prepared to protect the freedom, the beliefs, and the institutions of all those who seek peace.

The circumstance of history has entrusted to General Norstad the shield to protect peace and freedom against those who seek to destroy them.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars—indeed the entire Nation—is proud of the leadership which our country and its Armed Forces have produced in the person of General Norstad. The esteem in which he is held in the United States and by our NATO allies is an eloquent testimonial to his leadership that is based not only on generalship, but also on statesmanship.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars takes this occasion to express to General Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, our admiration for the effective manner in which he is performing so burdensome a task, our appreciation for his selfless dedication to the protection of our Nation and the free world, and our sincere hope for his continued well-being so that freedom-loving people will feel secure in the realization that the fateful position which he now holds will continue to be in good hands.

For these things, General Norstad, your former companions-in-arms, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, salute you; and on behalf of our 1,300,000 oversea veterans, it is my privilege to present to you at this time the highest award of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal.

REMARKS OF GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE BERNARD M. BARUCH GOLD MEDAL OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AT SHAPE, PARIS, SEPTEMBER 5, 1961

Commander Hansen, General Hittle, gentlemen, it is with a feeling of the greatest honor that I accept the Bernard Baruch Gold Medal from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It was a great disappointment to me that I was unable to attend your convention in Miami. I am doubly honored, however, by the fact that you have now made the award here in my headquarters. I accept this medal not only on a personal basis, but as a symbol of the confidence that your great organization has in this headquarters and in this Allied Command.

Because of the service and dedication of its members, the Veterans of Foreign Wars represent an important segment of the American people—a people which faces the future with the same fortitude and the same calm determination that have always characterized them in times of challenge. As evidence of this national strength and resolution, deployed in Europe are several hundred thousand American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, who are charged with the direct responsibility for defending the free world from aggression in this vital area. Their dedication to peace, to security and to the preservation of freedom is no less than that demonstrated by your members in earlier years, when many of you manned almost the same line.

It is my pleasure and my privilege to send to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through you, greetings from these Americans in uniform, these men and women who are your successors in the Armed Forces of the United States. As their commander, I wish to state with the greatest emphasis that you have every right to be proud of the American soldier of this generation.

I bring you greetings also from the soldiers, sailors and airmen of our allies, with whom these Americans are joined, from Norway to Turkey, in the forward defense of freedom, and of these men, too, you can and should be proud.

I know I speak for all of these forces—all of Allied Command, Europe—when I thank the members of your organization for what you have done, for what you continue to do to keep the free world free.

I can report to you with confidence and pride that all the NATO nations are taking appropriate action to give substance and strength to their avowed purpose—collective defense and the preservation of peace and security. The action they are taking might well be introduced by the eloquent words used by the NATO heads of government when at another time of crisis, December of 1957, they announced their actions by saying:

"Conscious of our intellectual and material resources, convinced of the value of our principles and our way of life, without provocation but equally without fear, we have taken decisions to promote greater unity, greater strength and greater security not only for our own nations, but also, we believe, for the world at large."

Results are the yardstick and measure of success. We can use as a rule the growth of our forces, the improvements in our plans and programs, the development of the vast physical establishment necessary to support modern armed forces, and the result would be an impressive one. But an alliance is made up of people with hopes and fears, sensitive to the conditions, the context in which they live. Thus, NATO is a thing of the spirit as well as of divisions and squadrons, and ships and guns, and tanks, and aircraft. For this reason, I would like to measure past success and future promise by the attitude of the members of the alliance. I might cite as examples any number of incidents that have occurred over the years but, out of an atmosphere of epithet and abuse from the East, the recent words of any ally shine particularly hard and pure.

At a Soviet-Rumanian rally in Moscow just a few weeks ago, Premier Khrushchev was again boasting of the devastation he could unleash. The objects of his threats were our European allies and, as usual, he pointed his comments most directly at the smaller countries. He spoke in this instance about the destruction he could bring to the orange and olive groves of Italy and Greece and to that great monument of civilization, the Acropolis. In his quiet comment on this threat, Prime Minister Caramanlis of Greece stated that if Mr. Khrushchev hoped to intimidate the Greek people by such remarks he should know that precisely the contrary would be the result. He observed that although it may be within the power of the Soviet Premier to destroy the monument itself, "he cannot destroy ideals of which the sacred rock of the Acropolis is the symbol and which are stronger than any rockets." This is the answer of a leader of freemen. It trumpets the high, clear note of freedom for all the world to hear. I repeat it to you as a true measure of the strength of the alliance.

Our military posture shows strength. We are not lacking in spirit, in courage, in calm determination. Confidently, we will work for peace; but we will continue to assign to freedom, as a hope as well as a heritage, the same high value as those who in the past have died for it. Our peoples and our countries will be defended.

The Old Stone Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, 250 years is not a very long period of time—as historians reckon it. But that span of years has witnessed the beginning of our country, its struggle for independence, its determined efforts to preserve the essential freedoms of religion, of speech, of free assembly.

Two hundred and fifty years ago, on October 8, 1711, the Old Stone Church in East Haven, Conn., was officially founded; and throughout the years, this church and its congregation have mirrored the growth of America. This venerable church stands today as visible proof of the indestructible faith and courage that imbue the tradition of New England.

I am more than proud to salute this church and its members on the occasion of this historic anniversary. Many of its members are friends and neighbors of mine; all of them share my pride in the heritage which the church preserves.

The story of the Old Stone Church is a fascinating one. I commend to the attention of this House the following article, which appeared in the New Haven Register magazine section of July 9, 1961. It is an eloquent exposition of the history of a tradition—a truly American tradition.

SERVING EAST HAVEN 250 YEARS: THE OLD STONE CHURCH—STATE'S THIRD OLDEST HOUSE OF WORSHIP IS CELEBRATING TWO AND A HALF CENTURIES IN THE NEW ENGLAND TRADITION BUT ITS HISTORY ACTUALLY DATES BACK TO AT LEAST 1679

Two and a half centuries of New England tradition are represented in the tall spire of East Haven's Old Stone Church. The church was founded 250 years ago in a tiny farm village east of the Quinnipiac River. No longer would farmers and their families have to make the long and wearying journey to New Haven every Sunday to worship God.

The 250th anniversary of the church is being celebrated by many events during the year. Special commemorative services are planned for Sunday, October 8, the date on which the church was officially organized in 1711.

Through wars and hurricanes, through prosperous times and through depressions, the church has grown slowly but steadily. Many devoted men and women, ministers and laymen, have contributed to this growth. The solid walls of the old church have survived, although many changes have been made to the interior of the building. Many generations have worshipped in the church while the colonial village of East Haven developed into a modern suburban community.

The present church building, which has been frequently renovated, was erected in 1774, less than a year before the Battle of Lexington. There are only two older meetinghouses in Connecticut—the brick church in Wethersfield, built in 1770, and the frame church in Farmington, built in 1772.

During the Revolution, patriot troops drilled in the vicinity of the church. In

1779 British invaders took refuge in the church after battling with the East Haven defenders and they confiscated the communion silverware.

The first pastor of the East Haven church was Jacob Hemingway, the first student of the collegiate school in Killingworth which later became Yale University. The tie between Yale and the Old Stone Church has remained strong. Many of the ministers of the church have been graduates of Yale Divinity School.

FIRST SETTLER

The history of the church actually began about 90 years before its official establishment in 1711, for services were held in East Haven as early as 1679. The first recorded settler east of the Quinnipiac River was Thomas Gregson who built a home in Morris Cove in 1644. Others followed him to the east shore.

For many years these families made the long trip every Sunday to church services in New Haven. They traveled on foot through woodland and marsh, then making a dangerous ferry crossing over the Quinnipiac River. In winter they had to start out before daylight, and they seldom returned to their homes before dark.

The East Haven settlers first petitioned the general assembly for incorporation as an ecclesiastical society in 1667. They held their own services from 1679 to 1681 in the East Haven schoolhouse or in private homes, with the Reverend James Alling as minister. From 1683 to 1685, the Reverend John Harriman conducted services. A permanent minister could not be obtained, however, and the settlers remained members of the First Church of New Haven, now known as Center Church.

The Reverend Jacob Hemingway, who was ordained as minister when the East Haven church was officially organized in 1711, was the son of Samuel Hemingway, one of the leading citizens of the village. Sir Jacob, as he was called by many of the early residents, remained in the East Haven pulpit for nearly half a century. He also served as village schoolteacher during the early years of his ministry.

The first meetinghouse, built on the village green near the schoolhouse in 1706, measured only 20 by 16 feet. In 1718, a larger meetinghouse, 30 by 40 feet in dimension, was erected on the northwest corner of the green. A 6-penny tax was assessed on the villagers to pay for its construction.

The first church members were strict Calvinists in theology and strict Congregationalists in matters of church policy. There was little dissent among the parishioners and East Haven took no part in the revival movement which was sweeping many parts of Connecticut, in this period.

The second pastor of the church was the Reverend Nicholas Street who preached in the East Haven pulpit from 1755 to 1806. Over 2,000 of his sermons were recorded during this period.

FOUGHT FOR BRITISH

The French and Indian wars were in progress when Mr. Street started his pastorate. Several East Haveners fought in the British Army, and a number gave their lives.

Mr. Street married one of his pupils in the village school, a girl of 13, named Desire Thompson. Such early marriages were not unusual in those days. Desire died when she was 20, the mother of three daughters. Mr. Street's second wife, Hannah Austin, bore him five sons and two daughters.

Mr. Street, known around town as "The Parson," was as strict a Calvinist as his predecessor, and this suited his parishioners. The East Haven church generally ignored "The Great Awakening" which was sweeping New England. Mr. Street frequently exchanged pulpits with President Timothy Dwight of Yale.

The church was growing and the meetinghouse was too small. In 1769 the Ecclesiastical Society voted to build a new meetinghouse of stone. There was disagreement as to the best location and Thompson's Corner was selected as a compromise.

Capt. Amos Morris was named chairman of the building committee whose other members included John Woodward, Joel Tuttle, Stephen Morris, Isaac Chidsey, Stephen Thompson, Dan Bradley and Stephen Smith. Members of the committee visited Boston to view the Old South Church. This recently completed building served as a model for the East Haven church.

Building materials were plentiful in the neighborhood. The villagers contributed their teams and wagons and their own labor. A few Indians pushing long-handled wheelbarrows also joined the labor force, according to some reports. Stone was cut in the nearby hills and mortar was made from sand and shell lime burned on the bank of the Quinnipiac River.

OPENED IN 1774

It took 2 years to complete the walls and roof. The building measured 73 by 50 feet. The building was dedicated and opened for worship in September 1774, although it was still without a steeple. The Revolutionary War was starting and the village had to contribute both funds and manpower to the cause of freedom.

There was one serious accident during the construction of the church. A scaffold gave away and three men fell to the ground with heavy stones in their hands. No one was killed, but Stephen Thompson suffered a fractured skull and Joseph Hotchkiss a crushed leg.

The meetinghouse originally fronted on the south on the main road, with four doors for entrance. The pulpit was elevated against the north wall. The pews resembled boxes, with walls so high the children couldn't see out. Each family had its own pew. The only heat on frigid winter. Sundays was provided by small foot stoves warmed by hot coals.

Many parishioners came a great distance on foot. In summer many walked barefooted, carrying their shoes and stockings until they reached the church. People stayed in church all day with services both morning and afternoon. There were Sabbath Day houses around the church yard. These provided shelter for both horses and people. Between services people took time out for lunch and a rest by the fire in these shelters.

No musical instruments were used in churches in New England during the 18th century. A pitch pipe, however, was allowed for the aid of the small choir of psalm singers.

Mr. Street strongly supported the movement for independence and frequently denounced King George III from the pulpit. When Benedict Arnold demanded the keys to the New Haven Powder House and marched his troops off to Massachusetts to join the patriots who were fighting the British there, he was joined by several from East Haven.

And 50 East Haveners led by Captains Josiah Bradley and Amos Morris opened fire on the British invaders of Maj. Gen. William Tryon as they landed on the east shore of the harbor in July 1779. A pitched battle took place near Beacon Hill. The East Haveners were driven back into the Foxon Hills. The British went inland as far as the church where they rested for a few minutes and helped themselves to the church silverware. Several East Haven homes and fields were burned, for a total loss of about $25,000.

After the Revolution, most East Haveners became strong Federalists, President Thomas Jefferson was violently attacked for his "heretical religious views." In 1785 East Haven separated from New Haven and became a town. In 1788 several members of the parish withdrew and organized Trinity Episcopal Church. It is reported that they were annoyed because Mr. Street had the audacity to petition for an increase in salary.

East Haveners in those days were easily annoyed. Governor Saltonstall who lived on the lake which now bears his name once killed some geese belonging to some farmers of the community because they were invading his property and disturbing his rest. This started a feud which spread throughout the town. In the next election Governor Saltonstall did not get a single East Haven vote.

In 1796, the people of the church finally got around to finishing the steeple. It was no sooner completed than, in October 1797, the town was hit by a tornado which toppled the steeple and tore off the church roof. They were soon repaired and the church now became a landmark seen for miles in every direction.

A bell was provided for the steeple in 1798. A clock was installed in the belfry at the same time. Previously the call to worship had been announced by beating a drum. It was reported by one resident of the town that Deacon Joshua Austin "beat the drum from Chidsey's Hill to Goodsell's Hill" every Sabbath morning.

The bell was cast right in East Haven and Dr. Bela Farnham threw in 19 Spanish dollars to give it a silvery tone. A year later the bell tolled the death of George Washington.

* * * * *

THE PASTOR'S BRIDE

The next minister of the East Haven church was the Reverend Saul Clark, a graduate of Williams College. He served from 1808 to 1817. He was married in 1808 to Miss Amy Bradley of East Haven. Not everyone in the church approved of the marriage. One member is reported to have commented, "She is no more fitted to be a minister's wife than a chestnut bur is for an eyestone." From all indications, however, the marriage proved a happy one.

A series of revivals was held in the church during Mr. Clark's pastorate. Not all of the members appreciated the young, vigorous pastor and a few families withdrew from the church. Mr. Clark saw the need for a more virile Christian life in the church and he won support for regular contributions to missions. During his brief service with the church, Mr. Clark worked as a pioneer, paving the way for many years of constructive work ahead.

In 1817 he asked the ecclesiastical society to dissolve his pastoral relationship with the church, stating that the salary was insufficient to support his family.

The Reverend Stephen Dodd, a graduate of Union College, filled the pulpit from 1817 to 1846. This was a period of relative calm in the church history. Mr. Dodd frequently preached against intemperance. He has been described as "a kindly man, yet stern and dogmatic in his thinking and somewhat dictatorial." He was a capable disciplinarian, as the boys of Joseph Rogers' private school, attending the church in a group every Sunday, soon found out.

The interior of the meeting house was remodeled in 1822. The square pews were removed and replaced with slips. The permanent sale of pews was started at this time, netting the church about $8,000. This plan continued for 30 years, after which a rental system was established. It wasn't until 1914 that the present budget system with an annual pledge canvass was adopted.

The First Church of Fair Haven, now the Grand Avenue Church, was formed in 1830 as a daughter church of Old Stone.

The Foxon Congregational Church, founded in 1893, was a later offshoot of the East Haven church.

Every year Mr. Dodd delivered a military address in May when the East Haven militia held training day. A concert by the fife and drum corps would usually be followed by a "tug of war."

The only major changes in the exterior of the Old Stone Church since its erection in 1744 were made in 1850 during the pastorate of the Rev. Daniel Williams Havens. Doors and windows on the east and south sides were filled up. New doors were placed on the west side. Thus the front of the church was moved from south to west. The pulpit was moved to the eastern end of the sanctuary where it still remains. The project also involved lowering the windows, building new galleries and covering the interior walls with hard finish.

STEAM HEAT INSTALLED

Nine years later, a larger steeple, 126 feet high, was erected and an iron fence was placed around the church. In 1868, steam heat was introduced to the church, making Old Stone the first meeting house in Connecticut to be heated by steam.

In 1874, just a century after the building of the church, a chapel was added. It was built of cut stone to harmonize with the original building. Mr. Havens presented a centennial discourse upon the dedication of the chapel.

• • • • •

For 2 years—1877–79—the Reverend Joseph A. Tomlinson supplied the pulpit. The Reverend Daniel James Clark started his 39 years of service to Old Stone Church in 1880. That same year, President Rutherford B. Hayes came through East Haven on the way to the home of his grandfather in Branford. He was greeted by the young pastor at the church corner. It is said that the President remarked on the quality of the church bell's tone.

Undoubtedly, the most remarkable incident in the history of the church took place on September 6, 1885. During a communion service conducted by Mr. Clark a white dove entered the church and twice lit upon the pastor's head. The bird also is reported to have sat upon the Bible several times and cooed. The event was reported the next day in both the Morning Journal-Courier and the Register.

When the bird lit upon his head the first time, Mr. Clark was reading from the Gospel of St. John which includes the words: "I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him." Mr. Clark commented upon the strange happenings during his sermon. At first people in the congregation had been amused by the bird's appearance, but now many were moved to tears.

The founding of the Christian Endeavor Society in 1889 and the Junior Christian Endeavor in 1894 were among the less sensational events of Mr. Clark's ministry. He served during the Spanish-American War and World War I. Several sons of the church and one daughter served in the latter conflict.

The Reverend Harry K. Eversull, whose book, "The Evolution of an Old New England Church," provided much of the information contained in this article, became pastor in 1920. A new parish house was opened in 1924. The Sunday school was reorganized under Mr. Eversull's leadership.

INCORPORATED IN 1924

On April 11, 1924, the church was incorporated as the First Congregational Church of East Haven. The Ecclesiastical Society formed in Colonial times was dissolved.

Five of the first seven pastors of Old Stone Church served in the pulpit for 30 years or more. In recent years there have been more frequent changes of ministers. Times have changed and people do not stay put in these United States.

Mr. Eversull was followed in 1925 by Ralph E. Harris. Other ministers have included: Emerson L. Curry, 1928–36; William Henry Nicholas, 1937–40; William G. West, 1941–48; Duane Hatfield, 1948–50; James E. Waery, 1950–54; Edward S. Hickox, 1955–58, and A. Karl Phillippi, the present pastor.

Many of the former ministers are expected to be present at the special services October 8 commemorating the 250th anniversary.

The years have been hard on the ancient stone structure. In 1928, the entire steeple had to be reconditioned. At the same time, the church was electrified.

In 1933, services had to be held in the parish house because the church ceiling was falling. The following year, the old oak roof beams were replaced with steel girders and a new slate roof was installed. The interior was redecorated and the 70-year-old heating system replaced.

Another building expansion program was launched in 1950. The cornerstone of a new education building, made of brick and other modern building materials, was laid on April 6, 1952. As the town of East Haven has expanded, so have the activities of the church.

Although rightfully proud of the history and tradition of this old Colonial church, the members today are very much alert to the problems of the 1960's. They are confident the church will help to meet these problems by continuing its growth of the past 250 years.

The County Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of San Diego County's outstanding community leaders has been chosen president of the National Association of County Leaders. He is supervisor David W. Bird, my good friend and neighbor:

ABOUT OUR NEW PRESIDENT

David W. Bird, a man who has spent 40 years in the service of his Nation and his county, has been elected the 26th president of the National Association of County Officials.

Since he entered the Navy during World War I, "Dave" Bird has been almost continuously in the public service, and most of that time it has been in elective public office.

Although he was born in Philadelphia, he is a "native" of California as natives go in that State. He has lived there since he was 15, growing up in National City, going to high school there, going into private business there, entering public office there.

In 1920, Dave entered the automobile business, and during the next 27 years owned a filling station, garage, and automobile sales agency. During all of these years, the call of public service was in him. In 1924 he was elected to the City Council, and served four straight terms for a total of 16 years. His colleagues elected him mayor the final 6 years of his tenure.

During his regime as mayor, his leadership resulted in the highly successful negotiations between the city and the U.S. Navy, that followed a vote in 1937 by the citizens to release 90 acres of waterfront land for a naval supply depot. That was one of the most important decisions in the area's history.

While on the council he found time to devote his talents not only to his own city, but to all cities in California. He took an active role in the affairs of the League of California Cities, rising successively to director, treasurer, and finally vice president.

COUNTY CAREER BEGINS

In 1940, at the urging of his many friends, he successfully sought a position on the five-man Board of Supervisors of San Diego County, and his role in county affairs began. He has served on the board continuously since his election, and is now in his sixth 4-year term. He is currently the chairman, the seventh time he has held that responsibility. Upon completion of his present term he will have served on the county board longer than anyone else on record.

During World War II Bird was chairman of the county civilian defense committee. Today, as chairman of the board, he is also chairman of the Unified San Diego County Civil Defense and Disaster Council, which advises the supervisors on matters concerning the civil defense program for 10 cities and the unincorporated areas of San Diego County.

In 1944 the County Supervisors Association of California elected Dave to its board of directors. During 1949–50 he was the association's president and for the past 7 years he has served as treasurer.

SERVED NACO

Dave Bird has also been a very active man in the affairs of the NACO. He was a member of the civil defense committee in 1951, 1953, 1954 and 1955. In 1957–58 he was elected as a director of the association and he has been third vice president for 1959–60.

Two California Governors have called upon Bird to assist in State matters. Gov. Earl Warren appointed him to the State disaster commission, the California Defense Mobilization Service Committee and an advisory committee to select a new State welfare director when that position was vacant. He is presently serving on Gov. Edmund G. Brown's local planning advisory committee.

In his hometown of National City, Bird is a charter member of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, being post commander of the latter in 1933. He was also a charter member and past president of the National City Kiwanis Club. Fraternally he is a member of the Southwest Lodge F. & A.M. and the Shriners.

Dave and his lovely wife, Margaret, continue to maintain their home in National City. Their son, James, is an architect in San Diego; one daughter lives in National City and another daughter lives in the nearby Laguna Mountains.

Soviet Nuclear Testing and Its Effect on a Peaceful Area in New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the recent resumption of above-ground nuclear testing by the Soviet Union has had a profound effect throughout the world.

For a thoughtful essay on its effect on a peaceful area in my congressional

district, Broome County, N.Y., I include a column by Tom Cawley published in the Evening Press, Binghamton, N.Y., September 19, 1961:

THIRTY-THREE MICRO-MICROCURIES CAST CLOUD ON PEACEFUL TC SCENE

(By Tom Cawley)

It is probable you weren't aware of it—what with the new network television programs going on the air during the weekend—but the micro-microcuries of radiation around here rose from 2.6 on Saturday to 33 on Sunday. That's about times-12.

Chances are you never even noticed it, what with staying glued to the old tube and wondering whether last year's school clothing would last another year.

The 33 micro-microcuries were measured in each cubic meter of air.

They flitted about in a cloud like evil fireflies, raining on the still-green hills, pelting old Binghamton, mansion and slum alike; falling gently on the rich and poor without discrimination.

The micro-microcuries blanketed old men sitting resignedly in the September sun, children soaring high on their backyard swings, on families clustered for one of the last outdoor weekends, broiling steaks and hamburgers.

The micro-microcuries came all the way to our hometown from the Russian Arctic, without visa or let. They are the only true international travelers who have no regard for boundaries, religion, color, or political opinion.

The weekend measurement was the highest over upstate New York since 1957, when it climbed to 50.

The micromicrocuries are the small advance messengers of death, and while the count was going up—measured, deadpan, by State Health Department people at Albany—I was talking about the local weather to the new freshmen at Broome Tech on upper Front Street.

Looking at these bright, good-looking young men and women from the auditorium stage. I wondered what their future would be. I said the weather was frequently wretched, but that they would be happy here, because the people of the valley welcome them as students and friends with open arms.

All the time, I was thinking about those small machines at Albany that were showing the content of the air we breathe.

I talked to them about the fun and satisfaction of living among green Appalachians in the summer, and snow-covered Appalachians in the winter, but I didn't talk about the important thing, dramatized by the offer of a new fringe benefit by the Scintilla industrial plant to its employes—a fallout radiation kit.

That is the kind of world we suddenly find ourselves living in these days, even in these obscure hills. Two days later, I spent an hour driving around in those hills and looking at the dairy cattle, which also are not ignored by the all-embracing micromicrocurie, and I thought of something Joe Louis, the destroyer, said of his to-be victim, Max Schmeling:

"He can run, but he can't hide."

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend to the attention and serious consideration of my colleagues in the House a statement on recent international conferences on textile imports and exports. The U.S. negotiating team has worked to establish agreements that would be equitable to participating nations and would, at the same time, save the vitally important American textile industry from uncontrolled competition from imports.

Seabury Stanton, recently reelected chairman of the Northern Textile Association and president of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., of New Bedford, Mass., has devoted a great deal of time during the past 3 months to these highly important conferences and to the welfare of the domestic textile industry.

His statement, which was presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Textile Association in Poland Spring, Maine, September 14, draws several carefully considered conclusions: First, that favorable action must be given a petition of the textile industry by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It calls for the textile industry's designation as one necessary to our national economy. Further, he says that if negotiations with leading textile export nations are to be fruitful and beneficial to the American industry, it is vital the President have full authority to act unilaterally, when and if necessary.

Mr. Stanton's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. STANTON

International conferences with the leading exporting and importing countries were provided for in item 6 of President Kennedy's program for assistance to the textile industry, announced May 2, 1961, in an attempt to obtain an arrangement which would avoid undue disruption of established industries as a result of uncontrolled imports.

Such an agreement was worked out in Geneva in July, but Japan, feeling that she should be in a preferred position because of her voluntary agreement to limit cotton textile exports to the United States during the 5-year period ending January 1, 1962, withheld signing the Geneva agreement until a separate arrangement with the United States could be worked out.

Our State Department agreed and negotiations started August 21 in Tokyo, as you know.

Our negotiating team consisted of Mr. Warren M. Christopher, special consultant to the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, George W. Ball; Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs; and Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Labor Affairs.

These negotiators were accompanied by a group of industry and labor advisers representing manufacturers of fabrics, made up goods, woven apparel, knit goods, and other miscellaneous cotton textiles.

When we reached Japan, we found that we were faced with an offer which had been previously made by our State Department to grant Japan an increase of 5 percent overall in their quota for 1962, together with an increase of 10 percent in ginghams from 40 to 44 million yards, and an increase of 33⅓ percent in pants and trousers in 1961.

The Japanese also had been advised that it was our intention to reduce exports from Hong Kong to the United States by at least 30 percent below the 1960 level. This formed the basis for the Japanese demand for a 30-percent increase in their own exports to the United States.

We were thus faced with an almost impossible negotiating position, with an increase of over 5 percent having already been granted, and with the Japanese industry apparently convinced that they were entitled to a full 30-percent increase to compensate them for the part of our American market which they believed they had lost to Hong Kong because of their voluntary agreement with us.

As the Geneva agreement provided more of a freeze of the status quo than an overall reduction, if there is to be any substantial relief for our U.S. cotton textile industry it must be obtained in large measure from the reduction in imports from Hong Kong.

It was, therefore, impossible to agree to increase imports from Japan by anywhere near the reduction obtained from Hong Kong, and almost no negotiating room remained after the 5-percent increase already promised to Japan before our arrival.

As a result of this unfortunate situation, our negotiating team was obliged to stand fast, and a deep feeling of bitterness and disappointment developed among the members of the Japanese industry.

In attempting to reach an agreement, the Japanese Government faced a very serious political problem because 5 years ago it had adopted a program of limitation of exports to the United States, based on the belief that the U.S. Government would hold imports to about 250 million yards overall and that any further increase would be too damaging to the U.S. economy to permit.

You will recall that when Sherman Adams, speaking to our Northern Textile Association annual meeting at Portsmouth, N.H. in 1956, announced the original quota arrangement he said that he believed this would form a pattern for the control of imports if they became excessive from other countries.

Thereafter, our Government permitted imports from sources other than Japan to rise rapidly until they were four times the level which existed when the Japanese Government committed itself to restrain exports.

The new agreement with Japan must, therefore, be viewed against this failure on the part of our own Government to act in the manner which was expected by both the Japanese Government and the U.S. textile industry. The Japanese felt that they had been misled by the failure of our Government to limit exports to the United States from other countries, and particularly by permitting imports from Hong Kong to increase to a point almost equal to those from Japan.

Although the final Geneva agreement placed Japan in a much more preferential position than the other countries represented, when it is viewed in the light of Japanese-United States relationships over the past few years the reasons for this preferred position became obvious.

There are inherent in the Japanese agreement, however, certain dangers which it will be necessary to watch carefully:

1. The very much smaller number of categories than were included at Geneva, and the resulting opportunity for concentrations to occur in items not listed but included within the category of "All other" in each group.

2. The increase in permitted concentrations in already sensitive areas, such as ginghams, velveteens, shorts, and trousers, men's and boys' T shirts, and others.

3. The lack of provision for unilateral action on the part of the United States to stop imports of an individual category or item if concentration or market disruption occurred, as was provided in the Geneva agreement.

The controlling provision in the Japanese agreement provides for consultation between the two Governments "whenever there is excessive concentration of Japanese exports in any particular cotton textile items, except those for which specific quotas and ceilings are established, and such concentration is causing or threatening disruption of the U.S. domestic market, etc."

This consultation between the U.S. Government and the Japanese Government shall be for the purpose of determining an appropriate course of action, and, pending agreement on further action, the Japanese Government agrees to hold the exports of the items in question at 110 percent of the exports of such items during the 12 months prior to consultation.

This is by no means as strong a control paragraph as it would be if unilateral action by the United States were provided, but, with the safeguards and counterchecks which are being established within our Department of Commerce to administer both the Geneva agreement and the Japanese agreement, any concentrations should immediately come to light. In that case, it seems hardly likely that the Japanese Government will fail to take action after the oral commitments made by them to our negotiating team before this agreement was signed in Tokyo, and I believe we can rely on their good faith in this regard.

If I believed that the Japanese 1962 arrangement established a pattern for other countries and other fibers for the future, I would be pessimistic. Japan will, I believe, now sign the Geneva arrangement, and I believe it will eventually see the advantages of becoming a participating member in this large group of exporting and importing countries. Their desire for a bilateral agreement is understandable under present circumstances, but, as a result of the operation of the Geneva agreement and the drastic control of Hong Kong exports to the United States, these circumstances will no longer exist.

I feel that the whole concept outlined in item 6 of President Kennedy's program of May 2 is on trial, however; and, if it is to work successfully, it must be controlled throughout both the periods of negotiation and those of administration by giving authority to the Chief Executive to act unilaterally if it becomes necessary at any time.

This means to me that the necessity for favorable action on the petition of the textile industry to the OCDM for designation as an industry necessary to the national economy is of the utmost importance. Such a designation does not instruct the President how to proceed to preserve that industry, but does, under the law, invest him with full authority to take such action as he may deem necessary.

If our Commerce, Labor, and State Departments are to carry on negotiations with other countries leading to agreements with regard to limitations on exports and imports, it seems to me that it is vital that full authority be vested in the hands of the President to take unilateral action should it be necessary for the success of this program.

Decisions by the Board of Veterans' Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the question of appellate review of veterans' claims, I ask unanimous consent to have included, as part of my remarks, law students' comments on the adjudication system of the Veterans' Administration.

As I have indicated in the RECORDS of September 13, 18, 20, 21, and 22, 1961, pages A7197, A7398, A7461, A7570, and A7618, law students of various law schools have performed a review of Veterans' Administration claims in certain cases presented to them by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Following completion of this study, the law students furnished the committee with general comments on the adjudication system and under unanimous consent I include their comments at this point:

LAW STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON THE ADJUDICATION SYSTEM OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In taking advantage of your invitation to make additional comments on the general subject, I should like first of all to assure you of my complete sympathy with the principal views and objectives set out in your letter, and more specifically in House Report 2031 (86th Cong., 2d sess.). However well meaning the administrative personnel of the VA may be, the removal of this area of decisionmaking from judicial review is pregnant with inherent dangers. Not the least of these is the absence of recorded precedent to serve as a guidepost to subsequent decision, for without a considerable degree of uniformity in result on like facts, decisions in this area will unavoidably be viewed as arbitrary and unfair. I dissent most strongly from the view of the Administrator that decisions involved in these appeals are merely "factual determinations." It is certainly true that factual determinations must be made from the evidence, not only with respect to percentages of disability but in many other ways as well. But the legal effect to be given the facts when found is not only independent of those facts but crucial to the result. So, for example, in cases where the issue involves service connection, a finding of service connection is not a factual finding but a legal conclusion which may or may not follow from certain facts. Moreover, the findings of fact are themselves so often dependent on legal presumptions, that a lack of uniformity in the application of these presumptions must necessarily result in lack of uniformity in the decisions.

You will note from the conclusions of law submitted herewith that I have had recourse to the regulations promulgated by the Administrator, as they are reflected in the Code of Federal Regulations. I fear that I must take issue with the statement in your letter of May 25 that "Title 38, United States Code, contains all the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration dealing with the benefits applied for in these six cases." While this statement may be technically correct, the regulations issued by the Administrator under the authority of 38 U.S.C. 210 have the force of law to the extent they are not inconsistent with the statute. As such these regulations must be given legal effect in those cases where they make more specific the general guides furnished by the statute, and where they choose between alternative interpretations of ambiguous portions of the statute. I found, as you must already know, that these regulations are highly disorganized, unduly complex, and badly in need of thorough overhaul.

One other matter worth mentioning relates to the evaluation of the medical evidence in these cases. Since notations on medical records, perhaps especially on military medical records, tend to be cryptic, it is apparent that any reviewer of these kinds of cases must either be personally familiar with a large number of medical terms and methods of medical evaluation or he must have ready access to some clear source of information about them. He must also have access to some reservoir of the "generally accepted medical principles" which play so prominent a role in many of these cases. For my own part I had informal recourse to the medical authorities here at the university for assistance with the resolution of several of these problems. Perhaps the other people you have asked to review the pilot project cases have been personally equipped to grapple with these problems better than I. I would suggest, however, that if it has not already done so, your committee might find it interesting to study the sources of medical advice or authority used by the various administrative organs of the VA. While the regulations referred to above contain some such references, the material offered there is only fragmentary. Obviously any serious gap in the information of this nature which is available to the various organs of the VA may also play hob with uniformity of decision.

I have enjoyed this brief exposure to the important work of your committee, and I appreciate this opportunity to make a minor contribution to its current project.

As you requested, I tried each case de novo, on the record supplied me, making findings of fact and conclusions of law, in much the same manner as a trial examiner for the NLRB would. After a little research, I noted that for most of the statutes with which I was working, there were no precedents as to their interpretation. My interpretations were therefore based on a tabula rosa.

I should like to note that section 311, with its cross-reference by way of definition to section 353, is most troublesome. Section 311 can be interpreted a variety of ways, and even after consulting the committee report in the Senate of 1943, it is not completely clear to me why the words "and was not aggravated" was appended to the end of that section. However, I gave the statute the construction that seemed to me to be the most sound, considering its precise language.

I found this to be extremely interesting and I have the following general comments to make which may be of some help to the committee. I was pledged throughout in my efforts by the fact that, in most cases, the basis upon which the regional offices predicated their decisions was a matter of conjecture. Their decisions on review, in most instances, were cryptic at best and in most instances purely conclusory. As you will note, most of my cases revolved around the issue of aggravation of preexisting conditions. There was no indication of fact-finding on the question of increased severity and consequently no section 353 determination. In very few cases were there any indications of what facts were found to be significant. Thus, with trusty Dorland's Medical Dictionary in hand, together with the help of a patient physician friend, I had to sift the medical evidence myself to arrive at my findings of fact. Also, section 311 impressed me as being a draftman's monument to confusion. The regulations were of considerable help here but unhappily, only after I had wasted considerable time on the code.

For these reasons you will note that I rather presumptuously overturned, at least in part, 9 of 10 of the regional offices' decisions. The main general reason that I was prompted to do this was because it seemed that the veterans weren't being accorded the presumptions that they were entitled to. The language of the decisions, alone, made this interpretation possible, since, because of their terseness, one could never tell what presumptions or evidence was operative.

---

1. Administrative review of veterans' cases under the present system operates arbitrarily and erroneously in many cases so that revision of the system is needed.

The cases seemed to be decided unusually arbitrarily even for an administrative proceeding; rarely was the reason for any action taken by an administrative board indicated in the record on appeal.

In 6 of the 10 cases reviewed, we reached results different than those reached by the Veterans' Administration. The statutes seem to be fair ones but they are not being properly applied by the VA. One error frequently made is that statutory presumptions operating in favor of the veteran are ignored. Many times the VA will assert that the veteran has failed to prove a certain point when it is clear that a statutory presumption exists which relieves the veteran of this burden in the absence of any other evidence.

A system providing for judicial review of veterans' cases would be an improvement, but in any case the VA's dual role of advocate and judge should be terminated if just results are to be reached.

Are You Smart Enough To Be a Congressman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Information Agency is conducting a survey to determine the proficiency of the Members of Congress in certain languages. Last week each of us received a letter from USIA asking us to provide information with reference to our language skills which would assist USIA in this survey.

I do not know how my colleagues reacted to this inquiry concerning their educational attainments. However, Mr. Speaker, I thought they would be interested in my reply, which follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1961.

Dr. DONALD J. IRWIN,
General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. IRWIN: I have your letter in which the U.S. Information Agency seeks to determine the proficiency of Members of Congress in certain languages. Will you kindly advise me as to the purpose of this survey? Personally I think Congress should make a rather penetrating survey of the U.S. Information Agency.

In the meantime, I want to make a little survey of my own.

1. I would like to ask how in the world USIA, whose primary purpose is to sell the United States to other countries, can justify having Ralph K. White as Chief of its Soviet Bloc Division.

2. What justification is there for Mr. White's saying that Soviet aggression in Berlin and around the world originates partly in defensive fear and in a sincere desire (by the Soviets) to stabilize the cold war conflict?

3. What justification is there for White's saying that we are too inclined to look upon the Communist leaders as villains?

4. What justification is there for his saying that we overestimate their evil?

5. What justification is there for his saying that we should not dismiss the words of Soviet leaders as lies because most of the time what they say is close to what they think?

6. What justification is there for White in his recent public statement, leaving the clear implication that the differences in relative moral standing between Soviet Russia and the United States are only of degree and listing our U–2 flights and our attempts to help Cuban freedom fighters as proof that we are not unlike the Reds?

7. If Dore Schary now employed by the USIA? If so, in what capacity and what are his duties?

8. Is Reed Harris now employed by USIA? so, in what capacity and what are his duties?

9. Have these two men been recommended or approved either directly or indirectly by Paul Corbin?

10. Have these two men been approved or recommended by the Director of USIA, Edward R. Murrow?

11. How many employees, other than Schary or Harris, have been recommended or approved either directly or indirectly by Paul Corbin and who are they?

Yours very truly,

GORDON H. SCHERER.

George Washington University Offers "Telecourse" in World Geography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the George Washington University, in cooperation with WTOP–TV, will offer a "telecourse" in world geography this fall under the direction of Dr. Meredith F. Burrill. I think that such a course will lead many people to a more trenchant understanding of the complexity of the world's problems by providing insight into the personality of nations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a description of the course and information about it:

The citizen of the 20th century can grasp the complexities of his world better with a knowledge of its geography. The political, social, and economic struggles that make today's headlines are more comprehensible with a basic knowledge of geography.

Every country—every State in the world of nations—has a personality of its own. The geographic personality is never simple; sometimes it is tremendously complex. It is made up of a setting (mountains, jungles, deserts, rivers) in which its people have developed a way of life—systems of agriculture or industry, a type of government, forms of religion and art and music, styles of dress and of housing, rituals of marriage and birth and death. The sum of these characteristics is a nation with its own aspirations, its own contributions to world society, its own position of dominating or being dominated. As the patterns of world tension shift and change, a nation may be brought suddenly to the center of the international stage—or it may gradually lose world attention. To understand a nation's personality—how it relates to that of other nations, how it is changing—is the purpose of geographic study. The best way to learn world geography is to travel. Because we can't all do that, the instructor will make an effort to bring the world to you—the sights and sounds of other cultures—by using maps, globes, slides, and motion pictures to supplement and give dimension to his lectures. You will find that you see more, understand better, when you know what to look for. The time to study geography is before you travel, not afterward.

Because it is impossible to predict which country will be in the headlines next week or next month, it may be necessary from time to time to depart from the syllabus in order that the instructor can tell you about a particular country at the same time that you are reading about it in the newspapers. To inform you when your interest is greatest is more important than the schedule.

REGISTRATION—CREDIT

Registration for geography 54—world geography for credit in the college of general studies will be held in building F, 706 20th Street NW., 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., from August 20 to October 6, 1961. A tuition fee of $75 will be charged by the university, payable if desired in three equal monthly portions of $25. There will be 45 half-hour television sessions for the course which begins on Monday, September 25, and is completed on January 26. Examinations will consist of a 1-hour midterm on November 18 and a 2-hour final examination on January 27, both to be held at the university. Credit students must take the examinations. Cost of textbook and telecourse materials is included in the $75 fee. The course carries 3 hours of credit in the college of general studies.

NONCREDIT

Those not desiring college credit will register by sending in the blank on this brochure, together with $17.50 registration fee, which includes the cost of the textbook and telecourse materials. Noncredit registration is open throughout the course.

TELECOURSE MATERIALS

All students registering for credit or noncredit will receive the textbook, telecourse guide, a set of Rand McNally outline maps, and a Hammond atlas. The National Geographic Society has kindly offered Dr. Burrill the use of its wealth of maps, its new globe, and other visual materials to give dimension to the lectures. Outstanding guest lecturers will appear.

All registered students will be taken on a special private tour of the Map Division of the Library of Congress, the National Geographic Society, and the Cartographic Branch of the National Archives.

Classroom 9: World geography will be offered every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 6:30 to 7 a.m. on channel 9, WTOP–TV.

STAFF

Supervision: Dr. Robert D. Campbell, executive officer and professor of the department of geography at the George Washington University.

Administration: Dr. Grover L. Angel, dean of the college of general studies, the George Washington University.

Director: Paul Liebler, WTOP–TV.

Instructors: Dr. Meredith F. Burrill, director, Office of Geography, Department of the Interior, and secretary, Association of American Geographers.

University coordinator: Lillian Brown, director, radio and television, the George Washington University.

(Further information concerning registration may be obtained by calling the university's college of general studies, FE 8–0250, extension 441 or 487.)

Congressman Gilbert's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 87th Congress has at-

tained an outstanding and enviable record of achievement; the list of its major legislative accomplishments is impressive.

This Democratic Congress, with the leadership of a Democratic administration, has passed most of the legislation promised by the Democratic platform of 1960 and requested by the President; this Congress has been more productive than any session since the early New Deal era, in spite of the fact that much of our time had to be devoted to numerous problems inherited from the past 8 years of Republican administration. Once again, we have proved that the Democratic Party has the best interests of the people at heart, for the record shows that for the first time in many years a really serious effort has been made to meet some of the more pressing social problems of our times.

I have conscientiously worked with the President, and at every opportunity have fought for the progressive, liberal program set forth in the Democratic platform. The Congress has been in session for more than 8 months, meaning unremitting hard work, fraught with grave responsibilities. My serious attention has been required not only in matters on the domestic front, but also in international affairs. The ever-darkening world picture, because of increased Soviet threats, has intensified our burdens; one crisis after another has been the order of the day, and the Berlin crisis is now the most serious. The space supremacy race, foreign aid, increased assistance to Latin American countries, Russian resumption of nuclear testing, defense legislation, all weighty problems, had to be considered and effectively met. The following priority legislation has become law.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Labor Day, 1961, brought pay raises totaling an estimated $536 million to more than 27½ million employees. An additional 3,624,000 coming under the new law will receive a minimum hourly wage of $1 to be increased to $1.14 in 1964 and to $1.25 a year later. Those already covered by Federal wage laws will be raised to $1.15 this year and to $1.25 in 1963.

I would have preferred a direct increase in minimum wage to $1.25 this year, and in January of 1961, I reintroduced my bill which so provided. The bill which was passed represented a compromise, but it was the best we could get. I fought in committee and in the House of Representatives for a direct raise to $1.25. When the bill came before us for consideration, I pointed out that for years there has been overwhelming evidence of the need for strong, equitable, humanitarian, minimum wage legislation, and that necessary amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act have been long overdue. The new law does provide at least some assistance to our underpaid workers, which they desperately needed in order to exist in view of present alltime high living costs.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

More than 3.7 million Americans are now receiving bigger social security checks under the new Social Security Act amendments of 1961. One out of every four persons drawing social security received the automatic increase under the liberalized benefits enacted by this session of Congress. The new law also reduced the optional retirement age for men to 62 (with reduced benefits); increased widows' benefits by 10 percent; raised the earnings ceiling for retired persons, increased the Federal share of State programs for the needy aged, blind, and disabled, and liberalized the law in other respects.

During the debate in Congress, I stated:

Although this is a scaled-down version of President Kennedy's plan, it does provide some benefits and is another step forward toward our goal of adequate assistance to our older citizens. In a country as rich as ours, it is a sad commentary upon our Government that the needs of our older citizens have not been provided for more adequately and that their sad plight has been so consistently ignored. Although I am gratified by any increase in benefits under the Social Security Act, I am hopeful that the time is not too far distant when my bill, providing for full benefits, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, to men at age 60 and to women at age 55, will be passed.

My bill also provides for the removal of the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. I shall continue to press for complete removal of such limitation.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

This is the most comprehensive housing measure passed by Congress in 12 years. It provides $4.88 billion in Federal loans and grants to cities, towns, and rural areas for urban renewal, public housing, elderly housing, farm housing, college housing, urban mass-transportation systems, home improvement, community facilities, to list some of the benefits provided.

I urged passage of the bill and stated:

I receive many requests daily from my constituents who describe the intolerable housing conditions under which they exist and ask my help in securing decent housing. The unfreezing of the 100,000 units of public housing left in the original 1949 housing authorization would provide a substantial stimulant for the low-rent program which has been sadly neglected during these past years. Although we have tried to meet the needs of the ill-housed among our low-income families, we have seriously neglected another segment of our population—those in the moderate income bracket who earn too much to entitle them to public housing and yet cannot afford privately built, non-assisted housing. I am, therefore, pleased with the broadened FHA section 221 program which provides assistance to low- and moderate-income and displaced families.

Positive action must be taken in all areas to help cities recover their economic stability, improve transportation systems, attract middle- and upper-income residents and business. I am pleased to support this bill which provides so many long-needed benefits; which will help our poorly housed people, and which will rescue our cities from permanent deterioration and give them incentive and help along the positive approaches of urban renewal, rehabilitation and renewed economic growth.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

This legislation set up a $394 million program of loans to depression-burdened communities to establish new industries and create jobs.

I introduced a bill providing for such aid in January of this year, for I have long recognized the dire need for such assistance. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which held extensive hearings on the bill, I heard the many witnesses who testified before us and pleaded for passage of the legislation. In urging passage of the bill, I stated:

We have had 7 years of diminished economic growth, 3½ years of slack, and 7 months of recession. In these days of crises, we cannot permit further deterioration in our economy; we must take positive and effective steps to stimulate the economy and pave the way for its full capacity performance; we must aim for the highest possible rate of economic growth. Five and a half million unemployed workers live in the 103 designated distressed areas; in New York State there are numerous areas which are in trouble and which are in desperate need of the assistance this legislation would give them.

Many of my constituents are of Puerto Rican background; I am happy that the bill before us would help Puerto Rico, as it meets the bill's requirements as to depressed industrial areas. Much progress is being made in Puerto Rico, and I should like the people there to be encouraged in their efforts to improve their commonwealth as well as their standards of living.

ADDITIONAL MAJOR DOMESTIC LEGISLATION, DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY LEGISLATION

The Temporary Unemployment Compensaton Act provided for repayable Federal grants to States to provide 13 weeks' additional unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers exhausting their benefits. This helped alleviate the severe hardships of unemployed workers and their families during the recession period.

The bill providing aid to dependent children of needy unemployed parents was of great help to the children of our Nation who were suffering untold hardships and deprivations. Another law also extend the special milk program for children.

The veterans home loan program was extended; other laws beneficial to our veterans were passed. We passed a bill to assist our farmers.

I also voted for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission; the bill providing for the Peace Corps, an effective step forward in our international relations; the bill to assist our youth and help control juvenile delinquency. I was happy to vote for the longevity pay raise bill to assist our postal workers; I was one of the cosponsors of the arms control-disarmament bill.

We also passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act amendments, a bill providing increased authorization for the food for peace program; funds for inter-American social and economic cooperation program were provided. Numerous defense authorization and appropriations measures as recommended by President Kennedy have also been enacted by the Congress.

Failure to get favorable action on strong, effective civil rights legislation during this session of Congress came as a grave disappointment to me. I urged that the Congress take action and shall continue to press for passage of neces-

sary legislation until every vestige of discrimination has been wiped out. I reintroduced my bills this year which would end present evils now inflicted upon millions because of race, color, creed, or national origin, and which would assure all our citizens of true equality as guaranteed under our Constitution.

I reintroduced my bill providing for health care for the aged under the social security program and urged the committee in charge to vote out the bill. We were not given the opportunity to act on the legislation, and this was most frustrating to me and all those who wished to be helpful to our older citizens. I stated:

Adequate medical care for our older citizens is one of the most critical social and humanitarian problems confronting us, and one which demands necessary, effective, Federal legislation. In my opinion, the best assurance we can have that special medical needs of the aged would be met, is to provide for a practicable plan under our social security system. Hundreds of letters and numerous petitions have sent me by my constituents, urging Federal action and the social security approach. They contain pitiful statements as to suffering and hardships and inability to provide themselves with the medical care they desperately need. I shall not allow their pleas to go unheeded. The Federal assistance involved is due the workers of our Nation, who have, by their efforts, built our Nation to its present great strength.

Education remains one of the most important of our Nation's domestic problems. It is one which intimately affects the welfare and security of our country, and it greatly affects the lives of a large number of individual Americans. For want of adequate schools and qualified teachers, a segment of American youth is being denied a vital part of its birthright. I exceedingly regret that Congress did not pass a suitable, effective, Federal aid to education bill. The bill which passed, continuing the impacted areas school-aid program and the National Defense Education Act, amounts to only token assistance. I am hopeful that the Congress will meet its responsibility on this vital question early in 1962.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

Space limitations prevent my discussing all the legislation and questions of importance to my constituents. I have represented them to the best of my ability in Congress; I have been anxious to help them whenever called upon, concerning their personal problems. It has been gratifying to receive letters expressing their confidence in me and assuring me of their continuing support. I assure them that I shall continue my best efforts in their behalf.

I maintain a Bronx congressional office at 1004 East 163d Street, Bronx; telephone Ludlow 9-7280, which is open daily. I invite my constituents to call there and discuss any requests or problems they may have. I am happy to have them write to me at my Washington office. I urge them to call at my Washington office, 1723 New House Office Building, when they visit the Nation's Capital.

The Citizen's Responsibility for Civil Defense, by John Alsop, of Avon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Honorable John Alsop, one of the leading citizens of Connecticut, delivered an excellent and comprehensive address on the citizen's responsibility for civil defense. He was addressing a luncheon meeting of the Joint Service Clubs of Middletown, Conn., but I think his speech, which points the way for needed effort, should be brought to the attention of the Members of this House. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit Mr. Alsop's speech for the RECORD:

THE CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

(By John Alsop)

I approach this subject with the utmost gravity and in the knowledge that the attitude of most people toward measures of civil defense is not just one of apathy; it is one of actual revulsion, revulsion against the stupidity of a war of nuclear dimensions, against the mental picture of the catastrophic results of an attack.

Thanks to our knowledge of the terrifying destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, thanks to the reports of the fearful results of the tests of larger bombs which have since taken place, thanks perhaps in part to the false idea stimulated by the book and movie "On the Beach" that all-out atomic war would inevitably destroy everyone in the world, the average person in America has come to the conclusion that if such a war should take place he is doomed whatever he does, and that our enemies are doomed also.

And this leads to the further conclusion that either we will have a peace of mutual terror or a war will occur and all will die.

In either case, conveniently for those who choose to think this way, there is no purpose in making any exertion whatsoever.

But the Russians have not come to these conclusions: For example, 60 million Russians, 28 percent of population, have had 14 hours of nuclear survival training.

These 60 million Russians are permanently enlisted in the Russian civil defense organization, the DOOSF. An equivalent level in Connecticut would be 700,000 people active in civil defense.

There is a shelter in Moscow dug down 1,300 feet which can accommodate all the inhabitants of the Kremlin.

They clearly feel that efforts to survive are worth making, for they are making them.

Communist doctrine teaches that the conquest of the world by communism is historically inevitable. Translated into its simplest terms this means that our cold war enemies will continue to probe, to experiment, to raid, and to press until they achieve the aims their dogma prescribes for them. Every time that they act whether it is in Greece and Turkey, Iran, China, Vietnam, Berlin, the Congo, or any other place they are risking nuclear war. Yet they continue.

The corollary must be that we must lay wishful thinking aside and realize that a nuclear war is a possibility.

Look at Berlin. We are pledged to defend a small highly populated city area over 100 miles from our nearest border whose approaches are completely dominated by the enemy. If we fail to make good on our pledge every position of strength we have all over the world will be undermined. With the Russians ever more menacing, surely the spark is there, ready for ignition.

And I would point out that if we survive this particular crisis we may expect another one, in another part of the world, to be served up to us shortly thereafter. The danger will be of long duration—it has been, is, and will be part of our daily lives.

But if you will concede the possibility of a nuclear war, perhaps you will not concede the possibility that with preparation we can survive as individuals and as a nation.

There is much literature on this subject, and it makes grim reading. However, what seems to stand out in everything that I have read is that while the blast and heat of explosion would create at the target terrible destruction, very difficult to defend against the great danger to human life, the great threat to national and individual survival, would be nuclear fallout, against which it is entirely possible, and not difficult to protect yourself. Herman Kahn, in his book "On Thermonuclear War, indicates that a minimum effort on civil defense, with the expenditure, mainly on fallout protection, of $500 million by the Federal Government, a small sum in these inflated times, could save between 20 and 50 million lives.

I have become convinced that with a proper commitment by the Federal, State and municipal governments and far more important with a major effort by our citizens aided where necessary by one or more of those levels of government, we can survive and the first priority is fallout protection.

What is fallout? It is billions of radioactive particles of earth and debris, sucked into the mushroom cloud of a nuclear bomb, which later fall back to the earth's surface.

The important things to remember about it are, first, that its ability to hurt or kill weakens rapidly; its radioactivity decays; and second, that it consists of particles. The air is not poisoned—it is the particles which are poisoned. They lie where they fall, emitting radioactivity in every direction in a straight line. If you are behind a barrier which shields you from them as they lie and if you do not breathe them into your lungs and if you stay behind your barrier until they are sufficiently decayed to offer no further threat, you will survive.

I shall not go into the technicalities of fallout protection beyond saying this: most single family houses in Connecticut offer relatively easy possibilities of adequate protection with some expenditure of time, effort, and money. Our cities, properly surveyed, can probably offer even better protection against fallout at a smaller price for those who live in multiple family dwellings, if preparations are made many public shelters can probably be created quite easily in public buildings, office buildings, and other places of public accommodation. An engineer I met and talked with the other day participated in a survey of Montgomery, Ala., not long ago and I have seen his report. Existing structures, without improvement, offer a significant protection factor for the entire population if properly utilized. In many cases, improvements can be made at low cost, which greatly increase this factor.

Now let us consider our responsibilities. First, like good Americans, let us consider our duty to our country. The measures that you take and that the Federal, State, and municipal governments take, will certainly influence our enemies in their decisions about how much to dare, how aggressively to behave.

Our entire defense, is based on our second-strike capacity, that is, our capacity to inflict damage after we have been hit first. Clearly, it is our responsibility to minimize the benefits accruing to the enemy who

strikes the first blow. Clearly, also, if we are going to deter attack, the enemy must be aware that a functioning United States will survive such an attack. A properly functioning, all-encompassing civil defense resting securely on a maximum effort by the individual citizen to provide himself with all-around security is as important to our foreign policy and national defense as our ability to strike the enemy.

President Kennedy, in his acceptance speech, said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." Here is an area where all of us can help. It must be a massive and a universal effort. Unless everyone has a place to go to, knows where it is, and knows that it has within it the means to protect and support life, it is not enough. Shelter for all, nothing less, must be our aim.

It is not necessary to stress the citizen's responsibility to his family. Many have said to me "I don't care for myself—if it happens, it happens." But most will react when it comes to their families, particularly their children who have all their lives still before them.

Ask yourself now the question, "What would I do if the radio announced an attack?" If you don't know, and most don't, then the time for you to do something is now.

So what should you do?

1. As a first step, find the best suited place, preferably in your cellar, for your protection. If you live in a multiple dwelling, it will probably be necessary to establish a joint approach to the problem with other families.

2. It may be necessary to survive for 2 weeks inside the shelter. Clearly, an extra supply of food and water must be made available, ready and waiting. Likewise, medical supplies should be there, for unless you are a doctor, or are lucky enough to share a shelter with a doctor, you will have to be your own. Other necessities are listed in civil defense pamphlets.

3. Establish a plan for what you and each member of your family are going to do in case of attack. There should be a check list to minimize the confusion created by panic.

4. Arrange to make such improvements as you can to increase the shielding factor. Your improvements can run all the way from a completely blastproof underground shelter, at great expense, to sandbagging the cellar windows. Civil defense manuals are available to guide you on this.

5. Face the fact that the threat which hangs over us may endure for the rest of your natural life. The improvements you may make will cost money; see to it that they are of lasting worth. Your expenditure of time, effort and money is like paying the premium on your fire insurance policy—you hope that what it buys will never be needed. But if it is needed, you want to have no question that it will give you the protection you have paid for.

6. Look into your local civil defense effort. Get active in it and encourage others to do so.

And while we are considering responsibilities, let us consider what your Federal, State and municipal governments should do for you. First, let me reiterate that the cornerstone of an adequate civil defense is what each citizen does for himself and his family. But he must have some assurances from the levels of government, and he must in many cases have some help.

The major assurance that he must have is that before, during, and after any attack the government, whether it be Federal, State, city or town, will be there and functioning, and that it will be able to continue to preserve law and order.

I will not comment upon the application of this to the Federal Government—its plans and preparations are no doubt ramified and secret. But for the State government and for the municipal governments, this means sheltered control centers and protection for those upon whom we must depend for guidance and sustenance after a fallout period ends. Our present lack of these facilities must be corrected. When the people emerge from their shelters they must have living leaders to whom they can turn.

It is ridiculous to ask the citizen to mortgage his property or his income to provide himself with 2 weeks' protection which will end with the discovery that he is emerging into a world of chaos, without law and order, with no authority of government to tell him where to go for food or assistance or what to do to help the general effort to restore the situation.

Governments, perhaps at all levels, must cooperate to identify and prepare places of public shelter in our towns and cities to add to the capacity provided by individual effort but not to replace it. In view of the mobility of our population it is obvious that any public place which can be easily converted to the protection of people should be so converted. I am glad to read of the conference on this of last Friday in Hartford. It is a matter of urgency.

Upon government must rest the planning for weeks and months which would follow the fallout period in terms of decontamination, food, water supply, and the whole agonizing process of cleaning up debris and getting the economy back into working order.

In addition to the assistance implied in identifying and improving shelters for public use, and in taking the responsibility for the postfallout emergency. Government has considerable responsibility for the encouragement and the direction of our citizens in their efforts to help themselves and the Nation.

This includes, again on the State and municipal level:

1. A clear statement of what we have as a result of our efforts to date; if, as I believe, we are largely unprepared at both levels, we should know it, and the knowledge should be coupled with clear plans for remedying our deficiencies. Unless we have public confidence in our civil defense effort the citizen will not do his part. He does not have confidence in it now.

2. A major educational effort to make people recognize that we are in danger, and to help them prepare for it. I have suggested the enlistment of just such groups as are represented here at this meeting. The service clubs whose main aim and theme is service to the community have a real opportunity and responsibility in this area of public indoctrination. And the State and municipal governments must enlist them and help them do the job. Let me state clearly that the solution of this problem of civil defense is a matter of leadership, leadership at all levels of government and in all segments of our life. Business must lead, labor must lead, the press must lead and these are clear indications, in this area of the State at least, that this is taking place. But the individual citizen must lead also. If someone who has the respect and confidence of his neighbors builds a shelter, some of them will follow suit, and then more will follow those.

3. Quite clearly, action should be taken at whatever level is legally indicated to exempt shelter improvements from the property tax.

4. Building codes must be reviewed and if necessary changed to make possible the construction of these emergency standby facilities on a reasonable basis consonant with safety.

5. It is quite obvious that financing for many will be a serious problem. My hat is off to Howard Smith and the Middletown Savings Bank for their lonely action in making low-cost loans available for this purpose. But for a broad program I believe we shall have to look to the State. Some form of statewide low-cost financing program either by guarantees or direct loans should be considered as part of our approach to this problem.

6. Some weeks back, I recommended an immediate study of all these problems by the Civil Defense Advisory Council with the purpose of producing an early report containing a minimum immediate program for State civil defense. I further stated that if such a minimum immediate program could not be attained within the limits of existing legislation and appropriations, the Governor should call a special session to implement it.

I do not believe in rushing in to a special session on this or any other matter without a definite emergency and a definite series of proposals to act upon; I believe at this time the emergency exists but I do not believe the legislature should convene without a report to guide it. But the time for action is now, for by the same token, against the background of our present posture in the world, if it is clear that certain reasonable things should be done to protect us we cannot wait until the spring of 1963.

So much then for these responsibilities, yours to your country, and those of your government to you. Let us hope they will be discharged for the alternative is the possibility of a disaster of unthinkable proportions.

I have made these remarks with the purpose in mind of persuading all who hear or read them that the possibility of nuclear war clearly exists, that a sound civil defense program (which we do not presently have) is essential to preventing nuclear war, that with proper precautions most of our people can survive, and that if they do the Nation will survive and recover from such an attack.

If by our joint efforts to protect ourselves we avert war and thus waste those efforts in making them unnecessary it will be a glorious waste. If by failing to make an effort we contribute to the coming of war and waste 50 million lives it will be a waste of shame and horror.

I have referred to those things which this Government can do and should do. Doubtless there are many additional ideas I have not mentioned. The governments at all levels have their serious responsibilities in this matter.

But, my friends, in this case to a degree unknown since the individual American provided his own protection on the frontier, the future of your families, the future of your town and State, the future of the Nation is up to you.

It is time to recognize the facts of the situation.

It is time to evaluate them in terms of survival.

It is past time for a sense of urgency about this.

Let us protect our country and all it stands for by protecting ourselves.

Imports Threaten Our Free System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a recent article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Free-Trade Fight," which contains an excellent account of the present strong shift

in the Congress toward modification of the reciprocal trade treaties and widespread demands for relief for American industries and workers from the very harmful effects of the operation of these laws.

Time and time again, over a long period of time, I have urged that these laws be reappraised, reevaluated and modified to enable American industry to survive and keep our faithful American workers employed.

Day by day the situation is getting worse and is drastically affecting a broad spectrum of American industries, old and new.

I hope that every Member of the Congress will read this excellent article because it points out very clearly the dire threat that current so-called reciprocal trade is posing for American industries and millions of workers and their families—indeed for our entire economic system.

It is clear that if some way cannot be found to check the impact of this increasing cutthroat competition from abroad, our industrial strength will wane and our economic system will be facing disaster with business failures and widespread unemployment.

As I stated so many times, I strongly favor every possible measure of profitable trade and commerce with other friendly nations.

I am very anxious to support every and any law that would bring about this desirable result. But foreign trade, as it is now being conducted under the trade treaties, is a one-way street, and while imports rise, exports decrease.

It should be evident that the Congress must take early action, if we would preserve here in this country the proper climate for our free enterprise, industrial prosperity, full-time employment and national progress and advancement commensurate with the dynamic demands of the space age.

I urge that Congress and the executive department of the Government give these matters attention at the earliest possible time, so that further encroachments by foreign imports upon our domestic economy, which are sapping its vitality, and threatening our way of life, can be stopped, and a sound and sane trade program be inaugurated.

The article follows:

PROTECTIONISTS GAIN, PERIL KENNEDY 1962 BID FOR MORE LIBERAL LAW—CAMERA, RADIO TEXTILE FIRMS' PLEAS SWAY CONGRESSMEN; UNEMPLOYMENT IS A FACTOR—A SHIFT IN THE SOUTHERN VIEW

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's freer trade drive in 1962 will face a towering obstacle: congressional protectionist sentiment of a magnitude not seen since the high-tariff twenties.

Well in advance of next year's administration push to extend and liberalize th reciprocal trade law, demands for defense against import competition are swelling mightily. Members of both parties from many parts of the land are responding to home-State complaints from industry and labor about real or threatened damage from the rising influx of foreign goods. There are growing rumblings of discontent about the effectiveness of present safeguards. Scarcely a week goes by without a new speech on the House or Senate floor calling for import quotas on some foreign product, a step essentially distasteful to the Kennedy regime.

"You can start with bread along the Canadian border and go all the way down to strawberries on the Mexican border; I don't think you can find many holes in the map where there isn't a complaint from someone about imports," remarks a key House official.

A House Democrat runs through this list of plaintiff industries: "Coal, some steel, pottery, cement, oil, glass, some machinery, lead and zinc, cameras, transistor radios, all kinds of textiles, clothing, baseball gloves, fishing rods—all these and more are howling about imports." And, he adds, "Congressmen are listening now."

PROTECTIONIST RESOLUTION

Sample response: More frequent introductions of the perennial protectionist resolution urging that the Senate and House declare it "the sense of Congress" that no more tariff-easing agreements be negotiated by the executive branch during the remaining life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring next year. This resolution has been introduced more than 70 times this session, compared with some 40 last year.

"This isn't a case of the same old protectionist groups making more noise," cautions a longtime House stalwart for freer trade who has been doing some private sampling. "This time there's more of 'em." An ardent protectionist who has done his own polling cheerfully agrees, "We're the strongest we've been since the first reciprocal trade law in 1934," he enthuses.

A potent combination of political and economic forces underlies this gain in strength. The departure of President Eisenhower, for one thing, has put more Republicans in the protectionist column. "Mr. Eisenhower dragged a lot of kicking and screaming Republicans along with him on trade" asserts a key legislator. "Now that he's gone, they're reverting to type." Senator BENNETT, of Utah, who backed Ike on trade legislation in 1958, is urging safeguards now against certain meat imports. Also, almost all of the GOP's 21-seat gain in the House in the 1960 election is counted a plus for protectionism.

SOUTHERN VIEW CHANGES

On the Democratic side, the southerners who began abandoning their traditional free-trade stance as Dixie industrialized are turning more protectionist as foreign invasion of their markets grows.

This year influential Democratic Representative VINSON, of Georgia, engineered a demonstration in which some 70 textile-State lawmakers, mostly Democrats, stood up on the House floor and demanded import controls. Senator BYRD is backing away from his traditional support of freer-trade legislation.

More borderstate and northern Democrats are heading the same way. Even such liberal Senators as MUSKIE of Maine and MCCARTHY of Minnesota want to require consideration of foreign wage rates in any decision on relief from import competition. Outspoken for more protection is New York's Representative STRATTON, whose upstate district encompasses such import-affected industries as textiles, gloves, and General Electric Co.'s heavy electrical equipment works at Schenectady. More and more northern Congressmen are feeling the heat from local unions, including those of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, even though national labor leaders favor liberalized trade.

Much of this pressure is prompted by the fact that unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis has remained at almost 7 percent of the labor force despite economic recovery. "If you've got any unemployment in your district at all, you have a hard time justifying a free trade position," asserts a midwestern Democrat. Another lawmaker complains: "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

MACHINERY, TEXTILE IMPORTS UP

The incoming tide of foreign goods clearly is increasing in amount and variety. Spurred by economic recovery in this country, U.S. imports jumped in July, the latest month for which figures are available, to the highest monthly level since September 1959. At nearly $1.4 billion, adjusted for seasonal fluctuation, this was 16 percent over the June level and 9 percent above that of July last year. Increases were reported in U.S. purchases of machinery, vehicles, metals, and textile products. Not only is there a rising flow from long-time suppliers abroad, but newly developing lands are seeking out the rich American market. One recently introduced item: tennis rackets from Pakistan.

Obviously the rising winds of protectionism on Capitol Hill portend a major battle against the administration's attempt to extend the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and push into new ground. Rather than trimming back past trade concessions, White House officials are hunting ways to open the domestic market wider to foreign producers. The key aim: To supply Mr. Kennedy with bargaining tools to prevent U.S. goods from being closed out of trading blocs abroad, such as Europe's six-nation Common Market. Instead of the cumbersome item-by-item tariff-cutting authority first handed President Roosevelt and extended 11 times since then, Mr. Kennedy may seek new powers to slash import duties on a broad range of commodities.

"Unless the present mood of Congress changes completely, any idea that the administration can get approval of this sort of thing is sheer fantasy," snaps a Southern Democrat.

A TRIP TO HOLLYWOOD

Even now, protectionists are working to build a solid case against trade liberalization next year. Democratic Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, a consistent foe of freer trade, heads a House subcommittee that has collected evidence from far and wide of import damage to U.S. employment. So far, Mr. DENT's group has delved into textiles and cheese and has even taken testimony on the effect of foreign airlines' invasion of the United States on employment of American pilots. In the works: A subcommittee trip to Hollywood to inquire into the effects of foreign film imports on U.S. moviemaking.

Although Congress has not had major trade legislation to deal with at this session, significant indicators of increased protectionist power keep showing up in legislative measures. House lawmakers wrote into the foreign aid authorization bill a provision barring loans to nations for building or running any plants that would produce goods in competition with U.S. manufacturers, unless such nations promised to limit exports to this country to 10 percent of annual output. Although a Senate-House conference eased the restriction to 20 percent, the amendment stayed in the measure.

Protectionists claim credit for the pressures that brought insertion of a "stiff interpretation" into the treaty for U.S. membership in the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Reflecting concern over possible dilution by the organization of this country's control of its own trade policies, the provision specified that U.S. membership would neither lessen nor expand this Nation's sovereign powers.

DEMANDS FOR RELIEF

What many lawmakers want as a price for any support for trade liberalization is some firm assurance of more relief for import-injured industries. Such help could take the form of administration-proposed import quotas for certain products, or simply of greater Presidential acceptance of Tariff

Commission recommendations for curbing imports or raising tariffs to protect domestic producers.

Strong words of warning have come from Mr. VINSON, one of the administration's ablest vote-getters among southern Democrats: "Unless quotas are imposed that will provide the necessary protection to the textile industry in the United States, I think I can safely predict that at least some of the Members who voted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1958 will have second thoughts if a bill to extend the act is presented on the floor in 1962."

Since he spoke, the United States has worked out an agreement with 16 nations to reduce cotton textile imports to this country and reroute some of the flow to other lands. How effective it will be in curbing the competition and relaxing congressional pressure for action remains to be seen.

"This administration has got to recognize that industries are getting hurt," declares a key Southern Democrat. "Kennedy can't go on ignoring Tariff Commission recommendations as Eisenhower did."

CURBING PRESIDENTIAL POWER

Of 35 recent cases in which relief was recommended by the Tariff Commission, Congressman STRATTON of New York relates, 22 were turned down by the White House—"a sorry percentage," he scoffs. To stop this sort of thing, protectionists would like to make Tariff Commission recommendations mandatory, rather than leaving final judgment up to the President; such a sharp change does not seem likely to be adopted soon, however.

Congress mood is not lost on the administration, in any case. Indeed, some lawmakers suspect Mr. Kennedy has recently been careful to avoid a congressional rebuff on tariffs. He sent back for further study recent unanimous Tariff Commission recommendations for relief for domestic industries against imports of baseball gloves, ceramic mosaic tile, and certain kinds of glass, these Congressmen note. A Presidential "no," they suggest, might have been overridden by a two-thirds vote of Congress—a check provided in the 1958 extension of the trade law.

In both the substance and presentation of its 1962 trade proposals, the administration will strive to anticipate and overcome congressional objections. A key feature of its new program is expected to be a broad new plan to ease the impact of further tariff cuts. Rather than relying on higher tariffs or import quotas to protect domestic industries, the plan would emphasize increased Government help to rehabilitate companies, industries or communities hard hit by imports.

Soon Cabinet officials and their top aides will start beating the drums for the new trade approach, promises one official. "Once the President gets into the fight," insists another, "it will put a whole new perspective on things." To help cultivate support for freer-trade plans both in Congress and in the business world, Mr. Kennedy has already named a Republican banker, Howard C. Petersen, as a special White House assistant.

The administration's congressional allies won't be idle, either. One administration lieutenant in the House remarks: "I expect to do a lot of talking on this matter between sessions." Democratic Representative BOGGS of Louisiana, a long-time battler for freer trade, plans public hearings next month by his Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. He expects the testimony will provide much ammunition against the protectionist attack. Mr. BOGGS has also signed up former Secretary of State Herter to help head a study of world economic and trade problems.

Cuba: The Record Set Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said since the ill-fated Cuban invasion as to where the responsibility should rest for this tragic failure. It has been most disconcerting to view the efforts of some of some critics to fix the total blame on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and dedicated people in the CIA.

Many have asked why can't the record be set straight so that all Americans can know just who was responsible for this debacle that did so much to lower the prestige of America.

We have such a document now that is complete in detail. It is an objective statement of the activities that led up to the landings at the Bay of Pigs.

A real service has been performed by Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy who has written an article entitled "Cuba: The Record Set Straight," published in the 1961 issue of Fortune magazine.

It is plain, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility rests with the President of the United States and with his principal appointed advisers in the White House, in the Department of State, and the United Nations. Let's have no more talk about the Joint Chiefs of Staff and/or the CIA being responsible for this fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear and I submit herewith the article by Mr. Murphy that does in fact set the record straight. I urge all Americans to read it and request unanimous consent to include herewith as a portion of my remarks the above-referenced article.

CUBA: THE RECORD SET STRAIGHT

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Not long ago, at President Kennedy's daily staff meeting, the special assistant for national security affairs, McGeorge Bundy, opened the proceedings by noting, "Sir, we have four matters up for discussion this morning." The President was not in a zestful mood. "Are these problems which I inherited?" as asked. "Or are they problems of our own making?" "A little of both," was Bundy's tactful answer.

The exchange revealed a new and saving humility. Some days after this incident, Kennedy addressed the Nation on the subject of Berlin. The ebullience, the air of self-assurance that marked his first month in office had gone. He spoke earnestly to his countrymen but his words were also aimed at Premier Khrushchev, who up to this point had appeared not to be listening. This time Kennedy did get through to Moscow; and any lingering doubt about the American determination to defend Berlin was dispelled by the response of the American people. The President's will to stand firm was clear, and the Nation was with him.

Nevertheless, in any full review of John Kennedy's first months in office, there must be reported a failure in administration that will continue to inhibit and trouble American foreign policy until it is corrected. This failure raises a fair question: whether Kennedy has yet mastered the governmental machinery, whether he is well and effectively served by some of his close advisers, and whether they understand the use of power in world politics. The matter is of vital importance; in the crises that will inevitably arise around the world—in the Middle East, in Africa, in the Far East, in Central Europe—the U.S. Government must be in top form, and possibly even, as Kennedy himself suggested, act alone.

Administrative confusions came to light most vividly in the Cuban disaster. That story is told here for the first time in explicit detail. It is told against the background of the U.S. reversal in Laos, which in itself should not be underestimated: Laos, once in the way of becoming a buffer for its non-Communist neighbors, is all but finished; now, in South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, a stout friend of the United States, is under murderous attack by Communist guerrillas; the U.S. loss of face is being felt from the Philippines to Pakistan, and in the long run the damage may prove to be even more costly than that caused by Cuba.

Let us turn back then to the train of events, beginning with Laos, that culminated in the disaster in the Bay of Pigs. Fortune is publishing the account for one purpose—to set the record straight for concerned Americans.

Kennedy, from the day he took office, was loath to act in Laos. He was confident that he understood the place and use of power in the transactions of the Nation, but he was baffled by this community of elephants, parasols, and pagodas. Then, too, he brought to office a general surmise that our long-range prospects of holding the new and weak nations of southeast Asia in the Western camp were doubtful in the extreme. In this respect, he was leaning toward the Lippmann-Stevenson-Fulbright view of strategy. This school holds that U.S. power is overcommitted in southeast Asia, and that the proper aim for U.S. diplomacy there should be to reduce local frictions by molding the new states as true neutrals.

The U.S. position in Laos had become acute while Dwight Eisenhower was still in office. Eisenhower must therefore bear a considerable part of the blame for the U.S. failure; he let a situation go from bad to worse, and indeed he apologized to Kennedy for leaving "a mess," and that it might take the intervention of U.S. troops to redeem it. There had been a moment when the struggle in Laos had turned in favor of the pro-U.S. forces under Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, the former Defense Minister. In a series of small but decisive engagements, more by maneuver than by shooting, Phoumi eventually took the capital, Vientiane, early in December, but at this point the Russians intervened openly on the side of the Communist faction, the Pathet Lao. In concert with a large-scale push by well-trained troops from North Vietnam, they introduced a substantial airlift into northern Laos (an operation that still is continuing).

The collapse of the Royal Lao Army then became inevitable unless the United States came in with at least equal weight on Phoumi's side. One obvious measure was to put the airlift out of business. The job could have been done by "volunteer" pilots and the challenge would at least have established, at not too high an initial risk for the United States, how far the Russians were prepared to go. Another measure would have been to bring SEATO forces into the battle, as the SEATO treaty provided.

In the end, Eisenhower decided to sheer away from both measures. The State Department was apposed to stirring up India and the other Asian neutrals. Secretary of State Christian Herter agreed in principle that the independence of Laos had to be maintained, yet he was unable to bring to heel his own desk officers and the policy

planners, who were apprehensive that even a limited military action would wreck the possibility of some kind of political accommodation with Moscow. The policy shapers, especially in State, hung back from any sequence of actions that might have committed U.S. policy on the central issue: that Laos was worth fighting for. Even the modest additional support that the Defense Department tried to extend to Phoumi's U.S.-equipped battalions in the field during the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration was diluted by reason of the conflict between Defense and State. Under Secretary of Defense James Douglas was later to say, "By the time a message to the field had been composed in Washington, it had ceased to be an operational order and had become a philosophical essay." And a vexed Phoumi was to exclaim that the reasoning of the American Ambassador, Winthrop Brown, was beyond his simple Oriental mind. "His Excellency insists that my troops be rationed to a few rounds of ammunition per man. He tells me that I must not start a world war. But the enemy is at my throat."

After the responsibility passed to Kennedy in January, Phoumi's position was still not completely hopeless, if he had been able to get adequate help. But early in March a sudden Communist descent drove him off a position commanding the principal highway in northern Laos. That unfortunate action was the turning point in his part of the war. For the relative ease with which it was done raised in Washington the question of whether Phoumi's troops had the will to fight.

By then Kennedy was committed to the Cuba operation. He therefore now had to reckon with the very real possibility, were U.S. forces to become involved in Laos, of having to back off from Cuba.

At this juncture Kennedy's foremost need was a clear reading of Soviet intentions. For this he turned to his "demonologists," the New Frontier's affectionate term for its Soviet experts. The most influential among them—Charles E. Bohlen, State's senior Sovietologist, and Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson at Moscow—were agreed that Khrushchev personally had too much respect for U.S. power to stir it into action, as Stalin had carelessly done in Korea. Yet, while Khrushchev was plainly indulging his preference for "salami" tactics, it was impossible to judge how big a slice he was contemplating, or whether he was being pushed by Mao Tse-tung. The only reading available to Kennedy was, in a word, ambiguous. Maybe Khrushchev was moving into a vacuum in Laos just to keep out Mao. If so, then the least chancy response for the United States was to assume that Khrushchev would be satisfied with a thin slice in Laos, and to maneuver him toward a compromise—a neutral government in which, say, the Pathet Lao would have some minor representation.

This course was urged by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and also was being pressed by Prime Minister Macmillan in London. It came to be known as Track Two. It was intended to lead to a cease-fire followed by negotiation. Oppositely, the Joint Chiefs of Staff still believed, as they did under Eisenhower, that the military challenge demanded a military showdown: action by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under which a mixed allied force, including Americans, would move into Laos and take over the defense of the important cities, thereby freeing the Royal Laotian Army to move into the field without risk of being sapped by subversion in the rear. This option was labeled Track One, and it was favored as well by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his deputy, Roswell Gilpatric.

While Kennedy favored Track Two and supported a conciliatory note that Macmillan sent to Moscow, he decided he also had to make a show of starting down Track One, in case the political gamble failed. He permitted himself a dramatic gesture. At his televised press conference on March 23, he addressed himself somberly to a map of Laos—a country "far away" but in a world that is "small." Its independence, he went on, "runs with the safety of us all," and in language that all but told Khrushchev that he was in for a fight, he implied that the United States was preparing to go to its defense. There was, meanwhile, a tremendous deployment of U.S. forces in the Far East, involving the 7th Fleet and Marine combat units on Okinawa. The Army's strategic-strike units in the United States were made ready. A belated effort was made to buck up Phoumi's forces with an increased flow of fighting gear. U.S. military "advisers" went into the field with his battalions. Against this background, on March 26, Kennedy went to Key West and met Macmillan, who was on a visit to the West Indies. The Prime Minister made it clear that Britain considered Laos hardly worth a war, and wanted no part in a SEATO action. (De Gaulle, in a separate exchange, had told Kennedy flatly that France would not fight in Laos.)

From that point on, the idea of a military showdown in Laos looked less and less attractive to the President. He did issue one warning to the Russians that might have been construed as having a military tone. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko called at the White House and Kennedy took him into the rose garden, beyond earshot of his staff, and said, "The United States does not intend to stand idly by while you take over Laos." But that was the last run along Track One.

By then, Rusk was in Bangkok for a meeting of the SEATO powers, still hoping to extract from the meeting at least a strong statement that would condemn the Soviet intervention in Laos and reassert the determination of the SEATO powers to defend the new nations of Southeast Asia. In this mission Rusk failed. None of the ranking Democratic Congressmen, or Republican, spoke up in favor of intervention. Moreover, when Kennedy pressed the military chiefs for specific recommendations, he got divided answers. Gen. Thomas White, then Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, were both confident that the Communist penetration could be defeated and Laos saved. They said that since the Communists could throw far more manpower into the battle, the U.S. war plan would have to include the possible use of tactical nuclear weapons on a limited scale. They maintained, however, that a clear U.S. resolution to employ nuclear weapons, if there was a need, might in itself discourage further Communist penetration. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, had much less confidence in the U.S. ability to stop the Communists. Lemnitzer expressed the apprehension that U.S. military action in Laos might be matched by Red China and Russia in a fast reopening of the war in Korea. Two such wars, by his calculation, might require no fewer than 20 U.S. divisions, more than the Army had in its entire order of battle, as well as general mobilization to support them.

"In effect," Kennedy demanded, "you're telling me that I can't do anything—without starting a nuclear war?" This, he swore, he'd never do, which by itself was a startling reversal of a fundamental premise of the Eisenhower strategy: that U.S. forces would have recourse to nuclear tactical weapons on whatever scale the pursuit of U.S. objectives required. The White House, while conceding to the Communists the option of uninhibited escalation, would not tolerate even a limited escalation on the nuclear side by our own forces. Any military move in Laos therefore seemed hopeless.

The fear of the nuclear escalation factor became the sanction for the policy that was pursued thereafter. In light of this, the scene of Kennedy addressing himself to the map of Laos, in his first appearance as Commander in Chief, is now memorable for its fleeting revelation of a spirited man who was eager to present himself as a strong President, but who all too quickly turned unsure of his principal resource of power.

The chiefs, although they took different views of the risks of the Laos situation, were fundamentally agreed on a central point. And that was that the United States had to be prepared to employ tactical nuclear weapons. But Kennedy and his civilian strategists, moving away from the nuclear base of the Eisenhower strategy, read into their professional differences a bankruptcy of means and doctrine. The low esteem in which Kennedy began to hold the military leaders whom he inherited from the Eisenhower administration has not been concealed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara is rewriting the Eisenhower strategic doctrine, in collaboration with the political scientists at the White House and State. The backing away from nuclear strategy, which ended in the U.S. retrea in Laos, is now being formalized by McNamara. (His prescription will call for a conventional base for NATO strategy in the defense of Berlin.)

So there was, by early April, even as Laos was slipping farther and farther below Kennedy's horizon, a breakdown of communication between the political and the military sides of the Government, and this would contribute largely to the failure of Kennedy's next venture.

The Cuba affair has been called the American Suez. In the sense that Suez, too, was an utter fiasco, the bracketing is wryly accurate. There is, however, a clear difference between the two operations. Ill-managed as it was, the Suez invasion would have succeeded had not Eisenhower used the influence of the United States to bring three Allies—Britain, France, and Israel—to a humiliating halt. (It should be recorded that neither Britain, France, nor Israel made any critical comment on the U.S. excursion in Cuba.) In Cuba the defeat was wholly self-inflicted. Even as the expedition was creeping into the Bay of Pigs, just before midnight of April 16, the political overseers back in Washington were in the process of knocking out of the battle plan the final, irreducible element needed for victory.

If the U.S. military are without a peer in any one technique of warfare, it is in putting forces ashore across a hostile beach. For the Bay of Pigs, all the necessary means were at Kennedy's hand. It was, by the standards of Gen. David M. Shoup's marines, an elementary amphibious operation in less than battalion strength. And, indeed, as a tactical exercise, it was well devised and daringly and successfully led. But after the strategists at the White House and State had finished plucking it apart, it became an operation that would have disgraced even the Albanians. When Kennedy looked around for the blunderer, he found him everywhere and nowhere. Practically everybody in his inner group of policy movers and shakers had been in on the planning.

Only after the disaster was upon them did he and his men realize that a venture which was essentially a military one had been fatally compromised in order to satisfy political considerations. One not unfriendly official who also served under Eisenhower was later to observe: "Cuba was a terrific jolt to this new crowd because it exposed the fact that they hadn't really begun to understand the meaning and consequences of action—the

use or misuse of power, in other words. They had blamed Ike's apparent inaction on indecision and plain laziness. Cuba taught them that action, any kind of serious action, is hard and certainly no safe business for amateurs."

The idea for the invasion had taken root during the early summer of 1960. By then, thousands of defectors from Castro's Cuba were in the United States. Many of them were professional soldiers. The job of organizing and training them was given to the Central Intelligence Agency, as the Government's principal mechanism for mounting covert operations of this sort. It became and remained to the end the specific responsibility of one of the CIA's top deputies, Richard M. Bissell, a former economist who is also a highly practical executive. Among his other first-class accomplishments, Bissell had masterminded the U–2 operation, which was, until it finally missed, as one day it had to, the most economical and comprehensive innovation in espionage in modern times.

Training camps for the exiles were set up in a district in western Guatemala offering some privacy. The original idea was to feed the recruits back into Cuba, to reinforce the several thousand anti-Castro guerrillas already established in the mountains. Toward the autumn, however, a more ambitious and riskier project came under tentative consideration. Castro was organizing large formations of militia and was obviously bent on crushing the counterrevolutionary movement before the Cuban populace caught fire. With a view to saving the movement, it was proposed to build up an invasion force big enough to seize and to hold on the Cuban shore a beachhead sufficiently deep for the expedition to proclaim a provisional government, and so provide a rallying base for the discontented. By this time, too, the rudiments of an anti-Castro air force were in training nearby. The planes, however, were all obsolete—mostly propeller-driven B–26's, twin-engine bombers of World War II vintage that had been redeemed from the Air Force's graveyard. Associated with them was a troop-carrying squadron with which a small detachment of paratroopers was training.

During the summer and fall of 1960, Eisenhower from time to time personally reviewed the scheme. In late November, the last time it came up for his comprehensive review, an operational plan had not yet crystallized; no timetable for action had been set. Across the Potomac at the Pentagon, Under Secretary of Defense Douglas, who was charged with quasi-military operations under the noncommittal category of collateral cold war activities, was keeping a watchful eye on the project, and releasing such military talent and gear as the CIA requisitioned. Neither he nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff (whose connection with the project remained informal at this stage) believed that much good would flow from an attack made by Cubans alone. For one thing, the resources then available permitted the training of only 300 men or so, and the air unit had but a dozen planes. This was hardly enough to bring down a tough, well-armed regime, and Douglas repeatedly counseled more realism in the planning. Indeed, it was taken for granted by Douglas and the others directly concerned that a landing in force could not possibly be brought off unless the expedition was shepherded to the beach by the U.S. Navy (either openly or in disguise), and covered by air power in whatever amount might be necessary. Eisenhower, the commander of Normandy, understood this well enough.

YOU MAY HAVE TO SEND TROOPS IN.

It became obvious toward the end of 1960 that Ike would be out of office well before an effective force would be ready. So the decision as to how big the show should be, and how conspicuous should be the U.S. share, and in what role, was no longer his to make. Given the relaxed attitude at the White House, the military chiefs also relaxed; military concern for the enterprise sank to the "Indians"—from the four-star level to the colonels on the Joint Staff who had been advising the CIA in such matters as training and tactics. Bissell was encouraged, on the one hand, to go forward with preparations for an invasion, but he was cautioned to be ready to fall back to the more modest objective of simply generating a supply of reinforcements for the anti-Castro forces in the mountains.

Before Eisenhower was fully rid of his responsibility, however, a number of disquieting developments combined to impart to the enterprise an air of emergency. It was established that Castro was to start receiving, early in 1961, substantial deliveries of Soviet jet fighters, and that pilots to man them were already being trained in Czechoslovakia. From all indications, these would provide him, by early summer, with an air force that would be more than enough to extinguish the last chance of a successful invasion by Cuban exiles; it would be by all odds the most powerful air force in Latin America. Two other developments were scarcely less worrisome. Castro was making progress in his systematic destruction of his enemies in the mountains, upon whose cooperation the invasion counted, and there was no way, save by an overt air supply, to get guns and ammunition to them. The stability of the exile movement itself was, moreover, coming into question. Warring political factions threatened to split their ranks, and men who had trained long and painstakingly were impatient over the failure of their American advisers to set a sailing date. The feeling took hold of them and their American sponsors that it was to be in the spring or never.

After his election, Kennedy had been briefed fairly frequently on the Cuba situation, along with that in Laos. As his hour of authority approached, the question of what to do about Cuba was increasingly on his mind. The problem had a personal angle. In his fourth television debate with Richard Nixon, he had sharply blamed the Eisenhower administration for permitting communism to seize a base there, "only 90 miles off the coast of the United States." He discussed Cuba, along with Laos, at length in both of his preinaugural talks with Eisenhower, and by his stipulation. Ike was inclined to rank Cuba below Laos in terms of urgency, but Cuba clearly worried him. In their second conversation Ike said: "It's already a bad situation. You may have to send troops in."

THE FIRST NECESSITY: CONTROL OF THE AIR

On taking office, Kennedy at once called for a detailed briefing on the condition and prospects of the U.S.-fostered operation. This information was supplied by Allen W. Dulles, the Director of the CIA, and by Bissell. After Kennedy had heard them out he decided that he had to have from the Joint Chiefs of Staff a technical opinion of the feasibility of the project. It is at this point that the locus of responsibility begins to be uncertain.

The operation was not a Department of Defense responsibility. Only once before, in early January, had the chiefs formally reviewed the plan, at Eisenhower's invitation. Now they were asked only for an "appreciation" of its validity. The enterprise, moreover, had expanded considerably in scope and aim in the past few months. With more than 100,000 Cuban refugees in the United States, recruiting had stepped up, and the organizers were at this point aiming at a landing force of about 1,000 men. An operational plan for a landing on the south coast of Cuba, near the town of Trinidad, was finally beginning to jell. There the country was open, with good roads leading into the Escambray Mountains and the needed link-up with the indigenous guerrillas. Also cranked into the plan were ingenious schemes—a barrage of radiobroadcasts from nearby islands and showers of pamphlets from airplanes—intended to galvanize the anti-Castro Cubans in the cities and villages into demonstrations as the invaders struck. It was never explicitly claimed by the CIA that a general uprising was immediately in the cards; the intention was to sow enough chaos during the first hours to prevent Castro from smashing the invasion on the beach. Once the beachhead was consolidated, however, and if fighting gear went forward steadily to the guerrillas elsewhere in Cuba, the planners were confident that a mass revolt could be stimulated.

Finally, the plan still assumed that U.S. military help would be on call during the landing. Castro's air force consisted of not quite twoscore planes—a dozen or so obsolete B–26's, plus about the same number of obsolete British Sea Furies, also slow, propeller-driven airplanes. But in addition there were seven or eight T–33 jet trainers, the remnants of an earlier U.S. transaction with the Batista government, so the force was not the pushover it appeared at first glance. Armed with rockets, these jets would be more than a match in a battle for the exiles' B–26's. The scheme was to destroy them on the ground in advance of the landing, by a series of attacks on Castro's airfields; should the T–33's escape the first surprise blow, there would be ample opportunity to catch them later on the ground while they were being refueled after an action. In any event a U.S. carrier would be close by, below the horizon, and one or two of its tactical jets could presumably supply whatever quick and trifling help might be required in an emergency.

It stood to reason that, considering how small the landing party was, the success of the operation would hinge on the B–26's controlling the air over the beachhead. And the margins that the planners accepted were narrow to begin with. The B–26's were to operate from a staging base in a Central American country more than 500 miles from Cuba. The round trip would take better than 6 hours, and that would leave the planes with fuel for only 45 minutes of action, for bombing and air cover, over Cuba. In contrast, Castro's air force could be over the beachhead and the invaders' ships in a matter of minutes, which would increase his relative air advantage manifold. Hence the absolute necessity of knocking out Castro's air power, or at least reducing it to impotence by the time the ground battle was joined.

This, in general terms, was the plan the chiefs reviewed for Kennedy. The assumptions concerning the possibilities of an anti-Castro uprising not being in their jurisdiction, they took these at face value. They judged the tactical elements sound and, indeed, they accorded the operation a high probability of success. They were allowed to appraise the training and the equipment of the forces. A team of officers was sent to Guatemala. On the basis of its report, the chiefs made several recommendations, but again their assessment was favorable.

Late in January, Kennedy authorized the CIA to lay on the invasion plan, but he warned that he might call the whole operation off if he had a change of mind as to its wisdom. D-day was tentatively fixed for March 1 but this proved impossible to meet. For one thing, it took some time to organize the quarrelsome exiles in New York and Miami into a workable coalition that would sponsor the expedition. For another, it was decided that a battalion of about 1,400 men was needed to secure a beachhead, and that the force, which called itself the Cuban brigade, should be beefed up generally. In consequence of these developments, the target date kept slipping until it finally came firm as April 17.

It has since been reported that the President was inwardly skeptical of the operation from the start but just why has never been clear—whether he judged the force too small to take on Castro, or because he was reluctant to take on so soon a nasty job that was bound to stir up an international ruckus, however it came out. Some of his closest advisers, in any case, were assailed by sinking second thoughts. What bothered them was the "immorality" of masked aggression. They recoiled from having the United States employ subterfuge in striking down even so dangerous an adversary as Castro, and they were almost unanimously opposed to having the United States do the job in the open. Even with the best of luck, there would certainly be a flutter among the six leading Latin-American states, which, with the exception of Venezuela, had refused to lend themselves to any form of united action against Castro. And the repercussion would scarcely be less embarrassing among the neutralists of Asia and Africa, whose good opinion Kennedy's advisers were most eager to cultivate. And so the emphasis at the White House and State began to move away from a concern with the military considerations—the things needed to make the enterprise work—and to become preoccupied with tinkerings they hoped would soften its political impact on the neutral nations.

THE DISMEMBERING BEGINS

The "immorality" of the intervention found its most eloquent voice before the President during a meeting in the State Department on April 4, only 13 days before the date set for the invasion. (Stewart Alsop told part of the story in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.) The occasion was Bissell's final review of the operation, and practically everybody connected with high strategy was on hand—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, General Lemnitzer, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, as well as Bundy, Paul Nitze, Kennedy's specialist on strategic planning at the Pentagon, Thomas Mann, then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs, and three of Kennedy's specialists in Latin American matters—Adolf Berle, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin. There was also one outsider, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who had been Kennedy's favorite choice for Secretary of State, and whose support he wanted. After Bissell had completed his briefing and Dulles had summed up the risks and prospects, Fulbright spoke and denounced the proposition out of hand: it was the wrong thing for the United States to get involved in.

Kennedy chose not to meet this issue. Instead, he quickly noted certain practical considerations and then, going around the table, he asked various of his advisers whether they thought the operation should go forward. Without exception, the answer was, yes. Berle was particularly outspoken. He declared that "a power confrontation" with communism in the Western Hemisphere was inevitable anyhow. As for this enterprise, "Let 'er rip" was his counsel. Mann, who previously had been on the fence, now spoke up for the operation. Rusk, too, said he was for it, in answer to the President's direct question, but as would presently be manifest, he privately had no heart for it. Two other men among the President's senior foreign-policy advisers, not present at the meeting, shared Fulbright's feelings: Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, and Adlai Stevenson, with the United Nations in New York, who soon came to know in a general way that something distasteful was afoot. In deference to these views, Kennedy—either at the meeting or soon afterward—made two separate rulings that were to contribute to the fatal dismembermen of the whole plan. First, U.S. airpower would not be on call at any time: the obsolescent B–26's flown by "our" Cubans would be on their own. Second, the B–26's could be used in only two strikes before the invasion—first on D-minus-2-days (April 15) and again on the morning of the landing. Although these limitations clearly lengthened the risks, Lemnitzer did not dispute them, nor did Bissell's own military advisers; they were confident that if the B–26's missed the T–33's on the first go, they would surely catch them on the second.

During the few remaining days, Kennedy drew his circle of advisers more tightly around him. Apart from Bundy and Rostow, the only White House advisers who remained privy to the development of the operation were the Latin American experts—Adolf Berle and Schlesinger. Lemnitzer and, of course, Allen Dulles were in and out of Kennedy's office. But the doubts of Rusk and Fulbright and of others were all the while imperceptibly converging on the President and, bit by bit, an operation that was marginal to begin with was so truncated as to guarantee its failure.

The embarkation of the expedition was scheduled to start on April 10. This was, in itself, quite a job. Some half dozen small steamers were collected for the first movement, together with a number of tactical landing craft. The takeoff point was a port on the Caribbean, several hundred miles from the training area in Guatemala, and the transfer of the Cuban Brigade was done by air and at night, through 4 nights, in the interest of secrecy. The gear aboard the ships was enough to supply the landing force through 10 days of battle, and also to equip the thousands of guerrilas expected to be recruited after the beachhead was gained.

Only a week before the embarkation, and indeed only a day or so before the last go-around at the State Department, another serious change was made in the invasion plan. At the insistence of the State Department, Trinidad was eliminated as the target landing area. State's reasons were complex. Rusk decided that the entire operation had to be kept "unspectacular" and minimize the overtness of the U.S. role as much as possible. That required shifting the attack to a less populated, and less accessible area, where Castro's reaction might be slower and less effective. Rusk and his own advisers were also anxious to be rid at all possible speed of the incubus of responsibility for mounting the operation in Central America, anxious that the B–26's should be based as rapidly as possible on Cuba. The only vulnerable airfield capable of taking the planes was one in poor condition near the Bay of Pigs, on the Zapata Peninsula, about 100 miles to the west of Trinidad. Here the countryside was quite deserted and, to succeed at all, the invaders had to seize and hold two narrow causeways leading across a swamp that was impassable on either side. These actions did not end the last-minute curtailments directed by the White House. Even the arrangements for arousing the Cuban populace and trying to stampede Castro's militia with leaflet raids and radio broadcasts were struck from the plan, and again because State was afraid that they would be too obvious a showing of the U.S. hand. On April 12, while the convoy was heading north, Kenndy was impelled to announce at a press conference that the United States would not intervene with force in Cuba. Rusk made sure the idea got home by repeating the same guarantee on the morning of the invasion. The effect of this was to serve notice on the Cubans in Cuba, who were known to be waiting for an encouraging signal from the United States, that whatever they might be tempted to try would be at their own risk.

THE POLITICIANS TAKE COMMAND

Clear to the end, Kennedy retained tight control of the enterprise. As each new sequence of action came up for his final approval—the go signal for the embarkation, then for the preinvasion airstrike on the morning of April 15, he came to his decisions quickly and firmly. All the way, however, he reserved the option to stop the landing short of the beach. He kept asking how late the enterprise might be reversed without making it look as if Castro had called an American bluff. He was told: noon on Sunday, April 16, when the invasion force would be 11 hours of steaming from the Bay of Pigs. The Sunday deadline found Kennedy in the Virginia countryside, at Glen Ora; only then did he raise his finger from the hold button. As he did so, he noted with relief that no other unfavorable factors had materialized. He was mistaken. At dawn of the day before, by the timetable, the B–26's, having flown undetected through the night from their Central American staging base, appeared over Cuba and bombed the three fields on which Castro's ready air was deployed. (The attack was, on the whole, highly successful. Half of Castro's B–26's and Sea Furies, and four of his T–33 jets were blown up or damaged and so removed from the imminent battle.) The story was put out that Castro's own pilots, in the act of defecting, had attacked their own airfields. This was a gloss, to say the least; the attackers were indeed defectors from Castro, but they had defected long before. Later that afternoon, at the United Nations, after the Cuban Foreign Minister, Raul Roa, had charged that the attack was "a prolog" to a U.S. invasion, Adlai Stevenson arose and swore that the planes were Castro's.

From this hapless moment on Stevenson's role becomes unclear. There was a subsequent published report that he intervened to block the second strike. Stevenson has flatly denied, and continues to deny, that he even knew about the second strike, let along that he demanded that it be called off. But there was little doubt about his unhappiness over the course of events in the Caribbean and he conveyed these feelings to Washington. Before Sunday was over Bundy was to fly to New York, to see Stevenson (Bundy said) and still wearing, in his haste to be off, sneakers and sports clothes. This sudden errand followed a shattering order that went out to Bissell.

It was Sunday evening, only some 8 hours after Kennedy had given the go-ahead. In the first dark, the expedition was even then creeping toward the Cuban shore. In Bissell's office there was a call on the White House line. It was Bundy, being even crisper than usual: the B–26's were to stand down, there was to be no air strike in the morning, this was a Presidential order. Secretary of State Rusk was now acting for the President in the situation. If Bissell wished to make a "reclama" (Federalese for appeal), it could be done through Rusk.

Bissell was stunned. In Allen Dulles' absence (he was in Puerto Rico), he put his problem up to CIA Deputy Director Charles Cabell, an experienced airman. Together they went to the State Department to urge Rusk to reconsider a decision that, in their judgment, would put the enterprise in irretrievable peril. Cabell was greatly worried about the vulnerability to air attack first of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. The ships, he suggested, could unload and retire to the open sea before daylight; as for the troops ashore being unduly inconvenienced by Castro's air, it had been his experience as a colonel in the Burma theater, he told the visitors, the air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear: military considerations had overruled the political when the D-minus-2 strike had been laid on; now political considerations were taking over. While they were talking, Rusk telephoned the President at Glen Ora to say that Cabell and Bissell were at his side, and that they were worried

about the cancellation of the strike. Rusk, at one point, put his hand over the mouthpiece, and asked Cabell whether he wished to speak to the President. Cabell shook his head. Perhaps that was his mistake; it was certainly his last chance to appeal a lamentable decision. But Bundy had made it clear that Rusk was acting for the President, and Cabell is a professional military man, trained to take orders after the facts had been argued with the man in command.

On their return to the office, Bissell flashed orders to the B–26 commander at the staging field, more than 500 miles from the Bay of Pigs. The force got the changed orders shortly before midnight, only half an hour or so before they were scheduled to depart; the bomb bays were already loaded and the crews were aboard. Meanwhile the planes carrying the paratroopers had taken off, and the first assault barges, still unobserved, were even then approaching the beaches.

TUESDAY, THE TURNING POINT

Past midnight, in the early watches, Bissell and Cabell restudied the battle plan, while signals of consternation welled up from their men far to the south. At 4 o'clock, less than an hour before first light on the Cuban shore, Cabell went back to Rusk with another proposal. It was manifestly impossible for the brigade's small force of B–26's only 16 were operational) to provide effective air cover for the ships from their distant base against jets that could reach the ships in minutes. Cabell now asked whether, if the ships were to pull back of the 3- or 12-mile limit—whichever distance U.S. legal doctrine held to be the beginnings of international water—the U.S.S. *Boxer*, a carrier on station about 50 miles from the Bay of Pigs, could be instructed to provide cover for them. Rusk said no and this time Cabell finally took advantage of the reclama that Bundy had extended to Bissell. The President was awakened. Cabell registered his concern. The answer still was no.

Shortly after that, on Monday morning, April 17, Brig. Gen. Chester Clifton, the President's military aide, received word that the Cuban Brigade had landed. They had little chance. They were without the ranging firepower that the B–26's with their bombs and machine guns had been expected to apply against Castro's tanks and artillery as they wheeled up. Castro's forces came up fast. He still had four jets left, and they were indeed armed with powerful rockets. He used them well against the ships in the bay. Before the morning was done, he had sunk two transports, aboard which was the larger part of the reserve stocks of ammunition, and driven off two others, with the rest of the stock.

Now Kennedy and his strategists became alarmed. About noon on Monday, Bissell was told that the B–26's could attack Castro's airfields at will. Orders went to the staging base for a major attack next morning. But the orders came too late. Most of the pilots had been in the air for upward of 18 hours in an unavailing effort to keep Castro's planes off the troops and the remaining ships. That night a small force was scratched together. It was over Cuba at dawn, only to find the fields hidden by low, impenetrable fog. Nothing came of the try.

Tuesday, the second day, was the turning point. The men ashore had fought bravely and gained their planned objectives. They had even seized and bulldozed the airfield. But they were desperately short of ammunition and food, and under the pressure of Castro's superior firepower and numbers they were being forced back across the beach; three B–26's trying to help them were shot down.

Two small landing craft had made rendezvous with two remaining supply ships and taken on ammunition and rations; but, from where they were, they could not reach the beach until after daybreak, at which time Castro's jets were certain to get them. There remained still one last clear chance to make the thing go. *Boxer* was still on station. The release of a few of its jets simply for air cover should see the two crafts safely to the shore.

DEFEAT IS AN ORPHAN

That night Kennedy was caught up in a White House reception, a white-tie affair, for Congress and the members of his Cabinet. He was informed by an aide that Bissell wished to see him. The President asked Bissell to come to the White House. Calls went out to the other principals—to Rusk, who had been entertaining the Greek Premier at a formal dinner at the State Department, to McNamara, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke.

They gathered in the President's office shortly after midnight. One of the participants recalls: "Two men dominated that singular occasion—the President and Bissell. Bissell was in the unhappy posture of having to present the views of an old establishment that had been overtaken by disaster. He did so with control, with dignity, and with clarity." Bissell made it plain that the expedition was at the point of no return; unless U.S. airpower was brought forward, the men on the beach were doomed. In substance, he asked that the *Boxer's* planes be brought into the battle to save the operation. Rusk still would not have this. Several others were also opposed, including the President's personal staffers. Burke vouched for the worth of Bissell's proposition. The discussion with the President lasted until 2 a.m. Its outcome was a singular compromise. Jets from the *Boxer* would provide cover next morning for exactly one hour—from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m., just long enough for the ships to run into the shore and starting unloading, and for the remaining B–26's to get in a hard blow.

Next morning, through an incredible mischance, the B–26's were over Cuba half an hour ahead of schedule. *Boxer's* jets were still on the flight deck. But Castro's jets were ready. Two of the B–26's were shot down; others were hit and forced to abort. That was the melancholy end. At 2:30 that afternoon, Bissell received word from one of his men aboard a ship in the Bay of Pigs: Remnants of the landing force were in the water and under fire. There was a final message from the gallant brigade commander ashore to this effect, "I have nothing left to fight with and so cannot wait. Am headed for the swamp." Bissell went to the White House to report the end. Kennedy gave orders for a destroyer to move into the bay and pick up as many men as it could. It was no Dunkirk. Only a few men of the 1,400 were saved.

"Victory," Kennedy noted some days later, "has a hundred fathers, and defeat is an orphan." Yet, for all Kennedy's outward calmness at this moment of defeat, he was never, after it, quite the same. Speaking before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, a grave President said, "There are from this sobering episode useful lessons for all to learn."

Switch Hitting Nipped Both Reds and Fascists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, here follows the fourth of a series of articles about the House Committee on Un-American Activities written by Pulitzer Prize winner, Edward J. Mowery:

SWITCH HITTING NIPPED BOTH REDS AND FASCISTS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—In baseball, alert managers fight for the services of a good switch hitter * * * who can handle the hot ones zooming from right or left.

In the realm of parliamentary maneuvering, no congressional body in history has proved more adept in switch hitting than the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC).

HUAC trapped Communists (in government, sensitive industries or organized labor), the Nazis and Fascists (at their recruiting centers and propaganda mills) and agents of the Japanese (whose treachery paid tragic dividends at Pearl Harbor).

Through the crucial '30s, '40s, and '50s, HUAC took 'em as they came amid the anguished howls of civil rights purists and self-appointed, egghead guardians of "constitutional liberties."

The glare of public exposure focused upon such HUAC victims as Manfred Zapp, Fritz Kuhn, Earl Browder, G. Wilhelm Kunze, William Z. Foster, and William Pelley.

These and a host of two-bit subversives gaily plotted America's destruction.

The committee's first full-blown investigation in 1938 centered upon the German-American Bund testimony and legwork revealed the bund's reserve force of 5,000 storm troopers and its amazing Nazi propaganda network.

HUAC files on the Nazi-Fascist fifth column were bulging by the time Hitler armies started their sweep across Poland (September, 1939).

HUAC's relentless campaign against Axis traitors in the United States had these results:

Fritz Kuhn was convicted of stealing bund funds and lost his citizenship; William Pelley's pro-Nazi Silver Shirt Legion dissolved; Arno Risi and Mrs. Leslie Fry (Nazi-Fascist leaders) fled the country and tons of Nazi propaganda coming via Japanese ships, were seized.

In 1940, the committee issued a devastating 414-page report on the activities of Nazi organizations in this country. Two subsequent reports (totaling 438 pages) had immediate repercussions.

The first pinpointed the Nazi-Fascist-Japanese subversive combine, leading to the citation of 44 Axis organizations. The second report contained original bund documents later used in convicting G. Wilhelm Kunze.

The HUAC spotlight also swept to the German diplomatic corps, exposing the Nazi activities of Dr. Frederic Auhagen, Hans Ackermann (and his wife), Manfred Zapp, Guenther Tonn and others.

By 1942, the committee had supplied the President with a list of 17,000 identified with the Nazi movement in the United States.

But HUAC did not neglect the threat posed by the continuing Communist and Japanese conspiracies. A startling, 287-page report on Jap subversion disclosed that committee hearings had revealed before Pearl Harbor that Tokyo had detailed information on all U.S. naval craft and fleet positions around the giant naval base.

Acting speedily on this information, authorities moved hundreds of Japanese from vital west coast areas. And a chorus of protests from civil rights groups rained on Washington.

One of the most ironical and significant disclosures by the committee was the rapport between Bundists and Communists before Hitler double-crossed Stalin and invaded the Soviet Union (June 22, 1941). Nazis and Reds were working in complete

accord to sabotage America's plane production.

As the Axis internal threat disintegrated under the battering HUAC investigations, the committee realistically concentrated on the "supreme" threat—communism. (Nearly a third of all testimony before the committee from 1938–48 concerned Axis subversion.)

Communist infiltration of government, labor, politics, and "patriotic" organizations, as detailed by numerous witnesses, filled the headlines.

The committee exposed sabotage (sit-down) strikes in Los Angeles, New York, Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Onglewood. The names, positions and salaries of hundreds of Federal employees identified with subversive organizations went to the Justice Department.

One report, citing 160 organizations as fronts, lifted the veil of pseudo-patriotism from which notorious groups as the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, American Youth Congress, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, Civil Rights Congress, and American Youth for Democracy.

Many officials of these organizations defied HUAC and were convicted of contempt.

The battle against subversion, however, had taken a new and significant twist, the committee advised the House (1947). The U.S.S.R. was using the "direct approach" to milk America of its scientific know-how.

"The Soviet," HUAC reported, "has obtained every one of America's industrial, military and chemical patents * * * and Amtorg (U.S.S.R. agency) has compiled a handbook of strategic U.S. construction."

(The across-the-counter purchase of U.S. patents by Russian agents actually began in 1944, when the Rosenberg spy ring started funneling information to the Kremlin. In a single month, Russia obtained 112,764 patents.)

HUAC, sensing the need for new legislation in the field of subversion, named a special subcommittee in '48 under the chairmanship of (then) Representative Richard M. Nixon. Witnesses at subsequent hearings included such experts as Adolph A. Berle, Attorney General Tom C. Clark, Harvard Prof. William Y. Elliott, Samuel N. Birnbaum, Louis Waldman, and Morris Ernst.

Again in 1956, the committee sought the advice of 125 leaders in education, military, science, labor, and religion to bolster the continuing investigations. Their testimony contributed to the publication of two works: "Soviet Total War," 900 pages in 2 volumes, and "The Communist Conspiracy," 2,000 pages in 5 volumes.

One of the major allegations against the House Un-American Activities Committee hurled by those seeking its "abolition" is its paucity of achievements.

What is HUAC's record of legislative accomplishments?

An independent study conducted by the Library of Congress reveals that HUAC recommendations from 1941 to 1960 totaled 129, of which 80 were incorporated in bills introduced in Congress.

Laws enacted followed 35 committee recommendations, and an additional 52 bills containing committee-related suggestions were pending at the close of the 86th Congress. Eight of these bills were passed by the House. Recommendations ran the full gamut of security safeguards.

The watchdog phase of HUAC's mandate resulted in the adoption of 13 recommendations by the executive department.

The proof of the committee's major spadework, HUAC supporters stress, was reflected in the passage of these five vital bills: Internal Security Act (1950), Immigration and Nationality Act (1952), Communist Control Act (1954), Espionage and Sabotage Act (1954), and the Immunity Act (1954).

Included in the 33 "emphasized" recommendations made by the committee to tighten security precautions were increased penalties for seditious conspiracy, registration of trained spies, strengthening the Federal loyalty program, deportation and exclusion of alien subversives, and passport denial to dangerous participants in the international Communist movement.

The research study of HUAC's legislative history contains 130 pages of documentation. The foreword states:

"This record will refute once and for all the assertions made by uninformed persons that this committee has no legislative purpose * * * that the object of its hearings is 'exposure for exposure's sake.'

"The fact's clearly show that (HUAC's) activities have always been directed toward remedial legislation in its assigned field of inquiry * * * (and) congressional approval of the committee's functioning is exemplified by the vast amount of legislation * * * following its recommendations."

It might have added that approval by thinking Americans * * * is even more convincing.

Governor Brown, of California, Appoints Abe Kofman as Highway Commissioner

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abe Kofman, newspaper publisher, businessman, and civic leader from my Eighth Congressional District of California has just been appointed to the Highway Commission of the State of California.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown has once again demonstrated the sagacity and political acumen which characterize his appointments to high office in his administration as Governor of California.

Commissioner Kofman typifies the self-made man. He was born in Brockton, Mass., and was raised in a family of modest means. He learned at the early age of 8 what it means to assist his family to make a living by selling newspapers on the streets of Brockton.

Kofman's great interest in civic affairs was also demonstrated early in his life when he served on the Zoning Board of Norwich, Conn., before reaching the age of 30. In 1932 Mr. Kofman was a delegate to the 1932 Connecticut Democratic State Convention which nominated Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Commissioner Kofman has been in business for himself for 42 years. He started a small circulation business at age 16. Three years later he was asked to handle circulation for the Hearst publications in Norwich, Conn. In 1939, he purchased the Times-Star newspaper in Alameda, Calif. In 1950, he purchased the Morning News of San Leandro, Calif. Today, both of these newspapers are fine examples of sound business enterprise and high jouralistic standards.

Mr. Kofman has served his community well. He has presided over the Alameda Contra Costa Counties Jewish Welfare Foundation. He is a 32d degree Mason as well being a member of the Shrine, Elks, Eagles, and a past chancellor in the Knights of Pythias. He is a past president of the Oakland B'nai B'rith. In addition, Mr. Kofman was instrumental in starting the Alameda Community Chest and was quite active in the Red Cross.

The new commissioner's appointment has been greeted with high praise from his local community. The City Council of San Leandro, Calif., cited his dedication to public service in a special resolution which specifically commended Governor Brown for making this selection. The San Leandro Chamber of Commerce also took particular note of Kofman's new position by honoring him with a luncheon. The San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal applauded the new commissioner in an editorial. Besides offering congratulations and best wishes for success, this newspaper pointed out that it was good to have a newspaperman on the commission. It indicated that Kofman, who served as a director of the California Newspaper Publishers Association, has gained a broad view of the whole State and its problems. The editorial further said:

We'll wager Kofman will tackle the problems of our area without partisan political machinations becoming involved.

Abe Kofman's life to this point has been exemplary of what living as an active citizen in a democracy means. He has become successful under the free enterprise system. He has devoted many long hours in the service of others. He has demonstrated strong convictions and no fear of showing them, because early in the 1960 presidential campaign, his newspaper became one of the first daily papers in the country to endorse John F. Kennedy. I am certain that as Abe Kofman undertakes this new service to his State, he will add additional chapters to a brilliant career. I further believe that his personal philosophy of life is best epitomized in the words of Thomas Jefferson that state:

If in the course of my life, it has been in any degree useful to the cause of humanity, the fact itself bears its full reward.

Longevity Step Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged and pleased to join 360 Members of this House in support of the postal longevity bill, legislation designed to establish a more equitable method for granting longevity step increases for postal employees and thereby correct a gross injustice in the Government service that has existed far too long.

During the course of the debate on this bill some very interesting facts were revealed. For instance, in excess of 80 percent of postal clerks and carriers spend all their working lives in one salary level while other Federal employees who come under the Classification Act advance to other salary levels. And, further, that two-thirds of the employees of the postal service are in level 4 and are frozen there, rarely having the opportunity to move to higher levels. For this reason longevity pay is vitally important to them.

We, in this country, have come to expect and indeed, demand prompt and efficient handling of our mail and we do not hesitate to complain on those rare occasions when orderly delivery is disrupted. However, the Congress, whose responsibility it is to provide compensation for Federal employees, has not been so prompt and efficient in giving recognition to and rewarding the dedicated postal clerks and carriers who provide us with good and faithful service.

I was not appointed a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House in time to vote for the postal longevity bill in committee but I wish to express my appreciation to the committee on behalf of the postal employees in my district for their favorable action on this legislation. It is my hope that the measure will become law as quickly as possible.

Mr. Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, too often, the accomplishments of great men are ignored until it is too late to express appreciation for dedication and devotion to service.

In the years that I have been a Member of this House, I have been impressed by the caliber of many of its Members, by their willingness to advise and guide, by their sense of responsibility, by their warmth and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no one who embodies these qualifications more than my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island.

I am sure that the Members of this House will join with me in appreciation of his efforts, and of the fact that we are not alone in recognizing them.

I was pleased to note that Newsweek magazine on September 18 took note of some of Mr. FOGARTY's splendid accomplishments. I commend this Newsweek article to the Members of this House as I congratulate my friend from Rhode Island for more than living up to the faith his constituents and his country have placed in him.

I am privileged to be a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, many of whose activities parallel those of Mr. FOGARTY's. He has been a loyal friend, an impartial judge, a keen observer, and an astute adviser. I am delighted that others recognize the unique abilities of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The article follows:

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH

Around Washington, Representative JOHN FOGARTY (a stocky, graying Democrat from Rhode Island) is known as "Mr. Public Health." The title had never seemed more appropriate than it did last week, when the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health—largest single source of medical research money in the United States—were released by Congress. Looking over the results, FOGARTY smiled with satisfaction. "I wanted a little more money," he said, "but this will do nicely."

As chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee in the House, FOGARTY has managed almost every year for the last decade to boost the budget for the National Institutes of Health considerably above the amounts requested by the White House. This year was no exception. Last week's House-Senate conference report on NIH appropriations shows a whopping budget of $738 million—$155 million more than President Kennedy requested overall.

On the House Appropriations Committee since 1947, FOGARTY has been the person mainly responsible for raising the NIH budget from $3.5 million then to its present figure. He has prodded the Congress and the Public Health Service into entering new fields of research, from heart, cancer, and mental-illness programs to studies on fluoridation, mental retardation in children, silicosis, virus, and allergy research. Today, NIH finances slightly more than half of all medical research in the United States.

Budget: How does FOGARTY perform the miracle of winning more money from the House? First, he makes sure that he knows the medical fields and the needs for more medical research in detail. He decries department heads who support lower budgets than he thinks necessary, keeps after them until they admit they want more. FOGARTY has them document the need thoroughly; then, on the floor of the House, he shows economy-minded Members just how the budgets are arrived at.

Soft-spoken and retiring (except for his bright-green bow ties), FOGARTY has always been immensely popular with his fellow Congressmen and has received citations from almost every medical group in the country. A Harmony, R.I., bricklayer's son who started off as a bricklayer himself, FOGARTY has what his colleagues consider a truly brilliant mind, an amazing memory, and a great motivation to help the helpless.

FOGARTY's pet project for the future is to set up an environmental health center. This year, the Senate killed funds for his new center. "We will get it next year," said FOGARTY firmly.

H.R. 8617, the Philippine War Damage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, a statement issued by President Kennedy on September 8, regarding H.R. 8617, the bill to authorize the payment of the balance due on the Philippine war damage claims awards.

I fully share the President's regret that this important legislation has not been approved by the Congress during this current session. I believe that the settlement of this obligation which we have voluntarily assumed has been delayed much too long. I earnestly hope that H.R. 8617 will receive speedy approval when the Congress assembles for the beginning of the second session in January.

The President's statement reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1961

I regret that the bill, H.R. 8617, to compensate Philippine citizens for World War II damage to their property, has been held over until next year by the House because of the press of other business.

We had hoped that this long-delayed recognition of the stanch contribution of our Philippine allies through the satisfaction of their claims would receive congressional approval this year. However, the administration continues to give wholehearted support to the legislation, and is hopeful that it will be approved by the Congress early in the next session.

The Late Joseph F. Waldron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, there was a good deal of discussion in this Chamber and an even greater amount of material inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently concerning a bill (H.R. 7061) to amend the United States Code to provide for payment of unused compensatory time accumulated by deceased postal employees, and for other purposes.

The bill was passed in the House August 22, and is now pending Senate action.

It is in this connection that I would like to mention a former postal employee, Joseph F. Waldron. The city of New Bedford, Mass., last month lost a humble but very distinguished citizen in the person of the late Mr. Waldron.

Joe was a good citizen in both war and peace. He had an outstanding record as a combat infantryman in World War I, serving in three major engagements. He was wounded by machine gun fire September 16, 1918, in France, and was ultimately awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. I think it would prove a source of pride for postal workers everywhere to read the citation accompanying the award presented to Joe on Boston Common, April 17, 1923, by the Assistant Secretary of War, Dwight Davis:

Joseph F. Waldron, a first-class private while serving as company mail carrier, repeatedly volunteered to carry important messages while under heavy machinegun

and artillery fire. Although severely wounded in the head and neck, he continued to accomplish his dangerous mission, refusing medical treatment until ordered to the rear by his company commander.

He was considered, throughout the city, New Bedford's No. 1 war veteran, and served the city for half a century in the postal service. He maintained a lively interest in all community affairs up to the time of his death and was not afraid to associate himself with difficult but worthy causes.

For 40 years he battled, in season and out, for a municipal auditorium for the city. No tangible results show as yet from this crusade, but I am sure that he died in the hope that his dream would one day be fulfilled, and I am sure that it one day will be. I am equally sure that when it is, his name will be prominently associated with it.

Joe had another quality which never received public notice until after his death. The quality is described in both a news story and editorial published in the New Bedford Standard-Times. In all the long years of his service with the post office, Joe never took sick leave—because he was never sick—and while he could have retired long before he actually did, he refused to do so or to take advantage of his accumulated sick leave for the same reason—he was never sick.

We might rightfully wonder, if Joe had had a vote, how he would have voted on H.R. 7061—or do we need to wonder at all?

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to extend my remarks by inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several news stories published in the Standard-Times following Mr. Waldron's death, and an accompanying editorial:

JOSEPH F. WALDRON, DSC, DIES AT 73

Joseph F. Waldron, 73, holder of a Distinguished Service Cross for World War I heroism and generally regarded as New Bedford's No. 1 war veteran, died unexpectedly today after a heart attack at his home, 122 Thompson Street.

Joe, as he was popularly known, was pronounced dead on arrival at St. Luke's Hospital, where he was taken in an ambuance.

A retired postal worker, he got up this morning, dressed and was about the house at 9 a.m., preparing breakfast. He went into another room and did not return. His sister, Mrs. Mary Madden, found him dying and summoned medical aid and a priest.

Family members said there was no history of heart trouble. He had enjoyed robust health.

Other residents of the Thompson Street home include Joe's brother, William F. Waldron, also a retired postal worker and an inseparable companion of his brother, and Mrs. Madden.

A kindly and charitable man, Mr. Waldron was a devout Catholic and a man who had been intensely active in New Bedford Post 1, American Legion, of which he was commander in 1931–32. The post elected him a life member in 1929.

From the time of his return from France in 1919 he had advocated building a memorial to New Bedford's war dead in the form of an auditorium. The project is still talked about, but little has been done.

The funeral has been tentatively set for Monday morning at St. James Catholic Church, of which Mr. Waldron was a longtime communicant. He also was a member of McMahon Council 151, Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Waldron was born in Oldham, Lancashire, England, and came to New Bedford with his parents as a boy of 5. His first employment was as a mule spinner in the former Dartmouth Mills. He became an American citizen through naturalization.

A month short of becoming 20, he was appointed a substitute carrier here and reported for his first service in April 1907. When the parcel post service was inaugurated in 1913, he was one of two men assigned to that branch. That was in the horse-and-cart era. Motor vehicles succeeded a few years later.

Since Mr. Waldron was used to walking in his postal work, he appropriately entered the infantry when he joined the Army in October 1917.

WOUNDED, DECORATED

Among the war scars he carries to his grave is one in the forehead where he was hit by a shell fragment while a member of Company G, 61st Infantry, 5th Division. His chores also included acting as mail clerk for his company.

His DSC was awarded for extraordinary heroism while under machinegun fire in France September 16, 1918.

After months of hospitalization, he finally came home, being discharged from the Army July 28, 1919. While his scars of battle were vivid reminders of his war service, he never applied for a disability pension.

Returning to his postal duties, Mr. Waldron became ardently interest in veterans' affairs and aided in founding the American Legion post here.

In 1937 he was a prime mover in raising funds to underwrite the Legion's State convention in New Bedford, and he repeated the effort for the State conclave here in 1957.

HELPED FUND DRIVE

When the American Legion inaugurated a $5 million nationwide endowment fund drive in 1925, it was Mr. Waldron who handled the New Bedford end of the project. His efforts resulted in New Bedford residents going over the $17,000 quota here. This fund is devoted to child welfare and veterans' rehabilitation under Legion sponsorship.

With his brother, William, he had made many trips to faraway places to attend national meetings of the Legion, including trips to Paris.

Through the years, Mr. Waldron always was on hand to pay personal tribute to veterans as they died. He visited nearly all graves of New Bedford men who had died in France.

He had retired from the post office in May 1957 under mandatory provisions on reaching 70.

Because of some deafness, he often spoke loudly. His greetings to his many friends and admirers boomed across Center streets as he carried on his postal deliveries from a truck. He had rounded out 50 years of service before retirement.

In leaving the postal service, Joe had given it the equivalent of 1 year and 3 months of extra service in unused sick leave.

CITED FOR ACTIVITIES

On his retirement, the Standard-Times said editorially, New Bedford's best known postal worker retires with the best wishes of the entire community he has served so well during this half century.

"He has maintained always an alert and constructive interest in community affairs, being one of the wonderful breed known as 'boosters' which believes firmly there is no place like the hometown."

He was cited during the Know Your America Week in 1959 for "civic activities performed throughout a life of constructive activities."

Joe Waldron had been honored at numerous functions, the last a testimonial dinner held in the National Guard Armory September 29, 1957.

Back in 1923 the Young Men's Catholic Total Abstinence Society feted him in the New Bedford Hotel for his heroic war service. The Grand Army of the Republic, United Spanish War Veterans, American Legion, and postal organization were among groups assisting in the tribute.

MAYOR SAYS CITY TO MISS WALDRON

Mayor Lawler said today that the death of Joseph F. Waldron, D.S.C., was a great loss to New Bedford and that if a municipal auditorium long urged by Mr. Waldron is ever built by the city, it will certainly be named for Joe.

"It seems unfortunate that Joe should have died before the realization of his dream for a municipal auditorium," the mayor said.

"Truly his efforts for civic good will long be remembered. New Bedford will miss Joe Waldron."

SCHOOL DAYS ARE RECALLED BY CLASSMATE

Joseph F. "Joe" Waldron's death came less than 24 hours after he left with a Standard-Times reporter a program of 1906 graduation exercises at the New Bedford Textile School.

The program was mailed to him by Charles Dvorak, a former New Bedford resident now living in St. Petersburg, Fla. The names of Mr. Waldron and Mr. Dvorak were on the program.

"I happened to be cleaning out my old files and ran across the textile school graduation program, and I found that your name and my name are both on it," wrote Mr. Dvorak, who was in the auto repair business here.

"I remember well when you were going to textile school. This happened 55 years ago. You turned out to be a postal employee and I an auto man. This ought to be a good story for the Standard-Times."

WALDRON PAID TRIBUTE BY GOBELL

Postmaster John J. Gobell described Joseph F. Waldron, D.S.C., today as about the best liked letter carrier the post office here ever had.

Commenting on Mr. Waldron's death, Postmaster Gobell said, "For years Joe was our best beloved employee." He said the World War I veteran was most unselfish, and in fact when he retired at 70 in 1957 left more than $5,000 in unused sick leave.

"He could have retired a year earlier and been paid this amount," Postmaster Gobell said.

JOE WALDRON

Every community, large or small, takes pride in a few of its residents who come to be regarded almost as institutions because of their personality or achievements or both.

Joseph F. Waldron, D.S.C., who encouraged everyone, old or young, to call him Joe, was such a person. The fact that he had performed a heroic duty in time of war and had won one of the Nation's highest honors, the Distinguished Service Cross, did not set him apart from those who did not do as much. It seemed, in fact, to bring him closer to everyone.

Every policeman on the corner, every shopkeeper and at least one out of every two of the shop's customers, knew Joe. Educators knew him because he arranged for years for school speakers on patriotic holidays. Veterans knew him, for he was enthusiastically active and interested in their affairs. Hundreds of others knew him simply as a perpetually cheerful mail man. When he walked or drove down a center street, the number of greetings made it appear that Joe knew everybody and vice versa—and that was probably just about true.

His popularity stemmed from much more than just a bright disposition. It took no

more than 5 minutes' conversation with Joe to convince one that he loved his country and thought his home town was the greatest in the world.

He was a charter member of Post 1, American Legion, and strove constantly to make it the best post possible. But his pet project was a municipal auditorium and it was to this that he dedicated the last years of his life. Should one be built in the city, it could bear no finer name than Joseph F. Waldron Memorial Auditorium.

Even though Joe has failed to see this goal come to reality, he always had time to share the tears or triumph of somebody else, even a stranger.

That's just about an unbeatable combination for making friends and that is why, if Joe Waldron ever had an enemy, no one ever heard of him. He was an institution in New Bedford, and institutions are hard to replace.

A Truly Eminent Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to extend my heartiest congratulations to my distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker pro tempore and majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, upon the occasion of the 21st anniversary of his leadership in our great House of Representatives. Nothing that I might say could possibly present an adequate portrayal of the contributions of this great American who is a truly eminent statesman of wide renown.

His devoted, effective service of many years is so well known to Members of this House, to the people of his great district, the Nation, and indeed the world, that I feel a sense of real humility that anything I might say concerning the historical, monumental work of this great American would be like carrying coals to Newcastle.

The career of JOHN W. MCCORMACK is in truth a great saga of the most progressive, as well as the most troublous and restive of the unprecedented and fabulous era in which we live. JOHN MCCORMACK is made of precious stuff. He is endowed with great gifts and priceless talents and by virtue of outstanding ability, lofty character, industry, resourcefulness, and hard, unceasing work, he has risen to the topmost rank in the greatest legislative body in the world and in the public affairs of the Nation.

He has been a great and inspiring leader, responsible for steering through the Congress in war and peace some of the most epochmaking legislation in the long, glorious history of the Nation, the trusted confidant and adviser of Presidents, loyal friend and counselor and invaluable helpmate of our great, illustrious Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN. Unswerving in purpose, vigorous of action, undaunted of spirit, humane of impulse, broad, tolerant, and generous in nature, JOHN MCCORMACK has carved for himself an enviable niche in American parliamentary history, and has won the admiration, devotion, and affection of his colleagues and a secure place in the hearts of his fellow Americans.

He has served the House and his country with superb and tireless devotion. He has given of himself, his energies, and his great talents with a willingness, enthusiasm, and unselfish spirit that indelibly mark him as the great patriot that he is.

I am highly privileged indeed to pay him my humble but heartfelt tribute for his many years of service, his outstanding and brilliant leadership, his memorable achievements, and for the humane qualities, persevering loyalty and warm, vibrant friendships that have endeared him to all those who have ever served with him and all those who know him.

There may be many reasons, to be sure, for the memorable achievements and accomplishments of this great American statesman and leader. They are too numerous to mention here. But I would be most remiss if I did not allude to his gracious, charming helpmate, his devoted and beloved wife, Harriet McCormack, who has been, not only his constant companion, but his most trusted confidant and most valuable adviser.

That there are other and greater honors and public responsibilities in store for JOHN MCCORMACK is obvious, and I wish him and his dear wife, Harriet, many more years of affectionate comradeship, every measure of success and happiness in the future, and an abundance of all those graces which come from the Divine Maker. May they have many very happy returns of this noteworthy day.

Precarious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N.H., Thursday, September 21, 1961, entitled "Precarious Freedom":

PRECARIOUS FREEDOM

Khrushchev talks about making Berlin a free city, whose independence would be guaranteed by her neighbors. This is not a new idea. Trieste and Danzig, both coveted ports, were made free cities, Trieste after World War II and Danzig after World War I. Neither lasted long as such. Hitler seized Danzig, and Italy got Trieste by a special agreement with Yugoslavia, the other claimant. A free city of Berlin would last no longer.

In the Middle Ages the German towns of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lubeck were free cities. From the 14th to the 16th centuries they were part of the Hanseatic League, an organization of cities, chiefly German, which began as merchants' associations and soon added political power. Eventually all joined the German Empire.

Theoretically a free city should keep its independence as long as the tiny European states of Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, and San Marino. These have been independent for centuries, though completely surrounded by larger countries. The free cities were not as lucky, perhaps because, as seaports, they possessed an asset which their neighbors coveted. Berlin is not a seaport, but that does not guarantee it longer life as a free city than Trieste or Danzig.

Salute to George Averill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press has been one of the keystones of our democracy. A free, responsible, informed, and enlightened press has been possibly the greatest force for education our Nation has ever known.

One of the leaders of a free, responsible press in Michigan has been Mr. George Averill, who for the past 42 years has been editor and publisher of the Birmingham Eccentric, one of the finest weekly newspapers our Nation has ever produced.

The impact of the Eccentric on local and State affairs spread far beyond the Birmingham, Mich., area because of the wise leadership, the policy of fair and impartial reporting which have been so much a part of his newspaper under the direction of George Averill.

Now, Mr. Averill is stepping down, but not out of the newspaper business. He will continue his fine weekly column, "This and That," and he will advise and assist in editorial policies of the Eccentric.

All of us are sure that George Averill will continue his vigorous and constructive work for Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalistic fraternity, and its objectives of improving press coverage, methods, and standards in these times of increasingly complex news gathering and evaluation.

The Birmingham Eccentric offered a salute to George Averill on its editorial page this week, which I offer at this time for the RECORD. I join the Eccentric in wishing George Averill every happiness in the years ahead and in thanking him for the great contribution he has made to a free, responsible press:

WE OFFER A SALUTE TO GEORGE AVERILL

"Unswerving dedication to industry, self-discipline and high ideals."

This has been the story of George R. Averill, who after 42 years as editor and publisher of the Birmingham Eccentric, sold his interests in the paper and announced his retirement last week.

From the time he was 15 years old, George has known hard work. Another part of his character is his intellectual curiosity.

It is recognized in his maritime achievements, for example.

George became a chief engineer for fresh water ships, sailing the Great Lakes, at the age of about 20 and of salt water ships of unlimited tonnage at the age of 24.

In the latter capacity, he served aboard Liberty ships in the U.S. merchant marine during World War I, an unusual feat for one so young.

After the war, George obtained a job as reporter on a Fostoria, Ohio daily newspaper. He gained still more experience after moving to the Journal in Detroit (since acquired by the Detroit News).

In February 1920, George bought the Birmingham Eccentric. It then had a circulation of about 1,000 and one full-time employee.

Today, the Eccentric has a circulation of well over 13,000 and employs more than 100 people.

When George bought the paper, the limited machinery in its print shop was hand-operated. George displayed his industriousness, his will to endure hard labor, by operating the machinery himself.

When publication day rolled around each week, George worked straight through from Wednesday morning to Thursday noon without stopping to sleep.

It has been this type of devotion to the task before him that has helped to bring about the success this newspaper has achieved over the years.

In the beginning, the paper was printed by the Western Newspaper Union in Detroit. Later, a flatbed cylinder press and a folding machine were purchased. Still later, a web-perfecting press was bought.

Today, the Eccentric's composing room is the largest of any weekly in Michigan. Five linotype machines operate day and night, 5 days a week.

When George purchased the paper, it was housed in the old telephone building behind Shain Drugstore on Pierce at Maple.

Then, for 38 years, it was located at Woodward and Hamilton. In May 1960 the Eccentric moved into a new, modern plant at 1225 East Bowers, which houses its operations as well as those of the Averill Press.

These are steps of progress—progress that reflects the intelligent leadership, industriousness, courage and fortitude of George Averill.

George has always been tremendously interested in politics as an observer, both at the local and State level. He served as chief aid for Kim Sigler's campaign for Governor, then as his executive secretary after his election.

Because of his role in the newspaper, George refused to have any elective office so that he would always be in a position of impartial, objective chronicler and critic.

This again attests to the character and ability of the man.

Through the newspaper, as a tool of communication—reporting accurately and interpreting understandingly—his constructive influence in the Birmingham-Bloomfield community has been of significant value and an important contribution over the years.

George now has the distinction—and responsibility of editor emeritus. We are happy that he has the opportunity to enjoy the much deserved reward and privileges of retirement.

And we are pleased that George will still contribute, from time to time, to the editorial contents of our paper. His "This and That" column will continue as a regular weekly feature.

Yes, we salute you, George Averill, and we pledge ourselves to continue your long tradition of community service and uphold and improve upon the standards, principles and ideals which were identified in your many years as publisher of the Birmingham Eccentric.

Fourteen for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we were privileged a few days ago on September 7, 1961, to hear the remarks of 14 freshmen Members of the House of Representatives speak on the subject "Operation Survival." All of these men were Republicans.

Americans can be justly proud of the awareness of these colleagues and of their desire to inform America of their very strong convictions with respect to the future of the way of life we all love and cherish.

These colleagues represent a new mold in political life and I for one am very proud to have the privilege of serving with them in the Congress of the United States.

In the September 1961 issue of National Review, a most informative and articulate spokesman for the conservative view, there appears an article entitled "Fourteen for Survival" which in an excellent way sets forth the objectives of our colleagues in presenting Operation Survival.

With unanimous consent I include herewith the above-referenced article:

[From the National Review, Sep. 23, 1961]

FOURTEEN FOR SURVIVAL

Never mind that they did it by prearrangement. Never mind that the speeches were prepared in advance and as, if you like, a stunt. Never mind, that as usually happens with House oratory, chances are nobody was paying much attention. The fact remains that when 14 freshman Members of the House of Representatives arise and deliver themselves, in sequence, of sound conservative pronouncements on urgent problems of public policy, that, boy, is news. And when the 14 (with, if you please, the blessing of the minority leader) proceed to equate conservative policies with the very survival of the nations, that is not merely news but "News." To vary the song that was popular when most National Review editors were youngsters—

"In something like a century and a half,
It's only happened once."

But the rest of the song—

"It probably never will happen again
In months and months and months."

will not do, because one senses as one reads the speeches, each and every one of the round robin: these are men who will return to the fray, again and again and at every opportunity. They are men who burn with a message. And that message is that continued pursuits of certain existing public policies will mean that America will perish. It will happen again, because these are men who are determined that America shall survive.

Take Congressman DONALD BRUCE, of Indiana, who captained Operation Survival (see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 7): "We have," he says in his eloquent introductory remarks, "educated ourselves in an attempt to restore a balance in Government, a withdrawal of Federal control from the multiple intrusions into the lives of the people, a pledge of fiscal integrity, moral responsibility, and sound progress based upon constitutional liberty."

Or Representative SHRIVER, of Kansas, who believes that the American people are indeed willing to spend whatever is necessary to insure the defense and security of the Nation, but adds: "The great majority of my constituents favor postponement of new domestic programs to finance the greater defense spending."

Or Representative HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, of North Dakota, who insists upon the incompatibility between present wage policies and the drive for exports required for the health of our economy: "We cannot indulge in make-work, shirk-work practices, artificial restrictions on uses of new equipment or processes, or have unions quarreling over work jurisdictions whether at missile bases or factories."

Or Representative PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois: "The new administration tries to meet every problem with increased spending. Debt is to be managed, not paid off. Living beyond our means is a luxury we can ill afford."

Or Representative DURWARD C. HALL, of Missouri, himself a physician, who has attacked socialized medicine and everything smacking of socialized medicine. Or Representative BOB DOLE, of Kansas, who lays it on the line about current proposals for undercutting the independent agencies: "Government regulation," he insists, "where necessary, should ever reside with Congress." Or Representative RALPH BEERMANN, of Nebraska, who makes a stirring plea for getting Government out of the farm problem. Or Representative JOHN ROUSSELOT who demands that Government get out of the housing problem as well. Or Representative JAMES BATTIN who wants us at last to "lay our cards on the table" in our dealings with the Soviets, and shows he understands what that would involve. Or Representative JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois, who reminds the House that the Communists have been winning because "they have been truly at war with us, while we have tried to make ourselves believe that the cold war was really just a synonym for unrest—brought on by the new nationalism or anticolonialism." Or Representative HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin, or Representative DAVID T. MARTIN, of Nebraska, or Representative JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa, or Representative JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, any of whom can start writing editorials for this magazine any time they like.

Sure, we know: one swallow doesn't make a summer. But 14 Congressmen is 14 votes, boy, and big oaks from little acorns grow, and think what we could do with one-half plus 1 of 437 Congresmen who talk like that.

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following National Gallery calendar of events. Director John Walker has announced an excellent and top level program and list of events for the month of October 1961. It is a wonderful opportunity for enjoyment and improvement.

The calendar follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, OCTOBER 1961

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Tiepolo drawings. A selection of 135 drawings and 8 etchings from the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Galleries 68, 69, 69–A, and 70. Through October 15.

New exhibition: Thomas Eakins, A Retrospective Exhibition. Central gallery, G–7, through G–13. Opening October 8.

Recent publication: Tiepolo drawings. Exhibition catalogs of 50 pages with introduction by Graham Reynolds, 199 illustrations. Size 7½ by 10 inches. Price $1, postpaid.

New publication: Thomas Eakins, A retrospective exhibition. Catalog, 17½ by 10 inches, 132 pages, with 96 illustrations and 1 color plate. Introductory essay by Lloyd Goodrich. Price $2.50, postpaid. Christmas cards: Folders (with envelopes) reproducing in color and in black and white 38 works of art from the gallery collection. Prices, 15 cents and 10 cents each, postpaid. Complete catalog with 22 color and 16 black and white illustrations, 25 cents, postpaid.

Sunday lectures: A series of lectures on Spanish art will begin on October 1, and with the exception of October 8, will be continued into November.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collection. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturdays, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 1

Painting of the week: Rouault. Nude With Upraised Arms, (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 62, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The exhibition of Tiepolo drawings, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Romanesque Art in Spain," guest speaker, Rev. Herbert L. Stein-Schneider, pastor of the French Protestant Church of Washington, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Roy Hamlin Johnson, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 8

Painting of the week: Piero di Cosimo. The Nativity With the Infant Saint John. (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 13, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Tiepolo and Venetian Painting, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: Thomas Eakins, guest speaker, Lloyd Goodrich, director, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, Harry McClure, pianist, East Garden Court 8

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 15

Painting of the week: Toulouse-Lautrec. Alfred la Guigne (Chester Dale Collection), gallery 85 Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The changing representation of the nude in Western art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Velasquez. Guest speaker: Joseph C. Sloane, professor of art history, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Strings, Richard Bales, conductor; Mark and Nancy Ellsworth, violinists; east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22

Painting of the week: Circle of Verrocchio (possibly Leonardo). Madonna and Child with a Pomegranate (Samuel H. Kress collection); gallery 9, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30; 11- by 14-inch reproduction and text for sale, 15 cents postpaid.

Tour of the week: The Thomas Eakins Exhibition, central gallery, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Spanish Influence on Central and South America," guest speaker, René C. Taylor, professor of art history, University of Granada, Spain, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Shirley Sudock, mezzo soprano; Robert Parris, pianist (program in honor of United Nations Day) East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 23 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29

Painting of the week: Allegretto Nuzi and Master of the Fabriano Altarpiece, Madonna and Saints Enthroned (Mellon collection) gallery 1, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour for the week: Eakins and American painting. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: El Greco, guest speaker, Harold E. Wethey, professor of art history, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Allen Barker, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5) in stereophonic sound.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, Republic 7–4215, extension 272.

Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, recent statements of Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., professor of Latin American history, Marymount College, Arlington, are extremely interesting and pertinent to some burning contemporary issues.

His recent comments on revolutionary movements and Latin American affairs are revealing and helpful.

It was be presumptuous as well as inaccurate as he points out in substance to associate the honored and great name of Thomas Jefferson, perhaps the most illustrious of our American political philosophers, an acknowledged authority on questions of human freedom, with warped or misconstrued concepts of how to get rid of oppressive government.

The great Jefferson made it very clear in his writings and utterances that while he supported the right to alter or abolish an oppressive government, he never advocated that the right should be exercised indiscriminately. Ever conscious of sound, ethical, and moral principles which he believed inevitably should govern the right to rebellion, he held to the view that the attempt to alter or abolish an existing government is not an absolute right, but rather a right limited by definite, well-established principles.

The rules and the practices of anarchistic and nihilist systems, such as so often serve the purpose of communism, are diametrically opposed to those of valid, democratic principles. Under these systems, where violence, deceit, betrayal, lies, and misrepresentations, per se, are justified and encouraged in order to foster and spark rebellion, it is not necessary that widespread violations of human rights exist, that peaceful means of legal redress are impossible. Dictatorial fiat is the measure and the means.

On its face, the seizure of the *Santa Maria* appears as an act of piracy. It, therefore, could not be justified on moral grounds; in fact such an action must be interpreted as contrary to established principles of international law.

Confiscation and seizure and exercise of dominion over private property belonging to private individuals or groups in peacetime is a violation of civil and municipal, as well as international law, and no rationalization, however dialectical, can negative that fact. The same rule would be applicable to government property either in a domestic or international forum. That is a fundamental rule of law long respected in every civilized society, and unjust armed aggression against another state is legally and morally condemned.

America must always be mindful of the origin of our own country and in that sense this Nation should never reject the moral basis of any valid and honest movement whose aim is to throw off the yoke of oppression by tyrannical dictators. At the same time, Americans should hope and strive for orderly evolution wherever it is possible in order to avoid violence and bloodshed. To allow Communists to flout this rule of law in order to impose Marxist dictatorship can never be tolerated by freemen. This Nation must respect and uphold the right of any people to seek liberation from tyranny and establish a free government of its own choice.

Father Thorning is a deep thinker whose views are invariably supported by very able and scholarly perception

founded on fundamental moral and democratic principles. His commentary on current events, particularly those relating to Latin American affairs, carries greatest weight and enjoys authoritative standing, not only in academic circles, but among governmental and diplomatic experts and contemporary leaders.

Moreover, his linguistic ability and special mastery of the Spanish and Romance languages, combined with his vast knowledge of Latin American affairs, and the great respect and confidence in which he is held by our neighbors to the South, give this distinguished scholar great repute and stature in Latin American countries as well as in our own.

I hope that our State Department and other Government agencies working to improve our Latin American relations and strengthen our devoted and faithful friends in Latin America will not only pay increasingly careful attention to Father Thorning's views and opinions, but will take appropriate steps to draw upon his vast store of knowledge in this field. The unquestionably high standing, and popularity which he enjoys in Latin America and his intimate knowledge of the personalities and the conditions in Latin America mark Father Thorning as one of our most qualified, if not the best qualified, American in Latin American affairs.

Many of us who are greatly concerned that we are in danger of losing additional ground in Latin America to the Communist bloc would be reassured if the knowledge and great ability of this most alert, talented and courageous American were brought to bear upon the policies and conduct of our efforts to keep Latin America on our side in the current life and death struggle for human liberty.

It is vital that in this struggle the great, fundamental moral, ethical and human principles that lie at the base of our American system be rigorously applied to the solution of current problems. In this effort, Father Thorning's counsel could unquestionably prove most valuable.

What's Wrong—and Right—With Profits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Mr. Augustus Long, who heads the Texaco Co., the fourth ranking oil company in the United States has written a most interesting article entitled "What's Wrong—and Right—With Profits?" published in the September issue of Dun's Review.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG—AND RIGHT—WITH PROFITS?

(By Augustus C. Long)

It is frequently said that the conflict between communism and capitalism is not so much physical or military as it is a struggle for men's minds. It is further argued that if the people of a free nation clearly understand the principles of capitalism and the opportunities it affords, they will not readily forfeit the freedom which allows capitalism to survive. For freedom is the only climate in which capitalism can flourish.

If this argument is valid—as I wholeheartedly believe it to be—then all of us who recognize our stake in the free-enterprise system have before us a major and pressing task. That task is to provide the public—and in some cases their representatives in government—with a fuller comprehension of the workings of capitalism. For if they do not understand its basic principles, they cannot be expected to appreciate why it is superior to a state-dominated Communistic economy.

The very words "free enterprise" in themselves sum up the essential difference between the Soviet and United States economies. In the Soviet Union a bureaucracy determines how many shoes and spoons and automobiles are to be made, in what color and size, and at what price. The consumer is not consulted.

Under free enterprise, on the other hand, the consumer can spend his income in any way that will give him the most satisfaction. And there is only one way that the motivating force of capitalism—the prospect of profit—can be realized. That is to manufacture a product or render a service which is attractive to consumers both in its quality and its price.

It is apparent that without the incentive of profit our free-enterprise economy could not operate successfully. Yet profits have come to be associated in many people's minds as something undesirable and improper. A generation of sniping by reformers in and out of government has erased, for untold numbers of Americans, the distinction between profits and the old cliche of "ill-gotten gains."

These people do not understand—perhaps because they have not been told—what happens to what is left of a company's income after it pays its taxes and other costs of doing business. This lack of understanding can easily lead to the belief that these profits are, in fact, a kind of special fund, privately administered, which is siphoned off into the pockets of a select few persons "at the top." And, obviously, no one laboring under this sort of misconception can be expected to have faith in a system that would allow such a situation to exist.

The business community has the responsibility to explain to the public, by every means at its command, what profits really are and what they represent. Profits are the rewards for taking risks, for making innovations, for meeting consumer requirements and desires. Profits are the source of increased employment and of rising wages. And profits are an essential factor in making possible the investment capital required for economic progress. There has never been a period in our history when a high level of investment has not been associated with a high level of employment and general prosperity.

The public should be told that profits provide the return which a company makes to its stockholders, in the form of dividends, for the use of the tools which their investments have supplied. And because there was no assurance at the time the investments were made that the venture would succeed, whatever profits are realized represent not only a payment to the stockholders for the cost of using the tools but a reward for taking the risk in the first place.

Further, it should be pointed out that if a reasonable return is not made to stockholders, a company will find that in today's highly competitive market it cannot attract sufficient investment capital to carry on effectively and expand its operations. In a dynamic, growing society, business cannot afford to remain static.

Nor has it. The record shows that, in the postwar period alone, the average investment for each production worker in the manufacturing industries rose from about $7,000 in 1946 to approximately $18,000 in 1959. The effect of this has been to increase both the quantity and quality of tools provided by industry to supplement the efforts of labor. As a result, the output of the entire economy per hour of labor has risen at an average rate of 2.4 percent annually since 1900. This means that the amount produced with an hour's labor has been doubling every 30 years.

PROFITS AND PROSPERITY

These are some of the facts about profits that must be explained to the public. They need to know that from the beginning of this Nation's history, the prospect of profits has been responsible for generating our unparalleled output of goods and services, that it has made possible our high national level of income and standard of living and that it holds forth the promise of even greater achievements in the future.

All these things are what is "right" with profits. But just as this story must be told if business is to win the confidence and loyalty of the public, there is another story that also needs to be told. This is the story of what is "wrong" with profits, and I suspect that even some businessmen do not fully appreciate its significance.

What is wrong with profits is that there are not enough of them. No matter how they are viewed, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that in recent years this motive force for enterprise and risk-taking has been inadequate to do the job which our expanding economy requires.

In 1950 all corporate profits before taxes amounted to 16.8 percent of the national income; in 1960 they had fallen to 10.6 percent. In 1960 corporate profits after taxes were about the same as the amount earned 10 years earlier—$22.8 billion—but this was actually a decline of more than 20 percent when inflation is considered.

Over this same period the aftertax profits of leading manufacturing corporations fell from 17.1 percent to 10.5 percent, measured as a return on net assets. And whereas these profits came to 7 cents per dollar of sales in 1950, by 1960 they had fallen to 4.4 cents.

However, the profits situation is even more serious than these data reveal. As a result of inflation in the postwar years, the costs of replacing wornout plant and equipment have risen well above the depreciation permitted for tax purposes. So, industry has been forced to use part of its profits to make up this deficiency.

It is apparent from these facts and figures that profits are in grave danger of dwindling to the point of all too little return. Yet it is not necessary to refer to statistical tables and abstract theories to appreciate the very real threat this poses to the economic progress of the American public.

KEY TO EMPLOYMENT

Whereas expanding profits contribute to the creation of jobs and to job security, the depressed earnings of recent years have forced many companies to retrench all along

the line. This, in turn, has led to a very high level of unemployment throughout the country, in some areas to critical conditions. Certainly this is not a climate favorable to restoring and maintaining a high level of employment. Even Samuel Gompers, while president of the American Federation of Labor, recognized the importance of profits when he stated: "The worst crime against the working people is a company which fails to operate at a profit."

The profits squeeze also has created a deficiency in the level of investment in new plant and equipment. Granted that consideration must be given to the ups and downs of such expenditures as a result of cyclical movements, the fact remains that the all-time high point in the history of this country's investment outlays was reached in 1957. Furthermore, in the light of the present outlook for profits, the propects for exceeding that investment level in the near future are uncertain.

During the past 10 years the United States has put only 15 percent of its total output into capital formation, which includes the output of producers' durable equipment as well as the activities of the construction industry. In this same period, Japan, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Canada, Norway and Sweden were all investing 20 percent or more of their total output in capital goods. As a result, it is estimated that approximately half of our present industrial capacity is of wartime or even prewar vintage, while some two-thirds was installed prior to 1950. This aging stock of plant and equipment has presented serious problems involving our balance of payments position and our international trade.

Looking ahead, it is estimated that plant and equipment requirements for the present decade will approximate $500 billion, or about $200 billion more than was invested in productive facilities over the past 10-year span. Yet, in many cases the effect of inadequate profits has been to postpone plans for necessary expansion. This, of course, is bound to continue to exert a depressing influence on the labor market.

It is apparent that this widespread contraction of profits is seriously affecting not only the private sector of the economy but the public sector as well. Inevitably, such a general decline results in lowered tax revenues to Federal, State and local governments. For example, as a result of the falling-off of profits between the first and fourth quarters of 1960, corporate tax liability dropped $4 billion at a seasonally adjusted annual rate.

It may be seen, therefore, that the continued reduction of profits, if left unchecked, may set in motion a rapidly descending spiral of business activity, impairing the entire economic structure and weakening the Nation both internally and in international affairs. The consequences are readily apparent. History teaches that whenever a private-enterprise economy breaks down, the inevitable result is that the government vastly increases its direct participation in, and control over, the economic life of the nation. And we have seen the results of such governmental intervention on nations abroad.

We cannot hope to win the cold war by aping or emulating those nations which have handed over their liberties to the state. Freedom from state control is the very principle that distinguishes democracies from dictatorships. To take such a course would be to deny our entire heritage, to write off as meaningless all that has occurred from Concord and Lexington to Korea and West Berlin. And then we would not be freemen, and we would not be Americans.

I have no concern over the continuing integrity of the American spirit. I do, however, have very serious concern over the ease with which that spirit could be frustrated by the simple process of economic drift. And that drift, already running more and more strongly against us, can be successfully opposed only by restoring profits to normal, healthy levels.

To this end, every businessman has the responsibility to spread the message of the importance of profits as they affect our free-enterprise system. Every one of us has the responsibility to work for the revision of our obsolete tax laws, to strive unceasingly in the fight against inflation, to defend the right of business to exist and function without Governmental harassment. Only when we succeed in accomplishing these things can we insure the continued strength and vigor of capitalism.

Fish and Nutrition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a very important gathering of nutritionists and marine scientists from throughout the world is currently underway in the Capital, the FAO International Conference on Fish in Nutrition. More than 300 delegates from some 50 nations are in attendance. They are here to evaluate the place and potential of fishery products in the health and diets of the peoples of the world—more than half of whom suffer some varying degree of malnutrition.

The most important business of the conference is the presentation of more than 100 scientific papers. Particularly stressed during the meeting will be the importance of fish as a source of animal protein in forms which can be made available to remote sections of the world, such as the recently developed high-protein food: fish flour.

I have spoken in this Chamber before on the subject of fish flour and of the unnecessarily restrictive Food and Drug Administration ruling that it should be considered unfit for human food because it is made of the whole fish. This is an unfortunately narrow interpretation of the food laws and one that does not consider the urgent worldwide need for such a remarkable new food. Other nations, as evidenced by the wide participation in the FAO conference, recognize the potential of fish flour and I am very hopeful this present obstacle to full-scale production can be overcome.

I am inserting in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues two important papers on fish in nutrition. I urge my colleagues to note also the comments and insertions on this same subject by the Honorable OTIS PIKE, of New York, and Senators SMITH and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, all three of whom were quick to recognize the importance of whole fish flour.

The first paper I commend to your attention is titled "Evaluation of Fish Flour in the Treatment of Infantile Malnutrition," was prepared by a team of scientists at the British-American hospital in Lima, Peru. I am excluding charts that accompanying the report, as they would mean little to the laymen.

The second paper, by B. C. Guha of the University of Science and Technology of Calcutta, India, is very significant. It deals with the primary topic of the conference, the role of fish in human nutrition.

The articles follow:

THE ROLE OF FISH IN HUMAN NUTRITION

(By B. C. Guha, University Colleges of Science and Technology, Calcutta, India)

ABSTRACT

A large proportion of the world population suffers from a suboptimal nutritional level, both in quantity and quality. Calorie intake per caput per day ranges from less than 2,000 to more than 3,000. Protein intake ranges from 40 to more than 100 grains; animal protein intake is sometimes as low as 7 grains per caput per day, or even less in some countries. It is no wonder therefore that protein malnutrition is prevalent in many countries, and this affects specially young children and infants. In many countries there is a shortage in the diet of calcium and of vitamins, especially of vitamin A and members of the vitamin B group.

Fish contains proteins of high biological value, comparable with that of egg, milk, and meat. The content of proteins, fat, minerals, and vitamins varies between species; for instance, fat content varies from 6 to 20 percent. Fish oil has a higher proportion of unsaturated fatty acids than animal fat. It is also a good source of calcium, phosphorus, iron, and a number of vitamins. Preservation and careful processing does not affect the nutrient value much.

Fish consumption is low in many countries, where one would expect a more liberal supply. Unless technological methods are employed for making fish and fish products available to the people without deterioration, and without considerable loss of its nutritive value, its consumption cannot be increased to the extent which may be desired. The utilization of the byproducts of fish processing, its scales, and offal, would reduce the cost of the edible portion of the fish. This cost question is important in regard to the increased consumption of fish, as most consumers who like fish and would benefit by its consumption are quite often unable to buy fish in adequate quantities because of the price.

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

It is unfortunate that, in spite of the great advances made in the knowledge of food and nutrition and in its application to raise the level of nutrition, the large majority of the human population is still living on a suboptimal nutritional level in the light of the dietary standards recommended by appropriate international and national bodies. This relates both to qualitative and quantitative deficiences in the diet in large areas of the world. The deficiencies are revealed by the national food balance sheets which give the amounts of food in each category, available for consumption in a country from internal production after making allowances for seed and feed requirements, exports and imports, stocks, wastage, etc. This situation has been, by and large, confirmed by data obtained from diet surveys conducted on different groups of the population, though the number of such data in different countries is not very adequate.

The levels of both the production and consumption of food in the world are very uneven. The highest rate of consumption prevailing in a few countries is over 3,100 calories per capita per day, whereas in some others it is below 2,000. The qualitative defect in the diet is, however, even more

widespread than the quantitative. While in a few countries protein consumption is as high as 100 grams per capita per day, in many countries in Asia, Africa, and South America, most of the calories are derived from cereals and starchy roots and tubers and a relatively minor proportion from milk, eggs, meat, or fish. The proportion of protein, particularly protein of animal origin, in the diet in these countries is, therefore, low. In some countries the amount of protein in the average daily diet is only 43 grams, of which a very minor proportion (about 7 grams) is derived from animal sources. Likewise, there is deficiency in regard to calcium, vitamin A, and the vitamins of the B group in many countries.

Although frank deficiency diseases like scurvy and rickets are not common today, there is fairly widespread protein malnutrition in many countries. This occurs particularly in the children, in the late weaning and postweaning periods. It may be pointed out that the damage that may be done to the body in early life by malnutrition can hardly be made good later in life by correct or even by abundant feeding. The vulnerable groups of the population, viz, the children and expectant and nursing mothers, have therefore to be particularly looked after in regard to their food consumption according to optimum nutrition standards.

It is well to remember that national averages of food consumption are made up of the figures for consumption of the best fed as well as the worst fed segments of the population. When these averages are low, it is clear that some parts of the population must be living at a very low nutrition standard indeed. It is, therefore, no wonder that children in such segments of the population are the first to suffer from protein malnutrition and other deficiencies. Even in better fed countries, like those of North America, Europe, and Oceania, there are some groups of the population who are not consuming the food they need for optimum nutrition, sometimes for low-income reasons and sometimes from lack of knowledge.

It may also be recalled that more freedom from deficiency diseases would not necessarily mean that one is living at the best possible level of health and efficiency of which one is inherently capable. There is, so to speak, a "no man's land" between freedom from disease and optimum health, which has to be conquered by planned action in regard to food and nutrition.

THE NUTRITIVE VALUE OF FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS

The consumption of fish where ever available in sufficient quantities can be expected to help considerably in correcting the state of malnutrition so widely prevalent in the world today. Fish is a highly nutritious food. It is particularly valuable for providing proteins of high quality comparable with those of meat, milk or eggs. This similarity is indicated by biological experiments as well as by direct aminoacid analysis.

Proteins of different species and varieties of fish differ to some extent in their amino acid composition and higher figures both for lysine and tryptophan for certain species have been recorded. Results also vary depending on the method employed for amino acid analysis. Generally, however, fish proteins tend to be higher in lysine and lower in tryptophan content than meat. Thus fish appears to supply a high-class protein comparable with those derived from other animal sources. Biological tests with animals and with human subjects confirm the high value of fish protein. Fish proteins have also been found to nearly equal casein in plasma protein regeneration in depleted rates and to be better than casein in promoting hemoglobin regeneration. However, much more detailed work on the proteins of different species of fish, including shellfish and other marine animals, usable as food, is called for.

Apart from quality, fish constitutes also quantitatively a good source of protein. The edible protions of fresh-water and estuarine fish investigated in India contain about 14 to 25 percent protein. In marine fish also it varies from 9 to 26 percent. Thus qualitatively and quantitatively, fish consumption might in a significant measure supplement the low-protein, high-cereal diet consumed in many countries of the world. Fish, including proposed fish like fish flour, has been found to improve such diets. Cereal proteins are rather low in lysine and methionine, in both of which fish protein is relatively rich. Papers are being presented in this conference reporting the value of fish flour in supplementing high-cereal diets and also in combating protein malnutrition.

Different species and varieties of fish vary in regard to percentages of protein, fat, mineral matter and vitamins. There are varieties of freshwater fish which contain as low as 0.6 percent fat. Such fish should be useful in cases where a low fat, high-protein diet is recommended. On the other hand, most fish contain higher proportions of fat. Some of the fatty fish have nearly 20 percent fat. Fish oil has generally more unsaturated fatty acids than animal fats. Since poly-unsaturated fatty acids are beneficial in keeping down the cholesterol level of blood, fish and fish oils are likely to be particularly useful in this regard. This work has only recently begun and should be actively pursued. In this conference some papers report the effect of the ingestion of fish and fish oils both in experimental animals and in human beings.

Fish is also a fairly good source of calcium and phosphorus, particularly small fish which are eaten with the bones. It is also a source of iron and of a trace element like copper. Fish has also a fair proportion of the B vitamins. In regard to most of these nutrients, fish would appear to be comparable with meat. Reports on the nutritive value of different species of fish in these aspects are, however, rather scanty and more information in this regard is desirable.

The nutritive value of processed fish and fish products consumed in different countries of the world has also been reported to be high. Canning and freezing do not appreciably affect the protein value. Salted and sun-dried fish and often fish meals as commercially produced have also a high biological value. Smoking or dehydration at temperatures not higher than 110° F. or treatment with cathode rays for sterilization does not also significantly affect the amino acid composition of fish proteins. Some fermented fishery products and fish pastes as consumed particularly in Asian countries are likewise good sources of valuable protein. The indigenous methods of preserving fish in both a nutritious and palatable form have stood the test of time. But more scientific and detailed work on the effect of the methods of preservation, both traditional and modern, is desirable, considering that millions of consumers have to depend on fish preserved in one way or another.

PRESENT-DAY LOW CONSUMPTION OF FISH

Fish is, therefore, a good food, the consumption of which deserves to be encouraged to promote the level of nutrition in the whole world and particularly in countries consuming high-cereal and low-protein diets. Analysis of the present-day food consumption tables shows, however, that except in a very few countries like Norway, Chile, and Japan, where figures for daily per capita consumption are of the order of 104, 82, and 60 grams, respectively, fish and fish products constitute a relatively minor proportion of the total diet in the world. Even in the aforesaid countries, where per capita consumption is the largest, it provides not more than 2 to 4 percent of total calories, 10 to 17 percent of total protein and 2 to 15 percent of the total fat content of the diet. In other countries, even those which have a long sea board, consumption of fish is less. In some countries like India, the production of fresh-water fish is about one-third of that of marine fish and consumer preference is quite often for the former. In attempts to increase the supply of fish, therefore, increased production of both marine and fresh-water fish should be considered.

Taking an overall view of the problem, it would appear that fish provides a valuable source of protein and of oil containing poly-unsaturated fatty acids. The latter are likely to be beneficial in keeping down the cholesterol level of blood. From published work, the proteins of fish appear to be comparable in biological value and in essential amino acid composition with those of milk, meat and eggs. It is, however, desirable to carry out more detailed researches on different varieties of fish, including fresh water fish and shellfish and other edible marine animals, and these should be particularly related to the amino acid composition and the biological value of the proteins and to the fatty acid constituents of the fish oils. The nutritional effects of these proteins and oils and also of the fish as such, both on experimental animals and on human beings in different physiological and also pathological conditions have to be studied both more extensively and intensively. The minerals including trace elements of fish and in its different organs should also be investigated.

The consumption of fish in the world is low. It should be stepped up wherever possible and particularly in countries where a high-cereal, low-protein diet is consumed, because there appears to be a definite supplementary relation to the proteins of fish to those of cereals.

They have also been reported to have a definite value in combating protein malnutrition in early childhood. Fish is, however, a highly perishable material. It undergoes autolytic, microbiological and chemical decomposition quite easily. The consumption of fish oils which had deteriorated because of oxidation has been reported to produce injurious results on animals. Since most countries consuming a low-protein diet are located in tropical and subtropical regions of the world, the consumption of fish in these areas can therefore be stepped up only if it is properly preserved. Apart from the use of ice, which can preserve fish only for very short periods, the methods used in these different countries have been to salt fish, dry it or prepare fermented products (pastes and sauces) out of it. Other methods like smoking and canning which are not yet extensively used in these countries may also be developed. Refrigeration is at present development of dehydration, carried out unfor preservation and for distribution. The development of dehydration, carried out under controlled conditions, to produce an edible fish flour, of good quality, should be an important line of advance in future. For certain purposes the fish flour has to be deodorized completely, but some consumers prefer a fish flour with a slight flavor.

Unless technological methods are employed for making fish and fish products available to the people without deterioration, and without considerable loss of its nutritive value, its consumption cannot be increased to the extent which may be desired. The utilizaton of the byproducts of fish processing, its scales and offal, would reduce the cost of the edible portion of the fish. This cost question is important in regard to the increased consumption of fish, as most consumers who like fish and would benefit by its consumption are quite often unable to buy fish in adequate quantities because of the price.

We trust that this conference, as the first international scientific conference of its kind, will provide pointers to future progress

in regard to the scientific and technological aspects of fish and fish products, and will thus make a contribution to the raising of the nutritional standard of large segments of the human population in the immediate years ahead.

EVALUATION OF FISH FLOUR IN THE TREATMENT OF INFANTILE MALNUTRITION

(By George G. Graham, Juan M. Baertl, Angel Cordano, research division, British American Hospital, Lima, Peru)

ABSTRACT

Gross deficits of energy and protein in the diet of Peruvian infants lead to an elevated mortality and stunted growth. Cow's milk is scarce and its cost prohibitive to the mass of people, making an inexpensive substitute of prime necessity. Commonly consumed grains enriched with a deodorized fish flour of high biological value should satisfy the energy and protein requirements expeditiously.

In a group of undernourished infants with and without kwashiorkor, modified cow's milk was used to initiate recovery, stabilize body composition and obtain a steady gain in weight. Subsequently they were given three different bottle feedings at isocaloric and isoproteic levels, recalculated daily: (M) modified cow's milk; (V) vegetable protein mixture of high biological value; and (WF) wheat flour enriched with 10 percent deodorized fish flour (VioBin).

One infant had additional periods of fish flour as the sole source of protein. Cottonseed oil and sugar were used to equate the caloric and fat intakes, and minerals and vitamins were added.

Growth and nutritional status were studied with the help of nitrogen balance determinations at selected intervals.

These results, along with determinations of serum albumin and urea, hemoglobin and hematocrit, suggest that a mixture of wheat and fish flour, 100 grams of which contain approximately 18 grams of protein and yield 350 calories, satisfies the energy and protein requirements of undernourished infants as well as cow's milk and a mixture of vegetable proteins of high biological value. When fish flour alone was used as the source of protein, the results were equally satisfactory.

In a further group of infants, the wheat-fish flour product was used to initiate recovery with satisfactory results. In one infant, because of large, bulky stools and nitrogen wasting, it was necessary to replace the cottonseed oil with a fat emulsion (Lipomul-Upjohn), noticeably improving absorption.

(This study was supported by a research grant from the National Institutes of Health (A-4635), U.S. Public Health Service.)

Labor: As Jimmy Hoffa Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial personalities on the American scene today is James Riddle Hoffa. A few days ago I read an interesting and revealing article about Mr. Hoffa appearing in the August 1961 issue of Fortune magazine.

Although I do not fully concur with the activities of Mr. Hoffa, I feel that it would be to our advantage to know as much about this man as possible.

The article is as follows:

LABOR: AS JIMMY HOFFA SEES IT

James Riddle Hoffa today is riding as high and handsome as an over-the-road trucker with his foot on the pump of a 97-foot rig on a downhill straightaway. Overwhelmingly reelected president of the Teamsters Union at the convention in July, he is now winding up the last lap of a national sweep of contract negotiations. He has survived congressional inquisition and ordeal-at-law; the onslaughts of monitors and moralists have disturbed him no more than mosquito bites. He heads the biggest labor union in the world, the only fast-growing big union in the country. The sky's the limit; Jimmy's Teamsters have claimed jurisdiction over every unorganized worker left in the country.

Fortune offered Jimmy a chance to express his views about the future of his Teamsters Union and whatever else was on his mind. He accepted and in short order put himself vividly on the record on such topics as free enterprise, how to win a strike, politics, automation, bigness, and President Kennedy. Hoffa was interviewed at two breakfasts (the only free time in a tight-packed 5 days in Chicago). With him was Bill Isbell, a teamster organizer. Both men wore the open-necked, short-sleeved shirt that is almost the badge of a teamster. Jimmy Hoffa has great personal charm. Said the clerk at the hotel, "My wife thinks I'm crazy, but I like the guy." When Hoffa is not angry or engaged in rough paternal joshing with his boys, his manner can be surprisingly mild, almost gentle. But the smallest gesture—signaling someone to answer the phone or come into a room—betrays the habit of command and the expectation of obedience. A guest for breakfast the second morning was Barney Baker, the 300-pound teamster organizer, who has bragged of knowing big-time gangsters across the country, once ate 86 double pork chops at a sitting, and carries the scars of bullet wounds from the dock wars of the thirties. Clearly, Baker is a redoubtable fellow, but he takes his orders from Jimmy Hoffa, who in Baker's opinion is "one of the sweetest guys God ever created." Jimmy that morning wanted to know how Barney's weight-reducing program was coming along. Barney said he had lost 30 pounds, had 40 to go. "Well," Jimmy ordered, "lose it." Then Hoffa, a teetotaler himself, told how he had found one of the boys drunk the night before and ordered him to stay in bed and sleep it off. "He's a good man," observed Jimmy affectionately, "but he's weak."

On paper Jimmy's words show an occasional violation of the schoolbook rules of grammar, but he can bore incisively and lucidly to the heart of a matter, or plead his cause with a kind of rhythmic eloquence. Jimmy, furthermore, is informed. He cites from his reading of speeches by George Romney, articles by Clark Kerr, books and articles on automation, the trade journals of transportation, and he is at home with points of law, labor-force statistics, and the actuarial, mechanical, and economic facts of trucking.

ON HOW TO PREVENT MOB RULE

Jimmy hasn't changed his mind about the Landrum-Griffin Act. He says that title VII of the bill, "where it deals with secondary boycott, where it deals with organizational picketing, where it deals with the very life of unions, is going to have to be changed if unions are going to survive."

Concerning the Landrum-Griffin Act's provisions to protect democracy in unions, Jimmy argues, "You cannot organize individuals of any description—I don't care what type it is—whether it be executives, clergymen, union officials, politicians, housewives, or anybody else, you cannot organize them into a group and not have rules and regulations that control the internal affairs of that organization, or you have a mob. And when you try to allow—as you are now trying to do under title I [Bill of Rights] of Landrum-Griffin—to allow psychopaths, internal disturbers of every description, to come into your meetings and just run rampant on the theory that democracy means that he can monopolize the floor, you'll destroy the effectiveness of the union of being able to administer, or have the employer have confidence in the administration of the officials who are elected."

As to whether or not the Teamsters Union is a democratic organization: "I say we have the most democratic organization of any labor union in America. I don't think that anybody who ever attended a Teamster meeting can argue that we don't have democracy, because truckdrivers won't hold still for anything except that. You don't get these 'panty waists.' When you're talking about truckdrivers, and you get into a meeting of a thousand drivers as I did the other night in Los Angeles, where there's three factions in the meeting, you'll find out how democracy works, and you'll find out if you don't have a strong chairman to run that meeting, you'll have a mob inside of 15 minutes."

Jimmy's next aim in bargaining is to have all Teamster contracts throughout the United States expire the same day, in effect creating a national contract. This is one answer proposed by his lawyers to the present legal restrictions on the secondary boycott. Defending the idea of a national contract, Jimmy says, "Every type of employer in America, including transportation, is more thoroughly organized than the unions in that industry. You talk about an industry and I'll show you the counterpart of the national association, regional association, State association, city association. And whenever we sit down to negotiate a contract, what do I find at the bargaining table? While it's not national bargaining yet, at every single session, at every single bargaining table, the same representatives are there speaking for management. And the same argument, if it was placed on a tape recorder, could take place at the bargaining table without the employers' representatives saying a word; the same stock objections to everything that you present to them; the same set of economics trying to show that it's impossible to give what you're asking for. It's really national bargaining by segments."

Asked whether the Teamsters would ever call a nationwide strike if they got a national contract, Jimmy barks back "Ridiculous. People who talk like that don't understand transportation. There is no value in striking the U.S. transportation. You have to understand the flow of transportation in America. You have a more effective economic reaction from employers to a limited strike than you do a massive strike. When all transportation is down employers have no compelling competitive reasons to settle a strike. When you have selective strikes of the transportation system, which affect a limited number of employers and a limited number of employees but a maximum flow of freight, it's more effective than a general strike."

THE PUBLIC'S A SMART OPERATION

As to how the public interest can be protected in an economy made up of big unions and big employers bargaining with each other, Jimmy replies with an economic orthodoxy that would leave Robert Taft somewhere out in leftfield. "If you try to price your product too high because you're big, somebody new'll come into the field and take

the market. The best evidence is that when General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler tried to stay out of the compact field, it wasn't Romney that forced them into it, but rather it was the foreign-car market that came in from Europe that really forced the big three into compact automobiles. It wasn't the Supreme Court of the United States that protected the consumer against inferior products of any one of the automobile companies, but rather it was competition that forced them to have products of the best nature to be able to get the best percentage of sales that they could get out of the automobile industry. The same goes for steel or any other commodity.

"The public knows far better than anybody in this country what they'll buy and what they won't buy. The public's a pretty smart operation. That's the difference between being big and little. Satisfying the public."

For the next bargaining go-round in 1964 Jimmy plans to stress fringes rather than wages. But as to wages in the next 10 to 15 years, "They'll be double."

Despite rising wage costs, the price of transportation will go down, Hoffa thinks, because "railroads are going to merge. Truck lines will merge, and as you have bigger truck lines, bigger railroads, less truck lines, less railroads, the more full loads you will handle by the same number of trucks, or even less trucks, less boxcars. And when you have a balanced movement of freight in any form of transportation both ways, then the rate can go constantly down even though the wage scale goes up, because the productivity overcomes the cost factor."

COURTROOM FEATHERBEDDING

Jimmy expects to have more free time now that the monitors appointed by a Federal court to watch the Teamsters Union are off his neck. But when asked what the monitors prevented him from doing that he wanted to do, he says, "Nothing. Nothing. I didn't pay any attention to 'em."

"I didn't want them around because they were trying to restrict me, and I wouldn't be restricted, so they kept me constantly tied up in court to keep from being restricted, until I had to work more hours to be able to do the same things I can do now with less hours.

"Wasted motion, that's what burns me up. You go to court at 10 o'clock, and you sit til 12, and you come back at 2 and home a 5 and you've accomplished that [snap of fingers]. And you had to come down in the morning at 8 and work till 10. Then when you get back at 5 you eat and come back at 8 and work till midnight to get through what you could have did if that silly court wouldn't have had you there from 10 to 5."

The automation that unions fear is even beginning to invade unions. This is Jimmy's description of the way it is happening at the Teamsters: "We just got a reproducing machine in our office. Ten girls couldn't type letters as fast as that machine could produce 'em every minute. Ten girls couldn't do it. Every minute they're coming out of the machine just like that. Write one letter out in the reproduction machine and forget about it; walk away. Want a hundred; set a gadget. Want two hundred; set a gadget. Walk away and off they come as perfectly as though they were typed again. Reproducing typewriter actually is what it is. Can't buy it; you gotta rent it it's so exclusive."

As for the truckdriver who is displaced by automation, Jimmy takes a dim view of predictions that he can be retrained to white-collar work. "I know that whole theory. I read the book on it. But it's a theory, and not a practical proposal. I say they can't do it and I say they can't prove they ever did it—percentagewise. I'm not talking about the exception. You take the person who didn't finish high school and you tell me how you're going to take that individual off a truck and send him to a 6-week course and move him back around into some sort of a position that takes high school or better to do. That's where most of the people are today. Do you realize that 19 percent of the unemployment today are individuals ranging from 19 to 21 years of age? That's the group. You know why? I'll tell you why. There's 2,500,000 estimated young people who will leave school without ever finishing grade school in the next 10 years. There's 5 million estimated people who are gonna leave high school without ever finishing high school. That's 7,500,000 people who will be placed out into the field of earning a living for themselves at some type of an operation who have less than a high school education. Now they want to talk about training, then they can take the money they're talking about and give it to the kid who has to maintain his family or maintain himself and keep him in high school—or keep him in grade school and high school—and they won't have to worry about him when he becomes 40, of not being able to break him in to a new vocation if his form of employment disappears." [1]

Despite the dislocations caused by automation, Jimmy insists he has no intention of holding up progress. "We've never stopped automation," he declares. "There isn't any employer we do business with that will tell you we've ever stopped automation. We simply get for the workers their share of the savings of the automation."

Jimmy takes the same cool view of the jurisdictional problems raised by automation. "Listen," he says, "you can't change what's going to happen. You're not going to hold back progress. Progress is going to change union jurisdictional lines and they might as well accept it. There'll be a third of the unions left. [Craft-union leaders] admit it privately. I've talked to them. And the oldtimers, once they're gone—they can't live forever—the young fellows'll sit down and work out their problems.

THEY'RE MORALLY GUTLESS

Jimmy expects automation to cost his union members in long-distance hauling, as consolidating, modernizing railroads take over more volume, and in warehouses, as automation replaces them. He expects to gain members in shorter hauling, as suburbs and shopping centers proliferate. Meanwhile, he is protecting his union's power base by organizing new workers. "We're the only union that's progressing," he says. "We increase because we're on the street every day. It's just like any industry. The more salesmen you have, the more customers you contact, the greater the percentage of success in selling. That's our success."

The great hope and the great problem in Jimmy's line of business is organizing the white-collar worker. Jimmy concedes, "It isn't easy."

"I'll give you my opinion of 'em," he says. "They're intellectually smart but they're morally gutless. That about sums 'em up. They want everything in the world, but they don't want to fight for nothin'. They've been a kind of sheltered, secure group." Nevertheless, "the last 10 years we've been able to organize more white-collar workers than in the last 50, and we'll continue the next 10 years to organize more white-collar workers than we did in the last 10 years because with all the new machines that are being invented and put into offices, the more white-collar workers will be displaced.

"I read an article recently where there were seven machines introduced at a display in the Waldorf Astoria. And there was a statement made by the powers that be at that meeting that there would be 5 million white-collar workers displaced in the next 5 years by machines. Which means that they will have to be more specialized, and the more specialized the more competitive it will become, and the more competitive the more necessary to have unions. And the greater the productivity, with a limited number of people working in every office, the more they will need organization to get individual recognition.

"And we will profit," Jimmy drums out the words with flat, cool confidence, "by having the workers in offices, same as we have on platforms and on trucks, seek out our union for self-preservation."

The Teamster strategy for white-collar organizing is based on personal relations. Efforts are focused on office help directly connected with truck terminals or manufacturing plants where the Teamsters have already organized the rest of the workers. "It's very difficult to approach an office building such as the Prudential office building and start handing out leaflets," explains Jimmy. "But the stewards and drivers who live and work with these people every day have personal contact, can sign 'em up out of a personal feeling as well as an economic feeling."

Now that he has shown the world that he can cut the mustard on his own, Jimmy Hoffa has a hankering to be invited back into the respectability and companionship of the AFL–CIO. He made this very clear at the convention. Jimmy has also made it clear, however, that he's not about to be had easily. Asked whether the Teamsters would give up their efforts to organize the unorganized in all jurisdictions if they were readmitted to the federation, he replies, "We will not go back into the AFL–CIO and be restricted in organizing. That we will never do." But whether this be bravado—or horse trading—remains to be seen. Hoffa says he plans to increase from 3,000 to 5,000 the Teamsters' staff of well-paid organizers. But this could be a form of demand bid on the part of the Teamsters.

YOU ASSOCIATE WITH THOSE YOU NEED

Asked who will be the next president of the AFL–CIO, Jimmy says, "I would think that Joe Keenan (of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) or Walter Reuther would be the choice. I think that Joe Keenan would be the best man because he's a very good politician and would be able to hold them together. I don't think Reuther could hold the federation together."

As to whether Joe Keenan, if elected, would invite the Teamsters back into the AFL–CIO, Jimmy says rather thoughtfully, "I don't know what Joe would do. I know that Joe would try to unify the American labor movement. Joe recognizes that employees, no matter how much they may hate each other, never expel people from their associations. They sit down, discuss their mutual problems, even though they go their own way at the end of the meeting. I think that's what Joe would do. It wouldn't be a personal question with Joe. Matter of fact, I don't think it would be a personal question with Reuther if he became president."

Asked whether he thinks Reuther would have him back, Jimmy says, "I would believe it; I would believe it in due time, yes, Reuther's a politician. Politics necessarily means that you can't have the choice of who you associate with, but you associate with those who you need to become a winner."

Passing on to even more exalted political levels, Hoffa assessed the performance to date of President John F. Kennedy, blamed by the teamsters for what they like to call the

[1] Jimmy Hoffa left school after the seventh grade, but at the moment he does not appear to be threatened with unemployment, technological or otherwise.

Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill. Jimmy says reflectively, "Watching him in these Khrushchev meetings, and watching what he has did since he was inaugurated, I would question whether or not he will be able to coordinate himself as an administrator with the rest of Government, or rather be determined to be an individualist. And you cannot be an individualist when you're heading up an organization, but you have to be a coordinator, and flexible, to hold responsible, intelligent people around you. Because when they're slighted, they'll leave you, and you get secondary people around you."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Let's Stop the Name Calling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in today's Washington Star there appears what I consider to be a very fine column entitled "Let's Stop the Name Calling," written by William S. White. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend its reading and careful consideration to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP THE NAME CALLING—EXTREMISTS SEEN AIDING KHRUSHCHEV—LEADERS URGED TO STAY CALM IN CRISES

(By William S. White)

There are small but unmistakable signs that a familiar American reaction to prolonged periods of international strain, name-calling among ourselves is about to set in.

If it sets in generally, it will be one of the most handsome gifts we could hand to Nikita Khrushchev and the Soviet Union.

For the first and most basic of all Mr. Khrushchev's objectives has never been so clearly manifested as now. It is the objective of division. He tries to divide the Western allies over Berlin, the United Nations within itself, and the American people within themselves.

Thus it will be the greatest of pities and the most fantastic of national errors if by our own words and actions we promote for him his prime purpose of putting people and political parties in this country at each other's throats.

Let us, for heaven's sake and also for our own sake, stop acting as though those nice old ladies, male and female, who want only negotiation at any price, really have the power to sell us out to appeasement. They don't, not for a moment.

And let us, for heaven's sake and also for our own sake, quit acting as though those bluff characters who demand an atomic ultimatum to Mr. Khrushchev by sundown really have the capacity to hustle us into an unthinking nuclear war. They don't, not for a moment.

We have no reason whatever to fear either kind of extremism. The responsible leaders in both parties have in fact for months demonstrated a great capacity for sound, calm, and responsible conduct in the face of the most frigidly menacing blasts yet to blow from the cold war.

At the moment, however, and in spite of the fact that we all surely ought to know by now that every time of trouble always brings out the lunatic fringes, the outlook for continued calm reason is becoming a bit beclouded.

There are those who believe the President should declare in advance precisely when and how and where he would use atomic weapons against the Russians in various eventualities. They have a right to this view. But they have no right to suggest that those who think otherwise are "soft on communism—" those dissenters often being, ironically, some of the most decorated and conservative officers in the American military services.

Those who think that the Berlin crisis (and all others) should be approached solely with glad hymns to "negotiation" and glad offers to same also have a right to that view, extraordinarily silly though it is. But they do not have the right to suggest that those who think otherwise, and would like to mix a little power and determination in with the negotiations, are reactionaries and warmongers.

This kind of enfevered nonsense, and the enfevered nonsense of those who believe you avoid war by shouting "tough" slogans, will do nobody but Premier Khrushchev any good.

And, unhappily, much the same spirit is now being shown by a few emotionalists in both political parties. A small but increasingly eager Democratic ultraliberal handful is privately pressuring President Kennedy to "get tough with the Republicans"—any time, anywhere, for any reason.

And a Republican ultraconservative handful is privately pressuring the party leaders to get tough with the Democrats—also any time, anywhere, for any reason.

Meanwhile, perhaps the most authentic anti-Communist in the United States, J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, has just done a notable service in the present atmosphere.

He has warned the public that indiscriminate denouncing as Communists of those we don't agree with "helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their opponents."

There is one other thing he might very usefully do. He might also justly point out that the indiscriminate labeling of other people as more or less Fascist warmongers isn't too helpful either. What we need in this dangerous period is a great deal of creative tolerance among ourselves.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD some very pertinent remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], on which I have the honor to serve.

The chairman, who has served with distinction as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the years he has been a Member of the Congress, is one of the best informed of its members of reclamation affairs. It would be well for those from the reclamation States to heed well what the distinguished and knowledgeable gentleman from Colorado has to say about reclamation. He says reclamation projects must be "clean as a hound's tooth" and I thoroughly agree. He also cites the results of a crash program wherein on at least nine cases investigations were hurried, or not fully completed and repayment contracts were not signed prior to construction and how these projects got into subsequent difficulties.

I think the gentleman has given us good reasons for not rushing into approval of these reclamation projects and not blindly following the recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not think we gave nearly enough attention to these Colorado River project transmission lines. We have accepted what the Bureau of Reclamation submitted as an analysis without nearly as thorough an examination as the problem deserved. We have got to realize that the Bureau of Reclamation is no longer the clean-cut scientific organization it once was. It now deals in ideology rather than engineering and economics and we must recognize it as such.

Reclamation, as I have often emphasized, is one Federal program that is little understood by Members of the House from the eastern part of the United States—and yet it is these Members who actually hold the balance of power when it comes to a House vote on a reclamation project.

The reclamation program has a much easier time in the Senate because the 17 reclamation States start off with 34 votes out of 100—just 17 short of a majority. In the House, where representation is based on population, the reclamation States start off with 99 votes out of 437—or 120 short of a majority. Included in the 99 reclamation votes are 58 from the States of California, Texas, and Oklahoma. Thus in the 14 Rocky Mountain and Far Western States where the reclamation program is of primary concern—excluding only California—there are just 41 Members of the House, out of 437.

Aside from good plain sense, this is one of the reasons why it is so essential that reclamation projects be clean as a hound's tooth. If the reclamation States come to the Congress with a request for a Federal investment in projects it must be on a basis of sound economic and financial feasibility, and—prior to appropriation of funds for construction—a clear indication of the water users' willingness to repay that part of the Federal investment that is within their ability to pay.

That is why I have always insisted, for example, that repayment contracts be signed by the water users before construction begins on a reclamation project. It is only through a responsible

policy of this kind that reclamation can be justified in the House of Representatives.

When such a policy is not followed reclamation is in trouble. We already have several examples of what can happen when projects are not thoroughly studied and repayment contracts with the water users not signed prior to construction.

The most notable example was the authorization of a number of projects in the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946, and a subsequent "crash" program of construction. In at least nine cases investigations were hurried, or not fully completed, and repayment contracts were not siged prior to construction. All of these projects got into subsequent difficulty as a result of undue haste to get construction underway, and all have caused substantial losses of Uncle Sam's moneys. The Federal expenditures on these nine projects have come to $58,246,722 and while it is possible that some of this may be repaid eventually, most of it will not.

This is the sort of thing that gives reclamation generally a "black eye" and which makes it more difficult than good judgment would require to secure House approval of sound projects.

A Federal reclamation program, with proper investigation, planning, and construction, is a sound investment in national progress. At the same time, those of us from the reclamation States, who have the most direct interest in such a program, have the responsibility to insist that the reclamation program be carried forward on a basis of sound financial and economic feasibility.

Project Corn Tassle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for some years many of us have sought to make the golden corn tassle the national floral emblem. One of the moving spirits in this attempt has been Miss Margo Cairns, of Minneapolis. On September 19, Miss Cairns addressed the Sertoma Club luncheon here in Washington on the subject "Project Corn Tassle," in which she traced the history of corn and its meaning for the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that her address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT CORN TASSEL

(Address by Miss Margo Cairns)

Soon after Christopher Columbus reached the New World he sent Queen Isabella a letter in which he wrote that the natives they had found on the island were agricultural, that his brother walked through 18 miles of a new grain. He further reported that "The natives call it maize, but we call it corn."

This was the first knowledge of a third major grain created to bless mankind. A whole New World fed and sustained by a new grain unlike anything before known. A new world, a new grain, yet perhaps both were as old or older than those of Europe and Asia.

Columbus used the word "corn" understandably. In the Old World the word "corn" was a genetic term used in reference to any grains of the area—wheat, barley, rye, and millet.

In the New World, from the Canadian border to Lake Titicaca high in the Andes and down in the valley of the Urubamba the red man called the New World grain "maize." The name has profound meaning. As this grain fed, nourished, and sustained as no other food, it was given the tenderest name in any civilization—that of "mother," and the ancient people's word for mother was maize.

Apparently the remarkable civilization which, after many centuries culminated in the golden kingdom of the Incas, began down in the sheltered valley of the Urubamba. There were no broad miles of fertile lands as we know them. There were only steep mountain walls. Into these walls the ancient people carved terraces. On these were developed many of our favorite foods, all native to the New World—maize, potato, tomato, peanut, many kinds of beans and many fruits. As the population increased the terraces climbed the mountains. Agriculturalists in our Nation strengthened the plant corn by going north; the ancients strengthened it by going up—almost to the snow line.

The ancient peoples did not have the wheel, nor iron, nor any draft animals. How they cut huge blocks of granite out of mountain walls with such skill that the blocks fit together so perfectly that a knife blade cannot be inserted between them, is a continuing wonder to modern engineers.

Greatest of all their accomplishments as builders is the amazing city of Macher Piccher, literally carved out of and upon a mountain peak. How it was built, why and when, remain unanswered questions. Last June was the 50th anniversary of its discovery by Hiram Bingham, the inquisitive, thoughtful, archeologist, who had to know if fancy were fact.

The discovery of Macher Piccher will forever remain a monument to his penetrating reasoning. Called the lost city of the Incas, it was believed to exist only as a legend. Talking with a very old Peruvian Indian, Mr. Bingham gleaned sufficient information to encourage him to take a team of experts into the little-known section of the wild mountainous area.

It was to this hidden city that the heir of Atahulapa, the last Inca fled from the Spanish, taking with him his family, nobles, and retainers. Search as the conquistadors relentlessly did, they never found a trace of them. The city remained hidden until June 1911, and Mr. Bingham's astounding discovery. It is now considered one of the wonders of the world, a great tourist attraction. On terraces carved into the mountain and stretching up to the entrance was grown the food for the occupants of this royal city.

A treasure such as maize had proved to be could not be secluded. Through the centuries it traveled mountain trails aiding in developing other people—the Mayans, Toltecs, Aztecs. For centuries it has fed humanity in our own vast Southwest. Excavations prove it was in what is now Alabama and Georgia fully 5,000 years ago.

This "mother" of the ancient peoples was waiting on the Atlantic coast to succor the white race as it surged into the New World. Then known as Indian corn, it was a vital factor in establishing the early colonies. As food, as legal currency, and as barter, it was the support of every settlement. Cornhusks filled the mattresses of Americans well into the 20th century. Now corn, in myriad converted forms, touches the life of every American every day.

One of the delights of pioneer children was sucking the sweet juice from a stalk of green corn. Today a part of corn's sweetness is converted into the Nation's candy. Late statistics reveal that last year's candymakers produced over 8 billion pounds returning, on the wholesale level, $1,200 million.

Into this huge amount of candy went 800 million pounds of corn syrup which would require approximately 20 million bushels of corn to produce. Nearly 44 million pounds of dextrose or refined sugar also went into candymaking last year.

The figure—$1,200 million—is oddly significant. That was the estimated value of the golden treasure wrested from the Incans by the conquistadors in payment of their Inca's ransom. Would not this infer that candy is gold in the United States? Certainly many other products of corn are.

It was a plant, domesticated in the mists of antiquity, that was the foundation of building through many centuries, the fabulous golden kingdom. It is this same plant that, in only 350 years, aided by the vision and vigor of Americans, that converted this vast virgin land into the leading nation of the world. What a triumph for a plant.

There Will Always Be a Babe Ruth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, just as surely as the editor told Virginia there was and always would be a Santa Claus, so, too, there will always be a Babe in the minds of those of us who had the privilege of seeing this most colorful of all sports personalities in action. Who could forget the toothpick ankles carrying a huge frame, somewhat expanded at the middle, but rounding into powerful arms and shoulders, and keen eyes which probably were responsible for the finest coordinated swing of all times.

Always ready to go "beyond the call of duty," I recall an exhibition game in which most stars would not have appeared. The field was ankle deep with mud, the crowd was there and the Babe put on his usual colorful show. At one point in the game he slipped and fell, came up looking like a four-legged beast which likes to wallow in that environment, the crowd roared and he enjoyed every bit of it.

It seems fitting to reflect once more on a great career when a record established in 1927 was recently assaulted, but not equaled.

A reprint of a column written 11 years ago appeared in the Sunday, September 24, edition of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News. It is eloquent testimony to a great personality:

SPORTS SHOP

(By Al Clark, executive sports editor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Eleven years later: Clayton L. Wert, 237 Kelker Street, Harrisburg, requested a reprint of the following column

written 11 years ago by Al Clark, executive sports editor. The column was originally printed in the Sunday Patriot-News editions of July 2, 1950. It was Mr. Wert's thought that many of the things said of Ruth in the column written 11 years ago are being brought forcefully to mind today by the assault of Roger Maris on Ruth's home run record.)

BABE RUTH AND A 7-YEAR-OLD'S QUERIES

"No, Mike, Babe Ruth isn't dead."

"But, Daddy, I just heard it on the radio. Roy Nassau said: "Babe Ruth's widow will be here Thursday. Right here in Harrisburg. She's gonna 'vell a monument or sumpin'. That's what he said. Said she would be at Island Park where the Senators play. If a man has a widow then the man must be dead, don't he, daddy?"

"Well, Mike, Babe Ruth isn't dead. That's what the man said on the radio. But don't you believe it. Babe Ruth isn't dead. He will never die. He's just gone away—gone away for a long, long time."

"Where has he gone, Dad?"

"The Man in the Sky wanted him to play baseball in His League, son."

"Who is the Man in the Sky?"

"He's the man who takes care of all of us. You and me and fellas like the Big Guy."

"Couldn't Babe Ruth take care of himself? He was an awfully big man, most as big as a bear."

"Yes, Babe Ruth could take care of himself. Do it mighty well, too. But he was tired. And he had pains. He ached a lot. His head hurt. So the Man in the Sky took care of him."

"Ain't that being dead?"

"Some folks might say so. But I wouldn't. I would say Babe Ruth couldn't die."

"Why not? Is he too big?"

"That's it, Mike. In many ways the Big Guy is too big. Much too big. He might go away. Like up to visit with the Man in the Sky. But he would just be away. He wouldn't be dead. Not real dead, anyhow."

"TELL ME ABOUT BABE RUTH"

"Well, you and I could sit here all night and talk about Babe Ruth and we wouldn't be able to tell all of it. But maybe, if I told you about the time he hit all those home runs. He played 22 years and hit 714 homers, son, and about the time I saw him cry and about the time he played with the kids and stopped a real-honest-to-goodness ball game you would understand why Babe couldn't die.

"Perhaps you are too young to understand now. But there will be a day when all this about the Big Fella will be clear. That day will be when you've grown from a little boy to a big boy.

"Well, with Ruth there were big things and little things. Big things like: Most home runs one season—60—1927; things like 714 home runs in 22 years of regular season play plus 15 homers in World Series play; things like playing 22 years, appearing in 2,502 games, going to bat 8,389 times and getting 2,873 hits, scoring 2,174 runs. Things like leading his league 11 times as a home-run hitter.

"Those are the big things. But, to me, it was the little things that made Ruth so magnificent a player. Made him the man who couldn't die.

"I can tell you some of the things I've seen the Big Guy do. And those are the things that make me tell you he's just gone up into the sky.

"I remember that September day, the 29th, in 1927. That was the day when he hit his 60th home run in one season. It was the eighth inning of the game between the Yankees and the Senators. Babe Ruth was at bat. His home run record had been tied at 59. And now the Big Fella, he was a moon-faced giant and walked on tooth-pick legs, waddled like a duck to home plate. Tom Zachary, Old Long Tom, was pitching for the Senators. The day before, September 28, Tom Zachary had seen the Babe unleash the power he had and watched him blast two homers in a row. The last of the two had equalled the Babe's own record of 59.

"Zachary sweated. He wiped the beads of sweat from his forehead, tweaked the peak of his cap. Then he bent to his work. A fast ball, outside. Babe reached for it. Bam! Off it went—the Babe's 60th homer.

"That homer won the ball game for the Yankees, 4 to 2. And it won for Ruth everlasting greatness. Maybe Ralph Kiner will break his record, son. Maybe Ted Williams will. Or somebody else. But they will never take from Ruth the record. They will be known as the men who broke Babe's record but Babe will always be the King of Swat."

"Tell me more, Dad."

"Well, that was the moment of his greatest glory. Now I'll tell you about his moment of his greatest trouble.

"That was the night the Big Guy was awfully tired. Tired like you after you've been playing Hopalong Cassidy and riding your bike all of the day.

"He looked sick, too, like a man who hurt inside. Maybe he was a bit sick even then. I wouldn't know.

"He was almost through with baseball as a player. And he knew no major league team wanted him as a manager. You see the Big Guy wasn't the kind who would make a good manager. He didn't know how to boss people. The date was May 17, 1935. The Boston Braves and Ruth were traveling westward through Harrisburg to play other National League clubs. Ruth was news. Folks wanted to know of his plans. Wanted to know how he was standing up, physically, as a gate attraction with the Braves.

"I met his train at Pennsylvania Station. Ruth, stooped and dejected, stood on the observation platform. We chatted. I asked of his plans for the future.

" 'I'm tired,' the Big Fella said, 'very tired. My legs hurt. This is my last trip as a player,' he told me. 'May I quote that?' I asked.

" 'Go ahead,' he said. There was a tear in his eye. He was dejected. A sorry figure.

"Well, 16 days later, Ruth put away the monkey suit of the Braves and retired forever as a player.

"There are two pictures of the Big Fella, Mike. There are others. Like the very best picture. The picture of Babe and the kids—his kids.

"Kids followed him everywhere he went. They swamped him. He loved it. Why? Because he was just a great big kid himself.

"I once saw him single out a crippled lad. A one-legged youngster walking on a crutch 'Hiya, kid,' he greeted the crippled lad. 'Hiya, kid,' 'Gosh, Mr. Ruth,' the kid answered. 'Gosh.' And then into his patch pocket went Babe's big hamlike hand. Out came a brand new baseball. 'Here, kid, one for you,' he laughed and tossed the ball to the youngster.

" 'Gosh, Babe, thanks,' the kid said. 'OK, kid,' laughed the Big Fella."

"That's why Babe Ruth can't die, is it, dad?"

"That's why, son. That's why he just went visiting with the Man in the Sky."

"But he has a widow, dad."

"Sure, and she'll be here Thursday to dedicate a plaque at Island Park to another fine sportsman's memory—that of Tom Crowley, the man who brought organized baseball back to Harrisburg. But that's another story, Mike. So off to bed with you now. And you might dream of Joe DiMaggio, Ted Williams or Kiner. And say a little prayer for the Big Guy up in the Sky."

Communications Satellites and Free, Competitive, Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the United States can proudly proclaim the historic "firsts" in extending the distance of sight and sound. American ingenuity is responsible for the wireless, the radio, and television, to name only a very few of the major breakthroughs. Now, another "first"—worldwide direct communications in sound and sight—may be near at hand. Project Echo, which was used to bounce the voice of President Eisenhower across the Nation in a matter of seconds, first demonstrated the practical use of a communications satellite which could be placed in orbit and used to relay voices to all parts of the world. We are presently on the threshold of directly projecting not only voices but pictures between continents. This will stimulate worldwide enterprise, cooperation, and understanding. Equally significant, these achievements will be the result of the American free, competitive, private enterprise system.

Approval for this endeavor was given last July when President Kennedy formally endorsed the Eisenhower policy of private initiative in the communications satellite system. Noting that this Nation has traditionally followed a policy of conducting international communications through private enterprise, subject to Government regulations and licensing, President Eisenhower set forth the policy on January 1. At that time, he said that "the Government should aggressively encourage private enterprise in the establishment and operation of satellite relays for revenue-producing purposes." There can be no doubt that the companies involved have the needed communications experience, knowledge, and skill to see this through. They already have working international communications agreements with their foreign counterparts.

The setting up of a global communications system is not without its problems of both policy and technology. I suggest that objections to the announced setup must be resolved. Criticism and delay could well hinder the project, and thus allow Soviet Russia to win the race to the heavens, with a workable satellite communications system.

A quick completion of this project in a manner which will serve the public interest will be a great forward stride for our national prestige. We will demonstrate the application of space science to the progress and welfare of all mankind. Furthermore, a working satellite system achieved by free enterprise under suitable governmental regulation will provide the greatest evidence of the vigor of our system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD

the editorials of several California newspapers on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Red Bluff Daily News, Red Bluff, Calif., Mar. 2, 1961]

TRIBUTE TO INVENTOR

Eighty-five years ago, on March 10, 1876, Alexander Graham Bell uttered the first words ever sent over a telephone. We are in the ninth decade now of that miraculous instrument, and as any parent of a teenager will testify, many a message of less import has been transmitted during that time. Yet such is the inherent versatility of Bell's invention that we today take rather calmly the promise that soon we will be talking long distances by means of electronic waves bounced off the moon or orbiting satellites. We may even live to speak to someone on the moon itself.

It is doubtful that even the imaginative Bell himself dreamed of the multitude of uses the telephone would be put to; the key role it would play in our lives. Even if there are moments when we wish he also had invented a way to keep talkative people from hogging party lines and inept ones from dialing wrong numbers, we owe him—and pay him—a warm and sincere tribute.

[From the Sacramento Union, Mar. 12, 1961]

THE RIGHT NUMBER

Eighty-five years ago this past week, Alexander Graham Bell uttered the first words ever sent over a telephone. We are in the ninth decade now of that miraculous instrument, and, as any parent of a teenager will testify, many a message of much less import has been transmitted during that time.

Yet such is the inherent versatility of Bell's invention that we today take rather calmly the promise that soon we will be talking long distances by means of electronic waves bounced off the moon or orbiting satellites. We may even live to speak to someone on the moon itself.

It is dubtful that even the imaginative Bell himself dreamed of the multitude of uses the telephone would be put to; the key role it would play in our lives. Even if there are moments when we wish he also had invented a way to keep talkative people from hogging party lines and inept ones from dialing wrong numbers, we owe him—and pay him—a warm and sincere tribute.

[From the Modesta Bee, Modesta, Calif., July 6, 1961]

IMPLICATIONS OF SPACE ACTIVITIES

What the industrial revolution did to the society and economy of our forebears is nothing compared to what the space revolution we are now experiencing is going to do to our economy and society in the next few decades.

You will, figuratively and literally, be living in another world. The following picture of that world (let me hasten to say) is not the creature of my imaginings, but the studied forecasts of some of the most knowledgeable and serious men in government, in industry, in public life.

It comes from a study by Congress' Space Committee on the Practical Value of Space Exploration; from a Brookings Institution report on "Implications of Space Activities for Human Affairs"; on NASA's fourth semiannual report to Congress.

There will, most certainly, be a breathtaking system of virtually foolproof, space-based communications devices operating globally. First will come ordinary telephone calls bounced back by an orbiting sphere, then high fidelity radio, and finally many channeled TV. Within a decade it should be possible for a billion people or more to watch the same TV program via satellite relay television. Grasp what that means—if you dare.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has already received NASA's permission to develop an earth orbiting communications system that will provide global commercial space circuits; and it is putting down $25 million of its own money to get the project started. It may cost upward of $170 million to eventually set up a worldwide system of 50 satellites and 13 terminals, an insignificant figure when you consider that cheaper long range distance calls would be inevitable.

In education there could be "live" regional presentations of lectures and special events, which now are taped. School children could be exposed to worldwide "live" events anywhere while they happened. Space based radio and TV could be used to do much of the teaching in underdeveloped areas.

Or take the subject of weather. Mark Twain would have to eat his words about everybody talking about the weather but nobody doing anything about it. Weather satellites would give us a constant global weather reporting system, and think what just a 10-percent improvement in accuracy in weather forecasting would do for the farmers, builders, airlines, shipping, tourist trade.

An aero satellite family, planned for 1964 (in "stationary" orbit 22,300 miles above the equator) would be able to watch weather happenings over an entire hemisphere. That means a worldwide system of accurate long-range and short-range weather predictions.

You would know whether to expect a tough or mild winter. You could predict rainfall or drought. You would get early warnings of tornadoes, floods, hurricanes. Farmers would get 7 to 30 day forecasts allowing them to take advantage of short run weather phases for planting, harvesting. You could arrange vacations to fit the weather you wanted. Think what accurate weather reporting would do for fairs, golf tournaments, horse shows, etc. And not a few of these serious scientists and technicians and businessmen look forward to the time when fogs could be dispersed at will and hurricanes and typhoons be disrupted when being formed.

But communications and weather are not the only fields to benefit by outer space exploration. Other practical byproducts are legion.

The demand for miniaturization of instruments for space exploration has already brought us a radio the size of a lump of sugar, given us a wristwatch powered by the same mercury batteries that operate a timing device in the Explorer satellite. Remote controlled command systems for satellites and missiles have already supplied devices for opening and closing garage doors for moving cars, and to let us retune TV sets from our chairs.

Air travel will be revolutionized as a result of the X–15 research plane and other advanced aerospace craft. It will be possible to hop from coast to coast, or across the Atlantic, in a couple of hours. These planes will fly at an altitude of 50,000 feet and a speed of 1,500 miles an hour.

The use of space research byproducts by industry and business is practically limitless. There are the new materials already being produced commercially as a result of space research—metals, alloys, fabrics, compounds—new types of glass that filter intense light; new plastics to make unbreakable plumbing.

NASA's Deputy Administrator, Hugh Dryden, undoubtedly understated it the other day when he asserted that the advanced technology required for more and more difficult space missions is advancing at a meteoric rate.

[From the News Call Bulletin, San Francisco, July 28, 1961]

TALKING SATELLITES

In urging speedy perfection of a worldwide network of communications satellites, President Kennedy has pointed up the imminence of practical dividends from space research.

Within a few years such satellites undoubtedly will be transmitting radio messages, telephone calls, and space telegrams around the globe. International television is sure to follow.

According to the National Academy of Sciences, satellites will multiply by 10,000 the number of messages it is now possible for the world's crowded communications channels to handle.

They will bring the telephone to millions of people in many countries who now are beyond reach of this instrument Americans take for granted. They will make worldwide TV feasible. They will supply a major impetus to the communications and electronics industries, at home and abroad.

Above all, such satellites will serve to bring all nations into even closer contact—thus providing man with an unparalleled opportunity for cultivating greater understanding among the peoples of the world.

By endorsing former President Eisenhower's policy of "private ownership and operation of the U.S. portion" of this new communications system, Mr. Kennedy has assured its earliest implementation. For the Nation's history proves free, competitive enterprise is capable of exercising much more imagination and ingenuity than any governmental bureaucracy.

At the same time, President Kennedy was wise to extend again to Russia and other nations an invitation to take part in a peaceful communications satellite system.

[From the Chronicle, San Francisco, Calif., July 26, 1961]

PUTTING PHONE CALLS IN ORBIT

The most apparent practical nonmilitary use of space exploration techniques is the orbiting of satellites from which can be bounced or relayed telephone, radio, or television signals on a worldwide basis.

So promising is this lifted horizon in the field of communications that already a dozen U.S. companies have spent millions of dollars in research on systems and techniques, though only a few isolated experiments have actually been performed and all working systems still exist only in theory.

Every corporation in the communications field, however, sees the future of communications via space as a business which will eventually mean billions of dollars to common carriers and to equipment manufacturers.

The decisions to be made about this great new industry involve many scientific and engineering alternatives, which are being variously explored. They involve many more public questions, such as what company or agency will have the right to send satellites into space, how far Government will claim the right to regulate or conduct the buisness, and what arrangements should be made with other countries, where in most cases communications are government owned.

Many conferences and discussions have resulted this week in a firm statement of administration policy by President Kennedy. He said that this country, appropriately, would leave satellite communications to private enterprise, with competition to be encouraged where possible, and with Government contributing research and regulation. Other countries will be invited to participate in ownership, operation, and regulation.

That statement of policy is a necessary and well thought out next step in the constructive use of space. Historically, communica-

tions agreements have been the most binding and least disturbed of all international agreements. Maritime law, postal agreements, cable and radio treaties have been honored by the most arrogant and insolent of dictators. It is comforting to know that while the nations brandish their missile-bearing rockets, the very same rockets will be the foundation for a greater opportunity for the peoples of the world to talk together and to see each other on television, and that American private enterprise will play so large and competitive a part in making this vision a reality.

[From the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Aug. 11, 1961]

ECHO'S BIRTHDAY EMPHASIZES VALUE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Echo I, the U.S. earth satellite balloon, will mark its first year in space tomorrow morning—4,480 orbits and 138,136,000 miles after its launching last August 12 by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This birthday emphasizes the importance of America's vast private enterprise communications system.

The Echo project was the brainchild of Dr. John Robinson Pierce, a 51-year-old research director at Bell Telephone Laboratories.

The 100-foot balloon, still visible at times in the evening sky over San Diego, demonstrated the practical possibilities of satellite communications. Although originally expected to remain aloft only a few weeks, it is still capable of bouncing back radio and television waves to earth.

This is just one of many communications advances made by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its associated companies in the Bell System.

This system of private enterprise research and development made a major breakthrough with transitors in 1948. The application of this discovery is a prime factor in America's superiority in missile and satellite instrumentation, miniaturization, and reliability.

For the public, transistors have brought an array of useful products from pocket radios to lightweight hearing aids.

Bell pioneered another significant development with the solar battery in 1955. This invention converts sunlight to electrical energy. It is being used in space, and experimentally for phone service in remote areas of the earth.

Western Electric, manufacturing and supply unit of the Bell System, coordinates management services on Sage (semiautomatic ground environment) construction—part of our vast air defense system.

Our distant early warning system—the Dew Line—is another example of America's private communications systems working with the military for national defense.

Bell Laboratories is developing the Nike-Zeus system for defense against long-range missiles.

All of this has been going on apace with the expansion of domestic communications services. At the end of 1945, the Bell System included, exclusive of private line telephones, 22.4 million phones. As of December 31, 1960, this number was 60.7 million phones.

We talkative Americans carried on an average of 90.5 million telephone conversations daily in 1945. Last year, the average of daily conversations was 219 million.

In addition, we have extended and improved our overseas communications for defense, commerce, and personal convenience far beyond anything that was comprehended 20 or 25 years ago.

These are merly highlights of communications progress touched off by old Echo's birthday tomorrow, 1,000 miles or so out in space.

But one can wonder where our defense effort, our scientific explorations, our national growth, would have been without the investments, the initiative and the imagination of our private enterprise communications industry.

We could not have found the answers in fragmented firms and centralized government control.

[From the Stockton (Calif.) Record, Aug. 12, 1961]

SIR ECHO'S BIRTHDAY IN SPACE

The United States has fired 45 satellites into orbit to the Russians' 13. Only one Soviet vehicle still is touring space as against 28 for the United States. Of these the screwball "satelloon" Echo I is outstanding in visibility.

Today is Echo's first birthday. The shiny big balloon has spun around the earth 4,480 times for a total of more than 138 million miles. Although Echo has been holed many times by meteorites and drained of its gas, the bag remains intact for lack of atmospheric pressure that would cause its collapse.

We have seen Echo on recent nights cruising up out of the west across the north-central sky. It still shines brightly and appears to waver on course, sometimes giving the appearance of intelligently curving to avert collision with a stationary star. The "satelloon" at its apogee is 1,075 miles up, and at its perigee 846 miles. It is the only satellite visible to the naked eye, although on rarely clear nights the polka-dotted Explorer IX can be seen.

Sir Echo should stay up another year or more to remind viewers the world over of the possibilities of peaceful use of space. It was the first successful effort, although crude at the time, at bouncing television and radio signals over great distances.

[From the Los Angeles Herald Express, Aug. 26, 1961]

OVERREGULATION

America's unprecedented and unmatched industrial accomplishments were made possible by the free enterprise system.

The Kennedy administration, therefore, used good sense in deciding to let private enterprise own and operate a future global radio communication satellite system.

However, it is not premature, even in this early stage of development, to sound a warning against overregulation by Government. The President already has indicated limitations and restrictions on the operation of the satellite system.

We know from sad experience what happens when the heavy hand of bureaucracy falls on any industry. For example, look at what a heck of a mess our overregulated railroads are in today.

Memorial Services in Honor of the Late Judge Abraham E. Pinanski

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for years, one of the ablest and most highly respected jurists of the United States was the late Honorable Abraham E. Pinanski, who served as associate justice of the superior court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for about 20 years, being appointed January 29, 1930, and serving in an outstanding manner until his death on October 5, 1949.

For many years prior to his death there existed a close friendship between the late Judge Pinanski and myself, a friendship I greatly valued.

On September 16, 1961, at a special session of the superior court—the great trial court of Massachusetts—at the courthouse, Dedham, Mass., memorial observances were held and conducted in honor of the memory of the late Judge Abraham E. Pinanski.

On that occasion, the memorial address was delivered by Mr. Benjamin A. Trustman, which address I include in my remarks.

The late Justice Pinanski was not only a brilliant lawyer and judge, but he was a great American, and more, he was a good man, broad and understanding in relation to his fellow man, possessed of nobility of character that was an inspiration to others to lead a better life, and taking an active interest in all activities that were beneficial to mankind:

REMARKS OF BENJAMIN A. TRUSTMAN, ESQ. AT MEMORIAL IN HONOR OF LATE JUDGE ABRAHAM E. PINANSKI

(Memorial observance at special session of the superior court at Dedham, Mass., on Saturday, September 16, 1961)

May it please the court: We are met here today to honor once again a good man. We are met not in the immediate aftermath of the tragedy of his passing, in a moment torn with grief at our great loss. Rather are we met after the lapse of 12 years has given us a perspective against which, in quiet and perceptive reflection, we may reevaluate our early appraisal. And measured against the passage of time, in such a framework, we find our early appraisal reaffirmed.

Since most of those present today knew Judge Pinanski so well, I shall take but a moment to sketch a few bare biographical facts.

He was born in east Boston on July 9, 1887, the son of Nathan Pinanski, a pioneer leader of the Boston Jewish Community. In 1904 he was graduated from Boston English High School. At Harvard College he completed his work in 3 years, but graduated with the class of 1908. In 1910 he was graduated from the Harvard Law School. He joined the legal department of the Boston Elevated Railway Co. where, as an assistant general counsel, he acquired substantial trial experience. In 1913 he established a law firm with George E. Morris, Esq.

During World War I he was a captain in the ordnance department of the Army and after his discharge he was counsel to, and a member of, the Boston district claims board of the War Department. In 1921 he formed the new law firm of McConnell, Pinanski & Morris. He spent most of his time in the trial of cases and was elevated to the superior court bench by Gov. Frank G. Allen, on January 29, 1930. In his 19 years as an associate justice of the superior court he sat on many important cases. He died on October 5, 1949, at 62 after an illness of several weeks.

I knew Judge Pinanski for the last 25 years of his life—not as long, perhaps, as many here present, but as intimately, perhaps more intimately—than most who were not members of his family. I knew him throughout his prime, when he was approaching the full flowering of his tragically shortened life. He was 15 years older than I—a period short enough to permit substantial intimacy but long enough to make him a senior entitled to, and receiving, the admiration, respect,

and affection of a grateful junior to whom he taught much.

I worked with Judge Pinanski, talked, and walked with him, on countless occasions over the years. I think I came to know him as he truly was—a fine lawyer, an outstanding judge and a tireless—almost avid—worker for his fellow man and for his community—an exemplary human being in the finest conception of man's role on earth. This was no accident. He had inherited from his parents a predisposition to philanthropy and good works.

He talked constantly of public service and its importance to the character of the server. This was religion with him, and the practiced what he preached.

Time will not permit a listing of all his affiliations, but a few of the most important must be mentioned in order to have some appreciation and reminder of the distinction of the offices he held and his position in the general community.

He was a vice president of the Associated Jewish Philanthropies and had been a director of the Federated Jewish Charities which preceded it. He was vice president and chairman of the executive committee of the Beth Israel Hospital; president of the Jewish Child Welfare Society; president of the Hebrew Free Loan Society (which his father founded); president of the board of trustees of the Boston Public Library, trustee of the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital and of Boston University, of Temple Israel and of Congregation Adath Jeshurun. He was a member of the executive committee and cofounder of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, a member of the board of managers and chairman of the appointment committee of the Boston Dispensary. He was a member of the councils of the Boston Bar Association, Massachusetts Bar Association and Harvard Law School Association.

I have never met any one more busily occupied in the interest of his community and his fellow man, or with such an intense fervor and restless zeal. He gave unstintingly of himself; his sincerity, loyalty, and devotion were never less than whole. We could never understand how he found the time to attend all the meetings of all these organizations. I well remember him running to a meeting at court recess at 1, runing back to court at 2 and to another meeting on the same day at 4, and perhaps another at 8. He was a man of driving and tenacious energy and a passionate advocate of all causes he espoused. Gifted with an active, fertile mind and a talent for oral and written articulation, he conveyed to others his own tremendous enthusiasms and dynamism. He combined rare qualities of heart and mind and spirit. He joined leadership in his chosen profession with a deep sense of community responsibility.

To the law and to the bench and to his many public and philanthropic affiliations, he brought to bear a penetrating intellect, enthusiasm, energy, and vitality until illness struck him.

There was nothing taciturn, reserved, or shy about Judge Pinanski. He was an extrovert who loved not merely doing things for his fellow man but with his fellow man. He loved people. He had a certain magnetism which caused others to follow his lead. He was a gracious and charming companion. Though intensely serious and tightly wired, he had at the same time a delightful sense of humor, and constantly admonished others to maintain a sense of proportion and not to take themselves too seriously.

He had a refined sense of values and of the fitness of things, and to him only the ethical and honorable way was the correct way. He abhorred pomposity and false pride and pretense.

As a lawyer and judge he was a stickler for detail. He probed into obscure recesses of the law. He had an intellectual curiosity and was fascinated with new problems and new solutions. From his years as a trier of cases and his experience as a judge, he became keenly interested in medico-legal problems and wrote and lectured much to improve legal and judicial practices. He was a cofounder of our pretrial procedures. He was in the forefront of the constant battle against judicial delays. He was a wise counselor, and on the bench he was blessed with a calm, equable and considerate temperament. His warmth and generous spirit communicated themselves to other members of the bar, his colleagues on the bench, witnesses and jurors in the courtroom, and coworkers in his philanthropic causes. He earned the affection and respect of all who had contact with him.

He had a strong sense of family loyalty and was devoted to his dear wife, daughters, sisters and brother.

Too often notoriety outlives fame; too often do we remember our worst citizens longer than our best ones. It is right that we should have this occasion to think again of this good and kind man and of his contributions to this community and our great debt to him. To borrow a phrase, he was the very model of a lawyer, judge, citizen, husband, and father. He made emulation difficult. He lived a rich and useful live, pathetically cut too short. His public service will be his monument.

We may perhaps find some comfort in a passage from Longfellow:

"There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian
Whose portal we call death."

I should like to believe that Judge Pinanski is still serving with his energy and enthusiasm in the hereafter.

Dr. Vladimir Fabry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic air crash in which the world lost the life of Dag Hammarskjold, we also suffered the loss of the life of Dr. Vladimir Fabry, the legal adviser to the United Nations operations in the Congo.

In the following statement by John C. Sciranka, a prominent American Slovak journalist, many of Dr. Fabry's and his esteemed father's attributes and good deeds are described. Dr. Fabry's death is a great loss not only for all Slovak's, but for the whole free world.

Mr. Sciranka's statement follows:

Governor Fabry (Dr. Fabry's father) was born in Turciansky sv. Martin, known as the cultural center of Slovakia. The Communists dropped the prefix svaty (saint) and call the city only Martin.

The late assistant to Secretary General Hammarskjold, Dr. Vladimir Fabry, inherited his legal talents from his father who studied law in the law school at Banska Stavnica, Budapest, and Berlin. The old Governor before the creation of Czechoslovakia fought for the rights of the Slovak nation during the Austro-Hungarian regime and was imprisoned on several occasions. His first experience as an agitator for Slovak independence proved costly during his student days when he was arrested for advocating freedom for his nation. Later the military officials arrested him on August 7, 1914, for advocating a higher institute of education for the Slovakian youth in Moravia. This act kept him away from the front and held him back as clerk of the Bratislava court.

He was well equipped to aid the founders of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia, which was created on American soil under the guidance and aid of the late President Woodrow Wilson. After the creation of the new republic he was made Governor (zupan) of the County of Saris, from which came the first Slovak pioneers to this city and county. Here he was confronted with the notorious Communist, Bela Kun, who made desperate efforts to get control of Czechoslovakia. This successful career of elder Governor Fabry was followed by elevation as federal commissioner of the city of Kosice in eastern Slovakia.

But soon he resigned this post and opened a law office in Bratislava, with a branch office in Paris and Switzerland. The Governor's experience at the international court gave a good start to his son Vladimir, who followed in the footsteps of his father. During World War II the elder Fabry was imprisoned by the Nazi regime and young Vladimir was an underground resistance fighter.

Dr. Vladimir Fabry, 40-year-old legal adviser to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold with the United Nations operation in Congo, who perished in the air tragedy, was born in Liptovsky Svaty Mikulas Slovakia. He received his doctor's degree in law and political science from the Slovak university in Bratislava in 1942 and was admitted to the bar the following year. He was called to the United Nations Secretariat in 1946 by his famous countryman and statesman, Dr. Ivan Kerno, who died last winter in New York City after a successful career as international lawyer and diplomat and who served with the United Nations since its inception. Dr. Vladimar Fabry helped to organize postwar Czechoslovakia. His family left the country after the Communist putsch in February 1948. His sister Olga is also in the service of United Nations in New York City. His father, the former Governor, died during a visit in Berlin before his 70th birthday, which the family was planning to celebrate on January 14, 1961, in Geneva.

Before going to the Congo in February, Dr. Fabry had been for a year and a half the legal and political adviser with the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. In 1948 he was appointed legal officer with the Security Council's Good Offices Committee on the Indonesian question. He later helped prepare legal studies for a Jordan Valley development proposal. He also participated in the organization of the International Atomic Energy Agency. After serving with the staff that conducted the United Nations Togaland plebiscite in 1956, he was detailed to the Suez Canal clearance operation, winning a commendation for his service.

Dr. Vladimir Fabry became a U.S. citizen 2 years ago. He was proud of his Slovak heritage, considering the fact that his father served his clerkship with such famous Slovak statesmen as Paul Mudron, Andrew Halasa, Jan Vanovic, and Jan Rumann, who played important roles in modern Slovak history.

American Slovaks mourn his tragic death and they find consolation only in the fact that he worked with, had the fullest confidence in, and died for the preservation of world peace and democracy with such great a leader as the late Dag Hammarskjold.

Prizewinners of Nationwide Essay Contest Sponsored by Post Office Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the United Federation of Post Office Clerks, AFL–CIO, this year conducted for the first time a national essay contest open to all post office clerks across the Nation on the subject of What's Right With a Career in the Postal Service.

As President E. C. Hallbeck of the large Government union pointed out in announcing the unusual contest, it is human to gripe—and everyone knows about the things we do not like in our work. But here, he said, was a chance to accentuate the positive; a chance to examine the plus side of our jobs in Government; to help explain why so many thousands of men and women find rewards in a career of public service.

Such a contest also gives us as legislators valuable and unique guidance in terms of better understanding of the grassroots reasons that motivate so many Federal employees in devoting years of fruitful labor to the public weal. Such a contest, I would think, provides the Government itself with ideas of direct benefit to recruitment programing.

It is with this latter thought especially in mind that I am happy to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of several of the prize-winning essays which were selected from among more than 600 entries by a panel of three eminent judges all well-qualified for their demanding task through their knowledge of Government activities. The judges were Jerry Kluttz, who writes the Federal Diary for the Washington Post and the nationally circulated Jerry Kluttz Newsletter on Federal Activities; Joe Young, editor of the Federal Spotlight in the Washington Star and publisher of the Federal Employees News Digest and Annual Almanac, and John Cramer, Federal columnist of the Washington News whose column is also syndicated nationally.

These judges all agreed that first prize should be awarded to a young Chinese-American post office clerk in my home State: Mr. Robert David Wong, 26 years old, of 1405 Fourth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., a member of local 2 of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, who has been a clerk only 3½ years. Mr. Wong's prize consisted of an all-expenses-paid trip to Washington which ended only this week. During his visit here he was received by Postmaster General J. Edward Day and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission John Macy, who both personally congratulated him on his success. He was also the guest of honor at a dinner sponsored by the Air Mail Committee of the National Air Transport Association headed by John Hart of Chicago. Mr. Wong's entry was not only deemed best in its substance but also by virtue of its artistic presentation in illuminated script—something that is nearly a lost art.

Here, then, is the text of the prize-winning essay:

TO DO MY BEST TO BE A GOOD AND USEFUL CITIZEN—TO SERVE MY FELLOW MAN

It is not the thought of being a public servant in a Government postal installation as much as it is the chance and privilege of serving others through my job as a postal clerk.

It is the knowledge that what I am doing is essential to the happiness and well-being of my community and my Nation—for to millions, joy is imparted each day through letters they received from friends and from loved ones who wrote a thought, and in faith, placed a postage stamp on an envelope—which eventually passed through my hands and on its way.

It is the assurance that these letters will reach their destination; for somewhere, a letter of my own is intermingled within millions of parts of machinery and of human hands—and I am confident that this combination of automation and the untiring efforts of the human heart—working together—will bring the mail to its goal.

It is the way of life that I have chosen for mine own. As the privilege of voting is inseparable from a democratic government, so also is my indisputable right to voice my thoughts through my postal union, and through its legislations, better my working conditions, benefit from health and sickness insurance plans, receive reasonable living wages, as well as representation that will continually seek to further my welfare while I am serving the public.

It is a warm feeling to know that as a postal clerk, I am doing my duty well, and through faithfulness excel. In giving a part of myself, I am doing the best I can. I am being a good and useful citizen—I am serving my fellow man.

The second and third prizes, involving cash awards, went to Richard A. Hartman of 300 Baer Street, Hanover, Pa., a member of local 3285, and to John Held of 1128 West Staver Street, Freeport, Ill., a member of local 117. The texts of their essays follow:

Dedication, loyalty, education, security, purpose. Are these your goals in life?

Dedicate yourself to a life of service to your country and to others. Give your loyalty and your talents to a service which has no equal—a service which like no other personally touches and affects everyone—a service created for no individual or group but for all, the rich and the poor, the farmer and the city dweller, the young and the old—a service which knows no race, creed or nationality—your postal service.

Rejoice in the realization that friends and relations separated by distance are closer through your efforts. Share in the glad tidings you speed on their way.

Take pride in the fact that you are an integral part of a vast and complex system upon which the very economy of our great Nation is dependent, that your every duty is part of a well-organized production and the actors are efficient and conscientious workers devoted to their chosen careers.

Be selfish, if you wish, in your reasons for wanting this work. The rewards are many.

Education need not stop when school is out. That little town in a distant State, which is mentioned in today's news, is no longer unknown. The city is no longer just a spot on a map. Each piece of mail represents a warm and familiar place which is home to someone like you and which is as close as the separation in your case or the pouch on the rack.

Travel with a little imagination along with each letter from coast to coast and border to border, even to strange and exotic lands.

Cherish the security and peace of mind for which everyone strives. Good pay, vacation, holidays, insurance, and sick benefits are your further rewards.

And when you near the end of the journey, enjoy your retirement and give thanks to God for the guidance and the opportunity for the true and complete fulfillment of purpose which was yours as a public servant in the postal service of the United States of America.

I am the heartbeat of America. I pump business through the arteries of commerce and industry. I bring solace and cheer and news to the veins of each throbbing community.

I carry the great metropolitan dailies, small town weeklies, orders for thousands of dollars, magazines, soap and toothpaste samples; haul tons of advertising, invoices, and bills. I start parcels, news, and pictures to farflung ports and villages all over the world.

I ride the superjets, single engines and 'copters; trains, trucks, and horseback, too. I follow the malemutes in Alaska, ride bateaus in Louisiana bayous; go by pack animal, snow shoe, mailboat and by foot. My speed comes from monster machines, missiles, Metro and the hands, eyes, and feet of humans.

I am big and sprawling—the world's largest business. I spawned a great union in the 1900's; nursed them on breasts of adversity, weaned them on political hacks and cradled them because they had my welfare at heart. I have been hard on them but they love me for what I stand for.

I am a part of history. I brought sorrowful news from St. Joe to Sacramento in 1865; carried word of safety and great need from the 1906 San Francisco earthquake; of hope in the 1849 gold rush.

I was in the second wave at Normandy, Iwo Jima, and Omaha beachhead. I was at Chateau Thierry and Missionary Ridge, too.

I am famous for "Greetings", "Dear John", and "Dad, send money." I am the bearer of sad tidings of death and suffering; the joy of weddings, births, and promotions. I run the gamut of pathos and emotion. I am the harbinger of all events.

I am manmade but greater than any man. I am a public trust and all connected with me are trustees for the public. (As a postal clerk I am proud to be a part of this great heritage aided by a great union, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.) A service to all Americans upon which no price can ever be placed. I serve America.

Yes, I am big and great and intangible. The heartbeat of a great nation. I am the postal service.

The Silly Civil Rights Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Civil Rights Commission that literacy tests, as a prerequisite to voting, be abolished is so ridiculous that it borders on insanity. Hon. James H. Gray, publisher of the Albany Herald,

Albany, Ga., in a short editorial appearing in that paper on September 20, 1961, shows, in a masterful way, how dangerous the proposal is.

The editorial is as follows:

THE SILLY CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSAL

The wild-eyed do-goodism in which the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is prone to engage was never better exemplified than in its harebrained proposal that literacy tests, as a prerequisite to voting, be abolished nationwide by congressional dictum. The Commission argues that these tests have been grossly abused in the South and employed as a means of disfranchising Negroes, including many who are literate and otherwise thoroughly qualified to vote. But, in its fuzzy-mindedness, the Commission completely overlooks the fact that if conditions such as they describe exist anywhere, the fault is not of the law itself, but of a maladministration of the law.

Also overlooked is the fact that, in reserving to the States the right to establish their own voting requirements, the Constitution of the United States recognizes that limits can reasonably be placed on universal suffrage. By the courts, as well as by the people, literacy is universally recognized as such a requirement. This thinking was stressed heavily by Thomas Jefferson and others of our Founding Fathers in their private writings on the shaping of this Republic's organic law. Their arguments, although not directed specifically to the proposition of a minimal standard of literacy, stressed the heavy responsibility resting upon the electorate to choose judiciously. Thus it becomes apparent to thinking men that to sweep away this single standard completely would be to dilute further the responsibilities bearing upon the individual citizen.

Because of this problem, the challenge, then, is not to abandon the reasonable qualifications which bear directly on an individual's ability to know what he is voting for, but to deny enfranchisement to the uniformed and the venal lest we weaken seriously the fabric of democracy.

That is why the Civil Rights Commission's proposal is downright silly.

Atomic Power Becomes Competitive in Peaceful Use of Atom Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the Soviet Union continues its series of nuclear bomb explosions and contamination of the atmosphere throughout the world with radioactive fallout, the United States pushes forth in its endeavors for peaceful use of nuclear power. One example is the Yankee Atomic Electric Co., in Rowe, Mass., a pioneer in marking a new trail toward more dependable and less costly power. Under unanimous consent I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield Daily News of September 22, 1961 concerning the fifth anniversary of the first contract signed by the Atomic Energy Commission, under its power demonstration reactor program, with Yankee Atomic Electric Co.:

ATOM POWER BECOMES COMPETITIVE

Only 5 years ago, Yankee Atomic Electric Co. signed the first contract with the Atomic Energy Commission under its power demonstration reactor program, under which the Government agreed to underwrite up to $5 million of the cost of research and development, and waive interest charges on the nuclear fuel for 5 years.

However, the financing was arranged by the 10 sponsoring companies, including the Western Massachusetts Electric Co. These firms purchased $20 million in common stock, and arranged for as much as $37 million from banks and insurance companies. The president of Yankee Atomic said: "We felt that here was a job for private enterprise and industry, not the Government." The plant constructed at Rowe became the third full-size power reactor to go into operation in this country, and is now pouring its kilowatts into the New England lines.

Yankee Atomic never claimed that it would be possible to produce power at Rowe cheaper by atom than by coal. In fact, their engineers estimated a cost of 12 to 14 mills per kilowatt hour, compared to a cost of less than 9 mills for fuel-produced electricity at the same site. However, only operating experience can determine the final cost, and there are variables which may benefit the Rowe comparisons. Coal prices can be expected to continue rising, and transportation costs (already representing 75 percent of the price of coal delivered to the West Springfield powerplant) are also likely to increase. On the other hand, the price of nuclear fuel may well decline as production and competition increase. Yankee Atomic will help to provide the answer to the question: How long will it be before the declining price of nuclear power falls below the rising cost of fuel-produced power?

It may be sooner than had been predicted. The Pacific Gas and Electric Co. has just announced that it will construct an atomic powerplant with about twice the capacity of the Rowe plant. It will be erected 50 miles north of San Francisco at a cost of $61 million, and will be unsubsidized and taxpaying. The engineers estimate that it will produce electricity for less than 6 mills per kilowatt hour, a cost competitive with a conventional steamplant in that area.

Yankee Atomic is a pioneer, marking a new trail toward more dependable and less costly power.

Congressman John F. Shelley Delivers General Pulaski Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD, and commend to the attention of the membership of this body, an address delivered by the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, on the occasion of ceremonies honoring the great Gen. Casimir Pulaski, held in San Francisco, Calif.

The address of the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, follows:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN F. SHELLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, DELIVERS GENERAL PULASKI ADDRESS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, friends, I am deeply honored at your invitation to come and share with you these ceremonies honoring the great Gen. Casimir Pulaski, fighter for the freedom of Poland, and martyr to the cause of American liberty and independence.

You are performing a great and most important service in honoring the memory of this gallant patriot.

Any people, or any nation, failing to look back in gratitude and respect to its outstanding figures, will slowly but surely lose sight of the purposes and ideals which brought it into being.

It is altogether fitting and proper that in these ominous days, when tyranny sits astride vast continents on either side of the United States, we should turn our eyes again to the lives of the freedom fighters of the past.

By pondering their example, studying their motivation, we shall discover how a brave people may not only find the secret of survival, but the secret also of victory, in the face of apparently hopeless odds.

Today the God-fearing people of valliant Poland are subjected to the rule of Communist tyranny. And today, the shadow of that rule leaps across the world every time the ranting, fist-banging dictator, Khrushchev, disapproves of the policies of the free world as expressed in the United Nations.

Tyranny cannot tolerate free expression by free men. Particularly is this true of Communist tyranny. And nowhere in the world is Communist ruthlessness more evident than in the nations which have fallen into its grip.

Today the world sees a collossal and monstrous mockery. Communist spokesmen cry out in protest against what they call imperialism.

They denounce what they call colonialism.

But in all modern history, has any power been as relentlessly and as ruthlessly imperialistic?

Has the world ever seen more land grabbing tactics than the Soviet Union and Communist China practice against their weaker neighbors?

Who are today's most ruthless imperialists?

Who are today's most brutal colonizers?

Look at the map of Europe. See there what the imperialistic Soviet has done to Poland, to Czechoslovakia, to Hungary, to the nations of the Baltic and the Balkans.

By every vicious and unprincipled device of penetration the Communists destroyed the capacity of their neighbor nations to govern themselves.

By treachery, subversion, deceit, by naked force, the Communists have seized power over every land and people within their reach.

Let those people attempt to cast off their shackles and the Red army mercilessly crushes the uprising of free men, unarmed, but gallantly and heroically struggling for their freedom.

At the very time while the Communist diplomats and propagandists cry colonialism and attempt to point the finger of guilt at the nations of the Western World, they intensify their grip on their own satellites, their own colonies.

We may have thought that tyranny walked the earth in the 18th century when Poland was so brutally mistreated, and when her gallant sons like Casimir Pulaski fought the tyranny of his day.

We may have thought that we had seen a ruthless colonialism when the power of Britain was unleashed against the struggling American colonists.

Our fight then was a fight to cast off the shackles of Britain; a fight to burst free from the confinement of colonial status. That glorious revolution blazed up like a flame in the night to catch the eye and

kindle the hearts of all those who despise tyranny and cherish freedom.

That was the issue and that the challenge which brought Count Pulaski to America and caused him to join the American forces in their life and death struggle for independence.

So great were the talents, the abilities, and the dedication that Pulaski brought to the American cause that he was made a general in our forces, and fought the good fight until he fell in battle—not in his native Poland—but here in the United States of America.

We know today that the fight of Pulaski in Poland, just as the battles of Pulaski in the United States, were fought against the same enemy: An overbearing, powerful tyranny. To the mind of General Pulaski the cause of human freedom was the highest cause in which a man could freely risk everything, including life itself.

Whether the victims of tyranny were his own people of Poland, or whether they were his admiring and cherished friends here in the United States, Pulaski's great heart leaped to the defense of the weak against the tyrannical strong; the oppressed against their oppressors.

But, did any tyranny he ever knew reach the depts of cruelty and of evil reached today by communism?

The world will not and must not ever forget the barbaric massacre of the flower of the Polish military at Katyn Forest.

The world will not and must not forget the cynical cruelty with which the Red Army abandoned the Warsaw uprising to the merciless vengeance of the Nazis.

The deep and grievous wounds inflicted on Poland must not blind any of us to the truth of the fact that the atrocities were repeated in every part of the world, and upon every free people thrust or drawn into the Communist orbit.

Count Pulaski recognized here in the United States the same essential tyranny he had fought in Poland.

You and I, today, must recognize that the same tryanny which seized Poland is not the Polish enemy alone but the enemy of free men, whoever, whatever, and wherever they may be.

In a struggle of this kind—the long and wearying struggle of free people to remain free, and of subjugated people to regain their lost freedom—a resort to arms is the last and most desperate tactic to be used.

Instead, what faces us—you and me and millions like us throughout the world—is a struggle of the heart, of the mind, and of the will.

Tyranny today occasionally wears an affable smile; it walks like a tourist through supermarkets; it speaks to us from our finest hotels; it uses every possible technique of deceit to lull us to sleep.

Communism speaks the language of deception from the multiple tongues of its agents. Krushchev baas like a lamb, pleading that he doesn't want war. He wants coexistence and the peaceful competition of trade.

The other side of the Communist coin, Mao Tse-tung, startles the world by his apparent readiness to accept nuclear warfare with all of its horrors in order to rivet the iron collar of communism on the neck of humanity.

But what Khrushchev is talking about is not peaceful trade competition as we know it.

He is simply attempting again to disarm the West, materially and spiritually, while he directs the economy of the entire Communist empire in channels that will prove ruinous to the merchants of the free world.

Khrushchev loundly argues for disarmament and for an end to the testing of nuclear weapons, but at the very time he argues for such disarmanent, he refuses to sign or accept enforceable guarantees of inspection.

He is perfectly agreeable to having the free world actually disarm in exchange for a Soviet promise that they will do the same thing.

When the free world insists that such disarmament should be enforced by inspection teams, Khrushchev rebels at the suggestion.

Modern history is littered with the broken promises and the treaties solemnly signed and cynically violated by the Communists.

We must never, under any circumstances, permit ourselves to be either deceived or disarmed by the tactics of Mr. Khrushchev, or his successors.

The blunt fact is that communism is atheism. There is no law in that system above the wish of the tyrant.

Wherever the protection of the moral law is taken away from the individual he stands helpless and lonely before the massive power of the tyrant.

For example, if there is no God, as the Communists preach, and if the moral law against murder has no validity, what is to prevent the tyranny from starving the Russian Kulaks, or massacring the Polish officers in the deep recesses of Katyn Forest?

If the moral law has no meaning, what is to prevent the Communist tyrants from using individuals and whole peoples in any way they may please?

If the moral law has no validity, and is not binding on the Communists, why should they not sign thousands of agreements? Why should they not give their solemn word to any agreements which they fully intend to violate and break at their own convenience?

Here is the system that has made a mockery and a caricature of the conception of charity. For the Communists parade up and down the continents of the world, seeking out human misery and falsely claiming that they will extend the hand of charity and help to the victims of economic distress.

But, wherever they have gone they have made distress even deeper. They have made misery even more hopeless. They have rendered every patriotic impulse toward freedom a crime of treason, punishable by death, in the Communist system.

This knowledge is a grevious burden which free men everywhere must bear with patience and courage.

There is no quick answer to this. There is no single answer to it.

People like you and me must live with this evil thing * * * must be ever vigilant if we are to save not only ourselves, but our children and our grandchildren from this monstrous tyranny.

It is true that in these blessed United States of America, founded upon the blood and heroism of gallant and courageous men like Casimir Pulaski, we do not have the absolutely perfect society.

But what we have, thank God, under our Constitution, is the ability of free men to govern themselves.

We have the power, with our political freedom, to move against the things that may be wrong with our society. And with each succeeding year we move ever closer to achieving the American dream.

With each succeeding year we open wide the horizons of social justice. We expand the area of civil rights. We attempt to make life better for everyone, every woman, every child in our country.

Out of our abundance we attempt, at least, to lift the burdens under which others are struggling. We attempt to share what we have with those who have not.

We do not claim to be perfect. We do not claim to be in agreement with each other. That is not the way of a free society.

You and I in this blessed land are completely free to disagree with each other about the direction of our public affairs. We do not think there is room in this country for a governing class to impose its will upon the rest of us.

The sacrifices of Pulaski and of others like him were to fashion on this continent an independent nation where men have all the privileges, but also all the difficulties, the dangers, and even the disappointments characteristic of a free society.

The Communist system believes, with its pride and arrogance, that it has the final answer, and the only answer to human government.

We have the humility of free, honest men. We know what the answer should be, and we hope and work and pray that through the individual effort of all of us we can by degrees improve ourselves and improve our society.

We proclaim the American way to the rest of the world, not because we have achieved perfection, but rather because we know that within the American way, there are the mechanics, the instruments, and the techniques of achieving the pursuit of happiness.

In this land we have no natural enemies as the Communists do. We do not attempt to arouse class against class in a constant fratricidal war.

Where the Communists raise the clenched fist of hostility, we attempt to extend the open hand of friendship.

Every tradition we have, and the spirit that moves through all of our laws is one of profound respect for the individual human person.

In the Communist system, you and your children, as I and mine, are of no significance. We are simply units of energy, deprived of a will of our own, deprived of conceiving our own goals in life.

We would be completely the intellectual, economic, psychological slaves of the state.

Is that to be the end of the Nation founded upon the vision and courage and sacrifice of a Pulaski, a Washington, a Lafayette, a Steuben?

Here in the United States, we have proclaimed the dignity and the rights of every man. To that end, we work from generation to generation, making progress slowly, perhaps, but steadily, constantly, certain that one day we shall achieve our goal.

We have drawn from every land under heaven good and decent people who have brought here the finest traditions and highest culture of lands of their national origin.

All have contributed to the happiness, the welfare, the moral tone of our country, and all have helped keep ours what she has always been: The land of promise.

For every renowned figure like Pulaski, there have come thousands upon thousands of others unknown to fame.

But here they have established their homes and reared their families.

Here they have taught their children the lessons of God-fearing and decent people. Here they have built into every community that sense of self-respect and fairplay and respect for others which make this country what she is today.

Our ideals are to help, not to hurt other peoples and other nations. The turning wheel of history has made us the arsenal of the free world.

Let this never be an arsenal simply of material weapons alone; of tanks and bombs and bayonets alone.

May we help make sure the arsenal of freedom is in the highest and noblest sense of the term: A place where the wavering and the doubtful and the exhausted may come for that spiritual renewal that will help them maintain their own will to resist tyranny in all its lying and treacherous promises.

We are engaged in a warfare of the spirit and the mind and the stakes in that war are total mastery over the bodies and souls of men.

We must not fail.

We shall not fail.

The sacrifices we are called upon to make for the cause are small indeed compared to what Pulaski offered and what Pulaski gave to the cause of American freedom and American independence.

I am honored indeed, to share this observance with you and to pay my respects to that great Polish-American patriot, Casimir Pulaski.

Let us hope that in years to come, many years after you and I have passed on, our children will still assemble here under the free and open American sky to look back with gratitude and respect to that great and noble man, and from his life to draw inspiration for their own.

Allotments for Servicemen's Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following detailed explanation and information will be helpful in understanding and submitting the proper documents and application.

An allotment is a sum of money that is deducted in whole or in part from the serviceman's pay and is sent in the form of a check by the Government to the dependent of the serviceman. Since part or all of an allotment is deducted from the serviceman's pay, the Government requires that in accordance with existing rules and regulations the serviceman himself make the application for allotment through his immediate commanding officer.

There are two main types of allotments: One is known as a class E allotment. This allotment consists of a sum of money—amount to be specified by the serviceman—which is deducted from the serviceman's monthly pay and is sent home to any person the serviceman may specify. The total amount received by the person at home is deducted from the serviceman's pay, the Government does not contribute to a class E allotment. Since this is wholly from the serviceman's pay, anyone designated by the serviceman is eligible for the allotment.

The other type of an allotment is known as a class Q allotment. In this type of allotment a certain amount is deducted from the serviceman's pay, and a certain amount is contributed by the Government, according to the number of dependents the serviceman claims and according to his rank.

The following persons are eligible for a class Q allotment:

First. Wife of the serviceman, and the serviceman's children under 18 years of age are automatically eligible. However, when the serviceman makes his application for the allotment through his commanding officer, he should submit a certified copy of his marriage certificate, together with a certified copy of the birth certificates of each of his children under 18 years of age. The serviceman's wife can obtain these copies and send them to her husband to submit with his application for her class Q allotment.

Second. Parents are eligible if the following conditions are met: (a) The serviceman did contribute more than one-half of their income before he entered the service, (b) if new circumstances have arisen since entry into service making parents now dependent for at least one-half of their support. These circumstances include death or illness of the supporting member of the family; (c) if the parents have other children over the age of 18 years, or other relatives living at home, then a notarized affidavit must be prepared by such persons stating why they cannot support, or contribute to the support of the parents; (d) the parents must prove that they are now dependent upon the serviceman for at least 50 percent of their income. The Government will send the parents forms to fill out to prove their dependency immediately upon receipt of an application for the allotment filed by the serviceman.

All papers should identify the serviceman by full name, rank, service serial number, and full military address—this is most important.

The following table gives you the portion the Government contributes and the portion the serviceman contributes in a class Q allotment; you will note that the serviceman's rank determines this:

Serviceman's rank	Amount deducted from pay of serviceman	Total amount paid to dependents and number of dependents		
		1	2	3 or more
Grades E–1, E–2, and E–3	$40	$91.30	$117.10	$136.90
Grades E–4 and E–5	60	137.10	137.10	156.90
Grades E–6, E–7, E–8, and E–9	80	157.10	157.10	176.90

Military enlisted personnel, grades and ranks

Pay grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E–1	Recruit	Seaman recruit	Airman, basic	Private.
E–2	Private	Seaman apprentice	Airman, 3d class	Private, 1st class.
E–3	Private, 1st class	Seaman	Airman, 2d class	Acting corporal; lance corporal.
E–4	Corporal	Petty officer, 3d class	Airman, 1st class	Acting sergeant.
	Specialist, 4th class			Corporal.
E–5	Staff sergeant			Staff sergeant.
	Specialist, 6th class			
	Sergeant	Petty officer, 2d class	Staff sergeant	Acting staff sergeant.
	Specialist, 5th class			Sergeant.
E–6	Platoon sergeant			Gunnery sergeant.
	Sergeant, 1st class			
	Specialist, 7th class			
	Sergeant, 1st class	Petty officer, 1st class	Technical sergeant	Acting gunnery sergeant.
E–7	Master sergeant	Chief petty officer	Master sergeant	Acting master sergeant.
E–8	Master sergeant	Senior chief petty officer	Senior master sergeant	First sergeant.
	1st sergeant			Master sergeant.
	Specialist, 8th class			
E–9	Sergeant major	Master chief petty officer	Chief master sergeant	Sergeant major.
	Specialist, 9th class			Master gunnery sergeant.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement by one of our great engineers, formerly with the Army Engineers, the men who have done the biggest and best construction jobs not only in this country, but all over the world. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of Col. G. M. Dorland, who has been and is working with the Governors of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and the great group of men from Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee. I wish we had space to list all of these great men who have done such a grand job, not only for these three States, but for the Nation and the world. The man who was first appointed to represent us in Alabama and who still holds this position is the Honorable Bill Drinkard, whom I have known all of his life, and he and the other fine men from Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee, have done a superhuman job and the work they are doing will go down in history. I wish I had the many speeches that I have heard from the former Chief of Engineers, Gen. Lewis Pick, who built the Burma Road, developed the great Missouri River and projects all over this earth. I wish all of the people could have been with me when the great present Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, made speeches all over this land, not only about this project, but projects from the east, west, north, and south, not only the Tennessee-Tombigbee, but the Alabama-Coosa, the Warrior-Tombigbee, the Chattahoochee and just all of the great rivers of this great Nation. Mr. Speaker, when this project, the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is completed, we will have a direct route from Sioux City, Iowa, right on down to Cairo, Ill., and on through that great and rich country through all of those States to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest undeveloped project on this earth—something that should have been done a 100 years ago, but I believe now with all of my heart that we will get this project that was described so wonderfully well by Col. G. M. Dorland in his speech here in Washington several weeks ago, which reads as follows:

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY PROJECT

(Address by Col. G. M. Dorland)

During recent weeks national attention has been focused on the transporting of America's Saturn space booster from the Huntsville, Ala., Arsenal to the launching base at Cape Canaveral, Fla. This feat made important news headlines because the booster's tremendous size made it impossible to transport any other way except by water. Mounted on a barge especially built to carry the load, the giant booster was carried some 2,200 miles over inland waterways down the Mississippi into the gulf and around the tip of Florida to its destination.

I call your attention to this event not only to point up the importance of an inland waterway system, but to emphasize the fact that the trip could have been made in half the time by following a more direct course which is not yet available, but which we hope will become a reality in the not too distant future.

I am referring, of course, to the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project, the last major link needed for complete connection of mid-America's great inland waterway system.

This connecting link which we are here to discuss today is considered so important by the States of Alabama, Tennessee, and Mississippi that they have entered into a compact and created the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Authority to devote full time and effort to making this project a reality.

Creation of this authority didn't just happen, but has been the culmination of a dream that was first conceived by the early French settlers.

For more than 150 years, small groups have made efforts from time to time to get the project going, but met with little success other than to keep the idea alive.

Realizing the ineffectiveness of this approach, the States decided to form a compact and combine their efforts. To the States of Alabama, Tennessee and Mississippi, the waterway represents a vital step toward tri-state economic development and their Governors are willing and eager to participate in seeing the project to a successful conclusion.

Here is one of the early meetings with the Corps of Engineers including the former chief Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick and the present chief, Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, who was then district engineer of the Mobile district.

Here are the Governors in a special called meeting to discuss promotion of the project. (Point out names of those in photo, etc.)

This is a photo of former Governors Coleman of Mississippi and Folsom of Alabama at the signing of the compact between Alabama and Mississippi.

Here is Tennessee Gov. Buford Ellington signing the compact for Tennessee.

Here are members of Mississippi Rivers & Harbors Association, authority members, Governor Barnett and the district engineer after attending a recent authority meeting.

These scenes are only an indication of the serious attitude and determination of the States involved. The Governors realize the importance of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project for their States' economic and industrial development and are pledging their full support.

At the authority's January meeting in Nashville, Governor Ellington, of Tennessee said, "The realization of this project will make possible, progress in this region beyond contemplation."

Governor Ross Barnett of Mississippi said "No single navigational project in the Nation would benefit more people than would this waterway."

Governor Patterson, of Alabama praised the project in a message to his legislature and asked for an appropriation to help promote the waterway.

Following the signing of the compact, the authority (which is composed of the Governor and five appointed members from each of the three States) held its first meeting in October 1958, and appointed W. H. Drinkard as secretary-administrator and Glover Wilkins as assistant administrator.

These men are concentrating their every effort toward coordinating the efforts of the tri-States, disseminating information and creating an active interest in the project.

This is an example of the authority's promotion activities. This model of the waterway has been shown throughout the tri-State area in water resources meetings, in State capitols of Tennessee and Alabama and viewed by some 3,000 people at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Associations meeting in St. Louis, as well as at the industrial exposition in Florida.

Interest in the project is not confined to a few highly interested persons, but is widespread among State and local officials as well as the people of all three States.

Here you see three of Mississippi's highway commissioners who took time off from busy schedules just to help dedicate this sign which was the first of a number being erected to mark the future route of the waterway in Mississippi.

WHAT THE PROJECT MEANS TO AMERICA

While this waterway project is of primary importance to the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee, it actually has many more far-reaching benefits. When this connecting link is completed, it will provide deep water transportation facilities, serving 17 midcontinental and Southern States—a system that reaches from Minneapolis to Mobile and from Brownsville, Tex., to St. Marks, Fla., and covers more than 10,000 miles.

You can see from this map that our great rivers in the midcontinent area have been developed and linked by canals so that today they are joined in one vast network. We believe that you will agree that the Tennessee-Tombigbee gap is worthy of serious consideration and will form an important connecting link.

We believe, too, that you will agree that this is not just a local project, which is to benefit a few counties or States, but a project that will benefit all America. Water transportation and commerce over this system of waterways has grown by leaps and bounds in recent years and giant barge tows composed of many units carrying up to 3,000 tons each are moving swiftly and economically throughout the entire system.

It would be difficult to estimate the total overall benefits now being enjoyed by the various States.

However, from the standpoint of the value to the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee, we can envision tremendous additional advantages to be gained by completion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

One of the most promising advantages is the potential development of industry in an expanding area once described by former Chief of Engineers Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, as "the future Ruhr Valley of America."

In the section of northeast Mississippi through which the proposed waterway runs, 116 new industries representing an investment of more than $16 million have already located and 94 more have expanded operations in the past 10 years. These plants now employ 26,775 persons with an annual payroll of $70 million.

Sections along the waterway in Alabama and Tennessee have experienced even greater growth. This has prompted someone to say that where the waterway goes, industry grows.

Therefore, the opening of this waterway link will serve as a major attraction to industry and bring greater employment and increased income to cities and States along its banks.

We hasten to say that the industrial progress referred to has consisted of the creation of new industrial opportunity and not the pirating of industry from other areas.

Needless to say, this influx of new industry represents an important boost to the economy of the areas involved through expanded business, increased payrolls and new employment opportunities. Many of these plants have chosen their location in anticipation of transportation advantages which

will eventually result from the opening of the waterway. Think, therefore, how attractive the area will be to industry when construction work is actually started.

Much of the region along the proposed route has been designated as a depressed area, but the real cause of the depressed condition has been the swift transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy.

Scenes like this have long ceased to be representative of the tristate's economy. Faced with a continuing decline in agriculture the States have turned to industrial development as a means of stabilizing the economy and promoting progress.

Opening of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will not only offer industrial opportunity, but it will prove advantageous in other ways. For example, it will open up a new avenue for the economical distribution of grain from the glutted storehouses of the Midwest to the growing southeastern region where it can be consumed. The chicken industry is already moving westward to areas of Alabama and Mississippi which have proven particularly adapted to cow, calf and pig programs. In fact, the raising of cattle has shown tremendous progress and the weaned calves are being sold to the feeder lots in the Midwest.

Therefore, the surplus grain, which exists in such great quantities could be utilized by the livestock industry in the tristates and thus do much to relieve the surplus storage problem.

RECREATION

In addition to its many economic advantages the waterway will also provide recreation facilities along its banks which will benefit many thousands throughout the area.

Waters like this will attract hundreds of boats and fishermen and the experience of other dams and reservoirs prove that fishing is a popular sport among all classes. Fishermen line the banks day in and day out. Pleasure boats on Cumberland's old Hickory Lake have been estimated to have a value representing more than the total cost of the project.

Those, who just want to swim or relax, find family relaxation on sandy beaches.

And, the duck season attracts an overflowing number of enthusiastic hunters.

Not to be overlooked, of course, are the many other recreational opportunities such as water skiing, speedboating, and just plain picnicking.

Not only do the people have an outlet for family recreation, but the increased business in sporting goods, equipment, food and supplies, transportation, clothing, etc., according to national estimates runs into astronomical figures annually.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Aside from the peacetime benefits the Tennessee-Tombigbee project will offer, it will also provide important advantages in times of national emergency. With the present single route down the Mississippi to the open gulf, sabotage or other enemy action could cut off the midcontinent waterway outlet. However, Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will provide an alternate route as well as a two-way outlet to the gulf.

To paraphrase an old saying "two routes are better than one," and especially so when vital war material must be kept flowing for our national defense.

We, therefore, submit that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is an important link that offers not only an alternate route, but a shorter, more protected intracoastal route that will save time and dollars in case of enemy attack.

WHAT IS THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE PROJECT?

The Tennessee-Tombigbee project is a 150-year-old dream first envisioned by the French settlers and the early frontiersmen as they crossed the Blue Ridge and Cumberland Mountains.

Barring this dream is a hill jutting 569 feet above sea level and dividing the watersheds of the Tennessee and Tombigbee Rivers.

The proposed waterway will provide a slack water channel 9 feet deep with a minimum width of 170 feet stretching 253 miles from Demopolis, Ala., to Pickwick Pool on the Tennessee River and create a canal that will accommodate the size tows now being operated on the Ohio, Tennessee and Upper Mississippi Rivers.

The 168-mile river section will include 4 locks and dams providing a lift from 73 feet at Demopolis to 190 feet at Amory, Miss., and consisting 21 cutoffs for flood control.

The 45-mile canal section will be constructed by excavation and levees on one side of the hill with five locks and dams providing a lift from 190 feet to 330 feet.

A 40-mile divide-cut beginning with the Bay Springs, Miss., lock and dam will provide a lift from 330 feet to 414 feet, thus completing the waterway to Pickwick Pool.

WHAT IS THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT?

It has been said that the Tennessee-Tombigbee project is "the most planned, unconstructed waterway in America."

The Federal Government first recognized the feasibility of this waterway back in 1874 and directed the Corps of Engineers to make a study and estimate the cost. The resulting study was reported to be unfavorable.

Years later in 1938 the economic feasibility of the waterway was again recognized; the project was then approved by the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

In 1946 the project was authorized by Congress, but put into a "deferred action" category by the House Appropriations Committeee. Since that time it has been often reconsidered, restudied, and delayed.

Today a new report released by the Corps of Engineers estimates that more than 12 million tons of freight would move annually over this waterway. We feel that this estimate is conservative considering the fact that traffic over the Tennessee River and the Warrier-Tombigbee Rivers exceeds by 300 percent the original estimate made by the Corps of Engineers. We believe that this precedent will be sustained.

OUR PLEA

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project merits your early consideration and approval so that plans for construction can begin with all possible speed.

We urgently request that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors review the project at its earliest convenience and render a favorable decision. We ask that this be done as soon as possible so that the Bureau of the Budget can include a request in the President's budget for fiscal 1963, which will be presented to Congress in early 1962.

To be specific, gentlemen, we need your early approval; we need $2½ million to start planning for construction; we have lost valuable time in producing a vital asset to our Nation and with your help and support we can get the job underway without further delay.

In behalf of the authority and the States of Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee, I thank you for permitting us to present our story to you here today.

Deferments, Release or Transfer of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker this statement is designed to provide servicemen with a ready reference which may be used as a basis to advise those who have been affected by the Army's current expansion. Army regulations and directives include appropriate criteria and procedural instructions for processing all types of personnel requests and require that the serviceman himself initiate some action. Thus, this statement makes no attempt to state the specific criteria but gives only the category of action, to whom and how the serviceman must apply to receive consideration, and the general considerations involved. It is hoped that this information will assist in answering queries as to how they can proceed to resolve their individual problems in the subject areas covered.

The Army recognizes that the military buildup and tightening of early release, deferment, and other policies will impose some hardships and burdens on many individuals. The actions being taken may result in interruption of studies or careers, husbands and sons will be called away from their homes and families, and serious inconvenience will be caused to many. These hardships will of necessity occur particularly in the present situation when the security needs of the Nation must take precedence in this critical period.

SECTION I

1. Category: Compassionate reassignment.

2. Apply to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward through military channels to the appropriate major commander for final decision. As an exception, military personnel who are assigned overseas but who are in the continental United States on leave may apply directly to the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

3. Considerations:

A. The following general conditions must exist to obtain consideration of a request for compassionate transfer:

1. The problem must be very much more severe than difficulties being experienced by other servicemen.

2. It must involve a member of the serviceman's immediate family (wife, children, father, mother, sister, or brother).

3. Reassignment must be the only possible solution.

4. It must not be a chronic condition but must be capable of resolution or substantial alleviation within a year or less.

B. Applications must be fully documented with evidence which will clearly establish that all the conditions enumerated in A above exist.

C. Mental instability, immaturity, psychoneuroses, climatic allergies, retarded children, problems confronting in-laws, indebtedness, contemplated retirement, and purchase of homes are not normally a basis for reassignment.

SECTION II

1. Category: Deferment from entry on active duty of members of the National Guard and Army Reserve who have received active duty orders.

2. Apply to:

A. Members of National Guard units to unit commander who, if he approves will forward to State adjutant general for final decision.

B. Members of Army Reserve units to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward to corps or Army commander for final decision.

C. Individual reservists not members of units directly to corps commander for final decision.

3. Considerations:

A. The following may be considered as a basis to apply for deferment from entry on active duty:

1. A member pursuing graduate studies on a full-time basis in a field of primary interest to the Army.

2. A member whose entry on active duty will result in extreme personal or community hardship.

B. Reference 2 above. It must be remembered that the involuntary call up of National Guard and Army Reservists will impose hardships on them, their families, and their communities. National Guard and Reserve units have been screened annually to remove from them those individuals who could not be expected to serve on active duty in case of national need. Under the circumstances, it is considered that no individual will qualify for deferment on a personal or community hardship basis unless it can be established that his call to active duty will create problems very much more severe than will be created by the call to active duty of any other member of the Reserve or National Guard.

SECTION III

1. Category: Deferment from oversea assignment.

2. Apply to unit commander who, if he approves, will forward through military channels as follows, for final decision:

A. Thirty days or less, installation commander.

B. Thirty-one to ninety days, Army or comparable major commander.

C. Over 90 days, the Adjutant General, Department of the Army.

3. Considerations:

A. The same general conditions must exist as prescribed for compassionate reassignment and the same documentation is required. See action I, paragraphs 3a and 3b.

B. The increased movement of military personnel overseas and the suspension of movement of dependents to Western Europe require that only the most meritorious cases be considered. Family separations, ordinary pregnancies, and financial difficulties are not in themselves a basis for deferment.

SECTION IV

1. Category: Movement of dependents overseas.

2. Apply to: The serviceman himself on receipt of PCS orders must apply to the oversea commander through military channels for authority for dependents to accompany him to or join with him in his oversea assignment.

3. Considerations:

A. Determination of whether movement of dependents will be authorized is based on:

1. Approval of the oversea commander.

2. Availability of quarters in the command.

3. Availability of transportation and other logistical support such as schools, commissaries, post exchanges, and medical facilities.

4. Operational requirements of the unit and the command.

B. After the oversea commander has authorized the movement of dependents, the transportation terminal commander of the respective Army area will contact the family, provide necessary assistance, and issue movement orders. Under no circumstances should movement to the port commence until a firm port call is received.

C. Government sponsored movement of dependents to Western Europe, except to Berlin, will be suspended on October 9, 1961. Dependents of affected personnel will be moved to designated locations within the United States at Government expense.

SECTION V

1. Category: Early separation from active duty, all components—Regular Army, Reserve, National Guard—on active duty.

2. Apply to:

A. Officers:

1. Regular Army to unit commander who forwards through military channels to Department of the Army for final decision.

2. Other than Regular Army to unit commander who forwards through military channels to major commander, or Department of the Army as appropriate, for final decision.

B. Enlisted personnel: To unit commander, who, if he approves, forwards through military channels to the Army or major oversea commander for final decision, except requests for separation in the national health, safety, or interest, which must be forwarded to the Department of the Army.

3. Considerations:

Early releases from active duty for any reason have been suspended except for those in the best interests of the service. Best interests of the service include those actions in lieu of elimination or court-martial and those cases wherein undue personal or family hardship is established. In this connection, the circumstances must be established as being not only substantially more severe than those experienced by other personnel on active duty but also more severe than those which will be experienced by the individual who would have to be drafted or recalled to active duty from civilian life as his replacement.

SECTION VI

1. Category: Applications for direct commissions.

2. Apply to:

A. Enlisted personnel on active duty to unit commander who will forward through military channels to the Army commander or Department of the Army, as appropriate, for final action.

B. Members of Reserve and National Guard units not on active duty to unit commander who will forward through military channels to appropriate headquarters for final decision.

C. Individual reservists and persons with no military service to Army corps which will provide information, guidance, and necessary forms.

3. Consideration:

A. There are a wide variety of programs through which both Regular and Reserve commissions in the Army may be obtained. The criteria for each varies but in general, applicants must be citizens of the United States, between the ages of 18 and 27, have at least a high school education, and be mentally, morally, and physically qualified.

B. Because of the necessity for careful selection, processing of applications for commissions is time consuming and may be expected to require 3 to 6 months for final action. Thus individuals who have been alerted for active duty, either through the Selective Service System or as a member of the Reserve components cannot expect to apply and be commissioned before they enter on active duty. However, the fact that an applicant enters on active duty as an enlisted person will have no bearing on a pending application for commission. If appointed as an officer, the individual can be ordered to active duty directly from enlisted status.

SECTION VII

1. Category: Recall to active duty of Reserve and National Guard officers.

2. Apply to:

A. Enlisted personnel on active duty who hold Reserve commissions: To unit commander who will forward through military channels to the Department of the Army for final decision.

B. Individuals not on active duty in any status directly to Army Corps for information, administrative processing, assistance, necessary forms, and forwarding to the Department of the Army for final decision.

3. Considerations:

The major need is for the younger company grade officers with limited need for certain field grade specialists. Competition for present vacancies is keen, as the emphasis is on quality rather than quantity. Processing of application will require 60 to 90 days.

SECTION VIII

1. Category: Change of length or date of commencement of active duty tour of commissioned ROTC graduates.

2. Apply to:

A. Students not yet commissioned to professor of military science at the university who will forward to Army commander for final decision.

B. Commissioned and on active duty to unit commander, who, if he approves, will forward through military channels to Department of the Army for final decision.

C. Commissioned, but not yet on active duty will be ordered to active duty as now scheduled unless earlier call is required. Apply directly to Army commander.

3. Considerations:

A. Prior to August 22, 1961, some ROTC graduates were granted 6 months' active duty training tours. Effective August 22 all ROTC graduates were to be ordered to extended active duty for 24 months and those already on 6 months' active duty training tours were extended for 1 year.

B. When individuals accept an ROTC contract, together with the assistance provided by the Army, they agree to serve on active duty for a minimum of 2 years. Thus, it is considered that changes can be justified only for personal or community hardship of an extreme nature.

SECTION X

1. Category: Transfer to the Standby Reserve.

2. Apply to:

A. Members of the National Guard to unit commander who, if he approves will forward to State Adjutant General for final decision. Note: Since National Guard has only Ready Reserve units, if approved, individual will be discharged and automatically transferred to Army Reserve.

B. Members of Army Reserve units to unit commander who if he approves will forward to the corps commander for final decision.

C. Individual members of Ready Reserve not assigned to a unit directly to corps commander.

3. Considerations—General categories which may qualify:

A. Individuals who have completed service and/or Ready Reserve obligation.

1. All Ready Reserve obligations and all enlistments in Ready Reserve components which would have ordinarily expired between October 1, 1961, and June 30, 1962, are automatically extended 1 year. Those members of the 32d Infantry Division, 49th Armored Division, and supporting forces ordered to active duty in October 1961 by Department of the Army message dated September 19, 1961, whose obligations or enlistments expire prior to October 1, 1961, are also extended by 1 year.

2. Because of the various combinations of service which satisfy reserve obligations, individuals in doubt concerning their current status should communicate directly with the corps commander.

B. Those engaged in critical civilian occupations provided they do not possess critical military skills.

C. Those whose mobilization will result in extreme personal or community hardship. See section II, paragraph 3b, for definition.

The John Birch Society: Pros and Cons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the May 19, 1961 issue of Civic Affairs Monthly, a publication of Civic Affairs Associates, Inc., the address of which is 2612 P Street NW., Washington, D.C., an excellent analysis of the pros and cons relative to the John Birch Society. As a member of the society, I am anxious that people have an opportunity to know the strong points of the society as well as its vulnerabilities in order that they may come to an independent evaluation of the society. I, therefore, under unanimous consent include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

To anyone seriously interested in politics and how to be effective in it, an understanding of the John Birch Society can be very useful. The important points to understand are:

1. The conditions which led to its founding.
2. How it operates.
3. The mechanics of "action groups."
4. Strong points of the Birch Society.
5. Vulnerabilities of the Birch Society.
6. Prospects of the Birch Society.
7. Significance to the reader.

CONDITIONS WHICH LED TO FOUNDING OF BIRCH SOCIETY

The most important question of today is whether nations will be organized to promote individual freedom and free enterprise or whether they will be organized under a state-owned and run collectivized system with consequent reduction of the individual's political and economic freedom. On one hand there are those who believe in our American system of individual liberty and free enterprise. On the other, there are those who believe in the Communist system of complete state authority and ownership of economic institutions. On the other hand, also, are those who favor a much larger role for government and are moving in the direction of a collectivized, state-dominated society—not affiliated with the Communist conspiracy.

Everyone is, or should by now be, familiar with the well-organized, purposeful, total effort directed from Moscow and Peiping to bring about world revolution. This effort includes preparation for armed conflict, intelligence activities, propaganda, and the organization of subversive groups of citizens in every non-Communist country. These groups are carefully manipulated, oriented and directed under discipline by trained experts in agitation and propaganda to mobilize opinion on behalf of Communist objectives and in opposition to anti-Communist activities and groups. They work to infiltrate important institutions such as the government, the press, the churches, the schools, trade unions and other key organizations which can serve as vehicles for propaganda and indoctrination. These activities are covert. They are aimed at undermining existing institutions and bringing about the replacement of free government by Communist domination.

Those who believe in a larger role for government, centralization of power in government, and government domination or ownership of industry—but are not affiliated with the Communist conspiracy—generally are inspired by humanitarian ideals and believe that people will be better off under a planned, collectivized system. While they seek greater power for government, they deny that this is at the expense of individual freedom. These groups—riding under the banners of "change," "reform," and "progress"—are idealistic and have great appeal to the "have-nots," the discontended, and people with strong charitable and underdog feelings. They are generally strongly motivated and reasonably well organized.

Those who believe in free enterprise, decentralization of authority, limited government and other traditional American ideas are usually not well organized. Being generally in the category of "haves" (as opposed to "have-nots"), they are content with things the way they are, take it for granted they will stay that way, and devote their time and energies to improving their individual status in the community, economically and socially. Being self-reliant and individualistic, they do not readily organize politically. Being possessed of a certain status, they are cautious and reluctant to become controversial through political activity. Becoming controversial may interfere with their efforts to maintain their economic and social status.

This group tends to restrict its political efforts to giving money to those who will enter the political lists on their behalf.

In recent years, this group has begun to realize that they are losing in a fight to the finish with the collectivists to retain the kind of system under which they have done so well. Conservative and libertarian publications such as National Review and Human Events have acquired followings. Young Americans for Freedom and the Collegate Society of Individualists have been organized and have shown a phenomenal growth. The National Chamber of Commerce has led a drive to get businessmen active in politics with their do-it-yourself action course in practical politics.

Another manifestation of this "awakening of the right" has been the John Birch Society. Robert Welch, former vice president of a Boston candy company, becoming aware of the threat to the way of life traditionally enjoyed in this country, is determined to oppose the forces of the left by building an organization which will systematically fight to keep our system, using the same kind of discipline, agitation-propaganda know-how, and tactics that the collectivists have been using successfully for years.

HOW THE BIRCH SOCIETY OPERATES

Analysis of problem

Robert Welch, the founder and leader of the society, sets forth in his "Blue Book" an analysis of the problem: Collectivism, or socialism, is a contagious cancer characteristic of societies which have passed their peak and are decaying. European nations are already badly infected, and the infection has spread to the United States.

He does not differentiate between communism and domestic collectivism or socialism, but believes they are one and the same, the "liberals" or "leftwingers" being simply Communists in sheeps' clothing—or "Communist dupes."

Welch states that the Communists' goal of world conquest is about two-thirds complete. There is very little time left to turn back the tide.

According to Welch, the Communist takeover of the United States is planned by four methods:

1. Infiltration, subversion and propaganda—a fifth column or Trojan horse.
2. Fomenting civil war in the United States and backing one side.

3. Inducing the gradual surrender of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations while working to get control of the United Nations organization.

4. Completing the transition of America from a free society to a socialist or collectivist one where economic and political institutions will be close enough to communism so that merger will be logical and easy.

Welch also maintains that Communist (including liberal and leftwing) influences are today so strong even within the United States that it is difficult, nearly impossible, to get anti-Communist information into the press and other media of communication.

While it is very late, Welch believes there is still time to save the free world from communism.

Purpose of Birch Society

The purpose of the Birch Society is to awaken the people of America to the threat as seen by Welch and recruit as many as possible of them as members to work together against communism. While the principal area of action is the United States, Welch's purpose is to expand the Birch Society into a virile, anti-Communist movement in other countries that are still free, and possibly even behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Birch Society methods

Welch proposes that the society be militant and adopt the same effective techniques used by Communists and others to agitate and propagandize for their cause.

While the society has no other sanctions available to it than expelling members, Welch would enforce discipline within the membership. This he considers necessary for effective action and as a counterinstrument to anticipated Communist infiltration of the society.

Specifically, Welch lists 10 methods of operation:

1. Establish reading rooms or libraries of anti-Communist literature.

2. Promote and expand radio coverage of conservative commentators.

3. Promote expansion of conservative and anti-Communist publications.

4. Encourage letter writing campaigns to newspapers, Government officials, etc., on behalf of anti-Communist causes.

5. Form front groups to agitate and propagandize for worthwhile causes. Urge Birch members to join existing groups with community standing, try to get them to understand the problem and take positions supporting the various causes the Birch Society is promoting.

6. Expose the covert activities of Communists.

7. Heckle Communists and other opposition speakers at meetings.

8. Form speakers bureaus; endeavor to obtain platforms for conservative, libertarian, and anti-Communist speakers.

9. Form local Birch Society chapters at home and abroad.

10. Take an active part in political campaigns, both inside political parties and out.

In addition, the Birch Society publishes a magazine entitled "American Opinion," distributes bulletins to its members and circulates the "Blue Book" and the "White Book" which explain the movement and promote its ideas.

Each chapter of the society has a leader appointed by Welch, all of whom serve without pay. The society employs regional field men to direct activities and stimulate local action. Welch draws no salary. Headquarters is Belmont, Mass.

Mechanics of "action groups" (such as the Birch Society, COPE, the ADA, Young Americans for Freedom, etc.)

Those who wish to influence public policy may write their Congressmen, they may become active in their political party, they may write letters to the editor, or contribute articles or even start a publication of their own. They may also organize an "action group."

Action groups work to enlist public support for one or more causes. They issue statements, hold demonstrations or rallies, and agitate in various ways to make themselves known and get their views across. Fundamentally, they try to build a climate of opinion favorable to their cause and unfavorable to their opposition. They do not worry about being controversial, assuming that if effective, they will be attacked and smeared in an effort to discredit them. Likewise, they will attempt to discredit groups that oppose them.

They often tend to be extreme or sensational in their views. This may be necessary in order to obtain support. It has been found that an appeal to the emotions is far more effective than some sort of reasoned, moderate appeal. While this can be necessary to rouse support, it also narrows the number of people who may be inclined to respond, since most people are not attracted by extremist causes. It likewise makes the groups vulnerable since extremism makes most people react with caution, avoidance, or negative feelings.

Action groups, like political campaigns, tend to attract neurotics. A cause supplies them with a needed emotional outlet. Such people often work the hardest, contribute the most money, but also make statements which are open to ridicule and horror.

Nevertheless, action groups rank high as a means of developing public support for causes, and eventually making the desired impression on public policy.

STRONG POINTS OF BIRCH SOCIETY

While it is difficult to assess the validity of Welch's belief that communism is now two-thirds of the way toward success in world domination (many think less, some think more), there is a strong, widespread, growing feeling that we are losing the cold war. Abroad, communism continues to advance. While its progress slowed during the Eisenhower administration in terms of countries taken over (Tibet, South Vietnam, Cuba), the growing discontent in South America, the obvious success of Communist penetration in Africa, and the deterioration of the Lao situation, have caused grave concern.

Following the anti-Communist alarms on the domestic front from 1948 through 1954, efforts to expose Communist activities in the United States have fallen off, but many suspect the Communists are active and growing in influence—simply not being publicized.

It is this feeling that we are losing—well exploited by Kennedy in his campaign—that provides fertile ground for formation of a virile anti-Communist action organization.

Those genuinely disturbed by Communist gains and successes are anxiously looking for some vehicle through which they can work to help win the fight. The Birch Society has provided an organization and a program in which they can participate and feel effective.

The discipline imposed on members, the air of purpose, the supplying of an interpretation of history, and a positive program of activity, all are important ingredients in the success of the society.

VULNERABILITIES

Any action group that is effective will be attacked by those whom it opposes. This is particularly true when that opposition is the Communist Party. The Communists are out to win; they will brook no opposition and will stop at nothing. To the degree that they have been successful in infiltrating the community they are effective in passing the word and getting their interpretation of events across.

In addition, there is the hostility noted above by the vast majority of people toward extremist causes, whether of the political left, or the right.

In view of these known hazards, it is wise of action groups to couch their public appeals in acceptable terms and to base them on provable facts. To do otherwise is simply to supply opponents with ammunition. Here are some characteristics which render the Birch Society vulnerable:

1. Implausible statements: The suggestion that President Eisenhower, his brother, and John Foster and Allan Dulles are or were Communists or conscious workers for Communist causes, even if true would not be believed except by the most credulous. This one piece of nonsense casts doubt on the whole fabric.

As William Buckley of National Review expresses it, "a man's subjective motives (cannot) automatically be deduced from the objective consequences of his acts." If they could, Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain would be Nazis because their policies allowed Hitler to develop into a viable menace.

2. Being unable to distinguish between communism and socialism lays Welch and the society open to severe criticism. While we may want neither system, and while socialism may be an entering wedge for communism, it is incorrect and unfair to the high and humane motives of socialists and liberals to impute that they are conscious members of the Communist conspiracy.

3. Pattern thinking: This is a trap into which many anti-Communists unwittingly fall. Because the Communists are skilled in disguising their work, the student of communism soon finds that he can detect their operations only by becoming aware of familiar patterns, then tracing back. The experienced student of communism becomes adept at this and is usually correct. However, the appearance of a pattern is not enough, of itself, to prove anything. Hard evidence is necessary. Where Welch thinks he sees a pattern, he often considers this sufficient evidence of itself.

As an example, one of the commonest plays of Communists in smearing opponents is to label them Fascists or Nazis. Experienced students say that when a group is labeled with one of these titles, 9 times out of 10 (unless it is an overtly racist group deserving such a label) you can trace this labeling back to a Communist or pro-Communist source. This does not mean the person who said it is a Communist. Time magazine, in an article, called the "Blue Book" Welch's "Mein Kampf"—an obvious slur designed to hang the Nazi label on Welch. The "pattern thinker" might jump to conclusions, whereas a careful look will simply show that Time's thorough researchers probably picked up some of their background from the Peoples World, the official West Coast Communist Party publication. Two other characteristics of the Time article trace back to the same source. No one, however, should suggest that Time, its research staff, or librarians are Communist.

4. Faulty research: A year ago, Welch wrote that the national chamber action course in practical politics is slanted to encourage the selection of leftwing candidates. He therefore suggested that the chamber had been infiltrated. The reference was to the case study for session No. 6. A check would reveal that the author of the case study was Biehl Clarke of Civic Affairs Associates, who—we are in a position to assure you—is neither Communist nor even leftwing.

5. Semantics: In any effort designed to influence public opinion, one tries to put his best foot forward. The trick is to hang good labels or symbols on your cause, your organization, and hang bad labels on the causes you are opposed to. Mr. Welsh made the fundamental public relations misstep

of "calling a spade a shovel" in describing the Birch Society. Thus he calls it monolithic. This is a bad word. Instead, he could have said that a degree of discipline would be necessary in the organization.

As another example, Welch is critical of democracy as a form of government. In terms of the technical definition of democracy, the United States is not a democracy, and many political philosophers would agree that democracy is a poor form of government. But to the average person, or even the above average person, democracy is a good word, a plus symbol, and to be against it is bad or a minus symbol. The same idea could have been expressed clearly without coming out against something people consider to be good. This has made it possible to smear the Birch Society as being undemocratic—which to most people means bad.

In another case he refers to some of the 10 methods spelled out above as being mean and dirty. In this instance, he is probably over critical of his own intentions. The 10 methods are more or less conventional methods used by political organizations and action groups. Applying these adjectives, however, makes it possible to say that Welch is for punching below the belt, because he said so.

Again, Welch speaks of infiltrating established organizations. This sounds like Communist methods and is therefore bad. Yet if one says, "The Birch Society encourages its members to be active in community organizations and to speak up for what they think is right," it means the same thing, but is obviously just expressing the old American right of free speech.

In short, by his choice of words, Mr. Welch has often painted his own child in the harshest possible light and has thereby given his critics excellent ammunition.

PROSPECTS OF THE BIRCH SOCIETY

Obviously it has a market. There are large numbers of people desirous of working for a militant, anti-Communist, anticollectivist, proindividual freedom organization.

It is set up in terms of organization to be effective and to command loyalty.

It has evidently received substantial backing which has not been frightened off by the attacks on it.

In fact, the publicity it has received recently—although largely negative—has reportedly attracted new support.

Because of fundamental errors in its analysis of the present situation and because of inept framing of language in the "Blue Book," it has made itself more vulnerable than necessary.

Because it relies on the personal leadership of Robert Welch rather than strictly on principles, its continued success is an open question depending on the survival of Welch and his appeal.

While the attacks on and exposure of the society will cause some loss of support and a large degree of disapprobation, it is open to question whether the society has been or will be damaged enough to cripple or destroy it. Probably not.

Whether it has been or will be effective in its purpose of promoting individual freedom and combatting collectivism, is a question that cannot be evaluated at this time. Even at a later date, it may be difficult to judge because evidence in this kind of matter is difficult to gather and credit hard to assign. Certainly the campaign against Khrushchev's visit to the United States met with some success. To the extent that the Birch Society initiated it and participated, it did influence public policy and opinion.

SIGNIFICANCE TO READER

While participating directly in a political party organization is perhaps the most effective way of influencing public policy, on a par, or at least not far behind in importance, is developing a climate of opinion favorable to a cause. Organizing or participating in an action group is one of the most effective ways to influence the political climate.

Since action groups are generally attacked by their opposition to discredit them, those who may endanger their livelihood or community status by being identified with controversial organizations often allow themselves to be neutralized. This is part of the game. As Harry Truman once said about politics, "If you don't like the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

The reader should never be taken in, however, by reports in the press, radio, TV, etc., that put an action group in a bad light. At the most charitable, it must be considered that writers in the press are always working against deadlines and seldom have time to do thorough research; to sell their publication they must continually report conflict and stir emotions—attacking an individual or an organization is much easier and more interesting than presenting an objective, carefully documented report; in addition to the existence of writers with political convictions who slant their material, a large number of writers—like most Americans—are just naturally suspicious of militant organizations. In the case of the Birch Society, even reliable sources have printed as facts things which were not true at all. When evaluating the Birch Society, or any other group, it is essential to get back to the hard facts. Get them from reliable sources. Check them. If you don't have time to do this, suspend judgment; don't be a conclusion jumper.

(NOTE.—One of the things that Civic Affairs Service is organized to do is answer questions of this type on organizations and movements. To the best of our ability, we will supply factual, documented answers in reply to your queries.)

Action groups are an effective device to mobilize opinion. They need not be as controversial as the Birch Society. They may be formed to promote just about any cause, on a local, State, or national level. Their methods are effective. Readers of Civic Affairs Monthly, wishing to influence public opinion or policy on given matters, will want to consider the use of such groups. The purpose of this article is to show how such groups can work, what methods they use, and some of the pitfalls to be avoided.

Nuclear Bombs: Their Effects and What Can Be Done About Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my office received a pamphlet today on the subject of "Nuclear Bombs: Their Effects and What Can Be Done About Them." This information has been compiled and written in plain language which can be easily understood by the average layman. The Honorable WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is the author. My office has been beseiged with requests for information concerning fallout and its effects and what can be done to protect the public in the event of a nuclear attack. The American people are ready to meet the challenge of any potential enemy in a courageous way. They will not be bullied or bluffed and they simply want to know what is the best way to meet any possible attack. I believe that Congressman BATES has made a great contribution by having this article printed. I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. Of course, all of us hope and pray that the day will never come when fallout shelters will be placed in use. We all hope that answers to the problems that might lead to a catastrophic war will be resolved and a solution for world peace will be realized in our time. President John F. Kennedy has broadened the program for civil defense. Local officials are enlarging their programs and I feel the apathy which has been so evident in the past is beginning to lessen. We do not want to alarm the American people but precautionary steps must be taken for the protection of our citizens. I include Congressman BATES' article.

NUCLEAR BOMBS: THEIR EFFECTS AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THEM

(By Congressman WILLIAM H. BATES, Republican of Massachusetts, member of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

The recent resumption of Soviet nuclear tests and the general concern about a thermonuclear war has developed great interest in questions of nuclear bombs and resulting fallout. The following questions and answers give an insight into some of these problems.

Why are we interested in fallout shelters?

Fallout in an atomic war as well as blast, heat, and initial radiation from the bomb could kill millions of people. Fallout shelters could save the lives of about 45 million people in the event there was an atomic attack on the United States. Any kind of material between you and the fallout—as well as distance—will cut down on the radiation reaching you. Specially designed shelters, called fallout shelters, are very effective in providing protection against atomic bomb attack.

In our joint committee hearings it was brought out that civil defense preparedness could reduce the fatalities in an assumed attack on the United States from about 25 percent of the population to about 3 percent. It was also brought out that more than 96 million people in the United States do not live in or near likely target areas and therefore not in the likely area of direct or near direct hits of atomic bombs. The people not in the area of direct hits could be expected to survive by using adequately supplied fallout shelters.

Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb was recently quoted as stating that 9 out of 10 persons in the United States could be saved by using adequate fallout shelters.

What is fallout?

It is the radioactive debris from a nuclear bomb which has been airborne and deposited on the earth. This debris could be in the form of solids such as dust which could be seen or individual atoms which could not be seen. It could fall in dry form or it could be brought to earth by rain or snow. The invisible rays, called radiation, given off by the fallout material causes injury to the body and if a large amount of such radiation is received it causes death.

Local or close-in fallout occurs almost immediately and continues for 10 to 20 hours after detonation. This is the most dangerous fallout. Intermediate fallout (which comes from the troposphere up to a height of approximately 50,000 feet) takes place during the first few weeks after the

explosion. Delayed or distant fallout (which comes from both the troposphere and the stratosphere above it) is the slow dropping of radioactive particles from the air over a period of years. The latter may cover the entire earth although of course it would be greatly diluted and therefore of much less danger.

The main kinds of radiation from fallout that may affect man are beta particles and gamma rays (similar to X-rays). These kinds of radiation also exist naturally although their concentrations are so low compared to the radiation from local or intermediate fallout that they are not injurious to health.

Most of the radiation from fallout decays to a harmless state in the first few weeks. During the first 2 weeks or so fallout shelter protection is extremely important for survival.

After a few weeks the main danger comes mostly from the fallout isotopes, strontium, and cesium, which decay very slowly. Danger from these isotopes results primarily from eating or drinking food which has been contaminated by fallout. The danger from these long-lived isotopes is encountered after leaving the fallout shelters.

Why is fallout harmful?

The local fallout which occurs in the first 10 to 20 hours after detonation and the intermediate fallout during the first few weeks require that fallout shelters be made available. The radiation coming from the fallout is most intense and bombards the unprotected body in the same manner as sunlight enveloping the sunbather. Unlike sunlight, however, the gamma emitters are very penetrating and about 8 inches of concrete or its equivalent is considered a minimum for protective sheltering during the first 2 weeks after the bomb detonation.

The fallout danger after this 2-week period becomes more important from radioactive matter which may enter the body by eating or drinking anything contaminated with fallout. Strontium and cesium are the major hazardous isotopes in this category.

The ultimate harm done to the biological system it inhabits is made progressively worse because it concentrates in the bone structure where the radiation it gives off destroys the bloodmaking material in the bone marrow.

Future generations may inherit changes such as body deformities produced by absorption of certain amounts of ionizing radiations.

What are the allowed amounts of radioactivity taken internally?

Tolerance levels or maximum permissible amounts for biological system uptake have been specified for many of the radioactive isotopes. These are very small amounts usually stated in terms of millionths of a unit of radioactivity. The measurement of such small amounts of radioactivity requires special equipment.

We hear of the term "roentgen"—what does this mean?

A roentgen is a unit used to express the amount of radiation a person or object is exposed to. For example a fluoroscope used to X-ray a person's foot in a shoe store for proper fitting would radiate about 1.5 roentgen in the foot.

Whole body radiation exposure to the following doses produces the following results:

(a) Instantaneous doses of 5,000 or more roentgens produce immediate shock resulting in death within a few hours.

(b) Doses of 800 or more roentgens produce fever, nausea, and vomiting within a few hours resulting in death within 1 to 2 weeks.

(c) Doses of 450 to 700 roentgens also produce fever, vomiting and nausea within hours but only about half of the individuals so exposed would die.

Doses of less than 200 roentgens would produce only mild symptoms of nausea and vomiting but complete recovery can be expected.

What kinds of shelter materials are recommended?

Concrete, brick, sand, metal and earth are adequate materials for protection. Equivalent shielding effects among several materials are as follows: 8 inches of concrete (minimum required) equals 12 inches of earth equals 16 inches of books equals 30 inches of wood.

What size shelter would be needed?

An allowance of 10 square feet per person for a family shelter is adequate.

Could protection from fallout be provided by shelters?

Yes. Expert studies and tests conclude that shelters located in homes, under school playgrounds, parks, parking areas and in industrial plants would provide adequate protection from fallout. Fallout protection in most cellars or basements without adequate shelters would not provide enough shielding to protect people from the harmful radiation.

What would these shelters cost?

Shelters providing fallout protection could be constructed for about $100 per person sheltered. This would apply to the larger type shelters. Family shelters, because of the smaller size and the accommodations desired would cost somewhat more.

Could people live in these shelters for 2 or 3 weeks?

Yes. They would have living and sleeping accommodations, toilet facilities, water facilities, batteries for lights and radio, and a filtered air system. You should see your local civil defense agency for more details concerning the construction, equipping and use of these shelters.

What conditions would be encountered outside the fallout shelters after the 2-week period?

First of all, it should be pointed out that the period spent in the shelter could be 2 weeks more or less. Notification of when it would be safe to leave the shelter would be obtained by battery powered radio.

When you are told that it is safe to leave the shelter the air outside would be safe to breathe. Most food supplies and water supplies would be safe to use.

For example the normal household water supply in your house would probably be safe to drink. Of course if the water comes from an open reservoir which has been heavily contaminated by fallout, special filtering may be required to make it safe to drink. You would obtain special instructions on this by radio.

Canned foods you may have had stored in your house would be safe to use. If the cans were not protected and were exposed to fallout the outside of the cans must first be washed or wiped before handling. The contents of course would not be harmed.

Fresh vegetables and fruits could also be used although the fallout should first be washed off and the fruits and vegetables peeled as a protective measure.

Of course, civil and military defense officials would monitor food and water supplies, roads, and buildings to obtain detailed information on how much fallout exists. Then they would inform the people what precautions are required.

We've heard of the terms "kiloton" and "megaton"—what do they mean?

A kiloton is a unit used to specify the size of a nuclear bomb. It is equal to the explosive power of 1,000 tons of TNT. For example, the Hiroshima bomb had a yield of 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent. A megaton is equivalent to 1 million tons of TNT.

What are the effects of a 10-megaton bomb on an average city?

Blast, heat, and immediate radiation are the effects of a bomb detonation.

A 10-megaton bomb would dig a crater 240 feet deep and 2,500 feet in diameter. Brick apartment houses would be destroyed out to a radius of 7 miles from the point of detonation. Wooden buildings would burn up to a radius of 25 miles from the point of detonation.

What are the effects of a 10-megaton bomb on man himself?

Blast injuries from flying debris would occur out to a radius of 7 miles from the detonation. Second degree burns (blistering) on the bare skin would occur out to a radius of 25 miles.

Thermal effects on humans resulting in casualties are produced from:

(a) Fires caused by direct combustion from the heat from the bomb.

(b) Skin burns.

(c) Temporary and permanent blindness from the intense light of the fireball.

What are the radiation effects of a 10-megaton bomb?

Initial nuclear radiation of 700 roentgens or more would result in death to unprotected persons and would cover a radius of 2 miles. Fallout, assuming a 15-knot wind (15–20 m.p.h.) would deposit 450 roentgens 150 miles downwind, 25 miles across and over an area of 2,500 square miles. The deposition of 450 roentgens infers a radioactive fallout which would indicate by radiation detector measurement a 450-roentgen intensity.

What are the blast effects on humans from nuclear weapons?

The blast wave close in would hurl material fragments with great force including propelling humans around as in an intense tornado. Further away lung damage and rupture of the eardrums would result.

How much TNT or other chemical explosives were used in World War II?

The total amount of bombs and shells used by all combatants in World War II was the equivalent of less than 3 megatons. Khrushchev the other day talked of a 100-megaton bomb. This single bomb would be equivalent to 30 times all of the bombs and shells used during the 6 years of World War II.

A 20-megaton bomb has the explosive power of a freight train filled with TNT stretching from Boston to Mexico City.

Champion of the Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of September 23, 1961:

CHAMPION OF THE COMMON MAN

The Reverend John E. Huss, minister of the Main Street Baptist Church in Jacksonville, Fla., has written a book, "Senator for the South" which is a biography of OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina's senior U.S. Senator.

Before going to Jacksonville, Mr. Huss was pastor of the Southside Baptist Church at Spartanburg for 7 years. Senator JOHNSTON and his family are members of that church. This gave Mr. Huss ample opportunity to become well acquainted with Senator JOHNSTON.

Mr. Huss calls Senator JOHNSTON's greatest characteristic his "enormous concern for the common man."

The son of a tenant farmer, OLIN JOHNSTON has the background to appreciate the

problems of common men. His early years, says Mr. Huss, "were spent in a typical southern farmhouse, unpainted, with no finished ceilings and no bathroom. The cooking was done on a wood stove in the kitchen; the water came from a dug well. There was not a single household item which could be called a luxury."

Senator JOHNSTON came up through politics the hard way—twice elected a State representative, he was defeated in his first bid for the Governor's mansion and twice defeated before becoming Senator from South Carolina. Since that time, he has become the 11th ranking Member of the Senate and the 10th ranking Democrat.

His ability and seniority have given him the important posts of chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, chairman of the Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry, and member of the powerful Senate steering committee, which appoints the membership of the various standing Senate committees.

Steady as You Go: The Growing Storm Ahead—A Report to the Second Congressional District by Congressman Daniel B. Brewster, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable DANIEL B. BREWSTER, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, clearly alerted his constituency to the perils of the hour.

Because the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] has so ably expressed quiet confidence in the ability of our Nation to withstand this, our greatest challenge, I would like to include his entire remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, OF MARYLAND

The 1st session of the 87th Congress draws to a close at a point in time where our Nation faces perhaps the greatest peril in its history. The tensions in our cold war struggle with the forces of international communism continue to mount. Each day brings new Soviet pressure at some point along our line of defense.

We have attempted to achieve world order under law. We have supported international organizations which provide the machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Soviet Union has deceitfully used these same organizations only to further its own selfish ends. It is a sad but obvious fact that military force is the only argument they understand. As a result—we have no further alternatives—we must increase both our nuclear and our conventional military strength.

We must be ready to engage in mutual mass destruction—or stand ready to extinguish brushfire wars, rapidly, before they lead to universal catastrophe.

The President of the United States, in his innaugural address, summarized—in one sentence—our national defense objective: "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

It cannot be overemphasized that the rapid growth of the Communist empire is a real and present threat to our very survival. The Communists now control one-third of the world's population and territory. The rulers of this vast empire have proclaimed without hesitation, vacillation, soft-pedaling or apology that their ultimate goal is world domination—and they have not attempted to conceal their dedication to this goal.

This gigantic cold war encompasses every field of human endeavor—moral, military, and economic. In a sense, we are engaged in a struggle for the minds of men everywhere. We believe in the inherent dignity of the human individual. The Communists believe that man was born to be subservient to the state.

One hundred sixty-one years ago, Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of our country said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God—eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Jefferson's pledge must be America's pledge.

Those of us who enjoy and believe in freedom must be willing to fight to maintain it. Our enemy must know that we and other peoples who believe in liberty as deeply as we do, will choose to die on our feet rather than live on our knees.

President Kennedy outlined our course for us in his speech on the Berlin crisis when he declared: "Any dangerous spot is tenable—if brave men will make it so."

The thousands who have risked death to come over the wall to freedom have faith in our cause. Others will follows—so long as we have faith in ourselves—and the determination and the courage to back that faith.

If we stand up now—if we weather this challenge—if we convince the Soviets of our steadfastness—peace with pride may be our reward. If we falter—the avalanche will begin.

Every word—every deed—every action we take—must be aimed at one objective—we must convince the Soviet Union that we will not yield one further inch to communism. We must answer every threat of force with calmness, but with a determined show of counterforce. We must convince Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts that America is united and strong—but above everything else—we are ready to once again demonstrate the courage that made America great.

Information You Should Know About the Soldiers' and Sailors' and Airmen's Civil Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, you have been ordered to report for active duty with the armed services. You owe money on your car, your home, and perhaps even on a personal loan. At the time you made these debts, you were earning considerably more than you will earn as a serviceman. Once in the service, you know your service pay may not take care of all these debts.

Congress realized that many people would, from time to time, be faced with this situation. Therefore, it decided to give you, in the interest of national defense, some protection. This protection is found in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, which as the name suggests, affords protection on civil matters only and does not cover criminal prosecution. It is one of a series of Federal laws concerning military service that may be found in the appendix to volume 50 of the United States Code (50 U.S.C. app. secs. 501–590). The act is still in effect and though titled Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, protects others, including members of the Air Force (50 U.S.C. app. secs. 464 and 466(c)).

This Relief Act does not, repeat, does not, wipe out any of your obligations. Rather, it temporarily suspends the right of your creditors to use a court to compel you to pay if, but only if, the court finds that your inability to pay is due to your military service. Your obligation to honor your debts still exists, and some day you must pay up. In short, the idea behind the Civil Relief Act is to suspend, in certain cases, court proceedings during your tour of duty in the military service, so that upon your return to civilian life you might have an opportunity to be heard and to take measures to protect your interests.

Caution: This Relief Act is highly technical. Remember, your benefits under it are limited. Do not assume that you know all the ins and outs of the act, after reading this pamphlet. It is intended only to give you a simplified bird's-eye view, so that you will have some idea of the protections the act affords. If, after reading this pamphlet, you believe some provisions of the act may be of immediate benefit to you, you should discuss their application to your problem with your civilian attorney or with a legal assistance officer of the Armed Services. If you desire the services of a legal assistance officer, go to the nearest military installation and ask for his help.

HOW A LAWSUIT IS PROCESSED

Before discussing the actual provisions of the act, it might be helpful for you to understand how lawsuits are generally conducted.

The person who brings the suit is known as the plaintiff. The person against whom the suit is brought is known as the defendant. The typical lawsuit is begun when the plaintiff, either himself or through an attorney, files a written document called a complaint with the proper court. In the complaint, he states why he has started the suit. After the complaint is filed, the plaintiff must give the defendant notice that the suit has been started. This is accomplished by means of a summons. A summons is a formal written notice to the defendant to the effect that a suit has been filed against him and that unless he contests the suit, judgment may be entered against him.

If the defendant desires to contest the suit, he will normally file a written document called an answer stating why the plaintiff should not win. After a trial, at which both sides may be heard, the court enters a judgment in

favor of one of the parties. For example, in a lawsuit involving money, the judgment may either order the defendant to pay or may state that he owes nothing. If the defendant is ordered to pay, he should remember that, although he does not have any property or money at that time, the judgment may be collected years later.

If the defendant does not file an answer within the time specified in the summons, he is said to have defaulted. When the defendant has defaulted, the court may enter a judgment by default in favor of the plaintiff.

PART I: GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section A. Who is protected?

The Civil Relief Act applies only to "persons in the military service." Persons in the military service include:

First. All persons on extended active duty, whether inductees, regulars, members of the National Guard, Reserves, or volunteers, serving with the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Marines.

Second. All officers of the Public Health Service detailed for duty with the military services, and

Third. All persons who are training or studying under the supervision of the United States preliminary to induction into military service.

In some instances, however, certain benefits are given to the dependents of persons in the military service and to those persons who have guaranteed obligations of servicemen.

Section B. When are you protected?

You are protected during the period of your active military duty and in most cases for short periods after separation. Active duty begins on the date you enter the service and ends on the date you are separated. Enlisted reservists and draftees have an additional benefit under the act in that they may ask for relief as soon as they receive orders to report for active duty.

Section C. Where do you get the protection?

The protection of the Civil Relief Act applies to all lawsuits in any court in the United States, from a justice of the peace court to the U.S. Supreme Court.

PART II: GENERAL RELIEF PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL LAWSUITS

Section A. Protection against default judgment.

(a) General: As has been previously mentioned, a lawsuit begins when the plaintiff files his complaint. If you, the defendant, do not file an answer to the plaintiff's complaint within a certain time after you have received notice that the complaint has been filed, the court may then enter its judgment against you. This judgment is known as a default judgment. However, one of the major benefits that you, being in the military service, derive from the Civil Relief Act is that a court may not enter a default judgment against you unless a certain definite procedure is followed. How this is done is explained below.

(b) Requiring military affidavit: Under the act, before a court can enter a default judgment against you, the plaintiff must make and file a statement under oath that you are not in the military service. If he is unable to make such a statement then he must file a sworn statement, first, that you are in the military service, or second, that he is unable to find out whether or not you are in the military service.

(c) Rights of the defendant in the service: If the plaintiff files a sworn statement stating you are not in the military service, a default judgment may then be entered against you. If the plaintiff's statement fails to state you are not in the military service, a default judgment may be entered by the court only after it has appointed an attorney to represent you and the attorney is heard in your behalf. An attorney so appointed to represent you has no power to waive any of your rights or bind you by his acts.

Further, in the event the court enters a default judgment, it can require the plaintiff to put up a security deposit. This security will protect you in the event the judgment is later set aside. That is, the security will be used, if necessary, to pay you for any damages you may have suffered as a result of a judgment that was incorrectly entered against you.

(d) False affidavit: We have said the plaintiff must file a sworn statement as to your military status. Suppose he swears in that statement that you are not in the military service, knowing that you are—then what? The Relief Act makes such false swearing a crime and the guilty party can be sent to prison for as long as a year, fined not more than $1,000, or both.

(e) Setting aside a default judgment: If a default judgment is entered against you during your military service, or even 30 days thereafter, you may still have some protection. You may ask the court to reopen the case and to set aside the default judgment. The court will do so if you can show, first, that your application to open the case is being made within 90 days after your discharge from the service; second, that you were harmed or prejudiced by reason of your military service in presenting your side of the case to the court; and third, you have a valid, legal defense to the suit. Even though the plaintiff has been found guilty of false swearing as discussed in previous paragraphs, you must still meet all three of these requirements before your case may be reopened.

Caution: If you hear, either indirectly through a friend or directly through receipt of a summons, that a lawsuit has been filed against you, don't panic. Instead, see your civilian attorney or legal assistance officer. Let him advise you before you take any action.

By acting without such advice you may waive the protection the Relief Act gives you. Getting technical for a minute, your protection against default judgments, as discussed above, applies only when you fail to make "any appearance" in the lawsuit. What acts on your part constitute "any appearance" are too numerous to mention. Furthermore, an act that may not be considered "any appearance" in one court may be in another.

Always get the advice of an attorney. It may be to your advantage for the lawsuit to be tried immediately. But this decision should be made only after an attorney has reviewed the facts of your case.

Section B. Stays.

(a) General: As you have seen, the Relief Act gives you some relief from default judgments. That relief you have no matter what the plaintiff has asked the court to do—be it to allow the plaintiff to adopt your child, to grant a divorce, to award damages for injuries, and so forth. Because this relief applies generally to all lawsuits, those sections of the act are referred to as "general relief" provisions. There are still other important "general relief" provisions in the act. Those pertaining to Stays of lawsuits will be discussed next.

A stay is an order of the court stopping or delaying court proceedings in the lawsuit until a later date.

(b) How military service affects stays: At any stage of a lawsuit you, a serviceman, may ask the court to stay the proceedings. This is true whether you are the plaintiff or the defendant. In addition, the court itself may order the proceedings delayed without being asked. If the court is not asked for a postponement by the person in the military service, then it is not required by the act to grant one. On the other hand, when a stay is requested by a serviceman, the act requires the court to grant it unless, in the opinion of the court, his ability to prosecute or defend the lawsuit is not materially affected by reason of his military service.

When you ask for a stay initially, you need only to show the court that you are in the service. If the other party to the lawsuit does not want it delayed, he must prove to the court that your military service does not materially affect your ability to prosecute or defend. You have no automatic right to a stay. The judge of the court will decide whether you should have one. If he does grant one, under the act, he may order it for as long as your military service plus 3 months.

Requesting a stay may be any appearance for the purposes of a default judgment mentioned above.

Section C. Statutes of limitations.

In most instances, a person who has a right to bring a lawsuit in any court or a proceeding before any Government administrative board or agency must do so within a certain time limit. The laws and regulations setting this time limit are known as statutes of limitations. These statutes start running from the instant the suit or proceeding could first have been filed. A statute of limitation is said to have run when the time limit for filing has passed.

Under the general relief provisions of the Civil Relief Act, these statutes stop running while you are in the military service. In order to determine whether a particular statute of limitation has run, exclude the period of time that you are in the military service.

For example, someone damages your car in Virginia on January 2, 1961. You enter the service on February 1, 1961, and

remain in the service until January 31, 1963. Suppose Virginia's statute of limitation requires suit for damages to be filed with the proper court within 6 years from the date of the accident. Under the Civil Relief Act, the 2 years you are in the military service are not counted in the 6 years you have to file suit. Thus, you have until January 1969 to file suit.

Suppose in the above that you had damaged someone else's car. In this instance, the other party would also have until January 1969 to bring suit against you.

In both of the above examples, the accident occurred before you entered the service. Nevertheless, the same results would be reached if it had occurred after you had entered the service.

PART III: SPECIFIC RELIEF PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO PARTICULAR LAWSUITS AND SITUATIONS

Section A. Interest in excess of 6 percent per year.

Let us assume that you entered into an obligation which requires you to pay more than 6 percent per year. Afterward you enter the military service. Under the Relief Act you may start paying, if you like, only 6 percent. However, you are advised to tell your creditors what you are going to do and cite the Relief Act as your authority. If the person whom you owe objects, he must ask the proper court to require you to pay more than 6 percent per year. However, before the court can do so, the party that you owe must show that your ability to pay interest in excess of 6 percent is not materially affected by reason of your military service."

As used in the Relief Act, interest include service charges, renewal charges, fees, or any charges—except bona fide insurance—in respect of such obligations.

Caution: This relief applies only to obligations made before you entered military service, not to those made while in the service.

Section B. Installment contracts, mortgages, trust deeds, and so forth.

While a civilian, you entered into contracts to buy a home, a refrigerator, wristwatch, automobile, or perhaps even a horse. You paid so much down and agreed to pay the remainder in monthly installments. Under each contract, you agreed, for all practical purposes, that if you failed to make the payments on the dates the contracts called for, the seller could take the property back and sell it to the highest bidder.

Furthermore, you may have agreed, for example, that if at the time of the sale you still owed $1,500 and if the seller were to get only $1,000, you would still be liable to the seller for the $500 difference.

With the above contracts in force, you enter the military service, and because of your reduced income, you fail to make payments when due. Does the act provide you with any protection?

Yes, but not to the extent of being unfair to the seller. Remember, we are talking about contracts you made and paid on before you entered the service. Under these circumstances, the seller cannot repossess or foreclose on the property involved without first getting the permission of a court. If the seller were to take the property and sell it without a court's permission, he could be made to pay a fine and even be sent to jail. Before the court will give its permission, it looks into the reason behind your failure to make payments when due. If satisfied that it is because of your military service, the court will then do what it thinks is fair to you and to the seller. It may, for example, order you to return the property to the seller, and the seller to return to you the amount you have already paid. Or, it may decide to let you keep the property and make smaller payments than called for in your contract.

Caution: This protection does not apply to obligations entered into after you enter military service.

Section C. Leases and evictions.

(a) Leases: When you entered military service, you and your dependents were living in a rented house or apartment. You pay rent by the month. The lease still has a few months or even several years to run. You cannot and your dependents do not wish to, remain in the house or apartment. Can you cancel the lease?

Yes, by giving your landlord 30 days' written notice and citing the act as your authority. The 30 days does not necessarily start running from the day notice is given. Rather, it starts running on the day the next monthly rent payment is due. For example, you pay rent on the first of each month. You give notice on the 20th of October. In this case, you owe rent for November. Your lease terminates on the last day of November.

The act has a special notice provision for leases requiring rent to be paid other than monthly. The right to terminate leases under the act includes not only property leased and occupied for dwelling purposes but also property leased and occupied for "professional, business, agricultural, or similar purposes."

Caution: The most common misconception of the act is that it gives you the right to terminate a lease made after you enter the service—it does not. This means that a lease made while you are in service should contain a clause providing for termination on 30 days' written notice if you receive transfer orders.

An example of such a clause, where you are renting from someone, follows:

It is expressly agreed that if the lessee herein should receive official orders relieving him from station at ——— or retiring or relieving him from active duty in the Army (Navy) (Air Force) or assigning him public quarters, he may terminate this lease upon written notice of his intention so to do, and such termination shall become effective 30 days after the date of the service of the notice upon the lessor, and if the date of such termination shall fall between days on which rent becomes due, there shall accrue on the first day of the rental period in which such termination shall take effect a proportionate part only of the rent which would be due but for such termination.

Where you are renting to someone, consider the following:

It is expressly agreed that if the lessor herein should receive official orders returning him to station at ——— or retiring or relieving him from active duty in the Army (Navy) (Air Force) he may terminate this lease upon written notice of his intention so to do, and such termination shall become effective 30 days after the date of the service of the notice upon the lessee, and if the date of such termination should fall between days on which rent becomes due, there shall accrue on the first day of the rental period in which such termination shall take effect a proportionate part only of the rent which would be due but for such termination.

(b) Evictions: Your dependents—wife, children, parents, and so forth—are living in a house or apartment for which the rent is $80 or less per month. The rent is not paid. Can they be evicted?

Yes, but only after a court has given permission. This is so whether your dependents began living there before or after you entered military service. If the landlord evicts them without first securing a court's permission, he could be fined, placed in jail, or both.

Once the landlord asks a court's permission to evict your dependents, the court first decides whether or not nonpayment of rent is due to your military service. If the court decides it is not, then the court may order your dependents evicted.

On the other hand, if failure to pay is attributed to your military service, the court will make the landlord wait for not longer than 3 months before they may be evicted. The idea is to provide a reasonable time during which another place for your dependents to live can be found. However, the payment of all rents due is not thereby excused.

The landlord is also prohibited by the act from holding your household goods as security for unpaid rent, unless permitted by the court.

PART IV: MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section A. Insurance.

You are the owner of a commercial insurance policy insuring your life. On entering military service, you are no longer able to pay the premiums.

If you wish to keep the policy current, you may, under the act, request the Veterans' Administration to guarantee payment of the premiums. The maximum amount of life insurance on which payment of premiums will be guaranteed is $10,000. That amount may be in one or more policies.

Upon separation from military service, you have 2 years in which to pay all premiums and interest due.

Section B. Storage liens.

Suppose either before or during your military service, you place your "household goods, furniture, or personal effects" in storage. You fail to pay the storage charges when due.

Under these circumstances, the storage company cannot sell your property to cover its charges without a court order. If your failure to pay is due to your military service, the court may stay the proceedings or enter a judgment that the court thinks is fair to both parties.

Section C. Public lands, mining claims, and homestead entries.

Special provisions of the act relate to mining, homestead and other claims on public lands. These claims will not be

lost through absence resulting from your military service if you follow the provisions of the act.

PART V. TAXES (AND MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION)

Section A. General.

The act exempts your service pay and personal property from taxation by States in which you may be stationed other than your home or domiciliary State and also provides that the payment of income tax may be deferred for up to 6 months after discharge if your ability to pay the tax is materially impaired by reason of your service.

Section B. Residence against domicile.

(a) General: Before you can determine what taxes are properly assessable to you and your dependents, you must understand the distinction between the terms "residence" and "domicile" and the protection afforded by the act.

Under this act, the sole right to tax your military pay and your personal property remains with your State of domicile when you are absent therefrom in compliance with military or naval orders.

(b) Residence: Residence is generally defined as a "factual place of abode" at a particular time. However, a great deal of confusion exists in defining this term because various State laws define the words "residence" or "resident," differently. The definition of "resident" in the tax laws of the various States differ from one another. Whenever a word is specifically defined in a particular law, that definition is, of course, controlling.

(c) Domicile: Domicile may be defined in legal terms as "that place where a man has his true, fixed, and permanent home and principal establishment and to which, whenever he is absent therefrom, he has the intention of returning."

To understand the problem of domicile, you must first understand that there are three kinds; namely, first, domicile of origin or birth, second, domicile by operation of law; third, domicile of choice. It is legally impossible not to have a domicile, and an old domicile is not lost until a new one is acquired.

Domicile of origin is the domicile automatically acquired by every child at birth and is identical with the domicile of the parents. The actual place of birth does not determine domicile of origin. For example, a child born to U.S. citizen parents while in the service stationed in Virginia does not necessarily become a domiciliary of Virginia. If, at that time, the father was domiciled in Colorado, the child, also becomes a domiciliary of Colorado.

Like domicile of origin, domicile by operation of law exists independent of the subject's intention and actual residence. For example, a woman upon marriage generally loses her own domicile and, by operation of law, acquires that of her husband, regardless of her actual residence or intention.

Domicile of choice is the place which a person has voluntarily elected and chosen for himself to replace his previous domicile. To change your domicile there must be a simultaneous concurrence of these elements:

First, actual residence—bodily presence—in the new locality; second, an intention to remain there permanently or indefinitely; and third, an intent to abandon the old domicile.

Once the above elements have occurred simultaneously you have changed your domicile. However, proving the requisite intent, particularly if the change of domicile gives you a tax advantage, may be difficult. In this event, your word, though considered, will not necessarily satisfy taxing authorities. They may demand, and properly so, evidence of someovert acts on your part indicative of the requisite intent. In short, your actions speak louder than your words. Some of the clearest indications that you consider a State to be your domicile is by registering to vote and votifig, licensing your motor vehicle, and paying income and personal property taxes, if any. Caution: Do not register to vote or vote in any election in a State that is not your State of domicile unless you intend to abandon your old domicile and establish that State as your new domicile.

Service personnel are tempted from time to time to change their domicile in order to avoid the income tax of a particular State. Before doing so, you should remember that domicile not only exerts its influence in determining your liability for income and personal property taxes, but in other very important areas as well. The following is illustrative of these areas:

First, liability for State inheritance taxes; second, where your will would be probated; and who may act as executor thereof and as testamentary guardian of your minor children; third, the right to vote; fourth, bonuses for wartime service; fifth, the right to hold public office; sixth, the right to homestead, veterans claims, or tax exemptions; seventh, whether you or your children may attend a State college without paying higher fees required of nondomiciliary residents; eighth, where you may obtain a divorce.

In short, before attempting to change your domicile, take a good long look at the overall picture.

Section C. Income taxes.

As previously stated, the act, a Federal law, exempts your military pay from all State income taxes except those imposed by the State of your domicile while absent therefrom in compliance with military orders. Therefore, unless your present duty station is located in the State of your domicile, your military pay cannot be taxed by the State where stationed even though their laws provide otherwise.

The act does not exempt nonmilitary income derived from sources within a State where you may be serving. They can and do, for example, require you to pay an income tax on salaries from civilian employment therein, rents from real property located therein, and profits from the sale of such property, even though your domicile is elsewhere. Ordinarily you will file a resident income-tax return to your home State on all of your income and a nonresident return to the State where serving on nonmilitary income earned in that State. This could mean that you may pay taxes on your nonmilitary income to both your home State and the State where serving. Tax credits may reduce the overall tax burden, however.

Furthermore, the act does not exempt any civilian member of your household from taxes by the State in which he or she is temporarily residing. For example, if you are domiciled in Florida, ordered to duty in Virginia, and accompanied by your wife—civilian—who obtains employment there, your wife is liable to Virginia for income tax on her salary from Virginia employment. See your legal assistance officer or income tax adviser for rules governing apportionment.

Any tax on income—Federal, State, or local—may be deferred for a period extending not more than 6 months after separation from active service, without interest or penalty, if your ability to pay the income tax is materially impaired by reason of such service. You should make written request upon the taxing authorities for such deferment. Note that this does not excuse you from filing a return unless your home State law specifically exempts you from filing.

Section D. Personal property taxes.

As the "tax day" varies from state to state, your personal property could be present for tax purposes in several taxing jurisdictions the same year. To protect you, the Act prohibits any state except that of your domicile from taxing your personal property.

It is emphasized that the Relief Act does not relieve your wife from paying the tax to the State where residing on her personal property. It is often difficult to determine whether certain personal property belongs to you or your wife.

Section E. Real property taxes.

Real property—such as a house—is subject to local taxes. The Act gives you no exemption from this tax.

Section F. Motor vehicle registration.

The act allows you to retain your home State registration on your motor vehicle as long as you have paid the license fee or excise required by your home State. The vehicle title should be in your name alone as the Act exempts only you.

PART VI: CONCLUSION

The specific nature of all of the relief available to you under the Act is a matter about which you should consult an attorney. The Act is designed to deal fairly with you and your creditors. While relief is very often available to you, you are expected and required to show good faith by doing what you can to discharge your obligations.

Aid to Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, why not let our senior citizens earn more? I feel very strongly that the amount that our senior citizens who receive social security

benefits should be entitled to earn, without endangering their benefits, should be increased to $2,400 per year, at least.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include an excellent editorial on this subject which appeared in the issue of September 2, 1961, of the Saturday Evening Post, as follows:

WHY NOT LET THE ELDERLY EARN ALL THEY CAN?

(By Bruce Bliven)

A controversial feature of the social security law is the one that restricts the earnings of the beneficiaries between the ages of 65 and 72. Congress seems to have an uneasy conscience about this matter; repeatedly, since the law was first passed in 1935, the regulation has been liberalized. According to the most recent change, the beneficiary must give up only $1 for each $2 that he earns between $1,200 and $1,500, and $1 for each $1 earned above $1,500.

A good many people feel that the restriction on earnings ought to be abolished entirely, and numerous bills have been introduced to bring this about. Among the arguments in favor of such action are these:

1. Elderly people need the money. More than one-third of all Americans beyond 65 have no income except social security payments. A study made in Milwaukee, Wis., showed that the average retired couple was receiving a total of $110 a month at a time when the cost of living for two persons was reckoned at $186.

2. This law discriminates against those who must work for their living. You may receive unlimited amounts as dividends, interests, pensions, annuities, or rentals, without having your social security affected.

3. Conditions have completely changed since the law was passed in 1935, when the great depression was severe. It was intended to force people out of the labor market. Today, in view of our grim contest with Soviet Russia, we need every bit of productive power this Nation possesses.

4. Health experts are unanimous in saying that elderly people ought to do at least some work to preserve their physical and mental vigor.

5. We now have the anomalous situation where the Government is making a big propaganda drive to persuade industry to hire and retain older workers, and then punishes these workers for accepting employment.

That repeal of this limitation would be overwhelmingly popular with the country there is little doubt. However, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has in the recent past opposed abolition of the restriction. Its arguments are these:

1. It would be expensive. The number of persons receiving benefits would be increased by about 1,400,000; the immediate cost would be $2 billion a year; and the long-range cost would require an increase of 1 percent in the payroll tax.

2. Most of those now receiving social security are not well enough to work for wages.

3. Social security was never intended to be a pension or annuity, but insurance against the hazard of unemployment in old age.

Those who favor abolition of the restrictions reply that the actual cost to the economy as a whole would not be nearly so large as the figure quoted indicates, whatever the effect on the cost structure of the social security system.

Abolition of the restriction would reduce the work of those keeping the records, who now alter thousands of monthly checks in accordance with the changing pattern of work.

The Government would obtain a substantial sum in income taxes on the increased earnings of those now receiving social security.

In many cases people who cannot live on their social security benefits—since the dollar has lost half its purchasing power in the past two decades—are a burden on local relief rolls. Permitted to earn as much as they can, some of these would require less help from community agencies, or none.

Almost every cent of the extra money that would be earned would go into buying consumer goods.

As to the health of elderly people, a report by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself, in September 1960, states that only 36 percent of those between 65 and 72 "were unable [because of chronic conditions] to carry on their usual activity or had some limitation in the kind or amount of activity."

While it may be true that social security was not intended as an annuity or pension, it is in fact so regarded today by nearly everybody—including the 1,400,000 who have paid social security taxes in the past and are now prohibited from receiving any benefits.

And finally, some people would argue that if the restriction on earnings is socially undesirable, it should be repealed even though this would at first cost a substantial sum.

Freshmen Speak Out in Congress of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to a newspaper article written by Ralph de Toledano. We are all aware of the outstanding crop of freshmen Congressmen, and we of the conservative philosophy, are espccially proud of the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman DONALD C. BRUCE. He has grown in stature as few freshmen ever grow. His attacks on the leftwingers, do-gooders, and spenders has been outstanding. He is the type of conservative his constituents of Marion County, Ind., appreciate. More power to DON BRUCE and his conservative program.

The article follows:

FRESHMEN SPEAK OUT IN CONGRESS OF UNITED STATES

(By Ralph de Toledano)

In the House of Representatives, the freshman Congressman is considered the lowliest of creatures. Only in rare cases does he emerge as a public figure in the first months of his tenure. As a result, the new Congressmen tend to band together, as the young Republicans did during the 80th Congress in the "Marching and Chowder Society," later headed by Richard Nixon.

Now 14 Republicans, newly elected to the House, have pooled their intellectual resources to state a philosophy and a program. Since everything must have a title these days, they have called their efforts Operation Survival and then taken to the floor to speak their pieces. Last week, the operation was launched by Representative DONALD C. BRUCE, an energetic and dedicated Hoosier. What he had to say reflected no partisan bitterness. In fact, his statesmanlike approach was more than a little refreshing and what he had to say was, in effect, a manifesto of enlightened conservatism.

"We believe," DON BRUCE said, "that though conditions change and circumstances vary, there are valid truths that remain unchangeable. We believe that these truths are as applicable today as they have been throughout history." This, in his mind, does not negate the concept of progress. The only true hope for progress lies in the strengthening of our free society of constitutional Government with its preservation of the delicate balance between the legislative, judicial and executive branches of Government.

Reiterating the classic American formulation that "all men are endowed by their Creator" with the inalienable rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," BRUCE rejected the welfare state ideal "which holds that government can be the grantor of rights or the guarantor of individual happiness. It is the function of government to protect the inherent rights of individual man" by restraining those who would infringe upon the natural rights of any man—be the aggressor individual, corporate, or a group of individuals merely associated in a common action.

Unlike many who hold more liberal views, Representative BRUCE sees no place in this country for the Marxist theory of the class struggle or any other form of Socialist dogma. "We agree with Lincoln," BRUCE said, "that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

As a consequence, apprehension is expressed at the fantastic growth of Federal control over the lives of our citizens * * * we observe that the Federal Government is rapidly ceasing to be the servant of the people and is rapidly becoming its master. * * * witness the perversion of words, where liberty becomes license, where collectivism is disguised as progress, where subsidies are substituted for initiative, where dependency replaces responsibility.

The Bruce manifesto really comes to grips with a question worrying many Americans by its direct attack on those who regiment life in this country. In blunt language BRUCE charged:

"The tentacles of the social planners, who possibly out of the finest motives but lacking in the understanding of liberty and the lessons of history, attempt to impose their ideas of what is good for their fellow man upon their brethren, thereby falsely assuming that he is helping us to move ahead into a glorious tomorrow."

With equal bluntness, DON BRUCE, of Indiana—a State known for its sense of independence—warned that the freshmen Congressmen of "Operation Survival" had no intention of offering "material benefits as a largesse of government. We know that we can give nothing in a material way that we do not first take from the people. We have dedicated ourselves in an attempt to restore a balance in government, a withdrawal of Federal control from the multiple intrusions into the lives of the people, a pledge to fiscal integrity, moral responsibility, and sound progress based upon constitutional liberty."

I quote from this manifesto at such length because, given the nature of Washington, it caused little stir in the House of Representatives. Yet it is one that should be read with care, both by those who agree and those who disagree. Its language may not have the mellifluous flow of Churchill's periods, but its sincerity gives it eloquence of its own.

The speeches by the freshmen that followed the Bruce manifesto and spelled out

its propositions in detail had the same seriousness. Reading them, it struck me that the compilation was well worth saving, that it should be distributed in printed form by one of the less partisan foundations, and perhaps that the mimeographed sheets I held in my hand might be a historic document.

This last point may sound like an exaggeration. But there are far too few efforts by our legislators to rise above the battle over this bill or that measure and to state a few basic principles. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is seldom a source for this kind of serious appraisal. Last week, however, it became a vehicle for what may be referred to in the future as a milestone in American political action.

Television: A Children's Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, children have been the forgotten citizens of our country when it comes to television programs.

Now Newton N. Minow, FCC Chairman, and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy have come forward with a brilliant solution to the establishment of programs which will challenge and enrich the lives and the minds of all children.

There is, indeed, a whole new ferment in the field of television which will lead to better programs on the commercial networks.

I include herewith articles from the New York Times, and the Christian Science Monitor, on these matters:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1961]

TV: A CHILDREN'S HOUR

(By Jack Gould)

Parents who for years have been dismayed over the caliber of television in the hectic presupper period from 5 to 6 o'clock, will be inclined to give a cheer this morning for two Washington fathers.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, will be excused from all but the annual meeting of their Parent-Teacher Associations if they succeed in persuading the networks to cooperate in the presentation of a civilized children's hour.

The suggestion, announced by Mr. Minow in his second spectacular before a group of TV executives, is both overdue and timely; the child viewer always has received short shrift in TV's executive chambers, especially in light of his role in inducing adults to buy a TV set in the first place.

The American Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Co. swallowed confidently after Mr. Minow's speech, but the idea of rotating responsibility for the hour did have the appeal of making the burden of appeasement only one-third as bad as it might have been.

If the TV industry winced over the eagerness of the Department of Justice to be a mother's helper in smoothing out any legal barriers to a qualitative children's hour, it has only itself to blame. At the moment the younger generation's sole network program after school and before dinner is Dick Clark's "Bandstand," a session appealing to the substantial purchasing power of teenagers rather than to younger children, of whom Mr. Kennedy has seven and Mr. Minow two.

At the moment the children's hour falls in the domain of the individual stations associated with the networks, some of which offer cartoons while others present movies and TV reruns that capture the child and adult viewer on a single commercial hook.

The networks understandably regretted that Mr. Minow did not put a little more Federal emphasis on the children's shows that they do offer. On weekday mornings there is the fine "Captain Kangeroo," which now may find itself in a warmer CBS embrace, and there are a number of presentations on Saturday and Sunday mornings.

But the Messrs. Kennedy and Minow obviously do not subscribe to TV's pet theory that children and everyone else must learn to adjust to video's schedules rather than the other way around. The weekday wasteland in the late afternoon has been apparent for years.

Mr. Minow wisely kept on his own side of the regulatory fence and did not try to spell out what should be in the children's hour. The opportunities are so broad that if each network had one policymaking official experienced in the field, which none of the chains do, the job should not be insurmountable. The British Broadcasting Corp., which regards TV for children as an inviolate area of great responsibility, has done the assignment well for years.

But the Department of Justice and the FCC must be patient if they are to be successful child counselors in videoland. One of the TV industry's problems is that children often dislike children's programs, and in fairness they often benefit from some of the adult programing, which should be part of any overall balance sheet on the problem. A companion difficulty, of course, is that so much of TV for grownups poses no difficulties in comprehension for the very young.

The task of holding a child's interest in TV is an especially formidable one because the volume of programs leads to such rapid sophistication. And also there is the age problem; children's TV cannot use the buckshot technique over a broad span of years if it is to hit any one group with maximum effectiveness.

Such problems, however, are not for official Washington to add to its other concerns. It remains for the industry now to show that where children are concerned TV can offer something more than "time wasters," another of Mr. Minow's inventive phrases that cut so unerringly to the core of TV's contemporary problems.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 22, 1961]

TV REFOCUS ASKED

(By Josephine Ripley)

WASHINGTON.—It may be the better program campaign of Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, or it may be a public yearning for learning.

Whatever it is, the result has been a wide new spectrum of educational programs this fall on both commercial and educational television.

The appeal is to youth. The new programs, some of which will be carried nationwide on the big networks, are provocative, precedent setting, and varied.

There is NBC's "Continental Classroom," a program for teachers and college students featuring a two-semester course on "The Structure and Functions of American Government."

The program will premiere with Secretary of State Dean Rusk as guest, on September 25. It may be taken for college credit at many colleges and universities across the country.

It's a stiff, 5-day-a-week course and the first, of national scope, to depart from noncontroversial, scientific material.

"COLLEGE OF THE AIR"

It will cover theory, politics, constitutional issues, the presidency, the Supreme Court, Congress, and U.S. foreign policy.

CBS has a new educational program called "College of the Air," which also starts on September 25. The series will open with "The New Biology." It will be a daily, half-hour program carried over some 176 stations.

It is presented by the Learning Resources Institute which represents several national educational organizations. It is taped, and many stations have booked it for an early morning showing, around 6 a.m.

Something distinctly new and different, beamed directly to the young, its ABC's "American Newsstand." This will be a daily, 10-minute news program, 4:50 to 5 p.m. (New York time), Monday through Friday.

It will give emphasis to subjects of particular interest to young people—such as scientific achievements, educational news, the progress of Government programs such as the Peace Corps, and news of the entertainment world.

NBC has a similar program, called "Update," which is a Saturday news roundup for young people, showing at noon.

In addition to the network programs, educational TV stations are offering a wide selection of university-sponsored courses this year, according to the National Educational Association.

NEW YORK FARE

For New Yorkers, for instance, there are two New York University-sponsored courses: "The Literature of Modern Ireland" and "A History of Modern Russia."

Education will take over in the early evening as well as early morning, according to the National Educational Television and Radio Center schedule for the coming year. Its 52 educational station affiliates will carry outstanding educational programs during prime viewing times three evenings a week.

On Mondays, stations will present documentaries, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's "Prospects of Mankind," and the "Intertel" series, which includes the best documentaries from four countries, the United States, Britain, Canada, and France.

The Wednesday prime-time shows feature "Significant Persons," and Friday's show will be turned over to the arts.

All this—and more, of course—is entirely apart from closed-circuit television beamed directly to the classroom. It is estimated that some 3,500,000 children in some 7,500 elementary and high schools will be instructed by television courses this year.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 22, 1961]

(By Frederick W. Roevekamp)

NEW YORK.—The second Minow wave for program reform is splashing over the Nation's television industry, which has not quite dried itself from the first one.

This time, Newton M. Minow, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has focused his demands on the specific, and what he evidently considers crucial, area of children's programs.

Instead of the overwhelmingly gray, pallid children's fare now on the screens, Mr. Minow would like to see more programs designed to uplift, inspire, illuminate, and inform.

For a start, "just to get off dead center," he proposes that the three major networks take turns presenting a daily 1-hour afternoon show of the best you can produce for youngsters.

SEASON OF DECISION

"Your season of decision is at hand," Mr. Minow said in a speech prepared for the luncheon of the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York September 22 which was crowded by high-ranking broadcasting executives. "Use it wisely.

"No other group of men and women in the United States will make decisions which sweep with more penetrating impact upon the American mind. Your decisions will affect more children's hours in America, for good or evil, than the teachers in our schools, and I say with some shame, than many parents in our homes."

One of the first reactions in the industry to Mr. Minow's speech was the observation that while his by now legendary TV wasteland speech last May was a general indictment and challenge, this one was specific and would call for a specific response from the industry.

INDUSTRY JARRED

The broadcasting business has seen FCC Chairmen come and go. The role of active watchdog over the Nation's airwaves into which Mr. Minow has cast the FCC has not been entirely new on paper and in legal theory. But its sudden emergence into practice has bewildered the industry, which had become accustomed to regard the FCC as little more than a technical supervisor, observers say.

Within the few months of being in office, the energetic young lawyer has stepped into the center spot in broadcasting which for all practical purposes has stood empty until now, it is felt here. The rush for tickets to his luncheon appearance unsurprisingly resembled that of a Broadway "hit."

Mr. Minow's reputed determination to push his reform proposals and the signs that he is enjoying support in some key spots of the Federal Government, including the Justice Department and by implication the White House, have made him undoubtedly the most closely watched figure in broadcasting today.

After paying tribute to "tangible indications of an increasing awareness of your responsibilities," Mr. Minow assessed the quality and impact of present children's TV programs:

At one end of the quality spectrum, he said, there were shows of "some beneficial effects on some children." On the opposition end he saw programs which do children "obvious, documented emotional harm."

CHALLENGE POSED

While describing the latter as "inexcusable," he centered his concern on the middle of the spectrum, in the "larger areas of children's shows which neither help nor harm, which neither elevate nor debase, which neither lead nor mislead."

These "time-waster shows"—"dull, gray, and insipid, like dishwater * * * just as tasteless * * * just as nourishing * * * do no more than 'hold down and baby-sit,' period.

"To you who decide what to broadcast, I direct my question: Is this enough?" the FCC Chairman added.

"Are you sufficiently harnessing the vast power for good * * * are you providing our children with the unique values of television to educate, to awaken, to enrich their lives?"

Mr. Minow undertook to answer what he described as three major arguments advanced to defend present-day programing.

The first, he said, was that "there are the shows the children want."

He said a survey he had conducted last month among a number of children between 10 and 12 years showed that "99 percent of the respondents preferred candy to spinach, 92 percent preferred the movies to Sunday School, and 79 percent preferred to stay home and watch the game shows and soap operas on TV rather than go to school."

He said there was nothing wrong with giving children "some candy in the form of television escape" but that it was wrong not to give them "some spinach in the form of enrichment."

He said the "second excuse"—the advice to parents to turn off programs they don't want their children to see or to switch to another channel—was not "a good excuse for the TV station to keep on drugging the public air" and did not leave genuine alternatives. "Switch to what?"

As to the third argument, that broadcasters felt economically "trapped" by being unable to get sponsorship for shows—"I will never concede that improved business and improved children's programing cannot coexist."

NOD FROM KENNEDY

Apprehensions, frequently voiced by the TV industry that cooperation among networks for better programing would violate the antitrust laws, should be laid to rest, Mr. Minow said.

He said Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy had "authorized" him to say that the Justice Department would give "prompt and sympathetic consideration" to such a plan.

The FCC Chairman repeated his earlier disavowal of any FCC intention to set up censorship.

"This Commission does not believe in censorship, will have nothing to do with censorship, and will refuse to let the cry of censorship smokescreen our mutual efforts to improve broadcasting."

However, if the "will" to use the industry's broacasting "privilege" is there, he said, "it is more powerful assurance of mature responsibility than anything that Government regulation can ever bring about."

He said he saw no reason why TV should not be a "major cause for juvenile development" by contributing "heavily to teenage responsibility."

Most American Youth Not Afraid of Swearing an Oath That They Will Not Support Violent Overthrow of U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most American students are not afraid of swearing an oath that they do not support violent overthrow of the U.S. Government or organizations designed to accomplish this end. In the New York Tribune of September 8, 1961, a letter from such a young man is printed. I believe that he is more typical of our youth than the vocal minority who do object. Therefore his views should be of interest to the Congress:

Your editorial concerning the student affidavits is a disappointment. As a college freshman who may very well be applying for a student loan in the coming months, I see nothing wrong in stating that I do not believe in a subversive organization, that is, the international Communist conspiracy. A student is not required to take a loan and is therefore not compelled to sign an affidavit against any belief which he may entertain. If someone receives assistance from the Federal Government, it is to be expected that he will have to fulfill certain requirements. Perhaps when we realize that Federal participation means some Government control, the Federal aid to education enthusiasts will become more realistic.

For the United States to give aid to a Communist would be the ultimate in stupidity.

ROGER J. DALEY.

NEW YORK CITY.

The Servicemen's Survivor Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker the benefits accruing survivors of servicemen have been widely changed during the past 6 years. It is important that servicemen know this. It is important that the survivors of servicemen know this.

For instance, the $10,000 automatic insurance policy on every serviceman is no longer in existence. The servicemen going into service at this time are no longer covered by insurance. Examine your private insurance situation closely.

Instead of the insurance program, a plan of dependency and indemnity compensation has been adopted. This plan is said to provide better protection to a serviceman's dependents than the old insurance plan. But remember you are no longer insured as servicemen were in Korean war and World War II.

The benefits due survivors of servicemen under the present law who are dependent on servicemen are as follows:

SIX-MONTH DEATH GRATUITY

The new law fixes $800 as the minimum lump-sum payment in the event of death while a member of the Armed Forces is on active duty, active duty for training or inactive duty training.

The 6-month death gratuity is paid by the Service concerned as soon as possible after the serviceman's death. This goes to a spouse, a child or children, or—if designated—to parents, brothers, or sisters. The amount is computed as follows:

Total monthly pay—including special incentive, hazard, and basic pay but not allowances—times 6 equals death gratuity.

Example: A man in pay grade E–5, with more than 4 and less than 6 years' service, dies on active duty. He is drawing no special incentive or hazard pay. His designated survivor receives six times his monthly basic pay of $183.30—a total of $1,099.80.

The new law also provides that the maximum death gratuity shall not be more than $3,000, regardless of the monthly pay of the deceased.

DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION

Dependency and indemnity compensation will be paid by the Veterans' Administration, to widows, orphan children,

and dependent parents of those who die as a result of military service.

Eligibility: Widows, orphan children, and dependent parents of those who die of service-connected causes, either while in service or after separation, may be eligible for indemnity compensation.

Application: Application forms for indemnity compensation will automatically be sent by VA to the survivors, now on the rolls, of servicemen and veterans if it appears they are entitled to the benefit.

Applications filed either with the Veterans' Administration or the Social Security Administration will constitute applications for benefits from both agencies. Documents such as proofs of death, marriage, birth, and dissolution of marriages filed with either agency will be made available to the other agency.

According to marital status and family situation, compensation may be paid in any one, or in any combination, of three ways.

Compensation for widow: Payable monthly by Veterans' Administration to a serviceman's widow as long as she remains unremarried. The amount of compensation is related to the pay of the rank held by the serviceman at the time of his death, under the following formula: $112 plus 12 percent of member's monthly basic pay—rounded to next highest dollar—equals monthly compensation to widow.

Example: A man in pay grade E–6, with more than 8 and less than 10 years' service, dies. His monthly basic pay was $220.30. The compensation paid his widow is $112 plus $27—12 percent of his basic pay, rounded to the next highest dollar—a total of $139 per month.

The minimum payment of this type under the new law is $122 per month, in the case of the widow of a serviceman who was in pay grade E–1. No maximum limit is set, except by application of the $122 plus 12 percent formula.

If a widow is left with dependent children under age 18, additional income will be provided by social security benefits. Read about this under "Social security" below.

Compensation for children: This may be paid by the Veterans' Administration for the support of a deceased serviceman's children in the event their mother dies or is divorced from the serviceman or if she remarries after his death.

The act provides the following monthly rates of payment in such cases:

For one child, $70; for two children, $100; for three children, $130; each additional child, $25.

All of these payments are in addition to the benefits for which children under age 18 may be eligible under social security.

Payment of compensation for support of a child normally stops when the child becomes 18, but may be continued to age 21 if the child is in school, or for so long as a child is incapable of self-support by reason of physical or mental disabilities.

Children over 18 are entitled to indemnity compensation under conditions as follows: Helpless child, where there is a widow, $70 monthly; helpless child where there is no widow, $25 monthly added to the rate payable for a child under 18; child attending school where there is a widow, $35 monthly, until age 21; child attending school where there is no widow, rate payable for a child under 18, until age 21.

These payments may not be made unless any payments of servicemen's indemnity for the child are surrendered. The election must be signed by the person to whom death compensation payments are being made as legal guardian or custodian of the child, or by the child, if he or she has attained majority.

Compensation for parents: The new law increases the amount of income a parent may receive and remain eligible for the new form of compensation from the Veterans' Administration. The amount of compensation a parent or parents may receive is provided on a sliding scale according to other income.

Example: A parent whose other income is less than $750 yearly may receive $75 compensation each month. If over $1,750 no compensation is payable.

If the combined other income of both parents is less than $1,000 a year, they may receive as much as $100 a month in compensation. When their combined other yearly income is more than $2,050 and less than $2,400, they may receive a monthly compensation payment of $20. If over $2,400, no compensation is payable and so forth.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Members of the Armed Forces and their dependents will be eligible for the benefits provided by the old-age and survivors insurance program of the social security system on a permanent basis. Service personnel will contribute 3 percent through payroll deductions up to $4,800 of their pay.

This provision of the new law ends the temporary, partial coverage heretofore extended without cost to service personnel.

Social security will provide a monthly income for a widow with children. Children under age 18. A widow at age 62. Dependent parents. The serviceman himself at age 62.

The amount of social security benefits paid to survivors depends upon the "average monthly wage" earned by the serviceman.

Example: A man in pay grade E–5, with more than 6 and less than 8 years' service, dies. He has been making a contribution to social security for only 6 months, before which as a member of the Armed Forces he received the gratuitous coverage that was based on an earning rate of $160 per month. He is survived by a widow and two children. The widow will receive a monthly payment of $136 until the older child reaches age 18, when the payment drops to $108.80. It remains at this level until the younger child is 18, at which time payment stops. Upon reaching the age of 62, the widow will begin to receive payments of $54.40 per month for the rest of her life if she does not remarry.

The social security benefits for service members and their families are separate from, and in addition to, military retirement pay or any form of compensation benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

A special incentive to make the Armed Forces a career is provided by the new law, which allows social security credit to be counted for time spent in service that is also utilized for length-of-service retired pay. Previously, such time was "dead time" insofar as social security was concerned except for members retired for physical disability receiving pay based upon a percentage of disability.

Social security provides continuing protection, in civilian life as well as during service in the Armed Forces. Suppose, for example, a man enters service at age 20, after having worked under Social Security as a civilian for 2 years. Assume he retires at age 50, on a 30-year retirement. He then takes a civilian job covered by social security and works until he is 62 years old. The old age benefit he draws can be based on both his years in service and his years as a civilian worker, if he desires.

Here's another example: Under Public Law 880, 84th Congress, a former member of the Armed Forces who becomes totally disabled may begin drawing social security disability benefits at any age if he qualifies under the law and if he is not drawing retirement pay or VA compensation because of his disability. Suppose, for instance, a man is separated from active duty after 10 years of service. Six months later he is in an automobile accident which leaves him paralyzed. If he is totally disabled he can begin collecting social security disability benefits.

HOW YOUR CONGRESSMAN CAN HELP YOU

After reading this information, you should work always through regular channels. You should contact your Congressman only if regular channels fail, or in case of emergency when time is extremely important, or when information you desire cannot be obtained through regular military channels. Address your correspondence to: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, 1502 New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

NOTE

Public Law 51 of the 82d Congress, states:

No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

Put General Walker Back to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have followed with increasing inter-

est the developments in the so-called Walker case. I have read the official report made by Lt. Gen. Frederic J. Brown, acting inspector general, of certain allegations made by the Overseas Weekly, which occasioned the summary removal of Walker from command of the 24th Division in Europe prior to the time any investigation was made of the truth or falsity of the charges.

This precipitate action was most unusual, and in the light of the report by General Brown appears to have been unjustified. Despite the threat of war and the shortage of able and experienced combat leaders comparable to Walker, he has been benched for 6 months. General Walker should be put back to work.

GENERAL BROWN FOUND OVERSEAS WEEKLY CHARGES TO BE FALSE

In at least 10 specific instances General Brown concluded that allegations by Overseas Weekly were false and unfounded.

The Weekly, which caused the investigation claimed that General Walker had set up a problue program for use by his division, and that it was a part of a plan to promote the John Birch Society's ideas, and was in fact a part of the society's program.

General Brown's official conclusion regarding this charge: "That the problue program was not based upon any program of the John Birch Society."

Now one would think that in view of this positive finding, General Walker's critics would shift their attacks. But certain irresponsible critics are still trying to make some mileage out of the Overseas Weekly's allegation which General Brown found to be false and unfounded.

These critics seem to base their attacks upon the false assumption that there is something sinister about being zealous in the fight against the evils of communism. In my book, there is no such thing as being overzealous in the exposure of every facet of the Communist conspiracy. And our troops need this zeal applied to them as much or more than do others.

Instead of criticizing General Walker for his zeal in this regard, he should be praised to the high heavens by every patriotic American.

GENERAL WALKER, A BRILLIANT MILITARY LEADER

After all, who in America is better able to lead us and to inspire us in this life-and-death struggle against the Communist menace than is Gen. Edwin A. Walker? He is peculiarly well equipped for that role.

Let these swivel-chaired critics compare their record as Americans and their willingness to fight and die for its survival with that of General Walker.

The general served with great courage and distinction in the following campaigns: Aleutian Islands, Naples-Foggia, Rome, Arno, south France, central Europe, Rhineland, and he was in the hardest and bloodiest fighting that took place in Korea.

He is one of the most decorated officers of his rank in the Army today. Among those decorations have been the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, and Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Senior Paratrooper Badge, the French Croix de Guerre, the Norwegian Order of St. Olav, and the Order of the British Empire, to mention some of them.

WHAT ABOUT PROBLUE PROGRAM?

What, after all, was wrong with the problue program? Except by innuendo no one has dared condemn it. The reason being that it teaches good, old-fashioned American patriotism, and it alerts and educates the troops who are subjected to it to the evil designs of communism.

Mr. Daniel Lowery, senior vice commander of the New York Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and chairman of its Americanism Committee, after studying the problue program, referred to it as being "like a liberty bell, awakening in our soldiers the things that have lain dormant in Americans for too long. It was set up like a well ordered assembly line, to turn out apostles of and for America. It was dynamic Americanism."

Let us examine for a moment one of the findings of General Brown. In his report he makes this conclusion regarding General Walker:

Major General Walker is a sincere, deeply religious, patriotic soldier, dedicated to the Nation and the Army. He is not only violently anti-Communist, but has been for years, working at it with a passion, studying, lecturing, and reading all literature available on the subject. He is not only convinced that the hour is late but also that it requires drastic and immediate action on everyone's parts in or out of the Army.

Now what is wrong with that? Is General Walker not to be praised rather than censured for his courage, his wisdom, and his initiative in warning his troops of the dangers and objectives of communism, and in instilling patriotism into their hearts and minds? I think so.

HANSON BALDWIN WRITES ABOUT WALKER FROM EUROPE

Hanson Baldwin, one of America's leading journalists, recently reported on the Walker case after an exhaustive on-the-ground investigation in Europe.

General Walker—

He wrote—

who had an outstanding combat record in World War II and in Korea, is described by those who know him as a dedicated, sincere, deeply patriotic officer, with fervent and intense anti-Communist beliefs. His superiors agree that the 24th Division under his command was the best, or one of the best, in Europe.

Mr. Baldwin went on to explain:

He was relieved of his command last April and given an oral admonition because of the methods and material used in an intensely anti-Communist and aggressive troop information program he sponsored.

At the direction of the Pentagon, prior plans to transfer General Walker to a corps command in Texas with promotion to lieutenant general were canceled.

Since April, General Walker has been filling a colonel's billet as an assistant operations officer on the staff of Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, U.S. Army, Europe.

ARMY SHOCKED BY TREATMENT ACCORDED WALKER

But the Army has been shocked—

Continued Baldwin in his report from Germany—

First by what it feels is the summary treatment given to a man who is generally regarded as an outstanding leader and soldier.

General Walker at the time of his downfall was a much decorated veteran. He was characterized here as a "soldier's soldier," a division commander who had won the hearts of his men.

When General Walker was relieved from his division, the morale sagged temporarily, and many officers and men were disgruntled.

WALKER CASE MISHANDLED

Mr. Speaker, the Walker case has been mishandled in many respects. I have already mentioned the unprecedented summary action, on orders from the Pentagon, which relieved Walker of his command before charges by the disreputable Overseas Weekly were even investigated. In a sense he was convicted before he was tried. Was that any way to treat one of America's most respected and most decorated combat leaders?

Another strange thing happened. An inspector general's report is ordinarily considered privileged, and has been likened to the minutes of a grand jury; if it leads to a court-martial, the material adduced in the report may be presented as testimony under oath in court. But not so in the Walker case.

No court-martial was ordered. There was only a mild admonition, given orally by General Clarke. Yet, we witness this apparently unprecedented release of the report, even before it had ever been seen by General Walker. And it was done without according General Walker the privilege of being present and at the same time giving his side or his version of the findings that were represented by Mr. McNamara as being critical of General Walker and his conduct.

CRITICISMS OF WALKER RELATE ONLY TO MINOR MATTERS

As I have said, I have read the Brown report. I have studied it. And I have found nothing in it against General Walker that contains any substance. Much of the criticism by Overseas Weekly regarding references to prominent Americans were denied or explained in a way that made them sound quite different from the Weekly's version. Based upon hearsay, the alleged utterances were in the main either blown up or taken out of context from speeches made by General Walker, while not in uniform, to Americans stationed in Europe. The record reveals that there were many contradictions by witnesses who tried to remember what was said weeks or months beforehand.

GENERAL WALKER DID NOT TAKE FIFTH AMENDMENT

General Walker's critics have tried to make it appear to the public that during General Brown's investigation Walker took the Army's fifth amendment—that is, refused to answer some question because it might incriminate him. Such a claim is extremely unfair and very misleading.

This relates to article 31 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The fact

that an officer who avails himself of that provision does not necessarily mean that he is afraid of self-incrimination. And I am certain that was not the case in this instance. Article 31 includes rights regarding being "material to the issue" and also whether the officer being questioned considers the question degrading.

Knowing General Walker as I do, I feel certain he had good reasons for not answering, if as contended he declined to answer one of the thousands of questions propounded during the monthlong inquiry. The public was not told what the question was and the public has not been permitted to know why it was not answered.

ANY INFRACTIONS WERE OF MINOR IMPORTANCE

At the most, according to the Brown report, General Walker may have been guilty of some technical infractions of Army regulations in one or two instances. Show me a commanding general of any division who has never made a few technical errors in violation of voluminous regulations and I will show you a most remarkable man.

The report referred to a column attributed to General Walker in the division's newspaper last October, in which troops were urged to vote, and the column went on to suggest that a voting index of Members of Congress, prepared by the Americans for Constitutional Action, was available if any were interested in seeing it.

From a technical standpoint, that suggestion may not have been in conformity with Army regulations. But in any event it was done in a spirit of helpfulness. Walker did not advocate the election or the defeat of any candidate. No candidate's name was mentioned and no political party was mentioned. It was obviously a part of the general's purpose—a most commendable one—to arouse the troops to inform themselves and take part in American elections. There was certainly nothing sinister or mischievous about this. It was done aboveboard, in the best of faith, prompted by an admittedly laudible motive.

Perhaps an admonishment was in order. I do not know. But Walker was admonished, and in my opinion that should have been the last of that because it deals with a relatively insignificant matter.

In treating these side issues, all of relatively minor importance, let us keep our minds on General Walker's real mission in Europe. Does any one question his success in building up the spirit, the morale, and the battle-readiness of the 24th Division? Let us not be diverted from this magnificient performance. Let us not throw the baby out with the wash.

OVERSEAS WEEKLY SHOULD BE BANNED

Mr. Speaker, the case against General Walker should be viewed and appraised in the background of the Overseas Weekly—that discredited and salacious tabloid which spearheaded the attack against General Walker.

That paper has been under fire for years by Army officials. On July 28, 1953 Lt. Gen. Charles Bolte, commanding general of the Army in Europe, banned the Overseas Weekly from the newsstands of the Army's newspaper Stars and Stripes.

The Bolte action was reversed, but only after Mrs. Marion von Ropach, its publisher, promised to clean it up.

It is too bad that this scandal sheet has not been permanently banned from all newsstands of our military bases in Europe. It should have been outlawed long ago.

There is ample authority for banning it. A guidance sheet sent to local commanders in 1957 says:

Materials which are morally acceptable for sale and circulation are those which generally create a favorable climate, encourage a realization of moral, spiritual, and religious values; tend generally toward favorable treatment of marriage, a strong home life, patriotism, decency, honesty, integrity, and other virtues essential to the well-being of individuals and the Nation.

I cannot believe that anyone who has seen very many issues of the Overseas Weekly will seriously contend that it measures up to the criteria contained in that guidance sheet.

Termed the "Oversexed Weekly," this tabloid features sex, crime, prostitution, debauchery, and in the past has carried nearly nude photographs on its front pages with regularity. This scandal sheet circulates among some 50,000 servicemen in Europe.

Hanson Baldwin referred to the Weekly as follows:

Recent surveys by the Army of many issues of the Overseas Weekly resulted in the classification of about 150 columns of news as unsavory courts-martial, 46 individual stories as featuring ridicule of military leadership, 22 on the antiofficer, pro-enlisted-man theme, and a total of more than 200 stories dealing with prostitution, rape, or other violence, some of them adjudged to be excessively descriptive or lurid.

Most, but not all of the many senior officers this correspondent has talked to, agree with Secretary McNamara's description of the paper * * * as "personally repulsive."

It was only after General Walker, for obviously good reasons, barred one Siegfried Naujocks, a writer for Overseas Weekly, from barracks of the 24th Division at Augsburg and around Munich, that the false charges were brought against General Walker.

A recent development further exposes the editorial policies of that paper. A book just published by the editor of the Weekly, John Dornberg, called "Schizophrenic Germany," is most insulting and uncomplimentary to the present anti-Communist Government of West Germany and to the German people. It describes the split soul of the Germans, and alleges that they have not recovered from their Nazi and anti-Semitic past.

A review of that book in a German-language newspaper, a copy of which I have in my possession, says of it:

The purpose is to discredit the German people as well as the Federal Republic; this can even be gleaned from the text of the advertisement of Dornbergs book. It is ponderously headed "Will There Be a Fourth Reich in Germany?"; in addition, the ad is heavily embellished with swastikas.

In referring to the Walker case, precipitated by the charges made by Overseas Weekly, the review of Dornberg's book in the German newspaper contains this:

For the German public, the affair is not without interest, for Dornberg's anti-German book sheds light on the attack launched by him in Overseas Weekly against the anti-Communist American General Walker; and the attack against Walker presents us with clues as to what Dornberg may have had in mind when he manufactured his book, (the tenor of) which is directed against the anti-Communist Bonn Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have recited many reasons which I believe to be valid why the Overseas Weekly should be banned from our military bases in Europe.

In addition, the Department of Defense should look into the propriety of a contract which I understand is now in force between Overseas Weekly and Stars and Stripes, whereby the latter distributes the Weekly at a reported consideration in excess of $100,000 annually.

While the Stars and Stripes is not an official Government publication, it does have an American colonel at its head, I understand. He is in uniform and I assume receives the same salary and other benefits as other military officers receive.

There is every reason in the world why the Department of Defense should launch an investigation of Overseas Weekly, if indeed any investigation is needed. And immediate steps should be taken to bring about the cancellation of the contract I have just referred to, and the Weekly should be banned from our military newsstands.

We owe that much to the Bonn Government, and above all we owe it to the thousands of young American troops who are subjected to its unsavory contents.

GENERAL WALKER SHOULD BE PROMOTED AND REASSIGNED

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the present administration will reconsider its treatment of General Walker. With war clouds hovering about us, combat leaders such as Walker are hard to come by. This is no time to equivocate over relatively minor things. This is a time to get deadly serious about our future and the future of the free world.

General Walker has been admonished. That is water over the dam. Now let us look to the future. He should be promptly promoted to the grade of lieutenant general and given an assignment in keeping with his proven talents as one of America's most eminent combat leaders. Such an action would do much toward restoring faith in our purpose and faith in a system that, when the chips are down, rewards those who deserve it.

Babson Discusses How To Get Industries to Your City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include an interesting article which appeared in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, of Lawrence, Mass., on September 21, 1961:

BABSON DISCUSSES HOW TO GET INDUSTRIES TO YOUR CITY

(By Roger W. Babson)

BABSON PARK.—The treasurer of a large Massachusetts saving banks told me yesterday that his new deposits are running over $20,000 a day. I asked him how he invested that much and he replied: "I send it all to Mississippi." This means that the people of this New England city, instead of having their savings invested in New England, are sending them down South to be invested. Individuals in New England are sending their savings to New York City for investment in the stock market. Therefore, most New England cities are starving for capital with which to start new factories and give employment to their own people. This largely explains the troubles of New England cities today. Furthermore, this same situation explains unemployment conditions in other cities of the North.

SIX FASTEST GROWING STATES

In a previous column this summer I mentioned six Southern States which have special laws to encourage industry. I briefly explained that these laws permit city bonds to be issued to build factories, just as most States float bonds to build highways. So many inquiries have come to me asking details of these revenue bond laws, that I am devoting this week's column to the subject. I take as an illustration the city of Tupelo, Miss. This city is getting not only its capital largely from New England, but also some of our best young men. One of the ablest men in Tupelo is Frank Dodge, who came from the little town of New Boston, N.H.

The first step which a northern city must take, in this connection, is to have the State pass a law whereby a city may issue these revenue bonds to build factories as well as to build toll roads. Thus far, when a northern city has gone to its legislature for such an amendment, the bond dealers have killed the proposed amendment. They have been assisted by the conservative municipal bondholders of their community. These bondholders have selfishly thought only of themselves and have disregaraded the welfare of their community.

HOW THE PLAN WORKS

Let us assume that an established company with good credit is willing to build a factory in your community costing $500,000, provided the city will issue industrial revenue bonds in this amount to pay for the cost. The company for which the factory is being built takes a 20-year lease for $35,000, which includes modernization and interest at very low annual rates. This is possible because the interest is Federal tax exempt and because of other advantages. The cost of $500,000 includes land, concrete floors and walls, and all normal electrical wiring, plumbing, air conditioning, a sprinkler system, and heating for a building of approximately 125,000 square feet.

The building is owned by the city and gets a 99-year tax exemption from the city, county, and State. The credit of the firm leasing the factory is not encumbered because it is a lease contract. The $500,000 revenue bond issue provides the full faith and credit of the city voted by the citizens at a special election on the project. These bonds furnish Federal tax exemption to the purchasers because they are issued by a city. The rate of interest will be determined more by the credit of the leasing company than by the credit of the particular municipal issuing the bonds.

HOW TO SECURE DETAILS

Readers of this column may write to Mayor James O. Ballard, of Tupelo, Miss., for a copy of the "Bawi" law. States amending their constitutions accordingly should find their unemployment problems largely solved, since the new industries will provide new jobs for people who are willing to do good work at a fair wage. The program thus assures rising employment and a good rate of interest on a federally nontaxable bond, and the municipality receives a fair rental from the property. The bonds are amortized and interest paid during the term of the 20-year lease. So far, I have not known of a default.

Postal Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended a meeting of a governmental affairs committee which meets regularly to discuss political policies at the local, State, and National levels. Every member present was a successful businessman in a progressive community.

The discussion that day was on postal rate increases and the subject was discussed rather thoroughly from every angle. Among those taking part in the discussion were representatives from a very large mail order house and two printing concerns whose annual postal bills run into sizable figures.

One thing discussed and one which all here know exists, is the inefficiency within the departments. Possibly some of us here are partly responsible for this inefficiency. Review your district as you sit here and picture the post offices which cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination other than political. How may postmasters are receiving more salary than the receipts of their offices? I personally know of offices with less than 20 patrons. This morning I learned of one pennypinching conservation who has more than 100 offices in his State which do not pay their own way.

Before raising rates it might be desirable to conduct a mental survey and determine to what extent each of us is responsible for the huge annual postal deficit.

The following resolution adopted by the group attending the meeting to which I referred above, might be well worth considering:

1. The operation of the U.S. Post Office is a big business, and therefore should be run on a businesslike basis in the same manner as any other private industry. The flimsy argument that this is a Government service, and therefore should be permitted to operate at a huge annual deficit is just plain poor economic thinking. Only a very small percentage of Post Office duties should be considered public service.

2. Since the Post Office is a completely monopolized Government operation, this is all the more reason why it should be run in the most efficient and economic manner possible.

3. Instead of a well-run businesslike organization we have a conglomeration of featherbedding civil service regulations; wasteful redtape rules; with extravagant and ridiculous demands by the Postal Employees Association; all of this condoned and accepted by the Government postal authorities.

4. Since the Post Office operation is similar to a large corporation with small plants in many towns and cities, why not operate the Post Office in this usual successful way? Make the local postmaster accountable for an efficiently run organization under his control. Give him all the authority of management to hire, fire, transfer, and assign all work as he sees fit. See that he conducts the business on a reasonable budget consistent with costs, wages, and working conditions comparable to private industry in the same community.

5. In conclusion, we sincerely believe from many observations of our Post Office operation, that with good business practices it could be put on a paying basis, and not only eliminate the annual deficit, but the continual increase in mail rates as well.

Refreshing News of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD, and commend to the attention of the membership of the House, an editorial which appeared in the September 7, 1961, edition of the West Allis Star, an excellent weekly newspaper which is published in my district.

The editorial is entitled "Refreshing News of Youth," and I fully agree that the news it contains is both refreshing and welcome. All too often, we read about the difficulties of our young people and about the problem of juvenile delinquency—and too seldom, it seems to me, about the positive, constructive accomplishments of the vast majority of our youth. For this reason, I would like to congratulate the West Allis Star on its fine editorial, and to extend my sincere congratulations to the young people mentioned in it. Their actions should serve as an example and an inspiration to all the young people who are growing up and preparing for the responsibilities of adulthood and mature citizenship.

The editorial follows:

[From the West Allis (Wis.) Star, Sept. 7, 1961]

REFRESHING NEWS OF YOUTH

We hear so much of juvenile delinquency; of the increasing rate of crimes committed by the youth of our land and other disturbing reports concerning the difficulties of young people today.

It is therefore particularly refreshing to learn of the accomplishments of a group of West Allis young people who have developed a constructive outlet for their energies and interests.

Larry Klobukowski, a 16-year-old boy who lives at 1321 S. 96th Street, and some of his friends from the Catholic Youth Organization of St. Aloysius congregation have been writing, producing, filming and showing their own movies. They are now working on their sixth production, "A Walk in the Woods."

The young people call their movie company, "Elkay Productions." The films they produce are shown at St. Aloysius' school hall and most of the proceeds are turned over to the gymnasium fund.

It is encouraging to see young people display such imagination, initiative and aggressiveness in entertaining themselves in a constructive way. In addition to the good fun they must have in the process, they gain valuable experience in planning, organizing and cooperation. They certainly derive satisfaction and a sense of creative accomplishment they would not have gotten from watching television or from other prepared recreation.

Another group of West Allis young people recently took part in a national activity that was a credit to the youth of the entire country.

Seven high school age boys and girls from Mount Hope Lutheran Church attended the National Luther League convention held at Miami Beach. There were about 15,000 young people participating in this week-long meeting.

A columnist for the Miami Sun, Paul M. Bruun, devoted his entire space for one day to praise for the young visitors. He wrote, "A finer bunch of boys and girls can't be found anywhere on earth. They have a belief in Almighty God that is wonderful to behold."

"I had actually forgotten that there are youngsters in this Nation with perfect manners and with an attitude toward adults and to their fellow men that is wonderful to behold. * * *" "They have renewed my faith in the human race," he added.

Our community can take real pride in all of these youngsters. It is most refreshing to hear of them in a time when the failures of youth capture so much of the headlines of the day.

Dollar Instability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1961, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a table compiled by the First National City Bank of New York, showing the rates of depreciation during the last decade of the U.S. dollar—2.1 percent—and the currencies of 42 other nations. I had this table printed in the RECORD because I thought it showed graphically the need for taking steps to stabilize our dollar.

Today, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD additional material, pointing to this need. It is an article by Nate White, entitled "Trend of the Economy: Shoring Up the Dollar" which appeared in the September 19, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. Because I believe each Member of Congress will find this article of interest, I, under unanimous consent, place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 19, 1961]

TREND OF THE ECONOMY: SHORING UP THE DOLLAR

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—What is at stake in the Vienna meetings of the International Monetary Fund Board of Governors is the future of the international dollar, sometimes called the Eurodollar.

This is the dollar which is as good as gold.

The Vienna meetings seem distant to Americans. The world news, seemingly swirling in whirlpools of crisis, has forced Vienna to the shadows. Few people even know or care what the IMF is. Yet in Vienna the present and future stability of the dollar is being determined.

We say that it is in Vienna that this takes place. It is easier to express it that way. Actually the present and the future of the dollar are determined within the United States by the people themselves.

If Americans make their dollar worth more at home it will be worth more to others overseas. It is because Americans have carelessly cheapened their dollar at home that it is now in a continuing crisis overseas. Americans have stolen value from themselves. If they wish to preserve their dollar, both at home and overseas, then they must retain the value which it now has and if possible restore value to it.

Why should it seem to be such a far-off thought? The thought of restoring value to the dollar?

The West Germans restored value to their mark. The French have made the franc an excellent currency. The Italians have put the lira back in the prestige class. The Swiss franc always was there. Even though we disapprove of the Government of Portugal, the escudo is one of the world's finest currencies.

And now the British are hard at work restoring value and prestige to the pound sterling.

It is only the Americans who are still trying to save their dollar by gimmickry instead of by the hard, tough sort of process which restores value. This is why the Vienna meeting is so important to the United States. The dollar is in need of help. It needs this help from overseas, from European central bankers, from the collective thinking and equity of the IMF Board of Governors.

The place to begin with the dollar, of course, is at home. If the Americans tried to restore value to their dollar at home, rebuilding its content of value, they would need less to seek aid overseas.

The IMF was founded to stabilize the pressures on currencies when the winds of speculation or imbalance hit them. But it was not founded to take the place of sound policies at home. It is not supposed to be a substitute for fiscal, monetary and budgetary wisdom.

For 16 years the Americans have generously tried to help the world. They have poured assistance money into Iran, Bolivia, all of Western Europe, other nations of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. They have maintained expensive military establishments overseas. The American foreign-aid program has become a way of life for the United States.

This is a way of life which Americans support because they want to share their economic development with others. But the news indicates they have not always won friends and allies by this process. The United States was the major benefactor of the 25 nations which met at Belgrade 2 weeks ago. Yet these nations did not express either cooperation with nor support of the United States.

Similarly, the United States has encouraged discrimination against its products in Western Europe to assist in the rebuilding of European industry. Discrimination against dollar goods was removed in Britain and some European countries over a year ago. But dollar goods still face heavy discrimination.

The European Common Market nations, negotiating as one economic power and amassing their tremendous assortment of products from six nations, now oppose the entry into the area of dollar goods with increasing resistance. Euromarket negotiations at GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) have been tough, almost inflexible. American negotiators have not done very well. Furthermore, they use an arithmetical average for the six nations in their tariff negotiations, instead of a weighted average, nation by nation. This device—clever for Euromarket—operates in a discriminating way toward the United States, Britain, and others outside Euromarket.

The brilliance of Euromarket negotiators is not denied. Their sense of justice and equity toward other nations is certainly open to question and especially in the United States which for some 16 years has bent its policies and taxed its citizens in order to help the Euromarket nations restore value in themselves and in their own productivity.

This current aggressive position of Euromarket negotiators is not lost on American businessmen nor politicians. It could produce a protectionist reaction in the United States which would be difficult to control.

The excessive discrimination, deliberately encouraged by the United States in the days of Europe's reconstruction, has become a pattern that Europeans like. They want to begin to day with this discriminatory position and negotiate from there. American pleas for equity at times seem quite futile. Furthermore, the Americans have not been tough in their negotiating procedures.

This lack of toughness comes back to the American people themselves. They are operating a comfort economy. They want leisure time. They want the comforts of home at work. They want recess periods and coffee breaks. They wish to do everything at once—run a major defense system, a foreign-aid system, a space exploration system, improve their schools, their cities, their highways, their parks. But they want to do this at a leisurely pace.

These casual things in modern society, provided they do not destroy a nation's productivity, have their place. But when they destroy a nation's productivity or weaken it, it is time for the entire Nation to realize what is going on.

These processes have weakened the Nation's productivity. Wages in the United States have steadily moved ahead of prices. Thus a new kind of inflation has occurred which has destroyed more content in the value of the dollar than any other process. This is cost inflation.

The United States has not abandoned cost inflation. It pushes upward with cost inflation at every negotiating table. The steel settlement of 1959—after a costly and destructive strike—was cost inflation. The General Motors strike this year is an example of cost inflation. Practically every settlement negotiated these days contains built-in cost inflation.

If one looks at this from only a narrow point of view this kind of cost inflation seems somewhat small and inconsequential—a few cents an hour. But from the steady long-range view of the past 15 years it is the inflation which has destroyed built-in value of the dollar.

This value is not lost if the people of the United States should turn themselves around and make a determined effort to rebuild value into their dollar, even as did the West Germans determine to rebuild it into the mark, and the French into the franc, and the Italians into the lira.

But American administrations do not encourage the people to build value into their dollar. The Federal Government itself is the most inflationary influence in the economy when it operates enormous deficits in time of expansion. The Kennedy administration, as did the Eisenhower administration before it, is pursuing policies which steal value from the dollar.

At the moment the American people are not doing major things to increase their dollar's value. Businesses, it is true, are investing heavily in research and development, in new plant and equipment, in trying to remove obsolescence. They have not received the aid from their Government which they should have had. The idea behind this is to increase productivity. Yet the cost question constantly hits the businessman. He saves money in one spot only to have it eaten away in another by this whole problem of cost-push, the erosion of productivity, the cost of operating a comfort economy.

This is the reason why the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund in Vienna must consider ways to strengthen the fund to handle hurricane pressure on the dollar as well as on other currencies.

The real story is this: The Americans, having failed to stop the erosion of their productivity at home, the gradual weakening of their dollar, must now take their problem overseas. They must as a nation with enormous world commitments make sure that their dollar is shored up overseas to compensate for what they have not had the will to accomplish at home.

One comforting compensating factor in the situation exists. It is the heavy investment overseas by American companies to attempt to meet the competition from the booming European economies. This investment helps balance out the imbalance in the American payments deficits. In the 10-year period, 1949–59, American businesses increased their oversea investments by $34 billion. At the same time oversea businesses increased their investments in the United States by $24 billion. The $10 billion plus on the American side thus has helped counterbalance the deficits the United States has run in its balance of payments. But this oversea investment was achieved by foreign tax credits—amounting to a Federal subsidy—which the Kennedy administration tried this year to end.

And oversea investments, while productive in the long run, do not meet sudden pressures on the dollar in the short run.

Thus the United States faces the necessity at the moment of winning an expanded and strengthened IMF—which would draw expanded strength from West Germany, France, Italy, and other member nations as well as the United States itself—to protect the oversea dollar.

The pooled gold of the Euromarket nations—if pooled—would exceed the gold of the United States. This fact has become a monetary reality. The best currencies in Europe today are the franc, the mark, the Swiss franc, and the lira (if one rules out the escudo as a national currency). If the dollar is to hold its own, no amount of IMF strengthening can do this. Only the American people and their Government can restore value to their dollar. Only the Americans can rebuild the value they have destroyed.

This acute problem of a comfort economy ought to be faced today. The administration ought to present the hard monetary facts to the people. It could begin with the comfort strikes, but go on from there to the whole comfort system. A little austerity today might be good for the United States. And it could prevent serious austerity at some indefinite future date when the dollar calls for help.

Reemployment Rights and Unemployment Compensation for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, veterans may be entitled to reemployment in a position held prior to their service in the Armed Forces or to a job of like seniority, status, and pay under the following conditions:

First. Have left an other-than-temporary job to enter active service in the Armed Forces, provided that in any service entered into after 24 June 1948, he must have been separated not later than 4 years after entering such service, unless he was involuntarily retained.

Second. Service must been completed satisfactorily.

Third. Be qualified to perform the duties of his former job, unless service-connected disability renders him incapable of performing such duties.

Application must be submitted to former employer within the following time limits:

First. Generally, a veteran must apply to former employer within 90 days after separation from active service, or within 90 days after release from hospitalization which has continued after discharge for not more than a year.

Second. Reservists completing short terms of training duty (less than 90 days) must apply to former employer within 30 days after release from such training duty.

Third. Reservists completing 3 to 6 months' active duty for training must apply to former employer within 60 days after release from such training or release from hospitalization which has continued after active duty for training for not more than 6 months.

Fourth. Enlistees or inductees rejected for military service must apply to former employer within 30 days after rejection.

Veterans failing to obtain proper restoration to their old jobs should contact, first, in case of private employment, the Department of Labor, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights. Contact may be made through the nearest State employment office, second, in regard to Federal employment, the nearest office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, located in most first- and second-class post offices.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Veterans with active service subsequent to January 31, 1955, may be eligible for unemployment compensation benefits provided by the Ex-Servicemen's Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 if the following eligibility requirements are met:

First. At least 90 days of active service (less if discharged for a service-incurred disability).

Second. Separation under conditions other than dishonorable.

Third. Unemployment occurring after discharge.

Fourth. Any other conditions of eligibility prescribed by State of veterans residence.

A veteran is not eligible for unemployment compensation while—

First. Eligible for any other form of Federal or State unemployment compensation payments.

Second. Receiving payments from the Veterans' Administration in connection with education or training under the GI bill or the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Third. During the period following discharge in which eligible for mustering-out pay—30 days if entitled to $100 mustering-out pay, 60 days if $200, and 90 days if $300.

The amount of compensation payable varies and is based on the pay and allowances applicable to a member's military grade at time of discharge. The maximum weekly amounts range from $26 to $45 and the maximum periods range from 16 to 30 weeks in a benefit year.

Veterans must comply with the requirements of the State unemployment compensation laws to be eligible for unemployment pay benefits. Application should be made to the nearest local office of the State employment service in the State where the veteran is residing at the time.

Philadelphia Jewish Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Exponent, a leading citywide weekly, paid special tribute to the Germantown Courier, an important paper in my district, because the Courier published during the High Holy Days a feature article in the September 14 issue which refers to the part the Jewish people took during the earliest history of the founding of the Republic. The Courier article relates that there were Jews in Philadelphia before the arrival of William Penn in 1682.

I have included in these remarks the reference published by the Jewish Exponent and the feature article which appeared in the Germantown Courier which recites the part that was played by the early Jewish settlers in the founding of our country:

[From the Jewish Exponent, Sept. 23, 1961]

A GRACIOUS ACT

It was a gracious act on the part of the Germantown Courier to devote a leading feature article in its issue of September 14 to a review of the part our people have taken in the early history of the founding of the Republic, with special reference to some of the outstanding Jewish personalities of those earlier days. Our esteemed contemporary could not have found a more appropriate occasion than the period of the High Holy Days.

This contribution to better understanding and to the furtherance of friendlier relations

is most acceptable. It shows what can be done, where the spirit is there, to shed light where ignorance is still a source of irritation, if not worse. In expressing our appreciation, we know we are voicing the sentiments of the entire Jewish citizenry.

[From the Germantown Courier, Sept. 14, 1961]

BRITISH SHOT DESERTERS FROM THEIR ARMY AT THE GATES OF MIKVE ISRAEL CEMETERY

Certain of our friends and neighbors this week—those who seek God through Judaism—withdraw from their usual pursuits to mark a new year for their people in Rosh Hashana and culminate a period of high holy days with Yom Kippur, or Day of Atonement.

Their ancient ceremonies of worship have been held here since the earliest days of Penn's colony. Jews always have entered into the social, political and cultural life of Philadelphia and its environs. Without the aid of Haym Salomon and Israel Israel Washington's army might well have disintegrated through lack of funds for provisions.

It seems fitting and proper that the history of the Hebrew people hereabouts should be presented briefly at this time, serving to remind the Jew himself of the distinguished part he played and to explain to others the background of the Jewish people on the local scene.

For a complete understanding we must go back to A.D. 70 when after a siege by Titus, King Solomon's Temple on Mt. Moriah and the entire city of Jerusalem were destroyed. Many of its inhabitants fled while some remained in the rubble of the ruins. Sixty-five years later, Adrian rebuilt the city but the few Jews who had clung on were no longer permitted to stay there.

This dispersal of the Jews gave rise to one of the most unique situations in the history of mankind; they have retained and fostered their particular culture and language for 19 centuries.

They followed the trade routes away to the points of the compass, even to far Cathay. Then Rabbi Yochanan ben Zaccai persuaded Emperior Vespacian to permit them to establish a center of learning at Jamnia. That place became the seat of a great rabbinical academy wherein Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph was a noted teacher in the 2d century of the Christian era.

Simultaneously, descendants of King David ruled Jewish subjects of Parthia until Babylonian Jewish learning and culture came to an end about A.D. 1040 with the advance of violently fanatical Mohammedan tribes.

Then the focal center shifted to Spain where there was no persecution under the Moors and there occurred a golden age, distinguished by wide advances in philosophy, poetry, and litany.

In Spain Ibn Gebirol, a 12th century poet and philosopher, was the outstanding personage. He was followed by Maimonides who codified the whole gamut of Jewish traditional law into systematic order in the Mishnah Torah and "The Guide to the Perplexed." These are the bases to this day of Orthodox Jewry.

The year 1492 is an important year in that Columbus' discovery of America is associated with it. However, that was the year that Ferdinand and Isabella succeeded in driving the Moors from Spain and what is now Portugal and also when the Spanish Inquisition prevailed upon the Spanish monarchs to to expel the Jews. Others had scattered into Europe when they fled after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Next came the advancement of Hassidim which opposed the intellectual domination of Talmudic scholars. This new philosophical attitude was concerned with emotional expression and freedom from some ancient dogmas.

With the discovery of America, German Jews instituted a reform movement which they called enlightenment. The outstanding leader here was Moses Mendelssohn who advocated dropping some of the ancient laws and customs and repudiation of the tenet that a messiah would lead them back to Palestine. This was spread in America by German Jews.

Pursuing a middle course between the orthodox and the reformed groups are the conservatives. Their viewpoint is that Judaism is more than a religion in which much that is traditional is no longer tenable but should find expression in literature and the arts.

Thus we find the Jew as he first appeared here. In a lecture given before members of the YMHA about 1880, a noted scholar, H. P. Rosenbach, mentioned that it was a tradition that there were Jews in Philadelphia before Penn's arrival. There may be some basis for this statement inasmuch as there were almost 2,000 inhabitants of the city when Penn landed in 1682.

It is recorded that in January 1726, a special act was passed by the assembly to permit Arnold Bamberger and others to own lands and engage in trade and commerce.

Twelve years later the proprietaries (Penn's heirs) sold a piece of land to Nathan Levy for a burial plot. By 1747 a congregation, Mikve Israel—"Hope of Israel"—was established but it was many years before their synagogue was erected. It is interesting to note that a Rev. Mordecai Yarnall was instrumental in initiating the congregation. Yarnall was a minister among Friends who had displayed a great interest in the welfare of Jews. Between 1745 and 1775 members of Mikve Israel held their religious ceremonies in a small house in Sterling Alley which ran from Cherry to Race, between Third and Fourth.

The previously mentioned Nathan Levy donated his family plot to Mikve Israel and afterward Michael Gratz was directed to purchase adjoining land. The cemetery still remains at Ninth and Spruce.

The wooden gate which was at this burying ground long bore the marks of British bullets. It was the custom in European armies to execute deserters at the gates of Jewish cemeteries and the British followed that practice here during the Revolutionary War.

The Jews in New York City were stanch Whigs to a man and many of them were forced to flee when the British occupied that city during the Revolution. Probably the most noted was Rabbi Gershom Mendez Israel Seixas, a clergyman of great influence and eloquence. He had served at the Mill Street Synagogue since 1766 having come there from Brazil.

When Mikve Israel had erected its place of worship on September 17, 1784, it was widely known as the Lisbon Synagogue * * * from Portugal originally. Such names as Barrias, Nunes, da Costa, de Lucena, Marache, Henriquez, Seixas, Madeira, Seysius, Sasportes, and Carpelles appear on the list of members in 1784.

Salomon's part in the Revolution needs no retelling. Israel, who had lost all his property in a fire when he lived in Carter's Alley, had a fine credit standing in Europe. He borrowed money and saw Jefferson, Madison, General Lee * * * through financial difficulties. A grand master of the Free Masons in the city he was arrested by the British for his activities in furthering the American cause. He was tried and sentenced to be executed but was saved from death through the intercession of a British Free Mason.

When George Washington was installed President of the United States, Mikve Israel, speaking for all the Jews of Philadelphia and those of New York, Charleston, and Richmond, memoralized in part:

"To the Eternal God who is thy refuge, we commit in our prayer thy precious life and when, full of years, thou shalt be gathered from the people the righteousness shall go before thee and we shall remember amid our regret that 'the Lord hath put aside the godly for himself,' while thy name and thy virtues shall remain an indelible memorial in our minds."

Washington replied:

"Gentlemen: The liberality of sentiment toward each other which marks every political and religious denomination of men in this country stands unparalleled in the history of nations.

"The affection of such people is a treasure beyond the reach of calculation; and the repeated proofs which my fellow-citizens have given of their attachment to me and approbation of my doings, form the purest source of my temporal felicity. This affectionate expression of your address excites my gratitude and receives my warmest acknowledgment.

"May the same temporal and eternal blessings which you implore for me rest upon your congregation.

"G. WASHINGTON."

Casimir Pulaski Freedom Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, October 11, the anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski, will always remind Americans of the part that great Polish patriot played in the struggle for American independence.

Pulaski was always a fighter for freedom. In his native Poland he fought constantly to obtain liberty for the oppressed Polish people. In the year 1771, he made an unsuccessful attempt to capture the King of Poland, which resulted in a sentence of outlawry being passed upon him. He made his escape to France where he met Benjamin Franklin. It was Franklin who persuaded Pulaski to aid the Colonies in their fight for independence.

Pulaski's love of liberty knew no national boundaries. He saw America's fight for liberty as his own. General Washington quickly perceived the Polish patriot's military and personal qualifications and Pulaski quickly achieved the rank of brigadier general in command of a cavalry division. He performed with distinction and bravery at the Battle of Brandywine in 1777. He participated in many of the great battles of the Revolutionary War. Eventually, with the consent of Congress he was granted the right to form his famous Pulaski's Legion. In 1779, he commanded both the French and American cavalry at Savannah and in an assault on October 9, he was mortally wounded. He died on the U.S. brig *Wasp* 2 days later.

On this anniversary date of the death of that great Polish patriot it is appropriate that we remember that it is through men like Pulaski that America has absorbed some of the heritage, culture, and aspirations of Poland. It is right that we pause and consider how

much all Polish-Americans have contributed to the economic, cultural, and spiritual growth of America. It is also a propitious time to join with them in their concern for their native land which today is under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

The freedom and justice for which Pulaski fought so valiantly for, nearly 200 years ago, does not exist in his native land. This October 11 is an opportune time for all Americans to reiterate with all Polish-Americans their concern for the Polish people suffering under Communist rule by vowing that they will continue to work for conditions in the world which will allow the Polish people the right to choose the form of government under which they desire to live. Only under these circumstances can we be sure that the Polish people will once again be able to live in peace under the rule of law with all the free nations of the world.

The Belgrade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, many of us were disappointed by the recent action of the so-called uncommitted nations at Belgrade. I believe some of our objections to their actions are well illustrated by the following editorial taken from the Record-Courier, Ravenna-Kent, Ohio. I believe the editorial is self-explanatory and should be of great interest to the Members of Congress:

OUR FRIENDS PROVE INGRATES

The uncommitted nations whose heads of state and government met in Belgrade last week preferred to call themselves the unalined nations because, as one explained, they are each committed to its own principles. Among these, apparently, is not gratitude. A better name for them would be the ingrates.

For there was hardly one of the 25 among them which at one time or another had not been put on its feet economically through U.S. aid. And many among them are still recipients of this aid.

President Tito of Yugoslavia, the host nation; President Sukarno, of Indonesia, and President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, who led the attack on the West, all have been bailed out by American aid. It is said that Premier Jawaharlal Nehru of India deflected their all-out desire to support the Communist line, and had the backing of Premier Nu, of Burma; Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Premier of Ceylon; and Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus.

But the statement that came out of the conference was still heavily weighted with Communist-line policies. It called for another Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting which, in the present atmosphere, would be useless; abandonment of military bases around the world, including specifically the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo in Cuba; universal disarmament as advocated by Khrushchev; and the end of colonialism, without a word about the Soviet empire acquired since World War II. It could not have been slanted more by Khrushchev himself.

Allied Solidarity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond, in a recent article in the Washington Post, has raised the very pointed and important question: "If the worst comes, will Britain and France stand firmly with the United States in defending Western rights in Berlin?"

To answer this question, Mr. Drummond has gone behind the official position of the British and French Governments to an analysis of public opinion in these two countries.

Mr. Drummond's conclusion is both penetrating and disturbing, and it deserves our close consideration:

ALLIED SOLIDARITY: BRITISH PUBLIC INDIFFERENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

LONDON.—If the worst comes, will Britain and France stand firmly with the United States in defending Western rights in Berlin?

To answer this question it is necessary to understand that the official position of the British and French Governments—which are fully committed to defending Berlin—is not reliably, certainly not strongly, supported by either British public opinion or French public opinion.

In the United States, for example, the American people are overwhelmingly behind the Kennedy administration in not yielding an inch of the essential freedoms to be protected.

But here in Britain it is evident that in this matter public opinion is casual, uncertain, and borders on the indifferent. If the policy of the Macmillan government were to be governed wholly by the Gallup polls, it would be a very limp policy indeed.

The state of mind of the French people seems about the same. Were it not for President Charles de Gaulle's rocklike personal stand, there would be no telling what the French attitude toward Berlin would be today. There might well be a rush to the nearest exits.

This does not mean that the Macmillan and De Gaulle governments will not honor their commitment to defend Western rights in West Berlin if they are seriously interfered with. But it does mean:

That they really wish they didn't have the commitment, that in both countries public opinion to a great extent and official opinion to a great extent and official opinion to some extent will favor larger concessions to Mr. K. than we would.

That widespread anti-German sentiment convinces Khrushchev that he has a good opportunity to divide the three Western powers on the assumption that the British and French "won't fight for Berlin" and would in the end leave the United States standing alone.

Here in Europe this is exactly the tactic which Mr. K. is employing day after day to pry Britain and France from the United States and to persuade Washington that the NATO allies are not reliable. Right now most of the Soviet propaganda apparatus is orchestrated to this one tune.

One day the Russian Ambasador in London will give a British "ban the bomb" cleric such a lecture on the danger of Germany's starting another war that he will come away from the interview muttering: "There is no question that their decision (to resume testing) is a very understandable, terrific fear of a rearmed Germany."

Then the next day Khrushchev himself adds the element of threat to the existing quotient of anti-Germanism and gives the two an extra stir for good measure. He puts it out in a statement to a Western corresponent, saying:

"When it comes to a showdown, Britain and France will refuse to join the United States in a war over Berlin for fear of their absolute destruction."

You will recall that a few weeks ago in Washington this was what Soviet Ambassador Menshikov was saying to President Kennedy—that he better not resist anything that Khrushchev wants, because the American people will not fight for Berlin.

Now the Soviets are saying it to the British and the French and the Italians and they have more fertile ground on which to sow their seeds of disunity.

This is particularly visible in Britain. For example, the latest Gallup poll shows that only 5 percent of the American people hold the United States considerably to blame for Russia's resumption of testing while three times that number in Britain feel the United States to be considerably to blame.

On this point the Daily Telegraph, an independent, conservative newspaper comments:

"This is an attitude which it would be extraordinarily difficult to justify on the facts. * * * Any rational and unemotional judgment must discharge those who have conducted American international relations from any sort of provocation which could afford a proper excuse for the flagrant breach of the truce on tests."

But the British popular attitude, as in large part the French, is not rational; it is emotional. They have fought two wars with Germany and the horrors of the Battle of Britain are not readily forgotten. It is fair to say, I think, that if the British people were asked which is the greater long-term peril to world peace—Russia or Germany—the majority would say Germany.

What I am reporting is that, in my judgment, the British and French Governments will stand stanchly with the United States in defending Western rights in West Berlin, but that an uncertain, wavering public opinion will make negotiations with Khrushchev very precarious.

A Nation That Will Only Talk and Will Not Fight for Its Life Is Already Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Henry J. Taylor, distinguished war correspondent and recently Ambassador to Switzerland:

TALK CAN BE DANGEROUS

(By Henry J. Taylor, distinguished war correspondent, and recently Ambassador to Switzerland)

In some of his most ringing speeches, President Kennedy is doing our country a profound disservice.

The President himself and the White House speech-helpers—Schlesinger, Acheson, Bowles, Nitze, Bundy—are all eloquent men. Surely, they are sincere, but they are also

wrong. For they are talking way beyond their willingness or capability to act.

The more eloquent and convincing the words the more the damage when they are not backed up and are then repudiated.

This makes our Nation's official words hollow at best or, at worst, downright false. It was demonstrated in the eloquent warnings to Castro and then to Russia about Laos, which turned out to be humbug and bluff.

Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world and, therefore, to peace. Nothing is so dangerous for the security of the United States.

Russia, not America, will choose whether we are to have war. Russia holds the horrible initiative in this, because Russia would be the aggressor. She will not stay her giant paw just because we prefer not to be stormed or do not want war anyplace on earth. And unless all history from the days of the dinosaurs is reversed, Russia will, in time, storm us unless we recover the key to peace.

That key is our own willingness to fight.

UNTHINKABLE CATACLYSM

No one need inform me about the unthinkable cataclysm of war. If I had my way, I would wipe out of my own life every moment of more than 6 years in war.

So may we settle that point, except among morons. But are we right to dwell solely on the horrors when to fear war too much is the surest way to invite it?

We cannot possibly avoid war if we believe like a boxer, dazed and uncomprehending, who flees from the ring (Cuba) as soon as his opponent doubles his fists.

Why, we stood with Washington at Valley Forge and we were born to honor, bright with glory, and the vision, "liberty or death." Are we to make a mockery of this?

Our leaders are lagging. Our public is way ahead of them in sensing we must stand up to the bully. And once again, with that intuitive sense for justice which makes us a great people, the average American is right.

WINDY BLUFFERS

Aggressor nations choose their victims among windy bluffers, not among those of sober strength; among the craven, not among those with stout hearts, great productivity and an absolute determination to fight if they are trod upon.

We first must feel this strong determination and stout-heartedness and then make it known by our policies and actions. This feeling—this will—is the factor that counts. This—and only this—will stand guard for us in the perilous years ahead. The words will largely take care of themselves and are relatively unimportant. A brave nation needs no other ornament.

Our vast foreign aid programs are no substitute for this essential. We can live without them but we cannot live without a willingness to fight. We cannot do with dollars what we need to do with guts. In fact, the more we talk exclusively about money, tractors, ransoms, and enlisting America's youth into a peace corps, as if these would give us security, the softer we sound for conquest to the barbarians.

HEIRS HEROES

Men died for what we have. We are their heirs. Our heroes fought for this country and unless we are still willing to fight for it—not just talk for it or spend money for it—we will lose it.

"My son, that which I bequeath you, you must own anew if you would keep it," says an epitaph on a Concord graveyard.

Let our faith and our contempt of fear live up to our heritage. It must be no less and it need be no more.

We must banish defeatism. We have only one true choice for the future. We must never be afraid to stake our life and honor against all the might and fury of the vicious, disciplined and ruthless enemy of the United States.

To do otherwise is like the mole baiting its own trap. But once we act like the Americans we really are, our enemies will respect us too much to risk war against such a nation; for we are the greatest power on the face of the earth.

By not being afraid to fight we will, with that key, open the only door to peace. And if we are afraid to fight, you and I will do nothing but die in the war that need not be.

Centennial Luncheon of the Real Daughters of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a résumé of a wonderful luncheon that was given by an Alabama woman, Mrs. Mary McCall Henderson Imes, and the Real Daughters of the Confederacy. How I wish all Alabamians and all of the people everywhere could have been at this wonderful luncheon and heard our wonderful speaker, Mrs. Mary McCall Henderson Imes, make a speech and how I wish I had every word of it, and she told many stories about the long, long ago, but there were so many wonderful, wonderful women from so many States present and when we return next January, I hope we can have another meeting with Mrs. Imes' great group in your dining room and that you, Mr. Speaker, will be there with us. It is such an inspiration to see and be with the wonderful sainted women who are fighting and working and pulling and praying to keep some part of our way of life, and especially in our beloved Southland.

A centennial luncheon was held Thursday, August 17, 1961, in the Speaker's Dining Room of the U.S. Capitol, to pay tribute to Hilary Abner Herbert, Confederate commanding officer of the 8th Alabama Regiment. He fought in 10 major battles and was wounded 6 times; who served after the War Between the States as a Representative in the U.S. Congress for 6 times, and was appointed to the Cabinet post of Secretary of the Navy by President Grover Cleveland. The Honorable FRANK BOYKIN, dean of the Alabama congressional delegation was the speaker for the occasion, which honored the Real Daughters of Confederate veterans.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and Representatives of Alabama's delegation attended, including Representatives GEORGE ANDREWS, GEORGE GRANT, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, and CARL ELLIOTT.

Mrs. Deward Walker, president general of the Real Daughters Club of America brought greetings. She is from Front Royal, Va. Her father was one of Mosby's Rangers.

Mrs. McCall Henderson Imes, State president of the District of Columbia's 10 chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, presided and later, assisted by Mrs. Walker, placed a wreath in Statuary Hall at the statue of the famed Alabama Confederate general, Joe Wheeler. Mrs. Imes, cousin of former Congressman Ross Collins, and Will Whittington, of Mississippi, and sister of Col. Charles Campbell McCall, former attorney general of Alabama and general counsel of Public Works Administration, had eight great uncles in the War Between the States, and is founder of the Nation's Capitol UDC Real Daughters Club.

Col. Harmon Moore, U.S. Army, deputy chaplain, military district of Washington, native of Weedowie, Ala., who served in Korea and Alaska, gave the invocation at this 100th year observance.

Other daughters of Confederate veterans present were from many States:

Dr. Ella House Fales, Alabama.
Mrs. Harry Rascoe Fulton, Alabama.
Miss Leila Mae Taylor, Alabama.
Miss Irene Choate, Georgia.
Miss Mary W. Allen, Louisiana.
Miss Katherine Bell, Kentucky.
Miss Melnotte McDonough, Missouri.
Miss Lillian Chenoweth, Mississippi.
Mrs. Van Wylye, Maryland.
Miss Estelle Morrison, North Carolina.
Mrs. Robert P. Sweeny, South Carolina.
Mrs. Winthrop A. Trotter, Tennessee.
Miss Nancy Lucille Nelson, Tennessee.
Mrs. William C. Harllee, Texas.
Miss Camille J. Patterson, Texas.
Mrs. William Piercy, West Virginia.
Mrs. Charles W. Cairns, Virginia.
Mrs. Thomas Cassey, Virginia.
Miss Mary Embry, Virginia.
Mrs. C. W. Glidden, Virginia.
Mrs. Sybil Grant Hellmuth and husband Mr. William F. Hellmuth, Virginia.
Mrs. Nell Cave McCall, Virginia.
Mrs. Virginia Armistead Nelson, Virginia.
Mrs. Floyd B. Mathias, Virginia.
Mr. W. Dudley Rucker, Realson, and Mrs. Rucker, Virginia.
Mrs. Joeseph E. Via, Virginia.
Mr. William Marriott Piercy, Virginia.
Mrs. William H. Chism, Virgina.
Mrs. Cora E. Settle, Virginia.

Commies, Radicals Head List of Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, here follows the fifth of a series of articles about the House Committee on Un-American Activities written by Pulitzer Prize Winner Edward J. Mowery:

WASHINGTON.—One of the cardinal principles in successfully contesting an issue is to know your adversary.

The House Un-American Activities Committee—the primary target of the farflung abolition campaign—knows the caliber of its opposition.

It also knows their common objective:

Destruction of HUAC and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, vitiation or outright repeal of antisubversive legislation, and complete impotency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its fight against traitors.

Committee spokesmen say the major opposition consists of (1) Communists under Kremlin discipline, (2) fronters, leftists, and pinks, and (3) civil rights zealots traditionally alined with the malcontents.

In the secondary ranks are liberals and a smattering of misguided individuals of unquestioned loyalty.

In addition to the Communist Party, U.S.A., radical groups most active in the campaign are the Emergency Civil Liberties

Committee (ECLC), a cited Communist front, and the National Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (NCAUAC), seven of whose announced national officials have been identified as Communists before Government bodies.

Other well-known foes of HUAC are the Civil Liberties Union and Americans for Democratic Action.

The ECLC kicked off the "abolition" drive with a New York rally in 1957. The Communist Party took its cue in 1959, and the NCAUAC in 1960.

In its campaign program, the NCAUAC urges adherents to schedule "abolition" speeches, to stage "protest" meetings at HUAC hearings, to distribute available literature (indexed and expanded), to collect a stable of speakers and disseminate 12-inch-long-playing recordings of "Sounds of Protests."

Among its early officials were 3 Communists: William Z. Foster (who left the ACLU board in 1929), Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (bounced in 1940) and Louis F. Budenz, publicity director, who subsequently broke with the Communist Party and rendered yeoman service in fighting subversion.

The ACLU successively fought (1920 and 1923) deportation of alien, left wing anarchists belonging to the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), supported Sacco and Vanzetti (anarchists executed for a felony murder), and defended members of a religious sect who refused to salute the flag.

Eight years later charges erupted before the Dies Committee that the ACLU was communistic. Dies assertedly found no "evidence" supporting the charges during the examination of the ACLU's Harry F. Ward.

Ward, later bounced by the ACLU, was before the committee in behalf of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as subversive and America's "largest Communist front." The following year, 1940, the ACLU adopted its purge resolution.

It's inappropriate, the group ruled, for a member to serve on its ruling committees or staff who holds membership in a political organization which supports totalitarianism, or who publicly voices approval of such a principle.

It isn't clear whether the ban included the rank-and-file membership or halted its top officials from participating in or supporting front activities.

ACLU officials (past and present) have given such support.

The ACLU has also defended Smith Act violators, individuals denied passports (for dubious loyalty) and numerous teachers with alleged Red leanings. It has conducted, a decade-long battle against excesses of the Federal security program and its impact upon free speech and association.

In its current "abolition" campaign, the ACLU offers those interested a selected bibliography of anti-HUAC literature with these intriguing titles: "Guilt by Subpena," "The Dragon Slayers," "The Bankrupt Inquisition," "The Congressional Pillory," and "Fear, the Accuser."

Why is the ACLU working so zealously to abolish HUAC?

HUAC's mandate, running entirely in terms of propaganda, is wrongly phrased, and we believe both the letter and spirit of the first amendment make it unconstitutional or unwise, or both, Patrick Murphy Malin, ACLU's executive director, explained.

"We'd have no objection if the mandate ran in terms of subversive action or propaganda, directly and immediately related to such action. We've never objected to the mandates of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee (both authorized to probe subversion)."

The ACLU, Malin declared, favors opening the doors on propaganda (per se) * * * including Soviet propaganda.

"And," he continued, "it should be under no governmental restriction until that point where it is immediately and directly related to illegal action.

"A country that punishes belief and association is not merely a country with a lesser degree of democracy, it's on the way to becoming no democracy at all."

(The United States, of course, is a Republic, not a democracy.)

Knifing through ACLU's maze of fuzzy semantics, the group contends that an American-hating radical may incite a mob to blow up a bridge with immunity until the fuse is ignited. It is his constitutional right.

Back in 1920, a joint New York State legislative committee issued an exhaustive report on Revolutionary Radicalism after an investigation of seditious activities. In the segment dealing with the ACLU, the Lusk report commented:

"The effect of ACLU activities is to create in the minds of the ill informed * * * the impression that it is un-American to interfere with the activities of those seekng to destroy American institutions.

Authors of the Lusk report then sagely observed:

"It attempts not only to protect crime—but to encourage attacks upon our institutions. Many of [its] members are undoubtedly sincere in their convictions, but the consequences of their activity is injurious to the public interest."

Foreign Policy Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, writing in today's New York Times, the distinguished columnist, James Reston, has made a thoughtful and worthwhile appraisal of the current status of our foreign policy.

According to Mr. Reston:

President Kennedy has reached a critical point in his administration's relations not only with the Soviet Union but with the allies, the neutrals, the United Nations, and the Republican opposition.

Mr. Reston has critically discussed the President's relations with each of these bodies in turn, with the result that the dimensions of the problem confronting us in this turbulent field today are brought sharply into perspective.

As a companion to President Kennedy's ringing speech and declaration of U.S. policy before the United Nations today, this is a particularly timely article, and I commend it to my colleague's attention:

PRESIDENT IS UNDERTAKING REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 24.—President Kennedy has reached a critical point in his administration's relations not only with the Soviet Union but with the allies, the neutrals, the United Nations, and the Republican political opposition.

For the first 8 months of his administration he has been trying to reach an accommodation with all these forces.

He has sought to find some common ground with the Soviet Union on nuclear testing, disarmament, and Germany. He has tried to increase the authority of the United Nations, improve the procedures of consultation with the allies, be responsive to the opinion of the neutrals, and avoid divisive internal battles with the Republicans, particularly in the field of foreign relations.

The result of all this, as seen from here, has been disappointing. President Kennedy, who is a highly pragmatic politician facing a congressional election in 1962, is in the process of evaluating his own assumptions and the actions of the Russians, the United Nations, the neutrals, and the Republicans.

OPPORTUNITY TO REFLECT

The adjournment of Congress this week will provide opportunity for reflection and review. The Berlin crisis and the constitutional crisis at the United Nations have forced a reappraisal. The President is beseiged with advice on all these relationships with the East, the West, and the Republicans, and while no one knows what course he will follow, the general outlines of the issues and advice under discussion can be defined.

The President's preoccupation in his relations with the Russians is avoidance of a miscalculation on Washington's intentions on Germany. The President tried to make clear to Premier Khrushchev during their meeting in Vienna at the beginning of June that, while the United States was willing to negotiate some changes in the status quo, it would not tolerate the destruction of the freedom of the people of West Berlin.

Mr. Kennedy came away from that meeting convinced that Mr. Khrushchev was not prepared for a rational discussion of what was negotiable and what was not negotiable. The President concluded also that Mr. Khrushchev felt, probably on the basis of Washington's record in Cuba and Laos, that the United States and, particularly, its allies would not fight for Germany, so that Moscow could be extremely bold in pressing its demands.

This may or may not be the impression Mr. Khrushchev intended to leave with the President. But this is the impression he did in fact leave: that Moscow was convinced it could force the German solution it wanted and that the West would accept even a humiliating defeat rather than fight.

The debate in Washington now, therefore, is centering not on such negotiable questions as the German boundaries with Poland, defacto recognition of the Communist East German regime or the future armaments of West Germany—all of which this Government is already discussing privately in Washington—but on the threshold question of how to convince Mr. Khrushchev that the United States will fight rather than allow the destruction of West Berlin's freedom and the humiliation and dismemberment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

If this preliminary point can be established, either by a solemn warning to Mr. Khrushchev, as President De Gaulle and some of President Kennedy's advisers here have proposed, or by discussion between Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, in New York, then the other questions of boundaries, armaments, and the relations with East Germany can be discussed. This, so far as one can find out, is the U.S. position at the moment.

Removal of the threat on the possibility of war by miscalculation is the first priority; then, if that can be done, the prospect of serious negotiations on the future of Berlin and Germany, on disarmament and on nuclear testing will follow.

UNITED STATES-ALLIED RELATIONS

The pressure by Moscow on Berlin, and the death of Dag Hammarskjold have forced President Kennedy and his principal aids

from the universities to examine their assumptions about the cold war, the Western alliance and the organization of the United Nations.

They came to power last January determined to put an end to the angry dialog with Moscow, and were inclined to believe that the Eisenhower administration had not paid enough attention to the sophisticated views of allies or the yearnings of the neutrals.

When the pressure rose on Germany, however, and Mr. Kennedy asked Congress to increase the draft and appropriations to strengthen the defenses of Western Europe, he got little support from NATO.

In principle, the Allies were all opposed to the expansion of Communist power. France, indeed, was more pugnacious toward Mr. Khrushchev's demands than anyone else. But when it came to the sacrifices necessary to place more military divisions on the line in Germany, or to mount an economic blockade against the Communists, neither Paris nor London was very enthusiastic.

This lack of enthusiasm has increased talk in Washington about the fact that, after a whole postwar generation, the United States still has 250,000 men as a standing army in Western Europe, far more than any of its allies.

Instead of more cooperation with France, as President Kennedy confidently expected after his visit to General de Gaulle last May, there has been less in the last few months. While the British Government has been tougher in the German crisis than at any time in recent years, the rise of pacifist sentiment in Britain has introduced an element of doubt about British purpose into official thinking in Washington.

UNITED STATES-NEUTRAL RELATIONS

President Kennedy's experience with the neutral nations has been even more disillusioning, probably because he came to office with a highly idealistic estimate of the opinion of the new sovereign states of Africa and Asia.

During his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy talked more about the problems of the emerging nations of Africa than he did about the Western alliance. Since coming to power, though he originally promised to avoid too many ceremonial visits for at least 6 months, he has spent a great deal of time receiving the leaders of the new nations and identifying the United States with their aspirations.

In these meetings at the White House, there has been a great deal of talk about the principle of self-determination and the importance of disarmament and of a prohibition on nuclear testing. But when the neutral nations met at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in the middle of the Berlin crisis, and just after Moscow broke the nuclear test moratorium, the neutral leaders, who had been so assertive in supporting the principle of self-determination for Africans and Asians, showed little interest in self-determination for the Germans and were prudently moderate in their reaction to the Soviet nuclear tests.

Perhaps it was naive, as some of the President's more experienced aids and addies asserted, to expect anything more from the neutrals than a cautious double standare where criticism of the United States and the Soviet Union were concerned. The fact is that it shocked President Kennedy and led him to write into the foreign aid bill the stipulation that U.S. aid would hereafter take into account the political attitudes of the neutrals.

UNITED STATES-UNITED NATIONS RELATIONS

The death of Mr. Hammarskjold added to the pattern of reappraisal in Washington. The President has never been particularly idealistic about the United Nations. He does not spend his evenings dreaming about the brotherhood or the parliament of man. He has some advisers who do, and no doubt he will make a rally-round-the-United-Nations speech tomorrow in New York.

He had begun, however, to see the United Nations as a practical instrument for opposing Soviet attempts at subversion and in the last few months he had considered the possibility of doing everything he could to increase its authority.

The death of Mr. Hammarskjold interrupted this process. With an independent and courageous Secretary General, able and willing to carry out the instructions of the veto-free General Assembly, Mr. Kennedy saw the possibility of effective action in favor of the principles and purposes of the United Nations and against the expansion of Communist power.

In the last few days, however, the neutrals seem to Washington to be trying to find a compromise with Washington by reducing the powers of the Secretary General, which of course they have every right to do. Their decisions are bound to influence the reappraisal of policy now beginning in Washington.

KENNEDY-GOP RELATIONS

Such a reappraisal would have happened, no doubt, without any regard to domestic political considerations. But the fact is that the Kennedy administration's conduct of foreign policy is beginning to come under severe attack from the Republican opposition, and a congressional election will be held next year.

On this point, it happens that the aspects of Mr. Kennedy's foreign policy the allies and the neutrals like are precisely the aspects that are being criticized by his political opponents.

The allies are pleased that the President did not use U.S. power to force a victory in Cuba; the allies do not understand why he considered intervention there in the first place, but they are glad that he did not order the Marines onto the beaches in Cuba to settle the issue.

The Republicans, on the other hand, are condemning the President for indecision, for intervening in the first place and for not intervening enough in the end.

Similarly, the allies are appraising President Kennedy's restraints on Berlin and Germany, but the mood of the United States is against any more concessions to the Communists. The Republicans are exploiting this sentiment.

Former President Eisenhower brought this campaign against Mr. Kennedy to a climax a week ago in Chicago by condemning all the things the allies like: the President's restraint in Laos and in Cuba, his willingness to talk about bringing Communist China into the United Nations, and his support for membership in that body for Outer Mongolia.

This rising opposition of the Republicans to the conduct of foreign policy doesn't worry President Kennedy too much. He rather welcomes a familiar battle with the opposition at home rather than the complex controversies with the Russians, the allies, and the neutrals overseas. But he is a political animal, and political considerations will undoubtedly cross his mind when he goes to Newport in the next few days to think all this over.

More important than the political charges of the opposition are the opinions of that group of his advisers who think that power is the decisive factor in current world conflicts and that national power, rather than the opinions of the allies or the neutrals, should be given a much larger role in the President's decisions.

The argument of this group of advisers is that everyone else in the world seems to be thinking in terms of national interest and that President Kennedy should do the same. The idea, they argue, that opinion in the allied and neutral worlds is power has been tried and has not been proved effective.

Accordingly, they conclude, the time has come to stop being afraid of national power in the United States and trying to avoid the responsibilities of national power by leaving things to the allies, the neutrals, and the United Nations. In short they are telling the President to take the allies and neutrals at the level of their actions and decide things, as these groups do, on the basis of national interest.

It would be too much to say that this amounts to a revival of isolationist sentiment in Washington, but the fact remains that these questions are being discussed. In the end, they may not prevail. But there should be no doubt in the allied and neutral worlds that these considerations are now coming into review at the highest levels of the U.S. Government.

Secretary Rusk Reveals What Is Right and What Is Wrong With Current American Foreign Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news report by Edgar Ansel Mowrer entitled "Rusk Discusses Current U.S. Foreign Policy."

RUSK DISCUSSES CURRENT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

In his speech to the National Press Club of Washington, on July 10, Secretary of State Dean Rusk revealed, it seems to me, what is right and what is wrong in our current foreign policy.

During World War II, the Secretary said, we Americans concluded that as a nation we must throw ourselves into building a "decent world order in which such conflagrations could not occur." Add "free" to the expression "decent world order" and you have, I submit, exactly what most Americans think our goal should be.

During and right after the war this goal seemed accessible. For most Americans did not understand—nor did their blandly optimistic leaders—that the U.S.S.R., Hitler's former confederate, would oppose any such scheme of ours simply because it had in mind to constitute (by conquest and subversion) a different world order of its own—an all-Red world order. From this aim—as Secretary Rusk now acknowledges—it has never since deviated.

Nonetheless, the United States went ahead with other like-minded countries and created the United Nations with the firm intention of making it the nucleus of the kind of world order we sought.

Now, if the West had confined the U.S.S.R. and communism to the territory it occupied in 1944–45—Russia and East Europe—it might still have used the United Nations, provided also that all non-Communist nations joined forces to convince the Kremlin that its own type of world order would never be allowed.

But once the Communists conquered giant China—with Washington complacently looking on and talking of the "corruption" of National China—and once new states, with some old states, opted for "nonalinement"

as a posture which would bring them benefits from both sides in the struggle, the United Nations ceased to be the nucleus of any acceptable sort of world order and became instead a diplomatic battleground.

For the nonalined had and have no interest in victory by either side. Their advantage lies in the indefinite prolongation of the cold war provided they can keep it from becoming hot. And this position is the more impudent because all nonalined states depend for their protection upon the military power of the United States.

There was, in Secretary Rusk's speech, no evidence that he understands this part of the situation. He went one step beyond his stubbornly optimistic predecessors when he recognized that the, "central issue of the crisis is the (Soviets') announced determination to impose a world of coercion upon those not already subjected to it." But then he expressed surprise that the Soviet Union has not accepted our proposal for a ban on nuclear testing, thus showing he does not yet recognize that the U.S.S.R. intends to nibble the free world to death and needs a permanent threat of nuclear war to do so.

But above all, the Secretary showed—in my modest judgment—no understanding of the purpose of the neutrals—to keep the cold war going and milk both sides. Nor did he acknowledge that a world roughly one-third Communist and somewhat over a third nonalined cannot rely upon the colorless United Nations to produce a "decent world order" of the kind we all want. A Soviet veto can always prevent that—as can the votes of the nonalined.

America's goal can be reached only if we start creating, either outside or within the United Nations, a new free world alliance open to all peoples willing to oppose and defeat communism, and in the process, move toward universality. At this point, a reorganized United Nations could, and indeed must, establish and enforce the kind of world order free men can accept.

During the period of struggle, the United Nations is at best a battlefield and at worst a delusion. It seems to offer a cheap way out of the present struggle and thus morally disarms the Western peoples.

Until the United States accepts these facts—it seems to me—and acts upon them, it will continue to yield ever more ground to the Communist bloc led by a U.S.S.R. that not only claims to be but really acts like a great power.

Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the Record-Courier, Ravenna-Kent, Ohio, certainly summarizes the regrets of the United States and the world at the untimely death of Dag Hammarskjold. I concur with the statements contained in this editorial and feel it would be of interest to the other Members of Congress:

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD'S DEATH BLOW TO PEACE

The untimely death of Dag Hammarskjold is a blow to the peace of the world.

It brings a crisis to the United Nations itself at the time the U.N.'s forceful role in the preservation of peace at various places in the world is so sorely needed.

The prayers of all of us, the wisdom and effort of the world's keenest men and the luck of the Irish will all be needed to keep the old globe, already afire in several places, from bursting into flame.

These thoughts run through the writer's mind as he attempts to put down on paper the meaning of the sudden death of the administrative head of the United Nations.

Hammarskjold's quiet and scholarly but determined and dedicated approach to the world problem is fairly well known even by those who pay only passing attention to the U.N.'s effort. He was a citizen of the world. He believed in the direct approach.

Hammarskjold went to Peiping in 1955 to secure the release of 11 of 15 imprisoned American fliers. He put the U.N. military force at work on the Suez Canal in 1956 to keep order. And he moved into the Congo to put out a world-threatening fire in 1960.

It was his last-mentioned effort which revealed the tremendous potential of a strong United Nations. An international police force was moved into a chaotic area to prevent civil war and to keep the peace for the world.

Hammarskjold was succeeding. A civil administrative U.N. force has been busy for more than a year teaching self-government to a nation and educating the nation's nationals to the point that they will be able to take over their own affairs.

At the same time, an international police unit has been maintaining order and preventing alien forces from moving into the scene and taking over, sometimes under the guise of helping out specific factions in the new country.

Now Hammarskjold is dead. He died just as he seemed about to achieve complete unification of the Congo.

What will happen next?

It is going to take a great effort and unusual wisdom to save the U.N. as it is now set up. Russia wants to change it and will move into the world political arena rapidly and with force to put across its own ideas.

Will we be able to keep the present-type U.N. Organization in operation? Will we be able to keep our Congo police program in operation? To whom will the many new nations of the world now turn? How well have the new political figures of the new countries of the world learned the lessons of world government? How responsible will they be?

These and many other things we'll begin to learn soon.

Hammarskjold died a hero's death. Sweden can be proud of him. And all of Scandinavia can be proud of the great contribution its sons have made toward the implementation of world government (Trygve Lie, the first U.N. Secretary General, was from Norway).

People of Pekin, Ill., Express Their Affection for Senator Dirksen, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial column entitled "The Editor's Letter," by F. F. McNaughton, of the Pekin (Ill.) Daily Times of September 22.

Pekin is the hometown of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Last Friday the people of Pekin set aside the day to express their affection and respect for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This editorial speaks for the people of Pekin. It also speaks for me and countless others who know the Senator and are privileged to work with him.

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

This is D-Day—Dirksen Day.

The Senator quotes the Bible aptly.

So we'll quote a bit.

The Bible has a double negative saying that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country and in his own house.

Simply stated that says: "A great man is not honored in his hometown and in his own family."

Now there's one Bible saying that is not true in EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN'S case.

To begin with, his parents thought so much of the little feller that they named him after the 25th President and little did they dream then how near the little tike they were naming was going to come to being a President himself. He came as close as Roger Maris did to that 60. Just a nod from Lady Luck at the right time and both of them would have made it.

And when it comes to continuing loyalty "in his own house," who has been more loyal to a husband and father than have Luella and Joy? Bless their hearts.

As for Pekin, we doff our hats to EVERETT as our "great man."

Everywhere we go—California, London, Moscow—people say to us:

"Oh, do you come from the same town as Senator DIRKSEN?"

We try to be modest as we say, "Yes," meanwhile doing our best to be a moon for the moment and get some reflected glory from it.

EVERETT has done well by Pekin. As a young city councilman here he got a zoning ordinance adopted. He worked long and hard on that and practically wrote it himself. It was adopted and published in book form. (Later, folks with axes to grind got it rescinded.)

And to this day, as Senator DIRKSEN'S picture appears day after day in newspapers and magazines around the world, he brings both notice and honor to his hometown—Pekin, Ill., in the United States of America.

Once, in gratitude, Tazewell County sent Mr. DIRKSEN on a study trip to Europe.

I have another hope for him.

China used to consider America her best friend. We must get back on speaking terms with that old friend whose intelligent and hard-working people number a fourth of the whole world's population.

Who would be a better man to send to Peking, China, to make friends again than an eminent Senator whose hometown was named after the Chinese capital?

After we've reelected him, let's send Senator DIRKSEN from Pekin to Pekin, and on around through Russia, and back to Washington.

Medicare Program for Servicemen's Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this statement concerns you and your dependents. It is an important document

to be studied carefully and then passed on to your dependents and retained by them.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CARE FROM BOTH CIVILIAN AND UNIFORMED SERVICES SOURCES

Some dependents are eligible for both civilian medical care and care at uniformed services medical facilities. To be eligible for both, the dependent and the sponsor must meet the requirements indicated below.

Sponsor: Must be on active duty or on active duty for training pursuant to orders for an indefinite period or for more than 30 days.

Dependent: Must bear one of the following relationships to the sponsor:

Lawful wife.

Lawful husband, if dependent on service wife for over one-half of his support.

Unmarried legitimate child, adopted child, or stepchild, in one of the following categories:

Under 21 years of age.

Over 21, but incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity that existed before the age of 21, and dependent on service member for over one-half of support.

Under 23, enrolled in a full-time course in an approved institution of higher learning, and dependent on service member for over one-half of support.

A dependent's eligibility for civilian medical care ends when the sponsor retires, dies, is discharged or released from active duty, is dropped from the rolls of his service for desertion, or is divorced from the dependent. Children of a divorced sponsor retain their eligibility until adopted. If the sponsor dies while on active duty or while in a retired status, his dependents are still eligible for care at Armed Forces and U.S. Public Health Service medical facilities when space and staff are available.

For the purpose of administering the medicare program, eligible dependents in the United States are divided into two classes: Dependents residing apart from their sponsors and those residing with their sponsors. How does the revised medicare program affect each of these classes?

DEPENDENTS RESIDING APART FROM SPONSORS

Dependents eligible for civilian medical care who reside apart from their sponsors may continue to choose between civilian medical facilities and those of the Armed Forces or U.S. Public Health Service.

Each civilian physician and hospital, when providing care for dependents, will furnish the dependent with a claim form (DA Form 1863, "Statement of Services Provided by Civilian Medical Sources") to be filled in. The claim form will note that the dependent patient resides apart from the sponsor. If the attending physician requires the services of other physicians, an anesthetist, a physical therapist, or a private-duty nurse while the dependent patient is in a civilian hospital, a DA Form 1863 must be completed for each of them. These claim forms, too, must indicate that the patient resides apart from sponsor.

When applying for civilian medical care, the dependent should first ask the physician if he will participate in the medicare program. If he will, the dependent is not expected to pay the physician, nurse, or hospital for care covered under the program except for charges shown on page 15. Under Service regulations, the Government pays the physician for authorized care with the understanding that there will be no additional charge to the dependent or sponsor for that care. The physician signs such a statement on the claim form when he submits his claim for payment.

DEPENDENTS RESIDING WITH SPONSORS

Wives and dependent husbands and children of service members, who reside with their sponsors and who desire medical care at Government expense, must contact a uniformed service authority to determine whether the required care can be provided in a nearby uniformed service medical facility. If it cannot be provided, the dependent must obtain a "Medicare Permit" or the new "Nonavailability Statement"—DD Form 1251—from the appropriate service authority in order to have authorized care from civilian sources paid for by the Government.

Civilian medical services, to be payable by the Government, must meet the criteria of authorized care under the medicare program. DD Form 1251 does not establish requested care as authorized care, nor does it guarantee payment by the Government. It does serve as evidence that the dependent residing with the sponsor has cleared with the proper service authority and that the desired care is not available from a reasonably accessible uniformed service medical facility.

The issuance of DD Form 1251 places the dependent residing with the sponsor in essentially the same free-choice position as a dependent residing apart from the sponsor. However, DD Form 1251 is for immediate use only, in connection with a current illness or condition that may or may not be authorized under the medicare program. The Government's liability for medicare claims is determined from the diagnosis and from clinical information and/or certification furnished by the attending civilian physician.

A DD Form 1251 may be issued on a retroactive basis to cover civilian medical care already begun or completed, when it is determined that the patient could have obtained a DD Form 1251 by applying for it before the care began. A DD Form 1251 issued under these circumstances will bear a statement under "Remarks" that it is retroactive to the effective date.

In some cases, authorized Government-paid medical care from civilian sources may be provided without a DD Form 1251. These are:

In an acute emergency requiring immediate treatment from civilian sources at the nearest available medical facility to preserve life or prevent undue suffering. Examples would be a serious injury in an accident or a sudden, severe illness. The attending physician must state on the claim form—DA Form 1863—or on an attachment to it, that the case is actually an acute emergency.

When the dependent is away from the area of the sponsor's household on a trip; the dependent, sponsor, accompanying parent, or acting guardian signing the claim form must make an entry certifying that the dependent is "on trip."

For maternity care required by an eligible dependent wife whose husband has died while on active duty, if she was pregnant at the time of his death.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CARE FROM UNIFORMED SERVICES FACILITIES ONLY

Dependents are eligible if they bear one of these relationships to a retired service member, to a service member who died while serving on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, or to a deceased retired service member:

Lawful wife.

Unremarried widow.

Lawful husband, if dependent on service wife for over one-half of his support.

Unmarried legitimate child, adopted child, or stepchild if such child has not passed his 21st birthday. See page 2 for exceptions covering those past 21 years of age.

Unremarried widower, if he was in fact dependent upon the member or retired member at the time of her death for over one-half of his support because of a mental or physical incapacity.

Parent or parent-in-law, if dependent and if residing in a dwelling place provided or maintained by the service member or retired service member. A parent or parent-in-law of an active duty service member is also qualified for care at service facilities if he meets the above requirements.

CIVILIAN CARE PROVIDED

The Government will pay the major cost of the following civilian medical services for eligible dependents who meet the requirements outlined.

Hospitalization in semiprivate accommodations two, three, or four beds) normally not exceeding 365 days for each admission; all necessary services and supplies furnished by the hospital during hospitalization; doctors' bills during such hospitalization for the treatment of: first, acute medical conditions; second, contagious diseases; third, surgical conditions.

Laboratory and X-ray tests and procedures during hospitalization.

Certain costs for necessary diagnostic tests and procedures before and after hospitalization when hospitalization is for a bodily injury or a surgical operation.

Complete obstetrical and maternity care, including in-hospital care of the newborn infant. Infants delivered by civilian physicians in a home or an office may receive authorized care they need on an outpatient basis during a period not to exceed 10 days following the date of delivery.

Outpatient care for bodily injuries, including payments not to exceed $75 for necessary laboratory tests, pathological and radiological examinations.

Special-duty nursing service during hospitalization.

SURGICAL SERVICES

Treatment of surgical conditions only during hospitalization is authorized at Government expense. Surgical care for bodily injuries is authorized on an outpatient basis.

Surgical services desired or requested by a patient, which are not medically indicated, are not authorized for payment by the Government. The opinion of the physician in charge of the case will determine whether the services are medically indicated and therefore payable.

TREATMENT OF INJURIES ON AN OUTPATIENT BASIS

Government-paid treatment of bodily injuries of a patient not hospitalized, including diagnostic and therapeutic tests and procedures authorized by the attending physician, is authorized. Treatment of fractures, dislocations, lacerations, and other wounds that are legitimately cared for by dentists, including related diagnostic and therapeutic tests and procedures the attending dentist authorizes, may also be paid for.

The Government will pay a maximum of $75 for laboratory tests and pathological and radiological examinations, provided the attending physician or surgeon performs or authorizes them. Charges for the use of hospital outpatient facilities—for example, a cast room—required in the treatment of the injury will also be paid for.

The $75 limit may be increased only in special and extraordinary cases if the physician who authorizes the tests and procedures that exceed $75 in cost submits a special report.

OUTPATIENT CARE IN CIVILIAN FACILITIES

Outpatient care as such is restricted to authorized obstetrical and maternity care, treatment of certain bodily injuries, pre- and post-hospitalization tests and procedures and X-ray therapy begun or prescribed during a period of authorized hospitalization. For all other outpatient care at Government expense, dependents must use Uniformed Services medical facilities.

DENTAL CARE

Dental treatment is provided to hospital inpatients who are hospitalized for other authorized care, only when required as a necessary part of the treatment of the basic medical or surgical condition for which hospitalized. Outpatient treatment of fractures, dislocations, lacerations, and other wounds that are legitimately cared for by dentists may also be paid for. Authorized dental care does not include the cost of artificial teeth, bridges, fillings, teeth straightening, or prolonged treatment of the gums.

At Armed Forces and U.S. Public Health Service medical facilities, dental care is provided as follows in the United States:

First. In an emergency, to relieve pain and undue suffering. Permanent fillings, bridges, and dentures are not authorized.

Second. If required for treatment of a medical or surgical condition.

Third. Dental care in areas designated "remote" on a facilities-available basis.

Outside the United States: Dental care on a facilities-available basis.

MEDICAL CARE AT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

If medical staff, space, and facilities are available, the services will provide for all eligible dependents as follows:

Diagnosis.

Treatment of—

First. Acute medical conditions.

Second. Surgical conditions.

Third. Contagious diseases.

Fourth. Acute emergencies of any nature.

Immunization.

Maternity and infant care.

MEDICAL CARE OVERSEAS

As a general rule, dependents will get what care they need from Service medical facilities when they are outside the United States. If Armed Forces or U.S. Public Health Service facilities are lacking or inadequate, civilian medical care may be arranged for at the expense of the U.S. Government. Dependents residing in oversea areas where Service medical care cannot be provided may obtain full information from the appropriate oversea commander or from the nearest Service installation on how to obtain medical care from professionally acceptable local civilian sources.

IDENTIFICATION

When applying for any kind of medical care—at a Service or civilian facility, or to a civilian physician—dependents are required to present their Uniformed Services Identification and Privilege Card—DD Form 1173—as proof of their eligibility for medical care.

All eligible dependents except children under 10 years of age will receive a card. In some cases, such as a child living apart from his parents, a card may be issued even for a child under 10. In the case of a child under 10, the parent or guardian must furnish proper identification and certify as to the child's eligibility.

Dependents residing with their sponsors will receive their cards through their sponsors. The sponsor will fill out the necessary application form and submit it to his commanding officer. Sponsors residing apart from their dependents may send the completed application form to their dependents.

If the sponsor is unable, or declines, to fill out the application form, his dependent can obtain the necessary application form at any service installation, fill in as much information as possible, and submit it to the sponsor's commanding officer for completion and verification.

Dependents of service members who died while on active duty or while in a retired status can obtain an application for the card from a nearby service facility by applying there in person or requesting it by mail. Information on how to fill out the form and what certificates must accompany it can be obtained at the same time.

The completed application form must be taken to any nearby uniformed service facility. If the necessary equipment to produce the card is not available there, the dependent will be told where to obtain the card. Dependents who cannot visit a service facility that can issue the card may request it by mail.

The card must be turned in, first, when it expires; second, when a new card is issued; third, when the sponsor dies, is discharged, retires, or is released form active duty; or fourth, when the dependency status is otherwise ended.

When a card is lost, the loss should be reported immediately, so it may be replaced and the services may be on the alert against its being used improperly by someone who finds it.

If a person uses a card to obtain medical care to which he is not entitled, a fine of up to $10,000 and imprisonment for up to 5 years may be imposed on the offender. A dependent who allows another person to use his card unlawfully may be subject to the same penalties.

Damage to, or indications of tampering with, the laminated card makes it invalid.

A WORD OF CAUTION ABOUT CIVILIAN MEDICAL CARE

Dependents residing with their sponsors, in addition to furnishing proper identification, must present a DD Form 1251 to the source of civilian care.

Eligible dependents seeking medical care from civilian sources should make sure the physician and hospital are participating in the medicare program before beginning treatment.

A physician participating in the program must be legally licensed and qualified to prescribe and administer all drugs and to perform all surgical procedures.

A hospital, to qualify under the medicare program, except in an emergency, must be engaged primarily in providing facilities for the surgical and medical diagnosis, treatment, and care of injured and sick persons by or under the supervision of two or more staff physicians or surgeons. It must also provide continuous 24-hour nursing service by registered graduate nurses.

WHAT DEPENDENTS MUST PAY FOR CIVILIAN MEDICAL CARE—BASIC CHARGE

A service dependent in a civilian hospital will pay $1.75 a day, or the first $25 of the hospital cost, whichever is greater.

ADDITIONAL CHARGES

Private hospital room: The above hospital charge plus, first, 25 percent of difference between cost of the private room and weighted average cost of a semiprivate room, when private room is more costly, if attending physician certifies that private room is needed. Second, difference between cost of the private room and weighted average cost of a semiprivate room, when private room is more costly, if private room is for dependent's convenience.

Private-duty nursing care: First $100 of cost and 25 percent of charges over $100 when attending physician certifies that this care is needed.

Maternity care: First $15 of physician's charge for delivery performed in a home or an office, if dependent is not hospitalized later incident to the same delivery.

Injuries on an outpatient basis: First $15 of physician's or dentist's charges for each cause or accident cared for. However, multiple injuries to the same person resulting from a single accident will be considered one injury requiring paymen of maximum fee—$15.

Readmission to hospitals: First. Except in obstetrical and maternity cases, patients readmitted to a civilian hospital within 14 days after discharge, due to an acute complication of the condition for which they were originally hospitalized, pay $1.75 per day if they can prove they paid at least $25 for the previous admission. Second, all admissions of obstetrical and maternity cases during and directly related to the same pregnancy are considered as one admission.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a great article from the Rockland County Journal-News of Nyack, N.Y. This is a great article about one of the greatest men that you and I have ever known, and I imagine in your long life and mine too, we have known nearly all of them. I think back on the conventions, even long before Franklin Delano Roosevelt's great convention, which was managed by the great Jim Farley, when he, you, and I used to talk to another great man, your friend, Jim's friend, and mine, Vice President Cactus Jack Garner of the great State of Texas. Jim Farley is a fighter. He also has about the kindest heart of any man I have ever known. Jim Farley has a heart of gold and silver too, and he is always fighting for a friend and a principle, the same as he had to fight for Mayor Robert Wagner and the great victory which has just been won in the greatest city in the world, New York City.

Well, New York is the greatest city all around, and you and Jim and I have been to about all of the great cities, but they not only love Jim Farley in that great city, but, Mr. Speaker, I wish you could have been down at our beloved Mobile, Ala., and all over Mobile Bay and could have seen Big Jim when he marched up Royal Street, and how they saluted him and the men and women, white and colored, know him and love him. How I hope that good "Big Jim" Farley, the maker of Presidents and the maker of mayors, and our good friend, DeSapio and Mayor Wagner will all get back together like they should be and work together. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Jim Farley knows more people by their first names than any other living man. Jim Farley never did a man any harm. He is always helping, he is always giving, and he might not have done it on the ball diamond, but he has knocked more home runs in this land of ours in the ball field than any other living human being that I know, so I take off my hat to Jim Farley. How I wish all of these people all over America from Maine to Mexico could know this great man, the one and only Jim Farley, as you and I know him. I had a great kinsman who went to his reward just a year or two ago, from back home, who was president of the great Coca-Cola Co.

He and I were named for the same man. His name, like mine, was Frank Boykin, and every time we would talk, he would tell me about the outstanding things and the amazing work and the results that Jim Farley was getting for the great Coca-Cola Co.—the one where it says "The pause that refreshes." You do not have to pause when you see Jim Farley, but you will want to pause, and when you have been with him, you are refreshed and feel better for having met this great American, who has done so much for so many people and, as a matter of fact, for all mankind. So, Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak for you when I say that we will all go along with Jim Farley as long as we live on this earth and even in the world to come.

The article follows:

LARGE EVENING FOR JIM FARLEY

They call you Big Jim. Your name is James A. Farley. You stand behind a fellow named Mayor Robert Wagner, and the bright lights beam down on your shoulders as the television cameras take you into homes throughout the Nation. You hear the mayor thank you for your help in smashing New York City bossism. Your face is somber, but you're smiling inside.

You have had many big nights. You have stood beside the new President of the United States on election night and known in your heart you helped put him in the highest office of our country. Four years later it was the same, only greater, as you saw your uncanny prediction of a 46-State landslide come true.

But Thursday night ranks right up there with the biggest in your full life, because you paid; had shoved down the growling throats of a bossism that your political life and worth was in the past. The honors you deserved from the party which you served for a half century were dismissed as nothingness, because the man in the dark glasses willed it so.

They forgot Big Jim in Buffalo 3 years ago, when they left to try to elect a Senator they had shoved down the growling throats of a boss-cowed Democratic convention. They should have known that it would take better men than they to knock out the old Haverstraw first baseman. You left quietly, but those of us who appreciate you and your political creed knew you would be back.

It was a bitter pill you swallowed at Buffalo. The men who had known you all their political lives and had fed at the patronage table you controlled, had to admit with sheepishness that their vote was committed to "Carmine's man." The crowning blow was that your native Rockland went along with the crowd.

Forgotten by the new leadership was the man who started here when 18 and as a youngster was Rockland's county chairman. The laurels you brought your home neighborhood were many, as you climbed the political rungs of State and then National leadership and a Cabinet post. Your friends said publicly and privately that the day would come when some would be sorry for their treatment of Big Jim. They were right. That day came Thursday.

The bosses handed the governorship and a Senate seat to the Republicans 3 years ago. They could bully weak-kneed party leaders but they couldn't run a campaign or fool the people. How many of the faithful cast their ballot Republican then because of what the bosses did to Big Jim?

The experts say that Wagner's campaign was a master example of political wizardry. His weak points became strength. Criticism was turned to advantage. But this was no surprise to many who could see the fine hand of Jim Farley behind the strategy that crushed the machine. We wonder if DeSapio today, as he licks the wounds of his gouged Tammany tiger, wishes he had Buffalo to do over again and could take back his gutter treatment of Mr. Democratic Politician?

As we watched you on television, we tried to foresee the next chapter in your political history and knew that you'll be able to write it freely, without your hand being pushed by anyone. We regret that the man who once wrote in this corner, G. Wilson Bartine—your friend and mine—wasn't here to see your big night. But, Big Jim, we both know he was somewhere up there smiling.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Housewife's Best Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note in yesterday's Washington Post an article by George Dixon entitled "The Housewife's Best Friend," where he extolls the work that our new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, is doing not only to raise farm income but also to reduce the cost of groceries to the housewife.

I believe that this humorous but well written article should be available to all Members of the Congress, and under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD.

HOUSEWIFE'S BEST FRIEND
(By George Dixon)

I was rather concerned the other day when I read that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman wanted to be known as the Cabinet member who is the housewife's best friend. I would think a discreet man would try to keep that to himself. I trust I am as broadminded as the next husband, but I would look askance if I heard rumors that the Secretary of Agriculture had become my housewife's best friend.

I concede that Mr. Freeman had endeared himself to many of the Nation's housewives. I will concede even more. He may well be the first Secretary of Agriculture to engender rapport in the bosoms of a majority of our housewives, especially those who live in cities. But I am still unconvinced that I want my housewife swooning over him, even if he did keep down the price of bread and squeeze water out of hams.

I am not going to take any precipitous action, however. It is my plan to play this thing very cozy. Get shirty with a fellow who has squeezed water out of your housewife's ham and you are apt to throw her into his arms.

Until Freeman started squeezing, it's a wonder hams didn't squirt. His Republican predecessor, Ezra Taft Benson, allowed processors to inject 10 percent more water into hams than had been allowed by the Democratic Truman administration. This seemed flagrantly out of character, because Benson, an elder of the Mormon Church, was also a noted dry.

The Agricultural Department has also discovered, since Ez was replaced by Orv, that Ez wasn't as zealous a husband of the housewife's dollar as he tried to let on. The Office of Budget and Finance has belatedly found out that Benson stuck the taxpayers for $227,366 for his travels.

This staggering bill that the housewives and their househusbands had to foot was run up by the economy-talking Benson for transportation, hotels, and meals—no booze, because Ez didn't drink. The fellow who was supposed to be concerned with things down on the farm, made 213 trips within the United States and abroad. He made trips to Europe, Asia, the Soviet Union, the Near East—and 39 trips from Washington to Salt Lake City, his home. Of the 39 trips home, Ez charged the taxpayers for 36.

On a tour of Asia and the Near East he took his wife and two daughters, but repaid the Government $1,420 to cover the estimated extra cost of his family. Roundtrip fares around the world being what they are, this could rank as one of the most conservative estimates in estimating history.

Let us, however, not flog a dead horse, but get back to the current Secretary of Agriculture. Orv Freeman is showing himself a friend of the housewife in ways other than slicing her daily bread and squeezing her hams. He had been conducting surveys as to which tires her the more—standing up or sitting down.

Orv started with the premise that for years housewives have been told that, to save energy, they should work sitting down. He thought it was time to test it. His laboratory tests showed women actually used 4 percent more energy when sitting, rather than standing to wash the dishes and do the ironing.

The studies also showed that lifting things from a kitchen counter to shelves above the counter takes more energy when done from a sitting position. Rolling dough takes 9 percent more energy when your pampered one is sitting on a kitchen stool than when she is standing.

Merely getting on and off a kitchen stool adds to the effort expended by a squatworker.

Orv Freeman has discovered—and reports fearlessly—that if a housewife is a bit overweight it would be to her figure's advantage to use up more calories on her feet than on her posterior.

On second thought, I'm not too alarmed about his becoming overly friendly with any housewife I know.

Not if he makes cracks like that.

Late Judge Theodore Robinson Led in Fight To Get Seawall for City of Galveston—Was Able Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 1, 1961, Galveston County Judge Theodore R. Robinson, 60, who had served in his official capacity for 19 years with honor and distinction, died at St. Mary's Infirmary at Galveston.

He left behind a record of outstanding achievement in public service.

No testimonial can better emphasize his service to mankind than the seawall which extends along the beach of Galveston and which has served as the only barrier between the city of Galveston and the devastation of tides like those lashed by Hurricane Carla.

Had it not been for the seawall extension which Judge Robinson's leadership secured for the island, the destruction from Hurricane Carla would have been immeasurably worse.

Judge Robinson was educated in the Galveston public schools and attended Cumberland Law School in Cumberland, Tenn., and Baylor University in Waco, Tex. He was admitted to the State bar of Texas in 1926 and to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States on June 7, 1942.

In 1928, he was appointed assistant county attorney for Galveston County, in which capacity he served for 10 years. In 1938, he was elected to the Texas Legislature as a State representative and served for two terms. In 1942, he was elected county judge of Galveston County and remained in that office until the time of his death.

He was a good and efficient public official; he was my friend.

Among Judge Robinson's major accomplishments were: the westward extension of the Galveston seawall, which was named in his honor; completion of a new causeway linking Galveston to the mainland; establishment of a Galveston County health unit and construction of a new Galveston County jail; construction of the Galveston County Memorial Hospital; construction of a new annex to the Galveston County Courthouse; construction of the Blue Water Highway along the gulf coast linking Galveston and San Luis Pass; and at the time of his death was actively engaged in obtaining an extension to the Texas City seawall and in seeking a salt water conversion plant for Galveston.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to place in the RECORD four articles in tribute to Judge Robinson. The articles include: One in the Houston Post of August 3, 1961, entitled "Judge Robinson Was Devoted to Galveston"; one in the Galveson News of August 3, 1961, entitled "Theodore H. Robinson," and one in the Texas City Sun of August 6, entitled "Our Town"; and one in the Galveson News of August 2, entitled "Judge Robinson Dies."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Aug. 3, 1961]

JUDGE ROBINSON WAS DEVOTED TO GALVESTON

In the death Tuesday of County Judge Theodore Robinson, Galveston has lost one of its most devoted public servants. A native of the island city, Judge Robinson had served in his official capacity for 19 years.

There was nothing flamboyant in Judge Robinson's career. He conducted his work for the county with quite and unswerving efficiency, an attribute of service which was well rewarded as he saw the realization of several projects benefiting the city and the

county. These include the westward extension of the seawall, the opening of the new causeway across Galveston Bay, and a new county jail, now under construction.

In cultural matters, Judge Robinson was most devoted to Galveston's Rosenberg Library, whose extension service into the county always received his support. A quiet but invariably genial man, Judge Robinson made many fast friends during his career, all of whom will mourn his passing.

[From the Galveston News, Aug. 3, 1961]

THEODORE R. ROBINSON

Theodore R. Robinson, who died Tuesday, was a man of attainments who in 16 years of public life wrote an indelible chapter in the history of his native city and county.

Although regarded as an able attorney and jurist, his more distinguished service was rendered in his capacity as chairman of the board of county commissioners.

No marble to his memory and no epitaph can more graphically emphasize his devotion to the needs of the community than the monumental seawall from 61st Street to the western city limits. This was Judge Robinson's dream and he lived to see it come true within his lifetime.

Judge Robinson gave himself unstintingly to what he deeply believed was the most important thing to the future of this city. However, he gave equal thought to the needs of the entire county.

His faith was unfailing and his labors unceasing in winning congressional support for his storm-protection projects. The results of such dedication should serve as an inspiring example to those who remain and face the tasks of removing the last of the obstacles to city and county progress.

[From the Texas City Sun, Aug. 6, 1961]

OUR TOWN

(By Clyde Ragsdale)

He usually signed himself Theodore R. Robinson, but his countless friends never called him Theodore. To them he was just Ted or Teddy. Or sometimes they called him plain judge.

Few men have served their communities with more diligence and devotion than did Teddy Robinson. He was one of those men, like those referred to by Abraham Lincoln, who was acquainted with wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty.

A gentleman at all times, he was one of those rare personalities marked with a great patience and a generous quantity of diplomacy.

Teddy immensely enjoyed politics, which had been a part of his life for so long. There were two things a person could always expect Teddy to discuss with enthusiasm. These were politics and his family. His love for both was boundless.

Filling the position left vacant by Teddy Robinson will not be easy. In recent years his county judge's office has become a vital office in the affairs of the citizens of Galveston County. Seven consecutive times over a period of almost 20 years the voters expressed their confidence in him as a man and a conscientious public servant by electing and reelecting him as judge.

His record was clean, and no taint had ever come upon him throughout the years. He believed in Galveston County, its people, and its future—and he proved this faith in tirelessly working for the benefit of the entire area. His service knew no geographical limits, and his friends and supporters were as numerous on the mainland as in his own hometown of Galveston.

I believe it was Marcus Aurelius who said, "A man must stand erect, not be kept erect by others." And Teddy was a man who stood on his own feet, as an old Methodist circuit rider I once knew said, "foursquare before his fellow men."

As I was riffling through some papers on my desk Friday, I came across a copy of a letter typical of Teddy's tireless efforts to help Galveston County.

The letter had been addressed to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Teddy had just returned from Washington, and was urging ELLENDER to grant a request for $16,000 so the Corps of Engineers could make a survey in the Highland Bayou area near Hitchcock with a view to creating flood control measures.

Few men have devoted more energy and understanding to their jobs than did Judge Robinson. We need more men of his stature in these critical times.

[From the Galveston News, Aug. 2, 1961]

JUDGE ROBINSON DIES

(By Lillian E. Herz)

County Judge Theodore Robinson, 60, who had served 19 years as judge of the county commissioners' court and the county court at law, died at 6 p.m. Tuesday in St. Mary's Infirmary, after having suffered a heart attack.

According to his attending physician, Judge Robinson was taken to St. Mary's Monday after suffering angina pains. However, he seemed to have responded favorably, but suffered another attack while he was eating supper Tuesday and failed to rally.

FIRST AWARENESS

Judge Robinson's first awareness of a heart condition came last February when he was hospitalized for several weeks. After continued rest, he returned to his duties at the courthouse and apparently was in good health until he became ill Monday.

Judge Robinson participated in the causeway dedication ceremonies both on the causeway and at the Moody Center luncheon last Wednesday and was one of the principal speakers.

GALVESTON NATIVE

A native of Galveston, he was born May 1, 1901, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. George Robinson. His father served as commissioner of waterworks and sewerage of the city of Galveston for two terms.

He was educated in the Galveston public schools and received his law degree from Baylor University.

Judge Robinson married Miss Wilhelmina Johnson, daughter of Capt. Fred Johnson, prominent Galveston pilot, and Mrs. Johnson. They had one daughter, Shirley, and a son, Theodore, Jr.

SIX 2-YEAR TERMS

Judge Robinson served six 2-year terms, was just completing his second 4-year term and would have come up for reelection in next May's primaries.

He was first elected to the county judgeship in November 1942, having been nominated in the primaries, and assumed office January 1, 1943, succeeding Judge E. B. Holman, who had held the position 20 years.

At the time of his election Judge Robinson declared: "I am hopeful there will be no precinct lines and that all members of the court will work together for the good of everyone."

CREDO IN LIFE

"This," according to his colleagues on the commissioners' court, "was his credo in life, and his interest in the city of Galveston and the county of Galveston never waned throughout the years," they declared.

Shortly after his graduation from college, Judge Robinson was named assistant county attorney under the late D. B. McInerny. He served 10 years in the county attorney's office, 6 of which he served as first assistant.

In addition to McInerny, he served under County Attorney Owen D. Barker and under County Attorney Ralph Crawford.

IN LEGISLATURE

He also represented Galveston County in the State legislature, resigning to go into the practice of law.

He was first sworn into office on January 1, 1943, by the late Judge J. C. Canty, judge of 10th district court—the oldest district court in Galveston county.

Judge Robinson was proud of his record in office, proud of his efforts in obtaining the extension of the Galveston seawall, proud of being a part in obtaining another new causeway for Galveston, proud of the establishment of a county health unit, and of the various other projects both on the mainland and in Galveston which promoted the progress and development of the area.

TO WASHINGTON

Only a few weeks ago he went to Washington with Commissioner Paul Hopkins of precinct 3 and other mainland residents in an effort to obtain relief from flooded conditions in the Highland Bayou and Hitchcock area.

2. Notice, too, that the first demand of the Communist Party which concerns internal affairs is for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This, too, has nothing to do—directly—with communizing the United States, though all of you, I am sure, can see the gimmick in it. The party gives abolition of the committee first priority among all domestic issues because it wants free rein to carry out its subversive activities. Its aim is to destroy, not to build.

3. Further, these demands reveal, I believe, that the U.S. Communist Party has no hope of achieving power in this country legitimately. They reveal that it is counting on Moscow to conquer this country and that it is meanwhile doing everything it can to help the Kremlin in this task by promoting the adoption of U.S. policies which will weaken this country and, at the same time, build Soviet power.

I can assure you that every Communist and fellow traveler in this country is today doing everything he can to whip up support among the American people for these objectives.

How much are you doing to oppose them?

They are writing letters to newspapers, to the White House, the State Department, to Members of Congress. Are you doing the same?

They are introducing resolutions in parent-teacher associations, civic groups and community organizations of all types, and even in political parties. Are you actively opposing them in these groups?

Have you informed yourselves on such subjects as disarmament, nuclear weapons testing, recognition of Red China and the demilitarization of Berlin so that you can debate and defeat the agents of the enemy on these issues?

These are things that must be done by the American people—in all parts of the country—if we are to win the cold war and thus escape the devastation of nuclear missile bombardment.

There are other things you can—and should—do:

If Communist fronts are promoting these and other Soviet objectives in your community, they should be exposed and rendered ineffective.

When patriotic, anti-Communist organizations, individuals and Government agencies are made the targets of character assassination attacks by the Communists and their allies who want, above all else, to destroy them, you should go to their defense.

Keep informed about legislative and policy proposals for combatting internal subversion and Communist advances abroad. Throw your weight behind those which are sound and get others to do the same.

You should do everything in your power to assist the development of an effective nationwide civil defense program.

When you uncover facts on subversive activity—as opposed to idle rumor and gossip—you should pass this information on to your local FBI office or to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Remember that the Communists' major weapons are deceit, subterfuge and concealment. Your best weapon is, therefore, exposure, which is no more than the revelation of the truth about the activities of a criminal conspiracy and its adherents. Never be ashamed to use it.

Needed: More Markets for U.S. Products Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the LaCrosse Tribune published a thought-provoking article on the need for development of more markets for U.S. farm products. Generally, the editorial suggests two realistic approaches to this problem: First, development of more markets at home and abroad; and second, expanding research to provide more uses for these products.

During this session of Congress, I have introduced legislation for both purposes.

First, I proposed a renewed effort to create and execute a more realistic economic policy for the Nation. The purposes would include, first, providing top-level, long-range planning of economic policies and programs; second, providing guidance for—but not control of—our free enterprise system to meet the challenges at home and abroad; and third, better coordinating activities of Federal departments and agencies relating to national economic policy and development, and the role of America in world economy.

Among the specific steps, I recommended the following:

A global survey for markets for U.S.-produced products; analysis of world needs for new, or different, products that can be produced by our farms and facories; renewed efforts to tear down the barriers that now prevent the flow of goods—many of which are in surplus—to potential consumers elsewhere in the world—reassessing the impact of the growing competition from the Communist bloc; survey of fundamental shipping problems, including: Trade routes; subsidization of shipping; development of adequate port and harbor cargo handling facilities; rate setting policies; further revision of tariffs, quotas, and other barriers to U.S. products in international competition.

Now, let us take a look at the need for expanding research as to the need for further agricultural products. In Wisconsin, and throughout the Nation, dairying is a major feature of our agricultural picture. In proposing specific action to help resolve the problems of dairy farming, I propose the establishment of a Dairy Research Laboratory. The purpose would be to develop new and improved uses for dairy products. Out of such research, I believe could come new uses that could revolutionize the dairy industry and benefit the American people.

In the light of the great need for expanding markets for farm products, I believe that there should be a renewed effort to adopt courses of action along this and other lines. Reflecting further upon the needs for developing more markets, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the La Crosse Tribune printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF MORE MARKETS FOR U.S. FARM PRODUCTS WOULD HELP SOLVE SURPLUS

Figures released this week by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture show that production of Wisconsin corn for grain is 1 percent higher than last year, despite the fact that the acreage planted to this crop is 12 percent less.

These figures emphasize the underlying factor in the continuing surplus problem. While land acreage has been cut back through the conservation reserve program, farmers are producing more on the remaining allotted land. It seems to show that the conservation reserve has not been as successful as had been hoped.

Production these days apparently is determined not by the number of acres but by the number of bushels, pounds, or bags per acre. The scientific and mechanical revolution in farming has brought this about.

If the number of bushels per acre could be controlled, it might provide a solution to the problem, but such a control would be impossible and completely out of keeping in this land of free enterprise.

The present trend, continually advocated by universities, agriculture agencies, and others is for increased production per acre, with the thought that increased yields with increased efficiency mean more money for the farmers. This is true, to an extent, but it also means more surplus to be stored in Government bins about the country. Perhaps this program should be deemphasized for a time until demand can catch up with production.

The flooding of the market at this time with hundreds of millions of bushels of surplus corn by order of the Secretary of Agriculture is inopportune. The corn should have been released months ago so it could have been disposed of before the 1961 harvest.

This act could cause a glut of the market and a depression of prices for the new crop of corn.

The old law of supply and demand still is a major factor in achieving good prices for products. Development of more markets for U.S. farm products is the only solution—markets both at home and abroad.

Research to provide more uses for these products is another factor which should be emphasized.

Only in these two ways can the present dilemma be solved.

Baring: "What Killed Ophir Reflects Need for Department of Mineral Resources"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial reprinted from Engineering and Mining Journal of April 1961 titled "What Killed Ophir." I am sorry that the picture which appeared over the article cannot also be reproduced. It is a very dramatic depiction of a ghost town with nothing more than a deserted fire hydrant nestled in a cleared area in the foothills of a beautiful mountain range.

It stands as a sentinel memorializing what once was a thriving mining community. I have seen many ghost towns in Nevada and other Western States. The article "What Killed Ophir" tells the story. Twelve years ago, I introduced my first bill which would create a Department of Mines at Cabinet level. During every subsequent Congress that I have served, I have reintroduced the bill. Both the article and the purpose of the bill are hereafter printed.

Mining is the lifeblood of several of our Western States, not the least of which is Nevada. If something is not done without further delay to offset the ever-increasing importation of cheap-labor-mined minerals from foreign countries, domestic mining will be dead forever. Already, hundreds of mines in the western part of the United States are filled with water.

The editorial follows:

WHAT KILLED OPHIR?

A lone leaky hydrant in a weedfield high in a hanging valley in the Colorado Rockies can mean only one thing—you're looking at a ghost camp. Folks in the area say it's called Old Ophir. A few mine dumps on the sides of the mountains that rim the valley, a cluster of deserted cabins, the bleached skeleton of a saloon and a battered buckboard complete the scene. Talk about depressed areas? Here you have the No. 1 depressed area, with population zero.

There's something awesome, and yet something meaningful in this scene of desolate grandeur. Perhaps Ophir faded to extinction because the price of silver plummeted, or because the miners ran out of ore.

These things were considered normal risks of mining. If a man struck it rich, he was permitted to keep most of his gains. And so, against great odds, the prospectors of yesterday continued to look for more Ophirs. But today a combination of industry lassitude, unsympathetic government attitudes on Federal and local levels, and misguided labor unions work collectively to create more Ophirs, and at an alarming rate.

Smelter men tell us that in mining areas such as Salt Lake City the number of ore shippers has dwindled from about 200 to about 20 to 30.

Now what are some of the Ophir-makers, and what can be done about them? Here are some suggestions:

1. The ill-advised and unnecessary gold mine closing order L-208 of World War II shut down all domestic gold mines after virtually all able-bodied men had gone to the armed services. Damage was so severe that many of the mines never survived. A subsidy for domestically minded gold could reverse this Ophir-making trend.

2. County and State governments, representing the majority voting power of farmers and businessmen, are loading mining ventures with unfair and excessive taxes. There can easily be Ophirs on the Mesabi Range if Minnesota doesn't reverse its tax policies soon.

3. Mines are wasting assets, and as such are entitled to special tax considerations. And yet both the Truman administration and the current one regard depletion allowances as tax loopholes. A little enlightenment here would help.

4. Labor leaders have contributed to Ophir-making on two counts: (A) They have failed to recognize the basic economic law that although the cost of producing a metal (say copper) may run from 15 to 30 cents, all copper sells at virtually the same price. This completely rules out industry-wide bargaining, and demands that high-cost producers be given special concessions, otherwise they will go out of business—and many have. (B) The repeated annual demands for higher wages, first in steel, then in aluminum, and finally nonferrous metals resulted in inflated labor and material costs which have made it impossible for the small mine operator to compete with low-cost metal and foreign metal production.

5. Despite the alarming depletion of world silver supplies, expected to come to a head within 16 months, the Government is taking no action to stimulate domestic production. An upward adjustment of domestic silver prices, which is economically sound at this time, could reverse the present Ophir-making tide.

The foregoing comment does not imply that all domestic mining is on the skids, because, on the contrary, many new developments are underway. See Engineering and Mining Journal census of new plants, January 1961. But the vanguard of mineral development, composed of prospectors and the small mine operators, is bucking discouraging odds.

The one single way that the entire mining industry, including small and large operators, regional and national associations, and the mining press, can stop Ophir-making is to support Representative BARING's bill H.R. 2210.

This calls for the establishment of a Department of Mineral Resources with a Secretary of Cabinet status who will look after the interests of the mining industry as effectively, for instance, as the present Secretary of Labor is working to improve the status of labor.

Blanket responsibilities of the present Department of Interior, with all the conflicting and opposed interests which it tries to represent, are obstructing mining progress. We need a man and a Department in Washington with the sole responsibility of maintaining and promoting progress and welfare of the domestic industry.

The Underlying Dilemmas on Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Washington: The Underlying Dilemmas on Berlin," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of September 24, 1961. The article comments in an interesting and helpful manner on a speech by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on the subject of the use of nuclear weapons by the United States, a speech which brings home to all of us the importance of maintaining a strong, courageous, and yet sensible position with relation to the use of such devastating weapons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON—THE UNDERLYING DILEMMAS ON BERLIN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—The other day, President Kennedy sent a note to several of his associates in the Government asking why the policy of the United States on Germany was not better understood.

If he was firm on opposing Soviet demands in Germany, he noted, he was accused in some quarters of being recklessly belligerent, and if he was moderate and willing to negotiate, he was condemned in other quarters as a weakling and an appeaser.

One answer to his question is that he has neither defined what he means by being "firm" nor indicated what he regards as an honorable basis for negotiation. Maybe he shouldn't do so for tactical reasons now—this is a question on which intelligent people can and do differ—but it is a fact that both his warnings of when he will fight and what he will negotiate have been extremely vague and this has contributed to the lack of understanding.

Another answer is that his past words and actions on Cuba and Laos have not jibed. He has talked like Churchill and acted like Chamberlain. This is why even so wise and moderate a woman as Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine rose in the Senate this week and in a remarkable speech asked whether we had lost our national will to risk everything for our beliefs.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTION

Beyond this, however, is something much deeper. This is the unresolved, and perhaps unresolvable, philosophical question of risking the apocalyptic horror of nuclear war or avoiding the risk at the expense of other people and our own promises and principles.

This is the root of our present frustration. It is not that thoughtful people disagree because they do not understand the complexities of the German question, but that they understand all too well the desperate alternatives posed by the German crisis.

The neutral powers at the Belgrade conference did not fail to understand Kennedy's German policy; they simply did not face up to it. Most people won't face up to it, either, partly because both alternatives seem so desperate and partly because the dilemma is usually expressed, like everything else these days, in extreme either/or terms.

For example, Kenneth J. Foreman, writing in the Presbyterian Outlook, says the alternatives are no longer peace or war, but "peace with slavery or total destruction." America has always chosen the hard road to freedom, he concedes—freedom from King George, or fight. Freedom for the slaves, or fight. Safety for democracy, or fight—but it won't work now.

"We have done it before," he says, "but we cannot do it again. Let us pray," he says. "Let us, indeed."

The trouble with Mr. Foreman's conclusion is that the question is put the wrong way. One may agree on the general proposition that, if faced with the certain destruction of the human race or the certain expansion of Communist authority, life is better than death. But is that the question?

The choice before the President and the other leaders of the Western world today is not between the certainty of destruction and the certainty of Communist expansion, but between the possibility of destruction if we risk war, and the certainty of Communist expansion if we don't.

This is the immediate question, and when it is put this way, most Americans, including President Kennedy and Mrs. Smith and maybe even Mr. Foreman, would probably prefer the risk to the certainty.

THE PROBLEM OF DOUBT

President Kennedy's problem now is not philosophical but political and tactical. He has answered the philosophical question for himself. He will risk the possibility of nuclear war rather than the certainty of the Communist triumphs that would follow a successful blockade of Berlin. And what is widely overlooked in Europe and even here is that it is precisely because he has decided to risk nuclear war that he is willing to negotiate.

Having reached that conclusion, the question still remains whether he has made it unmistakably clear to Khrushchev. Mrs. SMITH obviously doesn't think he has. That was why she felt obliged to get up and for the second time in her career deliver on the floor of the Senate another declaration of conscience. She was not choosing the destruction of the human race, but merely saying that women know better than men, namely, that life must sometimes be risked in order to perpetuate life.

Tax Rate Reform and the National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions my friend and distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and I have, in discussing our companion bills, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, to reform Federal tax rates and methods, pointed out that their enactment would contribute to military preparedness. This is just as true in the present as in the past. A dynamic, growing economy provides the strongest base for our national security.

As the amount of capital in a country grows, so does its economy. This is a law of economics. It is true of any type of economy, whether socialized or communized or free enterprise as in America. When capital is accumulated, it will be used. When it is not accumulated, or is destroyed, it cannot be used. These are simple facts of economic life.

History, judgment, faith in freedom tell us that where capital accumulation and use are not subjected to disproportionate taxation, a free enterprise system will outperform all other economic systems.

When testifying before the Ways and Means Committee on May 3, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon stated:

As we look back over the past century we see that our record of economic growth has been unmatched anywhere in the world. But of late we have fallen behind. From a historic growth rate of 3 percent per annum in gross national product (1909–56, in constant prices), we have fallen to 2 percent in the latter part of the 1950's. In the last 5 years Western Europe has grown at double or triple our recent rate and Japan has grown even faster. While there is some debate as to the precise annual growth rate of the Soviet economy, CIA estimates that their GNP grew at a rate of 7 percent in the 1950's. Clearly, we must improve our performance. Otherwise, we cannot maintain our national security, we cannot maintain our position of leadership in the eyes of the world, and we cannot achieve our national aspirations.

Subsequently, President Kennedy launched a new military buildup. While judgments may differ as to the direction and emphasis of our military program, all thinking Americans are agreed that military preparedness and security come first in the order of things.

Mr. Speaker, our concern is not with the increase in military spending, which we have supported, but with the change in attitude in regard to the economics of growth which seems to have accompanied the increase. We hear that the increase in spending in the public sector will underwrite greater growth in the private sector of the economy. This not only is wrong in theory, it is disproved by the record. The recent inadequate growth record which Secretary Dillon cites follows years of continued buildup in public spending, a trend which continued right through the years of inadequate growth. What the Government takes in private income and capital simply represents a transfer to public spending of what otherwise would be spent or invested in the private economy. When increased Government spending is deficit financed, we run the risk of "hot money" which creates more inflation and subtracts from economic values.

Just as an army fights on its stomach, so does a government live off its economy. The greater the needs of government, the greater will be the demands on the economy. The increased military spending provides greater rather than less reason for releasing the tax blocks to economic growth.

The time for action is already late. In recent years, the economies of major foreign countries have grown more rapidly than ours because more of their current income has gone into capital formation. It has been reported by Mr. Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligency Agency, that upward of 30 percent of Russia's gross national product is channeled into capital formation. The rates of leading Western countries in 1959 are as follows:

Gross domestic capital formation, percent of GNP, 1959

Germany	23
Austria	23
Italy	21
France	18
Belgium	17
Britain	15
United States*	15

Source: Statistical yearbook, 1960, United Nations, table 166, p. 471.

*Source: Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, our problem domestically is that business expenditures for new plant and equipment have shown little net growth over the past decade, as shown by the following figures—in constant dollars—1960 value:

Business expenditures for new plant and equipment, 1951 through 2d quarter 1961

[Billions of dollars, adjusted to 1960 price level]

1951	32.3
1952	33.0
1953	34.7
1954	32.6
1955	34.0
1956	39.1
1957	38.8
1958	31.3
1959	32.6
1960	35.7
1961 (2d quarter)	34.6

Mr. Speaker, our legislation is designed to gradually reform the tax rates and methods which unduly restrain new capital accumulation and destroy too much capital already accumulated. It has built-in procedures for postponing scheduled income tax rate reductions in the event of budget unbalance thus providing all necessary priority to increased military spending. However, it should not be believed that it is increased military spending which thwarts the enactment of this critically needed legislation. Instead, it is the continued and persistent increase in spending on domestic programs.

The universal support which has been given to President Kennedy in his decision to increase military spending does not extend to domestic spending. Instead, there has been widespread reaction that it is past time to clamp down in the domestic area. We believe this reaction represents the true feeling of a majority of the Nation's citizens. Certainly, it is consistent with the general public interest in reforming the tax structure to permit the greater growth in the private economy which would mean adequate good jobs for all who are willing and able to work; increased productivity, so that wages and salaries will buy more, living standards will advance more rapidly, and as a Nation we will be able to compete more effectively with foreign producers; more revenue from a greater and more productive tax base, thus strengthening our capacity to meet whatever demands military preparedness may involve over the years ahead; a counterforce to a new surge of inflation, thus protecting our gold reserves and position of world financial leadership; enhancement of our prestige and influence in the world, and increase of our power for initiative in the contest with communism.

We have been greatly encouraged by the support our bills have received from diverse groups and people throughout the country. But we do not wish to mislead anyone. The Federal Government is at a point where it has got to make choices. It cannot just slide along with increased domestic spending and hope that some way or other the opportunity for thorough surgery on our uneconomic tax structure will open up. That opportunity can be created, but it will not just happen.

However, unless the choice is made to tighten domestic spending in 1962, carryover of the tax problem until 1963 will not improve the opportunity for favorable and adequate action. Every commitment for additional domestic spending simply uses up revenue dollars which otherwise could be applied to tax rate reform.

The choice has to be made that more capital for more growth through tax rate reform is more important to the public welfare than any competitive spending on any and all domestic programs.

Until recently, it was understood that the administration planned to submit for congressional action next year a plan for a thorough overhauling of the tax structure. Now, there are indications that action is no longer expected until a new Congress is elected in the fall of 1962 and takes over in 1963. This would project us into the mid-1960's before moderation in tax rates could be expected to have significant beneficial effect on the economy.

There seems to be some belief in Washington that the prospects for rapid recovery from the recent recession diminish the need for early action on tax rate reform. Nothing could be further from the truth. We also had rapid recoveries from the preceding recessions, but these did not prevent the poor overall growth record cited by Secretary Dillon. To make certain that the recovery is transformed into a period of more substantial and sustained growth, the relaxation of the tax blocks should have begun this year. The next best time is next year. To put off the problem until 1963 would be to invite a new lag in growth and employment.

Mr. Speaker, while the Congress is in adjournment, we hope that the administration and the congressional leaders of both major political parties will give new thought and attention to the plight of our economy under the present tax structure. It is not enough to think big in regard to the Nation's military needs. We must think big in regard to our domestic needs for more capital if we are to have the full strength and security which the private economy is capable of providing.

We regret that it was not practical to bring our bills to a legislative decision this year. However, we do want all of our friends and allies, in and out of Congress, who support this legislation to know that we will continue to urge its enactment. We hope that opportunity for enactment will come next year, and will do all that we can to bring about this opportunity. It is a time for working harder, not relaxing. The Government can make the choice for more growth in the private economy instead of more growth in total Federal spending, if it will. Our country will be a better place in which to work and live, and more secure in its freedom, when tax rates are moderate at all points.

The Possibilities of Our Fast-Developing Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, not being a scientist myself, I have always wondered just what the possibilities of our fast-developing space program are for the average person. Also, what we can expect in the future from the experiments now going on all over the world and what the ultimate possibilities are.

I requested a friend of mine, Mr. J. R. Neigh, 609 Crown Court Road, Alexandria, Va., of the Aircraft Marine Products Corp., of Harrisburg, Pa., to write for me a short article in everyday language discussing the above subject. He has been kind enough to do so and, in my judgment, his article is understandable to the average person and, also, a good picture in a brief form.

In answer to the question he poses at the end, "In what area should it be spent?" my own opinion is that at present it is a national defense necessity to proceed with all speed in the development of an antimissile missile. Whichever one of the two great powers first develops an antimissile-missile will be in control of the world situation. I feel that it is imperative that this be done before the Russians succeed in doing so. Other scientific achievements will follow in logical sequence.

Mr. Neigh's article follows:

The research objectives we must, as lay people, appreciate and realize the significance of, having been well outlined by our Government. The results of these objectives can well be the factor that will permit us to continue a way of life on earth that reflects a continued improvement over the way we know it today. Failure of a driving pursuit of these objectives could conceivably result in the earth becoming a satellite, and its people slaves to powers today unknown or to other earthly powers who might gain control of space and use it for the furtherance of their concepts.

To keep abreast of science and to satisfy man's thirst for knowledge, it is imperative that we control space. Certain things must be uncovered and understood in order to obtain this control. There are three basic steps necessary to attain this goal. They are: (1) Obtain a complete understanding of the nature of the control exerted by the sun over the events on earth, (2) learn the origin of the earth; in fact, we should learn the origin of the universe, including the solar system, and (3) search for the origin of life and for existence of life outside of earth.

To obtain these objectives will necessitate tremendous expenditures of time, effort, and, of course, dollars. The advantages that we will ultimately realize, however, will be tremendous and of such a nature as to tax the imaginative powers of our best thinkers of today. Already, we have accepted as practically everyday items some of the benefits that have resulted in the early work of our space program.

The orbit of the Vanguard satellite launched in 1958 revealed that the earth's true shape was somewhat different than we had believed. Navigational benefits were derived from the discovery and have been passed on to those who could benefit, such as airlines and steamship lines.

In searching for high-temperature insulations, the properties and capabilities of Teflon emerged. A very practical application of Teflon found in many homes today is the greaseless frying pan. Actually, the greaseless frying pan is an ordinary frying pan with a Teflon liner, and the reason it needs no grease is that Teflon has the lowest coefficient of friction of any substance known to man. In lay terms, this means that we know of nothing as slippery as Teflon. Because of the high temperatures at which Teflon will maintain its characteristics, it is quite suitable for the application in frying pans.

The development of reentry nose cone vehicles led to a refinement in the methods used in manufacturing certain ceramics. The additives utilized to come up with satisfactory ceramic nose cones today enable housewives to cook in one ceramic container, use it as a table service, then cover it and place it in the refrigerator for storage. Until the discovery of a ceramic which could withstand these extreme temperature changes, such thermal shocks were impossible.

Plastic dishes, until a year or so ago, could not be washed in dishwashers. The space program has led to thermal plastics that are now used in the manufacture of glasses, cups, dishes, and so forth, that have the same characteristics as regular glass and chinaware.

Advances that were discovered through the space program in the treatment of aluminum have led to aluminum engines in automobiles, a greater use of aluminum in structural members that now approximate the strength of steel.

There have been other side results from our still youthful space program. These are just a few that come to mind and can be directly recognized by our average citizen. There are many more areas where research and development programs have resulted in immediately useful discoveries. There is, however, an even greater area that is yet untapped and can conceivably lead to unimagined frontiers in space and living.

For some years, approximately 40, we have known that ionospheres are charged atmospheric gases which start about 40 miles above the earth and extend many tens of thousands of miles beyond. Studies of the ionospheres have been intense, and we have realized for some time that all shortwave and intercontinental radio communications depend on the existence of the ionosphere for their very existence. In several satellite flights designed to study these reflective gases, we have learned more than in all of the work combined over the preceding 40 years. Future flights incorporating experiments concerning the ionosphere we hope will open the door to information concerning ionospheres on other planets that can be utilized in the furtherance of earth communications.

The earth's magnetic field offers tremendous possibilities in the area of power harnessing. Vehicles utilizing these magnetic fields for power are within the realm of possibility today. Envision if you will getting into a surface, subsurface, or airborne vehicle where by simply dialing to a certain number, you automatically draw all the power needed to take you to your destination from the earth's magnetic field. No fuel tanks are needed. No carburetion is required—no refueling along the way. All the needs for such transportation are in the air around us right now. Our space program is gaining more information of this magnetic field that surrounds earth. The day will soon come when observations from the moon, space stations or other planets will result in sufficient knowledge of the magnetic field and other such fields that surround earth to enable man to put these powers to work.

In trying to determine the origin of earth and life, we can obtain much information from space particles. These particles can give us an insight into the physical makeup of other planets. Today's concepts are based on examination of particles that have collided with earth—meteorites. We realize, however, that these bits of space particles that have collided with earth burn up as they enter the earth's atmosphere. For years, we have called these bits of space particles shooting stars. Since they burn up as they come into our atmosphere theories that have been given through their examination are considered weak today. It is somewhat similar to looking at a pile of burned up newspapers or books and trying to determine what they said.

All of us, I think, are familiar with the breaking of the sound barrier. There are other barriers of a similar nature that have yet to be conquered. Perhaps the most intriguing is the light barrier, which, when broken, will place us in the position of living Einstein's theory of relativity. It would certainly be weird when we break the light barrier and can travel faster than the speed of light to arrive at one's destination, then seconds later see your image arriving.

The heat barrier has yet to be broken. Within our atmosphere there are definite limits as to how fast we can travel without burning up as does a shooting star. However, it is conceivable that someday we may be able to travel so fast that we overcome friction, which is the cause of the heat.

When the light and heat barriers are broken, we approach the time barrier. At the risk of sounding the complete fool, it is foreseeable that we will be able to project ourselves so fast as to break the time barrier and, in effect, propel ourselves backward in time. Should the time arise when we can do this, your imagination can certainly reveal all of the astounding possibilities that would be open for mankind.

The far-reaching implications of the overall science and space program leave no doubt in my mind that the moneys expended in these directions will never be excessive. I don't think the question is, "Should we spend these moneys?" so much as it is, "How much can we afford to spend and in what areas should it be spent?"

Hon. Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Paul Brown was one of my close personal friends. From the first day of my service on the Banking and Currency Committee, he took an interest in me and my congressional work. He was always most helpful and our friendship extended beyond the committee room to many personal contacts of a social as well as official nature.

He was a true southern gentleman in every sense of the word. Honorable, dignified, loyal, and charming—he represented the finest type of U.S. Congressman and set an example which I shall always try to follow. I consider it a privilege to have had the opportunity

to know Paul Brown. I am saddened at his death and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

The Aims of American Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it certainly can never be said that over the years I have been an enemy of foreign aid. Indeed, I have usually recognized the great functions which foreign aid performs in feeding the hungry, in preserving the peace, and in strengthening our own camp. Yet, foreign aid does not have a justification per se—regardless of the aims that it accomplishes. Charity which leads the able to a life of idleness, which is wasted on luxuries while necessities are not being filled, cannot be justified. Neither can foreign aid which is abused rather than properly used.

Still, both charity and foreign aid have at times a tendency to become a matter of habit—and in that they lose their effectiveness. But we must be wise to recognize that we do not discharge our responsibility to those to whom we give our funds, if we do not always continue to evaluate the uses made of these funds and their effect on those receiving them.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I believe we must constantly seek to reevaluate the aims and uses of our foreign aid. Unfortunately, we have developed over the years an unrealistic attitude toward foreign aid. At times we have looked at it as a panacea for solving many and all difficulties and ills in our foreign relations. At times we have thought that foreign aid could be used in order to keep our old friends, induce new friends, convert our enemies, strengthen the economy of underdeveloped nations, and at the same time serve as a tool for the growth of our own economy. Yet, it is obvious that foreign aid cannot be a solution for all the deficiencies in the international sphere. It is clear that we must make up our mind, in each individual case, what it is that we try to accomplish through it. And we must make certain that it is this particular purpose that is being served.

In today's Wall Street Journal there is an interesting article expressing the views of several foreign business leaders concerning our foreign aid. It is the major complaint of these foreign businessmen that the ever-changing U.S. policies in the area of foreign aid have failed to serve this country or the recipient countries.

This article calls attention to several important points. It stresses that among businessmen from the avowedly pro-Western underdeveloped countries there is bewilderment and indignation at the increasing willingness of the United States to shower aid upon the neutral nations. Not unnaturally, they believe preoccupation with wooing the neutrals causes U.S. aid programs to lag in their own lands. As M. Bank-Anthony, chairman of a large Nigerian construction concern, puts it:

'If a country shows a disguised leaning toward communism, why don't you ignore that country and concentrate on the countries that are your good friends? Then you could make a model of your good friend and let the others compare the difference with what they have.

Another important point is made in the article. Many of the foreign businessmen believe that the United States is putting too much emphasis on government-to-government aid programs and is not doing enough to encourage private commerce in underdeveloped countries. Many of these businessmen are worried about the ultimate effect of large government-to-government aid programs on the future of private industry in their countries. Says Mrs. Horton of Liberia:

There hasn't been enough done through foreign aid and technological assistance to encourage capitalism in Africa. This is not good for the ideology of the West. If the governments get too involved in the economy, the heads of state will become spoiled with power and will not release it.

It seems that, most of all, they all want us to make plain the objectives of our aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article titled "Lemon Aid," which appears in the Wall Street Journal of September 26, 1961, be printed at this point of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEMON AID

(By Norman C. Miller, Jr.)

SAN FRANCISCO.—"We don't know what the United States is trying to accomplish with its aid, and I doubt if your people know either."

This stinging indictment of U.S. foreign-aid policy comes from a South American industrialist, one of several score pro-Western businessmen at the recent International Industrial Conference meeting here. Conversations with businessmen from more than a dozen underdeveloped countries turned up similar troubled concern about a basic lack of purpose in U.S. economic aid.

These men strongly favor aid, particularly to their own countries. They are not especially concerned with bungling in its administration, although they generally admit such mishaps are not hard to find. Rather, what worries them is that in an effort to outdo the Communists the United States seemingly tries to do something for everybody, shifting emphasis helter-skelter from country to country and plan to plan to meet new Soviet challenges and in the process satisfies no one.

The stories they tell of U.S. aid in their lands is not pleasant.

"Not many years ago in Iran, the United States was loved and respected as no other country, and without having given a penny of aid," says Adol Hassen Ebtehaj, chairman of the Iranians' Bank, Teheran. "Now, after more than $1 billion of loans and grants, America is neither loved nor respected; she is distrusted by most people and hated by many."

To be sure, most comments are not phrased so bluntly. But it is abundantly plain, at the least, that these businessmen believe the United States is not getting a satisfactory return on its foreign-aid dollars.

Among businessmen from the avowedly pro-Western underdeveloped countries there is bewilderment and indignation at the increasing willingness of the United States to shower aid upon the neutral nations. Not unnaturally, they believe preoccupation with wooing the neutrals causes U.S. aid programs to lag in their own lands. Moreover, many of them consider aid to left-leaning neutrals a waste of money.

NEED OF A FRIEND

"If a country shows a disguised leaning toward communism, why don't you ignore that country and concentrate on the countries that are your good friends?" asks M. Bank-Anthony, chairman of Borini Prono & Co., Ltd., a Nigerian construction concern. "Then you could make a model of your good friend and let the others compare the difference with what they have."

"Substantial aid has come as soon as a country looks elsewhere for it or Communist countries offer it," charges A. Romeo Horton, president of the Bank of Liberia, Inc., and a University of Pennsylvania graduate. "Look how long Liberia has been a true and trusted friend of the United States, yet compare the amount of aid pouring into Ghana to the little bit we get."

"The neutral country is useless to you," contends a soft-spoken Thai. "If you want to have a friend don't let him put a mask on his face. Any day he may take off the mask and show what he really is. Then you have only wasted a lot of money."

In their own countries, these businessmen say, aid programs are hampered severely by recurrent shifts in plans by the United States. This is even more damaging, they say, than the occasional job that fails altogether—roads that are "tearing up like tissue paper" in Liberia, for example.

"They get these chiefs of mission down there," says a Chilean, "who always arrive with a pet theory. One fellow wants a pilot plan for agriculture, so we put all our eggs in that basket for a couple of years. Then the next fellow arrives, and he is interested in roads so we change the whole thing again."

And although the newly formulated "Alliance for Progress" policy is aimed at providing massive aid to develop fully Latin American economies, some businessmen from these lands, while endorsing the idea, are worried about whether the program has been fully thought out.

Take the need for land reform, one of the basic principles of Alliance for Progress. The Latin Americans say they accept the need to break up large landholdings, but they wonder whether the U.S. Government fully realizes the problems involved in, say, providing adequate irrigation for many small plots.

Moreover, they note the Communists also advocate land reform, and they fear the United States won't be able to make clear the distinction between its type of land reform and Communist land reform. If the meaning of the U.S. program is not clear to the people, they say, in the process of reform the United States may touch off revolution.

Among businessmen from neutral countries there is equal discontent with U.S. aid programs, but for different reasons. Echoing the political lines of their countries, they complain that the United States demands too many conditions for its aid, notably that they actively oppose communism. In addition, these neutrals contend, U.S. aid programs are hamstrung by redtape, while it is relatively simple to get cash and goods from the Communists. "A beggar has no choice," says Charles C. K. Baah, chairman of a construction company in Ghana and a member of Parliament. "Where he can get the help, he will."

WRONG EMPHASIS

Perhaps surprisingly, the businessmen from the neutral nations do agree with pro-West industrialists that the United States is putting too much emphasis on government-to-government aid programs and is not

doing enough to encourage private commerce in underdeveloped countries.

U Than Maung, managing director of Henzada Rice Corp., in Burma, pleads for the United States to give American companies better investment guarantees, and tax breaks in order to encourage more private investment in his country. Of course, investment guarantees and some tax concessions are available to U.S. companies now, but foreign businessmen complain regulations are so cumbersome that many investors are discouraged. "The regulations are so complicated that it defies one's intelligence to understand them," complains Mr. Baah.

Without exception, these businessmen are worried about the ultimate effect of large government-to-government aid programs on the future of private industry in their countries. "There hasn't been enough done through foreign aid and technical assistance to encourage capitalism in Africa," says Mr. Horton of Liberia. "This is not good for the ideology of the West." And he warns: "If governments get too involved in the economy, the heads of state will become spoiled with power and will not release it."

Moreover, they claim it is impossible to give aid to a government and at the same time weed out corrupt officials and change oppressive policies. "No foreign government representative can raise a question about corruption without insulting the very officials who are suspected," says Iran's Mr. Ebtehaj. "Corrupt officials merely dismiss such questions as an unwarranted interference in their internal affairs."

RESENT INTERFERENCE

Anyway, these businessmen resent any hint of U.S. interference in the sovereign affairs of their countries. In this view they find surprising support among some old colonial hands in Europe. "What right have aid-giving nations to prescribe the internal policies of a developing country?" asks Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of England's Lloyds Bank, Ltd. "Clearly none, none at all," he answers.

Dissatisfaction with government-aid policies does not mean that these businessmen want such programs tapered off, although some would rather have more aid issued under auspices of international organizations. What they suggest is a long-term program which strikes a better balance between government projects and encouragement of private enterprise. They want the United States to help devise, and then stick to, long-range plans and stop worrying so much about matching the latest Communist aid gambit.

Most of all, they want us to make plain the objectives of our aid programs. "If you are clear in your principles, the neutrals will respect you and the doubts of your friends will be removed," says Mohamad Ali, chairman of Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corp., Ltd.

Clearly, none of these men, whether pro-West or neutral, sees any clarity in our foreign aid program today.

Wagner Lands on Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Daily News of September 8, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I do this at the request of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is absent because of illness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGNER LANDS ON TOP

Mayor Robert F. Wagner's smash win in Thursday's Democratic primaries makes him unquestionably the top New York State Democrat for an indefinite time to come.

How did he do it? Our theory is (1) that Mr. Wagner is the kind of man many if not most New Yorkers like best—affable, unassuming, urbane, honest, easygoing; and (2) that he succeeded in pinning the "bossism" label to his opponent, Arthur Levitt, so that it wouldn't come off.

Without taking sides as yet in the mayoral campaign that climaxes on November 7, we'll offer our hearty congratulations to the mayor on his primary triumph (always liked him ourselves).

We hope earnestly, though, that in reorganizing the local Democrats the mayor will pay far more heed to James A. Farley, a solid man, than to his other two major helpers in the primary campaign—a couple of political peculiarities named Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and H. H. Lehman.

UHF Versus VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have been much concerned over a situation which has arisen as a result of an order recently issued by the Federal Communications Commission on deintermixture. This concerns some eight major cities, and I believe, if carried out, will ultimately spread to possibly every other city in the country that now enjoys very high frequency reception. In effect, the order of the Commission requires the cities affected to utilize ultra high frequency in lieu of very high frequency, thus depriving many areas of all reception.

For the benefit of my colleagues whom I know are most interested in this matter I include, under unanimous consent, the various bills and resolutions that have been introduced in this Congress to this particular matter in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 9267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H.R. 9277

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission

pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H.R. 9291

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commmerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H.R. 9293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H.R. 9322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H.R. 9349

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(ff) 'Very high frequentcy band' means that part of the radio spectrum between thirty and three hundred megacycles.

"(gg) 'Ultra high frequency band' means that part of the radio spectrum between three hundred and three thousand megacycles."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 307) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "It shall be unlawful for the Commission, in allocating television channels in the very high frequency and ultra high frequency bands, (1) to give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular municipality, locality, or region, or (2) to subject any particular municipality, locality, or region to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage."

H. RES. 450

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has sought congressional appropriations in excess of $2,000,000 for the purpose of conducting a special engineering study of telecasting on ultrahigh frequencies to explore the effectiveness of ultra-high-frequency television service, to determine the proper place of ultrahigh frequencies in our nationwide television system, to provide required additional information upon which basic administrative decisions on television channel allocations can properly be made, and to inquire into ways and means of improving ultra-high-frequency receivers and antennas; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress, on the basis of the foregoing requests, has appropriated funds in the amount of $2,000,000 for the conduct of such an experimental Commission study of ultra-high-frequency telecasting to be held in New York City; and

Whereas the Commission's ultra-high-frequency study is now only in the preparatory stage with operations not scheduled to commence until late 1961 and the final results thereof pursuant to a six-month extension recently requested of Congress by the Commission not scheduled to be ready until January 1963, or thereafter; and

Whereas it is recognized at the Commission and throughout the broadcasting industry that under the present state of the art, very high frequency channels and service are directly superior to the ultrahigh frequency in terms of wider coverage, receiver and antenna characteristics, and more widespread distribution of very high frequency receivers; and

Whereas the Commission, without awaiting the conduct or results of its experimental study of the ultrahigh frequency has, by proceedings instituted on July 27, 1961, now proposed to take far-reaching allocations actions which would require the deletion of existing very high frequency channels on an ad hoc basis in a number of American cities and would compel the very high frequency stations operating thereon to abandon their wider coverage very high frequency service so as to shift over to ultra-high-frequency channels and service; and

Whereas the results of the Commission's experimental ultra-high-frequency study for which substantial funds were appropriated would demonstrably be critical to any proper evaluation of the pending Commission proposals to delete existing very high frequency channels and service in favor of the ultrahigh frequency: Now, be it and it is hereby

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission should take no further action in those proceedings instituted by it on July 27, 1961, which would look to or would compel any television station operating on a very high frequency to shift therefrom to an ultrahigh frequency, until the Commission's pending ultra-high-fre-

quency study shall have been completed and a full and detailed report on the procedures, data, findings, and results of such study shall have been made readily available to the Congress and to the public.

H. RES. 457

Resolved, That the House of Representatives is opposed to the Federal Communications Commission's conducting any proceedings or taking any other action looking toward the involuntary change of any commercial or educational television station from a very high frequency to an ultra high frequency until at least six months after the study of ultra high frequency television broadcasting for which funds were appropriated by the Eighty-sixth Congress shall have been completed and a full, complete, and detailed report on the procedures, findings, and results of such study, together with data collected during the study, shall have been made readily available to the Congress and to the public.

H. RES. 469

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13) are particularly well suited to providing reliable high technical quality television service to the public throughout wide areas, especially in small and medium-sized communities and in the rural, farm, and other outlying sections of the Nation, that the present very high frequency channels are therefore absolutely essential to a nationwide television system in the public interest and none of them should be wasted, that stations now operating on the present very high frequency channels provide television service which is especially vital to the public, and that it would be contrary to the public interest for the public to be deprived of, or to have impaired, the television service it now receives from the existing stations operating on the present very high frequency channels; and be it further

Resolved, That it is therefore the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the Federal Communications Commission should not conduct any proceedings, or adopt or promulgate any rule or order, or take any other action which looks toward or which would require a commercial or educational television station now operating on one of the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13) to change its operations to any channel other than another of the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13).

Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in this mornings' Wall Street Journal points up the fallacy of depending on acreage allotments to reduce production of wheat.

The development of new higher yielding varieties of wheat, and the increased use of improved cultural methods, including fertilizers, continue to offset the reduced acreage under normal weather conditions.

These are the reasons I have continually advocated the plan for bushel controls developed by the wheatgrowers themselves, and introduced legislation (H.R. 9131) to provide this method of control. Our growers were the first to recognize the necessity of shifting from an acreage basis to a bushel basis for controlling production. They recognize, as I do, that technology advances in wheat production can largely offset acreage reductions.

Our producers should not be criticized for adopting these higher yielding methods. It is good economic sense to obtain the highest return possible from their investment. This is the American way of our free enterprise system, and it is as applicable on the farm as it is in any of our other industries.

The big difference between our wheat farming industry and other industry is that in wheat farming there are about 1,800,000 producers, whereas in other industries the number of producers is quite limited. Thus, in other industries, production and sales can be limited to market demands by the industry itself. In the wheat industry, however, only through Government supervision can wheatgrowers limit their sales to meet the market demands. Acres of wheat are not our problem. It is bushels. Only by permitting producers themselves to act jointly in limiting the number of bushels going into the marketplace will the problem be solved.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to may be introduced at this point in the RECORD:

WHEATGROWERS USE MORE FERTILIZER TO CASH IN ON HIGHER PRICE PROPS

Under Kennedy's program for cutting 1962 production of wheat, the top farm surplus item, farmers who reduce planted acres by 10 percent or more qualify for price supports of $2 a bushel. That's 21 cents above the prop level for this year's crop. Most farmers are participating in the program to get the higher supports, a check of wheat-raisers suggests.

But farmers buy more fertilizer so they can raise more wheat on the remaining acres; this could defeat the Government's goal. In Kansas, the biggest wheat producing State, plant food producers and retailers say sales this fall are running ahead of 1960, despite the smaller acreage. One dealer says his customers are spreading as much as 20 percent more nitrogen than last year. If the weather is good, this will increase yields per acre 10 percent, he figures.

Weather is the biggest factor determining yields, of course, but crop analysts say moisture conditions now are among the most favorable on record. Roughly 25 percent of the winter wheat has been planted in Kansas.

National Railroad Museum in Green Bay, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during previous sessions of Congress, I have introduced legislation for congressional recognition of a constructive effort by the community of Green Bay, Wis., for establishing a National Railroad Museum. The purpose of the museum would be to tell the dramatic story of the tremendous contribution of railroading to the progress of our country.

Unfortunately, Congress failed to enact the proposed legislation. Nevertheless, we in Wisconsin are proud that forward-thinking individuals and organizations are going ahead creatively with establishing this museum.

Recently, for example, a new organization was formed of individuals and firms having donated cash, goods, or services to the project. This reflects a real spirit of enterprise aimed toward the success of the museum—a project of historic, educational and cultural benefit not only to the people of Wisconsin but of the entire Nation. Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published a brief article on the organization's support of efforts to tell the story of railroading. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MUSEUM GROWTH CITED

There's a new organization in the Green Bay area known as the Officers Club of the Wisconsin and Yesterday Railroad.

It has an initial roster of 228 members. It consists of individuals and firms who have donated cash, goods, and services to the National Railroad Museum. Their contributions to date total $128,875.

The first function the club members are being invited to attend is the formal acceptance of a large steam locomotive by the museum Sunday from the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. The ceremonies will take place at the museum at 4:30 Sunday after the Packer football game.

Later a number of social functions are planned for the group, centering around the Railroad Museum. Members will be given railroad hats and caps emblematic of their rank in the club, plus membership cards entitling them to museum admission.

FAITH IN PROJECT

"These are the individuals and business concerns who have made opening of the museum this summer possible," said John Torinus, president.

"Actually it is difficult to place any monetary value on their contributions. Most of them were made before the museum became an operational reality and were based only on the faith that this would become a worthwhile community asset," Torinus said.

Torinus emphasized that membership in the club was still open and that the campaign to add to the museum's facilities would continue.

"The museum has proved this summer that it can operate successfully," he continued. "It is now a reality, and we hope that more and more people across the country will help us develop it into a truly national shrine to preserve the story of American railroading."

MEMBERSHIP LIST

Classes of membership are determined by the size of the contributions made to the museum.

The roster includes the following individuals and firms who have made cash contributions:

Presidents: Russell H. Winters, E. Roland Harriman, Kellogg-Citizens National Bank, Green Bay Press-Gazette, the Harriman Trust.

Directors: Harold Fuller, Homer McGee, George Banta, Jr., Neil C. Branson, Dr. John Goelz, Green Bay Clearinghouse, Green Bay & Western Lines, Kress Foundation, Morley-Murphy Co., Paper Converting Machine Co., L. J. Wood, Vern Bushman, H.C. Prange Co., WBAY and WBAY–TV, Michael Barnard.

Conductors: F. J. Lenfestey, Walter Scherf, T. A. Strid, the White Store, the Brillion Foundation, Diana Manufacturing Co., Green Bay Steel Tube Co., Wisconsin Public Service Corp., the Kimberly-Clark Foundation, the Barden Store, F. Hurlbut Co.

Engineers: Henry Beemster, Leo Bordeleau, Frank Cartier, John Evans, Bank of Green Bay, Brebner Machine Co., Bushman Dock & Terminal Co., Otto Kaap, People's Trust & Savings Bank, Super Valu Stores, the Vollrath Co.

Firemen: E. H. Manger, Clyde Meidl, Robert Meyer, Myron Miller, Orin Miller, Larry Moore, Max Murphy, Weldon McGee, William Nelson, F. M. Newell, the Northernaire, Herbert J. Olson, Henry Pahlow, Erwin Prust, Lincoln Race, Clarence Renard, R. H. Risdon, John M. Rose, John Rose, Fred Ross, Joseph Rothe, John Ryan, Ernest Schuette, Harry Sears, Harold T. I. Shannon.

John Stiles, Otto Stiller, Max Strehlow, R. W. Surplice, Edwin Sweetman, Harry Thayer, Walter Thew, John Torinus, Vern van Donk, Edward van Drisse, John Vannieuwenhoven, Leland Wells, Welsh, Trowbridge and Bills, West Side State Bank, Al Wetli, Wisconsin State Bank, Wisconsin Telephone Co., Jerry Atkinson, the Belson Co., John Borgenson, E. R. Brennan, the Reverend D. M. Burke.

Carlson Paper and Pulp Co., M. R. Carrigan, O. Carstensen, Charmin Paper Products Co., James B. Christensen, Robert Coates, Dr. Robert Cowles, Ray Decker, Dr. John Dettmann, Clayton Ewing, Fairmont Foods Co., Ferraloy Corp., Findeisen-Greiser, Leo V. Gannon, Gold Bond Ice Cream Co., Walter Greiert, Henry Hagemeister, A. G. Hay, Bernard Henkelmann, Christian Himmler, J. J. Holda, Milton Homuth, Hotel Northland, John Hutchinson.

Hudson-Sharp Machine Co., Jones Transfer Co., A. C. Kalmbach, L. J. Kelly, Charles S. Larsen, C. A. Lawton, Henry Lefebvre, Mrs. J. P. Lenfestey, Edward Liebmann, Dr. Clifford Lord.

Brakemen: Straubel Paper Co.

Trainmen: William Atkinson, Frank Bowles, Vending Service, Green Bay Saving and Loan, Green Bay Traffic Club, Dr. George Nadeau, Dr. E. G. Nadeau, Clinton Spielbauer.

Flagmen: Allouez Drug Store, Appleton Manufacturing Co., Tom Bartelt, Louis Belleau, D. Betten and Co., Broadway Pharmacy, Brock's Drug Store, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, James W. Byers, Central Drug Store, Christiensen Oil Co., DeCoster Construction Co., Ford Drug Store, Gigot's Pharmacy, Green Bay Canning Co., Holzer Drug Store, Humphrey Chevrolet.

Knowles Manufacturing Co., Kohl's, Inc., Krider Drug Store, LaForce Builders Hardware, Gerald Libman, George Mackin, Naph-Sol Refinery, Nelson Machinery and Boiler Co., Noel Construction and Realty, Osco Drug, Pinchard Drug, Preble Drug Store, John Fraser Ross, Edwin Schweger, Schultz Drug Store, Streu Drug Store.

The following firms and individuals have contributed equipment, materials and services:

Presidents: The Short Line Railroad Association of America, Vern M. Bushman, chairman, executive committee, the complete Hood Junction Depot, a prototype of an old-time depot on the Southern Railroad.

The Milwaukee Road, William Quinn, president, a Northern-type steam locomotive; volunteer crew constructed tracks at Museum; hauling Big Boy locomotive from Council Bluffs, Iowa, to Green Bay.

Chicago and North Western Railway—C. J. Fitzpatrick, president—gift of 1900 passenger coach; hauling Pershing locomotive from St. Paul to Green Bay; rails, signals crossing gates and other equipment; hauling C&S locomotive from Waukegan to Green Bay; help on frequent occasions in switching at museum and in shop work on locomotives.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad—Ernest Marsh, president—gift of Texas-type locomotive.

The Soo Line, George McNamara, president—gift of Pacific-type locomotive.

Union Pacific Railroad, Col. Arthur Stoddard, president—gift of Big Boy locomotive.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Co., Walter Tuohy, president—gift of Kanawha-type locomotive.

Republic of Korea and former President Syngman Rhee—gift of General Pershing locomotive.

Directors: Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range Railroad, Fred Voss, president, 14 carloads of ties; Ed Nancarrow, engineering and surveying of the complete track layout at the museum; Clem Vincent, serving as superintendent and chief engineer since the inception of the museum project; Win Thornton, outstanding liaison work with many railroads on museum projects.

Fred Okie, president of the Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad, arranging transportation of the Pershing locomotive from Korea to the United States; and Jack Doering and Eugene Roix, for their work and investment to install the narrow gage train.

Conductors: Bark River Culver & Equipment Co., furnishing equipment on numerous occasions; Jack Black, C. & N. W. superintendent, and William Freund, Milwaukee road superintendent, frequent help and advice; Francis Brunette and Roy Empey, technical advice; Frank Butts, gift of old L.S. & I. coach; Green Bay Area Chamber of Commerce; Green Bay Poster Advertising Co.; Duke Hawkins, supervising volunteer tracklaying crew; Harry Spencer and Robert Jacobi, technical advice and help on locomotives; Red Owl Stores, easement for spur track to museum; W. B. Riley & Son, gift of pickle car; Schuster Construction Co., gravel and concrete; United States Steel Corp., fencing.

Engineers: Elkhart Moraine Gravel Co., gravel; Vern Krieser, Francis Euclide, Larry Koeppen, and William Sloan, advice and assistance; Edgar Ellner and Elmer Iverson, technical advice and assistance; Green Bay Structural Steel Co., bolts and reinforcing bars; Robert Shaeffer, legal work; television stations WFRV–TV, WLUK–TV, and WBAY–TV and radio stations WJPG, WDUZ, and WBAY, publicity and promotion; Ashwaubenon Fire Department, Jim Hockers, chief, frequent help in steaming up locomotives.

Firemen: Northwest Hanna Co., C. Reiss Coal Co., and F. Hurlbut Co., contribution of coal; the Selmer Co., use of equipment; L. J. Thieman, technical assistance; Wetli Landscape Service, sod for depot.

Chapel & Amundson, Brebner Equipment Co., and Paynter Equipment Co., use of equipment; Frank Basche, Fred Grams, and Fred Koch, technical help; Wes Foshay, 2-weeks work during vacation; Ben Helminiak, James Parizek, and Albert Kawalek, technical help.

Brakemen: Badger Sheet Metal Works, work on locomotives; Blaine Williams, artwork.

Trainmen: Bay West Paper Co., paper towels; Straubel Paper Co., paper products; Earl Bosar, Howard Cronable, and Jerry Kositzky, technical help.

Flagmen: Miller Rasmussen Co., Rahr-Green Bay Brewing Co., Reimer Meat Products Co., lunches for volunteer crews.

Report to the People by Congressman Walter H. Moeller, 10th District, Ohio

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, I believe every conscientious Congressman has an obligation to the citizens of his district to report and analyze the accomplishments and shortcomings of the session. I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to review for the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio the record of the current session.

1. DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

There is no doubt that the greatest problem we face, and the one that is uppermost in the minds of the people of this country, is the question of dealing with the worldwide Communist conspiracy. On this question, the present Congress has responded, with unprecedented speed and with an impressive display of bipartisan national unity, to the President's call for increased military and space programs to meet the growing Russian and Chinese Communist challenges.

MILITARY BUILDUP

The defense budget has been increased by nearly $6 billion to provide for additional aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and more conventional weapons. Congress also authorized the President to call up 250,000 members of the Ready Reserve—Reserve and National Guard components—and extend the tours of those now on active duty, to beef up the armed services in the face of renewed threats in central Europe and to free nations around the world.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Included in the new defense appropriation are some $300 million to make a start toward the first meaningful civilian defense program we have ever had. Civil defense has been, to my mind, our greatest failure; it is really appalling to think that, while we spend billions upon billions on military armament, and other billions on foreign military and economic aid, we have not, until this year, provided any real protection for the millions of our citizens who will bear the brunt of a nuclear attack should it come at some time in the future.

NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

The recent Russian space feats serve to accentuate the big increase voted by the 87th Congress in our national space program. Though the $1.7 billion approved this year is a 75-percent increase over 1960, it represents a relatively small amount when compared to the $47 billion military appropriation—but, at least, it should start us on the road to matching and eventually surpassing the Russians in this vital field. As a member of the House Space Committee, I can

assure you that, in the future world, the nation which gains strategic control of space will be in a dominant position among the other nations of that world. In short, our national space program is no pie-in-the-sky program, but, rather, it is absolutely essential to our national survival.

FOOD FOR PEACE

By authorizing the sale of an additional $2 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations overseas this year, Congress has taken a giant step toward relieving the market-depressing surpluses here at home—and, at the same time, putting them to good use around the world in combating the grinding poverty of the underdeveloped nations—which, in itself, serves as a major Communist talking point in selling their "line" to unsuspecting countries.

FOREIGN AID

The foreign military and economic assistance program advocated by the President would make an excellent study in the parliamentary processes of the legislative branch of the National Government. This measure took over a month to make its way through the House and Senate to final Presidential signature. In the interim, Congress junked the administration's request for authority to borrow from the U.S. Treasury to finance long-term loans—the so-called backdoor method of financing—and reasserted the all-important principle of congressional control of the purse strings, by requiring annual appropriation of all funds expended under the act. This development assured strong bipartisan support of the bill. Former President Eisenhower, and other high-ranking Republican Members of Congress, also called for passage of the foreign aid bill.

With the House and Senate compromising on a final dollar figure, the foreign military and economic assistance program voted this year is substantially the same as similar measures passed during the last administration.

NEW LOOK IN FOREIGN POLICY

In addition to the military and space program increases, which signal our firm intention to withstand whatever pressure the Communists choose to apply, Congress also adopted two new programs in the foreign policy field in an attempt to reverse the current trend in world affairs which seems headed toward an eventual nuclear catastrophe.

The first of these, a bill to establish an Arms Control Agency that would emphasize our Nation's peaceful intentions, concentrate the work of all Federal, State, and local disarmament groups, and work out practical and effective alternatives to nuclear war, enjoyed the wholehearted bipartisan support of former President Eisenhower and former Secretary of Defense Gates. This bill in no way indicates a willingness to disarm unilaterally, which, to my mind, would be the height of folly, but, rather, shows a readiness to explore all avenues of approach to lessen world tension and to disarm only if other nations do likewise.

The Arms Control Agency bill was almost identical to the National Peace Agency bills I introduced last year and again this session. The Berlin crisis and the resumption of nuclear weapons testing make it imperative that we initiate, without delay, specific and concrete steps to insure that the chance for an enforcible nuclear test ban and a controlled system of world disarmament does not fall by the wayside.

If we are to defend and preserve our heritage of freedom and our treasured American way of life, we must find a practical and honorable way out of the world's present difficulties.

The second innovation in the foreign policy field was the passage of legislation creating a permanent Peace Corps program. The Peace Corps idea has been widely accepted by Americans of all ages, particularly those in their twenties and thirties, and by the underdeveloped nations in need of skilled technical assistance for their internal development projects. For example, Ohio State University will train a Peace Corps volunteer group starting this October for agricultural extension and demonstration work in the Punjab region of India.

Although I believe we must be extremely careful in selecting and training these young Americans for volunteer service around the world, I also feel that the Peace Corps idea represents the kind of new, imaginative program we desperately need to get the free world's quest for a just and lasting peace off dead center.

2. DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

On the domestic front, the 1st session of the 87th Congress has acted decisively to end the economic recession and start the Nation on the road to recovery. The many pieces of legislation passed and the many executive actions taken to end the slump have already improved the business and employment picture dramatically. However—and I feel it is almost impossible to overemphasize this fact—unemployment is still running nearly 7 percent of the total work force, nationwide, and at far higher levels in chronically depressed areas such as the 10th District.

I do not intend to let up in my fight to get adequate programs to counteract so-called "hard-core" unemployment problems. Though production nationally has now reached and exceeded prerecession levels, and gross income has risen sharply in the last 7 months, there are still two groups who have not benefitted from the recovery: (1) the 5 percent of those laid off during the recession who have not been rehired because of such factors as mechanization and automation of equipment, management reorganizations, and a continuing rise in labor productivity, and (2) those in economically depressed areas, such as our own, which have not shared in the general recovery.

Mr. Kennedy has promised to support additional measures next January, if the condition of these two groups does not improve substantially by that time.

And I intend to do my utmost to see that, since Congress feels that the necessity of offering friendly nations around the world assistance with their economic problems, Congress also sees the much greater necessity of helping the economically underprivileged in our own country help themselves out of their economic difficulties.

Permit me to list briefly the major domestic measures enacted this year which have contributed so much to the strengthening of our economy.

UNEMPLOYMENT AID

Three measures—Temporary unemployment compensation extension, provision of similar benefits for unemployed railroad workers, and aid to dependent children of unemployed parents—helped alleviate some of the worst suffering caused by the recession.

MINIMUM WAGE

Passage of the increase and extension of the Minimum Wage law—the first extension of coverage enacted in over 20 years—assures that within 4 years the 23.9 million workers now covered by the act and the 3.6 million newly covered workers will receive at least $1.25 per hour—certainly a minimum for those attempting to support a family in this period of rising prices.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security Act was also liberalized this year to provide a modest but long overdue measure of relief for our elderly and needy citizens.

HOUSING

The first substantial improvement and revamping of the Housing Act in over 12 years was passed and signed into law this summer. Many of the provisions of this comprehensive measure should be of great help to the hard pressed communities of the 10th District.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

The Water Pollution Control Act was materially strengthened by a greatly improved program for a broad Federal-State-local attack on this menacing problem.

AGRICULTURE

Although the general farm program enacted was a none too satisfactory measure, net farm income this year is expected to be up some 10 percent over 1960—to the highest levels since the Korean war. In addition, the feed grain program passed in March gives some indication of pointing the way out of our present dilemma of continuous overproduction and ever rising farm subsidy payments.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The legislation which appears to offer the best opportunity for real, meaningful assistance to the counties and communities of the 10th District is the Area Redevelopment Act, signed by the President on May 1. This measure, twice vetoed by the last administration, establishes a self-help economic development program, placing a premium on local initiative and local leadership. It is my sincere hope that the efforts we have already made in the 10th District, and the work planned for this fall and winter, will pay off in the form of more jobs, a better business climate, and improved economic conditions for the people of southeast Ohio.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the civil rights field, Congress passed legislation extending the life of the President's Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years. The Commission is now releasing comprehensive reports and recommendations to ensure equal civil rights and equal opportunity to all our citizens in the vital fields of voting, educaotin, housing, employment, and the administration of justice.

The present administration has taken more aggressive and vigorous action in the civil rights field than any other administration in history. More qualified Negroes have been appointed to top judicial and policymaking executive department positions in the past 8 months than in all administrations since the turn of the century combined. The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is making great strikes in eliminating racial discrimination in the Federal departments as well as in hiring for work on Government contracts. And the Justice Department has for the first time taken the initiative in school and voting cases and to assure equal treatment for interstate travelers.

Most important of all, perhaps, is the fact that the President has thrown the full moral weight of his office into the fight for equal rights and first class citizenship for every American. All these things are being accomplished in a quiet, effective and nondisruptive manner, but with the firm conviction that the blessings of this democracy are for all to share without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

3. BUDGET AND TAX OUTLOOK

All this legislation, particularly the Defense, Space, and Anti-recession increases, often means more to the average American in terms of the net effect it will have on his taxpaying pocketbook. In this connection, Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently stated that, unless the deepening world crisis necessitates further military expenditures, we can look forward to no tax rate increase next year.

This is certainly good news for the hard-pressed American taxpayer. Despite large budget increases, due primarily to our military buildup, Dr. Heller's group, as well as experts from the Budget Bureau and the Treasury Department, predict that tax receipts will rise as the Nation's economy recovers from the recession—so much so that taxes will not have to be increased—and we can expect a balanced budget within 2 years.

The estimate for the current fiscal year—1962—calls for a deficit in the neighborhood of $5½ billion. This, however, compares favorably with the last postrecession year of 1959, when the Eisenhower administration sustained the biggest peacetime deficit in American history—over $12 billion.

RECESSION NOTE

Those who have opposed this year's antirecession measures, and who, at the same time, have been outspoken critics of deficit spending, might see the inconsistency of that Legislative opposition from this startling fact: all fiscal experts here agree that, with full employment, there would have been budget surpluses in excess of $6 billion in both fiscal 1961, just ended, and in fiscal 1962—even after taking the increased appropriations into consideration.

TAX REFORM

The predictions on tax reform legislation are somewhat guarded. The administration proposed a series of such programs this year, including a liberal increase in the business tax depreciation schedule to encourage private investment in new plant and equipment. To offset the loss in tax revenues this would entail, Mr. Kennedy also proposed closing several loopholes in the present tax law. But opposition from all sides prevented consideration of the reform program during the current session. Administration leaders promise a renewed attempt next year to improve the tax code—but the degree of success they meet will depend on their ability to resolve the conflicting claims of all the special interest groups which have virtually paralyzed every attempt to reform and equalize the tax burden in the past 6 years.

INFLATION—THE DANGER OF A NEW WAGE-PRICE SPIRAL

Every thinking American is vitally concerned that a creeping inflation does not further decrease the sound value of the dollar and eat away at his hard-won family earnings. The President has voiced this universal concern in his recent request to both labor and management to show moderation and self-restraint in the current auto and steel labor contract negotiations.

Since these basic industries have the power to set the wage-price pattern for the entire country, it is my earnest hope that, in the national interest, labor will moderate its contract demands and management will agree to absorb as much of the final wage increase granted as possible without passing it on to the consumer.

The times are too critical and our country is faced with too many external dangers to permit the placing of individual or group self-interest ahead of the national interest. It should be remembered that a strong, noninflationary economy is as important to our national survival as the maintenance of a strong military establishment.

4. CONCLUSION

This completes my summary of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, one of the longest and most productive in memory. I believe, if next year's session continues the constructive and progressive trend established in 1961, the 87th Congress will go down in history as one of the most enlightened and forward-looking Congresses in recent times.

As we move on into the 1960's, the opportunities and challenges will be tremendous—but likewise, the dangers perilous and close at hand. It ill behooves the citizens, the Congress or the President of the greatest democracy on earth to fail to meet the responsibilities of this critical hour. All Americans—of whatever faith, creed, color or political affiliation—must unite to reaffirm again in this generation that free men, under God, can live and work in freedom, and be able to pass these blessings on for future generations to enjoy.

A Corrected Version of the Record up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this season of claims and counterclaims about the accomplishments of this Congress and of the J.F.K. administration up to date, I think a signed news report in the Chicago Tribune may help to throw some light on the question of, "Where should one look to get the facts?"

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a news report entitled "Voice of President Ghosts for Reporters" written by highly reputable Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune News Service in Washington appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF PRESIDENT GHOST FOR REPORTERS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—Theodore (Ted) Sorensen, special counsel to President Kennedy, was an hour late but 30 newspapermen awaiting his arrival in a private Washington home last Thursday night did not complain.

Drinks were plentiful, and the conversation spirited. When the tall, slightly stooped figure of Sorensen appeared, he was hailed jovially. Peering through his horn-rimmed glasses, he flashed a boyish grin, then got down to business.

"He was not really prepared," the President's closest adviser remarked, "but he did happen to have with him some information of value." He dug into his brief case, pulled out a stack of three-page mimeographed statements, and distributed them.

MANUFACTURED NEWS

"This is for your information in writing your stories," Sorensen warned. "It is not to be attributed in any manner whatever to the White House or the administration. It is to be used by you as your own without any hint as to its source."

The statements, it developed, claimed that President Kennedy had far outperformed former Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower in their initial encounters with Congress. The famous "100 days of F.D.R.'s first year in 1933 were comparatively unproductive in comparison with Kennedy's dazzling list of accomplishments.

WON'T SWALLOW THE BUNK

Many of those present accepted this assertion respectfully. The guests had been carefully selected. Carefully excluded from the briefing were representatives of such newspapers as the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, the Kansas City Star, the Dallas News, and others presumably resistant to administration propaganda.

But some recalcitrance developed. One correspondent, as Sorensen delivered a run-

ning commentary on his thesis, kept interrupting with rude questions.

"Do you expect us to swallow this bunk?" he kept demanding.

Another reporter, representing the Wall Street Journal, found himself suddenly under attack by Sorensen. He was accused of writing "the worst story" of the year in a recitation of Kennedy's relations with Congress which carried the heading: "On Balance, the New Frontier Is Still Far From Opened."

To the credit of a number of newspapermen present, they later disclosed reactions ranging from irritation to disgust at what they frankly labeled a brainwashing session. It is upon their accounts that an uninivited reporter bases this narrative.

FRAUDULENT RESEARCH

So-called background briefings for the information of the press are not uncommon in Washington. A prominent administration official holds off-the-record session with a group of reporters on the understanding that he will not be quoted.

The candid purpose of such briefings is to spread a point of view without pinning responsibility upon one individual. Newspaper stories based upon such interviews carry such terms as, "high administration official think," or "the administration is known to believe."

The Sorensen briefing advanced the propaganda technique one step beyond what has hitherto been attempted. Under the rules he laid down, the material he supplied was to be presented as the product of the writer's own research. Its White House source was to be concealed.

The guests at this latest briefing were Washington correspondents covering Capitol Hill. One of the routine duties confronting them in the near future is the writing of a survey of congressional accomplishments during the 1961 session now nearing adjournment.

PICKED HIS BROADCASTERS

In such summaries, the success or lack of success of the President in obtaining approval of his program is always a prominent feature.

Sorensen arranged to meet the newspapermen after some reports appeared that indicated President Kennedy hadn't done too well. Sorensen expressed a desire to counteract these misleading dispatches, privately, off the record, and under conditions guaranteeing secrecy.

A local newspaperman offered his home for the meeting and agreed to select the guests. Associated Press and United Press International reporters were invited, together with about 28 correspondents from New York City, Washington, Baltimore, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, the South, and the west coast, with the exceptions noted above.

Lawrence F. O'Brien, special White House assistant and congressional liaison man, was present to lend Sorensen a helping hand, when needed.

EVERY ONE'S A MAJOR BILL

Here is what Sorensen urged to the reporters to write in summarizing White House achievements of the congressional session:

President Kennedy recorded 33 "major legislative accomplishments" in the 1961 session. He thus proved himself three times as persuasive as President Roosevelt, who got only 11 "major" measures from Congress in 1933, and equally superior to President Eisenhower, who obtained only 14 "major" bills when he started his term in 1953.

This claim created some astonishment among certain listeners, who demanded a list of the 33 accomplishments. Sorensen solemnly listed creation of the Cape Cod National Park in Kennedy's home State of Massachusetts as a major accomplishment, noting that it was "the first major addition to the national park system for 14 years."

HE LISTS ALL OF THEM

Another major accomplishment negotiated by Kennedy, Sorensen said, was the passage of a bill limiting American tourist spending abroad to $100, instead of the $500 previously permitted. Another was the creation of an international travel agency to attract foreign tourists to this country. These were powerful measures in combating a balance of payments deficit and a gold outflow, he contended.

To pad the list of major accomplishments, Sorensen listed the Peace Corps, the juvenile delinquency bill, anticrime bills, and a measure creating 73 new Federal judges. A 2-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission, the only fragment left of a big civil rights package, was listed as a major feat.

MORE MAJOR STUFF

Other major accomplishments listed by Sorensen included increased funds for a project to land a man on the moon, legislation to speed up saline water conversion, and a "farm bill" which has produced the "best farm income year since Korea."

The addition of $6 billion to the military budget and authority to call up reservists to active duty added two more items to the list. Even a bill to keep the national debt ceiling at a record $298 billion was recorded as a major accomplishment.

Sorensen also listed temporary unemployment compensation increases, the depressed areas bill, social security amendments, a housing bill, water pollution control, a hike in the minimum wage, and "community health" measures to get his total.

IT IS MAGNIFICENT

The Kennedy record was magnificent, Sorensen asserted, in view of the "mathematical situation" in Congress. Any talk about the preponderant Democratic majorities in Congress—64 to 36 in the Senate and 260 to 174 in the House—was ridiculous.

The potential Republican-southern Democratic strength in the House was 280, he said, and the same coalition could muster 57 votes out of 100 in the Senate.

"We presented on March 24 a budget for fiscal year 1962 strictly balanced in view of the previous administration's revenue estimates," Sorensen told the reporters. "The deficit is now estimated to be 5 billion because of an increase in defense spending and a decrease in revenue because of the 1960 recession."

THE UNEXPECTED DID IT

"In short," Sorensen found up, "the effects of the new challenges in national security and space, and the effects of the recession more than account for the entire deficit—without them, all the increases in agriculture, unemployment, and other domestic programs would not have caused a deficit.

"This deficit does not compare unfavorably with the Eisenhower administration, which incurred the largest peacetime deficit in history, 12.4 billion in 1959, and spent 182 billion more than the Truman administration did."

The reporters were told that they could use these statements as their own and again warned not to attribute them to White House sources.

Sorensen brushed over the failure of the administration to get action on some of its major requests: Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, tax proposals, Treasury borrowing to finance a 5-year foreign aid program, the original farm program, retraining of unemployed workers, and a new Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs.

Public Budgets and the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that the balanced budget is one of the cherished goals of American life—whether the budget be that of a family or the Federal Government. I am one, furthermore, who is a stanch supporter of this principle, whenever it is possible and feasible, for financial responsibility is one of the foundations of any home or society.

The balanced budget, however, is a meaningless term until it is defined and put into perspective. For example, many Americans have become alarmed about the size of our Federal debt. It is interesting to note, though, that when we apply Federal accounting criteria uniformly, we find that deficit financing is not the rule for the National Government but has been the rule for the last 15 years for every other major section of our economy.

It is also interesting to note that in terms of dollars of constant value—1954—the national debt has fallen from $361.2 billion in 1946 to $250.1 billion in 1960, and that in relation to gross national product over the same period of time, it has declined by more than half.

These and other important points regarding public budgets and public debts have been made by one of my constituents, the distinguished professor of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, Frederick C. Mosher. This is a particularly comprehensive and enlightening article on this very important subject, and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

PUBLIC BUDGETS AND PUBLIC DEBT

(By Frederick C. Mosher)

(This is the second of two issues of Public Affairs Report based on a Bureau of Public Administration report, "Recent Trends in Government Finances in the United States," by Frederick C. Mosher, 75 pages; Berkeley, June 1961, $2.)

One of the most deep-seated and cherished of the ideals that most Americans associate with good government is that of the balanced budget. This has certainly been true since at least the founding of the Republic, and political campaigners from George Washington on, and of whatever political label, have run the call for economy, for budget balance, or for surpluses to discharge the debt. Although economic justifications for the balanced budget have been advanced over a good many centuries, it appears probable that the real foundation for this ideal lies in the solid soil of social morality rather than in scientific rationalism. The balanced budget for the household, the business, or the Government is a mark of social respectability, of honorable conduct. Even today, when most informed people agree that there are occasions when deficit financing is desirable, the incurring of deficits is widely regarded as evil, even when necessary; it is something to be avoided if possible and certainly something that

should be temporary. Deficits are associated with a lack of discipline, with fiscal irresponsibility, with waste and corruption, and even with socialism. They are, in short, unsound; they are bad.

The widespread legal limitations against deficit financing in the States and local governments are at least partially attributable to this feeling. Most State constitutions contain prohibitions of it or at least restrictions as to the special circumstances warranting it and special procedures through which it may be performed. At the national level, there are perennial efforts in Congress to enforce a balanced budget through one device or another. All of these have failed except the statutory debt limit which has had very doubtful effectiveness in this direction.

THE NATIONAL BUDGET

It is hot our intent to weigh the merits of the provisions and proposals or of the balanced budget ideal itself. It is necessary, however, to clarify in small part the meaning of "balance" when it is applied to the Federal Government, to State and local governments, and to private enterprises. One distinction, which is widely overlooked but is vastly important, is the manner of treating capital expenditures in Federal and in other bookkeeping. Our National Government is one of the very few major enterprises in the United States for which most capital expenditures are considered for budgetary purposes exactly like current expenditures. When it builds a post office or construct a dam or purchases airplanes or lends money, the outgo is treated as an expenditure regardless of the value of the assets acquired. If the total of these acquisitions plus the total of operating expenses exceed current receipts, the Government is considered to have a deficit.

On the contrary, if a State borrows money to build a new mental hospital, or if a school district borrows to build a new wing on the school, they may still be considered to have a balanced budget for legal and popular purposes provided their current revenues equal their current expenditures, not including the money expended from their construction bonds. By Federal standards, either might be bearing a tremendous deficit. Likewise, a private business might enjoy a profit of a million dollars for the same period that it borrowed 2 million to build an extension to its plant. By Federal standards, its results for the year would show a million dollar deficit. A householder who buys a $15,000 house and takes out on it a $10,000 mortgage would normally count against his annual earnings and his resources only the amount of cash he actually invested—i.e., $5,000. Were he the Federal Government, the entire $15,000 would be treated as an expenditure.

This difference of Federal accounting practice from that of most other enterprises is partially compensated by a parallel difference in the handling of the redemption of debt. Business, State, and local governments, and individuals normally consider payments on the principal of debt (or depreciation of capital assets) as a current expense to be included in their operating budget. The Federal Government does not; rather, payments on debt are a resultant of surpluses in its annual budgets, and it does not depreciate its physical property. This basic difference in practice would be completely compensated if the contraction of debt year by year approximately equaled the redemption of debt. But where borrowing tends to exceed debt redemption during periods of growth the difference can be very substantial.

In fact, if major capital expenditures were separated out from current expenditures, as they are in most other enterprises, the Federal Government would show a very healthy surplus in almost every peacetime year. For example, Federal budgetary expenditures for 1959 totaled $80.7 billion. Of this, $24 billion, nearly 30 percent, were for additions to Federal assets—public works, commodity inventories, equipment, loans, etc. Private accounting practice might very well have treated a large part of this as capital, but most of it was in fact considered as current expense. On the other side, there was no depreciation charge on existing assets and no charge for debt redemption. The basic point is that when we speak of balanced budgets, of deficits and surpluses, for the national Government, we are applying a very different, and ordinarily a more rigorous, criterion than when we apply the same terms to other kinds of enterprises.

It has been said, not infrequently, that deficits have become the rule in our national finance, and the implication usually is that this is not the case outside the Government. The curious contradiction is that, when we apply Federal accounting criteria uniformly, we find that deficit financing is not the rule for the National Government but has been the rule for the last 15 years for every other major sector of our economy. The ultimate test of deficit or surplus for the Federal Government is whether the debt has increased or decreased. In these terms: [2]

State and local governments have had a net deficit in every year since 1946; overall, their debts rose in this period from $13.6 billion in 1946 to $55.6 billion in 1959.

Private corporations have operated at a net deficit in every year since 1945; overall, their debts rose in this period from $85.3 billion to $281.7 billion in 1959.

Farms have operated at a net deficit in every year since 1945; overall, their debts rose from $7.2 billion to $23.7 billion in 1959.

Nonfarm individuals and firms operated at a net deficit in every year since 1943; overall, their debts increased from $40.5 billion in 1943 to $242.1 billion in 1959.

The National Government is in marked contrast to all of these. Its record from year to year was spotty. Overall, from 1945 to 1959, its net debt actually declined from $252.7 billion to $243.2 billion.[3] Its gross debt increased during the same period only from $278.7 billion to $290.9—an average annual increase of something less than 1 billion per year. In fact, if the deficits of the Korean war period were excluded, the overall picture, even of the gross debt, would show a modest average annual surplus.

There thus appears to be no "rule" of deficit financing for the National Government; in fact, superficial inspection would lead one to doubt that there is any "rule" at all governing national practice.

But analysis leads to an opposite conclusion. Our recent and current Federal experience—since 1930—is broadly consistent with our prior experience for the last century and in some respects with that since 1790. It has responded to similar objectives and to similar forces and influences in about the same ways. The principal differences have been in dimensions, not directions. Broadly speaking, our past as well as our current experience may be summarized as follows: [3]

1. During peacetime and prosperity, revenues equal or exceed expenditures, and the resultant surpluses are applied to outstanding debt.

2. During wartime, expenditures substantially exceed revenues and are financed in part by borrowing. War is, and has always been, the largest source of our debt, and war debt now amounts to more than four-fifths of the total national debt. Every war has been partially debt-financed: the Revolution, the War of 1812, the war with Mexico, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and the Korean war.

3. In times of depression (or recession), our fiscal position moves in the direction of a deficit, often resulting in an increase in debt. This tendency has been true of the 20 business cycles since 1879. It has been a consequence primarily of automatic decline in tax revenues—the customs during the 19th century, now greatly accentuated by the progressive income tax. It has not been—and is not primarily today—a result of positive governmental policy but of the built-in responsiveness of the tax system. Expenditures have not followed a consistent pattern. Virtually the entire national debt is a consequence of war or depression; and it apparently has been from the beginning.

The consistency of these financial responses to wars and the business cycle has been rather remarkable. Almost all of the war years of our history have been deficit years. In the 112 peacetime years between 1791 and 1916, there were 82 surpluses, some of them very substantial. There were 16 in which revenues exceeded expenditures by more than 50 percent. In the same period, there were 30 deficits; most of them were slight and most were also associated with business slumps.

In the period between the two world wars there were 11 surpluses and 10 deficits, the former occurring during the twenties, the latter during the depressed thirties.

In the 14 complete years since World War II, there have been 8 deficit years, 6 surplus years. Two of the deficits, 1952–53, were pretty definitely attributable to the Korean war and the military buildup it sparked. All of the others were associated with recessions or depressions—in 1949–50, 1954–55, and 1958–59. Each of these recession-associated deficits was marked by a decline in revenues; expenditures fluctuated. On the other hand, as in the past our revenue-expenditure relationship has been in such adjustment as to create sizable surpluses in most nonwar, prosperous years. Indeed, two of the Truman years, 1948 and 1951, produced dollar surpluses that were by all odds the largest in our history. The $8.5 billion surplus of 1948 was more than one quarter higher than the total of expenditures of that year.

In sum, it appears that our recent budget balance picture is entirely consonant with past American experience. Indeed, in light of the enormous expenditures for defense as a consequence of the cold war, our recent financial management would appear, overall, to be more conservative than that of some of our previous history. In this connection, it is of passing political interest that the Truman budget record is considerably more conservative than the Eisenhower record. In the 7 largely Truman years after completion of the World War,[4] there were four deficits and three surpluses. The net deficit, overall, was $5.7 billion. In the 7 entirely Eisenhower years, 1954–60, there were likewise four deficits and three surpluses. The net deficit, overall, was $19.2 billion. Truman had the largest single surplus in American history; Eisenhower, the largest peacetime deficit ($12.4 billion in 1959). If the 3 war years 1951–53 are omitted, Truman's peacetime record was overall a surplus of $4.2 billion in 4 years, or about a billion per year.

In surplus-deficit terms, the financing of the Korean war and the accompanying military build-up was itself remarkably conservative. The first fiscal year, 1951, the National Government actually showed a surplus of $3½ billion. This was followed by deficits of $4 billion and $9½ billion in 1952 and 1953, so that the net for the 3-year period was a deficit of $10 billion. This amounted to only 5 percent of total national expenditures during the period; conversely, 95 percent of all governmental expenditures were financed from current revenues. In no war in American history have current rev-

Footnotes at end of speech.

enues so nearly balanced expenditures, and in only one, the Spanish-American, has this record been even approached. In that war, the total deficit amounted to 12 percent of expenditures. But contrast the major wars: In the Civil War, almost three quarters of expenditures were met by borrowing; in the First World War, 70 percent; in the Second World War, 55 percent. The Korean record cannot be dismissed on the grounds of its being minor or a mere skirmish, certainly not in expenditure terms. For this was the period of the major military buildup. Between 1950 and 1953, military expenditures nearly quadrupled from $13 billion to $50 billion. And total governmental expenditures nearly doubled, increasing from under $40 to $74 billion. Yet the revenues almost kept up.

PAYMENTS TO, AND RECEIPTS FROM, THE PUBLIC

For purposes of appraising the impact of Federal governmental operations upon the private sector of the economy, students generally prefer the so-called consolidated cash budget to the regular, or administrative budget. The former eliminates all transactions that are purely intragovernmental, such as payments from one agency to another, but includes a variety of dollar exchanges between the Government and the public that are not covered in the annual budget. Largest among these are the financial operations of the various trust funds such as old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment insurance, retirement funds, etc. Thus, the payroll taxes into these funds are not included in the regular budget as governmental receipts, but they are included in the consolidated cash budget; conversely, benefit payments from these funds are excluded from the former and included in the latter. Because of these differences, the total cash expenditures and receipts of the Government, including the funds, exceed the expenditures and receipts covered in the regular budget by a growing amount, now running between $15 and $20 billion annually.

For most of the quarter century since these funds were established, they have been growing in aggregate size, which means that their intake has exceeded their benefit payment outgo. In fact, this was true in every year after the Second World War until 1959 and 1960. As a consequence, the payment-receipt ratio as reflected in the cash budget has generally been more favorable than the comparable budget balance ratio of the regular budget. That is to say that its surpluses have been larger; its deficits smaller; and in some years it showed a surplus when the regular budget was in deficit. In 1959 and 1960, this relationship was reversed by a very slight amount primarily because of increases in payments from the unemployment, old-age and survivors, and highways trust funds.

The surplus-deficit relationship of the cash budget has followed the same pattern as that of the regular budget since 1947. Receipts of the Government exceeded payments to the public in 7 years, and the reverse was true in 7 years. However, in 3 of the years which showed a deficit, 1952, 1954, and 1960, the amounts were so small as to be inconsequential. Over the entire period, while the regular budget produced a net cumulative deficit of 25 billion, receipts from the public exceeded payments to the public by 5 billion. The only very substantial payment-receipt deficits were those occasioned by the Korean war and the 1958–59 recession. The picture here again was considerably more conservative during the first 7 Truman years than in the last 7 Eisenhower years. The Truman period, including the entire Korean war, showed a net cash surplus of $16½ billion; the 7 Eisenhower years produced a net cash deficit of $11½ billion.

BUDGET BALANCE AND THE PRICE LEVEL

In recent years particularly, the moral arguments for budget balance have been vigorously fortified by economic allegations that deficits are inflationary and, unless scrupulously avoided, will bring about price increases. The theory holds that, if governmental expenditures are not matched by taxes and other revenues, there results a net increase in the total demand for goods and services, occasioning a general rise in prices. Furthermore, since a deficit must be met by borrowing, and Government bonds may be a basis for expanding the supply of money and credit, a secondary effect can be to increase the supply of money, again giving rise to price increases. This second argument does not apply to savings bonds, sold to private investors, which may in fact reduce effective purchasing power.

There is no doubt that these consequences have been of enormous potential impact when there have been massive deficits in time of war. They have given rise to wartime credit controls, price controls, savings bond issues, and so forth. But there is rather little empirical evidence that these effects are of much significance in peacetime years when the economy is operating at less than full employment. In fact, paradoxically, the experience of the past 40 years suggests almost the opposite conclusion. During the twenties, prices fluctuated unsteadily after a sharp drop in 1921 and 1922. In 1929, they were at about the same level as in 1922. There were Federal surpluses in every single year of the decade. During the thirties, in spite of substantial annual deficits for 10 years running, prices dropped substantially the first 3 years, rose somewhat during the following 4, dropped again in 1938, and then remained substantially constant until 1940. Overall, the wholesale price index was about 10 percent lower in 1940 than it had been in 1930, despite a cumulative deficit of nearly $30 billion during the decade. Consumer prices dropped even further.

With the relaxation of price controls following the war, prices rose sharply from 1946 to 1948. Yet 1947 and 1948 were years of substantial governmental surpluses. In 1949, a deficit year, prices declined but they rose again during 1950 and 1951. With the help of price controls during the Korean war, prices maintained a fairly even keel from 1952 to 1955 although these were all deficit years. They rose moderately in each of the succeeding years to 1958, even though 1956 and 1957 produced the only substantial budgetary surpluses since 1951. Through 1958 and 1959 wholesale prices remained practically constant though the consumer price index rose slightly. These were both deficit years, and, as pointed out earlier, 1958 produced the greatest peacetime deficit in history.

Over the entire period, 1946–60, the wholesale price index rose from 96.4 to 118.9, the consumer price index from 95.5 to 125.6.[5] But as indicated above, the net governmental position vis-a-vis receipts and payments to the public was one of a slight surplus of about $5 billion. One might therefore conclude that the governmental financial deficits were infinitesimally deflationary rather than inflationary.

These observations do not prove anything about the theory. To some extent, the apparent perversity probably reflects both built-in and planned responses in governmental finance to threatening or emerging economic conditions. Thus, deficits occur as a consequence of recessions which themselves bring about price declines or at least a slackening of price rises. And surpluses occur in prosperous years when prices tend to creep up. What the data do suggest, however, is that price movements are a resultant of a very wide variety of forces of which governmental surpluses or deficits are only one. During normal times when there is some slack in the economy, the effect of a relatively small deficit—relative to the total size of the economy—is of slight or insignificant effect.

BUDGET BALANCE AT STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS

One factor that has apparently diluted the potential effects of Federal budgetary policy upon the economy has been the financial behavior of State and local units of government. Their overall surplus deficit balance (including capital expenditures) has often run directly counter to that of the National Government. During the twenties, they spent more than they received in current revenues, while the National Government was operating steadily with surpluses. During the thirties, or at least from 1934 on, while Washington was trying to spur the economy with deficits, the State and local governments were showing small surpluses. With the wartime restraint upon civil construction and other domestic activities, State and local units likewise operated at surpluses through the war. After the war, responding to pent-up demands for capital works and improved services, they moved again to spending more than they received, and this tendency has been consistent almost every year since 1950. The net deficits in the past decade have been relatively small, varying from about half a billion to about $3 billion.

Therefore, when we add State and local to Federal for the period since the war, the aggregate impact of all government financial balances is somewhat more inclined toward the deficit side than is the case of the Federal alone. Over the whole period since World War II, cash payments of all governments exceeded their net cash receipts by $8.6 billion, an annual average of considerably less than a billion per year. However, the gross amounts are relatively small for most of the nonwar years. The deficits never exceeded 8 percent of governmental expenditures in a given year, and usually ran much lower. During the same period, the gross national product grew from about $211 billion to near $500 billion. In relation to this aggregate, the surplus-deficit ratio was, during most of the period, almost insignificant.

THE NATIONAL DEBT—ITS RISE AND FALL[6]

The national debt may be understood most easily as a resultant of the expenditure-revenue relationship. The connection is not immediate nor exact because of the fluctuating cash balances available to public treasuries and for other reasons. But in the main and over the long pull, the debt is a consequence of budgetary deficits and in about the same amount as the deficits. And the reduction of debt is, by and large, a product of budgetary surpluses. Most of our national debt, about four-fifths today, was incurred to finance the extraordinary costs of wars. And all of the remainder is an outgrowth of depression and recessions when receipts declined and expenditures sometimes rose.

The public debt has grown in enormous spurts and then, through fairly long periods, maintained its new level or gradually declined. Mixed surpluses and deficits in the first part of this century tended to offset each other and there was almost no change in the debt level between 1900 ($1,263 million) and 1916 ($1,225 million). It then jumped to $25.5 billion by the end of 1919; dropped gradually during the frugal twenties to a low of $16.2 billion in 1930; rose steadily every year of the thirties to $49 billion in 1941. The enormous wartime deficits brought it to a peak of $269.4 in 1946. Since

Footnotes at end of speech.

then it has fluctuated down and up—down in the prosperous years, up with the Korean war and periodic recessions. But the net effect, in raw dollar terms, was an increase to $286.3 billion in 1960.

Superficially, it appears that the national debt has increased even during the last 15 years since it reached its wartime peak of $269.4 billion. In percentage terms, this increase was relatively slight—6 percent or less than half of 1 percent per year. But viewed realistically, the debt has declined significantly since 1946. In fact, by every measuring stick the economic significance of the national debt has declined, and in most respects very substantially:

1. In terms of dollars of constant value (1954) the national debt has fallen from $361.2 billion in 1946 to $250.1 billion in 1960, or by 31 percent;

2. In terms of population and dollars of constant value (1954), the national debt has fallen from $2,555 in 1946 per capita to $1,390 per capita, or by 46 percent;

3. In relation to the general receipts of the National Government from which interest and principal on the debt are paid, the debt has declined very sharply: In 1946, the debt was more than six times the total budgetary receipts; in 1960, it was a little more than three and a half times total budgetary receipts;

4. In relation to the gross national product, the best available measure of the Nation's economic output, it has declined by more than half: In 1946, the debt was 128 percent of gross national product—i.e., 28 percent higher; in 1960 it was 59 percent of gross national product—i.e., 41 percent lower.

5. In spite of a near doubling of the average interest rate on the national debt between 1946 and 1960, total interest per capita and in 1954 dollars is now slightly lower than in 1946; it declined from $46 in 1946 to $38 in 1951; since then, it has risen to $45 in 1960.

STATE AND LOCAL DEBT—ITS FALL AND RISE [7]

State and local debt generally responds to crises in exactly the opposite from the Federal way. During prosperity, the State and local governments build, buy, and borrow; during depression, they retrench and hold the debt line or reduce it; during war, they are restrained from borrowing and building, so their debt declines.

The States and localities entered the depression with a total debt about equal to that of the Federal Government. The debts of each were between $19 and $19.5 billion in 1932. During the thirties, the Federal debt of course increased rapidly; State and local debt declined somewhat and then increased to $20.3 billion in 1940. The war brought a sharp drop in State and local indebtedness, and in 1946 their debt stood at $15.9 billion, about 6 percent of the Federal debt. Since then it has grown regularly and rapidly. In 1959, State and local debt was at an alltime high of $64.1 billion, about 23 percent of the Federal debt.

The aggregate of State and local debt has increased since 1946 in terms of the measures applied above in connection with the Federal debt:

1. In dollars of constant value (1954) State and local debt grew from $21.3 billion in 1946 to $57 billion in 1959;

2. The per capita debt in constant (1954) dollars increased from $151 in 1946 to $322 in 1959;

3. As a proportion of total general receipts of State and local governments, their debt increased by a rather small amount; from 29 percent higher than current receipts to 42 percent higher;

4. As a proportion of gross national product, State and local debt grew from 7.6 percent in 1946 to 13.3 percent in 1959.

It is interesting to note that with respect to their ratios to gross national product the Federal debt is moving downward toward the position it occupied before the war, and the State and local debt is moving upward toward the position if occupied before the war. At their recent rates of decrease and increase respectively, both should reach approximate parity with their respective 1940 ratios something during the sixties.

THE PUBLIC DEBT AS A WHOLE

Movements in State and local debt are in much smaller dimension than are those of the national debt. Consequently the increase in the former category since World War II has not been sufficient to counteract the relative decline of the national debt. Between 1946 and 1959, the gross public debt of all governments increased in absolute terms from $285 billion to $349 billion. But, in terms of the relative measures used above, the gross has actually declined.[8]

1. The total public debt in constant (1954) dollars declined from $382 billion in 1946 to $310 billion in 1959;

2. Per capita debt in constant (1954) dollars declined from $2,702 in 1946 to $1,752 in 1959;

3. In relation to total governmental general revenues, the debt declined from 5 times to 3 times;

4. In relation to gross national product, the gross public debt declined from 135 percent in 1946 to 72 percent in 1959.

---

[1] All the data that follow are taken from the "Economic Report of the President, January 1961," p. 182.

[2] "Net debt" is total outstanding debt less that held by the Government itself. Principal exclusions are the bonds held by the Government trust funds. These data about Federal debt are drawn from the Economic Report of the President, January 1961, and are based upon the national income accounts. They do not conform to the official debt of the Government as reported in the budget.

[3] The historical data which follow and those in the succeeding paragraphs are based principally upon John M. Firestone, "Federal Receipts and Expenditures," 1879–1958 (Princeton University Press. Princeton. 1960) and upon Lewis H. Kimmel, "Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy, 1789–1958" (The Brookings Institution. Washington. 1959) Appendix, "The Federal Budgetary Record," pp. 313–324.

[4] 1947–53. We here exclude the last war year, 1946, but charge to Truman the entire year 1953, thus attributing to him the entire period of the Korean war and charging him with the 1953 deficit of $9.4 billion which accounted for more than one-half of all the deficits incurred during the 7-year period.

[5] 1947–49=100.

[6] Data in this section are based upon the official national debt figures as reported in the U.S. Budget, as of the end of each fiscal year.

[7] Data in this and the succeeding section are based upon census reports.

[8] Data are based upon census report.

One Hundred Years of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, true charity is anonymous. Because it comes from the heart, it seeks to help the poor and unfortunate, asking nothing in return but to see the light of hope in the eyes of those who once despaired.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society is composed of Catholic laymen in almost every parish who give so much of their own time to help those who need a friend; the sick, the impoverished, and those who have lost their way.

The Vincentians do good for the sake of doing good; without pride, desiring no recognition, content to lend a hand to the fallen and help them to stand on their feet in human dignity.

Who belongs to the St. Vincent de Paul Society in your community? The names do not come readily to mind, because, while other people are enjoying themselves at social events, the Vincentians are visiting a humble home on a back street, or a hospital, bearing the sweet gift of charity that tells the forgotten that they are remembered.

For 100 years its members, from father to son and grandson, have been the laymen who serve as missionaries to the neglected in the cities and towns of Massachuetts.

On the centennial observance honoring the founding of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in Boston, the Lawrence Sunday Sun of Lawrence, Mass., in its lead editorial of September 24, 1961, titled: "100 Years of Charity" opened our eyes to the benevolent work of this organization.

If we had more of this spirit of helpfulness in the world today, how much better life would be for all the members of our human family. Certain that this editorial will touch many people with the kindness that characterizes the work of the Vincentians, I hereby insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF CHARITY

A large delegation of Vincentians from the 14 conferences, representing Catholic churches in Greater Lawrence, participated in the centennial observance of the founding of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in Boston. They were among over 2,000 members of this Catholic charitable organization who were electrified to hear Richard Cardinal Cushing announce that over $250,000 had been spent in the archdiocese last year in distributing welfare aid to the poor, needy, and neglected.

Information revealed by the cardinal at the banquet of members at the Statler-Hilton Hotel that there are two outstanding outlets in welfare aid in Boston conducted under his supervision * * * the "Salvage Bureau" and St. Francis Refuge which are the principal dispensaries in the metropolis where unbelievable works of charity are performed. That is where hundreds of thousands of dollars are expended by the societies throughout the archdiocese to relieve and assist the hundreds of thousands of unfortunates seeking aid.

The heartbeat of the St. Vincent de Paul Society is the thriving Salvage Bureau in Boston's teeming south end of Washington Street. The Salvage Bureau is the secret of much of the efficiency of the society. Here are distributed used furniture, clothing, shoes, bedding, dishes, cooking utensils and all kinds of household furnishings. When members of the society call on the poor and find that they need furniture or clothing, they contact the Salvage Bureau and the needed things are soon delivered.

Amidst the industrial turbulence of Boston's Albany Street lies an oasis of charity

unmatched by few cities of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Francis Refuge feeds the homeless, the unemployed, the hungry of the sprawling hub. Each day a long, desolate line of more than 600 destitute and forsaken men arrive for perhaps their only meal of the day. This quiet charity is, as are most good charities, on a nonname basis. Everyone who comes to the door is fed. There are no questions asked and no names taken.

As the cardinal's report says: "Who are these men? No one but God really knows. They are homeless, harmless, forgotten souls who have been lost in the shuffle of life. Full of sadness and sorrow, they seldom congregate. Theirs is a lonely existence. When they leave the Refuge after their meal, they simply lose themselves in the city where life passes them by. For information which they volunteer, some of them are former teachers, chemists, architects, lawyers, executives, men from all walks of life."

Unlike other charitable organizations which carry on similar work and depend on the United Fund or Community Chest for sustenance and existence, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, under the cardinal's supervision, raises necessary funds from parishioners, society funds, and sometimes bequests of the faithful. There are approximately 220 conferences connected with as many Catholic parishes, but there are many parishes that have not organized a conference of Vincentians yet. It is the plan of the cardinal to have every parish represented hereafter. He announced he will carry out this plan.

The St. Vincent de Paul Society is Cardinal Cushing's favorite archdiocesan organization of men who devote their time in each parish. Not only to this welfare work spreading sunshine into many poverty-stricken and afflicted families, hospitals, and nursing homes, but they are more interested in the spiritual work of mending broken homes, their principal aim is to bring fallen away people back to religion and God. To the personal and individual credit of the cardinal, the Boston archdiocese has more St. Vincent de Paul units than any other section of the United States. They struggle along on their own funds.

Greater Lawrence is proud to have 14 churches allied with this work and to have dispensed over $25,000 last year in welfare work in this vicinity. These parishes include St. Mary's Sacred Heart, St. Laurence's, St. Anne's, Holy Rosary, St. Augustine's, of Lawrence; St. Augustine's, of Andover; St. Michael's, of North Andover; St. Monica's, St. Theresa's, St. Lucy's, and Mount Carmel, of Methuen; also allied are St. Rita's and St. Joseph's, of Haverhill.

To all these conferences, particularly the members who have been carrying on such wonderful work unostentatiously, quietly, and in a Christianlike manner, congratulations and God's blessing for continued prosperity in their endeavors. May their numbers, their accomplishments, and successes increase a hundredfold in the next century.

Keith Worthington's History of Nephi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keith Worthington begins the next series of his historic articles on the 110-year development of Nephi, Utah, by describing the influence of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints upon the very settlement of the community.

Mr. Worthington is eminently well qualified to speak on the history of Nephi and the dominating role played by the church because he received both his bachelor of science and master of science degrees from Brigham Young University where he majored in history and minored in church history.

The articles, as printed by the Times News of Nephi, follow:

CHURCH

Central and foremost in the life of these early settlers was the church. It was their reason for being in the valley and it provided for them when everything else failed. The first Sunday meeting mentioned is October 12, 1851, less than 3 weeks after the city had been surveyed. Sister Martha Spence Heywood recorded that they had a good meeting and all acknowledged the goodness of the Lord.

It has been erroneously written in a history of Nephi that the first L.O.S. ward was organized in Nephi in November 1852, with Jacob G. Bigler as bishop.

There was no ward in Nephi at this time. Joseph L. Heywood was president of the Nephi branch of the church and therefor leader of the people. Jacob G. Bigler was called to be the presiding bishop of all the people in Juab County, which at this time included the saints in Nephi; a small settlement on Clover Creek (now Mona) and others. Among his duties was the managing of tithing. (Brough, p. 63).

In 1853 the people became dissatisfied with Brother Heywood as their president and succeeded in replacing him with Jacob G. Bigler. Thus Brother Bigler served a dual position as bishop of Juag County and president of the Nephi branch. (Brough, 6. 63).

As the church grew auxiliaries were organized. This history has been recounted many times before and I am not going to take the space to do it here, however, I would like to share with you readers some of the miscellaneous information I found as I searched the Journal History of the church, and other records.

Prior to 1855 the brethren and sisters met separate in their meeting house. In 1855 after returning from general conference Jacob G. Bigler instructed the people to discontinue this practice so that there might be more unity in the family. (Journal of Andrew Love, as cited in Journal History.)

In 1869 when President Young organized the stake, he also organized a school of the prophets, which helped the brethren to learn the gospel more fully and increase their knowledge of languages, etc. (Journal History, Oct. 30, 1869.)

The United Order was established at Nephi in 1874, and for a time was quite successful. Joel Grover was the first president. (Journal History, Apr. 19, 1874.)

The year 1856 brought the great reformation of the church, and Nephi was no exception, most of the saints being baptized and renewing their covenants. (Journal History of Andrew Love, as cited in Journal History of Church.)

At the close of the year 1875, the church was well established in Nephi, and the people were thankful that they were united in their efforts to build up the Kingdom of God.

THE BLACKHAWK WAR

After cessation of the Walker war, peace reigned in central and southern Utah until 1865 when Blackhawk, owing to a misunderstanding with a Manti citizen, determined to seek revenge and began again to wage war upon the people. He was successful at first, and other tribes throughout the area joined him. This was the opening of hostilities between the white settlers and Indians in southern Utah which continued several years.

Nephi, being in the center of the hostilities, took great precaution to be well prepared. Over 60 citizens of Nephi served in the Blackhawk war by suppressing Indian hostilities in Sanpete and Juab Counties from April 8, 1866 to June 8, 1866. They were mustered out at Nephi on June 8, 1866. (Original Role, Archives Division, Utah State Historical Society.)

COMING OF THE RAILROAD TO JUAB VALLEY

On May 10, 1869, the East and West were linked together by rail at Promontory Point. Soon after, the road was extended south from Ogden to Salt Lake and from Salt Lake south by the Utah Railroad Co. By February 2, 1875, the railroad had reached Juab Valley at York, about 15 miles north of Nephi. This event marked the end of the pioneer period in Juab Valley and the start of a new era. This was to be an era in which the valley would become a great wool center for all of southern Utah and many new industries would get their start.

LITTLE CHICAGO DAYS, 1875–1901

It was 2 years before the railroad was extended to Nephi. During this time York became a booming area. Before the coming of the railroad it had been unsettled but after it became the terminus, a number of homes were built, some railroad employees living there as well as others. During the time hundreds of loads of produce were hauled to and from Nephi.

Daily trains arrived at York, carrying freight, passengers and mail. Every day, Henry Goldsbrough, Sr., met the train with his hack to take the mail to and carry it from the train and also to bring passengers to Nephi to stay at his hotel. Some of the men who hauled freight during this time were Nephi Jackson, Edward Ockey, Heber Ockey Samuel Tolley, Billy Webster and others. Mrs. McCune says "While that point was the terminal of the railroad, it was a lively western railroad frontier, with something always happening." (McCune, p. 111.)

On Saturday, May 3, 1879, the railroad came to Nephi. Bishop Thomas H. G. Parkes gives the following account:

"On Saturday, May 3, 1879, the whistle of the first steam engine was heard in Nephi at 6:30 a.m., and on Monday May 21, the first train was run up to the depot. Schoolchildren, men and women got on and rode down to Brother Charles Sperry's and back. The band was there, also." (Ibid., p. 111.)

The line was soon extended to Chicken Creek, or Juab as it was rechristened. This became the southern terminal until 1889 when the line of central Utah was extended to Milford and to Frisco to haul ore from the Horn Silver Mine, but for all intents and purposes, Nephi became the business center. (Journal History of the Church, June 19, 1889.)

The Sanpete Valley Railroad was built in 1880, running from Wales, Sanpete County, to Nephi. It was built by an English company for the purpose of hauling coal from its mines. This line later went into the hands of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Co. Thus, Nephi, with its two railroads was in an enviable position. (Nephi Centennial Jubilee, 1851–1951, p. 34.)

Nephi during this period became the sub, the shipping point for southwestern Utah and Nevada. Wool was hauled by teams to Nephi, bailed and shipped to eastern markets. The Boston Wool Co. had its offices and storage at Second South and Main Street in Nephi. Cattle and sheep were driven from southern Utah ranges, loaded on railroad cars at Nephi and shipped to market. (Ibid.)

The Journal History recorded in 1887: "The Wool Association of Nephi runs several shifts

of hands—day and night, baling wool for shipment. Other firms are doing a lively business in that line." (Journal History, June 17, 1887, p. 6.)

During this time Charles Andrews built and operated a large baling center. The Summerhays establishment, operated by John Cowan and later by his sons, was also in that business. (McCune, p. 112.)

In writing to the Deseret News, in 1887, Samuel Pitchford, in discussing the various industries around Nephi, said of the wool industry:

"This industry has been steadily growing for a number of years, and the people of the northern portion of the territory are just awakening to the greatness of it. There are hundreds of men in the southern counties who depend entirely upon the wool produce for their sustenance. There are hundreds of thousands of sheep roaming the hills and finding pasturage in the rich mountain valleys of that section, and year after year their number increases and the wealth of the section increases with them. No one can really believe the importance and immensity of this industry until he visits Nephi and sees for himself. Nephi is the market for all the wool of this section and toward this port all the wool gravitates. In May and June the wool business is at its height, and Nephi is alive with bustle and activity. The wool clip last season was over 3 million pounds. Two million and a half was clipped in the spring. Nephi last season exported 3 million pounds and received for its $700,000."

Much of this prosperity was due to an organization called the Wool Growers of Southern Utah. This association was organized September 9, 1886, and according to Pitchford "consists of 200 members who represent 200,000 head of sheep and that will clip over a million pounds of wool annually." (The Salt Lake Herald, Dec. 25, 1887.)

HOTELS AND SALT LAKE DRUMMERS

Drummers from the large wholesale houses made Nephi their headquarters. These drummers loaded their whitetops and toured the south looking for business. Most of them made their headquarters at the Goldsbrough House, or the Nephi House, as it was properly named. (Nephi Centennial Jubilee, 1851–1951, p. 34.) Mr. Goldsbrough had a sample room for the drummers to display their wares to the merchants of Nephi, and his hotel became a very important place. Often it was necessary to make beds on the floor to accommodate all of his guests. (McCune, pp. 114–115).

As business increased he acquired teams to take travelers to the southern part of the State. As late as 1885, the following appeared in the Salt Lake Herald, January 7, 1885: H. Goldsbrough, the accommodating proprietor of the Nephi House is yet at his place of business, where he is prepared to convey travelers by team to all points of interest in southern Utah. His accommodations for travelers are ample and his teams excellent.

As business continued to increase other hotels were built to accommodate the many people who were coming to Nephi.

MERCHANTS AND BUSINESSES OF THE PERIOD

As the cattle and wool industry increased and Nephi became the center of two railroad systems, new businesses came in and others expanded until the town swelled beyond the 3,000 mark. There was so much business and the town became so prosperous that the nickname "Little Chicago" was attached to it.

The one and only hardware or tin shop in Nephi, called Cooper & Pyper, sold a carload of stoves and ranges in a year. (McCune, p. 115.)

Pitchforth gives us an interesting insight into the shops of the time. He says:

In describing Hyde and Whitmore's stock, one described the stock of all the principal merchants in Nephi. On entering the store Hyde and Whitmore you are ushered into the general salesroom. Here on the left we found dry goods in endless variety, such as dress goods, woolens, linseys, hosiery, ladies', misses', and children's cloaks, wraps, new markets, etc. In the center of the room is found men's and boy's clothing, glassware, crockery, etc. On the right side will be found the grocery department which is replete with choice groceries. The stock of gent's furnishing goods, clothing, etc., is full and complete. (The Salt Lake Herald, December 25, 1887).

The Cooperative Mercantile Institution, or, as it was commonly known to Nephites "the Nephi Merc." was doing a flourishing business in those things mentioned above, and also in butter and eggs, harness, and saddlery goods. (Ibid).

Charles Foote & Sons, one of the oldest stores in Nephi, was prepared to furnish everything from shoes to patent medicines and chemicals. (Ibid.)

George Atkin, Jr., operated a store that had as its motto "Small profits and plenty of them." He advertised in the paper the following:

"Oh! ye Nephites! and inhabitants of southern Utah, if you have your own interests at heart you should call at the cheap cash store, Main Street, Nephi, Juab County, and secure some of the many bargains offered in every line. Gent's suits are being sold from $6 to $20. Boys' suits from $2.75 to $6. Overcoats $5 to $15 each. We are paying the highest market price for grain, eggs, chickens, and butter, and endeavor to please all." (Ibid.)

During this period many new business buildings were constructed. An example of these was one constructed by Reed and Bryan. The building was two stories high and had all the modern improvements, elevator, steam, etc., and was finished inside and out in excellent style. (Ibid.) The cost was $10,000 and it was given the name of "Nebo Block."

In 1888 the Deseret Evening News recorded the following new business in Nephi. A rather pretentious looking livery stable for D. B. Broadhead, a harness shop for Booth and Broadhead, a new bakery for James Woods, and a furniture store for Sells and Dinwoody. Also a new county courthouse was being erected.

Other stores during this period that contributed to the growth and prosperity of "Little Chicago" were: Excelsior Mercantile, Cazier Brothers Clothing Store, James W. Paxman Shoe Store, Edward William, Tailor; Cartwright Bakery; Ostler and Allen Harness Shop, Reid's Harness Shop, L. Frank's Clothing Store, National Dollar Store, two millinery stores, two barber shops and several saloons (McCune, p. 114).

Just prior to the turn of the century it was rumored that the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad was going to build its line to Nephi, go up Salt Creek canyon to Sanpete County, and on to southern Utah. There was a lively speculation in real estate and much land changed hands at high prices. Flour and salt mills were built and a plaster mill was established, there was talk of building a beef packing plant and a cheese factory (the Salt Lake Herald, Dec. 25, 1887) and the railroad had decided to move its terminal from Juab to Nephi (the Journal History of the Church, June 22, 1878, pp. 5–6). Everyone felt optimistic about the future. Samuel Pitchforth expressed it this way:

Nephi * * * soon will rank among the first cities of Utah. The population is now 3,000 and rapidly increasing. The climate is salubrious, invigorating, and healthful; the winters never very cold, and the summers free from excessive heat. The death-rate is remarkably low. The people are happy, healthy, and contented. Already Nephi has attracted a number of people from different parts of the Union, and many more are looking in that direction for homes and investments. There are a number of fine residences in the city, and pleasant homes are to be met with everywhere. Nephi is capable of supporting a large population, and there is every facility that is needed to make a big, prosperous city. (The Salt Lake Herald, Dec. 25, 1887.)

Address by Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Before the Disabled American Veterans Convention, St. Louis, Mo., August 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to include in my remarks an address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, held in St. Louis, Mo., on August 22, 1961. There is no person throughout America who is better qualified to make an address on the subject that he did than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for no one knows better than Congressman WALTER, the evil intent and purposes of international communism. There is no man who has fought more courageously to expose Communist activities in America than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS CONVENTION, ST. LOUIS, MO., AUGUST 22, 1961

It is always a pleasure for me to address any veterans' group. It is a particular pleasure for me to address you, the members of the Disabled American Veterans who have not only fought for your country and the principles on which it is founded, but have suffered for it in a way that most veterans, such as myself, have not.

I am going to discuss the most important question of our day. It is a question of great interest to all veterans, a subject they know much about, which they dislike intensely and, I am sure, hope they will never experience again. I am referring, of course, to war. More important, I would like to say a few words about what you can do to prevent it.

Are we going to get into a war over Berlin? This is a question that is paramount in the minds of millions of Americans—and also Germans, Frenchmen, Britons, and the peoples of many other nations. If war comes over Berlin, it will drastically affect the lives of a large part of the earth's population. For this reason, it is a matter of deep concern to hundreds of millions of people.

If we do not have war over Berlin, will it develop over the future of Laos, Quemoy and Matsu, the Congo, or any one of the world's many other trouble spots where the forces of freedom are meeting head on with those of communism?

I am certain that for years to come we will have wars, but that they will be small, local wars—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I am certain of this because 81 of the world's Communist parties have openly declared, in a statement adopted unanimously in Moscow and released last December 7, that they will foment and support such wars—and they are powerful enough to do it.

Khrushchev said the same thing in his now famous—or notorious—speech of January 6 this year. The Soviet Communist Party has also forcefully proclaimed the same doctrine in the draft program, made public on August 1, which will be presented for adoption at its 22d Congress in October. This program is a blunt declaration of war against all free men and nations, and it pinpoints the United States as the No. 1 enemy of Communists everywhere.

While I feel certain that we will see many small wars in the years ahead, I also feel certain there will be no war on U.S. soil—if we are strong enough. I firmly believe that war will not develop over Berlin—if the United States and other free nations see to it that their strength—military, economic, political, and spiritual—is always greater than that of our Communist enemy.

Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party, and all the Communist parties of the world have declared war on us, yes—but not all-out nuclear war. It is a war of destruction by subversion and every other means short of all-out military conflict.

This type of war we cannot possible avoid. We are in it, whether we want it or not. Our enemy has not only started it, but is fighting it vigorously with all means at his command. We can, if we choose, turn our backs on this reality. But if we do so, we will be merely guaranteeing either our eventual enslavement under communism or the total nuclear war we want to avoid and which, I believe, we can avoid.

If we turn our backs on this war, the enemy, because he will be unopposed, will inflict a whole series of defeats on us—military, and also economic, political, diplomatic, and psychological. His power will grow steadily. Ours will wane just as steadily. Before long, the day will come when he will feel confident that he is so strong and we are so weak that he can deliver an ultimatum—surrender or face annihilation.

Perhaps, we will not even have the luxury of surrender. When this day comes, so much of the world will be under Communist rule and there will be so many millions of restrictive and rebellious people enslaved by Communism—and intensely hating their Communist governments—that the Kremlin will face a tremendous danger of internal rebellion that could sweep through the Communist world and destroy it. It will literally be sitting on a powder keg.

Could Moscow then risk the "peaceful" absorption of some 190 or 200 million Americans into its empire—freedom-loving Americans known for their dedication to liberty and their spirit of revolt against oppression?

Is it not quite possible that, under these conditions, Moscow would believe that it first had to unleash some nuclear missiles to teach us Americans a lesson? And then, as its forces occupied our nation after this nuclear destruction, would it not also feel that millions of our people would have to be liquidated to make sure that the survivors had really learned the lesson of nonresistance? Who would be liquidated? Why, the most dangerous elements, of course—our political leaders, our clergymen, educators, lawyers, businessmen—everyone, young or old, male or female, who might offer, or attempt to lead, resistance.

The reality that confronts our country and every American today is awesome and, if you think it through, truly frightening. There is no use trying to kid ourselves on this point.

Today, we are faced with these alternatives: We win the war short of all-out nuclear war that the Communists of the world have declared on us, or else we will surely suffer: (1) tremendouc nuclear destruction, or (2) limited nuclear destruction, plus liquidation of many millions of our citizens and incorporation of the survivors into the Soviet totalitarian state.

Moreover, there is not much time. Communists are confident today that victory will be theirs before this century is out; in other words, within the lifetime of many of us who are here today.

The issue we face is not war or peace. Peace, in the real sense of the word, is out. The only choice we have is what kind of war we will fight. Are we going to have an all-out, nuclear war, or are we going to prevent one by winning what is euphemistically called the "cold war"?

As Americans, we can make only one choice—to win the so-called cold war.

How do we do it?

Inasmuch as this is a war, we must apply the principles of warfare.

First, we must know our enemy. This is the first rule of all warfare. You cannot fight an enemy you do not know. Get the facts. Study communism. Know communism's objectives and the means it is using to achieve them. The minimum knowledge required for all American citizens who want to make any contribution at all to our country's victory in this conflict is familiarity with communism's basic doctrines, strategy and tactics; knowledge of its line or position on current national and international issues; the names of the more important Communist fronts and organizations, worldwide and here in the United States. You should also be acquainted with the names of the leading Communists and fellow travelers both here and abroad.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this rule. It is no more than commonsense, yet many people overlook it. They want to, and try to, fight communism, yet they really know little about it. A general who committed his troops to battle without first attempting to learn all he possibly could about the strength and disposition of the enemy forces, about the tactics favored by the opposing commander, without fully utilizing his intelligence and reconnaissance units before the engagement, would be summarily dismissed as incompetent. If by chance he won a battle, it would be pure luck. The many cold war battles we must fight are too important and deadly in their cumulative effects to trust their outcome to chance. We must enter them as trained troops with the knowledge and skills that are the foundation of victory.

For some years now, the American people have been contributing millions of dollars annually to research on cancer and heart disease, because they know that these killers will be conquered only after we have learned what causes them, promotes their development, and what the carriers are. They know that diseases which killed many millions of people in the past have now almost been wiped out by study which uncovered their true nature, made it possible to destroy or inhibit their carriers and to develop immunity to them among their potential victims.

The same understanding and knowledge of communism on the part of our leaders and a large part of the American people—who play so important a role in influencing policy—is absolutely necessary to this country's successful conduct of the cold war.

Rule 2—Action. Knowledge that is not put to use is wasted. You can become a true expert on communism, but you will contribute absolutely nothing to the survival of our country and the defeat of its enemy unless you have the will to do, to translate your knowledge into deeds that weaken and contribute to the defeat of communism.

Apathy, smugness, indifference, failure to act, and a "let George do it" attitude on the part of millions of Americans has, for years, been one of our greatest weaknesses and a major ally of the Kremlin. Much of the success achieved by the relatively small number of Communists in the world—about 36 million in a total population of 2 billion—is due to the fact that they are activists. They are doers. They do not sit back waiting for others to change the world. They have assumed that task themselves, though they know they are tremendously outnumbered and that the odds against them, on a purely numerical basis, are great.

3. Get the help of others. Don't fight alone unless it is absolutely necessary—and it rarely is. Two heads are better than one. Ten men are more powerful than two. In union there is strength.

It has often been said—and truthfully—that for every Communist Party member in this country, there are 10 others who are ready and willing to do the work of the party. But it is also true that for every informed, active anti-Communist, there are hundreds of other Americans ready and willing to come to the defenes of their country and to fight its enemies. Their only trouble is that they are asleep or afraid to act because they feel they do not know enough to act effectively.

It is up to you to wake up those who are asleep, to impart your knowledge to those who do not know enough, or if you, too, lack it, to study with them to develop the knowledge needed for effective action.

4. Organize your helpers and plan your actions. Mere numbers are not enough. Actions that are not carefully considered and planned are not enough. An excellent book on communism, published quite a few years ago, has a very revealing title. It is called the Organizational Weapon. The U.S. Communist Party, the worldwide Communist movement and all their actions and campaigns are carefully organized. This is another key to the tremendous advances they have been able to make with relatively small numbers. Unless you have equal organization and planning, you cannot hope to engage in any conflict with the Communists and come out on top. A small, well-organized force with a definite plan of action will usually defeat a force larger in number but disorganized and acting without plan.

You, as members of the DAV, are already organized. You have at your disposal a readymade, important weapon. What are you doing with it? What can you do with it to insure your country the victory it must win?

Here are a few ideas:

To date, the major weakness of the free world in this struggle has been ignorance of communism. For years, the Kremlin's gains in all parts of the world have been attributable primarily to this. We cannot hope to win unless this condition is changed.

What is being done in your individual communities to alter this situation? Are courses revealing the true nature of communism being taught in your schools so that the citizens of tomorrow will not have the same handicap so many of our generation had in recognizing their enemy and perceiving what had to be done to protect their freedom? If such courses are not being given, what have you done to see that they become a part of your local school curriculum?

How about your local libraries, which are among the most powerful opinionmaking community institutions? If the people in your community are not as well informed as they should be on the subject of communism, is it because your library has failed to stock the kind of books which will give them the information they so vitally need? Hundreds of worthwhile books covering all

facets of communism have been published. Too few of these books can be found on library shelves where, in some cases, Communist-serving books abound. We are paying for this fact today—with crises over Berlin, Laos, and other strategic areas.

As taxpayers who support schools and libraries, you have a right to a voice in what they do—and you should exercise that voice to see that they make the maximum contribution to the preservation of the Nation for which you have fought and in which your children will have to live when you are gone.

If your library lacks funds, have you thought of making, or of getting others to make, gifts to it of outstanding books on communism?

How good a job is your local press doing when it comes to keeping the people of your community informed on the key issues in our battle for survival? If it isn't doing what it can and should be doing, isn't it possible that a visit—or a flood of letters—to the editor could change this?

Do you yourself know what the key issues of today are? Do you know Moscow's major objectives as of this moment?

On January 20 of this year, Gus Hall, boss of the U.S. Communist Party, made a major speech to the party's national executive committee. In this speech, he emphasized five issues as the important ones on which the party was to concentrate its activities. On May Day of this year, the party called on all Americans to demand that our Government take certain actions. On the basis of these two recent Communist directives, the following are the top issues of the day—because they are the Communists' most important, immediate cold war objectives:

1. Universal disarmament.
2. The complete abolition of nuclear weapons testing.
3. The dismantling of U.S. overseas defense bases.
4. The dissolution of NATO, SEATO, and other free world defense alliances.
5. And end to the cold war.
6. The adoption of the policy of peaceful coexistence.
7. Reestablishment of friendly relations with Cuba.
8. Recognition of Red China and its admission to the U.N.
9. Demilitarization of Berlin.
10. The ending of colonialism everywhere.

After these 10 points comes another 1 of major importance to the Communist Party because it always has a place in their platforms and directives:

Abolish the Un-American Committee.

These demands are revealing in several ways.

1. Notice that not 1 of the top 10 objectives of the U.S. Communist Party has anything to do—at least directly—with what might be called the positive promotion of communism in the United States. Party demands for nationalizing certain industries and other internal communizing steps are way down on its priority ladder. Every 1 of these 10 demands concerns U.S. foreign policy and, specifically, U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. These demands are, in themselves, proof that the U.S. Communist Party is nothing but the traitorous tool of a foreign enemy power. The demands the U.S. Communists parade as theirs are all made in Moscow.

Recently he addressed letters to Texas Representatives in Congress seeking a salt water conversion plant for Galveston.

In addition to his widow, daughter, and son, Judge Robinson is survived by a sister, Mrs. Helen E. Hemple, of Galveston, and four brothers, George E. Robinson, Jr., and Fred F. Robinson, both of Galveston; A. P. Robinson, Sr., of La Marque, and Mayor Lee A. Robinson, of Texas City.

MEMBER OF MASONS

He was a member of Philip Tucker Masonic Lodge of which he was past master; Knights Templar, El Mina Shrine, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie 48, and the Galveston Kiwanis Club.

In 1945 Judge Robinson was elected grand senior deacon of the Grand Masonic Lodge of Texas. He was a member and a trustee of First Methodist Church.

Funeral arrangements are being completed by J. Levy & Bros. Funeral Home.

GENUINE REGRET

News of Judge Robinson's death was received with genuine regret throughout Galveston and the mainland.

County Commissioner Irwin P. Dantin, who served 13 years with Judge Robinson as a member of the commissioners' court, said the county had suffered an irreparable loss.

"Judge Robinson was self-sacrificing in his interest in the country and he was loyal in his friendships," Dantin declared.

Never resort to violence or illegal actions of any kind. This helps the Communists and discredits the anti-Communist cause. Stick to lawful means.

Avoid unfounded attacks on any individual or organization. Be scrupulous about your evidence and the rules of fair play before making any charges. Again, the anti-Communist cause has been hurt if you have to retract an ill-considered charge you cannot substantiate.

At the same time, never backtrack or retreat when you know you are right. Stick to your guns. Resolve that although you are unjustly attacked and subjected to various pressures, you will not yield.

Don't surrender any group to the Communists. If you find that some organization to which you belong is being infiltrated, don't abandon it and give the Communists carte blanche to take it over. Bring the matter out into the open and organize your forces for a showdown fight. Don't resign from any group until it has become clear that the Communists have attained so much power in it that their grip cannot be broken.

Remember that there is no quick and easy solution to the problem of communism. The power and influence of the Communists in this country and elsewhere can be destroyed only in the way they were created; that is, by the concerted efforts of many thousands of people extended over a period of years.

Actually, you are limited in what you can do to help your country win this most decisive of all wars only by how much you really want to do. The more you study, the more deeply you become involved in this problem, the more you will find you can do—if you have the will to act.

Our enemy is the most dangerous this country has ever faced. He is powerful, clever, tricky. As strong as he is, however, and despite all the weapons and resources he has at his command, the fate of this country and the outcome of this war is not in his hands.

It is in your hands, in the hands of the American people. There is no question in my mind but that it is in the most capable hands, that you will not fail your country, that you will fight this war as you have others, and that victory—not atomic annihilation or Soviet occupation—will be ours.

The Late Honorable Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join the Members of the Georgia delegation and other Members of the House in paying tribute to the late Paul Brown. I had the privilege during my first term in Congress to serve on the same subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee with Paul Brown. In fact, he was the chairman of my subcommittee, and it was a disappointment when we on the subcommittee learned that he planned to retire at the end of the last session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand why Congressman Brown had such love and respect from the people of his district. His warm heart and kindly manner endeared him to all who knew him. He was respected because he was truly a dedicated public servant whose conscientious and loyal devotion to duty were an inspiration.

Personally, I shall always remember him for his kind and warm personality. He was never too busy to take the time to share with younger members the benefits of his wide experience and thorough knowledge.

To his wife and daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

Development Increases Land Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a great deal of time is spent in various committees of Congress each year discussing the administration and disposition of our public lands. Often the emotional and theoretical views of land management are more appealing than the practical and economic viewpoints. This has lead to some waste and improper development of our land resources.

Mr. President, we all need to give serious consideration to the background of legislation affecting our public lands. I ask unanimous consent to have printed the the Appendex of the RECORD an article by John Corlett in the Idaho Daily Statesman of September 4.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING
(By John Corlett)

When the Department of the Interior under the present administration talks about public interest, it means this can be achieved only in public ownership.

This is the key, not only to its power policy, but apparently in its land policy as well.

The Federal Government controls about two-thirds of Idaho's land area. As long as I can remember I have heard officials and others argue the major effort should be to get public land onto the tax rolls.

The day is past when large chunks of the public domain can be expected to be purchased and placed in private ownership. A few years back a proposal was made to sell the public domain to those who could develop it, principally livestock and lumber interests. A great hue and cry arose. The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management had too firmly established propri-

etary control, and for the most part under good management, of the western land.

Furthermore, it must be admitted that the governmental control was necessary to halt overexploitation of the land.

Times and conditions change and there is a valid argument whether the lands under the enlightened management developed the last 50 years cannot now be more efficiently developed under private ownership.

Land is virtually worthless if it is not developed. That was the philosophy behind the great Homestead Act, and the laws allowing desert entries.

There is not much land left for homesteading because this land must be such that a person can live on it and make a living from it.

But there has been a boom in desert entries, particularly in California and Arizona where there is a "mania" to build homes in the desert. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall was not long in office until he froze—for 18 months—all applications for desert land entries. He said he did it to stop speculation in land sales in California and Arizona and to allow the BLM time to process the applications on file.

There is a fair business in desert land entries in south central Idaho. The moratorium was just as effective there as elsewhere.

The story I get now is that additional rules and regulations have been devised which are rather effectively halting the granting of desert entries in southern Idaho where 350,000 acres of new land has been put under water by use of pumps since 1948.

While there is a backlog of applications for the desert land entries, the new rules allow them to be more readily denied. One rule in particular has a deadening effect on the future development of desert land through application of water from underground sources. Prior to Udall's desert entry moratorium, a person could get a special permit to drill a well and determine whether there was adequate water on land to be sought by desert entry. Now the rules are such that this determination is virtually impossible.

As far as Idaho is concerned there is more at stake than the mere granting of a desert entry to an individual. The 350,000 acres of reclaimed land has created a new empire in central Idaho. It has enlarged the State's population, its wealth and its tax base.

As long as water is proven for any public desert land in Idaho, its conversion to private hands has a decidedly beneficial effect on the economy, both of Idaho and the Nation.

* * * * *

The BLM, which built up in Idaho a fair reputation in the Eisenhower years among those citizens with which it dealt, doubtless is happy at the backfiring of another of Udall's directives.

Last June 27, the Interior Department issued a regulation that $5 an acre would be charged in yearly rental for rights-of-way across BLM land. The regulation struck at all utility companies—power, pipeline, gas and telephone, whose lines criss-cross the public domain all over the West.

The companies have been paying a yearly rental of $5 a mile.

Last week the Interior Department amended its regulation to provide that a "fair market value" would be charged for rights-of-way. The Department retreated when all utility firms and the public utility and public services commissions of the Western States, protested the $5-an-acre charge.

The 87th Congress Has a Notable and Impressive Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress has compiled an impressive record of significant achievement and accomplishment.

Few Congresses, if any, during this century have faced graver crises and more important decisions than the 87th. In January the Nation and the Congress faced a multitude of great problems and challenges. These included the previous problem of an economic recession which posed a real danger of turning into a depression; the threat to peace posed by the belligerent and arrogant leaders of the Communist bloc countries; increasingly strong evidence that we were less advanced in certain areas of space exploration, missile development and overall military might than we should be; significant evidence that our foreign aid programs of the past years had not been as effective and as instrumental in winning friends as the Nation had needed; and a general realization that the Nation was drifting without purpose and that we lacked leadership and a sense of direction.

President Kennedy in his state of the Union message recognized that "things will get worse before they get better" but addressed himself to establishing programs and policies that would start the Nation moving again.

The President delivered or transmitted to the Congress 15 messages on major legislative programs, along with 45 major administration bills and a series of Government reorganization plans. There were 12,000 bills introduced during the session.

The Congress after much study and debate on the numerous matters before it passed 33 major legislative enactments—a new high mark in legislative history.

The Congress concentrated on the all-important task of building up the Nation's total strength to meet the challenges at home and abroad.

As a result of actions taken during this session of the Congress, our country is now engaged in a broadscale buildup of our military strength which extends to every part of the Military Establishment. At the same time, we are embarking on long-range programs to build up our domestic economy and are endeavoring to strengthen our foreign ties and improve our relations with the friendly and the uncommitted nations around the world.

Is it appropriate that we review in some detail some of the achievements of this important session.

THE DOMESTIC BUILDUP

The most immediate and pressing of the problems we faced in January was that of a recession which saw a postwar peak in unemployment and a reduction of national productivity in some industries by as much as 50 percent. The President and the Congress acted quickly to deal with these problems.

Under authority previously granted by congressional acts, the President eased the tight money policy which in the view of many economists had contributed to bringing about the recession. The Congress has passed a number of measures to provide for an expanding economy and to encourage a higher rate of economic growth.

AGRICULTURE

For the past several years we have seen our agricultural economy declining while surpluses of crops and the cost of obtaining and storing them increased by billions. While farm incomes decreased, the cost of Government programs of assistance to farmers increased, and billions of bushels of surplus crops lay unused, eating up storage costs.

The new administration and the Congress has been able to take steps to break this vicious circle. An emergency feed grain program was enacted into law early in the session, providing for a 1-year voluntary cut in acreage of feed grain crops and increased price supports for the participating farmers.

Meanwhile the Congress considered and after much study and work enacted a broad-scale and long-range farm program—the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Emergency relief in droughts and other disasters caused by the forces of nature, has also been provided in a new Federal farm assistance program.

AREA DEVELOPMENT

The Congress followed up the quick emergency measures to improve the economy with legislation for comprehensive longer range programs to strengthen and increase the growth of our productivity. One of the serious problems of our time has been the development of depressed areas in various sections of our country, and in the rural areas particularly, as a result of the movement of industry from one section to another, the depression of such formerly great industries as coal mining, and the fact that higher mechanization of farming provides fewer employment opportunities for our farm population.

This year we passed the Area Redevelopment Act and it has become law and is now in effect.

The 4-year program launches a wide attack on the twin problems of unemployment and industrial decline in urban areas, and the growing problem of underdeveloped rural areas. The $394 million 4-year program sets up a loan fund for the development of new industrial facilities, and also authorizes both loans and grants to assist local communities in the construction of new public facilities. It provides technical aid for

long-range planning at the local level. It encourages the local communities to engage in the important work of technical training and retraining, which is increasingly essential in this day of automation. This program has been rather aptly described as operation "seed corn" for the American community.

NEW HOUSING ACT

Another major legislative achievement was the passage of the 5-year $4.9 billion housing program. This greatly expanded housing program provides a vast array of tools for financing and building a better order in the towns and cities of America. The provisions for FHA mortgage financing for low- and moderate-income families have been extended on liberalized terms. The new act authorizes Federal grants for urban renewal projects and open space development. Congress has provided for loans for needed college dormitory construction.

Farm housing and housing for elderly citizens has also been authorized and extended. The public facilities loan program for cities has been extended to aid our cities both large and small in financing needed municipal improvements.

Practically every city and town in our State of Tennessee is participating in one or more aspects of this legislation, authorized and expanded by Congress, to assist community development and industrial growth and development.

SMALL BUSINESS AIDS

The Congress has granted the Small Business Administration a greater role in Federal procurement policy in order to assist small business to participate in Government contracts and subcontracts on a broader scale. We have provided additional lending authority for the Small Business Administration and for the small business investment companies in order that they may assist small business enterprises of the Nation.

A chairman of Subcommitee No. 1 of the House Select Committee on Small Business charged with overseeing the operations of the SBA, I have urged administrators of this potentially great agency to take more positive and vigorous action in using the tools provided by the Congress for assisting our small business community. It is indeed gratifying to see those potentialities being used more vigorously by the new SBA Administrator, Mr. John E. Horne.

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

In the public works appropriations bill of 1961, Congress has provided funds for new starts in resources development at a faster pace than in previous years. The Corps of Engineers, the TVA, our Reclamation Bureau, the Atomic Energy Commission, our National Park Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, and our great regional power programs will all expand their activities under new legislative actions of this session of Congress. In our public works program we are making greater capital investments in America, to preserve and develop our natural resources in response to increasing demands of our swiftly growing population. Decreasing water, forest and mineral resources—and actual scarcities in some areas—underscore the urgency of this need which Congress has recognized as important in the public interest.

A new Water Pollution Control Act was approved during this session—evidencing the Nation's concern for an adequate water supply. Another act increases the funds for grants to States and interstate agencies for both operation and construction of new sewage plants, thus encouraging and stimulating the purification of our water supply throughout the Nation.

ROADS

This Congress has aided the work of building a stronger America by advancing the new Federal interstate highway construction program. To keep that program for a system of some 40,000 miles of superhighways on schedule, Congress increased the Federal Government's share from $25 to $37 billion. The new authorization extends for an additional 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for control of billboard advertising along the interstate highway.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Congress took action to increase the minimum old-age insurance benefits for our elderly citizens, liberalized the disability provision of the act, and provided that men may exercise the option to retire at 62 instead of 65, with benefits adjusted accordingly.

The Social Security Act was amended to permit States to use matching Federal grants to aid children of the needy and unemployed.

VETERANS

Congress extended the GI home loan bill for World War II and Korean war veterans until July 25, 1967, and authorized $1.2 billion in appropriations to veterans for direct loans in rural and small-town areas.

Funds were approved for compensation and pensions, hospital and medical care programs and other vital services to our veterans in a Veterans' Administration budget of approximately $5 billion. Included were funds for continuation of our veterans' hospital construction and modernization program.

JUDGES

Legislation creating 73 new Federal judgeships, greatly needed, was approved by Congress. Three of these authorized will be in Tennessee.

SECURITIES

A 2-year study of the Nation's stock exchanges by the Securities and Exchange Commission was ordered by the Congress, on the initiative of the House.

EDUCATION

Congress extended the National Defense Education Act for 2 years and provided for a program for impacted school areas, with Federal funds to be channeled to communities with heavy concentrations of Federal employees with schoolchildren crowding local school districts throughout the country. These two bills were important parts of the administration's comprehensive education program which were considered during this lengthy session. The fight for needed assistance for public school construction, college facilities, college student loans, and scholarship recommendation will be reconsidered in the next session.

TRADE, TRAVEL, AND TRANSPORTATION

Congress took positive steps to encourage development of our tourist industry, through passage of an act for establishment of a new Office of International Trade and Travel in the Department of Commerce. This program is designed to give coordinated planning and vigorous promotion both at home and abroad to measures which will stimulate travel in this country by tourists from overseas.

To provide assistance to the distressed transportation industries, particularly the railroads, Congress expanded the Interstate Commerce Commission's authority to make loans to railroads for a period of 27 months—to June 30, 1963.

Congress passed several laws, also, to assist aviation and to promote aviation safety.

We approved a bill authorizing $300,000 for the United States to participate in the 1964–65 New York World's Fair.

REORGANIZATION

These, in the main, were the domestic legislative actions which kept Members of Congress on the double quick through the long 1961 session. There are, inevitably and as usual, some who feel that Congress accomplished too little and some who think it achieved too much. However, by any standard, this was an exceptionally productive and positive session on Capitol Hill. For a new start toward a total American effort in the domestic sphere, the 1st session of the 87th Congress set a pace that has not been matched since the 1st session of the 73d Congress, which made the first 100 days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration famous.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUILDUP

There were no recommendations before Congress this session more important than those to provide for our Nation's military buildup which President Kennedy proposed and the Congress provided.

The Congress approved a record peacetime budget of some $46.6 billion—an increase of $6.4 billion over the defense appropriations for fiscal 1961. This is $4.8 billion more than was requested for national defense in the budget of the previous administration.

The extra defense dollars are going to provide greater national strength and a better overall defense program.

Funds are included for the buildup of our logistical and military transport forces, for expanded military construction, for civil defense shelters and other civil defense projects.

While funds are included for more rockets and more weapons of the very expensive highly technical type; funds are also included for improved light rifles and the standard military hardware necessary to fight any type of war.

Increased defense appropriations will provide for a bigger Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

Total U.S. forces are to number 2,743,227. This includes an Army of 1,-

008,000, a Navy of 657,000, a Marine Corps of 190,000, and an Air Force of 888,227.

The new military program is designed to give us a strong nuclear striking force which could survive any initial attack and thereby provide a strong deterrent against nuclear war. It is also designed to provide a force capable of meeting any small aggressive action promptly and decisively. The overall program will give us greater power and greater flexibility—capable of meeting any war threat.

In short, the military buildup represents comprehensive and balanced preparedness on a scale that this Nation never before attempted except in a period of declared hostilities.

BUILDING STRONGER ALLIANCES

Alliance for progress, food for peace, and the Peace Corps are works that identify a vastly expanded American effort, undertaken during this session of Congress, to strengthen our international alliances, build friends, and buttress the foundations of freedom around the world.

Most Americans apparently agree that foreign aid is an essential part of our overall defense strategy. Our military assistance programs help to support armed forces and installations abroad that would take a great many more of our American tax dollars and much of our own manpower if we were trying to go it alone. Our economic and technical assistance programs are designed to create conditions which contribute vitally to the maintenance of strong friendly governments around the world.

ANOTHER TREATY ACTION

Twenty of the twenty-one republics of Latin America formally joined with us in launching the Alliance for Progress in the recent Inter-American Economic Conference at Uruguay with Castro's Cuba definitely excluded from the program so long as Cuba remains under Communist domination.

Even before this alliance was breaking new ground in Latin America earlier this year the Congress provided funds for the previously authorized Latin American assistance program by appropriating $600 million. This included $100 million for disaster relief in Chile and another $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration.

Congress also gave new scope to strengthening our allies through passage of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Under an expanded food-for-peace program, $2.5 billion worth of surplus farm commodities will be shipped overseas during the months ahead for needy people around the world.

THE PEACE CORPS

Congress approved the new Peace Corps as a new aid and a new idea to give our Nation's youth a chance and opportunity to work for understanding and promotion of the cause of peace.

Too often we have provided guns to our friends instead of understanding. Too often have we tried to buy allies with impersonal dollars instead of personal relationships. This new program stresses the importance of the need today for our country to be understood for what we are, not a group of materialists serving only mammon, but a Nation of free men and free women believing in the virtues of freedom, liberty and democracy.

The Peace Corps, recommended by President Kennedy, will screen applicants thoroughly before they are accepted into the Corps for oversea service. After 3 months of rigorous training in the United States, the volunteer Peace Corps men will be sent overseas for 21 months of service in teaching and training in designated countries.

Other important actions taken by Congress, at this session, to strengthen America's position in international affairs, include extension of the Sugar Act, with its continuation of the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports; ratification of the treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River, a bill strengthening the Fugitive Felon Act, which provides new legal weapons to deal with such international crimes as the hijacking of airplanes.

These numerous legislative actions all add up to a giant stride toward a total American effort in the economic defense and diplomatic affairs to battle for freedom.

We have thus set in motion legislative actions to build up and strengthen our Nation on three fronts—military, economic, and the international or diplomatic.

The complete job of assuring the continuation of freedom and liberty cannot be done in one session of the Congress nor in one decade but we have begun and the Nation is now moving forward again with new purpose and with restored vigor with which to meet the crisis filled world.

The Late Honorable Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly devoted servants of the people has passed on to another life. Our beloved former colleague, the distinguished Paul Brown, of Elberton, Ga., has died.

Those of us who knew Paul will never forget the friendship and devotion of this man. Born and educated in Georgia, Paul was the true southern gentleman. For some years I had the honor of serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee and may I say that working with him there was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. His wise counsel was often sought and freely given; his understanding of basic problems was deep and always exercised; his judgment was faultless and benefited his colleagues on many occasions.

In 1960 when he decided to return to his Georgia home, we knew that we would sorely miss him and we have.

A distinguished legislator and lawyer, his example will long serve as a model of excellence for his successors.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Brown and their daughter.

Votes and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, following the rollcall vote on the question of the extension of the Civil Rights Commission—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 13, page 18034—I took the floor to explain the vote which I had cast and to point out to the Members of the House of Representatives the direction in which lay real progress in the civil rights field. In its lead editorial of September 25, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat makes comment upon the right to vote and the Civil Rights Commission. In connection with this body's consideration of that matter, I would like to place in the RECORD the editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, "Only Literates Should Vote":

ONLY LITERATES SHOULD VOTE

The Civil Rights Commission—whose life Congress has just prolonged for 2 years—recommends literacy tests for voters be abolished by act of Congress through the Nation.

It seems to make no difference that such a proposal is directly contrary to the U.S. Constitution and an abortion of commonsense.

Even apostles of lowest common-demoninator democracy ought to be able to see this. Perhaps they are too myopic with fervor to care about the Constitution or reason.

As everyone should know, including Commission members, the Constitution specifically provides individual States shall decide on voter qualifications—not Congress or a civil rights bureaucracy tucked away in some Washington aerie.

What this agency asks would require an amendment, which would never be passed, or Supreme Court surgery on the Constitution, which would never be tolerated.

Why should anyone be permitted to cast a ballot, if he cannot read the issues or faintly understand them—perhaps not even read the names of candidates?

As the New York Herald Tribune observes, few would seriously argue infants or the insane should have the right to vote; they are not competent or responsible. Neither are illiterates.

It would be wrong to assume—and who does?—that all who presently vote are competent and responsible. But fundamental law of the Nation guarantees States the right to establish certain qualifications so the ballot will be as intelligently cast as possible in a popular-franchise society.

The average intelligence of voters in America, in any democratic State, leaves much to be desired—a price for the democratic system, but worth it. It makes no vestigial sense, however, to further dilute this intelligence below the literacy line.

The civil rights advocates argue literacy tests have been brutally abused in some States. That's sadly true. They have been used to bar Negroes from the polls for generations.

This is a shameful distortion of States rights. But it is bad administration of law that's at fault—not the Constitution. Or the underlying purpose of literacy qualifications.

As Congressman TOM CURTIS of St. Louis recently declared on the floor of the House, too often civil rights folk use all their influence to insure a freely cast ballot.

They ignore, as Congress has ignored, the right to have the ballot counted honestly. One right without the other is meaningless.

What the Nation needs is a strengthening of literacy tests and basic qualifications for voters, not a headache ball demolishing ballot safeguards that now exist.

If millions go to the polls and don't know what they are voting for, both the Nation and democracy suffer.

Junkets, Anyone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of wider ventilation of some of the highjinks which are becoming all too common in Washington these days, I submit for printing in the RECORD the following copyright article by the noted columnist, George Dixon, which appeared recently in the Washington Post:

JUNKETS, ANYONE?

(By George Dixon)

When the Kennedy administration was just 3 months old, I sat abashed at a dinner the Women's National Press Club was giving for the Nation's newspaper editors. I was not, however, abashed by either the newswomen or the editors, although both can be quite abashing when they put their minds to it. No, I was abashed by Arthur Sylvester.

I had not expected to be abashed by Mr. Sylvester because, up to a short time previously, he had been only the Newark News' abashful, if not barefoot, boy.

But now he sat up there at the head table, wearing an important look, and the brand new title of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

He fixed the lovely ladies of the press with something less than a desirous eye and began to lecture them on the iniquities of junkets. He stated, in many severe words, that members of the press who indulged in junketeering were untrue to their professional trust, and implied that grabbing a free ride was tantamount to hitchhiking with a witch on her broomstick.

"Li'l Arthur," as some of us called Mr. Sylvester before he metamorphosed into a bureaucrat, looked so noble as he chided us that I promised myself I would try to be a good boy in the future and emulate him. I vowed to turn down every junket.

Time went on, but I went nowhere. However, I had my Sylvester-instilled virtue to keep me warm. Then I read an Associated Press report on the comings and goings of President Kennedy's $5,500,000 jetplane that costs $270.86 an hour to run, exclusive of maintenance, depreciation, and the pay of its Air Force crew.

The article, by Frances Lewine (who, ironically, was president of the Women's National Press Club that April night when Mr. Sylvester took it upon himself to rebuke us), began matter-of-factly with a tabulation of President Kennedy's 12 successive weekend flights to Hyannis Port, Mass. It picked up interest for me at the third paragraph, which stated casually:

"And, along with the President go members of his personal official family who want a hitch to the shores of Cape Cod."

Miss Lewine pointed out, with seeming nonchalance, that among the most frequent hitchhikers were the President's two brothers-in-law, Sargent Shriver and Stephen Smith. Then away down, six paragraphs from the end, she dropped in this:

"Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, rode the big jet on a mission to complete negotiations on the sale of his summer home in South Chatham."

I could scarcely credit that our stern junket denouncer had taken a junket for personal real estate dealing. I checked thoroughly. I learned Miss Lewine's information not only was correct, but firsthand. She'd heard Mr. Sylvester mention his mission with her own acute little ears. She'd been with him on the same flight.

I also learned, from other sources, that Mr. Sylvester had been extremely busy, prior to Miss Lewine's disclosure, importuning newspapers to send representatives on Government-paid trips. The most recent was to West Berlin.

Among those importuned were a number of editors who had sat abashed when Mr. Sylvester delivered his antijunketeering admonition. Having been made to see the light by the avenging angel, they sent reporters on the flight—but insisted upon reimbursing the Defense Department for their fare.

And How Do You Feel This Morning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the West Hartford News recently published an editorial which reflects an attitude of faith in this country and what it can do that deserves repeating. In these moments of tension, we are tempted to forget our strengths and abilities. This editorial is well worth your attention:

AND HOW DO YOU FEEL THIS MORNING?

Enough of gloom.

There is indeed plenty to despair about in this cockeyed world. The airwaves drip with it, the front pages scream it out, the editorial pages moan over it and the Cassandra columnists are having a field day.

None of these is calculated to make a mood in which the challenge can be constructively met. What we need is the literately strident voice of a Churchill, a confident roar.

The voice should be raised loudly in behalf of the self-governing virtues of the United States of America, for our purposes and by all odds the Government which is most of, by and for the people. We are always naively startled when we discover that our national virtues are less obvious to others than to us. But not to accept this fact calmly is to ignore commonsense. It is always our sins which are advertised.

The voice that must be raised, the only voice that the bully in the Kremlin really respects, is the composite voice of America. The only American mood which really suits Khrushchev is a mood of mute resignation.

We can be sorry, as individuals and as a nation, that so great a portion of our energies must be directed to the wasteful business of waging a war that skirts around the ragged edge of bombing, and probably will continue to do so. We can regret that the important affairs of men are crowded off the front pages by a preoccupation with fallout shelters. But we can have the guts not to brood about these things; we can keep survival in perspective.

We are told that, despite what seem to us the seeds of mankind's intellectual self-destruction which lie in authoritarian government, the Russian dynamic has captured an advantage in many of the uncommitted countries. We can react to this in anger at "unappreciativeness." Or we can react in wisdom that young energing nations will tend to be suspicious of old and rich established ones, that the drive of Russia is comparatively young and its faults concealed by oppression and suppression.

We can only lose the long war for the imagination of men by dissipating our stockpile of proud faith on our systems of human conduct—conduct of our self-government and conduct of our economic structure. Everybody has a little of that stockpile in his own backyard, at his hearth, on his office desk.

As individuals and as a society we dispel the gloom when we acknowledge that things are pretty messy but that we have the courage and the will to act in our own national behalf. There is no question about the capacity. The action will, we hope, never be needed at the level of world conflict. But the action is needed every day, every minute, on everyone's part at the level of personal performance of one's own task.

Cheerfully done.

The American Legion at Its 1961 National Convention Held at Denver, Colo., Commended Cherokee Textile Mills, Sevierville, Tenn., for Standing Firm Against Criticism for Using as a Slogan on Its Outgoing Mail—"Ours Is a Republic, Not a Democracy—Let's Keep It That Way"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following news articles by the Associated Press and United Press International appeared in Knoxville, Tenn., newspapers and reveal the action taken by the American Legion at its recent national convention held at Denver, Colo., at which time it commended the Cherokee Textile Mills of Sevierville, Tenn., for refusing to cease using on its outgoing mail the slogan, "Ours Is a Republic, Not a Democracy. Let's Keep It That Way."

[From the Knoxville Journal, Sept. 15, 1961]

LEGION BACKS SEVIERVILLE FIRM'S STAND

DENVER, September 14.—The American Legion has thrown its support behind a Ten-

nessee textile firm in a controversy with the Post Office Department over a slogan on mailed material.

The company is the Cherokee Textile Mills of Sevierville. Beginning last spring, the firm on outgoing mail stamped this slogan:

"Ours is a republic, not a democracy. Let's keep it that way."

A resolution approved at the Legion convention yesterday said the Post Office Department informed the owner of the mailing meter that the slogan was "objectionable and misleading," and "of a political or ideological nature."

The meter company, Pitney-Bowes Co., demanded that Cherokee return the meter and the Tennessee firm refused, the Legion resolution said.

The Legion said it commends the Cherokee company for its resolve in standing firm against this unwarranted invasion of its rights as an American citizen.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sept. 14, 1961]

MILL PRAISED FOR POSTAL SLOGAN

DENVER, September 14.—The American Legion national convention yesterday commended the Cherokee Textile Mills of Sevierville, Tenn., for "standing firm against this unwarranted invasion of its rights" by the U.S. Post Office Department and Pitney-Bowes Co.

Cherokee has been using a slogan in its mailing meter which says, "Ours is a republic, not a democracy. Let's keep it that way."

A resolution, originated by California Legionnaires, stated that the Post Office has informed the Tennessee mill it considers the motto "objectionable and misleading" and "of a political or ideological nature."

Pitney-Bowes, the resolution went on, has made demands that the die and the mailing meter, which it manufactured and owns, be returned. Cherokee has refused.

The Legion resolution said the veterans organization itself "reaffirms its belief in this Nation as a republic, not a democracy."

The Cherokee Textile Mills expressed its appreciation to the American Legion in the following public "thank you" announcement:

THANK YOU, LEGIONNAIRES

We appreciate the honor bestowed upon us.

America can be saved from self-destruction, but only by the people back home, not by the politicians in Washington.

Only by returning to trust in God and to the Constitution can freedom be made secure. Only the people back home can place American patriots in Congress and weed out party hacks who place personal and party greed above the welfare of their country.

A Congress filled with patriots would cause the Communist conspiracy to collapse as a house of cards. Such a Congress would restore to America that God-given freedom that has been so tragically voted and adjudicated away by unscrupulous officeholders of both parties.

The courageous action by the Cherokee Textile Mills in refusing to yield to pressure tactics has revived nationwide interest in the age-old controversy regarding the use of the term "republic" and "democracy" in describing the American form of government.

It is recalled that in 1953 I had the honor of being awarded the George Washington Gold Medal by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., for my magazine article titled, "The United States Is Not a Democracy, It Is a Republic—Long Live Our Republic."

In view of the national attention being given our form of government, I wish to include in my remarks at this point the magazine article which was published in the June 1953 issue of the National Republic magazine:

THE UNITED STATES IS NOT A DEMOCRACY, IT IS A REPUBLIC—LONG LIVE OUR REPUBLIC

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people to delete from their vocabulary the word "democracy" when referring to our form of government. History tells us that our Government is and always has been a Republic, and the following facts will support this statement.

The United States of America was established as a constitutional republic. When the Constitutional Convention had completed its labors, a citizen of Philadelphia asked Benjamin Franklin what kind of a government had been set up. Franklin replied, "A republic—if you can keep it."

The word "democracy" is not found in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, always spoke of "the Republic," or "our republican form of government."

In all the state papers of Presidents for the first 125 years—from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson—there is no reference to the United States of America as a democracy. Julia Ward Howe did not style her great patriotic anthem "The Battle Hymn of the Democracy."

James Madison distinguished sharply between "republic" and "democracy." Said Madison:

"Democracies ever have been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property, and have been, in general, as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

In 1848 William H. Seward said:

"Democracies are prone to war, and war consumes them."

But centuries earlier Aristotle had written—in 322 B.C.:

"A democracy, when put to the strain, grows weak and is supplanted by oligarchy."

That is why we always have a demand for Government controls in times of emergency. The same warning was heard in declining Rome, when Seneca said, in 63 A.D.:

"Democracy is more cruel than wars or tyrants."

In 1918 Woodrow Wilson described World War I as a "crusade to make the world safe for democracy." But with the end of the Wilson era, the word passed quickly from our popular vocabulary.

Beginning in 1933—the year President Franklin D. Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to Communist Russia—we became a democracy again, and since that time a tremendous Government-supported propaganda has been directed to all young people, to teach them to scorn those who insist this Nation was established as a republic.

Article IV of the Constitution provides:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

All the historical evidence shows that we were a republic from 1789 until about 1933. Who decided we should then become a democracy, and why? Bequeathed to us by 20 years of New Deal democracy, we have only the tragic rolls of 1,435,000 battlefield casualties, and a staggering Federal debt of $267 billion.

Although Communist Russia is recognized universally as the most tyrannical dictatorship in all human history, the Moscow meeting of the Communist Internationale, in 1935, formally decreed that the Soviet Union should henceforth be described as a democracy.

Soon, the principal Communist-front organizations throughout the world began to incorporate the words "democracy" or "democratic" in their title. Thus, in 1935, we find in the United States such Communist organizations as the American League for Peace and Democracy, the Church League for Industrial Democracy, the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, and many more. By 1940 there were more than 60 Communist-front organizations in the United States, each with the word "democracy" or "democratic" in its corporate title.

For more than 20 years we have watched a determined worldwide campaign to make the words communism and democracy synonymous. On the occasion of Stalin's death, in March 1953, the national committee of the Communist Party in the United States described the passing of the Communist dictator as "a tragedy to all democratic humanity."

Under our Republic, government is the servant of the people; under the distorted concepts of godless communism, democracy has become the master of the people.

A Checklist for Determining Debt Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, debt policy and public finance are matters of highest priority and broad public understanding of fundamentals in this area is essential.

E. Boomie Mikrut, serves as the director of the Municipal Finance Commission of the State of Michigan, delivered a most informative paper at the 55th annual conference of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada earlier this year at Seattle, Wash. Entitled "A Checklist for Determining Debt Policy," I feel this is a significant contribution and of help in developing such understanding and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHECKLIST FOR DETERMINING DEBT POLICY

(By Edward B. Mikrut)

One of the definitions of the word "policy" is "prudence or wisdom in the management of affairs." This is the meaning which is most applicable when we speak of debt policy. The setting of wise policies in the assumption and management of local governing debt pivots on many variables and this discussion outlines some areas to be considered for a system of debt policy.

Briefly the areas are (1) the purposes of borrowing, (2) methods of financing, (3) and (4) limits of borrowing—upper limits and time limitations, (5) type of borrowing that best suits your needs, (6) managing the debt, and finally (7) selling your bonds.

When borrowing money, even a Government service has to be competitive and in this area there is no distinction between a Government agency and a commercial enterprise. You are competing for the investor's dollar in a free market, and the badge of sovereignty confers no special distinction.

Now, admittedly, administering a debt program is not a science, despite its highly technical nature, but a specialized art. And therefore, many of the guidelines for a sensible debt policy that are to be presented here, are quite obviously matters of judgment, but judgments that represent a rather broad consensus in the financial councils of this country.

Now, let us first talk about the reasons for and purposes of borrowing and some of the solutions which may be advanced by the finance officer.

REASONS FOR AND PURPOSES OF BORROWING

There are two broad categories of borrowing which every finance officer meets in his work: (1) Operations and (2) capital improvements.

There are several situations where short-term borrowing for operations may become necessary. As usual one is where payments by the State to the local municipality may be delayed because of slow collections on the State level, such as highway funds or State-aid payments. In cases of this kind, borrowing in anticipation of the collection of current taxes becomes a necessity. Or, let us suppose that municipal revenues were overestimated and expenditures underestimated which created a cash shortage in the operating fund. Here too, borrowing becomes necessary, but at the same time the finance officer should determine the cause and recommend to the governing body a solution to avoid the cash crisis. Usually, this means recognizing the trend of the overall economy, both local and national, and making some allowances for setbacks when preparing the budget.

In many States political subdivisions have varying fiscal years, which do not coincide with the tax collection date, thus creating a cash shortage. Where this is the case legislatures should consider changing the tax due date to coincide with the beginning of the fiscal year.

Another possible answer to short-term borrowing is to collect the tax more frequently, for example, quarterly instead of annually or twice a year. This would even out the feast and famine of the treasury and at the same time ease the taxpayers burden by not requiring a large amount of cash at one time.

Quite frequently municipalities have not only borrowed against current taxes, but would like to borrow against next year's taxes in order to meet current needs. Where such borrowing is permitted by law, it should be used for emergency purposes only. The law is usually specific that such borrowing "is for operating expenses which could not have been foreseen and adequately provided for in the current budget."

But it is in the area of capital expenditures that borrowing is most frequent. With the mounting pressures on operating budgets there is a trend to include in the bonding program not only the buildings and sites, but also equipment, office furniture, typewriters and sometimes even supplies. Here you run into a question of policy. On the one hand you have the policy of good sound financing practice and on the other the necessity of placing the buildings into operation, for which current funds are insufficient to supplement the borrowing. Without going into the merits of the opposing policies, I would say that from the standpoint of sound fiscal practice, bond financing should be limited to buildings, sites, and equipment which will become a permanent part of the building in order to make it a going concern. This would preclude the purchase of typewriters, filing cabinets, office supplies, and the like, with bond proceeds.

Instead of bonding, some projects can be completed with funds obtained from a 2-year capital improvement tax levy and borrowing against the current year's and next year's taxes. This type of short-term borrowing can be effectively used in building small projects without levying the full amount needed in one year, without waiting to accumulate the funds and without issuing short-term bonds.

EXTENT OF FINANCING

How shall we finance our needs?

The ideal way, of course, would be to pay cash for everything. But a complete 100-percent pay-as-you-go policy for capital improvements is just not workable. Some projects are of such size that it would be impossible to finance them. To attempt to accumulate the funds before starting construction, may delay a needed project and most probably the increase in construction cost would equal or exceed the interest cost on the borrowed funds. Such lack of planing would be a disservice to the public.

But what is the proper ratio of pay-as-you-go? Some finance men talk in terms of allocating 25 percent, 10 percent, or 5 percent of the budget for capital purposes. This is a matter to be decided based upon judgment and experience in your particular community. Mr. David M. Ellinwood of Moody's Investors Service has always recommended 25 percent as a goal toward which governments should strive. This makes good sense because if revenues decline, the capital improvements in the annual budget can be temporarily postponed without curtailing operations or incurring an operating deficit. Also part of the capital budget appropriation not used for projects, may then be devoted to debt retirement.

We must distinguish between the pay-as-you-go portion in the capital budget and the requirement in some States of a downpayment. In municipalities which cannot incur debt except as the borrowings are authorized by a vote of the people, a downpayment is not required. On the other hand, where the local governing body can authorize the issuance of bonds without a vote of the people, the borrowing law requires a downpayment. Thus, in New York and New Jersey the governing body must provide at least 5 percent of the cost of an authorized project in its current budget and bonds can be issued for not exceeding 95 percent.

Now this partial pay-as-you-go and partial borrowing might include the establishment of a revolving fund. If the law permits, a bond issue could be used to establish such a fund. Usually this is limited to a specific purpose, such as special assessment improvements. This is good, for it eliminates going to the market with small, high-cost special assessment bond issues.

Another type of revolving fund could be established by the accumulation of a cash surplus which is replenished by current appropriations. This revolving fund could serve many purposes—it could be used for capital improvements, equipment replacement, supply purchases, or even meet part of the current operating needs of the municipality from the beginning of the fiscal year to the first tax-collection data.

A word about 100 percent borrowing. This method of borrowing is utilized in financing large improvements which would be difficult to pay for out of current funds, and where there is no surplus to be used as a cash downpayment. And also in situations where because of the population growth and shift, the need for facilities may be immediate and cannot be met from current appropriations.

UPPER LIMITS OF BORROWING

I will now cite four traditional limitations on borrowing—the first of which is the legal limit established by statute. The maximum debt limit established by statute should not be a goal, but a guide. Quite often officials not only want to reach the legal limit, but many times go beyond it with such devices as the authority or district. True, in some States the limits were established during the depression and today appear to be unrealistic in face of our expanding needs. Here, I think the legislatures should take corrective measures.

A second limitation is to express a debt limit in terms of the assessed valuation. Experienced investors have established a rule of thumb for direct and overlapping debt of 10 percent. Municipalities rarely have been in difficulty with a 10 percent or less over-all debt while those with 15 percent or more have been in difficulty frequently. Because assessed valuation varies from local unit to local unit some States have adopted the concept of State equalized valuation, thus bringing all units on a comparable basis. And in most cases the State equalized valuation is considerably below the true cash value. This gives the investor both a standard of measurement and a cushion of safety.

A third limit can be expressed as so many dollars of debt per capita. This limit is difficult to determine because no standard can be established as taxpayers of different communities can shoulder the debt burden in varying degrees.

In each case you must relate the per capita debt to the specific community rather than setting an arbitrary dollar limit. Obviously some communities because of their economic situation, or because of the per capita income of their taxpayers, are in a much better position to carry a higher per capita debt than others. Consequently, before a dollar limit is determined, a thorough analysis must be made of the community's economic condition and prospects for future growth or possible adverse developments.

Fourth, many years ago the old classic rule of thumb was that debt service should not exceed 25 percent of the budget. Of late, public salaries have come to be considered inviolate, not subject to reduction in the event of hard times, and the thinking today is that debt service should not exceed 15 percent of the budget.

Mr. Ellinwood, of Moody's has suggested another limit, which is the rule of thumb that direct debt should not exceed three and a half times the total annual expenditures. This again is a matter of judgment, but a judgment that comes from many years of experience in the field of municipal bonds.

The final measurement is the municipality's ability to pay. This of course depends on age and growth of population, wealth of the taxpayers, stability of income and diversification of industry.

TIME LIMITATIONS

Many maximum periods for which bonds can be issued are established by statute. However in no case should bonds be issued for a period longer than the useful life of the facility. In determining maturities and the maximum period an appraisal should be made of all factors, including outstanding and future debt. Some people look to the maturity schedule of a new issue as an indication of willingness to pay or rather a lack of disposition to pay in the case of stretched out maturities. An aggressive maturity schedule is often construed as a very positive credit factor. Unfortunately there are some municipalities which not only have issued bonds for the maximum legal time limit, but through refunding are paying for facilities and equipment long since abandoned. The day of reckoning may not be far away.

TYPE OF BORROWING

Whenever possible, short-term borrowing should be used instead of immediately bonding for the whole project. This effective method of financing during construction reduces the amount of interest which otherwise would have to be paid on the total amount of bond proceeds. Also the bond

proceeds would not be lying idle or invested at a lower interest rate than the coupon rate, should the project be delayed.

Usually, the best type of borrowing is by the issuance of general obligation bonds. These bonds, because they are paid from ad valorem taxes without limitation as to rate or amount have wider market acceptance and quite often are sold at a lower interest cost than other types of bonds.

In addition to general obligation bonds, a municipality can usually issue revenue bonds, special assessment bonds, and bonds pledging a specific source of income, such as gas and weight taxes. The choice of a bond issue is a matter to be determined by the municipality with the good counsel of the finance officer. Often the choice is limited because the maximum legal debt limit for general obligation bonds has been reached, because the project or facility benefits a small segment of the community (such as paving certain streets) and finally because of political considerations the governing body may be reluctant to ask the voters for approval of general obligation bonds.

MANAGING THE DEBT

In order to properly manage the debt it is important to look ahead and determine the community's needs for several years. If only one project is necessary to meet the needs for the next 5 or 10 years, then perhaps a bond issue combining principal and interest into equal annual debt service payments would be appropriate. If, on the other hand, the needs are growing and more bonding will be done over a period of years, then a schedule of equal annual maturities and a declining interest charge will allow for additional bonds without creating peaks in the annual debt service requirements.

To implement the long-range planning a sound capital budget must be formulated. This should include an estimate of capital outlays for the next 5 or 10 years and a determination whether the taxpayers have the ability to finance them. Moreover, as new facilities are built, there will be corresponding increases in operating expenses and the annual operating budget must be realistically prepared in view of the capital outlay needs.

Once the orderly debt structure is adopted, the investor and taxpayer must be apprised. Complete and accurate accounting must be maintained and reported. Not only should the investor and taxpayer be informed, but also the three well-known credit agencies of Moody's, Standard & Poor's, and Dun & Bradstreet. How well a municipality keeps its financial house in order will determine the success of its next bond issue.

Finally there should be an annual review of your complete capital program for the original 5 or 10 years, which at best was only a considered estimate. This review will take into account any new developments; it will incorporate improvements in the light of past experience and will be the basis for future planning.

SELLING YOUR BONDS

There are at least five points which should be considered in marketing bonds.

It goes without saying that new issues must be dovetailed into existing debt. Existing debt and the schedule of maturities will determine the type and length of the new bonds, and whether they should be paid in equal annual maturities or total equal annual debt service.

The frequency with which bonds are placed on the market is an important factor in determining their salability—equally important as is bond soundness. In bringing bonds to market care must be taken not to come too often. It is entirely possible that the latest issue will be competing with the unsold bonds of the first issue, thereby depressing the price of the first. With that in mind, buyers will want a higher price for the second issue for fear a third might be in the offing and depress the price of the second. A good rule to follow is to have no more than two sales annually—about 6 months apart. This gives the purchasers of the first issue ample time to place it in the hands of investors.

Also before selling bonds it is best to have final costs firmly established. To sell bonds based on rough estimates of cost can result in either actual costs being higher than the bond issue and requiring additional bonds to complete the project or the estimates can be too high resulting in a surplus and the excess bond proceeds being used to upgrade the original project. For example, the original estimate may call for tile floors and later, because of surplus funds, a change is made to include wall-to-wall carpeting.

When coming to market, one should never attempt to outguess the market interest trend. If the project or facility is needed, sell bonds now. Many instances have been recorded where waiting for the interest to decrease has resulted in a situation where not only the interest cost has risen, but also the construction cost. No local official can be expected to outguess the bond market and should not attempt it.

Finally, it is my firm belief that a public offering of bonds will result in a lower interest cost to the municipality. For example, in Michigan by statute, bonds must be offered for public sale if the amount is $10,000 and over. Although this may appear to be too low, our legislature has recognized the cost advantage accruing to the municipality from competitive bids over that of negotiated bids.

SUMMARY

This checklist of necessity must be general and should be used merely as a guide. Each specific issue has its peculiar problems and each municipality is unique unto itself. With that in mind, the checklist is summarized:

1. Determine the purpose for which you will borrow—operating, capital improvement.

2. Extent of borrowing—full bonding, combination pay-as-you-go and bonding, pay-as-you-go only.

3. Upper limits of borrowing—can be expressed as a percentage of the legal debt limit, of the assessed valuation, of the operating budget, or as a per capita amount.

4. Maximum period of time—borrowing cannot exceed the useful life of the facility and should be for a much shorter period.

5. When possible, general obligation bonds should be used because of the unconditional promise to pay and will generally bring the best interest rate.

6. Coordinate long-term financial planning with the capital and operating budgets, which should be reviewed annually.

7. Orderly marketing of bonds requires a dovetailing of proposed debt into existing debt, limiting the number of issues per year, having final estimates of cost, timing the sale to actual need for money, and insisting on competitive bids at public sale.

The Late Honorable Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, like all who were privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives, I had deep affection and respect for Paul Brown. His fine qualities of mind and heart endeared him to all and made him one of the outstanding Members of the House. During my years of association with him on the Banking and Currency Committee, Paul Brown was always most kind and gracious, and his devotion to duty was an inspiration to his younger colleagues. While we differed on many fundamental issues, I was always impressed with his nobility of character and I feel that all his colleagues were better for having known this truly good man.

To Mrs. Brown and his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their heavy loss.

Fallout Shelters at ITU Printers Home in Colorado Springs, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a challenging address delivered by Dowell E. Patterson, before the convocation of the American Academy of Medical Administrators in Atlantic City this week. Mr. Patterson is superintendent of the International Typographical Union Printers Home in Colorado Springs, Colo. I am sure that the fallout shelter program adopted under the able direction of Mr. Patterson will set a pattern for others to follow. His speech follows:

FALLOUT SHELTERS AT ITU PRINTERS HOME IN COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

(By Dowell E. Patterson)

It has been difficult for most medical administrators of institutions to realize the enormity of radiation danger from nuclear fallout or to visualize the panic and horror that would ensue if such an attack were to be made upon the United States.

Those who have been aware of the distressing ramifications that would occur, and are knowledgeable of protective measures necessary to be taken in event of nuclear attack, have doubtlessly been handicapped by lack of funds and authority to proceed in erecting, or providing an adequate shelter.

We are not overcritical and are not condemning boards of trustees and other governing agencies for lack of initiative. It has been very trying, almost impossible, for the average citizen to realize that such an attack could ever be made upon the United States. Moreover, there has been a strong tendency toward a fatalistic attitude in the matter of fallout radiation. Sometimes these so-called fatalists will become facetious by uttering statements like "what does it matter; I have had it" or similar drivel. In most cases these remarks are more a defensive attempt to minimize, or excuse, their disinterest or lack of preparation, rather than really being willing to accept the fate of calmly and stoically dying from an overdose of nuclear radiation.

Competent radiologists explain that death from nuclear radiation is far from a comfortable or easy way out. We venture the opinion that when a victim is seized with attendant nausea, bloody diarrhea, and acute pain, he will not be so complacent in quietly

accepting his fate as an inevitability. He is then likely to try, rather belatedly, to survive.

This administrator, who is privileged by your grace to present these remarks here today, was fortunate not to be handicapped by the board of trustees of the International Typographical Union Printers Home, Hospital, and Sanatorium, the institution I have the honor to represent, in making provision for protection of patients and personnel in event of fallout nuclear radiation. Conversely, when the proposal was first made by your speaker to gentlemen of that board of trustees composed of Mr. Elmer Brown, of Indianapolis, president; Mr. Roy T. Baker, of Denver, Colo., vice president; Mr. William R. Cloud, of Seattle, Wash., secretary-treasurer, and trustees Guy M. Billingsly, of Washington, D.C.; Ross K. Edmonds, of Cleveland, Ohio; W. J. Beacham, of Atlanta, Ga.; and Basil J. Hillman, of Niagara Falls, N.Y.; it was submitted with some degree of trepidation because of the financial outlay involved. But, without hesitation, your speaker was urged by members of the board to proceed at once and to look upon the expenditure as insurance that we would pray to God we would never have to collect.

It is unnecessary to explain to administrators here assembled, the assurance, inspiration, and confidence such emphatic action by the board of trustees gave me in pursuing the work of erecting and equipping fallout shelters. This enabling action came at a time when discussion of the subject of fallout shelters as a protection against radiation brought forth either indifference, hostility, or ridicule. It took courage, foresight, and determination by the management of the Union Printers Home to authorize protective shelters, equipment, and stores, when they did so as far back as September 26, 1960. Their action has been vindicated by reason of recent statements made by President John F. Kennedy and the emphasis he, as our commander in chief, has placed upon the kind of civil defense preparedness which is already in readiness at the International Typographical Union's institution in Colorado Springs. Subsequent to the establishing of our shelters, the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado was directed to build its headquarters under a large mountain. The work is well on its way to completion.

Inasmuch as we have erected two shelters, one for patients and personnel and the other for agricultural personnel and a few bred cows, the work at our institution has attracted some attention. We have been commended and all that sort of thing, but of much more importance our pioneering has received notice by the civil defense authorities at Battle Creek, Mich., and we were requested to supply pictures to be used in publications, ostensibly for the purpose of assisting others in getting ready for eventualities.

And so, in an effort to be of some actual and practical assistance to you who represent so many institutions, and upon whom falls the current responsibility of getting something done, and in haste, for the protection of your respective institutions, I submit the following observations and suggestions:

First, understand thoroughly what is to be accomplished. The words "fallout shelters," "protection from radiation," and "disaster shelters," appear to be inadequate. Rather let's mentally underscore as our aim "The Will To Survive." Upon this premise we should resolutely dedicate ourselves to that objective.

As a starting point, it is suggested that each of you visualize, as nearly as you can, and as far as your imagination will permit, what will be the state of affairs if suddenly we were informed that in one half an hour radiation from fallout caused by a nuclear bomb would be upon your city. Thirty minutes in which to prepare to survive. And under conditions of panic. Without advance preparations and organization there obviously would be chaos.

Which brings us to consider three stages of preparation for protection, in our will to survive:

1. Preattack planning and construction. Equippage, stores, and essentials, ready for immediate use.

2. Survival during attack.

3. Postattack work for immediate protection and future survival.

Our major, or immediate concern, of course, is with the first phase of the three stages, that of planning and preparation.

It is unnecessary that we devote much time to the matter of construction as all detailed specifications may be secured from the U.S. Government's Civil Defense Agency. It is important to point out, however, that each hospital, or institution, should consider its particular needs as to space which could be utilized and possible parts of buildings or basements already accessible and being presently used for purposes far less essential.

With remodeling to meet safety specifications it is quite likely that many, if not all, of the institutions you represent, could hold shelter expenditures to a minimum. The basic idea is to keep 3 feet or more of building material between human beings and radioactive fallout. In other words, aboveground shelters should have 3-foot walls and roof. If a basement is used, all underground, there is a reasonable expectation that the floors above will give equivalent protection. It is best to check with civil defense authorities on your building needs and possibilities.

Charts may also be procured showing a progressive schedule of dosages that may be absorbed by a human being before too much damage is done and also the effects of greater amounts of radiation, up and to the quantity which will cause certain death. It is essential that such charts be available and in your shelters.

Assuming that you find proper places to reconstruct your present buildings, or that you have built an adequate shelter to house your patients and personnel, allowing of course for the inevitable expendables who cannot be moved or those who will never reach the shelter because of chaotic traffic, panic or family motivations, the matter of equipping and stocking the shelter for a minimum of 2 weeks' subsistence is one that must have close attention. It is elementary that a well-built shelter without food, water, means of disposal, communication and medical supplies, would be of little value.

Again, the Civil Defense authorities furnish a list of articles which should be taken into a shelter. These lists, it should be understood, are based on single family unit needs. Special attention must be given to needs of an institution or a general shelter to house many persons in a larger space.

In addition to the ordinary items that would be necessary for subsistence, it would be well to have available several dosimeters. This instrument records the amount of radiation in a given place. With it, information may be secured at a glance which will determine whether the place is safe or not. Means may be found to stop the radiation leak, or part of the shelter may have to be abandoned. It reassures the safety of a shelter when free from effects of radiation.

An ordinary Geiger counter, or several of them, depending on size of shelter and number of persons housed, is important in testing food and water. Contamination is readily revealed by means of a Geiger counter.

Food and water should be stored in a protected place in even the best shelter, as upon these commodities life depends.

We repeat, that one must visualize all eventualities when planning, stocking, and equipping a shelter. There will be no time for second guessing. Every detailed item should be in place and ready for use. All warning time, minutes in some instances, 3 or 4 hours if lucky, depending upon wind direction and velocity, will be needed for moving patients and personnel and to subdue panic. Therefore, the shelter should be ready. Everything in its place. When this desired point has been reached, it would be well to have organized drills so that each person will understand his position and what is expected of him.

The kind of food to store is one that the individual administrator had to choose with care and as being germane to the equipment and conditions of his particular shelter.

Your shelter may be the ultimate in extensive luxury. To transpose your entire hospital underground would be an ideal circumstance. There will be, because of practical considerations common to those of most hospitals and institutions, far more administrators who have to plan for survival instead of operating on an "as usual" basis.

Regardless of the luxury idea, we must foresee the lack of electric power (unless you can generate your own), the lack of heat, water, and perhaps many other utilities to which we have become accustomed.

There are ways of combating each of these obstacles, depending upon your individual needs. I should be pleased to discuss these matters with you on that basis or indulge in a question and answer session if time permits.

Subsistence medications must be selected with care. Some surgical arrangements for immediate emergencies are needed. Disposal systems without water must be furnished. Light and heat for minimum cooking can be secured without great difficulty.

A protective shelter to house your patients and personnel for a 2-week period is estimated to be the length of time to escape danger. Thought and energy must be put into the project. It can be made ready.

ATTACK AND SURVIVAL

And now we consider the second phase of a radiation attack. Let us assume that notice is received and 45 minutes is the limit in which we have to get ready. If we are properly prepared and drilled we can go in the equipped shelter in an orderly manner. Two potentialities will doubtless confront us. Some of our people are on the outside and can't or will not, get to us. Secondly, and quite seriously, there may be a convergence of fright-impelled outsiders who, having made no provision for themselves, will descend upon your hospital or institution. If some of these creatures can be absorbed, all well and good. However, if the movement turns to mob proportions, precautions taken previously, should be brought into action. It then becomes a matter of not only the will to survive but the survival of the fittest. Indelicate as the development might be to contemplate, its likelihood is one that is to be expected.

When the shelter is finally shut there should be organized routine as soon as possible. To conserve food, as there will be need for food after the confinement period, two meals a day on a rationed basis should be sufficient to maintain the individual during his inactivity. Arrangements for hot drinks could augment the meals. It might be of interest to know that crates of soda pop can also be stored to supplement the water supply. Scientifically, it has been determined that the bottled drinks may be preserved for long-time storage. Their consumption in a shelter would, in most cases, have to be without ice. But this hardship could be endured. Water can be stored in polyethylene containers which are available.

The method of disposal in the absence of sewerage facilities is one that has been studied diligently. Most basements are not equipped with toilets, and even so, radio-

active water used through them would preclude their use. One answer to this problem is presented. Portable camping toilets were procured in sufficient numbers. Each is supplied with a plastic bag with drawstring. When tied there is no odor or other disagreeableness. Each bag may then be deposited in discarded steel oil drums, stored for the purpose. As an added precaution, lime can be used in each barrel and a plastic covering placed on top of the barrel. Toilets are placed in private, partitioned enclosures erected in the shelter. Bed patients may be similarly cared for, and any awkwardness in this respect can be offset by use of disinfectants which have been stored in supply. Not unlike the procedures now pursued in hospitals.

With food, water, medicines, disposal facilities, lights, arrangements for hot beverages (without city current) flashlights, waterless soap, disposable utensils for eating, reading material, and a determination to live, survival for 2 weeks in a fallout shelter may not be so bad. Transistor radios, to receive direct messages from civil defense headquarters advising of the progress of the attack and when safe to emerge, should be standard equipment.

It has been stated that the first 24 hours of fallout are the most deadly. The effectiveness, under most conditions of attack, begins to taper off after that time. Nevertheless, all of these are possibilities dependent upon any number of contingencies. It is advisable to be prepared for at least a 2-week confinement as a safety measure.

There may be some brighter sides to the attack stage. From reliable information it appears likely that the water will not be immediately contaminated by radiation. This is because so much of it is already in the pipes and underground. But the time will come when the fallout will seep through to the bottoms of the reservoirs and then contaminate all the water destined to come through the pipes. We refer again to the need of a Geiger counter to ascertain the radioactive extent of the water. Having water for a few days, however, would be a help. But again, one should not depend on the possibility of having uncontaminated water, even for a short time.

Underground municipal or central operations for utilities may, in the future, provide all necessary power in the event of nuclear fallout, but such arrangements are far from perfected at the moment. And, momentarily, we may be attacked. Until you are assured of a self-maintained protection shelter, you and your institutional population are vulnerable.

POSTATTACK ACTIVITY FOR SURVIVAL

There is no way of estimating what the consequences of an attack of nuclear radiation will be. While the effects will be serious, we are reliably informed it will not be the end of all things, as some fictional writers have imagined. It will be bad enough. The extent of the attack and the size of the bombs used, together with the selection of them by the enemy, all have a bearing on obstacles and problems which will confront the survivors. If the attack is localized, the problem of getting a start back to normal operations will not be extremely hazardous. But it is quite likely that if the enemy attempts the use of nuclear radiation warfare, it will be predicated on an allout attack with full intent to render a crippling blow.

Quantity food and water might be needed for some time after the attack. It should be stored in a protected place where it can be reached for emergency use.

Those institutions which have even limited farming facilities must plan to reestablish a way of life as soon as possible. Agricultural fallout shelters are essential. Farmworkers should be instructed so that they may act immediately and almost automatically. In our agricultural shelter, where we had to build it above ground, there are provisions for the farmers and dairymen. In addition there are quarters for seven bred cows. The herdsmen are instructed to cull out seven such cattle from the entire herd of Holdstein animals. Their safe sojourn will insure fresh milk, even though in curtailed quantity, and seven calves to begin restocking the herd.

Radiologists inform us that chickens can withstand five times as much radiation as man. Following this advice, we have instructed the farmers, in the few minutes warning time left to them, to house the entire flock of chickens in the hope that they may survive the attack and thus continue the supply eggs.

Arrangements have been made for protecting many bags of corn seed from dreaded radiation. Already a supply for replanting is stored. As soon as possible after attack the land should be plowed and then reseeded.

It is also strongly recommended that firehose, capable of spraying a strong pressure, be made ready for use as soon as the attack is ended. The roofs of all buildings can thus be unburdened from radiation and buildings made safe for immediate occupancy.

In the days following an attack it would be well to keep tuned constantly to the central civil defense station for instruction on procedure.

Again the ugly prospect of vandalism and mob violence is to be expected until complete law enforcement is reestablished. Therefore, the same precautions made for protection at time of attack must be available for employment during the first hours, or days, of the postattack period.

IN SUMMARY

It will be noted that this presentation is without annotations or reference indications. The reason is twofold. First, because of the brief time for preparedness and secondly, because much of the material is based on experience from pioneering. However, some of the authoritative statements were secured from civil defense agencies and voluminous data were graciously furnished by Roland R. Anderson, M.D., a radiologist of repute in Colorado Springs, who has tirelessly devoted an excessive amount of time in assisting in the will to survive program as it pertains to radiation danger.

Our work has been primarily to attempt to combat the dangers from radiation fallout caused by weapons and bombs and the effects of them, that are currently known. We have done our best under these circumstances.

It shall be our purpose to keep informed on any new instruments of death and destruction and the devastation that might be caused by them. We prefer to reason logically that for any instrument of death conceived by man there can, in like manner, be created a defensive or offensive protection.

We have no patience with defeatism. Such common statements as "it's so terrible, it'll never be used," or "no one's going to be mad enough to start an H-bomb war," and again, "I am sure the President and all those generals know more about it than we do," and finally, "after all, perhaps it's God's will," are in opposition to historical facts and complacency based on mottos, indicate nothing more than resignation to fate and a lack of the will to survive.

The Rule of Law—A Tool for Preventing World Holocaust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in his address to the United Nations General Assembly, President Kennedy called for a system of world law. All civilized nations have long accepted the principles that force, and the power of arms, are not the proper tools for the resolving of internal conflicts between their peoples. In all civilized countries one who is wronged has access to the courts—who determine the requirements of justice. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in international relations—where power politics and mass terror and destruction have been the tools for the adjudication of claims. It is clear that the future of the human race will not be safe unless a system of world law will replace the system of world warfare.

President Kennedy keenly observed that "to destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy, creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons." Indeed, the emphasis on the urgent need for the global extension of the rule of law was a continuing undercurrent throughout the President's address.

This urgent call for world law is not totally visionary. Continuous and persistent effort to create a grassroot worldwide movement for a rule of law has been underway for a few years now. The American Bar Association has assumed a position of leadership in creating support for this movement among the legal profession the world over. Regional conferences of leaders of the legal profession have recently been held in San Jose, Costa Rica, for the American Continent, and in Tokyo for the Asian and Australasian regions. Further meetings are scheduled for the African Continent in December of this year, for Europe in March of next year, and a comprehensive world conference will also take place later in 1962. A central moving power behind these conferences has been the Committee on World Peace Through Law of the American Bar Association, under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles S. Rhyne. Indeed, it was during Mr. Rhyne's presidency of the American Bar Association that this movement was initiated.

The accomplishments of the movement for world peace through world law were well summarized in an address made by Mr. Rhyne at the closing session of the recent Tokyo Conference, at which he said:

A revolutionary new idea on achieving peace was born here in Tokyo when the conference decided to take its case against war

to the peoples of the world. Never before has the case against war been taken directly to the grassroots with a call to every man, woman and child to assume their part in the great task of ending battle as man's method of settling disputes between nations.

This is the first time in the history of the world that an international group of lawyers has issued a call for action to the United Nations, to all governments, and to the people of the world—a call which if answered by those to whom it is directed can in fact substitute law for war. For there can be no doubt that those to whom these calls have been issued do indeed have it within their power to end war by creating a world ruled by law. The conference has also set forth the fundamental legal principles and a work program for lawyers to achieve the great objective of world peace through law. Thus for the first time all the ingredients for success of a program of world peace through law have been set forth in one document.

As one who as attended many international conferences of lawyers, I can truthfully say that the accomplishments of this Asian Conference far exceed those of any lawyers' conference ever held in moving the world toward that great day when peace will indeed reign in the world. Thus, this conference is one of the great landmarks on the road to accomplishing man's great desire of world peace.

The success of these regional conferences demonstrates the tremendous interest that the lawyers of the world have in mobilizing not only their own profession but the lay citizenry of all nations to increase the rule of law in international affairs as a substitute for force. It is noteworthy also that the lawyer delegates from 19 nations who participated at the recent Tokyo meeting were able to produce unanimous conclusions as to the effective means whereby world law could become a realistic accomplishment. I believe that the Consensus of Tokyo presents a most interesting document of both international legal philosophy and international legal reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have the document, Consensus of Tokyo, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSENSUS OF TOKYO [1]

We lawyers of Asia and Australasia assembled at this conference being convinced that the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs will promote world peace hereby declare our consensus as follows:

I. Peace maintained through the international rule of law will assure a world society dedicated to justice and to fulfillment of the fundamental rights of individuals and nations. Thereby man may pursue in freedom and with equality of opportunity his legitimate aspirations for economic, social, and political progress. To achieve these objectives organized law must replace organized war as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity.

II. Being gravely concerned over the threat of weapons of mass destruction and the hazards to mankind arising from existing international tensions and world disorder, we dedicate ourselves to the establishment of the international rule of law through an organized worldwide effort of the legal profession. We pledge our full and active support of the program and principles set forth in this conference.

CALL FOR ACTION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

As an immediate step to lessen world tensions, we urge the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations now in session to request immediately of the International Court of Justice advisory opinions concerning the following:

I. All legal questions involved in the Berlin crisis, including air corridor use, land access routes, and the walling off of East Berlin.

II. Whether any nation has a legal right to conduct nuclear tests and if so subject to what limitations.

III. All legal questions involved in other crisis areas wherever world peace is threatened.

We urge that the General Assembly request the nations involved to refrain from further prejudicial action until such time as these advisory opinions have been rendered and a legal basis for solutions identified.

We further urge that the United Nations immediately begin preparation of drafts on the following:

I. A convention to be signed by all nations dedicating the use and knowledge of outer space to the peaceful uses of all mankind.

II. A convention on disarmament to which universal adherence may be demanded thereby ending the ever accelerating arms race before nuclear holocaust occurs.

III. A convention laying down rules governing investigations and interventions by the United Nations in the interests of preserving peace, thus avoiding the misunderstandings arising from the lack of such rules.

We pledge our assistance in the drafting of these conventions and we urge the lawyers of the world to give their support to this effort as an essential part of the world peace through law program.

TO GOVERNMENTS

We urge the governments of the world to:

I. Renounce the use of armed force, political subversion, economic sanctions and defamatory propaganda for aggressive purposes.

II. Agree to resolve all disputes with other nations through peaceful means and to submit all legal issues to appropriate international tribunals.

III. Recognize the dignity of the individual and the protection of fundamental human rights as the foundation of the rule of law in the world community.

IV. Accept the supremacy of the rule of law over governments both within nations and in the world community.

V. End the ever accelerating arms race before it explodes by accident or design into atomic holocaust.

VI. End all nuclear tests under an effective inspection agreement which insures compliance.

TO THE PEOPLE

We remind mankind that:

Under the rule of law the individual may live in freedom, in dignity, and in peace. In the absence of the rule of law the individual becomes the subject of arbitrary power over all political, economic and social life. He lives under tyranny and apprehension in fear and bondage.

We therefore call upon the peoples of the world to support this program for world peace through the rule of law as the imperative of our day. In recognition of the power of public opinion in building a world of law, and to reverse the current senseless trend toward war, we further call upon all mankind to take the immediate and practical step of communicating to their government leaders and United Nations representatives, through every possible means, their full support of the above recommendations and the program of world peace through law as herein set forth.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community.

II. Founded upon the consent of its constituents, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice, human dignity, and morality common to civilized societies. It must represent the generally accepted customs and agreements of all nations and individuals throughout the world.

III. International law in a dynamic world must be constantly adjusted to changing needs. It must take account of the special circumstances of newly emerging nations.

IV. Individuals, private organizations, nations, international organizations, and juridical persons should all be subject to international law, deriving rights, and incurring obligations thereunder.

V. The international rule of law should be based upon the principle of equality of all its subjects before the law.

VI. All who are subject to international law must fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VII. All who are subject to international law must resolve all their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation, or other peaceful procedures.

VIII. Judges on international tribunals must be impartial, professionally competent and free from political and other improper pressures.

IX. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of States, must have the power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

X. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals must be enforced by appropriate international community action.

XI. Those subject to international law should be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication before an impartial international tribunal before any judicially imposed community sanctions are applied.

XII. Individuals should be entitled to effective legal protection of their fundamental and inalienable human rights.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now, therefore, resolves—

I. To participate to the fullest in the world peace through law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international relations, and to that end,

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To encourage all lawyers to support the program of World Peace Through Law by undertaking the formation and support of Committees on World Peace Through Law within their national or local bar associations, and

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that Conference, and

V. To support the proposed new international organization to be known as the "World Peace Through Law Institute."

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions by specific actions this conference recommends—

I. That the lawyers of the world declare their support and take action toward establishing a "World Law Day", and

II. That a World Conference of lawyers be convened in 1963 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend, and

[1] Adopted unanimously on Sept. 20, 1961, by lawyer delegates from the 19 nations at the conference.

III. That the topics for discussion at the World Conference include the following:

A. The basic principles of the rule of law in the international field;

B. International Judiciary Machinery for Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes;

C. Arbitration and other Means of Settlement of International Disputes;

D. The United Nations and Regional Organizations as Factors Encouraging the International Rule of Law;

E. Facilitation of International Commerce and Economic Development Through International Law;

F. The Role of Lawyers in Development of the International Rule of Law.

IV. That the World Conference consider designating a "World Rule of Law Year" during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the international rule of law will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action, utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the World Peace Through Law program; and

V. That the World Conference approve a plan to establish on a permanent basis a "World Peace Through Law Institute" which shall have the following purposes:

A. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during World Rule of Law Year.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the international rule of law, including arrangements for periodic conferences of lawyers to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To effectuate decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the World Conference.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to impress upon them the vital necessity of establishing the international rule of law.

E. To study and make recommendations in respect to development of rules, principles and standards of international law defining and regulating matters of aggression, including use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare and political propaganda; and also establishing the necessary community sanctions, together with the right of self-defense, reprisals, and other means of prevention of aggression in international affairs.

F. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations desirable for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

G. To create new and expand existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and materials, and research on international law in order to create a complete, accessible worldwide source of information essential to further development of the international rule of law.

H. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world needed to create and strengthen the legal system and law rules required to achieve and maintain world peace, and to make from said funds grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

I. To stimulate and administer a coordinated global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organization to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of existing knowledge of international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties, or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of international law recognized by the community of nations which can form the basis and foundation for an improved international legal system;

4. Drafting of model codes dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

(a) International investment, to safeguard adequately the interests of both the capital exporting and the capital importing nations;

(b) Commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both producing and consuming nations;

(c) Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

(d) Nuclear test inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

(e) International arbitration, public or private, including a model clause compromissoire;

(f) International agreement on arms control and disarmament;

(g) Unification and harmonization of law in such fields as are practicable and desirable.

5. Engaging in a comprehensive study of the best and most efficacious system of specialized international courts, taking into account the varying legal traditions of different cultural and geographical groupings.

VI. That there be established a global system of regional Chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full Court would be permissible.

VII. That there be established an Asian Court of Justice with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

VIII. That in international matters, individuals, private organizations, juridical persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties before the International Court of Justice and its regional Chambers, and the proposed Asian Court of Justice.

IX. That the membership of the International Court of Justice be reconstituted to more accurately represent the many areas and legal systems in the world which are not now adequately represented on that body.

X. That arbitration procedures be unified and modernized, more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought, that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged, and that a system of reporting and disseminating decisions of arbitral tribunals be established.

XI. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XII. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XIII. That consideration be given to the changes in the structure of the United Nations which are essential to allow it more efficiently to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security under the rule of law.

XIV. That the U.N. Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that since it was written the world has undergone great change; that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled U.N. membership; that the tremendous achievements of science and technology have produced new and complex international relationships; and that the Charter is no longer adequate to meet the new and urgent needs of the peoples of the world of today.

XV. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly be given greater authority; and the International Law Commission be strengthened and authorized to meet continuously throughout the year.

XVI. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges, the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges, and professors of law.

CONCLUSION

We lawyers attending this Conference on World Peace Through Law pledge wholeheartedly and completely to devote ourselves to the foregoing program to the end that the rule of law will govern all men and all nations so they may pursue their legitimate aspirations in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

The Late Overton Brooks, of Louisiana

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our good friend and distinguished colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, was a great shock to all of us.

He was a man of high ideals and worked untiringly in the cause of good government. He had a profound knowledge of our Nation's problems and gave of his time and effort unstintingly. His counsel and guidance will be greatly missed for he was a dedicated American, devoted to his country and to his congressional district.

Back in 1952, in the 82d Congress, Minority Leader JOE MARTIN appointed me to serve at large on a special Armed Services Subcommittee going to Korea during the crucial days of the Korean war. The bond of friendship I formed with the chairman, OVERTON BROOKS, on that trip will be a wonderful memory as long as I live.

As first chairman of the newly created House Science and Astronautics Committee, OVERTON BROOKS was a pioneer in developing our space program and his vision and foresight were responsible in a large part for the rapid strides we made after an admittedly slow start. His accomplishments in the short years that he served as chairman will live in our Nation's history.

In the 16 years that I served with the gentleman from Louisiana, I was always inspired by his courage, ability, and dedication to his country.

I share with his countless friends their sorrow over his sudden passing and I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy. His colleagues in the House will never forget him.

Newswomen Who Cover the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the brightest members of the Washington press corps is Bonnie Angelo, of Long Island's Newsday. Bonnie, who was installed this month as president of the Women's National Press Club, is known throughout Washington not only for her great talent but also for her cheerful disposition. Editor and Publisher, on September 9, published an article about Bonnie Angelo, which I know will be of interest to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSWOMEN WHO COVER THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Gerry Van der Heuvel)

BONNIE ANGELO

First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy sat at the head table glancing frequently at the program in front of her. On the makeshift stage in the Statler's Presidential Room a little blond girl rode out on a tricycle and said her name was Carolyn, she was 3, and she "lives upstairs." She also volunteered such information as her mother's age and shoe size and that sometimes her daddy sat around with his shoes off doing nothing at all.

It was the Women's National Press Club's annual dinner and stunt night—the distaff version of the Gridiron Club's lampoon of Washington VIP's.

Wearing a $3.98 dress from a 5- and 10-cent store and a borrowed $385 blonde wig, the petite girl on the slightly oversized tricycle doing an impudent Eloise version of the President's daughter was raven-haired Bonnie Angelo of Long Island's Newsday.

SHE GOES ANYWHERE

Two days later she received the first annual Paul Tobenkin Memorial Award for "the Nation's best newswriting in the fight against bigotry."

Diversity is an acquired grace—an adaptability that city editors like to think the old-timers had but they don't come that way anymore.

When the likes of Bonnie Angelo comes along they shake their heads and wonder at the sudden benevolence of fate.

"I don't really have a beat," she says almost apologetically. "I just go where something's going on that looks like a good story."

Occasionally "something's going on" at the White House, at a congressional hearing, or down at Cape Canaveral.

The Tobenkin award was for her five-part series on the situation in Prince Edward County, Va., where the public schools were closed rather than submit to integration. Negro children were left without schools.

"The effect of Bonnie Angelo's series was considerable in stimulating public action to provide education of Negro children," the award committee said. "It was well reported, well documented, well researched, and extremely well written."

Bonnie and her husband, Harold Levy, and Leonard Baker comprise Newsday's Washington bureau.

Hal, bureau chief, does the "think pieces"—the interpretative stories, Leonard Baker concentrates on the local angle, and Bonnie usually comes up with the "people" stories that Alicia Patterson's paper handles so well in its three-column format.

In addition, Newsday syndicates its special features. The Chicago Sun-Times gave three- and four-column spreads 3 days running to Bonnie's stories from Cape Canaveral during the launching of the first American astronaut.

UP FROM THE SOUTH

Bonnie came up from Winston-Salem, N.C., stopping to do a stint at the fashion editor's and home furnishings desk at Newsday.

"In fact," she says, "you name the department and I've been in it—everyplace but the sports desk and I wouldn't be surprised if I landed there." And if she did she'd go out and learn every play in the Washington Redskins' book, finagle a pipeline to the Senators' dugout, and know every trout stream and deer track in Maryland and Virginia.

One gets the impression that Bonnie must have taken the alarm clock apart as a child and was so intrigued with what she found that she's been delving into inner workings ever since.

LEAST FEMININE MIND

Her good friend, Nancy Hanschman of CBS, and godmother of 19-month-old Christopher Levy, sums up Bonnie as "the most feminine of all people with the least feminine mind. She has a knack of getting to the heart of a story no matter what the subject."

Her husband and boss concurs with this.

"Bonnie is a superb reporter," he says. "She writes with a great deal of flair and does a good job no matter what the assignment."

"Of course, maybe I shouldn't be saying this," he laughts. "— this relationship gets somewhat involved—but we have great fun."

As a matter of fact, thanks to Bonnie, Hal is prowoman reporter oriented.

"Women reporters in Washington," he says, "have demonstrated they are just as able and in some cases more so. Whether a reporter is male or female should not be considered. It's the kind of job that is done. The male has no inherent talent for reporting that's greater than the female's. As far as physical hardships are concerned, Bonnie demonstrated during the Presidential campaign that she could keep up with the rest in going sometimes 20 and 22 hours a day."

Bonnie and Hal met in the newsroom of the Winston-Salem Journal. The first time they talked together Hal complimented her on a story she had done on the State parole system.

"Bonnie's cheerfulness helps her in her relations with other reporters," Hal says. "She's not overly aggressive—some women reporters are—but she's interested in everything and she's intensely curious."

THE PEALE TWIST

An abundance of curiosity has paid off in her work. This includes a preelection scoop which she shared with John Lindsay of the Washington Post.

A group of Protestant ministers, headed by Norman Vincent Peale, met in Washington with a total press blackout. According to Bonnie the participants had to show identification before they were admitted to the room and they were warned not to talk to reporters.

"If they hadn't been so secretive," Bonnie says, "I probably wouldn't have been interested in their meeting."

But they were and Bonnie was interested. She and Lindsay found a way to be at the closed session. They eavesdropped and reported what was said at the meeting. The press conference later was not nearly so all-inclusive.

Although her assignments are varied, and she finds this a satisfactory arrangement, Bonnie admits that playing the field has its drawbacks.

"Sometimes, I think it would be nice," she says, "to be a member of the 'club'—in the House Press Gallery, for instance, or at the White House, although I do feel at home there from covering the campaign.

Bonnie thought it was fun representing Newsday with Alicia Patterson coming out for Kennedy and Harry F. Guggenheim (her husband and coowner of the paper) being a stanch Republican.

"The other reporters would kid me," Bonnie says, "and ask which faction I was representing this week."

Presidential campaigns, even those they haven't covered, are of great interest to the Levys. They have an impressive collection of campaign and Presidential mementos dating back to the Civil War.

Adlai Stevenson has promised them a campaign handkerchief that his grandfather had when he ran for Vice President. They still have hope that it wasn't just a "campaign promise."

The Red Mein Kampf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in our present struggle it is essential that we understand that human freedom and dignity go hand in hand with improved economic strength and physical well-being; and that one without the other cannot long endure. We require a patriotic citizenry, sensitive and courageous and willing. There is an example of this in our midst, the International Latex Corporation and its founder, A. N. Spanel. Over the years by means of informative editorial advertisements in paid newspaper space they have reminded the free world of the strength produced by the value we prize and the threats the Kremlin poses.

As the most recent example of this patriotic effort, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial advertisement by A. N. Spanel which appeared in the New York Times on Friday, September 22, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED MEIN KAMPF

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

"Khrushchev's main dispute is with this country. His object is to secure surrender at Berlin by the United States. But he is seeking to secure American surrender by threatening the British, the French, and the West Germans.

"What Khrushchev has really been telling the British, French, and Western German representatives there, is not just that he has the bombs to annihilate them. He has been telling them, rather, that in any real crunch at Berlin, he will use his bombs first against Britain, France, and Western Germany * * * after that, of course, the Americans will not move a finger (so he says).

"This 'you-will-get-it-first' line gives ugly meaning to the publicly used word 'hostages,'

• • • Although the style is Hitlerian, even Adolf Hitler never used quite these tactics."

The above is an excerpt of an analysis by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Joseph Alsop. It appeared Friday in his column under the title, "Hitler Never Did This."

Obviously, Khrushchev's contempt spares none, not even the Russian people from whom he has kept the truth about his reckless nuclear testing. Even for them his stock in trade includes total censorship and falsification.

His brazen, cynical call for peace talks while he completes the entrapment of the East German people and their barbed-wire imprisonment, forces the comparison between Khrushchev and Hitler. So much so, indeed, that we are persuaded to reprint our article "The Red Mein Kampf," which first appeared in the press June 7, 1961.

No matter what transpired in the personal dialogs between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, "the war called peace" will go on until the terrible consequences are fully understood and there is a final return to sanity.

In the aftermath of the Vienna venture in summitry, it is all-important to remember that the fundamentals of the historic conflict between the two worlds cannot be altered by words or slogans or social amenities. The Kremlin's changes of tactics—its swings between "smiling diplomacy" and desk-thumping rage—must not again blind us to the inflexible objectives of world communism.

Those objectives have remained fixed, whether their chief spokesman was a Lenin, a Stalin, or an exuberant Khrushchev. They have been spelled out in all the basic Communist documents from 1917 to date. They add up to a total commitment to the conquest and burial of the freedom, the morality, the human dignity and the spiritual values by which the Western world lives.

This, in essence, was the point made brilliantly by one of our ablest journalists, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in a recent column in The Washington Post when he wrote:

"The place to examine Soviet objectives is not in the face of Nikita Khrushchev but the face of Communist dogma and practice. These objectives have not changed an iota from Lenin to Stalin to Khrushchev; and are expounded in the Moscow manifesto of December 1960, as openly as Hitler's plans in 'Mein Kampf.' Signed by the representatives of 81 Communist Parties, it represents the declared purposes of the Soviet Union and Red China."

The manifesto makes it clear:

That wars of national liberation—as in Laos and Vietnam—are "sacred wars," justifiable and desirable, never to be considered ended until they have brought Communist regimes.

That any non-Communist regime is automatically illegitimate and therefore fair prey to Communist attack of all kinds.

That peaceful coexistence means that the West must not join in defending any country against Communist attack and must not help any country which has temporarily lost its independence to Communist attack.

When, for tactical reasons Mr. Khrushchev's words and music may vary from the Moscow manifesto, the only safe course is to remember the Moscow manifesto, no matter how jovial Mr. K. seems at the moment.

Mr. Drummond then went on to express his certainty that Khrushchev will be unimpressed and uninfluenced by what our President says, because the Soviets respect only power and the will to use it. If Mr. Kennedy wants to leave no doubts as to American determination to resist Communist expansion, the only way to make it clear to the Soviet Premier is not by strong words but by demonstrating the power and the will to resist.

Though Mr. Drummond was writing shortly before the Vienna confrontation, nothing happened there to open his warning to question. On the contrary, it has been confirmed and fortified.

The meaningful elements in the fateful historic equation are power, intelligence, determination, and courage. But even if we have these, they will not suffice unless they rest on a solid foundation of free world unity. As long as the Western alliance is disoriented and enfeebled by conflicting purposes the Kremlin will continue to have the right-of-way in carrying out its grand design for world conquest.

In the perspective of time, indeed, the President's meetings with General de Gaulle before, and with Prime Minister Macmillan after, the exchange of views with Khrushchev are sure to prove much more significant than the Vienna episode.

We are persuaded that first priority, if we are to gain the initiative in the conflict with communism, must become the achievement of true unity in our own badly splintered world. On May 5, 1957, we wrote in these columns.

"We hold in our hands a greater deterrent against the Kremlin menace than the hydrogen bomb and missiles of global range. Its name is Unity, free-world unity of purpose, geared to a renewed confidence in Western civilization."

The need for that all-important deterrent is more urgent than ever before. Serious divisions within the coalition of free nations, more than anything else, embolden the Kremlin to drive more confidently and more recklessly toward its goals of world dominion.

All this is explicit in the Moscow equivalents of Hitler's "Mein Kampf." As long as we gear our emotions and our policies to Moscow's temporary tactics and slogans, we are condemned to remain victims of deception and self-deception. Red leaders from Lenin to Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung have spoken bluntly about their main advantage, namely the "contradictions in the camp of the imperialists." It is within our power to cancel out those contradictions and confront the monolithic enemy with a voluntary but resolute unity of our own.

Our way of life, yes, survival and growth of the whole world, depends on it.

Kennedy's Economic Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal published in its issue of September 25, 1961.

The letter deflates the Journal's editorial on inflation and gives concrete evidence of the correctness of the policy and goals of the Kennedy Administration.

The letter by Seymour E. Harris, political science professor at Harvard University deserves the attention and consideration of all thinking people:

KENNEDY'S ECONOMIC GOALS

Your editorial "The Fount of Inflation" (September 11) argues that inflation is not to be associated with steel wage-price spirals but with cheap money and reckless spending supported by the Kennedy administration. The noninflation of the Eisenhower administration is probably the result, it is held, of "relatively noninflationary policies of that administration."

This seems to the writer to be a wholly unsupportable position. First, the Eisenhower administration achieved almost the unachievable, an 8 percent inflation of consumer prices and 9 percent of prices of gross national product (GNP) in three peacetime years (together with substantial unemployment), a price record surpassed only once in the 20th century in peacetime.

Second, a study of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee showed that the major part of the inflation in wholesale prices other than farm and foodstuffs in these years was the result of inflation of steel prices. And the Eisenhower administration was largely responsible for the major steel agreement that contributed to this inflation. Today, the Kennedy administration has to live with the results of this agreement. Moreover, persistent rumors prevail that Mr. Nixon made a deal with the steel producers that they would withhold any rise of prices associated with the wage increase until after the election.

Perhaps the inflation was even greater than so far has been suggested. In the Eisenhower "peace" years the administration experienced a 16-percent increase in prices of the GNP.

What about the policies of the Kennedy administration? The Journal does not say that about two-thirds of the rise of expenditures for fiscal year 1962 over fiscal year 1961 is for defense; nor does it suggest that part of the rise in expenditures reflects underestimates of expenditures for fiscal year 1961 and 1962 of the Eisenhower administration. In the orgy of spending in fiscal year 1959 let us observe, with its $12 to $13 billion deficit, defense accounted only for 27 percent of the $9 billion rise of expenditures.

A point not mentioned by the Journal is that with the expected rise of the gross national product of about $40 billion in the first year of recovery revenues should rise by $10 to $12 billion annually and thus assure a balanced budget for fiscal year 1963 without any change in the tax structure. There may even be a surplus—on the assumption that the international crisis does not deepen.

Finally, what is the evidence of a cheap money policy? Is it that the Kennedy administration wants to provide the country with enough money so that interest rates do no rise so much as to abort the recovery through discouragement of investment? Is this the correct approach, or is it the Eisenhower one of starving the economy for money and thus contributing substantially to two recessions with large and increasing amounts of unemployment, probably costing the Nation substantially more than $100 billion, or at least 20 times the expected deficit for fiscal year 1962?

The genius of the Eisenhower administration in giving the country rising unemployment, price inflation in peacetimes, and shorter and shorter recovery periods—45, 35, and 25 months in successive rises—is not easily matched.

A restrictive monetary policy was an important contributory cause of our economic difficulties. In 3 Eisenhower years the expansion in monetary supplies was less than 1 percent per year, an amount clearly inadequate for an economy that should grow at least 4 percent per year. No 8-year period in generations has experienced such monetary restraints.

The goals of the Kennedy administration are maximum growth and minimum inflation. An Eisenhower record of about 2½-percent growth per year and 2-percent rise of prices in the relevant GNP deflator should

not please the supporters of Eisenhower economics. A goal of 4 percent or more rise of output per year and inflation of less than 1 percent (largely neutralized by improved quality of products), is the goal of the Kennedy administration. This is not an inflationary program, nor is it based on reckless spending; and should inflation threaten, the administration is prepared to use all anti-inflationary weapons: Not monetary policy alone, the Eisenhower weapon, but fiscal policy also.

And lastly, let me say that unless labor and business are reasonable in their demands, monetary and fiscal policy will not prevent inflation—that is, unless the monetary authority through restrictive monetary policies should invalidate the rise of wages and prices and thus bring on more robust depression.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Littauer Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

East Orange, N.J.: Nation's Cleanest City, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our communities continue to grow. Populations are more concentrated than ever. Man is gregarious and will enjoy the proximity of more of his fellows than ever in the past. This togetherness means mutual problems. One of these—the general housekeeping and beautifying of a town has been solved by East Orange, N.J., as described in this article by J. Robert Lackey in the Public Health News August 1961 for which I respectfully request inclusion into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST ORANGE, N.J.: NATION'S CLEANEST CITY, 1961

(By J. Robert Lackey, assistant health officer, East Orange, N.J.)

The city of East Orange is the proud winner of the 1961 title of "The Nation's Cleanest City." This fact was attested to on May 3, 1961, when the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up and Fix-Up Bureau in Washington, D.C., presented Mayor James W. Kelly, Jr., with the Ernest T. Trigg Trophy.

The award was based on the city's entry which describes the community effort expended in making the city a better place, in which to live, work, and play, through planned campaigns of community development and betterment. This is only the second year for East Orange in the annual contest. In 1960, the city was declared winner in its population class and also was judged the best first entry.

The East Orange program is spearheaded by a citizens' committee appointed by Mayor Kelly which is made up of representatives of the engineering, health, fire, and shade tree departments of city government, the board of education, and by representatives of the city council, garden club, woman's club, and the chamber of commerce. The committee is coordinated by Tom Cervasio who is supervisor of refuse collection for the engineering department.

The city's refuse collection contract provides for two "Clean-Up Week" collections each year when all residents are encouraged through various media to go through their residences and places of work to clean out useless or unneeded items. At the same time, they are urged to better maintain their lawns, hedges, fences, trees, gardens, homes, and other buildings to make East Orange a safer, cleaner, healthier, more attractive city.

The major spring project is participation by the city's 13 public and 6 parochial schools in an educational program to demonstrate the benefits of a clean, healthy, well-managed city. Each classroom of each school develops posters, slogans, poems, songs, skits, etc., to emphasize the merits of a cleaner East Orange. Entire assembly periods are often devoted to this topic. The committee spends an entire week visiting the schools to evaluate this participation, the cleanliness of the school, the classrooms, restrooms and halls, the school property, and the children themselves. The children are encouraged to work with their parents in cleaning, painting, fixing, and planting around their homes and properties. Special committees plan the supervision of the project for their school. Awards are given in three categories; public elementary, parochial elementary, and high school.

The spring Clean-Up Week program is thus largely promoted through the schools. The fall Clean-Up Week collection program is coordinated with Fire Protection Week. The clean-up committee was also instrumental in initiating an air pollution control program for the first time in the spring of 1961. The major emphasis in this effort was placed on the operation of building incinerators and oil-burning equipment in apartment and commercial buildings.

The health department has been an active and enthusiastic participant in these clean-up programs since they were started. The value of the program to the health department can be summarized as follows:

1. It brings about a citizen awareness of the benefits of a clean city.
2. It materially reduces potential rodent harborages.
3. It reduces the number of unsightly lots and ragweed-growing areas.
4. It is a sound action program that creates year-round good will.
5. It brings the department into close cooperative programing with a number of the other major departments, thus making it easier to get close cooperation throughout the year.
6. The school program is an outstanding health education demonstration on an annual basis which reaches the entire 12,000 schoolchildren.
7. The success of the program has brought widespread recognition to the city of East Orange and indirectly to all departments involved.

Ringing Declaration of American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in his ringing speech before the United Nations yesterday, President Kennedy made our position as a nation clear before the world—our willingness and desire to work for peace, coupled with our firm commitment to join freemen everywhere in standing up to their responsibilities.

As the Washington Post so clearly stated the issue this morning:

President Kennedy held up the vision of a world free of terror, of despotism, and of the weapons of mass extermination. In doing so, he in effect challenged the Russians across the board, on all the great issues of the day that threaten peace—their efforts to handcuff the United Nations, their manufactured crisis in Berlin, and their stalling on disarmament. * * *

Only time will disclose whether such words are wasted upon the Soviet Union; whether either (the President's) appeal for peace or his warning that we have the will and the weapons to defend a just cause will be heard; whether the grim facts of the world crisis any longer are open to the arbitrament of reasoned words. We must now wait upon the events of the crucial 10 months of which the President spoke. We will wait in better spirit and in firmer resolve because our cause has been well stated. What words can do for our purpose, our principles, and our policy they now have done.

Mr. Speaker, this was a truly great speech at a time when it was sorely needed, and I would like to join my many colleagues who have congratulated the President on his wisdom, courage, and insight at this critical period in our history.

Cutting the Dropout Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial broadcast in the public interest by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., station WBZ—WBZ–TV in Boston, Mass.:

CUTTING THE DROPOUT RATE

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ–TV)

Late last month WBZ joined in a widespread appeal to young people to return to school at the end of the summer vacation period. Classes have now reopened for the new school year, and we hope that very few youngsters have made the mistake of prematurely halting their education.

Today we'd like to follow this educational problem one step further. We'd like to show what individual communities can do in the coming year to see that those now in school stay on to earn their diplomas.

Educators have been concerned with the dropout problem for years. And here in New England we've done better than other parts of the country in holding our young people in school. Still the record should be improved in many communities. And two definite steps can be taken that will help do just that.

Surprisingly enough, one step is simply to improve students' reading ability. Reading difficulties are the source of many serious student problems. It's the youngster who can't understand his work, who can't keep up with his class who is most likely to quit school.

Programs have been developed that will greatly improve the reading of almost any student. Yet of our 250 Massachusetts high schools, less than half now offer this vital assistance.

The second way to attack the dropout problem is to develop good guidance programs. Studies in the State shown that where adequate guidance facilities are available, the dropout rate is cut roughly in half.

All but a handful of our secondary schools now have at least some guidance program. But in many places the ratio of students to guidance personnel is far too large for effective work. The average across the State is one guidance teacher to every 550 students. Leading educators, though, feel the ratio should be no higher than one to 300.

There will always be some youngsters who will not finish high school. And some dropouts are the result of personal problems beyond the community's control. But there are thousands of other youngsters who could be helped through school with improved reading and guidance facilities.

It costs money to attract and retain an adequate number of trained guidance personnel. It costs money to expand reading programs. But this money is an investment in youth and the overall community.

Tribute to the Late Representative Overton Brooks of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Overton Brooks," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of September 18, 1961, being a tribute to the late Representative Overton Brooks, of Louisiana.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERTON BROOKS

Few men on the American political scene—past or present—have bucked the political winds of partisan politics with the success of Overton Brooks. For 25 years he sat in the House of Representatives through 13 successive victorious elections. Efforts were made—though rarely—to unseat him both in his own Democratic Party's primaries and through Republican opposition in general elections. Always he swept to victory, usually with ease. He became known as unbeatable.

That, together with congressional seniority thus gained, plus indefatigable will to work for constituents even in the most insignificant matters, carried Mr. Brooks to high prestige in Congress—to House committee prominence rarely if ever equaled by any Representative from this State. For many years he was ranking Democratic member of the House Armed Services Committee. When the space age came and a new committee was necessary, Mr. Brooks was unanimous choice of his party in the House for chairman. He held that post at his death. Recently, a private industrial organization honored him as "Space Congressman of the Year." He was a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Smithsonian Institution Museum of History and Technology Building, and of the Government Operations Committee.

Of course Mr. Brooks benefited from the one party system of the South so far as general elections were concerned. But through a quarter of a century he was able to guide his political course in a manner that carried him from the original status in 1936 of "a Long candidate" to a point where at times he aroused both ire and support of both conservatives and "liberals" in and out of his party and yet could be defeated by neither. He was a capable political craftsman who never let himself be lulled into belief of political security by a big election victory. The end of one campaign, to him, simply was the signal to prepare for the next one.

Often those who had opposed Mr. Brooks vigorously in one campaign would support him in the next—or past supporters would turn to opposition. For example, his toughest fight for reelection was in 1942 when solid Shreveport union labor support, organized to a perfection rarely found in any one economic group in any election, kept him in office. Later votes on certain issues in Congress aroused antipathy among organized labor and support among business conservatives.

The strongest outbreak against Mr. Brooks came during the present session of the House when he voted with the Democratic Party to pack the House Rules Committee—a plan conceived by Kennedy and other liberal forces who hoped to speed action on Kennedy "liberal" legislation. Mr. Brooks had been reelected last fall by a substantial majority over general election Republican opopsition in a district where the GOP Nixon ticket gained a majority over two opposing tickets in Shreveport and Caddo and a large plurality in the congressional district as a whole. He had not endorsed the Kennedy-Johnson ticket until the afternoon before election. The result of this series of incidents was, for the first time in Mr. Brooks' political career, creation of an organized effort—immediately after he had won an election—to oppose him in the next election.

What the result might have been had Mr. Brooks lived is something no one can say. But his answer was to gird for battle at once and he had been carrying on his fight for 1962 from a hospital bed when death ended a career which had wrapped him in the mantles of unending victory for a quarter of a century.

Opposition to Mr. Brooks in campaigns and in connection with votes in Congress on highly controversial issues was purely political and partisan, never personal. Those who opposed him most strongly at times on the political front often were among his close friends in nonpolitical life. On his last trip to Shreveport—shortly before he had to undergo abdominal surgery in Washington—he visited and chatted cordially with some who had been most outspoken in criticism of his House Rules Committee vote.

The political philosophy of Mr. Brooks was built chiefly on one keystone: his party—the Democratic Party. He was, heart and soul, a Democrat in general political philosophy and, nearly always, in his votes. But he did not hesitate to go against National Democratic Party principles on issues such as segregation. Often he explained actions in Congress which brought some criticism with the statement that "I am a Democrat, I was elected as a Democrat on a Democratic Party ticket, and in the general operation and functioning of my party I stand behind it always."

There are literally thousands of persons in the Fourth District who can recall personal kindnesses, favors, or action in official capacity by Mr. Brooks in their behalf. No request was too insignificant in nature or too unimportant politically or otherwise to gain his help in personal or community problems unless departure from his established political beliefs was involved. Rarely did a person asking a favor—or a service—fail to get a personal reply to the request and personal action by Mr. Brooks or his staff.

Through his party seniority and prestige, and through his endless personal efforts, Mr. Brooks did much for his district, particularly in gaining and retaining military installations and in such fields as flood control and other waterway development. He was a devout churchman, a member of many professional and other organizations. He gained many honors and tributes through his work as a Congressman. The respect with which he was held in Washington as well as in Louisiana was demonstrated in the statements of regret expressed by high Federal, State, parish, and city officials, including President Kennedy, and by civic leaders locally.

The Times joins the people of Louisiana's Fourth Congressional District—as well as many others elsewhere who knew and respected Mr. Brooks—in extending sympathy and condolences to the surviving members of his family; especially to Mrs. Brooks and to their daughter, Laura Anne.

Milk and Politics Shouldn't Be Mixed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as I frequently have stated when discussing my national milk sanitation bill, sanitary regulations are for the protection of the public health and should not be used as trade barriers to protect local milk monopolies. By the same token, my national milk sanitation legislation is a sound, constructive and much-needed measure, and it should not be turned into a political football to be kicked here and there for political advantage.

An editorial in the September 20, 1961, Dairy Record takes the same view on this matter. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that editorial in the RECORD.

POLITICS REARS A VERY UGLY HEAD

To our recollection, the Midwest questioned neither the motives nor the integrity of Ezra T. Benson or other former Secretaries of Agriculture when they opposed National Milk Sanitation laws but now that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has given the National Milk Sanitation Act his qualified endorsement, he is accused by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and others in the East as being provincial and the motivation for his decision was his Midwest background.

Governor Rockefeller in his ill-tempered diatribe charged that passage of the Milk Sanitation Act would open the markets of New York's dairymen to a periodic flood of surplus milk from the upper Midwest and would mean disastrous results for the New York dairyman. It is very evident that someone put those words in the Governor's mouth; otherwise, he would know that this is highly improbable. Of course, no mention was made by the Governor of the steadily mounting surplus of New York milk that is going into manufactured dairy products, and with which Midwestern manufacturers

are finding it increasingly difficult to compete because of the maladjustment of the class 3 price under order 27 and the manufacturing milk prices in the Midwest.

Among others who went into a pet when Secretary Freeman knocked over some of the sacred cows (figuratively speaking, of course), of eastern markets sanitary requirements, was Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York. After Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, accused Governor Rockefeller of assuming a "horse and buggy" attitude, Senator KEATING's reply approached the height of asininity when he stated that Senator HUMPHREY apparently did not care about the health of New Yorkers and that "now that the presidential campaign is over, he is exclusively Minnesota bound." We defy Senator KEATING to produce any evidence that milk produced and distributed under the U.S. Public Health Service model code has ever endangered the health of anyone.

The whole point is that Secretary Freeman did not attack the milk sanitation regulations of any city or any State. However, because many eastern producer groups have made such a fetish of their allegedly higher milk sanitation standards than those recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service, a comparison was made by Secretary Freeman of the USPHS model code and the regulations in force in many of the eastern milk marketing areas.

Despite pious protestations to the contrary, many of the so-called health regulations set up by municipalities and States are not designed wholly to protect the consumer but rather as economic barriers. And when anyone claims that the health of the consumers is endangered when they use milk produced under the model code of the USPHS, he either is displaying his ignorance or is not being honest.

The unfortunate part of the discussion on the National Milk Sanitation Act is that it has been permitted to degenerate into a political brawl despite the fact that it is not being fought along political lines. And both parties have been equally culpable.

We have disagreed with Secretary Freeman on several occasions, but we credit him with giving an honest and sincere statement of his beliefs with reference to the Sanitation Act. It is our feeling that Governor Rockefeller and his political buddies are attempting to make political hay from Secretary Freeman's statement. We feel that Senator KEATING's remarks were better left unsaid and the same could be applied to those made by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who declared that Governor Rockefeller who probably is a likely candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964 has thrown away any chance he might have had to win the Wisconsin primary.

There are others who are doing their best to use the Sanitation Act as a way to build their political fences. To all of them we say a pox on both your houses. Let the issue be decided on its merits and not be used as a political football.

Drifting on the Potomac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I introduced legislation to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. A similar bill was approved by the Senate on August 2, 1961.

This legislation is receiving the support of organizations and individuals throughthe United States. Recently a resident of the Sixth Congressional District in Maryland, Miss Ada E. Clarke, sent me an excerpt from her father's diary concerning the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Her father, Mr. William J. T. Clarke was appointed to the Treasury Department by President Abraham Lincoln and was a Treasury employee of 53 years. He was also an excellent writer and his record of his 2-day trip down the Monacacy River and along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal in 1896 gives a picture of the C. & O. Canal as accurate today as it was over 65 years ago. The excerpt follows:

DRIFTING ON THE POTOMAC

It is only rational to indicate some reason for whatever you do. Therefore I say that under the pressure of work during the busy season, I began to feel that I was getting too much under the sway of its swirl, so I resolved to jump out of the vortex before I was swept in the undertow. So I took Will and went down to the depot, one Sunday morning, and got aboard a train, to go anywhere; saying I was going to hunt a spot to camp for a week or so, somewhere up the Potomac. We rode on the railroad for a couple of hours, and got out of the train in an open stubble field, about 2 miles from the Monacacy. We walked across the field and took a road leading down to the river, plucking some blackberries that grew on bushes in the dusky mystery of ditches; and also went in an orchard and plucked some few green apples.

At the river, we walked along some distance beside the canal, came to the locks, where was a store, the lockkeeper's house, and the dwelling of the man who kept the store, on the hillside in a small garden, among some trees. There were several boys at the lock, and one young man, with only one leg, whom I knew to be the son of the man who owned several small skiffs that were drawn up on the shore of the river. I asked him if he would hire a boat for me for a few hours, and he said they were all engaged. So I went into the store to inquire where I could get one; and bought some crackers and cheese, while the storekeeper told me all he could about the impossibility of getting a boat. They seemed to consider that there was something extraordinary and suspicious in this idea of seeking a place to camp; and by keeping up the conversation were trying to focus their judgment as to whether I really had any such purpose in my mind. I wasn't very sure about it myself, but I did not want them to find that out, as what I mostly was after was a boat, for I really wanted to float down the river. However, I knew that if they found that out they would not let me have a boat. The one-legged youth, whose opinion of me had been somewhat shaken by an undertone remark of one of the boys, who had known me at Comus, finally came to the conclusion that the boy was sinister in what he had said, and concluded to let me have an old boat that was tied up on the other side of the river. "Anything that will float, will suit me," I said. So we went down to the river shore, and got into a skiff and crossed the river, where we found an ancient bateau, chained to the gnarled roots of an old tree, where it had been decaying in the mud. It looked as if it had begun to vegetate, from long disuse; for these was a growth of grass in its seams, and it was liberally encased with mud, the woodwork, in parts, porous like cork in decay, for it had evidently been long abandoned.

"Will that suit you?" inquired the youth with a peculiar smile, as if he wondered if I was gawk enough to take it. "Will you guarantee it to float, and keep the water out?" "Oh, yes; it's safe enough, and dry." "Well," I said, "I don't care for looks, if you say it is safe." "I wouldn't dare to tell you it was all right, if it was not," said the youth, in a way that assured me. So Will and I got in the boat, and looked it over; then I paid for its hire, and said we were going to float down the river some miles, and I would send the boat back on a canal boat the next day.

"Oh, it don't matter," said the youth, "if it never comes back; we ain't got no use for it."

Will took up the oars, and pulled her out in the middle of the stream; letting her float down on the current, which made toward the snags of two trees, through which the boat shot on the incline of a fall. The banks of the river were overgrown with trees, that shaded the broad stream, which had high bluffs on either side. It was beautiful in the grandeur of the wilds of nature, for it was like floating through the solitudes of a wilderness that had never been explored.

It was a lovely bright day of golden sunshine, no breeze stirring, and in places where the stream ran deep, the surface was smooth as glass, with thistledown and dust floating on the water, and gossamer webs with a silvery flicker, were easily discernible, stretching across the stream, from the wildwoods and brush of the lonely banks, in the silence of the beautiful day.

We floated along all the afternoon, Will merely rowing the boat slowly in the pleasure he enjoyed, guiding her where the current was sluggish, and letting her go freely in the rapids, very much exhilerated, sometimes swinging in the swirl of an eddy, and hearing the caw of crows, as they lifted on wings of laboring flight from the trees. For the country through which we were passing on the stream was a lonely solitude, and we were in the deep valley with heights on either side covered with a dense growth of wild forests; the only signs of life being blue herons, seen now and then, standing solemnly at the edge of reeds where the shores were marshy in the shallows, and we could see the boulders that covered the bottom of the river, the green slimy grass waving in the flow of the water, which was only a few feet deep, and so clear we could see the big fish dart off and flash out of sight, and we could hear the dreamlike voices of birds in quiet lullabies of song that seemed the very echo of the drowsy leisure of the warm, pleasant day.

Then we came where the stream seemed to open its bosom in the slope of the long green hills, rising far away to the lone blue sky; with cattle browsing on the hillsides and down in lonely meadows of pasturage land. And here the river was parted in the middle in many islands, with swash-channels flowing between them, so that they were isolated in links of a long chain, one after another, in groups of trees, and with long-shelving beaches, like proud argosies in verdure breasting the stream with every sail outspread on tall majestic masts, sailing grandly toward the sun, the wind flipping coins of gold on their prows in glances of gilding sunlight.

Sometimes the point of an island, partly submerged, with white sandy beach and pebbles, would seem like the nose of a big fish, swimming swiftly, as it made its way against the flow of the current of the stream, that seemed to smile in a marl of shallow water, flicking silver and gold in the sunlight on the cluttering white pebbles and sparkling bubbles in the lightly lisping water, and we heard the flutter of wings as some big buzzards rose in flight from the carcass of a calf that had been swept down in a freshet; and on the shelving strand of smooth white sand, many silvery curlews with bright red eyes and twittering voices were hopping about very lively; and sand snipes, with long bills and slender legs,

were picking the worms hid among the pebbles on the beach, glistening rays of gold in the fiery blaze of sunlight, sweeping in a flood of warm, golden sunshine down the sylvan valley of the beautiful stream.

Drifting along on the lazy flow of the river, how dreamy seemed the day, in a land where it seemed always afternoon, the drowsy lull of tinkling cowbells, the humming of busy bees, the fragrance of the wild rose and honeysuckle, the pensive song of the phoebe bird that seems the very voice of the solitude, the lull of the water gurgling in the swift flow of rapids, and now by perpendicular bluffs of rugged grey rocks, overgrown with ivy, and with pendent vines of the trumpet flower in scarlet bloom, tall sycamores or the spires of cedars, the chatter of noisy bluejays; then by flat meadows stretching far inland, whence you could see the vapory violet that ever hovers on the mountains, far away in the distance on the verge of the sky; and floating by narrow gulches where the islands of trees slit the stream in twain, in openings like windows, as we slowly drifted by.

It was restful indeed to lie in the boat like a couch and drift along on the silent water, as the shadows of the trees began to walk and stretch in the elongation of the sun descending in the west in the rich glowing tints of evening, as we floated into the gloom of the lofty bluffs, at Balis Bluffs, opposite the meadows where some thousand men were slain in the early days of the War of the Rebellion, long, long ago. Slowly gliding and quietly slipping on a long stretch of sluggish water that was as smooth as ice and silent, with duck feathers, chaff of wheat, and fluff of thistle needles floating on the mirror-like water, glittering in silvery flashes, in the long gliding rays of the evening sun, now shining down the valley of the river. It was here we pulled into Edwards Ferry.

Garner Gives Stock in 10 More Banks to Southwest Texas Junior College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, since it is my honor to represent the district in Texas which includes Uvalde, the home of the renowned former Vice President of the United States, John Nance Garner, people frequently ask me about him, his health, and his activities.

It should therefore be of interest to many to read the article which appeared in the September 21 issue of the Uvalde Leader-News concerning Mr. Garner. I will add that Mr. Garner is enjoying good health. He continues to take a deep and sincere interest in governmental affairs and in the stability and well-being of our country.

Aside from his great contribution to the cause of good government, Mr. Garner has achieved distinction as a benefactor of mankind. That fact is evidenced by the recent contribution to the Southwest Texas Junior College, described in the following article from the Leader-News:

Monday of this week John Garner presented to Southwest Texas Junior College his stock shares in 10 Texas banks and Wednesday gave the college $100,000 in cash. Garner said he estimated the bank stocks worth at least $200,000.

Last month Garner gave the college his bank stock certificates at the La Pryor State Bank and the Zavala County Bank at Crystal City. This previous gift included controlling interest in the Zavala County Bank, amounted to an estimated $300,000 to $500,000.

Still previously to the aforementioned gifts the former Vice President of the United States gave $100,000 to Southwest Texas Junior College.

Bank stock gifts Monday of this week included shares in the following banks: Union National Bank of Laredo, American Bank of Commerce at Victoria, Stockmen's National Bank at Cotulla, Zavala County Bank at Crystal City, First State Bank & Trust Co. at Rio Grande City, First National Bank at Poth, First State Bank & Trust Co. at Mission, Groos National Bank at San Antonio, First State Bank at Three Rivers, and City National Bank at Colorado City.

In making the presentations Monday and Wednesday of this week Garner again stated to the college officials:

"Everything I have was obtained in this area and I decided to give it back where it came from. The people of Uvalde County and this area made it possible for me to have what I have. This is my way of showing my appreciation."

He also added that he had never had a chance to go to college but wanted a part in helping make SWTJC the best college in the country.

United States Shifting Concepts on U.N., Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, few of us gathered here today would deny that this Nation is facing a critical period for its very existence. Berlin, Cuba, Laos, the United Nations—each of these problems and many more demand courage and firmness if America is to continue as the free world's leader. Vacillation and indecision in these critical days may even signal the ultimate defeat of this Nation.

In realization of these bunt realities of national survival in the nuclear age, the Kennedy administration is gradually reviewing the idealistic concepts which it brought to office last winter. A careful ear is now listening to those critics and advisers who have advocated a more realistic policy of aiding our reliable allies and conducting a foreign policy with our national interest as the prime consideration.

The gravity of present world tensions necessitating a critical review of this administration's foreign policy demands the urgent attention of every citizen. In the belief that my colleagues will benefit greatly I am enclosing two Minneapolis Sunday Tribune articles from its editorial section of September 24. I commend these thoughtful words for the careful consideration of all Members of the Congress:

TOPIC OF THE WEEK—U.S. SHIFTING CONCEPTS ON U.N., FOREIGN AID
(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Pinpointing trends in official thought is hazardous. A supposed trend may be no more than a flimsy and fleeting confirmation of the beliefs of the beholder.

It is with reservations, therefore, that one may tentatively conclude that the Kennedy administration has moved away from idealistic concepts of America's role in the United Nations and as the supplier of economic aid to one and all.

With some degree of safety, however, it may be said that the Kennedy administration reflects a deep disappointment in the United Nations as an agency based upon the realism of the division of world power.

This will not necessarily be reflected in President Kennedy's speech to the United Nations. Public policy still calls for a brave front on the potential of the world organization.

Also, with some degree of safety, it may be said that the Kennedy administration has turned a critical eye on continued aid to neutral nations which are not thought actually to share U.S. ideas on world order. Aid to Ghana, Yugoslavia and other countries is under reexamination.

What may be developing is not a rejection of either the United Nations or generous foreign aid, but what some would consider more realism in the pursuit of American self-interest in both the United Nations and foreign aid.

Two high-level officials are playing an important part in this. One is the President's brother, Robert F. Kennedy, who ranges far afield from his Cabinet position as Attorney General. The other is Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Attorney General Kennedy played a critical part in the decision to withhold aid for the construction of the Volta Dam in Ghana.

FULBRIGHT is now expounding what he calls a "concert of free nations" which, were it ever to exist, would undoubtedly render the United Nations less a world force than it is today.

The concert of free nations would, by consultations, make world decisions, particularly in the Atlantic Community, as they were made by a concert of European nations in the 100-year period from the Congress of Vienna to World War II.

This conception leaves little room for the strengthening of the United Nations. Strengthening the U.N.'s executive authority is a professed American policy. But there is nothing mutually exclusive about moving for a stronger United Nations and for a concert of free nations at the same time. There are certain contradictions of an important nature involved, but one project does not necessarily kill off the other.

It can be seen that what bothers the critics of the U.N. most is the sham of world democracy. Every nation has a vote. Upper Volta's vote is cast at the same weight as that of Russia or the United States. This is not realistic. It has no relation to world power. Major world power lies now with two nations, the United States and Russia.

This is so well known that the United Nations cannot take any effective action without the backing of one power or the other. In almost every case the United Nations action has been taken with the backing of the United States and over the opposition of the Soviet Union, and in one case with the backing of the United States against the opposition of England and France.

FULBRIGHT makes the case that revising the United Nations Charter to make the world organization the true residuary of world power is fatuous. What is being talked about is many generations ahead. The United States, no less than Russia, will op-

pose submitting its self-interest to the judgment of nations as yet unprepared to govern themselves.

Dag Hammarskjold's death, of course, magnifies the problem. If he is, as some say, irreplaceable, the United Nations will in the future be even less effective in the enforcement of its idealistic aims.

But the United Nations cannot be, and will not be, abandoned by the West if only for the reason that it represents the idealistic concepts of Western thought.

Behind this front, however, may be developing something more nearly like what FULBRIGHT is talking about. He is talking about the strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a political as well as military instrument.

He is talking about the expansion of such agencies as the European Common Market, the Organization for Economic Development Cooperation, the Coal and Steel Community, and other agencies which draw the Atlantic community toward common purposes and policies. He sees the beginnings of an Atlantic community parliament.

It is within such a political formation that major decisions in the free world would be made through an established machinery of consultation.

FULBRIGHT's exploration more nearly reflects the realities of world power as they exist today than does the United Nations. It may well be that the Kennedy administration as a whole is moving in this direction. It is certainly moving toward a better understanding of the sad truth that power and force, and not ideas, must balance the world today.

CONCERT OF FREE NATIONS?

Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in an article in Foreign Affairs quarterly that is especially timely because of the current impasse at the United Nations, recommends that a concert of free nations be formed in order to unify effectively the forces of freedom.

As Richard Wilson points out elsewhere on this page, FULBRIGHT makes such a recommendation because he feels that the United Nations, although it was designed to form just such a concert, has fallen far short of the hopes which attended its creation.

FULBRIGHT emphasizes that the Soviet Union's demand for the reorganization of the U.N. secretariat on the troika principle is aimed at emasculating the U.N. and reducing the office of the Secretary General to the same impotence which blights the functioning of the security council. The veto, of course, is responsible.

The death of Dag Hammarskjold obviously gives the Soviet Union a new opportunity to insist on its reorganization plan. Whatever the outcome of the Soviet demand, the prospects are that the United Nations will emerge from its current session in a weaker rather than in a stronger state.

As a consequence, there is much to be said for Chairman FULBRIGHT's approach. He points out that his objective should be pursued inside the United Nations insofar as possible, but that it also should be pressed outside of the U.N. through such other existing instrumentalities as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Common Market, the European Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and other agencies which already link the Western nations.

In fact, as Chairman FULBRIGHT points out, article 2 of the NATO treaty provides for the development of the nonmilitary potentialities of the Atlantic community in these words:

"The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them."

This provision never has been implemented, but perhaps the time is ripe to consider doing so. It should be emphasized that what FULBRIGHT recommends is a "concert of free nations" made up of an "inner community" of the North Atlantic nations and an "outer community" embracing much or all of the rest of the non-Communist world.

In such an organization, the inner community of Western Atlantic countries still would provide economic aid to the underdeveloped nations for sound development program, would respect the sovereignty of the new countries and would consult them on specific common problems. But such an organization also would encourage a greater sense of responsibility among the underdeveloped nations than now exists, and admit them to partnership only when they earn it. Such a concert of free nations would be a community rooted not only in common peril but also in common values and aspirations. As such, FULBRIGHT reminds us, it would serve as a "realistic accommodation between our needs and our capacity."

The Muzzling of Maj. William E. Mayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the alleged political activities of General Walker are only an excuse for getting rid of a competent, outspoken opponent of Communist penetration and subversion.

The real reason for muzzling the military is to remove one of the irritants that prevent the creation of a favorable climate in which the Stevensons, Bowles, Schlesingers, and so forth, might negotiate with and appease the Kremlin. The muzzling of Maj. William E. Mayer is proof of the fact that Walker's alleged political activities are not the real reasons for his persecution.

The Members of Congress may be interested in my letter of September 22, 1961, to Senator STROM THURMOND, in which I discuss the Major Mayer matter and its relation to the policy of this administration in clamping down on the military's discussion of Communist aggression:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1961.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First, let me congratulate you on your splendid and tireless efforts which resulted in the Senate's decision to investigate the muzzling of our military men in connection with their informing and instructing the boys in the service and others about the strategy and techniques of the Communist conspiracy to subvert the free world as part of its drive for world domination.

From what I know as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, it is shocking and incomprehensible that the administration should prevent anyone, much less our informed military officers, from instructing men in the armed services and the American people about the dangers and subtleties of the new weapon of modern warfare, namely, Communist internal subversion.

We're spending billions to protect this Nation from the missiles and nuclear weapons of the Soviets if the current struggle develops into a shooting war. At the same time we would deprive our boys and people of knowing how to defend themselves from the weapons that are presently being used against them in the so-called cold war.

Frankly, Senator, I'm actually sick inside about this and other soft-on-communism policies we are following, because we're losing this fight on all fronts. I did not intend to make a speech in this letter, since you know these things as well, if not better, than I.

My real purpose in writing you is to call to your attention a stupid and frightening incident of muzzling which those responsible for this edict cannot brush aside on the basis that the officer muzzled is an eccentric, uninformed, or mixing politics with his pronouncements.

Maj. William E. Mayer, now assigned to the Army Command and General Staff College, was the chief neuropsychiatrist of the U.S. Army in charge of the task force responsible for the rehabilitation of returned American prisoners of war who had been unbelievably brainwashed by the Chinese Communists.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of Major Mayer's address made some time ago before the Freedom Foundation. This address was taped and has been heard since by many people. The Taft Broadcasting Co. of Cincinnati, as a public service, recently broadcast this taped speech of Major Mayer.

The people of the Cincinnati area were so impressed with what Dr. Mayer had to say that, as a result of public demand, he was invited to make a television appearance over the Taft station, WKRC–TV, at which time he answered questions of a panel concerning his experience with Communist brainwashing techniques.

Xavier University and Our Lady of Cincinnati College, in my district, as a result invited him to speak on the same subject matter. The major accepted enthusiastically. But the other day Major Mayer was compelled to cancel these appearances.

I am herewith enclosing a copy of the lead editorial of the Cincinnati Enquirer of Wednesday, September 20, 1961, entitled "The Plague Hits Cincinnati." This exceptionally well-written editorial states the case against the muzzlers far better than I can. As the Enquirer editorial points out:

"Major Mayer is no wild-eyed fanatic, no crank, no crackpot. He is, instead, a solemn, thoroughly informed, articulate young physician, whose splendid talents led to his appointment as chief neuropsychiatrist in the Army task force responsible for rehabilitating American prisoners in the Korean war * * * he knows, perhaps better than any other American, the shortcomings and the inadequacies that converted one-fourth of our Korean war prisoners into collaborators and one-tenth into informers."

The Enquirer editorial concluded with this statement:

"Here was a brilliant, dedicated, thoroughly equipped young American with a story that his fellow Americans needed to hear. That he has now been denied the opportunity to tell that story is an outrage for which 'stupid' is too charitable an adjective."

As you know, the 81 Communist Parties met in Moscow last December. It was decided there that an all-out effort had to be made to discredit and destroy anti-Commu-

nist organizations and activities, particularly in the United States. It is appalling but within a few weeks after that Moscow meeting there began in this country an all-out attack on anti-Communist persons and programs. I don't need to document for you the innumerable incidents that have taken place. Your investigation will no doubt disclose who started the agitation to kill the anti-Communist Defense Department seminars, which were originally inaugurated as a result of a National Security Council suggestion in 1958.

May I respectfully suggest that your committee inquire as to whether or not the muzzling of the military could be part of the program of certain people in the State Department who feel that they can negotiate a settlement with the butchers of the Kremlin of the world tensions created by them in their drive for world domination. Perhaps your committee could determine whether these starry-eyed appeasers helped promote this idea of the muzzling of the military in order that there might be created a more favorable climate or atmosphere in which they could carry on their negotiations with the Kremlin. Could it be that these State Department appeasers feel that the attacks on the Communist conspiracy by the military are an irritant that must be removed because it prevents a favorable climate or atmosphere? To my mind it is a combination of the two factors I have discussed in this letter which led to the muzzling of the military and the removal of the film of the Communist-inspired riots against the Committee on Un-American Activities from Defense Department training courses.

In any event, the case of Maj. William E. Mayer, in my opinion, would be an excellent one with which to start your investigation because the authors of this muzzling policy cannot excuse this frightening directive on the pretense of political meddling.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON H. SCHERER.

Address of Hon. John Volpe, Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1961, the Honorable John Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at Utica, N.Y., delivered before the convention of Italian-American War Veterans, a most inspiring speech. Those of us who, like the Governor, are of Italian descent, are proud of the record of accomplishments that has been attained by our fellow Italian-Americans in all fields of activities in the land we all love so well. I am privileged, Mr. Speaker, to have Governor Volpe's address made a part of the RECORD:

All of us here have known or felt the best of two worlds—the Old World from which we stem—Italy, that land of glorious and imperishable history; the New World in which our roots have been sunk—America, land of freedom and opportunity to which we have given our allegiance and our hearts.

As you are, I, too, am descended from immigrants. My parents came here at a time when all roads—just as they once led to Rome—led to America, a land whose special inner air and inner light sang of equality and opportunity for all.

America—a land which promised that man could rise above poverty or the circumstances of his birth if only he would work hard enough, perservere long enough, and hold fast to faith and courage.

That promise was fulfilled for me as it has been for many of you. I worked with my hands—as my father before me had done—until, under our system of free enterprise, I began my own business which prospered and, as time went on, became Governor of Massachusetts.

Is there any other country in all the world which has written so many success stories as this beloved land? There is not. But while we hold America in our hearts we share a special warmth for the land of our ancestors.

I'm sure that many of you—in both war and peace—have trod the soil of Italy and felt at home as you marveled at its beauty or were saddened in some places, at its poverty.

I, myself, have been to Italy several times, traveling many of its 19 regions.

I went to Abruzzi, that region of majestic mountains from which my parents came; to Tuscany; to Piedmont; to Rome to the See of Peter; to many other places. My visits deepened my pride of heritage and my love of America—for Italy and America are very close in heart.

There is not a schoolchild in the world today who would not be at home in Rome and Italy, seeing before him the landmarks of history he has studied.

There is not an adult who does not savor the overwhelming sense of history there. That was proved last year when the Olympic games took place in Rome on sites more than 2,000 years old.

Marathon runners came flashing down the Appian Way, built some 400 years before Christ, dashing past some of the world's most famous monuments—the Arch of Titus in the Roman Forum, the Arch of Constantine, the Coliseum which was Europe's first skyscraper, built just 80 years after Christ.

Down in the Caracalla Baths, gymnasts were doing their tricks; there was wrestling in the Maxentius Basilica; and in the crater left by an ancient vocano on Lake Albano, the rowers plied their oars.

Ghosts of ancient Rome smiled over the shoulders of hundreds of thousands of spectators. Yes, we have much to be proud of—for more than any other people, Italians have the strongest ties with America.

America was founded by one Italian, Christopher Columbus, who came to the outskirts of our land; it was named after another, Amerigo Vespucci, who was the first to touch the mainland of this continent when he landed in South America, 5 years after Columbus' discovery, to gather information for maps.

What Amerigo did for South America, two other Italians, John and Sebastian Cabot, did for North America. Cabot has been a famous American name through the centuries—but many people fail to realize it is Italian in origin. John Cabot was really Giovanni Cabotto, a Genoese who became a Venetian citizen before establishing himself and his son Sebastian in England.

From England, the Cabots set out to explore North America, and on their explorations and maps, England based its claims to a portion of this hemisphere. It was a long time before Englishmen ventured to make the voyage accomplished by the Venetians.

There has never been an explorer to equal the exploits of Marco Polo, the Venetian, who penetrated China, Tibet, Abyssinia, and all of Asia in the 13th century, to leave a fascinating record for posterity.

The genius of our ancestors was not limited to exploration. St. Thomas Aquinas, who came from Aquino, is still the greatest philosophic genius who ever lived.

And in all the centuries since they died who has there been to surpass Leonardo, Michaelangelo, Botticelli, Titian, or Rafael? Or to match Galileo, Petrarch, Virgil, Cicero? The Rubicon is a tiny dried-up stream today; but who has forgotten the name?

The Rubicon lies in Savignano in the Emilia region. In the days when Julius Caesar commanded the Roman legions—and the Roman Senate feared the power of those legions—the senate posted an edict on the banks of that river. It said: "General or soldier, veteran or conscript, armed person, whoever you may be, stop here; and let not your standards, nor your arms, nor your army cross the Rubicon."

This is the edict that Julius Caesar defied when he led his battle-scarred veterans across the Rubicon and on to take control of Rome with the famous cry: "The die is cast."

Yes, every one of us has much to live up to in our heritage. And we should conduct ourselves in our business and private lives with principled integrity, honesty and courage—so that we reflect only honor on the name "Italian."

In the final analysis, man's important task is to be true to himself. If he is true to himself, then he cannot, as Shakespeare pointed out, be false to any man. Men in public life, especially, must be strong enough to use as their yardstick of measurement, not what is popular but, what is right?

You cannot please everybody; if you try that, you have a sure formula for failure.

The Italians have a little story to prove you can't please everyone. I heard it many times from my mother—and no doubt many of you also heard it in your homes.

This is the way I heard it:

"Il mondo deva parlare: 'Una volta, c'era in abruzzi, un padre e suo figlio di dieci anni chi avevano un ciucio. Daveve andare in campagna.'

"Il padre disse a suo figlio: "Tu vai a cavallo, e io cammino.'

"Le persone parlare, e disse cosi: 'Ma, che ragazzo sensa chure. Il padre cammina, e suo figlio va a cavallo.'

"Il padre disse: 'Tu figlio, tu cammini e io varo a cavallo.'

"Dopo un poco cammino, le persone guardi: 'Che padre crudele. Lui va a cavallo e il figlio cammino.'

"Il padre disse: 'Sciamente, no due portiamo il ciugo sulle spalle. Il mondo deva parlare e possiamo condedare a nessuno.' "

In the last 2,500 years, the world has gained much knowledge, but it has gained little wisdom. In our lifetime, we have seen three wars—you have all served our country in one or more of them, as I did. There is not one of us who does not understand the meaning of the words, "War is hell."

We stand again today in a time of great danger. Science has brought us to that point where the world can choose destruction or a greater civilization.

Yet we can look on the world from almost any window and see trouble brewing somewhere. Thunder is rising over Berlin—and the world asks itself: Will reason prevail in the mind of the Russian dictator? Or will annihilation erase civilization? Now, as never before, man needs a deep spiritual strength to guide him.

It does us little good to mourn over those mistakes which today make possible the Berlin crisis—mistakes made in an earlier myopic time when this country bartered secretly with its then-ally, Russia.

We allowed a divided Germany in the past, but the time has come when we must make a stand at last. We cannot allow the Russians to drive us out of Berlin with the pretext of turning over the East German Government to their henchman, Walter Ulbricht.

With England and France, we are committed to Berlin. We cannot run out on our obligations to fulfill those commitments and protect the free world from the steady encroachment of communism. If Berlin

was worth fighting for a dozen years ago, it is worth it today.

If we back down on Berlin, we will be forced to back down all over the free world.

There is an old Latin maxim, "Si vis pacem, pare bellum." ("If you want peace, prepare for war.")

We yearn for peace, but we must not compromise the principles at stake in the ideological war. To compromise with evil is a worthless expediency. We must do whatever is necessary with speed and dispatch: Bolster our Armed Forces, increase our bomber production, rehabilitate and modernize our Navy's ships, 80 percent of which were built during or before World War II.

When we make a stand in Berlin, it is not a matter of defending a people who a few short years ago were making war on us—a war which all of us here remember full well.

No, what we are doing today is defending a way of life in the world, defending the rights of people to freedom and self-government. If the atheistic dictatorship of the Soviets subjugates West Berlin, it can subjugate all the people of the free world, including the United States.

We have learned we cannot trust the Communists. They are masters of duplicity. Their words and their actions belie one another. On the one hand, they cry peace. On the other, they stir the cauldron of war. Wherever their Government has reached, there the people know not the meaning of the word "freedom."

Winston Churchill said this about the Communists: "A Communist is like a crocodile. When it opens its mouth, you cannot tell whether it is trying to smile or preparing to eat you up."

Well, we can't let ourselves become so weak that the Reds get the idea they can eat us up in Berlin or any other place in the free world.

At Yalta and Potsdam Stalin promised that the East Germans could make their own self-determination in free elections. Khrushchev repeated this promise in Geneva in 1955. The Soviets should honor that promise today at a time when they say they want to get out of Berlin. The West would abide by whatever the East Germans decided in a free election—and to insure its freedom, the election should be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.

It is a farce and a lie to insist that the people of East Germany choose communism as a way of life—this is proved by the 1,500 people who have been fleeing to the West every single day from Communist Germany. They have been, as West German officials put it, voting with their feet against the Red regime.

Free elections would solve the problem of Germany and prevent war. Though all the world fears war, Russia has a greater reason to fear it than anyone else. Between the Soviets and the West, lie 100 million captive Europeans. Their hatred of Red domination is so great that should Russia turn her guns and her face away from them to fight the West, they would set upon her from the rear and help destroy her.

Khrushchev hopes to frighten the West with his rattling of nuclear armaments. Recently, he boasted to Britain's Ambassador to Moscow that he had Western Europe at his mercy. Moscow would need just six H-bombs, he said, to wipe out Britain and nine more H-bombs would take care of France.

The answer of France and England is to stand firm against the cyclone in the East, it is the answer of all of us.

It would be the answer of the Russian people if they were allowed to open their minds to the world—if they were not insulated from truth by their leaders and fed distortions and lies.

At the Governors' conference last month in Hawaii, we urged a national fallout protection program for the United States. We suggested that legislatures legalize State income tax deductions, exempting the cost and value of fallout shelters—to encourage Americans to plan an insurance program for survival. The will for survival and preparation for it is also the strongest deterrent to any war.

We must continue to negotiate, but we must not fail to prepare on every level, military and civilian. And we must never compromise with principle, for the temporary safety we buy can be reduced to ashes very quickly with the next Communist aberration.

In 1956, Khrushchev told his people, "A Communist has no right to be a mere onlooker." And to prove it through the years, the Reds banished to Siberia thousands they thought were too apathetic to the cause.

In our democratic society, we can be active or passive and no one punishes us. But each one of us has a moral obligation to commit ourselves on the side of freedom, to defend our Government and our way of life. We have a responsibility—each one of us—to preserve the special glory attached to the name "American."

We are a Nation founded on the philosophy that all men are cauldron of God. The Communist philosophy says there is no God. This is a philosophy so completely foreign to the heart and soul of man that it cannot endure forever. As Pope John said: "Ideologies which do not take the profound aspects of man into consideration, cannot last."

In preserving our freedom we preserve that of the world. The words spoken by Thomas Paine back in 1776 are still true today. "The cause of America, is, in great measure, the cause of all mankind."

We have solved many terrifying problems in the past, and we will solve this one, with God's help, and that spirit which is found only in America—that spirit which recognizes every man has a soul and is entitled to walk upright in human dignity among men and before God.

Now, a moment ago, I mentioned that in our democratic society we can be either active or passive. In closing, I should like to make a comment on that theme.

All who are members of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, have in the past, taken up arms in defense of our great country. There was nothing passive about that, that was an active effort if ever there was one.

We did our jobs and we have returned to private life; and now as citizens, we can either be active or passive.

I should like to commend to you this evening the active role in civilian life for all Americans of Italian extraction. Although you belong to this great organization, it must always be remembered that you are citizens first and veterans second.

As former President Eisenhower said, "In these troubled times, it is as necessary that we get behind our President as it is in times of actual war."

So let us actively support our Government, and one way to do this is to seek public office and responsibility ourselves. I should like to see more Americans of Italian extraction actively seeking public office, filling public posts of responsibility, and taking on the job of actively producing the kind of government that we all want in this great country of ours.

A lineage which has produced the leadership of the civilized world, which has produced many of the world's greatest personages in culture, arts and letters certainly has the talent and the ability to produce leadership in our great country today.

United States Studies Fish Flour Use To Aid Undernourished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the FAO conference now in progress in Washington on the subject of fish in nutrition has focused attention once again on the use of fish flour as a valuable supplement to human food.

This subject, Mr. Speaker, is no longer a matter of interest only to the fishermen in my district and to the plant there where fish flour is made.

This product has been endorsed by Secretary of the Interior Udall and by Food-for-Peace Director George McGovern in their addresses to this conference. And the President himself urged the mobilization of our scientific forces to utilize the sea as "our major untapped source of food."

The scientific papers presented at this conference, Mr. Speaker, have left no doubts as to the nutritional merits of this food. They have been unanimously in favor.

And I am pleased to note now that this product has become of interest to the business community. Our interest is not just humanitarian, not just a matter of helping our foreign policy—fish flour now promises to be a healthy new industry for States with fishing fleets.

The Journal of Commerce points this out in its page 1 column of September 21, 1961, and I include it at the conclusion of my remarks:

UNITED STATES STUDIES FISH FLOUR USE TO AID UNDERNOURISHED

WASHINGTON.—Who's for some nice hot fish-flour pancakes this morning? Or how about some delicious fishmeal ladyfingers for dessert tonight?

Before you turn green, consider for a moment the unlimited possibilities of using fish flour and meal as a high-protein food for the world's starving millions.

The U.S. Government certainly is giving it a lot of serious thought, and at a high level, too.

Earlier this month, for example, Secretary of State Dean Rusk wired 98 of his diplomatic posts scattered around the underdeveloped world to start thinking about the prospects for introducing fish concentrates into the diet of their areas.

SPUR TO ECONOMY

Increasing use of fish meal and flour not only will alleviate malnutrition and protein deficiency, he said, but it could also spur the economies of many of these countries by stimulating development of industries to produce and process the needed raw materials.

George McGovern, President Kennedy's Food-for-Peace Administrator, has long thought that the oceans, as a relatively untapped food source, hold immense promise for a world dangerously short of protein. What's more he feels there is no more inviting source of abundance.

Quite seriously, Mr. McGovern says that he recently "enjoyed a whole meal from

soup to dessert with fish flour in every dish, and it was delicious." Chemical treatment in the grinding of whole fish into flour and meal removes the fat, the smell and the impurities, he explained.

SURPLUS INSUFFICIENT

Mr. McGovern's interest in fish concentrates stems from his knowledge that the U.S. food surplus, big as it is and important as it is to poorer nations, cannot provide the protein needed in the diets of these countries. But fish, he said, would.

NEW SOURCES SOUGHT

Another Cabinet officer taking a long look at fish nutrition is Interior Secretary Stuart L. Udall. He challenged scientists at a meeting this week of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to come up with new sources of food for the world's exploding population. The sea, he said, is the place to start looking.

The Government's interest in fish concentrates, interestingly enough, stems from the drastic decline in fishmeal prices last year brought about when Peru started production at its extensive new facilities. FAO met in March to study ways of stabilizing prices by boosting consumption, and the result was a new focus on fish concentrates for human consumption.

Estimating that 500 million people now suffer chronic protein deficiency, FAO experts figured it would require 5 millions tons of fish concentrates annually to satisfy their dietary requirements.

Current world production is about 2 million tons, so the U.S. Government feels there's lot of room for expansion.

J.F.K.

"Unjustifiable Leniency"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the unusually high rate of violent crime in Washington, D.C., demands firm and vigorous action by the courts. Justice may be tempered with mercy—but the strong obligation of the courts must always be to protect life, limb and property of decent, law-abiding people.

The North Washington Council of Citizens' Associations, in a documented resolution adopted September 16, 1961, protested the bestowing of "unjustifiable leniency" on those who have chosen deliberately to live outside the law.

The council, which is composed of 10 neighborhood associations, made the valid point that the punishment must fit the crime if we are to deter the growing number of rapes, murders, and assaults that plague our Nation's Capital.

I concur in the views of the North Washington Council. The police department is doing a commendable job. But, in far too many instances, the speedy arrest of criminals is being negated by minimum sentences and/or probation.

I hope that everyone who is interested in making Washington a more safe place to live and visit will read and study this resolution. It follows in full:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1961.

At the regular monthly meeting of the North Washington Council of Citizens' Associations, held on September 13, 1961, the following statement was unanimously adopted:

"District residents have felt for a long time that our crime rate could be diminished if the punishment were made to fit the crime. It is morally wrong that we request and permit our Metropolitan Police to risk their lives to apprehend criminals, delinquents, etc., when our judges are not handing out sentences stiff enough to deter future offenses."

There are innumerable examples—the most recent being the case of Morris A. Kent. This boy, aged 16, who has been arrested in connection with 3 rapes, and assaults on 8 women here, has a record of housebreaking, dating back many years. Thanks to the completely unrealistic attitude of the social workers, who sympathize with the criminal rather than with his victims—the inexcusable negligence of the judge, in accepting their recommendations for leniency, in view of the crimes perpetrated, this youth, who should have been punished, and then re-educated and rehabilitated many years ago, has now developed into a menace to the law-abiding residents of the District.

Another example is Deboyce Jackson, a man with a record of traffic violations and convictions, dating back to 1948. This man has been held by the grand jury on charges of homicide, drunken driving, speeding, and operating a car on a revoked permit, after having killed a 5-year-old boy with his car. He has been charged over the years with 37 traffic offenses, including ignoring stop signs, drunken driving, driving recklessness. His operator's permit and tags have been suspended three times and were revoked and never restored in 1954. This man has on occasion been sentenced to a fine of $100—or 90 days—and has in each case paid the fine. We feel that the judge involved was too lenient—there should have been no alternative but a stiff jail sentence.

After the body of the Condetti boy was found, approximately a year ago, and it was discovered that the boy had been in the hands of a sexual pervert, the Evening Star carried the statement that "the police department knew of 500 persons, any one of whom could have been responsible for the crime." If the police know of these persons, it would seem obvious that they had already been in the hands of the police. Why are these 500 perverts allowed to go free—to make our highways, parks, and playgrounds unsafe; not only for adults, both male and female, but also for innocent children who are unaware of the danger they are in? There is not a responsible parent in the District today who dares to let their young child out of sight for many minutes, in fear of what might happen. The small boys playing ball outside their own homes, must be under constant supervision, for fear a "friendly stranger" might approach them. If a neighbor's daughter calls on you, the neighbor telephones within 2 minutes to find out if her 6-year-old is there. There is little point in maintaining public playgrounds for the children, when children can be kidnaped by sex perverts from such playgrounds—as happened to little Hattie Jackson several weeks ago—this child is yet to be found.

The Mallory ruling—where the man was acquitted of self-admitted rape, on a technicality, and then proceeded to Philadelphia, where he raped yet another innocent victim; is yet another example of unjustifiable leniency by our judges.

To place the blame on poor home environment is ridiculous. There are many excellent citizens who have grown up in worse environments. The blame lies clearly with the social workers, in the first place, and then with the judge, who is guided by his emotional reaction of sympathy, rather than by the laws of the land.

If there no longer shall be a deterrent to crime, we need no longer comply with the laws. Why conform to acceptable social behavior, when it is more exciting, and often more remunerative to perpetrate felonies, than to earn on honest living.

We as citizens are horrified at the leniency of sentences imposed; we feel that the time has come for the courts to realize that they are in authority, not only to reprimand the guilty; but also to safeguard the law-abiding citizens. The time has come that criminals must receive severe penalties—the maximum penalties—not the minimum or probation. The criminals have had a wonderful time in the District, and throughout the Nation, during the last many years—but surely it is time to give the Nation back to the law-abiding citizens, that they may feel free to walk on their roads; free to let their children play; free to go to the movies after dark, or into a store during daylight hours.

The North Washington Council went on record as desiring that all judges here in the District be made aware of the desires of the citizenry—we feel that we are entitled to the utmost protection the law can give—and our judges should enforce such laws.

Yours very truly,

NORTH WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS.

Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts, H.R. 4172

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill, and in doing so, I cede priority to no man when it comes to concern for the economic soundness of this Nation. But I must express amazement with remarks made by some of my colleagues in which they admit ignorance about the arts and even more, a blatant lack of concern for artistic culture of the American society. Do these gentlemen seriously believe that the basic heritage of our country lies in its vaults, in its bankbook? I have devoted much attention to our Government's budgetary problems, but I cannot and I believe history will not equate dollars with ideas, moneybags with human creativity, gold with the cultural vitality that sets a nation thinking, searching, living, fighting, and dying. Masses of men do not fight and die for gold—individuals may, a power-hungry oligarchy may, a materialistic cabal may—but men in great numbers, the common people of the earth, do not.

Ancient Athens was wealthy. I wonder who here now can stand and do honor to her fiscal programs in a manner equaling the glory that has been heaped on her magnificent cultural contributions to the Western World. Rome commanded riches from every corner of the known world in her day. How has history remembered her gold, compared to man's memory of Cicero, Horace, and the ageless Virgil? Mankind remembers Maecenas, not because of his wealth, but because of what he did with his wealth.

Maecenas gave the world Virgil and Horace, and through them, he staked his claim in the history books.

The accumulation of wealth and power, the construction of sound governments, are but means to an end; they are tools with which man seeks the peace, the beauty, the joy of life and living that does homage to his Creator. The whole world has marveled at America's productive genius, her political strength, and the power which she has steadily acquired because of these accomplishments. Today, our Nation is a collosus, and fully recognized as such.

But, to what end is this collusus striving? August Heckscher contributed to the report of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, and in his article, he warned that:

This country is being watched by peoples * * * many of them as new to nationhood as they are old in cultural achievements * * * who ask whether under a system such as ours the highest values can be maintained.

I say that they can be, and I say that the desire of the American people that they shall be should be manifested in the actions of this Congress. That this can be done under our system is proven in the British Arts Council, the Old Vic, the Royal Ballet, and opera. The promising partnership which can be forged between government and the arts in a democracy has been demonstrated by the Opera Comique, the Comedie Francaise, Scala Opera of Milan, the Amsterdam Concertgebouw, the Salzburg Festivals, the Vienna State Opera.

If reason is needed why we should concern ourselves with the arts as well as with budgets, I call attention to the fascinating role which the muses have been playing in the battle for men's minds in Germany. In December of 1958, Howard Taubman of the New York Times reported that "the arts have become one of the sharpest weapons in the competition for German minds. Berlin is a major battlefield in this contest." In this regard, gentlemen, I cannot help but wonder that this Government which refrained from building a cultural center in Washington did not hesitate to help build one in West Berlin.

Every mature society is concerned with encouraging the creative abilities of its members. This has been the mark of every great civilization since the dawn of time. To encourage enjoyment of and participation in the arts, which make our life on earth pleasant, beautiful, and stimulating, has been the goal, not only of ancient Rome and Athens, but of modern societies as well. I would like to quote more from Mr. Hecksher's report:

The arts are a vital part of human experience. In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music and the sciences * * * our society must stimulate and support richer cultural fulfillment.

The ultimate dedication to our way of life—

Mr. Heckscher wrote—

will be won not on the basis of economic satisfaction alone, but on the basis of an inward quality and an ideal.

Is the ideal for which America stands a balanced budget? Shall we be known to future generations as the nation gathered wealth for the sake of wealth and structured a great government to serve small purposes? I think not. I think Americans hold loftier dreams than some of my colleagues here will grant them. And Americans—being what they are—will not be frustrated in their quest for nobler things to accomplish.

Thirty Phantom Acres Found in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 1961, I introduced H.R. 9329, a bill to prohibit Government payments under the 1962 feed grain program for the retirement of phantom acres.

At that time I pointed out there were approximately 5 million phantom corn acres under the 1961 program. The Secretary's feed grain report submitted to Congress pursuant to Public Law 87–5 stated that there were 87,047,500 acres of corn planted in 1959–60 whereas all previous Department of Agriculture figures indicated a 1960–60 corn planting of 82,088,000 acres. These are the 4,959,500 phantom corn acres. The Department's recent publication, the Feed Grain Situation, lists 15 million acres of corn retired in 1961 while the Secretary's report listed 20.1 million acres of corn retired in 1961. Where, then, are these 5 million phantom corn acres?

Just 2 days after I introduced my bill, a story appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune which sheds some light on the picture and dramatically illustrates the unsavory situation which has developed in the 1961 program.

The chairman of the Minnesota State ASC Committee has resigned his high agricultural office because of the revelation that some 30 acres in excess of his actual 1959–60 corn base were granted to him by the Administrators of the 1961 feed grain program. Here we "see" for the first time 30 phantom acres. Unfortunately for the American taxpayer, however, this still leaves the balance sheet of the feed grain program showing 4,959,470 corn acres unaccounted for even though 30 acres have been found in Minnesota.

Because of the wide interest and the possible misuse of $150 million in this program, I am including the full newspaper account from the Minneapolis Tribune of September 22, 1961 as follows:

FARM UNIT CHIEF TELLS VIOLATION, RESIGNS

The chairman of the Minnesota agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) committee resigned Thursday.

Donald A. Willette, appointed in March by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, said he quit because a Delavan, Minn. farm his family owns got a larger corn allotment than the law allows.

The violation, he said, was unintentional, but he added:

"The only way I can correct it—and preserve my integrity and that of the State committee and it program—is to resign. I further am ordering repaid the part payment which the family farm corporation received in advance under the feed grain program."

George Etzell, Republican national committeeman from Minnesota, said last night:

"We got wind of this violation and we wrote a letter to Freeman about 10 days ago. We didn't present it as a fact. We just asked a question, 'Could this be so?'

"We're the minority party on a Federal level. We feel it's our duty to keep an eye on things like this. I presume the action was taken on the basis of our letter."

The ASC service in Minnesota has been the core of controversy recently. Republicans charged "wholesale" firings of employees after the Democratic administration took over in Washington.

Willette couldn't be reached for comment on the resignation or the amount of money involved.

He made public his resignation at a meeting of the committee and its employees in St. Paul yesterday morning.

Robert S. Bergland, Roseau, Minn., was named acting chairman. He said a new member of the three-man group will be appointed by Freeman "within the week, I'm sure." The third member is Russell Johnson, Cokato, Minn.

Committee members are paid at a rate of roughly $40 a day for time spent on the job.

In a statement released to the press, Willette said his Delavan farms are owned by a family corporation in which he and his three sons are partners.

"We expanded the operation and rented more land," he said. "As it turns out, the corn allotment given this operation exceeded what current regulations permit.

"The ASC field man in a district has the responsibility to check for violations of the program and to correct them within the machinery of the program. This was missed in my case. I hope from my experience the future violations will be discovered at their inception and be corrected before innocent parties are hurt."

An addendum to his statement gave these facts, as assembled by a Department of Agriculture investigator:

The Willette corporation includes three farms—two owned by the family and one rented. The county ASC committee assigned 219 acres—including land on all three farms—to corn acreage. Another 30 acres—also from all three farms—was added in May.

But the rented farm of the combination had not had corn raised on it in 1959 and 1960. Thus, it should not have been included in the allotment, according to emergency feed grain program regulations.

Said the Agriculture Department representative: "There is no evidence of collusion, fraud, or pressure."

Thailand Juveniles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening I had the pleasure of attending a gathering of some friends of Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber at the home of my

constituents Elinor and Robert B. Wolf in Chestnut Hill, to listen to a report by my distinguished constituent on his observations of life in Thailand this past summer. Dr. Hoeber served as a member of an educational and cultural exchange team and was sent to Thailand by the State Department.

His report on juvenile problems and his remarks on general conditions were very interesting. His 3 months there appeared to be well spent and he reported that American investments were wisely used. I was pleased to hear that Thailand could be considered as a strong friend of the United States.

I have attached a newspaper report of his observations regarding his trip and the conditions which he found affecting juveniles:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Sept. 26, 1961]

DR. HOEBER SAYS RESPECT FOR ELDERS KEEPS CRIME RATE OF THAILAND YOUTH LOW

(By Maurice M. Lewis, Jr.)

Thanks in large measure to Buddhism, which stresses respect for elders, Thailand is keeping juvenile delinquency far below even the best levels here, a Philadelphia expert reported yesterday.

The findings were made by Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, deputy city welfare commissioner, who spent 3 months in Thailand studying that land's welfare setup.

"Respect for their elders is one of the fundamental concepts which Thai children are taught early in their lives and there is every indication that it will remain one of the principal sources of economic and social stability," he said.

COMPARABLE POPULATIONS

Hoeber said that Bangkok, Thailand's capital, has a population of about 2 million, roughly comparable to Philadelphia.

Last year, 1,600 juveniles were turned over to Bangkok court officials from that city's entire metropolitan area, he said; "Philadelphia had some 10,000 court cases involving boys and girls under 18."

He said also that the close family ties taught by Buddhism have resulted in only 1,200 children being abandoned or neglected and institutionalized in all Thailand, as against 4,500 in this city alone.

SUBMITTED REPORT

Asked by the Thailand Government to make a detailed study of delinquency, Hoeber submitted a 48-page report to Gen. Prapas Charusathira, Minister of the Interior.

In it he noted that not only has Thailand a surprisingly low rate of delinquency by Western standards, but that the crimes committed are less violent than those in Philadelphia.

Juvenile assault cases in Bangkok totaled 16 last year—juveniles arrested for violating traffic regulations on the river flowing through the city, he said.

Most common crimes are for shoplifting, purse-snatching, petty thefts—and gambling, for which juvenile arrests are rarely made here.

WARNS OF FUTURE

In exploring the reasons for the nation's low rate of underage crimes, Hoeber credited Buddhist training, general prosperity, and the fact that much of Thailand is rural. Most juvenile crime, experts say, takes place in crowded cities.

Hoeber warned officials there, however, that if the nation undergoes a population explosion as has been predicted, juvenile crime rates may soar. He pointed out further that Thailand is in a state of transition, where a child out grazing the family water buffalo listens to modern music over his transistor radio.

"Such influences from TV, radio, newspapers, and movies are creating a sense of instability," he said. "However, family and religion continue to be the culture."

After completing his assignment, Hoeber spent a month of accumulated vacation time to travel through India and visit Istanbul, Athens, Rome, and Germany, including the Soviet zone of Berlin.

He was on leave without pay while in Thailand, where he served as a member of the educational and cultural exchange teams sent to world points by the State Department.

The Importance of Grass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, an Idaho farm leader, Mr. Ray V. Swanson, recently addressed a group of farmers and livestockmen in Idaho on "The Importance of Grass." In his remarks, Mr. Swanson puts into words the thoughts and feelings of a large majority of the people of Idaho who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by Mr. Swanson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF GRASS AS PRIMARY FORM OF FOOD

(By Ray V. Swanson)

There are too many people, including too many in government, who fail to understand the importance of grass to the development of civilization itself, not alone to the importance of the Nation and its economy.

We livestockmen, in fighting for the right to use the hills and valleys on which to graze our stock, are accused of selfish motives and careless conservation. We may have been slow in employing public relations experts to point out to the country that where we have been selfish in any degree we also have had the Nation and its 180 million people in mind, supplying them with the by-products of the grasses that go to waste when not used in a conservative manner. Others who want the forests and the valleys for happy hunting grounds with little or no benefit accruing to anyone but themselves have won the bureaucrats to their side and are about to include Congressmen as their sympathizers. The livestockman who feeds the Nation with vital red meats cannot continue his service to the Nation without grazing lands for his herds and flocks. It is well for men to have something to shoot at. It is convenient also for them to enjoy the health giving foods that will be lost without the grasses to sustain them. We must also remember in this Nation that we do not know how near we may be to war—and armies have to be fed. We run the risk of defeat when we cut back too far our potential feeding operation. Livestock herds and flocks are not built in a day. Once reduced, years are required to build them back. In the midst of war for survival it is too late to add materially to our meat productive capacity.

The livestockman is a conservationist. He understands better than anyone else the dire consequences to the Nation of depleted natural resources. He works nearest to the soil, to the animals and to the grasses that sustain them. He recognizes as folly of the worst degree any wasting of our forests and valleys or any false conservation practices. He is always an advocate of true conservation, but never subscribes to the philosophy that conservation without use is conservation. Conservation without use is waste, and he calls waste a crime against the Nation and against our children and those to follow.

If anyone knows Americans have an obligation in this generation to keep the opportunity open, it is the livestockman who is close to our national resources and depends so much upon their conservation—and not their waste. Yet we are told how to conserve these valuable resources by men never directly dependent upon them—men whose lives were never touched by mountain virility. Many of them lack the background as a prerogative to the understanding of conservation—and that is the background that builds through generations of family experience a love of the soil and its lifegiving products of grasses, trees, flowers. For, it is an abundance of these gifts of nature upon which the Nation depends for its greatness. True conservation is a part of the obligation we shoulder as citizens of this Nation. We must battle for the kind of conservation that will keep our Nation strong—and not make us a sitting duck for Red takeover.

The stockman is first to frown on improper conservation of resources, for upon the resources he depends for the prosperity and continuance of his business. We cannot overstress our firm and well-grounded belief in the multiple use of our public lands, deriving the most possible good from them while at the same time practicing conservation at its best.

The use of the forests for grazing our herds and flocks, timber to build America, recreation in its many forms for the health and happiness of the people—this is the multiple use we advocate for these valuable areas. We oppose as wasteful and ruinous to the future greatness of our Nation any action that will further throttle the conservative use of our hills and mountains—for in these God gave us much for which to be thankful as well as proud.

Idaho perhaps has more potential permanent wilderness areas than any other State, with 3,089,623 acres. We hope to face a future of growth and general development, not a future of vast and permanent wilderness where nutritious grasses will be denied the herds and flocks. But Idaho's fight will continue for many years if we are to maintain our rights to water and to the development of our resources. We are battling great odds in Congress by men who appear to oppose development but who may simply not understand the importance of the wise use of the grasses and multiple values of the forests. Saving the forests for multiple use and wise conservation will require a long course of education for those who favor locking up the forests because they cannot feel the importance of things with which they have not had a lifelong comradeship, such as grass to maintain and strengthen the Nation itself. We repeat, changing this attitude will come only through a long period of education. But even education will not change the policies of biased men—or those with sinister motives.

Appendix

Problems of Discrimination in the Nursing Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Some Other Dimensions of Prejudice," reprinted from the American Journal of Nursing for September 1961, dealing with problems of discrimination in the nursing profession.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprinted from the American Journal of Nursing, vol. 61, Sept. 1961]

SOME OTHER DIMENSIONS OF PREJUDICE

Ten years ago, Negro nurses placed a large part of their professional welfare in the hands of all their nurse colleagues. They bequeathed to the American Nurses' Association the program for the advancement of Negro nurses which they had carried, almost alone, in their National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses. At the same time, they offered to share with the total profession their own intimate knowledge of the price of prejudice.

The issues which must be faced in successful integration need not be repeated here. They are before us constantly in the public press. The waste of human resources with which segregation threatens our whole society is well documented. While no single social group such as nursing can carry the primary responsibility for achieving full integration of minority groups into the complex society in which they must function, each such social group has its own unique functions to perform in helping to melt the glacier of prejudice.

AN ENCOURAGING RECORD

Those responsible for the ANA's Intergroup Relations Program appear to have capitalized on the solid foundation built by the NACGN. Today, only one State and a few districts deny ANA membership to Negro nurses. The ANA platform, its professional code, its bylaws and those of most of its constituents, record its belief in the need for a continuing intergroup relations program and the fact that nursing is "unrestricted by considerations of nationality, race, creed, color, or status."

Many States and some districts have organized intergroup relations committees, ostensibly ready to identify and deal with discriminatory practices which might befall members of minority groups. ANA official registries and professional counseling and placement services have, generally, established policies which attempt to assure equal opportunities in work situations. National and State legislative programs are lending increasing amounts of support to civil rights legislation. More and more employment standards and contracts covering groups of nurse employees carry nondiscrimination clauses. And, a continuous gathering of facts by ANA shows that, while none of these policies or expressions of good intentions exists every place to protect every minority group member, there is rapidly growing evidence of their acceptance by more nurses and by their employers, too.

This is an impressive written record, as it appears on the books of the ANA. As viewed by authorities in the field of human relations, nursing is one of the few professional groups of any significant size which seems to be truly integrated, at least in 53 out of ANA's 54 constituent units. But, this may be a record which is compared too easily with the lack of achievement of other professional and social groups rather than with the absolute concept of what we must consider right in the whole field of human relations.

THE RISK OF A PAPER PROGRAM

When the members of the NACGN dissolved their own group to turn to the ANA, they admitted frankly that integration could not be achieved by a minority group alone, and they placed their confidence in their colleagues' desire to work with them. This kind of courageous forward movement is an essential part of the pattern to success in integration. In its turn, ANA has offered the moral leadership, the forthright policy statements, and the organization channels essential to a positive integrating process for the total profession. But, as with any national program, there is always the risk that it will become a paper one.

If nursing has more than a paper program, it may be because of the very nature of nursing and of nurses. And, certainly, it is due in no small part to the outstanding Negro nurses who have demonstrated leadership in dealing with the problems of discrimination, not just to their own group, but to the whole profession. Perhaps the rebuffs most of them have experienced from time to time have been offset by the rewards they reap from serving a patient on the basis of his need rather than his creed or color. And, perhaps these rebuffs are more rare in nursing because of this same way of thinking among other members of the profession. We would like to believe so.

There is no doubt, however, that the written record fails to measure the nuances and the subtle person-to-person expressions of prejudice which, many of us know, continue to exist within nursing. Whatever their source—thoughtlessness, or habit, patterns of culture, ignorance, or innocent patronizing, or even man's general inhumanity to man—we must discipline ourselves to recognize them when we commit them. For, unfortunately, few of us—whatever our color or creed—are without some kind of prejudice.

In the often painful process of achieving integration any minority group may suffer indignities. But, prejudice in nursing is being exposed, identified, dealt with. And, out of this process comes learning and understanding. We have a feeling that any of our number who has personally been paying the price of prejudice will not consider that price too high if all of us will apply this learning to dealing with all kinds of prejudice—not only prejudice against individuals, or groups, but also prejudice against ideas.

Stop—Look—Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, an article has just recently been called to my attention which has caused me to "Stop, look, and listen."

It is written by a Northwestern University student about an organization known as the National Student Association.

Now just what is the National Student Association and what are its activities?

I would certainly like to know a lot more about it after reading this article and talking with some students of my acquaintance who are suspicious of the activities of the organization to say the least.

If I have been given an accurate description of what took place at the recent national convention then I do think there should be some evaluation made of this group by the proper congressional committees. I am not indicting. I am just asking questions and I am sure you will want to ask questions after you read this article.

Following the article is also a brief note about the author and a quote from the Chicago Tribune. The article stands on its own feet and anybody who has different ideas should also be able to stand on their own feet in offering a reply.

Here is the article:

MISREPRESENTATION OF 1 MILLION STUDENTS BY NSA

(By Kay Wonderlic, Northwestern Gamma Phi Beta [1])

Our Government has severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, but American youth remains on record wishing to help Cubans in their university reform movement.

The U.S. National Student Association (known as NSA) passed a resolution in August saying, "* * * the extent and direction of the recent university reform cannot yet be ascertained. * * *" Nevertheless, it concluded that American students should aid the movement. This resolution has been sent around the world, presumably speaking for American student opinion, but NSA does not reflect the thoughts and sentiments of the American student.

WHAT IS NSA?

What is NSA? The association claims 1,300,000 student members, or the total enrollment of the 350 member colleges and

[1] Reprinted with permission of the Crescent of Gamma Phi Beta, in which this article appeared through the courtesy of editor, Mrs. J. J. Marek.

universities. In the name of American students, NSA for 13 years has spoken before U.S. congressional committees and acted as a political pressure group in Washington, where it maintains a permanent staff.

NSA also votes for America's youth at international student meetings. A president of a foreign student union has said that in his country NSA is assumed to be voicing the opinions of American students. Now, living in this country, this foreign student realizes NSA speaks only for the opinions of the few individuals "who run NSA."

NSA, contrary to its preamble (which states, "We, the students of the United States of America * * *") and the impression it attempts to achieve, does not insure nor even encourage true representation. NSA says it can speak for American students because member schools send delegates to the annual "congress," a summer convention during which resolutions are passed. What NSA fails to recognize is the fact that these delegates are rarely elected by member schools. They are not selected on the basis of knowledge of the subjects to be discussed, nor knowledge of how the students they represent feel on the subjects.

Topics covered at the congress are not geared to current issues on member campuses, but to areas where NSA officers feel the campuses should be concerned. In other words, a few officers try to create interests for students with whose interests they are generally unfamiliar. No organization can reflect a nonexistent sentiment. Under such conditions delegates can neither reflect nor represent student opinion.

In 14 hours, 1 of the 5 committees at the 1960 congress passed 44 resolutions. This allows an average of about 20 minutes for debating each resolution in a committee of more than 200 delegates.

The subjects that this committee attempted to debate and the problems they tried to resolve are not conducive to such cursory treatment. Here are a few examples, titles of resolutions passed by this committee: Cuba, Nuclear Testing, Africa, Latin American Policy, South Korea-Turkey, Japan, India, Ethiopia, Hungary, Totalitarianism, Eastern European Exchange, and World Youth Forum.

During the summer, NSA sponsors an 8-week seminar for 15 students, handpicked by the National Executive Committee of NSA, to study a few of these areas. This is recognition of the complexities involved in these problems and the need for careful consideration of them. Yet, congress delegates are expected to pass resolutions in these areas and more in a few hours.

FACTS OR DISTORTIONS?

Background papers are distributed to aid delegates who are not totally familiar with all the issues being discussed. The papers are usually written by national staff and executive committee members. Often, they tell only one side of a crucial, highly debatable issue. The background papers are frequently quoted in the section of resolutions labeled as fact. What finally appears in this section of each resolution is often an opinionated distortion stated with pretentious certainty.

For example, a resolution claiming to give the facts on the controversial and hotly debated House Un-American Activities Committee states simply that the committee "violates personal rights, and endangers free expression."

This seems to be the pattern in NSA resolutions: highly opinionated material quickly approved by weary delegates who come to the convention with little or no knowledge of what they will be expected to know.

"Whether we are right or not is irrevelant, we must speak," a top NSA officer explains. And so, for the sake of getting delegates to act, committee chairmen push through resolutions from the Chair. They speak for motions and then preside over the vote. Because this tactic leads to a dogmatically derived decision, no book on parliamentary procedure allows it.

STUDENTS WARNED THEY MUST REVOLT

Idealism reaches a peak at NSA congresses as delegates are told of the common bond among students throughout the world and are warned they must revolt against traditional and outmoded practices, both on the national and international level.

At the 1960 congress, NSA sponsored a panel on the sit-in movement. The panel consisted of Negro participants in the movement, their defending lawyer, and a white girl who volunteered as a secretary for the leaders of the movement. To add to the emotional pitch of the meeting, delegates were led in songs of the sit-in movement. That some of the delegates from southern schools walked out of the meeting was not surprising.

The moderator, an NSA officer, was the same individual who was largely responsible for NSA taking a stand in favor of supporting the sit-ins—a stand which was taken without a vote of member schools, without consultation with them, and without notifying them of the decision before involved schools read it in their community newspapers.

NO MINORITY REPORTS—NO MINUTES

NSA fails to provide information regarding the tremendous dissents which have occurred annually at the congresses. Minority reports are not published. Minutes of the meetings are not distributed, even to members. The brotherhood of youth that is spoken of so frequently in NSA sessions seems a reality when NSA bluntly states that all 1,300,000 members feel "yes" or "no" on politically hot issues.

The discrepancy between actual and claimed representation continues. It becomes a glaring fact when it is realized that only 13 of 97 resolutions discussed at the 1960 congress were voted upon by the delegates. The rest were decisions of the NEC, the National Executive Committee, which consists of regional officers and national officers.

This group, with 34 voting members, has the constitutional power to decide stands and programs for the 1,300,000 members. It meets immediately after the summer congress and passes resolutions which are on the books for a year before they can be altered or reversed by member schools. Almost two-thirds of all NSA resolutions, and all of the NSA programs, are the product, not of thinking on 350 college campuses, but of discussion around the NEC table.

NONVIOLENT PROTESTS IN JAPAN UPHELD

In September 1960 the NEC passed a resolution upholding the Japanese riots which kept a U.S. President from visiting the country. The consequences of the rioting, and the suspicion that it was led by Japanese Communists was not mentioned in the fact section of this resolution. It was called a student demonstration and the NEC put NSA on record as upholding the right of these students to nonviolently protest actions which they consider unjust or undemocratic.

It was mid-December, 4 months after the passage of this resolution, that member schools were notified of the decision. Even then, it was merely included in a codification of 140 other resolutions. With one copy of this codification being sent to each member school, the chances that the resolution, or any other, would be noticed and discussed are small. If member schools should object to an NEC resolution, or suggest modifications, their criticisms are neither recorded nor published.

Even members of the NEC were unclear as to what they passed concerning Japan. Of three contacted during the 4 months, one denied it was passed, one said he didn't know if it had been, and the other said a resolution to that effect was passed, but he couldn't recall specifics of it. Even as the NEC was unsure of its decision, and members uninformed, copies of resolutions were sent around the world.

A resolution of the NEC is supposed to be retained only if affirmed by the congress the following year. This has been easily sidestepped. Resolutions go to the congress and, because the NEC doesn't put them high enough on the priority list (which determines the order in which they will be discussed), time doesn't allow their passage by the congress and they are again sent to the NEC, and again passed as NSA opinion.

By this method a resolution to abolish compulsory membership lists for all student organizations has existed for 4 years without ever being voted upon by member schools. This does not stop NSA officials from pressuring for the goals of such resolutions. Mandates may be involved, which will be carried out just as mandates from the Congress. U.S. Congressmen will be told that this is what the youth of the Nation desires.

A REPRESENTATIVE ORGAN FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS?

Through its regional structure, NSA claims the NEC is representative. However, the regional votes are not proportional. For instance, the Utah region has 5 member schools and 1 vote on the NEC; the New England region has 51 member schools and only 2 votes on the NEC. NEC members rarely discuss the issues they vote on with representatives from schools in their region. A school is unable, through the association, to find out how its representative votes at the NEC sessions.

Inserted in the 1960 Congress program, NSA gave a history of NSA which concluded with this remark, "Accurately reflecting the feelings of students on member campuses, USNSA's structure provides a representative organ for American students, despite the pluralistic heterogeneity of the Nation's system of higher education."

How can NSA substantiate this claim? Many of us who belong to NSA are just beginning to learn the hypocrisy of the statement.

NSA does not represent those in its membership; its structure precludes the possibility. Many who belong to NSA are unaware that they do. Schools join and leave NSA according to the whims—or fears—of individuals in campus student governments. Few students know or care anything about NSA. It doesn't harm them, they think. It helps them once in a while with pamphlets to refer to on campus problems.

The greatest apathy of all is being demonstrated by the more than 1 million students who are allowing NSA to speak for them in this unrepresentative manner. In the past, many of those who have opposed NSA, or wished to reform it, have found its leadership had too much of a stronghold to be broken with the small effort they were willing to put forth. To correct what is a serious situation within NSA, will take a knowledge and devotion equal to that of the NSA leaders. Those students who are concerned about the implications of NSA, who desire a democratic form of representation, and who believe that speaking with knowledge is more important than emotional rantings, do not have the advantage of full-time salaried leadership, as does NSA. But there are more than a million students being misrepresented; it would only be through continued apathy that they would not be able to make the truth, which is on their side, heard.

QUEEN WITH A CAUSE

"Last year's May Queen at Northwestern University, Kay Wonderlic, has assumed the role of campaigner for some responsibility on the part of the U.S. National Student Association. She and about 1.3 million other college students (the total enrollments of the 350 institutions participating in the NSA) are constituents of this organization. Miss Wonderlic, vice president of the Northwestern University student senate, has had occasion to learn how NSA operates, and she proposes to do something about it," said the Chicago Tribune editorially recently.

"At the base of the NSA pyramid are the 1.3 million, many no doubt totally unaware of the organization. At the apex is a permanent staff of a Washington office and a national executive committee of 34 members. Between is an annual congress, made up of delegates most of whom have no mandate from their home campuses. The shakiness of their credentials as genuine representatives does not restrain the congress and the executive committee from speaking in the name of 'the students of the United States of America.' Passing resolutions on all sorts of complex national and international issues is a principal activity of NSA. Last year 97 resolutions were (briefly) before the annual summer congress. What bothers Miss Wonderlic is the presumption of it all. At the congress, 'background papers' written by members of the national staff and of the executive committee are circulated for the benefit of participants smart enough to realize they do not know what they are doing. These papers, Miss Wonderlic contends, can be highly partisan and opinionated. Committees of hundreds pass on resolutions at a rate of several an hour. The full congress never does get around to most of the resolutions, which are acted on by the executive committee after the rank and file have gone home.

"These resolutions (in the nature of things, half baked and often leaning to the left) are then sent around the world and quoted at Government hearings as the views of the students of the United States of America.

"Among the delegates at the NSA 1961 congress will be Kay Wonderlic of Northwestern. It will be an uphill struggle to win this outfit to responsible tactics, but we are sure Miss Wonderlic will make a good try. We wish her success, though we expect the system to emerge intact from criticisms even as well grounded."

Corry, Pa.: A Town That Is Proud To Stand on Its Own Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in Erie County, in the 24th District of Pennsylvania, is a town by the name of Corry—known for its potatoes, its diversified industry, and its community spirit.

This community of less than 8,000 has a highly active chamber of commerce, and under the leadership of its secretary, Stewart A. "Doc" Long, its enterprising citizens—through their own initiative—went out and raised over $125,000 for an industrial development fund that has resulted in four fine new plants being established in Corry. This large sum came from outright subscriptions, with no strings attached other than the assurance that the money would not be given away.

Mr. Speaker, Corry exemplifies what other communities in the United States can do with public spirit and a real effort. As their Congressman, I am proud of these citizens and wish to take this opportunity to recognize their efforts and zeal, which I know will be an example and an inspiration to other communities.

Where Are We Heading?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, with the deep concern over survival which pervades the minds of the citizens of our country now that the Soviet Union has embarked on atmospheric nuclear tests, and the dangers involved in the Berlin crisis, it is a bit difficult to think back on the 1st session of the 87th Congress which is now history and analyze the successes of the session, as well as its shortcomings. When we went into session in January, the economy of our country was uppermost in our minds, although the mounting Soviet challenge never left us. First, we wondered what kind of a program the President would propose, and how he would conduct himself in international affairs. I can point up the direction in which he intended that this Government should go in two ways: First, there was a clearcut desire to further the centralization and expansion of the Federal Government. Secondly, there was clearcut evidence of the desire to secure responsibilities in the executive branch which traditionally and constitutionally have reposed in the Congress. As we look at the successes, partial successes, and failures of the administration in various areas of legislation, it will be possible to analyze the position we are in now, and in what might be attempted next year. On the international scene, we were discouraged and disappointed with the reverses in Laos, and in Cuba. I hope that the administration will now show the kind of leadership in the Berlin crisis which will enable the people who are presently free to remain free. In order to secure unquestionable military strength, we must forge ahead in research and development and appropriate the tremendous amounts of money necessary. It is significant that during this last session, the Congress has not been asked to cut back expenditures nor have revenues been increased to prevent a deficit. The economic recovery is now evident, and some indications are that this is the beginning of a boom. However, it is of the utmost importance in these crucial times to hold down domestic spending, budget in the black rather than the red, and in so doing we may achieve economic stability as well as military stability.

AGRICULTURE

You are all familiar with the action taken this year in the field of agriculture. The new feed grains bill was passed early in the session, which contained three features which I have been advocating ever since coming to the Congress, that is, payment-in-kind as an inducement to reduce production, voluntary retirement of acres and price supports contingent upon compliance with the program. I am still concerned about the policies the Secretary of Agriculture might use in disposing of the surplus commodities reflecting the cash payments which were made to retire acres from production. This authority could drive down the prices of feed grains, which would be detrimental to the Midwest, but helpful to the feed-deficit areas of the East and the South. The omnibus farm bill was passed without the requests of the Secretary of Agriculture in which he desired to have the Congress transfer to him its responsibility to write farm legislation. I am pleased we extended the feed grains legislation for another year, and provided for a 1-year 10-percent reduction in wheat, and extension of the important laws, such as the National Wool Act, Public Law 480, the special school milk program, and improvements in our farm credit laws. Next year, we can look forward to studies and legislation to provide for a long-range farm program especially affecting feed grains, wheat, and sugar. All these programs are due to expire next year. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was expanded slightly, permitting additional commodities to make use of marketing orders. It is imperative that farmers and individuals involved in related industries thoroughly study the ramifications of all proposed new programs because what is enacted next year may stand on the books and affect agriculture for a long time to come.

EDUCATION

Early in the session, we began consideration of a general Federal aid to school construction and teachers' salary bill. The administration included the extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, aid to federally impacted areas laws, as a part of the package since that law is so well accepted and 319 Members of Congress have districts which receive aid through them. This issue soon became embroiled in a controversy over the desirability and constitutionality of providing Federal aid to private and parochial elementary and secondary schools. When the National Defense Education Act was considered for extension and revision, since it was due to expire next year, the controversial Federal aid to private and parochial elementary and secondary schools was added to the National Defense Education Act, providing for loans for construction to these schools, but not for public schools in a similar way. The Rules Committee refused to schedule the three major education bills before the House because of this controversy, and therefore, Federal aid to higher education, which would have provided for construction of academic facilities and financial assistance

grants to students received the same fate. Later on, an effort was made by some to pass a school construction aid bill along with the extension of present laws authorizing Federal aid to federally impacted school areas and NDEA. This was undesirable to the large majority of the House of Representatives since the bill was not actually limited only to those areas of need as desired by many in order to give limited meaningful aid, nor was it desired by many proponents of broad Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools since it provided nothing for teachers salaries. With these series of defeats, the Congress extended federally impacted areas laws and the National Defense Education Act for 2 years, thereby enforcing any aid to elementary and secondary schools—if considered next year—to be voted on its own merits. The disappointment in education legislation to me was twofold. The proposed additional assistance to higher education was shelved even after the need was clearly demonstrated and accepted by most to be within a Federal responsibility. The second, after a thorough study on rehabilitation and special education, not enough was done to forward the needed improvements in these areas. It is my hope that further work in these areas will be conducted next year.

FOREIGN AID

The big controversy in the foreign aid legislation was not whether it should be passed or not, nor even over the amount of funds authorized. It was, rather, whether a new policy should be adopted providing the administration with long-range—5 years—planning authority plus funding of the program through Treasury borrowing—back-door financing—which would have circumvented the Congress right for financial review which it presently has through annual appropriations. I support long-range planning authority, but annual appropriations. The House, in its enthusiasm to show that it would not condone Treasury borrowing to finance the development loan funds, adopted a bill which even provided for annual authorization. Later, the House-Senate conferees worked out the difference in a very acceptable manner. The foreign aid bill was adopted, and shortly thereafter, the Appropriations Committee reported its bill to finance this authorization, $1,112,500,000 will be provided for the Development Loan Fund, $296,500,000 for development grants, $275 million for the President's contingency fund, and $1,600,000,000 for military assistance. When the House Committee on Appropriations cut the military assistance grant to $1.3 billion, I thought this was an unwise move and supported a motion to increase this amount by $300 million. I thought the administration justified its request for the larger amount for military assistance which goes to improve the fighting capabilities of our allies.

DEPRESSED AREAS—MINIMUM WAGE

This session passed a depressed areas bill. I supported the retraining and relocation of workers phase of the bill, although I did not feel sufficient emphasis was placed on retraining. I believe that workers who have lost their jobs because of basic changes in the economy and technology must be encouraged to learn other skills which are in demand. I opposed the method of financing this legislation, which—again—is the back-door financing approach. This session also approved a minimum wage bill which increased wages for those affected by the bill to $1.15 to be increased to $1.25 in 3 years. This legislation also includes many intrastate businesses of certain volumes. I believe the various State legislatures should legislate minimum wages for strictly intrastate businesses, and the Federal Government should confine itself to businesses in interstate commerce.

PEACE CORPS

After much discussion, the House approved the establishment of a Peace Corps for the next 3 years. Previously, the Peace Corps was operating under a Presidential order. The legislation thus gave legislative approval, and approved $40 million for its operation.

ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

The House also approved the establishment of an arms control agency. I supported this legislation since I felt that in the past our officials representing us in international conferences have too often not been certain what should be proposed because of indecision on the policy level. There, of course, cannot be any disarmament now under the stress of the international situation. However, there is a need for a continuing study of the scientific, economic, political, legal, social, psychological, military and technological factors related to arms and arms control, and this would be the specific responsibility of the permanent agency.

SOCIAL SECURITY

This session of Congress revised the social security program by increasing the minimum benefit from $33 to $40 a month, and allowing men to retire at 62 with lower benefits. We also increased survivors benefits by 10 percent and reduced eligibility requirements. Social security taxes were increased one-eighth of 1 percent on both employer and employee, and three-sixteenths of 1 percent for self-employed individuals.

HOUSING

The administration's urban development bill providing for a $4.9 billion housing program is now law. This legislation allows the Federal Government to bypass State governments to establish direct lines of finance and control from the Federal Government to the cities. The bill permits the use of Federal funds to buy and set aside land to be released later for public use. There is also a strong element of "backdoor spending" in the bill, that is, borrowing directly from the Treasury without a specific authorization from the Appropriations Committee or committing the Government to spend certain amounts before receiving an authorization from the Appropriations Committee. Examples of such "backdoor spending" are the public housing contract assistance and urban renewal grant contract assistance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In all, Congress authorized slightly more than $49 billion for national defense during this past session; there is a bipartisan, all-out effort here in Washington to build up our military forces to meet not only the current Berlin crisis, but any potentially dangerous situation anywhere in the world. This general buildup includes $12.5 billion for the construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; it continues the B–52 bomber production programs, provides for 2 new nuclear-powered missile frigates and steps up the Polaris submarine production to 29 by 1964, instead of 1967. Congress also authorized the President to call up to 250,000 reservists and National Guardsmen for active duty of not more than 1 year and to extend training periods. Other authorizations include the construction and improvement of our missile sites and nuclear submarine bases; also, research on solid and nuclear propellants as well as the development of the latest weapons for use in conventional warfare.

HIGHWAYS

More than $11.5 billion was appropriated by this session of Congress for the completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972, and to bring Federal apportionments for primary, secondary, and urban programs from $925 million to $1 billion annually. Congress also fixed Federal gas and diesel tax at 4 cents per gallon, raised the levies on tires, tubes, retread rubber, and on heavy trucks and buses.

WATER POLLUTION

Because of the greatly increasing demands for additional water supplies—a demand that will be a major challenge within 10 years—Congress expanded its water pollution control program and increased grants to the States and interstate agencies from $3 million annually to $5 million for operations through June 30, 1968. This session also increased its appropriation for the construction of treatment works from $50 million to $100 million annually, and substituted a sliding-scale formula for the present 30-percent limitation on Federal grants.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Having considered some of the major legislation which has been acted on during this session of the 87th Congress, I also want to take note of the views of my constituents in the Minnesota First District. In April of this year, I sent out some 110,000 questionnaires. Of this total, more than 10 percent mailed their replies—an unusually high return. I believe this indicates that the citizens in my district have a great interest and concern about their Government; it also indicates that they want their representative in Washington to know what they are thinking on important issues. Here are the results of my 1961 questionnaire:

Do you think that our civilian defense program has been satisfactory? Yes, 43.06 percent; no, 42.14 percent; no opinion, 14.80 percent.

A Peace Corps of young Americans should be established under Federal auspices for oversea development work? Yes, 54.08 percent; no, 32.62 percent; no opinion, 10.30 percent.

To restore greater confidence in the dollar and halt the drain of gold overseas, we should return to high tariffs and trade restrictions against other countries? Yes, 36.11 percent; no, 47.65 percent; no opinion, 16.24 percent.

Reduce our military forces overseas? Yes, 27.10 percent; no, 55.21 percent; no opinion, 17.69 percent.

Curtail oversea travel by American citizens and restrict duty-free merchandise they can purchase abroad? Yes, 48.86 percent; no, 34.89 percent; no opinion, 16.25 percent.

Reduce our production costs and increase our production to compete more effectively in the world market? Yes, 78.56 percent; no, 9.14 percent; no opinion, 12.30 percent.

Remove American businessman's incentive to invest in dollar-rich oversea countries? Yes, 51.03 percent; no, 20.07 percent; no opinion, 28.90 percent.

Should the Federal Government establish a Freedom Academy which would conduct courses for community leaders in both the United States and abroad on the Communist threat, and to develop a "counter science" against the Communists? Yes, 63.61 percent; no, 20.25 percent; no opinion, 16.14 percent.

Should Congress enact a farm program which, among other things, would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to set market prices and enable Government marketing of major quantities of agricultural production through the Commodity Credit Corporation? Yes, 27.73 percent; no, 53.87 percent; no opinion, 18.40 percent.

Do you favor loans to private and parochial schools, both elementary and secondary as suggested, similar to loans for colleges and universities? Yes, 20.15 percent; no, 76.48 percent; no opinion, 3.37 percent.

Should we continue to oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations? Yes, 70.57 percent; no, 20.04 percent; no opinion, 9.39 percent.

If another attempt to reach an agreement with Russia to ban nuclear testing should fail, should we resume underground testing? Yes, 75.20 percent; no, 12.94 percent; no opinion, 11.86 percent.

To assist economically-distressed areas, do you approve of: Federal grants-in-aid to the States to establish industry? Yes, 41.96 percent; no, 42.08 percent; no opinion, 15.96 percent.

A Federal rehabilitation program to retrain and relocate workers in other fields? Yes, 58.48 percent; no, 29.88 percent; no opinion, 11.64 percent.

Finally, one could not survey the work of this session of Congress without noting the grave state of world affairs—a situation which has deteriorated steadily while the work of this Congress has proceeded.

I do not believe that this country's foreign policy should be based on the mere containment of the Communists. Our foreign policy should, rather, be dedicated to the great task of forcing what has been a steadily advancing communism into a steady retreat and withdrawal from countries which it has enslaved. Consequently, I believe first it is wisdom for our country to build its military forces not just to meet the current threat in Berlin, but to ensure our security regardless of where the threat to peace comes from. I have often thought that it is one of the unfortunate, elemental facts of our time that countries under dictatorships tend to be over confident when assessing the military capability of our country. This was surely the case both in World War I and in World War II. I believe it is now also true, though a prudent man might find it difficult to understand why this should be. During peaceful days, we are concerned about our own families, our own endeavors, and our own communities. This is a privilege we expect to enjoy in a country such as ours. It is, in fact, what accounts for the deep-seated pride in being Americans. But, however difficult it is to arouse our people, once this occurs, our enemies in the past have found that we prosecute war with an almost fanatical energy. This fact is in no way a boast; it is a fact of history, and I believe Americans are now willing to do whatever they can for their country.

How can it be, then, that those who would now violate their agreements with our country in an attempt to enslave even more millions could underestimate an aroused American Nation? I am convinced in my own mind that the vast majority of Americans will tolerate no further concessions to the forces of communism. If negotiations are called for based on the assumption of the Communists that there must be some Western concessions, then I oppose such negotiations. I believe the line has been drawn—not just in Berlin—but around the world. In negotiations the demand on our part should be for the rights and freedom of peoples behind the Iron Curtain as in all other countries of the world.

For human beings by the millions to face the prospects of a nuclear war is one of the enormous and terrifying facts of this era. But millions of Americans have, in the past, been willing to pay the supreme sacrifice rather than bow to foreign domination or foreign terrorization. Any man who would say there is nothing worse than death, I would think such a man dead already. Worse than death itself is human freedom denied; worse than death is moral depravity. Worse than death is a life void of a belief in God and the freedom to practice that belief. I decry the morally bankrupt slogan popular in some minority groups in England—the slogan "Better Red than dead."

There was an American in an equally cruel era of our history who had another slogan that stirs my heart and mind today just as it stirred our ancestors almost two centuries ago. Patrick Henry said it best, and we still remember, "Give me liberty or give me death." That, I believe, is the conviction and nobly defiant stand that most worthily recommends itself to all Americans in these days of crisis.

There Is Only America Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Nina M. Pulliam, world traveler, author and newspaper executive, addressed the annual convention of Theta Sigma Phi, women's national journalistic fraternity at the Universtiy of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., on August 19, 1961. Mrs. Pulliam is the wife of Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of the Indianapolis Star and News, the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette.

From her extensive experience and travels Mrs. Pulliam has drawn an exceedingly clear picture of the problems this Nation faces and how they developed. Her address is a compelling call to Americans to meet the challenge of communism with the best weapons we possess—the courage and commonsense which made this Nation great.

Excerpts from that address follow:

THERE IS ONLY AMERICA NOW

The dateline—U.S.A., summer of 1961—is a dramatic combination of words and numerals, for both the time and the place are supercharged with trouble and anxiety; and sometimes humiliation and deep anger.

Americans are face to face with a fearful necessity to which we can no longer close our minds—the necessity to determine whether we have the wisdom and the stamina to find and face the answers to the awesome questions of our time; or whether we choose, instead, to drift on, as though in a dreamworld, until we are finally blasted awake, only to discover that our time has run out—and the chance to find those answers is gone beyond recall.

Where does America stand today—in the eyes of Americans, and in the eyes of the rest of the world?

In April of this year the President of the United States spoke to the American Newspaper Publishers Association at our annual convention. He gave us his opinion as to where the country stands today—he informed us that he considers the freedom of this Nation to be under deadly threat.

I could not possibly agree more heartily than I do with the President's evaluation of our position. But I disagree with him almost entirely as to the cause and the cure.

That the freedom of our country is under deadly threat is hardly news to most thinking Americans. For 30 years now the wisest and most experienced among us have been trying continuously to be heard with the same somber warning—that our freedom is under deadly threat—and that unless we awakened to that calamitous truth, and put a stop to the further deterioration of that freedom, we would find ourselves just about where we do find ourselves in this unsettled summer of 1961—dangerously near the point of no return, so far as being a free people living in a powerful and respected republic is concerned.

There was a time when America stood up before the world as the most admirable of nations, desired as a friend and feared as an enemy; in those days an American's life was worth something in other parts of the world; in those days an American wasn't reviled and spat upon or held for ransom in other countries; nor was the American flag being burned in front of American embassies across the world; our planes weren't being hijacked in flight, and our foreign properties weren't being confiscated under our very hand; we were respected; and we were respected because we deserved to be.

As Americans, born and bred in freedom, we find these violations against our lives and property and our national honor utterly intolerable.

What has been going on inside America? What has been happening to Americans?

It should be very clear to us now—it is certainly clear to those on the outside looking in at us—that we have been growing less confident of ourselves and of the unques-

tionable rightness of our American way of life; we have become more and more confused as to our real aims and purposes as a nation; we have been losing influence and respect throughout the entire world, whether enemy or friend; we grope futilely for a dependable direction, for we have long since abandoned our original and reliable direction; those responsible for leading us are beating at the waves while our national life is indisputably under deadly threat; we have been acting, in very truth, as William Lederer has charged us with acting—as "a nation of sheep."

Do you know where Alma-Ata Kazakhstan, is? It lies east of the Urals, deep in Soviet Russia. In July, just about 3 months after Mr. Kennedy's "deadly threat" speech in New York, Nikita Khrushchev made a speech in Alma-Ata. He shouted to his audience there "There is only America ahead of us now—and that country can be compared to a wornout runner." The people cheered, and Mr. Khrushchev grinned—and shook his fist.

This taunting message from that remote place had deep significance for you and me, for Mr. Khrushchev's meaning is very clear indeed. The Kremlin Communists believe that Britain and France can be written off, so far as being effective enemies of communism is concerned; Russia already holds captive an appalling part of Europe; communism has the seeds of tyranny and violence planted and flourishing in every corner of the earth; there is only America now between them and the fulfillment of the evil vow they swore against all mankind 40-odd years ago.

Bluntly translated, the meaning of that vow is that communism will neither waver nor weary until every vestige of freedom and dignity and truth has been eradicated from all the nations of earth; and the whole world is controlled from Moscow.

Make no wishful-thinking mistake about it—that is the undeviating aim and intention of every real Communist—changeless, relentless and lifelong. To this end, every drop of effort and energy and hate, every conceivable deceit and subversion, is being driven against the United States on a 24-hour-a-day basis, every day of every year.

This summer of 1961 is sadly reminiscent of the fateful summer of 1938—the tragic year of Neville Chamberlain's misbegotten Munich, which promised "peace in our time". Our leaders are trusting in the same sort of nebulous hopes which were relied on then. They appear to believe that if we survive one more Khrushchev—or Mao Tse tung—or Castro-inspired crisis, without bombs being rained down on Dallas or Detroit or Los Angeles, we've got it made, we've got "peace in our time."

Our situation fairly pleads for statesmanship and strong, offensive leadership; we seem, instead, committed to the pursuit of weakness. If this continues, it can end only one way—in a great American tragedy.

What is the real truth of our situation? Wherein is the real tragedy of it?

The real truth of it is that there is no peace in the world today. There has been no genuine peace since that autumn day in 1917 when communism began its grim and bloody march against freedom and truth—when Soviet Russia was spewed up and spawned as a nation.

And the terrible tragedy of it is that we are allowing communism to wage virtually a one-way war, planned and plotted by them, and suited to their own terms and timetable.

We have not only surrendered the offensive, we have literally rejected it—when a dozen ready-made opportunities to recapture it have been openly slapping us across the face. Each action of our malefactors is carefully calculated to put us in the most completely unfavorable position possible; each wishywashy reaction of ours, makes their plan an accomplished fact.

This was Lenin's dream; it was Stalin's determination; it is Khrushchev's reality.

As responsible citizens, it is our duty to inform ourselves as fully as our minds permit concerning the tactics and the intentions of communism; for we will have to deal with it, as surely as we have to deal with fire, flood and pestilence, if we intend to survive.

Analyze the mind of the Communist and his methods and his performance. Like it or not, you have got to know that the confirmed Communist is completely dedicated to the cause for which he works—and he does work—and hard. He venerates communism, for it has replaced God and all personal freedom and integrity for him; he will subvert anything whatsoever to it; and he believes absolutely in its eventual supremacy over all the world.

I wish there were time to give you some firsthand pictures of communism, as a way of life, behind the Iron Curtain—in the captive satellite nations as well as in Russia. Wherever you see it, you see it revealed as the blatant big lie it really is. It is nothing but another form of tyranny and suppression of the great masses of people by the ruling few at the top. Those rulers hold the power of life and death—and worse—over every man, woman and child who has the dreadful misfortune to be trapped under Communist control. It is the most highly centralized and inhuman form of government and way of life ever fashioned, the utter quintessence of imperialism and evil. As for me, I should far rather be dead than red.

There is no nation which has freely chosen communism as a way of life; no people ever freely chose to live under any form of tyranny and suppression. And any highly centralized government eventually becomes the agency of suppression over the many by the powerful few at the top. It makes no difference what benevolent claims and promises it makes; it makes no difference what name it takes in order to conceal its true nature.

Today more people in the world are affected by the words and actions of Nikita Khrushchev than by those of any other living person. And the United States, so recently regarded as the most powerful nation among nations, so recently respected and trusted, as the real and abiding rallying point of world freedom—the United States herself awaits with dread the news of what crisis Khrushchev will next create, either directly or through his robot ventriloquists, such as Castro.

And so in this troubled summer of 1961, we face some fearful facts concerning our position in the world and that of our avowed executioner, Russia. What does a brief recapitulation of those facts reveal? These things, among others:

In 1947, the U.S. Government under Mr. Truman, began its foreign aid program. It was designed "to contain communism." Since then the American people have paid out in foreign aid over $80 billion; and we are committed to much, much more.

We have proof that much of this great outpouring went to countries now alien to us and quite lost to the free world; much of it was actually used against us; most of it was an utter waste, helping neither us nor the common people like us in the countries who took it. And did it contain communism?

This is a part of the record. During the very years our foreign aid program has been in effect, 750 million more people have been booted behind the Iron Curtain, under outright Communist control; another 750 million have moved closer to communism, and have practically broken all ties which ever drew them toward the West.

In addition to this acquisition of a billion and a half more people, Russia has established hundreds of hotbeds of hate against us all over the world, ready to do violence against us whenever the Kremlin gives the order. As witness Cuba. Today, without let or hindrance or protest, Russia is arming Cuba and preparing her as a missile-launching base, a mere 90, wide-open miles from the American coast.

Does any of this delude you into thinking we have bought peace and friendship and freedom with our foreign aid billions? Did those billions "contain" communism? Is any of those acts of Russia the act of a nation devoted to peace?

What has been going on inside America during those years of Russia's startling evolution?

Thirty years ago the United States began a retreat—a retreat from the fundamental principles on which we were originally constituted a nation, and by which we had prospered and grown strong. We abandoned our time-tested traditions, and substituted therefor a hodgepodge of fatuous theories, all of which had been tried, had failed, and had been completely discreditd by other long-gone nations, hundreds of years before America was so much as a dot on the world map.

That is the real reason our freedom is now under deadly threat; that is the real cause for our weakness within, and our loss of prestige and respect without.

As Americans, we inherited the most admirable traditions ever handed down to any people. The word "traditions" is not a hollow word; to Americans it should be a hallowed word, for our traditions grew from the highest ideals which ever prompted any group of men and women to weld themselves together into a nation.

The most powerful force which impelled our founders to create this Nation was an urge which would not be silenced—the urge to give reality to man's most innate longing, the imperishable longing to be free; to be free in mind and spirit, and to have freedom of action and expression.

And our American freedom is unique—for it is rooted in the most noble documents ever devised—the Holy Bible, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our strictly American ten commandments—the Bill of Rights.

Throughout these written documents and throughout the traditions handed down to us, we are constantly cautioned that the individual is the one absolutely indispensable unit of freedom; and we have accepted the injunction that it is our utmost responsibility to protect and sustain the individual's integrity; for that is the gift of God to man.

Americans have projected these faiths into our cherished hope for all mankind—the sum and substance of it being that we have aimed to attain a state of true brotherhood-and-freedom throughout the world.

While we remained mindful of the true nature of our inheritance of freedom, and faithful to the traditions which grew out of it, the United States prospered. We became the miracle of modern times. We had great substance with which to work, but our success was essentially due to the unique freedom in which we lived. We were free to study and learn and think; to dare and discover and create; and thus to accomplish our highest aims and aspirations, all in accordance with the ability and sometimes genius with which we were endowed.

And in the main, we did so; in the main, we worked hard and were sensibly provident; we studied and thought and undertook new and daring things; in the main, we assumed our responsibilities as mature citizens, acknowledging we had a debt to

pay for the freedom we enjoyed; and we emerged on the world scene as a strong and respected nation, of individually strong men and women.

But 30 years ago we began to grow careless. We came to assume we had inherited our freedom in fee simple absolute. We ignored the ages-old admonition that freedom's price of eternal vigilance is a high and a continuing price; we were being sold the idea that we could forget that price.

For nearly 30 years now the foundations and the safeguards of our freedom, as originally set down, have been subjected to assault from without and from within. For nearly 30 years, while communism has bombarded those foundations from outside, we have been chiseling at them from inside. With no thought for the future, we have allowed this deterioration to continue, ignoring what we know—that nations are more often destroyed by weakness within than by strength from without.

Today our Nation's total debts stand at $3,000 billion. No nation ever staggered under such an incomprehensible, ruinous debt. We have placed a lien on the output of our productive plant and on our income unto the tenth generation.

Our personal initiative and our very self-respect, our great productive business machine and our established form of Government itself are threatened with annihilation.

For nearly 30 years now we have been led stealthily but steadily away from the constituted form of our Government.

During those 30 years we have subverted our inherent commonsense to the counterfeit claim that Government can do a better job than the people of owning and operating all the productive elements of this country—from farming to higher education; we have supinely submitted to giving up billions after billions of our dollars to fruitless foreign aid; we have stood still while the bureaucrats scurried around trying to reshape us into a welfare state; we have stood still while Government took over more and more of those affairs which, by the very nature of this republic, are the responsibility of the individual or the community or the State; in short, we have finally succumbed to the incessant pressures of the bureaucrats, and have conceded we want freedom from responsibility more than we want freedom itself.

And in doing so, we induced into our national bloodstream the parasitic germs of weakness and welfare statism which are now consuming and exhausting us as a great and free Nation of strong men and women.

Today we are face to face with the awful consequences of our years of folly; for we have now abdicated to government so many of freedom's responsibilities, and have surrendered in heavy payment therefor so many of freedom's rights, that the remaining vestiges of our freedom are, indeed, under deadly threat.

Unless we call a halt to these bureaucratic procedures which are undermining us, they will succeed finally in reducing us to a bankrupt, impotent, has-been nation.

For the good American way of life is not invulnerable to these arrogant violations of the natural and human and God-given laws on which this country was established.

The people out across this country know some very important things which our leaders in government have either forgotten or never learned.

There is statistical proof that the American people are well aware of the gravity of our Nation's position; there is also satistical proof that the determination of the people is stronger and more purposeful than that of those who are handling our Nation's affairs; that our thinking is straighter and more down to earth; and that our willingness-to-act is not only more rational but more courageous.

America is literally pleading for strong leadership—leadership which has the courage and commonsense to stop the wasteful, domestic fiascoes which are weakening us within; and the courage and commonsense to restore us to our lost position of strength and respect in the outside world.

This is our country. Its business is our business. Before time runs quiet out, let us tell the Government what we know and what we want—and what we expect government, as our representative, to do about it.

We want the defense for our Nation and the protection for our way of life that we have poured out billions of our dollars to buy and pay for—and for which we must pour out many billions more. We will resist the New Frontier philosophy that the new American way of life must be to go underground, to live in fallout cellars and to survive on ersatz candy bars.

We want our Government to start formulating our foreign policy on the basis of what is good for America; and to get over its obsessive fear of the opinion of the rest of the world. The opinion of the rest of the world neither pays our bills nor buys us any defense or friendship. Russia gives not one ruble for world opinion—she defies the whole world, ignores and outrages world opinion, and continues to grow steadily more powerful.

We know that foreign aid should be confined to those nations whose leaders will use it for the good of the people—not to line their pocketbooks or lend to our enemies—and who are pledged to speak up and stand steady in the cause of freedom.

We know it takes strong men and women to withstand the pressures of today's world-wide problems; and we know that a nation of welfare state featherbedders, feeding at the public trough, living off Federal aid schemes, won't have the fortitude to save America when the chips are down; we do not intend to stand still any longer and be merely silent onlookers at the continued ruthless abortion of our Republic into a second-class welfare state.

We know that no cause can win, no matter how noble, without wise and vigorous leadership in a steady direction; we want that kind of leadership; and we want it to do some commonsense planning to restore sanity to our financial affairs and to get us back on the beam of our proper course.

And we most emphatically want to retrieve our lost offensive by forcing world opinion back to the crimes of communism, where it belongs. We have a dossier of those crimes as high as the sky. What of Hungary, of Francis Powers, of Cardinal Mindzenty—and millions more?

The record of communism's criminality lies unused, collecting dust in the United Nations' under-the-table shelves; when, in fact, it gives us, ready made, the real ammunition we need for defeating communism, if only we had the ordinary commonsense and the American-type courage to use it.

The people out across this country know all these things. Let us tell our leaders to quit playing politics with our lives and fortunes and our national honor and get down to the business of taking care of America.

Public opinion, the voice of the people, is the most powerful force in American life. We can stop America's further retreat toward disaster only if we individually assume a more aggressive and informed concern in our Nation's affairs. Speak up whenever you can; and talk back whenever you must.

If we reject our responsibility to do so we may well be finished as a free Nation living under God, governed by and for the people; and mankind's noblest experiment will vanish from the earth.

And You Thought It Couldn't Happen Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial which appeared in the Feed and Grains Journal recently. It contains some very interesting observations and some very informative material that I believe the Members of the Congress and the public should know about. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in the RECORD:

AND YOU THOUGHT IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE?

Secretary of Agriculture Orville (Der Fuehrer) Freeman's "hatchet squadrons" swooped down like swarming cluster flies on the American Soybean Association's convention in Indianapolis the week before last. Their purpose? To ram through a resolution endorsing Dictator Freeman's recent price support skulduggery on soybeans of $2.30 a bushel.

President John Raber of the radical Indiana Farmers Union led this insurgent force, variously estimated at between 30 and 50 administration socialists and sympathizers.

So intent were they upon ramrodding their Russian-inspired views through the convention that one of the wildest scenes imaginable, in such an august setting, transpired. Fortunately, even the court order obtained by Der Fuehrer's followers did not restrain the election—which these rebels tried to prevent.

Before this convention, these Commie sympathizers were not members of ASA. They simply paid the $3 fee before entering the convention hall and then made every effort to move in and take over.

Needless to say, these same tactics can be expected to become well perfected before a similar attempt is made. State and sectional producers groups, and State Farmers Elevator Associations, in particular, unquestionably will be their next targets.

As a result of the 45-cent boost in the support level for this grain, as much as a 120-million-bushel carryover can be anticipated for our fifth largest crop by the end of the 1962 marketing year. Most of it could end up in Government hands at a cost to taxpayers of up to a quarter-billion dollars.

The Government paying farmers not to grow corn and other feed grains to reduce the surplus, while guaranteeing them higher prices to overproduce soybeans, simply creates a new surplus, and is the height of inconsistency.

This connivance is just about as fantastic and idiotic as the 4,500,000 acres of land that Freeman recently "lost," which will cost taxpayers another $150 million. He paid farmers $680 million to reduce corn acreage by 20,090,511 acres under the 1961 Feed Grains Act. Only 15,379,000 acres have been retired; hence, with typical USDA inefficiency, these 4,500,000 acres must either never have existed or never were planted to corn and grain sorghums.

In explaining this transaction to the Senate, Delaware's well-known feed dealer and poultry raiser, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, compared this hocus-pocus to the age-old joke about fakers and slickers selling the Brooklyn Bridge. "But at least there was a bridge," this fiscal watchdog declared in exposing this phantom acres scandal.

And to add further insult to injury, did you know that Russians now are buying American hard red wheat for 62 cents less per bushel than U.S. consumers? Meanwhile, Khrushchev is reported to be planning an announcement of free bread for his people as proof of the superiority of the Communist system.

"Why in blazes should we finance our own destruction?" snapped Ohio's Representative DELBERT L. LATTA, when he heard the news.

A rich harvest of trouble may also soon be expected because of our vast holdings of foreign currencies, now estimated at $4 billion, plus another $4 billion in IOU's from alleged "sales" (?) of our surplus farm commodities.

This hoard of foreign "funny money" is due to increase by leaps and bounds, inasmuch as Uncle Sap is now embarking on programs involving "soft loans" for hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign governments.

It is conservatively estimated that in less than four decades the United States will own or be owed more than $150 billion worth of this "funny money" that cannot be converted to dollars, to say nothing of not spending it without an agreement with the issuing country. How this country's forefathers would shudder.

In the final analysis, our "do good" officials have been dealing in sheer fiction when they claim to be "selling" surplus farm products to foreign countries. In the light of the foregoing, they ought to stop hoodwinking the taxpayers and tell everyone that these programs have been a giveaway all along.

Inasmuch as our mail is so heavy from those concerned with keeping their own communities informed of the rapid communistic inroads being made daily upon our freedoms, we would urge our readers to subscribe to Human Events, 410 First Street SE., Washington 3, D.C., at $12.50 a year, and to the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles 28, Calif., at $6 a year.

Strong rightwing pressures, currently coming from the grassroots in the form of heavy mail to Congressmen, are having a profound effect on their voting attitudes. If you have firm convictions against the idiotic waste and absurd farm and giveaway programs growing by leaps and bounds in Washington, make your views known weekly to your Senators and Congressmen.

That's not quite enough to accomplish the job, however. In addition, write to your own and nearby newspapers regularly. Protest to the local and county chairmen of your political party often, because they have the ear of the policymakers all along the line. Yes, and consistently write President Kennedy, too.

Remember the oft-reported admonition in the first Hoover Report, "No king ever wielded a scepter more powerful than a 5-cent pencil in the hands of an American citizen when he sits down to write his Congressman or Senator."

Freeman, Cochrane and their stripe must be ousted, and the commie bureaucrats shipped back to Russia now.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of medical aid to the aged is vitally important to our Nation. A society in which its citizens cannot receive proper medical care does not have the right to call itself prosperous.

Barbara Yuncker, the highly regarded journalist, wrote in the New York Post of September 24, 1961, a moving article about a 74-year-old woman who tried to get assistance under the Kerr-Mills plan. She failed to receive the necessary aid. Her case is an example of why it is imperative that Congress pass promptly a program of medical aid to the aged through social security. I hope that it will be a priority matter next session.

I include, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, the above-mentioned article:

HEARING TOLD HOW WOMAN, 74, TRIED VAINLY TO GET MEDICAL AID

(By Barbara Yuncker)

Miss "Jane Smith" is 74, a retired private school teacher, frail but fiercely independent, getting by in New York City on total income of $149 a month—social security, plus a tiny pension.

Heavy medical bills have wiped out her savings; she has had surgery on both eyes for cataracts and suffers osteo-arthritis, gall bladder disease, arteriosclerosis and thyroid difficulties, but can still live at home. Every month her bills for medicine, Blue Cross, and two doctors' visits total $25, not allowing for emergencies.

WAITS IN VAIN

Miss Smith is exactly the person whom the Kerr-Mills Act was supposed to help: the independent oldster who is medically indigent. Yet, this is what happened when, reluctantly, she applied in June under the State's new medical aid for the aged program.

She was told she'd have to make two trips to the department of welfare office, though all the facts in her case were attested by a leading social service agency. (The welfare office was 65 blocks, 2 buses away; $1.20 is a big item in a budget that allows only $10 a week for food.) When she got there she waited 3 hours in vain because of a mixup.

Then the investigator did come to her home. On July 12 the application was rejected on an incorrect interpretation. After it was reopened she was told she couldn't continue to go to the doctor she'd used and trusted for years unless he became a welfare panel doctor. So he agreed to qualify.

After further rigamarole and checking by the social agency she was again rejected on August 23, this time because her doctor hadn't filed a form he said he'd never been asked for and because the rules said an application had to be processed within 2 weeks. But, they said, she could reapply. By the time the service agency got that straightened out her doctor was on vacation, so his signature was unavailable.

DECRIES BOTHER

Miss Smith is still waiting, scrimping frantically to buy medicine and keep up her Blue Cross premiums, nervously apologetic in her fear that she's been too much trouble to everybody.

For the sake of her dignity she's lucky she has no kin; they'd have been investigated to see if they could pay her bills. Or that she has no savings; she'd have to prove she'd spent them first, except for a permitted $900.

Miss Smith was a witness-by-proxy Friday when the Joint Legislative Committee on Health Insurance Plans undertook to find out how the State's Metcalf-McCloskey Act, implementing Kerr-Mills, is working out. She was brought in spirit by Jean Wallace Carey testifying for the Community Service Society.

FORCED ON WELFARE

Mrs. Carey was one of a daylong parade of witnesses whose aggregate testimony said, in effect, that Metcalf-McCloskey was not yet helping those in was designed to help, that the investigation of relatives prevented proud old people from applying, that income and savings limits were too low, that independent old people were being forced to pauperize themselves and go on welfare which the law never intended and that elimination of dentistry, eyeglasses and podiatry ignored frequent and major complaints of the elderly.

Big Science—Marvel of Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the wide range of new vistas opened by the modern development of science produces some of the most important problems ever faced by the world. If we do not find the proper answers, not only will our national security be placed in danger, but the future progress of mankind will be retarded or even stifled.

I am not a scientist by training or profession. I have studied international affairs over the years carefully and have discussed the problems of space development with those in position to know. In my humble judgment, our first step must be further to develop an effective antimissile missile. We must speed up our present efforts to do this in every possible way. In this way we can preserve our national security and at the same time guard the peace of the world. I might add that an antimissile missile is strictly a defensive weapon if in the possession of a peace desiring nation such as the United States of America.

The following article from the New York Times magazine of July 23, 1961, by Alvin M. Weinberg, Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, at Oak Ridge, Tenn., points up some of the decisions our Nation faces in a concise manner. I particularly call attention to the parts of his remarks concerned with putting a man on the moon and with the possibilities that modern progress in the field of biology enables us to forecast.

The article follows:

BIG SCIENCE—MARVEL OR MENACE?

(By Alvin M. Weinberg)

Throughout history, societies have expressed their aspirations in monumental enterprises which, though not necessary for their survival, have taxed them to their physical and intellectual limits. History often views these monuments as symbolizing the societies. The pyramids symbolize Egypt, Europe's magnificent cathedrals symbolize the church culture of the Middle Ages, Versailles the France of Louis XIV, and so on.

When history looks at the 20th century, she will see science and technology as its theme; she will find the monuments of big science—the huge rockets, the high-energy accelerators, the high-flux research reactors—symbols of our time just as surely as Notre Dame is a symbol of a past age.

The emergence of these symbols, as supreme outward expressions of our culture's aspirations raises three broad and difficult questions: Is big science ruining science? Does it cost too much? Is it working on the right things? These questions deserve serious attention, for they relate not only to science but to our whole society. Because of their complexity, however, I shall be able only to touch upon them here.

IS BIG SCIENCE RUINING SCIENCE?

The English astronomer Fred Hoyle recently set off a lively controversy by arguing against the United Kingdom's going into large-scale space research. He maintained that space research is not worth the money and manpower involved and certainly does not justify spending more on it than on any other branch of science; further, that wherever science is fed by too much money, it becomes fat and lazy: he claimed to see evidence that the tight intellectual discipline necessary for science is, especially in America, being loosened.

I shall touch upon Hoyle's first point later. As to his second, I confess that I share his misgivings. To begin with, since big science needs great public support it thrives on publicity. The inevitable result is the injection of a journalistic flavor that is fundamentally in conflict with the scientific method. If the serious writings about big science were carefully separated from the journalistic writings, little harm would be done. But they are not. Issues of scientific or technical merit tend to get argued in the popular, not the scientific, press, or in the congressional committee room rather than in the technical society lecture hall.

Add to these trends the enormous proliferation of scientific writing, large parts of which remain unread in their original form and therefore must be predigested, and one cannot escape the conclusion that the line between journalism and science has become blurred.

In the second place, one sees evidence of scientists spending money instead of thought. This is one of the most insidious effects of the large-scale support of science. In the past, both of these commodities have been hard to come by. Now, however, money is relatively plentiful while thought is not. Thus there is a natural rush to order, say, a $10 million nuclear reactor rather than to devise a crucial experiment with the reactors at hand.

Finally, the huge growth of big science involves the spending of large sums of public money. This has added greatly to the number of administrators whose job is to see to it that the money is spent wisely. Just as it is easier to spend money than to spend thought, so it is easier to tell other scientists how and what to do rather than to do it oneself. The big scientific community tends to acquire more and more bosses. The Indians with bellies to the laboratory bench are hard to discern for all the chiefs with bellies to the mahogany desk.

But it is fruitless to wring one's hands over the bad effects of big science. It is an inevitable part of our scientific development and, for better or for worse, is here to stay. What we must do is learn to live with it. We must make it flourish and at the same time keep it from trampling little science—that is, we must nurture small-scale excellence as assiduously as we lavish gifts on spectaculars.

With respect to big science, huge laboratories like Oak Ridge play a central role. They were established to encourage big science yet to segregate it and prevent it from taking over little science. Big science's triple diseases—journalitis, moneyitis, administratitis—have always been with us in the big laboratories. Being aware of these pitfalls we have made conscious efforts to cope with them—by requiring internal review of each publication, by occasionally sending an administrator back to his laboratory, by subjecting large expenditures to enough scrutiny so that money is not too easy to get.

I do not believe that we at Oak Ridge, or, I suspect, other such institutions, are completely successful in these efforts. We do the best we can, however; and at least, by confining big science to such institutions, we prevent the contagion from spreading.

What really bothers me is the evidence that big science is invading the universities. One need not look far to find billion-volt acccelerators and megawatt research reactors on many campuses. The justification for this is that such gadgets are now needed for basic research and basic research is best done in conjunction with education. But I think there is a very grave danger in this incursion.

A professor of science is chosen because he is extremely well-qualified as a scientist, thinker, or teacher. If he becomes too involved with big science he will have to become a publicist, if not a journalist, an administrator, and a spender of big money.

I do not for a moment suggest that college professors are not able bigtime administrators. I merely point out that the proper function of a professor is to be a professor; that once big science has invaded his precincts and he becomes an operator, his students and his intellectual eminence and proficiency are bound to suffer.

Are there ways of bringing big science into the educational stream other than by converting our universities into national laboratories? One way, which has been tentatively suggested by the President's Science Advisory Committee, is to strengthen the already close relationships between the Government laboratories and the universities. I would go a step further and propose the creation of technical universities close to or in conjunction with the large Government laboratories.

One advantage of such a scheme would be that the big laboratories have already made their peace with big science: the onerous housekeeping function, the layer of inevitable administrators and publicists, is already in being. Professors in collaborating universities, who might be drawn in part from the existing scientific staffs of these laboratories, would not have to get involved as strongly in activities not related to their science as they would if they had to start big science from the beginning.

In addition, the big Government laboratories have facilities and technically trained personnel who are not now pulling their full weight in the educational job that must be done.

DOES BIG SCIENCE COST TOO MUCH?

In exploring this second question, let us take a look at our Government's spending policies in this area. The present Federal expenditure on research and development is $\$8.4\times10^9$ ($8.4 billion) a year, which is about 10 percent of the Federal budget and about 1.6 percent of the gross national product. Of the $8.4 billion, about 80 percent is spent on defense research.

The rate of change of our research and development budget, averaged over the past 10 years, has been 10 percent a year. This corresponds to a doubling time of 7 years. Since the doubling time of the gross national product—now estimated at $500 billion—is about 20 years, at the present rate we shall be spending all of our money on science and technology in about 65 years. Evidently something will have to be done or big science will ruin us financially.

What can be done? We have decided, though implicitly, that our military budget shall represent about 10 percent of our gross national product. Now, both our military and our scientific might are instruments of national policy. It therefore seems to me that the general principles that have guided our military-fiscal policy should be useful in guiding our science-fiscal policy.

Thus, we ought soon to decide to devote a certain fraction of our gross national product (GNP) to nondefense science rather than paying for each scientific expenditure on an ad hoc, item-by-item basis. At the moment science grows much more rapidly than does the GNP. I would suggest that we settle on some figure—say, less than 1 percent of the GNP—as the long-term bill for federally supported, nondefense science, and that we stick to it for a period of, perhaps, 15 years.

Our science budget will then increase only as fast as our GNP; but we scientists shall have to get used to that idea.

IS BIG SCIENCE WORKING ON THE RIGHT THINGS?

If we settle on an overall science budget that is geared to the GNP, we shall have to make choices among various scientific projects. But where should these choices be made? Are there any fields of science more important than, for example, manned space flight or high-energy physics?

It would be naive, if not hopeless, for us to argue that we should not use scientific achievement as a means of competition with the U.S.S.R. Major Gagarin's feat has caught the world's fancy, and we may as well face up to it. But are we wise in choosing manned flight into space as the primary event in these scientific Olympic games? I shall argue against so doing on three grounds: radiation hazard, expense, and relevance.

It is my impression that the hazard of space flight, particularly the radiation hazard, is not fully assessed as yet. Several recent analyses suggest that the radiation shielding for a space craft would be formidable. To shield an entire capsule against occasional high-energy solar flares might require about 10 tons of materials; to shield a man individually would require about a ton.

These figures are not catastrophic. Yet I find them disturbing for two reasons.

First, the measurements of solar flare radiation, if not of the Van Allen Belt radiation, are still very uncertain. Second, we are still uncertain as to the biological effects of the high energy protons in the solar flares, and of the energetic heavy particles found in the cosmic rays. All in all, the uncertainties are too large to enable us to assess the radiation danger reliably at present.

The radiation hazard does not clearly make space an intolerable environment for man; on the other hand, it does make space a much more hostile environment than we had suspected even 5 years ago. The idea of man tramping about on the moon's surface without shielding for any extended time seems to me quite unlikely.

The corollary I draw is that, on the basis of what we now know, manned space travel is not definitely feasible in the sense that we can now really place a firm upper limit on the cost of a round trip to the moon: the estimates of $20 billion to $40 billion for this mission are so large and cover so wide a range as to make the outsider doubt their validity on a priori grounds.

I am reminded that the Lexington project predicted that if we spent $1 billion we could have a nuclear aircraft flying at the end of 10 years. The time and money have been spent, but we have words, not nuclear airplanes, flying.

The other main contender in the scientific Olympics is high-energy physics. It, too, is wonderfully expensive (the Stanford linear accelerator is expected to cost $100 million), and we may expect to spend $400 million a year on this area of research by 1970.

The issues with which it deals have greater scientific validity than those dealt with in the manned space program; but its remoteness from human affairs is equally great. Its advantage, from our point of view, is that we are ahead of the Russians in this field.

But even if it were possible to generate the same popular interest around high-

energy physics that comes naturally to manned space travel, I am not persuaded that this is the battleground of choice. There are other areas that are more closely related to man's everyday environment, that have bearing on man's welfare, and in which we are ahead.

The most spectacular of these is molecular biology, a field in which the Eastern contributions is minimal. We have learned more about the essential life processes—growth, protein synthesis and reproduction—during the past decade than during all previous history.

In my opinion, the probability of synthesizing living material from nonliving before the end of the century is of the same order as the probability of a successful, manned round trip to the planets. I suspect that most Americans would prefer to belong to the society which first gave the world a cure for cancer than to the society which puts the first astronaut on Mars.

And there are others, mostly resulting from the growing population pressure—the problem of nuclear energy (in which we are ahead), of water, of atmospheric pollution, or of chemical contamination of the biosphere, for example. Each of these is a technical issue that can lay claim to our resources and will have to be considered when we make choices.

But it is presumptuous for me to urge that we do biology on earth rather than biology in space, or make other specific choices. What I am saying is that these choices have become matters of high national policy. We cannot allow our overall science strategy, when it involves such larger sums and even larger human implications, to be settled by default, or to be pre-empted by the group with the most skillful publicity department. We should have extensive debate on these questions of scientific choice; we should make a choice, explain it, and then have the courage to stick to it.

In making the choices we should remember the experiences of other civilizations. Those cultures that have devoted too much of their talent to monuments that had nothing to do with the real issues of human well-being have usually fallen upon bad days: history tells us that the French Revolution was the bitter fruit of Versailles, and that the Roman Colosseum helped not at all in staving off the barbarians.

It is for us to learn well these lessons of history. We must not allow ourselves, by shortsighted seeking after fragile monuments of big science, to be diverted from our real purpose, which is the enriching and broadening of human life.

Facts, Foreign Policy, and Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

AND

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

I—RHODES REMARKS

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, recently a conference of so-called uncommitted or neutral nations concluded its business in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

I will not dwell on the sordid results of that conference since they have already been dealt with extensively by Members of the Congress and by the Nation's press. But I cannot avoid commenting that their incredible actions should have come as no surprise to anybody. Even the appellation "uncommitted" or "neutral," proudly borne by these nations, should have given sufficient warning to all the world as to the course they would follow in any showdown between East and West. For who on the face of this earth who possesses decency, moral sense, or bravery could remain uncommitted when the choice presented lies between liberty or slavery, between the principles exemplified by Western Christian civilization and the diabolical machinations of the worldwide Communist conspiracy, a conspiracy drenched in the blood of countless millions of human beings?

Mr. Speaker, the unjustifiable failure of these nations to condemn aggression by the U.S.S.R. against all mankind cannot be excused upon the grounds of ignorance. The innate and inherent evil of the Communist conspiracy has time and again been exhibited for all the world to see. It has shown its slack-jawed, leering face in countless atrocities, in the wholesale butchery of freedom-starved Hungarian patriots, in the demonic suppression of millions of its subjugated peoples, and in countless lies, deceits, and treacheries.

No, Mr. Speaker, it was not a lack of knowledge of the nature of Soviet communism and its works which impelled the neutrals to scorn the free and embrace the oppressor. Nor do I think it was a lack of decency or moral sense. It is opportunism of the most blatant kind. It is an opportunism which sees a clear-cut determination on the part of the Soviets to win and a lack of such a will in the West. It is an opportunism which is born of the fear engendered by Soviet displays of raw power.

Mr. Speaker, the real importance attached to the shameful results of this conference of frightened men lies not in its groveling before circuslike displays of Soviet might but in the fact that it has exposed the utter bankruptcy of an American foreign policy which is based upon the currying of the whimsical and capricious favor of such weak reeds.

It is the failure of this senseless policy which concerns us and to which my colleague and I will address ourselves this afternoon.

As the cold war moves into its decisive phase, the geographic locations of the uncommitted nations assume great significance. A Communist Africa, or an Africa torn asunder by Communist-inspired chaos and made ripe for quick conquest by Soviet forces, threatens the entire southern flank of NATO.

Continued Soviet penetration of Latin America, carried on from the newly acquired Communist base in Cuba, poises a dagger at the underside of the United States.

Soviet domination of, or Soviet-inspired neutralism in, India would endanger all of southern Asia and cut vital communications links between NATO and SEATO.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I do not argue that the uncommitted nations are unimportant or that they should be ignored. But I do insist that any policy which seeks to win them to our cause through semantics, financial giveaways or good example ignores the more important aspects of the cold war. Such a policy can bring us to disaster for it estops us from taking steps which can bring us victory and leads us into actions which can bring us only to defeat.

We speak of "propaganda victories" as if vast armies were added to the forces of the free world each and every time Khrushchev exposes his aggressive intent.

But I must ask, Mr. Speaker, if these are victories, what have we won? The answer is that nothing has been won. For in all our concern to follow domestic and international policies which will be pleasing to the uncommitted nations we have overlooked the unpleasant fact that when we speak in the tongues of the angels of our virtues and our enemy's sins, we speak only to ourselves.

Our allies know which side is right and which side is wrong. They have already made their choice to stand at our side, for the freedom they seek to defend is their freedom as well as ours. They do not need contsant reminders from us concerning our moral righteousness.

The uncommitted of the world are also aware of the side on which justice lies. But they cannot afford to concern themselves with anything quite so sophisticated as the distinction between who is right and who is wrong.

They can only pay attention to the question of who is going to win and who is going to lose. For they recognize that their survival depends upon their ability to choose the winning side in a struggle in which they cannot avoid choosing sides.

In our preoccupation with "What will the uncommitted think?" we have committed acts of weakness that guarantee a loss of respect amongst those who only admire strength, which includes most of the uncommitted nations.

Mr. Speaker, we stand face to face with an enemy which never ceases to remind us, through word and deed, that he intends to conquer and enslave us. To date our response has been timid and childlike in its naivete. We pray about winning men's minds through good works and charity while our enemies win men's bodies through subversion and aggression, and paralyze their minds through fear. We have become devotees of the very word "negotiation," disregarding the cold facts which tell us that you cannot negotiate your own destruction. We kneel before the altar of the United Nations, disregarding the fact that this body is being gradually subjugated to serving Soviet aims. But we have not done that which must be done to win the struggle into which we have been forced.

Mr. Speaker, we are running out of time. It is not yet too late—we can still win. But in order to do so we must have a policy of victory and in order to formulate such a policy we must first face facts.

Fact No. 1 is so simple that it has escaped many of our leaders. It is that we are fighting for survival. And that survival can only be attained by a total victory over those who would destroy us. There is no middle way; our enemies will not permit it.

Once we accept this fact we can begin to fight. Until we do we are helpless in our purposelessness.

Fact No. 2: Once embarked on a policy of victory we must at all costs avoid doing anything, anything at all, which will assist the enemy or render to him comfort and encouragement. For it should be obvious to all that anything that helps our enemy hurts us.

Fact No. 3: Unpleasant though it might be we must face the fact that the victory we seek involves risks. This victory cannot be had cheaply. If we are unwilling to take risks we are unworthy of victory. As Benjamin Franklin put it, "He who sacrifices liberty for safety's sake deserves neither liberty nor safety." Recognition of this fact demands sacrifice as well as risk. It involves willingness to dig in and prepare to face whatever consequences our quest for victory and peace bring upon us.

Fact No. 4: By virtue of the abundance which God has heaped upon us, and the initiative, willpower, and ingenuity which He has seen fit to imprint upon the American character, the United States is today the leader of the free world. Recognition of this fact demands acceptance of the full responsibilities of that leadership. For if the leader will not lead what can be the fate of the followers?

Fact No. 5: We have entered into the final phase of the struggle for freedom. We must recognize the lesson of recent years. Time is our enemy, not our friend. In the 16 years since the end of World War II the Soviet Union has risen from the ashes of that struggle to a power which dominates a third of mankind. This rise to great power will not cease merely because we desire that it should. It will continue, and Soviet subversion round the world will continue to weaken and conquer its victims. If we are to seek victory as the only alternative to defeat we must accept the lateness of the hour and act accordingly. Our every word and deed must be carefully calculated and executed. Above all, commonsense must, in every case, prevail over sophistry. Intricate and involved diplomatic maneuvering which served a civilized world for many centuries has no great place in this struggle. Today our situation demands not a Richelieu but a Stonewall Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched upon the failure of our foreign policy, such as it has been. I have outlined the basic facts which must be recognized before a reasonable foreign policy can be formulated. I have avoided partisanship because the survival of our liberty rises far above political maneuver. Should we lose the present struggle the chains with which we will be bound will be nonpartisan.

I will now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], who will outline the foreign policy, the strategy for victory, which we believe is indicated by the facts which I have discussed.

I commend his remarks to the President, to this body, and to our fellow citizens. This policy is, in our opinion, the only course which this Nation can follow. There is no other way if liberty is to live on in this world.

II. LIPSCOMB REMARKS

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his concise examination of the facts of life in the cold war.

These facts taken together demand a policy of realism, firmness, resolve and a willingness to sacrifice. Above all they demand that we seek victory, final and complete.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months the voice of weakness and appeasement has been heard in the land. It is a voice which speaks in trembling tones of negotiation and accommodations. It speaks of war, even a war to preserve Western Christian civilization, as unthinkable.

It justifies its weakness by claiming that the policy of "calibrated surrender" which it advocates is realistic and one of reason. It places supreme value upon materialism, it worships not God but gadgetry, not heaven but real estate. Its accents are those of the highly educated but its creed is the cowardice of craven fools. In its extreme, but sole logical conclusion, it bleats "better Red than dead."

For it cherishes not the ideals by and for which men live but only life itself. In the end its goal is mere animal survival—survival at any price.

Mr. Speaker, we do not address ourselves to those who speak in this shrill voice for they are insensible to the reason of courage—to the creed of brave and free men.

We speak instead to the vast majority of our fellow Americans who, despite years of exposure to the incessant voice of unreality which equates love of country with chauvinism and courage with extremism, have remained steadfast if inarticulate in their determination to preserve our liberty and traditions.

One hundred years ago the Northern States fielded a magnificent fighting force—the Army of the Potomac. For 4 long years this army displayed unbelievable courage and devotion. And for 4 long years it suffered tragically because of inept and indecisive leadership. But yet, there was not a single day in this 4 years in which the will of the men of this army to triumph was diminished by one whit. As it moved from bloody field to bloody field, from disaster to disaster, it retained the will to fight, and die if need be, the will to win. The greatness of this army lay in the fact that it endured. And in the end its endurance was rewarded by sound leadership and eventually, victory.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the American people might be compared today to that great army.

Though they have suffered humiliating defeat upon humiliating defeat they continue to endure and to keep alive the will to win. They have seen nations whose independence was first secured by the United States turn viciously and unjustly against them, as in the case of Cuba.

They have distributed the hard-won fruits of their labors to nations who now turn their backs upon us in our hour of need. They have shed their blood on foreign fields only to see that which they fought to preserve destroyed and new tyrannies arise to replace those which they so gallantly disputed.

But they have never wavered. They stand ready today to sacrifice whatever the struggle demands of them. And they deserve a leadership which can match their devotion and courage. They deserve a policy which can attain that which they seek: peace with honor and freedom for all mankind.

Such a policy, Mr. Speaker, cannot be formulated until our leaders accept and recognize the facts which the gentleman from Arizona has just discussed.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I shall expound upon the conclusions to which these facts point.

Fact No. 1: That we are now engaged in a struggle for the survival of liberty and that this struggle can only end in victory or defeat makes it imperative that we adopt victory as our goal.

There are those among us—the "ostrich policy" advocates—who refuse to accept the words of our enemy that he seeks to destroy us. Their heads buried in the sands of appeasement they fail to see that every day, in every part of the world, the international Communist conspiracy moves forward aggressively, positioning itself so as to be better prepared to strike at us at the propitious moment.

Instead they continue to hope against all hope and reason that somehow this enemy, flushed with successes to which they themselves have contributed by their unwillingness to recognize our peril, will abandon his ever-increasing efforts to destroy us.

We must accept without reservation the fact that we are engaged in a war and that the only acceptable conclusion in this war is victory. For the only alternative to victory in this struggle is defeat.

Having accepted this fact we must then begin to plan for the winning of this victory. And we must disregard the notion that the enemy can be persuaded by words alone to yield to our desire for peace and freedom for all mankind.

Thus this first element in our policy of victory would prevent us from entering into negotiations with the enemy when there is nothing about which to negotiate, as in the case of Berlin.

Given the aggressive nature of communism the conference table is only another weapon in the cold war for the Soviets. We must avoid letting ourselves be put into positions in which this weapon can be pointed at our heads.

All legal and other considerations aside, the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin is essential to our national security. At the present moment we cannot hope for more than the status quo, but we cannot accept less. Negotiations over the Berlin situation, conducted under the Communist gun, can only achieve a victory for the enemy. We cannot concede a single thing and no rational person could expect the enemy to make any concession. But the mere fact that we permitted ourselves to be forced into a conference through the enemy's aggressiveness would constitute a major victory for world communism.

There have been suggestions that we might concede recognition of the Oder-Nesse boundaries between Poland and East Germany. But such a concession would represent a severe blow to our ally, West Germany, which rightfully looks forward to the reunification of their homeland in its entirety. Such a concession would be an act of cowardice and a travesty in our relationships with West Germany.

We should set preconditions for any negotiations on Berlin. Among them should be the immediate reopening of the borders between East and West Berlin and destruction of the wall recently erected on that boundary.

Until such preconditions as this are met we should consider negotiations impossible.

Fact No. 2 demands that we would avoid giving aid or comfort to the enemy, surely a self-evident fact. In addition to demanding that we cease all of the disgraceful trade in strategic goods with the enemy and his satellites which has recently reached startling proportions, this fact might also indicate the need to stop all trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc and such a possibility should be thoroughly studied.

Given the economic and industrial backwardness of the enemy trade in any goods helps him to gird for the conflict for which he prepares. Such trade is sheer madness.

We must deny aid to all these nations under the suasion of the Kremlin.

We must impress upon our allies the danger of such trade and seek to persuade them with every means at our command to desist from carrying on such trade. We must avoid trade with those who experience shows us will reship goods consigned to them to the Soviet bloc. In short we should give serious consideration to an absolute embargo upon trade with the enemy. And posthaste we must abandon the manaical practice adopted in recent months of shipping subsidized surplus American foodstuffs and grains to the Soviet Union courtesy of the pocketbook of the American taxpayer. It is madness to feed an enemy when the lack of sustenance in his homeland can create unrest and thus become our ally.

We must look carefully at every proposal to judge if it is something which the enemy desires. Recognition of Red China is one of the cherished goals of world communism. Ample proof exists that such a step would be of enormous benefit to the enemy. It must therefore be resisted. And despite the hot denials of those in the administration who have, by their ambigious acts and statements, brought us to the brink of this disaster. we can prevent admission of Red China to the United Nations. We can prevent it despite such statements as that made by U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson on "Meet the Press" Sunday, September 17, to the effect that there was little or nothing this Nation could do to prevent the seating of Red China.

We can prevent it simply by making amply clear to all the world that we will not tolerate such a step. Admission of this international bandit, continually in violation of the U.N. Charter, would violate that charter and destroy any effectiveness of that body as an instrument of world peace.

We must state without reservation our determination to prevent this crime from taking place. The United States pays by far the greater share of the costs of this body. It distributes enormous sums to a large majority of the members of the United Nations. If we are willing to make clear our determination in this matter even if it means abandonment of the United Nations, we will prevail.

Our attitude toward the admission of Outer Mongolia should be similar since this, too, will help the enemy.

Further, we must recognize certain highly unpleasant facts about the United Nations itself. We must recognize that, in the guise of fulfilling its mission as a peacemaker in the Congo, it has rendered a tremendous service to the enemy by attempting to destroy, by force of arms, the only effective anti-Communist and pro-Western group in that strife-torn area, Katanga. It has set the stage for the eventual takeover of the Congo by the Communist-leaning followers of the late Patrice Lamumba by encouraging a coalition government with these Soviet stooges occupying places of power.

It has done this in complete disregard of the fact that such coalition governments inevitably lead to Communist domination. History will record that the enslavement of 600 million Chinese came as the direct result of the adoption of a coalition government by the Chinese.

We learned this bitter lesson too late, having precipitated the formation of a coalition government which included the Chinese Reds. We cannot afford to permit the United Nations the luxury of learning such lessons as this through experience.

This and other similar acts by the U.N. make it imperative that, if we are to continue to support this body, it must cease forthwith to render aid and comfort to the enemy. If it does not it has ceased to be a friend of peace and becomes instead an ally of our enemy and an enemy of liberty.

In this, as in all other areas, we must be realists and not idealists.

Fact No. 3 demands that we be willing to accept the risks inherent in a policy of victory without flinching.

Any such policy involves risks. We must be prepared to take them. When the enemy rattles his sabers we must not scurry for cover, muttering vaguely about negotiations on the way. We must instead stand resolute and firm. We must recognize the fact that nuclear warfare is far less appetizing to the enemy than it is to ourselves. We must also realize that fear of such a war, and a determination to avoid it at all costs, is an open invitation to the enemy for expanded aggression on a massive scale. We must make amply clear that we reserve unto ourselves the decision to use nuclear weapons at any time and any place where our national security demands it. It must be our decision, and not the enemy's to decide what points of issue are worth fighting such a war.

All qualifications aside we must put the enemy on notice of our willingness to fight a nuclear war if only to avoid having to fight one. Experience has shown that the Soviet Union will withdraw whenever their bluff is called. This was the keystone in the Eisenhower policy and it must become the foundation of the policy of this administration. It was best expressed by Theodore Roosevelt when he said, "Speak softly, and carry a big stick." Unfortunately, in recent months this policy has been interpreted to mean "Speak strongly, carry a big stick, and make abundantly clear to the enemy that you are afraid to use it."

Fact No. 4 involves acceptance by the United States of world leadership. We must recognize the fact that we bear the heavy responsibility for the maintenance of freedom in the world.

Our strength is the strength of the free world; our weakness the weakness of the free world.

In the past our refusal to accept the duties of leadership has led to fear and suffering in Laos, South Vietnam, Cuba, Latin America, Algeria, Angola, and soon to be, in Mozambique.

We have opened all of Latin America to Communist penetration and eventual conquest by our indecisive if not cowardly policy on Cuba.

The failure of the United States to stand firm behind our ancient ally, France, in its hours of desperation in Algeria and at Bizerte, has brought suffering and despair to Algeria. It has seen the Algerian rebel leadership pass firmly into the hands of Soviet stooges. It has drained France of its wealth, its manhood and, most dangerously of all, its unity.

A similar disaster threatens another old friend, Portugal in its provinces of Angola and Mozambique. The Communist inspiration of the troubles in these areas has been plain for all to see. And yet we stand aloof in this desperate struggle, stooping only to cast a cowardly vote in the U.N. against a friend to aid a foe.

The people of Cuba lay pressed neath the heel of Communist tyranny and all of Latin America trembles as the Cuban based agents of the Kremlin move amongst their midst intent upon creating chaos and from chaos, conquest. And we here too remain aloof, offering to the threatened people to the south a shield of paper dollars when they seek to avoid

the bullets of Communist maneuvering. In place of strength and leadership we give them money and then wonder why they begin to hold us in contempt. It is because we have, in our weakness of character, been contemptible.

We must assert our leadership in all these areas, and in all the world. We must crush the Red serpent in its Cuban nest and we must do so forthwith. The interantional situation permits no other solution.

We must make clear our support of our friends, including France and Portugal in their efforts to work out long term, equitable solutions to the problems attending the development of nationalism in colonial territories. Also, however, we must make clear that we will stand with them against Communist aggression in those territories, hiding under the guise of nationalism.

We must, in all these matters act in our national interest, for in so doing, we act in the interest of freemen everywhere. Our position of free world leadership demands no less of us. Failure to accept our responsibilities threatens not only ourselves but all free nations as well.

If we seek to impress the uncommitted of the world we must display not only the strength that we possess but our willingness to use that strength whenever and wherever freedom is endangered. If we will show to the world our absolute and unshakable determination to win over the forces of despotism and slavery they will stand beside us in this struggle secure in the knowledge that we are there should they need us to protect them from Communist domination.

Fact No. 5 is self-evident. The struggle has reached its decisive phase. Recent actions by the Kremlin show that they are now attempting to bring the struggle to a swift and victorious conclusion.

Displaying raw and unbridled force they seek to intimidate the United States and its allies with threats of the force they display. We must not permit ourselves to be intimidated by this circus-like display but must, instead, make clear to Khrushchev that the unparalleled power at our disposal stands behind our will to resist.

We must commence to take actions designed to put the Kremlin off balance.

We must take every advantage offered us by the seething unrest in the satellites and in Red China. We must expose to the world the vast weaknesses of the Sino-Soviet bloc rather than to help to propagandize their unproven strengths and shabby circus tricks.

Finally, we must acknowledge to all the world our determination to bring this struggle to a victorious end with dispatch and resolve.

We have outlined, in its barest essentials, a strategy for victory. The administration might well pay heed to our words. We stand at a crossroads which on one side leads to peace and liberty and on the other to slavery and death.

This administration can go down through all the ages as the leadership which destroyed mankind's greatest threat. Or it can be despised by all generations to come as the leadership which led the world into chains. The choice is here. It must be made. God willing, we will choose to win.

This Is the Way Friendship Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, United States-Mexico border area residents, who diligently seek still greater friendship between our two neighboring countries, have found an outstanding ally for their efforts in American Consul General John F. Killea, of Monterrey, Mexico.

Consul General Killea has brought ability and enthusiasm to his job in Monterrey. His wife shares these qualifications. The two of them have become increasingly more active of international joint civic enterprises which are the keystone of that part of the border.

Because all too rarely in these days are compliments passed around, it is a privilege to quote below from a letter I received from Dr. Carlos Canseco, Jr., ex-district Rotary International Governor from Monterrey, and chairman of the International Committee of the Monterrey Downtown Rotary Club:

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL,
September 13, 1961.

I am the chairman of the International Committee of the Monterrey (Mexico) Downtown Rotary Club, and I consider it important to bring to your attention a most unusual act of cooperation which has occurred for the consecutive year between our Rotary Clubs and the American consulate general of Monterey, plus many of your constituents of Mission, Tex., McAllen, Tex., Harlingen, Tex., Brownsville, Tex., and Padre Island, Tex. Incidentally, the Chamber of Commerce of Dallas also cooperated to an unusual degree.

The occasion was the observance of Labor Day, a national holiday in your country on September 4, 1961. Your very able, imaginative, and sympathetic Consul General John F. Killea, of Monterrey, suggested that we join forces on that day and hold a benefit for underprivileged that were patients in the pediatric wing of the university hospital of this city. His wife, Lucy, and some of the wives of the officers of the Labor Department assigned to the bracero center here in Monterrey serve as nurses aids in this wing.

Your fellow citizens and those of the valley from the cities mentioned made generous contributions, too numerous to list here, but I want to make special mention of individuals like Jack Drake of the Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce, Ward McAllister of the McAllen Chamber of Commerce, Al Ady of the Mission Chamber of Commerce, O. M. Longnecker, Jr., of the Brownsville Chamber of Commerce, who represented the businessmen and merchants of these towns. I also want to make special mention of Richard C. Ingram of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

Here in Monterrey, business firms of Mexico and the United States gave magnificent support to the benefit as did, of course, the Rotary Clubs and other civic groups, citizens of Monterrey and members of the American community living here.

The most interesting observation from those of us in Mexico is that the United States is indeed fortunate in having such wonderful representatives of good will as Consul General and Mrs. John F. Killea in it Foreign Service. In their more than 3 years among us they have achieved a greater status than that of officials as they are considered sincere friends of Mexico and its people, and in particular to those of us who live here in Monterrey.

Usually little credit is given to State Department officials when a job is well done. There exists strong feeling in this community that the Killeas have done more to bridge our two nations, to insure better understanding, than anyone could believe possible. I would hope that you could insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that your colleagues can be made aware of the excellent work of your State Department consul general in this city.

Stockpiling and a Quota Needed for Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of my letter to President Kennedy concerning the serious situation in the domestic iron mining industry, particularly in Michigan and Minnesota:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter concerns a very serious situation which I feel deserves your personal attention.

The domestic iron mining industry is in critical condition at the present time. You should be advised of recent developments which may have a disastrous effect on our national security as well as the health of our domestic economy. In my district in northern Michigan, where an important part of the Nation's iron ore has been produced during the last century, there has been a drastic curtailment in the exploration, production and development of high-grade ores in underground mines. If the trend continues, this great industry will soon be extinct.

The domestic iron mining industry is suffering acutely from the effects of excessive foreign imports. Iron ore imports rose from 9 million tons in 1952 to 36 million tons in 1955. During the same period, domestic production of iron ore was decreasing from 98 million long tons in 1952 to 59 million long tons in 1959. This tremendous increase in imports is the main cause of the curtailment and shutdown of domestic iron mines. Our miners are unemployed and our communities are distressed because of the impact of imported ores. This fact was recognized in a study by the U.S. Department of the Interior in a report entitled, "Mineral Facts and Problems, 1960 Edition," which states in part:

"The trend from domestic to foreign iron-ore supply over the last 10 years, if continued, will deprive the United States of a substantial part of its basic income from iron-ore mining and will eventually put the Nation in the position of having to depend on oversea deposits for most of its iron ore. Therefore, devising ways to modify the trend and assure that the Nation's future iron-ore supply will come principally from domestic sources, and also to assure that iron will be available to supply our expanding industry when and where it is needed, presents the principal problem in iron ore."

Today iron mine shutdowns have reached catastrophic proportions and unless some action is taken to keep them in production, their output of this critical metal may be permanently lost to the Nation's economy. The loss of important sources of domestic iron ore is an unfortunate circumstance at any time, but particularly so at this critical juncture when our national safety is in jeopardy.

If the deep iron mines in Michigan and Minnesota remain closed and are permitted to fill with water, they will be forever lost for all practical purposes. Once filled with water, it would take several years and millions of dollars to bring a mine back in production. We learned through bitter and tragic experience in World War II that we could not rely upon foreign countries to supply our needs for critical and strategic minerals and metals. For identical reasons, we cannot depend upon foreign sources in the event of another conflict.

In the interest of keeping our reserves of iron ore intact and available in time of national emergency, I respectively request that you take the following courses of action:

1. Authorize Government purchases and stockpiling of iron ore from producing mines at prices which will permit their continued operation, in cases where such mines would otherwise be closed and filled with water and thus lost permanently to our economy. Congress has delegated the President authority to take this action under the stockpiling provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

2. Authorize the impostion of a reasonable quota on the importation of iron ore from foreign countries under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

A stockpiling program of iron ore would preserve the status quo and assure the Government an adequate supply of this important mineral resource. The long range solution to the preservation of our iron mining industry lies in the curtailment of excessive imports.

Several years ago, former President Eisenhower under authority above cited, caused quota restrictions to be imposed on the importation of crude oil. This quota has been continued during your administration. No doubt it is fully justified and necessary to protect the domestic oil industry. In a memorandum to the President dated April 23, 1957, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization stated:

"The investigation clearly established that the rate of imports could reach a point at which the incentive for exploration and development in this country would be so reduced as to make us dependent upon overseas oil supplies to meet our national energy requirement."

and further,

"I have reason to believe that crude oil is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security."

The tremendous increase in imports of iron ore since 1952 is having the same disasterous effect upon the domestic iron mining industry that the importation of foreign oil had upon the domestic oil industry.

I am sure you will agree that iron ore and oil are vital natural resources equally important so far as our national security is concerned. The evidence is overwhelming that the domestic iron ore industry is languishing and dying as a result of the foreign imports. The evil effects of foreign imports are more devastating in the case of iron ore than in the case of crude oil. For these reasons, I urge you to give this country's iron ore industry the same quota protection that is being accorded the domestic oil industry.

Respectively yours,

JOHN B. BENNETT.

Old-Age Survivors and Disability Insurance—Past Major Changes in the Law

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a summary of past developments of the old-age survivors and disability insurance law prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under the direction of Miss Helen E. Livingston of the Education and Public Welfare Division of that service.

This summary was first prepared 2 years ago and was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of April 28, 1960, page A3619.

Miss Livingston has now brought this summary down to date, including the social security amendments of this year, Public Law 87–64. My insertion reprints the summary previously inserted to which has been added the new material.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD-AGE SURVIVORS AND DISABILITY INSURANCE LAW

The social security system provides two kinds of assistance for the aged, dependent children, and the severely disabled in this country: (1) a social insurance plan, commonly known as social security, financed by tax contributions by workers and their employers and paying benefits on the basis of these contributions, and (2) Federal grants-in-aid for State plans for persons (including the blind) who can demonstrate need as defined by the State. This memo will be limited to a brief description of the development of the insurance, or social security plan.

In summary it could be said that three basic features of the social insurance program have remained unchanged since the system was established in 1935: (1) Benefits are paid as a matter of right to insured persons, without a need test; (2) the benefits are related to earnings, as contrasted with uniform or flat benefits to everyone; and (3) the system is financed entirely by equal payroll contributions for employers and employees (and related payments by the self-employed) as contrasted to systems financed from the general revenues. The system has always been on a self-supporting contributory basis (a requirement of the law since the 1950 amendments) without a general subsidy from the Federal Government.

The three major policy changes made by the Congress since 1935 were: (1) The shift of emphasis in 1939 from the private insurance principle based on individual equity to a family program through the payment of benefits to dependents and survivors rather than exclusively to the individual worker; (2) the change in 1950 from a plan primarily for workers in commerce and industry moving toward a universal plan for practically all individuals and families in the country dependent upon earnings of any kind; and (3) the addition of a new program for the severely disabled, accomplished by the disability freeze (a form of waiver of premium) in 1954, and by authorizing benefits for disabled persons aged 50 and over in 1956. Attached is a résumé of major features of the Social Security (OASI) Act showing changes made by the Congress since the system was first established in 1935.

MAJOR FEATURES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY (OASI) PLAN SHOWING CHANGES MADE BY CONGRESS

Social Security Act of 1935 (Public Law 271, 74th Cong.)

Coverage: Workers under age 65 in commerce industry (about 3 out of 5 of the labor force).

Type of benefit: Old-age benefits to the worker when he retired at or after age 65 together with cash-contribution refunds to survivors when the wage earner died and to living workers aged 65 who had not been in covered employment long enough to qualify for benefits.

Benefit amount: Weighted in favor of the worker with short service or low wages but increased for those who had contribtued for many years.

Contribution rate: 1 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $3,000 a year. [The original tax rate was scheduled to increase, by steps, to 3 percent each by 1949 but, through so-called tax freeze legislation by the Congress it was held at the 1-percent rate until 1950.]

Retirement test: [1] Benefits canceled by any earnings from regular employment.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine amendments (Public Law 379, 76th Cong.)

Coverage: Extend to workers over 65.

Type of benefit: Extended to certain dependents of retired workers (aged wives, children under 18) and survivors (widows and children under 18) of deceased workers.

Benefit amount: Revised to reduce emphasis on length of contributions but still gave credit for each year of service. "Money back" guarantee eliminated. [In effect deemphasizing these features in favor of dependent and survivor—or "family"—benefits.]

Average primary benefit at the end of 1941 (first year benefits were paid), $22.60.

Contribution rate: The change did not ultimately become effective because of the "tax freeze" noted above.

Retirement test: [1] Allowed earnings of $14.99 per month from covered employment with no loss of benefit.

Nineteen hundred and fifty amendments (Public Law 734, 81st Cong.)

Coverage: Considerably extended to some 10 million jobs, chiefly the nonfarm self-employed (except members of specified professions), regularly employed farm and domestic workers, employees of nonprofit institutions (on a group elective basis), and State and local government employees not covered by a retirement system (at the option of the employer).

Type of benefit: Extended to aged dependent husbands of women workers.

Benefit amount: Roughly doubled through a revised benefit formula (still weighted in favor of low-income workers), with a related increase for beneficiaries already retired. Repealed provision giving credit for

---

[1] Also known as "work test" or "income limitation."

each year of service, and related benefit to more recent earnings.

Average primary benefit prior to amendments was $43.86.

Contribution rate: 1½ percent each for employers and employees on wage up to $3,600; to rise, by steps to 3¼ percent each in 1970 and thereafter.[2]

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $50 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Nineteen hundred and fifty two amendments (Public Law 590, 82d Cong.)

Coverage: No change.

Type of benefit: No change.

Benefit amount: Increased benefits by about 15 percent (around $5). Average benefit in 1952: $49.25.

Contribution rate: No change.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $75 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Ninteen hundred and fifty-four amendments (Public Law 761, 83d Cong.)

Coverage: Extended to another 10 million workers in the course of a year, including self-employed farmers, more domestic and farm workers, State and local government employees under retirement systems (at the option of the employer and the election of the group covered), ministers, and all self-employed professional groups previously excluded except lawyers, dentists, doctors, and other medical groups. (About 9 out of 10 workers in the labor force now covered.)

Type of benefit: The "disability freeze" provision—essentially a "waiver of premium" clause was adopted to maintain both the insured status of severely disabled workers at any age, and their benefit amount.

Benefit amounts: Increased by about 15 percent by a change in the benefit formula. Average old-age benefit: $59.14 at end of 1954.

Contribution rates: Increased to 2 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $4,200 to increase to a maximum of 4 percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $1,200 a year, with one benefit deducted for each $80 or fraction thereof above this amount, except that no earnings could be deducted for any month in which earnings were $80 or less.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six amendments (Public Law 880, 84th Cong.)

Coverage: Self-employed lawyers, dentists, and all medical groups (except physicians) and members of the uniformed services.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for severely disabled persons aged 50 and over; age for women lowered to 62 paying full benefits for widows at that age but actuarially reduced benefits for widows and women workers unless they delay retirement to age 65.

Benefit amounts: No change.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2¼ percent each for employers and employees (the additional one-fourth percent to finance the disability benefits plan through a separate trust fund) to increase to a maximum of 4¼ percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight amendments (Public Law 85-840)

Coverage: Minor extensions.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for the dependents of severely disabled persons aged 50 to 64, inclusive.

Benefit amounts: Increased by 7 percent. Average old-age benefit: $66.04 in late 1958.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2½ percent each for employer and employees on wages up to $4,800 to increase, by steps, to 4½ percent in 1969 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change except that no earnings can be deducted for any month in which earnings were $100 (formerly $80) or less.

Nineteen hundred and sixty amendments (Public Law 86-778)

Coverage: Minor extensions.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for severely disabled persons regardless of age.

Benefit amounts: No change.

Fully insured status: Coverage for one-third of quarters after 1950 (or after age 21) and up to disability or age of retirement (or death if earlier).

Contribution rate: No change.

Retirement test: Provided that, for earnings between $1,200 and $1,500—$1 in benefits would be deducted for each $2 of earnings and, above $1,500 the deduction would be on a $1 for $1 basis.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-one amendments (Public Law 87-64)

Coverage: Minor extensions.

Type of benefits: No change.

Benefit amounts: Minimum benefit increased from $33 to $40, and widows' benefit increased from 75 percent of husbands' primary benefit to 82.5 percent of this amount. Also eligibility age for men lowered from 65 to 62 paying actuarially reduced benefits. (The reduction rate for men workers is the same as that for women workers.)

Fully insured status: Coverage for one-fourth of quarters after 1950 (or after age 21) and up to disability or age of retirement (or death if earlier).

Contribution rate: Increased to 3⅛ percent each for employer and employee on wages up to $4,800 to increase, by steps, to 4⅝ percent in 1968 and thereafter.

Retirement test: Changed the $1 benefit deduction for each $2 of earnings range to $1,200 to $1,700 with $1 for $1 reduction thereafter.

The following table reflects the increase in the average monthly old-age benefit in payment status:

End of year	
1940	$22.60
1941	22.70
1942	23.02
1943	23.42
1944	23.73
1945	24.19
1946	24.55
1947	24.90
1948	25.35
1949	26.00
1950	43.86
1951	42.14
1952	49.25
1953	51.10
1954	59.14
1955	61.90
1956	63.09
1957	64.58
1958	66.35
1959	72.78
1960	74.04

[2] The rate for the self-employed is 1½ times the employee rate.

A Letter the President May Get Someday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column from the Montgomery Advertiser written by Judge Walter B. Jones of Montgomery, Ala.

Judge Jones is an outstanding jurist and knows whereof he speaks. He has little sympathy with some of the current opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court as evidenced by this article and the purported letter written to the President:

A LETTER THE PRESIDENT MAY GET SOMEDAY

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

On the way to Chicago by train the other day, I made the acquaintance of an interesting gentleman, a lawyer and a student of history. We began to discuss world conditions. Then our talk turned to conditions in the South.

This gentleman noted, as all of us have seen, how the Federal judiciary is cutting down on the constitutional rights of the States; and, without any constitutional power whatever, is directing and controlling all activities which under the Constitution, are reserved to and belong solely to the separate States of the Union; and how the Supreme Court has arrogated to itself the power of a third legislature and is steadily destroying all local governments.

We observed that the Federal judiciary in less than a decade has practically taken over the fixing of qualifications of voters in the States, their registration, and the conduct of primaries and elections; directing the management and control of the States' public schools, and fixing the qualifications of their teachers; arbitrarily bossing private and publicly assisted housing; remaking the wills of citizens long dead; telling the States who can and who cannot practice law in the State courts; denying freedom of association to people, telling them with whom they must associate; directing the citizen how to run his private club, telling him how to manage his restaurants and hotels; telling private corporations how to seat people on their buses and in their trains; telling barbers whose hair they must cut; controlling the trial of cases in the criminal courts of the State; determining the boundaries of towns and cities; under the guise of Federal employment laws, denying the employer the right to manage his own business; permitting the unlawful picketing of his business and encouraging the beating up of his employes and customers.

My friend expressed the view that some Federal judges in the South are fed up with the part which, under the decisions of the Earl Warren court, they are expected to take in invalidating the constitutions and laws of the States. I suggested that some day one of the judges might be so outraged at what he is expected to do as a Federal judge that he would send in his resignation to the President and decline to continue a party to destroy the Union of the States as established by the Founding Fathers.

"I believe you have been reading my mind," said my friend as he reached in his pocket and handed me the copy of a letter. "What do you think of this letter?" Well, here's the letter:

"Dear Mr. President: I hand you this my letter of resignation of the office of U.S. district judge for the southwestern district of the State of Alaga, same to be effective today. In taking this step, it is proper I state briefly some of my reasons for resigning: When I became a Federal judge some 30 years ago, I took an oath to support the Constitution and laws of the United States. I have been faithful to this oath. Now, I am asked to support a new kind of constitution, one as rewritten and amended by the Federal Supreme Court from decision day to decision day, and I am to forget that the Constitution can be amended only as provided in article V.

"The peace and happiness of my people, the enjoyment of their rights and privileges,

the preservation of their State governments under the 10th amendment, mean more to me than to serve under the rewritten constitution beneath whose shield countless thousands of Communists take shelter; nor am I willing to have part in construing the Constitution so as to destroy the great white race which made it and has maintained it through the years.

"I cannot be a party to sacrificing the rights of our people under the Constitution. I am not willing to be one of the destroyers of their time-honored ways, known and accepted by the entire Nation for generation after generation. Other judges may continue as little cogs in the Federal judicial machine, but as for me I shall not turn against my people and violate my oath to uphold their written Constitution.

"I am admonished to forget that the 10th amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, is still a part of the Constitution. It is insisted that I declare the iniquitous XIV amendment the only part of the Constitution worthy of observance today and rule that all other parts, including the 9th amendment, are but as sounding brass or tinkling cymbals. I am asked to decide that our great States are but minor provinces of the Washington Government. I am commanded to believe that nine men, human beings, on the Supreme Court beyond the reach of their people, are more powerful than Congress, the President, and all the State legislatures, and that a majority of one among the nine has the power to make law and can make his sociological, economic, and political creed the law of the land. Two masters stand one on my right and one on my left: the Constitution of 1787 we all love and respect, on my right; and on my left, the rewritten and revised Constitution of today's Supreme Court.

"I know I cannot be loyal to two masters, I am bound to hate one and love the other, to support one, and despise the other. And so, Mr. President, I take the right, I choose to be loyal and uphold the Constitution I swore to uphold. I will not follow the rulings of the Federal Supreme Court which, like a weather cock, change with every varying wind. I cannot stultify myself by remaining longer on the Federal bench. This is my resignation. Other judges may follow what course of action they please, but, as for me, I do not subscribe to the doctrine that the Constitution in any case whatever can be amended by mere judicial interpretation or that constitutional mandates may be nullified by ingenious construction of its plain provisions. I am, sir, very respectfully, Jefferson Jackson Cleveland."

Death Does Not End Opportunity To Be Helpful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some Members may recall Melvin J. Maas, who is now chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

As a major general of the Marine Corps, he rendered exceptional service as a combat pilot; later, he served as a Member of the House.

Shortly after that service, he became blind, but for years, though blind, he has traveled about the country and by his example encouraged the physically handicapped.

Should one be inclined to think of his individuals handicap or difficulties, Mel's life and his present work should silence the complainer. To one as active as Mel always has been, and still is, physical disabilities mean nothing. With the same willingness to sacrifice himself, because of his courage, his disregard of any obstacle, he is today rendering outstanding service to the Nation.

Met him recently at the Bethesda Naval Hospital while on a routine visit, was again encouraged by his example, and recently he sent me an article entitled "To The Living," and which I read:

Something went wrong in the laboratory of a chemical plant a couple of years ago and the resultant explosion severly burned a technician. It developed that 625 square inches of skin were needed to cover the seared area while nature went about the process of reconstruction. To save the life of the burned man, 80 of his fellow workers volunteered to undergo "shaving" of their own skin for the necessary grafts which would provide temporary protection.

After the patient had recovered, his doctors made some calculations. They found that the skin donated by 80 living men approximated the amount that could have been obtained from one dead person—if that one had been thoughtful enough to bequeath his skin to a tissue bank before he died.

While blood banks have been common since World War II and eye cornea banks are springing up throughout the world—many of them as special projects of Lions clubs—tissue banks tend to suffer because few people realize the extent to which their bodies could benefit humanity after death. The tissue bank at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md.—one of the first of those that now exist—finds that any donor could make as many as 99 different deposits, which could be preserved and stored for varying lengths of time, to alleviate suffering, restore sight or prolong life—all without interfering with the normal operation of funeral rites and unbeknownst to those who view the body before burial.

At Bethesda alone, more than 9,000 tissue deposits have been collected, stored, and reused in the United States and abroad to restore health to more than 3,500 persons suffering from disease, injury, or congenital malformation. These deposits include eyes, skin, bone, arteries, and cartilage as well as fascia, which is connective tissue, and dura, the covering of the brain.

One of those who signed up early in the Bethesda program was the young wife of a Navy petty officer. Her brother had died of osteomyelitis, an inflamation of the bone which is often fatal, so she was particularly anxious to contribute bone to the bank. She was given a card to carry with her at all times. This asked any doctor who might be present at her demise to notify the Bethesda medical center or the nearest tissue bank at once, since the tissues to be contributed are ideally removed within 24 hours of death.

When she was fatally injured in an automobile accident not long ago, word was sent to Bethesda, where a surgical team is on 24-hour standby to collect deposits. The team did its work swiftly, then the body was reconstructed so that it was suitable for burial and taken to a funeral home specified by the family.

Several methods of preserving tissue have been developed to permit long-term storage, but Bethesda favors "freeze-drying." Parts of the bone were kept in their natural form for certain uses; others were ground to chips. All were frozen to minus 75° centigrade, dried out, stored in glass vacuum containers, and carefully labeled.

Meanwhile, the 11-year-old son of an officer at a Midwest Air Force base had taken a mild fall during a baseball game and, surprisingly, had broken his arm. X-rays explained the unusual break by revealing a large bone cyst had weakened the bone.

After the doctor had set the fracture and it had healed, he called Bethesda to request 2½ ounces of bone chips. He was told they would be available when needed—not just because service personnel was involved; the Navy's tissue bank dispenses deposits free of charge to many civilian surgeons. The hole left by the cyst was scraped out and the chips, flown from Washington on the appointed day, were poured in. Within a year they would be replaced naturally by the patient's own bone.

Transplantation, not only of skin and bones, but of human organs, too, is becoming a broader science every year, and the future of what can be done with kidneys, hearts, ovaries, etc., looks bright indeed.

Perhaps the most spectacular transplant of all is the corneal graft which makes the precious gift of sight possible to the blind. Not long ago a 5-year-old girl, the victim of a hit-run driver, awoke in a west coast hospital, blind in both eyes. An examination revealed that gravel, dirt, and sand from the road had irreparably lacerated both corneas, the transparent windows, of the child's eyes. Surgery was recommended.

As the day of surgery approached, from far across the country a donor cornea, volunteered by a man on his deathbed, was flown to Annie in a little glass bottle. In a few months' time, when another operation is feasible, a second cornea collected by the Eye Bank for Sight Restoration, in New York, will be transplanted to her second eye, restoring Annie to full vision.

Under ordinary circumstances, corneas must be used within 48 hours after the death of the donor. But even here there is a breakthrough. Organizations like Medico's new International Eye Bank have perfected methods by which the eye windows are being preserved for export abroad. According to Dr. Herbert Katzin, research director of the Eye Bank for Sight Restoration, more than 5,000 Americans have been restored to sight since the bank's founding in 1944. Currently 30,000 others are awaiting their turn in line for new donations.

The next breakthrough likely will be in the field of gland transplants (a dwarf grew nearly 5 inches in a year after University of California researchers grafted a normal pituitary gland). Great hope comes from the few cases attempted so far, which have shown correction of Addison's disease by stillborn adrenal gland transplants, the correction of parathyroid deficiency by stillborn thyroid grafts. The banking of glands on a major scale is not feasible at this time, however, because glands must theorically be kept alive in a tissue culture to function.

Contrary to popular belief, leaders of major faiths, including the Hebrew, Roman Catholic and Protestant, not only express approval but encourage the use of the deceased human body to help the living. In their attitude, they would seem to be subscribing to the motto of the Bethesda Tissue Bank, "Ex Morte Vita," which means, "From Death, Life."

Mel is asking us only to attempt to aid in the task he has assumed and to which he has contributed so much.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post on September 25, 1961, there appeared a letter to the editor which should make us think. Although the issue of civil defense has engendered great interest, it has not received sufficient analysis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the letter of James R. Newman, dated September 20, 1961:

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,
September 20, 1961.

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST:

I address myself to the eminences and the serenities. I make them a modest proposal. Let our children go.

A nuclear war, which day by day seems more likely, may very well end human life. But suppose, more cheerfully, that only the people of the Northern Hemisphere are exterminated; that in the Southern Hemisphere it will still be possible, somehow, for some persons to survive. Why should we not transport our young children to these regions as a refuge? The merits and advantages of the proposal are obvious and many as well as of the highest importance.

For first, as I cannot conceive any sane person capable of human feeling would challenge, the war to come, if war comes, is not the children's concern. Our quarrels, our bitterness, our hatreds, our fears do not possess them. Our heroes and our devils are not theirs. They have barely begun their lives, they are not ready to end them for causes. They are too innocent and foolish to realize that death is preferable to life under alien creeds. I recall a story which Carl Sandburg told of a little girl, perhaps his granddaughter, who, after hearing his description of a battle of the Civil War, observed, "Suppose they gave a war and no one came." There is no reason to suppose that children, unless forced, would come to our war.

Second, the conduct of the war would be so much less burdensome if the children were removed. It would be unnecessary to yield to niceties, to observe amenities, to nurse the sick, to shield the weak, to spare the infirm. With the children gone, without the distractions and temptations of their cries and complaints, we could give ourselves over completely to the serious business at hand. There will be many fewer mouths to feed, less need for water and air and bandages and whole blood. Children are notoriously subject to epidemic diseases; thus a prolific source of infection would be eliminated.

The savings in money alone would be immense, and would not only pay to transport the children and maintain them until they could fend for themselves, but would leave a handsome margin for use in vigorous prosecution of the war. I have made a rough calculation for U.S. children which bears on the point. Say we take many of the children from the ages of 2 to 12—the younger are too frail, the older are more stable and could be useful to us at home—then we shall have about 25 million to transport and keep. For this purpose, allow $1,000 a head. The total is $25 billion, a sum well under half our annual military appropriation. Surely this is not too much to spend, considering the advantages to be gained.

Thirdly, we rid ourselves once for all of the incubus of a shelter program. What a relief no longer to have to pretend. What a comfort simply to face the facts. No sensible person, even among scientists, believes in the efficacy of shelters. Down one goes to the well-stocked, cozy hole. Then what? There is the gentle patter of fallout on the roof; one is shielded from the blast; the light of a thousand suns (or is it now a million suns?) does not penetrate. The Lares and Penates are there. The family is snug. Father is pedalling the air pump. Mother is preparing a tunafish casserole. The radio is on. Splendid. But when does one come up and what is there to come up to? Anarchy? Cannibalism? The living dead? Bloated corpses? Troublesome questions. And even more troublesome is the effect of fire and heat, a subject which none of the experts and no one in the establishment has seen fit to discuss. I lay this omission, of course, to delicate feelings. It would, I believe, undermine morale to be reminded of the fire storms over Tokyo, Hamburg, Dresden, where a mere few thousands of tons of high explosives produced atmospheric convulsions.

Now with weapons, each of which may yield the equivalent of 10, or 50, or 100 million tons of high explosives, the fire storm produced by a single bomb will, I am reliably informed by an article in Scientific American, vaporize the structures and burn off the vegetation of an area of at least 15,000 square miles. Even in a deep shelter the occupants will be quickly barbecued. What a dreadful thing to contemplate. It is enough to make cowards of us all. The necrophiles, the bitter ones, the incandescent patriots, those among the aged and ailing who take comfort in the thought that their demise will coincide with that of mankind: these endorse the view that shelters will give shelter. But secretly they laugh at our innocence. We must not encourage them. If we are to die for the cause, let us not cheapen and betray the sacrifice: Away with the shelters, and all will become clear.

Fourthly, there is the grave moral issue of suicide. The law forbids it to the individual. On a national scale, however, is it apparently acceptable. Do we not, after all, make the law? Thus we may write its exceptions. Still, the questions nags us, can we require the suicide of those who have no voice in the making of the laws, viz. children? It is a fine point, and none would venture to say how our leaders would feel compelled to decide it. My proposal disencumbers them of this obligation.

Fifthly, there must be many who, like myself, have a weakness for children. In format and freshness they are much preferable to the larger editions, their parents.

Children are unwrinkled, unwarped. They are healthy. They smell nice. They are not cynical. They suppose life to be an end in itself. Properly nourished, watered and cared for, they grow up. When grown they can breed. The dead do not breed. Quite recently the eminent geneticist Herman Muller described a scheme for setting up large-scale sperm banks. Sperm could be stored indefinitely; it could be classified according to the characteristics of the males who produced it. Human evolution would thus, in a sense, come under man's own control. Yet the scheme presupposes the continuance of women. It is my impression that sperm by itself will yield no fruit. Here again the proposal is vindicated; for there will be female as well as male children: instead of storing germ plasm we will be storing the young themselves and thus assure the future.

For the moment I have said enough. I am anxious that wise men consider my proposal.

It is feasible? (Less feasible, say than a journey to the planets?) Is it visionary? (More visionary than the preservation of freedom by a nuclear war?) Is it too costly? Is there yet time to execute it—in part at least if not in whole? Could it be made a matter of international cooperation? Is a country without children worth living in? Perhaps not. In that case some better course must be found. Let the wise men define it.

JAMES R. NEWMAN.

Nuclear Bombs, Their Effects and How To Protect Against Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the resumption of nuclear bomb tests the average American is confused as to the result in radiation fallout and how to protect against it.

To assist in promoting a better understanding of fallout and its effects the following questions and answers have been prepared by the staff of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy:

NUCLEAR BOMBS: THEIR EFFECTS AND HOW TO PROTECT AGAINST THEM

I. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR BOMBS?

Question. What is fallout?

Answer. The radioactive debris from a nuclear detonation which has been deposited on the earth after having been airborne is what is meant by fallout. This debris could be in the form of solids such as dust which would be seen or individual atoms which could not be seen. It could fall in dry form or it could be brought down by rain or snow.

Question. What kinds of fallout do we have to deal with?

Answer. Local or close-in fallout occurs within the first 10 to 20 hours after detonation. Intermediate fallout (which is in the troposphere) takes place during the first few weeks after the explosion. Delayed or distant fallout (which is in the stratosphere) is the slow dropping of radioactive particles from the air over a period of years. The latter may cover the entire earth although of course it would be greatly diluted and therefore of much less danger.

Question. What kinds of radiation are we subjected to?

Answer. The main kinds of radiation from fallout that may affect man are beta particles (fast moving electrons) and gamma rays (similar to X-rays). These kinds of radiation also exist naturally although their concentrations are so low that they are not hazardous.

Question. What radioactive elements are the major hazard?

Answer. There are hundreds of radioactive elements which are called isotopes. Only a few are dangerous. Most of them decay to a harmless state very fast. Many of the isotopes released by nuclear weapons lose their radioactivity before they reach the earth. A few, such as strontium and cesium, remain radioactive for a long time.

Question. What other radioactive debris might be hazardous which is in fallout besides strontium and cesium?

Answer. It was indicated in both the 1957 and 1959 hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, on fallout from nuclear weapons tests that

strontium 90 and cesium 137 are still considered the greatest hazard in worldwide (distant) fallout. In addition carbon 14 is also considered a potential long-term hazard.

Question. What is radioactive half life?

Answer. Half-life is the time required for a radioactive substance, called an isotope, to lose 50 percent of its activity by decay. Therefore, the radioactive isotope called strontium 90 which has a half life of 28 years loses one-half of its activity every 28 years. Each radioactive isotope has a distinct half-life.

Question. How long does fallout last?

Answer. Fallout dangers are primarily concerned with strontium 90 and cesium 137. They both have a half life of about 28 years. In the event of nuclear war a period of 2 weeks is considered minimal for shelter protection.

Question. What other harmful effects result from nuclear detonations besides fallout?

Answer. Blast, thermal (heat), and immediate radiation. We'll talk more about these effects later.

Question. What hazard is there from the ingestion of radioactivity?

Answer. Strontium and cesium are beta emitters and become ingested by the eating of milk, food, or water, which has been contaminated by fallout. Strontium, as well as some of the other chemical elements is a bone seeker. The ultimate harm done to the biological system it inhabits is made progressively worse because it concentrates in the bone structure where the beta radiation it gives off destroys the bloodmaking material in the bone marrow.

Question. What are radiation genetic effects?

Answer. These are inheritable changes, mostly mutations, produced by the absorption of ionizing radiations. The biological significance of low levels of radioactivity is still largely unknown.

Question. What are the allowed amounts of radioactivity taken internally?

Answer. Tolerance levels or maximum permissible amounts for biological system uptake have been specified for many of the radioactive isotopes. These are very small amounts usually stated in terms of millionths of a unit of radioactivity per ounce of food or water. The permissible amounts are much lower than the amounts at which radiation effects have been observed.

II. EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR BOMBS ON HUMANS

Question. What are the effects of a 10-megaton bomb on an average city?

Answer. It would dig a crater 240 feet deep and 2,500 feet in diameter. Brick apartment houses would be destroyed out to a radius of 7 miles from the point of detonation. Wooden buildings would burn up to a radius of 25 miles from the point of detonation.

Question. What are the effects of a 10-megaton bomb on man himself?

Answer. Blast injuries from flying debris would occur out to a radius of 7 miles from the detonation. The area affected would cover 150 square miles. Second degree burns (blistering) on the bare skin would occur out to a radius of 25 miles. The area affected would cover 2,000 square miles.

Question. What are the radiation effects of a 10-megaton bomb?

Answer. Initial nuclear radiation of 700 roentgens or more which would result in death to unprotected persons and would cover a radius of 2 miles or an area of 12.5 square miles. Fallout assuming a 15-knot wind would deposit 450 roentgens 150 miles downwind, 25 miles across and over an area of 2,500 square miles.

Question. What are the blast effects on humans from nuclear weapons?

Answer. Primary effects from the blast wave are: lung damage, rupture of the ear drums.

Secondary effects result from flying fragments propelled with great force by the blast wave.

Tertiary effects result in the human body becoming a missile propelled by the blast wave.

Question. What are the thermal effects on humans?

Answer. Casualties are produced from:

(a) Fires caused by direct combustion from the heat from the bomb.

(b) Skin burns.

(c) Temporary and permanent blindness from the intense light of the fireball.

Question. What are the immediate radiation effects on humans at the time of the blast?

Answer. To answer this we must first define a "roentgen" in lay language: "A roentgen is a unit used to express the amount of radiation a person or object is exposed to."

Exposure of the whole body to the following doses produces the indicated results:

(a) Instantaneous doses of 5,000 or more roentgens produce immediate shock resulting in death within a few hours.

(b) Doses of 800 to 5,000 roentgens produce fever, nausea, and vomiting within a few hours resulting in death within 1 or 2 weeks.

(c) Doses of 450 to 700 roentgens also produce fever, vomiting and nausea within hours but only about one-half of the individuals so exposed would die.

Doses of less than 200 roentgens would produce only mild symptoms of nausea and vomiting but complete recovery can be expected.

III. PROTECTION FROM NUCLEAR BOMBS

Question. What need is there for civil defense shelters?

Answer. In an atomic war, blast, heat and initial radiation would kill millions of people near ground zero of the detonation. Many millions can be saved by use of shelters from the resulting fallout. Any kind of material between you and the fallout (as well as distance) will cut down on the radiation reaching you.

In Joint Committee hearings (1959) it was brought out that civil defense preparedness could reduce the fatalities in an assumed attack on the United States from about 25 percent of the population to about 3 percent. Instead of killing 50 million the deaths could be reduced to about 5 million. Under present conditions such an attack would cost the lives of about 50 million people with some 20 million sustaining serious injuries. It was also brought out that more than 96 million people in the United States do not live in or near likely target areas and could be expected to survive by using properly supplied and adequate shelters.

Question. What kinds of shelter materials are recommended?

Answer. Concrete, bricks, sand, metal and earth are adequate materials for protection. Equivalent shielding effects among several materials are as follows: 8 inches of concrete (minimum required) equals 12 inches of earth equals 16 inches of books equals 30 inches of wood. In most of the country, everywhere except in areas hit by the heaviest fallout, these thicknesses would give ample protection for a fallout shelter.

Question. What size shelter would be needed?

Answer. An allowance of 10 square feet per person for a family shelter is adequate.

Question. Could absolute protection from fallout be provided by shelters?

Answer. Yes. Expert studies and tests conclude that buried shelters located in groups under school playgrounds, parks, parking areas, and in industrial plants would provide adequate protection from fallout.

Question. What would these shelters cost?

Answer. These shelters providing fallout protection and blast protection up to 10 pounds per square inch could be constructed for $100 per person sheltered.

Question. Could people live in these shelters for 2 to 3 weeks?

Answer. Yes. They would have living and sleeping accommodations, toilet facilities, water facilities, their own power supply and a filtered air system.

SOME GENERAL DATA ON NUCLEAR BOMBS

Question. What is a kiloton?

Answer. A kiloton is a unit used to specify the size of a nuclear bomb. It is equal to the explosive power of 1,000 tons of TNT. For example, the Hiroshima bomb had a yield of 20,000 tons of TNT equivalent (20 kilotons). A megaton is equivalent to 1 million tons of TNT.

Question. How much TNT or other chemical explosives were used in World War II?

Answer. The total amount of bombs and shells used by all combatants in World War II was the equivalent of less than 3 megatons. Khrushchev the other day talked of a 100-megaton bomb. This single bomb would be equivalent to 30 times all of the bombs and shells used during the 6 years of World War II.

Question. How much TNT would be required to have the explosive effect of one 20-megaton bomb?

Answer. A 20-megaton bomb in the form of TNT would require a railroad train of boxcars stretching diagonally across the United States from New England to California.

The M–14 Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years there has been considerable public and official discussion concerning the M–14 rifle. I have had a tremendous interest in this weapon, in expediting the procedure from drawing board to manufacture and distribution to troops.

Certain criticism of the M–14 production program has arisen in recent months, much of it from unqualified criticis.

It is a well-known fact that two of the three producers of the M–14 are located in my State of Massachusetts—Harrington & Richardson, Inc., of Worcester, Mass., and the Springfield Armory, of Springfield, Mass.

One of the most authoritative magazines in the armaments field, the American Rifleman, an organ of the well-known National Rifle Association of America, has just published this week a complete and detailed article on the status of the M–14, written by Walter J. Howe, editor, and Col. E. H. Harrison, U.S. Army, retired, associate technical editor. It gives me pleasure to quote this magazine as reporting that "the M–14 is indeed a mass-producible" weapon and that Harrington & Richardson, Inc., the Springfield Armory, and Winchester are meeting their commitments, which article I include in an extension of remarks, with the additions therein to the article entitled "Adoption of the M–1" and "Development of the M–14":

THE M–14 RIFLE—A COMPLETE AND DETAILED REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE NATION'S NEW SHOULDER ARM

(By Walter J. Howe and Col. E. H. Harrison, U.S. Army, retired)

INTRODUCTION

More than 4 years have passed since the U.S. Army adopted the M–14. During most of that time public interest has been, understandably, passive. However, early in 1961, as a result of critical reports in newspapers, public and congressional interest in the M–14 heightened. Suddenly concerned about the seemingly slight progress that had been made in equipping U.S. troops with the new shoulder arm, critics—qualified and otherwise—offered opinions.

The criticism was varied in nature but one opinion overshadowed all others: The M–14 cannot be mass produced. If this was the truth, then indeed a serious and costly misjudgment had been made and the public must be informed accordingly.

Because this is a matter of special interest to NRA members, a top Rifleman team was assigned by NRA Executive Vice President Franklin L. Orth to visit all major M–14 manufacturing facilities and to interview the responsible officials in Government and industry connected with the M–14 program.

With the full permission and assistance of the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps, the plant tours and interviews were conducted. No limitation or censorship requirements were even suggested. Wholehearted cooperation, to a degree not often realized, was shown to the NRA team by every official, foreman, and worker in the industry plants (Winchester and Harrington & Richardson) and Government installations (Department of the Army, Ordnance Weapons Command, and Springfield Armory).

On this and the following 10 pages, then, is a report to the public on this important and timely matter.

The end of the Korean war left most countries with a pressing need for small arms of new types. The NATO nations agreed on an interchangeable rifle cartridge, and the principal nations adopted, among other arms, new self-loading rifles. There is no NATO rifle nor has there ever been any requirement established for one. In 1954 Great Britain, Belgium, Canada, and also Australia adopted a rifle offered by the Belgian Government's Fabrique Nationale d'Armes de Guerre. This was later modified by each country to suit its own ideas. France adopted the French MAS 1949/56, and West Germany eventually chose the CETME rifle.

The United States, quite unlike other nations, already had an excellent semiautomatic rifle, the M–1 (Garand), and was under no such immediate compulsion. The U.S. Army studied the problem very seriously, taking into consideration the rifles developed elsewhere and its own experience, including that in the significant Korean war only then just ended.

A new weapons system was decided on, in which four single-purpose shoulder arms are replaced with a rifle-size weapon of unusual capability. After long and severe tests of both the basic idea and the weapon designs available for it, the M–14 was chosen. It is chambered for the 7.62 millimeter NATO cartridge—which is essentially our present 30.06 cartridge, but shortened about one-half inch. The announcement of the M–14's adoption was made by the Secretary of the Army on May 1, 1957.

The American Rifleman described in detail the considerations underlying this development, its history and that of related items, and the rifle itself, in its issue of June 1957. The outline "Development of the M–14" (app. B) summarizes this history.

As might be expected, many of the questions and problems which arose in past developments appeared again. This is noticeable in the M–1 and M–14 rifle histories. So a summary account "Adoption of the M–1" (app. A) is also given here for reference. It may lend perspective—and especially help us avoid making judgments on new rifles on insufficient information.

The rather long and slow development pace, ending in the May 1957 standardization of the M–14, was continued in its first procurement phases also. There was still no immediate necessity for a new rifle. "The good is enemy of the best," and the fact that our service rifle was as good or better than any yet existing elsewhere in quantity delayed its replacement. Other factors also governed the procurement so much that they must be mentioned. The general feeling in the United States at that time held military expenditures to an austerity maintenance level. In short, there was no climate or appropriations for production of the M–14 rifle.

On October 4, 1957, the first Soviet earth satellite (sputnik) shattered this mood. The initial result was to focus public attention and willingness to act on only the highly unconventional research vehicles and weapons. Only recently the effort was extended to conventional weapons.

Springfield Armory began production of the M–14 shortly after its standardization. Between February and April 1959, production and facilities contracts were awarded to Winchester-Western Division of Olin, New Haven, Conn., and Harrington & Richardson, Inc., Worcester, Mass. (Facilities contracts, usual in such cases, provide a greater or lesser quantity of Government-owned equipment for use by the contractor.) Winchester had manufactured more than 900,000 M–1 rifles during World War II, and Harrington & Richardson nearly 500,000 M–1's during the Korean period.

A remarkable feature of these first commercial contracts was that the price allowed per rifle ($68.75) was markedly less than that for the M–1 rifle nearly 20 years earlier. Some factors influencing the contractors in making such a low bid were the unfavorable business situation prevailing at that time, and the great desire for work for their factories and localities. However, this abnormally low price undoubtedly contributed to difficulties in the first production by encouraging corner cutting.

When the contractors could not make the rifle at that price, they organized their production efforts much more seriously. At the same time the price was negotiated upward and is now about $95 per rifle. This rifle, with its unprecedented performance requirements, thus costs much less than the retail price of a good-quality sporting rifle.

The contracts required that deliveries begin in 12 months and continue at an increasing rate.

While H. & R. was able to start toward production quickly after the receipt of their first contract (by using machinery intentionally left in their plant by the Government, from the former M–1 rifle contract) they were plagued by production difficulties of many sorts. Some were purely internal, while others involved the setting up and receipt of subcontracted material. (H. & R. subcontracts a very considerable part of the rifle.) These difficulties were compounded by a Government change order in metallurgical specifications for the bolt and receiver. This change order, resulting from discovery of cracks in some receivers of rifles in the field, brought production at H. & R. to a complete halt.

After the installation of new heat-treating equipment, production was resumed and H. & R. was able to make up lost deliveries and arrive at the end of its second contract, in August 1961, exactly on schedule.

In review, H. & R.'s difficulties and delays cannot be ascribed to any single shortcoming by themselves or the Government. Rather, they experienced a full run of problems that can beset a manufacturer who is set up for the comparatively easy production of sporting arms and is then called upon to convert to the manufacture of U.S. military small arms with their demanding specifications.

It is a transitional difficulty that has cursed the progress of exacting military contracts in the past, and bids fair to be equally troublesome in the future unless everyone who is directly affected profits by the experience.

Winchester too had their difficulties in producing M–14 rifles. Although they received their contract earlier than H&R, they have still to achieve either the monthly production rate or the total production of H&R.

Winchester, truly one of the world's leading producers of sporting arms and with a long and successful history of military arms production, in effect took a calculated risk and lost. On receiving their first M–14 contract they decided not to manufacture the rifle as they had manufactured the M–1 rifle, with conventional milling machines, profilers, etc. They considered it would be worth taking the extra time to design special machinery for both wood and metal working. Although such machinery traditionally takes longer to get into operation, the end result would be a higher production rate of uniformly acceptable rifle components. Winchester's venture into this automated rifle receiver production line was almost disastrous. In spite of the closest cooperation between the machine-tool manufacturer and Winchester, the automated machinery was delivered much later than anticipated and it took many months to get the machines operating properly. Today these machines are performing to expectations and, in addition, backup equipment is maintained so that when any station of the automated equipment is faulty the entire receiver production can be continued.

The high-production woodworking equipment that Winchester installed has proven successful from the beginning.

Winchester, in contrast to H&R, manufacturers wholly within its own plant 80 percent of the dollar value of the M–14 rifle. They make all major parts and most of the smaller parts with the exception of the easily procurable springs, pins, and screws.

Like H&R, Winchester was affected by the heat-treatment change order. This, coupled with their receiver production difficulties, delayed Winchester's deliveries in any substantial quantity until April 1961. A further difficulty, experienced earlier in their contract, was caused by Winchester having to make barrels from a steel extremely difficult to machine. Although the original contract that Winchester signed called for this barrel steel, Springfield Armory and H&R (somewhat later) were permitted to use another type of steel that is within specifications but easier to machine to acceptable dimensions and finish.

The difficulty that Winchester experienced in getting the Government to permit this changeover caused some hard feelings between the contractor and Ordnance in the early stages. Contract-adjustment machinery now exists for solving such problems quickly.

Now out of their production difficulties, Winchester not only looks forward to comparatively trouble-free production, but wants new contracts.

If a rifle were not mass producible, then after all the difficulties H&R and Winchester have gone through they would certainly not be anxiously looking forward to the opportunity for more and greater production.

At this point, in August 1961, the NRA sent its staff team to visit all three M–14 producers.

Permission for the visit was given at once by the authorities. On arrival at each plant we were welcomed by the official in charge, who placed himself at our disposal for the whole time to show the manufacture and to answer questions. We spent one full day in each of the principal plants—Winchester, Harrington & Richardson, and Springfield Armory—in examination of the actual manufacture.

An impression received from the beginning, and steadily confirmed throughout the inspection, was the large size of the production operation. The NRA staff photographer made approximately 220 excellent photographs of the heavy, modern equipment used. Some representative examples are shown on these pages. Anyone acquainted with commercial sporting arms manufacture, with its small single-operation machine tools, hand-fitting assembly, and limited possible output of a given type, will be struck by the contrast.

Another observation, possibly even more striking, remained with us throughout. This was an atmosphere of interest, friendliness, and confidence displayed by the supervisors and workers in all three plants. These men are experts, who have made many small arms in the past and know what they are doing now. Their frame of mind can be so favorable only when they like their work and are proud of the result. Obviously, too much emphasis must not be placed on an intangible like this, but it is very real.

After viewing the operations in each plant, the staff team sat down with the plant management, asked questions, and invited comment. The questions were answered immediately and openly. There was no hesitation in admitting that the M–14 specifications impose a severe test on the manufacturer. In the opinion of both commercial contractors, the specifications are unnecessarily severe in several places. Both commercial contractors also gave a frank account of serious difficulties and delays they experienced during the early portion of their production, a good part of which they considered was caused by Government delays in giving them assistance they requested. We will return to these points.

On the central question of mass producibility the answers were positive.

The Springfield Armory considers that there has never been a real doubt. It recounted that the M–14 was designed to be mass produced, that to test this very point a pilot lot was manufactured by production methods before the M–14 was even standardized, that the production package of drawings furnished each contractor shows every manufacturing operation in tested detail, and that the Armory has maintained its own production accordingly.

The contractors strongly disputed that getting into production was, or could be, simple. However, they and all their people are enthusiastic over the rifle. On the central question, both contractors stated unequivocally that the M–14 is mass producible, and both expressed a strong desire to be allowed to produce it in much greater quantities than provided in contracts up to now.

Answering the question most directly, all three producers simply pointed out that they are mass producing now.

Harrington & Richardson deliveries, after a slow start, in recent months of 1961 were 15,000 in May, 20,000 in June, and 15,000 per month in July and August. This completed the delivery of rifles required through their second contract. A third contract beginning in September 1961 at present requires initial production of 10,000 per month, rising to 16,000 per month by the end of 1961 and continuing at that rate.

The delivery figures for all contractors mentioned here are complete rifles only. Maintenance spare parts included in their contracts are not regarded.

Winchester was comparatively slow in getting its special automated machinery into operation. It was much more severely delayed by an extensive Government change order (involving heat treatment) or receivers and bolts than the other producers. After a complete halt of several months, the company resumed production with 1,000 rifles in April 1961, rose to its required 4,000 for August, and expects to reach 10,000 per month in December, which is its required rate at that time.

Springfield Armory was scheduled to produce 2,000 per month initially, rising through 3,000 per month and leveling off at 5,000 per month. To fill in the above contractor shortage, the armory, now in its third order, is producing 6,500 per month and could readily produce much higher, though it does not desire to do so because of other responsibilities.

Total contracts and deliveries as obtained from the contractors, in the table below, show the picture even more clearly.

In short, the manufacturers are producing at such a rate that they now are in plain sight of the completion of all existing orders within months, with total delivery of 472,600 rifles.

Of course, this does not mean that production will stop. New contracts can be expected before then, and for considerably larger quantities, if it is desired to utilize the contractors' capacities more fully. But it does mean that any possible question as to mass producibility of the M–14 rifle ceased to exist some time ago.

The NRA team completed its plant visits with an extremely favorable impression of all three producers. Their spirit is something exceptional. The size and quality of their operation arouses real admiration. The contractors undoubtedly had serious problems, but it is evident that in the main they have overcome them, and the present production rate speaks for itself.

The occasion for the staff team's work was thus disposed of by the time it had completed its visits to the three production plants and discussions with their responsible officials. We went on, however, to interview Brig. Gen. Elmer J. Gibson, commanding general of the Ordnance Weapons Command and project manager for the M–14 rifle, to get further information.

General Gibson spent a whole day unreservedly on the interview, and answered all our questions with most remarkable thoroughness. Following are outstanding features of his replies.

A matter both commercial contractors referred to repeatedly was the slowness with which their requests for deviations from contract specifications (almost always relaxations) had been answered by the contract-administering authorities. The contractors emphasized that this slowness (whether the request was granted or refused) was a great factor in delaying their recovery from the early production shortages. On the other hand, the number of these requests for deviations has been very large, though the manufacturers entered on their contracts with full information on what was required and made no objection then.

General Gibson pointed out that requested deviations must be examined, sometimes with extensive technical study, to know that they will not be damaging to the rifle in some unexpected way. Also, contract officers are required by law to find out whether a deviation lowers the cost of an operation, and if the Government is entitled to a return of its money. He said that some deviation requests had required too much time to act on. He has made technical teams available from Springfield Armory with instructions to give all cooperation to the contractors on their requests. This is paying off. Contractors have been advised by General Gibson that they can come direct to him if they cannot get solutions. The statements made by the contractors to us on this problem did in fact refer to it mainly in connection with past events rather than the present.

General Gibson then discussed some facts which are useful for an understanding of M–14 rifle production.

The rifle is not static, and details are changed from time to time—for example, the dropping of the M–15 heavy-barrel type, the uncertainty for a time as to whether a bayonet lug was desired, and the regular provision of folding-hook buttplate on all rifles.

Even in manufacture, there is continuing product improvement. For example, the handguard has already been changed, consideration is being given to a plastic stock, and there is a desire to lighten the rifle.

Not all problems will end with perfected production, even if that is achieved. Problems of field use and maintenance will show up. For example, already a minor problem has developed in the handguard. However, as with all products, these are coped with as they arise and are part of the overall product improvement.

The word "rifle" may be a misnomer. It may cause people to think of the M–14 in terms of a simple rifle, while actually it is required to be far more than that and contains many capabilities of a light machine-gun.

General Gibson sees great possibilities in an integration committee which has been set up to coordinate the solution of problems for all makers. The setting up of such a committee is not as simple as one might think, because of the antitrust implication. It was approved by the U.S. Attorney General on August 17, and General Gibson has scheduled the first meeting in November, at which he will be chairman. The integration committee can discuss only technical matters.

When asked about the remarks of both contractors that they desire to manufacture more M–14 rifles, General Gibson's reply was explicit. He will take every rifle a contractor can produce. Then, when the contractors are in effect about to use up all the money that is available, he will go to the Army and ask for more money on the grounds that they are producing, they have tremendous potential, and the only thing lacking is money.

As to the future, a third commercial contractor for production of the M–14 rifle will be selected, probably in October. A number of manufacturers have bid and some of them offer production processes entirely new in gun manufacture.

The new contractor will be required to begin production 13 months from contract signing, and deliver 100,000 rifles in the following 12 months.

To our question as to what total production of M–14's is planned by the Government, we were for the first and only time unable to obtain an answer. The Government will not reveal its intention in this respect. However, General Gibson explained that part of the reason for introduction of a third contractor is to secure competition. The Army will be guided wherever possible by considerations of performance and cost. In awarding contracts, the Army evaluates the unit price offered against what equipment the Government will have to buy. General Gibson speaks enthusiastically of the next contractor, whoever it may be, because he is a firm believer in competition. The more qualified contractors working on the rifle, the more costs will be driven down and the better the product will be.

Even during all-out war, there are very few, if any, items of equipment supplied

without regard to other requirements. All of them compete. In times of peace or only cold war, there is also the very important economic factor. Though this is the richest nation in the world, funds are never unlimited, and the effort spent on any one weapon is fixed fundamentally by the overall need for it as determined by the highest responsible authorities and, even more, by the funds authorized for it by Congress.

SUMMARY

In summary, then, this is the situation. The M–14 is indeed a mass-producible shoulder arm. The firing tests conducted on each rifle and the extensive endurance tests conducted on sample rifles drawn from production lots indicate the M–14 to be capable of performance and reliability of the highest order for its intended purpose.

Springfield Armory is turning out rifles at its assigned level and the two commercial producers, having overcome their initial production difficulties, are meeting their commitments. At this time approximately 30,000 rifles, with spare parts, are being delivered each month. By the end of 1961 the figure will be 32,500 per month. Assuming that the fourth source of supply (the third commercial contractor) meets his obligations, then production by December 1962 could be of the order of 40,000 per month. Rifles of earliest production are being reinspected, reworked if necessary, and modified to incorporate latest changes at Raritan Arsenal. As completed, these go into the supply line. Finally, the entire program is being managed at the highest level.

Given the opportunity of investigating and evaluating the entire M–14 program as this team has had, it is now difficult to understand why such deep and prevailing doubt ever existed as to the wisdom of choosing the M–14 for mass production and issue to our troops. Certainly, there were instances and incidents that gave rise to concern for certain aspects of the program. But, there seems no justification for the published criticism indicating that the rifle could not be mass produced.

It is certainly wrong to attempt to cover up serious errors of judgment in the selection of equipment for our Armed Forces. No one can countenance action by either Government or private industry that would knowingly permit less than the desired best to be adopted, manufactured, and put into service. However, it is equally as great a disservice to the Nation to cast general doubt upon the equipment with which our troops are being armed, unless the critic has first fully informed himself on the matter.

APPENDIX A

ADOPTION OF THE M–1

The replacement of an old equipment type with a new is never accomplished without more or less serious problems.

These problems are personal as well as mechanical. Many users have by long familiarity come to like the old type. They have through necessity learned to handle it in ways which make the most of its capabilities and get around its less favorable characteristics. With adoption of the new type these users see their special skills no longer required.

In the item itself, difficulty comes with quantity manufacture. It can be expected that any kind of item when first mass-produced will show some unexpected defect or trouble not experienced in the development model. Though apparently not completely preventable, this is minimized by careful preliminary manufacturing study and corrected in the early production runs.

When the item is put in service, it is an equally old observation that some defects will appear which had never been detected before. The responsible engineers know that if the development and the service testing were well done, any remaining defects are not fundamental and can be corrected with only some delay, annoyance, and expense.

These factors, plus the desire for improvement when experience or changed conditions show it to be useful, commonly result in improvements even after adoption. It is usual for items of any complexity to be given manufacturing changes and minor functioning modifications (not affecting required interchangeability) throughout their life. All this applies to weapons generally. It is familiar in such items as commercial airplanes and automobiles.

Military small arms are not different. However, the normal problems are in their case complicated by the great personal interest taken by small-arms enthusiasts and to some extent the general public, while passing with comparatively few questions the same problems in items of far greater magnitude, difficulty, and cost.

The M–1 rifle, immediate predecessor of the M–14, was approved and adopted at the beginning of 1936. During its early manufacture, some interested persons objected strongly to the adoption of this new rifle, and a few permitted themselves to be led by intensity of partisanship into absurdities. Some of these objected to superseding the 1903 Springfield rifle that had served so well. Others declared the new rifle, by reason of its design, could never shoot as accurately as the old Springfield, or even acceptably. Some who had never been in a manufacturing plant except as visitors stated with conviction that the M–1 rifle was unsuited to manufacture in quantity. In view of the attention attracted by these representations at the time, it is worth noting how the matter came out.

The first M–1 production order was for 1,500 rifles. Anticipating more than that, Ordnance undertook a retooling program at Springfield Armory in 1938, and the production rate was brought to 200 rifles per day by January 1940. The first production rifles had several quite unexpected functioning troubles that had never occurred with the development and service-test rifles. It was eventually found that these malfunctions were not inherent, but stemmed from slight changes made in the dimensions of certain parts during retooling for mass production. This was then corrected, and also the gas cylinder was changed to a different and stronger form. The objections to the M–1 came at the time of these puzzling malfunctions of the first production. One event which brought the objections to a close was a separate formal test of the M–1903, the M–1, and two competing rifles by the Marine Corps, which had not yet adopted a new rifle. The result showed the military superiority of the M–1 beyond any question.

Meanwhile, the early defects had been corrected, and by mid-1941 Winchester was turning out over 100 rifles a day and Springfield more than 1,000. This was then considered a large production. During 1942 and 1943, however, it did not keep up with new demands. Production of M–1903 Springfield rifles, which had been begun by Remington and Smith-Corona for the British, was taken over and continued until the beginning of 1944. Thereafter Remington continued with only the manufacture of spare parts while Smith-Corona returned to making typewriters, and all requirements were supplied with M–1's. Winchester made up to 750 M–1 rifles per day and Springfield reached a rate of 5,000 per day.

Approximately 4,014,731 M–1 rifles were made from 1940 to 1945, far more than any other small arm of any kind except carbines. Aproximately 1,427,970 additional were made by Springfield Armory and other contractors during the Korean war. In all, M–1 rifles were produced in such numbers that they have supplied the requirements of the U.S. Armed Forces and several other nations.

After the standardization of the M–1 rifle, Mr. Garand stated that it was inherently capable of the same accuracy in target shooting as the M–1903 Springfield, and he indicated the principles of adjusting it for this purpose. The outcome has proved him correct. The rifle was always made to quality standards. In 1953 the armory was directed to supply match rifles for the national matches, and investigation was begun on the specific operations to obtain maximum accuracy. These were established in a far fewer number of years than were required to do this with the Model 1903 Springfield rifle. Match performance of the national match M–1 rifle is now quite comparable with that of the Springfield, and probably it is still improving.

In short, after initial disappointments in both rifle functioning and production against stepped-up demands, the M–1 rifle was manufactured in unprecedented quantities. It was a striking military success. It has turned out to be an excellent long-range target rifle. Most important, U.S. troops fought World War II with a semiautomatic rifle which gave them a decided advantage over their enemies. No other major power had a really good semiautomatic rifle.

APPENDIX B

DEVELOPMENT OF THE M–14

New weapons must be conceived and developed long before they are needed. Even while World War II was still going on, thought was given to the rifle required in future. Experience was available from the T–20, developed during the war to meet demands of combat troops for a full-automatic form of M–1 rifle. It was based on the M–1, but with a 20-round magazine, a switch for automatic and semiautomatic fire, and a muzzle brake to control climbing in automatic fire. The T–20 performed as intended, and certainly would have been used if the war had not ended when it did. Its development was carried through the T–20E2 and completed in 1947.

Further development was directed toward an entirely new weapon type.

To put it on a sound basis, the cartridge was developed first. The purpose was to eliminate unnecessary weight and especially unnecessary length which has a great effect on the design and dimensions of automatic guns, yet to retain about the power of the military 30.06 cartridge. A new caliber .30 round was designed and manufactured at Frankford Arsenal in 1945. Thereafter all rifle-caliber developments used this cartridge. In 1953 its final form, the T–65E3, became standard for the NATO nations as the 7.62 mm. NATO cartridge.

The British had proposed a considerably lighter caliber .280 cartridge. Based on battle experience, our Army opposed the adoption of any less effective smaller caliber. Fundamental in this decision was the fact that not merely a new rifle was wanted. Required was an arm for a single cartridge replacing the conventional rifle, carbine, submachinegun, and automatic rifle, and for all rifle-caliber machineguns (unless a different cartridge were to be used in these). For uses where the carbine and submachine gun have been employed, a low-powered cartridge would be of some advantage. For a rifle proper and for machineguns it was entirely inadequate, according to the U.S. concept of those weapons.

It is important to note that this concept is that of our field forces. They prescribe the operating characteristics and performance which contemplated new equipment must possess. When pilot and service-test models are presented by the responsible engineering branch (in this case the Ordnance Corps), it is again the field forces which decide on the one to be adopted. That was the course

throughout the development of the new rifle.

Eventually four rifles were seriously considered—the British Government-developed EM–2, the U.S. T–44 and T–47 developed by the Springfield Armory, and the T–48 developed in the Belgian Government establishment Fabrique Nationale. The EM–2 and the T–47 were dropped. The T–44 and T–48 were given severe service testing from 1952 on, including testing in quantity at locations in the Arctics, the tropics, and most sections of the United States. The concept of a single rifle replacing former shoulder weapons was checked with a special order of 5,200 FN rifles, by a variety of combat units and all the service schools. As a separate action, Ordnance was directed to have 500 of each model built, by different establishments, to determine whether they would perform satisfactorily when made by mass-production methods. Both productions were successful.

On May 1, 1957, the Secretary of the Army announced the new small arms weapons system, including the M–60 general purpose machinegun, adopted a short time before, and the T–44E4 adopted as the M–14. These weapons were adopted after thoroughness in development and testing unprecedented in our history and probably anywhere.

The new standard rifle was at first produced also in a heavy-barrel model with bipod and folding butt hook, designated M–15 and intended for sustained fire. Changes in tactics and continued experience with the rifle showed the heavy barrel to be unnecessary, so the M–15 was dropped. All M–14's are now regularly made with the folding butt hook, and the bipod is attached when required.

The M–14 is the first multipurpose U.S. infantry rifle. The military characteristics which guided its development were designed to produce a weapon capable of fulfilling a variety of combat roles which up to that time had been fulfilled by single-purpose weapons. Specifically it was desired that the new rifle replace the M–1 of 9.7 pounds weight, the carbine of 5.5 pounds, the M–3 submachinegun of 8.9 pounds, and the Browning automatic rifle weighing 19.4 pounds. For the new rifle to be capable of replacing these four weapons, it was necessary that it possess the long-range, point-target accuracy of the M–1 rifle; the selective semi-automatic and full-automatic fire features of the carbine; the short-range burst-fire capability of the M–3 submachinegun; and the long-range automatic sustained-fire capability of the Browning automatic rifle. All these were desired in a weapon of less weight than the M–1 rifle.

The M–14 rifle does possess these extreme capabilities in a weight of 9 pounds. It is interesting to note where in the rifle these reside.

When the ordinary rifle is fired at night the propellent gases burn outside the muzzle in a flame which is visible for hundreds of yards, conspicuously disclosing the shooter's position. The M–14 flash suppressor on the muzzle prevents the formation of flash and makes the discharge of the rifle invisible at ranges greater than 50 yards. The importance of this has been increased by experience in the Korean war, and other information has shown that night combat is to be the rule in fighting certain enemies.

The M–14 gas-actuating system functions over a wide range of ammunition ballistics. With the substantial number of domestic producers of NATO ammunition, and the possibility of using ammunition of foreign manufacture, this may become important.

The fiberglass handguard with its resistance to heat adds considerably to the sustained-fire capability of the rfle.

A cylindrical roller on the bolt actuating lug greatly reduces friction between bolt and operating rod, and improves reliability of the weapon under adverse conditions such as heavy rainfall or lack of lubrication.

Clip guides on the action accept 5-round clips, with which an empty or partly empty magazine can be refilled quickly through the top of the action. In sustained automatic fire, loaded magazines are inserted directly into the bottom of the weapon.

The hinged buttplate in conjunction with the bipod contributes to firm control in automatic fire.

In addition to excellent accuracy, the M–14 rifle has given outstanding performance under a variety of adverse combat-type conditions.

During sustained-fire tests at Fort Benning, an M–14 was fired continuously at 60 rounds per minute for 3,080 rounds. The test was terminated because of chambered rounds being preignited by the hot barrel. At no time did the barrel fail to stabilize the bullet in flight. The front ends of the stock and handguard eventually burst into flames, but the rifle continued to fire. Here the rifle is approaching traditional machinegun capability. Such extraordinary performance distinguishes the M–14 from its predecessors and its recent competitors.

Lesya the Ukrainian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 24, a full-length bronze statue of Lesya Ukrainka, Ukrainia's most famous poetess, was unveiled and dedicated in ceremonies held in the Ukrainian Cultural Gardens in Rockefeller Park, Cleveland. Under leave previously granted, I include the message I prepared for this occasion:

LESYA THE UKRAINIAN

Larysa Kosacheva, known to the literary world as Lesya Ukrainka, is a symbol of the rich Ukrainian culture, a mirror of the sufferings borne by the Ukrainian people and a good omen for the future of the Ukrainian nation.

Like the great Shevchenko and Franko, to whom her lifetime work is bound by the gift of genius and the power of expression, she was born into an age of ruthless censorship imposed by the imperial Russians. Her life, much like that of Shevchenko, was marked with great suffering and human tragedy. Stricken with tuberculosis at an early age, she became bedridden for long periods of time and confined to a world of books and great ideas. Through her talented mother, Olha, she came to know the literatures of the world and through them grew up in an atmosphere that reflected the thinking and literary movements of contemporary Europe.

The era of Lesya Ukrainka was marked by the efforts of the Russian czars to stamp out Ukrainian consciousness of being a separate and distinct people from the Muscovites. In 1863 Count Valuyev, a Russian political minister, issued this infamous dictum which was strictly enforced, "There never was, is not now, and never will be a Ukrainian language." This prohibition was followed up in 1876 by an imperial ukase which prohibited the printing of books or the importation of books in the Ukrainian language, while making compulsory use of the term "Little Russian" when making reference to Ukraine. Much of the Ukrainian gentry and educated class accepted this process of Russification and allowed themselves to be absorbed into the Russian manner of thinking.

During this period of great trial for Ukraine, it was the women of the villages in that country who saved the nation from complete demise. While it had become popular among the gentry to accept Russification, the Ukrainian women on the whole rejected it as distinctly unfashionable and indeed degrading. It was the stern stand on this question taken by Ukrainian women, particularly at the village level, that kept the spirit of the nation alive. The writings of Lesya "the Ukrainian" reflect this brave spirit of Ukrainian women. To me, one poem among her many stands out as expressive of that indomitable spirit which has held the Ukrainian nation together during its long period of trials and suffering at the hands of imperial despots. That poem is Vain Tears, which merits special attention on this occasion:

VAIN TEARS

Laments and groans are all around,
Irresolute, faint challenges,
Complaints against vile destiny,
And foreheads bowed in betterness.
And all the time we still bewail
Our Ukraine's ancient misery;
With tears we wait the coming day
For chains to break and set us free.
Such tears the more inflame our wounds,
Delay their healing, make them ache.
Our chains might rust from falling tears,
But of themselves they'll never break.
What use are such despondent moods?
For turning backwards 'tis too late.
Much rather let us set to work
And strive a future to create.

I commend the Ukrainian Women's League, Cleveland chapter, for the initiative that they have taken to make possible a statute of Lesya Ukrainka in the Ukrainian Cultural Gardens of Cleveland. In honoring this immortal poetess, you pay tribute to the courage and indomitable spirit of Ukrainian women of all ages.

The Right to Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable JACOB JAVITS, of New York, which appeared in the September 1961 issue of the magazine Americas:

THE RIGHT TO EQUALITY

(Article by JACOB J. JAVITS in the September 1961 issue of the magazine "Americas")

(JACOB K. JAVITS has been a U.S. Senator since 1956. He previously served four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and 2 years as New York State Attorney General. He has consistently championed civil rights programs, sponsoring and serving as a floor leader for much of the recent legislation in this field.)

The struggle against the remaining racial and religious discrimination in the United States engaged my interest and action long before I entered public life. I cannot emphasize too strongly the primary importance

of this struggle to the tranquility of our country and its moral leadership of the free world. Patience and determination are basic qualities for success, law is the necessary equipment, but most essential of all is the support of a well-informed public opinion. This book is my contribution to the effort to provide information and to stimulate discussion and study of one of the major issues of our time.

I was born in 1904, and I remember vividly my life as a small boy, the son of Jewish immigrants, in a janitor's flat on Orchard and Stanton Streets on the lower East Side of New York City. My father made pants and doubled as janitor of the tenement, then later worked full time as the janitor for $30 a month, plus rooms. My mother sold crockery and dry goods from a pushcart. In school I read about democracy and about the equality of all in America, but to a poor Jewish boy, running errands for a candy shop, scratching for a penny, watching my father get out the vote for $2 a head paid by a saloonkeeper who was a Tammany Hall captain, the words "democracy" and "equality" seemed just so many distant, high-sounding phrases. I had little thought that I could win social acceptance, not to speak of being permitted to serve in the high public offices of Congressman, attorney general of New York State, and U.S. Senator.

My own experience is symptomatic of the social revolution which has marked American life since the turn of the 20th century. The United States of the early 1900's was a "white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon" country, as people used to say. Millions of citizens were not white or Protestant or "Anglo-Saxon" (meaning descended from western European stock), but the dominant assumption was that they should be satisfied with the skimpier educations, the dirtier jobs, and a severely limited right to advance in the economic or political world. In 1900 the top-ranking colleges admitted only a handful of students from minority families, and most of these came from decidedly exceptional circumstances. It was difficult for a Catholic of Irish or southern European background, and still harder for an eastern European Jew, to rise high in the basic industries, in the professions, or in the realm of arts and letters. No realistic person would have thought of proposing anyone but an old-stock white Protestant for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency of the United States. As for the average Negro, in either the North or the South, he was lucky to find a livelihood that kept him in ramshackle housing and grubby food.

During the decades after World War I, the United States went on chipping away at the crust of caste. There were years when the Nation seemed to turn backward, but overall it headed toward the elimination of discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color.

By the late 1950's, the highest prestige colleges were competing with each other to enroll outstanding students regardless of family background. More miles of trim suburbia were stretching out, now inhabited not only by the old-stock executive group but by the middle-class and working-class sons of immigrants. The only Federal civil rights law since Reconstruction days was passed in 1957, and was followed 3 years later by further civil rights legislation. In one area of U.S. life after another, Negroes scored more firsts. A particularly striking event occurred in 1958. For decades the top echelon of the U.S. diplomatic service had been considered a special preserve of the well born. On January 23, 1958, President Eisenhower appointed Clifton R. Wharton Minister to Rumania, the first Negro to be named U.S. chief of mission to a country of predominantly white population.

All the while, the 1954 Supreme Court decision ordering the end of the color line in public schools was doing its work. Desegregation was resisted by efforts ranging from the portentous to the ridiculous. In Arkansas, Gov. Orval Faubus so brazenly defied the Supreme Court that President Eisenhower ordered Federal troops into Little Rock. In Florida, Henry Balch, columnist for the Orlando Sentinel, thundered that a children's book telling about the marriage of a white and a black rabbit was a plot of the "integrating desegregationists," and hounded the volume off the shelves of the public libraries. (The author, Garth Williams, mused sadly: "It was written for children from 2 to 5 who will understand it perfectly. It was not written for adults, who will not understand it because it is only about a soft furry love and has no hidden message of hate.") Under the circumstances, desegregation moved ahead slowly. In 1960, on the anniversary of the Court decision, the statistics showed that only 6 percent of the Negro students in the southern and border States were attending integrated schools—and the percentage was zero in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Yet, whatever the rate of speed, whatever the obstacles, the Nation was going ahead desegrating its schools.

Today, I am confident, the United States is entering a period when the walls of discrimination will go on tumbling—and being tumbled—down. The election of a Catholic to the presidency is already a fact. By the year 2000, it is conceivable that we may see the election of a Negro to the Presidency or the Vice Presidency. The appointment of a Negro Secretary of State does not seem far-fetched when a man like Ralph Bunche is considered. A former Assistant Secretary of State, this distinguished American Negro is second only to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold at the United Nations; he has, and has richly earned, an international reputation as a peace negotiator and statesman. Negro leaders have told me that they feel it will be politically feasible to name a Negro to the Supreme Court within the next 10 years.

In the proximate future we may well see a marked increase in the number of Negroes in Congress. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, spurred on by the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, has launched a drive to triple Negro registration in the South and thus to put it on a par with the present 60 percent registration of eligible white voters. I believe that the number in the House of Representatives is likely to grow steadily, and that, from the Negro 10 percent of our population, between 30 and 40 qualified persons may be elected as Representatives to the 106th Congress by the year 2,000. Long before then, I expect to see the first Negro since the Reconstruction era taking his place in the U.S. Senate.

By 1965, public school integration should be well on its way even in the Deep South. The next two Congresses, those which convene in 1961 and 1963, will probably bring an end to the archaic Senate rule XXII and therefore to the filibuster, which has been the special and stubborn hurdle on the road to civil rights legislation. I make this prediction on the strength of my own experience in the Senate and on the basis of my observation of the mood of the country during the civil rights debates of 1957 and 1960. There is a new generation in the United States—and of those who live below the Mason-Dixon line. Today the South is producing an ever increasing number of enlightened citizens who, while still opposed to general civil rights legislation, do not carry over the ancient southern opposition, indeed revulsion, to the idea of accepting Negroes as the equals of whites in public affairs. For example, during the civil rights discussions of recent years, a notable number of southern leaders conceded that the full enjoyment of the ballot belongs to the Negro as well as to the white man.

If the country's past argues for a continuing social upsurge, the country's present certainly does not gainsay it. The Negro group, latest of the groups to make its bid for equal rights and equal opportunities, is certain to increase in political power and certain to use that power to win more opportunities. Since 1950, it has been estimated, the potential nonwhite vote has catapulted 25 percent in New York, 50 percent in Chicago, 62 percent in Los Angeles. By the year 2,000, one out of every three voters in New York and Chicago, and one out of two voters in Los Angeles, may well be nonwhite. Population shifts of minority groups to urban areas are creating a tide that could elect a nonwhite mayor in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, or Los Angeles, before many years. In the South, as a result of the civil rights legislation already passed and the additional laws that are almost certain to come, the Negro will vote more and more. And, as all American groups have done, he will use the vote to broaden opportunities for himself.

Outside the South, the antidiscrimination forces can count on a hard reality of modern U.S. life; prejudice has proved to be ineffective politics. In the past, bigotry and hate may have had some success, but today they simply do not work. In my own career in politics, I have had no little experience with religious smear campaigns. In the late part of the senatorial campaign in 1956, literature appeared in New York City—which has a large Jewish population—carrying the innuendo that I had forsaken the Jewish faith. The matter was brought out into the open during a television interview when viewers telephoned in the question: "Is it true that you changed your Jewish faith?" Questions such as this, as every public figure knows, are like that old verbal trap which calls for a yes or no answer to the question: "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?" Air time ran out before I could reply that I had not changed my religion. Yet, according to my analysis of the 1956 results, the question had little or no effect on the voters of New York State.

The most spectacular proof that appeals to religious prejudice do not work in modern U.S. politics came in the West Virginia presidential primary battle in 1960 between Senator John Kennedy, a Catholic, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a Protestant. Although Senator HUMPHREY made it ringingly plain that he wanted no votes gained from religious bias, anti-Catholicism was a blatant part of the campaign. Seasoned observers thought the prejudice might well have a decisive effect: West Virginia is 95 percent Protestant and was supposed to have a strong anti-Catholic tradition. But when the votes were counted, Kennedy had won a thumping three-to-two victory. He was hurt little or not at all by the anti-Catholic campaign. On the contrary, apparently he was actually helped by it. Heavily Protestant West Virginia seemed the more determined to give the Senator, a Catholic, a victory as a way of showing that it wanted no part of elections determined by irrelevant questions of religion.

There are approximately 18 million Negroes in the United States, one-half of whom live in the South, and another third in five urban centers in the North. Statistics offer a dramatic picture of how meagerly they share in our expanding economy. In 1939, the median income for white workers was $1,112 a year; for nonwhite workers, it was $460. In 1955, white workers had a median income of $3,986, contrasted with $2,342 for nonwhite workers. These figures make plain that while the nonwhite population has shared in our general prosperity and reduced the difference between incomes, the Negro nevertheless continues to pay a sever price solely because of the color of his skin. Today, two out of every five Negro families

earn less than $2,000 a year. Average Negro incomes are still far below white incomes.

There is a final fact about the results of discrimination, the most important of all. The future of our Nation—indeed, its very existence—may well depend upon whether nonwhites living in the underdeveloped countries choose communism or freedom. The great contest revolves around the 1,200 million people—largely Negro and oriental—who live in the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa. This global picture is crucially related to our domestic struggle over civil rights and the ending of discrimination. It is so importantly related because the nonwhites are watching closely to see whether we practice what we preach about equality and justice.

No U.S. domestic situation gives the Soviet Union and the international Communit Party more fuel for their propaganda machines than our two faces on civil rights. In terms of world prestige, Little Rock cost us more in 1 day of violent prejudice than the launching of all the Russian space satellites.

Even more damaging to our prestige was the reaction of the press in the uncommitted areas of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Typically, the Times of Indonesia declared: "It is hard to realize that this is taking place in a country proclaiming its democratic liberties for all to hear." We simply cannot hope to win the nonwhite peoples of the world conclusively to our side if they doubt that we will consider them equals. They will continue to doubt just as long as we wave our Constitution at them with one hand, and with the other tolerate the denial to a substantial part of our citizens in a broad region of our own country of their rights under the Constitution.

As the United States hurries along the road toward genuine democracy, all kinds of efforts will help. The agitation of organizations will have its importance; so, too, will the labors of dedicated individuals and the studies of psychologists, sociologists, economists, and historians. But the prime need is law—more firm, carefully formulated legislation on the Federal, State, and municipal levels directed toward making equal rights and equal opportunities ultimate realities. Law is the indispensable advance guard of social change. It gives well-intentioned men a standard to which they can repair. It nudges the indifferent and it tames the hostile.

In this connection, too little attention has been paid to the fact that the Federal Government now spends more than $30 billion a year on contracts with private firms. This means that hundreds of thousands of jobs are placed where the Government has the power—indeed, the responsibility—to see that they are filled without regard to religion or color, but the Congress has to help. In 1953, by Executive order, President Eisenhower established the Federal Committee on Government Contracts, the main purpose of which is to combat discriminatory practices in industries fulfilling Government contracts. The Committee has done some good work, but it is hampered by inadequate funds and staff and especially by the fact that it does not have the authority of an institution established by Congress. (Since 1953, it has investigated only 837 complaints, and settled to its satisfaction only 245.)

In 1959, as part of his package civil rights proposals, President Eisenhower recommended the establishment of a statutory Federal Commission on Equal Opportunity Under Government Contracts. New York State pioneered in this field with the formation of the State commission against discrimination. This agency's experience and its success fully justify the President's recommendation. The Eisenhower proposal was lost in the Senate compromises, but its ultimate enactment is of prime importance.

Action is needed to bring, in all 50 States, the enactment of legislation already existing in 5 States, which forbids discrimination in any housing aided by federally guaranteed mortgages under the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans' Administration (VA). The existing State laws authorize agencies or commissions to deal with discrimination on a basis of conciliation and mediation and, if these fail, by civil action in the courts. But a big share of the responsibility for driving Jim Crow out of the housing field must be assumed by the Federal Government—and it could do a great deal more than it is presently attempting. It should be fundamental Federal policy for all agencies connected with housing to push vigorously for equal opportunity to a decent home. Every effort should be made—particularly every administrative effort—to bring about compliance by builders who seek the aid of FHA and VA mortgages. The urban renewal program shows that this can be done.

Those of us who live in States like New York, where public sentiment and every responsible governmental agency are on record against any inequality of opportunity, have a special responsibility to practice, and practice in highly positive terms, what we preach. If southern segregationalists are to be deprived of their most cherished distortion—that racial or religious discrimination which persists in the North gives a license for Jim Crowism in the South—then none among us can be a mere bystander in the fight.

It is a fight filled with its ups and downs, its nagging complexities, its shocking desertions, as I am only too well aware from my years in public office. It is also a fight peculiarly appropriate to the only nation in all of man's long history that ever dared mix so many different races, nationalities, and religions, and, having mixed them, dared to declare that the end produot could be equal rights and equal opportunity for all. That the people of the United States have the desire, the strength, and the faith to go on pushing toward this goal has been said many times, but it was once said in a way that carries its special force over all the intervening decades. In 1880, U.S. Senator B. K. Bruce rose to support a pending bill. His remarks moved to the subject of the general meaning of the country's experience, and he said: "As a people, our history is full of surmounted obstacles. We have been scaling difficult problems for more than 100 years. We have been (and will continue to be) settling material, moral, and great political questions that before our era had been unsolved."

B. K. Bruce was a Negro, born into human slavery, elected to the U.S. Senate from Mississippi amid all the anti-Negro bitterness and violence of Reconstruction days. His speech was in support of a bill protecting the civil rights and extending the opportunities of the American Indian.

Many predict that racial tensions in the United States will get worse before they get better. I am well aware of these predictions and of the possibility that they could be correct, but I still have great faith in the resourceful genius of our country. When public indignation is raised here there is no denying relief. To save ourselves—and do it just in time—there must be those who will not permit themselves to be still and compliant or permit their fellow-citizens to be complacent in the face of the incendiary injustices of discrimination and segregation which persist in our society.

Annual Tour of My Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, which by the way was one of he longest peacetime sessions we ever had, I am looking forward to a visit and a talk with the people whom I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States.

Ever since coming to Congress in January 1939, with the exception of 3½ years of naval service during World War II, it has been my practice following the adjournment of each session of Congress to make an annual tour of my district which carries me into every community. As will be noted from the following schedule, in addition to meeting constituents in my Altoona office, office hours are held in the lobby of post offices and in some instances hotels of the various communities, so that my constituents can stop to say hello, to inquire of some Federal legislation or to discuss a problem they may have with the Federal Government.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to announce the schedule of my annual tour of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties.

On Wednesday, October 4, I shall be in my Altoona office, room 335–337 Central Trust Building—Telephone WIndsor 4-8932—from 2 to 6 p.m. and on Thursday, October 5 from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., except during the lunch period.

On Friday, October 6, and Saturday, October 7, the following schedule will be observed:

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1961 (BLAIR COUNTY)

Tyrone: lobby of post office, 9 to 10:30 a.m.

Bellwood: lobby of post office, 11 a.m. to 12 noon.

Hollidaysburg: lobby of Capitol Hotel, 1:30 to 3 p.m.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1961 (BLAIR COUNTY)

Roaring Spring, lobby of Eldon Inn, 9 to 10 a.m.

Martinsburg, lobby of post office, 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon.

Williamsburg, lobby of post office, 1 to 2 p.m.

Claysburg, lobby of post office, 2:30 to 3:30 p.m.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1961 (CENTRE COUNTY)

Port Matilda, lobby of post office, 1:30 to 2 p.m.

Millheim, lobby of post office, 2:30 to 3 p.m.

Centre Hall, lobby of post office, 3:30 to 4 p.m.

State College, lobby of State College Hotel, 4:30 to 6 p.m.

Bellefonte, lobby of Penn Belle Hotel, 7 to 8:30 p.m.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1961 (CLEARFIELD COUNTY)

DuBois, lobby of General Pershing Hotel, 9 to 10:30 a.m.

Grampian, lobby of post office, 11 to 11:30 a.m.

Mahaffey, lobby of post office, 12 noon to 12:30 p.m.

Curwensville, lobby of Park Hotel, 1 to 2 p.m.

Clearfield, lobby of Hotel Dimeling, 2:30 to 4 p.m.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1961 (CENTRE AND CLEARFIELD COUNTIES)

Coalport: lobby of post office, 1 to 2 p.m.

Madera: lobby of post office, 2:30 to 3 p.m.

Houtzdale: lobby of post office, 3:30 to 4 p.m.

Osceola Mills: lobby of post office, 4:30 to 5 p.m.

Philipsburg: lobby of post office, 6 to 8 p.m.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them and workers, businessmen, and housewives are urged to drop by the temporary office in their hometown. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as they are.

As I stated before, I maintain a district office in the Central Trust Building at Altoona, Pa. It is open 5 days a week to serve the residents of the 20th Congressional District.

If I should be out of the office on official business there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or to assist in every way possible.

I welcome all those who may have a problem of great importance to themselves to meet with me when I am in their community or on this annual congressional tour of our district.

The Arabs of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, during the debate on the mutual security authorization, I addressed the House on the need to support the appropriation for United Nations Relief and Works Agency which cares for Arab refugees. At the same time I urged a more realistic attitude toward the problem which would recognize that resettlement of the refugees among their own people in Arab lands is the only logical solution.

The question arises again in the context of the mutual security appropriation. I would now like to call the attention of the House to a brilliant article on the Arabs of Palestine written by Martha Gellhorn, the distinguished novelist and war correspondent, in the Atlantic for October. This article is the clearest, frankest, and most penetrating report on the problem I have yet seen. I hope that Members of Congress and the members of our United Nations delegation will find it as helpful as I have.

This is a long article. However, I would like to quote but two paragraphs at this time:

UNRWA has been a splendid mother and father and can serve the refugees as a guide to the future. UNRWA's greatest gift to the refugees, to the Arab world, and, indirectly, to us all is the education and health of its charges. UNRWA should receive more money and be considered primarily an educational institution. In my opinion, UNRWA will be with us for some time, an admirable training school for young Palestinians and a kindly old folks' home for aged Palestinians. But UNRWA, too, must be taken out of politics. Its work should not be subject to Arab political supervision; none of its activities should be used for Arab propaganda purposes; and its Western personnel must keep themselves rigorously detached from the Arab-Israel controversy.

There is no future in spending U.N. money to breed hate. There is no future in nagging or bullying Israel to commit suicide by the admission of a fatal locust swarm of enemies. There is no future in Nasser's solution, the holy war against Israel; and we had better make this very clear, very quickly. Long bleak memories will recall the Sudetendeutsch and Czechoslovakia. In a new setting, Palestinian refugees assume the role of the Sudetendeutsch. Israel becomes Czechoslovakia. Propaganda prepares the war for liberation of "our brothers." Victory over a minor near enemy is planned as the essential first step on a long triumphant road of conquest. A thousand-year Muslim Reich, the African Continent ruled by Egypt, may be a mad dream, but we have experience of mad dreams and mad dreamers. We cannot be too careful. The echo of Hitler's voice is heard again in the land, now speaking Arabic.

Because I think the entire statement is worthy of the attention of the Congress, I would like to introduce it in the Appendix in full:

THE ARABS OF PALESTINE

(By Martha Gellhorn)

(Martha Gellhorn, novelist, journalist, and former war correspondent, has recently returned from a journey to the Middle East, where she went to see the Palestinian refugee problem in terms of real life, real people. Here she reports how the Arab refugees and the Arab Israelis live, and what they say about themselves, their past, and their future.)

According to Arab politicians and apologists, this is what happened, this is the authentic view, these are the facts. Doubt is treasonous. There can be only one truth, according to Arab politicans and apologists, and it belongs to them:

In 1948, war took place between five Arab nations of the Middle East and the Jews in Palestine. This war was caused by the United Nations, whose General Assembly resolved to partition Palestine into two states, one for the Palestinian Arabs, the other for the Jews. The Arab nations and the Palestinian Arabs would not accept this monstrous decision. They were obliged to protect themselves against it, with force. The United Nations operated as the tool of the Western imperialists, notably Great Britain and the United States. The United Nations wanted the Jews to proclaim the upstart State of Israel. Because of the Western imperialists, who favored Israel, the Arabs lost the war. By massacre, threatening broadcasts, pointed bayonets, and the murderous siege of cities, the Jews drove hundreds of thousands of Arabs out of their homeland. For 13 years, these Arab refugees have languished in misery around the borders of Israel. The United Nations (Western branch) bears the blame for these events and must repair the damage. The condition of the refugees is a sore on the conscience of honorable men. The Israeli Government refuses to welcome back to their homeland the refugees, now swollen to more than a million in number. This refusal demonstrates the brutality and dishonesty of Israel, an abnormal nation of aliens who not only forced innocent people into exile but also stole their property. There is no solution to this injustice, the greatest the world has ever seen, except to repatriate all Palestinian refugees in Palestine. Palestine is an Arab country, now infamously called Israel. Israel has no right to exist, and the Arab nations will not sign peace treaties with it but will, by every means possible, maintain the state of war.

The details of the Arab case vary, depending on the political climate of the moment and the audience. However, the Palestinian refugees always remain the invaluable, central theme. The case is painted the color of blood in the Arab countries: revenge and return. For the Western public, tears replace blood; the Arab case rests on the plight of the refugees and is a call to conscience rather than to arms. But no Arab statesman has ever promised final peace with Israel if only the million Palestinian refugees may return to their former homes.

The best way to consider this case is close up, by looking at the Palestinian refugees themselves, not as a problem, not as statistics, but as people. The Palestinian refugees, battered by 13 years in the arena of international politics, have lost their shape; they appear as a lump and are spoken of as one object. They are individuals, like everyone else.

Despite the unique care and concern they have received, despite the unique publicity which rages around them, the Arab refugees, alas, are not unique. Although no one knows exactly how many refugees are scattered everywhere over the globe, it is estimated that since World War II, and only since then, at least 39 million non-Arab men, women, and children have become homeless refugees, through no choice of their own. Their numbers grow every year; Angolans are the latest addition to the long list. The causes for this uprooting are always different, but the result is the same: the uprooted have lost what they had and where they came from and must start life again as handicapped strangers wherever they are allowed to live.

The world could be far more generous to these unwilling wanderers, but at least the world has never thought of exploiting them. They are recognized as people, not pawns. By their own efforts, and with help from those devoted to their service, all but some 6 million of the 39 million have made a place for themselves, found work, and another chance for the future. To be a refugee is not necessarily a life sentence.

The unique misfortune of the Palestinian refugees is that they are a weapon in what seems to be a permanent war. Alarming signs, from Egypt, warn us that the Palestinian refugees may develop into more than a justification for cold war against Israel. We ignored "Mein Kampf" in its day, as the ravings of a lunatic, written for limited home consumption. We ought to have learned never to ignore dictators or their books. "Egypt's Liberation," by Gamal Abdel Nasser, deserves careful notice. It is short, low-keyed, and tells us once again that a nation has been ordained by fate to lead—this time, to lead the Arab nations, all Africa, all Islam. The Palestinian refugees are not mentioned, and today, in the Middle

East, you get a repeated sinking sensation about the Palestinian refugees: they are only a beginning, not an end. Their function is to hang around and be constantly useful as a goad. The ultimate aim is not such humane small potatoes as repatriating refugees.

The word "refugee" is drenched in memories which stretch back over too many years and too many landscapes: Spain, Czechoslovakia, China, Finland, England, Italy, Holland, Germany. In Madrid, between artillery bombardments, children were stuffed into trucks to be taken somewhere, out of that roulette death, while their mothers clung to the tailboards of the trucks and were dragged weeping after the bewildered, weeping children. In Germany, at war's end, the whole country seemed alive with the roaming mad—slave laborers, concentration camp survivors—who spoke the many tongues of Babel, dressed in whatever scraps they had looted, and searched for food in stalled freight cars though the very railyards were being bombed. From China to Finland, people like these defined the meaning of "refugee."

No one could wish to see even the pale imitation of such anguish again. In the Middle East, there would be no high explosive, no concentration camps, but the imagined, expected scene was bad enough; lice and rickets and tuberculosis, bodies rotting in the heat, the apathy of despair. Why, in 1961, did I have such a picture of the Palestinian refugees? Obviously from what I had read, as one of the average absorbent reading public; notions float in the air exactly as dust does. Nothing that I had read or heard prepared me for what I found.

What do they look like, the undifferentiated mass known as the "Palestinian Refugee Problem"? What do they think, feel, say? What do they want? How do they live, where do they live, what do they do? Who takes care of them? What future can they hope for, in terms of reality, not in terms of slogans, which are meaningless if not actually fatal, as we know.

The children are as fast as birds, irreverent as monkeys, large-eyed, ready to laugh. The young girls, trained by carrying water jars or other heavy household bundles on their heads, move like ballerinas and are shrouded in modesty and silence as if in cocoons. The young men, crudely or finely formed, have in common the hopefulness and swagger of their new manhood. The middle years seem nondescript, in both sexes. After this the women, who age quickly but not as quickly as the men, wear unpainted experience on their faces; they look patient, humorous, and strong. When the men have grown visibly old, they turn into a race of grandees. Their color, infant to patriarch, ranges from golden fair to mahogany dark, all warmed by the glaze of sun. The instinct for hospitality, the elegance of manner have not been exaggerated.

UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East), inheriting its role from previous caretakers, has been the splendid mother and father of these people for 11 years. In the course of its parenthood UNRWA has spent about $360 million on the Arab refugees, this money having been contributed by members of the United Nations, with smaller but loving donations from private charitable organizations as well. Of the total the United States provided more than $238 million, Great Britain over $65 million—but spread across the years and in varying amounts, 61 states, including Israel and the Holy See, have helped with cash. The Soviet Union has never paid one cent. This is a tiny note of malice: Arab refugees often express tender emotions for the Soviet Union, whereas most of the village orators blame the United States and England, or that bogey, Western imperialism, for their exile.

In the so-called host countries, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and Egypt, UNRWA runs 58 refugee camps. The camps in Egypt are not in Egypt but in the Gaza strip, which is Palestine; Egypt is the de facto mandatory power, the land and the government of the Gaza strip are Palestinian. The majority of camps in Jordan are also on what was the territory of Palestine, now annexed to Jordan.

UNRWA has never yet been allowed to make a total proper census of its refugee population, so statistics about the number of ex-Palestinians are nothing except the best estimate possible; UNRWA itself says this. Over half of the registered Palestinian refugees do not live in camps, but have made more or less comfortable private arrangements varying from first-class houses, at the top, to hand-built Hooverville shacks, at the bottom. UNRWA calculates that, at the end of June, 1960, 421,500 refugees were living in their camps, almost double their camp population 10 years ago. The advantage of living in a camp is that life there is rent free; and for the poor, the standard of housing and sanitation in an UNRWA camp is better than that of the native population.

The international personnel of UNRWA, Americans and Western Europeans, is small; 128 men and women work in four countries. The mass of those who serve the Palestinian refugees are Palestinian refugees themselves, something over 10,000 of them. UNRWA is running a world, simply, a little welfare state. It makes villages, called camps, and keeps them clean and free of disease, feeds, educates, trains teachers and technicians and craftsmen, operates clinics and maternity centers, sends out visiting nurses, encourages small private enterprises with small loans, distributes clothing, soap, kerosene, blankets, provides hospitalization, footballs, youth clubs, mosques.

UNRWA is a kind, impartial parent; it has no favorites. However, people are all different, luckily; and though one man will arrive in exile as a destitute refugee and in time own a whopping Chevrolet and be a self-employed taxi driver, with a cozy home and a smilling wife in a flowered print dress and a gleaming refrigerator in the dining room, another will remain in whatever shelter UNRWA gave him, sitting either on his own floor or at a cafe table, waiting for nothing, or for divine intervention, or for the mailed, promised, delivering fist of Nasser. UNRWA did not invent the human condition.

Of UNRWA's 58 camps, I visited 8—in Lebanon, the Gaza strip, and Jordan. The plan and facilities of every UNRWA camp are alike; they differ only in size and are better or worse depending on whether they are newer or older and on the character of the people who live in them. Each camp has its clinic and school (or schools), warehouse center for distributing rations, "supplementary feeding station," where hot meals are served to those who need them, village bazaar street with small shops, market booths, cafes. The bigger the camp, the bigger the bazaar. I also went round two hospitals, two vocational training schools, and was received in two private homes, having been invited by refugees.

My guide and chaperone was an UNRWA employee, a Palestinian Arab, who served as translator when needed. My system was to say: "Please show me your best and your worst camp, and if time permits, let us also look at the in-between." In the camps, I knocked on any door and many. Nothing was planned. We chatted at random and went wherever I liked. In the Gaza strip, I was accompanied for a day by a young Palestinian in a pin-striped suit; he or someone like him is a cross every foreigner has to bear. He is local secret service, and the refugees know this; he is an ardent Nasserite, as apparently all Palestinian government officials in Gaza are, or must appear to be; and he is by avocation a propagandist and demagog. At one Gaza camp, besides this young gent, I had an escort of three Palestinian cops who lent an even heavier note to the proceedings. Otherwise, my visits were uncensored. I may have seen a true cross section of the Palestinian refugee population, and I may not have. I only know that I saw real people in the flesh, and a large number of them, and I know what they said. When the word "they" appears on these pages, it means those Arabs whom I saw; it means nothing more.

Beirut is a lovely boomtown, an entrancing mixture of Asia Minor and France, with scenery to lift the heart and glamor hotels all over the lot and more abuilding. We set off, my Palestinian guide and I, in a shiny car for an UNRWA camp in the Lebanese hills. My guide, like his colleagues who accompanied me elsewhere, was an executive, responsible for an UNRWA department, dressed in a Western business suit, a self-assured, middleclass organization man. The refugees are not only individuals, but they come from widely different social backgrounds. Men of the class of my guides would not be living in refugee camps; they might work in them as doctors or teachers.

This camp was inhabited exclusively by Christian Arabs. I wondered aloud at a separation by creed. My guide was a Muslim and said that Christian camps were always cleaner and superior to Muslim ones, and besides, very few Christians lived in camps; they arranged their lives better on their own.

The camp consisted of little cement or frame houses rambling over the hillside, a village of poor people, disorderly and beflowered and cheerful. School was letting out for lunch; troops of children, dressed in the pinafore uniform that small boys and girls wear in Italian schools, meandered home, shouting by-by at friendly, giggling length. They are Roman Catholics here, but the young teachers are refugees, not priests. They have to teach the children about Palestine, since most of them have never seen the country and even the oldest cannot remember it. The children are taught hate, the Garden of Eden stolen from them by murderers; their duty is to live for return and revenge.

The miniature white clinic had only one customer, a nice-looking girl of 21 who had brought her fourth baby for a checkup. Her husband works in Libya; she too lived there for a few years but returned. Libya is very expensive; she can live here with his parents and thus save money for the future. The resident nurse, a buxom, elderly woman, said they had no real sickness; in summer, the children got a bit of conjunctivitis and diarrhea; oh, no, trachoma is very rare, and besides, we cure it; there's some chickenpox now. My guide announced that if any refugee needed an operation he was taken in an ambulance to a hospital in Beirut where UNRWA reserved beds and paid for everything; you would have to be a rich man in Lebanon to get such good and speedy treatment. Her fourth baby, I mused, and she only twenty-one. Yes, yes, said my guide, the refugees have a higher birth rate than any other Arabs, and healthier children.

Refugees receive a monthly basic food ration of flour, pulse (dried peas, beans, lentils), sugar, rice, oils, and fats; this amounts to 1,500 calories a day per person, increased in winter to 1,600 calories a day, and it is not enough. The refugee must find some way to earn money to increase his diet, or keep poultry or rabbits, or grow vegetables. Many had planted tiny gardens here, but charmingly and with more enthusiasm, they also grow flowers for the joy of the thing. There is a daily milk ration for children and

pregnant and nursing mothers; and hot meals are served in the supplementary feeding station, to those who need them, on the doctor's order. In this camp, said my guide, 85 percent of the people have work. If there are hardship cases, when no one can bring money to the family, UNRWA's Welfare Section steps in. This pattern is universal.

If you think it is your duty, I said, to make everything seem better than it is, don't. I'm not on an inspection tour, I only want to get some idea of what life is really like. He stopped, offended, in the middle of the stony path and explained: here, in Lebanon, 80 percent of the refugees are better off than they were in Palestine. Twenty percent are not. The 20 percent were small capitalists, and there is much rivalry with the Lebanese in business, they make obstacles. Also it is political; they do not give the refugees citizenship, you understand, because the main part of the refugees are Muslims and that would upset the balance here, where the Christians rule. I do not speak to you of the rich Palestinian refugees; they are richer than before, they are very happy.

We went to pay the required visite de politesse to the camp leader. Every camp leader acts as an appointed village mayor; he has to keep the place running, serve as liaison officer with UNRWA local headquarters, and handle the complaints of his own people. Sitting in his neat office, with my guide, the principal of the school (a former member of the Palestinian police), and the camp leader, I listened to the first of what became an almost daily Mad Hatter conversation.

It went like this:

"The Arab countries invaded Israel in 1948 to save the Palestine Arabs from being massacred by the Jews."

"Were there massacres? Where?"

"Oh, yes, everywhere. Terrible, terrible."

"Then you must have lost many relatives and friends."

This, being a tiresome deduction from a previous statement, is brushed aside without comment.

"Israel overran the truce lines and stole our country. We left from fear. We have a right to our property, which brings in £47 million a year in income. If we had our own money, we would need nothing from UNRWA. Our own money is much more. We do not have to be grateful for the little money spent on us. We should have our own."

"Then, of course, you want to return to your property and to Israel?"

"Not to Israel. Never to Israel. To our own country, to our own part."

"But didn't the Jews accept partition, while the Palestine Arabs and the Arab Governments refused?"

"Yes, yes. And England protected the Jews. An Arab was arrested if he carried a pistol only to defend himself, but Jews could go through the streets in tanks and nothing happened to them. Also, England told the Arab States to attack Israel."

The principal of the school then spoke up. "In our school, we teach the children from their first year about their country and how it was stolen from them. I tell my son of 7. You will see: One day a man of 80 and a child so high, all, all will go home with arms in their hands and take back their country by force."

On this warlike note, we left. My guide had seemed a sober contented fellow until our little meeting, whereupon he sounded like a politician running recklessly for office. He then astonished me again.

"It can all be solved with money," he said. "Now the people have nothing in their mouths but words, so they talk. Money fills the mouth too. If every man got a thousand dollars for each member of his family, for compensation to have lost his country, and he could be a citizen in any Arab country he likes, he would not think of Palestine any more. Then he could start a new life and be rich and happy. And those who really do own something in Palestine must be paid for what they had there. But those are not many. Most had nothing, only work."

High on a mountaintop, with a downsweeping view of orange groves and the satin blue of the Mediterranean, is a small Moslem camp named Mia Mia. Here one whole Palestinian village, amongst others, had landed; they came from a mountaintop in Galilee, a place called Meron. Their headman, or village leader, the muktar, plied us with Coca-Cola and Turkish coffee in his exile's parlor. He is a beautiful man, perhaps 65 years old, lean, with exquisite manners. He wore the handsome white Arab headdress, held in place by the usual black double-corded crown; he was dressed in a well-preserved cream silk jacket, a white silk shirt, pressed gray flannel trousers, polished Italianate black shoes.

Whilst we sucked Coca-Cola through straws and studied his son's pitifully bad but lovingly executed paintings—a portrait of Nasser; Christ and the Virgin—the muktar talked. Seventeen people of his village were massacred, which was why they fled, but an old blind woman of 104 was left behind and the Jews poured kerosene over her and burned her alive. How did they know, if they had all fled? Well, then the Jews went away and some villagers crept back and found her, and besides, the United Nations Truce Commission also found her.

My guide looked embarrassed. The Truce Commission was a shaky point. It was a strain to believe that the U.N. military observers, occupied with armies and frontiers, would have had time to investigate each atrocity story in the country. I wondered where the families of the massacred and the cremated were; everyone knows everyone else in a village, surely the surviving relatives were the best witnesses.

"I could tell you many such stories," said the muktar.

"I am sure of it," said I. "But please tell me about Meron."

So I heard of Meron, their beautiful stone houses, their lovely groves, their spacious and happy life in Eden; all lost now. I could readily imagine this aristocrat living in a palace on a mountaintop and decided that I would later go and see his home; but for the moment I accepted a rose from him, and we set off to pay calls in the camp.

A woman of 40 or so, with a face like the best and juiciest apple, and lively eyes, seized me and hauled me into her house. She began, with gestures, to deliver an oration. She touched the ceiling with contempt, pulling bits away; she called upon heaven to witness her misery. Her voice soared and fell in glorious rhythms. She loved doing it and I loved watching it. In mutual delight, we smiled more and more as the tale of woe unfolded, until she could keep it up no longer, burst into roars of laughter, and kissed me copiously. My guide seemed unduly glum about all this, perhaps because this day we were three; a European UNRWA official had joined us.

"She is a big liar," said my guide, when we had left her house. "She lies as she breathes. We gave her all the material for a new roof. She sold it. She is so poor that she is going to make a pilgrimage to Mecca this year. She does not have to make a pilgrimage. Do you know what that costs? One thousand pounds."

In Lebanese money, this amounts to about $350—a fortune.

"Oh, she is a terrible bad one."

"I loved her," I said. "She's one of my favorite type of people in the world. A really jolly open crook. I hope she has a wonderful time at Mecca."

"But we have to fix her roof anyhow," said the UNRWA official.

In our suite of followers, I had noticed a tall boy of 16 or 17, with fine intelligent eyes, a happy fact, and a fresh white shirt. I spoke to him in English, and he understood; I asked whether we could visit his family. His house was no larger than any other, but clean, peaceful, and touching, with orderly furniture and picture post cards tacked to the walls. His mother was blind from cataract, and his grandmother seemed older than time, of a generation so old that she had tattoo marks on her cheeks.

The boy had graduated from high school and now worked as manager of the food distribution center in the big camp (14,000 inhabitants) on the plain below. He must have been very competent and very reliable to merit this job. He hoped to become a TV-radio engineer. He did not speak of Palestine. There was work he wanted to do, wherever a man could do such work. UNRWA is now building a vocational training school in Lebanon; it should be open in the autumn. With any luck, this boy will learn the technical skill he so desires and make his own life independent of anyone's charity.

We heard shrill painful child's crying and went toward the sound. A child of about two was tied by the ankle to a chair, howling the same word over and over. A younger child was silently trying to hold its body up, clinging to the arm of another chair. On a clean mat, on a clean little sheet, a baby twisted its body restlessly, but its legs lay still. All three were remarkably good-looking, all seemingly husky and well formed.

The camp leader carried on a short barking exchange with their young mother and reported: "She is 25. None of the children can move their legs; the legs will not hold them. The child is tied because he can pull himself out of the house and get hurt. She says, please, will you help her?"

Speaking French to the UNRWA official, because no one else there knew the language, I said, "She can easily have five or six more children like this. It is terrible for her. The visiting nurse ought to explain about birth control."

"You don't know what you're saying. UNRWA could not touch such a thing, not even mention it. Here are these people, and the name of their country does not exist on the map any more. If we start teaching them birth control, we will be accused of trying to wipe out the people too. Besides, the men would never allow it. They want to have a lot of sons; it is a matter of pride with them. And politics enters too, as into everything; I've heard them say it. We need to have many children and grow and increase so that the world will never forget us."

"They're doing well, from what I've seen."

"About 30,000 babies a year."

The camp leader, escorting us to our car, remarked that no one here had any work. He delivered a short speech in English; he was a very nice, gentle man. "All the men do is sit in cafe and suffer, suffer. A young man sees time running, running, and he gets old with no years. If I did not got my land to hope for, I lose my brains."

On our way to Beirut, the UNRWA official said, "Eighty percent of the men in that camp work. It's quite a prosperous little camp."

"Do they lie just for the fun of it? It had been a long day.

"Well, it's natural in front of us. If they earn too much, they are taken off the ration lists. If they earn above a certain amount, they aren't eligible for the services. Free medicine and doctoring and schooling. So, obviously they don't want us to know."

"Like non-refugees with the income tax collectors?"

"That's it."

"Do you know what they are earning?"

"Not really. How could we? Of course, if anyone has regular employment, we eventually learn of it and cut down the rolls."

The refugees, in camps as well as outside of camps, do find work of some sort; otherwise, on 1,500 calories a day, they would soon become and look like a severely undernourished, sickly group. UNRWA's health statistics can be relied on; they know how many refugees use their medical services and for what reason and with what results. The standard of health is unusually high and is one of UNRWA's finest achievements.

On the plain below Mia Mia, the land is green with citrus groves, banana plantations, where nothing grew before. This is the work of refugees; someone should be very grateful to them. Refugees who were city dwellers in Palestine gravitate to city work: taxi drivers, employees, merchants. No matter what official attitudes are, all of these people tend to seek their own previous level, under the universal refugee handicap of starting from scratch, of being exploitable, and in competition with established locals. Besides, they are living in a part of the world where poverty is an endemic disease, and it is hard for anyone to make a good living, unless you are born into a silver-spoon family.

Out of the blue, my guide announced: "There is no crime in the camps. No thefts, no fires, no blood feuds. It is much better than it was in Palestine. They know they are all brothers in refuge. There were a few murders some time ago; someone raping, something like that. It is natural. But no crime."

And this is true. In all the camps. Exile has taught one valuable lesson: how to live peacefully and lawfully together.

To enter the Gaza strip you require a military visa from the Egyptian government in Cairo. I had arrived in Cairo expecting to proceed like the wind directly from there to Gaza but was informed, by the local UNRWA press officer, that this permit took 2 or 3 weeks to get, and sometimes you never got it. Besides, there was only one UNEF army plane to Gaza each Saturday, and they didn't like carrying anyone except their own personnel; besides, it was now Thursday, and tomorrow was the Moslem Sunday, and indeed all looked hopeless. I foresaw bumming a jeep ride over the sandstorming desert and infiltrating into the strip somehow; but meantime I called on the Egyptian authorities.

Because of the Moslem holy day, and the number of passport photos I needed and the number of offices I had to run between, it took about 4 days to get the visa, and every minute was enjoyable. The Egyptian officials could not have been kinder, and I loved seeing them, the new ruling class, who remind me, in their cheerful, inchoate, important busyness, of many new ruling classes I have observed round and about, over the years. It is difficult to believe that these pleasant young men, in shirt sleeves or uniforms, with their numerous callers, their telephones, their mounds of mimeographed forms, their empty Turkish coffee cups, have any connection with the vainglory, the xenophobia, the anti-Semitic hatred that smear the press and pour over the air of their fascinating city.

The Gaza strip, from all accounts, would be a real hellhole. It is roughly rectangular slice of land, on the southernmost Mediterranean frontier of Israel, some 40 kilometers long by 5 to 10 kilometers wide, and 365,000 people, refugees and residents, live on it. I imagined it as a sand dune, packed solid with human flesh, blazing hot, hideous, and filthy. It is none of these. The weather was so idyllic—a china-blue sky and a constant cool breeze—that I assumed this was special luck and at once asked my charming landlady about it. No, the weather in Gaza was always delightful. She had lived here for 30 years; there were two "sticky" weeks in the summer, otherwise you could not find a more benign climate. Flying over the strip, I had noted plenty of sand, but also plenty of green. There were always citrus groves in Gaza, my landlady reported, Gaza was famous for them, but since the refugees came these had greatly increased, as had the general cultivation. Anything grows here, she said, exhibiting her blossoming garden.

Then I remarked that Gaza town was a beehive of activity, with all the UNEF soldiers, Danes, Norwegians, Indians, Canadians, Yugoslavs, who patrol the Israeli-Gaza border and spend money in the town in their free time, and the Egyptian upper crust which oversees the Palestinian officials, and UNRWA and visitors and the local residents and, indeed, the refugees. The refugees seemed to bring prosperity with them; it was most mysterious.

Not at all, said my landlady, we do not know why we are not completely bankrupt; but she was adding a third floor to her already roomy house, so great is the demand for lodgings. Sizable villas are being built in what must be the fashionable section of Gaza. The main square boasts an array of parked. Mercedes, finned pastel American cars, and humbler Volkswagens. The taxis in Gaza are new. There is an imposing movie theater, in the ugly worldwide chromium-and-junk style; there are abundant cafes and numerous ill-lit dingy shops, typical of the region. An economist could surely answer this riddle: If no one has any money, what are these eccentric merchants and purveyors of services doing?

The refugee camps are much larger than those in Lebanon, small towns by Middle Eastern standards. They are by no means luxury establishments, but many people live in a nastier state in American and European slums. The poor villagers of Gaza are not as well housed or cared for as the refugees. The Gaza strip is not a hellhole, not a visible disaster. It is worse; it is a jail—with a magical long white sand beach, and a breeze, and devoted welfare workers (UNRWA) to look after the prisoners.

The Egyptian government is the jailer. For reasons of its own, it does not allow the refugees to move from this narrow strip of land. The refugees might not want to leave at all, or they might not want to leave for good; but anyone would become claustrophobic if penned, for 13 years, inside 248 square kilometers. A trickle of refugees, who can prove they have jobs elsewhere, are granted exit visas. The only official number of the departed is less than three hundred, out of 255,000 registered refugees. It seems incredible. Rumor says that more refugees do manage to go away illegally, by unknown methods.

These locked-in people—far too many in far too little space—cannot find adequate work. Naturally, there is less chance of employment than in the other "host countries." Meantime, they are exposed to the full and constant blast of Egyptian propaganda. No wonder that Gaza was the home base of the trained paramilitary bands called commandos by the Egyptians and Palestinians, and gangsters by the Israelis—the fedayin, whose job was to cross unnoticed into Israel and commit acts of patriotic sabotage and murder. And having been so devastatingly beaten by Israel again, in 1956, has not improved the trapped, bitter Gaza mentality; it only makes the orators more bloodthirsty.

Another Mad Hatter conversation, practically a public meeting, took place in the office of the leader of two adjacent camps, a man in charge of some 29,000 people. The camp leader, the self-appointed orator, sat behind his desk. The Secret Service youth, mentioned earlier, the quiet UNRWA Palestinian, my regular chaperone, and the three uniformed cops of highish rank completed the company.

First the camp leader told me how rich they had all been in Palestine and how miserable they were now and how much land they had all owned. I do not doubt for 1 minute how much land some of them owned, nor how rich some of them were, and I did not point out this subtle distinction: if everyone owned the land claimed, Palestine would be the size of Texas; if everyone had been so rich, it would have been largely populated by millionaires. To gild the past is only human, we all do it; and to gild it with solid gold is even more human if you are a refugee. This part of his address was already so familiar that I could have recited it for him.

Then he spoke of Jaffa, his native town. The Jews surrounded the city, firing on all sides; they left one little way out, by the sea, so the Arabs would go away. Only the very old and the very poor stayed, and they were killed. Arab refugees tell many dissimilar versions of the Jaffa story, but the puzzler is: where are the relatives of those who must have perished in the fury of high explosive—the infallible witnesses? No one says he was loaded on a truck (or a boat) at gun point; no one describes being forced from his home by armed Jews; no one recalls the extra menace of enemy attacks, while in flight. The sight of the dead, the horrors of escape are exact, detailed memories never forgotten by those who had them. Surely Arabs would not forget or suppress such memories, if they, too, had them.

As for those Arabs who remained behind, they are still in Jaffa—3,000 of them—living in peace, prosperity, and discontent, with their heirs and descendants.

"The Jews are criminals," the camp leader continued in a rising voice. "Murderers. The are the worst criminals in the whole world."

Had he ever heard of Hitler?

He banged his table and said, "Hitler was far better than the Jews."

"Far better murderer? He killed 6 million Jews as a start," I observed.

"Oh, that is all exaggerated. He did not. Besides, the Jews bluffed Hitler. They arranged in secret that he should kill a few of them—old ones, weak ones—to make the others emigrate to Palestine."

"Thirty-six thousand of them," said the secret serviceman, proving the point, "came here, before the war, from central Europe."

"It's amazing," I said. "I have never before heard anywhere that the Jews arranged with Hitler for him to kill them."

"It was a secret," the camp leader shouted. "The documents have been found. Everyone knows. It was published. The Jews arranged it all with Hitler."

There is a limit to the amount of Mad Hattery one can endure, so I suggested that we visit the camp. I knocked on a door at random, before the camp leader had a chance to steer me anywhere. Two young married couples lived here. In a corner by the courtyard wall stood a group of visitors, silent Arab women, in their graceful long blue dresses, slightly hiding their faces behind their white head veils. The older women wore silver coins on chains across their foreheads; this is very pretty and is also guaranteed to prevent sickness of the eyes. It was useless to try to lure the women into talk, but one of the husbands talked freely. The secret service youth translated.

"It is the blame of America that this happened, because they help the Jews. We only want America to help us to get back to our land."

"How?" I asked. "By war?"

"When the Arabs are united, we will make the war."

"What do you want from us then? Arms to make this war with?"

"No, we want you to stop giving arms and money to Israel. Just now Kennedy has given Israel $25 million for arms."

"I do not believe that the U.S. Government has ever given or sold arms to Israel. What about the arms Nasser gets from Russia and Czechoslovakia?"

"That is all right. That is different. They are peace-loving nations. They only want to help the undeveloped countries."

The secret serviceman put in: "America offered us arms, but with conditions. We will not accept conditions. So we take from the Eastern countries, who give without conditions."

"What do you do?" I asked the fat young husband.

"Nothing."

"What would you like to do?"

"Be a soldier and fight Jews."

This oratory pleased the public very much.

"Do you all like Nasser?" I asked, politely.

Wide smiles. General joy.

"We do. Certainly. Oh, of course. He will unite with us and make us strong. He is our leader."

For rest and relaxation, together with thousands of locals, I went to the school sports day. Fifty thousand refugee children attend school on the Gaza strip, 98 percent of the possible school population. In Gaza's spacious stadium, 2,000 school children were gathered. They ranged from tiny tots, the Brownies, in berets and ballet-skirted orange uniforms, to boys in running shorts and muscles. They paraded past the governor of the Gaza strip in the viewing stand, led by girls in colored outfits who formed the Palestine flag. The human flag was followed by the Brownie babies, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, girl gymnasts, and boy gymnasts. "We dressed every one of them," an English UNRWA offical said. "This show costs us about $2,000, but it's worth it. It gives them something to look forward to. They all love it." They loved it and their admiring families loved it and the public loved it.

The children had marched in earnest stiff-legged style. ("Like the British Army," I said. "Like the Egyptian Army," he said.) They then lined up in formation, and a loudspeaker blared out Arabic. Three times the children shouted a unanimous, squeaky but enthusiastic reply to the loudspeaker's commanding male voice.

"What are the cheers for?"

"The first is: 'Long Live a Free Palestine.' The second is: 'Long Live the United Arab Republic.' The third is: 'Long Live Gamal Abdel Nasser.'"

I stayed to see the white-clad gymnasts, as graceful as a field of Isadora Duncans, doing lovely swaying motions with blue gauze handkerchiefs.

The Vocational Training School at Gaza is a freshly painted group of buildings, with well-kept lawns, flower borders, scrubbed Spartan self-respecting dormitories, and impressive workshops equipped with the complex machinery that modern life seems to depend on. The boys were on their playing field that afternoon, a holiday, marking white lines for various sporting events to come. A few of them drifted back and wanted to show off every inch of their school. Did they like it here, did they enjoy their work, were they happy? Needless to ask; the answer glowed and shone on them. The graduates of this school find good jobs for which they are trained; amongst its many other parental functions UNRWA operates a placement bureau throughout the Middle East. This is the new generation, the UNRWA graduates, and you find them everywhere in the Arab refugee world. They have not yet been crippled by exile, regret, or hate, and they may well be the brightest citizens of the Arab future. They are the source of all hope.

Two accidental conversations stick in my memory. Once, lost in the UNRWA compound of offices, I chanced on a pretty, dark secretary, who told me the kind of inside human angle of history which is more interesting than any other. In 1956, when the Israelis took the Gaza strip, during what they call the Sinai campaign and we call Suez, for short, telephone communication was restored between the Strip and Israel, which is, after all, just across the fields. In the midst of enemy occupation, the secretary's sister-in-law rang up from the small town where she lived in Israel, to have a chat. How was everyone? The sister-in-law reported that they were fine, her husband was doing very well, they had a nice house and no trouble of any kind. The secretary, recalling this family news, said, "I think if we had all stayed where we were, nothing would have happened to us. All this would not have come about. And what is it for? My children have never seen Palestine. I tell them; and in every school, every minute, they are always told. But when they are grown? The people who knew Palestine will die, and the young ones—will they be interested?"

The second memorable talk took place at the Sewing Center. The Sewing Center is another of UNRWA's camp inventions, and it is self-supporting. UNRWA Sewing Centers teach dressmaking and new uses for traditional Palestinian embroidery—vast tablecloths and sets of napkins, blouses, skirts, which sell at good prices to local customers and to city specialty shops. Hundreds of refugee girls earn small wages and stave off boredom, while learning a trade. The Gaza center was managed by a bustling cheerful plump Palestinian refugee, who would be taken for a bustling cheerful plump young Jewess in any Western country; but, of course, Arabs and Jews are the same race, Semites. The young manageress showed me massive tablecloths (which none of us would be grand enough to own or get washed), and she praised her girls, who sat on a long porch, embroidering, flattered, giggling.

It was as clear as if she wore a sign, but I asked anyhow: "You're happy, aren't you?"

"I have a nice husband, and two children, and a comfortable house. I like my work very much; it is very interesting. Yes. We are happy." And she smiled. Such a smile. The world isn't lost, not even on the Gaza Strip.

Most of the Christian Arab refugees live scattered around Gaza in rented private houses. A few Christian families asked for free Government land at the edge of a Muslim camp, the usual free allotment of building materials from UNRWA, borrowed extra money, and built their own houses with small well-tended gardens. My UNRWA guide, himself a Greek Orthodox Arab, took me to visit one of these trim, respectable self-made homes, belonging to a family he had known before in Jaffa.

The old mother was half blind; the recurrence of eye disease is a Middle Eastern, not a refugee affliction. My guide and this family had not seen each other for some time, and immediately after their first greeting, the old woman wept with incurable grief and was consoled, gently, but as if he had done so often before, by my guide. He explained: this family had suffered a great tragedy. One of the sons was killed by shellfire, in Jaffa.

I report this because it was the only family I met where an actual human being was known to be dead. Here, at last, the infallible witness testified; and here this death, 13 years old, was mourned as if it had come upon them yesterday. My UNRWA guide behaved as if this case were unique and deserved the aching pity which everyone feels for those who have lost a loved member of the family in war.

I left Gaza, wishing that I could take all the young people with me, and not to Palestine, but out into a wider world. Their destiny should not be to go back, but to go forth. They need exactly the opposite of what the Jews need. There is plenty of room for both needs.

Officially, over 600,000 Palestinian refugees live in Jordan, more than in the other three host countries put together. But legally there is no such thing as a refugee in Jordan. The refugees are full citizens of Jordan; they have every right and privilege and opportunity that a born Jordanian has. Many of the Palestine Jordanians are contented and have made good lives, despite the limitations that a hot, barren, undeveloped country places on all its inhabitants.

Much of the barrenness and poverty could have been corrected by a scheme for the use of the waters of the Jordan River, to irrigate land now wasted. Eric Johnston, who was President Eisenhower's special representative to implement this life-giving plan, finally reported: "After 2 years of discussion, technical experts of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria agreed upon every important detail of a unified Jordan plan. But in October 1955 it was rejected for political reasons at a meeting of the Arab League."

Judging by the refugees I saw in Jericho, in camps outside Jerusalem, in Jerusalem itself, the boon of citizenship fosters sanity. The emotional climate in Jordan is noticeably different from that of the Gaza Strip. A school principal stated that children are taught the history of Palestine, "without politics." Exactly what this means, I cannot say. In Jordan, a refugee's education and self-reliance showed at once in his politics. The better educated, the more able do not waste their time on thoughts of violent revenge, and give their loyalty to King Husqein. The more ignorant and less competent nourish themselves with a passion for Nasser, war, and return.

Two men, living next door to each other in a camp outside Jerusalem, aptly illustrate this difference in personality and politics. The camp watchman, who lived in a new little UNRWA house which was already a pigsty, with empty sardine tins on the floor, a filthy yard, rags for bedding, announced, "We were evicted by force, and so we will return. Led by Nasser and Hussein and all the Arab leaders." His neighbor, an old man, had cleared the stony ground around his house and made a flourishing vegetable garden. Inside his courtyard you could hardly move for the rows of drying laundry. He did not have a word to say about war or force or Arab leaders. He said that he would rather starve to death than not give his grandchildren education. "As long as I live and can work, my grandson will go to the university."

The largest Jericho camp is run by an objectionable tyrant, yet its cleanliness was nearly Swiss. "I gave them 6,000 trees," said the refugee-tyrant, speaking in his capacity of God. "Five years ago, the Muktars (the village leaders) would not let me give the people trees; they said if they plant trees, the people will never want to go home." Now trees rise over the walls that separate the little houses, and more trees are to be distributed. An inexhaustible supply of clean water flows from 21 water points. Forty thousand people live here in solid dwellings, under the stern eye of their tyrant; bird-fast children play in the streets.

"How is your name? Are you well? Good-by. Good night. Hello, leddy." The children chirped and circled; the tyrant tried roughly to shout them off. One boy, determined to have his say, presented me with a whole English sentence.

He took me to his home, four airy rooms (one lined with chairs for visiting), a neat yard, presided over by a smiling serene-faced

mother, very proud of her son who could speak alone in a foreign language, to a foreign guest. He told me, slowly, of his life, his family, and his ambitions. He was 13 and had studied English here for 2 years, in school. He had never talked English with anyone before, except his teacher. After this encounter, I visited some English classes in another camp, to watch the miracle in the making. The boy wants to become a teacher.

"In this country?" I asked, waiting for the expected cry, "No. In my country. Palestine."

"No, not in this country, in Jerusalem or Amman."

So finally I realized, as I should have all along, that "country" means town or village; when the Arab peasant refugees talk of their country—even if they happen to be in it, as they are here—they are talking about their own village, their birthplace. The boy's mind had gone no farther than the big cities of the only country he knows; his mind may travel much farther than that. The highest ambition of all the best students is to become a teacher or a doctor. Teachers and doctors are needed throughout the world, and the Arab world needs them intensely.

Jordan has a vocational training school also, as happy and hopeful as the school in Gaza. Here I foregathered with a class of budding plumbers, another set of citizens the world can well use. They were very merry in their blue work clothes and greasy hands, and full of plans for the future. One wished to go to Kuwait, one to America. One boy said he wanted to plumb in Palestine. The youngest and smallest of them, in a curiously wise voice—both bored and dismissive—said, "Oh, all that will take a long time." None of them was interested enough to go on with it.

The only place that looked as I originally expected refugee life to look was in the Jordanian part of divided Jerusalem, in the old Ghetto. Jews had festered in those lightless rat holes, jammed among the ancient stones, for longer than one can imagine; for 13 years, Arab refugees have endured the same hideous life. This is medieval misery and squalor; nothing like it exists in the modern world.

From a fetid passageway, a straight-backed, cleanly dressed, handsome boy bounded into the cobbled alley street. He took the arm of his teacher, who happened to be my guide that day; they were good friends. He was the star pupil of his class. Where could he possibly study? In the street, the boy said, anywhere outside. He has known no other home than a single damp room, a dungeon, where he lives with his bedridden grandfather, his parents, and a brother.

"All the boys from here are good boys," the teacher said, and his amazement showed in his voice. "And very witty." He meant "intelligent," I later discovered.

Did the UNRWA Director know of this vile slum? No, said the camp leader. I hurried off to ask why UNRWA allowed human beings to live in such revolting squalor. Whereupon I was informed that the Director had visited the Jerusalem Ghetto within 2 weeks of taking on his job. UNRWA had tried, at various times, to move these refugees, who refused to go because they preferred living inside the city. But now, since their birth rate had risen at such lightning speed, they were more than ready to leave, and within the year they would be settled in a new camp outside Jerusalem. There were two more dreadful refugee slums in the "host countries"—I did not see either; these were the only subhuman living conditions, and it was not UNRWA's fault they continued. They would, in time, be eradicated.

Despite all difficulties, UNRWA runs a welfare state; no other exists in the Arab Middle East. "The refugee has a net under him; the local population has none."—quote from an UNRWA official. It should be stated that the UNRWA personnel loves its Arab charges, which is not only right but essential. You cannot help those you do not cherish.

With my suitcases packed, and my mind overpacked with treasonous doubts, I set off for Israel, across the street. I had not dared tell anyone, including the Western UNRWA officials, of this intention: to have been in Israel, to go to Israel, is enough to brand you as an enemy and, more possibly, a spy. The Arab psychosis (an ornate word but not too strong) about Israel is official, and infectious. There may be many reasonable people in the Arab countries who are able to think calmly about Israel and about Arab-Israel relations; if so, they choose safety and keep their mouths shut.

When it comes to moving from one side of Jerusalem, which is Jordan, to the other side of Jerusalem, which is Israel, the world of dream sets in. You take a taxi, through normal streets, and suddenly you arrive at a small Jordanian frontier post, also in a city street. You wait, in this little shack, while your passport is checked against the exit list. After this formality, a charming courteous young porter carries your suitcases half a block. You tip him, and he deposits them on the porch of a house which is no longer there. Artillery fire removed it, years ago. Around you are shelled houses; one side of the street is Jordan, with laughing soldiers in the shelled houses; one side of the street is Israel, with washing hung out on lines. You walk a half block further, leaving your bags behind. You are now at the Israel frontier post, another shack. Like crossing the river Styx, this is a one-way journey. When you have left Jordan for Israel, you cannot return by this road. The Arab blockade of Israel thus extends to foreign visitors. You would have to fly from Israel to neutral territory and start all over provided the Arabs still like you, after a visit to Israel.

Since you will not be admitted to any Arab country if you have an Israeli visa on your passport, you carry your Israeli visa on a separate sheet of paper. Other nations than ours present their traveling citizens with two passports. After the Israeli border police have checked your visa, an equally charming courteous young porter, an Israeli, collects your bags from the porch of the nonexistent house in no man's land. You tip him and put the luggage in a taxi and drive a few blocks to your hotel. From your hotel in Israel you have a fine view of the beautiful wall and the old city of Jerusalem, where you were residing three-quarters of an hour ago.

There is not a war on, not by any terms we know. The object of this nonpeace-nonwar exercise is to destroy Israel, which remains undestroyed. I cannot see how it helps the Arab countries, but perhaps it does. Perhaps they need one enemy they can agree on, as a unifying force, as cement for their nationalism.

I wanted to visit Palestinian Arabs in Israel, the ones who stayed behind, the nonrefugees. Seeing them at home, I thought I might better understand the mentality of their brothers in exile. Some important clue was lacking, but I could not name it or define it.

The driver of my car, on the journey in Israel, was an Israeli Jew, born there, who speaks Arabic as his second mother tongue and looks so like Nasser that it is a joke. I said I wanted to visit the village of Meron, on a mountaintop in Galilee. He said that at Meron there was an ancient temple of the Jews, the grave of a famous rabbi, a synagogue, a Yeshiva (the Orthodox Jewish equivalent of a Catholic seminary), but nothing else to his knowledge. Let us go and find out, I said. So we drove north through this country, which is a monument to the obstinate, tireless will of man. In 1949, the new immigrants, like ants on the hillsides, were planting trees: their first job. It looked as if they were planting blades of grass and seemed a pitiful act of faith. Now the trees have grown.

There are countless changes in Israel, but the Arab villages along the road to Nazareth have not changed. The old adobe or fieldstone houses cling to and grow from each other. They are charming, picturesque, primitive, and wretched; but not to Arab peasants. This is the way it always was; this is the way they like it and want to keep it.

We drove up the mountain. Between the synagogue and the heroic ruins of the 2,000-year-old temple, we did indeed find Meron, the home of the aristocrat who had offered me a rose on a mountaintop in Lebanon. There were not more than 12 houses in the village. The Muktar's palace is a long narrow stone shed, with an ugly narrow porch along the front. Instead of beams, bits of rusted railway track hold up the porch. The other small houses were built of the honey-colored, rough field stone, with traditional graceful doors and windows. Inside, the houses were like stables unfit for decent animals. The rich fields and groves the Meron refugees had described were the steep slopes of the mountain behind, where the villagers cultivated tobacco and some fruit and fig trees. In their day, the village had no electric light or water; the women carried water on their heads from the wadi at the foot of the mountain. The view is a dream of beauty. Hardship for hardship, Meron is no better than their refugee camp, Mia Mia, perhaps not as good; but memory is magical, and Meron was home.

Beside these pretty stone hovels tower the remains of a great temple. The blocks of granite in the fragmented wall are as massive as those in the wall of Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem. The broken pillars are enormous, unadorned, and suddenly Samson is real and pulled down real pillars as heavy as these. Here, 2,000 years ago, the Jews were praying in a new temple, for 2,000 years is not all that much in the history of the Jews or of this land. And here, with weeds around their low walls, stand the abandoned houses of the descendants of warrior strangers, the Arabs who came to this country and conquered it when the temple was some 600 years old, doubtless already a ruin. Were the villagers of Meron happy when they lived on this mountain; did they think it Eden then? And why did they run away? The war never touched this place.

On January 1, 1960, according to Israeli statistics, 159,236 Muslims, 48,277 Christian Arabs, and 22,351 Druses lived in Israel. These people will have increased, but that is a good enough basis to work on; roughly a quarter of a million Arabs by now. The Jewish population, coming together here from the four corners of the earth, was 1,858,841. These dissimilar people live on 8,000 square miles of quite beautiful, laboriously and lovingly reclaimed rock heap and sand dune—of which one-third is irreducible desert. The Druses, a separate and secret sect, are a phenomenon; they are content. They trust and approve of the Jews; they are loyal citizens of Israel. The remaining Arabs are something else again.

On this tour, I visited a Christian Arab village near the Lebanese frontier; a Muslim Arab village on the coastal plain near Acre; two Muslim villages near the Jordanian frontier; a new Muslim settlement near Tel Aviv—the exact copy of a new Jewish settlement, built by the government; and a

Roman Catholic priest, in the beautiful crusader city of Acre.

My idea was to search out Arab schoolteachers, on the grounds that they would probably speak English, were educated men, would know the feelings of their communities, and would have thought about Arab problems. Arabs, living in their own communities, have their own schools, by their own wish, where the children are taught in Arabic, according to Arab principles. Nissim, my driver, was to serve as translator until I had found someone I could talk to; he was then to disappear. I did not want anyone to feel hampered by his alien presence. I might have spared myself anxiety. The candor of the Arabs is proof of their freedom inside the State of Israel; they are not in the least cowed.

In the Christian Arab village, the schoolteacher was an attractive lean young man, with prematurely gray hair, working in his garden in the cool of the evening. He had a good modern house, a young modern wife, and after 6 years of marriage, a first baby, a 6-month-old girl named Mary, whom he and his wife so adored that neither of them took their eyes off the child at the same moment. He was healthy, prosperous, respected, freely doing his chosen work, loved and loving; by any standards, a fortunate man. After hours of listening to him, I had grasped the lacking clue, and felt hopeless.

"Great Britain helped the Jews," he said. "The English gave weapons to the Arab countries, and they gave weapons to us. In this village we were all armed; we all fired at the Jews, every one of us. But our bullets were no good; the English gave bad bullets to the Arabs. Four out of five of the bullets were no good. When we saw this, we ran away to Lebanon for 2 weeks and then we came back."

"Were any of you killed in these battles?"

"No, no one. Yet, we refused partition. We did not want the Jews here; we wanted the whole country for ourselves, as is right. We only lost because of the United Nations and the Western Powers.

"The Ottoman Empire crushed the pride of the Arabs. The Western Powers divided the Arabs into many nations, after the First World War, to keep them weak. In the 1948 war, the next village was bombed by the Jews; when we saw that, we knew we had no hope."

(Pause for breath: The Jewish Air Force at the time consisted of 19 Piper Cubs, a nice little plane, not a bomber; the next village was a good 7 or 8 miles away.)

"Now we have military zones, all along the frontiers. We must ask for permission to travel or work in different places. They have taken our land which is in the military zones. Yes, they pay for it, but very cheaply."

"At the price it used to be worth in the mandate? Before it was improved by the Jews?"

"Something like that. No, even cheaper. Just now two boys from this village were caught on the Lebanese frontier; the Lebanese police sent them back. The Israelis are holding them for interrogation. How could such boys be spies?"

"I don't know. But you do remember that the Arab countries are at war with Israel? I should think it might be hard for the Jews to know what Arabs they could trust."

"They are right not to trust 50 percent of the Arabs in this country."

"How can they know which 50 percent?"

"Oh, they know everything. They have a C.I.D. agent in every Arab village. He is a Jew, and everyone knows him."

"What's the use of having a secret policeman if everyone knows he's a secret policeman?"

"There are plenty of informers. I don't know what it is that has taught all Arabs to be spies." He said this with real despair.

"There is compulsory education in this country up to the age of 14. That is a very good thing. We did not have such a thing before. But the Muslims do not send their girls to school half the time and do not send the boys if they can earn. Then what? The fine for the father is only five pounds. What is five pounds to the father?"

"Do you really mean that you want the Jews to supply the schools and the law which makes education compulsory, and also to force the Arabs and Druses to send their children to school and take advantage of this education? Wouldn't that make the Jews even more unpopular?"

He admitted, with a smile, that this might be the case and went on: "Nasser buys arms from Russia because he could not get them from the West. Egypt has 22 million people, so it needs many more arms than the Israelis, who are only 2 million. But Nasser is not crazy; he will not make war. He spends as much on social reform as on arms. All children now go to school in the Arab countries."

"Have you ever visited the Arab countries? Have you been to Egypt?"

"No."

We drank more coffee; we lit more cigarettes. I braced myself for further enlightenment.

"The Arab Kings were not the true representatives of the Arab peoples when they made war against Israel. Now all the refugees should come back and we should have partition."

At this point, I decided to make one long, determined stand to see whether there was any meeting ground of minds on a basis of mutually accepted facts and reasoning.

"Please bear with me and help me," said I. "I am a simple American, and I am trying to understand how the Arab mind works, and I am finding it very difficult. I want to put some things in order; if I have everything wrong, you will correct me. In 1947, the United Nations recommended the partition of Palestine. I have seen the partition map and studied it. I cannot tell, but it does not look to me as if the Arabs were being cheated of their share of good land. The idea was that this division would work, if both Jews and Arabs accepted it and lived under an economic union. And, of course, the Arab countries around the borders would have to be peaceful and cooperative or else nothing would work at all. The Jews accepted this partition plan; I suppose because they felt they had to. They were outnumbered about two to one inside the country, and there were the neighboring Arab States with five regular armies and 40 million or more citizens, not feeling friendly. Are we agreed so far?"

"It is right."

"The Arab governments and the Palestinian Arabs rejected partition absolutely. You wanted the whole country. There is no secret about this. The statements of the Arab representatives in the U.N. are on record. The Arab governments never hid the fact that they started the war against Israel. But you, the Palestinian Arabs, agreed to this, you wanted it. And you thought, it seems to me very reasonably, that you would win and win quickly. It hardly seemed a gamble; it seemed a sure bet. You took the gamble and you lost. I can understand why you have all been searching for explanations of that defeat ever since, because it does seem incredible. I don't happen to accept your explanations, but that is beside the point. The point is that you lost."

"Yes." It was too astonishing; at long last, East and West were in accord on the meaning of words.

"Now you say that you want to return to the past; you want partition. So, in fact you say, let us forget that war we started, and the defeat, and, after all, we think partition is a good, sensible idea. Please answer me this, which is what I must know. If the position were reversed, if the Jews had started the war and lost it, if you had won the war, would you now accept partition? Would you give up part of the country and allow the 650,000 Jewish residents of Palestine—who had fled from the war—to come back?"

"Certainly not," he said, without an instant's hesitation. "But there would have been no Jewish refugees. They had no place to go. They would all be dead or in the sea."

He had given me the missing clue. The fancy word we use nowadays is "empathy"—entering into the emotions of others. I had appreciated and admired individual refugees but realized I had felt no blanket empathy for the Palestinian refugees, and finally I knew why—owing to this nice, gray-haired schoolteacher. It is hard to sorrow for those who only sorrow over themselves. It is difficult to pity the pitiless. To wring the heart past all doubt, those who cry aloud for justice must be innocent. They cannot have wished for a victorious rewarding war, blame everyone else for their defeat, and remain guiltless. Some of them may be unfortunate human beings, and civilization would collapse (as it notoriously did in Nazi Germany) if most people did not naturally move to help their hurt fellow men. But a profound difference exists between victims of misfortune (there, but for the grace of God, go I) and victims of injustice. My empathy knew where it stood, thanks to the schoolteacher.

"Do you follow the Eichmann trial?" I asked. An Arabic daily paper, weeklies, and radio station thrive in Israel.

"Yes. Every day." He wrinkled his nose with disgust.

"Do you not imagine that all the Jews in Israel believe this massacre of their people could have been prevented if the Jews had had a homeland to escape to? Don't you think that they knew, also, what you just said: there would have been no Jewish refugees from here—they would be dead or in the sea? Doesn't that perhaps explain them to you a little?"

He shrugged, he smiled; with these gestures he tacitly admitted the point, but it was of minor importance. "In 1948, the Arabs were not united; that is why we lost. In 1956 the Jews beat Nasser. He will never make war. But when there are 5 million Jews here in Israel, the Jews will make war, because they will need more land."

"Israel is about the size of New Jersey, a State in America. Some 6 million people live quite comfortably in New Jersey. Israel could become an industrial state, a very useful one."

"No, it cannot. The Arab nations will not allow it. They will not trade with Israel. They will not let Israeli ships go through the canal. They do not wish Israel to do these things. They will not accept Israel."

"It is hopeless," I said. "In my lifetime, those who threatened war sooner or later produced it. If Arab-Israel politics keep up like this, my friend, perhaps all of us, everywhere—you and your wife and Mary, and my child and my husband and I—will have the privilege of dying in the same stupid final war."

He thought I was making a rich foreign joke. He has never seen even a corner of a real big war; he cannot imagine it. He thinks war is something that lasts a few weeks, during which you shoot off bad bullets at a remote enemy, no one is killed, you run away for a bit and then come home to your undamaged houses and lead a good life, indeed a better material life than before. None of these Arabs has suffered anything comparable to what survivors of modern war know; none can imagine such catastrophe.

The Christian schoolteacher sent me on to a friend of his, a Muslim schoolteacher, in a village called Masra on the plain near Acre. The Muslim schoolteacher was a young black-eyed beauty, who received me in a bleak cement-walled room, scantily furnished with an ugly desk, wardrobe, straight chairs, and daybed. He wore striped pajamas, traces of shaving cream, and a princely ease of manner. We got right down to business.

Before 1948, the population of Masra was 350; now it is 200. They owned little land, they had worked on neighboring kibbutzim and in Acre factories. They always had good relations with the Jews. "No one here shot at Jews; and no Jews shot at us." (Note the order of the sentence.) But now Masra had grown and swollen; 900 refugees lived here.

"Refugees?"

"Yes, people from those villages."

He gestured out the door, across the fields.

"What? From villages nearby?"

"Yes, yes. Those villages. They are maybe 7 kilometers away."

"And you consider them refugees?"

"Of course. There was no fighting near here, but the people are frightened, so they fled to the Druse villages, where they know they will be safe, because the Druses were always friendly with the Jews, and after, they came here. The Israeli Government will not let them go back to their villages. The Government offered them other land, but they will not take it. Before the war, only my father sent his sons to school from this village. Now we have a school and 240 children in it, 100 girls and 140 boys. We have a water tap at every house and electric light; never such things before. No one owned a radio; now there are 100 radios and refrigerators, too. The people earn good wages.

"Then everyone must be happy."

"No. The people are not glad. They want to go back to their old houses, even if there is no light or water or money."

They knew the refugees were "living under good conditions"; he had brothers in Lebanon and Syria who were doing well. How did he know? They wrote messages to the Israel radio, which broadcast them, and the Lebanon radio sent messages back; that way they heard news of their families.

But all the refugees should return and Israel should be partitioned. I put the same proposition to him as to his Christian colleague; if the Arabs had won the war, would they accept partition?

"No, never, of course not. We would let some few Jews live here as immigrants but not be masters, not in any part of Palestine."

"Why do you think the refugees left in the first place?"

Well, there was much fear. Then, they all knew about Dir Yassin and expected the same to happen to them. Inside Israel, the Arabs do not need or use the refugees' stories of massacres; they do not have to account for flight, since they are still at home. They know what happened around them, and their neighbors know, and such stories would be pointless. But they do speak of Dir Yassin, which was a genuine massacre and took place in the village of that name, near Jerusalem, on April 9, 1948.

Before the official Arab-Israel war started (on May 15, 1948) there had been months and months of "incidents." ("From the first week of December 1947, disorder in Palestine had begun to mount. The Arabs repeatedly asserted that they would resist partition by force. They seemed to be determined to drive that point home by assaults upon the Jewish community in Palestine."—Trygve Lie, "In the Cause of Peace," Macmillan, 1954.) By February 1948, aside from scattered Arab attacks on scattered Jews, and reprisals for same, the "Arab Liberation Army" had moved into Palestine from the north, and Jerusalem was bombarded, besieged, and cut off. The Jews were trying to run food to the beleaguered Jewish population of Jerusalem. A lot of Jews were getting killed in that effort, in Jerusalem and elsewhere, and in the eyes of some Jews not enough was being done to prevent or avenge this. The State of Israel did not exist; no functioning Jewish government could control this anarchic, deadly phase of undeclared war.

Two famous illegal groups of militant Jews, the Stern Gang and the Irgun Zvai Leumi, had their own ideas on how to fight fire with fire. The British regarded them both as terrorists. The Jewish Agency and their underground army, the Haganah, which were the official Jewish authorities in Palestine, also rejected the Stern Gang and the Irgun Zvai Leumi, because of their ruthlessness. Under the circumstances that created them, these two outlawed bands do not seem very different from resistance groups, partisans, or commandos, all of whom were admired as patriots, and none of whom obeyed the Queensberry rules.

The Irgun Zvai Leumi, in any case, behaved like desperate men at war, not like the millennial inheritors of a high moral code. The village of Dir Yassin lay close to besieged Jerusalem and its lifeline road. According to the Irgun, Dir Yassin was a nest of snipers and armed Arabs; an effective enemy concentration. On their own, the Irgun decided to attack Dir Yassin. Their leader was killed by Arab fire from the village; the Irgun fighters then went brutally mad and shot everyone in sight. Two hundred and fifty Arabs were killed.

To this day, Israelis cannot get over their shame for Dir Yassin while failing to remind themselves, the Arabs, and the world that murder, horribly, begets murder; and they could present a longer casualty list of Jews killed by Arabs, before and after Dir Yassin, during the twilight period of terror that preceded open war.

The news of Dir Yassin spread like the tolling of a funeral bell throughout Arab Palestine. According to their own ethical code and practice of war, Dir Yassin must have seemed a natural portent of the future to the Arabs. They intended to massacre the Jews; if the Jews were victorious, obviously they would massacre the Arabs. As the beautiful schoolteacher poined out, Dir Yassin threw the fear of death into vast numbers of the Arab population. In panic, the fled from Palestine.

Since we were talking about war, we came easily to the subject of Nasser.

"Here they love Nasser. All love him. He is Arab person. They do not believe what he says on the radio—kill the Jews, kick them into the sea. So long he says it, and nothing happens. It will not be war. Something else will arrange, but not soon."

The Christian Arab schoolteacher had told me of a priest in Acre whom I should see, but I could not find him. Instead, I directed myself toward the nearest church steeple, rang a doorbell beneath, and was admitted by an enormous, rotund priest in a brown cassock. He looked like an Arab but was an Italian. He had lived in this country for nearly 30 years and had learned how to survive: by laughter. He laughed at everything, and it was an awesome sight, as if a hippopotamus broke into silent mirth.

We settled on his stiff upholstered visitors' chairs, and he ruminated on the problem of the refugees. If there was the choice between a big financial compensation or return, only 50 percent of the refugees would wish to return, and most of those who came back would not stay. "They could not endure how this country is run. The disicipline. The work." The refugees are kept thinging of Palestine by the Arab leaders, by propaganda. Why not build factories and arrange land resettlement in the Arab countries? (The Arab governments do not wish this, Father.) Give the money to the Arab governments and tell them to get on with the job and control it. (How?) By force. (But what force, Father?)

He often told Arab priests about the thir-13 million refugees who came from East Germany to West Germany; they were all absorbed into West Germany and enriched the country. Why would not 800,000 Arab refugees enrich the Arab countries, which were big and underpopulated? But it is no use; Arabs have never heard of any other refugees or any other problem than their own, and they cannot think about that, in a practical way.

The whole problem is between the East and the West; the Arabs are very happy in the middle, using blackmail. This would stop if the East and the West came to terms, or if the West was united and strong and could impose its will. (But how, Father?)

Ah well, the Jews might as well let the refugees come back; the Arabs here are loyal to the state. ("The ones I've seen detest the Jews and the state, Father, and you know it." I expected his laughter to make a sound, it was so violent.) Yes, yes, that is true but they do nothing. There is no resistance, no underground. Think what they could do if they really wanted to, with the Arab countries all around as a base. (Some Arabs did for a long time, Father—until 1956, in fact; look at the countless incidents with the U.N police force called out to investigate murders, thefts, sabotage.) Oh, that was nothing, nothing to what they could do if they really wanted to.

With another mute roar, he told me that the Arabs said, First we will finish with the Sabbaths, and then with the Sundays. They never changed their ideas. They went around looking at the women and the houses they would take when they managed to get rid of the Jews and the Christians. He laughed himself into a good shake over this one.

I asked about the Eichmann trial and the reaction of his Roman Catholic parishioners. Well, his Christian Arabs thought Eichmann was right, because the Jews were the enemy of the German state. They were always the enemy of the state; the Pharaohs had to drive them out of Egypt, the Persian King tried to clear them out, Ferdinand and Isabella kicked them out of Spain. No one could live on good terms with them, so Eichmann was right. (Horrified, really horrified, I said, "Surely that is not a Christian attitude to the most appalling murders we know about?" He found it terribly funny that I should expect a Christian attitude from Arabs.)

"I do not like either Arabs or Jews," the priest announced with great good humor, "but I serve them with my whole heart, as I must."

He asked me at the door whether there are any Christian Arabs in refugee camps. Yes, I had seen a camp of Christians in Lebanon.

"I am surprised. There must be very few. I would have expected them to manage better. They do not dream all the time. They have more contact with reality than the Moslems."

By now I could foretell one local Arab account of reality. First they explain that they did not lose the war against the Jews; various others are responsible for the defeat. Then they boast cheerfully of their present material well-being, as if they had invented prosperity. At this stage, the Israeli Jews might be wisps of smoke; they had nothing to do with building the country. However, Arabs are miserable; although they never had it so good, it is not good enough, owing, of course, to the Jews. Usually these Arabs say how much they love Nasser and in their devotion are curiously remindful of Nazi Austrians, 25 years ago, when they praised the handsome distant leader, Adolf, from whose hand all blessings would flow. What they believe they now want is to bring the refugees home and partition the state. They

have not considered this as a practical matter, nor imagined its effects on their newfound prosperity.

I visited a school in a village where prosperity had broken out like a rash—new houses, shops, hospital, high school, bigger elementary schools—and the teachers harangued me as foreseen. After telling me how well off everyone was, and bragging of their growth, they told me they were all unhappy and poor because they had owned 40,000 dunams of land (10,000 acres) and now only owned 10,000 dunams. But another Arab, who had not overheard this conversation and was employed as an agricultural inspector, explained that the 10,000 dunams were irrigated, which was new, and also they were scientifically farmed, and therefore produced far more than the 40,000 dunams had. To listen to these conversations is work for a psychiatrist, not a journalist.

I yearned for my silent hotel room in Jerusalem, but Nissim had two heart's desires, and Nissim was such a nice man that I could not refuse him. There was a "great lady" he wanted me to meet, a Moslem. "She began a Moslem women's club all alone, she," Nissim said. "Such a thing has never been. What a brave woman. The Moslems go to a place and learn together, and hear lectures, the women. Is it not wonderful?" I could see that Nissim was by nature a suffragette. He also wanted me to visit a new village of government-built houses, which the Arab citizens buy on the installment plan by paying a low rent. Not everyone has a chance to own such fine, inexpensive houses, and Nissim—like all Jewish Israelis—is ardently proud of every improvement in his country.

First we called on the lady, who lived in a modern villa, luxurious by middle-class standards anywhere and palatial by Middle Eastern standards, very shiny and tasteless. Nissim thought it wonderful; so did she, with well-bred restraint. She was young, charming, just returned from her schoolteacher's job, bathed and dressed for the afternoon in a sleeveless red dress. She spoke of her Muslim women's club, whose members ranged in age from 15 to 60, and learned sewing, cooking, child care, listened to lectures, and were enthusiatic over their new venture. I am a suffragette like Nissim and was delighted. Then the predictable complaints began. The peasants, she said, have work and money and don't care about anything else. But the educated people suffer; they have all this education, and after they finish their studies, what can they do? Only the professions, and business, and a few are elected to Parliament; but they cannot get positions in the army. Her husband, a pharmacist, has to take four buses to reach his place of work, but here is this village of 8,000 people without a pharmacy; why don't the Jews open a pharmacy?

"If there is such a crying need for a pharmacy here, why doesn't your husband start one himself? This is not a Communist state; there are no laws against private enterprise. You are well-known people, full and free citizens. You could certainly raise a loan, if you need it."

You are not supposed to argue about complaints; it is abominable manners. Her face closed like a lovely olive-colored trap.

"The Israelis say that they do not conscript Arabs—except the Druses, who insisted on it themselves—because the only people the Israeli Army would ever have to fight are Arabs. It seems decent to me, and it seems like reasonable military security. How would your men feel if called upon to fight fellow Arabs, who might be their blood relatives and intended to be their liberators? Do you think it is a good job for a man to join an army he cannot serve with his heart, and would sell out if the time came? That may be excellent work for spies, but not for soldiers."

She opened her closed face to say, "Yes, I see. But it is our country."

It was too hot, and too futile. Besides, I was tired of the convention which apparently requires non-Arabs to treat Arabs as if they were neurotic children, subject either to tantrums or to internal bleeding from spiritual wounds. This girl did not strike me as a pathetic weakling.

"Only by right of conquest," I said. "In the seventh century. The Jews got here first, about 2,000 years ahead of you. You haven't lived as masters in your own house for a long time. Aside from the Crusaders, the Ottoman Turks bossed you for a steady 400 years, before the British took over. Now the Jews have won back their land by right of conquest. Turn and turn about," I said, feeling as beastly minded as an Arab myself. "Fair's fair."

"How was it?" asked Nissim, who has been waiting in the car. "She is fine, isn't she? Think that she starts to teach the Muslim women. No other one did."

Israelis are the first to explain (and who know better?) that it is painful to be a minority: the Arabs in Palestine became a minority suddenly. It is grievous (as who knows better than Israelis?) to be separated from the numerous, needed members of your family. Israelis will also explain that the Arabs in Israel are torn in two: their racial loyalty belongs to the enemies of Israel, and they are afraid; if the Arab nations make war against Israel, as is regularly promised on the radio from Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, what will be their fate? Would the outside Arabs regard them, the Arabs inside Israel, as collaborators, traitors?

The emotional position of the Israeli Arabs is tormenting (and is held in that torment by the Arab radio stations), though they are materially secure, protected by equal justice under law, and by an almost exaggerated respect for their feelings. If the Arab nations made peace with Israel, it is possible that all Israeli Arabs would relax, be happy, and wholehearted supporters of Israel. If not, not. No one, after listening to Israeli Arabs, could believe that Palestinian refugees would be either contended or loyal citizens of Israel.

The new village, that so pleased Nissim, was rows of small plastered houses painted in pastel shades, or white with pastel-colored woodwork. They have a porch-veranda, two fairly large rooms, a kitchen, a shower-washroom, and small gardens. No working-class Arabs I saw anywhere in the Middle East possess houses like these, but the owners were not satisfied, as I knew they would not be. One boy of about 14 could speak English; boys of this age are valuable informants—they parrot their elders without reflection.

"We are very poor," He said.

"How can you be very poor and live in these houses? You have to pay for them."

"We must to work very hard. More harder than before. Terrible work. We have no land."

"Wasn't farming hard work?"

"No. That was easy. Not like now."

"How does your family manage?"

"My brother works. In Tel Aviv. In a gasoline station. That is terrible hard work."

When we left, the pretty, healthy children ran beside the car, shouting. I waived. Nissim looked queer, something was wrong; that chronic optimist seemed sad.

"What's the matter, Nissim?"

"Nothing. What the children say."

"You mean just now, shouting?"

"Yes. They say: 'Where you going, bastard? I spit on you.'"

What for, I thought, what for, and will it never stop?

"Do you hate the Arabs, Nissim?"

"No. Of course no."

"Why not?"

"What is the good of hate?"

What indeed? Arabs gorge on hate, they roll in it, they breathe it. Jews top the hate list, but any foreigners are hateful enough. Arabs also hate each other, separately and en masse. Their politicians change the direction of their hate as they would change their shirts. Their press is vulgarly base with hate-filled cartoons; their reporting describes whatever hate is now uppermost and convenient. Their radio is a long scream of hate, a call to hate. They teach their children hate in school. They must love the taste of hate; it is their daily bread. And what good has it done them?

There is no future in spending U.N. money to breed hate. There is no future in nagging or bullying Israel to commit suicide by the admission of a fatal locust swarm of enemies. That is no future in Nasser's solution, the holy war against Israel; and we had better make this very clear, very quickly. Long bleak memories will recall the Sudetendeutsch and Czechoslovakia. In a new setting, Palestinian refugees assume the role of the Sudetendeutsch. Israel becomes Czechoslovakia. Propaganda prepares the war for liberation of "our brothers." Victory over a minor near enemy is planned as the essential first step on a long triumphant road of conquest. A thousand-year Muslim Reich, the African continent ruled by Egypt, may be a mad dream, but we have experience of mad dreams and mad dreamers. We cannot be too careful. The echo of Hitler'es voice is heard again in the land, now speaking Arabic.

Unfortunately for us all, including the Arabs, the Middle Eastern Arab nations have been hit by independence and the 20th century at the same time. It is a lot to handle, and they are not handling it safely or sanely. The cold war does not help them; it encourages folly. East and West both treat the Arabs with nervous anxiety; placatory and bribing, East and West keep their eyes fixed on the geographical location of the Arab states and the immense amount of oil under their deserts. No one does or can talk practical facts about Israel to the Arabs; it would be useless. Even the soundest Arab leaders have tied their own hands tight in an official hate policy. At present, any Arab government which urged a quick, peaceful, advantageous settlement of the Palestine refugee problem would be mobbed. The mobs have been indoctrinated for 13 years, as have the Arab refugees.

The Palestinian refugees could have been absorbed into the economic life of the Arab countries long ago, despite the remark of UNRWA's Director—in his 1960 report—that jobs do not exist for the refugees in the Arab countries. Of course they do not exist; if they did, the Arab standard of life would be a finer and a better thing than it is now. The jobs must be made; but the Arab countries need to have the jobs done as much as the refugees need to do them. The Director of UNRWA states, in the same report, that the majority of Palestinian refugees are unskilled peasants and there are enough or too many of those in the Arab countries already. No doubt. But unskilled peasants, all over the world, have learned to become skilled factory workers or scientific farmers, at very short notice; that ability to learn is what makes our modern industrial civilization tick. The Yemenite Jews who moved in a week from the Middle Ages to Israel, the unskilled Polish peasants operating the Nova Huta steel mills are obvious examples of this transformation. Neighboring Arabs regard the Palestinian Arabs as outstandingly intelligent. I would think this reputation deserved. There is no reason to believe that they cannot learn as others have.

Where there's a will—and as much unused land and wasted water, mineral and oil resources, underpopulation and undeveloped industries as in the vast Arab territories—

there's a way. "Western Imperialists" would have to contribute most of the cash for the way, and it would be cheap at the price. It is more expensive to maintain paupers forever than to establish free, self-supporting citizens. One outlay of capital is futile and never ends; the other is a capital investment, humane and profitable, and pays for itself. It pays in buying peace, and we don't have to argue which is the better bargain, peace or war. "Western Imperialists" should provide the way; the Arab governments would have to provide the will.

Economics are not all, and the tragedy of most refugees is not that they starve in their countries of adoption, but that their hearts and minds and souls starve. They are lonely strangers who do not speak the language of the new land, or know its customs; they are aliens. But the Palestian refugees look, feel, and organize themselves socially as the Arabs of the host countries do. They speak the same language, they practice the same religion. The Christian minority would find fellow minority Christians in every Arab country except Lebanon, where they are on top. The Palestinian Arabs are not foreigners in the Arab world; they are members of their own family.

According to Arab politicians and apologists, the Palestinian refugees refuse to become integrated in the Arab world; it is Palestine or nothing for them. Everyone shouts for the Palestinian refugees, and at them, and about them, but no one has ever asked the refugees what they themselves want: where do you want to live; what do you want to do? My tiny personal Gallup poll unearthed plenty of refugees who were happy where they were and had no desire to return to Palestine, no matter what; and plenty of refugees who longed to emigrate to the richer Arab countries, where the future looks brighter, or out into the great non-Arab world. Except for one Christian Arab from Jaffa, who thinks Jews more honest than Arab Muslims and better people to do business with, none of them wanted to return to Israel, as Israeli citizens, and dwell in peace with their Jewish neighbors. We need a secret poll of both sexes, from the age of 12 onward, to discover the refugees' own wishes for their own lives. The poll would have to be secret because it is impossible, even perilous, for an Arab refugee openly to disclaim interest in Palestine. Such a freethinker would be marked as a traitor to the Arab cause. Man is a political animal, but he also wants to live. Politics have offered a very dry crust to these refugees for a very long time.

Yet the Arab governments insist that the Palestinian refugees are a political problem. Once a year, formally, they brandish these waiting lives at the U.N. Assembly. The rest of the year, with different degrees of intensity, depending on their domestic politics, they wield these waiting lives to stir up Arab hate at home. The Arab governments say they will not accept the existence of the state of Israel, now or ever. The logical conclusion is that, when ready, they intend to burst from their cold belligerent status into hot armed conflict and terminate Israel's existence. We cannot force the Arab nations to make peace with Israel, but we have to prevent them from making actual war—for the sake of all human life, their own included. A vital preventive act would be to remove the Palestinian refugees as a justification of war.

Is it fruitless to offer terms to the Arab governments? We cannot hurry them, or threaten them. Their pride has been scarred; they are uncertain noisy adolescents in a tricky clever adult world; their nationalism is new, and they suspect insults or attacks on it, from every side; they do not live easily with themselves or with each other; and they have not yet understood that a nation is only as strong as its people—arms laid on top of disease, illiteracy, and poverty are a useless burden. But if we know our own minds, are patient, firm, and generous, in time the Arab governments might allow us to enrich their countries.

Our Western offer should be clear: UNRWA is to continue as a bridge to the future; we will pay for the bridge and the future—Palestinian refugees are gradually to become Arab citizens, earning their own livelihood on land, in industries, which our money and technical help will make available. All of this, but not another penny for a political problem. The Palestinian refugees must be taken out of politics forever and given the same chance that millions of refugees have had before them: a chance for work, private peace, and private life.

Would the Arab governments reject such an offer flatly, in pique, and turn UNRWA over to the Russians? The Arab leaders do not care for communism at home. Russia, as parent and teacher of hundreds of thousands of young Arab refugees, would not charm them. In the ugly East-West rivalry for Arab affection (and oil and geography), we might for once risk taking a reasonable, compassionate line. We are not likely to be outbid in this field. The Arab governments do not love us, but they fear the proselytizing Communists more.

UNRWA has been a splendid mother and father and can serve the refugees as a guide to the future. UNRWA's greatest gift to the refugees, to the Arab world, and, indirectly, to us all is the education and health of its charges. UNRWA should receive more money and be considered primarily an educational institution. In my opinion, UNRWA will be with us for some time, an admirable training school for young Palestinians and a kindly old folks' home for aged Palestinians. But UNRWA, too, must be taken out of politics. Its work should not be subject to Arab political supervision; none of its activities should be used for Arab propaganda purposes; and its Western personnel must keep themselves rigorously detached from the Arab-Israel controversy.

The Palestinian refugees are a chain reaction. Arab politicians and apologists would have us believe that the explosion began with the Balfour Declaration to "view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a home for the Jewish people." More likely, the explosion started in the depths of time when the Romans drove the Jews from their one and only homeland, the soil that grew their history, the Bible. Nearly 2,000 years later, Hitler and his followers committed such barbarous crimes against the Jews as all Christendom and all Islam, barbarous too, had never inflicted in the centuries of the Jewish dispersion. The Nazis and the gas chambers made the State of Israel inevitable: the Palestinian Arabs and the five invading Arab armies determined the boundaries of Israel.

The Palestinian refugees are unfortunate victims of a brief moment in history. It is forgotten that Jews are also victims in the same manner, of the same moment. The Arab-Israel war and its continuous aftermath produced a two-way flight of peoples. Nearly half a million Jews, leaving behind everything they owned, escaped from the Arab countries where they lived to start life again as refugees in Israel. Within one generation, if civilization lasts, Palestinian refugees will merge into the Arab nations, because the young will insist on real lives instead of endless waiting. If we can keep the peace, however troubled, the children of Palestinian refugees will make themselves at home among their own kind, in their ancestral lands. For the Jews there is no other ancestral land that Israel.

Road Improvements in Foreign Countries at U.S. Taxpayers' Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 8612, the national home rule road program, my attention has been called to the many millions of American dollars that the International Cooperation Administration has made available to foreign countries for road improvements.

The following summary of obligations for foreign highway projects reveals the many millions of U.S. dollars made available and their worldwide distribution:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Summary of obligations for highway projects, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to June 30, 1961

[Thousands of dollars]

	Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1961	Net obligations, fiscal year 1961
ICA and predecessor agencies programs	314,942	19,057
Inactive programs	35,525	
Korea	1,489	
Turkey	30,031	
European oversea territories:		
Belgian	1,540	
French	574	
United Kingdom	1,891	
Active programs	279,417	19,057
Far East	165,286	6,234
Burma	950	200
Cambodia	28,221	1,980
China, Republic of	1,753	
Indonesia	5,550	749
Japan	35	
Korea	10,566	2,424
Laos	16,366	235
Philippines	12,025	87
Thailand	31,751	448
Vietnam	58,069	111
Near East and South Asia	73,681	7,945
Afghanistan	14,000	3,089
Ceylon	1,697	162
Greece	10	
India	94	
Iran	2,498	
Iraq	598	
Israel	35	
Jordan	12,852	646
Lebanon	3,343	139
Nepal	1,182	890
Pakistan	2,234	
Turkey	627	
UAR (Egypt)	2,933	
Yemen	5,403	3,019
CENTO	2,182	
Asian Economic Development Fund	23,903	
Africa	11,731	3,329
Ethiopia	67	67
Liberia	2,384	337
Libya	1,861	
Mali, Republic of	6	6
Morocco	23	18
Nigeria	113	113
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	31	
Somali Republic	184	32
Southern Cameroons	15	15
Sudan	4,426	1,312
Tanganyika	16	16
Tunisia	2,605	1,413
Europe: Spain	241	45

Summary of obligations for highway projects, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948, to June 30, 1961—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

	Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1961	Net obligations, fiscal year 1961
ICA and predecessor—Con.		
Active programs—Con.		
Latin America	28,478	1,504
Argentina	4	4
Bolivia	3,624	55
Chile	550	155
Colombia	373	24
Costa Rica	45	18
Cuba	6	
El Salvador	6	
Guatemala	20,620	
Haiti	1,094	
Honduras	247	71
Mexico	202	16
Nicaragua	28	5
Panama	608	432
Paraguay	249	
British Guiana	371	317
West Indies and East Caribbean	451	407

NOTE.—Data exclude projects financed under the Development Loan Fund.

Source: Mission Quarterly Project Reports (D-8).

Okinawa: A Story of United States in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, the Honolulu Advertiser's veteran political writer, Mr. Brian Casey, recently returned from the Ryukyus after a thorough on-the-scene survey of conditions on Okinawa. His observations were reported in a series of articles which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser. I feel that Brian Casey's vivid and comprehensive report is deserving of attention, especially so since President Kennedy will be sending a factfinding team to similarly study the conditions now existing in Okinawa.

With the permission of the House, I would like to insert in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, the articles written by Mr. Brian Casey:

OKINAWA—A STORY OF UNITED STATES IN ASIA

(By Brian Casey)

Military government—a benevolent American variety—still rules foreign soil 16 years after the end of World War II.

The soil is that of Okinawa.

We hold it through the 1951 peace treaty with Japan. We have built it—because of the world crisis—into our most powerful base in the Far East. Communist China is but 450 miles away, Russia not much farther.

We recognize Japan's "residual sovereignty" over Okinawa and the other Ryukyuan Islands. We will give the islands back to Japan—but not until global "threat and tension" are gone—and, at best, that's a long way off.

Meanwhile, how good a job of governing Okinawa are we doing?

We have raised the standard of living of Okinawa's 885,000 gentle people—but we have not filled their emotional vacuum. They are "orphans," Japanese by culture and preference, American wards by military necessity.

Culturally, they would be more comfortable if Okinawa once again were a Japanese prefecture. This is what they want. But economically, they've never had it so good as under American rule. They are the victims and the beneficiaries of a paradox.

Politically, the people want more autonomy, more American democracy. They resent U.S. military control, no matter how well meaning. They clearly and strongly prefer U.S. civilian control.

They want to elect the Ryukyuan chief executive, now appointed by the U.S. high commissioner. They want to decide how their tax dollars should be spent, without American interference.

Rebuffed in these desires, they suspect that the United States doesn't trust them with a full set of democratic tools. They suspect, too, that because they are friendly to America, they are being taken for granted when the foreign-aid dollars are allocated.

"South Korea, Laos, Formosa—all get many millions more in aid than we do," a top Okinawan government official complained to this writer.

Basically peaceful, pliable people, Okinawans are slow to take offense. Centuries of poverty and privation (they still remember prewar Japanese discrimination) have taught them to smile in the face of adversity. But its wrong to believe they can't be stirred to anger.

In 1958, bitter about American payment policies for land appropriated for military use, they elected 5 members of the left-wing, anti-American Okinawa Peoples Party to the 29-member Legislature. OPP captured 26.5 percent of the vote. U.S. prestige took a nosedive.

The explosive land issue later was resolved with adoption of an enlightened rental system that has satisfied most Okinawans whose property was taken for military installations. But the inept handling has left scars.

The United States suffered another shock only last year. The occasion was President Eisenhower's brief stopover en route to Korea—after anti-American riots forced cancellation of his Japan trip. Although the command assured Washington that Ike would be warmly welcomed by America's oriental charges, his visit was a failure.

Briefly, this is what happened:

Leftwing agitators and pro-Communist students appealed to the populace to demonstrate against Ike. They promised there would be no violence.

But military commanders, understandably concerned, took what turned out to be overcautious security measures. The parade route was changed. Troops were posted at 6-foot intervals along the highway, their backs to the motorcade.

In Naha, the capital city, a Marine lieutenant colonel panicked at the sight of several hundred Okinawans snake dancing on the lawn fronting the Government buildings. He ordered his fatigue-clad men to draw their bayonets.

This maneuver infuriated even pro-American Okinawans. The ranks of demonstrators swelled. The upshot was that the President of the Nation that runs Okinawa, after chatting briefly with local leaders, was whisked off along an unpaved back road. The din of "Yankee, go home" still rang in his ears. He was white-faced and angry.

American troops are in many places in this troubled world, but Okinawa is the only foreign area over which the United States exercises complete control.

By terms of a 1957 Presidential Executive order, this control is vested in the Secretary of Defense. As a practical matter, he delegates it to an Army general who assumes the title of high commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands.

"The most striking feature of the Executive order," one authority has written, "is that it allots absolute powers to the high commissioner."

By virtue of this delegated authority, the high commissioner exercises all administrative, legislative, and jurisdictional powers conferred on the United States.

His authority includes the right to:

1. Veto any bill or any part or portion thereof.

2. Annul any law or any part or portion thereof within 45 days of its enactment.

3. Remove any public official from office.

Along with these sweeping powers go responsibilities. The executive order directs him to "encourage the development of an effective and responsible Ryukuan Government, based on democratic principles and supported by a sound financial structure."

He also "shall make every effort to improve the well-being of the inhabitants * * * and shall continue to promote the economic and cultural advancement of the inhabitants."

Theoretically, his power is checked by this section:

"The high commissioner shall preserve the basic liberties enjoyed by people in democratic countries, including freedom of speech, assembly, petition, religion, and press, and security from unreasonable searches and seizures and from deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

But the high commissioner has made no provision for trial by jury or grand jury indictment—not even for American military dependents or American civilians.

The U.S. Constitution, reputed to be the world's greatest document, was not exported in whole to Okinawa.

WHAT LIFE IS LIKE FOR 65,000 AMERICANS BASED ON OKINAWA

On a narrow, 66-mile island, bordered by the Pacific Ocean and the East China Sea, Washington has installed a unique military regime.

For on Okinawa, the only foreign area under U.S. control, the military calls the shots—politically, economically, culturally, as well as militarily.

Okinawa wasn't always choice duty for American service personnel. Prior to 1950, it was an assignment to be avoided. "An outpost for outcasts," "the end of the line," were popular epithets.

The Korean war, which underscored Okinawa's strategic importance, changed that. The United States embarked on a vast military expansion program. It was undertaken in the knowledge that the base might be held indefinitely.

Official policy was to make Okinawa a pleasant place to live. In this, the United States has succeeded.

What is life like for the 65,000 American servicemen, dependents, and civilian employees stationed on this distant outpost?

"On Okinawa," said the southern-born wife of an Air Force major, "the livin' is easy, man. Real easy."

"Where else," asked an Army colonel, "could I drink Beefeaters' gin for a quarter, eat a lobster dinner for $1.75, get my car polished for $1.25, my shoes shined for a nickel? Tell me."

They, and many like them—officers and enlisted men—enthusiastically endorse Okinawa as a place to work and play. This feeling of attachment shows up in the duty extension rate—reportedly the highest in the world. Few want to leave.

For most, the chief attraction is the low cost of living—the chance to save a few dollars without forgoing all luxuries. Food in the commissaries is cheap and plentiful;

the PX's are liberally stocked with American goods and appliances. And you can employ a maid for $20 a month.

The vast Government housing areas compare favorably, both in appearance and durability, with those in Suburbia USA. They are beautifully landscaped and well maintained.

The sports enthusiast has his choice of several first-rate, U.S. built and operated golf courses. There is no shortage of swimming pools, tennis courts, and bowling alleys. The beaches are excellent.

Chances are at night Mr. Serviceman will make a beeline for his air-conditioned club. He'll imbibe a few of those quarter-a-shot drinks (some night they're only a dime), maybe watch television awhile, then sit down to a well-cooked meal.

After dinner he can play the slot machines that are such stellar attractions at overseas military clubs. If it's bingo night, he can gamble for prizes worth hundreds of dollars. If he likes to dance, a slick combo, imported from Japan or the Philippines, will play acceptable versions of "Stardust," "Summertime," or "One O'Clock Jump."

The good life hasn't challenged the barriers of rank. This is still the Army. If anything, Okinawa life, military style, has become more rank conscious than in any other area where American troops are stationed, at home, or abroad.

This is typified by the present license-tag system.

There are 16 or so categories of license plates, depending on one's rank. Bird colonels or generals and their Department of Army civilian equivalents (GS–16 and above) have their choice of low numbers or their initials on their plates.

The same privilege is accorded chief master sergeants, except there's a small e in front to make sure nobody confuses them with generals.

A lieutenant colonel's plate carries the letters LC before the numbers, a major is designated MA, a captain is CP, and so on down through the officer categories.

If a private has a car, his license tag numbers are preceded by a big EE. A corporal's designation is ED. Things really get confusing at the sergeant level:

It's just a plain E plus number for a senior master sergeant, EA is for a master sergeant, EB for technical sergeant, EC for staff sergeant.

All American civilians who don't work for the military and all Okinawans have plain, old-fashioned numbers on their plates.

The license plate system intrigues some newsmen. A Japan Times columnist who wrote about it says it mystified his readers. American reporters who have tried to find out who instituted the system encounter silence. They are only told it is to encourage reenlistment.

Servicemen have been asked, on exams for promotion, what they think of the system. The results haven't been publicized. The general impression the writer got is that most servicemen think the whole thing's dudicrous—somebody's wild idea.

Another slice of life which amuses some observers, and irritates others, is the treatment accorded visiting VIP's (very important persons). All Congressmen—even some newsmen—fall into this category.

The standard operating procedure for handling a VIP includes a warm airport welcome by command representatives, who present him with a detailed itinerary for his entire stay.

He is whisked away in a staff car, unmistakably labeled "VIP" in bold, colored letters, to the plaza housing area where all dignitaries stay. For those required to pay, the charge is $1.50 a day (daily laundry service included).

Then follows a round of briefing, interviews and parties with various high-ranking officials that keeps the VIP stepping lively from early morning until he sags, exhausted, into bed at night.

A highlight is likely to be a helicopter ride or a tour of a new missile installation. If the VIP decides to hold a press conference—and such is discouraged until just before departure—a command representative is always present.

On the rare occasions when a VIP junks his prepared schedule, the command frets. A visiting Congressman decided to dine with old friends at a local teahouse. Counter-intelligence agents quietly stood watch outside to protect him.

CIC agents sometimes are overzealous. One Congressman, alighting from his plane, spotted an old buddy on the outskirts of the welcoming delegation. He rushed forward to embrace his friend, a former resident of Hawaii. They chatted briefly.

Afterward an agent sidled up to the Congressman's friend. "Say," he asked, "what did you whisper in the Congressman's ear?"

The red carpet treatment serves a dual purpose: the dignitiary leaves with vivid impressions of Okinawa's strategic importance in the free world's defense perimeter; he may also leave without contact with Okinawans and thus with little insight into their hopes and aspirations.

"The brass," said one American critic, "is almost 100 percent successful in shielding VIP's from discontented elements in both the Okinawan and American civilian communities."

Longtime observers of Okinawa military control say it is becoming more relaxed, more tolerant of dissenters, more conscious of its responsibilities year by year.

Lt. Gen. Donald P. Booth, high commissioner from 1958 to early this year, did much to resolve conflicts with both the Okinawan population and nonmilitary American civilians.

Booth encouraged participation in American-Okinawan friendship activities, in line with President Eisenhower's "People-to-People Program."

Community Relations Committees now exist in all political subdivisions with a substantial military population, to discuss mutual problems with Okinawan leaders. Service personnel repair school buildings, build water lines, teach English, sponsor scholarships and baseball teams.

Booth's successor, Lt. Gen. Paul W. Caraway, also has hammered on the need for active participation in local affairs.

In a recent talk, Caraway criticized the "triangle" type—the service family abroad "that moves in a social triangle: from their homes to their clubs to the commissaries and exchanges and back home again."

He said Americans overseas cannot afford to be charged with "triangle behavior. We cannt afford it as Americans and as members of the free world community."

Caraway also has served notice he will deal harshly with Americans who commit crimes against Okinawans—a situation which Okinawan newsmen claim is serious in places like Koza City.

WHY THE MILITARY CONSIDERS OKINAWA OF SUCH STRATEGIC VALUE

Why does the United States consider Okinawa to be a choice military base—principal link in the chain of free world defenses in the Far East?

Why did the United States sever the island from Japan in a move that, some scholars say, still is veiled in mystery? What about this "residual sovereignty" doctrine? What was Okinawa's status before Uncle Sam took it over?

Since maintenance of strategic military power is America's sole purpose for staying there, let's briefly examine its military significance.

The high command understandably is reluctant to discuss this subject in specific terms. A stock answer is: "Just look at the map and you'll understand how strategic it is." Their main point: the proximity of Red China's eastern coastline—a mere 450 miles, or a half hour by jet, away.

More important than geographical location, however, is America's freedom of action on Okinawa. There are no foreign governments to bargain with, nobody to tell the United States what it can and cannot do.

For the military, such freedom these days means not only full flexibility in preparation for any conventional hostilities or "brushfire" type wars, but also the right to build missile installations, the right to store nuclear weapons.

Both Nike-Hercules and Hawk missile units have been installed on Okinawa. Mace B missiles with nuclear warheads are next, the authorities Missiles and Rockets magazine reports.

This offensive missile, with a 1,200-mile range, will bring important Red Chinese industrial centers within easy striking distance.

Is the United States stockpiling atomic weapons on Okinawa? The command is noncommital. "I will neither confirm nor deny it," said Col. William H. Nelson, Jr., chief public information officer on the island.

"There are the big bombs over there," a friend told me on a nighttime drive through one part of Okinawa. He pointed to a dimly lit area off in the distance. "Enough to knock out every airfield in Red China."

What of Okinawa's vulnerability to enemy attack? Aren't heavy troop concentrations and installations in a small area a prime target?

Military commanders readily agree it is vulnerable. But, they add, so is every other base around the world—in varying degrees

Okinawans are distressed by such talk. More than 100,000 of them—noncombatant civilians—perished in World War II. Historian George H. Kerr observes:

"No prefecture [of Japan] contributed so little to the preparation for war and its prosecution * * * but none suffered as much in widespread misery, in loss of human lives and property, and in ultimate subservience to military occupation."

Fear of involvement in another such disaster, coupled with their historically pacifist traditions, compels them to censure the United States.

Introduction of nuclear weapons, said one resolution unanimously adopted by the legislature, could lead to "annihilation of the entire Okinawan population."

When World War II ended, no one thought Okinawa would become a permanent American military base. But loss of China to the Communists and Okinawa's usefulness during the Korean conflict changed all that.

Thus, when the Japanese peace treaty was negotiated in 1951, the United States, somehow, emerged with full powers to govern Okinawa, pending its inclusion in the United Nations trusteeship system (with the United States as sole administering authority).

Only scattered protests were heard. India objected on grounds Okinawa was sovereign Japanese territory that Japan had not acquired by conquest from another country.

"For the United States to continue to administer the islands," India warned, "can be a source of dissatisfaction to large sections of the Japanese people and must carry the seeds of future dispute and possible conflict in the Far East."

Perhaps because territorial acquisition runs counter to America's heritage, the late

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced that Japan retained "residual sovereignty" over Okinawa.

This is interpreted to mean that Japan some day will regain full control.

In December 1953 Dulles said it was essential to peace and security that the United States remain on Okinawa "as long as conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East."

Former President Eisenhower in 1957 reaffirmed the residual sovereignty doctrine. President Kennedy followed suit—in his recent talks with Japan's Prime Minister Ikeda.

In abandoning its trusteeship proposal, some experts believe, the United States demonstrated its intention not to take permanent possession of Okinawa.

The Okinawan people, who consider themselves to be Japanese (many Japanese disagree), want their status clarified. More and more they feel they are being used as pawns in United States-Japan relations.

They were sorely disappointed that Ikeda didn't discuss reversion with Kennedy. But they applauded promises of increased economic aid from both nations, and welcomed Kennedy's assurance they soon can fly Japanese flags from public buildings on national holidays.

Although some observers claim that Japan considers Okinawa to be expendable, the Okinawan people flatly reject such thinking. They note they have been an integral part of Japan since 1879 while, prior to that, close cultural and economic ties had existed for centuries.

A principal factor behind the reversion-to-Japan movement is the Okinawan's feeling of uneasiness, of statelessness. It is a spiritual, rather than an economic, need.

This interpretation, advanced by Prof. Ralph Braibanti of Duke University, finds favor with many leading Okinawans:

"An emotional and spiritual void was created by severance from Japan—the fountainhead of the Ryukyuan's culture and the object of their emotional allegiance for many generations.

"To all outward appearances the Ryukyus have been cut off from their mainland and have been occupied by a nation which, however well intentioned, is culturally alien.

"Moreover, the Japanese are now political and legal equals of the Americans; but the Ryukyuans, their Japanese citizenship held in suspension, are subject to military occupation and are legally subordinate to both American and Japanese—a situation shocking to Ryukyuan self-respect."

THE FAILURE OF THE AMERICAN PRESS TO KEEP READERS INFORMED ON WHAT IS REALLY GOING ON IN OKINAWA

The American press has failed in its responsibility to keep the world informed about happenings on Okinawa—locale of the most important U.S. military base in Asia.

This dereliction starts right at home plate, so to speak, with the American-owned-and-managed Okinawa Morning Star. The finger of guilt points equally to the wire services, news magazines, and some big newspapers which have permanent correspondents overseas.

Ironically enough, the best reporting job is done by Stars and Stripes, an authorized Army publication, which maintains a five-man bureau in Naha.

Neither Associated Press nor United Press International has a full-time reporter on Okinawa. Both depend on part-time correspondents who work for the Morning Star.

A roving wire service reporter drops by occasionally—but only for a few days en route to a more exciting assignment.

Time, Life and the New York Times share a single correspondent—a harassed weekly magazine publisher who admittedly is neck-deep in production problems and financial ills. He can't spare much time for searching reporting.

Although the U.S. press falls down on Okinawan news coverage, it's true that it would be a difficult assignment for an independent-minded journalist.

This is so because the U.S. military—traditionally wary of newspapers and newspapermen—can be pointedly (and successfully) hostile to unfriendly newsmen on Okinawa.

Take the case of Peter Craigmoe, news editor of the Morning Star a couple of years back. He wrote a story about military housing developments that the command didn't like. He was openly reprimanded by an Army public information officer, who demanded a retraction.

Craigmoe refused.

His "recalcitrant" attitude spurred Col. William H. Nelson Jr., top PIO on the island to action. He complained to Star Publisher Joseph Servaites and Editor Robert Prosser. Craigmoe was fired.

Craigmoe's successor as news editor, J. R. Roseberry, claims he too was sacked—for writing an editorial sharply critical of an Air Force commander.

Later, in the Honolulu Advertiser, Roseberry wrote that the "outside world receives only a hazy picture at best of what transpires" on Okinawa. For this, he blamed military pressures, and fear and disinterest on the part of news media themselves.

The Morning Star itself is a quasi-military publication that seldom criticizes the command. Reason for this cozy relationship is primarily economic. The Star enjoys exclusive magazine distributorship rights in all the island PXs—a lucrative arrangement.

The Star and the command are wedded in other ways:

The Star's city editor, who is also part-time Associated Press correspondent, is a reserve Army captain who pulls his duty in Colonel Nelson's office on weekends.

Also, Colonel Nelson's chief assistant holds down a part-time job on the Star.

"There's no question," an observer said, "that the command is a lot more buddy-buddy with the Morning Star than with its own Stars and Stripes."

A chief critic of military rule is Larry Krebs, 32, one-time University of Chicago student and ex-Army corporal, who publishes a magazine called This Week on Okinawa. He also is the Time, Life, and New York Times correspondent.

When the civil administrator's post became vacant 2 years ago, Krebs lobbied vigorously against appointment of another military man.

He spent his own money for radiograms to key Congressmen, urging a civilian be named to the post. Congress disregarded his advice.

This may have influenced Krebs' attitude; when Brig. Gen. John G. Ondrick assumed the job, Krebs didn't wait long before tangling with him.

He later charged Ondrick with "firing the competent people and those who disagreed with him." One of those axed, Krebs said, was George Taggart, a widely known fisheries expert.

Now, said Krebs in a recent interview, "Ondrick has had it. Since Caraway (Lt. Gen. Paul W. Caraway) took over, Ondrick has lost all his authority. He can't even hold a press conference any more."

Krebs' acid pen and outspoken ways have kept him in hot water—both with the command and elements of the American business community.

Counterintelligence agents keep close tabs on his movements. They got a court order in October 1959 and scrutinized all his mail—incoming and outgoing—for a period of 122 days.

Krebs, who claims credit for initiating press criticism of the administration 2 years before the local language newspapers, shows signs of weakening.

"In one sense," he reflected, "my magazine's independent view is outmoded. Both Ryukyu dailies—whose editors like to say that my magazine was the first truly independent publication on the island—now print the news as they see it.

"I've been tilting with windmills and the fun of tilting isn't what it used to be," Krebs confessed. "Yes, and even I pull my punches. I have to live with these people."

Said a friend of Krebs:

"Before he leaves I'm sure he hopes to succeed in his big ambition—to become a martyr to the cause of free speech and free press."

The command, having put up with him for 7 years, isn't likely to let that happen.

THE GOVERNMENT SYSTEM ON OKINAWA?

A vociferous critic of Okinawa's U.S.-imposed military control is a tenacious American lawyer who claims the basic governmental structure is illegal.

"The military is running Okinawa," says Attorney Howard B. McClellan, "under a presidential executive order that itself is unconstitutional.

"It confers powers the President doesn't have authority to confer—like the power to legislate or to create courts."

McClellan's principal quarrel is with the court system the United States created to try military dependents and other American citizens, as well as Okinawans charged with serious crimes.

(Separate but subservient Okinawan courts handle most cases involving Okinawans.)

Prosecutions are carried out, McClellan argues, in violation of the Federal Constitution and Bill of Rights because there is no provision for jury trial or grand jury indictment.

"It's my opinion, one shared by other American lawyers here," says McClellan, "that any time the United States proceeds against one of its citizens it may do so only within the framework of the Bill of Rights.

"American civilians abroad must be tried in courts that are constitutionally established, after indictment by a grand jury and trial by petit jury. But on Okinawa, the United States prosecutes its citizens without any of these safeguards.

"I don't believe the United States can rule anybody—unless in time of war or state of national emergency—except within the framework of the Constitution."

McClellan, 41, a New Mexico native, started a law practice on Okinawa after serving a hitch there with the Air Force.

A squat, heavy-set man with penetrating blue eyes and a solemn manner, he's the ace trial lawyer on the island. His self-styled appellation:

"Champion of all the lost causes."

McClellan and a fellow lawyer, Charles P. Hagood, formerly of Hawaii, are impatient to challenge the system's legality before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Thus far, they admit, they've been outmaneuvered by the military.

They claim that any time there is a challenge to the system—meaning the possibility of a habeas corpus petition's being filed in Washington—the defendant is freed or treated leniently.

American civilians, Hagood claims, "have licenses to kill.

"They [the judges] give you a scolding, a suspended sentence, and banish you from the kingdom—like getting a free ride home.

"That's because they don't want a test of their authority.

"This place," Hagood observed, "is run much like Hawaii was during the war. Only there is no emergency wartime justification."

Russell L. Stevens, director of the U.S. Judicial Department and chief justice of the appellate court, strongly disagrees with McClellan and Hagood on both the validity of the Executive order and the judicial system.

"There is absolutely no question in my mind," says Stevens, longtime Honolulu resident and former Guam attorney general, "about the complete constitutionality of the Executive order.

"Both the Panama Canal and Guam, prior to 1950, were run under systems not greatly dissimilar to this one. The Executive order is sound as a dollar because Congress, by appropriating funds for this administration, has put its stamp of approval on everything going on here.

"The Executive order doesn't provide for jury trials, so we don't have them. It's that simple.

"U.S. laws," Stevens continued, "generally speaking do not extend to Okinawa, which is a foreign country.

"Constitutional rights, like trial by jury, do not extend to legal proceedings in foreign countries.

"The Constitution does not follow the flag all over the world. For some purposes yes, for others no. It's a very complex proposition."

Stevens readily admitted that the judicial system isn't independent, since the high commissioner appoints the judges.

"But the high commissioner or the civil administrator has never even hinted how I should rule on a case. My only contact with them is purely administrative," he asserted.

Stevens wouldn't venture a guess on how a U.S. mainland court would treat an appellant from Okinawa.

"In the absence of a precedent I would not know * * *."

Stevens wouldn't say so, but this writer learned that he favors instituting jury trials. He has been overruled by the military command.

The matter is now being studied by high Defense Department officials, it is reported.

Assuming an appellant cannot seek redress in a U.S. appellate court, where can he take his legal troubles?

Until recently it was believed he could appeal to the U.S. Department of Defense, which as jurisdiction over Okinawan courts.

But Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, in refusing to pass judgment on a tax evasion case, ruled that his office "would not act as a reviewing authority for the independent judiciary of Okinawa."

The present court system has some unique advantages for certain types of lawbreakers. Robert Prosser, editor of the English language daily, The Morning Star, pointed out in a recent article:

"While it is currently impossible for an appellant on Okinawa to carry his woes back to a superior court in the States, it is also true that the person on Okinawa is safe from the long arm of the stateside lawsuit.

"There is many a fugitive from a stateside alimony rap on Okinawa who would like to keep things just as they are.

"While it is of scant comfort to the errant husband, wives who send them to an early grave via the family carving set are usually treated with benign approval by the present courts.

"To change these courts would do a distinct disservice to these two rather popular groups."

HOW VICE FLOURISHES ON OKINAWA

Vice is big business on Okinawa.

No one knows how big. Informed sources disagree whether it ranks before or after PX's in dollar volume.

An estimated 15,000 to 20,000 girls, many fresh from the rice paddies and canefields, actively peddle sex to servicemen, tourists and localities. Fees: $1 to $10.

The military looks the other way—unless an establishment's record is so flagrant as to require an off-limits sign.

Most spots employ "hostesses" (B-girls in the United States) whose job is to hustle drinks and provide companionship for customers.

World travelers belittle even the "classiest" Okinawan nightspots as "poor imitations" of those in Tokyo's Yoshiwara district. They do admit, though, that its tab is much lower and the "girls have a certain rustic, unspoiled charm."

The combination of low-cost sex and liquor figures prominently in the plans of entrepreneurs who would like to make Okinawa a tourist mecca.

The vital role that these commodities play in the local economy was acknowledged by the Ryukyu Shimpo, one of two big Okinawa daily newspapers, in an article last March.

It noted that the business recession was becoming worse in base towns.

Most hard hit by the tense situation in Laos are red-light quarters in Koza, Gushikawa, Ishikawa, Kin and Kushi. Some bars and cabarets have never been visited by a single American serviceman customer since the issuance of the Kennedy announcement that causes the U.S. military to stand by.

Some are closed and others are changing to snack bars and other types of business to cater to Okinawa customers.

Sources say there is little organized vice on Okinawa—just thousands of independent operators. Venereal disease is fairly prevalent. "We're very concerned about VD," an American health official acknowledged.

Gambling is another popular pastime on Okinawa.

It centers primarily around the thousands of slot machines that are found in the military clubs.

The machines are an indispenable part of every club's operation. Profits (averaging about 40 cents on the dollar) are used to hire entertainers as well as to keep food and drink prices at a low level.

Many Okinawans have become slot machine addicts. At the Harborview Club, which has a limited Okinawan membership, local women play the one-armed bandits for hours at a stretch. The club has been nicknamed "the gymnasium."

While the military ducks official comment on prostitution and gambling, veteran servicemen vigorously defend the system.

"If it weren't for the easy availability of sex," a lieutenant told me "our troops out here would go nuts."

Another problem is the off-base segretion situation.

It exists at a place called Koza Four Corners, an intersection in Koza City near sprawling Kadena Air Force Base.

On one side of Four Corners is a section reserved for white servicemen, the other side is for Negroes. Both areas are saturated with bars and B-girls.

The man who defies this color barrier endangers his life.

This contribution to interracial misunderstanding was the brainchild of an MP colonel, back in 1952. He decided segregation was necessary to protect servicemen from one another—to reduce incidents among white and Negro troops.

For several years, trespassers were forcibly removed by MP's. This ejection policy was abandoned about 1955, after criticism from the U.S. Negro press. But self-imposed segregation remains.

Although there have been trespassers' invasions in strength in recent years, things have been fairly quiet since a grenade-throwing incident 3 years ago.

Stories about Koza Four Corners could fill a book.

Attorney Charles P. Hagood, formerly of Honolulu, tells of driving through the Negro section one Sunday afternoon to find a white kid about 21 in the street, screaming for help. He was bleeding from his head.

"I asked him what happened. He said he was just walking down the street and somebody clouted him with a whisky bottle. He didn't know why. Turns out he had just arrived on the island and didn't know the score.

"I took him to the Yacht Club and combed glass out of his hair."

An island of "regimented vice" is what a Protestant clergyman called Okinawa in February 1960. He demanded that an Air Force general be recalled to Washington to explain why.

What had incensed Caradine Hooten, general secretary of the Methodist Board of Temperance, was an article in Time magazine about activities at Kadena Airmen's Club.

Entitled "Home Was Never Like This," the Time story said in part:

"Okinawa's Kadena Airbase was last week proving that life in a remote U.S. military outpost facing Red China can indeed be beautiful.

"Not only were the brass and high-ranking noncoms of Okinawa enjoying the privilege of private bathing beaches and their well-appointed clubs; even privates and corporals could go to their own pleasure domes for evening relaxation.

"Each evening, busloads of pretty Okinawan hostesses pull up to the blue-and-white striped awning before the Kadena Airmen's Club, and the gaily chattering girls—each of whom has passed a physical exam—hurry inside to dance with and entertain GI's. The charge for an evening's companionship: 75 cents."

The article spotlighted other club attractions: 34 slot machines, bingo games with $1,000 prizes, 5-cent drinks, steaks for a quarter, and assorted other exciting attractions.

Air Force Commander Maj. Gen. Dale O. Smith denied the vice charges and invited local newsmen to dinner—to see for themselves if anything was unsavory.

Smith said the club employed the girls to dance with stag airmen—just like USO dancing partners back home. All were from good families, the general said, and had passed both medical and security checks.

Impartial observers agreed that Time's "Life at Kadena" was exaggerated (the controversy quickly died), but shortly thereafter the club banned all newsmen.

The no-newsmen barrier still existed 3 months ago when Al Ricketts, entertainment columnist for Stars and Stripes, tried to get into the club.

Ricketts later ran an item which pointed out that the rule was ludicrous where Stars and Stripes is concerned. "It isn't likely we would use this space to knock a military club. We're here to help," Ricketts wrote.

An investigation was launched to find out who banned Stars and Stripes.

Another story that upset the command was written by J. R. Roseberry, former news editor of Okinawa Morning Star. It appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser late last year.

"Gambling, gin, and gals are the three G's that keep lonesome American GI's occupied on Okinawa during their off-duty hours," Roseberry reported.

"Little or no attempt is made to hide prostitution on the island. It has what amounts to 'unofficial official' recognition by the U.S. military."

"The brass," I was told by the unimpeachable source, "hit the roof when they read Roseberry's story. They're very sensitive about that sort of thing, you know."

Just how sensitive I learned firsthand when I casually broached the subject to Col. William H. Nelson, Jr., the command's top public information officer. "Say, Colonel, what about prostitution and gambling?"

The colonel looked upset. "You aren't going to write anything about that, are you?" He didn't want to talk about it.

THE BOSS OF OKINAWA WEARS THREE STARS, THREE HATS

The top man on Okinawa is a slightly-built mild-mannered American with three stars, three hats, and a confident belief in his ability to maintain American prestige in this potentially explosive, key U.S. defense base.

He is Lt. Gen. Paul Wyatt Caraway—commanding general of Army Forces on Okinawa, high commissioner of the Ryukyus and representative of the Pacific commander in chief, who freely discussed his manifold duties in an hour-long interview.

"I don't think it makes any difference," said General Caraway, "whether a man in a gray flannel suit or a khaki uniform runs this place."

That was his reply to the question of the desirability of U.S. civilian control of Okinawa in nonmiliary areas. Such a step has been advocated by a consultant to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is desired by the Okinawan people.

"I wouldn't argue the point," said Caraway, who devotes 80 percent of his time to his high commissioner's duties. "But a civilian administrator might encounter certain complications."

Caraway said he isn't aware of any "agitation" in U.S. Government circles, including the State Department, for a change to civilian control.

Assuming his Okinawan post in February after serving as a key planner in the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the general said he doesn't contemplate any basic administrative changes for the present.

He dismissed as without merit charges made in American civilian legal circles that the Presidential order establishing the governmental structure is invalid, that the court system is illegal, that American citizens are being denied full protection of the Bill of Rights.

"It is my opinion," the general said deliberately, "that nothing we do out here contravenes the U.S. Constitution.

"I just reread the Executive order. It has the basic protections and practically quotes the old Bill of Rights. If the forms don't satisfy certain people * * * well, they'll have to determine that for themselves."

The general said he hasn't ducked any court challenges to the present system—another charge leveled by some American lawyers. He denied there was any interference with the press. He said there is no mail censorship or telephone tapping.

Caraway indicated he will move cautiously in the area of increased self-government for the Okinawan people.

"There has been a steady accretion of self-government, with the advice and under the supervision of the American administration. This process will continue.

"I for one won't try to accelerate the self-government process. By that I don't mean they aren't capable of more self-government. But they can be harmed if put under forced draft."

Caraway emphasized that there was a "very little reservoir of managerial and legislative skills available to the U.S. administration. We have tried to utilize the competence that was available. It's purely a question of trial and error how fast you can go. This is not a drag race but a long-term effort."

What about accusations that he's running a one-man show, that he has shunted aside Brig. Gen. John G. Ondrick, director of the so-called U.S. Civil Administration?

"The high commissioner," said Caraway, pointing to himself, "is the civil administrator of the Ryukyu Islands. USCAR is simply my staff. I just operate differently than did my predecessors.

"In all the jobs I've had, I've moved in on everything. I used to be a strategic planner for the War Department. That's a job made up of millions of details and needing tremendous coordination. I have to know what is happening and to be sure everybody knows what he's doing. I don't want chaos."

"Furthermore," said Caraway, whose hobby is work, "I don't want General Ondrick as the civil administrator taking the brunt of things. I told them I had the ultimate responsibility for what happens."

"The bus stops here and not some place else," said the general. "I don't operate through a facade of people who diffuse responsibility. I operate like Harry Truman did and as J.F.K. is trying to do. But I haven't usurped responsibilities as some of those USCAR people claim."

Caraway defends his veto power over acts of the Okinawan Legislature as "legitimate and necessary. I haven't used it yet and I'll be as careful about exercising it as my predecessors."

The general brushed aside the big reversion question as a policy problem he's prohibited from commenting on. Then he added: "But military people, I would say, are naturally opposed." The United States, the general said, pinpointing the overall problem, "will be here as long as threat and tension exist in the Far East.

Caraway, whose parents, Thaddeus and Hattie, both served in the U.S. Senate, has made a favorable impression on the Okinawan people. He's a master public relations man when touring the countryside. Mr. Ambassador himself, an observer disclosed.

"He is friendly with everybody and even shakes hands with the children. He wears a smile at all times. He already has appeared before more people in 5 months than his predecessor did in 3 years. He is also conscious of press relations and treats the press pretty good.

"In his office, however," the observer said, "he's a real tiger. He just loves to work."

Caraway also is noted for his tolerant attitude toward dissenters and has a keenly developed sense of humor.

At a recent press conference, a Ryukyu Shimpo reporter who, incidentally, had just returned from a 3-month "national leader" program in the United States, criticized Caraway for opposing an increase in personnel in two offices maintained by the Okinawan government in Japan.

"It is indeed regrettable that the high commissioner has expressed views opposing this plan, sir."

Caraway smiled. "Mr. Shimoji * * * I am sorry you do not approve of what I did," explaining that the Okinawan government had not justified the proposed personnel increase.

The General's laughing eyes swept the room.

"I should hate this to turn into an exclusive interview between me and Mr. Shimoji, although I am enjoying it very much. Does anyone else have any questions?"

THE CIVIL ADMINISTRATOR WHO BELIEVES OKINAWA WILL CONTINUE TO BE OCCUPIED FOR MANY YEARS

Brig. Gen. John G. (Duke) Ondrick, 55, so-called civil administrator of Okinawa, firmly believes that no American abroad "should ever forget how to drive on the Los Angeles Freeway."

This oft-quoted observation, emphasizing Ondrick's indorsement of the rotation system, has been cited as evidence that he fired key civilian personnel in his regime because of their long service overseas.

Not true, says Ondrick, a big, bluff, affable hail-fellow-well-met type who has held the CA post for 2 years.

Since Lt. Gen. Paul W. Caraway assumed the job of high commissioner in February, Ondrick's star has been in eclipse.

"Although I believe in rotation—every American should go home from time to time to get reacquainted with his country—I didn't RIF (release through reductions in force) on tenure, but on jobs.

"Some people don't understand the dynamic changes that occur in an economy that starts from scratch.

"Ten years ago there was a dire need for a transportation expert for Okinawa. I cut out the job when the need was gone.

"Now I've put in for a bank examiner, one of 10 new jobs I've requested because of the booming economy.

"Why, some of the Okinawans are so well off they drive around in air-conditioned cars. A pineapple expert also is badly needed now.

"Some people have the idea," the general reflected, "that they are never going to leave this place."

Ondrick, like General Caraway, is unsympathetic with advocates of U.S. civilian control of Okinawa.

"The Army," he said, "has done a good job with no squawks.

"You don't hear anything about this place in Congress * * * no cries, no hullabaloo.

"No, I don't see any contradictions in terms (a U.S. civil administration headed by Army generals on active duty). It's truly a civil administration—no bones about it.

"More than 90 percent of my staff is civilian. I don't know what more could be accomplished by a civilian (in his job)."

In Ondrick's view, America will continue to occupy Okinawa for years to come.

"I don't see us leaving as long as tension exists out this way. And I don't see Red China getting good enough to get in bed with."

In a speech early this year, entitled, "Why Are We Here?" Ondrick emphasized Okinawa's strategic importance. It is so situated that "aggressive threats to the entire northeastern, eastern and southeastern areas of Asia can be effectively countered from here."

"It is a harsh fact, but nevertheless a fact," he said, "that the Ryukyuan people are able today to live in peace, to go about their daily business of earning a living * * * to live in dignity as human beings because of the presence in this area of forces sufficient to deter Communist conquest.

"From our viewpoint, the nature of the common danger is such that we ought to be able to expect the utmost in cooperation from the Ryukyuan people in the performance of our mission here."

In Ondrick's opinion, the United States is not based on Okinawa but rather "Okinawa is the base."

Under questioning, Ondrick admitted that from a military standpoint freedom of action on Okinawa is more important than the geographical location, "although not much more so."

Does he believe Caraway has downgraded him?

"I don't think so. Each high commissioner works differently."

Ondrick maintains he isn't at all perturbed by his administration's critics.

"I don't even bother to answer criticisms from the so-called free press," he said. "They leveled their pistols at the wrong head."

The general mentioned some of the posts he has held—deputy chief of staff for administration of the 8th Army, deputy chief of staff of the 6th Army.

Then he hunched forward to whisper confidingly to the reporter:

"I'm a pro, a real pro."

The implication was clear that his present job is duck soup for a man of his wide experience and capabilities.

At the reporter's request, the general sent an aide for a copy of his biography. He leaned his powerful shoulders back in his swivel chair and read it.

"I almost forgot I had them," he said.

He was referring to his decorations, which include a Silver Star.

Although nobody on Okinawa doubts that Ondrick is a crack soldier, some have misgivings about his ability to deal with a civilian population.

"I've found him to be a sincere, straight-shooting guy who cleaned out some deadwood," one observer said. "But any Army general would be miscast in the role of civil administrator."

One of Ondrick's severest critics is American newsman Larry Krebs.

Referring to Ondrick as the "sword in the gray flannel scabbard," Krebs once wrote:

"The civil administrator is an excellent soldier, a man of integrity, honor and intelligence.

"I feel equally certain that the present position he holds is beyond his capabilities.

"This view is shared by too many responsible Okinawans to be ignored."

AN INTERVIEW IN A DESERTED TEAHOUSE WITH "THE GRANDDADDY OF ALL OKINAWAN AGITATORS"

The granddaddy of all Okinawan agitators, Kamejiro Senaga, still causes U.S. military commanders to blanch when they recall their troubles with him—even though, in recent years, the ranks of leftist political forces on Okinawa have thinned considerably.

They labeled him the "Red Mayor of Naha" after his election as the capital city's chief executive in 1956, and promptly set out to topple him from this high post.

This they accomplished in less than a year.

After a 90-minute-long exclusive interview with the 53-year-old Senaga in a private room at a deserted teahouse, I could understand the military's fear of this dapper little man with a full bag of anti-American prejudices. (Reporter's note: I used my own interpreter to conduct the interview.)

Principal plank in his platform, and that of the Okinawa People's Party which he leads, can be summarized in a sentence:

Immediate and complete reversion of Okinawa to Japan and abolition of all U.S. bases.

In the meantime, Senaga and OPP advocate policies aimed at:

Persuading the United States to remove all missile installations and nuclear weapons from Okinawa.

Guaranteeing the rights of labor unions to organize without obtaining American approval.

Getting the United States to pay rentals on former prefectural lands that are being used for bases.

Gaining complete freedom of speech, assembly, press, and travel.

"U.S. foreign policy," Senaga asserted, "is a war policy because you are bringing Mace B missiles into Okinawa—missiles with nuclear warheads and a range of 1,400 miles. This was announced 4 days after the Kennedy-Ikeda talks.

"In this respect, Kennedy's policies are worse than Eisenhower's," he said, "because Mace B is much more powerful and offensive than the Nike-Hercules and Hawk missiles which are already here."

Senaga also would like to see the United States booted out of Japan.

"Japan can't be independent if she has foreign troops and bases on her land."

Senaga, whose antipathy toward Japan's Liberal Democrats matches his anti-Americanism, admits that reversion will be extremely difficult to accomplish, "because Ikeda is pro-American."

Under questioning, Senaga reluctantly admited the United States has done a "little good" for Okinawa. He immediately qualified this faint bit of praise:

"American democratic principles were introduced here but military policies always have been given top priority. Protection of the people's rights and property has become secondary.

"The United States has given economic assistance but it is insufficient compared to the aid we would get from Japan as a prefecture.

"If we were again part of Japan our poor people would get medical treatment for nothing. There is no such law in Okinawa. When our people get sick they get poorer and poorer. The gap between the poor and rich is getting wider and wider."

Senaga refers to his U.S.-manipulated ouster as Naha's mayor as, "very undemocratic * * * an infringement on basic human rights * * * one of the most undemocratic examples ever seen in this world."

Senaga says he still is ineligible to run for office, is forbidden to travel to Japan, and his party in prohibited from publishing a newspaper.

The U.S. military has long assumed that Senaga is a dyed-in the-wool Communist. High American civilian officials aren't so sure. They say, "In the absence of documentary proof, we can just say he's Communist-oriented."

The question was put squarely to Senaga. His answer:

"There are no Communists on Okinawa. Americans consider those who don't agree with them as Communists. I am not a Communist.

"History will show whether Marx and Lenin principles are right. I'm preoccupied with the liberation of Okinawa and gaining people's basic rights and will accept any principle contributing to those goals.

"The Japan Socialist Party has principles based on social democracy. It favors immediate reversion and I favor this. The OPP is like the leftwing in the Japan Socialist Party, but it is not Communist."

He chatted on, "I'm always considered anti-American, but I'm not against the American people. If I was, I wouldn't be interviewed by you today. My struggle is against your imperialistic policies. There is nothing personal."

His attitude toward Soviet Russia?

"The Russians aren't on Okinawa so I don't know firsthand. From what I read in the papers Russia is proposing disarmament and peaceful coexistence and I favor that. Why can't America and Russia cooperate in accomplishing those goals?"

Senaga said he wasn't always in disfavor with the American military government.

"I was jailed for 3 years in Yokohama for opposing the Japanese militarists," he said. "After the war, the United States made me president of the Uruma Shimpo newspaper (now the Ryukyu Shimpo) because I was a pacifist.

"Then they arrested me in 1954 and exiled me to Miyako for 2 years (for harboring a political fugitive). The people didn't like that treatment so when I was released I was elected mayor."

Senaga glanced at his watch. Time to go. He ran a hand through his thick black hair. He fingered his mustache, adjusted his brown gabardine slacks, smoothed his white cotton sports shirt. He descended the stairs. At the doorway he bowed slightly. "Sayonara."

He opened his khaki umbrella as protection against the stifling midday sun and melted into the crowd.

OKINAWA'S NATIVE CHIEF EXECUTIVE DOESN'T THINK HE SHOULD BE APPOINTED BY THE UNITED STATES

Seisaku Ota, 58, handsome, dapper chief executive of the government of the Ryukyu Islands, advocates a policy that could cost him his prestigious job.

"I favor an elected chief executive," said Ota, who now serves at the U.S. high commissioner's pleasure. "The Okinawan people don't have enough self-government."

Ota and other Okinawan leaders friendly to America believe Uncle Sam is neglecting her Far East wards.

In addition to the increased self-government issue, they complain about:

The United States' penny-pinching policies that contrast sharply with her generosity toward countries like Laos, South Viet Nam, South Korea, Formosa.

America's resistance to Okinawa's moves to tie herself closer to Japan.

Continued rule by military men when they would prefer to deal with American civilians.

Although cautious in his comments to this writer, Ota implied that America's relatively low level of aid to Okinawa can damage our world posture.

"We are getting $4.6 million a year in direct aid now. For awhile, we only got $1 million a year. We have asked for $10 million a year and I hope we get it," Ota said.

"I think America should do her best to improve the welfare and well-being of the Okinawan people in order to keep her good record in history as the great America. By doing so, it will be a driving force for closer coordination and a better relationship between Japan and the United States."

Despite Okinawa's economic growth in recent years, Ota noted that "our living standards are still lower than most Japanese prefectures." (Just how Okinawa compares with Japan's 46 prefectures is disputed. Ota says Okinawa ranks 44th; a U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee consultant rates Okinawa 38th).

Ota, as chief executive, supervises all GRI executive agencies, which employ 9,200 persons. He is responsible for executing the laws and ordinances applicable to the Ryukyu Islands. He also heads the pro-American Okinawa Liberal Democratic Party which presently controls the legislature.

Okinawa-born, he had a distinguished career in the Japanese civil service. He was civil administrator of the Pescadores Islands during World War II.

Ota's assistant, Deputy Chief Executive Hiroshi Senaga was more talkative than his boss.

A one time University of Hawaii student, Senaga put the basic problem this way:

"Our philosophy, our government policies and practices, the way we do things are similar to Japan's—quite different from the United States. No one can judge which way is better.

"We want to do things in our own way. They are peculiar because of our geographical location, social conditions and somewhat backward economy. This must be understood by the United States."

Senaga objects to U.S. control of Okinawan government purse strings. "We want budgetary freedom—the right to spend our own tax dollars in our own way."

He said all political parties support the elected chief executive proposal.

"U.S. reaction," he observed, "is always negative. They qoute the examples of Hawaii and Alaska before statehood, when the President appointed the Governors. But Okinawa is not an American territory, and besides, the Governor of Puerto Rico is elected."

U.S. reluctance to having Okinawa move closer to Japan's orbit is another source of irritation, Senaga said.

"We want American to acknowledge Okinawa's special relationship to Japan. The United States should welcome any assistance that Japan gives us—economic, financial, technical, even administrative help.

"The United States does it now (permits some Japanese aid), but from our viewpoint, it's not satisfactory.

Although both Ota and Senaga understandably side stepped the issue of military versus civilian control, other pro-American Okinawan political figures discussed it freely—after being assured their identities would not be disclosed.

One expressed this opinion (concurred in by two veteran observers):

"All political leaders dislike military government. They want civil control—no question about it.

"Okinawans want a real, not artificial, civil administration. The sign says: 'U.S. Civil Administration,' but things are run just as they were when we had a military governor. There's even been a song written about it."

Top American officials fully agree on one point raised by critics—that there is insufficient direct economic aid.

"We are parsimonious," one told me on a not-for-attribution basis.

"I would say that we pay a pretty small insurance premium for what we have here—a billion-dollar base. There are certain things people expect in the modern world in the way of social security and welfare programs. It's part and parcel of modern life and these people can't afford it.

"We can't buy friendship—here or elsewhere—but certain things can be done. Another $4 or $5 million a year would mean a lot.

"Don't forget this. The United States would get full value for each dollar because we handle the money in concert with the Okinawan government. We don't have to grease anybody's palm."

Another ranking official observed:

"Ten years ago, $5 million would do a lot here. Now the economy is rolling along pretty good. As an economy becomes more sophisticated, it takes more money to make an impact.

"We should be prepared to step up our aid. Much more than $5 million could be spent, without waste and for good purposes, to the betterment of America's image here and in the world."

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO OKINAWA'S ECONOMY IF U.S. MILITARY FORCES WERE WITHDRAWN?

If U.S. military forces ever pulled out of Okinawa, her economy would collapse like a straw house in the path of a typhoon.

For the fact is that Okinawa's material well-being is highly dependent upon U.S. spending.

American dollars account for half the national income. The various services employ some 50,000 Okinawans. Thousands more work as domestics and gardeners for American families.

Of Okinawa's $93 million export-income gap, $88 million is made up by U.S. spending.

Mostly because of this gigantic prop, partly through increased trade and production, considerable economic progress has been made in the last 5 years.

In this period, total output of goods and services has increased more than 8 percent a year. Per capita income has climbed at a 6½ percent rate and now stands at $216—below Japan's but higher than most Asian countries.

The heavy reliance on armed forces expenditures, however, worries both American and Okinawan leaders.

Lt. Gen. Donald P. Booth, former high-commissioner, spelled out this concern in a message to the legislature this year.

While progress has been favorable, Booth said, "fundamental problems remain * * * the economy is not fully stabilized. It is excessively dependent on the military base economy."

He said agricultural production costs are so high that the three basic commodities—rice, sugar, pineapple—"can all be imported more cheaply than they can be produced locally."

Booth termed the trade balance "unsatisfactory." While exports increased $5.5 million from 1959 to 1960, imports jumped by $15.7 million, or almost three times as much.

Okinawa's basic economic problems are the same as those with which her people have grappled for hundreds of years. They can be summarized this way:

Too many people, too little land, meager resources.

Population density on Okinawa island—1,500 persons per square mile—is the world's highest. Furthermore, it is increasing by 15,000 people a year.

Arable land is scarce and much of it is being used for military installations. Mineral resources lack economic significance.

Human resources, too, one authority points out are still at a relatively low level of development in terms of labor skills, technical training and administrative abilities. There is inadequate venture capital to exploit such resources as are available.

"These are the ingedients of poverty * * * and Okinawa has always been poor," this authority adds.

In the long run, there are three possible solutions for Okinawa's economic ills:

Increased industrialization with expanded trade and commerce, emigration and birth control.

Income from manufacturing has almost doubled during the past 5 years. New factories include those for the manufacture of textiles, steel and electrical products, rubber shoes, chemicals, plywood, paper, and cardboard.

Tourism is being eyed as a potential source of national wealth. The industry is now starting to crawl. Major drawbacks are lack of firstclass hotels and restaurants. A Hawaiian company, headed by State Representative Peter S. Iha, hopes to build a $1,200,000 hotel within a year.

American and Okinawan officials have worked out a joint long-term economic plan to stimulate productivity by more efficient use and expansion of available resources.

It contemplates increased technical training, encouragement of foreign investment, and an expanded capital improvements program.

The plan has its critics. An American businessman claims it is inadequate.

"What is really needed," he says, "is an Okinawan equivalent of Puerto Rico's Operation Boostrap plan which attracted foreign investment with tax moratoriums, loans to industry, and other inducements."

"It leave much to be desired. In fact, I don't think they have a good workable plan," says a Hawaiian entrepreneur who has scouted investment possibilities there.

In recent years, birth control and emigration have been viewed as partial answers to the over-population problem.

There has been some postwar emigration to South America, where Okinawans are welcome. U.S. Senator OREN E. LONG is spearheading a move to establish a separate immigration quota for Okinawa. The Okinawan Legislature is studying birth control measures.

While living standards generally have improved considerably over prewar years, benefits have not been spread equally.

"Many farmers haven't shared in the boom," a Hawaiian observer reports.

"Their lots are so small they can't utilize modern techniques. They have been slow to form cooperatives, like those in Japan to pool land and resources."

A University of Hawaii professor, a few years back, commented on the distribution of wealth:

"The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. Instead of a big 5, though, they have a big 20," he said.

An American official complained about "exploitation of workers. Wages are low, prices are high and so are taxes. Labor unions are still weak. Businessmen have successfully resisted passage of a minimum wage law.

"But it isn't true the poor are getting poorer. Walk along the streets and see if you find a person who looks underfed. The Okinawans wear better clothes and eat better than they ever did."

"The business class is expanding," he observed, "but not fast enough to suit us. Stock ownership isn't yet widely spread."

Some Japanese social critics claim there is no middle class in Okinawa. They also assail "conspicuous consumption * * * the ostentatious display of wealth by the big businessmen who drive around in air-conditioned Cadillacs."

Such conditions, American officials point out, "are prevalent in any society that has undergone an industrial and social revolution in a decade. In time they will be corrected."

POLITICAL PARTIES AND LABOR UNIONS—POTENT FORCES IN OKINAWA'S NEW ORDER

With the passing of Okinawa's simple agricultural society, political parties and labor unions are emerging as potent forces in the new order.

Their growth and development, along "responsible" lines, have been encouraged by U.S. military authorities in the past several years.

For this, much credit is given Lt. Gen. Donald P. Booth, High Commissioner from 1958 until early this year.

The reserved, studious Booth made several moves that strengthened conservative forces and reduced the appeal of leftwing, anti-American elements.

By helping resolve the bitterly unpopular land payment policies, he gained the respect and admiration of most Okinawans.

By strongly advocating a two-party system, he helped persuade various factions to combine forces.

By permitting military-employed workers to organize, he gave the struggling young trade union movement a needed boost.

Booth's policies had tremendous impact.

Politically, they helped pave the way for formation of the Okinawa Liberal Democratic Party, which later took over legislative control. It previously had been split into three factions.

Booth aided unification efforts by promising to appoint a chief executive who belonged to the party holding a majority of legislative seats.

In the labor field, Booth's sympathetic approach was partly responsible for the tripling of union membership—from 5,000 to 15,000 in 3 years.

"It is my policy," Booth wrote an American labor organizer, "to encourage the orderly growth of the union movement. History has shown that employees' organizations have been a major factor in elevating the standard of living in modern economic life."

At the same time, Booth fought leftist political groups and discouraged unions from engaging in political activity.

He prevented the Communist-oriented Okinawa Peoples Party from publishing a newspaper (or house organ) during the election campaign. He refused to let several OPP leaders visit Japan.

Unions suspected of Communist tendencies aren't certified. That means employers are not required to bargain with them.

In his approach to both politics and unions, Booth undoubtedly was aided by Defense Department experts in Washington.

Reliable sources say top AFL–CIO leaders were consulted on ways to promote U.S. style unionism. This was done, through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to prevent leftist Japanese labor organizations from moving in on the virgin Okinawan territory.

The ICFTU had decided to send a representative to Okinawa in 1956 after a study mission reported that workers there needed help badly. But it wasn't until 1959 that a man was assigned. "Military red tape was partly to blame for delay," an ICFTU spokesman claims.

The Okinawa Liberal Democratic Party, modeled after Japan's Liberal Democratic Party and working closely with its leaders, scored a smashing victory in last November's election—capturing 22 of 29 legislative seats.

Both the Okinawa Socialist Masses Party, a reformist, middle-of-the-road group, and the radical OPP, fared badly. OSMP lost four of its nine seats, while OPP slipped from five to one. One independent was elected. Three minor parties failed to gain representation.

The most conservative and pro-American of the various political groups, OLDP leaders shrewdly decided to identify themselves with the ruling Japanese party.

To this end, Seisaku Ota, party chairman and Okinawa's chief executive, visited Japan prior to election. He conferred with Prime Minister Ikeda and other government officials. In addition to widespread publicity, it is suspected that Ota returned with a sizable campaign kitty.

The OLDP also jumped on the reversion bandwagon—emphasizing a gradual approach—which contributed to its success.

Whether Ota and OLDP can retain their lofty position hinges in large degree on the popularity of American policies. If U.S. prestige should slip, so will OLDP.

OLDP lawmakers are under fire for reneging on promises to cut taxes and boost government employees' pay. The fact they tried to raise their own salaries didn't help.

Until recently, political parties, as such, were relatively insignificant. The individual politician was the dominant factor. His personal ties and fund raising capacity were paramount.

Although "personalism" remains strong, organization, programs and issues are increasingly important. One political scientist observes:

"Political trends of the past few years have indicated the rising importance of issues; men and parties of supposed prestige have been defeated by the issues and organization activities of their opponents. A transition of substantial proportions appears to be slowly underway."

Simultaneously, pressure groups—teachers, businessmen, unionists—are gaining in number and influence. The leading newspaper, the Okinawa Times, is said to be crucial to the formation of public opinion.

If voter turnout is an accurate barometer, Okinawans would appear to enjoy their politics. Of 448,887 registered voters, 376,241, or 85 percent, participated in the last legislative election.

Still, there are people who doubt the extent to which they have embraced democracy.

"In our 16 years here," one observer commented, "we have never really gotten across the real meaning of democracy. Many Okinawans don't understand that while democracy has privileges, they must be earned.

"There still a lot of vote buying and some neighborhoods operate under a group system whereby everybody votes as a bloc for a certain candidate—the candidate who appeals most to their emotions."

The fledgling labor unions also are troubled by growing pains.

They have been handicapped by lack of experience, political interference, and inter-union strife. Various leftwing groups have attempted to horn in on their activities—particularly a Marxist student organization.

Just 18 months ago, there was a bitter laundry strike. Employees, working for 5 cents an hour (under sweatshop conditions), struck for 9.

Student agitators moved in. They carried placards reading "Ban the Bomb," "Ban the Bases," "Reversion Now." They chanted slogans and snake danced on the picket line. Popular revulsion to such tactics helped doom the strike.

"That kind of activity appears to be on the decline," an American official said. "But the unions are made up of young kids in low-paying industries who may be susceptible to the leftist movement. There's no cause for complacency."

Methods used are often quite unorthodox—at least by U.S. standards.

During a recent strike, the company manager, a prominent American businessman, was held captive in his office for 25 hours. Okinawan police said they couldn't interfere unless there was violence. U.S. military officials stayed aloof.

The businessman finally was rescued by Attorney Charles Hagood, formerly of Honolulu. Hagood cleared a path by swinging a bulging briefcase at the strikers—to enable police intervention. The demonstrators backed off.

Commenting on the incident and several similar ones, the magazine This Week on Okinawa said:

"Many nonmilitary Americans * * * have come to the conclusion that if they want protection they must provide it themselves. It is time for the authorities to decide whether law or vigilante action will prevail."

The local American Chamber of Commerce, fearful of "irresponsible" labor practices, recently proposed a Taft-Hartley type law for Okinawa.

A union group exploded.

"We protest the slave wage policies of the chamber and the explotation of Okinawans by foreign businessmen. We will push for reversion to Japan," said the unionists.

"They completely ignored the fact," said Chamber President Dale Lock, "that we favor a 12-cent-an-hour minimum wage law and 12 cents is a lot more than many workers now make."

WHAT THE OKINAWANS WOULD LIKE TO DO ABOUT THEIR ORPHAN STATUS

Asking an Okinawan if he would like once more to be part of Japan is like asking an orphan if he would like to have parents. The answer, almost invariably, is yes.

The reversion question, of course, isn't that simple. It is so complex, in fact, so entangled in the web of international diplomacy, it makes clear-cut analysis difficult.

Some general observations:

Okinawans consider themselves to be Japanese by culture and desire. A vast majority favors reverting to Japan's control.

Most realize that immediate reversion is neither practical nor even possible.

Most are friendly to Americans and would be willing to permit the United States to retain her bases.

They suspect, and with good reason, that the present Japanese Government isn't anxious to take them back—at least not yet. They are both bewildered and dismayed by this attitude.

A young Okinawan political leader sees reversion in this light:

"We would like to revert to Japan tomorrow. We know that is impossible.

"We understand and appreciate why the United States is here—to help keep the peace in Asia. We know that if the United States pulled out, there would be a great economic crash. Many people would lose their jobs. The standard of living would go down.

"We favor reversion—when time and the war situation permits. Once the free nations and the Communist countries work out some permanent ways of peace, peaceful coexistence, then Okinawa can revert to Japan."

He said reversion would bring certain economic benefits.

"Modern society is progressing toward the welfare state. But things like retirement systems and crop insurance require a big pool. We can't afford them. As part of Japan, we would be eligible for these benefits.

"Furthermore, under Japan's prefectural equalization formula, we would collect more than $14 million a year in Federal aid. The United States only gives us $4½ million.

"Until such time as we do revert, we want closer ties with Japan. We hope the United States will permit this."

Basically, his views reflect those of the conservative, pro-American Liberal Democratic Party. It favors a step-by-step or piecemeal approach to reversion.

Other political leaders and pressure groups urge reversion "as soon as possible." A small, radical minority demands "immediate and complete" reversion, plus abolition of U.S. bases.

Political scientists and American officials agree that most Okinawans favor ultimate reversion to Japan.

Why?

"Japan is the fountainhead of Okinawan culture," explains Prof. Ralph Braibanti of Duke University. "Okinawans now live in a cultureless vacuum. The principal factor behind reversionist sentiment and anti-Americanism has been the uneasiness arising from uncertainty.

"The present statelessness of Ryukyuans is bewildering and degrading. They are citizens of neither Japan nor the United States nor even of a Ryukyuan nation."

Tsuyoshi Ginoza, an Okinawan who wrote his master's thesis (University of Wisconsin) on the international legal status of the Ryukyus, points out that Okinawans:

"Don't enjoy the guarantees of either the Japanese or the U.S. Constitutions. Travel abroad, even a short visit to Japan, may be restricted by the passport control of the administering authority."

An American official believes the reversion question is more of a "popular feeling than a political movement. The people want to belong to somebody and the United States has said she doesn't want them permanently."

Although it is as politically unpopular to oppose reversion as it was in Hawaii to buck statehood, there are dissenters.

Discounting a few "independence" advocates, most opponents are businessmen who are fearful of competing against their shrewder and more experienced Japanese counterparts.

"We have a protected economy now," one told me. "We like things the way they are. The Japanese would gobble us up. Sure, we're for reversion—after we die."

An American of Okinawan ancestry, visiting relatives in Naha, bristled when asked about reversion.

"That's all they talk about—reversion, reversion, reversion. It makes me sick. They don't know how well off they are. They can't compete with the Japanese. They'll lose their jobs."

U.S. military authorities are adamantly opposed to reversion. Some regard the movement as subversive.

"Reversion to Japan?" a colonel said, thinking out loud. "Not under any conditions."

"To maintain bases on Okinawa by agreement with a sovereign Japan," says another opponent, "would be to subject the security of our principal Pacific base to the uncertainties of our relations with Japan."

Okinawan leaders, of various political shades, appear to be increasingly suspicious of Japan's reversionist position.

The Okinawa Times, the leading newspaper strongly criticized Prime Minister Ikeda for failing to bring up the subject at his summit conference with President Kennedy.

The Times assumed that Ikeda, as leader of the country with residual sovereignty rights, would naturally request return of administrative authority. Ikeda's failure to do so, editorialized the Times, "reveals the

weak-kneed attitude of the Japanese Government."

The Times deemed "regrettable" the fact that "public election of the chief executive, freedom of travel to Japan, and expansion of automony, were disregarded at the conference; * * * we cannot deny the fact that Okinawan problems have seen no progress."

If, as is generally believed, virtually all elements in Japan want Okinawa back, how can Ikeda's position be explained?

One can only speculate. Some educated guesses:

If Japan regained control, permitting the United States to retain its bases, there would be a renewal of leftist agitation in Japan which could endanger United States-Japan relations.

Ikeda's government likes the feeling of security its gets from the presence of a powerful American military establishment on Okinawa.

Japan can use Okinawa as a leverage to extract economic and other concessions from the United States.

It would be too costly for Japan. In addition to subsidizing the Okinawan Government, she would lose a large American dollar market.

"Why take a sick child now when he's healing?" an Okinawan businessman said. "Wait until he gets healthy and then he can come home to Papa."

Meantime, it can be assumed that Okinawan leaders will continue to apply reversion pressure to both American and Japanese Governments—if for no other reason than to squeeze the last possible yen and dollar out of both.

THE CONLON REPORT—DO WE MISTRUST DEMOCRACY ON OKINAWA?

What Okinawans consider the most significant postwar analysis of their country and its problems is viewed with disfavor by U.S. military authorities.

That is because the study, made less than 2 years ago for the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, advocates American civilian administration for Okinawa.

Called the Conlon report, it was prepared by Robert A. Scalapino of the University of California.

Although the Okinawa section is only five pages long and is available free, the High Commissioner's Office of Public Affairs doesn't have copies.

Or so this reporter was told several times at the office itself.

"Okinawan leaders," I was assured by various observers, "swear by the Conlon report. It's like a bible to them."

They are impatient for the day when the American Government will carry out its recommendations.

Principal points in this report:

U.S. civilian government should be established within the near future.

Okinawa's chief executive should be elected.

Most Okinawans want to revert to Japan.

The United States, before too long, should probably return Okinawa to Japanese control with an agreement permitting retention of military bases.

The United States inept handling of the land issue a few years back did much to create a strong leftwing political movement.

Main policy issues confronting America in Okinawa, the report points out, turn on the type of administration and the degree of local self-government.

"At present, Okinawa is under military rule; the high commissioner is the commanding general. The primary argument for this system is that since we are in Okinawa for military reasons only, it is logical that military authorities hold responsibility for policy decisions.

"It has been argued that a civilian head would lack authority and might be ineffective in the face of military pressures."

The case for continued military administration is not without merit, the report says, but arguments "favoring some type of civilian administration are more powerful."

Three main arguments are:

Almost all Okinawan leaders, with very few exceptions, favor a civilian government.

It would create a much more effective political symbol for the United States in Okinawa and in the whole of Asia.

It would be a logical step in the growth of America's position in Okinawa, complement local democratic efforts, and represent a necessary transitional stage prior to any Japanese administration.

The report suggests that a civilian high commissioner could fuction under either the Department of Defense, State or Interior as long as he had explicit lines of authority.

U.S. refusal to permit election of the chief executive is very vulnerable politically, the report notes.

Having established Okinawan democracy, we are now saying that we do not trust it. To many Okinawan leaders this stand is retrogression. If our position is adamantly held, once again the cause of political moderation in Okinawa may be harmed.

The United States should permit the election of the Okinawan chief executive.

Past U.S. mistakes did much to promote the cause of radicalism in Okinawan politics, the report claims.

"The leftwing Okinawa Peoples Party, capitalizing upon our deeply unpopular land policies, rose rapidly after 1952 to become the strongest single force in Okinawa politics.

"Our abandonment of the lump-sum payment system has helped to reduce the appeal of radicalism.

"Obviously, the Okinawan political scene has elements of weakness and uncertainty.

"In part, the fault is ours. We did much to build a far-left movement in this unlikely place by failing to handle basic issues like land policy properly and in time."

Since the Conlon report was written, the conservative pro-American Okinawa Liberal Democratic Party is now the single strongest force.

Prior to 1960, conservative elements had been hurt by internal dissension and America's land policies.

On the reversion issue, the report says, in part:

"The Okinawan people are Japanese in culture and in desire.

"By a heavy majority they favor return to Japan, but their interest in the subject or intensity of feeling varies with the individual or social group and with the times.

"The call for reversion is partly a form of protest. Thus, when grievances mount, it becomes louder, while in periods of relative satisfaction, it is more subdued.

"Broadly speaking, however, the overall political pressure for reversion will probably become stronger rather than weaker with the passage of time."

While the climate of American-Okinawan relations is greatly improved, the report says, "these gains can probably be held and advanced only if development continues on both the economic and political fronts."

The report ends on this note:

"At some point in the not-distant future, it will probably be desirable to return Okinawa to Japanese authorities, with an agreement for the retention of American military bases.

"In the meantime, we should take the political and economic actions necessary to make our positions most acceptable and beneficial to the Okinawans whose good will we will always want."

IF WE FAIL IN OKINAWA, WE MAY NOT ONLY LOSE 800,000 OKINAWANS, BUT 2 BILLION ASIANS

It would seem time for America to take a hard, searching look at her 16-year occupation of Okinawa to determine what our future position there should be.

Some observers believe present U.S. policies in her key Pacific defense outpost could, if left unchanged, seriously tarnish America's image in the eyes of all Asians.

Some principal areas to consider:

The United States never has indicated how long she intends to rule Okinawa, except for general references that it will be as long as conditions of threat and tension exist in the Far East.

The continued need for a military-style regime in opposition both to American traditions of civil supremacy and the desires of the Okinawan people.

The failure to permit a greater measure of self-government.

Unrealistically low economic aid policies which are in striking contrast to America's open-handed generosity toward other Far East countries.

Certainly the most delicate, and complex, problem involved in United States-Okinawa relations is the occupation's duration.

Will it last for 5 years? Ten years? Fifty years? Okinawans would like some idea of how long the United States plans to retain administrative control.

There are two broad alternatives, a consultant to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee has pointed out:

Maintain the status quo and refuse to speculate on future plans, or think in terms of laying the groundwork for eventually returning Okinawa to Japan.

While the first alternative has "maximum military flexibility and convenience * * * it has one fatal weakness: it pays no homage to the dominant political factors in the equation, and would ultimately be self-defeating.

"Our Okinawa policy must be a part of, not apart from, our Japan policy. The political facts of life dictate that Okinawa is Japanese and must at some point revert to Japan.

"A proper sense of timing on this issue and correct interim policies, both political and economic, are crucial to our long-range interests."

A veteran Okinawan observer put it this way:

"It is the young Okinawan, seeking identity, who will fight hardest for reversion unless he is given a more specific answer to the how-long-will-it-be question.

"He does not know that Japan treated Okinawa like a poor country cousin before the war. He only knows he wants to be part of a bigger entity and that, at the present, his Japanese counterpart is better educated, better fed and clothed in most areas."

The question of U.S. military versus civilian control has been given scant attention in Congress.

A Congressman who broached the subject to a Defense Department official last year was brushed off.

"The Department of Defense is not prepared to contemplate this (civilian control) in the immediate future," the official said.

Many observers believe the issue is an important one that should be thoroughly reviewed by key administration and congressional leaders.

Although all political elements in Okinawa are clamoring for more self-government, their pleas have been resisted.

Principal issue is election of the chief executive. Okinawan leaders have difficulty understanding why this "democratic" move is opposed—particularly when the U.S. high commissioner has absolute veto power.

U.S. economic aid has been woefully inadequate, the Okinawans complain. From 1954 to 1959 it averaged little more than $1 million a year.

Congress, apparently agreeing the Okinawans had a legitimate gripe, last year authorized a maximum of $6 million a year for economic assistance. But it appropriated only $4.4 million.

The so-called Price bill was hailed by Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE as a "symbol of economic salvation for the Okinawan people." Okinawans agree it was a big step forward. But they are fighting for a minimum of $10 million annually—an amount top American officials privately admit could be wisely spent.

Other areas where present policies could stand reexamination include matters like travel restrictions between Okinawa and Japan, applicability of the U.S. Constitution, legality of the court system, the need for a separate immigration quota for Okinawans.

Six years ago, American newsman Larry Krebs discussed Okinawa's significance in an editorial that attracted considerable attention. It would appear to be equally valid today. Said the editorial in part:

"Okinawa is as important a place as exists in today's troubled world. The world has always been troubled but Okinawa has not always been so important.

"It's important for three reasons: it is a military base; it is part of Asia; it is under the complete control of the United States. Its value as a military base is generally known and accepted; its significance as part of Asia is not.

"Elsewhere in the world our foreign policy has inherent excuses to cover failure: the resurgence of nationalism curtails a policy in one country; the fall of a cabinet precipitates a crisis in another; Communists snarl a plan in a third.

"Not so on Okinawa. Here we, and we alone, control. Here is Asia with the age-old problems of land, of poverty, of disease, of democracy without a democratic tradition, the problems of an uprooted, bifurcated culture with shallow roots in the past and vague hopes for the future. The problems of a people shopping for something to put their trust in.

"Solve these problems even partially and the world will point a finger and marvel. But if, with unlimited control and virtually unlimited funds, if we can't make the American dream work for 800,000 Ryukyuans, the 2 billion Asians will know it.

"We may not only lose face; we may lose Asia."

UHF Versus VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have been much concerned over a situation which has arisen as a result of an order recently issued by the Federal Communications Commission on deintermixture. This concerns some eight major cities, and I believe, if carried out, will ultimately spread to possibly every other city in the country that now enjoys very high frequency reception. In effect, the order of the Commission requires the cities affected to utilize ultra high frequency in lieu of very high frequency, thus depriving many areas of all reception.

For the benefit of my colleagues whom I know are most interested in this matter I include, under unanimous consent, the various bills and resolutions that have been introduced in this Congress to this particular matter in the RECORD at this point:

H. R. 9267
[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
September 16, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H. R. 9277
[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
September 18, 1961

Mr. MOSS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between 54 megacycles and 216 megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H. R. 9291
[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
September 19, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four mega-

cycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commmerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H. R. 9293

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 19, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public, apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H. R. 9322

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 20, 1961

Mr. RILEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", but nothing in this Act shall authorize the Commission to delete the assignment of any television frequency between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) made to any community on or prior to September 1, 1961, for the purpose of having all commercial and educational television stations in that community operate on frequencies outside the frequency band between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels)".

SEC. 2. Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(s) Have authority to require that apparatus designed to receive television pictures broadcast simultaneously with sound be capable of receiving all frequencies allocated by the Commission to television broadcasting, including frequencies between fifty-four megacycles and two hundred and sixteen megacycles (very high frequency channels) so allocated on September 1, 1961, and to prescribe minimum performance capabilities for such apparatus appropriate to such requirement, when such apparatus is traded, shipped, or transported in interstate commerce, or is imported from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public."

SEC. 3. Title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROHIBITION AGAINST SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN TELEVISION SETS

"SEC. 330. No person shall trade, ship, or transport in interstate commerce, or import from any foreign country into the United States, for sale or resale to the public apparatus described in paragraph (s) of section 303 unless it complies with the requirements prescribed by the Commission pursuant to the authority provided in that paragraph: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to carriers transporting such apparatus without trading in it."

H. R. 9349

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 21, 1961

Mr. MACK introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

A BILL

To amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the authority of the Federal Communications Commission in the allocation of television channels

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(ff) 'Very high frequentcy band' means that part of the radio spectrum between thirty and three hundred megacycles.

"(gg) 'Ultra high frequency band' means that part of the radio spectrum between three hundred and three thousand megacycles."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 307) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "It shall be unlawful for the Commission, in allocating television channels in the very high frequency and ultra high frequency bands, (1) to give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular municipality, locality, or region, or (2) to subject any particular municipality, locality, or region to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage."

H. RES. 450

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

August 31, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has sought congressional appropriations in excess of $2,000,000 for the purpose of conducting a special engineering study of telecasting on ultrahigh frequencies to explore the effectiveness of ultra-high-frequency television service, to determine the proper place of ultrahigh frequencies in our nationwide television system, to provide required additional information upon which basic administrative decisions on television channel allocations can properly be made, and to inquire into ways and means of improving ultra-high-frequency receivers and antennas; and

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress, on the basis of the foregoing requests, has appropriated funds in the amount of $2,000,000 for the conduct of such an experimental Commission study of ultra-high-frequency telecasting to be held in New York City; and

Whereas the Commission's ultra-high-frequency study is now only in the preparatory stage with operations not scheduled to commence until late 1961 and the final results thereof pursuant to a six-month extension recently requested of Congress by the Commission not scheduled to be ready until January 1963, or thereafter; and

Whereas it is recognized at the Commission and throughout the broadcasting industry that under the present state of the art, very high frequency channels and service are directly superior to the ultrahigh frequency in terms of wider coverage, receiver and antenna characteristics, and more widespread distribution of very high frequency receivers; and

Whereas the Commission, without awaiting the conduct or results of its experimental study of the ultrahigh frequency has, by proceedings instituted on July 27, 1961, now proposed to take far-reaching allocations actions which would require the deletion of existing very high frequency channels on an ad hoc basis in a number of American cities and would compel the very high frequency stations operating thereon to abandon their wider coverage very high frequency service so as to shift over to ultra-high-frequency channels and service; and

Whereas the results of the Commission's experimental ultra-high-frequency study for which substantial funds were appropriated would demonstrably be critical to any proper evaluation of the pending Commission proposals to delete existing very high frequency channels and service in favor of the ultrahigh frequency: Now, be it and it is hereby

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission should take no further action in those proceedings instituted by it on July 27, 1961, which would look to or would compel any television station operating on a very high frequency to shift therefrom to an ultrahigh frequency, until the Commission's pending ultra-high-frequency study shall have been completed and a full and detailed report on the procedures, data, findings, and results of such study shall have been made readily available to the Congress and to the public.

H. RES. 457

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 14, 1961

Mr. ANDREWS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the House of Representatives is opposed to the Federal Communications Commission's conducting any proceedings or taking any other action looking toward the involuntary change of any commercial or educational television station from a very high frequency to an ultra high frequency until at least six months after the study of ultra high frequency television broadcasting for which funds were appropriated by the Eighty-sixth Congress shall have been completed and a full, complete, and detailed report on the procedures, findings, and results of such study, together with data collected during the study, shall have been made readily available to the Congress and to the public.

H. RES. 469

[87th Congress, 1st Session]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

September 18, 1961

Mr. GRANT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13) are particularly well suited to providing reliable high technical quality television service to the public throughout wide areas, especially in small and medium-sized communities and in the rural, farm, and other outlying sections of the Nation, that the present very high frequency channels are therefore absolutely essential to a nationwide television system in the public interest and none of them should be wasted, that stations now operating on the present very high frequency channels provide television service which is especially vital to the public, and that it would be contrary to the public interest for the public to be deprived of, or to have impaired, the television service it now receives from the existing stations operating on the present very high frequency channels; and be it further

Resolved, That it is therefore the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the Federal Communications Commission should not conduct any proceedings, or adopt or promulgate any rule or order, or take any other action which looks toward or which would require a commercial or educational television station now operating on one of the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13) to change its operations to any channel other than another of the present very high frequency television channels (channels 2–13).

Tribute to Frank Boyden, Headmaster of Deerfield Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Deerfield Academy, I should like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], in tribute to a distinguished humanitarian who is completing his 60th year as headmaster of Deerfield Academy, one of America's great independent schools. Dr. Frank L. Boyden is today revered not only in the world of education, but throughout the world at large for his understanding of, and faith in, boys. Never one to restrict his efforts solely to the promising student, his faith in boys who were problems to others as well as themselves has been justified a thousand times as they have assumed positions of leadership in the armed services, in the professions, in business, in government, and, of course, in education. It is no exaggeration to say that Dr. Boyden has molded the character of his times through the sense of responsibility which he instilled in his students. As a lover of horses, of baseball, and of boys, Dr. Boyden and Mrs. Boyden, too, today receive the respect and affection of "the sons of Deerfield" from all corners of the globe. It is my privilege to be counted among this fortunate band. My experience under the warm but watchful eye of the great headmaster remains a cherished part of my heritage as I pay tribute to a great American.

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, your committee presents a bill to this House which is $860,900,000 below the budget estimate for foreign aid. There are some other minor items providing a further reduction of $10 million.

The committee and the members of the conference committee who were thinking about it are very much disturbed about this situation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States at this moment has a debt of $295 billion. Last year we had a deficit of $3,900 million for the 12 months ending June 30, 1961. To August 31 this fiscal year, we were running behind $5 billion, while for the first 18 days of September, we ran behind $1,584 million, a higher rate than last year.

That is one of the reasons why some of us feel so strongly we cannot support a bill for foreign relief, which is plunging our country into deeper and deeper debt over the years. The people who have been operating this thing, and especially those who have promoted this Development Loan business without knowing enough about it to realize what their situation is and what the situation of the country is, are convincing more and more thinking people every year that we must quit the business of dumping $4 billion in 1 year out the window, where it is doing the people of this country no good at all.

Next year, when we sit down to mark up a bill of this kind, if we do it for as large an amount as is being demanded this year, there is going to be no escape from wildcat inflation. There is no question but what there will be a deficit exceeding $20 billion this fiscal year which ends on June 30 next, and that is going to be followed by wildcat inflation.

I hope that the people of the United States will come to realize what they are doing to our country for there can be no salvation unless the people come to realize how necessary it is to balance our budget and conserve our resources.

I am submitting herewith tables that show not only regular appropriations from the U.S. Treasury, but the "back door" authorizations to withdraw funds from the Treasury. The back-door authorizations run to $19,673 million. The regular and permanent appropriations will run more than $93 billion. The total authorizations to expend given by this first session of the 87th Congress will run to over $113 billion.

This means that with prospective receipts we can expect our national debt to expand about $20 billion to $315 billion.

How can we ever expect to have a balanced budget if we are going to continue that sort of riotous spending? Bankruptcy and terrific inflation are all that I can see ahead, face to face with these figures.

The tables that are referred to follow:

Table of regular appropriation bills, 1st sess., 87th Cong.

Title	Budget estimates to House	House action	Budget estimates to Senate	Senate action	Conference final	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
3d supplemental	$1,235,482,769	$803,506,119	$5,275,213,127	$4,637,419,970	$1,604,055,637	−$3,581,157,490
Inter-American program	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	
4th supplemental	88,024,000	47,214,000	88,024,000	47,214,000	47,214,000	−40,810,000
Total, 1961 supplementals	1,923,506,769	1,450,720,119	5,963,237,127	5,284,633,970	2,341,269,637	−3,621,967,490
1962 appropriations:						
Treasury-Post Office	5,371,801,000	5,281,865,000	5,371,801,000	5,327,631,000	5,298,765,000	−73,036,000
Interior	782,387,000	753,319,000	782,387,000	813,399,850	779,158,650	−3,228,350
Labor-HEW	4,282,148,081	4,327,457,000	5,004,281,081	5,161,380,000	4,915,965,000	−88,316,081
Legislative	105,647,577	104,353,335	136,082,802	135,432,065	135,432,065	−650,737
State, Justice, judiciary	795,891,202	751,300,050	795,891,202	762,038,550	756,422,550	−39,468,652
Agriculture	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	6,089,244,000	5,967,457,500	5,967,494,500	−121,749,500
Loan authorizations	(612,000,000)	(629,900,000)	(612,000,000)	(725,500,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)
Independent offices	8,625,561,000	8,404,098,000	9,174,561,000	9,098,769,500	8,966,285,000	−208,276,000
General Government—Commerce	666,278,000	626,958,000	666,278,000	650,438,200	641,135,800	−25,142,200
Defense	42,942,345,000	42,711,105,000	46,396,945,000	46,848,292,000	46,662,556,000	+265,611,000
District of Columbia	(292,438,188)	(268,122,400)	(292,827,398)	(270,438,360)	(270,067,897)	(−22,759,501)
Loan authorization	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(+4,400,000)
Federal payment	30,753,000	32,753,000	39,753,000	32,753,000	32,753,000	−7,000,000
Military construction	1,047,568,000	883,359,000	1,047,568,000	1,020,146,750	951,990,750	−95,577,250
Foreign assistance	4,993,901,000	3,835,245,000	4,993,901,000	4,416,091,000	4,123,345,000	−870,646,000
Public works	3,732,038,000	3,662,701,380	4,000,788,000	3,940,926,880	3,908,880,980	−91,907,020
Supplemental	604,975,447	573,040,923	1,134,639,841	1,068,503,903	1,125,927,341	−8,712,500
Total, 1962 appropriations	80,079,628,307	77,896,020,688	85,634,210,926	85,243,260,198	84,265,811,636	−971,265,020
Total, all appropriations	82,003,135,076	79,346,740,807	91,597,448,053	90,527,894,168	86,607,081,273	−4,990,372,280
Total, loan authorizations	(636,600,000)	(658,900,000)	(636,600,000)	(754,500,000)	(754,500,000)	(+117,900,000)

"Back door" bills, 1st sess., 87th Cong.

Title	Executive requests	Senate action	House action	Enacted
Veterans' direct loans, multiyear (public debt)		$1,050,000,000	$1,050,000,000	$1,050,000,000
Area redevelopment, multiyear (public debt)	($300,000,000)	300,000,000	(300,000,000)	300,000,000
Agricultural commodities, sales for foreign currencies (contract authority)	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
Special milk program (contract authority)	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
Housing Act (public debt and contract authority)	8,003,000,000	8,103,000,000	8,803,000,000	8,858,000,000
Cape Cod National Seashore Park (contract authority)	(16,000,000)	16,000,000	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)
Federal aid to airports (contract authority)	375,000,000	375,000,000	(375,000,000)	(225,000,000)
Mutual security, 5 years (public debt, contract authority, use of certain repayments)	9,187,000,000	8,187,000,000	400,000,000	300,000,000
Highway Act (contract authority, diversion to "trust fund")		1,660,000,000	1,803,000,000	1,660,000,000
Agricultural Act	9,000,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000	5,400,000,000
Total	28,670,000,000	27,196,000,000	19,561,000,000	19,673,000,000

Trend of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article by Nate White from the Christian Science Monitor of September 23, 1961. This emphasizes the importance of budgetary and fiscal responsibility by our Government if we are to retain our position of world leadership. Taken in connection with the growing power and cohesion of the European Common Market—especially since Great Britain has applied for admission—failure to maintain sound financial policies would be even more dangerous.

The article also indicates the damage already done to our world position by the statements made by high officials in the Kennedy administration during the past months and by its extravagant domestic spending programs to date. I might add that Mr. Kennedy's campaign statements about the stagnant condition of our economy were a contributing factor.

The article follows:

TREND OF THE ECONOMY
(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—Despite the fact that he started with serious handicaps, U.S. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon emerged from the Vienna meeting of the Central Bankers of the free world with a hard-won laurel wreath on his head.

This was the meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund, the most sophisticated group of monetary authorities in the world.

This board heard and saw Mr. Dillon. He had one theme which he constantly reiterated in his formal address and in private to the key Central Bankers. This was that the U.S. economy was on a substantial upward pattern of expansion, of vigorous economic growth, and that above all the Kennedy administration was determined to balance the Federal budget in the fiscal year 1963 which begins next July 1.

The central bankers were impressed with Mr. Dillon, even though they continued to hold their own private views of the U.S. economy. These private views were best expressed by the French who today are the proud possessors of a franc which is one of the world's strongest currencies, a currency with a gold content of nearly 75 percent.

The French supported the general idea of expanding the funds which would be available to the IMF for handling any emergency request for assistance from a country whose currency was in trouble. But they also said that there must be firm rules and requirements, that such a fund should not be automatic, like a checking account, and that they intended to be consulted about any use which would be made of IMF resources, particularly where the franc was involved.

Banker after banker from Europe made it clear: "Yes, we will help strengthen the IMF with our currencies, but we will not give IMF carte blanche. Automacity is out. And if we need our money ourselves we shall want it back in a hurry."

This is the new situation in the world. The dollar no longer dictates the terms. The Europeans dictate the terms.

Vermont Royster, the editor of the Wall Street Journal commented from Vienna on the irony in the situation. Time was when U.S. officials lectured the French and Italians about putting their economic houses in order. Yet here at Vienna were the French and their colleagues in Europe lecturing Mr. Dillon on sound fiscal policies.

Small wonder.

Mr. Dillon went to Vienna from an administration which came into office 8 months ago with an economic policy report, prepared by Dr. Paul Samuelson, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which said that "a grave economic challenge confronts our economic system," that "stagnation in the American economy can prevent us from making those improvements in our industrial productivity." and which used adjectives to describe the economy as "basically sluggish," "disappointingly slack," "sagging," and "anemic."

Only 6 months ago President Kennedy's economic advisers headlined "chronic slack" as the economy's basic problem.

Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg painted the economy in the early months of the administration in terms of deep depression.

Mr. Dillon had to overcome at Vienna the nagging doubt of the European central bankers that the Kennedy administration was still responding to yeasty pressures, born of the recession, and might not apply sufficient discipline to the new upward movement which is now developing.

The Kennedy administration's commitment to policies of "compensatory deficits" to overcome unemployment has not been lost on Europe's chief bankers. Mr. Dillon made the point over and over again that the United States would balance its budget in fiscal 1963. A few thought Mr. Dillon, like the player queen in Hamlet, "protests too much."

Vienna moved the free world's monetary system a step beyond the present ad hoc or "play it by ear" arrangements to more formal agreements for a strong IMF. The new moves do not contain the automacity urged by some specialists nor is the IMF converted into a supranational bank, as urged by Dr. Robert Triffin.

The hard fact clear from the Vienna meetings is that the monetary specialists of the world are now in position to dictate terms under which they assist the dollar. These terms are simply: budgetary and fiscal responsibility in the United States.

Extremist Views Sow Distrust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an article which recently appeared in the New World, published in Chicago by the archdiocese of the Roman Catholic Church.

I believe that Reverend Graney has placed this entire question of those who propone extremist views in its proper perspective.

I think this article will go a long way in helping all Americans meet the challenge of Communist subversion and yet not destroy the basic elements of respect for the views of others so inherent in the very structure of our Nation's basic philosophy.

Father Graney's article follows:

EXTREMIST VIEWS SOW DISTRUST

(By William F. Graney)

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker has drawn sympathy from certain quarters as another anti-Communist suffering for his cause. Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society which Walker reportedly joined here in Chicago, and the beleaguered general, are defended by a line of reasoning that says:

"How can there be anything bad about an anti-Communist? There must be some good a man like Welch is doing in alerting Americans to the menace of communism. The only ones being hurt by him are the Communists. Let him run awhile."

In fact, the Communists are not the ones being hurt. Welch is not turning up any Communists. All his efforts only build up a spirit of distrust among Americans right at the very time when trust in one another may be a most important asset of this country.

There are two identifiable lines of political thought running through this Nation at the present time. One is called liberal, the other conservative. Both of them are legitimate points of view for Americans, but they oppose one another in areas like foreign aid, Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged.

The basic point in all these clashes is not so much their outcome as the means through which they are settled. If they are settled through the democratic processes outlined in the Constitution then we can still say this is Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. For this reason we Americans have to trust one another, even and perhaps especially those with whom we disagree.

Now a man like Robert Welch has no such trust in his fellow Americans, nor in fact in the very processes of democracy. For him every American who promotes the politically liberal point of view is a Communist, or a collaborator with the Communists, or a dupe of the same. He says such people of a liberal bent of mind are laying the groundwork for a sellout to the Communists. His attempts to undermine people's confidence in their elected and duly appointed representatives add nothing to the discussion and pursuit of this Nation's hopes and goals. He leads to only a self-defeating fear and distrust of one another.

The trend of his thought as expressed in his "Blue Book" and the dismissal of all present political leaders as treacherous or inadequate lead to only one possible conclusion: make Welch our dictator. And this distilled idea does drop down to at least some of his followers. It can be seen, for instance, in letters to the editors in Chicago papers, which, by the way, give an outlandishly large amount of space to this segment of the community's thought. A recent letter in one of the papers wistfully sighed for a dictator to arise amongst us to lead the Nation from its present peril, a Lincoln-like dictator to be sure, but a dictator.

Welch travels under the disguise of a conservative anti-Communist. If his purpose were truly to promote the development of conservative thought and win it more popular understanding and support, he would deserve nothing but praise. Or if his purpose truly were to educate people on the philosophy and ambitions of communism, the need and the difficulty of dealing with it effectively, then again his efforts would be laudatory. But he destroys the value of both his conservatism and his anticommunism by his unreasonable insistence that anyone who disagrees with his conservative point of view is a Communist, a dupe, etc.

The anticommunism of Welch or others who sail under his banner brings immediate denunciation. Those who disagree with his accusation that support of a politically liberal point of view reveals a Communist are left no choice. They have to resist such anticommunism, for they see it doing more harm than good.

Boiling Out Basic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we hear talk of extremism, its causes and effects, and it was therefore with great interest I read the editorial in the September 20 issue of the Ellsworth Messenger, written by Dwight Payton, editor and publisher of that paper. In my opinion, his treatment of the problem is an objective analysis and a look at the cold hard facts involved. I commend his excellent discussion to those willing to boil out of the basic issues and face them squarely:

BOILING OUT BASIC ISSUES

There are so many ulcer starters in the world today most folks contend by simply ignoring the unpleasant and concentrating on the sunny side of life.

There is some virtue conceded to looking on the bright side but there always come times when the dark side demands attention if disaster is to be avoided. Right now, for instance, Americans need to be aware of the war threat. The towering national debt and the threat it spawns of run-away inflation are of grave concern to all but the thoughtless. The acceleration in recent years of the socialistic trend, the threat to national security posed by gangster labor bosses—these problems are ulcer fodder for sure.

We ignore them because we feel impotent and incompetent to do anything about them. But they won't just go away so thought should be given.

Perhaps the feeling of futility most of us have in face of today's complexity develops because of our inability to think our problems down to basic issues where understanding begins. Perhaps what we call problems are only symptoms of more basic ills.

The gulf between right and left, conservative and liberal in America has widened alarmingly and it well may prove to be that this fact keys most of the other problems besetting us. We talk about creating understanding among the peoples of the world yet we fail to understand each other right here at home. What is the cause of this widening gap, and what the implications?

It is entirely possible and even probable that unless better understanding and greater tolerance here in America is developed, and speedily, our whole society could just bog down. We become a Nation of extremists with no middle ground, a Nation wherein the binder of convictions held in common has been lost. We become a Nation divided and as such weakened.

Extremism only becomes dangerous when extremists become monopolists and dominate thinking. This has become the case today. The average citizen, the common man, the middle grounder has lost his voice by allowing himself to become segmented into special interest groups and subsidized into silence. He practices escapism by the simple procedure of ignoring problems. Concentration on pleasure has become the sedative, the sleeping pill for the men and women who used to serve as balance wheel of our society.

Extremists rule the day. The liberals openly fight to complete the transformation of the American way of life to socialism. The conservatives seek to hold America to its origin of individual freedom.

Boil away all the semantical camouflage and confusion and reduce issues to naked finality and the extremists in America are fighting the age old battle of freedom versus slavery.

Realization of this will be a shocker to many, but the truth stands. We come to the final moment of decision—regimentation or freedom, big government over the masses or big individuals over government, free enterprise or government control, the American dream or socialism's sugar-coated nightmare.

It is ironical that the last exercise of freedom for a free society is the right to embrace regimentation.

The first step in salvation always is to identify truth and face reality. The widening gulf between the extremists is a danger signal. If we don't face facts and decide issues on the point of truth the decisions will be made for us, willy-nilly.

Big government or little government? People independent of government or dependent on government? Private ownership of wealth or State ownership? Responsible freedom under God's laws or prostituted freedom of men's making? Spiritual factors dominant or materialism?

Freedom or slavery?

Education and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director of the American Federation of Teachers, made a study 10 years ago at the University of Missouri of the college and university preparation of Members of Congress. He has brought this study up to date in a report entitled "Education and Congress." I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND CONGRESS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers)

INTRODUCTION

Ten years have passed since I made a study at the University of Missouri entitled "The College and University Preparation of Members of Congress, 1937–51." A part of this study was introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Wednesday, April 23, 1952, by the then U.S. Representative Clare Magee, of Missouri. The study was based on the various editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the appropriate years. As some Members do not fully cover their educational attainments in their biographical sketches, there was chance for error. The margin of error, however, was extremely small because the record is reviewed each 2 years. Twenty-three points were established to classify this information. These were:

1. No university or college training indicated.
2. State university attended in State of election.
3. State college attended in State of election.
4. State university attended outside State of election.
5. State college attended outside State of election.
6. Private university attended in State of election.
7. Private college attended in State of election.
8. Private university attended outside State of election.
9. Private college attended outside State of election.
10. Additional education secured in State university and State college in State of election.
11. Additional education secured in private university and private college in State of election.
12. Additional education secured in State university and State college outside State of election.
13. Additional education secured in private university and private college outside State of election.
14. Additional education abroad.
15. M.A., M.S., etc., degrees secured.
16. Honorary doctorate degrees.
17. Phi Beta Kappa members.
18. A.B., B.S., etc., degrees secured except professional.
19. LL.B. degrees secured.
20. M.D. degrees secured.
21. D.D.S. degrees secured.
22. J.D. degrees secured.
23. Ph. D. degrees secured.

The President of the United States recently proposed to extend Federal aid to education. While the principle was recommended by both major parties in their 1960 platforms, defeat resulted. Two major publications are quoted concerning this.

RECENT EVENTS

The New York Times recently said editorially, under the heading "The Promises of School Aid":

"The issue of Federal aid to education has been obscured under a smokescreen of extraneous issues. Under various pressures, ranging from simple hostility toward any form of Government support to advocacy of aid to parochial schools, the simple outline of needs and priorities has become blurred. What remains is a residue of compromises.

"Now that discussion in the House is being revived and action is readied to be taken—as it must be—before the end of the current session, it is well to recall the original commitments and promises.

"Both political parties, in 1960, included basic commitments on Federal aid in their platforms.

"The Democratic plank pledged: 'We shall act at once to help in building the classrooms and employing the teachers that are essential if the right to a good education is to have genuine meaning for all the youth of America in the decade ahead.' It promised to 'end 8 years of official neglect.' It specified that 'assistance will take the form of Federal grants to States for educational purposes they deem most pressing, including classroom construction and teachers' salaries' and assured 'the construction of academic facilities as well as dormitories at colleges and universities.' It called for loans and scholarships for students.

"The Republicans went on record with a pledge for 'Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation.' They also promised aid for college construction, student loans, and graduate fellowships.

"President Kennedy in his special message to Congress on February 20 left no doubt about his administration's commitment. He asked for aid amounting, over a period of 3 to 5 years, to $5.6 billion. He demanded, as a priority measure, aid to the public schools of all States computed according to numbers of pupils in attendance and the average income level in each State. He proposed to let the States be in charge, not only of the distribution but also of the determination of the local need either for school construction or teachers' pay.

"In his message the President said: 'For some 40 years the Congress has wrestled with this problem and searched for a workable solution. I believe that we now have such a solution and that this Congress in this year will make a landmark contribution to American education.' Later he called public school aid 'probably the most important piece of domestic legislation.'

"These are the pledges and commitments, the background facts, and the priorities that should be kept in mind as the debate is resumed. They leave no doubt that action, so urgently needed, must now be taken—as promised."

More recently the Economist, of London, England, said, on September 2, 1961, under the heading "Nothing for Schools:"

"On Federal aid for schools—which Mr. Kennedy has rightly called the most important domestic legislation before Congress—the President has suffered his sharpest and most painful defeat of the session, even though in the end he was prepared to accept, not half a loaf, but simply a few symbolic crumbs. On Wednesday all but 6 Republicans in the House of Representatives and 82 Democrats combined to refuse even to consider a modest proposal to give $345 million for 1 year to the country's neediest tax-supported schools. Originally the President had asked, and the Senate had approved, a 3-year program costing $2.5 billion. Linking the scheme with two popular ones which Congress cannot afford to let lapse—Federal loans to college students and aid to the so-called 'impacted areas,' communities whose schools are swamped by the children of servicemen and Federal employees—was of no avail. The House knew quite well that it could dispose of these two matters in a separate bill before it goes home. * * *"

RELATION TO CONGRESS

While it has been stressed that Federal aid to education is really "Federal participation in education." Educational aid is not to be considered as relief, but as an obligation of the Federal Government to the students of the Nation. It is important, however, to note the educational advancement of the Members of Congress during the years studied.

REPORTED FINDINGS

A. Educational attainments of U.S. Senators

Point	Year												
	1937	1939	1941	1943	1945	1947	1949	1951	1953	1955	1957	1959	1961
1	20	22	22	21	18	16	13	13	13	13	10	8	10
2	28	27	27	28	33	33	35	39	39	38	38	35	34
3	6	4	4	4	5	7	8	7	10	10	10	12	11
4	16	18	16	16	17	15	13	10	4	4	5	6	7
5	3	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
6	16	17	16	14	15	19	19	19	18	17	16	16	15
7	13	13	18	19	18	18	14	16	4	4	5	7	8
8	24	21	21	25	26	28	34	29	15	14	18	18	18
9	8	6	9	7	8	7	8	8	6	6	6	10	11
10	14	14	12	13	14	16	15	19	21	20	20	24	27
11	8	10	10	10	12	12	9	10	21	21	20	20	18
12	9	7	8	11	12	10	10	9	13	13	13	15	16
13	19	16	17	18	10	24	28	25	24	22	25	30	31
14	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	3
15	10	9	10	11	15	14	18	19	16	16	16	19	19
16	24	20	24	28	32	31	29	26	30	28	28	28	26
17	5	6	6	5	4	7	10	8	2	2	2	3	4
18	69	62	64	67	69	71	71	73	45	46	47	54	55
19	39	39	40	38	45	50	51	49	42	42	42	45	47
20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
22	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	8	8
23	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2

B. Educational attainments of U.S. House of Representatives

Point	Year												
	1937	1939	1941	1943	1945	1947	1949	1951	1953	1955	1957	1959	1961
1	137	120	102	111	96	82	84	80	82	83	80	75	61
2	95	97	116	106	105	113	122	124	90	87	86	92	90
3	26	36	36	28	33	36	33	26	33	34	34	38	34
4	29	28	34	28	33	33	36	36	33	27	26	35	29
5	5	5	7	15	5	6	9	5	10	5	4	6	9
6	103	104	110	117	116	116	119	112	78	82	92	105	86
7	59	65	63	42	61	68	68	74	74	68	63	56	83
8	79	94	101	103	117	112	113	104	60	64	53	51	56
9	30	24	18	20	15	20	13	17	24	19	21	18	24
10	59	68	77	66	67	67	69	66	64	68	75	76	74
11	61	56	66	69	67	61	73	44	65	85	93	91	94
12	12	12	16	15	18	21	15	22	17	17	11	11	14

Point	Year												
	1937	1939	1941	1943	1945	1947	1949	1951	1953	1955	1957	1959	1961
13	52	60	61	63	68	56	71	58	67	68	71	80	90
14	7	9	6	11	11	10	11	5	10	9	10	10	8
15	24	27	27	35	39	37	34	31	27	30	28	32	27
16	11	9	14	16	17	15	22	23	18	27	26	27	28
17	5	5	5	6	9	10	8	11	5	8	10	7	9
18	140	148	150	152	156	164	164	184	179	179	195	219	219
19	141	138	150	140	139	159	164	166	165	164	156	176	184
20	6	8	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	4	5	4	6
21	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
22	4	3	4	7	9	9	7	10	12	9	10	9	6
23	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	4	4	6	7

CONCLUSIONS

1. That American education is included in the daily thoughts of its citizens.

2. That additional Federal participation in education has been urged by the 1960 major platforms.

3. That major media in America and abroad are pointing to shortcomings and temporary defeats in the Congress in this area, and are keeping the public informed as to the future.

4. That the educational attainments of Members of both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives since 1937 have been important, as reflected by their biographical sketches.

5. That to the present time these higher educational attainments by the Congress have not been reflected in a breakthrough of major additional Federal aid to education.

U.S. Air Force Paves the Way for Accident Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my pleasure to review a copy of the Hawaiian Falcon, the publication issued by the U.S. Air Force in Hawaii, which carried an inspiring article about Maj. Melvin J. Kay, Director of Ground Safety in the Inspector General's section of the Pacific AACS Area Headquarters, who recently helped develop a program to reduce accidents in that command to a minimum.

I was very happy to learn from this article that Major Kay, one of my constituents, is making such an outstanding contribution to our defense efforts in the Pacific.

Major Kay had an illustrious record in World War II, and I believe that he represents that fine element of Americans who remained in the service after the war; and through whose efforts we today can point with pride to our Defense Establishment in our hour of need.

If President Kennedy can confidently today challenge the Soviet threat to disrupt world peace, it is only because thousands upon thousands of young men like Major Kay recognized their continuing duty to their country and remained in the service, helping develop and perfect America's arsenal of defense.

It is always encouraging to see the efforts of our military personnel, such as Major Kay, be given recognition in our service publications.

I know that I speak for the people of the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, as well as all Americans, in paying tribute to this dedicated American who, through his own resources and ingenuity, is helping make it possible for our young air warriors to conduct their missions with a greater degree of safety.

I am sure that the program which Major Kay has developed for his command is a source of comfort to the parents and wives who stay behind hoping and praying daily that no harm will come to the young men who are today our first line of defense in the farflung areas of the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, the article about Major Kay and his contribution to air safety follows:

ACCIDENT PROGRAM PLANNED FOR PACAACS AREA

WHEELER.—Headquarters, Pacific AACS Areas, has developed a commander's accident prevention awards program to be implemented throughout the entire area.

The program is aimed at controlling accidents involving flight-line operations and flight safety, reduction of military and civilian disabling injuries, Government and private motor vehicle accidents and USAF property damage.

A 6-month project of Maj. M. J. Kay, Director of Ground Safety in the Inspector General's section of PACAACS Headquarters, the program affords three awards for the top group, squadron, and airman who has contributed the most to his unit's ground safety program.

The awards will be given based on the best safety record in the PACAACS area and is supported by a special grant from PACAF.

Based on semiannual unit reports, the award recipients will be selected by the Area Ground Safety Council at Wheeler.

Nurses Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the eastern half of Westchester County, N.Y., where a number of our Nation's most prominent businessmen reside. Stories of success are the rule rather than the exception, but few if any can compare with the saga of Mr. William Black, of New Rochelle.

Born in my native Brooklyn, educated at Columbia University, William Black built a small shelled nut stand on Broadway into what is today one of the Nation's largest coffee roasting houses and restaurant chains, Chock Full O' Nuts Corp.

More important than his tremendous business success, however, is the fact that he has built a business with a heart. The ready smiles and courteous service of the Chock Full O' Nuts employees is a measure of the working conditions and profit sharing which the founder his pioneered. Moreover, Mr. Black has always felt a moral responsibility to the big city which has been the primary site of his success.

Among his many philanthropic acts, two recent sizable gifts to the fields of medical research and nursing are notable. I wish to insert the following editorials from the New York Times and the New York Journal-American of September 6 at this point in the RECORD. They are a suitable expression of thanks from two great newspapers to an equally great American:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1961]

NURSES NEEDED

The country needs three nurses for every two it now has. The range of their services in modern health care has expanded so rapidly that we keep falling farther and farther behind in the availability of nurses, even though we are training more of them than physicians or any other group of health professionals.

A $1 million gift just made to the Lenox Hill Hospital will help ease this shortage in New York by enabling the hospital to expand its nursing school, now three-quarters of a century old. William Black, the industrialist who made this splendid gift, had already earned the commendation of the community by a $5 million donation last year to Columbia University for the construction of a medical research center.

His latest benefaction will enable Lenox Hill to put up a new hall of nursing with teaching facilities, laboratories and dormitories far superior to those it now has. It will also make it less likely that the hospital will have to repeat its experience of 2 years ago when the lack of nurses became so pressing that it was obliged to dispatch its director of nursing to Ireland to recruit 50

trained nurses there. More such gifts throughout the country would do much to help us achieve our national goal of a 50-percent expansion in the ratio of nurses to population by 1970.

[From the New York Journal-American, Sept. 6, 1961]

GIVING IS LIVING

We like the philosophy expressed by coffee magnate William Black in his advice to every rich man:

"Your body surely won't attend the reading of your will—and if your soul does not attend, you will never have experienced the joy of giving."

That's good advice for those who are not so rich, too.

This city has benefited because Mr. Black, founder and chairman of the board of Chock Full O'Nuts Corp., experiences the joy of giving. Last year he presented Columbia University with $5 million for a medical research building. Now he has given Lenox Hill Hospital $1 million for a new nurses' school and residence. That is constructive philanthropy.

Late Judge Theodore Robinson Led in Fight To Get Seawall for City of Galveston—Was Able Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 1, 1961, Galveston County Judge Theodore R. Robinson, 60, who had served in his official capacity for 19 years with honor and distinction, died at St. Mary's Infirmary at Galveston.

He left behind a record of outstanding achievement in public service.

No testimonial can better emphasize his service to mankind than the seawall which extends along the beach of Galveston and which has served as the only barrier between the city of Galveston and the devastation of tides like those lashed by Hurricane Carla.

Had it not been for the seawall extension which Judge Robinson's leadership secured for the island, the destruction from Hurricane Carla would have been immeasurably worse.

Judge Robinson was educated in the Galveston public schools and attended Cumberland Law School in Cumberland, Tenn., and Baylor University in Waco, Tex. He was admitted to the State bar of Texas in 1926 and to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States on June 7, 1942.

In 1928, he was appointed assistant county attorney for Galveston County, in which capacity he served for 10 years. In 1938, he was elected to the Texas Legislature as a State representative and served for two terms. In 1942, he was elected county judge of Galveston County and remained in that office until the time of his death.

He was a good and efficient public official; he was my friend.

Among Judge Robinson's major accomplishments were: the westward extension of the Galveston seawall, which was named in his honor; completion of a new causeway linking Galveston to the mainland; establishment of a Galveston County health unit and construction of a new Galveston County jail; construction of the Galveston County Memorial Hospital; construction of a new annex to the Galveston County Courthouse; construction of the Blue Water Highway along the gulf coast linking Galveston and San Luis Pass; and at the time of his death was actively engaged in obtaining an extension to the Texas City seawall and in seeking a salt water conversion plant for Galveston.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to place in the RECORD four articles in tribute to Judge Robinson. The articles include: One in the Houston Post of August 3, 1961, entitled "Judge Robinson Was Devoted to Galveston"; one in the Galveson News of August 3, 1961, entitled "Theodore H. Robinson," and one in the Texas City Sun of August 6, entitled "Our Town"; and one in the Galveson News of August 2, entitled "Judge Robinson Dies."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Aug. 3, 1961]

JUDGE ROBINSON WAS DEVOTED TO GALVESTON

In the death Tuesday of County Judge Theodore Robinson, Galveston has lost one of its most devoted public servants. A native of the island city, Judge Robinson had served in his official capacity for 19 years.

There was nothing flamboyant in Judge Robinson's career. He conducted his work for the county with quite and unswerving efficiency, an attribute of service which was well rewarded as he saw the realization of several projects benefiting the city and the county. These include the westward extension of the seawall, the opening of the new causeway across Galveston Bay, and a new county jail, now under construction.

In cultural matters, Judge Robinson was most devoted to Galveston's Rosenberg Library, whose extension service into the county always received his support. A quiet but invariably genial man, Judge Robinson made many fast friends during his career, all of whom will mourn his passing.

[From the Galveston News, Aug. 3, 1961]

THEODORE R. ROBINSON

Theodore R. Robinson, who died Tuesday, was a man of attainments who in 16 years of public life wrote an indelible chapter in the history of his native city and county.

Although regarded as an able attorney and jurist, his more distinguished service was rendered in his capacity as chairman of the board of county commissioners.

No marble to his memory and no epitaph can more graphically emphasize his devotion to the needs of the community than the monumental seawall from 61st Street to the western city limits. This was Judge Robinson's dream and he lived to see it come true within his lifetime.

Judge Robinson gave himself unstintingly to what he deeply believed was the most important thing to the future of this city. However, he gave equal thought to the needs of the entire county.

His faith was unfailing and his labors unceasing in winning congressional support for his storm-protection projects. The results of such dedication should serve as an inspiring example to those who remain and face the tasks of removing the last of the obstacles to city and county progress.

[From the Texas City Sun, Aug. 6, 1961]

OUR TOWN

(By Clyde Ragsdale)

He usually signed himself Theodore R. Robinson, but his countless friends never called him Theodore. To them he was just Ted or Teddy. Or sometimes they called him plain judge.

Few men have served their communities with more diligence and devotion than did Teddy Robinson. He was one of those men, like those referred to by Abraham Lincoln, who was acquainted with wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty.

A gentleman at all times, he was one of those rare personalities marked with a great patience and a generous quantity of diplomacy.

Teddy immensely enjoyed politics, which had been a part of his life for so long. There were two things a person could always expect Teddy to discuss with enthusiasm. These were politics and his family. His love for both was boundless.

Filling the position left vacant by Teddy Robinson will not be easy. In recent years his county judge's office has become a vital office in the affairs of the citizens of Galveston County. Seven consecutive times over a period of almost 20 years the voters expressed their confidence in him as a man and a conscientious public servant by electing and reelecting him as judge.

His record was clean, and no taint had ever come upon him throughout the years. He believed in Galveston County, its people, and its future—and he proved this faith in tirelessly working for the benefit of the entire area. His service knew no geographical limits, and his friends and supporters were as numerous on the mainland as in his own hometown of Galveston.

I believe it was Marcus Aurelius who said, "A man must stand erect, not be kept erect by others." And Teddy was a man who stood on his own feet, as an old Methodist circuit rider I once knew said, "foursquare before his fellow men."

As I was riffling through some papers on my desk Friday, I came across a copy of a letter typical of Teddy's tireless efforts to help Galveston County.

The letter had been addressed to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Teddy had just returned from Washington, and was urging ELLENDER to grant a request for $16,000 so the Corps of Engineers could make a survey in the Highland Bayou area near Hitchcock with a view to creating flood control measures.

Few men have devoted more energy and understanding to their jobs than did Judge Robinson. We need more men of his stature in these critical times.

[From the Galveston News, Aug. 2, 1961]

JUDGE ROBINSON DIES

(By Lillian E. Herz)

County Judge Theodore Robinson, 60, who had served 19 years as judge of the county commissioners' court and the county court at law, died at 6 p.m. Tuesday in St. Mary's Infirmary, after having suffered a heart attack.

According to his attending physician, Judge Robinson was taken to St. Mary's Monday after suffering angina pains. However, he seemed to have responded favorably, but suffered another attack while he was eating supper Tuesday and failed to rally.

FIRST AWARENESS

Judge Robinson's first awareness of a heart condition came last February when he was hospitalized for several weeks. After continued rest, he returned to his duties at the courthouse and apparently was in good health until he became ill Monday.

Judge Robinson participated in the causeway dedication ceremonies both on the causeway and at the Moody Center luncheon last Wednesday and was one of the principal speakers.

GALVESTON NATIVE

A native of Galveston, he was born May 1, 1901, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. George Robinson. His father served as commissioner of waterworks and sewerage of the city of Galveston for two terms.

He was educated in the Galveston public schools and received his law degree from Baylor University.

Judge Robinson married Miss Wilhelmina Johnson, daughter of Capt. Fred Johnson, prominent Galveston pilot, and Mrs. Johnson. They had one daughter, Shirley, and a son, Theodore, Jr.

SIX 2-YEAR TERMS

Judge Robinson served six 2-year terms, was just completing his second 4-year term and would have come up for reelection in next May's primaries.

He was first elected to the county judgeship in November 1942, having been nominated in the primaries, and assumed office January 1, 1943, succeeding Judge E. B. Holman, who had held the position 20 years.

At the time of his election Judge Robinson declared: "I am hopeful there will be no precinct lines and that all members of the court will work together for the good of everyone."

CREDO IN LIFE

"This," according to his colleagues on the commissioners' court, "was his credo in life, and his interest in the city of Galveston and the county of Galveston never waned throughout the years," they declared.

Shortly after his graduation from college, Judge Robinson was named assistant county attorney under the late D. B. McInerny. He served 10 years in the county attorney's office, 6 of which he served as first assistant.

In addition to McInerny, he served under County Attorney Owen D. Barker and under County Attorney Ralph Crawford.

IN LEGISLATURE

He also represented Galveston County in the State legislature, resigning to go into the practice of law.

He was first sworn into office on January 1, 1943, by the late Judge J. C. Canty, judge of 10th district court—the oldest district court in Galveston county.

Judge Robinson was proud of his record in office, proud of his efforts in obtaining the extension of the Galveston seawall, proud of being a part in obtaining another new causeway for Galveston, proud of the establishment of a county health unit, and of the various other projects both on the mainland and in Galveston which promoted the progress and development of the area.

TO WASHINGTON

Only a few weeks ago he went to Washington with Commissioner Paul Hopkins of precinct 3 and other mainland residents in an effort to obtain relief from flooded conditions in the Highland Bayou and Hitchcock area.

Recently he addressed letters to Texas Representatives in Congress seeking a salt water conversion plant for Galveston.

In addition to his widow, daughter, and son, Judge Robinson is survived by a sister, Mrs. Helen E. Hemple, of Galveston, and four brothers, George E. Robinson, Jr., and Fred F. Robinson, both of Galveston; A. P. Robinson, Sr., of La Marque, and Mayor Lee A. Robinson, of Texas City.

MEMBER OF MASONS

He was a member of Philip Tucker Masonic Lodge of which he was past master; Knights Templar, El Mina Shrine, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie 48, and the Galveston Kiwanis Club.

In 1945 Judge Robinson was elected grand senior deacon of the Grand Masonic Lodge of Texas. He was a member and a trustee of First Methodist Church.

Funeral arrangements are being completed by J. Levy & Bros. Funeral Home.

GENUINE REGRET

News of Judge Robinson's death was received with genuine regret throughout Galveston and the mainland.

County Commissioner Irwin P. Dantin, who served 13 years with Judge Robinson as a member of the commissioners' court, said the county had suffered an irreparable loss.

"Judge Robinson was self-sacrificing in his interest in the country and he was loyal in his friendships," Dantin declared.

Address by Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Before the Disabled American Veterans Convention, St. Louis, Mo., August 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to include in my remarks an address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, held in St. Louis, Mo., on August 22, 1961. There is no person throughout America who is better qualified to make an address on the subject that he did than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], for no one knows better than Congressman WALTER, the evil intent and purposes of international communism. There is no man who has fought more courageously to expose Communist activities in America than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS CONVENTION, ST. LOUIS, MO., AUGUST 22, 1961

It is always a pleasure for me to address any veterans' group. It is a particular pleasure for me to address you, the members of the Disabled American Veterans who have not only fought for your country and the principles on which it is founded, but have suffered for it in a way that most veterans, such as myself, have not.

I am going to discuss the most important question of our day. It is a question of great interest to all veterans, a subject they know much about, which they dislike intensely and, I am sure, hope they will never experience again. I am referring, of course, to war. More important, I would like to say a few words about what you can do to prevent it.

Are we going to get into a war over Berlin? This is a question that is paramount in the minds of millions of Americans—and also Germans, Frenchmen, Britons, and the peoples of many other nations. If war comes over Berlin, it will drastically affect the lives of a large part of the earth's population. For this reason, it is a matter of deep concern to hundreds of millions of people.

If we do not have war over Berlin, will it develop over the future of Laos, Quemoy and Matsu, the Congo, or any one of the world's many other trouble spots where the forces of freedom are meeting head on with those of communism?

I am certain that for years to come we will have wars, but that they will be small, local wars—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I am certain of this because 81 of the world's Communist parties have openly declared, in a statement adopted unanimously in Moscow and released last December 7, that they will foment and support such wars—and they are powerful enough to do it.

Khrushchev said the same thing in his now famous—or notorious—speech of January 6 this year. The Soviet Communist Party has also forcefully proclaimed the same doctrine in the draft program, made public on August 1, which will be presented for adoption at its 22d Congress in October. This program is a blunt declaration of war against all free men and nations, and it pinpoints the United States as the No. 1 enemy of Communists everywhere.

While I feel certain that we will see many small wars in the years ahead, I also feel certain there will be no war on U.S. soil—if we are strong enough. I firmly believe that war will not develop over Berlin—if the United States and other free nations see to it that their strength—military, economic, political, and spiritual—is always greater than that of our Communist enemy.

Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party, and all the Communist parties of the world have declared war on us, yes—but not all-out nuclear war. It is a war of destruction by subversion and every other means short of all-out military conflict.

This type of war we cannot possible avoid. We are in it, whether we want it or not. Our enemy has not only started it, but is fighting it vigorously with all means at his command. We can, if we choose, turn our backs on this reality. But if we do so, we will be merely guaranteeing either our eventual enslavement under communism or the total nuclear war we want to avoid and which, I believe, we can avoid.

If we turn our backs on this war, the enemy, because he will be unopposed, will inflict a whole series of defeats on us—military, and also economic, political, diplomatic, and psychological. His power will grow steadily. Ours will wane just as steadily. Before long, the day will come when he will feel confident that he is so strong and we are so weak that he can deliver an ultimatum—surrender or face annihilation.

Perhaps, we will not even have the luxury of surrender. When this day comes, so much of the world will be under Communist rule and there will be so many millions of restrictive and rebellious people enslaved by Communism—and intensely hating their Communist governments—that the Kremlin will face a tremendous danger of internal rebellion that could sweep through the Communist world and destroy it. It will literally be sitting on a powder keg.

Could Moscow then risk the "peaceful" absorption of some 190 or 200 million Americans into its empire—freedom-loving Americans known for their dedication to liberty and their spirit of revolt against oppression?

Is it not quite possible that, under these conditions, Moscow would believe that it first had to unleash some nuclear missiles to teach us Americans a lesson? And then, as its forces occupied our nation after this nuclear destruction, would it not also feel that millions of our people would have to

be liquidated to make sure that the survivors had really learned the lesson of nonresistance? Who would be liquidated? Why, the most dangerous elements, of course—our political leaders, our clergymen, educators, lawyers, businessmen—everyone, young or old, male or female, who might offer, or attempt to lead, resistance.

The reality that confronts our country and every American today is awesome and, if you think it through, truly frightening. There is no use trying to kid ourselves on this point.

Today, we are faced with these alternatives: We win the war short of all-out nuclear war that the Communists of the world have declared on us, or else we will surely suffer: (1) tremendouc nuclear destruction, or (2) limited nuclear destruction, plus liquidation of many millions of our citizens and incorporation of the survivors into the Soviet totalitarian state.

Moreover, there is not much time. Communists are confident today that victory will be theirs before this century is out; in other words, within the lifetime of many of us who are here today.

The issue we face is not war or peace. Peace, in the real sense of the word, is out. The only choice we have is what kind of war we will fight. Are we going to have an all-out, nuclear war, or are we going to prevent one by winning what is euphemistically called the "cold war"?

As Americans, we can make only one choice—to win the so-called cold war.

How do we do it?

Inasmuch as this is a war, we must apply the principles of warfare.

First, we must know our enemy. This is the first rule of all warfare. You cannot fight an enemy you do not know. Get the facts. Study communism. Know communism's objectives and the means it is using to achieve them. The minimum knowledge required for all American citizens who want to make any contribution at all to our country's victory in this conflict is familiarity with communism's basic doctrines, strategy and tactics; knowledge of its line or position on current national and international issues; the names of the more important Communist fronts and organizations, worldwide and here in the United States. You should also be acquainted with the names of the leading Communists and fellow travelers both here and abroad.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this rule. It is no more than commonsense, yet many people overlook it. They want to, and try to, fight communism, yet they really know little about it. A general who committed his troops to battle without first attempting to learn all he possibly could about the strength and disposition of the enemy forces, about the tactics favored by the opposing commander, without fully utilizing his intelligence and reconnaissance units before the engagement, would be summarily dismissed as incompetent. If by chance he won a battle, it would be pure luck. The many cold war battles we must fight are too important and deadly in their cumulative effects to trust their outcome to chance. We must enter them as trained troops with the knowledge and skills that are the foundation of victory.

For some years now, the American people have been contributing millions of dollars annually to research on cancer and heart disease, because they know that these killers will be conquered only after we have learned what causes them, promotes their development, and what the carriers are. They know that diseases which killed many millions of people in the past have now almost been wiped out by study which uncovered their true nature, made it possible to destroy or inhibit their carriers and to develop immunity to them among their potential victims.

The same understanding and knowledge of communism on the part of our leaders and a large part of the American people—who play so important a role in influencing policy—is absolutely necessary to this country's successful conduct of the cold war.

Rule 2—Action. Knowledge that is not put to use is wasted. You can become a true expert on communism, but you will contribute absolutely nothing to the survival of our country and the defeat of its enemy unless you have the will to do, to translate your knowledge into deeds that weaken and contribute to the defeat of communism:

Apathy, smugness, indifference, failure to act, and a "let George do it" attitude on the part of millions of Americans has, for years, been one of our greatest weaknesses and a major ally of the Kremlin. Much of the success achieved by the relatively small number of Communists in the world—about 36 million in a total population of 2 billion—is due to the fact that they are activists. They are doers. They do not sit back waiting for others to change the world. They have assumed that task themselves, though they know they are tremendously outnumbered and that the odds against them, on a purely numerical basis, are great.

3. Get the help of others. Don't fight alone unless it is absolutely necessary—and it rarely is. Two heads are better than one. Ten men are more powerful than two. In union there is strength.

It has often been said—and truthfully—that for every Communist Party member in this country, there are 10 others who are ready and willing to do the work of the party. But it is also true that for every informed, active anti-Communist, there are hundreds of other Americans ready and willing to come to the defenes of their country and to fight its enemies. Their only trouble is that they are asleep or afraid to act because they feel they do not know enough to act effectively.

It is up to you to wake up those who are asleep, to impart your knowledge to those who do not know enough, or if you, too, lack it, to study with them to develop the knowledge needed for effective action.

4. Organize your helpers and plan your actions. Mere numbers are not enough. Actions that are not carefully considered and planned are not enough. An excellent book on communism, published quite a few years ago, has a very revealing title. It is called the Organizational Weapon. The U.S. Communist Party, the worldwide Communist movement and all their actions and campaigns are carefully organized. This is another key to the tremendous advances they have been able to make with relatively small numbers. Unless you have equal organization and planning, you cannot hope to engage in any conflict with the Communists and come out on top. A small, well-organized force with a definite plan of action will usually defeat a force larger in number but disorganized and acting without plan.

You, as members of the DAV, are already organized. You have at your disposal a readymade, important weapon. What are you doing with it? What can you do with it to insure your country the victory it must win?

Here are a few ideas:

To date, the major weakness of the free world in this struggle has been ignorance of communism. For years, the Kremlin's gains in all parts of the world have been attributable primarily to this. We cannot hope to win unless this condition is changed.

What is being done in your individual communities to alter this situation? Are courses revealing the true nature of communism being taught in your schools so that the citizens of tomorrow will not have the same handicap so many of our generation had in recognizing their enemy and perceiving what had to be done to protect their freedom? If such courses are not being given, what have you done to see that they become a part of your local school curriculum?

How about your local libraries, which are among the most powerful opinionmaking community institutions? If the people in your community are not as well informed as they should be on the subject of communism, is it because your library has failed to stock the kind of books which will give them the information they so vitally need? Hundreds of worthwhile books covering all facets of communism have been published. Too few of these books can be found on library shelves where, in some cases, Communist-serving books abound. We are paying for this fact today—with crises over Berlin, Laos, and other strategic areas.

As taxpayers who support schools and libraries, you have a right to a voice in what they do—and you should exercise that voice to see that they make the maximum contribution to the preservation of the Nation for which you have fought and in which your children will have to live when you are gone.

If your library lacks funds, have you thought of making, or of getting others to make, gifts to it of outstanding books on communism?

How good a job is your local press doing when it comes to keeping the people of your community informed on the key issues in our battle for survival? If it isn't doing what it can and should be doing, isn't it possible that a visit—or a flood of letters—to the editor could change this?

Do you yourself know what the key issues of today are? Do you know Moscow's major objectives as of this moment?

On January 20 of this year, Gus Hall, boss of the U.S. Communist Party, made a major speech to the party's national executive committee. In this speech, he emphasized five issues as the important ones on which the party was to concentrate its activities. On May Day of this year, the party called on all Americans to demand that our Government take certain actions. On the basis of these two recent Communist directives, the following are the top issues of the day—because they are the Communists' most important, immediate cold war objectives:

1. Universal disarmament.
2. The complete abolition of nuclear weapons testing.
3. The dismantling of U.S. overseas defense bases.
4. The dissolution of NATO, SEATO, and other free world defense alliances.
5. And end to the cold war.
6. The adoption of the policy of peaceful coexistence.
7. Reestablishment of friendly relations with Cuba.
8. Recognition of Red China and its admission to the U.N.
9. Demilitarization of Berlin.
10. The ending of colonialism everywhere.

After these 10 points comes another 1 of major importance to the Communist Party because it always has a place in their platforms and directives:

Abolish the Un-American Committee.

These demands are revealing in several ways.

1. Notice that not 1 of the top 10 objectives of the U.S. Communist Party has anything to do—at least directly—with what might be called the positive promotion of communism in the United States. Party demands for nationalizing certain industries and other internal communizing steps are way down on its priority ladder. Every 1 of these 10 demands concerns U.S. foreign policy and, specifically, U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. These demands are, in themselves, proof that the U.S. Communist Party is nothing but the traitorous tool of a for-

eign enemy power. The demands the U.S. Communists parade as theirs are all made in Moscow.

2. Notice, too, that the first demand of the Communist Party which concerns internal affairs is for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This, too, has nothing to do—directly—with communizing the United States, though all of you, I am sure, can see the gimmick in it. The party gives abolition of the committee first priority among all domestic issues because it wants free rein to carry out its subversive activities. Its aim is to destroy, not to build.

3. Further, these demands reveal, I believe, that the U.S. Communist Party has no hope of achieving power in this country legitimately. They reveal that it is counting on Moscow to conquer this country and that it is meanwhile doing everything it can to help the Kremlin in this task by promoting the adoption of U.S. policies which will weaken this country and, at the same time, build Soviet power.

I can assure you that every Communist and fellow traveler in this country is today doing everything he can to whip up support among the American people for these objectives.

How much are you doing to oppose them?

They are writing letters to newspapers, to the White House, the State Department, to Members of Congress. Are you doing the same?

They are introducing resolutions in parent-teacher associations, civic groups and community organizations of all types, and even in political parties. Are you actively opposing them in these groups?

Have you informed yourselves on such subjects as disarmament, nuclear weapons testing, recognition of Red China and the demilitarization of Berlin so that you can debate and defeat the agents of the enemy on these issues?

These are things that must be done by the American people—in all parts of the country—if we are to win the cold war and thus escape the devastation of nuclear missile bombardment.

There are other things you can—and should—do:

If Communist fronts are promoting these and other Soviet objectives in your community, they should be exposed and rendered ineffective.

When patriotic, anti-Communist organizations, individuals and Government agencies are made the targets of character assassination attacks by the Communists and their allies who want, above all else, to destroy them, you should go to their defense.

Keep informed about legislative and policy proposals for combatting internal subversion and Communist advances abroad. Throw your weight behind those which are sound and get others to do the same.

You should do everything in your power to assist the development of an effective nationwide civil defense program.

When you uncover facts on subversive activity—as opposed to idle rumor and gossip—you should pass this information on to your local FBI office or to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Remember that the Communists' major weapons are deceit, subterfuge and concealment. Your best weapon is, therefore, exposure, which is no more than the revelation of the truth about the activities of a criminal conspiracy and its adherents. Never be ashamed to use it.

Never resort to violence or illegal actions of any kind. This helps the Communists and discredits the anti-Communist cause. Stick to lawful means.

Avoid unfounded attacks on any individual or organization. Be scrupulous about your evidence and the rules of fair play before making any charges. Again, the anti-Communist cause has been hurt if you have to retract an ill-considered charge you cannot substantiate.

At the same time, never backtrack or retreat when you know you are right. Stick to your guns. Resolve that although you are unjustly attacked and subjected to various pressures, you will not yield.

Don't surrender any group to the Communists. If you find that some organization to which you belong is being infiltrated, don't abandon it and give the Communists carte blanche to take it over. Bring the matter out into the open and organize your forces for a showdown fight. Don't resign from any group until it has become clear that the Communists have attained so much power in it that their grip cannot be broken.

Remember that there is no quick and easy solution to the problem of communism. The power and influence of the Communists in this country and elsewhere can be destroyed only in the way they were created; that is, by the concerted efforts of many thousands of people extended over a period of years.

Actually, you are limited in what you can do to help your country win this most decisive of all wars only by how much you really want to do. The more you study, the more deeply you become involved in this problem, the more you will find you can do—if you have the will to act.

Our enemy is the most dangerous this country has ever faced. He is powerful, clever, tricky. As strong as he is, however, and despite all the weapons and resources he has at his command, the fate of this country and the outcome of this war is not in his hands.

It is in your hands, in the hands of the American people. There is no question in my mind but that it is in the most capable hands, that you will not fail your country, that you will fight this war as you have others, and that victory—not atomic annihilation or Soviet occupation—will be ours.

The Honorable John McCormack

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to express my great respect, admiration, and affection for the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK.

As a freshman Member of this House, I found that there were some difficult problems to be solved. I went to the majority leader to discuss these problems and I found him to be not only understanding and helpful but an advocate in my cause to help solve these problems for my district. I am sure many Members of the House have had this same experience which all of us will remember. Here is a man who has given years of devoted service in a position of extreme importance and high leadership and yet is always willing to take the time to help and guide younger Members of the House.

I shall always remember his kindnesses to me and count his friendship as one of the great experiences during my service in Congress. His Christian ideals, his dedication to America, and his devotion to duty make the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, an outstanding leader not only of the Democratic Party but an outstanding leader of our country.

Eavesdropping in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, commenting on the recent report approved by the House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., has made a number of very pertinent observations on the growing practice among Federal agencies of recording telephone calls.

In view of the importance of this matter and the emphasis which the Journal properly pays to the underlying principles involved, I commend the editorial, which appeared in the September 21 issue, to the attention of our colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

EAVESDROPPING IN WASHINGTON

The House Government Information Subcommittee has called attention to the disturbing and spreading tendency among Federal agencies to listen in on office telephone conversations.

It surveyed 37 major agencies in the capital and found that in 33 of them, telephone calls are monitored regularly. Of that number, 21 have no rules governing the eavesdropping, and 17 do not require that the caller be told his line is being tapped.

The subcommittee concluded its report with a warning that:

"There are indications of a dangerous drift toward a huge bureaucracy peering over the shoulder of the citizen."

It makes the inevitable and ominous comparison between this threat and the frightening fiction of "1984" in which "Big Brother" keeps his eye on each citizen of his totalitarian state.

The drift toward invasion of privacy began innocently. Taps were arranged to permit secretaries to note pertinent information, dates, and names that might slip the caller's mind. This was, and in many cases still is, done with the full knowledge of the caller; whatever principle is lost is written off in the name of efficiency.

The more sinister aspects of the practice are apparent in the report's disclosure that 21 of the tapping agencies apply no restraints, and 17 don't require the caller be informed.

The affronts to privacy committed in the name of efficiency under these conditions can never be calculated. The phones are open to any ear, the callers to any harassment.

Tolerance of the practice by the major agencies is tantamount to official approval. This is why the House subcommittee is fearful. Acceptance has a way of filtering down from the top.

The courts have protected the right to privacy in case after case, including many which involved wiretapping. Even in instances where the taps were productive of

information important to law enforcement and where the eavesdropping was strictly controlled, the courts have struck them down.

The right to privacy is one of the basic guarantees of American citizenship, and from it flows the other freedoms the American citizen enjoys. It is dangerous to have it flaunted in the halls of government, no matter what the reason.

Goals of the New Frontier—The Peoples' Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 87th Congress closed, President John F. Kennedy took an action which can mean a saving of $1 million a year in the cost of Government operations.

I refer to the President's Executive Order 10964 which amended Executive Order 10501, the Government regulation controlling information classified for military-security reasons. The amendment, establishing a system to remove outdated security stamps from the great bulk of military-security documents, is one of the important achievements so far in the long fight to force the Federal Government to recognize the peoples' right to know.

The thin veneer of new leadership which has been superimposed on the massive bureaucracy since January is not enough, of course, to prevent secrecy-minded career officials from equating secrecy with good government. But if the new administration continues at the pace it set during the first 8 months, it may be possible to prevent secrecy from becoming a way of life in Government.

The Kennedy amendment to Executive Order 10501 is an action the House Government Operations Committee first urged on the executive branch in June 1958, pointing out it would cut down the high cost of secrecy. A staff analysis of the effect of the Kennedy amendment indicates that a saving of $1 million a year in Government operating costs is a conservative estimate. It is based on an estimated $48,000 saving in handling classified documents now stored in warehouses; a $712,500 saving in handling classified documents in current use and a $248,000 saving in the replacement of safes to store the classified materials. The savings will be possible because the new system President Kennedy has established downgrades the military-security material from top secret to secret to confidential at regular intervals, and the great bulk of the material will be declassified after 12 years. The Kennedy order also cut out an unnecessary requirement that the documents be stored in expensive fireproof safes.

The attempts by the Congress and the press to force the Federal Government to honor the people's right to know will promote governmental economy and efficiency. But even more important is the prime necessity for an informed populace in a democratic society, for the deceit of secrecy nurtures totalitarian government. This idea has been forcefully expressed by President Kennedy, both as a candidate and since taking office—and the support of a President who is clearly on record in favor of the greatest possible flow of Government information is a powerful new weapon in the fight for freedom of information.

Most of the information problems which the previous administration left on the doorstep of the new administration have been solved with President Kennedy's support in the war the press and Congress have been waging against growing Government secrecy. And there is a hopeful note in the fact that new information problems which have cropped up since the Kennedy administration took over have, in most cases, been solved. An example of fast action by the new administration to solve left-over information problems is the case of the secret meetings which an Eisenhower administration task force had held to engineer a new regulation permitting water to be pumped into commercial hams. The new Secretary of Agriculture immediately removed the "administratively confidential" stamp from records involved in the watered ham decision and ordered public hearings on the whole issue. In the case of compromise settlements of liquor law violations—a secrecy problem which the press first brought to the Treasury Department's attention 10 years ago—the new administration ordered all settlements with moonshiners, bootleggers, or other violators made public.

The leaders of the new administration also moved fast to solve the information problems which developed after they took over the responsibility of Government. At the White House, for example, the President's advisers at first went along with a Civil Service Commission proposal to issue regulations prohibiting the public disclosure of all "official" information, but the restrictive language was revised when the potential effect of the restriction was forcefully brought to the attention of the White House. And the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—after receiving numerous complaints from the press and Congress about secret tests of nonmilitary rockets at the Wallops Island test site—agreed to permit press coverage of future scientific tests.

The Treasury Department at first decided that information about nonprofit organizations granted tax exemption would be available only in one Washington office, but after contacts from Members of both the House and the Senate the agency decided the information could be made available by mail. The new Treasurer of the United States also blocked an attempt by a Federal Reserve bank to demand concessions from a press photographer in exchange for the bank's cooperation on a story. The Air Force blocked an attempt by a unit commander to retaliate against a civilian employee who had written a letter of complaint to a Senator, and a list of "administrative" aircraft set aside for VIP transport jobs was declassified and made public following a number of congressional complaints.

The initial reaction of the new officials of the Kennedy administration, as they faced the military security information problems which have plagued democratic government since its inception, appeared to be based on a desire to hide the ugly facts of international life from the American public. At first, both the President and his Secretary of Defense seemed to lean toward greater restrictions on public access to military information when U.S.-Russian relations became strained. The President, in the prepared text of a newspaper convention speech, discussed "the need for far greater official secrecy" and urged the press to impose a "self restraint" on the publication of news of possible value to a potential enemy. The Secretary of Defense, in testimony before Congress during the same month of the President's speech, appeared to urge a Pollyanna attitude toward the Nation's defense system. He said that information critical of defense capabilities should be replaced by statements praising our weapons, but he later explained he was suggesting such misinformation should be given to Russians only, not the American public.

The initial confusion in the handling of military security information problems was overcome as the leaders of the new administration settled down to the job of running the huge Defense Department, taking a calmer view of the problems. In an off-the-cuff speech after the first U.S. astronaut flight was successful in a blaze of publicity, the President himself emphasized and reemphasized the strength a free society can bring to bear against a secret society. And the new administration, following a congressional recommendation made repeatedly to earlier administrations, directed military men to stick to military matters in their public speeches.

Finally, the new Secretary of Defense established new public information policies for his agency, and the new policies placed strong emphasis on the need to keep democratic society informed on issues of national defense. This action—coupled with the President's new order to remove outdated security stamps from tons of Government documents—shows that the new administration has developed a firm resolve to protect the people's right to know. Translating that resolve into effective information practices will be one of the crucial challenges the Kennedy administration faces.

The Late Honorable Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, over the years it was my privilege to be closely

associated with the late Paul Brown, of Georgia, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was a most able and conscientious member of that committee. Time after time it was the Brown amendments which took the quirks out of legislation being formulated by the committee. Much legislation on the books today, although not bearing his name, reflects the imprint of his wisdom and skill as an outstanding legislator.

In particular, I remember Paul Brown as a conferee in our meetings with Members of the Senate in working out compromises on legislation passed by the House and Senate. With frequent regularity, it was the commonsense solutions of Paul Brown which resolved many of the difficult problems with which the conference was faced. In fact, it was here that he was at his best because he always proceeded on the basis that problems existed not to baffle but to be solved in a sensible way.

Paul Brown was more than a Representative of the 10th District of Georgia. Labor, business, and farmers everywhere have benefited from his distinguished service to his country. May this thought soften the sorrow of his devoted wife and daughter in his passing.

Bridge of Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, much is said and written about the necessity of cordial relations and friendly understanding between our country and our neighbors in the Southern Hemisphere. These friendships can be earned and maintained not only through diplomacy of government, but also by individuals whose devotion of mind and heart to the principles of democracy inspire respect and warmth from other countries and serve as a bridge of friendship between us.

A distinguished example of such a citizen is Rev. Joseph F. Thorning, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Register, of September 24.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUATEMALA HONORS "PADRE OF AMERICAS"

WASHINGTON.—Guatemala's highest national decoration was awarded to the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrolltown Manor, Md., and professor of Latin American history at Marymount College, Arlington, Va.

The honor was given because of Father Thorning's "vision and courage" in "upholding freedom and decency against the Soviet-dominated regime of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, which was overthrown by Guatemalan freedom fighters in June 1954."

Father Thorning, who has been called the "Padre of the Americas," served as special adviser to the U.S. senatorial delegation at the 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela, in March 1954.

Why Not Let the Elderly Earn All They Can?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Saturday Evening Post, which I believe merits careful consideration by all of us.

There is no question that the senior citizens of this country are experiencing difficulty in making ends meet under fixed incomes as the cost of living continues to creep upward.

I hope that during the recess we will all have an opportunity to discuss this very serious problem with our constituents with the view of considering legislation in the next session of Congress which would help solve some of the problems now being faced by the older people of America who today constitute more than one-fourth of our total population.

The editorial follows:

WHY NOT LET THE ELDERLY EARN ALL THEY CAN?

(By Bruce Bliven)

A controversial feature of the social security law is the one that restricts the earnings of the beneficiaries between the ages of 65 and 72. Congress seems to have an uneasy conscience about this matter; repeatedly, since the law was first passed in 1935, the regulation has been liberalized. According to the most recent change, the beneficiary must give up only $1 for each $2 that he earns between $1,200 and $1,500, and $1 for each $1 earned above $1,500.

A good many people feel that the restriction on earnings ought to be abolished entirely, and numerous bills have been introduced to bring this about. Among the arguments in favor of such action are these:

1. Elderly people need the money. More than one-third of all Americans beyond 65 have no income except social security payments. A study made in Milwaukee, Wis., showed that the average retired couple was receiving a total of $110 a month at a time when the cost of living for two persons was reckoned at $186.

2. This law discriminates against those who must work for their living. You may receive unlimited amounts as dividends, interest, pensions, annuities, or rentals, without having your social security affected.

3. Conditions have completely changed since the law was passed in 1935, when the great depression was severe. It was intended to force people out of the labor market. Today, in view of our grim contest with Soviet Russia, we need every bit of productive power this Nation possesses.

4. Health experts are unanimous in saying that elderly people ought to do at least some work to preserve their physical and mental vigor.

5. We now have the anomalous situation where the Government is making a big propaganda drive to persuade industry to hire and retain older workers, and then punishes these workers for accepting employment.

That repeal of this limitation would be overwhelmingly popular with the country there is little doubt. However, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has in the recent past opposed abolition of the restrictions. Its arguments are these:

1. It would be expensive. The number of persons receiving benefits would be increased by about 1,400,000; the immediate cost would be $2 billion a year; and the long-range cost would require an increase of 1 percent in the payroll tax.

2. Most of those now receiving social security are not well enough to work for wages.

3. Social security was never intended to be a pension or annuity, but insurance against the hazard of unemployment in old age.

Those who favor abolition of the restriction reply that the actual cost to the economy as a whole would not be nearly so large as the figure quoted indicates, whatever the effect on the cost structure of the social security system.

Abolition of the restriction would reduce the work of those keeping the records, who now alter thousands of monthly checks in accordance with the changing pattern of work.

The Government would obtain a substantial sum in income taxes on the increased earnings of those now receiving social security.

In many cases people who cannot live on their social security benefits—since the dollar has lost half its purchasing power in the past two decades—are a burden on local relief rolls. Permitted to earn as much as they can, some of these would require less help from community agencies, or none.

Almost every cent of the extra money that would be earned would go into buying consumer goods.

As to the health of elderly people, a report by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself, in September 1960, states that only 36 percent of those between 65 and 72 "were unable because of chronic conditions to carry on their usual activity or had some limitation in the kind or amount of activity."

While it may be true that social security was not intended as an annuity or pension, it is in fact so regarded today by nearly everybody—including the 1,400,000 who have paid social security taxes in the past and are now prohibited from receiving any benefits.

And finally, some people would argue that if the restriction on earnings is socially undesirable, it should be repealed even though this would at first cost a substantial sum.

Down the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues' attention, without further comment, the following editorial from the Machinist on the defeat of the proposal to utilize byproduct steam for electric energy at the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor:

DOWN THE RIVER

Featherbedding is wasteful, no doubt about it. Newspapers, magazines, management representatives, and Congressmen remind us almost daily that it is an appalling waste to have two men do the job of one. Usually, they point the accusing finger at union members.

These guardians of the public conscience have been much less upset about another type of waste. At Hanford, Wash., the Atomic Energy Commission is building a plant to produce plutonium for atomic weapons. A byproduct of the plant will be 11 million pounds of steam an hour. Rather than let the steam go to waste, the Govern-

ment planned to convert it into electricity, enough to supply the entire needs of a city the size of Seattle, or North Dakota and South Dakota combined.

Half of this power would have been turned around to run the plutonium plant itself, thus making it self-sufficient. The other half would have been made available to the power-hungry Northwest where job-producing industries have been held back only by the lack of power.

But it was not to be. The profit hunger of the private power lobby prevented it. They high-pressured Members of Congress. They cried "socialism."

When the battle in Congress ended last week, the Hanford project was defeated. As a result, 11 million pounds of steam will go to waste every hour. It will be dumped down the Columbia River. And with the steam will go tens of thousands of jobs that might have been.

This is real waste.

Plebiscite and Self-Determination for West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on September 26, 1961. The article was my commentary upon President Kennedy's address to the United Nations, with particular reference to his suggestion for a prebiscite in West Berlin. The article follows:

President Kennedy's address to the United Nations was a very welcome clarification of the position of the United States in the face of the Communist-Soviet power drive for world domination.

His declarations for total resistence are positive and direct enough to prevent miscalculation on the part of Mr. Khrushchev concerning our will and determination to defend the free world.

President Kennedy's speech indicates a high degree of leadership. His proposals merit the full support of the people of the United States, and will, I am certain, receive similar support from the people of the free world.

On September 16, I introduced a resolution calling upon the occupying powers in West Berlin, the United States, France, and England, to announce a plebiscite in West Berlin to allow its citizens an expression of self-determination. An election in West Berlin would result in an overwhelming vote in favor of a continuing association with the free world.

President Kennedy's speech accepted the principle of a plebiscite for the people of West Berlin. I hope that he will follow through on this principle with the announcement of an election for its self-determination to be held in the near future. This election would most glaringly expose Mr. Khrushchev's campaign to strangle and then capture West Berlin under his fraudulent slogan of making it a "free city."

The President's sweeping proposals on disarmament are a sound political defense to Khrushchev's propaganda on this subject. We must not, however, indulge in wishful thinking or self-deception. There can be no true disarmament until the Communist-Soviet parties and nations publicly renounce by word and deed their repeated dedication to the defeat and destruction of the free world and its institutions.

Statement of Hon. John L. McMillan, Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that it now appears that the 1st session of the 87th Congress will adjourn prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia revenue bill. The membership of the House District Committee has been very diligent in undertaking to complete action upon this bill in order to provide the greatly needed revenue to the District of Columbia. No fault can properly be placed upon our committee or upon the House of Representatives for the failure of the act to pass.

On March 18, 1961, the House of Representatives passed and sent to the Senate a revenue bill which increased the District sales tax by 1 cent. This bill was not acted upon by the Senate until August 26, 1961, at which time many new taxes and other provisions were added. Thereupon conference committees were appointed by the House and Senate and after conference a bill was agreed upon in which the House conferees agreed to several of the new proposals contained in the Senate bill.

When the conference report came before the House of Representatives it was rejected because of the Senate provision seeking to extend the provisions of the so-called impacted area school funds law to include the District of Columbia. Upon a rollcall vote the House rejected this provision and the conferees of the House and Senate again met and submitted a conference report which left unchanged the previous conference report with reference to extension of the impacted area school funds law to the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the diligent efforts of the House conferees to sustain the second conference report it was again rejected by the House of Representatives upon a rollcall vote.

Again, the undersigned, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, requested the appointment of conferees in the hope that the bill could be salvaged. The Speaker appointed conferees and those conferees have been and are now willing to meet with Senate conferees with the view of making every reasonable effort to bring an acceptable revenue bill out of conference.

When officials of the Senate were contacted, we were advised that some Senate conferees had departed from the District of Columbia and that the Senate would not be willing to go forward with this revenue bill. This position was being taken, we were advised by Senate officials, because of the strong feeling for the Morse amendment—impacted school funds application—to the District revenue bill and that it would not be deemed suitable to hold further conference in absence of the conferees.

It is estimated that the failure to enact the revenue bill deprives the District of Columbia of approximately $1 million per month at a time when such funds are vitally needed to balance the current District budget. Had the Senate acted upon this legislation in March 1961, when it was sent to that body from the House of Representatives it would have already yielded a large sum of money through the new sales tax provisions. The failure of the Senate to participate in further conference and make another effort to resolve the differences between the two bodies upon the one issue in dispute can have no effect other than to deprive the government of the District of Columbia of millions of dollars in revenue during the coming months while the Congress is in recess.

The unfortunate result experienced in this legislation cannot properly be attributed to the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives or to the membership of the House. We have made every possible effort to get agreeable and workable revenue legislation for the District.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 20,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills, which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 15th report of my voting and attendance record. These 15 reports show how I voted on 1,921 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 94 percent.

87th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll-call No.	Date 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn 258, Halleck 170.)	Halleck.
		H. Res. 1, barring George O. Chambers from taking oath as Representative pending investigation by House Administration Committee of congressional election in Indiana's 5th District.	
3	Jan. 3	On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Adopted 262 to 166.)	Nay.
4	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 127, enlarging the Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members:	
5	Jan. 31	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 217 to 212.)	Nay.
6	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:	
7	Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed 392 to 30.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 167, authorizing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities for 1961:	
8	Mar. 1	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 412 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5128, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961:	
9	Mar. 7	On amendment providing an additional $29,900,000 for aid to schools in impacted areas. (Adopted 339 to 62.)	Nay.
10	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
12	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:	
13	Mar. 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section permitting Secretary of Agriculture to drive down market price by selling Government-owned corn and grain sorghums at 17 percent below price-support price. (Rejected 196 to 214.)	Yea.
14	Mar. 9	On passage. (Passed 209 to 202.)	Nay.
15	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:	
17	Mar. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 231 to 185.)	Nay.
18	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5463, amending and extending the Sugar Act to Dec. 31, 1962:	
19	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 284 to 129.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:	
20	Mar. 22	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 363 to 31.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5000, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
22	Mar. 23	On amendment requiring feasibility study before authorizing $3,812,000 for transferring Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 269 to 145.)	Yea.
23	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of dollar volume of sales of employer:	
27	Mar. 24	On amendment substituting language increasing minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of interstate operations test. (Adopted 216 to 203.).	Yea.
28	Mar. 24	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 196 to 224.)	Nay.
29	Mar. 24	On passage. (Passed 341 to 78.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
32	Mar. 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill H.R. 5043. (Rejected 126 to 291.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 30	On passage. (Passed 251 to 167.)	Nay.
34	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
37	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 912, providing 70 additional circuit and district judgeships:	
38	Apr. 19	On passage. (Passed 336 to 76.)	Nay.
39	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6027, liberalizing certain social security benefits and increasing social security tax:	
40	Apr. 20	On passage. (Passed 400 to 14.)	Yea.
41	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6518, making appropriations for inter-American social and economic program and the Chilean reconstruction program:	
42	Apr. 25	On passage. (Passed 330 to 82.)	Yea.
43	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
44	Apr. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 193.)	Nay.
45	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage on dollar-volume test:	
46	May 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 230 to 196.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6441, increasing annual Federal grants for sewage treatment works from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 and the overall limit from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000:	
47	May 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce annual funds to $75,000,000 and overall limit to $750,000,000 and to require States after June 1964 to match all funds in excess of $50,000,000 annually. (Rejected 165 to 256.)	Yea.
48	May 3	On passage. (Passed 308 to 110)	Nay.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	Quorum call	Present
51	May 10	Quorum call	Absent.
52	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program for 2 years:	
53	May 11	On passage. (Passed 231 to 157)	Yea.
		H.R. 6004, increasing annual salary ceiling for Council of Economic Advisers personnel from $345,000 to $2,000,000:	
54	May 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce salary ceiling to $700,000. (Rejected 151 to 196.)	Not voting.[1]
55	May 11	On passage. (Passed 209 to 137.)	Nay.
56	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 284, providing for consideration of H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce:	
58	May 16	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 241 to 70.)	Nay.
59	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 226, expressing sense of Congress favoring collective sanctions by the Organization of American States against Castro government of Cuba:	
61	May 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed 404 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce:	
62	May 17	On passage. (Passed 305 to 104.)	Nay.
63	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1852, authorizing additional construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1962:	
64	May 24	On passage. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 1986, repealing provision intended to prevent railroads from charging higher rates for carrying non-first-class mail than for carrying express matter:	
65	May 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to add amendment requiring the ICC to publish the difference in rates paid to the railroads by the Post Office and Railway Express Agency for carrying similar weight commodities. (Rejected 16 to 346.)	Nay.
66	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1962:	
67	June 1	On passage. (Passed 256 to 71.)	Yea.
68	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 6	Quorum call	Present.

Footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 7444, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1962:	
70	June 6	On amendment reducing the $250,000,000 for agricultural conservation program to $150,000,000. (Rejected 184 to 196.)	Not voting.[1]
71	June 6	On passage. (Passed 320 to 65.)	Not voting.[1]
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7446, providing 1-year extension of existing corporate normal-tax and of certain excise-tax rates:	
75	June 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to add language repealing the 10-percent transportation tax. (Rejected 189 to 196.)	Yea.
76	June 8	On passage. (Passed 295 to 88.)	Yea.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7053, providing that evidence should not be inadmissible in the District of Columbia courts solely because of a delay in arraignment (qualifies Mallory rule):	
78	June 12	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 104 to 252.)	Nay.
79	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
80	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 303, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Communications Commission:	
82	June 15	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 303 to 77.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 302, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Securities and Exchange Commission:	
83	June 15	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 176 to 212.)	Yea.
84	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6765, authorizing an amendment to charter of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock:	
85	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 18.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7712, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961:	
86	June 19	On passage. (Passed 292 to 63.)	Yea.
87	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 304, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Civil Aeronautics Board:	
88	June 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 213.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 305, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Trade Commission:	
89	June 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 221.)	Yea.
90	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6028, authorizing $4,900,000,000 in Federal housing programs over 4 years:	
95	June 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill extending existing programs for 1 year with a $1,100,000,000 authorization. (Rejected 197 to 215.)	Yea.
96	June 22	On passage. (Passed 235 to 178.)	Nay.
97	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 26	Quorum call	President.
		H.R. 7677, increasing the national debt limit:	
99	June 26	On passage. (Passed 231 to 148.)	Yea.
100	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
101	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
103	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7851, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1962:	
104	June 28	On amendment deleting a provision prohibiting price differentials in favor of economically depressed areas. (Rejected 173 to 239)	Nay.
105	June 28	On passage. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1922, authorizing $4,880,000,000 in housing programs over 4 years:	
106	June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 229 to 176.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 354, providing for a House of Representatives flag:	
107	June 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 108 to 270.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.J. Res. 225, granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact:	
108	June 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit Federal Government to nonvoting representation and exclude Federal Government from any financial responsibilities of the commission. (Rejected 92 to 257.)	Yea.
		H.R. 187, providing for judicial review of orders for deportation:	
109	July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 304 to 60.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5786, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore:	
110	July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 278 to 82.)	Nay.
111	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.J. Res. 435, providing for observance of the Department of Agriculture centennial:	
112	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Adopted 367 to 12.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2555, providing for advanced pay for civilian Government employees in emergency evacuations:	
113	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 285 to 86.)	Yea.
114	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6874, authorizing appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
116	July 20	On adoption of the conference report. (Adopted 354 to 59.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 328, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the National Labor Relations Board:	
117	July 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 231 to 179.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 336, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration:	
118	July 20	On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of H. Res. 336. (Rejected 184 to 215.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
119	July 25	On amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 241 to 170.).	Nay.
120	July 25	On passage. (Passed 408 to 0.)	Yea.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H.J. Res. 120, authorizing the President to order 250,000 members of the Ready Reserves to active duty for up to 12 months and to extend present Armed Forces tours of duty:	
124	July 31	On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 403 to 2.)	Yea.
125	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2311, authorizing additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, to meet possible Berlin crisis:	
127	Aug. 2	On Passage. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 30, granting the consent of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact:	
128	Aug. 2	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit participation of Federal Government to nonvoting representation. (Rejected 139 to 261.)	Yea.
129	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1643, providing wheat and feed grains program for 1962, and extending other farm laws (Agricultural Act of 1961):	
130	Aug. 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 224 to 170.)	Nay.
131	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7856, reorganizing Federal Communications Commission to permit the FCC Board to delegate its functions in adjudicative cases to employees:	
132	Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed 196 to 150.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7728, authorizing the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to private aircraft owners:	
133	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 307 to 78.)	Nay.
134	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 404, providing for House-Senate conference on H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1962:	
135	Aug. 8	On motion to table (kill) motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment providing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Rejected 164 to 235.)	Nay.
136	Aug. 8	On motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment authorizing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Adopted 235 to 164.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
137	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8033, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to delegate certain duties to employee boards:	
138	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 212 to 174.)	Nay.
139	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 406, providing for the consideration of S. 1815, providing an Assistant Secretary of Labor, to handle the problems of women workers:	
140	Aug. 9	On adoption of the resolution. (Adopted 369 to 16.)	Yea.
141	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6302, transferring Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, from Federal Government to Howard University:	
142	Aug. 9	On passage. (Passed 321 to 61.)	Yea.
143	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7851, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1962:	
144	Aug. 10	On adoption of conference report: (Adopted 383 to 0.)	Yea.
145	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
148	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
149	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
150	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
151	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
152	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
153	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Absent.
155	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8400, authorizing foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1962:	
157	Aug. 18	On passage. (Passed 287 to 140.)	Yea.
158	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
159	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8384, providing Federal penalties for airplane hijacking and other crimes committed aboard commercial aircraft:	
160	Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 373 to 5.)	Yea.
161	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
162	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7763, authorizing planning for U.S. participation in the New York World's Fair in 1964 and 1965:	
164	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 353 to 42.)	Yea.
165	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
166	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 84, subsidizing lead and zinc producers:	
167	Aug. 24	On passage. (Passed 196 to 172.)	Nay.
168	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8181, authorizing $20,000,000 for a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia:	
169	Aug. 28	On engrossment and 3d reading of bill. (Ordered 223 to 120.)	Not voting.[1]
170	Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 208 to 135.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 7176, providing for a national hog cholera eradication program:	
171	Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 337 to 3.)	Yea.
172	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8773, increasing readjustment payments to Armed Forces Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty:	
173	Aug. 29	On passage. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yea.
174	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6242, exempting certain Department of Justice attorneys from the salary ceilings in their civil service classification:	
175	Aug. 29	On passage. (Rejected 172 to 223.)	Nay.
176	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8890, authorizing a program of Federal aid to education:	
177	Aug. 30	On motion to consider bill under Calendar Wesnesday procedure. (Rejected 170 to 242.)	Nay.
178	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8028, authorizing $30,000,000 for studying juvenile delinquency:	
179	Aug. 30	On amendment restricting pilot projects to the District of Columbia. (Rejected 187 to 217.)	Yea.
		S. Con. Res. 34, expressing the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be seated in the United Nations:	
180	Aug. 31	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 395 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1983, authorizing foreign economic and military aid:	
181	Aug. 31	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 260 to 132.)	Yea.
182	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
183	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
184	Sept. 5	On amendment increasing military assistance by additional $300,000,000. (Adopted 242 to 151.)	Nay.
185	Sept. 5	On passage. (Passed 270 to 123.)	Yea.
186	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
187	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9000, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
188	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 378 to 32.)	Nay.
189	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8723, amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act:	
190	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 245 to 161, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8666, promoting educational and cultural exchanges between the United States and other nations:	
191	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 66.)	Yea.
192	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
193	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Present.
194	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
195	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
196	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
197	Sept. 13	On motion to agree to Senate amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 212 to 185.).	Nay.
		H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and the judiciary:	
198	Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 1963. (Adopted 300 to 106.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9076, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal 1962 (Public Works):	
199	Sept. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate funds for Upper Colorado River Basin transmission lines. (Rejected 182 to 24.)	Yea.
200	Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 377 to 31.)	Nay.
201	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
202	Sept. 13	On adoption of conference report and approval of construction of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash. (Rejected 155 to 261.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8102, extending the time for making grants under the Federal Airport Act:	
203	Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment fixing extension at 3 years. (Adopted 396 to 4.)	Yea.
204	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
205	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 287 to 97.)	Nay.
206	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 455, providing for a conference with Senate on H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program:	
207	Sept. 15	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 243 to 135.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 464, providing for the consideration of committee substitute amendment to H.R. 7927, adjusting postal rates:	
208	Sept. 15	On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Rejected 142 to 222.)	Nay.
209	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Present.

Footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 2393, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
210	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 342 to 18.)	Not voting.[2]
		S. 1459, adjusting longevity step increases for postal employees:	
211	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 361 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 5751, providing for notification to recipients that his mail may contain Communist propaganda from abroad and providing for return to sender:	
212	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 369 to 2.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 8914, amending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding participation in 1962 feed grain program:	
213	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 213 to 149, a two-thirds vote being required.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
214	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 305 to 53.)	Not voting.[2]
215	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
216	Sept. 19	On passage. (Passed 290 to 54.)	Not voting.[1]
217	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Absent.
218	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
219	Sept. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 253 to 78.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 5628, providing Federal funds to study the establishment of a botanic garden in Hawaii:	
220	Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 215 to 125, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 4172, establishing a Federal Council on the Arts:	
221	Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 166 to 173.)	Not voting.[2]
222	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 238, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
223	Sept. 22	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 142 to 159.)	Not voting.[2]
224	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
225	Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 228 to 71.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
226	Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 252 to 50.)	Not voting.[1]
227	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.
228	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 258, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
229	Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 97 to 173.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
230	Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 192 to 81.)	Not voting.[1]
231	Sept. 26	On motion to agree with Senate amendment providing that foreign aid Inspector General need not honor a request for information from Congress if the President certifies he has forbidden him to do so.	Not voting.[2]

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea." [2] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

First Missourian To Head American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the highest honor which the American Legion can bestow was recently conferred upon Mr. Charles L. Bacon, of Kansas City, Mo., when he was elevated to the office of National Commander at the convention recently adjourned in the city of Denver, Colo. While there is a personal honor for Commander Bacon, it is also a great honor for the State of Missouri because he is the first and only Missourian ever to become National Commander of the giant veterans organization of 2,600,000 members.

Commander Bacon's elevation to this high office climaxed an arduous and carefully planned three-year campaign by his fellow Legionnaires from Missouri. So convincingly did he become the choice that four other candidates withdrew from consideration and were not even nominated.

Fellow-Missourians will further honor Mr. Bacon at a program designated as a nation homecoming celebration in Kansas City, Mo., on November 10–12. This will be a part of a large and significant observance for the rededication of the world famous Liberty Memorial as a monument to International Understanding. This famous memorial was erected shortly after the conclusion of World War I.

It has been our pleasure to know Charley Bacon as a successful lawyer in Kansas City. He is a graduate of Missouri Valley College, and is vice president of the college board of trustees. He obtained his law degree at the University of Missouri.

More particularly, it has been our pleasure to work very closely with Commander Bacon as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

We predict a banner year for the American Legion under his leadership. In his acceptance speech, he said:

> I know that it is your conviction as it is mine, that the more successful we make all the programs of the American Legion today, the stronger and better will be the America of tomorrow.

Congratulations to you, Charley Bacon. Congratulations to your fellow Legionnaires for their wise selection of a leader. All Missouri is proud of you.

"A Grateful American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress know only too well the various special interest and pressure groups, the lobbyists and philanthropic foundations which daily make requests of Congress for funds and appropriations. It may often seem a Member's time is completely consumed by people and organizations requiring special attention and extraordinary legislation.

Recently, one of my constituents, Mrs. Casimira Lucas, having noted the passage of a law which now makes it possible for private citizens to voluntarily contribute to the retirement of the national debt, sent a contribution of $1 to the House Ways and Means Committee to be forwarded to the Treasury Department. The depth of feeling which prompted her to make this gesture of assistance made a great impression upon me.

Mrs. Lucas wished to share in the continued growth of a free America. She writes that she wanted to help the country which has given her so much, and her patriotism is all the more eloquent because of the sacrifice she made to express it.

I am reminded of President Kennedy's words when he summoned us to new tasks and new responsibilities in his inaugural address, "ask what you can do for your country."

Mrs. Lucas and the 33 other devoted Americans who have thus far contributed $2,661.55, of their own free will, to the retirement of our national debt, deserve the sincere praise of a grateful Nation.

It is an honor to represent this unselfish American and her family in the Congress of the United States. I trust my colleagues will enjoy the same feeling of pride in America which I experienced when reading this letter.

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

MAY 7, 1961.

GENTLEMEN: Please do not laugh at the enclosed contribution of only $1, which is all I can contribute under present circumstances.

I only hope that the millions of readers will feel as I did after reading the enclosed article, and do the same as I am doing, giving whatever they can voluntarily to decrease the national debt.

God bless America and keep her safe.

My parents who brought me to America in 1913 have instilled in my brother, sister, and myself patriotism for our new country as well as our mother country, for which I will be forever thankful to them, and I am sorry that I can't prove it in a more generous contribution.

Sincerely,

CASIMIRA LUCAS.

The Honorable John W. McCormack

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join colleagues in paying respects to the present occupant of the chair, Speaker Pro Tempore JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Today is a significant one in the life of long time Majority Leader MCCORMACK because it marks the 21st anniversary of his election to that very important position.

Members of the minority have had a first-hand opportunity to realize the extraordinary ability and forcefulness of the Speaker pro tempore as he led his forces as majority leader in the legislative battles that have occurred during the past 21 years. During the 9 years I have served in this body, I have had an opportunity to observe the strong leadership exercised by Speaker pro tempore MCCORMACK as he served his party most efficiently and effectively as majority leader. He can use ridicule and sarcasm when the occasion calls for it but he can also be calm, moderate, gentle and persuasive. Whichever tactic he employs, he is one of the most compelling men in debate that it has been my privilege to hear.

It was once my privilege to serve with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] on a special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Our subcommittee was charged with the responsibility of revising the so-called Donable Property Act, the law under which the Federal Government donates surplus property to educational and charitable organizations. We worked closely together on this problem for nearly a year and the result has turned out to be of tremendous benefit to the communities in various States of the Union that are participating in the program.

During that year I had the opportunity of sitting with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts in a committee hearing room almost daily and out of that intimate association, in work we both enjoyed doing, I came to form an even higher regard and affection for Mr. MCCORMACK.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has been uniformly courteous and kind to me over the years and I not only hold him in the highest esteem as a distinguished legislator and leader but have great affection for him as a friend and associate. I am happy to join with my colleagues today in paying our respects to him on this significant occasion and wish also to extend to him my sincere good wishes for a relaxing and refreshing holiday, and my best wishes also for long life, good health, and peace of mind during the years that lie ahead.

Cramer Answers Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy by Scoring the Attorney General for Failure To Support Stronger Anticrime Measures

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues read George Dixon's column in the Washington Post and Times Herald a few days ago, in which the Attorney General was reported as being irked by my complaints that I had been unable to consult with him regarding my interest in strong anticrime legislation, and specifically the establishment of an Office on Syndicated Crime, with the purpose of collecting, evaluating, and disseminating information concerning the organized rackets.

I addressed a letter to the Attorney General reviewing the record and stating the facts, particularly in view of his very clear suggestion that he was categorizing me as one of the Members of Congress whose aim is to throw monkey wrenches into his program, which, of course, as the record will clearly show is not true. On the record, I have been an ardent fighter against organized crime, perhaps even more than the Attorney General himself, and have expressed myself as being concerned about the half-hearted approach of the Attorney General on fighting organized crime evidenced by his refusal to push some of the proposals I have made, and his failure to get through Congress three of his major anticrime measures this session, which should have been accomplished with his strong leadership.

I include a copy of my letter to the Attorney General, stating the facts of the case, and asking for a conference with him to discuss further legislation in the coming session.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: When I read Mr. George Dixon's column in the Washington Post last week, in which he reported you were "irked" by my complaints that I had been unable to consult with you regarding our mutual interest in anticrime legislation and that you were "never inaccessible" to "Members of Congress who desire to discuss matters of law and justice" with you, even if their aim is to "throw monkey wrenches" into your program, I was shocked and dismayed. As an ardent and long-standing backer of measures to bring under effective control the organized crime menace which confronts our country, I am the last Member of Congress on whom you can pin the label of "a monkey wrencher of your program." The record will show that I have been one of the stanchest allies you have—and enemies the organized racketeers have—on Capitol Hill.

As one who has repeatedly and unsuccessfully attempted to consult with you and to enlist your advocacy for even additional anticrime measures of my own, I hardly think these comments worthy of you as the highest law enforcement authority in the land.

The record will show this, as well as the fact that I am no Johnny Come Lately to the anticrime legislative field. Indeed, my credentials date as far back and possibly further than your own. Almost since my entry into Congress, I have advocated programs to curb the interstate crime threat which plagues our land—to the tune of a $22 billion annual "take."

Time and again I introduced measures aimed at the syndicates, only to watch them die aborning in a disinterested Congress. This session, I embodied all of my previous proposals, together with several new ones, in an omnibus crime bill. Designated H.R. 6909, this measure was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. For your information, the Cramer bill embraced every one of the anticrime proposals sponsored by you which could properly come before the Judiciary Committee. Significantly, my bill was the only one this session which did so.

The following chart speaks for itself on whether or not I supported your current anticrime drive—or perhaps, stated a bit more accurately, whether you supported mine.

Kennedy program	Advocated in this Congress by Cramer (H.R. 6909)	Advocated in previous Congresses by Cramer	Advocated by former Attorney General Rogers
Interstate travel in furtherance of organized crime.	Yes	Yes	No.
Transmission of gambling information.	Yes [1]	Yes	Yes.
Fugitive felon	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Wagering paraphernalia.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Compelling testimony	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Transportation of gambling devices.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Obstruction of agency investigations.	Yes	No	No.

[1] Similar curb.

Thus, far from being a footdragger or obstructionist in the anticrime field, I have been in the forefront of the battle. And, insofar as your own vaunted anticrime program is concerned, I supported it wholeheartedly at this session of Congress and, indeed, in all but two cases, in previous ones.

If there is any disagreement at all between us, it is because I feel the program sponsored by you does not go far enough or deep enough. To do the job that needs to be done, additional measures are, I believe, necessary. It was to secure your support and advocacy for such further measures that I have sought to see you. I felt I might win your approval of these proposals which I believe are the sine qua non of an adequate program.

These new titles are likewise embraced in H.R. 6909:

Additional Cramer program	Now or in the past advocated by Mr. Kennedy	Advocated by former Attorney General Rogers
Office on Syndicated Crime	Yes [1]	No.
Outlaw terroristic criminal offenses.	No	Yes.
Outlaw criminal business expenditures.	No	Yes.
Wiretapping relating to organized crime.	Yes	No.

[1] Broad crime commission.

I have been especially interested in the establishment of an Office on Syndicated Crime. Originally urged by rackets-buster Milton Wessel, such an Office would assemble, correlate and disseminate intelligence from all sources, Federal and State, relating to organized crime.

How can we hope effectively to fight organized crime if we don't know what it is, who is involved, how it operates, and how far it permeates our society?

Since you yourself had urged the creation of a Federal Crime Commission, a little over a year ago, which goes much farther than my proposal, and had renewed your advocacy during the recent presidential campaign, I cannot understand why, now that you are in a position to implement your idea, you have abandoned it. I cannot understand how I am monkey wrenching your program simply because I have not given up the fight for a sound syndicated crime information center to help local law enforcement agencies.

The merit of a crime clearinghouse is unquestioned. I make this statement not on my own authority, but rather on the authority of every recognized witness who testified before our Judiciary Committee during our recent hearings on organized crime. Sadly, the only opposition to my Office on Syndicated Crime proposal came from you and your assistant, Mr. Miller.

Since, for some unexplained reason, breaking entirely with committee custom and practice, those hearings have not yet been printed, I cannot send you a copy of them in order that you might peruse and confirm my statement.

It is certainly true, as Mr. Dixon reported, that I quizzed you briefly, during your appearance before our committee. I had been given special permission to participate in the hearings due to Chairman CELLER'S recognition of my longstanding and active interest in the anticrime field.

Unfortunately, my omnibus bill, H.R. 6909, was not officially before the subcommittee at the time. This, despite the fact that a subsequently introduced measure (H.R. 7039) was. It was not until several days after the hearings had begun that the chairman officially took cognizance of my bill and then only in a limited fashion.

So it was that, when the opportunity to question you was afforded me, far from discussing my measure, you pleaded ignorance of it. You had not seen or read it and thus were not familiar with its contents. And, as I recall the situation, when I attempted to press you on one of my legislative suggestions, I was summarily cut off by the chairman and the hearings were adjourned.

Since that time I have attempted, on numerous occasions, to discuss aspects of my program with you to enlist your advocacy for them. My attempts, regretably, have met with failure. But attempts there were—whether or not your secretaries kept a record—and I was shunted off to some of your many assistants whenever I asked to discuss anticrime measures.

Of course, it is true that we did, on one occasion, "break bread and ice" together. I remember that intimate gathering well. I am sure that others of the 34 members of the Judiciary Committee present did also. While it is probably true that no topic of conversation was barred at that luncheon, it is certainly also true that you were consumed with and directed the conversation at the luncheon largely toward securing a pay raise for Justice Department personnel. While I attempted to discuss at length organized crime on that occasion, I was less than successful.

But setting the record straight is of secondary importance to the far more pressing problem of effectively curbing the crime moguls who are gnawing at the moral vitals of America and sapping its economic vitality. Thus, despite our present impasse, I suggest you join me in my continuing anticrime fight on the legislative front. Much remains to be done, including three of your own proposals not enacted this session—immunity of witnesses, obstruction of justice, and gambling devices shipment.

I should, therefore, appreciate a meeting with you, not your subordinates, at the earliest opportunity in planning for the 1962 legislative allout anticrime effort.

In addition, I strongly urge the following:

1. That J. Edgar Hoover be permitted to testify at our future hearings, which was denied even during the 1961 hearings;

2. That you make available to the House Judiciary Committee the two reports—Mafia-Italy and Mafia-Sicily—which you heretofore refused to furnish on committee request;

3. That you give further consideration to supporting additional measures to fight organized crime, particularly the Office on Syndicated Crime proposal embodied in H.R. 6909.

I look forward to our meeting in the near future. I am hopeful it will produce useful and worthwhile results.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

The Mishawaka Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, for the first time, beginning on September 5, 1961, the citizens of Mishawaka, Ind., have their own daily newspaper.

In this era when the rising costs of production discourage the creation of new daily newspapers, the birth of the Mishawaka Times is an encouraging sign.

Although Mishawaka was first incorporated as a city in 1869, the city has never had a daily newspaper. Following 2 years of research, Publishers John Dille and John A. Scott, of Elkhart, Ind., were convinced that Mishawaka, with a population of 34,000, could support a daily paper. The managing editor of the Times is James P. McNeile.

I am pleased to salute the Mishawaka Times and to wish it well in the pursuit of truth and service to the Mishawaka community.

At this point in the RECORD I include the text of President Kennedy's telegram to Mayor Joseph Canfield of Mishawaka concerning the new paper:

HON. JOSEPH CANFIELD,
Office of the Mayor,
City Hall, Mishawaka, Ind.:

Congressman BRADEMAS has told me that your city will have a daily newspaper for the first time in 33 years. I know that this must be a great satisfaction to the people of Mishawaka and to you personally as their chief executive of the city.

A daily newspaper can be a dynamic factor in a city's progress and prosperity. Moreover, a free press can contribute to the citizens of the individual community just as it can educate the entire Nation.

I wish the Mishawaka Times and the people of Mishawaka every success in this endeavor.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

"Trust": A Program To Employ the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and call attention to an outstanding public service program being provided for the people of West Virginia, southeastern Ohio, and eastern Kentucky by station WSAZ–TV in Huntington, W. Va.

In addition to its regular public service programs, WSAZ–TV has been producing since May 20, 1961, a program called "Trust." This program is unique in that its sole purpose is to help find employment for the physically handicapped people residing in the tristate region.

Primarily, the program is designed to help the handicapped surmount the biggest hurdle—that of getting an interview with a potential employer. A special time was selected—early Saturday afternoon—to try and attract some potential employers who might view the program and see the capabilities of handicapped people. Consciously or not, these employers would have their first interview with handicapped people by means of television. During the program, specially selected handicapped persons appear on the program and discuss their background and the type of work they can perform. Emphasis is placed on the training individuals receive, age, lengthy of unemployment, marital status, salary expected, and when they can report for work.

I want to commend WSAZ–TV for providing a vital link in aiding those who are physically handicapped. This is a wonderful example of the initiative taken by local citizens to carry out President Kennedy's program for employment of the physically handicapped.

"Trust" is written and produced by Mrs. Leda P. Lewis, who has been untiring in her efforts to aid the handicapped. Mrs. Lewis has also been very active in helping to carry out the President's program to combat juvenile de-

linquency. Along with the members of the West Virginia congressional delegation, I am supporting the nomination of Mrs. Lewis to the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency.

For their valuable contribution to the betterment of our community, I salute the personnel of WSAZ–TV for making available this very worthwhile program. I wish to pay a special tribute to Mrs. Leda P. Lewis, writer and producer of "Trust," for contributing unselfishly of her time and talent to help obtain equal opportunities for all, including the physically handicapped.

Democracy Is Promoting National Prosperity and National Defense

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1917, the Speaker of the House, officially welcoming the visiting delegation from the Republic of Russia said:

> When our fathers proclaimed this Republic at Philadelphia July 4, 1776, there was only one other republic on earth—Switzerland—and the fathers were not certain this one would live until Christmas. Now, thanks to Almighty God, there are 27 republics in the world.
>
> In a large sense we made them every one—not by conquering armies, not by the mailed hand, but by the wholesomeness of our example, by teaching all creation that men can govern themselves.
>
> Of there 27 republics Russia is the newest and the biggest. It dazzles the imagination to think that she may be under free institutions, possessing as she does 180 million people and one-sixth of the land on the globe.

In that hour, when Russia after centuries of despotism under the czars had briefly espoused democratic government, every recognized nation in the world had embraced at least the forms of democracy. And Speaker Clark expressed the universal opinion of mankind that democracy had at last finally and permanently triumphed around the world.

The same faith was expressed by President Kennedy half a century later when he said at the great ovation tendered him on his 44th birthday:

> The dominant fact of the 20th century is that liberty grew and spread around the world.

What disillusionment has followed. What seemed to hopeful humanity to be the refulgence of a new day was but the flash of opening storm.

And today, after two world wars "to make the world safe for democracy," out of the 99 nations composing the United Nations—and others not admitted—only the Scandinavian and Benelux countries, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Ireland, Canada and the United States, Costa Rica, Chile and Uruguay, Australia, New Zealand, and Israel support governments indisputably democratic.

In the World Wars of 1917 and 1941 which followed the United States demonstrated not only the advantages of democracy in promoting national prosperity but its capacity for national defense as well.

At the conclusion of the Second World War the United States stood alone as the greatest military power the world had ever seen. We had the greatest army, more planes, more tanks, more ships than any other nation, and in our teeming cities, more wealth and greater productive capacity than all the rest of the world combined.

All nations, the military powers of every continent, were delighted to be associated with us and flocked to our standard and our leadership in the organization of nonaggression compacts of mutual assistance and defense. And we expended billions of dollars in the construction of air bases in every country contiguous to Russia and its satellites.

Almost overnight the wheel turns and our allies are withdrawing. Our position as an ally and a military power is dramatically weakened.

The Icelandic Althing has insisted on the removal of our northern base. France has notified us to leave and specifically interdicts nuclear weapons or warheads on French soil. Britain has banished American forces from four bases which cost us $50 million to build and mobs are demonstrating against our submarine bases in North Scotland.

American forces have been notified to abandon our Saudi Arabia air base at Dhahran.

Democracy itself is repudiated. In Korea we have for years expended vast sums in schools, hospitals, commissions, libraries and other facilities to establish a democratic government and democratic institutions.

We have contributed food, arms, and medical supplies, established modern police forces for cities, organized and drilled armies and supplied munitions and transportation and conducted free elections.

Yet in 1 hour the entire fabric of democratic government vanished and no one seemed to care. There was no protest and apparently no regrets. An entire nation trained in democratic ideas and ideals for more than a decade accepted dictatorship without comment and no one seemed to miss freedom.

At the close of the Spanish-American war, Cuba was ceded to the United States. The world took for granted it would be annexed and made a dependency or a part of the United States. Instead, we rehabilitated the country, organized public schools, founded a sound banking system, and encouraged the establishment of a new nation. Again, as in Korea, a communistic dictator took over; and recently when opportunity was afforded, the people, who had enjoyed a half century of self-government—an opportunity to rise against the usurpers, no one rose.

Throughout the world, to which, nation by nation, we have contributed so much, a black storm of hatred and insult and violence is rising.

Our Vice President, on a good will tour of South America, was set upon by a mob in Venezuela and stoned and spat upon while native police stood by disinterestedly.

Greece, whom we befriended through the years, would not allow our planes to refuel at Athens.

Austria, whom we saved from Soviet clutches, sent jetplanes to keep our transports from flying across one corner of her Tyrol.

In Bolivia the American envoy's visit coincided with bloody rioting, and in Lima riot squads using tear gas grenades were necessary to protect him, while hostile students adopted resolutions of protest. In Bogota his limousine was stoned by frenzied students waiting at the university, and two bombs were found at the country club where he was to speak.

The President of the United States, himself, invited to pay an official visit to Japan, was turned back by violent riots, and in Paris he was personally abused and insulted in the most provocative language by the head of the Russian government while foreign diplomats looked on in ill-concealed delight.

American planes have been repeatedly shot down by Russian aircraft and there has been no accounting. And provocations multiply.

Why this change in less than a decade from the pinnacle of fame and power and the respectful adulation and appreciation of a ransomed and delivered world to a position subject to contempt and enmity around the globe?

The answer is simple. The world stood by, hat in hand, when we had power and military might. Now that we have dropped to a second-class power the world turns to a greater power, Russia, the exponent of ruthless, brutal, irresponsible, military despotism.

Of course there are jingoists who insist that the United States can whip any nation on earth with one hand tied behind—and I hope it is so—and along with every other Member of the Congress I am doing everything I can to make it so, but all calm, dispassionate, appraisals by impartial authorities concede that Russia has 174 divisions to our 17, all better equipped; that they have 5 times the number of submarines and are turning them out more rapidly; that they are superceding bombers with intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads, and stockpiling missiles with ranges of 8,000 miles and an accuracy at that distance of less than 2 miles from the target, and any one of them could destroy an American city.

Our situation is identical with that of England when at the close of the First World War, obsessed with the idea of the invulnerability of her navy, she ignored developments in air power. Then when Hitler's bombers were on the horizon, Chamberlain bought such time as he could at Munich by the most humiliating concessions and when

driven into war, unarmed and unprepared, was saved by the American Expeditionary Force.

But in America the improvidence is even more incomprehensible. Although the atomic bomb and nuclear propulsion are American inventions and we first produced them, Russia in 15 short years has forged far ahead in their application to modern warfare and in the scientific domain in which they had their inception.

Russia put the first satellite in orbit. We have never yet been able to penetrate the stratosphere.

Russia took the first and only picture of the hidden side of the moon. Our scientists had decided we would never be able to map the other side, when a complete photograph of it was printed in the local papers. The Russians had obligingly given it to us.

They fired the first shot to hit the moon. Our observers through our own telescopes saw the reaction when the missile struck the surface of the planet.

The Russians put the first man in orbit and brought him safely back to earth—the greatest scientific achievement in the history of man, a feat we have not yet been able to duplicate.

They have built the largest hydroelectric plant in the world, two and a half times the size of the great Bonneville Dam.

They have just exploded the 16th nuclear bomb—incidentally evidencing their contempt for world opinion—and all the neutral nations, which have been uniformly condemning the United States for developing the atomic bomb, are filled with admiration and ready to mould United Nations procedure to Soviet policy. The astonishing performance of the Belgrade conference, just adjourned, in ignoring Russia's flagrant violations of international law in filling the atmosphere with radiated fallout, and castigating the West on colonialism is typical. And nations which have only been able to sustain their economy through aid generously extended by the United States, were among the most vociferous.

All world barometers indicate that through the last decade, respect for the United States has declined drastically while Russian prestige has mushroomed with the vapor of her exploding bombs and her soaring satellites.

When we contemplate in agonized astonishment the drop of the United States from supreme power and influence in so short a time, when our newspapers carry daily accounts of the preeminent achievements of our enemies, a people just emerging from barbarism, when we realize the deadly danger which menaces us and our form of government and our way of life, and all Christian civilization, we are inevitably confronted with the question, "Why?"

What irresistable influence could possibly have brought us in so short a time to this sudden and undeserved castrophe? How is it that we find ourselves and our Nation so unexpectedly on the brink of the precipice?

The answer is plain—inept leadership. With closed eyes and closed minds, blind and deaf to the screaming lessons of history and the wildly gesticulating signs of the times, we have driven at top speed and incredible dissipation of national wealth and resources into the mouth of perdition.

The watchmen upon the towers have failed us. The Pentagon and the committees of the House and Senate, following the admirals in blind obsession, have failed to realize that the whole military philosophy of the era has been changing. They have failed lamentably to understand the revolution which has been taking place in the technology of war. They have been living in the past, in the days of French 75's and no man's land and fixed bases. They cannot appreciate the fact that battles are no longer won with bayonets and wars are no longer won with battles and that modern warfare is a matter of chemistry and machinery and worldwide targets, and that casualties include entire cities with all inhabitants and millions of noncombatants in remote sections of the country.

The admirals of the U.S. Navy stubbornly refused to consider aircraft as anything more than toys until a small Japanese plane sank two of the finest and newest warships in the British Navy and airplanes hardly larger than kites sank decommissioned American warships in Hampton Roads.

But being finally convinced against their will that 2 and 2 were 4, they leaped into the front seat of the bandwagon and grabbed the lines and devised the aircraft carrier, the most elaborate, the most expensive, and the most vulnerable ship that ever sailed the seas. Still insisting fatuously that the Navy was the first line of defense, they starved other branches of the service in order to pour into the carriers every resource at their command. Engineers, technicians, artisans, skilled mechanics were monopolized, the choicest materials and all the attention and emphasis that the service could bring to bear, were concentrated on the carrier program. Year after year the admirals appeared before the House and Senate committees on the Hill, and the committees promptly and docilly recommended the authorizations and appropriations requested.

A task force of carriers, with auxiliaries, tenders, destroyers, and service ships cost in excess of a billion dollars. They travel at the rate of 36 miles an hour in this supersonic age and are as fragile as an eggshell.

So, while Russia concentrated on submarines and missiles, down at the Pentagon protocol was observed meticulously and clerks filed away tons of reports on unimportant details and America's war power steadily dwindled.

The 1960 budget contained no funds for construction of additional submarines or Polaris except for advance components, a notable and disastrous gap in the deployment of both.

The admiralty was not interested in either missiles or submarines, and as a result, the congressional committees were not interested. Oblivious to what was happening before their eyes, they passed up any hope that we would be ready with modern weapons when the the test of war came.

For example in the spring of 1957, only a few months before the sputnik was launched, Admiral Raborn waited in an anteroom most of the day before he was called before the House subcommittee. Admiral Raborn briefly outlined the Polaris system and its relation to the nuclear-driven submarine and its tremendous impact on modern armament.

He explained that it would be powered by a solid propellant, a feature which of itself would naturally attract attention.

He told of its phenomenal range of 1,500 miles and pointed out that when launched from a nuclear-powered submarine it would fill our greatest need—powerful Navy retaliation from the sea.

He made it plain that this remarkable combination of nuclear submarine and atomic missile would be all but invulnerable.

Nothing more revolutionary, or more needed in national defense, could have been suggested and yet no one was interested. No member of the committee asked even a perfunctory question. The chairman asked if there were any questions. There were none and Raborn was dismissed. His testimony had taken 5 minutes. And when he left the room national security went with him.

When the committee reconvened for the following session of Congress and the question of the Polaris program was again brought before the committee, although the sputnik had in the meantime alerted and alarmed the entire Nation, the committee showed no interest and Secretary of Defense McElroy without further consultation ordered acceleration of the program without waiting on the committee.

The same lethargy toward submarine and missile programs and the same obsequious deference to the admiralty characterized every other committee of the two Houses dealing with national defense.

But history has a way of balancing the equation. In great national need a great national figure rises to meet the occasion. Adm. Hyman Rickover is such a man. In my considered opinion, he has rendered the greatest service to the Nation of any man since Lincoln. But for him and the nuclear-propelled submarine, supplemented by Adm. William F. Raborn's Polaris, our situation today would be hopeless. In the secret depths of the sea, with no entangling base arrangements to be made with foreign governments, the submarine cannot be found and it cannot be destroyed. In constant radio contact with Washington, it can swiftly emerge in range of any Russian city or military installation and carries 16 Polaris missiles each of which is capable of destroying an entire city and its environments. As time runs out on the gallant SAC only the Nautilus and her sister nuclear propelled vessels can deter a brutal, consciousless aggressor from an unprovoked attack and the murderous extinction of the American people.

The admirals made every effort to stop the work of Admiral Rickover and

drive him from the Navy. Only his personal appeal to President Eisenhower gave him makeshift working quarters and the opportunity to save the Nation.

Had the United States in these crucial years followed Russia's example and put the thought, emphasis, and resources we wasted on carriers into missiles, we would have been the first into the stratosphere and would undoubtedly have been preeminent today in military power and world leadership.

Effort was repeatedly made to break the hypnotic power of the admirals over the House committeemen and divert the vast sums being spent for carriers to neglected defense items—submarines and missiles in particular. Only recently in writing the annual appropriation bills, were we able to get motions through the subcommittee to eliminate them. And even then the Senate invariably restored them.

When President Eisenhower had been in office only 3 days, we went down to the White House to see him and urge him to intercede and stop the mad carrier program. As we know now, President Eisenhower leaned over backward to avoid any implication of interfering with Navy procedure. He listened attentively and gently indicated that he believed the carriers would be effective in minor operations. Incidentally, we realize now that America will never again participate in a limited war. Any future war will be for keeps, with all chips down, and every nuclear weapon utilized. It is tragic to think that America might still be predominant and world peace assured if the President had disregarded interservice protocol and eliminated the carriers.

In the meantime, belatedly, the aircraft carrier craze has fallen of its own weight. Although we devoted something like 15 years to building carriers to the exclusion of important defense weapons and spent billions of dollars on the fallacious carrier program, all mention of it has disappeared from current reports and all reference to carriers or anything pertaining to them has vanished from the daily newspapers.

President Kennedy has avoided in all messages and recommendations any reference to carriers or the carrier program. Much too late it is a dead issue. The incredible carrier program has been sunk without a trace.

Not only were those engaged on the nuclear propulsion research and the Polaris denied adequate facilities but they were constantly subjected to galling demands of rank. Officious and critical demands for evaluation, reports, justifications and inspection, took time and energy which should have been devoted to study, research and fabrication and reduced morale and delayed progress.

Congressional committees added to the difficulties. After completely neglecting the projects—once they began to appear in the newspaper headlines—every committee and subcommittee which could claim jurisdiction called on them to appear for long and exhausting hearings to recount over and over again the same testimony and insisted on having reports on the most sensitive and revealing phases of the work, and newspapers carried every item that could be gleaned. Much of the data which enabled Russia to capitalize on American discoveries and inventions was secured from newspapers and official reports of congressional committees and executive departments.

It is to be hoped that we have progressed to the point where in the future our technicians and scientific executives can be protected from this irksome and officious exploitation.

It is now an accepted maxim, conceded by responsible military authorities throughout the world that in any future war no military force can survive under attack on the surface of the earth. Only those in the air, underground or beneath the sea will survive.

President Kennedy has reversed the program. In suggesting the assignment of American naval support for international operations, he has always specified submarines and has never mentioned carriers.

The long program calling for the construction of aircraft carriers has been abandoned. The last budgets have carried no funds for the construction of new carriers and the Navy has awarded no carrier contracts. After spending 15 years and billions of dollars preparing the one great weapon to be ready when needed, we now find that all the time and money and emphasis devoted to this huge Frankenstein is utterly wasted and the carriers are useless and will be driven up the nearest river as far as they can go as soon as war is declared or fighting starts. It is the most colossal national debacle in all military history.

The sole purpose of all military appropriations in this session and all future sessions—if there are future sessions—is to deter foreign predators from attack. In this darkest and most dangerous period in our annals the nuclear powered missile firing submarine is the most effective deterrent to war and the most assured implement of permanent world peace. We desperately need more of them—and our intercontinental ballistic missiles are still too recently in the experimental stage but there may be enough. It is late but perhaps not too late.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for his statement. I was the mayor of the city of Omaha where the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command is located. I know the views that the gentleman from Missouri expresses about the carriers are the very same views that are expressed by General LeMay.

Mr. CANNON. General LeMay said 3 years ago, and nobody has since denied it, that within 2 hours after the fighting started not a single vestige of the American Navy would remain afloat, except the submarines.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say that I am personally convinced of the value of the Polaris submarine. I have a very close personal friend who has his roots in Nebraska, and who is a graduate of West Point, who is now in the Bureau of Ships. He has for the last several years been instrumental in working on the Polaris submarine. He called on me just last week and said that he was frustrated, that there are so many administrative decisions and orders and so much bureaucracy surrounding the program now that it has become of age that he wondered whether he should get out of it. So, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will see to it that these people who know the Polaris submarine and are dedicated to it will not be frustrated and have any reason to remove themselves from Government service, because we need them very, very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

United States All Alone in Stressing Tax on Pay, Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is a very interesting analysis prepared by one of America's most outstanding financial columnists, Miss Sylvia Porter, which I think merits the attention of all of us here in Congress.

I believe Miss Porter raises some very interesting questions which should be considered when we prepare to revise our tax structure in the next session of Congress.

Miss Porter's article follows:

UNITED STATES ALL ALONE IN STRESSING TAX ON PAY, PROFITS

(By Sylvia Porter)

In capitalistic United States, a massive 86 percent of the billions of dollars the Federal Government collects each year comes from taxes on our paychecks, profits, estates or gifts. By far and away the major sources of revenue of Government in Washington are those of us who can earn or have the most.

In contrast, in Communist Russia, an overwhelming 85 percent of the billions of rubles the Kremlin collects each year comes from Soviet citizens across-the-board as they spend money to feed, clothe, shelter themselves. By far and away the major sources of government revenue in Moscow are sales, excise, and other taxes.

In our country, which pays homage to individual incentives to work and produce, we concentrate on taxing employment and production to such an extent that an insignificant 14 percent of the Federal Government's take comes from sales taxes.

In such strongly socialistic countries as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, though, the government gets one-half to three-quarters of their revenues from sales, excise taxes, customs duties.

Our Federal Government is alone in the world in relying so heavily on income and

profits taxes, refusing to turn to sales and similar taxes.

Our Federal Government is alone in delaying tax relief year after year, refusing to recognize that reform of oppressive rates has been a key to the recent spectacular economic growth of other nations.

Tax reform is dead for 1961. This session of Congress isn't going to pass any significant legislation.

Here's a table from the September bulletin of the First National City Bank of New York, comparing sources of total revenues of central governments, which should be an eye-opener to every thoughtful citizen.

[Percent]

Country	Tax take from—	
	Income, capital	Sales, other taxes
United States	86	14
New Zealand	64	36
Canada	60	40
Australia	59	41
South Africa	56	44
Netherland	54	46
United Kingdom	54	46
Sweden	53	47
Japan	51	49
Denmark	41	59
Belgium	39	61
Spain	39	61
Mexico	37	63
Brazil	34	66
France	31	69
Switzerland	31	69
Turkey	29	71
Norway	28	72
Italy	26	74
West Germany	22	78
Soviet Union	15	85

If more taxes are deemed essential, there'll be the greatest support ever for a general sales tax—and from an astounding number of high-level labor leaders and liberal Democrats too.

Cramer's Effort To Save Florida's Free Interstate Highway System Despite Construction of Sunshine State Parkway Toll Road Wins Bureau of Public Roads Approval and Gains Headway Providing It Is Not Now Contracted Away by Toll Authority

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for months since the State of Florida announced its intention to construct the extension of the Sunshine State Parkway, presently existing from Miami to Fort Pierce, to Orlando and Ocala and Wildwood, I have been fighting to preserve all parts of the Interstate System that might be affected by this toll road, which includes Interstate 75 serving the west coast and Interstate 95 serving Florida's east coast, and thus paving the way for proper planning for the parkway as well.

It has been my consistent effort to make certain that the State of Florida would take no toll road action that would jeopardize the free Interstate System as has happened in a number of other States where those States have lost Federal matching funds because the State has built competing toll roads, obviously at the time without realizing the long-range result. Being familiar with these precedents, as one of the ranking members on the Public Works Committee and the Roads Subcommittee of the House, and having consulted with the Bureau of Public Roads on the question, I felt it my duty to prevent the State of Florida from suffering financial loss and the partial destruction of the free highway system, perhaps unwittingly, in its planning for the parkway extension.

PROPOSALS AFFECTING INTERSTATE 75 ON FLORIDA'S WEST COAST

Earlier in the year, in a cooperative manner, I pointed out to the new Bryant administration in Florida the effects of its proposals at that time which definitely would have imperiled Florida's free system Interstate 75 on the west coast.

These objections have resulted in the State withdrawing its program to insert a 77.2 mile toll trap into Interstate 75 between the towns of Alachua and Wildwood as a substitute for equal mileage on the free Interstate System in the same area connecting that toll link up with the new turnpike extension past Orlando south to Fort Pierce.

Since that time, Governor Bryant has denied he ever made such a proposal, but the record speaks for itself and I cite that record hereafter.

First, in the March hearings before our Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highways, on March 9, 1961, under interrogation by me, Mr. W. C. Peterson, division engineer, Bureau of Public Roads, Tallahassee, Fla., the following record of the testimony will show he testified as follows:

Mr. CRAMER. I have one other question. You indicated that your fundamental problem was lack of a long-range program which is needed, and I understand presently there is now, under the new administration, discussions about rerounting the Sunshine Parkway which is the toll facility going down the east coast of Florida, and there was considerable discussion under the previous administration and a lot of negotiation, was there not, in determining whether to integrate a portion of that expressway into the Interstate System, or whether to permit the State to parallel the toll facility, with a freeway, was there not?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. And that problem was finally worked out, after lengthy consultations?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. And now, after some 5½ years, since the Interstate System was supposedly fixed, the State finds itself in a position, as far as your responsibilities are concerned, of having to contemplate a new location for that expressway, Orlando to the north, is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. What I know about that is that I attended a meeting at the road board about a month ago. A man was there who was in charge—I guess he is with the Sunshine State Parkway, and they had a consulting engineer, and they asked Mr. Anderson, our regional engineer, to attend this meeting. What they proposed to do is extend the Sunshine State Parkway from Fort Pierce northwestward to Orlando, from Orlando to Gainesville and from Gainesville to Ocala, and then north to the little town called Alachua, where we already have the interstate under construction, making this a toll facility. That will then eliminate approximately 85 miles of the interstate between there. And we were alerted that is what they were about to do, and I don't know what decision will be made.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, initially, as I understood it, the parkway was to go through Gainesville and over to Jacksonville, is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. And all agreements were reached and plans were made with regard to permitting the Interstate System to also have a route covering the east coast of Florida from Jacksonville to Miami and it was done in a way that was in conformity with your regulations, is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand the regulations, you cannot have an Interstate System freeway in close proximity, paralleling a toll facility. Is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. As far as I know, you cannot, because you are conflicting with free enterprise. I believe that was the decision they made on Highway 9 down there and they set up certain stipulations that if the toll road authority would agree to letting them build the parallel facility, would give them a letter to that effect, and other understandings, they could build it.

Mr. CRAMER. If, in fact they build this parkway from Gainesville to Alachua, you say they will lose 85 miles on the present Interstate System?

Mr. PETERSON. On present 75, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. Where does 75 go from and to in that area?

Mr. PETERSON. Route 75 comes from Valdosta, Ga., where you hit the State line, through Lake City, down through the central part of the State, and goes eventually into Tampa.

Mr. CRAMER. In the Alachua-Ocala area?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. So, therefore, that could possibly mean Florida would lose its allocation on interstate money for 85 miles of the interstate road presently approved, is that right?

Mr. PETERSON. That would have to be decided by higher echelons. I don't know whether that is right or not, sir. I presume that is correct. We made the 1961 estimate, we have it completed and whether or not this would be deducted from that estimate, I don't know.

Mr. CRAMER. Would it result in a person traveling on 75 having to use a portion of the parkway, which is a toll facility, in order to negotiate the full route?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right, he would have to ride 85 miles on a toll facility.

Mr. CRAMER. Isn't that contrary to the basic policies of the Interstate System program, that it should be freeways?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I believe it is, but I can't be certain about those things. Those are legal questions, I believe.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason I mentioned it is, here is another example, right or wrong, on the long-range merits and I am not suggesting whether it is right or wrong, but here is an example, is it not, of where lack of long-range planning in Florida becomes very difficult from your standpoint, is that not correct?

Here is a very substantial change in the routing of the Sunshine Parkway, which can affect the Interstate System measurably, being made by the new administration, after you have relied for some 6 years under the previous administration that the route was fixed. Is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. That is my understanding, yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. That is all.

Secondly, after further consideration of the matter and consultation with some

of the representatives of the Florida State Road Board, including Tom Cobb, attorney, indicating that they were quite adamant in their position proposing this toll trap insertion in Interstate 75 under their fallacious belief that Florida would be reimbursed by the Federal Government if this substitution took place, I asked Mr. Peterson to reduce to writing the specifics of this proposal. A copy of those specifics follows:

Mr. CRAMER, as I understand it, is interested in how the proposed turnpike extension would affect Interstate Route 75.

On the attached map we have shown the present location of FAI Route 75 by a solid black line. The approximate location of the Florida Turnpike is shown by a solid green line from Fort Pierce to a point where it would connect with relocated FAI Route 75. From that point northward to a point north of the town of Alachua, it is understood that FAI Route 75 would be relocated approximately as shown by the dashed green line and would be financed with bond funds and operated as a toll road. The location shown by a dashed black line is the portion of FAI Route 75 that would be relocated to tie into the toll portion but still financed with Interstate funds as a free facility.

Mr. CRAMER also desired that we furnish him with the length and estimated cost of the portion of FAI Route 75 which would be eliminated due to its inclusion in the proposed turnpike extension.

Between points B (Wildwood) and C (Alachua) on the attached map, the estimated cost is $29.2 million and the length is 77.2 (plus-minus) miles.

Third, it is obvious that the State had under consideration such a proposal and the Governor himself was fully aware of it, as he acknowledged in an interview with the Orlando-Sentinel which follows:

BRYANT DEFENDS 40-MILE TOLL ROAD NEED—CRAMER CHARGES ON FEDERAL ROAD FUND LOSS CHALLENGED

(By Robert W. Delaney)

TALLAHASSEE.—Disagreement with a charge by Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER that the rerouting of the State turnpike will cost Florida $30 million in Federal funds was voiced yesterday by Gov. Farris Bryant.

CRAMER complained that the Bryant plan for extending the turnpike through central Florida in place of the interstate highway along the stretch from Leesburg to Citra, would do "violence to the basic concept of the Interstate Highway Act of 1960 which envisions freeways throughout America."

Bryant's proposal calls for using turnpike funds to construct about 40 miles of toll road from those two points and then branching off from the interstate route with the toll road continuing toward Jacksonville and the freeway going toward Gainesville.

CRAMER had complained about people being forced to pay tolls on 77 miles of "what is now programed as a freeway." But Bryant pointed out it will be only about 40 miles.

Bryant said, "We cannot possibly build all of the Interstate System that is programed for Florida, in the foreseeable future, in the next 10 or 12 years."

He said that under the present Federal program, "which may change a dozen times before we're through," Florida will get $35 to $50 million each year in Federal interstate funds and that it will all be utilized.

As noted by Mr. Peterson, the loss of this insertion would be about $30 million of Federal matching funds, and if reduced to the extent, as proposed by the Governor, of some 40 miles, it would mean the loss of about $20 million.

CRAMER BLASTS TOLL HIGHWAY REROUTING—$30 MILLION LOSS SEEN IN BRYANT ROAD PLAN

(By Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Florida stands to lose almost $30 million in interstate highway construction under a proposal by the Bryant administration, Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, charged yesterday.

And, he said, users of the central Florida free interstate system—Interstate 75 from Georgia through Gainesville and Ocala to Tampa, St. Petersburg, and the west coast—would be forced to pay tolls on a 77-mile road section now scheduled as a freeway.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, the plan of the State road board (SRB) is to relocate the Sunshine State Parkway from its present Fort Pierce terminus through Ocala and Gainesville rather than up the east coast through Jacksonville as originally programed.

The parkway, under this plan, would intersect Interstate 75 near the city of Wildwood and rejoin Route 75 at the town of Alachua, some 77 miles to the north.

This would be a toll facility, according to the roads bureau report to CRAMER, and would be paid for by State toll road bond funds.

The State is requesting some 20 miles of interstate construction from Bushnell (at Route 75) to Wildwood to link up the toll facility, the roads bureau said. It said this section would be a free road constructed with interstate funds.

The Interstate 75 section to be replaced by the toll parkway would be dropped from the system, the report said.

CRAMER noted that this cutting out of an interstate section represents a loss of almost $30 million in funds to the State. He said the construction estimate was provided by the roads bureau.

CRAMER, a member of the special House Roads Investigating Subcommittee, said: "I can see no way the State can recoup this loss of interstate highway."

CRAMER said the Roads Bureau had not yet approved the rerouting and pledged he would oppose its doing so.

"This proposed insertion of a toll road into an existing and approved interstate highway, which feeds the entire west coast of Florida, does violence to the basic concept of the Interstate Highway Act of 1956 which envisions freeways throughout America," CRAMER said.

He labeled as "wishful thinking" any hope that Congress would reimburse Florida for toll road construction.

The interstate terminal points are fixed by the 1956 act, CRAMER noted, adding that therefore Florida cannot tack on the lost 77 miles to another section of interstate.

He also noted that the Federal interstate regulations prohibit building an interstate section parallel to toll roads in competition with them.

He said it was "very unlikely" the Congress would approve more mileage to Florida to recoup the loss.

CRAMER said the rerouting was an "absurd approach that will rob Florida of $30 million in Federal matching funds and turn a major freeway into a partial toll road."

CRAMER said the SRD rerouting came to his attention during the recent roads subcommittee hearings on Florida roads by testimony of W. C. Peterson, U.S. Bureau of Public Roads division engineer for Florida.

CRAMER requested a report from Peterson which he said confirmed the proposed rerouting.

One obvious effect of the rerouting would be to channel interstate traffic down through the center of the State. It also would, apparently, aid in paying off the toll facility bonds through funneling traffic off the interstate onto the toll road.

I trust this lays to rest the question as to whether there was such a plan and the fact that it has now been abandoned, I am sure largely because of my objection, speaks for itself. My objection follows:

It appeared the State would ignore my objection to the insertion of a toll trap on Interstate 75, therefore I introduced H.R. 6324 which would require approval of the Senate and House Public Works Committees before such a toll trap could be substituted for the programed free highway. This was reported in the Clearwater Sun, May 18 as follows:

CRAMER SUGGESTS CURBS ON INTERSTATE TOLL ROADS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER has urged the House Federal Highways Subcommittee to approve legislation requiring congressional approval of the insertion of toll roads, bridges and tunnels as part of the Interstate System.

The Republican Congressman introduced the bill after learning the Bryant administration was planning to insert 77 miles of toll road into the free Interstate 75 from Wildwood to Alachua.

CRAMER contends this will result in a loss of $20 to $30 million in Federal matching funds.

He also noted that under the Collins administration the State lost $20 million in Federal matching funds by inserting 44 miles of toll roads into Interstate 95 between Fort Pierce and West Palm Beach.

CRAMER explained that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads contends it has power to approve the integration of future toll facilities in the Interstate System without further action or review by Congress. The Cramer bill will require congressional approval before the insertion can be made by a State.

"Some review is necessary if the free and defense concepts of this program are to be preserved," CRAMER told the subcommittee.

He noted that a large number of applications for insertion of the toll facilities in the Interstate System are now pending before the Bureau of Public Roads.

"Inclusion of the toll facilities would in many instances subvert the free concept of the Interstate System as set forth in the 1956 Highway Act which said all highways constructed under the act shall be free from tolls of all kinds," CRAMER said.

"Their inclusion doubles taxes of the road users who are already paying road-user taxes, including the recently extended gas tax, with the understanding that they will have upon completion of this system a network of integrated freeways as set forth in the act," he added.

CRAMER said Florida, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Oklahoma are the States where construction of toll roads in the Interstate System is completed, underway, or contemplated.

Having lost this abortive effort to insert a toll trap into Florida's Interstate System on the west coast, the Bryant administration's next proposal was to shift that same section of Interstate 75 some 8 miles east to connect up with the toll parkway at an additional cost of $3 million to the Federal Government. This was summarily turned down by the Bureau of Public Roads as not being eco-

nomically justified. This plan, of course, would have had the effect of changing a substantial portion of the route location of Interstate 75 which has supposedly been fixed since 1956 under the Interstate and Defense Highway Act which was passed.

A new alternate proposal has been submitted and approved by the Bureau which requires relocation of a minimum of mileage in the Wildwood area and a minimum additional Federal cost. This plan seemed sound and I asked the Bureau's approval of it and such approval was recently given by the Federal Government.

So much for Interstate 75 on the west coast, and the Bryant administration's proposal to affect it adversely with its proposed toll road plans. Because of my objections, proper planning resulted.

PROPOSALS AFFECTING INTERSTATE 95 ON FLORIDA'S EAST COAST

There already being in existence the bobtailed Sunshine State Parkway bebetween Miami and Fort Pierce, a brief review of what happened there clearly indicates what could happen in the area of the extension of the parkway.

In 1957 the State road department, under the Collins administration, requested the Bureau to insert a 44-mile toll trap, between a point 8 miles north of Palm Beach and extending to Fort Pierce, into the Interstate 95 system, which resulted in the integration of the toll road into the free system, also the loss of some $20 million to the State in Federal matching funds. This is true because State annual allocations is on the basis of the amount of free mileage. Florida has thus lost about $1 million annually in reduced allocations since 1957. However, the Bureau did approve the freeway paralleling the toll road between the point 8 miles north of Palm Beach and Miami on the basis that traffic was justified by 1973, the end of the construction period under the existing interstate and defense highway program.

At the same time, the State, on the bobtail turnpike, entered into a bond issue indenture with the bondholders that no free competing highway would be built during the life of the issue without the approval of the bondholders. The effect of this restriction appears obvious in that the bondholders contractually can try to stop the State from connecting up any interstate links that may have been built in the competing area during the life of the bonds, meaning until 1994.

Whether this will be the result will not be known until the State attempts to connect up that missing link. This restriction certainly does jeopardize the competing free system, in that it is obvious the State in entering into such a contract puts the full faith of the State behind the agreement and would have to breach the contract to connect up the missing link if the bondholders objected, even in 1973 at the end of the program. The further obvious effect is that the completion of that interstate link is being held up and will be at least until 1973, assuming bondholder approval can be acquired then.

Realizing this result and that considerable precedent existed for the refusal of the Bureau to approve subsequent applications of States where toll roads serving the same traffic corridor had been constructed, I conferred with Mr. Frank Turner, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads, about the possible effects on Interstate 95 to the north between Fort Pierce and Daytona Beach in the event the parkway extension was programed from Fort Pierce to Orlando-Ocala.

FEDERAL ROADS BOARD BACKS CRAMER—IS BRYANT RIGHT, OR CRAMER, ON TURNPIKE-FREEWAY HASSLE?

(By David Kraslow)

WASHINGTON.—Florida motorists should be forgiven if they are confused about what's to be with the proposed Interstate 95 expressway from Jacksonville to Miami.

They get one story from Gov. Farris Bryant, another from Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of St. Petersburg, the State's only Republican Congressman and a member of a House subcommittee investigating the Interstate Highway System.

Bryant says CRAMER is playing politics and twisting facts when he says that a section of Interstate 95 would be jeopardized by an extension of the Sunshine State Parkway from Fort Pierce to Orlando.

Bryant says both roads will be constructed.

The facts, however, as this reporter knows them, seem to support CRAMER's position.

At issue is whether Florida will lose 135 miles of interstate expressway and at least $60 million in Federal money if the Bryant administration insists on extending the parkway.

The 135 miles comprise the Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce stretch of the projected Interstate 95. The Federal share of building that portion of the expressway is estimated at $60 million to $75 million. (Uncle Sam pays 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System.)

CRAMER said he was told flatly by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads that the Daytona-Fort Pierce section of Interstate 95 would be canceled if the parkway (a toll road) were extended from Fort Pierce to Orlando.

He said the Bureau told him the parkway extension "so closely parallels" the proposed interstate route "as to make the latter infeasible."

He quoted the bureau as saying there would not be enough traffic within the life of the Interstate System to justify paralleling the toll road with the freeway. The Interstate System is supposed to be finished by 1972.

In a prepared statement handeded newsmen, CRAMER did not name his source at the Bureau. Under questioning by this reporter, however, CRAMER—with some apparent reluctance—identified him as Francis Turner, Deputy Commissioner and Chief Engineer. Turner is a highly regarded career official.

Two days later, Bryant issued his counterblast.

The Governor criticized what he called an attempt by CRAMER to "embarrass a dedicated public servant." The reference was to Turner.

Bryant said Turner did not tell CRAMER what CRAMER said Turner told him.

"Mr. Turner tells us, with restraint proper for a public servant." Bryant reported, "that the Congressman used his own judgment in drawing conclusions from routine answers given him to his general inquiries into the status of our plans."

I did not hear what Turner told Bryant, nor did I hear what he told CRAMER.

But I did hear what he told me.

I telephoned Turner at his home several hours after CRAMER issued his statement.

Turner was not as flat in his statements to me as CRAMER had made him sound, but he generally confirmed what CRAMER had said.

Turner said the Bureau's cancellation of Interstate 95 between Daytona and Fort Pierce would not be "automatic" if the parkway is extended. But he said there is a "good probability" that this would happen.

If the parkway is extended, he said, the Bureau would go through the regular procedure to determine formally if the roads are closely parallel and whether traffic justifies both roads.

But he indicated the Bureau already has made an informal determination. Given the facts of the situation, he said, it is not difficult to "put two and two together."

Turner also confirmed something else CRAMER had said.

CRAMER said that if Bryant insists on extending the parkway and wants to do it immediately, this can be done with U.S.-backed financing and without putting tolls on the Fort Pierce-Orlando leg.

He said the interstate highway law permits States to float "anticipation bonds" to speed up construction of toll-free interstate roads.

Under this plan, the Fort Pierce-Orlando portion of the parkway would be designated as part of Interstate 95 and the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the cost.

The State would borrow money to start construction immediately and would be reimbursed before 1972 by allotments from the Federal interstate highway trust fund.

Although this plan also would result in knocking out the more direct Interstate 95 route from Daytona to Fort Pierce, CRAMER said, at least Florida wouldn't lose the 90 percent Federal money.

In any event, CRAMER said, if the parkway is extended, the motorist can forget about a direct expressway route between Jacksonville and Miami.

He would ride Interstate 95 from Jacksonville to Daytona, take Interstate 4 southwest to Orlando then turn again at Orlando onto the parkway to Miami.

The only point on which Bryant and CRAMER appear to be in agreement is that motorists would prefer the more direct route and a free road.

Turner estimated the less direct Jacksonville-Miami route via Orlando will be some 20 miles longer than the presently authorized Interstate 95 route running straight from Daytona to Fort Pierce.

The results of that conference and a review of the precedents, and a study of the problem by Cliff Enfield, present minority counsel of the House Committee on Public Works, and former general counsel for the Bureau under the Eisenhower administration, were called to the attention of the State and immediately was met with a scathing attack on me headed by the Governor.

I have ridden the difficult path toward preservation of Interstate 95 and thus facilitating, also, the construction of the parkway by trying to get Bureau approval of this free road, despite precedents to the contrary, and it has been a difficult one which I have single handedly attempted to chart the path and with overwhelming criticism from those who have not lived with these highway problems as I have for the past 7 years. This resistance resulted in the State's absolute refusal to file an application with the Bureau for a clarification of

the issue by requesting approval of Interstate 95 in view of plans to build the parkway, until a very recent date when the pressure to do so became too great.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER FLAYS ROAD ACTION LAGE—STATE EFFORT URGED ON FREE, TOLL LINKS

(By Dick McHenry)

COCOA BEACH.—U.S. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER of St. Petersburg lashed out last night at the State's inactivity in getting free Interstate 95 and toll Sunshine State Parkway approved by the Federal Government.

"The State should join in and help resolve this issue," CRAMER told a gathering of Brevard County Republicans which met for a dinner here at the Starlite motel.

"It's inexcusable that we should run the risk of losing $60 million in matching funds," he said.

He said the $60 million may be lost by the State in Federal matching funds if a guarantee was not obtained for both Sunshine State Parkway and Interstate 95 from Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce.

"There is no sense in treating the patient after death," CRAMER quipped.

Florida's only Republican congressman pointed out that the State had already lost $20 million under the Collins' administration on Interstate 95 from Fort Pierce to West Palm Beach by inserting a toll facility into the proposed free interstate system.

He also said the Bryant administration plans to insert a toll section into Interstate 75 between Alachua and Wildwood.

The congressman proposed a solution to the problem would be Governor Bryant's obtaining, before construction of the toll turnpike, "a written commitment from the U.S. Bureau of Roads."

He concluded that this guarantee should state that Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce, "will be approved despite the existence of the toll turnpike."

In an effort to force the State's hand, not being able to understand its reluctance to make proper application, I introduced a bill, H.R. 8770 to specifically provide that Interstate 95 could be constructed by the State despite plans to build the parkway. The Bureau testified before our Roads Subcommittee and substantiated my position that a serious problem existed, but suggested that the State would have to make application before the issue could be settled. I renewed my request for such an application August 22, during the hearings held on that date by the Roads Subcommittee. A résumé of the hearings as reported by the Clearwater Sun follows:

UNITED STATES TO TAKE NO HAND IN STATE'S TOLL ROAD FIGHT

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Public Roads Bureau will take no official hand in Florida's toll road versus freeway controversy unless or until the State makes formal application for Interstate 95 funds, a top-ranking highway official said here Tuesday.

Deputy Commissioner F. C. Turner told a House Public Works subcommittee the Bureau is "inclined to believe" Florida's long-range traffic needs can support both the Sunshine State Parkway toll link and an Interstate 95 section from Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce.

But he said there is not "nearly enough information" now available as a basis for any decision, and that the State administration and the Florida Road Department are the only ones who can supply that data.

Turner estimated a department decision could be made in "about 30 days" after receipt of the application.

Approval of Interstate 95 funds, he said, would hinge on answers to the following three questions:

1. Would the proposed toll road from Fort Pierce to Orlando be adequate to meet anticipated traffic needs up to 1975 without the freeway extension?

2. Would it serve local as well as interstate traffic requirements?

3. Would construction of Interstate 95 jeopardize the financial structure of the bonds issued for the Sunshine State Parkway?

REQUIREMENTS

Turner spelled out those requirements in testimony on a bill by Florida's Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER calling for an advance commitment by the road department that the tollway proposed by Gov. Farris Bryant wouldn't interfere with the State freeway system.

And he strongly inferred, without putting it into so many words, the Bureau thinks there might be such a conflict.

CRAMER, who openly admits his bill is designed to force a showdown on the controversy in the light of the State's refusal to get a clarification, promptly underlined what appeared to be Turner's reservations on this point.

He read into the record stipulations under which the State proposes to issue bonds for the toll road, as follows:

ASSURANCES

"To the extent they may legally do so, the authority, State road department and other appropriate agencies of the State of Florida shall adopt such resolutions or other proceedings and give such assurances to the company as shall be necessary to satisfy the company that no free roads or toll roads shall be constructed as long as the revenue bonds to be issued to finance said Orlando extension are outstanding, which will materially and adversely affect the revenue to be derived from said Orlando extension."

Turner conceded, under CRAMER's quizzing on that score, that considerable "pressure" could be exerted by bondholders against the construction of Interstate 95.

He also acknowledged, however, that backers of the interstate road would have a strong argument for construction of 95 as an important defense link along the State's east coast for missile and other military traffic—something the toll road wouldn't provide.

ACTION URGED

CRAMER, in urging the subcommittee action to force the decision, ran into opposition from Chairman FALLON, of Maryland, who objected that it wasn't the subcommittee's job to dictate a single State's decision.

But the Floridian got strong backing from three other lawmakers—Representatives SCHERER, of Ohio, SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, ROBINSON, of New York, and CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

Each noted that his own State has lost substantial freeway system mileage because of toll road construction—the thing CRAMER fears may happen in Florida.

And SCHERER joined CRAMER in attacking the Florida administration.

"It seems to me, he said, that if Florida goes ahead with the toll road without advance clearance, it will be adverse to the interests of the State. It looks like a move in the interests of the bondholders not the people."

DATA FOR BRYANT

In light of Turner's testimony, CRAMER didn't push for immediate action on his bill but said he wanted the subcommittee to look into the matter again as soon as the Roads Bureau has reached a decision.

Meanwhile, he arranged for copies of the day's testimony to be sent to Governor Bryant and the State road department.

CRAMER URGES INTERSTATE 95 AID FIRST—STATE LOSS IN FEDERAL FUNDS SEEN

WASHINGTON.—Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, yesterday challenged Gov. Farris Bryant of Florida to get a firm commitment of Federal aid for Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce before extending the Sunshine State toll parkway.

CRAMER urged the State to obtain a written commitment from the Bureau of Roads unequivocally stating that (the 135-mile stretch on Interstate 95) will be approved, despite the existence of the competing limited-access turnpike.

In a statement CRAMER also:

1. Challenged the Bryant administration "to obtain a written commitment from the bondholders (of the State toll parkway) stating they will have no objection to the construction of Interstate 95, to be completed by 1972."

2. Asserted that a comment on the Interstate 95 matter Wednesday by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, "confirms and substantiates my position."

Bryant wants to extend the Sunshine State Parkway from Fort Pierce to Orlando and on to Wildwood, where it would connect with Interstate 75, coming down from Georgia and going on to lower west coast cities.

CRAMER said last week Florida will lose $60 million in Federal aid assistance on Interstate 95 if the Fort Pierce-Orlando toll parkway is built.

CRAMER said then that Francis Turner, Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Roads, had told him the Bureau wouldn't approve money for the interstate freeway if the toll road was built, because they would too closely parallel one another.

Bryant says both highways will be justified.

Federal Highway Administrator Whitton was asked Wednesday what bearing the toll road would have on Federal aid for the Daytona Beach-Fort Pierce stretch on Interstate 95.

"If the State should determine to build the toll road between Fort Pierce and Orlando it would be the Bureau's routine procedure to inquire of the State when projects are proposed on Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce as to whether construction with interstate funds on that location would jeopardize the bonds of the toll road," Whitton said.

My request that proper application be filed was also reported by the Clearwater Sun on August 25, 1961, as follows:

CRAMER SAYS STATE MUST ASK INTERSTATE 95 OK

WASHINGTON.—Florida's Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER is renewing, in light of new testimony from the Public Roads Bureau, a demand that the State administration apply immediately for approval of the Daytona to Fort Pierce link in Interstate 95 before proceeding with plans for extending the Sunshine State Parkway.

He has spelled that out in telegrams to Gov. Farris Bryant and the State road board and will also send transcripts of the Roads Bureau testimony to both groups.

CRAMER calls the immediate action "imperative" as the only means of officially determining whether construction of the toll road between Fort Pierce and Orlando would jeopardize Interstate 95 and the rest of the State's future freeway system.

The Floridian based his latest demand on comments from Deputy Commissioner F. C. Turner of the Roads Bureau before a House Public Works subcommittee Tuesday.

FUTURE POTENTIAL

Turner told the lawmakers the bureau "is inclined to believe" Florida has the future traffic potential for both the toll road and

at least some type of extension of Interstate 95. But he said there is not nearly enough information available for a firm decision and that the State would have to furnish such data in connection with an application for the interstate project.

He conceded the Bureau is considering the possibility that the interstate link might be only a two-lane road instead of the divided four-lane highway which CRAMER and other interstate backers want. He said, however, there had been no firm decision on that score.

Turner emphasized that the Roads Bureau has no jurisdiction in the freeway versus toll controversy in the absence of a formal application for the interstate project.

NEED ASSURANCE

Turner also cleared up another point in the matter when he made it clear the Bureau will not approve a small section of Interstate 95 such as a proposed 6-mile project in the Cape Canaveral area unless there is firm assurance the State plans to finish the whole 135-mile section from Daytona to Fort Pierce prior to 1972.

Tuesday's hearing was staged to consider a Cramer bill calling for a Government guarantee that the toll road wouldn't jeopardize the Interstate System.

In light of Turner's testimony, CRAMER withdrew his request for immediate action on that measure and instead asked that the subcommittee take another look at the situation after the Roads Bureau has received and acted upon the Florida application.

Even Governor Bryant's office admitted that the highway bill I introduced was meritorious:

ASSURES ROAD 95 FUNDS—BRYANT AID SEES MERIT IN CRAMER'S HIGHWAY BILL

TALLAHASSEE, August 18.—A spokesman for Gov. Farris Bryant gave backhanded approval Friday to a bill introduced by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, to guarantee construction of Interstate 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce.

"Mr. CRAMER's idea for assuring the construction of I–95 through congressional action seems to have merit," said John Evans, Bryant's press aid.

"It will offer protection for this road from recession, national emergency, or any one of a multitude of other facts bearing on Federal highway programs."

Bryant and CRAMER have been at loggerheads over the State's road program for the past several months. A particular point of contention has been extension of the Sunshine State Parkway between Fort Pierce and Wildwood, and the 135-mile segment of the interstate highway from Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce.

CRAMER has contended the turnpike, which would be a State toll road, would parallel I–95 and therefore jeopardize its construction under Federal provisions of the interstate program.

In a statement issued Sunday and reaffirmed today, Bryant said the two superhighways would form "two sides of a triangle, which obviously are not parallel."

CRAMER introduced a bill in Congress Thursday that would guarantee construction of the Daytona Beach-Fort Pierce segment of I–95. The move came after a public works committee hearing at which bureau of public roads administrator Rex Whitton testified "conditions" would be attached to construction of I–95 if Bryant carried through plans to extend the turnpike from Fort Pierce to Wildwood.

He said the public works committee, of which he is ranking member, had scheduled a hearing on the bill for next Tuesday.

I insert copy of my statement before the Roads Subcommittee on my bill to save I–95 August 21, 1961:

TESTIMONY BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. CRAMER, REPUBLICAN, OF FLORIDA, ON BEHALF OF HIS BILL H.R. 8770, WHICH PROVIDES THAT THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM IN FLORIDA SHALL NOT BE AFFECTED BY STATE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SUNSHINE STATE PARKWAY EXTENSION, DELIVERED BEFORE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 21, 1961.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I have requested these hearings as the result of my determination that Florida's free interstate system shall remain free, shall not be prejudiced by any action of the State or Federal Government, and shall be adequate to serve our country's defenses.

Florida has announced its intention to build the Sunshine State Parkway and recently validation proceedings were filed. This proposed toll road's effect on the free highway system in Florida is the subject of these hearings.

When the Federal Bureau of Public Roads Administrator, Rex Whitton, testified before this committee last week on this issue it became apparent that the State of Florida had not asked that the Bureau make a decision on the issue involved—despite my urgent pleas—and that some action would thus have to be taken by someone to make sure that Florida's free system is protected and that the construction of the turnpike will not prejudice that system.

I am sure the members of this committee and the Bureau are familiar with decisions in similar situations where, as evidenced by the report filed in January by the Comptroller General of the United States in his review of cost estimates for completion of the Interstate and Defense Systems in January of 1958. Therein, he quotes examples in Texas and Massachusetts where the Bureau denied the States authority to construct links on the already designated Interstate System because of the existence of a toll road.

In these instances, these competing freeways on the Interstate System were not parallel with the toll roads in the sense they were close by, but instead were many miles away. Massachusetts lost $92 million, Texas lost $36 million and Kansas lost 112 miles or about $65 million because of the existence of turnpikes capable of serving similar traffic corridors.

Thus, on precedent, it cannot be gainsaid that the Bureau of Public Roads has denied the States the right to construct free roads on the Interstate System because of the existence of toll roads serving the same traffic corridor. This, I do not want to see happen in Florida because of the construction of the Sunshine State Turnpike, thus losing Florida 135 miles and $60 million in Federal funds.

Likewise, on the record, in instances where the Bureau has approved free route locations which serve the same traffic corridor, such approvals have usually been subject to the conditions that no projects are to be advanced to construction on the free route until it is clearly demonstrated that the toll road cannot carry the traffic and the construction will not jeopardize toll road bonds. If this attachment of conditions to what is now an unencumbered free interstate Route 95 would be the result of building the Florida Turnpike, which I hope is not the case, then I think the State should be advised of this before it goes ahead and mortgages our free system to the bondholders.

It is my hope that this committee, after hearing the Administrator, will come to the conclusion that I think should be drawn in the Florida case—that the construction of the Sunshine State Turnpike should not affect adversely Florida's interstate system—that Florida can go ahead with the construction of this vital link in our Interstate and Defense Highway System that serves Florida's teeming east coast that is growing in leaps and bounds—and of equal importance, that an adequate highway will be usable by Cape Canaveral and other defense requirements.

It is inconceivable that the Bureau or Congress would fail to give an unconditional green light to the interestate link that connects Cape Canaveral, on which the eyes of the world are focused in the missile and outer space races and which is a vital cog in our efforts to catch up to and surpass the Soviets.

This hearing thus has significance that far transcends Florida and its problems. Our defense, our outer space efforts are affected. The integrity of the Interstate and Defense Highway System as a free system, free from the injection of toll traps wherever possible throughout the country, is at stake. Because similar problems will arise in the future, the States, the country, and Congress should have an understanding of the problem and how it is being handled.

This is a unique opportunity for the Bureau and for Congress to render a service. It is unique because this is the first situation to my knowledge where Congress has been appraised of problems that may arise by virtue of the construction of a toll road before it is under commitment or construction. Thus, before the State proceeds, before it is inextricably committed to a toll road program, there is an opportunity—and I think a duty—for all questions to be answered, for decisions to be made, and for a clear road to be paved for Florida's proper and adequate highway program for the future.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
July 25, 1961.

To: Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER.
From: Clifton W. Enfield, minority counsel (formerly general counsel, Bureau of Public Roads).
Subject: Incorporation of toll roads in the Interstate System.

As you know, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (now codified as 23 U.S.C. sec. 129) for the first time authorized the Secretary of Commerce to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road then or thereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the system. Shortly after the enactment of this act the Department of Commerce established a policy for the incorporation of toll roads as a part of the Interstate System and for the construction of free sections of the Interstate System which compete with toll roads for traffic within the same traffic corridor. This policy has frequently been reaffirmed, and it was last stated by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, before the Committee on Public Works in his testimony on H.R. 5821, as follows:

"When a State proposes a toll facility as a part of the Interstate System, the proposal is analyzed in light of all circumstances which exist with respect to the particular toll facility and interstate route involved. Of course, a controlling factor is the statutory requirement that toll facilities may be approved as part of the Interstate System only when such action will promote the development of an integrated system. In addition to this, three specific considerations are used as guides in determining whether a toll road can be accepted as an interstate highway location or whether the interstate location should be constructed along a parallel alinement. These considerations are:

"1. Whether the toll facility will be adequate to accommodate safely and efficiently the type and volume of traffic, both local and interregional, forecast for the year 1975;

"2. Whether the toll facility will adequately meet local needs as well as those of interstate commerce; and

"3. Whether construction of an alternate free facility will jeopardize the financial structure of the toll facility."

There is inherent in this policy statement a prohibition against constructing any interstate free route in the vicinity of a toll road which will adequately serve the traffic needs of the traffic corridor through which it runs until 1975 and if the construction of such a free route would jeopardize the financial structure of the toll road.

Subsequent to enactment of the 1956 act, and in response to expressions of concern by persons interested in assuring the financial structure of existing toll facilities, the Secretary of Commerce on September 10, 1956, issued a press release, a copy of which is attached hereto, wherein among other things he stated:

"There is no intention whatever of building any interstate routes paralleling a toll road which until 1975 will adequately serve the traffic needs of the area through which it runs."

This policy has prevailed continuously since its enunciation and as far as I know is still the policy of the Department of Commerce. This policy has also been made known to the Congress, and it apparently has received congressional approval by acquiescence. It was fully brought to the attention of the Congress by a report to the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States, in connection with his review of cost estimates for completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, which report was submitted on May 16, 1958. On page 19 of the Comptroller General's report, a copy of which is attached hereto, reference is made to this announced policy to the Secretary of Commerce, and it was commented upon in hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate on August 12, 1958, in connection with hearings of the subcommittee on the report of the Comptroller General.

In applying this policy to the proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway in Florida, it would appear, according to Bureau standards previously applied, that if interstate Route 4 from Daytona Beach to Orlando and that section of the Sunshine State Parkway (which is to be constructed as a toll road) from Orlando to Fort Pierce can adequately serve the traffic needs until 1975 within the corridor between Jacksonville to Miami, that a free section of interstate Route 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce would not be justified nor would its construction be consistent with the previously announced policy of the Secretary of Commerce.

It is understood that the general location of interstate Route 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce has already been approved by the Bureau of Public Roads, and should the Sunshine State Parkway be extended as a toll road from Fort Pierce to Orlando so as to connect with interstate Route 4 and provide an adequate traffic facility between Fort Pierce and Daytona Beach prior to construction of the free section of interstate 95 between Fort Pierce and Daytona Beach the decision as to whether or not to construct such free section would necessarily have to be made by the Bureau of Public Roads whenever the first project on this section is submitted for program approval by Public Roads. Such program submission may be for either preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, or construction, and before giving approval thereto in carrying out the announced policy of the Department of Commerce it would be necessary for Public Roads to determine if the combination of the Sunshine State Parkway and interstate Route 4 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce will adequately serve traffic in the area until 1975 and if construction of the free section of the Interstate System to be initiated by the project submitted for programing approval would jeopardize the financial structure of the toll road. Presumably if these two determinations are answered in the affirmative, based upon the announced policy of the Secretary of Commerce, approval of a project leading to construction of the free section would not be given by Public Roads.

There are at least three precedents, as I recall, for Public Roads' refusal to approve the location of a free interstate route where a parallel toll road will adequately serve traffic in the area until 1975 and where construction of the free road would jeopardize the financial structure of the toll road.

Such a situation existed with respect to a free route of the Interstate System proposed by the States of New York and Massachusetts between Albany, N.Y., and Lee, Mass., which would parallel the New York Berkshire Throughway and a part of the Massachusetts Turnpike, both of which are toll roads, for a distance of approximately 41 miles and on a location varying from 2 to 8 miles north of the toll road. The proposed free section in New York was estimated to cost $61.7 million and the portion in Massachusetts $30.5 million, for a total estimated cost of $92.2 million. The Bureau of Public Roads did not approve the specific location of this proposed free section but insisted that the toll roads, which were determined to be adequate for service of traffic in the area until 1975, should be the location of the interstate highway. The two States ultimately selected the toll roads as the interstate route, and Public Roads has approved the same.

The State of Texas proposed the route of a free section of the Interstate System between Fort Worth and Dallas parallel to and up to approximately 10 miles distance from an existing toll road. This free section was estimated to cost approximately $36 million. Public Roads refused to approve this location because it was determined that the toll road would adequately serve traffic in the area until 1975, and the toll road was subsequently designated as the interstate route between these two cities.

In each of the above instances the action of Public Roads pertained to the withholding of approval of a specific location of an interstate route as proposed by a State. It is recognized that Public Roads has already approved the location of Interstate Route 95 in Florida, generally along the present route of U.S. 1; however, there is also precedent for Public Roads requiring the designation of a route differing from one previously approved where a toll road will adequately serve traffic in the area until 1975. Prior to the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which, as previously pointed out, first authorized the incorporation of toll roads in the Interstate System, Public Roads approved the location of an interstate route that generally paralleled the Kansas Turnpike, which is a toll road, between Wichita and Kansas City for a distance of about 220 miles. Following enactment of the 1956 act, Public Roads requested the State to revise the location of the parallel free route and include the entire length of the Kansas Turnpike as the interstate route location between Wichita and Kansas City.

The State objected to this change on the grounds that (1) the Kansas Turnpike is not actually in the same traffic corridor as the proposed free route, (2) the proposed location of the interstate route would serve numerous towns and a population of nearly one-half million people, and (3) the turnpike will not adequately serve local needs, as intended by the 1956 act.

A compromise agreement was ultimately reached between the State and Public Roads whereby a part of the Kansas Turnpike between Wichita and Emporia was designated as the route of the Interstate System in lieu of 112 miles of the designated free road in the same general area. The remaining 108-mile section of the designated free route which paralleled the Kansas Turnpike between Emporia and Kansas City, at distances varying up to approximately 40 miles, was retained as the interstate route.

In instances where Public Roads has approved free route locations of the Interstate System which parallel toll roads such location approvals have often, if not always, been subject to the conditions that no projects are to be advanced to construction on the free route until it is clearly demonstrated that the toll road cannot carry the traffic and the construction will not jeopardize toll road bonds. With regard to this later condition Public Roads has usually required a written statement from the toll road authority that construction of the free route will not jeopardize the financial structure of the toll road.

Application of the announced policy, of the Department of Commerce, not to build an interstate road serving the same traffic corridor as a toll road which until 1975 will adequately serve the traffic needs of the area through which it runs might be applied with different effects under different situations based upon the facts of a particular case. In interpreting and implementing this policy with respect to construction of Interstate System 95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce it is required that the following determinations must be made to permit construction of Interstate System 95 even though it would generally parallel Intersate System 4 and the proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway within the same traffic corridor between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce:

1. That IS–4 and the toll road will not adequately serve local needs of the industrial, commercial, and residential areas which are building up along the route and particularly in the vicinity of Cape Canaveral and will not adequately serve the defense requirements.

2. That highway users generally prefer the proposed route of IS–95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce over the longer and more circuitous route provided by IS–4 and the proposed extenstion of the Sunshine Parkway.

3. That traffic counts would justify both limited-access routes.

In light of the announced policy of the Department of Commerce not to construct a free interstate route paralleling a toll road which will adequately serve traffic in the area until 1975 and the aforementioned precedents where this policy has been applied to designate a toll road as the interstate route rather than a parallel free road proposed by the State, before proceeding with the proposed toll road extension, if the State of Florida does not intend to abandon construction of presently designated IS–95 between Daytona Beach and Fort Pierce, it would appear to be in the interest of the State to secure from Public Roads an interpretation of its policy as applied to the facts existing in Florida and a commitment from Public Roads that construction of the proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway will not be a basis for Public Roads withholding approval of construction projects on IS–95.

The local newspapers reported "Bryant Says CRAMER To Get What He Asks, But No Credit" when the State finaly made application as I had recommended. That article follows:

BRYANT SAYS CRAMER TO GET WHAT HE ASKS, BUT NO CREDIT

(By Ann Waldron)

TALLAHASSEE.—Gov. Farris Bryant is going to do exactly what Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of St. Petersburg, wants him to do.

But he would have done it anyway, and he doesn't want CRAMER to get credit for it.

"It's as though he were seeing that I start home for dinner and then he asks me to go home for dinner," said the Governor—rather crossly—at his press conference yesterday. "But I'm going. And I'm going after he asks me to go."

CRAMER has demanded loudly that the Governor apply for a Bureau of Public Roads decision on construction of Interstate 95 between Fort Pierce and Daytona Beach before going ahead with bond validation proceedings on the turnpike.

The Governor said yesterday that you can't ask the Bureau of Public Roads for a theoretical decision on a hypothetical project.

"But you must submit a specific project for their approval," he said. "And that's what we're doing. We are proceeding in orderly and due course. We have submitted plans for construction of Interstate 95 in the Canaveral area. The Bureau of Public Roads will reply to that before the turnpike bonds go on sale."

Following the State's final application, I requested that the Bureau approve the application for an unequivocal commitment that Interstate 95 could be constructed even with the parkway extension.

Interestingly enough this position finally began to sink in and even one of the candidates for the Democratic nomination for Congress in the newly created 11th District, which includes the Cape Canaveral area, to be served by Interstate 95, agreed with my position and asked that the Governor follow my recommendations. I include an article from the Cocoa Tribune of August 18, 1961, quoting his remarks:

ROUNDTREE LAUDS CRAMERS STATEMENT ABOUT ROADS

William H. (Bill) Roundtree, Cocoa-Rockledge attorney, who is a Democratic candidate for Congress in the new 11th Congressional District, issued the following statement today:

"Florida needs all of the new highways that can be constructed. The issue that confronts us is priorities and costs. It has been painfully obvious for many years that Brevard County has the State's number one road problem, and the greatest need for new roads. Accordingly, the road needs of Brevard County should be solved first. Any commitment to extend the turnpike toll road before assuring the completion of four laning of U.S. 1, and construction of Interstate 95 in Brevard County, is sheer folly.

"Gov. Farris Bryant should get an absolutely firm agreement in writing from the Federal Bureau of Roads before committing the State to extend the turnpike toll road to Ocala, or to Orlando. I suggest that he call personally on Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton to get this agreement.

"The Federal and State Governments have established that Interstate 95 is to built as part of the Federal-aid Highway system. In 1956 the Federal-aid Highway Act provided that the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the cost, plus future maintenance. Interstate 95 is to be built from Jacksonville to Miami. The toll road from Miami to Fort Pierce parallels the proposed route. The State of Florida lost some 20 million dollars in Federal road funds because of the construction of the turnpike toll road. If the turnpike is extended to Ocala, or to Orlando, the State will lose many more millions of dollars by having to pay off existing bonds and then having to pay the cost of refinancing the whole toll road with new bonds. Oh, what a joyous date for the bond dealers.

"In addition and even more costly, there is the distinct probability that if the Turnpike toll road is extended to Ocala, or to Orlando, the Federal Bureau of Roads will not go forward with the construction of Interstate 95, because both these roads would serve the same traffic corridor. Florida would then lose more than $60 million more.

"Congressman CRAMER is absolutely correct in warning the public as to both of these costs, namely, the cost of refinancing the turnpike bonds and the loss of Federal road funds. He is the ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program in the House of Representatives. He is not playing politics. Anyone who would take the time to read this subcommittee's reports on the Federal highway program would immediately recognize that he knows whereof he speaks. He is talking good, plain commonsense to the people of Florida. I heartily commend him."

It is interesting to note in making its submission to the Bureau, the State, by letter under signature of William T. Mayo, administrator of interstate highways for Florida, clearly showed that if I had not raised this issue the State would not have undertaken a study of the problem and submitted the necessary evidence to free Interstate 95 from adverse effects of the parkway. I quote from that letter as follows:

The need for the study developed from certain allegations to the effect that FAI–95 could not be approved from Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce, if the Sunshine State Parkway was extended to the vicinity of Wildwood, because the Sunshine State Parkway would handle a major portion of the I–95 traffic if I–95 was not built.

Based upon the studies and reports submitted together with the announced intention of the State to update and accelerate construction in the general area under controversy, the State submitted a request for the construction of two links in Brevard County from State 520 west of Cocoa north to State Road 46, a distance of 21.7 miles, and 10.3 miles south of Melbourne to State Road 514. The Bureau approved the applications pursuant to my request.

Preceding action on this request, which took place September 19, the State had applied for bond validation on the parkway extension, which hearings took place September 14, and validation was approved. At those validation hearings it was brought out prior to and during those validation proceedings that the State turnpike authority had entered into an agreement in the bond indenture with the bond house of Dillon, Read & Co., that the State would build no competing free roads. Copy of a newspaper article concerning this follows:

THE AGREEMENT SAYS NO COMPETING ROADS

TALLAHASSEE.—There is an agreement of sorts that the State will not build competing highways if the Florida State Turnpike is extended.

Section 7.16 of the bond indenture (the contract with the bondholders) reads:

"Certain projects. The authority covenants that it will not construct any other turnpike project, in addition to the project to be constructed and financed under this indenture, if the construction of such other turnpike project will materially and adversely affect the revenues. The authority covenants that whenever there shall come to the attention that any Federal, State, or other agency shall project or plan the construction, improvement, or acquisition of any highway or other facility which may be materially competitive with any part of the turnpike system and in the same traffic corridor it shall cause the traffic engineers to make a study of the effect of such proposed highway or facility upon the operations of the turnpike system. If, in the opinion of the traffic engineers, such highway or facility may be materially competitive with any part of the turnpike system, the authority covenants that it shall not agree or consent to the construction, improvement, or acquisition thereof unless it can then comply with the earnings tests for the issuance of additional bonds."

C. H. Peterson, consultant engineer for the turnpike authority, said this would be no legal bar to the State building competitive roads, but added that it would be in most instances a practical bar.

No State would want to jeopardize its credit by doing anything which would hurt its outstanding bonds.

The Federal Bureau of Roads has a rule that it will not approve for construction any section of the interstate which would jeopardize bonds owed on turnpikes.

John F. Fowler, a vice president of Dillon, Read—New York bond house managing the turnpike bond issue—said the bankers have no agreement with the State about competing roads.

Fowler said the eight bond houses in the banking combine view Interstate 95 as the only important competition to the turnpike.

He said the bankers had discussed Interstate 95 with Governor Farris Bryant and that Bryant had "adopted a timetable on which we are relying."

"The statement of policy which the Governor has issued is the one on which we are relying," Fowler said.

The policy referred to is that Interstate 95 will be completed in 1972—the last year of the interstate program.

Exhibits introduced in yesterday's validation hearing shows that when Interstate 95 is open to traffic in 1973, income of the turnpike will drop from $17 million a year to $12 million despite an increase in tolls from Fort Pierce to West Palm Beach.

The $12 million a year, though, would be enough to pay off the debt on the turnpike—if traffic on the turnpike comes up to engineering estimates.

During the court hearing on the validation proceedings, John Hammer, chairman of the turnpike authority, testified that when Interstate 95 was opened for traffic from Daytona Beach to Fort Pierce, even as late as 1973, $5 million of the $17 million income to the toll road would be lost, or about 30 percent of the revenue. Mr. Hammer has stated consistently, however, that in his opinion the two roads were not "competitive" although the testimony is clearly to the contrary. Assuming that they would be considered noncompetitive, as Mr. Hammer declares, and it being essential that this final element be clarified before the bonds are sold, on September 21 I addressed a letter to the Governor after reading a strongly worded attack by him against me which was most misleading, I requested that the State remove I–95 from this contractual restriction. This would thus prevent the bondholders in 1973 from objecting to connecting up such links of I–95 as might be built between now and then in order to make it a usable segment in competition with

the Parkway. So far the State has shown no inclination to acquire such an unequivocal agreement. This is perhaps understandable in view of the fact that this present Bryant administration will not have to be answerable during its 4 years in office, but whatever administration is in office in 1972 and 1973 will have to meet the objections of the bondholders if the present administration is not farsighted enough to avoid that unhappy eventuality. I, therefore, challenge the Bryant administration again to follow through with my second recommendation, having followed my first one suggesting that an unequivocal commitment from the Bureau be acquired, my second suggestion being that the State get a written withdrawal from the effect of the indenture provision excluding construction of competing free highways specifically relating it to Interstate 95. This puts in focus the present status and problem still remaining.

A copy of my letter to Governor Bryant follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1961.

Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor of the State of Florida,
Tallahassee, Fla.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I have just read your recent statement concerning the future of the free Interstate System and the turnpike in which you, in an obvious effort to mislead the people of Florida by playing a numbers game, stated that I opposed the relocation of I–75 serving the west coast of Florida in order to connect up with the turnpike, which, of course, is utterly false when you full well know that my concern has been, since you dropped your abortive plan to insert a toll trap into I–75 over my objections, to preserve I–95 on the east coast and thus clear the way for construction of the turnpike without running the risk of an adverse effect by the turnpike on the free system.

The record of the Bureau of Public Roads, and of our Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, will clearly substantiate this and will disprove your effort to confuse the issue.

The record will show the following:

First, that I introduced a bill asking for approval of I–95, testified to that effect, and stated that it was my hope that the Bureau, after the State has submitted an application as I requested, would approve that application. This application was finally made on the date of the bond validation proceedings and, pursuant to my request, has been approved.

Second, that I have requested, and have so advised you, as well as Mr. Hammer, chairman of the turnpike authority, then it is approval is to mean anything, then it is imperative that the turnpike authority enter into an agreement with the bond houses in behalf of the future bondholders that they shall have no right to object to the completion of I–95 at any time despite their obvious concern over its effect on the turnpike bond financing. I am sure you are well aware that the turnpike authority has entered into an agreement, as contained in the indenture filed with the court, to the effect that no competing freeways will be built without the approval of the bondholders. Mr. Hammer testified that some $5 million revenue would be lost if I–95 were completed as late as 1973, which apparently is the State's plan of delayed construction, and thus would reduce by some 30 percent the toll revenue. Likewise, your submissions to the Bureau indicate that completion of the toll road would reduce traffic on I–95.

Thus, it becomes obvious that unless the State, having followed my initial recommendation for making application to the Bureau for approval of I–95, follows it up by acquiring a written commitment from the bond houses on behalf of the bondholders that I–95 is specifically excluded from the restriction against building free highways that will funnel traffic from the toll road, that the bondholders will have an absolute veto right over the completion of I–95 anytime during the life of the bonds.

I repeat this request to you although I realize that this matter would not come to a head during your administration but rather in some future administration whose program would be to complete I–95, thus reduce the tolls on the turnpike, and thus run smack into the restrictive provision against such completion as contained in the present idenure unless I–95 is specifically excluded from it. I am asking that you use your good offices to make certain that such an agreement removing I–95 from the present provision, which otherwise mortgages this free road to the whims of the bondholders, be entered into.

Third, if you will recall, my objection on I–75 many months ago was to the abortive proposal of the State to inject a toll road therein, as a Bureau of Public Roads representative in Tallahassee stated under oath before our committee, was the State's plan—a plan to insert 79 miles of toll road into I–75 on the west coast and thus lose the State some $30 million in Federal matching funds. When this evidence was brought out, your road board representatives who were in attendance at the hearings claimed that they were not concerned because Florida could receive reimbursement in the form of money or additional mileage for this loss. When I proved beyond a doubt that this was not the case, that Florida would lose the money and the west coast of Florida would end up with a toll trap to boot, this effort to sweeten the turnpike bond issue program was dropped.

I am sure you recall that you were quoted in the Orlando newspapers as having stated that it was correct that your administration was considering the injection of a toll trap into I–75 but that it was 40 instead of 79 miles and Florida would thus have lost some $20 to $25 million instead of $30 million. Apparently, this plan too was dropped due to my objection.

I, at no time, opposed the present proposal to connect the turnpike with I–75. The Bureau did raise some legitimate questions when it was proposed to relocate a substantial portion of I–75 at the additional Federal cost of at least $3 million and the State was requested to submit alternative plans. I recommended the approval of these alternative plans, which the Bureau has now approved. The result of this change of plans is that the taxpayers save about $2½ million and everyone in the areas involved is not adversely affected by lengthy relocation. The initial toll-insertion and lengthy relocation plans were poor plans and your administration admitted it by withdrawing them and replacing them with the present sound plan.

I am sure you are well aware that this is now, and has been, my position and it is not my intention to permit your administration to attempt to confuse the people of Florida by playing a numbers game, attempting to confuse my position or trying to convince the people that your turnpike authority has not entered into an agreement that gives the bondholders control over the completion of I–95 when the court records prove to the contrary. I renew my request that the present issue be settled by the simple solution of getting in writing a commitment that the bondholders will not object in the future to the early completion of I–95 despite their present contractual agreement to the contrary.

May I say further that since this issue has been raised, I am glad that the State administration has finally developed a construction program on some of the missing links of I–95, but I am disturbed that at the same time the turnpike authority is contracting to permit the bondholders to prevent its completion if they wish to do so during the life of the bonds—meaning possibly A.D. 2001.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

I trust this fully documents this single-handed and most difficult fight to save Florida's free highways and to facilitate a sound toll-road program as well.

Future Needs of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a speech made September 22, 1961, by Mr. Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Chicago Board of Trade. As head of the largest commodity exchange in the world, Mr. Liebenow speaks with considerable understanding and knowledge of the present situation in American agriculture. I believe his analysis of current conditions on the Nation's farms and his proposals for a future course of action, aimed at strengthening our free farm economy, should be seriously studied by all those interested in the subject:

FUTURE NEEDS OF AGRICULTURE

(By Robert C. Liebenow)

I am most pleased that you have invited me to be your luncheon speaker here today and honored that your organization feels what I might have to say will make good listening.

I would like to divide this into three parts—first of which will be entitled "What Is Right About American Agriculture Today"; the second of which will be entitled "The Government Is a Mighty Poor Farmer"; and the third of which will be entitled "A Future Plan for Agriculture."

In an age when Americans celebrate the achievements of our men-in-space, we tend to overlook the remarkable progress being made by our Nation's men-on-the-farm and their contribution to the cold war effort.

Experts may debate the relative merits of the United States' and Russian space achievements—but there is no argument over the relative merits of competing American and Communist farm economies. In this vital area of world rivalry, the American farmer is a hands-down winner.

He produces three times more per hour today than his father did in 1910—food and fiber enough for himself and 25 other people.

In a recent 6-year period, from 1951 to 1957, his farm output increased nearly twice as much as that of American industry—a phenomenal increase of more than 42 percent per man-hour.

As a result of the U.S. farmer's on-the-job efficiency, the American consumer in 1959 spent only 20 percent of his disposable income for food—compared to the Russian consumer's 56 percent, the Japanese con-

sumer's 42 percent and the West German's 46 percent.

These are notable accomplishments, a record every American can be proud of. Yet the American farmer, so to speak, finds his virtues hidden under his bushels. He is not hailed as a conquering hero of the cold war competition. He gets no parades, no medals. Instead, he is regarded by the farm economists in Washington, and by many of his fellow countrymen who take him for granted, as a problem.

Mr. Khrushchev and his Chinese Communist allies only wish they had this kind of agricultural problem—one resulting from plenty rather than scarcity. For Mr. K., whose background after all is in agriculture and not in space, it must be especially irksome that in this fundamental competitive area the American way of doing things is a source of envy to his own countrymen.

It wasn't too long ago that the Soviet premier himself spent a good deal of time touring America's harvest-rich midlands to get a firsthand look at how a free farm economy works. And before that, he dispatched a special delegation of Soviet agricultural policymakers to study our system.

Significantly, while he and his emissaries always try to get the last word on other aspects of American life—how the Soviet Union has bigger dams or improved industrial techniques—the Russian farm experts made no claims vis-a-vis Russian versus American farm progress.

The reason is obvious to anyone familiar with the Soviet farm system. For while the American farmer is a boon to our economy, the Russian farmer is indeed a problem to his Communist master planners.

In the Soviet Union, approximately one-half the population lives on farms—not because Russians prefer farming as a way of life, but because their farm productivity is so low. Despite desperate efforts to update farming methods and to increase agricultural output in Russia, the Soviet worker must labor four to five times longer than the American worker to buy any standard food item.

And in Red China, where regimented agricultural communes serve as a counterpart to the Soviet farm villages, the situation is even worse. Not only is the Chinese farmer an economic problem for Peiping, but recent reports tell of his becoming a political threat to the regime.

Small wonder that when Mr. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung recite the blessings of the Communist system as opposed to the capitalist, they never mention farms or the farmer.

With this in mind, it might be well for Americans to take a fresh look at their own farm "problem" and see it in perspective. For the American farmer, rather than being a drain on his society, is a source of strength in the cold war struggle.

Only 8.7 percent of our people live on farms, as compared to the Russians' 50 percent. Mechanization and modern agricultural techniques have made millions of farm workers available for labor in other areas—an economic shift which our cold war opponents, with their plans for a massive industrial push on the free world, would pay dearly to accomplish.

In terms of furnishing lifeblood to a healthy, balanced national economy, the American farmer represents even more than the food and fiber he grows. He represents a primary industry, one of the biggest.

The American farmer buys approximately $16 billion in farm machinery, gas, oil, electricity and other products every year. He uses more steel than goes into passenger cars. He uses more petroleum than any other single industry.

Farming itself employs 7.5 million American workers—and approximately 24 million individuals, one-third of our work force, owe their jobs to the fact that we enjoy a prosperous agricultural economy, one which defines its "problems" in terms of plenty rather than want.

These are the material benefits which the American farmer provides the free world in our grim contest with the Communists. But in addition, he represents a vital ideological symbol in the battle for men's minds.

Unlike his Communist counterparts, the American farmer is no antlike creature, no social-political drone carrying out State objectives. Rather, he is proud, independent, intelligent and resourceful, an individual contributor to his community and his Nation. These are the attributes which his free system of agriculture encourages—and they are the attributes which undeniably account for his accomplishments and his progress.

All of this, and more, is what is right about American agriculture today.

It has its headaches, to be sure, as do all segments of our national economy. And for the farm economist, the Government official, the city dweller, and the farmer himself, it has its seemingly insoluble problems. But so, let us remind ourselves, does space travel. And while we are handing out kudos to our men in space for their accomplishments, let's not forget the less dramatic, but equally important, victories of our men on the farm.

I am in agreement with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman when he states the farmer is doing a fine job. I agree that all farmers are not getting their share of the national income, but I part company with the Secretary and Dr. Cochrane quite definitely when it comes to solving the farm problem.

The agricultural history which is being written today is a costly and dramatic example of Government intervention, with further intervention and failure as the inevitable end products.

In the midst of all the confusion and technical details, several clear facts are emerging in the field of agriculture, all interrelated. These facts are:

1. Federal fixing of prices.

2. An attempt at controls over every segment of the marketing system.

3. High costs to the taxpayer.

There was an ancient Roman deity, called Janus, who was able to face two ways at once. This is what we are witnessing now in Washington; for example, an ability to threaten industry with antitrust prosecution for price fixing, and yet at the same time demanding that the Secretary of Agriculture be given additional powers to fix prices.

As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Agriculture is using the authorities given to him by the Congress to virtually eliminate the free competitive marketing system of the United States, at the same time that he is advising the Common Market countries that "our approach toward international trade is quite simple. Basically we believe in the efficacy of the commercial marketing mechanism as the best means of providing consumers with goods and services. Where the commercial marketing mechanism has problems in rendering this service, it is our desire to help strengthen it so that it can function adequately."

When the emergency feed grain bill was before the Congress, many Congressmen pointed to the fact that farmers were in the midst of marketing their 1960 crop of corn and other feed grains. There was fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the extraordinary powers proposed in that measure to force down the cash price of corn by the sale of tremendous Government stocks on the free market. The Secretary gave assurances that he would not do this. He said as follows: "You may be sure that we will not administer this program so as to reduce the income received by farmers prior to October 1, 1961, from sales of feed grains from the 1960 crop, below that they would have received if this program had not been enacted."

However, as soon as the feed grain bill became law, the Department of Agriculture proceeded to sell tens of millions of bushels of feed grains under the pretext that this was corn "threatened with going out of condition." Between October 1, 1960, and September 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation sold for domestic use over 235 million bushels compared with 105 million bushels in the same period a year earlier.

This action by the price fixers has caused the price of corn to be at least 10 cents a bushel below the level it should be—below what the open market would have paid. As a matter of fact, on the 14th of September 1961, the cash price for No. 2 corn in Chicago was actually 8 cents under a year ago. The a matter of face, on September 14, 1961, the cash price for No. 2 corn in Chicago was actually 8 cents under a year ago. The price fixers have taken tens of millions of dollars out of the pockets of corn producers.

One of the objectives was to break the price of corn in order to drive farmers into the new corn program.

Let us now turn to another commodity, namely soybeans. Here is a commodity which has shown the greatest growth in acreage, production, exports, markets, and so forth, of any crop in the country. This group of producers has been the most farsighted of any agricultural group. They looked at the mess which the controlled commodities had gotten themselves into, and said to themselves, "This is not for us. What we need is to work to expand markets both at home and abroad." They went to Washington and pleaded with the Secretary of Agriculture not to raise the price support of soybeans above $2.00 a bushel. They did not want to lose their markets for soybeans and its products to a Government warehouse. Throughout the years they have considered price support as a device facilitating the orderly marketing of the crop—not as a sales to the Government.

Their entire concept was to avoid surplus soybeans. With this basic long range view, their production has been moved into consumption channels. For each of the past several years, they have set new records in their exports of soybeans and soybean oil. They are developing expanded markets for soybean meal. The net result has been a crop worth over $1.1 billion—the fourth most important cash crop—higher than three of the so-called basics. This policy has also enabled the soybean producer to have a profitable outlet for some 25 million acres.

Under sensible price supports the forces of demand and supply have enabled this commodity to move through normal channels. The open market moved the crop at substantially above support prices. Against the wishes of the producers, Secretary Freeman established a price support level at 45 cents per bushel above that in existence in 1960. The last crop report is witness to the problem created—yes, created by the Government, because the price fixers are in the saddle. Soybean production is estimated at 720 million bushels, 29 percent above last year and 24 percent above the 1958 record.

When this administration proposed the Agricultural Act of 1961, it attempted (1) to take over the functions of Congress, and (2) to obtain authority to place the Cochrane theory of supply management over every agricultural commodity into operation. The Congress was wiser than the controllers. It refused to give this authority. However, the proponents of this concept are dedicated people—dedicated to placing controls over every segment of the marketing system and destroying the open competitive marketing system.

Last week, the Department of Agriculture announced it would begin selling corn

because the price was too high in some areas. This is a new concept. What they really meant to say was that they desired to punish all those "gamblers" who refused to go into the feed grain program for 1961.

Actually, they were attacking the 60 percent of the corn producers who wanted no part of these supply-management schemes. Here we have the Government determining what is a "reasonable" price—for reasonable substitute the word "regulated."

In a recent press release, the Department of Agriculture announced that it intended to sell 850 million bushels of corn during the next marketing year. This is 17 million bushels of corn a week. Certainly, if they accomplish this objective, the price of corn will be low. The feed grain-livestock ratios will be high, and as Secretary Freeman has said, cheap feed grain means cheap livestock prices.

Thus, we can expect in the fall of 1962, a situation under which livestock prices will be driven down, and the administration will be coming forth with its program to solve the problem which it itself created. The solution that they will offer is the one which the supply managers have always offered—that is, production and marketing limitations. This is their real objective. In the meantime, farm income will be destroyed for the producers of cattle and hogs. The cry will be made that the open market does not work. Obviously, it cannot work when the Federal Treasury is used to destroy it.

You are going to hear much about how much this program has saved the American taxpayer. Keep in mind that there are those familiar with agriculture who are saying:

This administration by its feed grain sales policy has reduced corn producers' income for 1960–61 by at least $100 million. At the same time it has forced an additional 100 million bushels of corn into the 1961 crop corn loan. While an attempt will be made to charge this cost to the previous administration, knowledgeable people will know better. The reduction in production resulting from the feed grain program will be very small.

Costs will be tremendous. Remember that soybeans under a program, which had operated up to now at practically no cost, will become a commodity owned by Commodity Credit Corporation, with all the attendant Government costs. Remember, that the Government is paying out some $700 million in an attempt to reduce feed grain production by 10 percent. Remember that the Government will be acquiring several hundred million bushels of corn at $1.20, and selling back at least as much at about $1.00 per bushel. Remember that the Government forced under 1960 loan about 100 million additional bushels of corn. Add it all up, they say, and you will find a neat package that couldn't be bought for less than $1 billion of your own money.

When all the costs are pulled together, the taxpayer may find he has spent up to $3 per bushel for corn not produced, has lost the great advantage of the open market to the bureaucracy, and that there will emerge the demand for more controls. Controls breed controls. This is a lesson which all history has taught.

If a fundamental fault of existing farm programs is support price loans, is there an alternative? We need some way to increase farm income during this period of adjustment. What should we do if the things we are doing are wrong?

The Chicago Board of Trade has advocated the substitution of direct payments to producers for support price loans. These would not be payments across the board because 80 percent or more of farm commodities now move in a free atmosphere, but would be payments for commodities now in trouble and only on an interim basis.

I am quite surprised at the reaction in some quarters to this simple and logical idea. It has been opposed on the grounds it would be another Brannan plan and would, therefore, cost billions of dollars.

The Brannan plan was put forward by Charles F. Brannan in 1949. It proposed, through the use of payments and other devices, to broaden Federal aid programs to include almost every farm product. The inclusion of additional commodities in any program for direct Federal aid would cost more money.

Estimates of the Brannan plan budget varied. It would have been expensive—no doubt of that—not because of payments, but rather because of the maximum number of crops that were to be covered. The cost of a program which uses direct payments to producers will depend, obviously, upon the number of products included and the rate of payments.

Estimates on the cost of a payments program can only be uncertain in their accuracy. If confined to the limited number of troublesome surplus crops, such a plan probably would be considerably less costly than the $4 billion being spent annually in the name of farm aid.

Several billion dollars have gone to farmers in the form of payments from the Treasury since 1933. The soil bank is a program whereby farmers are paid money out of the Treasury to take land out of production. It is a payments program.

Some persons oppose payments so vehemently that one might infer there is something morally and ethically wrong with the idea. This, of course, is nonsense. A payments program, as a substitute for the existing loan program, would do six things:

1. Stop expenditure of hundreds of millions yearly for storing grain.

2. End a pattern of commodities being tossed onto domestic markets to avoid spoilage, and in so doing depressing prices.

3. Make export subsidy expense unnecessary.

4. Thus end a practice that brings cries of "Yankee imperialist" whenever American farm products are subsidized into markets that smaller farmers in free nations consider their own.

5. Directly bolster farm buying power with every dollar spent; whereas much of the $4 billion now being expended annually in the name of agricultural support does not go to farmers.

6. Reduce the cost of eating.

The reasons for the reduction in storage and export costs are immediately apparent. So is the reason for the decrease in the consumer's food bill. By direct action, loans raise the price of farm products. Payments operate indirectly and have a comparatively minor effect on food costs.

The board of trade feels that a payments program would be highly constructive for other valid reasons. One is that it would free markets. This would enable the commodity exchanges to perform the functions for which they were established. It would be in the interests of the board of trade.

We also think a program that frees the markets is in the interest of everyone concerned—provided, of course, it also gives the producers their fair share of the national income.

Payments would permit a more flexible farm program and one which would make it relatively easy for the Federal Government eventually to get out of the business of trying to run the details of farming.

Another alternative to the existing program would be much stricter controls and much higher support prices. Judging from the past, the move toward stricter controls for all commodities is the wrong move. Production control to date has not been successful.

Its proponents point to tobacco. One must not forget that tobacco represents a very unusual situation. The acreage of tobacco, all types, is around one million annually as compared to the more than 50 million in wheat and the tremendous acreage in other principal crops.

Nor is the tobacco program all on the plus side. Individual allotments are getting smaller and smaller; exports are declining. In the principal types of tobacco, an acre which has an allotment has a very high value as compared to an acre without an allotment. As an example, an acre of Flue-cured tobacco land in Pitt County, N.C., in 1957 was worth $2,500; an acre alongside it without an allotment was worth $100 or less, a difference of $2,400. This is fantastic, but it illustrates the artificial value which can accrue to land covered by a Government allotment.

The replacement of the existing system in tobaccco would have tremendous repercussions. The same thing is true, to a lesser extent, for all the other crops with Government allotments.

Some advocates of more drastic controls want to shift to a unit basis. A producer would be given a marketing allotment in terms of bushels, bales or pounds.

This unit method was tried out on cotton and tobacco before World War II. The acts which authorized it were repealed after the Supreme Court outlawed the original Agricultural Adjustment Act. If that act, so Congress reasoned, was unconstitutional, so were the tobacco and cotton acts. Also the men administering the tobacco and cotton acts were pretty glad to get rid of them. They were headaches and were increasingly unpopular with the farmers.

In 1938 Flue-cured and burley tobacco producers again were given poundage quotas. After 1 year the growers discarded unit controls and went back to acreage allotments.

The unit approach is very drastic indeed. Such a scheme probably would have to be extended all across the board. If feed grains are controlled, what about livestock? If livestock is controlled, what about poultry, and so on. I don't believe the regimentation required for the unit system would set well with the farmers or other people. I think there would be black markets all over the place. I don't think it would work well or be kept very long. The result would be a king-sized hangover with solution of the farm problem further off than ever.

Acreage allotments for crops in surplus may have to be continued, but I feel that we must recognize that tightening controls on almost all farms is not the way out.

There is production control in industry. The answer to a slump is to cut down output. This is easy for industry, where the direction of production is concentrated and in a comparatively few hands. But there are millions of farmers, agriculture being the last bulwark of small business. Production is so widely diffused that drastic controls on a farm-to-farm basis become tough, really tough.

To repeat, it is time—and past time—to look at this farm problem carefully and objectively. There are a lot of misconceptions which stand in the way of progress.

One trouble with the thinking in some circles is that the farm programs were designed primarily to help the little fellow. The fact that large benefits go to the bigger operators is pointed to as proof that something is radically wrong. That does not follow. Admittedly there should be some limitations of farm benefits. I see no reason to subsidize city men who make their living in town and also own a lot of land. But today it is not the little man alone who needs assistance; it is the men who produce most of our food and fiber, the good, capable farmers.

I cannot repeat too often or emphasize too strongly that an essential step toward a solution of this farm problem is to understand what it is all about.

The farmer needs Federal aid. That means subsidies any way you look at it, but let us not forget there are many other interests which have been, and are being subsidized.

In the past there were huge subsidies to railroads. Many, many millions have been spent on ocean and air mail subsidies. The tariffs are subsidies. The postal deficit is the result of a subsidy. Foreign aid results in huge subsidies. So it goes.

There is not reason to single out the farmer for criticism simply because he is getting Federal aid. The question is: Does he need this aid? The answer, in my considered opinion, is in the affirmative.

If our people are told the essentials of the agricultural situation, I am confident they will insist on an adequate and well-rounded farm program.

An adequate and well-rounded farm program will be many programs in one. But it will include fewer controls on a farm-to-farm basis and the substitution of payments, where possible, for support prices.

If I read our experience in past years correctly, this is the way our Federal farm program must go eventually. The sooner the better for all concerned.

Thank you.

Is the Congress Mentally Ill?—Is That Our Defense?

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reliable information came to me that within the last 10 or 15 days the House had passed 240 bills. Will someone in the House advise me as to the accuracy of that information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair is not in a position to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was not making it with the idea that it was a parliamentary inquiry. It was a request for information. Perhaps one of the reading clerks will be helpful to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not have that information. I suggest the gentleman refer to the calendar or to the bill clerk.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not need unanimous consent to do that, do I?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Inasmuch as the information came from a reliable source, permit me to speak briefly on the question whether the Congress is mentally ill or whether we are only mentally and physically exhausted. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include certain portions of a decision rendered by the circuit court of appeals here in the District which defines and distinguishes between a mental disease and a defect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hopes the gentleman is not submitting that as evidence of his original statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is just the Court's opinion; well, yes, it is evidence, but not very strong evidence, of responsibility for a criminal act, if I may be permitted to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

IS THE CONGRESS MENTALLY ILL? IS THAT OUR DEFENSE TO SOME OF OUR APPROPRIATIONS?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President told us that, while we wished to avoid war, we would continue our effort to extend aid, bring freedom to people throughout the world, that we would not desert West Germany.

If Khrushchev backs his words with action, devastating war is just over the horizon.

Rightly, the President has called for and Congress has appropriated billions upon billions for national defense. The President is calling men from their homes into the armed services, sending advance detachments overseas.

The threat of a war which might destroys us is with us. This being true, what is the Congress doing to make possible a successful military defense?

We have a national debt of more than $288 billion. We now pay an annual interest charge of almost $9 billion, for which we get nothing at all except a postponement of the payment date.

The Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, which is charged with appropriating your tax dollars, from the well of the House recently said we were spending each hour of every 24-hour day $1 million more than we took in. That is, each day we add $24 million to our national debt. Increase the annual interest payment—water over the dam, under the bridge—money down a rathole.

Inasmuch as to be successful in war a nation must be economically, financially sound, and highly productive, as well as being able to produce courageous, skilled, fighting men, is it not a sign of a mental disease or defect when the Congress, knowing however distant it may be, there is a limit to our natural resources, our manpower and our productive ability, continues to spend public funds on enterprises which, however desirable and helpful, do not contribute to our war potential, our ability to make our future secure?

The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia has recently established the doctrine that one accused of crime "is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of mental disease or mental defect." [1] See exhibit A.

[1] *Durham* v. *United States* (214 Fed (2d) 874.)

Is the Congress showing sound mental judgment when, knowing the threat of an immediate war from a foe acknowledged to be almost our equal if not our superior in productive ability and military might, it authorizes the expenditure of a billion dollars, as we have, for a trip to the moon? War, if it comes, will not be fought on the moon. How will that expenditure, however desirable from a scientific standpoint it may be, contribute to the situation now confronting us?

Is there something wrong with our mentality or judgment when we authorize, as we recently did, the expenditure of $20 million for an aquarium in one of Washington's federally owned buildings? Does that expenditure at this time indicate a "mental" or other defect?

By Executive order the President established a Peace Corps and in his contingent fund had money to operate it. Yet he insisted the Peace Corps be made permanent, although the State Department already had authority and money to do everything which a Peace Corps, made up of young American volunteers, can do. This at cost of additional millions.

The other day we were asked to create an Advisory Council—more millions—to help the Government to advise on the arts.

Do the last two actions indicate that, in preparing to protect our individual freedom and our national security, we are using good judgment?

The list of additional expenditures, none of which will contribute to the wining of a war, might be extended indefinitely.

Just one more incident. The Congress permitted, refused to rebuke or disown, a representative of the State Department who, without any authority, pledged us to give South American countries $20 billion. This when we all know that in Congress rests the sole authority to authorize the expenditure of your dollars. We must either make good on the promises of our representatives who have no authority to create such obligations, or repudiate those who speak for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to again ask as in the beginning: Is the Congress suffering from some mental disease? Does it have a mental defect?

It is getting ready to win a threatened disastrous war?

Has it in mind, as its primary purpose, the future security of our country or is it helping the executive department or both political parties shop around for votes—for support from minority groups—from those who always, one way or another, by fair means or foul, make a profit out of war, out of the misery and suffering—many times the death—of those who are called upon to fight a war?

Today we are asked to continue encouraging people without training or prospect of employment to become residents of the District, knowing as we do that we must, at least for the present, furnish them homes, food, clothing and, according to the present bill, educational opportunities—thus adding to the Nation's already overwhelming burden,

thus lessening our ability to make adequate defense if war comes.

EXHIBIT A

In the Durham case to which reference was made the court said:

We use "disease" in the sense of a condition which is considered capable of either improving or deteriorating. We use "defect" in the sense of a condition which is not considered capable of either improving or deteriorating and which may be either congenital, or the result of injury, or the residual effect of a physical or mental disease.

Remarks of A. Willis Robertson, in Newport News, Va., September 25, 1961, at a Luncheon Honoring Gen. Frank F. Everest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the commanding general of the Air Force's Tactical Air Command of the United States, Gen. Frank F. Everest, a great American and a great military leader, is retiring from active duty. He has served his Nation selflessly for more than 33 years.

This past Monday, September 25, 1961, several hundred prominent Virginians attended a luncheon in General Everest's honor. All of us were privileged to hear a brief but eloquent address by our distinguished U.S. Senator from Virginia, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, along with an uncommonly fine address by General Everest himself.

In addition to knowing of the high regard that Senator ROBERTSON and all of us from the tidewater area of Virginia have for General Everest, I believe my colleagues would be interested in reading our able Virginia Senator's comments on the vital subject of civil defense. Also I believe my colleagues would be interested in seeing General Everest's remarks on the Tactical Air Command.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have the addresses made by Senator ROBERTSON and General Everest placed in the RECORD and I heartily commend both of them to the attention of the membership of this body:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, IN NEWPORT NEWS, VA., SEPTEMBER 25, 1961, AT A LUNCHEON HONORING GEN. FRANK F. EVEREST

I take great personal pleasure in honoring Gen. Frank F. Everest today on the occasion of his retirement. General Everest is an old friend. We have shared many a memorable fishing and hunting expedition together. For me, he brings to mind the words of the Book of Ecclesiastes, where it is written: "A faithful friend is a strong defense: and he that hath found such an one hath found a treasure."

General Everest is retiring after more than 30 years of active duty. During this time, he has served his country well in many capacities. General Everest, in fact, is one of a small number of American airmen who rank among the pioneers of military aviation in this country. He was one of all too few Americans who championed the cause of air power before World War II. After the war began, he helped to organize, train, and shape the air force that contributed so much to our victory.

The persistence that General Everest has shown as an advocate of air power can be personally attested, I know, by General Twining. During the war, General Twining's plane crashed in the Pacific Ocean. An air search combed the face of the deep in vain and was about to be called off as hopeless. General Everest insisted, however, on trying once more, and directed further flights. Before long a B–17 sighted General Twining's raft. Soon the general, like Jonah, was able to walk again upon the dry land.

General Everest's career has been long and meritorious. Born in Council Bluffs, Iowa, he graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1928 and launched his aviation career shortly thereafter. Once we entered World War II, General Everest's duties brought him a variety of major assignments in the South Pacific Theater, where he was awarded a Silver Star for gallantry in action. He later was assigned to Air Corps Headquarters in a variety of planning capacities.

After the war ended, General Everest assumed command of the Yukon sector of the Alaskan Air Command. Subsequently he served tours of duty in Washington, Korea, and Europe. Upon returning in 1959 as commander in chief of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, General Everest rounded out his career as commander of the Tactical Air Command at Langley Air Force Base.

I salute General Everest today, then, both as a valued friend and as a distinguished public servant. His contributions to our defense strength, which have been so notable, must now be carried on by others. In this troubled age of atomic power, all of us have responsibilities for our defense, whether we are in military or civilian life.

In this connection, one of my concerns is civil defense, and particularly fallout shelters in which I hold a special interest as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that considers housing legislation, as chairman of the Joint Senate-House Committee on Defense Production, and as a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Those of you who live or work in the Newport News and Norfolk area recognize the need for adequate civil defense and the importance of fallout shelters in an area which could be brought under enemy attack. Newport News contains the largest private shipyard in the world, as well as vital defense centers and installations.

Here, as in other parts of the country, numerous buildings, tunnels, underground passages, and other structures can offer civil defense protection for large numbers of people. Steps are being taken to identify and outfit as many structures as possible. The Defense Appropriations Act of 1962 provided over $200 million for civil defense, of which nearly half is for a national program for identifying and marking available community shelter space in existing structures, and for improving shelter space in Federal buildings.

But community shelter in existing buildings can accommodate only a fourth or so of our total population, and available Federal aid for fallout shelters can be applied only toward public structures. Every private citizen and private business needs to take steps now to assure greater fallout protection. Only a little effort may bring large results, since fallout radiation decays rapidly and becomes only one-tenth as lethal after 7 hours and only a hundred after 2 full days.

As an indication of what can be done privately, I would like to mention the case of the First National Bank in my hometown of Lexington, Va. Wholly on its own, the bank refurbished its basement as a fallout shelter and stocked it with canned goods and drinking water as well as with microfilms of bank records. This space can accommodate 15 to 20 people in case of emergency. The results were accomplished without great inconvenience and without the use of public funds.

The present occasion has lead me to make a few remarks about what all of can do to assure our future defense, just is it has brought us here to honor what one man has done in the past for us all. As before, it will take initiative, courage, and persistence to overcome the numerically superior forces arrayed against us, but we can succeed nevertheless.

Members of our Senate breakfast group know how I delight to tell how a superior ground army of the Philistines was defeated during the reign of King Saul. The Philistine army was encamped in one spot of the valley, the Israelites under King Saul in another. Day after day Goliath paraded between the two armies, challenging all comers in defiant terms. No one had the courage to accept his challenge until the day David, a shepherd boy, appeared before King Saul and asked the privilege of doing so.

David had few missiles—only "five smooth stones out of the brook." Goliath scornfully watched David approach, perhaps saying to himself: "With one stroke of my right hand, off goes his head." But David said to Goliath. "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts."

That was a difference, but it was the winning difference.

Let us then, continue to put our trust in the Almighty in facing the future. And let us all wish General Everest Godspeed in whatever endeavors he may undertake in the years ahead.

REMARKS OF GEN. F. F. EVEREST AT THE PENINSULA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TESTIMONIAL BANQUET ON SEPTEMBER 25, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster, Judge Smith, Senator ROBERTSON, honored guests, members of the Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, I am happy to be with you today, but at the same time I regret that it is the last time for me to join you, at least as an active member of the Air Force.

Mrs. Everest and I have enjoyed the privilege of being a part of your community for the past 2 years. Military people grow accustomed to moving constantly and of making new friends, but we never find it easy to say goodby.

In recent years this has become more significant because the military and civilian communities have blended into a single entity, sharing common interests and enjoying warm relationships through mutual understanding.

'Twas not always this way. There was a time when the military was virtually cut off from the civilian world, and neither group knew much about the other. There was no chance for understanding because there was little communication between the two.

The change started with World War II when total mobilization left few American homes untouched. Since that time, despite the premature demobilization in 1946, we have lived in a climate of fluctuating tensions, but there has been a steadily increasing recognition of the continuing need for strong military forces in being.

It would be impossible for a democratic nation to maintain such forces without public support. The intermingling of the military and civilian communities, the side-by-side living and the common interests, have produced a high decree of harmony and mutual respect.

But the change goes even deeper than this. The American people have become acutely aware of international affairs, and this has led to a better understanding of our role in the cause of world peace. Not only have we as a nation, and as individuals, accepted the fact of free world leadership, but we know that our responsibilities will not diminish so long as there remains a threat to freedom anywhere.

In accepting this fact, we know that the high cost of maintaining an adequate defense is justified, because the stakes are of the highest—they include the dignity of man and his basic freedoms. Our strength does not rest alone with the military, but flows from a sense of national urgency and the unanimous approval of the American people for the course we have taken and the effort that is required to maintain sufficient defense forces.

Technology and science have given us aircraft, machines and weapons with fantastic potentials. Supersonic planes and ballistic missiles have collapsed time and distance, and today there literally is no target out of reach, and no place to hide.

Soon man will conquer space, to further compress the shrinking globe and draw the nations of the world into an even tighter community of interacting and often conflicting societies. This time of rapid technological change is made even more significant by the presence of political and sociological disordered throughout the world.

Because many of these things—the complexities of technocracy, the stresses and strains of the competition between the Western democracies and the Communist world, and the constantly shifting sands of world affairs—cause considerable apprehension, we tend to overlook basic fundamentals. We often lose sight of our most precious resource: people.

In this age of automation, we in the military worry more about people than anything else. Despite the current fascination with computers and automation, the greatest computer ever devised is still the human brain.

Science will never be able to build an electronic brain that can exercise judgment, generate original thoughts, or demonstrate courage and love of liberty. Nor will there ever be a machine dedicated to God and country.

Thus, man, because he has a brain and a soul, will continue to be the key to the kind of national defense we have now and will need in the years ahead.

For us in Tactical Air Command this has a special meaning. TAC is a powerful command, designed to accomplish a variety of jobs and with the ability to move quickly to any corner of the world. And the backbone of our force is the professionally qualified, highly motivated airman.

Take for example the tactical fighter pilot of today. He is combination pilot, navigator, bombardier, radio operator and flight engineer. He has made lonely ocean crossing a commonplace occurrence, enduring long hours of grueling work, making precision rendezvous with aerial tankers and often faced with adverse weather at his oversea landing point. And every day he must work diligently to stay ready for instant response to any emergency.

For all his loneliness in flight, he is never quite alone. Working with him are equally skilled men providing support in reconnaissance, communications, tanker operations, maintenance and all the activities that are required to keep him ready for combat.

These people are highly skilled, but their skills are not static. They constantly train to maintain and improve their capabilities. They are professionals in every sense of the word.

Too often we fall into the easy habit of accepting a stereotyped picture of military life and military people. Some citizens in the past must have thought the military consisted of men who came into the service, did nothing but patricipate in military exercises, fought if the Nation was forced into war and after 30 or more years of life in various parts of the world they could look forward to a comfortable retirement.

This never was the case, but it is grotesquely untrue now. There is no room in the military for a man who cannot think and who cannot grow steadily in ability and potential. Too much depends on each individual. He is too important economically and, more precisely, he has a large share of our security in his hands. The fighter pilot of today carries a greater burden of responsibility than was ever before imposed on one individual fighting man.

The American people are gaining a better understanding of the military man, Regular and reservist alike, and in the weeks and months ahead this understanding will grow.

There can be no doubt that the future holds little promise for an appreciable relaxation of world tensions. President Kennedy has urged Americans to accept this fact and to be prepared for the sacrifices that will be required of us in pursuing a determined course of defending freedom wherever and whenever it is threatened, employing whatever means may be necessary.

The men of Tactical Air Command have this sense of determination and dedication. They demonstrate this daily in carrying out their duties and in constantly sharpening their professional skills. I can pay them no greater tribute than to say I am confident that they will acquit themselves magnificently, no matter what the future holds.

I am equally confident that they will continue to receive the public support they must have to do the job. This is the kind of support they have reecived from you down through the years, and is a reflection of common interests and mutual respect.

Hon. Paul Brown, of Georgia

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, this body has been saddened to hear of the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia. I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with him on the House Banking and Currency Committee for many years prior to his retirement last year. He was known to us all as a diligent and wise legislator, a kind friend and a southern gentleman.

My colleagues, I am sure, join me in the hope that he found much happiness in his retirement to his beloved Georgia during the past year. Paul Brown served his district and his State and his Nation well for almost two decades.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and daughter at this time of bereavement.

Address by Newton N. Minow, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a significant address delivered by Newton N. Minow, the distinguished chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, to the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York City on September 22, 1961.

The text follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE RADIO AND TELEVISION EXECUTIVES SOCIETY, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 22, 1961

President Culligan, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, let me first mention a few changes we are making at the FCC.

Congress has passed and President Kennedy has signed the FCC reorganization legislation, giving us a chance to slice red tape. We can now divide the seven of us into panels of three. This means you will be entitled to twice as much Commission attention for the same budget dollar.

I don't know whether that doubles your pleasure or makes you feel half-safe.

This is my first visit to New York since joining the FCC. I regret this because I used to get here very often—indeed, the law firm of which I was a partner has its offices on fabled Madison Avenue. As I returned here today, some friends suggested in view of my last speech to some broadcasters that I might need a bodyguard as I approached all of you. I tried to get Elliott Ness, but he was unavailable—he didn't want to be identified with any more violence.

There are many of you here who attended the NAB Convention in Washington. Today, I'm not going to talk about wastelands. We've all had enough of repeats and summer reruns.

To those of you who think my remarks last May went a little too far, I emphasize that I do not retract a sihgle word.

But to those of you whose silence conceals agreement, I express my gratitude. I bring you encouragement for the purposes that you as conscientious broadcasters want to accomplish, and I assure you of our confidence in your success.

But for those relatively few of you who came away from Washington with nothing but dismay and fear that bureaucratic meddling with broadcasting had arrived, I repeat some words you must have overlooked. I said last May, "I want to see broadcasting improved and I want you to do the job."

I meant it then and I mean it now.

It is not for me or any other Government official to tell you what to broadcast, or what not to broadcast. It is not for me or any other Government official to say that a show must go off—or that a show must go on. In spite of this often repeated position, there recently has been a lot of talk and debate about censorship. Some of it has been reasoned and genuinely motivated, but some of it has been designed to divert attention away from responsibility. For those of you who have any doubt, I repeat: this Commission does not believe in censorship, will have nothing to do with censorship, and will re-

fuse to let the cry of censorship smokescreen our mutual efforts to improve broadcasting.

For those of you who do not believe this and those of you who disagree with our view regarding censorship, I invite you to explore this with us at law.

One case recently decided by the Commission is on its way to court now, and our courts are the proper place to settle any issues which you may think are unresolved. For my part, I asure you that I will welcome this clarification, whatever the outcome.

Even in advance of that, however, I think we can learn something about the meaning of the word "censorship" from a recent incident familiar to all of you. Intelligent, responsible and well-meaning people insisted last week that the FCC do something to prevent the broadcast of an episode of the Jack Paar Show, filmed in Berlin. Let me read to you one telegram sent to me last week by a sincerely concerned citizen:

"I do not know if your Commission has jurisdiction over the type of program presented by Mr. Jack Paar tonight but if you do and if you had prior knowledge of the shallow and callous manner in which he was going to treat a matter which is torturing millions of people throughout the world then you and your entire Commission should resign at once. If you had no power to prohibit its harm then your office or whichever one had or should have had this power is a mockery."

The FCC is not going to evaluate anyone's judgment in producing that program. We all may have our personal views about the wisdom or lack of it in planning the program, the risks involved, the reflection on the maturity and intelligence of our great Nation at a time of awesome crisis. But for the FCC to have suppressed its broadcast would have been censorship in its most deplorable form. I repeat: the FCC will not and cannot have any part of censorship. That is the law, and that is the only way to maintain broadcasting in a free society.

The broadcasting privilege is in your hands. If the will to use it well is there, it is more powerful assurance of mature responsibility than anything that Government regulation can ever bring about. And if the will is not there, then in the long run you can only hurt yourselves and your country. And as citizens you alone will bear the responsibility of wasting one of the Nation's precious resources.

Your judgment, based on a constant awareness of your responsibilities, must determine the course of programing—but I assure you that we intend to take your responsibilities as seriously as we take our own.

In holding you to these responsibilities, however, we recognize that the key men in networks have a problem that is unique in broadcasting. For while a station manager is usually concerned with the day's schedule—network heads and the men who assist them in making decisions are preoccupied with "What comes next?"—a few months ahead, in the case of programing currently scheduled; and they must plan even a year or more ahead in arranging next season's lineups. Often, tomorrow's broadcast was last year's decision.

Many of you in this room have the power to decide what 120 million of Americans will be seeing and hearing for an average of 200 minutes a day. Your decisions will shape people's knowledge, their opinions, their understanding and their future.

This means that you must have much lead-time to prepare for new programing—time to create, to dream, to negotiate, to sell, to produce, to schedule.

It also means that right now is the time to take a long look at the result of last year's decisions as they come up shortly in the fall schedule. This is a critical season because there are tangible indications of an increasing awareness of your responsibilities. With rare exceptions, broadcasters are sensitive to the need for change. The mood for change is in the air, and the evidence of change is slowly but surely coming on the air.

Right now you have a full year to glimpse the new while reexamining the old—and to think very seriously about where your responsibilities should lead you next year.

It is with this in mind that I want to speak with you about the current broadcast season—for this is the season of decision.

This year, the country will be in your debt for the heavier emphasis on news and public affairs offered in the network schedules. You know better than I how urgent it is to give the public as much information as possible in these terrible times. A democracy depends for survival upon the wisdom of informed citizens called upon to make painful decisions. The powerful voice of radio and television can be the major contribution to the people's knowledge, or through abuse, democracy's doom.

There are hopeful indications of fewer "crime-evening" hours this year. We hear that much unnecessary violence is ending up on the cutting room floor. The NAB, under the wise leadership of Governor Collins, has renewed its emphasis on the enforcement of the industry radio and television codes. The FCC will help in any way it can to further this enlightened self-discipline.

There are signs of renewed vitality at the local station level, with more dedicated determination to serve the needs of the local community.

Changes cannot occur this afternoon. But these are welcome signs, at a time when you are planning and making hard choices for the coming year.

And while you are making these choices, I know that some of you are turning your attention, as we at the FCC have done, to the 70 million children's hours spent each day with television. The FCC is doing its part. In our new broadcast forms, we propose to ask licensees about their efforts to provide programs for children. This is the first time in the history of the FCC that this question has been asked, and I hasten to add that the credit for this improvement belongs to the Commission under the leadership of Fred Ford last year.

There are at least a dozen important problems I should like to discuss with you today, problems of mutual concern to you and the FCC. But to me, the subject of surpassing significance, the compelling need which I believe requires your most urgent attention as you plan for next year, is for some serious thought about the 70 million children's hours.

And so today I want to talk with you about television and our children.

In the course of our work, we at the FCC have read and studied books, pamphlets, printed lectures, speeches and theses on this subject. We have been exposed to all shades of opinion.

I have personally come to the same conclusion as one of the authors, and I quote: "For some children under some conditions, some television is harmful—some television is beneficial—most television is neither harmful nor beneficial."

On first reading, this conclusion seems to say nothing. On reflection, I think it says a good deal.

We all know that the potential of television to help or hurt our children is enormous. We know that television occupies more of a child's time each year than school, or than church. And in some homes, children spend more time with their TV sets than with their parents. (Parenthetically, many parents spend more time with their TV sets than with their children.)

Since ratings are important in this room, let us examine what they say. Each day, 27 million children under the age of 12 look at television. Thirteen million will be viewers at 5 o'clock this afternoon, 15 million at 6, 18 million at 7, 17 million at 8. During that especially frantic period in most homes before dinner when so many mothers are busy, young children spend much of their time before the television screen, often mesmerized and hypnotized by what they see and learn.

At the far end of the spectrum is that minority—and I underline minority—of television for children which does them obvious, documented, emotional harm. Some recent testimony before Senator Dodd's committee included deeply disturbing thoughts about what has guided some few programs developed for children.

For its historic value, to see where we have been, let me quote some recent testimony before the Senate by a brave television packager who frankly described the past. He read a memorandum prepared for a network program executive, describing some program ideas which—and I quote—"Will hold the kids." Making the hero—and again I quote—"tough and hard to get against a violent physical action background with a seductive beautiful girl each week, should get the result we all want." These and similar ideas, the memorandum continues—again I quote—"will please the critics and the PTA and at the same time be sexier, be more violent, and have more conflict." The memo even includes a definition of "conflict"—"he's got his clothes off, he's trying to put them back on and she won't let him: conflict."

Of one thing I am sure. That approach has not in any conceivable manner fooled the critics and the PTA. A review in the PTA magazine of a network children's television show offered this chilling description:

"A coarse voice, a crude vocabulary, a vulgar enunciation, atrocious grammar, bestial grunts, howls, yowls, shrieks, gargles, croaks, spittings, and other hideous and uncouth noises emanate from throat and stomach to produce the unsavory stew that's poured over your child every Saturday morning in the hope of eliciting the right answer to the sponsor's question: 'What's for dessert?'"

The quotations I read from the Senate testimony represent only one end of the spectrum, and I cannot believe it represents a typical approach to children's programing. We can all agree, I hope, that this concept of television fare is inexcusable.

At the other end of the spectrum are those programs, again unfortunately in the minority, which have some beneficial effects on some children. These programs—and there are hopeful signs that they are increasing in number—are designed to uplift, inspire, illuminate, and inform.

But now—in the middle of the spectrum—is this larger area of children's shows which neither help nor harm, which neither elevate nor debase, which neither lead nor mislead. These programs, and they are in the majority, stimulate neither sadistic tendencies nor intellectual curiosity. They arouse thoughts neither of mayhem nor creativity. These are the timewaster shows; they are dull, grey, and insipid like dishwater, just as tasteless, just as nourishing.

The timewaster shows occupy most of the viewing hours of our children. They hold down, and babysit. Period.

To you who decide what to broadcast, I direct my question: is this enough? Are you sufficiently harnessing the vast power for good—are you providing our children with the unique values of television to educate, to awaken, to enrich their lives?

I don't accept the proposition advanced by some that TV itself causes juvenile delinquency. But shouldn't TV be a major cause

of juvenile development? I am skeptical about the charge that the sex and violence on TV cause teenage immorality. But doesn't TV have the duty to contribute heavily to teenage responsibility?

Few who have watched the full fare of children's TV shows could work up much anger against these timewaster programs for what they are; rather, all of us, particularly we parents, could work up much sorrow about these TV offerings for what they are not, when we know what they could be.

What could they be? Permit me to take as a case history a recent example of a children's program. I submit this program as an example only. The decisions as to its future have already been made. But I suggest that this specific reference may serve to make our discussion more meaningful.

The American Broadcasting Co. announced in July that this fall it would offer a new children's program called "Discovery." ABC said "Discovery" would be on 5 days a week for a half hour each day between 5 and 5:30 in the afternoon.

The idea of the program, which ABC described as "a landmark in children's programing" is summed up in the network's promotional materials this way:

"Curiosity is as natural to the growing child as the desire for sweets. The young person's mind reaches out for stimulation. Questions and answers are as vital to its development as good food is to a youngster's body. Kids are interested in everything; their instinct is to learn, to know."

"Discovery" proposed each day to be "dedicated to young curiosity—America's 20 million bright, inquisitive, imaginative preadolescents who think it might be fun to take a trip to the moon; whose greatest immediate concern might be the selecton of a puppy; who know more about the planets than their parents; who collect baseball cards, postage stamps, or salamanders."

When ABC offered the program to its affiliates, however, it was off to a very late start. Of the 110 markets ordered by the sponsors, stations in 67 of these were able to clear the show, but 43 could not. The program was actually offered in a total of 152 markets, and in these, 76 stations said that they would carry the show. Some local stations had already made commitments elsewhere. Some had local children's shows of their own.

Yet, the 76 stations which said they would carry "Discovery" would have made the program available in 65.5 percent of the television homes of America, and the 67 stations which cleared it as part of the sponsors' order accounted for 64.9 percent of all U.S. television homes, reaching a potential audience of more than 14 million children.

This was not enough. Some of the advertisers felt that there would not be sufficient viewers to make their advertising worthwhile, and dropped out.

The result was that the show was cancelled—and it will not be seen by one child in the country.

It is not my purpose to argue that this particular program should be on the air. That decision rests with you radio and television executives. Rather, I want to examine with you the decisionmaking process which produced this result.

Certainly, the network should be commended for trying. Certainly, those stations that had reasonable local reasons for not clearing the show cannot and should not be blamed. And those advertisers who were willing to invest in this type of program should be applauded.

But assuming with me for the minute that "Discovery" did have all the values suggested, then where does the responsibility rest for killing a children's program with so much hope and promise? Is it enough to shrug our shoulders and say, "Too bad. They started too late." If that is the only excuse, I must suggest that there is something fundamentally wrong with a system in which the potential of reaching the homes of 14 million children is not enough to go ahead. No magazine, no newspaper, no other media of communication could have offered such an audience, with an early, or a middle, or a late start. We cannot accept the premise that the chance to reach 14 million children is not enough to be worthwhile.

Looking further at this grey, pallid area of children's television and "what they are not," let us pause for a moment and examine, as we did in the single case of "Discovery," "why they are not." What answers, explanations, and excuses are generally offered to justify the timewaster shows which do nothing to our children, or for our children.

The first excuse, always, is: these are the shows the children want. These are the programs attracting the largest audience. Now I submit to you that there are times in this frenetic country of ours when we do not give the children what they want. I conducted a random survey myself last month among a number of children in the 10 to 12 age bracket. I discovered, or perhaps better, confirmed, a number of facts about the wants of children.

First, 99 percent of the respondents preferred candy to spinach; 92 percent preferred the movies to Sunday school; 79 percent preferred to stay home and watch the game shows and soap operas on TV rather than go to school.

There is nothing wrong with giving these children some candy, in the form of television escape, but there is something wrong in not giving them some spinach in the form of enrichment. And I have the feeling that most of us parents will send our children to Sunday School, even against their wishes; finally, even if we were tempted to keep our children home from public school to watch TV, there are State laws backing up the principle that you just can't always give the children what they want.

At this point arises the second excuse for innocuous TV fare: if the parents don't want their kids to watch the timewaster shows, the parents can turn off the TV set or switch to another program.

Of course, the negative, or veto power of the parent should be exercised more often, but is that a good enough excuse for the TV station to keen on drugging the public air? And as for switching stations, I ask you: switch to what? If the alternatives are merely the lesser of several evils, then we are talking, not about illuminating the world for children but rather about varying degrees of darkness. It's time you creative television professionals lit a few million candles so that you could take our children out of the darkness.

I shuddered to read a sobering conclusion by a student of TV: "So commercial television is a medium that is by its physical nature absorbing, but by its human organization doomed to be repetitious, predominantly shallow and stereotyped. By its physical nature, it is bound to take up much of the leisure time of people; by its human organization it is bound to be cautious about newness and change. Indeed, the most likely social effect of TV is no effect."

If we believed that, none of us should waste our time with broadcasting either in the industry or in the Government. But I refuse to believe it. I hope you refuse to believe it and that all of us will try to do something about it.

Next, let's go to the third excuse for putting on timewaster TV shows for children. This excuse has to do with sponsors and markets and merchandising. Now, if we agree with the purpose and philosophy of the Communications Act, that the airwaves belong to the people and that broadcasters use them as the people's trustees in the public interest, then the slide rule measurement of markets and merchandising cannot be controlling. These commercial considerations cannot be controlling generally in the case of the broad public, and particularly in the case of children.

True, in our system of broadcasting you are required to earn your own way. And, as our recent financial report on the industry's figures indicates, you are prospering rather handsomely. I think you can continue to prosper and, at the same time, do an improved job of programing, particularly in the case of children. I will never concede that improved business and improved children's programing cannot coexist.

Some of you have stated that you feel trapped in a competitive situation where you feel you will suffer competitive disadvantage by offering higher levels and standards of programing for children.

We all know about Mr. Mencken's admonition that "No one ever went broke underestimating the taste of the American public." But I do not believe that any nation can stay great by underestimating the capacity of its children.

All of us in this room today share the same purposes. You constantly want to improve programing for our youngsters. Let us offer to help by making a specific suggestion to the networks.

There are 7 days a week and three networks. May we eliminate Sunday for the time being, as most of you put on your Sunday best anyway. That leaves 6 days and three networks. Why not divide the competitive disadvantages, if there are any, by accepting that each network will be responsible for 2 days a week at an agreed late afternoon hour for offering a children's program in which you take great pride? For example, suppose ABC takes Monday, CBS Tuesday, NBC Wednesday, ABC Thursday, etc., for the week at, let us say, 5 p.m., and offer a regularly scheduled children's hour representing the best you can do. At periodic intervals, perhaps you could agree to rotate the days on any basis you deem fair to yourselves and each other.

Let there be competition between you for quality during that children's hour, so that parents and children can find, on at least one network for at least 1 hour each day, a program representing the best you can produce for youngsters. Let that program be as lively, as entertaining, as educational, as whimsical as your creative talents may lead. In that way, every family can know that at a given time every day (at least in those cities where there are enough outlets available), their children will be able to see a program which will in some way make a meaningful contribution to their imaginations and their minds. Put on whatever you want during that 1 hour every third day, and be guided only by what you in your own minds and hearts think is a good children's program.

If you are worried about the antitrust laws, I bear greetings from the Attorney General. He has authorized me to tell you today that the Department of Justice will give prompt and sympathetic consideration to approving any plan you may devise involving a combined effort to improve children's programs. The Attorney General, speaking as the father of seven children, urged me this week to be an advocate in this adventure, which could be so meaningful to all children. He emphasized that any plan, any efforts in this direction are entirely up to you, and any cooperative efforts by the industry should be undertaken only if you want to work together on a solution. And he added that the size of his own family might make some contribution to the ratings for these programs.

I offer this idea not because it is the best solution, but so that we may at least get off dead center into the area of constructive discussion. Feel free to ask your Government

to help you if you want it. We can lift a burden as well as an eyebrow.

You may have some better ideas about how to make progress. I hope you do. You may prefer thinking about half hour network programs with your affiliates—many of whom make valiant local efforts at enriching children's hours—providing a local children's program during the other half hour. You may want to make further efforts during the early morning hours for preschoolers, an important time when some of you have already made distinguished contributions. But the point is to direct your attention, your creative talents and resources to a national need which demands the best of all of us.

I advance this specific suggestion today so that you'll have something to shoot at, something to think about, something to open discussion for service which only you can perform. Any plan will require some complex decisions and involve the application of your experience, your imagination, and your business judgment. If you're not interested in this approach, let us know if you have some more desirable alternatives. But, as the President said in his inaugural, "Let us begin."

Now, I have talked mostly about the 70 million children's hours each day, because I think they are of overriding importance. But there are many other ideas, issues, problems, and questions facing you and the FCC. I wish we had more opportunities to exchange views. Before leaving, I'd like to touch briefly on some other thoughts on general and adult programing.

I've been doing some reading lately, as well as viewing television. I read that one-half to 75 percent of all new television shows fail to make the grade, and do not return to the air for another season.

I refer you to the results of one survey of personal preferences conducted among decisionmakers in networks, agencies and program production firms. The men who were polled were described as being "primarily responsible for most network and much local programing through their influence in the selection of programs to be seen or offered for selection." They were anonymous—but I'm sure many of them are here today.

Their own preferences as revealed in the survey bear no comparison with the decisions they have made in the past. I wonder what convinces them that 64 percent of the public might not—like themselves—prefer to see more general drama, that 50 percent might not—like themselves—prefer to see more informational programs and documentaries, that 40 percent might not prefer to see more news?

Why not try your own taste for a change? If you prefer the new, the creative, the daring, the imaginative—why not give your audience a chance to share your preferences? Try assuming for a time period that the audience is not really so very different from yourselves. Try to kick the habit of underestimating the public's taste and take a flier on the premise that they are just as knowledgeable; just as ready, just as responsive as you are to the best you have to offer.

In this season of decision, you will choose what the people will see and hear. As you make your choices, remember that not every game show is a winner, not every western strikes gold, not every private eye captures the public. If you give people a meaningful choice, you will be surprised to find an every growing response to diversity—and to excellence.

There are leaders in every profession and the leaders of broadcasting are in this room. It is the leader who will be examining last year's mistakes and looking at next year's possibilities. If some of your colleagues complain that you leaders are rocking the boat, I refer you to some wise words of an advertising man, Charles Brower of B.B.D. & O. in 1955:

"If Christopher Columbus, the well-known sailor from Genoa, had applied modern advertising research methods to his proposed voyage, a consumer jury test would have told him in advance that the world was flat; depth interviews with expert seamen would have revealed the impressive monsters that awaited him hungrily at the end of the sea; motivational studies among his crew would have shown that they were only interested in money; Ferdinand and Isabella would have canceled the appropriation; America would never have been discovered, and you would all be Indians."

Your season of decision is at hand. Use it wisely. No other group of men and women in America will make decisions which sweep with more penetrating impact upon the American mind. Your decisions will affect more children's hours in America, for good or evil, than the teachers in our schools and, I say with some shame, than many parents in our homes. You will decide what the country's children—and your own children—and all of us will see and hear.

At this hour when the world watches with dumb fears the testing of the nerves of man—and of his weapons—all of us concerned with broadcasting are undergoing a test of our own, a test of our faith in the infinite capacity of the minds of men. How we pass that test in the next few years may well determine how this Nation, and how civilization itself, meets the test for survival.

Mastermind Behind the Voice That Pierces the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Spencer Gray, the well-known editor of one of Westchester County's (N.Y.) leading publications, the Herald of Westchester, has had widespread experience in traveling about the world, mixing with the people who are responsible for the leadership in various countries, and studying the problems which beset our times.

Mr. Gray is a linguist of accomplishment and a very charming gentleman who has contacts in all parts of the globe.

The following article which he has written merits wide distribution:

[From the Herald of Westchester, White Plains, Westchester County, N.Y., Sept. 21, 1961]

COMMUNISTS FEAR WHAT THE UNITED STATES REGARDS AS TRUTH

(By J. Spencer Gray)

MUNICH, WEST GERMANY.—This is the saga of the onetime youngest Chief of the State Department, who is charged with having made one mistake: That of being right when nearly everyone else was wrong, which is in Government an almost unforgivable offense.

"A living legend in the State Department and the Foreign Service," one of the most influential molders of European opinion concerning the United States—a man who has played a crucial role in American dealings with Europe and the Soviet Union for more than a generation—has an almost pathological aversion to publicity.

Although U.S. Secretaries of State starting with Charles Evans Hughes have regarded Robert F. Kelley as one of the most brilliant men to serve his country abroad in modern times, Kelley disclaims, with total modesty, any of the great credit which is rightfully his.

BUILDS REAL UNDERSTANDING

Yet this immensely talented, agile, athletic, albeit intense Boston Irishman has had as much or more to do as anyone with building a realistic American understanding of the aggressive aims of the Soviet Union, and in mapping effective counter-measures to the incessant barrage of Red propaganda that assails the ears of Russian men in the street as well as Europeans.

American newsmen abroad considered it a major news beat when I was able to obtain from Kelley, now head of the American Committee for Liberation in Europe, the first full-dress interview ever obtained by an American newsman with this scholarly, ingenious protector and alert advancer of our Nation's interests in Europe and the Soviet.

For more than 2 hours in his Kapta Hapodob (map) and book-lined study overlooking the former Oberweisenfeld Airport in Munich—where Adolf Hitler used to arrive and depart on his demoniacal missions—we discussed problems facing the United States in its efforts to combat Red propaganda in Europe and inside the Soviet, and its efforts to build a realistic and favorable image of what the United States is really like.

Never during my interview with this dignified, erudite giant of American international relations was there a suggestion by him of the vast role he has played both in official and unofficial circles during the critical years of the emergence of the United States from isolationism, its buildup into the world's foremost power, and its conflict with expanding bolshevism.

Yet, I could not help but recall, as we talked, the monumental tributes paid to him by former Secretary Cordell Hull, former U.S. Ambassador Robert D. Murphy and a host of other skilled observers of foreign affairs with an intimate knowledge of what goes on behind the scenes.

EARLY WARNING

Not even known to the vast majority of Americans, tall (5 feet 11 inches but appearing over 6 feet tall because of his stateliness) Robert F. Kelley laid the groundwork for the agreements of 1933 that reestablished American relations with Russia.

Even in those early days methodical and resourceful Kelley, then head of the State Department's Division of Eastern European Affairs, was warning of the threat that unbridled Communist expansionism could pose to the United States and the West. He was the main force in building up a skillfully, superbly trained corps of specialists in Russian affairs who would arm the United States to deal effectively with the clever, ruthless, incessantly active Red diplomatic and intelligence corps.

It was Kelley who developed the Russian Division in the State Department and managed, against great odds, to get funds to send men like Ambassadors George Kennan and Charles Bohlen to Europe to study the Russian language and the problems of that era and of the war years to come.

Cordell Hull paid frequent tribute to Kelley in his memoirs. He rated him one of the most "important and capable, experienced and dependable officials I found in high position in the State Department." The Secretary regarded Kelley as "a thoroughly capable and useful official."

The Hull memoirs delineate Kelley's vast role in laying the groundwork for the Soviet recognition treaty and in alerting U.S. officials from President Roosevelt down, to the pitfalls they would inevitably meet in trying to deal with the inscrutable Russians.

Senator Borah at the time he was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of

the Senate is credited with first giving consequence to the saying that "Kelley knows more about Russia than any other American." He said this was due to Kelley's knowledge of Eastern Europe, especially the Soviet Union, resulting from the 1917 revolution.

PIONEER IN FIELD

Former U.S. Ambassador Robert D. Murphy succintly summed up for me a salute to Kelley when he said: "I know that Kelley had many reservations about the decision to recognize the Soviet Union which was taken by the Roosevelt administration in 1933.

"He never permitted himself illusion regarding the implacable character of the leadership of international communism.

"He was conscious of the danger long before it was known to any large segment of American public opinion.

"He was a pioneer in this field, who deserves credit for a good deal of sound thinking on the subject."

Historian Robert Paul Browder recalls how heavily Hull and Roosevelt leaned on the expert advice supplied by Kelley: "Until a substantial basis of mutual understanding and common principles and purposes has been established," Kelley advised, "official intercourse with its increased contacts, is bound to lead to friction and rancor." Kelley then enumerated the problems which had to be resolved before diplomatic relations were resumed. Over and over again, the events of the 1930's and later years bore out Kelley's advance warnings and predictions.

John C. Wiley, former U.S. Ambassador to Portugal, Iran and Panama, who considers Kelley "a very close friend over a period of 30 years," recalled "the lighter side of his life was very limited."

"It consisted almost entirely of bridge and poker—of the spit-in-the-ocean variety."

THE MISTAKE OF BEING RIGHT

Speaking of Kelley's "deep concentration in everything that has to do with Eastern Europe, especially the Soviet Union and the satellite countries. Wiley told me, "I know of no one who has a greater degree of knowledge and understanding." Continuing, Wiley said:

"Bob made one mistake—that of being right when nearly everyone else was wrong, which as you may know, is in government an almost unforgiveable offense.

"Outstanding in his record of achievement is that he alone foresaw, well before our recognition of the Soviet Union, the necessity of having officers in the Foreign Service especially trained for future service in and around the Soviet Union.

"Limited by congressional appropriations, he was only able to select a very small group. In that small band were Chip (Charles E.) Bohlen (now special assistant to the Secretary of State, an expert on Soviet affairs) and George Kennan (now U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia).

"Bob has become a living legend in both the State Department and the Foreign Service," said Wiley.

Kelley was a "taciturn disciplinarian," New York Times pundit James Reston recalled, "who saw that his men went to the Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes, insisted on objective, carefully documented reporting, and added greatly to the preparation for the Soviet era."

So well did Kelley guide the establishment of the U.S. vital observation post on the Soviet Union that Red Ambassador Maxim Litvinov testified that Kelley's aides were in many ways better trained in Russian history than anyone in the Soviet diplomatic service.

Americans can draw confidence from the fact that, building on Kelley's model, the United States has steadily expanded the agencies that serve as our "eyes and ears" on Russia to the point that American knowledge of what the Soviets are doing and what are their likely next moves are far greater than most Americans realize.

AN EXPERT ON BOLSHEVISM

Loy W. Henderson, who retired last January 31 as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, recounted for me his impressions of Kelley when the latter was serving as a captain in the U.S. Army and a military attaché to our High Commissioner.

"I met Kelley in a restaurant. He was in the company of a young British colonel who was in command of some Baltic regiments [engaged] in holding back the Bolsheviks from the Latvia border.

"The young colonel later became Field Marshal Alexander and Governor General of Canada," Henderson related, adding:

"Bob was at that time [1921 to 1922] considered to be an expert on Russia and bolshevism. A year or two later, he returned to the United States, took the consular examinations and was appointed vice counsul to Calcutta.

"In 1924, Evan E. Young, who had been Bob's chief in Riga and who had become Chief of the Eastern European Division of the Department, brought Bob back to his division. I joined the division in 1925, just as Bob became assistant chief. A year later, he succeeded Mr. Young as Chief and served in that capacity for nearly 10 years."

Bob Kelley "was the youngest Chief in the State Department," declared Henderson.

"He distinguished himself as a scholar as well as a diplomat. He worked long hours, including weekends.

"He set up high standards for the [U.S.] personnel of Eastern Europe which have been maintained to this day."

OF CHIP BOHLEN AND GEORGE KENNAN

"It was he who established an Eastern European corps of specialists. The young men in the corps were sent to Europe for 2 of 3 years' training in the Russian language.

"Among the young officers selected by Bob were Chip Bohlen and George Kennan."

Henderson viewed Kelley as one "extremely careful in seeing that his colleagues and subordinates got full credit for work they performed * * * patient with those who tried and yet could not meet his standards. He had no time for drones."

Henderson also spoke of "Bob" as a sober, demanding scholar at work, vigorous and gregarious at play. He loved to attend ball games where he could root freely at the top of his lungs.

"He played tennis, not too well, because he enjoyed hitting the ball mightily rather than carefully placing it.

"He also was a good, noisy, fun-loving poker player."

Indicative of the continued esteem of members of the Foreign Service is that disclosed in a copy of a letter Henderson gave me:

JANUARY 31, 1961.

DEAR BOB: I am retiring today from the Foreign Service and the State Department. Before I do so, I would like to tell you how deeply grateful I am to you for the training which you gave me during the years when as a junior officer I served under you. You set a high standard of integrity, thoroughness and scholarship in dealing with the affairs of Eastern Europe which has left an imprint throughout the years on every officer in the Foreign Service who has worked in that area.

All of us who have served under you or with you have always regretted your retirement from the Foreign Service. We are glad, however, that even though you may not have been connected with the Service during the intervening years, you have continued to use your ability and talents in a manner which has been in the interest of our country.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

LOY W. HENDERSON,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Conservative, dignified, straight-as-a-poker a la West Point, yet warm and friendly, albeit within the limits of strict protocol, diplomat-strategist-historian-philosopher Kelley has had a career that rivals the most exciting cloak-and-dagger fiction, but is completely unobtrusive about claiming credit for his many accomplishments and completely shuns the public spotlight.

His talent in the diplomatic and foreign-affairs area was first put to use after World War I, when the Army sent him to the Baltic region for 3 years as a military observer.

The youthful Kelley was one of the most talented members of the brilliant generation of Foreign Service officers identified with former Ambassador Robert Murphy, Joseph C. Grew, Sumner Welles, and numerous other stellar names in the modern history of American foreign affairs.

A veteran of more than 30 years in the Foreign Service, Kelley returned from the smoldering Baltic to serve 14 vital years in Washington. He devoted much of that time to building up the skilled corps of experts who were to prepare this Nation for its new era of relations with the Soviet starting in 1933.

In 1937, the State Department dispatched Kelley on another critical mission—to Turkey, which the aggressively expanding Nazi empire viewed as the vital link in its aim of seizing control of the Balkans and burgeoning out into the Middle East and Africa.

Turkey was the center of Nazi efforts to undercut Allied influence and control in these strategically all-important regions. For Kelley and his aids, the period starting in 1937 was one of watchful, alert observation to prepare the United States to anticipate and counter Nazi moves in that area. But—possibly because the Allies relying on Kelley's experience and intelligence, were so well informed on Nazi movements—the Germans never made Turkey the operational base it had been expected they would. The Turkish pincer in a two-pronged drive from the Balkans through Syria and Egypt never developed. Kelley performed this mission, which carried him through the war years, with consummate skill.

For the past 7 years, Kelley has served as European chief ("Deputy to the President, Europe," is his official title) for the American Committee for Liberation.

A major function of the committee is the operation of Radio Liberty—the voice of freedom and democracy within the Soviet Union and its satellites. (Radio Liberty beams its broadcasts in Russian and 16 other languages of the Soviet Union.)

THE DEBASEMENT OF WORDS

Privately sponsored but viewed with favor by the U.S. Government, Radio Liberty faces the most ruthless competitor of all time in the propaganda world. It's challenge is herculean; it requires round-the-clock alertness and the greatest of resourcefulness to counter the sinister techniques of an array of Soviet communications experts who will stop at nothing in their ceaseless crusade to imprison the minds of men.

Khrushchev's greatest gains in the propaganda war, Kelley told me as we chatted in his office, have been scored via "debasement of words." When it comes to semantic juggling, the Soviets have no peer. They distort, invert, and destroy the meaning of words and concepts whenever and wherever it suits their ends.

As a prime example, Kelley cited the Red propagandists' distortion of the word "lib-

eration" in the very title of Radio Liberation, the former name of Radio Liberty, and its parent organization, the American Committee for Liberation, the president of which is Howland H. Sargeant.

Both these agencies are dedicated to a single paramount goal—the freedom of millions of the oppressed from the tyranny of body, mind, and spirit that is the Soviet system.

But Khrushchev and his Red underlings drummed into their subjects the notion that liberation (in Russian, osvobojdenia) really means freedom through armed force—implying the threat of armed action to gain control of the Red-led nations.

Among the Soviet rank and file there is no question about the meaning of "svoboda"—"liberty"—and it cannot be distorted by Mr. K. and his semanticist specialists. As a result, Radio Liberation became Radio Liberty, and the Kremlin was checked in its further attempts to make capital of the false concept of "freedom through force."

"Coexistence" is another concept which the incessant Bolshevik drum-beaters have totally subverted and destroyed, Kelley pointed out in our interview. To the American mind, "coexistence" means "live and let live"—the principle of living alongside other systems with different ideologies and procedures; each system tolerant of the others' existence. To Khrushchev and his colleagues, however, "coexistence" means "cold war." Thus, the propagandized citizens of non-Communist countries are deluded into believing that the cardinal Soviet objective is just the opposite of what it actually is.

Not only diplomats but journalists, Kelley emphasized, must completely understand this stepped-up strategy of "debasement of words" if they are to hope to cope with the massive assaults of the Soviets and their henchmen in the ever-raging war of ideology and propaganda.

Despite its insistence on honest, ethical procedures in stating the American case to the people of the satellites, Radio Liberty under Kelley is far from impotent in dealing with the diabolical Reds.

Many people in the Communist orbit originally tune in on the broadcasts to learn what the "enemy" is doing—and then discover that the radio voice of the West has raised many a point which is of vital concern to them. First priority is given to the correction of Soviet distortions of the role of the United States and the West—but Radio Liberty also takes skillful advantage of chinks in the Russian armor.

The Reds, for example, have never made public the fact that Vyacheslav Molotov was shifted from his discredited diplomatic post in Outer Mongolia to the Soviet atomic agency. The Russian man in the street could learn this only through Radio Liberty. "Why has this transfer not been made public?" the voice from Radio Liberty asked over and over.

THE "GRAPEVINE" IN RUSSIA

The question caught on among the populace within the Soviet and, like the content of many another Radio Liberty broadcast, spread via the grapevine. Embarrassed Soviet officialdom still has not made Molotov's transfer public. But the pressure of public opinion, spurred by the Radio Liberty broadcast, may well force it to do so before long.

Is Radio Liberty, its course closely watched by the immensely well informed Kelley, getting across to the people behind the Iron Curtain?

Without question.

Refugees from the Soviet and other Communist countries testify to this fact in large numbers. So do letters spirited out of the satellites, and so do the vast sums spent by the Soviets in their attempts to jam the broadcasts from the West.

But Radio Liberty is unrelenting in its efforts to reach the subjugated peoples of the East, and the response is increasingly encouraging. This unofficial branch of American "foreign policy" is an ever more effective weapon in the battle for men's minds between East and West.

The American Committee for Liberation, (ACL), which sponsors Radio Liberty, is headed by Howland H. Sargeant, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Trustees of the ACL include Reginald T. Townsend of Cross River; Mrs. Oscar Ahlgren, former president of the American Federation of Women's Clubs; H. J. Heinz II; W. H. Chamberlin, author of "The Russian Revolution"; J. Peter Grace, Jr.; Henry V. Poor; Dr. John W. Studebacker; former Gov. Charles Edison of New Jersey; Allen Grover, vice president of Time, Inc., and Whitney N. Seymour, president of the American Bar Association.

Major credit for the success of Radio Liberty must go to the tall, brainy, energetic Harvard educated Boston Irishman who probably knows as much about the Soviet mind as any non-Soviet in the world today—a taciturn, modest publicity-shy general in the political war whom I regard as one of the most impressive and formidable giants among men that I have ever met.

Getting at the Facts of Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a sudden eruption of stories criticizing the distribution of food out of supplies made available to the States by the Federal Government. I am deeply concerned because of the large number of people in West Virginia who receive surplus commodities.

Let us get this thing in perspective.

Undoubtedly, some people will cheat on any program, public or private, that has ever been devised by man. Our newspapers and magazines can perform a useful public service by exposing abuses, by keeping public officials on their toes, by making deliberate wrongdoers aware that they may get caught.

We cannot condone abuses and we must not coast into smug ignorance of the fact that they still exist. On the other hand, we must not injure thousands of deserving citizens.

On September 8, 1961, Life magazine printed an editorial attacking the food distribution program. Life based most of its attack on a story and an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on August 24, 1961. In attacking the food distribution program, Life magazine ignored its own article of March 10, 1961, entitled "Anguish of Men Without Work."

Life's article of March 10 opened with these words:

The faces of the Nation's jobless last week bespoke individual tragedies that were multiplied by the statistics of unemployment. By now, 5.5 million Americans were out of work. Anxiety, hunger, and hopelessness beset them and their families. They suffered the indignity of being useless and were ashamed at having lost their self-reliance. While the unemployed sought work and help and scraped along with food handouts, the Kennedy administration was pushing an omnibus program to revive the economy.

On the next page of Life magazine was the statement:

The life of the unemployed is a steady downhill slide. While Congress is about to extend unemployment compensation to a maximum of 39 weeks, families receiving it must still deny themselves food, return household goods purchased on credit, do without medical care—and go deeper into debt.

Another two-page layout of pictures in this same issue of Life was headed "Scant Food Handouts to Meet Aching Hungers." The caption under one picture read:

In Portage, Pa., near Johnstown, Steve Alexander, 37, an out-of-work coal miner, draws monthly ration of Government surplus food for his 10 children. Each gets about 1 pound of lard, a half pound of rice, plus dry milk, flour. The caption under another picture said, Pale and expectant, Jonathan Kimback, 6, looks up at surplus food carried by his father in Portage distribution center.

Since Life magazine, in September, put its trust in the Wall Street Journal rather than in its own reporting, it would be interesting to examine the Wall Street Journal article. It is written by Donald A. Moffitt, a staff reporter. The dateline is Corsicana, Tex., county seat of Navarro county.

The Wall Street Journal story said that L. G. Avery, a farm laborer, bluntly informs a visitor who found him whiling away his day in a rocking chair on the porch of his house:

This is one year people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of their cotton, because we ain't going to do it.

That statement became the basis for an editorial in the same issue of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "The Man With the Hoe." And the statement attributed to L. G. Avery was repeated again in the Life magazine editorial. It was quoted in an editorial August 29, in the Marietta, Ga., Daily Journal. And the Memphis Commercial Appeal reprinted the entire article on August 27.

Kenneth A. Douglas, county judge, Navarro County, Tex., says in a letter which has already been reproduced in the RECORD:

I have not as yet been able to find anyone that knows Mr. Avery. He is not on the rolls as a recipient of surplus foods. I do not know to what he was referring when he said, "people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of the cotton because we ain't going to do it," because the farmers did get the grass out by the farm laborers in this county.

The Wall Street Journal had quoted this same Mr. Douglas as follows:

"We're not trying to be another Newburgh; we're just trying to solve a local problem," says Kenneth A. Douglas, young county judge and chairman of the commissioners court—the county's chief administrative agency. Mr. Douglas says the county is attempting to reduce future food distributions to about 1,000 persons a month, less than a third of

this month's total of eligibles. So far, at least, Federal officials have not protested.

That is what the Wall Street Journal said. And here is what Mr. Douglas says:

I did not say that we are attempting to reduce future food distribution to about 1,000 persons per month. Navarro County voted to remain in the program for the fiscal year, beginning September 1, 1961, and it was necessary that we use some figure, because we are required to pay 30 cents per person per month. We used the figure 1,000 because it was a nice round figure, however, we later cut that figure down to 750 recipients.

The statement that Federal officials have not protested is, in my opinion simply a statement made to make it appear that our Federal officials are trying to tell us in Navarro County how to handle our county's business. I do not think the Federal Government would even think of protesting and what Federal official would make the protest—should one be made?

The Wall Street Journal said:

At last count, 3,367 Navarro County residents—about 10 percent of the population—were collecting free vittles, including such provisions as "Mr. Kennedy's mule" (canned pork and gravy) and "goober grease" (peanut butter.)

Life magazine embellished the account by referring to "canned pork and gravy—called 'Mr. Kennedy's mule' in Corsicana."

Mr. Douglas, on the other hand, has lived in Navarro County all his life and he says:

"Mr. Kennedy's mule" and "goober grease" are words never heard in Navarro County, at least by me, until I read the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. DOUGLAS says the Wall Street Journal story was inaccurate in other details. He comments:

There are more statements untrue in the account in the Journal article than there are true statements.

The Wall Street Journal story datelined Corsicana, Tex., also had this to say:

In Louisiana, where the State welfare department handles the chore of certifying applicants for welfare aid, the department ran out of funds to pay staff members to handle the task after the food giveaway program was expanded. Though $125,000 was budgeted for this purpose in fiscal 1961, the department had to beg $35,000 more from the State's treasury to carry through until July 1. A like total, $160,000, is reserved for certification in fiscal 1962, "but that won't be enough," says a welfare official.

"We feel like we're sitting on a keg of dynamite," says another Louisiana welfare man. "We don't have any control over this program."

One Louisiana official notes that some 200,000 people are getting Federal free food in the State now, compared to only 90,000 a year ago. The commodities are rolling into the State at a three-carloads-a-day clip, and officials reckon even more parishes (counties) would take part in the distribution if there were any more warehouse space.

Mary Evelyn Parker, commissioner of public welfare for the State of Louisiana, made these comments on the Wall Street Journal article:

The participation figures quoted by Mr. Moffit (90,000 last year and 200,000 now) did not originate in this office. Actual records show 105,000 certified on August 19, 1960, and 172,000 on August 18, 1961.

The budget figures quoted also were misleading. It is true that we had to secure an additional $35,000 to complete fiscal 1960–61, but this was due, as much or more so, to budget limitations than to the availability of additional items.

No parish in Louisiana has failed to participate in commodity distribution because of the absence of warehouse space.

The paragraph, "We feel like we're sitting on a keg of dynamite. We don't have any control of this program," was completely erroneous.

The first part of the quote was in reference to an inquiry as to complaints or abuses. (This was what the reporter actually was looking for.) We stated that during the entire time that we had been in the program we had practically no complaints from public officials, grocers, landowners, or anyone else. We then said that the people in Louisiana are very vocal about their welfare program and in the absence of complaints, it was possible we were sitting on a keg of dynamite without knowing it. This was strictly a facetious remark, and should have been interpreted as such.

The second part of the quote on control of the program apparently related to our statement that we did not have the money and staff to make a home visit and contact collateral references on each application. In the absence of such verification, we felt we did not have complete control of eligibility in the urban centers.

You may rest assured that we will not participate in, and assume the responsibility for, any program over which we do not feel we have adequate control.

The Federal Government, the State governments, and many local governments have staffs of trained administrative personnel and investigators checking constantly to discover and to correct abuses in the food distribution program.

It is important to understand the reasons for the food distribution program, and the manner in which it operates.

It begins with the almost miraculous efficiency of American agriculture. This is the one thing in America that the Communist countries envy most of all. They hate to admit that we are ahead of them in anything. But they frankly admit that we are ahead of them in agricultural production, and urge their people to catch up with us.

If our agriculture were as inefficient as agriculture in the U.S.S.R., we would have 60 million more people on farms than we do now. That is one-third of our whole population. Just imagine what it would be like without those 60 million people to help produce other goods and services for defense and civilian consumption. Just imagine the effect on our Armed Forces, and even on our professions and our arts.

This agricultural know-how is the thing nearly all the world, friends or enemies, wants most. And in many nations, American farm products are doing more than American arms to stop the onrush of communism.

It would be inexcusable if we let hungry people in other countries turn to communism if we shut off all food and fiber except what we can produce and sell at a profit. It would be inexcusable if we let thousands of our own people go hungry, or suffer the hidden hunger of malnutrition and meager, unappetizing meals while we ship food to other countries. And we should not expect our farmers to supply this food and fiber for payment far below the earnings of fellow Americans in other lines of work.

We need food reserves as part of our military defense.

We need food reserves for emergency use in natural disasters.

All these are reasons why we have programs to supply food to people in need in many different situations, and must continue to have such programs.

The Federal Government has accepted the responsibility for setting down the general rules under which this food will be made available to State agencies—and for getting the food to those agencies. It is responsible for making sure that the States and communities follow reasonable procedures in administering the programs; and recovering payments from the States for any food proved to be fraudulently used.

But within those limits, it is up to the States to determine the exact rules for eligibility of individuals, to determine what individuals are eligible, to store and distribute the food, require adequate records and to guard against abuses.

This system is in harmony with the traditional division of powers between the Federal Government and the State and local government.

Most Americans believe that the best people to investigate need and determine eligibility and run the program locally and guard against abuses are the local people in a town or country, and in the State.

We must do everything in our power to make sure that all our able-bodied citizens can find employment at wages high enough that they can adequately feed their families without expecting the farmer to donate most of his labor, investment and managerial skills. That is the ideal in our private enterprise economy.

But those who are not able-bodied and are in need, and those who cannot find employment at a decent wage, must be adequately fed out of our rich abundance of food. We must make sure our food distribution programs are honestly and efficiently administered. We must have a free press to keep us on our toes, and we hope they will make every effort to be accurate and unbiased. And we must learn, calmly and deliberately, to distinguish between the rare incident, the exaggeration or distortion, and the serious abuse.

Our Embattled Probers—Walter Warns of Apathy to Red Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, here follows the sixth of a series of articles about the House Committee on Un-

American Activities written by Pulitzer Prize Winner Edward J. Mowery:

WASHINGTON.—The peril posed by the Communist threat to America's survival, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER warned yesterday, is both "real and grave."

As to the frantic efforts by certain elements seeking "abolition" of the House Un-American Activities Committee, its chairman declared:

"The anemic public response to this campaign is heartening and augurs well for the abiding patriotism, circumspection, and intelligence of most Americans."

Stressing that the Communist "masters of the Kremlin" have already enslaved 900 million people and have predicted that the hammer and sickle will fly over the United States in another generation, the Pennsylvania Democrat said:

"This is their avowed objective, despite the propaganda veneer of 'peaceful coexistence,' and members of the conspiracy in this country are working diligently toward that end.

"Regretfully, they're being abetted by a small but deadly segment of our own people who either ignore the threat to our survival or a blind to its significance."

Hailing the "courage" and "dedication" of Congress for its uncompromising fight against subversion, WALTER said:

"Congress and the vast majority of thinking Americans recognize and condemn attempts to impose the atheistic ideology of Marxism on this Nation.

"And with God's help * * * it will never occur."

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the 67-year-old lawmaker said, is investigating an average of 1 espionage plot per day, and nearly 200 suspected Communist fronts and Communist infiltrated organizations are on the FBI's "active" investigation list.

"Spies abound in the Red bloc diplomatic corps," WALTER explained, "and we now have a Moscow satellite 90 miles from the Florida Keys. Against this background of obvious peril * * * we observe the spectacle of an abolition drive against HUAC.

"We on this committee apologize to no one for attempting to expose the perfidy of those who would destroy the security of the United States."

Describing HUAC's mandated duties in the area of subversion, he said:

"This committee has, as its lawful responsibility, Communist activities in the domain of national security * * * serving fundamentally as an advisory and investigatory body of the Congress. It is the only House committee having that specific area of study."

Touching upon the obstructive tactics by the Supreme Court minority in dealing with contempt citations, WALTER—a recognized authority on constitutional law—said recent decisions hinted strongly at a dangerous usurpation of powers by the judiciary.

Referring directly to the minority opinions in the Wilkinson-Branden case, HUAC's chairman declared:

"By the narrow margin of one vote was avoided the interesting spectacle of head-on collision between judiciary and Congress. The single vote postponed a necessary resolution of the question whether the judiciary would be permitted to destroy a legally constituted congressional committee.

(The minority in the Branden case opinion were Associate Justices Hugo O. Black, William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, Jr., and Chief Justice Earl Warren.)

"The dissents suggest a determined challenge to the doctrine of separation of powers a doctrine hitherto recognized as fundamental to our constitutional system and maintenance of our liberties."

Calling the dissents a "bold impingement" upon legislative power, he said:

"We had been forewarned, however, of the course taken by these minority justices in several recent Supreme Court decisions, of which I believe the entire country has taken note and at which most of us stand aghast.

"Members of the minority wish to work their personal will against Congress constitutional prerogatives, to advance their own views as to proper subjects for legislative investigation * * * and the course the inquiry should take.

"This minority (in weighing HUAC contempt cases) seems hypnotized by the expression, 'exposure for exposure's sake,' a phrase which has re-echoed between Court and leftwing circles.

"Somehow, the word 'exposure' has been downgraded in the process. Exposure is revelation, education—the bringing forth of truth."

Caustically touching again on the Court minority's apparent affinity for leftwing cliches, Walter observed:

"We in Congress do not 'expose for exposure's sake' in any greater degree than the Supreme Court 'decides for decision's sake.' As for the typical Communist smear phrase, 'witch hunting.' * * *

"The Salem witches were the product of pure imagination. But the Communist witches are plaguing the earth."

HUAC functions discreetly in accordance with strict rules of procedure, the chairman added, and serves as the model for House standing rules governing all committees.

"We have been zealous to protect the civil rights of all persons. And we believe we have succeeded. Of course we've made mistakes, which we have tried diligently to rectify and from which we have profited.

"We shall always welcome constructive criticism motivated by genuine interest in the preservation of our free society. We will oppose abolition of this committee with every weapon at our command.

"But we cannot guarantee to preserve the good will of Communist witnesses or other Communists—or those in complicity—with any more success than the courts can preserve the good will of criminal defendants.

"And who would suggest that the courts be abolished * * * for that reason?"

Walter, who will retire at the end of this session, reiterated HUAC's deep appreciation for the confidence it enjoys among the vast majority of Americans.

"We are all fighting a common enemy to preserve the precious heritage of unprecedented freedoms. God help this Nation if stagnation, apathy, or moral decay should deliver us into the hands of the terroristic, Marxist criminal conspiracy."

Essay Winners Reveal Spirit of Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following prize-winning essays written by students in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. These students were participants in the Constitution Week essay contest sponsored by the Francis Broward Chapter of the DAR, and they emerged as winners because their essays were truly exemplary of the spirit of the Constitution. I want to congratulate these young people for their interest and enthusiasm, and extend my congratulations to the Francis Broward Chapter of the DAR for the patriotism they have demonstrated by sponsoring this contest.

The essays follow:

MY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Denise Ouimet)

As I kneel here in church, I think; first of all, I think it is awfully hot in here. I wish I was outside, breathing the clean, fresh air. And then I see Maria, Maria is from Cuba. She is in my class at school. Then I think what it must be like to be shut out of churches and schools. I have a vivid imagination and as I kneel there, I can almost see this lovely church, the church I am in right now, closed down, with Cuban and Russian soldiers standing outside.

All of a sudden I feel sorry for Maria. I have just taken this for granted before. Now I am glad I am here. They do not have this right to worship as they please. We have freedom of religion. Forever? Oh, please God. * * * As I leave church, I say a silent prayer, a prayer of thanks, and a prayer of hope, for the future.

I go through a rather boring 3 hours of school. Then it is recess. Then that was when I heard Joe.

"Joe Davis. I heard what you said."

"So what."

"So you can't say that."

"There's freedom of speech, isn't there?"

"Yes, but it doesn't mean you can go around saying words like that."

"What does it mean?"

"It means," I began, "like if you don't think we have a good government you can say so. But all good laws are in accordance with God's law. You're misusing your liberties. You can't be arrested for something like that, but maybe you should be. Honestly."

"All right, I'm going into the room and read that book. You know. The one on the Constitution."

As Joe left, I thought some more, I thought that the way I had been sounding off at Joe, maybe I should watch myself more. I should practice what I preach. My duty was to myself first. Right then I made a quick resolution to try harder in the future.

When I went home, I waited anxiously until the paper came. I took off the rubberband, opened it and read first, you guessed it, the funnies. Then I read the TV section. Then the front page and the sports. I take it for granted that what I am reading is true. This is where freedom of the press comes in. The reporters are not allowed to write what they want. They must write what is true. In some countries, they write what the government says. The people cannot believe what they read.

In the editorials, they can put down what they think, and how they feel about everything. In this country, people are right until proven wrong.

If you had ever lived in Cuba or Russia, you would really appreciate these freedoms we now take for granted. Every so often we should stop and think how lucky we are to be living in this country, "the land of the brave and the free."

MY FREEDOMS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Jerry Beasley)

If old truths are to retain their hold on men's minds, they must be restated in the language and concepts of successive generations. What at one time are their most effective expressions gradually become so worn with use that they cease to carry a defi-

nite meaning. The underlying ideas may be as valid as ever, but the words, even when they refer to problems still with us, no longer convey the same conviction.

Our Constitution has been the ideal of freedom which inspired modern Western civilization and whose partial realization made possible the achievements of the American race. This comparatively new document is the reincarnation of the English Magna Carta and the French Declaration of Rights.

In the course of history many have praised liberty, but few have explained its importance to us as individuals and as a country. In an advancing society the restriction of liberty reduces the number of things tried and thus reduces the rate of progress. This freedom is not given to the individual because it gives him greater satisfaction; rather it is given with the thought that the ordinary man will better serve others if given that right. Giving this freedom far surpasses any decree a government could issue for the advancement of a civilization.

Liberty does not only mean that the individual has the opportunity to choose freely; it also means that he must bear the consequences of his actions and will receive praise or blame for them. Liberty and responsibility are inseparable. Our society has maintained itself because most individuals have accepted the position resulting from their own actions. Though it seems that each person who succeeds in fulfilling his dreams would do so by accident, it also stands to reason that each individual would turn his attentions to those events that he has considerable control of. By profiting by the mistakes of those before him and trying to control those events in his life that he is capable of controlling, the individual can socially mature and by doing so, increase the status of his society.

As I have been writing a man has died to preserve my freedoms. This man died to keep me, as an American, free to live in a democratic country. I not only feel an obligation to this man but to those before me who have founded this Government that gives me the opportunity to live as a free individual. I feel I should be devoted to the preservation of those freedoms inherited from my antecedents.

Not being constantly plagued by the fear of government interference in my social and economic life, I can devote my whole to the increment of my social status and the standing of others like myself. There are no limitations upon my life until I infringed on the rights of others.

To best use our freedoms we must have a clear perception of what they entail. Occasionally there are those who, whether by chance or choice, interpret their freedom as license, or the right to do as they please. These individuals are using their freedom for the detriment of their civilization. Under no type of government yet conceived in the mind of man has there been such an organization of people that permitted the individual to do completely as he pleased.

In being governed as I am in this country, I am free from the domination of those mentally and physically stronger than I. Since we are not dominated by any particular group, we have the freedom to profit by the mistakes of our forefathers and to pass our knowledge to those proceeding us.

As time passes ours is the only type of government that grows stronger with the progression of the individual. Our Government is founded on the concept that each man has a certain divinity and we have instituted our laws on this concept. In founding our Government with a faith in the divinity of man, we are acknowledging the power of God to give supreme intelligence; and through God no man can fail.

Capital Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD some very pertinent remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], on which I have the honor to serve.

The chairman, who has served with distinction as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the years he has been a Member of the Congress, is one of the best informed of its members of reclamation affairs. It would be well for those from the reclamation States to heed well what the distinguished and knowledgeable gentleman from Colorado has to say about reclamation. He says reclamation projects must be "clean as a hound's tooth," and I thoroughly agree. He also cites the results of a crash program wherein on at least nine cases investigations were hurried, or not fully completed and repayment contracts were not signed prior to construction and how these projects got into subsequent difficulties.

I think the gentleman has given us good reasons for not rushing into approval of these reclamation projects and not blindly following the recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not think we gave nearly enough attention to these Colorado River project transmission lines. We have accepted what the Bureau of Reclamation submitted as an analysis without nearly as thorough an examination as the problem deserved. We have got to realize that the Bureau of Reclamation is no longer the clean-cut scientific organization it once was. It now deals in ideology rather than engineering and economics, and we must recognize it as such.

Following are the remarks of Mr. ASPINALL:

Reclamation, as I have often emphasized, is one Federal program that is little understood by Members of the House from the eastern part of the United States—and yet it is these Members who actually hold the balance of power when it comes to a House vote on a reclamation project.

The reclamation program has a much easier time in the Senate because the 17 reclamation States start off with 34 votes out of 100—just 17 short of a majority. In the House, where representation is based on population, the reclamation States start off with 99 votes out of 437—or 120 short of a majority. Included in the 99 reclamation votes are 58 from the States of California, Texas, and Oklahoma. Thus in the 14 Rocky Mountain and Far Western States where the reclamation program is of primary concern—excluding only California—there are just 41 Members of the House, out of 437.

Aside from good plain sense, this is one of the reasons why it is so essential that reclamation projects be clean as a hound's tooth. If the reclamation States come to the Congress with a request for a Federal investment in projects it must be on a basis of sound economic and financial feasibility, and—prior to appropriation of funds for construction—a clear indication of the water users' willingness to repay that part of the Federal investment that is within their ability to pay.

That is why I have always insisted, for example, that repayment contracts be signed by the water users before construction begins on a reclamation project. It is only through a responsible policy of this kind that reclamation can be justified in the House of Representatives.

When such a policy is not followed reclamation is in trouble. We already have several examples of what can happen when projects are not thoroughly studied and repayment contracts with the water users not signed prior to construction.

The most notable example was the authorization of a number of projects in the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946, and a subsequent "crash" program of construction. In at least nine cases investigations were hurried, or not fully completed, and repayment contracts were not signed prior to construction. All of these projects got into subsequent difficulty as a result of undue haste to get construction underway, and all have caused substantial losses of Uncle Sam's moneys. The Federal expenditures on these nine projects have come to $58,246,722 and while it is possible that some of this may be repaid eventually, most of it will not.

This is the sort of thing that gives reclamation generally a "black eye" and which makes it more difficult than good judgment would require to secure House approval of sound projects.

A Federal reclamation program, with proper investigation, planning, and construction, is a sound investment in national progress. At the same time, those of us from the reclamation States, who have the most direct interest in such a program, have the responsibility to insist that the reclamation program be carried forward on a basis of sound financial and economic feasibility.

Don't Open U.N. to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared recently in the Chicago Daily News and which I believe states most emphatically the case against admitting Red China to the United Nations.

I hope those who will lead the debate in the United Nations on the admission of Red China will ponder the logic of this editorial and then use every resource at their command to make sure that the uncommitted nations of this world who have toyed with the idea of admitting Red China to the United Nations be made fully aware of the tragic consequences of their folly.

The editorial follows:

DON'T OPEN U.N. TO RED CHINA

Once again the theoreticians in the Kennedy administration have bumped their noses on hard facts. A plan that might

have opened the door to Red Chinese membership in the United Nations has been shelved to the accompaniment of furious back pedalling.

The State Department seriously considered a plan to offer Red China a U.N. seat, with the proviso that Nationalist China retain both its membership and its seat on the Security Council. The theory was that the Communists would refuse, and by so doing remove themselves from possible haggling over membership in the U.N. session this fall.

The flaws in the plan soon became apparent. As any sophomore political science student could have predicted, the prospect of such a deal infuriated Nationalist China.

Relations between the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek government hit a new low, and our Ambassador to Nationalist China, Everett F. Drumright, has been called home for urgent consultations to repair the breach.

Leakage of the plan also brought a predictable protest from Members of Congress, who know better than the State Department the depth of opposition to U.N. membership for Red China.

At best, the proposal would have been a dangerous gamble. Red China has rejected the so-called "Two-Chinas" solution, it is true, but the opportunity to squeeze in and work inside the United Nations for the expulsion of Nationalist China might be too great to resist. Nationalist China was reported to be prepared to pull out of the United Nations if the Peiping regime got in, a move that would vault the Communist Chinese to immediate power in the organization.

The argument is constantly heard that it is "unrealistic" to bar the world's most populous nation from the U.N. halls. But it would be far less realistic to offer U.N. membership to the nation that is still at war with the United Nations in Korea.

By no stretch of the imagination has Red China demonstrated any willingness to abide by the U.N. Charter. The rape of Tibet, the attempts to expand into India and Southeast Asia, as well as the unresolved conflict in Korea, all attest to the contrary.

It is entirely possible that the admission of Red China will at least be brought to the point of debate in the U.N. General Assembly this year, after a long period in which the United States has been able to prevent even that preliminary step. That prospect, however, should not frighten our diplomats to the extent of giving in without a fight.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress will be published not later than Tuesday, October 17, 1961. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Russian Colonialism, the U.N., and House Resolution 211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed this body on the subject of "Hammarskjold, the Russian Troika, and the Necessity of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 21, 1961, pages 19333–19337. My chief theme was the central issue of colonialism in U.N. Assembly debate and the urgency for us to pinpoint this on the only real remaining imperialist and colonial power on earth, namely Russia, operating both within the U.S.S.R. and beyond this legalistic facade.

It was most gratifying to witness the President emphasizing this very point in his address to the U.N. Assembly. His remarks underscore further the necessity of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Relevant to the issue of colonialism, I request that the remarks made by the President be printed in the RECORD. I also ask that the congratulatory telegram sent by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of both the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the National Captive Nations Committee, be printed in the RECORD:

FAVORS U.N. DEBATE ON COLONIALISM

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant, not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a colony—and we know what colonialism means; exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, class or color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under government installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers, books and trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your remarkable and forward-looking address to the U.N. Assembly earns the admiration and appreciation of every American. We heartily endorse the forthright challenges you offered to that body in a spirit of humanism and reason. Your challenge to discuss in full the subject of colonialism throughout the Communist empire, meaning within the Soviet Union itself, has our strongest support. On this we look forward to a full and courageous disclosure of all the facts.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

We're Moving to the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Missilani, an employee publication of the Hercules Powder Co. for Friday, September 22, concerning the current trend of American banking. I believe this editorial contains a message which should be read by every American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE MOVING TO THE LEFT

A recent survey taken by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J., of senior students in an eastern high school revealed some astonishing facts and provides Herculites and all other Americans with something to think about.

Of the students interviewed, 61 percent did not believe in profits; 62 percent thought workers should not produce at top capacity, and 55 percent endorsed the Communist philosophy, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need."

Another survey of high school and college students revealed that a large majority of young people expect Government to provide more and more varied personal services to the public. They voiced little objection to deficit spending and increased taxation to acquire these services.

Slowly, but relentlessly, we follow the path to socialism, the destruction of personal ambition and our free enterprise system. The welfare state looms larger on the horizon with each passing day.

The apparent lack of understanding and appreciation of our system and its inherent benefits—our high standard of living, of freedom of choice and personal liberties—poses a real and dangerous problem for industry, educators, and parents.

It seems obvious that our youth have no basic understanding of the things which have made America a bulwark of freedom. Gone is the emphasis on personal ambition, integrity, devotion, and self-sacrifice. No longer do we feel the necessity to pledge allegiance to God, country, family, employer, or anyone or anything else. It's no longer a question of what can I give, but what can I get.

We have forgotten that we get only by giving. We fail to recognize we never receive something for nothing. We always have to give; what we're giving now is our freedom, self-respect, and integrity.

A century ago, Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President, gave utterance to a thought applicable to his time and ours:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the

wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

It seems ironic that a nation of great fighters—fighters for freedom, justice, honor, improvement, prosperity, and the dignity of man—stands in jeopardy of losing its greatest and most important battle by default.

The Secretary of the Interior Visits the Ozarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on September 21 and 22, I was privileged to accompany Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall on a visit to the Ozark rivers region of Missouri. It was quite plain to those of us who joined Mr. Udall on his trips down the Current-Eleven Point Rivers system that he was impressed and delighted with our hill country and that he enthusiastically endorses the legislation now pending to preserve this area, which he termed "awe inspiring."

The Secretary stated:

My recommendation from now on is that it be given the highest classification possible by the Park Service. This area should be a national park.

The following excerpt from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 25, 1961, reflects Mr. Udall's views:

UPGRADING THE OZARKS

Missouri and the people of the Ozarks will benefit from Secretary of the Interior Udall's suggestion that the status of a national park be given to the Current, Eleven Point, and Jack's Fork region. Mr. Udall for the first time has enjoyed the beauty of the Ozark hills and forests and fished the clear, free-flowing streams. He knows the outdoors and is at home in an old pair of pants with a fishing rod in his hand. The importance of preserving the wilderness beauty of the Ozark Rivers for all Americans now is not lost on him.

But before this can be done, as Mr. Udall pointed out, all members of the Missouri congressional delegation must be behind legislation to create a national park in the Ozarks. Mr. Udall has offered to confer with Republican Representative CURTIS, the author of a rival plan for preservation of the rivers by the National Forest Service.

In view of Mr. Udall's enthusiastic endorsement of a national park for the Ozarks, we hope Mr. CURTIS will now add his support to the Symington-Long-Ichord bill to preserve the area under the administration by the National Park Service. Mr. CURTIS has said he will support any reasonable plan.

Representative PAUL JONES has reported some opposition by his constituents in Ripley County to the Park Service plan, and has taken no position on either bill. We hope that Mr. JONES and the people of Ripley County will back the Park Service plan. If not, perhaps the boundaries could be redrawn to exclude the area of opposition.

A simple amendment to the Symington-Long-Ichord bill is all that is needed to create a national park. No changes in sections of the bill calling for hunting and for life occupancy of land taken for a park are contemplated. While the distinction between a national park and a national monument are slight, park status, in the words of Mr. Udall, "upgrades" the project. A national park is a place of outstanding scenic beauty that should be preserved for the benefit of all Americans.

Ted Fearnow, of U.S. Forest Service, Offers Wise Conservation Philosophy in Address to Rotary Club of Elkins, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this month the Rotary Club of my home city of Elkins, W. Va., was privileged to hear an address by Ted Fearnow, Chief of the Division of Information and Education of the Eastern Region of the U.S. Forest Service. Mr. Fearnow, who has been affiliated with conservation work since 1927, when he joined the West Virginia Game and Fish Commission, drew upon more than 40 years of experience in this field in presenting an eloquent exposition of the progress and the goals of conservation policy in our national forests.

His remarks are of value to all of us, Mr. President, as we deliberate on the development and conservation of our natural resources, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE ROTARY CLUB, ELKINS, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 11, 1961, BY TED FEARNOW, CHIEF, DIVISION OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATION, EASTERN REGION, U.S. FOREST SERVICE

One of the privileges I claim for long tenure is the right to reminisce. I recall that West Virginia has produced some outstanding men in the field of conservation. When I started to work for the old West Virginia Game and Fish Commission back in 1927, I had the privilege of working as an understudy to the late A. B. Brooks, one of the grandest men I have ever known. He was a naturalist, a conservationist, and a lover of the hills and streams of this State. His ability as a writer was such that he has become known throughout the world of professional conservation workers. He is quoted frequently among the top-ranking conservationists of this country.

As I look back over the years, another man who stands out in my memory is the late Arthur A. Wood, who for many years was supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest. "Arthur A." was born over on Lost River, and worked his way up through the ranks to become Supervisor of the Monongahela National Forest. Many of the beautiful forest plantations, recreation areas, and campgrounds that we enjoy are monuments to his foresight. He was truly a man of vision.

There are many definitions of the word "conservation." Perhaps the best definition is wise use. In the realm of renewable resources, nonuse is not always conservation. Those who have grown up on farms know that to abandon land is not necessarily land conservation. The same is often true in the case of forest acreage. The thriftily managed forest offers many significant advantages over a stagnated, over age, decadent forest. From the standpoint of deer and other browsing animals, harvesting of timber actually stimulates the production of needed food plants. Wild turkey and ruffed grouse require openings in the forest where grass and other green foods are available. Prof. Aldo Leopold, one of our pioneer wildlife biologists, always stressed the fact that good wildlife habitat is a phenomenon of the forest edge, where old growth, young timber, brush land, and open land occur in close proximity.

We are hearing a lot these days about the value of outdoor recreation and tourism as a means for strengthening the economy in West Virginia. After some 40 years of working toward this objective I am extremely sympathetic to this effort—but I can't escape the feeling that we may be attempting to oversimplify a difficult and complex situation. You folks here at Elkins have had an opportunity to witness at close range a 40-year sustained effort to rebuild and develop the mountain forest empire of central West Virginia for this very purpose, so you know it is not an overnight job. We are still faced with a tremendous need for pollution control, flood control, and eradication of scars that have been made on the land.

I first became acquainted with the work of the Monongahela Forest back in the twenties when I was working for the State in game and fish conservation at Charleston. At that time the burning problem—and I mean just that—was prevention and control of forest fires. It took 20 years to turn the tide in this battle, but until it was won no real development program could safely be launched.

Later, the problem of open-range grazing was tackled. As long as cattle and sheep roamed through the hardwood forests, wildlife restoration and timber management were thwarted. It has taken many years of planning and hard work to lay the foundation for what you now have.

Even now, the reconstruction process continues, for timber currently being sold from the Monongahela Forest is chosen with special emphasis on stand improvement. It is often a thinning and weeding operation. The value of the timber resource is not fully reflected in present timber sale receipts, important as these are to the local communities which share in this income for schools and roads. In the spirit of true conservation, the Monongahela Forest is upgrading its forest resources so that they may better serve West Virginia and the Nation for countless generations in the future.

Now, a survey of outdoor recreation resources is being completed on the Monongahela. After 40 years of backbreaking work, the forest stands at the brink of significant advancement in the field of outdoor-recreation development.

If you want to catch a glimpse of the future, pay a visit to Sherwood Lake camping and picnic areas on the White Sulphur Ranger District. These examples of accomplishment, which can be seen on the ground by all who choose to look, are no accident. They are the result of careful planning and faithful execution by competent and dedicated men over a long span of years.

Through sustained effort, working under long-range plans toward a definite goal, the foundation has been laid for a million-acre multiple use area in central West Virginia that will benefit every segment of our population. The broad patterns of land

uses—water, wood, forage, recreation, and wildlife—will serve the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

By way of illustration—the forest road system which taps timber to keep local industries in operation also provides access for hunters, campers, and tourists who can relax and enjoy the scenic wonders that are enhanced by a thrifty, well-managed forest. One of the points that surprises many people is that harvesting of timber under good practices actually enhances recreational values in our West Virginia mountains. Forage for deer, our major big game species, is definitely increased by systematic cutting of timber. Furthermore, a thrifty, growing forest is more attractive and far safer for public recreation use than one which is decadent and full of "widowmakers."

Under multiple use management the campground which serves tourists and other visitors during the summer months becomes a sportsman's camp area during hunting and fishing seasons. I have seen the large grassy plots that are frequently a part of public recreation areas on the national forests, serve as food plots for game animals during the critical late winter and early spring months. There is a human aspect also to this matter of multiple use.

Personnel who are employed during the summer months through operation of recreation facilities often round out yearlong employment by working during the winter months in timber operations. Multiple-use operation is the key to getting the most mileage from our forest acreage from a natural resource point of view—it is also the key to maintaining our human resources by providing substantial yearlong employment opportunities.

Recreation is as much a part of the forest as the trees themselves. Whether it be a small woodlot, a farm forest, or a million-acre national forest, the appeal to our esthetic sense is such that we find it hard to resist. Under the multiple use principle of management, where wildlife, water, wood, recreation, and forage needs are being met, ideal situations are created for recreation enjoyment. The Forest Service is anticipating a total of 100 million recreation visits to the national forests of the country during 1961. The national forests of today are truly America's playgrounds.

The program I am describing does not require new legislation for it has been recognized and supported by one administration after another without regard to political parties. It was recognized 50 years ago when the Weeks law authorized the purchase of land for national forest purposes in West Virginia and other States. The last session of Congress passed a multiple-use law, further emphasizing its support for this plan of management. The present session has stepped up its authorization for expanded recreation facilities and an accelerated program of resource development and management for the national forests. We are on our way.

Of course, it would simplify matters if we had enough land to set aside separate areas for recreation, timber growing, grazing, hunting, water production, and other important uses. But the simple fact is that we do not have this much land. The United States is fortunate in having 8 percent of the world's forest area. But Soviet Russia has more than twice as much. What we lack in area we must make up in scientific management and full utilization. The necessity for making the fullest possible use of our forest areas is obvious.

While we conserve and develop our natural resources to build a beautiful America, we must also build a fruitful and productive America if we are to remain strong and have the freedom to enjoy our natural heritage.

At the time the Monongahela National Forest was created some 40 years ago, four out of five Americans lived in a rural or farm oriented environment. Today the figures are reversed—four out of every five Americans live in a city or suburban environment. This shift of population is having many effects on our national posture. It is particularly noticeable in the need for outdoor recreation and better public understanding of resource conservation problems. We are stepping up our efforts to take conservation education into these urban areas to develop a full realization of our dependence upon renewable resources of the land for our national strength.

At the present time, the Forest Service, with the help of the USDA motion-picture service, is developing a series of conservation motion pictures for nationwide distribution. Using a ranger, his wife, and teenage daughter as the principal characters, along with a city cousin who visits the ranger's family, an opportunity is provided for the ranger's young daughter to set the city cousin straight on dozens of matters dealing with outdoor life. It is a matter of deep pride to me and to all West Virginians that the Monongahela Forest was chosen to provide a background of good multiple-use land management for educational pictures of this type. When they are completed, these films will be shown in schools throughout the country. Scheduled for weekly showing over a period of 6 weeks, I hope city schoolchildren will develop a warm acquaintance with the ranger and his family and absorb much of the vital conservation information that is incorporated in these films.

Full development of renewable resources is essential to our survival as a strong and free nation. Water, wood, recreation, forage, and wildlife are inseparably linked with sound coordination and planning under the multiple-use management principle. With diligence, competence, and foresight, forested lands can be made to contribute to the future welfare of the Nation for countless generations.

Tribute to Billy Carmichael

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Tribute to Billy Carmichael," at this point in the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO BILLY CARMICHAEL

(Remarks of Dr. Frank Porter Graham, United Nations representative to India and Pakistan)

Last night, this noon, and tonight have in common their occasions of remembrance. Last night the 1088th presentation of Paul Green's beautiful symphonic drama by the able and devoted cast and chorus, the address of David de Boinville, and the large and enthusiastic audience, all combined to commemorate the 374th anniversary of the birthday of Virginia Dare. Conceived in England and born in America, she was the prophetic symbol of the British Empire and the American Nation yet to be born. The spiritual cornerstone of both the Empire and the Republic was laid on these historic shores in the times of Elizabeth the First. In these days of Elizabeth the Second, the Garden within these gates which bears both their names and which is nurtured by the women of the North Carolina garden clubs reminds us in this hour of the world's peril that America, Britain, and the allied nations stand together for freedom and peace on the earth.

We remember the lost colonists as the pioneers of the pioneers, who came after them and, with Bibles, axes, muskets in their hands and homesteads in their hopes, crossed rivers, mountains, prairies, plains, and the mountains again, another sea—making America both to the pattern of their often haphazard, sometimes ruthless and always relentless wills and to the substance of their unresting dreams.

At noon today was commemorated the cooperation of the three institutions of the Consolidated University of North Carolina nationally distinguished in faculties, libraries, laboratories, and in many values and services to truth, to youth and to the people of America and the world: (1) the Woman's College, fairest daughter of the old north State and one of the foremost and largest colleges of liberal arts for women in the world; (2) the North Carolina State College, which has moved into the front rank of the land grant colleges with eminence in agriculture, engineering, textiles, and architecture, and which this year will inaugurate in the Nation the celebration of the centennial of the Morrell Act marking the beginning of one of the most revolutionary and creative chapters in the history of higher education and in the making of a more democratic, productive and abundant America; (3) the university at Chapel Hill as old as the United States and as young as her most aspiring youth, the first State university to open its doors as the university of the people, something new under the sun, where hopes are being increasingly fulfilled in its eminence of scholarship and services in the liberal arts, the graduate and professional schools, with high recognition in the Association of American Universities of North America.

These three institutions, in their mutually reinforcing and consolidated strength and wide usefulness and in cooperation wtih our good neighbor Duke University and all our schools, colleges and agencies of the people's life, are all together building under a southern sun in a pleasant land between the mountains and the sea one of the great free, coordinated, integrated, liberal, scientific, agricultural, technological, hospital, medical, library, research, intellectual, humane, and spiritual centers of the modern world.

All these, the pioneers, the events, movements, and institutions, converge and meet in the meaning of this place and this night, dedicated in grateful memory to the pioneering spirit, the dynamic personality and noble services of William Donald Carmichael, Jr. As successor to the ably versatile and devoted Charles T. Woollen, the first controller, and as himself the first financial vice president of the University of North Carolina, Billy Carmichael gave the utmost of his boundless energies, drive, imagination, and creative spirit evenhandedly to each of three institutions in their services to student and people, State and Nation as the threefold university of all the people of North Carolina.

Billy Carmichael left the opportunities of the New York Stock Exchange and the generous lures of Wall Street at the call of his lifelong friend but more at the call of his alma mater and the consolidated university, which shared the top priority of love with his wife and family, his church, and his native State.

Any honest differences of opinion were part of the vigor, variety, and creative freedom of the university and merged in the higher loyalty and deeper and wider meaning which enriched and transcended the life of us all. It was a great joy to this and other presidents who all appreciated his great de-

votion and generous capacities, to work with him as a loyal and dynamic member of the consolidated team in great adventures of mind, spirit, and action for the advance of the whole university in the services of all the people of the whole State.

Along with Governors, legislators, presidents, chancellors, and business managers, professors and staff, Billy realized full well that what the university was created for and lives to fulfill, is to provide the distinguished and devoted scholars and teachers with books and equipment for transmitting the human heritage; for finding and publishing new truth; for challenging the minds and developing the total victorious personality of every youth to the height of his or her capacity in a free and wholesome self-governing community of teachers and students; for their competence on the job and for integrity and excellence in their standards of life and work; and for special and civic services in the locality and in the wide world in need of the best which youth has to give this generation and the generation to come.

Billy was ever valiantly in the midst of it all—tireless but humorous, winsome and witty, industrious and jolly. What fun it was to be in teamwork together for this and that, whether large appropirations for all three institutions, higher faculty salaries, books and test tubes, building programs, research facilities, publications, athletics, religious life, student welfare, the Statewide hospital and medical program, business foundations, endowments, student scholarships, fellowships, et cetera, including, for example, the university sponsorship of the lost colony and the university war programs in which were trained over 35,000 young men for the fighting fronts from which many never returned.

A gallant comrade has gone to join them. Their immortal spirits and influences cluster with us here on this Billy Carmichael Night in eternal vigil over the university, the freedom of our country and peace in the world, for which they all gave the last full measure of devotion.

In these days of the precarious peace of deterrent terror, may this commemoration mean a rdedication of us all to freedom and peace through excellence in education, and a more enlightened, stronger and more effective United Nations. May the life and work of Billy Carmichael and all those who have labored and now labor in and through our threefold universities and all our schools and colleges, become a part of the structure and substance of man's unresting dream of building on the earth a noble home of the family of man for equal freedom, justice, and peace under law and human brotherhood under God in this age of mortal peril and immortal hope for all mankind.

Welfare Services Available to Migratory Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, during this session of Congress, we have frequently been impressed with the fact that the affluence of American society does not extend to the migratory farmworker and his family. Migratory farmworkers who in 1959 earned an average of $911 for farm and nonfarm work, are the lowest paid citizens in our society. Because of their inadequate, substandard income, migratory farmworkers are in acute need of the welfare services generally available to other citizens. But the harsh fact is that the transient nature of the migrant's work frequently prevents him from meeting residence requirements which would enable him to obtain these services.

The defects in our national and local welfare policies which produce these problems were most informatively discussed in a September 6 article in the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial. In noting the inadequacies of these policies, particularly as they affect transients, the article points out:

An arresting irony of the situation is that general assistance is the only non-Federal welfare category. It is the only kind of money available to the transient whose resources collapse when he is just passing through.

Because the article recognizes the injustice of welfare policies which exclude migrants, and because it recognizes the need of the migrant for welfare services generally available to other citizens, I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE, 5—MIGRANT NEEDY

Federal involvement in welfare aid may be regrettable, but is it avoidable?

The needy pay little heed to State lines.

The welfare crusaders of Newburgh, N.Y., claimed that they were carrying a load for which responsibility belonged to Southern States. There is some justice in what they say. But the larger question is how responsibility for an individual welfare recipient can be assessed to any locality, at least in many cases.

There must be many Newburgh welfare recipients who grew up in Virginia or North Carolina, who worked a few years in Washington or New York City, and who have since drifted into Newburgh. Whether they were employed for a while at Newburgh has been an issue of fact in the controversy, but does it really matter very much? How can the needs of any person who has been on such a hegira be charged against any specific State or city of the country.

One of the strongest objections which has been made to present welfare policies is that they tend to exclude transients. There are many thousands of Americans wandering around the country today—some of them migrant farmworkers—who are sick, hungry and desperately in need of help.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, estimates the migrant farmworker population, including women and children, at "as many as 2 million. He says that the workers in this group earned an average of $710 on farms plus $201 of nonfarm income in 1959. This is by no means the whole of the migratory needy, although it is perhaps the bulk of the problem.

Because welfare programs are so heavily financed by the Federal Government, there are many complaints from social workers and interested organizations about transient exclusion policies.

In Arkansas, for example, welfare grants totaled $38,143,747 in fiscal 1960, with $29,115,489 of this coming from the Federal Government.

A goodly percentage of the migrant needy move through Arkansas on their rounds but they get precious little welfare money.

In Arkansas, to qualify for most types of assistance, one must have resided within the State either for 3 of the last 5 years or for 5 of the past 9 years—with all of the past year spent in residence.

These new and stiff requirements were set up by the 1961 Arkansas Legislature. They are the stiffest permitted by Federal law and, it may be noted, are much stiffer than those which provoked angry outcries from liberals at Newburgh, N.Y.

About the only important exceptions to them are aid to dependent children, on which a 1-year residence requirement is the maximum permitted in any State, and general assistance, the relief of the good old days, before the Federal Government got into the picture.

An arresting irony of the situation is that general assistance is the only non-Federal welfare category. It is the only kind of money available to the transient whose resources collapse when he is just passing through.

General assistance also is used for a wide variety of other human needs—for all the things that don't fit into the neatly compartmented "categorical assistance" categories, such as aid to dependent children, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, and so forth. Our impression is that most of it does not go to transients. Even if it did, it would not go far to meet their needs. Officials at the Jefferson County Welfare Department estimate that they have an average of $400 a month to disburse for general assistance—the figure varies.

"Not too many [transients] come by the office," says a spokesman.

The transient in trouble in Pine Bluff is more likely to turn to private agencies, such as the community chest.

Chest officials will ask him where he is going. They will then provide him with (1) one meal, and (2) gas or a bus ticket to get him part way there. More likely than not, the chest assistance will get the transient to Little Rock. At Little Rock, he will hunt up another charity which will give him transportation to St. Louis, for example—or most of the way to St. Louis if the agency's funds are low.

In some States, this sort of transient aid is routinely given by county and city welfare departments—sometimes only to the nearest out-of-county city. It is not difficult to envision a family of transients caught on this sort of a merry-go-round and traveling for weeks on end.

Newburgh, the locus of the big welfare fuss of 1961, is a community with many economic problems, including a high rate of unemployment. It seems a fair guess that many Newburgh residents are drifting around the country, hitting up public and private agencies in other cities for aid, just as Newburgh is being hit up by people who didn't happen to live in Newburgh when they went poor.

The Record of the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress has been one of the most productive in history.

This record has been the result of the joint efforts of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration. It has been likened to the memorable first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration. In March 1933, it was closed banks and soup lines. In January 1961, it was sagging farm prices, rising unemployment, stifled credit, and unfavorable balances of payments.

President Kennedy's watchword has been action—action on behalf of the American economy and action on behalf of American security. His dynamic leadership has strengthened America's position, both domestically and internationally. Where the Eisenhower administration maintained the status quo, the Kennedy administration took the initiative. Where President Eisenhower used the veto, President Kennedy has offered constructive proposals to move America forward.

As his first official act, President Kennedy ordered the distribution of surplus food to those hardest hit by the recession. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—area redevelopment legislation which President Eisenhower had vetoed. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—the most comprehensive housing program in more than a decade. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—a wage and hour statute increasing the minimum wage and broadening coverage under this law for the first time in many years.

The Congress passed and the President signed a feed grains bill. Congress passed and the President signed the most far reaching comprehensive farm bill since I have been a Member of this body. This Democratic Congress passed and a Democratic President signed legislation making 600,000 additional persons eligible for increased social security benefits and earlier retirement. This Democratic Congress, cooperating with a Democratic President, produced 33 major items of legislation for the American people.

The result of all this is a stronger America. Economically, we are looking forward to a year of record prosperity. Every major economic indicator points up. After falling for three consecutive quarters, the gross national product rose by 3 percent in the second quarter of 1961. At least half of this $15 billion increase is due to administration programs. Chairman Walter Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers estimated it will reach a rate of $565 to $570 billion in the spring of 1962. If this estimate is realized, our economy is growing at a rate of nearly 10 percent annually.

Every sector of our economy is expanding. Manufacturing production increased by 11 percent from February to August; in the preceding 6 months, manufacturing output had declined 7 percent. Inventories, responding to higher sales, were growing in contrast to cutbacks early in the year. Business outlays for capital goods—both buildings and equipment—are rising and surveys indicate investment expenditures will pick up substantially by the end of the year. Housing starts are up one-third from the recession low to more than 1.3 million in June, July, and August. Net farm income, estimated at $12.8 billion, will be the highest in 8 years, and net income per farm is expected to set a new record while costly surpluses are being cut.

Individual Americans have more money in their pockets with the personal income rate up $16 billion to a record $422 billion. Extended unemployment compensation, increased surplus food distribution, and the feed grains program added $800 million to private purchasing power. Wages and salaries increased by $13 billion. Corporate profits before taxes stood at $45 billion, an annual rate $5½ billion above the first quarter of the year. Four million more Americans were working in July than in January with experts predicting substantial declines in unemployment in the near future. We are moving rapidly toward full employment, a condition our economy has not enjoyed since early 1957.

In international financing, President Kennedy reversed the drain on our gold reserves, stabilizing the value of the dollar and reassuring the world of the soundness of the American economy. After 16 months of consistent declines, our monetary stock increased this spring. That increase has continued. For the first time since 1958, August reports showed a $17 million inflow of gold.

President Kennedy let our potential enemies and the world know that henceforward we would operate from a position of strength, not weakness, and he backed his words with action. He, with the cooperation of Congress, doubled our Polaris submarine program insuring a full operational fleet 3 years sooner than originally scheduled. He increased long-range missile programs, expanded naval and ground forces, and stepped up troop carrier plane procurement, increasing the mobility of our forces. President Kennedy, with the cooperation of this Congress, has moved to give us alternatives other than capitulation or nuclear holocaust.

John Kennedy stepped into office in the midst of a world terrified by sputniks and frightened by the progress Russia was making in missiles. He answered by stepping up every phase of our space technology, taking the positive position that our space goals in this age were to make the United States not the second best, but the undisputed leader among the nations of the world.

Where legislation was needed, he requested it and the Congress responded with major legislative enactments in almost every legislative field.

We submit to the American people the record of this session solely upon the basis of its value to our people and to the continuation of our way of life. We will enter the next session resolved not to stand on our past record but to move forward with further goals designed to strengthen our country and to expand our economy.

We have no alternative but to move forward. The standard of living of our people demands it. The security of our country and of the free world demands it.

With the death of Dag Hammarskjold, the United Nations confronts the greatest test in its troubled history. With the Berlin crisis deepening, America faces a challenge to her principles and to her very existence. With the Khrushchev appetite seemingly insatiable, communism threatens to gorge on the souls of free peoples everywhere.

At this turning point in history, the virility and the strength of the United States, the health of her economy, the versatility and might of her Armed Forces, and, above all, the determination of her people, are indispensable to our leadership in the free world and our capacity to insure the preservation of human dignity. The stakes are high; the problems difficult. What we do in the 2d session of the 87th Congress may be our supreme test. We will not fail our responsibilities.

Corps Training a Fine Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are indeed a young, optimistic nation. I hope each of our generations will produce a breed of young, idealists whose fresh-eyed hopefulness will play a strong part in adding its bit to the upward and onward toward better things for the world of men. When it is all said and done, those who dare to follow fresh vision and a new approach are frequently successful in changing much for the better.

Such vision and hopefulness are a great part of the Peace Corps. The occasion of the graduation of the first student Peace Corps trainees at Rutgers University, who were addressed by Gordon Boyce, assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps, is described in the following editorial from the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J.; for which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPS TRAINING A FINE SUCCESS

"Never be ashamed of being idealists," the Peace Corps volunteers were told Friday night as they received their graduation certificates at a simple ceremony in Douglass College's Jameson Auditorium.

The speaker was Gordon Boyce, assistant to the director of the Peace Corps, and it was a significant occasion. This group of dedicated volunteers was the first group to complete training, and will engage in the pioneer effort of the Peace Corps, a project in Colombia.

The young men who form the group had completed 9 weeks of intensive training at Rutgers University. The course was an arduous one. They studied the Spanish language and Colombian and Latin American history and culture. They worked hard on physical conditioning. They refreshed their knowledge of American institutions and traditions.

After a few days at home these young men will depart for a 2-year stay in Colombia. There their life will be rigorous. They will be building schools and roads and sanitary facilities, and digging wells. They will be organizing youth groups.

Our observation of these young men during their training period here, through the eyes of our news staff, leads us to believe that the project in which they will be engaged will be a successful one. They have seemed dedicated, hard-working young men. It is clear that they take their work seriously. While they were with us they were models of good conduct.

We are proud that Rutgers, the State university, has been host at this pioneer training project of the Peace Corps. And we are happy that this training course went so smoothly and efficiently. This is another example of the State university in the Nation's service and in the world's service. History has been made on the Rutgers campus in the past 9 weeks.

Beauty Care for Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many businesses and organizations throughout the country have very worthwhile projects underway which receive little if no attention from the general public. These projects are truly humanitarian and responsive to the needs of those less fortunate than we.

Such a project has recently come to my attention that merits the attention of you, our colleagues in the Congress, and all Americans.

The National Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Association is actively engaged in helping to brighten the lives of patients in charity wards of hospitals, homes for the aged, mental hospitals, homes for the orphaned and similar institutions. They do this through an unselfish program that provides professional beauty care to these patients.

Dr. Beatrice S. Sloan, psychiatrist and chief of the women's services at the South Florida State Hospital for mental care has very ably set forth the accomplishments of the members of the National Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Association in a speech at their 41st annual convention held in Miami Beach.

With unanimous consent I wish to include herewith in my remarks an article that incorporates Dr. Sloan's remarks, that appeared in a recent issue of the NHCA bulletin.

I hope all Americans will read this article so that they will know of this good and unselfish work on the part of many of our friends and neighbors:

BEAUTY CARE FOR NEEDY

Speaking before more than a thousand delegates attending the National Beauty Salon Week breakfast at the recent 41st Annual Convention of the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association in Miami Beach, Dr. Beatrice S. Sloan, psychiatrist and chief of the women's services at the South Florida State Hospital for mental care, praised the institutional welfare work being conducted by the association's members to help patients in institutions throughout the United States.

The welfare work is professional beauty care, such as permanent waves, shampoos, hair shaping and styling to patients in charity words of hospitals, homes for the aged, mental hospitals, homes for the orphaned and similar institutions throughout the year, culminating annually during National Beauty Salon Week, which will be observed in 1962 during the week of February 11–17.

The text of Dr. Sloan's speech follows:

"A patient doesn't have to tell you that she no longer has a zest for life and that she feels quite hopeless about the future. You can see it in her posture. You can see it in the neglect of her skin and hair and her overall grooming. Actually, what we say is, there has been a loss of morale.

"In the psychiatric hospital, grooming is our barometer. Frequently it is the real indicator as to the progress of a patient. The first time in a female ward that a patient comes up and whispers to the nurse, "Please put my name on the list for a shampoo," or "the list for a permanent," we know the barometer is going up, because there is nothing so gratifying in our work as the metamorphosis that takes place in the female psychiatric patient who has been depressed, has been totally neglectful of herself in every area, and who begins to find some portion of that self-love is still present.

"We have instances in our wards where the dramatic change in one patient who returns from the beauty parlor with a permanent influences the progress of the other patients.

"They share their pleasures and they share their joys, and believe me, they share the other things—the disappointments and so on.

"It would do your hearts good if you could see a 22-year-old girl who came to us just a blob of human protoplasm, regressed to the level of a very young infant, who responded to shock treatment and who asked if she could have her hair done at our beauty parlor. When she came back, instead of a mud-gutter blonde, she was a beautiful blonde child with curly hair and she really had a new outlook and there was a total uplift in her entire personality.

The other patients were very much aware of this change. They commented on how beautiful she was. That was not all. The family that had practically rejected her completely, visited her just a week later, and she was still blossoming and they were very much surprised, pleasantly, of course, and for the first time in the 7 months that she had been with us, her parents asked if they could take her home for a weekend.

I think our lesson got across to them, and I think, too, that perhaps her mother learned something from it, because she decided that she would visit the beauty parlor and have something done for herself.

The patients are urged to enter our charm school. This is a must the first time. You sometimes have to propel them a little bit to go over to the charm school, but it is only the first time. Believe me, no matter how sick they are, how deep the depression, after they have been there once, we have 100-percent attendance. It is the only activity—and I mean this sincerely—the only activity in the entire hospital that gets 100-percent attendance.

What is our charm school? Our hospital is 4 years old and 4 years ago this was started, not as a charm school, but as a self-improvement course. We were aware of the fact that before improvement or progress could be made psychiatrically, we had to see some interest, some awakening of the desire in the patient to improve herself or himself—and so the self-improvement course began.

At that time we have nothing to work with. The State of Florida, like all of the States, does not provide cosmetics, and the many necessities of the patients.

Well, I believe this is where the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association performed one of those miracles for which we are ever grateful.

We contacted NHCA, and you produced quite a few gallons of shampoo concentrate. You provided us with something else that is most necessary—deodorants. You provided us with nail polish, cosmetics, and oh, something very important—combs. We did not have a single comb to use in this self-improvement course, but we did get thousands, so each patient could have one or two.

Our self-improvement course began using just what we had there with volunteers—you people came in from the outside world and helped our patients, and not only helped our patients, but helped the staff to understand better the patients' need along these lines.

"After all, what do you do for an individual who comes into the beauty parlor? I don't mean now the special person who mixes up colors, or who does the research on what is best used on which hair and so on; I mean you people who actually work with your clients, who come into the beauty salons. Do they get a lift from what you do?

"Let me tell you that psychiatrically they really do. First of all, they come in and they relax. They get rid of tension—in fact, in private practice, I had many women tell me that the only way they could get rid of or cure a migraine headache was to go to the beauty parlor, have a scalp massage and sit under a warm dryer, and when they left, they were a new person. If that is not a lift, then what is?

"I do not think that any one of you should ever hesitate to suggest to a woman that she get a new hairdo, because she will get a lift. Do not hesitate to suggest that she change the color of her hair, and that she be daring and expeditious and try something new. It does not matter what her age is, because teenagers are doing it, too.

"Again, I am going to say when you do the wonderful work that you do, you frequently are restoring self-esteem to a woman, or an individual, or, as I like to put it, the proper proportion of self-love. You do this because as a result of what you do she has the knowledge that she is attractive, that she is well-groomed, and that she is part of a dynamic and still conscious world, and I think this gives the woman the greatest lift of all.

"We sincerely thank you for all you do; all your contribution to our hospital, and to the many other State hospitals throughout these United States and Canada.

"This work, this charm school work, these courses in self-improvement and good grooming and so on, are going on all over the country and in every State hospital, and I believe in the veterans hospitals as well.

"This is only possible because you make it so. You people are not only the doers, but you are the givers. I will say this: Without your contributions, we would not have the necessary help to take care of our patients.

"So, for all of the millions of gallons, I guess, of shampoo concentrate, the deodorants—and oh, they are important—for the combs, for the lotions, for the cosmetics of every variety—I do not want to omit anyone—believe me. I am adding my sincere thanks to the thanks of hundreds of others who have received your bounty."

Harrington Park Citizens Unite, Arrange To Aid Carla's Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, despite man's long record of inhumanity to man there arise occasions upon which the more humane aspects of our feelings toward our brothers gain the upper hand. Such is the situation in Harrington Park, N.J., in respect to the victims of Hurricane Carla in Texas.

Harrington Park citizens have made extensive plans to collect money and material which will be sent to a certain community in Texas. The particulars of their plan are described in this news story by John H. Kuhn, the Record, Hackensack, N.J., for which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRINGTON PARK CITIZENS UNITE, ARRANGE TO AID CARLA'S VICTIMS—BOROUGH TO SEND FREIGHT CAR FULL OF MATERIALS TO A TEXAS COMMUNITY

(By John H. Kuhn)

HARRINGTON PARK.—Victims of hurricane Carla will receive direct aid from residents of this borough by the end of the month.

TO CHOOSE ONE TOWN

A program for the entire borough to assist a Texas town was formulated by a committee of 25 residents last night.

The group has already made arrangements for the use of a freight car from the New York Central Railroad. It is hoped the car can be loaded with 15,000 pounds of materials by September 24.

Mrs. DeForest Lewis was named chairman of the group. Committees were named to arrange the various aspects of the campaign, which will not be connected with any charitable organization. The project will be known as "Aid a Texas Town."

Residents hope to select a specific community in Texas to receive the aid. It is hoped a town similar to this borough can be located. Efforts to reach the area by telephone yesterday were unsuccessful because phone lines are down in much of the area.

The railroad will provide the freight car, which will be placed on the John J. Demarest siding. Fifty-pound cartons, in which materials will be packed, have been donated for the campaign.

The committee said the materials it desires to collect are clothing (not too heavy because of the warmer climate), shoes, rubbers, and household linens. The clothing should be marked for size. Shoes should be tied together and marked for size, as should the rubbers. It is asked that a $1 contribution be included with each donation to help defray the cost of shipping the car to Texas. Shipping costs were set at $700.

Collection depots will be established in 21 locations throughout the borough. The material will be packed in the cartons at the depots.

Contributions will be received Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week. Next Thursday and Friday the committee plans to pack the material in the cartons. On September 23 and 24 members of the fire department will load the freight car.

According to the schedule, the car will leave here September 25 and arrive in the Houston area September 30.

Containers for cash contributions will be placed in local stores.

Literature to inform residents of the campaign will be distributed through schools and churches tomorrow and Sunday.

Committees named to work on the project are: Fred H. Quantmeyer Sr., finance; Mario Bettega and the fire department, loading; Andrew Krivak, transportation; Mrs. Kenneth Baer, motor corps; Mrs. George McNeil and Mrs. Robert Nelson, collection depots; Mrs. John Stockman and Edward McLester, publicity and literature; and Mrs. Bruner Potter, posters.

The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1961, I introduced House Joint Resolution 372, to give official status to the American's creed. Since that date, many Americans from all parts of the United States have written me relative to this legislation. Each has affirmed his belief in the American's creed as written by William Tyler Page.

Among these letters is one from Mr. Hoxsie Y. Smith, president, board of trustees of the Brawley School District of Brawley, Calif.

It is significant that all pupils in the Brawley elementary schools are required to learn not only the American's creed, but the preamble to the Constitution of the United States and the statement of basic human rights from the Declaration of Independence. I submit that by learning about these matters these schoolchildren are indeed learning about America and will be better Americans as a result of the efforts of those citizens like Hoxsie Y. Smith in the Brawley School District.

Under unanimous consent I wish to include herewith in my remarks the letter from Mr. Smith, dated September 18, 1961, and the document distributed by the Brawley School District to students:

BRAWLEY, CALIF., *September 18, 1961.*

Hon. BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress,
House Post Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: I was very pleased to read of your joint resolution and your remarks concerning the American's creed in a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1961. I wholeheartedly agree with you that the American's creed should be shared by young and old alike and the principles set forth in it should be reaffirmed by every American. Patriotism is not out of date and it is time that we "stand up and be counted" as Americans.

I thought that you might be interested to know that the American's creed has been required learning for all of the sixth grade pupils in the Brawley elementary schools. The students must memorize and understand its meaning before being promoted from the sixth grade. I would like to see this put into effect in every school district throughout the United States.

The people of your district are very fortunate to be represented by such an able and dedicated American.

Very sincerely,

HOXSIE Y. SMITH.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America, as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic, a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

STATEMENT OF BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS FROM THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

("Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said, this my own, my native land."—Scott.)

New Aid for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is with great satisfaction that I note the Congress' decision to attack the Nation's junvenile delinquency problem.

In the more densely populated areas juvenile delinquency exists in its most virulent form. The State of New Jersey, itself heavily populated and a stone's throw from the largest city in the world, is needful of funds to assist in combating this problem—as is mentioned in this Newark News editorial of recent date for which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW AID FOR YOUTH

Congress finally has responded to President Kennedy's call for a "total attack" upon juvenile delinquency. As a result, major

municipalities will receive Federal aid in dealing with a problem that has placed an increasingly heavy burden on individual community resources.

Although New Jersey has escaped the gang wars that plague New York, there is nonetheless a need not only to increase police vigilance, but also to strengthen such preventive measures as vocational training, counseling and the procurement of jobs.

Under the 3-year $30 million program authorized by Congress, Federal aid is to be concentrated in those cities which can prove the greatest need. In that respect, Mayor Carlin will ask his committee on youth for recommendations. If Newark qualifies, the city and its various welfare agencies doubtless will welcome the opportunity to participate in such a farsighted project.

The Outlook for Jobless Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg's recent address on "The Outlook for Jobless Negroes" is one which I hope will be widely read by the American public and by Negro citizens whose peculiar dilemma it discusses. While Secretary Goldberg does not minimize the burden of racial discrimination which saddles a segment of the citizens of our Nation with a disproportionate share of unemployment, he offers information which should be made as available as it is possible to make it on what the Federal Government has done to help in this problem and he renders sound advice which cannot be too-oft repeated:

THE OUTLOOK FOR JOBLESS NEGROES

(By Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg)

(Because he bears the major burden of job discrimination and lack of education, the Negro also suffers most unemployment, but his future can be brighter than it is.)

There were 5 million unemployed Americans this spring.

Nearly a million of these unemployed were Negroes.

Almost 1 out of every 8 Negroes was unemployed, compared to the white group's rate of almost 1 out of 16.

As you can see, Negroes were hit twice as hard as the white group when it came to having work.

Unfortunately, these proportions are nothing new. A period of unemployment such as our Nation underwent the past few months simply dramatizes what has been prevalent and obvious to the statistician and sharply realized by the nonwhite worker in the United States who has suffered its inequity all these years.

Among the jobless Negroes, almost one-half, 460,000, were without work 15 weeks or longer.

Almost twice as many Negroes as in the white group were forced to work part time this spring.

Without belaboring the facts further, it is obvious that the Negro has been saddled with a disproportionate share of the country's unemployment problem.

He has made up a good proportion of the so-called hard-core unemployed in the United States.

And his job outlook will not improve in the stiffening competition for work foreseen in the years ahead unless he helps himself while we attempt to help him.

I say this knowing full well the job discrimination that the American Negro has faced since the Civil War. I say this knowing full well the barriers he still must overcome, socially, economically, and politically.

I also say this knowing that it is more difficult for Negroes to get jobs commensurate with their training.

But, I say this because of a few immutable facts about the long-term unemployed Negro worker which goes beyond past discrimination.

When unemployment begins to rise in this country, it first hits all workers, white or black, earning livelihoods in the unskilled occupations. These are the jobs which need little or no education and training. These are also the jobs that have been disappearing from American industry since the turn of the century when one out of every eight manual workers was unskilled. Last year this group represented 1 out of every 20.

The need for more education and skill in jobs available is increasing rapidly. Even semiskilled and skilled workers have felt the pinch in recent years.

The Negro, mainly through no fault of his own, has been, generally, the worker with the least education, the least training. Thus, he is usually holding down more of the poor, unstable jobs than other citizens. When a recession or depression occurs, the Negro becomes the classic unemployment statistic, the greater problem, once again.

But we are truly living in a time of transition. Opportunities for all men to gain an education, learn a trade, earn a better living, are opening doors closed tightly within our recent memory.

How can the American Negro help himself in these times? He can help himself by looking to the future and what it promises, rather than to the past and what it has been. This applies not only to the breadwinner today but also to the advice he gives his children and the steps he takes to keep his children in school.

It is true that the security which the American Negro seeks cannot be achieved without opportunity. But opportunity cannot be grasped without ability. And ability does not express itself without education and training.

Therefore, the Negro must prepare himself now, whether he is in high school or college or earning a living, to meet the increasing competition for the better jobs, the jobs which require training and education and intelligence, the jobs which will generally provide a living even when times are bad.

Now is the time for everyone, white or black, to get all the education he can get, or refine his salable skills to meet the increasing demand for skilled workers.

Jobs and careers that may have been beyond the attainment of the Negro 20 years ago are becoming available today. Much of this has been accomplished by national leadership in the destruction of discriminatory barriers. Just as much has been done by the American Negro in standing up for his rights.

The Federal Government is doing something about opening doors to these jobs and careers. President Kennedy has created a new arm in the executive branch called the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to make sure that the color of a man's skin or his religion or nationality is not a bar to employment. The Vice President is chairman of this committee and I am vice chairman, with Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry R. Holleman directly responsible to me for its operation. We are applying the equal opportunity premise immediately within those industries which have Government contracts.

One of the most frequent reasons we are given for the nonemployment or lack of promotion of Negro workers is that they do not have the necessary educational background, or that they do not have the training.

Many times these reasons are merely excuses. More often it is the truth.

This is not the time to look back for the reasons underlying the truth. We are aware of all of them.

We must look ahead to see what can be done to make the present reasons for the discriminatory practices merely excuses. For we can battle excuses with truth if truth is on our side.

Here is where the Negro must help himself. He must be willing to overcome his physical environment, his social status, his economic depression, by learning. The Federal Government intends to help.

The administration has already taken measures to deal with some of the factors inducing unemployment, which, in alleviating for all Americans, will, of course, aid the Negro's problem as well.

Since considerable numbers of workers have already been displaced by automation and technological change, a manpower development and training bill has been introduced in the Congress as a remedial measure. The proposal provides for on the job, classroom, and other types of vocational training with Federal retraining allowances up to a maximum of 52 weeks.

Another bill has been introduced which would provide training programs for youths between 16 and 22 years of age. This group historically, in good times or bad, has an unemployment rate three times as high as the rest of the work force. Negro youth have an even higher rate, something like six times as high.

This legislation, if enacted, would provide for on-the-job training for this age group with the Federal Government sharing the expense; would provide job opportunities to gain experience in public service work operated by State and local governments; and a Youth Conservation Corps for young men to work in camps at the national forests and parks, and State forests and recreation areas.

As you know, President Kennedy has already signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act, intended to provide various kinds of assistance to areas of persistent unemployment. The act provides loans to encourage new industry and expansion, occupational training of unemployed or underemployed workers.

To meet the challenge of automation, I have established a new Office of Automation and Manpower to help find the answers to this growing problem to our industry, which is adding to our unemployment problems.

These next 10 years will make all the difference in the world to working Americans. The key will be education and training for the future.

The Negro must be in the positions to make the grade. While it must be mainly his own effort, he can be sure that his Government, this administration, is going to help. The measures I have mentioned briefly are intended for those Americans suffering the most in these changing times.

The hard core, the continual unemployment among the nonwhite citizens of this Nation must be, will be, softened by the cooperative efforts of all of us.

President Kennedy's words at his inaugural should be remembered: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The American Negro, by striving for more education and job training, will be doing for his country by doing for himself.

I do not believe anyone could ask for more—or for less.

A Half Billion Dead Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the world is well supplied with experts who reiterate problems, the expanding population, the urbanization of our Nation, and the need for prevention rather than cure of disease. And yet with this knowledge at our disposal we suffer abuses of ever-increasing self-destructiveness to continue. The pollution of water is a serious problem and needs correction, all agree. This editorial from the Asbury Park Evening Press, September 16, discusses the extent to which fish are being wantonly destroyed for lack of control of waste products.

I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HALF BILLION DEAD FISH

The Wildlife Management Institute is authority for the statement that 6,300,000 fish were killed last year by polluation in the Nation's lakes and streams. The greatest killer was industrial waste with agricultural poisons running second. In diminishing order of importance was domestic sewage, mining operations, and wastes from airfields.

We submit that the needless killing of more than a half billion fish annually is something to think about. How many million more fish are contaminated and yet live to become part of the Nation's food supply will never be known. The number is probably large and the threat to the public health considerable.

Health is a universally popular subject of discussion. Hardly does a group of friends assemble for a social evening before at least one of them brings the state of his health into the conversation. Any drive to fight a specific disease enlists hundreds of workers even though the disease has been conquered and the crusade is being kept alive by those whose livelihood is at stake. Yet pollution of the air we breathe and the water we drink and in which we swim attracts little attention.

The peril to health contained in contaminated water supplies is well known. Research has demonstrated that polluted air is no less a danger to human well-being. Authorities agree that air pollutants are a causative factor in lung cancer and cardiovascular diseases. Yet those who work so hard to conquer these diseases do not put forth the same effort to prevent them. How long could air and water pollution persist if all the dedicated men and women who work for all the health drives were to center their attention on the problem?

Pollution is one of the unfortunate by-products of our industrial age. This need not be so. Industry can continue to exist and make a profit without endangering the lives of the people who live in its vicinity. The talk of industry leaving the State if it is obliged to stop killing our citizens is nonsense. It is the last minute plea of a few reactionary industrialists unwilling to spend the mnoey needed to modernize their plants. They are the Bourbons who refused to accept responsibility for injured employees and, thereby, brought about the enactment of stern compensation laws. Their present failure to cooperate for the public good will lead to the enactment of equally stern laws against plants which pollute the air and water.

There Is No White Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following very interesting article appeared in the Negro Digest, of September 1961, reprinted from the Sign:

THERE IS NO WHITE RACE

(By Dr. George F. Carter)

(No matter how much they avoid saying it, the thinking of many Americans is infected with the egoistic error that the white race is superior. Science shows there is a biological basis for classifying racial groups as Negro, Mongol, and European. But science knows of no special white race. Dr. George F. Carter, an anthropologist of national standing, takes up this challenging question in the following interview.)

Question. Dr. Carter, many people speak of the races of mankind. Do they deny the basic unity of the human race?

Answer. Some people, through ignorance or bigotry, deny this basic unity. But the expression "races of mankind" is also used by scientists who have no intention of denying the biological unity of the human race. They make general classifications of groups and speak of them as distinct races, for example, the Negro, the European, and the Mongolian. Biologically, these races are all variations of the same human species, the human race.

Question. Are you saying that, as a scientist, you are convinced that all these different groups of people had a common human ancestry?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Have scientists been able, geographically, to pinpoint the origin of that common ancestry?

Answer. Scientists are quite generally agreed that all men have had a common place of origin. It had to be in the Old World. It is clear that this had to take place somewhere in the warm belt from southeast Asia across to Africa. For some decades now, the earliest stone tools and earliest manlike skeletons have been found there. Recently, parts of a skeleton have been found in Kenya, in east Africa. And right with the skeleton parts, stone tools were found.

Question. How long ago do scientists figure that men lived there?

Answer. About 700,000 years ago.

Question. How are scientists sure that the skeleton remains belonged to a man?

Answer. Because, whatever you call him, he made and used tools. This particular creature, tiny in size but with a brain capacity equal to that of the huge gorilla, was importing stone from miles away and breaking it up to get sharp pieces to work with. This is toolmaking, and only man does such things.

Question. Do you find any conflict between the theory of evolution and the creation of man by God?

Answer. Not in the least. Scripture tells us that God formed man out of the earth. The theory of evolution seeks to explain how that formation took place over a period of time. The important thing about a man, the main thing that sets him off from the animals, is his possession of a spiritual soul. Since the physical sciences are concerned with material things, you can hardly expect them to explain the creation of the soul—and the nature of the soul. The soul is an immaterial substance.

Question. But even scientists must be concerned with the spiritual nature of man?

Answer. I readily admit that. But for knowledge of a man's spiritual nature, a scientist must get beyond the limitations of physical science and rely on philosophy, theology, and divine revelation. Sound theology and science should not contradict but supplement each other.

Question. As a scientist, how do you tell the difference between man and an animal?

Answer. That's easy. Scientists study the way creatures act. When we find a man making and using tools, we have found the products of a mind that was at work. It is because of his power of mind that man is mentally very different from his nearest relatives in the animal kingdom. Moreover, when a scientist finds a man worshiping, he rightly suspects the presence of a soul. So, when skeletal remains are on the borderline between an animal and a man, the scientist will seek further evidence of how the creature acted when alive in order to tell which he was, man or animal.

Question. Granting man originated long ago, and possibly in east Africa, how did men today come to be so different? What about those "races of men?"

Answer. Races are biologically different groups of men. There is a Negro race, a European race, and a Mongol race. These are clear-cut cases of kinds of men with differing skin colors, body proportions, hair forms, and so forth.

On the other hand, there is no Jewish race. Negroes, Europeans, or Mongols may be Jews—that is, belong to the Jewish religion. There is no Irish race. That is a national group. There is no Germanic race. That is either a national group or a speech group; but in either case, it includes a number of biologically different groups.

Question. You do not mention a white race? Why?

Answer. White skins mark only a minor group of the European or Mediterranean race. This kind of man is distributed all around the Mediterranean Sea. In color, it varies from the fair skin of the northwest Europeans, through the olive-brown skins of the Mediterraneans, to the dark brown skins of the Ethiopians. Yet all people have characteristics that show that, under this variable coloring, they belong to one race. So there just isn't a white race.

Question. How did the different races come about?

Answer. First, let's notice that there was plenty of time, if current scientific thinking is correct. Second, let's recognise that no two individuals are exactly alike. This is variation. It goes on all the time, among all peoples. Given hundreds of thousands of years, there was plenty of time for a significant amount of change. Finally, every land is different and puts different kinds of strain on human beings. This tends to favor some variations over others. This process we call selection. Selection acting an immense amount of time on the constant variation found among any group of human beings can create, biologically, permanent, notable differences. These are racial differences.

Question. That sounds reasonable. But why should Negroes be dark-skinned, frizzly-haired, flatnosed, and thicklipped?

Answer. Negroes are tropical people, historically. They are found close to the Equator in Africa and in southeast Asia, including the island world north of Australia. They apparently have been there for a very long time. They have, in a sense, developed a permanent tan. Tropical sun is a terrific burden for fair-skinned people.

The short, curly hair of Negroes is fun to think of in the reverse. I notice around the office that in summer our long-haired girls pause in their typing to lift the hair off the back of their necks. The Negro girl, with a naturally cool hairdo, never has to do this. Her race lived in hot lands a long time. Her type of skin and hair, best suited to such lands, is unlikely to be an accident.

There are even more such traits. Negroes are short trunked and long limbed. This type of body construction gives the maximum of surface in proportion to body bulk. This is advantageous for losing heat—and in warm climates this is a great help. As for the flat noses and thick lips, we lack adequate explanation.

Question. It is easy enough to see that for the Negro, but let's see you apply the influence of environment to the Mongols.

Answer. No difficulty. Let's start with body form. The Negro's relatively lean body form is at one extreme and the Mongols are at the other. Mongols tend to have short, thick bodies and relatively short limbs. The classic Mongol homeland is Inner Asia, a land of great winter cold. The body build of Mongols is good for heat conservation.

Europeans live in a variety of climates—from the hot areas of North Africa, to the mild areas of the Mediterranean, to the cold areas of northern Europe. As you might expect, Europeans are variable in body form.

Hair form is also interesting. Negroes have the shortest hair, and the more northerly races have the longer hair. The Mongols are beardless, as are the Negroes, while the Europeans are bearded.

Question. How come the Mongols don't have beards? In a very cold climate, it seems such a homegrown muff would be very useful.

Answer. In a really cold climate, your breath freezes in your beard, and you are soon wearing an ice mask. Even north Europeans live in areas that are only moderately cold. Mongols live in lands of extreme cold. Most of Europe is between 30° and 50° in January, while the inner Asian homeland of the Mongols is between minus 20° and plus 10° in January. This makes the difference between having your breath freeze in your whiskers and having your whiskers protect your face.

That a beard and long hair are snug features in breezy, damp, cold weather is a fact well known to those that ride motorcycles. However, since beards and long hair are out of style, except in some rather odd social circles, we don helmets, neckerchiefs, and other equipment to achieve the same protection.

Question. That sounds good for beards. How do you explain a white skin?

Answer. Interestingly enough, the white skin really is something to be explained. All of mankind is brown skinned and dark haired and brown eyed, except for one odd group. Only the northwest Europeans are light skinned, light eyed, and odd in hair color. When you consider what a handicap it is to be fair skinned, you can guess that there would have to be some very good reason for being light skinned. Light-skinned people are found in one of the dampest, cloudiest, and most sunless regions of the world. Besides northwest Europe, there are other such regions: the northwest coast of America, the southwest coast of South America, the South Island of New Zealand, and the island of Tasmania. Of all these areas, only the European was reached by man at a very early time. Access to the others was blocked by seas or by arctic cold. Is it an accident that we have light-skinned people in the cloudiest part of the earth that man could reach in the earliest time? It hardly seems likely.

But what selective factor was at work? It would have to be a strong one to overcome the unhappy effects of sunburn.

We have found the clue to this in the slums of London. There, light- and dark-skinned races live side by side in similar economic circumstances. The dark-skinned children have a much greater amount of rickets than do the light-skinned children. Rickets is related to poor diet, with a lack of needed vitamins, the kind of vitamin that can be created by irradiating the fats of the skin with sunlight. Dark skins block off the deep penetration of the sun's rays. Light skins let it in to do its beneficial work.

For a very long time, food supplies were often short, especially in winter. Malnutrition would then be common. Vitamin deficiencies would exist. Those individuals that could get a boost even in the dim winter sun of northwest Europe, most of which is in the latitude of Newfoundland, had a valuable asset. The lighter skinned had a better chance to survive in the sunless winters of the northwest. The effect of this kind of selection, over a great period of time, has been the emergence of fair-skinned, northwest European types out of an originally olive- or brown-skinned type of man.

Question. Does this variation go more than skindeep? Are there psychological differences?

Answer. Yes. Negroes apparently have been exposed to malaria longer than the rest of mankind. We find they have a blood specialty called sickle cell anemia that is linked with resistance to malaria. Then, too, we are belatedly learning that there are some differences in basal metabolism between most of mankind and some of the people who lived virtually unclothed and unhoused in cold climates. The natives of southern Australia and those of Tierra del Fuego at the extreme southern tip of South America had apparently changed slightly to be able to withstand those conditions. We know of racial differences in blood types and in reaction to specific drugs.

Question. Does this mean that the races are mentally different?

Answer. We suspect that they are, but it is interesting that we cannot prove it.

This suggests that the differences are rather small.

Question. If you think that there may be some differences, why don't you use intelligence tests to determine the mental rank of each of the races?

Answer. We would, if we knew how. As those who use tests are first to state, however, it is very hard to know when you are testing native ability and when you are testing social and economic background, as well as motivation. We know these to be powerful influences.

Question. There certainly have been European, Mongol, and American Indian civilizations. How do you account for the lack of a distinct Negro civilization?

Answer. This is perhaps the most difficult problem to answer. It is, however, accessible to reasoning. First, there has been only one origin of civilization. This came in the Near East. All the rest of the world that came to the level of civilization can be shown to have gotten their basic start from that one center. This is true even for the American Indians, who seemed to have gotten their ideas via India and China, who in turn had gotten them from the Near East.

All the people who were out of the line of this flow of ideas remained backward. There were also laggards in all races. Even northwest Europeans were laggards for a very long time.

The Negro parts of the world were all far from the center of ideas. Negro Africa is blocked off by great deserts. The Negro world of the Pacific is remote from the Near East. Once developments moved at a quickened pace, men with advanced ideas simply went around areas held by peoples with greatly retarded cultures. The Spanish took one look at the wonders of California and went back to Mexico. There were settled, tractable, and taxable Indians there. The California Indians were too retarded culturally to yield any harvest to anyone except a missionary.

A most interesting case of such lagging is found among the Ainu of Japan. They are a white race. The Japanese found them in posession of the islands. They treated them just as we did the Indians, and today the remnants of the Ainu live on reservations.

Question. But aren't great opportunities now opening up to the Negro?

Answer. Yes. The real test of the Negro people is now before them. The spread of ideas around the world is moving at an ever-quickening pace. We cannot expect to see instant results. The Negroes' opportunity in this country began 100 years ago, when they were freed. We are just beginning to see what the relatively few number of Negroes who have had the good fortune and ability to get an education can do. Perhaps the number of Negro doctors and professors and businessmen is quite a good response to the limited opportunity they have had.

Question. What about the future? Will we go on becoming more and more different?

Answer. No. The process of the past is now reversing. In the past, men lived in tiny groups, each traveling exceedingly little. This is a condition ideal for allowing the local variations to become fixed and for great differences to arise. Today, we have great masses of mankind with ever-increasing mobility. All of mankind seems to be on the move. In the recent past, we have been more and more rapidly moving toward convergence, through the mixing of races.

Question. Are we still "varying" and being "selected"?

Answer. Certainly. Look at your own children. No two are alike, and none is exactly like his parents. Selection is still going on, but it is a different set of things that are now being selected for. I suppose that we in America are being selected for resistance to heart failure, ulcers, and ability to live in large communities. Where selection in the past was mostly for resistance to physical forces, we now have adequate housing and clothing for countering heat and cold and can take vitamin pills if we need them—which we seldom do. But social forces have grown more complex. We are probably already pointed toward a more sociable type of man.

Englewood Students Voice Opinions on U.N. on Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is the responsibility of each succeeding generation to try to understand and solve the problems of their time. Those who meet this task are always only a few. I am encouraged to find youngsters who promise to rise to meet the demands of their world.

The following article from the Newark Evening News of September 23, by Josephine Bonomo, describes the project of a group of junior high students who are most certainly preparing to accept their responsibilities.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGLEWOOD STUDENTS VOICE OPINIONS ON U.N. ON TAPE

(By Josephine Bonomo)

ENGLEWOOD.—The scene was a classroom and the voices were those of teenagers, but the problems being discussed were those that the whole world is concerned with now.

As a tape recorder captured their thoughts, 11 boys and girls at Englewood Junior High School discussed the future of the United Nations. Sometime next week, the tapes will speed across the continents to take those thoughts to teenagers in South Africa and New Zealand and to ask for an exchange of views.

"We want to know how those people feel about the subjects we talk about," Barbara Shomer, chairman of the group, explained at a rehearsal session last week.

Although Babs and the other boys and girls in the group are sophomores at Dwight Morrow High School this year, they started the project last spring when they were ninth graders at the junior high. The group met after school as part of a voluntary special projects program guided by Theodore S. Davis, school principal, and a faculty adviser. They concentrated on discussing world events.

SENT OUT LETTERS

When they decided they wanted to bring other teenagers round the world in on their discussions, Davis help them to send out letters to departments of education in 30 different countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, proposing an exchange of views.

The response was good and the tapes prepared this week will go to the Union of South Africa and New Zealand as the first two countries responding. They will be played in schools in those countries and it is hoped that the students there will send back their own impressions and opinions.

To prepare the recordings, the 11 students returned to the junior high after school for the last 2 weeks. They decided the topics they wanted to discuss were the United Nations, integration and the Berlin crisis, but only the first two matters were included on the first tapes. Eighth and ninth graders at the junior high were invited to sit in on the sessions so that they could carry the project on in the future.

Babs asked for volunteers to prepare a 3-minute introduction on the United Nations. After that, the discussion was spontaneous.

"Watch your slang," Babs cautioned. "They won't understand it."

Andrew Halvorsen and Mark Macomber tried out their introduction.

"This is an important time for the United Nations," Andy said. "With the world in crisis, it is important for the U.N. to come to decisions and to find solutions for our problems. The U.N. should be strengthened so that it can work effectively."

BIG U.N. ISSUE

Mark continued, "The big issue before the U.N. now is the successor to Dag Hammarskjold as Secretary General. Will it be able to stay together without him? Will it have the same power? The Russians insist on a 3-man board of Secretaries, while the Western Powers insist on a single Secretary. Will this end in a stalemate?"

From the students grouped in a circle, the answers came fast.

Mike Grabow said, "The Russians will use all their power to keep a man like Hammarskjold out of that post. They'll use every trick in the book. And we'll try to keep their choice out."

Lee Taplinger was more optimistic. "The Russians forced the Secretary before Hammarskjold to resign and no one knew Hammarskjold at all until he walked in. We may not know of another man who is just as capable and he may just walk in."

Judy Johnston interposed, "I think we should give our opinion of how well the U.N. has done its work—examples of times when it has been effective and times when it has not."

The other students nodded agreement.

"Should we ask questions at the end of our discussion?" one asked. "Maybe we should ask questions about their country."

It was decided to devote 25 minutes of each tape to the U.N. and 25 minutes to the problem of integration. The response to the initial tapes will determine what will be done in the future. It has already been suggested that the Englewood tapes might also be sent to other schools in this country.

The tapes were recorded Thursday evening. Other members of the group were Lynn Etish, Robert Zorn, Kathie Ernst, Nancy Rosenberg, and Joan Holliday.

Let's Fly the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial by Roelif Loveland, which appeared in a recent issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

LET'S FLY THE FLAG, PLAIN DEALER URGES

(By Roelif Loveland)

There's a steady thud of nuclear explosions in Soviet Russia, and our own West trembles underground.

What can the average American citizen do about the frightening world situation? The big decisions won't be his.

There is one thing he can do. He can rally 'round the flag, and he can display the Stars and Stripes on appropriate occasions to show that he is but one of millions who are united, calm, aware of what the future may bring—and brave enough to accept it.

The Plain Dealer believes that great good could come from displaying our national colors on Veterans Day, November 11, and on other national holidays, from one end of Cuyahoga County to the other. Far better to look at this symbol of hope than to let the present tense situation lead us to despair.

Scoffers and cynics will say: "Displaying the flag doesn't make a man a patriot." Scoffers and cynics be damned.

Of course such a display doesn't make a man a patriot, but a great turnout of flags will say to the young man who is sweating it out in the White House: "Mr. President, some of us voted for you and a lot of us didn't. But wherever the treacherous road may lead you, you won't be going it alone. We're behind you all the way."

FLAG IS A SYMBOL OF OUR UNITY

Our flag is a symbol. But it is a symbol which binds us together, rich and poor, black and white, yellow and red, Catholic, Protestant, Jew, as nothing else can do.

For its component parts are more than stars and stripes; they are the graves of those who have died that we might live; they are the hopes of our children and our children's children for a brighter day; they are all the things we hope to improve in our Nation so that all men may have the same advantages; they are courage in times of trouble and faith in the loving and understanding hand of God.

We have observed over the years that some homes, many of them modest ones, some more pretentious, do fly the American flag. But more should—in fact all should, especially at such special times as Veterans Day. (Even at this early date, a commitment of mind and a check on the availability of a flag and a means of display are in order.)

The Plain Dealer therefore urges, in all sincerity and in all seriousness, that the American flag be flown from every home in Cuyahoga County on November 11 as a token that we stand together in an increasingly frightening world, and as a pledge to those who lie in foreign lands and in the cemeteries of the North and South, that courage still remains an American attribute, and that Nikita, should he blow the whistle, will discover that he has made his biggest mistake.

Hon. Sumner Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many persons in many nations were saddened today to read of the passing of Sumner Welles yesterday in Bernardsville, N.J. He will be remembered as one of the workers for peace, a diplomat who helped shape many of the great proposals made by our Nation at critical times during the thirties and forties.

Today, as we work toward a full-scale alliance for progress with Latin American nations, we have become more aware than ever of the contribution made by Mr. Welles in this area. He foresaw many of the difficulties that now must be overcome. He warned us against the dangers of the Castro regime long before there was widespread recognition of those dangers. He not only originated the term "good neighbor policy"—he tried to carry it out to the utmost.

The New York Times today has summed up Mr. Welles' accomplishments with a news story and an editorial. A review of those accomplishments is well worth making.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial and news story appearing in the New York Times of September 25, 1961, inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and news story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMNER WELLES

Sumner Welles was a fine example of a vanishing breed of diplomat. Tall, elegant, reserved, precise, sophisticated, and superbly professional—these are characterizations that immediately come to mind in thinking of Mr. Welles.

He reached as high as a career diplomat can in our foreign service—Under Secretary of State—and he served in many capitals of the world. However, Sumner Welles will always be most strongly connected in the history books with Latin America. It would be

hard to think of any American career officer of the last half century who was as familiar with and so respected in Latin America as Mr. Welles.

At the height of his career—the decade from 1933 to 1943—it is no exaggeration to say that Sumner Welles made American policy toward Latin America more than any other diplomat or official. And this was the great period of the flourishing of the good neighbor policy under Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was a lifetime friend and admirer of Sumner Welles. It was an unhappy day for the United States and for Latin America when a quarrel with Secretary of State Cordell Hull over Latin America led Mr. Welles to resign from the Foreign Service.

The years that followed were fruitful in a literary sense, although Mr. Welles is most likely to be remembered for his vivid history of Santo Domingo (now the Dominican Republic) published in 1928.

Sumner Welles was in the best sense a diplomat of the old school, when diplomacy was personal and professional. Few Americans were better known or more highly regarded in the chanceries of the world than he. There is no fear that he will be forgotten, for he made his mark on the history of the 20th century.

SUMNER WELLES, 69, DIPLOMAT, IS DEAD

BERNARDSVILLE, N.J., September 24.—Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, died early today at the family home of his wife after a brief illness. He was 69 years old.

Mr. Welles, who was in the diplomatic service for a quarter century before leaving the Government in 1943, was credited with having originated the phrase "good neighbor policy" to characterize the aims of the Roosevelt administration toward the Latin American Republics.

He was among the first U.S. diplomats to carry forward his country's policy to halt dollar diplomacy and armed intervention in Latin America. In his long and mainly successful dealings with these countries he sought to avoid any traces of the patronizing attitude so annoying to Latin Americans.

During his career as a diplomat, Mr. Welles' precise and lucid mental process, together with his wide knowledge of modern political history and political economy, won him wide respect.

His many important diplomatic missions included a swing around the principal capitals of Europe just before World War II in an attempt to establish facts upon which his country might act for peace.

As chairman of a State Department committee formed during World War II to outline postwar international cooperation plans, Mr. Welles drafted proposals later used in modified form as the basis of the United Nations.

Mr. Welles was born in New York on October 14, 1892. He was a son of Benjamin and Frances Weyth Swan Welles and a grandnephew of U.S. Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, one of the leading antislavery orators. After graduating from Groton School, he received an A.B. degree from Harvard in 1914 and entered the State Department, partly through the influence of a family friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

He was efficient, precise and reserved and went rapidly to the top after having held minor posts in the Tokyo and Buenos Aires Embassies. By 1920, Mr. Welles was Assistant Chief of the Division of Latin American Affairs of the State Department and gained much field experience as a general utility man on diplomatic and diplomatic-financial missions to such places as Haiti and Honduras.

After a tour of duty with a U.S. financial mission in Santo Domingo, Mr. Welles wrote a book called "Naboth's Vineyard," using the theme of a Bible story in which Naboth is murdered at the instigation of the Jezebel to obtain his vine field. In Mr. Welles' book the Dominican Republic was Naboth's vineyard and the United States was Jezebel.

WAS ENVOY TO CUBA

When Mr. Roosevelt entered the White House in 1933 and Cordell Hull became Secretary of State, Mr. Welles became Assistant Secretary of State. His knowledge of Cuban affairs prompted President Roosevelt and Hull to send him to Cuba as Ambassador, a post that he held from April to December of 1933. He was succeeded by Jefferson Caffrey and returned to his post as Assistant Secretary of State.

After William Phillips became Ambassador to Italy and his place as Under Secretary of State became open, Mr. Welles and R. Walton Moore, both Assistant Secretaries, were considered for the promotion, which went to Mr. Welles on May 21. The post of counselor was revived for Mr. Moore.

World War II seemed to be in the making and, as a high officer in his country's first line of defense, Mr. Welles proposed a White House meeting of foreign Ambassadors to discuss world peace. It was a spectacular bid for world accord and it was favored at first by Mr. Roosevelt, but Japan and the other so-called aggressor nations were lukewarm to it. The conference was not held.

Mr. Welles' success in keeping his Government informed during the 1938 Munich crisis won Mr. Hull's praise and after the outbreak of World War II Mr. Welles headed the U.S. delegation of the American Republics' peace conference in Panama City.

The conference, held 3 weeks after the start of the war, declared a 300-mile-deep neutrality zone about the Western Hemisphere, but the belligerent countries paid no attention to it. Mr. Welles represented the United States at a meeting of an Inter-American Financial and Economic Committee in Washington that year.

SENT ON TOUR BY ROOSEVELT

On February 9, 1940, about 4 months before the sitdown war gave place to the allout war, Mr. Roosevelt announced that Mr. Welles would visit Rome, Vatican City, Berlin, Paris, and London as his personal representative on a factfinding mission. Mr. Hull was not enthusiastic about Mr. Welles' mission, which did, in fact, produce a crop of rumors. One of them was that Mr. Welles was empowered to negotiate a peace-at-any-price settlement that would have aided the Germans.

Some time later, recalling his 1940 European trip, Mr. Welles wrote that he had found Mussolini of Italy overweight and had noted that he sipped a hot brew and kept his eyes closed during most of the interview. Somewhat to his surprise, Mr. Welles found Hitler dignified and his voice low and well modulated.

Neville Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Britain spoke of Nazi aggression with white-hot anger and Edouard Daladier, Premier of France, was lucid, vivid, realistic, Mr. Welles found. He also called Pope Pius XXIII one of the constructive forces working for the regeneration of mankind.

Upon his return, Mr. Welles made a report to President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull that Mr. Hull called superb in its mature insight and well-ordered expression of opinion.

Before going to Europe, Mr. Welles had accepted an important position on the Advisory Committee on Problems of Foreign Relations formed by Mr. Hull. Later Mr. Welles was chairman of one of this group's subcommittee that prepared plans for a postwar organization that eventually became the United Nations.

AT CHURCHILL CONFERENCE

The next year Mr. Welles was among those who accompanied President Roosevelt to the historic meeting with Sir Winston Churchill aboard the battleship *Prince of Wales*, off Newfoundland, that resulted in the Atlantic Charter.

After the United States entered World War II, Mr. Welles headed delegations to the Panama neutrality conference and to the 21-nation hemisphere solidarity conference that opened at Rio de Janerio on January 15, 1943. Mr. Welles' energetic maneuvering was followed forthwith by declarations of war on the Axis by all of the conferring countries except Argentina and Chile.

For some time, however, Secretary Hull and Mr. Welles had not been in complete agreement on several important phases of foreign relations. The differences between Mr. Welles and his immediate superior were discussed widely in the press and on September 30, 1943, Mr. Welles resigned and devoted himself largely to writing commentaries on foreign affairs.

In addition to "Naboth's Vineyard," published in 1928, Mr. Welles was the author of a number of books, including "Four Freedoms" (1942), "The Time for Decision" (1944), "Where Are We Heading?" (1946), "We Need Not Fail" (1948) and "Seven Decisions That Shaped History" (1950).

After his retirement from the Government, Mr. Welles spent much time at his country home, Oxon Manor at Oxon Hill, Md., not far from Washington. On December 27, 1949, he was found unconscious in a woods on his estate, suffering badly from exposure. He was taken to a Washington hospital where it was feared that amputations might be necessary. Mr. Welles recovered without surgery, however.

HAD HEART ATTACK

He explained that he had been stricken with a heart attack while taking a walk in the woods to overcome insomnia, and that he had fallen unconscious.

Mr. Welles had spent most of his time in recent years either at his home, 1840 24th Street NW., Washington, or at his summer residence at Bar Harbor, Maine. He had withdrawn completely from public affairs since his 1949 illness.

His clubs included the Metropolitan in Washington and the Knickerbocker and Union of New York.

In 1915, Mr. Welles married Miss Esther Slater, daughter of Horatio Nelson Slater 2d, a Webster, Mass., cotton manufacturer. They had two sons, Arnold Nelson Welles and Benjamin Welles, correspondent for the New York Times in Spain.

The marriage was terminated by divorce in 1923, and 2 years later he married Mrs. Mathilda Scott Townsend Gerry, former wife of U.S. Senator Peter Goelet Gerry of Rhode Island.

His second wife died in 1949, and in 1952 Mr. Welles married Mrs. Harriette Post, who had resumed her maiden name after divorce from Baron Emerich von Jeszensky. The third Mrs Welles is a daughter of the late George B. Post, a founder of the New York Stock Exchange firm of Post & Flagg.

Surviving besides his widow and two sons are a sister, Mrs. Harry Pelham Robbins, of Southampton, Long Island, and six grandchildren.

A brief service for Mr. Welles was held this afternoon at the residence where he died. This was to be followed by cremation, as Mr. Welles had requested.

A memorial service will be held at St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church in Washington on Tuesday at 4 p.m. An additional service will be held at St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church in New York on Friday at 2 p.m.

Sam Rose Addresses Annual Meeting of Spanish War Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SAM ROSE ADDRESSES ANNUAL MEETING OF SPANISH WAR VETS

Sam Rose, chief of contact at the Veterans' Administration, was one of the featured speakers at the annual convention of the United Spanish War Veterans at Little Rock, Ark., this week. Following is the text of Rose's address:

Mr. Chairman, Commander in Chief Howard, National President of the Auxiliary Mrs. Cone, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to bring you the warm greetings of our Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr.

Let me give a hearty salute to C. E. M. Howard, your commander in chief, J. H. McElroy, your adjutant general; all of the rest—fine, dynamic men, men much younger in spirit than the number of their years would indicate.

It gives me a deep feeling of pride and pleasure to appear at another of your encampments—63 national encampments. What an amazing record. The record of your encampments spans all those inventions and developments, good and bad, that we view as essential parts of our way of life.

While you were meeting in your first encampment, a curious and inventive mechanic was tinkering in a barn in Dearborn, Mich. His name, Henry Ford, and his tinkering changed the habits of America.

While you were gathering in your fifth encampment, two brothers were stealing time from their bicycle repairing to devour all the books they could find about how birds could fly and how gliders could stay up in the air. Soon the sands of Kitty Devil Hill in North Carolina were to witness the miracle of men with wings, and the age of airpower dawned on the unsuspecting world.

While you met in your 44th encampment, a group of dedicated men worked day and night under the west stands of an athletic field at the University of Chicago. The result of their work was spectacular; for those men first liberated and controlled the power within the atom.

You have seen the birth of the automobile, the airplane, the atom, and now the exploration of outer space. What an exciting time to have lived. And how your fellow Americans look up to you for without a doubt you bear, nobly and with dignity, the history of our country on your shoulders. And a very vital and significant part of our history was your war, the war with Spain, the war that endowed each of you here with everlasting memories, your war that forever etched the names of San Juan Hill and the jungles of the Philippines into the annals of American bravery.

You served your country well and faithfully in the Spanish-American War and you are still serving in the same exemplary manner in 1961. No group wears a prouder badge of courage and honor than that to which your membership, by your service and sacrifice, is richly entitled. For you are distinguished not only by your exploits in combat, in time of war, but equally by your many contributions, and the constancy of your patriotism, in this difficult peace.

For service seems to be a keyword in your organization. You give of yourself in service to veterans in our hospitals; you provide an inspiration to your fellow citizens of all ages; you contribute to others every day of your lives.

We sincerely hope every day of your lives will be filled with the satisfaction that comes with dedicated service. For do your members really retire at any age? Not a United Spanish War veteran. Not as long as there is work to be done or a contribution to be made. And that is the secret of the youth of this organization—for age is not measured in years, but in spirit, and you men have found the Fountain of Youth more certainly than Ponce de' Leon. Your spirit has found its Fountain of Youth in unselfish service and patriotic dedication to America. You have earned the respect and yes, the love of all America, and we of the Veterans' Administration consider it an honor and privilege to salute you.

We consider you very special veterans.

Let me give you a few facts to show you just how special we think you are. Our most up-to-date records show that there are some 29,000 Spanish War veterans on our pension rolls. In addition, VA checks are being mailed regularly to the surviving dependents of 76,000 deceased Spanish War veterans. A total of about $124 million was paid out to veterans and to the dependents of deceased Spanish War veterans during the past fiscal year. On an average day of the year, such as today, September 18, 1961, you wil find about 1,400 Spanish War veterans receiving VA hospital care. You will also find some 200 others as members of our domiciliaries.

I am so proud and enthusiastic about the VA medical program that today I want to touch on just one—but a very important facet of it—the VA medical program for the aging.

VA's attack will be twofold: Adding years to the life of veterans and, what's more important, adding life to the years of veterans. Behind all of VA's many activities in behalf of the aging veteran—medical, social, economic, lies a single thread of philosophy which is true for all humanity.

Life is precious, is glorious—at any age.

The Veterans' Administration with its 170 hospitals from one border of our land to the other is rapidly becoming the Nation's largest center for research into the ailments of an aging population. Almost one-third of VA's medical research is related to the aging and, at present, our personnel is actively engaged in approximately 2,500 projects in this field. This would include, among many others, heart conditions, arthritis, and studies on the aging process of the older person. These studies include patients in hospitals and outpatient clinics. In the field of outpatient care there are specific studies of the Spanish-American War veterans underway at Brooklyn, San Francisco, and Boston. There is a VA-wide study of cancer. This is a cooperative study with private medicine and medical schools, which includes a survey of the various diagnostic tests and treatment procedures, chemical, X-ray and surgical.

There are thousands of outpatient visits by Spanish-American War veterans to our clinics and private physicians under the VA program each year. Our outpatient care also covers home visits by physicians and nurses.

I know I do not have to tell you these things to prove to you that you are remembered, and respected, and thought about every day as our senior citizens, beloved by all Americans.

Thank you again, my dear friends, for allowing me to come to your encampment, and for your kind invitation to address you. You have honored me by your invitation.

To paraphrase the words of Heinrich Heine:

"The years keep coming and going,
Men will arise and depart;
Only one thing is immortal:
The remembrance in your countrymen's hearts."

Ammunition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, soon to appear is the first edition of a newsletter edited by Miss Martha Rountree whose distinction as a television and radio personality has been recognized for many years. I ask unanimous consent that this first edition entitled "Ammunition" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMMUNITION—VOLUME 1, ISSUE 1

We as a nation should be alerted: There is a danger that many of our top secret messages could be intercepted by Soviet agents right under our noses.

There is a very real danger that secret messages to and from various sensitive agencies around the world; to and from our allies; to and from the U.N., could be intercepted, copied or tampered with by the enemy.

One reason for this is that many of the communication lines (the tie-lines and leased lines used for telegrams and cables) are serviced by the American Communications Association, a union which had repeatedly been found to be a Communist-controlled organization. This union was expelled from the AFL–CIO in 1950 for following a policy that was directed "toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party."

It has been stated by experts that the possibility of sabotage in the communications area was the greatest danger to our national defense.

The fact that there is a danger calls for a thorough congressional investigation and then legislation that will eliminate the danger of espionage through or sabotage to our communications system.

Back in 1956 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held hearings on this situation. At the time, the General Counsel for the Defense Department was Wilber Brucker, who later became Secretary of the Army. Brucker confirmed the story in testimony before the committee.

In the fall of 1960 the House Committee on Un-American Activities heard testimony on Communist penetration of communications facilities which proved a danger to our security still exists.

Recently, following inquiries from constituents, Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, asked the Department of Defense for an explanation. This was the Pentagon reply:

"Persons servicing Department of Defense communications lines do not, simply because of the nature of their work, have access to classified information or to locations designated as 'restricted areas,' and that before persons whose work requires access to classified information or to restricted areas are permitted such access, they must first have been granted an authorization for access to such information and areas."

Right here, we would like to quote the testimony of the Defense Department's General Counsel, Mr. Brucker, to the investigating committee when he was asked:

"Is there any way that the Defense Department could preclude access under existing law, preclude access to the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon to per-

sons in the American Communications Association, a Communist-dominated organization?"

Brucker's answer: "I know of none."

Another question:

"In other words, at the present time, although the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon are serviced by a Communist-controlled organization, the Defense Department, is under existing law, helpless to protect itself?"

Brucker: "To that extent it certainly is."

And this question, a very important one.

"Are you cognizant of the fact that there has been testimony before the Internal Security subcommittee to the effect that persons under the discipline of the Communists controlling the American Communications Association now have access to messages coming from the Pentagon by a monitor system whereby they can plug in, listen to conversations?"

"Regrettably, yes, I know that."

Another question:

"Are you conversant with the facts which have been revealed by the Internal Security subcommittee of the Senate to the effect that restricted telegrams coming in from the Pentagon have been intercepted by persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?"

Brucker: "I am aware of that."

And this question:

"Are you conversant with the fact that the North Atlantic cable which carries very important messages vital to the security of our Nation is now serviced by the American Communications Association, a Communist-controlled labor organization?"

Brucker answered: "I have learned that, too."

To set the record straight, one of the earlier questions directed to the Defense Department's General Counsel (later Secretary of the Army) Wilber Brucker at the time was:

"Are you aware of the fact that the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon at this very hour are serviced by the American Communications Association, which has repeatedly been found to be a Communist-controlled organization?"

The answer from Brucker was:

"I see your point and I am very glad that you raised that. Yes. And we are disturbed."

The committee then asked Brucker:

"And I take it, if I am not being a little bit redundant, that under present powers vested the Defense Department is absolutely helpless to cut off that access to the messages?"

Brucker answered: "That is correct."

Getting back to the letter from the Pentagon assuring the Senator that all was well * * * the letter says in part:

"It should also be noted in this connection that all classified messages are transmitted in code so that persons who may be engaged in servicing communication facilities are not in a position to gain knowledge of the content of messages."

Now on that very point, Brucker was asked:

"Are you at all conversant with the general, not the specific, the general technique of trying to break a code, one nation trying to break the secret code of another nation?"

Brucker: "Yes, I am."

Follow up question:

"You know of course, do you not that one of the techniques of trying to break a code is to have access to messages involved in sending that code, is that not correct?"

Brucker: "That is."

And then the $64 question:

"Is it not true that coded messages of the Pentagon, highly confidential coded messages of the Pentagon which go out over the tielines and leased lines serviced by the Communist-controlled American Communications Association are in such situation or status that they can be available to a monitoring system even though in code to persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?"

Brucker: "You have described it correctly."

The testimony was lengthy and is a matter of record—a record available to any American, or any Congressman and Senator who would care to request it, but we will conclude this particular testimony with just one more of the recorded questions and answers.

This question again directed to the Defense Counsel:

"And do you as the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, feel that that condition, that situation, is a large or at least a situation of grave concern to this Government?"

The answer—Brucker:

"I feel, sir, that that situation is nothing short of deplorable to be allowed to continue any longer than is absolutely necessary."

One Senator on the committee asked:

"In addition to the existing situation so far as monitoring is concerned, those people are always there to sabotage those very important communication lines, aren't they?"

The answer:

"They are, and while I would not describe or give any information of an unclassified nature, I know a place or places where that could occur with disastrous results."

The recent letter from the Defense Department to the New York Senator stated that:

"The authority of the Department of Defense to protect its sensitive information from untrustworthy persons does not include the power to expel these same individuals from the premises where classified work is being performed, and that the Defense Department does not consider it unreasonable to assume that there are some among those who continue to be employed on nonsensitive work in the same facility who constitute a physical threat to the security of the facility."

It is true that the Brucker testimony was taken 6 years ago. But, each year we have checked the situation and each year it has remained the same. The threat still remains. Only a few months ago, over in the House, the story was updated and found to still be the same. Legislation from time to time has been offered, but, as of today, little has passed.

The root of this cancer is buried at 60 Hudson Street, New York City—the Western Union Building—where employees are under the control of the American Communications Association (the union described as being Communist controlled), and certified by the National Labor Relations Board of the Government of the United States of America. Under this certification, Western Union is compelled to bargain and deal with the American Communications Association.

Daily, thousands of messages make the trip from Washington's Pentagon to the termination point or relay point at 60 Hudson Street, New York City. Here messages of all kinds are handled by employees, under the control or domination of the American Communications Association. Many of these messages are Government messages from the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force and other Government offices. Messages to the United Nations terminate at 60 Hudson Street. The members of the American Communications Association handle messages dispatched and received by the most vitally important department of our Government including the Pentagon and State Department. The Pentagon or the State Department will tell you that they have ways of coping with the situation, that they have special scrambling devices, that they check the employees who handle special classified material. The truth of the matter is they can't check everyone. There is no way of being sure. Even if the Pentagon were sure that all is under control there, they can't prove to you that all is under control at 60 Hudson Street, where there is good evidence to indicate things are under the control of Moscow. At 60 Hudson Street messages for overseas could be intercepted, lines and cables used in times of national emergency could be sabotaged.

If the American Communications Association did not represent the telegraphers at the New York office, the Commercial Telegraphers' Union would.

The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, AFL–CIO, has fought the American Communications Association for over 10 years. This year, 1961, in a printed statement to its membership, the CTU said:

"ACA is not affiliated with the AFL–CIO or any other American trade union organization. In fact, ACA was expelled from the CIO in 1950 for following a policy that is directed 'toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party'."

The same statement by the Commercial Telegraphers' Union, AFL–CIO, goes on to point out that:

"The ACA officers have refused for years to answer questions about their affiliation with the Communist Party. In 1951 the ACA officers were called before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate. The following ACA leaders, who are still leading ACA, hid behind the fifth amendment and refused to say whether they were members of the Communist Party: Joseph P. Selly, president of ACA; Dominick Panza, vice president of ACA; Charles L. Silberman, editor of ACA News; Victor Rabinowitz, attorney for ACA. Six years later, in 1957, the Senate subcommittee called Joseph P. Selly and other ACA officers once again. Selly hid behind the fifth amendment and refused to answer questions about Communist Party membership. He also refused to say whether other ACA officers were Communists. Furthermore, he took the fifth amendment when he was asked if ACA had ever contributed money to any organization controlled by the Communist Party.

The ACA officers have been identified as Communists by witnesses under oath. On August 9, 1957, Mrs. Concetta Padovani Greenberg appeared before the U.S. House Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington. She testified that she had been employed by Western Union as a D&A clerk at 60 Hudson Street, New York, since 1927. She was an ACA member and on the ACA local executive board. She testified that she had been a Communist Party member for 13 years. She stated under oath that she knew the following as Communist Party members: Joseph Selly, president of ACA; William Bender, vice president of ACA; Dominick Panza, vice president of ACA; Charles Silberman, editor of ACA News. She also named the following employees in New York as Communist Party members: Sally Freestone, Ruth Bollinger, Frank Lagos and Clair Feller.

(NOTE.—In view of the above history, it was not surprising to read in the New York Times a few months ago (Nov. 30, 1960) that Victor Rabinowitz, who has been ACA's attorney for years, was representing the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro in a lawsuit against certain banks in New York City.)

According to testimony before the U.S. Senate subcommittee the rank-and-file members of ACA were defeated by a crooked election in their attempts to elect officers of their own choosing. Witnesses testified under oath that in 1948 Jack Jacobson, who is now president of of ACA Local 40, picked up ballots from ACA members in branch offices and at 60 Hudson Street, took the ballots to a room in the St. George Hotel, opened them

and made out new ballots for all ACA members who had not voted for the "right" candidates. After these ballots were "corrected" by Jack Jacobson, they were mailed from various sections of New York City."

There is more on the record.

We are told by one source close to the Pentagon, to quote in part:

"The communications network of the Department of Defense, both in the United States and abroad, requires servicing by many thousands of persons. Included in this large number are some who are represented in collective bargaining arrangements by the American Communications Association which was expelled from the AFL–CIO in 1950, because it was considered to be Communist dominated. As the employees have selected the American Communications Association as their bargaining agent, the association must be recognized by the employer. The certification of the association as a bargaining agent is outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense.

"While there are some instances in which members of this union are engaged in servicing communication networks used by the military departments, every effort is made to insure that classified information is not disclosed. The Department's requirements specifically prohibit the use of commercial telephone, telegraph and radio circuits for the transmission of classified information. Only special circuits, which employ the most highly sophisticated coding, encrypting, and scrambling devices, are used for the transmission of classified information. Military communications experts are confident that the use of these devices on circuits reserved for classified traffic effectively safeguards messages against espionage.

"Although untrustworthy individuals may be denied access to classified information and may be barred from closed or restricted areas where classified work is being performed, the Department of Defense does not have legislative authority to exclude these same individuals from the private premises of industrial facilities, if the employer chooses to assign them to unclassified work. Consequently among those who continue to be employed on nonsensitive work in the same facility, it is reasonable to assume that there are some who may be disposed to commit sabotage or to engage in subversive activities. Moreover, there are many important facilities wherein no classified work whatsoever is performed, but which because of their specialized capabilities can be considered essential elements of our overall national defense complex. This includes not only a large number of prime and subcontractors, but many supporting service facilities such as power, transportation, communications, and other utilities.

"Several legislative proposals relating to the problem areas (H.R. 5424, H.R. 5425, and S. 1769) have been introduced in the present session of Congress. These bills would extend the security program so as to include employment in vital defense facilities, even though no classified information may be involved. Specifically, these bills would authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage or other subversion. The Department of Defense is keenly aware of the fact that legislation of this kind requires careful and deliberate consideration in order that the rights of individuals and the rights of the Government to protect itself are kept in proper balance.

"The Department of Defense is fully mindful of its responsibilities in this area and within the limits of its present authority has sought to provide suitable and effective measures to protect the Nation's secrets. Whether the legislative proposals referred to above, or some other types of legislation would best serve to safeguard our defense facilities against both espionage and sabotage are ultimately for the determination of the Congress."

Whenever something seems wrong in Washington, everybody blames the Government. This time Congress must share the blame. There is enough evidence to indicate the need for legislation. And so far as the Government is concerned, they too are in possession of enough evidence to demand action. If the Government worked as hard to get legislation on situations like this as they do for other kinds of legislation, we would all be able to sleep easier at nights.

Agencies and private industries supplying the tools for our national defense should not have to cope with the danger of Communist penetration in communications—or anywhere else, for that matter.

During almost every legislative session session since 1951, general hearings held to determine the underlying facts of Soviet peneration of the United States, have revealed that the American Communications Association, controlled certain termination and relay lines involving Washington. As late as last year the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report published through the Government Printing Office reveals testimony on page 407, given by Mr. Tyler Post, then Director of the Office of Security Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve, to the effect that the situation we have described here continues.

Imagine, a union, any union, under the domination of the Communist Party, taking orders from Moscow, in a position to intercept messages to our NATO officers, our allies, our ships at sea, our armed services, our Norad headquarters, our representatives at the United Nations—all being censored or intercepted first by agents of a foreign power. Imagine what could happen in the event of war. Telegraphers under the domination of Moscow planted at relay points could reword messages, warn the enemy, advise the enemy, point out military orders, give the location of ships and submarines at sea, and, in radio stations throughout the country (scheduled to go off the air or on a lower frequency in an emergency) could under the command of a Communist, stay on the air, give false information, provide a homing signal for missiles, submarines, planes, and direct enemy agents, propagandize—need we go any further?

We are sure that when this letter is circulated a cry will go up to the effect that everything is under control—that special checks are made on those handling classified information, that special devices are being employed to defeat this menace—special scrambling machines to insure the safe communication of coded messages of classified nature. Our answer: do we know if the Communists have keys to these scrambling machines? Remember the defection of the two from NASA whose defection caused the codes of the whole free world to be changed? Can we be sure that every single message is kept tucked tightly to the bosom of trustworthy people?

We are grateful that our Government employs such measures. We are annoyed that the taxpayers' money must be spent for double care to outwit enemies, but—why should these enemies be on the spot in sensitive areas in the first place?

You will hear that the American Communications Association is certified by the National Labor Relations Board and the members and officers of the American Communications Association ask "Would we be certified if we were Communists?" The answer to that question is "Yes."

Mr. J. L. Wilcox, vice president of employee relations for the Western Union Telegraph Co., testified that under the law Western Union is compelled to bargain with the American Communications Association.

A member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, during a hearing on Communist penetration of communications facilities, asked Mr. Wilcox:

"In view of the fact that the American Communications Association was expelled from the CIO because the CIO found that it consistently followed the Comamunist Party line, and in view of the fact that the officers who we have alluded to have been identified as Communists, why does Western Union bargain with the American Communications Association for these many facilities?"

Mr. Wilcox: "The answer to that, is very simple—simply because we feel we are obliged by law."

Question: "If you did not bargain with the American Communications Association on the various facilities on which they have been certified, you as a company would be in a positoin of engaging in unfair labor practice; is that correct, under the existing law as it is interpreted?"

Mr. Wilcox: "We certainly would."

Mr. A. Tyler Port, Director of the Office of Personnel Security Policy, has testified that the Department of Defense cannot assure the Congress of the American people that all reasonable measures have been taken to safeguard our national security because Communists are permitted to work in vital communication facilities. That the Defense Department understands that, regardless of what specific international development occurs, infiltration of the defense effort by agents of the Soviet Union is a continuing Moscow objective.

Mr. Port urged Congress to enact legislation providing the necessary means for excluding dangerous individuals from facilities considered vital to the national defense.

Unfortunately there is nothing in our laws saying it is a crime to be a Communist. For over 10 years that issue has been before the courts each time the Communist Party, U.S.A., has won out. But that's another story. Ammunition will tell you more of this one later.

Certainly legislation seems in order. To date, no adequate congressional action has taken place. Proposals still nestle deep down in the legislative hoppers, overlooked, forgotten, buried.

Congress should now enact legislation to protect the United States against all dangers in our communications system. Appropriate committees of the Congress should undertake speedily a study to determine what legislation is necessary to protect vital private and Government communications by telegraph, cable, telephone and radio from subversive activity.

The Department of Justice, acting under the Communist Control Act of 1954, should proceed against any Communist dominated unions which are functioning in defense work.

The NLRB should be given power to suspend a union from benefits under the Labor Relations Act when it find that officials of that union have filed false affidavits of non-Communist affiliation.

To conclude:

An investigation is needed now.

There is far too much evidence to dismiss the issue of Commuist penetration in communications.

We would hope that everything is cleaner than the proverbial hound's tooth, but if things aren't that way, we must act.

The concern of many that the problem is worse than indicated motivates us to deal with this ticklish issue first.

MARTHA ROUNTREE,
Editor.

P.S.—Next week we will document for you the story of the millions of dollars worth of strategic goods that your Government is permitting to be shipped to Russia and other Iron Curtain countries. It's an amazing story.

M.R.

Passing to the Offensive

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last June at Seattle University Dr. Charles Malik, a professor at American University in Washington and former president of the General Assembly of the United Nations, delivered the commencement address to Seattle University's graduating class. The subject of Professor Malik's address was timely in June and has been increasing in importance and relevance ever since. The address, entitled "Passing to the Offensive," deals with the complexion of the free world and is an indictment of the West's present attitude toward the insidious machinations of the Communist endeavor.

I heartily commend Professor Malik's effort and genius in presenting in an enviable manner this difficult topic and I request unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we have been on the defensive for many years now. We have allowed the Communists to make a mockery of our institutions, our beliefs and our system. We have been apologizing for our practices, our profits and our way of life. In Dr. Malik's words:

Morally and spiritually the Communists put you and me on the defensive; they talk in terms of "capitalism," "imperialism," "colonialism," "monopolies," "profits," "exploitations," "means of production"—all purely economic, purely materialistic terms.

And how do we engage ourselves in debate with them? We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the 19th century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people, and that, as to profits, everybody now shares in them.

Dr. Malik is, of course, right. We have been apologizing to the Communists and our voices have had a ring of feebleness and a sickly note of timidity. If we do not believe in our system, if we must continually go on the defensive, if we cannot face up to the Communist challenge and assert our pride in our heritage, our Nation, and our system, if we must grovel and whine, defend and apologize, why, then we deserve what the Communists have in store for us and we will have only ourselves to thank for whatever becomes our lot.

Dr. Malik says:

There are people and forces inside and outside the Western World whose effect is to undermine whatever unity there is in that world. I am not thinking of the Communists whose very purpose is to conspire in that direction. I am thinking of the soft-headed, the duped, the tired, the frightened, the sentimental, the superficial, the unauthentic, and the perfectly innocent who mean well. If these people have their way, freedom will finally fall by sheer division and default. An offensive must therefore be mounted on this front.

We are running out of second chances. We can mount an offensive geared to bring freedom to the Hungarys, the Laos, the Cubas, the East Berlins if we can find again the character and the courage and the firmness that make America the world leader it is today. If we heed Dr. Malik's advice and the advice of the many level-headed, clear thinkers in our midst and change our fumbling, groping tactics, then we will win the cold war.

The address follows:

PASSING TO THE OFFENSIVE
(By Dr. Charles Malik)

I

Those who have known in their lives and in their traditions the dignity of man and his freedom, those who for centuries have believed in, and have flourished on the basis of, the inviolability of the human person, have tended to be too much on the defensive. Often they have talked and acted as though they were in the wrong. A certain fright and timidity, nay a certain false modesty, has assailed them. Even if at times they find themselves apologizing for some shameful fact—and shame and apology could be signs of spiritual strength—they nevertheless appear to forget that in every sphere of life the offensive, if genuinely and rightly mounted, is the best means of self-defense. Nothing I believe is more needed today than for those who know and believe in God, truth, man, and freedom, to pass to the offensive.

There are five fronts in which it is necessary today to pass to the offensive. I may entitle these fronts the front of communism, the front of neutralism, the front of those who are engaged in undermining the unity of the Western World, the front of materialism, and the front of what I would term the least common denominator. The center of the first two fronts lies outside the Western World, the center of the last two fronts lies inside the Western World, and the center of the third front exists at once inside and outside.

II

Morally and spiritually the Communists put you and me on the defensive; they make us feel guilty, and we supinely accept the terms of their debate. They talk in terms of "capitalism," "imperialism," "colonialism," "monopolies," "profits," "exploitation," "means of production"—all purely economic, purely materialistic terms. And how do we engage ourselves in debate with them? We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the 19th century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people, and that, as to profits, everybody now shares in them. It is evident that there is about this response a pathetic air of apology, a ring of feebleness, a sickly note of timidity, and those who make it clearly suffer from a guilty conscience. When we thus accept to be drawn into debate with the Communists on their own terms we confirm them in the feeling that they were right; it is as though we were telling them, "You are right in your attack; we are sorry for our past ways; but behold, we have now corrected them."

This will not do. The Communists should be answered, not apologetically, not as though they were right, but in terms taking them completely off their guard. They should be answered in human, moral, and spiritual terms.

After saying two or at most three sentences on economic and social questions, or perhaps even before saying them, we should be in a moral-existential position ourselves to turn to these men and say to them:

What about freedom of thought and inquiry in your realm? Can people seek the truth really freely? Can they really dissent? Can they really question your fundamental presuppositions?

What about freedom of conscience and religion? Do you Communists go to Church? Do you fall on your knees and pray? And why do you persecute those who do?

What about human rights and fundamental freedoms? Which of these rights are really enjoyed by your people?

Tell us please, what is the object of your ultimate worship? Is it the theory of dialectical materialism? Is it atoms in motion? Is it force and revolution? Is it the satisfaction of your bodily and mental desires? Is it the Communist Party? Is it Marx and Lenin? And if they say it is Marx and Lenin, then we should be able to quote them some 50 statements by these men on moral and spiritual matters that would put them morally completely on the defensive.

What about the unity and the continuity of the tradition? Why is your movement an absolute break in that unity and that continuity?

Is there any free criticism of the government in your realm? Have your people ever been given a genuine free political choice?

What about your iron dictatorship? What about your police state?

What about the minority rule under which all Communist states languish?

What about the fact that, far from ever being chosen by the people, communism was always imposed by force by a handful of men?

What about the methods of subversion all over the world in which every dark trick of deceit and destruction is used?

What about the camps of forced labor?

What about Hungary, what about Tibet, what about the Chinese communes?

And since you always love to repeat that you are working day and night to "bury" us and that our children shall all be Communists, then let us assure you that in this you are completely mistaken, and that we are working day and night to liberate your people from your yoke, so that the day will come, and we trust soon, when the very names of Marx and Lenin shall be forgotten?

It is most important that the Communists be put on the defensive. It is most important that the total arsenal of political, moral, and spiritual values be brought to bear upon this struggle. Naturally, if we do not believe in the primacy of these political, personal, moral, and spiritual values, we will not bring them up at all, or we will bring them up with our tongue in our cheek. But to keep on talking only in their materialistic terms, to accept timidly their universe of discourse, to be constantly on the defensive vis-a-vis their onslaught, is already to have been vanquished by them.

One is not seeking to win a game of words and arguments: it is history and destiny that are at stake. I would certainly settle for losing the argument of words provided I win the contest of history. The pathos of the situation today is that the argument reflects the contest. It is most important therefore to develop and execute policies and actions that will put the Communists and their friends historically on the defensive. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must therefore pass to the offensive, not only of thought and conviction, but of that real, decisive, historical action which shall cause the Communists to take to their heels.

III

The neutralist front is becoming more and more significant. Those who, for whatever reason, wish to remain outside the gigantic world struggle between communism and freedom have every right to expect the rest of the world to respect their freedom.

As a matter of fact, real neutralism, implying real freedom of choice and real in-

dependence of judgment, is a triumph for the idea of freedom. The free world can only welcome it.

But a neutralist, rightly asking that his will be respected, has no right himself to impose his will on others. By his own logic, he must not object if others choose not to be neutral in this great struggle. Himself refusing to take a stand, the neutralist must respect those who do. A neutralist who is all the time working to extend the domain of neutralism, especially if this extension happens to be at the expense of only one side, is obviously not neutral.

Nor will one who really wishes to—and can—stay outside the struggle, play one side against the other. A neutralist in that case identifies his interests with the division of the world. He flourishes so long as there is tension; as soon as tension relaxes, he ceases to reap much value from his neutralism. Below a certain degree of tension, and above a certain degree of tension when the pressure increases considerably on the neutralist to take a stand, neutralism ceases to be profitable. A neutralist, beginning by wanting to serve peace and understanding, could easily develop vested interests in the absence of peace and the absence of understanding.

Then there is a neutralism that is, in fact, a Communist front. In a life-or-death struggle this kind of neutralism cannot be tolerated.

Policies at the United Nations; policies at home; fundamental pronouncements; the tenor of the press; international political, economic, and military arrangements; the whole political, spiritual, and ideological orientation of the nation—all these things can serve as tests to distinguish the genuine from the false type of neutralism.

One sometimes gathers the impression that the West is on the defensive with respect even to the neutralist world. Therefore, the needed offensive here is simply to welcome and support the neutralism that is genuine; to be so strong and self-confident that one will not fall for the neutralism that is a fake; and to measure neutralism always by the radical historic struggle whose issue will determine the fate of everybody, neutralist and nonneutralist alike. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must, while fully respecting the freedom of the true neutralist, nevertheless feel that in fighting for freedom, truth, and man, they are really assuming responsibility, not only for themselves, but for the ultimate interests of the neutralist nation itself.

IV

There are people and forces, inside and outside the Western World, whose effect is to undermine whatever unity there is in that world. I am not thinking of the Communists whose very purpose is to conspire in that direction. I am thinking of the softheaded, the duped, the tired, the frightened, the sentimental, the superficial, the unauthentic, and the perfectly innocent who mean well. If these people have their way, freedom will finally fall by sheer division and default. An offensive must, therefore, be mounted on this front.

England cannot be separated from Europe. Therefore, a determined effort must be made to heal the breach between the so-called inner six and outer seven.

France is an integral pillar of the West, and Western civilization is unthinkable apart from French culture. Therefore, France does not deserve an unequal treatment, and every force that tends to weaken or embitter or humiliate France must be resisted.

Germany must not be so slighted and intrigued against as to begin to think of neutralism as an alternative. Therefore, Berlin must not be abandoned, and those who desire a weak Germany must not prevail.

North Africa must be saved from chaos and bitterness. Therefore, the Algerians problem must be settled soon, with a view to developing a North Africa that is positive, cooperative, and friendly to the West.

Japan is vital to every balance in the Far East. Therefore, relations with Japan should be deepened further, in the service of freedom and man.

Latin America must not be allowed to drift toward neutralism and anti-Americanism. Therefore, far-reaching measures must be devised and prosecuted with a view to cleaning up the Western Hemisphere of the Communist virus and promoting the friendliest relations between Latin and Anglo-Saxon on the basis of their common civilization.

The United States cannot go it alone in the modern world. Therefore, isolationism, in all its subtle shades, should not have the last word, and America should embark on a bold, new policy of developing still more intimate relations with all her friends.

The impression is often gathered that, owing to national jealousies and conflicting national interests, the West is hopelessly divided on itself. A vigorous offensive for unity must, therefore, be mounted. For what is at stake today is not this or that nation, but the entirety of Western civilization, with its marvelous traditions of man, of freedom, of truth, and of God. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth must, therefore, sink all their national differences in the interest of their one common civilization, which is not so mortally threatened and so dangerously undermined.

V

I include many things under the front of materialism. Besides softness and the life of ease, besides the quest after money and material gain, besides the all-consuming passion after economic security, besides greed and covetousness, and besides trusting only our senses and what they deliver, besides these things I include the fundamental spiritual attitude which denies real order in the nature of things, which denies that there is a real objective higher and a real objective lower, which instead derives the higher integrally from the lower, which obliterates the dimension of rank, excellence, quality, depth, and which, therefore, knows no rest, no grace, and no ultimate peace.

But there is a higher and a lower in the nature of things. An animal is higher than a stone and a man is higher than an animal. And in man his moment of understanding is higher than his moment of bodily desire, and perhaps his love is even higher than his understanding.

Nothing is more needed today than a mighty spiritual offensive which will put the material in its place and restore to the spiritual its original primacy and preeminence. The mind that understands and creates, the spirit that suffers and sacrifices and loves and is at peace with itself, the fellowship of the pure and free and transparent, the joy of conversation and reason and sharing, the soul that rejoices in beauty and grace and being, the good will that is full of light and positive intent, God, the absolute mind, absolute spirit, absolute love, absolute reason, absolute grace, absolute goodness, absolute Being—these things come first, and everything else second. Man, it seems, can never learn this lesson; he must always invert the right order of values and put the lower things first. That is why God had to shock him out of his senses by dying for him on a cross, in order that at least while He remains hanging on the cross, man has no choice but to see that God comes first. All the gadgets, all the machines, all the economic security in the world, all the titillations of our senses, all the hungers of our body, are nothing compared to these things. And these things have a being and an efficacy and an origin completely independent of all matter, all body, all machines, all security, and all hungers of our nature.

This does not mean that I scorn or spurn or sneer at the wonderful products of industry. On the contrary, I look upon science and industry as among the most important benefactors of mankind, and upon their products as among the greatest monuments of the creative mind and spirit of man. And if I can afford it, and if I am not engaged in some mortifying exercise for the sake of something higher, I will always buy the best car, go to the best doctor, drink the finest wine, live in the finest house, and sleep on the most comfortable bed. And, what is more, I will always wish and work, not only for me to enjoy these marvelous products of industry, but also for others to enjoy them. The concept of economic and social justice is an absolutely valid concept. But he who does not know how man may become so ensnared and infatuated by these things as to lose the original, sharp edge of his soul, has still much to learn.

Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, cannot allow the creative sources of their being to be sapped by softness and materialism. Nor can they rise to the historic demands of the hour, in meeting the challenge of communism, in helping the noncommitted world, and in effecting the needed Western unity, except on the basis of the primacy of the mind and spirit. They must therefore rebel against the tyranny of the lower and reinstall the higher; on its legitimate throne.

VI

The question of the least common denominator is the distressing phenomenon of people without an enduring backbone. Because diverse points of view in this age are mingling and challenging each other on every turn, people with a weak backbone soon take on the color of those who surround them. This is very reminiscent of the parable of the sower in the Gospel where the seed has fallen among thorns, the thorns being the other points of view which so confuse us as to depress the truth to the least denominator common to all.

Let a Jew be present in a company of Christians, and the name of Christ can no longer be mentioned. Let a Catholic be present in a company of Protestants—or conversely—and the question of the Church is automatically muffled. Let a Moisem, or a Buddhist or a Hindu be present in a company of Christians, and soon you hear the statement that all religions are alike.

Let an atheist associate with people with faith, and soon the conversation turns to some political gossip or to social progress and the wonders of science. Let a man from Asia or Africa meet people from the West, and soon all that is important is technical assistance and the problems of development. Let a Communist meet a man from the free world, and soon the atmosphere is one of class struggle and pure economics.

Men of real backbone will never betray their fundamental convictions. They will never allow other points of view to dull or flatten their soul. They will at least remain silent, and silence often speaks a volume of words.

It is possible to be polite, without ever abandoning your convictions; it is possible not to offend, while absolutely remaining loyal to the best and deepest you know; it is possible to be understanding and helpful, without deluding others that you are one of them; it is possible to cooperate with others, while remaining firm in the truth as

God gives you to see the truth; it is possible to sacrifice yourself for them, without asking or expecting anything in return.

In this age of softness, appeasement and compromise, it is most essential that we pass to the offensive of holding fast to the deepest we know. The dimension of depth must be reopened with all its wonders. There is no excuse to live on the surface while the mysterious depths are beckoning us all the time. Who will remain the same man once he has really gone through the Book of Job or the Psalms of David or the Epistles of Paul or the wonderful Liturgy of Chrysostom or the incredible sufferings of Teresa or the unbelievable torments of Dostoyevsky? Once these mysterious heights are revealed, and with them and through them the infinite compassion and understanding and mercy of God, who can any longer live in the plains? In these matters what is possible is also necessary. Nothing is more tragic than if those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, should, in the intensity of the challenge, forget their principles or water down their beliefs. When the soul thus loses its integrity, none can respect it any more. Nor can it in the end respect itself.

The law of freedom does not require that all points of view should merge into a blur. All that is necessary is an order of mutual respect. Above all change and accommodation, one point of view should remain immovable and grounded as on a rock. When the darkness lifts, that which is held by the rock will lift all men unto itself. And its immovability will itself cause the darkness to lift.

VII

The present moment in history requires, more than any other moment in the past, that those who know and believe in man, freedom, truth and God, pass to the offensive on every front. The Communists must be put on the defensive by shifting the grounds of the battle from the economic and material to the moral and spiritual. The neutralism of the neutralists must not be allowed to weaken freedom and promote communism. Whatever the national sacrifices, the unity of the West must be strengthened fivefold. The primacy of the spiritual must be affirmed over all that is material, primitive, elemental. Those who know and believe in the truth must remain firm as a rock in their belief, whatever their association and whatever their trials.

To those of you who have completed their intellectual and spiritual preparation and are now leaving these halls of learning, this is my special message:

Live in this age—neither in the past nor in the dreams of your imagination. Understand that the battle which is now raging is perhaps the most decisive in history. Understand that the forces of darkness are joining hands on every side against all that is truth and God and light. Enter into the battle with all your enthusiasm and all your heart. Realize what an infinite honor it is to be living and engaged in the battle today. Never allow the enemy to put you on the defensive. Pass to the offensive on every front. In your own lives trust God despite all your frailties. He will save you in the end. You have seen great visions and you have dreamed great dreams. I beg you to remain faithful to the deepest you have known. In its own day it will lead you to the rock of certainty that can never be moved.

And when you have run your course, and you are about to receive the prize, may it be said of you that you overcame the powers of darkness, and may your heart then, in profound gratitude, reflect something of the humility that was Christ's, and of the joy of His victory over the world.

Our Forgotten Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Arizona Weekly Gazette an editorial entitled "Our Forgotten Heritage," written by the editor of that newspaper Mr. Henry Kiel. Because of the universal appeal of Mr. Kiel's message that we, as children of God, can find common strength in our spiritual beliefs to meet the threat of communism, I feel many of my colleagues will find this editorial of deep interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Our Forgotten Heritage," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FORGOTTEN HERITAGE

("Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?"—St. Matthew 7: 16.)

We grow too soon old, and too late smart.

Nostalgia will conjure up, for most people of German origin, varied circumstances when ancestors repeated this admonition.

Prior to the introduction of radio onto the American scene the church, as a rule, was the center of the social behavioral pattern. When leisure hour entertainment, or occupation, was needed, we went to church. Books were not too plentiful. Talking moving pictures with cinemascope, color, Todd-A-O, and other gimmicks, were unknown. Television, of course, was in the future.

Young people, needing companionship, and wanting an opportunity to be with their favorite friends, had to go to the church. This usually meant twice on Sunday, again Wednesday night for prayer meeting, and choir practice on Friday night.

When newly married couples started their own home, if they stopped going to church it was for a short period of time only. Upon the arrival of their first-born they took the child and went back to church so that he too could have benefit of tried, and trusted, footsteps in which to follow.

These were happy families. They needed no barbitals or other transquilizing opiates for sleep. When they retired for a night's rest it was with a feeling of having done their best in the sight of God and man. Honest toil and serenity sprang from fulfillment of duty. Each day was full and each night welcomed.

Technology, however, brought some changes—something happened.

Audio and visual home entertainment, sound-technicolor moving pictures, of fine dramatizations, offered ample employment of leisure time. Books on every subject became available in cheap paperback volumes. Practical education, on every phase of contemporary living, was subconsicously acquired while being entertained.

The church was no longer needed. It no longer was necessary to pray for good crops and an abundant harvest. Where soil analysis disclosed deficiencies, chemicals were added. If it failed to rain fields were irrigated. Harvests were so bountiful surpluses piled up.

A philosophy of materialism now, 40 years later, permeates national thinking where once there was room only for development of spiritual well-being and church teachings.

Materialism, it is true, has its place in our life. When communism began to threaten the Nation in this era of technology, it would have been irrational not to progressively proceed with techniques which assure protection in case of defensive need.

But why apply the thinking based upon materialism to our dealings with nations, not allied with communism? Why meet the agnostic nation which delegates man to a position as chattel of the state on the basis of their materialism?

In competing with the Eastern bloc with their ideals based on materialism we are failing to use our strongest asset. Members of the Western bloc and neutral nations are all believers in the supremacy of God, a belief that made our Nation great.

These Western bloc and neutral nations all believe in the principle of the Golden Rule. All have an equivalent of the belief in the brotherhood of man. Would it not, therefore, be elementary to weld these nations to us by the simple expedient of pointing out that the world's problem is one in which unbelievers are making cold warfare on believers in, and children of, a living God?

What difference does it make if God is called by any other name if all believe in the Golden Rule? Faith is stronger than idolatry or materialistic substitutes. God's answer of love for fellowmen, properly used and intellectually proclaimed, will unite where materialistc beliefs, and promises based on material things, fail.

Review the creeds of those nations who are now either neutral, or alined with the Western bloc, what do we find?

Buddhist doctrine proclaims: "If a man foolishly does me wrong, I will return to him the protection of my love; the more evil comes from him, the more good shall go from me."

Hebrew doctrine says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself—the stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself."

When a disciple asked Confucius if there was one word which might serve as a cardinal precept of life, Confucius replied: "Never do to others what you would not like them to do to you."

Moslem truths proclaim: "Lo, those who believe in that which is revealed unto thee, Mohammed, and those who are Jews, and Christians, and Sabaeans whoever believeth in Allah and the Last Day and doeth right, surely their reward is with their Lord, and there shall be no fear come upon them, neither shall they grieve."

In the code of Hindu beliefs there is this edict: "Wound not others, do no one injury by thought or deed, utter no word to pain thy fellow creatures."

And, finally, as Christians, in the Sermon On The Mount, we are taught: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven."

Have we turned our backs on God? Do we no longer follow the precepts of this teaching whether it be given to us as believers in the Golden Rule through Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, Judaism, or Christianity?

A better way to say "too soon old, and too late smart" is that it is not that life is too short, but rather that we are too long in taking on God's ways.

Instead of meeting Russian threats with material promises, let's adopt a code of moral rearmament. Flush out the tactics of the unbeliever. Show God-fearing nations that our enemy is common to us all. He is the scoffer, heretic, infidel: the agnostic. No

enemy of righteousness has ever prevailed against God. God, not the state, is supreme. The state that would make God's children subservient to a godless, classless society cannot prevail against Him.

Day of Reckoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an article from Barron's Weekly of September 18 on the Congo:

DAY OF RECKONING—IT HAS COME FOR BOTH THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE CONGO

To some future historian, especially one with an ironic turn of mind, the outbreak of open warfare in the Congo last week cannot fail to be a source of endless wonder. The ruthless attack on Katanga, to begin with, was launched by the United Nations, a world organization which, under the terms of its charter, is solemnly dedicated to the cause of peace. The brunt of the fighting was borne—"with great gallantry," according to dispatches—by troops of Sweden, India, and Eire, countries which boast an unbroken record of ignoble neutrality. Perhaps most incredible of all, the whole bloody business was apparently sanctioned by a U.N. resolution of last winter, which U.S. diplomats supported and subsequently hailed as a triumph of American statecraft.

Even then their complacency squared not at all with the facts. On the contrary, as we observed at the time (Marron's, Feb. 27), the U.N. resolution, with its insulting reference to Belgian mercenaries and its mandate for the use of force, constituted a scarcely veiled assault upon the Western position in the Congo. As the tragic events of the past few days have unfolded, it has grown clear that the assault is downright naked. Under the flimsiest of pretexts, and in violation of past solemn pledges, the U.N. command by military means has sought to impose the will of other Congolese authorities upon the independent state of Katanga. Thereby it is seeking to replace a government that is supported by its people and friendly to the West with an alien power, which, while theoretically neutral, in practice has worked to further the Communist cause in Africa. Whether or not it succeeds in its shocking design, the U.N. has fired a shot which will echo loud and long. Katanga has shattered once and for all the sprious moral facade with which some circles have endowed the glass house on the East River. It also furnishes one more devastating proof of the folly of American diplomacy, notably as practiced since January by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In pursuit of a will-o-the-wisp known as world opinion, Washington, at his behest, has chosen to evade its obligations and to neglect its vital interests. The time has come, we submit, to call this disastrous policy, as well as those responsible for it, to account.

Such a reckoning by rights must begin with the Eisenhower administration, which, by cravenly "letting Dag do it," took the first steps toward undermining freedom in the Congo. However, for the current state of affairs, which finds the United States in effect financing a war of aggression by its enemies against its friends, Messrs. Stevenson, Williams, Bowles, and Rusk must bear the blame. Last February, it will be recalled, after the death of rabble-rouser Patrice Lumumba, the U.N. Security Council convened in emergency session. In an atmosphere of crisis and riot, it passed a resolution, drawn up by Ceylon, Liberia, and the United Arab Republic (and supported by the United States), which called for "the removal of all Belgian and other foreign military and paramilitary personnel and mercenaries"; reaffirmed the supreme authority of the U.N. in the Congo; and authorized it to prevent civil war even, in the last resort, "through the use of force." Since then, under U.N. protection, a so-called Congolese Parliament has met and chosen a 46-man cabinet headed by Cyrille Adoula. The new regime at Leopoldville, significantly, also includes as Vice Premier Antoine Gisenga, a former Lumumba supporter who has been called a "Moscow-trained Red," and one of his henchmen as Minister of the Interior (who controls the police).

Since taking office in July, the Congolese Government, while nominally neutral, has lost no time in showing its true colors. It has invited Communist embassies, which had been shut down as centers of subversion by a predecessor, to reopen their doors. It also turned up among the nonalined states at Belgrade, where Premier Adoula, in a statement which attracted far too little notice here, boasted openly of furnishing support to the insurrectionists and armed invaders in neighboring Angola.

Above all, the Congolese authorities promptly launched a campaign of intimidation and pressure against mineral-rich Katanga, which, ever since Belgium granted the Congo its independence last summer, has flourished as a free state under pro-Western, pro-capitalist President Moise Tshombe.

As tension mounted and the threat of civil war grew, the U.N. command, which has had forces stationed in Katanga for over a year, went into action. Late in August it started to arrest and deport the white officers who have helped build up Katanga's army. Last week, under its so-called mandate to keep the peace, it launched what is tantamount to preventive war, not against the would-be aggressors in Leopoldville but against their target in Katanga. What the U.N. obviously expected to be a brief police action has turned into bloody fighting, which, at week's end, continued to rage.

Where the grim episode will end, no man can say. What can be said—or, preferably, shouted from the housetops—is that the whole affair is a damning indictment of the United Nations. In purging the Katanga army of its white officers, the U.N. forces behaved in the worst traditions of a police state, disdaining warrants and other legal procedures, ignoring contract or property rights and employing terroristic methods. In seeking to overthrow the Tshombe government by force of arms, the world organization has ridden roughshod over its oft-repeated pledges to Katanga, over the principle of self-determination, and over its pious professions of faith in peaceful negotiations and the rule of law. Politically and morally, the U.N. stands revealed to the world as bankrupt.

The same thing must be said of American foreign policy and of those who have planned and executed it. As Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, bitterly charged the other day, "If the Congo goes Communist, it will not be because of Soviet intervention, but because of intervention by a United Nations army, created by American policy and paid for by American money." Under Republicans and Democrats alike, in one part of the world after another, U.S. diplomacy for over a decade has been the gravedigger of freedom. In the interests of its own survival, this country can delay no longer in reversing its suicidal course.

New Jersey Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, within our own generation the cultures and societies of our planet have grown myriad and kaleidoscopic. Our knowledge of each other increases quickly. Because of this rapid, worldwide exchange—languages change, costumes and manners change—all this and more at an-ever increasing pace. The task of the historian is being jet-propelled to an ever-broadening horizon.

In a situation which promises constant flux it falls the duty of each generation to expose its young to the traditions and history of their common past else it becomes unappreciated and lost. For this reason, I am proud to endorse the New Jersey Tercentenary whose aims and plans are described in these articles—one from the Sunday Star-Ledger by John Soloway, September 10, and the other from the Newark Sunday Times by Elizabeth McFadden, September 17. Mr. Soloway's description of the persons who are working to create the Tercentenary is very vivid and thorough. Miss McFadden gives a detailed account of several exhibits which are near completion. All in all these two articles offer a fine résumé of the history and progress of the New Jersey Tercentenary.

I ask unanimous consent to include these articles at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Sept. 10, 1961]

STATE'S 300TH YEAR TO STAR PEOPLE, PURPOSE, PROGRESS—PREPARATIONS NOW UNDERWAY FOR GALA CELEBRATION IN 1964

(By John Soloway)

New Jersey will be 300 years old in 1964 and preparations for the celebration are already underway. In fact, they started a year ago when five of the State's top industrial art directors, in shirt-sleeve sessions at an East Orange hotel, began the successful 7-month search for the New Jersey tercentenary symbol. Before the celebration's over, some 70 million people from all over the globe at one event alone—the New York 1964–65 World's Fair—will know what New Jersey symbolizes for three centuries: people, purpose and progress.

FIRST TO SIGN

New Jersey, anticipating its tercentenary, was the first State to sign up for the fair at Flushing Meadow Park, and its pavilion has been assigned a choice 2-acre site adjacent to the Unisphere.

And as the panorama of events unfolds, 6 million Jerseyites—in pomp, pageantry, and programs—throughout the State's 21 counties and 500-plus municipalities, will join the statewide celebration that is without precedent.

The public touch-off of the anniversary observance is scheduled for next Sunday when the 16-ton New Jersey tercentenary historymobile roars into the State fair at Trenton.

TO TRAVEL 8 MONTHS

Following its appearance in the State capital, the historymobile will take to the road to proclaim the upcoming festivities. The vehicle, donated by New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and the Ford Motor Co., will travel the State from April 1 through November 30 annually.

The wheels for the State celebration actually began to turn on June 24, 1958, when the legislature voted "to formulate and implement a 5-year program for the proper observance of the beginnings of New Jersey and its subsequent role in the lives of the people of this State and Nation."

The 11-member tercentenary commission, headed by Union County Senator Robert C. Clane, began its plans almost immediately.

STILL GROWING

Tercentenary ideas were tested and perfected at brainstorming sessions of the commission's advisory committees, which are still being expanded.

At present, about 150 such committeemen, top leaders drawn from industry, education, finance, labor, government and history, advise and guide the commission.

Among the early advisers who have become committee chairmen are:

Lee H. Bristol, chairman of Bristol-Myers Co., ways and means; Robert M. Lunny, director of the New Jersey Historical Society, historymobile; Dr. Hubert Schmidt of Rutgers University, historical; Dr. Frank B. Stover, Bloomfield superintendent of schools, education, and Thomas S. Ruzicka, art director of N. J. Bell, who coordinated the efforts of the five-man team that came up with the tercentenary symbol.

FEATURES TREE

The symbol, a three-section triangle, stands for Jersey's people, purpose, progress. The central figure is a stylized tree, symbolic of the growth and future of New Jersey.

The symbol will be reproduced many millions of times in newspapers, industrial literature, advertisements, school work, auto stickers, highway signs and other means, according to David S. Davies, the commission's executive director.

Once in general use, every resident in the State will come across it at least once a day, commission officials estimate.

TO BE HALLMARK

Commenting on its importance Governor Meyner said:

"Perhaps no single effort is of greater significance in establishing a sense of New Jersey than this symbol to represent the State's 300th birthday. Its wide and continued use during the coming 3 years will establish it as a hallmark of the tercentenary.

"This symbol represents another major contribution by New Jersey industry to the success of the State's tercentenary," added the chief executive.

Besides Ruzicka, art directors who served on the design group included: Edward Colker of Warner-Chilcott Laboratories of Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Co., Morris Plains; James K. Fogleman, CIBA Pharmaceutical Products Inc., Summit; Shelly Reed, Schering Corp., Bloomfield; and Norman S. Weinberger of Warner-Lambert Products Division of Warner-Lambert.

PLAN FAIR EXHIBIT

Design of another kind—involving architectural competition to determine the Garden State architect who will prepare plans for the New Jersey building at the World's Fair—was undertaken in the early stages of the tercentenary celebration preparations.

The New Jersey chapter of the American Institute of Architects gave unanimous approval to the competitive method of selection.

Marcel Villaneuva, of East Orange, headed the architects' committee and Sherley W. Morgan, director emeritus of the School of Architecture at Princeton University, was named professional adviser for the competition.

IN TWO STAGES

Stage I was a preliminary search for ideas from architects who were residents of New Jersey and licensed to practice in the State.

Stage II will be restricted to the finalists selected by the jury of awards.

The winners of the competition, each of whom won $1,000 and will develop final drawings under stage II, were:

Philip S. Collins and John R. Diehl, both residents of Princeton; Bernard J. Grad, with Harry B. Mahler, both of the Newark firm of Frank Grad & Sons, and George E. McDowell, of Montclair. The winner will be commissioned as architect for Jersey's building at the New York Fair.

DISCUSS PARKS

Another joint effort in connection with the State's tercentenary—this one by members of the Federal New Jersey Tercentenary Commission—may bring lasting benefit to New Jersey.

The Federal group, at its initial meeting, voted to give top priority to the establishment of Sandy Hook and the historic Monmouth battlefield as State or National parks.

A recreational facility at Sandy Hook has long been sought. The Federal commission believes that the tercentenary will set an appropriate target date for getting the job done.

Part of Monmouth battlefield is now for sale as an industrial park site. The Federal commission and its State counterpart are moving to investigate the possibility of purchasing and maintaining the land as a historic monument.

COUNTIES ACTIVE

Jersey's 21 counties began talking tercentenary a year ago, as well. Bergen was first to organize its 15-member committee.

At last reading, some 150 committeemen were stirring up new interest in the celebration, stimulated by county freeholder groups and State senators, who are serving as honorary chairmen of the county groups.

For 1964, histories of the counties will be written, historic buildings restored, archives programs inaugurated, and pageants dramatizing county growths presented.

On the municipal level, nearly a fifth of the State's cities, towns, and boroughs have about 1,000 committeemen, named by the mayors, planning and preparing.

URGE SPECIAL STAMP

Nationally, the drive for a tercentenary commemorative stamp will be renewed next January at the U.S. Post Office.

Philatelic societies and individual collectors had suggested that a special stamp be issued in 1963 honoring Jersey's 300th birthday.

A petition filed last year was bypassed by postal authorities on the grounds that commemoratives generally are limited to statehood anniversaries. New Jersey would, therefore, not qualify until 1987—the 200th anniversary of its ratification of the Constitution.

Negotiations were reopened this year through Robert J. Burkhardt, the Assistant Postmaster General now on leave for the Jersey gubernatorial campaign. He'll return to the post early next year.

All in all, New Jersey's tercentenary should be a humdinger.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Sept. 10, 1961]

AS WASHINGTON SAW THE DELAWARE

(By Henry Charlton Beck)

George Moorhead of Pennington brought me the facsimile of an old map the other night and so far it has led to a number of new adventures, as well as almost as many mysteries. Best revelation so far is that as far as George Washington was concerned, Alexandria was a place as well as a township, and that the place, today and for a long while and very good reasons, has been Frenchtown on the Delaware River.

The original of the map appeared in an early life of Washington. It is called "A Map of the Country from Rariton River in East Jersey to Elk Head in Maryland Shewing the several Operations of the British and American Armies, in 1776 and 1777." The publisher was C. P. Wayne, of Philadelphia.

A more military man than I might find special interest in the deployment of the armies and who was in command and precisely where. My special delight, and probably yours, is in the number and variety of place names and the spelling of them which in many instances has been lost in time. Beyond that the map presents a kind of miniature history of the little ferries along the river as they used to be.

The ferries are no more. In their place bridges have come and many of them have gone. Yardley, in Pennsylvania, is shown as Yardley's Ferry and here the bridge, hastily erected after the flood of several years ago broke through the earlier span, has just been removed in favor of a gigantic new span a little further up. This I crossed only the other evening, remarking the fact that new bridges have the habit of taking a running broad-jump and missing the lore along the river that lies below.

Next above Yardley's was McConkey's Ferry, now Washington's Crossing on both sides of the river, each side marked by a park and the New Jersey side by the McConkey house which is part of New Jersey's system of historic sites. There is a narrow bridge calling for a crawling speed, mindful that it simply will not do if automobiles get any wider.

Not far above was Blucmount's Ferry, or so the name seems to be spelled, and this one seems to have been utterly lost in the annals. Next name up is Falls, below Coryel's Ferry (with one "l" in this instance), and you know well that Coryel's or Coryell's Ferry by this time is Lambertville. There is a connection between the Coryells or Coryels of Coryel's Ferry and the men and women who knew Frenchtown as Alexandria, the place and not the remaining township.

Between Coryel's Ferry and Hart's Ferry, now Stockton, where there is a bridge even as there is at Lambertville, across from New Hope, Pa., was Robinson's Ferry, and if we were to piece together the story of the little ferries I shall have to have much more information on this. Much of the amazement of many, the Old York Road, which comes up through Pennsylvania by way of Jenkintown, is shown as crossing at Hart's (Stockton) and not Coryel's (Lambertville) no matter what the historic markers say.

Oh, yes, there is a road shown from Lambertville, pushing on through what is indicated as Amwell Meeting, now Amwell, to Ringo Town, now Ringoes, and then one up toward Flemington, once Flemingtown, but I always have gone along with the historians who wrote of and showed me the other way. Although the road was obviously more obscure, the road from forgotten Robinson's Ferry went directly to Ringo Town, with Rock Town, now Rocktown off the road entirely by this time, indicated almost as importantly as Ringo Town, which went through the processes from John Ringo's Town to Ringo Town and now, Ringoes.

In passing, I must point out some other names on George's old map which in themselves are challenges for new material or at least a regrooving of the record in the usual development of folklore. Somerset Court House is there and before you say that this now is Somerville I must contradict you and say that it was Millstone and that the first courthouse was burned there in a Revolutionary raid. Cranbury was Cranberry,

Hightstown was Hiatstown, and above it, on the road to New Brunswick, were the names, Storey, Jacques, and Striker. I would say that each was at least a cluster of houses.

Alexandria, as I have told you, is the name retained by a township in Hunterdon county and it must have had pleasant familiarity in George Washington's ears. To me it has been a familiar name as well as a cause for continued research because of the corporate name, St. Thomas's, Alexandria, a little church erected in 1723 and now completely restored. There is an alternate name appearing sometimes, St. Thomas's, Kingwood, the name of the township across the road. Some have said that there may have been an even earlier church across the way but I have come to the conclusion, for one reason and another, that the township line was either moved or made more definite as time went on.

It is a credit to the Episcopal Diocese of New Jersey that it assisted in the restoration of the oldest church in Hunterdon, indeed, that section of New Jersey. It was Calvary Church in Flemington that took the initiative and well I remember the locked and boarded-up gem of early American ecclesiastical architecture and the weed-grown graves, some of them those of veterans of the French and Indian War as well as the Revolution. I noted only the other day that the surrounding cemetery is now well kept and that Sunday services have been maintained throughout the summer. Surely this old church is worthy of the distinction of a national historic outpost and I hope that someone will put these wheels into motion one day.

It is the shrine of old St. Thomas' which has kept the hame, Alexandria, ever green even more than the township in which it is located. However, before I take you on to Frenchtown, once Alexandria, at least as far as the old map and other records go, let me refresh your memory on some of St. Thomas' lore, still fringed with mysteries after almost 15 years of probing.

At what I will call the west end there once was an upstairs window, long ago artfully stoned in, supporting the conclusion that at one time there was a gallery and at least giving credence to the report that an arrangement was made for New Jersey slaves to sit there during services. I have even heard it said that these family retainers, who actually were more than slaves used the "lost" window as a door, but that would have required a ladder.

Often have I wondered about the name of the young woman who at the outset concentrated attention on the old church by expressing a desire to be married there. The warden of those days was the late Lester W. Oliver, Jr., of Clinton, who provided a key with which the long-closed door was opened and the shutters pried back so the girl could make an inspection. I was told later on, after preliminary arrangements for the wedding were begun, that the bride-to-be saw the tablet of stone, fitted into the wooden floor of the only aisle, just outside the sanctuary, and decided forthwith that she "didn't want to be married on anybody's dead body."

Some of us concluded that as much as her feelings must be respected, she would have had great difficulty in avoiding such a prospect in many historic churches, in this country as well as in Europe, where many a crypt is under the church floor. On the slab is this inscription: "In Memory of Lewis Stevens, Esq., who departed this Life April 19, 1772, Aged" (and here the number is still in doubt) "Years." Long after that, when the sagging floor was being repaired, I was one of those who explored the space underneath and there is some doubt in my mind that the marker was more than a memorial.

On the other hand, it is quite possible that all traces of the burial of Lewis, as well as that of his more celebrated brother, John, of the well-known Stevens family of Stevens Institute, could have vanished. Some of us felt like ghouls, investigating as much as we dared. However, the conclusions have gone back and forth over this intervening time—first we said that this was merely a memorial tablet, then we thought that there were graves, at least under or nearly under the altar, and then that the burials were truly in the glebe.

The Stevenses, who were builders and benefactors of the Church of the Holy Innocents, in Hoboken, owned the Cornwall farm, just down the hill from St. Thomas's, and here is the obituary notice of John Stevens, called "Great John" Stevens, even as my old friend, John Heaney, found it:

"Died, at his seat in Hunterdon County, N.J., on the 7th current, the Honorable John Stevens, Esq., aged 75 years, and was buried in St. Peter's Church at Cornwall farm near Pittstown. Mr. Stevens supported a very respectable character through life and by his death society have lost a valuable member."

This notice, John Heaney wrote, appeared in the New York Journal and Patriotic Register on Saturday, May 19, 1792. That the name, St. Peter's, was used in mistake never has been fully explained beyond the fact that it must have a reporter's mistake. The name always has been St. Thomas's and, in a moment, you will see why I feel it to be important that you have something of what you may have forgotten. Tom Gordon, in his Gazeteer of 1834, lists Alexandria as a place as well as a township and, further, locates an Episcopal Church there. No less than one I feel honored to call the town historian of Frenchtown, whom you will meet in a momnt, has told me that there never was an Episcopal Church in Frenchtown even when it was Alexandria, and that old St. Thomas's must have been the church to which reference was made.

Here is the Gordon entry: "Alexandria, post town of Alexandria Township, Hunterdon County, on the bank of the Delaware River, at the junction of Nischisakawick Creek with that stream, 11 miles west of Flemington, 35 north of Trenton, 189 from Washington Capital; contains a tavern, store, grist mill, and 8 or 10 dwellings, a Presbyterian and an Episcopalian church." I have taken the liberty of spelling out some of Tom Gordon's abbreviations inasmuch as they may mean little to many.

In the subsequent entry on Alexandria Township, Alexandria is listed as one of the post towns, along with Alexandria, Milford, Mount Pleasant, and Pittstown. The population in 1830, presumably when Tom was making his checkup, was 3,042. There is no reference to Frenchtown, as such, although it is quite possible that the new name, imported by French refugees who were taking up property there, were using it unofficially because of confusion with the township itself.

There were years of neglect which now, I am happy to report, may be forgotten in the tasteful restorations that have been accomplished.

Actually St. Thomas' lies between Pittstown and Everittstown and, after a few moments of great personal satisfaction, which I hope you will allow me, I pushed on to Frenchtown itself in search of someone who just might remember an older name, Alexandria, as it was prominently revealed on the "Rariton River in East Jersey" map. There are other ways to Frenchtown, of course, but the roads we chose were those best known to the men and women to whom the Revolution was a reality and for whom the French and Indian War meant the building of forts along the Delaware River.

There is a new, or comparitively new, way, by now—all the way up, or down, the Delaware, the very country into which the discovery of an old map pours a new interest—the Daniel Bray Memorial Highway, long referred to as "the Missing Link" in that here for the longest while, in spite of new and impressive roads elsewhere, there was little more than a wagontrack. Now the crowding rocks of a little mountain have been carved away and a road that few in New Jersey know well pays tribute to the man who gathered up the Durham boats for Washington's crossing of the river. Even so, only a homemade sign in Frenchtown proclaims the name.

At the spanking new post office in Frenchtown I inquired cautiously for the older name, Alexandria, and was told that there had been such. Taking a shot in the dark, I asked if there were any old books, or even little tattered brochures, on the rise of Frenchtown from Alexandria, and was told there were—which all goes to prove the old saying that you sometimes can't see the woods for the trees. In all my days in Hunterdon, particularly in Flemington, I had never heard the name, Clarence B. Fargo. He is, unquestionably, the town's historian, however unsung. "He wrote the history of Frenchtown in 1933," I was told, "and unquestionably he'd like to talk with you."

That is how I met Clarence B. Fargo, now 88, as amiable a longtime resident of Frenchtown as I ever hope to meet. And that is how I heard more of Paul Henri Mallet-Prevost, a native of Geneva, Switzerland, came to live there in 1794. Thought to be a Frenchman, so many decided that he was that Frenchtown quickly emerged from Alexandria which was, before that, Sunbeam.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Sept. 17, 1961]

NEW JERSEY AS CIVIL RIGHTS SOURCE—MOBILE EXHIBIT PREPARED FOR TERCENTENNIAL DEPICTS ITS ROLE

(By Elizabeth McFadden)

The portrait of New Jersey as a pioneering source of American liberalism is being drawn in a mobile exhibit being completed here.

It is the 16-ton unit that will tour the State between now and New Jersey's third centennial in 1964. Its first display will be at the State fair in Trenton Thursday.

Installed in 1 of its 10 display cases is the original "Concessions and Agreements of the Proprietors, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the Province of West New Jersey in America, March 3, 1676."

They represent, says David S. Davies, executive director of the New Jersey Tercentenary Commission, the successful flowering in the raw, new country of the then revolutionary seeds of civil rights sown in Europe by men like John Locke.

LIBERAL GRANT

The concessions, a bid for settlers, gave, Davies says, a "liberal grant of freedom 125 years before the Bill of Rights." They assure trial by jury, due process of the law, and freedom of conscience and religion.

The precious document, signed by William Penn, among others, was brought here last week from the Burlington safe in which it is customarily kept by the west Jersey proprietors. It is insured for $100,000.

With other exhibits, it was brought to Texhibit Industries at the foot of Commerce Street here. The company renovated the mobile unit donated by the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. for the commission's use. The exhibits will be changed in 1963 and 1964.

The 32-foot-long trailer has telescope sides that, when stationed at a supermarket, fair, or other busy centers, open to a width of 15 feet.

MONMOUTH PATENT

Visitors will then circulate past the exhibit's 10 jampacked cases to view the concessions and the Monmouth Patent of 1665, another landmark in American strides toward freedom for the individual.

This, although it was put out by an official who was under the mistaken notion he had the right to issue it, played a role nevertheless in developing American liberalism, Davies says.

It granted "free liberty of conscience without any molestation or disturbance whatsoever" in religion. It guaranteed the right of free election and the making of "such peculiar prudential laws and constitutions amongst the inhabitants for the better and more orderly governing of them."

The man who unlawfully promised such legal bliss was New York's Governor Richard Nicolls. He had been sent by James, Duke of York, to oust the Dutch after England's King Charles II had granted his brother the Dutch lands from the Connecticut River to the Delaware.

York wanted Nicolls to gain control of the territory for John, Lord Berkeley, and Sir George Carteret who bought the West Jersey province from him. They sent Carteret's cousin, Philip, to govern the tract. But, says Davies, the dream of liberalism smoldered in men's minds.

NEWARK PURCHASE SHOWN

What Davies calls the showpiece of the exhibit is an Indian diorama showing the purchase of Newark, July 11, 1667. Six figures, fashioned by a New York sculptor, Thomas Newbery, portray Indians of the Lenni Lenape tribe meeting white representatives of Capt. Robert Treat.

Two Indians are inspecting goods offered in trade. One is trying on a red, trooper's coat. Another looks at a basket of knives. A third is being offered a quill to make his mark on the deed.

Painted into the background by Robert Kane, New York artist, is a scene looking over the Newark Meadows. The site of the actual signing, Davies explains, was a spot now on Route 22 just west of an artificial lake made of the then meandering Weequahic stream and of manmade hills now separating it from marshland to the east.

Treat, Davies relates, thought Philip Carteret had cleared everything with the Indians for him to bring in a group of New Englanders.

INDIAN TREATY

But the leader of the band leaving one theocracy to set up another here found, Davies says, that the Indians had not been consulted.

Treat sent emissaries up the river to confer with 90-year-old Oraton, sachem of the Hackensacks, as the neighboring Indians were called. When they returned, leaders of the white settlers, who had established themselves in what is now Military Park, signed the pact in the diorama.

Review of the 1st Session, 87th Congress by Representative Melvin Price, 24th Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 87th Congress has been one of extraordinary activity—producing more affirmative legislation than any other session, certainly, since the end of the Second World War.

Three factors, as I see it, were responsible.

First. The Government was under the leadership of the same party in both the executive and legislative branches. A Democratic President had the advantage of a Democratic majority in the Congress heading the responsible committees and the leadership.

In the last 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, the Republicans were unable to hold control of Congress, and even in the first 2 years the Republican legislative majorities were paper-thin. Democrats cooperated honorably with the Republican President on all decisive issues of foreign policy. But on many domestic issues, divided control simply meant a stalemate.

Second. The times were ripe for action to meet piled up problems. Many issues had been debated for years and had been the subject of extensive committee hearings. Many programs approved in 1961 would have been enacted earlier, though perhaps in a more limited form, had Congress not been confronted with the actuality or threat of a Presidential veto.

Third. The leadership of President Kennedy proved vigorous and informed. The President had spent 14 years in the House and Senate and he understood many issues in the same frame of reference that Congress did. In addition, he showed consistently the instinct for action that was revealed during the campaigns leading up to the elections last November. It seems to many of us that he showed himself in harmony with a deep desire of the American people to break out of the long postwar confusions and move boldly into a future that promises something better than nuclear destruction.

A summary of congressional actions in the first session shows this record:

A new farm program was put into effect and broad new approaches were made toward the protection of city workers from the most damaging effects of the rise and fall of the business cycle.

An unusually large number of major laws were passed in the area of public services and substantial improvements were made in existing services.

A start was made toward revising the tax system in the direction of greater equity and of business stimulation.

A start of great importance was made toward basic improvements in providing sound educational opportunity, equality of job opportunity, and protection of the health of our older people.

Our foreign policies were maintained firmly, and I am happy to report that in this area the Republican minority in Congress gave the President generous bipartisan support.

Significant new steps were taken toward revision of our foreign economic aid programs—a revision that should help check the abuses in these programs and also make them more effective.

A beginning was made—a vital beginning—toward rebuilding our armed services to provide them the ground force and tactical muscle to meet the sudden emergencies of Soviet Union pressure, of limited or "brush fire" wars, of sudden explosions in corners of our dangerous world.

In my own work in the House, I have continued service on the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

These are important committees and I take seriously my work on them.

It was a source of particular gratification that President Kennedy, facing the crisis on Berlin, chose first to strengthen the ground and tactical forces. I protested years ago when the Eisenhower administration began cutting this strength, misled by its own slogan about getting "more bang for a buck." This was acceptance of a doctrine implying that any future collision would inevitably end in nuclear war.

I refused then—and I refuse now—to believe that we have no better answer. We must have flexible power, flexible power-in-being, to employ appropriate means to meet many kinds of pressure.

On one subject, I strongly disagreed with the President—his refusal to restore the drive for the B–70 manner bomber, with a prospective 2,000-miles-an-hour speed. Both Houses of Congress insisted on voting funds to push ahead with development of the B–70, and I earnestly hope that the White House and Department of Defense will reconsider their tentative decision not to spend the money.

There was satisfaction, also, in seeing a food-stamp plan put into effect after the previous administration had refused to use the authority Congress had granted.

I was a House sponsor of the bill, passed in 1959, authorizing the plan to employ our farm surplus to give better nourishment to needy families. Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, declined to put it into effect. A food-stamp plan proved useful during the second World War, and I am happy that our program has now been started on a pilot-project basis by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

I have been naturally deeply concerned with Army Engineers and other watershed projects in St. Clair and Madison Counties, and I am happy to report substantial progress.

Surveys for the east side levee and sanitary district are within a few months of completion, partly because we were able to obtain more money to finance them.

All preliminary work has been finished for the Hog River and Pig Creek project in the Mascoutah area, which falls within the agricultural watershed program. Final approval has been given by the Committees on Agriculture of both House and Senate and this means that actual work should start soon.

We can anticipate final approval next year of the Kaskaskia River channelization project, which when completed will open up a large area of southern St. Clair County to industrialization. This has been approved by both the Army Engineers and the Budget Bureau and final congressional authorization is expected in the 1962 omnibus rivers and harbors bill. We were able to get continuation of funds for Carlyle Reservoir

operations, which are part of the Kaskaskia program.

The new Athens Flood Wall program will go into construction planning soon as the result of appropriation of $35,000 to the Corps of Engineers. This means the initial phase of construction for the flood wall will follow.

A year ago in writing a review of the last Congress, I pointed out that after 8 years of the Eisenhower administration there was "an accumulation of piled-up needs." Without disparaging the integrity of the former President, I cited shortages in schools, hospitals, college and university facilities, in our social security programs, in housing and farm programs. His administration, fighting to hold the line against these programs, had a vested interest in continuing the record of opposition.

The record this year is entirely different.

Congress with administration backing passed social security amendments broadening benefits for an estimated 4.4 million persons—and also provided for financing the increased benefits by higher payroll taxes.

Minimum benefits were raised from $33 a month to $40; widows' benefits were raised to 82.5 percent of husbands' benefits; men as well as women were given the right to claim benefits at age 62; increases were made in the Federal contribution for old-age assistance; beneficiaries were given the right to earn as much as $1,800 a year without sacrificing social security claims. The slightly higher taxes allowed this program to be put into operation with full fiscal protection of the system.

Congress passed an omnibus housing bill—a new program allowing a broader attack on urban blight and slums and offering some help to cities in meeting the difficulties of traffic congestion and outmoded transit systems. Mr. Eisenhower repeatedly vetoed less comprehensive housing bills.

Congress passed a new authorization increasing the program of Federal aid to assist communities in cleaning up our polluted river systems. Mr. Eisenhower for 2 years had tried to get Congress to kill the smaller program already in existence.

Congress increased authorized funds to complete the Interstate and Defense Highway System over a 10-year period—and showed a sense of fiscal responsibility by approving taxes to pay for the expenditures in a manner that Senator BYRD of Virginia said would "meet all the apportionments."

Congress passed a new minimum wage law, raising to $1.25 an hour the minimum wage in interstate industry and expanding the protections of the law to 3.6 million workers not previously covered. The benefits go into effect gradually over a 4-year period so to give business time to adjust.

This was the first time since the original Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was passed that coverage under the law had been broadened by amendments rather than narrowed. A new principle was established—that employees of great retail and other service industries have as much claim to basic wage protection as industrial workers. The Eisenhower administration blocked this kind of bill. In the Kennedy administration, Congress passed the program.

The Kennedy administration and the new Congress came into office at a time of sharp business recession. This recession was not acknowledged by the former administration during the political campaign—but it was a grim fact of life.

Recovery from the 1958–59 Eisenhower recession was never completed; unemployment ranged at about 5 percent in 1959–60, and by December 1960, had climbed back to almost 7 percent of the work force in a new recession.

The impact of automation and the shift of industry from old fields to new ones offer a serious challenge to our system. We have begun to develop programs that acknowledge its seriousness.

Congress passed a bill to extend benefits under unemployment compensation—and the bill provided for Federal advances to the States, to be repaid by increased payroll taxes, rather than through so-called Federal loans to the States, such as the 1958 Eisenhower temporary program offered—no State in fact has repaid any loans under that program.

Congress, at President Kennedy's request, passed a bill expanding the aid to dependent children program so that assistance would go to families where a father was unemployed—through no fault of his own—as well as to families where the father was too ill to work or had actually deserted the children.

Congress passed a new depressed areas bill to extend Federal loans, grants, and technical guidance to both urban and rural areas where industries have petered out and where joblessness is severe and chronic. Former President Eisenhower twice vetoed similar bills.

Congress took the first steps toward meeting the basic problems of automation by setting up a training and retraining program to equip workers with new skills they need to work in new industries and types of jobs.

Some enlightened democracies have long had such training programs, but never before Mr. Kennedy had any American President proposed that we recognize our full educational responsibility. We do not want ablebodied men, whose jobs have disappeared through automation or whose skills are outmoded, to sit in idleness and live in the despair of public relief.

Our business community has made a steady recovery from the recession. All the important statistics point to a rising level of business activity, which will mean both greater employment and profitable enterprise.

It should be clearly understood, however, that the 87th Congress and the Kennedy administration will not be satisfied with any so-called recovery that leaves great pools of unemployment at anything like a 5-percent level. The President has already announced he will submit proposals next year for permanent improvements in our jobless compensation system, in our tax system, in other programs that stimulate business and provide cushions against recessions. Our economic system spreads its rewards among millions of people, and we recognize our responsibility to help it work effectively for all our people.

The 1st session of the 87th Congress saw new approaches toward a long-range farm program to meet our needs.

The basic change has been one in philosophy; we look upon the productivity of our farms in food and fibers as a blessing instead of a curse.

We have a rapidly growing population, and the time is coming when we shall have immediate need for our abundance. There are hungry people in the world, and we have now a food-for-peace program that is searching for ways to use our surpluses more effectively.

Congress this year passed a new feed grains program and extended it for a second year. We passed an omnibus program providing new weapons for the Secretary of Agriculture in attacking the present problem of surpluses.

Still other weapons may be needed—but a change in attitude was the first thing. In the Eisenhower administration the Secretary of Agriculture tried to attack surpluses by decreasing price supports, which simply gave farmers an incentive to raise bigger crops to avoid a loss of revenue, and the surplus program cost more money than ever before. We intend to pursue a different course—with diligence and with a sense of stewardship.

We are heading into a budget deficit of an estimated $5.3 billion for the fiscal year ending next June 30. This results, however, from clear and special circumstances.

A major portion arises from the $3.5 billion in additional defense expenditures requested by the President as a result of the challenge of the Soviet Union on free Berlin.

Another major factor is Mr. Kennedy's realistic revision of the revenue calculations of the last Eisenhower budget. That budget did not take sufficiently into account the loss of revenue in corporation and individual income taxes that would result from the then-unacknowledged recession.

When business activity drops and people are laid off jobs, Government income suffers. Mr. Kennedy's Budget Bureau has estimated that revenues will be $1.4 billion lower for fiscal 1961 and 1962 than Mr. Eisenhower's Budget Bureau estimated them.

In the 1958–59 Eisenhower recession the loss of revenue and the rise in spending were so sharp that there was a whopping $12 billion deficit in fiscal 1959. Nothing approaching that figure is in prospect now.

We are putting our affairs in order and handling them in a businesslike way. The leakage of gold to other countries was halted. Steps have been taken—including action by Congress to reduce duty-free purchases by Americans abroad and to encourage visits to the United States by tourists from abroad—to equalize the balance of payments.

A beginning has been made on streamlining the independent agencies of the Government such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Maritime Commission. Reorganization plans for the Federal Communications Commission and National Labor Relations Board were blocked, but modified plans are certain to be offered again.

As business improves and the administration pursues policies to reduce the level of long-term and chronic joblessness, Government revenues will rise again. With a steady growth rate, the economy can carry the burden of our necessary Defense Establishment and sustain the high level of social services our people desire and deserve in our modern democracy.

Congress stood firmly behind President Kennedy as the Berlin crisis sharpened, and I am convinced that our people are together on his pledge that we will gladly negotiate at any time for a peaceful settlement of all disputes with other nations—but that we will never sacrifice the freedom of Berlin and the North Atlantic Alliance that is the shield of the whole free world.

Some departures have been made in foreign policy—many of the greatest importance.

Action was completed on a new program of international economic cooperation when the Senate ratified a program instituted during the Eisenhower years.

The Kennedy administration developed a tremendously expanded program for economic development of our neighbors in Latin America—the alliance for progress that formed part of the President's inaugural address and was given flesh and structure at the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

The Peace Corps was set up—the nucleus of what I believe will be substantial numbers of American young people working in many nations as representatives of all that is best in America.

There was legislation this year to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. There was substantial progress in other ways.

President Kennedy made it publicly clear that he thought the Supreme Court was right in 1954 when it outlawed racially segregated public schools as unconstitutional. In all the years that people tried, they could never get such a public declaration from former President Eisenhower. The moral force of the White House has been thrown for the first time behind implementation of the Court's decision.

The Department of Justice has been increasingly active in pushing voting rights cases in areas where the voting rights of some citizens seem to have been denied.

The Department of Justice moved to halt terrorism and rioting against the constitutional right of citizens to travel freely in interstate transportation and to travel without personal humiliation. The Kennedy administration summoned no paratroopers; it sent in U.S. marshals to uphold the civil processes of the law.

The administration moved also, and decisively, to spread job opportunities for citizens who are members of minority groups. The new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is moving to enforce Executive orders against race discrimination in hiring workers on work done under Government contract. An equal chance at a job, an equal chance to vote—these are the keys to progress for all human beings.

The 1st session of the 87th Congress was not able to complete action on all major programs. School aid and health care for the aged under the social security system were left for next year. Major tax revision was left for next year.

The record of work actually done, however, is long, and there is every prospect that from the groundwork laid in 1961 we can move to complete the program.

The World, a New Concept in Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this distinguished body the issuance of a new compact national newspaper to be published in Washington and distributed nationally beginning October 12.

Publication of this paper marks the culmination of 5 years of planning and research by Willard W. Garvey, a businessman from Wichita, Kans., who is president of W. W. Communications, Inc., the corporate entity publishing the journal.

The World began because Mr. Garvey believes there is a need for a newspaper which will report the achievements of people in proper relationship to the activities of Government and bring to the fore the journalistically neglected private sector of our society.

Because its scope is different from that of any other publication, the World will not compete with existing newspapers and magazines, but will pioneer in an untried, challenging area of creative journalism.

Acknowledging the newsworthiness of Government news, which his paper will cover concisely and fairly, Mr. Garvey has asked his editors only to give fair treatment to the contributions to society by people acting through initiative and enterprise. He believes that this is how the United States began—through individual effort.

Editor Ralph de Toledano has stated that the World will make a special effort to report fairly and without bias the deliberations of the Congress.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading a reprint of the article which appeared in the August 26 issue of Editor and Publisher entitled "National Weekly Leans Toward 'Influentials'." With unanimous consent I include this reprint in the RECORD calling attention to the fact that the publication date given therein as September 7 has been moved up to October 12 since the appearance of this article:

NATIONAL WEEKLY LEANS TOWARD INFLUENTIALS

WASHINGTON.—The Washington World will be on the newsstands September 7.

It is disturbing to publisher Willard Garvey that his still aborning paper has already been labeled a voice for the conservatives. He and Editor Ralph de Toledano believe the World will be an unique publication based on an individual philosophy, and patterned on the principles of the London Economist and the Manchester Guardian.

"I don't like to come out with a lot of high sounding principles," Mr. Garvey says, "because when the paper comes out if it's been overrated we're dead."

However, he is convinced the people in this country have been conditioned to accept the negative approach.

"The news media are replete with man's inadequacies—his needs—his problems," he says. "What is needed is the positive slant where every item of news will increase mass self-sufficiency."

Emphasizing that he is not a crusader (I'm no Marshall Field) or an "agains," he says it is his aim to "create, seek out and make newsworthy private constructive achievement as opposed to the 90 percent of the news that now emanates from the Government."

Since it is also part of his philosophy never to start anything new where an existing group can do the job, Mr. Garvey does not see the World in competition with the dailies or the weekly news magazines.

It will be a weekly national newspaper trying for an audience of what the opinion researchers call "the influentials."

ON SLICK PAPER

Of tabloid size the paper will be printed on English finish stock (also used by the London Economist) and will sell for 15 cents a copy.

Mr. de Toledano, who admits to being a nonconformist conservative himself, says it will be the aim of the World to "do a job of reporting both sides." One feature will be columns on an important controversy written by two people with opposing views.

Another feature will be a grassroots page on which local stories in key cities will be summarized.

In addition to Mr. de Toledano, former associate editor for Newsweek, the roster includes associate editors Fred Theroux, formerly from the Sunday staff of the Washington Star, and Jack Purcell who was with the New York Daily News, Time and Hill & Knowlton, public relations agency.

Ben Podgor, formerly with the National Enquirer, will be business manager. Malcolm Kildale, New York and Washington freelance artist, will be art director, and Kathrine S. Smith from the Tri-City Sun, Shefield, Ala., is assistant to the editor.

Mr. Garvey was reluctant to discuss the amount of money to be put into the paper. He said he has had offers of backing but preferred to keep the venture private. However, he said he will not put unlimited funds into it. ("It discredits you to be economically unsound.") Ultimately, he said, the paper must be supported by subscription and advertising.

Although starting as a weekly—with a national rather than a local concept of news, the paper hopes eventually to become a daily. However, this, Mr. de Toledano says, is "in the realm of hope and dream rather than plan. The job we have set now is getting the paper off the ground."

Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, 1962

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid appropriations bill which the conference committee has sent us contains one provision which merits especial note. I refer to section 108 which reads as follows:

SEC. 108. It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

Members will recall that identical language was contained in the foreign aid appropriation legislation enacted last year and in 1959. Members will also recall that very similar language was contained in the House version of the authorization bill recently enacted but that this language was modified in conference in the interests of an abbreviated statement of policy.

Section 108 means what it says—this free Government of ours will not countenance distinctions made abroad between one American citizen and another for reasons of race or religion. The Congress intends that this policy be given full effect as was made clear in the brief discussion of this section at the time it was adopted by the House two weeks ago on September 5. It was made clear in the Senate where the committee report states, in part:

The committee urges the executive departments concerned to give force to the sense of the Congress as expressed in this section in the administration of the foreign assistance program to the extent feasible and by other appropriate means.

Our historic national tradition has made this policy clear—in 1885 when the United States refused to accept the protests of Austria-Hungary on the appointment of our ambassador to that kingdom because the designee's wife was of the Jewish faith; in 1911 when the United States abrogated the trade treaty with Czarist Russia which had been in effect since 1832 on the grounds of Russian mistreatment of American citizens of the Jewish faith; in 1924 when we protested to the Swiss on the exclusion of American Mormon missionaries; in our 1938 protests to Fascist Italy on the exclusion of American Jews; and in more recent years, during the previous administration, our inclusion of American Negroes as guests at U.S. Embassy receptions in apartheid South Africa—and without incident.

In effect, in section 108 of the bill before us the Congress has given voice to a tradition long established and with ample precedent in our dealings with foreign powers. Unfortunately, there are those charged with conducting aspects of our foreign affairs—which in these complex times is no longer confined to diplomatic chores but ranges afield to economics and to military policy—who think in terms of a doubtful popularity of the moment rather than principle and who overlook the policy set by both tradition and this Congress. But in forfeiting principle, we forfeit respect.

When we send Public Law 480 grains to the United Arab Republic and abide with that nation's dictation that the food cannot be shipped in U.S. bottoms owned or operated by Americans of the Jewish faith, we sacrifice principle and respect. When we stand by without firm protests and permit the Saudi Arabs to exclude Americans of the Jewish faith from even a few minute's use a commercial airport terminal facility built with U.S. taxpayer funds, we forfeit principle and respect. When a foreign power refuses to let one of our own colleagues, a Member of this body, visit installations built under this and similar legislation, and such a refusal produces only the weakest of reactions from our Department of State, we have traded our birthright of principle and respect for a mess of popularity porridge—and, as experience has sadly taught us, porridge with all the vitamins removed.

Contrast this if you will. The Kingdom of Morocco, a member of the Arab League, last week announced that a leading Moroccan Jew, R. Bennaroch, has been appointed to a high post in the Ministry of War. Other Moroccan Jews occupy other Moroccan posts of responsibility in the Sherifien Government. Yet our State Department quails at the sending of Americans of the Jewish faith to positions in Morocco or other Arab lands in the fear of offending and in the hope, one must assume, of winning their good will. Such appeasement may have won some momentary acknowledgment—but we have but to look at the record of recent months and years to see that it has purchased us nothing substantial in the way of friendship. Rather it has encouraged these countries to pull feathers from the eagle's tail.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to long detain this body by dwelling on the obvious. I merely wish to make known to the executive departments concerned that it was with serious intent that the Congress in its wisdom chose to include section 108 in the pending bill—and it is our intent that the policy it sets forth be given full force. In addition, I would suggest that when the executive departments submit the reports required by the foreign aid authorization bill that they make special reference to actions under section 108 of the pending bill and under section 102 of the authorization bill which contains language different in content but similar in spirit so that the Congress and the people may know that we hold firm to our principles and that we cherish not only the respect of our sister nations but also our own national self-respect. Such periodic reports are indeed very much to be desired and it is my intention at the proper time to make a formal request of the responsible department for their submission.

What Is the Circumnavigators Club?—By Circumnavigator Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, Fellow, Royal Geographical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article, "What Is the Circumnavigators Club?" as there have been many queries concerning this unique organization.

Commander Dodge, who is one of the few men living today who circumnavigated the earth aboard a square-rigger, formerly was the editor of the circumnavigators log of the Circumnavigators Club, New York, including its 50th anniversary issue, Spring-Summer 1953. It contained a report of the testimonial dinner given in honor of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the club's honorary president. Also, this 100-page number had a lengthy and unusually illustrated article by Circum Editor Wendell Phillips Dodge, FRGS, "My Circumnavigation on a Square-Rigger." A large double-page illustration showed Cape Horn as few persons ever have viewed it, as this famous and virtually always terribly stormy cape rarely is visible to ships passing it.

This remarkable photograph was obtained on June 29, 1952, from a helicopter attached to the U.S.S. *Oriskany*, CV-34, being an official U.S. Navy photograph. Wonder of wonders in this part of the world, the atmosphere was clear.

Indeed, Commander Dodge "rounded the Horn" without ever seeing it, sailing by like the verse of the old "Clipper Ship" chanty:

They say she's bound to sail so fast
That a man on deck can't catch the mast!
And a porpoise trying to keep ahead,
Will get run over and killed stone dead.

The article follows:

WHAT IS THE CIRCUMNAVIGATORS CLUB?

A club designed to extend points of friendly contact among men who go to the ends of the earth by steamship, airplane, train, camel caravan, dhow, dugout, or even cruder means of travel, in the cause of commerce, research, exploration, big game hunting, military, naval, aviation, maritime, and governmental service; news reporting, or for the simple pleasure of travel—and good fellowship.

Thus did circumnavigator No. 1, the late Joseph D. Morrison, who boarded the River Styx ferry June 7, 1959, at the ripe old age of 90, express the thoughts and hopes of his cofounders, James H. Birch, Jr., and E. H. Patterson, during an Indian Ocean voyage together in 1902. It was then and there

that these American travelers "deliberately, and without malice," perpetrated the Circumnavigators Club, which was thereafter incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with world headquarters in the city of New York—latitude 40°45'16" N., longitude 73°58'54" W., the earth, the cosmos. It, therefore, may be said to be the first—and only—club in the celestial sphere.

For this reason, more than any other, the Circumnavigators Club boasts no clubhouse—its dues are so microscopically modest as to be out of step with present-day dollar values—more in keeping with the current exchange of the celestial heavens; its membership widely scattered over the entire earth, precluding frequent intimate contact. Yet, many of the world's great have applied for membership in its magic circle and have felt themselves honored and privileged to add the word "Circumnavigator" to their names.

The Circumnavigators Club does not seek out members. It welcomes invited applicants possessing the necessary qualifications, the first of which is that the applicant must have made at least one complete circumnavigation of the earth in one direction, east to west, or west to east, but it does not have to be continuous at one time. An applicant may not break up a full east to west or west to east circumnavigation by turning around, however. He may return to where he left off and then continue to make the complete circumnavigation in one direction.

Among notable Circumnavigators Club members may be mentioned Circumnavigator President of the United States, and Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, William Howard Taft. Volume 1, No. 1, of the log of the Circumnavigators Club had this to say about this most genial soul: "From any point of view, the most important circumnavigator is William Howard Taft. Weighing something over 300 pounds, he is unquestionably more of a circumnavigator than any other member. Also, he has more of the even curves of a sphere about his person than any competitor, however ambitious."

All meetings, luncheons, and dinners of the Circumnavigators Club are brought to order by the rapping of a whale's tooth gavel, gift of another famous Circumnavigator member, the Honorable William Jennings Bryan, who ran for President of the United States more often than any other political aspirant, and whose celebrated "cross of gold" speech in his first campaign raised him to the very forefront of the world's great orators of all time.

A letter, dated April 28, 1910, to the club reads: "I am sending you by express the whale's tooth which I promised the Circumnavigators Club. The fact that it is a tooth makes it appropriate for your club, not that the club shows its teeth frequently, but because it seems to enjoy good eating, if I could judge from my experience at the dinner which it gave to me. But the tooth is appropriate for another reason; namely, it is the tooth of a whale, and a whale is not only the king of the ocean, but is a great traveler.

"It is a circumnavigator of the first order, and I am sure that the whale from whose jaw this tooth came would feel honored if he knew that this little part of his anatomy would find an honored tomb among the treasures of the Circumnavigators Club.

"W. J. BRYAN."

To mention but a very few, as space does not permit a parade of more circumnavigators of the past: America's celebrated bandleader and march king, Circumnavigator Comdr. John Philip Sousa, not overlooking his famous beard; the only American general with the rank and title of "Commander of the Armies," Circumnavigator Gen. John J. Pershing; Circumnavigator Col. William F. Cody, the famous Buffalo Bill; Circumnavigator Harry Lauder, and Circumnavigator Harry Houdini. And yet another ex President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, whom we delight to have with us right now.

Currently president of the Circumnavigators Club is Circumnavigator Richard G. Coffin, of the Socony Oil Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

Two Timely, Pertinent Editorials Appearing in the Los Angeles (Calif.) Examiner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, here is an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner, Saturday, September 23, 1961, on the editorial page thereof. This article is written by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Jack Lotto. Note therein that in paragraph 7 the House Un-American Activities Committee is mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, but again with my vigorous commitment and expression of belief, this is no time whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, for any citizen who claims to be patriotic to the best interests of our beloved Nation in security matters, to in any manner do anything which actually weakens—or even tends to weaken the security of our beloved Nation against subversive infiltrators or the domination of any person or group of persons who are known to be actual members of the Communist Party in the United States, or who are known to be actual Communist dupes or fronts:

RED SCARE DRIVE PREDICTS MASS ARREST OF U.S. CITIZENS

(By Jack Lotto)

The Communists are raising the specter of concentration camps in the United States.

The scare campaign is part of a program to frighten the unthinking into backing the Reds on destruction of U.S. security laws.

In trying to unite public opposition to the Supreme Court upheld McCarran Act, the Reds built scary pictures of Hitler era prisons being prepared for Americans.

The bogeyman theme was laid down by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, national chairman of the Communist Party, in the party's limited-circulation magazine, "Political Affairs."

The party is desperately fighting to stave off execution of an order to list its members with the Government and label its propaganda as Communist material.

DISTORTION

According to Mrs. Flynn the Reds are to spread the fiction that all who oppose war, all who advocate peace, disarmament, coexistence, can, upon the judgment of the Attorney General, be shunted off to concentration camps, along with Communists, fighters for Negro rights, labors' rights, etc.

"A military involvement in any area of several spots where a so-called crisis exists, and hundreds of Americans are listed as subversive by the FBI, the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Birchites, and what have you, could find themselves in a concentration camp.

"Let it be known far and wide to the American people what the end of the trail is for Americans under the McCarran Act," Mrs. Flynn wrote.

The outward Communist concern for American freedom would be laughable if it wasn't so tragic. The local Reds are part of a global conspiracy to destroy freedom and represent the world's worst tyranny.

LIMITED USE

The detention camp law has long been on the books. What is important to know is that the clause goes into effect only in the event of the invasion of the United States, or a formal declaration of war, or insurrection within the United States.

It would affect only those persons suspected on "reasonable grounds" by the Attorney General as being likely to engage in sabotage or espionage on behalf of a foreign power.

This section of the law is certainly no threat to the general public, but only to those who would attack from within to aid foreign forces.

Despite this fact, the Reds are told by their national chairman—

"When it (detention clause) becomes fully known, I am confident there will be such universal indignation and repudiation of this disgraceful act, as will sweep it into oblivion. Victory is possible."

SMOKESCREEN

Actually, the attack on the detention clause is a smokescreen for the Reds to wipe out the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Smith Act.

Mrs. Flynn claimed that the Communists, by fighting to nullify the security laws by every possible means, are spearheading the struggle and holding the dikes against "possible future victims."

Another strong objection of the Reds—once they register under terms of the existing law—they are forbidden to work for the Government or in defense plants.

The false Red complaint, as voiced by the Red chairman—

"One of the first acts of the Nazis was to deprive the Jewish people of the right to earn a living. The McCarran Act does the same thing to Communists and others."

FEAR SPREADERS

The comrades were instructed to try to line up "millions" on the single issue of ending the McCarran Act and similar laws.

Among the organizations they were told to contact for support were the AFL–CIO, American Civil Liberties Union, American Jewish Congress, Railroad Brotherhoods, Americans for Democratic Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Lawyer's Guild, and independent unions.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting the following text of another editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner for Friday, September 22, 1961, I expressly call attention to the following language which is quoted from a statement by FBI Director John Edgar Hoover: "There is probably no significant section of the American public—regardless of age, race, social standing, occupation or political orientation—whose interests have not coincided, on occasion, with one or more of the Communists' immediate demands." Mr. Speaker, I do this because it increasingly appears to me that there are some very prominent American citizens who seem to be ready and quite willing to publicly charge other American citizens who disagree with them on matters of race, creed, social standing, occupation or political orientation as being Socialists, and they make this charge because, as Mr. Hoover says, the Communist Party happens to take substantially the same position on the same sub-

ject with which the disagreeing American citizen takes issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and many other Members of this great legislative body, of which I have now been a Member almost 15 years, have heard me frequently say that I believe any patriotic American citizen should be entitled to pray the way he wishes, to write the way he wishes, to speak the way he wishes, and to print whatever he wishes. But, Mr. Speaker, I have limited these freedoms of worship, speech, and press to the legal limits set by established law. This means, in my humble judgment, that they must be law-abiding citizens.

The referred-to article follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER WARNS OF BLIND ATTACKS ON REDS

WASHINGTON.—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warned Americans Thursday against being "merely against communism without being for any positive meansures" to improve conditions which the Communists attack.

"The danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views on a particular issue happen to parallel the official (Communist) party line is obvious," he said.

"The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their proponents."

Such persons, Hoover said, "would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

Hoover's views were expressed in a document entitled "The Communist Party Line" he prepared at the request of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Making it public, Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, termed it "the wisest and most penetrating treatment of the 'party line' that I have ever read."

Hoover said a chief tactic of the Communist Party line is the use of immediate demands which often coincide with the desires of many loyal, respectable citizens.

"There is probably no significant section of the American public—regardless of age, race, social standing, occupation, or political orientation—whose interests have not coincided, on occasion, with one or more of the Communists' immediate demands," Hoover said.

The FBI Chief said, "the Communist Party line, which promises all things to all men is skillfully designed to appeal to people from every walk of life and, at the same time, to confuse the public by blending proposals ostensibly sponsored by the Communists with those of legitimate organizations."

However, he said, the uninformed citizen is often misled.

"He may accept the party line at its face value," Hoover said, "or he may make the equally dangerous assumption that anyone who advocates proposals similar to those which make up the party line is automatically a Communist."

Internal Threat From the Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Platt Cline, editor of the Arizona Daily Sun of Flagstaff, Ariz., in my district, is one of the most sound and respected commentators of Arizona and national affairs. Under general leave granted Members, I enclose the following from his "News and Views" column of September 20, 1961:

RADICAL RIGHTWINGERS

Robert Welch, founder of the radical rightwing John Birch Society, this week described democracy as "mob rule" and "the worst form of government there is."

He made his statements at the seventh annual Constitution Day Convention in Chicago.

Perhaps he favors a dictatorship with himself at the head of it. Or, if he favors rule by a special group, the big problem is, Who decided who belongs to the group? Robert Welch? Jimmy Hoffa? Herbert Hoover? Harry Truman?

Welch's clear statement of his opposition to our form of government is evidence that the greatest internal threat we have in the United States are the rightwing radicals such as the Birch Society gang, not the Commies, of whom we have probably less than 25,000 in the whole country.

Take your pick: Would you rather have Mussolini-Hitler-Franco or Khrushchev? That's about what it boils down to if you want to go in for the radical extremes of the political spectrum.

The Birchites are to date largely a bunch of more or less well-intentioned crackpots. But they could become a destructive force of major proportions.

Democracy may be "mob rule," as Welch says. And it may be the most costly, inefficient and clumsy form of government known. But it's still the best.

A Great Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, many words of praise have been written about the magnificent speech the President delivered before the United Nations. The President spoke with courage and frankness. He chartered the course toward a just and lasting world peace for all nations to follow, marking clearly all of the hazards which must be eliminated before peace can be secured. His words should give renewed hope and inspiration to all men. It may well be recorded in history as the equal of his inaugural address.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the wonderfully expressed editorial from the Jersey Journal of Tuesday, September 26, which I feel is the reaction of most thinking people:

A GREAT MESSAGE

President Kennedy's address to the United Nations Assembly could prove to be one of the decisive statements of our time. It can be so because it was, on the highest level, a campaign speech seeking votes—votes to keep the world sane.

It was addressed to the young voters in the United Nations, the new nations. It went particularly to those which have risen proudly to independence so recently in Africa. It made clear their stake in the struggle to control the U.N., how they would lose if the Soviet Union has its way in watering down the authority of the U.N.

The President's other themes: Disarmament; cessation of nuclear testing; the release of captive peoples everywhere, including the millions within the Soviet stockade; the sharp criticism of Soviet weaknesses, including their need to fence in their own people; all of these can be realized only if the U.N. holds together in the manner its founders intended. Should the U.N. collapse, then the other goals will become almost impossible.

And so the speech can be a world turning point because it was a candid appeal for world support. Its whole strength is that it relies upon man's willingness to stand up for man's dignity.

If we are wrong on that, then there is not much hope for the world anyway.

Goals of the New Frontier—Health and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is in a violent struggle for the minds and hearts of men. Newly independent, and in most cases, underdeveloped, nations of the world are looking at both the United States and the Soviet Union as a means of finding their blueprint for the future.

The problems which these nations face are formidable. Whether or not their problems will be met in an atmosphere of freedom on totalitarian tyranny, will depend to a large extent on how we in America care for our own social and economic needs. If we as a nation can provide a greater amount of social justice within our free society, than the Soviets with their ruthlessness, there can be no doubt as to what path the newborn nations will take toward national self-realization.

One of the greatest challenges which faces our free society, and every other society, is that of providing an adequate program of health services and benefits for all our people regardless of their financial position.

The health of any nation is the key to its own future. It is an extremely important factor in determining its economic vitality, the morale and efficiency of its citizens, and success in achieving its national goals.

OUR HEALTH NEEDS

Here in America much has been done to provide a healthful life for our people. Yet, much remains to be done. Although we are now spending more than $25 billion a year for health services, there are major deficiencies in the quality and distribution of these services.

All too often our new medicines and new methods opening the way to a fuller and more useful life, are beyond the reach of those who need them most. Financial inability, inadequate community resources, and shortages of trained

personnel prevent too many people from reaping the benefits of medical knowledge.

As President Kennedy said in one of his important campaign statements:

In no area is progress more vitally needed than in the area of health. We must provide Federal grants for the construction, expansion, and modernization of medical schools, dental schools, and schools of public health. We must provide loans and scholarships for medical students. We must provide grants for renovating our older hospitals. We must provide long-term grants for increased medical research, including basic research. We must expand our efforts for rehabilitation.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

To fulfill this important campaign pledge, President Kennedy sent a special message to Congress on health and hospital care on February 9 of this year.

In addition to the President's proposal for medical care for the aged through the social security program, this message outlined bold and progressive programs in the fields of health personnel, medical research, care of our youth, vocational rehabilitation, and community health facilities.

HEALTH PERSONNEL

To help alleviate the critical shortage of doctors throughout the Nation the President proposed a 10-year program to expand training facilities in medical and dental schools through construction grants and a program of 4-year medical scholarships. The need for more physicians throughout the Nation is pressing. Merely to maintain the presently inadequate physician-population ratio of 133 physicians per 100,000 population, 3,600 more medical students must be graduated annually than were graduated in 1959. Unfortunately, Congress has failed to act on this important legislation. It remains as unfinished business for the next session which convenes in January.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

In the area of medical research there is also much to be done, Mr. Speaker. A recent survey made by the U.S. Public Health Service concluded that tremendous unnecessary loss of life, health, and money has resulted from the failure to use new research findings. At that time the Public Health Service determined that 40,000 yearly deaths from cancer could be eliminated; that 40 million children do not have protection from tooth decay afforded by fluoridated water; that 20,000 persons die yearly from preventable rheumatic fever attacks and rheumatic heart diseases, that 60,000 new cases of tuberculosis occur every year although there are well-known ways to prevent its spread; and finally, that 17 million persons have chronic disability and a high proportion fail to receive care that would reduce handicapping effects.

These facts clearly indicate that we have fallen down in the past in providing adequate protection for our people. To begin progress again President Kennedy proposed increases in the annual Federal grants for health research facility construction, now authorized under the Public Health Service Act, from $30 to $50 million. Here again an important proposal was put off in this session of Congress because of other urgent economic and defense needs.

In his message, the President pointed out the need for increased attention to the health of our children. Since 1950 our Nation has slipped from 6th to 10th place among the advanced nations of the world in the saving of infant lives. Each year some 400,000 babies are born with congenital malformations, and untold numbers begin life mentally retarded, afflicted by cerebral palsy, or suffering from other serious conditions which require prompt and effective care and additional research.

CHILD HEALTH

In this important area of national concern President Kennedy proposed the establishment within the National Institutes of Health, a National Institute of Child Health and Development which would include a Center for Research in Child Health as well as other broad ranging health research activities not now covered by the specialized work of the existing institutes. He also asked for increased appropriations for existing Children's Bureau programs covering child health and welfare, and asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study and report on the adequacy of existing school health programs.

COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Let it not be thought, however, that this Congress did nothing in the field of public health. It did enact one very important bill, the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961.

The purpose of this measure is to improve community health services and facilities for our aged people and for the chronically ill, and for research in seeking the causes and cure of crippling diseases. It provides matching funds for improved nursing home programs, home health care plans, and outpatient diagnostic services. This bill also authorizes increased funds for the construction of public and nonprofit nursing homes.

The need for this legislation was pressing. With the lengthening of our life span in America the problems of chronic illness have increased. More than half of the 17 million persons over 65 years of age, excluding those in institutions, have some kind of chronic health problem that interferes with their daily living according to data collected by the National Health Survey of the Public Health Service. The survey also shows that chronic illness is not peculiar to the elderly. It also effects the middle-aged, the young adults, and children as well.

Public health personnel and others in the field of health are faced with the problem of most effectively and most economically ministering to the health needs of those afflicted with chronic illnesses. They point out time and time again that many of these people could be adequately cared for in nursing homes or in their own homes under adequate programs. The purpose of the bill which Congress enacted is to aid the State governments in making such nursing homes and programs available.

THE TASK AHEAD

As I have indicated, there is much to be done to provide our people with a better opportunity for a more healthful life. I feel that Congress has taken a great step forward in passing the President's Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. Yet much remains to be done. There still remains the medical care to the aged program, and proposals for increased health personnel, medical research, child health, and vocational rehabilitation. The President has shown what must be done, Mr. Speaker, now it is up to Congress to act on his proposals.

Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, mindful of the heavy obligations we in Congress will shoulder next year—a key year in the life of the State Department's reciprocal trade program—I earnestly urge every Member of this body who cherishes the basic interests of his constituents in industry, agriculture and labor to examine carefully the following document and note well its contents:

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

(A brief review by O. R. Strackbein, Chairman, the Nation-wide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

The first Trade Agreements Act was passed in June 1934, for a 3-year period.

TARIFFMAKING BY CONGRESS

This act marked a sharp break from the historic method of tariffmaking of the preceding 145 years. The Congress itself had written all previous tariff legislation and with minor exceptions had determined the individual tariff rates. This process became exceedingly demanding of the Congressional Committees concerned, i.e., the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The tariff structure had become complex and tariffmaking had become a highly technical process.

Tariffmaking by Congress itself had come under attack, moreover, because it lent itself to log rolling. A demand for a "scientific" tariff was widely expressed and this resulted in the creation, first of a Tariff Board in 1909 and later a Tariff Commission, in 1916.

CREATION OF TARIFF COMMISSION

The purpose in setting up a Tariff Commission was at first to provide an advisory body for legislative guidance and later to take from the shoulders of Congress the process of tariff rate adjustment itself. The Tariff Commission was therefore a creature of Congress, established to do detailed and technical work for the Congress. However, the executive branch was invited by Congress in the legislation creating the Commission to a share of the tariffmaking power vested in Congress by the Constitution by giving to the President the authority to appoint the members of the Tariff Commission, which were six in number, equally divided between the two political parties.

The tariffmaking power of the Commission was not started until 1922 when the Fordney-McCumber Act for the first time authorized the Commission to make comparative cost-of-production studies in this country and abroad for the purpose of as-

certaining the cost of articles in domestic industries and in competing industries in other countries. The President, upon a finding of the Commission, could then increase or reduce existing rates by as much as 50 percent.

This limited tariffmaking power was continued in the Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 (the last tariff written by Congress itself) and the Tariff Commission continued on a limited scale to make findings on relative foreign and domestic costs of production of particular articles. The cost-of-production formula from 1922 to 1934 led to 69 completed investigations of which 15 led to tariff increases and 18 reductions. In 32 cases the rates were left undisturbed. Four cases were otherwise disposed of.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

When the Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934 this approach to tariff adjustment was virtually discontinued. A provision in the act prohibited the application of the cost-of-production approach to any item that was the subject of a trade agreement concession. Today this means that some 95 percent of the tariff items are excluded from this type of tariff adjustment.

In place of this system which was regarded as too cumbersome the 1934 act provided that the President might enter into foreign trade agreements and reduce or raise existing rates up to 50 percent regardless of cost-of-production differences. The 50 percent limitation was the same as under the preceding tariff acts; but the President was substituted for the Tariff Commission as the prime mover in the premises; and the avowed purpose was to reduce tariffs and not to raise them.

In 1945 a new extension of the act authorized the President to reduce all existing rates another 50 percent. In some instances, i.e., in those cases in which the tariff had already been cut 50 percent, this made possible a total reduction of 75 percent.

Unlike some other countries, we made no provision for compensating for rising prices in those cases in which we have a specific duty. This is a duty expressed, not in a percentage of value (known as an ad valorem duty) but in terms of a specified number of cents or dollars per unit of measurement, such as yards, square feet, pounds, tons, or individual articles. If the rate was 10 cents per yard and the price per yard was $1, the tariff was equivalent to 10 percent ad valorem. If the price rose to $1.50 the protective rate fell to 7½ percent; while a rise in price to $2 reduced the rate to an equivalent of 5 percent ad valorem. We have a considerable number of specific rates.

Therefore the rise in prices since 1934 has produced a tariff-reducing effect quite aside from actual tariff cuts.

GENERAL AGREEMENTS ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)

From 1934 to 1947 we negotiated only bilateral trade agreements, i.e., agreements with individual countries; and completed about 28 of them. In 1947 we negotiated in Geneva with 22 countries and on October 30 of that year signed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, usually known as GATT. This went into effect January 1, 1948.

Subsequently we took part in three additional multilateral conferences for tariff reductions: Annecy, France 1949; Torquay, England 1951; and Geneva 1955. In 1960 we went into a conference in Geneva, devoted to the Common Market of Europe and in 1961 we are engaged in carrying out further tariff reductions.

Beyond the 1945 act which added the second 50-percent-tariff-reducing authority, the act of 1955 empowered the President to reduce tariffs another 15 percent and the Extension Act of 1958 added another 20 percent. The latter authority was not exercised until 1961.

Today GATT has 39 full-fledged members and several limited memberships, including that of Japan.

DRASTIC REDUCTION IN OUR TARIFF

Under the trade agreements program the protective effect of our tariff has been reduced a full 80 percent. A part of this reduction came from the effect of price increases on specific duty rates, as explained above.

The average rate of duty on dutiable items when the Trade Agreements Act began was slightly over 50 percent. Today it is not much over 10 percent.

POWERS OF CONGRESS IMPAIRED

Under the Trade Agreements Act the President is authorized to bind items on the free list. This is an obligation not to put a tariff on these items. A considerable number of items have been so bound.

He is also authorized to bind items at existing rates. This is a promise not to raise rates. Many items have been so bound in the various trade agreements.

These bindings have been questioned as tying the hands of Congress by foreign executive agreement. Should any future Congress wish to impose a tariff on an item bound on the free list or to raise one that had been bound against an increase it could do so only by violating our international commitment.

Such a roadblock against free action by Congress has been condemned as the exercise of unconstitutional power by the executive branch; but no corrective action has been taken. The Congressional authorization to the President to make such bindings came at a time of economic distress, i.e., during the Great Depression; but it represented a long-range type of commitment that goes beyond any one Congress, i.e., it extended into Congresses not yet elected the will of a particular Congress (i.e., Congress of 1934) and thus reduced by that much the meaning of biennial elections.

RENUNCIATION OF IMPORT QUOTAS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) contains a similar binding of the Congress with respect to the imposition of import quotas. Our Department of State was instrumental in having the contracting parties of the general agreement (22 in number at the outset, now 39) adopt a provision binding upon the members not to institute or maintain import quotas. While several exceptions were written into the general renunciation of such quotas, these exceptions were transitory, so that in time we would face a quotaless flow of trade among the nations.

Since import quotas are an instrument used in the regulation of foreign commerce and inasmuch as our Constitution places the responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce upon Congress, the State Department was treading on very dubious constitutional ground when it committed this country in a foreign executive agreement not to use this instrument. The Department thereby seemingly and possibly effectively set itself above Congress and the Constitution at the same time.

While Congress is not bound by an executive agreement, the power of Congress to act freely is impaired by the consideration that an international commitment would be violated if Congress acted contrary to the antiquota provision of GATT. Therefore the action of the State Department represents a critical encroachment on the power of Congress.

FAILURE OF TARIFF AND NEED FOR QUOTAS (IN CERTAIN INSTANCES)

Among our imports are many products that come from a variety of foreign sources. Chinaware, for example, is imported not only from England, Germany, and other European countries, but also from Japan. The same diversity of sources is true of various items of textiles, steel, glassware, optical goods, cameras, toys, and numerous other products.

A tariff that would be suitable with respect to imports from European countries would in most cases be wholly inadequate with respect to imports that come from Japan and other low-cost countries.

On the other hand, if the tariff were tailored to fit the low-cost countries it would be too high with respect to European counties. It would in fact exclude them from this market.

It is under situations of this kind in particular that import quotas represent a more suitable method of controlling imports than does the tariff. This follows from the fact that each tariff rate applies alike to all countries (under the most-favored-nation clause) other than the Communist controlled ones. Under the Trade Agreements Act of 1951 the latter must pay the unreduced rates of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The antiquota provision of GATT therefore is regarded by many who face the import problem as a most unfortunate and unjustified interference by the State Department with the legislative and regulatory functions of Congress.

FURTHER ENCROACHMENT ON CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY

The encroachment of the executive branch on the congressional authority to regulate foreign commerce has, in the eyes of many of the adversely affected parties, extended far beyond the impairment of the power of Congress to impose import quotas and to change tariff rates without upsetting international commitments.

It extends also to the remedy against the serious injury that may be incurred by an industry through a tariff reduction.

THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

In 1951 an escape clause of its own was adopted by Congress in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of that year. This clause laid down criteria of injury and added import quotas as a possible remedy for import injury.

The reply made by officials and their supporters to the numerous complainants against the administration of the Trade Agreements Act has been and still is, first, that great care is taken before a trade agreement is made to make sure that no duty will be reduced below the so-called peril point or the tariff level below which serious injury would occur. Studies are made preparatory to trade agreement negotiations and public hearings are held, giving interested parties an opportunity to be heard, it is asserted. In recent years, moreover, the Tariff Commission itself has been directed by law to make peril point findings before entry into any trade agreement.

Secondly, it is further asserted, that if our negotiators do make mistakes and cut a duty too deeply or if unforeseen developments lead to a flood of imports, there is the escape clause. It is ready for use by any industry that finds itself in serious difficulties from rising imports. In other words, there is a remedy after a trade agreement is made.

FAILURE OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ADMINISTRATION TO FULFILL EXECUTIVE ASSURANCES

This double-headed answer to complainants suffers from three fatal defects.

1. Finding of a peril point is a speculative venture by six mortals of the Tariff Commission who, as all other mortals, lack omniscience. They are expected to determine what will be the effect on imports of a given item if the tariff is reduced a given amount. Since they do not know what the effect of the existing tariff is, because there is no way of measuring the effect, they cannot possibly know what would be the effect if it were reduced 10, 20, 35, or 50 percent.

Bitter complaints have been heard over the extremely short time allowed for the

peril point findings. In 1960 upward of 2,000 items were processed in a matter of 2 months of hearings. The complaint, while seemingly justified, may be regarded as beside the point because the peril point could not be found ahead of an actual tariff reduction regardless of the amount of time spent on futile inquiry.

The preparation for a tariff-reduction undertaking must at best be a great game of guesswork and the weighing of possible political repercussions if the tariff on such and such item is reduced. This preparation, aside from the finding of the peril point by the Tariff Commission, is in the hands of the Trade Agreements Committee, composed of representatives of seven or eight executive departments and the Tariff Commission. They sit under the name of the Committee for Reciprocity Information (CRI) as a hearings board and conduct hearings on the same items on the same day as the Tariff Commission. They are not concerned with the peril point but may advise the President to disregard it, which he may do. He has but to write a letter to two congressional committees stating his reasons for so doing. The CRI presumably furnishes him with the reasons.

The hearings before the CRI are as hasty as they are before the Tariff Commission. A half day may be given to a group of items.

The "great precautions" taken in preparation of a trade agreement are in fact no more than hit-and-run inquiries that satisfy neither the principles of sound inquiry nor the witnesses who are heard. The extremely hasty methods followed are in sharp contrast to the deliberations under the escape clause procedure, which represents action to remedy the errors of tariff-reductions.

2. The law requires that before a duty is reduced in a trade agreement the President must find "as a fact" that the existing duty on any given product is unduly burdensome and restrictive of trade. Either no such findings have yet been made or they are kept a secret. The Committee for Reciprocity Information has steadfastly refused to expose any such findings.

That such findings are not made would seem to follow from the fact that the Presidential list that is prepared for negotiation with other countries and which is submitted for peril point findings to the Tariff Commission has contained numerous products whereof the importation in recent years had doubled or increased even more sharply. Under such circumstances a finding that existing duties are unduly burdensome and restrictive of trade would be very difficult indeed.

Since the Tariff Commission is asked to find the peril point on such items it follows that in the judgment of the White House a duty could still properly be reduced even if imports paying the existing rate had increased several-fold.

3. The final answer made to complainants is that even if errors are committed by the negotiators at Geneva and tariffs are cut too deeply, the domestic industry is backstopped by a sure remedy under the escape clause.

The domestic industries that have brought cases under this clause, with few exceptions, regard these assurances as the most cynical of all.

THE RECORD UNDER THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

The record speaks for itself. It shows a 10 percent effectiveness.

For a considerable period after 1947 the Commission, as it was then constituted, rejected one industry application after another. Later, under a different group of Commissioners appointed by a different President, a considerable proportion of the cases resulted in findings of injury by the Commission and recommendations for a higher tariff or an import quota to the President.

For a period of 27 months beginning in January 1959, under a new Chairman and one new member, marking a new departure, the Commission processed 25 cases and made a recommendation to the President in only 2 cases. A number of the findings were 4–2 decisions. This meant that only two cases or one-twelfth of the total gained approval of the Commission in over 2 years' time.

The composite record under the escape clause from 1948 to early 1961 was as follows:

Cases completed by the Tariff Commission	113
Applications dismissed by the Commission	14
Cases in which no injury was found	50
Cases in which serious injury was found	28
Cases in which Commission divided equally	7
Total	99

Fourteen other cases were either terminated without a formal inquiry or were withdrawn; 35 cases of the 113 went to the President, 7 of them under equally split decisions.

The President took positive action in 13 cases; but later dropped 2 of them, thus leaving only 11 in effect. These are largely on products of minor commercial status with two or three exceptions; namely, lead and zinc, bicycles and watches. The others are safety pins, dried figs, clinical thermometers, linen toweling, spring clothespins, etc.

STATE DEPARTMENT DOMINATION OF THE SCENE

Principally this hollow record may be attributed to the domination of the scene by the State Department and the President, to the virtual exclusion of Congress. Considerations of international relations have pushed consideration for domestic producers to one side. Presidential appointment of members of the Tariff Commission, including the designation of the Chairman, has virtually assured the implementation of executive policy rather than that of Congress.

Since both the President and the State Department are heavily engaged in the conduct of foreign affairs and since the fortunes of domestic producers have been delivered into their hands, it is not surprising that the pleas from these domestic sources fall on remarkably deaf or foreign-policy-attuned ears. Their interests are left virtually without counsel at the bar. Members of Congress, who are in the one branch of the Government that is responsive to the people back home, are no longer able to respond to, support or defend their constituents even though the Constitution provides that they, the legislators, and not the executive branch should regulate our foreign commerce.

EMIGRATION OF INDUSTRY

The upshot is that now that imports have succeeded in penetrating our market in unprecedented fashion, driving domestic manufacturers before them, these find themselves denuded of defenses and therefore at the mercy of imports. They have tried the remedies provided by law and have found them empty. In self-defense many of them have sought and continue to seek escape, no longer through the escape clause, which they have found wanting, but by investing in foreign countries.

These unsatisfactory conditions cry out for a remedy.

It would be far better to forget the preparatory cautions prior to negotiation of a trade agreement as these have been carried out. The peril point findings provide a spurious assurance against reckless tariff-cutting while the CRI hearings must have been highly hypocritical, considering how far out tariff has been dismantled. With all the caution our tariff has been reduced, one way or another, by 80 percent. Evidently this took a lot of study and caution. A meat ax would have served as well and would have deceived fewer people.

The need today is for a proper remedy, available and applicable when it is needed. The test of a tariff reduction comes to light in the results rather than in the process of preparation for the reduction.

The United States and all other members of GATT reserve the right in making a trade agreement to remedy injury by restoring the tariff part way or all the way back to its previous level. This question should then be nothing more than one of fact; and it is the function of the Tariff Commission to make this finding. The rest should be automatic and could not support either resentment or retaliation by other countries. They have the same right as we and they put on or take off restrictions at will and with impunity—with one difference: they do not bother with so cumbersome a process as our escape clause. Moreover, we have compensated other countries in those few instances of tariff increases as a result of escape clause actions, by reducing the tariff on other items. Thus there can be no grounds for retaliation.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, another of our colleagues has been called to eternal rest. The untimely passing of OVERTON BROOKS is a shock to all of us. I served with him on the Committee on Armed Services and for a time his office was on the same corridor as mine in the New House Office Building. I passed it daily. And I sometimes wondered if his office was ever closed. Even on Sundays he would invariably be at his office.

He was a tireless worker who loved his work. I do not believe anyone could be more conscientious. If anything, he was too conscientious. He asked more of himself than could possibly be expected of any man. It is typical of him that he did not allow himself sufficient time to fully recover from an operation, with the result that he had to be readmitted to the hospital and a few days later passed on to eternity.

OVERTON gave his life in his conscientious effort to serve his people of Louisiana and his country. As chairman of the important Committee on Science and Astronautics, he carried more than an ordinary burden. He had the innumerable and truly perplexing problems that one faces in organizing a new committee and of a committee which would have jurisdiction over a subject only in the embryonic stages. OVERTON BROOKS served as a pioneer and his dedication to his work resulted in the many things that have been accomplished by this new standing committee of the House.

No job was too big for OVERTON. Nor could he be assigned too many jobs. The bigger the job, the more duties and responsibilities he had, the better he liked

it. He sought always to serve. And he served well. He served well on the Committee on Armed Services, but he saw an opportunity for larger service when he took over the chairmanship of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

With the passing of OVERTON BROOKS we have lost an invaluable colleague, and I have lost a personal friend. I extend my sincerest sympathy to his wife and family. I share their loss.

Goals of the New Frontier: U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in his profound and moving address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, President Kennedy expressed the view of most thoughtful Americans that "mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind."

The President's eloquent statement was followed by a proposal for general and complete disarmament under full international control. His solid stand for this objective was greeted by wide acclaim throughout the world.

The President's expression of hope and his endorsement of an ideal were not mere words and eloquence. They were the expression of an idea which the President spoke about during the campaign and an idea central to the whole notion of the New Frontier. Moreover, as this session of Congress demonstrated, it is an idea which we believe to be worthy of the best efforts of the country.

As the session of Congress ended, a bill to create a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was passed. The bill, as initially approved, won 290 out of 341 votes in the House and 73 out of 87 votes in the Senate. These powerful demonstrations of congressional approval for a serious new approach to disarmament underline both our backing for the President and our interest in a new approach to peace.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will fill a great gap in our policy making machinery. Unfortunately, U.S. disarmament efforts have suffered from a lack of expert advice, lack of reseach support and lack of adequate preparation throughout much of the postwar period.

Our disarmament negotiators have returned from the conference table time and again to complain of inadequate backstopping and incomplete and unresolved instructions from home. Clearly, something had to be done to coordinate policy formulation and rationalize our research program for disarmament.

The President's new Agency was designed to fill this gap by John J. McCloy, his Special Adviser on Disarmament. The Agency will take the place of a small Disarmament Administration within the State Department. Its functions will be to coordinate research, policymaking, negotiating, and public information on disarmament. Its research mandate will be as broad as the greatest problems of peace; it will cover all aspects of the political, economic, legal, technical, and military approaches to the problems. New ways to keep the peace in a disarmed world will be studied; as will the economic aspects of disarmament.

With this broad mandate, the Agency's Director should be well prepared to formulate sound proposals for arms control and disarmament under full inspection. Basing himself in solid research, the Director will also be able to make his position known directly to the President; for the legislation gives him the rank of an Under Secretary of State and cites him as the adviser of both the President and the Secretary of State for all disarmament matters. This unique setup is designed with a specific purpose in mind. All too often past disarmament problems have occurred because the man in charge did not have sufficient status to resolve disarmament disputes between the various agencies. In order to make his position clear and to insure full coordination and compliance with a final policy decision, the Director is made the President's personal adviser. Once the President decides on a given proposal, therefore, the new Director will have sufficient status to insure that it is carried out.

Since the Director must also carry out his mandate through negotiations, he must be the adviser of the Secretary of State for this special aspect of the problem. In formulating research he is the President's man; in negotiating the fruits of research he works hand in hand with the Secretary of State and is designated as his adviser.

The new Agency should do much to clarify the problem of disarmament and to put us in position to offer challenging new approaches to the Russians on this question. Already the people working in this area have shown their competence by presenting the U.S. first complete disarmament treaty in Geneva this spring. Our test-ban proposals indicated our seriousness of purpose but also—by being the very first of their kind—proved that we had not been well prepared in the past. Henceforth we should be in position to present such detailed and thoroughly prepared proposals at each step of disarmament negotiations.

The President has proposed that William C. Foster, head the new Agency. Foster is a well respected Republican who headed the Marshall plan after Averill Harriman and who has served in many high capacities in the Defense Department. It is to be expected that Foster and the new Agency will now begin the serious and complicated work of laying out a new American position for world disarmament.

There is no doubt that the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a major step forward. It fulfills the promise of the Democratic platform and underlines the serious hope of all Americans and all mankind. It is truly, as its statement of purpose indicates, a new "agency of peace."

The Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education: A Solution to the Needs of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a report from my research team at the State University of Iowa which showed that 27 percent of those parents who wanted to send their children to college cannot afford to do so.

Further, the report indicated that college and university enrollment is increasing at the rate of 5 percent per year. Thus, if present trends continue, by 1970, 50 percent of all Americans between 18 and 24 years of age will be enrolled in colleges and universities.

These figures are disturbing. The Nation may lose the potential contribution of many capable young people because the cost of a higher education is becoming prohibitive. With the increasing enrollment, the facilities and faculties of our colleges and universities will be very heavily taxed. It will be necessary to turn away many, many capable students.

This situation is one which must not be allowed to materialize. This Nation, at this juncture in its history, must train and develop every young person who has ability and capability. We cannot afford to lose a single individual.

In releasing this report to the press, I very briefly outlined a plan which, I believe, would do much toward meeting and solving this problem.

My education proposal, which I have chosen to call the Iowa plan for growth and progress in higher education—because it is very largely the product of work done by my research team at the State University of Iowa—consists of two phases:

Phase I would grant either a tax credit or a tax deduction to the parents of college students or to the student, depending on who incurred the expenses. I have introduced three pieces of legislation which would accomplish this.

Phase II contains some novel, interesting and, I believe, practical proposals which would greatly encourage parents to provide for their child's higher education.

The purpose of this plan is to assist parents in making advance financial preparation for a college or university education. At the same time, there would be created a vastly expanded and, I believe, adequate loan fund from which colleges and universities could borrow in order to expand their faculties, facilities, and programs providing they could prove the need and their ability to repay.

One of the proposals which we are now studying includes granting to the parents or guardian a $50 tax credit each year for each child up to age 18 or entrance into college—whichever is first—providing that an investment certificate was purchased at a private financial institution or from the Government. These certificates, which would be negotiable only at an institution of higher learning would create a loan fund upon which colleges and universities could borrow. When the child enters college his account at that institution would be credited in the amount—maximum $900 plus interest—of certificates purchased to age 18. The amount credited would be disbursed in four annual payments. In case the child did not attend college the account established for him would revert to the Treasury.

Another proposal to which we are giving some thought is one that would combine a tax credit and a tax deduction. The plan would work in the following manner:

First. A parent or guardian would receive a tax credit of $50 per year per child up to age 18 or entrance into college—whichever was first—if a $50 investment certificate was purchased.

Second. A parent or guardian would receive a $100 tax deduction if an additional investment certificate, in the amount of $100, was purchased. This would amount to a tax savings of about $20.

It is my hope that early in the next session I can introduce legislation to set up phase II.

The public and editorial response to these proposals has been very favorable.

There are several aspects of this plan which I want to make very clear.

This plan would encourage the general as well as the specialized education. While we need engineers, scientists, mathematicians, and foreign language specialists, we must not ever slight the humanities.

Under this plan there would be no strings attached as to the use of the certificates at the time they were negotiated except that the student must meet and maintain the academic standards of the institution in which he was enrolled.

Investment certificates would be purchased from private financial institutions—such as banks, savings and loan institutions and insurance companies—and perhaps as bonds from the Treasury.

This plan would provide a much needed fund upon which institutions of higher learning could borrow in order to expand their physical facilities providing only that they could show need and the ability to repay.

This fall, I plan to hold a series of conferences with business leaders, financiers, and educators regarding these proposals in order to work out the details thereof and in order to solve several problems. Preliminary conversations indicate that these consultations will be helpful and that in this way we can work out the remaining problems. It appears now that there are no problems regarding this plan which are insoluble.

I am convinced that a plan, such as the Iowa plan for growth and progress in higher education, can and will meet the problems of higher education which are confronting us. It will meet them without instituting Federal control. It will meet them without introducing the religious question. It will meet them by granting some financial assistance to parents and by encouraging parents to make advance financial preparation for their children's higher education.

I plan to expend considerable effort on these proposals because I think that they are correct and because they are needed.

Bankruptcy and the Experience of Judge Miles C. Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Judge Miles C. Riley, of Madison, Wis., has been practicing law for 54 years. For the past 30 years he has been conducting bankruptcy hearings in 16 counties in Wisconsin. During this period he has earned a well-deserved reputation as an expert on his subject and as a fair and greatly respected judge. The following article taken from the Credit Union Bridge of September 1961 gives us much insight not only into the workings of the bankruptcy laws, but to the personal experience and wisdom of Judge Riley:

A DAY IN A BANKRUPTCY COURT

(Personal bankruptcies have increased tremendously in the past few years—as much as 2,000 percent in some areas. Here's a look into one bankruptcy court, and one expert's views on the causes and remedies.)

A day in one of the busy U.S. bankruptcy courts is a revealing experience.

To these courts come people seeking relief from debt burdens; people whose business or personal affairs have become so hopelessly tangled that they feel the only solution is permission from the Federal Government to declare themselves broke.

More than 90 percent of today's bankruptcy cases are wage-earner cases; that is, personal rather than business bankruptcies. The volume of personal bankruptcies has increased tremendously in the past few years—as much as 2,000 percent in some areas.

Credit union officers—and everyone else interested in family finance, consumer credit, practical economics, and mid-century American sociology—might well find it interesting and educational to sit in on a day in a local bankruptcy court. The hearings, of course, are open to the public, as are records of the court.

Probably the dean of U.S. referees in bankruptcy is Miles C. Riley, of Madison, who at the age of 84 has been practicing law for 54 years and has been conducting bankruptcy hearings for 30 years.

The district he serves includes 16 counties in Wisconsin, with several medium-size cities, a number of industrial communities, and some of the best dairy and farming lands in the Nation. The volume of bankruptcies handled by Judge Riley's court has increased from a total of 37 in all of 1945 to more than 600 in the last year.

Is Judge Riley's court typical of bankruptcy hearings held across the Nation? Generally yes.

Let's sit in on a few cases during a typical morning's hearing:

FIRST CASE, MR. A

Mr. A is 40, an insurance salesman, is married, has four children aged 4 to 18. After he is sworn in by Judge Riley he sits nervously at a table with his lawyer, a few feet from the judge.

In response to the court's questions, Mr. A says he owns no real estate; he recently turned a house he was buying back to the mortgagor and realized $250 in the transaction, and his lawyer said Mr. A used this money toward paying debts. Mr. A's total assets, represented in total value of personal property (household goods and clothing) is $150, and his personal property is mortgaged in the amount of $185. Creditors (two of whom are present in the room) claim total debts of $4,300.

Mr. A has two cars, both paid for. One, a 1954 Buick, not in running condition, is of minimum value; the other, a 1951 Chevrolet in running condition, has a value of $100. He has $10,000 in term insurance; the policy is 2 years old and has no surrender value. He owns no stocks, bonds, or other securities.

His creditors include a bank with a revolving, "good-anywhere-in-town" credit plan. His salary is a "guaranteed" $450 a month, but he must meet an ever-increasing quota to receive his guarantee, and some months he doesn't make it.

Asked by the judge why he applied for bankruptcy, Mr. A says, "I have so many creditors there's nothing left." Turning to representatives of a bank and a finance company sitting across from him, he says, "I'm not complaining; you guys have been swell to me. But I've had so many threats of suits and garnishments, it got so I was afraid to answer the phone."

After conferring with the attorney and the creditors, the judge says "I see no reason for appointing a trustee in bankruptcy in this case, since this man obviously doesn't have anything. Unless there are any objections?" The creditors voice no objections.

BANKRUPTCY GRANTED

In approving Mr. A's application for bankruptcy, the judge concludes his case by citing the law; tells him that he need not appear again unless he is summoned by the court; and advises him that if he inherits property within 6 months of the date of filing for bankruptcy he must immediately inform his attorney (who will turn such inheritance over to the court) or face prosecution.

Mrs. B, a pleasant-looking housewife of 22, takes her seat confidently after she is sworn in. Her husband was granted bankruptcy in the same court a week earlier. She says she has one small child, and the judge notes, "prospects for another, I see." She is a high school graduate who works as a stenographer for the State.

She and her husband own no real estate. Their only assets are personal property and clothing. They pay $46 a month rent. They have a $1,300 debt to a sales finance company (household goods) on which they pay $44 a month; they owe $2,188 on a new, 1961 automobile and pay a finance company $62 a month; and have total debts of $6,700.

The judge earlier had ordered the husband to dispose of the car and get a cheaper, second-hand model, and he asks the woman's attorney whether this has been done. The lawyer says the husband is having difficulty getting credit to buy a used car. "I want that car turned in to this court tomorrow," the judge says.

A representative of a finance company, sitting in the hearing room, asks the court for immediate possession of the new car. He says his company is going to take a loss on the automobile, and wants immediate possession. "I agree with you that you're going to take a loss," the judge says. "I agree you should have possession as soon as possible. I sympathize with creditors and it is my job to see that creditors are protected.

"But when you make an unjustifiably large loan to a person you know can't keep up the payments, you must expect some trouble, including bankruptcy. That's part of your business." The creditor says he did not know these people couldn't make the payments. "Then you should have," says the judge.

This man and wife have a combined income of $400 a month. The judge asks Mrs. B why she is applying for bankruptcy. She said her husband has had threats of garnishment and the boss said he'd be fired if it happened. She is expecting a child, and will quit work in a matter of 6 months. She is cheerful and composed as she testifies, an attitude the judge does not like to see in these cases.

"Now you listen to me," he says. "I don't want you to take this thing lightly. This is serious business, do you understand? I want you people to get back on your feet. You have one child and another on the way. You have a duty to Uncle Sam to bring these youngsters up right." As he does in every case, he asks the lawyer whether he is sure his client has made full disclosure of all assets, and returns to Mrs. B.

"Have you told your lawyer the whole truth? I insist on this; this court must know the truth. It wouldn't be a bit nice to have that baby over in the jail, would it?" The judge finally grants bankruptcy after giving Mrs. B final instructions as to the law, and she gets up cheerfully and leaves.

When she is gone, the judge says, "Look at that little know-nothing girl; she hasn't got sense enough to come in out of the rain. And if you could have seen her husband—he's worse. And these are the ones these ——— credit people really load it on. (Judge Riley is a man of pungent speech.) "A nice girl—nicest girl you'd want to meet. But she just doesn't have any ——— sense when it comes to credit or family finance."

Mr. C is about 40, employed as a house painter, and has four children, aged 12 through 16. He has a ninth-grade education. His assets in personal property, total $660, and his debts total $3,850. He went through bankruptcy once before, 10 years earlier, before the same judge.

He has no real estate; has never had any. Household goods, wearing apparel all paid for. Has a 1951 Buick, worth $100, paid for. No life insurance, no securities and no money owed him. His take-home pay averages $90 a week. As he does in each case, the judge asks the reason for applying for bankruptcy, adding, "I'm not asking for an apology. You have every right to file for bankruptcy, and I am here to help you. I merely ask you for your reasons, the facts behind your trouble."

This man owes money to many doctors and hospitals; there has been much sickness in the family. He also owes finance companies and stores. Mr. C says he often works "short weeks" on the job. His wages have been garnished and his boss advised him to go into bankruptcy; otherwise his job is threatened. No creditors appeared in court.

In granting bankruptcy the judge told Mr. C, "now when these creditors come around crying on your shoulder I want you to make no promises. You tell them to see your lawyer; that your affairs are in the hands of this court." Repeaters, he says, are rare in his court, but among the few who do declare bankruptcy more than once, the reason often is that creditors have talked the debtor into giving them money; the debts behind the second bankrupty often are the same debts behind the first.

D HAS EIGHT CHILDREN

Mr. D, 36, is a machine operator, married, with eight children ranging from 2 to 12. He has 9th-grade education, owns no real estate. His personal property is free of debt. He owns two cars, a 1951 Buick, not operating, value $100, and a 1948 Plymouth, in running condition, worth $20 to $50. He owes $1,500, including many small bills to utilities, stores and finance companies, and $100 on the car that doesn't run. He has no life insurance. All eight children live at home; six are in school. His take-home pay is $80 a week.

FIFTEEN GARNISHMENTS

Why did he apply for bankruptcy? His attorney said Mr. D tried several plans of voluntary debt payment but they never worked out. He had one garnishment after another, a total of 15. "I had to do something so I could get food and clothes for my kids." His attorney said he failed to pay his way out from under his debts because of the repeated garnishments. The judge noted that many bankruptcies are caused by garnishments, particularly in industrial areas where companies have rulings under which a worker is fired after one, two or three garnishments.

In granting Mr. D bankruptcy, the judge congratulated him on being in relatively good shape considering the conditions. "Your household goods are paid for, and you haven't gone over your head on an expensive car. This shows good sense; in some ways you have handled your affairs pretty well. Considering the size of your family and your income, it's no wonder you're in financial trouble. You're an example of the kind of person the bankruptcy law is designed to protect."

Mr. E, 38, an auto assembly plant worker, has a wife and two children, owns no real estate, and his only assets are personal property. He owes about $1,500 to small loan companies, stores, an encyclopedia publisher, and others. Through his attorney he has requested relief under chapter 13 of the bankruptcy law and wants to pay $20 a month on his debts. (Ch. 13 protects a wage earner from garnishments while he pays off his debts on a schedule under court supervision.)

He says he does not want straight bankruptcy because "then they'd take my furniture and household goods away, and I'd have to buy new stuff on credit and start the whole thing over again."

The judge told Mr. E "you and I have established that you can pay $20 a week to your creditors, and that you want to pay them. Your creditors have agreed on such a plan. Now I want you to leave here with an obsession to pay these debts. I don't want you to go into debt again or make another move involving a dime without consulting this court.

"If you find you can't make these payments, this court has the power to reduce them. If you get a raise and want to make bigger payments, we can increase them. We want to make it a pleasure for you to pay your debts and enjoy the feeling of not owing anybody. We've taken the shackles off you. No creditor can touch you with a garnishment as long as you play the game with us."

The judge added that the court might order Mr. E to return the encyclopedia (one of the expensive adult sets) because "while they're nice to have, they're not exactly a necessity for a man in your financial shape."

Mr. F, a 30-year-old salesman, came into his hearing owing $21,250. Of this amount, $16,000 represents a house mortgage. He owes $1,600 to finance company A and was paying $56 a month; $1,800 to finance company B, and was paying $70 a month; $1,180 to finance company C, paying $50 a month; $450 to a bank, paying $45 a month; $235 on a store charge account, paying $12 a month; and $320 to a chainstore, paying $18 a month.

JUST A SUCKER

This adds up to about $250 a month, plus his house payments of $119. His income is $400. The judge shakes his head. "It's hard to imagine anybody getting himself into such a ——— mess," he says. "How did you get into such remarkable financial trouble?" Mr. F replies that his wife has been sick a lot, then adds more realistically, "I'm just a sucker for easy credit." Before granting Mr. F. bankruptcy, Judge Riley expressed himself colorfully in condemning Mr. F for being such a "credit boob" and condemning the lenders involved for letting this man have money.

It is not only loan companies that are called down. In one case a banker sat in the hearing room as a man was being questioned on his request for bankruptcy. The man was $28,900 in debt, and the bank in question had a $3,000 lien on his car, plus an additional unsecured note of $1,500. Noting that the car's value was listed as $1,750, the judge turned to the banker and said, "Well, well, you bankers are getting a little nutty, too, aren't you?"

To a finance company representative after an applicant ticked off a long list of debts, Judge Riley said, "Do you see what you people are doing? Here's a fine example of how you people operate. How is this man supposed to pay you and all the others? Why did you allow this man to borrow a nickel?

"Now you sit there waiting for your share of the dividends of this man's assets. Well, I can tell you there won't be any dividends.

This man hasn't got a ——— thing but his clothes and his furniture, and part of that is mortgaged. You can take your share of the credit for the shape he's in."

Judge Riley admits to three obsessions that he has developed in his 30 years as a bankruptcy referee; all three are interconnected.

His first obsession is that "this country has only one resource, it's kids. I'm 84; old fogies like me don't count. I don't worry too much about the other old fogies that come in here; they've had their chance. But the kids who come before me in trouble, and go out of here with the scarlet letter of bankruptcy stamped on them—I can't tell you how serious I think this is."

His second obsession is that "America is in a fantasia of credit. I realize that this country never could have become as strong and important as it is without credit," he says. "I am not opposed to credit. But this fantasia—this frenzy of people to borrow money and frenzy of creditors to give it to them."

CRITICAL OF LAW

And his third obsession is that American bankruptcy law is doing a poor job. "My experience tells me that at least half the people are able to pay their debts if given time extensions," Judge Riley sees the answer in chapter 13.

But he is critical of chapter 13, too. "What is needed in chapter 13 cases is a staff of counselors who will talk with people, examine their problems, educate them to understand how they got into trouble, and keep them enthused about paying their debts. It should be done by competent, trained people, and done with personal interest and good feeling. Otherwise, chapter 13 is the bunk."

Who is it that decides whether a person shall ask for straight discharge in bankruptcy or relief from debt under chapter 13? "The defect in the system is that the lawyer makes the decision," he said, "not the client,

and not the court. Most lawyers simply put a man through straight bankruptcy. Many lawyers know next to nothing about bankruptcy law, and many university law schools don't teach it. I have had lawyers in this court ask me 'what is chapter 13?'

"Lawyers don't know—and it's not their business to know—how much help their clients need in solving their financial troubles, how much economic rehabilitation could be given, or what is the story behind each bankruptcy."

LAW NEEDS CHANGING

Judge Riley believes strongly that the Federal law must be amended so that the bankruptcy judge—no one else—shall decide whether a man is relieved by straight bankruptcy or under chapter 13. And he insists further that the amended law must make provisions for providing competent staffs of counselors for every referee in bankruptcy. (Judge Riley for some time has had his own staff of counselors.)

"Creditors must be educated too. They must be told by someone—and nobody is doing it now—that if they extend easy credit they have to accept hazards.

"Let me give you an example of what this frenzy for production, production and more production is doing to this country. I had a fellow in here from a big company—one of the biggest in the United States—that had a claim of $30,000 against a bankrupt. He was not one bit fazed by the fact that he wasn't going to collect. You know what he told me?

"'Listen Judge, this is peanuts. Don't you think my company can take a $30,000 loss once in awhile? I'm sure it won't bother us very much. We expect a certain amount of these.'

"Here's what I told him," Judge Riley said. "Sure, this loss is peanuts to you, but you have competitors who can't afford a loss like that. And you're setting the pace of credit in your industry by your example. What about all the people who are going to get in debt and wind up in bankruptcy court—some of them with their whole lives shot—because your company can stand a big loss? To say nothing of small businessmen that have to risk their necks extending credit, trying to compete with you."

THIRTY-YEAR SUMUP

"Let me sum up my position on credit and bankruptcy, based on 30 years of looking at the dark, brown side of the family and business finance," he said:

"In 1935 there were roughly 77,000 bankruptcies in the country, of which 46 percent were individual. This was while 26 percent of the population was unemployed. In 1960, there were 110,000 bankruptcies, of which 90 percent were individual, and 6 percent of the population was unemployed.

"Behind this tremendous increase in personal, individual bankruptcies are an obsession among businessmen for increased production at any cost, and a fantasy of credit in which both the borrower and lender have lost their heads.

INTENDED AS RELIEF

"Bankruptcy is intended to be, and should be, a relief for distressed people, not an easy way out of responsibility. Actually, it often is not an answer anyway—people who think bankruptcy means wiping away all debts are mistaken. Mortgages—any valid liens—are not dischargeable through bankruptcy. The only debts wiped away are unsecured debts; anything bought on a valid lien must be paid for or it can be taken away. Many bankrupts have learned that after the finance company takes the car away and the store takes back the furniture, and the lawyer has been paid his fee, he's no better off than before, and has to get right back in the hole for more furniture and other necessities.

"Every bankruptcy court should have a trained staff of counselors, by law. It should accept the idea that its job is to see that a bankrupt learns something from his experience and is encouraged to pay his debts if at all possible, and pay them poudly."

Union and Echo Reaches New Milestone

SPEECH
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Union and Echo, a Catholic newspaper in Buffalo, N.Y., recently enlarged its editorial offices. In dedicating and blessing this addition, the Most Reverend Joseph A. Burke, bishop of Buffalo, said:

This newspaper has defended principles that were not invented by men but were revealed by the living God. It will continue to perform that vital task for the enlightenment and progress not only of our country, but of God's holy church.

The observance marked completion of a second-floor addition containing editorial, advertising, and general office space for the 89-year-old publication. The official newspaper of the diocese of Buffalo, it has a circulation of 46,000.

The addition provides 5,000 more square feet of space for production of the paper and makes possible a rearrangement and expansion of printing facilities on the first floor.

Alfred H. Kirchhofer, editor of the Buffalo Evening News, who spoke at the dedication of the new building at the site in 1933, noted today:

This is a significant day because no other publication in Buffalo within a period of 28 years has had to double the amount of floor space it occupies.

Continuing, Mr. Kirchhofer called attention to the "interrelationship of the art of writing and printing to the development of all publications, secular and religious."

He observed that Catholic publishers are expressing themselves increasingly on social issues which affect the Catholic population and the entire community. He quoted a recent description by His Holiness Pope John XXIII in speaking of the high standards set for newspapers.

The pontiff told a convention of Italian journalists that their work constitutes a "difficult and serious profession," whose members must have "the delicacy of a doctor, the versatility of a literary scholar, the intuition of a jurist and an educator's sense of responsibility."

Msgr. Francis J. O'Connor, the editor-in-chief, termed the occasion a time for gratitude and rededication.

Commending the staff of the paper, he said that "all have shown what the church means when she speaks of the golden age of the laity." He said the addition to the building is a symbol of "their joint effort in ideas and in service."

Mayor Sedita cited the expansion as a sign of growth and success. "It is the earned and deserved reward for faithful adherence to certain concepts of mission and responsibility which have marked the existence of the Catholic Union and Echo," he said.

Cy B. King, executive editor of the Courier-Express, commended the diocesan publication on its growth and remarked:

We complement one another in our reporting of matters important to the citizens of this community. The Catholic Union and Echo does a job for Buffalo and the diocese which, in its breadth and depth, we never could hope to do.

By the saine token, the daily papers do a job of furthering community understanding by the publication of articles and news of religious objectives and ideals that possibly would not reach those of other faiths by other means.

Joseph P. Driscoll, associate editor of Catholic Union and Echo, was master of ceremonies.

Open house was held for nuns of the diocese from 3 to 5 o'clock, and for friends of the newspapers from 8 to 10 in the evening.

The editorial that follows appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on September 20, 1961:

UNION AND ECHO REACHES NEW MILESTONE

The Courier-Express today joins in western New Yorkers' tribute to the Catholic Union and Echo, official newspaper of the Catholic diocese of Buffalo, upon the dedication of the publication's newly expanded editorial offices and mechanical facilities.

Down through the years the Union and Echo has maintained the highest newspaper standards in reporting the progress of the diocese as well as explaining and interpreting the teachings of the Catholic Church to its laity and non-Catholics as well.

As succinctly stated by Cy B. King, executive editor of the Courier-Express: "We complement one another in our reporting of matters important to the citizens of this community. The Catholic Union and Echo does a job for Buffalo and the diocese which, in its breadth and depth, we never could hope to do. By the same token, the daily papers do a job of furthering community understanding by the publication of articles and news of religious objectives and ideals that possibly would not reach those of other faiths by other means."

We feel certain that the new addition to the Union and Echo is only one of many such progressive strides that will be taken in the future as the newspaper expands. In present and future attainments we wish our neighbor publication continued success.

Hon. Paul Brown, of Georgia

SPEECH
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia, has brought grief to all who knew him. Prior to his retirement last year, I was privileged to serve with him for 2 years on the Committee on Banking and Currency. There, as in all our other contacts, he was unfailingly kind, courteous and helpful.

Paul Brown brought great dignity and ability as well as the wisdom of long experience to our committee's deliberations. He was thorough and practical and constructive—qualities which, throughout his two decades of service in the Congress, enabled him to contribute greatly to his district, his State, and his Nation.

I am grateful for our association, brief though it was, and I join our colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife and daughter.

Addresses by Hon. Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, at the Vienna Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, addressed the Board of Governors assembled for the annual meetings of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Finance Corporation, International Development Association, and the International Monetary Fund. On Friday, September 22, Mr. Black also addressed the closing joint session of the Boards of Governors.

Because of the vitally important role the World Bank is playing in the world today, Mr. Black's remarks are especially significant. For this reason I commend them to the attention of our colleagues:

ADDRESS OF EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

It is a great pleasure for me to find myself greeting you here in Vienna, and let me add my own most cordial thanks to our hosts for inviting us to spend a few days in the gracious atmosphere of their lovely city. There will not, I trust, be any lack of harmony in our proceedings to disturb the shades of Mozart, Haydn, Schubert, or Strauss, and I hope that the ghost of Metternich will not be distressed by any informality in our diplomatic ways.

I would like to address a special word of welcome to this meeting to our new members, the governments of Nigeria, Portugal, Laos, New Zealand, and Nepal, and to the representatives here of other countries who have applied for membership. With the new membership now in sight, our organization will embrace nearly eighty nations. This must be one of the largest and most representative international gatherings that has ever met in this capital, which has such long traditions of diplomacy, culture and science.

I shall not attempt, on this occasion, to give a detailed review of the whole scope of the World Bank's activities. We have invested in development projects in 57 member countries and territories and have added to our capital resources by borrowing in the capital markets of seven member countries and Switzerland. The facts and figures about our operations are in the annual report before you and I shall not repeat them. Instead I will touch on a few of our problems—some old and some new—and, since this year, for the first time, I am presenting to you the annual report of the International Development Association, I shall give some special attention to that newest member of the World Bank family.

But before delving into these matters I want to say a word in appreciation of a man who is about to leave our immediate circle, a man who has done perhaps as much as, if not more than, any single individual to make possible the record of the World Bank and its affiliated organizations. I refer to Mr. Robert Garner.

In 1947, Mr. Garner left a lucrative and comfortable position in industry to become vice president of the World Bank. For the next 9 years he worked tirelessly to build up a competent professional staff and to fashion sound and suitable policies for a new venture into international banking. Many who are senior officers of the Bank today received their training under Mr. Garner and I know they share my conviction that he has a rare and precious talent for getting the best from his associates.

Five years ago, Mr. Garner was able to bring into being another organization, to whose design he contributed greatly, and which was aimed at serving private industry in the underdeveloped world in a way that the World Bank was not empowered to do. He presided over the birth of the International Finance Corporation and nursed it through its inevitable growing pains. Again he was a pioneer and imparted to those fortunate enough to work with him something of his own indomitable spirit.

All of us who have been privileged to know Mr. Garner well and to work with him are the better for it. I would like to wish him every contentment in his retirement and offer him the assurance that he has most certainly made his mark and will not be forgotten.

The lending activities of the World Bank continue at a high rate. Loan commitments during the past year amounted to about $610 million. Since the end of the year we have signed eight loans in a total of over $160 million.

The year's loans conform to the usual pattern of Bank operations with some growing emphasis on transportation.

A $90 million loan to Pakistan represents the Bank's contribution to the implementation of the Indus Basin Settlement which was reached last year. I am glad to report that construction will shortly start on several vital irrigation works in Pakistan, which form part of the 10-year construction program included in the settlement. The Indus Basin Development Fund, which the Bank is administering and into which participants in the financial arrangements are paying their contributions, has been organized, has made calls on the contributing governments, and has already begun disbursements.

The Bank has been holding meetings at regular intervals with a consortium of countries interested in the financing of India's 5-year plans. Last May a similar consortium was organized for Pakistan. These meetings have helped significantly to mobilize and coordinate the finance necessary for the early years of the current 5-year plans of both countries. We are now considering the appropriateness of the consortium technique in several additional countries.

The year was an active one for our Bond Marketing Department, but our outstanding funded debt rose by only $155 million, the smallest increase in 5 years. Two circumstances limited our need for new money. First, disbursements on loans have not been moving as fast as previously; for a variety of reasons, construction of many of our projects is taking longer. Secondly, we sold from our loan portfolio during the year, without our guarantee, about $200 million of our borrowers' obligations. Our total sales of loans, including participations at the time of loan signing, have now passed the $1 billion mark. The annual report has a discussion of this part of our business which I think you will find interesting.

All our borrowing during the year was done outside the United States. In July of 1960 we made a very large borrowing from the Deutsche Bundesbank. This was followed by our 9th and 10th issues on the Swiss market. (We are currently negotiating a further borrowing from the Swiss Government.) Last spring, for the first time in 6 years, we raised new funds in the Netherlands. And after the close of the year our bonds were offered for the first time on the Italian market. This was the first offering on the Italian market in more than 25 years by a non-Italian borrower, and it was most successful.

I am very pleased with the reception which World Bank bonds have been accorded recently in all European markets. I can assure my European banking friends that we will continue to do everything we can to keep the World Bank an attractive channel for investment funds flowing from Europe to the underdeveloped countries.

There are two, what I might call extracurricular, activities of the Bank which I would now like to mention:

At the meeting in Tokyo last July of the Development Assistance Group, consideration was given to a number of measures that might be taken by the governments of capital-exporting countries to further encourage the flow of private capital into the underdeveloped countries. This increasing attention which is being given to the contribution that private foreign investment can make to the development of the underdeveloped world is a trend I welcome. Among the measures discussed was the possibility of devising a multilateral scheme for the insurance of foreign investments against various noncommercial risks. The Governments of Germany, Japan, and the United States already have guarantee programs covering investments of their nationals in underdeveloped countries. During the past few years suggestions have been made in various quarters for a similar program on an international basis, and the Development Assistance Group has asked the bank to study and report on the potentialities and problems involved in the establishment of such a program. The bank has accepted this request. In doing so, however, we made clear that while we were generally familiar with the various proposals, we had no preconceived ideas about their usefulness or feasibility. We have made some progress with our study, but I am not yet in a position to forecast our conclusions.

Another subject that is frequently mentioned in this connection is the settlement of disputes between governments and private investors. As most of you know, the Bank as an institution, and the President of the Bank in his personal capacity, have on several occasions been approached by member governments to assist in the settlement of financial disputes involving private parties. We have, indeed, succeeded in facilitating settlements in some issues of this kind, but the Bank is not really equipped to handle this sort of business in the course of its regular routine.

At the same time, our experience has confirmed my belief that a very useful contribution could be made by some sort of special forum for the conciliation or arbitration of these disputes. The results of an inquiry made by the Secretary General of the United Nations show that this belief is widely shared. The fact that governments

and private interests have turned to the Bank to provide this assistance indicates the lack of any other specific machinery for conciliation and arbitration which is regarded as adequate by investors and governments alike. I therefore intend to explore with other institutions, and with our member governments, whether something might not be done to promote the establishment of machinery of this kind.

The Bank's regular technical assistance services were more active in the past year than ever before, and I shall have more to say about them later in these remarks. Here let me mention just one specific feature:

Our Economic Development Institute completed its sixth course during the past year and the Institute now has 118 alumni. Many of them have asked if, on leaving EDI, the kind of reading and reference material to which they were introduced during their stay at the Institute could be made available to them, and to their colleagues, when they got home. We have now made arrangements to distribute 85 libraries of carefully selected economic development literature to various institutions in our member countries. This program is a joint venture; the cost is being shared between our Economic Development Institute and the Rockefeller Foundation. The libraries consist of approximately 400 books, articles, and papers, in English. The Institute is planning similar libraries in French and Spanish, which will entail a substantial amount of translation. In the distribution of these libraries we have given preference to agencies and ministries in which Fellows of EDI are employed.

Let me turn now to the report of the International Development Association.

As of September 1, 54 countries have completed all the formalities to join IDA. Together they have subscribed the equivalent of $908 million to IDA's initial capital; of this amount $756 million will be available in freely convertible currencies by the end of 1964. $178.5 million of convertible currencies are now paid in, in accordance with the terms of the articles.

You will see from the report before you that, during the period of 8 months from the beginning of IDA's operations in November 1960 to the end of its first fiscal year, development credits totaling $101 million had been extended to four countries. Since June 30, $36 million in additional IDA credits have been extended and two further countries have been added to the list of recipients.

You will also see that each of these credits has a 50-year maturity and that there are no interest or commitment charges. Each credit, however, carries a small service charge to provide IDA with income to meet its administrative expenses. Amortization begins after a 10-year period of grace. This pattern, we think, effectively meets the organization's objective of providing development capital on terms which do not bear heavily on the borrower's balance of payments. However, IDA's charter allows considerable flexibility in setting terms, and we are not committed to any uniform pattern for IDA financing.

IDA's charter also allows considerable flexibility in determining the countries in which IDA will operate. There is a variety of circumstances where we feel an IDA credit may be justified. A necessary condition in all cases is evidence that the borrowing government is making a real effort to mobilize its own resources and to gear its financial policies to development. This standard, as I have said before, has been borrowed from the Bank and is being applied in IDA operations. But, IDA need not apply the same standards as the Bank with respect to a borrowing country's capacity to repay in foreign exchange. There are a number of countries, especially those that are very poor, whose foreign exchange situation is such that they cannot borrow abroad at all on conventional terms. Because of their bleak balance of payments prospects, IDA is prepared to assist these countries, when the government can show a definite will to mobilize domestic resources and to avoid inflationary policies.

A second, and large, group of countries in which IDA is prepared to operate consists of those whose burden of foreign debt service is so high that, while they can borrow on conventional terms some of the external capital which they require to carry out their priority programs, they cannot prudently borrow the whole of it. In these circumstances you may find the World Bank making loans and IDA extending credits at one and the same time. This, in fact, has happened with India, Chile, Sudan, and Colombia, for example.

These are very broad criteria. In practice, the decision for or against an IDA credit or the decision on the right blend of IDA funds and conventional funds calls for a large element of judgment. It is just not possible to apply to all countries a single yardstick of creditworthiness. Ratios of debt service to exports, or of debt service to local budgetary receipts or gross national product—while indicative—cannot be used as rigid criteria. Much depends on the particular circumstances of the borrowing country, on the stage of development it has reached, on the structure of its economy, on the prospects for increased exports, and so on.

There is yet another element of flexibility in IDA's charter of which we shall take advantage; namely, the range of projects which IDA will consider. The charter authorizes us to go beyond the usual types of projects financed by the Bank, and the authors of the charter clearly expected us to do so. The recent IDA credit to assist in the financing of a municipal water supply makes a first step in this direction. We are also actively considering a project to finance the construction of an industrial estate and another to finance a technical training program. We are considering these kinds of projects in consultation with other organizations, including the appropriate specialized agencies of the United Nations.

In the administration of IDA funds, questions of terms, eligibility, and project selection all raise problems, many of which we are still in the process of resolving. But we have seen enough of the picture to be convinced that IDA's major problem will be the meagerness of its present resources. There is in sight now a volume of promising applications which, if approved, would absorb a substantial part of the convertible funds initially subscribed for IDA's first 5 years of operations. India and Pakistan together are already in a position where they could quickly absorb in worthwhile projects all of IDA's capital by themselves.

Some members of IDA cannot yet present concrete proposals for credits because they are not yet able to present adequately prepared and justified projects. But others show every indication of coming forward with very substantial requirements, demonstrating that once a country organizes itself for development it can rapidly build up a burden of debt which may limit, at least temporarily, its ability to borrow abroad on conventional terms. In these circumstances, even on a conservative estimate, IDA's funds are likely to fall far short of the need. And considering this, it is none too early to ask ourselves what the future of IDA ought to be.

More is at stake here, however, than just the future of IDA. Development is now accelerating on a broad front in the underdeveloped world, and this presents two important problems to be tackled if we are to maintain productive cooperation between lenders and borrowers. First, we must redouble our efforts to insure that the aid offered really serves a priority development purpose; we must use all the influence that we can command, and extend all the help that we can, to insure that the underdeveloped countries themselves effectively utilize all their available resources. Secondly, quite apart from whether the funds flow through IDA or some other channel, our common objectives require that a greater proportion of the development capital provided should bear terms comparable to IDA's.

On the first of these points, let me say that, in my view, the ability of a borrower to use capital for sound development purposes is no less important—and indeed it is more important in the long run—than the form in which a lender makes capital available. This is why the Bank and IDA insist on every borrower presenting a well-conceived project which could fit into a sound development program. This, in fact, is the justification for our whole range of technical assistance services.

Over the past 14 years the Bank has been steadily increasing its technical assistance activities. We have deliberately adopted a liberal definition of these services. In the budget for the current fiscal year we are providing funds which will be applied to the financing of general survey missions; to the costs of our Economic Development Institute; to our general training programs; to the expenses of resident Bank representatives and of Bank staff members seconded to member governments in an advisory capacity of one kind or another; to the cost of sector surveys, such as a general transportation study in Colombia and a highway study in Peru; and, in special cases, to the cost of feasibility studies on individual projects. In addition, we have done considerable work as executing agent for the United Nations Special Fund on some large preinvestment studies.

The Executive Directors have shared my view that one of the most important activities in which the Bank can engage is trying to help member governments through services of the kind I have mentioned to organize their advance along the road to development. Today, the need is greater than ever—in part because of the increase of the development effort in many countries, in part because of the emergence of many nations with governments still lacking experience in the development field, and in part because of the increase in the number of aid-giving agencies whose efforts can be coordinated most effectively only in the recipient country. There is at once a much greater recognition than ever before of the essential importance of development programing and of sound project preparation; and at the same time there is an urgent need for competent people to help the underdeveloped countries to achieve these ends.

Against this background, we have recently decided that the Bank should expand its assistance to member countries by forming a group of highly qualified development advisers who will be available to our member countries on request for extended periods of time. These advisers will be integrated into a Development Advisory Service administered by the Bank. They will perform such duties as chief or senior economist of a general survey mission; resident economic or financial adviser to a government; member of, or adviser to, a planning office; administrator, or adviser to the administrator, of a development program; or simply an adviser on current economic and financial problems. We aim to recruit for this Service only those with the highest professional qualifications. We are under no illusions that this will be an easy job, so we can expect that at first the Development Advisory Service will be very limited in numbers.

These members of the Service, of course, will not go out equipped with model devel-

opment programs. The task of the development adviser is not to try to impose solutions but rather to illuminate the choices which governments must make if they are to proceed along the road to economic growth. The choices may be among the various economic sectors covered in a national program or among the various projects within a sector. In any case, the development adviser's job is to present choices in an orderly way, gathering cost data and identifying the benefits of projects so that the government can decide more confidently how fast to proceed and in what direction, given all the competing claims on its financial resources.

This is all a very practical exercise, not just for the underdeveloped countries but for the capital-exporting countries as well. In debates over development assistance there is too much emphasis, I think, on the quantity of the aid and too little emphasis on the quality of the effort.

The questions, "How much aid?" and "On what terms?" can only be answered dispassionately if there exists the element of sound development programing and administration. This is the lesson, I think, of our consortia meetings on India and Pakistan. In each case the background was the country's development program. Without these programs there would have been little basis for concerted action by the aid-giving agencies. Indeed, without a well-conceived development program as a basis, I do not see how the appropriate quantity of aid can ever be realistically determined for any country, whether with a consortium or without one.

Now I come to the second of the two important problems that I earlier referred to; namely, the need for a greater proportion of development capital bearing terms comparable to those of IDA. This problem gives me—and indeed should give all of us—serious concern.

If I have any criticism to make of the results of the India and Pakistan consortia meetings, it is that too much of the capital subscribed will be provided on terms which bear too heavily on the balance of payments of the recipients. I do not mean to dwell on these cases, but they illustrate what is true not just of these two countries but of a growing number of others as well: it is going to be harder and harder to keep development projects and programs moving ahead in an orderly fashion and at an orderly pace unless the aid mixture has a larger component of funds on a grant basis or on terms comparable with IDA's.

When the Organization for European Economic Cooperation looked at the flow of official—not private—capital to the underdeveloped countries for the years 1956–59, it found that more than half went in the form of outright grants. This seems a very creditable record, and it was in its time. But there are signs that the ratio between conventional credit and what one might call unconventional credit is already changing—and, from my point of view, changing for the worse.

During the period studied by OEEC, more than nine-tenths of the aid extended on other than "hard" terms came from the United States and France. Other countries, during this period and since, have become substantial lenders to the underdeveloped world, but they have not yet brought themselves, to the extent that existing circumstances require, to extend their aid otherwise than on conventional terms.

Furthermore, when one looks at the outstanding "hard" debt of individual underdeveloped countries, one sees in most cases a rapid increase and, in too many cases, a persistent tendency for debt repayments to pile up in the early years. Taking some examples from Latin America, there is one country where at the end of 1953 only 24 percent of it was repayable in the next 5 years while, at the end of 1959, 56 percent was repayable in the next 5 years. In another, the ratio went up from 16 percent at the end of 1953 to 50 percent at the end of 1960. There is a similar trend in Asia and elsewhere. In one case, the ratio went up from only 8 percent at the end of 1953 to 33 percent at the end of 1959; in another, from 28 percent at the end of 1952 to 50 percent at the end of 1960.

To me these figures are warnings of possible financial reefs ahead. I do not have to explain to this audience how the machinery of economic development could be overloaded with foreign debt until it sputtered to a halt amid half-built projects and mountains of discarded plans. I expect, indeed, that there are some in this audience who can point to projects in their own countries which are at this very time suspended in midair, so to speak, for this very reason. Maybe it is a half-finished highway or a hospital that has been built but not equipped. This kind of disruption kills peoples' hope in orderly economic progress and, if it persists, can lead to serious disillusionment.

Superficially, it would be nice if we could devise some reliable index of credit worthinesss which would tell us in every country and with complete assurance when we were headed into financial trouble. But, as I have said, there is no such index. Of course, there is the possibility that when debts fall due, defaults will be forestalled by voluntary action on the part of creditors to extend the period of repayment. But this would only magnify the accumulation of interest payments, which by themselves have in many cases already attained a formidable size. Surely our objectives demand that we minimize this kind of financial uncertainty and avoid the risk of disrupting the march of development through financial default.

The safe and sane way to minimize these dangers is to maximize the amount of official capital which is supplied at very long terms with only a token interest burden. I sincerely hope that in the months ahead lending countries will make every effort to reverse the trends I have cited by increasing the share of capital that goes to the underdeveloped countries on terms properly geared to their requirements.

It may be that some of our capital-exporting member countries interested in further development in the underdeveloped world may find it difficult to administer aid on nonconventional terms through bilateral programs. To them I would say that IDA's charter allows us to accept supplementary contributions from them at any time. Indeed, more generally, I think it is none too early for member governments to turn their minds toward the possibility of handling a greater share of the common burden in this way.

It has been a source of great encouragement to me to see the increasing practical interest in the development of the underdeveloped countries on the part of the nations of the Atlantic Community and Japan. This interest is being sustained in the face of urgent claims on the resources of these nations and in some cases in the face of economic and financial vicissitudes which call for a close examination by them of their overall commitments. But there are few commitments I can think of which should take precedence over a commitment to support the growing momentum of development in the underdeveloped world. Let us be especially diligent, however, that the resources we look for in the name of development assistance are asked in support of programs and projects which will, in fact, produce the results which all of us are seeking. But once we have this assurance, and we are having it in increasing measure, then let us be steadfast in our support, and generous in our appraisal of the need. For how else can we preserve hope in the future except by trying, and keeping on trying to make common cause with the peoples of the underdeveloped world, in helping them to rise from the depths of the poverty which for so long has been their lot.

REMARKS BY EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, AT THE CLOSING JOINT SESSION OF THE BOARDS OF GOVERNORS

May I, at the outset, express sincere thanks, both for myself and for my associates, for the many kind words which have been said about the work of the Bank and IDA during the discussions here this week. Your continued understanding of and support for our varied activities in the broad field of development assistance are very heartening to us as we face the great tasks which lie ahead.

Much as I appreciate the compliments you have paid, I appreciate even more the constructive suggestions which so many of you have put forward for further improvement in the level of our performance. I will not, of course, attempt to comment upon those suggestions at this time, but I know that I speak for the Executive Directors as well as for the management of the Bank and IDA when I assure you that they will all receive our careful consideration.

Several Governors indicated disappointment that the Bank's rate of lending appears to be declining somewhat. I want to say to them that, in this situation as in so many others, figures tend to be misleading. It was essentially an accident of the calendar that the total volume of Bank loans for the past fiscal year was somewhat lower, rather than somewhat higher, than that of the year before. Before the end of the fiscal year we had, in fact, completed negotiations on several loans, aggregating over 90 million, the final signature of which had to be delayed for technical reasons in the borrowing countries which were entirely beyond our control. The important consideration, of course, is not the total volume of loans contracted within any given 12 months; it is the volume and the continuity of the flow of business through our institutions over a period of time. I am glad to be able to tell you, therefore, that the Bank—quite apart from IDA—is now handling more business than ever before in its history, and that I foresee no slackening of demand for Bank funds.

In this connection, let me assure the several Governors who commented on the point that we are fully determined that IDA resources shall not be used as a substitute for Bank lending but shall rather serve their intended purpose of augmenting the total flow of development capital from both institutions.

Turning now to the IDA itself, I was greatly encouraged to note the general agreement among almost all Governors who spoke that the Association has an important contribution to make and that its potentialities are not to be measured by the modest size of its initial resources. As I indicated in my annual address, the time is not far off when we must face up to the question of just what role we want IDA to play in the whole field of development assistance, and what are the nature and size of the funds which it will need to play that role. In my own view, IDA can be an instrument of immense value, and I hope and believe that in due course it will so evolve.

In at least one respect, namely the scope of IDA financing, the discussion revealed some misunderstanding of the policies which the Executive Directors have adopted, and I want to say a word about that. The IDA charter permits, as you know, the use of IDA's resources for any project "of high development priority." The Executive Directors and management are determined to make full use of the broad authority thus conferred upon us. In the economic sector, our financing will not be confined to so-

called infrastructure projects—we have already in view, for example, projects to finance an industrial development bank, an industrial estate, and irrigation and other agricultural projects. And we expect to be active in other sectors: in the field of water supply, for example, where the projects are often designed for both productive and public health purposes; in the challenging field of education and technical training; and in several other fields as well. But let me add one thought. The selection of the projects which IDA finances is the result of a process of consultation and mutual agreement; we can only finance projects when both we and the Government concerned are satisfied that a high development priority will be served. It is thus a mutual responsibility resting not only upon IDA but equally upon the recipient governments to use ingenuity and broad judgment in selecting for IDA financing those projects, whatever their nature, whose effective contribution to development is likely to be greatest.

And that brings me to an important point. Several Governors have urged that IDA be administered in accordance with the dictates of our hearts. If what is meant is that, in using IDA resources, we must constantly have in mind the ultimate objective of improving the standards of life of the peoples of the underdeveloped world, I am in full agreement. But if the meaning is that we should substitute our hearts for our heads in investing IDA resources, I could not disagree more completely. For the one lesson of experience that more than any other has been borne home to me over the years is that the surest way of defeating our ultimate development objective is to use carelessly or ineffectively the scarce resources which have been entrusted to us. To finance a project that is not technically or financially sound, or which has a low development priority, or which has not yet been worked out to the point where its successful execution is assured—to do any of those things because we allow the urgency of the development need to becloud sound judgment—is, I suggest, to betray the responsibility that is ours. For let us never forget that money provided to the less developed countries buys nothing lasting for the peoples of those countries except as it is effectively invested either in additional physical facilities or, even more important, in the improvement of human resources. That is why we have insisted, and will continue to insist, on the same high standards of investment for projects financed with IDA funds as for those financed with Bank resources.

We recognize, of course, that no matter how successful we are in achieving high standards of investment, we will not adequately meet the needs and problems of our less developed members by project financing alone. Indeed, looking back upon the record of the Bank, the striking feature to me is how steadily we have evolved from what was at first essentially just a project financing agency into the more rounded family of development institutions that we have by now become. To the tool provided by the Bank's financial resources, we have over the years added other instruments of development: technical assistance and training programs; IDA and IFC; the mobilization and coordination of finance from many sources; advisory services of an ever increasing variety. But though we have traveled far, we are quite aware of our inadequacies in relation to the magnitude of the development task. We know that the road ahead is long and hard, but I am convinced that we are moving in the right direction. Given your help and support, we shall continue to press forward along that road and we accept with high hope the challenge it presents.

It remains for me only to say goodby to you all and to wish each of you a safe journey home.

At It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I pointed out how Richard Goodwin, presidential White House assistant, was running a one-man State Department on Latin America and about his "chance meeting" lasting almost 3 hours—with Guevera, Castro's Communist economic minister. It seems that Mr. Goodwin has not learned his lesson as yet and is now holding diplomatic hands with one Rodriguez, another outstanding Communist member of Castro's revolution.

The American people have a right to demand that the President put his house in order and one way to do that it to squelch these puerile undertakings by Mr. Goodwin and let Secretary of State Rusk be in fact the Secretary of State.

The article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the September 25 issue of the Long Island Daily Press elaborates on the subject:

GOODWIN AGAIN ON THE PAN

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Goodwin, 29-year-old White House expert on Latin America, is still operating like a one-man State Department.

He is carrying on his own secret negotiations with Communist leaders in Cuba despite howls of protest from the State Department.

Goodwin, who held a chance meeting with Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Castro's Communist economic czar, in Argentina last month, had an unannounced rendezvous with Carlos Rafael Rodriquez, editor of the Communist newspaper Hoy.

Neither Goodwin nor Rodriguez are talking about their mysterious meeting although it has already produced some very explosive results.

For instance, Rodriguez, on returning to Havana, narrowly escaped assassination by a group of assailants that shot up his car while he was traveling along the Via Blanca.

The Castro government blames the Central Intelligence Agency for the attempt on Rodriguez's life. However, reliable U.S. intelligence sources claim that the assailants were anti-Castro underground fighters.

Word of the Goodwin-Rodriguez meeting has caused a group of responsible Senators to consider the recall of Goodwin for a second round on his one-man foreign policy operations.

A Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, already has questioned Goodwin about his meeting last month with Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Castro's Communist economic czar, at the recent Inter-American Economic Conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

During the private Morse inquiry, Goodwin passed off his conference with Guevara as a chance meeting when both men met at a diplomatic reception.

However, Goodwin's followup meeting with Rodriguez, along with new evidence that the conference with Che was anything but a chance get-together is causing the Senators to take another look at Goodwin's activities.

One Senator's inquiry at the White House brought back word from President Kennedy that Assistant Secretary Robert Woodward is the responsible officer on Latin American affairs.

Meanwhile, at the State Department an aid to Woodward reports that "the situation is intolerable. Something is going to have to give pretty soon." He reports that Goodwin continues to take on problems of Latins who bypass the State Department and come directly to him.

Note: Rodriguez, a Havana University professor, is the senior official of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization (the nucleus of Cuba's new, single party) in addition to being editor of Hoy.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Asks "Aid to Children—Not Parents"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in its September 27 issue, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat contains an editorial supporting a bill which I have introduced to combat the abuse of the aid-to-dependent-children program for assisting illegitimate children. This is a serious problem and I appreciate the Globe-Democrat's concern and support for my proposal. In essence it is to give an option to the State to weigh the value of a moral home atmosphere and the value of keeping a child with its natural mother, where these conflict. I should like to place the editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on this question in the RECORD at this point:

AID TO CHILDREN—NOT PARENTS

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS has made an attempt at solving one of the most difficult problems that face social workers, or society.

That is, how to help children born out of wedlock, without encouraging the mother to bear more illegitimate offspring.

Critics of the aid to dependent children program often say that it encourages loose women to bring children into the world without a husband, simply to collect ADC benefits. But doing away with the benefits, others point out, punishes the child more than the parent.

Congressman CURTIS has introduced a bill which would permit the States to deal more effectively with this problem. It would enable them to take a child away from the mother, if the home environment is immoral or amoral.

The child could be placed in a foster home, or public institution, and ADC payments would go to the foster home or institution—instead of the guilty parent.

CURTIS said:

"Aid to dependent children is to help the children, not the parents. Whenever possible, a child should be kept with the parent. The guiding star should be healthy, moral home environment for the child.

"But there is disagreement in what constitutes healthy, moral home environment. I believe a second illegitimate birth by a mother is persuasive evidence that a home, run by that mother, constitutes an immoral atmosphere."

"It does not mean, and should in no sense mean, that aid to the illegitimate children should be cut off. It simply means that the payments for the children should no longer be made to the mother, but should be made to an appointed curator, and paid over to the person or institution which provides the child, or children, with the healthy and moral home atmosphere.

As of late 1958, there were 745,000 American families receiving aid to dependent children. Of that number, almost 150,000, or about 1 out of 5, were cases where the father and mother of the children were not wed.

Mr. CURTIS' bill is one way to end this abuse of the ADC program.

Public Works Appropriation Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express to the members of the conference committee on the public works appropriation bill the appreciation of the people of western Kansas for their consideration of flood control and reclamation projects in our State.

In a semiarid area, such as western Kansas, we are plagued by either too much water for a brief time, or too little moisture over long periods of time. That is why we are so vitally interested in projects which are designed to conserve our water resources and make them available for progress and growth.

I know I express the sentiments of all of our people when I say that I deeply regret that the conferees did not see fit to retain in the bill a $400,000 appropriation to begin construction on the Glenn Elder reclamation project. I know the money could have been put to wise use to get this urgently needed project underway. The conferees recognized the importance of the project by including in the conference report $199,000 to carry forward the preconstruction planning studies. It is my understanding that plans for the dam and reservoir are complete, and I am confident the committee will give favorable consideration to construction money in the next budget.

The people of western Kansas are likewise grateful to the committee for including $215,000 in planning money for the Kanopolis unit, and $58,500 for the Wilson unit.

These two units, when built, will provide irrigation for about 41,500 acres from reservoirs built and now being operated by the Corps of Engineers. There is a dependable water supply. The only remaining tasks are to provide the irrigation canals, laterals and drains.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the conferees for their consideration in making $3,305,000 available for carrying on construction work on the Almena unit in Norton and Phillips counties. This project is going to be a valuable asset to Kansas when completed, providing as it will irrigation for more than 5,000 acres, flood controls, recreational facilities and a dependable water supply for the city of Norton.

The $1,493,000 appropriated for the Cedar Bluff unit will carry this project well toward completion, expected in 1965.

The civil functions section of the Bill included $3,200,000 for Wilson Dam and Reservoir on the Saline River in Russell County. This is the second appropriation for construction and indicates the committee is determined that the project shall be carried on to completion in an orderly manner.

There are three other relatively small yet very important flood control projects now under investigation by the Corps of Engineers, and when they are submitted I am sure the House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee will give them its usual careful and sympathetic consideration.

The proposed projects are on the Arkansas River at Dodge City and Great Bend and on the Cow Creek downstream from Lyons, with particular reference to a drainage problem near Sterling.

Panama Canal Treaties: Total Revision Demanded in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, I have made many addresses, in and out of the Congress, and issued numerous press releases on the subject of the Caribbean danger zone, in which the Panama Canal is a key target.

As the result of long study of the subject, it has been possible to predict events long before they occurred and to give timely warning to the Congress and other proper authorities. Although my worst fears have been more than justified, any satisfaction that may be derived from having been accurate in prediction is a sterile one.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the end of the deteriorating situation in the Caribbean is not yet in sight. In Cuba, there is a Soviet satellite and recently on the opposite side of that strategic sea it has found a counterpart in British Guiana, forming part of the Red link now being forged in the Caribbean.

The latest news from the isthmus is that the Republic of Panama is making ready to demand a total revision of the Panama Canal treaty structure, which I have long foreseen, and have repeatedly endeavored to meet with a valid program to safeguard our vital interests .

In order that the Congress, the Executive, and the Nation at large, may be fully informed, I quote a recent feature story in an influential Isthmian newspaper and my own press release of September 7, 1961, which follow:

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA MAY SEEK BIG HIKE IN CANAL ZONE ANNUITY—PANAMANIAN FLAG IN ZONE COULD ALSO BE TREATY BID

Panama will seek a massive increase in the annuity the United States pays for the use of the Canal Zone when President Roberto F. Chiari's administration makes its bid for "total revision" of the United States-Panama treaties governing the Panama Canal, informed sources believed today.

Leading Panamanian officials have frequently said the present $1,930,000 annuity is unrealistically low for a reliable, commercial enterprise in an age when the United States is expending billions around the globe on projects which are nebulous by comparison.

President Chiari is expected to catalogue Panama's claims in his State of the Nation address at the October 1 opening of the new session of the National Assembly. At his press conference yesterday he confined himself to saying that he would seek an increase in the "direct benefits" Panama's economy derives from the canal.

Second Vice President Jose D. Bazan has given some indication on administration thinking regarding the $1,930,000 Canal Zone annuity when he compared it to the $8 million plus which the United States pays Libya for the use of a single airfield—Wheelus.

Some officials have indicated informally that $10 million might be regarded as an acceptable Canal Zone annuity for the time being, but there is general unwillingness to give any advance line on Panama's bid before the hard bargaining begins.

During his victorious Presidential campaign Chiari also declared himself in favor of the Panamanian flag flying beside the Stars and Stripes wherever the U.S.-flag is flown officially on the Canal Zone. It is therefore regarded as probably that this will be among Panama's claims.

But yesterday the President limited himself to saying: "We must reach a position in which we have no more claims to make. For this, total revision (of existing treaties) is necessary."

It is understood that while Panama has not yet formally communicated its call for treaty revision to Washington, U.S. officials have been told that such a call is coming up.

Presumably an official request for recogition of the treaties would follow Chiari's state on the nation address.

The most recent treaty governing United States-Panama relations was the Remon-Eisenhower treaty, signed in 1955. A principal provision of this treaty was the increase of the annuity by $1,500,000 from $430,000.

The original United States-Panama treaty is dated 1903, shortly after Panama won its independence from Colombia. Revisions were incorporated in the 1936 treaty, negotiated during the administration of President Harmodio Arias.

Independent estimates have put the Panama Canal's total direct and indirect annual contribution to the economy of Panama at about $60 million, or a sum roughly equivalent to the country's national budget.

However, this total includes many items which could not be expected to be included in Chiari's list of "direct benefits."

The President charted Panama's economic dependence on the canal yesterday by tracing the fluctuation in the average per capita income in Panama.

This figure stood at $380 in 1945, when the U.S. Military Establishment in the Canal Zone remained close to its wartime peak.

Came 1951 and the rundown of the Canal Zone military to peacetime normalcy, the average annual per capita income in the republic had fallen to $317.

It was only in 1959, after 14 years of effort to strengthen Panama's peacetime economy, that the average per capita income edged back up to the $380 of 1945.

Chiari revealed that his administration has set itself the target of boosting this figure by $10 yearly from here on out.

Means to achieve this aim include:

Wider distribution of the national income. Chiari has frequently said that Panama's rich should do more to share the nation's bounty with the poor.

A development program encouraging private initiative, rather than by supplanting it with the government's own efforts.

The construction of 10,000 housing units by the government over a period of 5 years—a total investment of $34,250,000.

The building of a number of new hospitals and health centers throughout the country, including a regional hospital at Aguadulce, a new psychiatric hospital and a colony for the mentally ill at Los Santos and the enlargement of the Santo Tomas Hospital at a total cost of $16,718,000.

Completion of the Inter-American Highway and the construction of 12 feeder roads (the third phase of the government's road plan) at a total cost of $76,120,000.

Electric power for interior communities and rural areas of Panama and Colon at a total cost of $24,985,000.

Industrial survey, promotion and financing to the tune of $4 million.

The construction of a number of hotels and beach resorts as tourist attractions.

An increase in agricultural production through rural credit organizations with emphasis on the cultivation of rice, corn, grain, coffee, and cattle raising. Total cost, $7,125,000.

President Chiari also revealed that:

1. The budget for the coming year would be $65 million.

2. The deficit up to the end of August was $9.9 million, but the administration was confident of reducing it to $2.5 or $3 million by the end of the year.

3. There would be no cabinet changes for the present, although Minister of Labor, Health and Social Welfare Dr. Sergio Gonzalez Ruiz has signified his intention of returning to his medical practice upon his return in 6 weeks from a social security conference in Turkey.

4. The determination of his government to take over the printing of the lottery tickets.

CARIBBEAN DANGER ZONE: PROGRAM FOR ITS SECURITY

(By Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania)

The pro-Communist election victory in British Guiana on August 21, followed by vicious attacks on the United States in the U.N. on August 24 by Fidel Castro's Cuban delegate about our Guantanamo Naval Base and by the Soviet delegate about our military bases in Puerto Rico, have again focused world attention on the Caribbean danger zone immediately to the south, despite high tensions over Berlin.

With Cuba already a Soviet satellite and British Guiana as a new one, both flanks of the Atlantic approaches of the Panama Canal are covered by Communist beachheads, advantageously located for the next steps in the long-range plan for Caribbean conquest through the processes of infiltration and subversion.

The key targets in this plan are the strategic, historic isthmian canal route areas; Panama and Nicaragua.

In Panama, our legal position, weakened on September 17, 1960, by an ignominious surrender to radical elements to fly the flag of Panama over the Canal Zone territory, is under continuous attack by the same forces, at times requiring strong handling by the Government of that Republic. In Nicaragua, the United States is well supported, which fact has also made the humane government of that country a prime object for subversive attack. Thus, the ring around the Caribbean is being rapidly forged to make that sea a Red lake.

The program that would adequately meet the Caribbean crisis is:

1. Making definite and reaffirming the principles of the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention in the Western Hemisphere by subversive forces known as the international Communist conspiracy.

2. Making definite and reaffirming U.S. policies for exclusive sovereign jurisdiction over the Panama Canal.

3. Forming an adequate Caribbean Patrol Force on a permanent basis.

4. Upholding exclusive U.S. control over the Guantanamo Naval Base and retaining the Connally amendment unimpaired.

The time for action by the Congress and the President in these policy matters has come. If not taken before adjournment the same influences that led to striking the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone will again have unrestricted freedom and can be counted upon to bring another ignominious surrender. If the United States flag is struck at Guantanamo our country will lose the Panama Canal.

I urge all Americans and patriotic organizations to write or wire their views on these questions immediately to their Senators and Representatives, the Secretary of State, and the President, and, after adjournment of the Congress, to follow through with personal and group interviews.

Duplicity in the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by the deletion of the provision of the Peace Corps legislation which materially affects the composition of the groups sent to the Arab and other countries, action which is a further indication of the duplicity practiced by the Democratic Party and on September 21 wired President Kennedy concerning this, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I am shocked by the action of the House of Representatives deleting from the Peace Corps legislation the provision that "the Peace Corps shall not perform services in any foreign country in which, by reason of law or official policy, any member of the Peace Corps will be discriminated against because of his race, creed, or color." The deletion of this provision will materially affect the composition of those groups sent to the Arab and other countries. You have repeatedly stated, before you were President and thereafter, that you are against any action of discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Do you intend to approve this legislation?

Respectfully,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Member of Congress.

How You Can Help the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I just obtained a copy of the excellent document "The Communist Party Line" prepared for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In this publication Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, one of the most respected of Americans, concluded his statement on the Communist menace in these terms:

Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting. These persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them.

In this connection I insert herewith an excellent editorial of September 23, 1961, by Mr. Jones Osborn, editor and publisher of the Yuma Daily Sun:

HOW YOU CAN HELP THE COMMUNISTS

"There is probably no significant section of the American public—regardless of age, race, social standing, occupation, or political orientation—whose interests have not coincided, on occasion, with one or more of the Communists' immediate demands."

This plain statement of fact comes from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is part of his warning that no section of the American public should ever be branded communistic merely because their interests happen to be the same as some Communist interest at that particular moment.

Mr. Hoover points out that it is, in fact, an established tactic of the Communist Party to adopt immediate demands "which often coincide with the desires of many loyal, respectable citizens."

The FBI Chief says that "the danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views happen to parallel the official (Communist) party line is obvious."

On this small point, we have to differ in a minor degree with the FBI Chief. The danger of which he speaks should be obvious, yes. But judging from the reckless manner in which too many Americans have tried to pin the Communist label on other Americans (especially those who disagree with them), we would say the danger is not nearly obvious enough. Either that, or the name callers deliberately stoop to name-calling and risk the obvious danger.

What is this danger of which Mr. Hoover warns?

He says, "The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their opponents." In other words, reckless name calling confuses the public, which comes to wonder who the enemy really is. Thus the victims of name calling lose their effectiveness as leaders and loyal, respectable citizens are thereby divided and weakened.

Mr. Hoover's warning against reckless name calling is expressed in a document entitled "The Communist Party Line." It was prepared by him at the request of the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In making the document public, Committee Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND termed it "the wisest and most penetrating treatment of the party line that I have ever read."

Mr. Hoover offers another warning, of particular interest in these troubled times. He warns that being merely against communism without being for any positive measures to improve conditions which the Communists attack is not enough. He said we would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. "Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism," he reminds us. "However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

Mr. Hoover's warning is welcome, in times when anticommunism shows signs of becoming a professional way of life in itself. Anticommuinsm alone, as the FBI Chief warns, is just not enough to build a better America. In the meantime, if you want to help the Communists, try reckless name calling.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I wish to call your attention to a group that marched in the American Legion's national parade here September 11. Thirteen captive nations were represented in the parade by their national colors. It was an impressive sight, although it did not receive the publicity in Denver's daily newspapers that such an event ought to evoke.

This display of the national flags of the captive nations can be of great moral support to those victimized by Communist Russia. I can only hope that if House Resolution 211 is passed, that you will consider the display of these flags worth recommending through your Special Committee on Captive Nations.

I am enclosing herewith the publicity given this event in the Denver Catholic Register of September 7, 1961.

Sincerely,

BOB RAMSEY.

LEGION PARADE TO FLY CAPTIVE NATIONS' FLAGS

The national flags of 13 captive nations of Soviet Russia will be represented in the parade of the American Legion in Denver on Monday, September 11.

The flags, to be carried by airmen from Lowry Air Force Base, will be one of the groups comprising the marching units of Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post 1, Denver.

The captive nations that will be represented in the parade are Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine.

The idea for having these captive nations represented in the Legion's parade originated with Bob Ramsey, a member of the editorial staff of the Denver Catholic Register.

A member of Denver's Legion Post 1, Mr. Ramsey suggested the idea to James P. Eakins, head of the post's Americanism committee, after corresponding with Lev E. Dobriansky, the originator of the captive nations resolution.

This resolution was made a law of the land in 1959. Since then Captive Nations Week has been observed throughout the United States every year in July.

FLAGS WILL HONOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Bob Ramsey)

Toward the end of an estimated 10-hour American Legion parade in Denver September 11 will come a banner flanked by two U.S. flags. That banner will proclaim: "The American Legion Salutes the Captive Nations," and behind it will follow 13 national flags of nations now under the despotic control of Soviet Russia.

It is the hope of the American Legion, as it is of the free world, that all captive peoples regain their liberty, which is brutally suppressed under the heel of communism. The exhibition of these 13 flags will be a public expression of that hope.

We can see the significance in this act by recalling the dignity reserved for our own national emblem—the Stars and Stripes. It has a long and glorious history. It has symbolized our ideals, inspired our poets, and covered our dead.

And so it is with the captive nations. Each has its traditions, cultures, and national emblems. Separate as they are from those of Soviet Russia, it is, nevertheless, the hammer and sickle that supposes to represent these peoples.

Nowhere is this more evident that in the non-Russian nations within the borders of the Soviet Union. Many, if not most, maps fail to show the national boundaries of such independent nations as Cossackia, Byelorussia, and Ukraine.

Russia has tried to create the illusion that she represents these and other independent republics in the Soviet Union. But she does so in vain. Despite long years of occupation and terror, despite plunders and persecutions these nations continue to retain the unconquerable determination to live in freedom and peace.

Any show of nationalism by captive countries, however, especially the public display of their national flag, is ruthlessly suppressed. Their only hope is that we of the free world will not forget them or the goals they seek to attain.

Let these flags of captive peoples then fly in the land of the free until they can be flown without fear in the countries they represent.

The American Legion salutes the captive nations and urges support and recognition of their people. It is our hope that all U.S. organizations, big and small, will join in this recognition of the captive nations in some way, if not by displaying their national flags in public ceremonies.

Let Khrushchev and his cohorts learn that even though they can plunder nations, they cannot and will not conquer the souls of their slaves or the symbols they use to advance the will to be free.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I have recently read about a bill which you have proposed—House Resolution 211. I wish to commend you for it—it should provide the captive nations with a new hope; even those people in East Germany I would include in this category. I shall write my Congressman, HAROLD JOHNSON, and urge him to support it. I am shocked by many of our leaders who do not speak out strongly against the Russian domination of these people; this talk of "colonialism" by the Russians is ridiculous, when they are practicing a more ghastly brand of colonialism than the world has ever seen.

Keep up the good work—you truly represent the American people with such thinking as this. Help keep us strong by not catering to this type of reasoning.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS G. ROSS.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

CONGRESSMAN DANIEL FLOOD: I am in favor of your Committee on Captive Nations which you to trying to form. Our country is in dire need of such a committee since nothing is visably being done to help captive nations. Best of luck and most of all keep fighting.

Yours truly,

GERRY ANN DRUMHELLER.

[From the Ukranian Weekly, Sept. 23, 1961]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH said recently "that America's determination to live up to its commitments on Berlin must be made crystal clear to the bosses in the Kremlin."

Senator BUSH, in a discussion with Lucian Daum of Hartford, chairman of the Connecticut observance of Captive Nations Week, pointed out that the Soviet Ambassador to the United States has expressed doubt about the willingness of this country to fight for Berlin.

"This is dangerous thinking by the leaders of the Soviet Union, as it might lead to a miscalculation which could bring on a disastrous conflict," said the Connecticut Senator, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Asked by Mr. Daum how the Berlin crisis should be met, Senator BUSH replied:

"This Berlin crisis points up the major issue of our lifetime, which is this: Are we going to live in a world of law and justice for men on earth, or are we not? Are we going to live in a world where men are enslaved by other men? This is the big issue that Berlin is only a symbol of, so to speak. And that is why it is an absolute essential that we, the United States and our allies of the West, stand firm on Berlin."

Mr. Daum agreed with Senator BUSH that the United States should point up more aggressively the fact that Communist imperialism has created a new kind of colonialism.

"At a time when Western colonialism is diminishing rapidly," Senator BUSH said, "the captive nations of Eastern Europe are the victims of a colonialism more brutal and more far-reaching than the world has ever known. Soviet colonialism extends to Poland, Lithuania, to Ukraine, East Germany, to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Latvia, and Rumania and Albania.

"And in addition to these countries, communism has enslaved the peoples of Tibet, and North Vietnam, and North Korea, and Cuba, just 90 miles off the shores of the United States. So Captive Nations Week is not an empty gesture. Rather, it is a time for us to rededicate ourselves to the universal principles upon which our own beloved land was founded."

Mr. Daum pointed out that all Americans ought to remember that "Russia is guilty of genocide, committed against the population of the Baltic States, the Poles, the Ukrainians, Hungarians, and other nations, forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union."

Part of the transcript of the discussion, which was broadcast by Connecticut stations July 20–23, 1961, follows:

"Senator BUSH. Mr. Daum, from your contact here in Connecticut and abroad—do you think that the people behind the Iron Curtain know about this Captive Nations Week observance that we are having in the United States? And if so, do you feel that it is effective in keeping hope alive in their breasts that one day they may regain their freedom?

"Mr. DAUM. Yes, Senator, I am quite sure—they have the opportunity to listen to Radio Free Europe, letters from here, visitors from Poland. You may count on it that the captive nations are looking up to us if we are willing to act accordingly to what we are preaching.

"Senator BUSH. Well, Mr. Daum, do you feel that the United States should be more aggressive in fighting this issue of colonialism? Remember last fall the U.N. by a vote of 86–0 adopted a resolution condemning colonialism, and the Soviet Union is using this resolution in its own campaign against the West in the cold war. Since the Soviets supported the resolution, do you believe that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations should aggressively point out that the Communist empire has enslaved once-free nations in Europe, and made them, in effect, colonies of the Communist empire?

"Mr. DAUM. Certainly, Senator BUSH, because we should bring to the attention of the whole world that the Russians are just making doubletalk. The Eastern European nations have, through the centuries, been natural barriers and it would protect Europe from invasion from Asia, like the Tartars, Mongols, Turks, etc.; but at the same time if we mean business, we can only call for uprising behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains if we are certainly prepared and want to support them all the way through militarily and economically. Otherwise, we can't call for any uprising and we also cannot afford any mistakes as in Hungary and Cuba. A right decision of firmness on Berlin should be extended with a military and economic plan for the liberation of the captive nations. Let us not forget that the Russians realize that they cannot trust the captive nations, or their armies.

"Senator BUSH. You think that future uprisings, such as the Hungarian uprising of 1956 and other uprisings in Poland and East Germany that we recall so well—do you think that the West need to encourage these uprisings behind the Iron Curtain—do you think they need support from us?

"Mr. DAUM. No, they don't need any support, any call to throw off communism; but one thing we have to make sure—that we will support them completely—even with our Armed Forces if necessary."

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to express my support of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations—House Resolution 211.

MAMIE MAHONEY.

Creating a Patsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that President Kennedy's education at the famous Fabian Socialist London School of Economics has served him well when he tries to tell the American people that costs of production can be raised without increasing the cost of the product.

This fancy theory is discussed in the following article by Donald I. Rogers which appeared in the September 26 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

CREATING A PATSY

(By Donald I. Rogers)

President Kennedy, accepting the word of his economic advisers, assumed that the steel companies could make a "good profit" without an increase in prices in spite of the fact that the companies are being obliged to grant wage increases under terms of the contract signed at the close of the devastating strike.

He has now learned, however, that major steel producers refuse to pledge to hold the price line in the face of rises in operating costs. Ten of the leading steel companies have told him that they cannot be party to an agreement with the White House to forego price rises if they are necessary.

It was a hard lesson for Mr. Kennedy to learn, though he has certainly handled his public relations well in making it appear that the bad bogeyman of inflation is a product of the wicked steel companies and not, of course, of the union which demanded the wage increases or of the Government which does nothing to limit inflationary policies and programs that are politically popular.

In a letter sent to the country's 12 leading steel manufacturers on September 6, the President declared a steel price rise would threaten economic stability and said his advisers believed expanding production would maintain a healthy profit level without increasing prices to offset the October 1 increase in employment costs.

The advisers, as the President now has learned, were dealing with industry averages, and "good profit" is a term that is, at best, mighty vague.

While the industry as a whole has profitable operations, the second largest company in the country hasn't made enough profit to cover its regular dividend for the last 6 months—even without the new wage increase. One major company—one of the recipients of the President's letter—has been operating in the red. Deep red. Another company, still profitable, has experienced steadily declining profits since 1955.

The view from the White House is a little different than the prospect from the front office window of a private corporation struggling in the competitive world. In a dog-eat-dog industry, there's no chance to back up and correct mistakes. You either survive or you don't. It's one thing to regard the industry as a whole, as the President of the United States sees it, but quite another to regard an individual corporation in that industry, as the president of a private company sees it. As a whole, the steel industry ranks 32d among 41 major manufacturing industries in profit realized on investment. In other words, only eight industries make less profit on investment and 31 industries make more profit on investment.

Some companies are in the red; some are breaking even; some are doing reasonably well, though hardly well enough to cause much excitement among investors in Wall Street. No company pays its dividends, replaces wornout equipment or expands by using industrywide averages. Each company must earn its own dollars, and some of them are not now doing that.

The administration advisers should have known—as the President has now learned—that an industry average of profits has no more relevance than the average height of our population when it boils down to an individual company's pricing decisions. Price policies in any company are not dreamed up; they are scientifically achieved.

What disturbs me most, however, is the spectacle of the President of the leading capitalistic nation in the world, speaking as though profits were unimportant to the Nation. Profits are most important. A President with any awareness of economics should know that; so, most assuredly, should his economic advisers.

First, an unprofitable company cannot provide its share of economic expansion to produce more jobs—a matter which, if I recall, the President does deem important. Second, many individuals and institutions have no other income than profits. Of further importance is the fact that the Government's own income depends to a large degree on the profitability of industry—for that's where the bulk of the tax collections originate.

I cannot believe that the President and his economic advisers do not know these verities. Thus I must conclude that all of this folderol was designed to help the President and the administraiton reap some political advantage. That advantage is clear.

Now the inflation which is bound to result from the Government's own cheap money policies, labor policies and spending programs, can be blamed on industry, that convenient whipping boy of every politician whose limitations preclude statesmanship. The steel industry has been picked for the patsy—the fall guy.

Hon. Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the high respect that has been so ably and widely expressed for the late and

lamented Paul Brown. I always thought of him as being one of the most respected and honorable men I have ever served with in the House of Representatives. He was a great patriot, a loyal friend, and a valuable servant of the people.

To the family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions of the Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of my colleagues to the summary of findings and conclusions of the subcommittee which recently concluded its investigation of the National Labor Relations Board.

This subcommitee was authorized by the Honorable ADAM C. POWELL and the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

As chairman of this subcommittee, it is my hope that the National Labor Relations Board and the General Counsel will implement the findings of our subcommittee as quickly as possible. I believe the findings and conclusions of this subcommittee represent a sincere effort to make the National Labor Relations Board a more effective instrument for carrying out national labor policy in our country.

I do not agree with the views expressed in the minority report that our hearings were either a forum for criticism of the Board as constituted under the previous administration, or that our recommendations are a forerunner to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Anyone who will take the trouble to study the transcript of proceedings of this subcommittee will find that the hearings were conducted in a completely impartial manner and that exceptional efforts were made to assure the minority on the subcommittee full opportunity to cross-examine at length those witnesses who had presented testimony criticizing Board procedures.

The transcript will further show that this subcommittee had analyzed procedures of the Board prior to the Eisenhower administration and that indeed the sole purpose of this investigation was to afford Congress an opportunity to review the operating procedures of this very important agency of Government established by an act of Congress.

As regards any suggestion that the findings and conclusions represent an effort to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, anyone taking the time to read the subcommittee's report will have to conclude such a conclusion is totally unfounded. It would appear that those who make such suggestions have not read the subcommittee's recommendations.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I am in complete agreement with the Honorable ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a member of the subcommittee, who, in his separate views of the report, stated that these hearings have served a useful purpose and that they can indeed serve as a basis for some constructive legislation.

The subcommittee's findings and conclusions follow:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT BY THE NLRB

(Summary of findings and conclusions of the Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board, House Committee on Education and Labor)

1. The subcommittee finds that in many areas and in many industries, the policy of the United States as set forth in the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947—to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining—is not being effectuated. Despite over 25 years of statutory prohibition and widespread publicity, the number of unfair labor practices grows, rather than diminishes, and at an alarming rate. Some of the causes, and proposed remedies for this situation, are set forth below.

THE DELAY PROBLEM

A. In representation (election) cases

1. The subcommittee finds that it takes entirely too long between the petition for an election (to determine whether or not employees want to be represented by a union) and the actual holding of the election. In large part this delay stemmed from a bottleneck at the Labor Board level. This aspect of the delay problem promises to be alleviated by the delegation of authority put into effect on May 15 of this year which gives Labor Board regional directors final authority in these matters, subject to a discretionary right of appeal to the Labor Board.

2. The subcommittee finds that one reason for the delay in representation cases lies in the fact that the Labor Board permits time-consuming hearings when there is no seriously contested issue to be heard. The subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board give serious consideration to adopting pretrial investigatory techinques designed to prevent abuse of its processes by dilatory tactics in representation cases.

B. In unfair labor practice cases

1. The subcommittee finds that there is an unconscionable delay in the processing of unfair labor practice cases which renders final Labor Board decisions almost nugatory and futile. This delay stems in large part from the ever-increasing caseload of the Labor Board members and can be resolved, at least in part, by greater delegation of authority to the trial examiners who hear the cases. Therefore, the subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board give consideration to adopting regulations which would curtail the scope of the review in 'run-of-the-mill' cases and afford more time in the tough cases which call for thoughtful deliberation. The subcommittee suggests that the Labor Board study the practices of other agencies—the Atomic Energy Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, etc.—which have adopted a restricted and discretionary type of review in comparable situations.

2. The subcommittee further finds that a partial reason for the caseload, and hence the delay in unfair labor practice cases, lies in the inadequate remedies of the Labor Board. Labor Board orders constitute in many situations no more than a "slap on the wrist." They are both too little and too late. They constitute, in the words of one witness, "a license fee for union busting." The subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board reconsider the problem of remedies with an eye to taking the profit out of unfair labor practices.

3. The subcommittee finds that the caseload of unfair labor practice cases, and hence the consequent delay, is caused in part by the fact that some attorneys actually advise their clients to engage in such practices. The subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board adopt regulations providing for the disbarment of such attorneys from further Labor Board practice for a period commensurate to the offense.

THE ENFORCEMENT AND REVIEW OF LABOR BOARD ORDERS

The subcommittee finds that there is much needless delay in enforcement of Labor Board orders. The losing party delays, lingers, and waits because disobedience of a Labor Board order is not punishable until it is enforced by court action. The subcommittee recommends legislation modeled after the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which would make violation of Labor Board orders punishable by contempt unless petition for judicial review is filed within a period of 30 days following issuance of the Labor Board order.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL AND THE ISSUANCE OF COMPLAINTS IN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CASES

The General Counsel, by statute, is given absolute authority over the issuance of complaints in unfair labor practice cases. If he does not believe that a charge filed with him makes out a case, he can refuse to process the matter before the Labor Board and the charging party has no recourse, appellate or otherwise. Despite claims of elaborate precautions in the field and on appeal in Washington, to insure that all meritorious cases are processed, there is sufficient reason to conclude that the General Counsel, at least in the past, has taken only the "sure thing." This conclusion is fortified by the past refusal of the General Counsel to specify his reasons for refusal to process a case. The subcommittee acknowledges that the present General Counsel has almost doubled the number of complaints issued.

The subcommittee recommends that section 10(b) of the act be amended to provide that the General Counsel shall issue a complaint whenever he has reason to believe that a violation of the act may have occurred, and to require the General Counsel to serve on the charging party a summary report of his reasons for refusing to issue a complaint whenever he declines to do so.

USE OF INJUNCTIONS

A. Section 10(1): The mandatory injunction provision

The subcommittee finds that section 10(1) cases, once the court injunction has been issued, have not been expedited in the administrative process. The Labor Board Rules and Regulations require that such cases "shall be given priority" (sec. 102.97), but there are so many cases given priority that this is apparently meaningless. The subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board give these cases expeditious treatment by new devices and techniques such as: permitting the respondent to appeal directly to the Board on the basis of the facts found by the court which issued the injunction; by denying all requests for extensions of time; by curtailing the number of days permitted in filing complaints, answers, exceptions, and other legal documents; by establishing a special "expediting" section at the Board level for treating such cases.

This subcommittee further finds that the statutory provisions requiring, automatically, that the "officer or regional attorney" seek a court injunction whenever he has reasonable cause to believe a "charge" is true and that a complaint should issue, has resulted

in hardship in many situations. The subcommittee, therefore, recommends that the statute be amended so as to give the Labor Board officials opportunity to exercise their discretion in whether or not to petition for the issuance of a court injunction.

B. Section 10(j): The discretionary injunction provision

The names of Norris and LaGuardia are constant reminders of the dangers inherent in conducting labor-management relations by way of injunctions. Nevertheless, this subcommittee finds that injunctions are now utilized extensively against union activities and to an almost nonexistent extent against employer unfair labor practices. Failure to utilize the 10(j) discretionary injunction often results in irreparable injury. This subcommittee, therefore, recommends that the Labor Board give careful consideration to greater utilization of the 10(j) injunction in situations when unfair labor practice charges are filed and the Board finds reasonable cause to believe that such unfair labor practice is continuing and will be continued unless restrained, and will cause irreparable property or personal injury or injury to the exercise of rights guaranteed by section 7. Illustrative are the situations of flagrant and aggravated acts of picket line force and violence, the situations of repeated discharge of union adherents, the situations where employers or unions flagrantly refuse to bargain in good faith, and the situations wherein the employer threatens to intimidate his employees by closing the plant or shifting work to affiliated factories.

PROBLEMS OF FREE SPEECH

A. The use of "race-hate" speech

This subcommittee condemns the utilization of "race-hate" propaganda in connection with labor-management disputes. There has been considerable testimony that such appeals to "race hate" are in violation of section 8A1 of the Labor Act and should be held as an unfair labor practice by the Board. However, other witnesses, equally critical of "race hate" appeals, raised the question whether the constitutional guarantee of free speech protected such utterances, contemptible as they may be, and questioned whether such appeals could be held to constitute an unfair labor practice under 8A1. The committee recommends that the Labor Board provide an adequate opportunity for this matter to be resolved by the U.S. Supreme Court. Meanwhile vigorous enforcement of the President's policy to refrain from contracting with employees who discriminate in employment would go a long way toward discouraging such appeals.

B. The captive audience

The subcommittee finds that in many situations the employer utilizes the "captive audience" technique to present his views to his employees on company time and on company property; and that in contrast, the union is deprived of all effective techniques and media for communicating with the employees. This prevents a full discussion and a full understanding of the issues, and effectively deprives employees of their rights to self-organization. The subcommittee recommends that the Labor Board reexamine its Livingston Shirt doctrine with an eye to adopting a policy of equal opportunity in presentation of issues. Should the employer choose to march his employees to a captive audience meeting, the union should be allowed equal time in discussing the issues. Should the employer choose to mail out literature to all his employees, the union ought to have the right to have its views mailed to the same employees by the employer at the union's expense. The Landrum-Griffin amendments of 1959 require more than this equality and fairness in internal union elections. A representation election ought to be conducted with the same degree of fairness.

Community Pressure

The subcommittee finds that community pressure often denies citizens of the United States of "rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws" and that this deprivation often occurs "under color of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage." It follows that the situation can best be handled under the Civil Rights Statutes, and this subcommittee recommends that whenever an appropriate situation be raised in a Labor Board proceeding, that the Labor Board inform the Department of Justice of this fact.

The subcommittee further recommends that suggestions for changes in procedures before the Board prepared by the Labor Law Section of the American Bar Association be adopted with no further delay. The subcommittee's investigations have confirmed findings by McKinsey & Co., Inc.—a private management consultant firm—that gross mismanagement and lack of adequate standards have contributed to long delays in dealings with the Board. The subcommittee agrees that regional offices waste precious time because practically all decisions must be cleared through the Washington office of the Chief Counsel or the Board. It urges the McKinsey & Co. recommendations be implemented as soon as possible, including greater autonomy for regional officers, so that bureaucratic "redtape" can be reduced to a minimum or eliminated.

Will We Bite?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy made a fine speech last Monday before the United Nations. It now remains to be seen whether or not his actions will follow his words. The dangers prevalent on disarmament are well discussed in the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer in the September 25 issue of the Long Island Daily Press:

REDS DANGLE SAME OLD DISARMAMENT BAIT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

While Soviet generals, engineers and scientists frantically beef up Russian military strength for a coming showdown with the United States, that master Communist staller Valerian A. Zorin once more dangles the bait of disarmament. It looks as though the American administration is again rising to the Soviet lure.

Think a moment: the U.S.S.R. after duping the United States into a 3-year cessation of atomic tests, suddenly rushes to test its new and monster weapons. It totally disregards the objections of those nonaligned countries who systematically attack the United States for previous testing and France for just four current tests, which may have resulted in about a tenth as much fallout as the recent Soviet tests. The Kremlin accomplishes this precisely when, with a Berlin shown-down looming, it needs to appear—and be—militarily as formidable as possible. Moreover, Khrushchev has to move fast. For if the United States really reentered the armament race it could up our military budget by 50 percent and soon far surpass the Communists.

But this is exactly where Comrade Zorin comes in. Just when American public opinion is about to demand that President Kennedy quit fooling and beat the Russians to N-bombs, anti-missile missiles, shelters and the other essentials of freedom in the nuclear age, the Russian once more acts as though after 15 months of stalling he really wants more disarmament negotiations.

One may have expected President Kennedy to greet this latest Soviet "willingness" once more graciously to discuss disarmament with us with a loud Bronx cheer—and get on with the arms race in order to strengthen our Berlin position.

Instead he comes up with an echo of Khrushchev's former phony proposal of complete disarmament. As that Kennedy champion James Reston describes the situation in the New York Times, although the Kennedy administration has been "profoundly disappointed" in its effort to create a new spirit, "it came to office determined to put an end to the angry dialogue with the Communist world, to elevate reason in the counsels of the nations to emphasize military solutions of the world's problems and to build the United Nations not only as a forum but as an effective arbiter for the peaceful settlement of disputes."

Obviously, it has done nothing of all this. Each hope has been blown up in Kennedy's face by Khrushchev. The latter never had, and has not now, the slightest intention of permitting any of this to happen. What he wants is to lull an awakening American public back to sleep while he seizes Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, etc., etc., etc.

We Need Leadership and the Will To Win in Our Struggle With World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disappointing aspects of our administration's foreign policy during the past 8 months has been a complete backing away from the life-and-death challenge of the international Communist conspiracy. Have we ruled ourselves out of competing with the Reds for the minds of men? Have we come to the juncture in our Nation's history when we lack the courage to fight affirmatively for our ideals against the most tyrannical, godless force ever known in the world? Or is it because there is a fundamental belief that a Communist is not really a Communist and their threats are not really threats. Many in this country honestly believe that world communism presents no imminent danger. I suggest that the facts do not support this contention.

Communism is the No. 1 domestic and international problem of the United States of America and poses our greatest threat and challenge. The State Department has indicated that it does not understand the nature of the Communist conspiracy. Its unfortunate history is one of concession, appeasement, retreat and weakness. I suggest that this is not the temper of American opinion

nor an indication of the resolve of our people to recognize our enemy, understand them for what they are, how they operate and what they plan as well as their resolve to take the steps necessary to win in this struggle. It may seem inconsistent to state this, since the President must assume responsibility for the conduct of the State Department, but I feel that President Kennedy understands the Communists. His record in the House of Representatives indicated he had a basic awareness of the threat of international communism.

My concern comes largely from what the President and the administration leave unsaid. My concern stems further from the unmistakable conclusion that one must reach after following the 8-month record vis-à-vis the Soviet Union that we are afraid to take the initiative, afraid, to win, in effect, in this struggle which will determine whether this planet is to be free or slave. The State Department internationalists have charted our course in a manner which indicates their overall preoccupation is with their desire to come up with a "draw" in the Russia-United States conflict even though the record is replete with evidence that the Russians are playing the game to win and are, unfortunately, doing just that. To win requires the taking of risks, that point should be made clear. However, our State Department is operating on the assumption that war is the worst thing that can happen. War would be hell but who can argue that living under communism is worse than either the threat of war or war itself?

No one could disagree with what President Kennedy told the Nation on the Berlin speech. On Monday of this week, he made another fine address to the United Nations and gave eloquent testimonial to our peaceful intentions and aspirations. However, in my judgment the real point was missed then as it has been by the State Department in the past 8 months and ever since the end of World War II. The United States must develop the plan, develop the leadership which will bring about a victory of the forces of freemen over the forces of slavery. No where do we get any indication that this is to be desired or even considered. This vital point is lacking in our foreign policy today more than at any time since 1945.

While our overall policy during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations was not as strong as the free world longed for, by no stretch of the imagination did it go to the extreme that we have seen in 1961. Suddenly the State Department adopts a policy which I refer to as one of "civility." Under the doctrine of "civility" the Russians are treated as if they are responsible members of the world community of nations, that they want peace and that the only problem is to find mutual ground for accord, negotiation and concession. Along the way, we have seen our Goverment delete strong references to communism, encourage diplomatic recognition of puppet states, make available surplus grain to Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, open our postal system to the flow of Communist junk mail and commit many other foolhardy blunders to conjure up the right spirit from our foe. Let us trace this policy which is supposed to bring about peace and harmony and see how it squares with American concepts, American security and our hopes for a free world safe from subversion, war and threats against individual liberties.

First, it almost seems redundant to go over Communist history but some Americans still hold to the idealistic mirage that communism really is not so bad, that it represents more of a land reform or collective experiment. From the beginning, the Communist credo has clung to but one philosophy. This was that capitalism would eventually be destroyed and world communism would be instituted. Along the way, anything was proper to achieve these ends from murder and deceit to internal subversion and the conquest of peaceful countries. The record of Communist perfidy needs not to be recounted. Their words have been belied on every turn by their deeds. They have been at war against us incessantly from the beginning. They were at war against us when President Roosevelt opened the gate by giving them the respectability of diplomatic recognition from this country in 1933. They were at war with us at the very time we were sending them lend lease supplies and fighting with them against the Fascist overlords, Hitler and Tojo. They are at war against us now but we do not want to admit it. Unfortunately, our State Department does not seem to know it. We are still living under a Presidential proclamation of December 16, 1950, which states in part:

PROCLAMATION 2914

Whereas world conquest by Communist imperialism is the goal of the forces of aggression that have been loosed upon the world; and

Whereas if the goal of Communist imperialism were to be achieved, the people of this country would no longer enjoy the full and rich life they have with God's help built for themselves and their children; they would no longer enjoy the blessings of the freedom of worshiping as they severally choose, the freedom of reading and listening to what they choose, the right of free speech including the right to criticize their Government, the right to choose those who conduct their Government, the right to engage freely in collective bargaining, the right to engage freely in their own business enterprises, and the many other freedoms and rights which are a part of our way of life; and

Whereas the increasing menace of the forces of Communist aggression requires that the national defense of the United States be strengthened as speedily as possible:

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do proclaim the existence of a national emergency.

Why do we turn our backs on the facts? They are clear. They are convincing. Certainly no one can allege that the Communists can be trusted more in 1961 than in 1950. Exactly the opposite allegation would be closer to the truth. What, then, are we doing in face of this national emergency?

One of the first things this administration did was to censor a speech of Adm. Arleigh Burke who was supposedly under the misapprehension that the Communists were our enemies and was going to say so publicly in an address. The White House announced that henceforth there would be no derogatory references to the Communists and all speeches would be cleared with the White House first. This was followed by the Defense Department memorandum which withdrew the program known as Operation Blue. This program had been used successfully to educate our servicemen on their enemy—the Communists. General Walker was rebuked for his anti-Communist activities on the grounds that he invaded the political field.

In his January 20 inaugural speech, President Kennedy referred to a "new start" which his administration would take in regard to our dealings with the Reds. Strong statements were made concerning Cuba and Laos but in both cases our action did not match the words. In Cuba, we withheld vital support from an invasion which on admission of our officials was prompted by U.S. participation and Cuba officially went into the Communist camp. After being humiliated, our officials then supported an abortive "tractors for prisoners" deal and set the tone for our national posture.

In late June, the Commerce Department, with State Department approval, announced that it would henceforth permit sales of subsidized farm commodities to the Soviet Union and its European bloc. What could be more ridiculous? The one factor which makes war unlikely is the lack of food in Russia and the Iron Curtain countries. So what do we do—we help them out with this, their greatest problem. Congress has expressed its strong disapproval of this policy.

In June, the Congress discovered that we were playing the role of a real sucker in the United Nations. U.S. dollars were used by the administration to pay into the U.N. Special Fund for the Congo operation to make up for the share which the Soviet Union refused to pay. Their assessment was made under article XVII of the U.N. Charter; they refused to pay, and this administration used $5 million from the President's contingent fund and $10 million from the mutual security fund, literally giving it in direct aid to our enemy. That is not all. The administration has recommended increased aid to Yugoslavia and Poland under the theory that they are not in the Communist orbit. This flies directly into the face of facts. On July 13 of this year a joint communique was issued by the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia which expressed great satisfaction with relations between the two countries which it states "are developing normally and the positions are similar or coincide on the major international questions."

Yet this administration looks forward to a new round of conciliatory gestures toward Tito. Study a few examples of the export licenses granted by our Commerce Department which authorize shipment of material to Yugoslavia. On July 12, licenses granted for shipment of $639,000 in iron and steel scrap; August

4, another license for $639,000 worth of scrap metal; August 16, license approved for shipment of $354,412 in copper scrap; August 28, license approved for shipment of $732,000 in iron and steel scrap. All of this, mind you, to a "neutral" nation which finds its relations developing "normally" with Russia and whose positions are similar or coincide on the major international questions.

Since 1948, U.S. Customs Bureau officials have been under orders to screen Communist propaganda coming into this country of the junk mail variety. Let me make it clear that no one objects to letters which are of a first class nature, from individual to individual. Here we are talking about hundreds of thousands of tons of Communist mail which is coming into the country to be delivered free. During the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, if this mail were determined to be political, it was intercepted. Since March 17, under order of the Kennedy administration, the plug was pulled on this flood of propaganda mail and the Communists have had a field day sending their trash to our youth. Pressed for an answer, the Post Office Department gave this official answer for stopping the 13-year-old program of intercepting unwanted and unsolicited propaganda:

The program had no intelligence value and it interfered with efforts to improve East-West relations.

Here we see the key to the sorry story of our relations with the Communist international conspiracy during these past 8 months. Improve East-West relations by softening our criticisms of the Communists, refrain from focusing attention on the fact that they are our avowed enemy, do not call attention to their lies, deceit, treachery—just hope, hope that sooner or later they will be moved by a spirit of justice and fairness to settle all of the problems of the world. This, I suggest, is not only naive, it is completely bankrupt and presents a serious danger to our national security.

The President has followed this policy and has cautiously refrained from strong words in talking of our enemy. Take the Captive Nations Declaration as a good example. This was an unfortunate example of this soft policy. The 86th Congress provided for the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and urged the President to make a yearly declaration until these nations are freed from the Communist yoke. In 1959, President Eisenhower made a strong declaration which referred to the "nations throughout the world which have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet Communism" and to "Soviet-dominated nations." No doubt was left in any mind that we considered the Russian leaders as the captors, the oppressors. Contrast this to the appeasing declaration issued this year:

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION ON CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1961

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas many of the roots of our society and our population lie in these countries; and

Whereas it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 16, 1961, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.

Not one reference to the mortal enemy of the United States but rather a hope for "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom."

My colleagues, we see everywhere a complete breakdown of our Government's determination to defeat international communism. Do we honestly think we can come out of this life and death struggle with a "draw?"

We see the same policy manifesting itself in the behind-the-scenes efforts of prominent members of this administration to accomplish the diplomatic recognition of Red China and Outer Mongolia. Many factors suggest that the deal has already been made. Following the conference between Prime Minister Macmillan and President Kennedy, the Associated Press on April 12 reported from London:

In a reversal of longstanding policy, President Kennedy's administration has decided not to oppose U.N. debate next fall on Red China's bid for a seat in the United Nations, informed diplomats reported today. Instead, the United States is working on a new strategy to keep Peiping out of the world body—at least until 1962. The diplomats said Mr. Kennedy told British Prime Minister Macmillan at their meeting last week he needs at least 12 months to prepare Americans to accept the Red Chinese into the world organization.

We are being prepared now, make no mistake of that. Public indignation has forced the administration to ostensibly oppose the admission but the same end is being accomplished. Only this week, on Tuesday, September 26, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson gave one more indication of this frightfully soft approach to communism in his declaration at the United Nations that the United States will not obstruct the admission of Communist Outer Mongolia to the U.N. He did not make it clear whether our country would vote to recommend this Communist country for membership or abstain from the voting but in either case it could be decisive of the issue. Here once more is the wornout policy of doing business with the Communists. We have been doing business with them for 28 years and the cause of freedom has lost over one-third of the world in the process. They will continue to do business with us as long as they can bargain away our very lives.

Think of that. We will not obstruct the recognition of Outer Mongolia. Owen Lattimore has been on an extended tour there. He and others of his type give two reasons for such recognition.

First, they say, this will encourage diversity within the Communist bloc. Second, it will give us a listening post in the Far East. Recognition of Outer Mongolia implies acceptance of the fiction that this satellite is an independent state, responsible for its own foreign policy. This is absurd but, more important, recognition will do immeasurable damage to the U.S. position in the Far East since it represents another instance of appeasement.

All in all, this 8-month record is indeed a sorry one for the American people. It signals the fact that we are not really in the battle with the Russians. We are content to drift and appease.

A DOMESTIC ISSUE?

Is communism merely an international issue or is there a bona fide threat of internal subversion? Note well what the man most qualified to say, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, told a House Appropriations Subcommittee this spring:

The Communist Party, U.S.A., during the past year has stepped up its activities among the youth of our Nation. In addition to their youth work, the Communists devoted considerable effort toward infiltration of our industries and unions, in improving their agitation and propaganda machinery, in exploiting the prevailing international political climate in an effort to make Soviet policies more acceptable to American public opinion, and in rebuilding their influence among all segments of our society. (Hearings on H.R. 7371 (State, Justice, judiciary appropriation bill) before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 6, 1961. U.S. Government Printing Office. (P. 423.))

He further stated that the Soviet intelligence setup is the most extensive in history and yet, I would add, we expect to "improve East-West relations." He said:

The Soviet intelligence services have reorganized, multiplied their contacts with the American people, and have become aggressively bolder in spearheading their espionage offensive against the United States. The intelligence organizations of the satellite countries, carefully coordinated under Soviet leadership and control, have gained increasingly in experience and ability.

The current, widespread ramifications of the Soviet bloc espionage networks which today extend throughout the entire United States, have indicated a realistic need for a further tightening of our security on the homefront. While the Communists speak of peace, their intelligence setup is the most extensive in world history. (Ibid., p. 425.)

There is nothing partisan in the fight to destroy Communist subversion. Two of the most dedicated Americans in this battle are Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. Both men have recognized that one of our greatest dangers comes from bureaucrats in Washington who either out of design or ignorance are selling the line that Communists are not really out to destroy us and we must be more friendly with them. Take the frightening and absurd views of one of the U.S.

Information Agency's top officials which was brought to light by the dedicated patriot, Senator DODD. In a recent speech he told his colleagues:

The most alarming evidence I have yet noticed of the weakness in our propaganda effort was the speech made on Monday, September 4, by Dr. Ralph K. White, Chief of the Soviet Bloc Division of USIA's Office of Research and Analysis.

This speech advanced the general theme that we are not too different from the Communists, after all. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall insert in the RECORD the text of Dr. White's speech; but at present I should like to give a brief and, I believe, fair description of its contents.

Dr. White contends the following:

That we and the Communists are waging a joint battle against mutual suicide.

That we err in not recognizing that the Russians are afraid of us and that many of their seemingly aggressive policies originate in this defensive fear.

That while the Soviets may appear aggressive in Berliin, they have a genuine desire to stabilize the situation there, based upon a sincere fear of aggression by the West.

That we are too inclined to look upon Communist leaders as villains and that we overestimate the evil of Communist dictators.

That we are too ready to dismiss the words of the Soviet leaders as lies when most of the time they are saying what they really think.

Then, in what surely must number among the great understatements of this century, Dr. White throws in these bromides:

He says that, in a sense, Soviet leaders are "less representative" of their own people than we are. He points out that their meaning of democracy is "rather different" from ours and that they are, therefore, "less democratic" than we are. He concedes that we are "less aggressive" and "less imperialistic" than they are. He ventures that "relatively speaking" we are more truthful than the Communists.

Dr. White, in conceding that we are more truthful than the Communists, implies that this difference is only in degree rather than in kind. He condemns the U–2 incident and our assistance to the Cuban freedom fighters as matters for which we should be blamed.

In another portion of his speech, Dr. White credits Khrushchev with having knocked "large holes" in Stalin's Iron Curtain, apparently unaware that a few weeks ago Khrushchev closed the largest hole in the Iron Curtain by building a concrete wall across the center of Berlin that is more literally an Iron Curtain than Stalin ever erected.

These are strange statements indeed to come from a man who is responsible for advising USIA on the most effective means of winning the ideological conflict with the Communists.

Apparently Dr. White feels there is not much of a conflict after all and that differences between us and the Communists are mere delusions and misunderstandings.

It is, I feel, a matter of shame for a Senator to have to refute on the floor of the Senate such statements from a U.S. official.

First, we are not engaged in any joint battle at the side of the Communists against mutual suicide. They, and they alone, threaten the world with destruction. If we are to have a nuclear holocaust, it is they who will cause it and nothing could be more false than the assumption that, somehow, we and the Communists are struggling together against the threat of nuclear annihilation, as though that threat had some independent status, some autonomous power of its own.

Second, I cannot believe that the brutal aggression of the Communists in East Berlin, in Tibet, in Laos, in South Vietnam, in Indochina, in South Korea, and other places, or the similar aggression which swallowed up all of Eastern Europe and China, is motivated by fear of the West. It is, rather, a logical and systematic implementation of the frequently declared aim of the Communists to subjugate the entire world. I hope that, after the fall of 1 billion persons to Communist tyranny since 1945, there are only a few left who maintain that these patently aggressive and inhuman acts were defensive, natural acts based upon fear. The fact that such a thesis is still being advanced by one of our leaders in psychological warfare is to me a cause of shock and almost of despair.

Third, Dr. White's thesis that Soviet actions in Berlin are based upon a genuine desire to stablize the situation there, thus fending off Western aggression in the future, is incredible in view of the facts.

The Communists have forced crisis after crisis in Berlin with the objective of forcing us out, gobbling up Berlin, and so undermining the free world position there as to cause all of Germany and all of Europe to fall within the Communist orbit.

The Communist purpose in Berlin is aggression and no other. And if the leaders of our own USIA cannot grasp this fact, if they do not have the comprehension to understand our enemy and his motives, whom can be expect to understand?

Fourth, Dr. White feels that the American people are too inclinde to look upon the Communist leaders as villains and that we overestimate their evil.

Here is a group of men in Moscow who have deliberately murdered 20 million people, through planned starvation, through assassination, through mass executions, through the slow living death of concentration camps and slave labor camps.

Here is a group of men who have enslaved 1 billion human beings and turned them into faceless cogs in the Communist machine.

Here is a group of men who have waged systematic warfare upon the basic tenets of our religous and philosophic heritage, men who will embrace any evil if it advances the Communist cause.

In the face of this, what can be said for a division chief in our USIA who feels that we overestimate the evil of our enemies?

Fifth, Dr. White chides us for being too ready to dismiss the words of Soviet leaders as lies when most of the time "what they say is fairly close to what they really think." What a remarkable statement this is.

Does Dr. White believe that the Soviet charges against us of germ warfare in Korea were made in good faith?

Does he believe that they were saying what they really thought when they tied us up in nuclear test ban negotiations while at that very time they were setting up the series of nuclear tests which are now taking place?

Does he believe that they were acting in good faith when they broke more than 1,000 solemn treaties which they had entered into?

The list of their perfidy is infinite.

It need not be recounted here.

What is unbelievable is that an American USIA official could make the statement that most of the time Soviet leaders are saying what they really think.

Sixth, the understatements of Dr. White to which I previously referred are actually incredible misstatements.

The Soviets are not merely less representative of their people than we are. They are not representative of their people at all in any real sense. They are enemies and enslavers of their people.

They are not less democratic than we are. They are not democratic in any sense; they are totalitarian in every sense.

Their meaning of democracy is not "rather different" from ours, as Dr. White alleges. There is no room for democracy at all in their ideology and they are avowed enemies of it.

I suppose we should be grateful to Dr. White that, after years of scientific research and evaluation, he can proclaim that we are less aggressive and less imperialistic than the Soviets. But the truth is that we are not aggressive at all and they are completely aggressive. The truth is that we are not imperialistic at all and they are the most imperialistic clique that ever existed.

Seventh, as for Dr. White's condemnation of the U–2 flights and our assistance to the Cuban freedom fighters, I have this to say.

The truth is that the U–2 flights were not only blameless but highly praiseworthy and necessary actions that contributed substantially to the security of this Nation and to its protection against surprise attack by the Soviets.

The truth is that our error in assisting the Cuban freedom fighters was that we did not give enough help to those who were striving to rescue their country from the grim oppression of a Communist dictatorship, maintained in power by Communist arms.

We can expect our enemies to attack us on these points; we can expect neutralists and those who are more committed to vague concepts of internationalism than they are to the life or death question of national security to find fault with these actions. But should we expect an official of our own U.S. Information Agency to make such attacks? If USIA is not for us, whom can we expect to be for us?

This is incredible but a good example of what is going on while we and our countrymen are sleeping. How do such men get into key positions of Government, you ask? The record of Communist infiltration in Government is a long one and needs no documentation here. Yet many of those color blind bureaucrats come in the front door. Representative WALTER blasted his own administration on the floor of the House on July 6 because of bad judgment in appointing unqualified men to sensitive positions. He said, in part:

According to press reports which appeared in several newspapers within the last 2 weeks, Mr. Salvatore Bontempo and Mr. Michel Cieplinski, have been selected to be appointed, respectively, to the posts of Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State.

Having acquainted myself with the background of both alleged nominees, I believe that both appointments have been made, or are about to be made, in violation of the law, Executive orders, existing regulations, and even of the most recent order issued by President Kennedy regarding full reports and detailed information on individuals considered for important administration positions. * * *

Both nominees come directly from the field of strictly political activities neither of them having ever been associated with matters affecting internal security, immigration, issuance of passports, and determination of citizenship and nationality, although all of those matters are within the purview of the law which they would be called upon to administer.

The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs is one of the most important offices in the Department of State, indeed, one of the more important offices of the entire executive branch of the Government. Not only is internal security of the Nation involved in the Bureau's operations but so is the security supervision of diplomatic and consular establishments and personnel as well as the very fate of hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens and aliens who leave this country or come to the United States each year. Both nominees are entirely foreign to the

important and technically involved field in which they are about to operate. By their appointment, violence is done not only to the law, to Presidential orders but also to the best interests of good government.

Mr. Speaker, having spent well over a quarter of a century in politics, I certainly recognize the necessity of paying up political debts. I am by no means an adversary of that reality of our political life. However, I deeply believe that payment of political indebtedness to individuals should not be in conflict with national interests, and that persons who for political reasons may be deserving of rewards should not obtain them at the expense of such interest, or be entrusted with duties for which they are not qualified.

In the case of Messers. Bontempo and Cieplinski, a perusal of their professional records and past experience most certainly disqualifies them from the respective positions for which they appear to have been selected.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these two statesmen at length because they highlight the overall internal threat to this country. All too few bureaucrats see the sinister nature of the Communist threat. At a time when we have a vigorous Communist Party working against us internally, many raise their voices against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, one of the forces which is working to protect us from communism. I have shown the film "Operation Abolition" on numerous occasions in my home district and I am always amazed at the number of people who seem to see a danger in it but rarely say a critical word against the Communists. At the end of this address I am including an answer to the critics of this film—a film which shows, as J. Edgar Hoover puts it, that "it can happen here"—prepared by my colleague, Representative JOHN ROUSSELOT, of California.

The Communists and their fellow travelers are working day and night in our very midst. Yet, through our predisposition to think only the best of our fellow men we at once are making their work easier. Communist-front organizations are flourishing. Anti-Americanism is openly proclaimed. Our book shelves and magazine racks abound with Socialist-Communist thought. Currently, a smear book, "The Un-Americans" is on the paperback book stands. It is a conscious effort on the part of a questionable American to tarnish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The author, Frank J. Donner, is described only as a constitutional lawyer. On February 16, 1959, HUAC issued a report titled "Communist Legal Subversion: The Role of the Communist Lawyer." At page 35, the following appears concerning this "constitutional lawyer":

FRANK J. DONNER, NEW YORK

Frank Donner was identified by a number of witnesses before this committee as a member of a Communist cell comprised of lawyers employed by the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D.C.

Herbert Fuchs, a former Communist who had helped to organize this cell in 1937 and actively participated in it until his transfer from Washington in 1942, testified on December 13, 1955, that Frank Donner was one of the NLRB lawyers who joined his conspiratorial Communist group.

On December 14, 1955, Mortimer Riemer, another former member of the Communist cell in the NLRB, confirmed Fuchs' testimony regarding Frank Donner. Donner was again identified by ex-Communist Harry Cooper on March 1, 1956.

Frank Donner, on June 28, 1956, appeared as a witness before this committee. Although admitting he was employed by the NLRB from 1940 until 1945 in the Litigation Section, he invoked the first and fifth amendments when he was questioned concerning Communist Party membership and affiliations. Mr. Donner was confronted with a U.S. Civil Service Commission questionnaire he had signed on June 2, 1943, while employed by the NLRB. On this official form, he had replied "No" to a question as to whether or not he held membership in a Communist organization. Conceding that the signature was his, Mr. Donner nevertheless invoked the fifth amendment when asked by the committee if he had been truthful in his statement to the U.S. Government.

Frank Donner was recently named general counsel for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. This Communist-controlled union, which was ousted by the CIO in 1950, is a recognized bargaining agent in many of our vital defense industries. The UE in a recent pamphlet described its new counsel as being recognized as one of the foremost authorities on NLRB law. It failed to mention that Donner was publicly identified as being a member of a conspiratorial Communist cell while employed as an attorney at the NLRB in the 1940's.

This fifth amendment author and the small band of overt sympathizers of the same ideology are meeting with little actual support but they are serving their purpose. Many people have become confused as to communism. Those who are patriotically fighting this subversive movement are often made the target of smear and derision. Some, like General Walker who was officially described as "eccentric," are being vilified and destroyed. As to the frantic efforts by certain elements seeking "abolition" of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Representative WALTER states:

The anemic public response to this campaign is heartening and augurs well for the abiding patriotism, circumspection, and intelligence of most Americans.

The battle, however, is going on. Until we officially brand the Communist international conspiracy as an enemy, the result will be in doubt.

The masters of the Kremlin have enslaved over 900 million people. Their conquest of 15,500,000 square miles represents 26 percent of the land area of the earth with over 30 percent of its population. Each day they promote their plans to nick away at more and more of the free world. Can anyone doubt that they are our avowed enemies? Why do so many get fooled by the false facade, the thin veneer of their professions for peace and humanity?

The basic truth that should be etched by our consciences after 28 years of perfidy by the Communists since the Roosevelt administration accomplished the recognition of Russia is that it is sheer suicide for freemen to appease or accommodate the totalitarian leaders of that atheistic country. We only deceive ourselves when we feel that a doctrine of civility will bring peace to the world. We only deceive ourselves when we hopefully contemplate disarmament without the first ingredient of Russian defeat or collapse. While Khrushchev speaks of peaceful coexistence he continues the policy of war and murder, buying precious time from the free world. Any hope of negotiation and agreement with or concession from the Soviets is unreal. Our true challenge is to develop a policy which will set our sights on an overall victory for the free world over the Communist tyrants.

For that reason, I have joined several of my colleagues in introducing the "victory resolution." It is predicated on the thesis that we must win and to do so we must first set our entire effort toward defeating those who would destroy us. This resolution, House Joint Resolution 593, declares that a "state of hostility" exists in the world and that "the abuses and usurpations of the global aggression" are "no longer tolerable." Therefore, "it hereby is, and henceforth shall be, the indomitable will of the people of the United States of America and the unswerving purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement." The resolution directs the President to prepare for the approval of the Congress a program to achieve this total victory. The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 593

Joint resolution expressing a declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement

Whereas numerous findings, resolutions, and condemnations in United States law, Presidential proclamations, and treaties which bind the United States, proclaim that the world Communist movement pursues invariably the same object, world conquest, and evinces a clearcut design to reduce all peoples under its absolute despotism; and

Whereas the supranational world Communist movement does not represent the Russian and other peoples under its totalitarian control, but rather, in violation of their legitimate national aspirations, commands their lands and resources as an industrial-military base for its global campaign; and

Whereas the world Communist movement operates on every level of human activity, using all conceivable pressures—ideological, psychological, economic, military, paramilitary, etc.—to bring about a widening influence and ultimately absolute control over every human thought, aspiration, and action in the nations it subverts and conquers; and

Whereas the United States of America has taken numerous steps including the use of Armed Forces to withstand the global aggression of the world Communist movement in certain areas in various foreign countries and within our borders; and

Whereas these steps which constituted a determination to resist certain individual thrusts of that aggression, in their totality have not met the full challenge of the global state of hostility that has been declared in dogma and prosecuted in deed by the world Communist movement; and

Whereas the nature of the threat demands the engagement of the full will of the American people against the hostile universal dedication of the enemy, and the application of a complete global policy to meet and defeat on every front the widespread coordinated forces of the world Communist movement: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That a state of hostility exists, and, finding no longer tolerable the abuses and usurpations of the global aggression un-

justly thrust upon men by the world Communist movement, in order to bring peace and security to this Nation and the family of nations and to realize the hopes expressed in law for the freedom of Communist-enslaved peoples, it hereby is and henceforth shall be, the indomitable national will of the people of the United States of America and the unswerving purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement in all its names, its parties and sections, and to this great end we urge similar action by all independent nations and humbly beseech the strength and guidance of Almighty God; and be it further

Resolved, That the President shall prepare for the approval of the Congress a program to achieve this total victory.

We speak with frustration and wonderment when we consider the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations. We ask ourselves how anyone but an opportunist can fail to see there is really no choice except freedom or slavery in the battle of East and West. Before we condemn the "neutrals" too loudly must we not admit that, looking through their eyes, we see the struggle as one where the Communists are dedicated to winning while the United States, the leader of the forces of freedom vacillates and continues bankrupt policies of concession and appeasement? Did not the recent Belgrade Conference of "neutrals" offer the best exposé of the sheer stupidity of our policies? Are we afraid to admit this? Does this conference give an indication of who they think is going to win and who is going to lose?

I have recounted only a few of our questionable policies here. The network of internal subversion is extremely vast and intricate. The international network of the Communist conspiracy represents a dedicated threat to our hard-won freedoms. We will not win against that force by concession or appeasement, by relaxing our guard, by allowing their mail to flow freely, by selling them our surplus grain, by selling them strategic material, by weakly allowing them to ridicule the U.N. Charter, by a doctrine of civility. Quite the opposite, if we set our sights on ultimate victory for freedom we will quickly determine that anything which helps them hurts us. We will reverse our drift and reassert our leadership and in these late hours of our struggle tip the balance toward the cause of freedom.

The article by JOHN H. ROUSSELOT follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT "OPERATION ABOLITION"

(By Congressman JOHN H. ROUSSELOT)

Charge: The demonstrators were not Communist inspired and Communist led.

Fact: George Christopher, mayor of San Francisco, quoted from the San Francisco Examiner, May 18, 1960: "The mayor said that in his opinion last Friday's riot was Communist directed and that for the most part, unknowing and misguided students were innocent pawns of trained Communist agitators skilled in crowd control tactics."

J. Edgar Hoover, quoted from "Communist Target—Youth": "It is vitally important to set the record straight on the extent to which Communists were responsible for the disgraceful and riotous conditions which prevailed during the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings. It is vitally important that not only the students involved in that incident, but also students through the Nation whom Communists hope to exploit in similar situations, recognize the Communist tactics which resulted in what experienced west coast observers familiar with Communist strategy and tactics have termed the most successful Communist coup in the San Francisco area in 25 years."

Judge Albert A. Axelrod, presiding judge at the San Francisco Municipal Court where those arrested at the riots appeared, made the following statement quoted on page A2 of the Washington Post, December 25, 1960: "I very definitely agree with the view of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the city hall riot of last May 13 was instigated by Communist subversives."

To clarify his position, which had been distorted in some quarters, Mayor Christopher made the following statement in his office on January 18, 1961: "Known Communists, and I repeat this emphatically, known Communists were in the lead of this demonstration." The students were dupes who joined some of these causers of agitation believing it as innocent and harmless.

Charge: The San Francisco police were brutal in their handling of the students. No witnesses have been produced who can verify that the rioters provocated the physical conflict.

Fact: J. Edgar Hoover, as quoted from "Communist Target—Youth": "One of the judges in a municipal courtroom in the city hall ordered the mob dispersed because the noise made it impossible for him to hold court. When an attempt was made to carry out the order, the crowd responded by throwing shoes and jostling the officers. An officer warned that firehoses would have to be used if the crowd did not disperse, but the crowd, instigated by Communists who had maneuvered themselves into strategic positions, became more unruly. One of the demonstrators provided the spark that touched off the flame of violence. Leaping a barricade that had been erected, he grabbed an officer's nightstick and began beating the officer over the head. The mob surged forward as if to storm the doors, and a police inspector ordered the firehose turned on. At a party meeting on the night of May 20, 1960, Archie Brown (ed. note: Archie Brown is second in command of the Communist Party in California) disclosed how the party intended to use a followup campaign with campus students as the target. He stated that the party planned to emphasize 'police brutality' as a rallying cry to attract sympathy of student groups."

Dave Hope, reporter, stated in an article on January 25, 1961, in the Oakland Tribune: "I was there. I was in the committee room, in the hallway, on the rotunda. I mingled with the demonstrators, watched the picket lines." On the following day in the Oakland Tribune in another riot article, he said, "I didn't hear any orders, but I did hear the police ask, even beg, the students to be quiet and to leave the city hall. All through the morning the police were polite and courteous. Even when the mob's mood turned ugly after the noon recess, and the hose was brought out, the students were warned repeatedly for a period of at least 10 minutes before the water was turned on. That didn't happen until one student grabbed an officer's nightstick and slugged him with it." It has been claimed that no one was ever charged for this; however, that is dead wrong. Hope went on to say, "* * * Robert J. Meisenbach, a University of California student who was than living in Berkeley, was arrested and charged with assault."

In the January 25 article, Hope went on to say, "Police were careful not to use excessive force. When two or three officers carry out one person, they're being gentle. The party never gets rough until it's man for man. So there was no chance for martyrdom, and this was disappointing. Martyrs must above all else be dignified. You can't be a martyr when, soaking wet, you're skidded unceremoniously down a flight of stairs on the part of your anatomy that should have been spanked more frequently in your childhood."

The San Francisco Chronicle, Saturday, May 14, 1960, in a lead article on page 1, reported that eight policemen and four students were injured. By the ratio of injuries it would appear that the so-called brutality was felt more by the police than the students.

Charge: The film is edited, distorted, cut of sequence and deliberately slants the facts.

Fact: Obviously, the film is edited, as is every film ever made. Three days of hearings, including the interviews of 46 witnesses, cannot be shown in a 45-minute film without editing and omission of most of the material. One thing is certain—the film does not show anything which in fact did not occur during the period of the hearings.

If, as has been claimed, there had been religious students present who wore armbands to distinguish them from the other protestors, the bands would have been visible in the film. For certainly, the films scanned the crowd in a most comprehensive way and any armbands present could not have been deleted from the film.

There are two errors in the film: One, Harry Bridges is shown leaving the city hall and the accompanying editorial comment says this was shortly before the riots. In fact, he arrived shortly after the rioters had been cleared by the use of fire hoses. The important fact is that Harry Bridges was there. Two, a sequence taken on Saturday was included in the Thursday sequence. David Hope stated in the Oakland Tribune, January 25, 1961, "It is astonishing that no more serious mistakes were made in putting the film together and drafting the commentary."

Mayor Christopher, in his statement of January 18, 1961, summed up by saying, "The pictures I believe speak for themselves. They are true. They are authentic. They tell the real story and, of course, at the same time, they are most unfortunate, to say the least."

Charge: The hearing room was unfairly "stacked" with those sympathetic to the committee.

Fact: J. Edgar Hoover, in "Communist Target—Youth", stated, "approximately 25 percent of the spectators in the room were individuals under subpena, and their friends, relatives, attorneys, and sympathizers. This group applauded and cheered the antics of Brown and Brodsky and booed, hissed, and ridiculed the committee at every opportunity."

Seven Baptist ministers from the San Francisco Bay area, who were in attendance at the hearings, issued a joint statement which was printed on May 17, 1960 in the publication of the Foothill Baptist Church, 1530 Foothill Boulevard, Oakland 6, Calif., which stated, in part: "We sat in the rear of the room (hearing room) on a raised platform where we could easily observe the proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators. We studied the crowd carefully for hours and could easily discern which were the masterminds of the mob riots. It is our certain conviction that this indefensible demonstration against law and order was conceived, planned, and directed by a few hard-core Communist agitators who were carrying out their textbook orders on insurrection with classic success."

These statements, as well as the film sequences taken within the hearing room, make it all too plain that, if anything, too many persons actively opposed to the Committee on Un-American Activities were inside the hearing room.

Charge: Sheriff Carberry of San Francisco stated, "There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students."

Fact: The above quotation was attributed to Sheriff Carberry by Paul Jacobs in his article attacking the film which was published in the November 24, 1960 issue of the Reporter magazine. On December 6, 1960, Sheriff Carberry issued the following statement concerning the above quote:

"I did not make that statement. I do not know the author of the article, Paul Jacobs, and have never spoken to him, and have never been interviewed by him.

"I was on the scene on Thursday and Friday (May 12 and 13) up to luncheon time when I went for a luncheon conference with the chairman of the committee, Mr. WILLIS. The disorders took place during the luncheon and I was in no position to know anyhing about them.

"I did not make that statement."

Charge: The film fails to name non-Communist groups by whom the protest against the committee was endorsed.

Fact: No one disputes that assertion. The important fact here is that those who were part of the rioting group responded to the orders and directions of known, identifiable Communists. Furthermore, the HCUA might have been subject to justifiable criticism, if in the course of naming and identifying the known Communists who are shown in the film, the names of other, non-Communist groups and persons were mentioned. The HCUA showed admirable and patriotic restraint in not identifying those groups so that the groups could not be subjected to "guilt by association."

Charge: Judge Axelrod, presiding judge of the San Francisco municipal court where the rioters were brought, stated, "I am convinced that they (the rioters) are not engaged in subversive activities nor in spreading subversive propaganda."

Fact: In a news article in the December 25, 1960 Washington Post, dateline San Francisco, December 24, 1960 (AP), Judge Axelrod is quoted as saying, "At no time did I condone their conduct. A single sentence (ed: the one quoted above in the charge) from my decision, quoted out of context, created that false impression." After the sentence quoted above, the judge went on to say, "However, they chose the wrong means to accomplish their purpose and let themselves become victims of those who profit by creating unrest, riots and the type of conduct which is outlawed by the penal code section I have quoted. As the result, they were arrested, fingerprinted, and photographed, and their efforts achieved a directly opposite result."

Charge: The film used to make "Operation Abolition" was obtained by the HCUA improperly and before the private TV stations which took the film could view it. Also, no credit lines are given. Furthermore, the sale of this film by a private firm is in violation of the copyrights of the stations which took the films.

Fact: The film was obtained by subpena, which is the normal legal way that evidence is obtained by any investigatory body or court of law. The TV people who took the film made no objections to this procedure. A copy of the film was made by Video Productions, Inc., Washington, at the request of the HCUA and quickly returned to the stations.

No credit lines were placed on the film because the film was presented as an official document of the HCUA to be submitted to Congress. In such cases, credit lines are not normally included, for the document is officially authenticated by the presenting committee and not by a private individual or firm.

No copyright infringement suits have been filed against Video Productions, Inc., nor are any planned, so far as is known.

Charge: The film must be inaccurate because of all the furor and controversy that it has created.

Fact: Dave Hope, writing in the Oakland Tribune of January 25, 1961, sums it up: "From the audience reaction (to the film) I would say it is extremely effective and that is why extraordinary effort is made to discredit it. Few people have seen Communists in action. Here they are shown when called before the hearing, screaming imprecations, insults, and contempt at a committee of the U.S. Congress. Almost maniacal in their challenge to law and order, they present an ugly picture that cannot be adequately described in words but becomes all too vivid in the film. * * * For those who took part in the riot and their apologists, the film is just too accurate, too revealing. That's why it is so bitterly attacked."

"Berlin" on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, September 27, 1961, concerning the current disagreement between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

"BERLIN" ON CAPITOL HILL

Let no one suppose that all the partisan wars on Capitol Hill will subside now that Congress has gone home. For far into the winter, we suspect, will be waged the bitter campaign between Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of the House Education Committee, and Representative CARROLL KEARNS, its ranking Republican, over the possession of two spacious committee staff rooms in the Old House Office Building.

Mr. POWELL, with arithmetic on his side, already has ordered the tiny three-man minority staff of the committee to clear out, and change places with six members of the Democratic staff he says are working away in a one-roomer across the hall.

But this "numbers game," fires back Mr. KEARNS, is a mere subterfuge which obscures an issue of deep principle. For the rooms, he says, have belonged by precedent to the minority since 1947, through fat years and lean, whether Republican or Democrat. Thus (as Mr. KEARNS insists in his battle communiques to the press), the issue is not unlike that in Berlin, where the rights of a minority are being threatened by an unprincipled majority. And the most shocking thing of all to Mr. KEARNS is that Mr. POWELL, so long a champion of minorities, wants to "trample minority rights" into the dust now that he is a member of the majority. Will the Republicans obey the ultimatum to evacuate by October 1? "We're staying," says Mr. KEARNS.

So the burning question now, and we don't know whether we can hold our breath that long, is what will happen when Mr. POWELL returns from a European trip late next month. What battle plan will he invoke? Will he try to take possession by stealth, in the dead of night? Will he storm the bastions with Democrats in open battle? Will there be casualties?

Well, we will have to wait and see, of course. But our money is on Mr. KEARNS—outnumbered, outvoted and outraged, but armed with the principle that minority rights must be protected at any cost.

The Attack Carrier—Mobile Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I was a member of a congressional group which made a short but impressive cruise aboard one of the Navy's attack aircraft carriers, the U.S.S. *Shangri-La*, then attached to the 2d Fleet. Only by actually going aboard and observing operation at sea is it possible to fully appreciate what awesome strength we have in our modern Navy.

Perhaps the highlight of our visit to this fine ship was the impressive firepower demonstration staged by the embarked air group. This display of airborne weapons under simulated battle conditions gave proof of how a carrier can move on the scene of a combat area and deliver the goods on target with precision and discrimination. The unique flexibility of carrier aircraft was shown to us when several planes rapidly shifted from conventional to nuclear weapons, demonstrating the mercurial adaptability of the modern attack carrier to the uncertainty of modern warfare.

The high speed of this ship plus its ability to maneuver unpredictably convinced me that the carrier is no sitting duck, but an elusive target immune to enemy ballistic missiles and quite able to protect itself against hostile aircraft with its own fighter cover overhead. I am sure that the security of our Nation rests in no small measure upon the presence of these ships deployed around the periphery of the free world.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George Anderson, recently referred to our carriers as the "gray ambassadors which speak a language of quiet diplomacy and assurance to our friends." Certainly our allies stand more confident against Communist parries and thrusts knowing that U.S. naval strength, as represented by our carrier forces, are always close at hand.

To commemorate this visit to the U.S.S. *Shangri-La*, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an article which appeared in the May 1961 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings on the subject of the aircraft carrier:

THE ATTACK CARRIER—MOBILE MIGHT

(By Comdr. Albert H. Vito, Jr., U.S. Navy)

Mobile, flexible and versatile—these are the words that Navy proponents apply to the modern attack aircraft carriers. Obsolete, vulnerable, and exorbitantly expensive are adjectives that are applied on occasions by others. Perhaps no single weapon system or element of military strength has been the subject of as much controversy and dispute as have aircraft carriers in the

nearly 40 years they have been part of our seapower.

At least a portion of this controversy stems from the difficulty in grasping the elements of the carrier concept without full knowledge of carrier operations.

Much of the lack of understanding of the carrier and her function in our missile-age arsenal arises from the fact that a pierside view is the only one many persons ever get of one of these ships. Certainly this view is impressive, but only in the way that bigness is always impressive.

Let us first examine mobility, a basic asset of all naval forces. A modern carrier force can maintain cruising speeds which allow moving 600 or 700 miles a day. This means that every day a carrier is at sea, the ocean area in which she may be lurking increases by more than a million and a half square miles. This is the true meaning of mobility, the hallmark of all naval forces since the days of the trireme. Critics of the carrier deride this mobility, claiming it is ridiculous to suppose that 600 miles of movement in a day is fast in an era of supersonic aircraft and ballistic missiles, but the arithmetic of areas cannot be controverted. They compare critically the movement of naval forces with the rate of movement of a jet bomber. A more valid comparison would be that of carrier speed against the speed of the bomber's base, its fuel supply, and its weapon logistics. The same critics have discovered, however, that a missile mounted on a railroad car somehow is infinitely less vulnerable than one in a hole in the ground, even though the railroad track provides mobility along predictable paths.

Carriers have been dubbed "sitting ducks." Obviously any target, military or industrial, can be destroyed if an enemy can put against it with precision a high-yield nuclear weapon. There are no exceptions to this general statement—hardened or not, a target will be destroyed if sufficient force is applied to it with enough precision. "Enough precision" is the key phrase in this statement.

Let us assume that an enemy determines a carrier's exact position at a given moment. In the ensuing minutes, while targeting information is collated and introduced into an attack missile, the carrier steadily moves away from the calculated impact point. Which way? How fast? The enemy cannot get the answers—the carrier is invulnerable. Invulnerability to the ballistic missile was a Navy asset long before the missile itself became a reality.

The attack carrier is flexible and versatile. She is not limited to single-purpose use. She does not have to be. The carrier and her embarked combat air group can range the gamut of force, from peacefully showing the flag, through armed reconnaissance, deft attacks in small scale, and full-scale attacks with conventional weapons, or if need be, with fission and fusion bombs, all or any of these delivered with the precision and discrimination that manned aircraft alone can provide. Her striking range covers the sea, its shores, and most of the world's land targets.

All attack aircraft in a modern carrier air group and some of the fighters can carry at least one atomic weapon, and yields are as high as 50 times that of the Hiroshima bomb. Delivery methods range from classic dive bombing and horizontal level bombing to the low altitude loft or laydown method, which assist the pilot in avoiding detection and interference in his attack.

Assuming for the moment that the modern carrier does represent the epitome of mobile, flexible, and versatile military strength—what lies ahead?

Carrier developments now in prospect give a relatively good index of the direction in which we are now proceeding. A look at current research and development projects and at new aircraft in early production stages clearly indicates that the combat capabilities of the carrier and her air group will increase during the 1965–70 era. Extensive examination of future carrier capabilities measured against opposition of the predicted caliber has been accomplished by military effectiveness experts, study groups and machine computers. The studies conclude in general that against the highest caliber opposition—the effectiveness of planned carrier airpower will be better than before.

To accommodate the new aircraft and electronic capabilities that will be fitted into carrier operations in the future, new attack carriers will join the fleet. *Kitty Hawk, Constellation,* and *CVA–66* are all *Forrestal*-class carriers. *Enterprise,* while slightly larger to accommodate her nuclear powerplant, matches *Forrestal's* flight facilities. These ships will replace *Essex*-class ships whose 20-year life is fast ending.

Nuclear power will give *Enterprise* an even greater capability to exploit the advantages of mobility. Almost unlimited range at sustained high cruising speeds will free her from the requirements of fueling at sea. Experience with the operations of *Enterprise* will be invaluable in demonstrating to the Navy the full application of nuclear power to surface units.

What is the future of these new ships? Are their functions to remain the same? Determination of the future of the attack carrier is involved with determination of the requirements for military strength that will devolve upon the United States in coming years. There is no question but that a formidable nuclear retaliatory capability will continue to be a necessary requirement. The Polaris, which exploits inevitability of retaliation and thus insures enemy credibility, is perhaps the best embodiment of nuclear retaliation as will be needed in the future. As other nations develop a matching capability, nuclear deterrent must become less effective as an assurance of peace. It is likely that military force as an extension of national policy will become dependent upon strong conventional arms, able to bring force to bear without risking Armageddon at each new difference of opinion.

The attack carrier is the spearhead of modern seapower and forms the vital core of the U.S. Navy's strength. As in the past and present, so in the future will the airpower made available to the fleet commander by the attack carrier be the element that permits the fleet to function in the face of determined air opposition. Amphibious warfare, sea supremacy, and our entire limited war capability are always dependent upon the presence of the air strength that the attack carrier brings into the area of operations. Without her, our ability to control the seas would be limited to sporadic, hit-and-run attacks.

We must, like the Romans, "Maintain the peace by constant preparation for war and by indicating to our enemies that we are as little disposed to endure injury as to offer it." Our mighty, modern, attack carrier force continues to be a fundamental element of our national strength, for accomplishing this end.

Congressman Paul Brown

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 25, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, one of saddest moments in my life here in Congress, I believe, came last year when my colleague, Representative Paul Brown, announced his retirement.

It was a sad moment because Paul Brown and I came to Washington together some 29 years ago and we became very close friends.

Members of Paul's family, who also were close to me during these years, kept me posted on his activities since his retirement.

His death this past weekend at his home in Elberton, Ga., removed from our midst a great public servant. And, also, it removed from my circle one of my truly great friends.

Never have I met a finer gentleman than Paul Brown. He was devoted to his family, his friends, his State, and his country.

Time will mark Paul Brown as a great legislator. His work on the House Committee on Banking and Currency was brilliant.

Many of us who served with Paul Brown have benefited from his advice. He always was ready to aid other Congressmen in answering questions for constituents concerning banking laws of our country.

Aside from the great contributions he made as a legislator, Paul Brown made many more contributions as a friend of everyone.

I join with these friends in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife and daughter on the loss of their husband and father.

Resolutions Adopted at National Convention by Knights of Columbus, Denver, Colo., August 15-17, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a copy of resolutions adopted by the Knights of Columbus during their national convention in Denver, Colo., August 15 through 17. These resolutions have a particular significance to all of us since they pertain specifically to the Communist menace throughout the world, a menace which seeks to destroy the very Chambers in which we conduct the daily business of Government. I therefore commend to all my colleagues a thorough reading of these most important resolutions:

ON CUBAN SITUATION

"Whereas we are faced with the unescapable fact that the island of Cuba, 90 miles off our shores, site of the American naval base that guards America's southern defenses, anchor for our defense of the Panama Canal, and key to the political future of Latin America, is today a totalitarian dictatorship and a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas Cuba is today a one-man government, held together by promises and fears, with control of the island's economic, politi-

cal and social institutions taken over by one of the best organized Communist apparatus in the Caribbean; and

"Whereas the loss of the Catholic nation of Cuba to the Communist conspiracy is a cause of great concern to all Americans and especially to the Knights of Columbus, whose members are deeply concerned for the welfare, well-being and plight of their fellow Catholics and for the welfare of the order in that country; and

"Whereas the Knights of Columbus, dedicated to the advancement of Christianity and the promotion of patriotism, have on many occasions raised their voices in protest against communism and the evil it represents, and as early as 1926 called the American nations attention to the danger of this then new irreligious philosophy that was just beginning to spread itself throughout the world, and did then embark upon a systematic campaign of education throughout the Americas for the purpose of arousing the sentiment of the people to this new danger, and this at a time when few Americans knew what the word 'communism' meant.

"Resolved, That the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus in annual convention assembled again calls for deep contemplation of the seriousness of the Communist takeover in Cuba and of its special concern for its members and fellow Catholics living in that country, and extends prayers, comfort, and solace to all of them to the ends that their nation may some day soon thrive under the sacred principles recognized by free governments everywhere as fundamental truths, that all men are created free and equal, that they are endowed by Almighty God with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; be it further

"Resolved, That we recognize the fact that national moral conviction is the main weapon that can stop an enemy who knows that he need not resort to atomic weapons when his victim has shown signs of a lack of courage and moral conscience, and that we will heed the alarm of patriotic and dedicated Americans who have been warning about this national weakness for the past decades, and will extend even greater efforts to create a spiritual atmosphere in the countries wherein the order now flourishes so as to prevent a repetition of the Cuba episode elsewhere."

ON COMMUNISM

"Whereas America, Canada, and the entire free world face today and for the foreseeable future an unprecedented challenge to its free institutions, security, and growth, which challenge stems from the rise to power of Communist regimes in Russia, China, and their satellites; and

"Whereas the Communist challenge to the free nations and to the fledgling nations emerging from colonialism in Africa and Asia, is posed on many fronts at once—military, economic, political, and ideological, which can only be met through proper understanding, steady nerves, a spirit of greatness, and a military buildup of forces as a warning to the Communists that free nations will not take one step back from this serious challenge and threat; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has called for united support in his emergency program to strengthen the Armed Forces and the military might of his country and the NATO nations, and has the almost unanimous bipartisan support in the Congress of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Knights of Columbus has been committed for many years to vigorously oppose communism in its conspiracy and plan to destroy Christianity and the constitutional governments of the free nations of the world; be it

"Resolved, That the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus, in annual convention assembled, having long recognized the incompatability of communism with the Christian faith and the political concepts of democratic America, wholeheartedly supports the actions of the President and the Congress of the United States in the emergency steps taken to meet the sweeping challenge and threats of communism not only in Berlin but in the whole world; and be it further

"Resolved, That our members everywhere be urged to acquire a working knowledge of communism's features and characteristics and its historical background, since such knowledge is indispensable to meet the challenge, pointed out in the warning of Pope Pius XI in 1937 that communism has spread so rapidly even though it has long since been rejected scientifically and proven erroneous by experience because too few people have been able to grasp the nature of communism and its tactics, strategy, and objectives."

ON ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

"Whereas the existing country of Red China, being an illegitimate government born of brutality, blood, and barbaric bestiality; and

"Whereas, by reason of its existence, this Government negates the qualifications necessary for its entrance into the community of civilized nations; and

"Whereas, as a free people, we must be opposed to Communist imperialism for the same reason that truth is opposed to falsity, freedom to tyranny, love to hate, and kindness to brutality; and

"Whereas, for the same reason that good cannot clasp the hand of evil without becoming evil, we cannot offer friendship to tyrants and murderers without advancing the cause of tryanny and murder; be it

"Resolved, that the supreme council, Knights of Columbus, stands firmly opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations at any time and under any conditions; be it further

"Resolved, that this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of State of the U.S. Government."

ON THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"Resolved, that the supreme council publicly endorses the Federal Bureau of Investigation and particularly its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, for the outstanding work being done by this agency and its Director, both in combating the Communist conspiracy and in setting an example of efficiency for all governments to emulate."

IMPRISONMENT OF BISHOP JAMES E. WALSH, M.M., BY RED CHINA

"Resolved, that the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to continue to use every possible means to effect the release of Most Rev. James E. Walsh, M.M., former superior general of the Maryknoll Fathers, who is still imprisoned by the Communist government of China; be it further

"Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State."

Before calling the 79th supreme council meeting to a conclusion, Supreme Knight Hart announced that the 80th supreme council meeting will be held in Boston, Mass.

John McCormack—A Great Man and a Great Leader

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleagues in congratulating JOHN MCCORMACK on his coming of age as majority leader. Whether or not I can match the eloquence of the tributes which have been tendered to him, I yield to no one in my admiration of him as a statesman and as a man.

During the 13 years that I have been privileged to serve in this House, JOHN MCCORMACK's ability as a leader has commanded my respect, while his uniform kindness and fairness have commanded my personal regard for him.

To his party, to the House of Representatives, and to the Nation, JOHN MCCORMACK has rendered service far and above the call of duty.

I am happy to have this opportunity to express my appreciation for his leadership in the past, and my continued confidence in his leadership in the future in whatever capacity where he may be called upon to serve.

Progress Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit the following "Progress Report" to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

In this report, I have set out what I believe to be the accomplishments of the Congress and the administration during the past session of the Congress. I have pointed out accomplishments for the Eighth District of Indiana. This has been a Congress of hard work and progress, and I am proud of its record. I am also proud of the new Kennedy administration. We have leadership and confidence again in the saddle. I herewith submit my "Progress Report" for the 1st session of the 87th Congress to the House of Representatives:

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA

The end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress is here. It has been a very busy and productive session for all America and the entire free world. As has been my custom in the past, I am again this year briefly reviewing for the people of my district, some of the major accomplishments of the Congress and the administration.

First, to the local scene, I would like to focus attention on some projects and accomplishments of the past several months as they affect the Eighth District. When the new Democratic administration took over the reins of Government in January of this year, the Eighth District, like many other parts of the country, was in the grips of a severe recession. President John F. Kennedy sought action. The Congress responded by providing some of the most positive and progressive legislation to come out of Washington since the days of the first Roosevelt Congress and his 100 days.

Let's look at the record. The recession, for all practical purposes, is over. While unem-

ployment in the district and around the country is still high, it is slumped off quite a bit. While there remains much to be done to improve the situation in areas like Pike County, the city of Evansville and others, the situation has improved. Progress has been made.

With passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, those areas of the district suffering from the effects of the recession have been offered hope and financial assistance from the Federal Government in order to relieve their problems. Some $394 million is provided under the act to assist communities, such as Evansville, to improve their community facilities, to attract new industries, to retrain workers displaced by the recession, and to enable these communities to start growing again. This program will be an effective aid to the district. The depressed areas bills of previous Congresses had been vetoed by former President Eisenhower. One of the first such bills introduced was one which I sponsored several years ago. I also introduced this legislation again this year, and am greatly pleased with the results.

Evansville has already presented its overall economic program, required under the new Area Redevelopment Act, passed by the Congress, to the administrator of the program. It has been approved by the agency, enabling the city to qualify for Federal loans and grants. City needs, such as sewer and street improvements will be emphasized in requesting funds and other assistance.

The eighth district will also benefit from the rural areas redevelopment program, administration of which is being handled by the Department of Agriculture. Under it, as provided by Congress, four district counties at this time have been certified as eligible to submit overall economic programs. When these are approved, the counties will be eligible for assistance in the form of loans and grants to stimulate economic growth in the areas, improve community facilities, recreational improvements, and for other purposes. Other counties in the district may be eligible under this program in the future. The four certified at this time are: Clark, Crawford, Harrison, and Perry.

Let's look at flood control. Here, we scored a "grand slam." We received just about everything which we asked for. It works out this way, as approved by the Congress in the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1962:

Cannelton locks and dam: $750,000 for construction.

Levee No. 5, Wabash River: $49,000 for planning.

Mason J. Niblack levee: $350,000 for construction.

Mississinewa Reservoir: $500,000 for construction.

Monroe Reservoir: $940,000 for construction.

Salamonie Reservoir: $700,000 for construction.

Uniontown locks and dam: $125,000 for planning.

McAlpine locks and dam: $5,500,000 for construction.

Markland Dam: $13,700,000 for construction.

Evansville flood wall: $100,000 ($200,000 of previously approved funds available for this project—specifically then, $300,000 is available).

Additionally, some $10,000 is included in the public works appropriation bill for a flood control survey on Pigeon Creek, near Evansville. Some $5,000 is also included for similar work on Oil Creek in Perry County.

Watershed projects in the eighth district this year include the following: the Middle Fork of Anderson River in Perry and Crawford Counties, where nearly 70,000 acres of land will form a watershed protection and flood control project. Applications are presently pending in the Department of Agriculture for the following watershed programs: Crooked Creek in Spencer; Muddy Fork of Silver Creek in Clark, Floyd, and Washington; North Branch of Little Pigeon Creek in Spencer and Warrick; Pigeon Creek in Gibson, Warrick, Vanderburgh, and Pike; Stucker Fork in Clark; Lost Creek in Orange, Lawrence, Washington, and Dubois; Little Pigeon Creek in Warrick, Spencer, and Pike. The first watershed project in the country to be approved under the act passed by Congress in August of 1954 is located in Perry County in the eighth district.

I am very much in favor of these projects, as they provide much needed flood control and recreational facilities which will be a real asset to the entire district. I will naturally follow through on these projects and do all that I can to help them along.

Other developments of importance to the people of the eighth district include:

1. General Services Administration declaring some 67 acres at the Indiana Arsenal, Charlestown, surplus, thus allowing Clark County to acquire 40 acres of this land for use as a 4–H Club fairground.

2. Reactivation of part of the facilities at the Indiana Arsenal, Charlestown, to provide ammunition needed in the additional national defense buildup * * * will provide from 300 to 375 additional jobs for an area hardhit by unemployment.

3. Passage of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial bill * * * both Houses of the Congress have approved this bill, but it will have to go to conference committee to iron out minor differences.

4. Selection of the southern route for Interstate Highway No. 64 will mean the road will be close to Evansville and will permit better integration and supplementation of the highway and water modes of transportation—will be near the area which has the greatest potential for future growth of those considered for the route.

5. New Albany received approval from the Housing and Home Finance Agency of its workable program for community improvement through the elimination of slums and blight. This approval must precede Federal loans and grants for urban renewal projects and for low-rent housing projects.

6. Evansville received a Federal advance of $37,594 to undertake preparation of a general neighborhood renewal plan for the south center urban renewal area.

7. Jeffersonville received a Federal advance of $109,032 to undertake preparation of a general neighborhood renewal plan for the Port Fulton urban renewal area.

8. The Louisville District, Corps of Army Engineers, awarded Traylor Bros. Inc., Evansville construction firm, a contract for the construction of the dam and appurtenances at the McAlpine locks project on the Ohio River. Amount of the contract: $8,811,000.

9. Charlestown received approval of its application for community facility improvements program. This enables the city to receive Federal assistance in the form of loans and grants for slum clearance and rehabitation for public housing.

10. The Rural Electrification Administration granted the Smithsville Telephone Co. a loan in the amount of $246,000. Will provide better telephone service for the people of Posey County as well as many others.

11. Congressional approval of the Federal judgeship bill provides for 73 new Federal judges. Indiana received two of these, one for the southern and one for the northern district of the State. (My amendment to the judgeship bill secured the two judges for Indiana, instead of just one as provided in the original bill.)

12. White County Bridge Commission bill passed by both Houses of Congress as an amendment to a bill which would authorize annual audits of certain interstate bridges and determine the length of the terms of office of their commissioners. (I think that we are finally nearing the end of a long, hard fight to make this bridge a "free" one—as it certainly should be after this long period of time. We will attempt to get final action on this bill at the next session of Congress.)

13. Army Ordnance has just awarded a contract in the amount of $6,746,001 to the Liberty Defense Powder Corp., a division of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., for the production of propellants. The work will be carried out at the firm's Charlestown, Ind., Arsenal, and at the facility on the Wabash River at Newport, Ind. This will provide an assist to the economy of the Clark-Floyd County area.

I am particularly pleased that several of my proposals, either incorporated in bills which I introduced at this session, or similar bills, have been passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. These include:

H.R. 4403: So-called Denton depressed areas bill—very similar to S. 1 (Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois), which passed Congress and became law under the title of Area Redevelopment Act. Will be of great assistance to areas of chronic and persistent unemployment such as Evansville. Became law this year.

H.R. 4406: Federal judges for Indiana—my bill provided for two additional Federal district judges for the State of Indiana, one for the southern and one for the northern district. Passed as part of the Federal judgeship bill providing 73 additional Federal judges. Became law this year.

H.R. 4408: White County Bridge Commission bill—to provide for the annual audits of bridge commission's books—terms of office of commissioners, etc. Passed both Houses of Congress, as part of general bridge audit bill. Must have minor differences ironed out. Passage seems likely early in next session. (Final victory is in sight in the long battle to make the White County Bridge a free one.)

H.R. 3518: To transfer certain land in Clark County, located at the Indiana Arsenal, Charlestown, to the 4–H Club of Clark County; legislation was not necessary as I was able to arrange for the transfer of this property from the Army to the General Services Administration. GSA has declared 67 acres of this land "surplus," thus allowing the 4–H Club of Clark County to apply for the 40 acres which they want for use as a fairgrounds.

H.R. 2470: Bill to establish lasting Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial at site of Abe Lincoln's home in Spencer County—for 14 years of his life—has passed both Houses of the Congress, and after minor differences are ironed out in conference committee early next session, it will most likely be speedily approved by Congress and become law.

H. Res. 169: To establish a committee of the Congress to study the effects of automation—because of the interest shown in this bill and those introduced by other Members of Congress, a special Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, headed by Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, began a study of this problem.

Administration accomplishments on the domestic front.

To combat the recession:

Temporary unemployment compensation extension: Passed 63 days after taking office.

Aid to dependent children of the unemployed.

Area redevelopment: Most comprehensive bill ever offered—first to pass; Eisenhower had vetoed earlier versions.

Social Security amendments: Included first reduction in the age of retirement for males—62—almost 5 million people will receive new or increased benefits.

To get the country "moving again":

Housing: The most comprehensive housing program in the history of Congress; major

expansion of urban renewal, public housing, housing for the elderly, college housing; first major middle-income housing—3 percent down payment; first aid to local mass transportation; first protection of open spaces in urban areas.

Water pollution control: 5-year doubling of program to provide benefits to 5,000 communities with 42 million people.

Minimum wages: $1.25 an hour and first increase in expansion of coverage (3.6 million), since 1938 original passage.

Space: Authorized trip to moon and beyond.

Community health facilities: Nursing homes for the aged, hospital rehabilitation, community services for the aged.

Agriculture: The best farm income year since the Korean war; emergency feed grain bill, reduction in acreage will be 3 times larger than best prior year, will help reduce great grain storage costs; omnibus farm bill, most comprehensive since 1938, expanded use of marketing orders-first wheat and feed grain programs since World War II; revisions of farm credit; Great Plains conservation program; expanded school milk; food for peace increased; savings to the taxpayers estimated at $800 million.

Further administration progress includes:

Federal judgeship bill passed: Provides 73 additional Federal judges.

Balance of payments position much better: (Under Kennedy administration leadership, our holdings of gold and convertible currencies increased by approximately $60 million during the second quarter of this year); gold outflow stopped, slight gains reported, in March of this year we had, for the first time since October of 1959, an increase in our supply of gold; that month, we showed an increase in our favor of $15 million.

Office of International Travel established: To promote foreign travel in this country.

Civil defense: First serious shelter program.

Federal aviation and highway bills passed.

As a side light to this discussion, I would like to mention the fact that as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have this year, as I have in years past, worked for, and voted for, the adequate funds necessary for the construction of hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act, and for the research made necessary in the fight to determine the cause and cure for the following: Cancer, heart trouble, mental illness, contagious diseases, nervous disorders, allergies, and other diseases such as diabetes.

ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS ON FOREIGN FRONT

The Kennedy administration inherited some of the worst problems in the foreign affairs field of any that previous Presidents had found when they took the oath of office. The Congo, Laos, Cuba, Berlin were all inherited from the old, previous administration. The Republicans had painted a "Rosy Picture"—both on the domestic and the foreign fronts. "All is well," was their cry. Yet, all was not well, at home or abroad. The situation on the homefront has been greatly improved under the effective leadership of Jack Kennedy and the intelligent men and women who are helping him in the new administration. The recession has been effectively stopped; unemployment is being cut back gradually, but firmly; the economy is on the upswing again. Business is good. In other words, the country "is on the move again."

The President has taken a firm hold on matters overseas, and the confidence of our allies and their people in this country is again being restored to the place where it should have been for the past 8 years. The former administration has swept foreign problems under a "rug of indifference." Kennedy has taken hold, and is proving to the whole world that this country will not be pushed around. We will stand firm on Berlin. On the United Nations. On disarmament through effective control mechanisms. Let's look at some of the trouble spots around the globe and the action that the Kennedy administration has taken:

World danger spots:

1. Berlin: A firm and resolute position; additional forces sent to back up insistence on continued Western rights, and continued freedom for the city.

2. Laos: Military debacle in January may be converted into neutral and independent state by virtue of our successful insistence upon a cease-fire before negotiations, and on supervised guarantees of independence. Allied policy is now unified again there.

3. South Vietnam: Vastly increased military assistance and the Vice President's trip have strengthened Diem government and its resistance to guerrilla infiltration.

4. Latin America: Despite setback in Cuba, more accomplished than any other time since Roosevelt's "good neighbor policy," objectives are to strengthen democratic relations, isolate communism and Castroism; (a) Alliance for Progress: funds voted, Uruguay Conference a success—emphasis on social reform and education as well as growth; (b) special assistance to Bolivia, Brazil, Venezuela, Argentina, and Chile; (c) increased broadcasts, trade agreements and defense coordination.

5. The Congo: Even though the situation there is still confusing, the early forceful stand of the United States against Soviet interference, helped the United Nations and local leaders to work out a stable and independent government.

6. Angola: Where U.S. vote in the United Nations won great acclaim in the Afro-Asian bloc as showing the new U.S. leadership for the principle of self-determination.

7. Other: Quiet, but effective U.S. statesmanship helped to prevent more serious crises in the Dominican Republic, Tunisia, Thailand, and elsewhere.

Major Kennedy administration initiatives in Foreign Affairs include the new, 5-year mutual security program, with a new agency to handle the program. The administration has promised that it will insure a program free from waste, corruption and inefficiency as was fairly prevalent under the previous handling of the foreign aid program. The 5-year provision of the program will insure long-range planning with foreign countries on various aid projects, but will also leave the control of the purse strings in the hands of the Congress, where it should be.

Establishment of the Peace Corps brings to the assistance of the Government dedicated men and women of all ages with all types of training and specialities. They will go out among the peoples of the underdeveloped countries around the globe and help them to help themselves. They will live with them, eat their food, live in the same kind of homes, ride the same modes of transportation. They will help erase the image of the "Ugly American." Further progress overseas will come with the establishment of the Arms Control Agency, which will work on the pressing problem of disarmament.

I return to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana with the knowledge that this Congress has done more for the American people than any Congress in almost 30 years. We now have a leader in the White House. We have world respect again. We have the confidence of our allies. We have a country on the move again.

Nothing can stop us, as a Nation or as a party, from moving ahead. For both are composed of the most enlightened, the best educated and the most warmhearted people on earth.

Resolutions at New England Governors' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, with the increased emphasis on reserve readiness in the Armed Forces of the country, it is important that we look to see that the best possible facilities and training are available to our troops.

Gov. John N. Dempsey, of Connecticut, has taken a great deal of interest in these matters, both as Lieutenant Governor and now as Governor. He has particularly watched the development of the National Guard troops of Connecticut, and has visited personally the troops of the 43d Infantry Division, a Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont organization, while they were undergoing active duty for training at Camp Drum, N.Y.

Camp Drum is an inactive Army reservation which is opened each year for the field training of all Reserve and National Guard divisions in the First Army area. As such it receives intensive use during this training cycle. Indeed, I am told it takes in the largest number of reserve troops for such training of any such installation in the country, including seven divisions.

Obviously the quality of the training which these reserve officers and National Guard officers and the active Army can give their troops depends considerably on the maintenance of the training facilities and the modernization of the ranges and roads. Governor Dempsey, however, has alertly noted that the camp was originally designed as an armored division training center; that it has been used intensively over the years with consequent deterioration of roads, training areas and communications, and now offers the 90,000 troops who train there during a given summer something less than perfection.

I am sure that 1st Army, under Lt. Gen. Edward O'Neill, and the Department of the Army itself, have given careful consideration to the needs of the camp and have furnished what improvements they can within priorities demanded by the budgets approved by Congress. But modernization has been effected in some regular camps, although possibly not to the degree desired. Installation of trainfire ranges, to bring rifle training up to date, for instance, has not been completely effected.

If we are to raise the level of training in our Reserve forces so that it parallels, where possible, the training given Active Army troops, and thus insures that the Army of the United States will be in a better stage of preparedness, I think we should review the modernization of all such installations as Camp Drum. That would include, I assume, Indiantown Gap, Pa.; Camp McCoy, Wis.; A. P. Hill

Military Reservation, Va.; Camp Pickett, Va., which is now being used as such a training center; and Camp Ripley, Minn.; among others. It might also require additional improvements for Active Army training centers such as Fort McLellan, Ala., and Fort Hood, Tex.

Certainly the status of these facilities deserves attention as part of our overall program to improve Reserve readiness. I submit the resolution of the New England Governors in behalf of such steps at Camp Drum, N.Y., for your attention.

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY GOV. JOHN DEMPSEY, OF CONNECTICUT, TO NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE AT KENNEBAGO LAKE, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 11, 1961

Whereas today's international tensions emphasize the increased training needs of the National Guard and the Reserves; and

Whereas essential to the fulfillment of these needs are training facilities comparable to those of a modernized Army; and

Whereas, Camp Drum at Watertown, N.Y., annually used by more than 90,000 troops from the New England States, New York, and New Jersey for instruction and field duty, is in need of more modern facilities if these troops are to attain the required state of readiness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the New England Governors' conference, urges that a program of modernization of its facilities be undertaken with all possible speed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governors of the New England States join with the Governors of New York and New Jersey in any cooperative effort which may be required in behalf of such a modernization program.

Is the Congress Mentally Ill?—Is That Our Defense?

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman's first duty is to protect the national security, the national sovereignty, and the public welfare.

From the date when the right to a trial by jury was first established, the one test as to the individual's responsibility was whether he knew the difference between right and wrong. The standard as to whether conduct is right or wrong is established by the thinking of the majority. If one lived among cannibals, eating a mother-in-law or the British officer, Lt. Simon Donaldson and his wounded companion, Pvt. William Mackay, by natives in Katanga, was no offense, while here cannibalism is not only a crime—murder—but horrible, revolting, and unthinkable.

But thinking and standards have changed and a year or two ago a U.S. court in the District of Columbia established a new doctrine, that is, that one accused of crime "is not criminally responsible if his unlawful act was the product of mental disease or mental defect."

Inasmuch as the mentality or the state of mind of all of us varies in some degree, today if one who has committed a crime has money, a capable lawyer, or even just the lawyer, he can escape punishment by having relatives or friends detail abnormal acts committed by him since he was a child, embody them in a hypothetical question, call a psychiatrist—an expert in mental diseases—who will, answering the hypothetical question and assuming the facts stated in the question to be true, express the opinion that the individual charged is suffering from a mental disease or has a mental defect.

Hence, unless the prosecution can establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is sane, a verdict of not guilty must be returned. The individual then goes to a mental institution—here in Washington, to St. Elizabeths—and if thereafter other experts viewing him determine that he is sane, he is discharged. The crime goes unpunished, and as happened here, the defendant murders several other individuals.

Inasmuch as it is the duty of the Congress to protect the security of the Nation and the welfare of the people and obviously threatened by war, as we now are, there being somewhere a limit to our ability to finance and successfully carry on a war, is the Congress justified in continuing to dissipate its resources in nonessential activities and expenditures, however desirable, when they do not tend to maintain or increase our military strength?

On September 25 the President told us that, while we wished to avoid war, we would continue our effort to extend aid, bring freedom to people throughout the world, that we would not desert West Germany.

If Khrushchev backs his words with action, devastating war is just over the horizon.

Rightly the President has called for and Congress has appropriated billions upon billions for national defense. The President is calling men from their homes into the armed services, sending advance detachments overseas.

The threat of a war which might destroy us is with us. This being true, is the Congress lessening our ability to make possible a successful military defense?

We have a national debt of more than $288 billion. We now pay an annual interest charge of almost $9 billion—for which we get nothing at all except a postponement of the payment date.

The Democratic chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, which is charged with appropriating your tax dollars, from the well of the House recently said we were spending each hour of every 24-hour day $1 million more than we took in. That is, each day we add $24 million to our national debt. Increase the annual interest payment—water over the dam, under the bridge—money down a rat hole.

Inasmuch as to be successful in war a nation must be economically, financially sound and highly productive, as well as being able to produce courageous, skilled fighting men, is it not a sign of a mental disease or defect when the Congress, knowing however distant it may be, there is a limit to our natural resources, our manpower and our productive ability, continues to spend public funds on enterprises which, however desirable and helpful, do not contribute to our war potential, our ability to make our future secure?

Is the Congress showing sound mental judgment when, knowing the threat of an immediate war from a foe acknowledged to be almost our equal if not our superior in productive ability and military might, it authorizes the expenditure of a billion dollars, as we have, for a trip to the moon? War, if it comes, will not be fought on the moon. How will that expenditure, however desirable from a scientific standpoint it may be, contribute to the situation now confronting us?

Is there something wrong with our mentality or judgment when we authorize, as we recently did, the expenditure of $20 million on an aquarium in one of Washington's federally owned buildings? Does that expenditure at this time indicate a mental or other defect?

By Executive order the President established a Peace Corps and in his contingent fund had money to operate it. Yet he insisted the Peace Corps be made permanent, although the State Department already had authority and money to do everything which a Peace Corps, made up of young American volunteers, can do. This at a cost of additional millions.

The other day we were asked to create an Advisory Council—more millions—to help the Government to advise on the arts.

Do the last two actions and many other similar ones prove that, in preparing to protect our individual freedom and our national security, we are using good judgment?

The list of additional expenditures, none of which will contribute to the winning of a war, might be extended indefinitely.

Just one more incident. The Congress permitted, refused to rebuke or disown, a representative of the State Department who, without any authority, pledged us to give South American countries $20 billion. This when we all know that in Congress rests the sole authority to authorize the expenditure of your dollars. We must either make good on the promises of our representatives who have no authority to create such obligations, or repudiate those who speak for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to again ask as in the beginning: Is the Congress suffering from some mental disease? Does it have a mental defect?

Is it getting ready to win a threatened disastrous war?

Has it in mind, as its primary purpose, the future security of our country or is it helping the executive department or both political parties shop around for votes—for support from minority groups—from those who always, one way or another, by fair means or foul, make a profit out of war, out of the misery and suffering—many times the death—of

those who are called upon to fight a war?

Today we are asked to continue encouraging people without training or prospect of employment to become residents of the District, knowing as we do that we must, at least for the present, furnish them homes, food, clothing and, according to the present bill, educational opportunities—thus adding to the Nation's already overwhelming burden, thus lessening our ability to make adequate defense if war comes.

The Role of the Peace Corps in America's Foreign Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a copy of an address by Milton J. Shapp, president of the Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia. The occasion was the annual awards dinner of the American Jewish Congress.

Mr. Shapp's speech, "The Role of the Peace Corps in America's Foreign Program," vividly points out the usefulness of such a Peace Corps. I am strongly in favor of the views of Mr. Shapp, and I know that many of my colleagues supported such a program in the passage of the bill.

I include this address in the RECORD, so that all Members can read it:

THE ROLE OF THE PEACE CORPS IN AMERICA'S FOREIGN PROGRAM

(Address by Milton J. Shapp, president, Jerrold Electronics Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., Annual Award Dinner, American Jewish Congress, Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1961)

Last June, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation upon his return from meeting Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. He stated two main goals of the United States; one, to strengthen the unity of the free world; and two, to build a lasting peace. However, President Kennedy stated, "The Soviets and ourselves have wholly different meanings for the same words—war, peace, democracy, and popular will. * * * We have different views of what is an internal affair and what is subversion; and above all, we have widely different concepts of where the world is and where it is going."

Peace is a wonderful word, but it does not mean the same to everyone. We in America tend to think that we have peace when there is an absence of armed conflict. This is not the definition used by other peoples. To attain our goals, we must look the the problems of the world through the eyes of others as well as our own.

Hundreds of millions of people in this world are not at peace today, because they can no longer tolerate the wretched poverty of their daily existence or the tyranny of the dictatorship under which they live. Can a woman find peace while she watches her children starve, or her husband flogged or shot for daring to speak out? These tyrannies are not confined to Communist countries, but are quite prevalent in the so-called free world.

True peace demands that there be freedom from want, that there be social justice, and that human beings be treated with dignity.

The May 27 issue of the Saturday Review contained some startling statistics. Four-fifths of the world's present population—80 percent—have not enjoyed the luxury of eating one square meal in their lifetime—nor is it likely that they will do so during the rest of their lives. Almost half of the children of the world—47 percent—will not have the opportunity of stepping inside a schoolroom at any time during their lives—even to obtain the barest minimum of an education.

Mr. J. Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co., recently published a provocative booklet entitled, "It is not too late in Latin America." In this book he reveals that 120 million of the 200 million people in Latin America are living amidst squalor in caves, under bridges, or in filthy dilapidated shacks in horrible slums. Their existence is wretched by any standard. If we are to enjoy our kind of peace, they must find theirs.

Further, we tend to think of peace as a world order of which Americans will be the main beneficiaries. The United States represent only 6 percent or 7 percent of the total population of this globe. Peace for others might very well be achieved by our elimination as a powerful Nation, thereby reducing the possibility of involving the world in a nuclear war.

Let's be honest. Are we any less callous? How many of us are concerned with the fact that perhaps 20 or 30 million people will starve this year in China because of the great famine that is afflicting that nation? Or are we secretly glad that this tragedy will weaken the Communist regime and thus relieve the pressures on ourselves? How many of us are concerned about the unfortunate human beings in the Congo who are suffering from the ravages of civil strife? Or is our real fear that conditions there may erupt into a conflict that would involve us?

If we are to attain true peace in the world, the task we face is enormous. Wishful thinking—slogans, flag waving. These devices will not keep America strong nor prevent the spread of communism.

No nation in history was ever better equipped than ourselves to meet the challenges of its time. Do we wish to reverse the flow of the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Memphis? We can do it. Do we wish to irrigate the entire Southwest? We can do it. Do we wish to put a man on the moon by 1970? We can and will do it. Do we wish to provide the opportunity for everybody in the world to be well-fed and housed so they can enjoy true peace?

We can do it. For the first time in history, a nation has the wealth as well as the technical and intellectual ability to mold its own future completely independent of previous historical trends.

To be successful, we must understand the true nature of the problems we face, and make an all-out effort to tackle them. Only then can we build a world in which our children will find security.

We who live seven generations after our own revolution have achieved great stability. We like to do things in a staid, orderly fashion, walking along familiar paths. But in the emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, there is no tradition of stability or pattern of steady progress. Youth is in the majority and in the ascendency.

Over 40 percent of the population of Latin America is under 15 years of age; the average age is but 21. Under the impact of the population explosion the trend is for an ever lowering median age.

We have difficulty understanding our own teenagers. Is it little wonder that the programs of foreign aid we have undertaken so far in the impoverished nations have failed to achieve notable results? These programs have not been geared to the needs of, nor do they satisfy the desires of youth. Youth is demanding the benefits of a better life for itself—in this generation. It is not interested with statistics that reveal 2 percent or 4 percent or 6 percent growth, but wants to accomplish in decades that which has taken other nations centuries to achieve.

There is an old saying in the advertising business: "I like strawberries, but when I go fishing, I use worms, because that's what the fish like." The Communists have been very busy fishing in troubled waters with much greater success than ourselves. Why?

It is obvious that Mr. Khrushchev and his associates have shown a greater understanding of the real problems than have we. Mr. K. repeatedly states his desire that the world avoid war, yet he says that the Soviets will redouble their efforts to help the peoples of the world throw off the yoke of colonialism and imperialism and establish governments that will no longer exploit the people. To us, this means subversion, revolution, and conflict, the very essence of what we wish to avoid. Yet, to the masses of people living in the developing countries Mr. Khrushchev is enunciating a program that is consistent with their aspiration for peace with freedom from economic want, with social justice and with dignity for each human being.

We find ourselves faving several dilemmas. Our traditions place us in complete sympathy with the desires of the underprivileged masses to achieve a better life. Yet we shirk at the expense in dollars and in effort to achieve this goal. We have established strong military, political, and economic ties with the ruling elements of many countries; but quite often these are the forces responsible for maintaining conditions of misery and tyranny that we deplore.

As much as we may desire, we cannot terminate these relations at once and throw our support to those who are demanding change. To do so might not be to their advantage or to ours. This could bring complete chaos as has been observed in the Congo, and might prevent this generation from receiving the material, social, or cultural benefits they hope to enjoy during their lifetime.

Further, sudden breaks with some ruling forces might create worldwide instability. Many of these governments support us diplomatically in the United Nations and have joined their military forces with ours for common defense. Major industries of Western Europe and here in the United States depend upon raw materials that come from the emerging nations of the world. Thus, politically, militarily, and economically we must prepare our course of action carefully and take practical steps to work with the governments where possible to introduce needed reforms.

Wherever it appears, though, that there is little likelihood that the ruling power will take steps to rectify conditions existing within their countries, if through use of our influence we fail to induce the present governments to institue programs of social reform, we must become disassociated with these rulers. We cannot afford to be identified with other Batistas, and must give no justification for future Castros to gain support on an anti-American program.

The Soviet Union has few economic or political ties with the ruling forces in most nations. The Communists are free to announce wholehearted support for programs of social progress within each country. This policy has much greater appeal to youth than our program that seemingly attempts to carry water on both shoulders. This does not mean we cannot cope with the disadvantage and gain support with the masses of people. Despite defeats in Cuba, Laos, and

elsewhere the real strength rests in our hands, if we but use it.

The secret is simple. We should pit our strength against their weakness. The Communists are not in a position to render all-out economic aid on a large scale to the needy nations of the world at this time. They are having difficulty raising sufficient food to feed themselves. The Communists are lending assistance to a few nations (Cuba, Ghana, Guinea, etc.) but they are putting undue strain upon their economy to accomplish this. Promises they make to render large-scale assistance to the people of other countries to improve their lot during this generation simply cannot be fulfilled. However, given 3 or 5 years, it is likely that the economic strength of the Communist nations will have increased to an extent that they can then render strong economic aid simultaneously to many countries and our present advantage will disappear.

While we have the economic edge, we should move swiftly. We have the capital, the material resources, industrial capacity and human capabilities to move on a vast program. If we were engaged in a military struggle with the Communists at this time, there would be no doubt of the willingness of the American people to make all sacrifices and to expend all energies to meet the challenge.

When bombs dropped on Pearl Harbor, this Nation galvanized into action over night, and we used the total resources that were then at our command. There was no worry about the cost—the job had to be done. Everybody knew it, and nobody raised a voice in opposition. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force needed men and equipment. Congress appropriated the funds. Our factories produced the required materials, and our manpower was utilized to the maximum. We did not say then we could fight a war on only one front. We faced the issues in Europe, Africa, and the Pacific. Certainly, we set priorities, but we did not shirk from the total task that we faced at that time.

The fact that the cold war battleground is not clearly defined; that the nature of our present conflict is to win the minds and hearts of people and thus support for our democratic way of life amongst the people of the emerging nations, in no way lessens the all-out effort that must be made if we are to prevent worldwide domination by the Communists.

Actually, if we analyze what we must do, the strain is not great—the sacrifice turns into a blessing. The prime needs of the emerging nations are for food, housing, and medical care to relieve present miseries, and for education, resource development, and industrialization in order to build self-sustaining economies in the future.

We have surplus food bulging our warehouses costing our taxpayers untold billions for storage. It is ridiculous to think that people should starve in any land for any reason while food rots here.

The emerging nations need help in expanding their own food production and housing facilities. Hundreds of millions of acres of virgin land is untilled today because access roads are needed to reach the areas and/or irrigation required to make the soil fertile. Roads, bridges, tractors, bulldozers, pipelines are needed in seemingly limitless quantities. With many of our own factories working at little better than half capacity—with 5 million of our own people unemployed, we should look at the opportunity to assist nations as a blessing in disguise—as an opportunity to remove many of our own citizens from relief and welfare rolls and give them productive jobs.

Skipping the military needs for a moment and considering only economics, it makes just as much sense to ship steel, cement, communication equipment, and other goods to the nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, who have purposeful uses for these materials as it does to use these materials to build battleships, airplanes, or tanks that soon land on the scrap heap due to obsolescence. In fact, it makes more sense economically to do so because by using these materials to raise world standards of living, we are creating future markets to absorb our products and thus increasing our opportunities for expanding future world trade. Armaments, once built, have no future economic value.

It would take hours to list all of the housing materials, pharmaceutical supplies, radio, telephone and television equipment, and other items that the world needs that we and only we in the United States can supply at this time. The opportunity exists for us to take the lead role and eradicate proverty, disease, and ignorance and to build a world that is secure because it enables others to attain higher standards of living.

As we embark on this program, one important ingredient must be added. In addition to financial and material assistance, a part of the spirit of each of us must go with the gift. We must give of ourselves so that the recipient feels wholly free to accept our offer.

This is the role of the Peace Corps in our foreign program. The operation of our Peace Corps will in effect be the international implementation of the Golden Rule. We shall help do unto others that which we have done for ourselves.

Too often in the past our foreign aid has not filtered down to the people who have needed it, nor have those who received materials from us known how to use them. If it is true that the present battle is to win the minds and hearts of the peoples in new nations, then our Peace Corpsmen will be the infantry of our new brigades.

It is they who by their gifts of service in the interests of humanity will convince the peoples of the world that the American spirit of freedom kindled in 1776 is alive and being carried forward today to all corners of the earth.

Food production is the most critical immediate project facing most countries. Stable governments cannot be built in hungry nations. Our young people will work with the local people to teach modern methods of farming and food distribution. It is not enough to supply fertilizers. Someone must encourage its use by demonstrating how soil productivity is increased and then continue to work with the local people until they, noticing its beneficial effects, are inspired to develop their own techniques for furthering the pattern of progress. It is difficult to teach nomad tribes the benefits of cutting grass and storing fodder to feed their animals, when for centuries they have tended their flocks in the hills. But if progress is to be made in increasing meat supply, this is a task that must be performed.

Tractors furnished to undeveloped nations need trained drivers and maintenance personnel to operate them and to teach the local people to handle the equipment by themselves. These among many other similar tasks are duties to be performed by members of our Peace Corps to help increase production of food.

Adequate housing is next in immediate importance. Quoting again from J. Peter Grace:

"The home and the family is the main basic unit of society upon which its stability or instability depends. The stanchest defender of private property and the most dependable opponent of communism is the man who owns his own home. And the readiest victim of communism propaganda is the man whose children lack a decent roof over their heads."

We have many skilled workers who can assist in community planning and construction. Once again, emphasis must be placed upon teaching by demonstration and showing illiterate primitive people how to use simple tools.

Education is the key to future success. Machines may make life easier, but it takes knowledge to design and operate the machines. We must teach people first to read and write; then the sciences and skills that will help lift them out of the morass in which they live today.

Health projects—fighting malaria, improving sanitation, child care work, even serving as midwives—these will be some of the duties of the Peace Corps.

What are the personal requirements of the people who will comprise our Peace Corps? First is the dedication of purpose. Anybody who joins this organization must truly believe in the brotherhood of man. He must have patience and understanding and be willing to make a sacrifice for the good of humanity. He or she must have a knowledge of and respect for the language, culture, and history of the country that is being served and also the background of our own history and culture. He must have the ability to work with people to organize and carry out projects, for he may be the only trained person among many people who have never worked on similar projects before. He is not a glory seeker, for surely there is no glory working in a small village in a backward country for a year or two when perhaps you cannot even measure the progress you are making at the time your term of service is through.

Our people must be able to cooperate or compete, as necessary, with groups of Communists who may be doing similar work in these countries. At the beginning for certain, we will be competing for the Communists believe that only through communism can a better world be built for humanity.

Our Peace Corpsmen must be able to demonstrate that we can help people develop a better existence, but that it is our intention to let the people of each country develop politically as they will. We must rest our case on the simple premise that once freed from economic want, peoples all over will not be susceptible to commnnism but will seek the other freedoms that only democracy can provide.

The waging of such peaceful competition offers a tremendous advantage to the world. The Communists and the free world will compete to benefit the people of all nations rather than to destroy their societies.

We have the capital, the material resources, the productive capacity, and the human talent to achieve all our goals. The future of the world will be shaped to the extent that we use these valuable assets.

Ammunition for the New York Central

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the proposed merger of the B. & O. and C. & O. Railroads is of critical concern to the residents of Westchester County, N.Y., and certainly should be of concern to all of us who have relied upon the judgment of cur regulatory agencies through the years.

The eastern railroads have been going through a period of critical readjustment, and the New York Central has

been making a valiant attempt to not only maintain its present passenger and freight service but to improve it.

There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that a merger of the B. & O. and C. & O. would greatly affect the freight revenue of the New York Central and in short order its efforts to maintain passenger service. For this reason I think the following editorial of the New Rochelle (N.Y.) Standard Star outlines very clearly the issue facing the ICC:

[From the New Rochelle (N.Y.) Standard Star, Sept. 12, 1961]

AMMUNITION FOR THE NEW YORK CENTRAL

More than the selfish interests of three railroads are involved in the merger proposal of the Baltimore & Ohio and the Chesapeake & Ohio. Railroads which the New York Central Railroad seeks to join.

That was the reason that Governor Rockefeller and County Executive Michaelian traveled to Washington, D. C., yesterday to testify before the Interstate Commerce Commission in behalf of the Central.

Citing the national defense role of the railroads, Governor Rockefeller pointed out that the "determination of the new railroad network for the eastern territory cannot be left to chance or to the struggle of carrriers themselves for their strategic advantages alone."

The State's interest, the Governor noted, is to assure improvement in rail transportation service to the State, its communities and its commerce and industry as well as to prevent an adverse impact on the State's economy.

As to Westchester County's interest in insuring continuance of a full-serviced, vital railroad system, Mr. Michaelian called attention not only to the 50,000 commuters carried to and from New York City daily by the Central and the New Haven railroads, but also to the industries of the county dependent upon railroad and freight service, particularly on the Central lines.

The Central is seeking to become a part of a three-way merger, rather than to permit the other two lines to join without it. It fears that if it is shut out, it will be undercut, forced to reduce present services and eventually face the possibility of being forced into bankruptcy to become a withered plum for the then-merged competitors to pick up at their convenience.

The Central argues that a far more efficient, economical, and complete railroad service can be developed should it be included in the original merger plans now before the ICC.

From the testimony of our State and county leaders, its arguments seem well merited and worth grave consideration by the Federal commissioners.

A House in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, objective analysis, made in the spirit of constructive criticism, is important in keeping, as the expression runs, a house in order. Especially valuable is this analysis when made by one with sincere interest and deep insight into the subject with which he deals. Ethan A. H. Shepley is just such an observer of the course of American democracy. Former chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., and now the chairman of its board of directors, Mr. Shepley has long been a respected leader of the thinking of St. Louis and of its civic affairs as well.

A recent speech of Mr. Shepley's, to the convention of the Theta Xi Fraternity, was brought to my attention and I wished to share it with my colleagues and with the country. As it turns out, this speech was "off the cuff" but in substance reflects the remarks he made at a meeting of the Missouri State Medical Association in 1957. This speech was reprinted in the June 1957 issue of Missouri Medicine and I believe that its words and ideas are important to us today. Therefore, I am placing this speech in the RECORD at this point:

ARE WE KEEPING OUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER?

(By Ethan A. H. Shepley, St. Louis)

We have been warned time and again that by winning freedom we do not thereby have it as a permanent possession. In fact, it is much easier lost than gained, and eternal vigilance is the price we must be ready to pay if we are to remain free.

But we in America have been so blessed with good fortune throughout the years that we are apt to permit ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security.

We have heard our Constitution described again and again—not only in Fourth of July speeches but by experts in government and political science—as the most perfect document of its kind ever produced by the brain of man. We are apt to look upon it as a sort of Aladdin's lamp—something that by itself will solve all of our problems and preserve our liberties. In our complex and crowded daily schedules, as we race against the clock to fulfill our business and social obligations, we seldom find time to stop and think about our own good fortune in being Americans. We tend to take our liberties for granted.

But in the words of Judge Florence Allen of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals "We cannot write liberty into a charter and send it out ready made for the next generation." It is high time that we wake up, for the trend of events in recent years should serve to warn us that all is not well and that the things we cherish are in jeopardy.

When we look at the sorry plight in which we find ourselves today throughout the so-called civilized world, we are bound to ask, "How did all of this come about? How is it that at this period of time in which, from the standpoint of material things, man has far more than ever before, he has never had a feeling of greater insecurity?"

Wishful thinking can be as dangerous as it is pleasant.

With our traditional love of liberty and our respect for the rights of individual citizens, we in America have nothing but hatred and contempt for the dictators, in whatever forms they may appear and by whatever titles they may be called. And we are quite ready to charge them with sole responsibility for the unhappy state of affairs with which we are now confronted.

We are inclined to claim credit for the good things and to hold others responsible for the bad. If for no reason other than our own protection, however, we would do well to examine the record of events that have taken place during the last 40 years for the purpose of placing the responsibility where it belongs and of determining the extent to which our own failures may have contributed to the situation.

That we and the other liberal democracies of the West may have in some way failed is suggested by at least two things. First, during the greater part of this period the people of the world have been suffering from a vicious circle of wars, and there has been virtually no period of time since 1914 in which we have been free from war or the threat of war, and this, notwithstanding the fact that the liberal democracies of the West won both of the World Wars that were fought during this period, and wrote the treaties that followed them. Second, the form of government prevailing in the liberal democracies that was regarded as the ideal by every country on the face of the earth prior to the First World War seems to have been losing ground steadily since then to the various totalitarian systems.

How then do we account for these rather surprising things?

Is it possible that some inherent defect in our system of government may be at the bottom of our troubles? Can it be that our system is not so good, after all?

Or can it be that we are failing to put into actual practice the system of government that we have adopted in our Constitution?

In his recent book called "Essays in the Public Philosophy," Walter Lippmann has expressed the conviction that the Western democracies have been steadily losing prestige since World War I, and that their governments have failed in their effort to deal with the realities of modern life. He contends that their governments have not been governing but on the contrary, have merely been attempting to appease the voters, and that with rare exceptions the political leaders in the liberal democracies have been insecure and intimidated men who have learned by experience that it is safer to be wrong until it has become popular to be right.

Mr. Lippmann's writing in fact has so impressed me that I have read him and I have reread him. My mind has become so imbued with his thinking that when I speak I am almost certain of being guilty of unintentional plagiarism, for which I hope Mr. Lippmann will forgive me.

According to his analysis of the situation, weak governments were looked upon as the ideal so long as the people were prosperous and happy and there were no hard decisions to be made. During such times our Government was permitted to function in accordance with the basic plan of our Constitution but with World War I came the need for hard decisions. The draft, the imposition of heavy taxes, annoying regulations and prohibitions, the rationing of food, gasoline, the protection of the public interest against private interest—all these called for hard decisions. At this point the people undertook to usurp the powers that should properly be exercised by their Government.

The whole structure of an Executive governing with the consent of a representative assembly was discarded, at least so far as it had to do with issues of vital importance such as the making of war or peace.

The people can consent to being governed, can select those who are to govern, can approve or disapprove their performance, and can remove them. But the people themselves cannot govern. The reasons are obvious.

The ability to reach sound conclusions and to make wise decisions on matters of importance requires an accurate knowledge of all material facts, as well as the training and experience needed to form seasoned judgments without undue delay.

These things can hardly be acquired—even by the more intelligent citizen—through the reading of newspaper columns and an occasional book, or by listening to political speeches or lectures on radio, television, or the platform.

To a great extent it is neither possible nor advisable to make a full disclosure of all the facts to the people generally, and this is especially true on the most important issues

which may involve the preparation for war or the making of a treaty.

Nevertheless, the voters have insisted upon substituting mass opinion for the judgment of well-informed and capable public officials. "The people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising, and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern." This kernel of thought comes from Mr. Lippmann's introductory essay, "The Obscure Revolution." From this seed idea—from this acorn, if you will—there quite naturally grows Mr. Lippmann's whole great tree of thought concerning the public philosophy, with all of its luxuriant and powerful branches. The people could not be aroused in either of the world wars or in the period between them to the exertion and sacrifices that would be required until they were frightened by early disasters or until their hatred had been sufficiently aroused, or they had become intoxicated by promises of utopia.

Have we forgotten that we fought World War I to make the world safe for democracy? It was a war to end all wars and yet, because of the extent of the hatred that had been built up in the people and their insistence upon a vindictive treaty, a second world war was almost guaranteed by the terms that were imposed upon the vanquished.

The leaders of these democracies recognized Mr. Hitler for what he was when he came into power and openly threatened to conquer Europe, but they were wholly unable to take effective action at the time when it was needed. The veto of mass opinion said no.

To labor the point further should be unnecessary for it seems abundantly clear that our Government is being stripped of the power to govern, and that power is being usurped by those who are totally incapable of exercising it.

As far back as 1930 James Truslow Adams has called attention to this situation and I quote: "As we look over the list of the early leaders of the Republic, Washington, John Adams, Hamilton and others, we discern that they were all men who insisted upon being themselves and who refused to truckle to the people. With each succeeding generation, the growing demand of the people that its elective officials shall not lead but merely register the popular will has steadily undermined the independence of those who derive their power from popular election."

The sovereign people would do well to analyze and criticize themselves with the same freedom they display in appraising the conduct of those whom they elect. As so well stated by Mr. Lippmann, "It will not do to think poorly of the politicians and to talk with bated breath about the voters. No more than the kings before them should the people be hedged with divinity. Like all princes and rulers, like all sovereigns, they are ill served by flattery and adulation. And they are betrayed by the servile hypocrisy which tells them that what is true and what is false, what is right and what is wrong, can be determined by their votes."

No, the trouble is not with our Constitution but rather with our failure to understand and follow it. Our system is too often thought of as nothing more than majority rule. But majority rule is tyranny, pure and simple—and tyranny has no place in our system. We are a constitutional democracy, in which the rule of the majority is tempered by justice—and our liberties are secured by our constitutionalism rather than by democracy. But we appear to have forgot these fundamental and all-important principles.

It seems that the people, with a complete disregard of the Constitution, are doing things it does not permit. And to make bad matters worse we are failing to do the one thing for which the Constitution does hold us responsible.

Responsibilities as well as rights and powers are rather clearly assigned by the Constitution.

The Executive shall govern, but only within the limits permitted by the Constitution and to the extent to which the people through their representative assembly shall give their consent.

And the people, acting through those of their number who shall from time to time be entrusted with the power to vote, shall choose the Executive as well as the members of their representative assembly.

To what extent are the qualified voters actually performing this function?

If you will take the pains to read a book written some years ago by Mr. Frank Kent, called "The Great Game of Politics," you will be convinced that with some few minor exceptions they are not.

In the words of President Kirk of Columbia University, "Most individuals in a free society are prone to think too much about rights and too little about responsibilities."

It seems clear that those of us who are accorded the franchise are acting as trustees for the people as a whole as well as for themselves individually and that the right to vote is not merely a right but, on the contrary, is a privilege carrying with it an important responsibility.

When John Doe goes to the polling place on election day, he is acting not simply for John Doe but as a representative of the people as a whole. When he fails to go he is not merely failing to exercise a right, but he is also defaulting in the performance of his obligation to the people. Would that it were feasible to deprive the defaulting voter of his right to vote.

Mr. Kent in his book makes it abundantly clear that the voters are not in fact selecting the persons who are to fill the elective offices.

For the most part they take little or no interest until the day of the general election by which time it has became a case of too little and too late. Their right to select has now shrunk to the mere privilege of choosing between the candidates that have been handpicked by the political organizations of the two major parties. They have no one but themselves to blame for their predicament, as it has been brought about by their own failure.

The real decisions were made at the time of the primary elections, and a glance at the records in this country will disclose the fact that at the primaries a surprisingly small percentage of the qualified voters take the pains to go to the polls.

And so, by default, the professional politician is permitted to perform a function that was neevr intended to be his. While of course there are exceptions, as a general rule the professional politicians are not unselfish, public spirited citizens who seek to serve the welfare of the Nation. To them politics is a business and they are in it as other people are in business—for what they can get out of it.

This being true, we can hardly expect the political organizations to nominate for public office the kind of men and women who are needed to make the hard decisions that must be made. They select people whom they hope to control, and in those all too rare instances where a real leader with the courage of his own convictions is accepted by the political organizations, you can be very sure that he was forced upon them by the pressure of the circumstances.

And so it would seem that this system of government of ours has broken down rather badly, not because of any defects in the Constitution or in the system itself, but because the people are doing things they have neither the right nor the capacity to do, and are failing to perform the all-important function that is assigned to them by the Constitution.

History seems to indicate that sooner or later people will insist upon a strong government, even at the expense of some of their liberties, and the danger is that the liberal democracies will wind up with some type of totalitarian control. There must be developed in the people a readiness to recognize that the interest of society as a whole must be served and protected by government, and that the people and the minority groups into which they divide themselves must be prepared to accept this as the responsibility of their government, irrespective of the effect its decisions may have upon the interests of the individual or the group.

It is pretty difficult to convince the individual citizen that his vote is important—that his participation is really worth the effort. So he "let's George do it"—and the trouble is that "George" does not do it. It seems that "George" expects some other "George" to do it.

And so in most instances the persons elected to office are not those best qualified to do the job and are not truly representative of their constituents. And Mr. Citizen, still overwhelmed by his feeling of impotence, looks to his particular pressure group to protect his interests from impairment or neglect at the hands of these representatives whom he did not select and whom he does not trust.

And then we have a government by tug of war, push and pull, threats and promises, operating to a great extent upon the disastrous philosophy that might makes right. Under such conditions we must not be surprised if those who are to make the decisions—if they are to avoid political suicide—must look to what is popular rather than to what is right.

The only solution to this problem must come through the proper education of our people. The successful operation of a liberal democracy requires a certain amount of collective unselfishness, a willingness to accept—even insist upon—a strong government—one that will not hesitate to make hard decisions no matter how unpopular they may be. And this ideal will never be attained unless and until the people generally come to understand that our Constitution is not an Aladdin's lamp and that the system it prescribes must be practiced as well as preached.

Address by Robert L. Garner, President, International Finance Corporation, to the 1961 Meeting of the Board of Governors of the Corporation, at Vienna, Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 21, Mr. Robert L. Garner, president of the International Finance Corporation, addressed the 1961 meeting of the Board of Governors in Vienna, Austria. Mr. Garner has a long and distinguished career with the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation. This year he is resigning his

duties, and this speech constitutes his last report to the Board of Governors.

This is Mr. Garner's farewell address and I am delighted to recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT L. GARNER, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION, TO THE 1961 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CORPORATION, VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Only a poet could be expected to find fresh words to describe the pleasure of being in this ancient and lovely city and of enjoying the gay and warm hospitality of our Austrian hosts. I shall merely add a simple word of appreciation and join in what has been so frequently expressed by earlier speakers.

The year since our previous meeting has been an important one for IFC. The amount of new investments was somewhat lower than in the previous year, although in the past few months we have made the largest commitments for any similar period.

But I consider more important several new developments. We have made the first sales of entire investments out of portfolio, in line with our basic purpose to help enterprises get started and then sell to private investors—thus revolving our funds. The three sales were on terms providing a satisfactory profit.

We have recently made commitments to provide equity-type capital to two private financial institutions in Colombia. This will enable them to expend their investment activities over a broadening range of local enterprises—chiefly smaller and medium size concerns, which it is impractical for IFC to finance directly.

Another quite different operation is a commitment of $3 million in a $72 million petrochemical complex in Argentina. Organized and largely financed by a group of important U.S. industrial companies and American and European investment institutions, IFC was invited to provide the small balance of funds needed to conclude the transaction.

These variations from the Corporation's usual type of investment add to the flexibility with which it seeks to supply the diverse needs of private business.

We have during recent months completed two studies, in Iran covering the potentials for enterprises in the chemical field and in Venezuela in meatpacking. We shall seek potential sponsors and be prepared to assist in financing if sound projects can be worked out.

Probably the year's most significant event for IFC is the change in its charter permitting investment in equities.

After 4 years of experience, I proposed this change at the annual meeting last year. By September 1 the change was authorized by the required number of member countries, with no adverse votes.

The purpose of this change is to enable the Corporation better to provide various types of investment funds, and in easily understood and simplified form.

Our experience indicates the greatest need of the type of customers with which we deal is for equity capital. It has always been the seed corn for development of private business in the industrialized countries, with borrowed funds as a secondary supplement. Only in recent years and in the developing areas has the practice grown to place main reliance on borrowing. This is largely due to the fact that most public financing agencies supply only loan funds, and at low rates.

Thus businessmen are encouraged to launch enterprises with excessive debt, often of short term and heavily in foreign currencies. This frequently leads to trouble.

My 40 years of financial and business experience make me an advocate of prudent financial structures. I, therefore, see great importance in IFC's new right to provide and stimulate the flow of equity capital.

A number of this audience are well aware of my strong convictions against public ownership of business. However, IFC intends to be merely an interim instrument for holding shares, pending the opportunity to sell them to private investors, which it has the mandate to do. The Corporation will continue to follow the policy of not participating in the management of enterprises in which it invests, and it undertakes to forego the ordinary voting rights of private shareholders.

One of the most important activities made possible by this charter change will be IFC's ability to assist in spreading share ownership in the developing countries. By underwriting or providing standby commitments it can provide facilities, often lacking, for the growth of capital markets. The ability to draw capital from large numbers of people is a necessary element for sustained growth of modern business. It is the basis of people's capitalism.

All in all, I believe that this year's developments give promise for increasing activity and usefulness for the Corporation.

I shall now take the liberty of speaking in a personal vein. On October 15 I retire as President of IFC. This will end over 14 years as Vice President of the World Bank and in my present post.

Helping build up the Bank was a fascinating and worthwhile task. In those early days it was new and untested; it received more criticism than support. But the foundations were soundly laid and as the years passed it gained recognition as a highly professional, expert organization with a worthy record.

So for me these years have been a great experience, working with the men and women from so many nations which comprise its organization, from Gene Black down through the ranks. It has enabled me to visit and to know and deal with the leaders of many countries, and to help chart some new paths in international financing.

Some of friends questioned why I chose to leave this powerful institution to take on the newborn IFC. There was the fact that I had been the most active proponent of the concept of IFC, and there was the appeal of building a new organization from the ground up. However, the main consideration was my interest in private business and my conviction that it can be the most dynamic force to bring widespread material progress to more people. I wished, therefore, to finish my executive career in helping spread good business in the developing countries. This endeavor, I can say, has likewise been highly interesting.

I turn over the reins of IFC with satisfaction. I am gratified that in assuming the presidency Gene Black will actively lend to the Corporation his talents and prestige. In Martin Rosen, who as Executive Vice President will be the operating general manager, I welcome a long-time associate from the World Bank in whom I have a full confidence. So I step out knowing that IFC is in the best of hands.

It is, I believe, accepted practice that in turning over command one is entitled to a valedictory. Mine shall be some personal comments on this business of economic development. And now I speak as an individual, not in my role as an official of an international organization. Since I have spent years working in this field, it is not necessary to assert my belief in its importance, nor my sincere interest in the developing countries. I trust therefore, that you to whom I speak may bear in mind the saying, "Let not him who is my friend speak only in soft words to tell me of pleasant dreams."

We need to keep in mind two significant developments in the postwar world.

First, the spreading realization that no nation can today walk alone;

Second, that for the first time those countries which have achieved a more abundant life have accepted responsibility to assist their poorer neighbors to improve their economic lot.

Thus the less developed countries have the unique opportunity to draw on the fruits of centuries of experience, organization, and technology in economic progress. They have the good will and support of the powerful free nations.

But I am troubled by the extent to which there is growing up the insidious consequences of too great reliance on foreign aid. Everyone repeats the platitudes that each country must be primarily responsible for its future and that others can only supplement its own efforts. Nevertheless, there are too many instances where the obvious attitude is that the chief responsibility of a government is to secure the maximum help from abroad, with lesser responsibility to mobilize its own resources, and to take action so that all resources are most effectively applied, and that internal conditions which hinder development are improved.

Probably the most important economic problem in the world is how the great areas with low productivity and standards of living can move steadily toward the levels achieved in North America and Western Europe.

If, working together, the richer and poorer countries are to make substantial progress to this end, it will require an honest facing of the facts. We certainly need to understand why certain countries have achieved a high degree of economic development and others have not. If we fail to understand the problem, how can we hope to solve it?

Let us briefly examine some of the frequently cited causes of underdevelopment.

It is often claimed that geography and natural resources are determining. They are of course important, and extreme conditions may inhibit any worthwhile economic activity—such as in the polar regions or utter deserts. But resources lie inert and have no economic worth except as people bring them into use.

It is easy to attribute the progress of the United States to its wide expanse and abundant physical resources. However, other areas—in Latin America, Africa, Asia—have comparable natural wealth, but most of it is still untouched.

On the other hand, there are countries in Western Europe with limited fertile land and meager mineral deposits, yet they have achieved high levels of economic life.

There appears to be only limited relation between resources and development.

Perhaps most often lack of capital is blamed. Let us take a look at this. In the first place, there is in most developing countries more potential capital than is admitted. But large amounts are kept outside, because of political instability and depreciating currency at home. Or it is invested in often unproductive land, low priority buildings, or otherwise hoarded. From the standpoint of development it is sterile.

The wide acceptance of the assumption that lack of development is primarily due to shortage of capital has led the United States and other richer countries to provide billions in loans and grants. Over the postwar period immense sums have been made available to the developing areas. Some of these funds have been well applied and have produced sound results, others have not. However, to most of the recipient countries the amounts are never sufficient. In my opinion, they never can be, because money alone accomplishes nothing. It is only a tool, and what it produces depends not on how much, but on how it is used. If it is applied to uneconomic purposes, or if good projects are poorly planned and executed, the results will be minus, not plus. The effective spending of large funds requires experience, competence, honesty, and organization. Lacking

any of these factors, large injections of capital into developing countries can cause more harm than good. The test of how much additional capital is required for development is how much a country can effectively apply within any given period, not how much others are willing to supply.

It is popular in many quarters to charge colonialism with lack of development in territories which have been dependent. This argument seems less persuasive when we observe that a number of countries which have been their own masters for long periods are no further advanced.

I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that economic development or lack of it is primarily due to differences in people—in their attitudes, customs, traditions and the consequent differences in their political, social and religious institutions.

Therefore, if the countries which are lagging are to join in the procession of economic progress their people must change some of their thinking and some of their methods. This is the stubborn core of the problem, the most important factor regulating the pace of growth—how fast will people adapt. A bulldozer can move most things, but not ideas and habits.

It is no service to truth and realism to avoid the fact that much effort and the sacrifice of some of the accustomed ways are the inevitable price of advancement.

Modern machines and the way of life which they demand can produce unlimited goods and services, but only for those who accept the required disciplines. Such disciplines are harshly imposed by the ruling powers in Communist countries. In free societies they must be voluntarily assumed by individuals.

I am sympathetic with those who prefer the old ways and the simpler life. But too many wish for the best of both worlds. It won't work—only frustration and failure can result from seeking the fruits without being willing to pay the price of admission to modern economic society.

Out of my experience I have arrived at a few simple requirements for any country to make its way up the economic ladder. Simple to state, most difficult to achieve.

The first requirement is a reasonable degree of consistent law and order—government which can govern. Each country must work out its own acceptable process by which it governs itself. But without a degree of continuity in political life, consistent economic growth is not possible. Public policies sway with every change in the winds; economic programs do not get off the ground; private investment is frustrated.

Next, I would put the requirement of reasonably honest and effective public administration. There is no denying that in many countries graft and corruption in public office lay a heavy tribute on resources which should go into development. Of course, the less developed countries have no monopoly on public corruption. But its toll is more destructive in poorer countries than in richer societies. This is a problem which is entirely up to the leaders and people of each country.

However, honesty alone is not sufficient. Administration needs to be effective, and more and more individual competence and adequate organization are required as an economy grows and becomes more complex. I have found that in dealing with public officials, the most prevalent obstacle to getting things done is the lack of experience, of training and of ability to make prompt decisions. More attention to training and organization is widely needed.

I can seldom refrain from commenting on the importance of financial stability to steady economic progress. There are many prominent supporters of inflation who claim that it is a necessary adjunct of growth; some assert that it creates development.

But I have taken a close look at inflation in quite a few countries. I have seen it upset governments; take the bread out of the mouths of workers, the old, the helpless; undermine the operations of business. So I continue to class it as a dangerous fever, which gives the patient a temporary spurt but quickly saps his strength.

Next, I would emphasize the importance of developing in broad terms a pattern of economic growth, a sensible plan of balance among agriculture, industry, transport, power, communications, with such provision for housing, education, and medical services as resources permit. From my experience, this type of basic program, setting out general and related objectives, is more practical than attempts to specify in detail and to direct all spheres of economic activity.

However the plans are made, they will reveal needs so great that there must be a selection of priorities. Of course it is also essential that the country seek to increase its own internal revenues. Many tax systems need overhauling to remove inequities and evasions, and to improve collections. However, if development is to be encouraged and not hampered, it is important to avoid taxation which hinders investment. The best chance for long-term growth in revenues is through increased productivity and national income.

Most countries have in their history experienced some form of feudal society, with wealth and power in the hands of a few. The most advanced countries have moved out of it; in many others it still prevails. This is one of the things which must disappear if there is to be economic progress in the modern sense. It can disappear under the guns of violent revolution, with the lives and property of those who have the most being forfeit. But the mass of people have never found quick prosperity through expropriation—through dividing up an inadequate pie. Grabbing the possessions of a few does not really help the many.

But revolutions are likely to come unless those who have the wealth and power are prepared to cooperate in working out means whereby productivity can be increased and its benefits more widely distributed. If they would look forward they should realize that there is greater opportunity and prosperity for those with superior ability and for capital in a growing economy with widely spread benefits than in a less productive society made up of a few rich and many poor.

So I put high on the list of public policy positive efforts to see that the benefits of growth be spread widely among more and more people—through jobs, ownership, opportunity.

I have some definite ideas as to the means of getting greater productivity, which is the essence of modern economic life, and providing for wide distribution of its benefits, which is both economically and politically imperative in free societies.

Obviously there is need for governments to provide the basic facilities and services. To do this in adequate measure will strain their human and financial resources. It seems sensible, therefore, to give the greatest scope to private initiative and capital in all fields which are not necessarily in the public sector.

There is convincing proof that this is the most assured method of getting development. The most productive economies which have brought the highest standards of living to the most people have been those which have permitted private initiative to control the widest range of activities. This system has worked in the United States, which began as a wilderness; it has worked in Europe and Japan, with the long established societies.

Over the past 14 years I have visited some 50 countries, most of them in earlier stages of development. The most substantial progress I have observed has come from the private sector, where it has been provided with basic facilities and a political and administrative climate in which it could exercise its talents.

In most instances of public ownership and operations of industry which I have observed, the results have been uneconomic. Too often political considerations determine the type of enterprise, and the size and location of plants. In instances where the facts are available, the publicly owned plants have generally cost more to build and many of them operate at losses, which have to be made up from public funds. At least certain countries, having burned their fingers, are abandoning or selling out to private interests some of these economic liabilities. Others, however, continue to experiment.

It is of course true that the role of government in economic affairs must vary according to the conditions in different countries. Much more is required in the way of planning, stimulation, incentives and financial participation where industrial development is in an early stage and where there is a scarcity of entrepreneurs, management experience and organized sources of capital.

Under such conditions, government has two alternatives in dealing with private enterprise. If it sincerely wishes to use its productive potential it can give support and finance on terms which do not repel private investment nor stifle private control and management. On the other hand, it can demand such rights and lay such restrictions that enterprise cannot operate on an economic basis. Frequently businessmen cannot get a clear answer to government intentions, often because the government will not adopt a clear-cut policy. So long as the uncertainty exists, it constitutes an obstacle to private investment.

Decisions as to the degree of government ownership and control are not always made on the basis of economics or political theory. Even limited experience in dealing with officials in some countries reveals that they are largely influenced by what will give them the greatest personal power and rewards. The greater the control in government hands, the more personally lucrative can be the exercise of such control.

I am convinced that increased productivity can best be assured by a combination of government and private investment and operation, each in its most appropriate sphere. The functions which only government can perform demand its full efforts and human and financial resources. Therefore, if we seek the maximum production and development, private initiative, management and capital should be called upon and given the opportunity to extend their activities most widely.

If productivity can be increased, how then can the benefits best be widely distributed?

We know that the doctrine of socialism says by public ownership of the means of production. Through the instrument of government (which the Socialists will operate) everyone will be allotted his proper and abundant share. It is an idea which has appealed to many, since the days of Thomas More's "Utopia." Up to now it has never worked, because it has never produced the abundance. (It is interesting to note that utopia—from the Greek—means "no place.")

Then there are the supporters of the ultimate welfare state, who propose that government (which likewise they intend to control) take the maximum amount from all who work and who own property and spread it around as they deem most fitting.

Some wise man has said, "there is no such thing as a free lunch." Someone must pay the bill, so the question remains whether people pay their own bills to the maximum extent, or have government take and distribute as much as possible.

I would propose to the developing countries a somewhat different approach in order to spread benefits more widely.

First, I would concentrate on how most effectively to encourage individual initiative and the flow of private capital into productive use. One specific means would be through revision of taxation to give incentives to production and investment and lay heavier taxes on unproductive assets.

I would make it attractive to both local and foreign capital to expand existing enterprises and to start new ones, providing more jobs, more goods, and wider opportunities for ownership of business. I would give incentives to larger companies to sell some of their shares to the general public.

I would work out means by which more farmers could purchase land and get assistance in improving their production and marketing. I would provide credit facilities so that the workingman could build or buy a house and pay for it out of his earnings.

This approach would, I believe, begin to build up a middle class of men of property, with opportunities for individuals to progress as far as their abilities warrant.

This is my prescription for building a productive economy and spreading widely its benefits.

I have touched upon some of the things which governments need to do to promote development, including making full use of the productivity of private initiative and capital.

There are, however, equally great responsibilities which private business needs to assume.

The time has come when no longer can businessmen afford to concentrate exclusively on their individual enterprises and to ignore their role in promoting the broad interests of their countries. They should see this as a matter of self-interest, because in the long run the success of all private business rests upon the progress and stability of the community in which it operates.

Furthermore, they should realize that the institution of private enterprise is under deadly attack, not only from avowed communism, but from advocates of all degrees of socialism and state control. Their propaganda is clever, organized, and persistent. Business generally has not effectively taken up the challenge. It has, by default, allowed itself to be put on the defensive. Unless it awakes to the present danger and determines to pay the price and make the fight to preserve and expand its system, its productive contribution may be lost to the world, and bring about total change in our society.

As we have pointed out in our annual report, there are some particular aspects of responsibility for foreign businessmen operating in the developing countries. They need to make special efforts to associate themselves with the local communities—first through maximum use of local resources and people, with positive efforts to provide training and opportunity for advancement to senior positions. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are mutual advantages in joint ventures with local enterprises, or in sharing ownership with local investors, including, where practicable, offering of shares to the public. And, on a broader front, foreign business interests are in position to set the example and stimulate their local counterparts in supporting education, technical and business training, and other constructive community activities.

And finally they can demonstrate and make known the benefits which they and all good private business contribute to economic growth.

There is one other major aspect of development to which I wish to refer.

Following World War II the interest of the more advanced countries in giving financial assistance to the less developed areas was evidenced in two directions—first, through bilateral financing, initially by the United States and more recently by Western Europe, as it rebuilt its own economy; and second, through international agencies, starting with the World Bank and the Monetary Fund, to which have been added IFC, IDA and recently the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition there have been the informal association of the Colombo plan and consortiums for India and Pakistan.

I have observed over these 14 years both types of operation. It might have been said before that my personal interest would naturally prejudice me in favor of the international approach. But now that within a few weeks I shall retire, I have no selfish interest to serve. I now can speak objectively and I shall state my convictions.

The first is that government-to-government financial aid cannot successfully be used to gain and hold political advantages for the country supplying the funds. Rather than making friends, bilateral financing between sovereign countries tends to create antagonisms and distrust. I have observed that within the non-Communist world the nations most friendly to each other are those between which there has been little or no intergovernmental financing. Contrariwise, the more one government has loaned or granted, the greater probability of suspicions and antagonisms. I believe the record gives support to my observations.

Also, there are inherent difficulties in arranging and administering developmental financing between governments. Officials and legislative bodies in committing the funds of their citizens have a responsibility that they be used honestly and effectively. Taxpayers are properly critical of abuses and waste. But however reasonable, recipient countries are inclined to consider conditions attached to aid as infringements on their sovereignty. And it is no salve to their sensitivity to have large numbers of foreign government representatives stationed in their borders to supervise the use of funds.

Furthermore, it is often impossible to disassociate a government's financial transactions from political motives, so that truly economic objectives may be subordinated.

And finally, there are obstacles to long-range action both in the providing and recipient countries. Commitments on both sides are necessarily subject to political changes and legislative actions. Qualified personnel are difficult to recruit due to uncertain tenure.

In my own country, the annual debates on foreign-aid appropriations are familiar to many of you. It is becoming apparent that the American people are more and more questioning and critical; not, I believe, of the mutuality of interests with the developing countries and the objectives of aid, but as to methods and results.

Because of the fundamental difficulties it is doubtful that large government-to-government financing can ever be handled effectively and with mutual satisfaction.

I believe there is a promising alternative in the record of the World Bank.

With substantial capital contributed by all of its 60-odd member countries, each in proportion to its resources, it has been able to approach the job of promoting sound economic development, free of the strains of political pressure and without the suspicion of political domination. It has been able to insist on more stringent economic and technical criteria than are generally proposed by agencies of individual governments. It supervises more carefully the application of its funds. Yet this firm insistence on performance has created a minimum of resentment.

The Bank has established a reputation for competence, objectivity, impartiality, and honesty. It has an international staff. It has gained the respect of its member countries, both the more and less advanced, and of the business and financial communities of the world. Its bonds are prime investments, so that it attracts the funds of prudent private institutions to supplement its government capital. Few informed people would argue with the statement that the lending of the Bank has produced results superior to most government-to-government transactions.

When it appeared that there was need for an additional type of credit for the more hard-pressed countries, and for a broader range of purposes, the Bank was given the operation of the IDA Fund.

Thus the proven instrument exists into which could be concentrated major intergovernmental financing. If the countries which have funds to devote to promoting development of the poorer areas would channel them through the World Bank, rather than in bilateral credits, the result would be more and better development, and better relations between nations.

In proposing the World Bank as the major instrument for development financing of public projects, I also agree that regional institutions, such as the Inter-American Bank, may play a similar role. As they demonstrate that they have established standards of competence, integrity, and freedom from political influence, comparable to those of the World Bank, they can likewise perform constructive service in their areas and be equally deserving of support.

It appears obvious that the United Nations, or other associations which are organized on a political rather than economic basis, do not fit the specifications I have outlined.

And in the field of fiscal and financial order, both in individual countries and internationally, I believe that the value of an international organization has likewise been demonstrated. The International Monetary Fund—born at Bretton Woods along with the Bank—has gained recognition as a most useful instrument for financial order and stability. I am sure that the discussions at this meeting will indicate widespread interest in giving the Fund even greater resources and responsibilities.

What about finance for private business in the developing areas? What is being done; what should be?

Here again I have some positive convictions.

The first is that private business and private capital are natural twins. The great developments of private enterprise have been nurtured on private, not public funds. In the long run business will not continue to be private if it depends unduly upon public credit. Furthermore, appropriations of public money are limited, and may well at any time be cut off, whereas private capital is an ever-growing stream. Private capital is constantly refreshed by that generated within business and by the savings of the people.

In the developed countries this flows constantly into use, into mortgages through savings institutions and insurance companies; into bonds of utilities and industries; and more and more into the shares of these enterprises.

The ownership of business has attained fantastic proportions in the United States. Most of our large corporations have many more shareholders than employees. Mutual and pension funds and other collective investment institutions represent the savings of tens of millions of Americans. Similar expansion of ownership is growing, not only in Europe, but in Latin America and some countries of Asia.

I therefore maintain that an immense reservoir of private capital exists throughout the world which can be tapped for expanding production in the less-developed areas.

But this capital must be enticed. It appraises the uncertainties and risks and expects ample potential rewards to balance these risks.

However, there are several forces which are damming this potential flow.

There is the threat of confiscation of property and rights. It is probably a conservative estimate that at least 500 millions of private capital have been held back from investment in Latin America because of events in Cuba.

There is the nationalism which in varying degree obstructs the import of foreign capital.

There is the jealousy of local businessmen who prefer their monopolies, and resent the appearance of foreigners who may supply the country with better products at lower prices.

And finally, there are the low subsidized rates at which funds of both national and international institutions are loaned to some private business.

A case can be made that in the general interest there is justification for transferring resources of the richer countries to those less fortunate for public purposes without too much regard to the cost of the money. It is more difficult to justify such public funds being made available to private business, at rates far below those prevailing within these countries, thus giving selected businessmen an extra profit.

Soundly operated business in these areas can be highly profitable. It is nonsense to claim that good business cannot start and prosper without cheap foreign credits.

Despite the usual provisions in the laws and regulations of public institutions, that in financing purely private enterprises (without Government guarantee) they are not to compete with private investment capital, the fact is that they do. By giving low-cost credits to one business firm they deter other borrowers from seeking funds in the private capital markets.

IFC is the only public institution, either national or international, which actually sets terms which are in line with those of private investment capital. Such terms are attracting private capital to join with us or to buy us out when the project has matured. Now that the amendment of our charter permits investment in equity shares, we can be more effective both in supplying the most needed types of capital to new and expanding business to meet their legitimate needs, and at the same time providing the type of investment which is attractive to local and foreign investors.

I recognize the great economic strides which have taken place in so much of the developing world. At any earlier time this growth would have been accepted as phenomenal. But this is a restless, impatient age, and awakening people are demanding immediate gratification of their desires.

I am fully aware of the immense problems faced by you and the other leaders of the countries, many of them just now attaining responsible statehood, which are moving through the no man's land between the past and the future. No one can expect perfection in this difficult task. But the stakes are so high you cannot afford basic errors. Your countries do not have a surplus out of which to pay for major mistakes.

I admit to being critical of much which I observe, of desiring improvement. But I believe that the problems can be solved if only people have the wish and the will.

I now come to the end of my final talk to the Governors of our member countries and our guests. Many of you I have known for years. As I retire, I shall continue to follow the fortunes of these institutions and countries with which I have been associated.

To all my friends, and to those many with whom I have crossed swords, best wishes and good luck in the challenging task ahead.

Washington Jewish Council Supports Federal Aid to Public Schools Only

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a recent public announcement by the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington expressing support for Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools, and opposition to such aid to religious and other private schools, either in the form of grants or of loans. My colleagues, I am certain, will be interested in the council's resolution, and the full text follows:

The Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington endorses President Kennedy's program of Federal aid to public, elementary, and secondary schools.

Two major principles underlie the council's views:

1. That the public school is a keystone of American democracy and has a primary role in its advancement.

2. That all parents have the right and freedom to provide a religious or general education for their children in nonpublic schools of their choice.

Taken together, these two principles require the strictest observance of the American constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state. It is a unique characteristic of the American system that public funds may not be used to support religion, and that religion is completely free from government domination or interference. Religion is wholly outside the jurisdiction, power, and financial support of the state.

Religion has always been and continues to be the core of Jewish life, and safeguarding the religious freedom of all groups is a constant concern of this council. We firmly believe that any impairment of the separation principle threatens religious liberty, jeopardizes other basic freedoms, divides the community into hostile segments, and weakens the fabric of American democracy. We strongly believe separation of church and state to be an abiding American principle, deeply imbedded in American tradition, which has given strength to our public school system and to the independent growth of religion in America. It is a principle of importance to all Americans of all religious faiths.

The public school alone is entitled to public financial support, whether that support takes the form of grants or loans. Government financial aid to nonpublic schools would weaken or impair the public school system. The right of parents to send their children to nonpublic schools does not, either constitutionally or in public policy, create or encompass any governmental obligation for financial support to parents who exercise this right.

The Jewish Community Council reaffirms its traditional policy of unequivocal support for the separation of church and state, and believes that the national welfare would be enhanced by public programs in support of public schools.

The council opposes the use of public funds for religious or other private elementary or secondary schools, either in the form of grants or of loans. Such aid (a) would violate the American constitutional principle of church-state separation; (b) would endanger the freedom of all religious groups; and (c) would tend to weaken the American public schools.

"Aw, Come on, Have a Heart"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a wonderful speech that was made in the Admiral Semmes Hotel today by my good friend, Brig. Gen. Emmett B. Cassady, at the United Fund kickoff meeting. I am putting this in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, so you and the men and women in every beat in this Nation will have a chance to see what this great man said in this speech today. General Cassady has charge of our beautiful Brookley Field here at Mobile, Ala. It is one of the outstanding Air Force bases of this Nation, where we have between 15,000 and 16,000 men and women working. It has done outstanding work and it has meant very much to so many men and women, not only here on Mobile Bay, where this beautiful base is located, but all over this State, and many other States.

Everyone who reads this great speech by our beloved friend, Emmett Cassady, will know some of the things that he called to our attention, which will mean so much to us and the people that will give the money to the great United Fund. Practically all of our leaders in this great city—both men and women—attended this luncheon to hear this great man make this wonderful speech that will not only be helpful to all of us that will help, but it will help all mankind. God bless our men and women that are working for the United Fund, and God bless Gen. Emmett Cassady for his great leadership, along with all of the other men and women at our beautiful Brookley that are working hand in hand with General Cassady and all of us to raise the money to help these people who have not had the blessings that all of us have had. It is a great work, and our Mobile people have never failed, especially the people at Brookley Field, and they never will.

The address follows:

"AW, COME ON, HAVE A HEART"

(An address by Brig. Gen. E. B. Cassady at the United Fund kickoff meeting, Admiral Semmes Hotel, Sept. 27, 1961)

I am highly honored to have been invited to keynote the 1961 United Fund campaign. It's not often that a career military man is asked to take such a role in such a noble undertaking. Yet we in the military, just like every other person in our free society, have within ourselves a need for this additional service to the cause of humanity. The privilege of talking to you today, plus my

own personal participation in the United Fund, helps to answer that need for me.

For several weeks now, I've been wondering what I should say to you on this occasion. I wanted to say something that would be stimulating; something that would help to get this campaign off to the start it deserves.

So one day I found my thoughts wandering back to my boyhood—it seems a few light years ago now. Memory singled out a small Emmett Cassady who, quite often, had vast and insurmountable problems. Some of them involved allowance, or overnight visits with friends; the sharing of toys or second helpings of dessert. Serious problems for a boy—when things weren't exactly going his way, he had a secret weapon. Turning to whoever his adversary seemed to be at the moment, he would simply say, "Aw, come on, have a heart."

Today I'm here to voice that same plea.

Boyhood memories have been replaced by the stark realities of the present. The problems have become infinitely more serious. As we begin this United Fund campaign, it's important to fully realize that we're dealing with the lives of people. Our own people who need help—clothes, food, medicine, or doctor's care, the things you and I take for granted. We may be dealing with a mother who is asking you for the very existence of her child. Literally hundreds of people are pleading for assistance. They may not say it to you personally, but through the United Fund they're calling on you—silently saying, "Aw, come on, have a heart."

As we begin this 1961 campaign, I think it's important to pause a moment and reflect—to analyze just what we're doing—why we are here—and, yes, even why we have a United Fund.

We are here to unite ourselves in a bond of friendship and concern for our fellow man. We are here to dedicate ourselves to the cause of human suffering. We are here to begin a team effort designed to meet the needs of the less fortunate.

There are people in this world whose lives have been beset by the gloom of misfortune—people who are living in the darkness of need or handicap. We are not here today to curse that darkness. We are here to light a candle that can guide them into a useful and productive life.

And if everyone here lights one small candle, sparking the generosity in the hearts of every Mobilian, we can create a bright world for those who must turn to the agencies of the United Fund seeking hope and courage to face the problems of daily living.

I readily admit that the United Fund did not truly live for me until several weeks ago when I was privileged to go on a come-and-see tour."

At the Rotary Rehabilitation Center, your heart goes out to spastics and crippled children who are trying to walk and talk. Over in the corner a little girl, strapped and braced up to the waist, is about to try that next step. She makes it and looks at you and smiles, and a lump comes in your throat as you realize that her greatest desire is simply to walk. Thanks to the United Fund, she's learning.

We went to the Mobile Association for the Blind and saw people hard at work making brooms and mops quickly and skillfully even though they could not see.

Experiences like these make you want to stop and take inventory. It makes you wish that this world could somehow be magically transformed into utopia where there is no misfortune or strife, where every child can walk and talk and every person can see.

Multiply this a hundred times over and you know why we're here and what we have to do.

These people must have more from us than sympathetic understanding; they must have more than a set of unfilled promises. They must have concrete evidence of our concern for them as they seek and find help through the United Fund.

The big thrill of it all comes when you realize that the United Fund is you—your work and your sense of justice—your time and your sense of fairplay—your dollars and your dedication to a cause.

That's why you're here today—because our community has a problem, a serious problem—and the United Fund is the best possible solution, as hundreds of hands reach out to you and hundreds of voices say, "Aw, come on, have a heart."

I can visualize the United Fund constantly repeating to you and to me and to every Mobilian the immortal words of Emma Lazarus engraved at the base of the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The United Fund is the lamp beside the golden door. That's why Mobile's gift must be generous, why the United Fund treasury must be filled—its budget met.

When I think of these people and the importance of our United Fund task, I wish I could dip into my experience and come up with a foolproof formula for success. I can't.

I can, however, give you some of the necessary ingredients that I think must go into this campaign if it is to be successful.

One essential ingredient is organization. I must confess, here in their presence, that I've been greatly impressed with the leadership in this campaign—with the way the business and civic leaders of this community have rallied to this noble cause.

I must confess, too, that as a military man, I'm partial to the use of majors and captains and sergeants. They are the backbone of our strength—they can and do get a heck of a lot of work done. There are no unimportant people, there are no unimportant tasks in this campaign. From Ernest Ladd right on down, every job must be done, and everyone who has responsibility must give his best, I know Ernest will give his best and in doing, I know he will lean heavily on our able Bill Kaufman, whose achievements are here acclaimed.

As I look into your faces, I think I can see what I consider the most essential single ingredient—dedication. It's the desire to achieve success. I'm sure we all realize that the road to a quota-plus performance is not a superhighway. We can't meet our needs for charity as easily as we can jump into a high-powered car and head for New Orleans or Birmingham. The simple facts are that it's going to take hard work, positive action, and selfless devotion on the part of every one of us.

In considering one other essential ingredient—faith—I'm reminded of Abraham Lincoln's words when he was asked during the dark days of the Civil War whether he thought God was on his side. His answer was, "My concern is not whether God is on our side but whether we are on God's side."

There's not a single doubt in my mind. When we work for the United Fund—we are on God's side. We are in partnership with Him. If you believe, you believe in the United Fund; if you live a Christian life, you'll give the United Fund your best effort.

Oh, it could be done another way, and in some countries it is done differently.

Yes, it's done differently in some countries. There they don't "waste" time on the cripples or the spastics or the mentally ill. They can be of no use to the state and consequently they can't "justify" their very existence.

No—we'll take the American way; where free men and women can come together and pledge themselves to the cause of humanity; to work together in a united effort. This is the democratic way. It is our way. It is the best way.

So, ladies and gentlemen, today is a day of dedication for all Mobilians. We must decide now that we will not betray the faith and the trust that has been placed in our hands. For charity there can be no set goal—there can never be enough. There can never be too much.

Let's see to it that every Mobilian has an opportunity to hear and answer the plea, "Aw, come on, have a heart."

Public Education at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made before the Illinois Association of Secondary School Principals at Urbana, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS

(An address by U.S. Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, before the Illinois Association of Secondary School Principals, Urbana, Ill.)

The general theme of my address this evening is public education at the crossroads. For the discussion of this subject, I have, of course, no professional qualifications. I cannot speak to you as an educator. My profession is law, and my career is, at present, that of a U.S. Senator. Senators these days are sometimes concerned about education, just as educators are sometimes concerned about Senators. The overriding concern of both ought to be an educational system that will nourish and safeguard freedom in our land.

The stark, central fact about the world today is that it is split into two parts, half slave and half free. To state it so is not to speak idly. In essence, one-half is dedicated to personal freedom; the other half subordinates personal freedom to the demands of the State. It is abundantly clear that, in the Communist half of the world, tyranny, in the sense of the cruel and arbitrary exercise of despotic power, is in fact deeply entrenched. In our half, while personal freedom under law is by no means the universal reality, it is the dominant objective.

Tyranny, of course, is not new to the world. Our forebears have suffered it, in one form or another, and have contended against it, at one time or another, for centuries. But never was there a time when tyranny presented so mortal a threat to freedom as now. The ancient tyrant rested his rule on spearpoints; yesterday's tyrant depended on muskets; today's tyrant has all the awesome weapons of modern technology at his command. In the time of our own Revolution—and in the time of the French Revolution—it was still possible for a people

to organize against a tyrant, arm themselves with small arms, and take possession of half a country, even before news of the revolt reached the Crown. In those times, it was still possible for the farmer and the merchant to seize his rifle, join a citizens' army, and fight against the tyrant's troops on somewhat equal terms. This kind of revolution has been a part of our Western tradition, and it has become a part of our concept, taught to us in our classrooms, and accepted by most of us almost as an article of faith, that people oppressed by tyranny will not endure it long, but will rise in revolt against it and break its yoke. Truth, we are fond of saying, once crushed to earth, will rise again.

I think that the time has come when we must reexamine this premise. The cinder brick wall that now closes off East Berlin is a stark symbol of how modern tyranny can impose itself on a whole people. The compelling picture of the East German sentinel leaping over the barbed wire barrier in a desperate jump for freedom, which you must have seen recently in our newspapers, the vivid accounts of East German families crashing through the wall in runaway trucks, the stirring stories of old men and women who leap from second and third story windows into the streets of West Berlin from houses along the borderline, all serve only to emphasize that a people subjected to modern tyranny have only one recourse left to them: escape.

Lest you say that I dramatize too much, and that I point, for illustration, to captive Germans in a satellite country under the boot of the Russian Goliath, let me remind you of a very different case in point, which, I believe, will even better illustrate my argument—not the case of the little rump country of East Germany, but the earlier case of all Germany, of Nazi Germany, familiar to us all.

Hitler was a modern tyrant whose power to retain the reins of government was surely put to the ultimate test. He achieved control of Germany, without ever having won majority support. Once chancellor, he arrogated to himself dictatorial powers, and crushed all opposition to his rule. He ordered Germany into a war that was not, even in the beginning, popular with his people. After the blitzkrieg victories, the war became a hopeless stalemate. Inexorably, the tide of battle turned; Germany was bled white on the battlefields of Europe; her armies were destroyed in Africa; her major ally, Italy, tottered and collapsed before the invading Allied armies, and Hitler's partner, the sawdust Caesar, was shot down in the streets of Milan, and hung by his boots for the crowds to revile. Two years before the war ended, it had become clear that there was no possible way for Germany to win. Yet, the German tyrant, thought mad by members of his own high command, continued doggedly to hold control. Hitler was dictator and Hitler remained dictator, while his armies, bludgeoned and beaten, retreated back toward the capital. Hitler was dictator and Hitler remained dictator, while the great cities of Germany were pounded into rubble by massive fleets of bombers, against which there was no shield. There was no place to hide. There was no way to win. And sane men, many of whom held high positions in the army and in the Government, conspired together in an effort to stop the bloodshed by deposing Adolph Hitler. But Hitler was dictator and Hitler remained dictator, until there was nothing left of Germany but the black and twisted ruins of Berlin. Germany stopped fighting when Hitler stopped living, his life taken by his own hand in a bunker under the rubble of his smashed chancery. I saw what was left of that chancery the last time I visited Berlin. It is just a pile of broken stone and masonry, a fitting monument.

The point I make is this: Modern tyranny, once it takes possession of a people, has the implements with which it can preserve its power indefinitely. It has armored divisions and highly mobile troops for swift dispatch into any corner of the country where trouble brews. It has secret police who mix constantly with the people and who, by wire or wireless, can instantly apprise the capital of any planned uprising long before it can be effectively launched. What's worse still, is that modern tyranny has the means with which to remold the minds of the people. The newspapers, the magazines, the radio and television programs, can be so efficiently censored and directed by the tyrant, the schools and universities can be so rigidly disciplined, that the people can be taught, in time, to accept what the state directs, and to forget what the truth may be. Never before, in all the history of the world, has a tyrant commanded any tools to compare with those he can now possess. Never before could a people be so completely captured and controlled. This is why I say, with the deepest conviction, that we must not let the tyranny of our times engulf what is left of the free world. For if tyranny triumphs throughout the world at large, it will plunge mankind into an age of darkness that could last a thousand years.

To prevent the new tyranny, which is Communist imperialism, from engulfing the free world, we have been long engaged in what has come to be known as the cold war. It may last for generations. To wage it will tax our strength and stamina, as nothing we have known before. To win it, in the long run, will depend upon the wisdom and understanding of the American people, which is the aggregate product of our educational system.

In these times it would be difficult to imagine anyone envying American educators. Your burdens are many. Not the least of them is finding ways to cope with the mercurial shifts of public opinion that wash against you.

We have been afflicted of late with much panic, and panic, sufficiently prolonged, can be fatal to freedom. Only a few years ago, an inquisition of sorts took place in this country. It reached into the field of education. Who can forget the raging controversies over loyalty oaths and the contents of textbooks? American educators, more than any other group, resisted these pressures. In resisting, often against heavy odds, the bullying of people whom you knew to be without qualification for passing upon either the philosophy or methods of our educational system, you reflected great credit upon yourselves and your profession.

More recently, in the wake of the Russian sputniks, the country made what seemed to be a turnabout-face. Having escaped, a bit battered but intact, from the acute era of Russophobia, you were next confronted with a ground swell of demands that you remold our American educational system overnight, if you please, in imitation of the Russian system. But, once again, you kept your bearings against the pressures of the opposite extreme. Both extremes were, of course, quite wrong.

A nation's educational system is the most important instrumentality by which its national values are served. It would be hard to imagine two nations whose values differ more absolutely than do those of the Soviet Union and the United States. Does it not follow that we should expect equal differences in the schools that each would devise to nurture and develop these values? Their education system is plainly designed to serve the needs of a rigid, doctrinaire, and authoritarian society. Ours is designed, or should be, to serve the needs of a free society.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my belief that, when we lay the measuring rod against our education system, we ought not to think in terms of comparison with Russia. For example, frantic warnings were but recently sounded that the Russians are turning out 125,000 graduates each year in the sciences, while only half that many are being graduated annually in the United States. Indeed, to read the comment in our magazines and press, one would have concluded that, unless a student has majored in physics, chemistry, and mathematics, he hasn't been educated at all. I suggest we should remember that Russia was but recently a feudal country; she is engaged in a massive effort, from a very late start, to develop the kind of industrial economy we have taken a century to build. Her need is feverish for competent technicians and engineers. The question we should ask ourselves is not whether we are presently keeping pace with Russia in the number of technicians we graduate each year, but whether we are meeting the needs of our own industry and defense. If we are failing to do this, then the Government should furnish such added inducement, including scholarships, as may be necessary to attract the number of science students our own needs require.

Just as this must be true where quantity is concerned, so also it must be true where considerations of quality are concerned. Here, the question we should ask ourselves is, not how our school curriculum compares with that of Russia, but rather, how is it serving the needs of our own country and the ends of a free society?

Such is the standard by which I would measure our system of public education in America. It is a harder standard than the Kremlin need apply to Russian schools, for the burden of American education is not only to train chemists, physicists, and engineers, but also to equip each student, regardless of his chosen craft, to accept and intelligently discharge the self-governing responsibilities that attend citizenship in a free country.

If you agree with what I have said thus far, I hope we are not now about to part company. I have posed the question of whether public education in America is fully meeting our own needs as a nation, and whether it is fulfilling its responsibilities to serve the ends of freedom.

I fear it is falling short of this goal.

The chief burden of my doubt is this: Do our schools stimulate our young people to the utmost? Do we require of them their full potentials? If not, we are wasting time and talent, both of which may be vital to our survival in freedom.

The critics of our secondary schools say that our typical high school graduate has had only a sketchy exposure to such demanding courses as chemistry, physics, and mathematics; that he has been permitted, while still too young to make responsible decisions, to act as the architect of his own course of study; that he has filled his time with "snap" courses; that he has probably played in the band, learned to dance, and may have tasted local fame by starring in the football or basketball team; that he knows how to get along well with the teachers and his fellow classmates, but he hasn't learned much. These critics charge that scholastic standards in our high schools are geared for the slower students, with the result that the abler students are neither challenged nor stimulated by their work, but develop a distaste for study, and, in the end, grow bored with school, spending much of their time in a frantic search for diversion.

Perhaps these criticisms are overstated; certainly they are not true of every high school. But if there is any truth in the charges, and I think there is, then it is time for us to reappraise some of the tenets basic to American education today.

There is much to be said in defense of the emphasis given to personality adjustment in

our schools. But the emphasis goes too far, I think, when it causes a corresponding de-emphasis on subject matter. John Dewey's great work well suited the needs of our country in his time. Prior to the First World War, we had the era of Pax Britannica. There had been almost a century of peace, progress, and prosperity. The Golden Age had come, and Dewey's emphasis on social adjustment, on the development of balanced and happy personalities, was natural. It harmonized with the times.

The Nation, in that day, was still caught up in the excitement of educating and training the tide of immigrants streaming to our shores. Adjustment indeed was a real problem, a real goal to be sought. The teacher who faced a babble of tongues and cultures in her classroom could see that the schools had as much of a role to play in adjusting youth to citizenship, as in educating youth to citizenship.

But times have changed. Our national assimilation is nearly complete. Our schools now have other and more pressing responsibilities than student adjustment. If we are to win the cold war for freedom's sake, we must discover, draw out, and develop our talent to the fullest. It is time, I think, in our own interest, to shift the emphasis back to subject matter, to make courses more challenging and more stimulating for all.

I recognize this proposal cannot be made without at once raising a host of further questions. If courses were to be made harder, you may ask, what is to be done for the slower student, or even the average student. I would answer: endeavor, insofar as possible, to give to each student a course commensurate with his abilities.

This would make for unequal treatment, it may be said, which is not only contrary to the traditions of free public schools, but undemocratic as well. I would answer: The true democratic principle is to afford to each student an equal opportunity. To give to each an equal opportunity does not mean to give to each an equal dose.

I recognize that it is much easier to make this proposal than to put it into effect. Your patience and ingenuity have already been strained in keeping a "standard" education up to standard for our burgeoning school population. To offer more for the gifted, and to establish alternative courses of study, will require enlarged facilities, additional training for teachers, and more money. This is a responsibility that local, State, and Federal governments must stand ready to assume.

I know this proposal may not be popular. It might cause a storm in each community, and doubtlessly would involve teachers in many more unpleasantries with parents. I make it because I think it is right. The important thing to remember is that the minds of our young are like the mines of the earth, and the richest ore may lie deepest. We owe it to our country, as well as to our young, to get from each his full potential. Is there another way to do it?

No appraisal of American public education, however brief, should overlook the tradition of anti-intellectualism in this country, and the mark it has left upon our schools.

With the end of the Revolutionary War, our young Union soon became preoccupied with the problems of settling the land and conquering a continent. Our land was vast and rich. Our faces were ever set against the raw frontier. The pioneer tradition has done much to shape our national character. This tradition does not breed intellectualism. Pioneering requires more action than thought. The cloistered, reflective life it holds in disdain.

We were nurtured at our birth as a nation by the great minds of the 18th century. But as we pushed our frontiers westward, we turned away from the heritage of Jefferson and Hamilton. It is significant, I think, that William Henry Harrison was elected President of the United States on no more of a platform than a catchy slogan, a log-cabin birth, and a taste for hard cider.

Even today this legacy of anti-intellectualism is everywhere present. A person with an intellectual bent is an "egghead." The "absentminded professor" is everybody's joke.

Our schools, likewise have been affected. A carnival atmosphere prevails at many of our colleges. Their impact upon their communities depends, not so much upon the quality of their faculties and academic programs, as upon the successes or failures of their athletic teams on the playing fields. The students are absorbed in extracurricular activities. Social life and good times sometimes seem to receive more emphasis, in and out of the classroom, than does the pursuit of learning. If courses in the physical sciences are being avoided because they are hard, then the clear implication is that alternative courses in history, political science, and literature, which ought to be equally hard, are made attractive by their ease.

Whether or not the public schools have contributed materially to anti-intellectualism in America, it is clear that they have suffered much from it. Can the schools help to cure the affliction?

Certain things, at least, can be done. Teachers and administrators can make it their business to accent the academic side of school life. Recognition, in the classroom and in the community, should be increasingly accorded to those who excel in scholarship. And teachers, at every level, should fight the temptation to withdraw into the cloistered life; they should work, rather, to bring academic activities to public attention. Teachers should be civic leaders. They should strive to participate actively in the affairs of their communities. The more that they will do this, the more will grow the general regard for them and their profession.

Government, too, has a role to play in helping to restore respect for learning. It is clear that the schools need money for new classrooms, for improved salary schedules, for all kinds of equipment which grows daily more expensive. The continued neglect of these things results in a downgrading of the prestige of schools and teachers, and of the intellectual side of life for which they stand. I am disappointed that an expanded program for financing these improvements passed the Senate but failed in the House this year. Federal aid to education, under legislation that will insure continued local control of our schools, is badly needed and needed now.

Let me conclude by saying that, perhaps, I should have said at the outset, that I feel genuinely honored to be here. If I have been overly critical, remember it has not been so long since I sat in the classroom, and this has been my first chance to talk back to so many teachers. If I have dwelt too much on what seem to me to be your shortcomings, it is only because there is not time enough to pay proper tribute to your accomplishments.

I thank you for being teachers, a noble calling, too poorly paid.

I thank you for having preserved the liberal arts, and for having withstood the pressure to turn the grade school into a trade school.

I thank you for the integrity you have shown in your unremitting efforts to keep intellectual freedom alive in America. It is on this ground alone that the cold war can be won; that we may emerge from it as free human beings, preserving the precious principles and institutions which give meaning to our conviction that what seems right today may change tomorrow, that final answers to the great questions involving the destiny of man have not been given, but must be sought anew by each generation. The right to change, to evolve, to grope for meaning, to question even the most fundamental assumptions, must never be abandoned.

Yours is our youth.

Yours is the future.

Report to the Voters of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the inauguration of January 1961 witnessed a beleaguered Washington struggling out of a snowstorm which had virtually immobilized the Government community. On this note of local crisis, President Kennedy entered the highest office in the land. During the ensuing months he has been called upon to meet crisis after crisis in foreign and domestic policy in seeking to carry forward the goals of his New Frontier.

These goals were outlined in the inaugural speech of President Kennedy; were implemented in his state of the Union message to Congress; and were detailed in this specific message to Congress for legislative action. It is the action of the 87th Congress, 1st session, on which I base my report.

This 12th report emphasizes my apprehension at the never-ceasing, mounting international tensions. The present state of world affairs leaves little room for optimism. The octopus-like tentacles of the international Communist conspiracy continue to engulf the peace and security of the world.

It is admitted that President Kennedy inherited the most serious problems in history. The crisis in Laos which was a spillover from the previous administration; the Cuban debacle which revealed many weaknesses in our intelligence agencies; the Vienna conference with Khrushchev; the Congo crisis; the renewed Berlin provocations, and the resumption of atomic testing by the Soviet Union. To add to this, the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold, the courageous Secretary General of the United Nations, has increased the tensions.

In the wane of the year 1961 we are faced by serious and seemingly unsolvable problems, while simultaneously being exposed to the rocket rattling of Khrushchev. Answers must be found to these problems, the immediate one being the critical Berlin issue. This issue, like the others, is interwoven in the "life struggle" of the United Nations. A single Secretary General as was the courageous Dag Hammarskjold will insure a useful United Nations. The troika plan sponsored by the U.S.S.R. will terminate the United Nations organization.

This unrelenting threat of international communism is the consuming issue of this decade. We know that this enemy unrelentingly, unceasingly and seemingly uncontrollably probes into

areas in which it can foment unrest, internal strife, and limited military actions. No longer can the free world tolerate these actions. No longer can the free world be rocked by events such as the failure of the Korean truce; the division of Vietnam; lesson of the Hungarian revolution; the sputniks, lunicks; the Suez debacle which gave the Russians a foothold in the Middle East; the Congo and Cuba. These events are the earmarks of the last decade.

Reacting to crises as they arise has proven inadequate and has led to Communist advances. The time for recriminations has long since past, but there is still time for us to once and for all realize that this monolithic giant is determined to conquer the world. The question is, What to do? While the implements and horrors of contemporary armed conflict are incomparable, it would do well for all to reexamine our country's history in an effort to rekindle the patriotism and determination displayed by the founders of this Republic. I do not advocate armed conflict as a method of solving world problems. I do, however, advocate a military establishment second to none which will permit us to negotiate from a position of strength with the men who understand and respect only brute force. I advocate a rekindling of the spirit of resistance which saved Greece and Turkey; a reaffirmance of our aims to those allied with us in achieving a just peace and preserving our free institutions to which we are dedicated. I advocate an affirmative foreign policy under which we will create circumstances instead of reacting to them.

As I said in addressing the House of Representatives on September 20, 1961:

Mr. Speaker, I have long and bitterly opposed aid to Tito, support of neutralism as a concept and toleration of the ungodly puppet slave regimes of the satellites. My voice has been unheeded.

My purpose today however is not to assume the stance of "I told you so" nor is it to raise a clamor against the administration or for that matter even against Tito, neutralism, or the satellites. Rather, it is to call for a somber and reflective reappraisal in the State Department and in the seats of power of the fundamentals and of the goals of our foreign policy.

In the late forties and early fifties, a former administration followed the policy of being firm against the satellites and of doing all that was within reason and within decency to bring about the collapse of those regimes in Eastern Europe which could not exist for 1 day without the support of Russian bayonets. It was not a wild policy of liberation, when we knew that abortive efforts to revolt would only lead to a blood bath and the loss of hopeless and innocent lives. It was, however, a policy which had as its purpose the support of the U.S. Government for the aspirations of the slave peoples for liberty and freedom. It did however encourage resistance to the Russian tyranny.

During the mid-fifties, we moved from this position to the far end of the spectrum and actively and openly supported a program of resistance and revolt in the satellites. To our everlasting shame, we were unwilling to support our words with our deeds when the inevitable cataclysm of Hungary followed as a result of our promises. I am sure most of the world believed that we had lost our nerve when we stood abjectly and shamefacedly by as the Russian tanks rumbled over the remnants of liberty in Hungary.

Inexplicably—perhaps as a result of our shame and perhaps as a result of our being lulled into a sense of false security—we then shifted toward the opposite end of the spectrum in our attitude and policy toward the satellites. The policy of liberation became a policy of live and let live. Indeed, we have given substantial quantities of aid to at least one of the satellites.

I say that the time has now come for a change in this policy and that if the Russians and Red Chinese are going to meddle in the affairs of the free world and if the Communists are permitted to stir up trouble in three-fourths of the world, they should be served quiet but firm notice that the United States is not going to stand idly by. We should make it abundantly clear to the people of the satellites that the United States has not forgotten them and that it is our firm determination that when the day arrives, they shall be free.

It is not a policy of "liberation" but rather one of supporting the legitimate and devout aspirations of the people of eastern and central Europe to be free in their persons, in their homes and in their beliefs. The same holds true for the puppets of the Red Chinese monster. Everywhere subjugated people should be made aware that they have the full and firm support of the United States in their yearnings for freedom from foreign domination.

It is rather ironic that we have fanned the flames of freedom in the colonial area to our own detriment while at the same time, maintaining silence with respect to the imprisoned peoples under the Communist lash. I say that the time has come to make it abundantly clear to the Communists, not by public proclamation but by soft word and firm deed, that they can no longer count on our neutrality, vis-a-vis the satellites and puppet regimes.

The time has also come for reappraisal in our policy toward neutralism. Again the pendulum has swung back and forth and, again, the rest of the world has come to believe that we will hand out our bounty regardless of the recipients' actions. I do not denounce neutralism. I firmly believe that every nation has the right to be neutral. I cannot agree with their decision but I admit their right. I do, however, denounce neutralism of the cynical variety which says, "I am neutral," but then supports one side of a dispute. Such an attitude is despicable. In such cases, I see no reason whatsoever for the United States to actively support such governments.

Everyone has a right to be neutral but he does not have the right to call on the U.S. taxpayer for support of his government. We cannot buy the support of the rest of the world and we should not try. On the other hand, we do have a number of stanch and true friends throughout the world. Where their governments are with us, I say we should support them to the maximum extent of our means and our resources.

In like manner, however, I am convinced that we should not support the governments of those so-called neutrals who are against us. I am not thereby advocating a withdrawal of technical assistance or the type of assistance which extends and reaches directly to the people of those countries, but I am advocating that we should not expend one cent which would tend to support the government of such nations nor would I waste our taxpayers' funds in developmental programs for such false neutral governments.

If there is any doubt as to which countries should be included in this classification, let those governments evaluate their own policies and statements. It was indeed heartening that the President himself has heralded a shift in this direction. The time has come when we must once again make it clear that we will support our friends and oppose our enemies.

The above comments are especially pertinent to Mr. Tito. We have poured our treasure into this country. We have lifted the standard of living of his people. We have supported him in his foreign policy contests, yet he turns his back on us in a crisis and embraces the Russian bear. I have said much previously in this House concerning our policy toward Yugoslavia. I need only say that every word I have spoken on this subject is coming true. I think it is abundantly clear that we should at this time inform Mr. Tito that our aid will no longer be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for the making of the foreign policy of the United States, but I devoutly hope that the words which I have spoken here will have some small impact on the course of our foreign policy and thus on the course of civilization.

President Kennedy is the architect of our foreign policy. He possesses the personal courage and conviction to carry forward a firm policy. Events today indicate that the President has embarked upon such a policy. His address at the United Nations was the clarion call.

The present Berlin crisis and U.S.S.R. resumption of nuclear testing lead me to look back but 25 years to the actions of the great world powers which permitted the "anschluss" in Austria and the "putsch" in Czechoslovakia. This costly lesson in world history must not be forgotten. To yield is tantamount to surrender. Today, it is Berlin—tomorrow may be too late to save our freedom.

The 1st session of the 87th Congress has succeeded in implementing a large part of the President's program.

National defense was strengthened by increasing the Armed Forces. Reserve and National Guard units were activated; expenditures were increased for construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels including Polaris submarines; and additional expenditures were permitted for military bases, missile sites, and nuclear submarine bases. Also, funds for the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were increased. The overall defense appropriation was $46.6 billion.

The foreign aid program aimed at assisting other peoples pricipally in underdeveloped areas of the world is not just a program of U.S. assistance but is a program to help others help themselves. It establishes a new criteria which must be met by recipient nations before financial assistance is granted. Good government with justice cannot be imposed entirely from the outside; there must be an internal desire for such progress. This, under the new program we will first ascertain that such desires are present and insure that recipients are utlizing our assistance for the benefit of the many and not the few. The United States as a leader of the free world must help other peoples to achieve their social aspirations under democratic governments. Congress gave $3,914 billion for this foreign assistance program.

The Peace Corps was established and also a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. A resolution was adopted which expresses the sense of the Congress against seating of Communist China in the United Nations. Under the new

Agency for International Development, which will coordinate all of our foreign aid activities, there will be greater control and more economical and intelligent expenditure of funds. Congress retained its control of this program by eliminating the back-door spending proposal. The $600 million previously authorized for the special aid to Latin America was appropriated under the Inter-American Economic Cooperation program.

The loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations was permitted and the Export-Import Bank was authorized to guarantee and insure American business accounts in foreign countries. As the first chairman of the United States-Canada interparliamentary group, I feel this committee played an important part in bringing about a treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River.

The alien orphan bill which expired on June 30 was made a permanent part of the immigration law, with safeguards added which prevent proxy adoption of orphans. Amendments were added to this bill to provide that second and third preference aliens will be admitted to this country on a nonquota status. This was designed to expedite the reunification of families of citizens and immigrants admitted for permanent residence. Also, provisions were added relating to the judicial review of deportation orders.

At the beginning of President Kennedy's term of office, the imbalance of our international payments and an increased outflow of gold were among the most serious problems we faced. By vigorous presidential directives, this tide has been stemmed and complete confidence in the dollar has been restored.

I am happy to report that as a result of one of my amendments, $1.8 billion worth of procurement has been effected in the United States. This money helped recovery as 40 percent of it was spent in distressed labor areas. This procurement has resulted in increased sales of American equipment and in increased jobs for American workers. This helped restore the dollar and returned the dollar to the United States.

A bill was passed which reduces from $500 to $100 the value of goods Americans may bring back duty-free from abroad. To promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad, a U.S. travel service was established in the Department of Commerce.

Nine hundred and twenty-eight million dollars was authorized to provide 13 weeks additional unemployment compensation; temporary grants were authorized to States to finance inclusion of dependent children of unemployed under Federal-State assistance program. A true, overall minimum wage law is hard to achieve. However, Congress enacted legislation which raises the minimum wage now received by 3 million workers to $1.25 a hour and extends protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to 3.5 million additional workers by gradual wage step-ups.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was established; $300 million in loans and $94 million grants was authorized for industrial plants and public facilities in areas of economic distress; and technical assistance, vocational rehabilitation and subsistence grants for persons undergoing training was provided.

Eleven and one-half billion dollars was authorized for completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972. The law also fixes Federal gasoline and diesel fuel tax at 4 cents per gallon and raises levies on heavy trucks and buses. Authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to railroads was extended for 27 months, to June 30, 1963. The amount available to the Small Business Administration for regular business loans was increased temporarily by $20 million. A bill was passed which broadens the authority of the House Judiciary and Senate Finance Committees to permit study of all matters relating to State taxation which affect business in interstate commerce.

The Social Security Act was amended to increase minimum payments from $33 to $40 per month; to increase benefits to widows; and to provide that male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62.

A 5-year, $4.9 billion housing program for low and moderate income families on liberalized terms was authorized. The moneys will also be used for urban renewal; open-spaces development in cities; college dormitory construction loans; 100,000 new units of public housing. Funds for housing for the aged denied by the previous administration were increased. Funds were provided for loans to cities to acquire mass transportation facilities. An interim increase of $1 billion was provided for FHA mortgage insurance authority.

In the field of health, education, and welfare, Congress extended for 4 years the $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training practical nurses; extended for 1 year the school milk program; and authorized the first juvenile delinquency program in 8 years. Sixty-three additional U.S. district judgeships and 10 in the circuit court of appeals were created. As a result, the court for the eastern district which includes Brooklyn will receive two new judges. This increase will enable the courts to process efficiently the heavy backlog of cases which has been steadily increasing.

Congress extended direct and guaranteed home-loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975. An additional $1.2 billion was authorized to carry the program through fiscal year 1967. Payment of a special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance was authorized; and payments to veterans' widows were increased.

The water pollution control program was expanded, and increased from $3 million to $5 million annually grants to interstate and State agencies for operations through June 30, 1968; increased from $50 million to $100 million annually for construction of treatment works. Perhaps we will see the deserts of the world bloom again as a result of the discoveries made by the extended saline water conversion program.

Due to the many expenditures this year, the national debt limit was extended to $298 billion and the 52 percent corporate tax rate and excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles, transportation of persons, and telephone calls were continued.

While this report is not optimistic, let us never forget that hope is eternal. Therefore, you and I must pray and work toward the day when we can say that peace is secure so that we can devote all of our resources and energies toward the elimination of human suffering, disease, and poverty at home and abroad.

It has been an honor and privilege to serve the residents of my district for the past 12 years. My Washington office is open year round, and letters sent there receive immediate attention. The address is Edna F. Kelly, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D.C. I am available to see my constituents at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings after 8 o'clock during such times as Congress is not in session.

Hon. John W. McCormack

SPEECH
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 23, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal pleasure that I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma and my other colleagues in tribute to our beloved Acting Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK.

In my opinion JOHN MCCORMACK is the personification of the ideal Member of Congress and leader of his party in this body. He possesses to a most unusually high degree all the qualifications required for his position—and these qualities have long been recognized, in particular, by Members on both sides of the aisle and by officials in the executive branch as well as by the press and the general public. His patriotism of the highest order; his unassailable integrity; his complete devotion to his tasks; and his incomparable gentleness; these have each been noted and have been the subject of the unusual accolades of his fellow Members. To my mind they can all be summed up in one word—a word that sometimes is used simply as a title, losing its real significance, but that eminently fits and describes JOHN MCCORMACK—"honorable."

He is honorable in every sense of the word. He, by his life, personifies the virtue, and we, by our tributes, accord him the honor that the virtue demands.

Twenty-one years ago it was my privilege to cast my vote for JOHN MCCORMACK as the majority leader in this body, and ever since I have had innumerable occasions to be glad on that account. I venture to say that the rec-

ognition accorded to him here today is but a slight semblance of that which will be given to him by history for generations to come when tranquillity is restored to the world and the happenings of the past 21 years can be viewed in calm perspective.

The words of Alexander Pope are peculiarly descriptive of our beloved and respected colleague:

Statesman—
Yet friend of truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear,
Who broke no promise,
Serv'd no private end,
Who gain'd no title,
And who lost no friend.

Mr. Speaker, may I join with my colleagues in wishing for JOHN MCCORMACK everything that is good and in hoping that we shall have the good fortune of having him with us for many more years to come.

The Pressure of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, September 30, it was my pleasure to address the 41st reunion of the 27th Division Association at Binghamton, N.Y. Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the text of my address:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD W. ROBISON, OF NEW YORK, TO 41ST ANNUAL REUNION OF 27TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION, INC., BINGHAMTON, N.Y., SATURDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 30, 1961

It is a very distinct honor, and I deem it a high privilege, to have been invited to attend and speak to this, the 41st annual reunion of the 27th Division Association. You veterans of "New York's own" division can be justly proud of the services rendered in defense of your beloved Nation in two World Wars. I need not add that we of New York State are equally proud and grateful.

Your division insignia—the letters "N. Y. D." (for New York Division), united in a circle with the constellation of Orion (in honor of your former commander, Maj. Gen. John Francis O'Ryan)—bears mute but eloquent evidence of the courage and valor of the men who wore it in France at Ypres, along the Somme River, and in Flanders, and then, 25 years later, at Makin, Eniwetok, Saipan, and Okinawa, remote islands that most Americans had not heard of prior to 1944, but thereafter islands whose names will be forever etched in our memory.

The cost to you of the ultimate victory which you brought home to us cannot be measured in bare statistics, but—for the record—it is, in part, shown by official Army records in this fashion: World War I, killed in action, 1,785; wounded, 7,201; and World War II, killed in action, 1,512; wounded, 4,980; captured, 1; and missing, 40. Your total casualties, from action in both wars, thus adds up to 15,519, and some evidence of your devotion to duty, and the fact that you were a remarkably cohesive fighting unit, is shown by that one of the above categories that states, simply, for World War II—in some of the ruggedest and bloodiest combat ever known—the enemy captured but one of your number.

Your specific honors include two Distinguished Unit Citations and three of your number were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. But perhaps your highest honor rests in the certain knowledge that you, and those others who are now no longer with you except in spirit, have truly earned the everlasting gratitude of your fellow citizens for (in these familiar words), "* * * conspicuous bravery above and beyond the call of duty."

Now, once again, your Nation is facing a new crisis—perhaps the greatest crisis in its history. Discouraging as this must be to you and others like you who bled and died in the cause of freedom, and who hoped and prayed that never again would the scourge of war make its mark upon this world, the hot metal of international conflict bids fair to spill over the restraining mold of reason, and those who cherish freedom have again reached the testing place. And, once again, it would appear that only the faith and courage of the people of the United States of America can stay the progress of tyranny.

Perhaps we should not find this so surprising, for the history of mankind clearly shows that each age has faced its own conflicts, each generation its own challenges. On a gravestone in a Concord, Mass., cemetery, we find this epitaph: "My son, that which I bequeath you, you must own anew if you would keep it." The Revolutionary soldier who dictated that epitaph knew—as we should know—that freedom is not something to be handed down from generation to generation, but rather must be earned anew by each succeeding generation. Perhaps, in the end, that is what makes it so precious.

The face of the tyrant who now threatens to bury us is a relatively new face, but the form of the tyranny he represents has not changed through the ages. Something else has changed, however, that may, in turn, be changing us, and it is this that I wish to talk to you about.

Near the end of World War II—fought, among other things, ironically enough, to save our present enemy from annihilation—a new and fantastic sort of weapon was dropped from the skies on the people of a city in Japan that most of us had never heard of before. Before the strange, mushroom-shaped cloud that has since become the trademark of nuclear explosions disappeared into the stratosphere, the world, as we had known it, changed—never again to be the same.

Principally, this was so because overnight the nature of war had changed. Nuclear arms had now so diminished the advantages traditionally associated with victory in war that no rational power could accept the idea of waging such a new war as matter of policy.

We came out of World War II holding in our own hands a monopoly on this new form of mass destruction. We were awed by our responsibility. We were also fearful that our monopoly might not last—since nature does not for long play favorites in yielding up its secrets. And so, we made a sincere and determined effort to place atomic ingredients under some form of international control, hoping thereby to save succeeding generations from the very sort of atomic-arms race that is today subjecting much of mankind to the moral temptations implicit in terror.

Back then, a few saw a measure of hope in all this. Albert Einstein, whose brain had helped develop this new source of energy, said: "Since I do not foresee that atomic energy is to be a great boon for a long time, I have to say for the present that it is a menace. But perhaps it is well that it should be, for it may intimidate the human race into bringing order into its international affairs which, without the pressure of fear, it would not do."

However, neither Einstein nor most of the rest of us reckoned as we should have, for no more than did Hitler has it ever sought to conceal its ultimate intentions—with a rogue nation that was bent on world conquest and saw, here, an unexpected opportunity to use that "pressure of fear" to achieve its own tyrannical ends.

So, in 1946, that rogue nation vetoed our plan to put nuclear ingredients under United Nations supervision. Then, with the help of American and British traitors, it stole our atomic secrets, and it girdled itself with nuclear rockets and bombs which it rattled ominously while it sliced away at the foundations of freedom here and there throughout the world as a butcher slices at salami.

This policy of nuclear blackmail worked for the tyrant whenever we wavered, as we sometimes did. However, whenever we stood firm, as at Berlin in 1948, at Lebanon in 1958, and whenever we refused to give ground as at Quemoy and Matsu, the tyrant backed off, though never swerving from its ambition to eradicate every vestige of freedom and dignity and truth from all the nations of the world.

But still we tried. We even imposed upon ourselves a moratorium on nuclear testing, and, right up to the end of that parade of men from Washington who, briefcases in hand, wore a weary path to and from Geneva, we hoped that across the conference table from us were surely men of reason and goodwill who—given enough time—would come to reason and then we might have peace in our time.

However—as you know—that time ran out some 30 days ago, and, showing the depths of his duplicity, the man who a year ago said:

"Should any side violate the obligations [on testing] to which it has committed itself, the instigator of such violations will cover itself with shame and it will be condemned by the peoples of the world,"—that man set off a series of well-planned and long-planned atmospheric explosions of nuclear devices.

He has produced thereby—as he fully intended—not only the type of radioactive fallout that everywhere endangers human health, but a sort of "psychological fallout," too, that may be far more dangerous, and it is this that I wish to ask you to think about.

The so-called neutral nations of the world were meeting at Belgrade even as Khrushchev set off the first three of those explosions. Were they so mad at the Russians that they hastened to our side in this global conflict? Hardly. The best they could muster was an expression of "faint regret" at what Khrushchev had done, and then they sent Nehru of India—muttering: "The foul winds of war are blowing once again. There are atomic tests, and the world grows fearful"—off to placate Khrushchev, and two lesser lights to Washington to urge us to appease the tyrant by seeking some way to ease the tensions the tyrant had created over Berlin.

Since then, the voices of appeasement have been raised elsewhere abroad—openly the question is being asked: "Might it not, after all, be better to be Red than dead?"

And, I regret to say, that even here at home—in what we used to call the "cradle of liberty"—that same question is being silently considered by those who believe that we have been painted into such a corner over Berlin that our only alternatives are appeasement or nuclear warfare.

For instance, a distinguished religious paper (the name of which I will give you if you wish), recently carried an article declaring that—in this current crisis—our alternatives are no longer peace or war, but "peace with slavery or total destruction."

The author went on to say that while always before America has chosen the hard road to freedom—Freedom from King George, or fight—Freedom for the slaves, or fight—

Safety for democracy, or fight—that this won't work now.

"We have done it before," he says, "but we cannot do it again." He ends by saying: "Let us pray."

Now, there is certainly nothing wrong with prayer, and I suspect that many Americans are praying over this physical and moral crisis of ours already, and that many more will resort thereto before the next few months are over.

However, what I think is wrong, and dangerously wrong about this sort of analysis of our dilemma is that it assumes that the certain result of standing firm at Berlin will be a nuclear war. This is based on the further assumption that Mr. Khrushchev is more willing to accept the consequences of a nuclear holocaust than are we. I doubt that he is, unless he is a madman as was Hitler, in which event we might as well abandon hope anyway.

But why should Khrushchev seem, now, so supremely confident? Is it because he believes that he senses a shift of American will and purpose? I think it must be that—since, despite his testing tactics, whatever nuclear advantage there is probably still rests with the Western Powers. During the Eisenhower years, we followed a policy of massive retaliation, partly with the thought in mind that Khrushchev's concept of psychological fallout worked both ways. Perhaps this was not a wholly satisfactory policy—certainly it was not entirely popular with all of our own citizens nor with many of the so-called neutral nations. It was especially unpopular with the Soviets—for obvious reasons. But it was effective because it was based on a position of courage and of strength.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy declared that we must try to find ways and means for providing ourselves with a wider choice than humiliation or nuclear war. I voted for the additional funds he said were necessary to improve our limited war capabilities, but I wonder if we have not unintentionally overstressed such thinking to a point where Khrushchev thinks we have now decided to reserve our nuclear deterrent for use only in the event of a direct attack upon us.

That assumption would seriously increase the danger of miscalculation—if, in fact, such a decision has not been made. William L. Shirer, in his book, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," describes how the German generals advising Hitler shook in their boots, in the late 1930's, at the thought of going to war against the powers then opposing Hitler—powers that had a potential military strength vastly superior to that of Germany. However—do you remember Neville Chamberlain and his umbrella? Hitler was led to discount the will and ability of those powers to use their collective strengths, and the result was something you men well know.

And so I think—although the President made an indirect reference to this in his excellent United Nations address last Monday—we must at once make it unmistakably clear to Khrushchev that, if necessary, we will resort to nuclear weapons in order to carry out our solemn commitments to the people of West Berlin.

Beyond that, I further think that it is time for us to begin to fight fire with fire. What do I mean?

Well, for too long now we have wrung our hands before the altar of world opinion—whatever that is—wondering whether it would be nice to test our aging supply of atomic weapons and what the world might think of us if we did. For too long we have failed to look with honest eyes at the morality of the sort of neutralism that was displayed at Belgrade. For too long we have failed to look with cold eyes at the enemy bent on destroying us and at what we must do to stay him.

So, I would suggest that now is the time to pressure Khrushchev wherever he is weak, even as he pressures us. Now is the time to put him on the defensive, and to get off the defensive ourselves, by using against him every political, psychological, and economic weapon we may have, instead of reserving them for a more serious threat than that he has created at Berlin. I would further suggest that we take another look at the United Nations, abandoning some of our idealistic thinking about it, and begin to use it—including our never-used veto power in its Security Council—to gain our own objectives. I think we must fight the admission of Red China to the U.N. with the same fervor we fight our domestic political campaigns, abandoning any thought of the inevitability of defeat. Finally, I also think we should refuse to negotiate away the future value of the people of the so-called captive nations—our "Cubas" behind the Iron Curtain—by agreeing to recognize East Germany as a sovereign state, and thus in principle accepting the whole Soviet satellite empire, merely to reaffirm something we already have, namely, the right of free access to West Berlin.

Now, all of these things, I admit, contain a considerable degree of calculated risk, and, if tried, may enhance the possibility of destruction. I also know that the consequences of nuclear warfare—though probably overemphasized, would be terrible indeed. But I doubt that, for a free people with a heritage such as ours, the consequences of surrender would be any less terrible.

And it is my further judgment that if we really wish to avoid the day when our alternatives are only humiliation or nuclear war, we must take this risk of drawing a line at Berlin and saying: "Here we stand, and, if necessary, here we die."

Let us, then, recognize the pressure of fear for what it is. Let us learn to live with it as the settlers who came to this area nearly 200 years ago, and who then later on pushed America's frontier across the Great Plains, learned to live with the ever-present danger of attack by burning, pillaging savages. Let us learn to subdue that pressure with the same courage shown by those of you who manned the trenches in France and the foxholes in those Pacific islands. Let us understand that Khrushchev is hoping that his stepped-up psychological fallout will eventually neutralize our courage and paralyze our will. Let us also realize that he wants us to believe that already our only alternatives are peace with slavery or total destruction, when, in fact and in truth, our real alternatives still are victory or defeat.

The moral temptations implicit in terror are all around us. Their only antidotes are that combination of a passion for liberty, of courage, and that form of discipline that springs from within—self-discipline—and of course, of faith—which combination has heretofore always marked the American people—a combination summed up in the words of the psalmist who, when his nation was threatened, cried: "Wait on the Lord, be of good courage, and He will strengthen thine heart; therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed and the mountains be cast into the midst of the sea."

Progress Report on Classics of Democracy Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time today to give to the House a progress report on the classics of democracy program, concerning which the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on page 6 of its report on the mutual security bill of 1961, said:

> The committee is pleased with the progress of what has been termed the "classics of American democracy" program. When this program was inaugurated, works such as The Federalist, which had inspired our forefathers, were unavailable in translated editions. Under the classics of American democracy program they have been translated into upward of 50 languages and dialects and made available to the peoples of new and developing nations at the grassroots. Perhaps no program has been more successful in winning the hearts and minds of the peoples of the new emerging nations. The committee strongly recommends the continuance and expansion of this program.

Naturally, I am pleased that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has given such high priority to this program since it is the development of the concept of a group of distinguished Chicagoans, most of them from the district I have the honor to represent, and which I, with the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], had the privilege to present to the Congress.

For the benefit especially of the newer Members of the House, several of whom have asked me for more information since reading this strong recommendation in the committee's report, I shall begin by briefly sketching the high points in the birth and growth of the program of which the Committee on Foreign Affairs has said: "perhaps no program has been more successful in winning the hearts and the minds of the peoples of the new emerging nations."

LUNCHEON THAT STARTED PROGRAM

First. Participants in the luncheon in Chicago were: Dr. Jerome Kerwin, chairman of the Charles P. Walgren Foundation, University of Chicago; Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor, Christian Century; A. T. Burch, then associate editor, and Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus, University of Chicago; Thomas B. Stauffer, a member of the faculty of Wilson Junior College with State Department background, the host at the luncheon; John McGinnis,

president, Pennsylvania Lodge 225, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; and Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, State Department visitor to the universities of India and other countries, a recognized authority in his field, as were the others in their respective fields. It was a small group, typical of many such in American communities that give direction and drive to worthy and moral causes.

Second. From this luncheon came the Chicago Committee for the Classics of Democracy, dedicated to the task of winning hearts and minds of people everywhere who were realizing their long dream for independence by making available to them at grassroots the classics of democracy that had been an inspiration to our own forefathers. It was this committee that first brought to public attention the shocking fact that even "The Federalist" had been translated into only one language and that edition was out of print. Mr. Stauffer served as the unpaid executive secretary of the committee.

NEWSPAPER EXPOSÉ ALERTS PUBLIC

Third. The Chicago Daily News, of which Mr. Burch was the associate editor and Mr. Bradley, the literary editor, was then owned by John Knight, whose newspapers in Chicago, Michigan, Ohio, Florida, and elsewhere, and whose news and feature service to other newspapers afforded a national audience reaching pretty thoroughly into American homes the country over. The publication in the Chicago Daily News of reports from its foreign correspondents in all parts of the world, substantiating the position of the Chicago Committee for the Classics of Democracy, had a tremendous effect in arousing the American people. They reported that in country after country books on democracy nowhere were available at grassroots while Communist literature was everywhere, that the Soviet books and pamphlets were at every newsstall and every corner while the literature of democracy, such as it was, was mostly in expensively bound volumes in a few scattered libraries visited by a relatively few persons. The reports of the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News were carried in the other Knight newspapers and in newspapers from coast to coast receiving the Knight news and feature service. This documented on-the-spot presentment by journalists of high standing and prestige alerted the American people for the first time to the almost unbelievable lag of the United States in the battle for the minds and hearts of people in quest for inspiration and knowledge in attaining the most perfect form of self-government.

Fourth. Meanwhile Dr. Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, with the wide and influential circulation of that publication, was making a large contribution to building popular demand for a program directly to reach and win the hearts and minds of people by imparting to them that faith in democracy that comes only from understanding.

AMERICAN PUBLISHERS JOIN FORCES

Fifth. In 1954 the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and I appeared before the distinguished committee of publishers serving as an advisory board to the U.S. Information Agency. Mr. Stauffer accompanied us as spokesman for the Chicago group. This committee, composed of some of the Nation's outstanding publishers and editors, gave its approval to, and endorsement of, a program to print in many languages and dialects the classics of democracy that had inspired our forefathers and to distribute them in inexpensive paperback editions through local news and book stands in all the foreign lands. Too much credit cannot be given to the American publishers who were among the first sponsors of the program and after its acceptance by USIA aided in having the classics of democracy printed in translated editions on local presses by local publishers in many foreign lands and distributed to the news stalls and book dealers in the usual manner of distribution in each of the respective countries.

QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS PUBLIC INTEREST

Sixth. In 1957 I reported to the House the overwhelmingly favorable results of a poll which I had undertaken of representative leaders of opinion throughout the country, and following this USIA put renewed effort into the expansion of the program. In the questionnaire sent to 5,000 leaders in all activities I had requested suggestion as to which 10 books should be included in what might be termed "The bible of Democracy." The replies were so thoughtful, informative, illuminating, and reflective of such deep American thinking on this subject that I caused their insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1956, A488–A495; January 19, 1956, A581–A588; January 20, 1956, A602–A607; and January 23, 1956, A666–A676, with a complete index in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, 1956, A816–A820. I recommend the reading of these letters by my colleagues.

REBIRTH OF "THE FEDERALIST"

I have from time to time reported on the progress and uniform success of USIA in carrying on the program. On April 8, 1959, I made my annual progress report to the House, and again on September 21, 1960. In these progress reports I emphasized the fact that "The Federalist," of which there was not one foreign translation in print at the time of the now famous luncheon in Chicago, had experienced a literal rebirth as a result of the classics of democracy program, in which USIA and private publishers, including the Franklin Press, worked in close cooperation. "The Federalist" appeared in an Italian edition, and was the bestseller of the year in nonfiction; appeared in German and was acclaimed in all the reviews in German newspapers as something long needed as a guide to self-government; appeared in Arabic and was acclaimed by the Arabic world. It was printed in African languages and was in the hands of all the delegates to the Pan-African Conference at Accra in Ghana.

PRESENT STATE OF THE PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, my progress report this year will be confined to a statement furnished me on August 9, 1961, by Howard O. Hill of the Translations Branch of USIA, of the classics of American democracy that have been printed in foreign languages up to date, the sizes of the editions and the sales prices. I shall follow this with comments by three members of the Chicago committee, Dr. Fey, Dr. McKeon, and Mr. Stauffer. Mr. Hill's statement follows:

Classics of democracy

	Language	Edition size	Retail price
Adams, John: "The Political Writings of John Adams," editor, George A. Peek, Jr.	English	30,000	$0.15
Calhoun, John C.: "A Disquisition on Government." [1]	do	30,000	.10
Dewey, John:			
"The Public and Its Problems"	Spanish [2]	16,000	.82
"Freedom and Culture" [3]	Arabic	5,000	.75
	Chinese	2,000	3.00
	English (India)	4,000	
	French	2,000	1.54
	German	6,300	1.50
	Greek	7,000	
	Kannada	2,000	.42
	Korean (4 editions)	[4] 2,000	.57
	Malayalam	1,000	.47
	Marathi	2,500	.52
	Portuguese	5,475	.92
	Tamil	25,000	.10
	Urdu (India)	25,000	.10
	Urdu (Pakistan)	5,000	.42
	In process: Turkish.		
Emerson, Ralph Waldo: "Emerson's Essays."	Arabic	5,000	$0.90
	Telugu	1,000	.40
	Tamil	2,000	.21
	Kannada	1,000	.26
	Malayalam	2,000	.32
	Japanese (4 editions)	12,500	.92
"Basic Selections From Emerson," editor, E. Lindeman.	English	50,000	.10
	Malayalam	2,000	.32
	Greek	4,000	1.50
	Burmese	20,000	.10
	Korean	3,000	1.00
	Bengali	5,000	.32
"Selections From the Works of Emerson," editor Hans Hartmann.	German	5,000	2.33
"The Portable Emerson," editor Mark Van Doren.	Hindi	10,000	.31
	Chinese	6,000	.43
	Gujerati	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32

Footnotes at end of table.

Classics of democracy—Continued

	Language	Edition size	Retail price
"Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin," [3] Benjamin Franklin.	Serbo-Croatian and English.	12,000	$0.31
	Serbo-Croatian	3,000	1.20
	Hindi	8,000	.63
	Arabic	5,000	.25
	Chinese	4,000	2.00
	French	3,000	1.80
	Gujerati	5,000	.37
	Greek	7,000	.83
	Hebrew	5,000	------
	Malayalam	1,000	.37
	Portuguese	6,000	1.20
	Marathi	5,000	.37
	Indonesian	10,000	.32
	Kannada	2,000	.50
	Vietnamese	3,000	.37
	Telugu	3,000	.42
	Burmese	5,000	.31
	German	4,000	3.00
	Korean	5,000	1.20
	Urdu	5,000	.94
"George Washington," [3] Marcus Cunliffe	Japanese	17,000	------
	In process: Urdu. Bengali.		
Hamilton, Madison, and Jay: "The Federalist Papers."	English	30,000	.15
	Italian	3,000	2.56
	French	2,000	9.60
	Korean [2]	5,000	1.54
	Spanish [2]	4,000	------
	German	1,600	7.41
	Spanish	10,000	.87
	Portuguese [5]	1,500	1.10
	Vietnamese [5]	2,000	.35
	Assamese [5]	1,100	.73
	Bengali [5]	1,100	.73
	In process: Hindi.[6] Urdu.[7] Gujerati.[6] Marathi.[6]		
Hand, Learned: "The Spirit of Liberty"	Burmese	6,000	.42
	French	2,000	2.86
	German	6,500	6.19
	Greek	2,000	.67
	Singhalese	2,500	.21
	Telugu	1,000	.31
	Turkish	23,000	(4)
"The Bill of Rights" [3]	Japanese	2,000	.42
Hume, David: "David Hume's Political Essays, editor, Charles W. Hendel.	English	20,000	.10
Jefferson, Thomas: "Thomas Jefferson," editor, Gilbert Chinard.	Burmese	5,000	3.84
	French	1,500	1.71
	Spanish [8]	3,000	------
"Jefferson: Champion of the Free Mind," Phillips Russell.	Malay	5,000	.34
	Japanese	17,000	.28
	Farsi	2,000	.32
	Gujerati	2,000	.31
	Marathi [9]	2,000	.42
	Urdu [9]	5,000	.21
	German [9]	2,000	1.85
	Spanish [9]	5,000	2.20
"The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," Adrienne Koch and Wm. Peden.	Bengali	3,000	.26
	Gujerati	5,000	.32
	Hindi	5,000	.32
	Marathi	5,000	.32
"Jefferson—A Great American's Life and Ideas," Saul Padover.	Chinese	4,000	.32
	Greek	3,000	.83
	French	1,800	3.42
"Thomas Jefferson on Democracy," Saul Padover.	Burmese	5,000	.31
	Chinese	4,000	.52
	Japanese [9]	2,500	1.39
"Thomas Jefferson and American Democracy," [9] Max Berloff.	Italian	3,000	2.40
"Thomas Jefferson," [9] Gene Lisitsky	English (India)	10,000	.32
	Arabic	5,000	.30
	Bengali	3,000	.34
	Chinese	3,000	.32
	Gujerati	3,000	.16
	Hindi	10,000	.32
	Indonesian	10,000	.06
	Japanese	3,000	.47
	Korean	2,000	.40
	Marathi	3,000	.16
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Punjabi	3,000	.32
	Singhalese	2,500	.20
	Tamil	10,000	.05
	Telugu	10,000	.05
	Urdu	5,000	.32
	Indonesian (reprint) [6]	3,000	.06
"The Jefferson Heritage," [3] Dumas Malone.	Arabic	------	.34
"Thomas Jefferson," [3] Vincent Sheean	Bengali	2,000	.62
	Vietnamese	1,500	.45
	In process: Hindi. Malayalam. Marathi. Tamil. Telugu. Urdu.		
"Political Writings of Thomas Jefferson," editor, Edward Dumbauld.	English	30,000	$0.15
Lincoln, Abraham: "Lincoln Reader," editor Paul M. Angle.	Thai	2,500	2.00
"Abraham Lincoln," Lord Charnwood	Arabic	4,000	.84
	English	75,000	.10
	Japanese [2]	5,000	1.05
"Abraham Lincoln," [3] James Daugherty	Arabic	6,000	.56
	Burmese (3 editions): 1st	5,000	.42
	2d	5,000	.42
	3d	10,000	.42
"Abraham Lincoln," Emil Ludwig	Bengali	1,100	.52
	Chinese	6,000	.23
	Gujerati	2,500	.42
	Hindi	5,000	.42
	Japanese	3,000	.56
	Kannada	2,000	.32
	Malayalam	2,000	.26
	Marathi	2,500	.42
	Oriya	3,000	.32
	Persian	1,500	.32
	Sinhalese	2,500	.20
	Telugu	2,000	.42
	Turkish	4,000	.35
	Tamil	2,000	.63
	Portuguese [2]	100,000	.10
	Assamese [2]	1,100	.42
"Abraham Lincoln Speaks," [3] Abraham Lincoln (USIS).	Hindi	6,500	.57
	Urdu	5,000	.63
"Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War Years," Carl Sandburg.	Hebrew	3,000	1.25
	German	5,000	8.49
	Spanish	3,000	5.39
	Arabic [2]	6,000	1.55
	Portuguese [2]	5,000	5.40
"Abraham Lincoln," Benjamin P. Thomas.	Arabic	4,000	.29
	Chinese	3,000	1.15
	Greek	5,000	1.67
	Korean	6,000	2.00
	French	3,000	2.54
	Spanish	8,000	1.76
	Slovenian	2,500	1.66
	Japanese	1,500	[10] 1.94
	German	5,000	3.81
	Serbo-Croatian	2,500	1.13
	Portuguese [2]	5,000	------
	Turkish (2 volumes) [2]	[4] 12,000	[4] .56
	Korean (revised edition) [2]	3,000	1.15
Locke, John: "Second Treatise of Government," editor, Thomas P. Peardon.	English	25,000	.10
	Spanish [2]	25,000	1.05
Mill, John S.: "John S. Mill: Representative Government," editor, H. Penniman.	English	25,000	.10
	Arabic [2]	4,000	.70
"Essays on Liberty," editor, Shields	English	25,000	.10
	Arabic	4,600	.56
Paine, Thomas: "Selected Writings," editor, Nelson F. Adkins.	English	30,000	.15
	Bengali	25,000	.10
	Gujerati	25,000	.10
	Hindi	25,000	.10
	Japanese	25,000	.10
	Marathi	25,000	.10
	Tamil	25,000	.10
	Arabic [2]	10,000	.10
Thoreau, H. D.: "Walden or Life in the Woods."	Arabic	4,000	.75
	Chinese	8,000	.43
	Bengali	5,000	.32
	Portuguese	4,000	.68
	Telugu	5,000	.63
	Korean	5,000	1.20
	Greek	5,000	1.00
	Malayalam	1,000	.42
	Tamil	1,500	.42
	Spanish [2]	15,000	.33
	German [2]	3,000	3.05
"The Story of H. D. Thoreau," [3] Charles Norman.	Spanish	73,000	.11
	In process: Arabic.		
"Selected Writings," editor, Cargill	English	30,000	.10
	Japanese	25,000	.10
	Arabic [2]	10,000	------
	Spanish [2]	28,000	------
De Tocqueville, Alexis: "Democracy in America."	Indonesian [2]	5,000	1.33
	Italian	10,000	.48
	Hindi	25,000	.16
	Japanese	5,000	.33
	Spanish	3,000	5.20
	Burmese	10,000	.21
	Italian: Vol. I	2,000	3.84
	Vol. II	2,000	
Wilson, Woodrow W.: "The Wilson Reader," Frances Farmer.	English	25,000	.15
	French	2,000	2.35
	Chinese	5,750	.50
	Gujerati	2,000	.31
"The Story of Woodrow Wilson," David Loth.	Chinese	12,000	.25
	Tamil	1,500	.10
	Portuguese	6,000	.27
	Malayalam [2] (serialization).	17,000	.01

[1] India has expressed interest in possible Indian-language editions.
[2] Published since last report.
[3] Added title.
[4] Each.
[5] Published since last report. The Hindi edition of "The Spirit of Liberty" for technical and contractual reasons is no longer active. In addition, the contract for the Japanese edition of "Spirit of Liberty" was renegotiated substituting Judge Hand's "The Bill of Rights."
[6] No contract finalized as yet.
[7] Original publisher unable to produce satisfactory translation. New publisher being sought.
[8] Free distribution.
[9] Published since last report for contractual reasons, the German edition of "Thomas Jefferson on Democracy" is no longer active. In addition, the Portuguese, Persian, Thai, Malayalam, and Kannada editions of the Lisitsky title are no longer active for technical and/or contractual reasons.
[10] Per set (vols. 1 and 2).

ITALIAN

PUBLIC LAW 480 BOOK PROGRAMS, CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY AND RELATED MATERIALS

I. Titles published

1. "An Anthology From the Writings of French Ideologues."
2. "An Anthology From Kant's Political Writings."
3. Joseph L. Blau, "The Age of Jackson."
4. Baron Charles de Montesquieu, "Selected Works."
5. Guiseppe Mazzini, "Selected Works."
6. Alexis de Tocqueville, "Selected Works."

II. Titles in process

1. Alexander Hamilton, "Selected Works."
2. Wilhelm von Humboldt, "On the Limits of Government."
3. Carlo Cattanso and Italian liberals, "Selected Works."
4. British liberal thought of the 19th century, "An Anthology."
5. David Hume, "Political Writings."
6. John Locke, "The Second Treaty and First Letter on Tolerance."
7. "English Political Thought From 1600 to Burke."
8. "An Anthology of Italian Liberalism."
9. "Liberalism in the Age of W. Wilson."
10. Benjamin Constant, "Selected Political Writings."
11. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Moral and Political Essays."
12. Abraham Lincoln, "Selected Writings."
13. F. D. Roosevelt, "Selected Works."
14. Thomas Jefferson, "Selected Works."

FRENCH

PUBLIC LAW 480 BOOKS PROGRAMS, CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY AND RELATED MATERIALS

I. Titles published

1. James M. Burns, "John F. Kennedy."
2. Nye and Morpurgo, "A History of the United States."
3. John Brown, "Hemingway."
4. Mario Einaudi, "The Roosevelt Revolution."
5. Max Lerner, "America as a Civilization."

II. Titles in process

1. Marcus Cunliffe, "Literature of the United States."
2. Alfred Owen Aldridge, "Franklin and His French Contemporaries."
3. Leonard Reissman, "Class in American Society."
4. Ferdinand Stone, "Main Institutions of American Law."
5. Henry Steele Commager, "The American Mind."
6. Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Frontier in American History."
7. Morton White, "Social Thought in America."
8. John I. H. Baur, "New Art in America."
9. W. W. Rostow, "Stages of Economic Growth."
10. Robert Bowie and Carl J. Friedrick, "Etudes sur le Federalisme."

DR. M'KEON LOOKS TO FUTURE

Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, State Department visitor to foreign universities, and one of the fathers of the program, writes:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have been going over the latest report of the publication of "Classics of Democracy." Mr. Thomas B. Stauffer has made the report available to the members of the citizens committee of your district which you have associated with you in your long and effective effort to get the "Classics of Democracy" translated and distributed. I am writing to you now to express my enthusiasm with the progress that has been made. Naturally, however, I think that I can serve my function as a committee member best if I add to such an expression of enthusiasm a few words of criticism and some indications of next steps that might be taken.

The reason for my enthusiasm is that the "Classics" begin to emerge clearly in this year's report. My interest in the program began during my travels abroad after the end of World War II. Both in the countries liberated from fascism and nazism and in the newly emergent states, there was little understanding of the principles or processes of democracy. The classics of Communist "democracy" were easily available, but similar fundamental and detailed statements of the principles and problems of democracy were hard to come by. This was true not only in Latin America and south Asia but even on the continent of Europe. Popular biographies of the fathers of the American Constitution or constructions of the image of the American way of life were no substitute for this purpose, though they might have an important place in an information program. My hope was that we might make "The Federalist" papers (and a dozen other works) available in all the major languages of the world so that they might be studied in the schools and read by curious educated laymen. I believe that we are beginning to achieve that end, and the effects of the program that I have observed in India and in the Arab States go far beyond what I had hoped for. An English paperback edition of "The Federalist" was widely displayed in the bookstores, and the Arabic translation received wide, intelligent, and favorable attention.

The importance of the program is political and social as well as educational and theoretic. It is relevant to the large problems of world order today as its mention in the report on the Mutual Security Act indicates, and the principles and issues the classics discuss are clearly related to your own programs on the Subcommittee on African Affairs and the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. I served as a consultant, earlier this year, in the preparation of the report of the Organization of American States on "Latin American Higher Education and Inter-American Cooperation," and I was struck by the fashion in which questions of economic aid were at each point related to cultural, moral, and political considerations. The Report has one section devoted to "The Formation of Persons Capable of Cultural Leadership," in which the statement is made:

"The universities, nevertheless, cannot be limited solely to serving the social requirements of the communities in which they function. Their obligations go beyond the needs for service in this restricted sense. If the institutions of higher learning were restricted to the service of social and economic needs, asy they appear, they would lack the necessary vigor to direct the course of society. Social and economic development is not neutral from the ethical point of view; it entails a series of problems of all kinds. To anticipate these problems, to contribute to directing social change along the desired lines, to build knowledge on a foundation of moral responsibility—these are the irrefutable taks of the universities" (pp. 3–4, of the report, Washington, June 1961).

Jefferson, Adams, and Madison are suggestive guides in the intricacies of these questions, and they provide the rest of the world and us insights, which tend otherwise to be neglected, into the problems of international diplomacy and cooperation as well as into the problems of a democratic society.

I turn now to the critical and prospective vein. Let me say, first, that I realize that the classics are not the whole or even the central concern of the USIA. I speak only of what should be done in a very small portion of the program of the Agency. My reflections are not concerned with the program as a whole; if they were I should add paragraphs of enthusiasm (and criticism) concerning activities which are not here mentioned.

Within the original program of the "Classics of Democracy," we have made progress, particularly in the case of "The Federalist." (1) The list of languages into which it has been translated is still short; the translations into some languages which were announced years ago are still in process; many languages could be added. Moreover some of the translations are of selections; they are useful if well made, but the whole "Federalist" should also be available. (2) We have not made as much progress on some of the other classics. I recommend that one or two be chosen, and pushed in like fashion. My candidates would be Locke, Mill (who have appeared only in English and in one translation), and Montesquieu (who is mentioned only in the Italian program). (3) We ought to get some translations of Americans who contributed to the formation of the Constitution. My candidates would be the "Political Writings of Adams," and the "Political Writings of Jefferson" (which have appeared only in English). We have made a beginning of translation of Paine and Thoreau, and we should go further.

This first paragraph requires a footnote. Among the books published are some from "The American Heritage Series," published in the United States by the Liberal Arts Press. These include Peeks' edition of John Adams, Post's Calhoun (?), Gabriel's Federalist (?), Hendel's Hume, Dumbauld's Jefferson, Adkins' Paine, Cargill's Thoreau. I have used some of these editions in my courses in the United States and in India. They are attractively priced abroad: the American edition of Adams is $1, the foreign edition is 15 cents. I used these editions in my courses at the University of Baroda in India, and I saw them in bookstores through the Near East and south Asia. These editions of Adams, Jefferson, Paine, and Thoreau might be translated into other languages.

If the time has come for further extensions of the program, I have two additions to recommend. (1) We might add books that will clarify the problems treated in the classics. I have in mind three kinds of works: (a) a good working commentary on the Constitution; (b) collections of materials bearing on the Constitution, such as W. U. Solberg's collection "The Federal Convention and the Formation of the Union of the American States," which contains almost 300 pages of "Madison's Notes on the Constitutional Convention" (it is published in the American Heritage series for $1.75 in the United States); (c) histories dealing with the problems of the period, such as Felix Gilbert's "To the Farewell Address: Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy" (published 1961) in which our neighbors in the world will find many problems similar to their problems today. (2) The second extension would move from the field of political classics to literary classics. We might draw up another list to make more easily available to other peoples one branch of American cultural activities.

I make these suggestions because it seems to me that the program is going so well that its effectiveness and scope might be extended, and no one could do this as well as the man who brought the program into existence and saw it so far along its way. Let me congratulate you again on the "Classics of Democracy," which is a superb statesmanlike achievement. If I can be of any help in the further steps of the program, please count on my cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD P. MCKEON.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS BY DR. FEY

Dr. Harold E. Fey, editor of the Christian Century, a participant in the Chicago luncheon and member of the

Chicago committee on the classics of democracy, comments on the USIA report, and makes suggestions on the future development of the program in the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The latest report of the publication program of the U.S. Information Service concerning "Classics of Democracy" is an exciting, even if a very incomplete document. The report has come to my attention from Thomas B. Stauffer who has made it available to members of the citizens committee of your district.

It makes us proud to be associated with you in this prolonged enterprise of translating and distributing some of the classics of democracy. I congratulate you and the U.S. Information Agency on the notable progress you have made in this enterprise. I hope this is only a beginning and that the effort will expand in numbers of languages and countries to be reached and in the content of the material which is translated and distributed.

First let me make a few suggestions concerning the reporting of this enterprise. It would be much more effective if the report were more elaborate and were standardized so that year-by-year comparisons could be made. The reader needs to know how many copies have been distributed as well as how many have been published, and what the totals are of the number of languages, numbers of copies published, number of copies distributed, and geographical areas of distribution.

One impression gained by reading this list is the comparative neglect of the people speaking the native languages of Africa. Some of these at least have been reduced to written form. I suggest that a conference be held between persons in the USIA who are responsible for this program and officials of the American Bible Society, 450 Park Avenue, New York 22, in order to secure help on the technical problems involved in translating these languages. Please understand my suggestion involves only technical problems and is not intended in any way to influence the content of the USIA program. The Bible has been translated into more than a thousand languages and its distribution until recent years exceeded the distribution of Marxist publications.

In addition to urging the extension of the present program of translating and distributing the "Classics of Democracy," I would urge the widening of the list to include standard books on the workings of democracy. For example, the book by Prof. Zachariah Chaffee of Harvard on civil liberities in the United States would make a useful adjunct. Books on the operation of municipal and State governments and the problems of decentralized support of public education, welfare, and health would be useful.

I agree with Professor McKeon that an extension could be made in the field of literary classics. Please understand that these suggestions for the improvement of the program are based on great admiration for what has been already accomplished and a desire that this program be extended and improved.

I should think that the program could be promoted through the broadcasting and other public activities of the USIA. I would suggest that the organization contact the television networks of this country with a view to making the "Classics of Democracy" enterprise the subject of a nationwide public affairs television show or series of shows.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. FEY, *Editor.*

MR. STAUFFER'S ANALYSIS OF REPORT

Thomas B. Stauffer, member of the faculty of Wilson Junior College, formerly with State Department in the foreign field, host at the Chicago luncheon, and member and executive secretary of the Chicago Committee on the Classics of Democracy, gives high praise to the achievement of USIA in developing the program but comments at some length, mostly in terms of praise, at times critical, with the underlying purpose of contribution to the development of the program to the full realization of the dream. His letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In general the USIA report is excellent and shows much active work and much achievement which we can only commend. Perhaps it is due to the concise form of the report, but I feel that the idea of the classics program, as distinct from the general long-term publishing program of USIA, emerges more clearly this year than in earlier USIA reports.

As I said in earlier letters, I think the background and intent of the classics program have been very fully developed in your former statements in the House, in 1959 and 1960, and need not be reviewed. Ample justice has also been done to the various persons who have helped in the early development of the classics idea.

Perhaps, therefore, especially in view of the recognition of the classics program in the report on the Mutual Security Act, any general comments this year should look to the future.

We must not forget that our ultimate original conception included other things besides the international political classics which are the background and the intellectual tools, so to speak, of our democracy. We had intended to advocate a series of American literary classics, and a set of documentary and historical works, including such materials as a good constitutional commentary like Corwin; to what extent USIA is meeting this intent does not appear in the present report about the political classics.

Although the classics program now seems more distinct in relation to the overall program of USIA, this report does not give the whole picture of classics publishing. Last year you will recall one of the important items of your statement was the great success of the Franklin Publications edition of "The Federalist" in Arabic. This year's report lists 15 USIA editions of "The Federalist," but there is no reference to the Arabic edition from Franklin, or any other editions of classics from sources other than USIA. Thus there are certainly 16 editions of "The Federalist" in use overseas, not just the 15 listed from USIA, and the 16th is a very important one. We do not learn from USIA, and I do not know, what else may be going on in the publishing of the classics, besides the work of USIA. It is true that we turned to USIA in the first place, because there had not been enough done by ordinary commercial processes over the years. But I wish we had a total scoreboard—a list of titles, a cross list of languages, and then maybe checkmarks of different kinds to show USIA editions in hardcover, or paperback, or by price; Franklin or other American sponsored editions; native editions, and so on. The idea is to know that the books are available to the readers, not necessarily to have the American taxpayer pay for them. What, for instance, has been added to available books, by Ambassador Zellerbach's group in Italy, which first published the Italian "Federalist"?

There is another difficulty in interpreting the present concise report: in former years the progress reports included a large body of material on the reception of the published classics, in the various countries abroad. This material included reports of actual sales, and reviews, and comments by leaders in the several countries. None of this material is included in the present report, though USIA may have it available in Washington.

I think, however, that we may assume from the present report that the books continue to be well received, from the fact that a good number of them have been reprinted, and that USIA has evidently stepped up their production both in size of editions and number of titles. There is in fact a notable advance in the latter two respects, and the achievement of USIA begins to approximate our intent of saturation publication of cheap translations. (See "Franklin's Autobiography" in the report.)

The present report has not distinguished in some cases between complete texts and excerpts or selections; in regard to "The Federalist" for instance, I know that the German text is a full one, the Vietnamese a booklet of excerpts. Since two Spanish editions of "The Federalist" are listed, one of 4,000 copies, one of 10,000; perhaps one is a full text, one selections, which I know we published in Argentina; or is this a confusion of two printings?

A general difficulty which concerns me is that USIA seems to have no plan for systematic cross-distribution of books, where there is more than one country in a language area. For instance, if someone in Chile wanted the excellent de Tocqueville published in Mexico, he would have to order it individually, since USIA seems not to provide for its distribution throughout the Spanish-speaking world. So, too, I would think that some way would be found to insure that French editions would be as easily available in Madagascar, Vietnam, and Syria, as in France, even at some additional cost to USIA.

Further, when texts are listed in English, it is not discernible where they have been published or sold; I believe from other correspondence with USIA that these are mainly paperbacks sold in India.

There have been some editorial mistakes; for instance—the French Federalist was reprinted from the excellent, but out-of-print 1911 edition; that edition included a text of the Constitution as of 1911, which was reprinted without the addition of the subsequent amendments to date.

Several of the texts approved by your broad survey of American leaders, in 1956, such as Humboldt and Mazzini, are now for the first time appearing in the USIA reports, and no action at all is reported on some of the titles, e.g., Burke and Bryce. On the other hand, USIA has made good use of some titles not on our original list, such as Adams and Calhoun; and our basic list was by no means exhaustive or exclusive.

It is curious, too, that Mazzini is reprinted only in Italy, the one place where he would be most familiar anyway. This is shown in the separate report at the end of the USIA presentation, on operations in France and Italy under Public Law 480: I am not familiar with the provisions of this law but the lists of books are very good indeed, though going beyond the classics in contemporary materials.

The publication of books of high intellectual order of Rostow's "Stages of Economic Growth" not only contributes to the intellectual development of the recipient countries, and the sophistication of their economic thought, but reflects great credit on the United States as the original home, and now the sponsor abroad, of such meritorious works. It is by no means likely or necessary that these newer works should enjoy the universal interest and approval which we found attached to the classics, nor is it necessary that this should be the case, in order for serious works on important current themes to be desirable additions to the overall USIA publishing program.

You will recall however, that your original statement on the classics made the point that these historic works were by men beyond the reach of present controversy or the

suspicion of being aimed at present international tensions; Judge Learned Hand was the only living author on our original proposed list.

I personally still feel that USIA has taken books about, or biographical material, or juvenile editions too easily as meeting the intent of the classics plan, to provide texts for adults. There is difficulty, of course, in that men like Washington and Lincoln did not leave bodies of formal writing on theory, like "The Federalist"; and I note that USIA now has, besides an abundance of good adult lives of Lincoln, a Lincoln reader (and of course, lives and juveniles do have their proper place in the overall USIA program).

One more general comment; at several places in the report USIA mentions difficulties on the part of local publishers in getting adequate translations of classics texts. May I mention that I, though I know no Arabic at all, once had to develop a method for translating some very delicate materials about the international labor movement, into that language. What I did was to take the texts to several translators, independently, explaining what I thought were the nuances in English, and asking each of them for an Arabic version. I then had these various Arabic readings put together by a U.S. Government native employee; then had the whole checked by a very intelligent Arab, for general literacy, quality, and accuracy; and then had that whole reviewed by a sympathetic trade-unionist, to be sure that we had caught the special idioms of the trade unions. This revised text was then published with considerable success.

I see no reason why USIA could not produce good translations by this method. Note that some of the most successful classics editions such as the German, Italian, and Arabic Federalist, are not by commercial translators, or publisher's employees, but are by distinguished leaders of the several countries—a diplomat, a professor, a jurist, who know not only the two languages, but the subject matter as well.

I now proceed to remark on the individual titles cited by USIA: It would be good in each case to know about the editorial apparatus, introduction, and so forth.

Adams: Not on our original list, but an excellent addition. I believe these English paperbacks were mainly sold in India.

Dewey: "The Public and Its Problems": Glad to see this somewhat neglected work, his most fundamentally and directly political one, get started. "Freedom and Culture" is a good additional title.

Emerson: Do the four Japanese editions total 12,500 thousand, or is each printing that big?

Franklin: This with the Emerson, shows the beginnings of the kind of language coverage, volume, and price at which the program should take aim.

Federalist: As noted in this listing does not distinguish between complete and abridged editions, and does not mention the important Arabic edition by Franklin Publications. The full texts have apparently not appeared in cheap editions. The Hindi, Marathi, and Gujerati editions are old friends; the first letter ever from USIA, in reply to my inquiry through you in 1954 about the classics, listed these, as I recall, as published; they have since come and gone in USIA reports, as published or pending, and here they are again, pending. Burmese visitors here have expressed the hope that there would be a Burmese edition. A reputable Turkish publisher has expressed interest in doing an edition, but has heard nothing from USIA.

HAND: A leading Greek intellectual and poet has praised the quality of the Greek translation of the "Spirit of Liberty." The Bill of Rights, though a more technically juristic work, is an excellent addition:

Jefferson: All that has been done is good, but there might be more action on the texts that with biographical material; the new countries can use Jefferson's ideas, but cannot live his life. The Lisitsky "Life" is good, but a juvenile, according to its U.S. publishers. It is a pity that so many editions of any USIA book should become inactive. With so many Jefferson titles, either there is a very subtle adaptation to local markets, or a great deal of energy has been spent in copyright negotiations rather than translating and publishing.

Lincoln: I welcome the addition of a volume of texts to the abundant biographical material. The use of Charnwood's "Lincoln" is a good idea, not only for its very high merit as literature, but because, written by a non-American for non-Americans, it explains a good deal of important background that an American might take for granted. Further, this tribute to our great President by an Englishman may be more convincing abroad than the same tribute from an American. Note the good prices on the various editions of the Ludwig "Lincoln."

Locke: Note that the "Letters on Toleration" is also included, under the Public Law 480 program in Italy.

Wilson: In my personal opinion, the books cited are not a very good presentation of Wilson.

I have commented above, that very little has been done with some of the texts on our basic list, though many fine titles have been added. And, as I said, though there is great progress in language spread, volume, and price, much remains to be done.

But all in all, this is a very excellent and commendable achievement by USIA. I would not be so minutely critical as I have been, if I thought the effort would be wasted. Here, there is much more to praise than to question and I think you can go before the House and the public with every confidence that they will join with you in praise of the very real accomplishments of USIA in this matter.

I trust that you continue to feel the same satisfaction and pride as the congressional sponsor of the classics program, that are felt by the committee of your friends here who have had the honor of working with you on the "Classics of Democracy."

Yours ever,

THOMAS B. STAUFFER.

A Vital Machine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned over the situation in which our railroad industry finds itself at the present time. With storm clouds gathering on the international horizon, our Nation's railroads are daily assuming an ever greater importance.

The Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, recently testified before the Interstate Commerce Commission on this problem, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the following editorial from the Elmira Telegram, published at Elmira, N.Y., on September 17, 1961, having reference to the Governor's timely proposals:

A VITAL MACHINE

Governor Rockefeller, whose efforts helped to save railroads from financial disaster, is at work on a new project. He has urged at Washington that a broad Federal program of aid be instituted, with the repeal of the 10 percent tax on passenger fares as the starting point.

The Governor is talking in terms of big money. The repeal of the tax, it is estimated, would be a $200 million boost to hard-pressed carriers.

Nothing in the American transportation scheme can take the place of railroads. If we can keep them—preferably operating as private corporations and not the playthings of a groping bureaucracy—we keep in operation a machine vital to peace and of incredible worth in war. If we can't we give our enemies a weapon of unimaginable power.

BILLS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on the following dates that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 27, 1961:

H.R. 84. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8320. An act to amend the Freeport Harbor project, Texas;

H.R. 8876. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers;

H.R. 9033. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9053. An act to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the periods for which loans under that title are made;

H.R. 9076. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9169. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

On September 28, 1961:

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3575. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Dania Reservation in Florida.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker pro tempore by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, 87th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 27, 1961:

H.R. 84. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian and other lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8320. An act to amend the Freeport Harbor project, Texas;

H.R. 8876. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers;

H.R. 9033. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9053. An act to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the periods for which loans under that title are made;

H.R. 9076. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9169. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

On September 28, 1961:

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota; and

H.R. 3575. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Dania Reservation in Florida.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker pro tempore by Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, 87th Congress, he did on September 28, 1961, sign an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1292. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1918, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution fixing the beginning of the 2d regular session of the 87th Congress.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On September 26, 1961:

H.R. 4317. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4998. An act to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7377. An act to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to provide certain additional research and development positions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8099. An act to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the General Supply Fund; and

H.R. 8444. An act to amend the act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia.

On September 28, 1961:

H.R. 84. An act to establish the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3575. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Dania Reservation in Florida;

H.R. 6775. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize ocean common carriers and conferences thereof serving the foreign commerce of the United States to enter into effective and fair dual-rate contracts with shippers and consignees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8320. An act to amend the Freeport Harbor project, Texas;

H.R. 8876. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers;

H.R. 9033. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9053. An act to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the periods for which loans under that title are made;

H.R. 9076. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9169. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 22, 1961:

H.R. 2655. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pamela Gough Walker;

H.R. 3863. An act for the relief of Woody W. Hackney, of Fort Worth, Tex.;

H.R. 4458. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work he determines to be required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho;

H.R. 7035. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7500. An act to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower;

H.R. 7916. An act to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 8406. An act to further amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, as amended, in order to change the name of the office established under such plan, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9030. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act;

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December 1961 as "Wright Brothers Day"; and

H.J. Res. 499. Joint resolution authorizing a celebration of the American patent system.

On September 26, 1961:

H.R. 115. An act for the allocation of costs on the Wapato-Satus unit of the Wapato Indian irrigation project;

H.R. 1325. An act for the relief of Mrs. Seto Yiu Kwei;

H.R. 1333. An act for the relief of A. N. Deringer, Inc.;

H.R. 1369. An act for the relief of Zsuzsanna Reisz;

H.R. 1378. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an exchange of certain land in Madera County, Calif., with Mary Saunders Moses;

H.R. 1394. An act for the relief of Laszlo Hamori;

H.R. 1399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan;

H.R. 1422. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agavni Yazicioglu;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of EN/2 Hideo Chuman, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 1496. An act for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Jeanine Ruth Tabacnik;

H.R. 1550. An act for the relief of Jesus Garza Lopez;

H.R. 1551. An act for the relief of Kim-Ok Yun;

H.R. 1569. An act for the relief of Isei Sakioka;

H.R. 1581. An act for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco;

H.R. 1583. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao;

H.R. 1614. An act for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis;

H.R. 1630. An act for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Joan Josephine Smith;

H.R. 1714. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. Katsaros;

H.R. 1898. An act for the relief of Isabel Brown;

H.R. 1901. An act for the relief of Georgia J. Makris;

H.R. 2136. An act for the relief of Hajime Misaka;

H.R. 2145. An act for the relief of Joginder Singh Toor;

H.R. 2179. An act for the relief of Essie V. Johnson;

H.R. 2280. An act to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range;

H.R. 2281. An act to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2282. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2283. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2308. An act to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, with respect to its applicability to certain vessels;

H.R. 2334. An act for the relief of Washington George Brodber Bryan;

H.R. 2555. An act to authorize pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations, to consolidate the laws governing allotment and assignment of pay by such employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2585. An act relating to the credits against the employment tax in the case of certain successor employers and to provide an election for past taxable years with respect to the determination of gross income from mining in the case of quartzite and clay used in the production of refractory products;

H.R. 2615. An act for the relief of Dr. Victor Wang Ta Ng and his wife, Alice Siu Har Ng;

H.R. 2666. An act for the relief of Adelina Benedict (nee Rosasco);

H.R. 2822. An act for the relief of Gregoire A. Kublin;

H.R. 3007. An act for the relief of Alberto Luciano (Rocchi) Rosasco;

H.R. 3133. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria A. Schmoldt;

H.R. 3393. An act for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos;

H.R. 3404. An act for the relief of Elemer Christian Sarkozy;

H.R. 3718. An act for the relief of Matthias Nock, Jr.;

H.R. 3920. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

H.R. 4028. An act for the relief of Lennon May;

H.R. 4221. An act for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz;

H.R. 4384. An act for the relief of Richard Fordham;

H.R. 4484. An act for the relief of Miss Liu Lai Ching;

H.R. 4499. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Ruda Daniel;

H.R. 4553. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba;

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of Compton Jones and Hulbert Jones;

H.R. 5138. An act for the relief of Francisco Joaquim Alves;

H.R. 5141. An act for the relief of Vito Recchia;

H.R. 5334. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Sullivan;

H.R. 5486. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication;

H.R. 5613. An act for the relief of Fernando Manni;

H.R. 5735. An act for the relief of Steven Mark Hallinan;

H.R. 6007. An act to amend section 505(d) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to certain positions in the General Accounting Office;

H.R. 6141. An act to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and operation of such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6158. An act for the relief of Adolphe C. Verheyn;

H.R. 6193. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyo.;

H.R. 6494. An act to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nevada, for defense purposes;

H.R. 6729. An act to provide for the disposal of certain lands held for inclusion in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N.C., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7057. An act relating to the determination of gross income from the property for taxable years prior to 1961 in the case of certain clays and shale which were used in the manufacture of certain clay products;

H.R. 7358. An act to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment;

H.R. 7576. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Gonzalez Fernandez Long;

H.R. 8236. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation;

H.R. 8302. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8341. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study covering the causes and prevention of injuries, health hazards, and other health and safety conditions in metal and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines);

H.R. 8414. An act to amend section 5011 of title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Veterans' Administration to use its revolving supply fund for the repair and reclamation of personal property;

H.R. 8490. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended;

H.R. 8678. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway and other highways on the Pentagon road network to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8762. An act to amend the Small Business Act;

H.R. 9080. An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore, & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate branch sidings over First Street Southwest in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9118. An act to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the third week in March as National Poison Prevention Week, in order to aid in bringing to the American people the dangers of accidental poisoning; and

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution providing for printing of "Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives."

E

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
OCT 16 1961
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1961 *No. 173*

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress will be published not later than Tuesday, October 17, 1961. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Legislative Review of Activities During 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this has not been an ordinary session of Congress, if indeed there is such a thing. It was marked by a change of administration in the White House, and by a change of leadership in the Senate. It began in a period of economic recession and adjourned in a time of international crisis.

Nevertheless, the agenda of this Congress was, in many respects, familiar. Several of the major bills it considered and adopted had been offered before, but had failed of ultimate adoption. Area redevelopment; minimum wage; omnibus housing; major amendments to our farm programs; long-term commitments to our foreign-aid program; these are distinguished parts of a substantial legislative record, at last written into law.

Great credit is due to the sponsors and managers of these bills, for their determination to see them enacted after long years of frustration. Great credit must also be paid to the new administration, for the intelligence and vigor with which it presented its program to the Congress. It is not too much to say that our efforts for a progressive legislative program in Congress would have been frequently unavailing without the concern and counsel of the Executive.

The accomplishments of this session are a testimonial to the good sense and vitality of the American system. Divided on election day, partisan on the stump, diverse in our interests, we can still meet in the National Legislature to do the country's business, without the enduring rancors that have plagued many nations of the world.

The Democratic Party, commanding majorities in both Houses, must take the major responsibility for the achievements, the postponements, and the shortcomings of this session. But in reality neither success nor failures are the property of one party. They are the property of each man and woman who serves the people in Congress, and ultimately of the people themselves, who have entrusted us with the management of their public business.

What follows is an accounting of that trust during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

ECONOMIC AREA—AGRICULTURE

Omnibus farm bill: Enacted a major farm bill to reduce wheat and feed grain surpluses; authorized Secretary to consult with farmers, farm organizations, and other groups to develop new farm programs; extended the Agricultural Trade and Development Act to December 31, 1964; consolidated and modernized the Farmers Home Administration; extended the Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1965; extended Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971; authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program to be paid by direct appropriations; and extended the Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds—Public Law 87–128.

Feed grains: Authorized a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 crop of corn at $1.20 a bushel with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, in an effort to raise the incomes of feed-grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands—Public Law 87–5.

Drought relief: Enacted a temporary 1-year program authorizing the sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price-support levels and permitting grazing of livestock on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs or moving hay on these lands in or near drought areas—Public Law 87–127.

Farm loans: Increased proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with debt over $10,000 from 10 percent to 25 percent to help meet the rapid and increased cost of farming—Public Law 87–8.

Mexican farm labor: Extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to December 31, 1963; prohibited infringement upon the rights of domestic workers—Public Law 87–345.

Cotton farmers' relief: Authorized emergency relief to cotton farmers where floods have made it impossible to plant—Public Law 87–37.

Farm credit: Liberalized farm credit laws to: permit installment payments on Federal land bank loans to be scheduled more frequently than semiannually if desirable to the borrower; permit Federal land bank loans to be made to corporations set up by farming families—now restricted to persons—extend from

5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate-term loans; require in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to the accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans—Public Law 87–343.

GENERAL ECONOMY

Federal unemployment compensation: Authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks—in an effort to ease the unemployment problem throughout the country—Public Law 87–62.

Aid to dependent children: Authorized a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962 of aid-to-dependent children, permitting States to aid needy unemployed parents and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates; and increased by $3 the minimum amount to which the Federal Government will participate on a matching basis in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision for recipients of old-age assistance—Public Law 87–31.

Railroad unemployment compensation: Approved benefits of a similar nature for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act—Public Law 87–7.

Railroad retirees: To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act permits men without 30 years service to receive reduced annuities upon reaching age 62; and reduced from 3 to 1 year the required time which must elapse after marriage before a wife or husband, otherwise qualified, may receive the annuity—Public Law 87–285.

Minimum wage: Increased minimum wage to $1.25 (from $1) and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers—Public Law 87–30.

Area redevelopment: Established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas—Public Law 87–27.

Social security: Increased minimum old-age insurance benefits and benefits to widows under the Social Security Act; provided reduced benefits to men at 62; liberalized disability provisions; increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent; increased (for 1 year) the amount of public assistance payments for old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled—Public Law 87–64.

Manpower Training Act of 1961: Authorizes a 4-year, $655 million manpower training program to help alleviate the unemployment problems by enabling workers whose skills are obsolete to receive training which will qualify them to obtain and hold jobs, with priority to unemployed persons including those in farm families with a net income of less than $1,200 a year—S. 1991.

Housing Act of 1961: Enacted a housing program, authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds. The act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of low-interest rate, 35-year mortgage loans for middle-income housing (except in hardship cases the mortgages may be extended to 40 years); requires a 3-percent downpayment on low-income housing, with a permissive inclusion of settlement costs; authorizes $75 million for mass transportation systems, and $50 million for "open space" grants; and includes a reauthorization of approximately 100,000 public housing units—Public Law 87–70.

FHA: Increased by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA—Public Law 87–38.

Veterans' home loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967; and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967—Public Law 87–84.

Federal Aid Highway Act: Enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, revising the original estimated authorization for 41,000-mile, 13-year program of interstate highways by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 billion to $37 billion; extended for 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls—Public Law 87–61.

Federal Airport Act extension: Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964, and authorized a total appropriation of $225 million, or $75 million annually—Public Law 87–255.

Small business loans: Increased by $20 million the amount that the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular business loan program, which will enable SBA to continue its loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month—Public Law 87–198.

Small business amendments: Increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million which, in addition to the $20 million approved in Public Law 87–198, increases the total SBA revolving fund to $1,125 million—Public Law 87–305.

Small Business Investment Act: Increased limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latters' investments in individual enterprises—Public Law 87–341.

ICC loans: Extended for 27 months (to June 30, 1963) authority of Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to help ease the credit difficulties of railroads—Public Law 87–16.

Small towns and rural counties: Established a 20-member bipartisan Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties to study and investigate Federal policies and programs relating to the economic needs and problems of these areas. (S. 1869.)

Water pollution control: Authorized an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants to control water pollution, thus raising the annual limit on grants from $50 million yearly to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, $100 million for fiscal 1964, through and including 1967. In addition, this measure increased from $3 to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States to administer water pollution control programs and extended the program through June 30, 1968, and authorized $5 million a year for the Secretary to use to develop demonstration program to treat sewage, to measure pollutants, and to evaluate the effects of sewage treatment—Public Law 87–88.

Debt limit: Increased the public debt limit by $13 billion to $298 billion through June 30, 1962—Public Law 87–69.

Lead-zinc subsidy: Aided the domestic lead-zinc industry by authorizing a 4-year program of stabilization payments for small mineowners—75 percent for lead and 55 percent for zinc of the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price whenever the market falls below 14½ cents—Public Law 87–347.

Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska: Authorized construction of the mid-State reclamation project in Nebraska and provided for its inclusion in the Missouri River Basin project. Estimated cost is $81,467,000, repayable within the 40-year contract period. (S. 970.)

San Juan-Chama: Authorized $221 million in appropriation to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan-Chama project, to irrigate land and help stabilize the economy of the water deficient Rio Grande and Canadian Basins. (S. 107.)

Illinois River: Authorized a $58 million project to improve and deepen the channel of the Kaskaskia River in Illinois to enable coal producers to transport coal by barges at reduced rates to permit competitive market pricing. (S. 520.)

TRADE AND COMMUNICATIONS ECONOMY

Foreign trade: Expands Commerce Department services to importers and exporters and accelerates programs to promote foreign trade. (S. 1729.)

Ship trade-ins: Liberalized the law regarding obsolete trade-ins by authorizing the Federal Maritime Commission to take trade-ins either when the owner signs the contract for construction or purchase of a new vessel or—at the owner's option—within 5 days of the delivery date of the new vessel. (S. 1728—Public Law 87—.)

Dual-rate shipping: Permanently legalized the operation of steamship conferences and dual systems of contracts for shippers and strengthened the antimonopoly provisions—Public Law 87–34.

Steamship operators: Authorized steamship operators under subsidy contracts to use part of their required reserve for research and planning—Public Law 87–271.

Broadcasting: Liberalized antitrust law to validate certain contracts for television broadcasting of professional sports games—Public Law 87–331.

Civil antitrust investigations: Authorized the Attorney General to compel the

production of documents required as evidence in civil antitrust investigations—S. 167.

Duty-free allowance: Reduced the duty-free exemption from $500 to $100 through June 30, 1963, to counter our unfavorable balance of payments—Public Law 87–132.

AEC sales: Accelerated property sales to stimulate the economic growth of atomic energy communities—Public Law 87–174.

Metal scrap: Extended to June 30, 1962, the existing suspension of import duties on metal scrap—Public Law 87–110.

Corporate excise extension: Extended for an additional year the existing 52 percent corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation, thus preventing a loss of revenue of some $2.5 billion—Public Law 87–72.

Clay and shale—tax treatment: Permits miners of clay and shale to include as a depletion allowance the process of manufacturing brick and tile—Public Law 87–312.

Income-tax returns: Curbed tax evasion by assigning identifying numbers to all taxpayers—Public Law 87–397.

Unemployment tax credits: Prevented double taxation in the case of Federal and State unemployment taxes arising as a result of a technical deficiency in the Federal tax law—Public Law 87–321.

Federal savings and loan: Strengthened the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the National Housing Act by increasing the reserves and cutting the overcapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation created as a reserve credit facility for savings and home mortgage credit institutions—Public Law 87–210.

VETERANS' AID

Disabled veterans' compensation increase: Provided increases in rates of service-connected disability compensation (to reflect cost-of-living increases since last compensation raise in 1957) ranging from 2.6 to 16.7 percent, depending upon degree of disability; restores for 2 years after January 1, 1962, the eligibility of veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, to apply for national service life insurance. (H.R. 879.)

Disability benefits: Increased weekly disability benefits for longshoremen and harbor workers to $70 (from $54); provided comparable increases in death cases from $81 to $105; and increased statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000—Public Law 87–87.

Veterans' widows: Increased payments to veterans' widows. (Public Law 87–268.)

INTERNATIONAL AREA

Foreign assistance authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal 1962; a long-term (5-year) Development Loan Fund program authorizing an appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion for each fiscal year from 1963 to 1966; and established a new foreign aid agency. (Public Law 87–195.)

Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin-American aid program, which includes $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration—Public Law 87–41.

OECD: Ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consisting of 18 European member nations, the United States, and Canada, to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of the member states.

OECD—Permanent representation: Authorized the President to appoint, subject to Senate confirmation, a permanent representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and provided for the cost of U.S. participation in OECD including salaries of the American representative and his staff. U.S. share is 25 percent of the OECD budget which will run to about $5 million annually. (S. 2423.)

Battle Act revision: Strengthen U.S. policy abroad by authorizing the President to permit economic aid to Iron Curtain countries, except the Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East, when he considers it important to U.S. security. (S. 1215.)

Foreign bank tax exemption: Exempted foreign central banks from payment of taxes in this country on interest accrued from ownership of U.S. Government securities not used or held for commercial purposes—Public Law 87–27.

Peace Corps: Carried out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples to help themselves. The Peace Corps is designed to provide the framework through which America's idealism, her humanitarianism, and her generosity can find a personal expression in the task of helping to build with our own hands a better world for our mankind—Public Law 87–293.

Disarmament: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament—Public Law 87–297.

U.S. Travel Service: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad—Public Law 87–63.

Surplus as aid: Authorized disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 87–27.

Sugar Act: Extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 15 months to June 30, 1962, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; and continuing the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota—Public Law 87–15.

Agricultural aid: Authorized the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less developed countries through development programs under title II of Public Law 480, Agricultural Trade Development Act—Public Law 87–92.

Alien Orphan Adoption Act: Made permanent and expanded the Alien Orphan Adoption Act which permits orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens to enter the country on nonquota visas—Public Law 87–301.

Refugee Assistance Act: Authorized aid for resettlement of refugees-escapees from Iron Curtain countries abroad and those seeking asylum here from Cuba; and authorized the President to use up to $10 million in any fiscal year in order to meet unexpected refugee and migration developments important to the national interest—H.R. 8291.

Repatriation assistance: Enacted an emergency 1-year repatriation assistance program to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens and dependents of U.S. citizens returning from abroad without available resources. Aid can consist of money payments, medical care, temporary billeting, or other goods or services needed for the health and welfare of the recipients—Public Law 87–64.

Caribbean Organization: Authorized the President to accept on behalf of the United States the agreement establishing the Caribbean Organization; the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization; made available to the Organization the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act; and authorized the Secretary of State to appoint a U.S. observer to the Organization. Organization is to concern itself with social, cultural, and economic matters of common interest to the Caribbean area—Public Law 87–73.

Fulbright Act: Authorized legally classified American nationals to qualify and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act for advanced education abroad—Public Law 87–153.

Cultural exchange: Consolidated all cultural and educational exchange programs in an effort to promote these programs to a more important position in our foreign relations. The exchange programs combined are the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, the Finnish-Debt Payments Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956—Public Law 87–256.

U.S. food reserve: Expressed an interest in exploring with other nations the possibility of establishing an international food and raw materials reserve under the United Nations and related international organizations to acquire and store in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials exclusive of minerals.

Export-Import Bank: Authorized Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries—Public Law 87–311.

Red China: Expressed as the sense of the Congress that:

First. The United States should continue to support the Government of the Republic of China as the representative of China in the United Nations;

Second. The United States shall continue to oppose seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; and

Third. The American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

International Finance Corporation amendment: Amended the charter of the IFC to allow purchase of capital stock to encourage private investment in underdeveloped countries by creating a wider flexibility of financing to meet the varying needs of private enterprise—Public Law 87–185.

Mercy fleet: Supported the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships to assist in disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the public health field and other works of technical assistance.

Inter-American Children's Institute: Continued U.S. participation in and contributions to the Inter-American Children's Institute—Public Law 87–365.

NATO: Extended through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, a commission established to explore means of increasing cooperation and unity of purpose among NATO countries—Public Law 87–116.

United States-France: Provided immediate effectiveness for atomic cooperation for mutual defense purposes between the United States and France—Public Law 87–363.

Loans to friendly nations: Authorizes loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations—Public Law 87–387.

TREATIES

Belgium treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Belgium to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Brazil: Ratified a treaty of extradition with Brazil.

Columbia River: Ratified a treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River.

Geneva radio regulations: Ratified the Geneva radio regulations containing a number of provisions relating to the international regulation of radio communication to assist the United States in carrying out its scientific efforts in radio astronomy and space research.

German war bonds: Ratified a second agreement with Germany for the validation of East German dollar bonds to enable owners of these bonds to establish they were acquired from legitimate sources and not through Soviet sources in Berlin at close of World War II.

International Telecommunications Convention: Ratified Executive J which continues in effect the principal provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention to maintain and extend international cooperation of the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds.

Load line: Ratified a modification to the International Load Line Convention.

Oil pollution: Ratified the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the High Seas by Oil.

Vietnam treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Vietnam to provide protection for property and interest of American citizens and companies in Vietnam and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Pollution of sea by oil: Implemented the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which prohibits discharge of oil from tankers and imposes fines and penalties for violations—Public Law 87–167.

DEFENSE AND SPACE EXPLORATION AREAS

Ready Reserves: Granted authority, requested by the President, to call to active duty up to 250,000 ready reservists, authority to continue until July 1, 1962; and to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months, which would otherwise expire on July 1, 1962—Public Law 87–117.

Alien enlistment: Authorized peacetime enlistments in the Army and Air Force by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence—Public Law 87–143.

Military procurement: Authorized $12.4 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962—Public Law 87–53.

Military: Clarified the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act—Public Law 87–391.

Additional military procurement authorizations: As requested by the President, authorized additional funds to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sea lift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorization for procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was $1,753 million; however, of this amount, additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000—Public Law 87–118.

Military construction: Authorizes $831 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases—Public Law 87–57.

Aeronautics and Space Council: Reactivated and strengthened the usefulness of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and provided that it be administered by the Vice President—Public Law 87–26.

NASA authorization: Authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency—Public Law 87–98.

Civil aviation insurance: Extended until 1966, for 5 years, title XII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to provide that in the event of war the Nation's civil air fleet would have adequate insurance coverage for war risks—Public Law 87–89.

War hazards: Increased monthly disability and death compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act—Public Law 87–380.

Military: Amended the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide specific authority for prosecution of bad check offenses—Public Law 87–385.

Marine Corps: Improved the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by providing for the expanded assignment of supply-duty-only officers to unrestricted duty—Public Law 87–123.

Emergency evacuation: Provided for advances in pay to Armed Forces personnel in cases of emergency evacuation of dependents from oversea areas—Public Law 87–188.

Coast Guard—temporary appointments: Extended to January 1, 1964, the authority of the President to make temporary appointments in the Coast Guard, or until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number authorized by law—Public Law 87–257.

AEC authorization: Authorized $270,440,000 for a total of 40 new AEC projects including the Stanford linear electron accelerator and electric generating facilities—Public Law 87–315.

AEC omnibus amendments: Enacted numerous amendments to the AEC Act designed to provide a better framework and to help us keep pace with emerging developments in atomic energy. Amendments included the transfer of 3 kilograms of plutonium and 500 grams of uranium 233 to the International Atomic Energy Agency to aid in the prestige of the LAEA as a center for distribution of special nuclear materials, and the transfer of 8 additional kilograms of plutonium and 30 kilograms of uranium 233 to Euratom for research purposes and to help start an experimental plan for reprocessing fuel elements—Public Law 87–206.

Air Force promotions: Provided a temporary program through June 30, 1963, for promotion for all active duty Air Force officers below the grade of colonel—Public Law 87–194.

Reserves: Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive, and other changes include making ROTC graduate training program run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary—Public Law 87–378.

WELFARE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AREAS
EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Aid to education: Enacted a $2,550 million 3-year Federal-aid-to-education program for school construction and increasing teachers salaries. (S. 1021.)

Impacted areas—NDEA extensions: Enacted bill which extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose. Also, extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages—Public Law 87–344.

College housing: Increased the loan authorization by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964—Public Law 87–70.

Educational TV: Authorized Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, building, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel. (S. 205—H.R. 132.)

Educational opportunities for migratory farm families: Authorized a 5-year program to aid in educating children of migratory workers. The Federal Government is to pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. (S. 1124.)

Freedmen's Hospital: Transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University as its teaching hospital—Public Law 87–262.

Juvenile delinquency: Authorized a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $10 million a year for 3 years to aid in financing projects to combat juvenile delinquency—Public Law 87–274.

Geodetic Survey: Improved and expanded the Coast and Geodetic Survey Act of 1948 to induce qualified scientists and mathematicians to join the service—Public Law 87–233.

Nurses scholarships: Extended for 4 years (to June 30, 1965), $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act—Public Law 87–22.

Vocational teacher training: Authorized two 1-year programs of Federal grants for training teachers of the deaf, and advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists—Public Law 87–276.

HEALTH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Migratory health services: Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. (S. 1130.)

National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Established a 15-member Council to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal law, regulations, programs, policies, and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor to provide a better understanding of conditions, needs, and long-range solutions of this problem. (S. 1132.)

Public facility loans: Provided eligibility to Indian tribes for assistance under the public facility loan program, title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Under present law, eligibility for loans under the public facility loan program is limited to "municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States." This provision has been interpreted as not including Indian tribes which resulted not only in discrimination but an inconsistency since all tribes are eligible for low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. (S. 2454.)

Major disasters: Authorized assistance to be given by the Federal Government to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in case of a national disaster. (S. 1742.)

Community health services: Expanded and improved community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged, construction of nursing homes, and training of public health personnel—Public Law 87–395.

Mass transit: Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities; $25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment—Public Law 87–70.

RESOURCE BUILDUP

Saline water conversion program: Extended the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorized a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount—Public Law 87–295.

Air pollution: Extended air pollution control authorization to June 30, 1966, provided for public hearings, and authorized $5 million a year to finance the studies. (S. 455.)

Shoreline areas: Authorized the Department of Interior to study means and costs of acquiring and preserving 14 ocean, lake, and river shoreline areas appropriate for recreational parks. Authorized the Department of Agriculture to study appropriate shorelines within the Nation's 186 million acres of national forests. Each department is to report its findings and recommendations within 2 years. Authorized $400,000 for each survey and a grand total of $25 million of matching funds to assist the States in acquiring State shoreline areas. (S. 543.)

Wilderness bill: Established a national wilderness preservation system providing that any time within 10 years, the President may recommend to Congress the permanent inclusion within the wilderness system areas totaling approximately 54 million acres. (S. 174).

Point Reyes National Seashore: Authorized an appropriation of $14 million to acquire land to preserve, for public recreational purposes, Point Reyes National Seashore in California. (S. 476).

National fuels study: Approved a resolution authorizing the Senate Interior Committee to make an investigation and study of the current and prospective Government policies, to determine changes for an effective national fuels policy. Report of the findings to be submitted by January 31, 1961. (S. Res. 105.)

Oceanography: Established a national 10-year program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources and to enhance the public health and general welfare. (S. 901.)

Wabash River Commission: Established a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission to coordinate Federal, State, and local plans for developing the water and land resources in the Wabash River Basin. (S. 811.)

Cape Cod Park: Established Cape Cod National Seashore Park to preserve for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the cape—Public Law 87–126.

Migratory waterfowl conservation: Authorized a 7-year migratory waterfowl conservation program permitting advances to States to purchase necessary lands—Public Law 87–383.

CRIMINAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

Circuit judges: Created 73 additional U.S. district and circuit court judgeships to help ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars—Public Law 87–36.

Tax Court judges' widows and dependent children: Provided a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States—Public Law 87–370.

Judgment and compromise settlement: Provided for the swift payment of judgments and compromise settlements against the U.S. Government won by State and foreign claimants—Public Law 87–187.

Jury commissioners: For the first time since 1884, increased the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts from the present $5 to $10 per diem for each day employed in the performance of duties. (S. 1899).

Agency investigations: Prohibits obstruction of any lawful inquiry or investigation by the Department of Justice or Treasury and strengthens prohibitions against injuries to persons furnishing information in connection with the inquiry. (S. 1665.)

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce. (S. 1658.)

Racketeering enterprises: Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities—business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, etc.—Public Law 87–228.

Transmission of bets: Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gamblin. Exempts information carried for use of the press and wireless communication—Public Law 87–216.

Wagering paraphernalia: Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers games, or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual court of its business, but allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal—Public Law 87–218.

Felons: Extended Fugitive Felon Act to all felonies—Public Law 87–368.

Espionage: Extended laws against espionage and censorship to acts committed anywhere in the world—Public Law 87–369.

Tax stamps: Made it a Federal crime to transport fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate commerce—Public Law 87–371.

Plane hijacking: Made airplane hijacking a Federal crime subject to a possible death penalty—Public Law 87–197.

Aircraft claims: Authorized immediate payment of up to $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damage as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles—Public Law 87–212.

Supplemental air carriers: Provided a permanent place in the aviation industry for supplemental air carriers without adverse effect upon scheduled carriers. Provides that a carrier may request and be authorized to perform limited services supplemental to those furnished by the regular air carriers, and authorizes the Board to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental service containing limitations on the type and extent of service authorized (S. 1969.)

REORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT AIDS

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans for the reorganization of the Government—Public Law 87–18.

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963—Public Law 87–264.

HEW: Authorized two additional Assistant Secretaries—one to handle international affairs, the second to handle medical and scientific matters. (S. 2073.)

Labor: Authorized an additional Assistant Secretary to perform functions relating primarily to the employment and effective utilization of women in our labor force—Public Law 87–137.

FTC reorganization: Provided for the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission to expedite the present workload—plan No. 4. Effective July 9.

CAB reorganization: Authorized the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide greater flexibility and a more expeditious handling of CAB cases—plan No. 3. Effective July 3.

Maritime reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Maritime Board—plan No. 7. Effective August 12.

ICC: Authorized reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission—Public Law 87–247.

FCC reorganization: Authorized FCC to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases to expedite and improve the administrative process—Public Law 87–192.

SEC reorganization: Authorized the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate certain of its functions by published order or rule to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board, and provides for appeals of such delegations—S. 2135.

SEC investigation: Authorized $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules, for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963—Public Law 87–196.

Internal revenue employees: Appropriated funds for an additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees—Public Law 87–159.

Alien employment: Removed the prohibition against Department of Commerce employing alien scientists and technicians in an effort to relieve a general shortage of personnel in scientific, engineering, and technical areas. (S. 2236.)

Travel expenses: Increased the allowances of Government employees for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include from $10 to $16 per diem allowances and from 10 to 12 cents a mile by private automobile—Public Law 87–139.

Interstate commerce—Property destruction: Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose—Public Law 87–221.

Rural carriers: Increased equipment allowance for rural mail carriers to 12 cents a mile. (S. 189).

Postal employees: Extended to employees in the postal field service the same salary-retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided under the Classification Act since 1956—Public Law 87–270.

Scientific and supergrades: Authorized an additional 480 supergrade positions and 280 additional scientific positions for the executive branch—Public Law 87–367.

NSLI special dividend: Authorized the payment of a special insurance dividend averaging from $100 to $150, for those veterans who have RS or W insurance. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance and the premium increases at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, with the increased rate at the end of each 5-year period—Public Law 87–223.

ELECTIONS AND THE WHITE HOUSE

Federal election laws: Passed a clean-elections bill to strengthen our electoral system, provide more realistic ceilings on campaign expenses, make available at the State level information on campaign financing, and provides for a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Federal office or to political committees acting for such candidates. (S. 2426.)

National conventions: The Senate adopted unanimously a resolution expressing as the sense of the Senate that the party conventions held every 4 years to nominate candidates for President and Vice President should not be commenced prior to the first Monday in September of the year in which the election is to be held. (S. Res. 141.)

District of Columbia elections: Implements the 23d amendment to the Constitution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; retains the voting age at 21 and provides for a 1-year residency requirement—Public Law 87–389.

White House: Established the White House as a national monument—Public Law 87–286.

STATUS OF MAJOR POINTS OF PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

ACTIONS COMPLETED

(Asterisk (*) denotes President Kennedy's original 16 points)

*1. Federal unemployment: Extended Federal unemployment compensation for additional 13 weeks—Public Law 87–6.

*2. Feed grains: Enacted an emergency feed grains program for the 1961 crop—Public Law 87–5.

*3. OECD: Ratified convention establishing Organization of Economic Cooperation Development—ratified March 16.

*4. Government reorganization: Reinstated the President's authority to reorganize the Government—Public Law 87–18.

*5. Distressed areas: Authorized $394 million distressed areas program—Public Law 87–27.

*6. Needy children: Authorized temporary program to permit States to aid needy unemployed parents and their children under Federal-State assistance program for 15 months to June 1, 1962—Public Law 87–21.

*7. Minimum wage: Extended coverage and increased minimum wage—Public Law 87–30.

*8. Judgeships: Provided for additional circuit and district judgeships—Public Law 87–35.

*9. Social security: Expanded social security benefits for an additional 4.4 million persons—Public Law 87–64.

*10. Travel service: Established International Travel Service in Commerce—Public Law 87–63.

*11. Community Facilities Act (H.R. 4998—Public Law 87–395).

12. Peace Corps (H.R. 7500—Public Law 87–293).

13. Disarmament Agency for World Peace—Public Law 87–297.

14. Agriculture Act of 1961—Public Law 87–128.

15. Foreign aid authorization—Public Law 87–195.

16. Railroad unemployment: Extended railroad unemployment compensation for an additional 13 weeks—Public Law 87–7.

17. Columbia River Basin: Ratified Columbia River Joint Development Treaty with Canada. Ratified March 16.

18. Sugar Act: Extended the Sugar Act of 1948, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers for 15 months to June 30, 1962; continued the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota—Public Law 87–15.

19. Ready Reserves: Authorized recall of 250,000 ready reservists—Public Law 87–117.

20. Procurement: Authorized additional funds for aircraft, missile and naval vessels—Public Law 87–118.

21. Foreign tax treatment: Unified tax treatment on earning assets of foreign central banks—Public Law 87–29.

22. Food for peace: Authorized $2 billion increase in title I authority of Agricultural Trade Development Act to continue sale of surplus agriculture products for local currencies—Public Law 87–28.

23. Mass transportation: Increased Federal assistance to State and local governments—Public Law 87–70.

24. German bonds: Ratified German bond treaty. Ratified May 4.

25. Extradition treaty: Ratified extradition treaty with Brazil. Ratified May 16.

26. Loadline convention: Ratified loadline convention modification. Ratified May 16.

27. Oil pollution: Ratified oil pollution treaty. Ratified May 16.

28. Treaty of Friendship with Belgium: Ratified September 11.

29. Treaty of Amity With Republic of Vietnam: Ratified September 11.

30. Geneva Radio Regulation Convention: Ratified September 25.

31. International Telecommunications Convention: Ratified September 25.

32. Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin American aid—Public Iaw 87–41.

33. Construction: Military construction authorization—Public Law 87–57.

34. Procurement: Military procurement authorization—Public Law 87–52.

35. Tax rates: Extension of existing corporate and excise tax rates—Public Law 87–72.

36. Highway Act: Amended Federal-Aid Highway Act raising $9.6 billion in additional revenues for the Federal-aid highway program and increasing by $11.5 billion the authorizations for interstate and defense highways for 1963–71—Public Law 87–61.

37. Housing: Enacted a $4.9 billion housing program expanding existing programs and new programs of assistance for moderate-low income families, and for the elderly—Public Law 87–70.

38. Public debt: Increased debt limit by $13 billion to $298 billion—Public Law 87–69.

39. CAB reorganization: Plan 3, reorganization of Civil Aeronautics Board authorizing the Board to delegate any of its functions to expedite adjudications and rulemaking proceedings. Effective July 3.

40. FTC reorganization: Plan 4, reorganization of Federal Trade Commission to delegate functions to expedite the work of the Commission. Effective July 9.

41. Maritime reorganization: Reorganization of Maritime functions. Effective August 12.

42. Supergrades and scientific positions increased—Public Law 87–367.

43. VA direct loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home loans programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967; and for Korean veterans to Februray 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loans programs through fiscal 1967—Public Law 87–84.

44. NASA: Authorized Vice President to head Space Council—Public Law 87–26.

45. Cape Cod: Authorized additional seashore recreational areas—Public Law 87–126.

46. College housing: Authorized $300 million annual 4-year program—Public Law 87–70.

47. Labor: Authorized one additional Assistant Secretary—Public Law 87–137.

48. FCC: Reorganization—Public Law 87–192.

49. ICC: Reorganization—Public Law 87–247.

50. AEC: Authorization—Public Law 87–315.

51. Saline water: Extended and expanded the program—Public Law 87–295.

52. Juvenile delinquency—Public Law 87–274.

53. Civil Rights Commission: 2-year extension—Public Law 87–264.

54. Small Business Act Amendments—Public Law 87–198, Public Law 87–305.

55. Aid to airports—Public Law 87–255.

56. Strengthen anticrime—Public Laws 197, 216, 218, 228.

57. Impacted areas: NDEA, 2-year extension—Public Law 87–344.

58. Delaware River compact: Partial enactment of Water Resources Planning Act—Public Law 87–328.

59. District of Columbia elections—Public Law 87–389.

60. Appropriations:

Third supplemental, 1961—Public Law 87–14.

Fourth supplemental, 1961—Public Law 87–74.

Agriculture, 1962—Public Law 87–112.

General Government matters, 1962—Public Law 87–125.

Interior, 1962—Public Law 87–122.

Legislative, 1962—Public Law 87–130.

Independent offices, 1962—Public Law 87–141.

Defense, 1962—Public Law 87–144.

Treasury-Post Office, 1962—Public Law 87–159.

Labor-HEW—Public Law 87–290.

Military construction—Public Law 87–302.

State-Justice-judiciary—Public Law 87–264.

District of Columbia appropriations—Public Law 87–265.

Foreign aid—Public Law 87–329.

Public works, Public Law 87–330.

Supplemental—Public Law 87–332.

PASSED SENATE

*61. Battle Act: Revision of Battle Act (S. 1215). Passed May 11.

*62. Education: Overall aid to education (S. 1021). Passed May 25. House delayed further action to next year.

63. Office space: Create a Commission on Presidential Office Space (S. 51). Passed July 7.

64. HEW: Authorized two additional Assistance Secretaries (S. 2073). Passed July 27.

65. Oceanography: Ten-year oceanography program (S. 901). Passed July 28.

66. Manpower training (S. 1991): Passed August 23 (H.R. 8399). House Calendar.

67. Shorelines (S. 543): Passed August 28.

68. SEC: Reorganization (S. 2135): Passed September 1.

69. Wilderness bill (S. 174): Passed September 6.

70. Air pollution control study: Extended to June 30, 1966 (S. 455). Passed September 20.

71. Educational TV (S. 205): Passed March 21. (H.R. 132, House companion on House Calendar.)

72. Commerce: Additional Assistant Secretary (S. 1456). Passed May 26—H.R. 6360, House companion on House Calendar.

IN CONFERENCE

73. Refugee resettlement (H.R. 8291).

74. Compensation: Increased rates for disabled service-connected veterans (H.R. 856).

HOUSE CALENDAR

75. Postal rates: Increase (H.R. 7927).

PASSED HOUSE

76. Conflicts of interest (H.R. 8140): Passed August 7.

COMMITTEE ACTION

77. Water Resources Planning Act (S. 2246, H.R. 8177). Hearings concluded August 16. (H.J. Res. 225, Delaware River Compact, partial enactment of this request.)

78. Constitutional amendment outlawing poll tax (S.J. Res. 81, H.J. Res. 404): Senate and House held hearings.

ACTION POSTPONED UNTIL NEXT YEAR

*79. Aid to medical education and research (S. 1072): Senate Labor has completed hearings but the House committee did not take any action.

*80. Aged: Health care for aged (S. 909, H.R. 4222). House must act first.

81. Tax revisions: House Ways and Means concluded hearings. House must act first.

82. Department of Urban Affairs (S. 1633): Senate Calendar.

83. Youth Corps: Youth employment opportunities and Youth Corps (S. 404). Senate Calendar.

84. Pension Plans Disclosures Act Amendments (S. 2520): Senate Calendar. (H.R. 8723, House failed to suspend rules, 245–161, so Senate action was postponed to next year.)

***85. Higher education (S. 1241): Senate Calendar. Action postponed, however, due to the fact that the Rules Committee of the House killed the House bill.**

Summary of legislative record

SENATE ACTIVITY

	82d 1st	83d 1st	84th 1st	85th 1st	86th 1st	87th 1st
	Jan. 3–Oct. 20	Jan. 3–Aug. 3	Jan. 3–Aug. 2	Jan. 3–Aug. 30	Jan. 7–Sept. 15	Jan. 3–Sept. 27
Days in session	172	125	105	133	140	146
Hours in session	996:46	763:35	559:41	860:44	1009:48	1005.00
Total measures passed by Senate	1,060	848	1,325	1,210	1,052	1,133
Senate bills	411	342	574	612	434	459
House bills	429	320	566	346	375	433
Senate joint resolutions	14	22	22	22	21	25
House joint resolutions	29	21	20	54	32	27
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	25	25	24	34	23
House concurrent resolutions	19	14	21	28	24	23
Senate resolutions	135	104	97	124	132	143
Public laws	255	288	390	316	383	401
Confirmations	26,069	23,420	39,897	44,620	43,567	48,962

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE U.S. SENATE

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture Act of 1961

S. 1643: Public Law 87–128, approved August 9, 1961:

This measure, as enacted into law, extends numerous important agricultural programs such as the Great Plains conservation program, the Wool Act, and Public Law 480; it contains wheat and feed grain programs for 1962; consolidated and simplified the agricultural credit laws administered by the Farmers Home Administration; and provided for advisory consultations with farmers in developing future agricultural programs.

The major provisions are:

TITLE I—SUPPLY ADJUSTMENT AND PRICE STABILIZATION

1. Consultation on agricultural programs: Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with farmers, farm or commodity organizations, and other interested groups in developing new or revising existing agricultural programs involving supply adjustments or marketing regulations through marketing orders, quotas, or price supports. The advisory recommendations accepted would be incorporated in proposals to be submitted to Congress.

2. 1962 wheat program: Required, as a condition for price supports, a mandatory 10-percent cut in wheat acreage allotments, with a 45-percent payment in cash or kind for diverting the 10-percent cut to soil conserving uses. Authorized an additional voluntary 30-percent diversion with payments in cash or kind of 60 percent. Any producer can divert up to the larger of (1) 40 percent of his allotment or (2) the smaller of 10 acres or the highest planted acreage of wheat in 1959, 1960, or 1961, whichever is greater. Permits advances of 50 percent to any participating producer.

Increased the farm marketing excess (the amount subject to penalty) and increased the penalty from 45 percent to 65 percent of parity.

Reduced the 15-acre exemption to 13½ acres, or the highest acreage planted for harvest in 1959, 1960, or 1961, whichever is smaller.

Repealed permanently the 200-bushel exemption from marketing quotas.

Authorized the Secretary to increase Durum wheat acreage allotments if necessary to meet demand requirements—3-year program beginning with 1962.

3. Feed grain program: Required, as a condition of eligibility for price support, that the producer divert 20 percent of his corn, grain sorghum, or barley acreage to conserving uses in return for a 50-percent payment in cash or kind.

Authorized an additional 20-percent reduction in corn, grain sorghum, or barley acreage, with a 60-percent in-kind payment.

Authorized the producers to plant castor beans, safflower, sunflower, sesame, or guarbeans on diverted acreage in lieu of payment.

Provided exemption of malting barley from the feed grain diversion program up to 110 percent of their average 1959–60 barley acreage.

Permitted the Secretary to limit participation in the feed grain program for 1962 if he determines such was necessary because of an emergency created by a drought or other disaster or to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the commodity.

4. Marketing orders: Expands eligibility list for marketing orders to include cherries or cranberries for canning or freezing; lambs, turkeys, peanuts (but no peanut products), apples produced in Michigan, New York, New England, Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, and California; and all other commodities not now covered except honey, cotton, rice, wheat, corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley, rye, sugarcane, sugarbeets, wool, mohair, livestock, soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, poultry (other than turkeys), eggs (other than turkey hatching eggs), fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing (other than those specifically covered), and apples (other than those specifically covered).

Prohibits the importation of oranges, onions, walnuts, and dates (other than dates for processing) which do not meet the grade, size, quality, or maturity requirements of orders applicable to the domestic commodities. At present, this restriction applies only to tomatoes, avocados, mangoes, limes, grapefruit, green peppers, Irish potatoes, cucumbers, and eggplants.

5. Wool Act: Extended the National Wool Act for 4 years through March 31, 1966.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT

Extended Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development Act, through December 31, 1964—a 3-year extension.

Provided title I authority of $4.5 billion for 3 years, 1962 through 1964, with a limit of $2.5 billion in any one year (oversea surplus commodity sales).

Authorized the use of foreign currencies for dollar sales to American tourists.

Required 5 percent of the proceeds of title I sales in each year to be set aside in amounts and kinds of foreign currencies specified by the Secretary of Agriculture for agricultural market development and required such amount of sale and loan proceeds as the Secretary determines necessary, but not less than 2 percent, to be convertible into currencies of other foreign nations for market development activities in countries which are or may become dollar markets.

Continued present limitation of $300 million, plus carryovers, in surplus commodities for emergency disaster relief abroad and economic development (title II).

TITLE III—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Consolidated and simplified the authorities administered by the Farmers Home Administration for real estate, operating, emergency, and water facilities' loans.

Provided a $60,000 indebtedness limit on Farmers Home Administration farm real estate loans.

Limited indebtedness of associations for soil and water conservation loans to $500,000 in direct loans, and $1 million in insured loans.

Provided for a $35,000 indebtedness limit on operating loans.

Authorized loans to soil conservation districts for purchase of conservation equipment.

Authorized emergency loans in areas suffering from natural disaster.

TITLE IV—GENERAL

Extended the period for making Great Plains conservation program contracts to December 31, 1971.

Extended school milk program through June 30, 1967, to be paid by direct appropriations.

Extended Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program through December 31, 1964.

Agricultural trade—authorization increases

S. 1027: Public Law 87–28, approved May 4, 1961:

Authorizes a $2 billion increase in title I authority of Public Law 480, making a total of $3.5 billion, plus any unused authority carried over from 1960.

Title authorizes the President to enter into agreements with friendly nations or organizations of friendly nations to provide for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies, which are then used for a number of purposes for the benefit of the United States and the purchasing country.

The total authorization available for calendar year 1961 was $1.5 billion, plus $335 million, carried over from calendar year 1960, which had been committed.

Agricultural trade development—Title II extension

S. 1720: Public Law 87–92, approved July 20, 1961:

This measure continues the authority contained in title II of Public Law 480, by repealing section 601(a)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960, which limited to June 30, 1961, the authority of the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less developed countries through development programs which are not feasible under title I of Public Law 480.

Under title II, food can be used or payment of wages-in-kind for labor intensive projects such as soil conservation dams, irrigation, and drainage canals, wells, roads, and other similar activities, which will relieve hunger and unemployment and, at the same time, contribute to the economic development of the recipient country.

Amendments to farm credit laws

S. 1927: Public Law 87–343, approved October 3, 1961:

Amends the farm credit laws: (1) Permits installment payments on Federal credit banks to be scheduled more frequently than

semiannually if desirable to the borrower because of his income pattern. (2) Permits loans to be made to corporations, set up by farming families; now loans can be extended only to "persons." (3) Extends from 5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate-term loans. (4) Requires in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to the accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans; any more that might be contributed past the 3½ percent would be accepted. (5) Combines the revolving funds of the production credit association, which hasn't a demand for all its funds, and the intermediate credit bank, which has need for more funds. (6) Provides for the liquidation of any assets of any cooperative association in a bank when that cooperative might disband.

Animal quarantine

S. 860: Passed Senate July 25, 1961. Pending in House Agriculture Committee:

In order to strengthen the animal quarantine laws and close a number of gaps and loopholes, this measure increases seizure authority of the Department of Agriculture; clarifies the Department's authority to restrict imports; increases authority for inspection and for sanitary regulations; and provides for injunctive authority.

Cotton farmers

H.R. 7030—Public Law 87–37, approved May 20, 1961:

An emergency measure to bring relief to cotton farmers whose land has been unplantable because of recent floods, or whose plantings have been washed out. Thousands of acres of cotton land are under water or are so wet that farmers cannot plant them. Thus, this bill will permit those farmers to transfer their acreage allotment to another farm within the county or in an adjoining county where they can plant on higher ground.

Disaster area lands

S. 2113—Public Law 87–62, approved June 29, 1961:

Authorizes the Department of Agriculture, for a 1-year period following enactment, to permit hay to be harvested from conservation reserve acreage where necessary to alleviate hardship caused by drought or other natural disaster. To be eligible for such relief, the Governor of the State must certify and the Secretary of Agriculture must determine the need.

Drought relief

S. 2197: Public Law 87–127, approved August 7, 1961:

To relieve the drought stricken farmer, Congress enacted a 1-year emergency program authorizing sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price support levels.

The act also permits grazing of livestock on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs, or moving of hay on these lands in or near drought areas.

Emergency feed for wildlife

S. 614: Public Law 87–152, approved August 17, 1961:

Authorizes the use of surplus grain (from CCC) by the States for emergency use (to prevent starvation) in feeding resident game birds and other wildlife.

Farm operating loans

H.R. 1822: Public Law 87–8, approved March 29, 1961:

To help meet the rapidly and substantially increased cost of farming, this measure amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide a 15-percent increase in the amount of funds which may be used for making operating loans to borrowers whose operating loan indebtedness exceeds $10,000. The present ceiling of 10 percent was exhausted by March 1 of this year.

Feed grains program

H.R. 4510: Public Law 87–5, approved March 22, 1961:

By an overwhelming majority, the Congress passed a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 crop of corn at $1.20 per bushel with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn; support to be conditioned on retirement of 20 percent of feed grain producing acreage.

The primary purposes of the measure are to raise incomes of feed grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands.

In order to receive the $1.20 price support provided by the bill, the producer must retire 20 percent of his feed grain producing acreage. If he chooses to do so, he may retire an additional 20 percent. Payment for the first 20-percent acreage reduction will be in cash or kind; payment for the additional 20-percent reduction will be in kind. The level of payment for the first 20-percent retirement will be based on 50 percent of what he might have grown on the retired acreage; for the second 20 percent, on 60 percent of what he might have grown on the additional acreage retired.

In lieu of the unlimited authority, given the Secretary by the House bill, to dispose of grain in Government stocks at less than market prices, the conference report provides that payments in kind are to be made in negotiable certificates created under the payment-in-kind program. Other Government stocks moving into the market will continue to be subject to existing law, which provides for sale at not less than 105 percent of the support price, plus carrying charges.

It is anticipated that the program, with at least 70 percent participation, will result in the production of from 500 to 700 million bushels less than were produced last year. Government storage facilities are now severely taxed to provide for existing surpluses. The current program provides supports of about $1.05 per bushel, with no acreage retirement condition.

Hog cholera—eradication

S. 1908: Public Law 87–209, approved September 6, 1961:

Establishes a national hog cholera eradication program under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture to restrict the interstate movement of hog cholera virus. Also directs the Secretary to establish an advisory committee of 12 members with a member of the Department as chairman. The committee will help determine the plans of the eradication program and help carry out the program.

Livestock loans—temporary

S. 1710: Public Law 87–106, approved July 26, 1961:

Extends temporarily until December 31, 1961, the authorization of the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency loans to established livestock owners who, due to drought, increased production costs, and lowered prices for their products, are forced to seek assistance. The authorization is due to expire July 14, 1961. It is included in the administration's agriculture bill (S. 1643) but due to the fact that this bill has not yet been acted upon the Secretary of Agriculture feels this measure important enough for action as a separate bill to cover the existing emergency until the omnibus bill is completed.

Mexican farm labor program

H.R. 2010: Public Law 87–345, approved October 3, 1961:

Extended the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years until December 31, 1963, and amended the act to (1) require that employers reimburse the United States up to $15 maximum for essential expenses of the program, except salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in compliance activities; (2) prohibit Mexican workers from being made available in any area unless reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers at wages, standard hours of work, and working conditions comparable to those offered to foreign workers; (3) prohibit any employer of Mexican labor from using these workers in other than temporary or seasonal occupations and from operating or maintaining power-driven, self-propelled harvesting, planting or cultivating machinery, except in specific cases to avoid undue hardship; (4) prohibit Mexican workers from engaging in some processing activities.

Perishable agricultural commodities—Amendments

S. 1037: Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Agriculture Committee:

This measure amends the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act to:

Improve and clarify provisions dealing with the eligibility for license, or for employment by licensees, of persons guilty of specified acts and persons affiliated with them;

Authorize an increase in license fees from $25 a year to a rate not to exceed $50, except retail dealers and brokers of frozen fruit and vegetables may not be increased beyond the $25;

Eliminate the Export Apple and Pear Act from the acts administered with license fees received under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act; and authorize appropriations to carry out the Export Apple and Pear Act;

Regulate the use of trade names by licensees to prevent deception;

Provide that opportunity for an oral hearing need not be provided in reparation cases unless the amount in dispute exceeds $1,500, instead of $500;

Make it clear that in an appeal from a reparation order, bond must be filed within 30 days after entry of the order and require that the bond be in cash, negotiable securities, or the undertaking of a recognized surety company; and

Defer license suspension in case of appeal until all judicial appeals have ended.

Special milk program—Extension

S. 146: Public Law 87–67, approved June 30, 1961:

This bill extends the special milk program for children 1 year until June 30, 1962, and authorizes $105 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to carry out the program.

The program, which has been in effect since 1954, authorizes the Department to reimburse schools participating in the school lunch program at the rate of 4 cents per half pint in excess of the half pint provided in the lunch. Other schools are reimbursed at the rate of 3 cents per half pint, and child care institutions at the rate of 2 cents per half pint. At present there are about 85,500 schools and other institutions participating in the program.

Sugar Act extension

H.R. 5463: Public Law 87–15, approved March 31, 1961:

This measure continues the President's authority to establish the sugar quota for Cuba through June 30, 1962, at a level found to be in the national interest but, in no event, in excess of the Cuban quota under the basic quota system of the Sugar Act.

It gives special consideration to Western Hemisphere countries and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities when additional purchases are made from foreign nations without regard to allocations.

The President's authority is continued to obtain refined sugar if raw sugar is not reasonably available.

If the President sets the Cuban quota at less than its basic quota, the amount of the reductions are to be distributed as follows:

(1) An amount equivalent to Cuba's share in any domestic area production deficit may be assigned exclusively to other domestic areas; and then

(2) To five nations whose quotas have been between 3,000 and 10,000 tons, a sufficient quantity of sugar to bring each up to 10,000 tons These nations are Costa Rica, Haiti, Panama, the Netherlands, and Nationalist China; and then

(3) To the Republic of the Philippines 15 percent of the remainder; and then

(4) To other countries having quotas under the act (except those five nations mentioned in (2) above) the remaining 85 percent in amounts prorated according to the basic quotas established by the act, "except that any amounts which would be purchased from any country with which the United States is not in diplomatic relations need not be purchased"; and then

(5) If additional amounts of sugar are needed, purchases may be made from any other foreign nation without regard to allocations, but with consideration given to countries of the Western Hempisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

Surplus food—College home economics

S. 1873: Public Law 87-179, approved August 30, 1961:

Amends the act which permits surplus agricultural and dairy products to be supplied to certain authorized high schools for use in home economics classes. It proposes that this authorization be extended to college students if they also use the same facilities and instructors that are now in use in the high schools.

Tobacco allotments—Transfers

H.R. 1022: Public Law 87-200, approved September 6, 1961:

Permits tobacco farmers who have agreed to limit their production to lease or transfer up to 5 acres of land for 1-year periods, during 1962 and 1963, to another farmer who produces the same kind of tobacco. Farmers having small allotments find that in some years planting would be uneconomical. The crop produced from the leased lands would be considered as coming from the farm from which the allotment is transferred.

APPROPRIATIONS

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 1st sess., including indefinites

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed		Final action, amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates	Public laws
			House	Senate			
	1961 SUPPLEMENTALS						
H.R. 5188	3d supplemental	$5,275,213,127	$803,506,119	$4,637,419,970	$1,694,055,637	−$3,581,157,490	87-14
H.R. 6518	Inter-American program	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000		87-41
H.R. 7712	4th supplemental	88,024,000	47,214,000	47,214,000	47,214,000	−40,810,000	87-74
	Total, 1961 supplementals	5,963,237,127	1,450,720,119	5,284,633,970	2,341,269,637	−3,621,967,490	
	1962 APPROPRIATIONS						
H.R. 5954	Treasury-Post Office	5,371,801,000	5,281,865,000	5,327,631,000	5,298,765,000	−73,036,000	87-159
H.R. 6345	Interior	782,387,000	753,319,000	813,399,850	779,158,650	−3,228,350	87,122
H.R. 7035	Labor-HEW	5,004,281,081	4,327,457,000	5,161,380,000	4,915,965,000	−88,316,081	87-290
H.R. 7208	Legislative	136,082,802	104,353,335	135,432,065	135,432,065	−650,737	87-130
H.R. 7371	State, Justice, Judiciary	795,891,202	751,300,050	762,038,550	756,422,550	−39,468,652	87-264
H.R. 7444	Agriculture	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	5,967,457,500	5,967,494,500	−121,749,500	87-112
	Loan authorizations	(612,000,000)	(629,900,000)	(725,500,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)	
H.R. 7445	Independent offices	9,174,561,000	8,404,098,000	9,098,769,500	8,966,285,000	−208,276,000	87-141
H.R. 7577	General Government-Commerce	666,278,000	626,958,000	650,438,200	641,135,800	−25,142,200	87-125
H.R. 7851	Defense	46,396,945,000	42,711,105,000	46,848,292,000	46,662,556,000	+265,611,000	87-144
H.R. 8072	District of Columbia	(292,827,398)	(268,122,400)	(270,438,360)	(270,007,897)	−(22,759,501)	87-265
	Loan authorization	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(+4,400,000)	
	Federal payment	39,753,000	32,753,000	32,753,000	32,753,000	−7,000,000	
H.R. 8302	Military construction	1,047,568,000	883,359,000	1,020,146,750	951,690,750	−95,877,250	87-302
H.R. 9033	Foreign assistance	4,993,991,000	3,835,245,000	4,416,091,000	4,123,345,000	−870,646,000	87-329
H.R. 9076	Public works	4,000,788,000	3,662,701,380	3,940,926,880	3,908,880,980	−91,907,020	87-330
H.R. 9169	Supplemental	1,134,639,841	573,040,923	1,068,503,903	1,125,333,341	−9,306,500	87-332
	Total, 1962 appropriations	85,634,210,926	77,896,020,688	85,243,260,198	84,265,217,636	−1,368,993,290	
	Total, all appropriations	91,597,448,053	79,346,740,807	90,527,894,168	86,606,487,273	−4,990,960,780	
	Total, loan authorizations	636,600,000	658,900,000	754,500,000	754,500,000	+117,900,000	

AVIATION

Aircraft accident claims

H.R. 7934: Public Law 87-212, approved September 8, 1961:

Authorizes immediate payment of not more than $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damages as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles. As a result of such accidents there may be urgent need to, for example, buy food and secure lodgings. Payments that might be made are not admission by the Government of liability; however, accidents involving missiles or aircraft are usually a clear case of liability.

Crimes on aircraft

S. 2268: Public Law 87-197, approved September 5, 1961:

This bill is designed to combat recent aircraft hijacking by applying Federal criminal law to crimes committed on aircraft in air commerce. These incidents have focused attention on the need for additional laws covering such crimes. There are Federal laws as well as State laws which are now applicable in many instances; however, few specifically meet the unique problems including the venue problem, which arise while aircraft are in flight. This measure fills the gaps by making criminal certain acts of violence which, if committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, would be crimes as defined by sections 113, 114, 111-13, 1363, or 2111 of title 18, United States Code, if committed on board an aircraft in flight in air commerce. Included are varying degrees of murder, manslaughter, attempt to commit murder or manslaughter, malicious destruction of property, and robbery.

Any person who obtains or attempts to obtain control of an aircraft by unlawful force or threat of force will be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both. If the act was committed with the use of a dangerous weapon, imprisonment may be for life but not less than 20 years, or by death if the jury so directs. One who assaults, intimidates, or threatens to interfere with a flight crew member in a way as to interfere with his duties to safely operate the aircraft will be subject to a fine of up to $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both. If a deadly or dangerous weapon is used, the penalty may be imprisonment for life but not less than 20 years.

An act which constitutes the crime of piracy if committed aboard a vessel on the high seas will constitute a crime if committed aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, punishable by imprisonment for life or for not less than 20 years, or by death if the jury so directs. This amendment to the Federal Aviation Act defines aircraft piracy to mean any seizure or exercise of control by force or violence or threat of force or violence, and with wrongful intent, of an aircraft in flight in air commerce.

To knowingly impart or convey false information concerning an attempt or alleged attempt to unlawfully obtain control of an aircraft, to interfere with a flight crew member, or to commit piracy will be subject to a fine up to $1,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year, or both.

With the exception of any municipal, county, or State government, or the Federal Government, and others who may be authorized under appropriate regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Agency, any person who, while aboard an aircraft operated by an air carrier in air transportation, carries on or about his person a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon or attempts to board an aircraft with such a weapon will be subject to a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years, or both.

All violations mentioned above will be subject to investigation by the FBI.

Venue: The trial of any offense under this act will be in the district in which the offense is committed; or, if the offense is committed out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, the trial will be in the district where the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought. If the offender or offenders are not arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may

be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia. Whenever the offense is begun in one jurisdiction and completed in another, or committed in more than one jurisdiction, it may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished in any jurisdiction in which the offense was begun, continued, or completed, in the same manner as if the offense had been actually and wholly committed therein.

The Administrator of FAA can authorize any air carrier to refuse transportation to a passenger or to transport property when, in the opinion of the carrier, it might prove inimical to safety in flight.

Federal Airport Act extension

H.R. 8102: Public Law 87–255, approved September 20, 1961:

Extends the Federal Airport Act for 3 years, to June 30, 1964, and authorizes a total of $225 million, with $75 million to become available for obligation each year.

Earmarks $7 million a year for the development of airports, to provide separate facilities for general aviation and thus relieve congestion at airports. Federal participation in constructing terminal buildings is restricted to costs directly related to the safety of persons at the airport.

Prohibits the approval of any project which does not include provision for installing certain specified landing aids such as high-intensity runway lighting as determined by the Administrator to be required for safe and efficient handling of traffic at the particular airport. Increased the Federal share of the installation of such aids from 50 percent to a maximum of 75 percent.

Provides that funds allocated to a State under the apportionment formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years shall become available for use in any State, at the discretion of the Administrator.

Requires publication by January 1 each year of the proposed program for airport development during the next fiscal year.

Amends the Federal Aviation Act to authorize various departments of the Federal Government to pay for space in public airports necessary in the performance of their duties.

Meteorology research

S. 681: Passed Senate Februray 16, 1961; returned to Senate February 23, 1961—Reconsideration motion pending:

This measure is designed to remove any doubt as to the Weather Bureau's existing authority to enter into research contracts for other than air navigational problems with public and private agencies (such as universities), thus permitting research contracts in all areas of meteorological science.

The specific authority under section 3 of the Federal Aviation Act authorizing the Weather Bureau to enter into these contracts has, upon occasion, been strictly construed as requiring a direct relationship to aeronautics and, though most of them do, this relationship is not always apparent; consequently, statutory questions have arisen. Thus, this measure clarifies the Bureau's authority to take advantage of highly specialized research facilities such as those found in universities.

In addition, this measure, at the discretion of the Chief of Bureau, authorizes the use of public funds for telephone services in private residences in isolated areas to carry into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States. In these semi-isolated or isolated locations, the Weather Bureau field facilities are not open on a 24-hour basis thus there must be some other means of contacting these isolated employees so they can post and disseminate storm warnings and other urgent information to the public.

Naval aviation—Golden anniversary

House Joint Resolution 398: Public Law 87–43, approved May 27, 1961:

In commemorating the 50th anniversary of naval aviation, to be celebrated June 6 through June 11, 1961, in Pensacola, Fla., this resolution authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to design and manufacture a galvano, for use as a plaque, to be presented to the Secretary of the Navy on this occasion.

Naval aviation has significantly contributed to the defense of the United States and through its training programs for friendly governments has contributed to the defense of the free world. This celebration will contribute greatly to the educational and cultural welfare and to the defense of the people of the United States by highlighting the great traditions of naval aviation.

Presentation to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired

Senate Joint Resolution 108—Passed Senate August 21, 1961. Pending in House Armed Services Committee:

Presents the Distinguished Flying Cross to Major General Foulois, U.S. Air Force, retired. He was in charge of the first airplane owned and used by the Army, commanded the first aero squadron to Mexico in 1915, served as Chief of the Air Service of the American Expeditionary Forces in France in World War I and was Chief of the Air Corps from 1931 until his retirement in 1935

Special meteorological services

S. 680—Passed Senate June 29, 1951. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Committee:

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct certain meteorological services in cooperation with or at the request of States, counties, cities, or other local government units, private organizations, or individuals. Authority is granted for the Secretary to receive payment of the cost of such work or services, in whole or in part, from the government units, private organizations, or individuals in whose behalf the work or study was made. Such payments may be in funds or property or both. Requires that all funds received are to be deposited in a separate account in the Treasury for use in paying the costs of such work or services, for making refunds, or for crediting appropriations from which the cost of such work or service may have been paid.

Although the bill authorizes payment for the work or service, whether or not it is required is discretionary with the Secretary.

Supplemental air carriers

S. 1969: Passed Senate August 28, 1961. Passed House amended September 18, 1961:

This measure provides a permanent place in the aviation industry for supplemental air carriers without adverse effect upon scheduled carriers. It provides that a carrier may request and be authorized to perform limited services supplemental to those furnished by the regular air carriers, and authorizes the Board to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental service containing limitations on the type and extent of service authorized. The bill would:

Grant statutory interim operating rights, in the nature of temporary "grandfather" rights, to existing holders of supplemental air carrier certificates who have performed a portion of the service authorized by their present certificates.

Make clear that a supplemental certificate is primarily a certificate for charter service and provide that the Board may, when the public convenience and necessity require, also authorize individually ticketed service.

Make clear that supplemental air carriers are not eligible for subsidy payments.

Permit the Board to issue a special operating authorization for temporary service between particular points during periods when regular service is inadequate.

Permit the Board to impose civil penalties for violations of title IV of the act relating to economic regulations.

Amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for a statutory definition of charter service.

Make clear that a regularly certificated carrier cannot also be certificated as a supplemental carrier.

Enable the Board to make a determination of fitness based upon considerations peculiar to the type of supplemental transportation for which authority is sought.

This legislation was requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board as a result of the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District against Civil Aeronautics Board, which determined that the Board lacked authority under existing law to issue limited certificates.

War risk insurance extension

S. 1931: Public Law 87–89, approved July 20, 1961:

Extends for 5 years until 1966 title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which provides that in the event of war the Nation's civil air fleet would have adequate insurance coverage for war risks. Commercial aviation war risk policies are issued with automatic termination clauses in the event of outbreak of a major war.

Wright Brothers Day

House Joint Resolution 109: Public Law 87–291, approved September 22, 1961:

Gives the President the authority to designate December 17 of each year as Wright Brothers Day in commemoration of the first successful airplane flight by Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903.

COMMUNICATIONS

American Samoa radio licenses

S. 1589: Passed Senate July 25, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

This bill authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to issue radio operator licenses to natives of American Samoa who are nationals of the United States and owe allegiance to it, but to whom full citizenship has not been extended.

Under existing law the FCC may issue radio operator licenses only to citizens of the United States and in certain cases to foreign nationals in the field of aviation.

Communication facilities—protection

S. 1990: Public Law 87–306, approved September 26, 1961:

Amends section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code as a further protection of the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communication facilities.

The amendment provides that whoever willfully or maliciously injures or destroys any of the works, property, or material of any radio, telegraph, telephone or cable, line station, or system, or other means of communication, operated or controlled by the United States, or used or intended to be used for military or civil defense functions of the United States whether constructed or in process of construction, or willfully or maliciously interferes in any way with the working or use of any such line, or system, or willfully or maliciously obstructs, hinders, or delays the transmission of any communication over any line, or system, will be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

In the case of any works, property, or material, not operated or controlled by the United States, however, this section does not apply to any lawful strike activity, or other lawful concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid and protection which do not injure or destroy any line or system used or intended to be used for the military or civil defense functions of the United States.

Federal Communications Act—Amendment

S. 1288: Passed Senate April 28, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Permits the Federal Communications Commission in certain situations to waive the annual inspection required under the statutory provision for a period not to exceed 30 days, upon a finding that the public interest would be serviced.

Under the present act, every ship of the United States must have the equipment and apparatus inspected at least once each year by the Commission, and there is no flexibility beyond the expiration of a 12-month period. In certain cases this creates a hardship on commercial vessels returning to the United States from extended foreign voyages. The ship radio station must be inspected at the first port of call rather than at a port selected by the shipowner for reasons of economic and operational convenience. Thus, this additional 30 days will provide the flexibility considered necessary and desirable.

Telecasting of professional sports contests

H.R. 9096: Public Law 87-331, approved September 30, 1961:

Authorizes the member clubs of a professional football, baseball, basketball, or hockey league, to pool their separate rights in the sponsored telecasting of their games and to permit the league to sell the resulting package of pooled rights to a television network without violating the antitrust laws. It also provides that such package contracts cannot be used to impair college football gates receipts through network telecasts of professional football contests at times when college games are normally played.

CRIME

Agency or department investigations

S. 1665: Passed Senate July 28, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Prohibits, subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, the obstruction of any lawful inquiry or investigation by the Department of Justice or the Department of the Treasury, and prohibits injury to any person on account of his furnishing or having furnished information in connection with any inquiry.

This will aid in protecting any witnesses who give necessary testimony prior to court proceedings from intimidation or coercion, a protection not now provided under the law.

Bad check offenses

H.R. 7657: Public Law 87-385, approved October 4, 1961:

Amends the Uniform Code of Military Justice by adding section 923a which would make specific the terms of the authority for prosecution of bad check offenses, thus creating a specific statutory authority for such a prosecution against members of the Armed Forces. None of the statutes under which violations are now prosecuted are entirely appropriate due to numerous technical problems in pleading or proving any bad check case.

Escape of juvenile delinquents

S. 1954: Passed Senate September 19, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Imposes a fine of $1,000 or 1 year in prison, or both, as a penalty for a juvenile delinquent under 18 who escapes or attempts to escape from the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative for violation of any law not punishable by death or life imprisonment and if the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings.

Espionage laws—Extension

H.R. 2730: Public Law 87-369, approved October 4, 1961:

Deletes section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code, which has the inadvertent effect of limiting venue relative to acts of espionage and censorship, to acts committed in the United States or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States. By repealing this section, venue will be extended worldwide as to citizens of the United States committing these acts.

False bomb information

H.R. 6334: Public Law 87-338, approved October 3, 1961:

Strengthens the present law on imparting false bomb information by making it a misdemeanor knowingly (but without malice) to impart or convey such false information, and by making it a felony to convey such false information willfully and maliciously or with a reckless disregard for human life.

Federal Youth Corrections Act

H.R. 5343: Public Law 87-336, approved October 3, 1961:

The purpose of this bill is to correct an existing inconsistency in the Federal Youth Corrections Act. At present a youth offender who has been committed or incarcerated is entitled, on discharge, to have his conviction set aside. However, a youth offender who is not committed but instead is placed on probation by the court is not entitled to this benefit. This bill now makes available to a youth offender placed on probation the same benefits as the youth offender who has been committed to a correctional institution.

Fugitive Felon Act

H.R. 468—Public Law 87-368, approved October 4, 1961:

To combat organized crime and racketeering, this bill amends the Fugitive Felon Act to bring within its scope any fugitive who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for any crime or an attempt to commit any crime, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term of more than 1 year under the laws of the place from which the fugitive fled.

Gambling devices

S. 1658—Passed July 28, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Broadens the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines (other than those defined under present law) manufactured for gambling purposes. Requires detailed records be maintained with respect to the acquisition and disposition of gambling devices that might be shipped or intended to be shipped in interstate and foreign commerce.

An inventory record of all devices sold, delivered, or shipped must be kept and must be open at any time for inspection by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Racketeering enterprises

S. 1653: Public Law 87-228, approved September 13, 1961:

Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities (business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, or prostitution or investigations of narcotic or liquor law violations). Also prohibits the use of mails or interstate and foreign commerce transportation to those with the intent of committing any crime of violence to further any "unlawful activity" or who might otherwise promote or manage any "unlawful activity." The penalty for violation: $10,000 or 5 years in prison or both.

Testimony—Compulsion

S. 1655: Passed Senate July 28, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

This bill authorizes compulsion of testimony and grants of immunity to witnesses in cases of graft, bribery, and extortion under the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hobbs Anti-racketeering Act.

Transmission of bets

S. 1656: Public Law 87-216, approved September 13, 1961:

Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gambling. Information carried for use of the press and wireless communication of information are not included. Any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the FCC, must discontinue or refuse to lease, furnish, or maintain any such facility after being notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency that such services are being used for transmitting or receiving gambling information. The penalty for violation: $10,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment or both.

Wagering paraphernalia

S. 1657: Public Law 87-218, approved September 13, 1961:

Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers game or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual course of its business (allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal). The penalty for violation: not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

DEFENSE

AEC authorization

H.R. 7576: Public Law 87-315, approved September 26, 1961:

Authorizes total appropriations of $270,440,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. An important item included in this authorization is $111 million for the linear electron accelerator at Stanford and the balance is new construction funds for 40 AEC projects.

AEC—Omnibus amendments

H.R. 8599: Public Law 87-206, approved September 6, 1961:

This measure is considered as the AEC omnibus bill of 1961.

Amendments include (1) the transfer of 3 kilograms of plutonium and 500 grams of uranium 233 to the International Atomic Energy Agency to aid in the prestige of the IAEA as a center for distribution of special nuclear materials; (2) the transfer of 8 additional kilograms of plutonium and 30 kilograms of uranium 233 to Euratom for research purposes and to help start an experimental plant for reprocessing fuel elements; (3) extends hearing times for the program, "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry"; (4) makes regulations concerning patent rights of atomic inventions; (5) sanctions the AEC's practice of not releasing all of the reports of an inventor's atomic inventions unless due to special circumstances; (6) transfers back to the State of California exclusive jurisdiction which the United States now exercises over portions of the AEC Livermore site; and (7) permits, at the discretion of the Commission, those persons having security clearance granted by another Government agency to fulfill security specifications of the AEC.

Career Compensation Act—Clarification

H.R. 4324: Public Law 87-103, approved July 25, 1961:

Makes more uniform the language of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 regarding reenlistment within 3 months from the date of discharge. The law now uses both "90 days" and "3 months" which has caused confusion and overpayment of reenlistment bonuses of the extra days that occur because of 31-day months. The uniform term would be 3 months.

Coast Guard—Temporary appointments

H.R. 8719: Public Law 87–257, approved September 21, 1961:

Extends the authority of the President to make temporary appointments in the Coast Guard, until January 1, 1964, or until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number authorized by law, whichever occurs earlier.

Emergency evacuation payments

H.R. 7724: Public Law 87–188, approved, August 30, 1961:

Authorizes advance payment of the basic pay of any member of the Armed Forces to a dependent who might be evacuated in an emergency from any oversea area. The advance pay would not be anything over and above the basic pay and could be drawn not to exceed 2 months in advance.

Enlistment of aliens

H.R. 181: Public Law 87–143, approved August 17, 1961:

This measure authorizes peacetime enlistments in the Army and the Air Force by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Under existing law, in peacetime a person may not be accepted for original enlistment unless he is a citizen of the United States or has made a legal declaration of intention to become a citizen; however, section 4a of the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides for registration and induction into the Armed Forces of male aliens under certain conditions. Many of these aliens, after serving a part of their military obligation, would like to enlist and make a career in military service but, because of assignment overseas or other circumstances, they are unable to comply with the requirement that an alien must make a legal declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be accepted for enlistment.

Thus, this bill eliminates the requirement that an alien must have made a legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States before he is eligible to enlist in the Army or the Air Force. And, in the future, the Army and the Air Force will permit persons to enlist who can furnish proof of lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence.

Family separation allowances

H.R. 6244: Public Law 87–207, approved September 6, 1961:

Relieves members or former members of the Armed Forces who, in good faith, received a family separation allowance between February 28 and September of 1958. The allowance was withdrawn after September because it was determined that the Defense Secretaries hadn't the authority to make them under existing law. The allowance was for servicemen who, because of inadequate living facilities or because dependents were not permitted, could not take their families to their assigned post and had to maintain two homes—one in the United States and one abroad. Those who accepted the allowance would not have to pay back the Government; those who have paid back any part of the allowance can request a refund from the Government.

Marine Corps supply officers

H.R. 4328—Public Law 87–123, approved August 3, 1961:

This bill eliminates the supply-duty-only officers category in the U.S. Marine Corps and authorizes their reassignment as officers not restricted in duty performance, to improve the combat effectiveness of the corps by providing for the expanded assignment of these officers whose skills lie primarily in the supply field.

Under existing law Marine Corps officers may be appointed as supply-duty-only officers in the grade of captain and above and, as a result, promotions for these officers is restricted to vacancies within this category.

This bill enables these officers to be reassigned on active duty lists of the Marine Corps (except the incumbent Quartermaster General) as officers not restricted in duty which will permit them to compete against unrestricted officers for promotion to the next higher grade.

Military construction authorization

H.R. 5000—Public Law 87–57, approved June 27, 1961:

This measure provides construction and other related authority for the Department of Defense, within and outside the United States, and authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components, in the total amount of $893,947,750.

A breakdown of the authorizations:

Army:	
Inside continental United States	$76,918,000
Outside continental United States	37,243,000
Classified	6,245,000
Emergency construction	10,000,000
Total	130,406,000
Navy:	
Inside continental United States	79,239,000
Outside continental United States	8,136,000
Classified	40,969,000
Emergency construction	10,000,000
Total	138,344,000
Air Force:	
Inside continental United States	146,868,000
Outside continental United States	32,293,000
Classified	285,300,000
Emergency construction	10,000,000
Total	474,461,000
Defense:	
Military family housing	8,650,000
Missile and space programs	27,000,000
Deficiency authorizations:	
Army	4,930,000
Navy	39,700,000
Air Force	3,359,000
Total	47,989,000
Reserve components:	
Army National Guard	$22,682,750
Army Reserve	12,505,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	7,794,000
Air National Guard	18,606,000
Air Force Reserve	4,865,000
Total	66,156,750
Deficiency authorizations:	
Army National Guard	28,000
Army Reserve	73,000
Naval Reserves	152,000
Air National Guard	363,000
Air Force Reserve	29,000
Total	645,000
Grand total of all authorizations	893,947,750

Military procurement authorization

S. 1852: Public Law 87–53, approved June 21, 1961:

This measure authorizes $12,571 million for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962. The specific types of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels to be procured are not designated in the bill in order to provide the Defense Department with more flexibility in this program. In the event of reprograming, however, the Department will notify the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations before implementing the proposed changes.

Pertinent breakdown:

Aircraft:	
Army	$211,000,000
Navy and Marine Corps	1,585,600,000
Air Force (of which $525,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command)	3,841,200,000
Missiles:	
Army	550,800,000
Navy	606,400,000
Marine Corps	27,000,000
Air Force	2,792,000,000
Naval vessels, Navy	2,957,000,000
Total	12,571,000,000

Military procurement authorizations—Additional

S. 2311—Public Law 87–118, approved August 3, 1961:

Authorized additional appropriations, as requested by the President on July 26, 1961, to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sea lift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorizations for the procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was for $1,753 million; however, of this amount additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000.

Summary of authorizations

Category and service	Appropriation title	Additional fiscal year 1962 NOA requiring authorization
Aircraft:		
Army	Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$36,700,000
Navy and Marine Corps	Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	281,400,000
Air Force	Aircraft procurement, Air Force	(211,500,000)
	Airlift modernization, Air Force	(82,600,000)
Subtotal, aircraft		612,200,000

Summary of authorizations—Continued

Category and service	Appropriation title	Additional fiscal year 1962 NOA requiring authorization
Missiles:		
Army	Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$33,770,000
Navy	Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	262,200,000
Marine Corps	Procurement, Marine Corps	
Air Force	Missile procurement, Air Force	8,800,000
Subtotal, missiles		304,770,000
Naval vessels: Navy	Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	41,600,000
Grand total		958,570,000

Museum Advisory Board

H.R. 4659—Public Law 87–186, approved August 30, 1961:

Establishes a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution of 11 members, 9 appointed by the President and the Secretary of the Smithsonian and Defense (ex officio). The members would serve without pay but would be reimbursed for necessary expenses. They would advise the Regents of the Smithsonian as to the portrayal of exhibits depiciting the contributions which the Armed Forces have made—not only in matters of time of war but in those matters that provide a powerful deterrent to war.

National Guard

S. 1342—Public Law 87–83, approved July 6, 1961:

Permits members of the National Guard who voluntarily participate in reenacting the Battle of First Manassas to be treated for the purpose of death and burial benefits, physical disability retirement, and other benefits provided by Federal law as if they were performing training duty, with the exception of pay and allowances.

Transportation facilities will also be furnished by the Government.

Naval Reserve officers' status

H.R. 4349—Public Law 87–109, approved July 21, 1961:

Provides that the commissions received by Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates shall be considered to be of the same status as those received by U.S. Naval Academy graduates. In this same status Reserve officers will also have to apply, as an Academy graduates must, to terminate his service. Now such an officer must petition if he desires to stay in the service. This requirement cuts down the eagerness of young officers to stay in the service and creates the impression that they are considered second-class officers.

Navy diving duty pay

H.R. 4323—Public Law 87–145, approved August 17, 1961:

This bill repeals existing law authorizing various forms of pay for personnel engaged in diving duty and established a maximum rate of $110 a month as special pay for military personnel performing diving duty. Under this bill, the Secretary of the Navy will establish a flat rate of $110 for all officers performing diving duty and a scale of from $55 to $100 a month for enlisted personnel depending upon skill and experience. At present, there are three separate types of pay now authorized for persons performing diving duty which will be repealed by this act.

Ready reservists

Senate Joint Resolution 120—Public Law 87–117, approved August 1, 1961:

Authorizes the President to order up 250,000 ready reservists to active duty for not longer than 12 months; part of the increased strength needed will be accomplished by added inductions, additional enlistments, and increased officer procurement. The President can also extend terms of enlistments and appointments where there might be a shortage of trained personnel in areas of critical need in the foreseeable future. The forces called will be those necessary to build up a balanced fighting unit; priority will be for persons who have not previously fought a war or served long periods of active duty and those whose occupation is not essential to maintain the national health, safety, or interest. As many troops as 250,000 may be called up under this authorization.

Reemployment rights—UMT

H.R. 8765—Public Law 87–391, approved October 4, 1961:

Amends the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to:

Reinforce the reemployment protection of those who perform additional military service under present conditions (250,000 reservists ordered to active duty under Public Law 87–117 of August 1, 1961).

Remove a requirement that rejectees must request a leave of absence from their employer to determine their physical fitness to enter the Armed Forces.

Assure those who are called for preinduction examinations and subsequently accepted or rejected are entitled to remain in their employment pending their induction or rejection.

Reserves—Participation

H.R. 5490: Public Law 87–378, approved October 4, 1961:

Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive, for as the law now stands, service is either for 1 or 3 years.

Other changes include making ROTC graduate training program run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary in place of the required 6-month active duty requirement. Also includes penalty provisions for those who fail to actively participate during terms of service in either the Active Reserve or the National Guard.

Troop command

H.R. 7722: Public Law 87–142, approved August 17, 1961:

This act provides permissive authority for officers of the Army Medical Service to exercise command outside the Army Medical Service when directed by appropriate authority.

Under existing law, a commissioned officer of the Army Medical Service is not entitled to exercise command because of his rank except within the Army Medical Service.

This legislation will permit a qualified officer of the Medical Service Corps to be utilized on the same basis as officers of other technical services.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alcoholic Beverage Control Act Amendments

H.R. 256: Public Law 87–238, approved September 14, 1946:

Provides for collecting taxes on alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia by a monthly reporting system. This will require the wholesaler to furnish a monthly statement showing the quantity of beverage subject to taxation which was sold by him during the calendar month, and to pay the tax on the quantity sold. This method has been in use for sometime in the District on the taxation of beer and wine.

This will eliminate the present tax-stamp method which requires that alcoholic beverage taxes be collected by the use of stamps, sold by the Collector of Taxes.

Bus fares—Schoolchildren

S. 1745: Passed Senate September 26, 1961:

Authorizes the District of Columbia government to reimburse each common carrier required to transport schoolchildren at reduced fares (10 cents), the difference between the reduced fare and the lowest adult fare (20 cents).

Compulsory school census

S. 560: Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Provides that all children below the age of 18 be listed in the school census. Now, children between the ages of 3 and 18 must be listed; the new ruling would be helpful to school officials in making projections of future enrollments. The census will be taken as often as requested by the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education.

The bill also provides for a designation on the census form as to whether the school attended by the child is public or private, to help in determining how crowded the conditions may be in the public schools.

Contract approval

S. 1651: Passed Senate June 16, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

This bill keeps pace with the rising number of contract approval actions which District law requires the Commissioners to act upon. The Commissioners are authorized to delegate to any Commissioner, or officer, employee, or agency of the District of Columbia government, the authority to approve contracts of $100,000 or less.

Court fees

S. 558: Public Law 87–349, approved October 4, 1961:

This bill eliminates an existing situation with regard to a District of Columbia statute where the District of Columbia is required to pay certain fees assessed by the district courts (which it either wholly or in large measure supports), but is exempted from paying costs.

Credit unions in District of Columbia

H.R. 6495: Public Law 87–249, approved September 14, 1961:

Amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit credit unions to issue life insurance to their members not in excess of the member's savings in the credit union, or more than $2,000, whichever is smaller.

This will enable credit unions in the District to provide life savings insurance for their members which now must be obtained outside the District, resulting in a loss of local business and revenue.

District of Columbia hospital extension

H.R. 4913—Public Law 87–79, approved June 30, 1961:

This measure extends the Federal grant authority of the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act for 1 year, from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1962.

This act has the dual purpose of providing the District and other interested Federal agencies with additional time to formulate a coordinated program of Federal assistance to George Washington University Hospital and other hospitals in the metropolitan area, and also preserves the present program of expanding private hospitals in the District through Federal grants provided under the provisions of the Hospital Center Act.

Divorce

S. 1761—Passed Senate September 11, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

This bill amends existing law relating to residence requirement for divorce, legal separation, annulment of marriage, and maintenance of children and former wives in the District of Columbia by providing:

1. Regardless of where cause of action arose, either party may sue for divorce in the District if he or she has been a resident of the District for 1 year.

2. If marriage occurred outside the District, annulment proceedings may be brought if either party has been a resident of the District for 1 year. To annul a marriage performed in the District, either party may bring the action so long as one of the parties is an actual bona fide resident of the District at the time the action is brought.

3. To affirm the validity of any marriage, whether performed within or without the District, action may be maintained if either party resides in the District at the time the suit is brought.

4. Reduced to 1 year (from 2) the period of desertion as a ground for absolute divorce.

5. Reduced to 3 years (from 5) period of voluntary separation without cohabitation as a ground for absolute divorce.

6. Eliminated the words "involving moral turpitude" from the description of a felony conviction and sentence for not less than 2 years to a penal institution, when this is used as a cause for the divorce.

7. Reduced to 1 year (from 2) the waiting period for enlarging a limited divorce to an absolute divorce, measured from the time the parties separated.

8. Required a divorced father to maintain his minor children; and a former husband who has obtained a foreign ex parte divorce and who has been served personally with process in the District must maintain his former wife if so ordered by the court.

Elections

H.R. 8444: Public Law 87–389, approved October 4, 1961:

To implement the 23d amendment to the Constitution providing that District residents may vote in the presidential elections, this measure will:

Retain 21 as the minimum age for qualified voters in the District.

Abolish permanent registration and require all qualified voters to register in the year in which the presidential election is held.

Liberalize requirements relating to absentee registering and voting, but permit only the physically incapacitated to register by absentee.

Establish procedures for presidential elections to be selected in two ways:

(1) By certification of the executive committee recognized by the national committee of a major political party, that is, a party which has had its candidates for electors of President and Vice President on the ballot in each of five States in the last election.

(2) Any other party may have its candidates for electors submitted to the Board of Elections by presenting a petition to the Board signed by at least 5 percent of the registered qualified voters as of July 1 immediately preceding the election.

Require an elector to take an oath or solemnly affirm that he or she will vote for the candidate of the party he has been nominated to represent; and that it shall be his duty to vote this way in the electoral college.

Provide that only the names of the candidates of each political party for President and Vice President shall be placed on the ballot.

Make provision for a substitute appointment by the party committee in case the candidate for elector dies, resigns, or becomes unable to serve.

Require a 1-year residency in the District before one has the privilege of voting.

Require that nominees for presidential electors must qualify as voters and must have been residents of the District for 3 years.

Forbid the sale of alcoholic beverages on the day of the presidential election and during the hours when the polls are open, except sales by pharmacists on physicians' prescriptions.

Fire Department workweek

S. 1292: Public Law 87–399, approved October 5, 1961:

Reduces the present 60-hour workweek of officers and members of the firefighting division of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia to a 56-hour average workweek.

Gambling in the District of Columbia

H.R. 4669: Public Law 87–259, approved September 21, 1961:

Strengthens the law relating to gambling in the District by authorizing forfeiture to the District of property seized in connection with a gambling violation.

The procedure prescribed for forfeiting property is a libel action brought in the municipal court by the Corporation Counsel. Unless good cause is shown to the contrary, the property is forfeited to the District and may be made available for the use of any agency of the District government or may be disposed of as the Commissioners may, by order or regulation, provide. Where there are bona fide liens against forfeited property, the property may be sold at public auction; however, before the bona fide lienholder is satisfied, the District's costs for the public auction must first be paid.

Healing Arts Practice Act amendment

H.R. 8032—Public Law 87–248, approved September 14, 1961:

Allows the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize the facilities of a nationally recognized examining board to examine and evaluate the professional skill of any graduate from any foreign medical school in order that the Commissioners may issue a license for these doctors to practice in the District. Also, makes it possible for a graduate of a medical school registered under the Healing Arts Practice Act to be given credit for a degree regardless of whether the school became unregistered after his graduation.

Indecent publications

H.R. 4670—In conference:

This bill strengthens existing law against indecent publications by authorizing forfeiture to the District of Columbia of property used in connection with a violation of the law relating to indecent publications. It also provides for enjoining as a public nuisance any place where persons resort or congregate to violate the indecent publication law of the District of Columbia.

Juvenile court judges—Two additional

S. 486—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

This measure provides for the appointment of two additional juvenile court judges for the District of Columbia, making a total of three. The two new judges will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The judges appointed as a result of this measure will serve for a 10-year term, or until his successor is appointed and qualified. To qualify, one must:

1. Be a member of the District of Columbia bar for a period of 5 years preceding his appointment.

2. During a period of 10 years immediately preceding appointment have been a resident of the District of Columbia or of the metropolitan area of the District for at least 5 years of which not less than 3 years must immediately precede appointment. Metropolitan area means Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia.

3. Have a broad knowledge of social problems and procedures and an understanding of child psychology.

This bill provides that the present judge of the court shall continue in office and be considered as occupying one of the three positions of judge provided in this legislation.

The chief judge, to be designated by the President, will receive $18,000 a year, and the associate judges will receive $17,500 a year.

Juvenile division—Youth correctional center

S. 2299—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Establishes a juvenile division within or in connection with the District of Columbia Youth Correctional Center and authorizes the judge of the juvenile court to commit to this division children 15 years of age or older which will provide the District with an adequate institution to rehabilitate older, more aggressive, juvenile delinquents.

Learners' driving permits

S. 1291—Passed Senate June 16, 1961. House Calendar:

This bill raises the fee for driving permits for learners in the District of Columbia from $1 to $2 to pay the cost of a traffic safety education program.

Life insurance

H.R. 7044—Public Law 87–245, approved September 14, 1961:

This legislation permits domestic District of Columbia life insurance companies to acquire common stocks of any other insurance company for the purpose of acquiring subsidiaries or affiliates. Limits the total investment to an amount equal to the investing company's capital, surplus, and contingency reserves in excess of the minimum statutory requirements of $150,000.

Thus, this amendment permits life insurance companies in the District of Columbia to compete on an equal basis with companies incorporated in other States. It permits companies to diversify by becoming allied with insurance fields such as fire, casualty, health, and accident. These changes will strengthen the domestic companies and provide more security and service to their policyholders.

Marital property rights

H.R. 7265—Public Law 87–246, approved September 14, 1961:

This measure amends the District of Columbia Code to provide a new basis for determining certain marital property rights. It establishes a uniform succession of both real and personal property and expressly provides for payment of debts, administration expenses, and taxes out of the decedent's real property if there is a deficiency of personal property.

Restores the inchoate right of dower and expressly provides that all existing sections of the District of Columbia Code relating to dower be construed to apply to both husband and wife.

Expands the existing form for renunciation to permit not only election of the legal share of real and personal property, but election of dower in lieu of the legal share of the real property.

Provides for election of dower in lieu of the legal share of intestate real property of the deceased spouse.

Provides for renunciation by a guardian or other fiduciary for an infant, incompetent, or person under disability.

Provides a limitation on the share of the surviving spouse filing a renunciation can receive in derogation of the mill. The renouncing spouse is limited to one-half of the net estate, or in the case of election of dower in lieu of the legal share of the real

property, to one-half of the net personal property and dower in the real property.

Clarifies existing provisions of the code relating to the interest of a spouse where there is a valid antenuptial or postnuptial agreement, by expressly permitting the surviving spouse to take a devise or bequest which the other spouse has voluntarily made to him or her.

Municipal Court—Jurisdiction

H.R. 3222—Public Law 87-242, approved September 14, 1961:

Confers jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and cross-claims in any action in which the municipal court had initial jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is now limited to cases of counterclaims and cross-claims when the value of the claims is not in excess of $3,000. Any claims for more than $3,000, although initial action is in the municipal court, is referred to the U.S. district court. This means that litigation must be dealt with by two courts, thus making the settling of cases a longer and more costly procedure than necessary.

Municipal court small claims branch

S. 561—Public Law 87-203, approved September 6, 1961:

Raises the dollar limit on cases admissible to the small claims and conciliation branch of the district court, from $50 to $150, to keep pace with the trend in small claims, which in recent years have declined sharply in number where they are below $50, but increased in number where they are between $50 and $150. This will better utilize the small claims branch, and at the same time entitle more litigants to enjoy the advantage of the branch's simplified procedures.

Perjury statute

S. 2356—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Makes the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements, under oath, when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

This act will further protect purchasers of insurance in the District of Columbia from being deceived and defrauded by dishonest insurance salesmen.

Physical therapy

S. 1762—Public Law 87-280, approved September 22, 1961:

Requires that all physical therapists be registered under the provisions set down by this act and carried out by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, unless these therapists are exempt under terms of other acts as specified, such as those employed under the immediate supervision of a licensed medical doctor. A board of examiners is to be appointed; they are to examine any applicant for a license to practice physical therapy. The Commissioners or whomever they may delegate are authorized to hold studies and investigations when necessary. A register of approved schools is to be kept.

Police force—Strength

H.R. 7218—Public Law 87-60, approved June 27, 1961:

This bill raises the authorized minimum limit of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia from 2,500 to 3,000 (at present the force has 2,714 members, 214 above the minimum level) to provide more adequate protection for citizens of the District.

Privileged communications—Clergymen

H.R. 5488—Public Law 87-318, approved September 26, 1961:

Prohibits District of Columbia courts from examining any minister of religion in connection with communications made to him in his professional capacity without consent of the party involved.

Public assistance—Consolidation

S. 914—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

This bill consolidates various statutes on District of Columbia public assistance; makes uniform in all types the requirement of relatives to contribute to aid and establishes residence qualifications.

The acts consolidated are: Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and general assistance authorized in appropriation acts for the District of Columbia.

Makes uniform in all categories a 1-year residence requirement for public assistance eligibility and applies the same uniformity requirements as to the responsibility of relatives to contribute to the support of the applicant. Thus, this measure requires the husband, wife, father, mother, or adult child of a recipient of public assistance or of a person in need of public assistance to be responsible for the support of the needy person in proportion to the ability of the relative to contribute to his support. The recipient of assistance or a person in need of assistance or the Commissioners may bring legal action to require support from the designated relatives while, under existing law, only the District of Columbia is empowered to sue responsible relatives.

Regulate the height of buildings

S. 1529—Public Law 87-281, approved September 22, 1961:

Amends the act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia. This bill eliminates the limitation that no buildings in a medium- or high-density apartment area could be over eight stories high; the limitation remains that no building in such an area could be over 90 feet high. This limitation will allow an increase from 8 to 10 stories for apartment buildings and would simplify the construction plans and lower the building costs per living unit.

Remove dangerous buildings

S. 557—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to require that unsafe structures be vacated under penalty of $300 fine or up to 30 days' imprisonment as figured after 5 days' notice to repair or take corrective action has been given. A fine not to exceed $50 per day will be charged against anyone who fails to carry out any repair required by the Commissioners.

This measure also establishes that any work undertaken to correct unsafe conditions which has been paid by the District of Columbia government is to be assessed against the property and to be collected as taxes; the "grace period" during which interest is not charged is cut to 60 days from 90 days and the interest charged is changed from 10 percent per annum to one-half of 1 percent per month.

Retired Government personnel—District of Columbia schools

S. 502—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Permits retired Federal employees to teach in the District of Columbia school system without loss or reduction in Federal retirement pay; also permits District of Columbia teachers who have reached the mandatory retirement age to accept Federal positions without loss or reduction of teachers' retirement pay.

Under existing law, retired Government personnel teaching in District of Columbia schools are forced to accept salaries reduced by the amount of their retirement annuity. As this law is applicable only in the District, the Maryland and Virginia schools benefit greatly by the utilization of the broad experience of retired Federal employees in teaching capacities.

Retirement—Policemen and firemen

S. 1918—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Extends benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired, or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of the 1957 act, or who retired prior to the effective date. Thus, under this bill, a widow and one child now receiving $150 a month will be increased to $200 a month.

Places on a complete parity the protection accorded the surviving dependents of men who died prior to the effective date of the 1957 amendments and the survivors of men who died after the effective date of the amendments.

These new benefits will be made effective the first day of the first month following the date of enactment.

Stream Valley Park

S. 588—Passed Senate June 16, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

This bill increases the authorization for acquiring and developing the Stream Valley Park projects, to extend them from the District of Columbia into Maryland. This would make grant authorizations to Maryland for these projects equal to those made for Virginia for similar projects in 1952.

Tax increase

H.R. 258—House disagrees to conference report:

Provides for means of collecting needed revenue for supplementing the District of Columbia budget. There is a $21.3 million deficit in the District of Columbia proposed budget, due to the cut in the Federal contribution to pay the expenses of the District of Columbia government and also due to the mandatory increases in District of Columbia government employees.

The increases in taxes include an increase to 3 percent from 2 percent on sales tax with no change on present 1-percent tax on groceries and imposes a tax upon each deed at the time it is submitted at one-half of 1 percent of the consideration of the deed, with certain specified exemptions.

Provides for the establishment of a parking fee account within the highway fund of the District of Columbia. The account would receive the revenue of all parking meters and other revenue acquired under the operations of the Motor Parking Facility Act and all the revenue now in the motor vehicle parking fund. The money will be used to maintain roads and highways and pay for the removal of snow and ice from the streets.

Provides for standby authority for the District of Columbia government to raise water rates and sanitary sewer service charges by as much as 25 percent to meet continuing construction and operating costs.

Permits the District of Columbia to be considered as an impacted area in order to receive Federal payments for school construction purposes.

Teachers College

S. 1328—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Establishes a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College leading to a degree of associate in arts. It will affect particularly the 175 to 200 graduates of the District public schools who are capable of college level study but who are not financially able to obtain a college education as well as those 200 to 250 students who are capable of some but not complete

education at the college level. The Commissioners are authorized to establish and determine tuition rates; it is suggested that $100 be charged for tuition and the school fees combined for those taking a full college program.

Tissue banks licensing

S. 2321—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Aids in the development of reconstructive medicine by authorizing licensing of tissue banks in the District of Columbia and facilitates the ante-mortem and post-mortem donations of human tissue. A person may, by written agreement, donate any part of his body, at the time of his death to the tissue bank. The bill amends existing law to facilitate the movement and transfer of the deceased within the District by authorizing the Commissioners to control this movement by appropriate regulations, as the transfer of tissue must be made within a very few hours after death has occurred.

Under present law, a burial permit by the health officer of the District, countersigned by the coroner, must be obtained, and it is also unlawful to destroy any part of the deceased's body within 4 hours of death. Also permits the coroner to allow tissue to be removed from any body in his custody or under his jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the person having a right to the body.

Trading stamps in the District of Columbia

H.R. 7622—Public Law 87-262, approved September 21, 1961:

Authorized the use of trading stamps by the merchants and retailers in the District of Columbia. In reality, this bill repealed in its entirety the District's present gift enterprise law prohibiting the use of such promotional devices.

Traffic Act

S. 559—Passed Senate June 16, 1961, pending in House District Committee:

This bill raises the maximum allowable imprisonment term for violations of District traffic laws, from 10 to 90 days.

Unemployment Compensation Act amendments

H.R. 5968—In conference:

Amends the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to bring it in conformity with existing wages in the District of Columbia by—

1. Extending the provisions of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to employees of certain nonprofit religious, charitable, educational, and humane organizations not presently covered by the act;

2. Permitting voluntary payments upon the part of employers into the unemployment compensation fund to protect experience ratings previously earned;

3. Establishing the maximum weekly benefit amount each year as 50 percent of the average wage of all covered workers in the District of Columbia;

4. Extending the duration of benefit payments from the present maximum of 26 weeks to a uniform 34 weeks for all eligible claimants unemployed for that period of time;

5. Removing the provisions in existing law requiring cancellation of benefits in the case of individuals who are disqualified by reason of voluntary leaving, discharge for misconduct, or refusal to accept suitable work;

6. Prohibiting certain individuals from receiving unemployment compensation if they voluntarily retire without good cause and have applied for or are receiving a pension or retirement;

7. Tightening the qualifying provision of the present law by deleting the so-called step back under which an individual cannot qualify for benefits more than two levels below that otherwise indicated by his high quarter earnings; and

8. Providing that benefits not be denied to an otherwise eligible individual for any week during which he is attending a training or retraining course with the approval of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board.

Unsanitary buildings—Condemnation

S. 563—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House District Committee:

Amends a sanitation law of the District of Columbia to correct certain deficiencies in specifying uniform administrative measures. Under the bill, when a building is condemned and the District government makes any repairs or demolishes the building, the cost of the repairs is assessed as a tax against the property. This tax may be paid within 60 days and there will be no interest charged. If after 60 days the tax is not yet paid, interest would be charged at one-half of 1 percent a month or fraction of a month. If after 2 years the tax remains unpaid, the property is liable for sale at the next tax auction.

The bill also provides a uniform system of notifying the owner of the condemned property of the action taken against the property by the Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings.

Washington Home for Foundlings

H.R. 6798—Public Law 87-226, approved September 13, 1961:

Authorizes the Washington Home for Foundlings to establish and support an agency which will seek to place orphaned children in foster homes instead of maintaining a home or building for the reception and support for the children. Also authorizes the erection and maintenance of a separate building for the care and treatment of men, women, and children who are afflicted with cancer. Former legislation authorized cancer treatment only for women.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge

S. 564—Public Law 87-358, approved October 4, 1961:

This bill apportions the expense of operating and maintaining the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge, on an equal basis, between Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

ECONOMY

AEC Community Act—amendment

S. 1622—Public Law 87-174, approved August 30, 1961:

To accelerate property sales and stimulate the economic growth of atomic energy communities, this amendment reduces from 1 year to 90 days the waiting period prior to a negotiated sale by the Atomic Energy Commission in disposing of atomic energy community property.

The Commission desires to terminate the community disposition program as quickly as possible by sale transfers of Government-owned property into private ownership.

Area redevelopment

S. 1—Public Law 87-27, approved May 1, 1961:

As a demonstration of the Senate's "persistence," it has, for the fourth time, passed a $451 million program in an effort to aid in alleviating the suffering in distressed areas hit by unemployment and underemployment—where it is substantial and continuous—not temporary and seasonal.

This 4-year program declares its purpose to be one of Federal help for areas needing economic redevelopment, to expand their economic activities, and provide employment wherever possible by—

Authorizing the President to appoint an Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce (confirmed by the Senate) to receive compensation equal to an Assistant Secretary. The Administrator is to perform such duties under the act as are assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce.

Creating an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board to advise the Administrator. The Board is to be composed of the Secretary of Commerce as Chairman and seven other department and agency heads.

Requiring the Secretary to appoint a 25-member National Public Advisory Committee on area redevelopment, composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, State, and local governments and the general public.

Authorizing $300 million in Treasury-financed loans—

(1) To industrial areas for constructing new factory buildings, rehabilitating and converting existing buildings for industrial use, redeveloping land and purchasing facilities, including machinery and equipment in cases of demonstrated need;

(2) For rural areas for similar type loans; and

(3) For construction, alteration, and expansion of public facilities in both industrial and rural areas.

Authorizing an appropriation of $75 million for public facility grants to be used in areas where the project could not be undertaken without the grant.

Including an antipirating provision which prohibits Federal assistance for relocating an existing business enterprise from one area to another.

Setting up eligibility requirements which must be met before assistance can be obtained.

Limiting loans for private projects to 25 years, and up to 40 years for public facilities.

Authorizing grants of $4.5 million to help redevelopment areas evaluate developing potentialities for economic growth.

Making urban renewal grants available to industrial redevelopment areas for nonresidential projects—under existing urban renewal programs.

Authorizing an annual appropriation of $10 million for retraining subsistence payments by the Department of Labor to unemployed workers who are undergoing training for a new job under the vocational training program.

Terminating the program as of June 30, 1965.

Council of Economic Advisers

H.R. 6094—Public Law 87-49, approved June 16, 1961:

This act removed the ceiling on appropriations for salaries for menbers, staff, and other employees of the Council of Economic Advisers, and thus leaves to the regular appropriations machinery of Congress to decide each year what sums are required to support the expanding work of the Council.

Among many other functions, the Council advises the President on the state of the economy and policies to promote full employment, economic growth, and reasonable price stability. Problems of international economic policy as they relate to these goals are demanding an increasing share of the Council's attention. The President has also asked the Council to take on additional responsibilities relating to natural resources and public works, manpower problems, economics of disarmament, and several other fields.

Dependent children—Aid

H.R. 4884—Public Law 87-31, approved May 8, 1961:

This bill will—

1. Authorize a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962, to permit States to aid needy unemployed persons and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates.

2. Use the same matching formula as is used in the present Federal-State aid to dependent children.

3. Require the State agency administering the expanded aid to dependent children program to enter into cooperative arrangements with the State agency administering the public employment offices in order to try to obtain employment for the parent.

4. Require that State welfare agencies enter into cooperative arrangements with the State vocational education agency for retaining unemployed parents.

5. Give the States the option to exclude from the benefits of the bill individuals who are receiving unemployment compensation.

6. Extend until 60 days after the close of the next regular session of the legislature, the effective date of the Flemming ruling which would have denied Federal matching funds to States who have terminated assistance to children in a home determined to be unsuitable unless the State makes other provisions for the children affected.

7. Allow the States the option of bringing needy dependent children under the program where a court of competent jurisdiction finds that the children are not receiving proper care and protection in their own homes and gives responsibility to the State agency to place them in approved foster family homes.

8. Increase from 80 to 100 percent Federal financing of grants for training of public welfare personnel from July 1, 1961, through June 30, 1963.

9. Authorize the use of appropriations to the Department of Labor for its administration of the employment security program to pay costs involved in borrowing State employment security personnel for the recently enacted Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act.

10. Increase by $3 the maximum amount to which the Federal Government will participate, on a matching basis, in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision of 1960 for recipients of old-age assistance (from $12 to $15). Effective July 1, 1961.

11. Increase the $9 million overall ceiling on public assistance grants to Puerto Rico—by $75,000 for fiscal 1961 an by $300,000 for fiscal 1962.

12. Include all States, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, District of Columbia, and Guam.

Federal unemployment compensation extension

H.R. 4806—Public Law 87-6, approved March 24, 1961:

To help ease the unemployment problem throughout the country, Congress authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks.

These additional payments are to be made available to unemployed workers who have exhausted their benefit rights under a State program after June 30, 1960, and before April 1, 1962.

It provides for financing by advances from the Treasury which will be repaid by a temporary increase in the net Federal unemployment tax of four-tenths of 1 percent on the existing wage base of $3,000, effective for calendar years 1962 and 1963.

The act requires that temporary unemployment compensation be reduced by amounts received as a retirement pension or annuity under a public or private retirement plan provided, or contributed to, by a base period employer. Thus an individual would not be permitted to receive unemployment benefits under the bill, without reduction for retirement benefits, if both types of payments arise by reason of service for the same employer.

The statutory limitation on amounts which may be granted to States for administration of their unemployment security systems is increased to $385 million (from $350 million) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and to $415 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

The agency administering the State law is required to furnish the Secretary of Labor information relating to the personal characteristics, family situation, and employment of background of individuals entitled to temporary extended unemployment compensation under this act (on a sample basis).

ICC—Loan guarantee

H.R. 1163—Public Law 87-16, approved April 1, 1961:

This law extends for 27 months (to June 30, 1963), the time during which the Interstate Commerce Commission can help ease the credit difficulties of the railroads by guaranteeing loans made by private or public institutions to railroads in economic distress.

The guaranty is limited, however, to capital improvement and maintenance loans maturing within 15 years.

Railroad unemployment insurance extension

H.R. 5075—Public Law 87-7, approved March 24, 1961:

Congress unanimously approved additional temporary unemployment benefits to unemployed railroad workers who have after June 30, 1960, and before April 1, 1962, exhausted all their rights to benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The maximum number of additional days would be 65 (13 weeks), but these benefits cannot exceed in any individual case 50 percent of the amount of unemployment benefits which could be paid to the unemployed worker in the benefit year.

The act authorizes the Treasury to provide in advance the funds needed to pay for these temporary benefits, estimated to be $24 million. It adds temporarily, for the years 1962 and 1963, one-quarter of 1 percent to the rate of contribution now required of railroad employers to pay for the benefits regularly provided. These advances will be repayable primarily from the additional money contribution.

Small business increase

H.R. 8922—Public Law 87-198, approved September 5, 1961:

This measure increases by $20 million the amount that the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular basis loan program. This will enable SBA to continue its business loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month.

Small Business Act amendments

H.R. 8762—Public Law 87-305, approved September 26, 1961:

Increases the Small Business Administration's revolving fund by $105 million to enable the agency to operate its lending programs through fiscal year 1962. The bill also provided for SBA, the Defense Department, and the General Services Administration to develop cooperatively within 90 days a small business subcontracting program. Before the Defense Department and GSA officials promulgate any subcontracting regulations, they must seek the concurrence of SBA. Should SBA not concur, the issue must be referred to the President.

Small Business Investment Act amendments

S. 902—Public Law 87-341, approved October 3, 1961:

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was designed to increase the supply of long-term loans and equity capital for small-business concerns. It provided incentives for private investors to form small-business investment companies, licensed and regulated by the Small Business Administration, to supply venture capital and long-term loans to small businesses. It authorized SBA to make loans to State and local development companies engaged in lending to small businesses.

Amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Major changes in the act are:

1. The amount of subordinated debentures of a small business investment company which the Small Business Administration may purchase was increased from $150,000 to $400,000.

2. The amount of its capital and surplus that a bank may invest in an SBIC was increased from 1 percent to 2 percent.

3. The amount of section 303(b) loans which SBA may make to an SBIC was set at $4 million, provided funds are not available from private sources.

4. The amount of funds from any source which an SBIC may furnish to a business concern was fixed at $500,000. A larger amount will require SBA approval.

5. SBA was given authority to institute administrative proceedings to suspend licenses of SBIC's for violation of the act or regulations.

6. SBA's revolving fund SBIC operations was increased by $75 million.

EDUCATION

College housing

S. 1922—Public Law 87-70, approved June 30, 1961:

Increased the loan authorization for college housing by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964, and increased the limitation for other educational facilities by $20 million for each of the same 4 years.

Education of Blind Act amendment

H.R. 9030—Public Law 87-294, approved September 22, 1961:

Authorizes wider distribution of books and special instruction materials for the blind by increasing the appropriations and the functions of the American Printing House for the Blind.

Federal aid to education

S. 1021—Passed Senate May 25, 1961:

The Senate, by a vote of 49 to 34, passed the Federal Aid to Education Act providing a 3-year program of Federal grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands to help local school districts support their public elementary and secondary schools.

Eight hundred and fifty million dollars is authorized to be appropriated in each year of the program (a total of $2,550 million) and the Federal funds may be used by the local school districts of the States and outlying possessions for the following purposes:

1. Employment of additional public school teachers and increase of teachers' salaries.

2. Construction and equipping of public school facilities.

3. Other maintenance and operating costs of public elementary or secondary schools.

4. Special educational pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects as determined by the State educational agencies.

The allotment of Federal funds among the States follows an equalization formula which is based on the States relative number of school-age children (5 to 17, inclusive) and relative income per pupil.

Adequate safeguards to insure State and local control of public education were included by providing that "in the administration of this title (1), no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system."

The bill provides that States shall distribute Federal funds for employing more teach-

ers and raising teachers' salaries, school facilities construction, and other maintenance and operating costs, to local school districts whose needs in these areas are greatest and which are least able to finance the costs. Provision is made for a hearing before the State education agency for any local school district whose application for Federal funds is denied by the State agency.

The bill makes provision for reduction, not exceeding one-third of the total for any year, of a State's allotments in the second and third years of the program, in case local and State support for public school financing is not maintained and improved, apart from Federal aid funds received under the program.

The bill provides that up to $150,000 a year of a State's allotment may be used for State agency administrative costs under the program.

Title II of the act provides for continuation of both Public Laws 815 and 874 as currently in effect for a period of 3 more years. These laws are also extended to cover American Samoa. Finally, provision is made for a full report of the operation of these laws, as continued, including an analysis of the relation between Federal payments under these laws and those under title I of the act.

Impacted areas-NDEA extension

S. 2393—Public Law 87-344, approved October 3, 1961:

This measure—

1. Extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose.

2. Extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instructions in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages by authorizing (1) payments to States to acquire needed laboratory and other special equipment for use in providing this instruction and to remodel laboratory or other space used for such equipment; (2) payments to States to expand and improve supervisory services in public elementary and secondary schools in the three above fields; and (3) loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools for the same types of special equipment and remodeling for which grants to States may be made.

Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961

S. 279—Public Law 87-274, approved September 22, 1961:

This measure is a 3-year program, 1962-64, designed to combat juvenile delinquency by—

1. Authorizing grants or contracts to States and municipalities and other public and nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning or research, to be used to demonstrate and develop improved methods to prevent, control, and treat juvenile delinquency. Grant recipients must contribute money, facilities, or services as required by the Secretary.

2. Authorizing grants or contracts with States, municipalities, public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning to be used to train personnel, develop courses, fellowships, and traineeships, with travel and subsistence allowances as determined necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grant recipients must contribute money, facilities, or services.

3. Requiring the Secretary to make studies, investigations, and report his evaluation of the effectiveness of the program. The Secretary is required to cooperate with and give technical assistance to the recipients, and provide short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to the program.

4. Authorizing the Secretary of HEW to appoint technical or other advisory committees to advise him on the administration of the act.

5. In addition to the 50 States, the act will cover the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

6. Authorizing an annual appropriation of $10 million for all programs.

Library facilities and services

S. 464—Passed Senate June 29, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

This measure amends the Library Services Act of 1956, to grant the consent of Congress (as required by Congress) for States to enter into a compact or agreement with each other to develop or operate library facilities and services.

Migratory farmworkers—Educational opportunities

S. 1124—Passed Senate August 25, 1961. Pending in House Education Committee:

Authorizes a 5-year program to aid in the education of the children of migratory workers. The Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. Federal assistance will be given the States to help defray costs for education during the regular school session; the child must attend school in a State for at least 5 days before assistance would be available; $300,000 would be provided annually for summer schools for migratory children; $250,000 would be granted annually to provide interstate planning and coordination of the educational program; $200,000 annually would be authorized to help pay for pilot projects for fundamental, practical education for adult migratory workers. The program would be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

The trend in library work is to larger units of service—for example, centralized book purchasing and cataloging for an entire region—in order to utilize available resources in the most economical and efficient manner. Such cooperative arrangements are of the greatest importance in raising the level of library service throughout the country. It is only through such arrangements that some of the smaller States and some of the less populous ones can afford to provide the library resources and services that they should and they want to provide. The interstate compacts will serve as the means to develop and enlarge the scope of the services that libraries can render to the people of the Nation.

Scholarships—Eligibility

S. 539—Public Law 87-153, approved August 17, 1961:

Permits legally classified American nationals to qualify and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act for advanced education abroad.

The original act limited this aid to American citizens. However, through inadvertence or by an interpretation of the statute, the people of American Samoa were not considered American citizens and, as a result, could not qualify for or receive financial assistance to continue their education abroad, as originally contemplated by the act.

By removal of this barrier, it is possible for these people to qualify in the same manner as other American citizens who pursue advanced education abroad.

Training for teachers of deaf

S. 336—Public Law 87-276, approved September 22, 1961:

This act establishes a 2-year program to assist in training additional teachers for the deaf. It authorizes appropriations of $1.5 million annually to higher education institutions which are approved as training centers for teachers of the deaf.

Provides for grants-in-aid to assist in providing and improving courses of training and study and to establish scholarships for qualified persons who wish to enroll in these training courses.

Provides for an advisory committee, composed of persons with special knowledge and interest in training teachers of the deaf and in teaching deaf children, to review the program and applications for grants-in-aid.

The national shortage of classroom teachers of the deaf began during World War II and has become more acute each year. It is the task of the teacher of the deaf to bridge the gap between the deaf child's world of silence and the world of sound and hearing, the world of language and speech. The success with which a deaf child is able to bridge this barrier, to develop language and proportionately to minimize his great educational handicap, depends upon the skill, the understanding, and the professional training of his teacher.

TV—Education

S. 205—Passed Senate March 21, 1961. H.R. 132—House Calendar:

The measure authorizes a 5-year program grant to the States and the District of Columbia to establish or improve the educational television broadcasting facilities in our public schools, colleges, and in adult training programs. The Federal aid, however, can be used only to provide the equipment needed for television broadcasting, including closed circuit television, and the group and the States must provide the buildings and the land required. No one State may receive more than $1 million in grants.

Requires applicants to provide assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education that necessary funds will be available to operate and maintain the facilities.

Grants assurance that the Commissioner of Education will not have any control over television broadcasting, nor can he amend any provision or requirement under the Federal Communications Act.

Requires each participant to maintain records as prescribed by the Commissioner, including a full disclosure of the amount of aid received and the manner in which it was used. In addition, the recipient must disclose the amount and sources of other aid used in the operation of the facility.

War orphans education extension

H.R. 3587—Public Law 87-377, approved October 4, 1961:

This measure provides additional time within which certain children may complete a program of education under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. The class of eligibles afforded additional time is limited exclusively to persons whose opportunities for an education under the act have been impaired by virtue of their residence in the Republic of the Philippines.

Additional time will be available to a person who had not reached his 23d birthday on June 29, 1956, and resided in the Philippines during all or part of the period June 29, 1956, through June 18, 1958.

The 1956 act provided that the educational assistance could be afforded only to an eligible person enrolled in a school or other educational institution in the United States, its territories, or possessions. This provision prohibited eligible persons residing in the Philippines from receiving assistance under the program while enrolled in a Philippine educational institution. In 1958, Congress removed this barrier by permitting the eligible orphans to pursue their educational program in their home country, but failed to grant the additional entitlement of 36 months to make up the original 5-year grant.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Air Force officers—Promotion

H.R. 7809—Public Law 87-194, approved September 1, 1961:

Provides a temporary program for promotion for all active duty Air Force officers be-

low the grade of colonel. The program would continue until June 30, 1963; up to 4,000 promotions could be made for the grade of lieutenant colonel and 4,000 promotions could be made to the grade of major. This would cover about 80 percent of those in the promotion zones for these grades.

Armed Forces house trailers allowance

H.R. 2732—Public Law 87-374, approved October 4, 1961:

Authorizes Department of Defense to set allowances, up to 36 cents a mile for transporting house trailers of members of the Armed Forces.

Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act

S. 685—Public Law 87-233, approved September 14, 1961:

Improves the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948 by offering inducements to qualified scientists and mathematicians to join the service. Temporary promotions would be granted if necessary or desirable by the Secretary of Commerce; there could be retirement benefits received after 20 years of service instead of the present 30 years; promotions from permanent grade of ensign may be temporarily made by the President to the grade of lieutenant junior grade whenever vacancies exist, as well as personal fringe benefits.

General of the Army Eisenhower

S. 1173—Public Law 87-3, approved March 22, 1961:

At the request of President Kennedy, former President Eisenhower is restored to his military rank of General of the Army.

General Eisenhower, in lieu of his military pay and allowances, will receive the compensation and other benefits conferred on former Presidents of the United States by an act of Congress in 1958. The compensation, as former President, is $25,000 a year for life, plus an additional $50,000 a year for an office staff, suitable office space, and the franking privilege.

The 1958 act also entitles the widow of a former President to $10,000 a year, upon waiver of any annuity or pension right provided by the Federal Government.

Government employees—Retirement

H.R. 6141—Public Law 87-299, approved September 26, 1961:

This measure continues, clarifies, and strengthens the prohibition contained in the act of September 1, 1954, against the payment of a civilian annuity or military retired pay to any person who has committed an offense against the national security of the United States or who refuses to testify before a duly constituted judicial or congressional proceeding on a matter relating to national security.

Restores civilian annuity benefits and military retired pay, including survivorship benefits to a number of widows and children, which, under the 1954 act, had been denied because of committing a variety of offenses not related to national security.

National Guard employees

H.R. 4785—Public Law 87-224, approved September 13, 1961:

Authorizes the Federal Government to pay the employer's share of the costs of retirement plans which are entered by civilian employees of the National Guard. Also authorizes withholding the employees' contribution from the salaries of these same employees when they enter State or territorial sponsored plans providing retirement, disability, or death benefits. At present the Government provides withholding services for these employees only if they are participating in State retirement systems.

Oversea teachers' pay

S. 841—Public Law 87-172, approved August 30, 1961:

This measure—

1. Amends a provision of the Defense Department Overseas Teacher's Pay and Personnel Practices Act, which authorizes payment of allowances during summer recesses to oversea Defense Department teachers when they have agreed in writing to serve for the next school year. Existing statute requires that, if for any reason a teacher does not report for duty at the start of the next school year, he must repay his summer allowance. This measure permits him to retain it if the cause of his failure to report for duty (death, serious illness) is considered valid by the Defense Department.

2. Also makes uniform the definition of "year" as "school year" rather than as "twelve months," to correct certain administrative confusion.

Panama Canal Company

H.R. 3156—Public Law 87-252, approved September 16, 1961:

Provides the Panama Canal Company with immunity from attachment or garnishment of salaries owed to its employees in order to protect the Company from having to process a large number of salary levies because of overextended credit to low-income employees of the Company by local merchants.

Postal employees—Retention benefits

H.R. 7043—Public Law 87-270, approved September 21, 1961:

This bill extends to employees in the postal field service the same salary retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided employees under the Classification Act since 1956.

It validates certain statutory salary increases made pursuant to Civil Service Commission regulations but ruled improper by the General Accounting Office.

And it also makes ineligible for salary retention protection certain employees whose reduction in grade results from a temporary promotion to a higher grade.

Under this bill (and the Classification Act since 1956) an employee whose reduction in grade level is not the result of a demotion for personal cause, is not at his own request, and is not the result of a reduction in force due to a lack of funds or curtailment of work, will continue to receive his former rate of pay for a period of up to 2 years following the date his position is reduced to a lower grade level. However, the bill does require that the employee must have served for 2 continuous years in the postal field service at the same or a higher salary and that his work at all times during the period was satisfactory or better.

Reservists—Travel allowances

H.R. 4786—Public Law 87-164, approved August 25, 1961:

Makes uniform for all Reserve personnel, either on active duty or inactive, with or without pay, the allowances for transportation as specified under the Career Compensation Act, section 303(a). Now, Reserve personnel ordered to training duty without pay are not authorized the travel allowances provided for other Reserve personnel.

Retirement eligibility—Minority service

H.R. 6597—Public Law 87-165, approved August 25, 1961:

Nullifies a decision made by the Comptroller General stating that service performed prior to the minimum statutory age for enlistment does not count in determining retirement eligibility. This decision, if it were enforced, would create hardships for any already retired personnel whose service might be ruled insufficient to receive retirement benefits. Also each retirement case might have to be considered separately due to varying statutory age minimums over the years.

Retirement fund—Interest rate

S. 739—Public Law 87-350, approved October 4, 1961:

Provides a method of fixing a fair and equitable rate of interest on money borrowed by the U.S. Treasury from the civil service retirement and disability fund. Now the interest is equal to the average coupon rate borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States that are not callable for 5 years. The new method would make investments callable in 4 years at which time the Secretary of the Treasury may then reinvest in other interest-bearing obligations of the United States with interest rates currently being paid in the open market for new borrowings. Investors in the retirement fund will be benefiting from more current interest rates paid by the Government.

Retirement increases—Permanent

H.R. 5432—Public Law 87-114, approved July 31, 1961:

This measure authorizes the use of the civil service retirement and disability fund to pay increases in annuities and survivorship benefits.

Cost-of-living increases were granted to certain retirees and survivors who, on August 1, 1958, were receiving or were entitled to receive annuities based on service which terminated prior to October 1, 1956. When the measure was enacted, it provided that initially the increases should be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund but that on and after July 1, 1960, the increases would terminate unless Congress appropriated funds to cover the cost. Thus the increases provided by the 1958 act are on a year-to-year basis, fully dependent on an annual appropriation for their continuance. Funds have been provided each year and, under present economic conditions, there is no prospect of abolishing the increases in the foreseeable future. Thus the Civil Service Commission recommended that the increases be made permanent and paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund, which this bill does.

Rural carriers—Equipment allowance

S. 189—Passed Senate July 27, 1961. Pending in House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

Increases the basic equipment allowance for rural mail carriers from 10 cents a mile or $3.50 a day to 12 cents a mile or $4.20 a day, whichever is greater. This allowance is intended to amortize the equipment used by rural carriers, cover insurance rates, buy oil and gas, etc. Only one increase for rural mail carriers has been made in 10 years, not enough to cover the rising cost of upkeep for their equipment.

Scientific and supergrade increase

H.R. 7377—Public Law 87-367, approved October 4, 1961:

Authorizes an additional 480 supergrade positions and 280 additional scientific positions for the executive branch.

The supergrades are GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18. Three hundred and fifty-six of the supergrades are authorized for the general pool of the Civil Service Commission to be allocated to the various agencies where justified and needed. Fifty may be allocated only upon approval of the President and for agencies or functions created after the effective date of this act, 14 may be allocated only to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency when created, 4 may be allocated only to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and 6 may be allocated only to the Immigration and Naturalization Service of

the Department of Justice, 35 for the Department of Defense, and 15 for the National Security Agency of the Department of Defense.

In the area of scientific-type positions, 80 such new positions are provided for the Department of Defense, 13 for the Federal Aviation Agency, and 4 for the National Aeronautics and Space Council. However, with reference to NASA, 65 such new positions may be established on or before March 1, 1962, 35 more beginning March 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1962, plus 35 more after July 1, 1962, or an aggregate of 135 such new positions. The salary range for the new scientific and professional positions will be from $12,500 to $19,000 a year, except (1) the maximum salary for the 13 new positions for FAA will be $19,500, and $21,000 maximum for 17 new positions in NASA.

Servicemen's Family Protection Act

H.R. 6668—Public Law 87–381, approved October 4, 1961:

This bill amends the Uniform Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, which provided a means whereby the military member could elect to receive a reduced amount of retired pay in order to provide for certain payments to his survivors. Prior to the 1953 act military personnel could not share their retirement income with their survivors. However, existing law has disclosed some deficiencies and inequities which are being corrected in this bill. A few of the major changes are:

New rule for entering the system: Provides that a person may elect at any time before he is retired or granted retired pay provided he makes the election 3 years before he is retired (existing law requires an election prior to the time he has completed 18 years' service).

Changes or revocations: Reduces to 3 years from 5 the period required before a change or revocation of the election can be made.

Void elections: To correct certain administrative deficiencies, if an election is made and found to be void for any reason except fraud or willful intent of the member a corrected election may be resubmitted within 90 days after he is notified in writing that the first election is void.

Fifty-percent limitations: To correct complicated formulas required in existing law, this bill permits the election of any annuity up to 25 percent of the retired pay for a wife and another in the same amount even though the combined amounts exceed 50 percent of the member's retired pay provided that each annuity computed separately does not exceed 25 percent of the reduced amount. In other words, under this bill a member may provide an annuity that will be in excess of one-half of his reduced retired pay.

Spouse and children: Authorizes the election of annuities as between a surviving spouse and children of the deceased by any other marriage.

Withdrawals: Grants discretionary authority to the Secretaries to permit a retired member to withdraw from the contingency option program where his continued participation would violate equity and good conscience.

Suits against Federal employees

H.R. 2883—Public Law 87–258, approved September 21, 1961:

The purpose of this bill is to protect Government employees from personal liability for accidents occurring within the scope of their employment. Under existing law, Federal maritime employees have such protection; thus, this bill provides equal treatment of the nonmaritime Government employees.

Suits against the United States will be the exclusive remedy for damages resulting from operation by any Government employee of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his employment. Suits brought against the individual employee in such cases will be removed to the Federal court and be deemed a tort action against the United States.

Travel expenses of Government employees

H.R. 3279—Public Law 87–139, approved August 14, 1961:

Increases the allowances of Government employees (judicial and senatorial employees included) for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include: from $10 to $16 per diem allowance for regular full-time employees for normal official trips; in unusual circumstances the travel authorization may be up to $30 per diem from $25 per diem; from 10 cents to 12 cents per mile allowance for use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes; up to $10 beyond the per diem regulations when travel is beyond the continental United States. Also adds parking fees as an item for reimbursement when incurred in official travel status; raises the authorized maximum per diem for certain State Department advisory committees to a par with other Government officials; and permits the President to establish per diem rates for travel outside the continental United States.

Transportation of remains

S. 1458—Passed Senate July 7, 1961. Pending in House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

This measure corrects a discrepancy in existing statute which authorizes the Government to pay the expenses of transporting home the remains of a deceased dependent of a Federal employee stationed in Alaska or Hawaii, but does not authorize payment for the expenses of transporting home the remains, effects, and family of an actual employee who dies while stationed in Alaska or Hawaii. This discrepancy arises from the passage of Alaska and Hawaii from the status of territory to that of State. This measure authorizes payment of expenses for deceased employees which have not been permitted since Alaska and Hawaii became States, and is retroactive to that time.

Transportation of effects of retired members

H.R. 4321—Public Law 87–140, approved August 17, 1961:

Authorizes the Government to pay for transporting the personal effects and household needs of retired members of the armed services to a place other than that originally selected if the former member pays for any excess charge over and above the original shipping. It also authorizes shipping household items wherever a surviving dependent may designate if the retired member dies prior to moving his dependents and shipping his household goods to a selected home.

U.S. attorneys

S. 1488—Passed Senate July 27, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

To equalize job opportunities, this bill makes the salary scale identical for attorneys in the Justice Department at the seat of government and for those attorneys working in the field. Under present laws those lawyers at the seat of government are paid under the Classification Act of 1949 at a lower salary than field attorneys or U.S. attorneys.

The $20,000 limitation for U.S. attorneys is retained.

War Hazards Compensation Act

H.R. 4357—Public Law 87–380, approved October 4, 1961:

Provides a 15-percent increase in the level of benefits payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act of 1942, relative to injuries or deaths prior to July 1, 1946. The War Hazards Act is a part of the Federal workmen's compensation system applicable to employees employed by Government contractors, and who work outside the United States.

The 15-percent increase, however, applies only to disability and death payments, payable for periods on or after the date of enactment.

It is estimated that the increase will cost about $720,000 for the life of the program; however, the present war claims fund from which these benefits are paid shows a surplus of about $832,000.

FINANCE

Bureau of the Mint statutes

S. 2130—Passed August 21, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Deletes from the statutes references to certain mints and assay offices which no longer exist. Also changes the name of the San Francisco Mint to the assay office at San Francisco, since the minting of money was discontinued in 1955 and has been an assay office since 1957.

Business records—Reproductions

H.R. 3227—Public Law 87–183, approved August 30, 1961:

Amends a section of the United States Code which will allow the reproduction of files kept in banks pertaining to transactions in trust or custodial accounts. The reproduction will be on microfilm and admissible in court. Many other files are now microfilmed but, due to a provision of the 1951 law, such trust and custodial accounts had to be kept in the original—creating a serious storage problem.

Dissolution of Federal Facilities Corporation

H.R. 7864—Public Law 87–190, approved August 30, 1961:

Dissolves the Federal Facilities Corporation established in 1954 to administer the disposal programs under which the synthetic rubber facilities and the Texas City tin smelter were sold. Now most of this property is disposed of and the remaining functions deal with the enforcement of the national security clauses contained in agreements of sale under the rubber disposal program. The remaining functions of the FFC would be taken over by the General Services Administration. Any claims outstanding against the FFC would be recognized and settled after the dissolution which will take place on September 30, 1961.

Domestic lead, zinc, mercury industries

Senate Resolution 206—Senate adopted September 23, 1961:

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution directing the U.S. Tariff Commission to make investigations of the present conditions in the lead and zinc industry and in the mercury, manganese, cobalt, and beryllium industries and report to Congress (next session).

Duty-free allowance reduction

H.R. 6611—Public Law 87–132, approved August 10, 1961:

As a part of the balance-of-payments program, Congress has authorized, for a 2-year period to July 1, 1963, a reduction from $500 to $100 the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring in duty free. However, because of the new program to promote tourism in the Virgin Islands, an additional $100 will be permitted tourists returning from the Virgin Islands, thus totaling $200 in this instance.

Electron microscopes—Duty free

H.R. 3385—Public Law 87–95, approved July 20, 1961:

Amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free entry of electron microscopes into this country, when imported for use by nonprofit research or medical institutions.

Federal Home Loan Bank directors

H.R. 8277—Public Law 87–211, approved September 8, 1961:

Simplifies the election system of the Federal home loan bank directors to abandon the division of directors into classes (large,

medium, and small districts and directors at large) and replaces it by election of directors by State. At least one director will be elected from each State with any extra vacancies distributed in proportion to the amount of shares of stock held by the Federal home loan banks; each district to have the same amount of directors as under the present system. No State is to have more than six directors, and all States are entitled to as many as they had as of December 31, 1960. The electors in each State will be the member institutions of that State; the number of votes will be equal to the number of shares of stock held. No director can serve more than three consecutive terms; appointments of directors can be made if there was a vacancy in the elective directorship or temporarily if a new bank is being organized.

Federal Reserve Bank building

S. 1005—Passed Senate August 23, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Amends the Federal Reserve Act to require the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the erection of any branch bank of the Federal Reserve. Under the current provision, branch banks can only be built at costs up to $250,000, which would come from a total construction fund of $30 million made in 1953. This fund is almost exhausted, and the costs of construction have made $250,000 an insufficient amount to complete a project. Any construction costs approved by the Board would be amortized out of the earnings of the Federal Reserve over a period of years.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

H.R. 7108—Public Law 87–210, approved September 8, 1961:

Strengthens the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the National Housing Act by increasing the reserves and cutting the overcapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which was created as a reserve credit facility for savings and home mortgage credit institutions. A prepayment equal to 2 percent of the annual net increase of the accounts of its insured members is required. This prepayment would be used to establish a primary (general) reserve and a secondary reserve. When the aggregate of these reserves reaches 2 percent of the total amount of all accounts of insured members and creditor obligations, the payments will cease, unless the reserves should fall below 1.75 percent. If the primary reserve reaches 2 percent, the Corporation would pay to each insured institution the amount of its share of the second reserve. The one-twelfth of 1 percent annual premium paid by all member institutions would remain the same. The members will be required to purchase stock for only 1 percent of the amount of the outstanding home mortgages and other obligations; now they are required to purchase stock for 2 percent of the unpaid principal.

Metal scrap—Import duties

H.R. 4591—Public Law 87–110, approved July 26, 1961:

This act extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1962, the existing suspension of import duties on metal scrap, which includes such principal types of scrap as iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys.

This measure also provides for the free entry of horsemeat, fresh, chilled, or frozen, when imported in immediate containers weighing, with their contents, 10 pounds or more. This suspension is required to help meet the increasing demands for horsemeat now being used in making foods for dogs and other pets, to feed mink and other fur-bearing animals, a use which has just developed in the last few years.

National bank branches in foreign countries

S. 1771—Passed Senate August 21, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Permits national bank branches in foreign countries to exercise the usual banking powers of banks of the foreign country in which the branch is located. This is necessary for the banks to better compete in methods of loans, bank guarantees, and public securities which may be peculiar to a particular foreign country and which existing regulations for the foreign branches do not cover.

National banks—Service charges

S. 1486—Passed Senate August 21, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Permits the Comptroller of the Currency to establish reasonable maximum service charges on dormant accounts in national banks. This would prevent any excessive charges which might be made on accounts which are not active and thus do not require many services of the bank. The Comptroller would be expected to define the nature of dormant accounts and the types of activity carried out by the banks in regard to these dormant accounts.

Old series currency adjustment

S. 1619—Public Law 87–66, approved June 30, 1961:

To clear up old historical statutory currency and effect a savings of about $10,000 a day in interest charges, this measure was adopted unanimously by Congress.

Before July 1, 1929, the old large-size bills were issued. There are still a good many of them outstanding on the books of the Treasury, although many have been destroyed by fire, flood, or accidents of one kind or another, or are in the hands of collectors who value them more for their historical interest than as money. In addition, between June 30, 1929, and January 30, 1934, the date of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, small-size gold certificates were issued to the public. About $12½ million of these small-size gold certificates are now outstanding.

This old series money is still outstanding on the Treasury's books as currency. This bill transfers these obligations to the non-interest-bearing public debt and, in the future, when any of these old series notes might be presented to the Treasury, they would be redeemed in full in new issues. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to write off from the books of the Treasury as much of the old series notes as he believes has been destroyed or irretrievably lost.

It also makes available for current use the security now backing up this old series currency which amounts to about $98.1 million in gold, silver, and other reserves for current use by the Government. This will reduce the Government's borrowing by some $98.1 million which amounts to some $3 to $4 million a year at current rates, thus effecting a saving of $10,000 a day.

Provision is made for maintaining a historical collection of these notes.

Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act

House Joint Resolution 124—Public Law 87–121, approved August 3, 1961:

This resolution amends the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act to delete limitations on the public indebtedness of Puerto Rico and its municipalities and subdivisions contained in that act. The amendment takes effect when the Commonwealth constitution is amended to include provisions limiting the debt-incurring capacity of both the Commonwealth and its municipalities.

The present debt limit on the Commonwealth and its five most populous municipalities is 10 percent of the tax valuation of all property while on the remaining municipalities it is 5 percent. The Commonwealth officials hope to increase the debt limitations as a step toward securing funds to construct and improve educational facilities and a modern highway system.

Public debt increase

H.R. 7677—Public Law 87–69, approved June 30, 1961:

This measure will increase the public debt limit for 1 year from the statutory level of $285 billion, by $13 billion, to $298 billion. Since 1946, when the wartime statutory limit came down from $300 billion to $275 billion, the permanent limit has been increased twice, from $275 billion to $283 billion in 1958, and then to $285 billion in 1959. It has been increased temporarily (for 1 year) five times since 1954. This year's temporary increase of $13 billion compares with 1959's 1-year increase from $285 billion to $295 billion and 1960's increase from $285 billion to $293 billion.

Public debt—Reduce by gifts

H.R. 311—Public Law 87–58, approved June 27, 1961:

This act specifically authorizes the U.S. Government to accept gifts of money or other property which are to be used to reduce the public debt. It provides for deposit of cash gifts, or proceeds from sales of other gifts, in a special account on the books of the Treasury, and money in this account is to be used to retire obligations of the United States which are a part of the public debt.

Occasionally the U.S. Government receives gifts or money or other property made on the condition that the gift be used to reduce the public debt. However, the Treasury Department has no specific authority to use gifts it receives in this manner and, in the past, has been depositing them in the general fund of the Treasury. Thus, this act will permit the gift to be used as the donor designated.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

American History Month

Senate Joint Resolution 22—Passed Senate August 14, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

To create greater understanding and appreciation of our country's history and its heritage, this resolution designates the month of February of each year as American History Month.

The President is authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe this month in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

American Patent System Week

House Joint Resolution 499—Public Law 87–292, approved September 22, 1961:

Authorizes the President to designate the week of October 15, 1961, as "The American Patent System Week," to commemorate the 125th anniversary (July 4, 1836) of the establishment of the U.S. Patent Office.

Antitrust Civil Process Act

S. 167—Passed Senate September 21, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Authorizes the Department of Justice to issue civil investigative demands requiring any person, other than a natural person, to produce documentary material for examination whenever the Department has reason to believe that the person may have material pertinent to a civil antitrust investigation. The civil demand must be in writing and must set forth the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged antitrust violations under investigation, as well as the applicable provision of the law. The material must be made available for inspection and reproduc-

tion at the principal place of business of the person from whom it is demanded.

This bill also provides that the demand may be tested in a district court where the person lives by filing a petition for an order of the court modifying or setting aside the demand. The tests for reasonableness and privilege of civil demands is the same as the test for subpenas duces tecum.

Antiobscene Commission

S. 162—Passed Senate June 12, 1961. Pending in House Education and Labor Committee:

This bill establishes a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, consisting of representatives of the Senate, the House, the Post Office, Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, State and local government, communications and mass media industries, education, and the clergy. The Commission would investigate methods of combating traffic in obscene materials, file a report and, after 60 days, cease to exist.

Civil defense activities

H.R. 8383—Public Law 87-390, approved October 4, 1961:

Legalizes approximately $1 million in contributions made by the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization to the States for emergency equipment and necessary activities in connection with civil defense activities.

Civil Rights Commission extension

H.R. 7371—Public Law 87-264, approved September 21, 1961:

Extends the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963.

Clean Elections Act of 1961

S. 2426—Passed Senate September 15, 1961. Pending in House Administration Committee:

To strengthen our present electoral system, the Senate has passed a clean elections bill which will—

Raise the limitations on campaign expenditures by congressional candidates to more realistic levels. A candidate for Senator or Representative at Large may spend $50,000 and a candidate for Representative or Resident Commissioner $12,500, or an amount equal to the higher of the following: (1) The amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number, up to 1 million, votes cast in the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such votes over 1 million; or (2) the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number, up to 1 million, persons registered to vote in the general election for the office which the candidate seeks, plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such persons over 1 million. (Existing law allows $10,000 for Senator and $2,500 for the House plus an alternative formula of much less.)

Make campaign financing information available at the State level by requiring reports to be filed with different officials, particularly the secretary of state.

Repeal the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and substitute a more realistic law and makes numerous other changes in existing law and in new law.

Congressional Medal of Honor holders

H.R. 845—Public Law 87-138, approved August 14, 1961:

Proposes that persons awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor be placed on the honor roll at age 50 instead of the present requirement of 65. Authorizes a monthly pension of $100 instead of $10 as is now paid. Those who now hold the Medal of Honor would be paid this increased sum automatically, future holders would receive the increased amount at any time upon request. Thus greater recognition would be given to the holders of this honor.

Emergency evacuations

H.R. 2555—Public Law 87-304, approved September 26, 1961:

Provides permissive authority to the heads of Government departments, agencies, and establishments to allow civilians employed on duty at places outside the United States, or at other places the President may designate, under emergency conditions, to make allotments from their pay for the support of their families and to draw up to 30 days' advance pay, if necessary. This measure also provides for the continuance of pay of such civilian employees if they are required to evacuate their oversea places of duty under these conditions.

Employment of aliens by Department of Commerce

S. 2236—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Permits the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity which is now prohibited. There is precedent for this authorization since NASA, the Departments of Defense, State, and Agriculture may employ such persons. Investigations must be made to determine, before an alien is hired, if there are any qualified U.S. citizens to fill the positions available. Agencies of the Commerce Department have been faced with a general shortage of scientists and engineers in the United States; many of the specialized jobs required by these agencies demand training that is not offered in many schools in this country.

FCC documents

S. 683—Passed Senate February 16, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

To eliminate excessive paperwork by the public and the Federal Communications Commission, this bill repeals the present requirement that, prior to submission, all annual and certain other reports, applications for construction permits, station licenses, modifications, or renewals must be notarized.

Fort Sheridan, Ill.

H.R. 7721—Public Law 87-160, approved August 25, 1961:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to relinquish any part of the legislative jurisdiction now held by the Federal Government to the State of Illinois over the land where Fort Sheridan Military Reservation is located. The jurisdiction particularly needed by the State is over the public civilian traffic on the State highway which crossed the military reservation; legally, the military patrols have no right to police civilian traffic.

General Von Steuben Memorial Day

Senate Joint Resolution 95—Passed Senate September 19, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Authorizes the President to issue a proclamation calling on Government officials and citizens to display the flag on September 17 in honor of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm Von Steuben, the German military expert who instructed our forces at Valley Forge and Yorktown during the Revolution and who conceived the drill regulations and rules of order and discipline for colonial troops.

GSA—Special police

S. 541—Public Law 87-275, approved September 22, 1961:

This bill amends the act of June 1, 1948, by adding a new section to authorize the Administrator of General Services, or certain officials designated by him, to appoint employees of GSA engaged in investigative functions to act as nonuniformed special police. The Administrator of GSA contends that nonuniformed special police are required to protect property under the control of GSA. These employees would be empowered to enforce Federal laws to protect persons and property, and to enforce rules and regulations issued by the General Services Administrator for protection of such property. The policemen designated under this bill will be authorized to make arrests without warrant for any offense constituting a felony when committed on Government property if such police had reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested is guilty of the offense.

At present the Administrator of GSA has authority to appoint uniformed guards as special police to protect Federal property. He is also authorized to appoint nonuniformed policemen to make investigations within the District of Columbia, but there is no authority for the appointment of nonuniformed police for duty outside of the District of Columbia.

Interfaith Day

Senate Joint Resolution 24—Passed Senate May 1, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

This joint resolution designates the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day, and requests the President to call upon all Americans and religious groups to observe the day appropriately.

It is believed that the observance of such a day will encourage the mutual understanding of all the people of our country and will serve to call the attention of the rest of the free world to one of the fundamental principles upon which the Nation was founded.

Joint Committee on the Budget

S. 529—Passed Senate May 2, 1961. Pending in House Rules Committee:

This act provides Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in appropriating funds required to run the Government. This is accomplished by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 14 members, 7 from the Senate Appropriations Committee and 7 from the House Appropriations Committee; 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, each, to assist Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

The committee will provide the same kind of expert staff facilities and detailed technical information for the Appropriations Committees as the Budget Bureau does for the Executive.

Lincoln's first inaugural

House Joint Resolution 155—Public Law 87-1, approved March 1, 1961:

The first act signed into public law by President John F. Kennedy was a joint resolution commemorating with proper ceremonies at the U.S. Capitol on March 4, 1961, the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln memorial, Indiana

H.R. 2470—Passed Senate, amended September 15, 1961:

Authorized an appropriation up to $1 million to establish a national park in Indiana, in memory of Abraham Lincoln. Lands will include Pigeon Creek Farm in Spencer County where Lincoln's mother is buried and the old Lincoln farm where Lincoln spent his youth.

Major disasters—Pacific islands

S. 1742—Passed Senate August 21, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

Authorizes assistance by the Federal Government to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in case of a national disaster; this would place these Pacific areas under the same law as benefits the States and local governments in time of disaster.

Medal—Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III

House Joint Resolution 306—Public Law 87–42, approved May 27, 1961:

Authorizes the President to award an appropraite gold medal, in the name of Congress, to the late Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in recognition of his services to the people of Laos and to peoples in other newly developing countries.

Medal—Bob Hope

Senate Joint Resolution 88—Passed Senate May 26, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Authorizes the President to present to Bob Hope, in the name of the people of the United States, a gold medal in recognition of his services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

Mine study

H.R. 8341—Public Law 87–300, approved September 26, 1961:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the causes of injury, health hazards, and unsafe working conditions in metal and nonmetallic mines, and to evaluate the programs and techniques necessary to provide safe and healthy working conditions in these mines.

National conventions

Senate Resolution 141—Senate adopted August 25, 1961:

Expresses as the sense of the Senate that national conventions should be held in September after Labor Day. With rapid communications and transportations it is felt to be unnecessary to prolong presidential election campaigns beyond the time needed to reach and appeal to the national electorate.

National Poison Prevention Week

House Joint Resolution 358—Public Law 87–319, approved September 26, 1961:

Authorizes the President to designate the third week in March as "National Poison Prevention Week" to encourage Americans to be more alert to the dangers of accidental poisoning.

National portrait gallery

S. 1057—Passed Senate July 27, 1961. Pending in House Administration Committee:

Implements Public Law 85–357 which authorizes the establishment of a section of the Smithsonian Institution to house the national collection of fine arts and a national portrait gallery of those who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the people of the United States.

This bill establishes a National Portrait Gallery Commission as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution to provide biographical study and research for the gallery.

National Youth Appreciation Week

Senate Joint Resolution 49—Passed Senate July 20, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

This resolution designates the 7-day period beginning on the second Monday of November of each year as Youth Appreciation Week, and requests the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The intent of the resolution is to stimulate more active participation by young people and their families in religious and civic activities, as a means of combating juvenile delinquency.

National Zoological Park

S. 2295—Public Law 87–360, approved October 4, 1961:

Authorizes appropriations for making improvements at the national zoo and places the direction of the improvements under the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The improvement program is not definite; whatever would be done would be reviewed by the Appropriations Committees. There is need for new cages and buildings (the newest one being 20 years old), a better traffic system, and other general improvements.

OCDM—Renamed

H.R. 8406—Public Law 87–296, approved September 22, 1961:

This measure renames the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization as the Office of Emergency Planning in order to describe more accurately its role in the Federal Government.

Pacific War Memorial

H.R. 44—Public Law 87–201, approved September 6, 1961:

Authorizes the appropriation of $150,000 to complete the construction of the chapel and memorial shrine of the U.S. Pacific War Memorial at Pearl Harbor. The memorial is to be located on the hulk of the U.S.S. *Arizona* and is to honor all personnel of our Armed Forces who died during the attack on Pearl Harbor. Three hundred and seventy thousand dollars has already been raised by public subscription and by appropriations from the State of Hawaii; they have been used in completing the first phase of the construction of the memorial. It is hoped that the memorial will be completed by December 7, 1961, which will be the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Presidential office space

S. 51—Passed Senate July 7, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

Establishes a seven-member Commission on Presidential Office Space composed of legislative and executive representatives. It is authorized to draw up and oversee the plans and execution of the remodeling of the Executive Offices as recommended in a 1957 Presidential advisory report.

The facilities in the east and west wing of the White House would be improved for the use of the President's personal staff and also would provide some accommodations for visiting dignitaries. In the Old State Department there would be a more efficient planning of the now cramped office space, and also proposed would be a tunnel from these offices to the White House to provide quicker communication between the President and his executive staff.

Public buildings—Site procurement

S. 931—Public Law 87–277, approved September 22, 1961:

Amends existing statute which requires that in cases of procurement of sites for public buildings by the Government, the grantor of the site must furnish, at his own expense, all evidences of title required by the Attorney General. This requirement tends to discourage desirable property sales to the Government. Thus, this measure, by authorizing the Government to bear the expense of searching the title, will place the Government in a more equitable bargaining position.

Senior Citizens Month

Senate Joint Resolution 27—Passed Senate September 18, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Authorizes the President to designate May as "Senior Citizens Month" in honor of the contributions of older citizens to the American way of life.

Small Towns and Rural Counties Commission

S. 1869—Passed Senate May 26, 1961. Pending in House Government Operations Committee:

Establishes a 20-member bipartisan Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties authorized to make a full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas. It is to study the needs, present and future, related to highways, public services, water resources, schools, recreation, financing, law enforcement, and business and industrial development.

The Commission is to determine the capabilities of State, county, and local government to meet the needs and seek means of improving coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies. It is to investigate the possibilities of the Federal Government encouraging wider dispersal of Government procurement operations, the location of Federal facilities as well as other matters which may be of assistance in solving the various problems of, and promoting the social and economic well-being of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas.

It is to report its findings and recommendations to the President and to Congress on or before February 1, 1963.

White House—Historic preservation

S. 2422—Public Law 87–286, approved September 22, 1961:

Provides for the administration and care of the White House, its surrounding grounds, and particularly the public rooms on its first floor, in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Park Service. It also provides a means whereby articles of historic and artistic value belonging to the White House will be under the custody of the Smithsonian Institution when they are not in use or on display in the White House itself.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission

Senate Joint Resolution 51—Public Law 87–364, approved October 4, 1961:

Establishes the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial in Washington, D.C., or its environs, to Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States.

The membership is to be composed of: Former Presidents of the United States; two presidential appointees; two Senators appointed by the President of the Senate; two Congressmen to be appointed by the Speaker; and three members to be appointed by the President, one from each of the following—The Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission, and the Director of the National Park Service or his representative.

The members are to serve without pay but will be reimbursed for necessary expenses. The Commission is to report its plans and recommendations to the President and Congress at the earliest possible date.

HEALTH

Air pollution control study

S. 455—Passed Senate September 20, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Extends to June 30, 1966, and authorizes up to $5 million a year in appropriations for a continuation of the present study being conducted by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in conjunction with various State agencies into the causes, effects, and ways to abate air pollution.

Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961

H.R. 4998—Public Law 87–395, approved October 5, 1961:

This measure expands and improves community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged and other persons by—

Increasing the availability, scope, and quality of community health services and facilities to assist in meeting the health needs of the chronically ill and aged;

Increasing and expanding research to more effectively develop and utilize hospitals and other medical care facilities;

Continuing grants to assist in the construction of health research facilities.

To accomplish the above objectives, this act—

Increases from $30 million to $50 million, for each of the next 5 years, the appropriation authorization for matching grants-in-aid to States to assist them in expanding their public health services for the chronically ill and aged.

Authorizes through June 30, 1966, up to $10 million annually in special project grants to public and nonprofit organizations for studies, experiments, and demonstrations of new or improved methods of providing health services outside hospitals, primarily for chronically ill or aged persons.

Increases for 3 years the annual appropriation authorization, from $10 million to $20 million, for grants-in-aid to States to construct public and other nonprofit nursing homes under the Hill-Burton program.

Liberalizes the eligibility criteria of rehabilitation centers for construction assistance under the Hill-Burton program, by requiring that rehabilitation centers, to qualify for Federal assistance, need to provide for medical services and either psychological, social, or vocational services. (Under existing law, all four are required.)

Amends the Hill-Burton Act to extend to June 30, 1964, the authorization for loans for construction of hosiptals and other medical facilities.

Increases the annual appropriation ceiling for hospital research grants from $1,200,000 to $10 million, extends the program to medical facilities other than hospitals, and authorizes appropriations for grants for constructing and equipping experimental or demonstration hospitals and other medical facilities.

Amends the authority of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make nonmatching grants of constructing health research facilities by permitting it to expire June 30, 1962.

Extends for an additional 1 year, until June 30, 1963, the matching grant program for constructing health research facilities, and increases the authorization from $30 million to $50 million a year.

HEW—Two Assistant Secretaries

S. 2073—Passed Senate July 27, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Establishes two additional Assistant Secretaries of HEW to aid the Secretary in carrying out activities of the Department. One of the additional Assistant Secretaries would be primarily responsible for assisting and advising the Secretary in the field of international affairs (developing U.S. foreign policies and programs in the field of international social affairs, representing the United States at international conferences, etc.).

The other one will be in charge of health and medical affairs.

Howard University—Freedmen's Hospital transfer

H.R. 6302—Public Law 87–262, approved September 21, 1961:

Authorizes transfer of the present Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University as a modern teaching hospital facility for Howard University, to assist the university in training medical and allied personnel, and to provide hospital services for the community.

Project Hope—Commendation

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8—Senate adopted April 3, 1961. Pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Congress unanimously adopted this resolution expressing appreciation for the energy and initiative shown by Dr. William Walsh and his associates in the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., for their splendid work in behalf of Project Hope—the hospital ship serving as a floating medical training-teaching center for the purpose of bringing the latest medical skills to developing nations.

Practical nurse training

S. 278—Public Law 87–22, approved April 24, 1961:

Recognizing the essential role of practical nursing in aiding the ill, Congress extended the 1956 act for another 3 years (making a total of 8) providing Federal assistance on a matching basis for vocational education training programs for practical nurses.

Up to 1956, there had been similar programs in the fields of agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, distributive occupations, and fishing which have proved highly successful through the years.

An innovation in the present bill is that Congress has agreed to include Guam as a participant under the act. At present all of the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have practical nurse programs in operation—increasing from 7,000 participants in 1957 to 40,000 in 1960.

The limit set for Federal grants in the nursing program is $5 million which must be matched by the participating State.

HOUSING

FHA mortgage insurance increase

Senate Joint Resolution 89—Public Law 87–38, approved May 25, 1961:

This measure amends section 217 of the National Housing Act to increase by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of the Federal Housing Administration. Section 217 contains the mortgage insurance authorization for all FHA programs, except title I home repair and improvement program and title VIII military housing program. At the present rate of use, it is estimated by the Federal Housing Commissioner that available authorization for FHA mortgage insurance will be exhausted before the end of May 1961. At the same rate of use, $1 billion in additional authorization will be sufficient to enable new FHA mortgage activity to continue until about July 15, 1961, or until a general housing bill has been enacted.

Housing Act of 1961

S. 1922—Public Law 87–70, approved June 30, 1961:

Major provisions of the omnibus housing measure authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds are:

TITLE I—NEW HOUSING PROGRAMS

Authorizes a 35-year, low-interest-rate mortgage loan program for moderate income families in sales housing with a downpayment of 3 percent of the first $13,500, plus 10 percent over $13,500 up to a maximum mortgage of $15,000; also provides for a 40-year maximum mortgage and permits discretionary inclusion of settlement costs in the downpayment requirement for hardship cases; for existing construction a 30-year maximum maturity applies. Made no change in the 40-year term now in existing law for displaced families. The low-interest-rate mortgage loan program for moderate income families limited to 2 years; no time limit in the case of displaced families.

Market-rate program for rental housing: Bases loan ratio upon 90 percent of replacement cost of new construction. Term of the mortgage can be presribed by the Commissioner at 5 percent but grants him discretion-authority to increase maximum to 6 percent if he finds it necessary to meet the mortgage market; program terminates July 1, 1963, for moderate-income families, with no termination date for displaced families.

Below-market-rate program for rental housing: Authorizes FHA to insure mortgages at below market rate with a partial or no insurance premium and liberalized features for payment of insurance claims. Program limited to nonprofit organizations, limited-dividend corporations, cooperatives, and public bodies or agencies which certify they are not receiving financial assistance from the United States exclusively for public housing. Maximum loan ratio is 100 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost, except in case of rehabilitation it is the sum of the repair cost and the Commissioner's estimate of value before rehabilitation. Program for moderate-income families terminates July 1, 1965, but continues after that date for displaced families.

Home improvement and rehabilitation loans: Loans may not exceed 20 years, or three-fourths of the economic life of the property, whichever is less; rate of interest cannot exceed 6 percent; loans on structures less than 10 years old must involve major structural changes or correct defects not known at the time of completion of the structure; applies to urban renewal areas as well as other areas; authorizes FNMA to purchase these loans.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY AND LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

For elderly: Broadens eligibility to include public bodies, agencies, and consumer cooperatives; permits 100-percent loans; increases the elderly housing direct loan authorization from $50 million to $125 million and eliminates the specific dollar limitation on the portion which can be used for related facilities.

Public housing: Removes requirement that disabled persons be at least 50 years of age. Permits payment of an additional annual Federal contribution of up to $120 a year for each elderly family provided it is required to avoid a deficit in low-rent projects; authorizes approximately 100,000 units which is the remainder contained in the Housing Act of 1949.

Demonstration programs: Authorizes $5 million in grants to public or private bodies or agencies to develop and demonstrate new or improved means of providing housing for low-income persons and families.

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL AND PLANNING

Urban renewal: Increases the grant authorization by $2 billion (to $4 billion); permits a locality of 50,000 or less (150,000 or less in case of a community located in a depressed area) to obtain a three-fourths Federal grant on the same basis as the regular two-thirds, i.e., without having to assume the cost of planning, etc.; authorizes the Administrator to use up to $25 million for mass transportation demonstration projects; authorizes SBA to make loans under the disaster loan program to a small business which has suffered substantial economic injury as a result of its displacement by federally aided urban renewal or highway construction program or any other construction program if Federal funds are used; increases from $125 million to $150 million the authorization for disaster loans to provide funds for displaced businesses; increases from 20 percent to 30 percent the amount of grant authorization which may be used for nonresidential purposes.

Urban planning assistance: Increases authorization from $20 million to $75 million; changes the amount of grant from one-half to two-thirds of the estimated cost of the work; extends planning to include transportation facilities.

TITLE IV—COLLEGE HOUSING

Increases the loan authorization by $1.2 billion through fiscal 1964.

TITLE V—COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Public facility and mass transportation loans: Increases the loan authorization by $500 million and provides that $50 million of the amount be made available for mass transportation loans.

Planning advances: Increases by $10 million the amounts which may be appropriated to the revolving fund for planning advances.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

FNMA: Increases special assistance authorization by $1.5 billion, including transfers.

FHA insurance programs: Extends the home repair and improvement program for 4 years until October 1, 1965; removes dollar ceilings on FHA's insurance authorization and provides that loans and mortgages may be insured until October 1, 1965, except for certain programs that have different termination dates; increases nursing home mortgages from 75 percent to 90 percent of value.

TITLE VII—OPEN-SPACE LAND

Authorizes $50 million in grants to help finance the acquisition of title to, or other permanent interests in, open-space land; limits grants in most cases to 20 percent of total acquisition cost, except in cases of public bodies where it can be increased to 30 percent.

TITLE VIII—FARM HOUSING

Extends the program for 4 years until June 30, 1965; authorizes an additional $200 million in addition to the unused balance of approximately $235 million of the $450 million previously authorized for the period ending June 30, 1961.

Farm housing research: Authorizes $250,000 a year for 4 years to carry out a program of research, study, and analysis of farm housing.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

Voluntary home mortgage credit program: Extends this program to October 1, 1965.

Hospital construction: Extends to June 30, 1962, the authority granted for loans and grants to public and nonprofit agencies for hospital construction under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, where applications were filed before June 30, 1953, and denied solely because of lack of funds; authorizes $7,500,000 for each of the additional years.

New authorizations under the Housing Act of 1961 and estimated budget impact in fiscal 1962

[Millions of dollars]

Purpose	Total new authorizations	Estimated budget impact in fiscal 1962
Total	$4,886	$343
Total loans	2,760	325
FNMA special assistance [1] (President's discretion)	750	225
Housing for the elderly	75	20
Public facility loans	450	50
Mass transit loans	50	10
Planning advances (sec. 702)	10	----------
Farm housing loans	200	----------
College housing	1,200	10
Loans for displaced business	25	10
Total grants	2,126	18
Urban renewal	2,000	3
Mass transit grants [2]	----------	5
Urban planning	55	3
Open-space grants	50	5
Farm housing research	1	----------
Defense hospitals	15	----------
Housing demonstration program	5	2

[1] The bill also allows FNMA to use approximately $200,000,000 of the Program 10 special assistance fund previously authorized by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958. In addition, repayments on mortgages in the management and liquidation fund established in 1954, amounting to an estimated $150,000,000 a year, could be used for the purchase of mortgages under the special assistance function.

[2] Permits use of up to $25,000,000 of urban renewal funds.

Veterans' home loans

H.R. 5723—Public Law 87-84, approved July 6, 1961:

Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967.

INDIANS

American Indian Day

Senate Joint Resolution 84—Passed Senate August 14, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

To call public attention to the achievements and contributions that the American Indian has made to this Nation's progress and culture, this resolution designates the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day.

The President is directed to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion and inviting the people of the United States to observe it with appropriate ceremonies.

Claims Commission

S. 751—Public Law 87-48, approved June 16, 1961:

This measure extends the life of the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1967, an additional 5 years, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress.

The Commission was established in 1946 to provide for a final disposition of all claims of Indian tribes against the United States that existed on the date of the act, August 13, 1946.

This extension is required in order that claims which the Indians have filed may be properly heard and decided; otherwise, the Indians will again resort to petitioning Congress for special jurisdictional acts to have their claims adjudicated.

There are 468 dockets now pending and active, some of which have been partly adjudicated and others in early stages of processing.

This act also provides for hearing examiners to assist the Commission in expediting its work. By assigning additional attorneys in the Justice Department to these claims cases, and attempting to reach settlements in cases which liability has been determined, a great many dockets can be disposed of.

Colville Reservation Confederated Tribes

H.R. 8236—Public Law 87-298, approved September 26, 1961:

Authorizes remaining funds, after settlements of certain judgments before Indian Claims Commission, to be credited to the account of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. These funds may be spent, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for purposes authorized by the tribal government body.

Employment

S. 200—Public Law 87-273, approved September 22, 1961:

This measure amends a 1956 act by increasing to $7,500,000 the annual authorization to carry out a vocational training program for American Indians residing on or near Indian reservations.

Although the Indian vocational training program has been in operation less than 5 years, it has become a most effective tool for equipping American Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 with salable work skills. These courses extend from 4 months to 2 years. In fiscal 1961 there were 1,700 students enrolled in various vocational programs throughout the United States. As of May 1, 1960, 743 Indians had completed training.

Land—Leasing

S. 108—Passed Senate March 30, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

This measure amends the 1955 Indian Leasing Act relating to leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and some farming purposes.

Under the 1955 act the Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the United States were permitted to lease their lands for a period of 25 years with the approval of the Secretary for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. In addition, these lands could be leased for farming purposes which require making substantial investments in improving land for producing specialized crops. The act also authorized leasing restricted lands of deceased Indians for the benefit of their heirs or devisees.

After the enactment of the 1955 measure, there arose several instances where the 50-year maximum leasing period was inadequate for the proper development of resources. To meet the needs of the Palm Springs Indians and the Navajo Tribe, Congress provided for 99-year leases on these two reservations during the 86th Congress.

Several other tribes, including the Seminoles, the Torres-Martinez groups and others, have all requested leasing authority beyond the present 50-year maximum.

This bill is designed to permit a lease with a term that is long enough to enable a lessee to obtain finanicng for the type development that is contemplated. It is drafted in such a way as to provide for lease periods up to 99 years. The Secretary of the Interior, however, may not approve any leasing with a term longer than is necessary to obtain the maximum economic benefits for the Indian owners. The bill retains the 10-year limitation on grazing leases and the 25-year maximum on farming leases that require substantial investments.

This measures also clarifies any ambiguity in the present law regarding mineral leases by omitting them completely.

Menominees

H.R. 4130—In conference:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make loans over a 4-year period up to a maximum of $1.5 million to Menominee Enterprises, Inc. This corporation succeeds the tribal entity of the Menominee Indians of Menominee County, Wis., as planned by an act of June 17, 1954, which terminated services to these Indians by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as of April 30, 1961. The corporation contains the tribal assets, primarily timber and a sawmill, and the proposed program provides for modernizing these facilities. In the absence of assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the 1954 termination program would have difficulty in succeeding without loan aid. The program lends to the Menominee corporation under conditions assuring repayment within 20 years.

Authorizes additional expenditures for the development of recreational resources, and sanitation facilities, a program interrupted because of the change in its status on April 30, 1961.

Northern Cheyenne Indians, Montana

S. 2224—Public Law 87-287, approved September 22, 1961:

Provides that Indians granted allotments under a 1926 act, giving mineral rights to the northern Cheyenne Indians, when they take possession of their subsurface rights,

must take them subject to any then outstanding leases. This provision is intended to encourage the development of minerals, discouraged now because a lessee cannot obtain a lease from the tribe that runs beyond 1976 when the land is to be transferred to the individual allottee or his heir.

Omaha Tribe

S. 1518—Public Law 87-235, approved September 14, 1961:

This bill disposes of a $2,722,288 claim collected by the Omaha Tribe after an official roll of the descendants of the aboriginal tribe member is compiled, $750 per capita is authorized with the balance of the claim being used for purposes designated by the tribal council.

Public facility loans

S. 2454—Passed Senate August 29, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Provides eligibility to Indian tribes for assistance under the public facility loan program, title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Under present law, eligibility for loans under the public facility loan program is limited to "municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of State." This provision has been interpreted as not including Indian tribes because they are not creatures of the States but quasi-independent Government entities recognized, supported, and dealt with by the Federal Government.

The exclusion of Indian tribes from the communities facilities program is inconsistent with other housing programs. Federal assistance for low-rent public housing and housing for the elderly program is considered available to the tribes. In addition, they are eligible for Federal assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. Thus omission from the public facilities program would be rank discrimination.

Pueblos-trust lands

S. 203—Public Law 87-231, approved September 14, 1961:

Declares the United States will hold in trust 69,706 acres of public domain lands which will insure continuity of use of this land by the Indians who have worked it under free use permit for the last 20 years. Such trust title will help foster the initiative for better soil conservation practices by the Indians.

Reservation roads

S. 1719—Public Law 87-282, approved September 22, 1961:

This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept the cooperation of any State, county, or local subdivision in the construction of Indian reservation roads and bridges. Cooperation will, as a general rule, take the form of contributions of either materials or funds, or both.

Frequently an Indian reservation road is constructed through an area where a part of the lands are owned by Indians and a part by non-Indians. The local government recognizes that it should pay the part relating to the non-Indian lands. Under existing law, the local government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs must each assume responsibility for a specific part of the construction; for instance, one may agree to do the surfacing and the other the grading. This is an inefficient procedure and it cannot be used at all when the construction work is to be done under a contract let by competitive bidding.

Thus, this act will permit the Secretary to accept funds from the local government and use them for an integrated road construction program under Bureau control.

Revolving loan fund

S. 1540—Public Law 87-250, approved September 15, 1961:

Provides for an increase from $10 million to $20 million for the Indian revolving fund so that adequate funds will be available from which worthwhile projects may be financed.

Seneca leasing law

S. 344—Public Law 87-230, approved September 14, 1961:

Changes existing law which states that funds acquired by leasing Seneca lands must be distributed with $5,000 going to the maintenance of the Council of the Seneca Nation and any funds above this being divided on a per capita basis.

Thus, this bill removes the $5,000 limitation and provides that the council may use all or any part of the lease money.

Utilities

S. 1501—Public Law 87-279, approved September 22, 1961:

Permits the Secretary of Interior, after notifying the congressional Interior Committees, to contract for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation to private organizations of any Government-owned utility systems (except part of an irrigation system) used by Indian reservations. Private participation will improve the service given by these utilities as the Bureau of Indian Affairs hasn't the necessary funds for the needed improvements or to effect improved service in many areas.

INTERNATIONAL

Alien Orphan Adoption Act

S. 2237—Public Law 87-301, approved September 26, 1961:

Made permanent and expanded the provisions of the Alien Orphan Adoption Act which permits orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens to enter the country on nonquota visas. To be eligible, the alien must be under 14 and must have been orphaned or abandoned abroad. The act provides, however, that no more than two children may be adopted by one family unless it would mean the separation of brothers and sisters, and prevents proxy adoption of orphans.

Permits immediate admittance of some 18,000 second and third preference aliens on a nonquota basis.

Assistance to refugees, migrants, and escapees

H.R. 8291—In conference:

This bill assists in the resettlement of refugees and escapees by—

Authorizing the President to participate in three programs: Contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), contributions to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the U.S. escapee program (USEP).

Establishing specific authority to assist Cuban refugees who have come to the United States.

Providing the President with authority to meet unexpected refugee, escapee, and migration problems by using up to $10 million in any fiscal year out of his foreign aid contingency fund.

Authorizing the President to delegate his responsibilities under this act to appropriate officers of the U.S. Government, to allocate funds to these officers to operate the programs, and to expend funds for necessary operating and administrative purposes.

ICEM, established on the initiative of the United States in 1951, now has 30 governments as members. Its purpose is to move surplus population and refugees from Europe to Latin America, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other countries. The organization assists these migrants in relocating and establishing themselves in their new surroundings.

USEP, operated by the United States since 1952, provides reception, supplemental material aid, and resettlement and local integration assistance to recent escapees from the Sino-Soviet bloc.

UNHCR, established in 1951, to promote the principle of asylum refugees fleeing from persecution and to reduce political tensions resulting when large numbers of people seek asylum in a neighboring country.

Aid to Cuba refugees heretofore has been made the responsibility of the Department of HEW. The program has been operated under the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and financed out of the President's contingency fund under that act.

Battle Act revisions

S. 1215—Passed Senate May 11, 1961:

This measure amends the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, the so-called Battle Act, to strengthen U.S. policy abroad.

The Battle Act of 1951 places an embargo on shipments of war materials from the United States to the Communist bloc and penalizes other nations which fail to do likewise by prohibiting military, economic, or financial assistance from the United States to them.

This measure deletes obsolete references to provisions which have been since repealed. It provides that the Administrator of the act may be either the Secretary of State or such other officer as the President may designate.

This amendment permits economic and financial, but not military, assistance to any nation or area, other than the Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East, which exports arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or items used in the production of these materials to the Sino-Soviet bloc, upon the President's determination that such assistance is important to the security of the United States. The amendment also permits assistance to a country which is neither effectively cooperating with, nor furnishing sufficient information to, the United States. If, however, aid has been terminated, such assistance can be resumed only upon a determination that the Nation has taken adequate measures to assure full compliance with the act. Each such determination must be reported to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Economic assistance is permitted through the use of any amount of mutual security funds, without regard to the present $30 million ceiling on assistance to any nation for which the act must be waived and also permits assistance through the use of funds of the Export-Import Bank, as well as local currencies accruing to the United States under Public Law 480 sales of surplus agricultural commodities.

Under this amendment the Administrator may, notwithstanding the requirements of this act, direct continued assistance to a country which knowingly permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials to any nation or area receiving economic or financial assistance if such would be clearly in the interest of the United States.

Caribbean organization

House Joint Resolution 384—Public Law 87-73, approved June 30, 1961:

This resolution authorizes the President to accept on behalf of the United States the agreement establishing the Caribbean Organization and the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization.

The resolution makes available to the Organization the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act and authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint a U.S. observer to the Organization.

The statute of the Caribbean Organization is an integral part of the agreement among the four powers. Except for the French territories, which will continue to be represented by France, the members of the Carib-

bean Organization will be the territories, commonwealths, or other possessions of those powers in the Caribbean area. Other territories eligible to participate are the Netherlands, Antilles, Surinam, British Guiana, the West Indies, the Bahamas, British Honduras, and the British Virgin Islands. French Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique will participate and will be represented by France. Each member of the Organization will have one delegate with one vote, except that France will have one delegation with three votes, reflecting French membership on behalf of three departments.

The Organization is to concern itself with social, cultural, and economic matters of common interest to the Caribbean area, particularly agriculture, communications, education, fisheries, health, housing, industry, labor, music and the arts, social welfare, and trade. It may make studies and recommendations, assist in the coordination of local projects of regional significance, arrange for or provide technical guidance not otherwise available, and, subject to certain conditions, make contracts or agreements for technical assistance with other international or national organizations.

Headquarters will probably be located in Puerto Rico.

Cooperation agreement with France

House Joint Resolution 569—Public Law 87–363, approved October 4, 1961:

Ratification of this agreement permits the United States and France to exchange classified information to permit French military forces to be trained in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons.

In addition the agreement provides for the transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapon systems (but not parts of atomic weapons) to improve the state of training and operational readiness of French military forces assigned to NATO.

Educational and cultural exchange

H.R. 8666—Public Law 87–256, approved September 21, 1961:

This measure is designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of the international educational and cultural exchange programs administered and sponsored by the U.S. Government by consolidating into one act the following programs: The Fulbright Act of the 79th Congress, Public Law 584; the Smith-Mundt Act of the 80th Congress, Public Law 402; the Finnish Debt Payments Act of the 81st Congress, Public Law 265; the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended; the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 of the 83d Congress, Public Law 480; and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 of the 84th Congress, Public Law 860.

The overall aim in effecting the consolidation is to promote the educational and cultural affairs to a more important position in the foreign relations of the United States.

Principal provisions of the consolidation:

Continues the President's authority to appoint a Board of Foreign Scholarships to select students and educational institutions for the program, and increases the membership from 10 to 12.

Permits U.S. participation in exchange programs sponsored through the U.N. or other international organizations.

Authorized use of exchange program funds for living expenses as well as transportation expenses of foreign students coming to the United States.

Authorized use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies for the exchange of U.S. and foreign students and teachers under a program administered by State Department.

Authorized use of funds to assist U.S. educational institutions in foreign countries.

Authorized the educational and cultural exchange programs for leaders and specialists as well as teachers.

Authorized the State Department to administer the programs involving exchange of persons and cultural presentations. Authorized USIA to administer exchange of books and educational materials, and Commerce Department to administer the trade fair provisions.

Authorized U.S. representation at cultural events in the United States as well as abroad.

Broadened the definition of cultural events to include meetings and assemblies—as well as artistic, dramatic, musical, and sports.

Revised the Immigration and Nationality Act and established a new nonimmigrant alien class for which visas as exchange visitors would be issued to teachers, trainees, leaders, and specialists.

Authorized program participants and dependents to accept employment.

Permitted one security investigation to be sufficient to cover any Government personnel who might change their functions within a department.

Permitted fellowships from foreign governments and international organizations to be taxed at the same rate as U.S. grants.

Applied the same tax rules and rates to income of exchange visitors as are applied to U.S. citizens.

Directs the President to submit annual reports to the Congress, detailing activities and expenditures made under this act.

Emergency Repatriation Assistance Act of 1961

H.R. 6027—Public Law 87–64, approved June 30, 1961:

The Emergency Repatriation Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the Secretary of HEW, after consulting with the Secretaries of State and Defense, to develop plans and make arrangements for providing temporary assistance to U.S. citizens and dependents of U.S. citizens, identified by the Department of State as having returned or brought here because of destitution or illness, or because of war, threat of war, invasion, or similar crisis.

This 1-year assistance, however, will be provided only if the citizen or dependent involved was without available resources. The aid can consist of money payments, medical care, temporary billeting, transportation, or other goods or services needed for the health or welfare of the individual. It can also include guidance, counseling, and other welfare services.

(Passed as an amendment to social security amendments.)

Exemptions—Foreign bank issues

H.R. 5189—Public Law 87–29, approved May 4, 1961:

Under existing law there is an income tax on foreign corporations which hold U.S. Government securities if they receive interest on them. In the case of a foreign government that holds U.S. bonds, there is no income tax; in other words there is an exemption in such cases.

Some foreign governments do not have central banks, instead they operate through corporations. In this type case the tax is payable on these securities. This bill is designed to equate this situation by making all obligations of that nature exempt whether they are owned by a country through its wholly owned central banks or whether it is owned by a foreign government banking business.

In addition, it extends to May 15, 1961, the period in which the spouse of a shareholder in a small business corporation may consent to an election not to be taxed as a corporation. Under existing law certain small business corporations can elect not to be taxed as a corporation; however, the Treasury Department regulations provide that in community property States, both husband and wife must make the election. Thus, in many instances the husband made the election but the wife did not. This measure merely grants the spouse until May 15, to sign the election where, in the first instance, a timely election was made by the husband.

Export declarations

S. 1289—Public Law 87–191, approved August 31, 1961:

To facilitate the movement of exports, this measure eliminates a nonessential step in processing export declarations by repealing the requirement of an oath on shippers' manifests of cargo and replaces it with a certification requirement.

Experience has shown the oath requirement to be costly, burdensome and superfluous since, under section 1001, title 18 of the United States Code, any false or fraudulent statements or representations concerning matters within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the U.S. Government is subject to a fine of up to $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Export-Import Bank—Credit insurance

S. 2325—Public Law 87–311, approved September 26, 1961:

Amends the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act which relate to export credit guarantees, by making it clear that the Export-Import Bank is authorized to insure, coinsure, and reinsure U.S. exporters and foreign exporters doing business in the United States in an aggregate amount of $1 billion outstanding at any one time against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with U.S. export transactions, and by authorizing the Bank to establish fractional reserves in connection with export guarantees amounting to at least 25 percent of the related contractual liability in the Bank.

This will make it possible for the Export-Import Bank to provide greater assistance to the United States through an expanded program for insuring or guaranteeing exports, which will help to solve the balance-of-payments problem of the United States by increasing exports.

Foreign Agents Registration Act

H.R. 470—Public Law 87–366, approved October 4, 1961:

Broadens the definition of "foreign principal" to require registration under the Foreign Agents Registration Act by individuals employed in a domestic partnership or organization which is substantially directed by a foreign government or political party.

Clarifies the so-called commercial exemptions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by providing that a foreign principal, in order for its agents to be eligible for exemption from registering under the act, must be engaged in activities which are either private and nonpolitical and financial, or private and nonpolitical and mercantile.

Foreign Assistance Authorization Act of 1961

S. 1983—Public Law 87–195, approved September 4, 1961:

This measure authorizes $4,253,500,000 for foreign economic and military assistance in 1962, and $1.5 billion in each of the following years, 1963–66, for the Development Loan Fund. The major provisions are:

Statement of policy: Stated its purpose is to strengthen friendly foreign countries by encouraging the development of their free economic institutions, productive capabilities, and by eliminating barriers to the flow of private investment capital. In addition, declared that it is the policy of the United States to support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information, religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion.

Development Loan Fund: Authorized a 5-year program of long-term loans to

friendly countries and areas with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities.

The loans are to be repayable in U.S. dollars and made only upon a finding of reasonable prospects for repayment.

Provided that loans may not be reloaned within the recipient country at rates of interest excessive or unreasonable for the borrower and in no event higher than the applicable legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

Authorized $1.2 billion for fiscal year 1962 and $1.5 billion for each of the following years, 1963–66, but required annual appropriations.

Authorized the President, when he determines it is important to the advancement of our interest and the development program, to enter into agreements committing loan funds in advance of but subject to the appropriation of such funds. Requires the President to notify the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of the provisions of such agreements, including the amounts of funds involved.

Authorized the President to establish an interagency Development Loan Committee, consisting of officers from Government agencies and confirmed by the Senate, to establish standards and criteria for lending.

Authorized the President to lend up to 10 percent of the Development Loan Funds to the International Development Association.

Development grants: Authorized $380 million in development grants plus unobligated balances (estimated at $15 million). Development grants will be used to raise educational, technical, managerial, and professional levels of certain societies. Authorized assistance to schools, libraries, and hospitals outside the United States that have been founded or sponsored by American citizens. Authorized up to $2 million to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy outside the United States.

Development grant activities will be financed jointly by the United States and the host government with the latter paying a fair share of the cost of the programs.

Authorized assistance through loans of foreign currencies to small farmers, up to an aggregate of $10 million at any one time.

Prohibits grants which would have a substantially adverse effect upon the U.S. economy or a segment thereof.

Investment guarantees: Continues and broadens the President's authority to make guarantees of certain investments up to a face amount of $1 billion, and expands the role of private enterprise in furthering the economic growth of less developed countries and areas. Authorized the President to guarantee up to 75 percent of an investment up to $10 million, against risks as determined by him; however, these investments must be for projects emphasizing economic development, social progress, and promote small independent business enterprises. Authorized guarantees up to 75 percent of an investment in pilot housing projects in Latin America up to a total of $10 million. These guarantees would cover investments made by U.S. citizens or business entities which are both U.S.-chartered and substantially U.S.-owned in pilot or demonstration private housing projects in Latin America. Requires a fee for each guarantee in an amount to be determined by the President.

Surveys of investment opportunities: Authorized $5 million to finance up to 50 percent of the cost of investment surveys and studies in less developed areas approved by the President. Excludes surveys regarding sources of oil, gas, and ores, along with studies aimed at determining the feasibility of mining and other extraction operations. To be eligible to receive such funds, the term "person" as applied to this section means a citizen of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by U.S. citizens.

Development research: Establishes a new program designed to contribute the results of systematic investigation to the improvement and the direction of economic aid programs.

International organizations and program: Authorizes $153.5 million for the support of international organizations and programs; funds to remain available until expended. Limited contributions to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance and the U.N. Special Fund (after calendar year 1961) to 40 percent of the total amount contributed, including assessed and audited local costs, for each year. Directed the President, in his determination as to whether aid should be continued to the Palestine refugees in the Near East, to consider whether Israel and the Arab host governments are taking steps toward the resettlement and repatriation of these refugees and the extent and success of efforts by the U.N. Relief and Works Agency and the Arab host governments to rectify the Palestine refugee relief rolls. Reaffirmed U.S. policy to participate in the Indus Basin development.

Supporting assistance: Authorizes $465 million for supporting assistance to be used beginning in fiscal year 1962, plus unobligated balances currently estimated at $50 million, and to remain available until expended. Supporting assistance joins together in a single category those programs which have been labeled "defense support" and "special assistance" programs.

Contingency fund: Authorized up to $300 million for a contingency fund to be used by the President for economic purposes that he determines to be important to the national interest.

Agrarian economies: Directed the President to place emphasis upon programs reaching the people who are engaged in agriculture.

Military assistance: Authorized a 2-year program at the level of $1.7 billion for each of the fiscal years. Military assistance may be furnished on such terms and conditions as the President may determine, and to any country, subject to conditions of eligibility, or international organizations, the support of which the President finds to be in the national interest. Limited defense articles for any one country in any one year to $3 million unless the President determines, among other requirements, that the increased ability of such country to defend itself is important to the security of the United States. Authorizes the President to use up to $300 million in Defense Department supplies for military aid if he determines it to be vital to the security of the United States. Limited to $57.5 million the amount of military equipment aid for Latin American nations.

General provisions

Aid barred: Bars aid under this act to the present Government of Cuba; to the government of any country unless the President determines that the country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement; to any country indebted to a U.S. citizen who has exhausted available legal remedies.

Small business: Establish an Office of Small Business to assist American small business in foreign aid program. Established a $5 million revolving fund to acquire usable U.S. machinery to sell to small foreign businesses and set a ceiling of $45 million on the original sale value of surplus property transferred to the Agency for International Development.

Recipient countries: Encouraged development and use in recipient countries of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations.

President Kennedy's statement of August 29, 1961

"The compromise which the Senate-House conferees have worked out is wholly satisfactory. It gives the U.S. Government authority to make commitments for long-term development programs with reasonable assurance that these commitments will be met. In providing 5 years of substantial authorization, the conferees have recognized the magnitude of the need in the developing countries. In insuring specific authority to enter into commitments with these countries, the conferees have recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will be forthcoming over a period of years. The agreement reached by the conferees today is an important decision both for the United States and the free world."

Foreign Commerce Act of 1961

S. 1729—Passed Senate August 25, 1961. Pending in House Banking and Currency Committee:

Provided new and expanded existing services which the Federal Government provides to American businessmen who are interested in exporting their goods.

The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to (1) provide for the establishment of trade fairs abroad to aid in exhibiting U.S. goods, (2) encourage the establishment of permanent centers which exhibit U.S. goods, (3) send trade specialists overseas to attempt to open new markets to U.S. goods, (4) provide information concerning existing trade opportunities, and (5) institute programs of trade fair promotion. Also, establishes under the Department of Commerce a professional career service. Members of the Foreign Commerce Corps would be sent, after a training program to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce, to our Embassies or other oversea posts. They would work on commercial and/or economic matters. The corps would function on much the same system as our Foreign Service Corps. Also, the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended to institute a comprehensive program of credit guarantees and insurance against political and commercial risks arising directly from export transactions. The Bank will utilize the services of private enterprise, particularly insurance companies and financial institutions. All exports which are guaranteed or insured must be at a uniform rate; the Bank has the authority to determine the terms and conditions of the guarantee program.

Foreign Service widows

S. 1067—Passed Senate March 30, 1961. Pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

In 1956 Congress enacted a measure authorizing a $1,200 a year annuity to widows of Foreign Service officers who were not entitled to an annuity under the Foreign Service retirement system provided the widow was in "actual need."

In 1960 this act was amended and the amount increased to $2,400 a year and expanded to include widows whose husbands "died" before August 29, 1954, and repealed the "actual need" test.

This measure amends the foregoing to include widows whose husbands "retired" prior to August 29, 1954.

In each instance the date, August 29, 1954, was selected because it was the effective date of the Government Employees Life Insurance Act and any Foreign Service officer who retired after that date would have some Government life insurance which would benefit his widow in the event of his death.

Inter-American Children's Institute

Senate Joint Resolution 66—Public Law 87–365, approved October 4, 1961:

This act enables the United States to continue participation in the activities of the Inter-American Children's Institute until

the end of 1963, by substituting 1963 and 1964 for 1961 and 1962 in the present law. This limit was placed in the law in 1960 when Congress raised the ceiling on U.S. contributions to $50,000 a year (from $25,000—to permit Congress to have a look at and form a judgment as to the Institute's increased activities as a result of additional funds.

The primary purpose of the Inter-American Children's Institute is to serve as a center for technical consultation, advisory services, to foster a helpful publication program, and to disseminate information on all matters pertinent to the welfare of American children.

The accomplishments of the Institute are recognized throughout the world, and Congress unanimously adopted this resolution authorizing our continued participation and cooperation in the Institute's efforts.

International Exposition for Southern California

S.J. Res. 132—Passed Senate September 11, 1961. Pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Directs the President to issue a proclamation calling on the United States and foreign countries to take part in the international exposition to be held at Long Beach, Calif., in 1966.

International Finance Corporation Amendment

H.R. 6765—Public Law 87–185, approved August 30, 1961:

Amends the charter of the International Finance Corporation by allowing it to purchase capital stock to aid the IFC in encouraging private investment in underdeveloped countries by creating a wider flexibility of financing to meet the varying needs of private enterprise. The IFC will not be allowed to vote the capital stock in connection with any managerial function unless a situation arose which placed the investment in jeopardy.

International food and raw materials reserve

Senate Resolution 128—Senate adopted June 1, 1961:

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution expressing, as the sense of the Senate, that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations and related international organizations for the purpose of acquiring and storing in appropriate countries raw or processed farm productions and other raw materials, exclusive of minerals.

These materials could then be used to (1) prevent extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities; (2) prevent famine and starvation; (3) help absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (but not minerals); and (4) promote economic and development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies.

U.S. participation would be contingent upon statutory authorization or treaty approval.

Latin American aid

H.R. 6518—Public Law 87–41, approved May 27, 1961:

This measure appropriates $500 million for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and $100 million for Chilean reconstruction.

The authorizing legislation was passed in 1960 to enable the U.S. representatives in Bogotá, Colombia, to give substance to a new program of development for Latin America. The objective of this development program is to implement the Act of Bogotá, signed by 19 American nations in September 1960.

In helping to carry out the Act of Bogotá, the funds involved in this appropriation will be aimed directly at the Latin American people through advances in fields which directly affect their lives. The President, in requesting this appropriation, stated:

"It will be devoted to social progress. Social progress is not a substitute for economic development. It is an effort to create a social framework within which all the people of a nation can share in the benefits of prosperity and participate in the process of growth. Economic growth without social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance * * *. Thus, the purpose of our special effort for social progress is to overcome the barriers of geographical and social isolation, illiteracy and lack of educational opportunities, archaic tax and land tenure structures and other institutional obstacles to broad participation in economic growth."

The fields included in this social progress are—

(a) Land settlement and improved land use;

(b) Housing for low-income groups through assistance to self-help housing and to institutions providing long-term housing finance;

(c) Community water supply and sanitation facilities;

(d) Supplementary financing of facilities for advanced education and training related to economic and social development as may be agreed upon from time to time between the United States and the Inter-American Development Bank. The IDB will also provide technical assistance related to the above fields. Technical assistance may be on a grant, loan, or reimbursable basis.

The International Cooperation Administration will also participate in the program and its primary responsibility will be for education and training programs; public health; projects for social improvement for the federation of the West Indies and other territories within the Western Hemisphere; and applied research and surveys in fields related to social progress. Most ICA assistance will be on a grant basis.

Six million dollars is to be used to help the Organization of American States in connection with the social development program.

The $100 million will be loaned to the Government of Chile to assist in financing specific reconstruction projects and activities made necessary by the series of severe earthquakes in southern Chile. Total damage as a result of the quakes was $372 million.

As finally enacted, the measure prohibits loans or reloans at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

Lincoln monument to Mexico

S. 653—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Authorizes the Secretary of State to procure a statue of Lincoln (at an estimated cost of $150,000) to present to Mexico in commemoration of its 100th anniversary of independence.

Loan of naval vessels to friendly countries

H.R. 7726—Public Law 87–387, approved October 4, 1961:

Authorizes the President to loan ships to the following friendly nations:

North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European area not to exceed six ships (Denmark and Greece).

Southern Asia not to exceed two ships (Pakistan).

Far Eastern area not to exceed six ships (Republic of China and Republic of Korea).

Two ships to be loaned to friendly foreign nations in the event of an emergency.

Extends for 5 years existing loans of two destroyer escorts to Portugal and two destroyers to Spain.

NATO—U.S. Citizens Commission

House Joint Resolution 463—Public Law 87–116, approved July 31, 1961:

Extended through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, a Commission established to explore means of cooperation and unity of purpose among the NATO countries.

Though the Commission was established on September 7, 1960, by Public Law 86–719, the actual membership was not appointed until March 21, 1961. Due to this delay plus the fact that some of the other NATO countries have experienced similar delays, it was considered essential to extend the life of the Commission. Ultimately these groups will hold an international convention to carry out the purposes of the original resolution.

OECD—Permanent representation

S. 2423—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Reconsideration motion pending:

This bill permits the President to appoint, subject to confirmation by the Senate, a permanent representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and provides for the cost of U.S. participation in OECD including salaries of the American representative and his staff.

The U.S. share of the OECD budget is 25 percent, and it is estimated that the total budget will run to about $5 million annually.

Paris convention on patents and trademarks

H.R. 5754—Public Law 87–333, approved October 3, 1961:

Implements the Paris convention in relation to the right of priority for patents and trademarks, by amending sections 1119 and 1126, title 15 of the United States Code, which provides that if an application for a trademark is filed in the United States within 6 months of the date the application for the same trademark was filed in a foreign country, the same date of registration shall apply to the U.S. application. In the case of patent inventions, the same right of priority applies but the period is 1 year.

This bill provides that if a subsequent application were filed in the foreign country after the first foreign application had been withdrawn, abandoned, or otherwise disposed of without leaving any rights outstanding, the first date would hold—if the other requirements had been met.

Peace Corps

H.R. 7500—Public Law 87–293, approved September 22, 1961:

This measure carries out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples help themselves. The Peace Corps is designed to provide the framework through which America's idealism, her humanitarianism, and her generosity can find a personal expression in the task of helping to build with our own hands a better world for our mankind. The major provisions are:

Purpose: To promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, and to promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people and a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served.

Staff and agency: Established as a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of State, headed by a Director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, at $20,000 a year, and a Deputy Director at $19,500 a year. The Director of the agency will report directly to the Secretary of State, and the integration of the Peace Corps programs with the foreign policy of the United States will be the responsibility of the Secretary of State.

Volunteers: Provides that the President may enroll in the Peace Corps for service abroad qualified citizens and nationals of the United States who will be called volunteers. A volunteer, to enroll in the Peace Corps,

must pass a general entrance as well as other examinations, successfully complete a training program including instruction in philosophy, strategy, tactics, and the menace of communism, be selected for oversea duty, and have a language proficiency. To qualify as a volunteer, one must be at least 18, single or if married both must volunteer, in excellent physical and mental health, emotionally mature, and exemplary in personal conduct. In addition he must have a good educational background and/or experience required for success both in the training program and in performance on the job.

Allowances: Volunteers will be given living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President may determine necessary (estimated to cost $9,000 per person). The volunteer is to live at a level generally similar to that of his host country counterpart. He will be credited with 2½ days of annual leave for each month of satisfactory service, which will permit him to travel some in the area in which he is stationed. While actually on leave, the volunteer will be given an additional allowance of $5 a day to cover expenses.

Termination payments: Volunteers will receive termination payments at a rate not to exceed $75 for each month of satisfactory service, to be paid at the conclusion of his service; unless his financial situation is such that he needs payments deducted to support a family.

National Advisory Council: Provides for Presidential appointment of 25 members to the Council from educational institutions, voluntary agencies, farm organizations, labor unions, and other public and private organizations and groups interested in the objectives of the Peace Corps. The Council is to advise and consult with the President concerning policy matters. The service is without pay; however, if they are not employed by the Government they may receive $50 per diem not to exceed 20 days in any fiscal year, actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

Peace Corps projects: For a project to be eligible: (1) It must make a contribution to the economic, social, or cultural development of the host country, and the government of that country must have requested the project and given evidence of its willingness to cooperate; (2) it must require primarily workers or doers with skills not sufficiently available in the host country; (3) maintenance and remuneration of volunteers must meet Peace Corps standards; (4) it must use volunteers who will be serving in this or other projects for a minimum of 2 or 3 years including training time; and (5) any sectarian religious propagandizing or proselytizing must not be permitted.

Authorization: Authorizes an appropriation of $40 million for fiscal 1962.

Red China

Senate Concurrent Resolution 34—Passed Senate July 28, 1961, passed House August 31, 1961:

Resolves to continue existing relations with and commitments to the Nationalist Chinese Government (Republic of China); resolves also to continue to oppose the Chinese Communists in their bid for recognition in the United Nations; and continues to oppose diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communists by the President of the United States.

Reemployment of Foreign Service personnel

S. 644—Passed Senate March 29, 1961, pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

Section 872(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, requires the agency of the Federal Government reempolying a Foreign Service annuitant to pay to the Department of State funds necessary to cover salary, employer contribution, and leave payments, and the Department in turn pays to the annuitant the portion of his salary that he is entitled to and the portion of his annuity that he is entitled to, making withholdings and deductions as required by law.

This bill is designed to simplify this procedure in some cases by allowing these fiscal arrangements to be handled either entirely by the Department as the law now provides or to be shared between the Department of State and the agency which employs the retired officer.

It also revises section 872(c) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, having to do with the recovery of excess payments, to accord with the change which the bill would make in section 872(b). Excess payments, if any, would result from overpayment of annuity. Generally, the State Department would recover the overpayment from subsequent amounts due the annuitant from the Department. However, authority is granted to permit recovery from the salary due so that, in death cases, all available sources could be utilized for the recovery of overpayments.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Act

H.R. 9118—Public Law 87-297, approved September 26, 1961:

This measure establishes a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament.

The major provisions are:

Purpose: The purpose of the act is to establish an agency to give impetus to the U.S. goals of a world which is free from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of armaments, in which the use of force has been subordinated to the rule of law and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully.

Organization: Provided that the independent Agency be headed by a Director, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate ($22,500 a year). Provided for a Deputy Director, also appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate ($21,500 a year); four Assistant Directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate ($20,000 a year). Authorizes the Director, under the supervision of the Secretary of State, to establish the necessary bureaus, offices, and divisions, including an Office of the General Counsel. Authorizes the President to appoint a 15-member General Advisory Committee, to be confirmed by the Senate, to advise the Director on arms control and disarmament policy and activities.

Functions

Research: Authorizes the Agency to (1) conduct research, development, and studies in this field; (2) make arrangements, through contracts, agreements, and grants, among other methods, for the conduct of such research, development, and other studies by private or public institutions or persons; and (3) coordinate research, development, and other studies conducted by or for other Government agencies, under the provisions of section 35 which provides the mechanism for coordinating these activities among the affected Government agencies and for resolving differences among them.

Patents: Provides that appropriated funds may not be expended for any technological research or development activity unless the expenditure is conditioned upon provisions effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely and fully available to the general public (unless limited by the Director for national defense purposes).

Policy negotiations: Authorizes the Director to prepare for the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies as the President determines necessary, recommendations concerning disarmament policy, consultation, and communication with representatives of other nations, international organizations, and diplomatic representatives of the United States at home and abroad to conduct negotiations concerning disarmament or to exercise any other authority in the act; to provide the USIA with official U.S. positions and policy on disarmament matters for dissemination abroad; and to formulate plans to establish and operate inspection and control systems which may become part of U.S. disarmament activities and the direction or assumption of U.S. responsibility for these systems.

Coordination: Authorizes the President to establish procedures to assure cooperation, consultation, and a continuing exchange of information between the new Agency, the Department of Defense, AEC, NASA, and other affected Government agencies in all significant aspects of U.S. disarmament policy, and to resolve differences of opinion between the Department of State and such agencies which cannot be resolved through consultation. This provision provides the mechanism for coordinating these activities among the affected Government agencies and for resolving differences among them.

General Provisions

Security: Requires full fields by the Civil Service Commission on all employees including consultants and, in the event the investigation discloses information which indicates the person may be a security risk, the report is to be turned over to the FBI for further investigation.

Appropriations: Authorizes an appropriation of $10 million to get the Agency started and to remain available until expended. This will permit Congress to review the Agency's growth and direction when these funds have been exhausted.

Report: The Director must make a report to the President for transmittal to Congress by January 31 of each year on the activities of the Agency.

U.S. Travel Service

S. 610—Public Law 87-63, approved June 29, 1961:

To strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, this measure authorizes an appropriation of $3 million (for the first year) to establish and maintain a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce. Thereafter the annual appropriation is not to exceed $4,700,000.

To carry out the idea of encouraging expanded foreign travel to the United States and facilitating international travel generally, this program initiates a broad national campaign to attract foreign visitors through advertising, through promotional materials, and by establishing Government travel offices in selected oversea locations. The program also provides for cooperation with private industry in developing domestic facilities designed to meet the special requirements of foreign visitors. In addition, provision is made for coordinating all Government efforts to ease barriers to international travel.

The U.S. Travel Service will be headed by a Director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, at $19,000 a year.

White Fleet—Emergency assistance

Senate Resolution 154—Senate adopted June 1, 1961:

The Senate unanimously adopted this resolution to express the sense of the Senate that it supports the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships ready to rush assistance to disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the field of public health and other works of technical assistance.

This fleet could be established by restoring to active service the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States now mothballed in storage, to be operated by appropriate nonprofit, private, philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to providing emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering.

JUDICIAL

Additional judicial district for Florida

S. 1824—Passed Senate August 17, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Creates a third judicial district for the State of Florida to be known as the middle district. There is need for the additional district and a reapportioning of the present districts due to the tremendous population growth in the State and the increased workload for the courts—especially the court of the south district where there has been an increase of 125 percent in the caseload in the last 20 years.

Appeals from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico

H.R. 7038—Public Law 87–189, approved August 30, 1961:

Transfers the appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico from the Court of Appeals of the First Circuit to the Supreme Court of the United States. In practice, the Court of Appeals of the First Circuit will not reverse the Puerto Rico Supreme Court upon a point of local law unless the decision is inescapably wrong or patently erroneous.

International rules of judicial procedure

H.R. 8490—Public Law 87–324, approved September 26, 1961:

Extends the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure until December 31, 1963. The Commission was established in 1958 to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements.

Judgeship bill—Omnibus

S. 912—Public Law 87–36, approved May 19, 1961:

Congress enacted a measure long overdue—that of providing the Nation with 73 additional judgeships. Of the 73, 10 are Federal circuit judges, 61 permanent district judges, and 2 temporary district judges. In addition, four existing temporary district judgeships were made permanent.

Of the 10 new circuit judges, 3 are for the 2d circuit, which comprises New York, Connecticut, and Vermont; 1 for the 3d circuit—Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virgin Islands; 2 for the 4th circuit—Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia; 2 for 5th circuit—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; 1 for 7th circuit—Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin; 1 for 10th circuit—Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, and Wyoming.

Of the 61 district judges, 1 for northern district of Alabama; 1 for Alaska; 1 for Arizona; 1 for Arkansas to serve in eastern and western districts; 2 for northern California; 2 for southern California; 1 for Colorado; 2 for Connecticut; 2 for southern Florida; 1 for northern Georgia; 2 for northern Illinois; 1 for northern Indiana; 1 for southern Indiana; 1 for Iowa to serve in northern and southern districts; 1 for Kansas; 2 for eastern Louisiana; 1 for western Louisiana; 2 for Maryland; 1 for Massachusetts; 2 for eastern Michigan; 1 for southern Mississippi; 1 for western Missouri; 1 for Nevada; 1 for New Jersey; 2 for eastern New York; 6 for southern New York; 1 for eastern North Carolina; 1 for western North Carolina; 1 for middle district of North Carolina; 1 for northern Ohio; 1 for Oklahoma to serve in northern, eastern, and western districts; 3 for eastern Pennsylvania; 1 for middle district of Pennsylvania; 2 for western Pennsylvania; 1 for Puerto Rico; 1 for South Carolina to serve in eastern and western districts; 1 for eastern Tennessee; 1 for middle Tennessee; 1 for western Tennessee; 2 for northern Texas; 1 for southern Texas; 1 for western Texas; 1 for Washington State to serve in eastern and western districts.

The two temporary district judgeships created one each for northern Ohio and southern Ohio.

The four temporary district judges made permanent were middle Georgia, New Mexico, western Pennsylvania, and Utah.

The judgeships created but not recommended by the Judicial Conference were: one for the third circuit; one district judge to serve in eastern and western districts of Arkansas; one for middle district of North Carolina; one for Oklahoma to serve in northern, eastern, and western districts.

Judgment and compromise settlements

H.R. 6835—Public Law 87–187, approved August 30, 1961:

Provides for the swift payment of judgments and compromise settlements against the U.S. Government won by State and foreign claimants. Money may be drawn from the permanent indefinite appropriation established by the Automatic Payment of Judgments Act, unless such funds are already provided for by the agency against whom the case is brought. Certification by the Attorney General as to the proper rendering of the case must be obtained before payment.

Jury commissioners

S. 1899—Passed Senate August 2, 1961. Pending in House Judiciary Committee:

Increases the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts from the present $5 (as established in 1884) to $10 per diem for each day employed in the performance of duties.

Retired circuit and district judges

H.R. 5255—In conference:

Clarifies the status of a retired circuit or district judge in regards to his further service on the bench. A judge, whether or not he is retired, who has sat on an issue in an appellate hearing on which a rehearing is ordered may be a member of the court at the rehearing. If a retired circuit judge has sat as a judge on the precise subject matter at issue before the court, he becomes competent to sit as a member of the court. A retired judge must not be a member of the court when the court appoints its officers or promulgates its rules. A retired judge must not be a member of the judicial council.

Tax Court judges—Widows

H.R. 4317—Public Law 87–370, approved October 4, 1961:

Provides a survivor annuity system for widows and dependent children of Tax Court judges, substantially identical to the survivor annuity system provided for Federal judges. The maximum benefit to a widow of a Tax Court judge is $8,437.50 a year based on 30 years' service at $22,500. The maximum additional benefit for dependent children is $360 per child with an overall limitation of $900. To qualify for this maximum benefit the judge must make contributions of 3 percent of his salary for 30 years or a total of $20,250.

Requires that the judge must have at least 5 years' covered service to qualify for survivor benefits. Widows will receive annuities starting at age 50 unless there are dependent children, in which case benefits will begin immediately. A widow's benefit will terminate on her death or remarriage, and children's benefits will terminate on death, marriage, or attaining age 18.

Provides that in computing the annuity for a widow of a Tax Court judge, service in the executive branch is to be taken into account at rate of three-fourths of 1 percent.

Insures that amounts contributed by a State or local government toward the purchase price of an annuity for an employee of a public school system will qualify for the 20-percent exclusion allowed by section 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code in the same manner and to the same extent as if the annuity were purchased for an employee of an organization described in section 501 (c)(3) relating to educational, charitable, and religious organizations.

U.S. courts—Relief appeals

H.R. 5656—Public Law 87–225, approved September 13, 1961:

Substitutes a requirement of reasonable notice in lieu of 5 days' notice on applications for interlocutory relief against orders of the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The requirement of 5 days' notice has, at times, prevented a court of appeals from acting with sufficient promptness in urgent cases. This act gives to the courts of appeals in which the interlocutory relief is sought the discretion to determine the amount of notice which is reasonable in the circumstances.

LABOR

Additional Assistant Secretary of Labor

S. 1815—Public Law 87–137, approved August 11, 1961:

Establishes a new Assistant Secretary (making four) of Labor. The new Assistant Secretary's duties will be primarily related to the problems and needs of women in the Nation's labor force.

The Assistant Secretary will be responsible for efforts to improve salary and benefit status of the 24 million women workers, as well as to improve education, training, and retraining of women.

Agricultural workers—Fair labor standards

S. 1123—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Labor Committee:

This legislation amends the agricultural child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. These provisions presently provide that a child below the age of 16 may not be employed in agricultural work during regular school hours. There is a total exemption, however, for agricultural work outside school hours—that is, a child of any age may be employed in agriculture before and after classes during a regular school session or during vacation periods. This bill narrows the exemptive area with regard to agricultural work outside school hours. It does not affect the 16 age minimum already applicable to agricultural work during regular school hours.

Specifically, it permits a child to be employed in agricultural work outside of school hours—

1. If he is employed by his parents on the home farm; or

2. If he is 14 years of age or over; or

3. If he is between 12 and 14 years of age and works within 25 miles of his home with the written consent of his parents.

The bill also makes any employer of a child, other than the child's parent, employed in agriculture under the age of 18 strictly liable for disability or death arising out of such employment. If, however, the employment is covered by a State workmen's compensation law, the employer's liability is discharged.

Interstate farm labor contractors—Registration

S. 1126—Passed Senate August 25, 1961. H.R. 7812—On House Calendar:

Establishes a system of Federal registration for farm labor contractors. Each labor contractor must obtain annually a certificate of registration from the Secretary of Labor; to obtain this certificate, he must

comply with specified obligations, such as giving satisfactory information concerning his conduct and method of operation as a farm labor contractor. The certificate may be withdrawn if violations have been committed such as giving false information to migratory workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment or failure to comply with working arrangements made with migratory workers or failure to comply with applicable Interstate Commerce Commission regulations.

Longshoremen and harbor workers—Amendment

H.R. 1258—Public Law 87–87, approved July 14, 1961:

This measure amends the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by—

Increasing the maximum level of weekly compensation benefits payable to workers or to the beneficiary of workers within the coverage of the act who are injured or disabled within the court of their employment from $54 to $70;

Providing comparable increases in death cases, adjusting the ceiling on average weekly wages from $81 to $105; and

Increasing the statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000.

The Longshoremen's Act establishes the standards for workmen's compensation for workers employed within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and by extension constitutes the workmen's compensation law for employees privately employed in the District of Columbia, for U.S. citizens employed by contractors with the Federal Government outside the continental United States, and for employees of employers engaged in operations on the Outer Continental Shelf. The benefits under these acts are paid by private employers or their insurers and not by the Governemnt.

Manpower Development Training Act of 1961

S. 1991—Passed Senate August 23, 1961, H.R. 8399—House Calendar:

This measure authorizes a 4-year, $655 million manpower training program to help alleviate the unemployment problem by enabling workers whose skills are obsolete to receive training which will qualify them to obtain and hold jobs, with priority given to unemployed persons including those in farm families with a net income of less than $1,200 a year.

Training allowances: Maximum of 52 weeks, with payments primarily equal to unemployment compensation payments.

Trainee selection: Primarily for unemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without training; includes persons with 3 years' working experience who are heads of families or households; grants the Secretary discretionary authority to permit occupational training of youths over 16 and under 22 in certain exceptional cases, however, no more than 5 percent of the total allowances may be used for this age group.

On-the-job training: Provides for a stepped-up program of promoting on-the-job training. Reduced training allowances will be available for those undergoing part-time vocational training as part of the on-the-job training program.

Travel and subsistence: Modest payments can be made to individuals receiving allowances away from home.

Employment guidance: Special programs for employment guidance and counseling where the Secretary of Labor finds the school dropout problem acute.

Safeguards: To prevent its benefits from being used in "pirating" industry from one location to another; to require that States maintain existing levels of expenditure for vocational training from their own funds; and to encourage prospective trainees to accept training opportunities rather than remain on unemployment compensation.

Report: Requires an annual manpower report to the President for transmission to Congress.

Estimated number of trainees: 110,000 full-time vocational trainees and 50,000 on-the-job trainees the first year; 160,000 and 125,000, respectively, the second year; 430,000 and 200,000, respectively, the third and fourth years with a 50-percent requirement for State matching.

Appropriations: $90 million for fiscal 1962; $165 million for fiscal 1963; $200 million each for fiscal years 1964 and 1965—with 50-percent State matching requirement.

Migratory farmworkers—Educational opportunities

S. 1124—Passed Senate August 25, 1961. Pending in House Labor Committee:

Authorized a 5-year program to aid in the education of the children of migratory workers. The Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. Federal assistance will be given the States to help defray costs for education during the regular school session; the child must attend school in a State for at least 5 days before assistance would be available; $300,000 would be provided annually for summer schools for migratory children; $250,000 would be granted annually to provide interstate planning and coordination of the educational programs; $200,000 annually would be authorized to help pay for pilot projects for fundamental, practical education for adult migratory workers. The program would be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Migratory health services

S. 1130—Passed Senate August 25, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. The Surgeon General may also appoint an expert advisory committee to assist him in the administration of the program. The program would operate through local, State, and Federal health agencies.

Migratory Labor National Advisory Council

S. 1132—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Labor Committee:

Establishes a 15-member National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal laws, regulations, programs, and policies, and any and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor. The Council is to consider, analyze, and evaluate the problems with a view to devising plans and making recommendations for establishing policies and programs to meet these problems.

The 15 members are to be divided as follows:

Three from private life to represent the farmer; three from private life with interest in and general knowledge of migratory labor problems; three from private life with experience in health, education, and welfare problems of migratory labor; three from private life to represent the migratory agricultural worker; and three with experience as State officials and knowledge of migratory labor problems. One will be designated by the President as Chairman of the Council and one as Vice Chairman. The Council is authorized to employ a permanent staff director and other personnel as required.

Minimum wage

H.R. 3935—Public Law 87–30, approved May 5, 1961:

Congress enacted and the President signed into law a measure extending coverage to 3,624,000 workers and an ultimate increase to $1.25 for presently covered workers. As enacted the amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 will—

1. Increase the minimum wage for presently covered employees to $1.15 an hour for the first 2 years after the effective date and $1.25 an hour beginning 2 years after the effective date (23.9 million).

2. For newly covered employees the minimum wage and overtime will be—

First year after effective date $1, no overtime requirements;

Second year $1, no overtime requirements;

Third year $1, 44 hours a week;

Fourth year $1.15, 42 hours a week;

Fifth year $1.25, 40 hours a week.

3. Cover (3,624,000 newly covered):

(a) Retail and service enterprises: Covers retail enterprises which have a million dollars or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at retail level) and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines which amount in total annual dollar volume to $250,000 or more—2,182,000 employees.

(b) Gasoline service stations which have $250,000 or more in annual sales (exempt from overtime)—86,000 employees.

(c) Suburban and interurban transit companies which have $1 million or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) covered for minimum wage but not overtime—93,000 employees.

(d) Establishments which have some covered employees, all employees are covered if they are in an enterprise which has $1 million or more in annual sales—10,000 employees.

(e) Construction enterprises which have at least $350,000 in annual business covered for minimum wage and overtime—1 million employees.

(f) Seamen on American-flag vessels covered for minimum wage but not overtime—100,000 employees.

(g) Telephone operators, but exempts those employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than 750 telephones—30,000 employees.

(h) Seafood processing employees for minimum wage but not overtime—33,000 employees.

4. Exclude from coverage in the retail trade: Auto dealers and farm implement dealers, hotels, motels, restaurants including retail store lunch counters, caterers and similar retail food services, motion picture theaters, hospitals, nursing homes, schools for handicapped or gifted children, amusement or recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis, and any small store which has less than $250,000 in annual sales even if it is an enterprise that has more than $1 million in annual sales.

5. Provide for special problems in retail and service trades:

(a) Commission employees in retail stores exempt from overtime if more than half their pay is from commissions and if they earn at least time and one-half the minimum rate.

(b) Assistant managers of retail stores exempt even if they perform up to 40 percent nonexecutive and nonadministrative work.

(c) Student workers may be employed in retail trades at subminimum rates under certificates issued by the Secretary in occupations not ordinarily given to full-time employees.

6. Exclude the proposed new coverage and the changes in exemptions for laundries that were contained in the Senate-passed bill. (Existing law remains the same for laundries.)

7. Provide other exemptions.

(a) Announcers, news editors, and chief engineers of broadcasting companies located in nonmetropolitan cities of 100,000 or less population exempt from overtime.

(b) Independently owned and controlled local enterprises engaged in bulk petroleum distribution exempt from overtime if their annual sales are less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes).

(c) Trip rate drivers and drivers' helpers making local enterprises exempt from overtime if the Secretary of Labor finds that the plan under which they are paid is consistent with the principle of the 40-hour workweek.

(d) Employees working in a livestock auction held by a farmer need be paid the minimum rate only for the hours they work at the auction if during that workweek they are employed primarily in agriculture by the farmer.

(e) Employees in country elevator establishments in the area of production exempt from both minimum wage and overtime if they have no more than five employees.

(f) Employees engaging in ginning cotton for market in counties where cotton is grown in commercial quantities exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

(g) Homeworkers making natural holly wreaths exempt from the act.

(h) Agricultural employees engaged in bulking shade-grown tobacco if they were employed in the growing and harvesting of the tobacco exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

(i) Employees transporting fruits and vegetables from the farm to market or transporting harvesting hands within the State exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

8. Include board and lodging as wages on the basis of a fair-value calculation made by the Secretary; also such prerequisites may be excluded from wages to the extent that they are excluded under a collective-bargaining agreement.

9. Authorize the Secretary of Labor to study employment effects of imports and exports in industries covered by the act and report the results to the President and Congress.

10. Authorize the Secretary to study the exemptions in the act for handling and processing agricultural products as well as the rates of pay in hotels, motels, restaurants, and other food-service enterprises and report the results with recommendations to the next session of this Congress.

11. Increase the minimum wage in Puerto Rico for presently covered employees by the same percentage as the mainland minimum, subject to review by industry committees in hardship cases; for newly covered employees the rates will be set by industry committee procedures.

12. Be effective 120 days after enactment.

Railroad retirees

S. 2395—Public Law 87–825, approved September 22, 1961:

To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment provides that men as well as women can obtain a reduced annuity after attainment of age 62 even though they do not have 30 years of creditable service. The reduction would be by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month the applicant is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue.

The requirement of at least 10 years' service for eligibility for any retirement annuity remains unchanged, as does the right of a woman with 30 years' service to obtain a full annuity at age 60 and the right of any individual to obtain a full annuity before age 65 on the basis of disability.

Reduces from 3 years to 1 the time required to elapse after marriage before any wife or husband who is otherwise eligible for a spouse's annuity can qualify.

The measure also provides that women who had qualified for an annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act as a widow before their marriage not to be disqualified for an annuity as the widow of the new husband if he dies within 1 year of the marriage.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Arizona-Nevada compact

S. 133—Public Law 87–50, approved June 16, 1961:

This act grants congressional approval to a compact between the States of Arizona and Nevada to establish a boundary line.

Due to the meandering of the Colorado River in the Mohave Valley, the location of the center of the channel of the river is uncertain which makes uncertainty as to the State line between Arizona and Nevada.

Boundary is to be established between the States along the Colorado River between the point where the Nevada-California boundary intersects the 35th degree of latitude north and Davis Dam.

The right to alter, amend or repeal the act is reserved.

Arizona and Nevada ratified the compact early in 1960.

Blue Ridge Parkway

H.R. 6067—Public Law 87–135, approved August 10, 1961:

Authorizes $35,000 for a survey of a proposed national parkway, an extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway, along the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains and through the mountains of Georgia.

Cape Cod recreation area

S. 857—Public Law 87–126, approved August 7, 1961:

This measure provides for the establishment on Cape Cod of a unit of the national park system to preserve the great beach area of Cape Cod as well as contiguous lands suitable and desirable for recreational purposes.

The basic idea behind this proposal is to promote the area's unique, cultural, scenic, historic, scientific, and recreational values. The area of about 26,670 acres will contain sections of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham and about 53 miles of beaches, 8 square miles of sand dunes, 20 freshwater lakes and important historic sites. Authorizes $16 million in contract authority to acquire land in the seashore.

Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington

S. 1060—Passed Senate September 15, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Authorizes funds up to $3,216,900 to construct control works and a pumping plant at Palmer Lake to enlarge the facilities to irrigate an additional 1,500 acres and supply about 3,650 acre-feet of supplemental water annually to the remaining irrigable area.

Delaware River Basin Compact

House Joint Resolution 225—Public Law 87–328, approved September 27, 1961:

Establishes the Delaware River Commission as a regional agency with jurisdiction over the Delaware River Basin including territory of each of the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. The Commission is to have the character of both a State agency of each of the four States as well as an agency of the Federal Government, and its membership is to consist of the four Governors, ex officio, and one commissioner to be appointed by the President. Each member is to have a single vote and, in most instances, majority vote would control.

The Commission is to have a wide variety of regulatory and administrative authority to develop basin water resources. Its various duties would include planning and execution of the development of water resources by acquiring or building and operating and maintaining dams, reservoirs, and similar facilities, to regulate flow of water for quality control, flood control, to encourage and promote sound watershed management, recreation, hydropower and its transmission.

The compact is for 100 years unless a State legislature or Congress gave notice of termination between the 75th and 80th year.

Disposal of certain Federal property

S. 1085—Public Law 87–151, approved August 17, 1961:

Authorizes sale at public auction of Federal Government land located near irrigation projects in Idaho, Wyoming, and Washington. The land now is used for operational and maintenance facilities which are old and in need of replacement. The money realized on the sale of the land will be used to replace the old facilities at a more convenient location.

Kaskaskia River, Ill., navigation

S. 520—Passed Senate September 19, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

Authorizes modification of the existing project at an estimated cost of $58,200,000 to improve the channel between Fayetteville and the mouth, with modification of storage allocations in Carlyle and Shelbyville Reservoirs.

Lead-zinc subsidies

H.R. 84—Public Law 87–347, approved October 3, 1961:

Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to pay small producers of lead 75 percent of the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price, and 55 percent of the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price of zinc.

To be eligible the small producer must have been actually producing ores within the United States or its possessions, and must not have produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined during any 12-month period between January 1, 1956, and the first day for which he seeks payment.

To assure the benefits of the bill for legitimate small producers, the maximum production eligible for stabilization payments would be 1,500 tons of each metal during calendar year 1962, 1,200 tons of each metal during calendar 1963, 900 tons of each metal during calendar 1964, and 600 tons of each metal during calendar 1965.

A producer cannot be paid in any calendar year, however, for any tonnage in excess of his maximum production during any calendar year between January 1, 1950, and December 31, 1960.

Payments will be made only on ores and concentrates produced from an operating unit in actual operation sometime between January 1, 1956, and August 1, 1961.

Operators of properties obtained after August 1, 1961, will be ineligible for payments unless they had produced ores or concentrates from a mine specified in a lease, permit, or contract sometime between January 1, 1956, and August 1, 1961.

Producers operating leased facilities cannot obtain payment under the bill if the use of the facility was obtained after the effective date of the act from another producer of lead and zinc who has leased a greater portion of his mining properties to other producers than he had made available in that manner at his highest production level between January 1, 1956, and the effective date of this act.

Little Missouri River compact

S. 1139—Passed Senate September 15, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Extends for 4 years the period for negotiation for apportioning the waters of the Little Missouri and its tributaries with the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Maryland land preservation

House Joint Resolution 459—Public Law 87-362, approved October 4, 1961:

Authorizes Secretary of Interior to purchase approximately 1,200 acres on the Potomac River opposite Mount Vernon to preserve the site from George Washington's home as it existed in his lifetime.

Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska

S. 970—Passed Senate September 21, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the midstate reclamation project in Nebraska and authorizes its inclusion in the Missouri River Basin project so that it may be integrated, physically and financially, with the other Federal works of the Missouri River Basin project.

This reclamation project will provide a regulated gravity and well combination water supply for approximately 140,000 acres of land and will replenish and stabilize the aquifer from which about 4,600 irrigation wells are pumping ground waters within the boundaries of the district. In addition, the development will produce substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits and provision is also made for initial irrigation pumping power and for ultimate development of commercial power.

The total cost of the project is estimated at $81,467,000 with the major part of it repayable within the 40-year contract period.

Migratory waterfowl—Conservation

H.R. 7391—Public Law 87-383, approved October 4, 1961:

This measure authorizes for a 7-year period, beginning with fiscal 1962, an appropriation not to exceed $105 million to purchase wetlands to be used by wild birds, particularly waterfowl.

This appropriation is merely an advance to enable the Federal Government and the State to purchase the necessary lands as a conservation measure to preserve the migratory waterfowl. The $50 million will be repaid to the Treasury from the proceeds of the revenue received from the sale of the so-called duck stamp which, at present, amounts to some $4 million a year. It is estimated that receipts in future years will average between $5 and $6 million a year and, as required by this act, 75 percent of the duck-stamp fund will be used to reimburse the Treasury until the entire amount is repaid.

The bill requires approval by the Governor of the State involved or the appropriate State agency before funds from the migratory bird conservation fund can be used to purchase the necessary land.

Mineral lands

S. 1674—Passed Senate July 27, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Grants greater flexibility to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to lease certain lands having mineral deposits in which the Federal Government has a partial or future interest. Under existing law these lands can only be leased by competitive bidding. This system tends to encourage present holders of the land to extract any minerals, regardless of sound conservation practices, for fear of losing the lease in a competitive bid; other prospective bidders, however, are discouraged from making offers by the uncertainty as to what minerals may be left on the land once they acquire it.

National fuels policy

Senate Resolution 105—Senate adopted September 11, 1961:

Authorizes the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to (1) make a complete investigation and study of the current and prospective fuel and energy resources of the United States and their future consumption; (2) study existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting fuels to determine what changes should be made in order to provide an effective national fuels policy now and for the future.

The committee is to make a report of its findings by January 31, 1962.

National historical park—C. & O. Canal

S. 77—Passed Senate August 2, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Establishes a Chesepeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park on 4,800 acres of federally owned property, with an authorization of up to $1,500,000 to buy 10,200 acres of adjacent land to permit development of adequate service facilities for the park.

Natural gas for industrial use

S. 1595—Passed August 14, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

This bill applies the same procedure of suspending rates for the sale of natural gas for resale for industrial use as applies with respect to domestic users. Thus, the Federal Power Commission may suspend the effective date of a new rate up to a period of 5 months, plus a 30-day notice period, while investigations are made concerning the rate increase.

Navajo-San Juan-Chama projects

S. 107—Passed Senate March 28, 1961. H.R. 7596—House Calendar:

This measure authorizes $221 million in appropriations to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan-Chama project to irrigate a total of 231,530 acres of land, to supplement water supplies for domestic and industrial uses, and to provide recreation and fish and wildlife benefits. The Navajo project is in New Mexico and the San Juan-Chama project is in Colorado and New Mexico.

The primary purpose of the Navajo project is to provide approximately 17,000 Navajo Indians with an economy equal to the non-Indians. The San Juan-Chama project will improve and stabilize the economy of the water-deficient Rio Grande and Canadian Basins of New Mexico by providing supplemental water to meet rapidly expanding needs.

Approximately $106,600,000 of the $221 million is reimbursable, with interest, over a 50-year period.

Oceanography

S. 901—Passed Senate July 28, 1961. Pending in House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

Authorizes a $700 million, 10-year national program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research, comprehensive in its scope, and recommended by the President as an international and worldwide program, designed to:

Coordinate all related programs now carried on by separate Government agencies and bureaus.

Provide for participation in this national program by educational and scientific institutions and laboratories, State agencies, associations, organizations, industries, and other qualified groups and individuals who can make a contribution to our scientific knowledge of the oceans and Great Lakes.

Increase our security from enemy sea or undersea attack; augment the efficiency of our undersea forces; advance underwater communications; improve commerce and navigation and safeguard it against disruption in the event of a national emergency; increase accuracy of long-range weather forecasts; enable mankind to foresee climatological changes of world significance; afford greater protection to life and property from violent storms; restore and expand our fisheries; alleviate the protein deficiency in the diets of millions all over the world; reveal ocean deposits of scarce and strategic minerals; expand our knowledge of fossil fuels; diminish pollution dangers from atomic and other wastes; and facilitate new medical discoveries.

Authorizations to National Science Foundation include $9,950,000 to construct research ships; $12,440,000 to operate them over a 10-year period; $37,200,000 for basic marine research activities with a limit of $8 million in any one year; $10 million a year for specialized oceanographic instruments or equipment for research and exploration; funds to construct shore facilities; and $4,800,000 for education and training in marine sciences with a limit of $480,000 in any one year. Other sums are authorized as would be necessary to meet the requirements for new ships, etc.

Requires the Budget Bureau to furnish an exact accounting to Congress each year for all funds spent and bars funds for technological research or development unless the information is made available to the public.

Oceanographic research—Coast Guard

H.R. 6845—Public Law 87-396, approved October 5, 1961:

Permits the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct oceanographic research, either independently or in cooperation with other Government agencies, as may be in the national interest.

The Coast Guard already has the necessary ships in service to permit far-reaching marine studies at minimum cost. There are 217 ships in the Atlantic, 99 in the Pacific, and 31 on the Great Lakes, of which many are large and well adapted to certain types of scientific research. The Coast Guard has already made notable accomplishments in the oceanographic research it has conducted in direct support of the Ice Patrol. It is anticipated that these endeavors, can be extended to every part of the oceans and the Great Lakes where Coast Guard vessels operate.

Outer Continental Shelf

S. 981—Passed Senate August 2, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Extends the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Geological Survey to perform certain of its work in areas outside the continental limits of the United States (i.e., the Outer Continental Shelves and the ocean floor). Such studies outside the continental United States can now only be conducted by the Survey if requested and financed by other Government agencies.

Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif.

S. 476—Passed Senate September 7, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

To preserve a portion of the few remaining shoreline areas for public recreation, this bill establishes a 53,000-acre area of the Point Reyes Peninsula, beginning approximately 15 miles north of the entrance to the Golden Gate Channel of San Francisco Bay and extending northward for 45 miles. Approximately 26,000 acres within the 53,000-acre national seashore has been set aside to preserve most of the ranching and dairying lands as a pastoral zone. Thus, as long as this 26,000 acres are maintained for their present purposes, the Department of the Interior will not acquire this land.

In this seashore area, the following types of facilities will be provided for use by the public:

Approximately 25 miles of new roads will be built, supplemented by hiking and riding trails.

Campgrounds will be established in suitable locations.

Bathhouses, shelters, comfort stations, water, food concessions, picnic facilities, and parking areas.

Docks will be constructed for boating purposes; riding stables will be erected and operated on a concession basis; five overlook

developments will be built and a headquarters development will be programed to include employee housing, utility buildings, power service, water, and sewage disposal.

The existing commercial fisheries at Drakes Bay and the existing oyster cannery at Drakes Estero will be continued under private operation but with added facilities.

Authorized an appropriation of $14 million to acquire the land.

Recreational facilities at Elephant Butte and Caballo Reservoir areas

S. 46—Passed August 29, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Provides for the establishment of recreational facilities at Elephant Butte Reservoir, which will cost approximately $458,000 and also facilities at Caballo Reservoir which will cost approximately $149,000. These reservoirs could be used for fishing, boating, and vacationing by the residents of New Mexico and Texas and others. The facilities which now exist are not adequate to meet the increasing needs. The new facilities would in no way threaten the allocation of water for irrigation and other uses. Provision is made so that an agreement can be made with the State of New Mexico for the administration of the facilities.

Saline water conversion program

H.R. 7916—Public Law 295, approved September 22, 1961:

This measure extends the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorizes a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount.

In view of the increasing shortage of usable surface and ground water in many parts of the Nation and the importance of finding new sources of supply to meet the present and future water needs, this program is designed to provide for developing a practicable low-cost means for the large-scale production of water of a quality suitable for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other beneficial consumptive uses from sea and other saline waters and other mineralized or chemically charged waters, and for the necessary research and studies of the problem.

In order to accomplish the purposes of the act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to—

1. Conduct, encourage, and promote fundamental scientific engineering research and basic studies to develop the best and most economical processes and methods for converting saline and brackish water into water suitable for consumption.

2. Conduct engineering research and technical development work to determine, by laboratory and pilot plant testing, the results of the research and studies mentioned above in order to develop processes and plant designs to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale.

3. Study methods for recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from the production of water to ascertain the possibilities of offsetting the costs of production by commercially valuable byproducts.

4. Undertake economic studies and surveys to determine present and prospective comparative costs of achieving water for consumption by the leading saline water processes employed in various areas in the United States.

To carry out the above studies and surveys, the Secretary is authorized to—

1. Make grants to educational institutions and scientific organizations and enter into contracts with institutions, organizations, and with industrial or engineering firms.

2. Acquire the services of chemists, physicists, engineers, and other personel.

3. Use the facilities of Federal scientific laboratories.

4. Establish and operate necessary facilities and test sites at which to carry on the continuous research, testing, development, and programing necessary.

5. Cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with State and local departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and with interested persons, firms, institutions, and organizations.

6. Coordinate all such programs with the Deparement of Defense.

7. Make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this act.

Shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.

S. 606—Public Law 87–173, approved August 30, 1961:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct at Milford, Conn., a research center for shellfisheries research. Marine biologists at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory at Milford have made revolutionary discoveries regarding the production of shellfish, but require expanded facilities in order to exploit their discoveries.

Shoreline areas

S. 543—Passed Senate August 28, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study means and costs of acquiring and preserving 14 ocean, lake, and river shoreline areas appropriate for recreational parks.

Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to study appropriate shoreline areas within the Nation's 186 million acres of national forests.

Each Department is to report its findings and recommendations to Congress within 2 years, and appropriations of $400,000 were authorized for each study. This bill also authorized appropriations of $25 million to the Department of the Interior for matching grants to States to purchase shoreline areas for State recreational purposes.

Authorized the National Forest Service to review the lands the Federal Government now owns to see if water-based recreation areas could be established on some of these lands already owned by the Government.

The 14 areas are: Cumberland Island, Ga.; Huron Mountains, Mich.; Channel Islands, Calif.; Fire Island, N.Y.; Cape Flattery, Wash.; Leadbetter Point, Wash.; Mosquito Lagoon, Fla.; Pigeon Point, Minn.; Popham-Saint John, Maine; Parramoure Island, Va.; Great Salt Lake, Utah; Lake Tahoe, Nev.-Calif.; Smith Island, N.C.; and the shores of Hawaii.

Spokane Valley project

S. 2008—Passed Senate September 19, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

Modifies earlier legislation to enlarge the present irrigation plant at an estimated cost of $7,178,000 to furnish more water for irrigation purposes.

Superior National Forest

S. 302—Public Law 87–351, approved October 4, 1961:

This bill increases the authorization funds from $2,500,000 to $4,500,000 to purchase lands within the Superior National Forest in Minnesota. The previous authorization, passed in 1948, permitted the Federal Government to consolidate its ownership of the Superior National Forest lands.

That act barred the Government from consolidating those lands, when privately owned, by any means but negotiation. This has proved costly and the present bill with its increased authorization of funds and extension of authority to enable the Government to condemn these lands (under its right to exercise power of eminent domain) would enable the Government to accelerate its program of preserving and protecting the Superior National Forest area and at a lower cost.

Virgin Islands Corporation Act

H.R. 4750—Public Law 87–382, approved October 4, 1961:

Amends Virgin Islands Corporation Act to allow the Corporation to increase its borrowing authority by $15 million in order to expand the present electric powerplant.

Wabash Basin Study Commission

S. 811—Passed Senate June 13, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

This bill—

1. Authorizes the establishment of a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission consisting of representative Federal agencies concerned and of the States of Indiana and Illinois. The Commission would be responsible for coordination of Federal, State, and local plans for developing the water and land resources in the Wabash River Basin in Indiana and Illinois.

2. In addition to preparing a comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the area, the Commission will—

(a) Recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for work on basic data, for project planning, and for construction of projects in the area.

(b) Foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the area.

(c) Submit periodic reports to the President, and the Federal agencies and Governors of the State concerned.

Wapato-Satus irrigation project

H.R. 115—Public Law 87–316, approved September 26, 1961:

This bill fixes the construction costs of the irrigation works that have already been constructed on the Wapato-Satus unit of the Wapato Indian irrigation project and allocates that cost on a per-acre basis to the lands that can be served by those works.

Washington State—Water deliveries

Senate Joint Resolution 76—Public Law 87–169, approved August 30, 1961:

Provides for delivery of water during 1962 to farmers in three irrigation districts of the Columbia River project while there are negotiations conducted to determine an equitable method between the districts by which to pay the additional cost incurred beyond the estimated drainage costs of the project. No charges to the farmers would be waived; payment would have to be made before 1963 deliveries would be made.

Water pollution control

H.R. 6441—Public Law 87–88, approved July 20, 1961:

Congress, as a part of the President's natural resources program, enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1961 which would:

Increase the existing $50 million in annual authorization for Federal grants to assist communities in constructing sewage treatment plants to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, and $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–67, retaining the requirement that 50 percent of the grants be used for communities with populations of 125,000 or less.

Limit individual construction grants to 30 percent of the estimated cost of building the sewage treatment plant, or to $600,000, whichever is smaller.

Authorize construction of joint sewage treatment projects serving more than one municipality, with $2.4 million set as the maximum Federal grant for the multiproject.

Bar the approval of any construction grant exceeding $250,000 in any State until all applications filed prior to 1 year following the effective date of the act had been either approved or rejected.

Authorize the reallocation of construction grant funds not obligated within 18 months after allocation and permit the Secretary to use the uncommitted allocation to increase aid to a project within the State where pollution occurred because of Federal activities.

Increase annual Federal matching grants to States for the administration of water pollution control programs from $3 million to $5 million, extended the program for 7 years through June 30, 1968, and directs the States by July 1, 1962, to list the criteria used in determining the priority of projects.

Extend Federal pollution abatement authority to all interstate and navigible waters in or adjacent to any State or States whether the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters.

Authorize the Secretary of HEW, in cases of intrastate pollution, to conduct investigations and make recommendations on abatement only at the request of the State Governor.

Authorize the Secretary, in cases of intrastate pollution, to request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement where his previous instructions had not been carried out, but he must obtain the consent of the Governor of the State involved in cases of intrastate pollution.

Authorize $5 million annually, with a total limitation of $25 million, to develop new methods of sewage treatment.

Authorize the establishment of water pollution demonstration and research facilities and require that at least one laboratory be located in each of the following areas: Northeast, Middle Atlantic, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and Alaska.

Remove the $100,000 annual limitation on research fellowships granted by HEW, but require an annual report by the Secretary to the appropriate committee of Congress on the operation of the program.

Authorize Federal agencies constructing reservoirs to include capacity for water quality control and, if the resulting benefits are national in scope, the cost would be nonreimbursable.

Direct HEW to conduct research and technical development studies of water quality needs and waste disposal practices in the Great Lakes.

Require that water polluted by discharge from Federal facilities be included in any Federal report on pollution.

Require that wages paid for work on sewage treatment plants constructed with Federal funds be in accordance with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Wilderness preservation system

S. 174—Passed Senate September 6, 1961. Pending in House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

To protect our remaining wilderness areas, the Senate passed this measure establishing a national wilderness preservation system. The major provisions are:

Statement of policy: States as Congress belief that increasing population and human developments will occupy or modify all areas of the Nation except those set aside for preservation in their natural condition and establishes a national wilderness preservation system to be composed of appropriate federally owned areas.

Definition of wilderness: Defines it for the purposes of this act as area where there is outstanding opportunity for solitude or a primitive or unconfined type of recreation which is of adequate size to make practicable preservation as wilderness and which may have ecological, geological, or other scientific, educational, scenic, and historical values.

Areas.—(a) Sets out the areas of Federal lands in national forests, park system, wildlife refuges, and game ranges to be designated or considered for designation, and establishes a procedure of review by the Executive and Congress prior to final action.

(b) Designates four categories of wilderness-type areas in national forests: wild, wilderness, roadless (canoe), and primitive. First three types will, by this act, immediately become wilderness areas, but the 39 primitive areas must be reviewed by the Secretary of Agriculture and recommendations made to Congress by the President. He may recommend the inclusion of national forest lands adjacent to the primitive area but, after inclusions and exclusions, the original size of the primitive area must be retained. These recommendations to Congress may be disapproved by either the Senate or House during the next following complete session of Congress. If disapproved, the primitive area may again be reviewed and resubmitted to Congress within 2 years. Requires that all primitive areas be reviewed and recommendations submitted to Congress within 10 years and all such areas not continued in the wilderness system under the procedure within the 14 years return to the same status as other national forest lands.

(c) Includes national park system lands in the wilderness system, and directs the Secretary of the Interior to review the park system units containing some 5,000 or more acres and report the findings and recommendations to the President. Before Congress convenes each year, the President is to advise Congress of his recommendations in this area and Congress again may disapprove (either Senate or House) at any time during the next following complete session of Congress.

(d) Includes wildlife refuges and game ranges as the Secretary of the Interior may recommend to the President within 10 years and the President makes the recommendations to Congress; however, neither the House nor Senate may disapprove under this section. The Secretary of the Interior may also recommend inclusion in the system of portions of new refuges or ranges added to its jurisdiction in the next 15 years; however, the Secretary must make his recommendation within 2 years after the addition of the new unit.

(e) Requires public notice, hearing, and submission of a recommendation to Congress of any modification or adjustment of boundaries of the wilderness system.

(f) Before final action on any inclusion of forest, park, and wildlife areas in the wilderness system, boundary adjustment, etc., this section spells out the requirement that Congress shall have the right to act on the recommendation of the President, even to the extent of discharging the committee on disapproval resolutions.

(g) Protects areas under consideration for the wilderness system from public land law appropriations for a 5-year period.

(h) Provides that no area (other than national forests, park system, wildlife refuges, and game range lands specifically provided for in the act) can be added to or eliminated from the wilderness system except by specific, affirmative authorization by law.

Private lands: Authorizes both Secretaries (Interior and Agriculture) to acquire private lands subject to congressional appropriations, or by privately donated funds, by gift or bequest.

Special provisions: Prohibits any commercial enterprise in the wilderness system (except grazing and mining in some areas), construction of permanent roads, use of motor vehicles or motorized equipment, motorboats, landing of aircraft, or use of any other mechanical transport. Limits construction of temporary roads or structures or other installations to the minimum necessary to administer the area. There are, however, some exemptions from these prohibitions and limitations:

1. Allows continued use of aircraft and motorboats where their use is a well-established practice, or where necessary to control fire, insects, and disease.

2. Grants the President authority to authorize prospecting, mining, exploration for and production of oil and gas, establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest within national-forest and public-domain areas.

Land use commissions: Authorizes the establishment of a Presidential Land Use Commission in any State having more than 90 percent of its total land area owned by the Federal Government—applicable to Alaska where more than 99 percent total land area is federally owned. Five-member Commission—with 3–2 political breakdown. The Commission is to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior and make recommendations on the utilization, development, and protection of Federal land areas in Alaska generally.

REORGANIZATION

Civil Aeronautics Board

Reorganization Plan No. 3—Effective July 3, 1961:

To relieve the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning, Reorganization Plan No. 3 would:

Authorize the CAB to delegate any of its functions to a division (panel) of the Board, to an individual Board member, or to employees or groups of employees of the Board by a published order or rule. In the case of adjudications and of rulemaking proceedings which are required by law to be made on the basis of a record, the delegation authority is limited to one or more Board members or one or more hearing examiners. The plan provides that a full-scale review of an action of a delegate shall be discretionary with the Board as to all actions delegated; however, a vote of one less than the Board majority is required to compel a full-scale Board review. The plan gives to the Chairman the authority to designate the individual Board members or employees who are to perform the delegated functions.

The plan is sufficiently broad to cover all matters—adjudicatory and quasi-legislative—and will, therefore, provide the necessary flexibility to expedite the Board's workload.

Commerce—Additional Assistant Secretary

S. 1456—Passed Senate May 26, 1961. H.R. 6360—House Calendar:

Authorizes an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to provide the most effective review of the expanding scientific activities within the Department of Commerce.

The new assistant will provide vital assistance to the Secretary of Commerce in coordinating and evaluating existing programs of the Department in the fields of science and technology, in expanding such programs where desirable to meet our national needs, in developing and implementing new research and development programs, and in representing the Department on top policy level scientific committees and groups, including the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

Increasing importance in scientific technology requires an officer with the rank of Assistant Secretary to assure that our responsibilities and programs are adequately carried out in the interests of our economy, national defense, and public welfare.

FCC

S. 2034—Public Law 87-192, approved August 31, 1961:

As a substitute for Reorganization Plan No. II, this bill provides for facilitating the work of the FCC and improving its administrative process. Adjudication by the FCC would be expedited by: (1) repeal of provisions that precludes a review staff in adjudicatory cases from making any recom-

mendations to the Commission; (2) permit delegating functions of adjudication to a panel of Commissioners, subject to review by a part or the whole Commission prior to any review that might be held in the courts; (3) petitions for rehearings must be made to the authority responsible for making the decision; (4) one or more Commissioners may conduct the hearings; (5) under the provisions of Administrative Procedure Act (a) oral arguments would be discretionary and (b) hearing officer would not be permitted to consult any person or party in issue in a case but would be free to consult with other examiners.

Federal Trade Commission

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961—Effective July 9, 1961:

To provide flexibility in handling the business before the Federal Trade Commission and to permit its disposition at different levels to promote greater efficiency, Congress approve Reorganization Plan No. 4 to—

Authorize the delegation of any and all of its functions to subordinates;

Afford review only at its discretion, unless two members of the Commission agree to a review;

Cause the decision of a subordinate to become final by denying review; and

Vest in the Chairman of the Commission the authority to choose the individuals who would exercise the delegated power.

Under existing law, the Commission now has the authority to delegate various duties but the Commission itself must designate the personnel to perform the functions, while under plan 4, if the Commission agrees to delegate a function to a subordinate level, the Chairman is vested with the authority to designate the personnel, including the Commissioners, to perform the delegated function.

Interstate commerce reorganization

H.R. 8038—Public Law 87-247, approved September 14, 1961:

Grants the ICC Commissioners the authority to establish boards of three or more qualified employees for reviewing recommended orders entered in cases in which hearings have been held.

Under present law the review function may be exercised only by the Commission or a division of the Commission. This new authority will enable the Commission to delegate work that can be performed at lower levels within the agency, thereby providing more time for the Commissioners to handle the increased workload due to new laws, intensified competition among the carriers, and the general expanding economy.

Maritime Commission

Organization Plan No. 7—Effective August 12, 1961:

This reorganization plan establishes a five-member Federal Maritime Commission. The members are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and are subject to removal by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, and malfeasance in office. The President will designate the Chairman. As Chairman, he will receive $500 a year more than the $20,000 yearly salary provided for the other Commissioners.

The plan abolishes the present three-member Maritime Board, and separates its functions between the Department of Commerce and new statutory Commission.

The Department of Commerce is to be charged with the award of subsidies and promtional functions of the old Board, and the new Commmission is to be responsible for the regulatory functions of the old Board.

It is felt that in vesting all subsidy functions in the Secretary of Commerce, it will be possible for Congress and the President to hold a single official responsible and accountable for the effective conduct of all aspects of this program, including the size and character of the fleet under the U.S. flag, the need for Government assistance, and appropriation requirements to support subsidy programs.

The new Commission will be responsible for:

(a) Regulating and controlling rates, services, practices, and agreements of common carriers by water and other persons under the Shipping Act of 1916.

(b) Regulating and controlling rates, fares, charges, classifications, tariffs, regulations, and practices of common carriers by water under the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933.

(c) Making rules and regulating shipping in the foreign trade to adjust or meet conditions unfavorable to this shipping, and to approve, suspend, modify, or annul rules or regulations of other Federal agencies affecting shipping in the foreign traffic, under section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920.

(d) Investigating discriminatory rates, charges, classifications, and practices in the foreign trade, and for recommending legislation to correct any discriminations under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

(e) Requiring that certain reports be filed, accounts, records, rates, charges, and other memorandums be kept as required by the Shipping Act of 1916.

(f) Rules and regulations, making reports and recommendations to Congress, subpenaing witnesses, administering oaths, taking evidence, and requiring the production of books, papers, and documents under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The Commission will have the authority to delegate, by published order or rule, any of its functions to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board, including such functions as hearings, on any matter or work before the Commission.

Reorganization authority

S. 153—Public Law 87-18, approved April 7, 1961:

To continue the practice established by the Hoover Commission, this measure reinstates the authority granted to the President by the Reorganization Act of 1949, to submit reorganization plans to the Congress for reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government. This authority will expire on June 1, 1963.

As provided in the act of 1949, the plans will become law unless disapproved by a majority of either the House or Senate by adopting a resolution of disapproval within 60 calendar days after the plan is submitted to Congress.

SEC investigation

House Joint Resolution 438—Public Law 87-196, approved September 5, 1961:

Authorizes $750,000 to permit the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963.

SEC reorganization

S. 2135—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

As a substitute for Reorganization Plan No. 1, this bill authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate any of its functions by published order or rule to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board except rulemaking functions as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Requires that the Commission itself retain the discretionary right to review any action taken as a result of delegation under this bill. This right may be exercised upon the Commission's own initiative or upon petition of a party to or an intervenor in the action, within such time and in such manner as the Commission prescribes.

Permits a single member of the Commission to bring any action taken pursuant to this bill before the full Commission for review.

Preserves a person's right to petition the court of appeals for review even though he may have been denied review by the Commission.

Transfers to the Chairman the functions of the Commission relating to the assignment of personnel, including Commissioners, to perform the functions delegated by the Commission to Commission personnel.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social security amendments

H.R. 6027—Public Law 87-64, approved June 30, 1961:

The 1961 social security amendments provide new or increased benefits to 4.4 million people, totaling some $800 million in the first year, with the increased costs being met through additional payroll taxes.

The major provisions as enacted into law are:

Increases in minimum benefit: From $33 to $40 the minimum monthly retirement benefit at 65 and the minimum monthly disability benefit, with proportionate increases in minimum benefits payable to dependents and survivors. This provision provides increased benefits for 2,175,000 persons, amounting to $170 million, during the first 12 months of operation.

Benefits at age 62 for men: Provides the option of early retirement to men at age 62 with benefits on an actuarially reduced basis. In the first year 560,000 would get benefits amounting to $440 million.

Liberalizes insured status requirements: Provides that a worker is fully insured for benefit purposes if he has one quarter of coverage for every elapsing after 1950 and up to the year of disability, death, or attainment of age 65 for men and 62 for women. This would bring 160,000 people on to the rolls in the first year for a total of $65 million in benefits.

Increases widow's, widower's, and parent's benefits: Increased aged widow's widower's, and surviving parent's benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the workers' retirement benefit. (Will affect 1,525,000 persons by $105 million in first 12 months.)

Establishes a period of disability: Extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1962, the period within which a person may file to establish a period of disability to determine eligibility for and amount of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

Facilitates coverage for certain State and local employees: Adds New Mexico to list of States permitted this method of coverage, and employees who originally had chosen not to come under the program will be given an additional chance to elect to be in the group which has coverage. Time extended to December 31, 1962. Ministers and Christian Science practitioners have until April 16, 1962, to elect; however, if a minister or Christian Science practitioner dies after September 12, 1960, and before April 16, 1962, his survivor would have the right to elect coverage up to April 16, 1962.

Increases tax rates: Beginning in 1962, contribution rates will be raised by one-eighth of 1 percent each for employees and employers and by approximately three-sixteenths of 1 percent for self-employed.

Increases public assistance: Increases for 1 year (to June 30, 1962) the amount of public assistance payments which would be subject to Federal matching for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and total disabled programs (by approximately $2.50), at an approximate cost of about $20 million.

Increases in public assistance: As enacted into law, increases Federal matching for the

lower payment States—by increasing from $30 to $31 the amount the Federal Government will match at the 80-percent base level, and increases the maximum which will be matched from $65 to $66—effective October 1, 1961, for a 9-month period instead of 1 year as in the Senate bill.

Authorized assistance to U.S. nationals: As modified, the program will apply only to U.S. citizens rather than U.S. nationals, and will continue for only 1 year rather than indefinitely. As noted in the Senate provision, the temporary assistance is for those U.S. citizens who have returned, or been brought back to this country because of illness, destitution, war, threat of war, or invasion.

Medical care: The Senate provision assuring freedom of choice to aged persons in selecting certain medical care has been held in abeyance to permit a more thorough exploration of its ultimate effect.

SPACE

Aeronautics and Space Council

H.R. 6169—Public Law 87-26, approved April 25, 1961:

This is an administration proposal to make certain changes in section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which established the National Aeronautics and Space Council to advise the President on space matters. The Council is composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of NASA, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; and authority is reposed in the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a member from the Federal departments and agencies of the Government and three civilian members.

The President, in his request to Congress, stated that he contemplated making the Council an active and useful instrumentality. He further stated that he desired to place the Council under the chairmanship of the Vice President. The present measure would amend the law so as to replace the President by the Vice President, as Chairman of the Council. It would also repeal the existing authority of the President to appoint a member from the Federal departments and agencies of the Government and three members from civilian life, and would make certain conforming changes. There are no changes which would affect the present concept of the Council, which was established as an advisory body to the President.

NASA authorization for 1962

H.R. 6874—Public Law 87-98, approved July 21, 1961:

This measure authorizes a total appropriation of $1,784,300,000 to the National Aeronautical and Space Administration for fiscal 1962 as follows:

Salaries and expenses	$226,686,000
Research and development	1,305,539,000
Construction of facilities	252,075,000

Space authorization—amended

S. 2481—Passed the Senate September 5, 1961. Pending in House Science and Astronautics Committee:

This bill amends the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-98) by increasing the amount allotted for "Construction of facilities" by $60 million, to a new total of $206,186,000. This $60 million is to be used to buy land adjacent to Cape Canaveral to provide a site for the launch complexes for the large Saturn and Nova vehicles.

TAXATION

Corporate and excise extension of 1961

H.R. 7446—Public Law 87-72, approved June 30, 1961:

This measure continues to July 1, 1962, the present 52-percent corporate income tax rate which would otherwise revert to 47 percent, and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons.

If these taxes were permitted to be reduced, the tax loss would be as follows:

	Unit of tax	Present law rate	Rate to become effective July 1, 1961	Revenue loss (millions) Full year	Revenue loss (millions) Fiscal 1962
Corporations	Normal tax net income.	30 percent	25 percent	$2,080	$925
Excises:					
Liquor taxes:					
Distilled spirits	Per proof gallon	$10.50	$9	158	155
Beer	Per barrel	$9	$8	89	87
Wine:					
Still wine:					
Containing less than 14 percent alcohol.	Per wine gallon	17 cents	15 cents	11	11
Containing 14 to 21 percent alcohol.	do	67 cents	60 cents		
Containing 21 to 24 percent alcohol.	do	$2.25	$2		
Containing more than 23 percent alcohol.	do	$10.50	$9		
Sparkling wines, liqueurs, etc:					
Champagne or sparkling wine	do	$3.40	$3		
Liqueurs, cordials, etc	do	$1.92	$1.60		
Artificially carbonated wine	do	$2.40	$2		
Tobacco taxes: Cigarettes	Per thousand	$4	$3.50	244	244
Manufacturers excise taxes:					
Passenger cars	Manufacturers' sale price.	10 percent	7 percent	402	352
Auto parts and accessories	do	8 percent	5 percent	75	65
Miscellaneous taxes:					
General telephone	Amount charged	10 percent	0	500	375
Transportation of persons	Amount paid	10 percent	5 percent	150	110
Total excises				1,629	1,399
Grand total, corporate and excise taxes.				3,659	2,324
Decrease in excess tax refunds					178
Total net revenue effect				3,659	2,502

Clay and shale—Tax treatment

H.R. 7057—Public Law 87-312, approved September 26, 1961:

Permits miners of clay and shale to include as a depletion allowance the process of manufacturing brick and tile. For purposes of computing the percentage depletion deduction is to be 50 percent of the gross income from the finished product but not in excess of $12.50 for each ton of this clay or shale used in the finished product. The type of products for which the sale or specified types of clay must be used are building and paving brick, drainage and roofing tile, sewer pipe, flowerpots, or similar products.

This provision is in the form of an election which taxpayers may make for all open years beginning before January 1, 1961.

Identifying numbers—Tax returns

H.R. 8876—Public Law 87-397, approved October 5, 1961:

To improve enforcement and collection of internal revenue taxes, this measure facilitates the expanded use of automatic data processing equipment by IRS and by enabling the Service to match information returns now filed with tax returns.

Requires individuals who file tax returns to record their account numbers on their tax returns. Individuals filing information returns (such as dividends or interest) are required to request the account numbers of those about whom the information is being filed and include the numbers on the information returns.

IRS intends to use social security numbers as the account numbers in order to minimize the number of persons having to be assigned new numbers.

Membership organization taxes

H.R. 929—Public Law 87-109, approved July 26, 1961:

This bill provides that prepaid membership dues income of membership organization may at the election of the taxpayer, for tax purposes be spread over the period during which there is a liability on the part of the organizations to provide the service, rather than reported involved must extend beyond the current year but may not extend for more than 36 months.

The membership organizations to which the provision applies are limited to those, such as automobile clubs, which have no capital stock and make no distributions of net earnings to members. A special rule is provided which spreads over a 5-year period the revenue loss which would otherwise occur in each of the first 3 years of transition to the new method for reporting this prepaid income. The provision is effective for taxable years beginning with calendar 1961.

State tax stamps

H.R. 1777—Public Law 87-371, approved October 4, 1961:

To prohibit transporting counterfeit State tax stamps in interstate and foreign commerce, this bill broadens the definition of "tax stamp" in the criminal code to include any tax stamp, tax token, tax matter imprint, or any other form of evidence of an obligation running to a State, or evidence of a discharge thereof.

Unemployment tax credits

H.R. 2585—Public Law 87-321, approved September 26, 1961:

This bill is designed to prevent the imposition of a double tax in the case of the Federal and State unemployment taxes which arise because of a technical deficiency in the Federal tax laws. At present, due to a variation in the definition of employer between the Federal and State laws, cases can arise where the usual credit for State unemployment taxes is not available where a trade or business changes hands within the first 20 weeks of a calendar year. This bill corrects the faulty operation of the Federal laws by making the usual credit available in these cases.

This measure applies prospectively only but will apply to all business corporations, both corporate and noncorporate.

A Finance Committee amendment provides that crushing and grinding are to be treated as mining processes in the case of clay and quartzite used in the manufacture of refractory products for open years beginning before January 1, 1961. This amendment also provides that the value of the ground clay and quartzite shall be equal to 87½ percent of the average lowest price for which such clay is sold by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

TRANSPORTATION

Bridge commission audits

S. 49—Passed Senate June 12, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee (H.R. 8921, passed Senate, amended September 25):

Establishes formal procedure for an annual audit of four bridge commissions and one bridge causeway authority created by Congress. The auditing is to be done in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Governors of the States concerned and in accordance with generally accepted accounting procedures. The Secretary of Commerce will review the reports and audits. Previously, these audits were conducted at the discretion of the various commissions and authorities.

Requires the Secretary of Commerce to fill vacancies in the membership of the bridge commissions, accept oaths of qualification, and remove members for cause.

Those involved are:

Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, Arkansas and Mississippi.

White County Bridge Commission, Illinois and Indiana.

City of Clinton Bridge Commission, Illinois and Iowa.

Muscatine Bridge Commission, Iowa and Illinois.

Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority, Texas and Louisiana.

Broadcast licenses

S. 1371—Passed Senate June 16, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

This bill permits the Federal Communications Commission to renew safety and special radio service licenses more than 30 days before the expiration of the original license, but retains the 30-day restriction on renewals of all other licenses. The limitation is burdensome and inefficient in the special safety and special radio service field, the inherent nature of which provides its own limitations and restraints on licensing.

Canadian vessels—Alaska

S. 707—Public Law 87-77, approved June 30, 1961:

This bill permits Canadian vessels to provide passenger service between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passenger and freight service between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska and in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, until such time as the Secretary of Commerce determines that U.S.-flag service is available to provide the necessary transportation.

Under statutes of long standing only vessels of U.S. registry are permitted to engage in coastal and intercoastal trades.

In recent years, however, because of increased vessel operating costs, and because of the small and seasonally fluctuating population, U.S.-flag vessels have found such service uneconomic to the point where there is now no regular U.S.-flag service provided, and none in prospect.

Carriers—Alaska and Hawaii

S. 1725—Passed Senate June 27, 1961. Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

This measure permits the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and establishes a joint rate review board.

It will become effective 120 days after enactment and applies to all carriers including railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, and airlines rendering freight transportation service.

This arrangement permits a number of carriers to render service from origin to destination on one bill of lading quoting a single transportation charge. Each carrier is required to file tariffs with the regulatory agency having jurisdiction over the carrier. These rates must be reasonable and free from unjust discrimination.

The joint board will pass upon the lawfulness of the rates after applying the standards for permissive joint rates and through routes currently provided for motor carriers of property under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Rates applicable to and from the docks in Hawaii are to be excluded from these joint arrangements since most of this service is in the nature of local drayage within a commercial zone which the ICC exempts from economic regulation.

Construction reserve funds

S. 2085—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

Extends for an additional year the period permitted shipowners for commitment of construction reserve funds. In order to encourage new construction, reconditioning, and acquisition of vessels, any citizen of the United States who owns or is operating a vessel in the foreign or domestic commerce, or in fisheries, or who owned or operated or was building a vessel which the Government purchased or requisitioned, may establish a construction reserve fund to enable him to build, recondition, or acquire new vessels. In this fund he may deposit proceeds from sale of vessels, indemnities from losses, and earnings of vessels documented under the U.S. laws.

In the case of sale, or actual or constructive total loss of a vessel, where the taxpayer deposits an amount equal to the net proceeds of the sale, or the net indemnity, in a construction reserve fund, if the taxpayer so elects in his income tax return for the taxable year in which the gain was realized, or determines within 60 days after the receipt of payment or indemnity for purchase, requisition, or loss of the vessel, if the payment is received subsequent to the end of the taxable year involved, no gain is recognized to the taxpayer in computing his net income for purposes of Federal income or excess-profits taxes. In return, however, the vessel owner must commit the amounts deposited for the intended purposes within a prescribed time, and the tax base of a vessel built, purchased, or reconditioned with the untaxed gain is reduced by the amount of the untaxed gain used.

Dual-rate contract agreements

S. 2154—Public Law 87-75, approved June 30, 1961:

This act extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1962, the present interim dual-rate law, which allows ocean common carriers and conferences serving the foreign commerce of the United States to continue using the dual-rate exclusive patronage contracts if they were under such contracts on May 19, 1958.

The dual-rate contract arrangement is a practice whereby a conference establishes rates at two levels, the lower is charged to merchants who agree to ship cargoes on vessels of members of the conference only, the higher being charged to merchants who do not so agree.

Dual-rate contracts—Conferences

H.R. 6775—Public Law 87-346, approved October 3, 1961:

This measure legalizes the so-called dual-rate system in maritime shipping. Under the dual-rate system, shippers who agree to use only conference vessels are accorded a lower rate than those who have not entered into such an agreement. It requires the Federal Maritime Commission's approval before a conference can institute a dual-rate contract.

The Commission cannot approve if it finds that the contract is detrimental to the commerce of the United States, or contrary to public interest, or unjustly discriminatory or unfair as between shippers, exporters, importers, or ports, or between exporters from the United States and their foreign competitors. In addition the Commission cannot approve conference contracts which authorize agreements between carriers or conferences of carriers serving different trades that would otherwise be naturally competitive unless in the case of agreements between carriers, each carrier, or in the case of conferences, each conference retains the rights of independent action; however, the prohibition on carrier agreements is limited to carriers not members of the same conference.

To be approved by the Commission all contracts must expressly: Permit prompt release of the contract shipper if the contract or conference could not provide the space he needs on reasonable notice; provide that rates shall not be increased for a reasonable period except in case of war; cover only those goods of the contract shipper to which he has legal right at the time of shipment; limit liquidated damages to amount due at contract rate on the particular shipment, less cost of handling; provide for a reasonable spread between contract and noncontract rates but not more than 15 percent of the noncontract rates; and exclude from coverage of the contract cargo loaded in bulk without mark or count.

Federal Aid Highway Act, 1961

H.R. 6713—Public Law 87-61, approved June 29, 1961:

The Senate adopted the conference report on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, which is primarily a revised authorization and refinancing plan for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The 13-year program, authorized in 1956, was originally estimated to cost the Federal Government, in matching funds, approximately $25 billion. This figure, in the 1961 estimate, has been increased to $37 billion, which is a $11.56 billion increase. The total cost will be $41 billion, of which $37 billion is the Federal Government's share for the Interstate System.

Upon completion, the Interstate System will be comprised of 41,000 miles of roads. To date, 10,408 miles have been completed, and some form of work is underway on a total of 25,383 miles, or about 62 percent of the total system.

This measure permits a State or political subdivision to use or permit the use of the airspace above and below the highway, not only for parking, but for other purposes as well, provided such use will not impair the full use and safety of the highway or otherwise interfere with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System.

It also continues for another 2 years (July 1, 1963) the authority for "incentive" bonus to States which enter into agreements to control billboards on the Interstate System (one-half of 1 percent).

A new feature is to authorize the use of defense access road funds to repair highways damaged by military equipment in constructing defense installations. This provision applies to damage caused by construction work begun before June 1, 1961, and still in progress on that date, and to damage caused by construction commenced or for which a contract is awarded on or after June 1, 1961.

The 1960 act authorized $925 million for each of fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for pri-

mary, secondary, and urban (A–B–C) roads. This phase was not changed in this bill.

To help finance the highway program, we have—

Continued gasoline and diesel fuel taxes at 4 cents a gallon through October 1, 1972.

Increased taxes (through October 1, 1972) on—

Trucks weighing over 26,000 pounds from $1.50 to $3 per 1,000;

Inner tubes from 9 cents to 10 cents a pound;

Highway tires from 8 cents to 10 cents a pound;

Tread rubber from 3 cents to 5 cents a pound.

Authorized truckowners to pay the Federal user tax in four quarterly installments, and made numerous technical and other changes.

Requested the Treasury Department to make a scientific study to obtain data on the percentage of gasoline purchased by retail dealers which is lost by shrinkage or evaporation and to make a report before January 1, 1962.

Provided for a 1-year deferral of the diversion of the remaining one-half—5 percentage points—of the Federal excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers from the general funds of the Treasury to the highway trust fund.

Federal Boating Act

S. 883—Public Law 87–171, approved August 30, 1961:

This measure extends the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

The purpose of the 1958 act is to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia. Besides safety regulations such as prohibiting reckless and careless operation of vessels on navigable waters, it provides for a coordinated and uniform type of numbering and registration of boats within the areas.

Federal Firearms Act, amendment

S. 1750—Public Law 87–342, approved October 3, 1961:

This measure amends the Federal Firearms Act, which among other provisions prohibits the shipment of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by persons under indictment or convicted of a crime of violence. Specific crimes are listed in the original statute with regard to which the act applies. The new measure makes the prohibition on trade in firearms applicable to persons indicted, convicted, or fleeing with respect to any crime which measures up to the Federal standard of a felony; that is, any crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of more than 1 year.

Fishery loan fund

H.R. 206—Public Law 87–219, approved September 13, 1961:

Authorize the fishery loan fund to make any necessary repairs on vessels which it has acquired through loan defaults on fishing gear and ships. Many of these vessels are in very poor condition; without adequate repair, they could be sold for only a small part of the original investment of the loan fund. The expenditures made would, in the long run, be a net gain to the Government.

Intrastate motor carriers

S. 320—Passed Senate July 17, 1961. House Calendar:

This measure amends the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to permit State commissions under a specific procedure to grant the right to motor common carriers operating within a single State to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the boundaries of the State in which intrastate authority is being simultaneously authorized. It also authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue certificates of registration to existing carriers engaged in interstate operations under the terms of the present second proviso.

The existing second proviso enables motor common carriers whose operations are confined to a single State and who have been granted a certificate to allow operation within the State from their State regulatory bodies, to also engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce must be carried on entirely within the State in which the motor carrier is certificated to operate.

Liberty ship sale

Senate Joint Resolution 21—Passed Senate September 1, 1961. Pending in House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to sell up to 10 Liberty ships for conversion into non-self-propelled barges. The vessels would be made immediately available to the Government in the event of a national emergency.

Requires that the sale of the vessels be made for cash only, after competitive bidding; that their operations be restricted to the domestic trade (excluding Alaska); that the vessels be ineligible for trade-in or exchange; and that they remain under U.S. documentation.

Mass transit program

S. 1922—Public Law 87–70, approved June 30, 1961:

Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities—$25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest rate loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment.

Merchant Marine Academy—Cadets

H.R. 3296—Public Law 87–244, approved September 14, 1961:

Authorizes the designation of up to four persons who are citizens of the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands to attend the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. They would be subject to the same rules, benefits, and could be graduated from the Academy; however, they could not be commissioned in the merchant marine or in the Navy, unless they have become citizens of the United States. The training that these men receive could be used to aid the vital interests of their home islands, where ocean transportation is so very important to the economic life.

Merchant Marine Academy—Faculty

S. 576—Public Law 87–93, approved July 20, 1961:

This measure clarifies the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and establishes suitable personnel policies.

It involves primarily conversion of positions of executive, administrative, custodial, and service personnel to positions subject to the civil service laws generally applicable to other civilian U.S. employees. In addition, it establishes an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation for the faculty which is comparable to that now provided for the civilian faculty at the U.S. Naval Academy.

Merchant Marine Academy—U.S. nationals

H.R. 29—Public Law 87–199, approved September 6, 1961:

Permits appointments to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy of residents of American Samoa, even though they are nationals and not citizens of the United States. No appointment to any office in the U.S. merchant marine shall be made, however, unless the Academy graduate is a U.S. citizen. The American Samoan nationals who graduate from the Academy will be able to use their training by creating a small corps of professionally trained persons for local navigation, port authority, etc.

Merchant marine amendment

H.R. 6974—Public Law 87–271, approved September 21, 1961:

This measure permits steamship operators to draw upon their capital reserve fund to finance research, new ship designs, and development programs; to borrow from the fund to purchase cargo containers, or as a reimbursement for such purchases.

Under the present provisions of title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, vessel owners holding operating-differential subsidy contracts are required to establish a capital reserve fund, in which must be deposited an amount equal to the annual depreciation on their subsidized vessels, proceeds from the sale of any subsidized vessels, all indemnities and insurance from loss of vessels, and any additional profits from operations of subsidized vessels as the Secretary of Commerce considers necessary to insure an adequate fund. In addition, the subsidized operator must set up a special reserve fund to take care of any operating losses and subsidy recaptures. Prior to passage of H.R. 6974, none of the idle reserve funds could be used to initiate experimental design work not directly related to an actual ship to be constructed.

Ocean freight forwarders

S. 1368—Public Law 87–254, approved September 19, 1961:

This bill is designed to correct various questionable practices of foreign freight forwarders by providing for licensing independent freight forwarders, to prevent unqualified persons from engaging in business as foreign freight forwarders and to regulate the activities of qualified foreign freight forwarders.

Amends the Shipping Act of 1916, to define the term "carrying on the business of forwarding" to mean dispatching of shipments by any person on behalf of others, by oceangoing common carrier in commerce from the United States or its possessions to foreign countries, or between the United States and its possessions or between such possessions, and handling the formalities incident to these shipments. It defines the term "independent ocean freight forwarder" to mean a person carrying on the business of forwarding for a consideration, who is not a shipper or consignee or a seller or purchaser of shipments to foreign countries, nor has any beneficial interest therein, nor directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by such shipper or consignee or by any person having a beneficial interest.

Requires a person to hold a license issued by the Federal Maritime Board to carry on the business of forwarding, but permits a person whose primary business is the sale of merchandise to dispatch shipments of merchandise without a license.

Directs the Board to prescribe reasonable rules and regulatons to be obesrved by independent ocean freight forwarders, and requires the forwarder to furnish a bond or other security acceptable to the Board, to insure financial responsibility and proper service performance.

Provides that licenses shall remain effective until suspended or terminated as provided in this act. Licenses may, upon application of the holder, in the discretion of the Board, be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may, upon complaint, or on the Board's initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended or revoked for willful failure to comply with any provisions of this act or with any lawful order of the Board.

Obsolete vessel trade-ins

S. 1728—Public Law 87–401, approved October 5, 1961:

Liberalized the law regarding obsolete trade-ins by authorizing the Federal Mari-

time Commission to take trade-ins either when the owner signs the contract for construction or purchase of a new vessel or (at the owner's option) within 5 days of the delivery date of the new vessel.

Off-season cruises

H.R. 6100—Public Law 87-45, approved May 27, 1961:

The purpose of this bill is to promote and encourage the fullest possible employment of American-flag passenger vessels on a year-round basis either on their regular routes or on special cruises during the slack seasons.

Under existing law, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 subsidized American-flag vessels, both passenger and cargo, are assigned to particular essential trade routes which they must serve on a regular basis year round. Since the advent of oversea aviation, passenger traffic by ship drastically slacks off during certain seasons of the year. During such seasons, even though full utilization of passenger vessels is not needed to provide essential service on the routes, existing law prohibits vessels from going on special cruises off the regular routes. As a result, American-flag passenger vessels frequently suffer heavy losses during the slack season while their normal foreign competitors engage in off-season cruises.

Thus, this legislation not only strengthens the operating condition of the American passenger fleets but allows American-flag vessels to receive a share of the growing cruise business to off-season vacation areas now served almost exclusively from the United States by foreign-flag ships.

Pollution of sea by oil

S. 2187—Public Law 87-167, approved August 30, 1961:

Implements the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which prohibits discharge of oil from tankers and imposes fines and penalties for violation. The bill implements the convention by prohibiting American ships from discharging wastes in any of the zones named in the bill, and requires a record showing where any waste may be discharged. Also provides for keeping oil record books by foreign ships when they are in U.S. waters, and establishes a fine of from $500 to $2,500 for violations.

Portland Harbor, Maine

S. 2394—Passed Senate September 15, 1961. Pending in House Public Works Committee:

Authorizes $8,340,000 to improve the harbor at Portland, Maine, to deepen the entrance channel to facilitate the movement of foreign crude oil through the United States to Montreal, Canada.

Prohibit destruction of property in interstate commerce

H.R. 2429—Public Law 87-221, approved September 13, 1961:

Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to (1) destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, or (2) break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose. Violators would be penalized by fines up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 10 years. Existing laws have no provision for punishment if there is willful damage or destruction of property per se in the possession of a carrier unless the carrier's own property is damaged also, or if such acts are not intentionally performed.

Railway Express revenue

H.R. 1986—Public Law 87-108, approved July 26, 1961:

This measure repeals the following two basic provisions of the Railway Mail Act of 1916:

1. A provision that the Postmaster General shall obtain from the Interstate Commerce Commission information showing revenue received by railroad companies from express companies for transporting express matter.

2. A provision authorizing the Postmaster General to reduce rail rates paid by the Post Office Department to the railroads for carrying non-first-class mail to the level of the express rail rates, if the express rates are lower.

These provisions were designed to prevent rate discrimination by the railroads against the Government in transporting non-first-class mail. Since cost-ascertainment procedures were crude at that time, these provisions gave the Government the best known test of reasonableness-rate comparison. The Postmaster General, from time to time, has requested the ICC to furnish information as provided by law on rail rates for carrying express matter. The Commission, in declining such a request, states in effect that the law does not place upon it the duty to make an investigation for the purpose of formulating rail rates for the carriage of express matter.

The ICC contended that the Railway Express Agency had never operated on a profit-and-loss basis, since it simply turned over to the railroads whatever amounts it had left after deducting its operating expenses at the end of each month. The Railway Express Agency (REA) always broke even on its own books, although the business as a whole has been losing money for years. Because of the contractual arrangements between the railroads and REA, the ICC has held that rates, as such, were not paid, and that for this reason, the provisions of the 1916 law could not be complied with. Revitalization of the express agency is now moving forward; however, these provisions of the old law stand in the way of the agency's return to solvency. Under the terms of a new contract between REA and the railroads, scheduled to become effective July 1, 1961, the express company would change its method of operation to one based upon profit and loss, and it could be construed that rates were being paid. The railroads and the express company fear that the provisions which H.R. 1986 repeal might then be invoked and this could result in huge losses to the railroads in rates paid by the Post Office Department for the transportation of non-first-class mail.

Ships and seamen fees

S. 1358—Passed Senate March 28, 1961. Pending in House Foreign Affairs Committee:

This measure repeals section 12 of the act of June 26, 1884, prohibiting a charge or collection of fees by consular officers for official services to American vessels and seamen, and repeals a provision of the act of June 4, 1920, authorizing the free issuance of passports to seamen.

It is estimated that this measure will save the Government about $400,000 a year.

Subsidies for reconverted vessels

H.R. 2457—Public Law 87-222, approved September 13, 1961:

This measure makes it clear that the provisions of Public Law 86-607, relating to the payment of temporary construction-differential subsidies, was intended to apply to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion, as well as to new construction, of the shipyard contract entered into after June 30, 1959.

The 1960 amendment, in emphasizing the temporary nature of the authority for payment of a higher differential percentage, provided that it would be effective "only with respect to the construction of a vessel the keel of which was laid after June 30, 1959." That wording has been interpreted by the Maritime Board as excluding vessel reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion previously covered.

Subsidy—90 percent interim payment

H.R. 6309—Public Law 87-243, approved September 14, 1961:

Effective July 1, 1962, this measure increases from 75 to 90 the percentage of estimated accrued subsidy that can be paid to subsidized operators before these operators have audited their voyage accounts and before the audits have been verified by the Secretary of Commerce. It also reduces from 15 to 5 the percentage that can be paid after the audit and verification and before the final annual accounting.

Vessel expenses covered by this operating-differential subsidy include vessel insurance, maintenance, repairs not compensated by insurance, wages and subsistence of officers and crew, and any other items of expense in which the Maritime Board finds that the operator is at a substantial disadvantage. These are what can be termed "current expenses" and must be met immediately by the ship operator, thus the long delays incurred as a result of audits, et cetera, are bankrupting lots of the ship operators and working a greater handicap on the shippers. Thus, this measure is designed to provide these operators with a degree of temporary relief.

U.S.-flag commercial vessels

H.R. 6732—Public Law 87-266, approved September 21, 1961:

This measure is designed to provide protection to vessels of U.S. registry engaged in the bulk trades, against foreign-flag vessels and vessels built or rebuilt abroad which seek documentation or redocumentation under the American flag in order to share in the carriage of the 50-percent-Government-financed cargoes reserved to privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels.

To accomplish this purpose the term "privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels" shall not be deemed to include any vessel which, subsequent to the date of enactment of this amendment, shall have been either (a) built outside the United States or (b) rebuilt outside the United States or (c) documented under any foreign registry, until the vessel has been documented under the laws of the United States for a 3-year period.

Vessel documentation

S. 881—Public Law 87-157, approved August 17, 1961:

This measure permits documentation of vessels which are sold or transferred to a citizen of the United States while on the high seas or in a foreign port. The present statutes provide for retention of the privileges of a vessel of the United States by any vessel sold or transferred until its first arrival in the United States. The new owners are sometimes at a disadvantage in dealing with officials in foreign ports since the owners are unable to establish their interest in the vessel by official U.S. documents.

Thus this bill makes it possible for the vessel to be redocumented while still abroad, which will enable the parties in interest to have clear evidence of title.

Vessel reserve funds

H.R. 6974—Public Law 87-271, approved September 21, 1961:

This measure increases industry cooperation with recently undertaken Federal Maritime Administration research and development projects, without undue strain on the ship lines' general funds. It authorizes operators of subsidized vessels to draw upon their capital reserve fund to finance research, and new design and development programs. It further permits these operators to borrow from the general funds for expenditures for research and development purposes, and provides safeguards for the operators' reserve funds to assure that they will be maintained at a level adequate to serve their primary purposes of vessel replacement and emergency use.

Vessels—Preferred mortgages

H.R. 2308—Public Law 87-303, approved September 26, 1961:

Strengthens the Ship Mortgage Act by extending preferred status to mortgages covering towboats, barges, scows, lighters, car floats, canalboats, or tank vessels of 25 or more gross tons. At present, the statute confers preferred status only on mortgages covering vessels of 200 or more gross tons.

This amendment, however, does not apply to mortgages in existence on the date of enactment, nor to any mortgage placed on a vessel in the 25- to 199-gross-ton bracket after the date of enactment under a mortgage on the vessel in existence on the date of enactment as long as the existing mortgage remains undischarged.

Virgin Islands fish boats

H.R. 3159—Public Law 87-220, approved September 13, 1961:

Authorizes small boats flying foreign flags to land catches of fish in the Virgin Islands. All fish must be sold for immediate consumption; none may be sold to any agent or employee of a cannery or freezer. Under existing law such foreign vessels are prohibited from landing fish in U.S. ports. There is a need to allow small boats from British islands to land fish cargoes, averaging from 900 to 4,000 pounds of fresh fish per month, in order to satisfy the demand for fresh fish in the Virgin Islands.

TREATIES

Belgium-United States Treaty

Executive J—Ratified September 11, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive J, a treaty of friendship, establishment, and navigation between the United States and the United Kingdom of Belgium, together with a related protocol.

The purpose of the treaty is to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities in those countries, in return for like assurances in the United States.

This treaty covers entry and sojourn, personal freedoms, property rights, business activities, taxation, exchange regulations, and matters affecting the status and activities of citizens and enterprises of one country within the territories of the other. It also provides that the property of nationals and companies of either part is not to be taken except for a public purpose, nor is it to be taken without the prompt payment of just compensation. It requires that if any dispute regarding any provision of this convention arises as between the parties, and if the dispute is not satisfactorily settled by other means, the dispute is to be submitted to the International Court of Justice. The effect of this requirement is to waive the Connally amendment requirement with respect to the limited category of disputes which might arise as to the interpretation or application of this treaty. At the point of referral, the International Court, before it can take jurisdiction, must find that its jurisdiction extended to the subject matter of the dispute.

This new treaty replaces the treaty of commerce and navigation of 1875. The new one does not contain provisions relating to the exchange of goods because of Belgium's reluctance to enter into long-term commitments and because commercial relations with Belgium have been subject to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; nor does it contain provisions relating to social security and the acquisition and tenure of real property because the provisions requested by the Belgian negotiators would have been in conflict with U.S. Federal and domestic law. The protocol to the treaty clarifies and construes certain of its provisions.

Brazil—Extradition treaty

Executive H—Ratified May 16, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive H, a treaty of extradition between the United States and Brazil signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961.

At ratified, this is a general treaty of extradition of the type now in force between the United States and some 65 foreign countries. It provides for extraditing fugitives who have been charged with or convicted of murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, abortion, malicious wounding, abduction, detention, kidnaping, bigamy, arson, piracy, burglary, robbery, forgery, embezzlement, larceny, obtaining money or valuables by false pretenses, fraud, willful nonsupport, perjury, soliciting or receiving bribes, narcotic offenders, smuggling, procuration, and numerous other crimes.

The treaty provides, however, that neither country has to extradite if the death penalty might be imposed. This article results from the fact that capital punishment is prohibited under Brazilian law. Neither country is required to extradite its own nationals but in its discretion may.

The United States has extradition treaties with all the countries of South America except Brazil and, as a result, Brazil has become a haven for fugitives from the United States.

Enters into force 1 month after the date of exchange of ratification.

Columbia River Basin treaty

Executive C—Ratified March 16:

The Senate, with one dissenting vote, approved ratification of a treaty between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington January 17, 1961. The treaty is designed to insure that water resources of the Columbia River Basin will be developed so that Canada and the United States will derive the maximum advantage in hydroelectric power, in flood control and other benefits.

Canada agreed to build three dams in Canada within a 9-year period with a storage capacity of 15.5 million acre-feet of water and, in exchange, Canada is entitled to one-half of the downstream power benefits. Downstream power benefits is the difference in the hydroelectric power capable of being generated in the United States with and without the use of Canadian storage.

The United States agreed to pay Canada $64.4 million over a 9-year period for primary flood control benefits obtained as a result of the Canadian storage dams. Additional payments, limited to $7.5 million over a 60-year period, will be made by the United States for secondary flood control, if and when such protection is actually required.

Under the treaty, the United States has an option for a 5-year period to initiate construction of Libby Dam in Montana, and Canada is to make available the land in Canada which will be flooded by the storage of water.

Each country is prohibited from diverting water from its natural channels in a way that alters the flow of any water of the Columbia Basin as it crosses the boundary for other than consumptive uses without the consent of the other country.

Each country will designate an entity or entities to be responsible for formulating and carrying out operating arrangements necessary to implement the treaty.

The treaty is to remain in effect for 60 years.

Geneva Radio Regulations

Executive I—Ratified September 25, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive I, the Geneva Radio Regulations, containing a number of provisions relating to the international regulation of radio communication, signed for the United States at Geneva on December 21, 1959.

The purpose of the 1959 radio regulations is to replace those which were adopted at Atlantic City in 1947 and approved by the Senate in 1948. Approval of these new regulations will materially assist the United States in carrying out its scientific efforts in radio astronomy and space research. The regulations are highly technical and relate largely to the following four main work areas: frequency allocations, frequency management procedures, technical regulations, and operating regulations.

German bonds treaty

Executive D—Ratified May 4, 1961:

The Senate ratified Executive D, 87th Congress, 1st session, the second agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding certain matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960.

This second agreement provides for validation of East German dollar bonds to enable owners of these bonds to establish that they were acquired from legitimate sources and were not acquired directly or indirectly as a consequence of Soviet sources of bonds in Berlin at the close of World War II. The agreement provides that once the validity of these bonds is established, certain procedures may be followed by the holders to negotiate the bonds or receive payment from assets originally pledged as security for their issuance.

Background: In 1952, the Federal Republic of Germany enacted a validation law under which German foreign currency bonds had to be submitted for validation. Validation was granted only if the bonds were not among the $350 million in face amount of amortization bonds, in the form of bearer instruments, which were seized from the vaults of the Reichsbank and other banks when the Soviets overran Berlin in 1945.

Under the first agreement of April 1, 1953, ratified as a treaty and entered into force on September 16, 1953, German dollar bonds are not enforcible in the United States unless validated.

The German law restricted validation procedures to bonds of issuers located in the German Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin; however, since 1953, it has been learned that certain outstanding East German dollar issues are guaranteed by solvent companies located in the German Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin and that certain East German issuers of these bonds have assets in excess of $4 million located in West Germany. Under the London agreement on German external debts, signed on February 27, 1953, action may be taken to satisfy the bondholders' claims out of these assets and guarantees. A procedure for validating the East German dollar bonds is a prerequisite to making these assets and guarantees available to the U.S. bondholders.

Without this second agreement, U.S. holders of these bonds would be unable to receive payment on the issues guaranteed by solvent companies located in the German Federal Republic and the Western sectors of Berlin or from the assets of East German issuers located in West Germany.

The agreement has the approval of the interested bondholders' protective committees, the banks which are trustees and paying agents for the issue in question, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

International telecommunications convention

Executive J—Ratified September 25, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive J, which continues in effect the principal provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention, signed at Buenos Aires in 1952 and approved by the Senate in 1955.

The purposes of the ITU convention are to maintain and extend international cooperation of the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds; to promote the development of technical facilities and their most efficient operation with a view toward improving the efficiency of telecommunications services, increasing their usefulness, and making them generally available to the public; and to harmonize the actions of nations in attaining those common ends.

Load Line Convention

Executive I—Ratified May 16, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive I, a modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention of 1930. The modification was proposed by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and northern Ireland on May 31, 1949.

As ratified, the modification makes a technical change in the provisions of article 3 of the convention by clarifying the definition of the term "new ship." Thus, this proposal makes future modifications in ship design, agreed to under the convention, applicable only to ships whose keels were laid on or after the date on which these modifications become effective. A "new ship," as defined in the original treaty was one whose keel was laid on or after July 1, 1932.

The International Load Line Convention, which entered into force for the United States on January 5, 1933, and is now in effect for 64 countries, prescribes the depths to which ships engaged in international commerce may be loaded. It requires that ships belonging to participating nations engaged in international voyages be surveyed and marked with loadlines to indicate the point beyond which a vessel may not be safely submerged.

OECD

Executive E—Ratified March 16, 1961:

The Senate ratified the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, together with two protocols, signed at Paris, December 14, 1960.

The convention creates the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an organization consisting of the 18 European members that comprised the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), plus the United States and Canada.

The OEEC was established in 1948 to help Europe recover from the war. The OECD, an outgrowth of the 1948 OEEC, is to promote economic stability and the orderly growth of the economies of the member countries. In addition, it is to devise more effective methods of assisting the less-developed countries and for arranging to distribute the aid burden more equitably.

The first protocol gives the members of the European Economic Community the option of acting individually within the OECD, or jointly through one of their commissions, such as the High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community, or the European Atomic Energy Community.

The second protocol covers the privileges, exemptions, and immunities of OECD officials and representatives.

Oil pollution treaty

Executive C—Ratified May 16, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified Executive C, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, signed at London, May 12, 1954.

As ratified, the convention prevents pollution of the high seas (only) by oil and oily wastes discharged by tankers and other ships only (not structures), and thus controls their harmful effect on coasts and coastal waters, birds, wildlife, fish, and marine resources. The Oil Pollution Act of 1924 continues to apply to U.S. territorial waters.

The convention applies to seagoing ships registered in any territories of a contracting government except: (1) Ships used as naval auxiliaries; (2) ships under 500 gross tons; (3) ships engaged in whaling industry; and (4) ships navigating the Great Lakes of North America and their connecting and tributary waters.

The convention is now in force for Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Penalties for violations by ships under U.S. registry will be imposed by U.S. courts if found guilty upon presentation of evidence by U.S. prosecuting attorneys.

Vietnam-United States Treaty

Executive J—Ratified September 11, 1961:

The Senate unanimously ratified the treaty of amity and economic relations between the United States and the Republic of Vietnam, a treaty designed to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Vietnam and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities in those countries, in return for like assurances in the United States.

The treaty covers entry and sojourn, personal freedoms, property rights, business activities, taxation, exchange regulations, and matters affecting the status and activities of citizens and enterprises of one country within the territories of the other. The treaty also provides that the property of nationals and companies of either part is not to be taken except for a public purpose, nor is it to be taken without the prompt payment of just compensation. It requires that if any dispute regarding any provision of this convention arises as between the parties and if the dispute is not satisfactorily settled by other means, the dispute is to be submitted to the International Court of Justice. The effect of this requirement is to waive the Connally amendment requirement with respect to the limited category of disputes which might arise as to the interpretation or application of this treaty. At the point of referral, the International Court, before it could take jurisdiction, would be required to find that its jurisdiction extended to the subject matter of the dispute.

This is the first of its type to be entered into between Vietnam and the United States; however, the provisions are substantially similar to those found in other modern commercial treaties negotiated by the United States. It does not provide for a specific treaty right of entry and establishment of business enterprises because of Vietnam's reluctance to accept such a provision based on her concern about the possible effects of potential economic penetration from abroad.

VETERANS

Appeals

H.R. 866—Public Law 87-97, approved July 20, 1961:

Requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals be in writing and that they contain findings of fact and conclusions of law stated separately. The practice of the Board now is to give only a narrative of some of the evidence presented and only generalized facts of law which in certain cases makes it difficult to tell why certain claims are allowed and others denied. Such a legal framework of presentation will benefit the claimants by requiring more care and analysis by the Board members.

Disability compensation increase—NSLI

H.R. 879—Passed Senate amended July 17, 1961:

This act provides increases in the rates of service-connected disability compensation to reflect the changes which have occurred in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957. It increases the monthly rates payable to veterans of all wars and peacetime service who have a service-connected disability rated between 10 and 100 percent or who are entitled to receive compensation at one of the higher statutory award rates which, at present, run to a maximum of $450 or as much as $600 monthly if the veteran is entitled to the $450 rate, needs regular aid and attendance, and is not being cared for in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

A monthly increase of 50 cents provided for the 10 percent disabled, $1 for the 20 percent, and $2 for the 30 percent disabled. Thus increases range from 2.6 to 8.9 percent in the disability compensation rates payable to veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent; however, for those veterans receiving or entitled to receive one of the statutory award rates the increases range from 7.5 to 16.7 percent.

Restores for 2 years after January 1, 1962, the eligibility of veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, to apply for national service life insurance.

Discharge

H.R. 6269—Public Law 87-102, approved July 21, 1961:

Makes the end of military duty effective from midnight of the day of discharge. The uniform ruling will help the Veterans' Administration end confusion in regard to benefit provisions in certain cases where soldiers have been injured en route home from point of discharge. It would only be in effect for such cases as occurred prior to December 31, 1956.

Deceased veteran—Remains

H.R. 7148—Public Law 87-99, approved July 21, 1961:

Provides for transporting the remains of a veteran who dies in a Veterans' Administration facility in any State, territory, or in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Canal Zone, to the place of burial in any State or the Canal Zone. As the law now stands such transportation is not allowed to Puerto Rico or any territory or possession of the United States, although the veteran may have been sent away from his home in one of these territories as the result of his military orders.

Home loans

H.R. 5723—Public Law 87-84, approved July 6, 1961:

Extended the direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967.

NSLI—Disability compensation increase

H.R. 856—Passed Senate amended September 1, 1961. Senate asked for conference September 1, 1961:

The purpose of this measure is threefold:

1. Effective July 1, 1962, this bill provides a new plan of insurance for national service life insurance (NSLI) policyholders. The plan is modified life insurance which provides a level premium throughout the life of the insured but the face value of the policy will be automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The face value of any extended term insurance in force under this modified life policy will also be reduced by 50 percent at that time. The insured, upon written application, payment of the required premium and without medical examination, may be issued additional insurance on the ordinary life plan to replace the amount of insurance which is reduced on his 65th birthday; however, in order to be eligible for this replacement insurance the modified life plan must be in force by payment or waiver of premiums at time of reduction. Permits NSLI policyholders to convert their term insurance to exchange their permanent plan insurance for the modified life

plan, and authorizes service-disabled persons who have been issued insurance under 38 U.S.C. 722(a) to convert or exchange their insurance for the modified life plan.

2. Restores for 2 years after January 1, 1962, the eligibility of veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, to apply for national service life insurance.

3. Provides increases in the rates of service-connected disability compensation to reflect the cost-of-living increases. It increases the monthly rates payable to veterans of all wars and peacetime service who have service-connected disability rates between 10 and 100 percent or who are entitled to receive compensation at one of the higher statutory award rates, which presently run to a maximum of $450 or as much as $600 monthly if the veteran is entitled to the $450 rate, needs regular aid and attendance and is not being cared for in a Veterans' Administration hospital. Increases from 3 to 7 years the presumption of service connection for multiple sclerosis.

NSLI—Dividends

H.R. 4539—Public Law 87-223, September 13, 1961:

Authorizes payment of a special insurance dividend ranging from $100 to $150 to veterans who have national service life insurance of the RS or W varieties. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance with the premium rate increasing at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, the permanent plans being the usual ones available and the term insurance of this variety with rates also increasing at the end of each 5-year period.

The W insurance, created by Public Law 85-896, provided that holders of RS policies who wanted to could exchange for a new type insurance not renewable after age 50, but at greatly reduced cost. It also permitted conversion to permanent insurance for the 675,000 policyholders in these two categories. Approximately two-thirds converted from RS to W. The mortality table on which the RS insurance was calculated was considered to be reasonable at the time the insurance program was started for those veterans who served on or after June 27, 1950. The RS insurance has produced a surplus in the revolving fund of approximately $65 million and, while there is no legal requirement that a dividend be paid, equity demands it.

Thus, this bill provides for an immediate dividend to all holders of W insurance and to all holders of RS insurance who exchange or convert their policies within 2 years after enactment of the bill for W insurance. For those holders of RS insurance who do not elect to do this, the dividend will be payable at the time of their death if it occurs after November 1, 1960, and before expiration of the 2-year period.

Outpatient care—And war orphans

H.R. 3587—Public Law 87-377, approved October 4, 1961:

Provides for outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as similar treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Provides additional time within which certain children may complete a program of education under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. The class of eligibles afforded additional time is limited exclusively to persons whose opportunities for an education under the act have been impaired by virtue of their residence in the Republic of the Philippines. Additional time would be available to a person who had not reached his 23d birthday on June 29, 1956, and resided in the Philippines during all or part of the period June 29, 1956, through June 18, 1958.

Veterans' widows' compensation

H.R. 6969—Public Law 87-268, approved September 21, 1961:

The purpose of this bill is to make adjustments in the dependency and indemnity compensation rates for widows of veterans whose deaths are service connected.

Under present law widows eligible for service-connected death pensions are paid $112 monthly, plus 12 percent of the pay of the veteran according to rank and years of service. The lowest payment is $122 monthly and the highest $337.

A widow eligible for non-service-connected death pension, with less than $1,000 of annual income (and as many as five children) could receive payments of $135 monthly.

The change enables the Veterans' Administrator to pay a widow or child an amount equal to the greater amount which the beneficiary would have been entitled to under the pension program.

War veterans—Eligibility extended

H.R. 2953—Public Law 87-101, approved July 21, 1961:

Authorizes veterans to qualify for the 90-day service requirement for receiving a pension by adding together two or more separate periods of duty which might have occurred in World War I or II or in the Korean conflict. Such an addition would also benefit the widows and children of deceased veterans. As the law stands veterans may only add up periods of service occurring in one war.

ROLLCALL OR VOICE VOTES ON LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY SINCE JANUARY 20, 1961, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress and, to be exact, since the 20th of January, President Kennedy has submitted 203 recommendations or legislative guidelines to Congress. These proposals have been examined, considered, changed wherever necessary, and some actions postponed until next session in order to give more study to the problem.

Below is a recap of legislative action taken on these recommended guidelines. Following the recapitulation is a list of all the recommendations with a detailed analysis of all activity on each.

Recap

Total number of recommended guidelines submitted	203
Action completed	124
Partial action	1
Passed Senate	13
Passed House	2
Reported to Calendars	7
Hearings	31
No action	12
In conference	2
Postponed to next session	10
Rejected	1

Number of Presidential recommendations submitted and number upon which Congress completed action from 1953 through 1961

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Administration submitted	83	128	147	151	155	149	162	152	203
Action completed	58	60	77	101	67	84	79	67	124

Symbols:
S—State of Union.
SPM—Special message.
S—State of Union.
B 3-24—Kennedy budget message:
*—In accord with President's program.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961

AGRICULTURE

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
#1. Enact special feed grain program fo r 1961; provide that cooperators will be eligible for price supports on corn and other feed grains; and authorize a special agricultural conservation program under which acreage previously planted to feed grains will be diverted from production for 1961 (E/C)	X	X	X	X	52 to 26 (3-10)	209 to 202 (3-9).			PL 87-51; approved 3-22-61.
2. Extend the Sugar Act	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-29)	284 to 129 (3-21).			PL 87-15; approved 3-31-61.
3. Authorize $2 billion increase in title I authority of PL 480, to continue sale of surplus agricultural products for local currencies (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (4-24)	Voice (4-26)			PL 87-28; approved 5-4-61.
4. Amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 to establish national farmer advisory committees for every commodity or group of related commodities for which a new supply adjustment program is planned; place responsibility for considering and recommending individual commodity programs; and authorize payment of expenses for the members of these committees (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61 (modified).

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

AGRICULTURE

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
5. Amend Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders to be used for a wider range of commodities; provide more flexibility in dealing with commodities for which a national or area program may be devised; and permit, subject to the approval of producers and Congress, the establishment of quotas and allotments for individual producers (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128: approved 8-8-61 (modified).
6. Amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit supply adjustment through marketing quotas authorized either in quantitative terms or in terms of production for individual farm acreage allotments, subject to affirmative approval by producers and Congress (SpM 3-16)	X	X					X		
7. Modify the Agricultural Act of 1949 (price supports) to permit the method of supporting producer income most appropriate to the competitive and international position of the commodity (SpM 3-16)	X	X					X		
8. Provide that either House or Senate can veto within 60 days of the program's submission to Congress (SpM 3-16)	X	X					X		
9. Extend Agricultural Trade Development Act (PL 480); authorize title I sales at a higher level; and liberalize contributions of food and fiber to voluntary agencies for use abroad (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61.
10. Expand the school lunch program, with the increase going to the areas of high level of unemployment; and change the allocation formula to include the number of children who actually receive school lunches (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-20)	319 to 65 (6-6)			PL 87-112; approved 7-26-61.
11. Extend and improve the special school milk program (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-21)	Voice (6-26)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61.
12. Permit farmers' cooperatives to purchase, acquire, and build processing plants and related facilities and to merge with other cooperatives so long as such activities do not create a monopoly or substantially lessen competition (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X			X		
13. Accelerate, through a larger Federal grant, the present Federal-State cooperative assistance program to farm and small-forest owners for the application of scientific forestry techniques (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-122; approved 8-3-61.
14. Expand tree-planting funds to make productive 50 million acres that will not restock naturally and to increase the timber stand on another 100 million acres (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-122; approved 8-3-61.
15. Consolidate and improve the lending authorities of Farmers Home Administration (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61.
16. Increase protection against losses caused by fire, forest insects and tree diseases (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-122; approved 8-3-61.
17. Provide funds to accelerate the permanent soil conservation and small watershed programs (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-112; approved 7-26-61.
18. Authorize contracts under Great Plains conservation program to be entered into for period ending 12-31-71 (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61.
19. Extend Wool Act (SpM 3-16)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-26)	Voice (7-27)			PL 87-128; approved 8-8-61. (Extended 4 years.)
ANTICRIME									
20. Strengthen anti-crime laws*	X	X	X	X	Voice	Voice	(H.R. 408).		PL 87-197. PL 87-216. PL 87-218. PL 87-228. PL 87-368.
AVIATION									
21. Amend the Federal Airport Act to— (a) Extend the act through 6-30-65; (b) Authorize Federal matching grants to State and local authorities—$100 million a year for each of next 4 fiscal years; (c) Make available for use in that or any other State, at Administrator's discretion, any part of funds apportioned to particular States which are not used or obligated in fiscal year for which authorized; (d) Provide that no project be approved which does not include installation of landing aids for safe and efficient operation; (e) Prohibit use of Federal funds for any part of an airport building except space for an activity directly related to safety; (f) Permit Federal participation in approved projects as follows: Up to 75 percent of certain costs relating to landing aids, and up to 50 percent of other allowable costs such as clear cones, runways, and taxiways; (g) Treat Alaska and Hawaii on same basis as all other States. (Letter to Vice President 4-24.) H.R. 8102	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-1)	Voice (8-1)			PL 87-255, app. Sept. 20, 1961.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

CIVIL RIGHTS

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
22. Extend Civil Rights Commission*	X	X	X	X	70 to 19 (8-30)	300 to 106 (9-13).			PL 87-264, approved 9-21-61.
23. Outlaw poll tax—Constitutional amendment*: S.J. Res. 58, 81, H.J. Res. 404	X	X							
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST									
24. Enact Executive Employees' Standards Act which would— (a) Close gaps in existing laws and eliminate differences in treatment; (b) Overrule existing judicial interpretation that *only* when money is involved is a former government employee prohibited from working for a private interest in a matter for which he once had governmental responsibility; (c) Establish special standards for part-time skilled Federal employees to permit them to continue their private business if there is no direct conflict between the public and private work; (d) Permit agency heads to adopt implementing regulations and impose disciplinary measures; (e) Include District of Columbia government and its employees; (f) Require each agency, within 120 days to issue codes governing ex parte contacts within the agency specifying particular standards to be applied in each type proceeding; (g) Provide penalties and appropriate sanctions for violations of such codes (SpM 4-27). S. 1902, H.R. 8140		X		X		Voice (8-7)			
DEFENSE									
25. Expand and accelerate Polaris program—authorize construction of 10 more submarines for 1962 plus 10 for 1961 (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-15)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-53; approved 6-21-61.
26. Increase Minuteman and Skybolt missile programs—$96 million and $46 million, respectively (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
27. Increase airborne alert budget by $44.6 million (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
28. Reenact sec. 512(b) granting discretionary authority to provide cost of airborne alert as deficiency expense (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
29. Accelerate Midas warning program by adding $60 million in new obligational authority (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
30. Strengthen capacity to meet limited and guerrilla warfare (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
31. Expand research on nonnuclear weapons—additional $122 million in new obligational authority (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
32. Expand airlift capacity—additional $172 million in new obligational authority (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-15)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-53; approved 6-21-61.
33. Increase procurement for limited war capabilities—$230 million in new obligational authority (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-15)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-53; approved 6-21-61.
34. Increase manpower by 13,000 men (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
35. Decrease B-70 bomber program by $138 million (SpM 3-28)	X	X					X		
36. Military construction authorization: (*)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-9)	411 to 0 (3-23)			PL 87-57; approved 6-27-61.
37. Military procurement authorization (SpM 3-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-15)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-53; approved 6-21-61.
38. AEC authorization, and include construction of new $114 million linear electron accelerator (B 3-24)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-18)	Voice (7-13)			PL 87-315; approved 9-26-61.
39. Appropriate an additional $100 million for the Army to procure new helicopters, armored personnel carriers, new howitzers, etc. (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
40. Appropriate additional $60 million for increase in Marine Corps strength to 190,000 men (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
41. Triple the $104 million request for OCDM (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-141 and 144.
42. Authorize the President to order units and members in Ready Reserves to active duty for not more than 12 months (E/C 7-26)	X	X	X	X	75 to 0 (7-28)	403 to 2 (7-31)			PL 87-117; approved 8-1-61.
43. Authorize additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces (E/C 7-26)	X	X	X	X	81 to 0 (7-28)	406 to 0 (8-2)			PL 87-118; approved 8-3-61.
44. Appropriate an additional $3,456,600,000 for defense, making total of $47.5 billion (E/C 7-26)	X	X	X	X	85 to 0 (8-4)	412 to 0 (6-28)			PL 87-144; approved 8-17-61.
45. Authorize immediately the Cooperation Agreement with Republic of France (9-7-61) H.J. Res. 569	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-20)	Voice (9-19)			PL 87-363; approved 10-4-61.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
46. Amend National Cultural Act to enlarge building site: *S. 516, H.R. 988									
47. Enabling legislation for ratification of 23d amendment—District of Columbia right to vote in Presidential elections	X	X	X	X	66 to 6 (9-19)	Voice (8-14)			PL 87-389; approved 10-4-61.
48. Provide for an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to House for District of Columbia (draft 7-14): S. 2342, H.R. 8178									
ECONOMIC									
49. Extend duration of Federal unemployment compensation (SpM 2-2)	X	X	X	X	84 to 4 (3-16)	392 to 30 (3-1)			PL 87-6; approved 3-24-61.
50. Extend duration of railroad unemployment compensation*	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-16)	Voice (3-6)			PL 87-7; approved 3-24-61.
51. Authorize Federal participation in aid to dependent children program (SpM 2-2)	X	X	X	X	Voice (4-20)	Voice (3-10)			PL 87-31; approved 5-8-61.
52. Improve the permanent unemployment compensation program (SpM 2-2, E/C 6-14): S. 2084, H.R. 7640									
53. Enact an area redevelopment program (SpM 2-2)	X	X	X	X	63 to 27 (3-15)	250 to 166 (3-29).			PL 87-27; approved 5-1-61.
54. Improve the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program: (a) Raise minimum monthly benefit for retired worker from $33 to $43 a month; (b) Improve retirement protection by paying actuarially reduced benefits to men at 62; (c) Reduce required coverage to 1 quarter out of every 4; (d) Increase widow's benefit from 75 percent to 85 percent of husband's monthly benefit; (e) Broaden disability insurance protection to include workers totally disabled for 6 months; (f) Finance improved benefits by adding ¼ of 1 percent each to employer's and employee's contributions beginning 1-1-63 (SpM 2-2)	X	X	X	X	90 to 0 (6-26)	400 to 14 (4-20)			PL 87-64; approved 6-30-61.
55. Increase debt limit (present ceiling of $293 billion expires 6-30) (B 3-24)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-29)	231 to 148 (6-26).			PL 87-69; approved 6-30-61.
56. Expand lending capacity of SBA (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	Voice	Voice			PL 87-198; PL 87-305.
EDUCATION									
57. Enact Federal aid to education bill which would authorize 3-year program of general assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries—$666 million for first year rising to $866 over 3-year period (SpM 2-20): S. 1021	X	X	X	X	49 to 34 (5-25)				
58. Extend payments to local school districts in areas of Federal impact, at about half the existing rates (letter to Johnson-Rayburn 2-27): S. 2393	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-12)	342 to 18 (9-18)			PL 87-344; approved 10-4-61.
59. Authorize $250 million annual 5-year extension of current college housing loan program to meet Government's share of residential housing for students and faculty, with additional lending authority for 1961 (SpM 2-20)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION									
60. Authorize annual $300 million 5-year long-term, low-interest-rate loan program for construction, renovation, and modernization of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures for higher institutions, public and private (SpM 2-20): S. 1241, H.R. 8900	X	X	X	X					
61. Authorize $26,250,000 5-year State-administered program of scholarships to supplement present programs of financial assistance to talented and needy students (SpM 2-20): S. 1241, H.R. 8900	X	X	X	X					
62. Extend and improve the National Defense Education Act (E/C 4-26): S. 2393	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-12)	342 to 18 (9-18)			PL 87-344; approved 10-4-61.
63. Provide funds for Indian schools (B 3-24)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-122; approved 8-3-61.
64. Educational TV:* S. 205, H.R. 132	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-21)				
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES									
65. Increase supergrades	X	X	X	X	Voice 9-20-61	305 to 53 (9-18)			PL 87-367; approved 10-4-61.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

GOLD RESERVE

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
66. Amend Federal Reserve Act to establish separate maxima for interest rates paid by member banks on time and savings deposits held in this country by foreign governments or monetary authorities (SpM 2-6): S. 1413, H.R. 6900		X							
67. Unify tax treatment on earning assets of foreign central banks (SpM 2-6): H.R. 5189	X	X	X	X	Voice (4-18)	Voice (3-21)			PL 87-29; approved 5-4-61.
68. Reduce from $500 to $100 duty-free allowance (SpM 2-6): H.R. 6611	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-14)	Voice (5-17)			PL 87-132; approved 8-10-61.
69. Establish International Travel Service in Department of Commerce (SpM 2-6)	X	X	X	X	Voice (2-20)	305 to 104 (5-17).			PL 87-63; approved 6-29-61.
HEALTH									
70. Enact health insurance program under social security program—for 65 years and over—eligible for social security or railroad requirement (SpM 2-9): S. 809, H.R. 4222		X							
71. Aid to medical education (SpM 2-9): S 1072, H.R. 4999	X								
72. Expand and improve community health facilities (SpM 2-9)	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-1-61)	Voice (7-25)			PL 87-395; approved 10-5-61.
73. Enable Public Health Service to create a Bureau of Community Health (SpM 2-9): S. 2269									
74. Establish with National Institutes of Health a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, including a Center for Research in Child Health (SpM 2-9) (draft 7-19): S. 2269									
75. Increase appropriations for maternal and child welfare grant-in-aid program, crippled children grant-in-aid program, and vocational rehabilitation program (SpM 2-9)	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-3)	Voice (5-17)			PL 87-290; approved 9-22-61.
76. Authorize grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements for research relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services (draft 7-19) (E/C): S 2273									
77. Appropriate $1 million for oral polio vaccine (E/C 3-13)	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-27)	Voice (3-7)			PL 87-14; approved 3-31-61.
78. Authorize additional Assistant Secretaries for HEW (draft 4-18): S. 2073	X	X	X		Voice (7-27)				
79. Appropriate $3,515,000 additional for new research facilities (water and air pollution) (SpM 6-14)	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-2)	Voice (5-17)			PL 87-290; approved 9-22-61.
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION									
80. Transfer financing of forest and public land highways to Highway Trust Fund (SpM 2-28)	X	X					X		
81. Increase authorization for regular A-B-C systems of primary, secondary, and urban roads by $25 million every 2 years beginning in 1964 until the $1 billion level is reached and maintained (present $925 million) (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X		Voice (5-4)	X		
82. Amend Federal Highway Act to require aid in finding reasonable housing at reasonable costs for persons displaced from their homes by future Federal aid highway projects (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)				PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
83. Extend outdoor advertising control and increase incentive bonus from ½ percent to 1 percent of the State's interstate highway allotment (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
84. Retain revenues from aviation fuels tax in the general fund rather than diverting to highway trust fund (SpM's 2-28, 4-20)	X	X					X		
85. Continue present gas tax of 4 cents a gallon scheduled to be reduced to 3 cents 7-1-61 (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
86. Increase diesel fuel tax from 4 cents to 7 cents (SpM 2-28)	X	X					X		
87. Increase tax on trucks over 26,000 pounds from $1.50 per 1,000 pounds to $5 (SpM 2-28): (increased to $3)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61
88. Increase tax on highway tires from 8 cents to 10 cents (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
89. Increase tax on inner tubes from 9 cents to 10 cents (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
90. Increase tax on tread rubber from 3 cents to 10 cents (SpM 2-28): (increased to 5 cents)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)	Voice (5-4)			PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
91. Prevent diversion of $800 million from excise taxes to take effect 7-1-61, from general fund to highway trust fund (SpM 2-28)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-15)				PL 87-61; approved 6-29-61.
92. Provide increased Federal assistance to State and local governments in planning new or improved mass transportation facilities (E/C 6-20)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

HOUSING

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
MODERATE INCOME GROUPS									
93. Expand FHA insurance of no-downpayment, 40-year mortgages—now available only to families displaced by governmental action—to include, on a temporary and experimental basis, *any family*, with amendments to make these mortgages more attractive to private investors (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	47 to 42 (6-8)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
94. Enact new program of long-term, low interest rate loans for rental and cooperative housing, financed from the special assistance fund of FNMA, and processed and supervised by FHA (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
LOW INCOME GROUPS									
95. Authorize construction of 100,000 additional low-rent units by removing present limitation on use of remaining authorization in Housing Act of 1949 for public housing (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
96. Broaden low-income housing provisions to provide maximum flexibility for local communities to fulfill their particular requirements; increase freedom for local housing authorities in establishing priorities for admission of tenants and in determining design, and a program of demonstration grants to afford communities greater opportunity to experiment in the field of housing for low income families (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
HOUSING FOR ELDERLY									
97. Increase present direct loan authorization for housing for elderly from $50 million to $100 million; 50,000 units of low rent public housing earmarked specifically for low income elderly persons and families; increase cost limitation by $500 per room, and authorize an additional subsidy of up to $10 per month for each housing unit (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
REVITALIZE URBAN AND METROPOLITAN AREAS									
98. Give local communities wider discretion in determining renewal areas (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
99. Provide new authorizations totaling $2.5 billion over 4-year period for urban renewal (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
100. Liberalize Federal allowances for relocation payments to displaced businessmen whenever the localities are prepared to share in larger compensations (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
101. Authorize FHA to insure a wide variety of loans for home improvement purposes in urban renewal areas (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
102. Enact legislation permitting resale of existing housing in urban renewal areas at realistic prices for rehabilitation (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
103. Increase authorization from $20 million to $100 million and increase Federal share of planning grants to ⅔ (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
LAND RESERVES									
104. Authorize $100 million to initiate a program of 20 percent grants to help public bodies finance reservation of land—by acquisition or other means—as permanent urban open space in form of parks and other facilities, and for urban renewal loans to help local agencies finance acquisition of open space for future public or private development (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X		235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61 (modified).
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND URBAN TRANSPORTATION									
105. Authorize an additional $50 million for public facility loans (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
RURAL HOUSING									
106. Extend for an additional 5 years, from 6-30-61, loan authority of Secretary of Agriculture for farm home improvements; and permit these loans to be secured either by mortgage or other acceptable form of security (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
VETERANS' HOUSING									
107. Extend and provide additional funds for veterans' direct home loan program (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-26)	Voice (4-13)			PL 87-84; approved 7-6-61.
108. Extend veterans' guaranteed home loan program (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-26)	Voice (4-13)			PL 87-84; approved 7-6-61.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

HOUSING—Continued

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
DEMONSTRATION, TRAINING, AND RESEARCH									
109. Appropriate funds for market analysis and statistics needed by private industry and for research into housing and urban problems (SpM 3-9)					64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
110. Enact special FHA insurance authorization to help finance tests and demonstration of new approaches to home design and construction in an effort to reduce costs in home building (SpM 3-9)	X	X	X	X	64 to 25 (6-12)	235 to 178 (6-22).			PL 87-70; approved 6-30-61.
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS									
111. Establish new Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs in executive (SpM 3-9): S. 1633, H.R. 8429	X	X	X	X					
INTERNATIONAL									
112. Revise Battle Act (S, E/C 2-22): S. 1215	X	X	X		43 to 36 (5-11)				
113. Appropriate the $500 million authorized (1960) for economic aid in Latin America, and $100 million for Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program (SpM 3-14)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-9)	330 to 82 (4-25)			PL 87-41; approved 5-27-61.
114. Establish permanent Peace Corps (pilot program set up by Executive order) (SpM 3-1)	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-25)	287 to 97 (9-15)			PL 87-293; approved 9-22-61.
115. Authorize a new, 5-year foreign aid program providing for (SpM 3-22, 5-25)—									
(a) Giving special attention to nations most willing and able to mobilize their resources, make necessary reforms, and engage in long range planning;									
(b) Consolidate all U.S. foreign aid programs under new Federal agency;									
(c) Place fieldwork under direction of a single mission chief in each country reporting to American Ambassador;									
(d) Provide new agency with 5-year authorization to make long-term, low-interest or interest-free development loans, repayable in dollars;									
(e) Direct Secretary of State to coordinate military assistance program, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Fund for Social Progress and international organization activities with economic aid;									
(f) Provide that annual appropriations be available until spent;									
(g) Appropriate $1.5 billion to finance the part of economic aid that is unsuitable for development loans;									
(h) Appropriate $700 million for long-term development loans, repayable in dollars;									
(i) Provide $1.6 billion for long-term loans for each of succeeding 4 years;									
(j) Make available for long-term loans the unappropriated dollar funds now coming in in repayment of principal and interest on previous loans to foreign governments;									
(k) Appropriate $1.885 billion for military assistance;									
(l) Include military assistance in Defense budget	X	X	X	X	66 to 24 (8-18)	287 to 140(8-18)			PL 87-195; approved 9-4-61.
116. Authorize use of $2.5 million in Egyptian currency earned under PL 480 as the U.S. contribution to UNESCO for removal of lesser Egyptian temples to be inundated by construction of Aswan High Dam; and authorize use of $1.5 million in Egyptian currency earned under PL 480 for grants to U.S. archeological groups for research prior to inundation of Nile Valley area (letter to VP 4-6): (Funds only)									
117. Increase USIA funds to $121 million (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-31)	256 to 71 (6-1)			PL 87-264; approved 9-21-61.
118. Enable United States to participate in resettlement of certain refugees (E/C 7-24): H.R. 8291	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-15)	Voice (9-6-61)		X	
119. Establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	73 to 14 (9-8)	290 to 54 (9-19)			PL 87-297; approved 9-26-61.
JUDICIARY									
120. Create 59 additional Federal judgeships (E/C 2-13): S. 912	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-3)	336 to 76 (4-19)			PL 87-36; approved 5-19-61.
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY									
121. Enact program to combat juvenile delinquency*	X	X	X	X	Voice (4-12)	Voice (8-30)			PL 87-274, approved 9-22-61.

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

LABOR

[Symbols: SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
122. Extend coverage and increase minimum wage (SpM 2-2)	X	X	X	X	65 to 28 (4-20)	340 to 78 (3-24)			PL 87-30; approved 5-5-61.
123. Provide an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor (E/C 5-4): S. 1815, H.R. 6882	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-27)	Voice (8-9)			PL 87-137; approved 8-11-61.
124. Amend Pension Plans Disclosure Act to strengthen enforcement (E/C 5-19): S. 1944, H.R. 8723	X	X	X	X					
125. Enact new manpower development and training program (SpM 5-25): S. 1991, H.R. 8390	X	X	X	X	60 to 31 (8-23)				
126. Youth Employment Opportunities Act (sent to VP 6-7): S. 404, H.R. 8354	X	X	X	X					
NATURAL RESOURCES									
127. Enact wilderness protection measure (SpM 2-23): S. 174	X		X		78 to 8 (9-6)				
128. Establish seashore recreation area at Cape Cod (SpM 2-23)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-27)	278 to 82 (7-10).			PL 87-126; approved 8-7-61.
129. Establish Padre Island as seashore recreation area (SpM 2-23): S. 4	X								
130. Establish Reyes Point as seashore recreation area (SpM 2-23): H.R. 2775, S. 476	X	X	X		Voice (9-7)				
131. Authorize studies of additional seashore recreation areas (SpM 2-23): S. 543, H.R. 5013	X	X		X	Voice (8-28)				
132. Authorize 10-year oceanographic program of $97,501,000 for fiscal 1962 (SpM 2-23): S. 901, H.R. 4276	X	X	X		50 to 32 (7-28)				
133. Enable the Coast Guard to engage in oceanographic research (letter 3-29)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-12)	Voice (6-5)			PL 87-396; approved 10-5-61.
134. Accelerate forest development on Federal public lands (SpM 2-23)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-7)	Voice (4-18)			PL 87-122; approved 8-3-61.
135. Establish planning commissions for all major river basins where adequate coordinated plans are not in existence (SpM 2-23): S. 2246, H.R. 8177 (draft 7-14)	X		(H.J. Res. 225—Partial accomplishment)						PL 87-328; approved 9-27-61.
136. Authorize reservation of known future reservoir sites by operating agency whenever necessary (SpM 2-23): H.R. 5261									
137. Extend and increase water pollution control (SpM 2-23)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-21)	307 to 110 (5-3)			PL 87-88; approved 7-20-61.
138. Extend air pollution control (SpM 2-23): S. 455	X		X		Voice (9-20)				
139. Extend and double current saline water conversion program (SpM 2-23)	X	X	X	X	Voice (8-31)	Voice (8-21)			PL 87-295; approved 9-22-61.
140. Provide uniform cost-sharing standards between Federal and local agencies on local flood-protection projects (SpM 2-23): S. 2246, H.R. 8177 (draft 7-14)	X								
141. Authorize HEW to conduct research as to quality of waters of Great Lakes and means of solving water pollution problems (SpM 2-23)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-21)	307 to 110 (5-3)			PL 87-88; approved 7-20-61.
POSTAL MATTERS									
142. Adjust postal rates to raise $843 million additional in postal revenue (B 3-24): S. 2382, H.R. 7927		X		X					
PRESIDENCY									
143. Protect succession to the Presidency by making existing law governing threats against and protection for person next in line for Presidency, apply to Vice-President-elect or if the Vice President has succeeded to the Presidency, the one next in line to him; authorize full-time Secret Service protection for VP; and authorize Secret Service protection for a former President for 6 months after he leaves office (letter to VP 4-24): S. 519, H.R. 6691	X	X	X	X		Voice (7-17)			
REORGANIZATION									
144. Reinstate authority to reorganize executive branch (priority list 2-21)	X	X	X	X	Voice (2-6)	Voice (3-29)			PL 87-18; approved 4-7-61.
145. Establish Commission on Presidential Office Space (B 3-24): S. 51	X		X		Voice (7-7)				
146. Fix term of agency chairmen at pleasure of President, and provide that he be responsible to the President (SpM 4-13)		X							
147. Authorize FPC to exempt from rate regulation up to 100 percent of the small individual producers of natural gas (under 2 billion cubic feet per year) whose sales in interstate commerce to pipelines account for only 10 percent of the total (SpM 4-13): H.R. 7575									
148. Authorize FPC to exempt from hearings applications by interstate pipeline companies to enlarge, extend, or replace facilities to benefit existing customers, which do not involve indiscriminate invasion of another pipeline territory (SpM 4-13): H.R. 7575									
149. Increase FPC membership from 5 to 7 (SpM 4-13): H.R. 7575									

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

REORGANIZATION—Continued

[*Symbols:* SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
150. Authorize FPC and any other ratemaking regulatory agency to require deposits (in escrow) to be returned to the consumer if the rate increase is ultimately disallowed (SpM 4-13): H.R. 7575									
151. Amend sec. II of the Administrative Procedure Act to remove the requirement that hearing examiners receive compensation in accordance with the Classification Act—instead prescribe salaries equivalent to a grade GS-16 (SpM 4-13)	X	X					X		
152. Reorganization Plan I-SEC (SpM 4-27): S. 2135 passed in lieu of	X		X		Voice (9-1)				
153. Reorganization Plan II-FCC (SpM 4-27) S. 2034 enacted in lieu of	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-27)	Voice (8-3)			PL 87-192, approved 8-31-61.
154. Reorganization Plan III-CAB (SpM 5-3)	X	X	X	X					Plan III, effective 7-3-61.
155. Reorganization Plan IV—FTC (SpM 5-9)	X	X	X	X					Plan IV, effective 7-9-61.
156. Reorganization Plan V—NLRB (SpM 5-24)	X	X	X	X					Plan V, rejected by House 7-20.
157. Reorganization Plan VI—Federal Home Loan Bank Board (SpM 6-12)	X	X	X	X					Plan VI, effective 8-12-61.
158. Reorganization Plan VII—Maritime functions (SpM 6-12)	X	X	X	X					Plan VII, effective 8-12.
159. Remove the ceiling on appropriations for salaries for members, staff, and other employees of Council of Economic Advisers (letter to VP 3-30)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-26)	Voice (5-11)			PL 87-49, approved 6-16-61.
160. Authorize additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce (*): S. 1456, H.R. 6360	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-26)				
161. Authorize FTC to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders (SpM 8-31): S. 2552, H.R. 1233, H.R. 1817		X							
SPACE									
162. Authorize $1,235,300,000 for NASA (E/C 3-29): H.R. 6874	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-29)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-98; approved 7-21-61.
163. Amend sec. 201 of NASA Act to permit VP to chair Space Council (E/C 4-10)	X	X	X	X	Voice (4-20)	Voice (4-19)			PL 87-26; approved 4-25-61.
164. Provide an additional $679 million for space programs (SpM 5-25)	X	X	X	X	Voice (5-29)	Voice (5-24)			PL 87-98; approved 7-21-61.
TAXES									
165. Enact an investment tax incentive in form of a tax credit of 15 percent of all new plant and equipment investment expenditures in excess of current depreciation allowances; 6 percent of such expenditures below this level but in excess of 50 percent of depreciation allowances; with 10 percent on the first $5,000 of new investment as a minimum credit (SpM 4-20, 5-25)		X							
166. Permit tax credit to be taken as offset against firm's tax liability up to overall limitation of 30 percent in any one year (SpM 4-20)		X							
167. Limit credit to new plant and equipment, assets located in United States and with a life of 6 years or more (SpM 4-20)		X							
168. Exclude from tax credit public utilities investment except transportation and investment in residential construction (SpM 4-20)		X							
169. Provide that, after a 2-step transitional period, American corporations be taxed each year on their current share of the undistributed profits realized in that year by subsidiary corporations organized in economically advanced countries (SpM 4-20)		X							
170. Repeal tax deferral privileges for individual shareholders of closely held corporations in economically advanced countries abroad (SpM 4-20)		X							
171. Eliminate "tax haven" device anywhere in world, even in underdeveloped countries, by eliminating tax deferral privileges for activities such as trading, licensing, insurance and others which seek out tax haven methods of operation (SpM 4-20)		X							
172. Eliminate tax benefits derived from investment companies abroad and treat the income derived through such foreign investment companies in the same way as income from domestic investment companies (SpM 4-20)		X							
173. Terminate the total tax exemption now accorded the earned income of American citizens residing abroad in economically advanced countries (SpM 4-20)		X							
174. Limit exemption for earned income to $20,000 for those residing in less-developed countries (SpM 4-20)		X							
175. Terminate the earned income exemption of $20,000 now accorded citizens who stay (but do not reside) abroad for 17 out of 18 months and are living or traveling in economically advanced countries (SpM 4-20)		X							
176. Terminate the exclusion from the estate tax accorded real property abroad (SpM 4-20)		X							

Rollcall or voice votes on legislative recommendations submitted by the President, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Jan. 20 to Sept. 27, 1961—Con.

TAXES—Continued

[*Symbols:* SpM—Special message; B 3-24—Kennedy budget; *—In accord; E/C—Executive communication; S—State of Union]

Recommendations	Progress								
	Hearings		Reported		Final passage vote		Postponed to next session	In conference	Final action
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House			
177. Correct double credit allowance for foreign income taxes on dividends (SpM 4-20)		X							
178. Repeal exclusion of first $50 of dividends from taxable income (SpM 4-20)		X							
179. Repeal 4-percent dividend tax credit on dividend income in excess of $50 (SpM 4-20)		X							
180. Provide a 20-percent withholding rate on corporate dividends and taxable investment type interest, effective 1-1-62, under a system which would not require preparation of withholding statements to be sent to recipients (SpM 4-20)		X							
181. Disallow business entertainment and maintenance of entertainment facilities such as yachts as tax deduction (SpM 4-20)		X							
182. Impose restrictions on deductibility of business gifts, expenses of business trips combined with vacations, and excessive personal living expenses incurred on business travel away from home (SpM 4-20)		X							
183. Withdraw capital gains treatment from gains on disposition of depreciable property, both personal and real, to extent that depreciation has been deducted for such property by seller in previous years, permitting only excess of sales price over original cost to be treated as capital gains. (Treat remainder as ordinary income.) (SpM 4-20)		X							
184. Clarify the law as to cooperatives and financial institutions so that all earnings are taxable to either the cooperatives or to their patrons (SpM 4-20)		X							
185. Apply withholding tax to cooperative patronage dividends or refunds in scrip or cash (SpM 4-20)		X							
186. Continue tax exemption for rural electric cooperatives and credit unions (SpM 4-20)		X							
187. Extend present net 2-cent rate on aviation gas to jet fuels, hold this uniform rate at the 2-cent level for fiscal 1962, and then provide annual increments of ½ cent after fiscal 1962 until the portion of the cost of the airways allocable to civil aviation is recovered by this tax: (SpM 4-20)		X							
188. Authorize use of taxpayer account numbers beginning 1-1-62, to identify taxpayer accounts throughout the processing and recordkeeping operations of IRS (SpM 4-20)	X	X	X	X	Voice (9-26)	Voice (9-7)			PL 87-397; approved 10-5-61.
189. Appropriation $34.4 million for IRS to employ 4,265 additional personnel for audit coverage (SpM 4-20)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-1)	Voice (3-28)			PL 87-159; approved 8-21-61.
190. Extend present corporation income and excise tax rates scheduled for reduction or termination on 7-1-61 (SpM 4-20)	X	X	X	X	Voice (6-21)	295 to 88 (6-8)			PL 87-72; approved 6-30-31.
TREATIES									
191. Ratify U.S. membership in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (SpM 2-6): Executive E	X		X		72 to 18				Ratified 3-1-61.
192. Ratify tax treaty with Canada (SpM 3-12): Executive G	X		X						
193. Ratify German dollar bonds validation agreement: Executive D	X		X		86 to 5				Ratified 5-4-61.
194. Ratify Convention on Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil: Executive C	X		X		92 to 0				Ratified 5-16-61.
195. Ratify modification of International Load Line Convention (SpM 3-27): Executive I	X		X		92 to 0				Ratified 5-16-61.
196. Ratify Treaty of Extradition With Brazil (SpM 3-27): Executive H	X		X		92 to 0				Ratified 5-16-61.
197. Ratify Columbia River Joint Development Treaty With Canada (SpM 2-23): Executive C	X		X		90 to 1				Ratified 3-16-61.
198. Ratify Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation With Belgium (SpM 4-10): Executive J	X		X		83 to 0				Ratified 9-11-61.
199. Ratify Geneva Radio Regulations: Executive I	X		X		66 to 0				Ratified 9-25-61.
200. Ratify Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations Between United States and Republic of Vietnam (SpM 5-29): Executive L	X		X		83 to 0				Ratified 9-11-61.
201. Ratify International Telecommunications Convention with annexes: Executive J	X		X		66 to 0				Ratified 9-25-61.
VETERANS									
202. Enact a selective increase in compensation rates for veterans with severe service-connected disabilities to offset rises in cost of living, and to adjust rates in some categories which are out of line (B 3-24): H.R. 879 (H.R. 856)	X	X	X	X	Voice (7-17)	Voice (6-5)		X	
203. Restore President Eisenhower to his military rank of General of the Army (SpM 3-1)	X	X	X	X	Voice (3-7)	Voice (3-14)			PL 87-3; approved 3-22-61.

Address by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, at Statewide Democratic Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Rhode Island Democrats were treated to an extraordinarily fine speech by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, at their annual meeting at Rocky Point, R.I., on Sunday, September 17, 1961. As my colleagues know, September 17 marked the 174th anniversary of the adoption of our Constitution. Although Rhode Island was the last of the Original Thirteen Colonies to adopt the Constitution, we yield to no one in our devotion to the great principles enunciated in the Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it was particularly appropriate that Governor Welsh chose to dwell on the necessity for zealous protection of individual rights and freedoms in the State founded by Roger Williams.

Governor Welsh rightfully called attention to the danger from those in our midst, who in the name of anticommunism, seek to undermine the basic liberties of free speech and association which we are seeking to preserve and strengthen in contrast to the Communist system of thought control and dictatorship.

I was particularly struck by the following passage in Governor Welsh's address:

The howling jackals of suspicion who talk big and think small, who accuse of treason Americans with whom they disagree, and who slander their neighbors with cowardly whispers of disloyalty, are no better than the Communists they oppose vocally. And they are equally a menace to human rights and freedom. For they are within our gates, they walk among us in trust, and yet would destroy the shield of freedom that protects them as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Welsh's address be printed in the RECORD so that the Congress and the public may have the benefit of his profound observations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. MATTHEW E. WELSH, OF INDIANA, AT A STATEWIDE DEMOCRATIC RALLY SPONSORED BY THE RHODE ISLAND DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE AND THE RHODE ISLAND YOUNG DEMOCRATS AT ROCKY POINT, R.I., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1961

Governor Notte, Senator Pastore, Senator Pell, Congressman Fogarty, Congressman St. Germain, Chairman McWeeney, distinguished guests, friends, it may seem that I have come a long way to be with you today. And perhaps I have, but Indiana is not as far from here as the map indicates, if we are to believe your neighbor—Connecticut.

For early in the history of our Nation, Connecticut claimed the northern fourth of Indiana, along with a sizable portion of other States en route to us. Had this claim been accepted, I would not be here today—at least not as Governor—for we would not now have the Democratic strongholds of Gary, East Chicago, and South Bend. And in Indiana and the Midwest, a Democrat has very few votes to spare.

But I did not accept your invitation in order to discuss partisan politics with you as enjoyable as that may be here in a solidly Democratic State. Your State is noted for its zealous protection of individual rights and freedoms.

And in a very real sense, America's liberty began here in Rhode Island. Your forefathers declared their freedom from British rule 2 months to the day before the Thirteen Colonies jointly proclaimed the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia. If liberty was born in the "City of Brotherly Love" in Pennsylvania, it was conceived in Rhode Island.

Since the days of Roger Williams, Rhode Island has been noted for its hospitality to those not in the majority: The Quakers, the Jews, the Catholics, and the Baptists—whose first church in America was built at Providence—and the Irish and Italians. Since its founding, Rhode Island has stood for the individual's right to be free, for his freedom of conscience, freedom to worship God as he sees fit, freedom to think and speak and write as he chooses, and freedom to act.

These freedoms are being challenged today by the Communist conspiracy abroad and attacked at home by those who direct their venom at their fellow countrymen and see treason in differences.

Whether the challenge is a Communist thrust in the Congo, a revolution 90 miles off our shores, a tottering regime in Laos, or desperate peasants in Brazil—the basic issue remains the same, freedom—the inalienable right of a man to be free.

Yet in this struggle, when the choice of the uncommitted is between the Soviet Union and the United States as the spokesman for freedom; America has not been the overwhelming selection. Why has this been so? I do not pretend to know, but it is obvious that these nations do not see us as we see ourselves.

Are we today less able or less willing to advance the cause of liberty than were our forefathers who fanned the flickering embers of freedom into a roaring blaze that less than two centuries ago cast its first light throughout the world?

Do we today have any less the sense of mission, of urgency—yes, even of destiny—than did those men at Providence who declared Rhode Island free of British tyranny and backed up their words with action?

Today marks the 174th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States by the convention at Philadelphia, the Constitution which has served as a bulwark of freedom and a model for many peoples seeking to protect their rights against the tyranny of the past.

While Rhode Island was the first of the colonies to declare its freedom, it was the last to accept willingly the yoke of a new government—its reluctance perhaps founded on fear for the rights of the individual citizen—a fear of trading the devil it knew, for the devil it didn't. This skepticism was good and healthy.

We now know, whether we live in Rhode Island or Indiana or Hawaii, that the choice was right, that through law, through our Constitution, through an orderly conduct of society not subject to the capricious whims of temporary leaders, lies our best guarantee of freedom.

And this is why we are so much concerned with methods and means, with procedures of law. For history has taught us, if it has taught us nothing else, that man's bitter and bloody struggle to be free is for the most part a battle for freedom from oppressive methods and means.

Justice Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court has enumerated a bare handful of these procedures around which have swirled the age-old battles: The right to be free from torture and hated oaths; the right to trial by jury; the right to confront the accuser face to face, and the right to know the charge and have a fair opportunity to defend ourselves.

And the Justice points out that our principles, our articles of faith, include our freedom to speak and to write freely, to worship God as we choose, the sanctity of conscience, the right to be let alone, and government only by consent of the governed.

These rights, these procedures, were hammered out on the anvil of time in the blistering heat of the forge of war. Are our arms now less strong, our eyes less keen, and our hearts less willing to defend these rights at home, where we won them first, or abroad, where the challenge is more open?

Almost three decades ago, one of the free world's greatest and most respected leaders, Franklin Roosevelt, said, "To some generations, much is given. From some generations, much is expected. This generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

These words are truer now than when our President first spoke them to a nation reeling under the impact of economic collapse and desperate with fear and doubt. For today we are engaged in the terminal struggle with those who would destroy individual rights in the name of a higher good.

But make no mistake about it, while international communism in whatever guise it may appear is our principal and strongest antagonist, there are others here in America and scattered throughout the world no less destructive of individual rights and freedoms. It is the evil attacking the rights of man that we have opposed throughout our history, and that we oppose so violently today, not the label it wears.

The howling jackals of suspicion who talk big and think small, who accuse of treason Americans with whom they disagree, and who slander their neighbors with cowardly whispers of disloyalty, are no better than the Communists they oppose vocally. And they are equally a menace to human rights and freedom. For they are within our gates, they walk among us in trust, and yet would destroy the shield of freedom that protects them as well.

These men and women go by a variety of names, and band together in packs sometimes public, but quite often secret and semisecret. They see our struggle with the ideology of the Communist world in the terms of a schoolyard fight, and they urge solutions as unrealistic and oversimplified as their premise.

That they have a right to their beliefs and the full expression of them, we cannot and would not deny, so long as their advocacy is not destructive of the freedom of others.

Yet a leader of one of these organizations has announced publicly that his group will use every device and trick of the Communists, every front organization possible, to attack those whom in his belief are disloyal to his ideals. Germany and Italy have gone through such sad experiences with these so-called superpatriots who pervert the ideals of a great Nation to the mean and twisted fancies of a fanatic fringe.

A policy advanced in good faith by officials is attacked as part of the Communist conspiracy. Departments of government are labeled as untrustworthy and leading us into the hands of Communists. Not content to differ and discuss as honest men can, they seek to destroy the advocate rather than what he advocates.

Not satisfied with discharging their vicious venom, they seek to destroy the reputations of those who dare to differ. The libelous letterwriting campaign to impeach the Chief Justice fo the United States for his opinions is a prime example of this activity.

But why should I spend these moments describing this small but cancerous growth

within our own society, when the greatest menace by far is the closed, slave coalition controlled by the Soviet Union. I do this for the deliberate reason that we must recognize what we oppose, not the label it wears.

We have been menaced before, although never so seriously. A generation ago it was by the Fascists, now by the Communists. We personify our political devils. We convince ourselves that when the evil of today has been defeated we can return to our own affairs content that freedom is once more made secure.

Unhappily this has never been so, and unless mankind undergoes a most remarkable change, there always will be those who seek to enslave others, or restrict their rights. Rhode Island was founded because some colonists in Massachusetts were not content with their own freedom, but had to attempt to force their beliefs on others, on freemen who refused to accept beliefs as chains.

This description of the internal enemies of freedom and the rights of man, may help to focus our attention on America's true role in the world, a role we have had for almost two centuries. While it is today more dangerous and more arduous to fulfill, it is not different.

For we are the leaders of the world revolution for the rights of man as an individual. We are the opponents of slavery of body or mind in whatever form and wherever found. We are the enemies, the first successful enemies, of colonialism whether it was British, Russian or any other imperialism. We are the Nation that through generations has aggressively fought the battle for freedom; and on every continent of the world.

We have learned through the years that political freedom cannot stand by itself in the world. Empty stomachs do not form a solid foundation for human freedom. We know that destitute, starving peasants, uncivilized, illiterate natives of the jungle, and frightened, impoverished workers in the rice paddies on the borders of Red China see freedom in different terms than we. But they do see and yearn for freedom.

Throughout the world today there are the stirrings of millions of people submerged for centuries in grinding poverty, disease, and starvation. They look for help and guidance wherever they can find it, and if they are careless in the selection of their friends, who can blame them.

All of our national leaders, but perhaps most keenly of all—President John F. Kennedy—are alert to our need to meet the global challenge to freedom in all its aspects They have the sense of urgency, of mission, and of destiny that we Americans must find again. Our leaders see our mission and plead with us to understand. But are we less concerned with freedom than our forefathers? Are we now content to drift into the backwaters of our times?

We bicker and quarrel among ourselves. Our leaders are attacked as being in league with the enemy. We doubt our mission and our resources to fulfill the challenge of history. We exaggerated our shortcomings and ignore our accomplishments. We seek to shop for freedom as though it were something to pick up at the bargain counter.

But freedom is not cheap. The price is high. And the question remains: Are we willing to see in time what is demanded of us and do it?

We believe in freedom, in democracy, in peace—and in that order. Let us then dare to do that which is required of us as Americans. To support the friends of freedom whatever they may be—in West Berlin, in Latin America, in Africa, in southeast Asia. Let us have the willingness and courage to give full aid to those peoples and those governments which respect the dignity of man as an individual which have the conviction that the rights of each citizen must be protected. And let us give active leadership and encouragement, as well as material help, to those emerging peoples who have not yet caught the full vision of freedom for themselves.

President Kennedy's bold programs for peace must have the support of all of us, not as Democrats but as Americans.

Further, and equally important, let us oppose those who would subvert freedom—wherever they are—at home or abroad. In this we can make our most direct and personal contribution. For whenever the full rights of any American are restricted or attacked, the image of America before the world is blurred and marred.

This is true whether these restrictions are because of color, or religion, or because self-appointed vigilantes seek to judge the loyalty of their neighbors. Here at home we can oppose every attack and every pressure on the fullest right of each American to speak, to write, to think, and to worship as he pleases.

Let us say to all the world here we stand, for as long as God and history gives us the heart and strength, we can do no other, for we are the Americans.

The New Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, every day we see pathetic pictures in our newspapers depicting life in the divided city of Berlin. Our President has rightly stated that the United States will remain firm and defend the rights of the West Berliners.

Yet, we have failed thus far to take any sort of firm action which would show the Soviets that we intend to protect those rights. We have had words, words and more words, but no action. Now rumors are circulating that we are ready to "negotiate," in other words to "give" on Berlin. One proposal that has been advanced is that we turn the whole question over to the United Nations for solution. In reply to this proposal, I wish to insert at this point an editorial from the Indianapolis Star, entitled "The New Isolationism":

[From the Indianapolis Star, Sept. 17, 1961]

THE NEW ISOLATIONISM

Strong support is developing for a proposal that the problem of Berlin be handed over to the United Nations, with the United States accepting whatever solution that body might devise.

This would be a very easy and apparently painless way out of a difficult and awkward situation. It would be in harmony with the purposes of the U.N. After all, it's supposed to prevent wars by helping to settle disputes which might lead to war, isn't it? The expectation seems to be that this device would enable the United States to step out of Berlin with a clear conscience and a solid position as far as world opinion is concerned, because what happened from then on would be the U.N.'s doing, not ours.

Actually it would not be hard to predict what would happen. Some sort of free-city status would be set up for Berlin, as long proposed by the Soviet Union. And then the city would simply be permitted to wither until it dawned on all concerned that the rule of the city had shifted to pro-Communist hands, that its life had become adapted to the Communist pattern, and that as an entity it was isolated and alienated from everything not Communist. So why shouldn't the city then be absorbed into East Germany to put an end to its abnormal situation? And so it would be.

Many Americans, and the United States officially, might deplore this. But it wouldn't really be our affair, would it? It would be the decision of the U.N. We could wash our hands of it.

This is the new isolationism. Maybe we should call it the Eastern isolationism, since its advocacy seems to center on the east coast. There used to be something called midwestern isolationism. Maybe there still is, although we haven't heard the epithet very often lately.

Those, including us, who were known as midwestern isolationists believe simply in making decisions of foreign policy on the basis of American interests first of all, of the interests of our allies next in order of importance, and of other interests only after these first two had been taken into account.

These new Eastern isolationists may have come around to putting American interests first, as they see it in a shortsighted sort of way. Their concern in the Berlin business is to see that the United States does not get drawn into a war over the quarrel there. Certainly that is in the American interest. They also are concerned for the international prestige of the United States, and that too, within limits, is commendable.

But handing Berlin over to the U.N. would be—in scarcely less degree than handing it over directly to the Reds—an outright abandonment of the interests of the people most intimately concerned, the people of Berlin, and indeed, of all Germany. This would be a striking example of the callousness toward other peoples and the shirking of world responsibility which the internationalists have always held up as the hallmarks of isolationism.

It might be different if the U.N. were different. But consider the Congo. There the U.N., supposedly intervening to defend self-determination, presided over a denouement in which self-determination was ruthlessly crushed. The U.N. mission—not the Congolese—decided which of the leaders of the various divisions of the Congo should govern. By design which was apparent from the beginning, those chosen to take power are outright pro-Communists or at least tolerant of the pro-Communists.

To turn the fate of any people over to such an organization is in deepest truth an abdication of world responsibility. And in the end it would result in the complete destruction of American interests. For if free peoples are to be subjugated one by one through being left to the mercies of the U.N., sooner or later America's turn will come.

Those who want the U.N. to do this, with Berlin and other problems, so that the United States can then sit back and escape responsibility for what happens, escape the task of defending free self-determination for peoples who want it—those are genuine isolationists.

Sound Economy To Promote Progress and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our American economy is the backbone of

our great Nation. Of course, our progress and material advancement depends upon a growing economy—but also our security, our survival, also depends upon our ability to produce essential items for our national defense establishments.

Recently, I spoke before the West Allis Advancement Association in West Allis, Wis., on the occasion of the association's 25th anniversary. I addressed myself to the economic needs of our country to support our struggle with anticapitalist communism. I ask unanimous consent to have this speech reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY STRESSES NEED FOR SOUND, STRONG ECONOMY TO PROMOTE PROGRESS AND SECURITY

Friends: As members of the West Allis Advancement Association, and as cooperating citizens of this fine community, you symbolize one of the great strengths—though too often little heralded—of our free way of life. That is; citizen action by association for progress.

I heartily welcome the opportunity, therefore, to join with you in celebrating your 25th anniversary; in paying tribute to the men of vision who organized this association back in 1936; and in looking forward with you to the future.

The progress and security of our Nation and its people depend upon a dynamic, forward-striding economy. The foundation of such dynamism, however, is created here in the grassroots—in West Allis and similar communities, small and large, across the country.

In your splendid endeavors to promote economic, social, civic, and other advancements you well recognize this requires a realistic approach, including: A hard look at the community's liabilities and assets; a reevaluation of economic deficiencies; exploration for new economic opportunity; and the creation of a strong community spirit to enlist individuals, associations, and others in the noble struggle to build a better community.

For your outstanding accomplishments, I commend you.

Recognizing that the battle has not been completely won—that both problems and promises lie on the road ahead—I stand with you ready to be of service in helping to promote greater progress in this fine community.

As your servant in the U.S. Senate, I have experienced—and let us face it, enjoyed—the opportunity as well as the responsibilities of serving you, the people, and the Nation.

In your thoughtful invitation for me to speak on this 25th anniversary, your board suggested a discussion of "The History and Results of Foreign Aid."

I shall be happy to discuss this significant feature of our national defense.

In my judgment, however, we must consider it in perspective, in relation to its proportionate role in our global effort to provide for our security and survival in a war-threatened world.

PROGRESS IN NUCLEAR-SPACE AGE

Today, we live in ever-changing, fast-advancing, revolutionary times.

The God-given ingenuity of man, miraculously transmuting ideas into tools for shaping history, has dramatically changed life in the 1960's.

Within reach of our memories—yes, within the 23 years I have served you in Congress—we have seen such far-reaching progress as:

Supersonic jet travel; and experimental rocket-powered airspeeds of over 3,500 miles per hour; man's adventure into outer space, including the orbiting of satellites and of man himself around the earth; an industrial revolution resulting from—among other things—automation; the mechanization of the American farm; improvements in business methods and procedures; scientific breakthroughs for bettering the health of millions of people; great improvements in mass communication, including television; a new kind of home life for Americans—functioning modernly upon electrical-pulse pushbuttons, as well as heartbeats; and a variety of other dramatic, far-reaching changes in our daily, national, and international lives.

Literally living in a new world—we must attain a new understanding and perspective of the forces and influences—and their interrelationships—that shape our destiny.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Today, there are over 100 nations—with a population of about 3 billion people—around the globe.

Now, how do we handle our relationships with these people and nations? By a system called foreign policy.

Basically, it includes:

The conduct of relations—economic, social, political, cultural—with friendly countries around the world; efforts to resolve differences—and meet the threats—of countries with whom U.S. policies are in basic disagreement, such as communism; evaluating the impact of world conditions—for example, the effects of trade and commerce, on our domestic economy—and adopting programs to protect U.S. interests; and accurately assessing other international events and their significance to our security and progress—utilizing these as guidelines for creating and conducting our own defense, economic, and other policies.

In normal times, we could:

Devote more of our time and energies to peaceful pursuits; utilize more of our human and natural resources toward an ever-better life—now fortunately the highest standard of living in history; and make great progress toward creation of a world in which law and order were respected, and all nations could pursue their self-determined goals.

Today, however, communism—controlling nearly 1 billion people and vast lands and industrial and natural resources—is clutching for our jugular vein—attempting to kill off freedom.

Consequently, the design of our foreign policy—and, in fact, the tempo and direction of our domestic life—is affected, to a large degree, by this great—and growing—threat to our security and survival.

EAST-WEST MILITARY FORCES

Now, what is being done to cope with this threat?

For 1962, Congress has earmarked about $48 billion for putting more "muscle" and "fire power" into our security forces. The major features include:

Mobilization of more manpower, including reserve forces;

Strengthen the mighty arsenal of jet planes, nuclear bombs, aircraft carriers, missiles, missile-carrying submarines;

Creating more mobility and flexibility—including atomic armaments—for limited warfare; and

Attempting to pace our development of atomic weapons to the Red threat—including the President's recent decision to resume underground nuclear testing.

A military force, of course, is effective only in relation to the size and power of its enemy.

During this year, Mr. Khrushchev initiated the "beefing-up" of Red military forces, by maintaining a high level of mobilized manpower in the military forces; resuming nuclear tests; more currently, testing higher powered rockets for delivery of super bombs; and engaging in more attempts at power politics and rocket-missile blackmail.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES AS FREE WORLD LEADER

In the face of the Red threat, Western nations—as well as the so-called noncommitted countries, have a stake in the survival of freedom; in the defeat, or at least containment, of communism; and in the creation of a world in which nations have the right to determine their own destinies.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

For this reason, we, of the free world, have banded together for our own security.

And now, after a circuitous trip, I come to your recommended topic, the foreign aid or mutual security program.

What is the purpose? Fundamentally, the program has served as the lifeblood of free world military and economic efforts to combat communism.

As a pioneering effort of nations to work together for mutual defense, there have, admittedly been mistakes. Because of this, Congress, I believe, must keep a microscopic eye on the program. The purpose would be to:

(1) Weed out unnecessary activities;

(2) Shoot for, and hit, more realistic objectives;

(3) Sharpen up the administrative machinery;

(4) Imbue its administrators with a greater sense of responsibility to the American taxpayer; and

(5) Generally to insure that the program better serves our national interests.

Now, what do we get for our investment in these free world alliances?

In general categories, the following:

Strategically located bases on the periphery of the Communist camp, with free world missiles "zeroed in" on the heart of communism; and

Supplemental defense forces, including millions of men and greater striking power on air, sea, and land.

For example, about 40 percent of the aircraft and 60 percent of the total allied naval strength is supplied by our allies.

In addition to strengthening our defense, also, the program—spending most of the funds right here in this country—creates an estimated half-million jobs for American workers.

The struggle against communism, of course, is not only military. Rather, it is also social, cultural, political and, particularly, economic. Consequently, it has been deemed advisable also to provide economic assistance:

1. To our allies to enable them to (a) serve as a stronger bulwark against Communist expansion, and (b) to better share the cost of free world defense; and

2. To less developed nations. Why? To wipe out breeding grounds of poverty, disease, underprivilege, undernourishment—often the target of Communist infestation.

Until—the standards of mankind are lifted to decent levels (incidentally, per capita income in such countries as India amounts to only about $60 per year); the "gap" between the "haves" and the "have-nots" has diminished or vanished; and there is recognition of human dignity and the right of self-determination of all peoples; there can be no real peace in the world.

NECESSITY OF WESTERN ALLIANCE

Along with other American taxpayers—now heavily burdened—I, naturally, would welcome relief not only from support of the foreign aid program—but also our costly military expenditures.

The facts of life in 1961, however, in my judgment, do not permit a weakening of our defenses or an abrogation of our responsibility as a free world leader.

Why?

First. The Communist bloc—the greatest threat to freedom in history—still strongly adheres to its oft-stated goal of world conquest. Mobilized for this objective, its military, economic, industrial, scientific, and other programs have one target: That of surpassing and burying us—and the free world.

Second. Red manpower—if Communist China is included—in military forces substantially exceeds that the free world.

Third. On the nonmilitary front, the Reds have an estimated 36 million agents operating in about 86 countries. This Red army of conspirators—conducting a global campaign of subversion, sabotage, espionage, represents a threat equal to—if not greater than—the military power of the Communists—if there continues to be an East-West standoff.

COPING WITH THE COMMUNIST MENACE

In our Nation's effort to combat—and cooperate with our allies in combating—communism, Uncle Sam alone cannot be expected to do the whole job.

Instead, we, individually and collectively, must:

First, mobilize to throw the necessary brainpower, manpower, and resources into the battle. Historically, one of the great strengths of America is the voluntary will to fight, sacrifice, and work to build a good life under a free flag, and to protect our country from its enemies.

Second, our civic, veteran, social, cultural, and, yes, religious and other organizations can and should reexamine the potential ways in which they might serve our national cause more effectively.

Third, we need to more greatly utilize the know-how and technology of free enterprise for selling the ideas and ideals of freedom. This includes more effective utilization of businesses overseas as "built-in Voices of America."

Fourth, labor, also, sharing a common bond with workers around the globe—possesses an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate how workers benefit under a free system, and how free collective bargaining can serve not only the worker but strengthen a nation.

Fifth, the creative minds—artists, writers, poets, musicians, dramatists—have a great opportunity to portray the spirit of a free people in their dedicated, relentless effort to create a better life for themselves and humanity.

CONCLUSION

For security, as well as for domestic progress, however, we will need to maintain a strong, dynamic economy. For this reason, we will depend tremendously upon grassroots cornerstones such as West Allis and upon leadership such as exemplified by the Advancement Association—to give us greater strength in a crisis-threatened world.

Now, I want to again extend my heartfelt congratulations upon your 25th anniversary, a real hallmark of progress. Upon your 50th and 100th anniversaries, I feel confident you will be able to point with pride to a still greater record of star-studded accomplishments.

Nuclear Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, two articles on subjects of deep interest to me. The editorial entitled "How Dead the A-Plane?" which appeared in the July 9, 1961, edition of the Post-Register of Idaho Falls, Idaho, and the fine article on the Rover project entitled "Alert to Trouble Ahead" which appeared in the News-Democrat of Belleville, Ill., on August 7, 1961:

[From the Idaho Falls Post-Register, July 9, 1961]

HOW DEAD THE A-PLANE?

It sounds now like the nostalgic remembrances over a big-willed but decidedly dead horse, but the atomic airplane apparently is not a forgotten issue with some Congressmen.

The AEC appropriation bill approved by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy did not contain the cancellation of A-plane funds as did the AEC proposed bill. The AEC, pursuant to President Kennedy's decision, knocked out a $33 million fund which had been poised previously for the A-plane this fiscal year.

It was an obvious attempt by a committee majority to keep the A-plane alive. A majority report of the committee stated significantly:

"The ANP (atomic plane) project has been in progress for approximately 14 years. Approximately $1 billion has been spent on the program. Although the program was plagued by many changes in objectives and vacillations in support, a considerable amount of progress has been made on the solution of the technical problems involved in the use of nuclear power for the propulsion of aircraft. Based upon classified information obtained from the AEC in executive session, the Joint Committee believes that technical progress in the past 2 years was exceptionally gratifying. The status of work on one of the technical approaches was such as to permit design and construction of a full scale nuclear engine for ground tests.

"A number of committee members were disappointed in the cancellation of the project. Their primary concern stemmed from the apparent lack of information on the technical status of the work by those in the executive branch who supplied the information upon which the decision to cancel the project was based."

"One of the technical approaches" referred to in the report was undoubtedly General Electric Co.'s direct cycle engine developed at the Idaho AEC station. As Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, pointed out in a recent talk, this approach definitely achieved the criteria which was established for it. Once this was achieved, he points out, however, the program was abruptly canceled and a whole new set of devious criteria laid out.

Congressman PRICE has made a personal mission of the A-plane for many years. His work on behalf of the project has been exhaustive, sometimes fevered. No pork barrel here. It is a dedicated conscientousness for a project in another State.

Judging from the report, Representative PRICE is not alone voice crying in the wilderness. But in the face of the White House decision on this querulous debate, no about-face is an immediate prospect. Could be someday, however, that an A-plane could be resurrected.

[From the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, Aug. 7, 1961]

ALERT TO TROUBLE AHEAD

There is a great deal less skepticism this time that the Russians really put a man into space. In fact, the U.S. Civilian Space Agency readily confirmed the "Vostok Two" project that sent Soviet Maj. Gherman S. Titov orbiting around the earth * * * and conceded that it may be quite awhile before we can duplicate the feat.

Thus the United States suffers a blow to prestige at a time when we ought to be making hay of our own. We are committed to the space race with Russia, but we are trailing and the Russians are increasing the gap.

This event of the weekend focuses especial timeliness to the comments of Representative MELVIN PRICE in the current Atomic Industrial Forum Memo. Congressman PRICE, who represents our own district and is chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's Research, Development and Radiation Subcommittee, strongly urges top priority be immediately assigned to our Project Rover nuclear powered rocket program.

He is on sound ground in making this demand, for the need is abundantly clear. Quoting Dr. Krafft Ehricke, one of our Nation's leading space scientists: "The universe is run by nuclear energy. Space will be conquered only by manned nuclear powered vehicles. Planning anything else for the late sixties is, in my opinion, flirting with obsolescence almost from the start."

To which PRICE adds: "The practically limitless sources of energy from nuclear reactions is the foremost reason for its superiority as an energy source. The highly concentrated nature of nuclear fuels dictates their use for the space missions of the future. Chemical rocket engines" in which the Russians are so far ahead of us, "cannot meet our future space requirements. * * * Nuclear energy provides us with leapfrog capability. It is the only reasonable way that I can see for becoming first in space exploration."

Project Rover has been begun finally, but it has taken a long time. Too long. There have been many delays that prevented getting the show on the road and PRICE predicts more pitfalls ahead, unless * * *

He proceeds then to cite chapter, verse and line where trouble is most likely to crop up. And this ardent champion of the atomic powered airplane knows whereof he speaks, for he pushed and guided the A-plane concept successfully * * * until this year, when it was arbitrarily pared out of the military program and shelved by budget cutters.

Conceivably this may be the fate of Project Rover, too, at some future date. Congressman PRICE notes that, vital as it is, "Rover does not have a specific job to do in the first manned mission to the moon which the Government has established as our first major national objective. Consequently, it may well develop that when our overall space program is reviewed sometime in the future for areas where cuts can be made, the budgeteers may take the attitude that since the Rover nuclear rocket has no specific slot to fill in our moon mission, it is not essential at this time. Such a lack of vision could lead us directly to another prestige disaster." This must not happen.

Family Job Has Priority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Arizona Republic's outstanding feature writer, Mrs. Bernice Jones, recently conducted through the newspaper a unique "working women survey" which attracted widespread interest. The survey, undertaken in August, provided background data used in the Western Regional Conference on Problems of

Working Women, held in Los Angeles on September 8–9 under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau. Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor and Director of the Women's Bureau, was keynote speaker at the conference.

Results of the survey appeared in the Arizona Republic for September 3, 1961. The newspaper reports that almost 500 women employed in fields ranging from the professional to housemaids responded. The returns came from the entire State with approximately 50 percent from the Phoenix area. Attached to more than one-half of the forms returned were letters expressing opinions and advice about the role of women today in the labor market based on their personal experiences. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY JOB HAS PRIORITY

(By Bernice Jones)

If the women of Arizona are typical of women the world over, the basic role of wife and mother will never become secondary.

But fighting to protect its priority and sanctity under the duress of today's economic and social pressures is exacting a heavy toll.

Among the hundreds of letters sent to Lady Fare in response to the working women survey tabulated at left, over and over again was written, "Home and family must come first."

The home and family do come first. But for those women who must work because the salary they earn is indispensable to the economic well-being of the family, the emotional cost is very great.

Delayed payment? One woman, who is working to pay off heavy bills that her husband's salary is insufficient to cover in addition to ongoing expenses, wrote typically:

"My daughter is not yet 2, and I leave her at a very fine nursery during the day. But I cannot escape a daily feeling of guilt and worry. I wonder if leaving her with someone else while she is so young will cause emotional damage that will create problems in her adult life.

"My only hope is that when she is old enough she will understand."

One answer? Although only a little less than 13 percent of the survey respondents were part-time employees, attached letters clearly revealed that the mother who has managed to find a limited job has managed to have frosted cake and eat it too.

Many of them have found employment at schools, either in offices or cafeterias. Their hours of work coincide with the hours their children are in school. They are home when the husband returns from his work. Dinner is simmering on the stove and only from her more entertaining conversation is he aware of his wife's dual role.

Husbands pay an emotional price too when their wives work, although Lady Fare's survey would indicate that men are beginning to appreciate that a wife's role is vastly different from that enacted in his mother's era.

More than three-quarters of the wives returning our questionnaire reported that husbands did not disapprove of their working. This applied equally to families with small preschool children, as well as in the older age bracket.

In addition, another 6 percent neither approved nor disapproved. Another 9-plus percent accept their wives' working as an unavoidable necessity.

Partnership: In days of old, when the social pattern of our lives was overwhelmingly rural, as opposed to the urban emphasis of today, family units were a production team unto themselves.

Every member had an important role to play in achieving economic security, as well as comfort. It was before the invention of laborsaving devices. Dawn to dusk labors left little time for emotional disturbances of more than minor dimension, except in rare instances.

It would appear that family partnership is returning. But, as with so many things today, it is a new form with so many more complexities that it has taken a decade or two for its members to be comfortable with it.

Earlier maturity: "A working mother must devise a strict schedule if family chaos is to be avoided," wrote a teacher.

"It must be a schedule everyone works out together, with each voluntarily assuming his share of the duties previously taken for granted as being done by the mother.

"For a few months after I returned to work (they had moved to Phoenix from another part of the country and wanted to protect their savings) the children found it difficult not having me there every moment.

"But now they have grown into a wonderful self-reliance and mature independence that is a joy. And we are a more closely knit family than we were before."

A book: To fully report on the depth and variety of the thoughtful letters would fill a book. But to list quickly other aspects of the working woman's life that were revealed in sufficient numbers to assume they are somewhat typical:

Some women feel other women expect too much in the way of salary and considerations when they enter the business world.

The fight for equal pay for women who are doing the same job men do will continue, apparently.

Particularly in relation to women who are the only breadwinner for a family.

"The chief reason given for paying men more is that they have families to support. If this is a basis for setting salary levels, it should apply equally to women in the same position."

Question: Of what use is experience and maturity when a great number of employers evidently refuse to hire a woman past age 35?

Wrote one woman: "This definition I saw long ago in a Florida paper states the problem concisely: 'An executive: a man who desires an attractive secretary 22–28 years of age with 40 years' experience'."

Yet more than 77 percent of our replies came from women over 34 years of age. And 85 percent reported age had been no factor in their employment. There were also a few letters from young women. Their cry: "How do we get the experience employers want when no one will hire us without it?"

Is there a new profession in the offing? The older woman finds it hard to find employment in business. The preferred younger woman is frantic to find efficient, trustworthy help at home to give her children the best care possible.

What of others? A more complete evaluation of Lady Fare's working women survey will be a part of the discussion material at the U.S. Department of Labor's regional conference in Los Angeles Friday and Saturday.

It may or may not find confirmation among the 150 to 200 representatives expected from Arizona, Nevada, and California.

But undoubtedly the statement of one Arizona woman will meet with agreement.

"Women must accept that the end of their business day is not the end of their workday. They must gear to handle the extra load their jobs away from home place on their shoulders with a minimum of wear and tear on themselves and their families."

Because, as Department of Labor statistics reveal, women are necessary to the total work force of the Nation. They are necessary for the stepped-up production that is vital to create the millions of new jobs needed in the Nation's future, says Mrs. Esther Peterson, U.S. Women's Bureau director, who will keynote the Los Angeles conference Friday night.

REPORT TELLS SURVEY RESULTS

(On Sunday, August 6, and again on August 16, Lady Fare carried a survey questionnaire to sample the opinion of its working women readers. Results of the survey will be a part of the U.S. Department of Labor regional conference on working women being held in Los Angeles Friday and Saturday. Below is the tabulation of that response; a cross section view of Arizona's working women.)

1. Is your job full time—part time?

Response: Full time, 87.2 percent; part time, 12.8 percent.

2. What type of work do you do?

Response: Secretarial, 41 percent; teacher, 15.3 percent; clerical, 10.1 percent; bookkeeping and accounting, 8.8 percent; nursing, 5.7 percent; sales, 4.4 percent; managerial, 3.1 percent; services, 3.1 percent; professional, 2.9 percent; skilled labor, 2.2 percent; technician, 2.1 percent; electronics and assembly, 1.3 percent.

3. Please check proper age group.

Response: Under 18, 0; 18 to 34, 22.5 percent; over 34, 77.5 percent.

4. Has your age been any drawback in getting or holding a job?

Response: Yes, 14.7 percent; no, 85.3 percent.

5. Please check your approximate yearly income before taxes.

Response: Under $3,000, 15.4 percent; $3,000 to $3,999, 24.3 percent; $4,000 to $4,999, 32.7 percent; $5,000 to $5,999, 19.1 percent; $7,000 to $9,999, 5.5 percent; $10,000 or over, 3 percent.

6. Why do you work?

Response: Married, add to income, 48.3 percent; single, 14.9 percent; divorced or widowed with dependents, 14.9 percent; personal achievement, 12.3 percent; children's education, 3.8 percent; home improvements, 3.3 percent; pay for home, 2.5 percent.

7. If married, what is your husband's attitude about your working?

Response: Approves, 78.8 percent; disapproves, 5.1 percent; doesn't care, 6.4 percent; disapproves but tolerates, realizes necessity, 9.7 percent.

8. If you have children, in what age bracket are they?

Response: Under 6, 13.4 percent; grade school, 26.2 percent; high school, 26.5 percent; college, 15.6 percent; on their own, 18.3 percent.

9. If under high school age, what arrangements do you have for their care during your working hours?

Response: Nursery, 21.6 percent; relative, 22.5 percent; housekeeper, 27.5 percent; neighbor, 19.6 percent; husband, 8.8 percent.

10. Please feel free to attach separate page with personal comments on your job satisfactions and disappointments, advice to women entering or returning to the work force, problems you have met and solved, needs you feel are common to all working women.

So Shall Ye Be Judged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted

in the Appendix to the RECORD an article from the September 23 issue of National Review entitled "So Shall Ye Be Judged: What Happened When a Conservative Publisher Found Himself in the Court of a Liberal Judge His Papers Had Often Attacked." This article was written by Messrs. Holmes Alexander and William F. Rickenbacker.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO SHALL YE BE JUDGED—WHAT HAPPENED WHEN A CONSERVATIVE PUBLISHER FOUND HIMSELF IN A COURT OF A LIBERAL JUDGE HIS PAPERS HAD OFTEN ATTACKED

(By Holmes Alexander and Wm. F. Rickenbacker)

Since 1946, William Loeb has been publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, which has prospered under an editorial policy that is not only conservative but also witheringly direct and honest. William Loeb fears not the mighty, not even when the mighty happens to be a Federal judge on the First Circuit Court.

Back in 1950, Loeb blasted the Dover group, a collection of prominent Bostonians including Charles Wyzanski, advocating the settlement of the Korean war on the Communists' terms. Not long afterward, Loeb attacked Wyzanski for acting as a character witness for Alger Hiss. In late 1956 and early 1957, Loeb severely criticized Wyzanski, as chairman of the Board of Overseers of Harvard, for permitting J. Robert Oppenheimer to give the William James lectures. And about the same time, Loeb hit Wyzanski again, for running the same act on a different stage: for Oppenheimer spoke at Exeter, of which Wyzanski was then a trustee.

In the autumn of 1957, Loeb was approached with the proposal that he found a competing newspaper in Haverhill, Mass. In the course of time he did establish the paper, but he ran into the organized opposition of 32 New England newspaper barons who banded together to run him out of Haverhill. Loeb filed an antitrust suit. A countersuit under the antitrust laws was filed against him. Before long (March 1959) Loeb found himself in court, facing his old friend Judge Charles Wyzanski.

Wyzanski offered to disqualify himself, saying, "I know there has been some Manchester newspaper which has been in the business of attacking me from time to time, and I don't know whether it is the plaintiff or not. I am quite immune from any bias with respect to it because I don't even read this stuff, but I think I ought to say to you that I know that somebody has been doing it, and maybe it is this plaintiff. If this plaintiff regards me as in any way biased, I wish the plaintiff would say so." (Point in rhetoric: is a man unbiased if he refers to material he hasn't read as "this stuff"?)

Acting with the innate chivalry that is a root of his nature, Loeb grandly declined the judge's offer. The case then proceeded, Wyzanski presiding, until late in 1960. At that point Wyzanski, in connection with another case, undertook a one-man investigation of Massachusetts politics. Issuing regular as well as criminal subpenas, Wyzanski finally caught a big fish: William Callahan, a chairman of the State throughway authority. While Wyzanski was off hunting for evidence of corruption, Loeb's reportorial staff was reminded of an earlier connection between Judge Wyzanski and his present quarry. After considerable research they turned up a story that made banner headlines.

EARLIER HISTORY

Some years earlier, while Callahan had been chairman of the Department of Public Works, the state had seized, exercising the right of eminent domain, some property belonging to Wyzanski and his family. Callahan had got up a board of appraisers and had ruled that landowners could refuse the offer made by the appraisers only by going to court. In practice, anyone actually prepared to go to court received a settlement of about a $1,000 more than the original appraiser's amount, to avoid the cost of litigation. But there was an exception.

Wyzanski, it appears, complained vociferously that the appraisers hadn't offered him enough. A trial date was set, but then before trial, Wyzanski received a settlement of many thousands of dollars more than the original price. Loeb's reporters could find no other case of a large out-of-court settlement. After the story hit the wire service, Wyzanski flew into court and filed with the clerk a detailed memorandum on his land dealings with the man he had recently subpenaed. The case hallooed across the headlines in Boston, and Loeb's paper, of course, ran a whole series of articles on the situation.

By April of 1961, the odor from Wyzanski's court had reached Washington. Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts entered the discussion of Federal judgeships with an interesting anecdote about Wyzanski. "It happens," said MCCORMACK, "that I have a nephew who is attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Not so long ago, a Federal judge in Boston threatened him with contempt of court in the performance of his official duties. I am going to confine myself to this issue alone," said MCCORMACK, "even though there are other instances of Wyzanski's highhandedness. Here is a copy of the Boston Globe of October 19, 1960. It was only 2 weeks before the election—a poor time for any judge to inject himself into the issues of a political campaign—whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. At that time, my nephew was protecting the interests of the cities and towns of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This particular judge misconstrued a statement by my nephew and this judge from the bench publicly stated that he might adjudge the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in contempt of court—or words to that effect.

"The judge even went further than that. He even stated from the bench, and I will quote the words directly from the newspaper: 'I am not myself quite aware why the Attorney General of the United States chose to further the ambitions of the attorney general of Massachusetts who is a Democrat.' Can you imagine that? What happened? My nephew and a few other attorneys general representing the attorneys general of the United States some months prior to that had a conference with Assistant Attorney General Bicks. Now let me go a little step further and I will quote from this newspaper article again: 'Any statements issued about this case were no doubt given out for political purposes and whoever issued such a statement may well be in contempt of court.' This is not an isolated case I am talking about."

JUDGE AS POLITICIAN

Congressman BURKE exploded in sympathetic detonation, and described his own victimization at His Honor's hand. "He not only injected himself into the affairs of the attorney general of Massachusetts," said BURKE, "but he also injected himself in the congressional fight in my district, tried to smear my good reputation, and made remarks uncalled for, subjected me to a vitriolic attack, an unfair attack that I could not answer.

"This particular judge, time and time again, has threatened attorneys and members of the Massachusetts bar who had the courage to appear before his court, has threatened them with citations of contempt, has impugned their motives, has besmirched their integrity and honesty; and he has developed such a condition that I would say 85 percent of the attorneys, members of the Massachusetts bar, are fearful to appear in his court. When a judge orders the issuance of a criminal summons 4 days before an election, when all the circumstances called for was the issuance of a regular witness summons, and tries to create the impression in the minds of the people of a Congressman's district that the Congressman was a defendant and not a witness, I say that he has abused his authority, he has violated civil rights, he has violated every decent principle that we can have in our courts; he has violated the code of decency of the court. I question his activities that day; the remarks he made from the bench were entirely uncalled for. If ever a judge was subject to censure, it was this particular judge, because he abused all the privileges of his position, all the authority vested in him by the U.S. Government when he tried to inject himself into that congressional fight.

This judge has acted in the role of a politician trying to influence the electorate by his intemperate and unfair statements from the bench. His activities on the bench are certainly open to question. The Federal bench is no place for a tyrant or a despot. He is ill mannered, discourteous, uncivil, rude, injudicious, and overbearing. He lacks balance."

EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, testified as a character witness in reverse: "Often the overrighteous can do much evil. This particular judge is overly righteous. He is bold, he is brilliant, but most arbitrary. He thinks he is the be-all and end-all of wisdom. His views cannot be questioned. He is a sort of a judicial panjandrum and, therefore, never hesitates to act as judge, prosecutor, and jury, all rolled into one. In a trice, he will on occasion convert his court into a U.S. attorney's office, or something not unlike a grand jury. Numerous complaints have reached me as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary concerning this judge's unusual and untoward conduct."

And CELLER quoted from a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Boston—a decision that amounts to a formal accusation of misconduct on the part of Judge Wyzanski: "Naturally witnesses can and should be required to explain the words they use. It is hardly necessary, however, to do so with ridicule or caustic criticism, or repeatedly to check a witness' use of words in reasonably common use by reference to the Oxford English Dictionary, or to require strict adherence to the rules of grammar. The bench is not an appropriate rostrum from which to teach the niceties of English grammar and usage. While performance by the trial judge of his function, indeed duty, to see that the truth is elicited ordinarily requires clarifying questions from the bench, and maybe on occasion sharp warnings, it is not his function or duty to take the conduct of a case away from counsel."

After being visited with so voluminous a barrage in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Wyzanski came off his high horse—but just for a moment. He asked Attorney General McCormack, the majority leader's nephew, to attend a public hearing concerning some asphalt companies. At the hearing, Wyzanski actually apologized to McCormack for having threatened him with contempt of court. He also said that in view of the hullaballoo (our word: it's not in the judge's O.E.D.) about the asphalt case, he would withdraw from it. But then he went on to express himself in pointed terms about the case of William Loeb from which he announced he would not withdraw.

Loeb's attorneys made a formal motion proposing that Wyzanski withdraw. Wyzanski refused. They went to the Court of Appeals, but the court upheld Wyzanski, principally on the grounds that he only

sounded prejudiced, but wasn't, really. At this moment Loeb is trying to get a stay of process from one of the justices of the Supreme Court.

So here is the great big liberal, Charles Wyzanski, conducting his court with a highhandedness which, if it had been Senator McCarthy doing it in his committee room, would have caused Wyzanski to turn off all the lights of Harvard and say: We've had it, and quietly expire. On top of that, he is determined to judge the man who has now completely exasperated him. "It is just as well that justice is blind," said EMANUEL CELLER in his résumé, "she might not like some of the things done in her name by Judge Wyzanski."

Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives had before it a large body of legislation which called for prompt action as well as intensive study. The following record of its activities reveals the significant role played by this committee in the interest of the Nation.

Of the 10,955 bills and resolutions, introduced in the House, a total of 3,721 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, or, approximately, 34 percent of all proposals introduced in one form or another. Of these, 1,146 were public bills and 2,575 were private bills. A total of 151 hearings were held; 71 public bills were acted upon favorably, of which 39 have been signed into law; 27 have passed the House and are awaiting action by the Senate; 2 bills are pending in the House; 2 bills are in conference and 1 in the Committee on the Rules; 323 individuals were beneficiaries of private immigration legislation, of which 130 were House bills, 86 Senate bills, 42 House joint resolutions, and 65 Senate concurrent resolutions. The House Committee on the Judiciary acted expeditiously on private claim bills. Out of a total of 548 private claim bills, 89 are pending in the Senate, 58 have been enacted into private law and 36 were disapproved.

Of major national interest are the following legislative proposals enacted into law and upon which this committee placed heavy emphasis:

Public Law 87–36, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. This act created 73 additional judgeships.

Public Law 87–228, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises.

Public Law 87–216, to amend chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information.

Public Law 87–218, to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Public Law 87–368, to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act.

These are a series of crime bills which, when taken together, make for a formidable weapon against organized crime.

The major enactment in the area of immigration and nationality was Public Law 87–301, to permit the entry of certain eligible alien orphans.

Also of major interest was Public Law 87–258, to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87–225, to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the United States courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies.

Litigants in Federal courts will be benefited by the provisions of this act since instead of a requirement of 5 days' notice which because of its inflexibility has created hardships, a reasonable notice is substituted.

Important compacts between the States:

Public Law 87–162, granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States.

Public Law 87–115, consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake.

Public Law 87–50, giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States.

These acts will settle many questions between the compacting States and lay to rest many questions which are before these States in the course of the absence of congressional consent.

Public Law 87–17, to amend Public Law 86–272 relating to State taxation of interstate commerce. State taxation on interstate commerce has become a most vexatious problem. Public Law 86–272 was too limited in scope to permit a thorough airing of the problem. Consequently, this act enlarges the scope of the inquiry. Both consuming States and manufacturing States are agreed that enlarging the scope of the inquiry and the very inquiry itself is one of the major accomplishments of this Congress.

Public Law 87–306, to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities.

Since the internal security of the United States is dependent upon secure, positive and instantaneous communications, it is understandable that this act is of major interest to the country. It strengthens the criminal law against willful or malicious interference with or destruction of any communication facility used or intended to be used for military or civil defense functions of the United States. If the communications system fails, it is apparent that all of the billions for armaments, for missiles, and for bombers would be in vain.

Public Law 87–324, to amend the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on Internaticnal Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended.

This act extends the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure until December 31, 1963. The Commission is to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements. Thus, the attention of the Commission is directed to the improvement of procedures which involve the performance of acts in foreign territory, the obtaining of evidence, the proof of foreign law, and the service of judicial documents, among other things.

Public Law 87–336, to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code—Youth Corrections Act.

Presently a youth offender who has been committed or incarcerated, is entitled upon discharge to have his conviction set aside. A youth offender who is not committed, however, and who, instead, is placed on probation by the court, is not entitled to this benefit. The instant bill will now make available to a youth offender who is placed on probation the same benefits that a youth offender receives who has been committed to a correctional institution .

Also significant are the following: Public Law 87–338, to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code—imparting or conveying false information. Public Law 87–366, to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Public Law 87–371, to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the counterfeiting of State obligations in certain cases, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–369, to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship, and Public Law 87–331, to amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes.

The results of the work of the committee members and the staff have been most gratifying and I, as chairman, am indeed grateful for the cooperation and the willingness to devote long working hours in the fulfillment of the responsibilities placed upon them. A detailed analysis of each subcommittee's work follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

In the field of immigration and nationality, Subcommittee No. 1 has acted on the following bills:

S. 2237 contains certain amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, incorporates into that act certain provisions of existing law for the purpose of codification and provides legislation designed to facilitate the unification of families of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. This bill; as initially passed by the Senate, extended until July 1, 1963, the orphan provisions as contained in section 4 of Public Law 85–316, as amended, which had expired on June 30, 1961. The House committee deleted the Senate language and substituted language which would incorporate and codify into permanent law, with modifications, the provisions of several successive, temporary enactments facilitating the immigration of alien orphans adopted by or to be adopted by U.S. citizens. The amendment authorizes the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to "eligible orphans" under 14 years of age who, prior to the institution or during pendency of adoption proceedings abroad, had been seen and observed by the adoptive parents, or to orphans who have been selected abroad and would be coming to the United States for adoption in accordance with applicable State statutes. Provision is made for the issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to eligible orphans if a visa petition filed in behalf of such eligible orphan was approved by the Attorney General prior to September 30, 1961, or was pending prior to that date and is subsequently approved.

The bill also includes provisions relating to judicial review of orders of deportation and exclusion of aliens entered by the Attorney General. These provisions are identical with H.R. 187 which passed the House July 10, 1961.

Additional amendments eliminate the existing requirement that a visa applicant state in his application his race and ethnic origin; accord veterans of the Korean hostilities the same naturalization privileges as existing law accords veterans of World War I and World War II; remove the existing 2,000 quota ceiling imposed on the "Asia-Pacific Triangle"; assure any new political entities immigration quotas equal to the total of quotas or subquotas presently established for each of the component parts which comprise the new entity; correct abuses resorted to by aliens who desire to obtain preferential status by contracting fraudulent marriages; require all petitions for naturalization filed after the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act (December 24, 1952) be heard and determined in accordance with the requirements of that act; restore to existing law illegality in procurement of naturalization as a ground for revocation of naturalization; set up rules of evidence under which the burden of proof to establish loss of citizenship by preponderance of the evidence would rest with the Government—the presumption of voluntariness under the proposed rules of evidence would be rebuttable, similarly, by preponderance of the evidence; provide for inclusion of the spouse or child of a naturalized U.S. citizen within the exemption from loss of citizenship granted such citizen who has attained the age of 60 years and who has resided abroad for not less than 10 years and is in bona fide retirement from a designated type of occupation; and, eliminate from the excluding clause of existing law tuberculosis and leprosy and provides for the exclusion of aliens who are afflicated with any dangerous contagious disease.

Four sections of the bill codify existing law applicable to the granting of waivers of certain excluding provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and consolidate with the basic statute provisions contained in separate enactments: to wit, section 4 of the act of September 3, 1954, and section 5, 6, and 7 of the act of September 11, 1957.

The bill also provides that the beneficiaries of second and third preference petitions filed prior to July 1, 1961, shall be accorded nonquota status. This provision is designed to expedite the reunification of families of U.S. citizens and immigrants admitted for permanent residence. This bill was enacted into law on September 26, 1961 (Public Law 87–301).

H.R. 8291, as amended, reenacts three provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, authorizing U.S. participation in, or operation by the United States, respectively, of existing programs of assistance to certain migrants and refugee-escapees, and authorizes the appropriation of funds for such programs. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of funds to assist certain refugees from the Western Hemisphere who fled to the United States for fear of persecution (such assistance having been hitherto rendered by using the President's contingency funds for the benefit of refugees from Cuba). This bill passed the House on September 12, 1961. It passed the Senate and is now in conference.

H.R. 187 creates a single, separate, statutory form of judicial review of administrative orders for the deportation and exclusion of aliens from the United States. Aliens may seek judicial review of an order of deportation by filing a petition in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, orders of exclusion to be reviewed exclusively by writs of habeas corpus. Such orders shall not be reviewed until all administrative remedies have been exhausted. The bill provides for trial de novo of substantial claims to American nationality by persons who have been ordered deported.

This bill passed the House July 10, 1961. Identical provisions are included in S. 2237, as amended, which was enacted into law September 26, 1961 (Public Law 87–301).

Under the general jurisdiction of Subcommittee No. 1, the following bills were considered:

House Joint Resolution 225 grants the consent of the Congress to an interstate-Federal compact that will create a regional governmental commission to administer comprehensibly the water resources of the Delaware River Basin. Parties to the compact are the Federal Government and the States of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. This resolution was enacted into law September 27, 1961 (Public Law 87–328).

H.R. 2730 extends the application of chapter 37 of title 18 United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship, to acts committed anywhere in the world by repealing section 791 of that title. That section now provides that the provisions of chapter 37 which apply only within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, on the high seas, and within the United States. This bill was enacted into law in 1961 (Public Law 87–369).

H.R. 176, as amended, provides for the representation of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals on the Judicial Conference of the United States. Additionally, the bill amends section 605 of title 28, United States Code, by eliminating the special budgetary position, thus placing the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals on the same level as other U.S. courts which are represented on the Judicial Conference. This bill was enacted into law September 19, 1961 (Public Law 87–253).

H.R. 8490 amends the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended (Public Law 85–906 amended by Public Law 86–287) by extending the life of the Commission for an additional 2 years to December 31, 1963, thus, providing a reasonable period for the completion of the Commission's projected program. The bill was enacted into law September 26, 1961 (Public Law 87–324).

Public hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1 on the Delaware River Basin Compact (H.J. Res. 225), the proposed Migration and Refugee Assistance Act (H.R. 8291) and on the several bills relating to the mailing of obscene matter.

The extent of the work of this subcommittee in the area of private legislation is set forth in the following table:

Private bills

House bills:	
Private laws	130
Pending in Senate	26
On Private Calendar	1
Incorporated in House joint resolution or other bills which became private law	42
Tabled	295
Tabled because Senate companion bills passed in lieu	14
Pending in committee	1,342
Total	1,850
Senate bills:	
Private laws	86
Passed House amended	2
On Private Calendar	2
Tabled	28
Pending in committee	51
Total	169
House joint resolutions:	
Private laws	2
Pending in committee	1
Total	3

Total private laws: 218.

One Senate concurrent resolution was approved. It included the names of 29 applicants for suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; 19 applicants for suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 19(c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; 14 applicants for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; and 3 applicants for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the subcommittee held 35 meetings, and conducted hearings on 22 days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

The subcommittee considered H.R. 2883 and a group of similar bills relating to the problem of personal liability of Government drivers. H.R. 2883 making the remedy provided in the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code the exclusive remedy in cases arising out of the operation of Government vehicles was favorably reported, passed both Houses and became Public Law 87–258.

The subcommittee conducted a hearing on House Joint Resolution 91 and several similar joint resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the continuity of membership in the House of Representatives in the event of disaster. House Joint Resolution 91 was favorably reported to the full committee. H.R. 298, providing for the recovery of the cost of medical or hospital care extended by the United States, from negligent third parties was also favorably recommended to the full committee at the close of the session.

Three bills concerning compensation systems administered by the United States which were favorably considered by the subcommittee passed both Houses and became law during the session. H.R. 7358 which became Public Law 87–317, extended the provisions for compensation found in section 4126 of title 18 to Federal prisoners injured

while working in the maintenance or operation of the institution in which confined. S. 935, enacted as Public Law 87–234, authorized the filing and consideration of certain National Guard claims under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act was increased by 15 percent by the enactment of H.R. 4357 as Public Law 87–380.

H.R. 1777 providing for the amendment of title 18 to bar the transportation of fraudulent State tax stamps or the equipment to make them in interstate or foreign commerce became Public Law 87–371. H.R. 3227 permitting the introduction of photographic reproductions of business records held in custodial or fiduciary capacities was enacted as Public Law 87–183.

Two bills referred to the subcommittee provided for relief from liability for groups of service personnel who were paid money under circumstances where the payments were subsequently ruled to have been erroneous. H.R. 6244 provided relief to servicemen who had received family separation allowances under a regulation subsequently ruled to be invalid. That bill became Public Law 87–207. Another bill, H.R. 7099, validating certain per diem allowances paid to Coast Guard personnel assigned to construct loran stations in foreign countries, was reported and passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate.

A bill, H.R. 4131, extending authority to the Comptroller General to waive indebtedness for erroneous payments to Government personnel was the subject of a hearing and was reported to the House in the form recommended by the subcommittee. The bill passed the House in that form.

H.R. 6533, validating payments of compensation to Government employees under an erroneous interpretation of a remedial employees' pay law, was favorably considered, reported, and passed the House.

H.R. 4528 provided for the relief of persons harmed as the result of the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at the Parks Air Force Base, Calif. The bill passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate.

A number of bills granting relief to States or political subdivisions within States were considered by the subcommittee. Among the bills recommended favorably was S. 1942 compensating the State of New Hampshire for amounts it paid as the result of the crash of a National Guard jet aircraft on a training mission. That bill became Public Law 87. H.R. 74, reimbursing the city of New York for expense incurred in rehabilitating a ferry slip for Army use, was reported and passed the House. A bill, H.R. 4917, authorizing the payment of half of the cost to Albany County, N.Y., in leasing Civil Defense communications equipment, was favorably considered and ultimately was enacted as Public Law 87–335. A bill concerning flood-damage payments to Hood County, Tex., H.R. 4360, was reported and passed the House.

Three bills concerning problems faced by school boards in connection with the Federal Government were recommended by the subcommittee and were reported to the House. H.R. 1627, concerning the Princess Anne County School Board, Virginia, provided for the payment of an amount to be fixed by the Court of Claims in return for the conveyance of the Oceana Public School property, the use of which was prejudiced by aircraft operations. H.R. 1627 was approved as Public Law 87–251. A similar bill, H.R. 6759, for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland, and relating to a school near Andrews Air Force Base, was reported by the full committee to the House. H.R. 6103, authorizing the refund of $1,500 paid as rent by the Stella Reorganized Schools, Missouri, for the use of a barracks after its school burned, was reported and passed the House.

H.R. 8958, which became Public Law 87–393, granted the Secretary of the Air Force the authority to settle claims arising out of the crash of an Air Force aircraft at Midwest City, Okla., without regard to the $5,000 limitation provided in section 2733 of title 10 of the United States Code.

Three joint resolutions recognizing centennial observances during 1962 were favorably considered by the subcommittee. House Joint Resolution 436 concerning the centennial of the Department of Agriculture became Public Law 87–161. House Joint Resolution 436 recognizing the centennial of the establishment of the national system of land-grant colleges and universities became Public Law 87–163. Senate Joint Resolution 98 providing for the observation of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act became Public Law 87–272.

The subcommittee favorably considered H.R. 8741 embodying the recommendation of the General Services Administration that existing law permitting the waiver by the armed services secretaries of payment or performance bonds in connection with cost type or supply contracts be extended to all Federal agencies in a uniform manner. The bill was reported and passed the House.

H.R. 310 extending limited authority for the settlement of certain claims arising from activities of members or employees of the military services outside the scope of their duties was also reported and passed the House.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connection with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	521
Private, House joint resolutions	2
Private, House resolutions	7
Private, Senate bills	18
Total	548
Public, House bills	52
Public, House joint resolutions	8
Public, House resolutions	9
Public, Senate bills	2
Public, Senate joint resolutions	1
Total	72
Grand total	620
Approved by subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	149
Private, House resolutions	3
Private, Senate bills	10
Total	162
Public, House bills	23
Public, House joint resolutions	3
Public, Senate bills	2
Public, Senate joint resolutions	1
Total	29
Grand total	191
Adversely reported by subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	36
Private, House joint resolution	1
Private, Senate bills	2
Public, House bills	10
Public, House joint resolution	1
Total	50
Reported to House:	
Private, House bills	146
Private, House resolutions	3
Private, Senate bills	10
Total	159
Reported to House:	
Public, House bills	20
Public, House joint resolutions	2
Public, Senate bills	2
Public, Senate joint resolution	1
Total	25
Grand total	184
Passed House:	
Private, House bills	141
Private, House resolutions	3
Private, Senate bills	8
Total	152
Public, House bills	19
Public, House joint resolutions	2
Public, Senate bills	2
Public, Senate joint resolution	1
Total	24
Grand total	176
Pending in Senate:	
Private, House bills	89
Public, House bills	7
Total	96
Public laws enacted	14
Private laws enacted	58
Bills vetoed, private	3
Sent 3 private claims bills of the House to the Court of Claims by House resolutions.	
Private claims settled administratively (tentative)	4

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

The jurisdiction of this subcommittee falls generally into three categories, namely, (a) general legislation, (b) patents, trademarks and copyrights, and (c) revision of the laws. In all 115 bills were referred for subcommittee action. At the end of this statement is a table showing the disposition which the subcommittee and in many instances the full committee and the Congress has made of this legislation. There follows a general discussion of the legislation touching the highlights of the subcommittee's program in this first session of the 87th Congress.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

As part of the subcommittee's program to study decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court for the purpose of introducing legislation where needed, the subcommittee favorably considered and the House approved H.R. 3247, to clarify the meaning of the term "organize" as it is used in the Smith Act. This bill is the result of *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298), which involved the question of whether 14 known Communists had violated certain sections of our internal security laws in conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and in organizing groups for the same purpose. The term "organize" has been rewritten so as to encompass not only the initial act of organizing but also the continuous process of recruiting new members, regrouping, and expanding existing organizations.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act was also the subject of a bill processed by the subcommittee. Today, while agents of foreign principals must register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, they need do so, under certain circumstances, only when the agents are "subsidized" by their foreign principals. H.R. 470, which became Public Law 87–366, expands the act so as to require agents, irrespective of whether they are subsidized, to register with the Department of

Justice if their foreign governments or foreign political parties exercise control or supervision over their policies and activities.

Another bill which became public law, H.R. 6834, relates to the imparting of false bomb information. This new act makes it a misdemeanor knowingly (but without malice) to impart or convey false bomb information, and further makes it a felony to convey such false information willfully and maliciously, or with a reckless disregard for human life.

In 1956 Congress enacted the Automatic Payment of Judgments Act, which materially reduced the administrative and legislative burdens both of the executive departments and of the Congress, by authorizing the automatic payment of judgments handed down by the Federal courts. This act has proven successful. As a result, a bill, H.R. 6835, was introduced to provide a corresponding simplification for the payment of judgments of State and foreign courts as well as the payment of compromise settlements in like causes. This bill has become Public Law 87-187.

Legislation on which the subcommittee expended considerable time and effort proposed enlarging the membership of the House of Representatives. The subcommittee considered some 21 bills, which would have increased the House membership variously from 437 Members to 469 Members. In addition to hearings there were several executive sessions in which the subcommittee as well as the full committee considered and reconsidered various aspects of the legislation. As of the end of this session, however, the full committee had taken unfavorable action on one of the bills, and the subcommittee has indefinitely postponed action on the remainder of the bills.

Several other general bills were processed by the subcommittee and became law. They are, H.R. 5343, permitting the courts to set aside the convictions of youthful offenders (Public Law 87-336), and H.R. 5656, providing for reasonable notice, instead of the present requirement of 5 days' notice, on applications to U.S. Courts of Appeal for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies (Public Law 87-225). In addition, others have passed the House and are pending in the Senate. They are H.R. 75, requiring the U.S. Supreme Court to treat appeals improperly taken from federal circuit courts as petitions for certiorari; and H.R. 2041, permitting the sale of stream-clogging water hyacinths in those areas where climates are such that the plants are unable to survive winter weather.

Interstate compact bills were also the subject of consideration by the subcommittee. Three of these compacts became public law. They are S. 133—Arizona-Nevada boundary compact (Public Law 87-50). H.R. 7454, the Pennsylvania-Ohio compact relating to Pymatuning Lake (Public Law 87-115), and H.R. 7189, North Dakota-Minnesota boundary compact (87-162). Other compacts considered or being considered by the subcommittee are H.R. 6243, authorizing Guam to enter into certain interstate compacts for the enforcement of criminal laws and policies, H.R. 7498, granting the consent of the Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, H.R. 6717, authorizing the district courts to entertain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and S. 464, authorizing interstate compacts for the development and operation of library facilities and services.

Other bills of significance studied by the subcommittee in this session are H.R. 3, dealing with Federal preemption of State statutes, and H.R. 3248, providing for the admission of certain evidence in court (Mallory case). This latter bill has been favorably reported to the full committee. Also referred to the subcommittee for its consideration is H.R. 3093, to eliminate the abuse of the use of habeas corpus by State prisoners.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

H.R. 4333, which substantially affects the trademark laws, was favorably considered by the subcommittee, passed the House, and is now pending in the Senate. The provisions of this bill affect details of registration, administrative and court procedure, and the internal organization of the Patent Office regarding trademark matters.

The subcommittee processed H.R. 5754, to carry into effect a provision of the convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property (Patents and Trademarks). The provisions of the convention are not self-executing and the instant bill, which became Public Law 87-333, amends Federal law to give effect to the convention to conform our Federal statutes to the applicable provisions of the convention.

Another bill enacted into law is House Joint Resolution 499 (Public Law 87-292), authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and others to make suitable arrangements for the observance of American Patent System Week, which has been designated by President Kennedy to be the week of October 15, 1961.

Pending in the subcommittee is H.R. 6354, a bill providing penalties for the counterfeiting of phonograph records. Also pending is H.R. 70, popularly referred to as the jukebox bill, which would require operators to pay royalties to songwriters for the public performance of their works on records in jukeboxes.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on H.R. 5487, which would permit patent holders to bring civil actions against Government contractors who infringe their patents while carrying out Government contracts. A number of other bills also being considered by the subcommittee concern overall Government patent policy regarding Government contracts.

The staff of the subcommittee has been working with the Copyright Office in connection with the revision of the copyright law. The committee recently published a report of the Register of Copyrights in this connection. This report contains the tentative recommendations of the Copyright Office. It has been issued by the committee for the purpose of inviting all persons concerned to submit comments and suggestions, which will be carefully considered in the next session of Congress, when the task of drafting a general revision bill is taken up.

The subcommittee has pending a bill to raise certain fees in the Patent and Trademark Offices (H.R. 7731). Similar legislation has been favorably considered in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses. The only new feature in the present legislation which distinguishes it from its predecessors is a provision for maintenance fees, sometimes referred to as renewal fees. This type of fee would be an innovation in our patent law, in that these fees would be required to be paid at certain intervals during the life of a patent in order to keep it in force.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

Classification of laws to United States Code and the District of Columbia Code

The primary aspect of the subcommittee's functions regarding the revision of the laws is the classification of the public laws to the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. During this 1st session of the 87th Congress there will have been enacted more than 400 public laws, comprising about 1,000 pages in the Statutes at Large. These have been reviewed, or will be reviewed during the recess, to determine their appropriate classification to the respective code. When the classification is completed these laws will be incorporated in cumulative supplements to the codes and it is hoped that printer's copy will be furnished to the Government Printing Office starting in early November 1961.

The laws of a general and permanent nature enacted at the 2d session of the 86th Congress were classified and incorporated in the second supplement of the United States Code, 1958 edition, which consisted of two volumes containing more than 800 pages and was the first time in the history of the United States Code that a supplement for one Congress required two volumes. This supplement became available in April 1961.

New edition of District of Columbia Code

The work of preparing the new edition of the District of Columbia Code has been completed and the first volume will be available this month. This edition consolidates the laws contained in supplement VIII with the laws contained in the 1951 edition, involving the voluminous editorial and manuscript work. Editorial notes have been enlarged and other improvements made. The new edition comprises three volumes and contains all the general and permanent laws relating to the District of Columbia in force at the beginning of the 87th Congress. The code is completely annotated and contains notes of decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court, the courts of appeals and the district courts, as well as the municipal court of appeals.

Enactment of titles into law

In continuing its program of making the codes more useful the subcommittee has devoted its attention to the preparation of bills to enact particular titles into law. Inasmuch as Public Law 86-682, enacting into law title 39 of the United States Code, contains the laws only up to March 1959, it was necessary to introduce a cleanup bill incorporating the postal laws enacted since that time. The bill (H.R. 173) was introduced early at this session. Also a bill to bring up to date titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code (H.R. 2597) has been introduced.

For several years the law revision staff of the subcommittee has been collaborating closely with the General Counsel's office of the Civil Service Commission in the preparation of a bill to enact into law title 5, relating to the executive departments and employees generally. A bill (H.R. 8748) was introduced in the 86th Congress and the subcommittee has received many suggestions with respect to the bill in response to its request addressed to all the executive departments and regulatory agencies. As a result a new bill is being prepared and it is hoped that it will be ready for introduction early in the next session.

Similarly, the staff has been cooperating closely with the office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense in the preparation of a bill to enact into law title 37 of the United States Code, "Pay and Allowances of the Uniform Services." A bill (H.R. 6700) was introduced early in the 87th Congress.

The subcommittee has extended to the District of Columbia Code its program of improving the codes, and a bill (H.R. 8857) was introduced last Congress to enact into law Part II of the District of Columbia Code, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, comprising titles 12-17. The staff has had numerous conferences with representatives of the courts and the bar association and many suggestions received will be incorporated in a new bill to be introduced in the next session.

Panama Canal Zone Code

During the 86th Congress, the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone appointed the committee's law revision counsel as an adviser on the preparation of a new Canal Zone Code. The present code was enacted in 1934 and has not been kept up to date by a subsequent amendment. The committee's law revision counsel attended several meetings of the advisory committee and a bill (H.R. 7468) has been introduced. The bill has

been referred to this committee and when reports are received from the departments, it is expected that it will be reported favorably to the House.

During the recess the work on this bill and the other bills mentioned will be pursued with the view of obtaining favorable action early in the next session.

Bills referred, 115.
Bills on which hearings were held, 37.
Bills reported favorably to full committee, 18.
Bills reported adversely to full committee, 11.
Bills pending in subcommittee, 87.
Bills reported to House, 16.
Bills passed House, 16.
Bills pending in House, none.
Bills pending in Senate, 6.
Bills which became law, 10.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION

In the exercise of its special jurisdiction over bankruptcy and reorganization the subcommittee considered a number of diverse measures. Three of these passed the House and are awaiting action in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. They are: H.R. 1961, H.R. 4473, and H.R. 7405.

H.R. 1961 is a complex piece of legislation directed at clarifying the status of liens in bankruptcy and clearly defining the powers of the trustee. A predecessor bill, H.R. 7242, passed both Houses in the 86th Congress but was not approved by the President. In considering H.R. 1961 this year the subcommittee once again endeavored to meet the objections raised by the Treasury Department in respect to the treatment of the Federal tax lien. A number of substantive amendments which had been suggested by Treasury were incorporated in the bill. The bill was also modified to take into account the recent action of the Supreme Court in *Lewis v. Manufacturers National Bank* which eliminated the need for certain provisions of the bill.

The subcommittee also favorably reported H.R. 4473. This bill is identical to H.R. 2236 which passed the House in the 86th Congress but was not acted upon in the Senate. The bill places a 3-year limitation on the priority and the nondischargeability of taxes. The House once again passed the bill and it is now before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

During the last two Congresses the subcommittee acted upon a large number of bills effecting relatively minor procedural changes in the Bankruptcy Act. In other proceedings in the Federal courts, these matters would probably have been dealt with by order of the Supreme Court. However, the Supreme Court does not have the power in respect to bankruptcy to issue rules superseding existing law which it has in other types of proceedings. This bill would give the Court the same power in respect to rules in bankruptcy that it now has in civil procedure, admiralty, criminal procedure prior to and including verdict, and review of decisions of the Tax Court. This bill has passed the House and is also before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Ten years after the enactment of the Chandler Act in 1938 a review of its operation was made and legislation was enacted to remedy various inaccuracies, ambiguities, or other minor imperfections. With the passing of a second decade, a second decennial review was undertaken and those measures which were considered necessary and noncontroversial were embodied in H.R. 5393. The subcommittee considered this bill and recommended a number of amendments to it. The bill is now before the House.

In addition to the bankruptcy legislation already discussed, the subcommittee also held hearings on H.R. 5341, a bill providing for comprehensive changes in the tenure, salary, and terms for retirement of referees in bankruptcy. No action, however, was taken on this bill.

The subcommitee had referred to it a number of bills within the general jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Five of these bills have now passed the House. They cover matter ranging from the Federal slug law to problems of jurisdiction and venue in actions against Government officials. The bills which have passed the House are as follows:

H.R. 1960. This bill makes it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia, which, because of certain existing limitations on jurisdiction and venue, may now be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6691. This bill provides criminal penalties against those who threaten the Vice President-elect or such other officer as may be next in the order of succession to the Office of President. The bill also gives authority to the Secret Service, which it does not now have, to provide protection for the Vice President, the Vice President-elect and a former President.

H.R. 8038. The purpose of this bill is to broaden the Federal criminal law dealing with the manufacture and sale of slugs and similar devices. It extends Federal jurisdiction to the use of slugs and other devices in machines which are to be operated by U.S. money.

H.J. Res. 358. Designed to make people more aware of the dangers of accidental poisoning, this bill authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation designating the 3d week in March of each year as National Poison Prevention Week.

S. 1990. As a result of the bombing of certain communication facilities, Congress was called upon by a number of Members to strengthen the Federal criminal laws in this area. The subcommittee held hearings on such legislation and reported out a bill which had already passed the Senate. This bill strengthens the criminal law against willful or malicious interference with or destruction of communication facilities used or intended to be used for military and civil defense functions of the United States.

During this session the subcommittee also held hearings on a number of other bills including House Concurrent Resolution 125, House Joint Resolution 475, and H.R. 8519.

House Concurrent Resolution 125 would designate a President's Day. No action was taken on this bill. House Joint Resolution 475 would create a "U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission," and would authorize the appropriation of $500,000 for its activities. This bill ordered unfavorably reported to the committee but was subsequently rereferred to subcommittee. H.R. 8519 is designed to strengthen the Federal law in respect to the hijacking of aircraft and similar deeds. Legislation dealing with this problem was acted upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and became law. No further action has been taken by the subcommittee on this bill.

A statistical summary of the work of the subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress follows:

Number of bills referred to Subcommittee No. 4: 63.
Number of bills on which hearings were held: 17.
Number of bills reported to full committee: 12.
Number of bills on which reports were filed: 9.
Number of public bills passed House: 8.
Number of public bills pending in Senate: 6.
Number of Senate bills disposed of: 1.
Number of bills approved by President: 2.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercises jurisdiction over a variety of subjects, including such topics as civil rights, the Federal judicial system, criminal statutes, and particular jurisdiction over antitrust matters.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, this subcommittee had referred to it 382 legislative proposals. Twenty-seven days were spent in conducting hearings before this subcommittee.

Among the legislative proposals enacted into law was the bill providing for 73 additional new Federal judges. This bill, which became Public Law 87–36, provided for the appointment of 63 new U.S. district judges and 10 new positions on the U.S. courts of appeal. In addition, this law created two new judicial divisions, one in the western district of Louisiana and a second in the eastern district of Arkansas. It also authorized new places of holding court in various judicial districts throughout the United States. In the consideration of this legislation the subcommittee considered approximately 40-odd bills dealing with new judgeships, new places of holding court, new divisions, and new districts.

Another major consideration by this subcommittee was the Attorney General's program for legislation against organized crime. After extensive hearings at which representatives of Federal and State law enforcement authorities, as well as representatives of bar associations, testified, there was enacted into law Public Law 87–228, which prohibits travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises. Also Public Law 87–218, prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia, and Public Law 87–216, which prohibits the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information by wire communication facility. Also enacted into law was the legislative proposal which broadened the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act by repealing the specific crimes contained in that statute and inserting the broad language to cover all felonies or high misdemeanors as defined by the law of the State wherein the crime was committed. This proposal became Public Law 87–368.

This subcommittee processed and recommended favorably reported what is now Public Law 87–189, which eliminates the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Judicial Circuit. Thus, appeals from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico will now go directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Another legislative proposal relating to Puerto Rico which the subcommittee processed was H.R. 6902. Under this proposal, the judges of the U.S. District Court for Puerto Rico would hereafter receive life tenure instead of the limited term they now have. This bill passed the House and was pending in the Senate at the close of the first session of the Congress.

The subcommittee processed the legislation which is now Public Law 87–253 which provides for representation on the Judicial Conference of the United States for the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Another legislative proposal enacted into law was H.R. 7259 which became Public Law 87–337, whereby the ban of section 142 of title 28 of the United States Code was waived with relationship to the newly created Lafayette Division in the western district of Louisiana. The enactment of this legislation would permit the General Services Administration to plan permanent Federal court facilities at Lafayette, La.

The subcommittee also reported the bill, H.R. 6242, which would have authorized the Attorney General to fix the salaries of attorneys in the Department of Justice. However, that proposal failed of passage in the House.

Another proposal reported by the subcommittee which was pending before the Rules Committee at the close of the first session was the bill, H.R. 6496, which would have extended the power of the Civil Rights Commission to investigate all types of fraud in voting and also extend the life of the Commission for an additional 2 years.

The subcommittee also considered the bill, H.R. 5255, to clarify the status of circuit and district judges who have retired from regular active service. This bill passed the House. It passed the Senate, amended, and at the close of the first session of the Congress was pending in conference.

Another bill which was pending in the Senate at the close of the session was the bill, H.R. 7037, which the committee reported. This bill is designed to cure important defects in the present venue statutes with particular coverage as to criminal offenses not committed in any district.

Another important proposal which the subcommittee considered and reported favorably to the full committee in an amended version was the bill, H.R. 2696, which would provide for legal representation for indigent defendants in criminal cases in the Federal courts. This proposal was pending before the full committee at the close of this session of Congress.

Another proposal which the subcommittee processed and which passed the House and was pending in the Senate at the end of the first session was H.R. 6690. This bill provided for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

LEGISLATIVE

Thirty-two bills were assigned to the Antitrust Subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The subcommittee considered 17 of these bills during 15 days of public hearings. One bill, H.R. 9096, involving telecasts of professional league sports contests, was enacted into law, becoming Public Law 87–331 upon approval by the President on September 30, 1961. Another bill, H.R. 8140, dealing with bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest in the Federal service, was passed by the House and is pending in the Senate. A third bill, H.R. 71, to prevent manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing or insuring the sale of their products, was ordered reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary, subject to action on a pending motion to reconsider.

Sports telecasts

On August 28, 1961 the subcommittee held a hearing on H.R. 8757, a bill to amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes. After study, the subcommittee ordered a clean bill, H.R. 9096, to be reported. As amended by the Committee on the Judiciary and enacted, H.R. 9096 enables the member clubs of a professional football, baseball, basketball or hockey league to pool their separate rights in the sponsored telecasting of their games and permits the league to sell the resulting package of pooled rights without violating the antitrust laws. At the same time, the bill provides that the antitrust exemption shall not apply to any such package sale which permits the impairment of college football gate receipts through network telecasts of professional football contests at times when college games are scheduled to be played. The bill further withholds the antitrust exemption from agreements which prohibit the purchaser of league television rights from televising any game within any area except the home territory of a member club on a day when that club is playing a home game. H.R. 9096 became Public Law 87–331 on September 30, 1961.

Conflicts of interest

On June 1 and 2, 1961 the subcommittee held hearings on a number of bills (H.R. 302, H.R. 3050, H.R. 3411, H.R. 3412, and H.R. 7139) designed to implement and strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interest in Federal employment. These hearings marked the culmination of more than 3 years of study by the subcommittee initiated by a staff study and a comprehensive staff report on Federal conflict-of-interest legislation issued in 1958, and including 10 days of hearings on conflict-of-interest bills during 1960. The subcommittee ordered a clean bill, H.R. 8140, reported to the Committee on the Judiciary. As amended by the committee and passed by the House, H.R. 8140 would strengthen, revise and simplify existing Federal conflict-of-interest laws; would make appropriate general provisions for consultants and temporary employees in the executive branch of the Government, and would integrate these conflict-of-interest laws with recodified prohibitions of bribery and graft. The bill is pending in the Senate.

Auto financing and insurance

On June 7, 8, 9, 28, 29, and 30, 1961, the subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 71, a bill to supplement the antitrust laws by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products. This bill is aimed at correcting what has been described as a monopolistic tendency in the automobile industry and a similar tendency in the businesses of financing and insuring automobile purchases, which contravene the national antitrust policy against monopoly and monopoly power. The subcommittee ordered H.R. 71 reported to the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment that would limit its applicability to passenger automobiles, including stationwagons. A motion to reconsider this action remains pending.

Premerger notification

On April 27 and 28 and May 3 and 4, 1961, the subcommittee held hearings on four identical bills (H.R. 2882, H.R. 3563, H.R. 6058, and H.R. 6698), to amend the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950, by requiring prior notification of important corporate mergers and acquisitions and by authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek preliminary court injunctions against mergers of doubtful legality. The antitrust enforcement agencies have indicated that such legislation would enable them to be informed of mergers not publicly announced in time to determine whether to seek a preliminary injunction, and thus avoid the problems inherent in unscrambling the effects of corporate mergers entered into in violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act. These premerger notification bills are similar in major respects to H.R. 9424, which was adopted by the House unanimously in the 84th Congress and are identical with H.R. 2143 as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary in the 85th Congress.

Civil investigative demand

On August 23, 1961, the subcommittee held a public hearing on H.R. 6689, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. The bill is recommended by the Department of Justice to cover situations in which suspected violators and others refuse to cooperate with the Department of Justice and where the Department believes that a grand jury investigation is not warranted. S. 167, a bill identical with H.R. 6689, was passed by the Senate in amended form and is before the subcommittee for consideration. In the 86th Congress a similar bill passed the Senate.

Functional discounts

On August 30, 1961, the subcommittee held a hearing on three identical bills (H.R. 3465, H.R. 4151, and H.R. 4529) to reaffirm the policy and purpose and clarify the intent and meaning of the Robinson-Patman Anti-price Discrimination Act (15 U.S.C. 13) by providing for mandatory functional discounts in certain circumstances. The bills would add a new proviso to section 2(a) of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. This proviso would require a manufacturing seller who restricts his direct sales to members of a particular functional class or classes to impose reasonable price differentials based on whether the customer purchases for resale to wholesalers or to consumers. The purpose of this requirement is to enable a wholesaler's customer to compete with like firms which purchase directly from the seller. These functional discount requirements would not, however, be imposed upon the seller willing to accommodate all would-be purchasers without regard to their size or function in the distributive process. Hearings on similar proposals were held by the subcommittee in July 1958, and again in June 1959.

INVESTIGATIVE

In the period elapsing since adjournment of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee conducted three sets of investigative hearings, and also received reports from Federal agencies concerning the steps they have taken to carry out the recommendations contained in the subcommittee's reports on investigations conducted in earlier years.

Port of New York Authority

On November 28, 29, and 30 and December 1 and 2, 1960, after final adjournment of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee conducted preliminary hearings dealing with the activities and operations of the Port of New York Authority. This investigation had its origin when, in March 1960, at the request of the New Jersey congressional delegation, the staff of the subcommittee was directed to make a study of those activities and operations, including a review of the scope of the authoritys' major operations.

The Port of New York Authority is an interstate, regional development authority established under compacts between the States of New York and New Jersey in 1921 and 1922 for the purpose of dealing with the planning and development of terminal and transportation facilities and improving the commerce of the port district. Operations of the authority exercise a farflung influence on interstate commerce, yielding tax-exempt revenues in excess of $100 million annually from tunnels, bridges, terminals, airports, and shops, all valued at more than $900 million.

Notwithstanding the clear responsibilities of Congress in relation to the Port of New York Authority, for the 40 years of the port authority's life there has been no thoroughgoing congressional review of its activities.

Finally, it has been alleged that in the period of 40 years since its establishment, the overall operations of the port authority have at no time been subjected to a comprehensive overall audit by any governmental agency.

At the November–December 1960 hearings the subcommittee examined into these and other matters to determine whether legislation is needed with respect to congressional consent to the interstate compacts creating the port authority.

The reason why these hearings were preliminary only is that the subcommittee had been materially hampered in the pursuit of its inquiry by noncooperative conduct on the part of certain officials of the port authority. These officials have refused to make available to the subcommittee many documents and records of the port authority whose examination is essential to enable Congress to

determine whether additional legislation with respect to the Port of New York Authority compacts is necessary. The facts concerning this conduct were by three separate contempt resolutions (Nos. 2117, 2120, and 2121) adopted by the House of Representatives in the 86th Congress, certified to the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for appropriate action under law.

Because of this behavior on the part of port authority officials, the subcommittee, in the exercise of its responsibility to inquire into the activities and operations of the port authority, was required to examine files and records of a considerable number of enterprises doing business with the port authority, and at great effort, to piece together information that would otherwise have been available in the port authority documents requested by, but withheld from, the subcommittee. There remain important areas in which, as the result of the position taken by the port authority officials in withholding records of the agency, the subcommittee has been wholly prevented from carrying out its legislative responsibilities.

Within the limitations imposed on the investigation by this failure of the port authority to cooperate, the subcommittee in these preliminary hearings inquired into a number of important matters, including the allegations that have been previously mentioned. A significant result of these preliminary hearings is that they confirmed the judgment of the subcommittee in insisting on compliance with its demand for the production of internal documents and in refusing to accept documents that were already of public record and oral testimony as a substitute.

Meanwhile, on November 25, 1960, an information was filed against Mr. Austin J. Tobin, executive director of the port authority, for violation of section 192 of title 2 of the United States Code.

In January 1961, this information came on for trial in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia before Judge Luther Youngdahl, sitting without a jury. On June 15, 1961, the court rendered its decision, finding the defendant guilty as charged. In his opinion, Judge Youngdahl sustained the subcommittee's right to demand production of the disputed documents and wholly validated the subcommittee's procedure. The conviction has been appealed and much time can yet be expected to elapse before a final judgment. Meanwhile the subcommittee's investigation is being suspended until a final judicial determination is made on the subcommittee's power and authority.

Ocean shipping

On March 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, and 16, 1961, the subcommittee conducted further hearings on antitrust problems in the ocean freight industry, supplementing 5 weeks of hearings previously held by the subcommittee in the fall of 1959 and in May 1960, in the course of which extensive testimony was received from officials of the Federal Maritime Board, representatives of steamship lines engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States, conference chairmen, and others.

In this investigation, the subcommittee's purpose has been to ascertain inasmuch detail as limitations of time and staff permit, first, the competitive practices of the ocean shipping industry in light of the requirements of the Shipping Act of 1916 and of the antitrust laws, and, second, the nature and adequacy of regulation and the enforcement of pertinent statutory provisions by the Federal Maritime Board and the Department of Justice.

The ocean freight inquiry began with a staff examination of hundreds of thousands of documents in the files of some 53 ocean freight conferences, and 9 American-flag and 4 foreign-flag steamship lines. The ensuing hearings disclosed that ocean carriers engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States have conducted their operations in gross disregard of the requirements of the Shipping Act of 1916 and of the Federal antitrust statutes. They further disclosed that the Federal Maritime Board had, for at least the preceding 12 years, been guilty of incredible neglect in carrying out the responsibilities delegated to it by the Congress under the Shipping Act of 1916. The subcommittee has examined in detail, the operations of a number of Federal regulatory agencies in connection with its overall study of monopoly problems in regulated industries. In this frame of reference the record of regulatory neglect by the Federal Maritime Board is unparalleled.

Furthermore, the industry's disregard of statutory requirements, coupled with Federal Maritime Board indifference to wholesale violations of the shipping laws, have necessarily injured the foreign commerce of the United States, have caused American consumers to pay more for imported goods, and have been detrimental to American manufacturers and exporters.

As a result of the 1959 hearings, the subcommittee referred to the Federal Maritime Board 127 instances of possible violations of the Shipping Act. It also referred numerous other possible violations to the Department of Justice. These referrals included 44 secret gentlemen's agreements restricting or destroying competition; 34 instances of discriminatory practices in apparent violation of sections 16 and 17 of the Shipping Act; 44 violations of conference agreements, rules, and regulations; 57 possible violations of the antitrust laws; and 7 possible violations of other criminal statutes.

At the subcommittee's hearings in May 1960 there were disclosed 29 additional unlawful gentlemen's agreements, and 21 additional instances of unlawful discriminatory practices. Still further apparent violations of law were referred to the enforcement agencies as a result of the 1961 hearings. It should be noted that these disclosures resulted from scrutiny of the records of only a relatively small portion of all ocean freight carriers and conferences.

On the basis of the subcommittee's hearings the Attorney General has embarked upon a sweeping grand jury investigation of steamship industry practices. Preliminary litigation, seeking to quash subpenas issued by that grand jury and served on more than 150 concerns, was terminated favorably to the Government in June 1960 and the investigations are underway.

The Federal Maritime Board, in response to the subcommittee's referral of possible violations, has instituted a number of important investigative and rulemaking proceedings, a number of which involve unfiled agreements whose filing with, and approval by, the Board are required by section 15 of the Shipping Act. Failure to file such agreements is a particularly serious offense because, as the Alexander committee report of 1914 made clear, the premise of the Shipping Act is that Government supervision and regulation of anticompetitive agreements is essential to compensate for the exemption of such agreements from the antitrust laws. Thus, when an anticompetitive agreement is not filed with the Board for approval, or is concealed from Board scrutiny, the violation strikes at the very heart of the Shipping Act. In recognition of the gravity of this matter, Congress prescribed a penalty of $1,000 a day for each day of violation. Beyond this, failure to file anticompetitive agreements between ocean carriers engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States subjects those participating in such schemes to the criminal and civil sanctions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other Federal antitrust enactments.

The 1961 hearings involved the practices of certain additional foreign-flag carriers and steamship conferences. The subcommittee also heard testimony from several noncarrier groups that asked to be heard. Further, it received testimony from the Federal Maritime Board and the Department of Justice concerning action they had taken with respect to the matters referred to them by the subcommittee. A representative of the Comptroller General of the United States testified concerning action he had taken on matters referred to him by the subcommittee involving overcharges on Government-financed shipments of bulk cargo amounting to more than $300,000. Also, the subcommittee heard testimony concerning the establishment of so-called neutral bodies to supervise and police the operation of conference agreements.

Not unrelated to the disclosures of the subcommittee's inquiry into antitrust problems in the ocean freight industry is the formulation and the recent approval by Congress of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 7. Heretofore, the functions of promoting and subsidizing the merchant fleet and the function of regulation, including enforcement of the Shipping Act, have been combined in a single agency, the Federal Maritime Board, to the almost total neglect of regulation. Under Reorganization Plan No. 7, enforcement and regulatory functions will be the exclusive province of a new Federal Maritime Commission, an independent agency. Subsidies and other promotional functions will be in a Maritime Administrator, a Presidential appointee, in the Department of Commerce and under direction of the Secretary of Commerce. It is to be hoped that this reorganization will enable separate, independent enforcement of the shipping laws.

Note should also be taken of recent amendments of the Shipping Act which impose salutary limitations upon the kind of dual-rate contracts which shipping conferences may utilize and require advance filing of tariffs to which carriers are required to adhere. The subcommittee participated in the early drafting of these amendments.

The 1961 hearings by no means mark the end of the subcommittee's investigation or of its interest and involvement in the vital antitrust problems affecting the ocean freight industry. The subcommittee will not only obtain periodic reports from the Federal Maritime Board and the Department of Justice, but will take further testimony, when appropriate, from their officials. It is essential in the public interest that effective action be taken by these agencies to correct the deplorable situation which has been revealed by this subcommittee's hearings. The type of regulation which has in the past characterized the ocean shipping industry cannot be permitted to continue.

Nearing completion and publication is a comprehensive report of the Antitrust Subcommittee containing a summary and analysis of its lengthy hearings and its detailed legislative recommendations for dealing with ocean shipping problems, for strengthening the competitive provisions of the Shipping Act and related laws, and for establishing an effective regulatory system.

Consent decrees and the television broadcasting industry

It is the policy of the Antitrust Subcommittee to maintain continuing scrutiny of matters previously the subject of investigation and hearings. In accordance with that policy, the subcommittee held public hearings on June 14 and 15, 1961, to obtain current and specific information from the Department of Justice and from the Federal Communications Commission concerning actions taken by these agencies in respect of the various recommendations contained in the subcommittee's report on the consent degree program of the Department of Justice, issued on May 25, 1959, and on its

report on the television broadcasting industry, issued on March 13, 1957.

At these hearings the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission appeared, presented testimony, and were interrogated. A highlight of the testimony presented by the Assistant Attorney General at these hearings was the announcement that an urgent recommendation of the subcommittee's consent decree report would be carried out. In its consent decree report, the subcommittee recommended that "revision of the current antitrust consent decree procedures utilized by the Department of Justice is essential" and that such revision "should provide notice to the public of the terms of the consent decree, and establish a waiting period after there has been agreement between the Government and the defendant." Such procedures, the subcommittee pointed out, would assure competitors of the defendants a greater participation in the preparation of the terms of a consent decree than is now provided by the sporadic discussions which the Department of Justice on occasion initiates." In his testimony, the Assistant Attorney General informed the subcommittee that procedures were about to be promulgated by the Department "dealing with the matter of permitting affected parties an opportunity to present their views prior to the actual entry of a proposed consent decree." On June 29, 1961, the Attorney General announced the adoption of such a procedure.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission testified in detail and at length concerning studies and investigations under way by that agency with respect to recommendations made by the subcommittee.

Space satellite communications system

As part of the June 14–15 hearings, the subcommittee inquired concerning the progress of the program for development of a satellite communications system, a problem of fundamental national importance. It developed at the hearings, and subsequently, that the Federal Communications intended that the space communications system was to be owned and operated by a group of 10 "international carriers." This would have meant that only four concerns would participate in the system's ownership since the other six companies in this group professed no interest whatsoever in space communications. More important, it would have meant that one of these four companies, A.T. & T., would have had a dominant and very probably a monopoly position in ownership of the space communications system. In effect, A.T. & T. would have been the chosen instrument of the U.S. Government to own and control civilian space communications.

PUBLICATIONS

Reports: "Bribery, Graft, and Conflict of Interest," House Report No. 748, July 20, 1961; "Telecasting of Professional Sports Contests," House Report No. 1178, September 13, 1961.

Hearings: Port of New York Authority, serial No. 24, parts 1 and 2, 1960; Federal conflict of interest legislation, serial No. 3, 1961; premerger notification, serial No. 5, 1961; antitrust consent decrees and the television broadcasting industry, serial No. 6, 1961; auto financing legislation, serial No. 11, parts 1 and 2, 1961; telecasting of professional sports contests, serial No. 13, 1961; civil investigative demand, serial No. 14, 1961; monopoly problems in regulated industries—ocean freight industry, serial No. 20, part 3, volumes 1 and 2, 1961.

A statistical summary of the work of the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress follows:

Number of bills referred to subcommittee No. 5: 382.

Number of bills on which hearings were held: 80.

Number of bills reported to full committee: 73.

Number of bills pending in subcommittee: 309.

Number of bills on which reports were filed: 19.

Number of public bills passed House: 14.

Number of public bills pending in Senate: 4.

Number of Senate bills disposed of: 5.

Number of bills approved by President: 9.

Number of bills pending in conference: 1.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Public Law 86–272 requires the Committee on the Judiciary to make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to taxation by the States of income derived from interstate commerce. In April of this year Public Law 86–272 was amended by Public Law 87–17 to broaden the scope of this study to encompass State taxation of interstate commerce generally. The responsibility for this task was delegated to a special subcommittee of which Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, was designated chairman.

In order to obtain the advice and assistance of recognized experts in this field, a 10-man advisory group was appointed. The group was composed of tax lawyers, professors of both law and economics, and State tax officials.

The subcommittee, upon recommendation of its advisory group, has instructed the staff to concentrate first upon the problems of State taxation of the income of corporations engaged in mercantile and manufacturing business in interstate commerce. The following is a synopsis of the work in which the staff is now engaged:

1. Review of the operation and effect of Public Law 86–272.

2. Analysis and classification of complaints received concerning the existing system of State taxation of interstate commerce.

3. Comprehensive study of literature in this field and of proposals previously offered.

4. Survey of business to ascertain the extent and the factual situation in respect to compliance costs and multiple burdens.

5. Detailed analysis of the prevailing patterns of State taxation of interstate commerce.

6. Compilation of basic economic data necessary to estimate the revenue impact of whatever proposals the subcommittee may, at a later date, deem worthy of consideration.

In addition to the staff work outlined above, Prof. Ernest Brown, of the Harvard Law School, and chairman of the advisory group, has undertaken for the subcommittee a study of the constitutional law in this area, including the extent of Congress power to legislate.

It should be noted that, although both business and the courts have frequently appealed to Congress for action in this field, the work now being done by the special subcommittee represents the first time in our history that Congress has fully undertaken its responsibility in this important and complex area.

Rosh Hashana Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, September 10, I returned to Philadelphia to attend services at my synagogue, the Congregation Temple Judea. Rabbi Meir Lasker, the senior rabbi of the congregation, delivered an extraordinary sermon. It is so timely and so full of helpful advice that I am offering the text of the sermon for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am confident that my colleagues recognize the enormous value of the work which is being done by the clergymen of our Nation in their efforts to improve conditions and to enrich the lives of our people:

ROSH HASHANA SERVICE

(By Rabbi Meir Lasker)

Friends, when I was a student at the Hebrew Union College, I had the delightful experience of listening to Dr. Rosenau of Baltimore, one of the humblest and sweetest personalities in the American Rabbinate. He lectured to us on the contents of a sermon. And he emphasized the thought that on Rosh Hashana morning he always touched on family matters and family problems for, he added, "the Jewish family is the basis of our religious life and our existence."

This thought can well be applied to the Torah portion of this morning. Abraham, the father, at the behest of the Lord, sets forth with his son Isaac to offer him as a sacrifice to God. Suddenly an angel appears with the cry, "Al Tishlach Yodicho El Ha-Nar"—Do not stretch forth thy hand against the lad and do him no evil. To me, the focal point in this whole story is not the fact that a father was so devout that he was willing to sacrifice his child to God, nor even the tradition of the divine intervention which forbade this supreme act. To me, the high point of this episode is in the words, "Vayelchu Shenaihem Yachov." They went together. Abraham and Isaac walked together. Father and son talked together. Parents and child found a common ground of understanding. "Vayelchu Shenaihem Yachov."

Now you know that it is not often that we can say this today, "Vayelchu Shenaihem Yachov" that parent and child walk together. If we are sincere and honest, we will have to admit that there is very little understanding today between parents and children. I know that both you and I can find innumerable reasons to explain this situation. Many essays and many sociologists have tried to explain it. The standards of society are in a state of flux. Few of us are today certain just what is right and what is wrong. The morals of society are undergoing a radical change. Home life and family life is changing and we are confused. The social and scientific approach has caused us to question the divinity of the Commandments "Thou shalt or thou shalt not" and the Bible is no longer the authoritative source of our morals. Our young people have accepted the new and radical views of a Bertrand Russell, a Philip Wylie and the older generation has been unable to break away from the traditions of the past. And so there is a certain misunderstanding that divides us—a sense of guilt and frustration that annoys us—and we no longer walk together.

In the tradition of the past, most of us were raised on faith. We were taught to have faith in a divine providence; faith that there was an all-seeing eye, an ear that hears, and that if we prayed sincerely and fervently our prayers would somehow be answered.

The generation of today which includes most of our young people, believe that fate not faith controls their lives. Whatever happens is not part of divine direction or divine control, it is simply a matter of chance. Perhaps the wars, in which so many died by chance and were wounded by chance may have brought this belief to the fore-

front. Few of our young people believe that they can control what life thrusts in their way. The average individual feels "It's a matter of Mazel—just luck; life is a hit or miss situation."

I am sure that many a modern Jew would be surprised to learn that Judaism accepts the idea that fate operates in our lives. Our sages stated, " HaKol B'Ydai Shomayim." There is much that is preordained, but there is also room for free will. Fate does play a role—a vital and important role in our lives, but it does not control all of life. And it is this point that is important.

Fate arranges the innumerable genes in such a manner that our physical bodies and our nature is predetermined even before birth. Fate decides to place us in a certain family—we have no choice in this. We do not select our parents. Fate also places us in a certain home environment. But now let us ask how many of us appreciate the heritage that fate has given to us. How many of us employ to the utmost the physical, intellectual, and spiritual powers that fate have given to us?

Here is where faith takes over. I speak now specifically to the younger generation, the teenagers, and the college youth. Your parents have faith in you, do not doubt it. Because of this faith and because of their experience in living, they have throughout the years strived to inculcate into your hearts and conscience certain ideals and certain values. They want you to understand that the so-called new and bizarre is not always the best. Immorality is not new, despite the many books that today directly and indirectly advocate it. It is old, ancient, and it was practiced thousands of years ago by the most primitive of peoples. Anyone acquainted with anthropological and sociological studies knows that. Lack of self-control, lack of discipline is not new, it is as old as man on this earth; selfishness and skepticism is not new, it existed before society was organized. What, then, is new—and what is sane? The standards of discipline by which the individual controls his emotions—that is new. Family life is new, family sanctity is new, true love between one man and one woman is new.

Because of the tensions you live under, because of the passions aroused by sex books, sex movies, cheap television programs, the values, the traditions, the ideals that enriched the lives of your fathers and forefathers have been rejected. That is not necessarily wrong. But what is wrong is that you have not built up new bulwarks for yourselves, and without them you cannot live a healthy, creative life.

We, your parents, do not expect you to live our lives, or even to accept as sacred all our traditions. We realize that some of our standards are outmoded. We fully understand that just as there are new frontiers in science, so there must come new frontiers in our social life. But social changes come slowly. Despite the fact that the automobile has today become the living room for young people, and the drive-in movie and parking place, the courting area, we, your parents, have done little to change the situation. In this we are at fault. But, at the same time, remember society still has accepted standards and violation of these standards not only leads to loss of respect and dignity, but often endangers your future happiness. And so I plead with both parents and young people—here is a problem, face it together, have faith in each other; work out some reasonable way of life, for only as you talk together, plan together, will you be able to remain together as an understanding family. I believe this is important for us to remember on this day, the New Year, for this is a period of remembrance.

There is yet another area in life where fate must walk hand in hand with faith. I speak of marriage. An interesting Talmudic legend relates that a Roman lady asked one of the sages, "How does God occupy Himself after the act of creativity in 6 days?" The sage explained, "The Good Lord spends his time arranging marriages." In short, He is a Divine Shadchan. For to arrange a successful marriage is as difficult a problem as the splitting of the Red Sea.

Like every rabbi and minister, many young people stand before me to be wed. And there are times when I ask myself, "Is that God's work or the Devil's—is there any real chance for happiness between these two individuals?"

Now we know that fate plays a role in this. No one can logically explain why two young people, out of the hundreds they encounter, are drawn to each other. And who has not at times marveled at the strange circumstances which brought a specific man and a particular woman to the decision to join life together. But let us realize that although fate brought them together—it is faith that must keep them together. Faith in each other, faith in the dreams that each couple has at first to build a happy future; faith that the sacrifices and compromises which each is compelled to make will be appreciated by the other.

A marriage, to be successful, must be worked at day in, day out. It cannot go along in some haphazard manner. If two people are to walk together, talk together, raise a family together, they must understand each other. There must be faith that kindness, sympathy, sensitivity will pay off in a happy marriage in which both will walk, hand in hand, through the years, finding increasing blessings, as with dedication, they meet the new responsibilities that arise. And there is yet a third area where fate calls on faith for help; namely, in our selection of careers.

When I entered the Hebrew Union College there were 20 in my class—only 8 graduated as rabbis. Now it is true that almost all of us went through the process of "weltschmerz." We doubted ourselves, we felt frustrated, fearful. All of us had misgivings whether the rabbinate was in reality our field. Because of this, many dropped out, only to regret it years later. Now some circumstance, some experience, some random event—in other words, fate propelled us to turn toward the rabbinate. But fate could not satisfy us, we needed faith—faith in our inner resources—faith in the importance of our work—faith to go on.

To you, young people confronted soon with the problem of selecting your careers, let me say, some incident will propel you into a certain highway of life and some force will help you select your life's work—have faith in it.

Life is often brutal. At times your faith will be shaken—there will be moments of doubt, of uncertainty. But if you hold to your faith in yourselves, in the work you do, if you give to your career the best of your mental, physical, and spiritual abilities, you will find therein happiness. For happiness comes not at the beginning but at the end. After you have overcome disappointments and frustrations and carried on, then happiness will come.

This day of Rosh Hashana, my friends, is a day of soul-searching. Have we given ourselves wholeheartedly to what we have undertaken? Do we recognize our shortcomings? Can we recharge our hearts and souls with a determination to do better? Remember—fate in each case opens the door, but it is faith that makes life more meaningful.

Now, if you will agree with me that faith plays a vital role in the relationship of parents and children, husbands and wives, and in the careers we select, perhaps you will also agree that faith plays a vital role in our acknowledgment that God is interested in human life.

Now, I know the skepticism that exists. I know that some will say like Job, "Life treats all of us pretty much the same" whether we have faith or not; whether we believe in God or not—all human beings undergo pain, heartache, suffering—so what is beneficial in believing?

In all honesty, I must admit that belief in God, devotion to religion, does not grant man immunity from the blows which rain down upon us. Religious faith is not a guarantee against human trouble. Fate does treat us alike.

But Judaism teaches us that faith in God helps man to live with his heartache without being crushed. It gives us strength to rebound when knocked down by our sorrows. It gives us courage to rise again. It helps us to become stronger in character, more perceptive, and more sensitive human beings. For a man of faith is not alone in this world. He is at one with his fellowman. He is a copartner with God and he feels that through his work he is helping to bring to fulfillment God's plan on earth. Such a faith makes life, yea, even the tragedies of life—a challenge. With such a faith we can, as the Bible states, "Vayelchu Shenlaihem Yachov" walk with man, walk with God, and feel that our life has purpose and is worthwhile.

I pray, therefore, that faith be granted to you all—faith in yourselves, your God, your work, so that the new year kindle in your hearts the determination to make your life richer and better in the forthcoming future.

Kewaunee Army Reserve Center Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with one world crisis followed by another, it is important, I believe, that we demonstrate our determination to defend ourselves and our homeland in case of aggression.

I was recently privileged to participate in the dedication of a new U.S. Army Reserve Center in Kewaunee, Wis. This new military structure is a significant forward step in our national efforts to be well trained and well equipped. Patriotic Wisconsinites have never shirked their duty to their country. I ask unanimous consent to have my speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Their being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these war-threatened times, the dedication of this new U.S. Army Reserve Center, here in Kewaunee, represents a significant and symbolic forward stride toward strengthening our national defenses.

The Nation, in my judgment, owes a special vote of thanks to you dedicated, defense-minded soldiers of freedom, who represent a mighty reservoir of manpower and defense; reflect the spirit of dedication to our national defense necessary to guard the ramparts of freedom; and stand at the ready to serve our country's call to colors.

Here in Wisconsin, we have experienced such a call. The President's mobilization—along with other units—of Wisconsin's famed 32d Division headquarters in Milwaukee;

380th Military Intelligence Platoon, headquartered in Madison; 410th Signal Construction Co., headquartered in Stevens Point; and 322d Chemical Depot Co., headquartered in Baraboo represents the seriousness of the world situation; a step toward further strengthening the U.S. defenses; and a real-life demonstration of how Wisconsin patriots stand ready to serve their country.

The dedication of this Reserve Center as well as the callup of these defense units represents efforts multiplied manifold all over the Nation to provide a stronger defense.

Now, I would like to discuss with you major aspects of our mutual security picture. To assure you that I shall not march off on the wrong foot, let me frankly say this:

I am a legislator—not an expert on national defense—althought this, sometimes, is a prevalent attitude among my coworkers.

As a Senator, I am, of course, required to vote "yes" or "no" on legislation to provide the necessary manpower, material, equipment, and weapons for our security forces. To accomplish this, we need, of course, a degree of knowledge on our military capabilities. Let's face it, however; we must depend upon you, the experts, for the bulk of the detailed decisions on defense.

In the 1962 budget, the Congress approved an unprecedented $48 billion for defense.

With these funds, the Nation, we hope will be provided adequate manpower; and equipment and striking power for a strong jet-missile-nuclear-space deterrent against attack.

In addition to the general strengthening of our defense forces special efforts are being made to:

Improve our missile deterrent strength by special emphasis upon hidden, moving, or invulnerable delivery systems. These include acceleration of our program for building of the Polaris submarine force; accelerating the building of the solid-fuel Minuteman missile, air-to-ground, and other missiles such as the Skybolt.

Better protecting the amount of our existing bomber forces for a nuclear deterrent by increasing our ground and airborne alert capacities, and installing bomb alarm detectors and signals at key warning and communications points and all SAC bases.

Reexamining and improving our continental defense and warning systems.

Reevaluating command and control of nuclear weapons authority to minimize risk of a triggered war by accident or miscalculation.

For protecting our population against nuclear attack by undertaking an expanded program of civil defense.

Our conventional war capabilities too have been strengthened with a flexible nuclear and nonnuclear striking power in the following ways:

Increasing manpower;

Reorganization and modernization of units, including new improved weapons to increase fire power;

Expanding air and sea forces for greater troop mobility;

Sharpen up training programs for guerrilla type warfare; and

Generally undertaking across-the-board efforts to improve the capabilities of our American forces for meeting crises around the globe.

COMPARE FREE WORLD-COMMUNIST ARMED FORCES

We realize, of course, that a defense force is significant only if effectively capable of coping with the size and power of its enemy.

In recent years, the U.S. mutual security program has forged the chain which held together the alliances of free nations—including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Central Treaty Organization, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and Australia-New Zealand-United States.

Today the United States, and its allies, have a total of 8,680,000 men in their Armed Forces, compared to about 9,300,000 in the Sino-Soviet bloc. Of the free world total, the European NATO powers have 3 million men under arms and the United States has 2.5 million. In the Far East, where the Republic of China and Korea are two significant bulwarks against Communist expansion, the allied forces total more than 1.5 million men.

We and our allies have about 29,000 aircraft in operational units and 3,700 major combatant vessels. About 40 percent of the aircraft and 60 percent of the total allied naval strength is supplied by our allies.

In addition, strategically located bases in allied countries on the periphery of the Communist camp provides launching pads for free world missiles, "zeroed in" on the heart of communism. By experience we have learned that it is extremely difficult, because of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, to get a good evaluation of the strength, mobility, and fire power of Communist military forces. Let's face it, however, the Red forces represent a formidable enemy.

In addition, the Soviet Union has recently resumed testing of nuclear superbombs; engaged in firing of higher powered rockets; and undertaken new orders, not only for modernization, but mobilization of more military forces.

Because of the greater concentration of military power by the world, we have found it necessary not only to strengthen our own defenses, but to bolster the defenses of free world nations allied with us in efforts to combat communism.

NEEDED: DEFENSE AGAINST ATTACK IN SPACE

A new feature of the military picture, of course, is the space challenge.

Recognizing that space could serve as a launching site for enemy attack, the free world has attempted to obtain agreements with the Communists for dedicating outer space for peaceful purposes.

Unfortunately, we have not been successful. To the contrary, the Reds have been moving ahead rapidly with developments of space vehicles, with military potential. In addition, they have been using this as a foundation for power politics and international blackmail.

Consequently, it is essential that we move full speed ahead on development of a space—defense program. This would necessarily include protection against nuclear bombing from outer space; satellites or other space craft used for attack; development of effective antimissile missiles; antidotes to nuclear fallout; and other defenses.

FOOT SOLDIER—NOT OBSOLETE

Throughout history, the creation of new, more powerful weapons often have been accompanied by illusions that the foot soldier would become obsolete.

Each time, however, this proved untrue. Despite new—almost Buck Rogerish—weapons, there is still a need not only for the traditional air-land-sea "guardsmen of the peace," but of ever higher caliber capability in such fighting men—the only really indispensable unit in our defense forces.

WORLD "HOT SPOT"

Currently, the world spotlight in the East-West conflict focuses upon two hot spots: (1) Berlin; (2) the United Nations.

First, let's take a look at Berlin.

To protect Western rights, obligations and interests, we will need to stand firm to repel any broadscale attacks by the Communists; utilize flexible, diplomatic and military footwork in parrying provocations; and undertake a more dynamic diplomatic offensive to find a peaceful solution to the Soviet-created crises.

In our efforts to find a solution, we must, in my judgment, adhere to two basic principles:

(1) Demonstrate militarily that we will not be "pushed around", and (2) offer constructive alternatives to a military showdown—not just "stand firm, but empty handed."

The fundamental principles in Western proposals should, I believe, include the following: (1) A recommendation that the question of unification or nonunification be settled by a U.N.-supervised secret ballot election; (2) If the Soviet Union disagrees—which in all likelihood it would—propose the establishment of a U.N. Commission to make recommendations for ending East-West occupation of Germany; (3) Object to change in the status of West Berlin without adequate safeguards for the interests and integrity of its citizens; (4) Resist interference with access to West Berlin by the Western nations.

Realistically, the Communists will be hard bargainers. Nevertheless, reasonable, logical proposals would, I believe, (1) Put the United States and the West in a better negotiating position; and (2) Garner support of world opinion—particularly on our advocating the universally recognized right of self-determination by the German people.

Unless the West comes up with constructive recommendations for solution of the crisis, we will—and justifiably, in my opinion—find our policies branded as "sterile stand-patism."

U.N.—A BATTLEGROUND

Now, let's take a look at the second "combat arena of East-West—and, yes, so-called neutral forces: that is, the United Nations.

The 16th session of the U.N. General Assembly promises to be explosive.

On the agenda are great issues of real significance to the free world and to peace.

The tragic death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold has cast a sorrow over the U.N. The high stature of statemanship in Mr. Hammarskjold's work reflected high credit not only upon himself but upon the office of Secretary General.

The U.N., of course, now faces the difficult task of finding a replacement.

Unfortunately, the job will be complicated by efforts of the Soviet Union to change the nature of the office of Secretary General to a triumvirate—representing the Communist, free world and so-called non-Communist blocs.

The major issues confronting the Assembly, then, include the following:

Replacing the esteemed and respected Dag Hammarskjold with an individual of similar high qualities.

Preventing the Soviet Union from replacing the single, workable Secretariat with a three-headed, self-nullifying monster called the troika—representing the Communist, Western and so-called Neutral blocs, each with a veto power.

Blocking the seating of Red China.

Presenting a realistic disarmament proposal to the world.

Protecting Western rights and obligations in Berlin, including emphasis on the universally recognized right of self-determination by the citizens of Berlin and Germany

The Soviet Union is expected again to harp upon the issue of colonialism. Today, however, communism represents the greatest colonial power in the world. Consequently, the West can—and should—stuff the issue down their throats.

CONCLUSION

For the future, then, the battle against communism will be fought on the production line, around the conference table, through trade channels, on the ideological plateaus for the minds of men—all of these conflicts under the shadow of poised, ready-

to-fire, push-button nuclear-warhead missiles.

However, the "military shield"—now and in the foreseeable future—will continue to serve as a major deterrent to expansion by the Communists.

As a leader of the free world, consequently, we need to—

Maintain a strong, forward-moving economy, with full employment, for meeting the domestic needs of our citizens, as well as to retain a good, healthy lead over the Communists' challenge on the agricultural-industrial-consumer goods production line.

Further strengthen our jet-nuclear-missile-space defense—to guard the ramparts of freedom and to deter would-be aggressors elsewhere in the world.

Pace our scientific-technological programs to stay well ahead of competition; and

Carry forward a realistic foreign policy, designed to: obstruct the expansionist efforts of communism; accommodate, or negotiate, conflicts of interest among nations or blocs of nations; prevent a third world war; and, to promote the cause of peace.

The International Telecommunication Union and Space Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION AND SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

(By Hon. Gerald C. Gross, secretary general, International Telecommunication Union)

In our world, on our small planet, the man in the street himself takes it for granted that not only telephone, telegraph, broadcasting, television, radar but now even space communications are normal means of exchanging words, images, and ideas. The word "telecommunication" comes from the two words tele (at a distance in Greek) and communicare (from the Latin to communicate). In the ITU Convention, the term "telecommunication" is defined as "any transmission, emission of reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or other electromagnetic systems."

While, however, the term "telecommunication" has been defined precisely we are plagued from time to time with that word "union." For example, as secretary general of the Atlantic City Conference of 1947, I recall receiving from the Associated Press an inquiry as follows: "Please advise soonest whether International Telecommunication Union is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the CIO."

The International Telegraph Union, progenitor of the present Telecommunication Union, was established at Paris, France, in 1865 under the provisions of a treaty, the negotiation of which, to quote Clark, was prompted by the motives of Napoleon III who, "at the height of his imperial glory and neglecting no means which would centralize the world in France moved to secure a European entente by the scarcely visible wires of telegraphic solidarity." If it ever was a European entente, the Telegraph Union did not remain so for long. By its 10th anniversary governmental administrations from Asia and Africa were admitted to the ranks of its membership; participated in its deliberations and were assigned a share in the task of shaping its destiny. Although it was the calculated purpose of the Telegraph Union to secure the technical advantages of a uniform tariff and regulations for telegraphic correspondence, significantly—as now in the case of the International Telecommunication Union—technical competence alone did not mark the boundaries of the Telegraph Union's jurisdiction. At a time, for example, when the tide of state sovereignty was running and not ebbing, the treaty negotiated at Paris in 1865 contained a provision assuring everyone—not merely sovereign members of the union—the right to correspond by means of the international telegraph.

The telephone was the second system of rapid long-distance communication to be developed. It was in 1876 that speech was first transmitted over wires by Alexander Graham Bell and as early as 1885 regulations governing the International Telephone Service were included, as was logical, in the International Telegraph Regulations, with little change in the structure of the union.

The next development was that of radio, the value of which for increasing the safety of maritime navigation, was soon realized. Radio was not the invention of any one person. While Marconi is almost universally recognized as the father of radio, one must not overlook the work of such pioneers as Hertz of Germany, Hughes in England, Branly in France, and Popoff in Russia. It was in 1901 that the first transatlantic radiocommunication was made.

Certain difficulties arose, however, since one of the early commercial companies in the field, which was given the right to install radio apparatus on ships, also claimed the right to refuse to communicate with any other radio station not equipped by that company. This led to the following rather amazing incident. In 1902 Prince Henry of Prussia attempted to send President Theodore Roosevelt a courtesy message while crossing the Atlantic after a visit in the United States. Being out of range of U.S. stations, the ship's operator tried to pass the message via an English station, but it was refused since the radio equipment on the ship had been installed by a rival company.

The German Emperor, when informed of this, enlisted the aid of President Roosevelt in bringing about an international conference. A meeting was held in Berlin in 1903 to undertake preliminary studies regarding the international regulation of radio and soon after that, the first International Radio Telegraph Convention was signed by 27 countries in Berlin in 1906, at which time the radio division became an important branch of the International Telegraph Union. The International Telegraph Convention of St. Petersburg, 1875, and the International Radio-Telegraph Convention of Washington of 1927 were fused at Madrid in 1932 into the International Telecommunication Convention of Madrid 1932, and the broader title "telecommunication" was applied thereafter to what previously had been known as the International Telegraph Union.

Scientific progress was such that in 1947 at Atlantic City, the structure of the ITU had to be radically altered and expanded by a new convention. On January 1, 1947, when this convention entered into force, the ITU found itself with a greatly increased staff, recruited on an international basis, with a number of technical organs working on a permanent basis.

It was also the Atlantic City Plenipotentiary Conference which negotiated an agreement with the United Nations under which the ITU became a specialized agency. An administrative council was set up which took over the supervisory functions previously exercised by the Swiss Government.

The big changes brought about at the Atlantic City Conference in 1947 were not quite a revolution in the Union, but merely pushed the limits of evolution to a stretching point.

To these significant changes and achievements appearing in the recorded history of the Union, I am compelled to add yet another. Upon reflection it is really an accomplishment of novel impression bound up intimately with the deepest wishes of each of us at this 12th Congress of the IAF. Hopefully, this forward step taken by the ITU will prove to be the precursor to the extension of reason, rather than anarchy, into the new dimension of outer space, I speak of the technically modest, but landmark achievement in the affairs of mankind, which occurred in 1959 in the city of Geneva. For it was there, at that time, that the first international rules of law applicable specifically to activities in outer space were negotiated by the International Telecommunication Union when provisions for frequency allocations involving newly designated space radiocommunication services were inserted in a revision to the ITU radio regulations.

The history of ITU in the field of international cooperation has been impressive. In our very specialized technical field, there has been remarkable cooperation among all nations involving all forms of political opinion. The successful results achieved and maintained over a period of almost a century provide a very concrete example of what can be done among scientists and engineers.

I need not stress this point here today because you, yourselves, have proved this can be true. In the International Astronautical Federation, which under the distinguished leadership of your existing president, Prof. Leonid I. Sedov of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences in Moscow and your general counsel, Andrew Gallagher Haley, have demonstrated in a brilliant way that such active cooperation for the peaceful development of astronautics is possible in the overall interests of mankind.

At this time let me make it quite clear that the secretariat of the ITU does not establish the basic policy of our organization. Ultimately, that policy must be established by the various conferences themselves and carried out through the administrative council and the permanent organs of the Union. Nevertheless, because of the day-to-day responsibility of the secretariat, many questions have come to our attention, and many answers have been suggested to questions concerning the future role of the ITU in space communication.

You all know that there is now scheduled an international conference, probably to be held in 1963, and preceded by a meeting of a special CCIR study group in the spring of 1962 to consider the allocation of frequencies for space communication and other space purposes. Many of the countries who will attend these meetings and who will have a considerable influence on the ultimate results obtained, will not have an immediate requirement for the substantial allocation of frequencies for their own space activities. They will, however, have a principal interest in accommodating space needs on a basis that will not prevent the use of the same frequencies for more ordinary ground or earth microwave purposes. Many of them will be concerned lest the large countries, such as the United States and the Soviet Union, use the lower microwave frequencies in a way that may cause significant interference to their own ground services.

I have heard it suggested that it may be necessary to devise a procedure internationally for the review of actual frequency selection in order to assure the contemplated protection to many countries. And it has also been suggested that the ITU would be

the appropriate place for such a function. Whether this need should be met by the ITU, must, of course, depend upon the policy decisions of our Government members.

Let me give you another illustration of the kind of speculation that has come to my attention concerning the future role of the ITU in connection with space activities. The successful launching of a communications satellite system to provide extensive facilities throughout the globe inevitably involves a considerable amount of international negotiation. This will extend into areas far removed from technical frequency matters. It may well be that any system that is evolved will have participating ownership of a number of countries.

There must also be detailed operating arrangements and other agreements essential to the effective success of the venture. Much of the negotiations will be of a bilateral or multilateral nature between operating entities. Much of it will also involve broad basic political agreement between the interested countries. And these in turn will have a direct bearing upon the frequency allocations and technical standards that may be required. I have heard it suggested that these negotiations be within the framework of the ITU because of the longstanding experience of the ITU in the field of communications and its record of substantial success of an international agency.

Certainly the experience of the ITU in providing for international meeting and negotion would come in handy in connection with matters such as I have just discussed. Again, whether the ITU should provide the framework within which such negotiation concerning communications matters is engendered must depend upon the careful judgment of the member governments.

Whenever one hears of space communication and the ITU, the question seems to arise whether the ITU should actually become an operating agency for the purpose of providing a communications satellite system accessible to the world. It cannot now become an operating agency. I use the term "operating agency" in the sense technically understood as an agency which itself operates a telecommunication service. In these terms let me say at once that ITU is not prepared at this time to go into the operating business of such multimillion-dollar network. It would take months and months, going into years, to change the regulatory technical character of the ITU to fulfill such functions. Similarly, any new organization which might be created to act as an operating agency would, in my opinion, require much more time than is available to acquire the necessary know-how and competence.

I feel that we should at this time utilize the existing operating entities in the ITU member governments to meet the urgencies of the situation with due attention being given to the necessary technical and operating regulations in order to protect the ultimate communication services for the public.

Specifically, such regulation should comply with the basic doctrine laid down in article 4 of the International Telecommunication Union, which among other things (and here I shall not take your time to quote article 4 in full, but I commit it to you for reference).

"ARTICLE 4. PURPOSES OF THE UNION

"1. The purposes of the Union are:

"(b) to promote the development of technical facilities and their most efficient operation with a view to improving the efficiency of telecommunication services, increasing their usefulness and making them, so far as possible, generally available to the public;

"(c) to harmonize the actions of nations in the attainment of those common ends.

"2. To this end, the Union shall in particular:

"(a) effect allocation of the radio frequency spectrum and registration of radio frequency assignments in order to avoid harmful interference between radio stations of different countries;

"(b) coordinate efforts to eliminate harmful interference between radio stations of different countries and to improve the use made of the radio frequency spectrum;

"(c) foster collaboration among its members and associate members with a view to the establishment of rates at levels as low as possible consistent with an efficient service and taking into account the necessity for maintaining independent financial administration of telecommunication on a sound basis;

"(d) foster the creation, development and improvement of telecommunication equipment and networks in new or developing countries by every means at its disposal, especially its participation in the appropriate programs of the United Nations;".

On Monday of this week I heard General Counsel Haley discuss the delineation of space from a legal standpoint with his reference to the Von Karman Line and his practical suggestion in reply to a question that this might be considered as something of the order of 50 miles above earth.

Here, a figure may be of significance to you when you consider the economics of the situation. We have spent a good deal of time discussing space communication problems and it may interest you to know that the launching of enough satellites to make an initial system will cost more than 10 times the entire ITU budget since its founding in 1865 until the present.

I wish I had the time to go into some of the fascinating technical details of the operation involved. All communication records were shattered when communication was established by radio with satellites up to several million miles away. Personally, I had the pleasure of seeing the last Mercury-Atlas launch from Cape Canaveral and of observing from the control room the splendid network of communications which has been established.

I have spoken about the successful cooperation which it has been our good fortune to obtain in the ITU among all our member governments.

As a further step in this direction I have invited the United States Government and the Soviet Government to send experts to Geneva to work with the ITU in the preparation for the 1963 World Conference on Space Communications to which I have referred. While the negotiations have been conducted so far with only the two governments mentioned—since they are the only two countries with active space satellites now operating—personnel from other member countries of the ITU would, of course, be most welcome. We need all the help we can get in this planning stage to assist in defining and delineating the many problems ahead of us.

The function of the ITU as a forum for countries of the world to resolve their basic problems with respect to telecommunication questions is obvious. Many coordinating problems inevitably will accompany such new types of operations in space. There will be related areas such as the possible negotiations to which I referred. These will be the areas in which attention should be given at this time, as a practical matter, in thinking about the role of the ITU.

Mr. President, it has been a pleasure to meet with you today. If there is time, I shall be happy to answer any questions that may occur to you. Thank you very much, sir.

Plea for Standardization of Firehose Threads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Threads has repeatedly made appeals to high authorities with respect to the need for a standard firehose thread to avert a disaster.

Under unanimous consent I wish to include herewith in my remarks correspondence Mr. Robert Ely, chairman of the International Association of Fire Chief's Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Threads, has recently had with the President of the United States and supplementary material which supports the view of the national association:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As chairman of a committee having national scope, we wish to inform you and others charged with the welfare, safety, and protection of our country that a serious, dangerous, and costly condition exists in the fire defense of our country. We refer to the use of so many nonstandard firehose threads.

With the advent of the nuclear age we are going through a time of peril for our country and have become much more dependent upon our neighbor, another city, or another State or States in order to survive. In the event of any nuclear attack on this country, there will be much confusion and many problems. Why should we compound our problems by having our firefighting equipment with nonstandard threads that will not fit our neighbors nor our neighbors fit ours?

When we read fire service history we find that during the bombing of England their firefighting operations were impaired considerably because of nonstandard firehose threads, also during the heavy bombings of Stuttgart, Germany, many adjacent cities were called for aid and they found to their dismay that their equipment was of no value due to different threads.

Much work has gone into this standardization program. Standards have been established and some States have passed laws in relation to this problem. However, this is not enough as there are many cities, military installations, State-operated facilities, as well as private installations that do not conform to the national standards. Even our great production city of Detroit has nonstandard firehose threads.

For over 70 years the International Association of Fire Chiefs has adopted resolutions (see attached latest resolutions) recommending that all firehose threads should be standard. Resolutions and recommendations have not been enough to get the job done. It is evident that proper legislation and financial help will be necessary to get the job completed.

We urge your active support and leadership in this very important standardization program and ask that you take the necessary steps to aid and assist the fire service to standardize all firehose threads nationwide.

Sincerely,

ROBERT ELY.

Enclosures: Four.

STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOSE THREADS

With the greater emphasis being placed on efficient mutual aid (the increase in large scale fires, the possibility of enemy attack) the need for nationwide firehose thread standardization is more imperative than ever.

Enemy bombs during World War II caused the leaders of England to realize the necessity of firehose thread standardization. Now all firehose threads in England are standard and can be used interchangably. We cannot afford to be less prepared.

The standardization of all firehose threads will:

1. Eliminate the confusion and delay cause by nonstandard firehose threads at mutual-aid fires.

2. Make a more effective fire force.

3. Reduce the cost of firehose couplings and fittings.

4. Help to conserve our natural resources, reduce the fire loss of life and property and reduce the drain upon our American economy.

5. Make it possible to make use of any and all of our firefighting equipment in event of a disaster or war.

6. Make it possible to stockpile firehose, nozzles, fittings, etc., and use them in any part of our country or with our Armed Forces when necessary.

Enclosure 1 is a copy of a chart of 462 different combinations of threads that one manufacturer has been required to make for 10 sizes of firehose. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

Enclosures 2 and 3 are copies of resolutions adopted by the International Association of Fire Chiefs asking for aid and assistance to standardize firehose threads.

Enclosure 4 is a copy of International Association of Fire Chiefs committee report on standardization of firehose threads.

For verification please refer to the International Association of Fire Chiefs annual conference proceedings 1958, pages 74, 75, 76, and 152; 1959, pages 147, 148, 155, 156, and 157; 1960, pages 167, 168, and 169.

You may want to review the progress that is being made to standardize firehose threads by referring to the following publications.

Western City magazine, December 1955, page 35.

Pacific Coast Fire Journal, May 1957, page 10; May 1958, page 11; October 1958, page 4; November 1958, page 11.

NFPA Firemen magazine, October 1957, page 24; November 1958, page 12; December 1958, page 18.

Fire Engineering, July 1957, page 620; November 1958, page 1004; November 1960, page 1046.

Los Angeles magazine, "The Firemen's Grapevine," October 1958, page 21.

Public Management Journal of the International City Managers Association, November 1958, page 267.

Trying to fight a fire with firehose that can't be connected together because of nonstandard screw threads is like trying to defend our lives with bullets that won't fit our guns.

Ways and means have been worked out so that many nonstandard threads can be rethreaded economically. Our committee will be glad to discuss the details with anyone who is interested. Please don't hesitate to call on us.

You now have the facts. We hope you will take the necessary steps to help get all firehose threads standardized nationwide.

ROBERT ELY.

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas throughout this country there are many types of threads for fire horse; and

Whereas this has hindered fire department operations on large fires; and

Whereas the successful operation of any fire department to handle large fires is dependent upon assistance from other fire departments; and

Whereas the IAFC as well as the NBFU and the NFPA has recommended the standardization of fire hose threads for many years; and

Whereas the NBFU 1956 pamphlet on national standard screw threads for fire hose couplings and fittings states in part that:

"For more than half a century the lack of uniformity in fire hose threads has been recognized as an unnecessary evil, contributing to the spread of many of our most disastrous fires.

"Enormous fire losses, constituting a serious drain upon American economy, have been due in no small measure to this lack of uniformity in fire hose threads."

Whereas in this era of the atomic age the potential of large fire is increasing; and

Whereas the International Association of Fire Chiefs has fostered standardization of many fire department appliances and equipment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, This 19th day of September 1958, the International Association of Fire Chiefs assembled in Los Angeles recommend to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization that they give priority to and lend all possible aid and assistance to the program of standardizing all fire hose screw threads throughout the United States of America and lend its influence to our allied countries.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas the International Association of Fire Chiefs has for over 70 years advocated the importance of standardizing fire hose threads throughout the Nation; and

Whereas notwithstanding the excellent progress made in such standardization in certain areas, the facts are that there are more nonstandardized threads today than at any time since 1873, primarily due to the growth of our country; and

Whereas the need of preparing for continuing emergencies—including a possible atomic war—emphasizes the importance of further intensifying the Nation's efforts toward complete standardization: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That all divisional and State organizations of the International Association of Fire Chiefs be urged to redouble their efforts to effectuate standardization in their respective areas; and be it further

Resolved, That to speed the cause of standardization, this association endeavors to secure matching funds from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to help defray the costs of the equipment necessary to accomplish the desired necessary standardization.

IAFC COMMITTEE GIVES REPORT ON STANDARDIZATION OF HOSE THREADS

(By Robert Ely, chairman)

The Committee on Standardization of Hose Threads was appointed July 8, 1958. Later, at IAFC's annual conference in Los Angeles, the committee with the aid of California State fire marshal, displayed and demonstrated the rethreading tools and equipment that are being used to standardize the firehose threads in California. Great interest was shown at the standardization booth when many chiefs observed how firehose threads could be standardized quickly and economically.

Our committee also composed and presented a resolution asking the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization to give priority to, and lend all possible aid and assistance to, the program of standardizing all firehose screw threads throughout the United States and to lend its influence to our allied countries.

The resolution was adopted at the IAFC annual conference.

A questionnaire that was prepared and sent to all State fire marshals received 33 replies. Only five States indicated that they had a law requiring standard firehose threads. Only 10 indicated that all fire departments in their State use the national standard 2½-inch threads. Only 11 indicated that all fire departments in their State used the national standard 1½-inch threads. Only 14 indicated that there was any organized effort to standardize firehose threads in their State.

In response to the question: "In what way can the IAFC help to get all the firehose threads standardized in your State?" 17 suggestions were received.

Through the cooperation of the North Dakota State fire marshal the same type of questionnaires were sent to all fire departments in North Dakota.

Eighty-six fire departments indicated that they used national standard threads on their 2½-inch hose. Twenty-four departments used nonstandard threads. Ninety-eight fire departments indicated they used national standard threads on their 1½-inch firehose and seven departments used nonstandard threads. Sixty-three departments indicated that they were interested in standardizing firehose threads and 10 departments indicated that they were not interested in standardizing their threads.

Another questionnaire, to solicit information on the OD of the male thread and number of threads per inch on each size of firehose in use in each fire department, was distributed through the cooperation of the New Mexico State fire marshal's office.

As a result of these questionnaires, it is suggested that:

1. The IAFC continue to urge the OCDM to assist in all possible ways in the standardization of all firehose threads and approve necessary funds to accomplish the job.

2. The IAFC study and assist in forming a suggested model law that can be adopted by each State or the National Congress requiring the standardization of all firehose threads and furnishing the fire departments with assistance to accomplish the standardization job.

3. The IAFC contact all underwriters and rating bureaus and urge them to increase their effort in recommending that all firehose threads be standardized and to assist in the standardization of all firehose threads nationally.

4. The IAFC contact all divisional associations of the IAFC and enlist their help on a local level to help get all firehose threads standardized.

5. The IAFC continue to give publicity to the need and desirability of standardizing all firehose threads; recommend that suitable speakers be provided at all State and regional meetings to explain how standardization can be accomplished.

6. The IAFC contact the State Governors and proper government officials to inform them of the renewed effort to standardize all firehose threads nationally and ask their help in providing proper legislation to require standard firehose threads.

7. That the IAFC collect and compile information on the best and most economical ways and means to standardize firehose threads and make all pertinent information available to fire departments.

Colorado Boys Ranch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wish to commend to the attention of the

Members of the Senate an article entitled "They Give Boys a Future," from the Denver Post magazine section on a Colorado project of which I am very proud. This project is the Colorado Boys Ranch at La Junta, which started operations last March. It is a home for young boys who are having problems at home or in the community. It was created through volunteer labor and private contributions. According to the Post article the Boys Ranch is badly in need of additional funds.

It was my great privilege to be present at the White House last Friday when President Kennedy signed into law S. 279—of which I was a cosponsor—establishing the new Juvenile Delinquency Control Act. Under this act, Federal funds were authorized to be used to aid the States in the battle for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

On the night the Congress adjourned it passed the supplemental appropriations bill which appropriated $8.2 million for fiscal 1962 for the implementation of this act.

I am hopeful that the Colorado Boys Ranch will be given high consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the time it determines to which projects funds will be allocated.

It is my intention to recommend to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Boys Ranch at La Junta be given a sympathetic hearing when he is making his recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Denver Post article be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY GIVE BOYS A FUTURE AND JUST ABOUT EVERYBODY WORKS AT THE JOB AT LA JUNTA, COLO.

(By Bob Jain)

Billy, 10, was headed for the penitentiary. He hadn't committed any crime—not yet. But his whole life to this point aimed him straight for a cell in the Canon City prison.

That, however, was before Billy went to live at the Colorado Boys Ranch at La Junta, Colo. The future looks more promising to him now.

Boys Ranch, the only such institution in the State, has not yet celebrated its first birthday. It started operations last March 18 when Mr. and Mrs. Estell Robinson moved into their remodeled "cottage" and prepared to receive the first boys. Robinson, former schoolteacher, principal and building contractor, is ranch manager. His wife is a registered nurse. Unofficially, they are foster parents to the five boys who live with them, first of what they hope will increase to 300 or more "orphans with parents" from throughout the State.

Billy (and of course that is not his name) is typical of the boys at the ranch. His parents separated when he was 5. His mother counted on school to take care of him during her working hours—but wasn't much concerned about it. Billy, with the child's instinctive knowledge that he wasn't wanted, wandered about the streets instead. A truant officer picked him up.

He was placed in a foster home. But his foster parents moved away and he went to another family. Financial circumstances forced them to give him up and he moved again—four times in all. Now he began to show up in court on minor charges—actually acts of rebellion against a world where he could find no love. The reformatory at Buena Vista seemed the next stop. Then the county judge thought of Boys Ranch. He couldn't sentence a boy to go there, but if the boy himself was willing and if there were accommodations at the ranch it might be arranged. Would Billy like to go there to live until he was through high school? To the lonely little boy, overwhelmed by problems too heavy for him, it seemed no worse than any other alternative.

Properly called the Colorado Boys Ranch Foundation, the ranch is a private, nonprofit corporation under Colorado law. It was created through an immense amount of volunteer labor and private contributions, as well as government aid on the Federal, city, and county levels.

Operating expenses come almost wholly from donations. A drive for funds to run the ranch and to provide the approximately $600,000 needed for improvements started today. Gov. Steve McNichols has designated this week as Boys Ranch Week.

Boys Ranch occupies what once was La Junta Village, a group of 51 buildings erected at the cost of $1 million in 1943 by the Federal Government to house civilian workers at the La Junta Air Base. The base has long since been abandoned. The housing was vacated in 1947. The flat roofs have begun to collapse. Windows are broken. Lawns and gardens have long since surrendered to weeds.

But the cement block walls are solid, as are the concrete slabs on which they rest. Sewer lines, with some repairs, will function for years. Power lines are as good as ever. Plumbing is intact and water is available. Gas is on hand, too, replacing coal as the heating fuel, for a cooperative gas company laid 3½ miles of gas mains from its nearest line to the ranch.

Thirty-two of the structures will become cottages. Another 17 will become classrooms, recreation rooms, and vocational training rooms. A store and the administration building complete the count.

Repair and modification is being done by junior chamber of commerce members from neighboring Rocky Ford. They travel the 10 miles from Rocky Ford to La Junta and back once a week to put on new roofs, tear down interior walls and erect new ones, change window and door arrangements and paint, both inside and outside. Internal arrangements must be changed to meet the needs of the 10 to 12 boys who are to occupy each building.

A group of 32 Mexican field laborers volunteered to work one weekend without pay. They did construction work, pulled weeds and did other necessary chores. And the garden clubs of Rocky Ford, La Junta and Swink are helping landscape the grounds.

Colorado's cattlemen have been the largest contributors to Boys Ranch. Gifts of registered and commercial stock have created a ranch herd of 82 head, plus 5 horses and 4 pigs. Since there are as yet no facilities to care for the cattle on the ranch they are boarded at no cost on neighboring private ranches, with most on the spread of Everette Marshall, former world's champion heavyweight professional wrestling champion and now a trustee of Boys Ranch.

One of the pigs, a particular pet, is being kept for the time being in an unrepaired unit, later to become a classroom. The housewife who lived in Unit No. 9 would be surprised to see this vast porker snuffling around her kitchen.

The boys also have 18 pheasant chicks, given to them to raise by the Colorado Game and Fish Department. These will be released when grown to replenish the State's game bird supply. The 48 pigeons—the number fluctuates—were captured by the boys at the ranch or at Marshall's feed lot. Two articulate geese round out the livestock. The boys take care of all the animals except the cattle, feeding them each morning before they have their own breakfast. They also make their own beds and are responsible for the cleanliness of their sleeping and study quarters.

Income from the livestock already figures large on the ranch budget and is expected to increase. As a working layout, the ranch will furnish much of the meat, dairy products and produce eaten by the boys and the staff.

Doctors and dentists have been the next largest contributors through service, gifts, and cash.

The bulk of continuing support, however, is expected to come from small but regular givers through the "Buck-a-Month Club." John May, executive secretary of the ranch, figures that 30,000 people giving $1 a month apiece will support 300 boys.

Officers and trustees are a fair sample of the community's business and professional life. The president is Dr. Richard L. Davis, a medical doctor; Carl Shafer, a lumber company manager, is vice president; Bob Cody, a savings and loan firm assistant manager, is treasurer. Trustees, in addition to Marshall, are S. O. Jeffers, a druggist; Milton Richert, a banker; Jim Myers, manager of an REA cooperative; Elias Candell, attorney from Lakewood and the only nonarea man on the board; and Earl Brubaker, owner of a cement products firm. Doyle L. Davidson, travel promotion official, is assistant executive secretary. Olin Richert and J. H. Macdonald, both bankers, are the ranch's trust officers.

May, his secretary, Mrs. Grace Rhodes, the Robinsons, and Mrs. Mary Watters, the cook, are the only paid staff members at present.

May, a former probation officer and police judge, says the ranch started as a result of concern by Colorado's county judges over the number of boys from broken homes appearing before them. Boys' ranches worked well in other States, but Colorado had none.

La Junta Village caught the attention of Howard Ashton, then Boulder County judge. He telephoned Judge Hal Chapman of Otero County in late 1958 to ask about it. Interested citizens from Boulder and La Junta met in La Junta in January 1959, to consider the project.

The Federal Government, which still owned the village, created a local housing authority to take title to the 37½ acres of land and the buildings. The authority deeded it over to the foundation.

Otero County donated another 160 acres. Olin, John, and Milton Richert bought the rest of a half section surrounding the ranch and gave it to the foundation in memory of their father, John. Options have been taken by the ranch on several thousand acres of farm and ranchland touching its present holdings. The city of La Junta presented the ranch with a complete frozen food plant.

A contractor estimated that building a new cottage would cost about $13,500. Remodeling those at hand, however, costs only $8,000 with even that figure reduced sharply by donations of material and by volunteer labor.

A list of donors would fill many pages. Nonmoney gifts include building material, fixtures, furnishings, transportation, and labor. At the foundation's headquarters in the La Junta Chamber of Commerce, for instance, where it rents desk space, high school girls from La Junta and nearby communities type letters to prospective donors and requests for publicity to newspapers, radio, and television stations throughout the State. Typewriters are loaned by a local office supply store. Women unable to go to the office type in their homes.

A vast amount of work has been done, but an even greater amount remains. There are another half-a-hundred buildings to be repaired. The streets need paving.

The trustees have plans for all this. Individuals giving $100 or more during 1961 will be listed in the administration building halls as Founders Fund members. Donations of $10,000 entitle the giver to dedicate a cottage to a person or cause.

"Anyone who pays for having a street paved can have it named after him," said May.

During the school year the boys go to classes in La Junta. They are taken in to town on Sunday, too, so they can attend any church they wish.

"You can send a boy to college more cheaply than you can send him to prison," May comments soberly. He reasons that from an utterly cold-blooded point of view it will cost less to set up the ranch and maintain it with its full complement of boys than it will to support them in prison later on, along with the cost of crimes they might commit.

But neither May nor those working with him in the foundation look at it that way. What they see is a group of hurt and bewildered boys, adrift in a world they did not ask to enter, who need help and, most of all, love.

Statements by the Honorable George W. Ball and the Honorable John M. Leddy at the World Bank Meeting in Vienna, September 19–21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to statements made at the recent meeting of the World Bank in Vienna, which I had the honor of attending as a Senate observer, by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and the Honorable John M. Leddy, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Both gentlemen are alternate governors of the bank and fund for the United States. I ask unanimous consent to have the statements inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BALL, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, AND ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE BANK AND FUND FOR THE UNITED STATES, AT THE BANK'S ANNUAL DISCUSSION

No one can study the annual report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development nor observe its operations throughout the past few years without the conviction that it has outgrown its name. The International Bank today is no longer merely a remarkable financial institution but a major instrument of human advancement. Under the perceptive and imaginative leadership of its president and other officers, its executive directors and its staff, it has provided not only material help but wise counsel to nations both new and old, that are caught up in the great ferment that is sweeping the world.

The nature of this ferment is still difficult to comprehend. Its elements are political, economic, social cultural, and scientific. It affects more than half of the world's peoples. It involves the release of massive forces through a kind of seismic social convulsion—the crumbling of old systems and the creation, often in violence and blood, of new nations and institutions.

What we are experiencing today is distinct from the waves of political revolution we have known at earlier times. That half of the world's population embroiled in this ferment is asking for more than national independence. Most of the peoples involved in this surging movement have already secured the juridical right to rule themselves. But all too often this is only the beginning of the task of building the essential institutions of statehood.

The people in what we have come to call the less developed areas of the world are giving insistent voice to many and varied demands—demands which we should not, indeed which we cannot, ignore.

They are demanding access to the basic material requirements of life—food, clothing, and shelter—which previous generations have known so meagerly. They are demanding other material comforts and conveniences that are available to the peopels of the more developed societies. They are demanding personal freedom and dignity, better education for themselves and their children, and the opportunity for cultural and spiritual growth. Finally, they are demanding the right to live out their lives in peace and security.

Quite obviously, all these demands cannot be satisfied quickly even by the most far-reaching and successful programs of economic development. Yet economic development remains an indispensable element in their fulfillment. If the revolution which we are witnessing today is to succeed—and its frustration could mean only catastrophe—then the more developed nations must provide, through public assistance and private investment (and I do not underestimate the importance of private investment), that measure of resources needed to transform and modernize at least half the globe.

All of this has been said before and much better. But today I want to emphasize two considerations that are not always adequately stressed.

First is the element of time and urgency. Most of the older industrial societies achieved their present levels of economic and technical development over a period of centuries, but the less developed nations of today will not wait. Two billion people are no longer prepared to accept the miserable conditions of life which their ancestors patiently endured. They are persuaded that the vaulting technology of the modern world offers the physical means by which centuries of stagnation can be overcome.

The second element that complicates our task is our lack of reliable insight into what we are doing and where we are going. We know very little about the anatomy of economic and social growth. An abundance of preconception masquerades as principle; an abundance of theory substitutes for experience. Yet the lessons implicit in the history of industrialized societies are largely irrelevant.

For we are dealing with disparate cultures, with violent emotional impulses, and with explosive political pressures. We find ourselves constantly moving into new terrain; we must experiment, appraise, and try to learn by doing, without losing our forward momentum.

It is here that the IBRD and its affiliated institutions are making a special contribution—the contribution of experience patiently acquired, thoughtfully appraised, and incisively applied. In a real sense the Bank has been a pioneer, moving with firm purpose through the tangled forest of economic development.

It is because of its willingness to depart from precedent that the Bank has evolved from being merely a lender of money to an institution that is playing a part in shaping the world revolution of development. In this process the Bank, through its varied initiatives, has contributed to our understanding of the process of development, and the means of encouraging development, far more than most of us realize.

The Bank, for example, has not been bound by any doctrinaire commitment to the principle that the marketplace must be the sole arbiter of investment. Many less-developed countries possess neither the institutional structure nor a sufficient entrepreneurial tradition to make this possible. If resources are to be injected into the investment stream in such a manner as to contribute most efficiently to economic growth then they must be employed systematically to build those basic elements of production—transportation, roads, powerplants, and factories—that are indispensable to the growth process. And this obviously implies a considerable measure of planning at the national level in which the state must necessarily take the lead.

The recognition of this paradox—that intelligent planning for a less-developed economy may be essential to the progressive achievement of economic freedom as the society moves toward a higher level—has been implicit in much that the Bank has done.

At the same time, the Bank has come to understand that national planning is itself an esoteric art which most less-developed societies cannot practice effectively without help and guidance. As an international organization bringing together the skills of many nations, the Bank has equipped itself to provide that guidance in ways that take into account the sensitivities of the developing countries.

Perhaps the most refined form of the Bank's activities in this connection has been the organization of consortia. In providing the leadership for consortia, the Bank has had an extraordinary opportunity to encourage, review, and criticize national economic plans. I am sure that few of us are fully aware of the amount of painstaking effort that has been expended in the leadership of consortia or of the quantity or quality of useful advice which the Bank's technicians have provided to the developing countries.

But the perfection of the consortium is not the only contribution which the Bank has made to the art and practice of national planning. It has created an Economic Development Institute to train senior Government officials, and the management of the Bank has recently proposed a Development Advisory Service which the executive directors have approved. Through this Development Advisory Service the Bank may provide expert help in development planning on a continuous basis, through career-type personnel. It may establish resident missions, where requested, to assist in the preparation and execution of broad development programs. It may furnish technical advice and assistance in the actual administration of particular programs of lesser scope. This, it seems to me, is a useful extension of the Bank's activities and one which deserves our full support.

One reason why the Bank has succeeded in its diverse tasks is that it has perceived the need to adapt its tools to the requirements of the responsibilities it has undertaken.

The establishment of the International Development Association is, I think, a manifestation of this perception. The IDA is now an effective member of the community of international lending institutions. But, as we can see from its first annual report, the demands on the International Development Association are increasing. We may well need to face an enlargement of IDA funds in the near future.

With the facilities of IDA serving as a complement to its own, the IBRD should be able to increase its effectiveness. Yet action through international mechanisms such as the Bank and its affiliated institutions is, of course, only one phase of the massive effort that is needed to meet the demands confronting us.

The United States has long recognized that the economically advanced countries cannot fulfill their responsibility solely through their participation in the work of the Bank. During the last few months, my Government has been engaged in a major renovation and strengthening of its own arrangements for bilateral assistance. President Kennedy's new program, which the Congress has just approved, rests on two major premises.

The first is the same premise which has animated much of the work of the Bank—that sustained economic and social progress under conditions of freedom can be achieved only by regarding the development process from the point of view of the recipient nation as a whole. Development programs can best succeed where there is a determination on the part of the peoples to mobilize their own resources for the purposes of working out overall country programs in which each project is related to all other projects. Human needs are too acute and capital resources too limited for money to be devoted to isolated projects which contribute little to the total national economy of an underdeveloped country.

The other major premise which played a part in the development of President Kennedy's new program has been the conviction that the task or raising the level of life in the less developed countries is one which the economically advanced nations must share. It is an undertaking far beyond the resources of any one nation.

It was with this in mind that my Government has welcomed the initiative taken by the IBRD in the sponsorship of consortia. It is with this in mind also that we have become an active participant in the development assistance group, soon to become the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. This group will provide a means for systematic consultation to increase the total volume of resources for development and to improve their utilization.

We have great hopes for the new Development Assistance Committee. We are convinced that, as it gains experience, it can play an even more useful role. Yet, here also, we are moving in an area of empiricism, and only time and experience will show exactly how the work of the Committee will develop.

But I do want to make one point quite clear. The Development Assistance Committee is merely another tool for all of us to use in responding to the formidable demands imposed by the revolution of development. In helping to mobilize the resources of the industrialized countries through all appropriate mechanisms—including consortia under certain circumstances—it will be in no sense a competitor of the Bank. Its activities will be harmonized so as to supplement and complement the Bank's own most useful efforts.

The efforts of which I have spoken so far—bilateral, international and national—offer hope and encouragement for the future. Primarily they are concerned, however, with only a single aspect of the development process, the provision of technical services and the investment of external capital resources to insure economic growth.

Yet we all know that economic development cannot be an end in itself. It is merely one means—albeit an indispensable one—of satisfying human aspirations. Economic development if aimed ultimately at the achievement of broad humanitarian goals. But if those goals are actually to be realized we must face up to the uncomfortable fact that economic development will have to be accompanied by other political, social, cultural and economic processes—and this presents a major problem.

Economic development cannot serve its real purpose if its benefits are enjoyed exclusively by a wealthy elite, while the great masses remain in poverty. Nor can there be any assurance of lasting benefits from economic development in any nation where the government is the master of society and not its servant.

It is with respect to this point, I think, that the debate among the more advanced countries as to the most desirable system of economic and social organization is most often misunderstood, particularly in the less developed nations. All too frequently the controversy is regarded as merely a dispute concerning the merits of governmental intervention in the economic processes of society.

Nothing could be further from the truth; the argument is far more fundamental than that. Every modern society—however advanced or primitive—takes for granted a measure of governmental control over the economy. The critical issue of our times is not "government control" but uncontrolled government. Where the people of any nation lack the power to choose their rulers, can criticize them only at personal peril and have no effective means of influencing their behavior, these people can easily be reduced to slavery, and there is no guarantee that any degree of economic development will actually benefit anyone except the rulers themselves.

A second major problem stems from the fact that the successful achievement of our humanitarian objectives depends to a considerable extent upon the ability of economic growth to keep pace with demographic developments.

The "population explosion" has become a familiar term in recent years. Even so, its true dimensions are difficult to grasp. Some time this year, the three-billionth human being will be born. On the basis of a statistical average, 200 births occur every minute. It is also a stark fact of demography that the major portion of these births is taking place in the less developed regions of the world.

The prevailing rate of population growth affects not only the net rate of economic advancement, but also the volume of resources and the nature of the national programs required to achieve rapid development. Even under the best of circumstances, the less developed nations will fight a losing battle unless they can obtain, and use with maximum efficiency, a huge volume of capital and technical skills. In this context, the population explosion, if continued, will place an ever-increasing burden on the more advanced countries and international lending institutions. It will place a burden as well on the developing countries, to achieve greater effectiveness in mobilizing internal resources for development.

The population problem must, of course, be taken into account in drafting national development programs. Areas with plentiful manpower may find it useful to stress development activities of a labor-intensive nature. Nations with small populations relative to resources may more appropriately consider labor-saving activities. And the rate of population growth will, of course, require close attention to the proper balance between increasing the production of basic foodstuffs and quickening the pace toward industrialization.

Rapid population growth, therefore, conditions the prospects for achieving the true objectives of economic development. It is a problem intimately bound up with the social and cultural traditions—and inhibitions—of each particular country. It is a problem which, in all its aspects, calls increasingly for the exercise of the most mature wisdom. But while we cannot solve this problem here today we can at least define our goal. We want a world in which every birth is accompanied by a birthright.

There is a third major problem which is too often neglected. In our preoccupation with the process of development at the national level we have given all too little thought, I fear, to the total economic impact of the development revolution on the world as a whole.

We can hardly expect the less-developed nations to attain a level of self-sustaining growth if they are unable to earn a growing volume of convertible foreign exchange in world markets. Any program for economic development may become an absurdity unless it realistically takes account of world trading patterns and prospects.

There are several facets to this complex problem. First, the less-developed nations must be able to find reasonably stable markets for the raw materials they produce. The foreign aid provided under even the most ambitious assistance program for a developing nation can be totally negated if that nation suffers an abrupt cyclical decline in the world market price for a major raw material it exports. This is particularly true of those countries which are dependent upon one or two basic commodities for the bulk of their foreign exchange earnings.

Quite apart from these cyclical fluctuations, we know also that certain primary commodities show a continuous tendency toward increasing output. As a result, the aggregate supply of these products may come to exceed any conceivable future demand at reasonable prices. Obviously, any development program aimed at increasing a country's capacity for producing commodities in world surplus will be self-defeating. In persistent surplus situations we must face the hard necessity of devising mechanisms, within a worldwide framework, to stabilize prices and production.

This is a problem which is preoccupying the U.S. Government today. We are giving a great deal of thought and effort to its solution. But I must emphasize that it cannot be solved by the creation of special preferential systems between groups of primary producing countries and one or more industrialized countries. Such discriminatory solutions, in the long run, will only delay and complicate the working out of these problems on a worldwide basis.

Another aspect of this question which enters into the total equation of development planning is the impact of worldwide industrialization on world markets. As the less developed countries progress toward economic advancement they will begin to move progressively into the edges of industrialization. Initially they may concentrate on the production of articles needed to meet the expanding demands of their own peoples. But if they are ever to be capable of continuing the development process through their own efforts—if they are to reach the beckoning goal of self-sustaining growth—then they must be able to sell their production on the world markets.

It goes without saying that in many of the developing nations the most valuable productive resource is low-cost labor. With a large reservoir of unskilled labor and a shortage of capital, it is only natural that such countries should tend to concentrate their production in labor-intensive industries. In an ideal world one might expect the industrial nations to move consciously toward more sophisticated production, leaving to the developing nations an expanding field for simpler manufactures. But this is not an ideal world and we all know well enough that the structural adjustments which this implies—even though marginal

so far as most economies are concerned—cannot be easily or quickly accomplished.

I would expect, therefore, that we are only at the beginning of a process in which the governments of the industrialized nations must take the lead in providing an orderly opportunity for the expansion of markets for the production of the underdeveloped nations. In the absence of a great deal of will and effort and consultation among nations there is grave danger that the normal and necessary changes in trading patterns will be artificially distorted by restrictive reflexes on the part of major consuming nations. In that event the hope for a prosperous world in which resources are most effectively used would be cruelly delayed or frustrated.

In my remarks this morning I have recited a litany of problems. Economic development itself, the improvement of political and social organization, the population explosion, and the relationship of economic development to the world trading system—all of these are complex and difficult. Formidable troubles for an already troubled world.

I would not suggest that the IBRD—nor any other national or international agency engaged in economic development—has the power to solve these problems. We cannot possibly assure a perfect adjustment between economic planning on the one hand and the relevant political, social, demographic, and commercial factors on the other. However, we must do our best to make certain that our plans and efforts in the field of economic development do not wholly ignore these vital problems, that we take account of them to the extent permitted by the dimensions of our knowledge and by the built-in limitations of the environment in which we work.

Development planning is complex, and those responsible for such planning may be forgiven a certain reluctance to accept the introduction of new complexities. But we shall do ourselves no service unless we make sure that those objectives are not frustrated by our indifference to forces and elements that are not included in the narrow definition of development planning. A great American philosopher once defined a fanatic as "a man who redoubles his efforts when he has forgotten his aim." The field of economic development demands men of talent and dedication but men for whom the overall humanitarian aim is always clearly visible.

It is with confidence this morning that we can commend the work of the Bank and its related institutions. Its past achievements are solid and enduring. Its future prospects are encouraging indeed, and I want to welcome all new and prospective members of the Bank and IDA represented here today.

I think we can say without qualification that the Bank has become a vital instrument for preserving a peaceful and orderly world and for promoting the advancement of mankind toward higher plateaus of material and spiritual well-being.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN M. LEDDY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AND TEMPORARY ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE BANK AND FUND FOR THE UNITED STATES, AT THE IFC ANNUAL DISCUSSION

It gives me great pleasure to join in paying tribute to Robert Garner, our distinguished president and good friend, as he approaches his retirement next month from the presidency of the International Finance Corporation. Robert Garner is the pioneer of the IFC. It was his wise leadership which guided this novel institution through its critical early years of experimentation in an untested field.

We all know how difficult his task has been. From the beginning the IFC has been handicapped by the limitation in its Articles of Agreement prohibiting the Corporation from investing in capital stock. Happily this prohibition has now been removed with the approval last month of an amendment to the Articles of Agreement. The large favorable vote on the amendment, reflecting approval by 88 percent of the governors and 94 percent of the total voting power, is due in no small measure to the unceasing efforts of President Garner to make the IFC a vital and progressive institution. We extend to him our admiration, our warm thanks and every good wish for the future. To Eugene Black, the new president, and to Martin Rosen, who holds the newly created office of executive vice president, we offer our full cooperation and our hopes for every success in steadily enlarging the role and influence of the IFC in furthering private enterprise in the developing countries.

Despite the serious restrictions in its charter, the IFC has succeeded in making 45 business investments in 18 member countries for a total of almost $58 million. Of this total, over $13 million represents five commitments entered into during the last 3 months, signifying a sharp increase in activity.

The IFC is the only intergovernmental financial institution established solely for the purpose of investing directly in private enterprise in the developing countries. And for each dollar of IFC money several additional dollars of private money have gone into enterprises in which the IFC has invested. Thus, we estimate that total investment generated by the IFC has been in the neighborhood of $200 million.

Since IFC's total authorized capital of $100 million is relatively small, it is especially important for the IFC to replenish its funds by selling its investments in completed projects to private investors. So far the Corporation has been able to make little progress in this direction, mainly because the prohibition against investment in capital stock has forced the Corporation to utilize devices such as convertible debentures, stock options, and contingent interest arrangements which are complicated, little known and not readily marketable in the developing countries. Now that the Corporation has been authorized by the new amendment to invest in capital stock, including common shares, we have every reason to hope that it will be able to sell its portfolio much more readily and thus truly revolve the limited capital at its disposal.

The new amendment, while enabling the Corporation to invest in common stock, does not permit it to participate in the management of private enterprise except to protect its interests in cases of default or jeopardy. It is the hope of the United States that the need for exercising this protective power will be rare. We are sure that the officers of the Corporation have no desire or intention that it intervene in operations which are properly within the domain of private management.

The Corporation now has greater flexibility to take full advantage of the opportunities open to it for stimulating private investment and enterprise. We are confident that it will move forward vigorously in carrying out its important tasks.

In closing, may I extend a warm welcome to our new members—we look forward to a close association with them in the work of the Corporation which lies ahead.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Summary of Major Legislative Activity, 1st Session, 87th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 108, 87th Congress, I should like to submit a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

During the 1st session 583 House bills and resolutions were referred to the committee, one of which was rereferred to the committee having legislative jurisdiction over the subject matter. Twenty-eight Senate bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Total referrals for the 1st session were 583 House bills and resolutions and 28 Senate bills and resolutions. This year 15 were enacted into public law, 2 were approved by the House but not acted upon in the Senate, and 4 remained on the House Calendar on the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

After the committee was organized in late February, the first order of business was consideration of an amendment to the Food and Drug Act to permit the continued use of certain food additives and pesticide chemicals which have been in commercial use since January 1, 1958, until the necessary investigations and scientific studies now in progress can be completed and regulations adopted to provide final assurance of the safe use of these additives and chemicals (H.R. 3980). The bill passed the House and Senate and is now Public Law 87–19. A complete explanation of the bill is contained in House Report No. 53, filed March 3, 1961.

Extension of unemployment and sickness insurance benefits to railroad workers who had exhausted their existing compensation was approved. This action was taken to provide temporary unemployment insurance benefits similar to those provided for workers in other industries—H.R. 5075, House Report No. 54—Public Law 87–7.

Under section 510 of the Transportation Act of 1958 the Interstate Commerce Commission was given authority to guarantee loans to railroads for capital expenditures. That section terminated on March 31, 1961, and after public hearings the committee approved a bill (H.R. 1163) to extend for 15 months the loan guaranty authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission—House Report No. 65, filed March 7, 1961.

The Senate companion bill provided for a longer extension and after a con-

ference, the loan guaranty authority was extended for 27 months—Public Law 87–16.

Hearings on H.R. 4614 and 15 similar bills were conducted by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance in March and April of this year. The general purpose of the bills is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit this country. The measure further provides for establishment in the Department of Commerce of a U.S. Travel Service headed by a Director. S. 610, a companion bill, the International Travel Act of 1961—became Public Law 87–63. A complete explanation of the bill is contained in House Report No. 323, filed May 1, 1961.

The administration's proposal to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of the aged was embodied in H.R. 4998. The major features of the legislation included authorization for increased appropriations to States and local communities in providing adequate public health services. It would also authorize appropriations for studies, experiments, and demonstrations of new or improved methods of providing health services outside hospitals. The bill also provides for an annual increase from $10 to $20 million for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for construction of nursing homes.

The committee held hearings on H.R. 4998 early in May and the bill was subsequently reported—House Report No. 599—with amendments. It passed the House and was further amended in the Senate. A conference committee resolved the differences in the bill and the President signed it on October 5—Public Law 87–395.

Further attention was given to the more efficient operation of the Federal Communications Commission. H.R. 7856 amends the Communications Act of 1934 so that the Federal Communications Commission will be able, by making better use of its own time and more effective use of its experienced and technically qualified personnel, to handle its large workload of adjudication cases with greater speed and efficiency than is presently possible. Thus, it is hoped and believed that these changes in law will enable the Commission to devote more of its time to major matters of policy and planning involving issues of general communications importance.

When the bill was considered in the House, the language of H.R. 7856 was incorporated in S. 2034, a companion measure which had already passed the other body. A conference committee was able to reach agreement and S. 2034 is now Public Law 87–192. A detailed explanation of the bill is contained in House Report No. 723, filed July 17, 1961.

At the request of the President of the United States, the chairman of the committee introduced a bill to carry out the administration's program for development of public airports by making an additional $375 million available over a 5-year period. Following public hearings before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and after careful consideration, except for the change in the method of financing the Federal-aid airport program, there was no major change of a substantive nature in the administration's proposal as reported—House Report No. 728—from the committee in H.R. 8102.

The language in the House bill prohibits the Federal Aviation Administrator to enter into contracts obligating Federal funds in advance of appropriations as the means of furnishing Federal aid to airports. In the future, the Administrator will be required to obtain appropriations before obligating Federal funds. The Senate bill (S. 2268) made no such change in the method of financing the airport program.

After the Senate and House had passed different versions of the legislative proposal, and a conference committee failed to reach agreement, the House proposed a further amendment providing for a 3-year program, incorporating the new method of financing. The Senate agreed to this and H.R. 8102, as amended, received Presidential approval—Public Law 87–255.

The Interstate Commerce Commission also suggested legislation to authorize it to delegate to three-man employee boards the function of reviewing recommended orders entered in cases in which hearings have been held (H.R. 6716).

After hearings by the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies a revised bill (H.R. 8033) was introduced and reported from the committee—House Report No. 750, filed July 20, 1961. The House and Senate approved the measure and it is now Public Law 87–347.

House Joint Resolution No. 438, authorizing $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study and investigation of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities association was enacted—Public Law 87–196.

The committee feels that the investigation and study called for under House Joint Resolution No. 438 is needed in order to maintain public confidence in the securities markets and to be informed as to whether at this time, in the light of changed market conditions, the investing public is afforded the protection which was envisaged in the passage of the Securities Act of 1933 and of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. A detailed explanation of the measure is contained in House Report No. 882.

A series of acts of a criminal nature committed aboard aircraft dramatically underscored the need for legislation to extend Federal criminal laws to certain crimes occurring on board aircraft in air commerce. The provisions of H.R. 8384 are based on the use of criminal sanctions as a deterrent to the commission of criminal acts, such as aircraft hijacking, murder, manslaughter, assault, and carrying concealed deadly or dangerous weapons.

Hearings were held on H.R. 8384 and related bills by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics. After extensive executive consideration, the committee revised and incorporated new language in H.R. 8384. The committee approved the amended bill—House Report No. 958, filed August 16, 1961—and the House inserted this language in S. 2268. The Senate concurred in the House amendment and the Senate bill became Public Law 87–197.

Legislation to establish a program of Federal matching grants for educational television facilities was again introduced and considered by the committee. The Subcommittee on Communications and Power held hearings on bills designed to speed up the process of getting educational television stations on the air so that the American people, children—as well as adults—in schools, colleges, and universities—as well as in their homes—may have the benefits of this new and important educational medium.

H.R. 132, after having been amended by the committee, was reported to the House—House Report No. 999—and is presently pending on the Union Calendar.

In order to rectify certain inequities and discrepancies in favor of the social security system as against the railroad retirement system, a bill (H.R. 8597) was introduced and passed which amends the Railroad Retirement Act, the principal feature of which is to permit male railroad employees with less than 30 years of creditable service to retire at age 62 on a reduced annuity. (S. 2395 became Public Law 87–285.)

The committee approved a bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State—House Report No. 1090. The Senate companion bill (S. 320) was reported from the committee and is presently pending on the House Calendar.

H.R. 5978, amending section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, was also reported by the committee—House Report No. 1116. This bill provides for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933. This bill is also pending on the House Calendar.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, as part of its legislative program, recommended that it be permitted to grant limited certificates to supplemental air carriers. The proposal was incorporated in H.R. 7318.

After careful consideration by the full committee and the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, substitute language was drafted to give the Board some, but not all, of the authority requested by it. The amended bill was reported to the House—House Report No. 1177, filed September 13, 1961—and the language contained in it was substituted for the text of S. 1969. The amended Senate bill is now awaiting further action by that body.

The committee conducted public hearings on bills to prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of articles imported into the United States from Cuba. Subsequently, H.R. 8465, as amended, was approved by the committee—House Report No. 1182, filed Sep-

tember 14, 1961—and passed the House. The Senate did not act on the measure prior to the adjournment of the first session.

S. 1186, which amends the act of June 13, 1906—stamping of gold and silver articles—provides that if a manufacturer or dealer applies a quality mark to the gold or silver article, he must also apply a trademark, duly registered, to the article so that he may be identified.

The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance held public hearings on S. 1186 and a companion bill, H.R. 5442. The Senate bill, with technical amendments, was approved by the committee—House Report No. 1190, filed September 15, 1961—and the House. The Senate agreed to the House amendments and S. 1186 became Public Law 87–354.

The committee also reported a bill (H.R. 2429—House Report 727, filed July 18, 1961) which later became public law, which would supplement existing Federal criminal laws in order to provide more effective deterrents to the willful destruction or damage of the property moving in interstate or foreign commerce—Public Law 87–221.

The committee considered and approved S. 1440—House Report No. 1181, filed September 14, 1961—a bill to amend the act of July 14, 1960, establishing a national register of names of certain motor vehicle operators. The purpose of the amendment to existing law is to enable additional States to participate in the national driver license program. The House passed the Senate bill without amendment—Public Law 87–359.

At the request of the Department of Commerce, a bill was introduced and approved which provided for an extension of the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance—H.R. 7341. The Senate bill—S. 1931—became Public Law 87–89. A detailed explanation of the bill is contained in House Report No. 567, filed June 22, 1961.

The Secretary of Commerce asked for authority to appoint an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to serve as his principal adviser on scientific and technological matters and his draft bill to accomplish this was introduced by the chairman of the committee—H.R. 6360.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance and the bill was subsequently reported to the House without amendment—House Report No. 885, filed August 10, 1961. At the close of the first session the bill was pending on the House Union Calendar.

In addition to the bills which the committee reported to the House during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, public hearings were held on communications satellites, milk sanitation, sales below cost and cease and desist orders, Civil Aeronautics Board legislative recommendations, amendments to War Claims and Trading With the Enemy Acts, hardwood labeling, drug advertisements, and hours of operation of daytime radio stations. These subjects will receive further consideration by the committee during the second session of the present Congress.

Rockefeller on Rails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, entitled "Rockefeller on Rails," appeared in the Baltimore Sun of September 12, 1961. Its favorable comment upon the Governor's plea for a three-way merger of the Chesapeake & Ohio, Baltimore & Ohio, and the New York Central system merits the attention of this House. Every Member concerned with improving the railroads' ability to serve the public interest should consider this proposal carefully:

ROCKEFELLER ON RAILS

In one sense Governor Rockefeller's testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission was a plea for inclusion of his own State's railroad, the New York Central, in any combination involving the Baltimore & Ohio and the Chesapeake & Ohio. This is a position which any Goverernor in a similar position would take. The Central is on its uppers, with a deficit of $28 million in the first 7 months of this year. The road, which has an annual payroll of $156 million, represents 40 percent of all the trackage in New York State. It has been hard hit by competition from the St. Lawrence Seaway as well as by the general economic decline. It desperately needs the financial relief which some kind of affiliation with the C. & O. alone or the C. & O. and the B. & O. in combination might bring.

This is the parochial case. But the Governor of New York went on to make a general case which should command respectful attention not only by the ICC but by the public at large. As he pointed out, nearly all the eastern railroads are in severe difficulties. It is in the public interest to save not only one or two of them but to insure that the rail net as a whole survives. A thorough reexamination of the relationships among all forms of transportation is necessary—and in the meantime it is in the national interest to permit the rails themselves to combine to achieve increase economy and efficiency.

The Governor's—and the Central's—preferred solution would be a three-way merger. Understandably, the B. & O. and the C. & O., pushing their own proposals for a two-way combination, have reacted coolly. They are right in pointing out the tremendous financial burden that inclusion of the Central would bring—and noting that B. & O. stockholders, looking to their own financial well-being, voted overwhelmingly to accept the C. & O. offer rather than Central's. But the views of the owners are not the only concern. The situation confronting the railroads as a whole is so grave today that the public interest must have careful consideration. It may well prove to be the deciding factor.

In this highly complicated and technical field, this public interest may, perhaps, be served by approving a speedy B. & O.-C. & O. combination, to provide some form of relief to Balimore's road, and putting off the question of Central's participation for subsequent consideration. But even if this is true, no immediate steps should be taken without a clear idea as to how it will fit into the pattern ultimately to be worked out. Governor Rockefeller's plea was more than a partisan presentation of his own State's case. It was a solid statement of the long-term problem.

Effect on Colorado Mines of H.R. 84, Lead and Zinc Subsidy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Congress has passed H.R. 84, a bill to authorize limited subsidy payments to small producers of lead and zinc. This bill represents at least partial success of the efforts made in this session to bring some measure of relief to this industry.

As chairman of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, it was my privilege to report favorably S. 1747. This bill, which I cosponsored with my colleague and chairman of the full Interior Committee, Senator ANDERSON, and others, combined a tariff-subsidy program along the general lines of the Wool Act. The duties to be imposed on foreign imports would have financed the subsidy payments to domestic producers who qualified under the provisions of the bill.

After the Interior Committee favorably reported S. 1747, the Senate Finance Committee asserted its jurisdiction because of the tariff provisions of the bill. This committee also reported S. 1747, but only after deleting title III relating to tariffs.

The language of H.R. 84, passed earlier by the House, is identical with the subsidy title of S. 1747. At this point, the Senate was faced with the choice of a bill authorizing limited subsidies—or no bill at all. It was agreed that the small producers were in very dire circumstances and it was better to pass the subsidy bill in this session and work for relief by way of the tariff in the next session. H.R. 5193, the Baker bill, designed to impose import duties on lead and zinc, was reported unanimously by the House Ways and Means Committee in the closing days of the session. It will be pending business when the Congress reconvenes in January.

During the course of the committee consideration of this legislation and since the bill reached the House and Senate floors, there has been considerable discussion and some disagreement as to the effectiveness of H.R. 84. In order to obtain the most accurate, current data possible from my own State of Colorado, I asked the director of the State department of natural resources, Dr. Ed Clark, to furnish me with a report of the mines in Colorado which could benefit from H.R. 84. This report, prepared by G. A. Franz, Jr., director of the Colorado Bureau of Mines, is comprehensive and explicit and I am confident it will prove valuable to the mining interests in the State as it has to me in analyzing this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to insert the report in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lead-zinc mines in Colorado

County	Mine name	Operated during the years as indicated by X					Development	Crude production (tons per year)	Mill capacity (tons per day)	County total
		1956	1957	1958	1959	1960				
Boulder	Caribou	X	X		X		X			
	Comstock	X						100		
	White Raven	X					X			
	Blue Bird		X		X	X	X			
	Occidental		X	X			X			
	Western Slope		X				X			
	Boulder County Tunnel			X			X			
	White Raven			X	X		X			8
Chaffee	Dumpite	X					X			
	Josephine	X					X			
	(K.O.) Burlington	X					X			
	Stonewall	X	X		X		X			
	Tilden	X					X			
	Tom Collins	X					X			
	Sitting Bull		X			X	X			
	Gold Eagle				X	X	X			8
Clear Creek	Ashland	X		X	X	X		100		
	Bald Eagle		X	X	X	X		10,000		
	Cosmopolitan	X					X	10,000		
	Dixie	X	X	X	X	X				
	Forge Hill	X	X							
	Franklin	X	X	X	X			300		
	Grizzly	X					X			
	Joe Reynolds	X						200		
	Johnny Bull	X	X				X			
	Keast Tunnel	X	X	X			X			
	Nabob	X					X			
	Red Elephant	X	X				X			
	Zero	X					X			
	Ashby		X				X			
	Bard Creek		X				X			
	Bellve Hudson		X	X			X			
	Big Five		X		X	X		800		
	Freeland Extension		X					100		
	Nevada Tunnel		X				X			
	Freighters Friend			X		X		100		
	Hot Pot				X		X			
	Marshall Tunnel					X	X			22
Dolores	Rico Argentine	X	X	X	X	X		30,000		
	St. Louis			X	X	X		100		2
Eagle	Morning		X				X			2
Gilpin	Carroll	X						100		
	Cherokee	X						100		
	Cliff	X					X			
	Enterprise	X					X			
	La Cross	X	X	X	X	X		1,000		(1)
	Lone Star	X					X			
	Pied Piper	X					X			
	Spring Day Extension	X	X	X			X			
	Williams Tunnel	X	X				X			
	We Got Em	X	X	X	X	X		100		
	Widdow Woman	X					X			
	Hayes & Wheeler		X	X	X	X		100		
	Meeker Success		X	X				100		13
Gunnison	Akron	X					X			
	Daisy	X	X				X			
	Gold Lynx	X	X	X	X	X		200		
	Hawkeye	X					X			
	Keystone	X	X	X	X	X	X		500	
	Star X-10-V-8	X	X	X	X	X		500		
	Micawber		X	X	X	X		1,000	100	
	Hot Rock	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	Carter				X		X		100	9
Hinsdale	Gold Quartz	X	X				X			
	Pelican	X			X	X		200	50	
	Rodney	X					X			
	Pride of America		X	X			X			
	Resorgimento			X			X			5
Jackson	Cap Rock	X					X			1
Lake	Big Four	X						1,000		
	Bi-Metallic	X						1,000		
	Hayden	X	X					1,000		
	Helena	X	X					2,000		
	Ibex	X	X					2,500		
	Irene	X	X					3,000		
	Julia Fiske	X	X					2,000		
	Resurrection	X						100,000	500	
	Yak	X				X	X			
	Little Alice		X				X			
	Lucky Five		X				X			
	Eureka			X			X			
	Gordon Tiger			X	X	X	X			
	Tom Thumb			X			X			14
La Plata	Knoll	X					X			
	Bessie G		X		X	X		500	50	
	Brawner		X	X			X			
	Muldoon		X	X	X	X		50		
	Farmer Boy		X		X		X			
	Lady Eleanor			X	X	X	X			
	Neglected				X	X	X			7
Mineral	Gormax	X					X			
	Monon	X	X	X		X		1,000	100	
	Outlet	X	X	X	X		X			
	Phoenix	X			X	X	X			
	Holy Moses		X	X						(7)
	Jack Pot					X	X			8

Lead-zinc mines in Colorado—Continued

County	Mine name	Operated during the years as indicated by X					Development	Crude production (tons per year)	Mill capacity (tons per day)	County total
		1956	1957	1958	1959	1960				
Ouray	Brown Mountain	X	X	X				500		
	Camp Bird	X	X	X	X	X		30,000	500	
	Greyhound	X	X	X			X			
	Keystone	X					X			
	Pony Express	X	X					200		
	Treasury Tunnel	X	X	X	X	X		(Over)		
	Monarch		X	X		X		500		
	Rouville		X	X	X	X	X			
	Revenue			X			X			
	Old Lout		X				X			
	Bachelor				X	X	X			
	Wewissi				X	X	X			12
Pitkin	Kris Kringle	X					X			
	Smuggler	X					X			
	Montezuma					X	X			5
Park	Buckskin Joe		X				X			
	Champagne		X				X			
	Hill Top		X	X				200		
	Betty					X	X			4
Rio Grande	Summitville	X				X	X		200	
	Mamouth		X							2
Saguache	Bennett	X					X			
	Bonanza	X					X			
	Cliff	X	X					400		
	Jupiter	X	X				X			
	Navajo	X					X			
	Queen City	X					X			
	Rawley 1 to 12	X	X	X	X	X		3,000	200	
	Warwick	X	X			X	X			
	Whale	X					X			
	Wheel of Fortune	X	X				X			
	Antero	X	X	X	X	X		10,000		
	D & J (Bonito)		X	X			X			
	Jenny		X	X	X		X			
	Lookout		X				X			
	Paragon		X				X			
	Marine Lode				X	X	X			16
San Juan	Black Hawk	X		X	X	X	X			
	Caledonian	X					X			
	Chattenoga	X					X			
	Gold King	X		X	X	X		12,000	400	
	Lark	X	X		X			2,000		
	Lead Carbonate	X					X		100	
	Little Dora	X	X		X	X	X			
	London	X					X			
	Longfellow Shaft	X	X			X	X			
	Mogul	X					X			
	Mountain Queen	X						500		
	Norma Jean	X					X			
	Oceola	X	X	X				1,000	150	
	Pride of the West	X		X		X		8,000	150	
	Ruby	X					X			
	Silver Cloud	X		X	X		X			
	Silver Ledge	X					X			
	Terry Tunnel	X		X		X	X			
	Auburn		X							
	Garry Owen		X	X			X		150	
	Kansas City			X	X		X			
	Shenandoah				X	X		(1)		
	Columbus					X	X			
	Brooklyn			X	X	X	X			24
San Miguel	Andrus	X			X	X	X			
	Bradley	X					X			
	Preston Moore	X					X			
	San Juan	X				X	X			
	Silver Pick	X	X				X			
	Badger		X				X			
	Carbenero		X		X		X			
	New Dominion			X			X			
	North Slope			X	X	X	X			
	San Bernardo			X	X	X	X			(11)
	Slide Mine				X		X			12
Summit	Big Four	X	X	X	X			300		
	Boss	X					X			
	Chatequa	X	X				X			
	Green Mountain Girl	X					X			
	Maid of Orleans	X					X			
	Meteor Tunnel	X	X					600	100	
	Minnie	X			X		X			
	National Treasure	X					X			
	New York	X	X	X	X			700	(2)	
	Wellington	X	X	X				700	100	
	Silver Wing		X					600		
	Shoe Basin		X	X	X	X		1,000		
	Blue Flag		X				X			
	Alliance		X	X	X	X	X			
	Gagen Tunnel				X		X			
	Washington					X	X			16
	Total eligible that have operated during the years 1956–60.							185		

[1] Use Gold King mill.
[2] See Meteor mill.

NOTE.—Total not eligible because of production in excess of 3,000 tons, combines metal, 3 (Eagle mine, Eagle County; Amethyst-Commodore, Mineral County; Pandora, San Miguel County).

Dancing Backward on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an address by the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, the dean of our Indiana delegation in the Congress and the distinguished minority leader in the House of Representatives.

This address, assessing the record of the first session of the 87th Congress, and of the new administration during the same period, was delivered at Muncie, Ind., on September 25, 1961.

Mr. HALLECK's speech follows:

Fellow Republicans and disillusioned Democrats.

Maybe it's too much to expect that we would have some members of the opposition present at a Republican fund-raising dinner—but the way things have been moving I'm not so sure.

Because—and make no mistake about this—a lot of people in this country have really had their eyes opened in the past 8 months—and getting your eyes open is the first step to becoming a good Republican.

The first session of a Democrat-controlled Congress under the leadership of the so-called New Frontier is over—for which we can all give thanks—and in assessing the accomplishments I am reminded of the story of the small boy who asked his playmate if he knew the difference between men and women.

The other lad thought it over for a minute and then said, "I guess the big difference is that women dance backward."

I don't want to oversimplify, but let me pose a few questions.

How do we go forward toward peace by fumbling in Africa, in Laos, in Geneva, in South Korea and in Cuba?

How do we arrive at a new frontier of real prosperity by dancing backward to the discredited spending sprees of some 30 years ago?

How do we go forward with sanity in government—balanced budgets—protecting the value of your dollar and mine—with a hope for tax reductions, when the Democrats insist on saddling the hard-working citizens of this country with billions more of debt?

You know, usually when you make a prediction in this business you stick your neck out a country mile. Well, I made a prediction early this year that was just about as foolproof as a prediction could be—

I said publicly that no matter what the Democrats did or didn't do—that they would break faith with a lot of good Americans who thought they knew what they were voting for last November.

Why did I say that?

Because if you take a hard look at the Democrat platform and all the campaign promises, it's obvious they couldn't possibly keep half of 'em.

They promised to spend new billions and yet they promised to balance the budget.

Well—they're spending the new billions all right.

Talk about the space age. Spending is headed for the moon.

But the Democrat promise of a balanced budget fizzled on the launching pad.

They promised vast new programs that would lead us all to the Utopia of a New Frontier.

But they also promised to protect the dollar.

They promised quick action to remodel the face of the Nation—whatever they meant by that.

But they also promised to be "thoughtful" in their deliberations—(like they thought out the "Tractors for Cuba" deal, I suppose).

They promised something for everybody—but at the same time they called on the American people for sacrifice.

I must say that what they may have had in mind as far as "sacrifice" is concerned is getting more ominous every day.

Some of our reservists and National Guardsmen are finding out the hard way.

So—having such contradictory promises in mind, I pointed out that half of the people who voted for the Democrats were going to wind up disenchanted.

Only, I didn't know it would happen so soon.

Believe me, the accomplishments of 8 years of sound, sane, firm Republican leadership under Dwight D. Eisenhower are looking better all the time.

In fact, I've never been happier to be a Republican.

We told the truth.

We fought clean and hard throughout the campaign, standing on principles of sound, sane government, and there we continue to stand.

We didn't make promises we couldn't possibly keep so we have nothing to take back.

And by the same token—I've never been happier that I'm not a Democrat.

I'd hate to be out here tonight trying to explain to a Democrat audience the difference between the Democrat record of promise and the Democrat record of performance. As my old friend, Senator Jim Watson, used to say, "If their platform had the measles, their performance wouldn't catch 'em." It's never been close enough.

They captured the Presidency.

They've got a solid 3-to-2 majority in the House of Representatives and a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate.

They packed the House Rules Committee to suit themselves.

The Democrats were all set to ride roughshod over anybody that got in their way.

But what happened?

Let's take a look at a few major items, foreign and domestic.

Many hard things were said by the Democrats during the campaign about the state of the Nation's defenses—some that should never have been said for the good of the country, because they didn't happen to be true.

Mr. Kennedy couldn't resist downgrading the power and majesty of America to the point that I wonder how much of it Mr. Khrushchev really believed.

Candidate Kennedy said, among other things, that we "must work to rebuild our rapidly deteriorating defenses."

It must have come as a surprise to some of his well-meaning supporters when the Department of Defense announced last month that we had a stockpile of atomic weapons to meet any threat of aggression. That, in fact, our stockpile was from three to eight times as big as Russia's.

Look, folks, that stockpile hasn't come into being in the last 8 months.

You just don't build the modern weapons of war overnight.

No, the truth of the matter is, that under President Eisenhower this country's defenses were the greatest in history—and a lot of work had been done to protect the old homestead before the New Frontiersmen took over.

Then there was the matter of prestige. We were told nobody liked us any more.

"Rebuilding our prestige must be the primary concern of our next President," is the way Candidate Kennedy put it.

I need mention only one word to indicate the progress we have made in that direction under the New Frontier: Cuba.

And wouldn't you know that one of the administration spokesmen tried to blame that fiasco on the Republicans. Well, they couldn't make it stick.

As part of this prestige business, Mr. Kennedy told the country this:

"Senior positions in the State Department, the Foreign Service, and the Defense Department shall be filled by the best talent available in both parties."

So we wind up with Acheson, Berle, Bowles, and Batt.

And he sends that great expert on foreign affairs—"Soapy" Williams—to represent us in Africa.

"Soapy" couldn't even keep Michigan from going broke.

Don't get me wrong:

Republicans in the Congress have stood with the President—by and large—on matters involving our relations with other countries.

The conduct of foreign affairs is his responsibility under our Constitution, and, realizing the gravity of the world situation today, we have, time and again, expressed our determination to support decisions made by the Chief Executive as fellow Americans—once these decisions are made.

I do want to make it clear that the Republican leadership had no part whatsoever to do with the decision to spring an invasion in Cuba. We were called in only after it was obvious that the whole operation had turned sour.

But we have supported the President on his indications of a firm stand on Berlin.

This only we ask: that our foreign policy remain firm and consistent—as it was under President Eisenhower.

We have supported requests for more defense spending but must insist that we not be led into a program of overspending in this area.

We have, in a word, put country above party in foreign affairs, even at times when some people thought perhaps we should have been a lot more critical.

And as we have met a responsibility to close ranks in the face of a common foe, Republicans in the Congress have also met a responsibility to the American people in opposing vigorously policies and programs on the domestic front which we have firmly believed not in the best interests of the country.

Mr. Kennedy gave all kinds of proposals top priority during the campaign. The people of this country were assured a lot of problems were going to be taken care of immediately.

One concerned agriculture. The Democrats were going to achieve 100 percent of parity for the farmers, cut production, bring lower prices to the consumer and save as much as $2 billion a year for the country.

That was the glowing promise.

This is the sorry record:

A loss to corn farmers because of a Department of Agriculture dumping program that has cost—and is costing—farm producers of the Middle West millions and millions of dollars.

A multimillion-dollar program to create a corn shortage which isn't going to come about.

Livestock, poultry, and dairy industries disrupted because of depressed prices.

And what's more, prospects are that the worst is yet to come in the years ahead.

I got a form letter from the Secretary of Agriculture a couple of weeks ago.

Among other things he assured me taxpayers were going to save a lot of money on reduced storage costs.

I've got news for Mr. Freeman, in case he hasn't been reading the papers. New stor-

age facilities are going up all over the place—I would assume with the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

Obviously, somebody is going to be disenchanted.

Now the experts are estimating that the Democrat-sponsored farm legislation is going to cost the country a billion dollars a year more instead of less—and create new problems for agriculture in the process.

Remember all the talk by Mr. Kennedy about giving labor a $1.25 minimum wage bill if he was elected?

You will recall that Republicans supported a $1.15 bill under President Eisenhower. It would have become law more than a year ago except that Mr. Kennedy, then a Senator, blocked it. He wanted a campaign issue.

Well, we passed a minimum wage bill this year that provided for $1.15 starting the first of September. Every worker who comes under the provisions of this act should understand that he could have had this 15-cent increase more than a year ago—as proposed by President Eisenhower and supported by Republicans generally, except for Mr. Kennedy's opposition.

Passage of the bill was hailed as a "great victory" for President Kennedy, even though the increase to $1.25 won't come about for another 2 years at the earliest.

Let's look at another firm Democrat pledge.

Last November Mr. Kennedy stated flatly:

"In 1961 a Democrat Congress, under the leadership of a Democrat President will enact a bill to raise teachers' salaries."

Also, he said, "One of the first items on the Democratic agenda in 1961 is the passage of an adequate bill for school construction."

I wonder what excuses they're going to give for failing on this one.

The Democrats can't blame anyone but themselves.

First, a Democrat-packed Rules Committee refused to report out a monstrosity that had the administration's blessing.

Then, in desperation, the Democrat leadership patched up a bill that nobody liked—not even the National Education Association. So most of the Democrats voted against their own proposal.

But I must say this: the failure of Congress to go along with the Kennedy administration on this issue was a major victory for public education in America.

The same thing may be said for the refusal of Congress to act on another major Democrat promise for the immediate enactment of a progress of medical care for the aged through social security.

This promise died in a Democrat-controlled committee, never seeing the light of day.

But there was plenty of activity in the first session of the 87th Congress which should give every citizen interested in sound government cause for deep concern.

It was the old story of "dancing backwards"—back to the spendthrift ways of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—of big spending programs on the home front that the country doesn't need and—in this day of increasingly heavy defense burdens—are downright dangerous to the well-being of our economy.

Overy strenuous Republican protests, this Democratic Congress whooped through a housing program beyond anything that could be justified.

It passed a sewer bill that goes far beyond the purpose of water pollution control—a program that is going to increase the size of Federal bureaucracy, add to the public debt and contribute to the dependence of local communities on money from Washington.

The country can thank Republicans in the Congress that the Democrats didn't go further than they did in committing your hard-earned dollars for years to come.

We held firm for safeguards in a depressed areas bill that wound up a far cry from the extreme proposals put forth by the Democrats early in the session when they would have put virtually every county in the country in the breadline category.

We stood our ground against repeated attempts by Democrats to undermine control of the purse strings in Congress by resorting to back-door spending, which simply means going directly to the U.S. Treasury for borrowed money.

This Republican insistence that the administration come to the Congress year by year for its funds can, and I predict will, save the taxpayer of this country billions of dollars in the years ahead, if we can continue to hold the line.

This points up the importance of electing more Republicans to the Congress next year.

The record we have made, in spite of our minority position, has established Republicans in the Congress as the country's first line of defense against attack on our economy and our system by the wild-eyed spenders and radicals who want to remodel America in the pattern of socialism or something worse.

Make no mistake about this: The 1st session of the Democrat 87th Congress, under the leadership of a Democratic President, has been the most spendthrift Congress in history.

Instead of an $80 billion balanced budget as presented by President Eisenhower, we have wound up with an $88 billion budget, with prospects for a $90 billion budget dead ahead.

This is the record of fiscal irresponsibility of a party whose chief spokesman, President Kennedy, said during the campaign:

"I believe the next administration should work for a balanced budget and that would be my intention."

So we wind up the first 8 months from $7 to $10 billion in the red.

How many millions of disenchanted taxpayers does that add up to?

The same candidate who insisted on unprecedented spending on aid programs told the people of this country last September:

"I see no magic to tax dollars which are sent to Washington and then returned. I abhor the waste and incompetence of large-scale Federal bureaucracies."

I wonder how many more voters are now disenchanted by the fact that some 100,000 new employees have been added to the Federal payroll since the start of the New Frontier?

It was Candidate Kennedy who said during the campaign:

"No expert in the Nation's Capital knows as much about a community's local problems and how to meet them as its local businessmen and officials. Too much government is just as much a threat to our liberites as too little government."

But it is President Kennedy who is pushing now for a new Department of Urban Development of Cabinet status that would create a vast new bureaucracy to meddle in local affairs from parenthood to parking spaces.

It was Candidate Kennedy who promised, "We Democrats do not intend to devaluate the dollar from its present rate. We will defend its value and its soundness."

It was Candidate Kennedy who assured millions of Americans in retirement that "I would protect those who are on fixed incomes. I am thinking particularly of those on social security."

Now the Democratic-managed Department of Labor has had to announce the biggest jump in the cost of living to hit the American consumer in years.

This is more dancing backward by the same Democrats who pledged to the Nation they would protect the purchasing power of your dollars.

I could go on and on documenting the disparity between the Democrat record of pledges to the American people and their failure to keep those pledges.

But someone might say—well, after all, this is politics—and shrug it off.

So let's forget particulars from here on out and look at the broad picture.

I'm glad I'm a Republican because the people of this country are now comparing the kind of leadership we enjoyed for 8 years under a Republican President—Dwight D. Eisenhower—with what we've got now.

And what they see isn't doing the Democrats a bit of good, believe me.

Any fair-minded citizen—and a vast majority of Americans are fair minded—now realizes that the Democrats inherited a country that was out in front by any valid standard you want to apply.

We had the greatest military power the world has even known.

We had the most productive economic system.

We had the broadest personal freedoms of any people on earth.

America—all up and down the line, was stronger and more promising than it was when Republicans took the helm in 1953.

Under President Eisenhower's steady hand we enjoyed 8 years of peace.

The country had confidence that we would win through in any showdown—come what may.

And let me make myself crystal clear on this point: it is my fervent hope that in the weeks and months ahead this new administration will match the Eisenhower administration for firmness of purpose.

I say this in all sincerity because if President Kennedy succeeds in achieving what is best for the country, then we all succeed.

But all of us know that the Nation today is in a serious crisis.

The overshadowing issue is our national survival as a free people.

Our goal must continue to be—as it was under a Republican President—winning the cold war and preventing the spread of militant communism over the world.

To sum up what I have been saying, let me point out that in this fight to win the peace three major factors are involved.

First is the wisdom and vigor of our leadership.

On this score the acid test is yet to come.

But history has demonstrated that a free people will rally behind a leadership that inspires confidence in its purpose—Republicans and Democrats alike.

Stephen Deactur said, "My country, may she always be right—but my country, right or wrong."

As Republicans we want our country to be right—we want our leadership to be right—and we will stand shoulder to shoulder on this.

We had an earlier crisis over Berlin—President Eisenhower stood firm and Mr. Khrushchev backed down.

We ask only that our new President show the same resolution in the days ahead.

The second factor in our survival as a free people, and our ultimate victory in any war, cold or hot, lies in the posture of our military defense.

We know now, by Democrat admission, that they were pointing a false finger of suspicion at the state of our defenses during the last campaign.

The truth is that we were strong—strong enough to deter the Russians from whatever aggressive designs they had in mind.

The truth is, that in spite of miscues on the part of the new administration since the first of the year, the greatest consolation to the American people has been the knowledge that we are not weak—thanks to the foresight of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

May I say this: even the appalling "goofs" haven't been enough to precipitate an attack against us.

This the American people are beginning to realize and that's another reason why I say the Republican record is looking better all the time.

The third, but not the least important factor in preserving our free way of life, is the maintenance of a strong, dynamic economy.

This involves establishing a healthy climate for free enterprise—giving the individual American a chance to make the most of the opportunities that have always been the real incentive for progress under our system. And it also involves protecting the value of our money.

It was General Eisenhower who once said, "The military is but the cutting edge of the great productive economic machine that is America."

This we must never forget because it is the wonderful, free way of life we are seeking to preserve.

In 8 years of Republican leadership we did establish a better climate for free, private enterprise. We did go forward to create new opportunities for individuals.

We did encourage initiative and self-reliance among our people as against the strength-sapping policies of paternalism we had labored under for so many years of the New and Fair Deals.

And we did protect the value of savings accounts, annuities, and wages by holding down the cost of living for every citizen.

But what are the Democrats doing to keep our economy sound?

They are claiming that the Democrat Congress enacted 75 percent of the administration's program. That happens to be baloney.

But I will say one thing:

This has been the most spendthrift Government in history.

They are spending you silly.

The only checkrein has been the hardy Republican minority—outnumbered as we are—who fought with more success than we could hope for, to stem the spending tide.

The people of America can thank their lucky stars—and Republicans—that the Democrats weren't able to get away with a lot of their extravagant schemes.

But don't think they won't be back trying next year.

They never give up.

And in that fact lies the Republican challenge.

We must fight harder than ever before to expand the beachhead of sanity in Government we are now holding in the Congress. We need a Republican majority.

To do this we must keep our eyes on 1962—emphasizing first things first.

By winning through in 1962 we will set the stage for Republican victories all up and down the line in 1964.

With the kind of loyal, dedicated folks I see here tonight we will get the job done.

You know, I keep thinking of the threat from Khrushchev that our grandchildren will be living under socialism.

Let us give him the lie with a resounding Republican victory.

Let us get into this fight with a renewed determination that in years to come all people who choose to stand with us shall live in freedom.

Tourism Now, Not Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, Senators have heard me speak before of the vigorous and enterprising manner with which the city of Trinidad is meeting its economic difficulties.

This town, in south central Colorado, has a long and a colorful history. The Spanish Conquistadors passed through this region. The old Santa Fe Trail ran down the main street of Trinidad. Kit Carson stole a horse here and Bat Masterson was once town marshal.

For many years Trinidad was a prosperous city dependent upon coal mining for its livelihood. Since World War II it has suffered a severe economic reversal.

With the decline of the coal industry only one mine remains open. Trinidad must look to other fields for its livelihood.

The city has been active and forward-looking in its attack on its economic problems. Its citizens have joined together in efforts to bring new life and new industry to the city.

Any listing of these men by me would be incomplete, for almost every citizen has contributed his support to these efforts. Among the leaders are State senator from Trinidad, Dr. James Donnelly, State representative Phillip Massari, Mayor James E. Griffin, City Manager Ben Veltri, and Jim Couey, chairman of the Trinidad Planning Commission and executive director of the area redevelopment committee.

I have worked closely with these men in my efforts to insure that Trinidad would qualify for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act.

In late July, I was pleased to be able to inform the citizens of Trinidad that their town and county would be eligible to receive the technical assistance and funds that are available under this program.

I have now been informed that the area's overall economic development plan has been approved by the area redevelopment administration.

It is a sign of vigor and determination of Trinidad that her plan is among the very first over the whole Nation to receive approval. This action means that the county, local governments, development groups, and individual enterprises within the county, are now eligible to submit specific applications for loans and grants under the distressed areas program.

Under the provisions of this program the community plans to retrain 600 unemployed men; to continue planning in detail for industrial development; and to develop new tourist facilities in the areas near Fisher's Peak and the still-incomplete Purgatoire River Dam.

Officials of the area redevelopment administration have assured me that steps will very soon be taken to launch this retraining program.

Trinidad is fortunate in having a historic past and a perfect climate, together with exceptional scenery. These serve to give the town an unusual tourist and recreational potential.

There is a growing movement among Trinidad citizens to seek national recognition for its nearby historic and scenic Fisher's Peak. It has been suggested that a national park or monument be established to commemorate those pioneers who crossed the foothills of this beautiful peak, as they trod the old Santa Fe Trail.

I have written to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall urging him to give this proposal the consideration it so obviously deserves.

Mr. President, one of the last bills to receive congressional approval this session, the Public Works Appropriations Act, contains an item of considerable interest to south central Colorado and to the city of Trinidad.

Construction of the Trinidad Dam and Reservoir on the Purgatoire River was authorized in Public Law 500 of the 85th Congress, passed in 1958. I was, at that time, a member of the Senate Public Works Committee which originated this measure.

I am pleased that this year we were able to obtain $205,200 for survey and construction planning on the Trinidad Dam by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Since I have been in the Congress, I have worked for the construction of this project. This year's action brings us closer to our goal.

An obstacle in the path of the construction of this $20 million project has been the need for water users and members of the local conservancy district to perfect their repayment commitments toward the project.

I am told that encouraging progress is being made toward accomplishing the repayment agreements.

The $205,200 we have appropriated here today will bring us close to completing the necessary surveys, planning, and design. I am hopeful that next year the Congress will be considering construction money for this project.

The Trinidad Dam is a worthy project which will give vital flood protection, supplemental irrigation water, and recreation facilities to an economically depressed community.

Mr. President, an excellent survey of of the Trinidad story was recently published in the Denver Post. Trinidad is gathering momentum and is moving ahead. The vigor of this movement has been well recorded by Mr. Bert Hanna and I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOURISM NOW, NOT COAL—TRINIDAD PULLING SELF UP LOOKING TO NEW DAYS

(By Bert Hanna)

TRINIDAD, COLO.—Here near the New Mexico border where flows the romantic "El Rio de Las Animas Perdidas en Purgatorio" an economically distressed community is making a brave and gallant effort to pull itself up by its own bootstraps.

An energetic, ambitious group of young civic leaders is pushing to fruition several projects for better utilization of resources and for transition to a new type of economy that may recapture the days of prosperity.

There are big new water development programs in the making.

There is a new area redevelopment program in the master planning stage.

There are soil conservation and flood control measures planned or in progress.

There is confident talk of a future golden harvest of tourist dollars from development of a vast, exciting and unexploited recrea-

tional area sweeping from the lofty Sangre de Cristo and Spanish Peaks area and picturesque foothills into the Fisher's Peak country and the route of the Old Sante Fe Trail.

There are dreams of the possible establishment of a new national park, of acquisition of lands for park purposes, of a new road across Whisky Creek Pass to connect this area with the San Luis Valley, of improved municipal facilities to attract new residents, industry, and tourists.

All these things are designed to replace an economy long based on coal production in what once was one of the richest coal mining regions in the United States.

The coal is still here in immense quantities, but the industry is as dead as last year's autumn leaves. Great numbers of miners on diminishing unemployment compensation steadily depart from a community that can no longer support them.

And everyone now admits that coal cannot be revived in the foreseeable future or produce any appreciable reemployment. There is only one coal mine now in production in the Trinidad region—the Allen Mine of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. employing around 600 men—contrasting to a day in the past when as many as 8,000 to 10,000 workers were employed in scores of coal operations.

Moreover, new automation techniques have reduced the necessity for much manpower, even assuming that new uses may be found for coal.

The new goal of Trinidad and Las Animas County—fourth largest county in area in the United States—is to forget about coal and the old abandoned mine shafts in communities that are largely ghost towns, and find a new horizon.

And Trinidad has plenty to sell in its program of attracting new residents and tourism.

As pointed out by the hard-driving city manager, Ben Veltri, Mayor James E. Griffin, and a corps of zealous coworkers on the city council and in business, there is no place in Colorado or in the West with a more colorful history or a greater recreational potential, a finer climate.

The new hopes and ambitions of community leaders and never-say-die spirit evident in the clean appearance of the city and newly painted homes cannot obscure the fact that Trinidad is sick. As a designated distressed area eligible for assistance under the urban redevelopment program, it certainly needs a shot in the arm.

Some of the current programs and goals:

1. Construction of the long-sought and congressionally authorized flood control and irrigation regulation dam across the Purgatoire River above Trinidad, a stream once named by the Spaniards "the River of the Lost Souls in Purgatory."

2. Increase of municipal water storage in North and Monument Lakes some 36 miles west of Trinidad from streams flowing off Trinchera Peak in the scenic Culebra Range of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. This, in turn, would benefit the promotion of a new recreational area for fishing and boating.

The North Lake project is slated to start next spring, helped by a State appropriation of $87,000 which Governor McNichols obtained. The plan would enlarge the lake capacity from 1,090 acre-feet to 4,200 acre-feet.

Ultimately, the plan calls for increasing the combined storage of North and Monument Lakes from about 3,000 to 10,000 acre-feet.

3. Completion of authorized flood-control projects of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service involving the control of floods in two arroyos running into Trinidad, one the Fisher's Peak Arroyo and the other Carbon Arroyo.

Often, torrents from these draws, have undermined or wrecked buildings in the heart of the city through inadequate outlet facilities. This project involves two small dams.

4. An all-out campaign for designation of the Fisher's Peak country immediately to the south of Trinidad as a new national park—or at least a national monument to those intrepid pioneers and explorers who trekked across the old Santa Fe Trail.

The dominant feature in this landscape, Fisher's Peak, is a wilderness area abounding in mesas, canyons and streams to form an extraordinary scenic wonderland, extending into the Raton country on the New Mexico side.

TOURED AREA

The Trinidad city manager took a Denver Post reporter-photographer team on an exhausting jeep tour of this area, as he did on a trip to the top of Trinchera Peak the next day.

Deer jumped across the jeep trails ahead of the vehicle. We ran into a flock of hundreds of wild turkey. There are bear in the canyon escarpments and even antelope, sage hens and some grouse, along with excellent fishing on the western side.

The peak, named after Capt. Waldemar Fisher, an officer of General Kearney's Army of the West, now is largely owned by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. and other private interests which might be prevailed on to contribute land for a new national park, in Veltri's opinion.

Across the foothills of this great mountain there meandered the oxen-drawn covered wagons of the 1850's, the frontiersmen of the old West, who followed the paths of Spanish conquistadors seeking the Seven Cities of Cibola, and paid toll to Uncle Dick Wooten, trapper and scout.

Here was the locale of such as Kit Carson, once caught stealing a horse in Las Animas County; Bat Masterson, one-time marshal of Trinidad and many other legendary western figures.

Trinidad as a frontier outpost can be said to be more than 100 years old, although it was not established as a townsite until 1876.

The Santa Fe Trail ran right down the main street of the present town. What other city or town in Colorado can boast of such history?

Indeed, says a study of the Trinidad master plan of the future prepared by Sam Huddleston,. a Denver planning consultant, "Trinidad's history, particularly as it pertains to the Santa Fe Trail, is a resource of great value.

"In combination with its location in an area of great scenic and recreational attraction and on main transportation lines, the history itself is a prime economic asset."

DAM SOUGHT

All students of Trinidad's problems are agreed that the main thing that would really prime the economic pump would be the construction of the $27 million Purgatoire Dam. Besides controlling disastrous floods that often have created chaos in Trinidad as late as 1955, it would buttress the agricultural economy of Las Animas County.

It would also provide much needed employment in the area.

Direct benefits of the Purgatoire project would be reduction of flood damage on existing property estimated at $275,000 annually and an increase of a half-million dollars in land values by removing the threat of inundation, the Huddleston study shows.

At the moment, the project is involved in some difficulties over water rights, including early rights to ditches such as the Model Dam and Reservoir and ditches further downstream where the Purgatoire joins the Arkansas River.

The dam wouldn't create much new water for agriculture, but it would enable better utilization of that water over a season besides creating a flood control impoundment.

The reclamation features of the project are in the hands of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and flood control under the Army Corps of Engineers.

There are other plans and projects in the works, sparked by the enthusiastic leaders who refuse to see such a great community drift into Limbo. The plans include an improved water distribution system and a new sewage system to complement the municipal gas and light system.

Such leaders are Veltri; Mayor Griffin; councilmen, Orlando Salas, John Cha, Ruben Tapal; Rotary Club president, Don Frush; Jim Couey, chairman of the Trinidad Planning Commission and executive director of the area redevelopment committee; State Representative Philip Massari and State Senator James Donnelly.

Trinidad is not dying, they insist. It is just being reborn.

You ought to go there some day. Not just out of curiosity for an old and tired mining camp. But to explore the scenery and take a long look at the history, romantic background, and the beautiful twin Spanish Peaks, named by the Indians—"Huajatolla"—or "Breasts of Mother Earth."

Final Report of the 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, after 9 months of work, the 87th Congress finally hung up its "adjournment" sign on the 1st session. Not since 1951, during the height of the Korean war, has Congress met at such length. It was a record-breaking session, too, for number of bills enacted. Some 360 new public laws were added to the statute books, nearly 4 times the number passed by the Founding Fathers during the entire First Congress, 1789–91. Whether this Congress 173 years later has substituted quantity for quality is up to history—and the taxpayers—to decide. With all this lawmaking activity, the 87th Congress finds itself with a heavy carryover of legislation to come up for final decisions in the 1962 session: medical care for the aged, the Du Pont stock divestiture bill, postal rate increases, compensation for service-connected disabilities. But it is difficult to imagine another session matching the 1961 windfall of major laws.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Defense budget request of $42.9 billion was boosted by $3.7 billion for a peacetime high of $46.6 billion. On top of this, Congress responded to the President's plea for additional funds by giving the military another $13 billion for aircraft, ships, and missiles.

Military construction of nearly $900 million was approved for construction and improvement of military projects at home and overseas, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases.

Moon-orbiting funds were boosted in the $1.7 billion authorization for the National Astronautics and Space Administration's 1962 program. Research on solid and nuclear propellants also were included.

Civil and Defense Mobilization became the Office of Emergency Planning, by congressional action, following the President's transferral, under existing law, of civil defense operations to the Department of Defense.

Atomic Energy Commission funds of $270 million were authorized for construction projects.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Foreign-aid funds of $4.2 billion were voted after spirited battles in both Houses of the Congress. After lengthy debate, the Congress agreed to retain control of the foreign aid pursestrings through annual review and appropriation methods, but granted the administration power to program development loans on a 5-year basis, plus a generous contingency fund for use at the President's discretion. In separate action earlier in the year, $500 million was appropriated for Latin American aid, as well as $100 million for Chilean disaster relief.

The Peace Corps was established as an independent agency subject to policy guidance by the Department of State, with an initial authorization of $40 million.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created to operate under the President and the Secretary of State to search for workable, bilateral means of ending the arms race.

Admission of Red China to the United Nations was unanimously opposed in resolutions adopted by both the House and Senate.

Immigration of alien orphans to the United States for purposes of adoption was granted permanent status.

Duty-free goods returning Americans may bring back from abroad were reduced from $500 to $100 in value in an attempt to stem the flight of gold.

Tourist travel in the United States hopefully will be encouraged by creation of a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Interstate and defense highway completion as scheduled by 1972 seems assured with authorization of $11.5 billion. The Federal apportionments for primary, secondary, and urban programs was upped to $1 billion annually. Federal gas and diesel tax rates were set at 4 cents per gallon, and levies were raised on tires, tubes, retread rubber, and on heavy trucks and buses.

Minimum wage stepups over the next 5 years to $1.25 per hour were granted to workers already covered by Federal law and to an additional 3.5 million employed people.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was created in the Department of Commerce to make loans and grants for industrial plans and public facilities in economically distressed area.

Hijacking and other crimes committed on airplanes involved in interstate or foreign commerce were made Federal offenses.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was directed to investigate adequacy of rules and regulations of stock markets.

Small Business Administration borrowing authority was raised to $1.1 billion, including $725 million for regular business loans.

Social security benefits were expanded; minimum monthly old-age payments were raised; widows' benefits increased; disability provision liberalized, and provision made for male workers to draw reduced benefits if they choose to retire at age 62. At the same time, the tax on workers and employers was raised by one-eighth of 1 percent on each.

Aid to federally impacted school areas was extended for another 2 years, through June 1963, and the National Defense Education Act was continued for another year.

Vastly expanded housing was approved, authorizing liberalized term for low- and moderate-income family dwellings; urban renewal; open-spaces development in cities; college dormitory construction loans; 100,000 new units of public housing; community facilities.

Juvenile delinquency came on the Federal horizon with an authorization of Federal grants of $10 million a year for 3 years to help communities and nonprofit agencies finance projects to combat the problem.

The Civil Rights Commission was extended for another 2 years to September 30, 1963.

Veterans' home loans were extended to World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975. An additional $1.2 billion was authorized for the direct loan program through 1967.

Water pollution control was increased by $52 million for construction and operation grants to State and interstate agencies each year, and a sliding-scale formula lifting the 30-day limitation on Federal grants was adopted.

Saline water conversion projects were given a 6-year lease on life under the Department of the Interior with a $75-million authorization for that period.

A supplemental appropriation bill carrying a whacking $1.13 billion was added to the regular 1962 appropriation for the operation of the agencies and departments of the Government. This was the expensive swansong of Congress before adjournment.

If I have failed to touch on any particular legislation which interests you—or if you wish further information on the laws I have summarized, please do not hesitate to let me know.

American Samoa Happy and Prosperous Under U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "American Samoa Happy and Prosperous Under U. S. Government."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SAMOA HAPPY AND PROSPEROUS UNDER U.S. GOVERNMENT

(By Napoleon A. Tuiteleleapaga)

Recent articles about American Samoa, "Forgotten Colony," April 9, Washington Post, and "Samoa, America's Shame in the South Seas," July's Reader's Digest, not only placed the Samoan people in the category of the ingrates and expose them to the ridicule of their fellow men in Western Samoa under New Zealand, as well as other neighboring countries, but also caused undue criticism of the U.S. Government and throw mud on the faces of its officials concerned.

Now and then a frustrated American, unable to cope with the conditions in his city or State, or because he has been disappointed by his own failures, decides to travel to the South Sea Islands, to cool off and to find comfort among the islanders. There, in order to find friends on his side, to make the people like him, with an eye to free meals and entertainment and a treasure of native curios, starts on a campaign of lecturing on the principles of modern government, what aids they should get, and as to what they should do to acquire these aids and privileges. Then, depending on the swing of the pendulum, he would climax his indoctrination with a promise to go to Washington and see that the people get what they needed. But, unfortunately, instead of going to Washington, or writing to the authorities concerned, he writes about conditions he thinks actually existed, or about what was told him by people who either did not fully understand the situation, or had words put in their mouths, thus giving the world a false impression and distorted conception of the island affairs. Consequently, instead of helping the people, as promised, he depicts them as still in their primitive stages in health and education, blames the chiefs for not being wise to what is going on, and also blames the local authorities and criticize the high command, its departments, and officials, for neglect of their obligations and responsibilities.

To correct such false and misleading information, as well as to give a true picture, the writer, a full-blooded Samoan, born and raised in the islands, and worked for the government under both administrations (Navy and Interior), submits the following facts to refute the assertions contained in the aforementioned articles, and to prove that the United States of America and its departments concerned have never failed in the performance of their duties in connection with their relationship with the government and people of American Samoa.

PLEDGE KEPT

The United States, since 1900, when the American flag was raised over the islands, has kept its pledge to see that people maintain their customs and culture and to secure their lands. Both the Navy and the Interior Departments have tenaciously adhered to the laws and policies concerning this pledge, despite the efforts by the people themselves to sell their lands. For this the Samoan people and outsiders who are interested in them are grateful to the United States for, if that sacred pledge had not been kept, the people would, like the Guamanians, the Hawaiians, and other places in the South Seas, be paying rent on their own lands. It is because of this sacred pledge that the United States, though fully aware of the difficulty in the operation of the government in its many phases due to conflict between the Matai system and the Constitution, has not enacted any laws or set any policies that might weaken that system.

During the administration of the Navy, for 51 years, the naval officers and enlisted men, despite the vast difference in customs and usages, had to overlook and undergo the many inconveniences to conform with the customs and culture. When the Interior took over, 10 years now, the officials and employees thereof carried on the example set by their predecessors.

HEALTH AND SANITATION

The author of "Samoa, Shame of America in the South Seas," referred to rutty and teeth-jarring over-water outhouses as marring and befouling beautiful Pago Pago Bay. I wonder why he failed to make a mention of the well-kept sanitary latrines built and maintained under the supervision of both the Public Works and Public Health Departments. He did not even make a mention of the modern toilet facilities in private homes. There are even septic tanks. Besides, practically every family has its own outhouse, which are kept always clean and sanitary, not only because of public health regulations, but also because of family rivalry and competition. In Samoa no chief, or family, wants to be excelled.

Neither the United States nor the Interior Department is to be blamed for the condition of over-water outhouses, inasmuch as it is the responsibility of the respective districts, counties, villages, and families. The U.S. Government does not pay for sanitation projects of the individual States, and neither does a State pay for such projects for its counties and cities. What would happen if the Federal Government starts financing all the inherent projects of every State and each county, city, and village?

The people of American Samoa have been most happy and prosperous under the American flag. In 1900 the population was only 5,769; in the last census taken in 1960 the figures zoomed to more than 20,000. This indicates a high birth rate.

When the Navy took over in 1900, the doctors and the whole naval population shuddered at the sight of children and some adults in every village covered cap-a-pie with tona, or yaws, a tropical disease known to some medical authorities as syphilis. Equally hideous was the sight of hundreds of men and women with large (enlarged) arms and legs, victims of the dreadful mumu, or elephantiasis. The malady also affected the male scrotum and the female breasts. Acute conjunctivitis, trachoma, partial or total blindness, were in galore. At present, a most scrutinizing examination would fail to discover a single child with yaws; and very few adults have the mumu or total blindness, except in those cases where the person afflicted has failed to report to the hospital or dispensaries, or refused to accept medical treatment.

The doctors are able and efficient, some of them are specialists. Assisted by well-trained and experienced Samoan medical practitioners and a staff of highly trained nurses, American Samoa has every right to be proud of its medical services. Many doctors in the United States who have been in Samoa, or who have had the opportunity of working or employing Samoan graduate nurses here in America, would not hesitate to commend on their versatile ability and dependability, though more on the practical than theoretical—the reason is plain.

I doubt that the small staff of doctors and technicians is to be blamed entirely on the Interior Department or the local authorities. The Government pays the doctors higher salaries than in some of the communities in the United States, Canada, and New Zealand. Besides, the local medical jobs are steady; and the pay does not depend on the number of patients admitted or cases treated. In addition, the doctors receive additional compensation from the incentive pay plan. Therefore, if a doctor declined to accept a job in Samoa, it would not be the pay, but for personal reasons, political or professional.

ROADS AND GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Both the Navy and the Interior have seen to it that the roads are kept in the best of condition. However, heavy seasonal rains, the daily dashing of the waves against the foundation of the roads, other climatic circumstances, and limited funds, make it impossible to maintain the condition desired. Compared to the roads in Fiji, some parts of New Zealand and western Samoa, and some country roads in the United States, the roads in American Samoa stand high.

As compared to the government buildings in Western Samoa, Fiji, and some in the United States, that are either dilapidated or needed painting, the buildings of the Government of American Samoa are very neat, strong, durable, and attractive: Take the Fita Fita Barracks now occupied by the police department, the enlisted men's barracks occupied by the legislature and the finance department, the post office, the supply department, and the customhouse. All of these are concrete buildings, devised and constructed to cope with the weather and climatic conditions. In its money-saving policies, the government does not deem it necessary to give these buildings a coating of paint every year. Besides, experts and economists do not judge exteriorly but interiorly. In regards to the hospital, American Samoa, according to several medical officers, American and European, who have been to American Samoa, has the best hospital in the South Pacific. The beds are always sufficient to accommodate the population—some of the outlying dispensaries, five in number, have beds. However, like anywhere else, more beds are needed in case of an epidemic.

AGRICULTURE

Nowhere in the world do the largest, sweetest, and most delicious bananas grow but in Samoa. Without scientific knowledge the people plant and nurse their crops: Banana, taro, breadfruit, yam, and coconut, with amazing success. Besides the marvelous work of nature, both the Navy and the Interior, in their desire to see the people have ample food, made rules and regulations concerning the planting and cleaning of plantations. The Agriculture Department, headed by a Samoan chief with a large experience in the field of agriculture and who also acquired his general education in the United States, not only give oral and written lessons in the modern ways of planting, but also make weekly inspections of the plantations. In addition, the district governors, county chiefs, pulenuus (mayors), and village councils, make their own laws enforcing planting and cleaning.

In regard to plant diseases and insects, the combined efforts of the Interior and the local government have seen to it that appropriate chemical and natural cures are procured to remedy the situation. However, even in the United States, the land of scientists and experts in agriculture and agronomy, problems dealing with insects and plant diseases still exist, and worse than American Samoa.

As to the decline of the coconut tree, neither Washington nor the local authorities should be blamed. Natural chemical activities and biological changes in the soil, enhanced by damage done by the coconut beetle, are the cause of this condition. Ever since the advent of the coconut beetle the authorities and chiefs have closely cooperated in their efforts to exterminate this pest. Laws were enacted and enforced; contrivances and traps made and used, but to no avail. Unfortunately, no chemical or scientific device could be found to rid this nuisance. The Samoan people are still doing their best to save their pride and mainstay, but what could they do if the natural obstacles enhanced by modern forces of evil—laziness, dependence on the market, pursuit of white-collar jobs, and constant visits to John Barleycorn—intervened and keep them from searching for the beetle as required by law? How could Congress and the Interior be blamed for the fault and failure of the individual planter?

EDUCATION

It is most unfortunate that the author of "Samoa, America's Shame in the South Seas," has picked Tafuna School as an example, for the schools in American Samoa. Tafuna is a village with only one original family, and though recently inhabited by several families from various parts of both Samoas, it still has a population of not more than 60. This type of negative exaggeration and false representation, as the author did, is not only a blow to the Department of Education and source of shame for the chiefs and people of American Samoa, but also exposes Washington to undue criticism.

Based on population and teaching facilities, American Samoa has a higher percentage of literacy as compared to some of the localities in the United States, to say nothing of other countries.

All along the bay area and throughout the villages there are American-type school buildings, built with concrete or timber and roofed with galvanized iron; the plans and construction are drawn and supervised by the public works department, subject to the approval of the director of education and sanction of the governor. All these schools have benches and desks; Poyer School and the high school have stateside desks. All public and private schools have all the equipment and paraphernalia the schools in the United States have, though they may not be as up to date and adequate.

Throughout American Samoa several villages adjoining each other have one school. They make plans, raise funds, and work together in all matters concerning the maintenance of their school and welfare of the children. Tafuna, because of its isolated location and small population—only 21 schoolchildren—is an exception. However, the conditions in Tafuna School are far from what the author had described. This particular school has blackboards. The children have desks made by themselves or by their parents.

Yes, the floor is covered with white pebbles and shells from the beach, but the children do not sit on them. They sit on strong mats woven from the leaves of the pandanus. Twenty-one primary pupils under 1 teacher is nothing compared to some schools in Europe and America, where up to 30 or more upper-grade students are under 1 teacher. About lunch, each child brings his own to school. Never in the history of the schools of American Samoa was lunch cooked and eaten together. Ninety percent of the children go home to eat lunch, inasmuch as their homes are within the radius of 10 to 20 yards from the school.

No local person can teach in the public schools without a teacher's certificate, signed by the principal of the Teachers' Training School, countersigned by the director of education and approved by the Governor. A large number of the teachers are graduates of the high school, where 85 percent of teachers are Americans with teacher's certificates from their respective State school boards. True, the pay of the Samoan teachers is small; however, based on logical grounds, the pay is tantamount to the individual's work. Several local boys and girls who have graduated from various colleges in the United States teach in the high school.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT'S OBJECTIVES

The author further states that "the Interior Department, while promising 'progressive development toward self-government,' and the attaining of 'maximum possible self-

support,' it pledges continuance of the archaic and now fading Matai system—one aim obviously nullifies the other."

The Interior Department is fully aware of the fact that the matai system is a hindrance to the progress of the government in connection with lawmaking and administration of justice, as well as policies and plans leading to self-government, and would like to do away with it. However, doing so would not only violate the sacred pledge to preserve the customs and culture, but would also displease the chiefs who, through the legislature on their own accord, continuously petition both Congress and the Interior to honor and perpetuate the system. Repealing the matai system at this time would be just like dehorning a bull at his prime.

However, the Interior has failed entirely to carry out two main objectives, which failure has caused the chiefs and the people, as well as outsiders who are interested, to doubt the sincerity of the Department and its officials. Whether this failure is the fault of the authorities in Washington or the local officials, is a matter of conjecture.

One of these is the obvious reluctance of the authorities concerned to employ local men for jobs they are able to manage. Instead they either hire people from outside of American Samoa or continue to renew the contracts of non-Samoans, despite individual protests, and resolutions passed by the legislature. This act on the part of the Governor, who has the prerogative to hire, renew, or terminate, invites suspicion and disgust; and the only reason for this act, as rationalized by the suspicious and wondering people, is friendship, favoritism, and nepotism, or a desire of Washington to spend their taxpayers' money on their own kin. This situation is beyond reason, inasmuch as it has been proven on several occasions that locals, who had been trained by Navy experts and C.B. technicians and specialists (during World War II) are able to manage the jobs concerned—and maybe better. As an excuse, the Governor and/or the authorities concerned hide behind a utopian technicality: no background; no college degree. But do all the non-Samoans who are holding jobs that local Samoans can very well do have college degrees? Thus, if the Interior Department officials in Washington or Samoa want to wait until the Samoans have earned college degrees, it would mean that the people would have to wait until the reincarnation of Abraham Lincoln before they are able to operate their own government and manage their own affairs. Another excuse is, the Samoans are not honest and trustworthy and do not have the integrity. True, a few employees have been dishonest and indiscreet, but why take them as a criterion? Since immunity is developed by taming the virus, so is honesty and faithfulness by giving the individual responsibility. The mistakes and shortcomings of the former will be the beacon light for the latter (employees). Therefore, this policy of not using the local men who are able to manage the jobs concerned, not only denies to the people the right to operate their own government and develop responsibility and reliability, but also is a violation of the promise made by the Interior.

The other failure is discrimination in pay. "* * * shall maintain a wage structure and conditions of employment which are consonant with the advancing social and economic conditions of the territory," is the last paragraph of the heading, "Economic Advancement" (objectives and policies).

The average Samoan is conscious of the fact that his brother American may have the education or qualification that he lacks, though he may have more practical experience, speaking of local jobs. He is equally cognizant—and is always reminded—of the maxim, "Give a man the worth of his work." In this connection the people often wondered why the pay of the Samoan employees are much lesser than that of the Americans, inasmuch as local employees who do professional or quasi-professional work, such as medical, dental, supervisory, and accounting, or clerical, perform practically 75 to 90 percent of such work; and their cost of living is much higher, according to local conditions. This is so disappointing and disgusting that a large number of our medical and dental practitioners, graduate nurses, schoolteachers and bookkeepers, and heavy machine operators, have reluctantly left their jobs and homes to find solace and equal treatment in Honolulu or the United States. In this respect the Interior is directly responsible for the loss of trained employees, as well as for the gradual though steady decrease in population due to the weekly departure of American Samoans, as above mentioned.

In fixing the pay status for the Virgin Islands the Interior considers items of food and clothing, and the difference in purchasing habits of the workers with urban wage earners. On what conditions is consideration based in fixing the pay status for American Samoa?

All government employees, because of the nature of their respective jobs, and the obligatory chores required of them by their denominations, societies, families, and villages, do not have the spare time to plant any of the native crops; thus have to buy all their native food from the market. All other items of food, such as canned meat and fish, salt beef, rice, bread, sugar, etc., are purchased at the local stores at a very high price. Their work (not including the engineers, plumbers, mechanics, and laborers) requires them to wear good and clean clothing. Their political and social status among their villages and communities require them to have everything for the care and support of their matais (head of families), relatives, missionaries, the entertainment of transient chiefs and their retinues, as well as malagas or large visiting parties, who usually stay for weeks. To meet this demand, they have to get refrigerators, stoves, radios, and whatnots. Also, under Samoan consuetudes, these employees, upon the failure of individual concerned, are required to pay for the taxes and fines of their brothers, sisters, cousins, and in-laws. They stand by for the family church contributions, pay for the hospital bills upon failure of relatives concerned, and to help a widow and (her) children of a brother or an in-law. Last, but not the least, these wage earners have very large immediate families themselves, ranging from 7 to 14. Worse still, 90 percent of the men employees are matais, either chief or talking chief, which aggrandizes their responsibilities. Let the reader figure out for himself this amazing high cost of living as compared with the very low salaries with an average of $50 for 2 weeks. Compare this to the conditions in the Virgin Islands.

If the Federal Government, under the Organic Act of June 22, 1936, contributed $9,711,424 for a period of only 3 years, and authorized appropriations not to exceed $11 million, for the development of economy and insuring the welfare of the people of the Virgin Islands; and the Interior Department in 1956, under the Revised Act of 1954, made the development and promotion of tourists the main activity (of the Virgin Islands), Congress can surely authorize appropriations, even one-quarter of the contributions to the Virgin Islands, for the development of the economy and welfare of the government and people of American Samoa.

Apropos of the whole situation, the assertions herein made concerning the failure or errors on the part of the authorities concerned are not to be construed as those of the present administration, but of the past; and the Samoan people look upon the present administration with hope and confidence, not only for the fulfillment of the Interior's objectives and policies, a better understanding and harmonious cooperation, but also for congressional Democratic help to aid us "do-it-yourself," and to prove to the world that our forefathers did not misplace their trust, or acted under any duress or misrepresentation, when they ceded the islands of Tutuila and Manu'a to the U.S. Government.

NOT A FORGOTTEN COLONY

The author of "Samoa, a Forgotten Colony," not only made an entirely wrong and misleading statement, but his article is a misnomer. In the first place, American Samoa is not a "colony." It is a U.S. possession, or protectorate, and it has never been forgotten, not even once.

Scarcely a year passes by without a visit to American Samoa by Members of Congress, or officials from either the Army, Navy, State, or Interior Departments. And neither has American Samoa been forgotten or left out intentionally in the outright grants and Federal aids.

The Federal Government supports the office of the Governor and a central government staff, the legislature and all its employees, as well as the judicial department. Congress appropriated $10,000 for the relief of the Manu'a people (easterly islands of American Samoa) after the hurricane in January 1915 had entirely demolished their houses and plantations. Congress again appropriated $11,000 for repairs to and reconstruction of island government buildings, roads, and schools, after the hurricane of January 1926. During and after the hurricanes, famines, and epidemics, which ravaged and spread during the following years, Congress and the people of the United States sent financial, provisional, and medical aid for the Samoan people.

Comparing the United States with New Zealand the author of "Samoa, a Forgotten Colony" said, "And, while the United States was dozing New Zealand went ahead with plans to grant self-government this October to western Samoa. * * *" The editorialist obviously admires New Zealand administration, but seems to forget that New Zealand's administration of western Samoa all has not been always well and quiet during the 40 years since New Zealand took over the islands from Germany. The chiefs and their people were so discontended that political turmoil and misunderstanding between them and the New Zealand Government and among the chiefs themselves prevailed over western Samoa for quite some time, and which led to quarrel and fighting and even bloodshed. Then, in 1918–19, the bells tolled for nearly 8,000 deaths, resulting from an epidemic of influenza spread throughout all the islands and villages of western Samoa. All this happened while the people of American Samoa were happily basking under the shadows of Old Glory waving high over their evergreen mountains and golden beaches. Furthermore, on several occasions, New Zealand had failed to supply the people with adequate medical care. As a result, western Samoans sought advice and treatment in American Samoa; our hospital and dispensaries were open to them. Whether it be a major or minor operation, a maternity or psychoneurotic case, the cost is always 25 cents a day. Does it then sound or look like a "forgotten possession"?

However, to be honest and fair to New Zealand and to our fellow brothers in western Samoa, American Samoa has not been without a period of political disturbance, but, fortunately, however, this period of unrest was the work of a frustrated American who, for selfish and exploitative reasons, disguised under "a traitorous" wish to help the people. Nevertheless, this was soon straightened up by the able management of the Navy. Things went back to normal; the frustrated and traitorous American departed. This, the only bad egg in the political refrig-

erator of the Government of American Samoa, was called the "Mau," did not last long. It hatched in April 1920, and died in July of 1921.

CHIEFS AND PEOPLE GRATEFUL—WISH TO RECIPROCATE

The chiefs and people have been always grateful and loyal to the United States. Their gratefulness is indicated by their willing cooperation and in their speeches on official occasions and in the manner of receiving and entertaining official visitors from Washington.

During World War II, knowing this to be the best opportunity to offer further evidence of their gratitude, as well as to prove their sincere desire to reciprocate, the chiefs met and discussed the matter of sending local help. As a result over 500 young men volunteered and signed a petition to Congress, via local authorities, to let them come to the United States to join the Armed Forces. For congressional reasons the petition was not accepted. Consequently, however, because of the urge by the chiefs and the desire of the young men themselves, means of transportation were sought. Some paid their ways with contributions by their families and relatives, some found transportation via Navy or Army planes or ships, and some had to risk punishment by stowing away. Soon—at the heat of the war—hundreds and hundreds of our young men were sworn in as fighting men of the United States and served in the various branches of the Armed Forces.

Side by side they fought with their American brothers; and though the war had ended nearly two decades ago, their footprints are imprinted in the shores of Guadalcanal and on the rugged hills of Iwo Jima; their blood besprinkled on and absorbed in the icy battlefields of Europe and Korea. Many of them received medals and were cited for bravery and heroism. Some of them are still in the United States for treatment, and those who have returned to their beloved Samoa carry with them the vestiges of battle—bullet and bayonet wounds, living proof of American Samoa's gratefulness, love, and loyalty, for and to the United States.

A PRAYER TO CONGRESS

To you, gentlemen, the people of the United States and inhabitants of its territories and possessions, look up for their happiness, security and liberty. To you the yet undeveloped or oppressed countries look up for support and survival. To you the whole world looks up for peace and freedom. To each and all of you, American Samoa and its 20,000 people, unrepresented in Congress and without a voice in Washington, look up for representation and sponsorship. To you our forefathers, who ceded our islands to the United States with a hopeful view for the happiness and prosperity of their progeny, looked and are still looking up from their graves for the fulfillment of their wish. To you we pray not to let the seed sown by our forefathers and your predecessors grow on barren soil or die for need of nourishment, and not to let the world say that our young men had fought and bled, or died, in vain.

You have spent billions of dollars on countries and peoples, who are neither your proteges, nor have pledged allegiance to the American flag, or rendered services to the United States. You have contributed millions of dollars to other U.S. possessions and territories, for the development of their economy, and to help them stand on their feet, as well as to acquire citizenship and work toward self-government. What about American Samoa, your possession and protectorate, whose chiefs did not hesitate to cede their islands and people to your care and protection and who, from 1900 to this very day, have spared no honors, left no traditional ceremony unperformed and, in rain or shine, gone through all the difficulties, seeking in the depths of the ocean and on the heights of the mountains, procuring and preparing things adequate and necessary for the reception of visiting Members from your dignified body, as well as officials from other departments in Washington.

In the name of the Government and people of the United States, and in the name of the chiefs and orators who ceded the islands and laid the foundation for our government, I, a son of the soil, a true and loyal servant of the government, chiefs, and people of American Samoa, as well as a proud and stanch supporter of the Government of the United States and its democratic doctrines and principles, pray that you, Honorable Members, remember American Samoa in your appropriations, aids, and grants. Please do not let our inability to return any revenue influence your decisions, but consider the causes of our failure. Your granting us $3 or $4 million, or a little more or less, for a set period of time, will not only help us improve our economy, our schools, roads, and health; save our Governor from blame and undue criticism and even curses for not getting the money promised or needed, despite his trips to Washington to be present at the hearings; raise the pay of our employees who have been working for the government for over 20 years, and those who deserve higher salaries because they do technical or professional work, and, last but not least, save our shameful faces from the scorn and sarcasms of our neighbors under the administration of other countries who delight in lampooning us, and shut forever the mouths of those who not only picture us in their writings and talks as "backward and forgotten," but expose the United States and its Departments and officials to undue criticism.

Speech by Gov. Harold W. Handley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the former Governor of the State of Indiana, Harold W. Handley, has recently delivered a speech of remarkable significance during the 146th annual meeting of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut at Yale University.

In his address at Yale the Governor spoke most eloquently of a danger facing our country of which all Americans should be cognizant.

To this interest, I am extending my remarks to include the following excerpts from Governor Handley's speech:

When one tries to determine why this dynamic, vigorous, and wealthy Nation has been placed on the defensive throughout the capitals of the world, it finally becomes evident that the nerve gas which has been weakening our will, softening our resistance, and penalizing our productivity, is the steady dosage of the bad medicine of the John Maynard Keynes disciples and their Fabian Socialist partners.

This group of pseudo-intellectuals has been infiltrating into many of our universities and colleges throughout the country, as well as high places in Government, over the past 30 years, and teaching a philosophy of big government, big spending, bureaucratic controls, and the annihilation of State sovereignty.

Such thinking does not bear the label of Marxism or communism, but is known as Keynesism—so called after John Maynard Keynes, British economist (1883–1946), whose teachings today are considered an ideal base for British and American Socialists.

This quack program of complete government domination, bureaucratic controls and confiscatory taxes received its clinical testing in Great Britain and is now working its destruction on the economy, prestige, and freedoms of the only hope left of the free world—our country.

This false philosophy, better known as Fabian Socialism, has been properly described as "Not an economic theory, but a weapon of political conspiracy," and all arguments against this dogma of despair are termed "reactionary."

* * * * *

Read any account of the fifth columnist activities in this country, of our soft and unrealistic appraisal of the Kremlin, the bitter denunciation of the American businessman, of those who advocate deficit spending and the freewheeling welfare state; and you will recognize the same names over and over again—the people who have put the United States of America on the defensive throughout the world against the aggressive policies of Russia and Red China.

Over 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln said that if this country were ever to be destroyed it would be from within, and not from without.

New ideas we certainly must have. Differences of opinion we should always weigh carefully, and if they merit it we should proffer support and respect. But we should always remember that it was ingenuity, creativity, constructive and rational thinking—combined with lots of hard work—that have brought America to her present eminence.

And finally it is time that every citizen who believes in our Republic realizes that any government big enough to give you everything you want is powerful enough to take everything you have.

Andy Finkelstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 16-year-old Andy Finkelstein of New York city is a young friend of mine who is disturbed over the need for training more scientists and technicians in the United States. Andy has been pondering what can be done to answer this need, and, in my opinion, he has hit upon a fine idea. Here it is in his own words:

In his book, "Strategy for Peace," President Kennedy expressed deep concern over the ability of Soviet Russia to train annually three times the number of scientists and technicians trained in the United States.

It is my opinion that in a time when our country is facing a challenge for its very survival, our Government should be getting full use out of its future scientific ability. Our technicians and scientists are spread too thin for maximum use by our Government. Some of the highest caliber go to MIT, Cal Tech, etc. A substantial number of these are immediately taken up by big corporations, because it is there that

they are offered the most money. I think it is time that something be done so that we can keep up with and forge ahead in our race with Russia.

In order to train more scientists and to use their scientific skills to meet our pressing needs, I feel it is imperative for the Government to establish a National Academy of Science, similar to West Point and Annapolis.

In order to get the top people to go, we would make it the highest honor for any student of the sciences: a distinguished group of the very top students who would be proud to attend the Academy and would feel that this is the only place to attend, and would not be tempted by the lure of big corporation money.

Attending the Academy would be an honor and there would be no tuition costs. Upon graduation, the students would of course go into Government work for 5 years just as a West Pointer must stay in service for a period of time. In this way, we can get the greatest coordination on specific important research projects.

This idea could be further researched by an organization such as the Ford Foundation which would work in cooperation with various agencies of Government.

Summing up, I think this school would turn out and mobilize our very top scientific brains for the maximum use of the free world's fight against communism. It will also stop so much of the talent from being taken up by the big corporations.

In my opinion, if a school like this had been started 15 years ago there would have been a vast difference in our scientific picture compared with the Russians. However, it is not too late for this school to be put in operation and to help us in the times ahead.

Andy Finkelstein's idea is admirable. Had we done what he proposes a dozen or so years ago, we might now be far ahead in our fight for scientific leadership in the world.

Therefore, I am going to ask President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara and officials of the Ford Foundation to investigate the possibility of making funds available for a study of this proposal.

And I want to thank young people like Andy throughout the United States who take their country's problems to heart. I hope that more and more of them will write their Senators and Representatives, their city officials and their schools, and give them the benefit of their ideas.

Target You—The American Schoolteacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the late Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick was, until his untimely demise some months ago, extraordinarily active in the service of our country and humanity. He deserves the gratitude of all those who cherish the dignity of man and the United States of America, under God.

Dr. Fitzpatrick's career as an educator was marked by his concern for freedom and high academic standards. He strove to improve and strengthen education as the best answer to the Communist attempt to capture our schools.

In 1955 he was a prime mover in the production of the first film in the educational series "Target You." Today his wisdom and foresight are revealed in the usefulness of this film as an aid to parents and teachers.

Dr. Fitzpatrick moderates this unrehearsed conference with experts on Communist subversion in education. The first film of the "Target You" series is an educational tool and an ideological weapon for the American schoolteacher.

It joins the schoolteacher with the parent to protect the child. "Target You" unites our people in support and defense of the free schools educating our children for American citizenship.

A public school teacher asks Dr. Bella V. Dodd and Francis J. McNamara what the Communist conspiracy is trying to do through and to her. She learns why she is a target of the enemy and what she can do to protect our children.

Dr. Fitzpatrick's pioneering in this vital endeavor should gain wider attention. As moderator of this film he speaks to us with good will, an American teacher leaving us his legacy of decency and hope. I wish to insert in the RECORD the biographies of this great man and his colleagues on the panel in the film "Target You," Dr. Bella V. Dodd and Mr. Francis J. McNamara:

Edward Augustus Fitzpatrick was born in New York City on August 29, 1884. He attended the New York City Training School for Teachers; received his B.S. from Columbia University in 1906; his M.A. in 1907 and his Ph.D. from Columbia in 1911.

Dr. Fitzpatrick's other degrees included: LL.D. Loyola University, Chicago, 1929; St. Mary's College, San Francisco, 1948; St. Norbert's College, 1954; Litt.D. St. Louis University, 1933; L.H.D. Loyola University, New Orleans, 1939; Ed.D. (honorary) St. Mary's College, 1951; D.Pd. (honorary) LaSalle College, Philadelphia, 1958.

Dr. Fitzpatrick taught in the New York City public schools from 1903 to 1908. He was commissioned a major of infantry, U.S. Army, serving in charge of draft administration in Wisconsin, 1917–19. As a lieutenant colonel of special Reserve (1934–42) he returned to active duty in the Office of the Director of Selective Service, April 1942–August 1945, and Industrial College of the Armed Forces, June–September 1946. He was made colonel in 1942 and remained an adviser and consultant on manpower to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces from 1946 until his death in 1960. He served as a member of the review commission on the deferment of Government employees.

In 1924 he became dean of the Graduate School of Marquette University and served until 1939. He was educational director of the College of Hospital Administration (first of its kind) at the same university from 1924–26; and president of Mount Mary College for Women, Milwaukee, 1929–54, emeritus 1954. He served as investigator of the publications of the U.S. Office of Education for the Subcommittee on Federal Activity in the Field of Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1954. He was director of the Institute for Human Education from 1952 until he died, as well as a consulting member of the Advisory Board of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces from 1946.

Dr. Fitzpatrick went on a mission to France as representative of the administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration of the United States in 1945 and was guest professor at the University of Mainz (Dolmeischer Institute) and investigator of American Studies in German Universities in 1951. He did the pilot study of books about American democracy for the USIA in 1954 and was consultant to the Brazilian Center of Educational Research 1956–57.

In 1925 he was the winner of the Modern Hospital Essay Contest and won the Sachs prize at Columbia University in 1927. He was awarded the Medaille de la Liberee (France) in 1944; the Selective Service Medal (Illinois), 1945; the Legion of Merit, 1945. He drafted the first minimum wage law for teachers in Wisconsin in 1913; the law authorizing establishment of the Training School for public service at the University of Wisconsin in 1917; the half-time school law for children in industry in 1921.

Dr. Fitzpatrick was president of the Association of Presidents and Deans of Wisconsin Colleges in 1937; investigator, Federal Commission on Industrial Relations; Fellow A.A.A.O.; life member American Political Science Association; National Municipal League; State Historical Society of Wisconsin; American Hospital Association. He was a member of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure; vice chairman of the Commission on Higher Christian Education, American Association of Colleges; chairman of the committee on liberal arts, National Catholic Education Association, 1948. He was editor of the Catholic School Journal from 1929 until his death.

Dr. Bella V. Dodd is a recognized authority on communism, a professor of political science, and a practicing attorney. Her testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee (Sept. 8, 1952) appears on pages 2 to 40 of the hearings on Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, Part I, 82d Congress, 2d session. In 1953 she testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities several times.

Dr. Dodd graduated from Hunter College in 1925, having been president of the student council and a Phi Beta Kappa. She received her M.A. at Columbia University in 1929 and the degree of doctor of jurisprudence from New York University in 1930.

For 12 years Dr. Dodd taught political science at Hunter College, and from 1935 to 1944 served as organizer of the Teachers' Union and its legislative representative. She was a leader in the Communist Party, serving as its legislative representative for several years. She was a member of its New York State committee, its State board and State secretariat. She took a prominent part in the national convention of the Communist Party in 1944 and for the next 4 years served on its national committee.

Disillusioned by her experience in communism, she broke with the party, publicly disclosed its real objectives, and received baptism at the hands of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on April 17, 1952.

Francis J. McNamara: director of research, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Director, American sovereignty campaign, Veterans of Foreign Wars and editor, VFW "Guardpost for Freedom," May 1954–July 1958; assistant legislative director, VFW, 1957–58.

Editor, "Counterattack" January 1950–May 1954; research analyst, 1948–50.

Oversea service, major. Two years as intelligence officer and adjutant, 1st Provisional Tank Group (Chinese-American), in northern and central Burma campaigns, and chief liaison officer, Chinese Tank Training Center in India.

Winner, Freedoms Foundation Award, 1957, for public address analyzing Communist strategy and tactics.

Has lectured at Naval Intelligence School and Department of Defense National Strategy Seminars; Command and Staff College of the Air University, Maxwell Field, Ala., and before International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Asian Art Comes Into the Classroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article "Asian Art Comes Into the Classroom."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN ART COMES INTO THE CLASSROOM

Dressed in his Boy Scout uniform for a meeting after school, the youngster walked up and down the aisles of the classroom, showing two gilded carvings to the other fourth grade pupils in the ancient history class.

"These are both from Thailand. This one is a * * *." He hesitated just a moment and then went on, triumphantly, "It's a Tapanom. That's a temple disciple. And this one is a Garuda. It's carved of wood, too, and it's from the 19th century. It's part of a temple decoration."

He passed the Tapanom to the boy in front, who in turn passed it on to another child. A little girl nearby took the Garuda, held it very carefully, let her fingers run gently over its surface and examined it on all sides before passing it on to the next child.

As the children all examined the Thai carvings, the teacher began to tell them about Buddhism and how it is a basic part of life in Thailand. She explained to them that, just as the religious faith of each is a major element in his daily life, so is Buddhism in the life of Thai children.

This was a new experience for the students at Sidwell Friends School in Washington. They study about Asia in their classes and see Asian art displayed in museums, but this is the first time that they have had Asian art and artifacts in their classrooms, as an integral part of their lessons, to examine closely and even hold in their own hands.

A MOST UNUSUAL GIFT

Asia and the customs of its various peoples are becoming very close indeed since Sidwell received a most unusual gift last December.

A gift of more than 400 pieces of Asian art and artifacts was presented to the school jointly by John W. Snyder, former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, and the Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, a nonprofit organization established in 1953 to promote a deeper understanding of Asian peoples.

The unusual aspect of the gift is the specification by the donors that the objects are not meant for a "museum," destined to remain in a formal display or locked behind the doors of a glass case. The students are to use them. They are to touch them, get the feel of them, and examine them closely in the classroom as part of their studies of Asian life and culture.

Sidwell is the eighth school to receive such collections through the foundation and the first private school so honored. The Sidwell faculty and students consider it a privilege to have this extensive collection as a permanent facility available for use in all classes.

COUNTRIES REPRESENTED

The gift collection contains some older pieces and many contemporary works. Some of the latter are excellent reproductions of classical art pieces. The countries represented in the collection are China, Japan, Nepal, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, India, Indonesia, and Burma. In addition, there are books and pamphlets for a reference library on Asia which includes items from Malaya, Pakistan, and Taiwan in addition to some of the countries represented by art works.

The objects are housed permanently in glass cases in classrooms and corridors throughout the school's various buildings. They can be "signed out," much in the same way that people borrow books from a free public library.

When a teacher in any class—from kindergarten on through the 12th grade—believes that the artifacts would add a dynamic motivation to a lesson, she selects the objects she wants for class. She may keep them as long as she wishes, unless, as sometimes happens, another teacher is waiting to use them.

As soon as the objects were ready for classroom use at the beginning of the second semester in February, teachers began to integrate their use in the curriculum of study. The artifacts are in special demand in the various art classes and by the language, history, and social studies teachers in the lower, middle, and upper school.

The Real Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to find a more searching test of the genuineness of democratic sentiments than is implicit in the famous dictum of Voltaire, "I do not agree with a word you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it." And it would be equally hard, as the Christian Science Monitor said, "to find an organization that subjects itself to this test more often and more willingly than does the American Civil Liberties Union."

I am really greatly disturbed to see such a fine organization subjected to baseless attacks because it sticks to its mission of fighting for the preservation of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, a fight that is never won. The ACLU, in its 41 years of existence, has had a long and honorable history. It has been praised by some of the best and most respected voices on the American scene. Numerous editorials have appeared in the greatest of the Nation's newspapers eulogizing the ACLU's willingness to fight for the rights of all citizens, conservatives and radicals, employers and labor unions, Americans in every walk of life and of every political complexion. Such praise has come from newspapers with widely diverse editorial policies. They have included the Atlanta Constitution, the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., the Capital Times, Madison, Wis., the Chicago Daily News, the Christian Science Monitor, the Denver Post, the Des Moines Register, the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N.C., the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, the New Orleans Item, the New York Times, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Toledo Blade and the Washington Post.

Many newspapers have disagreed with ACLU positions on particular cases, but they have acknowledged its purity of purpose and devotion to evenhanded defense of a principle—the freedom principle of the Bill of Rights.

Just before Congress adjourned, a pamphlet appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union." It did not contain the truth about the ACLU, but instead viciously and unfairly smeared this fine organization. It violated the sage advice given by J. Edgar Hoover in this article "The Communist Party Line," just published by the Senate Judiciary Committee, where he stated, "The danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views on a particular issue happen to parallel the official party position is obvious. The confusion which is thereby created helps the Communists by diffusing the forces of their opponents."

I am herewith inserting a letter to me from Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office, ACLU, which sets forth the real truth about the ACLU:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 25, 1961.*

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: On September 20, 1961, an article appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the American Civil Liberties Union which misinterpreted and completely misrepresented the history and function of the ACLU. An entire pamphlet entitled "The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union" published by an organization calling itself, "Organizational Research Associates" was placed in the RECORD. I am writing to you in the hope that a more accurate picture of the ACLU can be presented to other Congressmen.

The union's views, which have been recorded in public statements and annual reports throughout our 41-year existence, are well known to Members of Congress. We believe in a single standard for the Bill of Rights. For example, we have defended freedom of speech for the views of extreme rightwing groups as well as extreme leftists. Just recently we urged the Congress as well as the California attorney general not to investigate the John Birch Society on the grounds that the society has a perfect right under our Constitution to express and disseminate its views.

We do not hide behind the anonymity of a post office box as does the so-called "Organizational Research Associates," which issued the pamphlet. In a subsection entitled, "What Others Think of the ACLU," the pamphlet cites the discredited and ancient Fish committee report of 1931 (without bothering to indicate that this was over 30 years ago) as well as the 1948 California Senate Factfinding Committee on Un-American Activities report.

It ignores, however, the 1961 report of this California committee which states as follows:

"So far as the national ACLU is concerned, charges that it was a tool of the Communist Party have been made for many years, and we believe it appropriate at this place to include statements by Martin Dies, the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by Mr. Richard

Arens, present staff director of that committee. On October 23, 1939, Congressman Dies declared: 'This committee found last year, in its report, that there was not any evidence that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist organization.'

"On April 23, 1960, Mr. Richard Arens, present staff director for the House committee, delivered an address at the University of Illinois. On that occasion and in response to a question, he said, 'The American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU has never been investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities, or, so far as I know, by any governmental agency.'"

Also ignored is the 1959 report of the same committee in which it is stated, "We do not believe that the American Civil Liberties Union nationally is in any sense subversive; a part of its function is the protection of civil liberties of all people, regardless of the fact that some of them may be members of the Communist Party or other subversive organizations."

On the occasion of our 25th anniversary in 1945, President Truman sent greetings to us in which he said, "Officers, directors and members of the union have performed outstanding service to the cause of true freedom." On this same occasion, Governor Dewey also sent greetings in which he said "It has been inspiring to observe that the American Civil Liberties Union has stood unwavering on the principle of defending everybody's rights without distinction."

On our 40th anniversary last year, President Eisenhower sent greetings to us as did Adlai Stevenson, who described the ACLU as one of his "favorite organizations." Both President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon wrote articles for our monthly newsletter, Civil Liberties, last year giving their views. Roger Baldwin, the first executive Director of the ACLU, was invited to Japan by General MacArthur and to Germany by General Clay as a special consultant on civil liberties in those countries while they were under occupational authority. They both heaped much praise on him for his help.

I shall not burden you in setting out here in detail lengthy quotations from statements made by many other people in public life, as well as newspaper editorials which have lauded the work of the American Civil Liberties Union. Since the pamphlet has seen fit to quote certain statements by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover concerning Communist front organizations in this country, statements which do not mention the ACLU in any way, we would like to call your attention to a statement of Mr. Hoover which appeared in an article he wrote on September 30, 1959, entitled "Communist Illusion and Democratic Reality":

"We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as Communists those whose opinions on a particular question may, on occasion, parallel the official party position. We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communist those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox or unpopular beliefs.

"When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist, it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual, but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of anti-Communist forces.

"In combating communism, we must beware of vigilante action. The responsibilities of citizens are to be certain of the facts and to report these facts to the proper authorities."

We would very much appreciate having this letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to set the record straight about the ACLU.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE SPEISER,
Director, Washington Office.

Migrant Workers in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor is publishing an excellent series of articles on the migrant workers in Michigan. Because these conditions may apply in many other States and the subject is one of the increasing national concern, I ask unanimous consent to insert a number of these articles in the RECORD, and shall ask unanimous consent immediately hereafter for a further and interesting summary of action taken by a citizen of Bangor, Mich., Mr. Andrew Donovan, in this area of concern.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1961]

OPTIMISM HIGH AMONG MIGRANTS

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

HARTFORD, MICH.—Cherry picking was in full swing in southern Michigan, and the orchards were full of migrant workers. As I talked with them, I discovered that every one had a story of his own.

Mrs. Neil, picking with her grandchildren, told of the experience her family had coming here from Arkansas. The car they were driving was wrecked by a drunken driver, she said, and they were injured. Newspapers of Hammond, Ind., where they were at the time, carried a story of their sad experience.

From that time on, Mrs. Neil said, everyone was remarkably kind to them. When the family was recovered, people they never knew before got together and hired a man to drive them in his truck to the place in Michigan where they intended to go to pick fruit. A farmer gave them work, and soon they were able to get a new car. Mrs. Neil's comment: "It makes you believe in God when you got friends like that." She likes her work. "I've lived in New Orleans, but give me country life."

FOR A NEW HOME

Some migrant families are working to pay for new homes in Texas, their permanent location. The Pasados are an example. I met them in the municipal parking lot at Hartford where Cosme, the father, and his family of seven had paused to reconnoiter. Leader of a crew as well as picker, Mr. Pasado had come ahead from a picking job in Ohio to make arrangements for his people to harvest cherries.

In conversation with the teenage children I learned that their big objective in coming north is to pay for the new house. Everything the children earn picking goes into it. "Except what we get for extra jobs we pick up," explained Lupe. "We can spend that money for movies or anything." Mama, who speaks no English, was apparently thinking about the little home on the Rio Grande. In her hand she carried a sprig of a rose plant with a tiny root wrapped in paper.

"She will plant it in the camp we are going to next," explained pretty Enedina, teenage daughter who speaks English well. "When we go back to Texas she will take it with her and plant it in our yard."

Mama seemed pleased that I noticed her rose. "La rosa es hermosa," I managed to say haltingly. Mama beamed upon me as if I had accomplished something remarkable. "Si, si," she said.

AMONG STRAWBERRIES

One evening I visited a camp of strawberry pickers just outside Hartford. Mrs. Edith Holder invited me into her one-room home. Her optimism amazed me. She, her husband Brady (a commercial fisherman when at home in Florida), their son, and a niece, came north in May, "because the fish don't bite so good in summer."

"We've worked in three camps, picking," Mrs. Holder told me. "The bosses have all been so nice." She had no complaints about the shack the family occupied even though it had no running water, no refrigerator, no place to hang clothes. "We get milk every day from the ice cream man. He comes by in his wagon. Ice too. We keep it in this old clothes boiler, put newspaper over it and it lasts quite a while." She smiled apologetically: "We've just got to have ice in our tea."

Later the Holders hope to buy a used refrigerator. The farmer for whom they work has other crops to pick which will keep this family busy all summer, and he has promised to reserve this cabin for the Holders next year. "That way we can buy some furniture and keep it here."

DIPLOMA PRIZED

With the help of the two children the Holders were making from $12 to $15 a day at piecework in strawberries. This was a poor season; berries are small and you have to pick more than usual to fill a carrier.) "Just one man alone can't make a go of it," the migrant wife explained. "But with a wife and family it's not bad. And you'd be surprised at the friends you make traveling. Mrs. Holder brought out a ledger in which she had written names and addresses of people she met.

The Goodwin girls. Near midday I was seeking direction to town and came upon Diana Goodwin with her little sister Judy, at home in the family's one-room cabin near a strawberry patch. Diana had been excused from picking to take care of an ailing small girl. She was glad to chat.

Her mother, she said, had education. To prove it, she dug into a box and brought forth Ruby Lee Goodwin's high school diploma, a possession of which the family was rightly proud. "I'm going to get one too," said Diana brightly.

Rita Skaggs, a 14-year-old migrant neighbor, joined us. I happened to mention that I was writing articles for a newspaper. Rita clapped her hand over her mouth. "Something tells me I'd better hush," she said. But Diana only laughed and said she didn't mind a bit.

My visit ended when the rest of the Goodwins came home for lunch in a fairly modern convertible, which Mr. Goodwin, mechanic by trade, had acquired in the garage where he works winters.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 2, 1961]

PICKERS, VACATIONERS: TWO CLASSES OF MIGRANTS SEEN

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

HARTFORD, MICH.—You see human contrasts in this beautiful vacation land.

Two great summer migrant streams flow through it—vacationers bound for Michigan's many lakes and the fruit and vegetable pickers who come to harvest the crops.

The streams sometimes meet. Here, one summer morning, were two cars parked near the main intersection. One, a new Chevrolet station wagon with a Massachusetts license, was evidently bound for the Lake Michigan shore. The family of six was attired in fresh sport clothes. A trailer carried their luggage, and a carrier atop the automobile their sports equipment. Four youngsters peered out of the air-conditioned vehi-

cle while their father asked road directions of a local citizen.

HOW JOBS FOUND

The other car was not new, as its battered fenders indicated. The license plate bore the somewhat incongruous slogan, "Arkansas, '61, Land of Opportunity." The family, which included nine persons and a dog, was crowded, for these people had to take with them kerosene stove, blankets, and other household equipment—all needed when you're a migratory farmworker.

The tall, tanned father leaned under the opened hood trying to make the engine start. Unsuccessful, he detached a part and made his way with it to a nearby garage.

Meantime, the mother was busy in a street telephone booth looking up a number. Migrant workers often bring with them the name of a farmer who has applied to State placement officers for pickers, and she evidently was calling up for directions to get to the place.

As I stood on the shady street waiting my turn at the telephone, it struck me that both the Massachusetts and the Arkansas families were migrants. The Bay State people were part of the fun trek from city to shore and mountain in which millions participate. The Arkansas folk belonged to the vast mass of ceasonal workers and their families who crisscross the United States every summer supplying the demand for hands to pick crops in harvests which up to now have defied large-scale mechanization—strawberries, cherries, peaches, apples, tomatoes, "pickles."

PLANS DIFFER

The vacationers know their route long in advance, but the seasonal workers must plan as they go because their movements depend on the way the crops behave. And nature is variable. This summer the strawberries and cherries in southern Michigan are ripening about 2 weeks later than usual.

Despite the efforts of the Michigan Employment Security Commission staff, which tries to forewarn crew leaders and families, people are pouring in before work is available. Some of them size up the situation and take off at once for another area, possibly Colorado. Others wait it out, watching their cash reserves dwindle and maybe disappear.

Farm placement specialists, such as John E. Portschky at Keeler, shuffle through their files of applications for workers and shake their heads when men apply for picking jobs. Yes, pickers will be needed—but not yet. Two weeks, maybe a little more. But the workers keep on coming.

A shy lad from Arkansas stands at the office door. "I thought I'd ask you about a job, mebbe. You got any work for pickers?"

ATTITUDE PRAISED

Another applicant, obviously a family head: "We're picking berries down at Foster's, but there ain't goin' to be many more days' work. So I though mebbe we'd try farther north * * *. Nothing up there either yet? Okay. Thank you."

Mr. Portschky watches the man leave. "I've been here 10 seasons and I've yet to see any worker, if he's sober, be any thing but respectful even when you've got to tell them there's no work."

Other men follow the crops because they like the footloose life with no time clock to punch. One seasonal farmworker, a family man, gave up a job in a papermill at $1.75 an hour to work in the fields for 85 cents. "He told me he liked fieldwork," said Mr. Portschky.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 8, 1961]

MICHIGAN GROWERS TRY TO HELP MIGRANTS

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

BENTON HARBOR, MICH.—Some farmers are trying hard to better the conditions of their seasonal farmworkers.

"Make it a point to see Harry Nye," the farm placement specialist urged me when I called at his office to talk about migrant workers' problems. "He's really working at this business of labor relations.

"He's a grower himself—has 100 acres of orchards south of St. Joe. Heads a committee of the Michigan State Horticultural Society, the growers' organization. His committee got out a good little pamphlet on migratory labor relations from the constructive side."

INVITATION SECURED

Rolland Kelly, the placement man, thumbed through a stack of magazines and found a copy. It is full of practical, concrete suggestions for bettering relations between employer and worker by giving the worker more consideration as an individual. All of the suggestions are based on practices proved successful by Michigan fruit and vegetable farmers. Cooperating in its production were the various agencies in the State dealing with migrant farm labor and experts in engineering and labor management of two Michigan universities.

Interested in seeing how Mr. Nye was implementing these ideas on his own farm, I telephoned and asked him if I might come over and see him. He gave me a warm invitation so at half past seven the next morning, the hour he suggested, I pulled up the rose-bordered driveway of his modest farm home.

This morning was peach-thinning time, and workers were busy on ladders. It seems the crop was too abundant, as it usually is, with too many little green peaches on each branch.

To get good fruit, the green peaches must be spaced as far apart as a man's hand. A worker is paid $1 for each tree he thins, which means he must pick and discard many hundreds of green fruit to earn from $7 to $9 a day.

"Not a great deal, although it includes housing and electricity," said Mr. Nye thoughtfully. "But if the rate went up much we'd have to use a cheaper method of thinning—knocking the fruit off with a pole, and the jobs would be gone. Some growers do this now, but hand picking produces better quality."

WORKERS TALKATIVE

Mr. Nye took me out to meet the orchard workers. A gentleman in khaki, he approached each of his migrant employees with natural courtesy, introducing me and explaining to each one my newspaper connection. He then left me with the workers while he went about talking with others, giving me an opportunity to be alone with them.

The folks on the orchard ladders, both men and women, all seemed glad to chat, I found two of them especially vocal. Bill and John, both bachelors, had come from Texas to pick.. John, a former nightclub singer, had tired of cafe life and came to Michigan to pick crops two summers ago. He liked Mr. Nye and came back to him this year, bringing his friend, Bill.

Bill told me how he happened to come. "We were sitting by a little old Texas stream fishing one day and John said to me, 'Let's go up North to St. Joe in Michigan and pick fruit.' So we came. I've never been so near to being happy as I am here." The boys "batch it" in a one-room cabin on the farm, cooking their own meals.

Leaving the orchard, I went with Mr. Nye to see the cabins in which the workers live. They are far above average, for they have running water and refrigerators, luxuries unknown to most migrant families. Exceptional also is the big sandbox which this farmer has provided for the workers' tots.

Several former migrant families from Arkansas, for whom Mr. Nye has found year-round work, have exceptionally good housing in his farmyard.

Most growers feel they cannot afford to buy refrigerators for their seasonal help. Mr. Nye manages to get them by buying used ones in the winter when the demand is low. "I get three for $100. They last a few years, and when they wear out beyond repair I buy three more." He keeps an extra one to use in emergencies during repair periods.

COST PRESSURE NOTED

Mr. Nye is clearly doing the best he can. It is better than most. "We're not typical, perhaps, but a lot of family farmers are like us," he says. He thinks many more will come to see the importance of good labor relations as the subject is studied.

"The thing is to make it as pleasant and profitable for workers as we can and still keep our costs down," he explained. He thinks many improvements can be made without adding much to costs. "A grower can have mediocre housing but if the atmosphere is good it will be comfortable. The people make the atmosphere. A grower can be a powerful influence. There isn't anyone who doesn't respond when you act as if you care.

"We growers have studied production and become very efficient. Now we need to put ourselves to studying this farm labor management business. There's a world of opportunity in the study of human relations."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 16, 1961]

PICKERS DEPEND ON LEADERS—LAW NEEDED?

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

BENTON HARBOR, MICH.—Business organization of a sort has sprung up among the migrants—the 800,000 or so unorganized workers who follow the crops and pick the fruit and vegetable harvests.

It revolves around an entrepreneur called a crew leader. He's a picker like the others, usually a relative of some in his group. But he's also a contractor and manager of seasonal labor.

He arranges, with help of State employment services, to supply specific farmers with some 25 or 30 workers, provides transportation for the workers usually in a truck, and acts as liaison between them and the employer while they are on the job. Often he handles the payroll.

There are good crew leaders and bad crew leaders. The bad ones have caused the Congress of the United States to shape legislation designed to require crew leaders to register with Federal authorities. If enacted, this law would, it is hoped, make these contractors responsible for ethical practices much as private employment agencies are held responsible. Committees of both Senate and House, have approved proposed bills for crew leader registration in recent weeks.

A typical good crew leader was one I met at the Keeler Fruit Farm in southern Michigan. David Castellegia is a sturdy American of Spanish-Mexican descent. Mr. Castellegia was picking cherires along with his wife, sons, and a crew of relatives and friends when I talked with him. His farmer-employer, Lars Malling, regards him as a man he can depend on.

When he and his crew arrived for cherries this July it was the fifth year that Mr. Castellegia had fulfilled a contract with Mr. Malling. This employer counts on him to bring capable workers. He has provided him with a good little house with running water and refrigeration.

There are also crew leaders who are incompetent and even dishonest. One farmer told me he had dealt with 15 of this type before he found one who was thoroughly reliable. When he found this treasure, Clarence Brown, he made financial and managerial arrangements with him that have kept him coming back year after year.

HOW LEADER WORKS

Mr. Brown serves as the farmer's paymaster. Each week he receives all the money for the payroll, at the rate of 55

cents a lug for cherries. He in turn pays his men according to the amount they have picked, handling social security deductions. He also takes out for himself a percentage he and his workers have agreed upon as a fair return to him for providing transportation from Florida and back; trips to town in the truck; for getting them other work between harvests on this farm; and for acting as their steward and relationships with the boss.

At the end of the season he gets pay also from the farmer at the rate of 2½ cents a pound for the total weight picked. This is for his services to his employer which includes supervision of the camp and help in solving various farm problems.

These arrangements are usual. They vary from farm to farm according to agreements reached at the start of the season. The system seems to work well when both farmer and leader are honest men.

OTHER TYPES OF LEADERS

But irresponsible or dishonest crew leaders can cause much trouble. They exploit members of their crew, not paying them their fair return, not giving them proper services. They also abuse the confidence of the farmer. You hear of crew leaders accepting a loan from the farmer to pay transportation of workers and then failing to fulfill the contract. Sometimes they are never heard from again. Some have racket sidelines, dealing liquor and narcotics. Others are just incompetent.

In an orchard here I came upon a very young couple with a baby. They told me of their troubles with an irresponsible crew leader. This man found them work in the Ohio beet fields to which he brought them from Texas. When the job was finished he started to take them and other families in his group to the Michigan cherry orchards. His big truck broke down, and he used a pickup truck, too small to transport luggage. He had no contract, and when he reached Michigan he was late and unable to find jobs for his people. One evening he stopped his truck beside an orchard and told three or four families with children to get out.

FAMILY LEFT STRANDED

Maria Hernandez, holding her baby, continued the story:

"He took his own family in the truck and said, 'You go your way and we go ours.' We got out. We had nothing with us, because we had to leave our clothes and dishes and blankets where we were in Ohio. There wasn't room for them in the pickup.

"For 3 days we ate bread and boloney. I don't ever want to see boloney again. We were all dirty—3 days and no clean clothes. Then, God help us, we came to Mr. Lars. [Mr. Lars is Lars Malling, partner-manager of a big fruit farm.] He gave us a job and a place to live."

At this point Frank Hernandez, the young father, picked up the story. "After a few days me and my brother bought a car * * * for $45. We drove back to Ohio and got our things. We drove 500 miles in that old car, 40 miles an hour there and back, and we made it. Someone ought to catch that Joe Montes (the crew leader) and see that he gets what's coming to him. But I don't know where he's gone."

Federal registration of crew leaders, say proponents of the measures now in Congress, would serve as a check to such abuses and bring interstate offenders under Federal control.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 21, 1961]

TWO SIDES SHOWN IN MIGRANT HOUSING

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

HARTFORD, MICH.—"You can tilt this migrant labor picture one way or the other," said a thoughtful Michigan farmer as we chatted in the orchard. "You can describe the best conditions and get one kind of picture, or you can pick out only the very worst—and get something like that television program they called 'Harvest of Shame.' "

How was it possible, for so many people to tune in on a single program such as this, given months ago. Practically every farmer I have met in this fruit and vegetable center—the golden belt—has mentioned the program. All of them say it was unfair. They concede there is much to be improved in the situation of migrant farmworkers but they think the documentary did not give any hint of the effort being made by many farmers to improve the status of seasonal employees. Nor did it show an understanding of the family farmer's business problem—how to make a profit when costs are rising faster than prices received.

"We don't pay like we should, but then we don't take in like we should, either," one farmer put it.

Above all, the farmers said, the TV presentation didn't touch on one big stumbling block to progress—the discouragement a farmer feels when he has provided improvements such as showers, screens, and flush toilets, and has seen them ruined by careless tenants.

Both farmers and State officials who inspect housing told me of seeing screen doors yanked off the hinges, toilets stuffed with trash, showers damaged beyond use. Farmers told also of having equipped cabins with mattresses, cooking utensils, and stoves, only to have them disappear when the tenants departed.

HOPES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Some farmers say understandingly that these workers need to be taught what screens are for, how you treat plumbing, why you don't help yourself to furnishings when you leave. (Some hotel men would also like to give lessons to guests who don't understand property rights and depart with towels, trunk racks, and the like in their suitcases.)

The hopeful thing is that there appears to be improvement. Mrs. Joseph Hassle, a young farm wife I met at the Joe Hassle farm in Keeler, said that since they have employed crews under direction of a crew leader their losses have been reduced to a minimum. The crew leader, she says, takes responsibility.

Mrs. Lars Malling, wife of the managing partner of the Keeler fruit farms, also reported steadily improving care of property on the part of workers. She and her husband make a practice of weeding out the careless workers and inviting back the good ones each year. Practically all their migrant laborers are now what they call "retournees." Some have returned for their fifth year.

For these trusted peoples, Mr. Malling has provided housing better than most that you see. Several families, who have come for a number of years, have little cottages with bedrooms and running water. For the rest he has built a camp which has a playground for the children where they are safe from cars. Houses are equipped with gas stoves for use of bottled gas, and some have running water.

Mrs. Malling, artist, housewife, and bookkeeper for the farm, sums up what has happened this way: "We improve and our class of people also improves."

This writer does not intend to gloss over the housing situation nor become an apologist for farmers who could do better if they would. Some who could afford to provide decent shelter are giving their workers shacks that are worse than the housing they provide for their livestock.

Not many miles out of Chicago I have just seen wretched old boxcars with no windows and a single entrance made to serve as home for families of farmworkers. Some of the cabins are so deteriorated it is hard to believe they are inhabited. (Fortunately a new Illinois law is catching up with these careless employers.)

On the other hand it is only good reporting to say that most progressive farmers are sincerely trying to upgrade their migrant labor situation. They say frankly it is to their own interest to do so. Good farmers seek good labor. The better type of workers are attracted by good working conditions. Some actually "shop around" to find a satisfactory place to work.

Twenty-four States have passed laws designed to improve living conditions of migrant farm workers, but some of the States using much transient farm labor as yet have no such law.

Eulogy to Jacob Scher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report the death of Jacob Scher, the Nation's No. 1 expert on the legal problems involved in access to Government information. His death is a great loss to those who knew Jacob Scher personally, for he was so much more than a lawyer, a newspaperman, and a scholar—the fields in which he made his reputation. He was a humanitarian whose great feeling for his fellow man gave his work a depth of understanding, lifting everything he did above the ordinary.

He was first of all a teacher. There can be no greater praise than this. He also served as chief counsel of the Special Subcommittee on Government Information. His legal guidance was instrumental in congressional approval of the first freedom of information legislation in 1958. And his counsel was sought on all of the other important freedom of information moves by Congress.

And he was a newspaperman. To call a man a newspaperman, with a certain tone of deference that only those in the professional recognize, is a high compliment. Jacob Scher deserves that compliment, for he was a good newspaperman, an honest and able one. And he was an excellent lawyer.

But most of all Jacob Scher was a teacher. While he served as chief counsel for the subcommittee, he was teaching those of us with whom he worked about the intricate legal problems involved in gaining access to Government information. And while he worked as a newspaperman he acted as a teacher of his younger colleagues and he was a teacher of those who read what he wrote. His impact as a teacher is best reported by his students at the Medill School of Journalism. Following is an editorial from the Daily Northwestern, published where Jacob Scher taught school, and a résumé of his career published in the Washington Post:

A REVERED MAN

Jacob Scher was a man dedicated to completeness and honesty of approach. His personal convictions—about teaching, about

learning, about people—were always defended with his total strength. And he tried to push his students to defend the convictions they held.

He would not want any maudlin commentary on his death. He was not that kind of newspaperman; he was not that kind of teacher. He could tolerate the idea of death, even his own. To be frank, he could tolerate anything except sloppiness of thinking and sloppiness of writing.

It is infinitely more difficult for us to tolerate the idea that Jacob Scher's dynamic voice will no longer stimulate his students and his colleagues.

His death Wednesday deprived the university of a man who had much more to give. Those students who will not now have the challenge of working with Mr. Scher will never realize their loss. Those who had that challenge will realize only too well.

Certainly he was a stimulating lecturer, a warm (although often barking) individual. But the highest point of the man was his warmth and sympathy to human beings. Mr. Scher drove himself hard in his endeavors to help his students, to inculcate a truthful sympathy with the plight of less fortunate people, and to instill in them a dedication to end these plights.

He suffered various illnesses, but he forced them into the background so he could devote his time to his classes. He worked with a congressional committee to open previously closed areas of information so that the people might know of their Government. But he hurriedly returned to teaching as soon as he could. He was, above all, a scholar.

Many of us have suffered an immense personal loss. Beyond that, the university community—and the realms of education and journalism—have lost: a dear friend, a revered teacher, an insurpassable human being.

JACOB SCHER, PRESS LAWYER

(By Robert L. Asher)

Jacob Scher, professor of journalism at Northwestern University and one of the Nation's leading authorities on the law of the press, died of cancer Wednesday night in Chicago. He was 52.

Mr. Scher's lifelong campaign—to establish "true freedom of information and the people's right to know"—stemmed from an extensive career as newsman, teacher, lawyer and Government special counsel.

A 1931 graduate of the University of Illinois Law School, he practiced law in Chicago and New York before entering newspaper work with the United Press in the early 1940's.

He continued his career in journalism in various editorial capacities, working for the Chicago American, the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, the Nashville Tennesseean, the Chicago Sun, the Chicago Sun-Times, and the Chicago City News Bureau.

FREE PRESS CRUSADE

The free flow of information to the public became Jacob Scher's crusade as he continued to write and edit for the Nation's newspapers and to familiarize himself with every phase of press law.

He joined Northwestern's Medill School of Journalism faculty in 1947. He later served as special counsel to the House Subcommittee on Government Information.

As a professor, Mr. Scher taught countless future newsmen the basics of journalism—its history, its ethics and its law.

As subcommittee counsel, he carried on tirelessly his fight against secrecy in government, working always to loosen binding statutes that permit suppression of information. Largely a fruit of his labors, the first freedom of information bill correcting a restrictive statute was passed into law in August 1958.

Last year, as chief counsel of the subcommittee, he proposed a law designed to end Government secrecy through appeals to Federal courts.

BILLS STILL PENDING

His plan, still drafted into bills but as yet unpassed, would permit any person denied information by a Government agency to appeal to a Federal district court for action to enforce the right to know. News reporters would be among those eligible to carry such matters to court.

Yesterday, Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, chairman of the House subcommittee, said of Mr. Scher:

"He was a great newspaperman—a great humanitarian. Without Jacob Scher, the fight for the people's right to know would have ground to a standstill."

Even as he taught and gave legal counsel, Mr. Scher continued to work nights in Chicago's newsrooms. He also was freedom of information expert for the Inland Daily Press Association and the National Editorial Association.

PRAISED BY EDITOR

This year he was apponited freedom of information counsel for the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the group's convention here.

J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post and a past president of ASNE, said yesterday:

"The death of Jake Scher removes one of the country's foremost legal authorities on the rights assured in the first amendment. At the time of his death he was still at work on a manuscript on executive privilege which, had he lived, would have been added to the list of his contributions in the field. It is a great misfortune."

Mr. Scher, who lived in Highland Park, Ill., leaves his wife, Klema, and two daughters, Valerie and Dorothy. Funeral services will be held today in a chapel on Chicago's North Side.

Record of Committee on Public Works in the 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following summary of public works legislation reported by the Committee on Public Works during the 1st session of the 87th Congress:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee had 354 bills referred to it during the first session. These dealt with such subjects as navigation improvements, flood control, beach erosion, highways, bridges, water pollution, public buildings, land acquisitions, and water supplies.

The committee acted upon 68 river and harbor, flood control, and watershed resolutions proposed by individual Members of Congress, which require only committee action. The civil works resolutions authorized review survey studies by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that will ultimately result in project reports submitted to Congress if the projects are found feasible and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army. The watershed resolutions were acted upon pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended by Public Law 1018, 84th Congress—which requires watershed projects having more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity to be approved by the Committees on Public Works.

The committee approved 49 public building projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1959. These included courthouses, Federal office buildings, post offices, customhouses and border facilities throughout the Nation. While most of these were for new construction some of them represent repair and remodeling of existing structures.

One of the most important measures acted upon by the committee in this session was the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, now Public Law 87–88. Among other things this act (1) provides that Federal agencies shall give consideration in the planning of any reservoir to inclusion of storage for streamflow regulation for water quality control purposes, (2) directs the Secretary of HEW to develop and demonstrate sewage treatment means, improve methods and procedures to identify and measure pollution effects on water uses, (3) directs the Secretary of HEW to establish and maintain field laboratory and research facilities at various locations in the United States for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, etc., (4) increases authorizations for appropriation of funds for grants to State and interstate water pollution control agencies to assist in establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution control measures, (5) increases authorizations for appropriation of funds for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works, (6) increases the amounts of individual grants for construction of sewage treatment works, (7) applies Davis-Bacon Act provisions to rates of wages paid on projects for which construction grants are made, and (8) extends Federal abatement jurisdiction to both intrastate and interstate or navigable waters.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961 was enacted into law during this session. Title I of this act (Public Law 87–61) was reported by the Committee on Public Works and title II, providing increased revenues to the highway trust fund, was handled by the Committee on Ways and Means. Title I contains the following provisions:

"1. Approves the 1961 estimate of cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds to the several States for fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. The estimated total cost is $41 billion, of which $37 billion is Federal funds and $4 billion is to be provided by the States.

"2. Increases the authorizations for appropriation of funds for completion of the Interstate System from $25.44 billion, authorized by prior acts, to $37 billion, an increase of $11.56 billion, and extends the period of authorizations for 2 additional years, through fiscal year 1972.

"3. Extends the period within which States may enter into agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for regulation of outdoor advertising adjacent to the Interstate System from July 1, 1961, as provided in prior law, to July 1, 1963."

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The first interim report of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program entitled "Defense Highway Needs" was filed may 8, 1961 (H. Rept. No. 363).

The subcommittee's second interim report on "Construction Practices in Oklahoma" also was filed May 8, 1961 (H. Rept. No. 364).

Just prior to the convening of the 87th Congress the subcommittee conducted public hearings on December 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 13, 1960, which disclosed that many Florida State Road Department employees accepted thousands of dollars, in one form or another from contractors whose work they were

supervising. The contractors admitted they paid out the money, either through the devious method of sending specified weekly sums through the mail, or by making loans they had good reason to believe would never be repaid, or by the purchase of a wide variety of items which later were given to State personnel.

The testimony placed in the record in the Florida case is summarized in the subcommittee's third interim report filed September 20, 1961 (H. Rept. No. 1246).

The subcommittee conducted public hearings on March 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1961, with reference to the State's policies, practices, and procedures in the disposition of improvements located on right-of-way acquired for Federal-aid highways in Florida with particular attention to certain segments of the Interstate System in several Florida cities. Printed copies of the testimony are available under the designation of Committee Document No. 87–2.

Public hearings also were conducted by the subcommittee on June 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1961, following an investigation of highway construction practices in the State of New Mexico. Printed copies of this testimony are available under the designation of Committee Document No. 87–6.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

On August 24, 1961, the committee voted to set up a special subcommittee to conduct a study of real property acquisitions in Federal and federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings or otherwise. The subcommittee will conduct hearings, receive testimony and develop legislative proposals, if appropriate, and report its findings and recommendations to the full committee for transmittal to the Congress.

The subcommittee will conduct a comprehensive and impartial study of the acquisition of property by the Government. The study is to be a balanced and objective examination for the purpose of ascertaining whether existing practices are unfair either to the property owner because of inadequate payments or to the general taxpayer because of overpayments. The initial phase of the subcommittee's activity will be devoted primarily to intensive study by the staff. Public hearings will follow some time in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF WORK

I have had splendid cooperation and invaluable aid from all committee members. I am grateful to Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, ROBERT E. JONES, and FRANK E. SMITH, who served so ably as subcommittee chairmen. I am indebted to Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, ranking minority committee member, who has always been most cooperative and helpful. The committee is fortunate in having an efficient hardworking staff of experienced persons, and I commend them for innumerable tasks well done.

SUMMARY

Following is a summary of the bills and resolutions acted up by the committee in the first session:

Bills and resolutions enacted into law

Public Law No.	Bill No.	Date approved	Title
9	S. 307	Mar. 29, 1961	Beach erosion control of shore at Oceanside, San Diego County, Calif.
61	H.R. 6713	June 29, 1961	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961.
88	H.R. 6441	July 20, 1961	Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961.
184	H.R. 4660	Aug. 30, 1961	Mississippi River, payment for damages to Kings Lake Drainage District, Mo.
236	S. 48	Sept. 14, 1961	Recreation facilities in reservoir areas, authorize Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases.
275	S. 541	Sept. 22, 1961	Empower Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen.
277	S. 931	do	Sites for public buildings, repeal requirement that grantors finance evidences of title.
282	S. 1719	do	Amend title 23, United States Code, re Indian reservation roads.
307	H.R. 8678	Sept. 26, 1961	Convey portion of Shirley Memorial Highway and other highways on Pentagon road network to Commonwealth of Virginia.
360	S. 2295	Oct. 4, 1961	Provide for improvement of National Zoological Park.
373	H.R. 3019	do	Government Printing Office annex building, provide for construction.
386	H.R. 7888	do	Grapevine, Garza-Little Elm, Benbrook, Belton, and Whitney Reservoirs, Tex., extend time for reconveyance of lands to former owners.
388	H.R. 7854	do	Duluth-Superior Harbor project, Minnesota and Wisconsin, provide for abandonment of 21st Avenue West Channel.
392	H.R. 8558	do	Amend title 23, United States Code, re organization of Bureau of Public Roads.
------	H.R. 8320	------	Amend Freeport Harbor project, Texas.

Bills passed by the House and pending in Senate committee

Bill No.	Passed House	Title
H.R. 30	Aug. 2, 1961	Northeastern water and related land resources compact.
H.R. 157	Sept. 6, 1961	Change name of Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif.
H.R. 3801	Sept. 18, 1961	Authorize Secretary of the Army and Secretary of Agriculture to make joint investigations and surveys of watershed areas.
H.R. 4300	July 10, 1961	Designate Bear Creek Dam, Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam.
H.R. 5963	June 29, 1961	Amend General Bridge Act of 1946 re vertical clearance of bridges across Mississippi River.
H.R. 6676	July 10, 1961	Designate Kettle Creek Dam, Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam.
H.R. 7477	Sept. 6, 1961	Repeal sec. 409 of Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring submission of report to Congress concerning eligible public building projects.

Bills reported by the committee and pending on House Calendar

Bill No.	Reported from committee	Title
H.R. 947	Aug. 15, 1961	Designate new lock on St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock.
H.R. 8355	Aug. 28, 1961	Authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies.

Bills approved by House, amended in Senate, and awaiting final action

Bill No.	Passed House	Title
H.R. 8921	Sept. 18, 1961	Annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, and filling of vacancies in membership thereof.

Bills approved by Senate and referred to committee

Bill No.	Passed Senate	Title
S. 51	July 7, 1961	Commission on Presidential office space.
S. 340	Aug. 14, 1961	Authorize contracts with Standing Rock and Cheyenne River Indian Tribes to provide for clearing of certain portions of Oahe Reservoir area.
S. 520	Sept. 19, 1961	Authorize modification of Kaskaskia River, Ill., project.
S. 588	June 16, 1961	Amend act of May 29, 1930, to increase authorization for funds for extension of certain projects from District of Columbia into State of Maryland.
S. 811	June 13, 1961	Establish Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.
S. 1563	Sept. 8, 1961	Convey certain lands within Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes.
S. 1742	Aug. 21, 1961	Authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters.
S. 2394	Sept. 15, 1961	Authorize improvement of Portland Harbor, Maine.

Remarks of Trevor Gardner at Air Force Association Space Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on September 22 the Air Force Association sponsored a symposium on space in Philadelphia, as part of the 15th national convention of the association. The remarks made at that symposium contained pertinent thinking on today's problems. Moderating the panel was Trevor Gardner, chairman of the board and president of the Hycon Manufacturing Co. of Monrovia, Calif. His remarks, outlining the issue facing the panel, are hereby submitted for the RECORD:

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION SPACE SYMPOSIUM, SEPTEMBER 22, 1961, OPENING STATEMENT TREVOR GARDNER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND PRESIDENT OF HYCON MANUFACTURING CO., MONROVIA, CALIF.

As we sit here on this 22d day of September 1961, our Nation is facing an imminent and dangerous Soviet space threat. We are late in awakening to this threat. We are deluding ourselves by declaring that we are ahead in space science, but the Soviets just happen to lead us by a few years in the development of large boosters and man in space. We cannot afford to continue to lag in the field of military space development. Our President has already committed the Nation to a major national effort in space exploration—the lunar landing and return program. Our national leaders are now confronted with the need for a similar commitment with respect to U.S. military space superiority.

Let us direct our attention to the actual score in the space achievement of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

The U.S.S.R. has placed 15 devices in orbit with a total announced payload of 109,000 pounds. The United States has placed 51 devices in orbit with a cumulative payload of 30,000 pounds plus 29,000 pounds of engines and tanks. The maximum single payload we have been able to place in orbit is 4,600 pounds, compared with 14,292 pounds for the U.S.S.R.

Now let us look at some recent "ancient history." On August 19, 1960, the U.S.S.R. placed a 10,120-pound spacecraft in orbit and caused it to land at a time and place of their choosing. A payload of this size could have been a major nuclear weapon. We had no means then, nor do we have any capability now, to neutralize, capture, or destroy such spacecraft if they are hostile. Nor is any such capability under urgent development by our Government.

Since August 19, 1960, the U.S.S.R. has launched eight spacecraft of this general character, including the most recent launchings which carried Gagarin and Titov.

On September 1, 1961, the U.S.S.R. resumed nuclear testing, and to date has conducted 14 tests in the atmosphere. One possible objective of these tests is to perfect a "gigaton" (50–100 megaton) bomb.

Almost simultaneously the U.S.S.R. resumed a major ICBM test program in the Pacific in which two 7,500-mile successful tests have already been accomplished. Their announced objective for this program is to test a new and even large booster. In view of recent Soviet behavior concerning resumption of nuclear tests, a real possibility exists that a forthcoming test in this new ICBM series could involve the explosion of a giant nuclear warhead, instead of a dummy payload.

In the face of these two test programs and their grim implications of large thermonuclear bombs in orbit or in ICBM's, we must solemnly reexamine our military defensive and offensive space plans and urge our national leaders to permit us to embark upon a new and invigorated military space program.

We must also reexamine our civilian space program (particularly the lunar program) so that we will gain the maximum military yield as a dividend from this investment.

It is our purpose here today to address ourselves to these and other questions involving the military potential of the national space program.

Economic and Financial Background of IMF Operations During Past Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, on the world economic and financial background of IMF operations during the past year, at the annual meeting of the Fund in Vienna, Austria, September 18, 1961:

May I begin by saying how much pleasure it gives me that this year's annual meeting is being held in Vienna. For me, personally, our presence here brings back memories of quite a long time ago—of the time of the League of Nations reconstruction scheme for Austria after the First World War. In the summer of 1925 I served as one of the secretaries to Mr. Walter Layton (now Lord Layton) and the late Prof. Charles Rist, who had been asked by the League Council to report on the economic position of Austria. These two experts came to the conclusion that Austria was economically viable; but when they made their report at the League of Nations headquarters in Geneva there were those who thought that they had been too optimistic and dubbed them, after a vaudeville show then running in London, the "Cooptimists." This time, however, the optimists proved right. Whatever the vicissitudes through which this country has had to pass, it has undoubtedly established itself as a proud and independent country, thanks to the fortitude, resilience, and vitality of its people; qualities as deeply rooted in them as those of charm and good humor, which are perhaps more readily apparent.

A year ago, when our annual meeting was held in Washington, 68 countries were members of the International Monetary Fund. Today we have 73 members. Thus in the last 12 months five new members have joined the Fund—Laos, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, and Portugal. A number of other countries have applied for membership, and it is expected that several will be able to sign the Articles of Agreement in the next few months. The increase and expected increase in membership reflect the emergence in recent years of many new countries, particularly in Africa, all of whom we shall be glad to welcome as members of the Fund; but I think it also indicates a growing appreciation of the usefulness of the Fund as a center for consultation and as an institution capable of rendering valuable service to all its members. I would think that the usefulness of the Fund has been made even more evident by the intense activity in the year since our last annual meeting. In this year not only have the financial operations of the Fund been larger than in any other year of the Fund's history, but there has also been very considerable activity in other ways.

It might be of some interest to examine the developments of this last year against the background of the situation at the end of 1959 and early in 1960. Many countries were, of course, faced with difficulties, but world economic activity was generally at a high level, and showed signs of increasing. The adoption of external convertibility by a number of European countries at the end of 1958 had clearly been successful, and there had been an almost all-around increase in their gold and foreign exchange reserves. The rise in the general price level had been much less accentuated during 1958 and 1959, holding out the hope that the postwar inflation had at last been contained.

The improvement in the monetary position was underlined by the acceptance early this year of the formal convertibility of their currencies, under article 8 of the Fund Agreement, by 11 countries: Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. This was greatly to be welcomed, and brought the total number of countries which have accepted the obligations of articles 8 to 21. It is also satisfactory that we have now started regular consultations with article 8 countries in accordance with the view expressed by the Executive Directors in their decision of the 1st of June last year.

The growing freedom for the international movement of funds, as a result of the increased convertibility of currencies, and the greater stability of prices—so welcome in themselves—have, however, created new problems which the world has not had to face since the start of the Second World War. Some of these problems were discussed at our last annual meeting, others have developed since that time. I believe that much of the disquietude that has arisen in this new situation has not really been justified, but while it lasted it certainly exerted a disturbing influence. In the United States, mainly under the impact of a change in inventories once prices had become more stable, industrial production declined from the spring of 1960 and unemployment increased to the highest percentage since the end of the war. In the spring of this year, however, business activity began to recover so that the setback proved to have been of short duration. Even so, it was not without influence on the international monetary situation. As was natural in a period of recession, interest rates in the United States declined; and with boom conditions and fairly high interest rates ruling in most European countries, it was to be expected that there would be an outflow of funds from the United States. This outward movement coincided with growing misgivings about the competitive power of the U.S. economy, and also with some apprehensions connected with the election. A temporary flight from currencies into gold led to a steep rise in the price of gold in London which in turn intensified these fears and gave an impetus to fresh rumors and speculations. All this occurred at a time when there was a remarkable and continuing improvement in the basic position of the U.S. balance of payments. Imports were tending to fall as a result of the decline in business activity, but exports had risen substantially, and there was a trading surplus for the whole of 1960 of more than

$4.5 billion. Together with the net income from investments and services, the United States had available some $6 billion to meet Government expenditure abroad, including military expenditure and official assistance of all kinds. Thus the only uncovered foreign payments were of a capital nature—private long-term investments abroad and the outflow of short-term funds. Toward the end of the year and in the early months of 1961, the net income from trade and services rose further, and was sufficient to cover practically all the long-term private investment abroad at the current rate, in addition to Government expenditure abroad.

It was in this improving situation early in February that the President of the United States made his statement that steps would be taken to safeguard the value of the dollar, and that the dollar price of gold would be maintained. In addition, the President declared that "the United States has never made use of its drawing rights under the International Monetary Fund to meet deficits in its balance of payments. If and when appropriate, these rights should and will be exercised within the framework of fund policies." Assisted by reductions in discount rates in Europe and a determination to avoid any great decline in short-term rates in the United States, the outflow of short-term capital subsided, and, with certain advance repayments from abroad, there was a substantial improvement in the overall balance of payments.

The U.S. trade balance was helped by the strong boom which continued in most industrial countries in Europe, as well as Japan. Compared with 1959, these countries increased their imports by about 20 percent in 1960, and this was sufficient to lift the volume of world trade by about 10 percent. Even such a large increase in European and Japanese imports was not sufficient to raise the general level of raw material prices, which in fact slightly declined over the year. Since many of the less developed countries are dependent on the export of only one or two primary products, even a relatively moderate decline in the prices of these products may create difficulties in their balance of payments, and with only slender reserves to fall back on, many have turned to the Fund for financial assistance. Thus the general weakness in the prices of raw materials and foodstuffs have been reflected in the work of the Fund, which has had an unusually large number of transactions with the less developed countries.

Analysis of the First 9 Months of the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have made a summary of the actions and issues of the first 9 months of the Kennedy administration from the viewpoint of the minority. This summary is for publication in an excellent weekly periodical published in Seattle, Wash., namely, the Argus. This little article by me will be followed by the views of one of our Democratic Representatives in Congress.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I offer the article for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST 9 MONTHS OF THE NEW FRONTIER

The record of the 87th Congress, 1st session, is one of an administration and its executive bureaucracy seeking unprecedented powers and new spending authority.

To these legislative requests Congress, and especially the House of Representatives, mindful of its constitutional prerogatives, was cool at times, and in spite of a deep-seated desire to go along with the new President, he met defeat on a number of significant occasions. Notwithstanding these rebuffs, numerically or percentagewise, his scoreboard remained high as is evidenced by any summary of legislation enacted.

The cost of these New Frontier successes to the American taxpayer is an extra $2.5 billion over the Eisenhower budget for this year and an extra $10.5 billion more in fiscal 1962. By the same token the number of Federal employees to administer new and expanded programs is up in excess of 100,000 persons who were added to the Government payroll during the past 9 months and this trend is due to continue. One statistically inclined Senator calculated new employees were being hired by the New Frontier at the rate of 4 every 5 minutes. He figured the Kennedy administration was spending $650,000 per hour, 24 hours a day more than the Federal income.

The Federal debt, as a result, now approaches $300 billion, so that any student of economics will recognize—as Khrushchev surely does—our fiscal situation is vulnerable.

The projected Eisenhower budget surplus of $100 million for fiscal year 1961 was permitted to lapse to a deficit of $3 billion, while a planned surplus of over $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1962 instead will end up with an approximate deficit of $7 billion. The administration, in spite of Republican pleas, refused to hold down nondefense spending to offset an increase of $6 billion in the defense budget.

The Republican minority in the Congress did its best to blunt the President's drive for excessive money and power, while at the same time it strongly supported measures to preserve peace by increasing our military defense capabilities.

Republicans believe the New Frontier policies with respect to wage costs, agricultural price supports, and use of Federal spending to generate a higher level of business activity is adversely affecting our ability to compete in world markets and is shaking international confidence in our dollar. The theory that easy money and creeping inflation create healthy economic growth we believe is fallacious. We fear inflation and that undesirable Government controls and emergency power grants will follow us surely as night follows day.

To the credit of the 87th Congress, it rejected summarily the Kennedy request for authority to draw up a new agricultural program—subject only to a congressional veto. This would have reversed, in effect, the respective constitutional roles of the two branches of Government.

Likewise, and of great import, was the chilly reception given by Congress to the President's plea for borrowing authority to finance foreign aid outside of the normal appropriation process. This back-door spending authority was sought on a vast scale to avoid the constitutional legislative scrutiny and control over money drawn from the Treasury. In particular, the House of Representatives deserves credit for this victory in the executive-legislative tug of war. This is important because the Congress will become a mere rubber stamp unless it jealously guards its constitutional prerogatives to control the Federal purse.

An early battle was won by President Kennedy through the "packing" of the House Committee on Rules. While the objective of this action was stated as intended to allow the House to work its will on legislation, in actuality the New Frontier leadership used this control to "bottle up" 53 conservative bills and resolutions and to grant 11 "gag" rules.

Early in the session business conditions and the economic slump caused many Members to support welfare state legislation, but as recovery set in even the controlled Rules Committee cold-shouldered many must administration bills.

As for action on specific pieces of legislation, the House deservedly defeated a Federal aid to education measure. The Area Redevelopment Act which included a boondoggle "sweetener" for southern rural areas, unfortunately did pass. Also enacted into law was an $8 billion housing bill which included provisions to grant Federal assistance to local communities for things which these governments could and should do for themselves. This was the biggest political pump-priming bill in history.

As a Republican I have on occasion been severely critical of President Kennedy, but I have tried to be fair. Some of my friends sincerely have felt the President should be supported almost unreservedly because of the extremely critical world situation. However, I believe it to be equally important that members of a minority party not waive their responsibility to express opposing views when they feel that way.

I think the majority of Republicans in the Congress have exercised restraint since last January and have exhibited a wholesome attitude of constructive analytical opposition.

Personally, I have freely expressed disagreement with the theory that Federal money taken from the overburdened American taxpayer is the solution to all problems. Also I have been opposed to increasing the Federal debt.

As to foreign policy, I have strongly opposed any appeasement of the Communists. The administration in case after case has made concessions believing these generous acts on our part will be reciprocated. I disagree. Firmness, in my opinion, is the only attitude the Soviets respect. It has seemed to me—and I have aired this view—that in instance after instance we have been helping to dig the grave into which Khrushchev plans to push us. Especially I have objected to shipping food and military materiel behind the Iron Curtain.

In summary, as I see it, with the New Frontier, in spite of the President's excellent speeches, our position in world affairs has deteriorated. Cuba and Laos are only manifestations of an overall weak policy.

At home spend and lend policies have brought our country, it has seemed to me, much closer to the inevitable day of economic reckoning which is, of course, obscured on the surface by the false prosperity of huge military expenditures.

Thanks to the Republican minority in the 87th Congress the impact and dangers of imprudent overspending have been lessened. The setbacks given the Democratic leadership in this regard are in line with our belief that the people are not asking what the Government can do for them—rather the people are ready to do what is necessary for their Government in this time of trouble.

I look for congressional opposition to the New Frontier's welfare state programs to manifest itself more vigorously in the next session. Meanwhile I would say the accomplishments thus far, depending on one's philosophy, are neither entirely good nor entirely bad. Actually I do not find my constituents too much concerned over what Congress did or did not do in the way of legislation. Rather I find the Berlin situation is much more in the public mind.

As for me I appreciate fully this opportunity to express my views.

Closing Remarks by Per Jacobsson, Annual Meeting of International Monetary Fund, Vienna, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the closing remarks of Mr. Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, at the annual meeting of the Fund in Vienna, Austria, September 22, 1961:

I think I am right in saying that a larger number of Governors spoke on Wednesday during the Fund meeting than in any previous annual meeting. In the course of their speeches, many Governors described the situations in their own countries and the problems which they are facing. There were also many observations about the work done by the Fund, and suggestions for the future; and, in particular, many Governors referred to the question of the adequacy of the Fund's resources.

It is evident that much thought has been given to the preparation of the various statements which we have heard, and I should have liked to be able to comment in detail on them all. I am sure you will agree, however, that it would be impossible for me to do so today, but I can assure you that very careful attention will be given in the Fund to what has been said here at this meeting.

All I can do today is to refer more specifically to one or two of the more general points that have been discussed.

A number of Governors referred—as I had done in my opening remarks—to the difficulties of the raw material producing countries resulting from the weakness and fluctuations in the prices of their export products.

The Governor for Malaya requested that the Fund's staff should study this whole complex of questions, and I would like to assure him and the other speakers who referred to this matter that these questions have been considered, and will continue to be considered, most carefully in the Fund. Indeed, as you know, members of the staff took part in the discussions held by the group of experts appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations to study international compensation for fluctuations in commodity trade.

Many Governors also referred to the difficulties encountered by developing countries in their efforts to export to the industrialized countries. This is a matter which is causing concern in many quarters of the world, and I am certain that the representatives of the industrialized countries have carefully noted what has been said. Aid without opportunity for trade will be of little long-term benefit to the developing countries, and will therefore not fulfill the objectives of those who grant the aid. While the benefits of a multilateral payments system are recognized and accepted, we must give due weight to the fact that trade liberalization has not progressed sufficiently, and certainly not in fields which are of importance for the achievement of a better balance between the richer and the poorer countries. There are still restrictions and discrimination in the field of trade and shipping, and the Fund will continue to be interested in these matters. As several Governors have stressed, one of the purposes of the Fund is to facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade. The Fund will make every effort to pursue this objective within the scope of its functions. In this, and other matters, the Fund welcomes continued cooperation with other international and regional organizations.

From the discussions at this meeting, I think it is clear that there is complete agreement that monetary stability is the only safe foundation for sustained economic growth. That this has become so widely accepted is vital to the Fund in its work, for a stabilization program can never be truly effective unless all those involved in its implementation are convinced of its necessity.

The Governor who spoke first at our meeting on Wednesday—the Governor for Austria—laid great stress on the need for monetary discipline which had had such beneficial effects in his, as well as in other, countries. Many other Governors emphasized the same theme—and I conclude that there is worldwide agreement on this. As the Governor for the Netherlands so impressively pointed out, the monetary authorities have to tread a narrow path, particularly between inflation and deflation. This was a useful reminder of the difficulties of this task. I fully agree with him that our problems are primarily problems of monetary management, for whatever dangers may be inherent in certain of our institutional arrangements, I think good policies can overcome them, especially if international resources, when needed, are used to gain the time for the proper execution of a domestic program of action.

I think that the consensus at this meeting has been that the present monetary system should be maintained because it has served the world well during the years since the end of the Second World War. I agree with the Governor for France, however, who said: "While recognizing that the world cannot, in the present state of affairs, fail to apply the system of the gold exchange standard, we must remain conscious of the risks of this system." We believe that the system needs to be strengthened, mainly because the possibility of the transfer of funds from one country to another can cause difficulties against which a proper defense should be provided.

We have heard from the Governors of the two main reserve countries, the United Kingdom and the United States, that their Governments are determined to make all the efforts necessary to maintain a satisfactory balance of payments position and to preserve the value of their currencies. To enable the existing monetary system to work effectively, full confidence in the reserve currencies is indispensable, and we welcome these statements.

At the same time, an essential part in the present system is played by the International Monetary Fund, as a central agency lending strength to the currency structure. I think it has generally been agreed at this meeting that the Fund should be adequately equipped to help to deal with those problems that affect the stability of the system. And it is for this reason that we have been discussing the question of the strengthening of the Fund's resources by borrowing currencies under article VII of the Fund agreement. Attention has been concentrated on making arrangements with the governments of the main industrial countries. This is of course a question of profound interest to all members of the Fund, for they all are vitally interested in measures designed to meet any major strains on the world's monetary system.

I am glad to be able to say that all the Governors who touched on this subject expressed a positive interest in the Fund making suitable borrowing arrangements to meet this contingency, and it is particularly heartening to find a broad measure of agreement among the countries that would be the expected lenders under such borrowing arrangements. As a result of this week's meeting, I am confident that an arrangement can be worked out, large enough to be a powerful deterrent to any threat to the stability of our system. By its very existence, such an arrangement may indeed be expected to have a calming effect.

I mentioned in my opening statement that general safeguards for the lending members would have to be provided in any borrowing arrangement which would be established. Much attention has been devoted to this aspect in the discussion—and this is certainly a matter to which a great deal of attention must be given in the coming negotiations. Much work remains to be done, but my hope is that this work could be concluded by the executive directors before the end of this year. If that aim is achieved, there would be sufficient time for the member countries who will participate in this borrowing arrangement to seek early next year whatever authorizations are needed to give effect to the arrangement in their own countries.

In addition, several Governors, including those for Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, referred to the possibility of the Fund borrowing currencies from one or more of its member countries when, for other requirements of the Fund, the Fund's holdings of those currencies need to be replenished. Of course if the Fund needed to replenish its holdings in this way it would agree with the lender on all the terms on which this would be done.

It has been my experience that during all the work on the development of Fund policies and activated which has now been going on for many months, we have achieved a much better understanding of the working of our monetary system, and the role that the Fund may play in it. In the same way, we have found the discussions at the present meeting very useful and illuminating, and I am sure that the work which remains to be done will increase the understanding of our common problems.

I would like to take this opportunity to say a word about my friend, Robert Garner. I first met him at the time he was doing so much to help to organize the World Bank, and of course I have seen more of him since I came to Washington, while he was setting up the International Finance Corporation, and guiding it through its first formative and difficult years. He is a man who knows his own mind and has always been refreshingly outspoken. While we shall no longer have the opportunity of hearing his address to the Governors of the IFC, I trust and hope that we shall continue to hear a great deal from him in other capacities.

You are all aware from the annual report of the Executive Directors and from what has been said at the meeting that this has been a year of unprecedented work and activity for the Fund. I am grateful indeed for the kind remarks you have addressed to me personally, but I would like to remind you that the increased pressure of work has devolved very largely on the Deputy Managing Director, Mr. Cochran, and on the whole staff of the Fund, and I think great thanks are due to Mr. Cochran and the staff for the work they have performed and the untiring devotion they have shown to the true interests of the Fund and the member countries. I would also like to thank the Executive Directors for all their work and help, not only during the formal discussions in the Board, but also in the day-to-day efforts which must precede any formal Board decisions.

Before leaving this city, I should also like to join those others who have thanked our Austrian hosts for all the courtesies and hospitality they have extended to us during this strenuous week, and we must also thank the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as the Austrian Government, for the help they have given us in arranging this meeting.

I would like to end these remarks by commenting on what I believe to be one of the most favorable aspects of the world financial position today. I refer to the growing sense of mutual cooperation and community of interest in financial matters between the nations of the free world. The Fund has played and will endeavor to play a useful role in fostering this sense of interdependence among the nations, both through meetings such as this, and in the regular consultations with member countries and discussions in the Executive Board.

Keep the U.N. Alive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a respected businessman in Hartford, Conn., has long shown his interest in civic affairs through willing support of worthy causes. William M. Savitt, who has built a substantial reputation in the community for his interest in people and in the world, recently devoted an advertising column to a most pertinent comment on the death of the United Nations Secretary General.

I am submitting this column for the RECORD so that it may be read by many in this country who would not otherwise have an opportunity to see it:

[Reprinted from the Hartford Times]

KEEP THE U.N. ALIVE

(By Bill Savitt)

Dag Hammarskjold's untimely passing has saddened all who have shared his hope and dream of peace on earth.

He had a passion for peace, world peace. He lived for it. He worked for it. He gave his life in trying to attain it.

As Secretary General of the United Nations, he endured the slings and arrows of international politics. The Soviets wanted him ousted. Even among Western Powers he met resistance. His was a lonely job. And finally he was to die tragically in a plane crash in Africa. His death, too, came when he was on a peace mission.

Dag Hammarskjold personally was of a reserved and withdrawn nature. But he worked for the benefit of all mankind. He was able and astute in dealing with the hates, prides, and cross-purposes of nations. He advanced the concept that the little nations must have equal votes with the larger ones. He kept the international society alive.

His funeral will be held tomorrow in his home city, Stockholm. Delegations from the United States and other countries will pay their respects. In many lands, flags will be at half mast. Heads will be bowed, and prayers said for this great martyr of peace.

Dag Hammarskjold did not achieve his ultimate goal; the world is still war beclouded, still frightened and sad. But he did make notable progress in uniting human society and in trying to find ways to "beat swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks." He has made his mark on history.

Who will replace him? Who can replace him? What can we do? Let's bend our efforts in support of the United Nations. Let's keep the U.N. as a living memorial to Dag Hammarskjold and bring our strength to the cause of world peace.

Perhaps some day we'll find ourselves closer to the brotherhood of man.

Résumé of Veterans Legislation, 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress was a very busy one for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Eleven laws were enacted out of the 24 reported. It is interesting to note that the number of bills introduced—457—exceeds the number referred during the entire 82d or 83d Congresses and is nearly equal to the number introduced in the 85th Congress.

General hearings were held on the subjects of compensation for service-connected veterans, pension for non-service-connected veterans, as well as insurance, hospitalization, and housing.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a summary of the laws which have been enacted, as well as the various bills which have been reported and acted upon by the House or Senate:

SUMMARY OF VETERANS' LEGISLATION REPORTED, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

LAWS ENACTED

Public Law 87-84 (H.R. 5723): Extends period of time during which World War II and Korean conflict veterans may obtain benefits under the guaranteed and direct loan programs; increases maximum amount of direct loan from $13,500 to $15,000; and provides an additional aggregate amount of $1.2 billion for use in the direct loan program. New expiration dates follow:

Ten years from date of discharge from last period of active duty, any part of which occurred during World War II or the Korean conflict, plus an additional year for each 3 months of duty during the applicable war period. Entitlement is not continued after July 25, 1967, for World War II veterans or after January 31, 1975, for Korean conflict veterans. Final expiration date for the appropriate war applies for those with service-connected disabilities, or for certain veterans eligible for reinstatement of entitlement, regardless of length of service (July 25, 1967, for World War II and January 31, 1975, for Korean conflict). If loan report or application for loan guarantee is received by Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (or, in the case of direct loans, if Administrator issues commitment) prior to date of expiration of a veteran's entitlement, the loan may be guaranteed (or a direct loan may be made) after such date. Refinancing of delinquent indebtednes may be accomplished within the veteran's eligibility period.

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to advance to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the Administrator may request, for use in the direct loan program, the following sums:

After enactment	$100,000,000
After June 30, 1961	400,000,000
After June 30, 1962	200,000,000
After June 30, 1963	150,000,000
After June 30, 1964	150,000,000
After June 30, 1965	100,000,000
After June 30, 1966 (for use through June 30, 1967)	100,000,000

(Approved: July 6, 1961.)

Public Law 87-97 (H.R. 866): Requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. Effective January 1, 1962. (Approved: July 20, 1961.)

Public Law 87-99 (H.R. 7148): Provides that if a veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration facility in any State, as defined generally for purposes of title 38, United States Code (i.e., each of the several States, territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico), or the Canal Zone, the remains may be transported to the place of burial in any such State or the Canal Zone. (Approved: July 21, 1961.)

Public Law 87-101 (H.R. 2953): Permits the combination, or tacking, of two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war in satisfying the 90-day service requirement for payment of non-service-connected disability or death pension to veterans and their widows and their children. (Approved: July 21, 1961.)

Public Law 87-102 (H.R. 6269): Provides, in all cases, that whenever an individual is discharged or released from active duty he shall be deemed to continue on such duty—for the purpose of veterans' benefits—during the period of time immediately following the date of such discharge or release required for him to proceed to his home by the most direct route, and in any event until midnight of the date of such discharge or release. This rule was formerly limited by section 106(c), title 38, United States Code, to those separated from active duty after December 31, 1956. (Approved: July 21, 1961.)

Public Law 87-138 (H.R. 845): Increases from $10 to $100 the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor; permits payment, upon application, at age 50 instead of the former requirement of attaining the age of 65 years; and pays holders of the medal whether or not they are on active duty. (Approved: August 14, 1961.)

Public Law 87-223 (H.R. 4539): Provides for payment in cash of one special dividend on policies of insurance issued to approximately 660,000 Korean conflict veterans under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, or converted or exchanged for insurance under section 723(b), title 38, United States Code. Dividends were not previously payable.

Provides for payment of the dividend to those veterans who have converted to the "W" type (nonparticipating, permanent, level premium), or to those who hold the "RS" type (nonparticipating term) if the latter group converts within 2 years to the permanent "W" type of insurance. Should a veteran holding an "RS" type of policy die before expiration of the 2-year period allowed for conversion, the dividend would be payable to his estate.

The legislation provides authority in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer in the future to the general fund of the Treasury such amounts as are determined to be surplus to the needs of the fund. The law requires that administrative cost of paying the special dividend be borne by the surplus in the revolving fund, which at enactment amounted to approximately $60 million. (Approved: September 13, 1961.)

Public Law 87-240 (H.R. 1098): Provides that a flag shall be furnished to drape the casket of each deceased veteran of Mexican border service. More specifically, it provides that for the purposes of furnishing of burial flags the term "veteran of any war" will include any veteran who served in the active military or naval service during the period beginning on January 1, 1911, and ending on April 5, 1917, in Mexico, on the borders thereof, or in the waters adjacent thereto. (Approved: September 14, 1961.)

Public Law 87-268 (H.R. 6969): Dependency and indemnity compensation is paid to a widow whose husband died of a service-connected cause on the basis of $112 a month plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the vet-

eran according to rank and years of service. In effect, this means that the lowest payment would be $122 monthly and the highest $337. On the other hand, a widow eligible for non-service-connected death pension and whose income does not exceed $1,000 per annum and having as many as five children could receive payments of $135 monthly. The payment of $122 for dependency and indemnity compensation is for both the widow and the children. This legislation authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay a veteran's widow or child an amount equal to the greater amount to which the beneficiary would be entitled under the pension program; however, payment will be made as dependency and indemnity compensation. (Approved: September 21, 1961.)

Public Law 87-314 (H.R. 8414): Permits the Veterans' Administration to use its revolving supply fund for the repair and reclamation of personal property. The Comptroller General, on December 13, 1960, ruled that there was no statutory authority for the Veterans' Administration to employ processes and pay for services which did not meet a specific need of the agency, but which would be beneficial to the taxpayer and the Government as a whole. (Approved: September 26, 1961.)

Public Law 87-377 (H.R. 3587): Provides outpatient treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as is provided for veterans of the Spanish-American War.

In passing H.R. 3587, the Senate adopted an amendment which incorporates the features of S. 2051, as referred to the House from the Senate, without an amendment added to that bill at time of passage in the House. The House amendment to S. 2051 would have provided increases in rates of disability compensation payable to service-connected veterans. (See sections relating to S. 2051, H.R. 879 and H.R. 856.) S. 2051, as originally referred to the House from the Senate, and the amendment incorporated in the Senate to H.R. 3587 in which the House concurred, affords children of certain veterans (those who died of service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities) who were eligible for benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 but who, because of residence in the Republic of the Philippines, were unable to receive such assistance prior to enactment of Public Law 85-460 (effective June 18, 1958), additional time to complete their education. It permits all eligible persons under age 23 on June 29, 1956, and who would be otherwise unable to train after June 29, 1961, a full 5 years after June 18, 1958, in which to avail themselves of war orphans educational benefits, subject to their having resided in the Republic of the Philippines during some or all of the period between enactment of the original act and the enactment of the amendment which permitted training in the Philippines. (Approved: October 4, 1961.)

PASSED HOUSE AND PASSED SENATE WITH AMENDMENT, RETURNED TO HOUSE

H.R. 856: As originally passed by the House, the bill provides a new plan of insurance for national service life insurance policyholders (primarily World War II veterans). The plan is modified life insurance which provides a level premium throughout the life of the insured at a premium rate lower than that now available for permanent insurance, but the face value of the policy would be automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The face value of any extended term insurance in force under the modified life policy would also be reduced by 50 percent at that time. The bill permits NSLI policyholders to convert their term insurance or exchange their permanent plan insurance for the modified life plan. Policyholders who convert to the modified life plan may elect to retain the insurance otherwise lost at age 65 by paying premiums for age 65 without medical examination.

The bill was designed to reduce the magnitude of the problem which will develop 20 or 25 years hence as the 3 million holders of term policies attain advanced ages and term premium rates become progressively more burdensome with each 5-year renewal. This problem is now faced by some 15,000 World War I veterans who failed to heed advice of the Veterans' Administration to convert their policies to permanent insurance.

A comparison of premium rates proposed by the bill with rates under existing plans follows:

Age	Annual premium for the modified life plan	Annual premium, present rates		Level premium after age 65	
		5 LPT (term)	O.L. (ordinary life)	If 50 percent face continued	If 100 percent face continued
30	$9.83	$8.41	$18.47	$9.83	$43.22
35	11.72	9.00	21.31	11.72	45.11
40	14.09	10.06	25.10	14.09	47.48
45	17.17	11.72	30.07	17.17	50.56
50	20.84	15.04	36.94	20.84	54.23
55	25.22	20.95	46.53	25.22	58.61
65		47.00	78.97		

The Senate Finance Committee, in reporting the bill, made no changes in the above provisions; however, amendments were added which would accomplish the following, and the bill was returned to the House from the Senate with these provisions added:

(1) The provisions of H.R. 879, a compensation rate increase bill for service-connected disabled veterans, as originally reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and passed by the House, that is, without amendments to H.R. 879 adopted by the Senate Finance Committee providing for reduction of the rates for 10-, 20-, and 30-percent disabled and removal of section relating to presumption of service connection of the disease of multiple-sclerosis (see section relating to H.R. 879).

(2) The provisions of S. 977, a bill which seeks to provide a 2-year period, beginning January 1, 1962, during which those individuals who were at one time eligible to apply for national service life insurance but whose policies are no longer in force, or who never applied, or those who have less than the maximum of $10,000 in force, may reapply for such insurance to $10,000 maximum (largely World War II, but some Korean conflict veterans). Premium to be paid at attained age. Administrative cost to be borne by policyholders. Physical examination required and cost of such examination to be borne by applicant. Does not permit reapplication by World War II service-connected disabled veterans, but does permit such reapplication by Korean conflict service-connected veterans. Premiums for World War II veterans based on mortality tables in use during World War II; for Korean conflict veterans, premiums based on mortality tables in use during Korean conflict.

On Speaker's table in House: September 5, 1961, following amendment by Senate.

H.R. 879: Provides for increases in rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to veterans of all wars and peacetime service to reflect the changes which have occurred in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957, as well as to more adequately compensate the seriously disabled veterans. Average overall increase provided by the bill is approximately 9.2 percent. Exact percentage increases for various degrees of disability and for those eligible to receive statutory awards appear in the following table, along with estimates of cost:

Degree and paragraph	Cases, wartime	Cases, peacetime	Current wartime rate	H.R. 879 as reported [1] to House	Percent of increase, H.R. 879 as reported, over current rate	Current peacetime rate	H.R. 879 as reported,[1] peacetime rate	Total costs, H.R. 879 as reported to House
10(a)	752,739	47,724	[1] $19	$20	5.3	$15	[1] $16	$9,605,556
20(b)	285,824	14,410	[1] 36	38	5.6	29	[1] 30	7,032,696
30(c)	271,120	15,985	[1] 55	58	5.5	44	[1] 46	10,143,960
40(d)	157,989	6,866	73	77	5.5	58	62	7,013,040
50(e)	105,202	4,885	100	106	6.0	80	85	7,867,644
60(f)	82,416	4,090	120	127	5.8	96	102	7,217,424
70(g)	41,203	2,180	140	148	5.7	112	118	4,112,448
80(h)	25,261	1,010	160	169	5.6	128	135	2,813,028
90(i)	7,122	190	179	190	6.1	143	152	960,624
100(j)	74,987	9,626	225	245	8.9	180	196	19,845,072
(l)	2,775	202	309	335	8.4	247	268	939,384
(m)	2,004	295	359	385	7.2	287	308	727,668
(n)	377	16	401	435	8.5	321	348	159,000
(o)	142	45	450	500	11.1	360	400	106,800
(p)	2,194	160						1,393,200
(o)+(r)	3,085	705	150(600)	200(700)	16.7	480	560	4,378,800
(s)	10,600	900	265	285	7.5	212	228	2,716,809
Total								87,933,144

(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by ($47 additional to basic compensation paid monthly for veteran with these disabilities; this $47 rate unchanged).

Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand or both buttocks, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by ($47 additional to basic compensation paid monthly for veteran with these disabilities, this $47 rate unchanged).

(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation.

(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place or has suffered blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation.

(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation.

(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation.

(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceeded requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $450.

(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis. (This $67 monthly rate is unchanged.)

(r) If entitled to compensation under (o), or the maximum rate under (p), and in need of regular aid and attendance, while not hospitalized at Government expense, additional monthly aid and attendance allowance.
(s) If totally disabled and (1) has additional disability independently rated at 60 percent or more, or (2) is permanently housebound.

[1] Senate passed version of bill provided reduced amounts for 10-, 20-, and 30-percent disabled, as follows:

	Wartime rate	Peacetime rate
10 percent	$19.50	$15.50
20 percent	37.00	37.00
30 percent	57.00	57.00

Section 2 of the bill (which had its origin in H.R. 3350) provides that veterans who are receiving the statutory award of $450 and also additional compensation of $150 while not in a hospital will have their compensation continued until the first day of the second month which begins after they are hospitalized. If a veteran leaves the hospital against medical advice and is thereafter readmitted, the aid-and-attendance allowance during this period of hospitalization would be discontinued from the date of readmission for so long as that hospitalization continues.

Section 3 of the bill increases the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 to 7 years. (This section removed by Senate amendment.)

In addition to amendments described above, the Senate also added an amendment identical to that described in item (2), H.R. 856.

On Speaker's table in House: July 18, 1961, following amendment in Senate.

PASSED SENATE AND PASSED HOUSE WITH AMENDMENT, RETURNED TO SENATE FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

S. 2051. This bill is intended to afford children of certain veterans (those who died of service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities) who were eligible for benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 but who, because of residence in the Republic of the Philippines, were unable to receive such assistance prior to enactment of Public Law 85-460 (effective June 18, 1958), additional time to complete their education. It would permit all eligible persons under age 23 on June 29, 1956, and who would be otherwise unable to train after June 29, 1961, a full 5 years after June 18, 1958, in which to avail themselves of war orphans educational benefits, subject to their having resided in the Republic of the Philippines during some or all of the period between enactment of the original act and the enactment of the amendment which permitted training in the Philippines.

In passing the bill, the House adopted an amendment which incorporated the features of H.R. 879, as passed by the House on June 5, 1961. That bill provided increases in rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to veterans of all wars and peacetime service to reflect the changes which have occurred in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957, as well as to more adequately compensate the seriously disabled veterans. Average overall increase provided by H.R. 879 and by the amendment adopted to S. 2051 is approximately 9.2 percent. The exact amount of increases for various degrees of disability appear in the section "H.R. 879." The amendment also incorporated provisions of sections 2 and 3 of H.R. 879. The amendment to S. 2051 did not include the provision relating to national service life insurance which the Senate had previously attached as an amendment to H.R. 879.

Senate action: Substance of original bill, without House passed amendment relating to compensation, passed as amendment to H.R. 3587; September 14, 1961. See section relative to Public Law 87-377.

On Vice President's desk.

BILLS PASSED BY HOUSE, REFERRED TO SENATE COMMITTEES

H.R. 846: The bill proposed to add "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided.

Senate committee action: Tabled, June 29, 1961.

H.R. 848: Provides vocational rehabilitation for veterans disabled in the service during the period between World War II and the Korean conflict and makes this a permanent program by extension of the benefit to those disabled after the Korean conflict.

The vocational rehabilitation program provides training for 4 years, with the Veterans' Administration paying for books, tools, and supplies, as well as providing assistance and guidance in determination of the type of training which would assist the veteran in overcoming his service-connected disability. The bill provides for a presumption that those who are 30 percent or more disabled are in need of vocational rehabilitation and would provide assistance for those less than 30 percent disabled if the veteran demonstrates his need for such training.

Senate committee action: None. (A Senate bill, S. 349, was reported on August 10, 1961 (S. Rept. 700), which provided for readjustment benefits (educational and loan guarantee) for those with more than 180 days of service between the period January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, and included a section containing the text of H.R. 848. S. 349 was not considered on the floor of the Senate.)

H.R. 858. Provides that the annual salary of the manager of a Veterans' Administration hospital, domiciliary, or center shall be $17,700, and a director of professional services $17,450. Today, such rates vary but the rates prescribed by the bill are, in the case of the manager, at least $500 more than managers receive, and in the case of the director of professional services, the rate is at least $250 additional.

Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 859: Proposes repeal of mustering-out payments of between $100 and $300 for veterans of the Korean conflict. The effective date of repeal, January 31, 1965, is the date of expiration of other benefits provided by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (the Korean "GI bill").

Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 860: Repeals obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans. Benefits are not payable under the program to which the bill relates for any benefit week beginning after January 31, 1960. This obsolescence is occasioned by enactment of the Ex-Servicemen's Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, which established a permanent program of unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen and provided that, beginning in October 1958, military personnel would be entitled to unemployment benefits upon separation from active service in the Armed Forces as if they were subject to coverage under a State law.

Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 861: Authorizes payment in a lump sum of the total amount of compensation, representing the statutory awards of $47 monthly for the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ and $67 monthly for arrested tuberculous disease, which would have been payable for the period August 1, 1952, to the date of the bill's enactment had claim therefor been filed on August 1, 1952 (the effective date of Public Law 427, 82d Congress, which first provided such statutory awards for World War II and Korean conflict veterans). The bill would apply to all cases in which the condition involved was determined, before August 1, 1952, as service connected, and would require reduction of the amount payable by any such statutory awards paid during that period. The bill would require that an application for the benefits be filed by the veteran concerned within 2 years from the date of enactment and would preclude payment of any accrued benefits on behalf of any veteran who died before the date of enactment.

Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 873: Authorizes payment of the statutory award of $47 per month for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified in the law (i.e., one hand, one foot, blindness in one eye, having only light perception, both buttocks, or one or more creative organs), in addition to the basic rates of disability compensation and the rate payable to those who are permanently housebound (but in no event to exceed a total of $309).

Senate committee action: Tabled, June 29, 1961.

H.R. 5939: Provides that after expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program, approval of courses under the war orphans' educational assistance program shall be by State approving agencies. Specifically, it would amend chapter 35 to incorporate within that chapter those provisions of subchapters V and VI of chapter 33 (relating to State approving agencies and approval of courses of education and training, respectively, under the Korean GI bill) which apply to war orphans' educational assistance.

Senate committee action: None.

House Joint Resolution 73: This resolution has two purposes: (1) to determine what steps shall be taken to improve the care and rehabilitation of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped, and (2) to relieve the problem faced by the Veterans' Administration because of increasing utilization of its limited hospital beds by long-term patients, thus reducing beds available for other types of patients.

The special study sought to be authorized by the resolution would be conducted by the Veterans' Administration at a maximum cost of $300,000. It would be directed at determining the advisability and practicability of various methods of rehabilitation and of preventing physical and mental deterioration of veterans receiving or entitled to receive hospitalization or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration. The services of not more than 500 veterans who are receiving long-term hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration would be utilized. The resolution requires that the study be completed before December 31, 1963, and report with recommendations to be made to the Congress by March 31, 1964.

Senate committee action: None.

REPORTED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE, PENDING ON UNION CALENDAR

H.R. 2417: Proposes to increase by 10 percent the monthly rates, dependency and indemnity compensation, payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

House Report No. 437, May 26, 1961.

	Congress							
	80th	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th	87th (1st sess.)
Bills and resolutions referred	498	619	436	402	537	491	628	457
Hearings sessions	60	64	50	46	71	69	55	22
Hearings, printed pages	3,596	2,355	2,562	5,337	4,271	4,834	3,472	1,666
Executive sessions	49	34	27	55	37	28	21	8
Bills reported	60	44	36	36	48	44	42	24
Bills in House	16	1		14	1	5	2	3
Pending in Senate committees	6	16	14	2	17	11	6	9
Bills on Senate Calendar or in Senate		1	1	2			1	1
Recommitted		1	1			1		
Bills vetoed	1	2	4			1		
Bills passed over veto		1	2					
Laws enacted	36	24	22	25	30	26	33	11

Financial Operations of the International Monetary Fund During the Past Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, on the financial operations of the International Monetary Fund during the past year, at the annual meeting of the Fund in Vienna, Austria, September 18, 1961:

In all, 32 countries from all the continents of the world have received financial assistance from the fund or have had drawing rights under standby arrangements during the period since our last meeting. With the exception of the United Kingdom, all of these countries can be said to depend largely on the export of primary products. But the balance of payments difficulties which these countries have experienced have not as a rule been solely due to weakness in the prices of their export products, for many have also suffered from excessive internal demand connected with their own credit and fiscal policies. As long as the general level of prices on world markets was still rising, it was possible to expect that in the individual countries a certain amount of credit expansion would be absorbed by rising prices; but now that the general price level is more stable, an expansion of credit beyond the current requirements of the economy is likely to be reflected with little delay in a deficit in the balance of payments. In several cases the situation has been rendered more difficult by the continued maintenance of complex and discriminatory exchange systems. With the widespread desire to establish or maintain orderly monetary conditions and to simplify exchange systems, fund assistance has generally been requested in support of fiscal, monetary or exchange programs and the assistance has been given in the form of standby arrangements. In fact, of the 22 countries which have drawn from the fund during the past year, all but three have entered into a standby arrangement.

It would clearly be impossible for me to discuss in detail all these financial operations of the Fund. I should, however, like to mention briefly a few which have had unusual features and which seem to me to be of particular interest.

First of all, I should like to say a word about the drawing and standby arrangement granted to Yugoslavia at the end of last year. A total of $75 million, together with substantial credits from the United States and a number of European countries, was made available to Yugoslavia in support of an extensive exchange reform and program of trade liberalization designed to strengthen the Yugoslav economy and to integrate it more closely with the world economy. The immediate drawing, of the equivalent of $45 million, was made in six currencies—French francs, deutsche mark, Italian lire, Netherlands guilders, sterling, and United States dollars, and this was the first occasion on which a drawing was divided among a large number of currencies in accordance with the policy of diversifying the currencies to be used in drawings and concentrating on the currencies of countries with strong payments and reserve positions. The drawing of Italian lire was the first that had been made in that currency.

The operation with Chile in February of this year also contained a number of special features. The financial difficulties created by the earthquakes in May 1960, and uncertain prospects for the world price of copper, led Chile to enter into a standby arrangement with the Fund for the equivalent of $75 million in order to help maintain its program of economic stabilization. At the same time, Chile drew Argentine pesos amounting to a further $16 million to be used in partial settlement of the balance accumulated by Argentina under the bilateral trade and payments agreement between the two countries, which had already been terminated in anticipation of the transaction. This was the first time that a Latin American currency had been drawn from the Fund, and the first time that the Fund's resources had been used directly to assist a member to terminate a bilateral arrangement in accordance with an Executive Board decision taken in 1955. In addition, Chile was the first country whose outstanding drawings and available drawing rights under a standby arrangement exceeded the equivalent of 100 percent of its quota.

Four particularly large transactions—with Australia, Brazil, India, and the United Kingdom—have been carried out during the last 5 months. In these transactions the policy of diversifying the currencies to be drawn and concentrating on the currencies of countries in strong payments and reserve positions was continued.

The transaction with Australia in April, which involved a drawing totaling the equivalent of $175 million in seven currencies and a standby arrangement for an additional $100 million, was made in support of the Government's efforts to improve its foreign payments position by means of fiscal, monetary, and other measures. These efforts have been most successful, and I am happy to be able to add that, in view of the improvement in the position, the Australian authorities canceled the standby arrangement early this month after it had been in effect for only 4 months instead of a year.

Under the standby arrangement concluded with Brazil in May, the equivalent of $160 million was made available to support a broad financial program of fiscal, credit, trade, and exchange measures, designed to combat inflation and to achieve balance of payments equilibrium within the framework of a free and simplified exchange system. In addition to the standby arrangement, the Fund agreed to the rescheduling of the repayment of previous drawings totaling the equivalent of $140 million. The arrangement with the Fund has been supplemented by substantial credits from other sources and by renegotiation of Brazil's medium-term foreign obligations. Rapid advance has been made in unifying the exchange system, and early in July the Brazilian Government transferred all payments which had previously been affected at preferential rates to the free market.

The drawing by India approved in July, which totaled the equivalent of $250 million, was made in six currencies. This included a drawing in Japanese yen, the first occasion on which a member country had drawn an Asiatic currency from the Fund. India, whose foreign exchange reserves had fallen to a low level, requested the drawing at a time of seasonal reduction in certain raw material exports, and in order to bridge the timelag in the receipt of development aid under the third 5-year plan.

With these large transactions and the many smaller ones, it is clear that the Fund has done much to assist countries, both large and small, which are endeavoring to diversify their production and generally to develop their economies, but which still depend mainly on the export of primary products. Insofar as such development is financed by long-term foreign capital, the actual use of these resources will normally be reflected in a deficit in the current account of the balance of payments. Provided that the other elements of the balance of payments are in equilibrium, this current account deficit would be matched by the external financing, and there would then be no overall deficit. When this has not been the case, requests have frequently been made to the Fund for financial assistance, and then the purpose of the assistance granted has been to help the countries concerned to put their overall situation in balance. The 3 to 5 years for which such assistance has been granted has been intended to provide the time needed for the appropriate measures to take effect, and thus to relate the long-term development to the available long-term finance.

Turning now to the transaction with the United Kingdom last month, I would like to describe briefly the background of the international movements of funds which preceded it. I have already referred to the large movements of funds out of the United States last autumn and winter—partly to take advantage of high interest rates in Europe. A part of this flow went to the United Kingdom, where a construction boom and a marked increase in investment in plant and equipment had led to a substantial demand for finance, and, consequently, to a high level of interest rates. The inflow of funds from the United States and other centers led to an increase in reserves, in spite of the deteriorating position of the current account of the United Kingdom balance of payments. The British Government used part of the increase in reserves to repay in advance the drawing made from the fund in 1956, and also to reduce the Fund's holdings of sterling to 75 percent of quota.

Following the statement made by the President of the United States in February, the outflow of funds from the United States was sharply reduced, but there was still a movement of funds into a number of countries on the Continent in Europe, especially Germany, due at least in part to continued rumors about the revaluation of the deutsche

mark. The revaluations of the deutsche mark and the Dutch guilder by 5 percent early in March, however, gave rise to a new crop of rumors about further currency changes. All this proved very damaging to confidence, particularly in sterling because of the deterioration on the current account of the United Kingdom balance of payments. The authorities in the countries concerned strongly denied the rumors, but to small avail. It was even believed that the Swiss franc would be revalued, despite the growing deficit on the current account of the Swiss balance of payments, to which the Swiss National Bank drew attention.

In this situation a number of central banks—members of the Bank for International Settlements in Basle, as well as the Federal Reserve System of the United States—decided to cooperate more closely in the spot and forward exchange markets and in the granting of credits. In this way substantial resources were provided in aid of sterling, but this in itself did not arrest the outflow of funds from London. Steps were needed to remove the imbalance in the British economy and to obtain the external resources required while the steps were taking effect. Using, inter alia, certain powers proposed in the budget that had been submitted in April and voted in July, the British Government introduced toward the end of July a comprehensive series of fiscal and monetary measures, and certain other policies, designed to eliminate the deficit in the current account of the balance of payments, without imposing any restrictions on trade or current payments and, in particular, to restore confidence in sterling at the existing rate of exchange. The measures adopted by the United Kingdom showed the Government's determination to deal with both the immediate situation and developments over a longer period, particularly in relation to future budget expenditure and the level of costs.

In support of these measures, the United Kingdom drew from the Fund the equivalent of $1,500 million in nine currencies: United States dollars, deutschemarks, French francs, Italian lire, Netherlands guilders, Belgian francs, Japanese yen, Canadian dollars, and Swedish kronor—the first time the latter currency had been drawn from the Fund—and, in addition, entered into a standby arrangement for the equivalent of a further $500 million. The United Kingdom authorities announced that of the amount drawn the equivalent of some £200 million would be used during the following month or two for repayments of credits. This transaction with the United Kingdom was by far the largest ever entered into by the Fund, and in order to replenish its holdings of the currencies drawn, the Fund sold gold valued at $500 million to the countries concerned, in the proportion of one-third of the United Kingdom drawing in each currency.

The six transactions which I have mentioned are noteworthy for the size of the amounts involved and other special features, but it would be a false picture of the Fund's activities if it were concluded that the transactions with other countries had not also been of real importance. Perhaps the simplest way for me to indicate the wide range of Fund transactions is to enumerate all the countries which have received financial assistance from the Fund over the last 12 months. Twenty-two countries have drawn from the Fund, namely, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, South Africa, Turkey, both the Egyptian and the Syrian Regions of the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia. In addition, 10 countries—Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Morocco, Peru, Spain, Uruguay, and Venezuela—have had standby arrangements in effect during the year, although they had not found it necessary to make use of their drawing facilities. In fact, Spain felt able to cancel its standby arrangement with the Fund 5 months before it was due to expire.

It is of interest to note that 18 of the 20 Latin American Republics are included in this list. Over the years, Latin American countries have drawn the equivalent of some $1,100 million from the Fund. With the equivalent of a further $400 million available under unused standby arrangements with 16 of them, it is clear that the Fund has played a significant role in assisting the countries of Latin America in their efforts to overcome financial and economic difficulties.

Remarks by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, Air Force Association Symposium on "Space and National Security"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary of the Space Council, recently stated that we have space missions to help keep the peace, and space missions to help increase our ability to live well in peace. His remarks, at the symposium on space and national security sponsored by the Air Force Association at the 15th national convention in Philadelphia, are well worth the thoughtful consideration and study of the House:

REMARKS BY DR. EDWARD C. WELSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL, AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM ON "SPACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY"

Today, I am scheduled to launch a few capsules of fact and views regarding the national space program. Any messages conveyed during this brief orbit will be my own, and should not be thought to come from the National Aeronautics and Space Council, as such.

By way of introduction, it might be useful for me to make three broad generalizations which, in a sense, express my philosophy of this space challenge.

First, we are in a space race, and it is absurd to pretend that we are not. We are, moreover, not in the contest just for the fun of racing, but rather for our survival as a nation determined to protect its freedom and also as a nation determined to maintain and increase the margin of the material and spiritual advantages of a free society. We have no honest choice to do otherwise in view of the Communist threat. Having finally decided to run instead of walk, we can and, I believe, we will win the race.

Second, we should be making a vigorous effort in space development, in space exploration, and in space competence, even if no other nation were doing anything at all in space. The potential benefits flowing from this effort are so great that we would have no right to deprive our children or future generations of them, regardless of what the Communists decided to do.

Third, I believe that the values received from our space efforts will exceed the costs many times over. These values will be reflected in education, in medicine, in metallurgy, in international prestige, in diplomatic negotiations, in defense against aggression, and in higher standards of living generally. We can get all that for an annual expenditure averaging perhaps 1 percent of our gross national product.

Those generalizations indicate my attitude toward the space program. Now, I want to draw your attention to some aspects of the space picture which may fit more specifically into the discussion anticipated here today.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 states that it is the policy of the United States that "activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

That is a sound policy for any vigorous, peace-loving nation. Even though it is sound, however, I know also that it is sometimes misinterpreted. It does not mean that space has no military or defense uses.

I believe that the Defense Department's space vehicles such as ICBM's, Midas, Samos, and others, in the hands of the United States, are designed for peaceful purposes. Nothing is more essential for peace than the capability to discourage or deter attack.

In my view, we do not have a division between peaceful and nonpeaceful objectives for space. Rather, we have space missions to help keep the peace, and space missions to help increase our ability to live well in peace.

The Space Act itself goes on to recognize this dual approach to peaceful uses of space in its subsequent language. For example, it states that a civilian agency (NASA) shall exercise control over aeronautical and space activities, except that the Department of Defense shall have the responsibility for those activities primarily associated with our national defense. Moreover, the act requires that there be an exchange of information on space between the Department of Defense and the NASA. If only one agency were expected to be fully responsible for space programs, there would be no occasion for that provision.

Furthermore, the act created the National Aeronautics and Space Council to advise and assist the President in a whole series of functions involving policies, plans, and programs of all departments and agencies engaged in space activities.

While I do not want to dwell upon it, I do pause to mention a historical footnote. When the proposed language for this act was sent to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government in 1958, it was phrased so as not to give clear responsibility to the Department of Defense for space activities primarily associated with military missions. It is possible that this omission was a result of careless drafting or evidence of disinterest in military application to space or just optimism regarding our military position relative to that of the Communists. In any event, the Congress saw the error and changed the language.

As I just pointed out, the Space Act created a Space Council. There also was no provision for this policy-level organization in the original bill. As most of you know, even after the act was passed, the Space Council was left dormant, and it was not until the new administration came in that the Council was given the go-ahead to function.

The Council's responsibilities to advise and assist the President are as broad and comprehensive as the President may request. They are not limited to one or two agencies of the Government, but rather are applicable to the entire aeronautics and space field. For example, in one policy assignment handled by the Council, nine Government agencies were directly involved.

It is within the scope of the Council's functions to look into matters of duplication and to make recommendations for actions regarding such duplication. In my

judgment, it is more important to cure duplications of omission than duplications of performance. In the latter the job gets done even though it may be done wastefully, while in the former the job doesn't get done at all.

The following are some of the actions in which the Space Council has participated, since its revitalization almost 6 months ago:

1. Drafted an amendment to the Space Act, which put the Vice President on the Council, as its Chairman. The other permanent members are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of NASA, and the Chairman of the AEC;

2. Recommended the policy decision to accelerate the large booster program and proceed toward a manned lunar trip under NASA's direction;

3. Coordinated and submitted to the President an overall new space program which was presented to and passed by the Congress. This included the new project for a large solid fuel rocket to be developed by the Department of Defense;

4. Assisted in the decision to include AEC's nuclear power unit in a scheduled Defense Department launching;

5. Prepared and recommended to the President the communication satellite policy;

6. Prepared and recommended to the President a policy on the Defense Department's West Ford project.

I have heard again and again convincing statements as to the advantages for some types of missions that manned aircraft have over manned missiles. Many of these same arguments stand up equally well in comparing manned spacecraft with unmanned spacecraft. In both cases we need both.

The advantages of men in space vehicles seem to me to be obvious. There are observations, maneuvers, actions, and inactions concerning which decisions can be made by men and cannot be made by instruments alone. These facts are equally applicable, in my judgment, whether the spacecraft is on a mission to maintain the peace or on a mission limited to increasing our scientific knowledge.

I conclude these brief remarks with a perhaps unsophisticated but nevertheless alarming thought. The Communists have expressed their determination to dominate the world, and they will use all methods available for attaining that objective. We are already well aware of their use of space accomplishments as well as pronouncements and other actions to increase tensions and influence negotiations. They now have manned spacecraft, and they are pushing to increase this capability. You may be sure that they are not spending such effort and resources unless they believe firmly that it can be justified in terms of world domination. Manned spacecraft can be used, in the hands of aggressors as well as in the hands of defenders, for active military purposes. In the hands of Communists, they can also be used for blackmail purposes.

We do not dare leave this field to those who would destroy in order to gain power, just as we do not dare to leave empty-handed those who would build in order to retain freedom.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most lucid and logical analyses of conditions currently prevailing in the United Nations—and their effect on the United States and the world in general—appeared in the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat on September 20. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress. I am today sending copies to President Kennedy and to U.S. representatives to the United Nations.

The death of Dag Hammarskjold may very well have touched off the final countdown for the very life of the United Nations. If, otherwise, operations were to continue along present lines, then its demise would be a service to nations of the free world. For too long the organization has inclined toward fratricide, with each succeeding victim obviously having been marked for destruction by the association of assassins in the Kremlin.

The record speaks for itself. From the time that the organization came into being, countless millions of peoples have been swallowed into the Communist orbit. Contrariwise, how many human beings have been permitted to shed the Communist yoke during that period? The answer is that only those able to break successfully from the prison that is communism have gained their freedom. Not a single inch of land has been released from the Red terror through action of the United Nations.

What has been happening in the Congo is nothing less than tragic. The United Nations, most of whose financial support comes from U.S. taxpayers, is even today providing the arms, the men, and the orders for a virtual war on the one province of that region which has preferred to be identified with the West. Yes, the single anti-Communist unit in the Congo is not allowed to be free, independent, and non-Communist because the United Nations will not permit it to be.

What is on the agenda ahead is even more disgraceful and immoral. Red China has been permitted to advance to the threshold and now awaits only the opening of the doors which have already been unlocked. Such action will not only bring representatives of this country into association with another band of murderous beasts, but it will also make possible for these bloody bandits to enter this country with diplomatic status. Under the circumstances it might be hoped that Red Chinese delegates would enter New York from the west rather than by way of the Atlantic for it would be too great a humiliation to expose the Statue of Liberty to this type of experience. Here is a part of that famous poem on the tablet at the pedestal of the statue:

"Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!" cries she with silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor. Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

The tired, the poor, the homeless—yes. Archcriminals, murderers, fiends—no.

If, on the other hand, the United Nations becomes the moral force as envisioned as a possibility by the editor of the Tribune-Democrat, then it may not be in its adult years the utter futility of its infancy and maturity. The background of the United Nations, it is true, was not conducive to good breeding. One of its principal designers was later found to be a traitor to this country, and Stalin's bloody fingerprints cannot be erased from the charter.

Its upbringing has taken place in an environment that would challenge the will of even the most virtuous. With a membership consisting of many hoodlums, thugs, and shoe pounders, it is understandable that the organization could not continually remain on the straight and narrow. The fact that it has followed other courses all too often, however, cannot be overlooked. If it is ready to reform, then we must forgive and encourage. If it is not, there is no alternative but to do it in before it extends its disservice to humanity and to the world.

FUTURE OF WORLD DID NOT REST ON LIFE OF ONE MAN

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold was unquestionably a man of great ability and great integrity, and a diplomat of the first order. His shocking death, not yet fully explained, at this particular moment in history plunges the United Nations into disorder—partly because the Soviet Union intends to make it difficult to choose a successor of comparable quality.

Yet it is possible to grieve sincerely for the untimely death of a world leader without wringing our hands over the potential results of his death upon the future of the world. That future did not rest upon the shoulders of one man. It rests upon the courage, foresight, and initiative of all the leaders and all the citizens of the earth who are determined to preserve human freedom and security.

We tend too much in this and other countries to choose a leader, and then wash our hands of further responsibility and leave the decisions up to him. To a considerable degree that was done with the late Secretary General Hammarskjold. The United Nations and the world depended too much on him, and looked to him to preserve the U.N. against the assaults of its, and our, enemies. That he accepted this burden does not alter the fact that it was too heavy for one man to carry.

Now the United States, the most powerful nation the world has ever seen, is compelled to accept the responsibility its power imposes upon it. It must become in truth the leader of the so-called free world—that is, the portion of the world which is determined to avoid submission to the monstrous despotism of the aggressive Communist conspiracy. Moscow does not alone possess the power of veto in the U.N. We have it too. The Soviet Union does not have a preponderance of nuclear weapons. We have that, as the resumption of Soviet testing confesses.

But above all the United States has the great moral issue in this contest of wills. It is not the United States which raises barber wire entanglements and concrete walls to keep people from fleeing its oppressions. It is not the United States which rattles nuclear bombs over the heads of smaller nations for purposes of intimidation. No one fears America. Fear is the weapon of the Soviet Union and Red China—along with intrigue, subversion, and conspiratorial secrecy.

The men of Moscow hated Dag Hammarskjold, because they could not intimidate

him. Whatever and whomever they cannot control, they seek to destroy. Wherever they are in control, the people suffer. Their empire is infested with human discontent. They rob their victims of all but subsistence, and allow them that only because it is necessary to procure their labor. And this grim, unholy tyranny they propose to inflict upon all the peoples of all the earth.

We can no longer temporize with this corruption that has spread across too much of the earth. There is talk of possible choice of some neutral, in Hammarskjold's place, who will be acceptable to Moscow. That way lies disaster. Khrushchev has said himself there is no neutral man. How can there be, when the issue is between the armed and murderous burglar and the policeman? To permit a wishy-washy compromiser to hold this position would be fatal.

Either the United Nations represents a great moral principle, or it is worse than useless. If it admits Red China, whose hands still are red from the blood of United Nations soldiery, to membership it forfeits its right to be regarded as a moral force in the world. If it accepts the veto in the Secretary Generalship, or puts in that office one who stands neuter between the Communist horror and the bright hopes of freedom, it forfeits its right to represent humanity.

If it must perish, as the League of Nations did, because its members do not have the courage of their convictions, then perish it must. For it will no longer be a useful instrument of world policy—only a forum in which the conflicts of the world are aggravated.

Perhaps, now that Dag Hammarskjold is gone and the stark clarity of the conflict between archaic despotism and forward looking democracy is no longer obscured by his presence at the head of the world organization, the smaller nations will be able to see more clearly their own responsibilities—and their own destinies. If they do, Hammarskjold in death will have done what he had hoped, and failed, to do in life.

The choice is clear, and the smaller nations must make it. They hold the life or death of the United Nations in their hands. In any event, the United States will survive—perhaps not as we would wish it, perhaps for a time as a garrison state armed to the teeth, but it will never be conquered by any outside force. Not so, the wavering or the nonalined. They can find security only in allying themselves with the one power that can protect, but does not threaten them.

Let us be sure they understand this, and understand that their moment of decision has come. We do not contend that they must stand with us, but that they must stand with the future dignity, security, and self-government of mankind.

Remarks by Congressman Daddario at Air Force Association Symposium on "Space and National Security"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to discuss some phases of our national space program and the need to utilize our resources and facilities wisely when I participated in the symposium on space and national security at the Air Force Association panel on September 22 in Philadelphia. I offer my remarks for the RECORD:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DADDARIO AT AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM ON "SPACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY"

Previous speakers, Dr. Welsh and Dr. Dornberger, have spelled out the threat that confronts us as the result of the Russian space effort. I need not take the time to reiterate their views in support of the idea that such a threat exists.

It is obvious that the Russian space program has increased the prestige and power of that nation throughout the world. One needed only to view the first sputnik as it hurtled out of the western sky—as I did with my children and my neighbors—to be impressed. But on that day as I looked at those small faces turned to the sky, I could not help but feel that the excitement generated was one of wonder and not of fear. Since then, the Russians have put up 12 sputniks. Over 65 percent of the sputnik satellites have carried living specimens. This series has included a dummy mechanical man, biological tests with living animals and radiation instrumentation. The 11th flew Gagarin; the 12th, Titov. As these advances have been made, the wonder has become saturated with fear. For people cannot believe that the Russian space effort, once fully developed, will not be used for military purposes as part of their arsenal of weapons and vehicles.

I have for some 3 years now heard conflicting and diverse views as to how this threat should be met. Indeed, I have often heard it pronounced that the Russians have no intention to use their space capabilities for military purposes. If we were to follow that school of thought, we could one day wake up to a sky full of armed satellites hovering impregnable in space over the critical centers of the free world, and from that moment freedom would be lost forever. I would doubt if there is one U.S. intelligence estimate which suggests that we should develop our own strength on the basis that Russian intentions in space are peaceful.

As one step toward meeting the Russian challenge in space we must solve the problem of antimissile missile system. Our defensive capacities must include such a system as a beginning toward the preparation of a defense against satellites.

We already have a formidable capability available to us as we face the Russian challenge. Our soldiers have learned to live dug into the Arctic ice pack for months on end. The wide variations between heat and cold on a moon constantly bombarded by meteorites will most likely force us to live beneath its surface. These skills learned here on earth can be readily transferred to use in the moon program.

Similarly the Navy's experience in submarine work, where men live and operate in closed environments, is most valuable to research. The test on long undersea voyages with an atomic submarine is comparable to experiences that will be undergone in space travel.

The Air Force offers the most valuable talents, for its mission has been to place man in the widely divergent environments in which he must exist. It has put man through the stresses of extremes of temperature, speed, and endurance. Space is a natural challenge to the Air Force, and the target of the Moon, Mars, and Venus are logical steps to the conquest of this frontier. For our security depends on the adaptability of our defense capabilities to use all environments and to prevent them from being used against us. Abundant technological know-how is available in private industry. Research and development skills are of the highest order and only the call and the direction to be of service is awaited. And in the establishment of NASA we have a civilian agency with exceedingly great opportunities to assist in this effort.

It has always been my idea that there is nothing mysterious in this challenge in space and that our technical resources—civilian and military—are available in sufficient amounts not only to catch up to the Russians but to surpass them, and this before they can seize space for their own exclusive use.

What then must we do?

First of all, we must utilize all of the skills, resources, and facilities available to us. The Space Act of 1958 says that activities in this field must be conducted in such a way that we achieve the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States, with close cooperation among all interested agencies of the United States in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities and equipment.

This legislative directive must be strictly enforced. Every Government laboratory and the personnel attached thereto must be utilized to the fullest. Additional laboratories should not be built unless they are absolutely necessary. There should be the minimum dislocation of personnel. Ways and means must be established to support necessary existing projects while we utilize available personnel and facilities to meet this new challenge and develop the additional base for the intensified effort. For while I have said sufficient capacity exists, there is not the time to allow for inefficiency or misdirection.

By Presidential directive dated March 6, 1961, the Air Force was made the primary DOD agency to manage space programs. In this respect the directive carried out, I believe, the principle set forth in the report of Dr. Jerome Wiesner and his committee that recommended the President establish a single responsibility within the military establishments for managing the military portion of the space program. It is my belief that this should be carried further to be made effective. One Department of Defense representative should be named to deal directly with NASA in all matters affecting the use of facilities and personnel to accomplish missions, both civilian and military.

In that way, and under such circumstances, we can achieve the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States as we approach the accomplishment of national goals in space.

Let us consider as an example the moon program as such. President Kennedy has assigned a top priority to this project. Yet, both civilian and military experts who have discussed it have mentioned many intermediary problems that exist which must be solved as part of this effort. Civilian authorities have testified that these should be taken in order and solved before we try the more ambitious problems. One scientist has testified that there are basic biological investigations that are going to have to be made if we take seriously sending man to the moon and to the planets. Observers more aware of the Air Force capabilities and the Air Force program have stated that the lunar project is a natural focus for the vast space activity. They feel, as do the civilian scientists, that in order to achieve a manned lunar landing and return certain basic space capabilities must be developed. These are the same capabilities required for a large scale military, scientific, and technological utilization of space. They are military necessities and vital to our national security in the opinion of no less an authority than our moderator.

Yet, I think there is a basic difference in approach between the civilian and military proponents. The civilian scientists who have

testified in this area in the past have appeared to me to be cautious to an extreme. They wish to move slowly from step by step, to reach their goal, without the necessary urgency. The Air Force, however, because of its experience in taking man into increasingly hostile environments, wants to recognize a specific terminal goal of the moon landing as the logical extension of progressive development of greater capabilities in the uses of space.

My concern is to move together on these two paths. We must make sure that the civilian approach does not overlook the capabilities which are militarily useful and necessary in its scientific quest. So far, we have heard much of the usefulness of instruments in American programs with occasional efforts to downgrade the role of man. Yet, I submit that beyond the question of exploration of this environment must always lie the question of how man can control the uses of that environment to enhance his own security and well-being.

There is, of course, the clear and obvious reason that the development of space has identified it as another avenue of approach in the military sense, to be recognized in security planning. The position of the moon makes it a logical, critical terrain feature in this possible theater of operations. However, just as important from the view of space science is the data we will learn from lunar exploration, by instrument as well as by manned probes that may lead to solutions of questions regarding extraterrestrial life, the origins of the solar system and of life itself and the exploitation of resources which may lie fallow in and among the planets for the benefit of mankind.

We have no alternate choice. We are bound by the ingredients of time, money, manpower and materiel. They offer challenges in themselves that must be met. How well we manage them will determine our success. The development of outer space is a national goal. The civilian and the military must work side by side in this space effort and break down any barriers that exist between them. Let us remember that when our big boosters roar upward at Cape Canaveral, the words lettered on them will not read "NASA" or "Department of Defense," but simply: "United States."

The IMF and the World Monetary Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD remarks by Mr. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, on the IMF and the world monetary order, at the annual meeting of the Fund in Vienna, Austria, September 18, 1961:

When we consider the Fund's role in the monetary system, it is valuable to keep in mind the two complementary aspects of the Fund's financial activities: on the one hand, the granting of financial assistance by the Fund to help countries to meet an unbalanced position; on the other hand, the assurance that the country receiving the assistance will be taking the necessary measures to restore a proper balance. For such measures to be effective, it is indispensable that the authorities in the country receiving the assistance must be convinced that the restoration of the balance is in their true interest. As the Duke of Vienna said in "Measure for Measure," the one play of Shakespeare to be set in this city of Vienna: "The satisfaction I would require is likewise your own benefit." It is precisely when this identity of interest is fully realized that the programs which are supported by Fund assistance can be carried out in a spirit of mutual confidence and the desired success achieved. For that result, the countries must feel that stability is essential for their welfare as the only true foundation for sustained growth. In taking this view they can be encouraged by the evidence that those countries which have persisted in their efforts, and accepted the transitional difficulties of carrying out a stabilization program, have succeeded in staging an impressive rate of growth.

One of the requirements for economic progress is the availability for investment of real resources, and these cannot for any length of time be obtained by inflationary methods of financing. This is an old truth, but it seems that it has to be rediscovered over and over again. To obtain genuine resources requires, of course, effort. At the time when the richer countries are making considerable efforts to provide resources for the aid of the less-developed countries, these countries in turn will have to make the maximum effort to mobilize their own resources, and, through stability, create the conditions for the domestic and foreign resources to be used in the most effective manner. In creating these conditions, a great many countries have had the support of the Fund, and there can be no doubt that the Fund has thus contributed to the growth in production and trade that has occurred during the last few years.

All this seems clear enough, but I believe it is not convincing to all minds. While I think that nobody will want to maintain that sustained growth can be based on monetary disorder, there seems not seldom to be a lingering fear that stability will mean reduced economic activity, and even stagnation. It is true, of course, that stability is not enough, for the real national objective should be economic growth. Economic growth can be compared with the construction of a good house, with stability as its foundations. A good house can only be erected on solid foundations. Preparing the foundations, however, is not sufficient. There must be further initiative and activity and the necessary resources must be acquired to complete the building. In some countries it seems that the restoration of monetary stability has almost by itself led to a resurgence of activity, and soon produced the savings to finance it. But this is not always the case; in many countries special domestic efforts are needed, and for these efforts to be effective they have often to be supplemented by international assistance, technical and financial. To introduce monetary stability is often only the beginning of the efforts needed to achieve growth. While the subsequent efforts largely fall outside the sphere of Fund activities, the Fund does not underrate their importance and, insofar as it can, is anxious to assist these efforts in every possible way.

Broadly speaking, the financial assistance given by the Fund helps individual countries to keep in line with general monetary trends in the world economy, while avoiding measures that would be disturbing to international trade. This is an important task, but it does not exhaust the scope of monetary action. Our monetary system has to serve an expanding economy. It is not suggested that credit measures alone can engender a high rate of growth; the fiscal and economic structure and the whole range of social and market practices are of vital importance. It may, for instance, be important to remove maladjustments due to mistaken budgetary policies or in the cost and price structure which would retard growth. The conditions under which foreign trade is carried on are also important—and with the new trading arrangements now being established, particular attention must be paid to these aspects. The Fund in its work is naturally interested in these questions, but pays particular attention to matters of monetary policy.

Under modern conditions, the gold flow does not set fixed limits to the possible expansion of credit or international liquidity. Within each country the credit volume may be expanded in response to demand; and the monetary authorities can also take positive action to stimulate, and provide the basis for, credit expansion. Since the Second World War, on the whole, the problem has been to contain the expansion of credit rather than to stimulate it. All countries have been more or less involved in this process, but those countries that are responsible for a high proportion of the world's production and trade must be necessarily play a major role. They are aware, however, that even they cannot act independently of the general trend, and are therefore bound to act in cooperation with each other. Sometimes similar, sometimes complementary, policies will have to be pursued according to the ever-changing situation. The methods of cooperation will vary; there will be direct contacts, but there will increasingly be reliance on international institutions.

In article I of the Articles of Agreement, which sets out the purposes of the Fund, financial assistance by the Fund is only one of the purposes. It is also the objective of the Fund to promote exchange stability and orderly exchange arrangements; to assist in the establishment of a multilateral system of payments; to facilitate the expansion of international trade, and thereby to increase the productive resources of members; and to act as a center of collaboration and consultation. Indeed, without the close contact between the Fund and competent authorities in member countries, it is difficult to see how any of the purposes of the Fund could be achieved. This has been proved time and again to be the case in the annual consultations with article XIV countries. Already excellent results have been obtained in the consultations that have been begun with article VIII countries. Here it is a question of voluntary cooperation, and for that reason I believe that these consultations will be more, and not less, effective. The cooperation has to be inspired by the notion that countries have a common interest as partners in the international monetary system. This system has to be strengthened where it is vulnerable; but the policies pursued must be such that the system plays its proper role in the process of economic expansion. To observe, on the one hand, the necessary monetary discipline, and, on the other, to respond to the needs of expansion is no easy task. It raises many problems, but it is my impression that these problems are now being tackled more effectively than ever before, and with greatly increased chances of success.

Small Business—the Backbone of Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 I had the honor and pleasure of par-

ticipating in the 80th birthday anniversary celebration of the Brubaker Tool Corp. at Millersburg, Pa. The highlight of the program was the reading of essays of four students of the Millersburg-Upper Paxton High School on the subject "Small Business—the Backbone of Rural America." The second, third, and fourth prize winners were: Polly Dodson, Penny Hottenstein and Jane McCormick.

I would like to include, as part of my remarks, the first prize essay by Miss Anne Sheetz for which she won $250. Both the construction of this essay and the analysis it contains are excellent. It illustrates how keen and alert our young people of today are. Miss Sheetz' essay follows:

SMALL BUSINESS—THE BACKBONE OF RURAL AMERICA

Please read that title again—it states one of the most essential facts about our Nation—one that many of us never stop to think about. We all know that every human body needs a backbone—for support, shape, and transportation. And, rural America needs a backbone, too. Just as the human spine provides support for those 12 pairs of ribs, so also does small business support 12 advantages for rural America. Now, let's consider each of these so-called pairs of ribs in the life of a small community.

Naturally, the first advantage, provided by small business, which we students think of is the encouragement that it gives to us to complete our high school educations. By promising the high school graduate a good job in his own hometown and with excellent chances to get ahead, it urges him to obtain his diploma. And, as the number of graduates from high school is increased, our educational system is strengthened.

The next advantage, which is outstanding in a democratic country, is the promoting of the ideals of free enterprise and competition, both so essential to maintain this land of freedom. Small business provides a means whereby any courageous citizen may start his own industry, independent of any socialistic concern. It also aids in furthering competition, which is necessary if monopolies and unjust prices on consumers are to be avoided. Thus, we find two of the basic American ideals firmly guarded by the small business.

The third "pair of ribs" that small industry supports is that of providing employment to the people of nearby areas. Thousands of American breadwinners find excellent jobs in local small businesses. Also as important are the jobs made available to mothers and older people who desire work, but find it impossible to journey more than a few miles each day to obtain it.

In direct connection with this is the fourth advantage—the raising of the standard of living of the occupants of the nearby region. More money in the hands of these people means a greater buying capacity. A greater buying capacity means more luxuries and, as a result, a higher standard of living.

Now comes our fifth "pair of ribs"—the fringe benefits which aid the ordinary individual in times of trouble, illness, and old age. Small business provides for each one of its employees a certain amount of insurance, etc., which he probably would not have if he were self-employed or working on a farm. Then, if an accident should happen, his family would not be plunged into poverty due to the lack of funds for medical purposes.

Next, we must not forget the markets which small business provides for the raw materials—especially farm products—which are produced in the area. Herein is found our sixth advantage. For example, a grain mill in a rural section furnishes a nearby market for the farmers' produce of wheat, barley, etc.

Small business also aids the growth of the community—our seventh "pair of ribs." It encourages more people to move into the surrounding area, making it possible to be near their everyday jobs. As the business grows, likewise the community will grow and prosper.

In addition to this, is the eighth benefit—that of providing donations to the community. These donations may take the form of monetary contributions to such drives as the United Fund, or they may take the form of the construction of special institutions, such as libraries or museums. Thus, the region benefits culturally.

Members of the surrounding area especially enjoy the ninth advantage of small business—that of purchasing goods directly from the plant at a reduced price. A private blouse factory, for example, may be able to produce a larger amount of garments from the material allotted than is required by the market. These can then be sold at a reduced price to local consumers.

Still another way whereby the community benefits from small business is through the collection of local taxes. Factories, as well as private citizens, are required to pay a certain amount to the support of schools, local government, etc. Thus the small business helps to maintain the vital institutions of the rural community.

The 11th advantage consists of keeping the employees of the community in the town. Small business furnishes a local means for them to gain jobs. This prevents large-scale commuting and fosters a more closely knit community.

The 12th and last "pair of ribs" supported by small business is that of encouraging the establishment of more local enterprises. One factory may require special materials for its processes. Surely it would be more convenient, as well as money-saving, to be able to acquire these products from a nearby plant, set up for the express purpose of supplying them. And, there are many forward-looking men who are willing to grasp the opportunity of establishing such a plant, thereby creating another small business in the locality.

Thus, we have completed the 12 essential ribs of rural America. And, all are supported by that sturdy backbone—small business.

The Brubaker Tool Corp., was founded 80 years ago by the Brubaker family. Up until 6 years ago, it was owned and operated by the family. At that time Mr. Charles G. Beavers, Jr., and associates, bought into the company, but the new management has continued the old traditions established by the Brubakers of being a small busines concern employing local people and always aiming at perfection in its products.

Brubaker's quality metal cutting tools have kept pace with the revolution that has been taking place in America's transportation industry—from the necessary tools required by the steam locomotive industry, spanning to the special tools needed in today's space age by the aviation and missile industries.

There are many milestones in the company's growth including its service to war production during World War I and II, but Brubaker is also most proud of the fact that its tools were selected by Adm. Richard E. Byrd for both his 1929 and 1933 Antarctic expeditions. Commanding the best equipped expeditions ever, Admiral Byrd selected Brubaker tools for his metal cutting needs.

Brubaker is today not only a supplier to the aircraft, missile and automotive industries, but is also meeting the most exacting requirements of the optical and instrument industries. It has 250 employees under the management team of Charles E. Beavers, Jr., president, ably assisted by Martin E. Butters, John W. Dowding and James E. Barnette, all of Millersburg, Pa., and George N. Fairchilds and A. William Tilder, of Camp Hill, Pa.

Report by Congressman William H. Avery to the 1st Congressional District of Kansas on the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, each year a report is given the residents of my district. The following is the report for the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

The session began by focusing attention on the domestic proposals of the new administration and concluded with foreign affairs and national defense as the prime points of discussion and emphasis.

The Berlin crisis prompted an administration request for increased defense spending giving us the largest defense budget in peacetime history. The total is $46.66 billion of which $3.45 billion was requested by the President after the Berlin crisis. The Eisenhower defense budget request for fiscal year 1962 was $41.86 billion. Total appropriations by this session was $92,500 million.

For legislative purposes, the 1st session of the 87th Congress was the longest session since World War II with the exception of 1949–50, which was during the Korean crisis.

During the 147 days the House and Senate were in session, over 14,026 bills and measures were introduced, and 20,244 pages of proceedings were amassed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some 600 bills were enacted into law.

According to the Parliamentarians of the House and Senate, there may have been a possible "first" accomplished during the session. During the last day of the session, the House and Senate agreed to an adjournment resolution which meant each body could adjourn at its pleasure when its work was done. In the wee hours the House passed the supplemental appropriation bill for the executive agencies and then adjourned. The Senate was forced either to accept the bill as passed or there would be no supplemental appropriation, which was essential for the executive agencies. The Senate was compelled to pass the House version. According to the memories of the longtime Hill staff employees, this is probably the first time

one body was able to "force" the other body into affirmative action on a bill.

During the session, your Congressman had a 100-percent attendance record for the meetings of the Rules, Small Business, and Private Calendar Committees, answered 111 quorum calls, and had a 99.1-percent voting attendance record As ranking minority member of the Private Calendar Committee, personally worked on almost one-half of the 423 private bills which came before the three-man committee.

This year it was the honor of your Congressman to receive a recognition which only one other Kansas Congressman has enjoyed. Out of 173 Republican Representatives, your Congressman was selected to serve as one of five on the important House Rules Committee. Generally, the membership of the committee is chosen to represent all areas of the country. The Rules Committee must approve legislation before it is considered by the House.

As an indication of the office operation for the period January 1 to September 1, 1961, a total of almost 25,000 pieces of mail were received. This included over 8,500 first-class letters from the district. There were mailed out during this period about 21,000 pieces of mail, of which 14,225 was first-class mail. In addition, we received almost 150 newspapers per week from the district and 15 per week from elsewhere. During the year, a record number of visitors was recorded. The guest book in the office shows some 650 visitors since the first of the year.

The following is a brief summary of appropriations and some Federal activity for our district:

Civil works projects (flood control activity), $15,075,000.

Soil conservation and ACP work, $2,021,250.

Military construction, $1,827,000.

One of the most significant activities of your office in Washington was the continuation of the "Week in Washington" nonpartisan educational project for college juniors to learn government firsthand. The following schools participate—Kansas University, Kansas State University, Washburn University, St. Benedict's College, and Mount St. Scholastica College. The schools select the students solely on the basis of merit and academic achievement with the only requirement that they be residents of the State of Kansas.

While in Washington, the students visit Congress, committee hearings, both national committees and historic sites. Appointments are arranged with members of both political parties. In general, it is our desire to have the students attempt to obtain a general picture of practical lawmaking and politics at the national level. To date, 20 students have participated. Among the group have been two Rhodes scholars, and one Woodrow Wilson fellowship recipient. The total of honor and academic achievements amassed by the students at their respective schools is astounding. It is interesting to note the majority of students have indicated a desire to continue their education in graduate work to prepare for the teaching profession.

Here is a listing of some of the bills introduced by your Congressman.

Introduced and testified before Judiciary Committee on a bill to provide for the appointment of a third Federal judge for Kansas. A bill providing for additional Federal judges throughout the Nation, including Kansas, enacted into public law.

Introduced legislation to extend the conservation reserve of the soil bank for 3 years. Incorporated into feed grain program.

Offered an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act to insure adequacy of the railroad car supply.

Introduced a bill authorizing the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County. At Avery request, National Park Service held special meetings with local residents and is in contact with House Interior Committee requesting that a congressional hearing be held in the area. Among the newspapers endorsing this proposal are the Topeka Daily Capital, Manhattan Mercury, Kansas City Star, New York Times, Washington Star, Christian Science Monitor, and the Washington Post.

Proposed amendment to Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women.

Has a bill to amend Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax reform for small and independent business.

Introduced a bill to provide for reduction in Commodity Credit wheat holdings and restricting quantity of wheat marketable from producers for domestic and export users.

Introduced six private bills for the relief of certain constituents. Two bills have passed the House, one has been enacted into public law, one case has been successfully resolved by administrative remedy, and the other bills are pending before the House Judiciary Committee.

The following is a listing of the votes cast by your Congressman on major legislation acted on by the House during the first session:

Supported bills authorizing additional military funds for national defense including increased strength of all branches of the Armed Forces, stepped-up Polaris program, B–58 bomber production, improvement of military bases, missile sites, and nuclear submarine bases.

Voted against taxpayer funds being spent for subsidized electric power for preferential areas—Hanford project.

Voted against resolution to enlarge or "pack" the House Rules Committee.

Voted for the feed grain program and also for the 1962 wheat program.

Opposed back-door spending provisions for foreign aid program; voted for long-term planning.

Voted for Latin-American program for development and economic progress.

Opposed the establishment of the Peace Corps program on a permanent basis and as another separate and costly Government agency.

Voted for establishment of a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

Supported the resolution expressing the sense of Congress against seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Voted for temporary program to extend unemployment compensation and the bill which applies similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Voted for increase in minimum wage but opposed broad extension of coverage to include "local retail establishments."

Voted against establishment of $394 million area redevelopment program.

Voted to extend corporate, liquor, cigarette, and automobile excise tax and the provision raising temporary limit on national debt.

Supported authorization for funds and necessary taxes for completion of Federal interstate highway program.

Supported bill applying Federal laws to crime committed on airplanes engaged in interstate commerce and make hijacking punishable by life imprisonment.

Voted to extend present Federal Airport Act to provide Federal funds to improve air safety measures.

Supported changes in Social Security Act to increase monthly insurance payments, to increase benefits to widows, and provide male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62.

Voted for extension of aid to federally impacted school districts and extension of the National Defense Education Act for 1 year.

Opposed $4.9 billion 4-to-5-year housing program.

Voted against the broad Federal aid to education program providing funds for teachers' salaries and construction of facilities to public and private schools in House Rules Committee.

Supported bill to expand and extend program for Federal grants to States and communities for construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and studies to improve services for aged outside hospitals.

Voted for tax deductions for professional self-employed who set aside income for voluntary pension plan (H.R. 10).

Voted for bill permitting reduced retirement benefits at age 62 under railroad retirement system.

Supported program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act.

Voted for extension of school milk program.

Supported authorization to help local communities finance projects to combat juvenile delinquency.

Supported bill to extend life of the Civil Rights Commission.

Supported legislation designed to fight the interstate gambling and crime operations, such as the numbers racket.

Voted for extension of direct housing loan program for World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

Supported increase in rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

Opposed the expansion of the water pollution control program costing some $58 million.

Voted for funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including research on solid and nuclear propellants.

Supported amendment to Subversive Activities Control Act to bar employment on waterfront facilities and U.S. merchant marine vessels of persons who refuse to answer questions on Communist affiliations.

Favored resolution expressing sense of Congress that Organization of American States reevaluate the role of Cuba in inter-American affairs.

Voted for bill granting permament authority for admission of alien orphans to the United States for the purpose of adoption.

During adjournment, I will be traveling through the First District and will also visit Geary, Wabaunsee, and Wyandotte Counties to meet residents who will be included in our district pursuant to the recent reapportionment. While your office in Washington will be open to take care of your inquiries, we also will have an office in the Hotel Jayhawk, Topeka. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you feel I can be of assistance.

Remarks by Dr. Walter R. Dornberger, Vice President, Bell Aerosystems Co., at Air Force Association Symposium on "Space and National Security"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter R. Dornberger, a pioneer in rocketry, recently discussed the implications of the Russian space program in a talk at the Air Force Association symposium on "Space and National Security" at Philadelphia on September 22. In this speech, which has attracted wide attention, Dr. Dornberger said that the Russian capability in space, used as a tool to obtain world domination, contains the biggest threat of our time in his opinion. I believe his remarks are well worth the attention of the House, and I offer them for the RECORD.

REMARKS BY DR. WALTER R. DORNBERGER, VICE PRESIDENT, BELL AEROSYSTEMS CO., AT AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM ON "SPACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY"

Throughout history it has been of vital importance for any great, growing, and prosperous nation to gain military superiority in the three areas in which military operations take place—on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. Since the last war, space has been added to these areas as a fourth potential field of military operations.

Therefore, in spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, we should have no doubt that the Russian political and military strategists are aiming at military superiority in space. In the last 15 years the decisive role of space for the domination of earth has become increasingly evident. Let me quote just two statements, the first one made by our President a half year ago. President Kennedy said: "Who has superiority in space has superiority on earth." The second statement, made 2 months ago by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Eugene Zuckert, was: "The United States and the free world must insure that the means of earth domination inherent in space mastery not be preempted by the enemies of freedom. * * * The lesson is that through and from space, earth can be dominated."

Up to now, the Russian space effort has been thoroughly planned far ahead. It is obvious that scientists are not leading this effort, but rather political and military strategists on the highest level. This can be easily proved by the timing of their more spectacular achievement in space, a timing which has fitted so effectively into the overall Russian political strategy of the last few years.

Looking at the Russian space effort, we have to keep in mind that all participating agencies have to follow the directives given by the highest Soviet authority, therewith serving the political ends of this authority, whose objective is world domination.

History should have taught us that moral restraints such as treaties or avowed peaceful use of space never have or ever will influence the actions of a dictator.

Any means will be employed which lead to the final objective.

We can be sure that the Communists have realized that a military stalemate now exists, which may prevent them from ever achieving their goal through conventional political or military means. They know that starting a modern war today means their destruction also. They know they have practically no superior diplomatic or military means available to follow through successfully with their aim at world domination either peacefully, by threat or by war. In such a situation the Russians would be utterly foolish not to direct their efforts toward military superiority in space. According to Khrushchev's repeated statements, they are convinced they are ahead of the free nations of the world in the conquest of this space. Here, I am sure, the Russians recognize an opportunity for obtaining a new and unique military superiority.

It is a fact that space, for the military strategist, is just an extension of his field of military operations into a vertical direction. When we consider, for example, the space between the upper layers of the atmosphere and the lower Van Allen belt, this area alone will be 10 times bigger than all other fields of military operations combined. In this area, without encountering yet unknown hazards, a whole arsenal of the most modern manned, as well as fully automatic weapon systems could be stored and deployed, some remaining in space permanently, some recoverable and reusable.

Besides many others, reconnaissance, weather, navigation, communication, and detection satellites the same as spacecraft for bombardment, inspection, interception, command, maintenance, and supply could contribute to this military space force. If an enforced agreement with Russia about the peaceful use of space cannot be obtained, we will find one day this variety of defensive and offensive weapon systems established and ready to operate.

I see today no unsolved fundamental technical problem preventing the Communists from achieving such a goal within the next 10 years.

Step by step the Soviet space program, starting shortly after the last war, is developing this capability. Today they place payloads manned and unmanned in space, five times heavier than ours. They have the reliable, high-thrust boosters as well as the accurate navigation and guidance systems to do it. By clustering their existing engines and by using solid rockets to assist takeoff, they will be able already in a few years—when we are just starting to use the Saturn—to increase this payload capability to 100 tons for close orbits around the earth. With this payload capability, it will be easy for them to develop, test and operate manned, maneuverable, recoverable military satellites with high reliability and able to rendezvous. Having solved this rendezvous problem, there should be no major difficulty to put the military space force previously described in action.

The Russians already have launched a deep space probe to Venus from a satellite in a parking orbit. It would be just as easy to launch payloads toward earth. With Titov's 24-hour flight they proved to be far beyond the study phase in bioastronautics and well ahead of our man-in-space program. The experience gained in these Russian space achievements—supposedly serving only peaceful purposes—by one single directive from the strategists can be fully utilized in the development and operation of any needed space weapon system.

At the International Law Association meeting in Hamburg, Germany, in September 1960, Prof. Vladimir Koretzki answered when he was asked about the Russian thinking with regard to the upper border of air sovereignty: "The upper border of air sovereignty is fixed by the necessity of any nation to protect its country."

That means the Russians don't recognize any limits in space. They don't care if any one of our space systems flies on a course over Russia or not. As long as they regard it as a threat, they will try to interfere with its mission.

We don't know which Russian space weapon systems will have top priority, but we can be sure that in the very near future, when the Russians are ready, another U–2 incident will occur, this time in space, and if they choose, at the right political moment for the Russians. The target may well be any one of our presently operating or planned satellites, and there is not much we can do about it with our available weapons systems.

Or the Russians may choose a different approach. We may not even learn that a Russian interception took place. They may deny everything and we have no means to prove it. They may try to keep this part of their space effort secret. Certainly they will camouflage it. They may have the ability to guide their manned interceptor space craft to any spot in near space, to land at will and wherever they want. They may keep their interceptor satellites silent and make them hard to track by optical means or by radar, which should not be too difficult.

Out of this first military action in space, a kind of hide-and-seek war in space will result, first without too much effect on the situation on earth. But the Russians will not rest until they have obtained complete control of the space effort of the free world. Our space systems, such as reconnaissance, weather, communication, navigation, detection and interception satellites, which are so vital for our defense and the survival of our Nation will be wiped out of space.

This way, the Russians will achieve military superiority in space. The impact on the political situation on earth can hardly be overestimated. By doing what the Russians are capable of doing in space within the very near future, by wiping out our space systems, they will indirectly weaken our military positions on the ground, on the sea and in the atmosphere. They will change the military balance between the communistic and the free world in their favor. They will achieve their final goal of dictating the conditions of survival to the free world without a war and without firing a single shot on earth.

In this Russian capability in space, used as a tool to obtain world domination, I see

the biggest threat of our time. To counteract this threat in time by appropriate measures is certainly the greatest challenge for our country.

How will we organize, how support financially, how best plan, how will we manage our space effort, what are our goals, where to put the emphasis—these are some of the vital questions for which we better have the answer today.

Space will be conquered for scientific, political, prestige, propaganda, economic and military reasons. All are interrelated. All are important. But I think the military reason is the only vital one. We have to defend the right to be there. That has to be recognized. We have to do everything we can to prevent the Russians from taking over and from controlling space.

I am not advocating that any one of our great civilian space efforts should be canceled or pursued with less eagerness in favor of the military effort. We have to pursue both programs with all we have.

For one single reason: What good would it be, if we really send a crew of three men within the next decade to the moon, getting a tremendous scientific and prestige gain, when coming back, these astronauts may find that the free world does not exist any more?

Let me wind up my short statement with a quotation from a speech the Prussian soldier King, Frederick II, the Great, made in 1760: "God will always be with the strongest battalion."

Let's Back Fight for Freedom—in Red Area, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article, which is quite timely—Frank Howley's editorial on the Berlin situation. Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, retired, is the vice president of New York University and the former Chief of American Military Government in Berlin. His appraisal of the Berlin crisis appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on August 18, 1961.

The article follows:

LET'S BACK FIGHT FOR FREEDOM—IN RED AREA, TOO

(By Frank Howley)

Here we go again. This time it is Berlin, but this is only part of the same old operation which has been clobbering us from one end of the world to the other. If anyone has any doubt that our defensive policy against Soviet machinations has failed, this is another proof.

We simply cannot survive on a basis of defending ourselves against Soviet attacks in places of their choice and at times of their selection.

What is happening in Berlin now is a repetition of what happened in Berlin when I was there in 1947, leading up to the blockade of Berlin in 1948. The main difference is that the Soviets, having succeeded then in blockading Berlin, have had 12 years of continued success against us in other parts of the world. They are being swept along by their repeated victories over us.

In Berlin right now they have simply shifted from the diplomatic to the physical. Khrushchev found that at the United Nations he could not have his way even after his rude behavior. The United Nations continues with the same president. Khrushchev found that by negotiation he was not succeeding in the disarmament conferences, because we would not throw away our security. He found that the atomic testing discussions were not giving him what he wanted.

So he shifts his emphasis from negotiation to physical efforts to gain control of Berlin. He fully expects to succeed as he has succeeded in the past.

REDS LOST, BUT WON

It must be remembered that the hunger blockade imposed upon the people of Berlin in 1948–49 was, from the Soviet point of view, though not a total success, still a success.

We were the ones who lost 72 lives. We were the ones who spent a billion dollars, and ended up with the Soviets holding complete control of one-third of the city of Berlin, despite the international agreements which had specified that the city be administered as a whole by all four powers.

This third of the city, now controlled ruthlessly by the Soviets—now harasses the other two-thirds.

In Berlin now comes, as it has in other places, first, propaganda; then, step by step, the use of force against the people. The Communists will try not to give the Western Powers sufficient basis for an all-out effort against them. That will only come from miscalculation, if it comes at all.

On the propaganda front it is Khrushchev who is screaming that Berlin is a bone in his throat. It is we who should have been screaming, during the past years, that the Soviet troops and the Soviet Communist stooges, imposed upon East Berlin and East Germany, constitute an outrageous violation of solemn agreements.

I anticipate that next harassment of Germans will come by way of shipping-clearance papers. A few years ago we permitted the Soviets to compel the use of such papers. All trucking being shipped in and out of Berlin must receive these clearance papers from the nonrecognized East German government.

When this power to control German traffic in and out of the highways, railroads and canals was put into effect by the Soviets, I reported to higher authority that this would be the means of the next blockade of Berlin—a subtle blockade.

THEY HOLD WEAPONS

It still can be done. The economic miracle of West Berlin can be brought down to a crawling economy of unemployment, if the East German government adopts the simple policy of delaying the approval of these clearance papers. Without them no truck, barge or train of the West Berliners can move in or out of the city.

I believe that the Communist stooge government of East Berlin and East Germany will not blockade the Western exit and entrance; or at least will not block the Western Powers from access to and from the city. Instead they will hurt the Berliners while giving us no excuse for major retaliation. They will continue, however, to nip away our rights until we have few or no rights left in the city. This is the pattern they have employed in Berlin in the past, and all over the world against us.

From our point of view there is no answer to the Berlin question short of the answer to the German question.

The Russians must be made to live up their agreement to hold free elections in East Germany as well as West Germany. These elections must be under supervision and be based on a constitution for the entire country. Such elections must be free, otherwise they can be simply a means of turning over the entire country to Communist control. The U.S.S.R. agreed at Potsdam in 1945 to such elections. They have never lived up to their word.

There is a real danger that, in our desire to negotiate we will forget basic principles and agree to some makeshift arrangement that will be entirely favorable to the future control of Germany by the Communists.

PERILOUS BARGAIN

The Soviets would probably be willing to consider a common government for all of Germany with Berlin as its capital, if we would permit them to run their own elections in Communist-controlled East Berlin and East Germany—elections which would be handled without any outside supervision.

This would mean 100 percent representation by Communists for East Germany. Despite the difference in population of 16 million in East Germany under Soviet control, and close to 50 million in the western areas, the Soviets probably would demand equal representation in the common congress for all of Germany.

They might settle for one-third control of all of Germany—providing they could continue to control completely their eastern zone of Germany. This would give them a representation in the German Government; a representation greater than they had in Czechoslovakia when they successfully overthrew the legitimate government by making use of their one-third control.

If we agree to this, the Soviets will use East Germany as a weapon to beat us out of the rest of Germany. We set the precedent for such an idea by going to Paris after the blockade of Berlin was lifted and agreeing to a status quo which meant that the Soviets would take out of common control one-third of the city of Berlin. At that time the Soviets tried to reestablish their share of control over the two-thirds of Berlin, occupied by Britain, France, and the United States. I blocked this move.

JUST STEP 1

The steps being taken now by the Communist East German government in blocking the accesses to West Berlin are, at present, applied only to Germans of East Germany and of East Berlin. This is step one. Before the blockade of 1948, step one was to interfere with the comparatively small traffic of the United States, Britain, and France from Berlin to the West. A month or so after we meekly allowed them to do this, they imposed on the 2.5 million Germans of West Berlin the total hunger blockade which is so well known to all of us.

In dealing with the Soviets it is not enough to carry a big stick and speak quietly. We must carry a big stick and roar. The Soviets understand no other language. The British habit of quiet understatement is a real danger in dealing with the Soviets. Soviets are loudmouths. They scream. They understand the same language in reply. A gentle answer misleads them as to our determination.

The great danger today in dealing with the Soviets is the danger that they will overestimate their power and their ability to get away with another crime. They have good reason to believe they can get away with crimes against us. They successfully got away with the Berlin blockade and even when defeated by our airlift, ended up with more control than they had before.

After we had gone with Mr. Jessup to Paris and agreed to the lifting of the blockade on the basis of "let bygones be bygones," I reported publicly that, the Soviets having successfully gotten away with this crime against humanity, would try again to gain by force that which they were unable to gain politically.

The next try was Korea where the Soviets almost succeeded in gaining complete con-

trol of the entire country. As it was they ended up with control of half of the country.

WORLDWIDE PLAN

From Korea the Soviets moved to Indo-China where they provoked a civil war and had their Chinese Communist allies support the destruction of our friends in Indo-China. Finally they settled for half of the country, now known as North Vietnam, from which they are even now harassing South Vietnam and are causing trouble in the neighboring country of Laos, ably supported by supplies (including guns) dropped from Russian planes.

The Soviet plan in the former Belgian Congo went astray. The Soviets, even though their stooge Lumumba is dead, have now got a very good representatives in Gizenga and have control of the Stanleyville area, plus a big representation in the present chaotic government at Léopoldville. So, the Communists are making progress.

Next on their agenda is Portuguese Angola, south of the Congo River.

I have just returned from Angola where I found the Portuguese doing more for the poor people of Angola than most of the countries which have voted at U.N. to criticize Portugal's colonial policy.

WE DON'T LEARN

It's pointless to go on with the pros and cons in the many things which have been discussed and tried. We never seem to learn. We learned nothing from Laos, Indo-China nor from past Berlin experience. Being good hearted, we have become the international boobs of all time.

It's high time that our government, whether Republican or Democrat, begins to think in terms of the interest of the American people and begins to think in terms of reality. Work that can be done better by missionaries should be done by missionaries, not attempted by hypocritical politicians. International work that can be done better by private enterprise should be done by private industry. The international gangster operations of the Soviets should be called that and should be recognized as such.

We should stop misleading our own youth by giving respect to the Soviets; respect which they derive from international bodies devoted to truth and peace. For the Soviets to participate in the United Nations or for us to even consider the entrance of Red China is to deny the very foundation upon which the United Nations is built.

WOULD BACK REVOLTS

It's high time we indicate a belief in freedom. We are the ones who should be supporting revolutions all over the world—revolutions against tyranny and slavery, and not against only our friends. The best place to start is in Berlin and Germany—right now. After that, can come Hungary, the Balkans and the Baltic nations. Yet, when the freedom fighters of Hungary rose up and set up their own government we couldn't deny them fast enough; we couldn't assure the Soviets quickly enough that we had no hand in the revolution.

Let's, in the future, support these revolutions and encourage them publicly. Let us encourage them to fight for their freedom. There is no better place to start where people are willing to fight for their freedom, than in Berlin and in Germany—right now.

That the Soviets recognize this is indicated by their transfer of their Communist Marshal Konev to command the troops there.

This command shift is not to be against the West, though full propaganda is made of that idea. It is to put down an anticipated uprising of the German people against their slavery. If it does happen again, let's help these people to fight Soviet tanks and the Communist rulers with something other than stones, which is what they had last time.

Let's, for awhile, stop giving the smile technique to the enemy. Let's stop promising him that we won't hit him—we've paid a high price for our spirits of Camp David and for our spirits of Geneva. Thanks to our assuring the Soviets that under no circumstances will we fight, they have been able to concentrate not on building bases all over the world to defend themselves, but upon gaining great advantage by sending men into space. Meanwhile, we have had to defend ourselves at costs of billions of dollars against a possible attack from the Soviet Union. Let's let them be a little uncertain for awhile as to our intention—let's have them spend some real money and effort on defense. We can outlast them if we run by the same rules.

President Kennedy has made a step in the right direction. At least he is speaking with a firmness which represents the American people. Let's pray that our actions continue to be as firm as our words.

Rockefeller and the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House have expressed their concern about the unplanned railroad mergers now pending and, according to the public press, contemplated. Railroad service is too important to this country to have any part of it destroyed or weakened by uneconomical, hastily conceived mergers. It is my hope that the Interstate Commerce Commission will see to it, when considering applications to merge, that railroads not involved in the mergers will not suffer. There should be a well conceived, intelligent plan for the necessary mergers. That is the Commission's job.

In line with these thoughts and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the September 13 issue of the Springfield Union newspaper, Springfield, N.Y., entitled "Rockefeller and the Railroads."

ROCKEFELLER AND THE RAILROADS

Governor Rockefeller spoke for New England as well as his own New York this week when he asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to take a "coordinated approach" to railroad mergers. New England is deeply involved in the crisis of the eastern railroads, and it could be totally submerged by developments now in the making.

Mr. Rockefeller took the side of the New York Central System in its battle with the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway over control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The C. & O. claims pledges of enough B. & O. shares to effect a merger. It lacks only the required ICC approval. The Central is in an uphill fight for three alternate objectives: winning the B. & O. itself, joining in a three-way merger, or at least blocking consolidation of the other two lines.

At stake is the profit-producing freight area west of Buffalo. If the Central loses the merger case, it stands to lose business to the long-haul service that the C. & O.-B. & O. combine could offer. Central officials suggest publicly that losses in the west would jeopardize the future of the Boston & Albany division, whose New England service is largely supported by revenue from the West.

The same is true of eastern New York State, and that is Governor Rockefeller's concern. He urged the ICC to approve the three-way consolidation as the best way to serve all interests. These include New England's interests.

They also include the interests of the New York Central, but it is the public interest—not who owns which rail line—that the ICC is supposed to serve. And the public interest should not be divided into regions in a manner that favors one at the expense of the other. Governor Rockefeller had this in mind when he proposed a "coordinated approach."

The bankrupt New Haven Railroad is perhaps an extreme case, but it points up the difficulties of the short-haul New England rail net. The B. & A. has had the advantage of links with a bigger system. On a broader scale, shouldn't something similar apply now to the parent roads?

The rest of the Rockefeller plan is no less important. It asks a Federal transportation department as the master coordinator of railroads and their competitors, and it urges repeal of the Federal 10-percent excise tax on passenger fares. But both are doomed for now. The Eisenhower administration proposed a transportation department; the Kennedy administration picked it up and then dropped it for this year. Congress already has extended the excise tax despite the fact that passenger volume has dropped steadily since World War II when the tax was designed to discourage unnecessary travel.

The "coordinated approach" remains, and the ICC is alone in the decider's seat. Governor Rockefeller's voice is pitched against equal voices from other States where the pending merger plans would have better effects. New England shouted itself hoarse over the New Haven situation. It might do well to muster another argument now.

Voting Record of Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record:

Voting record, Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan

No	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	---do---	Elec ion of Speaker	Halleck.
3	---do---	H.Res. 1: Motion to vote without debate on resolution denying seat to either candidate for Congress from the 5th District of Indiana. (Passed 252 to 166.)	No.
4	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
5	---do---	H. Res. 127: To increase membership on House Committee on Rules from 12 to 15. (Passed 217 to 212.)	No.
6	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
7	---do---	H.R. 4806: To provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation. (Passed 392 to 30.)	Yes.
8	---do---	H.Res.167: To provide $331,000 to House Committee on Un-American Activities for investigations in 1961. (Passed 412 to 6.)	Yes.
9	Mar. 7	H.R. 5188: To amend the 3d supplemental 1961 appropriation bill by adding $29,990,000 for aid to school districts in federally impacted areas. (Passed 336 to 62.)	No.
10	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
11	---do---	---do	Present.
12	Mar. 9	---do	Present.
13	---do---	H.R. 4510: To recommit to committee the bill providing a program for feed grains for 1961 in order to eliminate sec. 3 which authorized sale of stored corn at 20 cents below support price of corn. (Defeated 196 to 214.)	Yes.
14	---do---	H.R. 4510: On final passage of feed grains bill increasing support price on corn for those who reduce acreage, etc. (Passed 209 to 202.)	No.
15	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 15	---do	Present.
17	Mar. 21	H.R. 4510: To approve the conference report on the feed grains program, 1961. (Passed 231 to 185.)	No.
18	---do---	Quorum call	Present.
19	---do---	H.R. 5463: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 284 to 129.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 22	H.R. 4806: To approve the conference report on the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961. (Passed 362 to 31.)	Yes.
21	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
22	---do---	H.R. 5000: To adopt an amendment to the military construction authorization bill requiring a study to determine whether Army Quartermaster Food and Container Institute should be relocated. (Passed 267 to 145.)	Yes.
23	---do---	H.R. 5000: On final passage of the bill to authorize certain construction for military departments. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yes.
24	---do---	Quorum call	Present.
25	---do---	---do	Present.
26	Mar. 24	---do	Present.
27	---do---	H.R. 3935: To approve the Ayres-Kitchin substitute for the committee's bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 216 to 203.)	Yes.
28	---do---	H.R. 3935: On a motion to recommit the bill to committee. (Defeated 196 to 224.)	No.
29	---do---	H.R. 3935: On final passage of the bill (minimum wage) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 340 to 78.)	Yes.
30	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	---do---	S. 1: On a motion to recommit the area redevelopment bill to committee in order to substitute H.R. 5943 for S. 1. (Defeated 125 to 291.)	Yes.
33	---do---	S. 1: On final passage of the area redevelopment bill. (Passed 251-167.)	No.
34	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 13	---do	Present.
36	Apr. 18	---do	Present.
37	Apr. 19	---do	Present.
38	---do---	S. 912: To adopt the omnibus judgeship bill providing for 70 additional Federal judges. (Passed 336 to 76.)	No.
39	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
40	---do---	H.R. 6027: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1961. (Passed 400 to 14.)	Yes.
41	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
42	---do---	H.R. 6518: To appropriate $600,000,000 for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean rehabilitation program. (Passed 330 to 82.)	Yes.
43	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
44	---do---	S. 1: On adopting the conference report providing for "backdoor financing" of the Area Development Act. (Passed 223 to 193.)	No.
45	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
46	---do---	H.R. 3935: To adopt the conference report on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 230 to 196.)	No.
47	May 3	H.R. 6441: On motion to recommit to committee the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 in order to reduce the authorization from $100,000,000 to $75,000,000 annually and to require States after June 1964 to match all funds in excess of $50,000,000 and to retain State jurisdiction over intrastate waters. (Defeated 165 to 256.)	Yes.
48	---do---	H.R. 6441: On final passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961. (Passed 307 to 110.)	No.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	---do	Present.
51	May 10	---do	Present.
52	May 11	---do	Absent.[1]
53	---do---	H.R. 2010: On final passage of the bill to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years. (Passed 231 to 157.)	Paired for.
54	---do---	H.R. 6094: To recommit to committee the bill to authorize additional funds to Council of Economic Advisers personnel in order to cut the amount from $2,000,000 to $700,000. (Defeated 151 to 199.)	Paired for.
55	---do---	H.R. 6094: On final passage to authorize an additional $2,000,000 for personnel of Council of Economic Advisers. (Passed 209 to 136.)	Paired against.
56	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 16	---do	Present.
58	---do---	H. Res. 284: To adopt a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to encourage travel in the United States by residents of foreign countries and to establish an office of International Travel and Tourism. (Passed 239 to 70.)	Yes.
59	---do---	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 17	---do	Present.
61	---do---	H. Con. Res. 226: To indicate congressional support for taking of collective measures by the Organization of American States against the Castro government of Cuba. (Passed 402 to 2.)	Yes.
62	---do---	H.R. 4614: To establish an Office of International Travel and to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. (Passed 305 to 104.)	Yes.
63	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
64	---do---	S. 1852: To authorize about $12,500,000,000 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
65	May 25	H.R. 1986: To recommit to committee a bill relating to information furnished the Postmaster General by ICC concerning revenues received by railroads from express companies. The recommittal motion was designed to provide that certain technical information be gathered annually by ICC concerning revenue paid railroads by the Post Office. (Defeated 16 to 345.)	No.
66	June 1	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
67	---do---	H.R. 7371: The appropriation bill for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary and related agencies ($751,300,050). (Passed 256 to 71.)	Yes.
68	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
69	---do---	---do	Absent.[3]
70	---do---	H.R. 7444: To recommit the Agriculture appropriations bill to committee in order to cut $100,000,000 from funds for agricultural conservation program. (Defeated 184 to 196.)	Yes.
71	---do---	H.R. 7444: On final passage of the agricultural appropriations bill involving $5,900,000,000. (Passed 318 to 65.)	No.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	June 8	---do	Present.
74	---do---	---do	Absent.[4]
75	---do---	H.R. 7446: To recommit to committee the Tax Rate Extension Act in order to eliminate the transportation tax on persons. (Defeated 189 to 196.)	Yes.
76	---do---	H.R. 7446: On final passage of the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961. (Passed 295 to 88.)	Yes.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
78	---do---	H.R. 7053: To recommit to committee the bill providing that in the District of Columbia courts confessions and other evidence shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay. (Defeated 104 to 252.)	No.
79	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
80	June 14	---do	Present.
81	June 15	---do	Present.
82	---do---	H. Res. 303: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2, concerning the FCC, submitted by the President on Apr. 27. (Passed 323 to 77.)	Yes.
83	---do---	H. Res. 302: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, concerning the Security and Exchange Commission, submitted by the President on Apr. 27. (Defeated 176 to 212.)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan—Continued

No.	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
84	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
85	...do	H.R. 6765: To authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock. (Passed 328 to 18.)	Yes.
86	...do	H.R. 7712: 4th supplemental appropriation bill for 1961 involving $88,000,000. (Passed 291 to 63.)	Yes.
87	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
88	...do	H. Res. 304: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 3, concerning the Civil Aeronautics Board, submitted by the President on May 3. (Defeated 178 to 213.)	Yes.
89	...do	H. Res. 305: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 4, concerning the Federal Trade Commission, submitted by the President on May 9. (Defeated 178 to 221.)	Yes.
90	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
91	...do	...do	Present.
92	...do	...do	Present.
93	...do	...do	Present.
94	June 22	...do	Present.
95	...do	H.R. 6028: To recommit to committee the Housing bill for the purpose of substituting provisions which would extend present program for 1 year. (Defeated 197 to 215.)	Yes.
96	...do	H.R. 6028: On final passage of the Housing Act of 1961 carrying authorizations of $9,000,000,000. (Passed 235 to 178.)	No.
97	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
98	...do	...do	Present.
99	...do	H.R. 7677: To raise the public debt limit for 1 year by $13,000,000,000 to $298,000,000,000. (Passed 231 to 148.)	Yes.
100	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
101	...do	...do	Present.
102	...do	...do	Present.
103	June 28	...do	Present.
104	...do	H.R. 7851: On amendment to defense appropriation bill in order to remove provision prohibiting use of funds for payment of a price differential on contracts made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations. (Defeated 173 to 239.)	No.
105	...do	H.R. 7851: On final passage of the defense appropriation bill ($42,700,000,000). (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yes.
106	...do	S. 1922: To adopt the conference report on the Housing Act of 1961 as approved by conferees of the House and Senate. (Passed 229 to 176.)	No.
107	June 29	H. Res. 354: To authorize a special flag for Members of the House of Representatives. (Defeated 108 to 270.)	No.
108	...do	H. Res. 225: To recommit to committee the resolution granting consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact in order to delete provisions for Federal voting membership and Federal cost sharing. (Defeated 92 to 257.)	Yes.
109	July 10	H.R. 187: To expedite judicial review of orders of deportation of undesirable aliens. (Passed 304 to 60.)	Yes.
110	...do	H.R. 5786: To establish the Cape Cod National Seashore. (Passed 278 to 82.)	No.
111	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 17	H.J. Res. 435: To provide for the observance of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 367 to 12.)	Yes.
113	...do	H.R. 2555: To provide for allotment and advancement of pay to U.S. civilian employees in emergency evacuations. (Passed 285 to 86.)	Yes.
114	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
115	...do	...do	Present.
116	July 20	H.R. 6874: To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the amount of $1,780,000,000. (Passed 354 to 59.)	Yes.
117	...do	H. Res. 328: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 5 concerning the National Labor Relations Board. (Passed 231 to 179.)	Yes.
118	...do	H. Res. 336: To discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 7 concerning the Maritime Administration. (Defeated 184 to 218.)	Yes.
119	July 25	H.R. 8302: To adopt an amendment to the military construction appropriations bill deleting $3,400,000 for transfer of the Food and Container Institute of Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Passed 241 to 170.)	No.
120	...do	H.R. 8302: On final passage of the military construction appropriations bill providing for an expenditure of $883,300,000. (Passed 409 to 0.)	Yes.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 27	...do	Present.
123	July 31	...do	Present.
124	...do	S.J. Res. 120: To authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months. (Passed 403 to 2.)	Yes.
125	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 2	...do	Present.
127	...do	S. 2311: To authorize appropriations of $958,500,000 for additional aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yes.
128	...do	H.R. 30: To recommit to committee the bill granting approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact in order to have the 7 Federal representatives on the Commission serve only in an advisory position. (Defeated 139 to 261.)	Yes.
129	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
130	...do	S. 1643: On adoption of the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1961. (Passed 224 to 170.)	No.
131	...do	Quorum call	Present.
132	...do	H.R. 7856: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 for the announced purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of FCC business. (Passed 198 to 150.)	No.
133	Aug. 7	H.R. 7728: To authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft in an emergency. (Passed 307 to 78.)	No.
134	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
135	...do	H.R. 7576: On a motion to lay on the table the motion to instruct House conferees not to agree to a project involving electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., at a cost of $95,000,000. (Defeated 164 to 235.)	No.
136	...do	H.R. 7576: To adopt the motion instructing House conferees not to agree to the Senate provision providing for electric energy generating facilities at Hanford, Wash., at a cost of $95,000,000. (Passed 235 to 164.)	Yes.
137	...do	Quorum call	Present.
138	...do	H.R. 8033: To amend Interstate Commerce Act to authorize delegation of certain duties to ICC employee boards. (Passed 212 to 174.)	No.
139	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
140	...do	H. Res. 406: On adoption of resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6882, to establish an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor. (Passed 369 to 16.)	Yes.
141	...do	Quorum call	Present.
142	...do	H.R. 6302: To transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University (District of Columbia) and to make it a teaching hospital for the university. (Passed 321 to 61.)	Yes.
143	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
144	...do	H.R. 7851: On the adoption of the conference report on the $46,500,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. (Passed 383 to 0.)	Yes.
145	...do	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 14	...do	Present.
147	...do	...do	Present.
148	...do	...do	Present.
149	...do	...do	Present.
150	Aug. 15	...do	Present.
151	...do	...do	Present.
152	...do	...do	Present.
153	Aug. 16	...do	Present.
154	...do	...do	Present.
155	Aug. 17	...do	Present.
156	Aug. 18	...do	Present.
157	...do	H.R. 8400: To adopt the mutual security authorization bill as amended by the House to include, among other things, a 1-year authorization for developmental loan assistance. (Passed 287 to 140.)	Yes.
158	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
159	...do	...do	Absent.[5]
160	...do	H.R. 8384: To make aircraft piracy a Federal crime punishable with a possible death sentence. (Passed 373 to 5.)	Absent.[6]
161	...do	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
162	Aug. 22	...do	Absent.[5]
163	...do	...do	Absent.[5]
164	...do	H.R. 7763: To provide for planning the participation of the United States in New York's World Fair of 1964 and 1965. (Passed 353 to 42.)	Absent.[6]
165	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
166	Aug. 24	...do	Present.
167	...do	H.R. 84: To stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by domestic producers on public, Indian, and other land. (Passed 196 to 172.)	No.
168	...do	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 28	H.R. 8181: To order the engrossment and 3d reading of a bill to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 223 to 120.)	Absent.[7]
170	...do	H.R. 8181: On final passage of the bill to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 208 to 135.)	Absent.[7]
171	...do	H.R. 7176: To provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. (Passed 357 to 3.)	Absent.[6]

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan—Continued

No.	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
172	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
173	...do	H.R. 8773: To increase the lump-sum readjustment payments for Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yes.
174	...do	Quorum call	Present.
175	...do	H.R. 6242: To authorize the Attorney General to fix the salaries of certain attorneys in the Department of Justice. (Defeated 172 to 223.)	No.
176	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
177	...do	H.R. 8890: To consider the bill entitled "Emergency Education Aid Act of 1961" (Calendar Wednesday procedure). (Defeated 170 to 242.)	No.
178	...do	Quorum call	Present.
179	...do	H.R. 8028: To amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act of 1961 by restricting Federal grants to the District of Columbia. (Defeated 187 to 217.)	Yes.
180	Aug. 31	S. Con. Res. 34: Expressing the opposition of the Congress to diplomatic recognition of Red China or its admission to the United Nations. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes.
181	...do	S. 1983: To adopt the conference report on the Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1961. (Passed 260 to 132.)	Yes.
182	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
183	...do	...do	Present.
184	...do	H.R. 9033: To amend the mutual security appropriations bill by increasing the funds for military assistance by $300,000,000. (Passed 242 to 151.)	Yes.
185	...do	H.R. 9033: On final passage of the $3,800,000,000 mutual security appropriation bill. (Passed 270 to 123.)	Yes.
186	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
187	...do	...do	Present.
188	...do	H.R. 9000: To extend for 2 additional years the National Defense Education Act and the Federal impacted school districts bill. (Passed 378 to 32.)	Yes.
189	...do	Quorum call	Present.
190	...do	H.R. 8723: To suspend the rules and pass the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961. (Defeated 244 to 161; ⅔ vote needed for passage.)	No.
191	...do	H.R. 8666: To suspend the rules and pass the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. (Passed 329 to 66.)	Yes.
192	...do	Quorum call	Present.
193	Sept. 11	...do	Present.
194	Sept. 12	...do	Present.
195	...do	...do	Present.
196	Sept. 13	...do	Present.
197	...do	H.R. 8302: To eliminate from the military construction appropriation bill funds to provide for the transfer of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Passed 212 to 185.)	No.
198	...do	H.R 7371: To accept a provision in the appropriations bill for the Departments of State and Justice and the judiciary extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to Sept. 30, 1963. (Passed 300 to 106.)	Yes.
199	...do	H.R. 9076: To recommit to committee the public works appropriation bill in order to reduce funds for the Upper Colorado River Basin and to eliminate certain proposed transmission lines. (Defeated 182 to 224.)	Yes.
200	...do	H.R. 9076: On final passage of the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $3,600,000,000. (Passed 377 to 31.)	Yes.
201	...do	Quorum call	Present.
202	...do	H.R. 7576: To adopt the conference report authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission containing provisions approving an electric powerplant at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 155 to 251.)	No.
203	...do	H.R. 8102: On a substitute bill for the Federal Airport Act, as passed by the House but amended by the Senate, submitted by the conferees calling for a 3-year extension with annual appropriations instead of "back-door financing." (Passed 396 to 4.)	Yes.
204	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
205	...do	H.R. 7500: On final passage of the bill to provide for a Peace Corps. (Passed 287 to 97.)	Paired for.
206	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
207	...do	H. Res. 455: A resolution sending to conference H.R. 2010 extending the Mexican farm labor program. (Passed 243 to 135.)	Absent.[3]
208	...do	H. Res. 464: To adopt a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7927 to adjust postal rates. (Defeated 142 to 222.)	Absent.[3]
209	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
210	Sept. 18	S. 2393: On final passage of a bill similar to H.R. 9000 extending for 2 years the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and the federally impacted school area bill. (Passed 342 to 18.)	Absent.[4]
211	...do	S. 1459: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees. (Passed 358 to 4.)	Absent.[4]
212	...do	H.R. 5751: To amend Subversive Activities Control Act to require the registration of persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign power. (Passed 369 to 2.)	Absent.[4]
213	...do	H.R. 8914: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (feed grains) to enable certain farmers to grow more barley. (Defeated 213 to 149; ⅔ vote needed.)	Paired against.
214	...do	H.R. 7377: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Civil Service Classification Act. (Passed 305 to 53.)	Absent.[4]
215	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
216	...do	H.R. 9118: To establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. (Passed 216 to 54.)	Absent.[5]
217	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
218	...do	...do	Absent.[5]
219	Sept. 21	H.R. 7500: To adopt the conference report on the Peace Corps. (Passed 253 to 78.)	Absent.[6]
220	...do	H.R. 5628: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for a study of the desirability of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden in Hawaii. (Defeated 215 to 125; ⅔ vote being necessary.)	Absent.[7]
221	...do	H.R. 4172: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. (Defeated 166 to 173; ⅔ vote being necessary.)	Absent.[7]
222	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Absent.[8]
223	...do	H.R. 258: To adopt the conference report increasing the District of Columbia sales tax from 2 cents to 3 cents, transferring certain moneys to the highway fund, and including an amendment providing for the inclusion of the District of Columbia among those areas to receive Federal funds as "federally impacted school areas." (Defeated 142 to 159.)	Absent.[7]
224	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Present.
225	...do	H.R. 7377: To adopt the conference report increasing the limitation on number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Civil Service Classification Act which report increased the number of positions beyond the House bill. (Passed 228 to 71.)	No.
226	...do	H.R. 9118: To adopt the conference report establishing a U.S. Arms Control Agency. (Passed 252 to 50.)	Yes.
227	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
228	...do	...do	Present.
229	...do	H.R. 258. On conference report on bill to increase District of Columbia sales tax from 2 cents to 3 cents and transferring certain parking fees and other moneys to highway fund. (Defeated 97 to 173.)	No.
230	...do	H.R. 9033. To adopt conference report on bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. (Passed 192 to 81.)	Yes.
231	...do	H.R. 9033. On motion to adopt Senate amendment 27 providing that foreign aid Inspector General need not honor request for information from Congress if the President certifies he has forbidden him to do so. (Passed 152 to 119.)	No.

[1] At Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.
[2] Conference in downtown Washington.
[3] Appointment with doctor.
[4] President's guest at the White House.
[5] In, or returning from, Michigan.
[6] If present, would have voted "yes".
[7] If present, would have voted "no".
[8] On official leave to attend sessions of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels.

The International Monetary System and the Role of the IMF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Per Jacobsson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, on the international monetary system and the role of the IMF, at the annual meeting of the Fund in Vienna, Austria, September 18, 1961:

With all the activity during the past year, drawings on the Fund have totaled the equivalent of nearly $2,500 million. So large a use of resources has had a marked effect on the Fund's holdings of currencies suitable for transactions at the present time. Even after the replenishment of these holdings by the sale of gold at the time of the drawing by the United Kingdom, the Fund's holdings of several convertible currencies are very low. In addition, it has to be remembered that there are open balances under standby arrangements equivalent to almost $1,100 million.

It had, indeed, become apparent at the end of last year, at the time of the strong outflow of short-term funds from the United States, that if the Fund were faced with substantial drawings by a number of countries with large quotas, its available holdings of convertible currencies would in all probability be inadequate. This has been borne out by the experience of the last few months. The Fund can, of course, make use of its gold holdings, but these are not necessarily revolving, and once they have been used for the replenishment of currency holdings they may not readily be restored by repurchases in gold. The Fund should therefore generally be careful in the use of its gold and should take into account other possibilities for replenishing its currency holdings, for instance, by the borrowing of particular currencies under article VII of the Fund agreement.

However, borrowing of currencies is not a method of replenishment that can suddenly be improvised. For this and other reasons, the whole complex of problems connected with such borrowing needs to be closely examined and brought to an effective solution. Consideration of these problems should be set against the wider background of the international monetary system. In the vivid discussions on the merits and demerits of the present system which have taken place in recent years and months, attention has largely been devoted to the tensions which may result from the international flow of funds in a world of convertible currencies, and, as you know, a number of suggestions have been put forward advocating more or less radical changes in the existing monetary arrangements. It has been valuable that these matters have been so vigorously discussed, and the first question we have to ask ourselves is whether the present system can be regarded as operating in a sufficiently satisfactory manner to be worth maintaining. If that question is answered in the affirmative, then we must consider whether any particular measures should be taken to strengthen the existing institutional arrangements so as to provide sufficient safeguards to meet any dangerous tensions that may arise.

On the whole, I believe the system has worked well. It would indeed be difficult to conclude otherwise in the light of the great gains that have been made in recent years. In the purely monetary sphere external convertibility has been established for a broad range of currencies, and with the better distribution of reserves, there is an increasing measure of freedom for capital movements. There has been a parallel development in the ever-growing liberalization of trade and, under conditions of relatively stable prices, international trade has been increasing at an annual rate of about 4 percent in recent years, reflecting by and large a corresponding rate of growth in world production. These are no mean achievements.

But in spite of these achievements there have been periods of tension and unease. I do not think that the movements of short-term funds from one country to another have impaired the financing of trade or the flow of goods, but it is largely the fears that these movements have aroused that have led to the questioning of the soundness of our present system. In some quarters doubts have been expressed whether the system under which countries hold part of their international reserves in currencies (which is known as the gold exchange standard) will work satisfactorily in the longer run, and whether this system might not break down as it did in the interwar period. I do not think we need draw that conclusion, for it is important to remember that the currency failures which occurred in the early 1930's were caused not by inflation, but by widespread deflation, by a fall in prices which made itself felt first in the United States and then in Europe. I am sure there will be no similar deflation now, for there has been such a change in the objectives of the authorities that sufficient measures would surely be taken to prevent such a calamity, if it seemed to be threatening. Secondly, in the 1930's the exchange reserves of many of the European countries have been acquired by large-scale short-term borrowing, and melted away when the short-term loans were not renewed; today most countries are the true owners of their exchange holdings. A third difference is that the International Monetary Fund today stands behind the nations' reserves, supplementing them within the framework of its principles and practices and working at all times to promote international monetary consultation and collaboration; there was no similar international agency in the interwar period.

Today two currencies, the U.S. dollar and sterling, are the main reserve currencies. There is no doubt in my mind that the authorities in the United States and the United Kingdom are determined to pursue policies which will ensure confidence in the stability of their currencies. Of the outstanding short-term U.S. liabilities, about two-thirds are in the hands of foreign central banks and governments, and the remainder is largely held by commercial banks and business firms. For sterling the proportion is very much the same. There are thus substantial amounts of these currencies in private hands, and with convertibility, liquid resources owned by business firms and banks can now with little or no difficulty be shifted from one country to another. There is indeed no lack of international liquidity in private hands, but for this very reason it is important that there should be adequate resources in official hands to meet the possible impact of international movements of private funds.

As indicated in the report of the Executive Directors before you, the fund has been studying in the course of this year a broad range of problems, some of general import and some of a more detailed technical, legal or institutional character connected with this situation. It is possible to summarize the main issues that have been considered in the form of three questions. To begin with, what are the payments difficulties for which the fund's resources may be made available under its Articles of Agreement? Secondly, how can the fund best use its resources to meet these difficulties? And, finally, what resources are required to meet the difficulties, and are the fund's available resources adequate to do so?

On the first question, the Executive Directors have discussed the extent to which the fund's resources may be used for helping to meet those deficits in the balance of payments of members that go beyond the current account and are attributable, in whole or in part, to capital transfers. From a purely practical point of view, there is of course great difficulty in separating current and capital payments under a system of convertible currencies. After a thorough examination of the various aspects of the problem, the Executive Directors have clarified the understanding of the Articles of Agreement, and in that way eliminated any doubt which had not already been dissipated by the practice of the fund, that the fund's resources can be used for capital transfers, in accordance with article VI and the other provisions of the articles. If a country facing an outflow of capital were to turn to the fund for assistance, the test to be applied by the fund would be in accordance with its accepted principles, i.e., that appropriate measures were being taken, so that the disequilibrating capital outflow would be arrested and assistance provided by the fund would be repaid within a maximum period of 3 to 5 years.

The answer to the second question—how the Fund can best use its resources—must take into account the strengthening of the current position and reserves of several member countries and the increased number which have accepted the obligations of article VIII. This has made possible the use of a much wider range of currencies held by the Fund, thus increasing the volume of its usable resources. The Fund has therefore sought to diversify the use of its currency holdings in such a manner as to insure that transactions with the Fund, and their repayment, will be conducted in those currencies which will be most helpful to the world payments situation. In pursuing this objective, the Fund has been guided increasingly by the principle that drawings should be made in the currencies of those countries that have a strong payments and reserve position, while it is to be hoped that repayments will generally be made in those currencies that can be strengthened by their use in this way. There are a number of technical and legal problems to be faced in evolving a satisfactory program for the use of a wider range of currencies in Fund transactions and repayments. Some have already been resolved, others will need further attention. A measure of the success already achieved is shown by the fact that during the last year drawings have been made in 11 different currencies.

As a result of sales of their currencies by the Fund, a number of countries have now acquired increased drawing rights because the Fund's holdings of their currencies have been reduced considerably below 75 percent of quota. The Fund must always take account of the fact that, should there be a reversal in the payments position, the existance of these increased drawing rights could give rise to appreciable demands on the resources of the Fund.

I come now to the third question—the adequacy of the Fund's resources. It will be apparent from what I have said about the Fund's evolving policies on the currencies that should be drawn that the answer to this question cannot be settled simply by adding up the Fund's holdings of gold and currencies, or even gold and convertible currencies, at any particular time. What is important is to insure that the Fund has enough of those currencies which it would be appropriate to use at any particular time, given the economic conditions of that time

and the purposes for which it is appropriate to use the Fund's resources.

I have already referred to the fact that the interest activity over the last year has reduced the Fund's holdings of certain currencies to a very low level, despite the recent sale of gold. But this is more than a transitory problem confined to the present circumstances, and is more than just the question of the Fund's own liquidity. It is vital to consolidate and defend the convertibile system built up over the last few years, and to avoid the risk of any relapse into restrictions and currency disorder. In order that the Fund may play its part in this effort and meet the expectations of its members, it must be in a position to provide resources that are adequate beyond doubt to meet any needs that may arise. And in a world in which market fears and expectations play a large role, resources—national and international combined—must not only be adequae to meet demands that may be made on them, but also large enough to convince the public that they are adequate to defend currencies from ill advised speculation. A substantial reduction in the Fund's holdings of major international currencies could itself become a disturbing factor, long before the point of exhaustion is reached, unless there existed satisfactory arrangements for replenishing these holdings.

All these questions have to be evaluated in the light of the swift changes in the balance of international payments that have occurred in recent years. In the circumstances I cannot conclude that the composition and size of the Fund's resources are adequate to support a healthy international financial structure without further strengthening. The need for additional resources might be remedied by an increase in particular quotas, but in present circumstances, I believe it can be handled more acceptably by firm borrowing arrangements. These would be concluded, in particular, with the main industrial countries, because of the major role they play in the swings in international trade and payments. This does not mean that other countries would have no interest in the conclusion of such arrangements, for the maintenance of a stable and convertible exchange system is as important to them as it is to the industrial countries.

Some of the problems arising from use to be made of the Fund's borrowing powers under article VII of the Fund agreement have already been discussed in general terms by the executive directors, but many aspects still remain to be considered. An essential step in the conclusion of any borrowing plan is for the authorities in the individual countries to obtain the power to lend to the Fund if they do not already possess it. However, it would not, in my opinion, be sufficient to leave the actual borrowing transaction to an ad hoc agreement between the Fund and the lending country under these powers. There is great merit in an assurance that additional resources are available to the Fund for its transactions. The ready availability of resources is itself a contribution to stability and strength. It has time and again been the experience of the Fund that assurance to a member that it has access to the resources of the Fund under the provisions of a standby arrangement is in itself a stabilizing factor of great importance; often it has not been necessary for the member to use all or, indeed, any of the drawing rights thus assured. There is good reason to believe that the same sort of benefit would be obtained from credit facilities granted to the Fund.

At the same time, adequate provision would have to be made for general safeguards for the lending members. There would, of course, be consultation between the Fund and the prospective lender, and it should be part of the arrangement that the Fund would not borrow from a member country unless the country's payments and reserve position permitted this. Moreover, the arrangement would be such that any member that had lent its currency to the Fund would readily be able to obtain repayment if its own payments position changed. There would, of course, be no question of any weakening of the principles that the Fund has worked out for the appropriate use of its resources. These have stood the test of time in a great variety of circumstances, and we know that they are endorsed by the members of the Fund.

I believe that it should not be difficult to arrive at an agreement that will give due weight to the various aspects of borrowing, and thus to establish a workable system which would be beneficial and acceptable to all the members of the Fund. There are, however, a number of decisions of policy still to be taken.

As is said in the annual report of the executive directors, the approach to the increase in the Fund's resources by means of borrowing "looks beyond the immediate needs and endeavors to equip the Fund to handle flexibly the many and varied situations that may arise under a system of freely convertible currencies."

Space and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, head of the Air Force Systems Command, recently made a telling case for the greater utilization of Air Force capabilities in the national space program. His is one of the clearest statements of possible military uses of space that I have read and I believe it should be submitted for study and consideration by the House:

REMARKS BY GEN. B. A. SCHRIEVER, COMMANDER, AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND, AT AFA SYMPOSIUM ON "SPACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY"

I believe the threat to our national security discussed by the other panel members is a major cause for concern. The development of effective functional capabilities in space will be a principle factor in the continuing struggle for leadership of the world. We have already seen that the Russians regard their space deeds with a militant pride. Their successes in space are presented as proof of the Communist credo that history is on their side and communism will rule the future world. We have the ability to prove them wrong, if we use our resources wisely.

It is not generally appreciated that in the last few years we have developed great resources which can be devoted to any one of several courses of action we may choose to develop a strong defense capability in space. Perhaps the best known of these resources are the missile test ranges which give us the ability to support space programs devoted to both military and civilian objectives.

In carrying out our ICBM programs we also have developed the capability to procure large modern systems which employ modern technology, and even more important, achieve reliable operational status with these systems after they have been delivered to the field. The experience gained in these programs covers the whole spectrum of research, development, procurement, transition of the systems from technical specialists to operational units in the field and logistic support throughout all phases of the programs.

Perhaps the most invaluable asset of all is the corps of the Air Force officers and men in whom this experience is embodied. We have learned techniques of management which permit us to bring new systems into the inventory in a few short years as we did with our ballistic missiles.

But there is no short cut to the creation of a team of dedicated and experienced men with a tradition of accomplishment. The Air Force has a highly competent team trained in the skills required to develop the necessary military capabilities in space. These people are accustomed to working with the sense of urgency necessary in programs vital to the national security.

In carrying out our national space program, certain basic functional capabilities are necessary and fundamental to both military and civilian programs. The best approach to our military space program is a mixture of unmanned and manned space vehicles. More emphasis on manned spacecraft is required. We must be able to use space on a routine, day-to-day basis. In order to develop this ability we must begin by developing the ability to place large payloads in space, the ability to navigate and maneuver spacecraft, the ability to go into space and return to earth at times and places chosen to support a selected mission, the ability to rendezvous in space and accomplish refueling or cargo transfer, in short, to transport, use and support man in space.

The unique abilities of man to observe and to use judgment are essential. Most important is the ability of man to exercise control based on his judgment. Man's abilities are necessary to support our national objectives and national security in the space age.

Along with development of the ability to place man in space in a functional role, a broad development program for components and techniques must be carried out. This will permit the combination of the experience and knowledge gained in placing man in space in a functional capacity with a choice of developed components and techniques to give us national defense capabilities in space.

I believe it is clear today that we must be able to observe or inspect satellites and determine whether or not an unidentified satellite is hostile or friendly, just as we are able to identify unknown aircraft today. Should a satellite be determined to be hostile, then we must have a capability to neutralize it. If we cannot deal with such satellites, the ability of the Nation to exist and preserve its essential values will be severely compromised or nonexistent.

Finally, the key to rapid utilization of space by man for military or civilian purposes is flexibility. We must not design our space vehicles and programs just to achieve those objectives which we can define now. We must design the vehicles with enough capacity to rapidly adapt to or incorporate the vast new knowledge which will flow from our space program. A manned space observatory should be designed so that the composition of the crew of observers can be modified or completely changed to accomplish new or additional missions. Such an observatory should have provisions for the addition or replacement of equipment simply and quickly in order to respond to new knowledge or new requirements.

The achievement of these capabilities in space will enable us to insure that space is not used for aggressive purposes—provided we achieve them in time. This, I feel, is an urgent matter, and it may require that we rethink our traditional approach to the use of technology.

Historically, we have tended to overestimate what we could do on a short-time basis, and to grossly underestimate what we could do on a long-term basis. As a result, the United States has been notably slow to recognize the military application of new inventions. This was an adequate philosophy for the days when oceans were real barriers and gave us time to mobilize after the outbreak of war. But today, technological surprise could be fatal.

Two of the most significant technical achievements of this century—the airplane and the liquid-fueled rocket—are American inventions. Yet in each case their first military application was made by other nations.

After the Wright brothers flew at Kitty Hawk, more than 3 years passed before the U.S. Army decided to buy an airplane. Even then the military potential of the airplane was not realized. When World War I broke out, and when American pilots flew in battle, they flew foreign aircraft exclusively. No American-designed plane saw combat during World War I.

The work of Robert Goddard, inventor of the liquid-fueled rocket, was neglected in the United States but was followed with interest overseas. By 1929, 3 years after Goddard's first successful test flight, Germany had embarked on a rocket program. Soviet rocket research started in 1933, and had recorded substantial accomplishments by 1935.

By 1939, Germany was spending one-third of her entire aerodynamic research budget at Peenemunde alone. She had 12,000 workers there and at least 1,000 qualified researchers in rocketry elsewhere in the country.

In the same year Goddard had five technicians. In the whole of the United States there were probably not more than 25 people working with liquid rockets.

The United States finally was forced to recognise the military significance of the rocket after V–2's started to rain on London. Soon American scientists began to learn of Goddard's work through reading captured German documents. Nevertheless, little more than a decade ago the ICBM was called a fantastic proposal. Early indications that the Soviets might be producing such a weapon were largely ignored.

I have cited these examples to indicate the danger that lies in inadequate military planning for the future. Now we may find ourselves in a similar position in regard to space. No one can predict what benefits its exploration will bring to mankind, but I am certain they will be immense. At the same time, space most certainly has potential military use.

We need to press forward vigorously with our national space effort. We should recognize that there is no inherent difference between basic military and nonmilitary space technology. The same hardware and techniques used to send up a scientific capsule can also be used to orbit an early warning satellite. The same techniques that can send a man into space as a scientific observer may also send him there in a military role.

What really matters is not the technology but the intent. Our intentions as a nation are peaceful and are known to be so. We should not be afraid to develop whatever systems are needed for our legitimate self-defense—and to give them proper priority.

Only by being strong can we preserve the peace. This is the primary objective of the military forces today. When the Strategic Air Command was formed, the people of America understood that air power is peace power. We need a clear understanding today that space power is peace power. Space power must become a vital part of our national strength and security.

Needed Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard much about the plight of the railroads, and the possibility of Federal subsidization to enable the railroads to compete with other forms of transportation. In Indiana, a merger of three major roads, the New York Central, Chesapeake & Ohio and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroads would seem to be the fairest and most economically feasible way to save this vital industry.

Therefore, I would like to insert at this point an editorial from the Indianapolis News entitled "Needed Merger":

NEEDED MERGER

This city and this State have a vital interest in a railroad consolidation proposal to be aired at a regional hearing by the Interstate Commerce Commission Monday.

This is the proposal to consolidate the New York Central, Chesapeake & Ohio and Baltimore & Ohio Railroads in a merger that could mean life or death for the affected companies, and economic strength or weakness for the State of Indiana.

The ICC's decision will not affect Indiana citizens alone. It is of great interest to the East, and for that matter to the entire Nation. Its repercussions will be felt by the badly ailing railroad industry everywhere.

The New York Central is and has been an essential link in Indiana's transportation system, and currently has trackage totaling 3,065 miles in the State, a figure which ranks third in all States served by the system.

As an employer, the N.Y.C. provides livelihood for 1,500 persons in Indianapolis and a total of 2,500 in Indiana, with payrolls of $10 million and $15 million respectively. As a taxpayer, it contributed $911,186 to Indianapolis and Marion County in 1960 and paid $4,563,610 to the State during the same period.

The Chesapeake & Ohio wants to control and merge with the Baltimore & Ohio. Both lines operate in Indiana but not as extensively as the N.Y.C. The C. & O. wants to exclude the N.Y.C. from the merger. The Central proposes a three-way consolidation. Mergers are necessary steps toward solving the plight of the railroads. But a merger which does not consider the general good of the public, or the harmful effects on other essential systems, is not the right step.

If the New York Central were excluded from the consolidation, the road's revenues would be seriously curtailed by diversion of freight to the other two lines. The N.Y.C. is not able to absorb such substantial losses. It would be forced to curtail or eliminate many of its services in Indiana, possibly discontinue them entirely.

If, however, N.Y.C. were permitted by the ICC to join in the consolidation, multimillion dollar savings would result. The N.Y.C. has 61 connections and 81 common points of service with the B. & O. Duplications in freight and passenger facilities could be eliminated and the savings could be used to improve service of both roads and revitalize them.

The New York Central has a strong case for making the consolidation a three-system affair. Indiana and the East would be provided a strong transportation net serving more people more effectively than a two-system merger.

The alternative may well be bankruptcy and nationalization of all three railroads.

Teachers as Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the government relations department of the Oregon Education Association asked a number of citizens interested in education to "examine the role of the teacher as a citizen." These opinions were put into pamphlet form in a publication entitled "Some Views on Citizenship."

The director of the government relations department, John H. Nellor, has sent a copy of the publication to me. I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time the comments of Senator WAYNE MORSE, who has waged a tireless battle for legislation which would improve our public education system, and comments I made in response to the question of what is the true relation of the teacher citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MORSE's remarks and my statement appear in the RECORD at this point in the hope that they will perhaps suggest to teachers and others ways in which educators can better meet the challenges facing our Nation at this time.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

We are living in a tightly interrelated world. A decision taken anywhere can bear upon each of us most cruelly, or for great benefit. Literally, you are among the most potent of the opinion makers. Use this power wisely. Use it for the ends of your profession, to be sure, but use it also skillfully on the high questions of policy and state. Do not be timid in your affirmation of the right as you perceive it to be right.

As a profession, you have the right, the duty and the responsibility of seeing to it that those to whom you extend the hand of professional acceptance are increasingly well qualified to teach and to learn. To you, and almost to you alone should be the determination, implicit in a profession, of the qualities and abilities of your colleagues and coworkers.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAURINE NEUBERGER

Teachers today have opportunities to participate in civic affairs far beyond those of men and women who taught as recently as 25 years ago. Before then, even the dress, speech and manners were often rather rigidly prescribed for teachers by the local school boards. Now you can be a candidate for the State legislature. You can take part in county or city political clubs, you may dress and speak as any other citizen. The communities have placed new confidence in teachers. How as teachers have you responded to these newly won freedoms? To be able to teach young people to become

educated citizens it is, I believe, necessary that teachers have a sense of personal involvement in the forces that seek to obviate social, political, and economic inequities. To become informed, to vote, to discuss, to exercise political initiative, these are the dutiful privileges of all citizens, but perhaps particularly of teachers as you ought by example to be worthy of emulation by those in your classes. I think that for you to fail to participate in the needs of the community and Nation not only robs the community of your minds, training and efforts, but neglects a constant source of needed inspiration in the classroom.

Who's Boss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Who's Boss?" from the September 25, 1961, issue of Broadcasting:

WHO'S BOSS?

The fact that the FCC voted finally to break down 13 of the remaining two dozen clear channels is not in itself too significant. The choice before the Commission was not whether any of the channels should be duplicated but whether all of them would be thrown open to secondary operations in undeserved areas if any actually exist.

The really important action was that, by majority vote, the FCC elected to defy the House Commerce Committee which specifically had requested that it defer final decision until the committee and Congress had the opportunity to consider pending legislation which would prohibit the breakdowns.

This was bold action. It was mitigated somewhat through the device of delaying consideration of applications for duplicated assignments so that no breakdowns possibly could occur until well after the next session of Congress convenes in January.

What does this action portend? Does it mean that in the controversial areas of television, involving deintermixture and substandard dropins, that the FCC will ignore congressional opinion? We doubt this. And we doubt whether Congress would condone in. President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 2, involving the FCC, was overwhelmingly defeated in the House, because it would place too much power in the hands of the FCC Chairman and because Congress is jealous of its prerogatives in relation to the independent agencies vis-a-vis the executive branch.

Congress has always resisted executive interference with the independent agencies. The licensing and legislative functions belong to Congress, its leadership, whether Republican or Democratic, always has contended. Because Congress is busy and does not have the expertise, it has created such agencies as the ICC, FCC, FTC, and FAA to perform specialized work. And it won't easily retreat from that position.

As to the merits of the clear channel breakdown, we feel the FCC action is untimely, but for the unusual reason that it waited too long. It was 16 years ago that the clear channel case was opened. Conditions have changed. There is no shortage of AM stations anywhere except possibly in isolated areas where it would be economic suicide to build new class II, 10 kilowatt stations. And these, in most instances, are the very areas where the only service now available is from the clear channels.

It will be a long time before there is a showdown. We have the hunch that certain FCC members voted for the partial breakdown with the hope that Congress would take over and decide the issue before any real damage is done.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on September 26, 1961, I introduced into the RECORD a series of articles from the Denver Post written by Mr. Herb Hughes on our national farm problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD two more articles in this series dated September 24, 1961, and October 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Sept. 24, 1961]

THE FARM PROBLEM—WRITING GRAIN PROGRAM HARD

(By Herb Hughes)

The most recent crop estimates for 1961 have brought forth some criticism of the 1961 emergency feed grain program, particularly from Congressmen.

Crop yields are setting records in production per acre. This should have been expected as more fertilizer was applied and the better land was devoted to the reduced acreage planted by farmers.

For consumers this should be good news. As our population expands it proves we have a reserve production potential.

A new Feed Grain and Wheat Advisory Committee has been appointed by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman to make recommendations for a new program to present Congress next year to become effective with the 1963 crop year.

This Committee has been meeting this past week for the first time.

The Committee has a hard task ahead of it in developing a program that will get results and still get the approval of most members of the agriculture committees of Congress.

The writer is personally acquainted with most members of the Advisory Committee. They have the experience and knowledge to make sound suggestions, and I have complete confidence in their ability to compromise any differences and to make sound, workable recommendations.

I wish I could feel as confident of what will happen to their recommendations after they are made.

Because they are an advisory committee it will be up to the Secretary of Agriculture and his policy committee to make the final recommendations to Congress after clearance by the President and White House staff.

Then the legislation will come under attack from many sources. The farm organizations as represented by their leaders will certainly not be unanimous in their support, if one can judge by past performance.

Then there will be the processors of agriculture products who in general like plentiful supplies and low prices.

The road will be long and rocky before farmers will know what to expect for 1963, and the members of the Advisory Committee may have difficulty in recognizing the final result as their work. There should be an easier and more effective way of dealing with this national problem.

Many times the administrative details of a farm program have more to do with its effectiveness than the basic legislation itself. Many examples of this are developing in the present 1961 feed grain program. Another important item is the cost of administration which has skyrocketed this past summer.

Next I will explore some of these administrative problems and their effect on farms.

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 1, 1961]

THE FARM PROBLEM—SURPLUS CUT NEEDED; POLICY DETAILS SCORED

(By Herb Hughes)

There is pretty general agreement among farmers in the big production areas of the country that it is necessary to reduce production of surplus crops.

What causes the most criticism is the inequitable way the program fits individual farms.

For example, the most recent legislation contains a provision that any acreage of wheat or feed grains diverted under the emergency program must be placed in a soil conserving use and must be in addition to the normal acreage devoted to such use in 1959 and 1960, including summer fallow.

The principle is sound and is necessary if results are to be achieved. However, in actual practice it rewards the farmer who in those 2 years ignored good soil conservation practices and instead planted his land heavily and contributed most to the accumulating surplus.

This provision, when applied, causes great dissatisfaction among farmers.

The proper way to do this would be to allocate to each county the acreage normally in conserving use and let the farmer committees allot shares to individual farms on the basis of a sound longtime land use program.

This has been one of the biggest objections to past programs. Yet it has not been corrected.

AGRICULTURE SLIPS

There is cause for concern in the plains areas of the country about the economic position of agriculture relative to the more humid areas of the country because of the effects of past farm programs.

Such programs in the past have been administered under the assumption that the surplus problems were caused by production from so-called marginal areas.

For example, when the first farm legislation was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1936, a new program was enacted to pay farmers to divert to conserving uses cropland in addition to that normally in that use.

HARD TO SELL

This program was hard to sell in the humid or Corn Belt section of the country because of the crop rotation systems and use of legumes which had been encouraged by our land-grant colleges over the years.

At that time I was familiar with the ratio of depleting crops to cropland in eastern Nebraska counties as compared to the western or wheat area.

Most eastern counties had a ratio between 60 and 70 percent but in the west most were in the 90 percent area. There was practically no summer fallow practiced then.

Today the position is reversed with the development and increasing use of commercial fertilizers and the experiments carried on by agricultural colleges and others of continuous corn, the crop rotation systems and use of legumes for soil building purposes has been substantially reduced in the eastern areas. But in the wheat or western areas

summer fallow, or the practice of alternate year cropping, has become widely used.

In the 2 years previously referred to and now used as a base, this humid area of the country had no restrictions on the acreage of feed grains or soybeans the main crops. In addition, farmers there had the privilege of planting 15 acres of wheat though they had never previously produced it, and a great many did so.

The economic advantage of the humid area resulting from the use of this period as a base along with the greatly increased yields per acre in that same area concerns me.

If we are entering into a long period of crop adjustment, adequate research on this problem should be carried out so the plains area can defend itself.

Clear Channels—16 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Clear Channels—16 Years Later," from the June 19, 1961, issue of Broadcasting:

CLEAR CHANNELS—16 YEARS LATER

What the Nation doesn't need most are more radio stations. This is not to say that reception everywhere is optimum. There are white areas but these are so isolated that broadcasters would be hard put to eke out a living.

Yet the FCC last week proposed to add new stations by breaking down half of the existing 24 clear channels to allow additional class II (power up to 50 kilowatts) stations to be licensed under "controlled conditions." What those conditions may be won't be known until the FCC releases its formal decision some weeks hence.

The FCC's decision was based on hearings held in 1945–46—16 years ago. Then there were fewer than 1,000 AM radio stations in operation. There were some 50 FM's and a half dozen largely experimental TV's. Today there are more than 5,000 broadcast stations, of which nearly 4,000 are AM's. Radio competition is so rigorous that some operators, illogically, forgetting about free enterprise, want the Government to consider the economic ability of a community to support additional competition. FCC Commissioner Robert E. Lee even has suggested a freeze on new AM stations.

This FCC inherited the clear channel problem from predecessor commissions. The membership—except for one, Commissioner Rosel H. Hyde—has turned over several times since 1946. Conditions today do not remotely resemble those of 16 years ago. There is no shortage of service in any metropolitan area.

Clear channels were created to serve rural and remote listeners by providing high power on channels protected from interference by other stations.

Clear channels still provide rural and remote service. But the extent of this service hasn't been audited since those 1945–46 hearings. The FCC proposes, for example, to duplicate all four of Chicago's clear channel stations in the heart of the Nation's breadbasket. Does it know how many people in the Middle West will lose out when the nighttime coverage of these channels is curtailed by the addition of other stations? How would these rural folk be alerted in the event of a national emergency?

We think the FCC waited too long. It needs updating. We have suggested before and we urge again that the FCC schedule arguments or a short hearing to determine whether the new breakdowns are necessary or desirable. Spokesmen for the farmers and the ranchers, as well as the lawyers and engineers, should be heard. The stakes are too big. Moreover, we fear that these duplicated assignments, once the breakdown is final, will gravitate to the more populous metropolitan areas, already surfeited with service. It happened before.

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are about to embark upon a new era of highway safety with the advent of a new paving material, Wyton, which will enable highway engineers to use color for direction, caution, and other warnings.

Traffic and highway engineers have long recognized the need and advantages of color paving since safety experts agree that people have long associated colors with direction and caution.

My home State has taken the lead in this field and many installations have already been made there. The first material to be put down was in the city of Chicago. The product, Wyton, was developed by the Velsicol Chemical Corp., which is a Chicago-based concern. Coming up with new products is "old hat" for Velsicol—they developed the first chlorinated insecticide to be synthesized in the United States, chlordane.

However, this new breakthrough is of vital interest as we proved with our multibillion-dollar interstate highway program. These high-speed highways and interwinding cloverleafs can use color for both direction and safety.

Perhaps some of my colleagues will remember certain news stories which appeared in the Washington newspapers telling of the work the District Highway Department did at Rosslyn Circle on the Virginia side of Key Bridge. They resurfaced the traffic islands with a grass-green color to keep motorists from driving their auto onto it. Besides bringing new beauty to the area it is serving its purpose.

On Sherman Avenue in northwest Washington, the center median was paved in yellow to provide safety for pedestrians and caution motorists. It, too, is proving very successful.

No one is more interested than I in enhancing the beauty of our national parks and monuments. Here, again, this material will add greatly to our various shrines, parks and play areas. At Carter Barron Amphitheater, the sidewalks were paved with a forest green color to blend with the natural beauty of the area as well as provide a safer walking area for the patrons.

While these few installations are demonstrations of what can be done with color paving, in Illinois they have utilized it in many other ways to protect life and limb.

The Chicago Sun-Times and the Tribune report that access roads to high-speed freeways are being paved with red or yellow material to caution motorists upon entering and leaving. Dangerous intersections about the city will be put down in red and yellow so that both pedestrians and motorists will show more caution.

Everyone has been associating colors with various warnings and their meanings are embedded in their minds from the day they are born. When we see them, our reflex is automatic.

One cause of highway accidents is road fatigue and driver indifference. Safety officials have discovered that one reason for road fatigue is driving over the same monotonous color which causes a sort of hypnosis. Drivers lose their reflex action to an extent and accidents result. Now color can be used to break up the monotony and act as an alarm clock for motorists.

Another functional property of this new product is it can be laid down over both concrete and asphalt roads without special advance preparation.

This is especially important when it comes to resurfacing bridges. On reinforced concrete bridges you have several maintenance problems. One of the more serious ones involved those areas of severe winters where salt is used to eliminate ice.

The salt, where reinforcement bars have been exposed by expansion joints or spalling, corrodes these bars and the strength of the bridge is seriously affected. Also, moisture gets between the deck and wearing areas, freezes and causes the wearing surface to break up. The new material can be used as a wearing material and sealer to keep the bars from being exposed to water and salt. This would avoid costly maintenance and inconveniences which occur when bridges are closed for repair.

Not only is this material a boon to highway and safety engineers, but the white material as well as other colors can be used at airfields. White landing strips would greatly improve visibility at night and during adverse weather conditions. Taxi strips could be paved in different colors so that pilots could differentiate.

Also I am advised, a major obstacle around airfields is birds. As my colleagues will recall, one of the major air disasters in the United States occurred at Boston where it was determined that a flock of birds caused an airplane to crash while it was taking off.

Some officials at the Fish and Wildlife Service have reasons to believe that certain colors used on runways might act as a repellant and drive the birds away. This in itself would be a tremendous contribution.

Mr. President, I do not expect all our roads to be paved with this new material, but if it can help reduce the slaughter on our highways it should be used at critical points.

New Frontier Farm Policies: A Report on the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, we have now completed the 1st session of the 87th Congress and I feel it is a fitting time for a thorough evaluation of the farm policies of the New Frontier. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by some of the tendencies exhibited by the Kennedy administration in this vital area of our national policy.

The fixation of the New Frontiersman for the complete and total domination of all American agriculture became apparent this year. So did a mania for centralizing all marketing decisions in Washington. So did an executive branch insistence on a patently unconstitutional method of imposing new farm programs on every farmer and for every farm commodity in America by voiding and making a mockery of the constitutional prerogatives of Congress. So did a callous disregard for both the American sugar grower and the intent of Congress as legislatively recorded in the Sugar Act extension. So did a number of unsound fiscal policies masquerading under the mantle of phony liberalism. And the final folly of the New Frontier farm policy was its naive program of providing surplus agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and the Eastern European Communist satellites at subsidized prices.

Each of these tendencies portends great danger to both American agriculture and to the free enterprise, private initiative system which built our great Nation. Fortunately for the people of this Nation some of these tendencies were completely stifled by the Congress and others were effectively limited. Unfortunately, however, some were consummated in spite of strong Congressional opposition.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take one brief moment to both thank and commend the minority members of the House Committee on Agriculture for their courage, dedication, and cooperation in steadfastly resisting the unsound and unsavory actions of this administration, while at the same time acting constructively and effectively on those portions of our farm programs which accrue to the benefit of our farmers and our Nation. Had it not been for their support and assistance I shudder to imagine the kind of America we would have in just 1 year on the New Frontier.

During this 1st session of the 87th Congress there were four major issues in agriculture. Three of these were legislative: the feed grain bill, the omnibus farm bill, and the sugar bill. The fourth was the Department of Commerce's announcement upon behalf of the Kennedy administration that subsidized sales would be allowed to Russia and the Eastern European Red nations.

I would like to review each of these major issues and also show some of the constructive measures which Republican members of the committee and the House supported.

THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The first piece of farm legislation this session was the enactment of a 1961 feed grain program. The administration asked for a 1-year program applying to corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum, whereby farmers would be eligible for price supports and land retirement payments only if they participated in the program. The Department of Agriculture also asked for unlimited authority to sell Government-held surplus feed grain in order to break the economic backs of "noncooperators."

The House Committee on Agriculture limited the program to only corn and grain sorghum and slightly limited the Secretary's feed grain dumping authority by providing that CCC sales could not be made for less than 17 percent below the support price.

In the additional minority views on H.R. 4510, expressed by myself and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] the ranking minority member of the Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee, we pointed out that the dumping authority was an unprecedented and unsound provision and we strongly opposed this feature on the floor of the House.

We pointed out, however, that except for this provision the proposal contained a number of features long advocated by myself and many other Members from the Midwest. These were the voluntary retirement of land, the use of payments-in-kind to finance this retirement, and the requirement that producers participate in the program in order to be eligible for the benefits.

Although it contained these beneficial features, we opposed this bill in the House because of its dumping features and it narrowly passed—209–202.

The Senate bill did not contain this controversial dumping feature so when the conference convened, I was hopeful a suitable compromise could be reached.

The final version which was worked out did represent a compromise of sort, but it still gave the Secretary of Agriculture vast powers in manipulating the grain market. It was one of the toughest decisions that I have been required to make as a Member of Congress, when I supported the conference report on this bill. I did so because I felt the farmer should be given the benefit of the doubt and because I felt that with proper administration this program could be of assistance in improving farm income and solving our surplus problem in feed grains. The record of the Department of Agriculture in administering this program unfortunately has left much to be desired. Here are some of the great unanswered questions Mr. Freeman has raised with his administration of the program:

Why is there a discrepancy of approximately 5 million "phantom acres" between the Secretary's report submitted pursuant to Public Law 87–5, which showed approximately 87 million acres of corn planted in 1959–60, and the reports of the Crop Reporting Board and other agencies within the Department, showing only some 82 million acres planted in 1959–60?

With the productive genius of the American farmer being fully exhibited this year, will the Department be able to sell some $680 million worth of payment-in-kind certificates without completely destroying the feed grain market? USDA has already sold 235 million bushels of corn between October 1, 1960, and September 1, 1961, as compared to only 105 million bushels during the previous year, under the pretext that it is "going out of condition."

What will be the total cost of such a policy? The loss to feed grain farmers on their 1960 crop because of this 1961 dumping may run into many millions of dollars; and the ultimate cost to the Government in taking over 637 million bushels of the 1960 corn crop, the highest on record, is still untold. These costs are, of course, in addition to the $680 million cash outlay by CCC to finance the payment-in-kind certificates.

What will the impact of this program be on hog, cattle, and other livestock? Indiscriminate dumping could easily disrupt the delicate balance between livestock and feed grains.

What effect will the little-publicized Neal Smith amendment which limits feed grain price support to cooperators to a volume based on the per-acre yields in 1959–60?

What is meant by the Department's recent announcement that 1961 corn market prices will be kept at "reasonable" levels? The current market price is only 64 percent of parity. Can this be "reasonable," particularly in view of the fact that no certificate corn has been sold yet?

These questions must be answered fully before this program can be made to work. Mr. Freeman told us he had the answers. We must wait to see whether he does.

SUGAR

Pursuant to legislation enacted in the 86th Congress, the Sugar Act was scheduled to expire on March 31, 1961. It was necessary, therefore, for Congress to extend this law and we did so in Public Law 87–15, by extending the act to June 30, 1962, giving the administration the authority it requested in regard to withholding from the Dominican Republic its share in the cutback of the Cuban quota, and establishing a congressional policy that in redistributing the Cuban quota "special consideration" should be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities. No provisions were made for protecting the legitimate interests of American sugar growers, particularly those in new production areas.

In a special study prepared in the Department of Agriculture last year at the

request of the House Agriculture Committee, it was clearly demonstrated that U.S. growers had both the capacity and the ability to provide more sugar for our domestic market. Because of the obvious justice in letting American farmers enjoy a greater share of the American sugar market, on May 19, 1961, I urged Secretary Freeman to clarify the administration's position in regard to increasing domestic production at the earliest possible date.

I cited three main reasons presented by new growers as justification of their request for an opportunity to produce more sugar. These reasons are first that increased U.S. sugar production will mean increased farm income in many Western and Southwestern States. Second, sugar is a deficit crop in the United States and since we rely on foreign sources for a great portion of our needs, an increase to meet these needs is justified. Third, the Cuban fiasco has tightened Communist control of Cuba, the nation we have historically depended upon for approximately one-third of our sugar supply. I pointed out that there is no valid reason why we should redistribute the Cuban quota all over the world when American farmers can do the job.

In spite of my suggestions and the concerted efforts of many Members of Congress, Secretary Freeman on August 3, 1961, announced that the New Frontier had forgotten the sugar farmers of America, saying in part: "For several reasons it appears inadvisable to present such recommendations before the beginning of the next session of Congress. World production and marketing of sugar are undergoing realinement and the situation has not yet stabilized. This fact coupled with other uncertainties in the international field lead us to believe it wise to reserve judgment, for the present, about some of the major issues respecting sugar import quotas."

It is certainly my hope that at the very beginning of the 2d session of this 87th Congress we can get down to the business of a long-range extension of this program which will properly reflect the interest and productive capacity of new growers, the forgotten farmers on the New Frontier.

Another disturbing aspect of the Sugar Act extension was the flagrant disregard of the administration for the intent of Congress in regard to the redistribution of the Cuban quota. Despite convincing evidence that at least three nations were prepared to purchase for dollars large quantities of our agricultural commodities in return for a share of our sugar market, the administration arrogantly disregarded the clear intent of Congress with regard to giving these nations special consideration. These nations were allowed to sell their sugar to us, but the administration did not require them to buy U.S. farm commodities.

In the statement of managers on the part of the House in House Report No. 839 on the omnibus farm bill, the following statement appears:

> Obviously some subordinate officials in the Department of State not only frown upon the clear intent and meaning of legislation which has been enacted by Congress, but arrogantly and deliberately refuse to execute the laws enacted as Congress has clearly indicated such laws should be administered.
>
> While these officials and representatives of the executive branch of the Government might not be guilty of malfeasance they very well may be guilty of malfeasance of office.

On the floor of the House on August 3, 1961, at page 13545 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the chairman of the committee, Mr. COOLEY, made the following statement in this regard:

> Unfortunately, the State Department operating through a man by the name of Martin seems to be making all of the decisions with regard to the purchases of sugar from all sources for our own domestic market. Mr. PAUL JONES, of Missouri, is chairman of our Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, and he has conducted hearings and has had Mr. Martin before the committee. I sat in on part of the hearings. I am frank to say Mr. Martin was arrogant and utterly indifferent to the clear intent and meaning of the language of the law that we wrote when we extended the sugar act the last time. He took full responsibility. We intended that consideration—yes, special consideration should be given to countries purchasing our agricultural surplus commodities. Apparently, that language in the law has been completely ignored by Mr. Martin in the State Department because it developed before Mr. JONES' committee that not only Brazil had offered to buy a ton of wheat for every ton of sugar that she was permitted to sell in our market, but it would up somewhat differently. I will repeat, the Brazilian proposal contemplated the sale of a ton of American wheat to Brazil or to people in Brazil for every ton of sugar which she was permitted to sell in our market. The final decision provided that Brazil should be permitted to sell into our market 225,000 tons. Someone told me that the sponsors of the project would not have to buy our wheat. When that was reported to me, I tried to ascertain the name of the person who made that suggestion and everything pointed to Mr. Martin. I am convinced, and I think our committee is convinced that Mr. Martin is the man who relieved the sponsors of the necessity of purchasing American wheat to the extent of 225,000 tons. The same situation existed in connection with the project submitted by some people in India. India ended up by being permitted to sell 225,000 tons in our market, and India was not required to buy a single ton of American wheat. The Fiji Islands had somewhat similar proposition. And there are other proposals pendings. Mr. Martin notwithstanding the language of this act of Congress said that anyone who specifically proposes a bilateral proposition of that type had one strike against him to start with. I submit we will never get rid of these surplus commodities, if we always have some bureaucrat putting roadblocks in the way. The Brazilians did just what I told Mr. Martin they probably would do, and that is they purchased their wheat requirements from Russia rather than from the United States.

In spite of these strong words the American taxpayer and the American farmer were left holding the bag and a golden opportunity to dispose of some of our farm surpluses has been irrevocably lost. As pointed out by the chairman, the Brazilians then turned around and purchased their wheat requirements from Russia.

OMNIBUS FARM BILL

After Congress had cleared the feed grain and sugar bills we were confronted with the so-called omnibus farm bill. This 79-page document was the most thorough and sweeping plan for the complete regimentation of American agriculture ever devised by the mind of man. Extensive hearings were held before the committee and the most obnoxious features were deleted. During the House debate on the bill on July 26, 1961, at pages 12483–12485 I listed 50 items in this bill which had been requested by the Kennedy administration but which were denied by our committee. I also pointed out that in spite of Mr. Freeman's description of the denuded bill as the "most comprehensive piece of farm legislation since 1938," most of what was finally enacted consisted of extensions and modifications of Eisenhower farm programs, most of which were enacted in the 83d Republican-controlled Congress. These included Public Law 480, the National Wool Act of 1954, the school milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs, the Great Plains program, and the provisions streamlining the Farmers Home Administration.

The wheat and marketing order amendments were to laws passed in the 1930's. The key feature of the New Frontier's program, title I, was scuttled. This was the proposal that was a warmed-over version of the Poage bill which was soundly defeated 236–170 in the preceding 86th Congress. It would have set up an arrangement whereby the Secretary of Agriculture through hand-picked so-called advisory committees could have set up producer controls on every one of the 256 farm commodities in the United States after going through a sham referral to Congress which could not amend or change any program but could veto it only by specific action. Inaction by Congress would cause it to go into effect. The final step would be a rigged referendum in which the Secretary could set the choices available and establish who could vote.

The Washington Post of Friday, June 30, 1961, succinctly wrote the obituary of this fantastic plan when it said:

> President Kennedy suffered a major defeat yesterday when the key provisions of his farm program were plowed under on Capitol Hill.

During the prolonged consideration of this bill a great many claims and counterclaims were made. It is surprising that even today some of these fallacious arguments in support of title I are still being presented. I would like to point out several of them which repeatedly crop up.

The first claim about this bill is that "Congress would retain intact its responsibility to hold hearings, to approve, reject, or amend any farm program proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture and representative committees of producers." Let us examine this statement in detail. First of all, Secretary Freeman's testimony on page 62 of the printed hearings indicated that any proposal sent to the Congress by the executive branch could not be amended. Here is the direct colloquy between Mr. Freeman and myself:

> Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to clear up one matter.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOEVEN. When a commodity program or proposal is submitted to the Congress, can the Congress amend or change such program?

Secretary FREEMAN. No; the Congress would vote it up or down.

Mr. HOEVEN. Now, you are not answering my question. Can the Congress amend or revise the proposal which you send to the Congress before it is submitted to the referendum?

Secretary FREEMAN. Under the terms of the bill you would vote it up or down—not amend.

Mr. HOEVEN. The Congress could not amend or change it?

Secretary FREEMAN. But the Congress could introduce, of course, at any time, any legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. I understand that, but I am directing my specific question to you when I contend that the Congress could not amend or change the proposal.

Secretary FREEMAN. Right.

Mr. HOEVEN. We could vote it up or down, and that is it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

The fact is obvious then that Congress would not retain its constitutional prerogative of amending legislation. I would add also that there is no requirement for hearings to be held and that Congress could not affirmatively approve a proposal. Any such proposal would go into effect automatically if there were no specific congressional action of disapproval within 60 days.

A second claim cited is that "it would diminish the power of the Secretary by requiring, first, congressional approval of changes in price supports, allotments, and other program changes and, second, a two-thirds vote would be needed before a change in programs could be made."

Any impartial observer should be able to realize that H.R. 6400 sought additional legal authority for the Secretary. If it did not, what would be the need for all the controversy? The statement of policy in the bill setting forth the purpose of the legislation rebutted any contentions that the authority of the Secretary would be reduced when it stated:

SECTION 1. Declaration of policy:

* * * * *

(d) improve and broaden existing legislation to assure flexibility for effective supply adjustment and price and income stabilization;

(e) authorize the utilization of such additional and varied price and income stabilization methods as will best protect the prices and incomes of farmers;

As to the point that a two-thirds vote of farmers would be needed to change a program, let me point out that sections 360(i) and 360(j) of H R. 6400 provided that the Secretary of Agriculture would determine just who would vote in any referendum. The final sentence of section 360(j) provided as follows:

The determinations of the Secretary as to the farmers eligible to vote in the referendum hereunder and the proclaimed results of such referendum shall be final and conclusive.

What this means to farmers is just this—in last year's model of this legislation, the Family Farm Income Act, or Poage bill, which, as I have previously indicated, was defeated by the House by a vote of 236 to 170, there was a similar provision which specifically tied down the question of who could or could not vote in any referendum. Under the criteria of that bill, the following percentages of producers would not be eligible to vote: Cotton, 25 percent; burley tobacco, 27 percent; Flue-cured tobacco, 9 percent; peanuts, 30 percent; rice, 10 percent; hogs, 45 percent; cattle, 55 percent.

I am not contending that these same percentages would necessarily apply to this year's bill, but I am contending that the Secretary would have the authority under H.R. 6400 to do exactly what last year's bill would have done in this regard. The power to select who will vote is the power to determine the outcome of that vote.

A third claim is that "producers of any commodity which does not have price supports or controls can remain free of controls. Any change would have to be initiated by producers and later approved by two-thirds of them."

In this regard, let me point out that the Secretary of Agriculture, not farmers, would write the farm program. Farmers should not be deluded into thinking they would have an effective voice; they would merely be handpicked rubberstamp advisers to the Secretary. As to initiating programs, here is what section 102 of H.R. 6400 provided:

(a) Whenever the Secretary determines such action is necessary or desirable, he shall provide for the selection under this section of a national farmer advisory committee for any commodity or group of commodities.

Furthermore, to this point here is what the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture said in his legal brief on the constitutionality of H.R. 6400:

Title I of H.R. 6400 provides for industry advisory groups, but the Secretary is required only to consult and advise with such groups, and the Secretary has the authority to determine the details of the programs to be established pursuant to title I of H.R. 6400.

A fourth claim is that "it would cut governmental costs for programs designed to raise farm income in direct proportion of the ability of producers to design sensible marketing agreements and tools."

My only comment in this regard is to point out that during the hearings no one from the Department of Agriculture or any one else was able to come up with any concrete cost estimates. Secretary Freeman was unable to give a specific answer when I asked him the following question at page 47 of the printed hearings:

Mr. HOEVEN. What is the overall cost of your new program, Mr. Secretary

Secretary FREEMAN. Again I would answer you, and I am not trying to be evasive, honestly, not having set down any program, there are no dollar figures. There are limitations on the bill itself.

Now one of those limitations, for example, is that you could not have any price supports above 90 percent. Each device has a limitation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Could you give us an estimate as to the overall cost?

Secretary FREEMAN. No; I would say only this: that it would be substantially less, I am confident, than the present cost of the farm program.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do you think so?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

I think that commonsense dictates that the cost of the present program which controls only five crops would be skyrocketed by title I of H.R. 6400 which earmarked controls for 256 commodities.

Another claim is that "it would encourage self-help, self-financed plans to stabilize agricultural markets. It would clear the way for fewer, not more, Government controls."

If this is true, why did part VII of subtitle C of H.R. 6400 provide marketing quotas and penalties for "any agricultural commodity, including but not limited to the following: corn, tobacco, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, grass seeds, vegetables—including potatoes—fruits, tree nuts, and seeds, hogs, cattle, lambs, chickens, turkeys, whole milk, butterfat, eggs, hops, honey, and gum naval stores.

I frankly cannot understand how Government controls can be decreased by authorizing controls on 251 more commodities as this language plainly and clearly does. Fortunately, the cattlemen, poultry producers, and livestock farmers of America recognized this fact and made their views known.

I cannot close these comments about title I without a final word about the most fantastic and highhanded proposal included in the whole bill, the Secretary's request for a "blank check" for the 1962 wheat program At pages 68 and 69 of the hearings the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. LATTA. I have one question. Is it not a fact that in this bill the 1962 program would not be subject to review by the Congress?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LATTA. That is true?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LATTA. This would be a complete abdication of the powers of Congress, would it not?

Secretary FREEMAN. In this instance; no. In this instance because of the pressure of time the Secretary would be empowered to select the committee without going through the selective procedures to develop a program and to submit it to the referendum.

Mr. LATTA. They would actually be writing a program for wheat without being passed or reviewable by the Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me interrupt. I thought that that provision after 1962 was only applicable——

Secretary FREEMAN. For 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. Only applicable for the selection of the advisory committee—you still have no program——

Secretary FREEMAN. No; in this instance so far as the wheat program is concerned because of the pressure of time, it would provide that the Secretary would be authorized to name and call together an advisory committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. And then you submit the program to the President and——

Secretary FREEMAN. No. This would be directly by referendum, in this instance, so far as wheat is concerned, because there would not be time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, we will recess now until 2:30 this afternoon.

It should be clear by now that the wheat provisions of this bill represent the biggest power grab of all. I, for one, feel there is a constitutional disability in any scheme to let the executive branch write, implement, and enforce a production and marketing program on producers of one of our most important grains without giving the Congress even the most perfunctory review.

SUBSIDIZED AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO COMMUNIST NATIONS

Probably the most bewildering action taken by this administration in the field of agriculture was the announcement by the Department of Commerce on June 22, 1961.

At that time the Commerce Department said in reversing a long-standing Eisenhower administration policy that henceforth it would issue export licenses to ship certain U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to Soviet Russia and the Eastern European Communist nations if such sales were made for a convertible currency. The Department further stated that North Korea, North Vietnam, Communist China, and Cuba would not be eligible for these transactions. The major commodities affected were feed grains, wheat, flour, rice, cotton, cotton textiles, and nonfat dry milk.

Under this so-called trade liberalization, export subsidies can be paid on food and fiber shipments to Russia and her European satellites. Export subsidies had previously been limited to shipments of surplus farm commodities to non-Communist nations only. The reason for the export subsidy program is that our domestic price level is substantially higher than the world market price and many of our agricultural commodities must be subsidized by the Government in order to be able to compete in world markets. These subsidies, for example, run up to 62 cents per bushel on wheat, 8½ cents per pound on cotton, 2 cents per bushel on corn, 21 cents per bushel on rye, and 7 cents per hundredweight on grain sorghum. At the same time our farm laws generally prohibit Government sales in the domestic market for less than 105 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges.

The arguments proposed by the New Frontier in support of this sweeping policy change were, first, that these sales would accrue to the benefit of the United States because we would be disposing of our farm surplus, and, second, that some of our allies were trading with the Communists; so why should not we compete with them?

The first argument is fallacious, to say the least. If it were to our benefit to sell to Russia at bargain prices, why, then, would it not be equally to our benefit to make the same sales to Communist China, Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam, the Red nations excluded by the Commerce Department announcement. I do not see how Russian or East German gold can be more desirable than Cuban or Red China gold. I, for one, do not think we need to make subsidized sales to any Red nation for their bloody gold.

The second argument is equally ridiculous. If we followed that rationale we could open our shop in Red China tomorrow since, despite our grave concern, a number of our allies are doing business with the Chinese Reds.

Here, then, are the real effects of the administration policy:

First. We would be making our farm surpluses available to the Russians and other Red countries at prices substantially below those at which American consumers could obtain those same commodities. Under this policy a miller in Moscow could get American wheat for up to 62 cents per bushel cheaper than could a miller in Minneapolis.

Second. We would have no control over the transshipment of these commodities to Cuba, Red China, North Vietnam, or North Korea. The Russians could very easily see to it that those nations received our abundance, despite the paper prohibition of the Commerce Department.

Third. We would be aiding the Communist movement in its weakest area, which is agriculture. In whatever fields of science or technology the Soviets have equaled or exceeded us, they must take a back seat in agriculture. It takes one-half of the population of Russia to feed itself and the other half. In America less than 10 percent of our population more than adequately takes care of itself and the other 90 percent. By providing a steady and abundant supply of food and fiber to the Reds, we would allow them to release manpower and resources for their avowed goal of burying us. We would be financing our own destruction.

Fourth. Sales for convertible currencies under this policy would be a mechanism for avoiding the prohibition in Public Law 480 which prevents soft currency sales, barter, or donations to Russia or areas or nations dominated by world communism.

When I learned of this action by the Department of Commerce, I joined with some 21 other Members of the House and Senate in sponsoring legislation to reverse this foolish decision. Action on these bills is now pending in the Congress.

About the time that this policy was becoming widely known, the omnibus farm bill was being considered. When the bill came before the House, I was happy to support an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATTA, which spelled out the intent of Congress on this matter.

The Latta amendment stated the policy of Congress that our Government should in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to the Soviet Union or to any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

The Latta amendment was adopted by the House and I was privileged to fight for its retention in the conference report. It is now incorporated in section 2(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1961, signed by the President on August 8, 1961.

I wish that the story could end happily at this point, but unfortunately the Department of Commerce has not as yet made any formal reversal or repudiation of its announcement of June 22.

At his press conference on August 8, 1961, the Secretary of Commerce was asked this question about the newly signed Agricultural Act of 1961:

Will you follow the declaration of policy though?

Mr. Hodges replied as follows:

Let me say this about the declaration of policy: We have not received in the Department of Commerce any request for a license to ship anything abroad, and nothing has been done.

The Secretary of State and I, as you may recall—the release is available—on August 4 stated that because of the negotiations—reading between the lines—so that we might keep ourselves flexible there would be no change at the present time in what we were going to ship or not ship, but that we reserved the right to change any moment.

Now, as quickly as Dean Rusk gets back, I am going to sit down with him, and I'd rather reserve an answer until we have a chance to talk it out together.

Later in the same press conference he was asked this specific question in regard to the June 22 announcement:

You mean you're thinking of rescinding that ruling?

Mr. Hodges replied as follows:

Whether we will rescind the ruling or not I can't answer. It's entirely possible that that will be the effect of it.

Mr. Hodges makes the point that up to the present time no export licenses have actually been issued. The important thing to keep in mind, it seems to me, is not whether any of these subsidized sales have been made. The important point is that they can officially still be made. Undoubtedly the widespread congressional interest in this matter along with the extremely difficult arrangements necessary for any kind of a transaction behind the Iron Curtain have kept American firms from applying for export licenses under the June 22 announcement.

Mr. Speaker I have stood in the barren streets of East Berlin and looked at armed East German "Vopos" forcefully prohibiting the flight to freedom of thousands of East Germans. I have seen the Iron Curtain clamp down right in the middle of the city of Berlin. For the life of me I cannot see any rhyme or reason in allowing bargain basement sales to such ruthless enemies of our basic ideals of freedom and human dignity. The Kennedy administration should promptly and emphatically reverse its foolish decision of June 22.

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION

I do not want to close my comments on this 1st session of the 87th Congress without briefly recounting some of the legislation which I and other minority Members supported and attempted to perfect.

These included bills to provide additional sums for Public Law 480 operations, an adjustment in the Farmers Home Administration operating loan authority, an amendment to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, a number of bills to provide drought assistance, an extension of the Mexican

farm labor program, and the establishment of a national hog cholera eradication program. In addition, of course, there were a number of provisions in the omnibus farm bill which were supported. These include the extension of Public Law 480, the extension of the school milk program, the extension of the Great Plains conservation program, the extension of the National Wool Act, the modernizing of the Farmers Home Administration as well as some of the wheat, feed grains, and marketing order provisions.

In conclusions, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that when we face new problems next year that we again reject the tenets of the New Frontier and that we dedicate our efforts toward the establishment of a sound, healthy, dynamic, and expanding agriculture, truly our most valuable national asset.

Germany: An Opportunity for Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under general leave heretofore granted I include in the Appendix an excellent article by Mr. Platt Cline, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Sun at Flagstaff in my district. Mr. Cline is one of the most highly regarded independent publishers in Arizona. The column follows:

OPPORTUNITY FOR SETTLEMENT

President Kennedy has made it clear that this Nation has no intention of being pushed out of Berlin. While emphasizing that we will not back down he leaves the door open for peaceful settlement of the dispute.

How else settle the question? Start a war?

Some commentators including the Phoenix newspapers take the stand that even discussing the matter with Russia is appeasement, another Munich and another case of a preordained failure for peace in our time.

What do they want to do—launch a war to unite East and West Germany?

The Russians took East Germany by force of arms during World War II. Whatever threat they have since become we should remember they were invaded by Germany in the early years of the war, and that they lost 10 million lives in that conflict. Of course the Russians have no intentions of getting out of East Germany because De Gaulle doesn't want them there, or the West Germans don't want them there. It looks like they are there to stay, at least until the Germans themselves figure out some way of getting them out.

Before we start screaming appeasement we should remind ourselves that a divided Germany is healthier for the peace of Europe and the world than a united Germany. Germany has invaded her neighbors time and time again. Talk to the Danes, the Dutch, and for that matter, the Czechs and the Slavs. Divided Germany probably will always lack the strength to commit aggression against the other nations of Europe.

If we consider that a divided Germany is better for peace and that East Germany is separate from West Germany, and in exchange for this formal recognition make sure we will have continued access to West Berlin, it will be the best and fairest deal we can expect to make under the circumstances.

The Russians are a continuing threat to world peace. But another threat is the failure of some American citizens to see the German picture as it really is.

Sandburg Leads Race for Illinois Poet Laureate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the great portrait of Abraham Lincoln alone should qualify Carl Sandburg as an Illinois poet laureate. In verse he gave to the world the life of Lincoln equal to volumes written by historians.

Born in Galesburg, Ill., in 1878 and now a resident of Flat Rock, N.C., he is still claimed by the people of his birthplace. He typifies the American way of life of the 20th century, born in poverty, and with skill and ambition arose to the top in his art.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Sandburg Leads Race for Illinois Poet Laureate," taken from the Western Courier of September 13, 1961, published in Macomb, Ill., be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANDBURG LEADS RACE FOR ILLINOIS POET LAUREATE

A coed-sponsored drive to name an Illinois poet laureate is gaining momentum—and with Carl Sandburg gaining strength as prime nominee.

Annie Williams, Downers Grove student, enrolled at Western Illinois University, started the campaign during the summer months. She has asked heads of English departments of 50 Illinois colleges and universities to name the person who should be honored as Illinois poet laureate.

Mrs. Charle J. Bednar, president of the Carl Sandburg Association, wrote: "I want you to know how grateful we all are for the interesting job you are doing for the Western Courier."

Annie is on the Courier staff at WIU.

Mrs. Bednar added, "You will note that two Illinois Senators, as well as Adlai Stevenson, are members of our board. We would feel it a justified honor if the State would compliment Mr. Sandburg by naming him 'Poet Laureate.'

"He will be 84 January 6, 1962. We will be very happy to cooperate with you in any plans for the future."

Sandburg is leading, Annie said. "But some don't go along with him. I was surprised that Howard A. Wilson of Knox College in Galesburg voted for Archibald MacLeish. Everyone knows that Sandburg's hometown is in Galesburg—even if he now lives in Flatrock, N.C.

George Williams College named Gwendolyn Brooks; Jeremiah C. LeHane, DePaul University, named Vachel Lindsay. Richard M. Eastman of North Central College declined to nominate a candidate.

Most English heads feel that Sandburg's residence shouldn't bar him for the honor.

Students are digging into the literature books in the WIU library to find out how to bestow the honor in a proper way once the poet is located.

The President's Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following intuitive and eloquent defense of President Kennedy's economic policy; it successfully refutes the fallacious argument that contends that there has been no change from the previous administration. The article appeared in the New Republic on September 18, 1961:

KENNEDY'S ECONOMICS

(By Seymour E. Harris, Littauer professor of political economy at Harvard University and was a member of the President's task force on the economy)

In his June television program, Mr. Walter Lippmann said of President Kennedy: What he has done in the first 4 or 5 months is "first of all to carry on in all its essentials the Eisenhower economic philosophy. * * * It's like the Eisenhower administration 30 years younger." Criticism from labor leaders and others has been even stronger. For instance, the able economist, Oscar Gass, writing in a recent issue of Commentary, declared that President Kennedy has "projected little and accomplished almost nothing." Gass is critical of his tax, spending, and interest rate policy. Leon Keyserling, a former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, who was so largely responsible for the acceptance of the "growth" thesis by the Democrats, found the President's goals far too low and stated that the "proposed programs fall far short even of compatibility with these excessively low goals. * * *"

I do not go along with these criticisms—though I am not critical of the economists, including members of the present Council, who have been urging larger deficits as a means of treating the unemployment problem. I share a view that a $10 billion deficit or thereabouts may be necessary to bring unemployment down to around 4 percent by next year. But this does not mean that the President should necessarily support a $10 billion deficit for fiscal year 1962.

Economics is one thing; politics is another. No one has criticized the President for lack of political acumen.

I have seen no evidence that the Congress is prepared to go along with large deficits except for security reasons. In fact, on a number of vital issues, it is clear that the President is ahead of Congress, which was not even prepared to go along with the President when he proposed $2.5 billion for a 4-year urban renewal program. Congress clearly differentiates between budgetary expenditures and other commitments in the housing bill. Nor did the Congress accept the President's recommendations in full in other welfare programs; e.g., the liberalization of old-age insurance and the manpower training bill.

Should the President move too far ahead of the Congress in his espousal of deficit financing, his program could be in jeopardy.

Where the line is drawn is a matter of political judgment. In my opinion a $5 billion deficit in fiscal year 1962, largely explained by the Berlin crisis, is acceptable to Congress; a $7 billion deficit may be tolerated; a $10 billion one substantially tied to welfare programs or (and) tax cuts would likely induce sabotage of the economic program of the President and the New Frontier.

The charge made against the President is that he appears excessively concerned with keeping spending and deficits down. But no administration has advanced as far as the Kennedy administration in accepting Keynesian economics. Whereas in his last economic report, President Eisenhower was silent on the recession and his aids, inclusive of Nixon, continued to deny it in the late months of 1960, Kennedy proclaimed its presence and expressed a determination to treat it with Federal deficits. In his speech before the National Press Club of June 20 the Secretary of the Treasury supported deficit financing as a means of treating a deficit—and this is the first time, to my knowledge, that this position has been taken publicly by a Secretary of the Treasury. Anyone who doubts the advance of the New Frontier should compare the Keynesian thinking of Roosevelt, Morgenthau, Snyder, Humphrey and Anderson with that of Kennedy. It was Eisenhower and Humphrey, not Kennedy, who would cut taxes at the top of a boom just when the appropriate policy would be a rise of taxes to treat the exuberant economy.

Indeed, in the debates on economic policy, the President has been cautious in supporting large deficits. But economists, increasingly aware of the emergence of budgetary surpluses long before full employment would be reached, urged recourse to deficits through tax cuts or (and) increased public expenditures. Most economists agree that the solution of the unemployment problem depends especially on adequacy of demand, in turn related to appropriate fiscal and monetary policy. Deficits and low money rates are the facets of adequate demand policy.

The Council and economists generally stress the need of appropriate monetary and fiscal policy as a means not only of dealing with cyclical unemployment but also with the estimated 1–2 millions structurally unemployed. That the level of demand is of great significance is suggested by this fact: Of eight industries that experienced a decline of jobs from 7.5 to 5 million in postwar, the loss was but 1 percent average in prosperous years and 8 percent in depressed years.

In Washington, nevertheless, there seems to be a disposition to over-stress the general against the specific attack. No general measures are going to solve the problems of the textile, coal, automobile, aircraft, and similar towns though they contribute to a solution. The rise of unemployment at the top of a boom in successive cycles, the rise in numbers and persistence of depressed areas, the decline of demand for the unskilled, the large increase of young and older workers especially vulnerable to unemployment—all of these point to a residue of unemployment requiring special measures.

The President has been well aware of this problem of residual structural unemployment. His support of the manpower training bill, the Area Redevelopment Act, a permanent revision of unemployment compensation—all of these point to his determination to solve the problem of structural unemployment by direct attacks as well as the deficit and monetary policy routes.

It is not clear that beyond a certain point the most economical way of treating structional unemployment is through general measures. The Secretary of Labor estimated that $700 million would finance the retraining of 800,000 unemployed in 4 years. Even if only one out of eight found jobs—say only for 8 years—the cost per man-year would be less than $1,000. But the cost of an additional job per year through deficit financing can very roughly be put at about $4,000—and this allows for the secondary effects on income of the deficit. In both instances, I do not deduct for gains in relief, unemployment compensation, and taxes.

Hence the President's reluctance to incur large deficits may, in part, be explained by a somewhat greater reliance on the direct approach (e.g., retraining, stimulation of new industries in depressed areas) than is favored by many economists.

Another point can be raised in support of the President's position; namely, that he has a responsibility to establish priorities in spending. He may not have foreseen the exact time of the Berlin crisis, but the possibility of an intensification of the cold war was clear to all. Excessive commitments on welfare outlays, and a tax cut, if added to later security outlays, might have put an excessive burden on the budget. The deficit in fiscal year 1961 was $4 billion, and current estimates for fiscal year 1962 are $5 billion, though the ultimate figure may well be higher.

Whereas Congress has gone along willingly with the President's proposals to spend for space and security, it has been amendable to welfare commitments. Indeed, there may be differences of opinion on whether the President is seeking an adequate deficit to bring recovery and stimulate growth, but that anyone can describe Kennedy's economics as a carbon copy of Eisenhower's is almost beyond belief.

The major objective of Eisenhower's administration was to reduce Federal expenditures and deficits, with the incidental advantage of price stability. The budget was not an instrument of policy, but an objective. For Kennedy, the budget was also a means of stimulating the economy.

In his special message on the defense budget of March 28, President Kennedy said: "Our arms must be adequate to meet our commitments and insure our security without being bound by arbitrary budget ceilings." In response to growing dangers he did not cut the military budget by $10 billion as Eisenhower did and impose on the Nation the massive retaliation doctrine in large part to apepase the economizers; nor did he give his Secretary of the Treasury virtually a veto power over military budgets as Sherman Adams reveals Eisenhower bestowed on Humphrey. Kennedy, in the face of danger, despite his concern for responsible spending policies, increased the military budget by at least $5 billion.

Nor has Kennedy followed Eisenhower in the latter's determination to balance the budget account rather than the budget. In order to give the budget a good appearance, Eisenhower rented post offices rather than built them (despite the increased costs), diverted civil service pension funds to the ordinary budget, sold FHA and CCC paper despite the adverse effects on the economy, disposed of $10 billion or more of relatively long-term securities in the midst of a recession in order to save interest and incidentally abort a recovery; and would finance a $100 billion road program out of a trust fund. At the outset of his administration, Kennedy stopped the sale of long-term securities and the sale of FHA paper in a recession when these were obviously serving to raise interest rates while the objective was to reduce them.

In the midst of great perils, the Government has to mobilize all weapons and that includes monetary policy. Yet Eisenhower refused to tell the Federal Reserve what was required of it and thus allowed the Fed to restrict monetary supplies and induce unemployment. At the outset Kennedy made it clear that he expected a policy of the Fed that was consistent with the objectives of the Government. The Fed felt pressure from the administration to provide more credit, reduce interest rates in the recession and in the recovery phase to keep rates from rising substantially. The President also understands that a reduction in rates would put a smaller burden on the budget: this is an alternative and additional way of bringing recovery.

Those who think that Kennedy's economics are a version of Eisenhower's should consider Kennedy's welfare proposals and accomplishments in the first 6 months of his administration; and they should compare these with the Eisenhower economic achievements over 8 years. Within 6 months the Congress had approved a depressed areas bill, a rise in minimum wages, temporary unemployment benefits, liberalization of social security, benefits for dependent children of unemployed parents, programs for water pollution, and the omnibus housing bill. In addition, the President asked for aid to education, college aid, hospital insurance and permanent revisions in unemployment compensation. Only in 1933 and 1935 can one find accomplishments of equal magnitude. Within 3 weeks of inauguration, the President had sent a temporary unemployment compensation bill to the Congress; and approval was obtained within 2 months of inauguration. Compare Eisenhower's timetable in 1958 for temporary help to the unemployed—a move made only under threat of permanent changes in unemployment compensation in a bill sponsored by Senator Kennedy.

Finally, Kennedy's objectives go way beyond fiscal responsibility. He was anxious to end the recession. In fact, a recovery of the second quarter of 1961 was a record achievement for the first quarter of a recovery and especially in relation to the percentage decline of gross national product. His spirited attack on the recession contributed greatly to its early end and quick recovery. However, Kennedy was even more interested in growth. The record on antirecessionary policy was good. But how to get the 4–5 percent of growth so necessary for our struggle with the Communists and an adequate welfare program without adding greatly to tax burdens?

Whereas Eisenhower and his aids either avoided discussion of growth—or when they did confront it, spoke only of the stimulation of private investment through tax favors—Kennedy has stressed education, housing, scientific research and medical care and research as the ingredients that would yield growth; though he was aware that the increased investment was a factor he has stressed that investment without adequate purchasing power and consumption would mean a waste of resources.

In short, Kennedy knows that the budget is a weapon to be used for economic improvement; that the objective of economic policy is not a balanced budget but a balanced economy; that the budget and the monetary machine are weapons to be used to treat cyclical indispositions, the disease of structural unemployment, and to stimulate growth; that in order to achieve the larger gains, the President has a responsibility to prevent any creeping inflation from becoming a galloping inflation; that fiscal and monetary tools, however important, are not the exclusive weapons for achieving economic goals; and that economic therapy must be tethered to political realities.

Exchanges of Educational Leaders Move Toward Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently I had the pleasure and privilege of being a guest speaker at a dinner given by the National Advisory Committee for the Exchange of Teachers in honor of some 200 teachers from 16 other countries who will be teaching in schools throughout the United States during the coming year. I was impressed with the high caliber of these teachers and their winning personalities because they were the kind of teachers which any superintendent would be pleased to have on his staff. It also occurred to me how fortunate our students will be to have these teachers from other countries during the coming year, as they bring firsthand information about their cultures, their people, their problems, and their aspirations to us. It will be a tremendously stimulating experience for the students, the faculty, and the community. These visiting educators will bring a new focus on some of our problems and at the same time, emphasize many of the benefits of our way of life which some of us may be taking for granted.

New units of work will be developed in the classrooms because these teachers are here. New interest in learning to speak other languages will be generated. A desire to visit their countries to know more about their people will be fostered, and events which take place in a certain country will become more vital and meaningful because other people have met a teacher from that nation.

Our own teachers will have similar experiences abroad. Some 484 American teachers will be exchanging jobs, or teaching on a one-way assignment basis, or attending summer seminars in the language and social science fields. Teacher exchange and training programs are among the most effective projects under the U.S. international educational and cultural exchange activities. Teachers go into the small as well as the large communities, and they are teaching students at all levels of society. It has been said that "the teacher affects eternity" as she imparts knowledge and truth year after year to new groups of students. It is my hope that this most important category of exchange can be increased considerably because of its benefits personally and academically, and in the area of improved international understanding. Not only do we need to interchange teachers with those countries whose teachers are well trained and whose systems are somewhat similar to our own, but also we need to supply teachers of English in large numbers to many countries of the world and teachers in many subject fields in the newly emerging nations of Africa and the not so fully developed countries elsewhere.

I would particularly like to commend the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the great care which has been exercised in recommending teachers for exchange to the Department of State and the Board of Foreign Scholarships, and for the excellent orientation program which they have prepared for the incoming foreign teachers to enable them to adjust more readily to American life and the American system of education, and orientation for American teachers going overseas, which has been conducted in cooperation with the Foreign Service Institute. I know of no better way to increase mutual respect, real knowledge, and good will than through the exchange and training of teachers and school administrators.

Let me say, quite frankly that I was proud to have these guest teachers from afar tell how much they appreciated my work in initiating and aiding our country's program of international cultural exchange, through the operations of the Smith-Mundt Act. I continue to believe this program produces significant and lasting dividends in terms of maintaining international peace.

Big Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Radio" from the September 18, 1961, issue of Sponsor:

BIG RADIO

In our humble opinion, what this country doesn't need is more radio stations. According to last count we now have about 3,600 AM outlets on the air, plus some 900 FMers, with another 150 construction permits.

We strongly urge the FCC to consider seriously the proposals which have been made for a moratorium on new licenses.

What the country does need is more good radio stations—stations that take pride in the fact that they're radio and in their ability to render exceptional service.

Good radio stations come in all sizes, shapes, and descriptions. But it's interesting to note that some of the best 30 years ago are still the best today. And it is also interesting to note that community radio hasn't swept away the need for the big area giant that sustained some sledgehammer blows in the early TV years and has now come back stronger than ever.

Sponsors are discovering that big radio delivers big. Many of the big stations perform a heartwarming service in the small-town and rural areas while discovering how to cope with the problems of building a metropolitan rating system.

To name only a few, all radio is proud of the present-day record of such stations as WGN, WHO, WSM, WFAA, WJR, WCCO, WSM, KSL, WSB, KDKA, KLZ, WLW, KMOX, WOW, WNAX, WWL, WSPD, WHAS, WBT, WTIC—obviously we cannot list them all.

The point is that such stations, of which there are perhaps 50 in the country, represent a different breed of radio. The continuing growth of radio as a national advertising force depends in large measure on their continuing growth.

A New Approach to Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are well aware of my long and intense efforts to enact legislation which will enable the Federal Government to assume its responsibility toward basic public education in the United States.

So far these efforts have been unsuccessful. Every year this issue has become involved in one or another extraneous matters. These have subdued the basic issues, which is the critical need to provide more and better educational opportunities for our boys and girls.

Unless we resolve this problem, unless we get American education moving forward at a more rapid pace, we shall not be able to survive as a free people in a free world.

Today our battle is not just a battle of firearms. While it is true that we must have a strong Defense Establishment in order to properly maneuver in a power conscious world, it is equally true that we are engaged in a battle of minds for minds.

Education—the training and development to the fullest extent of every mental and physical skill each of our boys and girls possess—is the key.

Experience has shown, Mr. Speaker, that nearly one-half of those rejected for military duty under selective service are those who have failed the mental tests. This alone proves the value and importance of education to our National Defense Establishment. We know, too, that the standards in our armed services will become higher and higher since we may continue to expect science and technology to advance still further.

The improvement of educational opportunities is definitely within the national interest. Nearly everyone recognizes this fact—at least nearly everyone gives lipservice to the proposition.

We have failed, of course, to express this broad national interest because so many who give lipservice are "yes, but-ers." Unfortunately, the "buts" touch upon areas over which all of us have great concern, and which are highly emotional.

First and foremost is the matter of local control. Despite the fact that the Federal Government has been aiding education in a limited way for many years, without imposing its will on curriculum and policy, this is a beautiful hatrack for those who would pose as

friends of education, but who in reality never give education a second thought.

The Congress has been willing, even anxious, to spend money to help certain school districts in areas of Federal activities without raising one whimper about Federal control. During the current fiscal year our expenditures through this program will be about $300 million. Since enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874, the Education Subcommittee has regularly been concerned about Federal control in the 3,800 school districts benefiting. We have repeatedly asked whether there was any attempt by the Federal Government to control local education. We have put the question, formally, in public hearings, to our colleagues, to board of education members, to school superintendents, and to businessmen. Not once has any witness suggested that there has been Federal control. In fact, the answers have been most positive. There has been no Federal control.

Be that as it may, we have had Federal control as a roadblock. Usually the "yes, but-ers" pick on our provisions for fiscal procedures to assure that Federal funds will be spent for the purposes for which Congress intends. Yet if we have no fiscal procedures we are charged with being careless of Federal funds.

We run into another problem when we attempt to establish bench marks to determine the allocation of funds to the States. If we use total school-age population, or if we use public school enrollment, there are those who cry discrimination. This involves us, one way or another, in the private school issue, which in turn involves us in religion. This is a question which has no place in our discussion of education, nor is it a proper subject for debate by the Congress.

Our basic problem has always been to devise distribution formula which would not be subject to misinterpretation and charges of discrimination. In the past we have used numbers of children as the yardstick because the committee has always felt children themselves were the best yardstick for measuring educational needs.

As one who has lived with this problem throughout my congressional career, I have come to the conclusion that what we are really trying to do is to use the broader Federal tax base to help State and local taxpayers finance the cost of improved education.

When we look at this proposition from this standpoint, we find that every citizen is a taxpayer, whether he sends his children to public or private schools.

In this frame of reference, Mr. Speaker, it has occurred to me that we should perhaps seek a new approach to achieve our goal: stimulation and encouragement of education.

One such approach has come to mind, and I offer it to my colleagues for discussion and consideration. It is my intention in January to incorporate the idea into legislation if, during the intervening months, reaction has been favorable.

This new approach is uncomplicated and quite simple. It provides the widest possible choice to the States, not only as to the purposes for which the money may be spent but also as to accounting procedures.

Since we intend to encourage and stimulate education in all of the States, and since there are pockets of need in every State, we would assist taxpayers in every State. We would authorize such appropriations as are necessary to allocate to each State an amount equivalent to 2 percent of total expenditures within that State for public elementary and secondary education.

In order to provide more assistance to States whose taxpayers have less financial ability to bear the burden of improved educational opportunities, we would authorize additional grants. This would be accomplished by determining the relative per capita income of each State. In those States below the national average, the allotment would be increased by the percentage the State falls below the national average. Thus, if per capita income in a specific State is below the national average by 10 percent, that State's basic allotment would be increased by 10 percent.

These Federal funds would be granted to the State educational agency and distributed to the local school districts through normal State channels, and by the State's normal equalization formula. The Federal support would be used by the local school districts for whatever specific purpose required at that level. Federal funds, when they reached the local level, would be unidentifiable, thus eliminating the possibility of any Federal interference. Moreover, since the Federal grant would be but a small percentage of the total expended, no State would have any hesitancy in speaking loudly and dominantly as the majority stockholder, so to speak.

I would have a built-in guarantee of continued State and local efforts. Naturally, under the formula, the more the taxpayers in a State spend for education, the more they receive in a Federal grant. I would, however, penalize them for reducing expenditures by reducing the Federal grant by a like amount. Thus, if a State were entitled to 15 million dollars, and its taxpayers decided to reduce their own expenditures by $10 million, the grant would be reduced to $5 million.

I would authorize the Commissioner of Education to accept the normal accounting procedures of each State, with the concurrence of the General Accounting Office. This would reduce the paperwork of the State agency to a minimum.

This new approach, it seems to me, has these virtues:

First. We—the Federal Government—aid taxpayers to support the type of education which all of us want and need.

Second. The burden of supporting education falls equally upon all taxpayers, whether they have children or do not; whether their children attend public or private schools. Therefore, it is nondiscriminatory.

Third. Since the financing of all education, public and private, comes from the earnings of the people, any Federal assistance to all local taxpayers is an indirect aid to those who support private schools.

Fourth. This proposal eliminates the need for complicated needs formulas, but provides more assistance to those taxpayers least able to support their local public school systems in the manner desired and needed. It does, however, provide the necessary encouragement and stimulation to the State and local taxpayers.

Fifth. Finally, we are assured that Federal money will supplement the money of the local taxpayers and not supplant it.

A Democratic Plan To Avert Unnecessary Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the State Labor News, an independent labor newspaper published in Columbus, Ohio, in its August issue carrys an interesting and persuasive editorial supporting passage of the secret strike vote legislation which I introduced on behalf of myself and Senators McCLELLAN and CURTIS a month or so ago. Our bill is identified as S. 2134.

I am happy to call to the attention of the Congress and the country this editorial from a labor paper discussing the Democratic and commendable features of S. 2134 and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PLAN

On the front page of this issue of the State Labor News, we have featured Senator KARL E. MUNDT's bill for a secret ballot procedure for strike authorization.

The usual procedure, when contract negotiation time arrives, is for the labor union involved to give management a 30- or 60-day notice of its desire for contract changes.

Membership meetings are held and labor union officials acquaint their members with the new demands and changes that will be requested in a new contract.

Then labor union officials ask for authority from the members present to call a strike if management should balk in granting the union's demands.

Almost without fail, usually by a voice vote or raising of hands of the membership present (very often a small minority of the union's entire membership) union officials receive the authority to call a strike.

Senator MUNDT's bill would change this to a procedure under which all members of the union would have a voice in the decision, after they have become acquainted with management's final offer. They would be able to accept or reject this offer by a secret ballot vote.

Oftentimes, strikes can be an extreme hardship on union members. Senator MUNDT believes therefore that they should at least have a voice in the decision.

There should be no objections by either labor union officials or management to this procedure. Labor union officials would be relieved of the final responsibility of ac-

cepting or rejecting management's offer. The responsibility, either way, would be on the entire membership.

Management knows it would have to make a fair offer in any new contract if it desired to avoid a strike.

Senator MUNDT's bill is no cure all for all strikes but it would restrain and restrict some pugnacious and strike happy labor union officials from calling strikes on impulse.

The procedures called for in the bill are certainly worth a trial.

Unique Courses Being Offered by the American Institute of Engineering and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. H. H. Katz, president of the American Institute of Engineering and Technology, Chicago, Ill., an interesting letter and pamphlet dealing with the student's outline, Greek-American bicultural history, prepared by Mr. Leonidas Fardelos, chairman, Greek-American bilingual department.

The pamphlet notes that Prof. John G. Manos has joined the faculty. Mr. Manos was born in Chicago, received his early education there, and obtained his master of arts degree at the University of Athens, in Greece. He has been a very prominent member of the Greek-American newspapers throughout the country and he has received several decorations. Formerly, he was the supreme president of the Greek-American Progressive Association.

Because of the uniqueness of the courses being offered by the Greek-American Bi-Lingual Department of the American Institute of Engineering and Technology, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Katz' letter and his preface from the bicultural history be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and preface was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: AIET has initiated and developed a bilingual division, wherein high school or gymnasium graduates in foreign countries come to the United States and study in their native language—English being taught for 1 hour per day.

On September 18, the Greek department of our bilingual division will begin a 3-year educational program for 60 young Greek men. The enclosed booklet outlines one of the first semester courses: Greek-American bicultural history.

To our knowledge, this is the first time this type of course has been taught in our country. If you can find time, in your busy schedule, to review the contents of this, I am sure you will realize the serious, almost critical necessity for its inclusion in our curriculum.

AIET is a private, profitmaking institute. We are conducting these foreign educational programs in several foreign languages, without domestic or foreign subsidy. Foreign students pay their own way, except for the private financial assistance which some receive from American relatives.

We hope that our work reflects some essence of the free enterprise system—even though we be an educational institute.

Sincerely yours,

AMERICAN INSTITUTE,
H. H. KATZ, *President.*

PREFACE

Sir Isaac Newton, the great English mathematician (who invented the calculus which we study at AIET), was greatly admired by many of his contemporaries. In answer to strong praise, he once said: "If I have seen farther than other men, it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants." This statement, on several counts, always helps to bring my thoughts as an American to our Greek heritage. I am sure that Newton acknowledged an important part of the credit for his discoveries to Archimedes, Aristotle, Plato, and other famous Greek philosophers. Also, his genuine humility reflected the strong tenet of the ancient Grecian way of life: "Moderation in all things." This ideal of Greek life was not a hollow phrase to be used on special occasions; it found its way into the principles of Grecian government, arts, and philosophy. When a powerful Greek athlete boasted that he could stand longer on one foot than any other man in Hellas, he was driven from Sparta, because he prided himself for an accomplishment at which he could be beaten by a common goose.

The spiritual and material accomplishments of the United States has also been brought about because Americans have "stood on the shoulders of giants." One of the most formidable of these giants is Greece. In this first semester course on bicultural history, we shall study the roots and development of the American history, culture, and government. Special emphasis will be placed on the interrelationship of Greek-American ideals and objectives, and the influences of Greek culture on the "American way of life."

The American way of life is largely made possible by the American system of government. The heritage of free government that is realized by nations of the free world is, in a large part, fulfillment of the ambition of mankind from ancient and present times.

Many of the basic ideas that are the root of the American system of government originated in Greece many centuries ago. The ancient Greeks were the first people to try the difficult experiment of self-government. The city-state governments of the "demos" (the people) planted the important seed of modern democracy. At times, this seed lay dormant, crushed under the foot of tyrants; other times, its roots were only nourished with the blood of patriots. Nevertheless, attempts to completely destroy these roots failed, and the seed branched through the course of history, into many countries of Europe and later, to America.

The American way of life is comparatively young: for every year of our history, European and Asian countries can count centuries.

Since the United States started out as a colony of Great Britain and was settled predominantly by Englishmen, it is natural that English institutions and political ideas should influence the American governmental structure. Basic principles of American democracy, originated in Greece, were exercised and experimented with in England, and further developed by Englishmen who came to colonize the United States.

Early Americans had to establish some of their own rules of order and conduct. Many political ideas, customs, and government structures of the Old World could not fit into the New World. The many reasons which brought about these changes will be discussed in our bicultural history program.

Bank Holding Company Formed in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently I have received a letter from the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, former Secretary of Defense and now chairman of the executive committee of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, in which he advises that the New York State Banking Department has approved the application of the Morgan New York State corporation to become a bank holding company by acquiring the stock of seven banks in New York State. It is my hope and expectation that the results of this action will prove beneficial to both the economy and the people of New York State. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement by Oren Root, State superintendent of banks, which should be of interest to the Congress:

BANKING BOARD APPROVES HOLDING COMPANY APPLICATION OF MORGAN GUARANTY AND SIX UPSTATE BANKS

Oren Root, New York State superintendent of banks and chairman of the banking board, announced that the banking board, upon his recommendation, has approved the application of Morgan New York State Corp. to become a bank holding company by acquiring all the stock of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and of six upstate banks: Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co. (Buffalo), Lincoln Rochester Trust Co. (Rochester), the National Commercial Bank & Trust Co. of Albany, First Trust & Deposit Co. (Syracuse), the Oneida National Bank & Trust Co. of central New York (Utica), and First-City National Bank of Binghamton, N.Y. It is expected that the three national banks will convert to State charter before their stock is acquired.

In his recommendations, accepted by the banking board, Mr. Root stated that he had "been influenced primarily by the conviction that the contemplated bank holding company will materially expand the opportunities for the economic growth of that part of the State of New York which lies outside of the city of New York and its suburbs, and will thus contribute to the accelerated economic expansion which is a cornerstone of both State and National policy."

The superintendent's recommendation further indicated that substantial benefits to the public and to the economy of upstate New York would result from formation of the holding company because of its expected contribution toward meeting the needs for increased bank lending resources upstate; because it can be expected to assist in the industrial development of upstate New York by attracting new and expanded industry; and because it will make available to these areas additional and improved banking services.

The board's decision, Mr. Root indicated, was also based upon its conclusions that creation of the bank holding company would not result in a lessening of competition among the affiliating banks, since they are not now competing witth each other to any significant extent; that the affiliation is unlikely to have any unsound or destructive competitive effects on other banks, small or large, upstate; that the size or extent of the holding company to be formed would not be beyond limits consistent with adequate or sound banking; that the asset concentration in the holding company would be within limits consistent with effective competition; and most importantly, that the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof, to which the banking law gives primary emphasis, will be served by approval of the application for the reasons indicated above.

The superintendent of banks noted that approval of the appiication would not be inconsistent with the preamble to the omnibus act which declares it to be the policy of New York State that "appropriate restrictions be imposed to prevent statewide control of banking by a few giant institutions." The new holding company will have 11 percent of the commercial banking assets throughout New York State and 8 percent of the State's commercial banking offices. If New York City is excluded, it would hold 16 percent of the commercial banking assets and 13 percent of commercial banking offices in the rest of the State. Including the Marine Midland Corp., the two statewide bank holding companies combined would have 16 percent of statewide commercial banking assets and 18 percent of statewide offices. In the areas outside New York City, the two holding companies would have 33 percent of commercial banking assets and 28 percent of offices.

Power Versus Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the editorial, "Power Versus Popularity," as written by John F. Loosbrock, the editor of Air Force-Space Digest, and as it appeared in that important publication. In view of the Berlin crisis and the need for our Nation to start exercising its power and position as leader of the free world, I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues and of the general public:

POWER VERSUS POPULARITY
(By John F. Loosbrock)

It is strange but true that the Berlin crisis and the Soviet resumption of nuclear testing may prove to be blessings in disguise.

As a result of these actions we may be, as some claim, closer to the brink of war than at any time since the Korean conflict. But the truth is that we have been standing at the brink of some years, with the edge of the precipice lost in the swirling fog of wishful thinking and obscured by the rose-colored glasses of negotiation and competitive coexistence. Now the callous cynicism and naked power politics revealed in recent Soviet actions surely must serve to blow away the fog and strip the blinders from the eyes of those who have sincerely believed that we could bargain usefully and honorably with the Soviets.

Surely it is now clear that the United States must exercise its power and position as leader of the free world and cease behaving as if it were a candidate for an office which history has long since thrust upon it. Surely it is now clear, even to the most woolly minded, that Khrushchev places a higher value on getting ahead, and remaining ahead, of the United States than he does on what Nehru, or Nasser, or Nkrumah thinks. Surely it must now be clear that power and the willingness to exercise it are the best propaganda tools in today's world and that it is difficult to sway the mind of a man who has a hobnailed boot on the back of his neck.

It is probably true that we scored a minor propaganda advantage in waiting out the Soviets on the resumption of nuclear tests. They did break the ban first, for whatever that may be worth. But it is certain that, over the whole span of the test-ban period, we lost much more than we gained.

The relative insignificance of our test-ban propaganda victory is indicated by the reactions of the so-called uncommitted nations meeting recently in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. If Khrushchev was really worried about what the neutrals thought, he would not have flexed his muscles just as they were convening. And if the neutrals were truly neutral they would have responded with more vigor than the pallid denunciation of the nuclear test resumptions that came from Nehru, and Nkrumah, and the rest. One can only imagine the roars of indignant anguish that would have poured forth from these uncommitted gentlemen had the United States been the first to break the test ban. They forget—or choose to ignore—the fact that it is only the wealth and the power of the United States that has thus far permitted them the luxury of remaining uncommitted.

The United States has yet to learn to be comfortable in the possession and exercise of its power. Even Franklin Roosevelt, who so well understood the uses of domestic political power, sold short on the international power market in his dealings with Stalin. And, since 1945, there have been few instances in which U.S. power was boldly and imaginatively used—possibly only one, the Marshall plan, which was bold in concept and execution. It was also essentially self-serving in purpose; the restoration of Western Europe was of prime importance to this Nation from a political and military as well as an economic standpoint. We reacted well in the Korean aggression, much to the surprise of the Soviets, then failed to press our advantage and wound up with an unsatisfactory stalemate which is still an ever-present source of trouble.

Elsewhere across the world and the years, our record is one of timid holding actions and eventual erosion of our position. We have wished to be loved, rather than respected. We have counted our victories in United Nations rollcall while the Soviets have counted theirs in terms of square miles conquered and millions enslaved.

The United States is still the richest and the most powerful nation the world has ever seen. Isn't it time that we used that wealth and that power to extend, rather than merely conserve, our social, political, and economic values? Do we believe in our system or don't we? Is it our aim to bury communism or isn't it? Do we really think a world can exist indefinitely half slave and half free? What are we aiming for? We had better decide and then go after it full bore, or else resign ourselves to an eroding attrition that will insure the waste of the tremendous total effort we have already poured into the defense of freedom.

Positive action to back up our recently muscular rhetoric may be costly in treasure, possibly in blood. It poses risks beyond those we have thus far found acceptable. We may lose some popularity, but it is dubious that we will lose any substantial support from our friends. And the stakes of the game are high enough to warrant great risks.

One thing is true. If our competitive system is not strong enough to bear the burden of the effort that is required—and that has yet to be mounted—in open competition with the Soviet system in every meaningful aspect of effort, then our system is not what it is cracked up to be, and those who say its decay is inevitable will be proven right. And we will wind up as the proverbial "richest man in the cemetery." The tombstone could bear his further tribute: "and best loved." Mr. K. would no doubt like that added touch.

The Need for Expanded Water Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent address of mine dealing with the important problem of expanding our water research and developing a more useful utilization of the water resources of this great country. It is entitled "The Need for Expanded Water Research."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MUNDT

A great deal has been said recently on the need for expanded water research. However, much of what has been said has emphasized the need rather than the substance of future water resource activities. Changes in levels and patterns of living radically alter the particular types of demands that people make on their natural environment. It is clear that this alteration necessitates an informed and imaginative approach to resource allocation.

Too often water resource programs and policies do not adequately reflect social, economic, and technical changes. Our Nation is developing swiftly. It is difficult to evaluate change and more difficult to formulate policies elastic enough to allow for major readjustments.

In the past 60 years, our population has increased roughly 42 percent. By the year 2000, our population will have nearly doubled and, if the present trend continues, will live mostly in cities and suburban areas. Improved standards of living and education mean increased demands for better housing, health, and recreation facilities. In the future, water will have to be allocated wisely between farm, city, and industry. More and more concern will have to be given to the preservation of our Nation's outstanding resources and magnificent natural beauty.

Growth imposes difficult problems upon existent water supplies. A continuing increase in total demands upon the resource base necessitates a higher degree of efficiency in the utilization of water. Science and technology provide us with the key which will unlock the door to future programing in this field. Scientific and technological advance enable man to substitute more abundant materials and utilize synthetics where materials are not readily available.

Today the average acre yields more food, and this produce is of a higher quality than ever before. Engineering skill has enabled man to control great rivers, at once a potential threat and salvation to those who must depend upon their waters for existence and livelihood.

Last year the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reported the principal factors affecting future water needs in the United States. The factors were population and industrial, including agricultural, production. As these increase, our withdrawals and use of water will increase proportionately.

Per capita consumption of water is the largest single factor determining increased withdrawals from municipal water supplies. As the distribution of our population gravitates toward a growing urban society and technological advance creates greater individual domestic demands for water, per capita consumption climbs steadily. I do not think most of us are sufficiently aware of the tremendous proportions of our domestic requirements for an adequate supply of potable water. Our individual daily water requirements have grown from 40 gallons in 1900 to about 147 gallons today. Improved plumbing and living standards, as well as new household devices, such as air conditioners and automatic clothes- and dishwashers, swell per capita consumption figures.

We in South Dakota are becoming more and more keenly alert to the dangers of this situation because we are, simply, overexposed to them.

Every American is proud to see his Nation prosper; to recognize that his Nation provides him with the highest standard of living in the world. We in South Dakota are especially proud of the progress which has been made since the settlement of the Dakota territory which began in 1861. We are proud that our State has become one of the leading stock-producing and farming areas in the United States. In addition, the average production worker in a manufacturing industry in our State saw his weekly earnings increase 51.6 percent between 1950 and 1958. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in these same years our electric output increased 10.5 percent and engineering construction awards 30.8 percent.

Yet these percentages carry with them new problems and responsibilities for the citizens of South Dakota. Between 1950 and 1960 South Dakota experienced a substantial growth in urban population. In 1950, 33.2 percent of the total population lived in urban communities, while in 1960 this percentage had increased to 39.3 percent of the total population. This urban development has raised per capita consumption and created new demands upon our municipal water supplies. Already a water-short State, South Dakota must now allocate more and more of its water supply to small towns.

The economy of South Dakota is built upon agriculture. Over 70 percent of all the water consumed in South Dakota is required for agricultural uses. Reoccurring droughts and subsequent runoff have detrimental and unpredictable effects on crops and livestock. Thus the economic stability of the State of South Dakota is inevitably bound to the success of its agricultural enterprises, and to the adequacy of its water supplies.

The principal factor influencing agriculture in the Northern Great Plains is irregular and generally deficient rainfall. In addition, the Department of Agriculture has estimated that two-thirds of the rainfall in the Great Plains States is lost by evaporation alone. Because precipitation is not uniformly distributed over the four seasons, often the amount received during the growing season is inadequate with respect to plant-growth potential. Consequently, gross supply received in any one location must be efficiently applied for man's varied purposes. Coordinated research in water allocation and technological development are essentially the only approaches to future programing in this area.

The outstanding water problem in South Dakota has always been one of source, and of the adequacy and availability of a water supply. Proceeding directly from this problem are the very important questions of competing uses. There must be enough water for all purposes. It is clear that in the future, water in South Dakota will have to be allocated primarily between irrigation and municipal uses.

Municipal usage will be closely allied with industrial development. In South Dakota most manufacturing industries employ less than 100 persons per establishment and are usually located in metropolitan or suburban areas. Consequently these industries obtain water supplies from municipal facilities and the availability of industrial water will be part of municipal water problems over the next 20 years. Larger industries which develop their own supplies will be guided by water supply in their plant locations.

In 1955, the Census of Manufacturers reported that average annual water use per manufacturing employee in South Dakota amounted to 470,000 gallons. When this figure is applied to a projected 1980 manufacturing employment figure, South Dakota's water needs for manufacturing will be about 7,200 million gallons by 1980. Moreover, expected industrial development in South Dakota is likely to occur in the processing of agricultural raw materials, wood, minerals, and associated metallurgical operations. These industries require larger amounts of water per employee than any other type of manufacturing enterprise. Such industrial development could very well increase per employee water requirements to roughly 600,000 gallons with an anticipated water usage in South Dakota of about 9,720 million gallons a year. To a great extent, municipal water supplies will have to bear the strain of this increase.

In a State in which an adequate water supply is necessary to the success of its agricultural enterprises and economic stability, this urban and industrial growth poses serious questions.

Presently, many towns in South Dakota are water short. The situation can only be improved through increased research. Last year the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reported that there were only three States in the United States where the cost of water from municipal systems is higher than in South Dakota where the cost per million gallons is $281. In order that this cost be reduced, South Dakota must find more water. Additional water supplies are absolutely essential to both urban and agricultural welfare.

The situation in many small towns is indeed serious, while those citizens of South Dakota engaged in agriculture deserve to reap more benefits from the land. At a minimum they must be assured adequate water for crops and livestock, and protection against the ruinous advent of frequent drought.

Our problems then, clearly necessitate expanded research in the allocation of water and in the development of technological skills which will enable man to make more efficient use of surface and ground water supplies. On the national average, 1 acre of irrigated cropland produces the equivalent of 3 acres of nonirrigated land. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reports that current research in water-saving devices in the field of irrigation alone promise to lead within the next 20 to 40 years to water savings in the West of at least 10 million acre-feet of water annually. The committee concluded that the amount of physically feasible resource development remaining in the 17 reclamation States was enormous, and that potential projects for which data had been summarized in their report would about double the production from presently irrigated lands. Moreover, evaportation reduction, phreatophyte control, weather modification and saline conversion represent substantial new sources of water supply.

In the past, 80 percent of existing irrigation was developed by non-Federal interests, while Federal reclamation programs accounted for only 20 percent. These figures demonstrate the extent to which State and local interests have been effective and efficient in this regard.

Current problems will entail vigorous research if we in South Dakota are to find a solution to increasing demands upon our municipal and agricultural water supplies. General research will not suffice. What I am saying is that future development must be tailored to specific problem areas and that the time has come for the people of South Dakota to take cognizance of exactly what can be done.

The only major surface water supply with any degree of dependability and stability in South Dakota is the Missouri River. The drought of 1959 clearly demonstrated that other major streams and tributaries in the State are unreliable for any extended large-scale use. Because 80 percent of the ground water wells in South Dakota are of the shallow-well type, the yield from this source is extremely limited.

The population in South Dakota is highest along the eastern border in the Big Sioux and James River Basins and in the Black Hills area. Conversely, the Missouri River is the only reliable fresh water source and is located in the sparsely populated center of the State. During periods of drought, urban water problems are widespread and frequently critical. Potentially, impounded Missouri River water could be transported to the more populated areas and thus provide an additional surface water supply.

Last year the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources reviewed the specific water situation within four general economic areas in South Dakota. The committee stated that in eastern areas, the purchase of "potholes" and importation of additional water were prerequisites. They concluded that the only adequate source for importation of needed additional water supplies was the Missouri River.

In considering the east-central area which offers the greatest increased potential in the State, the committee offered several suggestions. I wish to call to your attention the following excerpt from the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources' report:

"Importation of water from the Missouri River will correct many water problems. This is proposed in the Missouri River development program for irrigation purposes. The many needs for water may be served as incidental purposes but no Federal program other than irrigation covers such alleviation of water shortage problems. * * * All uses of water in this area suffer serious shortages under present conditions. Economic stabilization and associated human values are utterly dependent upon new water supplies, the only known source of which is the Missouri River."[1]

Since the passage of the Flood Control Act in 1944 which authorized development of the Missouri River Basin, extensive research has been undertaken in order to determine

[1] Water Resources Activities in the United States, Views and Comments of the States, Report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., 2d sess., December 1960, p. 307.

the most practical and efficient solutions to water problems in this area. Federal, State, and local interests cooperate on many levels while the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee was established to coordinate all related activities. Major investigations have been conducted by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Reclamation which outline the broad areas in which further research should be forthcoming. Reports issued subsequent to these investigations review the progress already made and direct attention to immediate needs and proposals.

In June of 1960, the Missouri-Oahe projects office in Huron, S. Dak., issued a report on the Oahe unit of the James division of the Missouri Basin project. The report provides a plan for diversion of water from the Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River for irrigation of 482,000 acres of land in eastern South Dakota, municipal and industrial use in 22 towns and cities, fish and wildlife developments at 28 locations, and recreation uses. Construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir was begun in September of 1948 by the Corps of Engineers and is to be completed in 1965. The proposed Oahe pumping plant would divert water from this reservoir and distribute it through a system of canals, laterals, storage reservoirs, drains, and pumping plants. It is estimated that such a system would irrigate 482,000 acres of land in eastern South Dakota and create an adequate municipal and industrial water supply in this area.

I wish to call your attention to the following excerpt from the report of the Oahe unit:

"The plan of development of the Oahe unit would permit municipal and industrial water service to 22 communities and their associated commercial-industrial establishments. These communities are located in and adjacent to irrigable areas of the unit and along the irrigation works for the area and also along the James River below the Oahe unit.

"Many towns in this area have longstanding deficiencies in the quality or quantity of their water supplies. Ground-water resources are available for development in most of the area but the water usually contains excessive concentrations of dissolved solids. Sulfate, sodium, bicarbonate, and in some cases fluoride concentrations in the deep artesian ground-water sources make them qualitatively inferior to alternative surface water supplies. Water from the shallower aquifers generally contains excessive concentrations of iron and has excessive hardness. Surface water supplies in this area are generally of good quality regarding dissolved solids but may have objectionable tastes and odors and, in the absence of regulatory storage, are not reliable sources of supply for most municipalities. Importation of a relatively superior surface water supply from Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River would, for the first time, make an adequate raw water supply of good quality available to many municipal-industrial water users in the area.

"Reconnaissance-type cost estimates based on July 1959 price levels, comparing annual costs for developing and using the Oahe unit water supply and similar costs for realistic alternative sources, are the basis for project formulation and show that the following 22 communities would enjoy definite financial advantage over any reasonable source of supply by using the Oahe unit water supply for municipal purposes: Aberdeen, Agar, Ashton, Blunt, Brentford, Claremont, Columbia, Conde, Faulkton, Frankfort, Hitchcock, Huron, Mellette, Menno, Miller, Mitchell, Northville, Onida, St. Lawrence, Scotland, Stratford, and Tulare.

"Delivery of water from the project works would be made 'at canalside' at a cost per acre-foot based on payment of an appropriate share of the ultimate annual O.M. & R. costs for jointly used works and repayment in 50 years of allocated costs with interest on the unpaid balance. Municipal and industrial water users will be required to provide all works needed at and beyond the canalside delivery point. Any community in the area desiring a water supply, even though not on the list of 22 communities, can obtain water on this basis.

"The 22 listed communities had a combined population of about 55,100 in 1950. With development of the Oahe unit, these communities are expected to have a total population of 145,400 or more by the year 2044. Water requirements for the group, including industrial uses normally supplied by municipal systems, are estimated at 32,475 acre-feet by year 2044 at the points of diversion from Oahe unit water-supply sources. An additional 3,855 acre-feet may be supplied direct to agricultural-products processing plants, making a total for the group of about 36,330 acre-feet annually at the points of diversion." [2]

In view of the nature of water problems currently facing the citizens of South Dakota, serious consideration must be given to this proposal and additional research undertaken in order to better determine allied benefits.

Any multipurpose development program requires comprehensive investigation, but there is no good reason why appropriate steps cannot be taken immediately. With about 72 percent of the water resources occurring in the northern one-third of the State, and 75 percent of the annual demand in the southern two-thirds, the State of California experiences many of the same problems that confront us in South Dakota. The result of 10 years of investigation, the California Water Plan offers a valuable example of the type of program which can be initiated to assure adequate water for irrigation and smalltown usage.

On January 15, 1959, a working group appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture published an evaluation of research needs for soil and water conservation. Their report emphasized the benefits of multipurpose development, and proposed expansion and establishment of regional and national research centers. The following is an excerpt from the report entitled "Facility Needs, Soil and Water Conservation Research":

"These centers should provide the type of highly specialized or expensive physical facilities that exceed the financial capabilities of existing individual research units. In order to achieve the maximum benefits from such centers, they should be financed and administered to assure their availability to research workers from other laboratories; and, they should serve as focal points for coordinating research on the specific problems for which they are established. To effectuate the desired coordination, consideration should be given to locating these centers at or near an institution of higher learning at which research on appropriate subjects is already underway. This would permit interested graduate students of the institution to become acquainted with work underway at the center and to gain valuable experience in the subjects under investigation. Highly trained scientists are the first requirements in any research program. In all cases a sound system of maintaining collaboration and coordination between research at the center and related research at other State and Federal locations should be established.

"It is essential that a proper balance be established and maintained at the centers between the development of basic principles for guiding future research work and finding solutions to the immediate parts of the overall problem currently faced by landowners and technicians. This is necessary in order to protect the Nation's resources and to obtain the greatest benefit from public expenditures for the protection of those resources." [3]

Specifically, the report recommended that major attention should go to improving the design and performance of closed conduit spillways and other conservation structures. To facilitate this recommendation, a Research Center for Engineering Design of Conservation Structures should be established. Moreover, the working group was apprised of the obvious deficiency in physical facilities available by the Agricultural Research Service and the four State agricultural experiment stations for meeting the soil and water conservation problems urgent in this area. Western South Dakota was mentioned as a possible location for a new center for research in this region. Also outstanding was the mention of needed facilities for the research center in Brookings, S. Dak., which studies plant nutrition, soil physics, and irrigation engineering.

These recommendations of the Department of Agriculture support the preliminary studies by the Bureau of Reclamation concerning an improved municipal and irrigation water supply for eastern and central South Dakota. Studies conducted at South Dakota State College on private pumping systems concur in their findings.

It is clear that, to be effective, multipurpose water development must reflect research in specific areas. Cooperation on Federal, State, and local levels is a prerequisite, but equal regard must be accorded to the work of interested private and educational groups.

The urgency of these water problems cannot be overemphasized. In order to meet present needs in this field, Congress has an obligation to review current proposals. I urge that serious thought be given to the feasibility and appropriateness of the programs which I have outlined. I caution my colleagues that these situations will become aggravated in time, and yet I shall always emphasize proper budgetary considerations in this regard. Indeed, Congress is already faced with myriad obligations. Nevertheless, in the past, coordinated research has illustrated its economic soundness upon many occasions. Through research, much can be accomplished at a very small cost. Research, opposed to the cost of construction of facilities or a reservoir, is only a small part of the total bill. When investigation has proven programs to be both fruitful and sound, Congress should take immediate steps to authorize projects that will meet urgent needs.

Population expansion necessitates that we develop the supply and distribution of our water resources. Urban growth will require that sites of unusual natural beauty or unique recreational and scenic value be developed for the enjoyment of the public. There is much to be done toward the conservation of good water, and the conversion of water of presently inadequate quality. Appropriate measures can assure enough water for both municipal and agricultural needs. Technological advance indicates that soon it will be economically feasible for man to modify weather conditions and to put salt and brackish water into use, thus expanding our existent water resources.

---

[2] Report on Oahe unit, James Division—South Dakota, Missouri River Basin project, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Region 6, Missouri-Oahe Projects Office, Huron, S. Dak., June 1960, pp. 26–28.

[3] Facility Needs, Soil and Water Conservation Research, a report of findings by the working group appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Jan. 15, 1959, p. 234.

At present, Congress has many commitments. Yet our outstanding commitment is to strengthen and perpetuate our democratic way of life. We must provide for future generations, insure that waste and rash judgments do not endanger the welfare of our successors. We must recognize that wise actions on our part are the best possible guarantee of this.

I therefore urge that Congress take prompt steps to appropriate funds to implement and promote research in water resources activities which we have already authorized. The specific problems of South Dakota, whose water needs are growing so rapidly, must be carefully considered and I trust that the Congress will enact whatever further legislation may be necessary to meet them. Such action is clearly in the national interest.

Ranking Minority Member Surveys Activities of Judiciary Committee, 87th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives can be justly proud of the record of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The chairman, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and the other members of the committee are to be congratulated for an outstanding record of legislative accomplishments. As the ranking minority member of the committee I commend both the excellent leadership and cooperation of Chairman CELLER in making this record of accomplishments possible. I also point with pride to the real degree of nonpartisanship with which the legislative tasks before the committee were approached.

As I shall indicate, much of the legislation, which has now passed both Houses of Congress and has been approved by the President, originated with the Eisenhower administration.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

The first major legislation reported by the committee was S. 912—Public Law 87–36—a bill to create additional Federal circuit and district judgeships. At the beginning of the session, as the ranking minority member, I introduced several bills in order to carry forward the unfinished work of the Judiciary Committee from the 86th Congress. One of these was H.R. 469, a bill to create 35 additional Federal judgeships—3 circuit and 32 district judges. This was identical with H.R. 12552, 86th Congress, which the Judiciary Committee reported on June 15, 1960, and the Rules Committee reported a rule on June 25, 1960. Even though President Eisenhower indicated judicial appointments under the bill would be on an approximate 50-percent Republican, 50-percent Democratic basis, the Democratic leadership did not bring H.R. 12552 up for consideration.

The bill reported and passed with some modification in the 87th Congress, S. 912, provided for the appointment of 73 Federal judges—10 circuit and 63 district. Together with existing vacancies, S. 912 will permit the President to appoint more new judges than any President appointed during any 4-year term of office. When all the appointments have been made the existing judgepower of the Federal courts will be increased by more than 30 percent.

Although many of my colleagues and I considered S. 912 created more judgeships than were warranted by the facts, we supported the bill on the floor of the House in order to provide additional judges in those districts in which additional judgepower was critically needed. At the same time we made a strong appeal to President Kennedy to continue the precedent President Eisenhower indicated he would establish by appointing the new judges on an approximately 50-percent Republican, 50-percent Democratic basis. In our opinion this is the only method by which the appointment of Federal judges can be removed from the consideration of partisan politics.

By the end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, President Kennedy submitted nominations for 54—10 circuit and 44 district—of the 73 judgeships created by S. 912. Of this number, 37—6 circuit and 31 district—have been confirmed. The President also submitted nominations for 20—5 circuit and 15 district—of the 31 existing vacancies, which have all been confirmed by the Senate.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

Another important group of bills approved by the committee relate to anticrime measures designed to suppress criminal racketeering and syndicated criminal activity. Most of these bills originated during the Eisenhower administration and had the strong support of former Attorney General Rogers. Attorney General Kennedy adopted and approved the program of Attorney General Rogers and recommended in addition a separate bill prohibiting travel or transportation in interstate commerce in aid of racketeering enterprise.

Our colleague on the committee, Mr. CRAMER, during the 86th Congress introduced all of the bills recommended by Attorney General Rogers and reintroduced them with modifications during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The chairman, Mr. CELLER, introduced several of the bills recommended by Attorney General Kennedy, while I reintroduced H.R. 468—Public Law 87–368—to amend the Fugitive Felon Act.

When considered as a whole, these bills constitute a well defined program to assist State and local officials with law enforcement problems which transcend the boundaries of the particular States. Considered separately, S. 1653—Public Law 86–228—prohibits travel or transportation in interstate commerce for the purpose of furthering certain illegal business enterprises involving gambling, liquor, narcotics, or prostitution. S. 1653 requires both a specific intent on the part of the violator plus the commission of an overt act in furtherance of the offense. In addition to the business enterprise offenses listed, S. 1653 also prohibits travel or transportation in interstate commerce in connection with bribery and extortion.

From this description it is evident S. 1653 has very wide application to the business enterprise offenses which are conducted by individuals who operate beyond the boundaries of any one State. If these persons would confine themselves and the operation of their illegal enterprises to within the boundaries of a single State, the assistance of the Federal Government would not be necessary. However, in many instances the real kingpin never enters the State in which the activities are conducted. This bill will be of immeasurable assistance since it makes travel or transportation in interstate commerce in furtherance of these crimes a Federal offense. Thus, if a henchman is sent into a particular State or if money or other materials are transported in furtherance of the offense, the Federal Government will be able to intervene both in the investigation and the prosecution of the offense.

S. 1656—Public Law 87–216—prohibits the transmission in interstate commerce of information relating to bets and wagers by wire communications, that is, telephone and telegraph. In addition, it permits the communication company to discontinue the facility of anyone who is violating Federal, State, or local law. This bill will be of great assistance to State officials in combatting bookie and other gambling operations which are conducted on a multistate basis.

S. 1657—Public Law 87–218—makes it an offense to transport in interstate commerce wagering paraphernalia, that is paraphernalia used in bookmaking, numbers, and similar games. It will also be of great assistance to local law enforcement officials in obtaining the assistance of the Federal Government in combatting enterprises which transcend the boundaries of a particular State.

H.R. 468—Public Law 87–368—which I introduced, was identical with my bill H.R. 11897 which passed the House in the 86th Congress. As H.R. 468 passed amended this year, it amends the Fugitive Felon Act by making it an offense to flee across a State line to avoid prosecution for, or give testimony on, any State offense which is defined as a felony by the laws of the State, or, in the case of New Jersey, a high misdemeanor. H.R. 468 will be of great assistance to State officials. It will permit the FBI to apprehend and arrest fugitives who have fled beyond the boundaries of the State in which the original offense was committed. This bill was originally recommended by Attorney General Rogers and later by Attorney General Kennedy.

In addition, H.R. 1777—Public Law 87–37—although not a part of the Attorney General's crime program, will make illegal the transporting in interstate commerce or the concealing, storing, or selling of fraudulent State tax stamps or other obligations of a State which have been transported in interstate commerce. H.R. 1777 is designed

to assist the States in stopping operations in which the obligations of the State are forged. A good example is cigarette tax stamps. In one instance Ohio suffered a loss of a million and a half dollars because of forged cigarette tax stamps.

The committee also reported S. 1990—Public Law 87–306—to afford protection to private communications facilities used in connection with military or civil defense functions of the Federal Government. This bill strengthens the criminal law against willful or malicious interference with, or the destruction of any communication facility used or intended to be used for the military or civil defense functions of the United States.

H.R. 6834—Public Law 87–338—by Mr. CELLER, makes the imparting or conveying of false bombing information a Federal offense. In the event such information is maliciously conveyed, or conveyed with a reckless disregard for human life, the offense is a felony; otherwise it is a misdemeanor.

In addition to bills defining criminal offenses, the committee reported H.R. 5343—Public Law 87–336—by Mr. CELLER, a bill to amend the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Before the enactment of H.R. 5343, a minor after serving a sentence could have the fact of his conviction eliminated from his record. However, a youth who was merely placed on probation could not have the charge eliminated from his record. H.R. 5343 will do away with this anamolous situation by permitting youthful offenders who are placed on probation also to have the charge erased after the probationary period. H.R. 5343 will thus serve a very useful purpose in facilitating the rehabilitation of youthful offenders who otherwise would carry through life the stigma of having a criminal record.

TAX STUDY

H.R. 4363—Public Law 87–17—by Mr. WILLIS amends S. 2524—Public Law 86–272—a bill reported by the committee in the 86th Congress, in order to broaden the tax study authorized by the earlier law. After the decision of the Supreme Court in the Northwestern Cement case, the committee reported S. 2524 in order to establish minimum standards for the State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. S. 2524 also authorized a limited study of the problem of State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. Many members of the committee, however, felt that the base for the tax study should be broadened in order to permit a comprehensive study of all phases of State taxation of revenue derived from interstate commerce. Accordingly, the committee reported H.R. 4363 and established a special subcommittee to study the entire problem. It is anticipated that as the result of this study Congress will be able to define precise standards for that State taxation which will not constitute a burden on interstate commerce and will be able to devise fair apportionment formulas for those instances in which the State taxation of those funds is appropriate. This study will be of vital importance to the States as well as to the Federal Government.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION AND EXTENSION OF LAWS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Another bill which I introduced at the beginning of the session was H.R. 470—Public Law 87–366—a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act in order to require the registration of domestic organizations which are substantially controlled, directed, or financed by a foreign government. This provides a much needed step in protecting the security of the United States by closing a loophole formerly available to those foreign governments which conduct their operations on an indirect basis by using domestic organizations as their agents. The bill in addition clarifies the so-called commercial exemptions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by providing that a foreign principal, in order for its agents to be exempt, must be engaged in activities which are either private and nonpolitical and financial or private and nonpolitical and mercantile.

In addition, Mr. POFF introduced H.R. 2730—Public Law 87–369—to further protect the security of the United States by extending the application of the espionage laws to acts of espionage against the United States which occur in foreign countries. Prior to the enactment of H.R. 2730 the espionage laws were limited to acts committed either in the United States, on the high seas, or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States. This limitation had prevented prosecution in those cases in which the offenses against the United States occurred within a foreign country. Now the United States will be able to prosecute for acts of espionage whether committed abroad or at home.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

For some time there has been a great need to adopt a new approach to conflict of interest in Government employment. At the beginning of the year the chairman, Mr. CELLER, and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 3411 and H.R. 3412, in order to carry forward the work of the Judiciary Committee in this field from the 86th Congress. Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill containing the recommendations of the New York City Bar Association.

Extensive hearings were held on these measures and a clean bill by Mr. CELLER, H.R. 8140, embodying the recommendations of Mr. CELLER, myself, and Mr. LINDSAY passed the House on August 7, 1961. The bill has already become known as the Celler-McCulloch-Lindsay bill and when acted upon by the Senate will be landmark legislation.

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

The committee reported a clean bill by Mr. CELLER, H.R. 9096—Public Law 87–331—to grant a limited exemption from the antitrust laws to professional sports leagues in order to permit the leagues to enter into package television contracts with the broadcasting networks. Mr. WALTER, Mr. MEADER, and I were primarily responsible for the amendment which protects college football on Friday nights and all day Saturday during the period beginning the second Friday in September and ending the second Saturday in December. Without doing violence to antitrust principles as ordinarily applied to business organizations, this bill will permit professional leagues to enter into package contracts for the televising of football, basketball, baseball, hockey, and other professional games.

ALIEN ORPHANS, JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DEPORTATION ORDERS AND ADMITTANCE OF 2D AND 3D PREFERENCE ALIENS

The committee substantially amended S. 2237—Public Law 87–301—in order to permit not only the continuation of temporary orphan adoption programs but also to provide a uniform judicial review of orders of deportation and permit the admittance into the United States of all aliens who have had a petition for a second or third preference status filed prior to July 1, 1961. This last provision, section 25(a) of the act, will benefit over 18,000 persons, mostly the parents or the unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens or immigrants already lawfully admitted for permanent residence. The provision for judicial review of deportation orders is designed to eliminate the practice whereby undesirable aliens abuse our courts by bringing repetitious and dilatory proceedings, usually petitions for writs of habeas corpus, in order to delay their deportation from the United States. On many occasions these undesirable aliens have been successful in delaying their deportation up to 10 years.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

House Joint Resolution 225—Public Law 87–328—by Mr. WALTER, gives congressional consent to the States of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware to enter into a compact for the development of the Delaware River Basin. This compact will mark a major step in permitting these States to cooperate and work together in controlling problems, such as flood control, which transcend the boundaries of the individual States.

OTHER MAJOR LAWS

In addition the Judiciary Committee reported other bills of major interest, including H.R. 5656—Public Law 87–225—to provide for a reasonable, instead of a 5-day notice, before making application to the U.S. court of appeals for interlocutory relief from the orders of certain administrative agencies; H.R. 8490—Public Law 87–324—extending the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; and H.R. 2883—Public Law 87–258—to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment. H.R. 1961 by Mr. POFF, to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to statutory liens and the powers of the trustees passed the House on August 8, 1961, while H.R. 1960, also by Mr. POFF, a bill to make it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in the U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia, passed the House on July 10, 1961.

Mr. CELLER has prepared a comprehensive summary of the activities of the committee which has been printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Reference should be made to the remarks of the chairman in order to obtain a full explanation of the work of the committee including the major bills and investigations which are still pending, since in these remarks I am obviously only attempting to cover the high points.

LEGISLATION REMAINING UNDER CONSIDERATION

There are several bills of a criminal nature on which activity may be anticipated during the next session of Congress. One of these is a bill to make obstructing investigations or inquiries conducted by the Federal Government a criminal offense. S. 1665, recommended by Attorney General Kennedy, to make the obstruction of investigations conducted by the FBI or the Treasury Department a Federal offense passed the Senate on July 28, 1961, but it was adversely reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House. Many Members considered that additional safeguards should be written into any bill of this nature. It can be anticipated there will be renewed activity in this field during the next session.

Likewise, wiretap legislation may be considered during the next session. S. 1086, to permit wiretapping under certain conditions, has received consideration by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate but there was no consideration of wiretapping as separate legislation by the House Committee.

There was no consideration of civil rights legislation during the past session of Congress other than a bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Bills have been introduced which contain the provisions of the platforms of both parties and it can be anticipated that after the administration has obtained consideration of less controversial measures, pressure will be renewed for civil rights legislation.

There are several measures pending in the antitrust field, which include: a proposal to require companies to give prior notification to the Attorney General or to the Federal Trade Commission before consummating a merger; a proposal to give the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission civil investigative authority—subpena power—in antitrust matters; a proposal to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to require mandatory functional discounts; and a proposal to prohibit the manufacturers of automobiles from financing the sale of their products. Extensive hearings have been held on all of these bills. A civil investigative demand bill, S. 167, passed the Senate on September 21, 1961.

Extensive hearings were also held on bills to increase the membership of the House. This controversial measure failed to receive the approval of the Judiciary Committee. There is speculation that some effort may be made during the next session of Congress to bring to the floor of the House for consideration a bill providing for a limited increase in the membership in the House.

Congressman John D. Dingell Reports to the People of the 15th District of Michigan

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present my sixth annual report to the people of my district on my stewardship in the Congress. I have filed such a report with my constituents at the end of each session of Congress during which I have been privileged to represent them and their interests.

During this session, I again served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have achieved significant seniority on both of these committees, and now have the honor of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the latter committee. The subcommittee is responsible for scientific research and study of the oceans of the world.

I have appeared before appropriate committees testifying in favor of legislation to liberalize social security, and have devoted a great deal of energy to study and sponsorship of new concepts of this system to offer more and better protection to our people. The program for medical care for the aged within the social security system, on which the Congress is expected to act next year, for example, and the reduction of the retirement age with full benefits, are both examples of legislation in this field which I have sponsored since I first came to Congress 6 years ago.

I was one of the leaders in securing authorization of funds for an investigation of the securities market by the Securities and Exchange Commission to determine whether the small investor is being adequately protected by existing law.

My vigorous support has been given to legislation protecting our consumers, not only from price gouging in natural gas and other commodities, but also from dangerous, adulterated, filthy and contaminated foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

I have supported school construction legislation, and have sponsored and supported tax measures closing loopholes and reducing the income tax of those in the lower brackets by raising the individual exemption.

I maintain two offices to serve my constituents, one in Washington, D.C., and one in Detroit at 7310 Grand River Avenue, where I will again be available, this fall, to meet with my constituents on their problems.

I. LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL WHICH HAS BECOME LAW DURING THE PAST YEAR

Mr. Speaker, I have had the satisfaction of seeing several bills which I introduced passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law by the President. They are:

H.R. 4038: The Blatnik-Smith-Dingell Water Pollution Control Act of 1961. The act provides new and stricter Federal sanctions against the polluters of our Nation's water supply, and increases Federal grants to States and municipalities for pollution abatement works. The bill was endorsed by all conservation, municipal, and public health groups, and will result in a real cleanup of our polluted waters.

H.R. 3874: The provisions of this bill were enacted as one of the Social Security Amendments of 1961. It provides for reduction of the retirement age for men under the Social Security Act from 65 to 62.

Other pieces of legislation, of which I was one of several sponsors, and for which I have worked for a number of years, were enacted into law this session. Among these were the bills which raised the minimum monthly primary benefits under social security from $33 to $40, increased widow's benefits, and included children of the unemployed under the aid to dependent children program.

I was also a cosponsor of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, and the Area Redevelopment Act, and had the immense pleasure of seeing my 6-year fight for a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour brought to a successful conclusion with passage of legislation similar to my bill H.R. 2412.

II. OTHER LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL DURING THE 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

I introduced many other measures during this past session, Mr. Speaker, on which no action has as yet been taken. However, my constituents may be sure that I shall continue to press for the passage of such measures as these:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H.R. 4084: Would establish Federal standards for unemployment compensation to guarantee benefits equal to not less than 50 percent of the worker's weekly wage, but not more than two-thirds of the average wage prevailing in the State, for a minimum of 39 weeks. This bill would have provided the average Michigan worker during the recent recession with an additional $19 weekly in benefits for the period for which unemployment compensation may now be paid, and also would have provided $49 per week for an additional 13 weeks. These two provisions, taken together, would have pumped a badly needed $1.3 billion of additional purchasing power into the American economy.

H.R. 6715: Under this measure, the Veterans' Administrator and the Federal Housing Administrator would establish funds in areas of substantial labor surplus which would be self-liquidating, and would be used to protect owners of homes subject to VA and FHA insured mortgages from default for 1 year while unemployed, and for 30 days after reemployment.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H.R. 2413. A bill to make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate in hiring

unjustly on account of age. This would help solve one of the gravest unemployment problems of those of middle age or older.

H.R. 101. This bill, the first civil rights legislation to be introduced in this Congress, is an omnibus bill to outlaw discrimination in voting, housing, transportation, and employment, and to create a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with strong authority to outlaw discrimination in employment.

H.R. 102. A bill to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to file civil actions for injunction on behalf of citizens whose civil rights are threatened or interfered with.

H.R. 103. A strong antilynching bill to prohibit and punish such violence when inspired by the race, creed, or color of the victim.

H.R. 104. A bill to establish a meaningful Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with real authority to halt discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

House Joint Resolution 3. A constitutional amendment establising uniform national suffrage by eliminating all restrictions on voting except for age and reasonable length-of-residence requirements. This provision was recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in its recent report on voting.

NATIONAL CONTRIBUTORY HEALTH INSURANCE

H.R. 4413 would establish a national program of contributory health insurance, and thus make adequate medical care available to all, on a prepaid basis. Under this program, the patient may choose his own doctor, and the doctor cannot be forced to take any patient he does not want.

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 4602: A bill to liberalize the definition of permanent and total disability under the Social Security Act to permit those who are so disabled as to be incapable of continuing work in their regular employment to retire without waiting for age 62. This will permit many now denied benefits under the unduly harsh disability provisions of social security to secure desperately needed help.

H.R. 5401 would reduce the retirement age for men to age 60 and for women to 55, and eliminate reduction of benefits on account of early retirement.

H.R. 5891 would continue payment of survivor and other benefits to children attending school up to age 21, rather than the present age of 18.

H.R. 4309: The administration's proposed Retired Persons' Medical Insurance Act, providing for hospitalization, skilled nursing, outpatient and nursing home care for persons receiving retirement benefits. I was one of the first sponsors of this measure, and I am happy to report that hearings have already been held and further action is scheduled for next year.

TAXATION

H.R. 2409 and 2410: These bills would raise the individual exemption to $700 and $800, respectively. For a family of four in the lowest taxable income bracket, this would mean an additional $80 or $160 of purchasing power per year.

H.R. 2408 would eliminate the 10 percent Federal excise tax on automobiles to help provide jobs for our automobile workers.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

By means of the closest of cooperation, Mr. Speaker, a Democratic 87th Congress, and a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, have made an extraordinary record of creative action in the last 9 months.

A primary objective of the Democratic program was reorganization of the House Rules Committee, to make it more responsive to the wishes of the House and to make it more difficult for the forces of reaction to utilize that body as an obstructive instrument. This reorganization, of which I was one of the first and most determined advocates, was speedily accomplished, and liberal measures, among the first of which were those for the relief of the unemployed and hungry, followed quickly.

ANTIRECESSION ACTION

Both the President and Congress acted quickly to end the recession of 1960–61. By Executive order, the President doubled the amount of surplus foods going to each needy family and began utilization of the food stamp legislation, which I sponsored last session and which the previous administration had ignored, in a number of cities including Detroit. Early distribution was made of tax refunds and veterans' insurance dividends to bolster purchasing power.

The Congress quickly enacted extended unemployment compensation coverage, on a temporary basis, for 600,000 unemployed workers. It also passed legislation to provide the benefits of the aid to dependent children program to children of the unemployed, providing over $200,000 over a 14-month period to 750,000 needy children and 250,000 needy adults. Both of these measures helped break the back of the recession, but to its everlasting discredit, the Michigan Legislature has denied the children of our unemployed $20 million by refusing to enact legislation to carry out provisions of this act.

To provide assistance to areas of high, persistent unemployment, like Detroit, the Congress enacted the Area Redevelopment Act, of which I was one of the first sponsors. This act makes funds available for redevelopment planning, industrial and commercial development projects, public facility construction, and subsistence payments to workers engaged in approved training and retraining programs.

The Congress enacted milestone amendments to the Social Security Act including among other things reduction in the retirement age to 62, of which I was a sponsor. This bill raised the minimum primary benefits from $33 per month to $40 per month and gave new coverage to 160,000 persons previously excluded because of lack of necessary quarters of coverage.

LEGISLATION TO INITIATE NEW SOCIAL PROGRESS

The Housing Act of 1961 made public housing available to 100,000 more low-income families, aided cities in preservation of open spaces and establishment of public parks, and liberalized FHA mortgages by reducing downpayments and extending the duration of the amortization period.

This session of Congress saw the first major expansion of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act since the original act was passed in 1938. The new law covers 3.6 million workers previously unprotected, provides pay raises for 1.9 million others, and raises the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour by two steps. Few of our workers in Michigan will be benefited directly. However, this may stop the movement of industry from our State to lower wage areas.

Strong water pollution control legislation was enacted, and the establishment of a whole series of national parks has been provided for by appropriation of funds for purchase of land.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Because of the new threats to world peace manufactured by the Soviet Union, the Congress unanimously provided the administration-requested $6 billion for increased missile programs—including a doubling of the Polaris program—increased bomber alerts, and new weapons and increased personnel for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Congress also doubled, at President Kennedy's request, the funds for America's program of space exploration.

For the first time, adequate civil defense was provided for, with a $207 million fallout shelter program and a reorganization of the administration of the program.

Congress also took a new and important step in national defense by enacting the administration's plan for a Disarmament Agency. This new Agency will be responsible for providing the research and the tools necessary for the writing of new U.S. policies to achieve effective and bilateral disarmament with safeguards and for new methods to seize initiative in this area from the Communists.

FOREIGN POLICY

The vigor of the Kennedy administration, and its close cooperation with the Congress, was manifested many times over in the field of foreign relations. The Peace Corps was established to give young Americans a chance to make a personal contribution toward building good will for America and to give substantial aid to new nations lacking in essential skills.

The new alliance-for-progress program will make available $600 million to help our Latin American neighbors help themselves.

The food-for-peace program, expanded and revitalized by Congress at the President's request, has been enthusiastically received as an outstanding way to reduce world tension and aid the world's hungry by utilization of surplus American foods.

The Congress has also recently appropriated almost $4.2 billion for other types

of foreign aid under a new approach, which for the first time will emphasize self-help and loans rather than outright grants.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Federal regulatory agencies have undergone extensive administrative reorganization for greater efficiency. Consumer-oriented appointees have given new direction to their respective programs and will insure better protection for the American consumer and homemaker.

The Food and Drug Administration received appropriations for a substantial increase in the number of its inspectors, to better enable it to protect the American people from unsafe foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Congress extended the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. Unfortunately, I was not able to secure complete acceptance of my bill, H.R. 6879, to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency, but liberal forces in Congress did extend the Agency for a further 2-year term. The work of this agency is too valuable to let it die.

I joined with the Attorney General in urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rules and regulations to halt unlawful racial segregation on buses and in bus terminal facilities. These rules have just been adopted by the ICC and will permit further progress in the battle for first-class citizenship for minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there has never been a time in American history when the President and the Congress have worked together so closely and effectively and have achieved more under such difficult circumstances. There are those who criticize our actions on the grounds that all this efficiency is costing too much, and excoriate what we have done because there will be a budget deficit of $5.9 billion this year. To them I would point out that 32 percent of this spending, half of which is to be repaid, was necessary to break the recession. Over half of this deficit is occasioned by additional spending for our national defense. The gravity of the domestic and world situations which the Kennedy administration and the 87th Congress inherited, required vigorous action and the substantial expenditures made to protect our country and restore our economy.

It is my hope that the next session of Congress will be as fruitful as this one, and I pledge to devote my energies to that end.

"College News Conference"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of interest that I recently noted Ruth Hagy's Peabody award-winning television program, "College News Conference," will return to the air this fall over the National Educational Television Network. This program, which has been cited by numerous civic and youth organizations, has been on the air from 1952 until recently.

I am particularly glad to note that "College News Conference" will be back on the air, because of the worthy contributions which this program has made in educating the American people on important issues. It has held a high place among the discussion programs which help provoke timely debate and have proved, I believe, to be of very real informational value.

I have enjoyed my association with "College News Conference" in the past, and I know that Mrs. Hagy looks forward to an informative and stimulating new series of programs.

Governor Rockefeller Urges Federal Department of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal on September 19, 1961:

GOVERNOR URGES TRANSPORT UNIT BUT THERE'S A BIG "IF"

Several years ago the famed Hoover Commission looked at the Federal Government's regulatory agencies in the field of transport, decried their piecemeal approach and admitted, sadly, that prospects for unified improvement appeared mighty slim.

This forecast has been proved out.

Last week Governor Rockefeller along with the mayors of New York State's major cities, including Mayor Henninger of Syracuse, appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Governor described the need for a coordinated regulation * * * and, we presume, subsidization * * * of the country's transport systems as a national must. He would accomplish this by creating a Department of Transportation.

(Underscored by the Governor was a coordinated approach to the merger and consolidation of the country's railroads to achieve, for them, a healthier economic climate.)

Obviously the Hoover Commission findings of more than a decade ago have not been translated into bureaucratic consolidations. Otherwise, the Governor would have had to testify differently.

Equally obvious is the absence of leadership by the present Federal administration in dealing with this vital, overhaul approach to the country's transportation industries even though study after study has led to the recommendation that the United States update its 19th-century hodgepodge approach.

One big "if" clouds any attempt to unify the Nation's patchwork regulatory jurisdictions of the country's airline, highway, pipeline, railroad and waterway carriers. That "if" is whether any degree of unity and coordination could now emerge from the Federal bureaucracies governing the country's transport. These are entrenched empires. Their rulers resist change like the plague.

But this country must come to grips with its mounting transport crisis which today involves chiefly the railroads. So far Governor Rockefeller is the only national political leader to speak out. He inadvertently laid down a challenge for others to do likewise. They should.

Government and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on September 27, 1961, Mr. John E. Swearingen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, addressed the annual meeting of the Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. While some of the thoughts contained in his speech have been oft-expressed, I believe that Mr. Swearingen has restated the problems inherent in governmental interference with the rights of private enterprise with a forcefulness, a clarity and an understanding that is most unusual and most compelling. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND AMERICAN BUSINESS

(By John E. Swearingen)

It is a privilege to meet with you and to discuss a problem with which we are mutually concerned; namely, the impact of Government on American business.

For several decades our Government has established as national goals certain programs which have a direct and vital impact upon the American business community. Many of these programs, such as national defense, are dictated by the realities of our times; others, such as medical care, are debatable. They all have one common denominator in that they require huge sums of money.

The decision to establish these programs is by nature political, determined as a result of our elective processes. This is not the forum to discuss the political wisdom of such decisions, nor do I desire to assume the role of a political pundit either pro or con.

As businessmen, however, you and I do have a domain of special competence. In the areas of production, manufacturing, wages, marketing, prices, taxes, and research, we have an obligation to comment on Government programs which will assist our economy in expanding or which, conversely, will cause it to contract.

Throughout this Nation there are millions of people, who for the first time in their lives are becoming seriously concerned about the economy of the United States. Soviet Union spokesmen have maintained for years that capitalism will collapse economically and that international communism will be victorious without firing a shot.

The economic solvency and the military strength of the United States are, therefore, the bedrock, the very foundation upon which rests the freedom of mankind. Other nations of the free world who face economic

difficulties can turn to us for assistance. We can only look to ourselves.

Obviously the Government, in and of itself, has no assets. What it accumulates it must first extract from the people in the form of taxes. From where does the money come? The source of revenues collected by the Federal Government in fiscal 1960 tells the story. They were as follows:

	Percent
Individual income taxes	46.4
Corporation income taxes	22.9
Excise taxes	12.2
Employment taxes	11.5
Other receipts	7.0

Since a large portion of the individual income taxes, corporate income taxes, and employment taxes are derived from employees and shareholders of American business, it is abundantly clear that the entire economy of our country rests upon the ability of American business to carry the burden which has been placed upon it.

Under the circumstances, it is axiomatic that Government action promoting business stability and growth benefits the Nation as well as business. Government action, on the other hand, that hampers business growth undermines our economic strength and tends to choke off at the source the tax revenues on which the Government's own manifold programs depend. Exploring the implications for business of Government policies, therefore, is just plain good business for the Government and its citizens as well as for industry. Let us briefly examine certain Government programs in the light of this concern.

I. FOREIGN POLICY

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1960, the United States has made available to foreign nations a sum of nearly $86 billion in various types of foreign assistance, grants and loans. We shall make available an estimated $5 billion in fiscal 1961 for a total of nearly $91 billion. After all types of repayment and returns of grants have been considered, by June 30, 1962, our net foreign assistance program will represent the astronomical sum of $86.5 billion.

Such a staggering sum of money is virtually impossible to comprehend. It is a tremendous tribute to our economic system that we have been able to endure such an economic strain without bankruptcy and collapse. No other nation on the face of the earth (even if it were so inclined) would have been capable of such largess. We have made this effort only by accumulating a national debt which is approaching $300 billion—a figure, incidentally, which is larger than all the combined national debts of all the nations of the world since the beginning of recorded history. Many of these foreign assistance programs were established to restore the war-ravaged economies of some of our friends and allies and to alleviate human suffering. To a large extent, the original purposes of many of our foreign assistance programs have been accomplished three and four fold. But there is a limit to the extent that assets of the United States can be transferred abroad. From a business point of view, therefore, objectives of our foreign aid programs should be scrupulously reviewed so that they can be brought within the realm of our ability to pay.

There is every indication as the years go by, that the American economy will be forced to compete with the state-controlled economy of the Soviet Union in many areas of the world. American business can only participate in such a competition if it is allowed to grow and expand. The vital area of our foreign policy concerning trade agreements and tariffs must be reexamined and placed on a truly reciprocal basis if American industry is to compete, not only with our opponents, but also with our friends.

A comparison of unit production between the United States and Western Europe from 1950 to 1960 should illustrate the point. In steel, automobiles, and total exports, the growth of Western European economy was from 100 percent to 400 percent higher than our own. While our steel production was increasing from 88 million tons annually to 90 million tons, Western Europe's production of steel increased from 51.9 million to 107 million tons. While our production of 7.8 million cars in 1960 was actually lower than the 8 million that rolled off our assembly lines in 1950, Western Europe manufactured 6 million cars last year, compared with 1.6 million 10 years earlier. While the value of our exports grew from $10.2 billion to $17.6 billion over the decade, Western Europe's over the same period grew from $10 billion to $21 billion. At the same time, Western Europe's gold reserve more than doubled, from $6.5 billion to $16.2 billion, while ours declined from $22.8 billion to $19.5 billion.

A businessman's conclusion must be that our economy must expand or the commitments we make in the future must be severely curtailed. To increase the commitments without expanding the economy is a sure blueprint for bankruptcy. But the way to expand our economy is by less Federal interference and control—not more.

II. FISCAL POLICY

Both political parties have consistently promised to end deficit financing, to prevent inflation, and to balance the budget. Neither party has been able, or perhaps willing, to redeem its pledges. The future promises more deficit financing and more inflation.

Those of us who are charged with the responsibility of business management know that the Government must provide an incentive for people to risk their capital, either in established businesses or in new ventures. Risked capital produces the vital mechanism where factories are built, jobs are created, and new and better products are made available to consumers. The positive course of action required at this time, therefore, is for the Government to provide tax and other incentives for industry; to increase these incentives, not reduce them. Among other things, more realistic tax depreciation programs are needed to encourage capital expansion.

Conversely, Government proposals that would increase taxes at the risk of throttling industry ignore the obvious fact that too large an appetite may drive the cook from the kitchen. When taxes become too restrictive, business inevitably contracts, and tax revenues decline.

Every corporate dollar subject to Federal income tax now shrinks to 48 cents in after-tax profits. Under the circumstances, the proposal to eliminate the modest relief from double taxation permitted to the stockholder, by taking away the 4-percent dividend credit in the computation of his own tax return, qualifies as both inequitable and restrictive on investments.

Percentage depletion, as all of us know, is another tax feature subject to recurrent attacks. This allowance, which affects not only our particular raw material but over 100 others, has served this Nation well as a matter of development of natural resources. At an hour when we must develop our resources to the maximum it is poor policy to allow this particular incentive to become a tax football.

The matter of fiscal policy and tax incentive can be discussed in a very technical fashion, or it can be rather simply stated as a matter of philosophy. Basically, the positive program, the green light which American business needs from Government on fiscal matters is the encouragement manifested in numerous ways which will urge the business community of America to expand and grow soundly. Growth requires risk capital, which businessmen are reluctant to invest when Government vagaries rather than economics determine whether gains are possible.

For at least a decade our political leaders have been warning the American people that sacrifices must be made to preserve and perpetuate our society. Defense appropriations have constantly increased to strengthen our military capabilities. At the present time these defense appropriations constitute $47.5 billion out of a budget of $87.7 billion.

As a businessman it is clear to me that someone in the Government is confused as to the exact nature of the sacrifices needed. Sacrifice means to do without. In my personal life and in the management function which I perform for my corporation, when vital emergency expenses are necessary, we curtail other activities and do without some things in order to meet our obligations.

The obvious answer to the increased military expenditures is not to raise taxes and to increase indebtedness, but rather to curtail or abolish unnecessary activities, to eliminate nonessential spending, to postpone costly, nonvital projects, and thus to do without until the priority objective is attained.

In a quotation attributed to the French author, Alexis de Tocqueville, the dangers of loose fiscal policy were stated as follows:

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess out of the public treasury."

Without comment may I cite the following statistics concerning those who derive all or a portion of their support from our Public Treasury:

Federal Government employees	2,400,000
State and local government employees (not including school employees)	5,300,000
Social security retirement benefits	14,300,000
Veterans' Administration pensions and compensation	4,500,000
Total	26,500,000

This is not a forum to debate the wisdom of the increased social security benefits, the medical program, Federal housing, reclamation, Federal aid to education, atomic power, urban renewal, and a host of other programs.

Ours is a forum, however, to constructively propose that when this Nation is in peril, we temporarily forgo vast expenditures in some of these areas and divert the funds toward our primary goal of survival. It is my sincere conviction that we must cease to face every crisis by maintaining all fringe benefits and levying additional taxes and controls on our economy. This is not sacrificing; this is economic suicide.

III. LABOR POLICIES

An essential ingredient in a vigorous economy is a proper balance between labor and management which protects the rights of both, and at the same time provides the greatest benefits for all consumers. Free collective bargaining under existing labor legislation has provided a mechanism under which labor and management have, to a large degree, successfully resolved their differences. Unfortunately, there now seems to be a tendency to make Government intervention, or the threat of it, a matter of common policy rather than a rarely used last resort. Throughout history there have been innumerable attempts on the part of governments to control artificially the laws of economics in respect to wages and prices. Never have these attempts been successful. Always they have produced an economy or scarcity, chaos, and confusion. I believe business will expand if collective bargaining and consumer acceptance in free competition are allowed to set wages and prices.

Responsible Americans must also realize that powerful labor unions exert political and economic influence far beyond that to which they are justly entitled. Local law enforcement in labor disputes more often than not fails to uphold existing laws and to protect property and human rights. The fact that unions are able to draw upon their vast treasuries for political purposes while business is prohibited from using corporate funds for those same purposes represents an imbalance that must be corrected.

When this imbalance is corrected (and I am certain it will be in time), the tremendous political power of the labor bosses will be restored to its proper perspective and the entire economy will benefit thereby.

Furthermore, to promote an expanding economy, the fruits of technology must be made available to all consumers in the form of lower prices, not exclusively harvested by labor in the form of higher wages.

IV. CLARIFICATION OF ANTITRUST POLICIES

The most positive step necessary to encourage the business community of the United States to expand and to seek new markets is a clarification of the antitrust policies of the Government. For the last two decades no legal counsel has been in a position to advise his employer accurately as to the precise limitations and restrictions of existing statutes. What is legal one day becomes the subject of prosecution the next. In fact, on occasions it has appeared to me that some people in Government believe that being big is automatically bad.

On occasions the Department of Justice seems to be seeking for ways to place roadblocks in the way of business expansion. The recent restrictions against bank mergers are but one instance. Similarly, on occasion, the Internal Revenue Service, by refusing to state its position, has completely ignored the practical difficulties created by its silence. It is no great trick to destroy business. The real art of government is to nurture business in its broadest definition so that all the Nation and all the people can benefit. When so much attention is being focused on morality of business, isn't it time some attention is also focused on the morality of government?

People in and out of government must be made to understand that if our Nation is to achieve a gross national product of $595 billion and provide tax revenues each year of $85 billion, then it must of necessity contain industrial complexes of vast magnitude. No responsible business leader condones collusion to fix prices or conspiracy to violate antitrust statutes. By the same token, however, no intelligent businessman supports the present confusion of antitrust policies, which vary from day to day as to what the laws mean.

V. HARASSMENT

For the last several decades it has become popular to harass business and at every opportunity to suggest new methods of regulation and control. Some politicians have made reputations by excoriating businessmen because they sold at too low a price. Others have gotten the limelight by allegations that industries sold at too high a price.

Such inconsistencies seldom seem to trouble business' critics. Business baiting has become too popular a sport for them to worry about consistency or the lack of it, or about facts or the lack of them. Unfortunately, moreover, some officials seem not to be able to distinguish between issues and personalities. The disability of the kind of personal harassment in which some Government officials indulge lies not so much in the wounded sensibilities of their victims—but in the debasement of the democratic processes, in the deliberate distortion of viewpoints meriting consideration, and in the reluctance that it engenders among executives to expose themselves to almost certain vilification if they try to contribute their special talents to Government. Isn't it time to call a halt to harassment for harassment's sake and to limit the regulation and control of Government to those facets that are absolutely essential for the national welfare?

VI. REGULATORY AGENCIES

At one time abuses in certain areas created the necessity for regulatory agencies in the Federal Government. Primary examples are the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission. However, the medicine of the regulatory agencies now threatens to kill the patient. Regulatory agencies, amounting to over 68 in number, have become substitutes for the regular legal, judicial, and executive processes of the Government. When originally conceived, the administrative actions of these agencies were to be subject, on their own merits, to review by the courts. But because of the vast multitude of the agencies' regulations, they now have all the practical force and effect of the law. Seldom can business appeal successfully.

Regulatory agencies not only promulgate the law through their regulations, they execute the law by finding business in violation of their edicts, and adjudicate the law in their own trial examiner hearings. One of the worst features of this growth of the almighty independent agency is that the individuals manning the various boards and commissions have long tenures of office, are political appointees, and have absolutely no responsibility to the people. It is no wonder, therefore, that the field of administrative law, as it affects business in buying, selling, shipping, hiring, firing, investing, and numerous other important areas, can only be described as a morass.

Furthermore, the control within the regulatory agencies is seldom exercised by the nominal heads. Frequently policies are established by civil service employees in job classifications far below the grade one would expect for individuals charged with these responsibilities. Thus it is that in many instances, an unheard-of, unknown employee in a regulatory agency can make a pronouncement vitally affecting the entire American business community.

Recently there have been attempts even to expand the authority of these regulatory agencies and to delegate even more authority to those in lower positions within the agency. Thus far, these attempts have not been successful, but they are indicative of the problem which faces the business community.

As a businessman, I feel the Government should reexamine the functions of many of these regulatory agencies in accordance with the recommendations which have already been made by many of the Hoover Commission task forces—to limit in extent the powers of these agencies, to provide for speedy judicial review in important cases, and to restore to the people the people's business.

VII. UNFAIR COMPETITION

The American business community has thrived on free and open competition; and the American business community is perfectly willing to invest its money and take its chances, provided it is allowed to enjoy equal opportunity and fair competition.

It would be a very positive step for the Government of the United States to get out of those businesses which can be performed by American industry. It is fantastic for the Government of the United States to take tax money from individuals and corporations, and then to compete with them in the operation of everything from ice-cream plants to powerplants and industrial complexes.

For years there has been a great clamor on the subject of getting the Government out of business. Frankly, in my opinion, on the basis of statistics available, very little seems to have been done.

The second area of unfair competition to which I would like briefly to allude concerns that of cooperatives. The theory of the cooperative, like that of the regulatory agency, was sound in its beginning. Few could object to a group of individuals combining their purchasing power in order to procure commodities at a reduced unit price. Business executives today have little quarrel with what is referred to as "on the farm" cooperatives which are legitimately engaged in the business for which they have been chartered. No one, however, can justify the organization of a profitmaking company engaging in manufacturing, refining, sales, and distribution which accumulates vast sums of money which are undistributed, and yet which pays no corporate tax. Corporations should not be forced to compete with others engaged in the same business on a volume basis when one is required by law to pay a 52-percent corporate tax, and the other markets its products tax free.

The growth of the competitive free enterprise system would certainly be encouraged if the obvious corrective measures were taken in this area.

VIII. GOVERNMENT APPOINTEES

In many ways, one of the most frustrating and disheartening experiences is to read the announcement of the appointment of an individual to a high Government position exercising vast authority over the business community when I know that he is hostile to the very economic beliefs upon which this Nation is predicated.

With rare exceptions, we in the business world are familiar with the economic philosophy of prominent people. We generally recognize the followers of John Maynard Keynes and Harold Laski. We read enough to identify Fabian Socialists and the followers of Hjalmar Schacht.

It is distressing when the television and newspapers report, as they frequently do, that persons of this type will be officially enunciating our economic doctrines. How refreshing and how positive it would be if the local, State, and National Governments delegated authority only to individuals who were well known advocates of our economic system. An upsurge of enthusiasm would occur among American business and professional leaders if outspoken advocates of American free enterprise staffed the boards, the commissions, and the advisory positions from which emanate the political power over labor and management. This would practically guarantee a resurgence in American business.

CONCLUSION

In my brief comments I have indicated to you some specific instances in which Government programs have a vital impact on American business and business expansion. Every one of the points which I have mentioned to you is actually a political decision, and can only be accomplished by political action.

As American citizens we, who are especially concerned with business management, recognize that many of the past and proposed Government programs will be wrecked on the rocks of economic reality. We have an obligation and a responsibility, therefore, to make our voices heard. Ours is a political system.

It is incumbent upon each of us to participate in the party of our choice at the local level and at the national level, and to give to politics, as citizens, a portion of our time and talents and money. Furthermore, we must serve in government when the specialized skills we possess are needed.

As individuals and as management officials, we have a responsibility to encourage our associates and our employees to participate

in the political party of their choice so that some of the positive programs which are for the benefit of our entire economy can be translated into political realities.

May I suggest to you that the marvel of our society is that it was based on individual responsibility, liberty, and opportunity. Regimentation, regulation, and government controls are as old as the ages.

From the tyrannies of Egypt to the modern barbarians of the Soviet Union, the techniques of totalitarianism have remained the same. The United States has been unique because its people accepted political responsibility and guided their own lives and destinies right from the beginning. We will remain great and become greater only insofar as we refuse to deviate from the fundamental principles upon which this political edifice was reared.

American business can meet any challenge that the future may bring, but we must meet it unshackled, unfettered, and free. We in the business world must not abdicate our authority to the ivory-towered Socialist or fuzzy-minded theorists.

Today there are undoubtedly among this audience those who can assist in recommending to government the positive programs which will guarantee American business expansion.

There is a vital task to be done. All of us must help in it.

Thank you.

A Year of Innovation and Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the excellent report of the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal for the fiscal year 1960–61.

The report outlines the imaginative steps being taken in New York State to meet its ever-growing needs for adequate housing for all and for urban renewal.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YEAR OF INNOVATION AND GROWTH

Innovation and growth have characterized the programs administered by the division of housing and community renewal during the past year. Changes in both approach and scope have been brought about by the interaction of two forces of government, both directed toward the improvement of urban life—one from the municipalities, the other from the State.

From the communities, the prime force has been the growing acceptance by an informed citizenry of the importance of renewing and conserving the physical resources of a central core in order to promote the economic and civic vitality of the municipality. The direct result of this widespread support for urban renewal has been increased demands for the State's financial assistance and services.

From the State, the force has been its policy of encouraging diversity in the use of its funds and services in a deliberate effort to tailor its aid to meet the varying requirements of individual areas. Adaptability—in design, in financing methods and in management practices—has been the keystone of administrative planning.

This interaction between the community and the State in developing "custom" programs to cope with local variations of the nationwide problem of urban blight has been in the highest tradition of home rule. At best, the urban renewal process is expensive, takes time, demands persistence, and requires imagination. The State, as the community's supporting partner in this process, has encouraged experimental efforts and pioneering programs that may well establish patterns for communities elsewhere to follow. It has responded to the individual needs and preferences of a diversified, democratic society.

Innovations in the field of finance have been the most significant changes affecting the programs administered by the division of housing and community renewal. Because the agency has functioned in some respects like a bank, supervising the State's loans for housing and urban renewal, two changes in financing have had tremendous impact on the scope of these programs.

NEW YORK STATE HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY ESTABLISHED

The first change, an imaginative plan to provide one-half billion dollars in low-cost mortgage loans for middle-income housing construction, was launched at the beginning of the year with the enactment of legislation creating the New York State Housing Finance Agency.

Until this year the limited-profit housing program, under which the State had provided 90-percent mortgage loans to private enterprise for cooperative and rental housing projects, was restricted to the $150 million authorized by the electorate.

The new method of financing the loans through the housing finance agency has expanded the program by creating an entirely new source of funds. The agency may now sell $525 million of its bonds to a broad segment of the investing public, thereby attracting into housing finance for the first time investment funds previously unavailable for mortgages because of the long-term commitment and the risks involved for investors unskilled in mortgage financing. The division, with its know-how in the development and operation of middle-income housing, can now represent these investors.

The proceeds of the bond sales will be loaned to the housing companies at the going rate of interest plus a service charge to support the agency. The limited-profit housing program has been expanded and placed on a sound fiscal footing without any further direct pledge of State credit, except for a $2 million loan to initiate the housing finance agency's capital reserve fund.

URBAN RENEWAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CHANGES FROM LOANS TO DIRECT GRANTS

The second important change in finance was introduced in the State's urban renewal program, revising the form of assistance from a loan to a direct grant. This revision was made for the sole purpose of reducing the cost of the program to the taxpayers.

When the urban renewal program was originally conceived in 1958 as a plan to provide financial assistance to communities undertaking urban renewal projects under the Federal title I program, financing was patterned after the loan and subsidy formula already in use for the State's low-rent housing program. The original program as approved by the electorate authorized the State to sell $25 million or urban renewal bonds and to loan the proceeds for 25 years. Corresponding annual subsidy payments sufficient to cover interest charges and debt retirement were also authorized.

This means of financing was deemed unnecessarily costly by an economy-minded State administration, since every dollar extended in direct aid would cost the State an additional 45 cents in interest charges. Unlike the State loan for the construction of a housing project that becomes revenue-producing and provides half of the debt retirement out of rental income, the loan for urban renewal is applied to a non-revenue-producing intangible, the so-called write down of the land cost, and subsidy must cover both debt retirement and interest.

With the entire urban renewal $25 million loan fund committed or reserved by the fall of 1960, a year and one-half after the program was launched, new legislation to expand the program was drafted for the 1961 session of the legislature. Here emphasis was placed on setting the program on a direct grant basis, with funds derived from current State revenues. The $10 million in new aid authorized by the legislature during the 1961 session will now cost the taxpayers $10 million, not $14,500,000 as it would have if the original financing arrangements had been continued.

In addition to the two major innovations in finance, a minor change in the low-rent housing program occurred this year as a result of the expanding economy and consequent decrease in the percentage of families at the bottom of the income ladder. This trend, which economists have been predicting would appear as a characteristic of the income picture during the present decade, is already in evidence in Glen Cove, a thriving community on Long Island's prosperous north shore. Surveys conducted by the division of housing and community renewal showed that Glen Cove's housing inventory should be increased primarily in the middle-income range, somewhat above that provided by the traditional low-rent program.

LIMITED SUBSIDIES UPGRADE PUBLIC HOUSING

To meet this special local problem, the concept of limited subsidy was introduced, and rents averaging $17.45 per room per month instead of approximately $12.50 were established for a new low-rent project.

The State's response to these local circumstances in the housing requirements of an individual community, however, extended well beyond the mere provision of new housing at suitable rents. With the cooperation of a housing authority of considerable vision, Glen Cove's new housing project is being designed from its inception for future conversion to middle-income cooperative ownership. Each building in the 12-building project will consist of four apartments. Each will be located on its own well-defined plot of land, and will be provided with its own heating plant and service facilities. Individual buildings, therefore, could be converted into tenant-owned cooperatives without alterations should incomes increase and tenants become ineligible for subsidized housing.

The plan has received favorable comment for two reasons: Adaptability that foresees economic change has been provided in the physical structures, permitting the gradual and easy exist of government when its assistance is no longer required; and the social atmosphere that holds out the reward of homeownership instead of the penalty of eviction for tenants who improve their earning capacity will restore an American tradition to low-rent housing management which too long seems to have been dominated by standards of income rather than need.

DESIGN INNOVATIONS RECEIVE SPECIAL EMPHASIS

Innovations in design have received special emphasis because the administrative planning that enables a housing program to meet successfully a community's needs ideally should be initiated with, and expressed through, design. An imaginative architect deals with the economic reality of land cost through design. In a specific instance this year, a site too limited to accommodate the

required number of apartments in the garden type of design preferred in the community prompted the architect of a low-rent project in Greenburgh to design split-level buildings that preserve the suburban atmosphere and yet meet the budget for land costs.

The unavailability of suitable housing sites in the large urban centers is a problem of such persistence and extent that it has called forth engineering ingenuity to create entirely new sites literally out of air. Currently the choicest New York City sites in the limited-profit program are a baseball park, a racetrack, and a railroad switching yard. There being an obvious limit to the number of sports fields available for housing construction, the railroad site represents merely the first in a rapidly developing trend toward utilizing air rights in order to create sites that will provide housing for middle income families within the urban areas.

While some design innovations were the natural response to economic necessity, others were studied as a part of a complete review of the division's design standards for both the low-rent and the limited-profit programs. The review was initiated from within the division and undertaken by the technical staff in an effort to provide, wherever possible, consistent policy for both programs, and to remove, wherever they exist, rigid requirements that have outlived their original usefulness.

During the course of this review, which is still in process, a new standard was adopted for the limited-profit program that will assure the construction of a substantial portion of apartments for the aging The overall objective will be 20 percent of all the apartments financed by the State in any community. This standard is similar to the prevailing standard for the low-rent program, which requires that 10 percent of all apartments financed by the State in any community be for the aging.

APARTMENTS FOR THE AGING

A substantial number of projects exclusively for the aging that are now in preliminary planning will undoubtedly meet this objective in certain communities for some time. When necessary, however, sponsors will be required to include these special apartments in their projects.

The increasing number of aging in the population not only dictated the division's policy of requiring that apartments for this group be included in its program, but also has been the motivating force in inducing a number of nonprofit organizations to consider sponsorship of housing projects exclusively for this group.

The most advanced of these special projects is also the first to be sponsored by a religious institution under State financing. Named "Fellowship Hall," it is sponsored by the Presbyterian Church of Mount Kisco, and will be built in Bedford Hills. A nonsectarian board has been named to direct the housing company.

The project's architectural design and management program have been developed in response to the special requirements of the aging group. Each apartment will have its own ground level entrance through a terrace, and its own garden plot. A combination recreation center and dining hall will serve as a focus of recreational activities, including the preparation of meals for those who wish to eat in company. A director of social activities, a nurse, and a superintendent will be residents of the project. An office for a doctor has also been included in the plans. The facilities of the project, therefore, will permit independent living without the isolation that is often the lot of the aging person living alone, and will provide the recreational and health facilities usually available only in an institution. In Fellowship Hall the sponsors have provided the most complete management program yet developed for the aging; their standards can be expected to influence future plans for similar projects.

ADVANCE IN HOUSING MANAGEMENT—AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR PROBLEM FAMILIES

Another notable advance in housing management during the year was the experiment in training so-called problem families, undertaken by the Rochester Housing Authority. The growing number of inmigrant families from rural areas invading slum areas of large urban centers has complicated the relocation problem in urban renewal programs. Ineligible in many cases for public housing, and unwanted elsewhere, these families are a drain on the municipal economy because of the excessive financial assistance and social services they require.

The Rochester plan, sponsored as a communitywide effort, is unique in several respects. It is conceived as a plan to improve the family's housing and employment opportunities as well as its community relationships. The family is moved from its slum apartment to a house in a middle-income area. Unidentified publicly, the family is started on a new life with a job for the wage earner, a decent home in a neighborhood where middle-class standards prevail, and considerable assistance in developing self-reliance from the social agencies of the community.

The houses have been purchased with funds donated by the business community, and are owned and maintained by the housing authority. Initiated in November with the purchase of the first house, the experiment will eventually cover approximately 15 families. At present, three families are included in the experiment.

Although viewed as an experiment requiring several years to develop a family's ability to be entirely self-sustaining, a significant change in the pattern of family behavior has been marked from the beginning. Responsibility as tenants in such matters as paying rent promptly and maintaining good housekeeping standards has been accepted. Good housing in a good neighborhood has been an incentive for the tenant to cooperate to the extent that he adopts the standards of his neighbors in the landlord-tenant relationship.

Ultimately it is expected that the experiment will enable the Rochester Housing Authority to develop standards for training problem families, and will determine how an enlarged program should be conducted and how much it should cost.

LOW-RENT PROJECT CONVERTED TO LIMITED-DIVIDEND COOPERATIVE

While the Rochester plan was initiated to cope with one management problem in a changing housing market, the Buffalo plan was launched to deal with another. Authorized late in 1959 and undertaken this past year, it involved the conversion of a low-rent State subsidized housing project to cooperative tenant management, and represents the first conversion of its kind in public housing. Prompted by the need for middle-income housing in the downtown area of Buffalo where the project is located, and by the availability of new public housing opening up in other areas of the city for the relocation of the low-income tenants, the Buffalo Housing Authority undertook a renovation program to upgrade the low-rent facilities to middle-income standards. Ownership has been retained by the housing authority, but the structures have been leased to a limited-dividend housing company organized for the purpose by a group of Buffalo businessmen who are also directing its management on a temporary basis until the tenant-cooperators have gained sufficient experience to operate the project.

TO ASSURE COMPETENT MANAGEMENT IN MIDDLE-INCOME COOPERATIVES—A PREOCCUPANCY TRAINING PROGRAM

A most important innovation brought about with the development of a number of small-scale cooperatives under the State's limited profit housing programs was the initiation of a preoccupancy training program. Intended to develop standards to be used by the sponsors of these projects in the future, the program was undertaken to assure that tenant leadership would be developed by the time a cooperative is ready for occupancy, thereby assuring competent management to protect the tenants' and the State's investment.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ARE EXPANDED AND IMPROVED

The services the State provided to its communities through the division of housing and community renewal were expanded and improved throughout the year.

In a step to strengthen the administration of the code, a State building construction board of review was appointed to act as a board of appeals on construction matters arising under the code. Composed of an architect, a consulting engineer, and a home builder, the members brought to this responsibility the professional background considered essential for the efficient functioning of the board.

Legislation to establish the administration of the State building construction code permanently in the division of housing and community renewal was enacted by the legislature and signed into law by the Governor in March. Under the new legislation, the code will be administered by a seven-member State building code council consisting of the commissioner of housing and community renewal, who will serve as chairman, and six members appointed by the Governor; and the board of review will be composed of three members of the code council with one member being either a registered architect or professional engineer.

The administration of the urban renewal program was also strengthened by the appointment of an advisory committee, composed of public officials dealing directly with urban renewal in their local communities. Since the purpose of this committee is to assure that the division's services are directly responsive to varying community needs, its responsibility this past year has been to review a number of changes in legislation to clarify and simplify sections of the general municipal law and the local finance law, as well as the major change in urban renewal assistance from loans to grants, discussed earlier.

Another service, the model housing code, was improved this past year to increase its usefulness to the small communities throughout the State. The code was expanded by the inclusion, for the first time, of ordinances covering mobile homes and mobile home courts. In addition, it was revised to conform with the format of the State building construction code, thereby facilitating its use by the municipalities under the latter code. The administrative guide, provided as a companion to the code, was revised to provide greater assistance in administration and enforcement.

Growth as well as innovation has characterized the State's programs during the past year. The most dramatic expansion has taken place in the middle-income housing program as a direct result of the increased financing made available through the New York State Housing Finance Agency. Fifteen new projects in New York City and one in Bedford Hills had been approved by the division and submitted for local action on tax abatement by December. The largest, a well-conceived neighborhood plan for a 4,700-apartment cooperative with commer-

cial, recreational and municipal facilities to serve an entire neighborhood in New York City, was a hope that did not materialize; the sponsors withdrew in the face of official opposition. All of the others, however, had been approved or were assured of approval by the end of March.

As a result of this stepped-up activity, 1961 will be a record year for the statewide middle-income construction program. A total of 11,415 apartments in these 15 new projects and in the 6 others previously approved are scheduled to go into construction during the year.

Growth also marked the low-rent housing program and resulted primarily from the approval of increased subsidies by the electorate in November. This increase in subsidies was made necessary by rising interest rates, and, until the voters voiced their approval, the full use of authorized loan funds had been jeopardized. Among the projects initiated, five received full approval and were placed under loan and subsidy contracts by the end of March.

GROWTH OF PROGRAMS DURING YEAR

Similar growth was displayed in the other programs under the division's supervision. The urban renewal assistance program was expanded to the maximum with the commitment or reservation of the entire $25 million loan fund. A related service, community surveys to determine the need for urban renewal and housing assistance, set a record with the completion of 20 surveys by the end of the year, approximately 50 percent more than last year, the previous high year. The State building construction code continued its growth, with 344 municipalities accepting the applicability of the code by the year's end, despite the unsettled question of the code's permanence and as demonstration of the ever widening recognition of this outstanding State service to communities.

The division's programs, adapted to the specialized needs of individual communities, have continued during the year to contribute to the improvement of urban life as a patr of the administration's overall drive for economic growth throughout the State.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to enclose in the RECORD at this point my summary of the actions of the 1st session of the 87th Congress to the people whom I represent. The summary follows:

WASHINGTON.—The first 9 months of 1961 have been ones of crisis, confusion, contradiction.

Berlin: A crisis focal point and a challenge to America.

Foreign policy—defense: Major improvements, some bungling, a great deal of waste.

Domestic problems: Recession hysteria—followed by a return to commonsense approaches.

BERLIN

As summer heat intensified, so did the Berlin crisis. By mid-July administration forces realized the seriousness of an unsound situation and ordered a speeding up of defense preparations, a new emphasis on our limited warfare capacity to meet changing situations firmly and without hesitancy—uncertainty which marked opening days of the Kennedy administration's foreign policy efforts.

Administration spokesmen talked in generalities. There were many contradictions, conflicting statements and estimates. To get first-hand, accurate and as nearly objective reports as possible, I was asked to visit Berlin, our other Western European bases. The Berlin assignment is explained by Chairman GEORGE MAHON in these words: "The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, which I head and of which Mr. WEAVER is a member, has tremendous interest in farflung operations of the Department of Defense and all our Armed Forces. We have to know what is being done with the money which we handle in various appropriations bills and we want to do what we can toward providing the best possible defense programs for the United States."

In Berlin: Diamond-hard determination, calm assurance. Those are the words to describe American forces from privates to commanders who are in daily contact with the potential enemy across the barrier built by the East German Communists. Well armed, well equipped, well trained, and with high morale, our forces are secure in the knowledge that what they do is right and that they have complete backing of the American people. I was able to pass along to them further assurances that the Congress wants to do all it can to provide them with the tools to carry on their work. Tough, professional veterans are armed with the M–14 rifle, the M–60 machinegun, best weapons of their kind in use today. And our troops know how to use these new weapons, I watched them in range practice, men of the 8th Infantry. Fired the rifle myself. I can assure you they are experts, capable of taking care of themselves.

The wall: Built by the East German Communists in August was more than an effort to block the flow of escapees from the East to freedom. The Communists have failed to snuff out the lamp of freedom which burns so brightly deep behind the Iron Curtain in West Berlin. So, they attempted to draw a curtain, to block off the light. Three hours in East Berlin more than demonstrated why they had to take this action. Walking from freedom into tyranny is like walking from a lighted room into a closet. In West Berlin people are friendly, assured and walk and work in surroundings similar to any American city. In the East it is drab, dreary, and the people walk in apathy. They lack the free stride, expectant look of freemen going about their business eagerly. The main stem, Stalinalle, looks prosperous. Big, new apartments, stores, brightly lit, but it's like the false fronts on a western movie screen. Behind is the rubble of World War II, destruction, and still the scent of death. Communists cannot afford this contrast.

American mistake: We should not have let the East Germans build the wall across Berlin. We lost a major round in the continuing fight for freedom when we permitted it. West Berlin is more than a symbol of freedom, it was a magnet, drawing freedom-hungry men and women to look and compare. Experts believe that without risk we could have stopped the wall. It may now be too late.

Overall look: I visited other border posts, backup echelons At one point on the Czech border I visited an armored cavalry division Men are on 24-hour alert, even those off duty can be on their way to border stations in 15 minutes. Vehicles are at top-performance capacity. The new, powerful M–60 tank will become the backbone of our Army's armored strength. It equals the best the Soviets have. The division commander at the Czech border told me he was faced by three Red divisions. "But," he said, "if they move against us we will destroy them." For the first time in history we have an adequate inventory of munitions, other supplies, on hand, near a potential battle scene. I visited with many Nebraskans holding responsible jobs. Found them all to be determined, confident, and calm. Our forces in Europe from the top commander to the private soldier, are professionally competent and unworried about the Soviet and East German intransigence in the Berlin matter. I was proud of our military forces and their dedication to their mission.

DEFENSE BUILDUP

Strategic effort: This year's four separate Defense budgets called for a sharp buildup of our ICBM arsenal including speedup of Polaris submarines. After early, hasty decision to drop B–47's, administration views changed and this important factor in strategic defense will be retained. Atlas construction program is will underway. New Titans have been fired successfully. Minuteman also will be speeded up.

Modernization: After years of effort by those of us on the Defense Subcommittee who saw present emergency needs coming, a decision was made this year to modernize, increase our ground fighting forces. This program would be going well—if these were normal times. It's my feeling we must move faster, even if it means building more assembly lines or speeding up those already in production—this is a must.

FOREIGN AID

Marked lack of enthusiasm: This would describe the attitude of most in Europe over continued economic assistance; however, most show a keen desire for continued military assistance. These observations confirm my own conviction that the phases of mutual assistance must be divorced and presented separately to Congress. With booming economy in Western Europe, it is apparent they could and should help in making assistance available to those countries where living standard is at the bare subsistence level; instead, President Kennedy again has presented a combined measure—with a new wrinkle—back-door finance. He wanted long term, multibillion-dollar aid without congressional controls. I voted against foreign aid this year because we cannot expect the American people to "buy" this program blindly with nearly 5 billion of their tax dollars. Most Americans would approve aid to those of our allies determined to face up to the Communist threat because their armed forces are working shoulder to shoulder with our own. They do not support blanket assistance to countries which, at best, are not friendly and sometimes actually support the Kremlin.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

Recession: With the advent of the Kennedy administration came a real degree of hysteria over the recession. A number of bills including area redevelopment, urban renewal, vast public housing programs, were jammed through Congress early this year—all were costly—all went through with the assistance of the administration-packed Rules Committee. As recession threats faded, so did the President's influence on the Congress. The very packing of the Rules Committee backfired. He had been promised by Chairman HOWARD SMITH that, if left alone, the committee would support any bill he labeled as "must." After the packing was accomplished, the committee—with a "liberal" Democratic majority—killed his aid to education bill. Other measures such as compulsory medical insurance, tax reforms, stalled in committee.

Expenditures: At that, the big spenders in Congress managed to add $908 million to the financial responsibility Nebraskans must bear. This comes to $644 for each of our State's 1,411,033 citizens. In all the budget

reached $95 billion, an increase of $6.5 billion over last year. This is not the full story, though, the President asked for $28 billion in back-door financing and, despite efforts by those of us who favor fiscal sanity, he got $19 billion this way. It is estimated by experts that the United States has been going into debt at the rate of $1 million an hour, $24 million a day, $168 million a week, or $8.9 billion for the first year of the Kennedy administration.

Ways to save: One of my last actions during the 1st session of the 87th Congress was to introduce a bill, H.R. 9121, designed to force fiscal sanity and avoid insolvency. The bill would have reduced the total number of nonessential Federal employees by 10 percent by not permitting agencies to fill vacancies through hiring from the outside. Instead of adopting this approach, the administration asked for additional personnel, including hundreds of so-called supergrade civil service employees with salaries ranging up to $19,500 a year; 800 such jobs were approved with 50 of them set aside for the President to use in staffing new agencies.

Social security: Along with all but 14 Members of the House I supported a measure which became law increasing benefits to widows and those receiving lowest benefit rates. Measure also permits men to retire at age 62 with reduced benefits. Other technical changes were made in the law. If anyone has a question in regard to his or her social security benefits, I'll be glad to help if possible. Just contact me, First District Representative PHIL WEAVER, 1230 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Agriculture: Congress took major steps to meet increasingly pressing farm problems, increase income of our farm families, lessen cost-price squeeze. Under the emergency feed grain program more than 71 percent of the corn, feed grain producers in Nebraska voluntarily signed up to reduce acreage by 20 percent or more. Same program will be in effect next year. Wheat: A 10- to 40-percent acreage reduction bill was passed with incentives for those retiring over 10 percent. These programs should cut acreages, surpluses; increase prices to farmers and cut costs to taxpayers by $500 million. Secretary Freeman has been ordered to bring in new, long-term program by January 15, 1962.

Resource development: Real progress was made in sound, orderly development of our water, power resources and highways. Nebraska projects including Salt Wahoo, Red Willow, were approved for construction. Survey funds were approved for Little Blue, Nemaha-Little Nemaha Basin where recent floods have done tremendous damage. At my request, House Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee included $40,000 for basinwide, comprehensive survey of Loup-Platte Valleys. This is essential to conservation of water for irrigation, power, municipal and industrial purposes and the future progress of eastern Nebraska. Survey work begins this fall.

I have asked Reclamation Bureau officials to speed work and to make sure adequate funds are available for complete survey job—future power needs—Nebraska's industrial growth must depend in large part upon future power available. To help meet those needs, power will be brought in from the Colorado River storage project and to insure this power being available at reasonable rates I joined with two of the three other Nebraska Congressmen to support construction of transmission lines for the project. Efforts were launched to link Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Salina, Kans., with an interstate highway. This may prove a long, hard fight and will need cooperation at the national, State, and local levels. Purpose of the interstate is not only to provide coast-to coast highways, but to link important cities within a unified commercial region, which the north-south interstate would do.

Lincoln Air Force Base: Atlas missile base construction is nearing completion and the big birds will be nested. The midyear revision in administration thinking will keep B–47's flying from Lincoln as another factor in our deterrent effort. Lincoln AFB continues to play an important role in our overall defense posture. Recognizing this, Congress this year approved, at long last, funds for a much-needed modernized medical facility.

House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, Indiana Republican, wrote me as Congress adjourned after a long and difficult session. In his letter to me CHARLIE HALLECK says: "I want to express my deep appreciation for your cooperation and commend you for the significant contribution you have made in the Congress."

I hope to see as many of you as possible this fall.

Sincerely,

PHIL WEAVER,
Representative in Congress,
First District, Nebraska.

The People of California's First District Express Their Views on Issues Before Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the results of my 1961 questionnaire to the people of my district on issues before the Congress.

A copy of my annual questionnaire is mailed to each family in California's First Congressional District which includes a registered voter. Again this year the response was heartening and most instructive to me.

Almost all of the questions involve issues that are either continuing concerns of this body or legislative proposals that are listed among our unfinished business for the second session beginning next January.

The questionnaire contained 12 questions; multiple-choice responses were offered to be checked and further remarks were invited. The responses to any one question do not add to 100 percent because more than one response often was checked.

The first question asked my constituents for what national needs "Would you be willing to sacrifice, even if it meant increasing your own taxes?" Fifty-one percent said they would so sacrifice to strengthen our Armed Forces; 35 percent to strengthen civil defense; 34 percent to retrain unemployed workers; 29 percent to increase outer space efforts; 28 percent to increase economic assistance to developing nations; and 27 percent to step up U.S. Information Agency broadcasts overseas. Six percent checked "None of them."

Concerning how to help finance improved health care for the aged, 49 percent favored the social security approach and 27 percent favored this approach but felt present coverage is inadequate. Twenty percent opposed the social security approach; 11 percent said "no Federal involvement" and 11 percent said existing public and private programs are meeting the problem.

There were three questions on education. The first: "Should Congress grant Federal funds to the States to help local school districts pay costs of public schools?" Thirty-two percent said yes and 20 percent checked "yes, reluctantly, because the need is so great." Twenty-nine percent said no, and 20 percent checked "no, because financing of education is entirely a local and State problem." Twenty percent approved Federal aid for construction only; 6 percent for operating costs only.

Forty-nine percent favored Federal grants to the States for college scholarships to able and needy high school graduates; 21 percent opposed this. Thirty-six percent favored tax credit to parents for dependents' college costs; 14 percent said higher-education financing should be no concern of the Federal Government.

Fifty-eight percent opposed expansion of National Defense Education Act to include classroom-construction loans to private schools; 17 percent favored this. Thirty percent said this would be wrong in principle; 24 percent would decide this on the basis of relative need and national interest, not as a church-state issue.

Only 3 percent would have continued existing farm programs; 37 percent said some new approach must be tried. Twenty-three percent said they did not know enough about the administration's proposed marketing order approach to express an opinion on it; 21 percent said it sounded like a good idea; 14 percent, like a poor idea. Thirteen percent said no farmer should have to comply to any farm programs; 8 percent said Government should not be concerned about crop surpluses, and 23 percent would eliminate all farm programs.

Sixty-three percent said Congress should finance this year's additional defense costs by closing tax loopholes; 19 percent would do it by increasing taxes and 5 percent by borrowing. Forty-four percent said we must do now whatever is necessary to defend West Berlin and pay for it later if need be; 21 percent said spending in any one fiscal year should not exceed revenues under any circumstances.

Thirty-one percent said they favored three of the current proposals to close income tax loopholes; 23 percent said they did not. Forty-five percent would limit deductible business entertainment expenses; 10 percent favored withholding of taxes on stock dividends; 9 percent favored withholding of taxes on interest.

Two percent said conservation and development of national forests and Federal public lands should be decreased; 42 percent would increase such work. Forty-four percent said future management of the natural resources of these lands should emphasize fish and wildlife uses; 41 percent, outdoor recreation; 42 percent, water; 33 percent, timber; 23

percent, grazing; 12 percent, mining, and 28 percent, all compatible uses.

On foreign aid, 49 percent said our allies should carry a heavier share of the burden of assisting developing nations; 39 percent would continue foreign aid only if the countries involved make internal reforms; 29 percent approved loans only, not grants. Eighteen percent feel we should put foreign aid on a long-range basis; 15 percent would reduce the program; 14 percent would continue it on a year-to-year basis and 9 percent would eliminate it altogether. Ten percent would not help neutral countries. Eighteen percent favored economic aid only; 5 percent, military aid only.

Concerning the relationship between military spending and spending for civil functions of Government, 41 percent would encourage economic growth to make more funds available for both at present tax rates. Fourteen percent would increase military spending and 12 percent would cut back on civil spending; 10 percent would both cut military and increase civil spending. Twenty-two percent suggested specific ways in which military costs might be reduced and 16 percent made money-saving suggestions for the Federal Government's civil functions. I am forwarding a number of these suggestions to officials of the executive departments and agencies involved and to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Press of Nation Acclaims Classics of Democracy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article written by A. Mervyn Davis in the St. Louis (Mo.) Sunday Post-Dispatch on the classics of democracy program concerning which the Committee on Foreign Affairs on page 6 of its report on the mutual security bill of 1961 said:

CLASSICS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY PROGRAM

The committee is pleased with the progress of what has been termed the "classics of American democracy" program. When this program was inaugurated, works such as "The Federalist," which had inspired our forefathers, were unavailable in translated editions. Under the classics of American democracy program they have been translated into upward of 50 languages and dialects and made available to the peoples of new and developing nations at the grassroots. Perhaps no program has been more successful in winning the hearts and the minds of the peoples of the new emerging nations. The committee strongly recommends the continuance and expansion of this program.

I am pleased and heartened by the acclaim with which the program has been received, not only by the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, but by the press of the Nation. Mr. Davies' article in the St. Louis Sunday Post-Dispatch, follows:

SPREADING THE IDEAS OF DEMOCRACY—FAVORABLE EFFECT OF AMERICAN CLASSICS ON FOREIGN READERS

(By A. Mervyn Davies)

The statement is commonly made that America's foreign aid program proves that we are a materialistic nation unaware of, or indifferent to, the intangibles of the mind and the heart. We resent the charge, we know it is untrue, but we cannot always bring to mind facts to refute it. The little publicized classics of democracy publishing program, conducted by the U.S. Information Agency, is one of the refutations that deserves to be far better known than it is. For it is one way we can give ideological assistance to the free world without bragging, without strings, without, in fact, drawing any unfavorable reactions whatever.

The fact that our Communist enemies have not confined their own foreign aid to military and economic kinds but have flooded the bookstands of the world with cheap paperbacks of their classics, so that the writings of Lenin, Stalin, Mao and Marx have been rivaling the Bible in distribution, helped greatly to get this program started.

The project began in 1954 when Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, inspired by information given him by one of his constituents, drew Congress attention to a startling fact: There were no copies available anywhere in the world at a grassroots level of the classics of our own form of government, the writings that helped create our democracy.

"The Federalist Papers," for instance, in which Madison, Hamilton, and Jay expounded the rationale of a federal republic and of the just completed U.S. Constitution, were found not to be in print in any language other than English, and furthermore, in all the years since their publication no edition had ever been published in any Asian language and there had been complete editions in only three of the languages of the West.

The upshot of O'HARA's proposal was that USIA was then directed to publish for nominal prices in the principal languages of the world a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

In the progress report he made to Congress on September 1, 1960, O'HARA said the success of the program had been tremendous. He termed it "the most significant development in our changing world in recent years." A House committee report of August 4, 1961, agreed with this estimate. "Perhaps no program," it said, "has been more successful in winning the hearts and minds of the new emerging nations." And it strongly recommended its continuance and expansion.

An idea of the scope of the program thus far, which is expanding year by year, may be gained from these figures. Some 35 titles have now been published and over a million copies have been sold. The "Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin" in the past year has been translated into 20 languages, with editions ranging from 1,000 to 12,000. Thoreau's "Walden" is in 11 languages, with editions of 1,000 to 15,000. Judge Learned Hand's "Spirit of Liberty," is in seven languages; "Selected Writings" of Thomas Paine in eight. These are just a few examples, taken from the latest report.

Some of the results have been exciting. For instance the U.S. consulate at Damascus reported excellent reception in Syria of the great English classic, "On Liberty," by John Stuart Mill, even while U.S. troops were occupying Lebanon. It was reviewed in six Damascus newspapers; and bought by Syrian university professors and students.

Still more noteworthy was the success in the following year of the Arabic edition of the unabridged "Federalist Papers." An excellent translation was made by Jamal Mohammed Ahmed, now Sudanese Ambassador to Ethiopia and an intellectual and political leader of his country. The publisher was Franklin Publications, a commercial venture which is operated by a consortium of American publishers with the express purpose of making American books more widely available abroad. The translator recommended that the work be universally used in Arab high schools and colleges.

Similar results have been obtained with other editions. Thus, the "Federalist Papers," previously unavoidable in German, is now in use in courses in six German universities.

The deficiencies in the program are readily admitted by its friends. They complain that it has gone too slowly and some of it is too expensive. They point out that Mill's "On Liberty," for instance, is available as yet only in its English and small (4,000) Arabic edition, that "The Federalist" is available only in a few languages and that the process of translating it into more goes very slowly.

Obviously, there are opportunities for widening the program. It could be extended to include literary classics as well as standard works on the workings of democracy. Jefferson, Adams, and Madison, in particular, it has been suggested, could provide invaluably suggestive guides to the solution of fundamental problems which new nations are facing as they try to organize themselves as democratic societies.

The USIA has been a controversial agency from birth. But in this area of its activities at least, it surely cannot be making a mistake. Many people have stubbed their toes trying to answer the question, What is America? The difficulties of the agency have largely revolved around the many different answers, that can and have been given. Dean Acheson supplied the voice with this high aim, "To cover the earth with truth"; but how many latter-day Pilates have sadly or scornfully asked, "What is truth?"

One kind of truth that is indisputable is the one represented by this "classics of democracy" program. For it is neither cold war nor that ambiguous, and often embarrassing, thing called "Life in the U.S.A." It is not even purely American as we share our democracy and our classics with other nations. What we are giving is, moreover, genuine aid in that we are sharing our intellectual tools, the tools that helped to give us our own freedom. As Representative O'HARA puts it, we are making available a "sort of Bible for the politics of our civilization," and that is the kind of propaganda that pays the biggest dividends.

It is a truism that the most important events and developments are not always those that hit the headlines. Often they have neither dateline nor byline and are not occurrencies that can be dealt with in yearbook or encyclopedia. They may even pass unnoticed for a century, when their importance at length becomes apparent. This may be the case with Mr. O'HARA's "classics of democracy," and all honor and thanks are therefore due to its initiator who at the age of 79 is still sponsoring it. There is no telling now how far reaching in its effect this program ultimately will prove.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, agreed to September 26, 1961, the President pro tempore, on September 28, 1961, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives:

S. 1292. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1918, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 84. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3575. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Dania Reservation in Florida;

H.R. 8320. An act to amend the Freeport Harbor project, Texas;

H.R. 8876. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers;

H.R. 9033. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9053. An act to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the periods for which loans under that title are made;

H.R. 9076. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9169. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution fixing the beginning of the 2d regular session of the 87th Congress.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate on September 28, 1961, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1292. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1918, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution fixing the beginning of the second regular session of the 87th Congress.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On September 26, 1961:

S. 29. An act for the relief of Ok Nyu Choi (Ann Wollmar);

S. 158. An act to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro;

S. 262. An act for the relief of Constantinos Georgiou Stavropoulos;

S. 263. An act for the relief of Guisseppe Glorioso;

S. 264. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong;

S. 547. An act for the relief of Young Jei Oh and Soon Nee Lee;

S. 553. An act for the relief of Olga G. Coutsoubinas and Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Maria Trela Terpak;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of Helen Haroian;

S. 1787. An act for the relief of Giovanna Vitiello;

S. 1990. An act to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities;

S. 2237. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; and for other purposes; and

S. 2325. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

On October 3, 1961:

S. 592. An act for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian;

S. 902. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

S. 1053. An act for the relief of David Lew Huie;

S. 1234. An act for the relief of Max Haleck;

S. 1537. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renee Deri;

S. 1585. An act for the relief of Margherita Ferrelli D'Amico;

S. 1750. An act to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act;

S. 1786. An act for the relief of Heripsime Hovnanian;

S. 1880. An act for the relief of Johann Czernopolsky;

S. 1906. An act for the relief of Fares Salem Salman Hamarneh;

S. 1927. An act to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1947. An act for the relief of Annemarie Herrmann;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of Kabalan Farris;

S. 2118. An act for the relief of Dr. John Lopinto Arzaga;

S. 2272. An act to disclaim interest in certain rights in certain lands in the State of Nevada; and

S. 2393. An act to extend for 2 additional years the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

On October 4, 1961:

S. 302. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948, as amended, relating to certain areas within the Superior National Forest, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 558. An act to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia;

S. 564. An act to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Virginia, to Maryland;

S. 739. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to interest earnings on special Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, with respect to employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and with respect to certain other categories of persons subject to such act, and for other purposes;

S. 1040. An act to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 1107. An act to provide a 2-year extension of the existing provision for a minimum wheat acreage allotment in the Tulelake area of California;

S. 1186. An act to facilitate the protection of consumers of articles of merchandise composed in whole or in part of gold or silver from fraudulent misrepresentation concerning the quality thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1440. An act to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), relating to the establishment of a register in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle operators' licenses;

S. 2102. An act to redesignate the Jefferson Division of the Eastern District of Texas as the Marshall Division;

S. 2295. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the organization, improvement, and maintenance of the National Zoological Park," approved April 30, 1890;

S. 2396. An act for the relief of the State of Louisiana;

S. 2397. An act authorizing the National Capital Transportation Agency to carry out part 1 of its transit development program and to further the objectives of the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537);

S. 2476. An act to amend section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 in order to clarify the authority granted under such section to the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain lands owned by the United States for lands owned by the State of Oregon;

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson;

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution fixing the beginning of the 2d regular session of the 87th Congress.

On October 5, 1961:

S. 1292. An act to amend the Act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the trade-in of obsolete vessels in connection with the construction of new vessels, either at the time of executing the construction contract or at the time of delivery of the new vessel; and

S. 1942. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The President also notified the Secretary of the Senate that on October 3, 1961, he had approved and signed the act (S. 2393) to extend for 2 additional years the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes, and transmitted his reasons therefor, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

It is with extreme reluctance that I am signing S. 2393, which extends for 2

years: (1) the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and (2) the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, which provides Federal assistance to "federally impacted" schools—districts furnishing free public education to children whose parents reside or work on Federal property, or whose presence due to other Federal activity causes a sudden and substantial increase in enrollment.

(1) The extension of the NDEA without the amendments submitted by this administration merely continues the current program, without urgently needed improvements, for 2 more years—years which are crucial to the training of more teachers and the strengthening of this Nation's teaching of science, mathematics, foreign language and other essential subjects. Particularly undesirable is the continuation of the discriminatory and ineffective non-Communist disclaimer affidavit. I hope the Congress can renew its consideration of these NDEA amendments next year, regardless of the new expiration date.

(2) Far more undesirable is the continuation for 2 more years of the current aid to impacted areas program, which gives more money to more schools for more years than either logic or economy can justify. This administration recommended a reduction in the cost of this program, an increase in its eligibility requirements and local participation, its extension for only 1 year instead of 2, and its eventual absorption in a general aid-to-education program. The rejection of all of these requests highlights the air of utter inconsistency which surrounds this program.

Communities which beseeched the Federal Government to maintain nearby installations, however uneconomical, now demand that the Federal Government rescue them from the fiscal burdens these installations allegedly create. School districts originally entitled to temporary Federal assistance, during a transition period in which the costs of these federally connected children could be absorbed, now demand that the aid be continued indefinitely, without any reduction for absorption, and without regard to the local taxes paid by those parents who entered the community to work on, but not reside on, Federal property. Individuals who profess opposition to Federal aid to education on grounds of States rights, racial or religious controversy, budgetary economy, or academic freedom do not hesitate to demand this Federal aid to build schoolhouses and pay teachers' salaries in their own areas.

I am not unmindful of the problems this program is designed to meet: overcrowded and hazardous classrooms in communities whose financial resources are strained to educate these federally connected children. But I believe that overcrowded and hazardous classrooms are undesirable anywhere, whether filled by the children of Federal employees or by the children of other Federal taxpayers, and whether the local resources are strained by the location of a Federal facility or by any other cause. A quality education is a necessity for all American children, not merely those who by good fortune live in a district covered by this program.

It ill becomes those who insist that we cannot afford the expenditure of Federal funds to aid the public education of all children, to insist with equal fervor upon the passage of this unsound and uneconomical measure which aids the education of only some.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare advises me that a refusal to extend this program at this time, thus deferring action until the next session of the Congress, would jeopardize the entire educational effort of a substantial number of school districts dependent in large measure on these funds, and unable to find substitute sources of revenue in time to meet current outlays. Many districts are legitimately in need of this aid in order to educate a substantial majority of their students whose parents both reside and work on tax-exempt Federal property. A veto would not distinguish between those properly entitled to this assistance and those who should be making more of an effort locally. I am therefore signing this bill. But the need to improve the standards of education in this country will still be before the Congress next year; and that need must be met on a basis which, for every dollar spent, goes much further to attack our most critical deficiencies than the measure I am required to approve today.

SENATE BILL DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on October 3, 1961, he had disapproved a bill of the Senate of the following title, together with his reason for such action:

AMENDMENT OF PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO LONGEVITY STEP INCREASES FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval from S. 1459, a bill to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees.

While the supporters of this legislation are well-intentioned and its objectives sound—improvement of the within-grade provisions of the postal pay structure, and better correlation of these provisions with the related provisions affecting employees paid under the Classification Act—this bill does not achieve these objectives, despite its $60 million annual cost. Moreover, the Congress failed to provide—through enactment of the postal rate increases recommended by this administration and its predecessor—the revenues necessary to cover the current postal deficit, much less a deficit of even greater magnitude. Without new revenues this bill would increase the postal deficit to over $800 million.

The classified and postal pay structures, including the longevity and within-grade provisions are in need of extensive revision, and will receive the sympathetic consideration of this administration, with recommendations to be forthcoming at the next session of the Congress. The reforms needed are fundamental and sweeping and will require the most careful consideration by both the executive branch and the Congress. However, budgetary needs are too urgent to permit approval of this measure unattended by revenue increases, at this time.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1961.*

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT, OF 1948, RELATING TO PROVISION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (PART 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1112)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 22, 1961, Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted individual views of himself and Mr. HART to accompany the bill (S. 2618) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for certain World War II losses, which were printed.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 25, 1961, the names of Senators CASE of South Dakota, SMITH of Maine, BOGGS, MCCARTHY, MUNDT, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, MILLER, CAPEHART, LONG of Hawaii, WILLIAMS of Delaware, BUTLER, CURTIS, KUCHEL, and NEUBERGER were added additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. MCGEE on September 22, 1961.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 27, 1961:

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of the Delaware River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency.

On September 29, 1961:

H.J. Res. 542. Joint resolution relating to the admission of certain adopted children.

On September 30, 1961:

H.R. 9033. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9076. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9096. An act to amend the antitrust laws to authorize leagues of professional football, baseball, basketball, and hockey teams to enter into certain television contracts, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9169. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

On October 3, 1961:

H.R. 84. An act to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1507. An act for the relief of Capt. Jacob Haberle;

H.R. 2010. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2279. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3132. An act for the relief of Lucille Collins;

H.R. 3401. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cairo;

H.R. 4917. An act for the relief of Albany County, N.Y.;

H.R. 5343. An act to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 5754. An act to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958;

H.R. 6775. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize ocean common carriers and conferences thereof serving the foreign commerce of the United States to enter into effective and fair dual-rate contracts with shippers and consignees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6834. An act to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 7259. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lafayette Division, holding court at Lafayette, La.; and

H.R. 8871. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1960.

On October 4, 1961:

H.R. 468. An act to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act;

H.R. 470. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

H.R. 1777. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the transportation of fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2181. An act for the relief of Kim Dom Yong;

H.R. 2640. An act for the relief of Yoko Takayashiki;

H.R. 2730. An act to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 2732. An act to amend section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretaries concerned to prescribe a reasonable monetary allowance for the transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings;

H.R. 3019. An act to provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for use of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3572. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3575. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Dania Reservation in Florida;

H.R. 3587. An act to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War, and to extend the time within which certain children eligible for benefits under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 may complete their education;

H.R. 4317. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4357. An act to increase monthly disability and death compensation payable pursuant to the War Hazards Compensation Act;

H.R. 4682. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa;

H.R. 4750. An act to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act;

H.R. 4797. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 5490. An act to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6122. An act for the relief of Maria Luisa Reis nee Loys;

H.R. 6668. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7377. An act to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to provide certain additional research and development positions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7391. An act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7657. An act to amend chapter 47 (Uniform Code of Military Justice) of title 10, United States Code, to provide a specific statutory authority for prosecution of bad check offenses;

H.R. 7726. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence;

H.R. 7854. An act to modify the project for the Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., to provide for the abandonment of the 21st Avenue West Channel, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7888. An act to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 to extend the time within which land in certain reservoir projects in Texas may be reconveyed to the former owners thereof;

H.R. 7890. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to dispose of certain land, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8099. An act to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the general supply fund;

H.R. 8383. An act to further amend section 201(1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8444. An act to amend the act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 8558. An act to amend section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the organization of the Bureau of Public Roads, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8765. An act to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8958. An act to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Midwest City, Okla.;

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution to provide for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 so as to permit the agreement for cooperation between the United States and France to be made immediately effective.

On October 5, 1961:

H.R. 4998. An act to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6845. An act to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 8320. An act to amend the Freeport Harbor project, Texas;

H.R. 8876. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the use of identifying numbers; and

H.R. 9053. An act to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to the periods for which loans under that title are made.

HOUSE BILL DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved a bill of the House of the following title:

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LOSSES SUSTAINED IN CONVERTING FROM STREET RAILWAY TO BUS OPERATIONS

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 8652 relating to the income tax treatment of certain losses sustained in converting from street railway to bus operations.

Although the bill is drafted in general language, it is designed for the relief of one taxpayer, the Twin City Rapid Transit Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. Under present law, taxpayers are allowed a 3-year carryback and a 5-year carryforward of the net operating losses of a given year. The bill would permit Twin City Rapid Transit Co. an additional 5-year carryforward period commencing in 1960 in which to deduct certain losses sustained in converting from street railway to bus operations.

The losses were incurred in 1953 and 1954, when the company was managed by officers who were subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to defraud the company. The position of the company is, in essence, that the management converted rapidly from a street railway to a bus system in order to complete its fraudulent activities quickly, intentionally disregarding the income tax consequences.

I can see no reason for making an exception to the policy of uniform treatment under the net operating loss carryover provisions of the taxing statutes under these circumstances. First, the extent to which tax considerations governed or would have governed the conversion from street railway to bus operations is necessarily uncertain. Secondly, assuming that the fraudulent conduct of the management of the company

made it impossible to deduct all the losses sustained, it would be unfair to shift the consequences of that dereliction to the public through special tax relief. The stockholders of the company were certainly in a better position than the general public to guard against the misconduct of their officials. Thirdly, approval of this legislation is inconsistent with orderly tax administration. It discriminates in the treatment of taxpayers similarly situated and grants relief retroactively.

Although disapproval of this legislation may reduce the ability of the company to postpone or avoid a request for increases in its rates of fare, that fact should not be used to modify the tax system to shift the burden of losses from the taxpayer and the local community to the country as a whole.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1961.*

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
OCT 19 1961
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1961 No. 174

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress will be published not later than Tuesday, October 17, 1961. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Accomplishments, 1st Session, 87th Congress: Report of House Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress has been a hard-working one and a successful one. With the adjournment of this Congress, the Members can feel satisfied with "a job well done." When a President delivers his message on the state of the Union at the outset of a Congress, which usually includes his major and important recommendations, it is understood that such recommendations are for a period of 2 years.

In the 1st session of this Congress, President Kennedy has had remarkable success with his recommendations. His leadership both in the domestic field and in the fields of national defense and foreign affairs have been outstanding.

President Kennedy's record of success during the first session of this Congress is far greater than any President has had for many years. For 34 of his major and important recommendations have been enacted into law by the Democratic controlled Congress, and particularly some domestic legislation against strong opposition of powerful groups both in and out of Congress. In addition, many other bills of importance to various sections of our country have also been enacted into law.

In other words, President Kennedy has seen enacted into law an unusually high percentage of his recommendations.

The important part played in the making of this record is due to the outstanding ability, experience and leadership of our beloved presiding officer, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, one of the great Americans of all time, and the man with the "heart of gold" in his love of his fellow man.

For example, comparing President Kennedy's first session of his first term with the first session in 1953 of the first term of former President Eisenhower, which is a proper comparison, President Kennedy has had enacted into law almost three times as many of his major and important recommendations than had former President Eisenhower, who then had a Republican Congress, as President Kennedy now has a Democratic Congress. In the field of national defense and world affairs, President Kennedy's record is most notable. With reference to legislation relating to these two important fields, I compliment those Members of the House, without regard to party, who gave bipartisan support to President Kennedy. For fortunately in the field of national defense and in the field of a strong and firm foreign policy, the President has a strong Congress supporting him.

When the President assumed office last January, the world situation was most trying and tense. As has been stated:

When President Kennedy assumed office, he was faced with the most trying world situation that has confronted a President in the entire history of our country.

In other words, this was the situation that President Kennedy inherited. He has faced this tense and trying situation with outstanding ability and great courage.

The increase in appropriations for national defense—the action of strength—the only thing the Kremlin respects—in the sum of several billions of dollars, the mutual assistance authorization bill and appropriation bill, the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps, the establishment of the U.S. Arms and Disarmament Agency and other legislation, are illustrations of the courageous leadership of President Kennedy in the related fields of national defense, and of a strong and firm foreign policy, and of the support and cooperation of the Congress.

The world situation is naturally of uppermost concern to the people of our country, and broader, to the people of the free world. We all realize that the cold, sinister, and evil minds of those directing international communism are bent upon world domination and control. Our people recognize the importance of a powerful national defense in order to maintain a firm and strong foreign policy. For our military strength constitutes a powerful force in carrying out effective results in the field of diplomacy for world peace. For our people sense and well know that the only things the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves. Therefore, our people realize that expenditures for strong national defense is the premium that we must pay for preservation and for independence and liberty. Our people are willing to make all sacrifices to this end. The leadership of President Kennedy in this respect has been outstanding, and the first session of this Congress has effectively cooperated with the President.

As national defense and foreign policy, without downgrading important domestic matters, are uppermost in the minds of our people, in my report of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I start out with the major accomplishments of this Congress in connection with these two important related fields.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The national defense measures which are of primary importance were greatly influenced by President Kennedy's inaugural address, and his address of July 25 on the Berlin crisis, and in consequence of the latter address the President made recommendations for appropriations of an additional several billions of dollars for further national defense over the original budget submitted by him.

On August 17 President Kennedy signed the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal 1962. The total of this bill is $46,662,556,000. This budget provided the largest peacetime budget in our history. It included almost all of the more than $3.4 billion which the President had requested less than a month earlier, and almost a billion dollars in addition to his request. A strong Congress felt that this additional billion dollars were necessary and could be utilized in our national defense.

The additional budget estimates of President Kennedy for increased national defense which the Congress exceeded, were for the increase of all of our Armed Forces, to modernize the weapons system of the Army, increasing our bomber alert sharply, increasing the Polaris program as well as our whole missile programs; in fact, providing for a sharp increase and acceleration of our nuclear capacity. The Congress also strengthened the powers of the President.

In addition, in the supplementary appropriation for 1962, $40 million were provided for procurement, for shipbuilding, and conversion by the Navy.

There is also included in the Defense Department appropriation bill a budget estimate of the President for $207.6 million for a civil defense and a shelter program. This amount was included in the military appropriation bill because of the recent transfer of civil defense functions from the executive office to the Defense Department. The Congress appropriated a full amount of $207.6 million. This a major appropriation, because it is the opening wedge in a very important program of civil defense and shelter for our people that should have been started years ago. Defense Secretary McNamara, in substance, testified that this is merely the first phase of a stepped-up civil defense effort designed to save millions of lives, to be developed on the basis of experience. It was a recognition of the fact that we needed a civil defense program as part of our defense preparations, and as Secretary McNamara said:

We can only pray that, like our armament, we shall never have to use it.

In addition, the Congress appropriated to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization $86,550,000, for the purchase of emergency supplies and equipment.

There is a further sum of $13 million for the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for civil defense medical stockpile supply activities.

The action of President Kennedy in recommending additional appropriations in the light of the aggressive attitude of the Kremlin in relation to West Berlin, and the Congress making such appropriations, has the widespread support of our people and our press. For the action taken by President Kennedy and supported by Congress is the action of one of strength, the most effective language that the Communists understand.

In addition, the President recommended and Congress appropriated $951,690,750 for military construction under the Department of Defense.

In addition to the appropriations for defense, the Congress enacted a most important measure giving the President discretionary authority to call up 250,000 members of the Ready Reserves for periods not exceeding 12 months, and to extend the tours of duty of personnel on active duty for periods of up to 12 months. To quote that great American, Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, this measure was "an assurance to the world that we stand firm, determined, united, and ready to make whatever sacrifice is required to preserve our rights, our obligations, and our freedom."

Among other legislation enacted into law relating to our national defense was:

First. A bill providing for the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and for the extension of certain naval vessel loans.

Second. A bill providing for more effective participation in reserve components of the Armed Forces, chiefly by amending the laws relating to the 6-month training program and participation in the Reserve components.

Third. A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces.

Fourth. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for aircraft in the sum of $958,570,000.

Fifth. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations both within and outside of the United States in the sum of $893 million and of this total $67,097,750 was authorized for construction of Reserve facilities.

Sixth. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. This law clarifies and removes any doubts that might arise with regard to the reemployment protection to be accorded certain persons who leave their jobs to enter the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense, as well as correcting other inequities. It also creates an additional 4-year period of service for reemployment rights purposes for persons entering or reentering on active duty after August 1, 1961.

Seventh. A bill to provide for the more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. The basic purpose of this law is to make omnibus amendments to the laws relating to the 6-month training program and participation in the Reserve components. The act contains five major revisions to existing laws relating to the Reserve components and the National Guard.

FOREIGN AID

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which authorizes the appropriations of funds is positive evidence of the interest which the United States has in assisting the peoples and governments of nations throughout the world who are less fortunate than we, and particularly those nations whose people are willing to help themselves and preserving their freedom.

This act is a milestone in the foreign relations of the United States comparable to the legislation authorizing the Marshall plan 13 years ago.

President Kennedy proposed to the American people and to the nations of the world that we undertake together a decade of development in which the industrialized nations would assist the peoples of the newly independent and less-developed nations of the world in their own efforts for peaceful economic and social progress. In order that the United States might undertake a position of leadership in this great program for progress, the President asked the Congress to enact the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The heart of the program for which the President asked was authority for a great program of development loans. In order that it might be clear to the world that the United States is indeed committed to leadership in the decade of development and to provide other nations with the assurances necessary for their own planning, the President asked that the Congress provide authority for the loan program for a period of 5 years and that the Congress also provide the authority necessary to make long-term commitments to the less-developed nations against which they might plan more surely for their own progress.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides that authority. For the first time United States development assistance has been put upon an assured basis of 5-year duration. For the first time the Congress has specifically granted the President the authority to give commitments to friendly countries that over a period of 5 years we would provide aid to them in specified amounts. The legislation declares that:

Whenever the President determined that it is important to the advancement of U.S. interests and necessary in order to further the purpose of this title, and in recognition of the need for reasonable advance assurances in the interest of orderly and effective execution of long-term plans and programs of development assistance, he is authorized to enter into agreements committing, under the terms and conditions of this title, funds authorized to be appropriated under this title, subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds.

The conference report on the bill contained this further statement of legislative intent:

It is understood that the conferees regard the language in the bill as authority for the Executive to make commitments which will be honored by the Congress un-

less there is evidence of obvious bad management or the other country has failed to meet its responsibilities.

These terms met with the approval of the administration. On August 29 President Kennedy commented:

The compromise which the Senate-House conferees have worked out is wholly satisfactory. It gives the U.S. Government authority to make commitments for long-term development programs with reasonable assurances that these commitments will be met. In providing 5 years of substantial authorization, the conferees have recognized the magnitude of the need in the developing countries. In insuring specific authority to enter into commitments with these countries the conferees have recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will be forthcoming over a period of years. The agreement reached by the conferees today is an important decision both for the United States and the free world.

While the legislation represented a compromise under which the Congress provided the President with the long-term commitment authority which he had declared essential to U.S. leadership in the world and under which the Congress retained its power over appropriations, nevertheless this is the first time the Congress gave such authority to a President, and this compromise is decidedly in the direction of the recommendations of the President. It is clear that the funds to meet the commitments made by the President must come from appropriations as authorized in the legislation. It is equally clear that the Congress has accepted a moral obligation to appropriate in the future the funds which will be necessary to meet commitments made by the President under the authority granted by the Congress unless there should occur some most unusual and unforeseen reasons by our Government to withhold future appropriations in connection with any commitments that may be made.

For this lending program the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorized appropriations of $1,200 million for the first year and $1,500 million for each of the following 4 years. These funds are to remain available until expended and authorizations unused by appropriations will remain available for future appropriations.

These sums are greater than have ever been previously authorized for development lending yet they are to be considered not as a ceiling but as a floor. The President is invited to return to the Congress in succeeding years to ask additional authorizations and appropriations of funds as he may find required by the interests of the United States. The authorizations of $1,500 million in each of the 4 coming years represent, however, the assurance of the Congress that the President may make commitments for assistance in such future years up to these amounts in the knowledge that the U.S. Congress will honor the commitments by the appropriation of necessary funds.

In order to provide the American aid program with the most effective administration possible the Congress has granted the President authority to establish a unified administration for the whole economic aid program. Programs formerly administered by the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, and otherwise may now be placed under a unified Agency for International Development. The Congress has provided the President with authority to appoint an official with the rank of an Under Secretary of State as Administrator of this new Agency for International Development—AID—reporting directly to the Secretary of State and to the President and having as his assistants two Deputy Directors of the rank of Deputy Under Secretary of State and nine assistant administrators with the rank of Assistant Secretaries of State. This action by the Congress should provide the AID administration with the ability to attract men of the highest caliber to join in the administration of this vital function of our foreign relations.

The new legislation has consolidated former categories of assistance into a new category of supporting assistance. Among other purposes this will assist those nations who in cooperation with our own military assistance program are engaging in military efforts greater than they can support without our help. The new legislation will continue and strengthen the point 4 program originated by former President Truman. It is continued as part of the program of development grants which will be directed toward the strengthening of human resources in developing countries through programs of education, health, and training in many fields essential to the progress of these nations. Development grant funds will help carry forward programs of community development, land reform, agricultural credit, sanitation and health facilities, urban and rural housing, and similar programs fundamental to social progress. New legislation continues the leadership of the United States in the United Nations Technical Assistance and Special Fund. It provides funds for our part in the work of the United Nations to bring order and peace out of chaotic conditions in the Congo. It provides funds to continue the U.S. assistance to the refugees in the Middle East and to help in their resettlement. Contributions are authorized to other United Nations activities such as the Emergency Fund in the Middle East, the Children's Fund, the malaria eradication program of the World Health Organization, the international atomic energy program, and others.

The new legislation authorizes for the first time a program of development research to analyze the problems of development with a thoroughness never before possible and to apply the principles of research, well established in industry, to the more efficient conduct of our economic and social development programs.

The new aid legislation also provides encouragement and incentives to private enterprise never before authorized. It is a basic policy of the administration, which Congress has accepted, to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort undertaken by the Government to advance economic growth in the newly developing countries. The new legislation expands existing guarantees and provides for the first time an all-risk guarantee, on any experimental basis, to insure against losses of investment for any reason, up to 75 percent of the investment. The new act also provides newly authorized assistance to private investors in locating investment opportunities. The act is especially mindful of the interest and potential contribution of small business and gives the President specific authority to assist American small business to participate in the program.

The second portion of the new legislation, the International Peace and Security Act, directs our military assistance not only toward protection of the free world from the older forms of Communist bloc aggression, but toward the new and more dangerous forms of Communist aggression: infiltration, and guerrilla warfare, and internal agitation. The legislation authorizes $1,700 million for military assistance and provides for the first time an additional special authority to the President to draw upon defense stocks up to the value of $300 million for military assistance purposes should the vital interests of the United States require it. This is a matter of great importance.

The Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962, appropriated, for the foreign aid program, the largest sum made available in 8 years. The total new obligational authority is $3,878 million; together with the carryover of unobligated balances, and $30 million for the newly established Peace Corps, the funds made available total $4,014 million. These funds, though below the President's request, will make possible the vigorous initiation of the decade of development.

If additional funds are necessary before the end of the present fiscal year, the President can submit a supplemental budget and Congress will respond favorably.

In addition, appropriations for foreign assistance programs will be referred to under "Agriculture."

The country and the free world are heartened by the outstanding leadership of President Kennedy—the strength and firmness of his policies and actions.

The President has evidenced such leadership in many ways: his recognition of the world situation by sharply increasing appropriations for our national defense, his firm stand on the Berlin crisis, and only a few weeks ago by his historic address to the General Assembly of the United Nations. As a result of his address, our country has regained leadership throughout the world.

The President's address was a sound appeal to world reason, based on sound logic, expressed with courage in a divided and somewhat frustrated world. He spoke as a statesman looking into the future.

The President's address is the "beacon light" for all who fearlessly seek a future world of peace.

His address was one of deep idealism that should particularly be heeded by and receive in the United Nations the support of all non-Communist nations,

especially small nations and those which have recently emerged from colonialism.

The President's address was also a practical one, as it was a sharp warning to international communism bent on world domination to "stop, look, and listen."

LATIN AMERICAN AID

On May 27 the President signed a bill appropriating $500 million for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and $100 million for the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program in fiscal 1961—Public Law 87–41—definite steps to furnish concrete support to his alliance for progress.

This is a program of major importance to President Kennedy in carrying out his far-reaching policy of strengthening our friendship with American nations in Central and South America through loans and grants for economic progress of their people and for political stability and strength. The Congress quickly responded to the request of the President.

Earlier steps had been taken, precedent to the appropriations granted in Public Law 87–41. Congress had authorized the programs in August 1960—Public Law 86–735—and the United States had subscribed to the Act of Bogotá, agreeing to join 18 other American Republics in promoting economic and social development in the Western Hemisphere. On January 18, 1961, former President Eisenhower requested without success $500 million to implement the inter-American social and economic cooperation program. President Kennedy repeated that request, and also asked for $100 million for the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program, in his March 14 message to Congress on Latin America.

The appropriation act of May 27, 1961, contained the following distribution of funds:

First, $394 million to the Inter-American Development Bank to establish a revolving fund for loans for housing, land reform, water and sanitation projects. These loans are payable in the currency of the borrowing nations;

Second, $100 million to the International Cooperation Administration, chiefly for grants for public health and education;

Third, $6 million to the Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States for assistance in improving economic institutions and conducting long-term national development planning; and

Fourth, $100 million for loans to Chile for reconstruction and rehabilitation of the earthquake-damaged areas of southern Chile.

A new Caribbean Organization—successor to the Caribbean Commission—was accepted by the United States in an act passed during the present session. The agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization was signed June 21, 1960, by France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The four countries had been members of the Commission which had served as advisers on economic, social, and cultural matters for the area since the Commission was created in 1946.

The establishment of the new organization gives its members greater stature and demonstrates to the world a process for extending local autonomy.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1961

The Democratic Party by its record has always recognized that a strong and virile family life in our country means a strong America. President Kennedy and the Democratic Party can be proud of the legislation passed during the first session that has strengthened the economic outlook of millions of American families. On the domestic front there is no more finer task a political party could be dedicated to than this.

Early in the present session the Congress passed three acts intended to furnish prompt relief to workers out of employment in the recession.

The first major bill proposed by the new Democratic administration to deal with the recession was enacted as the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961. An act extending similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act supplemented the first measure. A third law authorized temporary grants to the States to finance inclusion of the dependent children of unemployed workers under the Federal-State public-assistance program.

The President's statement on signing the temporary extended unemployment compensation bill contained, in brief form, a summary of the purposes and the effects of its provisions, quoted in part as follows:

> This program will immediately provide economic help for some 700,000 jobless workers and their families whose rights to receive regular unemployment insurance benefits under State law are exhausted. Within the next year it will provide benefit payments to an additional 2½ million workers who are expected to exhaust their benefits.
>
> This Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act will add almost $1 billion to the Nation's purchasing power in the next 15 months. These dollars will be hard-working dollars. They will be spent almost immediately—for food, for shelter, for the bare necessities. These dollars will flow into our stores, into our factories, onto our farms.
>
> This act is important, because it will provide much-needed help to over 3 million American workers and their families. It is important also because it will add hard-working dollars to the Nation's purchasing power. But important as it is, it is but a temporary measure to alleviate an immediate need. We must move forward with other and more permanent programs to invigorate our economy so that our free enterprise system can reach the level of production and employment which is its obligation and which its capacity and tradition promise.

The second measure authorized the Railroad Retirement Board to extend duration of benefits by 50 percent to workers who had exhausted normal benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. It was estimated that 60,000 or more workers would be eligible.

In both measures provision was made for repayment of Federal funds advanced to cover payment of benefits, by increasing temporarily the Federal unemployment taxes levied on employers.

The third act made families of unemployed workers with dependent children temporarily eligible for Federal public assistance payments. It was estimated that about 750,000 children and 250,000 adults would receive benefits during the 14-month duration of the program, at a probable cost of $200 million. Additional costs of $15 million were expected from other provisions of the bill which increased Federal payments for medical aid to public assistance recipients and for aid for children placed in foster homes.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

The passage this session of the fair labor standards amendments of 1961 represents one of our most significant actions in the field of domestic legislation. I have long been an advocate of legislation whose purpose is to assure that living wages are paid to all our citizens. During debate on this legislation on the floor this session, I recalled my experiences with our late distinguished Congresswoman Mary T. Norton, of New Jersey, in waging the fight in 1938 for the passage of the first minimum wage law, the Fair Labor Standards Act. The 1961 amendments represent the third time the minimum wage has been raised since the original act was passed. Under the provisions of the act, the minimum wage of persons previously covered was raised from $1 an hour to $1.15 an hour during the first 2 years that the amendment went into effect and to $1.25 an hour thereafter. Persons not previously covered who now came under the act qualified for a slightly different wage scale—$1 an hour during the first 3 years after the amendment went into effect, $1.15 during the fourth year, and $1.25 an hour thereafter. The newly covered persons also qualified for overtime pay on a scale slightly different from that of those already covered.

Several new procedents were established by the 1961 legislation: In the first place, coverage under the law was expanded for the first time since 1938. An estimated 3,624,000 additional workers, most of them in the retail trades, came under the provisions of the law. The inclusion of retail and service workers for the first time was a second precedent. In general, all employees of retail or service enterprises that maintain one or more stores, have an overall gross annual sales volume of $1 million, and buy annually at least $250,000 worth of goods which have been moved in interstate commerce come under the act. Unfortunately, some categories of businesses were specifically exempted and efforts will be made in the future to include them. The introduction of the dollar-volume-of-business test as a criterion was another feature wherein the new legislation differed from the previous law; and finally, the concept of "establishment coverage," whereby all employees of a covered firm came under the law, regardless of whether or not they are personally engaged in activities classified as interstate commerce.

The new minimum wage legislation went into effect on September 3 of this

year. Soon additional millions of workers will see the effects in increased pay envelopes and buying power. As President Kennedy pointed out in a statement issued the day the new law went into effect:

All fair employers know that a minimum wages does not harm the economy, but on the contrary helps eliminate unfair competition. In the months and years to come, I can see important gains for the whole economy resulting from this improvement to the living and working standards of our people.

AGRICULTURE

The legislation classified under the heading of "Agriculture" is, of course, of primary interest to our citizens whose occupation is farming or an industry related to it. Agriculture is the Nation's largest industry and the Congress in every session is deeply concerned with any legislation which affects such an important sector of our economy. But the interest of farmers in these laws is scarcely greater than that of the consumers of their products and of the other great industries—transportation, steel, public utilities, and automobile, nor can urban areas divorce themselves from an interest in agricultural legislation, so-called, as being directed only to rural areas.

So complex and far reaching are the subjects dealt with in this field that no session of Congress ever adjourns with the comfortable feeling that most problems have been solved by their just-concluded work. I know that we have not solved all the problems of agriculture as we adjourn this year, and that we must continue work when we meet again for the 2d session of the 87th Congress next January.

But I do have great pride in what we have been able to accomplish, and by "we" I mean an executive branch and a Congress working together with the same purpose. We can point to at least one concrete evidence in support of our pride. For many years the farm economy has been fighting a cost-price squeeze which now has been rewarded. The index of prices received for farm products rose by almost 2 percent during the month ending August 15 and by 3 percent during the following month. This striking change can be directly attributed to laws passed by the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Of the many laws dealing with agriculture, particular attention is called to two measures: first, the emergency feed grains program; and, second, the Omnibus Agricultural Act.

Immediately after Congress came into session it was necessary to take up the feed grains problem, becasue the time was not far off when crops must be planted. The enormous surplus of wheat and feed grain, it was feared, would be increased if the 1961 crops were not reduced in some way. Oversupply and low prices were depressing the agricultural industry and taxpayers were having to pay for holding nearly $4 billion of grains.

Without going into the details of the Feed Grain Act, signed into law on March 22, 1961, its provisions and purposes may be briefly stated. A 1-year emergency program provided specific incentives for farmers to reduce their production of feed grain, making the law of supply and demand work for the farmers. A voluntary cut in acreage and crops of feed grains was provided, with increased price-support payments to participants in the program for certain crops. Farmers responded enthusiastically and feed grains production for 1961 has been brought to a reasonable rate. It is estimated that about $750 million, in 1961, will be added to the 1960 income of producers of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley, and soybeans.

Having completed the emergency feedgrains program for 1961 early in the spring, attention was directed to the very difficult problem of devising general farm legislation which would be applicable to the 1962 crop. It is impossible to describe in brief space the different, even the clashing, viewpoints of the proponents and opponents expressed during the consideration of this measure. The act which was finally passed and signed by the President on August 8 was described by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, as "the most important piece of legislation, in the interest of farmers, to be enacted in a decade." Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman stated that he regarded the act as "the most constructive and promising farm legislation in many years," and President Kennedy called it "a major step toward a sound agricultural economy and a better life for the farmers of the country."

Even a brief summary of the Agricultural Act of 1961 would be too lengthy for inclusion in the present report. Title I, dealing with supply adjustment and price stabilization permits the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with farmers and farm commodity organizations in developing agricultural programs. Producers are permitted to retire up to 40 percent of wheat allotments, 10 percent mandatory and 30 percent voluntary, or 10 acres, whichever is greater. The act establishes payments under the wheat control program at 45 percent for the mandatory reduction and 60 percent for the voluntary reduction. The 1962 feedgrains program is defined in title I; the regional marketing order authority is extended to all agricultural commodities not specifically excluded; and the National Wool Act is extended from March 31, 1962, to March 31, 1966. Title II extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 from December 31, 1961, to December 31, 1964, with increased authorizations and other implementing provisions. Title III contained the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Title IV extended to December 31, 1971, the final date for entering into contracts under the Great Plains conservation program; extended the school milk programs through June 30, 1967; and extended the Veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs through December 31 1964.

The Congress enacted several additional agricultural laws in its 1961 session.

The agricultural appropriation law for fiscal 1962 contained items totalling nearly $6 billion—almost $2 billion more than the funds for 1961. The increase was largely due to the foreign assistance programs which, for the first time, were put on a pay-as-you-go basis by appropriation of funds for the current year. Previously the Commodity Credit Corporation had been merely reimbursed for the cost of farm surpluses disposed of abroad under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for related foreign programs.

The major items in the appropriations for fiscal 1962 were as follows:

Agricultural Department	$1,397,934,500
Foreign assistance programs	1,600,000,000
Reimbursement to CCC	2,969,525,000
Interior Department, grain for migratory waterfowl	35,000
Total	5,967,494,500

In addition, the law authorized the following:

	Million
Agricultural conservation program, calendar 1962	$250
Rural Electrification Administration loans	407.5
Farmers Home Administration loans	318

Public Law 87–15 of the present session provided for extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 from March 31, 1961, to June 30, 1962.

In the second session of the 86th Congress in 1960, Public Law 86–592 authorized the President to set the Cuban sugar quota for the balance of the calendar year 1960 and for the first 3 months of 1961 at any level not in excess of the Cuban quota under the basic quota system of the Sugar Act, and it directed the manner in which replacement supplies of sugar were to be obtained upon reduction of the Cuban quota. Under this act the Cuban quota has been reduced to zero.

The 1962 measure (Public Law 87–15) did not change the basic provisions of the law but two amendments to the emergency authority were included: (1) the President was no longer obliged to purchase any part of the sugar formerly supplied by Cuba from any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations; and (2) in the above-quota foreign purchases consideration should be given to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing our agricultural commodities.

Obviously this legislation is more than an agricultural law, because its implications for our relationships with Cuba and with the Dominican Republic in particular, and with other sugar-producing countries, are very important. Several proposals for making substantial changes in the basic Sugar Act will be considered in the 1962 session at which time preferred consideration will be given to permanent legislation relating to quota adjustments for foreign supplies and to expansion of domestic sugar production.

A number of other important measures relating to agriculture have become law, including the following:

Public Law 87–8, increasing the ceiling for loans from the Farmers Home Administration.

Public Law 87–10, to extend the time for application of the 1959 amendment to the Federal Nematocide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

Public Law 87–28, amending title I of Public Law 480 to provide $2 billion of additional authority during 1961.

Public Law 87–33, providing temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

Public Law 87–37, transferring cotton acreage allotments from flooded areas.

Public Law 87–62, relating to emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve acreage in drought areas.

Public Law 87–67, expanding the special milk program for children and extending it to June 30, 1962.

Public 87–104, extending the wheat referendum time to August 26, 1961.

Public Law 87–106, extending emergency livestock loans.

Public Law 87–127, dealing with surplus grain sales in disaster areas, under the Soil Bank Act.

Public Law 87–152, authorizing the use by States of surplus grain for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife.

Public Law 87–200, providing for the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments, from one farmer to another in the same county, for the 1962 and 1963 crop years.

Public Law 209, initiating a program for the eradication of hog cholera, at an estimated cost of $2.5 million.

Extension for 2 years of the Mexican farm worker—bracero—program.

HOUSING

Of major importance, the enactment this session of the Housing Act of 1961 and certain other related housing legislation will exert a long-range effect on many classes of individuals, particularly those in the middle and lower income ranges, who are ineligible for public housing and who up until now have been unable to afford to buy their own homes. This is another illustration of legislation passed by the Democratic Party to strengthen the family life of millions of American families. On June 30 President Kennedy signed the most comprehensive housing act ever passed by Congress. The following is a brief sketch of the major provisions of the act.

Under new housing programs, five categories of mortgage loans were established that could be insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Limited-interest loans are made to commercial developers, for construction or rehabilitation of sales and rental housing for moderate-income families. Persons buying new homes costing up to $15,000 now have lower down payments and longer terms—in some cases up to 40 years—in which to pay for their homes. Especially favorable financing arrangements are available to nonprofit organizations and public agencies for construction or rehabilitation of multiple-family rental dwellings—apartments—for moderate-income families. Funds are available on loan for improvement of existing dwellings within urban renewal areas. Loans are also available on cooperative apartments, where the units are individually owned.

The new legislation increased the 1959 authorization of a $50 million revolving loan fund to $125 million, to be used to make direct loans to nonprofit organizations for construction of housing for the elderly. It also authorized the Public Housing Administration to contract for an additional 100,000 public housing units.

An additional $2 billion in Federal capital grants for urban renewal projects was authorized with $25 million of this amount reserved for Federal grants to local agencies to apply towards the cost of mass-transportation demonstration projects, and $25 million for low-rate loans by the Small Business Administration to small businesses which are forced to vacate by urban-renewal projects or by other governmental actions.

One billion two hundred million dollars was added to the revolving fund for loans to colleges, universities, and hospitals for the construction of housing.

The community facilities loan fund for local water, gas, and sewage plant improvements was raised from $150 million to $650 million, with $50 million set aside for the construction of mass-transportation systems.

Under another title of the act a number of changes were made in the National Housing Act, including authorization to the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow for its special assistance program an additional $750 million; expansion of the existing home improvement loan guarantee program; easement of terms for Federal Housing Administration home mortgage insurance by extending the maturity date of mortgages on new homes and lowering required downpayment; and others.

To help States and localities to acquire land in and around urban centers for recreational, conservation, scenic, and historic purposes, the act authorized $50 million in Federal grants.

And, finally, the farm housing program was extended for 4 years and the existing $207 million authorization was increased by $200 million.

From the above summary, which describes only the more significant aspects of the legislation, one can readily grasp the comprehensiveness of the Housing Act of 1961. It is certainly true as President Kennedy said, that the legislation "provides an opportunity for a giant step toward better cities and improved housing."

Any summary of action by Congress this session relating to housing would be incomplete without mention of the action taken to extend the time limits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act pertaining to World War II and Korean war veterans. On July 7 President Kennedy signed into law a bill to amend existing legislation to extend the time in which veterans may apply for guaranteed and direct home loans, and providing $1.2 billion over the next 6 years for direct home loans. The bill also increases the maximum amount available to an individual through direct loan from $13,500 to $15,000. Under the new law, a veteran will be eligible for a GI loan for 10 years from the date of his discharge, plus an additional year of eligibility for each 3 months of active wartime service. The new cutoff dates for World War II veterans will be from July 25, 1962, to July 25, 1967; for the Korean war veterans the new dates will be from January 31, 1965, to January 31, 1975.

It may not be generally known that as of January 1, 1961, the Veterans' Administration has reported that a net profit of more than $59 million has been realized from loans to veterans under this program which have been made since the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Several important changes which liberalized provisions of the Social Security Act were incorporated in a measure which became law on June 30. The bill was signed by the President "with great satisfaction."

The principal effect of the new law is to increase social security benefits for some 4 million elderly persons, effective in September, 1961. The major provisions, briefly summarized, are as follows:

First. Minimum benefits for retired workers under the Social Security Act were increased from the present $33 to $40 per month. It is estimated that this will affect approximately 2,175,000 persons of retirement age.

Second. Men will be permitted to retire at the age of 62, the present retirement age for women, at a lower rate than they would receive if they waited until age 65. In the first year, about 560,000 persons are expected to receive benefits amounting to $440 million under this provision.

Third. Widows and widowers of an insured worker will get 82½ percent of his—or her—retirement benefits, instead of the present 75 percent. At an estimated cost of $105 million in the first year this will benefit more than 1½ million persons.

Fourth. The new law sets the level of outside earnings of retired persons for which a dollar is deducted for each $2 earned, at $1,201–$1,700. Below $1,200 there is no deduction; above $1,700 such earnings are subject to dollar-for-dollar deductions. For example, a retired person earning $1,700 a year will be penalized $250 instead of $350 as at present.

Fifth. Under an easing of qualifying requirements about 160,000 persons will be permitted to enter the program. A worker can now be insured if he was in a job covered by social security for one-quarter of a year out of every four quarters since 1950, instead of one quarter out of three as at present.

Sixth. Funds for the Federal-State public assistance programs were increased by $15.8 million over a 9-month period, starting October 1, 1961, and certain changes were made in the formulas for Federal participation. Similar increases were made in the formulas for aid to the blind and disabled and those receiving medical care.

Seventh. Increases in payroll taxes were provided, to go into effect on January 1, 1962. The costs of the new program for the first year are estimated at

$825 million, and the new taxes are expected to keep the program self-supporting. Employer-employee taxes were slightly increased in a sliding scale, thus maintaining an actuarial balance.

Provisions were also included in this legislation for an increase in the Federal matching maximum for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and for the expenditure of Federal funds for temporary assistance to certain U.S. nationals who have returned from foreign countries and are without immediately available resources, as well as certain provisions relating to extension of coverage.

A news story in early September reported that one of the beneficiaries under the program of increased monthly payments to retired workers was a former slave, Charlie Smith, 118 years old, of Polk City, Fla., the oldest person on the social security rolls. He is one of 58 persons 100 or more years old who started receiving the increased benefits, available to some 3,700,000 other elderly citizens.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

This legislation added a new section to title IV of the Social Security Act to make available, during the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1962, Federal grants to States wishing to extend their aid-to-dependent-children programs to include needy children—and relatives caring for them—of unemployed parents, on the same basis as Federal grants are available to needy children—and relatives caring for them—who have been deprived of parental support by the death, absence or incapacity of a parent. The bill included provisions designed to facilitate the employment of unemployed parents, or the retraining of such parents, if appropriate, and provisions to assure that aid is not provided when the parent has refused employment that it would be reasonable for him to accept. All existing provisions of the aid to dependent children program apply to the temporary expanded program, including, of course, the Federal-State matching formula. The legislation was recommended by the President as a part of his broad program to combat the then existing recession and to relieve resulting hardships.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In this very important field, the Congress has taken action to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years. A rider to the appropriation bill for the State and Justice Departments, the judiciary and related agencies—Public Law 87-264—provided the authority for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission until November 30, 1963.

The record indicates that a majority of the Members of both Houses feel that the activities of the Commission, during the 4 years since its establishment in 1957, have been worthwhile, and should not be terminated at this time, in fact, should be made permanent. The Commission is engaged in an extensive study concerning civil rights, and has already published comprehensive reports on voting and education.

An appropriation of $888,000 for the activities of the Commission for fiscal 1962 was included in the bill.

In the executive branch, based upon existing law, and the authority thereunder, the President, the Vice President, the Attorney General, and other executive and independent agencies have made marked progress, particularly in the field of job opportunity and advancement, of Government contracts, in interstate commerce transportation, and in other directions, such as in the protection of voters' rights, where the exercise of them are limited. But more is necessary to assure equal opportunity guaranteed to all by the Constitution.

In connection with civil rights, it is significant to note that the only civil rights legislation passed since the Civil War were in the 85th and the 86th Congresses, both Democratic controlled.

And yet, during the 83d Congress, Republican controlled, with former President Eisenhower in the White House, the Republicans did not even report any kind of a civil rights bill out of committee.

EDUCATION

Before reviewing the actions of Congress in the field of education, it may be useful to include a bit of background information. On February 20 of this year President Kennedy sent a message to the Congress in which he outlined a comprehensive program of Federal assistance in education. Stating that "our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education" and expressing the view that "a successful educational system requires the proper balance, in terms of both quality and quantity, of three elements: students, teachers, and facilities," President Kennedy proposed a multipart program of long-range assistance to these three elements. Included in his program were proposals for Federal assistance for teachers' salaries and classroom construction for public elementary and secondary schools—nonpublic schools were specifically excluded—assistance in the construction of college and university facilities; and assistance to college and university students. Subsequently, the President also made a request for a number of specific revisions in the National Defense Education Act, and in the impacted areas laws—Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress. Shortly thereafter, bills to implement the President's far-reaching programs were introduced in the Congress.

It soon became apparent, when consideration of this legislation began, that wide differences of opinion existed among the Members of Congress concerning the matter of Federal aid to education. These differences in view were so fundamental, and the complexities of the legislation so numerous that it was impossible to get the full program enacted this year. Nor was it possible to reach agreement in a second attempt to enact somewhat less comprehensive measures.

While these legislative efforts were going on, certain provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 expired and institutions of learning all over the country in areas that have become impacted because of Federal activities were vitally affected. In addition, the National Defense Education Act upon which hundreds of thousands of students in institutions of higher education and the institutions themselves have turned for financial assistance was slated to expire at the end of the present fiscal year.

Congress, therefore, voted a 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress and of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The new legislation contemplates a total expenditure for education for the next 2 years, under programs already in progress, of approximately $902,992,000. The Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal 1962 contains appropriations of an additional $70,000 for defense educational activities, $145,593,000 for payments to school districts—to extend Public Law 874—and $30 million for assistance for school construction—to extend Public Law 815. These amounts are in addition to the sum of $211,557,000 already appropriated by Public Law 87-290 for fiscal year 1962 for defense educational activities.

With passage of this legislation, Congress has thus made possible the continuation of programs of assistance for the construction and maintenance and operation of schools in impacted areas, including teachers' salaries. It has also assured continuation of funds for the many worthwhile programs included in the National Defense Education Act—viz, student loans; national defense fellowships; financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction; guidance, counseling, and testing of secondary school students; language development; research in audiovisual media for educational purposes; area vocational educational programs; and improvement of statistical services.

Also, title IV of the Housing Act of 1961 which provided for an annual increase in the loan authorization for college housing facilities of $30 million for the years 1961 through 1964. While most of these funds will be used for the construction of college dormitories, some will also be spent for dining halls, cafeterias, student centers, and so forth. Loans for construction of housing facilities for interns and student nurses will also be available.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

On February 6, 1961, the President sent a special message to the Congress which included his requests for major legislation on health and hospital care. One of these was for the expansion and improvement of community health facilities through increased Federal assistance to the States and local areas.

In response to a special message of President Kennedy, the Congress enacted the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. Assistance was provided in three general areas—community health services, nursing homes, and hospital and other medical research and construction.

The question of the health of our people is of paramount interest to President Kennedy and the Congress. The action taken covers a wide field including hospital and other medical research and construction, for increased Federal grants-in-aid to the States for construction of nursing homes, for increased annual authorization for community health services.

An excellent record has been made in the first session in these important fields meaning so much to all of our people. Furthermore, the progress made in medical research will benefit all mankind due to our wise policy of making medical progress available to people everywhere, for illness, sickness, and disease are worldwide.

A second measure extends for 4 years the present program of $5 million for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under the Vocational Education Act of 1946.

The appropriations for the major health programs of the Federal Government are contained in two acts—the Appropriation Act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1962, and the Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal 1962.

In the first act the appropriation for the Public Health Service totaled $1,240,052,000. Of this amount $738,335,000 was given to the National Institutes of Health—$155,335,000 more than the President had requested. Another large item—$203 million for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act—represented an increase of about $15 million over his request. Most of the remainder of the appropriation was allocated to the numerous programs of Federal grants-in-aid, administered by the Public Health Service.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal 1962 contained items totaling over $67 million, chiefly for grant-in-aid programs.

One extremely important bill (H.R. 4222 and S. 909) providing for medical care to the elder citizens was not acted on in the just concluded session, but will continue to receive attention next year. The Committee on Ways and Means has held 2 weeks hearing and will give further consideration in the next session.

President Kennedy has assigned the highest priority to it in his plans for the 1962 administration's legislative program.

In the meantime, Congress increased support of community health services and facilities serves to furnish more assistance to the aged, pending decision on the legislation dealing specifically with the problem.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

In a statement issued by President Kennedy upon the signing on June 29 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, the President paid tribute to the "diligent and conscientious work that was done by the Members of Congress" in working out the resolution of the many problems which were embodied in this legislation. The task which Congress faced was the provision of funds needed to permit the completion of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System by the target date of 1972. Authorized by the new legislation was an additional $11.5 billion needed to complete the program after hearings on the tax features by the Ways and Means Committee. Provision was made in the legislation for raising approximately $9.6 billion in additional revenues by increasing taxes on the various highway users, particularly the trucking industry, and on the related rubber industries who manufacture tires and tubes, and so forth. In addition, the present Federal tax of 4 cents a gallon on gasoline which had been scheduled to revert to 3 cents a gallon on June 30, 1961, was continued. At the same time all of the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers was diverted into the highway trust fund.

Under the interstate highway program, the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the funds and the States supply the remaining 10 percent. The billboard bonus program which allows the States an additional one-half of 1 percent reduction in its matching funds provided they agree to regulate billboard advertising within 660 feet of certain sections of the highway system was extended for an additional 2 years, through June 30, 1963.

The legislation also provides an amount of $400 million to pay for an increase in Federal outlays for primary, secondary and urban roads, costs of which are shared equally by the Federal Government and the States.

President Kennedy summarized the value of this legislation when he remarked:

> With the support provided by this act, the States and the Federal Government can continue with the construction of the new highway system, a system which will increase our defense readiness, decrease the appalling highway accident toll, lower transportation costs, and stimulate economic development.

Already we have evidence of the belief that the funds authorized by this legislation can also serve to provide a boost for the entire economy. In mid-August 1961, President Kennedy directed the Commerce Department to release immediately to the States more than $818 million in Federal highway funds. This is the allocation for the second quarter of the 1962 fiscal year. These funds will permit the States to speed up planning and construction of the Interstate Highway System and of other highways financed by this legislation as well, and at the same time will put additional money in circulation thereby aiding the entire economy of the areas affected.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Because the funds for the Small Business Administration's loan program were exhausted at the end of August, Congress appropriated an additional $20 million as a stopgap measure—Public Law 87-198—pending passage of bills providing funds and containing amendments to the Small Business Investment Act.

Public Law 87-305 contains authorization for $725 million to be used for loans to small business—an increase of $105 million over the current amount. This covers both the prime contract revolving fund and the business loan fund. The act authorizes the SBA, Department of Defense, and General Services Administration to develop a small business subcontracting program designed to give small concerns more business as subcontractors and supplies to prime contractors or subcontractors performing under Government procurement contacts. It also provides that all prime contracts in excess of $1 million and subcontracts in excess of $500,000 must include provisions, first requiring that prime contractors and subcontractors consult with SBA through the procuring agencies when requested to do so by the SBA, and second, enabling the SBA to obtain subcontracting information from the procuring agencies. Under the act, regulations issued by the Department of Defense and General Services Administration to implement the new subcontracting program must have the concurrence of the SBA, and if such concurrence cannot be obtained the matter must be submitted to the President for final decision. In summary, the purposes of the act are to increase the amounts available for regular business loans, to grant the SBA a greater role in Federal procurement policy, and to give small business investment companies greater access to capital.

A second important act incorporates several major changes in the Small Business Investment Act, which gives tax shelter to companies established to aid small business. The amendments in the new law may be summarized briefly:

First. Any one small business investment company may invest not more than $500,000 in any small business concern without SBA approval; and no investment may exceed 20 percent of the investment company's combined capital and surplus.

Second. The amount of subordinated 5-percent debentures that the SBA may be required to purchase from a licensed investment company, matching equally the company's equity capital, is raised from $150,000 to $400,000. An investment company must have $300,000 to start business, and half that amount may come from such debentures.

Third. The amount which the SBA may lend to all small business investment companies is increased from $250 million to $325 million.

Fourth. A maximum of $4 million is set as the amount that an investment company, after having invested all its funds, may borrow. This loan may go up to half its paid-in capital and surplus.

Fifth. The SBA may suspend a small business company for making false statements or for willful infraction of SBA rules. Formerly the only recourse was to the Federal courts.

Sixth. Banks may now invest up to 2 percent of their capital and surplus, instead of 1 percent as at present, in a small business investment company.

There are now 360 small business investment companies with a combined capital and surplus of more than $318 million, of which the SBA has supplied nearly $43 million by buying subordinated debentures. Most of these are rather small companies, formed by groups of investors or banks, but 32 of them have offered shares for public subscription. The biggest company is Elec-

tronics Capital with capital and surplus of $33,300,000.

THE JUDICIARY—LAW ENFORCEMENT

The prompt administration of justice by our courts, as well as effective law enforcement to protect law abiding citizens, and to detect and prosecute crimes of all kind, particularly organized crime, with adequate laws to enable enforcement, is a matter of primary importance. The President and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy are to be highly complimented for their leadership and affirmative activity in these fields.

The following measures were enacted into law:

A bill providing for 73 additional district and circuit judges.

This act, one of major importance, will assure decongestion of the Federal court calendar, for justice delayed is justice denied.

In response to recommendations by Attorney General Kennedy for legislation to combat organized crime and racketeering, and to meet criminal acts in other directions, legislation was enacted:

First. To prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises.

This act will prove a serious deterrent to such illegitimate enterprises as gambling, narcotics, liquor, and prostitution businesses.

Second. A bill with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information.

This act will assist the various States and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of wire communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of bets or wagers and gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce.

Third. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

This act will prevent easy transportation of wagering paraphernalia and will be most effective in combating organized crime and racketeering.

Fourth. Extending the Fugitive Felon Act.

This bill is an important part of major crime legislation. The Department of Justice clearly stated that this bill will strengthen the law enforcement, both State and Federal, against major criminal activities.

Fifth. A bill to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities.

This act is of major interest. It strengthens the criminal law against willful or malicious interference with or destruction of any communication facilities used or intended to be used for military or civil defense functions of the United States.

Sixth. A bill amending the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

It happened that I introduced the original Foreign Agents Act. This bill is another important step in enforcing the security of the United States.

Seventh. A bill to prohibit the counterfeiting of State obligations in certain cases.

This act will effectively deal with the problems being encountered by law enforcement officials in the control of fraudulent State tax stamps and similar false evidence of tax obligations owed to a State.

Eighth. A bill to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18 relating to espionage and censorship.

This is another act designed to further the security of the United States. It relates to protecting our country from certain acts of espionage committed abroad, as well as at home.

Ninth. A bill supplementing existing criminal laws providing a more effective deterrent to willful destruction and damage of property moving in interstate or foreign commerce.

In recent months a series of vicious acts where commercial planes were hijacked in air commerce, dramatically pointed the necessity of legislation with severe penalties. The Congress quickly enacted such legislation.

AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The plight of certain economically hard-pressed areas in our Nation has been well known and much discussed. Congress has been greatly concerned over the situation, and in 1958 and again in 1960 enacted legislation to provide Federal assistance to these areas. On both occasions, however, the legislation was vetoed by former President Eisenhower, in the belief that the assistance program was too extensive. This year a third attempt on the part of Congress to alleviate the economic hardships of these areas met with success under a sympathetic President. On May 1 President Kennedy signed the Area Redevelopment Act. At last the Federal Government is able to step into these areas of chronic high unemployment and work with State and local officials in programs to attract and settle new industries in the areas; to assist in the provision of necessary public facilities; and provide assistance to those undergoing job retraining. Through a program of loans and grants, a total of $394 million has been authorized for a 4-year program. Responsibility for overall administration has been vested by the Commerce Department in the Area Redevelopment Administration. Six other departments and agencies—Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing, and Home Finance Agency, Agriculture, Interior, and the Small Business Administration—will pool their resources to discharge their various responsibilities in connection with the program.

On June 9, Commerce Secretary Hodges released a list of 114 depressed industrial areas which would be eligible for aid under the program; on July 20 he released a list of 468 rural counties and 48 Indian reservations areas eligible for aid because of chronic unemployment or underemployment. The designation of specific areas was deemed necessary in order that the funds available would not be spread so thinly that the assistance would not accomplish the desired objective in any one area.

At the present time the Area Redevelopment Administration and the cooperating departments and agencies are working with citizens in a number of areas in the development of programs designed to improve the economic position of those areas. While insufficient time has elapsed since the signing of the Area Redevelopment Act for any widespread effects of the legislation to be reported as yet, however, the first grant under the program has been made. In July of this year a grant of $129,000 and a loan of $31,000 were made under the program to the town of Gassville, Ark., for the construction of a water system for the town, a necessity prior to the construction of a shirt factory, a cooperative project on which four Arkansas counties had been working since 1958. The grant and loan supplemented a local bond issue of $535,000. The case illustrates the kind of assistance which is available to communities whose economic situation is critical and who are genuinely interested in doing something about it.

VETERANS

Among legislation enacted relating to our veterans are:

First. A bill to extend the veterans guaranteed and direct home loan program and to provide additional funds for the veterans' direct loan program.

This act extends expiration dates for the home loan programs for World War II and Korean veterans.

This act is of great importance in connection with veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict obtaining a guaranteed or direct loan within the time limit prescribed for such veterans, together with an increase of maximum amount of a direct loan from $13,500 to $15,000.

Second. A bill relating to special insurance dividend for certain veterans of Korean conflict.

This act provides for the immediate payment of dividends on insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, which has been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section.

Third. A bill to increase the special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

This increases from $10 to $100 the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, permits payment, upon application, at age 50 instead of the present requirement of attaining the age of 65 years, and pays the holders of the medal whether or not they are on active duty.

Fourth. A bill to provide that combined service in more than one war shall be creditable for pension purposes.

This act combines the service in more than one war to meet the 90-day service requirement for payment of non-service-connected disability or death pension to veterans and their widows and their children.

Fifth. A bill requiring findings of fact and conclusions of law by the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

This act requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated.

Sixth. A bill to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for Indian war veterans.

Seventh. A bill to amend section 417 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that death pensions may be paid in lieu of dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases involving service-connected deaths occurring after December 31, 1956.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Among legislation enacted of interest to Federal employees is:

First. A bill relating to interest earning of Treasury issues held by civil service retirement and disability fund.

This act is important in that it will strengthen the financial integrity of the retirement and disability fund, and as a result of a new civil service formula the interest rate currently will be at least 1 percent in excess of the interest rate provided under the old formula.

Second. A bill to make permanent certain civil service retirement and disability fund annuity increases.

This act makes permanent and payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund temporary costs of living increases in annuities, and provides for certain survivor benefits which were authorized by Public Law 85–465 approved June 25, 1958, and under that law were dependent on or after July 1, 1960, upon yearly appropriations by the Congress for their continuation.

Third. A bill relating to salary protection for classified and postal service field employees in certain cases involving reduction in salary standing.

Fourth. A bill providing for increase in top grade positions under the Classification Act of 1949, and research and development positions of scientists and engineers.

This legislation has been under consideration for several years, and is a marked contribution toward efficiency in the agencies covered by this law.

Fifth. A bill providing for supergrade positions in the General Accounting Office.

TAXATION AND THE DEBT LIMIT

It is expected that during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, action will be taken with reference to aspects of the income tax structure. During the session just passed, considerable attention was devoted to an interim tax revision program, the crux of which was a proposal to provide businessmen a tax credit on funds invested in new equipment in order to stimulate new investment. Also included were certain revenue-raising features. The Committee on Ways and Means held 28 days of special hearings and a number of executive sessions on the President's tax recommendations of 1961. Prior to adjournment of the first session, the committee announced tentative decisions and issued a committee print for the consideration of the general public during the adjournment period. The committee has also announced that it will resume consideration of this tax bill as its first order of business in the next session.

Among the actions which the Congress took this past session in the tax field was the passage of the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961—Public Law 87–72—to continue for another year, until July 1, 1962, the 52 percent tax rate on corporations and certain mutual insurance companies; and to continue the excise rates set by the Revenue Act of 1951 on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars and accessories; the 10 percent tax on passenger transportation; and the 10 percent tax on local telephone service.

In another action—Public Law 87–69—the national debt ceiling was temporarily increased for 1 year through June 30, 1962, from its permanent level of $285 billion to $298 billion.

To help lessen the outflow of gold from the United States, a bill signed on May 4, 1961 amending the Internal Revenue Code to exempt all foreign banks of issue from the U.S. tax on interest earned on investments in U.S. Government obligations unless the obligations are held for, or used in connection with, the conduct of commercial banking functions or other commercial activities. While it is anticipated that this bill will have a negligible effect on revenues, it is important in other respects.

An amendment to the above bill extended until May 15, 1961, the period in which certain persons operating as small business corporations could elect not to be taxed as corporations. The objective of this amendment was to correct hardships incurred upon certain married couples in community property States by a Treasury Department ruling that both husbands and wives had to sign an election jointly in order to qualify.

Two other actions in the field of taxation might be mentioned. Public Law 87–17, approved April 7, 1961, expanded the scope of the study which was first authorized in 1959 by Public Law 86–272, concerning the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, to include all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States, territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Authority under this act is given to the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Finance who are making these studies.

Also passed is a measure which empowers the Internal Revenue Service to assign identifying numbers to all taxpayers. By the simple expedient of providing a means by which individuals are identified regardless of discrepancies in address or spelling of names, tax evasion is made infinitely more difficult. It is anticipated that the Federal revenue may be boosted by as much as $5 billion a year in increased tax collections which this legislation will make possible.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Early this year the President made recommendations for a comprehensive space program that will enable our country to be the leader in all aspects of a most important field, commonly referred to as "outer space."

The Congress in recent years established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA.

The Congress has strengthened the original act by amendments and cooperated by making adequate appropriations. The importance of the success of NASA, and keeping our country in the forefront cannot be overemphasized. The President and Congress recognizes this fact.

The President recommended the authorization this year of $1,784,300,000 for NASA for fiscal year 1962, which the Congress has passed.

In addition, a bill amending the existing law revising the organizational setup of the NASA and the Space Council, and providing for the Vice President to preside as Chairman of the Space Council.

The House committee has also conducted a number of surveys and inquiries all of importance in future action in this field.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1961

This act contains the following important provisions:

First. That Federal agencies shall give consideration in the survey or planning of any reservoir to inclusion of storage for streamflow regulation for water quality control purposes, except that such storage and releases shall not be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment or other waste controlling methods at the source.

Second. Directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and demonstrate sewage treatment means, improved methods and procedures to identify and measure pollution effects on water uses, and methods and procedures for evaluating effects on water quality and uses of augmented streamflow; and authorizes the annual appropriation of $5 million, with an aggregate of $25 million, for these purposes.

Third. Directs the Secretary to establish and maintain field laboratory and research facilities, including, but not limited to, one to be located in the northeastern area of the United States, one in the Middle Atlantic area, one in the southeastern area, one in the southwestern area, one in the Pacific Northwest, and one in the State of Alaska, for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, field demonstrations, and studies and training.

Fourth. Increases authorizations for appropriation of funds for grants to State and interstate water pollution control agencies to assist in establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution control measures from $3 to $5 million annually, and extends the authority for making grants for 7 years to June 30, 1968.

Fifth. Increases authorizations for appropriations for grants to municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works from $50 million annually and an aggregate of $500 million to $80 million for fiscal year 1962, $90 million for fiscal

year 1963, and $100 million for each of fiscal years 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967, resulting in an aggregate of $820 million or a total increase over prior law of $320 million, as well as other beneficial provisions. This act is of widespread interest throughout the country.

Among other important and significant bills enacted into law are:

First. The Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill.

This act authorized $131,440,000 for new construction projects in the atomic energy program, and $7 million for cooperative atomic power demonstration program.

In addition, this bill is an amendment to a prior year act authorization to $114 million linear electron accelerator atom smasher at Stanford University in California, which will be the largest electron accelerator in the world.

Second. AEC omnibus bill.

This act covered some 20 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Euratom Act of 1958, to bring them up to date with developments in the field of atomic energy. Among other things, the act authorizes the transfer of nuclear material for peaceful uses to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Euratom organization, as well as amending patent provisions and including miscellaneous technical and conforming amendments to the Atomic Energy Act.

Third. To extend to June 1, 1963, the powers of the President to submit reorganization plans.

The President submitted six plans, four of which became effective. The major parts of the other two plans were enacted by Congress through the passage of separate bills.

Fourth. A bill amending the Communications Act enabling the Federal Communications Commission to be more effective and efficient in the use of its experienced and technically qualified personnel, to handle its large workload of adjudication cases with greater speed and efficiency.

These changes in law will enable the Commission to devote more of its time to major planning involving issues of general communications importance.

Fifth. A bill of widespread interest recommended by the President to carry out the administration program for the development of public airports by making additional millions available over a 3-year period.

Sixth. The establishment in the Department of Commerce of a U.S. Travel Service.

The main purpose of this act is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit our country.

Seventh. A bill to amend the Shipping Act of 1916 through clarification and modernization.

This act will assure greater stability in the export and import waterborne commerce of the United States through clear permission for conferences to employ dual rate exclusive patronage system, under safeguards, in behalf of exporters and importers and increased efficiency in the administration and enforcement of regulatory laws.

Eighth. A bill affecting the regulation of U.S. foreign commerce to provide for licensing of independent ocean freight forwarders.

Ninth. A bill providing for the extension of the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

Tenth. A bill to provide for one additional Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor.

Eleventh. A bill to permit the entry of certain alien orphans.

This act constitutes major amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. It grants veterans of the Korean conflict the same naturalization rights enjoyed by veterans of other wars. It removes affliction with tuberculosis as grounds for exclusion. It enacts into permanent law the admission of alien orphans. It preserves family unity by permitting the spouse and children of the naturalized citizen to remain abroad after having retired to remain with the head of the family without losing citizenship. It provides for the reunion of immigrant families by granting relatives under quota admitted if registered before July 1, 1961.

Twelfth. A bill providing for a sharp increase of saline water research program.

During the past few years, expenditures for this important work have been running at the rate of less than $2 million a year. Under the expanded program authorized for the next 6 years, this amount can be increased by at least fivefold. The results of this research activity will be of great importance to our people, but more broadly, if we are successful first, in making salt water economically feasible by giving mankind everywhere such results and benefits we could greatly improve our international situation. For the shortage of water for human consumption and for agricultural uses, which problem is rapidly growing, is a matter of deep concern throughout the world.

Thirteenth. A bill authorizing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee, insure, coinsure and reinsure political and political and credit risks arising in connection with U.S. exports. Such legislation is important for placing American exports on an equal basis with foreign competitors.

Fourteenth. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training.

Fifteenth. A bill authorizing an appropriation of $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study and investigation of National Securities Exchanges and National Securities Associations.

Sixteenth. A bill to strengthen the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation.

Seventeenth. A bill to improve the organization of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The functions of this act are of increased importance as our country recognizes the essentiality of an expanded oceanography program.

Eighteenth. Another bill enacted into law provides for the expansion of the Coast Guard so that it may be organized to take part in a coordinated program of oceanography.

Nineteenth. A bill extending for 27 months the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission for capital expenditures of railroads who qualify.

Twentieth. A bill to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Finance Corporation to agree to an amendment to the Corporation charter so as to authorize it to invest in capital stock, enabling the Corporation to broaden its powers to more effectively accomplish its purposes.

Twenty-first. A bill permitting the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies.

Twenty-second. Various bills authorizing sizable additions to the National Park System, including a major accomplishment in this field of the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts, as well as the provision of several bills providing for the use of extensive land areas by the military service.

Twenty-third. The Congress gave its consent to several compacts between various States enabling the compacting States to settle perplexing questions existing between them of many years' standing.

With reference to the District of Columbia, the most important piece of legislation which Congress passed this year was legislation which set up the election machinery for the District in preparation for the presidential elections of 1964. On March 29, 1961, the 23d amendment was ratified by the required three-quarters of the States. This amendment gives to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for presidential and vice presidential candidates in national elections, a right they have not had since the District was created at the beginning of the 19th century.

To carry on the important activities of the various departments and offices of the District of Columbia government in the fiscal year 1962, Congress this year approved appropriations totaling $270,067,897. Federal payments to the District totaling $32,753,000 and loan authorizations totaling $29 million were also approved.

The action of Congress this session to transfer from the Federal Government ownership and administration of Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D.C., to Howard University, and to authorize appropriations for the construction of a new hospital to replace the totally inadequate and antiquated present establishment will meet with general approval.

Another action which affects hospital facilities in our Nation's Capital was the passage and subsequent approval of a bill—Public Law 87-79—which I introduced this session, whose purpose was to extend the Federal grant authority of the Hospital Center Act of August 7, 1946, for 1 year, from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1962. This legislation will give George Washington University Hospital and the Greater Washington-Southeast Community Hospital additional time in which to seek legislative authority for additional Federal aid; it will at the same

time preserve the present program of expanding private hospitals in the District of Columbia through Federal grants provided under the provisions of the Hospital Center Act.

Steps were taken to relieve the critical traffic situation in the area surrounding the District by providing initial funds for improvement of certain highways and granting to the National Capital Transportation Agency funds to go ahead with its program of acquiring mass transit rights of way, stations and parking lots along the principal highways leading into the District.

In a variety of other actions taken this session, Congress increased the authorized strength of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force, repealed the gift enterprise law of the District making it legal for merchants to offer trading stamps and other sales stimulators, raised to $150, from $50, the amount of a claim over which the municipal court would have jurisdiction—Public Law 87-203—amended the District of Columbia Code to clarify some ambiguities and correct certain inequities in existing District of Columbia law relating to the succession of real and personal property, and passed several other laws affecting specific aspects of the District government.

There are several more bills, some of major importance to the District that were not acted upon this session, which the Congress will consider in the coming session. As in the past, the leadership will cooperate with the House District of Columbia Committee in bringing up speedily bills reported out of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, a strong piece of evidence as to the diligence and accomplishments of the first session of this Democratic controlled Congress is the fact that President Kennedy signed a record number of bills, 401 public laws, and 284 private laws, a total of 685 laws; whereas former President Eisenhower in the first session of his first term, with a Republican Congress, signed 287 public laws, and 227 private laws, or a total of 514 laws.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski will always evoke grateful memories in the hearts of the American people for the gallant Polish gentleman who, like Lafayette, Von Steuben, and his own fellow countryman, Koscuisko, came from across the seas to battle for our independence. Although these four, the German, the young Frenchman and the two Poles, are the most distinguished of the European soldiers who fought for the American cause, they were by no means alone. Looking back over nearly two centuries, with the perspective which time gives, we realize that even to the conservative 18th century upper class there must have been something very appealing in the spectacle of a brave, high-spirited people, overwhelmingly outnumbered, but still daring to do battle with the mistress of the seas and the most powerful empire on earth. The more enlightened Englishmen themselves applauded the American spirit; large numbers declined to have anything to do with the affair, with the result that the Hanoverian King of Great Britain was obliged to hire German mercenaries for the purpose of subjugating his own subjects of English blood.

Pulaski was a true soldier of fortune. In his youth he had joined his father in rebellion against a Polish king dominated by foreign influence. The rebellion was crushed, the Pulaski estates confiscated, and the count himself proscribed as a traitor. Fleeing his native land he arrived in Paris where he applied to Benjamin Franklin for service in the American cause. Franklin promptly arranged for his transportation to America. Armed with a letter of introduction to Washington, Pulaski arrived in Boston in July 1776; met Washington the following month and was recommended by him to the attention of Congress. Up to this time there had been no regular cavalry in the American Army; four regiments were projected, and Washington suggested to President John Hancock that Pulaski be put in command of all the cavalry. As a Polish soldier of the upper class, Pulaski was, of course, born to the saddle.

Flinging himself forthwith into combat, Pulaski presently organized the cavalry unit which became known as Pulaski's Legion, by which he will always be remembered. He participated in the battles of Germantown and Trenton, was attached to the main army at Valley Forge during the winter of 1778–79, and was later detailed to join General Lincoln for the southern campaign. In 1779, leading his men in a dashing assault on the British works in front of Savannah, he fell mortally wounded on October 2, 1779, and died 2 days later. His burial place is unknown, but he was probably buried in the Savannah River. Today, on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, the passerby looks up to the majestic equestrian statue erected by a grateful people to the memory of a gallant soldier who gave his life for their freedom.

Our Acting Speaker

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune to be in attendance on conference committees meeting on the other side of the Capitol when tributes were being paid here in the House to our Acting Speaker, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and am taking advantage of the first opportunity to join with our distinguished majority whip and acting majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], in the great outpouring of admiration and affection and appreication given Mr. MCCORMACK in the closing hours of the session.

As the unanimously elected Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives, to serve during the temporary indisposition of our beloved Speaker RAYBURN, he has been suddenly and unexpectedly projected into one of the most important, most difficult, and most responsible positions that could fall to the lot of even as experienced and able a man as he is.

It is the glory of our form of government that in time of greatest need there are always available men qualified and seasoned to meet the occasion.

By happy coincidence the election of JOHN MCCORMACK as Speaker pro tempore falls on the 21st anniversary of his election as majority leader of the House. While Speaker RAYBURN has been breaking all records in length of incumbency as Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK has been as industriously and as effectively breaking all records in length of incumbency as majority leader. And in all the long time of illustrious men who have preceded him in that position he holds his own not only in length of service but in ability and capacity and achievement as well.

And in a much shorter list of exceptional men who have served as Speaker pro tempore he again leads in length of service and certainly in the intricacy and precedent-shattering difficulty of the problems presented in the closing days of the session of this particularly critical Congress.

He is not only a great leader, an astute parliamentarian and a master strategist but he also is gifted with those qualities of mind and temperament so requisite to the exacting duties of the speakership of the greatest deliberative assembly of our time and in world legislative history.

We wish for him and Mrs. McCormack a richly merited and long-deferred vacation and continued health, happiness, and contentment in an ever widening field of service.

The Freedom Awards of the Order of Lafayette, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Lafayette is composed of officers who served in France or French possessions during World War I or II, and its auxiliary members are also in favor of strengthening our traditional friendly

relations with France. It is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, and tax exempt corporation, with headquarters at 12 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

At its convention luncheon held at the Plaza Hotel in New York on May 19, 1961, its first Freedom Award for foreseeing and combatting communism was presented to Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army. Six hundred people filled the ballroom and heard General MacArthur make a brilliant and inspiring speech on the space age, which has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the Freedom Award by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The Order of Lafayette of which the Honorable Hamilton Fish is president general, adopted the following resolutions at its convention on May 19, which were compiled by a score or more of influential anti-Communists suggesting the names of a number of persons living and dead who have been leaders in the fight against the menace of communism, to freedom in America, and elsewhere:

THE ORDER OF LAFAYETTE—FREEDOM AWARDS

Freedom Award list: Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Cardinal Francis E. Spellman, Hon. Herbert Hoover, J. Edgar Hoover, Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Hon. Francis E. Walter, Hon. Martin Dies, George Meany, Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, Hon. John W. McCormack, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Hon. J. William Fulbright, Hon. John L. McClellan, Hon. James C. Eastland, Hon. Styles Bridges, Hon. Karl E. Mundt, Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, Hon. Walter H. Judd, Gen. Albert Wedemeyer, Rev. Daniel A. Poling, George E. Sokolsky, Martin McKneally.

Freedom Award (50)—Honorable mention during the last 30 years: Hon. Harold R. Medina, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Maj. Gen. Robert E. Wood, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Hon. William Jenner, Hon. Clare E. Hoffman, Hon. Katharine St. George, Hon. John R. Pillion, Hon. Bernard H. Kearney, Hon. Claire Luce, Hon. Joseph Starnes, Hon. Harold H. Velde, Hon. John S. Wood, Hon. Henry Kaufman, Hon. Robert Morris, John L. Lewis, J. D. Matthews, Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Rev. James Fifield, Rev. William James Hargis, Rev. Rayne Poucher, John T. Flynn, David Lawrence, Fulton Lewis, Jr., John O'Donnell, James F. O'Neill, Westbrook Pegler, Patrick Scanlon, Dan Smoot, Henry J. Taylor, Tom Anderson, William F. Buckley, Deven Adair Garrity, Frank Haneghen, Benjamin H. Freedman, George H. Schuyler, Walter L. Reynolds, Roy M. Brewer, Hon. Richard Arens, Hon. Spruille Braden, Merwin K. Hart, Frederick Koch, Joseph Pew, Brig. Gen. John Thomas Taylor, Maj. Gen. Robert E. Condon, Archibald B. Roosevelt, Mrs. Mary Markward, Ruth Montgomery, Mrs. William Sherman Walker, Alice Widener.

Freedom Award as a tribute to the memory of 25 deceased Americans: Mrs. Grace L. H. Brosseau, Homer Chailiaux, Gen. Clair L. Chennault, Hon. Bainbridge Colby, Hon. Herbert O'Conner, Hon. John Costello, Hon. John Foster Dulles, Hon. James S. Forrestal, William Green, Rev. James M. Gillis, William R. Hearst, Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Harry A. Jung, Alfred Kohlberg, Hon. Patrick McCarran, Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, Col. Robert R. McCormick, Hon. Lee S. Overman, Walter S. Steele, Ben Stolberg, Hon. Robert A. Taft, John B. Trevor, Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, Edwin S. Webster, Hon. Herman Welker.

These Freedom Awards are only to be presented at meetings or functions of the Order of Lafayette. It was decided not to include any former Communist in the lists many of whom have been very helpful in exposing the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

Mr. Fish, who was chairman of the first congressional committee—1930–31—to investigate communism told the Order of Lafayette convention that the most important organizations in fighting communism were the Catholic Church, FBI, the American Legion, the American Federation of Labor, and the congressional committee. These important groups, together with other veterans and civilian organizations, and numerous individuals throughout the Nation have been the real pioneers fighting in the front lines against communism in America for the past 30 years. At that time communism was a powerful force in the United States. The executive committe of the CIO was dominated by Communists. The American labor party in New York State composed of Communists and fellow travelers cast half a million votes. Fortunately, it is now extinct.

Today, due to the tireless and fearless efforts of numerous anti-Communist organizations, groups and individuals in exposing and combating communism, aided by public opinion, the Communists have been reduced in the United States to a comparatively small number of fanatics and fellow travelers. On the other hand, world communism has grown steadily into an appalling and dangerous menace to the free nations of the world including the United States.

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, as Secretary of State, on January 21, 1924, told a committee of the U.S. Senate:

> It will be seen that the question of whether Communist programs contemplate the use of force and violence has been passed upon by every class of tribunal which would pass upon it; namely, Federal and State courts, administrative tribunals and legislative committees of both Federal and State governments and in every case the result has been in support of the position that force and violence are inseparable from communism. * * * The essential fact is the existence of an organization in the United States created by and completely subservient to a foreign organization striving to overthrow the existing social and political order of this country. The subversive and pernicious activities of the American Communist Party and their subordinates and allied organs in the United States are activities resulting from and flowing out of the program elaborated for them by the Moscow group.

The Hughes factual declaration of reality and truth was subsequently endorsed by every investigating committee of Congress that the Communist Party was subversive and advocated and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States. It has taken 37 years for action by the U.S. Supreme Court to hold that Communists must register as agents of a foreign power.

Communists and fellow travelers are resisting and fighting this decision which should have been made years ago. It will be up to Hon. Robert F. Kennedy as Attorney General to enforce the decision of the Supreme Court as soon as the Frankfurter injunction or stay has expired.

For 30 years congressional committees have been investigating Communist and subversive activities in the United States. For 25 years, the House Un-American Activities Committee has been exposing the Communist conspiracy in our midst without fear or favor. This committee has incurred the bitter hatred of Communists and their fellow travelers because they have been successful in smashing communism wherever it raised its head in America, deporting alien Communists, driving Communists out of the Federal, State, and city governments, including our schools, and finally having the party outlawed and its members required to register as agents of a foreign power.

The Communist campaign against the Un-American Activities Committee is full of sound and fury, but it is as futile as New York snowflakes in July and rightly so as the American people overwhelmingly support the watchdog efforts of the House Un-American Activities Committee to expose and combat communism throughout the Nation.

Our very existence is at stake and time is running out. Almost all American citizens know today that world communism is a huge deadly conspiracy against freedom in the United States and throughout the world. Veritas magna est et praevalebit—The truth is mighty and will prevail.

Schedule of Post Office Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important duties of a Congressman is maintaining close contact with his constituents so that he may know their views and problems.

To supplement the other contacts that I have with voters of the Seventh District of Indiana, I customarily make a tour of each post office during the adjournment period. It requires a month to reach each of the more than 100 offices in the 11 counties of the district, but I have found it eminently worthwhile as it enables me to meet and talk with thousands of constituents.

Here is the schedule I will follow in my post office tour this year:

Thursday, November 9: 9 a.m., Oakland City; 10:15 a.m; Somerville; 11 a.m., Mackey; 12 a.m., Fort Branch; 1:30 p.m., Owensville; 2:45 p.m., Haubstadt; 3:45 p.m., Buckskin; 5 p.m., Princeton.

Friday, November 10: 8 a.m., Francisco; 9 a.m., Patoka; 10 a.m., Hazleton; 10:30 a.m., Decker; 11:30 a.m., Vincennes; 2 p.m., Monroe City; 3 p.m., Wheatland; 4 p.m., Bruceville.

Monday, November 13: 8:30 a.m., Emison; 9:30 a.m., Oaktown; 10:30 a.m., Freelandville; 11:30 a.m., Ragsdale; 1:30 p.m., Bicknell; 2:30 p.m., Edwardsport; 3:15 p.m., Westphalia; 4 p.m., Sandborn.

Tuesday, November 14: 9:30 a.m., Indian Springs; 10:30 a.m., Shoals; 11:30 a.m., Loo-

gootee; 1:30 p.m., Alfordsville; 2:30 p.m., Burns City; 3:30 p.m., Crane.

Thursday, November 16: 8:30 a.m., Harmony; 9 a.m., Knightsville; 10:30 a.m., Carbon; 11 a.m., Brazil; 1:30 p.m., Staunton; 2 p.m., Cory; 3:30 p.m., Poland.

Friday, November 17: 9:30 a.m., Bowling Green; 10:30 a.m., Centerpoint; 11:30 a.m., Clay City; 1:30 p.m., Coal City; 2:30 p.m., Patricksburg; 3:30 p.m., Spencer.

Monday, November 20: 9 a.m., Freedom; 10 a.m., Gosport; 11 a.m., Quincy; 1:30 p.m., Eminence; 2:30 p.m., Hall; 3:30 p.m., Monrovia.

Tuesday, November 21: 8:30 a.m., Harrodsburg; 9:30 a.m., Smithville; 10:15 a.m., Clear Creek; 11:15 a.m., Stanford; 12:15 p.m., Bloomington; 2:30 p.m., Unionville; 3:30 p.m., Eliettsville; 4:30 p.m., Stinesville.

Wednesday, November 22: 9 a.m., Solsberry; 10 a.m., Owensburg; 11 a.m., Koleen; 12 a.m., Bloomfield; 1:30 p.m., Doans; 2:15 p.m., Scotland; 3:15 p.m., Newberry; 4 p.m., Switz City.

Monday, November 27: 8:30 a.m., Worthington; 9:30 a.m., Jasonville; 10:30 a.m., Coalmont; 11:30 a.m., Midland; 12:30 p.m., Linton; 2 p.m., Marco; 3 p.m., Lyons.

Tuesday, November 28: 9 a.m., Farmersburg; 10 a.m., Shelburn; 11 a.m., Hymera; 12 a.m., Sullivan; 2 p.m., Fairbanks; 3 p.m., Graysville.

Thursday, November 30: 9:30 a.m., Merom; 10 a.m., New Lebanon; 11 a.m., Paxton; 12 a.m., Carlisle; 2 p.m., Pleasantville; 3 p.m., Dugger.

Friday, December 1: 9 a.m., Odon; 10 a.m., Elnora; 11 a.m., Plainville; 12 a.m., Washington; 2 p.m., Montgomery; 3 p.m., Cannelburg.

Monday, December 4: 8:30 a.m., Edinburg; 9:30 a.m., Needham; 10:30 a.m., Whiteland; 11:30 a.m., New Whiteland; 12:30 p.m., Franklin; 2 p.m., Bargersville; 3 p.m., Greenwood; 4 p.m., Smith Valley.

Wednesday, December 6: 8:30 a.m., Nineveh; 9:15 a.m., Trafalgar; 10 a.m., Morgantown; 11 a.m., Centerton; 12 a.m., Mooresville; 2 p.m., Brooklyn; 3 p.m., Paragon; 4 p.m., Martinsville.

Report to the Citizens of the First Congressional District of the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to review the activities of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. This is intended to express my personal viewpoints concerning the accomplishments and failures of the last session and to pinpoint some of the vital problems which should be given early attention by the Congress and the executive department in the next session.

Overshadowing all other problems facing Congress during the period from January to September were the crises brought on by developments in Cuba, Laos, and Berlin. To combat these developments, Congress acted in a bipartisan manner to pass legislation providing for vast increases in expenditures for our Armed Forces. Legislation was also passed to permit the President to extend enlistments for a 1-year period and to summon 250,000 reservists to active duty. Furthermore, an expanded space program was approved by the Congress. Great concern was expressed by some Members on the gap between the United States and Soviet Russia in the race for the conquest of space. The feats of Alan Shepard and Virgil Grissom not only heartened America but brought to the attention of the world the closing of the space gap. The President's recommendation to the Congress that the United States send a man to the moon and the approval of this project by the Congress have demonstrated to the world in general, and Soviet Russia in particular, our determination to excel in the exploration and conquest of space.

During the past session, the Congress also enacted a mutual security bill providing approximately $4 billion for aid to other nations in their fight against communism. This bill was a very controversial one since some Members questioned the value of spending vast sums for assistance to other countries. My vote in favor of this bill was based on the conclusion that this expenditure is necessary because, by helping others to combat poverty and disease, we are really defending America against the inroads of communism. Furthermore, statistics show that a considerable portion of the sums authorized for mutual security are spent in businesses in the United States and thus have favorable effect on our own economy.

In the passage of the mutual security bill, the Members approved the administration of foreign aid on a long-range—5-year—basis but continued the strong supervision and control of expenditures by Congress through its Appropriations Committee. It is my own observation that every Member should closely examine all expenditures for foreign aid to insure that our money is allocated to free nations with discretion and without any waste or extravagance. It is my strong belief that a great deal of the opposition to the mutual security program on the part of citizens and Members alike was generated by the many examples of waste and extravagance on the part of those administering the program. Congress has insisted that these abusives be eliminated, and it is my sincere hope that the corrective measures recommended by the Congress and supervision by the Appropriations Committee will bring about an economical and a just administration of this entire program.

The Congress reflected its viewpoint on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations by overwhelmingly adopting a resolution indicating its opposition to the admission of Communist China in the U.N. I voted for the resolution.

With emphasis on world peace, legislation was enacted providing the creation of a Disarmament Agency. To clarify any confusion existing as a result of the creation of this new Agency, I want to say it is not the intent to set in motion any immediate disarmament but rather to plan the arrangement of disarmament in the future upon the termination of the terrible threats to the safety of our own country. The President and the Congress were hopeful that the passage of the disarmament bill would have an important psychological effect on peace throughout the world.

The Peace Corps recommended by the President was also approved by the Congress. Some people believe the religious missionaries of various faiths have been carrying out the purposes of this organization for a long time, and some are skeptical of the efficacy of the Peace Corps. But, in a world fraught with danger and with the fight continuing to influence the minds of men in the struggle between democracy and communism, it was believed by the majority of the Members that the Peace Corps, composed of young dedicated people working for nominal salaries in the far corners of the world, might provide some answer in the quest for peace. I am certain that the Corps will be watched carefully, and that it will not receive renewed appropriations if it does not justify its existence.

It must not be forgotten that it became necessary for this Congress to approve $90 billion in appropriations—the largest peacetime budget—and to pass other drastic measures because of serious mistakes in our past foreign policy, particularly with respect to Berlin. In this report, there is no attempt to establish responsibility for these mistakes. On the other hand, we must eliminate the possibility that similar mistakes will be committed in the future by implementing a foreign policy which is clear-cut and thoroughly understood not only by the American people but by all peoples throughout the world.

Having personally visited the city of Berlin, I can attest to the problem created by the decision of the past—to divide Berlin. This difficulty is emphasized, of course, by the fact that Berlin is entirely surrounded by East Germany. The dramatic flow of East Germans through Berlin to West Germany was a continuing embarrassment to Soviet Russia. No place in the world demonstrates so clearly the vast difference between the accomplishments of a free people in a free society and the failures of a slave people in a communistic society as does the city of Berlin. The United States has a legal and moral obligation to Berlin, and this was presented in a forceful manner to the United Nations by President Kennedy in his recent speech in New York City. The President's forceful stand on Berlin has the complete support of the Members of Congress. This position was made known to Khrushchev by the President in a face-to-face meeting and has been restated time and time again, not only by the President and the Secretary of State, but by leaders of both political parties in the Congress of the United States.

Turning to our domestic problems, the Congress acted on many important pieces of legislation. In the early weeks of the session, Congress passed a bill providing for temporary extension of unemployment compensation to combat the recession. Moreover, favorable action was given to the passage of an area redevelopment bill to assist some areas in handling the prominent problem of unemployment in their communities. I supported both of these measures.

I voted for the liberalization of the Social Security Act providing for higher cash benefits to certain widows effective September 1. The amendment of the Social Security Act also permits male workers to retire at the age of 62—an option previously given to women at a former session. The social security payments are produced from a trust fund, and necessarily this must be kept on a sound actuarial basis. Consequently, many liberalized proposals were not adopted by the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, because the payment of these additional benefits would have required additional assessments on employer, employee, and self-employed. One of the omissions, however, which, in my opinion, requires correction during the next session in January, is that pertaining to widows who are receiving payments based on their own former employment. Under the present amendment, only widows receiving social security by reason of their husband's employment benefit by the increased payments. I have urged the Ways and Means Committee to pass remedial legislation in the next session to correct this inequitable situation.

The Congress enacted a minimum-wage law raising the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and then in 2 years to $1.25. It also provided for extended coverage to 3.5 million additional citizens. This bill is identical to the one suggested by former President Eisenhower in the 86th Congress. I heartily endorsed the legislation in both instances. In addition to providing the worker with a living wage, this bill was, in my judgment, most helpful to the industries and businesses of our area. We have, in many instances, lost contracts through competitive bids with other industries and businesses located in cheap labor areas which did not pay the wage earner the minimum wage which is now mandatory. The revision will make for more equitable bidding and should enhance the possibility of contracts coming into our section of the country.

The housing bill of 1961 was also enacted. This bill contained many features which I did not like, but I supported the measure because it provided aid for college housing and granted some assistance to the elderly. I personally introduced an amendment to the bill on the House floor. This amendment which was successfully passed by the Congress provided for the allocation of certain funds to study mass transportation. It is my hope that this study will provide some solution to the problem resulting from the daily transportation of large masses of people from urban to suburban areas. This latter problem is acute in certain sections of the First District, particularly in the area surrounding the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. Those citizens who travel from South Jersey to Philadelphia know the tremendous traffic jams that occur on the Crescent Boulevard, Route 130, Route 38, and Route 70. The entire problem of transporting workers from suburban homes to urban places of employment requires, in my opinion, serious, concentrated, and immediate study. The amendment which I presented to the House had this as its objective.

Domestically, it is my opinion this Congress also had some very disappointing failures. For example, it refused to enact an adequate civil rights bill which I vigorously supported; it neglected to devise new programs to bolster farm income and hold down surpluses, and it made no progress in the revision of some of our antiquated tax laws which hinder the development of business and industry in this country. No action was taken by the Congress in regard to aid to education, medical aid for the aged, and increased postal revenues because this legislation was never submitted to the Members. After legislation is approved by the committee considering it, it usually requires the approval of the Committee on Rules. These three subjects—education, medical aid, and postal increases—were not approved by either the committee considering them or the Rules Committee, and consequently, the full membership of the House never considered these proposals.

Favorable action was given to the passage of a bill providing for a new Office of International Trade and Travel which was inaugurated for the purpose of attracting tourists to the United States. The Congress also enacted a Highway Act which increased tire, tube, and truck taxes to keep the interstate highway building program on a pay-as-you-go basis Furthermore, during the session, the customs regulation relating to exemptions for those traveling abroad was reduced from $500 to $100.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I participated in the preparation of legislation which I believe will effectively curtail organized interstate gambling in the United States. For many years the Congress has considered similar legislation because it has long been recognized that controlled and organized gambling is interstate and requires interstate regulation and enforcement. It has also been recognized that gambling equipment, in most instances, is transported in interstate commerce, and that Federal legislation is absolutely necessary to prevent the shipment of gambling equipment. Thus, the bills approved by the Judiciary Committee which effectively curtail organized interstate gambling in the United States were not only vital in the fight against organized crime, but were the first such bills approved by the House in more than a decade. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I believe this legislation provides the Attorney General with the necessary authority to effectively continue the fight against organized vice in the United States.

I supported most of the bills approved by the Judiciary Committee but opposed its recommendation for the creation of 73 new Federal judgeships. I recognized the need for new judgeships, and my opposition was based on the conclusion that 73 additional judges exceeded our requirements and, therefore, caused some unnecessary expense to our Federal Government. Thus, the 87th Congress approved almost twice as many new Federal judgeships as had been recommended by the 86th Congress. Under the new bill, New Jersey will receive one additional U.S. district court judge.

During the session, I fought vigorously against the bill authorizing the deduction of the Philadelphia wage tax from the salaries of Federal employees. I am happy to report to the citizens of the First District that such legislation was not enacted during this past session.

One of the important problems confronting the people in the First District is the failure of the shipbuilding industry in the Delaware Valley to obtain new contracts for the construction of ships. Some of this problem is the result of the advantage enjoyed by southern shipyards who are not paying the same labor costs as the northern shipyards. I have brought the problems confronting the Delaware Valley shipbuilding industry to the personal attention of the President, Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy. In addition to this problem, many other industries, particularly the electronic and photographic field, have been faced with the importation of cheap electronic and photographic equipment from the countries of Europe and Asia. Several committees in the Congress are presently at work in an effort to find some workable solution to this serious problem.

During this session, a staff in Washington and in Camden serviced the needs of the more than 500,000 constituents in the First Congressional District. During the recess, the office in Washington and the office in Camden will remain open to service the needs of the people of the First District. My Washington address is room 1440, New House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., and my Camden address is 108 North Seventh Street, Camden 2, N.J.

All constituents are invited to bring to either office any problem they have with the Federal Government in which I may be helpful.

Patterns of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the rural electric systems throughout the United States meet each fall in 10 regional assemblies throughout the country. The first of these this year was at Eau Claire, Wis., September 11 and 12. Since then, meetings have been held in Columbus, Ohio; Mobile, Ala., and Richmond, Va.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the speech delivered at these meetings by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I call particular attention to the emphasis which Mr. Ellis has given in his speech to area development at home and abroad, and to the proposal which I have strongly advocated of exporting the REA cooperative idea to the developing countries of the world.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today I want to talk with you about patterns of hope.

A year ago I stood before you at this meeting to speak of days of decision—to discuss the great issues of our program within the context of a fateful time period.

That time period was the few weeks in which all of us as Americans were called upon to elect a new President and a new Congress. As citizens we were also deeply concerned with the worldwide challenge to democracy which was building in intensity day by day.

As leaders of the rural electrification program, we also had a direct and keenly personal interest in the events of those days. We were filled with hope that new names and new faces on the national scene would bring better understanding of our aims and aspirations.

The new faces came—new names, new voices which were just beginning to be heard in the land when we met last February at Dallas for what I believe was our greatest annual meeting.

Now, after a few months, we come together again to survey our directions. Many things have happened since Dallas which affect you—some good, some not so good.

But out of these events, patterns are forming which we believe must guide our activities in the future. Some of the patterns are drawn by new designers; some differ very little from the old patterns, but just enough to require us to learn new techniques.

We call them patterns of hope because through all of them runs a bright thread of faith in ourselves, our programs, and our country. All these patterns, we think, must be measured on the cloth of our national security and the position America must maintain in the world community of nations.

This is especially true today, when the things we do, the things we say, add to or detract materially from the image of America in the other countries of the world.

A PATTERN OF STRENGTH

What you have done in this program lies close to the heart of America and our entire national posture. Because you have brought electric power to the vast, sparsely settled land areas of this country, America is a stronger nation, much better equipped to stand up to the Communist challenge today, and to face whatever the future holds.

Because of you, electric power is out there wherever it's needed in America. A pattern of strength, of diversity, exists which would never have been possible without this program. Largely because of you, the United States enjoys her greatest advantage over the Soviets, that of our fantastic agricultural production. For all the people of America, wherever they live, this is clearly a pattern of hope.

In my opinion, the entire country in these dangerous times can be thankful for still another reason that we have had a rural electrification program. Through the years you, through your NRECA, have been consistent champions of resource development.

Due in large part to your efforts and those of our allied organizations, we have today a strong Tennessee Valley Authority and, because of TVA, we have Oak Ridge and a dozen other major defense centers—as well as power for 52 electric co-ops.

We have the Government's Bonneville power complex in the Pacific Northwest and, because of it, the Hanford Plutonium Reactor as well as power for many rural electrics. We have great new sources of power opening up in the Colorado River storage project, where industries vital to national security can develop far from the industrial and population centers of the East—assuming the necessary Federal transmission lines are built. And 70 electric co-ops depend on the lines.

We have harnessed the Missouri River to provide power and flood control and navigation for a long-neglected area of the country. We fought step by step for the Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines that stretch across that northern tier of States, and today those States are vital to the defense of America. The power, although limited, is there, and so are scores of rural electric systems to distribute it, and so are the missile bases and complex warning systems which defend our Nation.

The Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administration systems, the St. Lawrence and Niagara projects, and still others—all of which we supported—serve hundreds of rural electric systems and fit into this pattern of strength.

I think it is absolutely true that America's investment in rural electrification and natural resources would be fully justified on the basis of national security alone, aside from the multitude of other human and economic benefits which flow from these programs.

Actually, these self-supporting programs repay every dime of the Federal investment—as contrasted with the fast-tax-writeoff subsidies to the commercial power companies. These power company subsidies cost the people billions, and, it is widely believed, never produced one penny of good.

During the period between 1951 and 1957 the power companies were allowed fast-tax-writeoff subsidies on more than $3 billion of new plant investment—on the theory that they were building capacity for national defense. This was a joke, of course. In reality, they got the subsidy just for building the plants they would have built anyway for normal expansion.

They got, in effect, interest-free loans, whose benefits extending over a 33⅓-year period will amount to over $4.5 billion.

I think it is high time the Government takes a look at that whole power company subsidy program to see just what our Nation got, or didn't get, in return for the taxpayer's money.

How much extra power reserve, if any, do we have to show for those billions of dollars of power company subsidy? And did it result in lower electric rates to the people—or higher?

Your pattern of consistent support for the resource programs which have helped make America strong has almost been balanced through the years by power company opposition. It's high time this opposition be exposed to the light of day—something it cannot stand.

POWER COMPANY OPPOSITION

The fact that we have a dynamic program today, despite their opposition, gives us hope that greater progress can be made in the future.

This country is still doubling its demand for electricity every 7 to 10 years. Rural electric demand is doubling even faster, every 5 to 7 years. In addition to this normal demand, we are in a period of great world crisis and preparedness and it's almost certain that in the years immediately ahead the Nation will require tremendous amounts of power which are not now foreseen.

HANFORD GENERATORS

Certainly the one thing we can't afford is deliberate waste. And the power companies were wastemakers in their all-out campaign this year to defeat the authorization of generators for the Atomic Energy Commission's plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash. By rallying the support of the coal companies, the mineworkers, and the power companies' usual big business allies, the power companies were able to knock the generators out of the AEC authorization bill in the House.

The giant plutonium plant there is being built. Enormous quantities of heat will be produced. This heat would produce steam to generate more than 800,000 kilowatts of electricity—55 percent of which would have gone to the commercial power companies.

Now, if the House does not reverse its unwise action next year, most of this heat will be blown into the air or into the Columbia River. What a symbol of waste.

What an image of America this provides for all the nations of the world that have so little, and which are trying so desperately to develop their own meager resources.

The conservative Washington Star said this after the Hanford vote:

"The real question at Hanford is whether, in the name of false ideology, it would be better to waste this steam than to turn it into kilowatts. Our Nation is not so wealthy, and never has been so wealthy, that it can afford intentional waste."

We agree. This waste of an invaluable resource is unforgivable. NRECA has a mandate from its membership to fight for the Hanford generators, and we shall go on fighting until those 800,000 kilowatts are on the line.

COLORADO RIVER TRANSMISSION LINES

But let us turn a moment to the Colorado transmission line fight. As I'm sure you know by now, we won that fight.

There is a very significant story behind our victory—one all of you should know.

At stake were transmission lines for the upper Colorado River storage project in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The question was whether the Government or the commercial power companies would control the power generated at the Federal dams of this $1 billion system.

The proposed Federal system represents a real pattern of hope for the people of a vast area of the west—including the members of 70 rural electric systems who would be able to buy the power directly from the Government rather than from a power company middleman.

After careful studies both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations had agreed an all-Federal transmission system be built. These lines would protect the public interest.

The power companies wanted the Government to build some of the transmission system—provided the companies could build some vital tollgate lines so they would control the power, and its price.

The most ridiculous thing about these power company demands was that they would not be buying any of the power from the dams. Under the law the nonprofit distributors have a first call on that power, and the rural electrics and municipal systems will need every kilowatt of it.

All the companies wanted to do was set up their tollgates so that the people would have to pay a toll before they could buy their own power. This, too, would constitute great waste.

The power companies could just have logically demanded the right to own tollgates on farm-to-market roads, so the farmers would have to pay them tolls to sell their crops or buy supplies.

The power companies didn't get away with it despite the most intensive lobbying campaign in their history. They fought right down to the wire. Even after we had won in the House, the Senate committee adopted language in the report which would have nullified the victory. Fortunately, the Senate-House conferees specified language which removed this obstruction.

One of the most influential and highest ranking Members of Congress, who first went to the House before some of his present colleagues were born, wrote this to me during the height of this campaign:

"The power trust is making the most carefully organized and most determined fight against these transmission lines that I

have ever seen since I have been in the House."

In view of their all-out effort, I'm proud of the fight we made, and I'm proud of the victory. Our people responded magnificently to our calls for help, and I want especially to commend the statewide managers and editors. They helped organize support for these lines where it counted most—in the States and districts of the lawmakers who had to make the decision.

President Kennedy and his staff, and Secretary Udall, Assistant Secretary Holum, and others of their staffs really went to bat and worked closely in this Colorado lines fight, and I know you all join with me in saluting them for a job well done on behalf of our people, and on behalf of all the people of America.

The lesson we learned from Hanford and Upper Colorado will be invaluable to us as we plan for next year. We were disappointed that so little was done by Congress this year in the field of resource development. The fine program pledged by the President in the campaign just never got off the ground.

Next year we must fight as we've never fought before for the program you have adopted—a program that includes new projects like Burns Creek, the Potomac River development, revision of unrealistic Budget Bureau policies, adequate funds for an expanded generation and transmission (G. & T.) program of our own, funds for the Upper Colorado transmission system, high voltage common carrier transmission lines to tie the major power producing regions together, the full Hanford plant, the Trimble bill—which among other things deals with cost allocations in multipurpose projects—and the river basin intertie lines.

This year the power companies testified and lobbied openly against REA loan funds for the first time in several years. And, for the first time in many years, the final loan authorization was considerably below what our survey showed the need to be. We were able to persuade the Senate to increase the amount originally voted by the House by $50 million—and the House finally agreed—but the amount is still $35 million short of what our January survey showed the need to be—and we keep hearing about large potential G. & T. loan applications which were not reported to us in our survey—that we used before Congress to justify the amounts we requested. The applications not included in our survey, of course, will probably have to wait until after June 30, 1962.

NEW REA POLICIES

But despite our concern over adequate loan funds, there are patterns of hope in the actions and policies of the new REA Administrator. In these few months, Norman Clapp has moved boldly and positively to help rural electric systems solve pressing problems in the critical areas of power supply, territorial integrity, and rural area development.

He has been aided tremendously, of course, by the fine team he has assembled—including his deputy, Dick Dell, formerly of NRECA.

Perhaps his most dramatic action has been the approval of the Indiana G. & T. loan. This $60 million loan is a real breakthrough for our program, and, combined with the Administrator's new security criterion and his firm stand against dual rates and restrictive clauses in power company wholesale contracts, gives us real hope that we're on the way toward a measure of control over our supply of power.

The Administrator has also announced that REA will stand behind its borrowers in territorial disputes, and will offer certain technical and legal assistance. This can be extremely important.

I know you all join me in proudly saluting Mr. Clapp for the great job he has already done as REA Administrator.

AREA DEVELOPMENT

Perhaps the most significant new domestic pattern of hope to come from the present administration has been the attention given to rural area development.

At Dallas you showed your determination to help redevelop our areas, and following your mandate we successfully supported constructive legislation in this area which is beginning to show results.

The first loan made by the new Areas Redevelopment Administration, for example, went to a rural area of Arkansas where a rural electric cooperative had been particularly active in community development activities. NRECA, through its general manager, has been named to the 25-man advisory board for the Areas Redevelopment Administration, located in the Department of Commerce. We have been active there and in many other ways. We supported an amendment for rural housing in this year's housing bill, for example, and helped to get it passed.

NEW RAD SECTION IN REA

The Administrator has also set up a new section in REA for rural areas development, headed by Richard M. Hausler, former NRECA and State paper employee. This RAD section will give constructive help to any borrower interested in carrying out a development program, including, in some cases, section 5 loans for the electrical equipment used in a new industry.

The expanded REA program is a part of an accelerated overall rural areas development program of the Department of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman has announced his determination to go all out in pushing this development concept, and his Department is in a position to be of real help to you. They want, and need, rural electric leadership and support.

At this point let me make it clear that the RAD program of the Department of Agriculture is completely separate from the new Area Redevelopment Administration program of the Department of Commerce. ARA loan-and-grant assistance is available only to areas designated as depressed areas—although it may render other kinds of assistance in all areas. The Department of Agriculture program operates in all rural areas.

At the summer board meeting this year, the NRECA Board of Directors authorized us to hire an expert in rural development to work with the staff and the member systems. We finally found him in the person of Ellery Foster.

By the time of our 1962 annual meeting in Atlantic City next March, we should be able to give you some evaluation of the progress made by then in the rural development field. By that time these programs should be past the organization stage and producing some real results.

* * * * *

EXPORTING THE REA IDEA

So you see, the events at NRECA provide a pattern of hope that in the future we will do an even better job of joining together to do the jobs none of us could do alone—and help our people build richer, more rewarding lives.

But, to me, one of the most exciting and challenging concepts to enter our program in many years is the growing recognition that the rural electric program—including our rural redevelopment activities—provides a pattern of hope for the underdeveloped countries of the world. These countries, after all, have much in common with the rural America of 1935—or even of 1961.

This past summer, the NRECA Board passed a resolution urging the administration to "export" the REA idea to these struggling countries. The Board believed the REA concept would produce very real economic gains in these countries, and at the same time give the people a sense of belonging, of ownership, of control of their own destinies—a pattern of hope.

Our program has worked a miracle in this country—it can do the same in others. The cooperative approach which lighted our land can light others—and it can also provide credit, medical aid, water, fertilizers, machinery and other tools of progress.

Rural area development in the United States is much the same as rural area development in Colombia, Brazil, or anywhere else in the world—given the differences in culture and stages of economic growth. So our cooperative area development efforts also offer new patterns of hope to the world as well.

None of these things can be done tomorrow, but the human needs will be there the day after tomorrow; and as the President has said, "let us begin."

We presented the Board's new policy—to export the REA idea—to the President and the Congress. They agreed with us—and promptly called upon us—upon you—for help.

We have begun, and so have the administration and the Congress. The President is firmly committed to the concept of encouraging the development of cooperatives as a feature of our foreign aid program. An amendment to the foreign aid bill this year by Senator HUMPHREY also directs that this be done.

A representative of NRECA, Jerry Anderson, was appointed to a planning committee set up within the International Cooperation Administration (now the Agency for International Development) to plan the new cooperative programs. NRECA's general manager was named to the policy committee to make the final recommendations in this area. NRECA's president and general manager have been asked to participate in an Inter-American Cooperative Conference at Bogotá, Colombia, November 6–11. We have been asked for ideas and recommendations on how to help get cooperative programs going, particularly in Latin America, where the forces of communism are hard at work to turn traditionally friendly countries against us. We have been asked to name outstanding people from our program to help staff the new Agency for International Development. We have written to you managers about this.

I know we all want to do everything we reasonably can to help these countries develop cooperative programs. The people in these countries are looking for practical help—from whatever source.

A Washington newspaper recently carried a story about a small village in Colombia. It quoted a young teacher as saying:

"The people here are good people but easily led. They will follow the first side—the Russians or Americans—that comes here and convinces them. But they don't want to be deceived with false promises. They'll all cooperate with the Americans but they don't want projects left half-done."

This is the challenge we face. Communism does not start and fester and spread among the rich, but among the poor. And most of the people in the underdeveloped countries are poor—poor farmers. We owe them and mankind an obligation to help, because it is the right thing to do—and because our national interest requires it.

Today, we have responsibilities as citizens, as Americans which transcend any special interest. There is something good in our program which others less fortunate can use, and we must help them use it.

The only alternative to helping them is to build a shield of rockets around our own

country and sit here waiting for the world to explode. And, of course, this is no alternative at all—it's an open invitation to international suicide.

And so we identify ourselves as rural Americans with rural peoples everywhere. We identify our problems with their problems, our hopes with their hopes. Even in our major problems of rural electrification and rural area development we find common cause.

There are moments in the lives of men when hope and despair hang in such delicate balance that the scale can be tipped by even the sound of a voice.

That voice may be the voice of a President of the United States—speaking with a quiet and firm conviction of the rights of all peoples to a place in the sun.

Or, the voice may be yours, speaking at this meeting.

Or, the voice may come from Moscow or Peiping or Havana—now purring and praising, now ringing with a hysterical madness that sweeps across the lands of the earth like a chilling north wind.

For my part, I prefer not to stand and shiver in this wind. I prefer to use all the patterns of hope that are evident on every side of us. I prefer to believe that we shall win, because I believe we have the intelligence and the compassion to win.

The stakes are the stakes of humanity.

Mr. Shepley's "Well Chosen Words"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at an earlier page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, A7936–A7937, I inserted a speech by Mr. Ethan A. H. Shepley, a prominent St. Louisan, dealing with our legislative processes in a democracy. The remarks, although made as a speech in 1957, contain ideas which are fresh today and which will be so long as man governs himself in the way we in America have chosen to do. These same ideas were contained in a later speech, to which I made reference, and I should like at this time to place in the RECORD the reactions of a leading St. Louis County newspaper to the ideas which Mr. Shepley presented. These reactions are included in an editorial entitled "Well Chosen Words" which appeared in the Watchman Advocate on August 30 of this year:

WELL-CHOSEN WORDS

Former Washington University Chancellor Ethan A. H. Shepley was talking considerable sense Monday when he told delegates to the convention of Theta Xi fraternity that the public is meddling too much in the decisions of their elected representatives in government.

Mr. Shepley pointed out that "the people are usurping powers they are not qualified to exercise. Persons holding elective offices have learned through bitter experience that they better do what is popular."

Mr. Shepley speaks as one who has observed the continuing growth of government by pressure and this one of the burgeoning weaknesses of our governmental structure today. No public official is free from it. Each group has an ax to grind and they grind it on the official. The result is that the group that applies the most heat usually gets the greatest service from its elective officials. This does not, by any means, indicate that any particular group because it gets the job done is best serving the public interest. More likely it means that it is solely serving its own interest and if the public happens to benefit in the exchange then the public is just lucky. If it doesn't it's just too bad.

The people presumably elect their officials because they consider them qualified. But, after the official is chosen then the special interests expect to take over. If the official is independent, seeks to administer his office strictly down the line he is accused of not cooperating and the wolves are immediately set upon him.

This was not the way our form of government was intended, but it is the way it is digressing and at a rate that bodes nothing but the least public good in the process. It is refreshing to see men of Mr. Shepley's stature recognizing it, and speaking out on it. It is to be hoped that others, just as enlightened, will also make it their business to do likewise in the public's own interest.

Scholarship in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Democratic national chairman, Mr. John Bailey, recently accused the Republican Party of only using scholars and intellectuals in the months before elections in contrast to the alleged Democratic practice of relying heavily on their advice. This speech, made at the American Political Science Association convention in St. Louis, is another example of the sloppy scholarship constantly indulged in by members of the Democratic Party hierarchy. In fact, I feel that if Mr. Bailey would have taken the trouble to have research done on his own remarks, he might find them to be inaccurate and unwarranted.

Within the past few months' time, I have been directing a special project on "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy" under the auspices of the House Republican policy committee. Some 24 leading academic and professional economists contributed study papers upon which were based the conclusions of a group of 48 Republican House Members. The papers were published. The economists, Democrats and Republicans alike, were eager to contribute their views without any repayment for their assistance, financial or otherwise. This was but a continuation in a series of Republican efforts to mobilize the minds of intellectuals throughout the United States and abroad.

Last year, the report, "American Strategy and Strength," under the direction of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], also drew upon military and defense experts both inside and outside of the academic world. The study drew widespread attention and became the first in a Republican policy committee series designed to make the American public aware of the theoretical and the practical aspects of formulation and execution of positive GOP policy on an issue of great concern to the American people and to the world. This was continued this year under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who led a similar task force study of "American Education and a Free Citizenry." This study, published and widely disseminated as were the others, used the views of diverse individuals and groups prominent in the educational field as background for the participating Republican Congressmen.

I might also add that the Republican National Committee has established a permanent division for arts and sciences, and therein deals with over 8,000 academic persons throughout the country who have expressed some interest or concern with the Republican philosophy of government. They are kept abreast of Republican efforts in fields that would be of particular interest, and their participation in related topics or projects is always encouraged—12 months a year, year in and year out. The response to this program, under the direction of Dr. Earl Nehring, has been particularly encouraging in recent months.

In contrast to this, the so-called Kennedy task force reports, which seem to be the only evidence of scholarship on the part of the Democrats, contain no study papers. No parts of the reports are attributable to any responsible academician. Their overlapping is exceeded only by duplications and contradictions, as in the space report where they criticize our concentration on outer space under the Eisenhower administration a page before urging more attention for the outer space program. Democratic intellect, hasty and introductory in nature, only scratches the surface of true research in its haphazard attempts to be all things to all party members.

For the truth in this matter is that the Democratic members are not secure and united enough to sponsor research unless they know in advance their findings. Dishonest scholarship and rigged research of the Democratic Party stand in contrast to the Republican record in this regard. In fact, if Mr. Bailey was aware of research in the political field he would have by now read a scholarly analysis of "The Candidate" by Joseph Lyford, former Democratic candidate for Congress in Connecticut. Published by the Eagleton Foundation as part of their case studies in practical politics, the book refers to Mr. Bailey as a "journeyman psychologist, a poker player with a sense of humor, a listener, a collector, an executioner but not an executive, and a man with a natural preference for the top dog. He has been able, with very little effort, to avoid commitments to any philosophy of government whatsoever. I know of nobody in Connecticut politics who would suggest that Bailey is in politics because of a burning desire to serve his fellow man or to promote a given set of governmental principles or ethics. To remain State chairman means that under his direction the party must win elections and control as many

jobs as it can." I do not criticize Mr. Bailey for his attention to wining elections. Rather, I feel that his attempting to cast an aura of academic respectability around his partisan life of bungling, barking, and battling is an insult to the thousands of academic and professional experts who attempt to bring a ray of factual material to the political arena on occasion.

The Republican Party has put the facts on the line, based on the background studies of those who know whereof they speak. The Democratic Party has spoken where it should have acted—a common tendency in governmental circles these days. Mr. Bailey should apologize forthwith to the thousands of academic experts who have contributed so much to the scholarship of Republican policy studies.

Theodore Francis Green Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 13, 1961, the new Terminal Building at the Theodore Francis Green Airport in Hillsgrove, R.I., was dedicated, and many of my fellow Rhode Islanders were present to inspect and admire this outstanding, modern facility. The event marked an additional step in the continuing growth of air transportation which is so important to the economy of the State of Rhode Island and our Nation as a whole.

The great statesman for whom our Rhode Island airport is named, former Senator Theodore Francis Green, was present on that occasion, and delivered a short, but most interesting and enlightening address. In a few paragraphs, this able gentleman traced for those present the amazing expansion of air travel and commerce during the little more than a quarter of a century which marked the time which had elapsed between his public service as Governor of Rhode Island and the end of his fourth term in the Senate. This is but one small example of the great progress and development in this country which Senator Green has witnessed during his lifetime and his presence at the dedication of the terminal building at the Theodore Francis Green Airport, was, indeed, an historic occasion, and for that reason I wish to have his remarks placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Rhode Island was also honored on the occasion of the same dedication by having as the principal speaker, a native son, and resident of my district, the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, who was appointed Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board earlier this year by our great President, John F. Kennedy. I would like also to submit Mr. Murphy's address for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF FORMER U.S. SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW TERMINAL BUILDING, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AIRPORT, SUNDAY, AUGUST 13, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Governor Notte, Mr. Murphy, invited guests, fellow citizens, it is good to be present here today at the dedication of this beautiful new terminal building. I have a special interest in this airport, because when I was Governor of Rhode Island, with the help of Federal funds obtained from the then Public Works Administration, we practically rebuilt this airport and provided not only for a new administration building, but also for new and extended runways for planes planning to use the airport for commercial business.

I can well remember my earlier trips to Washington to obtain funds from the old Public Works Administration, which was then under the command of the late Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior. I also remember the controversy in the old Public Works Commission as to whether it would be best to use cement or asphalt runways. In those days that was a big problem with engineers on both sides telling us which they believed was best for the airport. There was also a lengthy word battle as to what kind of lighting should go into the airport. With two of the largest electrical manufacturing companies in the world fighting for the contract, we finally succeeded in having the Public Works Administration advance the funds so that we could proceed with the construction of the airport. On the day we dedicated this field, Col. Roscoe Turner, a world famous aviator, who is now the manager of the State airport at Minneapolis, flew in from the west coast to help dedicate the field.

In those days I was particularly interested in Rhode Island's having one of the best airports in the country, and today I am heartily pleased with this new and beautiful addition to our airport facilities. The public officials, the architects, and the contractors who brought it about are worthy of our hearthy congratulations and thanks.

I am, indeed, pleased that your principal speaker here today, Robert T. Murphy, is a Rhode Islander who has recently been named by President Kennedy as Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Bob Murphy was chief counsel for me when I was chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. We investigated together some very important senatorial elections. Since those days Bob has gone from politics to aviation, and has won the respect of many Members of the U.S. Senate who admire his qualifications and ability to serve as an Administrator.

Again let me thank you for this opportunity to say a few words at these ceremonies.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW TERMINAL BUILDING, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AIRPORT, HILLSGROVE, R.I., SUNDAY, AUGUST 13, 1961

I am deeply honored by the invitation of Al Tavani, Rhode Island's able administrator of aeronautics, to participate with my fellow citizens of Rhode Island in the formal dedication of this magnificent new airport terminal building. It affords me an opportunity to return to my native State and to share with you the justifiable interest and pride which we have in the progress and development of transportation facilities in this great commericial region of America.

More than that, however, I am grateful for the opportunity to play a part in the dedication of an important transportation facility which bears the name of one who has played a most important role in the economic and social progress of this State and this Nation—Theodore Francis Green. It is interesting to observe that his life, which he lives with vigor and enthusiasm, has spanned the scientific evolution in transportation which has taken us from the plodding, horse-drawn vehicles to the jet engine, which is capable of propelling man at nonstop supersonic speeds through varying altitudes of the airspace to any quarter of the globe. He has lived that period of great transition, not as an idle observer, but as an active participant in and contributor to it. On behalf of the aviation industry of the United States, may I extend our thanks and appreciation to Senator Green for his various contributions to its promotion and development over the years.

The dedication of this new airport terminal is an event of significant importance, not only from a local point of view but also from the standpoint of the national interest. Together with similar airport facilities in hundreds of cities and communities throughout the 50 States, it constitutes a vital link in the air transportation system of our Nation. More and more of our national commerce—both persons and goods—are flowing through airports. In the light of the almost explosive growth of air transportation during the past decade and the portent of even greater expansion during the sixties, the importance of a system of airports adequate to meet present and future needs of air commerce is self-evident. Quite obviously, terminals must be kept abreast of, and in balance with, the phenomenal growth in the use of our Federal airways.

Today, air transportation is the principal means of interstate and foreign travel for passengers. It has exceeded the records of both the railroads and the transatlantic steamship operators. Last year, more than 57 million passengers traveled on our commercial air carriers. According to our forecasts, airborne passengers carried by our commercial air carriers will total 98 million by 1965 and 118 million by 1970. Moreover, airfreight or aircargo, which is still relatively in its infancy, will show marked progress in the next 5 or 10 years with the advent of uncompromised all-cargo aircraft which promise the hope of sharp reduction in current transportation costs.

Accordingly, it is not difficult to comprehend that an essential element in the safe development and expansion of our air commerce is a well-integrated system of airports designed to provide adequate facilities at both origin and destination of each flight. It is in this sense that they are vital links in our transportation system. It would be foolhardy, indeed, to spend increasing sums on the development and maintenance of adequate Federal airways and to ignore the fact that these highways of the sky must begin and end at a ground facility, or, if you will, an airport—an airport which, like that here in Providence, is experiencing a tremendously increasing volume of traffic of all kinds.

It is well to remember, however, that airports are essential, not only to provide for regularly scheduled services of air carriers, but also to meet the growing needs of general or private aviation, and the significant public need of our national defense. In recent years, thousands of business organizations and individuals have come to depend upon air travel by aircraft which they personally own and operate. A fact worthy of emphasis is that the total number of aircraft in the general aviation field far exceeds that of the commercial carriers—more than 70,000 in comparison with some 2,000 and accounts for more total flying hours than the commercial air fleet.

It is interesting to note that, last year, right here at the Theodore Francis Green

Airport; there were more than 40,000 landings and takeoffs accomplished by general aviation aircraft as compared to 25,000 by air carrier aircraft. This gives us some idea of the extensive use of airport facilities by members of the general public other than our common carriers. Just as Federal and local governments have found it necessary to provide an adequate system of public roads, so, too, must new airport facilities be provided which are adequate to safely accommodate private as well as commercial aircraft.

Moreover, one of the most significant public needs met by our airport system is that of national defense. This airport, like many others throughout the country, is open on a round-the-clock basis for the free use of military aircraft, some of which are based here. The Federal airport development program, on which millions have been expended in recent years, provides auxiliary facilities through which emergency services may, if necessary, be conducted. We all hope that the day will never come when such use must be made of our civilian airports, but you can well appreciate that, in the event of military action, airports such as this one would constitute true bastions of aerial defense.

Because this ceremony is taking place in our native State which is rich in early colonial history, I cannot help but recall that in the year 1643, Roger Williams and a brave band of colleagues sailed from these shores for London to secure a royal charter of property entitlement and political rights. History tells us that trip of Roger Williams across the storm-tossed Atlantic took many weeks. Today, as we dedicate this port on the ocean of the air, it is appropriate for us to note that here, through this modern facility, we, the descendants of Roger Williams have a means of transportation, not only to all the principal cities of the United States, but also on our U.S. international air carriers, the ability to go anywhere in the world without losing a night's sleep. Thus, to breakfast in Providence Plantations, at the head of Narragansett Bay, and to dine in London, on the Thames, which would be a wild fantasy beyond the vision of our Rhode Island founders, is an accepted fact for those of our generation.

I like to think that I am participating in the dedication of a public airport facility which is capable of serving, not only the needs of our most densely populated community—namely, the city of Providence, but also, because of its unique location within one-half mile of the proposed route of our Interstate Highway System—one which can serve all our communities because it will be no more than 30 minutes away from any population center, large or small, in our State. This is a transportation achievement unmatched by any State in the Union. The Theodore Francis Green Airport, therefore, can serve the needs, insofar as scheduled airline service is concerned, of the entire State of Rhode Island and even nearby parts of Massachusetts and Connecticut. By channeling scheduled airline service through this single great airport, we can preserve the adequacy and safety both in the air and on the ground of transportation service to this part of New England and, hence, better serve the needs of the population for convenient, safe and swift airline service.

This airport meets all the requirements of the basic criteria established by the New England Council in its master plan for New England airports to serve the scheduled air transportation needs of New England. Its runway lengths, its round-the-clock air traffic control surveillance, its instrument landing system, and its convenient ground distance from populated areas throughout the State and adjacent areas in Connecticut and Massachusetts make it a true regional airport within the contemplation of the New England Council, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This building represents a joint effort of both State and National Governments. The Federal contribution was justified, not only because of the factors I have mentioned, but also because of the complete Federal responsibility for the conduct of air traffic control, weather observation and postal operations. Therefore, I congratulate my fellow citizens of Rhode Island, our Governor, John Notte, our administrator of aeronautics, Al Tavani, and all others who have worked so diligently to make this a reality. It represents a striking contrast to the dedication of the State airport here at Hillsgrove 30 years ago when grass runways on a cleared area of 158 acres and a collection of nondescript hangar buildings opened Providence as a harbor on the ocean of the sky.

This new terminal building is a contribution to the asset side of our national ledger. It represents, as we know, a sacrifice on the part of the taxpayers of this State, but, in the words of our great President, John F. Kennedy, it is well to recall at this moment of our national life:

"This Nation cannot afford to be weak, it must afford to be strong."

Louisville After Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 1956, the city of Louisville, Ky., integrated its public school facilities. Below is an article from the September 1961, issue of the Anti-Defamation League Bulletin which tells what Louisville is like in 1961—5 years after integration. It illustrates a lesson which we all can make use of in our relations with those around us.

The article follows:

THE LOUISVILLE STORY—AFTER INTEGRATION

(By Gertrude Noar)

Louisville planned carefully for the day. Now, 5 years later, studies show that good teaching has brought about gains in achievement for Negro and white children.

"On September 10, 1956, when Louisville, Ky., opened its public schools, roughly one of every four children admitted was a Negro. This took place, in one of the great slave-trading centers of the Old South, without violence, without mob action, with hope for the future."

These words, from the book "The Louisville Story," by Omer Carmichael and Weldon James, were written soon after the event. This is the story of what happened next to Louisville's children and schools, in the years after September 10, 1956—the day "some of the customs and traditions of centuries ended."

It was clear back in 1956 that the city of Louisville itself was the hero of the peaceable transition from segregated to desegregated schools. Many of Louisville's citizens had worked for more than 2 years—ever since the 1954 Supreme Court decision—to prepare for the day. What they achieved has been called "a triumph of man's ability to solve some of his most vexing problems with reason and good will."

Louisville today is essentially a border State city with a distinctly southern atmosphere. Some of its 400,000 people live in stately and big old homes, far more live in friendly, small brick-and-limestone structures. Few of the school buildings in the heart of the city are new, but in the outskirts, and in surrounding Jefferson County, there are many new-style one- and two-story schools of several wings and spacious lawns.

Probably few visitors to the city concern themselves with Louisville's schools. There are too many blandishments around—the Kentucky Derby for instance. Some of Louisville's stores reflect the atmosphere of money casually won and lost; there are dresses selling at $200 and $300 apiece in shop windows. And Kentucky bourbon and bourbon bonbons are part of the city's pattern of convivial living.

It is also a city of some culture; the local philharmonic orchestra as well as touring orchestras provide a season of good music in Louisville's municipal auditorium. Popular Broadway plays are staged there, too. A good public library system lends, not only books, but records, feature-length films, and framed paintings to satisfy many levels of taste.

Some of Louisville's restaurants, including those in the two leading hotels, have desegregated along with the schools. Many small restaurants, however, and those in the two large department stores, still discriminate on the basis of race. Last spring, Negro students from high school and college, joined by some of their white classmates and professors, staged demonstrations to fight such discrimination. Crowds gathered to watch the picket lines as the students sang "Freedom" until the police carted them off to jail for obstructing traffic.

Soon after desegregation started in 1956, I visited Louisville to see how it was faring and what effect it had on children and their teachers. Despite the peaceable transition, September 10, 1956, had obviously been a day of anxiety and doubts. One of these is illustrated by a story circulated in Louisville that first fall. A 6-year-old girl was about to begin her long years of schooling that September 10. Her family gathered around her with last minute warnings as she left for school dressed in starched pinafore. She returned soon after 3 o'clock, skipping down the street. Again the family gathered: "How did it go, Sue Ellen? Is your teacher nice? Was there any trouble? Were there any colored in your room?"

"Oh, yes," the girl said, "Mary-Jane, a little black girl, sat next to me. We were both so scared we held hands all day."

Voluntary transfers had been offered as one of the steps in the desegregation process. At first, only a few Negroes had moved into white schools but, as those children brought reports of good treatment back to their families and friends, increasing numbers made the change. A reverse trend also set in; for many reasons, some children wanted to return to more familiar surroundings.

Teachers and students had the most difficult situations in secondary schools. Some teachers were prepared to pity the Negro boys and girls, believing them unable to reach the standards, but were unprepared to do anything about it. Other teachers felt that the students' problems were caused by the fact that they came from socially underprivileged homes, or that they didn't have money to buy books, or that they were suffering from lack of encouragement from both parents and teachers. These teachers were able to take steps to help them.

I visited an elementary school and saw very good teaching, indeed. White and Negro children—and their parents—expressed their appreciation of cultured and very able Negro principal and teachers. They had already stopped seeing color. Whatever the race of a good reader, he was praised and allowed to help his classmates. In one such classroom, I noticed that a group of 7-year olds, who happened to be Negro,

were following the text, but reading the small-print directions intended for the teacher. I asked the teacher why. "Why shouldn't children do as much as they are able?" she said.

It was clear in all schools that socio-economic background had much to do with a child's performance. When the white children were better dressed and better fed, they seemed to be the brightest in the school; when the white children were obviously poor and underprivileged, but the Negro children appeared to come from middle-class backgrounds, then the Negro children excelled.

During that first year, teachers and children worked very hard. There was excitement, tension, and wonder. Could they count on good results? Some teachers asked: "Isn't it likely that standards will be pulled down?" Some said: "After all, the Negro children weren't well prepared and isn't it true that many are apathetic and indifferent?"

Someone needed to get answers to these questions quickly. The person who did so is Dr. Frank Stalling at Louisville University, associate professor of education and coordinator of elementary student teaching at Louisville University. His first step was to set up a study of the immediate effects of integration on scholastic achievement in the Louisville public schools. More than 3,000 white and 1,300 Negro children on the second, sixth, and eighth grade levels were included. Tests administered before integration showed that Negro students were performing at levels lower than whites (from 5 months to 1 year and 2 months lower) depending upon the grade and subject or skill tested. The second testing period took place in 1957, after integration had been achieved.

The full report of this study appeared in the Journal of Negro Education, fall, 1959. An analysis of test results shows that since integration:

Among white pupils, gains in achievement amounted to 1.2 months at the second grade level; 9 months at the sixth grade level; and an average of 2 months in all subjects at eighth grade level.

Among all students, white and Negro, the gains were still greater: 3 months at the second grade; 5 months at the sixth grade; an average of 1 month in all subjects at the eighth grade. (Reading alone gained 4 months at the eighth grade level.) There had never been gains as great in a similar period in the past.

Seventy-five supervisors, principals, teachers, and students were interviewed. Only one person felt that integration had a negative effect on the motivation of pupils or teachers. All the others felt that integration had provided varying degrees of motivation to all concerned.

These conclusions were drawn from the study:

Scholastic achievement showed substantial gains for all, although greater gains were made by Negroes than whites.

Improvement seemed to be due in part to increased motivation, especially for Negro teachers and pupils.

The record of Louisville may serve to reassure those who fear that the immediate effect of integration is to lower levels of achievement.

As thus recorded, the immediate results of integration in Louisville were positive. They reflected hard work and the fact that many teachers made real efforts to give Negro children security, acceptance, and a feeling of being wanted; emotional needs which must be satisfied if children are to achieve their best.

Dr. Stallings later set about studying longer term results of desegregation in Louisville. In May 1959, another study was made, and reported under the title "Changes in Academic Achievement Since Integration." This time, median scores on tests in all subjects for all children were shown to be about the same as national norms. In other words, the achievement of white and Negro pupils was higher; a particularly substantial gain had been made by Negro students. All this was accomplished without any comprehensive or conscious program to preserve standards. And it was done despite the fact that the Negro children come from homes that have been buffeted by a variety of destructive forces—age-old social rejection by our culture, special tensions created by knowledge of violence directed against Negroes elsewhere.

The Louisville experience is heartening, but it is hardly unique. Wherever good teaching goes on, wherever a community cooperates with teachers who believe and act on the principle of the worth and dignity of each individual, children grow, develop, and flourish.

Tax Revision Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, I would like to make note of the fact that we have omitted one very important thing—a sound and solid revision of our tax structure. Our tax laws need overhauling to meet the demands of the 1960's and to give the people the relief they so badly deserve from double or dual taxation, from unsound and unfair taxes and from taxes piled on taxes.

Instead of this, we once again got piecemeal tax legislation to work with in the House. We did pass a tax numbering system which will modernize the efforts of the Internal Revenue Service. However, efforts in other fields of taxation seemed almost shotgun in their effect, rather than a concentrated effort at overhaul.

I was extremely pleased that tax inequities imposed on the clay products industry were, to some extent, alleviated. This was a just decision on the part of the Congress. However, there are needs for other industries as well, and a need for a complete new look at our business tax setup to determine how best we can assist business expansion. The proposals made by the administration this year were obviously unsound and to a degree unfair.

We must also reexamine our policy on transportation taxation to eliminate inequities there. The first step should be to do away with the unsound 10 percent tax on passenger travel of all kinds.

In other tax fields:

Cooperatives: The committee approved tentative language to tax cooperatives' patronage refunds, either as individual income or as corporate income.

Mutual insurance companies: The committee approved tentative language increasing taxes on mutual insurance companies.

Business expense accounts: The committee has approved language tightening up regulations on deductions for business expenses. Some effort is needed in this field but care must be exerted not to cause undue or unfair hardship.

Dividend taxation: The administration proposal for a dividend tax withheld at the source is most unsound and is completely without logic. Such a tax on dividends and interest would work undue hardship on small investors and small savers and would work a hardship on small companies and firms which make the payments.

Savings and loan taxation: The committee spent many days investigating this proposal but arrived at no firm decision. Prospects at this point are that no decision will be reached very early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the committee will take time next year to inquire into and examine the whole tax code, to overhaul it, to take out of it some unfair provisions on so-called luxury items and to modernize and streamline our tax system.

Construction Set-Asides Still Costing Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions during the past session of the Congress I have called the attention of the House to certain problems created by an arbitrary and foolish decision of the Small Business Administration to set aside construction projects for exclusive bidding by small business firms. In the field of construction, those firms are described as ones doing an average of less than $5 million worth of work annually, those not dominant in their field, and independently owned and operated.

I have mentioned general problems which have developed in this field. I have cited specific losses to the Government created by this program, and I have cited unfair and unreasonable competitive factors which have developed during the past year of set-asides.

No individual, either in the Department of Defense or in the Small Business Administration has successfully been able to challenge my contention that this program is costing the Government money. Those who deal daily with construction problems agree that it will cost between 5 and 10 percent extra to carry out our military and civilian construction programs under the set-aside agreements which are not really agreements at all but an arbitrary decision by SBA.

Using the Small Business Act of 1958 as a lever, the SBA has pried out of the Defense Department a reassurance that all contracts ranging in cost from $2,500 to $500,000 will automatically be set aside for the exclusive bidding of small contractors. I still have found no evidence

that any large segment of the construction industry asked for this privilege and subsidy. I have found no evidence that anybody in the Defense Department's construction agencies wanted such a program. The only conclusion that can be reached is that an empire builder in the SBA itself inaugurated the program and has forced it on the Government.

Twice during this session of Congress the House Committee on Appropriations has taken note of this problem. In the report accompanying the general Government matters, Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriations bill for 1962, the committee recommended that SBA, the construction agencies and industry representatives sit down to clarify the situation and resolve it. In the report accompanying the public works appropriations bill the committee asked the agencies involved to run a check on the cost factors involved.

Late in August the Small Business Administration did call a meeting, as suggested by the terms of the committee report. Instead of following the spirit of that report, however, the agency followed it to the letter. No representatives of construction agencies, as such, were present at the meeting to express their views. Instead, the Department of Defense sent over a special assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Logistics—a man whose prime duty it has been to foster the philosophy of the SBA in the Defense Department. GSA, too, had representatives who apparently go along with the philosophy of SBA, rather than speak out directly and openly for the people who handle construction problems as part of their daily work. I am told, in fact, that one man who is vitally concerned with this problem in the Defense Department actually requested permission from his superiors to attend the meeting. He was denied this permission and told, in effect, to tend to his own knitting and leave this for the policy people.

The result was a stacked meeting at which the representatives of the construction industry were given an opportunity to speak out, were listened to politely, and then were told that nothing much will be done.

SBA did agree to hold new hearings sometime in the future concerning size definitions. They also set up a committee which will consider the overall problem of set-asides but which has no real authority to recommend changes. Again, this committee will be stacked against the industry and against the construction agencies, and will be completely dominated by the SBA.

On September 12, the Small Business Administration did open the door slightly by calling a hearing on the size definition for dredgers. This is a highly specialized field of endeavor and requires extremely expensive equipment. I have made reference elsewhere in the RECORD to this meeting and to the extremely fine statement made by Senator RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana at that hearing.

I would, at this point, like to mention another development at that hearing. SBA has constantly maintained that no additional costs will accrue to the Government due to the set-aside program. They defy anyone to point out such additional costs. Well, at that hearing one dredging firm did point out such an added cost factor, still apparently with little result.

The job involved 2 million cubic yards of maintenance dredging at the Sunny Point, N.C., Army Terminal. Corps estimates of costs were $373,900. Four bids were received, one by the Arundel Corp., for $341,500. This was the only bid which was under the corps estimate. The other bids were as follows:

Atkinson Dredging Co	$458,000
Norfolk Dredging Co	462,500
Merritt Dredging Co	515,000

Bids were opened on August 29, 1961. On August 30, 1961, the Arundel Corp. received the following letter from the district engineer's office, Wilmington, N.C.:

> Your bid under Invitation No. CIVENG–31–075–62–2 for maintenance dredging at the Sunny Point Army Terminal, NC., is being returned as being nonresponsive since this invitation is a set-aside for small business as noted in paragraph 7 in the Advance Notice.
>
> The low bidder was Atkinson Dredging Co., Norfolk, Va., in the amount of $458,000.
>
> Your interest in the work of the district is appreciated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this represents an added cost to the Government of $116,500, or an increase of 31 percent in the cost of one job alone. This is fantastic waste.

I would like to make note of another factor involved in this particular bid opening. You will note that two of the bids, those by Atkinson and Norfolk, are fairly close together, and that the fourth bid, that by Merritt Dredging, is a whopping $53,000 higher. I am no expert in the field of bidding on such jobs, but I have discussed this with men who are expert, and it is their opinion that this was more than mere coincidence. One bid seems to have been dropped in just to make two other bids look good.

I have other examples of added cost to the Government from bidding which is foreclosed to construction firms with the know-how and ability to do the job just because those firms are competent and have grown.

A bid was invited on some telephone cable work at the Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. Total cost of the project was set at $1,200,000 by the contracting officer. Someone wanted it set aside for small firms only, and so, to please this individual, the contract was broken into two coequal parts, at $600,000 apiece. Invitations went out with the notation that the bid was set aside.

The lowest bid received from a small contractor was $648,761, on one job, $656,889 on the other. This bidding came at a time when the normal run of bidding across the country was far below the Corps of Engineers' estimates. Combined, these added costs total $106,650, or an increased cost to the Government of 8 percent.

Another example of waste was brought to my attention by the Charles Simkin & Sons, Inc., construction firm of Perth Amboy, N.J. Simkins is not a very big construction firm. In fact, in 1960, its total gross receipts were $4,242,605, well below the $5 million mark. However, Simkins happened to have a very successful year back in 1958, when it did $7 million worth of work, and so its 3-year average came to a little over the $5 million limits.

By any standards in the construction industry, Simkins is not big business, and it is not a subsidiary of any larger firm, being wholly independent both in ownership and operation.

Last year, under Invitation No. ENG–30–075–61–66, the corps invited bids on dismantling a heating plant at Richard I. Bong Air Force Base, Wis., and construction of an addition to the heating plant at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. Simkins bid on the work but was rejected as unresponsive because of size.

On January 10 of this year, Simkins wrote a letter to the Administrator, SBA, which says, in part:

> The effect of limiting projects under $500,000 to small business as you define it is reflected in a bid submitted by us to the Corps of Engineers invitation No. ENG–30–075–61–66, dismantling existing heating plant, Richard I. Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis., and construction of high temperature water central heating plant addition at McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N.J. Our bid was in the sum of $561,943; the next bid, which is a firm larger than ours, was $659,464. The third bid was $663,369.
>
> The Government would save $97,521, or 15 percent, on the base bid if this contract were awarded to us and $129,664 if the additive bid items were included. It is not in the interest of the Government to award this contract on the basis of small business as defined in the bid documents.

Indeed, it is not in the interest of the Government, nor the taxpayer whose interests the Government is supposed to watch over, to include such definitions and to increase costs by 15 percent. However, it was done despite all efforts to the contrary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another phase of this costly, unfair and unsound situation, the awarding of certificates of competency to small business firms by the SBA despite the best judgments of experts in the field.

And once again we turn to the C. G. Kershaw Constructing Co., Birmingham, Ala.

You will recall that in June, I mentioned this firm in connection with a report by the General Accounting Office dealing with the operation of the Government-owned concrete matting plant at Greenville, Miss. In the Greenville case, Kershaw's operations cost the Government an estimated $35,000 or 6 percent extra because the firm just was not competent to handle the job.

Well, having been stung once, the Corps of Engineers was even more wary of the Kershaw concern. On July 18, 1961, bids were opened at Memphis for pile dike construction on the Mississippi River in Tennessee. Four of the firms submitting bids qualified as small business concerns. Kershaw was low bidder at $399,350. However, one of the other bidders protested on the basis that Kershaw was not qualified to do the work.

The Corps of Engineers investigated and determined that the Birmingham firm was not qualified, both on the basis of past performance and on the basis of its manpower, equipment and skills for this particular type of work.

I am told by experts in the field that it takes very highly trained personnel to do this kind of work and that the only people who do perform well are those who have been in the field since early manhood and have grown up in this kind of construction.

Kershaw neither had the right type of manpower nor the right kind of equipment for the job so the Corps disqualified the firm.

Again, Kershaw appealed to the SBA and was once again given a certificate of competency—this despite the sad experience the Government had already had with Kershaw, and despite the fact that Kershaw listed among its principal assets some $37,000 worth of claims against the Government resulting from the Greenville dealings.

Kershaw got the job.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy there was an adage which went something like this: "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." This is a pretty sound piece of advice; it seems to me odd that SBA and the men who run it should take this advice.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned before that this set-aside program in general construction is not good. In some specialized fields it is particularly onerous. I have mentioned dredging. There are other similar situations. For example, I can cite the matter of drilling and grouting companies.

This is a highly specialized field. Whenever a dam is being designed, the engineers must know exactly what kind of subsoil there is, what kind of foundation rock, and so forth. To get this information requires diamond-bit drilling by experts who withdraw a core which is in turn examined by the geologists and engineers.

In the past 15 to 20 years there have been over 1,000 companies which have attempted to do this type of work. Only about six have remained constantly in the field. The others have gone under financially.

Of the six, three could well be considered big business firms because they not only do the drilling themselves, they manufacture equipment and drills, bits, and so forth and sell them to other drilling companies. The other three are small firms which do just about $5 million worth of work annually.

Another feature of the drilling business is the speculative nature of all bidding. If we knew what was under the earth's surface at the location of a dam, we would not need drillers. So, a drilling firm may find large sandstone deposits and cut through them like butter. On the other hand, they may run into granite boulders and break bit after bit, drill rig after rig. The cost could become fantastic in this event.

Still another feature involves the mobilization costs. The jobs are widely scattered and costs shoot up rapidly if the job is more than a few miles from headquarters. As a result, the six firms which have remained competitive have headquarters locations scattered all over the country so they can be near any potential job.

Still another feature of this field of construction work is that all jobs are small. There are not any $500,000 jobs at all. The average cost is right around $14,000.

The result of the SBA set-aside program is that at least one of the six competitive, good companies in this field has been eliminated from all Government work because, during the past 3 years, the firm has averaged between $5 million and $6 million.

Thus, the firm, Boyles Bros. Drilling Co. of Salt Lake City, Utah, has been knocked out of 25 percent of its normal work. Because of the SBA program, Boyles Bros., now considered a large business, is, within the next 2 or 3 years, going to be a small business.

Mr. Speaker, this just does not make sense. We have raised an umbrella of subsidy over one segment of an industry and we are destroying the incentive of the rest of that industry to grow, to compete, and to make a reasonable profit.

The end result is added cost to the taxpayers, another step toward socialism.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the great explorer Christopher Columbus, I have issued the following press release and express the hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation declaring October 12 a national holiday.

Congressman DANIELS will commemorate Columbus Day by asking the Judiciary Committee to make 1961 "the last year in which Columbus Day lacks Federal recognition."

DANIELS is one of the prime supporters of legislation to make Columbus Day a national holiday.

In his letter to the committee DANIELS said, "it seems singularly ungrateful for a nation which owes its very birth to Christopher Columbus to fail to give him the recognition his courageous exploits deserve."

DANIELS particularly stressed the importance of Columbus Day as a symbol of inter-American friendship. Noting that October 12 is a national holiday in at least 13 neighboring American republics, DANIELS said that "Columbus' discovery of the American Continent is a poignant reminder of our mutual origins and of the history we share with our neighbors to the south."

"As we endeavor to strengthen our bonds with Latin American," DANIELS continued, "we should surely not ignore this opportunity to publicize our common heritage. We can give a moral boost to our alliance for progress program if we designate October 12 as an occasion to dramatize inter-American brotherhood and solidarity."

Congressman DANIELS also sent a copy of his letter to President Kennedy, who himself has repeatedly stressed the historical bonds which unite the two Americas.

In his letter to the Judiciary Committee DANIELS urged the committee to hold hearings on the Columbus Day bill "as soon as Congress reconvenes in January."

The large number of Congressmen who have sponsored similar bills, DANIELS pointed out "is eloquent testimony to the fact that there exists in this Congress widespread sentiment in favor of giving Columbus Day national status."

If the Judiciary Committee will grant its prompt approval," he concluded, "I am most confident that the bill will have no difficulty whatsoever in passing the House."

Statement of Hon. Russell Long of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on September 12 the Small Business Administration conducted a hearing into size definition changes in regard to dredging companies here in Washington. The dredging companies had protested against the previous definition as it applied to them. They were grouped with other companies in the general category of construction and a small firm was described as one which did less than $5 million worth of work, on the average over the preceding 5 years, was not dominant in its field and was completely independent.

I personally feel that this definition is unsound as it applies to the entire construction field, but it is particularly unsound when applied to dredging companies. The equipment involved is huge and extremely expensive. Crews are skilled and labor costs are high. It costs several thousands of dollars a day to have a dredge tied up at the riverbank. So, to recoup their expenses, even small dredging concerns—by comparison—must do a tremendous volume of business at low profit. Competition is keen in this field, particularly for government contracts, since almost all the work done by dredging is for government—State, National, or local.

For these various reasons the dredging companies complained, and they got a hearing. Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, long interested in this problem as it concerns construction and particularly as it concerns river dredging work, appeared at the hearing. He made a very fine statement and a very comprehensive one. I have asked and gotten his permission to place the statement in the RECORD, which I do at this point:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

Mr. Chairman, as a charter member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I am appearing this morning in defense of the small business set-aside program for which I voted. I fully realize that the subject of this hearing is an investigation into the definition of

small business for the hydraulic dredging industry under the Small Business Act. I also realize, Mr. Chairman, that it is impossible to talk about the definition of small business with respect to this industry without making reference to the set-aside program, and I hereby respectfully request that you broaden the scope of this meeting to permit such reference by those who will testify here today. I assure you that any reference made to the set-aside program by members of the industry from the section of the country that I represent, will be closely tied in with the subject of the hearing.

I said that I am appearing in defense of the set-aside program. I say that because I firmly believe that unless the Small Business Administration takes another careful look at the manner in which the set-aside program is being applied to the hydraulic dredging industry, it is in danger of losing the entire program.

Perhaps it would be well to go into a little history of the hydraulic dredging industry as it pertains to the Gulf area. Thirty years ago, when the U.S. Government assumed full responsibility for flood control it undertook a major dredging program entirely with Government-owned and operated plant. The key to the master plan for flood control in the Lower Mississippi Valley was a pilot channel through the Atchafalaya Basin to make it possible for that basin to convey 1½ million cubic feet of water to the Gulf of Mexico. That pilot channel was dug entirely with Government-owned and operated plant.

In the postdepression days, it soon became evident that the U.S. Government should get out of the dredging business. In response to the mandate, a number of dredging companies who are represented here today, began to build, at considerable expense, hydraulic dredges that could undertake the work of flood control and navigation for a Nation that needed a lot of work on its waterways to protect its people from floods and to provide arteries of commerce necessary to the prosperity of the surrounding country. These companies did their job well. They built the necessary equipment and, at a reasonable price, they did 90 percent of the job of floodproofing the lower valley. They also provided navigating depths on the principal waterways of the valley.

It now appears that, through our definitions of small business, we are telling these contractors that they can no longer participate in this work. Frankly, I do not believe we had such a thing in mind when we organized the Small Business Administration.

During the past weeks I have been examining figures with reference to the hydraulic dredging industry as it affects my section of the country. I have come to the conclusion that, proceeding on an arbitrary definition of small business, we are attempting to protect people that do not need protection. We are protecting a relatively few people at the expense of the people who have built the industry. Those who will testify will bring out some interesting figures that I recommend to your careful study.

An examination of the records reveals that, without the help of set-asides, the so-called small business people will hold their own against the so-called big business people. I am alarmed to note that the trend of plans for the future seems to indicate that the so-called small business people will completely stifle the so-called big business people.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, if we continue the way we are going, we will succeed in bringing down public opinion against the entire small business program. I would hate to see the program killed after we have made so much progress. I voted for it, but I would have to vote against it if it ceased to accomplish the purpose for which it was organized.

We seem to have adopted the principle that in every industry we have big and little business. I do not believe that is so.

There are industries or segments of industries where we have no big business, or, if you prefer, where we have no small business. I believe this is the case in the hydraulic dredging industry.

If a firm is engaged in the hydraulic dredging industry, it must expend considerable funds for highly specialized equipment. This is equipment that will be utilized possibly only 50 percent of the time. This equipment must be manned by men of skill—men that must be retained in slack periods because their substitutes cannot be recruited on the open market. Such a firm must gross a considerable amount in a year in order to break even. I do not believe that our monetary criteria is a fair criteria in arriving at a distinction between big and little business in this industry.

In my opinion we have only small businesses in the hydraulic dredging industry. Do what you will with the definition, I do not think that you can manipulate it to prove that there is any real big business here.

It has been suggested that we are using the wrong criteria in attempting to measure this industry. It has been pointed out that we should, perhaps, use the size of the equipment rather than a monetary figure. This could very well be the case and it is something you should study when you consider your set-aside criteria.

In any event, it is my feeling that, proceeding along our present lines, we are about to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. We are about to force out of business the people that made the necessary investment in order to do the work our country needs. This should not be the goal of our small business program.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Small Business Administration carefully review its criteria with respect to the hydraulic dredging industry. This review should determine whether or not there is actually a basis for a line to be drawn between big and little business in the industry. If such a line actually exists, and I do not believe it does, an entirely new basis should be found to determine that line.

In the meantime, I would strongly recommend that hydraulic dredging set-asides be discontinued until such time as a true definition is arrived at for the hydraulic dredging industry.

Finally, in further studies into this industry I request that the following important factors be taken into thorough consideration:

(a) The hydraulic dredging companies of this Nation are an organization in being for use during times of emergency. Their equipment is on file in every engineer district in the country and can be called upon when needed.

(b) Prices on hydraulic dredging in the recent past have been most reasonable. They reflect the advantages of competition. We should not force our taxpayers to pay more by stifling competition.

(c) Insistence upon the elimination of competition on most dredging jobs will give rise to the unsavory practice of bidding by brokers who have no equipment, but who will bid on the basis that they can shop the job after they are the successful bidder. It will give rise to deception and cheating within the rules. We certainly could not encourage that.

(d) The elimination of competition is not the American way of doing business.

Mr. Chairman, I said that I am appearing this morning in defense of the small business set-aside program. The surest way to kill that program is to attempt to apply it where it is not applicable. I feel that it is not applicable in the hydraulic dredging industry and I urge you to take another good look before you attempt to force it where there is no room for it to do a job. I urge you to study carefully what is said here today.

Set-Asides Gets Bigger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under the original Small Business Administration decree on construction set-asides, the Department of Defense was forced to set aside automatically all jobs of $500,000 or less for exclusive bidding by small contractors. At the same time the SBA reserved for itself the right to examine all bigger projects and to demand set-asides on them as well.

We have had examples of projects costing up to $5.5 million set aside. In one, at Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., this operation cost the taxpayers an additional $165,000.

We now have an example of a $6.5 million project, the construction of a spillway at Proctor Dam and Reservoir, Leon River, Tex. This project is so big that if one small concern takes on the job, it will automatically preclude itself from bidding on any other set-aside Government contract because it will have become a big business firm under SBA rules and regulations.

I have received a letter from Mr. George R. Drake, a vice president of Johnson, Drake & Piper, commenting on this situation which I think merits the attention of my colleagues. I wish to place this letter in the RECORD at this point:

JOHNSON, DRAKE & PIPER, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Hon. PHILIP WEAVER,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Subject: Small business set-aside for Proctor Dam and Reservoir.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEAVER: We have just received a copy of the plans and specifications for the completion of embankment and construction of spillway at Proctor Dam and Reservoir, Leon River, Tex., invitation No. CIVENG-41-443-62-8, dated September 21, 1961, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, office of the district engineer, Fort Worth District, 100 West Vickery, Fort Worth, Tex., bid opening at 2 p.m., c.s.t., October 31, 1961.

This job has on the cover sheet, in large block printing, the following notation: "Bids solicited from small business concerns only" (see par. 11 of the invitation). Also paragraph 13 of addendum No. 1, dated September 27, 1961, reiterates the small business set-aside and defines a "small business concern," a "labor surplus area," and a "labor surplus area concern." It would appear from this definition that if an area is declared a labor surplus area by the Department of Labor, or if a concern in this area does less than $6,250,000 gross business per year, they would qualify to bid this job under the small business set-aside.

Our concern about this particular job is that our engineers have estimated the cost of this job could run in a range of $5½ to $6½ million, and that it is entirely possible by double shifting and/or overtime work to complete this job in 1 year. It would appear, even at the $6,250,000 qualification for a small business concern, that this bid is illegally constituted under the very definition of a small business concern in that the small business concern could be completing $6½ million worth of work during the course of 1 year's operations.

At this time it is impossible to state that the cost will definitely be over $6,250,000, or that the work could be done in 1 year or less. However, the strong possibility that both of these circumstances could take place would seem to merit a possible review of this particular job, and could possibly result in taking it off the market until SBA has satisfactorily proved that the two possibilities mentioned above are not possible.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE R. DRAKE,
Vice President.

Capt. William B. Clark Dies—Norwalk Hour Advertising Manager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Capt. William B. Clark, a close friend and highly valued citizen of Norwalk, Conn., recently died after a long illness. His loss is deeply felt not only by his family and large circle of friends, but also by his community. In tribute to him and in sympathy to his family, I respectfully submit the following editorial from the Norwalk Hour, which succinctly records Captain Clark's praiseworthy accomplishments and the esteem in which he was held:

CAPT. WILLIAM B. CLARK DIES—NORWALK HOUR ADVERTISING MANAGER—PIONEER ADVOCATE OF IMPROVEMENT OF LOCAL HARBOR FACILITIES; SERVICES MONDAY AT 1:30 P.M., FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH ON GREEN

William Buchanan Clark, Sr., 61, advertising manager of the Norwalk Hour for 20 years, died at his home, 10 Newtown Terrace, Friday afternoon, after a long illness.

He was first stricken seriously ill in December 1958, and was in and out of the Norwalk Hospital seven times, but he remained cheerful almost to the end and fought a courageous fight against his illness.

He was born in Chicago, Ill., on May 6, 1900, but lived in Norwalk for most of his lifetime. He became associated with the advertising department of the Norwalk Hour 25 years ago and was named manager of the department 5 years later.

Surviving are his wife, the former Anne Moore Stewart; two children by marriage, Durland Stewart, Jr., of Norwalk, and Mrs. Marjorie Stewart Ball, of Westport; and two children by a former marriage, William B. Clark, Jr., of Florida, and Miss Laurel Clark, of New Jersey.

Funeral services will be conducted at the First Congregational Church on the Green Monday at 1:30 p.m. with Rev. Dr. Harold Edgar Martin, pastor, officiating. Interment will be private. There will be no calling hours at the Raymond Funeral Home.

He was a member of many fishing and hunting organizations, and was a member of the Board of Governors of the South Norwalk Boat Club, where he was known to all as Capt. Bill Clark.

AVID ANGLER

Mr. Clark was an avid boatman and fisherman and dedicated a major portion of his spare time to campaigning for improved harbor facilities, safety on the water, elimination of pollution—always working in the best interests of the thousands of area families who enjoy recreational boating.

He was chairman of the first Norwalk Harbor Committee and it was largely through his efforts that the East Norwalk Boat Basin was created several years ago. With his committee, he convinced the city council of the need for public mooring facilities and floats were installed at the basin, adjacent to Seaview Avenue Park. Today more than 200 boatowners enjoy these facilities.

As interest in boating here mushroomed, accompanied by the dangers of heavy traffic in the harbor, he campaigned for a police patrol and in 1957 the first police boat went on duty in local waters. It was loaned to the city by Mr. Clark's close friend, Louis J. Gardella, owner of the Rex Marine Center, and operated by a member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary with a uniformed policeman on board. In 1958, the Norwalk Boat Works loaned a boat to the city.

But Mr. Clark was not satisfied with the temporary loaning arrangement and had kept up his insistence on city-ownership of a police boat. His insistence on city-ownership of its own patrol boat has led to the formation of a marine division within the police department starting with one speedy boat.

SPRITE ISLE COMMODORE

He was one of the organizers of the Sprite Island Yacht Club and became its commodore during the trying times when it moved into its new home on Sprite Island. He served for nearly 3 years, guiding the club to great successes and when he resigned in July 1953, because of business pressures. he was given a surprise testimonial dinner and presented with a plaque attesting to his achievements for the club and expressing appreciation to him for his leadership.

CIVIL DEFENSE AID

He always found time despite a busy schedule to be active in worthwhile civic affairs. When Col. Seth Wiard, U.S. Army retired, was named director of Norwalk Civil Defense, Colonel Wiard called on Mr. Clark to form a marine arm for the CD organization. Mr. Clark went to the boat clubs, convinced members of the need for a marine emergency unit, and signed up more than 200 boatowners who could be called within minutes to respond to any emergency.

It was his interest in boating that led him to write a boating and fishing column for the Norwalk Hour. Marinas and stores selling fishing and boating equipment quickly became aware of the big reading public attracted to the column and asked for advertising on the same page as the column.

AWARD WINNER

In 1956, the Hour carried 33,600 lines of boating advertising. Under Mr. Clark's promotion, this figure leaped to 135,442 lines in 1957, not including the many columns of news, and photographs accompanying the boating advertising. Because of the promotion of recreational boating, under Mr. Clark's direction, the Norwalk Hour in 1958 was awarded Boating's Golden Award, highest honor a newspaper can receive from the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers.

Clark redoubled his efforts in the promotion of boating the following year and as a result the Norwalk Hour won Boating's Golden Award for the second straight year. It ranked sixth in the United States, among all newspapers of all sizes, in boating linage. The golden ship's wheel came to the Hour again last year.

PUBLIC SERVICE

One of his ideas which caught the fancy of the judges in the Golden Award contest was the distribution of plastic bags to boat owners to precent the discard of refuse in harbors. Mr. Clark distributed thousands of these bags purchased by the Norwalk Hour, to marinas, boat clubs, and fishing equipment merchants.

He owned boats for many years, his latest being a 25-foot sea skiff named *Bill's Ahbi IV*. With its radio antenna, long fishing pulpit extending over the bow and outriggers reaching toward the sky, his boat is one of the best known in the harbor.

He promoted many fishing contests between boats and stimulated greater general interest in local waters. For the past 2 years the Hour has sponsored an areawide flounder fishing tournament, under Mr. Clark's direction.

His fishing interests were not exclusively in salt water. He liked to fish area streams and ponds also and each year at the start of the trout season, he always could be found at dawn trudging his way to a favorite spot. And he usually came back with his limit long before noon.

Mr. Clark was a man who enjoyed life. In addition to his intense interest in boating, he enjoyed playing cards, particularly cribbage. He relished the rivalry of a good game of darts or shuffleboard. He was known as a tough competitor, a man who liked to win, but was respected as a good loser. He was a great "ribber" and his penetrating barbs were the talk of the boat clubs, but he proved time and time again that he could "take it" when the tables were reversed.

POPULAR FIGURE

He was one of the best known and best liked boatmen in Norwalk, and he will be missed. When the seriousness of his illness became known in the South Norwalk Boat Club, where he was an active member, the Monday night meetings were less jovial than before. There was a major concern among members, who asked at each meeting, "How's Bill Clark?"

His accomplishments in the field of boating will live long after him. He will be remembered as a good family man, a good sportsman, a good citizen, a gentleman.

Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of West Virginia, in redistricting the State's congressional representation has created a new First Congressional District. In doing so the legislature added seven new counties to those I presently represent, and have assigned to four of my colleagues a total of six counties which have heretofore been my primary responsibility.

To the citizens of the seven new counties—Brooke, Hancock, Marion, Marshall, Ohio, Taylor, and Wetzel—I extend my greetings. I pledge to them that I shall serve their interests in the

same manner I have been serving the interests of the citizens of the old Third District.

To those citizens of the six "old" counties—Braxton, Calhoun, Doddridge, Gilmer, Harrison, and Lewis—this is to express my pleasure that our ties are not broken.

In order to more efficiently serve the newly constituted district, I intend to establish an office in the McLure Hotel, Wheeling, primarily for the convenience of those folk living in the upper Ohio Valley area. My established field office in the Clarksburg post office will serve the residents of the interior areas.

Peterson Evaluates 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1st session of the 87th Congress has adjourned, I would like to express my deep appreciation to both the leadership and to my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, for the help and assistance given to me in this, my first year of representing the First Congressional District of Utah.

I have examined the record of this session and in my opinion it will be long remembered for its antirecession legislation and for its bipartisan support of the largest peacetime military budget in history.

Over $47 billion, more than half of the money appropriated this year, is for national security. We have demanded a speedup in our space program, acceleration of the Minuteman and Polaris submarine program and a buildup of our ground and sea forces. All this is incident to an adequate defense of our country which, I believe you will agree, is proper spending to meet the Communist menace throughout the world.

ANTIRECESSION LEGISLATION

This Congress opened during a business recession. The President was forced to ask Congress to strengthen our domestic economy with an increased flow of money for such programs as aid to chronically depressed areas; emergency feed grain program; expansion of social security benefits; saline water conversion; water pollution control; easing mortgage credit; and a comprehensive housing program.

The stimulation of these programs has already paid national dividends. The September issue of Business Week states "Business Heads for Record High."

There are still sections of my congressional district which are economically depressed, counties like Carbon and Emery which are suffering an economic setback because of the depressed coal industry. In cooperation with the Carbon County Democratic Committee, the Price Chamber of Commerce, and civic organizations, I am sponsoring an economic conference for southeastern Utah with officials of the Area Redevelopment Administration to be held in Price, Utah, the middle of October. I am hopeful that roundtable discussions with Government representatives and civic leaders will result in a better understanding of the problems of the area and ultimately lead to a plan of renewed economic stability.

FEDERAL AID TO AIRPORTS IN UTAH

Another expanded program of this Congress which will have a definite impact upon the economy of Utah is the 3-year extension of the Federal aid to airport program. The FAA Administrator estimates that $697,789 will be spent in Utah during the next year and contract agreements may be made for an additional expenditure of $496,211 in the following 2 years. Airports within the First Congressional District of Utah included in the FAA Administrator's survey as eligible for Federal assistance upon proper application are:

Brigham City	$71,000
Cedar City	171,000
Escalante	170,000
Green River	143,000
Loa	5,000
Manti	32,000
Tremonton	51,000
Monticello	35,000
Nephi	207,000
Ogden	86,000
Richfield	144,000
St. George	69,000
Vernal	60,000

This Congress has been of a conservative nature. It refused to finance the foreign aid program with so-called backdoor spending on a 5-year advance basis; and refused to approve the construction of a Government-operated powerplant at the atomic plant in Hanford, Wash. It is significant that all tax reform proposals and the medical care/social security program were held over until the second session in January. Also held up were the Youth Conservation Corps bill, a proposal to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs, and an overhaul of unemployment insurance, just to mention a few. The Federal aid to education bill was turned down.

TAX DOLLAR BROKEN DOWN

The people of Utah by heritage and background are conservative. They are frugal and self-sufficient. They know the value of money and watch the tax dollar. Knowing this, I asked the Budget Bureau to give me the figures on where our tax dollar comes from and a breakdown on where it is spent. I received the following:

Where it comes from: 55 cents, individual income taxes; 25 cents, corporation income taxes; 12 cents, excise taxes; and 8 cents, all other receipts.

Where it is being spent: 58 cents, major national security; 10 cents, interest; 6 cents, veterans; 6 cents, agriculture; 20 cents, other.

Interesting to note is that over half of each tax dollar—58 cents—is spent on national security and space programs. Only 20 cents of each tax dollar represents the largest single nondefense expenditure. This expenditure covers the cost of all major nondefense programs and includes such items as natural resources, educational assistance—particularly to federally impacted areas in lieu of taxes—highway construction and public housing. Also included in the 20 cents of each tax dollar in this class are those programs such as small business loans, REA loans, area redevelopment loans, college housing and community facility loans, and so forth, which have repayment provisions and hence are not operating expenditures as such. As nearly as I can determine, from one-third to one-half of this type expenditure will be repaid to the Government.

UTAH'S WATER DEVELOPMENT

In Utah the most vital expenditure under this 20-cent category is water development—reclamation, irrigation, soil conservation, and so forth. This Congress, I am proud to say, has done much to promote and further the great reclamation projects and the best utilization of Utah's water facilities.

The Colorado River storage project is one of the greatest projects in the State of Utah. However, there are many other projects now under investigation or nearing completion.

A breakdown of the funds appropriated this year for Utah's water projects is as follows:

Weber Basin project	$8,404,000
Central Utah project: Vernal unit	1,248,000
Advance planning Central Utah project	1,095,000
Advance planning Emery County project	22,820
Emery County Project fiscal 1962	500,000
Army Engineers:	
Weber River	50,000
Price River (Willow Creek)	20,000
Project investigations:	
Bear River project	128,200
Lower Colorado Basin	42,000
Dixie project	10,496
Gray Canyon project	40,000
Bonneville Basin	1,000

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES DUE APPRECIATION

Mr. Speaker, a report of this year's activities would be incomplete without a word of heartfelt thanks to all the officials of the Government agencies with whom we work. Sometimes our problems defy solution, but wherever assistance can be rendered I have found these dedicated workers, both in Utah and in Washington, to be agreeably responsive. It is through such cooperation that many improvements were made this year in Utah, a few of which I should mention.

Resurfacing of 6.5 miles of rim road at Cedar Breaks National Monument.

Federal Communications Commission approval of permission to operate radio station KUTA at Blanding.

Labor Department designation of Carbon and Emery Counties as areas eligible for technical and financial assistance under area redevelopment program.

Inclusion of Federal court space in new Federal building at Ogden.

Approval by Agriculture Department and Budget Bureau of $811,000 loan for Weber-Box Elder Conservation District application for assistance in constructing an $877,000 water storage and distribution system.

Interior Department approval of the withdrawal of nearly 5,000 acres of high-

grade potash deposits, located in the Seven Mile area of Grand County, from oil and gas leasing, thereby making it possible for the Texas Gulf-Sulphur Co. to jointly develop the area with the Cane Creek deposit and justifying the erection of a $30 million mill.

Federal Communications Commission approval of TV translator stations to serve Carbon and Duchesne Counties, as well as other areas.

Agriculture Department designation of all Utah counties as emergency areas eligible to receive assistance under livestock feed program.

Agriculture Department and congressional approval of Blue Creek-Howell watershed project in Box Elder County.

Post Office approval of a contract station in North Ogden-Pleasant View area to provide facilities for purchase of stamps, money orders, parcel post mailing, and other receiving services.

Post Office Department extension of star route service from Collinston to Wheelon in Box Elder County from three to six times a week.

In submitting this accounting of my stewardship to the people of the First Congressional District of Utah, permit me to enumerate the legislative proposals that I introduced or jointly sponsored that have been enacted into public law. None of these would have been possible without the personal guidance of our very able leadership plus the neighborly and friendly advice of my colleagues.

Public Law 87–170: To permit waters users associations, irrigation and reservoir companies to sponsor projects under Federal Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, thus remedying the following seven pending applications which could not qualify prior to enactment of this bill:

Blanding Irrigation Co. in San Juan County, Dry Fork Sinks project in Uintah County, Antelope Irrigation Co. project in Duchesne County, High Creek project in Cache County, Levan Irrigation Co. in Juab County, Upper Kanab project in Kane County, and Minersville project in Beaver County.

Public Law 87–192: A private bill for the relief of J. A. Workman of Roosevelt, permitting him to resume gilsonite mining development work which he had started at considerable expense under lease executed with the Ute Indian Tribe and which had subsequently been invalidated for technical reasons through no fault of his own.

Public Law 87–81: A bill to change the boundary of Cedar Breaks National Monument by adding 111 acres to the southwest section and excluding 129 acres from the northwest section to conform more closely to the natural rim of the canyon.

Public Law 87–106: This legislation amended the act of April 6, 1949 so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such act until December 31, 1961. This authorization would have expired June 30, 1961.

Public Law 87–137: Provided for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor. Mrs. Esther Peterson of Provo was appointed to fill this position and was confirmed by the Senate.

Public Law 87–300: A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study covering the causes and prevention of injuries, health hazards, and other health and safety conditions in metal and nonmetallic mines, excluding coal and lignite mines. This is a modified version of the original bill introduced by me.

Public Law 87–347: A bill to authorize limited subsidy payments to stabilize small domestic miners of lead and zinc. This provides temporary relief to the basic problems of lead and zinc mines and mills in Juab County which have been forced to shut down or curtail operations due to instability of prices and supply through excessive foreign imports.

BOMARC-MINUTEMAN-SERGEANT PROGRAMS—VITAL

In conclusion I wish to reaffirm my interest in our defense program as it relates to the State of Utah. I have made a strong appeal for the continuation of the Bomarc program. I pledge my best efforts toward an expended program for the production of the Minuteman and the Sergeant missiles.

Voting Record of Hon. Steven B. Derounian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress finally came to an end the morning of September 27—a session of greater than average length, but less than average accomplishment, despite the fact that the President's political party controls the Senate by a 2-to-1 margin and the House by a 3-to-2 majority.

At this time I wish to report to the people of my district on my votes and actions as their Representative during this 1st session of the 87th Congress. I had an attendance record of 97 percent on quorum calls and record votes.

The descriptions of the measures on which I have voted are brief and for the purpose of identification only. It would be impossible in limited space to discuss each issue thoroughly. Upon request, however, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information on any particular bill. Some measures I have supported, some I have voted against. In many instances, I had hoped for something better than was presented. I should like here to comment on a few of these bills.

Although business has recovered from a temporary slump, as was expected, unemployment remains at a high level. The latest report in September indicates that 4,085,000 persons remain unemployed. Neither the leadership in Congress nor the administration has demonstrated any ability to decrease this number sufficiently.

Unemployment compensation was once again extended, and I voted for this legislation. The people should know, however, that when aid to dependent children was discussed the administration objected to an amendment which would have permitted an unemployed parent to qualify for Federal aid while performing services for a public agency, as recommended by the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member. This refusal of the administration became the basis of the problem faced by the city of Newburgh, N.Y.

Social security benefits were broadened further, and this legislation I supported, also. Again, however, during Ways and Means Committee deliberations, the administration refused to accept the proposal of the committee's Republican members to liberalize the present retirement test so that an individual could earn up to $2,400 a year without full deduction of benefit entitlement.

A "depressed areas" bill, enacted into law, contains language that can open doors to influence and favoritism in connection with public loans and grants and is without any protection against the pirating of industry from one State to another. I objected to this politically fraught legislation.

Although I had hoped to support a minimum wage bill, raising the hourly rate to $1.25, as Campaigner Kennedy promised the people, the administration requested the Congress to limit this increase to $1.15 for the next 2 years.

I was glad to have the opportunity to vote for the measure creating additional and sorely needed Federal judgeships, originally asked for by President Eisenhower in 1957 and in the succeeding years of his administration; however, the Democratic Congress refused to take action on his request.

The National Defense Education Act and Federal aid to impacted school areas extensions were brought to the House floor under suspension of rules. This, along with the Calendar Wednesday procedure, attempted in the case of Federal aid to education legislation, demonstrated conclusively that the Rules Committee cannot "bottle up" legislation on which the leadership sincerely desires action, as had been claimed earlier in the year when the Rules Committee was personally "packed" by the President.

Before leaving office, President Eisenhower had recommended a budget for fiscal year 1962 in the sum of $80.9 billion. The Kennedy administration increased this request and was successful in obtaining from the Congress authorization of $20 billion in back-door spending—without congressional supervision—and this sum added to the $93 billion appropriated through regular channels now brings the total estimated spending for fiscal year 1962 to $113 billion, a record high in spending.

To cover his increased deficit spending, the President requested and obtained from Congress an increase in the national debt ceiling to $13 billion, bringing it now to a total of $298 billion. I voted against this unprecedented

increase which came after only 6 months under the new administration.

The act establishing a Peace Corps was passed after striking out the following provision:

The Peace Corps shall not perform service in any foreign country in which, by reason of law or official policy, any member of the Peace Corps will be discriminated against because of his race, creed, or color.

I did not support this action.

Tax reforms sorely needed were not enacted. Although my Committee on Ways and Means held 32 days of hearings on the subject, the chairman of the committee had to announce that a bill embodying President Kennedy's tax recommendations would not be reported to the Congress this year. As a matter of fact, the inability of the Secretary of the Treasury to offer tax recommendations which could stand up under analysis and study by the committee has made impossible any final decision within this session of the Congress on the President's recommendations. The responsibility for this stalemate must rest with the administration, and particularly with the Treasury Department.

Here is my record:

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn 258, Halleck 170.)	Halleck.
		H. Res. 1, barring George O. Chambers from taking oath as Representative pending investigation by House Administration Committee of congressional election in Indiana's 5th District.	
3	Jan. 3	On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Adopted 252 to 166.)	Nay.
4	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 127, enlarging the Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members:	
5	Jan. 31	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 217 to 212.)	Nay.
6	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:	
7	Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed 392 to 30.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 167, authorizing funds of the Committee on Un-American Activities for 1961:	
8	Mar. 1	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 412 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5188, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961:	
9	Mar. 7	On amendment providing an additional $29,990,000 for aid to schools in impacted areas. (Adopted 339 to 62.)	Yea.
10	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
12	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:	
13	Mar. 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section permitting Secretary of Agriculture to drive down market price by selling Government-owned corn and grain sorghums at 17 percent below price-support price. (Rejected 196 to 214.)	Yea.
14	Mar. 9	On passage. (Passed 209 to 202.)	Nay.
15	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:	
17	Mar. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 231 to 185.)	Nay.
18	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5463, amending and extending the Sugar Act to Dec. 31, 1962:	
19	Mar. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 284 to 129.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:	
20	Mar. 22	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 363 to 31.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5000, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
22	Mar. 23	On amendment requiring feasibility study before authorizing $3,812,000 for transferring Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 269 to 145.)	Nay.
23	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of dollar volume of sales of employer:	
27	Mar. 24	On amendment substituting language increasing minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of interstate operations test. (Adopted 216 to 203.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 24	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 196 to 224.)	Nay.
29	Mar. 24	On passage. (Passed 341 to 78.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
32	Mar. 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill, H.R. 5043. (Rejected 126 to 291.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed 251 to 167.)	Nay.
34	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
37	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 912, providing 70 additional circuit and district judgeships:	
38	Apr. 19	On passage. (Passed 336 to 76.)	Yea.
39	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6027, liberalizing certain social security benefits and increasing social security tax:	
40	Apr. 20	On passage. (Passed 400 to 14.)	Yea.
41	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6518, making appropriations for inter-American social and economic program and the Chilean reconstruction program:	
42	Apr. 25	On passage. (Passed 330 to 82.)	Yea.
43	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
44	Apr. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 193.)	Nay.
45	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage on dollar-volume test:	
46	May 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 230 to 196.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6441, increasing annual Federal grants for sewage treatment works from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 and the overall limit from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000:	
47	May 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce annual funds to $75,000,000 and overall limit to $750,000,000 and to require States after June 1964 to match all funds in excess of $50,000,000 annually. (Rejected 165 to 256.)	Yea.
48	May 3	On passage. (Passed 308 to 110.)	Nay.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
51	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
52	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program for 2 years:	
53	May 11	On passage. (Passed 231 to 157.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6094, increasing annual salary ceiling for Council of Economic Advisers personnel from $345,000 to $2,000,000:	
54	May 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce salary ceiling to $700,000. (Rejected 151 to 196.)	Yea.
55	May 11	On passage. (Passed 209 to 137.)	Nay.
56	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 284, providing for consideration of H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce:	
58	May 16	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 241 to 70.)	Yea.
59	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 226, expressing sense of Congress favoring collective sanctions by the Organization of American States against Castro government of Cuba:	
61	May 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed 404 to 2.)	Yea.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce	
62	May 17	On passage. (Passed 305 to 104.)	Yea.
63	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1852, authorizing additional construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1962:	
64	May 24	On passage. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 1986, repealing provision intended to prevent railroads from charging higher rates for carrying non-first-class mail than for carrying express matter:	
65	May 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to add amendment requiring the ICC to publish the difference in rates paid to the railroads by the Post Office and Railway Express Agency for carrying similar weight commodities. (Rejected 16 to 346.)	Not voting.
66	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1962:	
67	June 1	On passage. (Passed 256 to 71.)	Yea.
68	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7444, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1962:	
70	June 6	On amendment reducing the $250,000,000 for agricultural conservation program to $150,000,000. (Rejected 184 to 196.)	Yea.
71	June 6	On passage. (Passed 320 to 65.)	Nay.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7446, providing 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax and of certain excise tax rates:	
75	June 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to add language repealing the 10-percent transportation tax. (Rejected 189 to 196.)	Yea.
76	June 8	On passage. (Passed 295 to 88.)	Yea.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7053, providing that evidence should not be inadmissible in the District of Columbia courts solely because of a delay in arraignment (qualifies Mallory rule):	
78	June 12	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 104 to 252.)	Nay.
79	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
80	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 303, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Communications Commission:	
82	June 15	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 303 to 77.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 302, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Securities and Exchange Commission:	
83	June 15	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 176 to 212.)	Yea.
84	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6765, authorizing an amendment to charter of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock:	
85	June 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 18.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7712, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961:	
86	June 19	On passage. (Passed 292 to 63.)	Nay.
87	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 304, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Civil Aeronautics Board:	
88	June 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 213.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 305, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Trade Commission:	
89	June 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 221.)	Yea.
90	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6028, authorizing $4,900,000,000 in Federal housing programs over 4 years:	
95	June 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill extending existing programs for 1 year with a $1,100,000,000 authorization. (Rejected 197 to 215).	Yea.
96	June 22	On passage. (Passed 235 to 178.)	Nay.
97	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7677, increasing the national debt limit:	
99	June 26	On passage. (Passed 231 to 148.)	Nay.
100	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
101	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
103	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
104	June 28	On amendment deleting a provision prohibiting price differentials in favor of economically depressed areas. (Rejected 173 to 239.)	Nay.
105	June 28	On passage. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1922, authorizing $4,880,000,000 in housing programs over 4 years:	
106	June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 229 to 176.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 354, providing for a House of Representatives flag:	
107	June 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 108 to 270.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 225, granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact:	
108	June 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit Federal Government to nonvoting representation and exclude Federal Government from any financial responsibilities of the commission. (Rejected 92 to 257.).	Nay.
		H.R. 187, providing for judicial review of orders for deportation:	
109	July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 304 to 60.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5786, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore:	
110	July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 278 to 82.)	Nay.
111	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.J. Res. 435, providing for observance of the Department of Agriculture centennial:	
112	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Adopted 367 to 12.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2555, providing for advanced pay for civilian Government employees in emergency evacuations:	
113	July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 285 to 86.)	Yea.
114	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6874, authorizing appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
116	July 20	On adoption of the conference report. (Adopted 354 to 59.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 328, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the National Labor Relations Board:	
117	July 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 231 to 179.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 336, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration:	
118	July 20	On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of H. Res. 336. (Rejected 184 to 215.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
119	July 25	On amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 241 to 170.)	Nay.
120	July 25	On passage. (Passed 408 to 0.)	Yea.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
123	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H.J. Res. 120, authorizing the President to order 250,000 members of the Ready Reserves to active duty for up to 12 months and to extend present Armed Forces tours of duty:	
124	July 31	On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 403 to 2.)	Yea.
125	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2311, authorizing additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, to meet possible Berlin crisis:	
127	Aug. 2	On passage. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 30, granting the consent of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact:	
128	Aug. 2	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit participation of Federal Government to nonvoting representation. (Rejected 139 to 261.)	Yea.
129	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 1643, providing wheat and feed grains program for 1962, and extending other farm laws (Agricultural Act of 1961):	
130	Aug. 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 224 to 170.)	Nay.
131	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7856, reorganizing Federal Communications Commission to permit the FCC Board to delegate its functions in adjudicative cases to employees;	
132	Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed 198 to 150.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7728, authorizing the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to private aircraft owners:	
133	Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 307 to 78.)	Nay.
134	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 404, providing for House-Senate conference on H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1962:	
135	Aug. 8	On motion to table (kill) motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment providing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Rejected 164 to 235.)	Nay.
136	Aug. 8	On motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment authorizing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Adopted 235 to 164.)	Yea.
137	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8033, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to delegate certain duties to employee boards:	
138	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 212 to 174)	Yea.
139	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 406, providing for the consideration of S. 1815, providing an Assistant Secretary of Labor, to handle the problems of women workers:	
140	Aug. 9	On adoption of the resolution. (Adopted 369 to 16.)	Yea.
141	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6302, transferring Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, from Federal Government to Howard University:	
142	Aug. 9	On passage. (Passed 321 to 61.)	Yea.
143	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7851, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1962:	
144	Aug. 10	On adoption of conference report: (Adopted 383 to 0.)	Yea.
145	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
147	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
148	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
149	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
150	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
151	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
153	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8400, authorizing foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1962:	
157	Aug. 18	On passage. (Passed 287 to 140.)	Yea.
158	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
159	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8384, providing Federal penalties for airplane hijacking and other crimes committed aboard commercial aircraft:	
160	Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 373 to 5.)	Yea.
161	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
162	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7763, authorizing planning for U.S. participation in the New York World's Fair in 1964 and 1965:	
164	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 353 to 42.)	Yea.
165	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
166	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 84, subsidizing lead and zinc producers:	
167	Aug. 24	On passage. (Passed 196 to 172.)	Nay.
168	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8181, authorizing $20,000,000 for a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia:	
169	Aug. 28	On engrossment of and 3d reading of bill. (Ordered 223 to 120.)	Nay.
170	Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 208 to 135.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7176, providing for a national hog cholera eradication program:	
171	Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 337 to 3.)	Yea.
172	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8873, increasing readjustment payments to Armed Forces Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty:	
173	Aug. 29	On passage. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yea.
174	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6242, exempting certain Department of Justice attorneys from the salary ceilings in their civil service classification:	
175	Aug. 29	On passage. (Rejected. 172 to 223.)	Nay.
176	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8890, authorizing a program of Federal aid to education:	
177	Aug. 30	On motion to consider bill under Calendar Wednesday procedure. (Rejected 170 to 242.)	Nay.
178	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8028, authorizing $30,000,000 for studying juvenile delinquency:	
179	Aug. 30	On amendment restricting pilot projects to the District of Columbia. (Rejected 187 to 217.)	Yea.
		S. Con. Res. 34, expressing the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be seated in the United Nations:	
180	Aug. 31	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 395 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1983, authorizing foreign economic and military aid:	
181	Aug. 31	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 260 to 132.)	Yea.
182	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
183	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
184	Sept. 5	On amendment increasing military assistance by additional $300,000,000. (Adopted 242 to 151.)	Nay.
185	Sept. 5	On passage. (Passed 270 to 123.)	Yea.
186	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
187	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9000, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
188	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 378 to 32.)	Yea.
189	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8723, amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act:	
190	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 245 to 161, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8906, promoting educational and cultural exchanges between the United States and other nations:	
191	Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 66.)	Yea.
192	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
193	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Present.
194	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
195	Sept. 12	Quorum call	Present.
196	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
197	Sept. 13	On motion to agree to Senate amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 212 to 185.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary:	
198	Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 1963. (Adopted 300 to 106.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9076, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal 1962 (Public Works):	
199	Sept. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate funds for Upper Colorado River Basin transmission lines. (Rejected 182 to 24.)	Yea.
200	Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 377 to 31.)	Yea.
201	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
202	Sept. 13	On adoption of conference report and approval of construction of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash. (Rejected 155 to 251.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8102, extending the time for making grants under the Federal Airport Act:	
203	Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment fixing extension at 3 years. (Adopted 396 to 4.)	Yea.
204	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
205	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 287 to 97.)	Nay.
206	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 455, providing for a conference with Senate on H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program:	
207	Sept. 15	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 243 to 135.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 464, providing for the consideration of committee substitute amendment to H.R. 7927, adjusting postal rates:	
208	Sept. 15	On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Rejected 142 to 222.)	Nay.
209	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2393, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
210	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 342 to 18.)	Yea.
		S. 1459, adjusting longevity step increases for postal employees:	
211	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 361 to 4.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5751, providing for notification to recipients that his mail may contain Communist propaganda from abroad and providing for return to sender:	
212	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 369 to 2.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8914, amending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding participation in 1962 feed grain program:	
213	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 213 to 149, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
214	Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 305 to 53.)	Yea.
215	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
216	Sept. 19	On passage. (Passed 290 to 54.)	Nay.
217	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
218	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
219	Sept. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 253 to 78.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5628, providing Federal funds to study the establishment of a botanic garden in Hawaii:	
220	Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 215 to 125, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4172, establishing a Federal Council on the Arts:	
221	Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 166 to 173.)	Nay.
222	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 258, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
223	Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 142 to 159.)	Nay.
224	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
225	Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 228 to 71.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
226	Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 252 to 50.)	Nay.
227	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.
228	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 258, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
229	Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 97 to 173.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
230	Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 192 to 81.)	Not voting.
231	Sept. 26	On motion to agree with Senate amendment providing that foreign aid Inspector General need not honor a request for information from Congress if the President certifies he has forbidden him to do so.	Not voting.

Pike Reports on His First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to present to the approximately 950,000 residents of the First Congressional District of the State of New York, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my report on the record of the 1961 session of Congress, and of their Congressman. I will get this report into the hands of as many of them as possible through this means, but I have neither the equipment nor the resources to get it to all of them. I hope that those who choose to throw it away—because it comes from a member of the wrong party, perhaps—will at least throw it in some public place where other, weaker souls might chance to pick it up.

First, as to the congressional district itself. Early in the year 1961 the figures on the 1960 census were made available, and they showed what we all knew already—that nowhere in America is the population exploding faster than in the First Congressional District of the State of New York. From a population of approximately 350,000 in 1950 it had reached 906,187 by 1960. It includes 350,000 more people than the next largest district in the State of New York, and is the fourth largest in the country. Among other interesting items the census turned up was the fact that we have the highest percentage of privately owned homes of any area in the country—87 percent of us own our own homes.

We also have the highest percentage of letter writers in the country. This is not a statistic; it is an opinion. During the 9 months that the House was in session, my office in Washington received approximately 20,000 letters from the people of the district, and my office in Riverhead received several thousand more. These letters covered every subject imaginable—from queries as to whether the Veterans' Administration would pay for elastic hose and false teeth for disabled veterans, necessitated by wartime injury—yes—to whether I could get an errant husband transferred to a Federal penitentiary closer to home—no. The largest volume of mail—approximately 1,400 letters each—was concerned with the 2 subjects of Federal aid to education—great difference of opinion—and changes in the tax law—they were against them.

As to the Congress generally—it was a conservative one. With one exception the Congress appropriated less money than the administration asked for to carry out its varied programs. The single exception, of course, was military preparedness, and in this case the worsening international situation made a change imperative after the President submitted his budget. Without exception the House of Representatives was more conservative than the Senate. Time after time the House would refuse to accept the monetary recommendations which the Senate had already approved. There were 18 major administration requests for money, totaling $91.5 billion. The Senate approved $90.5 billion of this; the House $79.3 billion; and the final compromise figure passed was $86.6 billion—this is what Congress spent this year. It is a tremendous amount of money, but I believe that, in general, it was spent wisely. By far the largest amount, $47.6 billion, was spent directly on our own national defense, and $1.6 billion more was spent on military assistance to our allies. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I had the opportunity to hear our military leaders and Defense Department officials explain in detail the need for this tremendous expenditure. In general, I supported the itemized expenditures in committee, and without exception supported the final bills on the House floor.

The next largest appropriation for a single department, however, was one I could not support. This was a $6 billion appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. While the Department does many useful things, it is still using the bulk of its money in what I feel is a tremendously wasteful price support program on six basic agricultural commodities. I do not see any justification for continuing to pay price supports for

growing agricultural products when the Government already has on hand nearly $9 billion of such products, costing a million and a half dollars a day to store. Federal programs are certainly necessary to prevent overproduction of these commodities, but once the overproduction is stopped the price will rise to a point where the farmer can make a good living on the open market without the necessity of a Federal subsidy. I see no more reason to pay farmers for not growing too much than I see for paying motorists not to drive too fast.

Without going through all of the items with which Congress concerned itself this year, the general pattern of the legislation developed as follows. In the early days of the session the Congress was deeply concerned with the serious recession in which we found ourselves and quickly passed several antirecession measures. These included aid to depressed areas, temporary unemployment benefits, and aid to dependent children. I supported all of these emergency measures.

During the middle period of the long session, the Congress was occupied with long-term programs aimed at keeping both our economy and our defenses strong. I supported all of the defense measures and over half of the rest of them. The defense bills and the farm bill I have already discussed; but among the other matters which came up during this period were liberalization of the social security and minimum wage laws, which I supported, and a housing bill which I supported in the House, but which was made so liberal by the Senate that it seemed financially irresponsible to me, and I was obliged to vote against the compromise measure which came out of the House-Senate conference.

During this middle period many items were passed which may not be of such great significance nationally, but which are of tremendous importance to our own area now and for the future. Among these is an increased water pollution control program, a program for converting salt water to fresh water, and grants for the improvement of airports. Of national significance was the approval of a greatly expanded civilian space research program.

It was during this middle period also that the administration's comprehensive aid to education program bogged down. While I was prepared to support a much broader program, I was happy that the program of Federal aid to impacted school districts was extended, as were the scholarship and loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The impacted areas program alone has meant about $2 million a year to our area.

The final phase of the operations of this Congress was devoted largely to the traditionally bipartisan matters concerning the conduct of our foreign affairs. This included such widely debated items as foreign aid, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. After all the debate was over, the traditional bipartisanship prevailed, and the foreign aid appropriation, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency all received majority support from both parties.

The longest session of Congress in 10 years adjourned at 6:16 a.m. on September 27, after being in session since January 3—and up all night on the 26th of September. It was a hard-working, productive session. I have appreciated the opportunity to be part of it, and have tried to be conscientious about the job. On 116 rollcall votes during the 9-month session, I voted 116 times. On 115 quorum calls in the same period I was present 114 times. I have kept in touch with my constituents through weekly reports in 30 weekly newspapers and weekly broadcasts over 6 radio stations. They have kept in touch with me by mail, telegraph, telephone, and personal visits to both Washington and my Riverhead office. I have tried to represent them faithfully, but I have not pleased them all. I have tried to help them, but I have not always been successful.

Next year the Nation will be confronted with the same basic problems. The cold war, Berlin, Cuba, Laos, and problems of foreign affairs will be at the front of everyone's mind. The basic issue will continue to be war or peace. In Congress the most controversial issue will be the financing of medical care for the elderly through the social security system. No one expects that it will be an easy session. The international problem which confront us are not going to disappear. We will, however, be able to start with an economy in good shape, a satisfactory balance of payments internationally, and the knowledge that in our foreign affairs we are operating from a strong domestic base.

What the successes and failures of the recent session of Congress have been depends, of course, on each constituent's own particular point of view on any given legislation. Those things which the Democrats call successes the Republicans are likely to call failures. Those things which the Republicans hail the Democrats may want to ignore. The best analysis which I have seen was written by the syndicated columnist, William S. White, who started his column as follows:

> It is now clear that the record of this session of Congress, the final paragraphs of which are now being written, will not please the Democratic National Committee, the Republican National Committee, or any other loudly partisan group or interest.
>
> The frantically liberal will not like it. Nor will the desperately ultraconservative. It won't win or lose any national elections, either the 1962 congressional election or the 1964 presidential election. It may, however, turn out to be quite pleasing to people of temperate minds and moderate purposes who don't care about politics for its own sake, but see it simply as a means by which certain things are accomplished, preferably in a quiet and rational way.

That is the kind of Congress it has been. I believe it is what the country needed. I am very grateful for the opportunity to have been a part of it.

My itemized voting record is as follows:

Date	Issue	Vote
Jan. 3, 1961	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn 258, Halleck 170.)	Rayburn.
Jan. 31, 1961	Enlargement of Rules Committee. (Yea 217, nay 212.)	Yea.
Mar. 1, 1961	Temporary extension of unemployment compensation. (Yea 392, nay 30.)	Yea.
Mar. 1, 1961	Continue House Committee on Un-American Activities. (Yea 412, nay 6.)	Yea.
Mar. 7, 1961	Supplemental appropriation for impacted school districts. (Yea 339, nay 62.)	Yea.
Mar. 9, 1961	Price support program for feed grains. (Yea 209, nay 202.)	Nay.
Mar. 23, 1961	Military construction bill. (Yea 412, nay 0.)	Yea.
Mar. 24, 1961	Increase minimum wage coverage. (Yea 341, nay 76.)	Yea.
Mar. 29, 1961	Aid to economically distressed areas. (Yea 251, nay 167.)	Yea.
Apr. 19, 1961	Appoint additional Federal district and circuit court judges. (Yea 336, nay 76.)	Yea.
Apr. 20, 1961	Improve social security benefits. (Yea 400, nay 14.)	Yea.
Apr. 25, 1961	Latin American aid. (Yea 330, nay 82.)	Yea.
May 3, 1961	Water pollution control. (Yea 308, nay 110.)	Yea.
May 7, 1961	Consider sanctions on Cuba. (Yea 404, nay 2)	Yea.
May 17, 1961	Encourage foreign tourists. (Yea 305, nay 104)	Yea.
May 24, 1961	Armed Forces appropriation. (Yea 402, nay 0.)	Yea.
June 6, 1961	Agricultural appropriations, including price supports. (Yea 320, nay 65).	Nay.
June 8, 1961	Repeal tax on railroads. (Yea 189, nay 196.)	Yea.
June 22, 1961	Housing Act of 1961. (Yea 235, nay 178.)	Yea.
June 28, 1961	Conference report on housing bill. (Yea 229, nay 176.)	Nay.
June 29, 1961	Provide a flag for Congressmen. (Yea 108, nay 270.)	Nay.
June 29, 1961	Delaware River Basin compact. (Motion to recommit.) (Yea 92, nay 257.)	Nay.
July 10, 1961	Establish Cape Cod National Seashore. (Yea 278, nay 82.)	Yea.
July 31, 1961	Authorize President to order Reserves to active duty. (Yea 403, nay 2.)	Yea.
Aug. 2, 1961	Northeastern States water compact. (Motion to recommit.) (Yea 139, nay 261.)	Yea.
Aug. 8, 1961	Eliminate public power project from atomic energy appropriation. (Yea 235, nay 164.)	Yea.
Aug. 18, 1961	Foreign aid authorization. (Yea 287, nay 140.)	Yea.
Aug. 21, 1961	Make hijacking aircraft capital crime. (Yea 374, nay 5.)	Yea.
Aug. 22, 1961	New York World's Fair participation. (Yea 353, nay 42.)	Yea.
Aug. 24, 1961	Subsidize lead and zinc mines. (Yea 196, nay 172.)	Nay.
Aug. 30, 1961	Consider Federal aid to education. (Yea 170, nay 242.)	Yea.
Aug. 31, 1961	Oppose Red China in U.N. (Yea 395, nay 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 5, 1961	Foreign aid appropriation. (Yea 270, nay 123.)	Yea.
Sept. 6, 1961	Extend Federal aid to impacted school districts. (Yea 378, Nay 32.)	Yea.
Sept. 6, 1961	Strengthen Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act sanctions. (Yea 245, nay 161.)	Yea.
Sept. 6, 1961	Encourage international educational and cultural exchanges. (Yea 329, nay 66.)	Yea.
Sept. 13, 1961	Extend Civil Rights Commission. (Yea 300, nay 106.)	Yea.
Sept. 13, 1961	Remove Colorado River public power project from appropriation bill. (Yea 182, nay 225.)	Yea.
Sept. 13, 1961	Extend Federal Airport Construction Act. (Yea 398, nay 4.)	Yea.
Sept. 14, 1961	Establish Peace Corps. (Yea 288, nay 97.)	Yea.
Sept. 15, 1961	Increase postal rates. (Yea 142, nay 222.)	Nay.
Sept. 18, 1961	Improve postal employees' longevity pay benefits. (Yea 360, nay 4.)	Yea.
Sept. 18, 1961	Require additional registration of Communist propagandists. (Yea 369, nay 2.)	Yea.
Sept. 19, 1961	Establish Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. (Yea 290, nay 54.)	Yea.
Sept. 26, 1961	Foreign aid appropriation. (Yea 192, nay 81.)	Yea.

A Hundred Years Ago in the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent of mine came across a letter written in 1855 describing his grandfather's visit to Washington. John L. Davidson was thoughtful enough to send a copy on to me. It is a delightful piece which I would like to share with my colleagues:

DEAR MR. BARRY: I have been transcribing a number of old letters and other papers which were the property of my grandfather, John Mitchell Davidson (1829–1917) and I have just uncovered a letter written by him to his wife-to-be from Philadelphia on February 20, 1855.

Among other things there are two paragraphs describing a visit to the House and to the Senate and I thought you would be interested to get a brief eye witness account of the Washington scene 106 years ago.

Grandfather Davidson, when writing double "s" he always wrote it as "fs" a form which had been handed down from colonial days.

During the Civil War he was badly disabled at the battle of Kennesaw Mountain in June 1864 and spent the rest of the war as a patient in Confederate military hospitals.

It is not my purpose to burden you with matters of a personal nature, but I thought you might be interested in reading the references to Washington.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. DAVIDSON.

(NOTE.—This letter was written to Julia A. Dunn by John Mitchell Davidson while he was on a buying trip to Baltimore and Philadelphia to purchase goods for a country store in Ducktown, Tenn. He was 26 years old at the time the letter was written. John married Julia on November 1, 1855 at Calhoun, Ga., and later served from 1862 to 1865 in the Confederate Army. His wife lived in Atlanta, Ga., from November 1862 until the surrender of the city to General Sherman on September 1, 1864. She and two small children were evacuated to Anderson, S.C. in a box car just prior to the burning of Atlanta by Sherman.)

PHILA PENN, *Feby 20th, 1855.*

DEAR JULIA: I arrived in this beautiful Quaker City this morning at 1 o'clock in the train from Baltimore, having left Washington City yesterday evening at 5 o'clock, at which city I spent two days with Bro A. T. Davidson whom I found their on businefs. On Monday we visited the National Galery & Pat Office, the greatest curiosity I have ever seen and worth all the shows I have ever seen. There I saw Genl Washington's full dreſs worn when he made his farewell addreſs and his camp equipage had in the Revolutionary War; Genl Jackson's dreſs uniform worn at the battle of N Orleans; Franklin's printing preſs, rifle and everything that was used by our fore fathers, besides collections if all animals, birds, and all the feathered tribes, serpents, fish and everything of the kind that lives & inhabits the different regions of all the world collected by our different ministers from other provinces under the sun, and models of all the machinery and anything that has ever been patented by act of Congreſs.

Well, after visiting that, we took a peep at a distance of the White House, where little Frankie lives. From thence we went up to the Capitol, first entering the Rotundi where I saw some of the best paintings and sculpture in the world—amongst which—the baptism of Pocohontas, Columbus discovering America, Declaration of Independence, surrender of Genl Burgoin, the Battle of New Orleans and a great many paintings forgotten at this time. Well, amongst the sculpturings are two specimens of Columbus discovering America with the globe supported on a hand; Genl Washington as a Genl and as a civilian with the inscription on each side—"First in peace, first in war and first in the hearts of his country"—and many Romish generals and many other things that would take one of greater intellect & greater powers of description than little Johnnie!

Well, we went into the House of Representatives where is the bright stars that illumine our Glorious Union, where I had the most exquisite pleasure of hearing some of the great Talent of the Union, but on the other hand, sorry to see such bad order prevailing in a body to make Laws for the great United States. But I was told on that day it was worse than usual a/c of the President having vetoed the great French Spoliation Bill, which he did on last Saturday evening to the great disappointment of all parties, but, Julia, I afsume Frankie is considered small potatoes if he is President and his own party is forsaking him.

Next we went into the Senate Chamber where I afsure you we saw some dignity and good order prevailing. The Great California and Pacific Railroad Bill was the matter of discufsion. I heard the Hons Pratt and Misfo, Sewrad of N.Y., Rusk of Texas, Guinn of Calia, Miller of S.C., and some other able men, names not recollected. I afsure you that it made a mountain *boy* feel rather *large* to see s much ability and greatneſs and much to please and amuse the enqyuring mind.

I got on safely, not meetin with any accident whatever—I paſsed through many beautiful cities and had fine times traveling on the cars and Steam Boats. I paſsed through Sam's city last night (Baltimore) just at Seven o'clock. The Engine enters outside the city where it is met by a team of horses that pulls the cars through the city, one man on the platform blough (blew) a horn all the while as though he was a twin Bro of Gabriel!, which is to keep children and anything off the track, most of the city we paſsed through they rong the large engine bell all the time.

O Julia, I afsure you that I thought of you and Sam paſsing through Baltimore and I laughed to *myself*—I love to think of you Dear Julia—I would be happy to see you tonight to show you the beautiful city of Phila which is all lighted up with gas and looks most beautifully.

I have been looking around today & formed several acquaintances. I had a letter to some gentlemen who have been introducing me to other businefs men. You should just see me—how I tried to do my best in the easiest way—I am truly happy to say to you, Julia, that I will have no difficulty in buying Goods as all the houses I have formed the acquaintance of seem willing to sell me what Goods I want. I will commence making my purchases in the morning and get through perhaps by the first of next week and then start home where I hope to see you in Calhoun.

I went to the Methodist Church tonight on Arche St where I heard some excellent speaking on the missionary cause in the city. I must close for fear to wear your patience out, for I have a retched bad pen. My compliments to Pa, Ma, Jenie & Willie. Julia, I would be glad to hear from you but I am afraid to say to you to write to Charleston for fear it would not get their, but write immediately to Charleston if you are in Calhoun and if I should leave before it reaches their, I will have my friends forward it to Ducktown, write to me to care of Mefsrs Hyatt, McBurney & Co.

Hoping to hear from you, I will close. Pardon this scribble and excuse all imperfections as I am writing in a large public Hall and several people are walking around me,—Beleive me, dear Julia, to be as ever, yours

Devotedly,

J.M.D.
(Alias Amos).

Problems as a Result of Foreign Competition for Domestic Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, at this critical time in our Nation's history while our attention is focused on the Berlin crisis and on other crises throughout the world, I believe we are disregarding another threat which, in its long term effect, may be as damaging to the basic strength of our country. It is incredible but true that what was only a small and insignificant trickle of foreign imports into this country 10 years ago has now become a raging torrent which threatens to undermine our whole economy.

A special subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee has been set up to study this problem. This subcommittee, which is ably headed by Congressman JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania, and of which I am the ranking minority member, has conducted extensive hearings. These hearings reflect that this Nation is now at the peril point with respect to foreign imports and, in the event steps are not taken to limit these imports, serious damage will be done.

A graphic example of the impact of foreign imports is furnished by our own hydraulic turbine manufacturing industry. Therefore, I would like to briefly outline the problems which it faces as a result of foreign competition for domestic business.

HYDRAULIC TURBINE INDUSTRY

The hydraulic turbine industry in the United States is relatively small. The average annual domestic bookings for the total industry has only been approximately $27 million per year during the past 10 years. The Federal Government is by far the largest purchaser of hydraulic turbines in the United States, and has accounted for approximately 60 percent of the industry's average domestic bookings during the past 10 years.

The engineering manpower, the extremely large tools and the facilities in the hydraulic turbine manufacturing industry are highly specialized, with practically no opportunity for product diversification. During peacetime they have an economic value only for use in

the manufacture of hydraulic turbines. These facilities have, however, in the past, and undoubtedly will in the future, be required for defense production and would contribute greatly to our national secuirty and defense.

THE PROBLEM

American industry has long been aware of the threat to its existence posed by foreign competition utilizing low-cost labor. The difference in wage rates paid in the United States and those paid abroad is of such magnitude and importance that foreign producers can underbid American manufacturers by substantial margins. Import duties on hydraulic turbines are currently 15 percent, having been reduced from the former rate of 27½ percent through the workings of our reciprocal trade agreement acts. The current rate of 15 percent is meaningless and provides no adequate protection against the impact of cheap foreign labor. American industry has long been aware of this lack of protection and has repeatedly made futile efforts over a 12- to 15-year period to obtain remedial action. As late as last year, discussions were held with the Tariff Commission about this situation and the Tariff Commission advised that they were powerless to act on any threatened injury to the industry until such time as actual imports reached a sufficiently high level to invoke the peril point provisions. Manifestly when this point is reached, there will no longer be a domestic hydraulic turbine industry since the production of hydraulic turbines usually involves a minimum manufacturing cycle of at least 2 years, and the damage to the industry would have occurred long before the actual imports reached our shores.

BUY AMERICAN ACT

For many years American industry relied on the dual effect of tariffs and the Buy American Act for protection on Federal procurement of hydraulic turbines. The Buy American Act, until 1954, provided a differential of 25 percent in favor of domestic producers.

Foreign competition on Federal projects began to be evident about 1952, but it was not until 1954 that a contract was awarded to a foreign manufacturer. This contract, for two hydraulic turbines for the U.S. Corps of Engineers' Table Rock project, was awarded on the basis of the reduction of the 25-percent preference to 6 percent when Executive Order 10582, which provided a new interpretation of the Buy American Act, was issued in December 1954. Since that time foreign producers have been successful in obtaining a substantial number of important Federal turbine contracts and in 1959, 52.78 percent of the dollar value of Federal procurement of hydraulic turbines was awarded to foreign manufacturers. In that same year, as a result of the example set by our Federal Government, a public utility district awarded a contract amounting to almost $10 million to a foreign manufacturer. Thus foreign manufacturers obtained in excess of $16½ million out of total orders for $31¼ million placed in the United States in 1959.

DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS PURCHASE ABROAD

As a result of the tremendous impact of foreign competition, one domestic manufacturer since 1959 has resorted to the use of foreign materials and manufactured components, and a second producer, the following year, commenced bidding in this manner also. Since the inception of this practice, five Federal contracts have been awarded to domestic manufacturers whose bids were based on the supply of varying percentages, up to as much as 49 percent, of foreign components, and in addition the low bid on a project involving the largest single contract in the history of the hydraulic turbine business has been submitted on this basis by one of the aforementioned companies.

LOSS OF JOBS FOR AMERICAN LABOR

A careful estimate, based on information obtained from the various procuring agencies of the actual parts being supplied from foreign sources on the projects mentioned above, indicates that approximately 852,000 man-hours of employment for American labor has already been exported to foreign countries as a result of the current interpretation of the Buy American Act, which permits up to 50 percent of the cost of the article to be supplied from foreign sources. The pending award of a contract for the John Day and Lower Monumental projects, on the basis of an analysis of the proposal by the low bidder, would export approximately 1,700,000 additional man-hours to foreign labor.

Foreign nations do not export jobs for their workers as is the practice in this country. It is well known that no nation which has a domestic hydraulic turbine industry other than the United States permits competition from foreign sources for their own state requirements whenever their domestic manufacturers are able to supply the size and type of equipment required. Therefore, a buy American policy for Federal purchases would not be in contravention of prevailing world practices.

BUY AMERICAN ACT WEAKENED BY INTERPRETATION

The Buy American Act was enacted into law by the 72d Congress. The debate in Congress clearly shows that this act was passed to alleviate unemployment and to create employment. It is especially pertinent to note that the legislative history, as reported in both the House and Senate, shows that one of the reasons why the act was passed was to prevent award to a foreign supplier of a particular Federal contract for hydraulic turbines so that man-hours of employment would not be lost to American labor.

This act has never been amended, but its value as a protection to American labor has been vitiated by interpretation. The act itself provides that all Federal purchases of articles, materials, and supplies must be "substantially all" of domestic origin unless the low domestic bid is considered to be unreasonable. The law itself does not provide any measure of unreasonableness. For many years Federal procurement practice had been to apply a 25-percent differential as a yardstick and any domestic bid which was not more than 25 percent higher than a low foreign bid was acceptable. With the issuance of Executive Order 10582 in 1954, this differential was reduced to 6 percent except in instances where the goods offered by the low domestic bidder were to be produced in a labor surplus area. Under such circumstances the differential is 12 percent. Also by interpretation the provision "substantially all" of domestic origin has been perverted so that anything less than 50 percent from foreign sources, calculated on a basis of cost, still qualifies as a domestic bid. Obviously, under this interpretation the Buy American Act provides no realistic protection to American industry when consideration is given to the tremendous differential which exists between prevailing American wages and foreign labor rates. Based on information published by Steel magazine, September 5, 1960, the average rate of pay in manufacturing, including fringe benefits, is $2.75 per hour in the United States. Comparable rates in Sweden are $1.08 per hour, 80 cents per hour in West Germany, 77 cents in England and only 55 cents an hour, including all fringe benefits, in Japan.

NO OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE MAN-HOURS

In the production of heavy equipment such as hydraulic turbines, each of which is especially designed to meet the particular requirements of a given project, there is no opportunity to utilize labor saving devices such as are used in mass production industries. The manufacturing facilities in factories of our foreign competitors are directly comparable, if not better than those which domestic producers can afford. Therefore, the man-hours required in manufacture are directly comparable regardless of the country of origin. The inequity to U.S. industry is compounded by the fact that much of the equipment in the plants of foreign manufacturers was supplied directly or indirectly through American aid after World War II and is therefore extremely modern.

MAN-HOURS SHOULD BE MEASURED

The use of cost as a measure of the proportion of a contract to be supplied partially from domestic sources and partially from foreign sources is without legal basis. The Buy American Act makes no reference whatsoever to cost in connection with the requirement that the articles to be purchased should be produced in the United States and made substantially all of American articles, materials and supplies Under a statute designed to preserve employment in the United States, determination as to whether a product is of American or foreign origin should of necessity be made on the basis of the man-hours required to build or to manufacture the equipment and its components rather than on the basis of cost. The use of the cost method of analysis actually encourages a greater use of foreign goods made in low-wage countries and permits even greater percentages of imports than would be permissible under a man-hours basis of analysis. In brief, the use of

the cost method of analysis encourages the export of American jobs.

Foreign bidders are quite aware of the administration of the Buy American Act and they have adjusted their bid levels as the preference differential in favor of domestic producers has been reduced. Prior to the issue of Executive Order No. 10582 foreign bids were usually only slightly less than 25 percent under the level of domestic tenders, but promptly after Executive Order 10582 became effective the level of foreign bids appears to have risen to take full advantage of the reduced preference.

Federal departments involved in the procurement of hydraulic turbines, namely U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, adhere to the present interpretations of the Buy American Act. However, it is interesting that the Tennessee Valley Authority, an independent agency, has arbitrarily established a preference differential of 20 percent in evaluating it's awards.

HYDRAULIC INDUSTRY VITAL TO DEFENSE

The manufacturing facilities of the hydraulic turbine industry include some of the largest machine tools in the United States, and these facilities have been recognized as an important adjunct to our national defense base. National security considerations are therefore clearly involved since these facilities cannot be maintained unless sufficient hydraulic turbine orders are available to justify their existence because no other products require manufacturing facilitie of such magnitude.

On June 27, 1956, the American hydraulic turbine manufacturing industry requested the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—at that time the Office of Defense Mobilization—to limit Federal procurement of hydraulic turbines to American suppliers. The appeal was made under the provision of the Buy American Act and Executive Order No. 10582, with specific reference to section 3(d) of that order.

After approximately a year of study, the Director of OCDM came to these conclusions, reported in his letter to the industry of March 8, 1957:

On the basis of the committee's findings and on my own study, I do not believe the present situation justifies a ruling that would recommend to Federal procurement agencies that all contracts for hydraulic turbines should be limited to U.S. suppliers.

In reaching this conclusion I have been influenced strongly by the fact that section 3(d) of Executive Order No. 10582 clearly envisages that exceptions under that section will be made on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, I recommend that decisions regarding procurement of hydraulic turbines continue to be made on a case-by-case basis. However, in view of the importance of the engineering skills and tools in the hydraulic turbine industry, I have instructed the Office of Defense Mobilization staff and the Inter-Agency Committee to keep future developments in the industry under close study.

I appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you and other representatives of the industry and want to assure you that each future case referred to this office for advice under section 3(d) of the order will receive our most careful and objective consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *Director.*

Again in 1958 the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, in connection with a proceeding under section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, made a study of the impact of foreign built heavy electric power equipment and hydraulic turbines on the domestic industry. The findings of this study were reported in a memorandum of decision issued on June 12, 1959. The OCDM Director in this decision found:

In the case of hydraulic turbines, I have concluded that if there were a substantial preemption of U.S. requirements by foreign hydraulic turbines, this could raise a question of national security. Inasmuch as Federal procurement of hydraulic turbines represents an important part of market availability to domestic producers of such items, I have recommended to the President that he provide for the review from time to time of the extent to which there is a dependence by the United States on foreign hydraulic turbines in order to determine whether any alteration in present policy would be necessary in the interests of national security. Meanwhile, in exercising its responsibilities under section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will maintain a continuing study of imports of hydraulic turbines.

Both of these findings by OCDM clearly indicate a recognition of the essentiality of the hydraulic turbine manufacturing industry to our national security. Despite this recognition of essentiality, Federal purchases from foreign producers have continued unabated. The resort to partial foreign manufacture by some domestic producers represents a valiant effort to continue in the hydraulic turbine business, but such action does not insure the continuance of their manufacturing facilities since such facilities can only be maintained when there is sufficient production to justify their existence.

UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In addition to the loss of jobs for American labor and the serious weakening of our national defense base, consideration must be given to the impact on the economy of the United States of our present procurement practices. At a time when an unfavorable balance of payments is a matter of serious concern to our Government, it hardly seems prudent to increase the outward flow of gold by awarding sizable contracts for Federal requirements to foreign producers. Such procurement not only adversely affects our balance of payments, but also results in an appreciable reduction in the flow of tax revenue to our Treasury. The loss of employment produces less income tax return from individuals and the loss of corporate profit reduces the corporate income tax revenue.

One of the arguments advanced in the past by our State Department, which has consistently been the one executive agency to advocate the circumvention of the intent of the Buy American Act, was the urgent need of dollar balances by friendly nations and the need to increase employment in those nations. Both of these needs no longer exist. Our foreign friends now generally enjoy favorable dollar trade balances and their economies have reached unprecedented levels of prosperity. Unemployment is no longer a matter of concern to them. Rather, a lack of manpower has now become a serious problem in some counties. This situation is particularly true in the nations which have important hydraulic turbine manufacturing facilities. It is our understanding that in the two studies by OCDM previously mentioned, the State Department was consulted and probably strongly influenced the OCDM in its findings.

SUMMARY

I believe the above information definitely indicates that the continued existence of the hydraulic turbine industry, as well as many other American industries, is seriously threatened by foreign imports; jobs for American labor are being lost; and the outward flow of gold is being increased and income to our Treasury is being reduced by the present application of the Buy American Act. Prompt remedial action is needed to correct this situation if our industries are to survive. A review of Federal policy should be undertaken by Congress and the Buy American Act should be strengthened in such a manner that it will be restored to its original effectiveness and contravention by administrative procedures will be prevented.

New York's Governor Urges Creation of a Department of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this time an article that appeared in the September 14 edition of the Buffalo Evening News. The article "Cue From Rocky," outlines the urgent need for a new systematic approach to "railroad consolidations, acquisitions and mergers." The article follows:

CUE FROM ROCKY

A call for a fresh approach to the breakdown threatening the Nation's railroads would seem the most logical thing in the world to expect from a national administration that has talked bravely about Federal responsibilities for helping metropolitan areas and promoting economic growth.

But no such call has come from the White House or the President's official family. Instead, it has come from Governor Rockefeller. He proposes the creation of a Department of Transportation to formulate a national policy for rail, air, water, highways and pipeline carriers. He underscores the need for a coordinated approach to railroad consolidations, acquisitions and mergers.

Governor Rockefeller thus has become the first national political figure of stature to speak out boldly for a recharting of the Government's role to deal effectively with the vast range of interlocking problems plaguing the whole transportation industry.

In taking the lead, Governor Rockefeller has voiced a view that is on all fours—at least in its broad diagnosis if not in specific reme-

dies—with the conclusion of various studies which have deplored the fragmented, narrow-gage approach of the Federal regulatory agencies. In fact, the Hoover Commission 12 long years ago decried the Government's "failure to think, or act, in terms of total transportation requirements." And though its specific recommendation differed somewhat from the Governor's ideas, it pinpointed then what was fundamentally the same problem—that (in the commission's words) of "preoccupation * * * with the regulation of rates and services, and with isolated problems in individual fields of transportation."

Room though there certainly is for debating the details of the Governor's specific proposals, he serves the national interest well in prodding the national administration to come to grips with the railroad crisis—something he has been practicing as well as preaching in New York State.

Goals of the New Frontier: The Federal-Aid Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to highways is one of the most immense public works programs undertaken in the history of this Nation. This leviathan undertaking by the Federal Government is the product of many years of study by the Congress. Perhaps the most vexing problem in the national highway picture today is our failure to impress upon the American people the growing gravity of the crisis in highway transportation. On the basis of considerable tenure as a member of the House Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway program, I have discovered many misconceptions and misunderstandings about the national highway program.

There, also, seems to be a lack of consciousness of and an absence of urgency over the crucially important economic and social factors involved. The crisis to which I refer became apparent both during and after World War II. Presumably realistic estimates of car and truck registrations and traffic volume were found to be much too conservative. The States moved frantically to provide a modicum of relief, but highway facilities were being swamped as fast as they were provided. The rising toll of traffic deaths, injuries and property damage abetted by increasing vehicle registrations, population increases, and population shifts of necessity became a matter of national concern.

Currently, there are 76 million registered vehicles in the United States, and estimates place registrations in 1975 in the neighborhood of 110 million. It is not only possible, but probable, that a 50-percent increase in traffic volume will occur within the next 50 years.

The mercurial growth in the population of the United States, of course, has been the most significant factor affecting the national highway picture. Our population has increased 18.5 percent since 1950, and projections place our population in the neighborhood of 260 million by 1980, about double the 1940 figure. Leisure time, in addition to our exploding population, makes the need for better highways more important than ever—we have become a travel-conscious Nation.

Another trend generating pressure on our highway system has been the shift from the central cities to suburban areas. Nearly two-thirds of the increase in the population of the United States since 1950 has occurred in the suburbs of metropolitan areas. In the central cities enumerated by the census population increased by only 8 percent as compared to a jump of 47 percent in areas outside of those central cities. This trend is probably the most important demographic and sociological fact of our times. Many experts believe that growth of central cities had completely stopped by 1956.

Because of these factors aggravating our highway problems, drastic measures have been and will continue to be necessary to reduce the frightful toll of deaths and injuries. Highway deaths during the 1950's alone nearly equaled the total of all the American war dead in World Wars I and II and the Korean war. You cannot in any form measure the costs of the millions who were injured during the same period. In 1959 alone, 37,600 persons were killed and 2,870,000 injured on the Nation's highways. The justification for Federal expenditures on highways has long been established.

The basic legislation governing the administration of the Federal-aid program today was adopted in 1956. It provided for the construction of the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways and specified that the system was to be completed in 1972 and be geared to anticipate the needs of 1975. The Congress also specified that the primary and secondary highways and their urban extensions were not to suffer by reason of the emphasis on the Interstate System, and that the acceleration of construction was to apply with equal force to these projects.

The highway trust fund which supports Federal aid to highways has been beset by dislocations ever since 1956. In 1958, we were faced with a recession, so it became necessary for Congress to vote an increase in the interstate apportionment and an emergency appropriation for primary, secondary, and urban construction. The compounding of financial difficulties during these early years of the accelerated program eventually reached the point where it became apparent that the interstate program could not be completed until at least 1976.

The incoming Kennedy administration, keenly aware of the necessity for getting the interstate program back on the track for completion in 1972, submitted its recommendations for the necessary financial reforms. The President warned that the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program was in peril, and stated:

> Timely completion of the full program authorized in 1956 is essential to national defense, to greater highway safety, to our economy.

The President pointed out that to deny the needed increases for the highway program would postpone completion 5 years beyond the original target date, and voiced strong opposition to either the stretching out or cutting back of the program.

I am pleased that the administration recommendations were substantially adopted in the present session of the 87th Congress. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961 revised the original estimated authorization for the 41,000-mile 13-year program by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 billion to $37 billion. This additional $11.5 billion authorization will make possible completion of the interstate program by 1972 as originally scheduled. The act, in addition, increased the Federal apportionments for primary, secondary, urban programs, from $925 million to $1 billion annually. The incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls was extended for 2 years, also.

It appears that we will now be assured of a sustained level of construction activity that will greatly minimize the peak-and-valley mode of operating that was characteristic of the program the past 5 years. This action will unquestionably be of great help to the States and the entire road-building industry.

It is unfortunate that disclosures of some malpractices tend to overshadow the imperative need for this program. Notwithstanding the ills with which the Federal-aid highway program has been beset, substantial progress has been made. In the first 5 years of the program which ended June 30, 1961, 10,800 miles of the Interstate System were opened to traffic and construction was under way on 4,800 miles. More than $11 billion has been put to work on the interstate program, and almost $11½ billion have been spent or committed for 119,000 miles of primary and secondary highways and their urban components. Contracts involving 46,000 additional miles were under way on June 30 of this year.

It is estimated that the Interstate System when completed will save at least 4,000 lives annually, reduce personal injuries by 150,000 and cuts economic losses by $2.1 billion. Early completion of the interstate highways is also essential to our expanding economy and the mobility of our defense weapons. When completed in 1972, the 41,000 mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways will be one of the greatest capital assets of our Nation, providing safety, enjoyment, and economies to all the people of our travel-conscious Nation.

Goals of the New Frontier: Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a mounting crescendo of voices pointed to water as one of our major health and resource problems during the waning years of the last administration. This host of public-minded persons was urging quick implementation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, recognizing that stronger Federal legislation was essential to conserve and develop adequate sources of clean water to supply the mushrooming needs of a burgeoning population. As in the past, predictions of future use had been understated. The situation was becoming critical.

The Congress in 1960 responded to the call for stronger pollution control legislation to encourage and stimulate construction of waste treatment plants by enacting H.R. 3610, my bill, amending Public Law 660. It was vetoed by President Eisenhower who contended that pollution was essentially a local problem and was opposed to Federal grants; the attempt to override the veto failed. Habitual complacency toward the public domain as a modus vivendi still presided over the Federal policymakers.

A change in attitude toward our great natural heritage was dearly needed in the highest councils of our Government. In the past we had not conserved and protected the natural resources with which we were blessed, nor had we replaced or used efficiently those which we utilized. Great virgin forests had been felled and not a seedling planted as a replacement. From the first we used our rivers as sewers, pouring waste into streams as beautiful as the Hudson, the Potomac, the Ohio, and the Mississippi. Not one unpolluted river system was left. National conscience pleaded for the instatement of a sound conservation philosophy as a matter of national policy.

The keynote for a new orientation was set by President Kennedy in his special message on Natural Resources on February 23, 1961. A redefinition of goals and policies, consistent with sound conservation practices finally became a reality. The rationale for the new course was clearly set forth. President Kennedy forewarned that:

> If we fail to chart a proper course of conservation and development—if we fail to use these blessings prudently—we will be in trouble within a short time. * * * Wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard—and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development.

President Kennedy emphasized, as I have long maintained, that all citizens have a stake in a sound resources program. Nor, as many have erroneously inferred, were conservationists attempting to arrogate to the Federal Government exclusive responsibility for the development and protection of our natural resources. The President reiterated what conservationists had long advocated—national leadership buttressed by the effective cooperation of State and local governments.

Although the variety of public works is as great as the needs and demands from which they spring, no field is so latent with opportunities for satisfying need and demand while at the same time greatly contributing to our continued growth and prosperity as the field of water resources and control. But, as the President pointed out, our bountiful supply of water is not a "blessing we can regard with complacency." By 1980 experts predict that demand for water will equal the available supply of 600 billion gallons a day. Repeated reuse will then become a necessity. We are faced with an unprecedented population explosion, and an accelerated and changing industrial technology, which together will combine to impose greatly increased demands for water. The challenge is then one of wise conservation and control of our water resources in order to adequately provide for our anticipated needs.

What is true in regard to the quantity aspects of our water supply is of greater import when considering its quality aspects. "Pollution of our country's rivers and streams," warned the President, "has reached alarming proportions." The protection and control of water quality, therefore, constitute the key to effective conservation and control of water resources.

The Federal role in water quality control is most adequately expressed in the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This session of the Congress enacted the legislation which I sponsored to improve and make more effective the Federal water pollution control program.

H.R. 6441, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, was approved by President Kennedy on July 20, 1961, as Public Law 87–88.

The amendments provide for intensified research, augmentation of low flows to control water quality, increased financial assistance to the States to aid them in administering their water pollution control programs, increased financial assistance under improved provisions to municipalities to stimulate construction of waste treatment works, and extension of Federal authority to enforce abatement of pollution to all navigable as well as interstate waters.

Of particular importance are those provisions of the act which deal with grants to assist municipalities in the construction of waste treatment facilities. Wholly lacking in glamor and public appeal, these needed public works too often lose out in the competition for local funds to more attractive projects, such as parks, schools, libraries, et cetera. Federal grants are admittedly a device to stimulate community interest and support in providing these essential facilities.

The 1956 Federal Water Pollution Control Act authorized individual grants in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of construction or $250,000, whichever was less. Appropriations for this purpose were authorized in the amount of $50 million annually within an aggregate sum of $500 million.

The success achieved by the application of this limited amount of Federal participation is undeniably impressive. In the first 5 years of operations under the 1956 act, grant offers were made for 2,746 projects. The total estimated cost of these projects is $1,292.9 billion and compares favorably indeed with the $225 million of Federal grants funds responsible for spurring this number of projects. This means that each Federal dollar has been matched by almost 5 local dollars. Of the 2,746 projects, 1,580 are completed and in operation and 710 are currently under construction.

All are aware, I am sure, of the sad neglect in the field of waste treatment works construction for more than 50 years. As a result, a backlog of needed projects has been built up which even these impressive figures have hardly touched. The Conference of State Sanitary Engineers reported that as of December 31, 1960, a total of 5,127 projects, including new plants, enlargements, and additions, are needed in communities serving 42 million people. This is the current need and does not take into account the growing needs which will develop as our population increases and as existing plants become obsolete.

Very obviously, the rate of progress we have been making—although markedly improved—has not been sufficient. Effective cognizance was taken of this fact by the new amendments to the act. While retaining the existing 30 percent limitation on individual grants, the previous ceiling of $250,000 has now been raised to $600,000. In line with this individual project ceiling increase and to afford financial assistance to a greater number of communities, the annual appropriation authorization for grants funds is increased from the former $50 million to $80 million for fiscal year 1962, $90 million for 1963, and doubled to $100 million each year for the subsequent 4 years. The objective of these provisions is to stimulate waste treatment works construction to the average level of $600 million annually—the level necessary to deal with the problem.

The spilling over of our cities and towns into the suburbs and the mercurial growth of satellite communities is given recognition by the act's provision which enables two or more communities to join together in constructing a waste treatment facility to serve their mutual needs. Each community is eligibility to receive its own project grant based on its pro rata share of the total estimated reasonable cost of construction subject to an overall limitation of $2,400,000 of grants funds to be awarded to any single multimunicipal project.

To promote the fullest use of appropriated grants funds, the act provides for reallotment of any such funds not obligated by a State within 18 months be-

cause of a lack of projects in that State among States which have a waiting list of projects. Such funds may also be used for making an additional grant for a project for which the need is due in part to Federal institution or construction activity in the community.

These are the act's specific provisions in regard to waste treatment works construction. Substantial impact in this same field is anticipated to result as well from the application of the enforcement authority provided in the act. Federal authority to enforce abatement of pollution now extends to all navigable as well as interstate waters. In 13 instances, where the Federal enforcement procedures have been brought to bear to abate interstate pollution, remedial time schedules have been established involving construction of treatment facilities amounting to $500 million. This figure will undoubtedly rise in direct proportion to the vigor of Federal enforcement activity.

Public Law 87–88 is the statutory basis for launching a concentrated effort to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage wastes into our waters. Its provisions combine to comprise a public works program of the first magnitude. It was deservedly hailed as the first major conservation measure successfully put forth by the Administration. Its success is vital to the health and welfare of our citizens and to our continued economic growth.

The unrealistic no new starts policy of the past 8 years is happily laid to rest. The budgetary yardstick which dictated this policy, while still importantly considered, no longer predominates over other considerations affecting the wise and orderly development and conservation of water resources. Instead, a strengthened Federal-State-local partnership is being forged to act in the best interests and benefit of all—to secure for ourselves and to preserve for the future the maximum use and enjoyment of Nature's bountiful heritage.

The People of California's First District Express Their Views on Issues Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in earlier remarks concerning the results of my 1961 questionnaire, I inadvertently failed to report the response to one of the questions. It follows:

Asked, "Should Congress pass further laws aimed at preventing recessions and limiting their effects?" 32 percent checked "yes"; 14 percent, "no"; 30 percent, "no, the less Government interference the better"; 15 percent, "no, present laws are adequate" and 16 percent, "not certain."

Yonkers Comments on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in order to give my colleagues an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the sort of thought prevalent in my district, I would like to insert into the RECORD a column by Sylvia Porter and an editorial, both appearing in the Herald Statesman of Yonkers. Surely the future of mankind is a most serious issue that we must carefully consider:

A BILLION GO TO BED HUNGRY TONIGHT: CAN WE RAISE HAVE-NOTS' STANDARD?

(By Sylvia Porter)

Nearly 1 billion people on our side of the Iron Curtain go to bed hungry every night. While you've heard endless argument about our responsibility to the underfed of the free world, what do executives in the food business think can be done to raise the food standards in the have-not nations? Points on this subject are made by Norton Simon, president of Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc., in this interview.

Question. Can the new, scientific, techniques of America's food industry be applied elsewhere in the world?

Answer. Yes; in the developed countries of Western Europe or Japan. No; not yet in the still developing free nations. While nearly all large U.S. food packers and processors are now exporting packaged foods abroad and most are operating processing plants overseas, most of those operations are in the better developed nations. In the truly underfed, improverished nations the surface has hardly been scratched.

GAP GROWING LARGER

Question. How quickly can the "have" nations lift the food standards of the "have-nots" this side of the Iron Curtain?

Answer. Begin with the fact that the gap between the wealthy and the poor nations of the free world is growing larger, not smaller. The U.S. food industry is making a start in the poor nations. Plants are going into Africa, Venezuela, the Philippines, Brazil, and Colombia. There have been market studies in Singapore and considerable interest in India. But, to date, a full-scale attack on the problem of widespread hunger and malnutrition hasn't taken place.

The underfed nations represent a huge potential market. To make these billion consumers real is the job we face.

Question. How can you manage this tremendous job?

Answer. We'll have to get a trade cycle going. Through the Government, we have been giving aid. The whole idea of foreign aid is controversial, but when you are dealing with a country such as India, where personal income averages 15 cents a day and where potentially there is a market larger than ours in the United States, there's no room for controversy if aid can get a trade cycle going.

These people now have nothing except debt to the village banker. If we can get them to the point where they have the tools and the ability to produce things the free world needs we can trade with them, and we then can begin to raise their food standards quickly.

Question. Are you saying that the U.S. revolution in food processing won't work in the underdeveloped economies until they have achieved industrialization and we must invest in aid and trade?

Answer. Eight out of ten working adults in the underdeveloped nations labor full time to produce their own food, with a bare margin left to take to market. If we want to stay wealthy, and particularly if we want to open markets to nearly a billion new consumers, we must help the hungry countries attain industrialization through an aid-trade cycle.

By forcing savings—literally wringing them out of the population at a terrific cost in human life and misery—the Soviets, and now the Chinese, saved enough of their annual production to move * * * to a modern economy. The underdeveloped nations must choose—they can force savings, Soviet style, or they can get an aid-trade cycle going with us.

If we want the economic fruits of trade with a billion new consumers, we must make a "total" decision that we are going to help build new economies, and one of our basic economic purposes should be to make consumers out of hungry, illiterate, and despondent people.

FEDERAL AID CAN HARM NEEDY NATIONS UNLESS PEOPLE HELP THEMSELVES, TOO

Poverty-stricken nations do not necessarily have to be poor, nor does massive intergovernmental aid insure that they will not remain impoverished.

These were the observations of an international financier as he retired as president of the International Finance Corp. and in his final report shared some of the benefits of his experiences with a gathering of the world's finance ministers.

Robert L. Garner, who served for 9 years as vice president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and 5 years as IFC president, set forth six requirements for a nation seeking to overcome its economic instability:

1. Consistent law and order, "a government that can govern."
2. Reasonably honest and effective public administration.
3. Financial stability, "absence of severe inflation."
4. A sensible plan of development.
5. An honest and effective tax system to raise internal revenue.
6. Avoidance of a feudal type of society, one in which the wealth and power are in the hands of a few.

Mr. Garner pointed out that too great a reliance on foreign aid is insidious and that such aid can become an excuse for failure to develop a nation's resources.

When experience, competence, honesty, and organization are missing, he said, large injections of capital into developing countries can cause more harm than good.

He added an observation which the United States by now should fully recognize as true: "Government to government financial aid cannot be successfully used to gain and hold political advantage for the country supplying the funds."

In urging that governments trying to improve their economic conditions rely on private initiative and private profit motives, the veteran financier gave voice to a philosophy that we sometimes seem to forget.

The great strength and progress of the United States have been built up on the basis of private enterprise and have been snapped only when we have turned to that socialistic paternalism which places the individual's hope for support and security in the hands of government.

Government at home and abroad, of course, must have an eye for the needs of those who cannot help themselves, but it must not destroy the initiative of those who want opportunity rather than aid.

Yet the latter is the course our unilateral aid programs, both domestic and foreign, seem to be following today.

Small Business Aided by Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Electro Networks, Inc., in a recent edition of its house organ, paid high tribute to a gentleman well known and well liked on Capitol Hill and Main Street, U.S.A., alike.

I am pleased to insert the following article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SMALL BUSINESS AIDED BY ARMY

ADVISER JACK W. ASKINS STRESSES HELP, GUIDANCE—ARMY EFFORTS RECOGNIZED IN PRAISE FOR HIS WORK

Numerically, America's small business community comprises 98 percent of all manufacturing enterprises.

Yet effective champions of the growth and solvency of this bedrock strength of our Nation must be numbered, at best, in an inverse percentage ratio.

One such key fighter for small business is a personable, articulate 50-year-old Texan.

He is credited by high-ranking administration military and business leaders with consistently helpful performance on behalf of manufacturers with fewer than 500 employees and not dominant in their fields. At the same time, he is noted for his open-door policy for large as well as small firms interested in Army procurement requirements.

SPEARHEADS ARMY SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTS

During the fiscal year 1960 he spearheaded Army spending of $1,527,917,000 on a prime contract basis with small business. This represented 31 cents out of each dollar of the $4,910,527,000 expended by the Army. Instructively, he was instrumental in the Army placing 1,747,454 contracts with small business of the 2,221,635 awarded. This was a whopping 79 percent of individual awards placed by the Army.

Askins played a significant role in the Army achieving the same high percentage of awards to small business in fiscal 1959. That year, the Army's Small Business Adviser pointed with pride to the 1,174,160 awards to small business out of a total of 2,199,228 which had been placed with America's business community.

U.S. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat of Alabama, militant chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, has said:

"Jack Askins is a conscientious and dedicated public servant who has worked long and hard in behalf of the small business community."

His House counterpart, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who chairs the House Select Committee on Small Business, believes that Askins "works both diligently and effectively to help the small businessman in his dealings with our Army."

Joseph D. Noonan, executive vice president of the Small Business Association of New England, Inc.—representing a group with two decades of work for small business in the New England States—recently endorsed Askins' work:

OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT

"Jack W. Askins," he wrote, "is an outstanding public servant. Both the Army and small business are fortunate in having a man with his impressive experience and proven abilities in such a key spot."

The Army Small Business Adviser possesses the vital experience and know-how which marked him a "natural" for his appointment.

He has served as advisor since 1952, following a 1-year interim appointment as Assistant Director to the Construction, Mining and Oilfield Equipment Division of the National Production Authority.

Askins, whose modulated voice and idiom suggest his southern Texas birth and upbringing, has gained increasing recognition as an authoritative witness before congressional committees. He skillfully breaks down complex statistics and related data to fundamental terms and analysis. These he often records on multicolored charts for visual presentation. Congressmen have been impressed with the meticulous, detailed rundowns of factual buying data he has compressed for viewing at a glance. He is so well acquainted with his subject, it has never been necessary for him to be primed with a written speech when testifying.

Askins advises the Army in all matters pertaining to small business.

FURTHERS ARMY IMAGE

His direct approach, lack of bureaucratic stuffiness is a natural characteristic. Askins adheres to his policy of being of service at all times. Self-imposed 6- and 7-day workweeks have not been uncommon. He is always seeking ways to further the Army image as a helpful, cooperative, service-oriented organization. He tells you earnestly:

"I never forget my mission is to help small business—and thereby help both the Army and our Nation. I will do anything to keep the small entrepreneur, with a legitimate product or service to sell the Army, from being inundated with redtape, bureaucratic formalities or administrative doubletalk. Whatever can be done to help this man get a one-stop deal will be fostered at this end."

Askins had the "U.S. Army—Small Business Handbook" published in 1959. It is a concise, one-stop treatment of the program, policy, procedures of the Army as it relates to purchasing. Instructively, prior to his advent, there was no manual on Army policy available to the public and business. Today, he has seen to it that numerous graphic texts spell out policies and procedures.

FIVE OVERSEA MISSIONS

Askins, who in World War II as a field grade officer with the Air Engineers and Army Corps of Engineers saw service on five oversea missions, as a civilian, before World War II, supervised the installation of all the drainage structures under the Pan American Highway in Peru, South America.

This occurred during the period following the Nazi blitz in Poland in 1939 and prior to his Army service in 1942. As an engineer, he just naturally fielded the assignment while employed by American Rolling Mill Co. as assistant general manager of the central and South American district of the Armco International Corp. It is this type of experience coupled with 60 months service in uniform during World War II that makes Askins the asset that he is today to the Army.

DYNAMIC PERSONALITY

Initiative, drive, and a dynamic personality assured his professional success. At the outset, Askins visited 128 small-business plants throughout the country. He explained to top management the services he could offer in areas of vital interest to them. He then opened a New York sales engineering and consulting office and established oversea representatives to service his client-firms' needs throughout the world.

Among the companies represented were the American Iron & Machine Works, Unit Rig & Equipment Co., Drilling Equipment Manufacturing Co., Big Four Machine & Supply Co.

This wealth of practical business experience and know-how has resulted in the Army small-business program achieving greater recognition and distinction for the Army. He has effectively fused industry techniques with Army policy. Notably, Askins, who had to create and build his program from a bone-naked foundation strut, has been instrumental in orienting Army procurement philosophy because of his incisive small-business leadership.

RECORD: AWARDS TO SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1942, when he began his career as Army adviser, his vigorous efforts have been responsible for record awards to small business of both prime and subcontracts.

He administers the overall policy and daily operation of 278 small business specialists throughout the country. He provides advice and counsel to all Army procurement personnel. At 60 installations across the continent, Askins sets up and oversees exhibits of items currently required and being purchased. These exhibits display items which are normally bought throughout the buying cycle of the year as well.

He recently directed and coordinated a Department of Defense joint industrial exposition with business concerns at Orlando, Fla. It was easily one of the most impressive, best attended industrial shows ever seen in the southeast. Florida's Gov. Farris Bryant was moved to warmly praise Askins for his outstanding performance in letters directed to his superiors.

This dedicated public servant whose office is in the Pentagon, perhaps has best stated his concern for and work with small business in the concluding remarks of a recent speech before an industrial group:

INDUSTRY IS DEFENSE LIFELINE

"There is an earnest desire and endeavor on our part to bring about the best possible working arrangement between the Army and industry. We are not unmindful that the lifeline of defense of our Nation is from you in industry to the soldier in the field. And small business makes an incalculable contribution to both the strength of the Army and the viability and economic health of our Nation."

He might have added his working credo—which surely helps explain the outstanding contribution he is making to industry and to the Nation as small business adviser to the U.S. Army:

"In World War II—as in every national crisis—small business came to the aid of the United States. It is surely fitting that the United States should now come to the aid of small business."

Let's Listen to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a friend has recently drawn to my attention an article in the Harvard Business Review relating to programs of aid to underdeveloped nations, with particular reference to our preparation for assistance to Latin America.

I found this a most stimulating article, and one that expresses well the need to understand the people we want to help and the need to learn from them while

we are helping. I should like to summarize for the RECORD some of the major points of this article, "Let's Listen to Latin America," by Charles H. Savage, Jr.

Mr. Savage spent the better part of a year in one of the Latin American nations and was preparing to return to the United States when he was asked how the United States could be of aid to that country. Mr. Savage had talked to men with a wide range of opinions while he was in Latin America—government officials and labor people, clergymen, and Communists, industrialists and factory workers, university professors, and peasants on the land. Based on his notes, his article tries to answer his friend's question, in such terms as to contribute a positive note to American thinking.

Help, in his opinion, requires an understanding of how a recipient nation, as a complex social entity, may be equipped to receive such aid, as well as understanding how the assisting nation may shape its aid most effectively. For, as he warns:

> Helping and being helped are among the more complex human activities, exacting the greatest psychological cost and demanding the most intricate social skill.

He notes instances where concern over nationalism, national dignity, and national sovereignty has been a factor in incidents as well as government decisions in recent months. And he suggests that a Latin proverb, "May the good Lord repay you" can be instructive in explaining attitudes whereby one is likely to regard a gift as something between the giver and his Maker or his motivations, rather than between the giver and the given. Similarly, he suggests that attitudes among the giving may lead to a wish to step in and follow through to see that gifts are effective, rather than a gift being merely the discharge of a desire to be helpful on the part of someone able to give.

It is vitally necessary to understand poverty and its psychology if we are to understand charity as well. Mr. Savage devoted a portion of his article to discussing one instance of poverty among boys wandering the city streets. And he makes a telling point that such poverty exists and has existed until people have tried to inure themselves to it, to overlook it, rather than deal with it.

> Poverty is the poor relation living in the house of the family of American nations that we don't wish to talk about. It makes us uneasy, and it is to the nature of this uneasiness that I wish to address myself.

Mr. Savage believes that "an effective remedy to the problems of such backward nations can spring only from accurate description."

Such description cannot result from introspection or elaboration with those who share the same views or intellectual debate that skirts the necessary action. It must probe the sensitive spots where the disease lies, do it sensibly and intelligently rather than through overstatement and exaggeration. Yet he thinks this is what we are not doing and he asks:

> Are we subject to some reverse obsession on the international cooperation front that is rendering realistic description and diagnosis difficult, and that is producing, consequently, a remedy that falls short of the mark?

He analyzes and quotes people among the young and idealistic with whom he talked. These quotations illustrate the longing for change and the willingness to follow the Communist path. He also illustrates the defensive attitudes of the elders, who often express the frustration of unsolved problems:

> It is also understandable that in mulling over poverty and trying to work through to some position on it—just as generation after generation in the past has tried over and over again to cut through the never completely solved issues of the alleviation of human misery—youth should communicate something of reproach and threat to the older hands—to the teachers, priests, business leaders, parents, politicians, and foreign-aid specialists to whom the stewardship has passed. And perhaps, down deep, the oldsters—they who once had such bright hopes and who, human beings operating in an imperfect world, at least tried—believe that their efforts merit from the youngsters, if not appreciation, at least understanding.

This exchange between the poverty-stricken and the comfortable, between the young and the elders, has led to a breakdown in communications and a frustration of policy. Resistance develops and leads to hostility, "the more hostile and the more silent because they had such love and such high expectations for those that they now face across the chasm of misunderstanding. As unrelieved obsession turns to hysteria, the one faction turns to thoughts of violent solutions to the unrelieved tensions, and the other draws tight at the prospect of possible attack and destruction."

Mr. Savage concludes his diagnosis by pointing out that many emissaries to underdeveloped lands sense these social signals of distress and may be infected by a hopelessness that any form of cooperative action can be developed. But he cautions that this must be counteracted by a willingness to analyze critically what is needed and apply the skills necessary:

> The United States has a great heritage in the management of its internal differences which history may one day cite as our major contribution to our age. We had to develop such skills as a condition of national survival. However, the existence of these skills is sometimes obscured by the waiting list of differences to which they have yet to be addressed.

South America felt no need to develop such skills, and did well under the circumstances. But Latin administration can improve its range of skills, to gain in economic development and to do so within the framework of their own traditions. An outsider who understands the problem can help by providing a new model of administrative flexibility responding to divergent viewpoints, willingness to encourage constructive solutions through effective conversation and ultimately to secure cooperative action. By his comportment, he may teach. In the sections in which Mr. Savage analyzes the oversea administrator, lie some of his most important lessons, and I offer them here, with his conclusions:

BEHAVIOR MODEL

> The outsider whose manner and behavior is such that he can practice the skills described is doing more than contributing to the solution of the substantive problems that bring him to those lands. He is providing a new model—where none previously existed—of administrative behavior by which divergent viewpoints may be responded to, effective conversation entered into with purposes other than rebuttal, and cooperative action secured among those able to handle the task. By so doing, he inoffensively invades the sphere of internal politics, sacrosanct up to now but always in the background of every commercial conversation.
>
> By his comportment, the oversea administrator teaches the lesson that to hear out and to reflect understanding and respect for the speaker is not necessarily an affirmation of agreement and support but serves secondary purposes. He paves the way for the emergence of less extreme positions by helping to drain off some small part of the unrelieved tension of the nationals, in the meantime educating himself and improving his capacity to distinguish the rough outlines of the many-faceted social system within which he will temporarily be at work.
>
> But most importantly, in his own small way, the oversea administrator is offering his hosts access to the vast storehouse of national wisdom that we have slowly created out of the range of differences that history has thrown at us for management. He is providing a visible example of a different sort of interpersonal behavior, an approach that his local associates may wish to "try on for size" in their own future interactions.
>
> To behave in this manner calls for a great deal of sophistication and understanding. Such behavior is based, among other things, on the recognition that no one is above emotional involvement and on the willingness to include the factor of this personal involvement in estimates of what is taking place. The fact that these allowances must be made while the administrator is preoccupied with adjusting to a strange setting and with accommodating the normal bureaucratic or organizational pressures to protect the mission and its personnel demands both a special type of maturity and a special type of backup support from the home office. Yet Americans have a tradition of rising to special circumstances, and what I have described seems to be the role demanded of those who will carry our private and governmental assistance programs overseas in the years ahead.
>
> Furthermore, I am convinced that our oversea people are now prepared to move beyond the preoccupation with personal adaptation described in the "culture shock" school of thinking; that is, the primary focus on the unsettling sensation, even mild panic, that results when the individual—set down in a different culture—finds that the behaviors which previously gained one set of responses no longer work as before, or even beget a completely different set of responses. I believe the passage of time has largely laid this ghost to rest. If I am wrong, let me point to the therapeutic values inherent in becoming absorbed with assessing the way the foreign society has achieved some resolution of the problems that beset it.
>
> Probably the greatest demands in an assistance program are those made of the home office—be it Washington, D.C., Wall Street, or one of our industrial centers—for support and toleration of a wider and sometimes frankly exploratory range of behaviors on the part of its overseas personnel. To provide lessons on the management of differences, the oversea administrator must himself come from an atmosphere in which differences are effectively managed, and there must be someone at home with whom he can

candidly share his burden of somewhat strange impressions and reactions. His assignment must be a flexible and supportive one if, of itself, it is not to interfere with the accomplishment of his mission.

For somewhat similar reasons I would urge that we not send members of the President's Peace Corps abroad with an obsession to be helpful. I am sure that they will be more helpful in the end if they set out with the more relaxed intent of looking and listening, studying and learning, and being helped.

CONCLUSION

What I am talking about is a new dimension of technical assistance which in a sense is preliminary and basic to the foreign aid we are now providing. Its essence is administrative skill in the management of differences—an area in which we have more experience and knowledge than we realize. Its execution resides in the transmissions of these skills to Latin administrators (fellow Americans, too), in a setting of genuine respect which cannot fail to come about if, using our powers of discrimination and concentration, we tune in on the problems to which these people address themselves and marvel at goals which they have set and the accomplishments that they have already achieved.

No man so fired the imagination and commitment of many Latin nations as did Simon Bolivar. After Bolivar had committed his personal fortune to the causes he struggled for, he concluded that there was another dimension of aid that he could offer his countrymen. His statement might well serve as a rallying cry for those who are interested in the development of these lands:

"I wish I had a material fortune to give to everyone of my countrymen; but I have nothing. I have nothing more than a heart with which to love them, and a sword with which to defend them."

Wooing the Japanese Wheat Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Co-op Grain Quarterly, summer 1961, entitled "Wooing the Japanese Wheat Market."

This article is of great interest not only because it reveals the prospect of a future quality grain market for our hard wheat in Japan, but also because of the decisive role played by the Colorado Wheat Administrative Committee and the Farmers Union Terminal Elevator, Inc., of Denver, Colo., in the first trial wheat shipment recently sent to Japan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOOING THE JAPANESE WHEAT MARKET

American co-op grain producers and merchandisers have proved they can meet and even exceed the most rigid quality and purity specifications imposed by foreign buyers.

This became apaprent last December during the series of test shipments of wheat to Japan, a respectable bit of business which it is hoped has opened new doorways to foreign markets. For this initial shipment of Great Plains wheat to Japan, the buyers specified that the wheat be of a certain protein content and that the grade certificates indicate the "cleanout"—the amount of shrunken and broken kernels and foreign materials. The special cleanout requirements provided for a maximum of 12 percent moisture, maximum 0.5 percent combined foreign material and dockage, maximum 0.5 percent wheat of other classes, and maximum 1.5 percent shrunken and broken kernels. While sedimentation values, which give an indication of baking quality, were not a contract provision, officials supervising the American end of the shipment requested a minimum of 45 for the 13 percent protein wheat, 48 for the 13.5 percent, and 51 for the 14 percent. Selected stocks of wheat were used in order to meet this request.

One of the important American suppliers participating in the Japanese test shipment was Farmers Union Terminal Elevator, Inc., of Denver, Colo., the regional marketing cooperative whose affiliates cover eastern Colorado, western Nebraska, and northwestern Kansas. As their part of the Japanese contract, this regional shipped 3,000 tons of specification wheat. Some of the problems involved are best described in the words of A. F. Gamble, the regional's manager:

"When the specifications for this first trial wheat shipment to Japan were announced," Gamble says, "we shared the misgivings of many in the grain trade in obligating ourselves on a contract basis to ship a quantity of such wheat within the short time schedule allowed. On the other hand, we felt very keenly an obligation to our members to exert our very best efforts in assisting in the trial shipment if at all possible.

"The biggest problem was the specification: Maximum 1.5 percent Shrunken and Broken. U.S. official grain standards allow 5 percent Shrunken and Broken in No. 1 wheat. Also, while sedimentation values were not a contract requirement, the Great Plains Wheat people (the Garden City, Kans., growers' association) requested minimum sedimentations which would require careful selection of wheat from good milling quality stocks.

"After having cleanout and sedimentation tests run on several lots of wheat and making trial cleaning runs over screens from our seed plant remodeled to fit the screen cleaner in our elevator, we bid on supplying the wheat and were awarded the contract. Ten of the local cooperative elevators in eastern and southeastern Colorado are located on railroads participating in the special export freight rate and they all pitched in to supply about half of the wheat, the remainder coming from our terminal at Denver. About one-third of the cars of wheat shipped from local co-ops met the cleanout specifications without being cleaned when they were graded at Denver. The other two-thirds were unloaded and cleaned at our Denver elevator. Through close coordination and extra efforts by the local co-ops and our elevator crew, the shipment was completed according to specification and on schedule.

"Colorado wheat farmers can be proud that through their local and regional co-ops they were in a position to, and did, fulfill this vital part in the task of opening up a market for United States wheat in Japan."

A complex story of human need, and of technocracy's response to that need, is contained in the story of the Japanese trial wheat shipments.

A look at population growth charts is never a comforting experience for the Japanese Government. An adequate supply of food is—and likely always will be—one of Japan's central problems.

Coming out of World War II, the Japanese Government made it a matter of policy to improve the health of the Japanese people through nutrition education.

To reduce its dependence on traditional foods and to tap new sources of food supplies, the Japanese Central Government embarked on a program to encourage consumption of wheat foods in at least one meal per day. This promised to be a formidable task since age-old rice and fish diets cannot be altered speedily.

Sensing that Japan offered a steady market for their wheat products, Pacific Northwest wheatgrowers took increasing interest in the Japanese developments.

Much of the Pacific Northwest's production is geared to Japanese needs since the area turns out about 100 million bushels of Soft White wheat, which makes an excellent flour for noodles, crackers, cakes, cookies, and other pastry items.

Oregon growers went to their legislature to seek a wheat commission. Their efforts were successful in 1947, and the results was legislation providing for a half-cent levy on each bushel of wheat paid by the grower as it moved into the marketplace.

Oregon growers began investigating the market potentials in Japan as well as in other Asian countries. Then came Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Oregon growers immediately laid plans to open an office in Tokyo to assist the Japanese Government in bringing about a massive change in its people's food habits. Oregon was joined later by Washington and Idaho groups with the resultant organization of Western Wheat Associates. Also, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., representing Great Plains growers, joined in the maintenance of the Tokyo office in 1960.

First cooperative project was the school lunch program, a logical place since it offered the priceless opportunity of acquainting a new generation with wheat foods.

The program produced immediate results, until today the majority of Japan's schools serve a nutritious lunch—including a 6-ounce wheat roll—to more than 18 million schoolchildren.

A baker's training school was introduced in which 160 rural bakers from all of Japan's prefectures took part in a 3-month training program. Upon completion of their training class, these bakers returned to their villages and conducted classes for other local bakers.

Kitchen demonstration buses staffed by trained home economists were another method devised to reach Japan's rural villages. Cooperating with other groups, the wheatgrowers secured eight buses and sent them into rural areas. Each bus averaged about 640 miles a month, and demonstrations emphasized a balanced diet featuring wheat foods. Four more buses were added to the program 2 years later.

All of these efforts have produced results. In prewar days, the Japanese consumed an average of 300 pounds of rice and 30 pounds of wheat. Today, the per capita consumption of rice has dropped to 264 pounds while wheat consumption has increased 300 percent to 90 pounds per person.

Wheat promotion efforts in Japan entered a second phase in 1959. The intense interest which was devoted to nutrition in Japan brought prospects of increased consumption of wheat. There was little doubt that White wheat will continue to play an important role, but indications pointed to an upturn in consumption of hard wheats, with the added expectation of a good market for Soft White wheat.

Watching the success of the Pacific Northwest, Great Plains wheat growers formed a regional market development association, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in 1959. Initial supporters of the regional organization were the Kansas Wheat Commission, the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, the Nebraska Wheat Commission, the Nebraska Wheat Growers Association, and the Colorado Wheat

Administrative Committee. North Dakota Wheat Commission joined in 1960.

Officials of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., saw Japan as a quality dollar market for the region's hard wheats.

A U.S. wheat mission left for Japan in December 1959. The mission task was to convince the Japanese of their importance to U.S. wheat export trade and to study the competitive factors.

The mission found that Japan was consuming wheat at the rate of 3.6 million metric tons a year of which 1.3 millions tons were produced domestically. While the United States was considered a prime source of soft white wheats, it was at the same time regarded as a residual supplier of Hard Red wheats.

The mission pointed to a United States-Japan trade balance which amounted to $1.4 billion in Japan's favor. The United States was pictured as Japan's best customer in international trade—a strong point in the trade team's argument to convince Government and industry officials of the desirability of increasing imports of U.S. wheat.

Continued growth in needs of hard wheats was apparent, and the mission recommended increased efforts to market Great Plains hard wheat in Japan.

Some of the most telling arguments came from Edward Seeborg, Foreign Agricultural Service's able cereal technologist, who went to Japan in the spring of 1960.

Seeborg discovered that Japanese millers and bakers had very little knowledge of U.S. Hard Red wheats and their specific qualities. Furthermore, they had experience only with relatively low-protein, weak-gluten type U.S. Hard Red wheats. The rapid increase in the mechanization of the Japanese baking industry indicated a rising demand for better and more uniform flour quality—a chronic problem among bakers.

Working with Japanese Food Agency and industry officials, Seeborg set up a series of tests with Great Plains hard wheat in various mill mixes. He convinced the officials that there were no major technical obstacles in modifying their methods to utilize quality hard wheats from the Great Plains of the United States. And, he pointed out that the naturally low moisture content of U.S. hard wheats added up to a considerable bonus value.

Mr. Seeborg's consultations did much to clear up misconceptions—and even prejudices—concerning U.S. wheat. He also convinced Japanese officials that the purchase of top-quality wheat from the United States is possible, provided the buyer has a clear and precise specification for any additional quality requirements not served by the U.S. grain grades.

Mr. Seeborg then recommended that the Japanese purchase a commercial size trial shipment so that they could more properly evaluate the milling and baking properties of Great Plains hard wheats.

At this point, the grower-supported, grower-financed Great Plains wheat organization took on the massive chore of removing the obstacles.

The first, most visible barrier was a natural one—the Rocky Mountains. The Great Plains area is one of the world's great agricultural empires but because of its distance to blue water, it is almost entirely dependent on rail transportation. And because of the mountain barrier rising on its west boundary, there has been a tendency to regard the Rocky Mountains as a dam which shuts off the flow of wheat to the export trade on the west coast. A breakthrough was needed.

While a number of railroads connect the Great Plains with the west coast, freight rates were prohibitively high, thus effectively preventing Great Plains wheat from moving into the Pacific export trade from the west coast.

From the start, the Japanese Government made it clear that it was interested in expanding its dependable sources of high-quality, Hard Red wheats. It had depended almost solely on Canada for wheat of this quality, but indicated that it wanted to extend its sources of supply if it could obtain the supplies which would be competitive with Canadian Manitobas both in quality and price.

The Japanese, too, indicated that they would much prefer to take deliveries at west coast ports which their ships normally visit to deliver Japanese goods.

Acting on this information, the Wheat Producers Transportation Committee, representing wheat producer groups, went before the Transcontinental Freight Bureau.

After the hearings, individual members of the Transcontinental Freight Bureau filed independently for a reduced rate for Great Plains hard wheats moving to the west coast export trade. The reduction to 81 cents per hundred was for a period of 1 year. (The rate later went to 82 cents as a result of a general rate increase.)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture then followed with a special export subsidy of 68 cents per bushel for Hard Red Winter wheat shipments from the west coast. This was a temporary rate designed to cover a trial shipment to Japan.

The way was clear for the trial shipment. Mitsui & Co., a Japanese firm, filled the tender for the Japanese Food Agency. Half of the 6,000-ton trial shipment was to be from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks on the west coast; the other half was to be gathered from free supplies directly in the Great Plains region, according to rigid protein and cleanout specifications. The wheat, averaging between 13 and 14 percent protein content, was designed to represent the quality wheat which Great Plains wheatgrowers were capable of producing.

After the trial shipment reached Japan for the rigorous series of tests by the Japanese Food Agency, Seeborg again was on hand to observe and to lend technical assistance. He worked with millers and bakers and showed them how to obtain the best results from Great Plains hard wheat, used by itself and in blends with Canadian Manitoba wheat.

The Japanese Food Agency agreed that Great Plains hard wheats of 13.5 percent could meet its import requirements.

Sedimentation readings are not being used at present, although there is a good chance that such sedimentation values will become part of contract specifications. It will be an excellent way to assure quality control.

James Thornton, manager of the Colorado Wheat Administrative Committee, represented the Great Plains organization as the Japanese Food Agency drew up its conclusions. He called the tests the most thorough and meticulous study that any country has made on its wheat import needs. "We hope that the Japanese will work toward the goal of including sedimentation readings in contract provisions," he added.

Thornton also reported that the Japanese will not specify cleanout levels, but they are expected to check this factor closely when shipments arrive at home ports.

Premiums for tight cleanout specifications are prohibitive, Thornton said. In addition, Japanese mills have facilities for handling reasonable amounts of cleanout, which can be channeled into a vast feed grains market.

All of the problems of establishing a U.S. market in Japan on a stable, continuing basis are not solved. First of these problems is getting a continuation—and possible further reduction—of freight rates for export wheat moving to the west coast. And export subsidies will be necessary to insure that the U.S. wheat is priced competitively with wheat from other exporting countries.

Another problem which is of immediate concern to producers is the high-quality level demanded by the Japanese in order to justify the replacement of Manitoba wheat. This requires a big increase in the production of strong-gluten varieties in place of the mellow-gluten varieties such as Pawnee and Wichita. "We cannot expect to supply large quantities of wheat above 13 percent protein and above a sedimentation value of 45 unless we produce such quality in amounts over and above domestic needs," Seeborg said.

Provided that these terms can be met, the flow of wheat to the Japanese market is likely to start out with 8 to 10 million bushels a year and gradually build up to 20 million bushels, or more, a year.

At stake is a huge cash business in Japan. Equally important is the reputation which the United States can set in meeting the quality needs of importing countries all over the world.

The Federal Role in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, never before in our history has there been so widespread appreciation as there is today of the importance of education in our national life. Today, there is a general realization that the future of our Nation and our Western civilization directly depends upon the quality and availability of educational opportunity. There is the great awakening to the realization that our national survival—and the survival of free institutions everywhere on earth—depends upon the product of schools and colleges in the free world.

When considered in this context, it is enormously important that every one of us—and particularly those who formulate education policy in our State legislatures and in the Congress—are directed toward strengthening and improving the American system of education.

In reaching this objective, I believe certain principles to be sound and progressive and summarize them as follows:

First. The basic responsibility for providing education rests with the State government, communities, and private groups; and Federal control or direction of education must be avoided at all costs.

Second. There is a continuing but increasingly profound national interest in education which makes it appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in strengthening and improving education.

Third. Federal programs, therefore, must be designed to assist States and communities and public and private institutions of higher education to overcome educational needs which must, in the national interest, be fulfilled, but which oftentimes State, local, and private action alone is insufficient to meet.

Fourth. The role of the Federal Government, therefore, is to assist States and communities and educational institutions to meet educational needs without weakening State, local, and private responsibility and without substituting Federal funds for traditional sources of

educational revenue. We should make dead certain that Federal aid stimulates additional educational effort.

I. THE EISENHOWER POLICY

During the Eisenhower administration Federal policies based upon these principles have worked remarkably well to improve education. Inherent in these principles is the assumption that once our citizens understand the needs of education they will make the necessary decisions to supply those needs. That is why the 83d Congress in 1954 approved Mr. Eisenhower's request which launched a national program of State education conferences that led to a White House conference in December of 1955. During this year far-reaching effort—in which all 48 States and 4 territories took part—500,000 citizens met in over 4,000 State and local education conferences to discuss school needs and to make recommendations for action at every level to meet those needs. This culminated in the White House conference at which 2,000 educators and interested laymen from every State and territory met to pool their accumulated knowledge and to make recommendations.

One of the principal recommendations of the White House conference was that the Federal Government undertake a program of temporary assistance to States and local school districts to help overcome the shortage of public school facilities which had accumulated as a result of 20 years of depression and war followed by a huge upsurge in the birth rate. It was agreed that the States could meet their current needs for additional facilities if they could once overcome this shortage. Otherwise, it was apparent that a whole generation of schoolchildren would suffer the adverse effects of overcrowded classrooms, double shifts, and antiquated facilities. Accordingly, the President—Eisenhower—recommended that the Congress authorize such Federal assistance over a period of 4 or 5 years. He made this recommendation and submitted his program to the Congress in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1959, and 1960. During all these years the Democrat-controlled Congress delayed this action. Year after year the Democrats turned down the President's proposals to aid education.

Had the President's recommendations been accepted in 1956 or 1957, it would have meant that the classroom shortage—142,000 elementary and secondary public school classrooms in 1960—would have been eliminated by now.

In 1956, Mr. Eisenhower appointed a committee to study the needs of education beyond the high school level. From the work of this committee—headed by a distinguished citizen of New York, Devereux C. Josephs—and out of the continuing studies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there was developed the recommendations that the President—set forth in a special message to Congress—which led to the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This act authorized a variety of interrelated programs designed to assist States, communities, and institutions of higher learning to strengthen and improve education in ways important to the national security. The National Defense Act of 1958 was designed with these specific objectives in mind:

First. Encourage able students to go to college and remain in college by making financial assistance available to those who need it, thus lessening the appalling loss of talent caused by able students dropping out of academic work after high school graduation. Between the spring of 1959 and June 30, 1961, 230,000 young men and women received substantial loans under the student loan program of the NDEA. In addition, 4,000 3-year graduate fellowships were financed under the terms of the NDEA.

Second. Improve counseling and guidance services available to schoolchildren and to extend modern testing techniques so that we can identify able students and encourage them to complete their education.

Third. Improve instruction—and facilities and equipment—in modern foreign languages, science, and mathematics in our elementary and secondary schools; and to increase our knowledge of vital but little-taught foreign languages at the college level.

Fourth. Expand programs of graduate education in all fields in order that we may have an adequate number of fully qualified college teachers.

Fifth. Stimulate additional research in the educational use of modern techniques of communication.

Sixth. Assist in the development of area vocational schools within States devoted to the training of technical and scientific personnel at a subprofessional level.

Seventh. Expand the science information services of the National Science Foundation.

Eighth. Improve State educational statistics services.

These programs are helping educators and others to do a better job in meeting pressing educational needs. They are proving extremely successful and worthwhile in their fourth year of operation. The National Defense Education Act embodies and exemplifies the Republican philosophy of helping education to do its vital job without Federal control, and without Federal invasion of State, local and private responsibility. The House in this, the 87th Congress, wisely extended the existing provisions of the 1958 act for another 2 years.

What else has the Federal Government done in education under a Republican administration? Let us look at a few representative items:

First. Under an act of the 83d Congress—the Cooperative Research Act—the U.S. Office of Education spent over $3 million in 1960 to finance research in basic problems in education; in learning, in effective teaching techniques, in the education of superior and retarded students, and other basic professional education problems.

Second. The vital educational programs of the National Science Foundation—fellowships and science teacher institutes—have been enormously expanded. Federal expenditures for these purposes were less than $3 million annually in 1953 to over $60 million in 1960.

Third. The budget of the U.S. Office of Education has been increased from less than $4 million annually to over $12 million in 1960, and the work of that office has been greatly strengthened.

Fourth. Overall, Federal expenditures in support of education at all levels—exclusive of expenditures for veterans' education and training which naturally became less in the last few years—have been substantially increased. For example, in 1950–51 the Federal Government spent about $800 million for programs in support of education, exclusive of the GI bill costs. By 1956–57, these expenditures had increased to $1.2 billion, excluding payments to veterans and, Federal expenditures continue to rise.

In 1960 Mr. Eisenhower recommended a school construction program under which the Federal Government would annually pay one-half the principal and interest coming due on $3 billion of school bonds issued by local school districts that need schools and need financial help to build them. The States would pay the other half of the costs. These Federal payments would stretch over the 20- to 30-year life of the school bonds, but would enable the districts to build the schools within a 5-year period in which the Federal-State commitments would be made. This proposal was rejected by the Democrat-controlled 86th Congress despite its obvious merit.

Another of Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations which did not receive enthusiastic support was one designed to assist institutions of higher learning to build the dormitory and classroom and other facilities they must have to accommodate the virtual tidal wave of college enrollments during the next few years. At present, Federal assistance is limited to low-interest loans for dormitory construction only—college housing loan program—made available under the Housing Act. The proposal sponsored an outright Federal grant of 25 percent of the cost of construction of all types of college faciilties. None of these programs or proposals would put the Federal Government in the position of taking over responsibility for financing education. They are designed to help and encourage State and local governmental and private agencies to do this job—as they have traditionally done it.

II. THE KENNEDY POLICY

How does the Kennedy approach differ from the Eisenhower policies in education? Basically, they differ in this way: The Kennedy program would commit the Federal Government to paying a substantial and permanent share of the cost of education in every State—regardless of whether the State itself is meeting educational obligations.

This is not in the best interest of education for several reasons:

First. It is completely unreasonable to believe the the Federal Government would undertake this financial responsibility on a permanent basis without also, sooner or later, assuming an equal re-

sponsibility for the administration, control and direction of education.

Second. It would weaken the basic support upon which our public schools must depend—the financial support of local and State government. Any such massive and permanent Federal intervention in education would effectively shift the financial responsibility from local and State sources. This could not help but impede efforts and initiative to make the necessary decisions on a State and local level to adequately support education. Even worse—the real strength of our system of education is in the interest and understanding of citizens at a local level which results in their resolving to take the necessary steps to have good schools.

Mr. Kennedy has cited classroom shortage as a major issue in proposing his aid to education program. A glance at U.S. Office of Education figures reveal a reduction in classroom shortage from 370,000 to 142,000 between 1954 and 1960 without benefit of a Federal aid program. In addition, the population projections of the Census Bureau indicate that the peak of educational needs in terms of population growth has already been reached, and that this ratio will decline during the next decade. In proportion to our population growth, attendance at public elementary and secondary schools has been decreasing, while college school attendance has been increasing.

The President's program also provides an opening wedge for Federal control over teachers' salaries. This, despite the fact that during the past 30 years teachers' salaries rose by 106 percent as compared to 91 percent for all persons working for wages and salaries and only 73 percent for government civilian employees. It also must be recognized that a large proportion of our public school teachers are women and all surveys on the subject show that women teachers average higher earnings than other women college graduates or professional workers.

Our public schools have increased their teaching staff proportionately faster than enrollment and the number of pupils per teacher has been consistently reduced. Since 1900 the number of public school pupils rose 140 percent, the number of teachers 250 percent and the pupil-teacher ratio was reduced by 11.2—from 35.6 pupils per teacher to 24.4 for 1960–61. If the percentage of college students seeking a teaching career merely remains stable over the next decade, the number of newly graduated teachers will almost double. Pupil enrollment, on the other hand, will increase far less—20 percent as compared with a 46-percent rise during the last decade.

The President claims that his proposal is designed to give aid to those who need it most. The facts of the matter are quite to the contrary.

Out of 45 States that replied to a questionnaire dispatched by the Office of Education in 1959, 15 States reported having districts, which although needing additional classrooms had reached their borrowing limits and had no access to other funds. There were 237 such districts, most of them small, out of a national total of over 40,000 districts—a showing that only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the Nation, legally lacked financial means to build needed schools.

In the few school districts where classrooms were needed and where the districts were borrowed up with no access to State or other funds to build them, there is sometimes a mere appearance of having reached a legal tax or debt limit by assessing property at a fraction of traditional value. Most legal restrictions on taxes and public debt were imposed by the people themselves or by their elected representatives, and can be amended or repealed by the same process.

It is interesting to note at this point, that the percentage of bond issues approved in public school bond issue elections reached a record high of 82 percent in 1960 as compared to 61 percent just the year before. During January, 1961, $157 million of school bond issues out of $170 million were favorably voted upon—92 percent. Annual new educational construction has almost tripled since 1950.

Under the Kennedy proposal, high income States will pay the largest share of the cost of his program and receive the smallest allocations despite the fact that they represent the greatest increase in school enrollment. On the other hand the low-income States that will contribute least to financing the program and receive far larger sums in their allocations—have had the smallest growth in pupil enrollment.

For example, our own State of New York, according to the Office of Education's 1960 survey, has a net schoolroom need of about 10,200. Texas requires 809 new schoolrooms. During the 3-year initial program under the administration's bill, New York State, although paying far more than Texas in financing the program, will receive considerably less in allocation although its classroom needs are 12 times as great.

New Yorkers would pay $312 million in Federal taxes to get $116 million in Federal aid. New York State would suffer a net loss of $196 million in 3 years.

III. SUBSTITUTE FOR KENNEDY PROPOSAL

A far more attractive and equitable means of aiding education has been thought out, and is gaining congressional as well as popular support, including 70 percent of the people polled in the 27th Congressional District of New York. This proposal and variations thereof has been offered as a substitute to the Kennedy-Ribicoff measure which met with overwhelming opposition in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Every U.S. citizen who owns real estate pays a real property tax to his local community government—a substantial part of which is used to meet local elementary and secondary school needs. The substitute proposal provides that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as a part of his real-estate tax shall be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes, the full amount of such school property tax, or such proportion of it as will result in a total additional tax benefit to these taxpayers of between $3 billion and $4 billion.

Under the present Federal income-tax law, State and local school taxes are deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. For example, a taxpayer who had paid $200 in school taxes as part of his local real property tax on his home, and is in the 20-percent Federal income tax bracket, realizes a saving of $40. The new proposal would retain this present practice but in addition would permit the taxpayer to take a $100 credit against what he owes Uncle Sam, that is, against his net Federal income tax. Hence, instead of a saving of $40, the homeowner under this proposal would save $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes on his home. Of course, if the taxpayer's school tax were less than $100 he would be permitted to save in total no more than the actual amount of his school tax. The tax credit would be available to real property-school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction.

The advantages of this approach are overwhelming:

First. The tax benefits provided would go directly to approximately 40 million taxpayers, including about 34 million homeowners, who with their families constitute almost 90 percent of our population.

Second. With the Federal Government completely excluded from the program, there would be no danger of Federal control over education. Depending on State law, each community itself, or the State, would be the final judge of how much more it would like to spend on its educational needs than it is currently spending.

Third. The funds made available to the taxpayers are greater than the sums contemplated under any of the other Federal aid to education measures which are seriously being considered; they would be even greater than the sums recently recommended by President Kennedy's task force headed by President Hovde, of Purdue University.

Fourth. Because of the complete exclusion of the Federal Government, there would be no expanded bureaucracy, no Federal administrative costs, and every dollar of tax money thus made available would purchase a full dollar's worth of school aid if the community decided to expand its expenditures for education.

Fifth. Inasmuch as the tax resources of every State and locality would be substantially increased under this proposal, each would have ample funds to provide for its own school needs as it chooses, for who knows better what these needs are than the citizens of the States and localities themselves.

Sixth. The so-called richer States would not be required to help finance the school needs of the allegedly poorer States, for under this proposal every State would have sufficient funds to meet its school needs out of its own resources. Rich State A would not be required to pay to the Federal Government in taxes twice or three times as much as it gets back in Federal school aid while poor

State B was receiving back in Federal aid two or three times the amount of tax money it paid to the Federal Government as its share of financing the Federal school aid program.

Seventh. Under other proposed Federal school aid measures, those States that have fully met their school needs would not, if given a free choice, expand their school facilities during the next few years, would nevertheless be compelled to pay their share in Federal taxes to finance the program. The only way these States could recover any of the money thus extracted from them under these various proposals would be to accept the Federal grants and use them to expand their school facilities. The result would be the highly uneconomic and wasteful extension of school facilities in many areas where such extension is unnecessary and where other more urgent needs exist and must perforce remain unsatisfied. Under this proposal, the use made of their money is not dictated to the taxpayer by the bureaucrats in Washington—it is determined by the taxpayers themselves, that is, by the parent, the citizen, the local school board, and the community of the State.

Eighth. Any objection to this proposal based on the assertion that it would bite into the Federal Treasury is equally applicable to any of the other measures presently under consideration. This proposal would lead to a good look at the Federal budget and the discovery of many items of less importance, or even of no importance, which could be readily eliminated with no ill effects on the public welfare.

Ninth. If unemployment does not decrease and business continues to falter, this proposal will provide the necessary tax relief which some of the proponents of expanded Federal aid programs assert to be necessary to stimulate the economy.

Tenth. The preemption of State and local tax resources by the Federal Government would be diminished, and thus an important step would be taken in contracting big Central Government and strengthening State and local government.

In order to encourage a closer relationship between school district leaders and parents, and at the same time correct a grave inequity in the postal rate structure, I introduced a bill (H.R. 4975) to grant second-class mailing privileges to elementary and secondary schools. Under present law religious organizations, fraternal orders, many colleges and universities enjoy second-class mailing privileges, but our public school system does not.

I am pleased to record at this point that H.R. 4975, having been endorsed by the Post Office Department, was favorably reported from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. On August 21, 1961, the measure passed the House and was subsequently referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It is anticipated that the bill will receive the same enthusiastic support in the Senate as it did in the House, and will become public law before the 87th Congress adjourns in 1962.

To meet the crisis which is occurring on the higher education level, I have used a similar tax credit approach in my bill H.R. 5589, which is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. H.R. 5589 allows a tax credit for income spent on education by any taxpayer either for his own tuition or for anyone he may wish to help educate. To keep it equitable the rate would be uniform for all at the lowest Federal income tax rate of 20 percent. The person in the lower tax brackets would obtain the same tax benefits as persons in all other brackets. It would only apply for tuition up to $1,200 a year, and would be applicable to all recognized educational institutions.

Money now spent on other less essential things would be encouraged to be spent in this vital field of the education of our people, and would assist many of our young people who are now prevented from going to college because their parents cannot afford it. The average cost of college education is $1,550 per year for each student. Among middle-income families, 80 percent hope to send their children to college but only half of these families ever do. With my proposed moderate tax incentive assistance plan many more families in the middle-income bracket will channel the money they now spend on less important things to the education of their children or themselves. Federal tax revenue saved in this legislation would be directly funneled into education and would create a 4-to-1 Federal incentive program. In other words, for every dollar the Government gave up in tax receipts $4 would be contributed by the people privately and voluntarily resulting in much greater expenditure by parents for better education of their children which otherwise would not be made. The effect of this would be to increase private investment by our people in the future of the country. A nobler use for our national income is difficult to conceive. Moreover, this legislation would impartially broaden the educational base among all accredited schools of our Nation without any danger of Federal controls.

Certainly an incentive to educate our people is as important or more important than an incentive to produce barrels of oil or shoe machinery or to entertain prospective business clients at nightclubs. Should there be a tax incentive for expense accounts but none to educate our children? This is precisely the situation under the present tax laws. I say it should be changed—and now.

This substitute program should obviate the necessity of Federal aid becoming a constitutional issue which could divide the Nation.

Real Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Donald I. Rogers, in a recent edition of the New York Herald Tribune makes some real sense. If this administration is truly interested in expanding the private enterprise system—and there is not much evidence of that yet—then Mr. Rogers' article could pave the way for not only increasing our gross national product, but also reducing unemployment.

REAL TAX REFORM

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has warned Congressmen that one of the first items of business after Congress reconvenes in January will be consideration of a new tax bill. Yet, just before he went to the hospital, Speaker SAM RAYBURN declared that there can be no tax reductions next year and, in fact, because of the cost of the cold war, taxes may be increased.

Mr. SAM is right as far as he goes, though in truth the cold war is responsible for a long, slow rise in military spending, while the domestic programs, more political than essential, have occasioned the swift, steep rise that may cause taxes to be raised.

The administration likes to deny this, but in recent years (dating back to the previous administration) the budget has increased by almost three dollars of domestic spending for each new dollar of defense spending.

So why consider a new tax bill? Every tax bill merely implements the preceding one, though for practical political reasons the revisions sometimes grant relief to one little segment of the population, but make up for it in another, until pressure causes an adjustment in the compensating area, but that's for a different Congress, a later session. You don't have to get elected every year, you know.

In reality, a new tax bill would be ridiculous. If Congress insists on foisting one upon us, I promise to wage a constant campaign to stimulate the interest and maybe the ire of the American public over the naivete which leads to the assumption by Congressmen that newer and broader ways of imposting the citizens is all that's required of them in dealing with the tax problem.

America doesn't need a new tax bill. It needs tax reform. Reform—not a rewritten version of the old code; not some new rules designed to widen the breech between the poor souls assigned to collect the taxes and the even poorer ones who are obliged to pay them.

Before we strive to put a man on the moon, let's try to replace our childish concept of economics with—heck, just an adolescent concept would be a big step.

Only a few months ago, President Kennedy won enormous support for his presidential campaign by complaining over the lack of growth in America's economy, compared with the economies of other countries.

Allen Dulles provided a later report showing that 30 percent of Russia's gross national product goes into capital investment; 23 percent of Germany's goes into it; 21 percent of Italy's; 18 percent of France's.

In the United States, the leading capitalistic nation, we invest 15 percent of our gross national product in capital investment. That's why we don't grow economically as fast as other countries.

Why? Because of our tax laws. Personal income soars in America. Gross national product increases. Government expenditures zoom upward with predictable constancy. But business investment in plant and equipment remains level—has remained level for a dozen years. The money needed for additional investment is taxed away.

It's taxed away as earnings that should be invested. Because of this policy, we have inflation and that, in turn, taxes away earnings that don't even exist but are merely

anticipated. Phantom profits that appear on paper are wiped out by ever increasing costs for the replacement of machines and equipment and buildings, because of inflation.

Fumbling along under this preposterous system, is the Internal Revenue Service which it is admitted by Commissioner Mortimer Caplin, doesn't really care about justice or equality or fairness—but only in revenue. He stated in crystal-clear language that an IRS ruling may apply to one person but not to another.

He asked for repeal of the gambling tax stamp law, which was supposed to yield $400 million in taxes a year over the last 10 years, because his outfit finds it too hard to collect the taxes. He warned that what may be allowed on a tax return this time around may not be allowed next time if the Treasury really needs money.

Taxes, he concedes by his statements, are collected by caprice and from the law-abiding and docile (and usually) the poorest Americans. The terrible truth is that the honest man is the patsy, the fall guy.

Already on file in Congress, awaiting debate, is the Herlong-Baker bill (identical bills, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031) which would provide for sweeping tax reform to be monitored by law and regulation, not by whim.

The program would, over a 5-year period, reduce taxes for everyone, individuals and corporations alike, yet, because of the increase in capital investment, result in higher revenues for the Government. If higher revenues are needed, this is the way to get them.

All tax rates would be cut at least 25 per cent. The highest rate would be 47 percent on individuals and corporations. Also, depreciation allowances and gift and inheritance taxes would be reformed.

You can get more information on the Herlong-Baker bill by writing to me at the New York Herald Tribune, 230 West 41st Street, New York 36, N.Y. At no charge I'll send you a condensation of the proposal.

Health Care for the Aged: Kerr-Mills and HEW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the title "Kerr-Mills Success—Despite HEW"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, pages 18372–18373; corrections to bring material up to date and correct errors in printing, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 19, page 19112—a summary of the State action for the assistance of the aged in the health care field under the Kerr-Mills Act which the Congress enacted in the 86th Congress. I also called attention to the fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has done little of a constructive nature to lead States to the enactment of the necessary enabling legislation to bring this form of assistance into effect in the States. Despite the attitude of the Department, great advances have been made under this farsighted law.

My placing this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD brought a response from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through its Assistant Secretary, the Honorable Wilbur Cohen. I subsequently replied to Assistant Secretary Cohen hoping to clarify the issue on what HEW's role has been in the advancement of the Kerr-Mills Act. Because of the importance of this question of health care for the aged, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and my reply to it.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
September 22, 1961.

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I read with great interest your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1961, concerning the administration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the programs of medical care for the aged under the 1960 amendments to title I of the Social Security Act.

I note in particular your assertion of the total absence of leadership by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage their implementation by the States and a failure to mention the provision for increased Federal financial participation in medical care in behalf of recipients of old-age assistance. I feel seriously that you have been misinformed on both of these points. Quite to the contrary, this Department has extended great effort to bring the benefits of this legislation to its best development.

First of all, the former administration acted very promptly upon the passage of the Kerr-Mills Act. The law was approved by the President on September 13, 1960, and material was sent to the States by the Department 3 days later. The present administration has continued and accelerated stimulation of State action. This has been done in a number of ways. There are the speeches and articles of Department officials, including myself, urging States to take the necessary action to implement the 1960 legislation. State agency personnel, both administrators and technicians, came to Washington to participate in the development of policies and procedures for the implementation of the program. Consultation was made available to the States by the staff of the Department in Washington and by its regional staff. In 1961 some 12 official documents have been transmitted to the States on the subject of medical care, including medical assistance for the aged and medical care of old-age assistance recipients.

The amendments made to the old-age assistance program in 1960 were simple in nature and did not require the kind of interpretation to the States as did the medical-assistance-to-the-aged legislation. We have, however, made the same effort to help States to expand and improve their medical services.

As you know the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act permitted payments directly to suppliers of medical care to public assistance recipients, including old-age assistance recipients. When the 1960 amendments increased the Federal share in these payments made to old-age assistance recipients, this type of provision was in operation in 43 States. Following the 1960 amendments five additional States have vendor payments in effect, three more have the necessary authorization. The remaining three—Alaska, Arizona, and Delaware require legislation. Of the 43 States that were making vendor payments before September 1960, 21 have improved their coverage or content from the level of that date. By January 1960, three States will expand coverage to the aged who are not in need of a money payment but are medically indigent. Eighteen States have not expanded their plan provisions from the September 1960 level, and one State requires legislation to take full advantage of the sums available under the Federal law.

Far from overlooking the importance of these developments, weekly reports have been issued on the status of these programs. In fact the information you cited on the adavances made was derived from Departmental reports.

The Department strongly supports the 1960 legislation for we believe the States need help in meeting the medical requirements of the needy aged. We further believe that the grant-in-aid approach alone through the old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged programs, however, cannot be expected to meet the problems of our older citizens who become ill. States have moved as rapidly as possible to use the 1960 legislation and we have helped and urged them to do so. The experience thus far clearly shows that this method or approach alone cannot meet the problem the Nation faces.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1961.

Hon. WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: Thank you for your letter of September 22, 1961, commenting upon my remarks accompanying the chart I had prepared to show the magnitude of the Kerr-Mills Act operation, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1961. I appreciate your assurance that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare strongly supports the 1960 Kerr-Mills Act to assist in providing adequate health care for our senior citizens. I wish the actions supported this assurance.

Granting the routine actions you say were taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, they fall short of providing leadership of the Department to encourage the States to implement the 1960 amendment. Furthermore, other actions and statements of Department officials were going in the other direction. It is true that the data for the chart came from departmental reports, yet the Department did not compile and publish this information in usable form. It required considerable effort to gather this material together to make the meaningful chart I put in the RECORD.

I would appreciate receiving copies of the speeches and articles of Department officials urging States to take the necessary action to implement the 1960 legislation, to which you refer in your letter, or sufficient reference to these speeches and articles so I may obtain them. Perhaps the trouble has been that the press has not given full publicity to these speeches and articles. Would you send me the publicity releases that accompanied these speeches and articles?

On the other hand, I am well aware of the undercover campaign being conducted by proponents of the social security approach to health care for the aged to denigrate the Kerr-Mills Act. We had a full impact of this in the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in the recent public hearings, beginning with the morning testimony of Secretary Ribicoff himself. I saw no attempts by officials of Health, Education, and Welfare, including yourself, to contradict this effort and to deplore it. Instead, there seemed to be encouragement upon the part of officials in HEW to carry on these attacks.

The attack on the Kerr-Mills Act has been largely directed obliquely by striking at its use of a means test, to make it appear that a means test is degrading and antisocial. I believe the official position of Health, Education, and Welfare is in favor of the use of means tests in many of our welfare and edu-

cational programs. Certainly, a publicity campaign which encourages people to look upon means tests as degrading can make them somewhat that way. However, a positive program to point out the proper purpose means tests serve, and why they are not degrading, can move public opinion properly in the other direction.

In light of your letter, I want to protest again what I pointed out to Secretary Ribicoff during the hearings, that HEW has been misrepresenting the budgetary problems of our aged by the use of incomplete and, therefore, misleading statistics. On the expenditure side, HEW points up only the cost of health care in the older person's budget, which is greater than for any other age group, but fails to point out that every other item in the budget for people over 65—food, rent, clothing, recreation, etc.—is less than that of any other age group, and that the total expenditures in the budget for people over 65, including the larger health care cost, is less than that for any other age group. On the income side of the budget, HEW has pointed up individual income instead of head-of-family income and ignored the important items of homeownership, savings, and other possessions which the older people have in more abundance than any other age group. Here the Department has shown unfortunate leadership.

I would also like to point out again the absence of leadership on the part of HEW in compiling and disseminating to the public accurate and up-to-date information about what is being done in the private sector in increased health insurance, added facilities, and skills for caring for the aged. The tremendous advancements that have been made in recent years in these fields was attested to by many careful studies presented to the Ways and Means Committee during the public hearings. This data should have been known, compiled, and disseminated by HEW. Certainly, after the hearings were completed, HEW should have helped in directing the public's attention to this data.

HEW still has not gathered pertinent information of what is being done at the county and local governmental level in the health care field and persists in issuing misleading information about what States are doing, minus this data. Many States operate their health programs primarily at the county and local level, rather than at the State level. HEW, in issuing its statistics, fails to note this important fact.

My statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1961, are mild when I think of the complete story of the negative leadership HEW has been giving to the country in this important issue of health care for our society.

I would be happy to have your further comments on this matter in rebuttal. I have no desire to be unfair, but I am determined to do the best I can to give the public as full and as balanced a picture of our health care programs as possible.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

The Politics of Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the important legislative questions of the 1st session of the 87th Congress was that of tax reform. Extensive hearings on this subject were held by the House Committee on Ways and Means, based upon the proposals of the President in this field. At a recent meeting of the Economic Institute on Tax Reform of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, I had the opportunity to discuss the bases of tax reform and its politics. Because of the current interest in this matter and its prominence before the Congress, I should like to place my statements in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS B. CURTIS, REPUBLICAN, SECOND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC INSTITUTE ON TAX REFORM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE POLITICS OF TAX REFORM

Tax reform is like the weather. Everybody talks about it, but no one does very much about it. Indeed, taxes, although a human creation, seem to follow rigid laws that are beyond the power of human control. The old adage, death and taxes escape no man, bears out this observation. Taxes are the essence of government, and government is the essence of organized society.

How do human beings reform something that is inhuman? By appealing to the inequities of it? I doubt it. I don't believe there is equity in taxes anymore than there is equity in fire or weather or any natural force.

The only sound appeal for tax reform is inefficiency of a specific tax or inefficiency in a tax system: (a) A tax may become too costly to collect; (b) a tax may become so burdensome that a government which seeks to enforce it falls in the process; or (c) a tax may bring about economic or social damage.

The equity of a tax is a subjective thing. This subjective thing becomes important because it bears upon the efficiency of collecting the tax. Our tax system is largely a system of voluntary collection. A voluntary system is the most efficient of all tax systems and should always be the goal of tax legislation. Some people smile when that observation is made, as the various penalties for tax evasion come to their minds. However, I submit that the penalties in our tax system operate mainly to assure our people that everyone pays his taxes and those who try to evade taxes do suffer the consequences. However, a tax system that fails to adjust for inequities results eventually in an involuntary system of collection, because of the prevalent feeling that everyone does not pay taxes.

Taxes follow the law of inertia. It is difficult to put a new tax law on the books. It is equally difficult to remove a tax law from the books. This is particularly noticeable in the Federal excise tax system which is selective. There really is no rhyme or reason about which products or services bear a Federal excise tax, except the efficiency with which the Government can get revenue. It is costly to put a new tax into effect. The longer a tax is in effect, however, the more efficient it becomes. Also, the longer a tax is in effect, the less economic and social damage it causes, because people learn to live with it. The wound heals over, a scar is formed, and pretty soon even the itching ceases and, only in bad weather, does one receive a twinge of pain.

There are three types of tax reform. One type of reform relates to the basic tax structure and is based upon political and economic theory. The other two relate to specific tax laws and are based upon immediate social and economic impacts.

I shall first briefly discuss the politics of specific tax reforms and then proceed to discuss in more detail the politics of basic tax reform.

The two types of specific tax reform are:

1. Those based upon appeals to efficiency, which include equity.

2. Those based upon appeals to produce or to eliminate economic and/or social results.

I think any government, whatever may be its basic tax philosophy, if it is wise, will listen to appeals to tax reform based upon efficiency and upon equity. Too often tax reform is pushed in the guise of equity, when the real argument relates to some alleged undesirable social or economic impact the tax creates. It is helpful to keep the two arguments separate in pushing through tax reform, although sometimes it is difficult to do so.

Let me illustrate. Quite a bit of political action has been directed toward eliminating the Federal communications excise tax. It is argued that the tax is inequitable because other goods and services are not taxed. It is also argued that the tax was put on as a temporary war tax. These appeals to equity are inconsequential because they have little bearing on the efficiency of collecting the tax. Unfortunately, in many respects the communications tax has proven to be an efficient tax; what inefficiency there may be stems from the inflationary impact it has, resulting from its multiplier effect on prices as it is passed on, marked up, through the entire business process and ultimately paid for by the consumer. I suspect that the consumer pays 50 percent more than the Government receives in revenue.

It is possible to organize politically to successfully change a specific tax without any sound reason at all, but this has to do with the techniques of lobbying and other political action. I have seen this done on many occasions, and admired the techniques, but I have always doubted whether the cost and the effort were really worth it. Certainly, the damage to the legislative process more than outweighs the benefits. However, it is less costly to organize politically to change a specific tax if it is based upon some sound reasons and, if the reasons are sound enough, it costs little or nothing.

It requires little effort to get a tax changed if a good case for its efficiency is made. This is one reason it is important politically to separate economic and social reasons from reasons of inefficiencies and pure equities. All that is required politically, in this instance, is to call the matter of inefficiency or inequity to the attention of a Member of Congress or any proper person in the Treasury Department.

It requires more political effort to get a tax changed based upon arguments of alleged undersirable social and economic impact. It is for this reason I suspect that many instances where a good case could be made on the basis of an undesirable economic impact, such a case was not made, but rather, an unsustainable appeal to allege inequities was made in its stead. However, this is a dangerous risk to take, because those who are not in agreement about the undesirability of the social or economic impact are left free to expose the inadequacies of the appeal to equity or inefficiency, and never have to answer the adequate arguments pertaining to social or economic impact.

Let me illustrate. The tax credit and exemption for dividends paid upon stocks is usually defended upon the grounds that it is inequitable to tax stockholders twice on corporate earnings. Well, this argument cannot be sustained, as it relates to efficiency of tax collections. This tax reform was placed in the code in 1954, not on the basis of any equitable consideration, but rather, on the basis of equalizing the tax impact on new equity with that of debt and retained earnings to finance corporate economic growth. Actually, if this matter were fully understood by the public, I think the political effort necessary to retain this reform in the

law and, indeed, to enact the next two steps as originally planned would be very little.

Indeed, I might make this observation about most legislation, particularly tax legislation; the primary political effort needed is to inform the public of the truth of the matter.

The double taxation of dividends, however, has been argued to the public on the basis of equities. There is little doubt in my mind which side has won the equity argument. It has been won by those who say, "What's inequitable about taxing stockholders twice?" We have a graduated income tax which taxes the investing class, who are the higher income brackets, as much as five times as much as wage earners. Frankly, I am still looking around for help in getting across the economic argument to the public. Indeed, I sometimes think I will convert Walter Reuther to the importance of not giving tax favoritism over new equity financing to retained earnings and debt financing before I get Keith Funston to understand the political wisdom of appealing to economic argument instead of equities.

The political problem of urging tax reform related to social and economic impact is complicated by the fact that not all people believe that a tax system should strive for social and economic neutrality. There is a growing school of political economists who argue that we should use our tax laws deliberately to bring about social and economic results. I shall discuss this later in relation to the politics of basic tax reform, but it must be alluded to at this point because arguments for specific tax reform to achieve better neutrality fall on many deaf ears today.

It is a very difficult political problem to deal with, because seldom do these people openly reject the theory of tax neutrality. Indeed, they give lipservice to it.

Another political problem we run into in trying to bring about tax reform to alter economic or social impact is that, unlike appeals to tax efficiency, these reforms, if enacted, often produce immediate losses of revenue. Unfortunately, the Treasury Department still computes revenue on the limited annual formula of tax rate times the specific tax base set out in the code. Apparently the revenue officials are not yet ready to try to compute the changes in tax bases, resulting from economic and social changes, or to recognize that a high tax rate can be a contributing cause to a lower tax base and, conversely, that a lower tax rate can contribute to a larger tax base. Not having reached these points, of course they don't consider the further refinement that the factor of tax collectibility decreases as the tax rate increases and the base narrows, and increases conversely. In other words, as the rate rises and the base narrows, the collectibility shifts markedly from the efficiencies of a voluntary system to the inefficiencies of an involuntary system. The costs of tax collection rise, and so the net revenue return is lessened.

Until the Federal bureaucracy charged with administering our tax laws and having great power over any tax reform reach the point of understanding the economic laws of taxation, it is very difficult to get through tax reform on appeals to undesirable economic impact of a particular tax law. It is time our citizens realized that the Federal bureaucracy is the strongest political party in America today. It is much stronger and more effective and, in certain ways, better organized than the two better known major political parties—the Republican and Democratic—particularly in technical fields like taxation.

It has always been my advice, and it remains so today, to people who want to get through tax reform—lay off the members of the Ways and Means Committee and concentrate on the nameless members of the bureaucracy. I can assure you when I try to get reforms through, that is where I begin.

As a conservative, I am happy about one thing. The bureaucracy is unsympathetic to tax reform to produce economic and social results just as much as it is apathetic to appeals to reform to produce tax neutrality. They are for the status quo except in respect to inefficiencies. Their guiding star is immediate revenue, and they compute it by applying the tax rate to what has been the tax base. Tax revenues to them are the resultant of the rate and the base set out in the code and are apart from a changing economy and changing social structure except as the results of the preceding year make their mark. To this extent, they are allies on the side of tax neutrality.

I now want to turn to the politics of basic tax reform. It centers around basic economic and political philosophy. I think it is time that those who advocate basic tax reform, and I do, realize that they are in fundamental disagreement with a more powerful political force. I do not want to get into a discussion of how to become politically active, although this is really the subject involved in discussing what barriers there are to basic tax reform, how insistent are the pressures for reform. A PAC (a political action committee) or a COPE (a committee for political education) constitute some of the basic barriers to basic tax reform, and the lack of a PAC or COPE on the side of reform indicate the weakness of the pressures for reform.

There is no acceptable reason that the political force opposed to basic tax reform should be more powerful than the political force in favor of reform. There are many explanations, however. The basic explanation lies in the fact that those opposed to basic tax reform give lip service to basic tax reform. Those opposed to basic tax reform give lipservice to the theory of tax neutrality and, yet, seek constantly to use tax policy to produce specific economic and social results. Those opposed to basic tax reform give lip service to the theory of expenditures trimmed to the amount of tax revenues to be anticipated from a sound tax structure and yet they deliberately seek to have the Government spend, in complete disregard for anticipated revenues. Those opposed to basic tax reform give lipservice to a balanced budget, at least over a business cycle, if not annually. Yet these politically adept groups have this year successfully promoted unbalanced budgets in years of anticipated prosperity.

In other words, we are engaged with opponents who avoid open public discussion and debate. They have gained their political power through pretending to agree when they disagree. They have not been frank with the people of this country.

It is difficult to have any tax reform under items 2 and 3 when we have high expenditures and a large public debt, because the demand for revenues is so pressing. If tax rates were lower and tax bases broader, we would implement many reforms without having serious economic or social impact. But, with high taxes, it is almost impossible to make any reforms and to attain tax neutrality. The basic law of inertia applicable to taxes works against change. Taxes to our economy are like speed to a ship. If the rate is low, a heavy application produces little change in direction. However, if the rate is high, the slightest touch of the rudder alters the direction. The Keynesian economists, who are opponents in this struggle, depend upon high taxes in order to implement their economic ideas. Without high taxes, governmental fiscal policy would be largely ineffectual in implementing social and economic ends. It is also noteworthy that without a large Federal debt governmental monetary policy would lose much of its power. Therefore, deficit financing is a part of their scheme of things. They do not, as a matter of policy, wish tax revenues to exceed expenditures, except for short periods, in which it is difficult to plan sufficiently ahead to avoid.

The Keynesian political economists don't want basic tax reform. The graduated income tax with rates up to 91 percent and the corporate tax of 52 percent are essential for them to accomplish their aims. So are the differentials essential to their schemes. These differentials include the 25-percent capital gains rates and the rates of so-called loopholes. These people do not believe in tax neutrality. They seek to use the tax structure to regulate and direct the economy.

These people are fundamentally opposed to the approach of the Baker-Herlong bill, not because the Baker-Herlong approach is not good tax reform, but because it will place our tax structure strongly back into a position of neutrality.

Tax is the basic feature of government. Why is it so hard to realize that those who sought to change our form of government looked to reforming this basic feature? Why is it so hard to realize that they will fight to the utmost, using any methods, any attempt to alter the basic change they successfully brought about in our tax structure?

The politics of tax reform, gentlemen, are wrapped up in the politics to preserve both the private enterprise system as well as the representative form of government.

We will have no basic tax reform next year, or the year after next, or the year after that. We will only have basic tax reforms when we expose to the people of this country what the true philosophy of the proponents of high taxes and high Federal debt truly is. Then let them defend their philosophy openly before the people, with all the sincerity that they possess, that a highly centralized form of government which plans the economy and social goals for our people is superior to the system of government and economics under which the harvest that we have been reaping the past few decades was planted and tilled. Let them not tell the people that the harvest we are reaping today is of their planting and of their cultivation. Those who have gone before us into the great beyond planted and cultivated the good harvest we are reaping. We have to look ahead into the next decades to visualize what we have planted and tilled for the next generation to reap.

People say to me, "Well, if this has been going on for many years, and it is in fundamental error, as you suggest, how have we withstood it? You are always saying we lead the world in economic and social achievement." Part of my answer is my prior observation. The other part of my answer is this: The representative system of government and the private enterprise system of economics are much tougher and sounder than anyone, its supporters or detractors, had suspected. It had to be in order to have withstood the abuse it has been subjected to over the past years.

But its resiliency is being depleted. We have weakened its regenerative process through our tax laws, in the discouragement of individual initiative. Time is running out on us. We must learn the politics necessary to effect basic tax reform and, in this knowledge, take political action.

Much Talk, Little Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Robert G. Spivack in a recent edition of the Sunday New York Herald Tribune points out how less than bold the New Frontier has proved itself. The American people have a right to demand the end of this confusion.

The article follows:

LESSONS IN POLITICS

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—The price eventually paid by a politician for campaign exaggeration is voter disillusionment and frequently voter distrust.

Now that Congress has gone home, the Kennedy administration is paying a part of the price.

To many voters John F. Kennedy is still a young man in the White House. He has suffered severe blows since the ill-fated Cuban affair. There is no indication that the crises to come will be any less severe. Perhaps no President since Franklin D. Roosevelt has had so many problems thrust upon him so soon. But they have not all been inherited.

While he is well liked as a person he still has to establish himself as a strong Executive.

Of course if war over Berlin is avoided, without surrender, and if there is some move toward establishing freedom in East Germany, then the administration's shortcomings at home will, for a while at least, seem insignificant because the sense of public relief will be so great.

But even if the Berlin crisis passes, there will continue to be domestic needs to be met on more than a day-to-day basis. Right now the first order of business is for the administration to reestablish public confidence that there is purpose, dedication, and the will to fight for what it says it believes.

The President is reported to have complained recently that he cannot understand why so much more is demanded of him than of his predecessor. The answer is that the public was led to expect so much more.

This is at the bottom of that letdown among so many liberal Democrats and independents who wish the President well—but also expect more of his words to be translated into political action.

During the presidential campaign we were told that the Kennedyites always played it cool and that they were master political calculators. Look how easily they humbled Hubert Humphrey, Adlai Stevenson, and even the shrewd Lyndon Johnson.

As campaign strategists their talents were impressive. But as strategists on Capitol Hill or in Government operations there has been one miscalculation after another. What were they?

To begin with there was a diffusion of objectives. The White House was so determined to equal F.D.R.'s first 100 days that it set out to do everything at once. Then it quickly decided to compromise. Afterward it became apparent that warmed-over programs of other years had better be handled first, because they were relatively easy.

The hard jobs were left for last and finally never did get done. There were two big steps forward and perhaps this is all they should have tried for: the establishment of the Peace Corps and the new Disarmament Agency. But we were told so much about other deficiencies, from the nonexistent missile gap to medical neglect of the aged, the public expected bold new approaches which were never forthcoming.

Another tactical error was deliberately to lay aside the fight to curb the filibuster. This was a move to appease the old South which demonstrated as usual that appeasement rarely works and went right on fighting New Frontier legislation. Then there was the medical care bill. After a look at the realities, it was put over to next session. Some believe this may yet prove a political bonanza in a campaign year, but it also could become a boobytrap if the Democrats don't deliver.

The miscalculation which may prove costliest and has severely shaken confidence in the new administration was the mishandling of the school aid program. The administration began to fight too late with too little. Yet this was the one piece of legislation that really tested the President's ability to deliver what had been promised in the campaign.

It was the kind of contest that other Presidents, F.D.R. for example, might have welcomed. Roosevelt would have gone straight to the people and told them exactly what he was up against. Kennedy might have proposed that the religious issue be met head on by suggesting that opponents of public school aid seek a constitutional amendment if they wanted to alter the accepted meaning of separation of church and state. After a feeble start, there was no leadership.

The education battle would have been a glorious fight in a glorious cause. And the glory would have been the President's.

The House Un-American Activities Committee: A Letter to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the Herald Statesman, of Yonkers, John A. Granlund, of Eastchester, N.Y., did an excellent job of putting into words his particular view of the problems faced by the committee and the broad congressional support that the committee receives. Because this is such a careful treatment of the issue, I believe Mr. Granlund deserves an even wider audience. Consequently, I would like to enter his letter at this point in the RECORD:

To the Herald Statesman:

The New York Civil Liberties Union gave a showing of the film "Operation Abolition," at the Edgemont High School in Greenburgh.

The film, showing student rioting at the time of the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities at San Francisco hall in May 1960, was taken by the TV people from whom the House committee obtained it by subpena, in order to have a copy of it made by the Video Productions, Inc., of Washington.

The purpose of the showing was to discredit this official evidence of the rioting by Communist-led University of California students. The result was apparently not very satisfactory to the Civil Liberties Union. Too many loyal Americans were present at their local school to show their support of the U.S. Congress in its effort to inform the people about the doings of our few card-carrying Communists and their many dupes in our midst.

These patriots recalled that, when the latest presidential election brought a liberal victory, organized and seemingly well-financed efforts to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities were increased in intensity; yet when the vote came in the House, only 6 Members voted against the appropriation for the continuance of the committee.

The chairman of the committee, when arising to speak in behalf of the appropriation, was given a long and standing ovation from virtually the entire House membership, Democratic and Republican.

The question is, What is the Civil Liberties Union going to do about such a Congress? Are they going to bend their efforts to make our Congress a one-party, Soviet-type affair, in order to do away with the nasty "watch-dog" activity of the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

And what is the Civil Liberties Union going to do about the Supreme Court, which also stamps its seal of approval on the House committee, when it says in *Whitney* v. *California* (274 U.S. 257 (1927)), "Criminal conspiracy is outside the protection of free speech"?

The Civil Liberties Union is indeed out on a limb. The times are too serious to deny the Congress its historical duty to investigate in order to inform the public and to legislate.

JOHN A. GRANLUND.

Civil Rights?—Civil Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Richmond, Va., News Leader entitled "Civil Rights?—Civil Wrongs."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS?—CIVIL WRONGS

More than a century ago, Roger Taney undertook to describe, in the Dred Scott case, the inferior status occupied by the Negro slave in the first part of the 19th century. The Negro, he wrote, at that time "had no rights the white man was bound to respect."

Taney's phrase comes inescapably to mind as one puts aside the Civil Rights Commission's report on housing. This strange document wholly reverses the situation Taney described in 1856. The whole tone of last week's report is that in the United States, the white man no longer is to have rights that anyone must respect. In the name of civil rights, the Commission has traveled full circle.

This long report—it runs to 20 pages—is based upon the premise that every bank in the land, and every savings and loan association, is in some fashion an instrumentality of the Federal Government. The reasoning is that these private institutions work closely with the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association; they are supervised and regulated by such agencies as

the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Comptroller of the Currency; their deposits are subject to Federal insurance; they derive many benefits from Federal law. This being so, in the Commission's view, it is recommended:

"(2) That the President (a) direct FHA and VA, on a nationwide basis, to take appropriate steps to assure that builders and developers will not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, or creed in the sale or lease of housing built with the aid of FHA mortgage insurance, or VA loan guarantees; (b) direct FHA, VA, and FNMA to take appropriate steps to assure nondiscrimination by lending institutions with which these agencies have dealings; (c) direct FHA and VA, in selling or leasing reacquired housing, to take appropriate steps to assure that such Government-owned housing will be available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

"(3) That the Federal Government, either by Executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures."

That is legalistic language. It may be hard to wade through, but the effort is worth making. What the Civil Rights Commission is proposing, especially in recommendation No. 3, is nothing less than the coerced racial integration of every neighborhood in the land.

To all practical intents and purposes, every financial institution engaged in a mortgage loan business at some point is supervised by a Federal agency. To require them to conduct their business "on a nondiscriminatory basis" has an innocent sound. Who could object to that? In practice, it would compel the lending institutions to make loans which in their business judgment were completely unsound. It would threaten the institutions with effectively being put out of business if they permitted the factor of race to influence their decisions in any way.

In this recommendation for radical Federal intervention, the Negrophiles of the Civil Rights Commission have wholly ignored the interests of individual depositors and the responsibilities of the lending institutions. Search this report from beginning to end, and except in Mr. Storey's ringing dissent, you will not find one paragraph, one sentence, one syllable, to suggest that the depositor has any rights at all. It has never occurred to a majority of the Commission that a bank or a savings and loan association does not lend public money, or even its own money; it lends the funds entrusted to it by depositors or shareholders. The lending institution's primary responsibility, surpassing everything else, is to this fiduciary trust; as Mr. Storey points out, banks are not institutions for social reform.

It is noteworthy that the top Government officials who were sounded out by the Civil Rights Commission on this far-reaching proposal responded with almost united opposition. Mr. Kennedy has made no gesture toward implementing the Commission's recommendations. The Congress, it is thought, would never give legislative consent. There is perhaps no reason for alarm on the part of homeowners or bankers at this time.

Yet the whole tone of the Commission's report raises concern. This is the fanatic voice of the passionate abolitionists of a century ago, ready to cry down every reasonable objection in a fury of equality. The right of a citizen to sell his property to whom he pleases, the right of a banker to loan his depositors' money according to his own best judgment—these rights must be obliterated. In pursuit of supposed civil rights, sad to say, the Commission would impose upon all Americans a new order of despotic civil wrongs.

Twin City Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the city of Minneapolis, Minn., is one of the most attractive cities in the Nation and many projects are now underway to add to its importance as an economic and cultural center. The businessmen of the downtown area have carried on an extensive improvement program and at the same time, under the direction of the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority, a 17-block area in the old downtown section near the Mississippi River is being cleared and rebuilt.

The vision and the enterprise of the civil leaders and public officials deserve recognition; in fact, their efforts have already received international notice. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, "Twin City Reborn," which appeared in the London Economist for September 9, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWIN CITY REBORN

(From a correspondent in Minneapolis)

Minneapolis is a well-favored city: its residential streets are shaded by lovely elms; its parks are admirable; its boundaries embrace a dozen sparkling lakes. As well as being the industrial hub and regional capital of the upper Midwest, Minneapolis is its cultural Mecca with its giant University of Minnesota, a symphony orchestra and two art museums. Minneapolis and its smaller twin city, St. Paul, lie on either side of the great Mississippi River, at the head of its navigable reaches. The combined metropolitan area contains 1,500,000 people but, although the population of the region is growing, the number of city dwellers is not expected to get much larger.

A few years ago a group of businessmen and civic leaders, watching with dismay as residents and industries fled from the center to the surrounding suburbs, decided that what was happening in dozens of other American cities was definitely not good enough for Minneapolis. A district along the waterfront now known as Gateway Center, where the city began a century ago, had taken on the characteristics of "skid row" and blight was spreading into neighboring areas. In the commercial heart itself many obsolete buildings had been razed to the ground but the sites remained, like gaps in a mouthful of teeth, unfilled except with parked cars. At the same time, shopping centers were springing up by the score in the suburbs, doing their best to rob the city shops of their trade. One such center was in fact built, at a cost of $20 million, by the city's largest department store.

To turn the tide, city leaders injected new life into the local planning body. Merchants banded together in a downtown council and proceeded to remind residents that the central city possessed hotels, restaurants, and entertainment facilities that suburban centers could not hope to rival. Many of the buildings were subjected to a facelifting operation; they were given new fronts, cleaned of the soot and grime that had hidden them for years and supplied with air conditioning. New buildings rose on previously vacant plots. Among them was the first skyscraper to go up in Minneapolis since the building boom of 30 years ago. Half a dozen multistory parking ramps were built to take stationary cars off the streets and the number of open parking lots was reduced. Several of the large hotels announced plans for expansion. Recently, construction was started on a $25 million project which will provide, in a single block, a 17-story office building, a 13-story motor hotel, and a new parking ramp for 1,000 cars. Public improvements, at a total cost of $18 million, have provided a health center, a library, a building for the State employment office, and a Federal courthouse.

These public buildings have gone up between the refurbished commercial district and the old Gateway Center area. In the past, piecemeal efforts had been made to halt the deterioration of this area but they all failed. The construction of a grand new post office and the laying out of a park did not inspire private capital to move in and consultants told the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority that only broadscale clearance and redevelopment would do the job. This is now under way. Seventeen city blocks, once containing cheap taverns and pawnshops and flophouses for down-and-out transients and elderly men living on wine and old-age pensions, are falling to the ground under the wreckers' hammers. The area looks like Frankfurt after its wartime bombings.

The new buildings will start to go up soon for now at last private capital is moving in. Municipal and Federal authorities, who between them help to plan and finance such urban renewal schemes, have recently approved a $43 million private project, which will include a new 17-story Sheraton Hotel, and another $22 million worth of privately financed construction is under negotiation. The developers hold out the promise of a "city within a city," employing 1,800 hotel, restaurant, and shop workers and providing housing for 3,500 people in four high-rent, high-rising blocks of flats overlooking the Mississippi.

The development of the Gateway Center will mean more than a striking addition of bricks and mortar. Although government agencies will have invested $15 million in the purchase and clearing of blighted land, the taxpayer will receive a sizable return on his investment; the 17-block area is expected to yield $1,600,000 a year in property taxes compared with only $375,000 before demolition took place.

Our Cold War Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Herald Statesman, of Yonkers, carried an excellent editorial on the power of truth in this struggle for man's future. I believe these comments should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

TRUTH IS OUR MOST POWERFUL WEAPON TO BARE COMMUNISM'S VULNERABILITY

We're sure the Soviet people have not heard from any of their own governmental sources about a couple of incidents in recent days.

Certainly they have not been told about 18 of their technicians arrested as thieves in a diamond mine and obviously they would

not be informed of the foiling of a Communist plot to overthrow the Government of Liberia traced to the Red Embassy in Ghana.

The incidents, we hope, are being broadcast by Western sources into the censor-deafened satellite nations and to those who yet hope to be free masters of their own destiny.

In Guinea, it turned out that Soviet aid got mixed up with a little private greed on the part of the 18 mining technicians.

They had been assigned to the diamond mines to show the natives how to get the best results. They were masters of their points, for they were caught lining their pockets with the newly mined gems.

In Liberia, a story out of Monrovia reports that the secret police broke up a plot to overthrow the Liberian Government in favor of a Communist regime and traced the support of the plotters to the Soviet Embassy in Ghana.

Nothing can kill the blandishments of the Reds quicker than exposure of their failures, their crimes, and their intrigues to those whom they would stab in the back while they pretended to help.

This is one weapon we should continue to be alert to use in the cold-war jousting for power.

Railroad Mergers: The Northeastern Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, E. F. Tompkins has written a most interesting article for the New York Journal-American concerning the "Railroad Mergers: The Northeastern Plan." I invite the attention of my colleagues to this article:

RAILROAD MERGERS: THE NORTHEASTERN PLAN
(By E. F. Tompkins)

Supported by eight mayors from his State, Governor Rockefeller made an effective plea recently before the Interstate Commerce Commission in favor of railroad mergers.

The Commission was considering the rival plans of the New York Central and Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads for control of the Burlington & Ohio. Governor Rockefeller proposed that the three companies be consolidated into one. A spokesman for the New York Central endorsed the recommendation. The presidents of the C. & O. and the B. & O. objected to such an action immediately, but were willing to consider inclusion of the New York Central after a reasonable first-step affiliation of the B. & O. and C. & O. In principle, if not in procedure, the executives of all three lines are really in agreement with Governor Rockefeller.

The prospect for a first-class railroad merger in the Northeast appears, therefore, to be good. This should encourage railroad merger movements in the Northwest and on the Pacific coast. And evidence is ample that consolidations are required to meet railroad problems and avoid the socialistic alternative of nationalization of the major transportation facility.

Another Rockefeller suggestion was more controversial.

Much of the railroad problem results from two kinds of competition: subsidized competition by other common carriers—airlines and users of highways and waterways—and competition by private trucking service which is not subject to regulation and rate adjustment.

The New York Governor proposed that Congress create a Federal department of transportation to make policy for railroads, airlines, boat and barge operators, highway users, and pipelines.

Something of the sort is in the political atmosphere.

At President Kennedy's request, the Department of Commerce is preparing for Congress a report on "all segments of the transportation industry," with legislative recommendations. And beyond doubt, law revisions are requisite: but should a new bureaucracy be erected?

Congress, under the Constitution, has sole power to regulate interstate commerce. Congress accepted its responsibility in transportation by establishing the Interstate Commerce Commission years ago. The logical course today would be to expand the Commission's powers to coordinate all public carrier facilities and maintain fair competition. Some new divisions would probably be desirable within the Commission. But to set up a new major agency, and risk conflicts of policy or purpose within the Government, would be a much worse complication.

President Kennedy's letter to Secretary of Commerce Hodges said:

"It is becoming increasingly clear that the current difficulties facing all segments of the transportation industry will require increased leadership and additional actions on the part of the Federal Government."

On the other hand, too much Government in transportation needs to be avoided.

Sound mergers and constructive amendments of the transportation laws are enough for now.

Television Without Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, considering the wide concern about the high rate of crime and violence offered over television, I thought my colleagues would like to read an article from the September 15 issue of Austrian Information describing the sort of TV fare offered the Austrian people. The article originally appeared in the Montclair (N.J.) Times and was reprinted by permission of the author:

COMPLETE SEASON OF TV WITHOUT CRIME—IN AUSTRIA

(The Montclair, N.J. Times published recently a report by Dr. James P. Pettegrove, assistant professor of English at Montclair State College, under the above title. We reprint this article by permission of the author, who visited Austria some time ago, and the Montclair Times.)

"Not a single crime show has been scheduled for the fifth season of Austrian television," said Program Director Florian Kalbeck yesterday in an interview at his office on Schellinggasse in Vienna's First District. "We not only avoid crime and violence," he added, "but other materials which we think unsuitable for our public, such as excessively erotic films."

Government-controlled Austrian television operates chiefly on a budget received from the current 250,000 owners of TV sets, each of whom must pay the post office 50 schillings ($2) per month. Dr. Kalbeck estimates his maximal audience at less than 2 million, or about one-fourth of the total population of the country. Owing to the present budget, all stations carry the program. To be sure, persons living along the Italian, Swiss and German borders may frequently tune in on foreign programs; from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia and Hungary no programs are relayed to border areas. As yet Austria has no color television.

TV transmissions begin daily at either 5 p.m. or 7:30 p.m. and end at 10:30 p.m. Taking the program for the last week in June as typical, one finds regular newscasts with a news roundup and sports commentary in the final 10 minutes each day. The Saturday transmission features a documentary film on Africa, followed by a 90-minute film entitled "Spring Is Here."

The Sunday program has more intellectual appeal. "The World of Youth" is an interview show. It is followed by the weekly half-hour course: "Can You Speak English?" For light entertainment there is the serial "The Leitner Family."

Monday begins with a talk for the housewife. This is succeeded by a taped version of a stage performance of a peasant farce. The first item of the Wednesday transmission, "We Look at Picture Books," is for children, as is "Sports for the 11-Year-Old." Then comes the weekly do-it-yourself show entitled "Ax in the House."

Ibsen's "Doll House," the feature of the week, will be relayed from Germany on Thursday. On Friday, concluding the TV week, an Austrian film "Honeymoon" will be shown. It is labeled "not suited for children."

Dramatic productions originating in the Vienna TV studio are obviously Dr. Kalbeck's fondest ambition. He came to his present position after 5 years' experience as play director at the famous Theater in der Josefstadt. However, a limited budget, short-term actor-contracts, and the prestige of stage performance place serious obstacles in the way of TV dramatics.

"With our 4 weeks' rehearsal time, which is all we can afford, we cannot approach the perfection of the best Viennese theaters," Dr. Kalbeck explained. "However, we have able directors on regular contract; and when we can obtain the necessary acting personnel, we can produce plays at a high level. We do this by limiting the number of our productions to about one per month."

The best TV drama, in the director's opinion, is that which deals with the insistent problems of our time. We rarely produce classics, though last year we did Goethe's "Urfaust." As yet we have done no Shakespeare.

"Lack of first-rate contemporary authors, both in Austria and in Germany, is our greatest shortcoming," said Dr. Kalbeck. "But even when an original play is written, there is little hope of obtaining the script for TV. It is not so much the financial advantage of selling the play to a big theater as it is the prestige of a stage premiere."

The director said he received many offers of playscripts from Austrian and German agents, but only after they have been rejected by the big theaters. Some foreign scripts arrive in the mail, but they are inferior—for the same reasons.

In lieu of original plays, Dr. Kalbeck has had his best audience response with productions of outstanding plays of the 1930's, or of the turn of the century. Frequently the older plays are reworked to increase their relevance to current events; or they are produced in period costumes.

The most exciting drama for the Viennese public, according to the program director, is life in Vienna. In this category was the Hungarian dramatist Horvath's play "Stories From a Vienna Wood." Through satire and

irony Horvath expresses the essential dilemma of Viennese life: its beauty and joy against a background of insecurity and hardship.

Otto Bielen's "The Little District Court" was another success in this genre. Bielen held up for ridicule the best-known foible of the man in the street in Vienna: his susceptibility to verbal insult and his readiness to go to court to heal his injured dignity.

As the expression "Ehrenbeleidigungsprozess" (case of insulted honor) suggests, the Viennese does not think in terms of ordinary slander, but of the chivalric tradition. Bielen's play was a tremendous success; its title has become proverbial. But in Viennese district courts hundreds of cases of insulted honor are still recorded from year to year.

Cultural cosmopolitanism is traditional in Vienna, once the capital of an empire of many nationalities. TV dramatics cannot overlook this fact. American, English, French, German, and Italian plays are interspersed with the works of native authors. But, unlike the theaters, foreign classics are not felt to be as acceptable for TV audience; instead, foreign plays are sought which reveal the intimate lives of people abroad. As examples Dr. Kalbeck mentioned Michel Fermaud's "Doors Slam," a piece which exposes the ups and downs of a French working class home, and Dody Smith's "The First Spring Day," which presents the life of an average British family.

The taped version of an actual stage performance is the best alternative to the expensive productions of the TV studio, in Dr. Kalbeck's opinion. The TV public is enthusiastic about this type of program for theater is every man's business in Vienna. Theater management people are also pleased to have their performances taped. Since this is usually done at the end of a play's run, it does not affect box office receipts. Theater audiences, at first perplexed by TV equipment onstage, now accept it as a matter of course.

"There is no competition between TV and the theaters," Dr. Kalbeck stated unequivocally. "But we are competing with the films—and without success to date, owing to our far too limited program."

The effects of TV showings on children are taken very seriously both by the TV authorities and by the general public. Programs containing materials unsuited for children are announced as such; parents are asked to make sure their children do not tune in," the director said. Nevertheless, a news item in today's paper points out a loophole in this method of censorship. The writer insists that an impulsive child may turn on the TV set in the middle of a show and thus innocently taste forbidden fruit. The writer suggests a dot in the prohibited picture as a signal for parents to send their children to bed.

The directors of Austrian TV are opposed in principle to advertising materials. The word for an ad suggests their feeling: "Werbeeinschaltung" means an insertion or interruption for sales purposes. However, the directors have hitherto permitted ads not exceeding 2½ minutes between 7:30 p.m. and 9 p.m. After July 1, ads will be allowed until 10 p.m., and they may be as long as 5 minutes.

Owing to the small buying potential of 250,000 TV set owners, advertising rates have been low. Seven hundred schillings ($28) per second was the flat rate in the past. As of July 1, rates ranging from 500 to 900 schillings ($20 to $36) per second between 7:30 p.m. and 10 p.m. go into effect. Five-minute ads will cost 45,000 schillings ($1,800).

Austrian TV and radio, though situated in different parts of the city, are controlled at the top of a government-appointed board of four directors, one of whom is named director general. Following the pattern of the Austrian coalition government, two directors from the People's Party and two from the Socialist Party. The TV director is a Socialist. "But this does not mean," Dr. Kalbeck hastened to explain, "that TV is an organ of party propaganda; on the contrary, an advantage of our coalition directorate is that both parties scrupulously avoid political bias.

In view of the small population of Austria, Dr. Kalbeck feels that television has made notable advances during the first 5 years of its existence. He needs only an expanded budget for the fulfillment of his ambition to raise the cultural level of the population at large.

Spotlight on Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act and its approval by President Kennedy represent an important step in assisting depressed areas. However, many practical difficulties and problems still remain to be solved. This point is well made by Prof. Helmut J. Golatz, program director of the department of labor education at Pennsylvania State College. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Spotlight on Depressed Areas," which appeared in America, September 9, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON DEPRESSED AREAS

(By Helmut J. Golatz)

Now that President Kennedy has signed the area redevelopment bill, the center of attention shifts from Congress and the White House to the depressed areas themselves. From here on, the initiative rests with the public and private leaders there.

The fundamental task facing them is to achieve an acceptable balance between the demand for labor and its local supply. In this connection two strategies are possible: (1) to encourage the movement of surplus workers into areas where there is less or no chronic unemployment—this is generally taken locally as a counsel of despair; (2) to encourage the creation of new jobs by the addition of new firms and/or the expansion of existing firms—this is perhaps the ideal, and it is certainly the most popular approach. The administration's policy is to speak softly on out-migration and carry a big stick on industrial development. This policy is realistically in tune with the dynamics of the depressed areas now.

The fact is that workers are leaving the depressed areas, but not as fast as jobs are. Their extra-economic concerns tend to immobilize them. Older unemployed workers, in particular, who have social and property stakes in a community and often have contract ties to an industry, hesitate to move.

Even the younger, more venturesome workers seem to leave in deliberate stages. First they change jobs locally. If this does not work out, they commute to a new job. When they have established job tenure, they move, but they keep in touch with developments at home. If prospects on the new job fade, they make arrangements to return. Meanwhile, in areas where soft-goods, female-employing industries have appeared, the wife works while the husband sinks job roots at a distance. If his prospects improve, she joins him. If not, her job serves as a cushion until he regains employment.

Because of the psychological and social expense involved in this extended process of out-migration, most public and private programs operate on the premise that the jobs should be brought to the people instead. This helps to account for the current emphasis on industrial development.

Industrial development is usually conceived in terms of attracting new firms to an area. Another approach lies in encouraging the expansion and growth of existing industries. Less effort has been expended in this latter direction, because the results are less dramatic and more difficult to measure. When a new plant starts operations, it is obvious that new local jobs have been created. In the case of expansion, however, the net gain in employment may not be apparent; in fact, in some instances, particularly when expansion involves modernization, there may be no gain at all, and perhaps even a loss.

Industrial development takes place within a community framework, and ultimately it rests upon public support. Here the caliber of local leadership becomes a significant force.

As a rule, business leaders have taken the initiative in organizing industrial-development activities in the depressed areas. One usually finds a close identification of the local industrial-development organization (committee, council, corporation) with the local chamber of commerce. Chamber personnel often serve as officials of these organizations, and chamber offices often provide development quarters.

This is not to suggest, however, that all segments of business leadership are equally enthusiastic about industrial-development programs. Generally, commercial and financial groups show more concern than industrial leaders. Merchant and bank groups are probably more sensitive to payrolls and purchasing power, while leaders in industry show greater interest in wage rates and labor costs.

One recalls the experience of a truck-and-auto salesman who accepted his post as chairman of the local industrial-development committee with considerable enthusiasm and verve. When he discovered, however, that the dominant manufacturer and employer in town frowned upon any competition in the local labor market in the form of new firms, and confirmed that displeasure with a sudden interest in rival makes of vehicles, the salesman resigned. Four years later, still in economic distress, the community is mustering its resources for another industrial-development effort. This may be an exceptional case, but the fact remains that manufacturing groups generally follow, rather than lead, industrial-development activities.

Occasionally another factor determines gradations of community support: the comparative complacency of locally owned firms as opposed to absentee-owned firms. The former are operated by members of a family who have achieved a comfortable economic and social standing in the community, which they can maintain without too much effort. On the other hand, the "foreign" firms are more likely to be managed by professionals who must make good in their present location to merit promotion up the corporate ladder. Seeking to break home-office quotas, they welcome every addition to the area economy as a boost in that direction.

Political leaders on both the local and State levels are beginning to display greater interest in industrial development programs. This is a function of the fact that industrial development is in the process of being democratized. Although industrial development organizations still largely reflect their business origins and leadership, their tend-

ency to appeal to an ever-widening circle of the public for funds to finance acquisition of industrial sites and construction of industrial facilities has broadened the base of their constituency. In some localities industrial development is everybody's business, because every effort is deliberately made—as in United Fund drives—to seek support from all groups and individuals in the community who acknowledge their stake in its well-being.

There is another way in which these activities impinge on the public or political sector. Development programs often require the commitment of local government resources in the preparation of industrial sites and in the initiation of urban-redevelopment projects. For example, when land was zoned for an industrial park within one of the larger cities in a depressed area, not only did the mayor and city council have to endure the political wrath of protesting taxpayers in the vicinity of the park, but they also had to find the tax money to finance extension of sewer and water lines to the new facility.

In this regard most smaller mining communities face particularly severe problems, for the passing of industry has left social as well as economic disabilities. Whether distributed in little clusters of coal patches or in small towns, the residents of these mining areas have had little practical experience in the exercise of civic responsibility. While they were in the saddle, the companies made all the basic decisions and allowed public services to go begging. Consequently, the general appearance of these localities now is blighted and bleak.

Moreover, many of the younger miners have moved to new operations or to larger industrial centers, thus dissipating the logical source of future leadership. To verify this dispersion, one needs only to visit these communities on a holiday and count the out-of-State license plates of the visiting sons and daughters.

Nothing less than redevelopment on a regional scale can ease the return of these traditionally isolated mining communities to the main stream of American life. Local initiative, though indispensable, will be at a premium during the transition.

Prospects for the more highly urbanized depressed areas are somewhat better. Having entered the industrial-development stampede at an earlier date, their leaders are well organized and know exactly what the role of Government programs should be: to provide technical assistance and to induce local financial assistance.

Some communities need money and a technical staff to take stock of their local resources and to relate them to the demands of migrating industries. Others need management services to exploit to the fullest the growth potential of the industries they already possess. Nearly all need retraining programs to help make their unemployed more employable—for new and expanding industries at home, if possible; for opportunities in other areas, if necessary.

Finally, in terms of financial assistance, depressed areas need matching State and Federal loans to stretch their local funds over as many projects as possible. They insist, however, that local initiative and effort should set the pace and outline the scope of industrial-development activity. State and Federal agencies should work with them, not for them.

The immediate aim of depressed areas is to diversify the economic base that they have. Although they admit that diversification has not solved their particular problems, they firmly believe that conditions would be even worse if they had not sought any new firms. In most cases, they can point to new firms as stabilizing factors or as holding operations in the face of the precipitous decline of the previously predominant industry—coal, textiles, railroad equipment or consumer durables. The new firms may pay lower wage rates and employ more females than males, but at least there are jobs which sustain community services and buy time while new industrial- and community-development programs are being launched.

Rather late, depressed areas have learned that provision must also be made for adequate public services. Industry may well be the goose that lays the golden eggs, but the political and social fabric in which that productive enterprise takes place must also be kept in good repair. The appearance of urban blight makes industrial and community development all the more difficult in the long run.

In a sense, the problem of chronic unemployment has put many communities in closer touch with economic reality. Every American town seems to have its own phantom plant that was going to locate there but finally moved elsewhere—the big fish that got away. To what extent this was truth or rationalization in specific cases is hard to say. The apparent insiders themselves give contradictory accounts. However, as the technique of attracting new firms is institutionalized, and as the base of community concern for economic growth continues to expand, there should be less and less of this uncertainty and mystery. If the big firm really makes inquiries, more and more people will know of it with certainty. If the inquiring firm rejects the community in favor of another, more people will know of that, too. The chances are they will want to know why.

The new law will help them to examine their community's human and economic resources with a more critical eye. It gives them money to assess their needs and to plan to meet them. It gives money to establish occupational and industrial training programs, thus making the labor force more attractive to new industry and at the same time inducing movement of workers to areas where their newly acquired skills may be in demand. It lends money for construction of plants and acquisition of other facilities, including machinery and equipment. It gives or lends money, depending on need, for construction of public facilities, such as water and sewage systems, to attract new plants.

Few supporters of the law expect miracles, and they hesitate to predict complete economic recovery for any depressed area. Instead, the law's backers are prepared for a lower, more manageable equilibrium of labor demand and labor supply. For many of the depressed areas even a 6-percent rate of unemployment will be a giant step up out of their depression of the 1950's.

An effective area-development program will represent more than a game of balancing supply and demand. It will signify that American communities have come of economic age. It will signify that the habit of dependence on the economic fortunes of one employer or company is a thing of the past, and that planning for economic growth is also part of a community's democratic charter.

Modern Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, 1961, and August 18, 1961, George Todt, of the Los Angeles Herald Express, again wrote two excellent articles calling attention to the infiltration of the Marxist artists into our way of life, and their influence on modern American artists. Because I think every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read these two columns, I wish to have them printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—NEW HOPE FOR FINE ART

"Art, as far as it is able, follows nature, as a pupil imitates his master; thus your art must be, as it were, God's grandchild."—Dante, "Inferno."

There is at least one aspect of so-called modern art in which all thoughtful citizens of our Republic may rejoice: It is not now and never has been, primarily an American art movement.

At exhibitions here, as well as abroad, the same tired old Marxist names appear with monotonous regularity—Pablo Picasso, Salvador Dali, Max Ernst, De Chirico, Paul Klee, Tanguy, Chagall, Miro, and the rest of their social revolutionary ilk.

All of them are decadent Europeans. There is not an American among them to be placed on the pedestal of the great in the modern art movement. The latter would be completely laughable to all normal human minds if not also quite tragic at the same moment.

When will we wake up?

GOODNESS, BEAUTY

This is a good question and one to which I have found an interesting and worthwhile answer on the local scene in Los Angeles.

It is something of an aesthetic antidote to social revolutionary snakebite.

Under the inspiring leadership of America's onetime darling of the motion picture industry—and a 100-percent patriot in every respect—Miss Mary Pickford has formed a group of several hundreds of prominent citizens here in southern California to fight for traditional art and culture, which is needed and timely.

The name of this dedicated body of good citizens is the American Institute of Fine Arts and its president, a veritable dynamo of energy and constructive ideas, is Col. Don L. Wells. Honorary president is Miss Pickford and the eminent Dr. Rufus B. von Klein-Schmid of the University of Southern California is honorary chairman.

AND TRUTH, TOO

Inquiries regarding AIFA may be addressed to Colonel Wells at 316 South Lapeer Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Organizations like this one can do much to stem the tides of artistic lunacy which so often in the past have given our people what, in all fairness, can only be called "the depraved look."

In the realm of ideological warfare, I consider Miss Pickford one of the most effective exponents of the conservative doctrine which is sweeping our Nation like wildfire today. She has real courage and recently stood up boldly against "Castro, communism, and abstract art."

I hope many more in the arts and allied professions will follow her inspiring example. Let's be counted for America.

Recently I had a very instructive session with Colonel Wells and learned from him that a resurgence of culture is appearing all over the world. He is optimistic for the future. This is what he told me:

"The rapid growth of the idea which started AIFA—and the way people have rallied to it—makes the institute a leader in demanding the recognition of recognizable arts for our people now and for generations yet to come, so that there will be understanding among peoples of all nations.

NOW YOU CAN SEE

"Recognizable arts are old on the historical scale. Art was a means of communication in the days of the caveman. It is a universal language even today. To reach all peoples of all nations, art must be recognizable. A painting of a horse with three heads and eyes floating in space * * * a man with half a face, torso off in another direction, tends only to add to the confusion of an already confused people.

"The average or typical citizen is the backbone of the country. He understands only that which he recognizes. We arrive at no good end in placing before him something he does not understand. He walks away from it in confusion, poking fun at American culture—as he did in the World's Fair in Brussels a couple of years ago.

WHAT ART CAN DO

Incidentally, membership in AIFA is only $5 per year and worth every cent of it. Those interested in membership may write Colonel Wells or call him at OL 5–9528 or CR 6–5432.

Not long ago, Miss Pickford revealed that she plans to leave her celebrated "Pickfair" to the Beverly Hills community as an art memorial. It is filled with art treasures and antiques. Not a single Picasso or Dali among them. This is really living?

To which the correct answer is, by all means, an unqualified yes.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—ART, OH WHERE ART THOU?

"It's clever, but is it art?"—Kipling, the "Conundrum of the Workshops."

Why has the so-called modern art school waged a bitter, internecine war against the adherents of traditional art over the years? What is behind it? Where are the bodies buried?

Many students of ideological patterns in our world today quite frankly think modern art is largely subversive.

Here are some of their views:

Writing in the New Masses in 1946, William Z. Foster, Red party boss in the United States, stated revealingly:

"There must be a clear understanding that art is a weapon in the class struggle. Not only is art a weapon, but a very potent one as well. Moreover, rising revolutionary social classes instinctively recognize the importance of art as a social weapon. They have always forged their own art and used it to challenge that of the existing ruling classes."

MIXED-UP MIND

Now what is the historical background of the modern art movement? Where did it come from? And why?

Actually, it received its first impetus from decadent art circles prior to World War I. From this was spawned the obscenity of dadaism, futurism, cubism, expressionism, symbolism, and, perhaps the most appalling of them all—surrealism.

The latter is the greatest mountebank of the lot: the No. 1 phony in the world of art—past, present, and future tense.

Here is what the celebrated British writer, J. B. Priestley, had to say after viewing one of the more flagrant—and fragrant—surrealist exhibitions in London nearly a generation ago:

"The surrealists stand for violence and neurotic unreason. They are truly decadent. You catch a glimpse behind them of the deepening twilight of the barbarism that may soon blot out the sky until at last humanity finds itself in another long night."

How did this meaningless gibberish called modern art commence in the first place? It stemmed from the same kind of sick outlook in tortured, twisted minds that later created communism, fascism, and nazism.

All of this assorted batch of monstrosities arose out of a jaded and disillusioned Europe in the early part of the 20th century.

SICK AT HEART

Social revolutionary artists, who were the ideological counterparts of their fellow social revolutionary political contemporaries, contrived to use art as a means of power over their fellows.

In true revolutionary style, they created their Frankenstein monster—which they conveniently labeled modern art—for only one specific purpose. And that was the deliberate warping of the human mind from all that which is beautiful, good, and true.

For these esthetic degenerates with a political twist desired man to turn to the contemplation and worship of disordered [illegible] of madness, ugliness, social protest, and [illegible] usage of esoteric, occult symbols in place of reality.

THOSE DO FINE

The remaining step for these unprincipled charlatans was simple enough in its accomplishment: this was to convince the ever-pushing crowd of social climbers throughout the world that failure to recognize and adopt their pernicious standards would stamp them socially as unimaginative bores.

As is the usual case with revolutionaries, they soon formed their own tight little ruling cliques. And thereafter, these uncouth barbarians have managed to gain—and hold—a virtual death grip on the elite in the realm of art. Incredible, but true.

MODERN ART?

Perhaps it is a sign of our debased times that so few voices have understood and cried out against this unesthetic travesty and outright blasphemy against our Western cultural heritage, against civilization itself.

This rotten garbage, which so generously labels itself modern art, has had the effrontery in the past to depict Jesus Christ as an ugly insect.

Such viciousness brands it as being fit only for unprincipled atheists, fools, or subversives. It can pass no test of any kind which is based upon the paramount virtues of art, which are reason, beauty, intelligence, inspiration, love, and esthetics.

What can modern art be without any of these to recommend it?

Press Statements for the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a foreword and press statements for the joint Senate and House Republican leadership.

There being no objection, the foreword and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The 1st session of the 87th Congress witnessed a Republican innovation in leadership that had a very unifying effect. The origins of the idea rest with former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Early in January 1961, a short time before the end of his administration, President Eisenhower summoned to the White House the Republican Members of Congress who had regularly attended his Tuesday morning congressional leadership meetings. For the Senate: EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican leader; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, whip; STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the policy committee; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman of the conference. For the House: CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican leader; LESLIE C. ARENDS, whip; JOHN W. BYRNES, chairman of of the policy committee; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, chairman of the conference; CLARENCE J. BROWN, ranking Republican member of the Rules Committee. Also regularly present: THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee (succeeded as national chairman by WILLIAM E. MILLER on June 10, 1961).

President Eisenhower pointed out that on January 20 the White House would cease to be the policy voice for the Republican Party and that historically this function had devolved on the Republican leaders of the Senate and the House in their respective capacities when the party was out of power.

After a general discussion, President Eisenhower summed up the conclusions as follows:

1. The Republican leaders of the Senate and the House would form a joint group, to be known as the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, with the chairman of the Republican National Committee to act as presiding officer, to hold meetings approximately once a week, after which the Senate and House Republican leaders, as spokesmen, would hold a joint press conference for the newspaper, periodical, TV and radio correspondents.

2. When desirable, other appropriate GOP leaders would be invited to meet with the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership.

3. For the purpose of coordinating the effort, stimulating research, and carrying out other administrative duties, President Eisenhower suggested the joint leadership be provided with a staff.

The innovation here was the decision to set up a "joint" Senate-House leadership. The obvious advantages of this leadership mechanism were (a) the opportunity for the Senate and the House Republican leaders to speak in a unified voice on Republican policy positions, and (b) the opportunity to resolve different points of view that might exist between the legislative bodies.

The first meeting of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership occurred on January 24, followed by meetings on February 2, February 9, February 16, February 23, March 2, and March 9. Meantime, a staff consultant was retained and, as a result of the experience gained in the first few weeks, an effort was made to give the meetings a more formalized voice. This led to preparation at the meetings of formal statements to be issued at the press conferences before submitting to questions from the correspondents.

Thus from the leadership meeting of March 23 forward a record of formal statements was kept. They appear here arranged by subject matter, under such headings as "The Berlin Crisis," "Tractors for Cuba," "Conduct of Foreign Affairs," "The Threat of Inflation," etc. Also included are two evaluations of the leadership meetings written near the end of this session of Congress by two noted Washington columnists, Peter Edson of the Scripps-Howard Alliance and Kenneth Crawford of Newsweek.

It should be noted that the members of the joint leadership met in Washington on March 9 with Senator Barry M. Goldwater, on April 20 with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and on May 1, in Gettysburg, with former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck had additional meetings with General Eisenhower on July 10, with Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on September 11, and again with General Eisenhower on September 12.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 7, 1961]

THE "EV AND CHARLIE" RECORD

(By Peter Edson)

With Congress about to adjourn, the regular weekly press conferences of the two Republican leaders, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, may be suspended for a few months.

No GOP decision has yet been made on what if anything will take their place during the congressional recess.

Democratic scoffers claim that this "Ev and Charlie" act, as it has been dubbed, will never be missed.

But there is some opinion among Republicans that the Dirksen-Halleck commentaries have been effective, have influenced policy and congressional votes, will be resumed next year. A recap of their criticisms reveals these points:

They blasted any moves to let Red China be admitted to the United Nations. A congressional resolution was passed almost unanimously, opposing any such policy.

They blasted the "two Chinas" policy. It was repudiated.

They blasted the move to recognize Outer Mongolia. The Kennedy administration backed up the idea.

They blasted the proposed swap of U.S. tractors for Castro prisoners held in Cuba. The deal fell through.

They opposed "back-door financing" for long-term foreign aid. They won. Congress cut the authorization and approved financing by annual appropriation.

They called attention to the increase of U.S. export licenses for trade with Russia. They are being reduced.

Many of these reversals of Kennedy policy were effected with strong support from conservative Democrats.

But in general, not even the Democratic leaders are too unhappy about the Dirksen-Halleck pronouncements on foreign policy. They backed up President Kennedy after the Cuban invasion fiasco. They have consistently backed him on the Berlin crisis. Their effort has been to stiffen the President's stand. They supported his defense buildup.

There has been little carping at President Kennedy himself. But top members of his official family have been singled out for criticism:

Ambassador Averell Harriman for indicating that a neutralist government in Laos might be headed by Souvanna Phouma.

Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles for saying that if India was attacked from any source, U.S. help would be there the next morning.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson for voting with Soviet Russia against Portugal on Angola.

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD for advocating the establishment of a free city in Berlin.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK themselves have not been above such mistakes. Several times they have advocated resumption of nuclear testing by the United States. In view of the bad reaction to Russia's announcement of its intention to resume testing, it is good the United States didn't take this step first.

On domestic issues the Dirksen-Halleck pronouncements have followed the more traditional Republican line.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 18, 1961]

THE LOYAL OPPOSITION

(By Kenneth Crawford)

President Kennedy is indebted to Republican leaders for the support he has received from them, overt and covert, at the session of Congress now approaching its close. The administration's legislative record, impressive despite recent reverses, couldn't have been compiled without them. The debt will never be acknowledged, not because the President and his associates are unappreciative, but because payment would embarrass the creditors as much as the debtors. With congressional elections in the offing, the fiction that the two major parties represent two wholly different and irreconcilable political concepts must be preserved. Custom demands it.

The weekly press conference conducted by Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN and House Minority Leader HALLECK—the so-called Ev and CHARLIE shows—have been artistic performances in their way. The two old troupers have contrived to be critical of the administration in what they have said while upholding its major foreign policies and the legislation necessary to carry them out in what they have left unsaid. The result has satisfied both the emotional Republicans, who are entertained by partisan gibes at the opposition, and the more sophisticated party men, who like to make a record for the next campaign but understand what the President and the country are up against in Berlin and elsewhere.

TEMPTATION RESISTED

In the area of foreign aid, Republican leaders have been nothing less than gallant. They know, as every politician knows, that this item is hard to sell the voters. It would have been easy for them to build demagogic fires against it even before Nehru and Tito, both beneficiaries of U.S. aid, made it easier by their pusillanimous behavior in Belgrade. The temptation for the out party to capitalize on latent isolationism must have been all but irresistible. Yet the minority leadership resisted it.

DIRKSEN and HALLECK opposed back-door spending, insisting that Congress retain the power of the purse by appropriating aid money each year to take care of that year's needs, but at the same time supported long-range project planning. Having achieved this compromise, they joined in the effort to give the President most of the money and authority he wanted. At one critical point, HALLECK led a contingent of Republicans through a teller line in the House to save a piece of military-aid money from Representative PASSMAN, the anti-foreign-aid chairman of the subcommittee in charge of foreign-aid appropriations.

PLANNED POLICY

All this moved one of the highest ranking Democrats in the Capitol to declare DIRKSEN and HALLECK "as responsible and patriotic men as we've ever had in command of a party up here." Deserved as this praise may have been, the Republican leadership's stand on foreign aid can't be attributed solely to noble impulses spontaneously generated in the breasts of Ev and CHARLIE. This and other positions of the minority have been carefully formulated at closed meetings of the joint Republican congressional policy committee, which was created at President Eisenhower's suggestion just before he left office and which has been influenced by him ever since.

So it is no coincidence that GOP leaders in Congress practice what Ike preaches. They have supported, besides big foreign aid, all Mr. Kennedy's military-spending programs. They have been restrained in their criticism of the administration's failures in Cuba and Laos. When they want to blow off steam, they blow it at Stevenson or Bowles but not at the President himself. They've served notice that they won't stand for admittance of Red China to the U.N. But no Republican leader except GOP National Chairman Miller has charged the administration with appeasement of the Communists in months and he has allowed himself only one such outburst.

On domestic policy, of course, the Republicans, as a party, have been consistently in opposition. But most of the administration's domestic bills have enough constituent appeal to command a few Republican votes and therefore require no organized help from Ev and CHARLIE.

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

THE A-BOMB BAN

(By Senator DIRKSEN, May 11, 1961)

It is becoming plain that the United States must reexamine its position with respect to the interminable negotiations on nuclear testing which have been conducted at Geneva since October 31, 1958. There now have been 296 negotiating sessions hinging largely on the question of inspection if a ban on nuclear testing is reached.

With the installation of the Kennedy administration in January this Nation dispatched to Geneva an offer of seven substantial concessions to Russia. Even before these concessions could be announced, the Soviets announced they were retreating from two agreements which had been obtained in previous years. Then, having heard our concessions, the Russians accepted only two of them and balked at the rest. Negotiations since then have been uniformly described by the Western delegates as nothing less than "depressing."

It is perfectly apparent that the Soviets are not negotiating: they are conducting a monumental stall. Because underground nuclear tests cannot be detected, this leaves the Russians free to continue this kind of testing if they wish while we have suspended our own efforts in this field.

On October 9, 1960, during the presidential campaign, Mr. Kennedy asserted that "when I am elected I will direct vigorous negotiation" in Geneva, and added significantly:

"I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit to determine whether significant progress is being made."

In view of the notable lack of progress to this date, we feel that in the interest of arriving at some discernible conclusion, President Kennedy should now fix a time limit and so notify the Russians. We feel that this is not only essential to American prestige but will make clear to the world the true intent of the Soviet Union.

(By Representative HALLECK, June 8, 1961)

A month ago the joint Senate-House Republican leadership suggested that President Kennedy fix a time limit on the interminable negotiations on nuclear testing which have been conducted at Geneva since October 31, 1958. We stated we felt this was not only essential to American prestige but necessary so the world will realize the Soviet Union does not want to reach an agreement. Two nights ago President Kennedy in his report to the Nation on his European trip made it clear that he could not discover during his conversations with Khrushchev a single ray of hope for adoption of a nuclear treaty.

There now have been 317 negotiating sessions at Geneva hinging largely on the issue of inspection if a ban on nuclear testing is reached. The question is: How much longer must America submit to this persistent Soviet stalling?

We know that we have conducted no nuclear testing in this country since 1958. But we have absolutely no evidence that the Russians are not conducting such tests because underground nuclear testing cannot be detected.

We insist that we can no longer take the chance that the Soviet Union will perfect its nuclear weapons while we forgo improving ours during interminable meetings at Geneva.

It is now common knowledge that the Russians intend to seek transferral of the

nuclear testing negotiations to the agenda of a general disarmament conference, thus junking the Geneva effort. If talks for 2½ years on a single phase of armaments are fruitless, how many more years will we have to live with the possibility the Soviet Union is secretly testing while we risk both our national security and world peace at another conference table?

We believe the United States has been extremely patient in view of the gravity of the issue and we respectfully urge the President to set a deadline on the negotiations and so notify the Soviet Union.

(By Representative HALLECK, August 15, 1961)

For many months it has been evident that the nuclear test ban negotiations at Geneva have been a waste of time and that we have been jeopardizing our own national security by continuing our self-imposed suspension of testing.

Twice during these months the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership has raised the question of whether the United States should set a terminal date because it has become increasingly obvious that the Soviet Union has not been negotiating, but stalling.

When these negotiations began 3 years ago there was little doubt we were ahead of the Soviets in nuclear weapons. We know the United States has done no testing during these 3 years. But how about the Soviet Union?

Because there is no present way to detect underground testing, how do we know the Russians have not been testing? How do we know they haven't been stalling to gain time to catch up with us or pass us in nuclear weapons? The answer to both questions is the same: We don't know.

But we do know this: While there is no absolute proof, there does exist enough information to indicate the Soviets have been testing during the negotiations. Further, we can state that this information is known to our highest Government officials. We think action is indicated.

Last week, President Kennedy announced he was sending our negotiators back to Geneva for one more try with the Soviets. We have no objection to this attempt, but we believe it should not be allowed to sandbag the Nation's safety. We say the time has arrived for the United States to resume testing.

We have repeatedly stated that in any meeting with the Soviet Union we must negotiate from strength. In this instance we believe the United States would be in a far stronger position if we resumed testing and insisted that the Soviet Union come to the conference table with a real desire to negotiate instead of stall.

Let us not forget that 3 years of voluntary suspension of tests has produced no results at Geneva whatsoever. Perhaps testing while offering to negotiate might bring all parties closer to the desired objective—a true nuclear test ban.

AID TO EDUCATION ISSUE

(By Representative HALLECK, June 22, 1961)

Mail from over the country indicates a rising tide of opposition to the administration's omnibus bill for Federal intervention in public education, a bill whose major provisions do violence to practically everything the Republican Party has always stood for in this area. This opposition is finding a response in the House of Representatives, since we are answerable to the people who elected us.

We are convinced a vast majority of Americans want to keep the responsibility for public education as close to home as possible. They realize it is inevitable that a Congress which appropriates billions of taxpayer dollars must also police the spending of those dollars.

These citizens, many of them educators, know that States and local communities have been gaining ground, not losing it, in classroom construction, pupil-teacher ratios, and teacher salaries without broadened Federal interference.

We recognize the Government's obligation to help in areas where school needs are aggravated by unusual numbers of children from Government personnel who are not subject to local taxes. This so-called impacted area problem has been handled as separate legislation in the past.

We do not believe the fate of this established program should, or will, hinge on acceptance of the omnibus bill. The Democrat-controlled Congress will not dare let this program die.

But make no mistake about this: the wrangling now going on in the Congress is just a forerunner of what the Nation can expect in future sessions once the responsibility for financing public education, with all its divisive issues, is shifted to Washington from 50 States and thousands of local communities.

(By Representative HALLECK, June 28, 1961)

I want to read the text of a communication from President Eisenhower which is in response to a letter I wrote him regarding aid to education:

"DEAR CHARLIE: I appreciate having the material you furnished me in respect to the pending education bills.

"It is clear to me that in practically every important respect this legislation is sharply at variance with the principles of good government.

"My views on aid to education are well known. Beginning 6 years ago I have advocated Federal help for school construction to replace shortages brought about by war and the depression of the thirties. However, I have always stressed, first, that such legislation be made temporary; second, that it be pinpointed to actual need; third, that there be State matching of the Federal funds; fourth, that no Federal funds be used for such operational expenses as teacher salaries; and fifth, above all else, that we meticuously avoid Federal control of education.

"I fail to find convincing evidence that these imperatives have been met. Indeed, I can only conclude that if this legislation were enacted, it would not only become permanent but also, by natural progression, it would ultimately result in Federal control of education. So believing, I am convinced that this legislation should be rejected.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

THE BERLIN CRISIS

(By Senator DIRKSEN, July 27, 1961)

The greatest hazard in the Berlin situation is the possibility of miscalculation by the Soviet leaders. There are two areas of error into which Premier Khrushchev might fall:

(1) A mistaken notion that because American officials differ among themselves, and because Democrats and Republicans criticize each other, there is no real will to defend freedom so far as America is concerned.

(2) A mistaken belief that the United States will not go all the way—i.e., to nuclear warfare—to meet its commitments in Europe.

Let's set the record straight.

As to the first point, let it be clearly understood that President Kennedy has the complete support of the Republican leadership in Congress in the Berlin crisis. If differences should appear, they would be on how to uphold our Berlin commitments, not whether to uphold them. We are all aware that the issue is not a city named Berlin, but free world unity.

As for the second point, no greater error could be made by Khrushchev than to believe that the United States would point a weapon but not be willing to fire it.

In 1958, in an almost identical crisis on Berlin, President Eisenhower somewhat puzzled people by saying that the United States would not fight a ground war. But Mr. Khrushchev was not puzzled. He knew what President Eisenhower meant—that we'd fight a nuclear war.

There was also a message for Mr. Khrushchev in President Kennedy's address to the Nation Tuesday night. The bulk of the President's request for additional defense expenditures was for expanded ground forces and plane and sea lifts. Nothing was said about need for money for our total strategic striking force—our supersonic planes, our missiles, and our nuclear warheads. The meaning is plain. In that vital segment of our defense, we are ready.

Of course, Congress will want to review the number of ground forces requested and the use contemplated for them. But I think Mr. Khrushchev is going to find the conference table more attractive on the Berlin issue than he has previously indicated.

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By Senator DIRKSEN, March 23, 1961)

This country's representatives in the United Nations, headed by Adlai Stevenson, apparently are embarked on a new diplomatic course that should be clarified by President Kennedy at his earliest convenience.

Last week our NATO partners were dismayed to discover the United States joining with the Soviet Union in voting against Portugal, one of the most faithful of our allies.

The question at issue was a resolution urging internal reform in Angola, a Portugese colony near the Congo. The nature of the resolution itself was valid grounds for the U.S. questioning the whole procedure because article 7 of the United Nations Charter specifically forbids inquiring into internal matters.

Despite this we deliberately sided with the Soviet Union and only the action of Britain, France, and other NATO nations resulted in rejection of the resolution. Incidentally, it marked the first time in the history of the United Nations that our country was paired with the Soviet Union on a losing issue before the Security Council—hardly a proud moment for Uncle Sam.

We, of course, realize that American sympathy and support must continue to go to the nationals in colonized areas, but we are convinced there are many avenues preferable to affronting our own allies.

We have been advised that the decision to side with the Soviet Union was made by President Kennedy himself. We feel an explanation is due the American people and our allies.

(By the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, May 29, 1961)

Like all Americans, we, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership want President Kennedy to succeed in his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev 6 days from now.

In June 1960 President Kennedy, then a Senator, laid down certain minimal conditions that should exist before a conference should be agreed to. Mr. Kennedy said:

"Our task is to devise a national strategy—based not on the 11th hour responses to Soviet-created crisis—but a comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies designed to increase the strength of the non-Communist world. Until this task is accomplished, there is no point in returning to the summit—for no President of the United States must ever again be put in the position of traveling across the seas, armed only with vague speculative hope."

These were Mr. Kennedy's words to the U.S. Senate on June 14, 1960. In the campaign, he made it clear repeatedly that a completely worked out agenda was another minimal requirement.

It is obvious that President Kennedy is going to meet with Premier Khrushchev at

a time when none of the minimal conditions he suggested exist. Certainly no "comprehensive set of carefully prepared, long-term policies" is yet in evidence. Neither is our position strengthened by the setbacks we have suffered in Cuba and Laos, or by the lack of enthusiasm here in the United States for the Vienna meeting.

We do not know what prompted President Kennedy to agree to the Khrushchev conference but we have certain observations about it which we, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, want to make.

1. The prime reason why negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States have almost always ended in failure is that the Soviets are negotiating for world domination while we have been negotiating for world peace. These are two completely incompatible objectives. They have destroyed all hope of progress. We think the President should put Mr. Khrushchev on notice that there will be no further substantive negotiations by the United States with the Soviet Union until there is evidence by the Soviets that when they speak of their desire for peaceful coexistence, there be tangible evidence of their good faith.

2. Almost equally destructive to the basic negotiating process has been the always-present Soviet tactic of endless stalling, hairsplitting, recessing, and postponing. Negotiations have been used by the Soviet Union principally to gain time. The President should inform Mr. Khrushchev that such Soviet stalling will no longer gain the Soviet Union time, but torpedo the negotiations forthwith. Again it should be emphasized that only good faith can bring us to the conference table.

It should be self-evident that so long as the Soviet Union adheres to its goal of world domination its talk of peaceful coexistence means nothing. It should be made clear to Mr. Khrushchev that we fully realize this and that until there is a real basis for negotiations, none will be attempted.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 8, 1961)

We are gratified that President Kennedy's trip to Europe appears to have had a beneficial effect on the free world alliance, particularly the NATO nations. Before the President Kennedy's departure we expressed our hopes for success in the meeting with Khrushchev. We believe the fact that nothing happened at Vienna is in itself some sort of achievement.

Nevertheless, we are disturbed by some of the impressions brought back to America by President Kennedy. For example: The President in his address to the Nation 2 nights ago declared that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words, have different views of right and wrong, and wholly different concepts about the future of the world.

We think President Kennedy's words are extremely significant.

Before the President's departure we suggested that Mr. Khrushchev should be put on notice that the United States would engage in no further substantive negotiations with the Soviet Union until there was tangible evidence of their good faith.

President Kennedy's own observations concerning the lack of communication between the Soviet Union and the United States in any conference is the strongest argument we have heard that Soviet words mean nothing and that we must insist on concrete demonstrations of good faith.

The President had no sooner completed his address to the American people 2 days ago when we were given another demonstration of this truism. The President told the American people that the only prospect for an accord with Mr. Khrushchev was their agreement that there should be an effective cease-fire in Laos. Yesterday, the Communist forces in Laos virtually doubled their active warfare.

It is beyond dispute that the only thing the Communists understand is strength. It is clear that what we now need is leadership of the type demonstrated by President Eisenhower in Iran, Lebanon, Quemoy-Matsu, Guatemala, and other areas. We suggest that instead of spending our energies in planning further negotiations we devote our resources to vigorous moves which the Kremlin will understand. We feel certain the President will have the support of all Americans if he chooses such a course.

(August 15, 1961)

As we move toward a showdown on Berlin it becomes increasingly important for this Nation's officials to speak with one voice of strength and determination.

As members of the joint House-Senate Republican leadership we have tried to avoid statements that would in any way weaken America's negotiating position with Communist nations. We feel it is doubly important for leaders of the party in power to do likewise, for on them rests the responsibility for policy.

We can only wonder what the world thinks when President Kennedy correctly announces we are going to stand firm on our Berlin commitments only to have important Democratic spokesmen make statements which are at variance with that policy.

The Democratic leader of the Senate has proposed that Berlin be declared a free city in contradiction to the President's position. Two weeks ago, the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, declared that he thought closing the refugee escape hatch from East Germany into West Berlin was a negotiable point because, as he put it, "The Russians have the power to close it in any case." It seemed like an invitation to close it, so last Sunday they did.

There have been other questionable statements by prominent administration spokesmen in other areas of diplomacy. Six weeks before negotiations even began on Laos Mr. Kennedy's Ambassador at Large, W. Averell Harriman, said in a TV interview that we would accept a coalition government, and there should be a place in it for the Soviet favorite, Souvanna Phouma.

Statements like these just cited invariably produce two disastrous results: (1) they weaken the bargaining position of the United States, and (2) they dismay our friends and our allies by a display of contradictions and confusion.

In these critical times why should responsible officials of Government, both legislative and executive, utter inconsistent opinions and statements which convey the impression of weakness and irresolution?

(See supporting data below:)

On April 2, W. Averell Harriman, President Kennedy's Ambassador at Large, just returned from a critical visit to the Far East on the Laos problem, was interviewed on television by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York. Harriman, despite the unbroken string of Communist triumphs resulting from coalition governments, declared "to start off with * * * I think (the Laos Government) has to be a coalition government." Harriman added that he thought the Soviet favorite, Souvanna Phouma, is "a factor that has to be dealt with, and I think he should be in any government."

On June 14 on the Senate floor, Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD proposed "the creation of a free city which embraces all Berlin * * * (to) be held in trust and in peace by some international authority until such time as it is again the capital of Germany. Let the routes of access * * * be garrisoned by international peace teams * * * I make these suggestions * * * as one Senator from the State of Montana, and I make them on my own responsibility."

On Sunday, July 30, Senator FULBRIGHT was interviewed on ABC "Issues and Answers" and was asked if he thought closing the refugee escape hatch into West Berlin would be a negotiable matter. FULBRIGHT replied, "Well, I think that that might certainly be a negotiable point. The truth of the matter is, I think the Russians have the power to close it in any case. I mean we are not giving up very much, because I believe next week if they chose to close their borders, they could, without violating any treaty right I know of. We have no right to insist that they be allowed to come out. As I said, I don't understand why the East Germans don't close the border, because I think they have a right to close it. So why is this a great concession? You don't have that right now."

(By Senator DIRKSEN, August 24, 1961)

At our press conference last week, we protested against what we considered free-wheeling remarks and proposals from Democratic leaders in the administration and in the Congress that have the effect of weakening the bargaining position of the United States in critical negotiations with the Soviet Union. In this respect we would like to direct attention to the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Chester Bowles.

When inducted into office, he was widely hailed as a No. 1 "idea man" in foreign relations for the New Frontier. In the 8 months that he has enjoyed this role he has been credited in the press with urging our U.N. vote with the Soviet Union against our ally Portugal on the Angola question, advocating recognition of Communist Outer Mongolia, and authorship of the so-called two Chinas concept which has caused our Asiatic allies to wonder if we are changing our minds on Red China's admission to the U.N.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Bowles achieved a fresh pinnacle as the No. 1 "idea man." In New Delhi he told a press conference that if India were attacked, help from the United States would be there "the following morning" whether the aggression came from India's neighbors or "any source whatsoever."

Now this is probably the first time the formulation of a military alliance was ever attempted in a press conference—and, I might add, without referral to the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. Government which has no military pact with India. In fact Prime Minister Nehru was so shocked he felt compelled to tell the Indian Parliament a week ago today that while he thought Mr. Bowles meant well, "we are not under anybody's protection, nor are we anybody's client in this respect."

We know that Mr. Bowles was recently scheduled to be fired but was not. We do suggest, however, that he either (1) be completely muzzled, or (2) be removed from the china shop of diplomacy lest he break something really costly.

TRACTORS FOR CUBA

(By Senator DIRKSEN, May 26, 1961)

While the President is entitled to bipartisan support where national security is involved it does not mean that we must remain mute when conviction dictates that we must speak out in the interest of security.

The disastrous handling of the Cuban invasion has caused America to suffer an enormous loss in prestige abroad. But now President Kennedy has compounded that loss by disclosing his official sponsorship of a so-called citizens movement for the American people to make blackmail payments to Fidel Castro.

What kind of precedent is this? What logic supports this decision? What has become of America's legendary position "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute"?

Of course, every American commendably hopes that another Castro bloodbath—this one involving the 1,200 invaders of Cuba—can be avoided.

But what is the price—$15 million worth of tractors? No. It is far greater than dollars and tractors. The price is another loss in prestige; another blow to our fast diminishing world leadership.

What new humiliation will this decision encourage the Communists to visit upon us? Are we not inviting Red dictators behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains to demand ransom for Americans they now hold?

The ransom money for Castro supposedly is being raised to further the cause of "liberation." But it is far more likely to do untold damage than good to the cause of liberation both inside and outside Cuba. Paying tribute to tyrants is as old as history, but it has never advanced the cause of freedom before and it won't this time.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 22, 1961)

The tractor-prisoner negotiations with Castro now appear doomed to be our Cuban fiasco No. 2. The handling of the Cuban invasion was a disaster in itself, but this tractor project is an incredible piece of business.

First, the administration claimed it had nothing to do with a suddenly created citizens committee to raise money to meet Castro's blackmail demands. Two days later the White House reversed itself and revealed that President Kennedy himself had initiated the movement.

Next, the whole project was immersed in doubt as to legality, there being four areas in question—its corporate charter, its right to export licenses, its possible conflict with the Logan Act, and the tax deductibility of any money collected.

If there has been doubt about the thoroughness with which the invasion plans were considered by the administration, it should be plain to all that even less thought went into the administration's handling of the tractor deal. It was a stumbling performance that has only resulted in further lowering our prestige abroad.

It is to be hoped that the fundraising committee will quietly dissolve, returning the unopened contributions to their senders before some new embarrassment occurs.

We suggest there is a course open to the administration in the future that might do much to get our foreign policy back on the beam. It would be to consult the appropriate leaders of Congress in advance, a course followed by President Eisenhower during his 6 years in the White House.

The tractor project certainly could have been avoided had this been done, because leaders on both the Democratic and Republican sides of the Senate had already gone on record against the proposal 2 days before the White House authorship was even known.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

(By Representative HALLECK, March 23, 1961)

We are very disturbed about the depressed areas bill which is coming along for consideration shortly, because we are convinced the unemployed in those areas have been sadly misled as to what it will accomplish. We are sick and tired of seeing these unfortunate people being treated like a political football.

Mr. Eisenhower sought desperately in both 1958 and 1960 to help areas of chronic unemployment, but the Democrats in Congress were more interested in creating campaign issues than in meeting a need. Now they have the ball and the bill they are presenting to the House simply won't do the job.

For example, our House policy committee analysis shows these facts:

(1) Only about 1 out of 17 unemployed workers in industrial depressed areas could get jobs under this legislation.

(2) Only about 1 out of 37 underemployed workers in rural areas would be helped.

(3) Only about 1 percent of unemployed workers in both industrial and rural areas could get retraining payments.

Enactment of the bill in its present form is bound to bring bitter disillusionment to the unemployed in these depressed areas.

The onl redeeming feature we see in this legislation is the acceptance by the House managers of four important features urged by President Eisenhower, including the vital provision to prevent one community stealing industry from another, with Government help.

Our policy committee is already on record favoring accelerated tax amortization to promote new plant construction and job markets in these distressed communities. This is the most potent weapon in our fight against unemployment.

FEED GRAIN AND FARM PROGRAMS

(By Representative HALLECK, April 13, 1961)

Although the Kennedy administration has only been in office 2½ months, the American farmers are already losing millions of dollars as a direct result of the administration's determination to force feed grain prices down by dumping huge stocks of Government-owned grain on the market.

The dumping program has been going on for a month. For example: No. 2 Yellow corn fell below $1.05 per bushel in Chicago at one point, a drop of nearly 15 cents in 2½ weeks and the sharpest market decline in 13 years.

Because corn is king in the grain market and affects other grains, the whole market has been depressed, with substantial drops in wheat, oats, and barley at a time when normally there is an upturn in prices.

Despite the fact that Congress in February specifically refused to give the new administration authority to dump, and had the pledge of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that his would not be done, the dumping is going on nevertheless. The farmers' pocketbook is being squeezed to the tune of at least $100 million loss in market values. The Kennedy administration is determined to force farmers to participate in what was supposed to be a voluntary reduction in acreage under the newly enacted emergency feed grain law. To do this they are rigging the market, a practice the Government itself deplores and prosecutes when undertaken by private enterprise.

Not only are farmers being penalized through lower prices for the grains they market, but, even more important, the cheap feed policies of the Kennedy administration will certainly encourage unsound expansion of the livestock industry. The results of this folly will not be fully apparent for a time, but by the fall of 1962 it is likely that hog, cattle, and poultry prices will decline disastrously.

This market manipulation is being performed in defiance of Congress The administration must bear full responsibility for the consequences which are sure to follow.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, September 15, 1961)

If there is one thing the Kennedy administration has clearly demonstrated this year, it is that it has no sympathy or understanding for the farm problem.

In 8 months the administration, despite a specific pledge to the Congress not to do so, has dumped over 230 million bushels of corn on the market compared to less than half that much in the corresponding period of a year ago. The loss to farmers in depressed prices has run into the millions and millions of dollars.

In addition, the so-called corn program which was to retire 20 million acres of cornland from production this year actually failed to do so by more than 4½ million acres, yet the Government paid the full price of $680 million. This means that $150 million of that money went for phantom acres that either did not exist or were never planted in corn, anyway.

But that is not all. This multimillion-dollar program was supposed to create a 700-million-bushel shortage of corn. It has failed to do so. In fact, it now appears that production and marketing figures will be approximately in balance.

This means that there will be the equivalent of a 700-million-bushel overhang on next year's market which promises to be as dismal for the farmer—and the taxpayer—as this year's market.

But the damage has not been confined to the feed grains market. The livestock, poultry, and dairy industries, as users of feed grains, have been thoroughly disrupted. Their losses, due to depressed prices, have also run into the millions of dollars. Now we have a special committee of the House investigating the drop in poultry prices.

In other words, the maladministration of this program has not only placed heavy losses on the American farmer but on the American taxpayer as well, and the end is not in sight. In fact, it is not too much to venture that we will be feeling the ill effects of this botched job for years to come.

THE HANFORD PROJECT

(By Representative HALLECK, August 2, 1961)

We are convinced that the people of this country want their Government to put national security above partisan political considerations.

We realize that the Kennedy administration made a lot of political promises in its 1960 campaign. These promises have already increased the cost of government on the homefront by billions of dollars. But we must never forget that we can spend ourselves to destruction without a shot being fired. This is what Mr. Khrushchev wants.

If President Kennedy really wants to make a start on economy, we have a suggestion.

Right now the Congress can save $95 million by rejecting the proposal to use the plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash., to create electric power at a substantial loss to the taxpayers. This project will not only operate at a loss, but it will also increase the cost of the basic operation of the installation, which is making plutonium.

Military and scientific experts say it will add nothing of significance to our national defense or our production of nuclear energy.

Moreover, it contradicts the depressed areas legislation we passed earlier this year to help keep industries at home and revive ailing ones, notably the coal industry. We understand and sympathize with the position of the United Mine Workers and the coal industry in opposing this project.

Here is an example of the Federal Government spending money to lose money. A solid majority of the House of Representatives has already rejected this project decisively and will do so again if given the opportunity. We urge the Kennedy administration and the Democratic leadership in the Congress to support us in our efforts to hold down unnecessary spending for programs that just don't contribute to our national defense—or our economic strength—in an hour of peril.

(NOTE.—For further reference to the Hanford project, see the statement by Representative HALLECK under "Spenders," Aug. 31, 1961.)

THE THREAT OF INFLATION

(By Representative HALLECK, September 15, 1961)

As we approach the end of this session of Congress—already the greatest spendthrift Congress in history—the evidence accumulates that the Kennedy administration is going to seek even greater spending next

year. Economic writers are already predicting that a record-breaking $90 billion peacetime budget will be presented to the Congress in January.

Recognizing, as we have, the need for additional national defense spending, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have repeatedly gone on record this year favoring the utmost economy in so-called domestic spending in a budget that originally was estimated at $80 billion by President Eisenhower and already has risen to $87 billion under President Kennedy.

Now, if a $90 billion budget is in prospect, the whole fiscal problem becomes something far more serious than just an additional burden on the taxpayers. It presents a threat of inflation that simply can't be ignored.

We saw the cost of living rise 48 percent under the last Democratic administration, due mainly to the loose fiscal policies of President Truman. Then we saw the cost of living stabilized by the Eisenhower administration because every effort was made to hold Government spending strictly to essentials.

We think the American people now have the right to ask whether or not the value of their dollar is again going to be reduced because we have the spenders back in office. We think there can be only one answer: If the Kennedy administration seeks, as it must, the vast amounts necessary for national defense and at the same time insists on additional billions for New Frontier schemes, then prices are going up and the value of our dollar down.

Additional defense spending necessitated by the Berlin crisis has already increased the tempo of the national economy. We say that reductions in proposed domestic spending are absolutely essential lest our whole economic structure be again subjected to the depleting effects of an inflationary cost-of-living spiral which, in the final analysis, does its greatest damage to those people least able to stand it.

TRADE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Representative HALLECK, August 24, 1961)

On several occasions we have applauded President Kennedy's efforts to stand firm on our Berlin commitments, while we condemned the State Department's contradictory flirtations with U.N. recognition of Red China and Communist Outer Mongolia.

We think that there is another department of the Government which is contributing to confusion almost as much as the State Department—the Department of Commerce, which controls American exports to the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.

According to the Commerce Department's own records, the dollar volume of U.S. goods licensed for shipment to the Soviet bloc increased 800 percent in the 3 weeks after President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin compared to the preceding 3 weeks. These licenses covered such items as railroad equipment, synthetic rubber, chemicals, and other materials which the Commerce Department ruled would not increase the warmaking potential of the Soviet bloc.

In June, the Commerce Department took another amazing step. Despite the fact that Communist food shortages were causing Khrushchev to recommend eating horsemeat, the Department announced that surplus farm commodities, subsidized by the U.S. taxpayers, would be sold to the Soviet Union and its satellites if they would pay in dollars.

As recently as 3 weeks ago export licenses were being OK'd for shipments of American-manufactured ball bearings and machine cutting tools to the Soviet Union, and aircraft ground and maintenance equipment to Communist Czechoslovakia.

Yesterday the House Rules Committee reported a resolution for a House investigation of the administration and enforcement of the laws covering control of exports. We Republicans will support the resolution, but we suggest that President Kennedy meantime consider strict curtailment of export licenses on shipments to the Soviet bloc until a policy in line with our Berlin stand can be worked out with the Commerce Department.

A LEGISLATIVE REPORT TO IKE

(By Senator DIRKSEN following a meeting of the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership with former President Eisenhower, May 1, 1961)

When General Eisenhower invited us to meet with him here in Gettysburg, he asked that Congressman HALLECK and I brief him on the congressional picture. We have just completed that task and I imagine you would like to know what we told General Eisenhower.

Of course, because the Senate is concerned with foreign policy, I had to touch on Cuba in my report to him. We told General Eisenhower that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle were badly shaken by the Cuban matter.

I took some pride, however, in relating, that Republicans have supported President Kennedy in the Cuban crisis, in the belief that once a nation is committed by its President, we must present a united front to the world.

As to the Kennedy program in Congress, we pointed out that we had already received more than 35 legislative communications and messages; in fact Congress has been inundated with them. But I had to report in all honesty to General Eisenhower that not one of the Kennedy proposals has generated any enthusiasm on either the Democratic or the Republican side nor can we find any evidence of real support for the Kennedy program by the American people.

Now the Kennedy program is just what everyone expected—deficit spending, increased Government controls, increases in the Government payroll, more welfare statism—that inevitable price which we must pay the piper—eventually more taxes.

It may be called the New Frontier but the Kennedy program is the old New Deal taken out of an old warming over. It was hot stuff 25 years ago but time has passed it by.

I think that is why the Kennedy program has not found ready acceptance to date with both the Congress and the public and I so advised General Eisenhower.

(By Representative HALLECK, May 1, 1961)

I was in agreement with Senator Dirksen in telling General Eisenhower that the Kennedy program has laid a big egg so far. I think it has just about talked itself to death.

We had some research done on the word content of the New Frontier. My friends, if all the New Frontier words were drops of water, we could irrigate the entire Far West with enough for the Gobi and Sahara Deserts too.

Mr. Kennedy used more than three-fourths million words in 1960 campaign speeches. His Government task force reports and 35 communications to Congress have added up to another 250,000 words. This brings the verbal output of the New Frontier to 1 million words and all we have to show for it so far are an extended Unemployment Compensation Act, a feed-grain statute, an extension of the Sugar Act and a depressed areas law.

The quality of the legislative proposals from the White House so far has hardly been worthy of the 1960 campaign speeches which President Kennedy made. We have seen no legislative proposals which would deal in any lasting way with economic or unemployment problems; no policy utterances that might be raising our prestige abroad.

It was with some pleasure we advised General Eisenhower that on many things on which the Democrats had disagreed with him last year they now agree—for example, the amount of immediate increase in minimum wages, a number of provisions in the depressed areas legislation, including industrial raiding, and, most remarkably, personal diplomacy. Evidently, when they have to be responsible for what they do, they see more nearly eye to eye with General Eisenhower.

In conclusion, I frankly told General Eisenhower that the American people certainly missed his wisdom and sure hand in Washington and if he ran for President tomorrow he would win by the biggest landslide in history. I think he liked that.

THE RED CHINA AND OUTER MONGOLIA QUESTIONS

(By Senator DIRKSEN, April 13, 1961)

The joint Senate-House Republican leadership has been very concerned about persistent rumors that our Government's position on the admission of Red China to the United Nations is softening.

Yesterday the Associated Press carried a story from London to the effect that President Kennedy in his discussions last week with British Prime Minister Macmillan had agreed not to oppose U.N. debate next fall on Red China's bid for a seat, and, further, that a revision in American policy was underway to condition the American people to acceptance of Red China's admission a year or so hence.

We are most happy that President Kennedy in his press conference later yesterday denied the news story in full. The President said, however, that Prime Minister Macmillan had discussed these proposals with him. We realize that when the head of one government who is our guest has a proposal our President must extend the courtesy of listening to it. But it is very heartening, we believe, to the American people to know that our President did no more than listen.

We want to uphold the hand of the President in his stated opposition to any change in our policy on Red China—as he put it—"under present conditions." Therefore the joint Republican leadership agreed this morning that we will cause to be introduced resolutions restating the opposition of Congress, already recorded 13 times, to any change in our present policy. We will invite Democrats of both the Senate and the House to join in sponsorship of this resolution and we believe that many will be happy to do so. We will also consult with the Democratic leadership of the Senate and House on scheduling consideration of the resolutions at the earliest possible moment and we are convinced they will be adopted overwhelmingly by both branches.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 28, 1961)

In April the joint Senate-House Republican leadership called for bipartisan sponsorship of a congressional resolution restating American opposition to admission of Red China to the United States.

Resolutions were introduced in the Congress on May 3—in the Senate by Majority Leader MANSFIELD and myself; in the House by Representatives ZABLOCKI and JUDD of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Joining in the sponsorship were 12 Republican and 3 Democratic Senators and 46 Republican and 20 Democratic Representatives.

Nearly 2 months have passed without action. Meanwhile out of the State Department have been coming distressing stories of a new offer we are considering making on the Red China question.

Supposedly the United States will back an offer that Red China have equal representa-

tion in the U.N. General Assembly with Nationalist China. This is supposed to infuriate Red China which wants the ouster of Nationalist China from the U.N., and therefore Red China will refuse our offer.

However, there is a flaw in this devious State Department reasoning. Nationalist China says it will withdraw from the General Assembly if Red China is admitted. Supposing Red China decided to take advantage of this fact and accepted membership in the General Assembly? Then where would we be? Nationalist China would be out and Red China in.

We are appalled at this dangerous guessing game. Now is no time for the State Department to be playing Russian roulette with our Red China policy.

We insist that now is the time for Senate and House consideration of the resolution opposing admission of Red China to the U.N. Any further delay can only be interpreted abroad as still another sign of American weakness.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, July 13, 1961)

It is the desire of the Republican leadership to support complete firmness in our policy in Berlin. But we must be equally firm on the question of recognition of Red China and Outer Mongolia, otherwise our position in Berlin will be weakened. Let me specify——

On April 12, following discussions in Washington with British Prime Minister Macmillan on the subject of Red China's admission to the U.N., President Kennedy told a press conference he was opposed to any change in our policy on recognition of Red China.

The next day, April 13, Congressman HALLECK and I, as spokesmen for the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, announced our complete support of the President's statement, and invited Democrats in the Congress to join us in sponsorship of resolutions reaffirming the American position on the China question.

Unfortunately, in the 3 months since, these bipartisan resolutions have been bottled up in Congress at the State Department's suggestion, while a flood of news stories has emanated from Washington that the State Department was studying sponsorship of a U.N. resolution admitting Red China.

But that is not all. Concurrently, there have been a number of stories concerning State Department consideration of American diplomatic recognition and a seat in the United Nations for Communist Outer Mongolia. Last Saturday it was announced from Moscow that Outer Mongolia has advised the United States it accepts our proposal for diplomatic ties.

Needless to say, we are deeply disturbed by any efforts that will accord any additional recognition by this country to Communist countries, and doubly so at a time when unity of the free world is of the utmost importance on the Berlin question. We respectfully suggest to President Kennedy that he clarify the situation at his earliest opportunity and we pray that when he does, the State Department's maneuverings in the Far East will be halted and that the President will reaffirm our strongly anti-Communist position in Asia.

(By Representative HALLECK, July 13, 1961)

I want to join Senator DIRKSEN in stressing our deep concern over the State Department's actions in Asia when the attention of all of us should be directed toward Berlin and a rallying of the free world to the Berlin issue.

The continued display of interest by some high State Department officials in the admission of Red China to the U.N. is bad enough, but the sudden emergence of a proposal to recognize Outer Mongolia is simply incredible.

President Kennedy was put on notice about Berlin in his conversations with Khrushchev in Vienna in the first week of June. We are advised that during that week one of our diplomatic officials in Moscow approached Outer Mongolia's Ambassador to Russia and opened discussions on recognition.

Outer Mongolia is the oldest of all the Soviet Union's puppet states having had a Communist regime since 1921. During the crucial 1940's when the Chinese Communists were trying to overthrow the Nationalist Government of China, their base of supplies was Outer Mongolia. In the Korean war, United Nations troops, including American boys, faced two regiments of Outer Mongolian forces and Outer Mongolians also manned antiaircraft guns in the Korean conflict.

It is fair to ask just what Outer Mongolia has done in the interest of world peace to warrant U.S. diplomatic recognition and a seat in the United Nations.

When State Department officials have been called upon in recent days to explain this unbelievable diplomatic sortie, their reasons have been thin indeed. We have been told that we need a listening post in upper Asia. There have been suggestions that only by admission of Outer Mongolia to the U.N. can the African state of Mauritania be admitted.

No wonder our friends in Asia, including Nationalist China, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippine Republic, are questioning the sincerity of American policy at this very moment.

We think it is of basic importance for President Kennedy to stop immediately these disruptive State Department operations. The free world is looking to us for leadership in Berlin, not confusion in Asia.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, August 31, 1961)

In 3 weeks the United Nations will meet in New York. Because of the Berlin crisis and the announcement that the Soviets are resuming nuclear testing, we think it is doubly important for the representatives of the United States to exert the strongest leadership possible in the forthcoming sessions. Our success could hinge on two issues—the Red China and Communist Outer Mongolia questions.

Unfortunately, for the past several months, our State Department conducted exploratory moves that led many people to fear both Red China and Outer Mongolia would be admitted to the U.N. without our opposition and perhaps with our approval. Further it was no secret that the U.S. Government might accord diplomatic recognition to Outer Mongolia.

On August 11 the State Department announced that for a considerable period of time it had "been exploring the question of establishment of relations with Outer Mongolia," but had decided against diplomatic ties. At the same time the Department stated: "We favor the retention by Nationalist China of its seat in the United Nations and oppose the admission of Red China."

In view of the previous positions taken by the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, we, of course, were gratified by these decisions. But we think one more step is needed before the United Nations meets September 19.

So far the State Department has only said that we will not give diplomatic recognition to Outer Mongolia; it has not said that the United States will oppose U.N. admission for that Soviet puppet state. On the contrary, on April 19 the U.N. was told by one of our representatives, Charles W. Yost, that "the United States will be prepared to support—and even to cosponsor—Outer Mongolia's admission * * *" if our investigation showed Outer Mongolia to be an independent state willing to meet its international obligations.

The Soviet Union has made the admission of the African country Mauritania conditional on the admission of Outer Mongolia. It has been our historic policy to oppose all "package" deals such as this. We strongly urge the State Department to clarify our position as soon as possible and to make it unmistakably clear that we will oppose not only the admission of Red China to the U.N. but of Outer Mongolia as well.

THE SPENDERS ARE BACK

(By Senator DIRKSEN, March 29, 1961)

The President's budget messages and the testimony of the Budget Director before the Joint Economic Committee make it quite clear that the new administration will not be bothered by making the books balance. Maybe the decade of the sixties will be the deficit decade. That will be no new experience.

The approach to the budget problem is ingenious to say the least. First, show that the Eisenhower budget for the year ending in June 1961 was based on miscalculation as to spending and income and turn a small surplus into a $800 million deficit.

And since there would be a deficit on June 30, according to the new fiscal Frontier figuring, a bigger deficit might not be too unpalatable by spending more. This will prepare the country for a $2.2 billion budget hole on June 30.

Then condition the country for the next year by setting up two sets of books—one for general spending and the other for defense spending—even though the money all comes out of the same public purse and is paid from the same tax revenues. It is proposed to hike defense spending by another two-thirds of a billion for the year ending June 30, 1962, with a hint that it might be more. Then there will be the built-in increases of other years plus those that this Congress is likely to approve.

The net of all this is pretty plain. The new fiscal Frontier balance sheet will be in the red on June 30; it will be a deeper red on June 30, 1962. The debt ceiling will have to be lifted, and the deficit decade will have a pretty good start.

(By Representative HALLECK, May 26, 1961)

For the past 4 months the Congress has been deluged with Presidential messages and communications proposing New Frontier programs. We are told they are still coming. The messages and communications have been vague and mysterious as to the cost of the projects, how long they will be needed, and where the money will come from to pay for them. They have abounded in contradictions, vague goals, confusion, hidden costs, and back-door spending.

For the past 2 weeks we have had staff members making a thorough search of all available material bearing on the cost of the New Frontier programs. They have reported back to us that the fiscal picture is projected so far into the future as to be unintelligible. They say there is such a welter of concealed authorizations, contractual commitments, and loan and subsidy programs, that dependable cost figures are impossible to obtain. However, by taking the New Frontier's own minimum estimates, it appears likely that approximately $60 billion additional will be spent by the Federal Government over the next 5 years. The calculation is that the Federal budget will reach at least $125 billion by 1965, if not sooner, compared to $80 billion in President Eisenhower's last budget.

As indicated, we cannot, through no fault of our own, vouch for the accuracy of these figures. In fact we are convinced that we cannot find out what the programs will cost and that President Kennedy has no man in his administration who knows what they will cost. If the President does have such a person, we will be happy to invite him to our next leadership meeting to advise us

what the costs will be and where we are headed.

Nevertheless, our research convinces us that we are entering a jungle of unprecedented spending and loose fiscal policy. Never in the history of our country has any administration so blindly plunged into the future with so little thought or so little preparation. It is plain that the Congress is going to have to exercise the utmost scrutiny and wisdom if this country is to be saved from a fiscal disaster of major proportions.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 15, 1961)

It now appears that President Kennedy intends to spend in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, at least $5 billion more in cash outlays than proposed by President Eisenhower and to obligate $9 billion more under contractual authority. This serious fiscal picture raises some very important questions as to what we can afford.

For example, it is becoming more evident every day that President Kennedy must soon decide which he thinks is more important to our people—the New Frontier domestic programs or our national security.

The President sponsors a $4 billion aid to education program, a $9 billion housing program, a $5 billion medical care program, and many other measures totaling more billions. At the same time the President tells us how dangerous the world situation is and calls for more and more individual sacrifice to meet the threat of communism. Mr. Kennedy describes "how long and hard a struggle must be our fate as Americans"; he urges us "to meet our responsibilities, however burdensome they may be"; and he suggests that we ask not what the Government can do for us but what we can do for the Government.

These are brave and commendable words, but we think it is about time the Kennedy administration applied some of its preachments to itself. Just where the Federal Government has tightened its belt under the New Frontier is difficult to discover. The administration's proposals for more and more welfare spending come thick and fast; the prospective deficits mount hourly.

When President Kennedy sponsors legislation to permit the purchase of $15,000 homes with no money down and 40 years to pay, the citizen begins to wonder what kind of sacrifices Mr. Kennedy is talking about. When the citizen reads that the national debt is climbing daily, he wonders whether it is he or his children the President believes should do more for their Government.

If we are going to develop a national willingness to sacrifice, the pace must be set in Washington. And the best place to start would be on a Presidential revision of the budget aimed at eliminating all but the most essential expenditures.

(By Representative HALLECK, June 15, 1961)

If there is one thing I believe the people of this country want more than anything else, it is for the leadership in Washington to protect our country against the threats of Mr. Khrushchev and everything he stands for.

When I say leadership, I include the leadership in Congress.

When I say everything Mr. Khrushchev stands for, I am talking about the kind of New Frontier schemes that foster further centralized government at the expense of local authority, private enterprise and individual liberties.

Currently, most of our attention is being directed to activities by the President and his administration involving global aspects of the cold war between the Communist bloc and the free nations of the world. We are spending most of our time worrying about, and billions of dollars trying to prevent, the spread of communism.

No one will deny our obligation to help free, friendly nations stay free.

But the overriding obligation we face is to keep ourselves free in the process.

On more than one occasion Mr. Khrushchev has predicted that the grandchildren of present-day Americans will be living under socialism. I, for one, do not underestimate Mr. Khrushchev's powers of observation. At the rate we have started under this administration, it may be our children who will live under socialism.

I think it is high time for the Congress to take a long, hard look at spending proposals now before us that would play into Mr. Khrushchev's hands by pushing this country further down the road to socialism.

While I'm naturally concerned about what the Kremlin might try to do to us, I am also concerned about what we are doing to ourselves.

(By Representative HALLECK, July 27, 1961)

The need for a conclusive stand on Berlin is unquestionable. I doubt if there is a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who will not support the necessary steps to bring this about.

However, I think most Americans will agree with me that as defense costs rise it is imperative that the Government retrench on other programs.

On May 26 at one of these press conferences I made an analysis of the unprecedented New Frontier spending and concluded with these words:

"Never in the history of our country has any administration so blindly plunged into the future with so little thought or so little preparation."

This statement was made 8 days before the famous Vienna Conference at which Khrushchev handed President Kennedy his ultimatum on Berlin. Fifty-four days have passed since President Kennedy was put on notice concerning Berlin and in those 54 days the administration has not lifted one finger to halt the vastly increased domestic spending program of the New Frontier.

Two days ago the President disclosed that the Berlin crisis itself is going to cost us $3.4 billion additional. He talked about deficits. He talked about more possible defense spending. He talked about possible increased taxes.

It is easy enough to call upon the American people to make additional sacrifices—to look not at what their Government can do for them but what they can do for their Government. But we have arrived at the day of reckoning. I say it is time for the New Frontier to find out what it can do for government—sound government.

It would make a lot more sense to everyone, and certainly to the masters of the Kremlin, if this administration decided to invest our resources in preserving American security and to spend less on the innovations of some domestic political planners. A Presidential message to the Congress proposing cutbacks on domestic spending would be most appropriate.

We of course are determined to support any means necessary to strengthen our Berlin stand and in that President Kennedy has our firm commitment. But we insist that the President owes the American people some substantive reciprocity and while the ordinary citizen is tightening his belt, let the Government do the same.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, August 2, 1961)

It has long been agreed that a strong and healthy economy is our first line of defense. This becomes doubly important when a nation is called upon to support multi-billion-dollar moon shoots, multi-million-dollar weapons, a large increase in military personnel, and a long-range foreign-aid program.

As members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, we are determined that our defense posture be at the maximum strength necessary and that President Kennedy be given the strongest hand possible in the diplomatic cold war. But we feel impelled to repeat that to arrive at this strength the Federal Government has to tighten its belt on all nonessential matters.

We believe these strictures apply not only to the Kennedy administration but to the Democratic-controlled Congress as well. Although President Kennedy on several occasions has asked the Congress not to exceed his budget, there is no evidence that the White House has sought to curtail any specific legislative excesses on which the Congress has already embarked, and they are several.

For example, there are housing, military, veterans, space, and the Youth Conservation Corps authorizations that have broken the budget barriers in excess of $5 billion. There are other examples but it suffices to say that when the budget itself is already out of balance, direct or indirect contributions to greater deficits, current and future, do not constitute a healthy situation.

Of course the Congress has a right to enact authorizations and appropriate money without regard to the President's budget. But with the White House exhibiting no reticence in spending matters we feel it imperative that Congress show every reasonable restraint possible. The administration has just finished a $3.9 billion deficit year and is now in a $5 billion deficit year. This is not a laudable start toward establishment of a sound fiscal policy.

True, there are those who fuzzily confuse spending with progress, but we feel confident from our mail and our own sampling that the overwhelming majority of the American people feel now is not the time for political excesses of any nature.

(By Representative HALLECK, August 31, 1961)

It is becoming plainer by the day that this Congress has been hearing from the folks back home about the need for tightening the purse strings particularly in view of the additional defense expenditures caused by the Berlin crisis.

In the last 3 weeks, the following significant actions have taken place which we believe more nearly reflect the mood of this country than the course followed by the Congress during the preceding 7 months:

1. On August 8, by a majority of 71 votes, the House eliminated from the atomic energy bill a completely unjustified proposal to spend $95 million to use the plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash., to create electric power at a substantial loss to the taxpayers.

2. On August 29, 2 days ago, a Senate-House conference committee agreed to strike from the foreign aid bill $1.6 billion in authorizations for a 5-year period, and, far more important, specified that instead of borrowing the money from the Treasury, the administration must come to the Congress on an annual basis for appropriations.

3. On August 30—yesterday—the House by a 73-vote majority insisted that an aid-to-education bill extending the impacted areas and national defense education programs, which we are all for, be considered a week hence without $325 million for a school program with entirely new formula which administration partisans had inserted in the bill without so much as a public hearing or even a reading of the legislation by the Education and Labor Committee.

Congress, in our opinion, now realizes that our people have seen enough Christmas-tree legislation. While I can only speak for the Republicans, I think the disposition of the Congress henceforth is going to be: Provide every dollar needed for defense but tighten the Government's belt on nonessential spending.

Naturally we are proud of the part the Republicans played in this turn of events because it has justified our efforts to support the President in the international crisis while opposing costly programs that could

either wait or are not needed under our form of government.

STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Senator DIRKSEN, April 20, 1961)

The New Frontier is overaccenting welfare proposals and has thus far failed to emphasize one of the real problems of the 1960's; namely, built-in, or structural unemployment.

What is really happening is that our economy is coming to grips with the composite results of our inventiveness, our ingenuity, our efficiency, our longevity, the steady increase of women in jobs, our abhorrence of waste, investments abroad, and the influx of competitive goods and other factors which have been slowly unfolding for a long time.

We have already seen what has happened to American agriculture as a result of technological improvements. In the last 10 years our farmers have produced approximately 28 percent more food with approximately 28 percent less manpower.

At the sametime our industrial workers have also been producing at increased rates in the face of a growing labor force. This has produced some startling results.

A few years ago there were 2 million railroad employees. Today there are 800,000. A few years ago there were 700,000 employed coal miners; today there are 200,000. These are extreme examples but the problem is more likely to grow in the industrial field than diminish in the years immediately ahead.

The built-in factors in structural unemployment have been operating for some time and the question is how we handle their increased effect. Obviously there is a shift occurring at an accelerated rate from blue collar work to white collar work, but the acceleration is not great enough to meet technological improvements.

We are setting up a study committee on structural unemployment to advise us on the role of Government in achieving the transition in our work and production patterns. We must keep step technologically, but we must make sure our work force benefits as the changes occur.

(By Representative HALLECK, April 20, 1961)

This morning we reached a decision that I believe will go far toward helping solve one of the basic problems now facing this country—the problem of structural unemployment. By structural unemployment we mean those unfortunate individuals whose field of occupation has been wiped out or greatly diminished by technological change.

We have approximately 5,500,000 unemployed and I have seen nothing in the proposals sent to Congress by President Kennedy so far that comes to grips with this basic problem. The simple fact is that the average worker today is capable of substantially greater output than a few years ago because of technological improvement. At the same time, the number of people entering the labor market each year is increasing. The question thus becomes: How can we enjoy all the advantages of technological change and at the same time keep our workers employed?

There have been a number of studies made on this labor problem but none of them has produced a practical solution. Therefore, Senator DIRKSEN and I have been authorized to set up a small committee of experts to advise us on this problem of structural unemployment.

We believe that we can perform a constructive service by conducting this type of study. The structural unemployment problem is, beyond doubt, going to be with us for many years unless labor and management and Government can form a partnership to meet the problem squarely and fairly and intelligently. In fact, I hope to announce over this weekend a concurrent project we Republicans are developing in the House on this same subject.

The important thing is: The United States must advance technologically, in fact, keep ahead of the world, but at the same time it must do so without imposing undue hardship on the working men and women of this country.

WAGE-HOUR SLEIGHT OF HAND

(By Representative HALLECK, May 11, 1961)

I think it is time to read into the public record the fact that the American worker is losing nearly a billion and a quarter dollars in increased pay because President Kennedy failed to live up to his campaign pledge on minimum wages. My figures are from the Department of Labor.

In 1960, President Eisenhower worked around the clock trying to get an opposition Congress to raise the minimum wage to $1.15 as of January 1 of this year. Senator Kennedy personally scuttled the legislation, flatly pledging he would raise it to $1.25 if elected President.

In February, as President, Mr. Kennedy asked Congress not for $1.25 but $1.15, saying it should not go to $1.25 for 2½ more years.

Since the $1.15 does not become effective until September of this year, this means that nearly 2 million covered workers will have lost $224 million in increased pay that they could have had under President Eisenhower's proposal if adopted last year. That is the price workers are paying for the 8 lost months on the New Frontier.

But that is not all.

When the law goes to $1.25, 2½ years after President Kennedy pledged it would, the workers covered—some 3 million of them—can ask themselves how much they are out of pocket between Mr. Kennedy's pledge and his performance. The answer is a further loss of $1 billion in wage increases promised but not delivered. That is the additional price workers are paying for the 2½ lost years on the New Frontier.

Last week, when he signed the new law, President Kennedy said, "I want to express my satisfaction in signing the bill to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour." Not a word was said about $1.15. Not a word about the 2½-year wait ahead of the American workers. Evidently the New Frontiersmen think the American worker can't read or write, add or subtract, multiply or divide—or remember. I happen to think they can and will.

(The following background information was released with Representative HALLECK'S May 11, statement:)

"August 3, 1960: Democratic-controlled Senate-House conferees failed to agree on President Eisenhower's proposed legislation for increasing the minimum wage to $1.15 effective January 1, 1961, the conference collapsing because Senator Kennedy insisted on $1.25.

"August 30, 1960: 'I intend to take this fight to the American people. I am sure that they will support me in November in my goal of a minimum living standard of $1.25 an hour. * * *' (Senator Kennedy to the minimum wage conference.)

"November 4, 1960: 'We have a minimum wage—but to be of any help at today's prices it must be raised to $1.25 an hour.' (Senator Kennedy in a campaign speech.)

"February 6, 1961: President Kennedy asked Congress for a $1.15 law plus broader coverage with provision to go to $1.25 28 months after the effective date.

"May 5, 1961: President Kennedy signed the minimum wage bill into law thus making September 4, 1961 the effective date for $1.15, and September 4, 1963 the effective date for $1.25.

"February 14, 1961: Secretary of Labor Goldberg told the House Education and Labor Committee that there were 1,906,000 covered workers who were making less than $1.15 and that the increase to $1.15 would mean an additional $336 million in their pay envelopes annually. Based on these figures the workers lost $224 million in their pay envelopes when Senator Kennedy scuttled President Eisenhower's bill (eight-twelfths of $336 million).

February 14, 1961: Secretary of Labor Goldberg also testified that there were 3,021,000 covered workers who made less than $1.25 and that the increase to $1.25 would result in $836 million more annually in their pockets. This means that the 2-year delay in President Kennedy's fulfillment of his promise to obtain a $1.25 minimum is costing the workers $500 million annually or a total of $1 billion for 2 years ($336 million subtracted from $836 million).

A SUMMARY STATEMENT

(Joint statement by Senator DIRKSEN and by Representative HALLECK, September 27, 1961)

We can recall no period in our times in which a new administration and Congress—both controlled by the Democratic Party—have promised so much and delivered so little. This was not the longest session of Congress in history—it just seemed like it.

To be sure, the old standbys of most Congresses were passed—foreign aid, social security amendments, highway funds, housing, judgeships, appropriations for defense, extension of expiring laws and the like. Some were the usual; some bore outlandish price tags; some made big government bigger.

But most significant, President Kennedy's major campaign promises stand unredeemed—in fact, appear unredeemable.

His aid-to-education program was rejected.

His tax program was pigeonholed.

His civil rights promises were forgotten.

His medical care for the aged was stymied.

His "do it yourself" farm program was plowed under.

His method of foreign aid financing, called the heart of the program, was killed.

His pledge of fiscal integrity vanished as the administration tobogganed into a huge deficit.

Indeed, the hallmark of this 1961 legislative venture was failure—in leadership, in accomplishment, and in campaign promises fulfilled.

Perhaps it can be said that the crowning success of this session of Congress was, after all, its overwhelming failure.

Surely most Americans upon reflection will find themselves more blessed for what they escaped than for what they received.

For this they can thank, in large measure, a sturdy band of outnumbered Republicans who fought throughout the session with considerable success for a beachhead of sanity in Government.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, although all but the ghost of the 1961 model of a proposed Federal aid to education program has left our midst, there is always the unhappy assumption that it will again haunt us in a highly professional manner in some succeeding session of Congress. Until the subject is shown of all political advantages, it can be ex-

pected to be resurrected at least once every Congress until a more glamorous bureaucratic scheme is concocted. Under the circumstances, it may be well for opponents of the sham to keep the issue alive through constant exposure so that everyone may eventually have an opportunity to detect the fraudulence behind the proposal.

The current Nation's Business magazine contains an article by Dr. Anthony Marinaccio, superintendent of public schools in Davenport, Iowa. It is an excellent indictment of the Federal aid program. It should be added to the documentary material already compiled in the case against this attempt to impose Federal control over the schools and teachers of our Nation. For this reason I request that it be included in the RECORD.

While I wish to be associated with the major conclusions of Dr. Marinaccio's frank presentation, I should like to implement his reference to the so-called impacted area assistance legislatiotn. While I appreciate that, in unusual circumstances, some communities may be suddenly overrun with a large number of children of employees of a Federal installation in temporary operation, the law which Congress initially enacted to handle the situations during the Korean war has been unwisely extended and ludicrously administered. I have on previous occasions appealed to my colleagues for correcting the evils that have arisen out of this originally well-meant and necessary program.

From the time that the big push for Federal control of the Nation's education was undertaken several years ago, Congress has in its wisdom rejected this attempted bureaucratic encroachment into our State and local school systems. However, the impacted area law, which was put onto the books in 1950 to ease some of the problems of the Korean war, has been continued without regard to the fact that it was created as a temporary expediency and has been administered without any respect whatsoever for the taxpaying public.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless case histories that could be offered in proof of the unreasonableness in the administration of the impacted area law, but perhaps the most telling instances persist right in this area. Permitting children of career Federal workers who have lived in the same place for many years to be counted for Government assistance is entirely preposterous. While the Federal Register has not been printed this year, the last edition lists thousands upon thousands of Government employees earning in excess of $10,000 per year. There are countless others in the same wage brackets but not listed in the Register. A majority of these Government employees are residents of Montgomery County, Md., whose per capita income is among the very highest in the Nation.

Is there any sound reason why the taxpayers of the constituency which I represent should have to pay to send the Montgomery County children to school? Of course not. It is an out and out violation of the rights of a majority of the taxpayers of this county.

I have spoken on this subject in the House previously. I suggested that, if the people of Montgomery County are not willing to pay their own school bills, then let Congress take this situation into serious consideration the next time it authorizes construction of another Federal installation. I can provide a substantial list of communities in the 22d District of Pennsylvania that would welcome the location of a Federal Government office, and I can assure you that residents will be happy to present a written pledge that the Federal Government need not contribute to the education of the children who grow up there. Bring some $10,000 jobs down there to us and we shall be eternally grateful. It would mean more business for our local industries and stores, and we could substantially reduce surplus labor conditions.

How absurd to give Federal funds to Montgomery County. Our industries and labor unions have set up funds to attract new plants and factories. We do everything possible to make our region attractive to relocations. We would be most happy to make space available to Government installations if you will provide some of the permanent jobs that you have given to residents of Montgomery County and the other districts around the Nation's Capital.

I supported impacted area legislation at the outset of the Korean war because it was obvious that some communities would be overrun by Federal employees and their families at installations established for temporary operation. There was no intent in the law to continue the program indefinitely or to prove a grab bag for cities which thrive on Federal income on a permanent basis.

There is no justification for the impacted area bill as presently interpreted and administered, and everyone knows it.

On Sunday, September 17, Miss Ingrid Jewell, Washington correspondent for the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, contributed an article entitled "Impact Areas' School Bill Is Seen Full of Abuses." Because honest reporting of this nature contributes valuable information that may be instrumental in correcting the abuses of this program the next time it is brought before the Congress, I include the following portions of Miss Jewell's report in the RECORD at this point:

IMPACT AREAS' SCHOOL BILL IS SEEN FULL OF ABUSES

(By Ingrid Jewell)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The bobtailed school aid bill which Congress has sent to the President continues for 2 years a program which the Comptroller General of the United States believes is full of abuses.

This is the so-called impacted areas program, enacted in 1950 as a Korean war measure to assist school districts for defense work or military service. * * *

But the impacted areas law has become one grand shakedown, in many school districts, according to the report of the Comptroller General. * * *

But many Members of Congress consider the impacted areas program, as now administered, unfair, inefficient, and bogged down with politics. It does not channel Federal money, necessarily, to school districts in need. It favors a few school districts across the country whose school authorities have been able to concoct records seemingly to indicate the presence of many federally connected children.

The Korean war is long over but the costs of this program and the number of benefiting children under it increase each year.

In 1950, the program paid out $29.7 million for operation of these impacted schools, including teachers' salaries. In 1960 it paid out $117.6 million for operation. Construction costs are down, from a high of $195 million in 1953 to $61.1 million in 1960.

CALIFORNIA BIG BENEFICIARY

The tremendous beneficiaries have been California, with its airplane and other defense plants, and the southern States with their military installations. In the decade, the program has cost almost $2 billion.

Pennsylvania has not done well at all, with $4.5 million for construction and $16.9 million for operation in the decade since the law was first enacted. Pennsylvania's entitlement last year was $4,525,000, of which more than $2 million went to Philadelphia which counts the children of Navy yard employees.

Since the defense plants closed, there have been few Allegheny County school districts which could legitimately claim to participate, and none has resorted to the extreme measure to build eligibility cited by the comptroller general.

Mr. Speaker, the full context of Dr. Marinaccio's article is printed below. I invite your close perusal of this important testimony against one of the most obnoxious bureaucratic proposals ever submitted for congressional consideration:

WE REJECT FEDERAL AID

(By Dr. Anthony Marinaccio)

Don't let anyone tell you that Federal aid to education won't lead to Federal control. I have been on the receiving end of Federal aid, and I have seen the controls develop and grow.

It's a dangerous delusion, this notion that aid from the Federal Government does not lead to interference with the freedom of local schools to manage their own affairs.

In a Missouri community where I served as superintendent of schools I saw a dramatic example of how this can happen. The public schools there were receiving Federal funds for vocational home economics education.

Ostensibly, there were no strings attached. In fact, however, we were harassed by a school supervisor who, in her capacity as an inspector employed by the State, but actually paid by Uncle Sam, attempted to force changes in our curriculums and facilities which our own vocational training specialists knew to be inadvisable.

When we refused to accept her ideas, she said: "Well, I am not sure that I want to approve the funds you get for this program."

What did we do? We did what I feel every school system in America should do in a situation where its basic rights are threatened. We rejected the Federal program and ran our own.

There are other examples of the controls which come with so-called aid from Washington. But before I enumerate some of those which my 27 years in education have revealed, I want to make this point most emphatically to all Americans—and particularly those responsible for the training of our youth: America is in real peril of losing its freedom as a result of corrosion from within, and that corrosion, I am convinced, will be hastened if the Nation adopts large-scale programs in which the Central Government finances local schools.

Some will say that I am an alarmist, that I am painting the picture in unnecessarily dark colors. Let me say that I am not wear-

ing blinders or fighting for a preconceived idea. I am, I think, a realist. I know that sometimes circumstances make it necessary for the Federal Government to help localities with their school problems.

One such special case is what is known as an impacted area. These are communities where, because of Federal installations, tremendous numbers of children come in suddenly and fill up the schools. Such communities should be given Federal help.

NEED FOR AID NOT WIDESPREAD

In most public school systems, there is no need for asking or expecting Federal help. The job can be done at the local level—where it should and must be done if we are to preserve our freedom. America has been built out of this thing we call freedom. People can learn how to handle freedom—to be free—only if they have such powers as free education. Essential to free education is the power of the community to decide for itself what its schools should teach, and how to finance the teaching.

If we allow Federal aid to education to come on a big scale, we will be moving—perhaps slowly at first, but more rapidly later on—to centrally directed education that could take us down the same road traveled by Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin and all the totalitarian societies of the past. I don't want this to happen. But it could happen. It's precisely the danger which Washington and Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin were concerned about when they met at the inn in Williamsburg after the Revolutionary War.

"Now that we have won this thing," they said in effect, "are we able to educate the masses of Americans to be free and to have responsibility for control of their freedom—or will chaos result?"

Proponents of Federal aid to education continually assure us there will be no control. In Davenport, in Peoria, Ill., in Missouri and in other places where I have had contact with public schools, I found the opposite to be true. Control does follow aid.

Those who administer aid want to check the programs and courses of a study. They suggest programs. They suggest the type of personnel you should hire and what you should pay them. They suggest what you should teach and, through these suggestions, they are actually controlling the situation.

Uncle Sam cannot hand out large sums of money without checking to make sure this money is properly spent. When you get to checking the spending you have to have a standard against which to check it. This becomes control. It is really as it should be. Billions of dollars should not be loosely distributed and their use left unmonitored. So, you're in a vicious circle. If you're running a public school system which receives Federal tax dollars, you have to pay attention to what the Federal Government or its agents say, or you just won't qualify for the funds.

Look at the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which sets up grants for science and mathematics.

The preamble to this act disclaims any intention to control local schools, yet you should have seen the thick report which we had to prepare in Davenport if we wanted to qualify for NDEA funds. We had to spell out in detail our program, our organization, and so forth. If that isn't control, what is it?

I know of communities which are spending thousands of dollars on science equipment, language laboratories, additional guidance personnel and tests financed from NDEA funds before they are ready for these things and before they know what to do with the new facilities.

This is an outrageous drain on American taxpayers. Many such communities spend the money from NDEA simply because it is there and its availability invites someone to spend it.

WASTE CITED

In my earlier experience with vocational education, the supervisor wanted us to redo our home economics laboratory. Instead of having a limited number of areas in which to teach cooking and so on, she insisted on having enough for everybody.

Well, this would have been a tremendous waste. We knew we would have only so many students in there, and we didn't want to leave other areas idle. After we rejected the federally supported program, we split the student group so that some were cooking, some were sewing, and some doing other things. That way we saved a lot of money and—most important—did a better job of teaching.

We are now starting an electronics program under vocational training for adults. Federally connected people, through the State, worked with us in making out the courses of study, and the plans for the program. They made suggestions for the kind of person we should find, and how much we should pay him.

In their letter they said, "These are only suggestions." Well now, you probably know what "only suggestions" means coming from a superior office.

The drive for Federal aid to education has been gaining momentum in recent years because of a tremendous growth in the numbers of children to be educated and the teachers and facilities needed to do the educating. In addition, inflation has led to a rise in the cost of materials needed for school construction and, most important, in the salary requirements of teachers, many of whom are still underpaid. The net impact of all these pressures in many communities has been almost revolutionary. The average taxpayer sometimes can't see why his taxes should be so high.

We have to get across to the taxpayer—at the local level—that his higher taxes are buying better schools and better education. If he is tempted to think that running to the Federal Treasury will relieve the burden, he must be shown that nothing comes from Washington that doesn't originate in his own pocket.

Most communities can handle these increased needs locally if they will recognize the needs and have the initiative to do the job. In Davenport, where our board of education is on record as opposing Federal aid, we overcame the problem of teacher pay. Our school board spearheaded the campaign, starting about 3 years ago. The board enlisted the support of our local chamber of commerce, and other civic groups. Result: In 3 years—counting next year, which is already budgeted—the average classroom teacher will have realized a pay hike of from $1,000 to $3,000.

We did this by getting local support for a school tax increase. I am gratified by the result. It has raised the morale of our teachers. They have seen that the public recognizes their economic status and have thrown themselves into the job. They have organized new courses of study, invented new materials for the classroom, introduced language labs, including the teaching of foreign languages to children in the second grade. They work after school and on Saturdays.

LOCAL ACTION ESSENTIAL

This is the heart of the matter. Local action to solve local problems. Not enough communities are doing this, in my opinion. Too many bond issues are thrown out because of lack of understanding; too many tax levies are being voted down. When that happens, the superintendent of schools and board of education run to the Federal Government for money.

We lost one bond issue last year but a committee came right back to push it and get the job done. One of the obstacles is the fact that the administration has come out for Federal aid. Many people in Davenport, meeting me on the street, say: "We're not against your program, but our taxes are high and we think we can get the money from the Federal Government."

One of the things which we should all recognize, realistically, is that if Federal aid is ever voted on a massive scale, many communities—including my own—will tend to think that they should apply for it, just to get their share. This is another reason why it is so important that the Federal programs be stopped before they get started.

I have studied history, and I am disturbed by the lessons it teaches. I see some ominous things in our society which emerged in past societies prior to their collapse. One of the most menacing signs is a drift into centralization abandonment of individual responsibility.

What is happening in America today is comparable to what happened to Rome and Greece and Egypt. After the individual citizens of those states rose to great heights and everything became abundant, they forgot how they got the abundance. We are living better than we have ever lived, yet I wonder if we are not forgetting how we got there.

We got there through individual initiative, not by turning to someone else to solve our problems. If we let the centralization trend continue, we will wind up in the predicament described to me by a Russian teacher to whom I talked recently. I asked this teacher why Khrushchev and the other Soviet leaders are pushing so hard to surpass America.

"We won't have to fight you," this teacher replied with cold impersonality. "You will fall from within."

The reason why we are drifting toward the superstate and consequent loss of local initiative, stems, I feel, from widespread ignorance of our economic and political system. Our youngsters—for the most part—simply do not know what got us where we are today, and what makes our system tick. The same must be said about our teachers.

In our public schools you see very little in our curriculums that even refers to our system of free enterprise. The student has to elect one economic course out of 12 years of work, one semester. We teach our economic system in only an incidental way.

Let me illustrate this: Say a youngster makes a pair of book ends in shop. He gets the mistaken notion that, since he paid 15 cents for the two pieces of scrap wood he used, and perhaps 15 cents for his shellac and whatnot, the book ends are worth less than a dollar. Then, when he sees a pair of book ends in a store window for $19.95, he assumes that somebody is making $19.

If our teachers understood our economic set-up better they would say:

"Now look, boys, you are going to make a pair of book ends," and then they would study together how book ends are produced by industry; what the overhead cost is; how much goes for taxes; what it costs to supply the tools and to pay the workers. When you put it all together you might find a 2 percent margin of profit, or 3 or 4, and that would give the youngsters a more accurate grasp of competitive enterprise.

Why are our teachers so poorly equipped in economics? Many of today's teachers weren't taught economics when they were in school—or, at least weren't motivated to study it. You must add to this the fact that some teachers feel they do not receive an adequate financial return from the society they serve.

RETURN TO OUR EARLIER VALUES

The challenge we face nationally has subtle aspects. When I was a boy young people were quickly acquainted with the fact that they had responsibilities. We carried groceries, or sold door to door. The importance of hard work, initiative and self-reliance was made plain to us not only in

our own families, but in our schools and in our communities.

We have slipped away from those principles, and we must get back to them. Our emphasis should not be on having big government do more and more for the individual, but on the individual doing more and more for himself.

If Federal aid to education becomes a reality, I am afraid it will mark the first step toward complete control of the education process by government. Dictation would move slowly, but surely, just as it did in Mussolini's Italy, where even the textbooks were changed and Il Duce's picture finally showed up on about every fifth page. The schools would eventually become an agency of government, and many people would take their children out of them, leaving the public institutions to accommodate only the paupers and unfortunates whom no one else would take into their private schools. Even private schools would be drawn to the magnet of Federal aid.

We must not let these things happen. The public school is the basis of our strength. It's the bulwark of our society.

In the future we must teach our children to be able to make comparisons between our way of life and communism, but the only way we can teach these things is, first of all, to make sure that they understand what America stands for. Then we should try and teach the truth about communism as nearly as we can see it, and as nearly as we can tell the story. This becomes a difficult thing because our teachers, while they are well meaning and patriotic, generally don't have a foundation which would enable them to compare the American way of life with communism.

I would want to have an intense in-service education program so that our teachers would know. Out of this would come a strong desire to promote the American way.

For a long time I have felt rather comfortable about our relationships with Russia, thinking that someday the people would overthrow their government, but after talking with some Russians, I don't believe they are about to overthrow the government. They have a strong desire, almost a religious feeling, that their country is going to rise to tremendous heights.

They have been imbued with the idea that they are going to surpass America. They have been given a little more than they had—and they had nothing before—and this, to them, proves that they are making progress.

We must give our youngsters the same faith and strong desire to fight for and to promote American values, and I am afraid that is an area where we are falling down.

We face a difficult job, but we must get this job done, or we truly will fall from within.

Development of Civil Aircraft Accident Investigation in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Edward E. Slattery, Jr., Public Information Officer, Bureau of Safety of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and a native of my State lectured before the Centro Per Lo Sviluppo Dei Trasporti Aerei in Rome, Italy, on September 15. His lecture was titled "The Development of Civil Aircraft Accident Investigation in the United States."

Mr. Slattery has been with the Civil Aeronautics Board for more than 19 years as a professional career information officer and has gained a reputation as one of the Federal Government's finest information officers and enjoys the trust and confidence of the aviation industry and of the press.

I think his remarks on this occasion give us a very interesting insight into the methods used by the CAB to reconstruct aviation disasters in the interest of future air safety, and therefore ask unanimous consent to include the lecture at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Edward E. Slattery, Jr.)

At the outset I should like to express my appreciation to your General Secretary Salvatore Tomasino and to the Centro Per Lo Sviluppo Dei Traporti Aerei for the honor of inviting me to appear before you.

Your general secretary has suggested to me that my talk to you concern itself with the development of civil aircraft accident investigation in the United States. I shall further limit my remarks to accident investigation concerned with American air carriers.

As in all countries of the world commercial air transportation in the United States inaugurated service and began its first technical and economic growth in the years following World War I, and particularly following the momentous Lindbergh flight in 1927 from New York to Paris. For the next decade American aviation developed vigorously but haphazardly, with new designs and technical equipment following one after the other, and sometimes at the expense of public safety. In a parallel sense the economic growth of civil aviation skyrocketed in the late 1920's and then, following the worldwide depression, slumped to an all-time low in the mid 1930's.

Finally, amid newspaper headlines of forced mergers and airline bankruptcies appeared the tragic story: "U.S. Senator Bronson Cutting Killed in an Airline Crash." As a consequence of these accumulating developments, and continuing turmoil over rates and methods of airmail subsidies, the attention of Congress was focused on the chaotic problem of U.S. aviation, and the result, in 1938, was passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of that year.

The physical nature of aviation, which made possible the crossing of several States on a single flight, made it mandatory that the new law be national in scope, applying equally to all 48 States. Thus, for the first time in the United States the Civil Aeronautics Act brought all segments of civil aviation under one general Federal law, established uniform regulations that pertained both to the safety and economic health of the burgeoning industry and promised to aid in the encouragement and development of civil aviation in the future.

For the next 20 years the Civil Aeronautics Act served as the great charter of American civil aviation development. During its existence it helped to make possible an aircraft manufacturing industry, a national air transportation system, and a private flying business unequaled by any other nation of the world. Then, in 1958, and again partly as the result of a series of major air disasters, Congress reexamined the needs and the posture of our civil aviation. Under the understanding leadership of U.S. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, public hearings were held to evaluate the need for new legislation to replace and modernize the old act. Thus was born the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 under which all civil aviation in the United States now operates.

To carry out the mandates of the 1938 act, Congress had originally created a three-part Federal agency known as the Civil Aeronautics Authority. However, after nearly 2 years of practical working experience, this cumbersome body was reorganized in 1940 and forged into two separate Federal agencies, and in much the same form that they exist today. The largest of these is the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA), which is part of the executive branch of the U.S. Government; while the other is the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), an independent agency of the Congress.

The FAA consists of some 42,000 employees headed by a single Administrator who is appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The principal duties of the FAA include the licensing of airmen and aircraft, the issuing of safety and airworthiness certificates, the promulgation of the U.S. civil air regulations, and the development and operation of the air traffic control system, which function absorbs the largest single group of its personnel.

The CAB, on the other hand, comprises about 800 employees, headed by 5 members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The largest part of the Board's functions are quasi-judicial and legislative in nature: such as authorizing air carrier operations by specific applicants over specific routes; setting rates for the carriage of mail, domestic passenger tariffs and air freight; establishing and paying subsidies for scheduled air transportation; governing mergers and interlocking relationships; and ruling on other economic matters, as well as serving in its quasi-judicial capacity as the agency of review and appeal of FAA actions affecting safety certificates.

Last but not least of the functions delegated to the Board by Congress is its independent responsibility in the field of civil air safety.[1] This is a broader responsibility than some aviation people seam to realize. Over the years, moreover, the Board's dramatic and widely publicized work in the investigation and cause determination of civil aircraft accidents, which is only one specialized form of its safety activities, has overshadowed some of its other equally important but lesser known safety functions.

For instance, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 specifically charges; It shall be the duty of the Board to:

"Make such recommendations to the Administrator (FAA) as in its opinion will tend to prevent similar accidents in the future.

"Ascertain what will best tend to reduce or eliminate the possibility of, or recurrence of, accidents by conducting special studies and investigations on matters pertaining to safety in air navigation and the prevention of accidents."

I cite these two paragraphs from the act here because they are becoming increasingly important to the subsonic present and the supersonic future of commercial air transportation. Indeed, the cost in lives and money in connection with any disaster involving jet-age transportation has nearly reached the point where we can no longer afford to have accidents. Consequently, it has become more and more important that we direct more and more of our technical knowledge and safety efforts toward developing ways and means th t will prevent accidents before they happen.

It might interest you to know that over the past 4 years the Board has made 165 formal recommendations directed at pre-

[1] Section 701–703 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 781–782, 49 U.S.C. 1441–1443.)

venting accidents. The majority of these recommendations have been made to the FAA, and the balance to the U.S. civil aviation industry. All were based on factual evidence developed by the Board's Bureau of Safety through specialized studies or obtained in the course of an investigation of an accident. I am pleased to report that approximately 80 percent of these recommendations were accepted and corrective action found possible.

But we are interested here today in the Board's specialized work in the field of civil aircraft accident investigation, in which its Bureau of Safety has been engaged continuously since 1938. In this time the Board has found the cause of more than 93 percent of all air carrier accidents it investigated. Since the end of World War II air safety technicians from more than 16 countries have come to America to visit and study the Board's method of operation in air crash investigation.

Initially, however, without precedence or guidance, the Bureau of Safety was forced to invent and develop many of the techniques it uses today as standard practice. It pioneered in using X-ray in search of metal fatigue; in assigning physical items and wreckage clues to medical, metallurgical, and other research laboratories; and with only scant evidence available it worked out its own ways and means to uncover meaningful facts relating to the cause of a crash, such as determining the power setting of an engine and the speed of an aircraft at impact.

Now after more than 22 years of operation, the Board's Bureau of Safety has acquired a fund of concentrated knowledge in a technically specialized area of civil aviation. Through the years it has brought together and trained its current professional staff of about 100 pilot-engineer-technicians who are known as CAB air safety investigators. The Director of the Bureau, Melvin N. Gough, active in aviation research and air safety for more than 30 years, is a nationally known engineering test pilot. Indeed, under Federal civil service minimum entrance requirements CAB air safety investigators must generally hold commercial pilot certificates or air transport ratings, an instrument rating, and have 10 years' experience in aviation.

The Bureau of Safety is composed of a total of some 150 employees, the majority of whom are based at CAB headquarters in Washington, D.C. About 50 persons, 40 of whom are Air Safety Investigators, are assigned to 10 area field offices across the Nation. Whenever a crash occurs the office nearest the accident scene takes over immediate responsibility.

I have decided to outline in some detail the method of operation we follow from the time an airplane accident occurs to the actual issuance of the Board's final report listing the cause of the accident. I have chosen the tragic bombing case of a National Airlines' DC–6B, which occurred over Cape Fear, N.C., one rainy night in January 1960. I know that many of you may recall this case from newspaper stories.

National Flight 2511 was southbound out of New York nonstop to Miami, Fla., and departed at 2334 with 29 passengers and a crew of 5 on board. All position reports were routine including one made over Wilmington but from then on there was silence.

This failure of flight 2511 to make its next position report resulted in FAA air route traffic control calling the flight repeatedly but without response. At this point FAA airways communications at the Washington control center automatically notified the Civil Aeronautics Board of a possible accident.

Following the call concerning flight 2511, the Chief of our Investigation Division immediately dispatched two air safety investigators via airline to the Wilmington area. On arrival they found that the North Carolina State Police had established security measures at the accident scene—a level, half-swampy field partially covered by scrub pine—and were awaiting the arrival of the CAB.

It was still raining when our men first inspected the wreckage of the DC–6B which had fallen in a fairly compact area, with most of the fuselage broken into fairly large sections. In this case, however, utilizing several Marine Corps helicopters, and private aircraft, we found two large pieces of fuselage skin and a 3-seat unit from the cabin at Kure Beach on the edge of the Atlantic Ocean 18 miles from the main wreckage. Thus, it was evident that the airplane had begun to come apart in the air considerably prior to reaching its final impact point.

On the basis of this information a technical staff was quickly assembled to assist the CAB senior investigator at the scene of the accident. Using the Board's Aero-Commander executive aircraft we dispatched from Washington two aeronautical-structural engineers, one powerplant specialist to check the engines, and one air-carrier specialist to review the operation of flight 2511 up to the time of the crash. With the arrival of these men the investigator-in-charge began organizing separate investigative groups and detailing to each group one specialized function. This group method is an investigative technique developed by the CAB over the years and the way it works is this: The CAB senior investigator invites top technical representatives from all aviation sources that are directly concerned with a major accident to participate in the investigation. In the case at Wilmington, he invited representatives from Douglas Aircraft, manufacturer of the airplane; Pratt & Whitney, manufacturer of the engines; Hamilton Standard, manufacturer of the propellers; National Airlines, owner of the airplane; Air Line Pilots Association and Flight Engineers International Association, whose members composed the flight crew; and the FAA, who had certificated the aircraft and flight crew, and operated the air traffic control system used by flight 2511.

In every instance all of these organizations cooperated immediately by sending several of their top technicians to Wilmington to assist the CAB. Thus, on the morning of the day following the accident, our senior investigator had organized four investigative groups, each numbering about eight specialists, and each headed by a CAB air safety investigator who directed the group operation. The four groups included: structures; powerplants and propeller; human factors; and operations.

In the meantime, 3 days after the accident, a light aircraft pilot located the body of a man on the west bank of the Cape Fear River, some 18 miles from the main wreckage site, in the vicinity where the fuselage skin and cabin seat had been found earlier. This body was identified as a male passenger by the name of Julian Andrew Frank.

There were two unique factors of interest concerning Passenger Frank that did not exist in the case of all other occupants of the airplane: the first was the fact that passenger Frank was carrying insurance in excess of $1 million; and, secondly, both legs had suffered an unusual shredded type of amputation. Because of this, and because of other unusual puncture wounds on the body it was decided that an autopsy should be performed.

Concurrently, additional small pieces from flight 2511 were being found in the Kure Beach area adjoining the Cape Fear River. It was at this point that the CAB Structures Group decided that they would reconstruct a mockup of the fuselage of flight 2511 in order to determine the origin of breakup, the progression of structural failure, and the cause of both.

The mockup was built in an old hangar on the Wilmington Airport. The structures group used 2 by 4 timbers conforming in outline to the size and shape of the DC–6B fuselage and over this wooden skeleton framework they tacked chicken wire. On this wire, slowly and meticulously, they secured piece after piece of the fuselage skin collected at the main accident scene, where most segments had been photographed and identified prior to being moved to the mockup.

Now, as you well know, anyone having anything to do with an airline accident—and this is especially true of the press—is always trying to be the detective who finds the cause. In this case newspapers in Florida were headlining that the Wilmington crash was the result of a faulty propeller blade that had snapped off in flight and cut open the cabin. In the meantime, our CAB investigators, who are trained never to speculate or discuss the cause of an accident during investigation, were quietly working to eliminate one suspected area after another. By the fourth day our investigator in charge had narrowed his attention to four possibilities:

1. That flight 2511 had been struck by another airplane, or a missile, which caused it to crash;

2. That flight 2511 had suffered structural fatigue in the fuselage wall which resulted in explosive decompression;

3. That flight 2511 had thrown a propeller blade through the right side of the cabin wall which created a rupture large enough to expel a seat unit and the body of Passenger Frank.

4. That the right forward cabin wall of flight 2511 had been shattered from an inside explosive force of unknown origin.

In the first instance the CAB operations group made a careful check of all aircraft airborne in the North Carolina vicinity at the time of the accident in order to check out the possibility of air collision. They also checked to see if any military aircraft or ground stations had fired missiles during the same period. All findings were negative.

At this point the CAB structures group reported that the size of the rupture in the cabin wall of flight 2511 was much too large to have been cause by explosive decompression alone. Corrective construction following previous cases of explosive decompression had developed a cross-webbing type of wall structure, which was used in the DC–6B, and would have prevented a large rupture.

The third possibility, that of a propeller blade breaking off and ripping through the fuselage, had been favored by a number of aviation authorities as well as the press. This theory was soon eliminated, however, when the CAB powerplant and propeller group recovered all propeller blades buried in the earth near the four engines at the wreckage site.

This left us with the No. 4 possibility, which was studied with considerable skepticism. Any explosive force from within an airplane cabin, after the elimination of the possibilities enumerated, would mean sabotage by bombing. And in all the history of American air transportation there are only two other proven cases where a bomb has been used to destroy an airplane; and only one of these resulted in a fatal crash.

The autopsy on Passenger Frank, in the meantime, had been completed and various metal particles removed from his body were undergoing laboratory analysis in Washington and New York. Nothing conclusive had yet been found. Out at the Wilmington Airport the fuselage mockup was progressing satisfactorily—so well indeed that from a

distance the fuselage appeared to be intact and real. From the mockup hundreds of small pieces of metal, rug fabric from the floor of the cabin, seat material, and other areas near the ruptured side wall were also undergoing laboratory inspection looking for evidence of explosion.

During the next few weeks our investigators gradually became convinced from structural evidence that the damage had been cause by a highly explosive substance. Almost simultaneously, evidence was discovered in Passenger Frank's body that indicated the presence of nitrate, which was also beginning to turn up in the mockup at the Wilmington Airport. More than that, evidence of manganese dioxide was located in the fuselage structure which indicated that electric dry cell batteries were in juxtaposition to the nitrate residue of dynamite.

Finally, our investigators located the amputated lower leg bone of Passenger Frank in one of the hatrack compartments opposite the rupture in the mockup fuselage wall. This bone contained a portion of the mechanism of an alarm clock imbedded in it and cloth around it that was definitely identified as coming from the trousers of the suit worn by Passenger Frank, and there was no doubt that this was part of his leg because no other passenger or crewmember had suffered leg amputation.

In this case the CAB investigation had developed along two separate technical lines: one involving clinical analysis in the field of medical pathology, and the other involving aeronautical engineering reconstruction and laboratory analysis of portions of the airplane involved.

As in most major air carrier accidents the Board convened a public hearing, in this case at Wilmington, N.C., in which all the finings of technical fact originally developed at the scene of the crash by the various CAB groups were entered in evidence as sworn testimony before a CAB board of inquiry. Six months later the Board issued its formal public report[2] summarizing as follows:

"It is the Board's conclusion that flight 2511 proceeded in a normal manner without operational difficulty, mechanical failure, or malfunction until shortly after passing the Carolina Beach H facility a short distance south of Wilmington, N.C.

"At approximately 0233 a dynamite charge was exploded, initiated by means of a dry cell battery within the passenger cabin and at a point beneath the extreme right seat of seat row No. 7.

"Mr. Julian A. Frank was in close proximity to the dynamite charge when the detonation occurred.

"The dynamite explosion severely impaired the structural integrity of the aircraft and after making a wide descending right turn, it experienced inflight disintegration and crashed 1½ miles northwest of Bolivia, N.C., at 0238."

The Board has never determined whether or not Passenger Frank committed suicide or was murdered. The Board's responsibility and jurisdiction in civil aircraft accident investigation is concerned with finding the cause of the accident so that with this knowledge remedial actions may be undertaken to prevent similar accidents. The criminal aspects of this tragic case, therefore, were referred for future action to the U.S. Department of Justice through its Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We have come a long way in American civil aviation since the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was passed by the Congress. Our airlines, in those days, operated some 300 twin-engined transports, none of which were pressurized for altitude flying. Today, in scheduled flying, we have a fleet of 2,000 airliners, most of which are four-engined and pressurized; and more than 450 of them are jet powered.

(Even though I have limited my general remarks to air carrier accident investigation, I believe I would be remiss as an information officer if I failed to pass along the additional civil aviation fact that our American private flying business, which we refer to as general aviation, has also grown from a few thousand small airplanes in 1938 to a huge and active fleet of 70,000 today, of which more than 6,000 are multiengine aircraft.)

And finally it is of interest to note the nationwide acceptance of air travel as an American transportation utility. In 1938 our scheduled airlines transported more than 1.3 million passengers—in 1960 they carried 53 million passengers.

These figures, the number of airline aircraft and general aviation aircraft, and the number of people carried in scheduled air commerce, will give you some idea of the present-day size and scope of American civil aviation. Its continuing economic and technical growth, and its existence as a public transportation service, depend on maintaining and improving its operational safety.

It was for this reason that the Congress of the United States delegated to its own agency, the independent Civil Aeronautics Board, certain specific duties, including, among others, responsibility for the investigation and cause determination of civil aircraft accidents; for making recommendations to the FAA that will tend to prevent similar accidents; and to ascertain what will best tend to reduce or eliminate accidents by conducting special studies and investigations pertaining to safety in air navigation and the prevention of accidents.

This, then, is the area of operations and the degree of responsibility for U.S. air safety fulfilled by the Civil Aeronautics Board and its Bureau of Safety.

[2] CAB Aircraft Accident Report, National Airlines, Inc., near Bolivia, N.C., Jan. 6, 1960: docket No. SA–352.

The 1st Session of the 87th Congress and Its Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks I wish to include a summary of major legislative activity in the 1st session of the 87th Congress which I have prepared and am distributing to the people of western Kansas:

THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS AND ITS RECORD

Because of the dangerous increase in world tensions, the 1st session of the 87th Congress was compelled to devote a major share of its attention to legislative matters which would prepare the Nation to meet and overcome Russian threats. The strengthening of the armed services was the first order of business. In addition to adopting a defense budget of around $45 billion for the fiscal year, which started on July 1, 1961, Congress also took steps to strengthen the Nation's position on the international front.

National defense: (1) Speeded up the Polaris missile-firing submarine production to 29 by 1964, instead of 1967; (2) continued the B–52 and B–57 construction programs, instead of letting them lapse as earlier planned; (3) authorized the President to call up 250,000 reservists and National Guardsmen, the first of which were called to active duty as the Russian attitude over Berlin became more menacing; (4) as tensions mounted, appropriated another billion dollars for more planes, missiles, and naval vessels; and (5) authorized the construction of additional Polaris submarine bases and missile launching sites at home and abroad.

Space program: Authorized $1.7 billion for a vastly stepped up program, which is aimed at sending a man into orbit and successfully conquering outer space. The urgency of this stepped-up program was demonstrated when the Russians succeeded in sending two men on orbital flights and returning them to earth. The Russians still maintain a lead in space, but the President and Congress are determined that the lead will be overcome. The space flights are of great potential military value and that accounts in part for the urgency attached to the expanded program.

International affairs: A program of about $4 billion of loans and grants for mutual security was approved. This is a part of the Nation's defense effort and the Joint Chiefs of Staff told Congress that the added military strength, which we acquire through the program, is essential to our own security. The emphasis of the economic part of the program was further shifted from grants to long term, interest-bearing loans. The program also recognized the fact that the United States cannot bear the full burden of this program alone and our allies, particularly in Western Europe, are urged to step in and assume a larger share of the responsibility. Also, increased attention will be paid to Latin America.

On the domestic front, these matters attracted a great deal of attention:

Agriculture: A 1-year emergency wheat program was adopted for 1962. Under the program, wheat acreage must be reduced 10 percent, but as compensation for reducing production, farmers will receive income protection through increased supports of $2 a bushel. Farmers can retire voluntarily up to 30 percent more of their acreage and in return will receive payments in kind equal to 60 percent of their average production. The program is a stopgap measure which is designed to reduce wheat stocks and prepare the way for adoption of a program of a more permanent nature. Soon, before Congress adjourned, a bipartisan group of Senators and Congressmen introduced legislation to establish a wheat marketing program developed by the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and other farm and commodity organizations. This is the wheat bill, which all groups will suport next year, offering as it does, the hope for higher prices, greater freedom for farmers and a reduction in the cost to the Government.

An emergency feed grain program was adopted for the 1961 crop and was continued for 1962. The program is designed to cut down on the supply of feed grains by limiting production. Farmers are compensated for participating in the program by an increase in income through higher price supports.

Congress extended the Sugar Act until next June 30, without making any provision for increased production by domestic sugarbeet and cane sugar producers. However, Secretary Freeman has stated that increased domestic production will be one of the Department's recommendations to Congress in January. The hope is that acreage in western Kansas can be greatly expanded.

The food-for-peace program was expanded and the disposal of an additional $2 billion in surplus commodities, under Public Law 480, was approved. The Nation's great agri-

cultural abundance is being regarded more and more as a blessing and as a valuable weapon in the cold war.

Although it may not be a legislative matter, several appointments in the Agricultural field were of particular interest to western Kansas. John Luft, of LaCrosse, was named head of Federal crop insurance program. Lud Strnad, of Brewster, was appointed to the National Advisory Committee on Agriculture; and Anson Horning, of Larned, was named to serve on the bipartisan Feed Grain and Wheat Advisory Committee of USDA, and is chairman of the Wheat Subcommittee. Mr. Horning is president of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers.

Helium extraction plant program: Congress appropriated $45 million to get this program underway. The first two plants authorized will be built in Ulysses and Bushton and others undoubtedly will be constructed in western Kansas. The plants will be built and operated by private companies and the Government will buy the helium for use in the space and atomic programs. The valuable helium gas has been going to waste. Now, it will be extracted before the natural gas is piped into pipelines, and stored to meet a rapidly growing demand.

Social security: (1) Raised minimum old-age insurance payments from $30 to $40; (2) increased benefits to widows; (3) provided for retirement for men at 62, with reduced benefits.

Veterans' affairs: (1) Extended direct and guaranteed home loan program for World War II and Korean veterans and authorized $1.7 billion for the program this year. Direct housing loans are of particular interest to veterans in rural areas, where it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a guaranteed loan; (2) authorized payment of $60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance; (3) increased statutory rate of compensation for service-connected disability.

Housing: Continued a program of insured loans under FHA and special programs for farm housing and housing for the elderly.

Education: (1) Extended the National Defense Education Act, under which loans are made to students with special emphasis on science and mathematics; (2) continued dormitory construction loans to colleges; (3) extended for 1 year, the special milk program for schools.

Economic matters: (1) Increased the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour by gradual wage step-ups; (2) authorized a $928 million temporary program to provide 13 weeks additional unemployment compensation benefits to jobless workers; (3) established an area redevelopment program under which pockets of unemployment and economic distress can be attacked; (4) continued the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway construction program and the Airport Act, under which municipalities are encouraged to improve facilities for handling increased air travel.

I want to end this report, with a personal observation on the grave danger the Nation faces from increased Russian pressure, not only in Berlin, but throughout the world. Apparently, the Russians hope to use threats and intimidation to make us pull out of Berlin and other areas that are absolutely vital to our security.

The quick response to the increased pressure, by the President and by the Congress, should be a clear warning to the Russians that these tactics will not succeed. The Nation is united in its determination to defend our vital interests, regardles of the risks involved. The mail and other communications which I received, clearly indicate that the people of western Kansas share the determination of people all over the Nation to stand firm against these threats.

Transmission Lines for the Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 1961, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Those Glen Canyon Transmission Lines—Some Facts and Figures on a Bitter Dispute." This was a special report prepared and distributed by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. It is my intention to discuss this report in full. Its glaring errors and the tortuous reasoning used by the gentleman to justify his position favoring all-Federal construction of transmission lines for the upper Colorado River storage project are a perfect example of his lack of understanding of the problems the Western States face as they try to continue their reclamation program.

It is just the type of philosophy and actions followed by both him and his brother—the present Secretary of Interior—that will block the central Arizona project, a project sorely needed by Arizona if it is to continue growth and prosperity. The gentleman says that he favored all-Federal construction of the transmission lines because of the benefits the people of his district would receive from this Federal power. The gentlemen knows, or should know, that the people of his district would get just as much and probably more electric power under the combination plan and get it at the same price. He should also know that it is the plan to take this power away from the people of his district when and as it is needed in the upper basin.

It would seem to me that the people of his district should determine which is to their best interest—more water or a temporary supply of Federal electricity. I would say that converting projects like the upper Colorado River storage project into a public-private power embroilment will be a big setback to true irrigation developments. His people have alternate means of developing their power supply but there is no substitute for water.

The involvement of the Salt River project and the preference customers from the gentleman's district aided and abetted by false and misleading propaganda evidently prepared by an ex-Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, a Mr. Harvey McPhail, has, in my opinion set back materially the chances for constructing true reclamation projects such as the people of Arizona are interested in. I am sure other members of the Arizona delegation understand these things since the powerful committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona is chairman gave instructions to the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation to work out wheeling arrangements with the companies and the junior Senator and my distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] vigorously opposed the all-Federal system.

I want to examine the gentleman from Arizona's statement but first, let me say with respect to lobbying and propaganda that there is no more vigorous, well financed, and persistent promotional organization than the Bureau of Reclamation. It has not only exerted its extreme pressures for the all-Federal transmission system throughout the region, but has gone around the country trying to drum up support for its vicious plan. Furthermore, it has threatened to use its influence on the approval of public works projects in other areas to force congressional acquiescence to its sinister proposal. It is regrettable that a Federal agency should be permitted to use taxpayers' funds to create such a fierce struggle and hostility between public and private power groups in Arizona and other States in the upper Colorado River Basin which heretofore had worked harmoniously together in the economic development of the region and in securing authorization of the Colorado River storage project.

I can well understand how my colleague reached the erroneous conclusions he did if they were based solely on the specious line of reasoning set forth in his analysis.

Before discussing Mr. Udall's arguments seriatim I would like to emphasize and make perfectly clear that the opponents of the all-Federal transmission line plan, in the Congress, in the region, and elsewhere, are extremely anxious that the Colorado River storage be a success. In order to assure that power will be sold at the lowest rates, with the most efficiency and reliability, with the greatest financial assistance to irrigation and the least burden on the taxpayer, it is necessary that we have concrete, firm data on which to base our conclusions. The costs under the offer of the companies are known. The facilities are specifically identified. The backup and firming is assured. There is a long background of succesful wheeling contracts. None of this can be said about the all-Federal plan. The lines are indefinite. No one knows what the ultimate cost will be. Everyone admits the system without other arrangements for backup and firming is unstable. If there is any bailing out to do it will certainly happen under the reclamation alternative.

Now, with respect to the specific items.

First. Anyone who has any familiarity with a wheeling contract, or has taken the time to examine into exactly what it provides would know that the entity performing the wheeling is given no control over the energy to be transmitted. Arguments that delivery of power creates control are just so much strawmen. Wheeling consists merely of a subcontract requiring the delivery of a specified amount of power at a certain place at a particular time. The supplier negotiates all the power sales and directs his subcontractor to deliver it in accordance with his wishes. It is nothing more than a general parcel delivery or truck-

ing service. To say that the utilities would gain control of the power is just as ridiculous as to say that the X trucking company in gaining control of our missile program because it transports missiles from California to Cape Canaveral; or, that the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad controls a coal mine merely because it transports some of the coal from that mine.

If there is any discrimination in availability of Colorado storage project power to the Congressman's district let me assure you it is because of Bureau of Reclamation actions. Regardless of who is the delivery boy, the Bureau would decide on its customers, the allocation of project power, the type of service to be given, and the price.

Second. The Bureau of Reclamation has constructed some transmission lines connecting Federal power projects and to load centers. To say, however, that historically it "has always constructed its own transmission lines connecting large dams in an area with each other and with population centers" is either to admit complete ignorance of the facts or to misrepresent them. Legislative history is replete with examples where the Congress has refused to approve Bureau of Reclamation proposals to do exactly that. How can anyone make such a claim in the face of the Keating amendment which has been included in Bureau of Reclamation appropriations for more than a decade. It must obviously be construed as an outright attempt to mislead the public. As you know, the Keating amendment prohibits the use of Federal funds for construction of transmission facilities for delivery of power to Federal establishments and preferred customers or to integrate Federal projects unless the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide such service. Let us get the record straight. This will admittedly be the first all-Federal Bureau of Reclamation system in the country if approved. No one can challenge this statement. In fact that is how it got its name.

Third. The Congressman agrees that there will be $175 million short-range savings to the U.S. taxpayers. He then gets confused and lost in converting to a long-range basis. He asks whether the utilities will build the lines and then wheel the power free of charge to the Federal Government. Of course this is silly. In the first place the company has responsibility to its stockholders, many of which will be recipients of project power by the way, and is in no position to make such a gratuitous gesture. It could not in equity require its customers to bear this additional freight cost over and above its other government taxes and I am sure the general public would not permit such an atrocious action. Second, the Bureau of Reclamation has no legal authority to accept free service of this kind. The Congressman does not try to explain how, under his line of reasoning, the short-range $175 million saving would suddenly evaporate rather than continue to increase with time, as it actually does. I am suspicious he did not follow through on this line of reasoning because he could find no basis to support his contention.

The analysis continues by stating that the Congress would have to appropriate over the life of the project funds to pay the wheeling charges. Now if the Congressman had just taken 5 minutes of the "hundreds of hours" he spent "reading the contentions of the two factions" in reading the law, he would have known that the revenues are available "without appropriation" to pay all costs of operation and maintenance of the project. This is the same practice as followed on the Boulder Canyon project. The wheeling charges are paid out of revenues obtained from the Federal Government's customers and not from taxpayers' funds in the General Treasury.

The argument is advanced that Federal construction of the transmission system will generate new business and new wealth in the area. This is true to an even greater extent under the combination transmission line plan since it will create new directly taxable facilities subject to both Federal and State and local taxes which the all-Federal project will not do. Furthermore, the pouring of the State and local tax moneys into the area will pyramid the economic growth since it will provide funds not otherwise available to the States and their communities. All this is achieved at no additional cost to the consumer, with the savings mentioned by the Congressman for the taxpayers, and with a greater and earlier contribution to the funds available for irrigation assistance.

Fourth. As stated above, the claim that transmission of power would give control of the project to the wheeling contractors is a discredit to the experience, fine work and satisfaction achieved in other areas under the wheeling system of operation. I am sure that Southwestern Power Administrator Doug Wright would not agree to any claim that he has lost control of the Southwestern Power Administration system over the past decade and a half because of his wheeling contracts. Contrariwise, he has repeatedly praised this method of operation. As for Herblock and the Washington Post, in my book their record of distorted reporting and innuendo in itself would justify raising questions on anything they supported. In the present issue the question is whether the taxpayers and water users will pay for the cow and the Bureau of Reclamation will get the cream—with no benefit to the preference power customers.

Fifth. If the Federal Government is building the most unprofitable transmission lines it is because the Bureau of Reclamation chose to do so. It hurriedly embarked on the construction of several lines before any negotiations with the private power companies could get off the ground. The companies would have been willing to build the entire system if they had been given an opportunity to do so. There has never been a willingness on the part of the Bureau to sit down in a cooperative fashion and work out the best possible plan of service, and the best way to get the job done. The companies have stated that they stand ready to build the entire system if that is what Reclamation wants. It is not too late to do so.

Sixth. It is alleged in the Congressman's analysis that the officials of the States involved strongly objected to the Arizona Public Service Co. proposal on the grounds that their participating projects could not be financed. The record again shows exactly the opposite to be true. In 1959 the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission requested and was recognized by the Department of the Interior "as the agency to maintain liaison with the four States of the upper division with reference to matters concerned with the allocation and transmission of project energy"—see 11th annual report of Commission dated September 30, 1959, page 26. On September 1, 1961, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission passed a resolution endorsing the combination proposal of the investor-owned utilities. Senator BENNETT inserted this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 5, 1961, page 16894. Two of the three Governors who appeared or presented testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on the matter opposed the all-Federal project. The third referred to congressional directions to Interior to confer with the private power companies, but took no position for or against the Reclamation plan. The Bureau's estimates of irrigation assistance under the two plans have never been verified and it has steadfastly refused to explain their details to the private power companies. If they were fully supportable, I doubt whether the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission would have arrived at the conclusion it did since there can be no question as to its overwhelming interest in the best development of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Seventh. It is contended that the companies' combination plan might result in higher power rates for thousands of Arizona customers. There would be no more firm arrangement possible than to enter into a long-term contract where the rates are known and established. All of the risks of changes in price levels, of unforeseen physical conditions and of engineering problems which would affect the total cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of the lines would be borne by the wheeling entity. If there is any way to assure the preference customers that the transmission increment of their power rates will not be increased over the life of the project, this is it. The bogy has also been used that increases in rates will be sought from State regulatory commissions. It is very doubtful that any State commission would upset a contract between a citizen—in this case the electric companies—and a sovereign power—in this case the Federal Government. If by chance a public service commission found the rates preferential or discriminatory when compared to the companies' other rates, the commission's powers would be limited to the exclusion of such facilities from the rate base. In other words the burden would fall on the company's stockholders and not on the rate payers. With all due respect to Mayor Paul Pearce of Eloy, Ariz., I am sure he

does not have the engineering and economic staff which would be required to make an impartial objective examination of the complex factors involved in determining which of the two plans would assure the most firm power rates for preference customers over the next 86 years. I have a hunch he was inveighed into writing his letter by a representative from some public power pressure group. I only wish he were permitted to hear both sides of this story.

Eighth. My good friend has also now coined a new definition of private enterprise. His view is that any business that is regulated does not come within his definition. This would encompass a gamut of activity including taxicabs, pipelines, and steamship companies. Also he claims that any industry which is eligible for rapid tax amortization is not free enterprise. Since this covers about every business in this country, I guess we do not have any free enterprise left. While sometimes I think we are rapidly approaching that stage, I thank God that there are still some of us left who recognize free enterprise when we see it. It is only free enterprise that pays taxes and is eligible for rapid tax amortization. It is a paradox for those groups who pay no taxes to call the kettle black.

Public power proponents continually say that electric companies are guaranteed exclusive territories in which to operate and guaranteed a prescribed profit. That is far from the facts. Municipalities can go to municipal operations and then deprive the companies of territory or industries can, and when economically justified do, install their own generating equipment. Furthermore, there is never any guarantee of profit. Under regulation, the companies have a right to earn up to a limited amount on their investment, but there is no guarantee that they can earn anything.

The free enterprise system permits the individual to work and invest his resources according to his choice. If anything, the risks of free enterprise are increasing in the electric power industry because of unfair Government competition and intervention, rather than decreasing.

With respect to construction of large dams and hydroelectric power projects by the "free enterprise" electric power industry, I have not the time to remind my colleagues of the many instances where it has been and is still being prevented from doing just that by opposition from the Department of the Interior. An example is the Mountain Sheep project now pending before the Federal Power Commission. It is strange that the public power advocates always piously support free enterprise when it does not interfere with their current ambitions but just let them be questioned on one of their pet projects and they cry as those plagued with a malignant disease.

Ninth. Throughout the first 40 years of its life the Bureau of Reclamation established itself as an outstanding engineering organization. It gained worldwide prominence for its advanced engineering designs and remarkable construction feats. It was during this period that it built the two projects, Grand Coulee and Hoover Dams, which received special awards for being included among the seven engineering wonders of the world. The Bureau established an enviable record in the development of irrigation projects consistent with the fundamental principles and objectives of the basic reclamation laws. It was always headed by a distinguished and renowned professional engineer.

However, at the end of World War II the public power advocates took over the organization and replaced the Engineer Commissioner with a New Deal newspaperman, Mike Strauss. Since that time it has reoriented its effort either openly or sureptitiously toward the objective of socializing the electric power industry in the United States. It has replaced sound engineering, economics and financing with political and ideological engineering, economics and financing. When the Solicitor's interest component shell-game opinion which tried to make $1 appear to repay $2 of investment cost was rejected in the late 1940's as being complete distortion of the intention of the law, the Bureau adopted the Colbran formula which is an even worse camouflage of the real financial repayment facts and an imposition on the taxpayers of the United States.

In the authorization and appropriation of funds for the Colorado River storage project it was necessary for the Congress repeatedly to admonish the Bureau to work cooperatively with the investor-owned electric companies to transmit, so far as possible, project power over the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area. This the Bureau of Reclamation has repeatedly failed to do. It has refused to work with the utilities to determine the true defects in the all-Federal transmission line plan for the Colorado River storage project.

It has doctored up the finding of the consulting engineers hired to review and evaluate the plan. It is alarming how Government officials can take the facts brought out by these consultants and twist them completely around in attempts to justify their position. No reputable engineer would be a party to such distortions. The consulting engineers have unreservedly highlighted the defects in the Bureau of Reclamation plan. They point out that first, the Bureau's plan is inadequate, lacking in reserve capacity, and not designed to carry the loads set forth in the so-called yardstick system. Second, the Bureau's yardstick system would not have the same degree of reliability of service as the private utility systems. Third, since the Bureau's plan is not dependable as an independent network, it would call for increased facilities and correspondingly higher costs to achieve dependability. Fourth, the consultants took exception to all the O.M. & R. costs used by the Bureau. They found the operation and maintenance costs for the transmission facilities to be provided by the Federal Government under the combination plan to be unreasonably high. Application of costs was not a uniform basis in comparing the two systems. Fifth, since the so-called yardstick system cannot provide the same class of service that the interconnected system—wheeling system—can provide, a true comparison from a service value standpoint cannot be made. Sixth, construction costs would be equal to or greater than any similar lines yet constructed in this country. The Bureau's estimates do not reflect the remoteness and roughness of the country. The Bureau's estimates of transmission line costs are too low. Seventh, the consultants specifically stated that their report did not endorse the all-Federal transmission system.

In the light of these comments by the engineer consultants, questions can be raised not only as to the present competence of the Bureau's professional staff, but as to their integrity. The recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation have been examined by competent and disinterested people and found sadly wanting.

Can the billion-dollar Colorado storage project development be any longer entrusted to such an unreliable and disaffected group of employees? The engineering profession has a great stake in the Colorado River transmission lines issue. It should disbar from membership in its organizations, or from any licensing or registration, those Government, as well as private, engineers who participated in this deliberate attempt to distort the true facts.

Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, on January 17, 1961, approved the yardstick Federal grid prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, then as now under Commissioner Dominy. Shortly after taking office under the present administration, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall endorsed Secretary Seaton's approval of the yardstick plan. There is no doubt, therefore, and there is no quarrel with the fact that the basic Bureau yardstick, drawn up for the purpose of evaluating the utilities' wheeling proposal, was approved by both Secretaries, one Republican and one Democrat. From this point on, however, this supporter of the all-Federal grid conveniently transforms clear fact into cloudy fantasy.

As Commissioner Dominy should have known very well as of June 2, the yardstick system approved by Secretary Seaton and Secretary Udall earlier this year was not, on June 2, and is not now the system approved in the bipartisan decisions. The yardstick system, as Commissioner Dominy must know, has been modified to the point where it now bears only a broad relationship to the original concept approved by the two Secretaries. There are indications also that the Bureau plan for the all-Federal system will be modified further before the plans are frozen for programing purposes.

Tenth. The Congressman states that he would fight any effort of the Bureau of Reclamation to dominate the electric industry in the United States. The clarion call has long since sounded and its about time for the Congressman to put on his uniform. In 1920, 40 years ago, public power generation represented

.07 of a percent of the total generation in the United States.

Today it is about 25 percent. The illustrious chairman of our House Appropriations Committee said in 1955 at a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations:

I believe that the bulk of the business, say 90 percent or more of all production and distribution of electricity, should be by private utilities. At the same time, we should keep something like 10 percent or less in TVA, REA, and municipal ownership as a yardstick, as a policeman on the corner, to be certain that the consumers are not left at the mercy of a giant monopoly which would control completely the production and distribution of this commodity which is as important today, both in the city and on the farm, as air and water and sunlight.

I could not agree more. The only trouble is that we have long since broken through his ceiling. On the basis of the statements made during the past year by officials of the Department of the Interior, it can be expected that this tide will be accelerated.

Eleventh. Of course, we can never predict what our taxes are going to be and I agree that the companies' figure is only an estimate. On the basis of past experience our taxes are usually greater, rather than less, than we estimate. I am not going to argue about the accuracy of one figure against another, but I am glad to learn that the Congressman's independent sources of information admit that there will be hundreds of thousands of tax dollars poured into the Arizona economy under the combination plan compared to zero or possibly an increase in taxes under the all-Federal plan. The extra cost to the Federal Government of the all-Federal plan of some $136 million in construction investment alone is going to have to be raised somehow if that plan is adopted. I realize that taxpayers in the eastern part of the country will bear the greatest share of this additional burden but even the Congressman's own constituents are going to have to make some contribution to this added cost.

Twelfth. The vote in the House on the issue indicated a sharp difference in viewpoint. However, it did not represent a true cross-section of the sincere convictions of the individual members because of the pork-barrel characteristics of the bill. There were more threats of deletion of projects if support was not given to the all-Federal plan than I have ever seen or heard of on a public works appropriation bill. There is something for everybody in it. If the transmission line issue were separated and considered alone on its own merits, I am confident the results would have been different. Maybe we ought to require basic legislative authorization by specific lines hereafter, the same as we do in individual projects.

Thirteenth. As in any controversy of this kind the views of prominent, intelligent individuals can be cited in support of a position. Certainly the Governors of at least two of the four Upper Basin States who, as indicated above, have endorsed the combination plan, would qualify under this specification. None of the Governors of these four States testified in favor of the all-Federal plan. The agency designated by the Department of the Interior as the agency to maintain liaison with the four States of the upper division with reference to the allocation and transmission of storage project energy, the Upper Colorado River Commission, is certainly a prominent, intelligent, reputable, and qualified group of individuals.

Fourteenth. I note that the two major newspapers referred to in the Congressman's analysis as supporting the all-Federal transmission line plan are the two noted liberal press, the Washington Post and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, with a long history of opposition to the free enterprise system. If that is the best impartial press he can cite in support of the all-Federal plan, I am more than ever convinced of the righteousness and merit of the combination plan. The prominent press of the area affected did not support the all-Federal plan and I would say that they know far more about the problem than the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Washington Post.

In summary, the most damaging indictment of the Bureau of Reclamation's actions is its complete disregard of the directions of the Congress to work cooperatively with the private utilities in the area to develop the best overall plan of transmission of storage project power, and its refusal, or probably its inability, to explain, justify, and openly defend its figures with sufficient supporting data. Its failure to let this information see the light of day in itself makes the analysis suspect. I hope that the Congress will arrive at a fair solution of this issue before it is too late to correct any mistakes that it might be making by hurried decisions in advance of agreement on the details.

I am satisfied that the Department of the Interior is working toward the construction of a national Federal network including both transmission and generation by steam and otherwise. I hate to see my misdirected colleagues, whom I hope do not believe in this Federal takeover of the electric industry, fall into the trap of supporting it because of some local pressure.

Editorials Published in Haverhill Journal and Manchester Union Leader in the Interest of American Shoe Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a random sampling of editorials published since 1958 by the Haverhill Journal and the Manchester Union Leader in the interest of protecting American shoe workers and their employers from unfair foreign competition. These and countless other editorials relating to the general theme of progress in the shoe industry have appeared in these newspapers:

[From the Union Leader, May 30, 1958]

WRITE TODAY

If you still have not written your Washington Representatives asking them to vote against President Eisenhower's move to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act, and to vote for the more reasonable substitute program, it's still not too late to do so.

As a matter of fact, since the big foreign trade bill debate will be coming up in the House next week, your letter to your Representative—if sent today—will probably do the most good. So even if you've already asked your Congressman to vote against the President's proposal to extend the act for 5 years and thus arm the Chief Executive with authority to reduce tariffs up to 25 percent, be sure to write again today—or your letter will arrive too late.

Although the substitute proposal is a compromise, it is a reasonable compromise in that it's a 2-year measure drafted and designed to produce more tariff-boosting than tariff-cutting, and, more importantly, the substitute bill would remove from the President the constitutional power he now holds to decide when tariffs should be raised to protect American industry, and return that power to Congress.

There seems to be a general misimpression that unless one works in an industry directly affected by our current mixed-up trade policies, one need not be concerned with this problem. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The real truth is this: When the textile industry or the shoe or hatmaking industry is hard hit by foreign imports, the economy of the entire New England area suffers. Much as some people would like to think so, the effect of ruinous—and unfair—foreign competition cannot be isolated to the industries involved. The resultant unemployment, to give only one example, becomes an immediate statewide problem.

So write that letter today to make sure it arrives in Washington before the start of one of the most important debates ever to occur on the floor of the House.

[From the Haverhill Journal, May 13, 1959]

IMPORTS AND THE WORKER

One of the most important actions taken at the recent convention of the United Shoe Workers of America is a demand for Federal restrictions on the imports of foreign-made footwear.

Anthony G. Accardi, of Haverhill, national director of the USWA, has stated that if the rise in imports that took place between 1957 and 1958 is repeated for the next 4 years, there would not be a shoeworker in the country working.

Not only is there a need to restrict shoe imports into this country, but there is also a need to restrict the export of leather from these shores. Unless there is combined action to cope with these two needs, serious economic problems will have to be solved in this area.

At the moment we are paying taxes that are used to buy leather and then send it overseas to shoe factories that have been constructed with tax money and whose operations are supervised by citizens of our country whose salaries are paid also by tax money.

All ecopomists are concerned with the flow of gold from our shores caused by an excess of imports over exports. The shoe industry seems to us to be the ideal place to begin to correct this situation.

The leaders in the industry, such as Wallace McGrath, president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, and the lead-

ers of labor, are pressing for necessary governmental action. Each and every resident of this area should join with them in an attempt to get action now—for unless we do, we shall all be in trouble.

[From the Haverhill Journal, May 4, 1959]

MORE ABOUT SHOE IMPORTS

The other day this newspaper brought to the attention of its readers the fact that foreign-made shoes were imported into this country during 1958 in greatly increased numbers in comparison with 1957 figures.

In the category of women's and misses' shoes, the principal product manufactured in this community, the increase in pairs amounted to 262 percent.

Wallace J. McGrath, president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, states that this alarming rate of growth is of real concern to American manufacturers whose costs are fixed at high levels due to the sharp increase in the price of materials and the fact that labor's share in the price of American shoes is the greatest of anywhere in the world.

In this city, according to the Division of Employment Security, more than one-third of the labor force of the area is engaged in the manufacture of shoes and shoe components.

This means that any increase in the import of shoes, an increase that directly threatens the jobs of one-third of our citizens, also threatens the very existence of this community. Shoes made with labor that is paid slave or near-slave wages, and produced with machinery and materials that our foreign-aid money helps to purchase, should certainly be imported only under restrictions that provide a good degree of safety for our own workers and factories.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 28, 1958]

UNEMPLOYMENT AND HAVERHILL

It is the misfortune of many individuals in this city that they have been unemployed for a long period of time. Most of these people are shoeworkers who are out of work because the shoe industry is suffering greatly in the midst of this recession.

One of the greatest reasons for this more than mild recession that has overtaken the shoe manufacturers is the great rise in shoe imports. The novelty shoe made in Haverhill has great difficulty competing with the cheap imported shoe, made in a depressed economic area with American financial aid and constructed by cheap labor.

This country has become strong because it has bolstered labor. Workers get a good wage for good work. If we permit products manufactured with near-slave labor, and incidentally, made with machinery we purchased, to compete without imposing fair tariffs, we are destroying our own economy.

And now, we're having difficulty increasing the benefit period of unemployment—unemployment caused by the policies brought into effect by the very people who refuse to aid the afflicted.

We hope the line on Main Street in front of the Employment Security Office doesn't get any longer. But we urge immediate action to increase the benefit period so that those now suffering will be aided.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Aug. 10, 1960]

CONCESSIONS THAT MUST BE STOPPED

George Fecteau, president of the United Shoe Workers of America, recently made an impassioned plea before two Federal committees for the elimination of any concessions given the importation of shoes.

There are more than 225,000 workers in the shoe and allied industries. The great rise in shoe imports that has taken place in recent years threatens the employment of every one of them.

In 1949, 3 million pairs of shoes were imported into this country. Ten years later, imports of shoes rose to the alltime high of 80 million pairs, while during that same period, our exports have dropped by 2 million pairs.

This situation points the way to disaster.

The great majority of shoe imports are produced in countries which maintain only minimum standards of living for workers. If the living standard of our own workers is not to be threatened, Federal protection is greatly needed.

This country has taken an economic shellacking in this field. Not only are workers paid slave wages in these countries which are now threatening the shoe industry, but we have sent our best technological assistance to them to help them give us a drubbing. It's about time we paid some attention to the needs of our own workers. And our own industries.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Sept. 11, 1958]

OUR LEADING INDUSTRY

Essex County last year was the Nation's leading footwear producing county.

This is no surprise to the Greater Haverhill resident who knows how much the employment figures in Haverhill depend on shoe production.

More than 7,000 people are working in shoe factories and allied industry in this city. And that figure is exclusive of those who work in tanneries.

There has been much talk about the need to diversify industry in our city. Many people have said that it is a bad situation to have half of your employable people working in one industry, depending on its seasonal drives and its normal ups and downs.

We don't dispute that, but we do argue with those who want to drive the shoe industry from our midst. By all means, let's expand our industrial outlook, but not at the expense of our traditional industry that has fed and clothed us for years.

Let us do what we can to help our leading employer. We must do what is possible to stabilize it, and then we can point with pride at it when we go foraging for other enterprises.

Yes, we want new industry for our community, but we must remember that in our quest for the new, we must not forget the old.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Oct. 14, 1958]

PROSPECTS

An article appearing recently in the Journal made note of the fact that one-third of all shoes made in the United States last year were manufactured in New England.

It is Massachusetts' proud boast that more shoes are made here than in any other New England State.

At the end of this month the National Shoe Fair will be held. This is a trade show in Chicago at which 95 percent of all the shoes produced in the country will be represented. It has great significance to Haverhill, because at this show, orders will be placed that will determine the extent of success that our highest employing industry will enjoy for the coming year.

From all indications, particularly those seen at the Advance Spring Market Week recently held in Boston, the shoe industry will be in for a good year productionwise. It is expected that the coming year will see production figures approach a record mark.

Of course, production alone does not determine a successful year. Manufacturers must find ways of keeping steadily climbing costs in control if they are to continue to produce and make a fair profit.

But if production can be kept at a high figure, we all will feel better, and we are sure other troubles will eventually be solved.

We wish all manufacturers in the Haverhill area good business at their Chicago exhibits and we hope they all return with good sized orders.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 15, 1959]

TYPICAL INEFFICIENCY

While the shoemen of this city and this country are scurrying in search of leather produced from cattle hides, at fair prices; while the Justice Department investigates the recent extraordinarily rapid rise in hide prices; while Iron Curtain countries have greatly multiplied their consumption of the world cattle hide market; while all of this is going on, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson continues to allow cattle hides to remain on his surplus commodity list.

Any shoeman in the country can testify to the fact there is no surplus in the hide market. France and Italy have placed restrictions on the export of their hides in recognition of a worldwide shortage. But the present administration of this country refuses to recognize that fact.

And as long as the facts go unrecognized, foreign aid funds will be used for the purchase of hides.

This means that other countries will be able to purchase this now precious leather at reduced rates. Then these countries will utilize almost slave labor to produce shoes that will be imported by this ccuntry and sold at prices that will cut the throats of the domestic manufacturer and shoeworker.

This is a situation that would be ridiculous if it were not so dangerous. Haverhill and other areas that depend upon the production of leather and shoes for the maintenance of their standard of living cannot expect to survive as long as such misgovernment is permitted to continue.

We call upon the administration to recognize that relief is needed—and needed now.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Nov. 18, 1959]

STATISTICS AND A THREAT

The rapid rise in the importation of foreign made shoes into this country over the past 2 years has caused a reaction from both management and labor within the industry.

George Fecteau, national president of the United Shoe Workers of America, recently sent a letter to all American shoe manufacturers seeking a unified effort to stem the flow.

He cited statistics which show that while export of U.S.-made shoes dropped from 8 million pairs to 4 million pairs in the last 10 years, imports of foreign-made footwear have grown from 3 million to 20 million pairs in the same period.

These figures demonstrate the existence of a situation that, if allowed to continue to exist, could result in a serious threat to the industry.

With all its problems, the manufacture and sale of shoes in this country is an excellent example of free enterprise. There are no administered prices on its merchandise. The price of its products is determined by their costs and these are set by supply and demand.

Unless the threat posed by importation statistics is recognized and dealt with in a reasonable and unified manner, domestic monopolies will be the only manufacturers continuing. Free enterprise and the capitalistic system will be dealt a serious blow.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 18, 1958]

THE NEW HORIZON

The passing of the Ides of March has left at least one bright star hovering over the small, independent shoe manufacturing industry. The Federal Trade Commission's ruling in regard to the International Shoe Co.'s "consent decree" clause contained in the contracts with its retailers, opens a new

market for the smaller shoe manufacturers.

The "consent decree" is a rather meaningless title for the contractual clause which states that in return for loans or business services from the International Shoe, its retailers would agree to buy exclusively from that company. The ruling of the Federal Trade Commission against this clause release some 1,200 retail stores to open-market buying.

This ruling is most important to our area where approximately half of our working force is employed in the shoe and allied trade industry, and also proves that a unified effort on the part of a small independent group can result in a favorable finding against such a giant of the industry as International Shoe.

Congratulations on a job well done.

[From the Haverhill Journal, June 22, 1960]

TOO LITTLE—TOO LATE

The New England Shoe and Leather Association has issued a call for immediate governmental action to provide protection for the shoe industry against the flood of foreign made goods now being imported.

This has become a distressingly serious situation, how distressing can be easily determined from one fact alone; the domestic production of rubber footwear for the first quarter of this year was exceeded by the import of foreign-made goods for the first time in history.

A total of 30,790,000 pairs of such footwear was imported during that 3-month period.

The major sources of these goods are Japan and Hong Kong, regions where wages in the industry average between 20 to 30 cents per hour.

If our charity to these areas is to continue, charity which, incidentally, seems to be completely unappreciated, we must keep our domestic economy at a high peak of strength.

Permitting unfair competition such as this to continue unabated will result in the failure of many of our shoe producers in this area and will present us with an unemployment problem of near unsolvable dimensions.

Protection is needed and is needed now.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Aug. 9, 1958]

TRADE SHOWS

The stereotyped picture of a businessman at a convention was blown to little pieces in the mind of a repersentative of this newspaper recently.

In attendance at the Allied Shoe Products Show and the Leather Show held in New York during the first week of August, that representative came back impressed with the caliber of men in the shoe and leather trade.

While, of course, not all of their waking hours were spent talking business, certainly very few of them were spent doing anything else. The lobby of the Waldorf-Astoria, where the leather show was held, was filled with conversation about colors and textures and naturally, prices, until the early hours.

A the New York Trade Show Building, where the allied products group exhibited, prices and new methods were the main topics of conversation.

From all reports, shoe business will be good this coming year. If it is, the men in attendance at these shows will play a great part in causing that success. We salute them, not only for their business astuteness, but also for their careful attention to the new things in their trade.

We wish them continued success.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Dec. 22, 1958]

GOOD START

January 1, 1959, will see the beginning of operations in Haverhill by the Edward Newhall Slipper Co., a firm that expects to employ about 75 persons in its new quarters in the Pentucket Building on Duncan Street.

"Industry coming to Haverhill," has a pleasant sound. While, of course, this particular manufacturing concern cannot be considered large, it will, nevertheless, make a good start for Haverhill in 1959.

Haverhill has always been blessed with the type of worker that this new concern needs. While Haverhill people have had a long tradition of working with leather goods, it is not that particular facility which makes Haverhill so attractive. Rather, it is the ability of the Greater Haverhill workers to do things with their hands that workers in other parts of this country find extremely difficult to accomplish as well.

Verification of that fact can be obtained by inquiries addressed to foremen and superintendents of plants that are located elsewhere in New England—plants that have to their sorrow decided on locating elsewhere because they felt the labor price differential was so important.

We hope that the Edward Newhall Slipper Co. will prosper beyond its dreams. We congratulate its officers on their decision to come to Haverhill.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Aug 25, 1961]

BASIC ECONOMICS

Legislation has been filed by U.S. Representative WILLIAM H. BATES which seeks to place quotas on the importation of shoes and other articles for the benefit of designated industries.

This legislation has been drawn in anticipation of battles over tariffs expected to take place during the coming year. The standard of living in the United States and the strength of organized labor have resulted in working conditions and wage levels that are far higher than those enjoyed in any other country in the world.

In Europe, the complexities of modern economic life have resulted in the establishment of a combination of countries known as the Common Market. Member nations are attempting to develop a free market between themselves, reducing tariffs which previously existed. In the meantime, a high tariff has been imposed restricting business with nations not members of the Common Market.

This country must seek the establishment of tariffs which are sufficiently high to protect our domestic industry, especially in regard to those countries who have acted in such a way as to make it difficult for us to do business with them.

We certainly hope that the legislation sponsored by Representative BATES will be accepted and passed at the next session of the Congress.

Frank L. Boyden, of Deerfield Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is little of praise and admiration that remains to be spoken of the character and personality of Dr. Frank L. Boyden. All too often, in contemporary speech, in search of eloquence, there is a tendency toward the careless and therefore meaningless overuse of superlatives in recognition of the events and personalities of our times.

There are few superlatives which remain to be spoken of the gentleman from Deerfield Academy, and there are none that have been said that are not fitting and proper.

I have never read, nor could I ever deliver, words which would adequately reflect the regard which I personally have for Mr. Boyden. The very qualities which endear him to his multitude of friends and which earn for him the unstinted respect of his contemporaries, defy commitment to words. Words alone are not enough. To know and appreciate the true character of the headmaster and his great school, one must know them personally.

I have known Frank Boyden and his work for far more years than I or he perhaps can or would remember, and I never cease to wonder at and be amazed by the dichotomy of his accomplishments. It occurs to me that without the slightest hint of insincerity, Frank Boyden is genuinely and ably, everything to everybody.

Reference is often made to the Deerfield Academy motto, "Be Worthy of Your Heritage," as symbolic of the character of the school and the colorful town in which it is located. To me, it is not enough to recognize this fact alone, for indeed, Mr. Boyden himself is a very significant part of his heritage which his motto commits to our attention. While he personally would be the last to recognize and acknowledge such a fact, and perhaps would even unassumingly deny such a comparison, Dr. Frank Boyden is the very personification of the spirit of the New England Yankee. The spirit which is, in fact, this heritage. His life and deeds, to which we all pay tribute, are an integral part of this spirit, a spirit not only characteristic of New England, but of our great Nation as well.

As a Member of Congress, a citizen, and a personal friend, I am sincerely pleased and honored to add my praise and congratulations to the remarks that have been said of this true gentleman, and great American, Dr. Frank Boyden, headmaster of Deerfield Academy.

Summary of Legislation Considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee, 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a summary of the legislation considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and enacted into law:

LAWS ENACTED, FIRST SESSION

MOBILE 250TH ANNIVERSARY MEDAL

Public Law 87–21—House Report 185

S. 900: This act directed the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a national medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Ala. Up to 5,000 of the

medals were authorized, to be delivered to the Mobile Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration Corp., upon payment of all costs.

S. 900 passed the Senate March 15, 1961; passed the House April 11, 1961; and became law on April 24, 1961.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Public Law 87–27—House Reports 186 and 256

S. 1 (H.R. 4569): This act establishes a new program to help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment. It created an Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized the Secretary of Commerce to designate two types of redevelopment areas (roughly, industrial areas and rural areas) as eligible for this aid. Eligible industrial areas include those where there is 6 percent unemployment and where the annual average rate has been at least (a) 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 years, (b) 75 percent above the average for 2 of the preceding 3 years, or (c) 100 percent for 1 of the preceding 2 years. The Secretary may also designate other industrial redevelopment areas if he finds on the basis of comparable standards, that they have suffered from substantial and persistent unemployment over an extended period. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to designate rural redevelopment areas, including low-income areas, areas previously designated under the Agriculture Department's developing program, areas of low-production farming, and Indian reservations.

The act authorizes loans for industrial and commercial projects, and loans and grants for public facilities, in redevelopment areas. Loan funds of $100 million each were established for loans in industrial and in rural areas to finance industrial and commercial projects. The interest rate on these loans cannot exceed current average yields on marketable U.S. obligations of comparable maturities, plus one-half of 1 percent to cover the cost of administration. Such loans are limited to 65 percent of the total financing required for the project. The act also established a $100 million loan fund for local public facilities directly related to the economic improvement of the redevelopment areas. Such loans bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate on all outstanding Federal debt plus one-fourth of 1 percent. In addition, $75 million was authorized for appropriation to make grants for public facilities in these areas.

Before an area can receive this assistance it must undertake an economic study of its employment problems to establish that redevelopment is feasible and to indicate the best uses of the assistance available. It must then submit an overall economic development program to the Secretary of Commerce for his approval. Loans and grants will be made only for projects consistent with the approved program. The act explicitly prohibits the use of any of the aids provided to transfer industry and employment from one place to another.

The act also authorizes appropriations of $4.5 million annually to be used by the Secretary for technical assistance to communities in alleviating or preventing unemployment or underemployment. Additional appropriations of $4.5 million annually are authorized to assist in training unemployed or underemployed residents of redevelopment areas to qualify them for new jobs. Appropriations of $10 million annually are authorized for subsistence payments, based on State unemployment compensation benefits, to individuals receiving such training who are not receiving unemployment compensation.

The act also waives certain requirements of the urban renewal program to make urban renewal assistance more readily available for industrial redevelopment areas.

S. 1 passed the Senate March 15, 1961. It passed the House with an amendment in the nature of a substitute on March 29. The conference report was agreed to by the Senate on April 20 and by the House on April 26. The President approved the bill on May 1, 1961.

INTERIM INCREASE IN FHA AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 87–38—No House report

Senate Joint Resolution 89: This resolution provided a temporary increase of $1 billion in the Federal Housing Administration's authority to insure mortgages. This was needed to keep the FHA program in operation pending enactment of the Housing Act of 1961, described below.

It passed the Senate and House on May 18, 1961, and was signed into law on May 25, 1961.

DUPLICATES OF ROBERT FROST MEDALS

Public Law 87–39—House Report 373

S. 712: Public Law 86–747, enacted September 13, 1960, authorized the President to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, New England poet. It made no provision for bronze duplicates of the medal. Because of the public interest in the medal, Public Law 87–39 was enacted, amending the 1960 act so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to coin bronze duplicates and make them available to the public at a price sufficient to cover their cost.

S. 712 passed the Senate on March 21, 1961; passed the House on May 15, 1961; and was approved by the President on May 25, 1961.

GOLD MEDAL FOR DR. THOMAS ANTHONY DOOLEY III

Public Law 87–42—House Report 374

House Joint Resolution 306: This act authorized the President to award a gold medal posthumously to Dr. Dooley in recognition of his gallant and unselfish public service in providing medical care for the underprivileged peoples of the world, particularly in southeast Asia.

House Joint Resolution 306 passed the House May 15, 1961; passed the Senate May 23; and was approved by the President May 27, 1961.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AVIATION

Public Law 87–43—House Report 375

House Joint Resolution 398: This act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to manufacture a galvano commemorating the 50th anniversary of naval aviation, and to present it to the Secretary of the Navy in connection with the anniversary celebration at Pensacola, Fla.

House Joint Resolution 398 passed the House May 15, 1961; passed the Senate May 23; and was approved by the President on May 27, 1961.

OLD SERIES CURRENCY ADJUSTMENTS

Public Law 87–66—House Report 500

S. 1619 (H.R. 5306): This act authorized the Treasury to adjust its accounts with respect to the large-size currency issued before 1929 and the gold certificates issued between 1929 and 1934.

At the time it was enacted, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System held about $98 million in gold, silver, and other assets as security for this currency. The act authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the general fund of the Treasury the gold and silver (amounting to about $61 million) held by the Treasury as security for this old currency. After enactment, the transfer was made for the amount outstanding July 1. This was credited as a public debt receipt, and the dollar amount of the currency was set up on the books of the Treasury as public debt bearing no interest. The act also provided for payment to the Treasury by the Federal Reserve banks of some $37 million, the amount of old series Federal Reserve notes outstanding. With this payment (made after enactment for the amount outstanding as of July 1), the Federal Reserve banks were relieved of liability on these notes, and the Treasury assumed full responsibility for their redemption and set them up on its books as public debt bearing no interest.

This process made the $98 million available to the Treasury for current use, reducing the Government's need to borrow an equivalent amount, and saving $3 to $4 million of interest a year.

The act provided that any of the currency affected should be redeemed from the general fund of the Treasury if presented; it did not impair the value or redeemability of these notes in any respect.

It also authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to determine, from time to time, how much of this old currency has been irretrievably lost or destroyed, and to make corresponding reductions in the noninterest-bearing public debt. Finally, the Secretary was authorized to preserve one piece of each kind of currency issued, in order to establish a historical collection.

S. 1619 passed the Senate on May 15, 1961. It passed the House on June 19, and became law on June 30, 1961.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Public Law 87–70—House Reports 447 and 602

S. 1922 (H.R. 6028): The Housing Act of 1961 was an omnibus measure covering most of our programs in the field of housing and urban affairs. Title I authorized several new programs to aid families of moderate income. The program of FHA mortgage insurance under section 221, previously restricted to families displaced by urban renewal or other Government action, was made available to all families, thereby providing liberal mortgage credit terms generally. Under this section homes priced up to $11,000 in normal-cost areas ($15,000 in high-cost areas) can be bought with as little as 3 percent downpayment and with loan maturities up to 35 years with an additional 5 years authorized if needed. This title also amended the section 221 rental housing program to permit loans with interest rates as low as 3⅛ percent in order to reduce monthly rental costs. Funds for these loans can be made available under FNMA special assistance. A new program of home improvement loan insurance under FHA was also established. Such loans may amount to as much as $10,000 per dwelling unit and carry maturities up to 20 years. In order to encourage new cost-saving materials and methods, the act also authorized a new program of FHA insurance for experimental housing.

Title II of the act contained measures to assist elderly families and those of low income. An additional $75 million was authorized for appropriation for the program of direct loans for housing for the elderly and, at the same time, the 2-percent equity requirement was eliminated so that loans can now be made for the full amount of the development cost. The act restored the full dollar authorization for low-rent public housing provided in the Housing Act of 1949, thereby permitting the construction of approximately 100,000 additional units. The Public Housing Administration was also authorized to make an additional subsidy payment of up to $120 a year in cases where income and rent-paying capacity of elderly occupants is so low as to threaten the solvency of a project. The act also abolished the requirement that there be a gap of 5 percent between the maximum income for admission to low-rent housing and the income required to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the private market in the case of families displaced by Government action. The income gap was also abolished for elderly families. This title also authorized $5 million for Federal grants for the purpose of developing and demonstrating n

and improved housing for low-income families.

Title III authorized an additional $2 billion for urban renewal capital grants and also raised the Federal share of net urban renewal costs from two-thirds to three-fourths in the case of small towns up to 50,000 population, and depressed-areas up to 150,000 population. Business firms displaced by urban renewal projects were benefited by provisions authorizing the Federal Government to pay the full amount of moving expenses (previously limited to $3,000) and by authorizing liberal loans through the Small Business Administration to help displaced business firms to meet the expenses of reopening in new locations. Assistance under the urban renewal program was extended to cover rehabilitation demonstration projects carried out by local public agencies. The proportion of funds which can be used for nonresidential urban renewal projects was raised from 20 to 30 percent. Hospitals were extended the same advantages in the urban renewal program as previously authorized for colleges and universities in the 1959 Housing Act. Under this provision certain expenditures by hospitals can be counted as part of the community's one-third (or one-fourth) share of urban renewal costs and the "predominantly residential" requirement is waived. Funds for urban planning grants were increased by $55 million and the Federal share of these costs was raised from one-half to two-thirds.

Title IV authorized additional funds for the college housing program, totalling $1.2 billion over a 4-year period.

Title V expanded and liberalized the public facility loan program. The act authorized $450 million for these loans which can be made to communities up to 50,000 population (up to 150,000 if in a depressed area). The interest rate on these loans was reduced by providing that it may not exceed (1) 3 percent, or (2) the average interest rate on all outstanding interest-bearing U.S. obligations plus one-half of 1 percent. An additional $10 million was authorized for the advanced planning program for local public works.

This title also contains a new, interim program of Federal aid for mass transit in urban areas, pending completion of longer range studies. Loans to public bodies are authorized for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of transportation facilities up to a total of $50 million. An additional $25 million is made available for demonstration grants (up to two-thirds of project costs) for projects designed to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems. It also provides specific authority for grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to develop comprehensive plans covering mass transportation as well as other urban problems.

Title VI contained amendments to the National Housing Act affecting the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration. The FNMA special assistance fund was increased by $750 million. In addition, the unused balance of existing authority provided by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 (about $200 million) can be used at the discretion of the President. Also, repayments which FNMA receives on its management and liquidation fund (about $140 million a year after payment of interest to the Treasury and other expenses) can be used for special assistance purposes for a period of 4 years. Another provision authorizes FNMA to make short-term loans on security of pledged FHA and VA mortgages. Such loans can be for 80 percent of the amount of the pledged mortgages and can run for 12 months.

This title also removed the dollar ceiling on FHA mortgage insurance and in place of it extended the program to October 1, 1965.

FHA's basic homeownership program (sec. 203) was liberalized by giving the Commissioner authority to reduce downpayments above the $13,500 level. The new minimums are as follows: 3 percent of the first $15,000 of value, 10 percent of the next $5,000, and 25 percent of any amount above $20,000. The maximum mortgage was increased to $25,000 for single-family homes (formerly $22,500). Under previous law, minimum downpayments were: 3 percent of the first $13,500 of value, 10 percent of the next $4.500, and 30 percent of any amount over $18,000. Also, to reduce monthly payments, the maximum maturity was extended from 30 to 35 years for newly built homes.

Other provisions of this title authorized FHA insurance of supplementary loans made to management-type cooperatives for improvements and repairs for necessary facilities; gave the FHA Commissioner discretionary authority to reduce the insurance premium to as low as one-quarter of 1 percent; and increased the loan-to-value ratio of FHA insured mortgages on nursing homes from 75 percent to 90 percent.

Title VII authorized a new program of partial Federal grants to State and local governments to help them acquire land for parks and recreational areas and other permanent "open space" use. Such grants may cover up to 30 percent of acquisition cost, and $50 million is authorized for this aid.

Title VII extends the farm housing loan programs for 4 years and authorizes an additional $200 million for these loans. Nonfarm housing in rural areas is made eligible as well as farms. Also a new program of mortgage insurance on housing built for domestic farm laborers is authorized.

Title IX contains a number of miscellaneous provisions. The most important of these are four affecting Federal savings and loan associations. To help finance housing for the elderly, these associations are permitted to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in loans on such housing, including rest homes or nursing homes, with a maximum term of 30 years and a loan-to-value ratio of up to 90 percent. Second, to facilitate trade-in home financing, these associations are authorized to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in nonamortized loans with terms up to 18 months, and loan-to-value ratios up to 80 percent. Third, they are permitted to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in certificates of urban renewal trusts, thus permitting a number of associations to pool their resources to finance urban renewal housing. Finally, they are authorized to lend to or invest in business development credit corporations, up to $250,000 or one-half of 1 percent of their outstanding loans, whichever is smaller.

In addition, this title extends the voluntary home mortgage credit program to October 1, 1965.

S. 1922 passed the Senate on June 12, 1961. It passed the House with an amendment substituting the provisions of H.R. 6028, on June 22. The conference report was agreed to by the Senate and the House on June 28, and the President signed the bill into law on June 30, 1961.

EMERGENCY FEED FOR WILDLIFE

Public Law 87-152—House Report 746

S. 614: This act authorized the use of surplus grains owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to feed wildlife in emergencies, such as severe ice and snow conditions or drought.

The act permits the States in such emergency situations to obtain grain from the Commodity Credit Corporation to prevent starvation of resident game birds and other resident wildlife. Such grain may be furnished, subject to CCC regulations, upon the following conditions: (1) It must be requested by the State fish and game authority or other State agency with similar authority; (2) the Secretary of the Interior must find that the area involved is threatened with serious damage or loss to resident game birds and other resident wildlife from starvation; (3) the State must requisition the grain from CCC; (4) the State and CCC must agree upon the quantities needed; and (5) CCC must be reimbursed by the State for its expenses in packaging and transporting the grain.

Similar authority is granted to the Secretary of the Interior to requisition grain from CCC to feed migratory birds (as opposed to resident game birds, covered by the provisions described in the preceding paragraph) which are threatened with starvation.

S. 614 passed the Senate on June 22, 1961; passed the House on August 7; and became law on August 17, 1961.

ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Public Law 87-155—House Report 751

S. 763: This act did away with a requirement, originally imposed in 1938, that the Secretary of the Treasury make an annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This appraisal was required each year as a basis for determining the amount of appropriation, if any, authorized to reimburse CCC for net losses realized in the preceding fiscal year. The new act continues to authorize appropriations for this purpose, but provides that CCC's realized losses shall be determined on the basis of its financial statements (subject, of course, to audit by the General Accounting Office) rather than requiring an independent appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury.

S. 763 passed the Senate July 17, 1961; passed the House August 7; and became law August 17, 1961.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION INVESTMENT POWERS

Public Law 87-185—House Report 501

H.R. 6765: This act authorized the U.S. Governor of the International Finance Corporation to agree to an amendment to the Corporation's charter as so to authorize it to invest in capital stock.

The International Finance Corporation is an international organization established to stimulate private investment, including equity investment, in the less developed countries which are members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It carries out this purpose by investing in private enterprises in association with American and foreign private investors.

Under its original 1956 charter, IFC's investments could take the form of conventional, interest-bearing loans or they could be equity-type investments involving the use of convertible debentures, stock options, or other devices, but IFC could not invest in capital stock. This limitation, according to testimony received during the hearings on H.R. 6765, severely restricted IFC's ability to carry out its primary function of stimulating private enterprise in the less-developed areas.

The amendment to the charter as authorized by this act contains safeguards against IFC exercising management responsibilities in the private enterprises in which it invests.

H.R. 6765 passed the House on June 19, 1961. It passed the Senate on August 25, and became law on August 30, 1961. On the following September 5, the President of the International Finance Corporation announced that the votes required to put the charter amendment into effect had been received.

STRENGTHENING FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Public Law 87–210—House Report 823

H.R. 7108: This act is designed to increase the reserves of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures accounts in savings and loan associations up to a statutory limit of $10,000. This will be accomplished through a system of premium prepayments by insured institutions. For most institutions, the required prepayments will be roughly offset by reducing the stock they must purchase in their Federal home loan bank.

Today, savings and loan associations that are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System must hold stock in their Federal home loan bank equal to 2 percent of their outstanding home loans. The new act, which will take effect January 1, 1962, will reduce this requirement to 1 percent, but it will not allow any institution that is a member on January 1 to reduce its stockholdings below 2 percent of its unpaid loan principal on that date or 2 percent of its unpaid loan principal at the beginning of any subsequent year, whichever is lower. A reduction below the former figure may be made only to the extent allowed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The required premium prepayment for an insured institution under the new act will be equal to (A) 2 percent of the net increase in accounts of its insured savers during the preceding calendar year, minus (B) the net increase during that year in the stock it must hold in its Federal home loan bank. These prepayments will be credited to a "secondary reserve," which the Corporation is directed to establish in addition to its "primary reserve," which is to be the general reserve of the Corporation. The prepayment requirement will be suspended after the primary and secondary reserves together reach 2 percent of all accounts of insured savers and all creditor obligations of insured institutions. Prepayments must be resumed when this total falls to 1¾ percent. The obligation to make prepayments will cease permanently when the primary reserve reaches 2 percent. When that happens, the obligation to make regular premium payments will be suspended for institutions that have been insured 20 years or more. Regular payments must be resumed, of course, if the primary reserve falls below 2 percent.

FSLIC projections indicate the two reserves together will reach 2 percent for the first time in 1970, whereas the primary reserve alone will reach that figure sometime between 1993 and 1995. Thus, if the projections are correct, the new act will produce a 2-percent reserve ratio about 25 years sooner than previous law would.

H.R. 7108 passed the House on August 7, 1961; passed the Senate August 29; and was approved by the President on September 8, 1961.

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

Public Law 87–211—House Report 825

H.R. 8277: This act, which will take effect January 2, 1962, will improve and simplify the election of directors of the Federal home loan banks.

Today, the elective directorships are divided into four groups: class A, representing large member institutions; class B, representing medium-size members; class C, representing small members; and directors elected without regard to class. In addition, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has provided by regulation for representation of each State in the district by a minimum number of elective directors ranging from one to three depending on the Federal home loan bank involved.

The interaction of these two requirements (division into four groups, plus minimum representation for each State) has resulted in a complex system of election under which the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may pass over a candidate who received a plurality of votes for a particular directorship and declare another candidate elected, or hold a runoff election among other candidates, in order to assure representation for a particular State.

The basic change made by the new act is to abandon the division of elective directors into classes. Instead, the act provides for apportioning the elective directors among the States in the Federal home loan bank's district by allotting a minimum of one directorship per State, with the remaining directorships distributed in approximate proportion to the shares of the Federal home loan bank's stock required to be held by member institutions in each State. No State will be allotted more than six directorships. Each State will be entitled to at least as many elective directors as it had on December 31, 1960, and the Board will add directors where necessary for this purpose.

Each directorship allotted to a State will be filled by an officer or director of a member institution in that State, nominated and elected by the member institutions in that State. In the election, each member institution may cast as many votes as the number of the bank's shares it is required to hold (which in turn is based on its home loans outstanding), except that no member may cast more votes than the average required stockholding for all members in the State. Any candidate receiving a plurality of the votes cast for a directorship will be elected.

The act also prohibits any director from serving more than three consecutive terms, and clarifies the Board's power to appoint directors in two situations: First, where a vacancy occurs in an elective directorship of an existing Federal home loan bank, and second, where a new Federal home loan bank is organized and it is necessary to make initial appointments of elective directors as well as appointive directors to get the bank started.

H.R. 8277 passed the House on August 7, 1961. It passed the Senate on August 29, and was approved by the President on September 8, 1961.

INTERIM INCREASE IN SBA BUSINESS LOAN AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 87–198—No House report

H.R. 8922: This act increased the ceiling on the amount of regular business loans the Small Business Administration may have outstanding, from $575 million to $595 million. This increase was needed to keep the business loan program in operation pending action on H.R. 8762, described on page 11, which provided a longer term increase.

H.R. 8922 passed the House on August 29, 1961. It passed the Senate on August 30, and was approved by the President on September 5, 1961.

EXPORT GUARANTEES AND INSURANCE

Public Law 87–311—House Report 1126

S. 2325 (H.R. 8381): This act authorizes the Export-Import Bank to guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsure against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with U.S. exports.

Such a program is needed to place American exporters on an equal basis with foreign competitors. Private insurance companies have been reluctant to meet this need, but the new act is designed to encourage private enterprise to provide export guarantees and insurance coverage to the fullest extent practicable. It is anticipated that at the outset export guarantees and insurance will be issued through an association of insurance companies, with the companies assuming a portion of the credit risks, and the Bank assuming part of the credit risks and all of the political risks.

The Bank's liability under the new program is limited to $1 billion outstanding at any one time. The program will be established on a self-supporting basis, with fees and premiums being charged commensurate with the risks covered. The Bank is required to set up reserves to cover its potential liabilities under the program at a ratio of 25 cents for each dollar of liability. The same ratio will be used in charging contracts written under the new program against the $7 billion ceiling on loans, guarantees, and insurance which the Bank is authorized to have outstanding at any one time under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

S. 2325 passed the Senate on August 25, 1961. It passed the House with amendments on September 13. The Senate agreed to the House amendments on September 14, and the President approved the bill on September 26, 1961.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Public Law 87–305—House Reports 1039 and 1180

H.R. 8762: This act provided additional authority needed for the Small Business Administration's regular business loan program. Under previous law, SBA was authorized to have up to $595 million outstanding in business loans, and to take Government procurement contracts in amounts up to $25 million and subcontract them to small business concerns. Under the new act, these two authorizations are merged, and the combined authorization is increased by $105 million, to $725 million, estimated to be sufficient through June 30, 1962.

A program designed to assist small business concerns in obtaining a fair share of subcontracts let by prime contractors performing under procurement contracts with the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration is also provided for in the new act. Under this provision these two agencies and the Small Business Administration will develop the subcontracting program cooperatively. The program will provide that all contracts in excess of $1 million and all subcontracts in excess of $500,000 must include provisions (1) requiring that prime contractors and subcontractors consult with SBA through the procuring agencies when requested to do so by SBA and (2) enabling SBA to obtain subcontracting information through the procuring agencies. It is specifically provided that the program will be administered by the procuring agencies, and will not dictate to the contractor the extent to which he should make subcontracts or the persons to whom subcontracts should be let. Regulations implementing the program will be issued by the procuring agencies, with the concurrence of SBA. If concurrence is not obtained, the matter in dispute will be referred to the President for final determination.

Other provisions of the new act cover publication of proposed procurement actions; SBA grants for studies, research, and counseling; reports filed by SBA and the Attorney General under the Small Business Act and the Defense Production Act of 1950; and authority for SBA to make prepayments of rentals on safety deposit boxes.

H.R. 8762 passed the House September 6, 1961. It passed the Senate with an amendment in the nature of a substitute on September 7. The Senate agreed to the conference report on September 14 and the House agreed on September 15. On September 26, 1961, the President signed it into law.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Public Law 87–341—House Reports 1040 and 1179

S. 902 (H.R. 8870): The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 established two pro-

grams to increase the supply of long-term loans and equity capital for small business concerns. First, it provided certain incentives for private investors to form small business investment companies (SBIC's), which are licensed and regulated by the Small Business Administration, to make equity investments in, and long-term loans to, small business concerns. Second, it authorized SBA to make direct loans to State and local development companies for the benefit of small business concerns.

The 1961 act made several changes in the first program. First, it authorized SBA to invest up to $400,000, on a 50–50 matching basis, to provide initial capital for SBIC's, or to increase the capitalization of operating SBIC's. Under previous law, SBA was limited to $150,000, solely for initial capital. As another inducement to attract increased capital into this program, the 1961 act raised the limit on investments in SBIC's by commercial banks (insofar as Federal law is concerned) from 1 percent of capital and surplus to 2 percent. It also fixed a limit of $4 million on the amount of operating loans SBA may make to an SBIC; the provision of the 1958 act limiting such loans to 50 percent of the SBIC's paid-in capital and surplus was retained, so that whichever of the two limits is lower applies. A new provision was added, limiting investments by an SBIC in any one small business concern to $500,000, except as larger investments may be approved by SBA. Again, this limit is in addition to the limitation of 20 percent of the SBIC's capital and surplus, fixed by the 1958 act, so that investments over the lower of the two limits may be made only with SBA approval.

The 1961 amendments also strengthened the procedures for enforcing compliance with the Small Business Investment Act, by authorizing SBA to suspend SBIC licenses and to issue cease-and-desist orders through administrative proceedings, and by authorizing judicial proceedings to take control of the assets of SBIC's where necessary.

The 1961 act liberalized the second program established by the 1958 act, by raising the limit on section 502 loans by SBA to State and local development companies from $250,000 for each identifiable small business concern assisted to $350,000, and by raising the maximum maturity on such loans from 10 to 25 years.

Finally, the amount of loans SBA may have outstanding under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (both programs) was increased by $75 million, to $325 million.

S. 902 passed the Senate on September 1, 1961. On September 6 it passed the House with an amendment substituting the provisions of H.R. 8870, which had been reported to the House on August 25. The conference report was agreed to by the Senate on September 14 and by the House on September 15. The President signed the bill into law on October 3, 1961.

John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, Reviews Economic Change Since 1st Session of 87th Congress Began

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress draws to a close, I think it is important that we review very briefly the dramatic change of the economic climate which has occurred since we first began in January.

The House will remember the low level of economic activity and the high levels of unemployment which prevailed at that time, especially after 8 years of increasingly high joblessness as each business cycle came to an end. Today the gross national product is on the rise to new record levels, total employment is at a record level for any August in our history, and the index of industrial production is at an all time high. We have, and we are witnessing, a recovery which is taking place much more rapidly than expected. Now, problems do remain. We still do have a million persons unemployed for as long as 6 months or more, especially under the impact of structural changes such as automation. Still needed are important programs such as the training and retraining of our unemployed workers. But we must review the background of accomplishment of the past 9 months both in terms of legislation passed by this Congress to maintain and increase the level of economic activity and strike at the problem of joblessness, as well as the many administrative actions along these lines. If we review them, I think the path will become clear—a pattern of legislation and action which has enabled us to make such progress during the past 9 months, and which gives us a major vantage point from which to continue our efforts in the immediate months and years ahead. These actions have been and are important to us, not only in terms of our own aspirations and our domestic economy, but they are also surpassingly important for our position in relation to the rest of the world.

In terms of legislation by this Congress such as the Area Redevelopment Act, such as the aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers, such as the temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits for the long-term unemployed, we see specific and concrete actions to help the jobless on the one hand and to spur economic recovery on the other. In such administrative actions as improving our employment service, reaching a record this past month in nonagricultural placements, in the substantial number of older workers placed, in the forward-looking program which has made important gains in equal opportunities for minority groups, as well as many others, again, are concrete examples of the actions I have described.

In the beginning of 1961, when the new Congress and President Kennedy took office, the United States was in the midst of a serious recession, marked by critically high levels and rates of unemployment.

The number of jobless workers stood at 5,400,000 in January 1961, equaling the postwar record for unemployment set in June 1958, and about 2½ times the jobless total in January 1953 when the Eisenhower administration first took office. Such diverse economic indicators as the gross national product, the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Industrial Production, manufacturers' new orders, employment on nonfarm payrolls, the factory workweek, weekly earnings—all were down considerably from previous marks.

I think it is important for all of us to recognize the fact that we have come a long way since then. Unemployment is down by about a million persons; employment on nonfarm payrolls is up by nearly a million on a seasonally adjusted basis. Moreover, our gross national product is up by about 5 percent, the index of industrial production by about 10 percent, manufacturers' new orders also by 10 percent—all on a seasonally adjusted basis. The factory workweek—a critical economic indicator—is up by a full hour on a seasonal basis and weekly earnings have moved up to about $94 a week—about $4 over the January level.

I would like to make it clear that despite the vigorous economic recovery we are experiencing, many problems still remain. Our rate of unemployment is still very high; long-term joblessness is still a major problem in this country. The impact of automation and technological change—in the face of a record crop of 26 million new workers expected to come upon the labor market during this decade—poses major challenges we still have to face and for which we must still devise realistic and meaningful solutions.

But I think it would be very instructive if we reviewed briefly the actions by the Congress and by this administration which have brought us to the point of economic recovery today.

Faced with a serious business recession when it took office, the Kennedy administration immediately took action to alleviate hardship and to stimulate recovery in the economy. Among the steps taken were release of surplus food to feed the needy unemployed, arrangements to provide assistance to the children of unemployed men, and early payment of Veterans' Administration insurance refunds.

One of the first legislative actions was a bill designed to pay, on a self-supporting basis, unemployment insurance to persons who had exhausted benefits under State and Federal programs. The need for this legislation was indicated because of the substantial increase in the level of unemployment and the upward trend in the number of persons exhausting their rights to unemployment insurance benefits. The average number of persons receiving unemployment insurance in a week reached almost 3.4 million in February 1961, compared to less than 2.2 million in February 1960, an increase of 55 percent. For the same 2 months, the number of persons who had exhausted their rights to unemployment benefits was 204,600—February 1961—compared to 132,900—February 1960—an increase of 54 percent. In response to the increased number of exhaustees and the high level of unemployment, Congress passed the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation—TEC—Act of 1960, which was signed by the President on March 24, 1961.

The Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, which became effective on April 8 of this year, provided that participating States could pay extended benefits to individuals who had exhausted their rights to regular

benefits after June 30, 1960. TEC benefits could not exceed 50 percent of the regular benefit entitlement or 13 times the weekly benefit amount, whichever was lesser. In addition, the act provided that participating States would be reimbursed during the life of the program for any benefits paid to an individual in excess of 26 times his weekly benefit amount. No TEC or reimbursement payments would be made for any week beginning after June 30, 1962. It is significant that all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands elected to participate in the TEC program.

From the beginning of the TEC program in April 1961 through August 31, 1961, some 1.8 million persons had filed claims under the TEC program. Of this number, about 1.6 million received TEC benefits amounting to more than $372 million during this period. A total of 11.9 million weeks of unemployment were compensated at an average rate of approximately $31.40 a week. An additional $19.2 million was sent to States as reimbursement payments through August 31, 1961.

This administration has also sent a bill to Congress proposing certain improvements in the unemployment insurance system. The bill would provide up to 13 additional weeks of unemployment benefits to workers with long-duration unemployment. It would provide such additional benefits at all times to workers who have a long and substantial record of employment, and during recessions to all workers who exhaust their regular unemployment benefits. Thus, both those who are suffering from long-duration unemployment due to recessions and unemployment due to technological displacement would have some additional income maintenance while they were finding other work. Such workers would be required to take a training course if it is determined that this will be necessary in order to secure reemployment. In addition, States would be required to continue their regular unemployment benefits to workers attending approved training courses, as a condition for receiving such benefits.

The bill would also strengthen State financing of unemployment insurance by broadening the taxable wage base from the first $3,000 of each worker's annual earnings to $4,800—the base used for the Federal old-age, survivors and disability program. It would also provide for equalization grants by the Federal Government to defray part of the cost of benefits in States with high rates of unemployment, and therefore high benefit costs.

The bill would also provide strong inducements for the States to bring their weekly benefits up to levels that were advocated by the former administration; namely, to increase benefit maximums to a level under which the great majority of workers would be entitled to receive at least 50 percent of their former weekly wages when employed.

Extension of the protection of the system to an additional 3 million workers is also proposed, of which the principal groups would be employees of small employers and nonprofit organizations.

These proposals would go far toward providing more adequate income maintenance for the unemployed, as well as to encourage retraining of workers who are technologically unemployed.

To further help persons with low incomes, the administration introduced and succeeded in passing the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. They provided for increasing the minimum pay from $1 to $1.15 per hour on September 5, 1961. Nearly 2 million workers will receive a total of more than $300 million per year. This minimum will be increased to $1.25 2 years from now. In addition, about 3.6 million workers will be brought under the act for the first time and will receive a minimum of $1 per hour. Of these, about 550,000 workers were being paid less than $1 an hour. Their incomes will increase by about $200 million on an annual basis.

One of the outstanding achievements of the administration is the Area Redevelopment Act. This legislation provides for training of the unemployed and loans to local communities to enable them to attract business enterprises. For the first time in our history, the Federal Government has assumed a responsibility for helping people in areas which have been hurt by shifts in consumer tastes, drastic technological developments, and sudden loss of markets.

This act was signed by President Kennedy on May 1, 1961, after several unsuccessful efforts in the previous administration to secure an acceptable measure. It is directed at stimulating economic growth in those areas victimized by chronic and persistent unemployment or underemployment. The act is directed at one major form of structural unemployment—the problem of people who are out of work because they have the wrong skills, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.

The Congress provided funds and some basic new approaches for creating job opportunities in this pioneering legislation. These included first, $200 million for loans to new and expanding businesses, primarily for land and buildings, with machinery and equipment loans permitted in exceptional circumstances; second, $100 million for public facility loans, for such projects as water, sewer, and other facilities directly related to new business enterprises; third, $75 million for public facility grants; fourth, $4.5 million annually for technical studies to assist local areas; and, fifth, $14.5 million annually for retraining costs and subsistence payments for unemployed workers.

These funds will benefit urban areas of substantial and persistent unemployment as well as rural areas of low income, high unemployment or substantial underemployment. Many of the Nation's Indian reservations, which likewise have been plagued either by low family income or chronic joblessness will qualify for assistance. Most importantly, the economy of all America will benefit, for, as President Kennedy declared at the time he received the task force report on area redevelopment:

> The entire Nation suffers when there is prolonged hardship in any locality.

One week after the act was signed, Secretary of Commerce Hodges established the Area Redevelopment Administration. Thus far the ARA has designated 129 urban areas and 485 counties, 47 Indian areas and 3 territories eligible for assistance upon the submittal of appropriate projects for their economic recovery. Economic development programs have already been received from 85 areas and of these 37 have been provisionally approved. Both Congressmen and local communities have demonstrated an intense interest in the program.

The Area Redevelopment Administration hopes to channel the resources of many existing Federal programs into redevelopment areas. The legislation contemplates that existing Federal facilities will be used to the maximum extent. To this end, certain operating functions have been delegated to other agencies to be performed under the supervision and coordination of the Area Redevelopment Administration. These agencies include the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration.

One of the most significant aspects of the Area Redevelopment Act is to provide through training or retraining job opportunities in those areas which have experienced substantial unemployment over a considerable period of time. To achieve this goal many thousands of workers must either have or acquire the skills which their new jobs will demand.

The Secretary of Labor makes manpower surveys of redevelopment areas to determine training needs, to test and counsel individual workers who are unemployed or underemployed to determine their occupational potentialities, and to select and refer individuals for training through vocational education, on-the-job, apprentice, or other appropriate methods of training. Subsistence payments to eligible workers receiving training are also provided, the duration of such payments being limited to not more than 16 weeks. The program brings together the key education and labor agencies of the Federal Government along with State and local educational and manpower and employment personnel in a concerted program to assist thousands of unemployed and underemployed to meet their training needs.

State employment security agencies which are affiliated with the Department of Labor are meeting with local redevelopment area committees in those areas where overall economic development plans have been approved. They are examining through their local offices the occupational training and retraining needs of the area. These efforts are being assisted by Department of Labor apprentice and training field representatives who have likewise been consulting with local community groups in their review of their training needs. Training programs, tailored to meet the needs of redevelopment areas, are being formulated so that they may be instituted as quickly as possible in various communities throughout the country.

Several of the most important steps in combating unemployment were made through administrative action rather than legislation. Immediately on assuming office the administration set out to strengthen the national network of employment offices. As a result, employment office activity has been stepped up considerably. Attention is being more sharply focused on such problems as older workers, automation, and technological change, youth, and migratory workers. These advances were made possible by a supplemental appropriation which permitted the addition of 2,500 more positions in the local employment offices. It also provided for 143 more positions in the national office so that greater national leadership and direction could be given to improving employment office services. At the same time the budget request for fiscal 1962 was amended to provide 1,600 additional positions for allocation to State and local offices.

Concurrently with these actions, the Labor Department informed all State agencies of the basic goals for the revitalized public employment service and changes in program emphasis. States were also instructed to initiate staff recruitment efforts, even in advance of budget allocation, and to develop training programs for newly hired staff. Since April, when staff expansion began, about 3,000 positions have been added in the employment service.

Each State was instructed to develop an action program, specifying the particular labor market activities requiring improvement, for each major labor market center; the jobseeker and employer services to be given priority; and the personnel and other requirements needed to achieve the program objectives. Procedures were also developed for program and operations evaluation and for accountability of fund expenditures.

Plans were developed in the early spring to initiate an immediate action program involving a nationwide "hire now" campaign designed to encourage expanded employer use of local employment offices and step up job placement efforts. The momentum of this campaign is continuing—publicity has been uniformly favorable with complete cooperation from all media—press, radio, and television. Expanded employer visits and phone contacts are resulting in many employers becoming acquainted with employment office services for the first time.

Job placements are now at an annual rate of 6 million and local employment office employer service representatives have increased their visits and phone contacts by 70 percent. The "Hire Now" campaign has contributed significantly to improving the public image of the employment service and in the months and years ahead will result in increased job placements and listing of job openings in local offices.

A new unit within the Employment Service has been created to deal specifically with the impact of automation and technological change in employment and unemployment. This unit is expected to provide national leadership to the State employment services. It will supervise demonstration projects in the field to find out how much the Employment Service can accomplish through careful advance planning with the employer, the union, and community training facilities, toward minimizing employment dislocation in various situations, involving the introduction of automation and other technological change.

Another example of solid achievement under an improved employment service system are the stepped-up placement services for older workers. Middle-aged and older workers as a group do not experience especially high rates of unemployment since they are protected to a greater degree than younger workers by seniority. However, they are not protected by severe cutbacks and layoffs due to technological change, company mergers, and plant movements from one part of the country to another. Once unemployed, they usually remain out of work longer and experience greater difficulty in finding another job. While some companies have instituted private training programs to retrain their own workers for new jobs in their establishments, very often these new jobs do not exist in sufficient numbers to absorb a substantial number of the employees affected and younger persons are likely to get the preference. Hence, many in the middle and later years are laid off and their prospects for reemployment are often dim unless they can get trained or retrained. The responsibility for training workers who no longer have an attachment to an employer is necessarily a public one.

The Area Redevelopment Act will be helpful to middle-aged and older workers because they are affected to a greater degree than younger workers who are better able to move readily to areas where job opportunities exist. Frequently the relatively few opportunities that remain in their area of residence are closed to older workers because of the mistaken notion on the part of employers that they are less physically fit, less productive, and less trainable, and these opinions are reflected in age limits in hiring—often set at age 45, 40, or even lower.

The middle-aged and older worker, whether he be unemployed as a result of technological change, plant movements or the business cycle, often needs assistance in finding a job. The public employment service has established specialized employment counseling and job placement services for older workers to meet this need. In the past, however, the limited financing of the public employment service in the face of the increased population, workforce and demand for service, has tended to reduce the effectiveness of services to special groups, such as the older worker.

The public employment service recently has shown progress and success in the placement of middle-aged and older workers. During fiscal year 1961, 1.1. million nonagricultural job placements of workers 45 years of age and over were made by the 1,800 local offices in the system. This represents 19.9 percent of all placements made. The national job drive, inaugurated by the Secretary of Labor in May of this year, undoubtedly contributed to this record along with an increase in the placement of workers in the lower age groups.

Shortly after taking office, the Secretary of Labor established a new Office of Automation and Manpower, in addition to directing the Employment Service to pay more attention to the problems of automation. This step demonstrated a recognition of the crucial importance of technological change in the broad problems of production, foreign competition, and employment. In the months ahead this office will develop recommendations on how best to reestablish full employment in the face of rapid introduction of technological improvements. The order establishing this office stated:

> Automation and other technological developments have increased productivity and displaced workers. They have also brought benefits to the economy.
>
> The skills required of our manpower change as our technology changes. Automation and other technological developments require greater skills from the labor force and displace those with lesser skills. These developments will accelerate in the years ahead. They will pose special problems for workers who suffer unemployment and must acquire new skills to meet changing manpower needs.

Quoting from President Kennedy, the order stated:

> Another fundamental ingredient of a program to accelerate long-run economic growth is vigorous improvement in the quality of the Nation's human resources. Modern machines and advanced technology are not enough unless they are used by a labor force that is educated, skilled, and in good health.

The Office of Automation and Manpower was directed by the Secretary of Labor to—

> Examine employment and unemployment by industry, occupation and area; current and anticipated technological changes; and all phases of technological unemployment.
>
> Develop programs for expanding and improving testing, counseling, training and placement of workers displaced by automation and other technological developments.
>
> Serve as a clearinghouse for materials dealing with various aspects of automation and technological development; conduct conferences with employers and workers affected by automation and other technological developments; and prepare appropriate informational materials for distribution to interested persons and organizations.

In addition to the actions I have just described, the administration introduced bills which were directed at two of the most critical unemployment problems. Unfortunately, neither of these bills reached the President.

The first of these two bills, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, was designed to attack the problem of obsolete skills. Under it, the Federal Government would assist unemployed workers unable to find new jobs because of lack of skill by helping to pay for their retraining. This bill strikes at the root of our unemployment problem—the rapid obsolescence of skills in an economy where technological change necessarily occurs with great speed.

The second bill, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, was de-

signed to help our youth find useful employment in a period when the number of young jobseekers is increasing very rapidly and the kinds of unskilled jobs they ordinarily get are shrinking in number. The bill provides three different approaches to this general problem:

First. On-the-job training and related training programs, including classroom instruction.

Second. Public service and public works employment and training program.

Third. A camp-oriented Youth Conservation Corps.

One other important factor in the amelioration of unemployment and low income should be mentioned in this brief summary of the administration's recovery program. This has to do with discrimination in hiring because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

To promote employment opportunities for minority groups within the Federal Government and firms that do business with the Government, the President established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This step underscores the administration's recognition that every American is entitled to equality of opportunity and that, in the fierce struggle between our way of life and that of the Communist imperialists, we are going to have to fully develop our human resources, making the best use of the brains and skills of every group in our population.

In the 6 months since the Committee started its work—April 7, 1961—significant steps have been taken to effectuate the basic goal of equal employment opportunity. Even the short-range effects have become evident, but it is the long-range effects which will tell the full story of the Committee's true impact on achieving job equality.

One of the first actions taken by the new committee was the launching of a survey of minority group employment in all executive agencies and departments. While the results of this survey still are not complete, enough information has been gathered to show conclusively that something definitely needed to be done if Government employees were all to be treated alike, without regard to race, creed, color or national origin. For example, while there are sizable numbers of Negroes employed, there also is evidence that their opportunity for progression above the lower grade levels has been completely out of balance.

The President, through the Committee and with the full cooperation of the heads of executive agencies and departments, set out to do something about this problem. Every executive agency and department has put into effect a strong policy of equal employment opportunity and has set up machinery to implement that policy. This policy is being carried down to the lowest supervisory level with the information that the President, the President's Committee, and the agency head all mean business.

At the same time, the agencies and the committee have been receiving complaints from Government employees or applicants for employment who feel that they have been discriminated against because of race, creed, color, or national origin. In the first 6 months of its operation, the Committee received over 500 complaints, more than were received in any one of the 5 years in which the Government Employment Policy Committee of the prior administration operated. There could be no better evidence of the faith and trust of Government employees in the sincerity of this administration's approach to their problem. The fact that these complaints are being investigated and the situation remedied where justified proves that their faith and trust are justified.

But the administration did not stop just with insuring fair treatment for minority groups in Government at present it went to the people to tell of this new opportunity for Government service. In this day and age when the Government has great need for workers with skills and devotion to public service, thousands of Americans possessing those skills were failing to offer them to the Government because of built-in discriminatory practices which discouraged them from seeking Government service. The Civil Service Commission and various agencies and departments sought out these potential public servants and interested them in Government service.

The same situation held true in Government contract employment: thousands of workers whose skills are needed in industry were being denied access to the employment where they could use those skills. Through the broad program of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, industrial employment doors are being opened for the first time to thousands of Americans. Here, as in Government, the emphasis is on the positive program of insuring equal employment opportunity. One of the most important parts of the program is the development of plans for progress by major industrial firms and the Committee. To date, 9 of the largest defense contractors with more than 800,000 employees have voluntarily signed statements with the Committee pledging equal employment opportunity for all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. Other firms now are developing similar plans for progress, and within a few months it is anticipated that several million American workers will be covered by these guarantees against discrimination. As a result, industry is finding a new wealth of skilled workers at all levels of employment to help provide the production we need to maintain and increase the pace of our industrial output.

These are some of the steps taken by this administration to obtain justice and fair treatment for all Americans and to put to use the skills of the great number of citizens who are underemployed and underutilized because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The administration has recognized the importance of women in our labor force by designating a new Assistant Secretary of Labor with responsibility for that increasingly significant group of workers. A woman was appointed by the President to serve as the new Assistant Secretary. In addition, a bill was introduced calling for equal pay for equal work, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for interstate commerce.

Here is a record of achievement of which we may be proud. The program by the administration and the Congress has met the acid test, as I have indicated at the beginning of these remarks. Unemployment is down by a million persons and industrial business and commercial payrolls are up by a million persons, but we still have a long way to go, and I am hopeful that the next session will see the enactment of such programs as I have indicated—the training and retraining of unemployed workers under the impact of automation and technological change—a permanent extension of unemployment insurance benefits—and a training program for youth, among others.

Business Has a Job To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a speech by Mr. W. B. Murphy, president of the Campbell Soup Co., before the Greater Creighton University Committee Convocation, impressed me with its clear message on the need for communication between men.

Mr. Murphy spoke ably on the role of business in America, its responsibilities to itself and the public, and the need for an appreciation of the private enterprise system in this country.

There are many in this Nation who are concerned over excessive Government regulation and interference with private business. Mr. Murphy in his speech points out that better communication on the part of business in this country can do much to alleviate the pressures for excessive Government regulation. By operating in the public interest and by telling the story of private enterprise, American business can preserve the needed climate for growth in future years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include Mr. Murphy's speech:

PRESERVING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(Remarks made by W. B. Murphy, president, Campbell Soup Co., at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr., Oct. 7, 1961)

A visit to Omaha is always a pleasure. I have many friends here and, of course, we have a deep interest in the community as one of its corporate citizens.

We meet here at this convocation sponsored by a fine university and its school of business. With a background in business, it would seem appropriate for me to talk briefly about several matters relating to our business life which are of concern to many of us.

Omaha is the center of a great agricultural area. I think the people and the businesses of this community are typical of

the great Midwest in being particularly sensitive to the pulse of the public. In this part of our country there might well be an above-average appreciation of the fundamental character of the American way of life, and of its inherent values. There is understanding and ready acceptance of the fact that our form of government and the free enterprise system are the backbone of our Nation's economic existence. It is certainly true that our form of government and our form of business economy go hand-in-hand. They have been responsible for the amazing and constant economic progress of our country and they are the envy of intelligent people over the world who have had the opportunity to observe them.

The theme of this convocation is communications. All of us recognize the tremendous power and importance of this force in our lives. Here is one of the most commonly mentioned, widely acknowledged subjects that could be imagined. It is as old as the prehistoric cave drawing, the smoke signal, the printed word.

And yet—it is as new as TV and the U.N. It is our biggest problem in international relations, domestic relations and labor relations. To a businessman, getting across ideas, beliefs and understandings to others is a constant day-to-day problem.

By sealing off the lines of communication from the rest of the world for 29 years, from 1917 to 1946, Soviet Russia was able to turn its people into a trained, non-resisting mass with only the "Commie" idea. By maintaining communications with the Eastern Europe satellites, the free world has been able to keep the minds and hearts of about 79 million captive people from surrendering to the Soviet masters. Freedom of communications is a distinctive characteristic of the free enterprise system and is the first thing killed under totalitarianism. In the free world, where truth is vital to our way of life, only communications based on truth can be effective over the long term.

Business especially is dependent on good communications, both internal and external. However, the businessman is sometimes so preoccupied with day-to-day operations that he overlooks some of the broader aspects of the communications job business has to do. We talk about our own companies or our own industries and sometimes forget that one of our prime obligations is to make sure that opinion leaders and the general public have a well-informed grasp and understanding of the business system as a whole. We have a duty to promote and strengthen our economic society, and communications are obviously a most vital means to that end. We have the job of protecting the fundamental character of the economic system not only from those who believe it should be radically altered, but from those who abuse its privileges.

Each of us was taught in our early school days that the democratic form of government was designed to serve the American people—and I think each of us has grown up with the realization that the businesses in our vast private enterprise system have been built up on the same "service" theme. The democratic form of government and the private enterprise system are in reality servants of the people. This is in sharp contrast to the Communist and other totalitarian countries where the lives of each person and the behavior of every business are controlled by a small ruling group who are not elected by or subject to recall by the public. With us, our Government and our business are intended to serve the public. With the Communists, the people and all business serve the government and the government has full control. You might say: "Why make such an obvious distinction? Everybody knows that." Well, sometimes I am not so sure.

We ought to ask ourselves whether the American system is today providing the greatest possible leeway for the private initiative of Americans in all walks of life, or whether we are becoming used to relying on the Government agency, the Government administrator, to tell us what we can and cannot do. It is contrary to what most of us believe and to our traditions to relax into the habit of turning our problems over to government.

No American today would deny that there are things in our rapidly expanding society that must be done by government. But these things, in the main, ought not be in the field of business operations if we are to preserve our economic society as we now know it. It is the continuous expansion of Government into activities that can better be done through private initiative that concern those who believe in the principles of our free enterprise system.

Let me emphasize at this point that no business should ever object to investigation and disclosure. Malpractices have no place in our system—they only weaken it—and should be constantly exposed. Moreover, some ground rules are necessary in our economic system, ground rules that apply not only to business, but to labor organizations and all private institutions. These ground rules obviously should be within the framework of our form of society, in the interest of the public, and established by the Government with the approval of public opinion.

Such ground rules should, of course, be clearly and precisely stated so that they may serve as a guide to the businessman. Moreover, they must be rules based on the American tradition of jurisprudence and fair play—written with the presumption that business practices are ethical until proved otherwise and not with the presumption that business is guilty until proved innocent.

It has been pointed out by others that the sophisticated socialists in the world realize that a government does not have to nationalize everything in order to move us away from democracy. The critical factor is regulation rather than ownership and certainly no one will, I think, quarrel with the statement that we are moving toward more, and not less, Government regulation.

This trend is not without precedent. C. Northcote Parkinson, in his book "The Evolution of Political Thought," shows that for as long as recorded history, there has been a seemingly inevitable cycle from democracy to socialism to totalitarianism and back to democracy, and that this cycle has happened in Asia, in Africa, and in Europe, as long ago as 400 B.C. and as recently as in this century.

Now, in retrospect, I am sure that businessmen and labor leaders might have prevented a good part of the trend toward greater Government regulation. Enlightened business and labor would have avoided the conditions that provide the excuse for much of the regulatory and social legislation that has been voted into existence.

More often than not, business and labor have brought down Government regulation on their own heads by the misconduct of a few of their members. Whenever there is publicized disclosure of discrimination, of unfair treatment, of misrepresentation, of false values, of collusion, and of sharp practice, there is a general clamor for legislation—no matter how isolated the instance, or untypical of business practice as a whole. Much of the regulatory legislation can be traced to such incidents of failure to follow the standards of economic conduct which we all know to be sound. And once a control is established, it is seldom withdrawn.

Of course it is not practical—and probably not possible—to retrace our steps—to say that management and labor now know better, that now we don't need the regulation we have because the economic world is enlightened.

This drift we are in would seem to indicate that there are some inherent faults in our economic system that make it necessary to have more and more Government controls to make our economy grow—that there are many abuses which Government controls must correct.

I question that there are such inherent faults.

The tremendous success and outstanding economic growth in our country, sparked almost entirely by the private enterprise system, is overpowering evidence of the fundamental soundness of that system. The system itself is not at fault and we must make sure that abuses by a few people do not obscure or detract from its strength and its virtues.

What I have said is simply this: We are moving in the direction of more and more Government regulation over the business system. The best way for business to help stop this flow is to not provide the excuses or the reasons that bring more control. This is not asking that business penalize itself, for the beauty and strength of the private enterprise system is that it rewards best over the long term when operated not only efficiently but in the best interests of the public.

Those of us in business have not merely a minimum obligation to act within the law, but the further obligation to exert leadership disciplined to high ethical standards. When there is failure in this responsibility, when standards degenerate, the drift toward greater Government regulation is accelerated. As you can see, it is my belief that the cure for this drift lies as much with business and labor as with our legislators and Government administrators.

The whole question of business behavior necessarily involves the overall responsibilities of business management. Today when great numbers of companies, large and small, accept the obligation to be constructive and useful citizens in the communities they serve—supporting countless charities, in many cases taking the lead in community development, and assuming an obligation to provide aid to educational institutions—there are still those who say that corporations have one responsibility and one only—the obligation to make a profit for their stockholders. That point of view is perhaps expressed nowhere more succinctly than in the statement of Eugene V. Rostow, when dean of the Yale Law School, in "The Corporation in Modern Society":

"The law books have always said that the board of directors owes a single-minded duty of unswerving loyalty to the stockholders and only to the stockholders if, as is widely thought, the essence of corporate statesmanship is to seek less than maximum profits, postwar experience is eloquent evidence that such statesmanship leads to serious malfunctioning of the economy as a whole."

Such a point of view overlooks, I think, a few basic facts of modern life.

First, what we term "American business" or "American industry" is not isolated—it is an integral part of the whole society and it serves that society.

For in the United States, business is not simply a way of life. It is, for most of the hours, the way of life today. We live in a business-oriented existence just as in other times men lived in feudal societies, or agrarian societies, or ecclesiastical societies. Under our system, it is not control of the land or the administration of the church, but the exchange of goods and services that constitutes the material complex of life—the place where in one way or another, most people must make their economic way.

And, second, democratic institutions—our schools, the arts, our Government—those segments of our life outside the industrial and mercantile activity depend in considerable part for their strength and growth upon the proper functioning of the free enterprise system—and this includes the mass com-

munications media which constitute our modern free press. After all, the business life of our country is about 80 percent of our economic activity—Government represents only the remaining 20 percent. So business must be something more than the pursuit of short-term profit. Business has an obligation to its stockholders, but it has many other obligations. As a matter of fact, it does not fulfill its obligations to its stockholders—or its employees—or its customers and suppliers—or to the public—unless it fulfills its obligations to each.

Now, profits are important since no earnings means no dividends and this also means no payrolls, unemployment, no money plowed back for research, no progress, no investment in new plants and equipment, less money for education, and less money for national goals. Profits matter very much, not only to business, but to the whole economy and to all our social institutions. They matter to Government, too, because without profits a very large proportion of Government revenues would dry up.

But it is a long jump from saying profits are important to saying that a business can be operated most profitably and in the best interest of the stockholders by thinking only in terms of immediate gain. The society in which we live, and the great majority of business managers, do not believe in profits at any price—or that expediency is the best policy. It is true that a company cannot for long march out of step with the society in which it exists.

In every working day, problems come to each one of us that directly or indirectly reveal to all of those about us our own standards of behavior. These are often not large, earth-shaking matters, but frequently rather small, commonplace things, that still are quite important.

For instance, how much value shall we incorporate in the goods and services we bring to market? Should we minimize the value and maximize the profits? The answer here is obvious.

The old theory of caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—went into discard a long time ago. Not only do we have the responsibility to eliminate the shabby and fraudulent, but in these days enlightened business faces up to the obligation to invest in constant experimentation and research toward improving its products and services. The future of our business demands this, and only if we focus our attention on the job of giving the consumer the best value, and constantly work to improve that value, can we bring out the creative drive that makes for a successful enterprise. Further, if we do not do everything in our power in this direction, we will soon find ourselves in trouble from the competitor who does do so.

Here is another example: How shall we portray our product or service in selling or advertising? Shall we stretch the truth and overstate the case? Here, again, the right answer is a clear one. You cannot kid the public for long. Overstatements—the half-truth—misrepresentation—these will finally end up where they belong: flat on their faces.

The unfulfilled promise has the habit of being long remembered. Advertising and selling for most of the products in our country are good, but this does not mean that there is not a considerable amount of advertising that overstates the case—and of course there are some products on the market that are not good values. But one of the great things about our way of doing business is that the consumer has a free choice. Products of inferior value soon lose out and the advertisement that misstates eventually is ignored. There is no question in my mind that long-term success demands high ethical standards in advertising and selling.

And again, how shall we treat our customers and suppliers? Fair and equitable treatment of customers and suppliers pays off over the long pull and the wisdom of this principle has been proven in the experience of our company. For decades—as long as our records show—and before the Robinson-Patman Act made discrimination illegal, the company I serve adopted a firm policy against favoritism in its pricing. It offered its products at what it considered a fair price, and refused to make exceptions which would give advantage to one buyer over another, even though such exceptions offered opportunities for short-term profit. This policy has proved highly successful—not only in establishing our integrity in the marketplace, but as a factor in increasing sales. We have always believed that when special concessions are made to one customer, crippled results invariably follow. Discrimination brings retaliation and, in the end, limits distribution. Favoritism is bad business—in fact, it is bad business regardless of ethical considerations.

What is true of selling is also true of buying. The best price is not always the lowest price if it is an unfair price. Too hard a bargain can result in underpayment and underpayment leads to loss of goodwill and destruction of the initiative to develop as a valuable source.

Of course, overpayment is also bad because it leads to softness and waste. My point is that buying and selling are areas requiring the exercise of sound standards. The shareholder has a right to expect that the income of the business will be achieved wisely and not so as to handicap its long-term growth.

Or take the matter of talking with competitors about products, prices, supply sources and such things. In most cases, whether legal or illegal, this is a retreat from good business practice and tends to produce a variety of inefficiencies and to curb initiative. Independent action encourages enterprise, efficiency and vigor. The great inventors worked and thought alone.

What I am saying here can be summarized in a single sentence: good ethics is good business.

Now, if it is true that our Government and our private enterprise system are designed to serve the people, and if it is true that business performs best under sound ethical standards and most businesses so perform as I believe they do, then why can't we halt the drift to greater Government regulation?

I think there are two factors here. Both relate to the matter of good, sound communications. There is an overall underestimation of the vital importance of the private enterprise system, and a failure to protect it from eroison by businessmen, labor leaders and legislators. The men in business and labor who know and realize the problem have not found a way to discourage the minority who by their actions provide the excuse for more and more Government regulatory action.

And, I doubt if the total story of the private enterprise system and its accomplishments and its manner of conducting itself has gotten across to all of our legislators—so we tend to be rather quick to add regulatory agencies to curb the behavior of the minority. Somehow or other we are letting the few who abuse their free enterprise privileges swing the whole trend of our Government legislation.

This boils down to the single point that there needs to be a full appreciation on the part of all of us of the role of the private enterprise system in our country's economic progress and of the fact that this superb system works best when operated not only efficiently but in the best interests of the public and that when so operated, it needs a minimum of Government regulation.

Perhaps this lack of understanding is in part a failure in our educational processes or due to faulty thinking—but more likely it is due to just plain inadequate communication among businessmen, labor and Government.

Business has a job to do. We must make certain, first, that we always operate with the broad interests of the public in mind, and second, that the true nature and the vital importance of the private enterprise system are widely and fully understood.

Remarks of A. Everette MacIntyre on Taking Oath as Member of the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has been profoundly enhanced by the three new Commissioners appointed by President John F. Kennedy. I recently attended when Mr. A. Everette MacIntyre took the oath as a member of the Commission. Mr. MacIntyre served long and faithfully with me as general counsel and onetime staff director of the House Small Business Committee. He is a fine gentleman, loyal public servant, and one of the country's outstanding antitrust lawyers. I know he will give great service as Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point Mr. MacIntyre's remarks made on the occasion of taking oath as member of the Federal Trade Commission:

REMARKS BY A. EVERETTE MACINTYRE ON THE OCCURRENCE OF TAKING OATH AS MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 26, 1961

First, I wish to thank you for having honored me as you have with your presence here today.

At the outset I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American and a personable and gracious gentleman, Commissioner, Robert T. Secrest. His record as a member of this agency is secure. He will be sorely missed. I deeply appreciate his friendship and the many courtesies he has extended to me.

It would be amiss for me to fail to express my deep appreciation to Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN and my other friends for the kind consideration, counsel, and assistance they have given me. The association, inspiration, and guidance given me by Mr. PATMAN and others with whom I have been associated in my work in the legislative branch of the Government provide me with strength to undertake the task ahead. Whatever I find myself able to accomplish I am able to do better because of the inspiration, knowledge, and experience I have acquired through my association with Mr. PATMAN and my other friends in the course of my work on Capitol Hill.

To my fellow Commissioners and to members of the Commission's staff I extend warm greetings. I wish to say that I am looking forward to my reassociation with you. The Federal Trade Commission is an institution of which anyone should be proud to be a part. It has been described as having a country club atmosphere. Perhaps it has in one respect. The fraternal aspect is

strong. However, that should not mislead people into believing that the leisure aspect of a country club prevails at the Federal Trade Commission. You who are members of the Commission's staff need no further explanation of that remark.

In my opinion, membership on the Federal Trade Commission or its staff affords an opportunity for inspiring, and stimulating, public service. Under the leadership of Chairman Dixon we are making much progress, but the task ahead for all of us is tremendous.

Recently, we have noted considerable discussion regarding the program of the long-drawn-out and numerous cases required to stop the use of a destructive industrywide practice. Sometimes this problem is referred to as the regulatory lag. We are mindful that this problem of delay in stopping the use of unfair industrywide practices is a serious one here at the Federal Trade Commission. Various proposals have been advanced for solutions. It is my view that utilization of some of these proposals will help very much in the improvement of our quasi-judicial process. However, I am convinced that none of them will prove to be a solution of the problem of delay in stopping industrywide unfair practices.

Due process in quasi-judicial proceedings is required no less than in judicial proceedings. Consequently, there is considerable question whether it is possible to properly and effectively utilize quasi-judicial proceedings to fully implement the legislative action which made unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices unlawful.

You are assured that it will continue to be my position that rights to due process in quasi-judicial proceedings should not be abridged in any effort to meet this problem of the regulatory lag. Other means should be sought.

It is my hope that consideration will be given to suggestions for quasi-legislative processes to implement the legislative action which has made unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices unlawful. If the Federal Trade Commission and the courts should conclude that Congress has not provided for this, then the problem should be placed before Congress without delay. I am convinced that quasi-judicial proceedings alone will not permit us to discharge our responsibilities. The use of unfair acts and practices is on the increase. The Federal Trade Commission at the beginning of the present year had fallen several years behind in its effort to meet this challenge by using exclusively the case by case method.

Recently, our fellow Commissioner Elman, publicly noted that the Commission has responsibilities which are nonjudicial. Perhaps he had in mind an activity and responsibility such as I am speaking about.

In any event, it is my thought that the New Frontier at the Federal Trade Commission should not be allowed to become a maginot line to be outflanked. Likewise, action should be taken to preclude reference to it as an endless frontier where cases drag on and on and the regulatory lag remains as the outstanding problem.

The Federal Trade Commission's performance of a quasi-legislative function through the use of the rulemaking process would be well within the intent of Wilson, Brandeis, and others who envisioned this Commission as an arm of the Congress. Those who conceived the idea for a Federal Trade Commission, and Congress in the enactment of the legislation which established this Commission, thought of it as an arm of the Congress and intended that it implement the broad framework of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. It is thought that the best way of doing that would be through the use of a quasi-legislative process of rulemaking which would condemn harmful trade practices industry by industry rather than case by case.

It is suspected that some will argue that this idea is, in fact, a proposal to make the Federal Trade Commission a wholesale house. Perhaps, inherent in this idea is an aspect of rendering public service wholesale instead of at retail, and in dribbles to businessmen and the public after standing in line a long time for relief.

Let me add that nothing I have said should be taken to indicate that I think the work of this Commission in handling legal controversies through the case by case method should be replaced. What I am suggesting is consideration of something to supplement the present case work of the Commission.

Of course, the performance of quasi-legislative functions by the Federal Trade Commission would require broad economic studies of practices and conditions used in industry and commerce. The Federal Trade Commission has unique legal tools for making such studies. It is on its way to the establishment of a professional economic staff capable of using those tools. These circumstances lead me to observe that there is as much immediate need for separating the tools from the toys as there is in separating the men from the boys so as to permit the doing of the job indicated.

Fish Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it has become apparent that a concerted effort is being made to obtain legal sanction for the sale to the American people of an adulterated food product made from filthy and putrid substances. This effort if successful would mark the first backward step in more than 50 years of progress in pure food legislation and enforcement in this country. The integrity of the Nation's food supply is under attack.

This attack is being made on two fronts. The first is an attempt to obtain the approval of the product by the Food and Drug Administration. The second is an attempt to force through Congress an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to exempt this product from the requirements of the act.

The product for which this special dispensation is being sought is called by its proponents "fish protein concentrate, whole fish flour." It is made by grinding whole fish of any variety, including scavenger fish, taken from inland waterways, swamps, and any and all other sources, and includes everything in and on the fish—head, eyes, scales, fins, intestines, contents of intestines, worms and parasites. From the resulting substance the fat would be removed by a chemical process and the remainder dried. It is this remainder which the proponents seek to have cleared for sale under the label "whole fish flour."

The proponents of the product have asked the Food and Drug Administration to establish a definition and standard of identity for the product. If this is done, the product could be sold to the American people under the proposed name with the blessing of the Food and Drug Administration, and the manufacturer could avoid a statement of the contents on the label.

Under the law a definition and standard of identity for a food product may be established only when the Secretary finds that "such action will promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." This procedure is meaningful only when taken with respect to a commonly known food which consumers know and generally recognize by a customary name, and the purpose is to establish certain minimum requirements as to contents and nutritional values so that consumers calling for the food by that name will be assured that the product meets these minimum specifications. The procedure is not in the interest of consumers when the product is an unknown or little-known article, for in such case consumers do not know the article, are not aware of its contents, and do not generally call for it by any name. To establish a definition and standard of identity for such an unknown article of food would lead to concealment from the consumer of the contents of the article. In the period of almost a quarter century since this procedure was authorized by the act definitions and standards of identity have been established for less than 20 different classes of foods, all of which were standard items in the American diet.

The Food and Drug Administration has informally expressed the opinion that whole fish flour should be regarded as adulterated because it would be made without the removal of those portions of the fish not normally regarded as acceptable for human food in the United States. The act brands as adulterated any article "if it consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food."

FDA's informal opinion is based on long-established precedent. For more than 50 years FDA has consistently held that a food product which contains insects, worms, rodents or parts thereof or the excreta thereof is filthy and putrid and therefore adulterated within the meaning of the act, regardless of the fact that the product may be so ground or otherwise processed that the presence of such filthy and putrid material is not detectable except in the laboratory, and regardless also of the fact that it may be so processed and treated that it is not injurious to health.

The courts have sustained this position in an unbroken line of decisions. As examples, the courts have condemned as adulterated such articles as fish containing parasitic worms; butter made from cream containing flies, rodent hair, feather parts, etc.; bread made from flour or with sugar stored under unsanitary conditions and containing weevils, cockroaches, insect fragments, or rodent or insect excreta; tomato paste containing pulverized corn ear worms and their excreta; and coffee beans containing various foreign materials. In each of

these cases the courts have so held in spite of proof that by reason of the processing to which the product is subjected it is not injurious to health.

Fearful that notwithstanding the pressure being brought upon it the Food and Drug Administration will stand firm on the foregoing principles, as indeed it must, the proponents of this product would have Congress let down the bars for the first time since the enactment of the first Federal pure food law in 1905. The approach is subtle. The proponents would make it appear that it is not intended that the product be sold to the American consumer but instead to the undernourished peoples of foreign nations. They say, however, that these peoples will not buy it or eat it unless they can be led to believe that it is a standard item in the American diet. Therefore, they wish to debase our food standards in order to induce foreign countries to eat a product which we deem unfit for food.

Thus a governmental label of purity is sought for the admitted purpose of misleading foreign consumers, and at the same time legalizing the sale of an adulterated food product to the American consumer under a definition and standard of identity that would operate to conceal its true contents.

Our fod supply is the safest in the world and as clean as modern technology can make it. Years of effort on the part of the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture have been devoted to this end. Vast sums have been spent by farmers, warehousemen, grain dealers, produce dealers, dairymen, railroads, flour millers, packing houses, canners, and food manufacturers in general to eliminate infestation and improve sanitation in the handling of grains, dairy and other agricultural products and all articles of food. We must not throw these achievements to the four winds in the dubious belief that deception of the foreign consumer is necessary for his own good.

Goals of the New Frontier: Major Innovations in Our Foreign Policy Will Provide a Harvest of Peace and Other Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the past session of the 87th Congress has been one of considerable and extensive legislative accomplishment in the field of foreign affairs. Not all, by any means, of the needs which are pressed upon the Congress and our nations by our tumultuous times have been met and much remains for the coming session and for the future. But important strides were made—strides which should ease and facilitate the conduct of our foreign policy.

Perhaps the most important of these strides was in the field of foreign aid. Here the most important new departure since the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and perhaps since President Truman's point 4 of 1950, was enacted in Public Law 87–195 (H.R. 8400). This new departure has two main routes: one in the shift to emphasis upon long-term loan financing as the main American contribution to economic development; the other in the creation of the new Agency for International Development as an integral part of the Department of State to bring our foreign aid activities into full coordination with our foreign policy in its entire scope.

The Development Loan Fund within the new AID was authorized to undertake a 5-year program of long-term loans to friendly countries with emphasis upon long-range plans for economic development and improvement. A sum of $1.2 billion was authorized for this purpose in fiscal year 1962 and $1.5 billion for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, 1963–66. Annual appropriations will be required for the succeeding fiscal years rather than the Treasury borrowing authority requested by the President, but in President Kennedy's words of August 29, 1961:

> The compromise which the Senate-House conferees have worked out is wholly satisfactory. It gives the U.S. Government authority to make commitments for long-term development programs with reasonable assurance that these commitments will be met. In providing 5 years of substantial authorization, the conferees have recognized the magnitude of the need in the developing countries. In insuring specific authority to enter into commitments with these countries, the conferees have recognized the necessity for this Government to give assurance that assistance will be forthcoming over a period of years. The agreement reached by the conferees today is an important decision both for the United States and the free world.

One of the tasks for the future is to insure that the commitment made by the Congress in this authorization is fulfilled, so that our development loan program can proceed in sound and succesful fashion.

The final appropriation for foreign aid was $3.9 billion—almost a billion less than the administration's original request for $4.8 billion and some $376,400,000 less than was provided in the authorization legislation. But although this appropriation was less than requested and authorized, it should also be noted that it marks an increase of approximately $100 million over the appropriations for the past fiscal year 1961.

Reorganization of our foreign aid establishment into the new Agency for International Development, authorized by Public Law 87–195, has been proceeding under the newly appointed AID Director, Fowler Hamilton. The results of this step must yet await the test of time, but legislative action in the last session has given the executive branch the administrative flexibility to make our foreign aid more efficient and a more effective instrument of our foreign policy.

A second stride forward in the field of foreign aid was taken in the appropriation—Public Law 87–41; H.R. 6518—of the full $500 million for President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress with Latin America. This program is directed at advances in fields which directly affect the lives of the peoples of Latin America. In the words of the President:

> It is an effort to create a social framework within which all the people of a nation can share in the benefits of prosperity and participate in the process of growth.

This represents a fine and proper development of our purpose as a nation in our relations with our neighbors to the south. At the same time, this act contained a special provision for $100 million to assist the people of Chile in reconstruction and recovery from the devastating earthquake which struck their country.

A third stride forward came with Public Law 87–256 (H.R. 8666) which I was pleased to cosponsor with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. This act draws together the various educational and cultural exchange programs conducted by our Government. Its overall aim in consolidating some 12 different previous acts into a whole is to promote the educational and cultural exchange programs into a more important position in the foreign relations of the United States. Clearly, this is a highly important field and one in which we are capable of doing much better. We now have a much improved statutory framework for the effective conduct of these programs as part of uor relations with the world.

Yet a fourth stride forward came in the important and morally pressing area of food for peace. An additional $2 billion was authorized by Public Law 87–28 for the sale of our surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480. In addition, Public Law 87–92 continues the authority contained in title II of Public Law 480 to use our agricultural surplus to help needy people in less-developed countries where it is not feasible to sell these commodities. The food for peace programs of our Government are surely among the most important. They are programs for which we would do well to seek further use and to further expand.

This short summary, of course, does not provide a complete catalog of all actions in the Congress or deal adequately with the tremendous role which, under our Constitution, the President plays in the conduct of our foreign policy.

Under the vigorous and farsighted leadership of President Kennedy we have taken important steps forward to strengthen our world position, to restore our international prestige, to renew vital ties with our allies, and to undertake new programs to help raise the living standards and the economic potential of newly emerging and developing nations throughout the world. The Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are examples of the type of positive programs which can be created whenever dynamic Presidential leadership and effective teamwork exists as is now the

case between our Democratic President and our Democratic Congress.

Our firm stands on Berlin, Laos, and in other trouble spots of the world, and the strengthening of our defense posture, have dramatically demonstrated to the Soviet leaders and to the leaders of other nations our steadfast determination to fulfill our global commitments. At the same time, we have worked actively for sound solutions to international problems through the United Nations, where we are so ably represented by our distinguished Ambassador, Adlai E. Stevenson, who knows that world peace cannot be obtained by slick "kitchen debates."

All of these major accomplishments in the foreign policy field have clearly demonstrated to the world our sincere desire for a just and lasting peace, with freedom for all peoples.

Since 27 Million Children Under 12 Years of Age View Television Programs Daily, FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow Is To Be Commended for Demanding That the Commercial Television Industry Raise the Standards of Children's Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton N. Minow, said in a recent speech before the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York City that 27 million children under 12 are exposed to television programs each day.

Because of the vast numbers of young people who each day view television programs, FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow is to be highly commended for asking the commercial television industry to raise the standards of children's programs.

A number of major steps undoubtedly will have to be taken in order to effectively curb the rising tide of juvenile delinquency in our country, which has an almost direct correlation with some of our present commercial television programs.

In a recent issue of Parade magazine, published by the Washington (D.C.) Post, an article by Lloyd Shearer pointed out that the Swiss have no juvenile delinquency and listed the reasons why this was so despite the increase of juvenile delinquency, not only among the poverty ridden but among the white-collar classes, in the United States and most other countries, including France, Canada, Mexico, England, and Russia.

Recently I introduced a bill (H.R. 8109) to discourage the exploitation of sex and crime on television programs, legislation which is based on laws now in effect in Canada and England. In view of these antecedents I hope the FCC and the Justice Department will strongly support H.R. 8109.

I include an editorial from the Washington, D.C., Daily News applauding FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow for his work in raising the standards of the broadcasting industry. I also include the provocative and informative article by Lloyd Shearer which I have mentioned:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News]

AN APPLAUDED CRUSADE

Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, came up with some gripping statistics in a recent speech before the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York. He said:

At 5 o'clock this afternoon, 13 million children (under 12) will be looking at their favorite TV programs.

At 6 o'clock, these kids will number 15 million, at 7 o'clock, 18 million, and an hour later, 17 million. Altogether, as the FCC computes it, some 27 million youngsters each day are preoccupied with what they see on the screen.

"We all know," he said, "that the potential of television to help or hurt our children is enormous. We know that television occupies more of a child's time each year than school, or than church."

So, for the first time, the FCC, under its new, youthful, and energetic Chairman, is going to ask station licensees what they are doing about providing programs for children. Parents universally will endorse this move, or any other sensible steps for the improvement in quality of TV fare.

It need not be Federal censorship, but rather authoritative vigilance and occasionally such reminders as Mr. Minow puts forth soberly on the awesome responsibilities of the broadcasters. Mr. Minow said recently that he did not expect to win all the battles in his many-sided crusade for better television, but if he wins this one, American families will be forever grateful.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post Parade magazine]

THE SWISS HAVE NO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—WHY?

(By Lloyd Shearer)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Juvenile delinquency is on the rise everywhere—not only in slum areas but in suburban districts—not only among the poverty-ridden but among the white-collar classes—not only in the United States but in France, Canada, Mexico, England, Russia, any country you can think of. Except Switzerland.

Switzerland has no juvenile delinquency problem.

How come?

What goes with this wealthy, industrious nation of 5 million people—half Protestant, almost half Catholic?

Why in this picturesque alpine democracy partitioned into German-, French- and Italian-speaking cantonments, are there fewer policemen proportionally than in any neighboring European country—and less crime?

How do the Swiss do it? Here are a few of the ways:

Stolid and stable, the Swiss control their children more strictly than we do ours.

In Switzerland youngsters are banned from motion picture theaters until they are 16. To see most films in most cantonments they must be 18 or over. For innocuous entertainment of the Walt Disney stripe the age requirement is lowered to 12. There is strict cinema censorship on the local level. The police control the theater box office. No 13-year-old girl and her boy friend saunter into a Swiss movie house to see a Brigitte Bardot film or "Not Tonight Henry."

"We believe in raising our children," one Basel schoolteacher explained to me, "free from the violence and sex which characterize your American movies and television. Also we do not make heroes of gangsters. I guess we have a more prosaic, middle-class set of values."

The Swiss cannot understand why we refuse to classify our movies for adult and minor viewing the way France, England, and other democratic nations do.

"It makes no sense," a local official in Andermatt told me. "In America you do not allow children to frequent bars and saloons. No minors may be served alcohol in your country, yet you permit your children to see movies about call girls, prostitutes, gangsters, and infidelity.

"It seems to me," he continued, "that Hollywood movies are getting more daring all the time."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Forthcoming from Hollywood this year are such films as "The Children's Hour," dealing with lesbianism; "Town Without Pity," dealing with mass rape; "Splendor in the Grass," dealing with teenage sex problems. In addition, the production of nude and near-nude movies by fly-by-night operators in Hollywood has increased so widely that a group of industry leaders are finally trying to do something about the problem. Unfortunately, they can do little so long as these operators find motion picture theaters in which to release their fare.)

Actually, most individual Hollywood producers are in favor of classifying their movies. Practically the only ones against classification are Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, whose handsome salary is paid by the major studios, and Albert Pickus, president of the Theater Owners of America.

These two high-minded gentlemen apparently do not believe in imposing any system on the public that might restrict the box-office take.

Says Johnston: "We only get on solid ground when we consider the effects of classification—any form of it. For here we see it for what it is—censorship, nothing more, nothing less. Who can dispute the fact that classification is essentially a surrender of parental authority, a denial of a parent's right to decide what is best for his child? * * *"

Says Pickus: "Virtually all theater men are opposed to regulatory or statutory classification. We know of no individuals or groups so Solomonesque in their ability that they should tell us what age groups should see our films. * * *"

Swiss parents to whom I showed these two quotations (taken from the September 1961 issue of the Journal of the Screen Producers Guild) smiled and snickered. They asked which was of more importance: the welfare of American children or the welfare of American theater owners. And this, mind you, from a finance-minded people who love profits.

THE REAL CAUSE

The Swiss, who have studied juvenile delinquency, do not believe its major causes are founded in unregulated movie and TV fare. They are too realistic for that. They know that broken homes, poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition, glandular imbalance, mental retardation, mobility of population and other factors play large causative roles. But it is their firm opinion that there is little juvenile delinquency in their nation because there is little parental neglect of children.

In Switzerland parents do not believe that they must not interfere with a child's individual self-expression.

In Switzerland parents do not want their children to get a driver's license or a motorbike license until the children are at least 18.

And that's the way they have compelled the cantonal regulations to read: no driver's license before 18.

Swiss parents believe that the development of a skill, a profession, a vocation is the most important factor in a youngster's rearing. And they believe that an automobile given to a young man is a deterrent to his educational progress, plus an unnecessary aid to premature dating and opssible promiscuity.

"I was shocked," a professor at the University of Neuchatel told me, "to discover in America how many high school students drive their own or family cars. I think American parents are crazy to allow this. It is educational suicide."

A recent survey made by an educator in Idaho of high school students who had autos showed none surveyed were A students. Most were D students or failing in their studies.

A further survey by an insurance company reached the same conclusion: ownership or control of an auto by a teenager in most cases leads to a lowering of educational grades.

Driving tests in Switzerland are extremely difficult, purposely so, and few youngsters obtain a driving license before they're 19.

The result is that there are relatively few juvenile car thefts or crimes involving the use of motor vehicles.

The average Swiss youth gets his first taste of danger not behind the wheel of a hot rod but in skiing, hiking, or mountain climbing, all sports which the Swiss say our youngsters should grow up with, in addition to those they already practice.

In Switzerland parents tell a child over and over again, "You must make something of yourself in this life." Offices and schools start at 7 a.m.

The Swiss honor their schoolteachers. They consider them important and pay them well. Their seven universities are world famous, and their Federal School of Technology has trained more brilliant engineers, chemists, and scientists than any other university in the world.

The Swiss also maintain a compulsory system of apprenticeship in industry, commerce, arts, and crafts. The boy who leaves school at 16 is apprenticed, say, to a watchmaking factory where he is paid a token salary while he learns what makes watches tick. He is closely supervised, must work by day and study by night. At the end of his apprenticeship he must pass a stiff examination or face the purgatory of becoming an unskilled worker.

In Switzerland a respect for labor and an interest in craftsmanship are instilled in children at an early age and reinforced time and time again.

AMERICAN MONEY STANDARDS

The Swiss make excellent teachers, and their training of children is so thorough and well rounded that for years the world's royal and rich families have sent their offspring to school here.

These wealthy children attend Swiss private schools—no typical Swiss sends his child to such an institution—and many of them are either spoiled flunk-outs from their own country's schools or children of broken homes whose parents don't particularly want the responsibility of raising them. The Swiss have seen these so-called private school children—all foreigners—in action for years and have some snide but closely guarded comments to make about them.

"The trouble with the American educational system," a Swiss educator confided to me, "is that your people don't regard your teachers as successful human beings. In America everyone uses money standards for judging success. Since teachers don't make much money they are not considered successful and are, therefore, not as widely respected as our teachers here.

"If you paid your teachers better you would respect them more. You would attract a higher type of teacher, and good teachers always help reduce the number of potential juvenile delinquents, since they inspire pupils to study and achievement."

While Swiss primary schools are coeducational, the Swiss parent does not believe his son should start dating girls until he passes 16. He believes his son should study, work, play, and prepare himself for a useful career. The same holds true for his daughter. Swiss parents are notoriously thrifty with allowances, so that youngsters don't have nearly as much money to spend as in America.

The Swiss do not believe in a society where sex is more important than work, and they impress this upon their children. The result is that the country has no Casanova tradition, but its divorce rate is also one of the lowest in the world—3.59 per thousand.

Swiss family life is stable. In the average Swiss home the mother reigns supreme. She is house proud and children proud and generally avoids frivolity. She does not vote and has never voted—except against her right to exercise the ballot.

DOMESTIC VIRTUES

She cannot take up a profession without her husband's consent, but it is she who controls the children and makes them toe the line. She impresses upon her children the need for good citizenship. She prepares her son for his compulsory military training, her daughter for a life of orderliness and thrift.

In Switzerland domestic virtues are encouraged, and domestic training schools and advice bureaus are provided for wives and young women.

Frequently girls from the very best families in Zurich are sent as domestics to homes in England and France to acquire housekeeping skills and knowledge of foreign languages.

Of late there has been an upsurge of churchgoing by young people in Switzerland, largely attributed to the increase of young, new, and enthusiastic pastors.

One of the most popular Swiss youth activities involves the various youth parliaments in which children of secondary school age meet in session, urge free railroad trips for students, more parks, more youth activities. These youth parliaments are recognized here as a useful preparatory ground for adult citizenship.

In Switzerland all men to the age of 50 face military service. They put in 4 months of training at age 20, then 3-week courses each year for the next 12 years. Every Swiss soldier keeps his uniform, gun, and ammunition at home, considers military service an honorable duty, a school for citizenship and equality.

Switzerland is essentially a country peopled by a middle-class society with all the virtues and faults of such a society. It is prosperous, solid, slow, inartistic, conservative, frugal, upright, pedantic, unimaginative, sober, precise, and hardworking.

Unlike our own country, it is not exciting, glamorous, or dynamic, but somehow while the youth of the world is enslaved in a cult of violence and crime for kicks, the people of this tiny, landlocked nation have managed to solve the problem of juvenile delinquency by setting a pattern for their children of hard work and meaningful life.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problem—and benefits—of automation are very real. They are before us today and must have the attention of the Congress.

I was privileged to speak to the Nebraska State AFL-CIO convention and pursue this subject and offer my support for the fine program which has been presented to the Congress.

I offer now my remarks before this convention in the hopes that these thoughts will throw some additional light on this subject and give all of us some basis for action in the 2d session of the 87th Congress:

Since World War II, this Nation has had its economic ups and downs. Recessions have come and gone, and after each recession has run its course, the number of long-term unemployed workers has been higher.

Today unemployment remains high. One reason is the fact that taxes are so high that business doesn't have the funds to expand. But another important and basic reason is automation. Automation is inevitable. We know it is here to stay and will expand greatly in the future, going into fields not even considered today.

We cannot stop it, nor would we want to. We must have automation if we wish to progress and hold our position as a world leader in industry and production. West Europe is pursuing automation aggressivley and we must stay ahead.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg called automation and other technological progress important to the American economy and said it may be necessary to step up the pace rather than tone it down.

As an economics major at the University of Omaha, I was taught and convinced that automation does not reduce jobs in the long run. As a machine takes over jobs in a plant or office, then new jobs are created in building and maintaining the machines. The problem, though, is that it takes a long time, perhaps years, to move from one skill to another. This is further complicated due to the fact that if you lose a job in Omaha to a machine, it may take years to get another job in some other section of the country where the machines are manufactured.

So we are faced with the situation—the fact of automation. It has created a surplus of workers and as one witness before Congress said: "Surplus wheat can be stored. Surplus workers—and this is what automation is creating—cannot."

We are all guilty of sweeping this fact of life under the rug. We ignored the situation for too long. Now it is critical.

There is virtually no trade or industry that has not or will not feel the effects of automation. Mr. David Sutton, of the Building Services Union, said that field has been affected by automatic elevators, vending machines, cleaning machines, dishwashing machines, automatic pinsetters, and so forth.

Patrick Gorman, of the Meat Cutters Union, has discussed the growth of machine wrapping, and we all know of the growth of self-service grocery stores and self-service trends in all retailing.

Railway workers have felt the impact of automated equipment in maintenance work. Office employees have been replaced by computers, a field which will show even more rapid expansion in the future, according to Howard Coughlin, of the Office Employees Union.

Joseph Beirne, of the Communications Workers, has testified on the tremendous growth of automation in the communications industry.

And we all know how automation in the packinghouses has already cost hundreds of jobs right here in Omaha.

It is estimated that 10 million persons will find their jobs replaced by machines in the next 5 years. At the same time we will have 6 million new workers entering the labor force in the same period, a total of 16 million jobs to be found in the next 5 years.

We are faced with a serious situation, locally and nationally. It has been growing for some years, yet it has not had the recognition nor the study it needs. I know—to those out of work—the words "study," "committee," and "further investigation" sound meaningless. Yet Congress—until this year—has never looked at this problem head on. It was only this summer that a special subcommittee was set up to take a close look at the problems caused by automation—and more importantly—seek to find the answers.

Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is chairman of this special House subcommittee. While I am not a member of this committee, I have talked to Congressman HOLLAND at length about his work and he has been kind enough to keep me informed of its progress. I have pledged my complete support.

Congressman HOLLAND tells me that prior to this year there was little attention given in Congress to this problem, so he has had to start virtually from scratch. Thus it is that we have had these hearings, and thus it is that we have had to take time when this problem is so acute to study the issues and problems in an effort to secure the right answers.

As Mr. HOLLAND said, "If similar hearings had been conducted 7 years ago, or even in 1956–57 when I asked for them in Congress, programs would be in effect today and the unemployment figure would not have snowballed to where it is now. We would not have the millions of unskilled workers we have today * * * they would have been retrained."

As you can see, Congressman HOLLAND believes that retraining is one big answer to automation. Certainly it is. But there are other parts of the program which must also come along at the same time or we will just change the unemployment statistics from unskilled workers to skilled workers, and that would be even more tragic for this Nation if such a thing is possible.

Let me offer you this thought—automation is not the problem; the problem is what we do with the fruits of automation.

It is not just a problem for the worker, as Walter Reuther has pointed out so well. Reuther tells of watching a Ford assembly line in which a motor block was made automatically in less than 15 minutes, work that would take many workers many hours to do. An engineer told Reuther, "You know, not one of these machines pays dues to the United Auto Workers. Reuther replied, "And, do you know, not one of those machines can buy a new Ford car either."

So there is a big stake in this problem for management as well as labor.

It was pointed out time and time again in the hearings this summer that automation can and should be a blessing to our people and to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Through the use of automation, productivity can be increased and cost can be reduced. This would result in permitting all to have more, for less money, provided there are those with money to buy the products.

It is ironic that there are today unemployed skilled workers in one part of the country and jobs for people with these same skills in another part of the country. This is part of a problem that must be solved.

It is ironic that we have more persons producing more products with more total value than ever before, yet we have a high level of unemployment. This is the problem.

It is ironic that we, as the wealthiest nation in the world, have this forced idleness and waste of manpower at a time when we are engaged in a death struggle with communism and need to have a fully mobilized economy.

What answers have the congressional hearings provided for these questions? What program is now advanced?

Here are the major points:

1. Retraining—on the job—of persons whose jobs are in danger of being eliminated. This is a step for management, for they have the greatest stake—next to the employee himself—in what happens to former employees. Personal good will, community relations, product good will and buyers for the company product all enter into this in-plant training program.

2. Vocational education training of persons who have lost their jobs and whose skills are surplus in the Nation. This would utilize our vocational schools, both public and private, for courses not to exceed 52 weeks. Priority would be given to the long-term unemployed in this program. Such persons would be paid allowances not to exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation payment.

State action is needed here to allow persons in training and retraining programs to continue to receive unemployment benefits up to normal amounts and limits. Only 10 States now allow such payments.

3. Creation of a national clearinghouse to classify needed skills and match them with trained workers by geographic areas.

4. Tax relief to men who wil take jobs away from home in areas where their skills are needed but who hesitate to move their families until there is some real assurance that a new job will work out and last.

5. More effective vocational guidance programs for the armed services to prepare men and women for civilian jobs after their service.

6. And finally, recognition that the real answer to unemployment is more jobs. This requires realistic depreciation formulas so that industry can build the new plants and take the gambles that are necessary if more jobs are to be created in our growing economy.

Along with these points, it is recommended that Federal policies and programs recognize the importance of local and private efforts, which collectively can do as much to solve the hundreds and thousands of individual problems as can a Federal program aimed at the entire problem.

As a member of the minority party in Congress, I am proud that my party is lined up to support this program. This is a bipartisan effort and this is as it should be. It is a tragic thing that during the recent Congress—the longest session since the Korean war—the majority did not bring up any of these suggested measures for action. The bills involved have bipartisan support and could easily have been brought up instead of having the House consider a botanic garden for Hawaii or a fish aquarium for Washington, D.C.

It is my hope that the majority party, which controls all legislation in Congress, will bring up these important bills early in the next session.

I might say that this is no new interest for me. I've long been interested in it since my father headed a committee of master plumbers here in Omaha which worked hard to create an apprenticeship program, which was established eventually and functions to this day. I believe apprenticeship courses are, in effect, the same principle used in retraining programs I have mentioned.

There will be ample production jobs in the United States if this automation problem is met and solved by Congress and other groups. We cannot afford to continually take stopgap measures to ease the problems of the unemployed each time a recession sets in, because it has been proved that such makework measures give only temporary relief—they do not solve the problem.

I am certain that you will agree with me that we do and will have the jobs available if we only get down to the heart of the problem by training and retraining displaced workers, providing them with new skills with which to produce for a stronger America, providing them with productive employment, and giving them the pride and joy of working for a greater America rather than living off relief and handouts from the Government.

Report by Congressman Garner E. Shriver to the 4th Congressional District of Kansas on the 1st Session, 87th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to submit this first annual report of my activities in the 1st session of the 87th Congress to the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District.

This has been a year of transition for the Nation. A new administration, led by President Kennedy, assumed responsibility on January 20 after 8 years of leadership by President Eisenhower.

This session of Congress began by acting upon domestic proposals of the new administration. However, events in such places as Laos, Cuba, the Congo, and Berlin also required decisions and action. The new crisis over Berlin at midsummer made its imprint upon the actions of the Congress.

Swift approval was given by Congress to an administration request for defense spending which has resulted in a record peacetime defense budget of $46.6 billion—nearly $5 billion more than requested by President Eisenhower at the first of the year. Total Federal Government appropriations for the 1962 fiscal year amount to over $92 billion—over $12 billion more than the previous year.

This was the first year of my stewardship in the U.S. Congress. It was a high honor for me to be elected to succeed the Honorable Edward H. Rees of Emporia who chose to retire after 24 years of distinguished service in the in the House of Representatives.

YOUR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

During these first months, I have attempted to establish with the help of my staff a congressional office which would enable me to promptly and efficiently

serve the 580,000 men, women, and children of this district in their relationships with the many Federal agencies and bureaus.

The following summary indicates the efforts of your congressional office in Washington to serve you:

Held 325 conferences with officials of some 43 different agencies on cases for constituents.

Mailed nearly 10,000 Government documents to Fourth District citizens.

Handled nearly 100 matters dealing with the Department of Agriculture.

More than 25,000 pieces of mail were received in the Washington office from the district, of which 13,547 were first-class letters.

Mailed out 28,940 pieces of mail to the district, not including questionnaires or the constituent's newsletter.

Nearly 850 visitors from Kansas signed our guest book in Washington.

I followed news and editorial views on local, State, and National happenings in weekly and daily newspapers from every one of the 15 counties in the Fourth District. In addition, numerous professional and trade magazines, newsletters, and newspapers of hundreds of associations, unions, and societies reached my desk during the session.

Fourth District public works projects for flood control purposes and watershed projects received appropriations totaling $18,675,000 for the 1962 fiscal year. The Cheney Reservoir project in Sedgwick County will be one of six new Bureau of Reclamation starts in the Nation in 1962 with $2,700,000 appropriated by Congress. Military installation appropriations in the Fourth District amount to $188,000 for the projects at Fort Riley, Kans., and McConnell Air Force Base at Wichita.

Your Congressman testified four times before House committees considering legislation affecting the district. Four floor speeches were delivered on the importance of strengthening America's defense and continued production of the B–52 jet bomber.

SHRIVER VOTING RECORD—100 PERCENT

More than 14,026 bills and measures were introduced during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. Some 1,232 were passed by the House and 1,133 by the Senate. However, only about 600 were enacted into law.

Your Congressman answered 112 of 115 quorum calls in the House and had a 100 percent voting attendance record casting 116 rollcall votes.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

The Congress is an organization of committees. I am privileged to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Claims. The workload of both the full committee and the subcommittee is heavy. Thirty-four percent of all legislation introduced in the House—3,721 bills—was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The Claims Subcommittee had 525 House bills referred to it. I was in attendance at 21 of the 23 full committee meetings, and 30 of 35 subcommittee sessions.

SHRIVER LEGISLATION

During my first year in Congress I have not attempted to author voluminous legislation However, I did introduce several bills which were the result of careful and deliberate study. Followlowing are those which I believe to be of special significance:

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP IN KANSAS

Introduced, and testified before Judiciary Committee, on a bill to provide for the appointment of a third Federal judge in Kansas. This measure was included with omnibus bill providing for additional Federal judges throughout the Nation. It has been enacted into public law.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

Introduced a bill which would permit and encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed persons by providing income tax deductions. Passed by House and pending in the Senate.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR UNIVERSITY TUITION AND EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Introduced a bill which would provide that taxpayers may deduct up to $1,500 yearly on their income tax reports for tuition and other educational expenses paid to higher educational institutions for themselves, their spouses, or dependents. Pending before House Ways and Means Committee.

RESOLUTIONS ON RED CHINA

Introduced a resolution which expresses the sense of Congress against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Passed by both the House and Senate.

It has been a genuine pleasure to represent the people of the Fourth District of Kansas in the Congress during the past session. I shall always attempt to the best of my ability to meet the serious responsibilities which face me as your representative. I invite you to keep me informed of your views on all issues which affect the district and the Nation. You may write to me in Washington, or during the adjournment I shall spend most of the time operating out of my office at 510 Schweiter Building, Wichita, Kans.

A Way to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an article, in part, which I wrote for the Pythian International and which appeared in its issue of July 1961:

A WAY TO WORLD PEACE

(By LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts)

It might seem superfluous to write on brotherhood for a fraternal order founded in friendship, charity, and benevolence. But I shall touch on the worldwide and governmental aspects of brotherhood, and believe that my brother Pythians will find such a discussion not out of place, as our order "teaches its members to be interested in public affairs—National, State, and local" (as stated in the brief history of our order).

Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee are fortunate in having opportunities to meet people from the far corners of the world, and also to visit them. What has struck me most in these contacts is how much alike we human beings are in our fundamental reactions, whatever be the color of our skins, or the state of the civilization in which we grew up.

We found fine, friendly, intelligent, understanding, and understandable people everywhere, including such far-off places as southeast Asia and India. Only last week I was similarly impressed with five visitors from the heart of central Africa with whom some of us had luncheon. It is easy to have feelings of friendship, charity, and benevolence toward such people.

These experiences made me realize the significance of the poem by Ethel Blair Jordan, entitled "Foreign?":

"I thought that foreign children
Lived far across the sea
Until I got a letter
From a boy in Italy.
'Dear little foreign friend,' it said
As plainly as could be.
Now I wonder which is 'foreign',
The other child or me."

In this jet age, the world in effect grows smaller. People everywhere are now as much neighbors as were people in bygone days who lived only a few hundred miles apart. Neighborliness and brotherhood take on new dimensions.

The jet age has also brought to mankind incredible achievements in science, in space exploration, in the prolongation and enrichment of life—but also in the awful means of destruction. Brotherhood, to enable mankind to share these great benefits and to avoid these terrible threats, has become more important than ever.

So, when Pythians emphasize brotherhood, they are in tune with the needs of the times, and are raising a standard to which men of good will must rally.

As Americans we can be proud of the fact that world brotherhood, achieved through a world organization founded on peace and justice, has long been the foremost goal of American foreign policy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the National Press Club on July 10, 1961 (referring to World War II): "Before the fighting was over, we had concluded as a Nation that we must throw ourselves into the building of a decent world order in which such conflagrations could not occur."

He explained how the efforts of the peace-loving nations have been blocked:

"The Soviet Union did not join the United Nations in fact, as well as in form, and lend itself to the commitments they and the rest of us made in the midst of a great war. An entire people was sealed off from the rest of the world, and secrecy became a prime strategic weapon. The institutions of the internatonal community were either ignored or undermined from within."

The ideal of brotherhood is based on religious conviction—on belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Unfortunately, the Soviet leaders do not have religious conviction. They do not believe in brotherhood. They do not believe in the dignity of the individual. They imagine that they have a superier belief. It enthrones the state, and downgrades the individual. They seek through world revo-

lution to "liberalize" the rest of mankind from their errors and force on them the Communist beliefs.

The greatest mistake which we can make—and unfortunately have made—is to imagine that we can expect honorable dealings and honorable negotiations with such people. The abortive tractor deal with Castro is but one example.

We must not expect Communists to act fairly, or to act as nationalists interested primarily in their own country, or to act as agrarian reformers, or as scientists, or as businessmen. These may be side issues for them, but we must expect them to act first and foremost as Communists and world revolutionists.

What can we do? Be strong, be united, be firm, and ride out the storm. We shall not be deflected from our goal of a world organized for peace and justice. We still share the "vision of the world" voiced by Alfred Tennyson in his poem, "Locksley Hall":

"Till the war-drum throbbed no longer,
And the battleflags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the
Federation of the world."

Address by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, speaks directly and forcefully on the security of this country and on his beliefs. General LeMay spoke recently at the luncheon of the 15th Annual Convention of the Air Force Association. His speech stressed the unity of flexible and diversified air forces and I believe offers a sound understanding of the power which is contained within those forces. I submit it for the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE, FOR PRESENTATION AT THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON, PHILADELPHIA, PA., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961

I am very pleased to be here in Philadelphia for the 15th anniversary convention and aerospace panorama. I know I am among friends, and that makes my participation a special pleasure.

Each of us here recognizes the seriousness of the world situation. And we know that in these times no one can be a passive participant in national defense. That is why we are here. That is why this association was formed.

Each year the association seems to do the impossible by having a larger and more interesting panorama. As a result of your efforts, the thousands of people who visit the exhibits and attend the meetings will come away with an increased understanding of aerospace power and greater faith in American technology.

Many key topics will be discussed in the next few days. Out of the convention seminars, briefings, panels, and speeches will come a report to the Nation that I feel sure will be reassuring. It will constitute a firm warning to those who threaten the peace of the world.

Never before in our Nation's history have we as a people been more patient and more determined to stand together to meet aggression. Because this is true I have not chosen to discuss hardware nor review the status of our overall aerospace power. We are confident of our strength. The free world walks softly, but firmly to meet any threat.

Our present strength and its effect on world events confirms more than ever the necessity for strong defense forces, not only today, but in the future. This is a continuing situation and a problem I intend to touch upon later this afternoon.

But there is another problem that I want to discuss now. It is a matter of high priority. It is a problem I feel the Air Force Association can work with us to solve. I say this because you are part of the Air Force family—a strong and vital part—and your assistance is both welcome and needed.

This problem is a matter of great concern to me—aerospace unity—because the strength of our aerospace power comes through unity of purpose and organization.

A very knowledgeable reporter stated recently that in the early 1950's he felt he knew what the Air Force stood for, but today he doesn't. His statement puzzled me. It also alarmed me because understanding our doctrine and concepts is basic and important to our existence.

Deterrence of aggression is composed of three basic elements—forces in being, public understanding of this force, and national determination to use the force if necessary. These are the three elements that make our force credible to our friends and to our enemies. If any of them is missing, credibility suffers proportionately.

Without understanding I don't think we can have the necessary degree of determination. And, of course, credibility is nil without these two elements. Now if this reporter, who has been close to aerospace power for many years, is not clear in his own mind as to just exactly where we stand today, it only seems reasonable that less informed people may be even more confused.

Is the public confused? If it is, how has it happened?

Admittedly, the Air Force has always had a variety of thinking within its own ranks. This is to be expected in a dynamic environment. We have been drectly affected by revolutionary technology. New developments have brought changes in emphasis in our defense posture.

Other factors also enter the picture—changing national strategy—and of course—the budget. Within the Air Force we have had, in addition to differences of opinion between missile, fighter and bomber people, the strategic, tactical, and air defense concepts. Then on the other hand there are the general war and limited war schools of thought and philosophical divisions on types of deterrence. You can add to this some additional confusion about our conventional war role and capability.

Possibly this variety of views is why the sharply defined picture that we presented in the early 1950's has become fuzzy to some people.

Yet our basic concept has remained firm through the years—national security requires that we build, maintain and modernize our aerospace power, and that we emphasize forces that can survive an attack and react with war waging and war winning capabilities. Today for the first time in history, we can be directly attacked by strong aerospace forces. Therefore, the Air Force believes the greatest danger to our national survival is the direct threat against the United States itself. By preparing for this threat we believe that our strength also deters lesser conflicts for ourselves and for our Allies.

But if there is some confusion today as to how we stand, we do indeed have a serious situation. If we do nothing more at this convention than to clarify our position, I think it will be of great benefit to the public and to the Air Force.

I think we have been consistent in our concepts since the formation of the GHQ Air Force in 1935. Our basic doctrine has remained generally unchanged since that time. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, the first commander of the GHQ Air Force, was outspoken on the subject of airpower. It was at this time that our new concept of air warfare was gaining attention. General Andrews held that national security could best be attained by building offensive rather than defensive capabilities.

History, of course, has proven the validity of the concept. We have had in war dramatic examples of the decisiveness of airpower. Possibly by retracing history from the middle thirties, we can gain an insight into the cause of public confusion about our present doctrine.

Until the formation of the GHQ Air Force, our air units were not in a cohesive organizational structure. This new command consisted of three wings in the ZI. Each wing was composed of all elements of airpower—bombardment, pursuit, attack, and reconnaissance. We were small, usually situated on the same base, and we worked together. We came to know each other and we understood and appreciated the contributions each made to total airpower.

In those days we identified ourselves with the Air Corps. We had unit loyalty, but we were "Air Corps."

World War II brought tremendous growth. Wings became commands and then grew to be numbered air forces. Individuals became specialized and to a degree lost their understanding and appreciation of the contributions of the other complementary elements of airpower. For example, it soon became common to hear airmen refer to themselves first as "8th Air Force," secondly as "Air Corps."

Each of the numbered air forces, you remember, had a distinctive shoulder patch. When we became a separate service, we adopted a new uniform and received many protests against the prohibition of shoulder patches. However, we found that we accrued a dividend in our determination to have an uncluttered uniform. It was impossible to tell—visually—whether an airman or officer was in SAC, TAC, ADC, or the other commands.

This condition exists today.

Visually, there is no difference in the blue suits.

But once he begins talking, the individual more often than not will quickly inform his listener that he is in a specific command.

And sometimes an individual inherits this command identification without any great effort on his own part. I think I can be considered a prime example of this. Because of my service in the Strategic Air Command, a lot of people think I am only interested in big bombers and have little faith in or use for missiles, tactical airpower, air defense, and the many other essential elements that go to make up total aerospace power. This most emphatically is not true.

I seek weapon systems that I think can do the best job and afford the Nation the most protection. I am a military conservative in that I believe we shouldn't discard a proven, reliable weapon system or concept unless we have something that is able to replace it and do a better job. In short, I believe in having protection along with progress.

Identification with a command is not confined solely to the people now in service. The same tendency is apparent among former Air Force men and other people in civilian life who are earnest supporters of aerospace power.

As you recall, when we became a separate service, we organized into commands so we could manage our resources more effectively. We did not consider, however, that the functions of the different commands were separate and autonomous. They were all part of the Air Force and mutually supporting. We in effect gained our independence through public understanding and conviction that all elements contributed to the entire broad spectrum of aerospace power.

During our growing stages there was strong emphasis on command identification. To a point this was and is needed and desirable. But it must not go to the point where it contributes to an impression that the U.S. Air Force is a conglomeration of forces, that each type of aerospace power is separate from the other and incapable of action outside a specified role. This gives the impression of inflexibility and nothing could be farther from the truth.

Aerospace power offers the ultimate in flexibility.

The ability to use it for different purposes and to concentrate it swiftly for a primary purpose, if need be, is one of its greatest assets.

Now, if we in our natural enthusiasm have contributed to a cloudy picture, it is time we take some swift and positive action to correct this impression. Since deterrence is credible only if there is understanding and determination, this calls for even greater unity on our part as we advance into the future.

Today, the Air Force is specialized. Many of our people have to specialize in one field due to the growing complexity of weapon systems. As a result, they often remain in one command for most of their careers and do not get the broad background that was received several decades ago. This trend will become more pronounced in the future. I do not advocate a return to the so-called good old days. I merely point out that technology has tended to multiply the number of parts in our Air Force. Our problem then, as we reach higher and farther, is to maintain our unity of mission and unity as an organization as we approach operational task in space. We must keep firmly in mind the fact that aerospace power is indivisible. This is stated in our basic doctrine. This basic doctrine hasn't changed over the years. Not because our doctrine has become dogma, but because this principle has stood the test of time and experience.

And we still have the same concept—the purpose of aerospace power is to deter attack against us and if we are attacked, to destroy the enemy's means to wage war.

This requires aerospace offensive and defensive forces capable of defeating the aggressor's offensive and defensive force. Only this kind of superior aerospace force can continue to be a credible deterrent against attack.

This force should consist of both manned and unmanned weapon systems to give flexible and diversified power. Parallel development and procurement of manned and unmanned systems is therefore mandatory as we update the forces in line with technological developments.

Today, at this moment, the regular establishment—your U.S. Air Force—and your Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units are at an alltime peak of combat readiness.

Through common purpose, mutual understanding, and respect we are capable and ready.

In closing, I believe we should do these things to insure that the Air Force remains an effective instrument of national security: First, we must have timely modernization of our aerospace forces. And we must act with vision and daring to exploit technology so as to achieve distinct strategic advantages.

Secondly, we must positively reaffirm our basic concepts. To be a credible deterrent, aerospace power must consist of flexible and diversified forces that have a war-waging and war-winning capability.

And third, we need to restate firmly that the U.S. Air Force is an entity whose elements all contribute to the aerospace power that is vital for our defense.

Not far from this very spot in 1776 our infant Nation made its Declaration of Independence. I ask that here at this convention we make a declaration of unity so that we may best serve for the common good of our Nation.

Air Force Secretary Zuckert Speaks Before Air Force Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, at the recent convention of the Air Force Association, to which I was invited as a participant in a symposium on "Space and the Future," a stimulating address on the Air Force job, today, tomorrow and the day after, was given by Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert. He also makes some pertinent comments on the award given Assistant Secretary Lyle Garlock which deserve your attention and I submit the speech for the RECORD:

If anyone had told me 15 years ago that tonight I would be giving this state of the Air Force message as its Secretary at this meeting, I would have dismissed the prediction as incredible. I cannot truly express my appreciation of the privilege of standing here in this role tonight.

The Air Force has expanded rapidly because it had men of vision and capacity at its head when it first became a dominant force for shaping world peace. The strange and fortunate thing was that the stature and ability of those who guided its explosive progress in critical days—Bob Lovett, Hap Arnold, Stuart Symington, and Tooey Spaatz—characterized at its best the complementary civilian and military leadership called for by the ideal working of our system of government. Believe me, Curt LeMay and I work every day of our lives to seek to maintain our partnership in that same tradition.

Besides my personal gratification at being here as the civilian head of our great Air Force, it is a source of deep satisfaction to participate in the Air Force Association's awards banquet.

Your association, through its firm devotion to the cause of airpower, has materially increased the chances of our success in the desperate struggle for peace. You have accelerated national consciousness of the essentiality of airpower, whether airplanes, missiles or vehicles for the barely penetrated frontier of space. Tonight you have here some of the heroes of that restless, productive effort.

We are gathered to honor not only prophets, but doers. We have seen their good works. They can take deep satisfaction from the tributes of those who are shoulder-close. There is no greater reward than tribute by one's own. Each of your honorees tonight is a prophet honored in his own country, among and by his own associates and coworkers.

I am sure I shall be forgiven if I add my own word concerning your top Man of the Year. Lyle Garlock has been our Assistant Secretary since 1953. He came to the Air Force with military budget experience where it counts. He became the single most effective force in giving vital civilian leadership and assistance toward maintaining the current effectiveness and future capability of the Air Force.

He combines vision and toughness—with a completely realistic sense of the workings of democracy and our Government. His motivation has always been simple; the best interests of our country. He never confused that with tactical objectives. He has always been the most delightful, enlightened and effective proponent of self-criticism by the Air Force in its advocacy—and this is certainly one of the most important functions of those who exercise civilian control. Our country can truly be grateful to Lyle Garlock, a statesman of airpower.

In addressing ourselves to the state of the Air Force, we are unalterably forced to look upon its role today in a grim struggle. The obvious place to turn is Berlin, but this is merely emblematic of a much wider battle. We will know when the Berlin drama has been played through whether the Soviets can be persuaded to see the wisdom of adherence to solemn contract and the peaceful settling of differences.

President Kennedy—because of the desperate need for some middle course between resistance and retreat, between atomic holocaust and surrender—has directed that the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines strengthen the entire range of their military operations capability.

We are trying to provide—and swiftly—a far greater measure of flexibility than called for by our previous plans.

It has been clear to the world in recent months that the United States is going to great lengths to demonstrate again its restraint, wisdom, and maturity in the interest of world peace. One evidence of that determination has been to increase our strength and ability to resist pointed threats to the peace, without reducing the backbone of our strategic nuclear posture.

This step has certainly demonstrated to the world that we are prepared to meet the growing threat in Berlin in any way it may develop. To attain the required flexibility swiftly has placed new demands on the Air Force.

There are two principal elements of the flexibility which the Air Force is seeking to provide. Both of these are part of the function of support for the Army. In order for the ground troops to be able to fight anywhere in the world, they need an airlift capability much in excess of that for which we had planned. In the last few months we have taken firm steps in the direction of meeting the need. We have bought new transports; we have strengthened our arrangements for utilizing the capability of the civil air fleet; we have taken the first steps to bring into being the newest and most modern military transport. These are but the beginning, because we intend to continue our emphasis upon this kind of support.

The Army also relies upon the Air Force for the necessary close air support to assist the ground troops. For some years, in accordance with the philosophy of our defense planning, the emphasis upon tactical air had diminished. This trend has been reversed—we are determined to find better and more imaginative ways of providing tactical air support. We will devote resources to strengthening tactical air in being.

This job will require—and will receive the closest working arrangement with the Army. The new unified command established by Secretary McNamara this week, leading to a new type fighting unit made up of elements of the Army's STRAC and our TAC, will speed the improvements we seek. It will provide a new, high-performance, strik-

ing force, with a global mobility and fighting strength across the spectrum of warfare.

At the same time that we are concerning ourselves with the pressing problems of today and tomorrow—airlift, tactical air, and the dispensable elements of strategic nuclear striking power, missiles, and aircraft—we are devoting ourselves to an area in which the military requirements are just beginning to appear. I refer, of course, to space.

America must push forward into the frontiers of space. Our trip to the moon is not merely a trip but a means of pushing the exploration of outer space with all the potential that this has for mankind. We cannot allow any power to dominate outer space with the implications that such space superiority could lead to a deadly military disadvantage to this country.

These Air Force jobs of today, tomorrow—and the day after—certainly present as difficult an array of management problems as any organization has ever faced. We are seeking to be self-critical and constructive in our analysis of how we might do the job better.

For example, we have been particularly concerned with the manner in which our weapon systems are acquired. The implications of modern technology are such that billions of dollars are involved in the full-scale development of any new weapon system. Although we believe that we have made great strides, we are not content with our own organization or our own techniques. The reorganization of the Air Force Systems Command last spring was an attempt to get at the heart of some of the problems within our own house. It is but a start.

We are also looking to industry for improvement in its performance in fulfilling our demand for the incredibly complex devices that constitute the sinews of a modern war machine. American industry's enormous contribution to our defense posture, and the unprecedented depth of its knowledge and participation, make me confident that industry will respond constructively. The seriousness of our problem is indicated by the fact that one petty mistake of procedure in testing a new missile can cost millions of dollars if the weapon blows up on the pad because of it. It is, of course, impossible to expect perfect performance in the environment of a racing technology. Nonetheless, we are convinced that better methods of contracting and the motivation induced by more imaginative contracting philosophy can be employed to obtain substantially improved results. We are taking steps to achieve these objectives.

Three areas are particularly deserving of attention—reliability, cost, and business responsibility.

Reliability, in simplest terms, means delivery when promised of a product that will work as advertised. Slippage on either count denies to the Nation a part of its defense capability.

But we must have reliability and timely delivery at costs which don't threaten to price us out of the weapon systems business. In this day of sophisticated weaponry, the challenge is clear.

There must be a joint Air Force and industry response to this challenge. The same compulsions and initiative which produce profits from timely delivery of reliable products in commerce must be brought to bear on Government work. The designation of defense business should not abrogate normal business responsibility. We must make sure that our business relationship is stimulative and productive of the best in American industry. We are far from that goal.

The things I have discussed tonight acquire an underlined importance because of the momentous events we are witnessing in the world today. Whether your thoughts turn to Berlin, southeast Asia or the nuclear test sites in Russia, you see a world of nuclear blackmail, violation of compacts among nations, inspired civil wars, subversion and aggression. All of these are truly disheartening in a world that had good cause to think it had seen the end of war.

But these are facts, and if we are to survive—certainly to survive as a great power—we must devote our energies and abilities to dealing with the implications of these facts in a world where there is no longer any security in distance.

In such a world, our Air Force is a vital part of our defense establishment and should be a great reassurance. We in the Air Force will continue to strive to deserve the resources provided us—to sustain a worthy response to the determination of the American people to maintain aerospace power to defend freedom.

Editorials Published in Haverhill Journal and Manchester Union Leader in the Interest of American Shoe Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following random sampling of editorials published since 1958 by the Haverhill Journal and the Manchester Union Leader in the interest of protecting American shoe workers and their employers from unfair foreign competition. These and countless other editorials relating to the general theme of progress in the shoe industry have appeared in these newspapers:

[From the Haverhill Journal, Sept. 20, 1961]

NEEDED SHOE TRAINING

As most of our readers know, this newspaper has established an advisory board composed of local citizens who meet monthly with the publisher and representatives of various groups within our circulation area. The purpose of these meetings is to draw forth from these groups comments and programs which the Journal can promote in order to assist the communities in making progress.

Recently this monthly meeting took the form of "Salute to Labor" with the State commissioner of industry and labor, John Callahan, present as the principal speaker. At that meeting the principal subject of comment was the feasibility and possibility of establishing some sort of a shoe training school in Haverhill.

Stewart Prue of Joint Executive Board 31, USWA, AFL–CIO, was quick to comment that there is a definite need now present in the industry for certain groups of labor. One of the most important of these groups is stitchers.

This is vitally important to Haverhill and surrounding areas because our eminence in the shoe industry is due in great part to the efficiency of the workers employed in the stitching rooms of our local factories.

Unfortunately, the average age of those employees is astoundingly high. When they retire or leave the factories, there is no one to take their place.

This newspaper proposes that a shoe training school be established in this community. We will do all within our power to see that this can be done quickly and economically. There seems to be little reason why some sort of immediate facility should not be made available for the training of stitching room employees. Quite naturally if such facilities were available, these employees would also be available for garment industry employment as well.

The Journal is ready to go forward on this program.

The fact this program was initiated at a meeting of our advisory board is and indication of the responsibility this newspaper feels it owes to its readers and to the communities in which it is circulated.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Nov. 2, 1960]

TARIFFS AND HOPE

The workers of this region know the need that now exists for the protection of local industry. There are few workers in our shoe factories who do not know shoe imports have shown a large increase in recent years and that these increases have been at the cost of domestic production. Naturally, shoe manufacturers are also alarmed about the present state of affairs.

It has been reported that 58 million pairs of shoes are expected to be imported into this country by the end of this year. This figure is up from the 35 million pairs imported last year.

Of the total amount of 58 million pairs, 28 million are leather shoes and 30 million pairs are rubber and canvas footwear. Last year 22 million pairs of leather shoes were imported and only 13 million pairs of the canvas and rubber variety.

Because of this situation, Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire has spoken sternly to the Tariff Commission and has stated that unless tariffs are raised, he will introduce legislation into the next session of Congress which will grant protection to the footwear industry.

Mayor Thomas O'Connor of Springfield, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator, has stated his forthright position in favor of protection. Senator SALTONSTALL has been investigating the problem for some time and has attempted to arrive at a solution.

We who live in this area do not intend to sit quietly by while our most important single industry is fighting for its life. Protection is needed and it is needed quickly. It should and must be granted soon.

[From the Haverhill Journal, May 21, 1959]

IMPORTS AND IMPORTS

A news story appearing in this newspaper the other day disclosed the fact that imports of Japanese made shoes and slippers into this country increased 190 percent this past year while imports of Hong Kong shoes and slippers increased by the almost unbelievable figure of 441 percent.

This story further quoted figures which revealed that the average value of the Japanese footwear was 40 cents a pair and the value of Hong Kong shoes and slippers reached the high figure of 62 cents per pair.

American industry and labor are concerned about the rapid increase of shoe imports into this country and have urged curbing action on the part of the Congress. Yet nothing is done.

Domestic industry is being sacrificed to the whims and misguided desires of those who would have us believe that unemployment at home can be taken care of by an increase in taxes to support higher unemployment relief payments but who forget that taxes can be assessed only against those who have an income. If shoe imports continue to increase as they have done the past 5 years, there will be very few shoe workers in this city with a job, and the books of all shoe manufacturers will be liberally colored in red ink.

Charity begins at home. A reasonable policy concerning shoe imports should be

adopted, one that will not punish domestic manufacturers and inflict unemployment on American workers. This policy should be adopted now.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 25, 1958]

THE CITY'S DUTY

Again the city is faced with the problem created by the closing down of one of our local shoe factories. Certainly many conditions enter into a manufacturer's decision to stop production.

But we have been wondering if any member of the official family of our city has attempted to discover if perhaps the city government might not be able to do something to keep the doors open of this employer. Perhaps the job lies within the confines of the industrial commission, but we still feel that somebody on the council should also investigate.

Of course, there is certainly no assurance that any such action would have an effect. But the city could say to a possible future replacement that the city did everything in its power to help the manuafcturer with his problems. Such action on the part of the city would go a long way towards creating an atmosphere of cooperation between municipal government and industry in general and the shoe industry in particular, an atmosphere that, in the past, has been sadly lacking.

We hope that in the future when locations and relocations of industry are once again in the headlines, Haverhill will be at the top of the list for positive consideration. One of the best ways to achieve that position is to have a reputation of being a community ready, willing, and able to cooperate in every fair way with industry.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Oct. 3, 1958]

LABOR AND EMPLOYER

The peaceful settlement of the problems of the Fifth Avenue Shoe Co. marks Haverhill as an area where management and labor are quick to look for commonsense solutions to their joint difficulties.

When worker and employer can sit down and look at a situation objectively and logically, there is no reason why a solution should not be forthcoming.

The Fifth Avenue problem was not a simple one. It was complex, involving all the technicalities of time-study and price scales for different grades of shoes.

Representatives of management and labor sat down time and time again hoping to reach some mutually agreeable compromise. The final choice was left where it should be, with the workers. When they gave their answer by means of democratic vote, it was a notice to employers everywhere that honest workmen in Haverhill will attempt to understand management.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Dec. 27, 1958]

SHOE PRODUCTION

Production of shoes in this country will reach 603 million pairs in 1959, according to figures compiled by the New England Shoe & Leather Association.

Such production estimates bode well for the city of Haverhill where more than one-half of our employable population is engage in shoe manufacturing or allied trades.

Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe & Leather Association, has predicted that shoe output this coming year in New England will rise to 206 million pairs, an increase of 5 million over 1958 figures.

"A good year in 1959" seems to be the slogan for the entire industry. Various reasons have been put forward as the cause for the favorable estimates. Better business conditions generally, cooperating weather, and the growing up of the wartime babies, all have been advanced as the sole basis for more shoe production. But it has probably been a combination of the three acting and reacting with one another that has produced the trend that shoe people have been looking to for some time.

We hope that the negotiations now being carried on between labor and management regarding a Haverhill contract reach a successful conclusion and that both groups will enjoy a profitable year.

[From the Union Leader, June 14, 1958]

QUESTIONS FOR BASS

In explaining his reasons for voting in favor of a 5-year extension of the liberal reciprocal trade program, despite the damage that New Hampshire industry has suffered because of our crazy, mixed-up trade policies, and despite the resultant unemployment, Representative PERKINS BASS made two ridiculous statements.

First, he said he felt it would be "a bad way to legislate to have tariff matters decided legislatievly as in the old days. It would encourage log rolling in Congress." We would like to ask BASS when the U.S. Constitution was changed—legally, that is—to take away Congress' power to regulate commerce with foreign nations?

BASS also claimed that he recogn'zed the need to have adequate safeguards to protect certain industries, such as the textile industry, but that he thinks the administration's bill has sufficient safeguards. What we would like to know is what good is an escape clause that is seldom invoked? If by "adequate safeguards" BASS means the provision of H.R. 12591 which stipulates that organizations or groups of employees can file an escape clause application, that still does not guarantee that the escape clause will be invoked by the President.

As a matter of fact, of the first 74 applications under the escape clause, the Tariff Commission recommended favorable action to the President in only 15 cases. And the President finally invoked the escape clause in only 7.

Hard-hit New England textile and shoe industries and their unemployed will be interested to know that the seven products were: watches, bicycles, linen toweling, alsike clover seed, dried figs, hatters' fur and women's felt hats.

[From the Union Leader, June 2, 1958]

HE'S MISSING AGAIN

Three of four members of New Hampshire's congressional delegation have responded affirmatively to the plea of the New Hampshire Shoe Workers Union of Manchester for assistance in obtaining reasonable protection from foreign imports for the hard-hit shoe industry.

The delinquent? You guessed it—Representative CHESTER MERROW.

At the time the letter from union business agent, Emile Simard, was received in Washington, MERROW was out of town. But that was nearly a month ago.

It would be nice if the representative for the American Association for the United Nations would tell Mr. Simard and his constituents—at his convenience, of course—just how he feels about the local union's request for curbs on the importing of foreign-made shoes.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 18, 1959]

HIDES AND HAVERHILL

In the city of Haverhill, more than half of the working population is employed in the shoe industry and allied trades. This does not include those large numbers employed in tanneries.

Because of the importance of leather to the economy of this community and the surrounding area, any action of the Federal Government that affects the supply and price of leather is of great importance to the citizens of this region.

When the Agriculture Department informed New England congressional delegation that it was going to act to partially relieve the severe shortage in the supply of raw materials for some kinds of leather, this newspaper had to cheer. Of course, it took that Department a long time to act, but we can't expect bureaucrats to react to economic facts as fast as private industry must if it is to remain in operation.

But the action of the Department is not the entire answer to the problem confronting tanners and manufacturers. It will not increase the supply of hides, but will act to only partially reduce the very large demand now being exhibited in the leather market.

France and Italy have placed embargoes on the shipment of hides from their countries. The Iron Curtain countries are in the world market purchasing every kind of leather available, apparently in order to fulfill Khrushchev's promise to the Russian people that they would have proper clothing. Recently every goatskin in the Indian market was cleaned out by the Soviets. If this continues, our foreign aid funds used to purchase hides in this country will aid the Communist plan by permitting certain countries to purchase hides here and export their own production in such a way that it will end up in the hands of our cold war enemies.

The cold war may have seemed a long way from the pleasant streets of this community but at this moment it is being fought in our factories and in the pocketbooks of employers. If we do not act; if we do not act soon; if we do not act soon and effectively, Haverhill and the entire surroundnig area can expect to be the scene of major wreckage in a war that is being fought without the use of arms.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Apr. 14, 1958]

AN UNBALANCED POLICY

At the start of 1958 approximately 54 percent of Haverhill's working force was employed by the shoe and allied trades industry. It is not difficult to see that anything which would affect the shoe industry would have its ultimate effect on the wages and standards of living enjoyed by the workers of our community. About one-half of the total annual wages paid in our city comes from this trade.

A considerable amount has been spoken and written about the foreign trade policy of our country in recent years. Over and above the fact that some $73 billion have been spent during the past few years outside of our country, there are other items in the foreign trade policy which greatly affect our economy, one of the most important being the tariffs placed on merchandise imported from foreign manufacturers.

An announcement was made recently concerning a 5 percent cumulative reduction of import tariffs on shoes for the next 5-year period which, in the final analysis, totals an overall 25 percent reduction. This type of legislation can do nothing but destroy that most fundamental part of our city's economy, namely, the small independent shoe manufacturer.

It is only through your individual efforts in expressing your opinions and concern on this type of legislation to your Representatives that we will collectively be able to stem this rising and imminent danger to our welfare.

[From the Haverhill Journal, June 30, 1958]

WELCOME BACK

It now appears that the Knipe Bros. factory in Ward Hill will be back in operation soon as part of the system of the Gardiner Shoe Co.

It would be well for Haverhill to find out from George Shapiro just what prompted his decision to return to Haverhill. Did any officials of the chamber of commerce seek him out? Did the Industrial Development Commission approach him? We doubt it. These bodies seems to be too interested in their internal affairs to go out and accomplish anything.

We know that the IDC is attempting to choose a full-time executive but that should not be an excuse for inaction. When a city stands to lose a factory as large as Knipe Bros., the responsibility lies on the commission to act and act quickly.

George Shapiro is well known as one of the operators of the Shapiro Bros. shoe factory that left Haverhill many years ago, mostly because of labor difficulties. We are glad to welcome him back. The Shapiro Bros. factory moved to Auburn, Maine, and has been tremendously successful. We hope the new Shapiro enterprise will prosper in its old surroundings.

We congratulate George Shapiro on his acquisition. We hope it means a better Haverhill. We only wish his presence here was the result of some prompting by organizations which were formed to accomplish just that.

[From the Union Leader, Sept. 8, 1958]

SHOE WORKERS TAKE A LACING

Emile Simard, business agent for the New Hampshire Shoeworkers Union of Manchester, in endorsing the recent report of the New England Shoe and Leather Association—which cited the fact that the shoe industry's share of the consumer dollar is now at an all-time low—highlighted one of the major reasons for this sad state of affairs. Foreign competition, Simard pointed out, "represents a good part of the employment and production which we in the United States missed."

Simard then pointed out some startling statistics: 11 million pairs of shoes imported into the United States last year; at least 15 million pairs scheduled to come into the country in 1958; and an estimate that by 1965 the figure will reach 25 million pairs annually.

Putting these statistics in understandable form, Simard charged that the latter "represents 50 factories producing 10,000 pairs of shoes each week for a full year."

And, to add insult to injury, the American Government has been training foreign producers in American methods of shoe manufacturing—also at your expense.

We are truly living in a remarkable era. Never before have the American people shown such willingness and ability to absorb unnecessary punishment. In an earlier era such shenanigans would have caused a spontaneous outburst of mass indignation.

[From the Haverhill Journal, Aug. 24, 1959]

ANOTHER BOOST

Decision of the Eames Shoe Co., Inc., to locate in Haverhill is another tribute to the skilled shoeworkers of this area.

Industrial Director Irving Franklin has reported that Sam Schoenfield, president of the company, stressed the high standards of workmanship that have placed their mark on Haverhill-made shoes as an important factor in his company's choice of location.

Director Franklin also states that the willingness of the city to embark on an industrial parking program is another factor influencing this company to operate here.

If Haverhill also is to be attractive to other industries, not in the shoe manufacturing field, adequate industrial parking is a necessity. This area has a definite edge on other areas when shoemaking is concerned, but when general industry is our target, we compete on an equal basis.

Many firms could make good use of the now vacant floorspace in Haverhill's industrial area. But without adequate parking facilities available in the vicinity of that floorspace, it will remain vacant.

Industrial parking is needed in Haverhill. We hope that a program to provide that necessity will be started soon.

Politics and People: A Platform for Peace

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we look back on the 1st session of the 87th Congress all of us are mindful of the unfinished business we came here to conclude. But some of us are mindful of the urgent business which arose after this Congress convened and which remains unfinished. In my judgment, the most urgent business to come before this Congress is the Berlin crisis, that is the third Russian-provoked crisis over the future of Berlin and the German nation. This business, this crisis, arose after this Congress convened. Congress responded to the new military programs proposed by President Kennedy for the defense of Berlin and the free world community, and this response on the whole has brought greater strength and versatility to our defense capabilities. What needed urgently to be done to secure the strongest position of military preparedness for our country has been done so far as authorization of programs and funds by the Congress is concerned. Every Member of the House has a right to some satisfaction for this record.

Military preparedness alone will not produce the just and peaceful resolution of the problems relating to Berlin and Germany. It is, however, a condition sine qua non to meeting the worldwide challenge of Russian Communist imperialism, of which the crisis on Berlin and East Germany is a vital part.

There is an urgent need for all of us to look beyond military preparedness to that plateau of international life which offers a just and lasting peace. President Kennedy in his stirring address before the General Assembly of the United Nations offered this admonition for those who may be inclined to the narrow view:

For peace is not solely a military or technical problem—it is primarily a problem of politics and people.

Politics and people, then, are the key to the kind of universal peace our Nation now seeks and has sought throughout its history.

This concept is not a new one. It has fermented in the minds of great thinkers and outstanding statesmen over the centuries. But there is something novel about it in our times and the manner in which President Kennedy has provoked the concept has the ring of greatness. For too long our national purposes have been burdened down with dehumanized economic proposals and dull technological details, all lacking sufficient appeal to stir the hearts and souls of the common man. As a nation we have been talking to the few while ignoring the many and too much of our talk has been with the miserable few who tyrannize the multitudes in that vast area of the world behind the Iron Curtain. We have paid dearly for this self-imposed isolationism from the common man of the world. The greatest price we have paid has been the surrender of our traditional role in the international arena on politics and people to the Russians. And the consequences of that default are all too painfully evident.

President Kennedy has left no doubts that he intends to wrest the initiative from the Russians in the international arena on the basic questions of politics and people. He began his drive to restore our Nation to its traditional role in international political affairs with his answer to the Russian aide memoire on Berlin and East Germany. In that reply he served notice that our country was prepared to reach a peaceful solution to the problems of Berlin and East Germany through application of the universally accepted principle of self-determination. The proposal went to the heart of the substance of politics and people. The appeal of that challenge lifted the hopes of the European peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain. That is, their hopes for a peace with justice for all the peoples of central-east Europe. The Russians shied off from this peaceful proposal while unleashing their confusion techniques through their worldwide propaganda machine. Those confusion techniques sought to bury the President's peaceful proposal in a deluge of fake charges, not the least of which was placing the Russian label of imperialism on that peaceful proposal.

It was in these circumstances that I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 354, which would have placed Congress squarely behind President Kennedy's proposal for a peaceful settlement of Berlin and East Germany on the basis of self-determination. Other resolutions on the Berlin crisis were introduced which in my opinion were generally too legalistic, too cold toward the great human issue involved, too heavily weighted with military considerations and too much out of tune with the "politics and people" aspects of President Kennedy's policies. It was for these reasons that I objected under the unanimous-consent rule when House Concurrent Resolution 351 was scheduled to come before the House. I was informed when I made the inquiry on the floor of the House, that Members would not be given the opportunity to offer amendments on that resolution and that debate would thereby be limited to the chorus of "yeas," which, as many Members feel, is unbecoming to the greatest political forum in the world. I had no other alternative but to object.

Members of the House who were directly concerned with the pending resolutions on the Berlin crisis adjusted their

differences of opinion, with the constructive assistance and helpful leadership of the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A revised resolution was prepared and printed as a committee print and readied for consideration by the House. That revised resolution was scheduled to come before the House on August 7. Members of Congress will recall that many had to adjust their plans to be present on that date, feeling that the matter at issue was serious and that it was vitally important for Congress to register its meaningful support for the firm position taken by President Kennedy. It was a matter of great disappointment to the membership of the House when consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 351, as revised, was removed from the calendar and the House failed to take action in support of President Kennedy. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Members who worked out the revised resolution with him bear no responsibility for the failure of the House to act on this issue.

It is significant to note that President Kennedy, in his address before the General Assembly of the United Nations, gave spirited proof of his intention to press the case of self-determination as the mediator in the disputes between the Russians and the West. He again challenged the Russians to apply this principle to the unresolved issues. He went further than the position taken in his reply to the Russian aide memoire when he warned the Russians "that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire." This warning urged the Russians to give up their empire of force, terror, and despotism before the tidal wave of nationalism, that is, the powerful wave of national independence, shatters it and the Russian nation along with it. Then he went a step further and put this political challenge before the entire membership of the United Nations:

> Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe.

Let there be no doubts that President Kennedy has entered the international political arena or that he intends to dominate the central issue of "politics and people" in that arena. It is time that Members of Congress were given the opportunity to stand up and be counted on this issue. I regret that the House adjourned without giving the Members this opportunity. The full voice of Congress is yet to be heard on this vital question of the day.

Tito: A Case of Western Disillusionment and Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Conference of so-called uncommitted nations held at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, a few weeks ago produced far-reaching results of a positive nature for the cause of freemen. These positive results were a fortunate accident of the Conference. In no sense were they contemplated by all those attending the Conference. They were forced upon the participants in that affair through the resumption of nuclear weapons tests by the Russians. Exposure of the Russian nuclear weapons tests by the United States on the day the so-called uncommitted nations opened their meeting produced a unique situation in which solid judgments on the real character and fixed intentions of the participants could be made.

We must never forget, nor allow the peoples of the free world community to forget, that those who gathered at Belgrade have long claimed detachment from either the cause of the Western World or the camp of the Russian Communist bloc. Most of the characters in the Belgrade comedy had taken special precautions to avoid too much public identity with the ideals of either side in the struggle between freedom and slavery. Some took great public pride in choosing the course of "positive neutrality," while never explaining what they meant by "positive," preferring to stir up speculation and indeed false hopes among the gullible in the free world community. The third Russian-provoked crisis on Berlin, with its built-in implications of nuclear war stimulated by Moscow, was put forth as the justification for the gathering of the so-called uncommitted at Belgrade. As the self-proclaimed third force in world affairs they claimed custody of a moral force which was to be exercised to save the world from nuclear disaster.

Many years of propaganda effort were expended to create this image of the third force. Tito was a leader in this propaganda effort. He and his agents had labored patiently and persistently throughout south and southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa to establish this image. And the United States, by virtue of our self-delusion about Titoism and our extravagant economic and military assistance handouts to maintain Tito in power, must share the guilt for Tito's success. For Tito had succeeded in luring many of the newly independent nations into his Russian beartrap. Tito was the first to learn the technique of sailing along on cloud nine of the cold war; that is, appearing to be free from control of the Russian totalitarian bloc while at the same time appearing uncertain as to where his sympathies in the cold war should be anchored. The cloud nine techniques employed by Tito had won him an enviable stature among the international opportunists and he had no trouble in recruiting students avidly interested in learning the skills involved. When Tito called for a special meeting of his class at Belgrade his most adept students lost no time packing their propaganda bags and heading for their final exams in Titoland. This was to be the culmination of some 10 years of Tito's labors. He had every right to test the fruits of his labors. His Russian friends had prepared the favorable climate of world opinion for Tito to make the supreme test of his labors.

This was the background of political realism for the Belgrade Conference. This is the only reliable background against which valid judgments can be made of the individual participants and the overall results obtained.

It is a curious phenomenon which finds much of the free press shocked at the behavior of most of the participants at Belgrade when news of the Russian resumption of nuclear weapons tests burst over the Conference. This phenomenon has dangerous implications. It suggests that the cause represented at Belgrade was honest, that the concerns of those gathered were legitimate and that the so-called uncommitted were not handmade pawns of Moscow. A continuation of this self-delusion by responsible elements in the free world community portends total victory for the Russian drive of world conquest. A people who cannot distinguish friend from foe and who place any part of their future in the hands of professional blackmailers have no chance of survival in the ideological storm which grips the world. The Belgrade Conference exposed the intractable foes of the United States with a sharpness which reasonable men can no longer ignore. The blackmailers were marked with an indelible stamp that no amount of camouflage can disguise. And the weak and timid were marked for what they are—unreliable in situations requiring honesty and raw courage. The moral force which the chorus of the uncommitted has long claimed turned out to be the "league of immorality" by any standard of measurement.

These results are among the self-evident values of the Belgrade Conference. There are others not so self-evident which are more vital to the interests of the United States and the free world community. Among these are:

First. The bold and skillful manner in which Tito defended the Russian resumption of nuclear weapons test. Tito not only joined with the Russians in their efforts to frighten the free world community into submission, but he provided the escape hatch justification for their behavior. This he did by alleging that Khrushchev was under great pressures from contending forces within the Kremlin aristocracy, causing him to resume such tests. The implications of this allegation were that the refusal of the Western Powers to accept the dictations of Khrushchev on the Berlin crisis left him no other choice but to authorize the test resumptions.

Second. The calm Tito handling of the "unexpected" during the opening day of the Conference suggests that he was well briefed in advance by his Russian comrades and thus well prepared to act out his role as defender of their actions. It is altogether possible that this entire affair was carefully arranged between Tito and Khrushchev as a device to stampede the "uncommitted" nations into the Russian barnyard thus tipping the balance of power so strongly against the West that no other course but concession to Russian demands on Berlin would be open to us. This same technique was used by the Russians in 1957 with the successful launching of the first sputnik. Then the effort was

made to destroy NATO by frightening the European members into a panic of withdrawal from that mutual defense pact. An emergency meeting of the NATO Council to hear a strong appeal from President Eisenhower for unity and calmness was necessary to cushion the severe shocks of that Russian strategic maneuver. The unbridled attacks against the West in general and the United States in particular launched by the majority of those attending the Belgrade sessions, delivered in the immediate wake of the Russian nuclear tests, suggests a well thought out conspiracy against truth and justice. Tito was the key to the execution of that conspiracy and must henceforth be rated on that basis.

Third. The eagerness with which certain elements of the free press lent themselves to advertising the escape hatch Tito set up for Khrushchev indicates a critical need for politically mature news correspondents at international conferences. At face value the Belgrade gathering was calculated well in advance as a device for degrading and weakening the firm position taken by President Kennedy on the Berlin crisis. The only reasonable questions were how much damage the propagandists gathered there could do to us and how much help they could provide the Russians. In the face of the obvious, an American correspondent of one of the news services rushed into the trap and went overboard lending credibility if not substance, to the Tito-Khrushchev shell game. Reportorial imagination typical to writers of wild west novels but entirely out of place in the setting of an international conspiracy, had Khrushchev engaged in a life and death struggle with the Red army leaders, with the Red Chinese assaulting him from the flanks and the peace of the world hanging in the balance. Khrushchev came out of this fiction appearing as a highly motivated hero. Nothing has been done to correct this fraud upon the people so the Russian guilt for resumption of nuclear weapons tests remains blurred.

Fourth. A significant but disconnected story was reported from Tehran, Iran, by the same news service exposing Russian threats of nuclear destruction of Iran unless that nation withdrew from CENTO. These threats were given meaning by the reminder of Russian nuclear tests then taking place just across the common border. This story explains one of the pieces in the complicated pattern of Russian plans connected with her resumption of nuclear tests. Tito is another but much more important piece in this pattern and to judge him otherwise is to refuse to recognize a dangerous enemy.

The reaction of President Kennedy to the outcomes of the Belgrade gathering give high promise that the game of self-deception with respect to Tito will come to a proper close—with Tito excluded from the competitive contest of raiding our public treasury. It is time this game was ended. Tito took us for much more than $2 billion over a 10-year period. The record shows that the more we allowed him to pilfer from us, the harder he kicked us. A change for the better calls for kicking Tito and his henchmen where it will be felt the most—in their grabby and treacherous hands. In bringing this dangerous and costly game to a close, President Kennedy should cause to be written upon the scorecard this warning: "A case of Western disillusionment and defeat."

The Living Death Under Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one slogan current in the free world today reflects the fears of the miserable few who seek to impose their will upon the firm resolutions of the many. To me, this is a classic example of the tail attempting to wag the dog. I refer to the defeatist slogan of "Better Red Than Dead."

The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States have rejected the admission of cowardice and mediocrity expressed by this slogan. The victims of Russian totalitarian aggression know the living death that communism imposes upon all the people wherever it succeeds in taking over the reins of power. Such an organization is the Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Communist Terror in Canada. The members of that association are attempting to communicate to the uninformed and the inexperienced the realities of life under communism. To encourage them in their positive actions, I have sent a letter of greetings to their annual meeting scheduled to take place in Toronto, Canada, next month.

Under leave previously granted I insert my letter in the RECORD:

MR. NICHOLAS PRYCHODKO,
National Chairman, Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Communist Terror (SUZERO), Toronto 18, Ontario, Canada.

DEAR MR. PRYCHODKO: Thank you for your good letter informing me that the 11th Annual Convention of the Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Communist Terror (SUZERO) will convene in Toronto. Please extend to all the members of the association my warm greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting.

The members of the association are well acquainted by personal experience with the terroristic methods employed by the Russians against the peoples in all the nations under their despotic control. Hence, the work they are doing to awaken the peoples of the free world to the stark realities of Russian Communist methods, tactics, and final objectives is of critical importance to the strength of the free world community. There is no substitute for first-hand experience in any field of human relations and your people have the kind of experience with the realities of life under Russian rule which must be communicated to the inexperienced.

I am convinced beyond any doubt that the Russian leaders are now making an all out effort to apply their techniques of terror against entire nations that are now free. They are using their present nuclear weapons tests in an effort to frighten the people of the free world into submitting to their demands on Berlin and East Germany. In the free world we hear the voices of weaklings and cowards shouting "Better Red than Dead"—which means nothing more than surrender. What these cowards fail to understand is that the life under communism which would come with surrender is worse than death—it is a living death. These same weaklings and cowards, if subjected to life under Communist rule, would be the first to welcome death as an angel of mercy. It is time that brave men began shouting "Better dead than Red" because courage and valor have always been the foundations of a free society.

The dedicated, fanatic Communist has been imbued with the idea that he should be prepared to die for the cause of communism. Many of them assume tasks in which death is a constant partner and do so in the belief that should they die their death is "an historical necessity" in order that communism may triumph throughout the world. In the early dawn of democracy, the Christian believers marched to their deaths in the confident realization that their greatest sacrifice would bring to the entire human family that way of life which benefits the dignity of man. From this basic Christian belief, supported by the martyrdom of untold numbers of believers, has come the culture, the values, the ethic and the ideals of western civilization, upon which democracy as we know it is built. Self-government which depends always upon the freely given consent of the governed originates from an understanding and recognition of the dignity man. Communism and all that it implies is the antithesis of these beliefs. This we should never forget. Nor should we forget the martyrdom of the early Christians or the later day Ukrainians as we who are free face the testing crisis of our beliefs.

I commend the work of your association in bringing the truth about communism to your fellow citizens in the Dominion of Canada and again wish all of you the fullest measure of success.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Congressional Record

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time.

The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue.

Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets.

With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
OCT 25 1961
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

E

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1961 No. 175

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-seventh Congress will be published not later than Tuesday, October 17, 1961. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Comments on Accomplishments of 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, my comments on the accomplishments of this 1st session of the 87th Congress for the benefit of my constituents in the great State of Indiana.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 1st session of the 87th Congress was one of activity and action, programs and progress.

It began, of course, as a new administration came to office. But it inherited many serious problems. Unemployment was high; farm income was low and dropping. Businesses were failing faster than in the great depression. The world was aflame. Cuba was Castro's. Laos and Vietnam were threatened. The Congo crisis was boiling. Berlin's coming events cast their shadow.

Against this backdrop of serious and ominous events, Congress and the administration went to work. First things were tackled first.

The hungry were fed and programs to stimulate the economy were enacted. Business was boosted. Credit was eased. Confidence was restored.

Our defenses were given new muscle. Aid for our allies was changed to cut out waste and inefficiency.

The farm problem was attacked with a new program. Congress, with the leadership of the new administration, set to work to build more and better homes, build our water resources, stamp out crime and rebuild our cities and areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

The President's 203 recommendations to Congress for new laws were the highest number in many years. Congress' action in voting 124 of these was also the highest number in years and the highest percentage of performance in years. Yet, Congress did not railroad legislation through nor did it rubberstamp. The budget recommendations for the bookkeeping year which began on July 1 were cut $1,368,993,290.

This was a hard-working Congress, involving long hours in committee and long days in session. Senate committees reported favorably on 1,239 measures, of which 1,133 were passed. We confirmed 4,164 persons for policymaking jobs in the new administration and 48,962 military officers for appointment or promotion.

It was my privilege to work on committees which were among those that contributed heavily to the accomplishments of the 87th Congress. In Finance Committee, we wrote the new social security benefits and new veterans' benefits as well as the new highway financing program. In Commerce, we wrote legislation on piracy in the skies, worked on safer air travel, expanded weather research, provided for exploration of the oceans for navigation, defense and food. In the District of Columbia Committee we made it possible for the people of Washington to vote for President and we attacked the juvenile delinquency problems.

It is, of course, impossible to list all the accomplishments of Congress and how the citizens of Indiana specifically will benefit. I shall, however, list some of the important bills passed and summarize how our State has benefited from some of these laws and from important programs administered by the Federal Government.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

In these days of international crises and threats from the Soviet Union, the most important work in Washington remains our efforts to keep the peace and to insure adequate defenses. There is no question but that our efforts were lagging. Much of the funds provided by Congress during the previous administration were not used. The Polaris submarine program through which we are able to hold nuclear bombs beneath the seas in readiness was one which Congress forced upon a reluctant administration.

This year we voted $6 billion more for defense than the previous administration had asked for. (The budget for the bookkeeping year starting last July 1 was prepared by the outgoing administration and revised by President Kennedy.) This allows doubling the Polaris program, beefs up our missile production, increases our bomber alert and strengthens us for guerrilla-type and other limited warfare such as we may encounter in Berlin. We also gave the President authority to call up reserves and we provided new muscle for the civil defense program.

While we arm for possible war, we cannot overlook the hope that some day we may find the elusive peace we long for. Thus, this Congress provided for creation of a Disarmament Administration, which may eventually be our great hope for permanent peace. We also created a Peace Corps, as requested by the President, to bring American know-how to the underdeveloped countries of the globe. This, too, promotes friendship and peace and will help other nations help themselves to achieve what we have been able to under freedom. Unless the downtrodden countries and peoples of the world find prosperity and security under freedom, they will experiment with communism.

This, too, is the essence of the Alliance for Progress, the modern "good neighbor" program for Central and South America which holds great hope for maintaining freedom in our hemisphere.

I look forward to the day when foreign aid will stop. Twice, as a delegate to the NATO meetings, I have told delegates from other nations that the burden of foreign aid is something that others should share

with us and that the burden on American taxpayers must be lightened. The new administration is now trying, through long-term commitments and reorganization, to end waste and inefficiency. Congress has supported their efforts. These new concepts were backed in the Senate by 78 percent of the Democrats and 65 percent of the Republicans.

It is important to note that the foreign aid program does not cost American jobs. Actually it makes jobs for U.S. workers. Most of the foreign aid funds are spent here in the United States to buy goods made by U.S. workers. About three-fourths of aid funds have been spent in the United States—it is expected to reach 80 percent soon—and a recent study showed that it is responsible for 600,000 American jobs. By promoting prosperity of countries abroad, the aid program results in an enormous expansion of U.S. export markets, thus creating more job opportunities for American workers.

The total moneys proposed for all foreign aid programs is less than two-thirds of what America spends on tobacco every year and about half of America's expenditure for liquor.

I hope that my constituents thus are not misled into believing then, that foreign aid does not bolster our economy at home. The program helps as as much as it assists our neighbors abroad.

Further it should be emphasized that not one church denomination, to my knowledge, voiced a dissenting opinion on the administration's proposed foreign aid program. The churches viewed the foreign aid program, as an act of "doing unto others as one would have others do unto them."

In Indiana, a total of $1,101,289 was spent under the mutual security program—the so-called foreign aid—the 17th highest in the Nation—for freight and commodities of Hoosier products, for the fiscal year of 1960.

The following Indiana firms and cities which benefited under this program are: Cummins Engine Co., Inc., Columbus, $43,-143; Roots-Connversville Blower Division, Connersville, $4,122; Mead-Johnson & Co., Evansville, $57,646; Admiral Products, $1,-338; McClumpha Overseas, Inc., $77,970; Symington Wayne Corp., $4,924; Utility Products Co., $6,861; World Bestos, $4,880 (all Fort Wayne); Diamond Chain Co., Inc., $107,453; General Grain Inc., $128,676; Eli Lilly & Co., $50,145; P. R. Mallory & Co., Inc., $1,856 (all Indianapolis); Joy Manufacturing Co., $103,746, Michigan City; South Bend Lathe Works, $1,615; and Studebaker-Packard Corp., $506,915, South Bend.

It is interesting to note also that from January 1954 until the beginning of this fiscal year, Indiana realiz over $11 million in the foreign-aid program. I personally voted also to prevent any aid from going into the hands of Communist countries. I am pleased to see that President Kennedy has taken action against some satellites and so-called neutrals since Congress has adjourned.

FOREIGN TRADE

When we began our session last January, America faced a serious drain on gold reserves. It was a real danger to the value of our money. This has been reversed by various means. Congress itself took several effective steps to stop this dangerous trend.

We passed certain incentives for foreign banks so that they would not insist on payments in gold. We reduced exemptions on goods America can import. We created an Office of International Travel to encourage travel by foreigners in this country. This last is a move taken by the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member. One-third of our gold drain was because we had more of our people traveling abroad and spending our money than there were foreign visitors to this country spending their money.

One bill which gained too little attention was the oceanography measure, on which I worked in the Commerce Committee. The Russians were getting far ahead of us in charting the ocean floor. This is important to navigation, to defense and to commercial fishermen. The new law will help us catch up.

ANTIRECESSION MEASURES

Now that unemployment is falling and business is better, it is easy to forget the plight of the Nation's economy just a year ago. In the outgoing administration, there were jokes, but little action against this rising and dangerous tide.

Soon after we began this session, we took immediate steps to combat the recession. We passed a bill giving temporary extension of jobless benefits to more than 600,000 persons who had exhausted their benefits. We voted aid to dependent children whose jobless fathers were unable to support them. And we voted special loans and grants to communities which had high unemployment and few job opportunities over a period of many months and years.

Eleven of Indiana's 92 counties—containing about 400,000 Hoosiers—are eligible for help in getting over their own local recessions. These are Clark, Crawford, Henry, Harrison, Monroe, Ohio, Orange, Perry, Ripley, Switzerland, and Vanderburgh Counties.

GETTING MOVING AGAIN

To get the country moving forward again, this Congress worked in many fields.

The greatest impact is being felt in the improvement we made in the minimum wage. We increased coverage for the first time since 1938, bringing in about 150,000 Hoosiers not previously covered. And we provided for raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour in two steps, providing a new minimum for more than a million Hoosier workers.

Over the next few months, great impact also will be felt in the new Housing Act. It will give low-cost housing to 100,000 low-income families. It will allow hundreds of thousands of middle-income families to own their own homes. Thousands have already found that lower downpayments and extended periods of credit make it easier than ever to build or buy.

This year, the Housing Act has taken into consideration the commuting problems of big-city people and provides help for better public transportation. It also provides improved help to cities for community facilities such as sewers and other projects. This new law also has wisely provided for holding and developing future park and playground land as cities expand

In our State, 170,000 homes were financed through FHA-insured loans. More than 10,500 apartments were built with FHA-guaranteed mortgages and more than 800,000 FHA home improvement loans had been used. These all will be speeded up and expanded.

The public housing provisions, which will aid the low-income families, will help Indiana greatly because of the backlog of plans for such units throughout our State. There are 4,600 apartments in 28 low-rent projects in Indiana now. There are 205 more under construction and 1,250 in planning stages, indicating the demand and the need.

Such housing is now being constructed in Indiana in New Albany, South Bend, Mishawaka, Evansville, Michigan City, and Terre Haute. We are pleased to have assisted these communities in pushing their programs forward.

Connected with the housing program is urban renewal—slum clearance. This is an effective Federal-State-private enterprise program to rebuild blighted areas. A dozen Indiana communities are engaged in this work now, with 14 projects going. Eventually, these will cost $162 million, of which $125 million will be in private enterprise funds. Newest projects are in Anderson, Bloomington, Fort Wayne, Kingsford Heights, La Porte, Marion, Michigan City, and Mishawaka.

Eight Indiana communities have borrowed interest-free funds to build needed community facilities. Up to now, these loans have been concentrated in major cities. The new law concentrates on those cities under 50,000 that need such planning help before they can float bond issues and begin work. This year we have worked with Terre Haute and New Albany on such projects. In New Albany they are building a needed hospital and in Terre Haute a much-needed sewer.

The Housing Act also assists colleges and universities in building dormitories to meet their expanded needs. Thirty such projects have been OK'd for our State with Hoosier colleges and universities borrowing $40 million. In these days of necessary higher education, this contribution cannot be over emphasized. Five Indiana schools during the past year availed themselves of these low-interest loans: Ball State, Muncie; Indiana State, Terre Haute (twice); St. Francis, Fort Wayne; Oakland City, and Notre Dame. They borrowed more than $8 million.

Eleven projects are underway in Indiana to provide housing for the elderly under various Federal programs.

The importance of the work of Congress this year in the field of agriculture cannot be overemphasized. The problem inherited at the beginning of this year was peculiar; food prices were going up and the farmers' income was dropping to depression levels.

We passed an emergency feed grains program and a new farm program. Farm income is now up and rising. It is estimated that total farm income is up $1 billion a year over last year. Yet, surpluses are being cut so that the taxpayer will save $800 million a year in storage costs alone. Two billion dollars worth of surpluses were taken to feed the hungry here and in friendly oversea countries. Some surpluses were sold to make up for production from land that had been taken out of production with proceeds from these sales going to farmers to make up for the food they did not sell from the lands they did not plant. Meanwhile, the housewife is finding that food prices have not increased.

WATER RESOURCES

The long-term value of our water resources and the value in developing them and controlling them cannot be stressed too much. Business, industry, and human life depend upon safe and adequate supplies of water. Yet, millions of dollars worth of damage occurs every year because of uncontrolled water. On the one hand, we find our water supplies polluted or dwindling. On the other, we find life and property damaged because of uncontrolled water. A stream which in summer may be so dry as to constitute a water supply problem and create a health menace, may in spring constitute a direct threat to homes and business and lives and may wash away tons of valuable top soil because there is too much water.

For many years Indiana was left behind on water resource protection and development. We are, at last, beginning to get somewhere near our share. And we are beginning, at last, to solve the problems.

I am the author of the Wabash Basin Interagency bill, which has passed the Senate and is now pending action by the House. This would give us the tools we need for development and protection of the Wabash Valley, which is 70 percent of Indiana. Passage of this bill is one of the key water resource measures listed by the Senate leadership.

I am equally proud of our work in obtaining needed funds for water projects in Indiana, especially since several of them were added in the Senate. During the current bookkeeping year construction will go for-

ward on the following flood control projects: Monroe, Mississinewa, and Salamonie Reservoirs and Niblack, West Terre Haute, Evansville, and Unite No. 5 levees. The Huntington Reservoir will be brought to the stage where it is ready for building.

Planning of the Uniontown locks and dam on the Ohio will be completed this year and construction of the following navigation projects will go forward: Markland, McAlpine, and Cannelton Dams on the Ohio, and Indiana Harbor and Calumet Harbors on Lake Michigan. In addition, work continues on the Calumet Harbor breakwater.

The following studies are being financed through the Corps of Engineers for possible future projects: Gary Small Peat Harbor, Great Lakes Water Level, Kankakee River (including the Yellow River near Plymouth), Little Calumet, Maumee Basin, Ohio Basin, Wabash Basin (including Vermillion River, Wolf Creek, Sugar Creek, Big Pine Creek, and Wildcat Creek), Whitewater River Basin, Oil Creek, Pigeon Creek, and the White River Basin including Monroe Reservoir, Salt Creek, East Fork of the Muscatatuck River, Big Graham Creek, Big Camp Creek, Sand Creek, Clifty Creek, Flat Rock Creek, Blue River, Indian Creek, Deer Creek, Beanblossom Creek, Richland Creek, Guthrie Creek, and Walnut Creek.

Watershed projects, which were approved this year under our Agriculture Department program are the middle fork of the Anderson River and French Lick Creek.

Congress has also provided for research funds with which to seek a breakthrough in finding ways to convert sea water into fresh water.

We also provided a 5-year program for helping local communities solve pollution problems. When a stream or a lake is polluted, the damage extends to many other communities, perhaps in other States. Therefore, there has been great need for Federal direction and assistance.

The backlog of communities who want to participate to end pollution and insure pure water supplies is lengthy. Dozens are waiting in Indiana alone for assistance in this field. The new law will help them. The State will receive $112,900 a year for administration of the new program instead of $63,100 up to now. A community in Indiana which was formerly limited to $250,000 in Federal grant money can now get up to $600,000 and several communities can pool their efforts to qualify for up to $2,400,000. Construction grants are also increased and this year Indiana communities will share in $1,673,480 worth of grants.

Grants were made this year for sewage treatment plants to: Andrews, Fortville, Marion, Nappanee, Nashville, Waterloo, Yorktown, and Zionsville.

SENIOR CITIZENS AND THE HANDICAPPED

In addition to the housing assistance for the elderly, this Congress made substantial progress in the social security field in assisting the ill, the handicapped, and the aged.

I am particularly proud that my efforts to provide for optional retirement of men at age 62 bore fruit. This provision was adopted. In addition, the social security law benefits were increased for those drawing the minimum amounts. It is estimated that 136,000 people in Indiana will receive $23.7 million in additional benefits through these changes which we first ratified in Finance Committee.

Restrictions also have been eased for eligibility for benefits and the pension paid to aged widows was raised.

My amendment to allow retired persons to earn more in part-time employment was adopted. I am hopeful that my bills to assist the blind in gaining greater benefit also will be adopted early next session. The Senate also took action to aid schools for the handicapped. Among those which will benefit is the Indiana School for the Deaf.

EFFORTS FOR HOOSIER BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

In March of this year, I sponsored the first Washington Conference of Business and Local Government. Mayors, county officials, chamber of commerce executives and businessmen throughout the State attended. This one-day meeting brought these Hoosiers, representing virtually every community in the State except rural centers, together with representatives of Federal Government agencies.

These agency representatives were on hand to assist in coordination of efforts for such projects as stream pollution control, airport construction and rebuilding of depressed areas. But they were also on hand to help in business and industry problems in such fields as Small Business Administration and aid in selling products to the Government and to foreign countries.

The conference was so successful other Senators began holding similar meetings.

We have worked very closely with representatives of individual businesses and industries in an effort to help them. Sometimes this meant assisting them in appointment with Defense officials; sometimes this meant work with Small Business Administration; sometimes with such agencies as General Services Administration, the Federal Government's purchasing and building agency.

The success of such Hoosier industries as Magnavox, International Harvester, Allison, Avco, Bendix, Studebaker and many smaller ones attests to our hard work. Through our efforts we have brought electronics, automotive, missile, truck, jet and other production dollars to our State. In the bookkeeping year just ended, Indiana received $353,202,000 worth of military contracts—1.6 percent of the total. This was better than previously, but not as much as our fair share. Recently awarded contracts, among them the Typhon missile system, sonobuoy work, radios and vehicle production should raise this during the current bookkeeping year.

Because of my position with the Finance Committee, I am often called upon to work with business and industry on taxation problems. In this session of Congress, my amendment on taxation of the clay products industry was adopted. The clay industry people have stated that my amendment has saved many Hoosier businesses in this field from bankruptcy.

My efforts have been equally diligent on behalf of the coal industry and the oil producers. In this connection, I have met with the Secretary of the Interior in connection with control of imports of residual oil which competes with domestic oil and coal production. I strongly supported a resolution directing a national fuel policy study, now being undertaken that should aid Indiana.

Some three dozen outstanding professors at Indiana colleges and universities have agreed to work with me as a sort of advisory group. After this group was organized, we had a highly successful meeting in Indianapolis with representatives of nearly all Indiana institutions of higher learning. The professors work with us in analyzing legislation and problems and in suggesting remedies.

Our office maintains close working arrangements with various groups representing all segments of Hoosier economy.

VETERANS

As a member of the Finance Committee, I have worked hard for better legislation for veterans. We had moderate success with GI bill for cold war veterans. Congress did pass extensions of home loan guarantees and direct loan programs for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. These programs are brought in line with present-day costs and with the new and better FHA housing program. The direct loans, for instance, now may go as high as $15,000.

As an indication of the desirability of these programs, Indiana veterans have used 108,450 guaranteed loans and 6,396 direct loans since the beginning of the VA programs. Total value of these loans is $815,866,531.

Further, I have introduced legislation (S. 468) which would provide veterans of World War I a $100 monthly pension. This bill is pending before the Finance Committee, and I shall work toward this goal.

TRANSPORTATION

Congress this year made several important strides in the transportation field. Financing of the Interstate Highway System was revised and the whole building program revamped. I only regret that I was unable to have my own amendment adopted that would have resulted in earlier completion of the System without disturbing the solvency of the program.

The 1961 act allots funds for interstate construction from 1963 through 1966. Indiana will receive $59,273,700 for this kind of highways in 1963. Additional funds will be available from later allocations.

During the fiscal year just ended Indiana received $51,798,132 in Interstate Highway System funds. In addition, more than $31 million was assigned for other Federal-State highway programs.

We on the Commerce Committee were shocked to learn that hijacking of airplanes was not a Federal offense. Since it is difficult to decide exactly in what State a crime of this kind occurs on a fast jet and since piracy is a crime which Congress can punish, we worked out a series of laws covering this kind of offense. It seems to have had the desired effect in that hijacking has stopped.

This year we also authorized a 5-year program for construction and modernization of airports. The new program will mean additional funds for Indiana communities which will be matched locally for safer and better airports.

In the fiscal year just ended, Indiana cities received $2,301,220 in Federal funds for airport construction. Cities which shared in these funds are: Bloomington, Elkhart, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Goshen, Indianapolis, Marion, Muncie, South Bend, and Valparaiso.

HEALTH PROGRAMS

Congress this year provided $50 million for each of the next 5 years for Federal-State programs to help care for the chronically ill and aged. We also provided $10 million a year for grants to colleges and universities to improve health services and care for these people.

The Hill-Burton Act through which many communities are able to begin hospital construction or expansion was extended. This has been an important law for our Indiana cities. During the past year, for instance, the following hospital construction was helped in our State: Auburn, DeKalb Memorial Hospital; Oaklawn Psychiatric Rehabilitation Center, Elkhart; Good Samaritan Home, Evansville; Parl View Memorial Hospital, Fort Wayne; McCray Memorial Hospital, Kendallville; White County Memorial Hospital, Monticello; Memorial Hospital and Nursing Home, New Albany; Henry County Hospital, New Castle; Porter Memorial Hospital, Valparaiso; and Pulaski Memorial Hospital, Winamac.

Many of these grants were arranged through our office.

OTHER HOOSIER CONSTRUCTION

During the year just ended, military construction in the State of Indiana totaled $2,848,000 other than for public works projects such as flood control and navigation. During the current year, Indiana has been allocated $2,310,000 for similar construction.

In the money year just closed, Bunker Hill Air Force Base received $1,777,000 for con-

struction. The National Guard built armories at Jasper, Richmond and Scottsburg; the Army Reserve built training centers at Lafayette and Rushville, and the Air Force Reserve built new facilities at Bakalar Air Force Base, Columbus.

In the current year, Bunker Hill will have $411,000 worth of new work done. Armories are to be built for the National Guard at Bedford, Monticello and North Vernon. Terre Haute is to receive money for work on an Army Reserve Center and large sums are to be spent on Baer Field, Fort Wayne, and Hulman Field, Terre Haute, for the Air National Guard.

Jefferson Proving Ground, Madison, and Indiana Arsenal, Charlestown, are being reactivated for the present emergency and work at Crane Naval Ammunition Depot is being stepped up.

Post office construction work also has come to our State.

New post offices have been built or are being built this year for the following: Bruceville, Pittsboro, Poseyville, Selma, Shipshewana, North Terre Haute, Waveland, Fulton, Millersburg, Centerpoint, Lucerne, Paragon, Rockport, Russellville, Anderson, Jonesboro, Otterbein, Zionsville, Griffith, Jasonville, Kimmell, Richville, Clarke Hill, Hanna, Harlan, Burlington, Harmony, Hillsboro, Stockwell, Miller (Gary), Lynnville, Stilesville, Dublin, Losantsville, Lynn, Madison, Oakland City, and Williamsport. Major remodeling has been done at the Irving Station of Indianapolis.

The Senate also has confirmed new postmasters for Boonville, Carthage, Edinburg, Fowler, Gosport, Lanesville, Loogootee, Marshall, Spencer, Springport, Tangier, Tippecanoe, Union City, Universal, Wabash, and Williamsport.

The most notable success was at Portage, the new town in Porter County. Originally, it was decided not to create a separate post office to serve this community which includes the proposed new port and which includes the new Midwest Steel mill. We were able to have a post office designated for this community and I was present for the dedication of the new building in September.

EDUCATION

One of the important controversies in the 87th Congress has been how much Federal aid there should be for education. The issue of whether there should be any Federal aid was decided long ago when loans were authorized for institutions of higher learning and when direct aid for communities with large number of children of Federal workers was voted.

There followed the National Defense Education Act which set up new programs to aid needy and worthy college students. This act was passed after the Russians launched their first space vehicle, and it became apparent that the United States was behind in science and technology.

In addition, the principle of aid to schools and schoolchildren through the hot lunch program is well established.

Because of the large number of public schools in Indiana which share in the aid for areas with substantial enrollments of children of Federal workers—the so-called impacted areas—I polled trustees and school superintendents in these areas. I asked them to state whether they needed such aid and whether such aid has resulted in any Federal domination whatever. These trustees and superintendents unanimously reported a need and no Federal interference whatever.

Here is a list of Indiana school corporations which received impacted area aid in the bookkeeping year just ended:

O-Madison Townships, Odon; Holt Township, St. Bernice; Perry Township, Loogootee; City of Loogootee; City of Clinton; Shoals Community Schools; Charlestown Metropolitan School District; Rockville Consolidated Schools; Clinton School Township, Clinton; School Town of Edinburg; Vermillion Township, Newport; Washington Township, LaPorte; Highland Township, Perrysville; Rutherford Township, Shoals; City of Franklin; Silver Creek Township, Sellersburg; Elnora Township, Elnora; Monroe Township, Henryville; Reeve Township, Cannelburg; Jeffersonville Township, Jeffersonville; Van Buren Township, Odon, Utica Township, Jeffersonville, Lawrence Township Metropolitan District, Indianapolis; City of Jeffersonville; Washington Township, Nabb; Barr Township, Montgomery; Blue River-Jackson-Spencer Townships, Gorydon; Jennings Township, English; Town of Clarksville; Madison Consolidated, Madison; Pipe Creek Township, Peru; Peru Township, Peru, Washington Township, Peru; Steels Township, Plainville; Washington Township, Washington; Jasonville; Town of Vevay; Worthington-Jefferson Consolidated, Worthington; City of Peru; Jackson Township, Logansport; Mooresville Consolidated, Mooresville; Tipton Township, Logansport; Lincoln Township, Danville; Linton-Stockton Schools, Linton, Washington Township, Danville, South Central Corporation, Corydon; Butler Township, Peru, Deer Creek Township, Peru, Bean Blossom Township, Stinesville; City of Bedford; Indian Creek Township, Bedford; Marion Township, Mitchell; Marshall Township, Avoca; Perry Township, Springville; Shanswick Township, Bedford; Van Buren Township, Bloomington, Washington Township, Bloomington; Eminence Consolidated, Monrovia; Martinsville Metropolitan; Monroe Township, Monrovia; Warren Township Metropolitan, Indianapolis, Decatur Township; Indianapolis; Vigo Township, Bicknell; Franklin Township, Roachdale; Washington Township, Greencastle; Clay Township Metropolitan, Carmel; York Township, Vevay.

City of Greenfield, Delaware Township, Fishers; Patriot-Posey District, Patriot; Central School District, Switz City; Washington-Stafford Consolidated, Lyons; Rising Sun-Ohio County Consolidated, Rising Sun; White River Township, Greenwood; Franklin Township, Marion; Center Township, Marion; Monroe Township, Marion; Jefferson Township, Upland; Eastern District, Owensburg; Pleasant Township, Whiteland; Mississinewa Joint Schools, Gas City; Jefferson-Craig Consolidated, Vevay; Sims Township, Swayssee, Van Buren Township, Van Buren; City of Greenwood; Fairmount Township, Fairmount; town of Fairmount; city of Marion; Central District, Maxwell; Vernon Township, Fortville; Taylor Township, Kokomo; Bloomfield District, Bloomfield; Hobart Township, Hobart; Eugene Township, Gayuga; Owen Township, Charlestown; Spice Valley Township, Huren; Southwestern Jefferson County, Hanover; Sunman Consolidated, Sunman; City of Aurora; Milan Consolidated, Milan; Kelso Township, Lawrenceburg; Metamora Township, Metamora; Manchester Township, Lawrenceburg; Moores Hill District, Lawrenceburg; Miller-Logan-Harrison District, Lawrenceburg; Miller-York District, Lawrenceburg, Linton Township, Terre Haute, Dillsboro School-Clay Township, Lawrenceburg.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In the session just ended, I was successful in passage of legislation which has given Indiana two new Federal judgeships. These will be of tremendous value in cutting down a huge backlog of cases pending. Justice has been denied in the Federal courts because of long delays due to overcrowded dockets.

We have legislation pending on many other matters, most of them of direct interest to Hoosiers. I look forward, for instance, to favorable action on a bill which should lead to the freeing of the New Harmony Bridge from tolls since more than enough money has been collected to pay for the construction and maintenance. I look forward also to action on several bills creating national parks in our State.

The best known of the park proposals is the one in the dunes area. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, some time ago offered a bill to create a huge Dunes National Monument. At first Senator DOUGLAS proposed to bar building of a deep water port that would accommodate seagoing vessels and would also bar the building of steel mills by Midwest and Bethlehem. Midwest has since built. Senator DOUGLAS then offered a bill to allow the port to be built, but to ban Bethlehem. He has offered still another bill, now pending, which would prevent the port and the other steel mill from being built, setting up a large national monument covering much of Indiana's Lake Michigan shoreline.

My position has consistently been that industry and recreation can be brought together on the shoreline and that dunes of historical value can be preserved. I have a bill pending which would divide this duneland, in effect, into two areas. The western part, adjoining Lake County, would be used for industrial and port development. The eastern part, adjoining LaPorte County, would be used for the national monument. Interior Secretary Udall has indicated sympathy with my approach which provides for conservation, recreation and industry.

I am working hard also for establishment of a Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in Spencer County, a Lincoln Parkway connecting the birthplace of President Lincoln in Kentucky with his boyhood home in Indiana and his adult home in Illinois and for a historical park at the site of Angel Mounds in Vanderburgh County. My bill for the Lincoln boyhood park has passed the Senate and we expect to clear remaining legislative hurdles early next year.

I intend to press my efforts to develop tourist trade for Indiana in this fashion. I also expect to press for canalization of the Wabash and for adequate flood control for our State.

In the field of national legislation, I am the author of a bill which would straighten out the allocation of radio and television channels. I am continuing to pursue my efforts for more freedom of information through less restrictive news coverage by radio and television.

OTHER SERVICES

My office in Washington is a Hoosier headquarters. We receive an average of 275 phone calls a day, most of them from Indiana. We have had nearly 6,000 visitors during the past year, most of them from home. This past spring, 95 Indiana high schools had students on Washington trips who called on us.

From January 1, 1961, to September 30, 1961, we received 45,938 letters and mailed out 50,678 letters. Most of this mail concerns legislation and problems arising from legislation. But we perform a variety of services for Hoosiers. For instance, we had about 300 inquiries from people from Indiana who work for the Federal Government and want assistance with something pertaining to their jobs.

The defense buildup has resulted in a great number of service and veteran problems. Since January 1, we have handled 709 of these problems, with the number growing daily. We assisted 261 Hoosiers with social security problems, 27 with draft board problems, 18 with railroad retirements, and 711 persons who sought patronage employment.

I have helped also with 61 immigration cases who could be helped within the framework of present laws. Fifteen private immigration bills were introduced to assist those people who were worthy and who could not be helped through existing legislation. Many of these have united families who had been apart for years through circumstances beyond their control. One example is that of Krste Angeloff, of Yugoslavia. He is the

adopted son of Mrs. Miles Angeloff, of Gary. He had been waiting 10 years to come to this country. During this time, Mr. Angeloff died and this further complicated the case. Krste was reunited with his family this year through our work. A similar bill united Mice Delich with his grandfather, Eli Belich in Terre Haute.

CONCLUSION

It is my sincere conviction that I am in Washington to serve. There are many ways for serving my State and my country. I feel we fight communism and work for the inevitable triumph of freedom by making America a better place in which to live and by helping other freedom-loving people. I feel that a strong and prosperous America which can be an example to the world is our strongest bulwark against enslavement.

The people who have sent me to Washington have asked me, in effect, to work hard, to study and to deliberate on the great issues of the day, to vote with sincerity and devotion and dedication to ideals, to assist my constituents, to consider the best interests of the State and Nation and to see that Hoosiers receive their fair share of bounty and assistance in solving their problems. I believe I am doing this. I welcome comments and suggestions from constituents.

Interim Report of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, for the 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the following interim report on the activities of the Committee on Government Operations in the first 9 months of the 87th Congress:

INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOR THE 1ST SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction and duties of the Committee on Government Operations are set forth in rule XI(8) of the House of Representatives.

Under this rule, all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to (a) budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations, and (b) reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government shall be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The rule also assigns to the Committee on Government Operations the duty of (1) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports; (2) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency; (3) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government; (4) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

ORGANIZATION

In order to perform its functions and to carry out its duties as fully and as effectively as possible, the committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, established five regular subcommittees, which cover the entire field of executive expenditures and operations. The names and chairmen of these subcommittees are as follows:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman.

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman.

In addition, four special subcommittees were organized to handle special problems:

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman.

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations approved and submitted to the Congress 11 reports of an investigative nature. At the close of the first session, a number of reports were in preparation and a number of investigations were underway. These will be considered by the subcommittees and the full committee early in the second session. Several hearings have been planned for the recess period between sessions.

For convenience, the published reports are listed here with the name of the originating subcommittee. A more detailed discussion of the material will be found below in the breakdown of the committee's activities by subcommittee:

First report (H. Rept. No. 184): "Activities Report of the House Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 1st and 2d sessions, 1959–60." (Full committee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman).

Second report (H. Rept. No. 321): "Health Research and Training, the Administration of Grants and Awards by the National Institutes of Health" (Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman). (Additional views filed.)

Third report (H. Rept. No. 324): "Air Force Ballistic Missile Management (Formation of Aerospace Corporation)." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.) (Additional views filed.)

Fourth report (H. Rept. No. 795): "U.S. Aid Operations in Peru." (Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman.)

Fifth report (H. Rept. No. 818): "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Progress of Study, July–December 1960)." (Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.) (Additional views filed.)

Sixth report (H. Rept. No. 1214): "Defensive Materiel Utilization Program." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Seventh report (H. Rept. No. 1215): "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Telephone Monitoring)." (Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.)

Eighth report (H. Rept. No. 1241): "Consumer Protection Activities of Federal Departments and Agencies." (Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.)

Ninth report (H. Rept. No. 1249: "New Civil Defense Program." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Tenth report (H. Rept. No. 1250): "Cambodian Port Highway: A Supplemental Report." (Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.) (Additional views filed.)

Eleventh report (H. Rept. No. 1257): "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Progress of Study, January–August 1961)." (Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. Moss, chairman.) (Additional views filed.)

COMMITTEE PRINT

"Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas (Suggested Action by Local, State, and National Governments)." A report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

LEGISLATION

The legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations covers a wide range of important governmental operations. It includes all matters relating to budgeting and accounting measures other than appropriations and all matters relating to reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government. Moreover, by precedent, property disposals and other matters involving the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act are referred to the committee.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the committee studied 176 bills and resolutions referred to it and reported 17 to the House. These are discussed more fully under the subcommittee breakdown below. However, those reported are listed here for convenience, with the name of the subcommittee which initially considered them:

H.R. 3279, to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 341; Public Law 87–139.)

H.R. 5742 (S. 153), to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 195; Public Law 87–18.)

H.R. 6094, to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 325; Public Law 87–49.)

H.R. 8099, to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the General Supply Fund. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 1217; Public Law 87–372.)

H.R. 8100, to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the General Supply Fund. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 1218.)

H.R. 8429, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and for other purposes. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 1053.)

H.R. 8603, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where competitors submit identical bids to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment, or services, and for other purposes. (Execu-

tive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 989.)

H.R. 8798, to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 1216.)

H. Res. 302, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 509.)

H. Res. 303, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961. (Executive and Legislative Reoragnization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 446.)

H. Res. 304, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3, 1961. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 510.)

H. Res. 305, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 9, 1961. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 511.)

H. Res. 328, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 576.)

S. 537 (H.R. 5294), to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic monmument purposes. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 558; Public Law 87–90.)

S. 539 (H.R. 3259), to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 559; Public Law 87–153.)

S. 540 (H.R. 3260), to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 560; Public Law 87–91.)

S. 796 (H.R. 5096), to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes. (Special Donable Property Subcommittee.) (H. Rept. No. 561; Public Law 87–94.)

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Seven reorganization plans were transmitted to the 87th Congress by the President during the 1st session. In the case of each plan, disapproval resolutions (which would reject the plan and thus preclude its going into effect automatically after 60 days from transmittal) were introduced and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961 (Securities and Exchange Commission). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 285 and House Resolution 302. House Resolution 302 was disapproved by the committee and reported unfavorably to the House, which likewise disapproved the resolution. However, the plan was rejected by the Senate.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961 (Federal Communications Commission). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 286 and House Resolution 303. House Resolution 303 was approved by the committee and reported favorably to the House. The House approved the resolution, thus rejecting the plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 (Civil Aeronautics Board). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 287 and House Resolution 304. The committee disapproved House Resolution 304 and reported it unfavorably to the House, which likewise disapproved the resolution. Not having been rejected by the Senate, the plan went into effect July 3, 1961.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 (Federal Trade Commission). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 288 and House Resolution 305. The committee disapproved House Resolution 305 and reported it unfavorably to the House, which likewise disapproved the resolution. Not having been rejected by the Senate, the plan went into effect July 9, 1961.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 (National Labor Relations Board). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 322 and House Resolution 328. The committee disapproved House Resolution 328 and reported it unfavorably to the House. The House approved House Resolution 328 and thereby rejected the plan.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961 (Federal Home Loan Bank Board). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 335 and House Resolution 337. The committee voted to lay on the table House Resolution 335, which was an action favorable to the plan. A motion to discharge the committee from consideration of the resolution was defeated in the House. Since the Senate took no action to reject the plan, it went into effect on August 12, 1961.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 (providing for reorganization of maritime functions). Hearings were held on disapproval resolutions House Resolution 336 and House Resolution 338. The committee voted to lay on the table House Resolution 336, which was an action favorable to the plan. The House defeated a motion to discharge the committee from consideration of House Resolution 36. Since the Senate took no action to reject the plan, it went into effect on August 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ACTION ON REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Rule XI, clause 8(c)(1) of the rules of the House, imposes the duty upon this committee to receive and examine reports of the Comptroller General referred to it and to make such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of the reports.

In discharging this responsibility all reports of the Comptroller General received by the committee are studied and analyzed by the staff and referred to the subcommittee of this committee to which has been assigned general jurisdiction over the subject matter involved.

The committee has received a total of 128 General Accounting Office audit reports for processing during the 1st session, 87th Congress, inclusive of 15 reports received between the adjournment of the 86th Congress and the convening of the 87th Congress. After preliminary staff study, these reports were referred to subcommittees of this committee, as follows:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	11
Military Operations Subcommittee	52
Government Activities Subcommittee	32
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	18
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	15
Total	128

Periodic reports are received from the subcommittees on the action taken with respect to individual reports, and monthly reports are made to the chairman on the status of all reports received. During the session, the subcommittees used the reports to further specific investigations and reviews. In some cases, additional information concerning the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General was requested and received from the administrative agency involved, as well as from the General Accounting Office. In another section of the committee's annual report dealing with the activities of the various subcommittees, more specific information on the action taken on these reports is included.

The committee maintains complete files of all the Comptroller General's reports received. A record is kept showing the subcommittee to which referred, the date of referral, and the action taken. All the reports received during the session will be reviewed by the committee in the light of additional information obtained and action taken by the subcommittees, and determination will be made whether specific recommendations to the House are necessary or desirable under rule XI.

SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKDOWN

A detailed description of the committee's activities, broken down by subcommittee, is given below. At the chairman's request, the subcommittee reports were prepared in accordance with the following outline:

OUTLINE FOR ANNUAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

I. Investigations:

(a) List investigative reports issued with name of report, date issued and a summary of each.

(b) List and describe other investigations not resulting in a formal report.

(c) Give money savings or recoveries as a result of any investigations, together with the estimated dollar amount of each.

(d) List and describe any other remedial measures taken and any nonmonetary benefits attained as a result of investigations.

(e) The number of days hearings were held.

II. Legislation:

(a) Total number of measures referred to the subcommittee.

(b) Reports issued with title, date and summary of each, and description of subsequent legislative action on reported measures.

(c) Number of days of hearings held.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation:

(a) Number of each received.

(b) Wherever action has been taken, name the report acted on, hearings held, if any; describe the action taken and the resulting monetary and nonmonetary benefits.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest:

(a) The cumulative money savings or recoveries from such prior activities, naming them.

(b) Other action, executive or otherwise, taken on such prior activities resulting in some affirmative benefit.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 87th Congress.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued: None.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. A continuing study of budget and accounting procedures in the Federal Government with special attention to the joint accounting program of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the General Accounting Office.

2. A study of administrative organization, procedures, and practices in the Federal Government. This involves, inter alia, continued analysis of replies to the detailed questionnaire submitted to the agencies by this subcommittee during an earlier Congress. The replies, made into a committee print, have been in great demand by legal scholars and other interested persons.

3. A study of the utilization of advisory committees, experts, and consultants in the executive branch. Congressman DANTE B. FASCELL, representing the subcommittee, conferred with White House officials follow-

ing dispatch of a letter to the President from Chairman DAWSON urging the adoption of standards and procedures contained in a bill in the past Congress reported by the committee and passed by the House but on which no action was taken by the Senate.

4. A study of new regulations issued by the Corps of Engineers following issuance by the committee of a report (H. Rept. No. 1637, 86th Cong.) on an investigation of expenditures for housing construction at the Granite City Engineer Depot in Illinois.

5. A study of the management operations of the Bureau of the Budget based on a critical report of the General Accounting Office.

6. Federal real and personal property inventory report (civilian and military) of the U.S. Government, covering its properties located in the United States, in the territories, and overseas, as of June 30, 1961. This annual inventory undertaking will represent a compilation of assigned values of real and personal property owned or controlled by the Federal Government which is located throughout the world. The report lists estimated present-day evaluations of public domain, Capitol Hill properties, as well as realty previously recorded on the books of the Government at zero value. Zero value properties are those which have been donated to, or obtained by, the Government at no cost.

This inventory report will represent the seventh endeavor by the Committee on Government Operations to record, in a comprehensive and concise manner, assets of the Government. Data for inclusion in the current report are being received and analyzed. The property inventory report is expected to be issued in January 1962 as a committee print.

During August 1961, the committee was advised that the Department of the Interior would serve as a pilot agency to reevaluate its realty holdings so as to show acquisition cost value as well as estimated present-day values. Efforts are being made within the Department, with assistance from other Government departments, to formulate criteria which can be utilized by the Interior Department, and eventually by other departments, in this endeavor. Criteria will be proposed by the Department, after which they will be reviewed by an advisory committee of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers. Final approval of reevaluation formulas will rest with the Committee on Government Operations.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation: No estimate possible at this time.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits: Included in (b) above.

(e) Days of hearings held: None.

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: 81 legislative measures were referred to the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

(b) Reports issued:

1. House Report No. 195 (H.R. 5742) further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963 (Mar. 23, 1961):

This bill, as reported, would revise the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which had lapsed because the 86th Congress had failed to extend its terminal date. Under the bill, a reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress by the President would become effective within the allotted time unless a simple majority of either House votes to disapprove it.

The bill was reported to the full committee and subsequently to the House and was passed. S. 153, a similar measure, was then passed in lieu thereof and became Public Law 87-18 on April 7, 1961.

2. House Report No. 325 (H.R. 6094) amending section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946 (May 1, 1961):

This bill, as reported, was recommended to the Congress by the President and was designed to increase the ceiling on appropriations for salaries which may be granted the Council of Economic Advisers from its present figure to $2 million.

After hearings, the bill was approved by the subcommittee and the full committee, and was subsequently passed by the House. In the Senate the bill was amended to remove the appropriations ceiling, thereby placing no limit on the amount of funds Congress could appropriate to the agency. The House accepted the Senate amendments and the bill became Public Law 87-49 on June 16, 1961.

3. House Report No. 341 (H.R. 3279), travel expenses of Government employees (May 3, 1961):

This bill had as its purpose to amend existing travel expense legislation to increase the maximum per diem rates and mileage allowances for the use of privately owned vehicles for certain civilian employees of the Government, among other purposes. The maximum per diem rates were raised from $12 to $16 per day and the mileage allowance for autos from 10 to 12 cents per mile. Among other things, the bill authorized the payment to employees of parking fees; transferred to the President authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget to establish per diem rates outside the continental United States; and increased the maximum allowance for official travelers authorized to be paid on an actual expense basis.

After hearings, the bill was approved by the subcommittee and the full committee, and was passed by the House. In the Senate it was amended to include certain judicial employees and Senate Members and employees under its provisions. The amendments were accepted by the House and the bill became Public Law 87-139 on August 14, 1961.

4. House Report No. 446 (H. Res. 303), disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961 (Federal Communications Commission) (June 1, 1961):

This resolution represented the sense of the committee that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961 relating to the Federal Communications Commission should not be approved. The plan, among other things, would have authorized the Commission to delegate any of its functions to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner or employees of the Commission, and would have abolished the Commission's mandatory review in cases of adjudication. It also would have transferred to the Chairman the Commission's functions with respect to assignment of Commissioners and commission personnel to perform the delegated functions.

Hearings were held on the plan and resolution by the subcommittee, and background materials and the committee report were prepared in cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The resolution was approved by the House on June 15, 1961, which had the effect of rejecting the plan and preventing it from becoming effective.

5. House Report No. 509 (H. Res. 302) approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961 (Securities and Exchange Commission) (June 12, 1961):

House Resolution 302 proposed that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961 relating to the Securities and Exchange Commission be disapproved. The plan would have authorized the Commission to delegate any of its functions to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, or to employees of the Commission, and would have given the Chairman of the Commission the authority to designate the individual Commissioners or employees who were to perform the delegated functions.

After hearings, the subcommittee referred the Resolution to the full committee with a recommendation that it not be approved. The full committee supported this view and made the same recommendation to the House. The committee report and background materials were prepared in cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The House sustained the position of the committee and rejected the Resolution, thereby approving the plan. Subsequently, however, the Senate, on June 21, voted to disapprove the plan, and it therefore failed to become law.

6. House Report No. 510 (H. Res. 304) approving Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 (Civil Aeronautics Board) (June 12, 1961):

House Resolution 304 proposed that Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 relating to the Civil Aeronautics Board be disapproved. The plan authorizes the Board to delegate any of its functions to a division of the Board, an individual Board member, or to employees of the Board, and gives the Chairman of the Board the authority to designate the individual Board members or employees to perform the delegated functions.

After hearings, the subcommittee referred the resolution to the full committee with a recommendation that it not be approved. The full committee supported this view and made the same recommendation to the House. The committee report and background materials were prepared in cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The House sustained the position of the committee and rejected the resolution, thereby approving the plan. Subsequently, the Senate voted to support the plan, and it therefore became effective on July 3, 1961.

7. House Report No. 511 (H. Res. 305) approving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 (Federal Trade Commission) (June 12, 1961):

House Resolution 305 proposed that Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 relating to the Federal Trade Commission be disapproved. The plan authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to delegate any of its functions to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, or to employees of the Commission and gives to the Chairman the authority to designate the individual Commissioners or employees to perform the delegated functions.

After hearings, the subcommittee referred the resolution to the full committee with a recommendation that it not be approved. The full committee supported this view and made the same recommendation to the House. The committee report and background materials were prepared in cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The House sustained the position of the committee and rejected the resolution, thereby approving the plan. Subsequently, the Senate voted to support the plan, and it therefore became effective on July 9, 1961.

8. House Report No. 576 (H. Res. 328) approving Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 (National Labor Relations Board) (June 26, 1961):

House Resolution 328 had as its purpose the disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 relating to the National Labor Relations Board. The plan would have authorized the National Labor Relations Board to delegate its functions to a division of the Board, an individual Board member, or to employees of the Board.

After hearings, the subcommittee voted to recommend that the committee not favor the resolution, thereby approving the plan. The committee supported the position of the subcommittee and made the recommendation to the House. The Committee report and background materials were prepared in

cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The House subsequently voted in favor of the resolution on July 20, 1961, thereby rejecting the plan and preventing it from becoming effective.

9. House Report No. 989 (H.R. 8603), public information on identical bids to public agencies (Aug. 17, 1961):

This bill would require the making of reports by Federal procurement officers to the Attorney General where identical bids exceeding $10,000 are made in response to an advertisement to bid. Among other things, the bill required a noncollusion affidavit to accompany each bid.

After hearings, a clean bill was introduced and reported to the full committee, and subsequently to the House, where it passed. A committee report and other background materials were prepared by the subcommittee staff. No action to date has been taken by the Senate.

10. House Report No. 1053 (H.R. 8429), establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and for other purposes (Aug. 28, 1961):

This measure was recommended to the Congress by the President and has as its purpose to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would transfer to the Secretary of the new Department the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and several of its constituent branches. The Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Administration would be transferred to the new Department. In addition to the housing functions, the new Secretary would conduct comprehensive studies of problems of housing and urban development, develop and recommend policies, exercise leadership in coordinating Federal activities affecting urban areas, and encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments of community development activities.

After hearings, a clean bill was introduced and reported to the full committee and subsequently to the House. The committee report and other background materials were prepared by the subcommittee staff. The bill was then referred to the Rules Committee, where it is awaiting action.

11. House Report 1216 (H.R. 8798), travel expenses for student trainees when assigned to certain Government positions (Sept. 19, 1961):

This measure was recommended to the Congress by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and authorizes the payment of travel and transportation expenses to certain student trainees who were not included in more comprehensive legislation reported by this committee in the 86th Congress (Public Law 86-587).

The bill was reported favorably to the full committee and subsequently to the House, where it was passed. The Committee report and other background materials were prepared by the subcommittee staff. No action to date has been taken by the Senate.

12. Action taken on House Resolution 335 and House Resolution 336:

In addition to the foregoing, hearings were held on House Resolution 335 relating to Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961, and House Resolution 336 relating to Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 transferred from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to its Chairman certain functions including the appointment and removal of personnel, the distribution of business among such personnel, the overall management, functioning, and organization of the Board. The Chairman, however, is governed by the general policies of the Board in carrying out his functions.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 created a new and fully independent Federal Maritime Commission and transferred to it the functions of the Federal Maritime Board, which was abolished. There were also transferred to the Chairman of the Commission the functions of the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and certain functions of the Secretary of Commerce. The Commission was given authority to delegate its functions to individual Commissioners or employees of the Board. A position of Maritime Administrator was provided for, and the present Maritime Administration was retained within the Department of Commerce. Certain functions of the abolished Federal Maritime Board relating to subsidies were transferred to the Secretary.

Background material was prepared in cooperation with the staff of the full committee. The subcommittee recommended to the full committee that the disapproval resolution on these plans be rejected. The full committee, however, decided to table both disapproval resolutions and make no recommendation to the House. This had the effect of approving the reorganization plans. No report was issued. Subsequently, the House acted upon both resolutions by motions to discharge the committee. By rejecting these motions the House sustained the plans. Since the Senate took no action to disapprove the plans, they both became effective on August 12, 1961.

(c) Twelve days of formal hearings were held during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS CONSIDERED, WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of each received: Eleven audit reports of the General Accounting Office were received.

(b) Action taken:

1. Audit of the Southwestern Power System and related activities, Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, and the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. (See item 3 below.)

2. Audit of selected activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the lower Colorado River Basin for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. (See item 3 below.)

3. Audit on the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities for fiscal year 1960.

With respect to the above three reports, the committee requested the comments of the Department of the Interior on questions and criticisms raised in the reports concerning depreciation accounting, interest during construction, inadequate statements comparing actual with planned repayment, administrative changes in important features of the Collbran project, energy rates charged the Government by the Yuma project, and trespass occupancy of lands along the lower Colorado River. The Department's detailed reply is being used as a basis for further committee inquiry.

4. A report on a general review of current automatic data processing developments in the Federal Government.

A detailed analysis of the report was prepared, and the Bureau of the Budget was asked to comment on a number of aspects of the report. The committee has had considerable correspondence and is maintaining close liaison with the Bureau on integrated long-range planning and coordination of ADP within the Government, as well as on equipment selection and acquisition policies. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, on October 16, 1961, approved a circular to all executive departments and establishments which sets out policies on selection and acquisition of ADP equipment.

5. Audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

The report questioned whether TVA may properly solicit suppliers by telegraph and telephone in lieu of public advertisement and submission of sealed bids in situations which appear not covered by the usual statutory exceptions. The committee has received conflicting legal opinions from the TVA and the Comptroller General. The matter is under active study.

6. Audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1960. No further action contemplated.

7. Audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for fiscal year 1960. Further study being made and comments will be requested from agency.

8. Review of admission and collection practices relating to the hospital and medical care program, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government, January 1960. Further study being made and comments will be requested from agency.

9. Review of selected operations of Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia government. Further study being made and comments will be requested from agency.

10. Review of selected activities of the Bureau of the Budget—Executive Office of the President, fiscal year 1960.

The report identified certain inadequacies in the Bureau of the Budget's program to improve management practices in the executive branch of the Government. In response to this criticism, a detailed review is being made of the records of the Bureau of the Budget pertaining to management survey contracts with private management consultant firms. A staff report on this aspect of the Bureau's management improvement activities will be prepared.

11. Audit of National Capital Housing Authority—fiscal years 1959 and 1960. Further study being made and comments will be requested from agency.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries: No estimate possible at this time.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: See I(b) above.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

1. Study and possible hearings on pending and other legislation to be referred in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

2. Continuation until conclusion of investigations reported in I(b) above.

3. The subcommittee study of the various Hoover Commission reports referred is continuing so that implementation can be pressed wherever efficiencies or economies for the Federal Government are indicated. An investigation is also being made into the advisability of recommending legislation to create another commission to study Government organization.

4. A study of the Government Corporation Control Act along with suggested changes recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

5. The study of scientific research and development, on which one report has been made, will be continued.

6. The study of the functions of the General Accounting Office in Europe is continuing and a check being made on implementation of the committee's recommendations.

7. The investigation into the importation of foreign excess property will be continued with close attention given to the revision of policies and procedures by the Department of Commerce, including the advisability of further legislation.

8. A special study of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial and commercial-type properties owned by the Government will be made with a view toward the recommendation of permanent legislation.

9. The subcommittee will continue its annual compilation of Federal real and personal property.

10. The investigation and study of personnel practices and procedures in the Government departments and agencies, particularly in the Internal Revenue Service, Des Moines, Iowa, and Bureau of Public Debt, Chicago, Ill., will be continued. Specific followup action is being taken on the implementation of the recommendations made by the committee in earlier reports.

11. The study of the advisability of requiring the President's budget to be presented in a manner separating capital investments from operating expenses will be continued.

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued:

1. "Air Force Ballistic Missile Management (Formation of Aerospace Corporation)," third report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 324, May 1, 1961 (58 pages).

This report reviews developments leading to the formation of Aerospace Corporation as the technical manager of Air Force space systems and advanced missile systems. Aerospace, a nonprofit corporation established in California, will direct certain projects formerly handled by Space Technology Laboratories, Inc. (STL), a wholly owned subsidiary of Thompson Ramo Woolridge, Inc. The former Air Force-STL arrangement was critically evaluated by the subcommittee in House Report No. 1121, 86th Congress, 1st session. STL continues to direct and engineer the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman ICBM projects for the Air Force, with diminishing responsibilities as these projects approach the operational stage.

In the report, the committee recommends that the Air Force review the remaining contract functions of STL with a view to closing these out as rapidly as possible, in order to eliminate overlapping layers of technical management. The committee suggests that the Air Force place greater management responsibilities on Aerospace Corporation and the weapon contractors as rapidly as they can assume them.

The committee notes that the Air Force has become the dominant military agency for ballistic missile and space systems and that Aerospace Corporation, with its direction responsibilities, will perform a central role. In the future, Aerospace is expected to build up to about 1,000 scientific and engineering personnel, with possible further growth in the future. The report warns against empire building which might dilute the high quality of the technical staff.

The negotiations which were required in the formation of Aerospace resulted in a transfer of personnel from STL, the purchase by the Air Force of STL's nine-building research and development center at a cost of $23.5 million, and the provision of an advanced payment pool of $5 million for Aerospace working capital.

The report notes that Air Force contract payments to both Aerospace and STL in fiscal year 1961 will be $84 million, compared to a cost of $78 million for STL alone in fiscal year 1960.

The Air Force attributed this increase to the peak workloads in the Minuteman program schedule, and to other added administrative support requirements.

The report reviews other technical resources of the Air Force Systems Command (formerly the Air Reserve and Development Command) and its several associated contract agencies.

The report states that specialized contract agencies such as Aerospace have become important adjuncts of Government efforts in scientific and technical fields associated with the national defense. There are several kinds of opposition to the use of such contract agencies. However, the tendency to use this contract system is bolstered by the increasing complexity of new weapons, the accelerated pace of technological development, and the compelling competition with the Soviets.

2. "Defense Materiel Utilization Program," sixth report of the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 1214, September 19, 1961 (35 pages). This report reviews activities in the Department of Defense related to the efficient use of existing inventories in lieu of unnecessary new procurement. These screening, identification, and utilization operations are related to, but outside of, the more integrated supply operations under such programs as the single manager program.

The scattered and complex organization for utilization is discussed, and the variety of procedures that must be carried out by inventory managers in order to find and utilize excess or surplus property held by other defense agencies are described. A need was clearly indicated for great simplication and more effective utilization of assets.

There is an estimated $13 billion in long supply or excess inventory in the supply systems alone, which comprise only about one-third of the total personal property holdings of the Department of Defense. Only a small portion of excess reported as utilized was processed through centralized and fully coordinated utilization programs. Inadequate identification data and lack of centralized screening procedures were apparent deficiencies in the supply systems. The existence of a backlog of surplus property appeared to be overemphasized.

The disposal sales system is geared largely to a high rate of disposal without adequate concern for utilization. Examples of inadequate procedures were cited. Furthermore, the rate of return from surplus sales appeared to be too low, especially in comparison with the advantage to the Government of utilizing property to the end of its service life.

Thirteen recommendations are made in the report, aimed at increasing the emphasis on utilization work, and at increasing its efficiency.

It was noted that a new single defense supply agency is to be organized under the Secretary of Defense. One of the objectives of the agency is to improve materiel utilization. The subcommittee states, however, that added emphasis on utilization will be required even under the new agency, and that strong interim control measures are necessary.

3. "New Civil Defense Program," ninth report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 1249, September 21, 1961 (82 pages). This is the first comprehensive report on the recent reorganizations in Federal civil defense and the administration's program for fallout shelters. It is the seventh subcommittee report in the past 6 years on civil defense problems. The report reviews new policies and measures designed to produce a stronger civil defense organization and an actual civil defense capability for the Nation. It also reviews the chronological development of shelter and evacuation policies over the past decade as the background of the civil defense assignment to the Department of Defense. It considers some basic attitudes which are taken toward civil defense programs and also includes a discussion of the current Soviet civil defense preparation.

Stating that the shelter identification and marking program is only a first step, the report calls upon the Department of Defense to develop an optimum shelter plan for the United States as rapidly as possible.

The effectiveness of underground shelters against radiation and some degree of blast effects the utility of group shelters as a basis for survival and recovery operations, and the cost of certain kinds of shelter systems are discussed. A need for stocking shelters with food and water introduces other problems. There also is a need for training programs to explain the use of shelters, and the other civil defense efforts that will be required, to the people.

The report calls for a sizable increase in civil defense research and development in order to find approaches to many unsolved problems. Such work also could lead to later savings in time, equipment, and money.

With regard to Soviet civil defense, the report concludes that the Soviet Union has been engaged in an expensive and expanding civil defense program. The Soviet Union now has shelters for a substantial part of its city populations.

The report includes a special warning note for the American people to avoid fly-by-night operators with civil defense-labeled schemes and to be wary of false advertising of civil defense merchandise and services.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Surplus property disposal: The staff has continuously scrutinized military surplus disposal actions, investigating more closely those which indicated dissipation of valuable Government resources.

A quantity of Navy radio sets were identified as having civil defense use, and through inquiries made of the OCDM these unused radio sets were made available to the civil defense organizations of New Jersey and Virginia, instead of being disposed as surplus. Savings are listed in I(c)3 below.

2. Missile site construction: The staff investigated delays in missile site construction and alleged irregularities in contractor performance. Certain matters were referred to the Comptroller General for opinion.

3. Military air transportation: Hearings were held on further developments in this field, particularly with regard to contract allocation procedures. A report will be prepared on this subject. Emphasis will be given to recent developments in MATS modernization and procurement of commercial airlift services.

4. Defense catalog and standardization programs: Hearings were held on the progress and accomplishments of these programs and on the extent to which prior committee recommendations have been followed. A report will be prepared on this subject.

5. Military flight pay: The staff is making a study of this matter in connection with the interest of many Members and current legislative proposals for changes in these pay regulations.

6. Military-civilian relations in air traffic control: The staff held conferences and reviewed developments in this field to determine whether economies can be achieved and air safety promoted by better integration and better use of facilities. A report prepared at the subcommittee's request by the FAA on "Air Defense Air Traffic Control Integration," was received and is being studied in connection with this investigation.

7. Defense reorganization: The staff is making a study of the reorganizations which have resulted from the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 and from the actions of the new administration.

8. Automatic data processing systems and equipment: The staff is studying certain aspects of the contracting for, and use of, automatic data processing systems and equipment in the Department of Defense.

9. Mutual weapons development program: The staff has conducted field investigations and preparatory studies to determine whether the mutual weapons development program in its present form is achieving optimum savings and the greatest possible technical benefits for military research and development.

10. Multilateral weapons production programs: The staff has studied programs for

production of U.S.-developed weapons in NATO countries intended to replace or supplement direct military assistance. Included in this study is the question of the transfer of proprietary and patent data to foreign firms.

11. Procurement of aerial reconnaissance cameras: The staff investigated complaints alleging irregularities in the award of contracts, and the complainant was notified of a ruling made by the Comptroller General in this matter.

12. Supply of electric power for missile bases: A staff inquiry was made into the matter. The complainant was advised of decisions by the Air Force which would permit participation in such contracts by other companies.

13. Alleged irregularities in procurement of generators at McClellan Air Force Base, Calif.: A staff investigation was made of this matter and initial results were furnished to the complainant company. Further exploration of the issues raised was included in the investigation of the defense standardization program.

14. Many subject matters were investigated by the subcommittee at the request of Members of Congress. The subcommittee staff endeavors at all times to respond fully and promptly to Members' requests, to assemble and convey the necessary information, or to advise Members on appropriate courses of action that may be taken by constituents who refer matters to them.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

1. As a result of increased emphasis on the utilization program in the Department of Defense due in part to the subcommittee's investigation, the central utilization program has achieved an increase of about $62 million in reporated utilization transactions.

2. The savings to the Government estimated to have resulted from the utilization of Navy radio sets for civil defense purposes in lieu of disposal as surplus (see I(b)1 above) are $500,000.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

1. "Air Force Ballistic Missile Management (Formation of Aerospace Corp.), House Report No. 324 (see I(a)1 above). Several developments with regard to Aerospace Corp. are of particular interest.

A. As noted on page 43 of the report, Aerospace Corp. will be included under the new defense policy with regard to Government patent rights arising from Government-sponsored research in new areas.

B. As noted on pages 33–34 of the report, there has been a strong interest generated in Aerospace Corp. on the problem of conflict of interest. Corporation policy has been formulated to avoid conflicts of interest which would reflect adversely on Aerospace or its mission for the Air Force.

C. This report has become a basic text in the study of contract organizations working for Government agencies. Several other studies have been initiated by groups within and outside the Government, utilizing the background data and issues presented in the report.

The following comment was made by the Secretary of Defense in a formal reply to House Report No. 324:

"A review of your report shows it to be an excellent, comprehensive and objective analysis of a complex subject. I am sure the report will prove to be of special value to the Air Force in developing the most effective utilization of the Aerospace Corporation. Like its predecessor, House Report No. 1121 on the 'Organization and Management of Missile Programs,' this report should be a valuable source document to all elements of the Department of Defense concerned with problems relating to the management of our major weapons systems."

2. "Defense Materiel Utilization Program," House Report No. 1214 (see I(a)2 above). The following nonmonetary benefits are being achieved in the utilization programs:

A. The utilization division as a part of the Armed Forces Supply Support Center will assume a central and higher role in the new Defense Supply Agency.

B. Work on a centralizing screening system is progressing and will be developed for use among all of the military agencies to increase the benefits of this program.

C. A single operating manual for utilization work is being developed at the Armed Forces Supply Support Center.

The following comment was made in the Department of Defense's formal reply to House Report No. 1214:

"The Department of Defense appreciates this opportunity to review and comment on this report, which is constructive and helpful. The recommendations contained in the report, after full implementation by this Department, will result in an improved materiel utilization program. Implementation of these recommendations in certain instances is already in process, and in other instances the recommendations will establish not only our objective for accomplishment, but a sound blueprint for achieving the objective."

In addition, the Department of Defense indicated that it concurred in all 13 of the committee's recommendations and that it was taking appropriate corrective action.

3. "New Civil Defense Program," House Report No. 1249 (see I(a)3 above). The subcommittee has already received indications that serious consideration is being given to many problems posed in this report in the new Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Defense.

A. The report emphasizes the need for economy and efficiency as well as the speedy execution of the shelter identification and marking program. There are indications that efforts will be made in the Department of Defense to accomplish these purposes.

B. Numerous requests are being received for this report and a large public interest has been evidenced in the committee investigation.

(e) Days of hearings held: A total of 12 days of public hearings were held by the subcommittee.

1. Defense cataloging and standardization programs: Executive briefing session on April 13, 1961, and public hearings on April 14, 1961.

2. Defense materiel utilization program: Hearing on May 16, 1961.

3. Military air transportation: Public hearings, June 19, 20, and 23, 1961.

4. Civil defense: Public hearings on August 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9, 1961.

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee:

No legislative measures were referred to the subcommittee during the session under review.

However, a statement by Subcommittee Chairman HOLIFIELD was read before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee on H.R. 4570. This bill would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as well as title 10 of the United States Code, to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where identical bids are submitted to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment or services. The chairman's statement reviewed a number of cases which have been investigated by the Military Operations Subcommittee and made suggestions. Some of the suggestions made were incorporated into the committee bill (H.R. 8603), which passed the House on August 22, 1961.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS CONSIDERED WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of reports received:

Forty-five reports on audits and reviews made by the General Accounting Office were received by the Subcommittee. All these reports were reviewed and analyzed by the staff, and the specific activities on the findings reported are shown below:

(b) Action taken:

1. The following GAO reports were used as background, documentation, or preparation of "Defense Materiel Utilization Programs," House Report No. 1215:

Review of interservice utilization of aeronautical supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, B–133313, September 15, 1961.

Review of the reservation of Army excess material for the military assistance program, B–133363, July 31, 1961.

Review of planned procurement and concurrent disposal of compressed gas cylinders, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, B–133376, June 30, 1961.

Review of management within the Department of the Air Force of replacement equipment, B–133361, June 30, 1961.

Review of management of idle production equipment within the Department of Defense, B–133372, June 30, 1961.

Review of reciprocating engine spare parts, procurement and repair requirements, San Antonio Air Materiel Area, Department of the Air Force, B–133019, May 10, 1961.

Review of supply management of selected electronic equipment programs, Department of the Navy, B–133313, January 31, 1961.

2. The following GAO report was used as background and documentation for "Air Force Ballistic Missile Management (Formation of Aerospace Corporation)" House Report No. 324:

Findings resulting from initial review of the ballistic missile programs of the Department of the Air Force, B–133042, December 27, 1960.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Because of the nature of the investigations undertaken by this Subcommittee, all reports are of continuing interest. Prior reports have contributed to current hearings and reports, and continuing notice is taken of subjects relating to past reports and investigations.

(b) The earlier reports of the Subcommittee in the civil defense area have continued to be basic texts for everyone interested in the field. These reports were:

(Those marked with an asterisk are no longer available for distribution from the committee.)

"Civil Defense for National Survival," H. Rept. No. 2946, 84th Cong., 2d sess., submitted July 27, 1956.*

"Status of Civil Defense Legislation," H. Rept. No. 829, 85th Cong., 1st sess., submitted July 22, 1957.*

"Analysis of Civil Defense Reorganization" (Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958), H. Rept. No. 1874, 85th Cong., 2d sess., submitted June 12, 1958.*

"Atomic Shelter Programs," H. Rept. No. 2554, 85th Cong., 2d sess., submitted August 12, 1958.*

"Civil Defense in Western Europe and the Soviet Union," H. Rept. No. 300, 86th Cong., 1st sess., submitted April 27, 1959.*

"Civil Defense Shelter Policy and Postattack Recovery Planning," H. Rept. No. 2069, 86th Cong., 2d sess., submitted July 1, 1960.

(c) Several earlier reports assisted in laying the foundation for the single manager program in the Department of Defense. The recent reports on military supply management—"Military Supply Management (Single

Manager Agencies)," House Report No. 674, 86th Cong., 1st sess., and "Military Supply Management (Progress in Single Management)," House Report No. 2074, 86th Congress, 2d session—assisted in adding needed impetus and emphasis on the single manager program and in the establishment of the new Defense Supply Agency. This agency appears to be initially aimed at control and management of the expanding single manager agencies, bringing the bulk of common military supplies and services under central direction.

Savings so far reported from the single manager program are as follows (as of June 30, 1961): Annual savings $23,929,496. One-time savings $543,816,316.

The Secretary of Defense has stated that savings of $2 to $4 billion in inventory reduction may be possible under the Defense Supply Agency.

Another benefit derived from these hearings and reports on military supply management has been their use as the basis for further studies by other groups and agencies of problems which could not easily be documented or studied before. For instance, the Attorney General utilized the hearing and report on single manager agencies for study of the competitive situation in the petroleum industry, as faced by the Military Petroleum Supply Agency. The report was entitled "Military Procurement of Petroleum, Report of the Attorney General Pursuant to Section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as Amended, as of November 9, 1960."

(d) In the area of "Organization and Management of Missile Programs," House Report No. 1121, 86th Congress, 1st session, a number of adjustments have been made in the management of these programs in response to subcommittee criticisms.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

The projected program of the subcommittee will include the following subject areas, and consist of followup investigations, collateral inquiries, and reports where appropriate:

1. Organization and management of missile programs.
2. Military supply management, including cataloging and standardization.
3. Military air transportation.
4. Civil defense problems.
5. It is anticipated that other matters will arise which will require subcommittee action.

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Investigative reports issued:

It is anticipated that a formal report will be completed and presented during the 2d session, 87th Congress, in connection with the subcommittee's investigation and hearing of August 1961, concerning the Government's nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba. (See below (b)1.)

(b) Other investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Following up extensive studies, public hearings, and formal reports[1] made by the subcommittee, beginning in the 84th Congress, regarding the Government's $110 million nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba, a hearing on circumstances concerning the close down on November 4, 1960, of the costly plant, and its subsequent status, as well as efforts being made to maintain a proprietary interest in it, was held August 29 and 30, 1961.

The hearing was conducted in executive session because of the confidential nature of some of the matters examined. Witnesses heard included GSA Administrator John L. Moore and other officials of the GSA, which owned the plant in the name of the Government; officials of the National Lead Co., whose subsidiary operated the plant for the Government, and of the Department of State, which dealt with policy matters concerning the plant.

The transcript is being screened for possible exclusion of confidential portions prior to publication by the Public Printer. It is anticipated that a report on this investigation and hearing, with appropriate findings and recommendations, will be completed for presentation during the next session of the 87th Congress.

2. Maintained investigative liaison with concerned Government officials regarding the status of the Government's $248 million nickel-cobalt contract obligations at Moa Bay, Cuba, and Braithwaite, La. The subcommittee's investigation of this matter resulted in public hearings May 11 and 12, 1959, and subsequent study. A report was in preparation but was suspended because of the political changes in Cuba, which resulted in shut down of the Moa Bay operation in late 1959 and its formal expropriation by the Castro government in July 1961. Current status of the Moa Bay operation was reviewed briefly in the course of the executive hearing cited above.

3. Continued investigation, initiated during 86th Congress, of method whereby the General Services Administration acquired the site for the proposed new Federal Building in Dallas, Tex. Further interviewed private citizens critical of the method, and conferred with concerned GSA officials. Studied documents obtained from GSA and a report made at subcommittee request by the General Accounting Office. Staff investigators prepared a detailed examination of the application of the law of eminent domain, a facet of the matter which continues under subcommittee study.

4. On request of a Member of Congress, investigated methods utilized in awarding contracts for cafeteria services in Government buildings in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Reported to the Member in letter dated September 15, 1961, and further questions raised are currently being studied.

5. As a result of the subcommittee's extensive investigations of various facets of Government surplus property disposal, including an investigation in spring 1961, of disposal activities delegated to the Department of Defense, the subcommittee recommended informally to the GSA that the agency study the feasibility of assuming more control over such delegated disposal operations. The GSA, accordingly, began such a study in July 1961, in line with the subcommittee's expressed belief that advantages in economy and efficiency might be accomplished. Subcommittee is maintaining liaison in the matter with concerned GSA officials.

6. Investigated, in response to complaint of a Member of Congress, the failure of the National Capital Park Service to utilize competitive bidding procedures in obtaining public address service for the 1961 season for the Carter Barron Amphitheater in Washington, D.C. Upon having the facts in the matter brought to his attention, the Secretary of the Interior advised the subcommittee that action has been taken to prevent a repetition of this practice and pointed out that the failure to use the proper procedure was unusual in that the procurement report for the 6-month period ending June 30, 1961, shows the Park Service formally advertised 94 percent of its dollar procurement volume, most of the remaining 6 percent representing transactions under $2,500.

7. Investigated competitive bidding in connection with GSA offering of approximately 1,391 acres of land at the Joliet Arsenal, Joliet, Ill., on request of a Member of Congress. Examination of facts in the matter and conferences with GSA officials indicated that inasmuch as the bid by Thomas F. Seay & Associates, Chicago, Ill., was not accompanied by the required bid deposit, it had been rejected as a nonresponsive bid.

8. Investigated GSA plans for remodeling the Roosevelt Park postal annex in Detroit, Mich., concluding that the agency had a sound, equitable basis for the proposed move, which hinged on approval of the renovation plan by the House Committee on Public Works.

9. Investigated policy and procedures of the GSA and other Government agencies with respect to the handling and disposition of articles which are lost and subsequently found in Government buildings. The inquiry was at the request of a Member of Congress and, upon its conclusion, the subcommittee drafted suggested legislation designed to standardize procedures in the matter.

10. Continued investigation, begun in 1960, in regard to operation and reorganization plans put into practice by GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service and effectiveness of its appearances before State regulatory bodies in rate cases. Conferred with GSA officials regarding personnel changes contemplated.

11. Investigated extensively the problems a Member's constituents encountered in their participation in the domestic manganese program administered by the GSA. Following conferences with officials concerned and careful study of records, it was determined that the case was an isolated one, rather than a general condition jeopardizing the efficiency and economy of the program, and already was on the docket of the U.S. Court of Claims. An appropriate report was made to the inquiring Member.

12. Upon learning that the Department of the Navy was in the process of negotiating the disposal of valuable Navy facilities at McCook, Ill., to the Reynolds Metals Co. as "contractor's inventory," a category which would not require submission of an explanatory statement to the Congress, the subcommittee initiated an investigation in April 1961. In a letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy on May 23, 1961, the subcommittee questioned the legality of that method for disposing of the property.

A conference between representatives of the GSA, which delegates disposal authority to the Navy, Navy representatives and the subcommittee chairman and staff members on June 23, 1961, resulted in an informal understanding, which was followed by submission of the appropriate explanatory statement on July 13, 1961. Submission of this statement in conformance with section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, prevented the establishment of a possibly dangerous precedent which the method originally advocated by the Navy might have set for disposition of other similar Defense Department surplus.

13. Investigated GSA plans for disposition of the surplus Keystone Ordnance Works, Crawford County, Pa. Conferred with GSA officials, studied records, and met with delegates from the Meadville, Pa., Area Industrial Commission, Pennsylvania State officials, and their Congressman in connection with the Meadville group's desire to acquire a portion of the property. The matter continues under subcommittee study.

14. Investigated circumstances surrounding bids for furnishing post office lock boxes to the Post Office Department. The study included conferences with complainants and General Accounting Office representatives.

---

[1] Public hearing Jan. 13, 16, 17, and 18, and Feb. 16, 1956, "Inquiry Into the Expansion and Operation by GSA of Government Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba"; H. Rept. No. 2390, 84th Cong., 2d sess., June 19, 1956; part 2 of aforesaid hearing held Oct. 18 and 19, 1956; public hearing Apr. 23 and 24, 1958, on "Disposal Problems of Government-Owned Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba"; H. Rept. No. 684, 86th Cong., 1st sess., July 17, 1959.

Following a review of the GAO decision of February 17, 1961, in the matter, no further action was indicated.

15. Completed an investigation, begun late in the 86th Congress, of an order by former Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield to move the northwest regional post office from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash. No further action was indicated upon assurance by the new administration that the interests of economy and efficiency would be upheld in the matter.

16. Upon request of a Member of Congress, the subcommittee investigated the well-drilling operations conducted by the Department of the Interior. Bids had been rejected by Interior for a well-drilling project and the Department had determined to drill the well itself.

A study of the records in the matter and conferences with Interior personnel indicated that, while it is the Department's general practice to obtain bids for well-drilling operations, the Department does maintain several drilling rigs of its own and performs a small percentage of its own drilling. In the instance investigated, it was determined that it would be economically advantageous for the Department to drill its own well.

17. Initiated continuing investigation of GSA plan for establishment of a new centralized, Government-wide communications system. Examined records, conferred with concerned officials; the matter continues under study.

18. Maintained investigative survey, initiated earlier, of proposals to sell communications facilities at Department of Defense installations, in line with study made by subcommittee regarding such a proposed sale during the 85th Congress at the Newport (R.I.) Naval Base.

19. Cumulative investigation in progress in connection with GSA use of brokers in disposition of surplus property. Recommendations will be made to agency, if warranted, upon completion of study.

20. At request of a Member of Congress, the subcommittee investigated use of Government land for approaches to the Jones Point Bridge in nearby Virginia. Approximately 56 acres on the Virginia side of the Potomac River, a property known as the Battery Cove Military Reservation, was reported excess by the Department of the Army in 1954 and no disposal action taken in view of developing plans for the bridge. GSA, in July 1958, transferred 7.26 acres to the Interior Department for use as approaches to the bridge, the remaining acreage being used under permit to the Commerce Department as an assembly and storage area for the bridge construction. Legality of the transfer for approaches' use was established and GSA will appraise the remaining acreage and formulate disposal plans when it is no longer needed for an assembly area.

21. Investigated, on request of a Member of Congress, problems of a constituent regarding a matter before the GSA Board of Review, which had not rendered a decision. It was determined that the constituent's attorney had been granted several delays to file a brief answering points raised at a hearing before the Board, but had not. The Board pointed out it could not render a decision until all the evidence in the argument was in the file. As a result of the subcommittee's investigation, the Board chairman initiated a telephone contact with the attorney, reminding him to file the brief and granted him an additional 30 days to do so.

22. An investigative examination disclosed an apparent relaxation in the GSA's policy regarding conveyances of property for park or recreational purposes under section 13(h)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. The subcommittee chairman and staff presented facts in the matter at a meeting with GSA officials on September 19, 1961. The GSA subsequently orally notified the chairman that the agency is revising its policy to more closely conform to congressional intent and the provisions authorizing conveyance of such properties at 50 percent of the appraised fair market value, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal, regardless of its former character or use.

23. As a result of an inquiry from a Member of Congress, the subcommittee investigated the awarding of contracts for auctioneer services by the GSA. Complaints alleging favoritism or unfairness in the Atlanta, Ga., regional office were not substantiated by the investigation. The GSA utilizes a rating system for auction firms to determine eligibility to auction Government property and the complaining firm, based on its past record, was qualified to auction smaller properties but was not eligible for consideration for a sale of great magnitude.

Factors used by GSA in rating the various auction companies seem reasonable and the subcommittee study of GSA files indicated that the standards are applied uniformly. As a result of the investigation, the subcommittee encouraged the GSA to continue its steps to put into practice two modifications which should do much to eliminate criticism which has arisen with respect to the practice of negotiating auction contracts: (a) While GSA regional offices are not required by law to advertise for bids in the awarding of auction contracts, they now are being encouraged to do so; (b) the Atlanta regional office now intends to solicit offers from those auctioneers qualified for sales of a particular value, rather than negotiate only with a particular auction firm. The new GSA property disposal handbook also urges the use of this method of inviting proposals by its regional offices rather than following the negotiation method.

(c) Money savings or recoveries as a result of investigations: Money savings were made in items under section II(b) and in section IV(a).

A greater proportion of proposed negotiated sales of surplus Government property reviewed by the subcommittee now is acceptable as originally proposed by the agency. The indicated greater agency concern with obtaining acceptable prices for surplus property is a direct result of the subcommittee's continued vigilance and careful study of each such proposal. Indirect savings through the preventive effects of the subcommittee's insistence upon maximum, fair returns for the Nation's taxpayers, on the basis of actual cash savings realized in the past, would amount to millions of dollars.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits attained as a result of investigations:

1. As a result of the subcommittee's recommendation, based on many investigations of Government surplus property disposals, the General Services Administration is studying the feasibility of assuming more control over disposal activities delegated to the Department of Defense, agreeing with the subcommittee that advantages in economy and efficiency may be accomplished.

2. The Secretary of the Interior advised the subcommittee that action has been taken to prevent a repetition of the failure of the National Capital Parks Service to utilize competitive bidding procedures in obtaining public address service for the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

3. Subcommittee drafted suggested legislation designed to standardize procedures in regard to the handling and disposition of articles lost and subsequently found in Government buildings, investigation having disclosed broad differences in the manner in which such property now is being handled. The draft was forwarded to the Member who initiated the investigation.

4. The establishment of a precedent which was subject to possible costly abuse and economic losses was prevented when the Navy Department, as a result of subcommittee action, abandoned efforts to dispose of a valuable surplus Navy facility as contractor's inventory, which would not have required submission of an explanatory statement to the Congress. The Navy then disposed of the property by negotiation in conformance with section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, submitting a proper explanatory statement to the Congress. The method originally advocated by the Navy could have served as a precedent for disposition of other similar Defense Department surplus, which should mount in volume with the announced closedown of outmoded installations.

5. The subcommittee's continued vigilance regarding any efforts to sell communications facilities on defense bases as surplus to private firms who then would furnish service to the base over the same lines (originally investigated during the 85th Congress) apparently has served as a deterrent to other defense efforts to take this uneconomic step.

6. As a result of subcommittee action, the GSA Board of Review took steps to speed up a decision in a case long delayed.

7. As a result of its investigation, the subcommittee encouraged the GSA to go ahead with steps to modify its method of awarding contracts for auctioneer services, evolving a more efficient system which should eliminate criticism which had arisen regarding its former method of negotiating auction contracts.

8. As a result of subcommittee action, the GSA reported orally to the subcommittee chairman that it was revising its policies regarding section 13(h)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended, which concerns conveyances of property for park or recreational purposes, in order to conform more closely to congressional intent and obtain the maximum 50-percent return, under the law, for such properties.

(e) Days of hearings held: Formal investigative hearings were held on 2 days.

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: During the first session of the 87th Congress the subcommittee has had a total of 44 bills and resolutions referred to it for consideration.

These measures are broken down as follows: 38 House bills, 1 House resolution, and 5 Senate bills.

(b) Reports issued: Reports issued with title, date, and summary of each and description of subsequent legislative action on reported measures.

1. House Report No. 558, dated June 21, 1961, to accompany S. 537 reported in lieu of H.R. 5294.

Summary: The purpose of the bill is to amend section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to remove the technical restriction imposed on transfers for historic-monument purposes now contained in that provision. The bill removes the stipulation restricting transfers to properties acquired by the United States subsequent to January 1, 1900, and substitutes a 50-year criterion for determination of historical significance.

S. 537 passed the Senate May 29, 1961, and was referred to the Government Operations Committee and reported out June 21, as a substitute for H.R. 5294, which had passed the subcommittee. S. 537 passed the House July 10 and became Public Law 87-90 on July 20, 1961.

2. House Report 559, dated June 21, 1961, to accompany S. 539 reported in lieu of H.R. 3259.

Summary: The purpose of the bill is to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended to permit nationals, American and foreign, to qualify for and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act, which provides such assistance for advanced education and study abroad.

S. 539 passed the Senate May 26, 1961, and was referred to the Government Operations Committee and reported out June 21, as a substitute for H.R. 3259, which had passed the subcommittee. S. 539 passed the House August 7 and became Public Law 87–153 on August 17, 1961.

3. House Report 560, dated June 21, 1961, to accompany S. 540 reported in lieu of H.R. 3260.

Summary: The purpose of the bill is to amend existing law to provide uniform authority for Federal departments and agencies to make advance payment for publications which do not fall within the category of newspapers, magazines or other periodicals.

S. 540 passed the Senate May 26, 1961, and was referred to the Government Operations Committee and reported out June 21, as a substitute for H.R. 3260, which had passed the subcommittee. S. 540 passed the House July 10 and became Public Law 87–91 on July 20, 1961.

4. House Report No. 1217, dated September 19, 1961, to accompany H.R. 8099.

Summary: The purpose of this bill is to amend subsection (a) of section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by removing the capital limitation of the general supply fund.

H.R. 8099 was reported out of the Government Operations Committee on September 19, passed by the House on September 22, passed by the Senate on September 25, and became Public Law 87–372 on October 4, 1961.

5. House Report No. 1218, dated September 19, 1961, to accompany H.R. 8100.

Summary: The purpose of H.R. 8100 is to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide the General Services Administration with authority to use the general supply fund to pay transportation costs of supplies for Government agencies and to obtain reimbursement for those costs from customer agencies on a delivered price basis for the supplies distributed through the fund.

H.R. 8100 was reported out of the Government Operations Committee on September 19 and was passed by the House on September 22.

The subcommittee, after considering their merit and purpose, tabled the following two bills: H.R. 1015 and H.R. 2685.

(c) Days of hearings held: Hearings were held on legislative matters on 2 separate days.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of each received:

1. The subcommittee has received a total of 81 explanatory statements of proposed negotiated disposals of Government surplus property for consideration during the first session of the 87th Congress. The statements are submitted to the committee in accordance with provisions of section 203(e)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and each has been thoroughly reviewed. The original estimated acquisition cost of the property proposed for sale amounted to $173,223,125 and had a current appraised value of $43,380,358, while the proposed disposal price was $41,346,905. Six of the explanatory statements concerned leasing of Government property at a rental of $177,940 per year.

Sixty-eight explanatory statements pertained to the disposal of real property having an original acquisition cost of $173,049,563. This same real property had a current appraised value of $43,301,512 and the proposed disposal price was $41,261,360.

Seven of the proposed sales were of personal property which had an estimated acquisition cost of $173,562 and a current appraised value of $78,846. This property was being sold for $85,545.

2. GAO audit reports—32

(b) Action taken:

1. Negotiated sales:

a. In 13 instances of the 81 explanatory statements, more information was felt necessary to evaluate the proposal and the responsible Government officials accordingly were interviewed. The disposal agency's files also were examined in most of the cases and particular attention was given to a study of the appraisal upon which the sales price was based.

b. In one case it was determined that there was sufficient cause to warrant a personal inspection of the property being sold to properly evaluate the material made available to the committee. In this case an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the negotiation was undertaken which included interviewing of the prospective purchaser and other interested parties, as well as a study of the real estate market in the locale of the subject property.

This proposal concerned the sale of the former Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, located at Panama City, Fla., to the Panama City Port Authority. The property consisted of 118.03 acres of land together with 56 buildings and related personal property. The property had been appraised at $1,200,000 and was to be sold for $1,025,000, which price included the release of a Government claim against the port authority for $80,000 bringing the sales price down to $255,000 below the appraised fair market value.

GSA central and regional office files were reviewed and the appraisal thoroughly studied. In addition, the property was inspected and officials of the port authority were interviewed. It was concluded that the proposed sales price was less than the fair value of the property. Accordingly, it was recommended to the Administrator of GSA that the sale should not be consummated for less than the fair market value as reflected by the appraisal.

In the following months, the subcommittee chairman met with a delegation of citizens from Panama City, Fla., and the staff worked and conferred with GSA disposal officials regarding the agency's efforts to follow the subcommittee's recommendations. GSA negotiations subsequently brought a new offer from port authority officials and on April 11, 1961, the GSA Administrator submitted a new explanatory statement.

This proposal excluded a 3.3-acre tract of land and 4 buildings, leaving 114.73 acres of land, together with 52 buildings and related personal property, subject to the sale. The revised appraised value of the property to be sold was $1,114,500 and the proposed sales price was $1 million exclusive of any Government claims against the port authority.

While the sales price was below the appraised value, the new offer was considerably more than the previous offer and was sufficiently close to the appraised fair market value that it was determined that the new offer should be accepted. The sale was subsequently consummated and, as a direct result of the subcommittee's actions, the net monetary increase to the Government amounted to $145,500.

c. The subcommittee also was concerned with the sale of the $20 million Government surplus aluminum extrusion plant at Adrian, Mich. The property was offered twice competitively but all bids were rejected and negotiations were conducted with the Harvey Aluminum Co., one of the bidders for the plant.

In connection with the subcommittee's study, the chairman and staff met on March 2, 1961, with GSA officials and a delegation of prominent Adrian citizens who urged subcommittee support of the proposed sale to the Harvey firm, rather than to a scrap company, on grounds that resumption of operation of the plant was vital to the community economy.

Following the administration's policy of selling the property subject to conditions requiring its operation as an entity to help alleviate unemployment in the area, GSA consummated the sale to Harvey Aluminum Co. for $3,626,100, which was $100,000 higher than the highest bid that had been received.

2. GAO audit reports:

a. Report on Review of Federal-Aid Airport Program and of the Program for the Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities and Materiel, Federal Aviation Agency, 1960. FAA queried as to corrective action taken with regard to GAO recommendations. Agency reply shows corrective action has been taken.

b. Review of certain contracts by the Federal Maritime Board, Department of Commerce, for construction-differential subsidy and related ship construction, March 1961. Agency reply to subcommittee inquiry shows that the corrective action taken is satisfactory.

c. Review of Accounting System and Related Matters, Office of the Administrator, HHFA, June 1961. In reply to subcommittee inquiry, agency states that it is now complying with most GAO recommendations.

d. Audit of the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1960. Correspondence with GPO shows that corrective action has been taken.

e. Review of selected operations of the compensation and pension program, Veterans Administration, June 1960. Agency reply to subcommittee inquiry indicates necessary corrective action has been taken.

f. Review of Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, fiscal years 1959 and 1960. Agency reply disagrees with GAO recommendations. Further inquiry is contemplated.

g. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the Atlanta regional office, HHFA, September 1960. Agency reply indicates that action is being taken to correct deficiencies.

h. Audit of general supply fund, GSA, fiscal year 1960. Agency reply to subcommittee inquiry is under study.

i. Review of certain aspects of the program for the termination of Federal supervision over Indian affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, March 1961. Department of the Interior queried as to corrective action taken. Report of special task force on Indian affairs, received August 7, is under study.

j. Audit of helium operations of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, March 1960. Awaiting agency reply to subcommittee inquiry as to corrective action taken on GAO recommendations.

k. Review of fur seal operations and administration of the Pribilof Islands, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, June 1961. Agency reply to subcommittee inquiry has not been received.

l. The following reports are under staff study:

(1) Review of local housing authorities, Public Housing Administration, HHFA, June 1961.

(2) Audit of GSA contracts DMP–49, 50, and 51 with the Hanna Mining Co., Hanna

Nickel Smelting Co., and the M. A. Hanna Co., Cleveland, Ohio, April 1961.

(3) Audit of GSA contracts GS-OOP(D)-12006, 12143, 12192, and 12213 with Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. of Oakland, Calif.

(4) Audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation, fiscal year 1960.

(5) Review of certain activities of the government of the Virgin Islands, fiscal year 1960.

(6) Review of selected phases of manpower requirements for cleaning activities, Post Office Department, January 1961.

(7) Review of relocation housing program for small homes as administered by the Office of the Administrator and the Federal Housing Administration, HHFA, April 1960.

(m) After detailed analysis and review, no action was deemed necessary on the following GAO reports:

(1) Audit of Boston National Historic Sites Commission, April 1961.

(2) Audit of Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, November 1960.

(3) Audit of Inland Waterways Corporation, fiscal year 1960.

(4) Audit of abaca fiber program administered by GSA, fiscal year 1960.

(5) Audit of Federal Facilities Corporation, GSA, fiscal year 1960.

(6) Review of policies and procedures relating to leasing of space, Public Building Service, GSA, July 1959.

(7) Audit of Federal National Mortgage Association, HHFA, fiscal year 1960.

(8) Audit of revolving fund, Small Business Administration, fiscal year 1959.

(9) Review of education and training programs for Korean conflict veterans and war orphans, Veterans Administration, fiscal year 1959.

(10) Review of loan guarantee and direct loan programs, Veterans Administration, fiscal year 1960.

(11) Review of selected insurance operations of the Veterans Administration, fiscal year 1959.

(12) Audit of Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans Administration, fiscal year 1960.

(13) Audit of Public Housing Administration, HHFA, fiscal year 1960.

(14) Review of certain activities of the government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, fiscal year 1959.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries: The subcommittee, during the 85th Congress, blocked the proposed negotiated sale of the Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard at Newport News, Va., because the price of $3,510,000 appeared grossly out of proportion to the true fair market value of the $20,391,000 facility. GSA, at subcommittee request, withdrew its delegation of authority to the Secretary of Defense to dispose of the facility and made a new appraisal, which was evaluated by the GSA during the 86th Congress. The subcommittee continued liaison with GSA as the agency negotiated further with the potential buyer. An impasse was reached in the negotiations and GSA and the interested firm each agreed to obtain another appraisal. GSA's new appraisal was delivered in September 1961, and currently is under agency study. The subcommittee has maintained liaison with the agency in this prolonged matter, and an early settlement is in prospect at a price in excess of a million dollars more than the one originally proposed.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: Personnel changes designed to improve the administration of GSA's region 6, Kansas City, Mo., are a further result of the subcommittee's public hearings there March 25 and 26, 1960, which exposed serious irregularities in operation of the regional office, which serves a seven-State area. An executive hearing followed on April 27, 1960, in Washington. Transcripts of the public hearings were printed and distributed. GSA promptly issued orders strengthening rules governing real estate transactions, but it was not until January 1961 that recommended personnel changes were completed. Earl H. Lund, regional director of GSA's Public Buildings Service, was transferred to another region and the resignation of Thomas G. Jay, regional commissioner, was accepted in December 1960, and took effect January 20, 1961. Testimony before the subcommittee showed that Mr. Jay, whose wife engaged in the real estate business and sold houses to GSA employees was a partner in a deluxe motel venture in downtown Kansas City, and, among other things, was a key figure in contract transactions including one in which work was completed in a Federal office months before bids were invited for performance of the job and questionable tactics were used to screen the irregular procedure.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

A. Program outline:

1. Study legislation referred to the subcommittee.

2. Examine and take necessary action on all negotiated sales and leases of Government property referred to the subcommittee.

3. Study and take necessary action on all GAO reports referred to the subcommittee.

4. Take action on inquiries and complaints within jurisdiction which are filed with the subcommittee.

5. Study progress made subsequent to public hearings of August 1960 regarding Civil Service Commission exceptions in use of specialized registers for hearing examiners.

6. Continue study of manner whereby GSA acquired site for the proposed new Federal building in Dallas, Tex.

7. Observe and evaluate any developments which further effect the seized U.S. Government nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba, and U.S. nickel-cobalt obligations in connection with private mining operations at Moa Bay, Cuba, and Braithwaite, La. Submit corrected transcript of Nicaro hearing of August 29 and 30, 1961, relative to closedown and subsequent status of the plant, to Public Printer and distribute printed copies upon receipt. Prepare formal report based on information obtained in the hearing.

8. Observe any resumption of proposed sales of communications facilities by the Department of Defense.

9. Maintain liaison with GSA in its efforts to sell the Naval Industrial Shipyard at Newport News, Va., in accord with earlier subcommittee recommendations.

10. Continue study of GSA plans for Government-wide centralized communications.

11. Continue study of GSA use of brokers in disposition of surplus property.

12. Confer further with GSA officials now working out a plan, in accordance with subcommittee recommendation, for the agency to assume more control over disposal operations delegated to the Department of Defense.

13. Update earlier study of GSA's Board of Review, particularly noting status of workload.

14. Prepare for preliminary public hearing scheduled in Washington, D.C., on November 29 and 30, 1961, on H.R. 8248, a bill to provide an orderly program of decentralization and relocation of facilities and personnel of executive agencies.

15. Continue study of GSA plans to dispose of the surplus Keystone Ordnance Works, Crawford County, Pa.

16. Further investigate methods utilized in awarding contracts for cafeteria services in Government buildings in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued:

1. Health Research and Training: The Administration of Grants and Awards by the National Institutes of Health.—House Report No. 321, April 28, 1961 (2d report of committee, 87th Cong.)

This report deals with the grant programs administered by the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, for the support of medical and other health-related research and training activities conducted in non-Federal facilities. The report, which is based on a comprehensive study by the subcommittee staff, examines the participation of the Federal Government in the Nation's health research effort and gives detailed attention to the role of NIH in supporting such research, together with training in the health fields. The report evaluates the policies and procedures of NIH for administering its various grant programs. Special attention is given to the problem of determining the Government's obligation for the indirect costs associated with supported research.

The report contains 13 specific recommendations for improving the operation of the grant programs administered by the National Institutes of Health. Detailed information on these programs is given in appendix tables.

2. Consumer Protection Activities of Federal Departments and Agencies.—House Report No. 1241, September 20, 1961 (8th report of committee, 87th Cong.)

This report is the first of a series being prepared in an extensive study of consumer protection activities which the subcommittee is conducting. The 338-page report is based upon factual data obtained from 35 Federal departments and agencies and is believed to be the most comprehensive effort to date to compile basic information concerning the consumer protection activities of the Federal Government. The report describes 103 separate activities which directly protect consumer interests and gives information concerning the number of employees assigned and the approximate annual expenditures for these activities. The report also contains agency comments on the adequacy of resources available for each direct activity from the standpoint of legal authority, personnel, equipment, facilities, and funds. The report lists an additional 150 activities which advance consumer interests or protect them indirectly.

In addition to listing consumer activities by agency, the report also lists them by category according to their nature and purpose. For each category, the report contains a discussion of steps taken to coordinate related activities of various Federal agencies and presents available information concerning similar activities carried on by State and local governmental agencies.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report: In addition to investigations resulting in formal reports, the subcommittee made many other inquiries into activities of the departments and agencies under its jurisdiction. Among the more important matters covered by these investigations are the following:

Activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation: The subcommittee has devoted considerable effort to continuation of its comprehensive inquiry into activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Subjects given particular attention include:

Government financed exports of agricultural commodities: Since the passage of Public Law 480 in 1954, sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and other Government financed exports have totaled nearly $10 billion—more than a third of all

U.S. agricultural commodity exports during this period. In most instances, the commodities financed have also been sold or subsidized for export by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Conflicts of interest: The subcommittee is examining the extent to which the Department of Agriculture has established and enforced adequate policies and procedures to protect against conflicts of interest in connection with CCC activities.

Price support, production adjustment and storage activities: These activities require—and are likely to continue to require for a number of future years—expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Coordination of investigative and enforcement activities: The subcommittee is examining the extent to which departments and agencies having investigative or enforcement responsibility involving similar or related matters coordinate their activities in order to avoid duplication of effort and best serve the public interest.

Antitrust law violations: The subcommittee is studying precautions taken to guard against violations of the antitrust laws in connection with Government procurement and other Government programs.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

Health research and training:

As a result of the Subcommittee's investigation of the grant programs administered by the National Institutes of Health, NIH has discontinued its former practice of making an indirect cost payment equal to 15 percent of the direct costs of a project regardles of whether and the extent to which indirect costs are actually incurred by the grantee institution when research is performed outside the institution. Although it is not feasible to estimate the total money saving which will result from this action, it might be noted that NIH makes grants of $2.4 million or more each year to non-Federal institutions for research performed in Veterans Administration hospitals. Since the VA actually bears the bulk of the indirect costs for this research (the granteee institution's expense being limited mainly to paperwork), it is estimated that the saving to the Federal Government in the indirect cost allowance for these projects alone will amount to at least $200,000 a year.

During the course of the Subcommittee's investigation, NIH changed its policy of permitting commercial firms to take title to the ownership of equipment purchased from NIH grants. Now equipment purchased with funds from a grant will remain the property of the Public Health Service.

Also in response to the Subcommittee's work, NIH is proceeding to initiate a number of management improvements in its grant programs, including the systematic financial review of the budgetary requirements of grantees. This action should lead to significant money savings.

Government financed export transactions: The subcommittee's investigation of Government-financed exports of agricultural commodities has resulted to date in identifiable refunds or recoveries in excess of $100,000, together with recurrent annual savings of approximately $1 million through new contracts for furnishing of recombined milk for troops in Japan, Okinawa, and Guam. Substantial additional savings or recoveries may result from other matters on which action is currently being considered.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

Health research and training: In addition to achieving greater economy in the NIH grant programs, it is expected that the Committee's recommendations will result in improved administrative policies and practices which will strengthen the effectiveness and productivity of these important research and training programs.

Consumer protection: In its study of consumer protection activities, the subcommittee gave particular attention to a 1960 Agriculture Department order allowing addition of 10-percent water to federally inspected hams. This order has been rescinded by the Department of Agriculture.

Antitrust law violations: Weaknesses in Agriculture Department procurement procedures disclosed by executive hearings were called to the attention of that Department. A number of matters indicating possible antitrust law violations were referred to the Department of Justice and are currently under investigation by its Antitrust Division.

Commodity Credit Corporation activities: As a report of information developed in the subcommittee's investigation, the Department of Agriculture reported it had taken action to prevent appointment of State ASC Committeemen whose private interests might conflict wtih their public responsibilities.

The subcommittee's investigation disclosed that the Department of Agriculture had no centralized control records to show actions taken on reports from overseas indicating irregularities in departmental programs. Such records are now being established by the Department.

The subcommittee chairman met with the Secretary of Agriculture to bring to his attention some of the more significant matters disclosed by the subcommittee's investigation of CCC activities. A number of additional meetings between the subcommittee counsel and newly appointed policy making officials of the Department of Agriculture were held in order to discuss significant disclosures in current and past subcommittee investigations. As a result, the Department has taken some action to improve its procedures and further action is under consideration.

Coordination of investigative and enforcement activities: The subcommittee's examination of coordination of Government investigative and enforcement activities is still in its early stages. However, it appears a number of matters already called to the attention of appropriate Government agencies and being further investigated by those agencies may result in substantial savings or recoveries.

(e) Days of hearings held:

Executive hearings were held on July 11 and 13, and public hearings on August 1 and 2 (4 days).

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: Ten identical bills were referred to the subcommittee; H.R. 7802, H.R. 7803, H.R. 7804, H.R. 7805, H.R. 7808, H.R. 7814, H.R. 7892, H.R. 7928, H.R. 8310, H.R. 8534. These bills would provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local units of government.

(b) Reports issued: A draft report on H.R. 7802 has been prepared for consideration by the subcommittee.

(c) Days of hearings held: Hearings on H.R. 7802 and identical bills were held 2 days, July 25, and 27, 1961.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of each received: Seventeen formal reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office were referred to the subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress. In addition, the subcommittee requested and received from the GAO a number of reports made to executive agencies. These documents have been or are being studied by the subcommittee.

At the request of the subcommittee, the General Accounting Office made a number of special reports concerning matters involving possible violations of antitrust laws.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

Grain storage: The subcommittee's investigation of CCC grain storage activities during the 86th Congress was a contributing factor in action taken by the Department of Agriculture to reduce storage rates approximately 19 percent. Estimated savings because of this reduction during fiscal year 1961 alone were about $80 million. It is anticipated that additional savings of around the same amount will be realized during the current fiscal year.

Production adjustment: The subcommittee's 1960 report on price support and production adjustment activities pointed out the tremendous costs of storing grain acquired as a result of programs providing price supports without production controls. The new feed grain program put into effect in 1961 restricts eligibility for price support to those producers who comply with acreage limitations. It is expected that this program change will result in very substantial savings.

Cheese and butter transactions: As of October 1961, total recoveries in cheese and butter transactions investigated by the subcommittee reached $2,319,187.70.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: During the 85th Congress, in connection with its report on Federal procurement of polio vaccine, the subcommittee recommended that the Justice Department conduct an investigation to determine whether there were antitrust law violations in the sale of other drugs and hospital supplies. The subcommittee was later advised by the Justice Department that possible violations of antitrust laws were being investigated in connection with the sale of four major categories of drugs or hospital supplies. In August 1961, three drug firms and three of their officers were indicted on charges of antitrust violations in connection with the sale of antibiotics.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Health research and training: The subcommittee will continue its surveillance of the research and training grant programs administered by the National Institutes of Health and, in addition, will give attention to the agency's policies and procedures in contracting for research.

Metropolitan area problems: The subcommittee will continue its study of intergovernmental relations with the consideration of an appropriate role for the Federal Government in meeting the governmental problems of our rapidly growing metropolitan areas. To facilitate this work, the subcommittee has invited comment from a number of prominent political scientists on a recent report by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on "Governmental structure, organization, and planning in metropolitan areas." It is expected that these commentaries, together with the Commission's report, will provide valuable background for public hearings and further subcommittee consideration of this important matter.

Consumer protection: The subcommittee will study Federal-State-local relationships in the field of consumer protection, with particular attention being given to activities for the protection of the public with respect to food, drugs, and cosmetics, false and misleading advertising, and deceptive practices.

Commodity Credit Corporation activities: The subcommittee will continue its investigation of CCC activities. It is anticipated that reports will be prepared on several additional phases of its investigation.

Antitrust law violations: The subcommittee will continue its examination of precautions taken to guard against violations of the

antitrust laws in connection with Government procurement and other Government programs.

Coordination of investigative and enforcement activities: The subcommittee will continue its examination of the extent to which departments and agencies having investigative or enforcement responsibility involving similar or related matters coordinate their activities in order to avoid duplication of efforts and best serve the public interest.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued:

1. House Report No. 795, 87th Congress, U.S. aid operations in Peru, issued July 26, 1961.

This report resulted from a comprehensive study of the U.S. aid program in Peru for the period 1955–60. It was the purpose of the study to determine whether the program, during that period of time, had been administered efficiently, economically, and according to law.

The report concluded generally that the principal deficiencies in the U.S. aid program in Peru during the period 1955–58, stemmed from the combination of an entrenched U.S. operations mission director who did not measure up to his responsibilities, and the failure of ICA/Washington to exercise supervision and control over his activities.

Specifically, the report concluded, in part:

1. Drought relief:

a. The USOM director (John R. Neale) divested himself of responsibility for this program by turning over its administration almost entirely to the Peruvian Government, without the knowledge of ICA/Washington, and in the face of a warning by the then U.S. Ambassador (Ellis O. Briggs) that the local government lacked the experience and facilities to cope with a program of such magnitude.

b. Almost 25 percent of the food provided remained undistributed at the time the drought was officially declared over by the Government of Peru; almost one-half of this amount still remained in the warehouses a year later.

c. Sales of grain generated the local currency equivalent of $3,600,000. Such sales were authorized by the agreement between the United States and Peru, providing that such funds were to be used to pay the wages of drought victims employed on work relief projects. However, as a result of Neale's failure to carry out his duties as USOM director, at least 60 percent of the sales proceeds were used improperly, that is, contrary to the uses contemplated when this program was inaugurated. The lack of adequate USOM and ICA/Washington records makes it impossible to determine what portion of the balance may also have been improperly used. An instance of improper use was the unapproved construction of eight houses at Puno and their sale, below cost and on an installment basis, to prominent persons in the town.

2. Road project: A $2 million loan to Peru, intended to aid its economy through construction of a road to open isolated areas for agricultural development and colonization, was the subject of such faulty and inadequate planning that after construction had actually started the route had to be completely changed, when belated soils tests established that the area to be served by the original route was unsuitable for farming. The road finally constructed under this loan ended in the middle of nowhere—"on the side of a mountain"—at a point about halfway along the projected route, where the project ran out of funds.

3. Pampas de Noco: A $125,000 irrigation project built at Pampas de Noco does not irrigate:

a. The significance of this particular failure lies in the stubborness with which USOM Director Neale continued the project even after he had received competent technical advice that the project was not feasible.

b. The reason the project was not feasible seems incredible, in any properly planned irrigation project—it was simply that there was not enough water available in the area to make use of the projected irrigation works.

4. Conflict of interest: USOM Director Neale entered into a conflict of interest situation for personal profit when he organized and invested in the corporation, Negociacion Bazo Velarde, S.A., for the purpose of operating a farm which was receiving aid under the U.S. program. He failed to inform his superiors of his participation in this operation.

a. ICA/W had information which should have compelled the pursuit of an inquiry into possible conflict of interest on the part of Neale for some 4 years before effective action was finally taken.

b. Even at Neale's administrative hearing, where the record clearly demonstrated that Neale was in fact in conflict of interest, both Regional Director Atwood and Ambassador Achilles persisted in impressing upon the board their beliefs that Neale was simply a victim of spite on the part of complainants.

c. ICA/W investigative personnel, Thomas E. Naughten, Michael Ambrose, Robert L. Shortley, and Charles A. Gannon, all demonstrated a peculiar disinterest in determining the validity of charges made concerning Neale's conflict of interest. This performance, inconsistent with what appears to be adequate investigative experience in the backgrounds of these men, points to a conclusion that ICA did not require, nor did they employ their best talents.

5. Internal audits: A lack of adequate internal audit facilities contributed to the difficulties experienced with the program in Peru, since the USOM was frequently unaware of developing difficulties for substantial periods.

a. The failure of the USOM to submit, or ICA/W to request, the submission of such internal audit reports as were made indicates a high degree of laxity at managerial levels both in Washington and in the field.

b. There were no end-use checks made of the drought program.

6. Poor supervision: Rollin S. Atwood, regional director, Office of Latin American Operations, ICA/W, did not properly perform his functions as the official primarily responsible for the effective operations of the U.S. aid program in Peru.

7. Investigative shortcomings: The Office of the Inspector General and Comptroller and its predecessor, the Office of Personnel Security and Integrity, ignored serious charges and delayed action in cases where prompt and adequate investigation might have proved embarrassing to ICA, the USOM, or to Neale.

The subcommittee recommended:

(1) That administrative action be initiated to prevent USOM directors and other key overseas personnel from becoming entrenched, as Neale did in Peru. Consideration should be given to developing, publishing, and adhering to a rotation policy limiting the tours of duty of such personnel.

(2) That before proceeding with any project, USOM directors be required to submit to Washington evidence of its technical and economic soundness, since roads that lead nowhere and irrigation projects that do not irrigate have a reverse impact on U.S. policy objectives, and add little or nothing to the economy of the recipient country.

(3) That policies and procedures for the administration of surplus agricultural commodity programs, such as the drought-relief program in Peru, be developed, published, and adhered to, including clear provisions relating to distribution, accounting, and accountability.

(4) That investigative and audit functions concerned with the aid program be improved, either through administrative action or legislative requirement, to guarantee the independence of such functions from interference by administrative officials. In this connection consideration should be given to:

a. Making the investigative and audit division chiefs directly responsible to the most senior aid officials and to no other administrative officials;

b. Giving individual auditors and investigators the right and requirement to report immediately in writing to their division chiefs any action or communication from any administrative official tending to obstruct or restrict the investigation or audit;

c. Requiring the division chiefs to forward such reports to the most senior aid official without delay;

d. Requiring division chiefs to report to the senior aid official, on a periodic basis, a record of the closing or other disposition of audits and investigative cases (other than routine security clearances) together with detailed reasons for the closing or suspending of unresolved cases.

(5) That the usefulness of internal mission audits and end-use audits be increased by requiring copies of them to be forwarded to the most senior aid officials, simultaneously with their submissions to mission directors.

2. House Report No. 1250, 87th Congress, Cambodian Port Highway: A supplemental report, issued September 21, 1961.

This report resulted from the subcommittee's inquiry into the present status of the $34 million 132-mile long Khmer-American Friendship Highway connecting the capital city of Phnom Penh with the port of Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam. The road, which was completed in June 1959, designed and built by American contractors and paid for by ICA, had been studied by the subcommittee in 1957–1958 and treated with in House Report No. 2012, 85th Congress, "Foreign Aid Construction Projects", issued June 26, 1958.

The subcommittee's principal findings and conclusions were that:

"On December 31, 1955, the engineering firm of Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., entered into a contract with the Government of Cambodia to design, supervise, and inspect the construction operations required to complete, in accordance with the latest U.S. techniques and methods, the above highway.

"The construction contractor, A. L. Dougherty Overseas, Inc., began operations under a letter agreement dated August 28, 1956. The construction was completed in May 1959, approximately 1 year behind original schedule, and the road was turned over to the Cambodian Government in July of that year.

"Almost immediately the road began to deteriorate, and in December 1959 a USOM highway engineer reported that the failure was due to serious deficiencies in either engineering or construction, or both.

"On the basis of evidence developed to date, ICA's engineering reports indicate that more than one-third of the road will require major repairs or rebuilding.

"The road, which was intended to be a showcase of American know-how, was so badly bungled that it has damaged our prestige, burdened us with costly repairs, and supplied the Communists with an effective source of anti-American propaganda."

The subcommittee recommended:

(1) That the Department of State and ICA keep in mind the irreparable harm that can be done to the prestige of the United States by the failure of any part of our foreign aid program. Since failure of "impact projects," such as the Cambodian highway, can be especially harmful, steps should be

taken immediately to insure the success of each through adequate and intelligent planning, execution, and administration.

(2) That the Office of the Inspector General complete without further delay the investigation necessary to fix responsibility for the road failures, and, if the findings warrant, transmit a copy thereof to the Department of Justice and the General Accounting Office for review and such action as may be appropriate.

(3) That ICA replace generalities with specific language to define the authority and responsibility delegated to USOM personnel for the exercise of control over contractual operations.

(4) That, as recommended in the subcommittee's 1958 report (H. Rept. 2012, 85th Cong., 2d sess., "Foreign Aid Construction Projects"), ICA strengthen its program of personnel integrity.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Conducted an inquiry into the circumstances of the State Department's decision to permit the display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

2. A country study of all U.S. programs in Bolivia.

3. Reviewed the Development Loan Fund operations in Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay.

4. Examination of selected development loans in countries other than Latin America as questions arose as to whether the provisions of such loans were in accord with statutory requirements.

5. Reviewed work papers of various ICA internal audits of country programs as questions arose concerning such audits.

6. Checked information received from various informants alleging foreign aid irregularities.

7. Initiated an inquiry into the extent to which ICA and the Department of Agriculture are conforming to statutory marking requirements on all commodity containers used in shipments of food surplusses under the programs of the ICA voluntary aid agencies.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

The principal concern of the subcommittee, especially in the case of the mutual security program, is the conservation of funds through more effective planning and more efficient practices within the agencies handling those funds. Although this produces a greater return for tax dollars spent, it does not generally lend itself to an accurate quantitative measurement of savings.

However, in the case of the Cambodian highway investigation, it is possible that the U.S. Government may recover from $2½ to $3 million from the contractors involved.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and any nonmonetary benefits:

Under date of August 18, 1961, the Director of ICA advised the subcommittee that the recommendations contained in its report "U.S. Aid Operations in Peru," are receiving the agency's most careful consideration as it proceeds with the task of organizing a new agency to carry on the mutual security program and establishing procedures for that agency. The Director stated, "In general the recommendations of the subcommittee appear to offer practical solutions to the problems noted in the report." He further stated that many recommendations previously made by the subcommittee have been adopted and have resulted in improved administration.

Following its investigation of certain road contracts which had been awarded to the contractor who built the Cambodian port highway, the U.S. Corps of Engineers disqualified that contractor from bidding on the $40 million construction of the main section of the Afghanistan regional highway project. The Corps of Engineers ruled that the firm was ineligible to bid on grounds that included poor performance in Cambodia.

During the subcommittee's inquiry into possible failure on the part of voluntary relief agencies to conform with statutory marking requirements on all commodity containers used in shipments of food surpluses under the ICA Public Law 480 program, the voluntary agency whose alleged noncompliance had caused the initiation of the inquiry, issued letter instructions to its agents to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

(e) Days of hearings held:

	Days
1. Peru investigation	10
2. Afghanistan highway	3
3. Cambodian highway	1
4. Bolivian aid program	1
Total	15

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee:

1. H.R. 8793, 87th Congress, by Congressman HARDY, to amend section 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the furnishing of certain efficiency records and other material to the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) Reports issued: None.

(c) Days of hearings held: None.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of each received:

The subcommittee has received 15 reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) Action taken:

1. Audit of Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation supervised by Federal Home Loan Bank Board, year ended June 30, 1960. No action contemplated at this time.

2. Audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1961. Audit disclosed no deficiencies requiring action.

3. Audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for year ended June 30, 1960. GAO recommended amendments noncontroversial. Inquiry disclosed Treasury not pressing for legislation at this time. No action contemplated.

4. Audit of Federal home loan banks supervised by Federal Home Loan Bank Boards, year ended June 30, 1960. Audit disclosed no matters requiring action.

5. Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1960. Audit disclosed no matters requiring action.

6. Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1960. Report being used in connection with present study of aid program in Latin America.

7. Review of mutual security program presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1961 for economic assistance to Korea, Pakistan, and Vietnam, Department of State. No action at this time. May be used for next session.

8. Review of negotiation and administration of selected construction and technical service contracts, ICA, Department of State, fiscal years 1958–60. Report covers most points treated in prior studies of subcommittee. Used in connection with examination of ICA Afghanistan highway contracts. No further action at this time.

9. Audit of Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1960. No action contemplated at this time.

10. Review of civilian and military personnel utilization in district offices and of certain military pay functions, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, June 1960. In view of recommended Treasury studies, no action by subcommittee contemplated at this time.

11. Audit of Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, fiscal years 1959 and 1960. No further action contemplated at this time.

12. Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Iran, ICA, Department of State, fiscal years 1956 and 1960. Reviewed and held in pending status for possible consideration next session.

13. Review of permissive activities relating to the manufacturing and taxation of distilled spirits, wine, beer, and tobacco products of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, November 1960. Reviewed and held in pending status for possible consideration next session.

14. Review of power activities, U.S. section—International Boundary and Water Commission; United States and Mexico, Department of State, fiscal year 1958–60. Reviewed and discussed with GAO. Will follow up to determine Department of Interior compliance with GAO recommendations.

15. Examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Thailand as administered by the ICA, Department of State, under the mutual security program for fiscal years 1955 through 1960. Reviewed and held in pending status for possible consideration next session.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

(See I(c) above.)

(b) Other affirmative benefits:

(See I(c) above.)

Under date of September 18, 1961, the Comptroller General directed a letter to the chairman of this subcommittee reading in part as follows:

"By highlighting significant deficiencies in the Peru aid program, the subcommittee has alerted the responsible agencies to the urgent need for effective supervision of all foreign aid operations and thus made an important contribution to better administration of the foreign aid program."

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

1. Continued study of operations of the mutual security program in several Latin American countries.

2. Continued study of marking requirements on containers used in shipment of Public Law 480 surplus food.

3. Study of certain of the functions and operations of the Office of Emergency Planning with particular emphasis on the rubber stockpiling program.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DONABLE PROPERTY

(Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued: No formal investigative reports.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

The subcommittee, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress kept in close contact with the various executive agencies connected with the donable program as well as the State agencies for surplus property. Staff of the subcommittee has several problems under careful scrutiny and has been investigating them informally.

The staff administrator has attended several meetings this session. He attended regional meetings of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington and Newington, Conn., a seminar at the University of Massachusetts, a dedication and meeting in Dayton, Ohio where the University of Dayton has received surplus property for their school; visited the industrial school at Piketon, Ohio, where they are using many useful items of machine tools. In July the staff administrator attended the

annual conference of the National Association of State Agents for Surplus Property at Phoenix, Ariz. En route to the meeting he stopped at Flint, Mich.; Dayton, Ohio, and the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base at Phoenix to investigate supply management operations.

The chairman of the subcommittee has requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to cooperate with the State agencies and the subcommittee staff in investigating all possible ways of streamlining donable property administration in order to reduce costs and to contribute the maximum possible to the constructive purposes of the program. The Secretary agreed to do this; and a joint conference is planned at Seattle, Wash., during the week of October 16.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

During the fiscal year 1961, a total of $318,765,361 in surplus property, at acquisition cost, was received by the States. Despite the fact that a total of $318,765,361 was transferred during fiscal year 1961 and a total of almost $400 million in fiscal 1960, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare states that the needs for institutions of public health, education, and civil defense, have not been met and this is readily understandable since there are at least 254,000 eligible institutions in the United States.

There is a continual expansion in the number of eligible donees as the Nation's population expands, and it would be difficult to estimate the amount of useful and needed surplus property that could be properly absorbed by these institutions.

The transfer of $318,765,361 in surplus property to donee institutions constitutes a saving to the taxpayers of many millions of dollars, since the property, if sold, would have returned no more than 5 percent on the average.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

The Department of Defense has announced that the regulations have been amended to permit a longer screening time for nonreportable property to education, public health, and civil defense units. This was the result of a joint study by General Services Administration, Department of Defense, Bureau of the Budget, and the State agencies. The study was instituted as a result of a request to the Bureau of the Budget by the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property.

On February 2, 1961, the subcommittee staff developed information that tax refunds, approximately $4 billion, are annually due on some 35 million returns. Consequently, if the submission of returns and payment of the refunds were expedited, large sums of money would be put in circulation as a stimulant to the economy. Furthermore, such a procedure would not cost anything, since the refunds are legal obligations against the Government.

A short memorandum developing this idea was prepared and the majority leader presented it at the next leader's meeting with the President. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue considered the idea favorably and issued instructions to the field to advise the public that speedy action would be given to requests for refunds. As a result, a large sum of money was placed in circulation; and this has been one of the successful recovery measures which is referred to by the President's Economic Advisers.

(e) Days of hearings held: None.

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: 38 bills were referred to the subcommittee.

(b) Reports issued: House Report 561 (H.R. 5096) (S. Rept. No. 271 (S. 796)), to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies. Passed the House July 10, 1961—passed the Senate May 26, 1961—approved July 20, 1961. (Public Law 87–94).

At the request of the chairman of the subcommittee, the staff worked with the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee and officials in the State Department (ICA) to amend section 608 of S. 1983 (H.R. 8400) concerning the amount of domestic excess property to be made available for foreign-aid programs. As originally drafted, the bill would have permitted an unlimited amount to be taken, thus seriously affecting our own donee institutions, since the donable program is based on surplus property; that is, excess property not required for the needs of Federal agencies. Section 608, as amended, permits ICA to utilize $45 million of domestic excess property for the foreign aid programs (Public Law 87–195).

(c) Days of hearings held: None.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

(a) Number of each received: One Executive communication, No. 174, consisting of a letter from the General Services Administration, dated December 30, 1960, was received by the subcommittee.

(b) Action taken: This report concerned the proposal of the General Services Administration to receive papers and other historical materials of former President Herbert Hoover for a presidential library at West Branch, Iowa. On March 1, 1961, the subcommittee took unanimous affirmative action to accept the proposal of the General Services Administration.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries: Covered below.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: On August 31, 1961, the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, announced the establishment of a Defense Supply Agency (DSA). This action will bring about the consolidation of several common supply and service activities in the three military departments with an anticipated savings of some $2 billion annually. This action by the Secretary stems in large part from the authority of the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

As indicated above, there has been a reduction in the amount of surplus property available for the donable program. This results from better management and utilization in the Department of Defense and by the General Services Administration in the civilian program.

It is expected that the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency will bring about still further progress in the Department of Defense and that the amount of surplus property will continue to decrease after consolidated common use inventories are brought under management control by the new agency.

It is, therefore, essential that those responsible for the donable program in the Executive and State agencies take advantage of all available surpluses for the unlimited needs of education, health, and civil-defense institutions. A program for the purpose as outlined above (I(b)), together with the analysis, evaluation, and disposition of pending bills, will constitute the projected program for the remainder of the 87th Congress.

SPECIAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

(Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued:

1. House Report No. 818, "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies" (progress of study, July–December 1960), issued July 28, 1961.

A major purpose of this report is to record the results of the subcommittee investigation during the last 6 months of the 86th Congress into improper restrictions on Government information. Also included in the report is an analysis of the Executive order establishing the system of restrictions on military information and a case study of a dramatic resolution of an attempt to use the claim of Executive privilege to withhold information from Congress.

Of the 28 cases discussed in this report, definite improvements in information availability can be reported in 11 instances. In 12 cases there was no change in the policy of restriction, and mixed results characterize the remaining 5 cases.

Improvements in information availability

1. The Department of Defense after long delay promulgated a directive establishing an automatic time-ladder method of downgrading various kinds of classified documents.

2. The Department of Defense modified a basic form used in the industrial security program in order to prevent needless and wasteful overclassification.

3. The Air Force abandoned its attempt to keep from the public the names of generals qualifying for flight pay without the necessity of flying.

4. The Air Force completed a lengthy review of questionable material in one of its training manuals and rescinded the publication in question.

5. The Navy conceded that one of its censors had been "overzealous" in deleting material from a manuscript submitted for security review.

6. The Navy reconsidered its claim of secrecy for the prices paid manufacturers of jet aircraft engines and made public all such information except classified data.

7. The Navy expunged from the records of Navy Band members adverse entries made in retaliation against their criticizing the handling of information about the air crash at Rio de Janeiro.

8. The Department of Labor reversed the policy under which it had kept secret the facts about growers found guilty of violating the Mexican labor agreement.

9. The Coast Guard reaffirmed its intention to make available to the public as soon as possible information about violations of the Motorboat Act.

10. The Atomic Energy Commission finally released to Congress and the public photographs of the 15-year-old nuclear bombs, many years after they had been declassified.

11. The White House revised the basic Executive order setting up the military classification system so as to limit the number of agencies which can restrict information.

Continued restrictions on information availability

1. The Department of Agriculture persisted in contending that the people have no right to know about Govenment contracts.

2. The Department of Agriculture refused to make available to the public minutes of an advisory committee meeting dealing with management of national forest land.

3. The Army admitted it had managed release of information about helicopter test results in order to gain publicity, and denied that such news management infringed on the people's right to know.

4. The Navy refused to provide materials needed by Congress for a study of Navy information clearance procedures.

5. The Department of Interior withheld a procedural memorandum from the public despite questions raised as to its authority to do so.

6. The Department of Labor persisted in its refusal to provide Members of Congress or the public information about out-of-court settlements of wage-hour violations.

7. The Department of State refused to review newly imposed restrictions on availability of historical documents to scholars and students.

8. The Internal Revenue Service formalized the policy of cloaking in secrecy the names of persons or firms commenting on proposed changes in tax regulations.

9. The District of Columbia Commissioners declined to open their legislative meetings to the public, claiming that the law is silent on the matter.

10. The Federal Aviation Agency refused to discontinue its discriminatory policy among news media and make available tape recordings of commercial airplane crash sounds.

11. The Federal Aviation Agency continued to withhold from State aviation agencies reports of probable cause of airplane accidents.

12. The U.S. Information Agency, backed up by President Eisenhower, refused to make available to Congress public opinion polls obtained at public expense.

PARTIAL IMPROVEMENT IN INFORMATION AVAILABILITY

1. Although the Army conceded that a press dispatch had been improperly censored by one of its civilian personnel, it did nothing to correct the situation except issue a brief memorandum.

2. The Army finally released to the public an unclassified report that it had been requested by another agency to suppress, but in doing so maintained that it had the right to withhold such information.

3. The Army refused to make public information about unsuccessful bids, although the information was given to a Member of Congress, thus reversing an earlier refusal.

4. The Army withheld, until 1 day after the election, an unclassified report analyzing testimony given in public before a committee of Congress.

5. The Post Office Department clarified regulations on withholding certain personnel information but declined to seek specific statutory authority for the withholding.

* * * * *

2. House Report No. 1215, Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Telephone Monitoring), issued September 19, 1961.

This report lists the results of a questionnaire sent to 37 Federal agencies on the practice of monitoring Government telephone calls which is not a planned development; it has just grown. Usually under no regulations—often without even the knowledge of responsible officials—it has become commonplace for a secretary or an electronic recording device to be listening in on many Government telephone calls.

A table summarizes the telephone monitoring practices in the 37 Federal agencies contacted. For purposes of the inquiry, telephone monitoring was defined to include electronic transcriptions as well as "a secretary or any other person being on the line for the purpose of taking either a verbatim or partial transcript of the conversation, whether or not the person on the other end of the conversation is notified of the monitoring." The summary shows that "33 of the 37 Federal agencies permit telephone monitoring; 21 have no regulations controlling telephone monitoring; 17 do not always require the other party to be warned a call is monitored."

As a result of the subcommittee's inquiry, many Government agencies apparently took a careful look at telephone monitoring practices for the first time. Seven agencies established telephone monitoring regulations after the inquiry, for example.

After the subcommittee's inquiry was initiated, reports were received that many Government telephones were equipped with special listening-in devices. Two systems in use are the transmitter cutoff switch installed on Government telephones for an extra charge of 25 cents a month and the listening-in circuit which costs 75 cents a month extra.

In view of the facts uncovered in the survery of telephone monitoring practices, the House Government Operations Committee concluded that—

Big brother may not be watching you, yet, but his secretary probably is listening in on your telephone calls to Government agencies. This telephone eavesdropping should be banned and all types of listening in should be tightly controlled by clear regulations which, at the very minimum, require Government officials to warn callers of telephone monitoring. When this is done it is unlikely that the Government will have to run up a monthly telephone bill for secret snooping devices to permit telephone eavesdropping.

The committee states that a complete survey of telephone monitoring practices in Federal Government is indicated to determine, among other things, exactly how many telephone listening-in devices the Government rents. The committee recommended that:

1. Every Government agency should control telephone monitoring by clear, written regulations.

2. The regulations should ban telephone eavesdropping.

3. The regulations should ban use of recording devices unless there is advance notice to the other party.

4. The regulations should clearly specify that advance notice must be given whenever a secretary or any other person is placed on the line for any purpose whatsoever.

* * * * *

3. House Report 1257, "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies" (progress of study, January–August 1961), issued September 22, 1961.

This report results from a decision, early in the 87th Congress, that the same procedures the subcommittee had followed in past studies would be employed with the new administration. Such a decision followed naturally from earlier findings that the problem of secrecy in Government is not a partisan one, but stems from the nature of bureaucracy as well as from the ever-present influence of military secrecy. Therefore, the subcommittee set out to investigate reports of continuing restrictions on the availability of information from Federal departments and agencies, to confer with the new administrators and executives on these restrictions, and to report the results of its studies to the committee and the Congress.

There were information problems left over from the previous administration in some 13 Federal departments and agencies. In addition to bringing these to the attention of the new administration, the subcommittee also worked on an equal number of new information restrictions which developed after the present administration took over. This report covers the attempts to clear up past information problems as well as the efforts to remove new information restrictions which arose during the first 8 months of the present administration.

The report includes a summary of each of the 34 information cases covered, a section setting forth findings and conclusions based on the cases, and a section covering the details of each of the cases.

The report states that most of the leftover information problems have been solved. Action came in nearly every case after a reminder from Congress of the President's unequivocal stand on freedom of information. And in those cases where congressional pressure was not enough, the weight of the White House was added to help reestablish the people's right to know.

Commenting on new information problems which have arisen this year, the report states that the experience of the present administration with its own information problems shows that a thin veneer of new leadership, superimposed on the massive bureaucracy, is not enough to prevent secrecy-minded career officials from equating secrecy with good government. But day-by-day pressure from above can prevent secrecy from becoming a way of life in government.

In a special comment on military information problems, the report concludes that the reaction of the new officials of the present administration, as they faced the military-security information problems which have plagued democratic government since its inception, appeared to be confusion at first, followed next by a desire to hide the ugly facts on international life from the American public, and finally by a firm resolve to protect the people's right to know both the good and the bad. Translating that resolve into effective information practices is one of the crucial challenges the new administration faces.

(b) Investigations not resulting in formal report:

Additional subcommittee activities, not covered in the formal reports, include extensive assistance to Members and committees of Congress, and Members of the House and Senate in removing restrictions on information and solving related problems. Similar assistance has been provided regularly for other researchers and historians. Specific investigations also have been made of the following matters:

1. The head of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett, took steps to force a broadcasting company and a number of local television stations to make changes in certain episodes of "The Untouchables."

2. Comdr. John James, USN, was relieved of his duties in the Clearance Branch, Office of the Chief of Information, following clearance of a magazine article. The Navy contended the action was a routine administrative shift.

3. The Air Force delayed announcing the cause of the crash of a B–52 in northern California, later reporting the crash due to gasoline shortage caused by a number of complicating circumstances.

4. The Federal Communications Commission, in letters to thousands of local radio stations, attempted to impose "national defense" secrecy restrictions on seemingly routine data. Investigation revealed, however, that the Commission had a unique problem, because certain information could apparently not be protected in a manner authorized by the appropriate Executive order.

5. The Upper Colorado River Commission, an agency set up under an interstate compact consented to by Congress and chaired by the representative of the United States, excluded the public from a meeting at which the Commission approved a proposal by private power companies.

6. The Weekly News Digest, circulated to more than 4,000 persons nationally from headquarters of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, was accused of putting a partisan slant on news items. Changes in the operation of the magazine were expected with the change in administration.

7. C. Darwin Stolzenbach, head of the National Capital Transportation Agency, criticized for holding closed meetings on transportation problems, promised at his swear-in ceremony to follow an open door policy.

8. News photographers were summarily barred from a Military Sea Transportation

Service ship involved in a fire at a San Francisco pier. Following the subcommittee's investigation, a change in Navy public information practices in the San Francisco area was promised.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

The value of breaking down the barriers of unnecessary Government secrecy often cannot be measured in dollars and cents, for the action contributes to an informed public and an effective democracy. Occasionally, however, it is possible to estimate direct monetary savings.

Such is the case with the decision by President Kennedy to follow the often repeated recommendations of the House Government Operations Committee and establish a system for routine declassification or downgrading of security documents filling thousands of Government file drawers. His Executive Order 10964 affects classified documents in storage and those in current use. It also makes unnecessary the use of expensive insulated safes. An economic analysis of the effect of the order disclosed that the reduction of unnecessary secrecy surrounding stored security documents will save the Government an estimated $48,000 a year. The new system for handling current security documents will save $712,500 a year, and the estimated annual savings on safes will be $248,000. Thus, this single action by the President—an action following up on recommendations made by the committee since 1958—will save an estimated $1,008,500 a year.

In another area substantial savings can be expected. The report on telephone monitoring practices (H. Rept. 1215) already has resulted in some administrative changes and more are expected. As a result of the report, for instance, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department disposed of telephone monitoring devices, resulting in an immediate saving of $1,500 a year.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

Improvements in Government public information practices resulted from each of the investigations noted above; such changes are noted in each case.

(e) Days of hearings held:

No hearings were held.

II. LEGISLATION

No legislation was referred to the subcommittee.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

Because of the subcommittee's close work with GAO officials on problems of access to information, audit reports on other matters, when they also deal with information problems, are sent to the subcommittee in addition to their being referred to the subcommittees primarily concerned. The following three reports were received, and an investigation of the information problems is underway.

1. Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Iran.

2. Review of selected activities of the Bureau of the Budget.

3. Examination of economic and technical assistance program for Thailand.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

Many of the subcommittee's activities this year are an extension of investigations initiated in prior years. Among the continuing benefits is an estimated annual saving of $400,000 resulting from Defense Department action in late 1958 removing unnecessary restrictions from historical military documents.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Each one of the past investigations which has not resulted in removal of unjustifiable information restrictions is continuing; in addition, work will be done on new information problems expected to arise.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ASSIGNED POWER AND LAND PROBLEMS

(Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued: None.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Kennecott Copper land exchange: The subcommittee is investigating allegations that the Bureau of Land Management exchanged public land worth about $493,000 for land worth less than $4,400, notwithstanding an alleged trespass on the public lands by building a town on the public lands under the guise of a mining lease.

2. Withholding of Central Valley power from Sacramento Municipal Utility District: The subcommittee is investigating charges that the top officials of the Interior Department in the previous administration refused to allow the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, a preference customer, to obtain power from the Central Valley project in California in excess of the district's allotment at a time when substantial quantities of power were being sold to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which is not a preference customer, thereby forcing on the district liability that may reach $990,000 a year during the next 10 years.

3. Increase of dependable power of Central Valley project: The generation of additional power that will begin in 1963 in the Trinity plants of the Central Valley project requires early action to redetermine the dependable power that will be available to preference customers of the Central Valley project and thereby increase the power revenues of the Government. This redetermination must be effected pursuant to the power and sales contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The subcommittee has been keeping a watchful eye on this matter. Unless the redetermination is made promptly and at the maximum possible level, the Government will not obtain maximum revenues from the additional power that will soon be available for sale to preference customers.

4. Water rights in Death Valley National Monument: The subcommittee is actively investigating charges that the Borax Co. in Death Valley National Monument has been illegally using water belonging to the Government and thereby also preventing the National Park Service from developing recreation facilities and public accommodations for which water must be available, as well as charges of malfeasance by certain officials in connection with the disposal of land and water rights in Death Valley National Monument.

5. Electric utility mergers: The subcommittee gave considerable study to the increasing trend toward mergers of electric utilities and the question as to whether the Federal Power Commission is applying adequate and proper criteria in reviewing applications filed in the Commission for merger of electric utilities pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824b).

6. Operations of U.S. Park Police: The subcommittee has been investigating charges concerning maladministration, misfeasance, and wasteful expenditures in the operations of the U.S. Park Police. This police force, consisting of almost 200 men, performs police functions in the National Capital Parks of Washington, D.C., and its environs, as a unit of the National Park Service. In conducting this investigation, the subcommittee has cooperated with other congressional committees and Members of Congress interested in improving the operations of the U.S. Park Police, as well as with the officials of the Interior Department who have responsibility over the Park Police. Following the subcommittee's initiation of its investigation, the Interior Department adopted a new promotion policy for senior police officers, began to consider the filling of several senior positions that had been kept vacant for almost 2 years, and began to reexamine the function and objective of the police force to increase its efficiency and economy. The inevstigation of the Park Police has not been completed. The subcommittee also cooperated with the subcommittee on National Parks of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in drafting proposed legislation to establish a trial board for the Park Police (H.R. 8567).

7. Electric power contract and Yellowstone National Park. The subcommittee has continued to prod the Department of the Interior to complete the restudy of the contract awarded by the Interior Department to the Montana Power Co. in 1959 for supplying electric power to Yellowstone National Park. The subcommittee's study and hearings during the 86th Congress (See H. Rept. No. 1932, 86th Congress, June 22, 1960) had revealed serious errors in the calculations which formed the basis for the negotiations with the company. But to date the Department has not revealed the results of the restudy.

8. Bonneville—California power intertie: During the 86th Congress, the subcommittee intensively examined into a proposal by the Interior Department to sell Bonneville project power at dump power prices to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The subcommittee's study revealed that the proposed contract would probably be contrary to the public interest, and the subcommittee therefore requested the Department to withhold approval of the contract until after a full and independent study could be made of an alternative proposal to construct an extra-high voltage common carrier transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and California. The proposed contract was deferred, and finally abandoned, as a study States of California, Oregon, and Washington, showed that the public interest could best be served by construction of the extra-high voltage common carrier transmission line to interconnect the Bonneville and California electric systems. The Department of the Interior initiated a restudy of its previously limited analysis of such an intertie, and it is expected that the Department's report will be available shortly before the beginning of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This report will be intensively scrutinized by the subcommittee.

9. In addition, the staff of the subcommittee cooperated with the staff of the full committee in preparing preliminary correspondence for the committee chairman on the following matters:

a. Yosemite Park and Curry Co. contract: Charges by the Comptroller General that the Yosemite Park and Curry Co. has, under its National Park Service concession contract, received commissions totaling $976,250 from a single subconcessionaire while paying less than half this sum to the Government as franchise fees for its entire concession operation during the past 18 years.

b. Minerals in railroad grant lands: Charges that public lands were patented to a railroad without investigation of the mineral character of the land, that the valuable minerals in the land still belong to the Gov-

ernment, and that the railroad has no right to exploit the minerals.

c. Contracts for professional engineering services: The propriety of certain contractual agreements for professional engineering services that ordinarily are performed by full-time Government employees.

d. Control of fires in coal deposits: The adequacy of the efforts of the Bureau of Mines to control fires in coal deposits on public lands and also in nonpublic lands. These fires consume large quantities of coal annually and create considerable danger to people, to property, and to natural resources.

e. Alleged conflict of interest in National Park Service: Charges that a park superintendent has received gifts and other personal favors from a concessionaire whose operations are subject to supervision by the superintendent.

10. Contract for electric service for Missileman bases in South Dakota: In the course of the subcommittee's work on other matters, an allegation was received that the Department of the Air Force was about to make contracts for electric service to missileman bases in South Dakota, the effect of which would be to endanger the Government's security in Government loans to several rural electric cooperatives amounting to more than $12,449,000. As the result of a subcommittee inquiry, further examination of the several proposals made by the respective bidders resulted in contracts which preserved the security of these loans, and also resulted in reductions in the price of the power to be supplied under the contracts, thereby saving the Air Force $621,229 to obtain the same amount of power over a 10-year period as compared to the lowest bid initially made.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

Sizable benefits can be expected to flow from the investigative work of the Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems; however, not all of these benefits can be readily translated into dollar figures. In addition, since much of the investigative work is continuing, it is impossible to determine at this time the money savings or recoveries resulting therefrom. An indication of the saving, however, is that resulting from the subcommittee's inquiry on the contract for electric service for Missileman bases in South Dakota, the Air Force will save $621,229 as a result, over a 10-year period.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

See I.(b) above.

(e) Days of hearings held:

None.

II. LEGISLATION

The subcommittee handled no legislation directly, but did cooperate with other committees on various bills during the session, as noted above.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

No General Accounting Office reports were referred to the subcommittee. A few were reviewed for incidental interest.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

See above.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Work will continue on the following matters assigned to the subcommittee: Death Valley National Monument.

Withholding of Central Valley Power from Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

Increase of dependable power of Central Valley project.

U.S. Park Police.

Comparative costs of direct transmission of power to preference customers of the Bureau of Reclamation at various projects, including Deer Creek project in Utah, Central Valley project in California, and elsewhere.

Kennecott Copper land exchange.

Role of Federal Power Commission in reviewing applications for merger of electric Utilities.

Electric power contract for Yellowstone National Park.

Bonneville—California Power Intertie.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

(Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman)

I. INVESTIGATIONS

(a) Reports issued: None.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

The subcommittee has undertaken a complete and comprehensive investigation and study of the organization, operations, practices and procedures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its constituent agencies, Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal home loan banks.

Relative to its previous activity in the 86th Congress, the subcommittee held 2 days of hearings, April 27 and 28, 1961, dealing with the bank board's seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, Long Beach, Calif. These hearings dealt exclusively with the Bellehurst Development. Testimony was received from C. S. Jones, the majority stockholder of the Bellehurst Development, and George A. Hart, Jr., attorney for the various corporations developing the Bellehurst tract.

In August, hearings were held in which testimony was received from two parties complaining of the operation of the bank board with respect to its supervisory and regulatory functions. These two parties were George West, Sr., chairman of the board of First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Atlanta, Ga.; and Robert R. Mullen, president of the Alice Savings & Loan Association, Alice, Tex.

Testimony was also received from employees and agents of the ninth bank board district relative to the board's role in supervising the Alice Savings & Loan Association and in an indictment of Robert R. Mullen that was later dismissed on motion of the defendant. The facts developed in connection with the indictment indicated a need for a searching investigation of the role of bank board personnel with other agencies of the Federal Government—the Department of Justice, the U.S. attorney in Houston, Tex., and the Internal Revenue Service.

The hearings occupied a total of 8 days, August 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1961.

The August hearings indicated a need for further investigation of bank board activities with respect to the Atlanta association and with respect to its activities in a number of other localities. Staff investigators will be sent to the field to study complaints channeled to the subcommittee through several Members of Congress.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation: The subcommittee's activities have been directed toward an improvement in the bank board's practices and procedures. Although dollar savings might result from such improvements, it would be difficult to state the result in terms of specific amounts.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits: It is difficult at this time to say with any certainty what benefits will be attained as a result of the investigation and activities of the subcommittee. It is expected, as a result of the subcommittee's activities, that the position of the board with respect to its supervisory and regulatory responsibilities will be improved; that various apparent deficiencies will be corrected; that the savings and loan industry will benefit from a clearer pronouncement of the operating standards and practices promulgated by the board; and that the efficiency and economy of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its constituent agencies in fulfilling its legislative responsibility will be improved.

(e) Days of hearings held: Hearings were held for 10 days during 1961, April 27 and 28 and August 11, 14, and 15 and August 21–25.

II. LEGISLATION

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: None.

(b) Reports issued: None.

(c) Days of hearings held: None.

III. REPORTS RECEIVED SUCH AS NOTICE OF NEGOTIATED SALES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT REPORTS, AND SIMILAR MATTERS WHICH ARE NOT LEGISLATION

Not pertinent.

IV. PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF CURRENT OR CONTINUING INTEREST

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries: None.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: The Federal Home Loan Bank has informed the subcommittee that a settlement of all outstanding disputes and differences between it and the Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, going back some 17 years, is imminent.

V. PROJECTED PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

The staff will undertake to study the complaints received by the subcommittee regarding the operations, practices, and procedures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Conferences with Bank Board officials will be held when necessary relative to matters of common interest.

Consideration is being given to holding hearings during the present recess period.

Hearings will be scheduled, after Congress reconvenes in January 1962. It is expected that past and future hearings will result in one or more reports.

Government Competition With Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning Government competition with private enterprise.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BUTLER

There are certain basic and fundamental objectives for national policy which are recognized by all of our citizens. The first is the stimulation of the growth in our economy. By that, I mean real growth measured in terms of increased output of the goods, and services our people need.

We also seek an economy where fair competition provides the regulator of all economic activity. The Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act were devised to create a climate in which our private enterprise system could grow and prosper. There are some basic inconsistencies among these different laws, but the Congress

adopted them because of a universal and widely accepted belief in a competitive, market-oriented economy, protected from monopoly control. This is the only system that stimulates producers to ever-greater efforts. Likewise, it provides consumers, including the Federal Government, with maximum values.

Still another objective which each of us seeks is the widest possible tax base to support the many essential services that can best be performed by our 50 States and the local governments which have been created under State constitutions. In these troubled times when heavy tax burdens are imposed upon the American people to meet the ever-growing demands of the cold war, there are compelling reasons to eliminate any activity performed by the Federal Government which private enterprise can conduct more effectively and at a lower cost.

Now that the 1st session of the 87th Congress has adjourned, it is well to reexamine these three objectives which I believe are accepted by all Americans. It is my firm conviction that the growth of our economy in a true sense can best be advanced by unleashing the initiative of private enterprise. Many distinguished economists who have examined the American economic system have stressed the fact that the individual decisionmaking centers found in the millions of American enterprises provide a stimulus for new ideas, new methods, and more effective production. This does not occur in an economy where final judgment is centered in the government. Under our constitutional system, the Federal Government was never intended to undertake business-type activities in competition with its citizens.

Today the Government is the largest single employer in the United States. It owns more real estate and it conducts complex financial operations permeating every area of our economy. A reexamination of these activities is clearly a means of promoting economic growth.

The second objective—the preservation of a competitive economy—presumes an absence of monopolistic power in any sector. The antitrust laws, which are vigorously enforced, assure that no private enterprise will be allowed to restrain the activities of a competitor, large or small. However, if the Federal Government becomes a competitor, the antitrust laws do not apply. Whenever it engages in any activity that is competitive with private firms, its resources are unlimited. It is not subject to the normal regulatory and judicial restraints; its industrial relations policies are not subject to review by the National Labor Relations Board; and its financial operations are not subject to the accounting rules and regulations imposed by the Internal Revenue Service nor are they subject to the approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission or other regulatory bodies

Americans have accepted the premise that competition is the most effective means of promoting the interests of consumers. Every fairminded person therefore will agree that it is virtually impossible for any firm to compete with the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the third objective is the widest possible tax base to support essential local services. For many years, I have consistently opposed the expansion of the Federal Government into areas such as Federal aid to education and other welfare measures. I am not unmindful of the need to provide the best possible training for coming generations of Americans. However, I am convinced that education and countless other matters can best be undertaken by State and local governments and should not be under the domination of the Federal Government.

Those who advocate Federal programs in these areas justify their position on the supposed inability of States and local communities throughout our great Nation to finance adequate programs. I propose to assist the States in securing the necessary revenues by eliminating activities presently conducted within their borders by the Federal Government. They provide little or no tax support to the States and the communities where these Federal operations are conducted. If private enterprise which does not enjoy a tax exemption supplies the same services to the Federal Government, we are providing immediate assistance to the States. This does not require either increasing the national debt or raising the level of Federal taxation. Furthermore, any profits which private enterprise may earn in the performance of these activities will add to Federal revenues.

Mr. President, for many years the subject of Government competition with private enterprise has been studied and reviewed by the Congress. It established the Hoover Commission in 1953 to study the organization of the executive branch of the Government. The Commission made an extensive appraisal of business enterprises within the Government.

The members of this Commission whose efforts were coordinated by former President Hoover included two of my colleagues, one a Republican, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, and the other a Democrat, the senior Senator from Arkansas. It also included two distinguished Members of the other body, again one a Republican, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, and the other a Democrat, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California. Among the 12 dedicated Americans who served on the Commission were 2 outstanding Democrats, James A. Farley and Joseph P. Kennedy. They all supported the basic recommendations of the Commission in the report on business enterprises submitted to the Congress by the Chairman, Herbert Hoover, on May 4, 1955.

The views of the Commission with respect to this broad problem of Government competition with private enterprise are as valid today as they were in 1955. The excerpts from the preface of this report is as follows:

"PREFACE

"Our economic system is based on private enterprise regulated where necessary to prevent monopoly and to provide for freedom of competition.

"The genius of the private enterprise system is that it generates initiative, ingenuity, inventiveness, and unparalleled productivity. With the normal rigidities that are a part of Government, obviously, the same forces that produce excellent results in private industry do not develop to the same degree in Government business enterprises.

"The Government creates business-type enterprises in economic emergencies, in the emergencies of war, and for the development of projects which are not adapted to private enterprise because of their nature or their magnitude. A very large portion of the Government business enterprises originated in World War I, the depression, and World War II.

"One of the major problems before us is the continuation of Government business enterprises after the emergency that engendered them has terminated. One reason that these agencies tend to perpetuate themselves is that by the time their tasks have been completed their personnel and the citizens in the communities where they operate resist termination. As a consequence, all too often they continue to function long after the original need has passed and even though the operation of many of them is not in the public interest.

The Government business-type enterprises, except in a few instances, pay no taxes, and pay little or no interest on the capital invested; they seldom charge depreciation and frequently their directing personnel is not included on their payroll. Likewise the "fringe benefits" of Government personnel in most instances are not included in their costs. Moreover, in addition to the fact that most of them pay no taxes, they deprive the Government of taxes which would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted these operations. Therefore, their claims of financial success are often wholly invalid; and, worse, with the advantages they receive from the Government, they are unfair competition.

"Because of vested interests, misleading or incomplete accounts, or other reasons, some of these enterprises have established an astonishing longevity.

"A classical case of this phenomenon dating from World War I was the Inland Waterways Corporation, which survived for 33 years—and lost money practically every year. It was typical of the vested interests created within and around it.

"The continuance of such activities by the Government must be made subject to rigid justification; occasionally this can be done, but the burden of proof in all instances must be on the Government. Unjustified continuance is a definite injury to the vitality of the whole private enterprise system.

"Aside from the fundamental public policy of maintaining an economic system which has produced the highest standard of living for a whole Nation in all the history of mankind, this system has also amply proved its vitality in preparedness for national defense. It provided inventiveness and productivity which, second only to the valor of our officers and men, have won for us both World War I and World War II. It can, in another such emergency, provide again the national sinews to win.

"It is on these principles that this report is based.

"Yet as this report will show, the Government is conducting a multitude of projects in competition with and to the injury of the very system upon which our future security and prosperity is based.

"While this report was being prepared, the Department of Defense has reviewed the activities of the Department in reducing competition with private enterprise. They enumerate 97 facilities in 20 categories, the elimination of most of which is recommended specifically by our report, which have either been discontinued or scheduled for discontinuance. The action of the Department of Defense is most constructive."

President Eisenhower proceeded to implement the philosophy expressed by the Hoover Commission throughout the Federal Government. Great progress was made in eliminating many business-type activities which were still being conducted by the Federal Government. At one time or another, there had been a justifiable reason for the Federal Government to embark upon these activities. However, bureaucracy is slow to change, and many of these functions continue in operation even though the need for which they were authorized has been fulfilled.

The U.S. Spruce Products Corporation, organized during World War I to provide spruce for airplane fusilages, provides one of the more conspicuous examples of such a practice. Its functions were abolished by an act of Congress a few years after the close of World War I, but in 1946, the corporation still had a president, a secretary, a treasurer, a car, and a chauffeur. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, liquidated by act of Congress in 1957, was provided with $65,000 for administrative expenses of liquidation in the President's 1962 budget.

The Bureau of the Budget during the Eisenhower administration issued directives in January of 1955 and supplemented them

on February 5, 1957, and again on September 21, 1959. They clearly stated the basic policy which should guide every agency of the Government in a reexamination of those activities which compete with private enterprise. I shall quote at this point directly from the policy as expressed in Bulletin No. 60–2 of September 21, 1959.

"It is the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial-industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels."

During the Eisenhower administration the Federal Government sold to private interests the Federal Inland Waterways Corporation, which operated barge lines on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. It also sold the entire synthetic rubber industry which was built during World War II. The national industrial reserve of plants and industrial equipment, under the Department of Defense, had 24 facilities in its plant reserve in 1959. Early in 1961, there were only 13, of which the Government owns only 3.

In President Eisenhower's last state of the Union message, he said:

"There has been a firm policy of reducing competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial and industrial installations and, in addition, the curtailment of approximately 550 industrial installations operated directed by Government agencies."

Now that a new administration has been in office for more than 8 months, the extent to which Government competition with private enterprise has been reduced or increased should be studied. Unfortunately, my examination of the record suggests that the Federal Government is once more embarking on programs which will provide further competition between the Federal Government and private enterprise rather than reducing it.

For example, during the closing days of this session, the Congress enacted an appropriation bill for public works, which provides funds to enable the Federal Government to build the transmission lines for the Colorado River storage project. If private enterprise were entrusted with this task, it is estimated that at least $61 million in Federal taxes and $107 million in State and local taxes would be collected over a 50-year period. Furthermore, $135 million in Federal construction funds would have been saved over the next few years at a time when the demands of national defense are so high. On the other hand, it is fortunate that the House of Representatives rejected the Senate's recommendations for the inclusion of a power reactor at Hanford, Oreg., in the atomic energy authorization bill for the coming year.

There are countless other activities which experience clearly shows could better be performed by private enterprise than through an expansion of business-type activities by the Federal Government. For example, the Defense Department operates air and sea transport services which often compete with private carriers.

Over the years, I have frequently referred to the obvious competition of Navy yards with private shipbuilding facilities. At the present time, more than 80 percent of conversions, alterations, and repairs to naval vessels are performed in naval shipyards. As a result of this competition, five major private facilities on the Pacific coast have been forced out of business since 1957.

To be sure, the Navy must maintain certain basic facilities to meet its needs in times of war. This has been the justification advanced for the continued operation of many shipbuilding and repair operations at a lower cost and more efficiently by existing private firms.

Is the basic concept that only Government facilities can meet wartime needs valid? Certainly, recent history reveals the fact that in every emergency it was necessary to turn to private shipyards and to expand them at an ever-increasing rate at great cost to the Government in order to meet the Navy's needs for new ships and the repair of battle casualties. This would lead to the conclusion that it is essential for the security of our country that private shipyards secure sufficient work at all times to maintain a trained and capable workforce which can furnish the base for necessary expansion in times of need. Fortunately, existing facilities are located along the sea coasts at strategic points, and they have always been at the disposal of the Federal Government.

The operation of naval shipyards which compete with private facilities immobilizes officers whose primary concern should be centered on military functions which are clearly outside the competence of civilians. Instead they are performing managerial functions for which their training and experience is inadequate. I fully recognize the need to maintain naval shipyards in certain locations where private facilities are not available and where national defense needs clearly justify their continuance or expansion.

In citing this competition between the U.S. Navy and private shipyards, I am merely using it as an example of the type of activity which must be constantly restudied in the light of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They have never been officially repudiated by any member of that dedicated group. They were accepted by President Eisenhower and implemented by the Bureau of the Budget.

The time has come when the Congress must once again take such steps as may be necessary to insure that every business-type activity presently conducted by the Federal Government is scrutinized with a view toward only maintaining those that are clearly necessary. Whenever it appears that private enterprise would be a more effective and less costly instrument of production, steps should be taken at least to permit it to demonstrate what could be accomplished with an environment conducive to securing its maximum participation.

We are engaged in a struggle to establish the rights of man throughout the world. In our foreign aid and development programs, it is essential that we encourage the maximum participation by American industry rather than channel our assistance on a government-to-government basis. American firms operating overseas with private capital destroy the Soviet allegations that economic efforts are inevitably linked to political ends. The pursuit of our present policies negates the very ends we are striving to achieve.

An article which appeared in the Saturday Review for September 30, 1961, by Dr. Heinrich Kronstein, director of the Institute for Foreign and International Common Commercial Law in Frankfurt, Germany, studied the delicate balance between private industry and government in their relationship with underdeveloped areas. The excerpts from Dr. Kronstein's article is as follows:

"During recent years the United States has developed, or at least accepted, a fresh approach to American activity in the new countries. The Government has conducted economic relations through its different agencies, or jointly with other governments, usually through the United Nations or an institution established under the auspices of the U.N. In turn, the recently sovereign nations have entered into economic relations through their governments. As a result, private enterprise has to a large extent lost its role as instigator, planner, and executor of development in these new lands. Adaptation of private policy to the needs of the countries or to American needs in foreign markets has declined. Many governments not in the Communist bloc have excluded private enterprise as a participant in important industrial fields or have created difficulties that amount to practical exclusion.

"A number of more or less settled practices have developed, such as making outright gifts of military and other technical materials, offering governmental long-term loans, and guaranteeing through governmental agencies credit which is made available as corporate loans.

"The combination of military and economic aid by the same organization, the U.S. Government, is a clear example of the confusion of social functions. The executive and the Congress, formulating one budget, make basic decisions on military, technical, and economic aid, even though these are administered by different agencies.

"Systematic planning of foreign development operations is a job ideally suited to the industrial experts in our corporations. Perhaps some corporations are engaged in this work, but I doubt that their part is substantial. The advisory services of industrial planners or economists not connected with industry may be helpful, but these people are not occupied with the actual job.

"It is interesting to see what great success a relative newcomer, Italy, has had in industrial planning. Fiat, Montecatini, Italian Edison, Innocento, and Pirelli established a joint agency to prepare a plan for underdeveloped territories. The Iranian Government employed it to outline the development of the southeast part of Iran. Argentina, Egypt, Tunisia, and Togo soon followed. Negotiations with central African states are now pending. This systematic inclusion of a private agency in the planning job is an important step. The Federal Republic of Germany is considering setting up a mixed agency composed of government and private groups to serve the same purpose. But this is still not enough. Private experts continue to be needed after the plan has begun to operate, as is evident in the recent efforts of the Argentine Government to bring American and European technicians there to run industrial plants erected with Government aid. In spite of the fact that the number of industrial plants in Argentina set up with Government aid had increased substantially by 1960, total production has decreased because of the lack of qualified people to run the plants."

One of America's greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, defined the proper role of the Federal Government as follows:

"The function of government is to do for the individual all of those things which he cannot do at all or which he cannot so well do for himself; but in all those things where the community or the individual can take care of his own affairs, the Federal Government ought not to interfere."

A century later the fundamental and constitutional objectives set forth by President Lincoln are still valid. No justification for a continued encroachment upon the activities of private citizens who manifestly cannot compete with their own Government has been made.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, the Los Angeles

Herald-Express has published some articles by George Todt, which I think every Member of Congress will want to read. This writer has done a fine job of graphically describing some very important issues of the day. I, therefore, wish to have five of these articles inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—COMMUNISM SHELTERED?

("There's villainous news abroad." Shakespeare—Henry IV, pt. 1, act 2, scene 4.)

Let's call this article today what it really is—an "open letter" to the Hollywood motion picture producers' fraternity, and may we expect an answer soon?

Perhaps before Christmas, too.

Here is a 64-million dollar question: Why haven't you gentlemen produced some anti-Communist films by 1961?

I thought we were in a cold war with the Marxist dictatorship based behind the Iron Curtain. At least the American people are being squeezed for upwards of $50 billions a year to support a military machine whose only justification is this one.

WHY ARE YOU

The international Communist criminal conspiracy is the deadliest threat to our liberties which this Nation ever has faced in her history. Yet you are still engrossed in making films against the long-crushed Nazis. Bigger and better anti-Nazi films are your highest priority.

But where are any anti-Communist offerings?

Make no mistake about it, this writer despises Adolf Hitler and all he stood for quite as much as you do. It was for this reason alone that I volunteered for service in World War II.

What I learned about Hitler in the numerous Hollywood films you produced in profusion 20 or 25 years ago motivated me greatly then.

All of us are glad he was defeated and killed.

This is now water under the bridge.

We are facing an even greater enemy today—and it is the brutalitarian Communist who is on the march in 1961, not the defeated Nazi totalitarian of 1941.

RAISING THE DEAD

You gentlemen seem to be 20 years behind the times.

Let's go to the heart of the problem: Is there a hidden reason why you cannot make anti-Communist films today?

Is the U.S. Department of State to blame?

Are you helpless in the face of secret directives from the Government—of the type akin to the notorious Fulbright memorandum to the Pentagon a short time ago—to make films which show up the imperialistic Communists in their true light?

A man close to the Hollywood picture recently told me that such was indeed the case. I found this "bombshell" hard to believe although I respect the gentleman's integrity who made this well-nigh-incredible statement. He is a member of the Greater Los Angeles Press Club.

WHEN IT'S TRUE

What the public would like to know—straight from the horse's mouth—is whether or not this may be true?

Have you been intimidated behind the scenes by the Government against making anti-Communist films for any reason whatsoever?

Let the long-suffering public have the facts if such has happened in the past and we will have a storm of protest which will cause the Fulbright memorandum fiasco to pale into insignificance in comparison. You will receive much support from the people.

Upon reflection, there are many specious reasons which might be advanced to the film industry why it would be advantageous for us not to make motion pictures which depicted the Reds in a bad light.

It could be said that we were engaged in delicate negotiations to disarm, end the cold war, not stir up the explosive international situation to become worse, et cetera, et cetera, and et cetera. We might dream up many such self-serving excuses.

REDS WE DREAD?

But the real point is that such specious reasoning did not apply in the case of Hitler a quarter of a century ago—so why now?

The Nazis and Communists are simply the opposite sides of the same totalitarian coin. What is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. Why show partiality for either one?

I agreed with you 25 years ago that the Nazis and Fascists under Benito Mussolini were no good.

I hope you will agree with me now that the Reds are no-goodniks, too.

I suggest you give them both the same treatment. Why not?

Since when have the Marxists been kind to American free enterprise?

If there should be some of you who cannot agree with my premise that the Communist threat is the real one today, don't complain to me—just tell it to Congress.

For some unexplained reason the gentlemen on Capitol Hill are assigning about 10 percent of the GNP (gross national product) annually to support a military machine designed to fight the Reds.

Perhaps we should ask what for?

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—GOLDWATER VS. LIBERALISM

(" 'Tis the sunset of life gives me mystical lore, And coming events cast their shadows before."—Campbell, "Lochiel's Warning.")

Not long ago I had breakfast with some friends in Los Angeles where Senatory BARRY GOLDWATER was the speaker and he received a tremendous reception from the numerous and important Republican brass present. His stock is going up every day. What is his thinking?

In the first place, he is entirely lucid and reasonable. When one hears his words, it is not the impossible balderdash relayed by his wily ADA political opposition which has axes to grind. GOLDWATER is completely down to earth, modest, and speaks in a normal tone of voice. He is the antithesis of the rabblerouser type.

Best of all, he shoots straight from the shoulder. There is no pussyfooting or indecisiveness with him. Ask him an honest question, you get an honest answer back. No doubletalk.

THOSE WHO SHOUT

BARRY GOLDWATER is of pioneer Western stock—half Jew and half gentile. He is very proud of both. And so am I. In my mind, he represents the best of our American Judaic-Christian philosophy which is the motivating force of the free enterprise system.

We Americans are a great partnership of various peoples, races, religions, and colors. As somebody once observed so aptly: "America is a tune which must be sung together." Let's keep it in tune.

One of the reasons I am proud to be a citizen of this great Republic of ours is that we have had more success than any other nation in working together with our differences. The key to success in this field is the word "Respect"—not "Tolerance." The latter is a weak word to me. It implies a position inherent within it of one who is superior, another inferior. But respect means something else.

WITHOUT REASON

Let us all recognize that our own personal rights end where the other person's nose begins—and then resolve that we will "live and let live" where our neighbors are concerned. Respect for the rights of others is something all of us can practice increasingly and be better Americans for it.

But to get back to Senator GOLDWATER. In this writer's mind he is the epitome of manly courage backed up by strong moral convictions and a thorough religious belief in God, the Father of us all. He is a fighter who would rather be dead than Red. He would have no trouble in standing up to Nikita Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung; would tell them off.

CARRY GUNS ABOUT

Although he is a strong man, GOLDWATER also knows Shakespeare's admonishment in "Measure for Measure" where the bard uses these words:

"O, it is excellent to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant."

But GOLDWATER, contrary to former Oxford Rhodes Scholar J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT—a fellow Senator and brother Sigma Chi, incidentally—thinks we ought to shoot for victory over communism, not merely put up a passive defense.

The Arizona statesman also diametrically opposes the liberal FULBRIGHT in the latter's controversial stand on muzzling our military men in the Nation's desperate fight against the Reds. The former is a brigadier general in the USAF Reserve. He is very popular with our fighting men in the armed services.

GOLDWATER'S philosophy and American ideology is just as modern as the supersonic jets he flies—and he has checked out on most of the newest jobs in Uncle Sam's arsenal. He is in his early 50's but somehow personifies youth with our young people, who are his greatest admirers.

OUT OF SEASON

I don't know if BARRY GOLDWATER may be our next President, but he might be. And this is the reason why: The American people are tired of losing our shirts on the world stage. They are aghast that we, the most powerful nation in the history of the earth, are getting kicked in the pants by every world gangster and pipsqueak. When do we start winning?

Unfortunately from our standpoint, the so-called "Liberals" have been unable to win for losing—and this is the acid test. I care not for political parties or personalities here; I just want us to win. If the liberal strategists cannot do it for us, then let's get a real conservative in there to see what he can do. Fair enough?

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—SOCIALISM IS COMMUNISM

("Truth crushed to earth shall rise again."—Bryant, "The Battle Field.")

Here in America, we have long had an old saying: "The truth should never hurt." But does it really pain sometimes after all? How about the muzzling of the military recently through the controversial methods utilized by the secret Fulbright memorandum? What are the facts in this curious, puzzling case?

I think Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, let the cat out of the bag in a remarkable speech to the Senate not long ago. He is a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve and a real authority on military affairs which concern our men in uniform.

In a particularly down-to-earth assessment of the Fulbright memorandum, he explained why its ADA originator has become so emotional and distraught regarding participation of our keenest military minds in the ideological (but certainly nonpolitical) battle against international and domestic Reds.

TO SEE BEHIND

"If the military teaches the true nature of communism," said the patriotic Senator from South Carolina, "it must necessarily teach that communism is fundamentally socialism.

"When socialism in turn is understood, one cannot but help realize that many of the domestic programs advocated in the United States—and many of those adopted—fall clearly within the category of socialism.

"Military leaders, in this case, are rightly teaching the truth. As is often the case, the truth can and does hurt."

I think this correct assessment goes to the very heart of the problem we are facing now. The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) largely are calling the tune for the new administration in Washington. This is, to all practical purposes, the political action arm in the United States of the British Fabian Socialists (see "Keynes at Harvard"). It is unduly aggressive and powerful.

So much so, in fact, that it can stifle outraged criticism of its aims and objectives from patriotic American sources. At least in certain cases. The military falls within this category now. The Fabian-oriented Arkansas solon, one of the ADA's most articulate spokesmen and a former Rhodes Scholar at Britain's Oxford University, has spoken.

COMMIE FACADE

He has managed to have imposed on our best military brains what amounts to a kind of anticonservative thought control, or censorship.

The generals and admirals are no longer encouraged to push socialistic communism to its well-deserved grave, as of yore. Except when the U.S. Congress is asked for new taxpayer dollars in huge appropriations bills.

Why should we commit upward of $50 billion per year on our Military Establishment—the Reds being our only real justification for our spending such astronomical sums—if the erudite Senator FULBRIGHT thinks Marxist communism is not enough of a menace to get ourselves upset about?

The real truth is that imperialistic, slave-ridden communism is indeed a real and terrifying enemy of our Republic and its proven free enterprise system, our Judaic-Christian culture and cherished American way of life.

A SOCIALIST MIND

During World War II, the psychotic Communist leaders massacred in cold blood some 16,000 captured Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and dumped their yet-warm bodies in a mass grave.

No wonder our military men are determined that America will never surrender in a fit of folly to the Reds.

They would become only the first of many millions of our people cruelly to be put to death by the notorious Iron Curtain cult of mass murder.

IS PEA IN A POD

Today the conservative counterrevolution against pacifist, appeasement-minded ADA doctrine is in full swing throughout the Republic.

New societies and patriotic groups are springing up in every city, town, and hamlet. There is a tremendous ground swell of old-fashioned American patriotism in the air, and it comes not a moment too soon. Our people are understandably afraid because our leaders have lost on the world stage far more often of late than they have won for us. It should not be.

Recently I talked before the newly formed La Habra Area Americanism Society which had started out with 8 citizens 6 weeks prior to my arrival there—and had already mushroomed into 350 members.

This is typical of what is happening all over the Nation now.

We will start to see the dividends in the 1962 elections.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—CONSERVATIVE ON UPSWING

("The old order changeth, yielding place to new." Tennyson—"The Passing of Arthur.")

According to the eminent weekly news magazine, U.S. News & World Report, in its recent issue commencing on page 45, "the signs are up, pointing to a change of direction for the Kennedy administration." And not a moment too soon.

Is J. F. K. veering to the conservative side? Well, at least a little bit it seems. So-called "liberal" solutions to our soaring troubles—and they are manifold nowadays—are fast becoming bankrupt and increasingly out of style. This illuminating article is worth reading.

AN UPWARD SWING

For it backs up the contention of this column over a long while that indeed a great conservative counterrevolution against Fabian socialism, either of the old New Deal or the newer New Frontier variety of same, is now sweeping the Nation.

Currents like this one are slow to start, sluggish in motion, and not always discernible to the casual onlooker at first glance. Many of us may not know exactly what to look for in the way of signs. Only when we go beneath the surface may we be expected to reach the heart of the problem. In this case it is worth looking for.

The main trouble with Fabianism or any other brand of socialism—including communism—is not that it sounds bad in theory. But it has a bad record of producing results for its earlier promises of all things to all men. That is where Marxism falls down.

Socialism cannot work at all without slavish controls over the lives and fortunes of of the citizens who comprise the state, and it must exploit them without feeling—except for its privileged bureaucracy, a self-styled elite which takes the place of the arrogant nobility of another day.

What is the difference anyway?

To the puny Socialist intellectual, whose selfish greed for power over the lives of his fellows overcomes his commonsense, our vaunted free enterprise system is merely decadent and reactionary.

TAKES SOME TIME

How, then, does he explain away the fact that it has produced the modern miracle known as the American way of life wherein 6 percent of the world's population living in the United States have produced almost half the wealth upon this planet?

If free enterprise is truly decadent, as the Marxist propagandists would have the human race believe, then perhaps what is needed today is the export of copious quantities of such American decadence to all the scattered quarters of the globe. At least, it ought to raise the standard of living of all who might be fortunate enough to come into contact with it.

Actually, incredible stupidity—as well as jealousy and envious hatred of the American system—is demonstrated by the great Socialist planners in their myopic, self-defeating attempts to polish off capitalism and free enterprise. The latter is largely the hand that feeds gratuitously much of Marxist bumbling throughout the world.

THEN THE ZING

We have spent over $100 billion in recent years on foreign aid which has largely disappeared as handouts to international Socialist governments

Where would they be today without our free enterprise doles "with no strings attached" to their inept Socialist bureaucrats? How would they be able to keep their collective heads above water, in many instances, without our succor? How can socialism be said to be a better system than free enterprise when the latter pays for itself—and much of Socialist systems elsewhere outside our borders, too?

RINGS THE CHIME

I think it is high time to stop shooting bazookas at the free enterprise goose which lays all those beautiful golden eggs.

Note to Marxists: Why bite the hand that feeds you?

Increasingly, as people commence to think in terms of down-to-earth arithmetic and commonsense in the future, the trend will be increasingly back to capitalism, not socialism. The latter is a fraud in an economic sense. And an ideological mountebank, as well.

As U.S. News & World Report carefully pointed out, there is no evidence of any mass flight to the conservative side yet—but the liberal ice jam is beginning to show some deep cracks.

Perhaps a start in this direction is now being made which will bode well for the Nation's future. Conservatism is the new wave of tomorrow.

Let's encourage J. F. K. to put the brakes on the impractical Fabians.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—WHAT IS CONSERVATISM?

("The nearer the dawn the darker the night."—Longfellow, "Tales of a Wayside Inn.")

No long ago I listened to Los Angeles Congressman EDGAR W. ("ECK") HIESTAND—sometimes called Mr. Conservative in Washington's House of Representatives on Capitol Hill—and heard him make some telling points. What is a conservative, anyway?

HIESTAND defines one as either a Democrat or Republican who believes in conserving the rights of workers, conserving the buying power of the workers' dollar and of the retirement income of pensioners, and in conserving all freedoms and the free enterprise system which made our Nation great.

Few men have done more to make conservatisim the respected word it has become than this California solon. He is definitely in the onrushing Goldwater pattern of thinking, both men live in the same family apartment house building in the Nation's Capital.

THE TRUTH INSIDE

What are more of his beliefs as regards conservative philosophy and ideology? Why has he become a champion against ADA (American for Democratic Action) socialism of the Fabian variety in the United States today? Where does he stand?

Frankly, HIESTAND resents the fact that conservatives—whose American principles stem from our Founding Fathers and the Revolutionary War of 1776, not the Marxist manifesto—are sometime erroneously and spitefully called reactionaries.

He thinks the so-called liberals and other radicals who continue to insist on dragging out the tired old Socialist welfare schemes that have previously failed to be the real reactionaries of today.

The Altadena Congressman strong believes that the purchasing power of our dollar must be strengthened further, not not debased.

OF EVERY MAN

This is a touchy subject, for loss of faith in the U.S. dollar might prove disastrous, at home and abroad. About a year ago there was a serious financial upheaval in Europe—much of it inspired by loose talk of our becoming a second-rate nation and the possibility of inflation through overspending our limited resources.

In the field of foreign policy and national security, HIESTAND stands for achieving a peace without appeasement or surrender. He is against the admission of Red China to the United Nations, thinks Fidel Castro is an abomination who ought to be squelched with old-fashioned American power. Using the U.N.'s military forces to set up a Communist state in the African Congo makes no sense to him. And he stands firmly for the loyalty oath and a continuing fight against all forms of subversion in our country.

IS THE GUIDE

This conservative Congressman—and he is typical of the steadily growing group who are

backing increasingly down-to-earth Americana over Marxist one worldism in these trying times—believes firmly in the free, private responsibility of the individual human being. Cooperation, not coercion.

He wants us to have ever greater opportunities to earn our way in life under a full head of our own steam and progress to a higher standard of living for ourselves.

He does not want us to be placed ultimately on Socialist-type doles, the kind which sap both self-respect and initiative.

Let the Government only do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves. No paternalism, please. We are proud citizens of a libertarian nation which has already demonstrated that we know how to stand on our own feet better than anybody else. Why change now?

WE MUST FAN

In a free economy—such as we have been in the past and, hopefully, may be continued for us in the future—we are allowed in a large measure to chart our own courses without governmental direction to herd us along a pathway chosen for us by what is euphemistically termed the elite; i.e., bureaucratic paternalism.

Those Americans who value personal freedom and making their own individual choices in life, within reason and responsibility dictated by their consciences, will vote increasingly for conservatism in the future.

Freedom is the real wave of the forthcoming era, not serfdom.

Democrats and Republicans will cross party lines to achieve it.

The Small Business Legislative Accomplishments of the 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the small business legislative accomplishments of the 1st session, 87th Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year after year, since 1950, when the present Small Business Committee of the Senate was established by Senate Resolution 58, the Congress has expressed its concern for the welfare of the Nation's small businessmen by the enactment of legislation designed to foster and promote a healthy small business community. No session of Congress in the past decade has adjourned without adding to the legislative arsenal of small business new weapons to help the Nation's small and independent enterprisers wage their oftentimes desperate struggle for survival on today's business battleground.

Perhaps mindful of the growing casualty lists mirrored in the mounting number of small business bankruptcies, the 1st session of the 87th Congress again demonstrated its awareness of the problems of small businessmen through the enactment of various measures to strengthen the small business segment of our economy. In summarizing these at this time, I cannot let the occasion pass without taking notice of the combined efforts of the members of the Senate Small Business Committee to help small businessmen hurdle many of the obstacles which stand between them and the successful conduct of their enterprises. Without stint the members gave of their time and energy to make it possible for the owners and managers of small concerns, if not to overtake, at least to stay competitively within shouting distance of their larger and more powerful rivals. In no slight measure, these efforts of the committee members were responsible for the enactment of significant small business legislation during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

When Congress passed the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, it in effect added a significant new dimension to the Nation's banking system by creating a new primary source of credit in the form of small business investment companies. The response of the investing public to the idea of small business investment companies has exceeded expectations. Today there are in existence 386 investment companies licensed by the Small Business Administration. These have aggregate capital in excess of $300 million available for long-term loans and equity capital for small business enterprises. Even so, as with all new and original concepts, it became evident that opportunities existed for improving and expanding the SBIC program, chiefly by means of making the formation of SBIC's more attractive to the investing public.

With this as an objective, Congress passed S. 902—Public Law 87-341—the Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961, to offer new incentives for the formation of SBIC's. These incentives took the following forms:

1. The amount of subordinated debentures in an SBIC which the Small Business Administration may purchase was raised from $150,000 to $400,000.

2. Banks may now invest 2 percent of their capital and surplus in SBIC's. Previously banks could only invest 1 percent of their capital and surplus in SBIC's.

3. The amount of section 303(b) loans which SBA may make to an SBIC is set at 50 percent of capital and surplus, with a limit of $4 million to any single investment company.

4. The amount of funds which an SBIC may lend to any one business firm was limited to $500,000, unless the SBA grants an exception.

5. SBA was given broad powers to investigate and issue cease-and-desist orders against SBIC's. After a hearing, SBA can suspend the license of an SBIC. Licenses, however, may not be revoked without Federal court action.

6. An additional $75 million was added to SBA's revolving fund for SBIC operations, an increase from $250 million to $325 million.

7. SBIC's may now cooperate with lenders and investors, whether incorporated or unincorporated, in furnishing funds to small business firms. Previously, such cooperation could only be extended to other lending institutions.

Two steps were taken during the 1st session of the 87th Congress to increase the effectiveness of the Small Business Administration as the champion of small business. H.R. 8762—Public Law 87-305—approved September 26, 1961, increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million, thus assuring the agency funds to operate its lending programs throughout fiscal year 1962.

Additionally, Public Law 87-305 laid the foundation for a program designed to increase the role of small concerns as subcontractors on Government procurements. Under its provisions, SBA, the Defense Department, and the General Services Administration must within 90 days from the date of enactment develop cooperatively a small business subcontracting program. Before any regulations governing this program are issued by the Defense Department and GSA, the concurrence of SBA must be obtained. Lacking this, points of disagreement must be referred to the White House for resolution.

No summary of legislation helpful to small business concerns passed during the 1st session of the 87th Congress would be complete, Mr. President, without mention of the following enactments:

S. 2325—Public Law 87-311—should encourage small business to enter the world trade market by clarifying the authority of the Export-Import Bank to insure, coinsure, and reinsure U.S. exports and foreign exports doing business in the United States in an aggregate amount outstanding at any one time of $1 billion against political and credit risks of loss stemming from export activities.

S. 1922—Public Law 87-70—authorized the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to a small business which has suffered substantial injury as a result of its displacement by federally aided urban renewal or highway construction program or any other construction program which was financed by Fedral funds.

S. 1—Public Law 87-27—Area Redevelopment Act, extended indefinitely the authority of the Small Business Administration, due to expire June 30, 1961, to make loans to State and local development companies. In commenting on this provision, the House Banking and Currency Committee's report on S. 1, stated: "These loans can greatly benefit areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus and will therefore promote the general purposes of the area redevelopment bill. * * * Through March 17, 1961, loans totaling $10,700,000 had been made * * * under this authority. * *. * No losses have been incurred to date."

Mr. President, these accomplishments of the 1st session of the 87th Congress with respect to small business legislation will undoubtedly help to improve the competitive position of our more than 4.5 million small and independent enterprises.

There remain, however, some important small business measures on which congressional action has not been completed. In the fields of tax relief and antitrust enforcement several bills that were introduced in the first session will again be considered when Congress convenes in January 1962. It is my hope that careful and prompt action on these measures next year will make it possible for the 87th Congress to go down in history as a Congress which left no doubt about its desire to strengthen our free enterprise system by fostering and encouraging small businesses to enjoy a healthy growth along with our rapidly expanding national economy.

Can't Change National Thinking by Passage of a Law or Gift of Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if we are to judge by the standards used by the people of the Fourth Congressional District and, I assume, that of the Midwest generally, the House has seemed to show a lack of responsibility—a lack due not to a lack of knowledge or our situation, but rather to what might be termed the "atmosphere" or "the climate", as the intellectuals put it, which exists here in Washington, which, overall, seems to be that our resources,

our ability, and our power are unlimited. That there is no bottom to the barrel; that, willy-nilly (our taxpayers can in some way give to all other people in other parts of the world everything they may desire and some things they do not want—that we can not only give them everything they ask, but force them to accept some things they do not want and will not use—while we at the same time prepare for an all-out war. That is a false assumption. If we continue to accept and act on it, we will meet disaster.

There seems to be a feeling on the part of our Congressmen and their advisers that we can, by the passage of a law, change not only the habits but the thinking of groups and nations which existed long before Columbus first saw America.

There are in Congress Members who have traveled abroad quite often and extensively, sometimes at their own expense, usually at the taxpayers' expense.

These individuals see misery and want and a lack of Christianity and freedom in other parts of the world. They are determined that we shall, by the enactment of legislation—by the stroke of a pen as it were—by either the loan or the gift of dollars, by technical aid, by teaching, demonstration and other assistance solve all their problems—make them happy, prosperous, and contented—accomplish the task which Christ and his Disciples undertook more than 2,000 years ago.

The same individuals seem to be convinced that, if other Members do not agree with their thinking, if we do not favor overall foreign aid—we lack Christianity, all feelings of decency, would let all others continue in their misery and want without extending a helping hand.

That is not our attitude. Speaking for myself, I have always endeavored to aid others, contribute to missionaries, will always continue to do so. Will always hope and work for improvement and the betterment of other peoples throughout the world.

But I can find no reason for attempting to force others to accept my thinking, my way of life, when, during the centuries, they have thought and lived otherwise.

Bringing freedom to people beyond the seas, as some of our international-minded one-worlders are trying to do, does not mean the imposition of the religion in which we believe, the customs under which we live, upon all others, certainly not by force.

The League of Nations, which Wilson accepted, was designed to bring peace throughout the world, and that without force.

United Nations has the same purpose, but would bring it about by gifts and loans, and, if necessary the use of force—through a one-world organization with laws applicable to every nation, imposed upon every individual, every nation.

As was pointed out by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has long been an advocate of internationalism, U.N. has failed, and, I quote, "We must look elsewhere." He so wrote in the October 1 issue of Foreign Affairs Quarterly, and reprinted in the October 2 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

The League of Nations failed; United Nations has fallen short of its objective, because people throughout the world do not—no more than individuals—conform to one pattern.

People have different ideas—not only as to the God which they should worship, but as to what they should eat, wear, and how and where they should live.

Nations, as individuals, are naturally selfish, and there is no evidence that as of today anyone will make the welfare, prosperity and happiness of his neighbor his chief objective in life, forget or abandon his own desires.

It does not follow that we should not try to aid others. It does follow that, while so doing, we must take into consideration our own needs, our own ability, for, except as we individually and nationally remain strong, we cannot effectively aid any other people or nation.

The foregoing may give you some idea as to why I have advocated and do now advocate a policy which will avoid waste and inefficiency in our own Government, maintain and build up our own strength, while continuing our individual and national efforts to help others who need and desire aid.

Because it is my conviction, and that is based upon the history of our Nation and my own 26 years' experience here in Congress, that our form of government, with the people retaining all power not expressly granted to the Congress, to the Executive, to the judiciary department, is the best yet devised to give a people freedom and opportunity, I have consistently opposed the delegation by the Congress of any part of its authority to the other two branches of the Government.

It is the reason why I have vigorously, sometimes perhaps too vigorously, opposed all efforts to surrender to any international organization any part of our national sovereignty.

The folly of such a surrender has been demonstrated. Though we have contributed billions upon billions to other nations, our situation today is no better—in fact, it is admittedly worse, so far as our national security is concerned—than when the program originated.

Today we are on the verge of war because we have disregarded Washington's advice not to become entangled in the affairs of other nations. Only by what may be almost unbearable sacrifices will we be able to extricate ourselves from our involvement in the present world situation. To our national security must our efforts now be devoted.

We cannot continue unlimited spending and win a war.

Buy Now, Pay Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

For those Americans who would escape a new and rapidly developing form of horaswoggling, honeyfugling, and horsefeathering, I strongly recommend a highly important, recently published volume which has as its title the intriguing, inviting, and enticing beckoning so alluringly presented to multitudes of Americans by a great variety of services and businesses: "Buy Now, Pay Later."

It is written by Hillel Black, published in New York by William Morrow & Co., and carries a foreword by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, PAUL DOUGLAS.

The book exposes what, while a legitimate business—the wide extension of credit and installment purchasing—presents pitfalls of which the average consumer, householder, and housewife are innocently unaware. The pitfall consists in no small degree of their ignorance of what installment buying actually costs them. Thousands never even inquire. Others are content with a reply that the charge is such-and-such percent. This leaves unanswered how much percent for what unit of time. It omits mention, also, of all kinds of special charges, of which virtually every installment buyer remains unaware.

The startling fact which Mr. Hillel Black's book reveals is that the financing of purchases has in many cases become more profitable than the profit on the purchased article or service itself.

The interest of Senator DOUGLAS—a noted economist and, before his election to the Senate, professor of economics at the University of Chicago—is that the installment buyer shall be informed, before he signs his installment contract, whether for an automobile, a dishwasher, a TV set, housefurnishings, or uses his credit card for travel, for dining, or for any purpose whatever—what the credit service is actually costing him above the price of the article or service he is buying. To achieve this end, Senator DOUGLAS introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, along with 20 cosponsors, of whom I am happy to be one, a bill which has become known informally as the truth-in-lending bill.

This bill (S. 1740) is entitled "A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

All that the bill requires is disclosure to the purchaser of what he is actually paying when he buys on credit; what the interest rate actually is; what fees, service charges, discounts, and other charges, not apparent on the face of the purchasing contract or not explicit in the use of a credit card, are.

Is there opposition to this legislation? Indeed there is. There is opposition from the vast and growing category of what Hillel Black, author of the book, rightly terms "the debt merchants."

Today, millions of Americans are being bombarded with pleas to "buy now, pay later." Credit cards are being generously handed to all possible takers, and persuasion to use them is a no less generous accompaniment.

Today, many an American family finds itself in precarious financial straits because it has succumbed, unaware, to the siren songs of the "debt merchants."

Reading of Hillel Black's "Buy Now, Pay Later" may avert countless domestic tragedies and contribute mightily to a sounder national economy which has been weakened by the spreading habit of buying things one doesn't need with money one does not have.

Inspector Thomas V. Slominski Wins Commendation on 100th Anniversary of District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Metropolitan Police force of Washington, D.C., in October will celebrate its 100th anniversary, and I believe it is fitting and proper that we give recognition to those men and women over the years who night and day have provided the law enforcement required in the Nation's Capital City, and even their lives, if need be.

In many ways the life of a policeman in Washington may well be more difficult than in any other American city. It is here that police officers must have the patience, tact, and courtesy mingled with effective forcefulness to do their job. It is here that small problems can be telescoped into incidents of far-reaching impact because this is the Nation's Capital and people of all nations are here.

It is particularly appropriate that this 100th anniversary falls in a year that one of the department's most capable and dedicated officers retires after 30 years of commendable service. I refer to Inspector Thomas V. Slominski, for the last 12 years the liaison officer between his department and the U.S. district and municipal courts here.

Inspector Slominski epitomizes the record of the Metropolitan Police force and its service to the citizens of the Nation's Capital down through the years. Here is a man, who is going into retirement, whose commendations have been legion the last 30 years. One highlight was a tribute by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the King and Queen of England on the visit of the British monarchs to Washington, D.C., in 1939.

Here is a man who has watched over schoolboys and schoolgirls from 1947 through 1961 as marshal of the American Automobile Association's annual schoolboy patrol parade held here, which yearly attracts some 15,000 youngsters from more than 25 States.

A particularly fitting tribute to Inspector Slominski was paid to him in an article in the Washington Evening Star of July 19, 1961, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURTS LOSING ESTEEMED POLICE "AMBASSADOR"

(By J. Theodore Crown, Star staff writer)

When Inspector Thomas V. Slominski decided 2 years ago it might be a good time to retire from his "ambassadorship" to District and municipal courts, there came a chorus of dissents that changed his mind for him.

Now the inexorable law of advancing age (the inspector will be 64 September 4) means he will retire by law on September 30.

FLOWERY PRAISE

How the courts will get along without him is hard to see, for judges have regarded him as almost indispensable during the 12 years he has performed as liaison man between the courts and police headquarters.

It was recalled today that no less than a dozen judges wrote letters in 1959 urging Inspector Slominski to reconsider retirement plans and to remain as long as time would permit.

The letters were flowery in their praise of the inspector, whose diplomatic suavity and equal treatment of all men had won him the soubriquet of "ambassador."

They said his character and ability was that of "an officer of whom the department and the District may be proud."

Influenced by the flood of mail to his headquarters, Inspector Slominski decided to forego his fishing expeditions.

REGRETS FROM MURRAY

Today Police Chief Robert V. Murray added his voice to those of the court, calling the inspector's work "magnificent," and regretting to see him leave.

Before he went to the courts as a lieutenant in 1949, Inspector Slominski made his mark in the ranks, winning several commendations for the arrest of murderers and other felons.

Born and educated in Chicago, he was with the U.S. Marines from 1917 to 1921.

Going through war duty without a scratch, Inspector Slominski was selected to participate in a training film being made here. A bayonet demonstration was so realistic that his opponent jabbed him in the left leg, thus inflicting his only wound of World War I.

Congressman Harold R. Collier, of Illinois, Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in the 87th Congress.

Convening the first Tuesday in January of 1961 and extending through the waning days of September, the 1961 session has been the longest in history except for those of World War II years and during the Korean war. With the change of administration in January, the legislative wheels turned slowly for several weeks. Notwithstanding this fact, bipartisan support of emergency legislation in March and April offered evidence of a late summer adjournment. However, highly controversial legislation was delayed in a most untimely manner as the session moved into the summer months and resulted in widespread political hassling behind the scenes. Misdirection and indecision within certain committees dealing with such issues as Federal aid to education, tax proposals, and foreign aid brought frequent deadlocks and delays. Contributing to congressional pressures were the series of critical developments in Cuba, Laos, West Berlin, and, finally, the tragic turn of events within the United Nations.

Reviewing the past session of Congress, its failures and its successes, one is reminded of the words of Winston Churchill:

To understand today's problems, one must have a sense of history.

We have lived in an aura of cold war tensions for more than a decade. Periodically the struggle between the free nations in the world and the Communist-dominated countries erupts with new fervor, and there is little reason for optimism in an early relief from these tensions. Thus the armament race is accelerated and national defense costs continue to rise.

As a nation we should have two primary concerns: First, to maintain peace without yielding principle in a world of grave international tensions and, second, to strengthen our economic and fiscal stability on the domestic front.

There is no question that deficit spending during this next fiscal year will reach a frightening figure of more than $7 billion. Many of us who are concerned with the mushrooming national debt of more than $290 billion are critical of several domestic programs which reflect imprudence at a time when the Nation has been called upon to make sacrifices. It is relatively simple for the average citizen to determine the extent of his Representative's anxiety over fiscal irresponsibility by evaluating his voting record; and this is particularly applicable to the record of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. Although authorization and appropriation bills passed this year exceeded by several billion dollars the basic needs of this Nation, one ray of hope was reflected in the repeated refusal of the House of Representatives to increase the back-door spending approach on certain bills.

While it is impossible to list all important legislation and business transactions in Congress this year, here are several of the most important bills which were passed during this session and a summary comment on them:

DEFENSE BUDGET

An alltime record high defense budget for peacetime was almost unanimously approved by both the House and Senate for fiscal 1962. The estimated spending figure for national defense during the new fiscal year is $46,662,556,000. This figure was increased from the original estimated defense request with the development of the new crisis in Berlin. The additional sum will be for the construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval facilities. It provides for the continuation of the B–52 and B–58 bomber production programs and two new nuclear-powered missile frigates. The program also provides for stepping up the Polaris submarine program to a total of 29 by 1964, instead of 1967.

AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Voluntary retirement is now permitted for men at age 62 with reduced benefits

and widow's benefits are increased 10 percent. Working pensioners are permitted earnings up to $1,700 without penalty. Minimum benefit payments are increased $7 monthly and qualification has been liberalized to one quarter out of every four instead of one out of every three. To meet the $825 million annual cost of these changes, social security taxes will increase again next January and the rate will continue to 4⅝ percent on each employee-employer in 1968.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress voted to increase unemployment compensation through Federal assistance to a maximum of 39 weeks and added a later proposal providing benefits for children of the unemployed.

EXPANDED FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAM

An authorized 5-year $4.9 billion housing program on liberalized terms was passed over stiff opposition. The bill includes 100,000 new units of public housing, extends the farm housing program, increases funds for housing for the aged and provides for loans to acquire mass transportation facilities.

EMERGENCY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

This legislation increases price support payments to participants for corn, grain, sorghum, other feed grains and soybeans and provides for a 1-year voluntary cut in acreage and crops of these feed grains.

LATIN AMERICAN AID

The appropriation bill effectuating the authorization passed previously provides for $600 million for a Latin-American development program. This sum includes $100 million for disaster relief in Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $1 million for loans and grants by the ICA.

EXPANSION OF SPACE PROGRAM

An authorization of $1.7 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was passed and signed into law to be effective in fiscal 1962. This includes increases for the manned moon-orbiting project and for research on solid and nuclear propellants.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

The establishment of an Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce carries an authorization of $300 million in loans and $95 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in areas designated as distressed. The program carries a termination date of June 30, 1965.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

An additional $11.5 billion was authorized in H.R. 6713 for the interstate highway system, to be tentatively completed by 1972. It will bring certain apportionments for primary, secondary and urban programs up from $925 million to $1 billion annually. It fixes Federal gas and diesel taxes at 4 cents per gallon and it also raises taxes on tires, tubes, retread rubber and on trucks and buses.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

Finally meeting a long-needed increase in U.S. district court judgeships and 10 circuit court judgeships, Congress voted a bill providing for a total of 73 judges. Because caseloads in the courts have become increasingly heavy, and litigation badly delayed over the past several years, the Eisenhower administration had made a request for additional judges, upon which Congress failed to act. In the spring of this year, approval was given in both the House and Senate by a large bipartisan majority.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

A 2-year extension of the National Defense Education Act was finally approved after the House had voted down consideration of an omnibus bill. The measure also extends to federally impacted school districts assistance for an additional 2 years, to June 30, 1963. The total authorization for these programs was $1.3 billion.

FOREIGN AID

A compromise $3,914,600,000 money bill was passed. The final figure was more than the House originally approved but less than the Senate voted, and President Kennedy had asked. The bill authorized a 5-year program but required annual appropriations. The program includes loans and grants for foreign economic aid and development, military assistance and support, and contributions to international programs.

PEACE CORPS

The administration's request to establish the U.S. Peace Corps, commenced by Executive direction early this year, as an independent agency was approved and an authorization of $40 million for its operation was granted for fiscal 1962, although only $30 million was actually appropriated.

ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

A measure which establishes a U.S. Arms Control (Disarmament) Agency was approved by both the House and Senate and signed into law by the President at the close of the session. Actually, a division within the State Department composed of 72 staff members has been in existence for quite some time. The new agency simply expands certain phases of research in this field and establishes a distinct entity for this operation, without providing any authority or jurisdiction which the erstwhile bureau within the State Department did not already possess.

MINIMUM WAGE

Increases in the $1 minimum wage to $1.25 an hour were approved with extended coverage to 3½ million additional workers by gradual wage stepups in amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It must be understood that the legislation listed above is but a few of the more important items on the legislative agenda. As a matter of fact, there were nearly 200 bills which will undoubtedly become public law that must properly be considered major legislation. These do not include scores of other legislative actions of the 87th Congress which were of a private or provincial nature.

In addition to the legislation acted upon favorably this past year, several administration proposals fell by the wayside, either in committee or through floor action. Among these was Federal aid to education, which was bottled up in the House after becoming entangled with religious and political issues. The proposed Department of Urban Affairs gathered little favorable support and may not even see the light of day next year. The Youth Conservation Corps, revamping of the unemployment pay system, major tax changes, and a postage rate increase plan all failed, but may get a second chance in 1962.

PERSONAL REPORT

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I introduced 29 bills covering a wide range of subject matter. Among these were:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the Senate and House of Representatives on appropriation bills.

H.R. 342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons.

H.R. 933. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1960, relating to exclusion from the mails of obscene articles.

H.R. 934. A bill to require a study of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation and other purposes.

H.R. 935. A bill to amend the Passport Act of July 3, 1926, to authorize certain restrictions and limitations with respect to the issuance and validity of passports.

H.R. 937. A bill relating to the treatment of certain advertising, sales promotion, and similar items in determining price and price readjustments for purposes of the Federal manufacturers' excise taxes.

H.R. 938. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

H.R. 939. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent.

H.R. 940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher education.

H.R. 941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the exclusion from gross income of the proceeds of a scholarship, fellowship grant, or student assistantship without regard to whether it (or any part thereof) represents payment for services rendered.

H.R. 1145. A bill to provide for the preservation of audio recordings of historical importance.

H.R. 1146. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors.

H.R. 1147. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States.

H.R. 5396. A bill to amend the act of September 14, 1959, with respect to sales and use taxes and other business activities in interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of this type of taxation.

H.R. 5921. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder.

H.R. 7271. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on the grounds of religious belief.

H.R. 7374. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain members of the uniformed forces shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States after engaging in any activity or conduct, while a prisoner of war, which results in giving aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States.

H.R. 7375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a return of a surviving spouse shall be treated as a joint return without regard to the time of the death of the other spouse.

H.R. 7679. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for all-charter certificates of public convenience and necessity.

H.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day.

H.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

H.J. Res. 506. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women.

H. Con. Res. 184. A concurrent resolution providing that appropriations for the mutual security program shall be reported in three separate bills, one for military assistance, one for economic assistance (other than technical cooperation), and one for technical cooperation and other matters.

H. Con. Res. 194. A concurrent resolution opposing further reduction of tariffs by Executive order.

H. Con. Res. 318. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should transfer to the Department of Defense functions of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

H. Res. 312. A House resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations.

H. Res. 321. A House resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives (appropriations).

More than 300 residents of the 10th Congressional District visited my office in Washington during the prolonged 1961 session. In almost every instance my staff arranged for visits to the White House, provided gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and arranged for tours of places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital. School and church groups, representatives of various business and professional organizations, and vacationing tourists repeatedly expressed their gratitude for the assistance and courtesies extended by our office during their stay here.

Earlier in this session, I took a public opinion poll in my district to determine how the majority of my constituents felt about some of the more controversial major legislative issues. The poll was particularly successful in that there was an excellent response. In fact, it ran 50 percent higher than the rate on most legislative polls. The returns were carefully tabulated on each question, a task which absorbed many extra hours of work on the part of my staff members. The consensus of my constituency, based upon this poll, were given complete consideration in my deliberations in voting on the issues in this session of Congress.

Because of the unusually late termination of this session, it became necessary for me to cancel or postpone speaking engagements back in the district during the month of September. Many of these commitments were made on a contingent basis, since Congress heretofore usually adjourned just prior to Labor Day; however I have a heavy calendar of speaking engagements for civic, church, service and school groups throughout my district during the recess period. Two members of my Washington staff are returning to the district for the recess period to join the home office operation which functions year round in Berwyn. Constitutents desiring to discuss Federal problems or pending legislation may arrange appointments in the district office during the recess period by telephoning my executive secretary on Pioneer 9-4115.

Congressional mail, which has been unusually heavy for the past year, is expected to taper off during the months of October, November, and December, thus providing more time for individual attention to case problems and committee work.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, my special assignments for the recess period have not been definitely designated. Your Representative has been particularly active in committee work during the past 8 months with such problems as the rapidly transforming aviation industry presents. Interstate and foreign commerce has undergone broad changes and even critical problems have developed in almost every field which must be coped with in the accelerated transportation industry by the Congress and its affiliated agencies. It is expected that our committee will conduct a series of studies and investigations on the jet and helicopter noise problems which have become a source of serious aggravation to the residents of our own district as well as those in areas of close proximity to the expanding airports of the Nation. Solutions to the noise problem and naturally the safety facets of these studies offer a very difficult challenge to the legislative and regulatory agencies of the Federal Government.

In closing, let me state that while the 1st session of the 87th Congress was marked with certain achievements and admitted failures in dealing with some of the delicate and critical domestic and foreign problems of this Nation, we face an even more difficult session next year with the seething world situation and a series of domestic issues which must be dealt with in the shadow of a tremendous national debt and heavy burden of present taxation upon our citizens.

Since this report, while it might appear lengthy, is actually but a comprehensive brief analysis of legislative activity during the past year, my office is prepared to provide detailed information on any and all bills of specific interest to all of my constituents. Requests may be made for such information either through the district office or by writing to my Washington staff, room 1622, New House Office Building.

Completely unsettled at the time of this report is the matter of congressional reapportionment in the State of Illinois. The State legislature has been unable to agree upon reapportioning the congressional districts as required following each decennial census. In the event an agreement cannot be reached during the special session of the State legislature in Springfield this month, I will join 24 incumbent Members in Congress and a host of other candidates in a statewide race for 24 at-large seats. Fully aware of the fact that any reapportionment agreement must be equitable within the realm of geographical and population standards, it is my earnest hope that a feasible plan can be adopted in the interest of preserving the constitutional concept of representative government. For whatever period of time the residents of my present district and citizens throughout the State of Illinois are without such representation on a district-by-district basis, they are without the type of personal representation which the constitutional system was designed to provide. This, however, is a matter which will be resolved by the time the 87th Congress returns for the 2d session next January.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. A statement by me concerning Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

The Honorable Orville H. Freeman has issued under date of September 20, 1961, a summary of his conferences in London and Brussells during the period September 8 through 14, 1961. This summary is most interesting in that it presents clearly and concisely the position of the Secretary with respect to a number of the trade problems affecting American agriculture.

I was particularly pleased to note his comments with respect to apple and pear exports to the United Kingdom. Because I feel that this summary will be of great interest to many farmers in the State of Oregon, I wish to include the report at this point:

"I went to Europe for three major purposes: To open the first U.S. agricultural exhibit at the London Trade Center; to confer with United Kingdom and Belgium governmental authorities regarding import restrictions on U.S. farm products; and most importantly, to meet with the European Economic Commission, and particularly the Commissioner for Agriculture, regarding tariff and trade problems affecting U.S. agricultural interests in the European Common Market.

"COMMON MARKET

"Roughly about one-half of our current agricultural trade of $1 billion with the Common Market countries is still unsettled in the current Geneva negotiations. Some ex-

tremely important commodities not yet settled are: wheat, wheat flour, corn and grain sorghums, poultry, rice, tobacco, vegetable oils, and prunes.

"For grain products and poultry, the Common Market has proposed the use of variable import levies instead of fixed duties. These duties, without limits, could be used to exclude outside trade completely. As the true economic forces take hold in the Common Market, our trade may even be larger than it is today, but the immediate effect of the application of these unlimited duties would, in my judgment, significantly worsen our trade position. Therefore, I emphasized to the EEC the importance of maintaining our current trade position.

"For other commodities, the EEC has proposed tariffs which are higher than those we now enjoy. For tobacco, the EEC position is further complicated by the fact that whereas we now have a specific duty schedule, the EEC has proposed a split duty, under which a greater charge would be made for our tobacco since it is higher priced than the tobacco of our competitors.

"I felt is imperative to let the EEC know that its present offers could result in serious losses in our agricultural trade with the Community in the next 5 to 10 years. If these proposals were accepted, U.S. grain producers, poultry producers, the tobacco farmers and industry, and rice producers could only conclude that the Six have adopted a highly protective system against their products. The proposed fee system covers 75 percent of the agricultural output of the Six.

"Although my original schedule did not call for a meeting with the full European Economic Commission, I was delighted to find in Brussels that such a meeting had been arranged. After a lengthy talk with Agricultural Commissioner Mansholt, I met with the full Commission for 3 hours. This gave me an opportunity to present our views to the important officials who are charged with the entire EEC program.

"TRADE LIBERALIZATION

"In the United Kingdom we met with senior officials of the Ministry of Agriculture and with Mr. Reginald Mandling, head of the Board of Trade. In these talks we asked for more liberal trade treatment from the British for a number of U.S. agricultural products.

"First, we stressed the need for an end of the discriminatory treatment now accorded to U.S. exports of fresh grapefruit, grapefruit sections, and canned citrus concentrates. For these products, the United Kingdom has liberalized trade for all areas of the world except the dollar area, and that means the United States. The British explained that this restriction has been necessary to protect the position of the British West Indies. We explained that our farm and trade interests in the United States are convinced that the restrictions are purely discriminatory, since other countries are free to supply the United Kingdom market without restriction. The result is that we are steadily losing ground in the United Kingdom market to other suppliers.

"With the British we also discussed apples and pears on which a quota system is in effect for northern hemisphere suppliers (the United States and Canada) which permits 20 percent of the annual quota to be delivered during the first 6 months of the year and 80 percent during the last 6 months. We emphasized that the quota is not flexible enough to permit the entry of larger imports from the dollar area during years of short crops in the United Kingdom. We therefore asked for an increase in the percentage of imports permitted earlier in the season and for an increase in the quota.

"In Belgium we discussed apples and pears and the high license taxes on imports of feed grains. With respect to apples and pears, the Belgians have a calendar system in effect which excludes apples and pears from the dollar area until February or March of each year. At the same time, imports from EEC countries are permitted all year round unless they interfere with Belgian market prices.

"License taxes which the Belgians impose on imports of feed grains are very much like the unlimited variable duties described above. At the present time these license taxes in Belgium have been increased to the point where they are practically equal to the amount our farmers receive for feed grains. We pointed out that the high cost of feed grains to Belgian livestock producers was adding to the cost spiral of livestock products in Belgium thereby inflating the cost of living and causing price problems for Belgian industrial exports; and, also, that they were not really assisting the small farmer in Belgium who would be more efficient in the production of livestock.

"While in Belgium, two other subjects were brought to my attention. First, the Belgian Minister of Agriculture said it was his impression that the United States was excluding ornamental shrubs from his country because of economic protectionism. I explained that I thought that the reason we did so was because of the possibility of disease and insect-transmission on the roots of the plants, but agreed to review the question to assure that the reason for our controls was scientific rather than economic.

"A second matter of great interest in Belgium was the matter of Belgian carpets. The Tariff Commission is now investigating the need for an increase in the tariff on carpet imports. Discussion of this item occurred during our visit with the Belgian Minister of Foreign Commerce. There is little doubt that the outcome of the current carpet investigation will be of great concern to the Belgian Government. In their minds, there is definitely a relationship between what they do for more liberal treatment of our agricultural imports and the outcome of the carpet investigation.

"I believe these discussions with the EEC members, the British, and the Belgians helped to clarify and strengthen our position. While no commitments were forthcoming on any of the specific matters discussed, I am hopeful that the way has been opened for improvement of our situation.

"LONDON TRADE CENTER AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT

"In London, I opened the first U.S. agricultural exhibit at the U.S. Trade Center. The exhibit was well done and attracted a large audience. More than 100 United States and British trade people were represented at a special preview of the exhibit. I am sure that through such promotion we can substantially expand our sales of these products in the British market, which has traditionally been our largest outlet for agricultural exports.

"Also in London, I met with U.S. market development cooperators in Europe. This is the joint effort with American farm and trade groups to expand the marketing and improve the utilization of American farm products in oversea markets. I was pleased to be able to report to them that the Congress has approved a dollar appropriation that will permit an expansion of our trade promotion program in Western Europe and provide funds to carry the programs forward on a 3-year basis instead of the 2-year basis previously authorized."

Keep Public Drinking Water Pure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is of utmost importance that I focus the attention of this Congress on an issue which is sorely dividing our Nation at so critical a time when our very existence is dependent upon our ability to strengthen our national unity.

I refer to a program launched by a subagency in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of this administration to promote fluoridation throughout cities, towns, communities, and all States of this Nation.

During the past year voters representing some 2,500,000 water users in 43 out of 56 cities rejected fluoridation with little more than about 50,000 having accepted.

Water is a prime necessity for life. All people are dependent upon pure, uncontaminated water. The addition of any substance to a public water supply for the purpose of affecting the bodies or mental function of the consumer establishes a dangerous precedent and preempts the inalienable right of the individual to determine what shall be done to and with his body as long as in the exercise of that right he does not infringe upon the equal rights of his fellow citizens.

An article which appeared in one of the most recent medical publications confirms that damage to bones can result from fluoride which occurs in natural water at a level as low as 0.8 parts per million. The U.S. Public Health Service claims on one hand that no harm can result from natural fluoride water as high as 8.0 parts per million, yet they require many communities where this occurs to reduce the fluoride content when it exceeds 1.5 parts per million—or abandon the source of supply. This clearly demonstrates that the U.S. Public Health Service itself realizes that the margin of safety is either narrow or nonexistent.

To use the very words of Dr. Walter L. Bierring, M.D., past president of the American Medical Association:

> Prominence in the cause of disease is being given to man's management of the health hazards connected with air pollution, stream pollution, fluoridation, and radiation.

Fluoride additives have been consumed at an increasing rate over the past 50 years. Changes in disease pattern during that same period of time have not been explained away by medical science.

It is a fact that those who want their children to have fluoride can give it individually, in measured doses, with greater safety, greater reliability than if it were put into public water supplies.

Once the precedent of adding fluoride to the public drinking water has been

established, there is almost no limit to the possibilities for the introduction of all manner of drugs. We may open a door which we will never be able to close.

Past errors should have taught official agencies that they should not assume an air of infallibility and an attitude of indifference to public wishes.

Among the many examples which have proven to be "human time bombs" we might cite the approval and use of radon, of thorium, and of iodide in public drinking water for the prevention of goiter, with disastrous results. More recently, the stilbestrol incident, involving a cattle fattening hormone, and the cranberry weedkiller pointed up the justification of the demand by the public for protection from introduction of unnecessary and unwanted chemicals into products intended for human consumption. When the harmful effects of these chemical agents, previously approved for use by an administrative agency of the Government, were brought to national attention, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, in ordering discontinuance of the use of stilbestrol and the cranberry weedkiller, stated:

> While the argument is going on, the consumer should not, in effect, be asked to serve as a guinea pig. The consumer should never be asked to take a risk of this kind.

I submit that this is the kind of action the Nation is entitled to in the case of fluoridation, especially when there are scientists of Nobel award stature who question the safety of fluoridating public water supplies.

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, composed of over 20,000 members of the American Medical Association, condemned mass medication, including fluoridation and the use of the public water supply as a vehicle for drugs. The Medical-Dental Committee on Evaluation of Fluoridation, sponsored by over 1,600 physicians, dentists, and scientists, have critically studied the fluoridation proposal and have shown that it is not safe, that its efficacy has not been demonstrated. They have also shown many reasons why prolonged intake of fluoride may lead to serious chronic conditions for some people. Fluoridation runs counter to the historic policy of the medical profession in maintaining the doctor-patient relationship.

Because of the very important fact that each individual reacts differently to medication, only a physician can determine when fluoride administration should be reduced or terminated.

Another aspect of this fluoridation problem, is a need to bring to the attention of this Congress the unethical methods used in promoting fluoridation, starting with the fourth annual conference of the State dental directors and the Public Health Service held in Washington in June 1951, culminating in a now new accelerated high pressure program of the U.S. Dental Public Health Division that will be conducted through the use of undetermined funds now being requested under House bill 4742 and Senate bill 917.

Mr. Speaker, these are not good bills. They would permit uncontrolled use of Federal funds for promotional schemes not in the best public interest.

Furthermore, this unethical promotion, among other things, now takes the form of aiding certain questionable actions on the part of many State boards of health. These boards while working closely with the U.S. Dental Public Health Division, to impose fluoridation upon an unsuspecting public, are actually supplementing directives which originate at the U.S. Public Health Service. The results are not only misleading in content but, by misrepresentation and distortion, tend to convey to local communities that fluoridation of public water supplies is imperative.

The U.S. Public Health Service has aggressively, through the use of taxpayers' money, promoted fluoridation throughout these United States with grants-in-aid inducements. Fluoridation projects have been underwritten by/or subsidized with Federal funds.

The American Dental Association through close coordination with the U.S. Dental Public Health Division has coercive access to control of vast Federal health funds. It has for years been persistently promoting fluoridation on a national scale, using promotional methods not in accord with the finest American tradition.

Free expression of opinion is being prevented among physicians and dentists; publication and exchange of scientific data among scientists and members of the professions is inhibited by threat of retaliation and economic reprisals. Dentists opposed to fluoridation have reason to fear disciplinary measures from their local dental societies.

When approximately some 60 million people have rejected fluoridation, including those in 100 cities which discontinued it after a trial because of damage to health and property; and when 100 million Americans are now facing possible fluoridation of their drinking water, I believe a most serious Federal policy problem exists.

Our citizens have certain fundamental and constitutional rights. The sooner they are recognized, the sooner we shall resolve the fluoridation controversy. These rights must be expressed as:

First. The right of every citizen to a water supply free from any drug or chemical not required for the purification thereof.

Second. The right of every citizen to a freedom of choice in matters concerning his health so long as this choice does not infringe upon the rights of others.

Third. The right of the professional person, particularly the physician and dentist and scientist, to investigate and to speak freely according to conscience, without fear of censure, and/or reprisal.

I further submit that this program which would treat American citizens as statistical averages rather than individual human beings is needlessly provoking antagonism toward an otherwise effective and important agency of Government. Promotional fluoridation harassment and intimidation of the public is disturbing the tranquility of this Nation at a time when we can least afford it.

Many letters received by the Greater New York Committee Opposed to Fluoridation, from citizen groups representing some several million people of this Nation, are pleading that something be done to combat at the Federal level this promotional menace of forced fluoridation. Certainly when citizens have demonstrated unmistakably their rejection of fluoridation, and when there exists substantial disagreement within the scientific and medical professions as to the safety and efficacy in the fluoridation of potable water, it should not, it must not, be supported at a Federal level.

Appointment of Hon. Paul J. Kilday To Be Judge of U.S. Court of Military Appeals

---

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to one of our most esteemed, admired, and respected colleagues, the Honorable PAUL KILDAY, in his appointment to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

PAUL KILDAY and I came to Congress in the same year, 1938, and we have been close friends ever since. No finer or more able man has served in the House of Representatives than PAUL KILDAY.

As has been so eloquently pointed out by Members of the Texas delegation, he has one of the brightest legal minds of anyone who has ever been a Member of this body. Indeed, it is not too much to say that PAUL KILDAY is a man of towering intellect. Many times we have observed his handling of complex and intricate legislation on the floor of this House, and many times we have observed the manner in which he is able to explain, in simple, clear, and concise language, the intricacies and complexities of that legislation.

PAUL KILDAY is a man of complete integrity. Not the least of his outstanding qualities, however, is his sound judgment. This is a quality which is somewhat rare, and yet is one of the most important qualities which a statesman or a leader in public life can possess.

It is with regret that we learn that PAUL KILDAY will not be with us in the next Congress, but Members can be reassured that his service as a judge on the U.S. Court of Military Appeals will be marked by accomplishments in the judicial arena as significant as those which have marked his accomplishments in the legislative field.

I commend his appointment to this most important tribunal. The best wishes of all the Members of the House are with him in his new endeavor.

Law and the Free Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, a friend has recently drawn to my attention an article in the Montana Veteran relating to an essay, "Law and the Free Citizen." It was written by John Logan, a member of the English class of John Doohan, of Anaconda Senior High School of Anaconda, Mont. John Logan is attending Williams College, Mass., as a freshman. He received the Tyng scholarship.

I found this a most stimulating article, which I would like to share with my colleagues:

JOHN LOGAN'S NATIONAL PRIZE WINNING ESSAY CONSIDERED MASTERPIECE IN LITERATURE

Printed here is the winning essay entry of John Logan, Anaconda Senior High School student who was graduated this spring. John Logan placed first in Montana and third in the national 1960–61 writing contest sponsored by the ladies auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This year's writing subject was "Law and the Free Citizen."

We feel that Logan did such a masterful job of self-expression in his essay, that it is worthy of reproduction for the benefit of our readers.

Logan's essay follows:

"LAW AND THE FREE CITIZEN

"As I kneel before my icon, I pray that I may someday enjoy citizenship in a democracy, a government by law, not by the state. I speak for the millions of oppressed and enslaved peoples of the totalitarian societies of the world. How fortunate are you, the citizens of democracies, the possessors of a great heritage of freedom and justice under law.

"In our atheistic societies, God-given rights are not recognized. Any rights which we may have are granted by the government and consequently the individual is unimportant. Our laws, products of a regimented legislature or of a ruling group's decree, are frequently and easily ignored by those in power. Our police whose prime objective is to preserve the tyrannical state, search without warrant, arrest without charge, and punish without trial. We are then like colonies of bees, efficient but lacking the individual initiative, freedom and happiness which can be based only on the democratic rule of law.

"In your democratic societies, the individual is of great importance. His divine or natural rights are protected and preserved, but also limited so that they do not interfere with the individual rights and freedoms of others.

"Your laws are made by lawfully elected representatives who although they represent the majority, protect the minority.

"Behind the actions of your law enforcement officers lies the strength of conscience and justice, rather than mere force and fear. Freedom of speech, of worship and assembly are recognized. The equality of all before the law, as well as the intrinsic right of all to 'life, liberty, and property,' are preserved.

"You may change your officials, your laws, or even your entire government without resorting to violence, for armed revolution is never necessary in a democracy.

"Yes, you are indeed fortunate.

"But how did you receive this wonderful inheritance? It is, in part, through men such as Hammurabi, Moses, Solon, Cicero, Justinian, and Napoleon, who have helped the rule of law grow.

"The flame of freedom under law was lit in America by the signers of the Mayflower compact who agreed to 'enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws unto which we promise all due submission and obedience.'

"The light generated by the Declaration of Independence for nearly 200 years has been dispelling the darkness of tyranny and oppression throughout the world. In unparalled eloquence it reaffirms the premise that governments gain their power and authority from the consent of the governed.

"The U.S. Constitution is a glowing example of the glorious results of a meeting of lawful representatives rather than of opposing armies. The justice and propriety of America attest to the timeless greatness of this document.

"But be not complacent and overconfident, for you citizens of democracies occupy precarious positions, indeed. You take a middle course between the complete lawlessness of anarchistic license and the absolute rule of communistic oppression. So do not expect freedom from government, but freedom through self-government.

"Your freedoms, your rights, and even your entire system may be destroyed by powerful foreign forces or by the far stronger evil of domestic indifference. Be vigilant, for your crime rate, an indicator of the reverence of and adherence to the law, is increasing at a frightening rate. Even average citizens are more frequently violating motor vehicle, hunting, fishing, and tax laws.

"Comparatively few people vote regularly and even fewer are active in politics. There is, then, a definite need for increased civic effectiveness on the part of all citizens.

"How must you combat these forces of domestic decay? You can practice in yourself and encourage in others individual virtue, for, after all, the effectiveness of the law is limited by the character of the individual citizens.

"Become educated and informed in matters of politics and encourage all others to make politics their avocation.

"Be sure you elect honest officials and lawmakers who represent your views. If the laws are not supported by the majority, they cannot be enforced. The corruption and crime introduced by prohibition show how dangerous a poor law can be.

"In deciding which new measures to support, consider them carefully. Are they constant with the basic democratic principles? Are they too gentle or too severe? If they are too gentle they will be disregarded or if too severe they will be unenforcible. Are they comprehensive enough to prohibit tyranny and yet limited enough to allow freedom? Are they explicit so that they may prevent crimes and presettle disputes by their clarity?

"Constantly reexamine present statutes, for there is no magic perfection in existing laws.

"Insist on strict and absolute enforcement. All laws must be binding on all people, or every law will be disrespected and ignored. Rigidly stay within the limits of existing legislation, since a disregard of one limit will inevitably lead to a disregard of all legal limits.

"Obey all laws, for they are sacredly binding upon all, since the majority consented to and approved of them. Drive your car according to law, be a true sportsman who obeys all regulations, and be honest and fair in paying your taxes which are your contributions to your government—your liberty insurance.

"Assist in preventing crime, give evidence freely, and serve on the jury willingly. Fulfill all the sacred obligations of citizenship. Be informed, be active, and be aggressive in performing these duties. The time to guard against oppression is before it comes.

"Certainly some of your laws have faults, but your security lies in knowing them and in working to improve them. Revise, enforce, and obey your laws, for their strengths are your strengths and their weaknesses are your weaknesses. Preserve, extend, and pass on your government of law to all the oppressed peoples of the world. Remember, there are many of us who have given and will give our lives for the bulwark and the basis of freedom, the law."

Establishment of Voluntary Pension Plans by Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning H.R. 10, a bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

For the past 10 years I have followed with considerable interest H.R. 10, a bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. I have long been in favor of the principle of this legislation, but on several occasions during the course of this 10-year period I found it necessary to differ with the proponents as to the method of achieving their goal. Today I am pleased to say that I wholeheartedly endorse H.R. 10 as reported by the Senate Finance Committee. The features which I found objectionable in the past have either been eliminated or changed to the point where I can, in all good conscience, embrace this legislation.

Practically everyone who is acquainted with this subject will agree that the principle of this legislation as now proposed is sound. Certainly the Members of the House recognized this in the 85th and 86th Congresses and again in this session when they passed H.R. 10 by a practically unanimous vote. Certainly the members of the Senate Finance Committee in the 86th Congress recognized this when, after extensive hearings, they approved H.R 10 by a 12 to 5 vote. On August 25 of this year, this committee ordered H.R. 10 favorably reported 14 to 3.

It was apparent to me, after reading the minority views in the Senate Finance Committee report, that a number of misconceptions still exist in the minds of two of my distinguished colleagues. Their proposals were heard and voted down by the committee in the 86th Congress and again this year. I am confident that the proponents of this legislation will, on the floor of this Congress, meet these arguments again and in such a way as to gain the overwhelming support of this body. Rather than criticize, I wish to commend the spokesmen for the various national self-employed groups because, to the best of my knowledge, at no time have they said, "If

you won't give us these benefits, then we wish to have them taken away from the corporate employees."

This is a good bill and for a number of reasons, one of which is the fact that it encourages people to help themselves. It encourages initiative, self-reliance, and the other qualities which helped to make this country great, but qualities, which I regret to say, are disappearing rapidly from the American scene. This Congress has an opportunity to resurrect these attributes which are so desperately needed by our country at this time by enacting H.R. 10 into law.

This remedial legislation is designed to correct an inequity in our tax structure which prevents this Nation's 10 million small business, farm, and professional people from receiving treatment comparable to that which is accorded corporate employees.

The impetus for the steady growth in corporate coverage was supplied in 1942 by the 77th Congress when it wisely enacted legislation which encouraged corporations to promote the economic well-being and future security of their employees. One has only to look at the increase which has occurred since 1940 to appreciate the soundness of this legislation. In that year 4.1 million were covered; in 1950, 9.8 million; and in 1960 the figure rose to 20 million. Approximately 1 million people are being added each year to private pension plans.

When we add to the 1960 total the approximately 8 million covered by State and local government plans, civil service, armed services, railroad retirement systems, etc., the total number of Americans covered by pension plans is approximately 30 million people.

H.R. 10 does not, as its few opponents would have you believe; broaden a tax loophole, and open a Pandora's box, but rather extends what has been proven over the past 19 years to be sound legislation to the point where it includes a dedicated, courageous group of Americans, the self-employed.

To accomplish this, self-employed persons are treated for retirement plan purposes as the employers of themselves. This was the fundamental concept of the House bill and it is retained in the Senate Finance Committee's substitute. As employers, self-employed individuals are permitted, like other employers, to deduct contributions (within specified limits) made to pension or profit-sharing plans for the benefit of themselves and such other employees as may be covered under the plan. Under the committee bill, a self-employed person would be permitted to contribute to a retirement plan 10 percent of his earned income or $2,500, whichever is the lesser. He would be permitted to deduct 100 percent of the first $1,000 contributed and 50 percent of the remaining $1,500, which may be contributed. The maximum deductible amount would be $1,750.

As employees, as with other employees, they are not taxed on such contributions made for their benefit, or the income thereon, until they receive the funds upon retirement or otherwise.

The committee changes have drastically reduced the size of the revenue deferral, in fact to a point where this can no longer be used as a major argument against this measure. Oh, I am not deluding myself, because there will be some who will cry economy, who will use the international situation as an excuse for opposing this bill; but these few, time and time again have, and will continue, to support domestic programs with high price tages and questionable dollar value.

The estimates for H.R. 10 range from less than $100 million to $200 million. In view of the actual experience in other countries, Great Britain, Canada, and New Zealand; and the fact that the Treasury Department generally overestimates, I am inclined to accept the lower figure.

Regardless of the exact amount, I wish to remind you that the potential revenue deferral is already made possible in the present tax law since the establishment of tax-deferred pension plans is available to any self-employed person who incorporates his business or occupation.

If we fail to act in this Congress, we will, I am ecrtain, force a great many of this Nation's self-employed to incorporate and in most cases solely for the purpose of gaining tax treatment relative to their retirement savings similar to that which is offered their corporate brethren. Passage of H.R. 10 will encourage these fine, hard-working Americans to retain their self-employed status, defeat will be a major blow to them and an invitation to incorporate for tax advantage because of their natural desire to protect themselves in their later years. Now I don't believe we can afford the loss of too many more self-employed without jeopardizing the position of this country both on the domestic and international fronts.

H.R. 10 is a good bill, it is a just bill. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in working for the early enactment of H.R. 10 in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Search for Scapegoats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, the problem of inflation has long been of great concern to me. In fact, on April 6, 1957, in an address at Pittsburgh, I foresaw the possibility of a gold crisis which unfortunately materialized some 2 years later.

There has been a strange disposition on the part of the administration to condemn price increases in certain industries, particularly steel. No concern has been shown for cost increases which, if not compensated by price increases, may jeopardize the existence of all industries. The excuse frequently advanced for singling out steel is that it is the bellwether of the economy.

The total sales of the steel industry in 1960 as reported by the American Iron and Steel Institute, which represents 95 percent of the capacity of this industry, were $14 billion. To be sure, this is a lot of money. However, to appreciate the true significance of this sum, it must be related to other indicators of economic activity. For example, it represents less than 3 percent of our country's gross national product. On the other hand, the Federal Government's receipts from the public in 1960 totaled $95 billion, which is 18.8 percent of our gross national product.

This Congress has authorized more new projects and approved more backdoor spending in a shorter period of time than any other with which I am familiar. This was done in spite of the need to meet our rising defense commitments by reducing nonessential civilian programs. Excessive spending by the Federal Government is contributing mightily toward new inflationary pressures.

Private individuals, business firms, as well as State and local governments cannot indefinitely increase the money supply. However, the Federal Government may do so by directly borrowing from the commercial banking system of the country through the issuance of new securities. This Congress has authorized an additional $14 billion of borrowing by increasing the ceiling on the national debt to $298 billion.

Inflation is produced by other governmental policies, some of which are not immediately recognized. For example, the State Department is endeavoring to assist underdeveloped countries by raising the market price of their principal export commodities. In fact, every American housewife will be affected if present plans are carried through as the wholesale price of coffee will be raised by 10 cents per pound through an International Commodity Agreement.

Barron's magazine, a respected business and financial weekly, places the blame for inflation where it belongs, on the policies of the Federal Government. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Search for Scapegoats" from its August 28 issue may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEARCH FOR SCAPEGOATS—WASHINGTON ALONE IS TO BLAME FOR INFLATION

Through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a journal which often may be read for pleasure as well as profit, the Nation last week found itself privy to the following exchange of courtesies between Senators ALBERT GORE, Democrat of Tennessee, and STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri. "Mr. GORE: 'I dare not undertake to express my views on large successful business operations, as my distinguished colleague from Missouri, who before disposing of his investment in private industry, was a marked success.' Mr. SYMINGTON: 'The Senator is very kind, as well as able. I understand he has not done so badly.'" Having set the RECORD straight on each other's finances, the two men of affairs, with the help of several like-minded lawmakers, thereupon proceeded to tell the steel industry in no uncertain terms how to run its business. Although wages of the steelworkers are scheduled to go up in October, the producers, so the Senators averred, "neither need nor deserve higher prices."

Taken alone, the foregoing colloquy might be filed and forgotten under what has been aptly captioned "Wind on Capitol Hill." Unfortunately, however, in this particular wind the observer can discern more than one significant straw. Just before the coterie of Senators took the floor to berate the steel masters, the Secretary of Agriculture, upon hearing of a prospective rise in the price of bread, publicly assailed the Nation's bakers. More generally, administration spokesmen have begun to stress the necessity for businessman and worker alike to exercise restraint, and to refrain from charging all that the traffic will bear. Such tactics, which might be termed open-mouth operations, obviously strike Washington as a shrewd means of clamping a more or less voluntary lid on prices (and, if imperative, perhaps on wages as well). The rest of the country, however, well may challenge both the means and the ends. For while the campaign has been launched with the con-

nivance of a few in Congress, it obviously constitutes a reckless, ill-considered, and wholly unsanctioned intrustion into the Nation's economic affairs. Moreover, if the past be any guide, it simply won't work. For the true villain of the piece is neither industry nor labor but Government, or more accurately, the credit and fiscal excesses which only the Federal Government can commit.

These truths, as well as several others, went by the board in Washington last week. In a letter to the American Bakers Association, the Secretary of Agriculture urged its members to think twice before raising the price of bread, "especially in view of the possible public reaction." Senator GORE had much more to say about steel First, he repeated the popular fiction that "steel prices are not set by competitive forces of the market, but by arbitrary arrangements made among the managers of large companies." He cited an estimate by the Preside Council of Economic Advisers as proof t in the fourth quarter of 1961, the industry, even in the absence of higher prices, would enjoy a "good rate of return." Finally, "in the name of the public welfare," he demanded that the Government use every possible weapon—including moral suasion by the President, antitrust action by the Department of Justice and, if all else failed, "utility-type regulation"—to keep Pittsburgh in line.

In another day and age, such proposals would have drawn a stinging rebuke, either from the opposition party or, most certainly, from the private interests involved. To date, however, the response has been faint. In a mildly worded reply to Mr. Freeman, the bakers merely pointed out that the cost of flour has gone up and that the association, unlike its individual members, has nothing to do with setting prices. As for steel, a trade publication has criticized some of the specific points raised by Senator GORE, most notably the CEA forecast of fourth-quarter profits. The industry itself, however, has held its peace.

While perhaps understandable, its continued silence is a matter of regret. For as even a moment's reflection suggests, there is a great deal indeed to be said. To begin with, in making his threadbare charges about so-called administered prices, Senator GORE, either by accident or design, wholly disregarded what in fact has been going on in the marketplace. For months (Barron's, June 12) the steel industry has been plagued by a rash of price-cutting in such products as electric-weld pipe, reinforcing bars and stainless sheet and strip. Even as the solon was speaking, his comments were being refuted by the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., which, after seeking for 8 weeks to exact a higher price for rigid conduit from its presumably helpless customers, last Tuesday had to beat a retreat. As for steel prices and profits, this publication does not presume to judge whether they are too high, too low or just right, and we commend the same restraint to Senator GORE and his followers. For what they are advocating is tantamount, willynilly, to peacetime Federal price control, unaccompanied by any curb on wages, and aimed solely at one line of business. If allowed to prevail, so outrageous a policy would spell the end of free enterprise in steel and the beginning of the end for the rights of private property everywhere.

Steel prices, in short, are the proper concern not of Congress but of those who own and operate steel mills. Pittsburgh alone must decide in October whether competitive conditions, current and prospective, warrant a higher price. Meanwhile, lawmakers who are genuinely troubled at the prospect of inflation need scarcely be idled. There is much to do right in their own bailiwick. For example, they can do something about a farm program which recently upped the support price for raw cotton, thereby touching off a spiral throughout the textile and garment trades. They might probe into U.S. quotas on fuel oil, which effectively have raised heating costs throughout the northeast. They might crack down upon a State Department which cheerfully exhorts the U.S. consumer, in the name of hemispheric solidarity, to pay 10 cents more per pound for coffee. If truly alarmed, the lawmakers even might urge the White House to alter its dangerous easy money bias and to tighten the Federal pursestrings.

On such issues, rather than on the price of steel, the dollar will stand or fall. If Washington continues to throw its weight against the consumer in one market after another, to keep credit plentiful and cheap and to run endless budget deficits, the currency sooner or later must suffer. Inflation cannot be stopped by exhortations or threats to private citizens, individual or corporate, or by the search for scapegoats. It can be stopped only by the determination, at the highest Government levels, to embrace a measure of financial restraint.

Protectionists Gain, Peril Kennedy 1962 Bid for More Liberal Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a number of Oregon farmers, especially those connected with our growing seed industry have been disappointed by the failure of the Tariff Commission to give what they consider to be adequate consideration to the needs of agricultural industries.

In this connection, they have directed my attention to the article which appeared in the September 20, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal. The material contained in this article, I think, will be of great interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTECTIONISTS GAIN, PERIL KENNEDY 1962 BID FOR MORE LIBERAL LAW—CAMERA, RADIO, TEXTILE FIRMS' PLEAS SWAY CONGRESSMEN; UNEMPLOYMENT IS A FACTOR—A SHIFT IN THE SOUTHERN VIEW

(By John A. Grimes, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's free-trade drive in 1962 will face a towering obstacle: congressional protectionist sentiment of a magnitude not seen since the high-tariff twenties.

Well in advance of next year's administration push to extend and liberalize the reciprocal trade law, demands for defense against import competition are swelling mightily. Members of both parties from many parts of the land are responding to home-State complaints from industry and labor about real or threatened damage from the rising influx of foreign goods. There are growing rumblings of discontent about the effectiveness of present safeguards. Scarcely a week goes by without a new speech on the House or Senate floor calling for import quotas on some foreign product—a step essentially distasteful to the Kennedy regime.

"You can start with bread along the Canadian border and go all the way down to strawberries on the Mexican border; I don't think you can find many holes in the map where there isn't a complaint from someone about imports," remarks a key House official.

A House Democrat runs through this list of plaintiff industries: "Coal, some steel, pottery, cement, oil, glass, some machinery, lead and zinc, cameras, transistor radios, all kinds of textiles, clothing, baseball gloves, fishing rods; all these and more are howling about imports." And, he adds, "Congressmen are listening now."

PROTECTIONIST RESOLUTION

Sample response: More frequent introductions of the perennial protectionist resolution urging that the Senate and House declare it the sense of Congress that no more tariff-easing agreements be negotiated by the executive branch during the remaining life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring next year. This resolution has been introduced more than 70 times this session, compared with some 40 last year.

"This isn't a case of the same old protectionist groups making more noise," cautions a long-time House stalwart for freer trade who has been doing some private sampling. "This time there's more of 'em." An ardent protectionist who has done his own polling cheerfully agrees. "We're the strongest we've been since the first reciprocal trade law in 1934," he enthuses.

A potent combination of political and economic forces underlies this gain in strength.

The departure of President Eisenhower, for one thing, has put more Republicans in the protectionist column. "Mr. Eisenhower dragged a lot of kicking and screaming Republicans along with him on trade," asserts a key legislator. "Now that he's gone, they're reverting to type." Senator BENNETT, of Utah, who backed Ike on trade legislation in 1958, is urging safeguards now against certain meat imports. Also, almost all of the GOP's 21-seat gain in the House in the 1960 election is counted a plus for protectionism.

SOUTHERN VIEW CHANGES

On the Democratic side, the southerners who began abandoning their traditional free-trade stance as Dixie industrialized are turning more protectionist as foreign invasion of their markets grows.

The year influential Democratic Representative VINSON, of Georgia, engineered a demonstration in which some 70 textile-State lawmakers, mostly Democrats, stood up on the House floor and demanded import controls. Senator BYRD is backing away from his traditional support of freer trade legislation.

More border State and northern Democrats are heading the same way. Even such liberal Senators as MUSKIE, of Maine and MCCARTHY, of Minnesota want to require consideration of foreign wage rates in any decision on relief from import competition. Outspoken for more protection is New York's Representative STRATTON, whose upstate district encompasses such import-affected industries as textiles, gloves, and General Electric Co.'s heavy electrical equipment works at Schenectady. More and more northern Congressmen are feeling the heat from local unions, including those of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers, even though national labor leaders favor liberalized trade.

Much of this pressure is prompted by the fact that unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis, has remained at almost 7 percent of the labor force, despite economic recovery. "If you've got any unemployment in your district at all, you have a hard time justifying a free trade position," asserts a

midwestern Democrat. Another lawmaker complains: "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

MACHINERY, TEXTILE IMPORTS UP

The incoming tide of foreign goods clearly is increasing in amount and variety. Spurred by economic recovery in this country, U.S. imports jumped in July, the latest month for which figures are available, to the highest monthly level since September 1959. At nearly $1.4 billion, adjusted for seasonal fluctuation, this was 16 percent over the June level and 9 percent above that of July last year. Increases were reported in U.S. purchases of machinery, vehicles, metals, and textile products. Not only is there a rising flow from longtime suppliers abroad, but newly developing lands are seeking out the rich American market. One recently introduced item: tennis racquets from Pakistan.

Obviously the rising winds of protectionism on Capitol Hill portend a major battle against the administration's attempt to extend the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and push into new ground. Rather than trimming back past trade concessions, White House officials are hunting ways to open the domestic market wider to foreign producers. The key aim: To supply Mr. Kennedy with bargaining tools to prevent U.S. goods from being closed out of trading blocs abroad, such as Europe's six-nation Common Market. Instead of the cumbersome item-by-item tariff-cutting authority first handed President Roosevelt and extended 11 times since then, Mr. Kennedy may seek new powers to slash import duties on a broad range of commodities.

"Unless the present mood of Congress changes completely, any idea that the administration can get approval of this sort of thing is sheer fantasy," snaps a Southern Democrat.

A TRIP TO HOLLYWOOD

Even now, protectionists are working to build a solid case against trade liberalization next year. Democratic Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, a consistent foe of freer trade, heads a House subcommittee that has collected evidence from far and wide of import damage to U.S. employment. So far, Mr. DENT's group has delved into textiles and cheese and has even taken testimony on the effect of foreign airlines' invasion of the United States on employment of American pilots. In the works: A subcommittee trip to Hollywood to inquire into the effects of foreign film imports on U.S. moviemaking.

Although Congress hasn't had major trade legislation to deal with at this session, significant indicators of increased protectionist power keep showing up in legislative measures. House lawmakers wrote into the foreign aid authorization bill a provision barring loans to nations for building or running any plants that would produce goods in competition with U.S. manufacturers, unless such nations promised to limit exports to this country to 10 percent of annual output. Although a Senate-House conference eased the restriction to 20 percent, the amendment stayed in the measure.

Protectionists claim credit for the pressures that brought insertion of a "stiff-interpretation" into the treaty for U.S. membership in the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Reflecting concern over possible dilution by the Organization of this country's control of its own trade policies, the provision specified that U.S. membership would neither lessen nor expand this Nation's sovereign powers.

DEMANDS FOR RELIEF

What many lawmakers want as a price for any support for trade liberalization is some firm assurance of more relief for import-injured industries. Such help could take the form of administration-proposed import quotas for certain products, or simply of greater Presidential acceptance of Tariff Commission recommendations for curbing imports or raising tariffs to protect domestic producers.

Strong words of warning have come from Mr. VINSON, one of the administration's ablest votegetters among southern Democrats: "Unless quotas are imposed that will provide the necessary protection to the textile industry in the United States, I think I can safely predict that at least some of the Members who voted to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1958 will have second thoughts if a bill to extend the act is presented on the floor in 1962."

Since he spoke, the United States has worked out an agreement with 16 nations to reduce cotton textile imports to this country and reroute some of the flow to other lands. How effective it will be in curbing the competition and relaxing congressional pressure for action remains to be seen.

"This administration has got to recognize that industries are getting hurt," declares a key Southern Democrat. "Kennedy can't go on ignoring Tariff Commission recommendations like Eisenhower did."

CURBING PRESIDENTIAL POWER

Of 35 recent cases in which relief was recommended by the Tariff Commission, Congressman STRATTON, of New York, relates 22 were turned down by the White House—"a sorry percentage," he scoffs. To stop this sort of thing, protectionists would like to make Tariff Commission recommendations mandatory, rather than leaving final judgment up to the President; such a sharp change does not seem likely to be adopted soon, however.

Congress' mood is not lost on the administration, in any case. Indeed, some lawmakers suspect Mr. Kennedy has recently been careful to avoid a congressional rebuff on tariffs. He sent back for further study recent unanimous Tariff Commission recommendations for relief for domestic industries against imports of baseball gloves, ceramic mosaic tile, and certain kinds of glass, these Congressmen note. A Presidential "No," they suggest, might have been overridden by a two-thirds vote of Congress—a check provided in the 1958 extension of the trade law.

In both the substance and presentation of its 1962 trade proposals, the administration will strive to anticipate and overcome congressional objections. A key feature of its new program is expected to be a broad new plan to ease the impact of further tariff cuts. Rather than relying on higher tariffs or import quotas to protect domestic industries, the plan would emphasize increased Government help to "rehabilitate" companies, industries, or communities hard hit by imports.

Soon Cabinet officials and their top aids will "start beating the drums" for the new trade approach, promises one official. "Once the President gets into the fight," insists another, "it will put a whole new perspective on things." To help cultivate support for free trade plans both in Congress and in the business world, Mr. Kennedy has already named a Republican banker, Howard C. Petersen, as a special White House assistant.

The administration's congressional allies won't be idle, either. One administration lieutenant in the House remarks: "I expect to do a lot of talking on this matter between sessions." Democratic Representative BOGGS, of Louisiana, a long-time battler for freer trade, plans public hearings next month by his Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. He expects the testimony will provide much ammunition against the protectionist attack. Mr. BOGGS has also signed up former Secretary of State Herter to help head a study of world economic and trade problems.

Report by Congressman Perkins Bass to the 2d Congressional District of New Hampshire on 1st Session, 87th Congress, September 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is a good time to look at the record, now that Congress has finally concluded this very lengthy 1st session of the 87th Congress. This report recaps the activities of the House and Senate during this past so-called honeymoon session.

If we were to characterize the congressional attitude of 1961 toward defense and foreign affairs, it would have to be one of bipartisanship and all but unanimous support of President Kennedy in his first 8 months of office. And this in spite of considerable feeling that the new administration had badly handled situations in Cuba and Laos.

As it has been since the beginning of the cold war, the Communist threat to our security posed by the military power of Russia and their goal of world domination overshadows everything else. To meet this threat, Congress approved, and in several instances exceeded, Presidential requests for military spending. As a result, the United States will spend over $51 billion in fiscal year 1962 for its security or about $275 for every person in the United States. Vast as these expenditures seem, the final appropriations were approved by unanimous rollcall votes in both the House and Senate. Also authorized was the callup of some 250,000 reservists and national guardsmen.

Economic and military assistance to our allies and the uncommitted nations roughly equal to last year's $4 billion commitment, were passed. An economic development loan fund with a 5-year authorization was approved, but with the requirement of yearly congressional appropriations. Many felt, as I did, that while the 5-year authorization was necessary for continuity in programing long-range development projects, it was equally necessary that Congress maintain a fiscal review. In this instance, the Republican minority insisted upon a constructive requirement in the foreign-aid program.

From my own Science and Astronautics Committee came a $1.7 billion space exploration appropriation. While I favored the original Kennedy request for $1.2 billion, I could not support the last minute request of $500 million largely for a "crash" program to push the man-to-the-moon project. I felt this second request was wasteful of our scientific and fiscal resources.

To balance the vast armament expenditures, the Congress did move in a small way to implement the growing need for disarmament by approving the

establishment of a Disarmament Agency to advise the President on effective disarmament techniques, looking to the time when the Russians are prepared to sit down and make serious progress towards world disarmament.

The Congress appropriated some $600 million to support President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" program for South American development. Also the successful Public Law 480 program for distributing surplus farm products to the needy of the world was extended indefinitely. Congressional approval was given to the President's Peace Corps and the Congress without dissent approved resolutions urging that the United States continue its firm opposition to U.S. diplomatic recognition of the Red Chinese Government or its admission to the United Nations.

On the homefront, New Hampshire residents will be interested in legislation to reimburse the State for claims paid by it for property damage suffered as a result of the 1957 Worcester, Mass., plane crash. Operated by a member of the New Hampshire National Guard, the plane was on a flight authorized by the Department of Defense. The State was reimbursed in the amount of $65,049.93. Also receiving congressional approval during the past session, were funds for the Souhegan Valley watershed project in Hillsboro County, as well as planning funds for a new Federal building for Concord.

The President's early antirecession proposals were well supported by both parties and both Houses of Congress. Quickly passed were a 13-week $1 billion extension of unemployment benefits with a companion $300 million bill increasing benefits to dependent children of the unemployed. In the same "era of good feeling" a much needed increase in minimum social security benefits were approved.

More grudgingly approved by midsession were a $4.9 billion housing bill, a $400 million depressed areas program, and a minimum wage bill providing a gradual increase to $1.25 per hour and extending coverage to an additional 3.5 million workers.

But as Congress continued its lengthy session, its resistance seemed to stiffen so that the final tally lists many Kennedy domestic proposals that had been postponed or defeated by adjournment time. Several factors were responsible for this—the ever present question of whether or not new or expanded welfare programs should be undertaken by the Federal Government with accompanying erosion of local responsibility; the problem of further big deficit spending in a period of prosperity on top of large deficits for both fiscal years 1961 and 1962; and the general feeling in Congress that our national resources should be directed more to countering Russian pressures in West Berlin and elsewhere around the world. These feelings were particularly strong in the more conservative House where many controversial domestic proposals of the Kennedy administration such as Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged under social security, and a farm program that would bring all crops under Federal Control were defeated or left for next year's session.

Perhaps the most glaring lapse of the Kennedy administration on the domestic scene was budgetary. The small surplus predicted by President Eisenhower for 1961 was wiped out in weeks by the new administration with its supplemental requests. In place of a projected Eisenhower surplus of $100 million, we finished up with a Kennedy deficit of over $3 billion on June 30. And vast new spending by the Kennedy administration for fiscal 1962, which began this July, promises an even greater deficit which may go as high as $10 billion. The unfortunate thing is that the new administration never matched spending requests with revenue requests.

We are told that an expanding economy will provide the necessary additional tax revenues to support the Kennedy program and that by late 1962 or early 1963 we will be "back in the black." But this method of stimulating tax revenue is highly inflationary and extremely difficult to control. Inflation-fed spending historically stays well ahead of revenues.

The failure of Congress and the administration to show restraint in spending and in its failure to pay for new programs will most surely be felt by us all in 1962. It will be most cruelly felt by people on lower and middle incomes, who are always hurt the most by a cheaper dollar and higher cost of living. This, I fear, is the bitterest domestic legacy of the first Kennedy Congress.

New Challenges in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, transportation has played a vital role in the development of the American economy since colonial times. It has made possible the common market which our 50 States enjoy.

Our effectiveness in meeting the challenge of the 1960's is dependent upon our ability to develop each form of transportation to its maximum capability. Our highways, railroads, maritime transport, and our airways each makes a distinctive contribution to our economy. Every effort must be made to permit the most effective integration of these services to best meet the needs of our country on a competitive basis.

The primary concern of government in connection with matters affecting transportation policy is to reduce the cost of goods and services for the consumers of America. A great step forward was accomplished in 1961 when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved the establishment of piggyback rates. This permits shippers to receive the benefits of both highway and railroad services, utilizing each in the most efficient manner on a door-to-door basis.

Piggyback service is already available to many communities. Processors of fresh-killed poultry in Georgia formerly were not in a position to market their products in metropolitan New York because their transportation cost was considerably higher than that of their competitors closer to that area. Railroad piggyback trailers have now changed that situation.

One railroad executive in discussing the future of piggyback service said:

> The potential is terrific. With proper pricing of our services, it should be most attractive to all railroads. We used to make statements to a customer, tell him what we could do. Now we ask him what he wants. And piggyback helps us to give it to him.

A further advantage of this service is that it will alleviate the boxcar shortage which has been a subject of great concern to many shippers. It will no longer be necessary to immobilize railroad-owned boxcars on sidings while they are being loaded and unloaded.

Mr. President, I have a great interest in the subject of transportation since Baltimore is one of the most important ports on our eastern shore. It is vital that cargoes destined for shipment from Baltimore or that comes to Baltimore are transported by land in the most efficient manner so that the useful radius of this great port may be extended as far as possible. Anything that contributes to lowering the cost of transportation will not displace workers but rather will increase job opportunities. Our economy has always expanded and required more employees to provide the goods and services constituting the American standard of living.

Piggyback transportation has already raised the problem of automation which has been of concern to many of my colleagues. On June 1, 1960, the Governor of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, addressed a special Governors' conference on automation at Cooperstown, N.Y.

In his opening statement to representatives of labor, management, and government, he defined automation as follows:

> Automation essentially is a complex of measures—organizational procedures, techniques and equipment—that combine to augment the output of a given worker in a given amount of time.

He then continued:

> This has raised the specter of possible job displacement on a large scale. But, since automation requires very heavy capital expenditures, the cost of providing the equipment upon which it depends is likely to limit the speed and the extent of its adoption. In a stagnant, slow-growth economy, there would be room for genuine concern over the displacement of men by machines. I do not believe we need fear such a situation in any general national sense in the period ahead. However, I feel very strongly we must be sure that other opportunities are available to the individuals affected by automation.
>
> We should welcome automation because our problem over the coming decade promises to be not one of creating enough jobs but one of creating enough production.

Recently, Premier Khrushchev, in his usual boastful manner, stated that the Soviet Union would surpass the economic output of the United States by 1970. This statement has been repeated on numerous occasions. In a speech commemorating the 40th anniversary of the formation of the Kazakhstan Republic, he admonished his listeners that the Soviet people should eat more horsemeat because it was cheap, nourishing, and after a while one grows to like it. Fortunately, we have not had to encourage our people to eat horsemeat in order to meet our defense commitments.

Half the Soviet labor force must devote their energies to agriculture in order to produce their food supply which would be most inadequate by American standards. Our economy provides more goods and services for all our citizens because only 7 percent of our labor force must expend their efforts on agriculture and related tasks.

While automation has usually been discussed in terms of industry, agriculture has shown the greatest increase in productivity of any sector of our economy. Expanding job opportunities, particularly in the service industries, has required the talents and skills of those people who previously would have been devoted merely to the task of feeding us. History shows that new developments are often resisted by those who lack the vision to see the expanded job opportunities that follow improved processes.

The Congress in the Transportation Act of 1958 endeavored to establish a transportation policy to better enable each form of transportation to serve the public on a competitive basis. It is apparent that during the next session of the Congress, an effort will be made to deny consumers the benefits of competition through the reestablishment of archaic standards of ratemaking by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A bill, S. 1197, which would have this effect, is now pending before the Senate Commerce Committee. Pressures were exerted to report it during the closing days of this session, but the committee deferred further action on it until next year by a 9 to 3 vote. I am opposed to any measure which would deny consumers the benefits of improved technology developed under competitive conditions. Piggyback operations will be a principal factor to be considered by the Senate if this bill is reported next year.

I believe all of my colleagues will be interested in a presentation of the advantages of piggybacking by Mr. Clair M. Roddewig, president of the Association of Western Railways before the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum on February 14, 1961. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Roddewig's address may be printed at this point in the RECORD:

NEW CHALLEGES IN TRANSPORTATION

(Address by Clair M. Roddewig, president of the Association of Western Railways, before the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum sponsored by the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, at Spokane, Wash., February 14, 1961)

Gentlemen, it's a pleasure to be with you today. I consider it a privilege to have been invited to address you at this luncheon, and I am also looking forward to participating in this afternoon's panel discussion.

Indeed, we representatives of the western railroads are always happy to meet with leaders of the farming industry. It was the closeworking relationship between farmers and railroaders which settled the West. And it will be continued cooperation between farmers and railroaders, plus that of our expanding industry, which will keep the West progressive.

Certainly, it is at meetings such as this that matters of timely concern to the country should be weighed and considered. And certainly, it is important groups such as yours that must help to guide the thinking of others.

The subject of my address today is "New Challenges in Transportation." Of all the new challenges confronting the railroads and other common carriers, I think the most serious is that posed by the tremendous growth of unregulated and private transportation.

This unregulated transportation has risen sharply each year since the end of World War II. Today it accounts for two-thirds of all intercity truck business and nine-tenths of all inland waterway barge business. This continuing siphoning away of business from common carrier agencies of transportation represents a very real danger to the economic stability of railroads and common carrier truckers.

One of the fastest growing segments of the unregulated types of transportation is the transportation of agricultural commodities by for-hire motor carriers. These competitors of the railroads compete for the agricultural transportation business of the country without regard to published rates and without regard to many other forms of regulation. The railroads, however, must compete for the agricultural business under a very restrictive form of rate control and regulation.

It is the unfairness of this situation that has prompted the railroads to ask Congress either to impose regulation upon the transportation of agricultural commodities by motor vehicle or, in the alternative, to repeal the regulation that is applied to the railroads when they handle such business.

All the railroads seek is competitive equality.

This is but one of many problems which beset the railroad industry. Notwithstanding these problems and the handicaps they impose, railroad management has been hard at work finding ways to compete for the transportation business of the country.

For many years now, management has been emphasizing careful research into the needs of the shipping public. We're searching out the changes that are needed in equipment, service, schedules, and prices. And we're making these changes just as fast as available funds and the regulatory authorities permit.

In recent years, there has been one significant change in transportation law and policy that has given railroads greater flexibility in adjusting their prices to meet the challenge of this growing volume of business being handled by unregulated and private carriage. I'm referring to the important change that was made in the rule of ratemaking by the Transportation Act of 1958. No longer can the Interstate Commerce Commission require railroad rates to be held at unnecessarily high levels just to protect the business of the railroads' competitors.

Prior to the Transportation Act of 1958, the railroads had extreme difficulty in establishing competitive rates. But, as the result of the pricing flexibility gained in the 1958 act, railroads have been making many price adjustments.

One of the impotrant new developments that has sprung from this new-found pricing freedom has been an explosive growth in piggyback service. Competitive rates, coupled with piggyback service, have been attracting many old customers back to the use of railroad service.

Piggyback, of course, is the picturesque name that was originally applied to the transportation of truck trailers on railroad flatcars. This basic idea of transporting truck trailers and other containers on flatcars has expanded in a variety of ways, particularly in the last few years

Today, the term is often used to include the transportation by railroad of freight shipments in truck trailers without chassis, and in vans without wheels; freight in metal containers of various sizes, some as long as trailers; and the shipment of new trucks and automobiles. As many as 12 large automobiles, or 15 compact cars, are now being shipped piggyback on trilevel flatcars.

Some 54 railroads now offer piggyback service as compared with 19 at the start of 1955. In 1954, 44,102 flatcars loaded with truck trailers were handled by the railroads. In 1955, piggyback loadings increased to 168,150, and kept on pyramiding each year until they reached 415,156 in 1959, and last year passed the half-million mark—totaling 554,212 carloads.

The contribution made by piggybacking to overall income needs of the railroads makes it possible to keep other freight rates at lower levels. And the profits made from piggybacking are helping to finance still other railroad improvements needed by farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and all others who ship by rail.

Indeed, the producers of agricultural commodities and the raisers of livestock have a direct interest in this new type of railroad transportation. The past year has seen the piggybacking of agricultural commodities, including grain, fresh fruits and vegetables, together with livestock, take on sizable proportions.

It is my judgment that the transportation of agricultural commodities and livestock in piggyback service will be responsible for the next great forward movement in railroad business. That is, unless Mr. James Hoffa, general president of the Teamsters Union, has his way in a three-pronged campaign he has started to destroy piggyback service on the American railroads. Mr. Hoffa has declared war on all forms of piggyback service.

Also, it's a bit tricky to demonstrate why the job security of Mr. Hoffa's over-the-road teamsters is of more importance to the Nation than the job security of railroad workers.

Too, it takes some fairly artistic doubletalk to justify Mr. Hoffa's indignation about the injustices to his teamsters who, for the past 30 years, have benefited from Government regulatory policies that have restrained the railroads from competing effectively with the booming cross-country trucking business, which has, in its turn, shrunk the job opportunities of thousands of railroad employees.

And it takes the burning of a lot of midnight oil to dream up any kind of an explanation as to how shippers are being injured by piggyback, when it is the shippers' acceptance and patronage of piggyback that has resulted in the explosive growth of this combination of truck and rail transportation in the last few years.

For example, the railroads are given a pat on the back for the improvements and the economies in the transportation of freight, which they have been able to effect through the development of piggyback—but a kick in the pants for sharing the resulting savings with the users of the new services, because it is attracting business and reducing the job opportunities for the over-the-road teamsters.

On a couple of points, however, there is no inconsistency in the Teamsters' propaganda. And that is when it comes to putting the finger on the railroads and the Inter-

state Commerce Commission, which they have costarred as the villains.

The ICC is portrayed as being under the thumb of the railroads. But in charging that the Commission is unduly disposed to favor the railroads, no attempt is made to explain why, if this were the case, the railroads' troubles have been steadily worsening during the last 30 years, while their competitors by air, water, and highway now account for the greater portion of the Nation's tremendously expanded freight and passenger business.

While looking to Congress to put a crimp in piggyback, Mr. Hoffa is again flexing his own quite considerable muscles.

In the earlier stages of modern piggyback, he forced intercity motor carriers to agree to restrict their use of piggyback. This strategy slowed down, but did not halt the development of this new means of transportation.

The story of piggyback is a fascinating one. Its beginnings reach back more than a century. Its history is still being made. Even today it is no more than a healthy infant.

It was less than 10 years ago that the various components necessary for the creation of this new and vital transportation service began to jell—and from that time on piggyback has been growing by leaps and bounds.

Today it holds the hopes of common carriers by both rail and highway for supplying services that will be more attractive to shippers, and thus minimize the advantages great numbers of them have been finding in operating their own transportation. This "do-it-yourself" or private transportation, as it is usually called, has been developing into an extremely serious threat to both the regulated railroads and the regulated motor carriers.

Piggyback holds also the hopes of the railroads for attracting the traffic they can handle most satisfactorily and economically. In the same measure, it holds the hopes of railroad workers for more job opportunities and greater job security.

The future for piggyback transportation is assured because it combines the advantages of both railroad and motor vehicle transportation into new services that meet the varying requirements of shippers.

Basically, piggyback is combining the economy, speed, and dependability of line-haul by railroad with the flexibility of the truck in loading at the doors of shippers, and delivering at the doors of those to whom the shipments are consigned, usually without any breaking up of loads or other handling between the points of origin and destination.

As the new services shake down into more definite patterns, and experiments with various types of equipment determine which are superior, there inevitably will be standardization along lines that will provide the most economical and satisfactory services.

As this goal looms closer, piggyback doubtless will become interchangeable between most if not all railroads, and will serve many more points than it does at its present stage of development.

Aside from the necessity of designing, building, and experimenting with new equipment, and new facilities for loading and unloading, along with the necessity of reducing line-haul costs and speeding up train schedules—matters which, generally speaking, are under the control of the railroads and railroad workers themselves—it also has been necesasry to overcome another formidable barrier before piggyback service could be made attractive to shippers. This is the barrier made up of obsolete regulatory policies which are under the control of Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

From its infancy, transportation by motor vehicle has been encouraged by the expenditure of billions of dollars on public highways by the Federal and State Governments. This has relieved motor carriers from the necessity of making any capital investment whatever in the greater part of the facilities they require to perform their services.

Because their rights-of-way are publicly owned, they are not taxed as are railroad rights-of-way. Their users, consequently, are not required to pay any taxes on these rights-of-way for the support of education, police and fire protection, welfare and similar services of State and local governments, as must the railroads on their rights-of-way.

But in addition to these and other advantages enjoyed by highway transportation since its beginning, the new industry was protected from railroad competition by rigid regulatory restraints. So while railroads were held under the heavy thumb of regulation that was designed for different times and conditions, their competitors were encouraged to help themselves to all the business they could get—any that, naturally enough, was the most profitable business.

The railroad rate structure, too, had become untouchable. It had been developed during the years when the railroads were, for all practical purposes, the only form of surface transportation along lines that were designed to encourage settlement and production in the newly developing areas in the United States.

Bulky and heavy products of relatively low value were required to be carried to distant markets at rates that often did little more than repay the out-of-pocket costs of the railroads, while manufactured goods of greater value were brought into these areas at higher rates.

A rate structure built up along these lines over a long period of time, and all molded to conform with State and Federal regulations, laws, and court decisions, left the railroads as vulnerable as sitting ducks when highways were improved and motor trucks came upon the scene.

The motor carriers took over all of the high-rated manufactured products they could get, and left the railroads with the less profitable traffic.

The railroads were helpless, and even to this day they have not been completely successful in extricating themselves from some of these harassing heritages of the past.

Efforts to make the necessary adjustments to stem the loss of the more profitable traffic were generally frustrated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which construed or misconstrued the law—depending on one's point of view—as requiring the Commission to shelter the motor carriers from the competitive rates which the railroads sought repeatedly but futilely to establish.

However, it is important to bear in mind that not all of the traffic the railroads lost to the motor carriers was the result of regulatory restraints. There were other factors, and one of the most important of these was, of course, the service advantages which truck transportation made available to shippers—advantages which are now incorporated in the new piggyback services.

The overall result of the regulatory policies that tied the railroads' hands in competing with the newer form of transportation, together with the other considerations mentioned, has been a precipitous decline since 1930 in the portion of the Nation's freight business handled by the railroads. In 1930 they moved 74 percent of all intercity freight, calculated by ton-miles. In 1960 they transported only 45 percent of the intercity business.

By the early fifties the railroads' financial situation, which had been worsening since the early thirties, began to cause really grave concern. This prompted a series of exhaustive studies by Congress and various Government agencies, and these were the forerunners of the Transportation Act of 1958.

One of the most important provisions of the 1958 act was its clarification of the ratemaking provision of the existing law.

The amendment provided that: "In a proceeding involving competition between carriers of different modes of transportation subject to this Act, the Commission, in determining whether a rate is lower than a reasonable maximum rate, shall consider the facts and circumstances attending the movement of the traffic by the carrier or carriers to which the rate is applicable. Rates of a carrier shall not be held to a particular level to protect the traffic of any other mode of transportation, giving due consideration to the objectives of the national transportation policy declared in this Act."

While the Interstate Commerce Commission has been slow in establishing precedents based on the 1958 act, and some of its decisions will have to be passed on by the courts, nevertheless, the shackles on the railroads have been loosened considerably.

The railroads are now exercising their recently established right to compete, as Congress clearly expected them to do. They are trying to bring about an orderly adjustment of the rate structure more nearly to reflect tansportation costs, rather than leave the rate structure rigidly tied to philosophies which have been unrealistic for many years.

The railroads are cooperating with shippers in developing means of providing more satisfactory transportation services, and means of reducing transportation costs. They are sharing the resulting savings with the shippers.

All of this is producing more business for the railroads. And in no area of transportation have the results been more spectacular than in the explosive growth of piggyback.

These, then, are the happenings that have led to the Teamsters taking the warpath against the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Commission, Mr. Hoffa declares in a letter addressed to his members, "has openly and completely favored the railroads instead of the trucking field, thereby rendering direct harm to the jobs of the Teamster drivers." The implication here that the Commission is somehow obligated to favor the trucking field is interesting, if not convincing.

Mr. Hoffa then goes on to explain that: "When piggyback operations began in earnest several years ago many persons questioned its usefulness * * *. However, the striking phenomenon of the current piggyback boom, which makes it entirely different from earlier piggyback attempts, is its overwhelming growth * * *. Today, following a series of favorable ICC decisions, piggyback is attaining almost fantastic proportions."

Mr. Hoffa finds it convenient to avoid any mention of the effect of the Transportation Act of 1958 may have had on the Commission's decisions. The only apparent explanation for this rather conspicuous omission is that he feels that the fiction of a strictly railroad-ICC conspiracy will best serve his purposes.

"The chief danger of piggyback," Mr. Hoffa continues, "is that scores of Teamsters are already losing their jobs," which is, understandably enough, more important to Mr. Hoffa than the fact that the people who are paying the freight bills of the country are the ones who are making possible what he calls "the fantastic and soaring growth of piggyback."

"Piggyback and the question of containerization are not local problems," Mr. Hoffa emphasizes. "They are national in scope. Every teamster should make it his duty to contact his Senator, his Congressman, and State or local governmental officials and inform them about the economic dangers of piggyback. We ourselves will do everything

possible to get national action on this problem."

Teamsters also are being urged to write to the members of the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Needless to say, railroad employees are not going to sit on their hands while Mr. Hoffa is at work. They, too, are writing to their Senators and to their Congressmen.

Gentlemen, the Teamsters Union must not be permitted to hog-tie piggyback service.

I'm confident that neither the Nation's lawmakers nor the Interstate Commerce Commission will allow themselves to be pressured into serving the Teamsters' selfish interests. The public interest is paramount.

Legislation that would halt the fairly priced piggyback service the railroads are giving to thousands of satisfied shippers would be an economic tragedy.

Piggyback service represents transportation progress, and transportation progress is essential to the continued growth of our Nation.

New ideas, new methods, innovations of all kinds that are designed to improve on ways of distributing the Nation's products should be encouraged—not hampered.

Farm interests, ranch interests, mining interests, manufacturing interests—indeed, all shippers—have a vital interest in progressive transportation. All are dependent upon the continuation of healthy common carrier transport.

The public still needs the railroads' "anything, anywhere, anytime" type of service.

With the "right to compete" securely established in the business of transportation—as it exists in every other phase of the American economy—the country can look forward to an ever-increasing quality of railroad service at the lowest possible cost.

Summary of the Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the usual custom of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am pleased to take this opportunity to summarize the record of activity of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

At the outset, however, I would like to express publicly to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means my sincere appreciation for their devotion to duty and for the conscientious and diligent manner in which they have carried out their responsibilities as legislators and as members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Members of the committee have been most assiduous in applying themselves to the business of the committee and in pursuit to their duties. Obviously, members of the committee have not always agreed on all of the measures which have been reported by the committee, just as I have not agreed with each and every such proposal, but this is the way the committee system operates and the results of our work during this session I am confident will stand the test of time.

As I have pointed out on past occasions in discussing the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is clear that the nature of legislation falling within the jurisdiction of the committee is of quite vital importance to each and every American citizen and to our Nation as a whole and it is, therefore, necessary that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means must always proceed with great caution and with the utmost prudence and care in carrying out our legislative functions. It is for this reason, among others, that the committee during this session of the Congress has conducted public hearings on a wide variety of subjects in order to receive extensive and detailed reaction from the general public as to proposals which have been referred to the committee. In fact, the committee has conducted public hearings on 8 major legislative proposals in addition to executive hearings conducted on certain other major and minor proposals. During the course of this session, the committee has held a total of 52 days of public hearings—exclusive of executive sessions—and has directly received testimony, comments and recommendations from a total of over 550 individuals in the course of these hearings. Table 1, which follows, shows the subject and the details of these hearings:

TABLE .—*Hearings held by Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 1st sess.*

Subject and bill number	Dates held	Number of witnesses
Temporary Unemployment Compensation and Aid to Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents (H.R. 3864 and H.R. 3865). (Printed, 1 part.)	Feb. 15, 16, and 17, 1961 (3 days)	31
Federal-Aid Highway Financing. (Printed, 1 part.)	Mar. 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 21, 1961 (6 days).	93
Social Security Amendments of 1961. Executive hearings. (H.R. 4571.) (Printed, 1 part.)	Mar. 9, 13, 22, 24, and 27, 1961 (5 days).	5
President's 1961 Tax Recommendations. (Printed, 4 parts.)	May 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 31; June 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1961 (24 days).	217
Temporary Increase in Debt Ceiling. Executive hearing. (Printed, 1 part.)	June 15, 1961 (1 day)	2
Hospital Services for the Aged Under Social Security (H.R. 4222).	July 24, 26, 27, 28, and 31; Aug. 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1961.	140
Tariff Treatment of Shrimp Imports (H.R. 6168)	Aug. 8, 1961	22
Taxation of Mutual Savings and Loan Associations (H.R. 2899 and H.R. 2900).	Aug. 9 and 10, 1961	26
Taxation of Exchanges and Distributions Pursuant to Antitrust Decrees (H.R. 8868, H.R. 8190, H.R. 7349, H.R. 7496, H.R. 7348, H.R. 1123).	Aug. 24, 1961	13

During the course of this session, there was referred to the committee a total of 1,585 bills and resolutions, in addition to 31 executive communications. Moreover, 10 messages of the President of the United States were on subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee. Of the total of 1,585 such bills and resolutions, there were 897 tax bills, 280 tariff bills, 366 social security bills, in addition to 42 bills of a miscellaneous character falling within the committee's jurisdiction. This represents, as has been about the usual average in the past, just under one-fourth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives.

During the first session of this Congress, the committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 44 bills, which total breaks down as follows: 20 tax bills, 15 tariff bills, 4 social security bills, and 5 miscellaneous-type bills. It should be noted in this connection that quite often the committee reports omnibus legislation which, statistically, appears as one bill but which in fact may combine the provisions of a large number of individual bills which were pending before the committee.

For the further information of the Members, I shall insert at this point table 2, which shows a breakdown of the measures referred to the committee, followed by table 3, which sets forth statistics on the status of bills reported by the committee during this Congress:

TABLE 2.—*Bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong. 1st sess., by category*

Tax	897
Tariff	280
Social security	366
Miscellaneous	42
Total	1,585

TABLE 3.—*Statistics on status of bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., 1st sess.*

	Tax	Tariff	Social security	Miscellaneous	Total
Bills reported to House	20	15	4	5	44
Bills passed House	16	10	3	5	34
Bills reported to Senate	12	5	3	5	25
Bills passed Senate	9	5	3	5	22
Bills enacted into law	8	5	3	5	21

Before reviewing in some detail the legislation which was favorably reported by the committee during this first session, at this point I will present certain

additional statistics on the committee activity which might be of interest.

From early January of this year until the adjournment of the first session, the full Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 83 times. As I heretofore mentioned, the committee met 52 days in the conduct of public hearings and it is estimated that it will require approximately 13 volumes covering over 8,100 pages of testimony for the printing of these hearings when all are published. In addition to the oral testimony and written statements of those who appeared in person before the committee at the hearings, hundred of statements and expressions of views are printed in the hearings and were given careful consideration by the committee.

In terms of substantive subjects, the committee reported and there was enacted into law both major and minor legislation in a number of areas of the committee's jurisdiction. This included the substance of certain legislation which was recommended by the President as part of his program, in addition to other measures initiated by the committee.

Among the major legislative enactments which became law were the following: the Social Security Amendments of 1961; the Federal Aid Highway Revenue Act of 1961; a temporary major amendment to the aid to dependent children program; and the enactment of the temporary unemployment compensation program.

It should also be pointed out that the committee spent a considerable portion of its time giving consideration to the recommendations made by President Kennedy in his tax message of April 20, 1961. The committee conducted 24 days of public hearings, receiving oral testimony from 217 witnesses, and 25 days in executive sessions on this subject. Certain tentative decisions were made for the purpose of having statutory language drafted and have been embodied in a discussion draft, which has been made available to the public for comment and recommendations. It should be pointed out that no part of this draft has yet been approved by the committee. A summary of the major provisions of this discussion draft is presented immediately following the summary of those bills which were reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, there is presented here a brief summary and digest of the bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, including a statement of the stage in the legislative process reached by each bill.

TAX LEGISLATION

H.R. 10, by Mr. KEOGH; reported in Senate September 13, 1961: As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill is designed to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by self-employed individuals by extending to such plans, and to self-employed individuals covered thereunder, many of the favorable tax benefits present law now provides in the case of qualified retirement plans established by employers for their employees. For retirement plan purposes, self-employed persons would be treated as the employees of themselves and permitted to deduct, within specified limits, contributions made to pension or profit-sharing plans for the benefit of themselves and such other of their employes as would be covered. They would not be taxed on such contributions, or the income thereon, until they receive the funds upon retirement, or otherwise.

In reporting the bill to the Senate, it having passed the House on a motion to suspend the rules, the Finance Committee amended the House bill substantially, retaining, however, the fundamental concept of the House bill.

H.R. 221, by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia; passed House September 19, 1961: This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House by voice vote, relates to the imposition of the manufacturer's excise tax on tires and inner tubes. Under present law, the tax is imposed at the time the tires or inner tubes are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. In the case of manufacturers maintaining their own retail stores or retail outlets, this means that no tax is imposed until the manufacturer makes a sale at retail, that is, to the consumer. Thus the retail inventory of the manufacturer maintaining retail outlets enjoys a tax-free status, whereas the independent tire dealer, because the sale to him by the manufacturer, producer, or importer occurred prior to his acquisition of the tires and tubes, can have only taxpaid inventory. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that independent tire dealers may have as much as 15 percent of their inventory investment tied up in these taxes, while their competitors, the manufacturers with their own retail outlets, need make no such investment.

This legislation would remove the competitive discrimination against independent tire dealers resulting from this situation by providing for the imposition of the tire or inner tube tax at the time the tire or inner tube is delivered to a retail store or retail outlet of the manufacturer, producer, or importer.

H.R. 929, by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; Public Law 87–109, signed July 26, 1961: The purpose of this legislation was to conform income tax accounting to more accurately reflect generally accepted accounting principles in the case of prepaid income arising from membership dues. The bill, which became public law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided that prepaid membership dues income of membership organizations may, at the election of the taxpayer, for tax purposes be spread over the period during which there is a liability on the part of the organizations to provide the service, rather than reported in the earlier year in which the income is received. The liability involved must extend beyond the current year but may not extend for more than 36 months. The provision applies only to membership organizations having no capital stock and making no distributions of net earnings to members, and is effective for taxable years beginning with the calendar year 1961.

H.R. 1877, by Mr. O'NEILL; Public Law 87–59, signed June 27, 1961: As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund, Boston, Mass., be considered a qualified and exempt trust from the time of its establishment in 1954 to June 3, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust was not operated in this period in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries. The Senate passed the bill with several amendments, which while not changing the provisions of the House bill, added provisions; first, extending for 2 years the period within which certain stock life insurance companies may make deductible distributions to shareholders in pursuance of a plan of mutualization adopted prior to January 1, 1958; second, reducing the tariff in the case of hair of animals, like the cashmere goat; and third, relating to the effective date of the qualification as a qualified trust of the pension fund of the slate, tile, and roofing industry in New York City. The House accepted the amendments of the Senate, and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 2016, by Mr. GREEN, of Pennsylvania; reported to House September 2, 1961: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides that, effective July 1, 1962, States and political subdivisions which operate retail liquor stores are to be required to pay only one special occupational tax imposed on retail liquor dealers under section 5123(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, each year, regardless of the number of locations at which the liquor is sold within the State or political subdivision.

H.R. 2017, by Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania; reported to House May 9, 1961: This bill would amend the provisions of present law permitting the Federal Government upon request to enter into an agreement to withhold State or territorial tax from compensation paid Federal employees who are employed in the State or territory so as to also provide for withholding of city taxes by the Federal Government, with respect to its employees who are employed in a city with such a tax, if the city has a population of 60,000 or more. The restrictions of existing law applicable to State withholding taxes, designed to limit the administrative burdens of the withholding by the Federal Government and to prevent hardship and discrimination in the case of the Federal employees involved, would also apply to the city withholding taxes, under the bill. Enactment of this legislation is favored by the Treasury Department.

H.R. 2244, by Mr. HERLONG; reported in Senate July 20, 1961: This bill amends the provisions of present law relating to the deduction, for income tax purposes, of charitable contributions. Under existing law, the 20-percent maximum limitation generally applicable in the case of individuals is increased to 30 percent if the contributions to which the additional 10 percent relates go directly to churches, operating schools, or hos-

pitals—or medical research organizations carrying on research in conjunction with a hospital. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the additional 10-percent deduction would also be available in the case of contributions to a foundation, and so forth, if the foundation, and so forth, is organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of turning over each year to one or more of these specified categories of institutions its entire net earnings and if any portion of its principal it may distribute may go only to one of these categories of organizations, to be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961. The bill passed the House by voice vote; in reporting the bill to the Senate, the Finance Committee amended the House provision to also make the 10-percent deduction available in the case of contributions to a university endowment association, this provision to be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate.

H.R. 2585, by Mr. UTT; Public Law 87–321, signed September 26, 1961: This legislation was designed to prevent the imposition of a double tax in the case of the Federal and State unemployment taxes resulting from a technical deficiency in the Federal tax laws arising from a variation in the definition of "employer" between the Federal and State laws. Under the law prior to enactment of this legislation, the predecessor employer, where a trade or business changed hands within the first 20 weeks of the year, was not treated as an "employer" for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax, but generally was so considered for most State unemployment compensation taxes. As a result, the first employer usually had to pay the State tax in such cases, and then the second employer had to pay the full Federal tax but could not obtain the credit usually available for the State tax paid by the first. This bill corrected the faulty operation of the Federal laws in this situation by making the usual credit available in such cases.

The bill was amended by the Senate in two respects, the first dealing with the effective date of the House bill—to make its application prospective only—and the second adding a provision relating to the percentage depletion deduction in the case of clay and quartzite used in making refractory products. The House accepted the Senate amendments to the bill, and the President approved it in this form.

H.R. 5189, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–29, signed May 4, 1961: This legislation, which was enacted at the request of the President as one of various desirable steps intended to improve this country's ability to defend its gold reserves, provided an exemption from tax for income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from U.S. Government obligations, but only if the obligations are not held for, or used in connection with, commercial banking functions or other commercial activities. The exemption is effective with respect to income receivd in taxable years beginning after 1960, and is expected to have a negligible effect of revenues.

The Senate added to the House bill a provision extending to May 15, 1961, the period in which the spouse of a shareholder in a small business corporation may consent to an election not to be taxed as a corporation, in certain circumstances. The House agreed to the Senate amendment, and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 6352, by Mr. BOGGS; reported to House May 16, 1961: This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, amends the provisions of the income tax laws which provide an unlimited charitable contribution deduction where in the last 10 years the charitable contributions and income taxes paid by an individual equal 90 percent of his taxable income—with certain modifications—in each of 8 years. The bill provides that this 90-percent test will be considered as satisfied for each of 2 consecutive years where the test is met on the basis of the average of contributions, taxes, and income in the 2-year period. However, the charitable contributions and taxes in each of these 2 years must represent at least 75 percent of the income of that year and no more than two sets of consecutive years may be averaged in this manner, under the bill. It is also provided that the 2-year averaging provision is to be available only where the charitable contributions taken into account are those going to churches, operating schools and colleges, hospitals and related medical research organizations, and certain other educational, charitable, or religious organizations. The amendment would be effective with respect to deductions allowable for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

H.R. 6371, by Mr. MILLS; passed House August 23, 1961: This legislation amends the provisions of present law relating to the retirement income tax credit. The retirement income credit was designed to give those who have retirement income, but who do not receive tax-exempt social security or similar types of tax-exempt benefit payments, a tax exemption of approximately the same size as that received by social security beneficiaries. A discrimination has arisen gradually, however, as changes have been made in the social security laws over the past several years without corresponding changes in the retirement income credit provisions of the income tax laws, so that the retirement income credit no longer provides equal tax treatment for those who may be retired under Government or private pension systems or may make provision through investment income for their own retirement.

This bill would again equailze the retirement income credit with the social security program by raising the maximum amount of income which can qualify for the credit to $1,524 a year, amending the earned income limitation to correspond with the amended provisions of the sociay security laws, and lowering, in certain cases, the age limit for qualification for the credit.

The bill as amended was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House.

H.R. 6413, by Mr. KING of California; passed House May 10, 1961: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would provide that, for purposes of the estimated income tax, fishermen are to be accorded the same treatment as presently is available for farmers, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

Under present law, taxpayers having income from farming have the privilege of filing the declaration of estimated tax, and paying the estimated tax, by January 15 after the end of the year in question—for calendar-year taxpayers—and this bill would extend this advantage to those having income from fishing.

H.R. 6713—title II—by Mr. FALLON: Public Law 87–61, signed June 29, 1961: The Committee on Ways and Means transmitted to the Committee on Public Works language for inclusion as title II to H.R. 6713, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, containing highway financing provisions making it possible for the greatly expanded program of Federal aid for interstate highways to be completed within the time originally contemplated, and without the necessity for a stretchout of the program. These revenue provisions will bring into the highway trust fund an additional $9.8 billion in revenues over the life of the program, in addition to transferring back to the general fund $2.4 billion in revenues attributable to passenger car and automobile part taxes. Under the legislation, it will be possible for the construction program to be completed in 1972.

The legislation, as agreed to by the conferees and accepted by both the House and Senate, provided for, first, continuation of the taxes on gasoline, special motor fuels, and diesel fuel at the existing rate of 4 cents a gallon; second, increase in the taxes on tires for highway-type vehicles and innertubes to 10 cents a pound, and on tread rubber to 5 cents a pound; third, increase in the tax on highway vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds to $3 per 1,000 pounds; fourth, dedication of 5 additional percentage points of the manufacturers' tax on trucks, buses, and trailers to the highway trust fund, received after June 30, 1962; fifth, continuation of the highway trust fund for an additional 3 months, to October 1, 1972, with all taxes now dedicated to the fund continued as highway trust fund revenues at these tax rate levels for the additional 3 months; sixth, repeal of the provision of previous law for diversion of 5 percentage points of the manufacturers' taxes on passenger cars, et cetera, and on automobile parts and accessories to the highway trust fund; and, seventh, provision for payment of the use tax on highway motor vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds on a quarterly basis and for the exemption of gasoline from tax where it is sold for nonfuel purposes in the manufacture of another article. In connection with the deletion from the bill, in conference, of a Senate amend-

ment relating to compensation of retail dealers of gasoline for tax paid on gasoline lost by shrinkage, evaporation, et cetera, the Treasury Department was requested to conduct a scientific study on this subject and to report the results of the study to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance before January 1, 1962.

H.R. 7057, by Mr. IKARD; Public Law 87–312, signed September 26, 1961: As unanimously reported to the House, this bill provided in the case of brick and tile clay and certain other clays that insofar as the holding in the Cannelton Sewer Pipe case departs from the principles previously enunciated in the Cherokee Brick & Tile Co. and Merry Bros. Brick & Tile Co. cases, it is not to be applied retroactively for years beginning before the Supreme Court granted certiorari in the Cannelton case on December 14, 1959. Thus in the case of brick and tile clay and any other clay or shale where the finished product is the first commercially marketable product, percentage depletion for these past years to the extent they are open will be based upon the value of the finished or end product.

An amendment of the Senate providing that for the purpose of computing the percentage depletion deduction with respect to these minerals "gross income from the property" would be 50 percent of the gross income from the finished product but not to exceed $12.50 for each ton of clay or shale used in the finished product was agreed to by the House, and with this amendment the bill became public law.

H.R. 7446, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–72, signed June 30, 1961: This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, continued for 1 year, until July 1, 1962, certain existing tax rates, including the 52-percent corporate income tax rate and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, and on general—local—telephone service and the transportation of persons. The extension of these tax rates for 1 more year was recommended by the President in his message on taxation, in which he said:

> Our present revenue requirements make such extension absolutely necessary again this year. * * * We cannot afford the loss of these revenues at this time.

H.R. 7859, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House September 19, 1961: This bill amends section 814 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—providing an election to take a credit against estate tax for estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers—to make it applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949—instead of December 31, 1951—to make the credit against estate tax available where the death of the first spouse to die occurred within the 3 years prior to that of the decedent in question but after December 31, 1947—instead of within 2 years of the decedent—and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes is to be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

H.R. 8652, by Mr. KING of California; vetoed by President October 4, 1961: This bill provided that in the case of a net operating loss sustained in the years 1953 or 1954, principally as a result of the conversion from street railway to bus operations, this loss, to the extent not offset against income in years before 1960, will be available in the year 1960 and 4 subsequent years as a net operating loss carryforward. The bill was designed to alleviate the unusual hardship existing in the case of the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co., Minneapolis, Minn. While most transit companies have spread their conversion to buses over many years, affording a sufficient period to absorb the loss against income—present law providing a 3-year carryback and 5-year carryforward for business losses—this company completed its conversion in an 18-month period, while under the management of officers subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to defraud the company, who intentionally disregarded the income tax consequences involved. At the end of the 5-year carryforward period provided under existing law, there remained a $5,200,000 unused loss.

The President vetoed the bill, expressing the view that it would be unfair to shift the burden of losses resulting from the fraudulent conduct of the management of the company to the country as a whole, and that approval of the bill would be inconsistent with orderly tax administration.

H.R. 8847, by Mr. BOGGS; reported in Senate September 21, 1961: This bill relates to the income tax treatment to be afforded the recipients of stock distributed in pursuance of a court order enforcing the antitrust laws. In general, the bill provides that such distributions shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital, and that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, the bill would have had general application to such cases involving antitrust distributions; however, at the request of the administration, committee amendments were adopted in the House at the time of passage of the bill which have the effect of limiting its application to distributions in the Du Pont antitrust case, as well as providing that in order for the provisions to apply the order pursuant to which the distribution is made shall require the divestiture of stock to be completed within 3 years or less from the date the order becomes final.

The bill was reported by the Finance Committee without amendment, and at adjournment of the first session was pending in the Senate.

H.R. 8876, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–397, signed October 5, 1961: This bill, which became law without amendment, was designed to improve enforcement and collection of internal revenue taxes. The taxpayer account number system provided for in the bill will make possible a greatly expanded use of automatic data-processing—AUP—equipment by the Internal Revenue Service and will enable the Service to match information returns now filed with tax returns. Taxpayer account numbers are basic to a satisfactory identification system for ADP equipment, through the use of which the Service hopes to develop a single file which would contain, in one place, information relative to all of the tax transactions involving a taxpayer, thus making possible the reaching of objectives in enforcement and collection of the taxes that could only be partially achieved in the absence of this legislation.

The bill provides that persons required to file tax returns may be required to record their account numbers on their tax returns, and persons filing information returns—such as those relating to dividends or interest—are to include the account numbers of persons with respect to whom information is supplied—such persons to supply their numbers to the persons required to file the information returns.

The committee has requested the Internal Revenue Service to work out a system involving the least possible burden to taxpayers in obtaining account numbers, and the Service has indicated that it intends to use social security numbers as the account numbers in order to minimize the number of persons having to be assigned new numbers.

Enactment of this legislation, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was recommended by the administration.

H.R. 8952, by Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts; reported to House September 23, 1961: This bill relates to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes. The Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 provided that in determining the base for the computation of manufacturers' excise taxes, a constructive sales price could be used where sales were made to retailers or to consumers if sales were also made at the wholesale level. However, this provision applies only if the normal method of sales within the industry is not to sell articles at retail, to retailers, or to both. This bill provides that the latter restriction will not apply in the case of manufacturers' excise taxes on refrigerators and related items, on electric, gas, and oil appliances, and on radios and television sets and related items.

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the provision would apply with respect to articles sold on or after January 1, 1962, with the understanding that this is not, however, intended to imply that this constructive sale price rule was not applicable to sales of articles covered by the bill prior to that date.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION (INCLUDING BILLS AMENDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TITLES)

H.R. 4806, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–6, signed March 24, 1961: This legislation, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, provided a temporary program of first, extended unemployment compensation to persons who have exhausted their un-

employment compensation under State and Federal unemployment laws, and second, reimbursement to certain States in meeting their cost of long-term unemployment compensation. Enacted as part of the administration's program to help offset the effects of the then current recession on unemployed workers and on the Nation's economy, the bill provided extended benefits for up to 13 weeks of total unemployment to workers who had exhausted their rights under State programs and under Federal unemployment compensation programs for ex-servicemen and Federal employees. Payments can be made to unemployed persons who have exhausted their benefit rights under State programs after June 30, 1960, and before April 1, 1962, for weeks of unemployment starting before July 1, 1962. The bill also provides that, to the extent a State pays unemployment compensation for more than 26 weeks of total unemployment in the benefit year, the State will be reimbursed for the number of weeks it pays in excess of 26, up to a maximum of 13 additional weeks, this number to be subtracted from the potential extended benefit payments under the bill to the individual. The cost of the program is financed by advances from the Treasury to be repaid by a temporary increase in the net Federal unemployment tax of 0.4 percent on the existing wage base of $3,000, for calendar years 1962 and 1963.

Under the conference agreement on the bill, an amendment was adopted relating to reduction in TEUC payments in certain cases of retirement pensions and annuities, as well as a provision increasing the ceiling for certain administrative expenses authorized under section 901(c)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act to $385 million for fiscal year 1961 and $415 million for fiscal year 1962; the conferees also accepted the Senate amendment directing the Secretary of Labor to collect certain information related to administering the TEUC program.

H.R. 4884, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–31, signed May 8, 1961: This legislation added a new section to title IV of the Social Security Act to make available, during the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1962, Federal grants to States wishing to extend their aid-to-dependent-children programs to include needy children—and relatives caring for them—of unemployed parents, on the same basis as Federal grants are available to needy children—and relatives caring for them—who have been deprived of parental support by the death, absence, or incapacity of a parent. The bill included provisions designed to facilitate the employment of unemployed parents, or the retraining of such parents, if appropriate, and provisions to assure that aid is not provided when the parent has refused employment that it would be reasonable for him to accept. All existing provisions of the aid-to-dependent-children program apply to the temporary expanded program, including, of course, the Federal-State matching formula. The legislation was recommended by the President as a part of his broad program to combat the then existing recession and to relieve resulting hardships.

Under the conference agreement on the bill, certain amendments of the Senate were accepted and/or modified and incorporated in the bill. These included provisions relating to the denial of aid under the program where the unemployed parent is receiving unemployment compensation; extending Federal matching funds under the plan to children placed in foster homes in certain circumstances; extending for 1 year, to June 30, 1963, the authorization for appropriation of sums for training grants for public welfare and increasing the Federal share to 100 percent; relating to the denial of aid, under a State plan, because of the conditions in the home in which the child resides and providing a period for further study of this problem; raising the overall ceiling on grants which may be made to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, to take into account the increased grants which would be made under the bill; and relating to the reimbursement of States for salaries and other expenses of the States' employees temporarily assigned to duty with the Department of Labor. Also included was a provision increasing from $12 to $15 the maximum medical care expenditures in behalf of old-age assistance recipients with respect to which there will be Federal participation.

H.R. 6027, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–64, signed June 30, 1961: This legislation, the social security amendments of 1961, provided desirable and sound long-run improvements in our social insurance system, designed to make the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program more flexible and effective in carrying out its basic purpose. With its enactment, additional purchasing power will be placed in the hands of people who very much need it, benefiting about 4,420,000 people within the first 12 months through new or increased benefits amounting to $780 million. The changes made, which were in general along the lines recommended by the President, are fully financed, consistent with policies established by the Congress in the past, and the program will thus continue to be self-supporting and on a sound actuarial basis.

The major provision of the legislation can be summarized as follows:

First. An increase from $33 to $40 in the minimum monthly retirement benefit payable to persons retiring at or after age 65 and in the minimum monthly disability benefit, with proportionate increases in the minimum benefits payable to dependents and survivors.

Second. Provision for payment of retirement benefits to men beginning at age 62—at their option—with the benefits payable to men claiming benefits before age 65 reduced to take account of the longer period over which the benefits will be paid.

Third. Liberalization of the insured status requirements, so that a worker will be fully insured if he has one quarter of coverage for every year elapsing after 1950—or after the year in which he attained age 21, if later—and up to the year of disability, death, or attainment of age 65 for men—62 for women. Previous law required one quarter of coverage for every three such elapsed quarters.

Fourth. An increase in aged widow's, widowers', and parents' benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the workers' retirement benefit—a 10-percent increase in benefits for these beneficiaries.

Fifth. Liberalization of the earned income limitation to increase from $300 to $500 the area in which only one-half of earnings above $1,200 are treated as excess earnings.

Sixth. An increase in the contribution rates of one-eighth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, with corresponding increases for self-employed persons, thus keeping the system fully self-supporting and actuarially sound.

Provisions were also included in this legislation for an increase in the Federal matching maximum for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; for the expenditure of Federal funds for temporary assistance to certain U.S. nationals who have returned from foreign countries and are without immediately available resources; extending through December 31, 1962—or, if later, the expiration of 2 years after the date on which coverage was approved for the group which originally elected coverage—the time in which employees who did not elect coverage under a divided retirement system agreement may change their decisions; adding New Mexico to the list of States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems; permitting survivors of ministers or Christian Science practitioners to file a certificate of election for coverage of the minister or Christian Science practitioner, in certain circumstances; and moving up by 1 year, to 1968, the scheduled increases in rates of tax for employers, employees, and self-employed persons.

H.R. 6145, by Mr. RIVERS of Alaska; reported to House August 15, 1961: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would provide a 1-year postponement of the reduced credit provisions relating to the Federal unemployment tax insofar as they relate to certain past advances to a State under title XII of the Social Security Act. This will have the effect of preventing the reduced credit provisions from applying to wages paid by employers in Alaska for calendar year 1961. The committee is aware that existing requirements for repayment of costs of outstanding title XII advances pose serious problems for a number of States—the reduction of credits provided by section 104 of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 is not affected by this bill. The bill does not present a permanent solution to the problem, but the committee felt that, because the cost of unemployment compensation in Alaska is extremely high and it is the only State in which the reduced credit provisions would come into effect this year, it is desirable to postpone the operation of these provisions pending a more detailed examina-

tion of the problem. The administration is presently developing proposals in this area for submission to the Congress. The committee was unanimous in reporting the bill, as amended, to the House.

CUSTOMS AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

H.R. 641, by Mr. BOGGS; passed House August 23, 1961: The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide for the free entry of one intermediate lens betaray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La:, which that university has acquired from abroad to be used in the field of experimental nuclear physics. The committee was advised that this particular type of spectrometer is not available in the United States but can only be purchased abroad from a firm which specializes in the design of such instruments. Under these circumstances, the committee felt that Tulane University should not have to pay import duties on such a highly specialized instrument, which is not available in the United States and is utilized in important scientific projects.

H.R. 3385, by Mr. IKARD of Texas; Public Law 87–95, signed July 20, 1961: This legislation, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the free entry of apparatus utilizing any radicactive substance in medical diagnosis or therapeutic treatment—such as colbalt 60 therapy units used in cancer diagnosis and treatment—and of electron microscopes, when imported for the use of, and not for sale by, nonprofit organizations and institutions, whether public or private, established for educational, scientific, or therapeutic purposes.

The committee was of the opinion that the general public interest would be scrved by permitting such organizations to import these needed tools of scientific research and educational pursuits without the burden of having to pay the substantial import duties which would apply in the absence of enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 3508, by Mr. BOGGS; reported to House September 20, 1961: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill is to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate any freight forwarder, authorized to act as such by any agency of Government, as a carrier of bonded merchandise not finally released from customs custody. At the time the provision of the Tariff Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate carriers of such bonded merchandise was broadened to include freight forwarders, only freight forwarders under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission were authorized to be so designated, the only reason for this limitation apparently being that other freight forwarders—such as airfreight forwarders—were not then as prominent in this field as they now are. The committee was of the opinion that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized to extend the privilege of handling bonded merchandise to any freight forwarder licensed to act as such by any agency of the Government.

H.R. 3668, by Mr. MACK; passed House June 14, 1961: This bill, which passed the House without amendment, amends section 498 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the extension of the informal customs entry procedure to import shipments not exceeding $400 in value. Present law permits informal customs entry to be made when the aggregate value of the shipment of imported merchandise does not exceed $250, thus obviating within this area the necessity for the more complex and burdensome customs procedures required for formal customs entry. The bill, which raises this ceiling to $400, retains the existing provisons of law giving the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to establish lower ceilings for certain types of merchandise and transactions when circumstances warrant his doing so.

H.R. 4449, by Mr. MACHROWICZ; passed House June 14, 1961: The purpose of this bill is threefold: First, to add iconostases to the list of articles for which free entry is presently provided in paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended providing for the free entry of certain articles for religious purposes; second, to provide for the free entry of adjuncts and appurtenances of the named articles whether to be physically joined thereto or not; and third, to extend the application of paragraph 1774 to cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations and associations organized and operated for religious purposes.

The committee was advised by the interested Government departments that enactment of this bill would assist in solving certain difficult interpretative questions which have arisen under the present provisions of paragraph 1774, and unanimously reported the bill to the House.

H.R. 4591, by Mr. MACHROWICZ; Public Law 87–110, signed July 26, 1961: The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1962, the suspension of duties on metal scrap. The limitations and provisos of existing law were continued under the bill. Favorable departmental reports were reeeived on this legislation, and no opposition to its enactment was made known.

In addition to a technical amendment to the House bill, the Senate added a section providing for the free entry of horsemeat, fresh, chilled, or frozen, when imported in immediate containers weighing, with their contents, 10 pounds or more. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House, and the bill became public law as thus amended.

H.R. 4940, by Mr. WATTS; Public Law 87–47, signed June 16, 1961: This legislation, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to prevent the circumvention of the control by the Philippine Government over the exports of Philippine tobaccos to the United States by providing that U.S. customs authorities shall only admit free of duty under the Philippine tobacco quota such tobacco as the Philippine Government has licensed for export to the United States free of duty under the provisions of paragraph 2 of article II of the Philippine-United States Trade Agreement.

H.R. 5193, by Mr. BAKER; reported to House September 26, 1961: The purpose of this legislation, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to impose sliding scale duties on imports of lead and zinc and lead and zinc articles. The duties would be imposed or removed, depending upon the domestic price levels of lead and zinc. The committee concluded that adoption of this formula is desirable, in view of the general dissatisfaction with existing quota arrangements.

H.R. 5852, by Mr. MEADER; Public Law 87–261, signed September 21, 1961: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for the free entry of a towing carriage for the use of the University of Michigan, which has a large ship model towing tank used for experimental testing and research on model vessels under simulated sea conditions, frequently under contract for the Maritime Administration and the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department. The committee was advised that no company in the United States specializes in the design and construction of ship model laboratory equipment, and was of the opinion that it would be in the national interest that the University of Michigan not be burdened with substantial import duties in its efforts to modernize and up-date its ship research testing facility.

In reporting this legislation to the Senate, the Finance Committee added a provision to the House bill which amended the Tariff Act to allow nonresident visitors to bring up to $100 in gifts into the United States duty free. The House accepted the amendment of the Senate, and in this form the bill became law.

H.R. 6611, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–132, signed August 10, 1961: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill, which was proposed by the President as a part of his program to counter the unfavorable balance-of-payments situation, provided a temporary—to the close of June 30, 1963—reduction, from $500 to $100, in the amount of articles acquired abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring into the United States exempt from duty, and waived, in the case of articles acquired in the Virgin Islands, the 48-hour period for which otherwise such resident generally must remain outside the United States in order to be entitled to the exemption.

The Senate amended the House bill to provide that in the case of articles acquired in the Virgin Islands by a U.S. resident arriving directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands, the exemption would be $200 instead of $100, without regard to the 48-hour requirement. The Senate amendment also would allow such a resident who has remained outside the United States for 48 hours or more an exemption of $200, not more than $100 of which shall have been acquired elsewhere than in the Virgin Islands. Under the conference agree-

ment, the House accepted the Senate amendments, and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 6682, by Mr. WIDNALL; reported to House September 22, 1961: As reported to the House, this bill provided for the transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act articles known as fowling nets. These nets are used to temporarily capture birds, and facilitate quick banding and release of the birds. These activities are carried out by persons and organizations, primarily under the coordination and sponsorship of the Department of the Interior, who are volunteer workers receiving no pay, although supplying their own nets or other equipment. The information and records developed from these activities are used in research by the U.S. Government. The committee was advised there is no knowledge of domestic production of fowling nets, and received favorable departmental reports on the bill.

H.R. 7431, by Mr. DADDARIO; reported to House September 22, 1961: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass windows imported for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn., and in St. Francis Xavier Church and auxiliary buildings in Phoenix, Ariz.

The committee is of the opinion that this legislation is meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments.

H.R. 7678, by Mr. TEAGUE of California; passed House June 29, 1961: The purpose of this bill is to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to extend the existing free importation provisions for wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes to wild animals and wild birds imported by any importer for exhibition for any purpose, or imported by a person or firm who in turn would sell them for ultimate use in exhibitions for any purpose. The amendments suggested by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury to an earlier bill on this subject have been incorporated in H.R. 7678, and the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7692, by Mr. HERLONG; passed House September 7, 1961: The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committed on Ways and Means, is to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, first, that when articles, imported in containers required to be marked to show the English name of the country of origin, are repackaged in the United States and offered for sale, the new packages shall be marked to show the country of orgin of their contents, and, second, that such containers shall be marked, in addition to the country-of-origin marking, to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that the new packages must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the English name of the country of origin of their contents.

The committee is of the opinion that enactment of this legislation will provide a comprehensive plan for insuring, in appropriate cases, that purchasers are notified of the origin of imported merchandise, thus greatly assisting in fulfilling the purposes of our marking laws. Penalty provisions for violation are included in the bill, and the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to make exceptions from the marking requirements in certain circumstances.

H.R. 8938, by Mr. BASS of Tennessee; reported to House September 22, 1961: The purpose of this bill is to limit the tariff provisions for lightweight bicycles to typical lightweight bicycles and prevent classification thereunder of nontypical lightweight bicycles. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this bill to the House.

MISCELLANEOUS (INCLUDING BILLS RELATING TO THE PUBLIC DEBT AND BILLS FALLING WITHIN MORE THAN ONE SUBJECT CATEGORY)

H.R. 311, by Mr. BENNETT of Florida; Public Law 87–58, signed June 27, 1961: The purpose of this bill, which became public law without substantive amendment, was to authorize the U.S. Government to accept gifts of money or other property which are to be used for the reduction of the public debt. It provides for the deposit of cash gifts, or proceeds from the sale of other gifts, in a special account on the books of the Treasury, and money in this account is to be utilized to retire obligations of the United States which are a part of the public debt.

Heretofore the Treasury Department, in the absence of specific directions to the contrary, has been treating gifts received by the United States for the purpose of reducing the public debt as unconditional gifts and depositing them in the general fund of the Treasury. The committee felt that those making gifts to reduce the public debt may prefer to have their contributions used for this specific purpose, and further that making this possible may encourage persons to make provision for gifts of this type.

H.R. 4317, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–370, signed October 4, 1961: As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this legislation was to provide a system of annuities for surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Prior to enactment of this bill the Tax Court was the only Federal court without an adequate system of survivorship protection, since the Congress in 1956 provided a survivor annuity system for other members of the judiciary generally.

The Senate amended the bill in several respects, and under the conference agreement—and as the bill became law—the House bill was amended to conform the benefit computation in the case of widows and dependent children of Tax Court judges to the formula provided in the 1956 act relating to widows and dependent children of Federal judges. In addition, a provision was added relating to the taxability of amounts contributed by an employer which is a public school system for annuity contracts for its employees.

H.R. 7500 (title II), by Mr. MORGAN; Public Law 87–293, signed September 22, 1961: The Committee on Ways and Means transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs language amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act in relation to Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders. The general effect of these provisions is to treat Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders in a manner similar to enlisted men in the Armed Forces for income tax and social security purposes.

These amendments were included as title II of the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs establishing the Peace Corps, and were accepted by the Senate in conference on the legislation, subsequently becoming law as a part of the Peace Corps Act.

H.R. 7677, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 87–69, signed June 30, 1961: This bill, which became law without amendment, provided for a temporary—1-year—to June 30, 1962, addition of $13 billion in the public debt limitation. The present permanent statutory debt limit is $285 billion; this legislation provided an additional $5 billion temporary increase over the temporary ceiling in effect at the time of its enactment—to $298 billion. Enactment of this legislation was recommended by the administration, the Secretary of the Treasury having advised the committee that this action was essential to the orderly and economical management of the Government's finances.

S. 1750, by Senator MAGNUSON; Public Law 87–342, signed October 3, 1961: This legislation, which was enacted at the request of the administration as an integral part of its anticrime legislative program, amended the provisions of the Federal Firearms Act by prohibiting the shipment, receipt or transportation of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by any person who has been convicted of, or is under indictment for, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. Prior to enactment of the bill, these prohibitions in the act had applied to any person who was under indictment for, or had been convicted of, a "crime of violence," as defined in the act. The Attorney General advised that enactment of this legislation would aid Federal law enforcement officers in their assault on organized crime. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, identical bills having been introduced by the chairman and ranking majority member of the committee.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF "DISCUSSION" DRAFT OF REVENUE BILL OF 1961

The discussion draft consists of 10 sections. The first indicates that the bill may be cited as the Revenue Act of 1961. The remaining nine sections would make substantive amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. They, together with the Treasury proposal on "tax havens," can be summarized as follows:

First. Investment credit—section 2: A credit against income tax is allowed for new investments (and for purchases of up to $50,000 of used property) made in 1961 and subsequent years. The credit generally is equal to 8 percent of the purchase price of domestic investments. It is not available for property with a useful life of less than 6 years and in general is limited to tangible personal property or other tangible property,

apart from buildings, used in manufacturing, production, extraction, transportation, or communications. It also generally is not available in the case of public utilities.

Second. Entertainment, et cetera, expenses—section 3: Restrictions are imposed on the deduction of entertainment expenses for income tax purposes. First, with specified exceptions, these expenses may not be deducted unless they relate directly to the production of income and are not merely for good will. Exceptions are provided for business meals, employee and stockholder meetings, trade association meetings, conventions, and so forth. Second, no deduction may be taken for business gifts to the extent they exceed $25 per recipient or for the payment of club dues. Third, entertainment and traveling expenses, to be deductible, must be substantiated in detail. Fourth, in the case of travel expenses, only a "reasonable allowance" may be deducted for meals and lodging.

Third. Mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, and so forth—section 4: Over a period of years mutual fire and casualty insurance companies are to be taxed on their underwriting income (their investment income presently is taxed) in substantially the same manner as stock casualty companies. After a 5-year transition period one-half of the underwriting income will be taxed in the year it is earned and the other half—to the extent it is not offset by intervening losses—will be taxed 5 years later. A transition rule gives partial exemption in the first 5 years. Small mutual companies will continue to be taxed only on investment income. Special provisions are applicable for reciprocal underwriters and interinsurers, factory mutual insurance companies, and companies with certain types of concentrated risks. In addition, the deduction now allowed life insurance companies for 2 percent of premium income from group accident and health business is repealed.

Fourth. Domestic corporations receiving dividends from foreign corporations—section 5: Domestic corporations receiving dividends from foreign corporations, if they elect to claim a foreign tax credit for foreign income, and so forth, taxes paid on the dividends they receive, must also include in their income these same foreign taxes for which they claim credit. This has been referred to as "grossing up" these dividends by the amount of foreign taxes paid with respect to them. Other technical amendments are also made.

Fifth. Exclusion for income earned from sources outside the United States—section 6: Earned income derived from sources outside of the United States presently is not subject to U.S. income tax if the individual involved is a bona fide resident of the foreign country. The draft limits this exclusion to some specified amount—undetermined in the committee's tentative decisions. In addition, contributions by employers to pensions, where the individuals worked abroad, are to be fully taxable to the individuals if they reside in the United States at the time they receive the pension in the same manner as employees who worked in the United States.

Sixth. Gain from disposition of depreciable personal property—section 7: Any gain on the sale of most types of depreciable personal property, is to be treated as ordinary income to the extent of any depreciation deductions previously taken. For this purpose only depreciation deductions taken in 1961 and subsequent years will give rise to this ordinary income treatment. This ordinary income treatment is to be applicable only in the case of sales and certain other dispositions of depreciable personal property. Taxpayers will be permitted to change to more conservative forms of depreciation if they desire to do so in order to minimize the possibility of realizing ordinary income under this provision. Also, taxpayers under this provision will be permitted to ignore salvage value in determining their depreciation base to the extent of 10 percent of the cost or other basis for the property.

Seventh. Tax treatment of cooperatives and patrons Section 8: Cooperatives are to be permitted to deduct patronage dividends only when they are paid in money, "qualified scrip," or other property except nonqualified scrip. In addition, a deduction is provided for nonqualified scrip when it is redeemed. The same amounts are to be includible in the income of the patron at about the same time the cooperative takes the deduction—except where the patronage is attributable to personal expense items. "Qualified scrip" means scrip with respect to which the patron had an option to receive cash or scrip for a 90-day period after issuance, or, in the case of farm cooperatives, scrip issued only after the farmer within the year to which it relates consents in writing to received the dividend in scrip rather than cash. In the case of "exempt farm cooperatives," provision is also made for the deduction of amounts paid in money, qualified scrip, or other property (except nonqualified scrip) which is paid out of earnings derived from business done for the United States or from sources other than patronage, such as investment income.

Eighth. Withholding on interest, dividends, and patronage dividends—section 9: Provision is made for withholding at a rate of 16⅔ percent on interest, dividends, and patronage dividends. The recipient on reporting his income for tax purposes "grosses up" his net dividend or interest payment by one-fifth to obtain the gross payment which he reports for tax purposes. The withheld amount is then available as a credit against the tax otherwise due. No receipts are required under this system. A system of exemption certificates is provided for those having no tax liability and intra-annual, or quick, refunds are provided for those where the withholding is excessive because of the number of their exemption, eligibility for retirement income credit, et cetera.

Ninth. Information with respect to certain foreign entities—section 10: Under present law domestic corporations must furnish certain specified information with respect to foreign corporations which they control or foreign subsidiaries of these corporations. If the information is not supplied, reductions are made in any foreign tax credit the domestic corporation might otherwise enjoy. This reporting requirement is extended to include not only domestic corporations but also individuals controlling foreign corporations and also to require information to be supplied with respect to certain additional types of foreign subsidiaries. Another requirement of present law requires certain specified information to be supplied by American citizens or residents who are officers, directors, or important stockholders of foreign corporations if they held such positions or have such stock interests at any time within 60 days after the creation, organization, or reorganization of the foreign corporation. Beginning in 1962 such information is to be supplied by such American officers, directors, or important stockholders on January 1 of that year and also by those who become so at any time thereafter.

Tenth. Treasury proposal on "tax havens:" The Treasury draft—available to the public but not in the committee print—identifies certain types of income—such as income from exports, imports, licensing, certain dividends and interest, and reinsurance. Where such income arises from transactions of a foreign corporation with a related party outside of the country in which the foreign corporation is organized, it is to be taxed currently to U.S. shareholders of the foreign corporation even though there is no dividend distribution. This treatment applies only where five or fewer U.S. stockholders own more than 50 percent of the stock of the foreign corporation and then only in the case of those shareholders owning 10 percent or more of the stock of the foreign corporation.

A Survival Kit for Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the sins of a few too often condemn large groups who are completely innocent of any unethical or unwise business practices. It is always news when anyone is involved in wrongdoing but those who act as good citizens and perform their proper tasks day after day are never considered newsworthy. Hence, there is a tendency that is quite understandable on the part of the public to stigmatize large groups because a very few individuals or firms have been involved in questionable practices.

Recently, there has been an outcry against advertising per se. Yet, no other factor has played as important a role in developing the economies of mass distribution which in turn make mass production possible. Unless we have a strong consumer demand for the goods and services produced by our fellow cit-

izens, it will be impossible to take advantage of new techniques which reduce costs and enhance America's standard of living.

Advertising budgets, while they may seem large in global figures, represent one of the most economical means of informing the American public of the merits of a particular product or firm.

Probably no individual is better acquainted with the problems of ethical and informative advertising than the former chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Earl W. Kintner. He made a most significant address entitled "A Survival Kit for Business" before the First Annual Conference, Sixth District, Advertising Federation of America, at Indianapolis, Ind., on April 21. It is worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SURVIVAL KIT FOR BUSINESS

(Statement by Earl W. Kintner of Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, Washington, D.C., before the First Annual Conference, Sixth District, Advertising Federation of America, Indianapolis, Ind., April 21, 1961)

I

A cynic can be delightful company during an interim of relaxation. Mordant wit often can illuminate the follies of mankind with penetrating accuracy. However, when the time for observation is over and the time for action comes, I find the company of cynics to be less than pleasant. In the realm of action cynicism often becomes an excuse for inaction, a mask for defeatism, a cloak for paralysis of the will.

Now that the scandals unearthed within the communications industry have been exposed to public view for some time the cynics have been in full cry. No lasting improvements or reforms will be made in the world of advertising, they say. Some of these cynics are the very men who must act if advertising is to operate in an improved moral climate. Other cynics include leading economists who have seized upon advertising's troubles of the past 2 years to renew their attacks upon the value of advertising to the American economy. Their eyes turn toward a planned economy in which advertising would be a poor relation, if not the enemy. Of greatest moment is the fact that the ranks of the cynics have been augmented by a host of aware and intelligent citizens.

I disagree with all these cynics, in and out of the industry.

Advertising is as susceptible to principled performance as any other form of economic activity. The rewards for ethical conduct are great and the dangers of unethical conduct are very apparent. The first such danger is the smoldering anger of the American public over shoddy advertising. Although this public indignation is not headline news every day, from my vantage point of the past 2 years I can assure you that it continues to be strong and deep. A surprising number of people have commented to me about the negative attitude that deceptive or tasteless advertising generates in them. Confronted with an advertisement designed to evoke a favorable attitude toward a product, these people often form a quiet resolve not to buy the product because of the offensive nature of the sales message.

Advertising is not a shell game. Good advertising informs; it does not deceive. These simple observations are truisms. Like many truisms, the great danger is that the truth may be so self-evident that is is ignored. It is almost presumptuous of me to remind this group of creative advertisers of these simple maxims. However, in any area there is a periodic need to reexamine first principles. As I have just indicated, in advertising this reexamination must take place in the context of a new evaluation of the American audience. That audience grows better educated and more sophisticated day by day. The proverbial advertiser who addresses all of his messages to 12-year-olds continues to do so at his peril. A brief backward glance is sufficient to highlight the sharply rising level of taste and sophistication of the American audience.

James Webb Young, a great advertising pioneer, discussed a 1913 advertisement of Postum in a recent article in the Saturday Review. The ad points out the advantages of Postum over Brazilian coffee, attributing the following ills to coffee:

"Sallow complexions; stomach trouble; bad liver; heart palpitations; shattered nerves; caffeine, a drug; weakness from drugging."

Mr. Young then quotes a judgment on the changes that 40 years of education bring: "We doubt if the present owners of Postum would OK copy like this today. Even if they did not own Maxwell House." Mr. Young's example is not an isolated one. Any of you that have read the AMA three volume series "Nostrums and Quackery," or "Skindeep," or Turner's "The Shocking History of Advertising," or Holbrook's "The Golden Age of Quackery," know that the incredible claims of yesterday would not convince today. Every increase in culture, every advance in education, every exposure to wider experience places an additional seal of doom on shoddy, tasteless and irresponsible advertising. Despite the appearance in recent years of some very sophisticated institutional advertising, I sometimes feel that advertisers are the last to weigh the American audience at its true value. Certain it is that today's consumer is aware, and that he resents being patronized as an unsuspecting boob.

Some of you may say, "Oh well, this storm will blow over like so many others have in the past." This attitude is a mistaken one. The present threat to public confidence in advertising, while considerably abated by the massive self-regulatory efforts made by advertising at all levels during the past 2 years, is still deep and broad. It would be as dangerous to ignore the indignation of the American audience as it would be to insult its intelligence.

If any of you believe that the storm has now blown over and that advertising no longer suffers ill repute among our citizenry you will find the current survey of attitudes toward advertising appearing in Advertising Age to be stimulating—and shocking—reading.

II

This cynical attitude among the public can be abated.

Somehow the advertising industry must do as effective a job in explaining the essentiality of advertising in a consumer-oriented economy, its role in the creation of jobs, its role in the establishment of new markets and new products, its role in raising the standard of living, as the industry, through its advertising council has done in promoting Smoky the Bear and explaining the necessity of public purchase of savings bonds. This task calls for serious effort. To concentrate on some shortsighted effort to create facile prestige for advertising would be a serious mistake. Prestige does not exist independent of stature. Prestige is only a reflection of the social utility of an individual or institution. Advertising has real social utility, real economic utility, but it is obvious that its utility has not been fully rationalized and communicated in meaningful terms.

One difficulty may be that in attempting to communicate the utility of advertising to the public admen often unconsciously address themselves to other admen. Many addresses, articles and books present telling points that are meaningful to the general public, but these worthy points often are obscured by the inclusion of some of the comfortable shibboleths and familiar jargon of the industry. A fundamental proposition of advocacy is to make the argument meaningful to the people you are seeking to convince. Demonstrating one's orthodoxy as a member of the "in grooups" should be reserved for "in group" meetings.

III

A cynical public attitude toward advertising is dangerous. Cynicism within the advertising industry also constitutes a great danger. A cynic, doubting the honesty of his competitors, is easily tempted to sail as close to the wind as he can. And if one cynic yields to this temptation than many others, including some otherwise well-intentioned and upright men and women will also yield, because it is very difficult to refrain from fighting fire wtih fire in a hot competitive battle. Well, fighting fire with fire may wipe out the temporary gains of an unscrupulous competitor, but bear in mind that the competitive struggle then shifts to a lower plane. And people are watching. Those who already had a low opinion of advertising are presented with new evidence to confirm their opinions. And many new recruits enlist in the ranks of the cynics.

And what of the upright advertiser who adheres to his principles and refuses to fight fire with fire? Hopefully, public awareness of deception will be his ally. Hopefully, governmental sanctions will be applied to his amoral competitors before his plight becomes serious. But if the upright advertiser emerges from the crisis bearing scars he may turn bitter when the next crisis arises. If this bitterness is allowed to compound then the level of the industry inevitably will sink. And if the level should sink an aroused public will demand that tighter and tighter controls be imposed upon advertising.

IV

My interpretation of American economic history is that many devices for governmental regulation of business have been developed only after a protracted demonstration that free entrepreneurs had failed to discharge their responsibilities for the furtherance of the national interest in a given area of concern. The history of our antitrust and trade regulation laws illustrates this point.

The cardinal element in the structure of the American economic system is that economic problems will be resolved by the interplay of free competitive forces and that competition in the market will be conducted fairly. Monopoly and unfair competition war against that principle. A market ceases to be free when predators are able to deny entry to the market to struggling new enterprises, to damage competitors by foul means or to unilaterally set the conditions of trade. In the late 19th century, it became painfully obvious that private efforts could not impede the transfer of market power from diverse and disparate competitive entities to the trusts. Therefore, the national interest in free enterprise demanded the creation of the antitrust laws and the vigorous enforcement of those laws by the Government. Early in the 20th century, it became glaringly obvious that the freedom of a few to engage in shoddy trickery denied the benefits of a free market to honest competitors and trusting consumers. Again, the national interest required the interven-

tion of Government, and the Federal Trade Commission was empowered not only to prevent monopoly but also to insure fair competition.

Examples could be multiplied, but this one example teaches us that strictures on the exercise of power by business—limitations on the freedom of businessmen—often have been the result of failures by business to discharge its responsibilities for the protection of the public interest without governmental intervention. The lesson is that business cannot operate unrestrained in a free society. Business must either act in self-restraint to further the public interest or have restraints imposed upon it.

The failure of business to discharge its responsibilities is not the sole reason for the rise of Big Government in the 20th century. Doubtless there have been, and now are, many who see absolute values in a statist system. These disguised totalitarians will not wait for a demonstration of irresponsibility by business to press for further governmental controls. At least a part of the rise of Big Government is attributable to them. However, as I attempt to foresee the future of our free economy I do not greatly fear the apostles of statism. The American people are not easily gulled by assertions that Washington is the fount of all wisdom and therefore should be the source of all power. I think that the American people have an abiding faith in the benefits of a free enterprise system. I think the American people will place further limitations on that system only if that faith is badly abused. And the responsibility for justifying that faith rests upon every American businessman.

V

The plain duty of every businessman to protect the free enterprise system by avoiding shady dealing is reinforced by compelling considerations of self-interest.

I maintain that the keystone of our great system of distribution is reputation. Think for a moment of your daily purchases. I am willing to bet that in the vast majority of your daily purchases the thing that you are really purchasing is a reputation. It may be the reputation of a manufacturer or the reputation of a retailer. It may be the reputation of a person whose advice is valued. But in each case, reputation bulks large in the transaction. Indeed, the brand name concept is based upon reputation. Why would an advertiser spend millions to spread its name and the virtues of its product if not to acquire a reputation that will furnish the basis of a multitude of fruitful continuing business relationships? It would seem beyond dispute that any businessman who seeks to make more than one sale to the same person must value his good name beyond all else.

It is true that in the not so long ago the American hinterlands were full of drummers who descended like lightning upon a community, sold an entire stock of goods and then disappeared over the horizon never to return again, thereby escaping the wrath of infuriated consumers. It is also true that some of this sort of bilking still exists. But in this day of rapid communication, isolation and ignorance are no longer the potent allies of predators. Means now exist to detect the business crook, and laws now exist to punish him. However, the rapid communication that now helps to foil the trickster presents dangers to the honest businessman as well. Now a momentary lapse from the strictest standards of honesty can imperial a reputation that was many years in the building. Since reputation is so valuable, since so much of our trade depends upon reputation, it behooves every businessman to guard his reputation zealously. Americans defend the profit system on the ground that profit is the legitimate reward for the assumption of risks. Certain it is that the entrepreneur must boldly embrace those risks which promise adequate potential reward, but it is also a part of the duty of the diligent and prudent entrepreneur to shun avoidable risks. The risk of the inconvenience and expense of a legal proceeding, the risk of legal penalties and the risk of loss of goodwill and reputation that are the result of a violation of the laws guarding consumers and honest competitors are avoidable risks. The careful businessman can safeguard his enterprise by careful adherence to the requirements of law.

And we must not forget that every businessman has a duty to the free enterprise system itself in addition to the duty that he owes to his stockholders. A demonstration that individual entrepreneurs can safeguard the public interest in the absence of the massive controls of a police state vindicates the cause of freedom.

Those businessmen who operate the distributive phase of our economy—those who advertise and sell in the consumer market—must bear a special responsibility of compliance with the law. This is so because the American public has more contact with this phase of our economy than with any other. The average citizen forms his impressions and expectations of our system as he hears and reads the advertisements urging him to buy and as he purchases and uses the abundant goods produced by our complex economy. Judge for yourself how many people wade through dry tomes on economics in any given year and compare this with your estimate of the number of advertisements the average person is exposed to during the same period and then conclude for yourself what is the major source of most impressions of our system. The awesome power of advertising suggests the awesomeness of advertising's responsibilities.

VI

A safe course can be steered between the Scylla of an unregulated, low-level competitive brawl and the Charybdis of massive governmental control. To hold that course advertising men and women must accept the responsibilities that inevitably accompany the enjoyment of freedom and regulate themselves in the public interest. In that path lies survival.

The Nation's antitrust and trade regulation laws mark the path of responsibility. Those who would accept their responsibilities, and thus earn their freedom, must do two things: First, learn the requirements of the laws guarding our free economy; second, comply with those requirements. Compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of those laws is a necessity.

Fortunately, means to ease the task of education have proliferated in recent months. Any businessman who honestly seeks to develop a working knowledge of the pitfalls of deceptive advertising now has plentiful sources of information close at hand.

I am gratified that the Federal Trade Commission, during the period of my chairmanship, measurably extended its educational efforts. The expanded guides program, the new technique of area-wide business seminars and increased assistance to national and local advertising groups all marked this increased effort.

A tremendous educational effort has been forthcoming from the advertising industry itself. The updating and revising of the codes of most of the national associations, the new Advertising Truth Book of the AFA, and the development of codes of ethics by local better business bureaus and advertising clubs have all contributed to a new age of enlightenment in advertising. And the efforts of the media in improving the educational climate deserve special mention. Just last week I received a copy of the new standards of acceptability of the Detroit News. These standards are emblematic of a nationwide effort by the media to revise standards in the light of changed conditions. The Detroit News standards combine principles from the latest FTC guides and decisions, the Advertising Truth Book, and the latest studies of the better business bureaus. I am proud that I could furnish a small contribution to this outstanding work.

Marked progress in accomplishing the second task facing honest businessmen—that of complying with the laws denouncing deceptive practices—has gone forward with remarkable speed and effect during the past 18 months. No recount of the massive efforts of the great national associations of your industry—the four A's, the AFA, the ANA, and the Association of Better Business Bureaus—is necessary here. Their efforts are comparable to the efforts of the advertising industry to gain the passage of the Printers Ink statutes. I am particularly concerned with the efforts of local advertising clubs and better business bureaus to establish thorough-going programs of compliance at the grassroots level. It seems to me that programs of this character are indispensable if the taint of deception is to be banished from American advertising, and I think that the advertising men and women in a host of American communities have clearly recognized the importance of grassroots compliance. An industry ruled by free imaginations can value freedom well. Advertising groups in communities throughout the Nation have clearly recognized that the public's clamor for truth in advertising must be answered, if not by them then by government. In a host of communities, ethics committees and advertising panels have been revitalized or new ones established. Local media, advertising agencies, and advertisers have joined together in a common cause to fulfill the responsibilities of a free industry.

VII

I have mentioned two potent reasons for a strong industrywide effort to attain voluntary compliance with the law, but I would be remiss as a citizen if I failed to mention a third reason. At this critical juncture in the war of ideologies every American must be concerned not only with preserving the free enterprise system within our borders, but extending that system throughout the world. I do not think that we can consider too often how much damage to our international influence can be caused by shady dealing in American business.

Far more damage can be caused than the facts in any given case warrant. Our detractors make skillful use of the propaganda trumpet. With a squeaky fact at one end, they can produce a triumphant blast out of the other. It is a blast than can be heard by credulous ears. Our detractors ignore the self-discipline of a thousand law-abiding businessmen while they herald the chicanery of one. And this one, our detractors shout, is free enterprise in action.

Unjust? Of course it is. We become indignant that our competitive system should be so misrepresented. The very strength of our economy should be a refutation that immorality built it. But, in typical American fashion, our indignation searches for a comforting explanation—preferably one that avoids personal involvement in any corrective action. With a shrug, we tell ourselves that business since the days of the Phoenicians has never been without its larcenous few and never will be.

To some, this philosophy may be comforting, but not to me—particularly at a time when individual freedom and State slavery are locked in a battle for the minds of men. We cannot afford to shrug away our weaknesses—minor though they may be in fact and in proportion to our virtues, they are not minor through the trumpets of our enemies. And the whole world is listening.

The integrity of our business community can be impeached by an amoral element. But the impeachment can be lifted if business will exercise those great privileges of freedom—self-discipline and acceptance of law.

Report of Legislative Activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning the legislative activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

In my capacity as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am pleased to present to the Senate a report of the activities of the committee for the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Your committee has seen the busiest session in some years. I believe the statistics and explanations presented hereafter will support the belief that 1961 has been legislatively productive in the best interests of the Nation's Capital City—the hub of one of the country's fastest growing metropolitan areas and the recipient of the inherent problems accompanying such mushrooming growth.

Congressional action was not completed on two matters of vital importance to the District's well-being; namely, the District's financial plight and the understaffed juvenile court where additional judicial manpower is critically needed.

To me, it is of paramount importance that conferees on the District's revenue bill return to conference sessions at the earliest opportune time next year to reach a decision to raise critically needed revenue for the operation of the District government. In my judgment, the Congress must face up to the hard facts that increasing governmental expenditures brought on by problems of a changing city require more local tax revenues and a greater Federal payment if the Nation's Capital City is to meet its obligations to its citizenry.

In the improvement of judicial machinery, again I believe it is regretful that the Congress has not seen fit to meet squarely the grave problems of the juvenile court where unattended juveniles today will become the full-fledged criminals tomorrow.

The Senate again passed legislation calling for 2 additional judges for the juvenile court whose backlog still numbers over the 1,000-case mark. The Judiciary Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE, conducted a series of hearings on juvenile opportunities and the causes of juvenile delinquency in the District, taking testimony from many of the city's youth leaders and law enforcement officers. Again, I am hopeful that early next year, if additional judges are not the entire answer, then opponents of this effort will propose a realistic, workable yet not a backward youth correctional alternative for wayward juveniles.

The Committee on the District of Columbia, I believe, is unique among Senate committees by virtue of the great variety of problems, running the gamut of legislative proposals, which come before it. Constitutionally, the Congress is the legislative arm for the District. The committee serves not unlike the upper house of a State legislature, a board of county commissioners and a city council combined, dealing with matters ordinarily common to both State, county, and municipal governments.

Many of us believe the District's legislative duties should be delegated by the Congress to a locally elected body, giving to this National Capital City true representative self-government. However, the Congress has not yet seen fit to approve this step although the Senate has passed such home-rule legislation 5 times in the last 12 years.

Since I realize the fact that few Members of this distinguished body seek out this committee for service, I believe that my colleagues on this committee are most deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the country generally for the long hours they spend in office conferences, hearings, and executive sessions to tend to the business of the Nation's Capital City and away from national and international matters and those dealing with their respective home States.

Therefore, I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who so unselfishly gave of their time and energies in the service of the District of Columbia.

They are my distinguished colleague, the very effective and hardworking senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare and Safety Subcommittee; my close friend and a willing worker, the junior Senator from Maryland, Mr. BEALL, whose long service both in the Senate and House on the District Committees, has made his work most valuable as chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE, whose skill and experience in municipal government and as an outstanding lawyer have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and the capable and efficient junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH, whose municipal government background served so well in his capacity as chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

To the other committee members, the junior Senator from Vermont, Mr. PROUTY, whose past service in the House and keen interest has been of great value to our committee; and the junior Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, whose capable enthusiasm and warm attention to the affairs of the Nation's Capital City have been invaluable to our committee deliberations, I wish to express my sincere thanks and deep appreciation for the hours they gave to the problems of the District of Columbia and its local government.

I believe the Senate and the Congress this year made real strides in the field of constructive legislation for the District.

Unquestionably foremost was enactment of a law to implement the 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States, granting to the citizens of the Nation's Capital City for the first time the right to vote for President and Vice President along with all other Americans. In this matter, the Congress acted with dispatch. Less than 6 months before, the 23d amendment had been certified as a part of the Constitution following its ratification by more than the required three-fourths of the States, also in near record time.

It is the fervent hope of many of us that since presidential voting has been granted to the previously voteless Nation's Capital that its plight as a city with taxation but without representation can also be changed. The next step in bringing fullfledged democracy to the citizens of Washington, D.C., is securing an elective city government under home rule legislation.

It is my wish that hearings on home rule legislation now before this committee can be scheduled early in 1962 and the bill be given a priority in the committee's deliberations.

Probably ranking second in the foremost legislative achievements in 1961 was the first implementing step in developing a mass rapid transit system for the Washington metropolitan area. Legislation was enacted authorizing a $2½ million program by the National Capital Transportation Agency to acquire land in suburban Maryland and Virginia for median strips for express transit service on two major highway links, express bus service on a third suburban arterial highway and parking areas and stations adjacent to such routes.

In the field of law enforcement, so important to a city where the crime rate has continued to climb year after year, the Congress authorized a 3,000-man Metropolitan Police force, interestingly enough 100 years after the Nation's Capital City saw its first organized police organization formed in 1861.

In an associated field, the Senate approved legislation establishing a juvenile division of the District's Youth Correctonal Center at the Lorton, Va., reformatory to permit eventual abandonment of the National Training School.

The committee again approved a bill outlawing mandatory capital punishment in the District, the only jurisdiction in the country with such a requirement, believing the District must get into step with other States in this field.

In an effort to curb traffic fatalities, the Senate passed legislation permitting the courts to increase jail sentences for traffic violations from 10 to 90 days.

The Senate passed bills providing for the District government to dispose of properties seized incident to violations of gambling and indecent publication laws of the District of Columbia. In addition, provision was made for the use of injunctions in connection with premises that have been involved in violation of the indecent publication laws.

In the field of improved judicial machinery the Senate authorized an increase in jurisdiction of the small claims court to aid many more residents in recovering money due and owing, provided the municipal court with authority over more civil cases by giving it jurisdiction over all counterclaims and cross-claims regardless of the amount of such cross-claims and counterclaims, amended the District of Columbia divorce, legal separation, and annulment laws and extended privileged communications to ministers of religion.

The Senate voted to strengthen the District's unemployment compensation laws to increase and extend benefits for workers and grant more protection for employers in connection with disqualification provisions.

In the education field, the Senate authorized establishment of a junior college division at D.C. Teachers College to meet an increasing demand for qualified teachers locally.

In the public welfare field, the Senate approved a bill consolidating the District's public assistance laws, providing a 1-year residence requirement, increasing relative responsibility requirements and making penalties uniform for fraudulent practices.

Two health regulatory measures won Senate approval. The District Commissioners were empowered in one bill to set standards and criteria for the regulation of the practice of physical therapy and a second bill authorized the establishment of tissue banks to aid the development of constructive medicine and surgery.

The Senate approved a bill extending for 1 year the Hospital Center Act with the assurance that the administration would send draft legislation to the Congress next year setting out a framework for orderly

planning and developing of metropolitan area hospital needs, rather than providing hospital facilities paid for by the District and presently used 40 percent by non-District patients.

In connection with this activity report, I should like to draw the Senate's attention to one overall figure in the statistical table hereafter. The committee in the 1st session, 87th Congress, had referred to it for action a total of 136 bills, acts, and nominations. Of this total 46 are awaiting final action by the committee and 62 were cleared by the committee for Senate action. The committee's active consideration of these matters stands as a commendable record in which the Senate should take justifiable pride.

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 1st session, 87th Congress, the following:

Senate bills	84
Housing bills	25
Nominations	27
Grand total	136

During the session, there were reported to the Senate from the committee 30 Senate bills and 17 House bills. Two Senate bills and one House bill remain on the Senate Calendar.

Of the 25 House bills referred to the Senate, 8 are pending before the committee.

Eighteen bills and acts have become public law as of this date (September 27, 1961).

Fourteen Senate-passed bills are pending before the District of Columbia Committee of the House.

Forty-seven hearings were held by subcommittees on Senate bills, 13 hearings were held by subcommittees on House bills.

The full committee held hearings on 18 bills and nominations.

The full committee met in executive session on five occasions.

Number of bills, acts, and nominations referred to committee: 136.

Number of bills, acts, and nominations reported to Senate: 62.

Number of bills and acts in process (hearings held): 2.

Number of bills and acts indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation, and nominations withdrawn: 26.

Number of bills, acts, and nominations awaiting final action: 46.

The following is a list, by title and number, of all bills and acts passed by the Senate during the 1st session of the 87th Congress (those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number):

S. 158. A bill to confer upon the domestic relations branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to hear and determine the petition for adoption filed by Marie Taliaferro. (Private Law 87–208.)

S. 486. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

S. 502. A bill to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government.

S. 557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended.

S. 558. A bill to amend the acts of March 3, 1901, and June 28, 1944, so as to exempt the District of Columbia from paying fees in any of the courts of the District of Columbia.

S. 559. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended.

S. 560. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925.

S. 561. A bill to amend the act relating to the small claims and conciliation branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. (Public Law 87–203.)

S. 563. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended.

S. 564. A bill to provide for apportioning the expense of maintaining and operating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland.

S. 588. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930, in order to increase the authorization for funds for the extension of certain projects from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland, and for other purposes.

S. 914. A bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes.

S. 1291. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits.

S. 1292. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

S. 1328. A bill to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes.

S. 1528. A bill to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children. (Vetoed.)

S. 1529. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended. (Public Law 87–281.)

S. 1651. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to delegate the function of approving contracts not exceeding $100,000.

S. 1761. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia.

S. 1762. A bill to regulate the practice of physical therapy in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87–280.)

S. 1918. A bill to extend benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of such amendments.

S. 2194. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended.

S. 2299. A bill to provide for the establishment of a juvenile division within or in connection with the District of Columbia Youth Correctional Center, and to authorize the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia to commit to such juvenile division, subject to the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act, children 15 years of age or older.

S. 2321. A bill to encourage and aid the development of constructive medicine and surgery and the development of medico-surgical research by authorizing the licensing of tissue banks in the District of Columbia, by facilitating antemortem and postmortem donations of human tissue for tissue bank purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2356. A bill to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940.

S. 2397. A bill authorizing the National Capital Transportation Agency to carry out part 1 of its transit development program and to further the objectives of the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537).

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. (Public Law 87–238.)

H.R. 258. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend section 4(a) of the act of April 1, 1942, so as to confer jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and cross claims in any action in which such court has initial jurisdiction. (Public Law 87–242.)

H.R. 4669. A bill to amend the law relating to gambling in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87–259.)

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia Hospital Center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act. (Public Law 87–79.)

H.R. 5486. A bill to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication. (Public Law 87–318.)

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended.

H.R. 6495. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87–249.)

H.R. 6798. A bill to amend the act incorporating the Washington Home for Foundlings and to define the powers of said corporation. (Public Law 87–226.)

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87–245.)

H.R. 7154. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs. (Public Law 87–227.)

H.R. 7218. A bill to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members. (Public Law 87–60.)

H.R. 7265. A bill to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia so as to provide a new basis for determining certain marital property rights, and for other purposes. (Public Law 87–246.)

H.R. 7482. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended. (Vetoed.)

H.R. 7622. A bill to repeal sections 1176 and 1177 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87–267.)

H.R. 8032. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, and for other purposes. (Public Law 87–248.)

H.R. 8444. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1955, relating to elections in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8466. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Taylor Street NE., District of Columbia. (Vetoed.)

H.R. 9080. A bill to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate branch sidings over First Street SW., in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 87-325.)

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Neville Miller, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to fill the unexpired term of James E. Colliflower, resigned, whose term expires March 3, 1961.

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Neville Miller, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

C. Darwin Stolzenbach, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

John Joseph Gunther, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 5 years from March 4, 1957, vice Andrew Parker, resigned.

Warrent D. Quenstedt, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

John B. Duncan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

Thomas L. Farmer, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

G. Franklin Edwards, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Frederick Gutheim, of Maryland, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Donald C. Hyde, of Ohio, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

May C. Barlow, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years.

James A. Washington, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1964.

Andrew J. Howard, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years.

The Agency Shop Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's American recently ran a very interesting editorial in which it analyzed and the recent decision by the National Labor Relations Board dealing with agency shops.

The National Labor Relations Board has handed down several important decisions lately. I believe the following editorial comment on one of the Board's most recent decisions merits the attention of all of us here in Congress:

While the Board's ruling on agency shops has been criticized in some quarters, it appears to me that the following editorial quite succinctly spells out the reasons why the board was correct in its decision.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in Chicago's American follows:

THE AGENCY SHOP RULING

The National Labor Relations Board, reversing a previous decision, ruled Friday that the agency shop—a compromise arrangement between union shop contracts and right to work laws—is legal under the Taft-Hartley Act. The main result of this ruling will probably be that States which have passed laws against the union shop will face new legislation battles on whether to outlaw the agency shop as well.

Under the agency shop arrangement, a worker does not have to join a union to keep his job, as he does under union shop contracts. But he does pay to the union sums equal to the fees and dues paid by union members. The NLRB ruling means that this device is legal under Federal law; it doesn't affect the States' ability to make their own laws about it.

In the circumstances, the ruling was realistic. It won't end the disputes about union rights against individual workers' rights, but it does leave a lot less to argue about; the difference between a union shop and an agency shop is the difference between compelling a worker to join and merely giving him an extra incentive.

Opponents of the union shop could argue convincingly that it was an infringement of a citizen's rights to deny him work unless he joined an organization he didn't want to join. But if he is merely required to pay for the benefits of having a union, whether or not he chooses to join, it can hardly be called a hardship.

The NLRB ruling involved a dispute between the United Auto Workers of Indiana and General Motors Corp. Indiana courts had held that the agency shop did not violate the State's right-to-work law. If Indiana wants to outlaw the agency shop, it can do so by amending its present law—and the same applies to the 18 other States which have passed right-to-work legislation.

In other words, the NLRB decision was not a blanket Federal decree. It simply limited the Taft-Hartley law to exempt the agency shop, and left it up to the individual States to decide if they want to follow suit.

Women and the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, 41 years have passed since women were given the right to vote in the United States. On August 26 in 1920 the 19th amendment to the Constitution was proclaimed to be effective and a law of our land. In simple language the woman suffrage amendment states:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

The reasons why women should vote are the same as the reasons why men should vote—the same as the reasons for having a Republic rather than a monarchy. It is fair and right that the people who must obey the laws should have a choice in choosing the lawmakers, and that those who must pay the taxes should have a voice as to the amount of the tax, and the way in which the money shall be spent.

The Republican Party played a leading role in the long struggle which culminated in the adoption of the 19th amendment. We should be reminded that prior to its approval by a newly elected Republican Congress as its first order of business in 1919, the proposals had been defeated on earlier occasions by Democrat-controlled Senate and House.

Republican achievements in behalf of women should be a matter of record and it is my desire to bring some of the more important activities to your attention.

The Republican Party platform of 1876 approved the "substantial advances" of women in gaining equal personal and property rights through action by GOP State legislatures. It also approved the appointment of women to public offices. Prior to that in 1872 the Republican National Convention had gone on record with the first national declaration favoring "addiitonal rights" for women. In 1870 the Massachusetts Republican State Convention had seated two women suffragetts as delegates.

The first woman delegate to a national political convention was a Republican. That was in the city of Minneapolis in 1892.

The first proposal to be introduced in the U.S. Senate—in 1878—to give women the right to vote was made by Republican Senator A. A. Sargent, of California, and the measure lost in the Senate four times—three times while under Democratic control.

The first formal "rights for women" plank was contained in the Republican Party platform of 1896.

There were two ways through which women could be enfranchised: Congress could submit an amendment to the National Constitution which had to be ratified by three-fourth of the State legislatures; or the legislature of each State could submit an amendment to its own constitution which would receive the approval of the majority of the voters. Every Congress since 1869 had received the appeal for woman suffrage, but it was the Republican Party in 1916 that went on record favoring woman suffrage. That same year, 1916, Miss Jeanette Rankin, a Republican, was the first woman elected to Congress.

The newly elected Republican Congress in 1919 enacted as the first order of business the equal suffrage amendment which was introduced by Republican Representative James R. Mann, of Illinois. The measure passed the House 304 to 88 and the Senate 56 to 25. Prior to that, from 1913 to 1919, the Democratic Party controlled both the House and Senate and five times the proposals to provide suffrage to women were defeated.

When the suffrage amendment went to the States for ratification, 26 of the 36

States which ratified had Republican legislatures. Twelve Republican States had given women full suffrage in State elections before the 19th amendment became a part of the Constitution.

The endeavors of the Republican Party to give the right to vote to the women of our Nation did not by any means conclude the party's ardent support of future and further accomplishment for women. The 1940 Republican National Convention proposed a constitutional amendment providing for equal rights for men and women.

In 1948, the GOP platform favored "equal work regardless of sex," and the conventions of 1952 and 1956 reaffirmed these stands. The 1960 party platform stated:

Congress should submit a constitutional amendment providing equal rights for women.

On February 16, 1953, President Eisenhower appointed Mrs. Clare Booth Luce as U.S. Ambassador to Italy and in July of that year Miss Frances Willis was appointed as U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland. Miss Willis was the first career woman diplomat to be promoted to the rank of Ambassador.

The appointment of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby was another milestone. She was the first women Administrator of Social Security Administration, and in that role she was the first woman to "carry the ball" in the creation of a new Cabinet post—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She headed it as its first Secretary, serving from 1953–55.

Other firsts for the Republican Party include President Eisenhower's appointment of Mrs. Pearl C. Pace as the first woman Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission on July 1, 1954, and the appointment of Mrs. Dorothy McCullough Lee as the first women Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board on August 31, 1956.

In January 1959, President Eisenhower designated Dr. Hazel K. Stiebeling to be the first woman to receive the highest honor the Nation can bestow on its career civil servants—the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civil Service.

We should not forget that one-fourth of the delegates and alternates to the 1960 Republican National Convention in Chicago were women—an alltime high for any party.

It is the profound belief of the Republican Party that men and women together will be able to enact more humane laws than men alone can enact. It is a known fact that questions concerning women and children can be treated with deeper seriousness by men and women together. Government consisting of men and women together has made our Republic more profound. The Republican Party's record is indicative of the thesis that in the larger housekeeping interests of city, State, or Nation, women have as important functions as in the housekeeping affairs of the home.

It was Theodore Roosevelt who said:

It is the right of woman to have the ballot; it is the duty of man to give it; and we all need women's help as we try to solve the many and terrible problems set before us. In the solution of these problems, we should use the full and not the cramped strength of every man and woman in the entire commonwealth.

Where Are We Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, attention has recently been focused in my State on action which is being contemplated by the United Auto Workers Local 971 of Elyria, Ohio, against two of its workers who are producing too much. By no means can it be said that tactics such as these are the cause of our national problems but they must be recognized as one of the contributing factors.

Americans are suddenly waking up to the fact that we are falling behind in our efforts to keep pace with our historical advancement and heritage. Instead of striving to do better and work harder, a national paralysis has struck the past generation with a result that we are seeking the soft life, the easy way out. True, we are ahead of the world as a Nation and our standard of living is unexcelled in all recorded history. Yet, many storm signals have been apparent for 3 decades but we are too content with the security won for us by others, our forefathers, to suffer any privation which might come from a long, hard look at what we are doing and where we are heading.

On September 12, 1961, the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried the following article:

TWO FACE UNION CHARGE FOR WORKING TOO HARD

Two veteran employees of the Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co. plant in Elyria face possible expulsion from their union—and consequent loss of their jobs—for refusing to cut down their production.

Members of United Auto Workers Local 971 will select a committee at their regular meeting tomorrow to arrange for a union trial for Walter Lucki, 42, of 7264 Maddock Road, North Ridgeville, and Walter Fingulin of Wakeman, Huron County.

Lucki, a crankshaft grinder, has worked at the Bendix plant for 22 years. Fingulin, a 20-year employee, is a storeroom man.

Local 971 and Bendix are negotiating a new contract. The current agreement expires October 1.

On August 26 the local adopted a policy by which members would produce "no more than the normal standard established for the job." Ordinarily, workers are paid extra for anything they produce beyond 100 percent of their company-set quota.

It was this action that resulted in the company filing an unfair labor practice charge against the union before the National Labor Relations Board in Cleveland yesterday. E. R. Willemin, director of company industrial relations, said the slowdown was a violation of the union's contract.

Lucki and Fingulin have refused to bow to the August 26 resolution and have been producing in excess of their established rate. As a result the local president, Frank Lender, notified them of four charges leveled against each man.

The charges are violating his pledge as a member; failing to carry out his duties as a member; acting against the membership in not following the majority's dictates; and setting himself apart and aside from the membership.

LUCKI COUNTERS

If found guilty, Lucki and Fingulin could be reprimanded, fined, or expelled from the union.

Yesterday Lucki countered by accusing the local of trying to stage a slowdown and condoning abuses by members.

Lucki said he could produce up to 135 percent of his quota in 6 to 6½ hours, if things go reasonably smooth. This earns him an extra $25 or $30 a week, he said.

Lucki has eight children and his wife is expecting a ninth soon.

Lucki claimed members instituted a slowdown because they felt the company was stockpiling in preparation for a possible strike when the contract expires.

IT'S COMPANY BUSINESS

"It's the company's business if they are (stockpiling)," he said. "There may be other reasons for stockpiling."

"The machinery and the materials are there and the incentive is there to be used. It should be used."

"The company has been very good to me in my 22 years," Lucki added. "I always believed that you shouldn't slap the hand that feeds you."

Lucki emphasized that he has always been a strong and dedicated union member.

"I wouldn't want to work at a plant where there was no union," he said, "but on the other hand there can be abuses. A union can have a stranglehold on a plant. I feel both sides should be fair."

MIGHT LOSE JOBS

If they are expelled, Lucki and Fingulin may lose their jobs. The contract calls for a union shop.

Lucki, however, felt confident he would not lose his job.

"It takes a membership vote to expel a member, and there are plenty of oldtimers who know what's going on in the plant," he said.

Lucki works the 3 to 11 p.m. shift. He claimed that he and his fellowworkers frequently finish their quota by 7 p.m.

"After that, they sit around upstairs and play cards," he said. "The place looks like a regular Monte Carlo some nights. Some of the guys who don't want to play cards sleep."

I received a fine, penetrating letter from a constituent which has a message in it. It raises some very interesting question and is certainly worth reading:

JEROMESVILLE, OHIO,
September 14, 1961.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: United Auto Workers Local 971 of Elyria, Ohio, are bringing action against two of its members because they are producing too much. The union claims the men must not go over a standard of production which has been set. The two men—Walter Lucki and Walter Fingulin—veteran employees, are doing 135 percent more work than the other men. These two men claim that the other workers finish their quota in half the working day and then sit around, or play cards, the rest of the day.

Mr. Lucki and Mr. Fingulin are earning more by their own endeavor. They are not asking the employer to pay them more for the same, or less, work as some unions keep

doing. They are meriting more by producing more.

To me this action, by the UAW 971 against these men, is a disgrace and has the smell of catastrophe. Dare we as a nation permit a policy of this sort? Are we to condone parasites? We cannot afford to pay in dollars and cents for laziness or minimal effort. The price in moral degradation is staggering.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the UAW Local 971 and one to our local newspaper. I would like to ask the officers, and members of local 971 some questions:

1. Do you suggest to your children in school that they only do enough work for a C or average grade?

2. Do you encourage your children to do only what is demanded of them and no more?

3. Do you permit anyone doing home repairs, or the equivalent, for you to work 4 hours 1 day and 4 hours the next day and chareg you for two 8-hour days?

Think what you are recommending to your members and the workers of tomorrow that are growing up around you. You should be ashamed for not holding up these two men as examples to be followed, as prototypes of the kind of workmen your union offers.

Mr. ASHBROOK, as a private citizen of another city, I can do nothing. I am asking you through your office, or that of the Representative of the Elyria district, to do something to stop this potentially disastrous action. Perhaps the pressure of public indignation may deter them.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GERALD LIKES.

JEROMESVILLE, OHIO, Route 1.

One of the outstanding newspapers of my district, the Mansfield News-Journal carried in its columns of September 17, 1961, this interesting editorial on the same subject:

THE WAY TO EARN NOTHING

Widespread attention is being focused on the two Elyria members of the United Auto Workers Union who face trial by a union committee for doing more than their quota of work.

They received bonus pay for their extra work even though it was done during the regular work shift. This was in accordance with a company-union agreement.

The union apparently does not object that these men made extra money. One of them probably needed it. He has eight children.

But the men did set a disturbing example by showing how much more could be produced in a normal 8-hour shift than the union quota permitted.

One of the men reported that often his fellow employees could fill that quota in 4 hours of an 8-hour shift. "After that they sit around and play cards," he is reported to have said.

In its origin, the quota system had two understandable purposes.

One: To prevent a company from unreasonably speeding up its piecework demands on the employee.

Two: To spread the work among more employees.

What has happened over the years is that the quotas have not kept pace with the mechanical advances in manufacturing.

Hence, in some instances a worker can now fill what was once a reasonable 8-hour quota in 4 or 5 hours.

So, a company which moved into an area where labor restrictions had not yet clamped down on its production, or a new company which started out wtih higher quotas, could produce more in less time and at less cost than the firm hobbled by out-of-date quotas.

Hobbled firms are finding they simply cannot meet competition from such untrammeled companies.

An unreasonable quota, therefore, no longer guarantees more men jobs but actually causes jobs to disappear as competition takes away the business that makes the jobs possible.

The Elyria case dramatizes the conflict between a man's normal desire to earn all he can and the union doctrine that less working means more jobs.

Actually the union doctrine is facing a severe test in many more places than Elyria.

Upshot of the whole matter is likely to be a new truism: "He who does nothing to be paid for soon finds there is nothing to be paid with."

No single group can be given the blame for our national problems. We see a loss of markets because of our high costs of production. These high costs of production are a result of business and labor practices but also reflect the high cost of Government. Our Government has encouraged practices of waste and inefficiency because it operates that way.

We appear to be constitutionally unable to balance our national spending appetite with tax receipts. We see an administration and a Congress dedicated to Keynesian and Fabian Socialist policies which call for billions more in welfare spending. We see a loss of trade abroad because of the contributing factor of governmental policies which are inconsistent, unreciprocal, and weak-kneed. We are reaping the welfare state harvest in a dollar which has lost over half of its purchasing power, a lack of national pride in work and accomplishment, a national debt nearing $300 billion which extracts $9 billion each year in interest alone.

The socialistic proposals which were rejected by Germany are being used to advance the economy of the United States. This interesting editorial appeared in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal on May 18, 1961:

GERMANY TEACHES THE UNITED STATES

U.S. economic advisers increasingly are embarrassed by contrasts between America and West Germany—persistent unemployment here as against a labor shortage there.

Scripps-Howard Writer Roger Stuart has dug up a long-secret report which helps explain the embarrassment.

The report was made by a team of U.S. economists and submitted to the West German Government September 24, 1951. On the U.S. team was Prof. Walter Heller, now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

Some of the recommendations:

West Germany was told it couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept on worrying about inflation. The government was chided for an excessive concern for price stability.

However, Dr. Ludwidg Erhard, West German finance minister, knew something about inflation. He had seen his parents' life savings lost when the mark went to pot. He rejected this advice.

Erhard also was told by the U.S. advisers that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." But German interest rates were left to find their own high level and so were savings and investment. Today West Germany is investing up to a quarter of its national output annually in the most modern industrial plant in the world.

Erhard was cautioned against liberal depreciation policies and advised instead to adopt a "compulsory investment program." But liberal depreciation policies helped the German economy grow last year at the rate of 10.8 percent. The U.S. rate was less than 3 percent.

Just 15 years ago West Germany was a defeated and demoralized nation, its resources squandered by Hitler, its factories and homes flattened by bombs. Since then it has taken in more than 12 million refugees. It has imported nearly half a million more and still has a labor shortage.

Average wages have doubled in 10 years and still are climbing. And increases mostly are in true values because of effective measures against inflation.

West Germany last year lost fewer than 40,000 man-days through strikes. We lost twice that many on missile bases alone. German wage raises have come out of increased productivity—8 percent last year. German prices have been kept competitive in world markets, thus rapidly expanding foreign commerce.

The Germans, in short, have followed the historic principles of free enterprise—despite the advice they got from the United States. Even the West German Socialist Party has repudiated socialism.

The general theories of the 1951 report, rejected by the Germans, are the general theories now being urged on America by Professor Heller and other administration economists: Big spending and even budget-busting tax cuts, which breed inflation; artificial restraints on interest rates, which discourage saving and encourage Americans to export jobs by investing abroad; gimmicks in the form of tax incentives instead of adequate depreciation allowances.

Somewhere in all this may be found a clue to our creeping rate of growth, so roundly deplored in the campaign. Now Professor Heller wants us to follow some more of our own bad advice.

All of this adds up to an Alice in Wonderland economy. Where are we headed? Do we still believe in the free enterprise system or are we hopelessly committed to the welfare state and the next step, state socialism? The discouragement of work, policies of business, labor, and government which discourage economy and thrift and a citizenry which no longer cares are all of the ingredients we need to destroy our free institutions. What a paradox it would be if a nation dragging its feet should be overtaken and passed by a nation dragging its chains.

The Vanishing Incentives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on June 8, 1961, Mr. Robert C. Tyson, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Co., addressed the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. In his speech entitled "The Vanishing Incentives," Mr. Tyson emphasizes the importance of economic incentives to our way of life. He further points out the deadening impact of our tax burden on incentives and the stranglehold effect that the present tax laws have on the savings and investment process

which is so vital to a private enterprise system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tyson's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VANISHING INCENTIVES

(By Robert C. Tyson)

I suppose it is no secret to you fine folks that production and profits in the steel industry have not, over the past several months, been cause for general jubilation. Rumor has it that a similar comment might perhaps also apply to your great basic industry. In recent weeks, however, things have been a bit better and everybody hopes they will get ever better and better so that the perplexing problems of the present will evaporate into dust of the past. But neither you, nor I, nor anybody else can guarantee such an outcome however devoutly desired. It is far wiser to recognize realistically that only as and when the problems of the present are satisfactorily solved will the road to a bountiful future be cleared.

With that in mind I turn directly to a subject that I regard as real cause for concern. I refer to the stifling—the vanishing, if you will—of the economic incentives upon which employment and growth in our land depend. Such incentives are more important to a free people than to those in authoritarian societies where men can be whipped into obedient servitude for the benefit of a ruling class. They can be forced to imitate the accomplishments that the initiative and resourcefulness of free men have elsewhere achieved. But where men are free it is obvious that maximum economic motivation and growth rest on the unhampered presence of incentives. The incentives are on the one hand the hope of achieving good income or profit through superior proficiency in producing wanted goods and services and, on the other hand, the disciplining fear of smaller income or loss for those who do not productively exert themselves in their own support. In a free society there is strong moral sanction for charity, but the essence of freedom is that no man is entitled to be a "free rider" on others' efforts without their consent.

I said that these incentives are being stifled in our land. The process has indeed been progressing for a quarter of a century or more. But for the past 20 years the stifling has been obscured and its evil consequences diminished or deferred by reason of the great war for survival and the insistent demands of the worldwide reconstruction years that followed it. To fight the fire in your house and repair the damage thereby wrought you don't need the profit and loss motives or, at least, they manifest themselves in different forms.

But, gentleman, the party is over; an era has come to a close. The uniform precedents of former postwar developments indicate, if followed this time, that we could be in for a stretch of rather difficult years—years of persistent unemployment; years of slackened economic growth; years when we greatly need the full stimulus of the historic incentives to invoke inventiveness, initiative, innovation, and risk taking so that we will become busy in finding and producing the new products of the future now that the war-accumulated tasks of the past have been done.

TO STIFLE INCENTIVE

The process of stifling incentives is simple and its consequence is disastrous for our type of society. Indeed it was all spelled out over 100 years ago in the Communist manifesto. It is quite simply to tax punish productive efficiency wherever it shows its head and everywhere to coddle the less efficient or the idle. If carried to the full this eliminates all of both types of incentives and converts everybody from the personal pursuit of productivity to the competitive practice of indolence.

So that brings me to taxes—a necessity in any organized society but subject to terrible abuse. Business leaders do not always agree, but the premise here is one from which no one dissents: There is no such thing as a tax incentive. Any tax at all is a deterrent or "disincentive," to use a lately coined word. No one is ever normally stirred to earn or to produce anything by the knowledge that it (or its equivalent) will be taken from him by taxes. People may produce in spite of, but never because of, taxes. This is not to belittle the importance of the manner in which taxes are levied—to which I will come in a moment; but it does permit the observation that big taxes as such are deadly deterrents. This is one case where I readily concede that bigness is bad.

OUR TOTAL TAXLOAD

May I next add that, by any absolute or relative measurement one wishes to use, taxes in America are big, mighty big. There are about 100,000 taxing authorities in America and in the last fiscal year they collected more than $125 billion. As an aside I note that in the same year they spent over $150 billion. The tax burden was equal to one-third of the combined income of all persons in the country. For comparison one may note that in 1926 the corresponding burden was only about 13 percent. Years ago the distinguished scholar, Colin Clark, made studies to estimate the taxload that a market economy could endure without breaking out into inflation, and concluded it was about 25 percent. We have passed that point. A recent bulletin of the First National City Bank of New York reported that among all the leading industrial nations we are in most significant respects, if not in every single respect, the highest taxed people on earth.

My point, my first point, is that no one of us who loves his country dares dismiss as unimportant the ever-mounting burden of total taxation we already bear, especially in view of the huge future social expenditures to which we are already committed but for which we have not provided. I remind you of the proverb anent the straw and the camel's back. So let's not forget that big point as Congress conducts the customary scramble in which all groups seek to get the "mostest" for themselves to be paid for by taxes on that convenient "other fellow."

THE EXPENDITURE ALIBI

I realize, as do you, that behind taxes and pushing them upward are swollen and swelling expenditures for which there is an infinite array of appealing rationalizations. Since the close of World War II, for example, our Government has spent, loaned, or given away to others abroad well over $100 billion. Also, I recall that back in the 1930's when farmers were having hard times we initiated a costly farm program; it is still with us and has cost so far about $60 billion. Of late it is still costing about $5 billion a year. In each of the past 6 congressional election years the benefit or the coverage under old-age or unemployment programs has been enlarged. This may appeal to the cynical, but it should perturb the prudent. We spend nearly $50 billion a year on national defense and international relations. I observe that for each increase of three people in productive employment over the past 30 years, there has been an increase of one person in Government employment of civilians, with attendant cost increases.

These matters are in some quarters undoubtedly regarded as untouchably hot potatoes. So be it. But I do not challenge that the expenditures may have accomplished good purposes. I will go further: I can—and you can, too—readily think up a whole lot of other good purposes that would cost, not trivial billions, but some handsome number of trillions. I have two comments—one as viewed by an accountant; another as viewed, perhaps, by a Cassandra. Since an accountant must ever balance the books I point out that whatever good is done by the spending must be balanced against the evil done by the taxing. Taking value from Peter to give to Paul does not increase total value one iota; instead, the value is undoubtedly in some part dissipated, if only by the overhead costs incurred in its transfer. Since a Cassandra would indulge in prophecy, I suggest that this Nation will encounter disaster if it continues to ride the fantastically rising curve of total taxing and spending it now bestrides—a much more than doubling in 10 years against a rise in national income at little more than half that rate. This great Nation could—despite wishful thinking to the contrary—dissolve its traditional institutions in financial bankruptcy. Within living memory it has happened to numerous other once strong nations.

I say this in full realization that there are two conflicting ideologies in our world today, each championed by a great nation armed to the teeth. We dare not lose that conflict. But some way other than sheer financial extravagance has got to be found, for the quite simple reason that whether you are murdered or commit suicide you are nevertheless dead.

THE CREATION OF JOBS

I turn next to the special impact of taxes, and particularly Federal income taxes, on incentives. It is best examined in terms of the mechanism through which new production and new jobs come into existence; for failure to understand and protect that mechanism lets any unemployment at all become the political occasion for initiating vicious tax-spend spirals that injure the mechanism and so perpetuate, rather than remedy, the unemployment. We had a taste of unemployment thus rendered chronic in the 1930's, from which we were rescued, however grim the thought, only by the galvanizing requirements of war.

We all know that economic activity is basically powered by human wants and that their effective satisfaction calls for many ingredients such as education, ingenuity, inventiveness, initiative, risktaking, thriftiness, moral and legal codes, dependable money, an orderly society, and so on—all of which are taken for granted. My present purpose is served by focusing on the axiomatic truth that for us there is one, and only one, important way that new production and new self-sustaining jobs come into existence. It is by the investment of savings in tools of production that men may operate to produce the marketable values to cover their continuing wage and investors' profit. It is the save-invest process. If taxation is designed to siphon off savings and discourage investment, it can choke off growth and strangle the private enterprise system. It has been so designed. Nearly 20 years ago the late Prof. Sumner H. Slichter said, and I quote: "The tax history of the United States in recent years has been fairly sensational. A visitor from Mars would suspect that a Communist fifth columnist was writing the laws for the purpose of making private enterprise unworkable." Should that chap revisit us now, he might well have the same suspicion.

ANTIJOB TAXATION

Consider the personal income tax: June 15 is not so far ahead nor April 17 so far behind that it could have completely slipped your minds. Its distinctive feature is that to each increment of larger incomes a progressively greater tax rate is applied, reaching 91 percent in the top bracket. Since the British have been consistently reducing the rigor of their personal income taxation, our 91 percent achieves the dubious distinction of being the highest such tax rate in the whole free world. Quite aside from Robin

Hood moralizing about letting anyone enjoy a competitively earned income greater than your own, can you think of a better way to siphon off savings from those most capable of making them and of investing them in the new job-creating ventures that spell progress? Is there a better way to destroy incentive to risk savings in new ventures than to tax away at steeply mounting rates any profits derived from so doing, while any loss of the savings so risked remains the investor's hard luck? Americans are adequately reckless but not recklessly foolish.

The taxation of corporate income unfortunately fits into the same growth and employment beclouding pattern. This is ominous because corporations provide two-thirds of all the nongovernmental employment and production. Through them the major flows of savings into growth-promoting investment are effected. During the past 14 years about two-thirds of the new productive investment, through which more than a half-million new nongovernmental jobs per year were created, resulted from corporate reinvested income. Current estimates are that in the period ahead we need to create new jobs at double that rate to avoid serious unemployment. It cannot be done by profit squeezing. It can only be done through profit enlargement.

Over 50 percent of corporate earnings—some three times the prewar rates—is now taken in taxes. Not only is this income taxed as earned, but it is taxed again when transferred as dividends to owners—the clearest case of double taxation to which no other form of enterprise is subjected. Dividends, which are all that owners get from their corporations, are a small part—less than 4 percent—of the Nation's income. Yet on this slim compensation to those who have risked their savings to provide the tools of production depends the functioning of our economy. It is shocking that they should be subjected to the heaviest taxation, for if profits and dividends should be abolished through taxation or otherwise our free economy would speedily disintegrate.

Double taxation of corporate income is an added efficiency-penalizing, incentive-undermining device and as such has no proper place in the tax system of a country dependent upon incentive for maintenance and growth of production and employment. When the rates were low this did not matter so much; now that the rates have risen to what may well be regarded as confiscatory levels it matters very much.

Inflation has rendered the taxation of corporate income harmful to economic growth in a special way. Under the code the depreciation allowable in calculating taxable income must be based on prices, often paid years ago, for the depricable items. But such amounts cannot at today's inflated prices possibly have buying power equal to that originally spent and thus be sufficient to enable the enterprise to just "stay even." The deficiency, which should realistically be regarded as depreciation, is thus treated as income and on that pretense over half of it taxed away. This is more than inimical to growth; it puts a tax on just keeping even. It directly handicaps all corporations having depreciable property and especially those heavily invested in long-life facilities. It indirectly handicaps all others who do business with them as their capabilites as customer or supplier are undermined.

Years ago when this problem was first discussed—as some here may remember—businessmen disagreed on whether there really was a widespread and important problem. There is no disagreement on that now. The big disagreement now is on what is the best way to solve the problem.

The President has proposed that some part of expenditures for productive facilities in excess of specified depreciation amounts be credited against income tax otherwise computed. This would be a welcome alleviation of the destructive tax burden on the vital corporate save-invest process. I must, however, also regard it as seeking to counterbalance while deferring correction of the depreciation situation. And yet that situation mightily needs correcting. I have fears that disagreement on how to do what all agree should be done may result in nothing being done. In the long parade of witnesses on the matter there are many who say the other fellow's solution is not the right one but proffer none of their own. There are others who agree that the other fellow's solution isn't the answer and then become another other fellow by proffering their own scheme—and so it goes. I would say that it is high time that businessmen who have agreed on the principle get together on the method, ever remembering that the most important thing is to take a step forward from where we are; the method by which the step is taken is secondary.

FISCAL TRENDS

From the viewpoint of safeguarding our essential economic incentives the current trend of fiscal proposals is frightening. On the expenditure side the proposals are for more and more spending and giving; prudence is not too visible. And yet we had better be prudent.

On the taxing side a crusade has been launched and its banner is "loophole." The selection of that word is some sort of semantic success if using good words to cover bad purposes can be so regarded. For if the fancy word is removed and the actual purposes examined their apparent intent in many instances is to shut off any breathing holes left in the thick blanket of taxation now smothering the vital incentives. How ironic if "loopholing" turned out to be "strangleholding."

I am not granted the time, nor is this the proper occasion, to appraise the several tax proposals in detail. My purpose here, moreover, is to proffer an orienting viewpoint on what is happening in and to our country and its incentives, rather than to condemn or commend specific measures. But I cannot forgo one or two comments.

Take that so-called loophole, the dividend exclusion and tax credit of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code. It wasn't put there because taxing authorities loved dividend receivers and wanted to show them favoritism. It was instead a meager step toward a correction of the serious and even dangerous injustice of confiscatory double taxation of dividends I have already noted. To repeal the provision is not to close a tax loophole; it is to resume full tax strangulation where it can do the most damage to the Nation's growth prospects. The pity of it is that only about one-half of 1 percent of Federal revenues is involved. Why risk our growth for that? Why not a little economizing in Federal expenditures instead?

Take proposed dollar limitations for tax purposes on "expenses for travel, entertainment and business gifts": This rests on the curious assumption that owners and managers do not know how much of what kind of expenses their employes ought to incur in order to end up with the biggest profits for the Government to tax; or else it is a first step in disallowing for tax purposes even more business expenses competitively incurred and thus covertly tax as income costs that clearly are not income. May I remind you of another camel—the one with his nose in the tent?

Take taxation of income earned abroad by foreign corporations owned in part or in full by domestic corporations: Aside from the intolerable administrative burden it would bring, it would introduce a startling new principle—that income is taxable before it is received and whether or not it is ever received. Foreign trade is a two-way street and this measure would certainly invite retaliation by foreign taxing authorities, thus hampering rather than furthering international trade with adverse effects on domestic business and the delicate balance-of-payments situation. Its advocates suggest that its imposition would increase Federal taxes by less than one-third of 1 percent. My own opinion is that its repercussions would enduringly lower them by many times that amount.

Take restricted stock option incentive plans and noisy agitation to repeal the provisions under which they exist: I think this a situation where any antagonism must arise out of a misunderstanding which full study would surely correct. In a country where taxation is smothering incentives, alternative incentives should be sought not forbidden. Stock option incentive plans are unique in adding nothing to production costs to be covered by prices consumers pay. Nor do they take anything away from a corporation. Instead they bring in new capital and stimulate its employees' performance. They tend to expand, but never contract, the tax revenue base by stimulating more efficient utilization of manpower, materials and equipment, and hence in providing greater profits, greater dividends and possibly capital gains to be taxed. Their presence does not injure other stockholders in any way except on the incredible assumption that any and all improvement in performance achieved would have been equally achieved in their absence. Repealing the provisions under which optionees' incentive gains, if any, are taxed at capital gains rather than at surtax rates would not increase tax revenues. It would diminish them. The plans were created by and exist under a provision of the tax law. Without it they would wither away and leave little or nothing to be taxed.

I come now to the end of these remarks. I have sought, I fear, to cover too much ground in too little time. I have not stopped to argue or hammer home the viewpoints I have proffered. But that may not really be too important because convictions to be meaningful in attitudes and actions must mostly be self-achieved. So I will just carry away the hope that my words may have helped to turn your minds from time to time to the vanishing incentives, and that your contemplations will result in such self-achieved convictions. And if these should result in actions—well, that would be the most for which I could wish.

Report on the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, with the 1st session of the 87th Congress now a matter of history and record, I would like to review the activities of the session and the relation of these actions to my district and the State of Indiana.

For more than 5 months of this legislative year, the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana was without representation in this body. It was a most unfortunate circumstance for the 460,000 residents of my district to be without a voice in this national assembly. The reason for this vacancy was the investigation into the election by order of the House of Representatives.

The manner of the investigation into our extremely close election again proved the integrity of the House and its committees. The result of the complete recount of the ballots proved that errors in tabulation and reporting could have denied the will of the majority of the voters in the district. A simple recount and tabulation of the ballots counted on election night by local precinct election officials gave me a majority of the votes. A count based on the application of uniform acceptance standards throughout the district also showed a majority in my favor.

Members of both political parties acclaimed the fairness and objectivity of the investigation. In their separate views to the unanimous committee report of my election, the Republican Members expressed their opinion that the contested election matter "was directed in a thorough and fair manner." The defeated contestant himself complimented the committee which handled the matter for "conducting the recount in an equitable manner."

Upon being seated, I introduced legislation which would provide a system of recount for congressional elections. My plan would allow States to pursue their own election contest procedures before certifying the results of the election to the Clerk of the House. This would speed the contest procedures and reduce the possibility of a district being without representation again for this reason. I am hopeful that the committee will consider the bill early in the next session.

Statistics of the session indicate that it was a hard-working, productive year. The length of the session was the longest in peacetime in decades. The number of measures introduced and acted upon were at near-record highs.

Most important to residents of the Fifth District of Indiana was congressional approval of the flood control construction in our district. After years of planning, construction will finally begin on the three-reservoir flood control system along the Wabash River. Congress appropriated $700,000 to begin construction of the Salamonie Reservoir in Wabash County. The Mississinewa Reservoir will be begun with a $500,000 appropriation. The Huntington Reservoir will undergo final planning and design; $53,000 was appropriated for this purpose.

President Kennedy's strong support for flood control and water resources development was a great factor in our legislative work this year. It gives renewed promise for rapid completion of these needed projects. His revised public works program included the three projects after the final Eisenhower recommendations had neglected the important Mississinewa project.

Thus, we begin the flood control system which is so vitally needed by the people of Peru, Wabash, and all those along the Wabash River in Indiana. With the construction of these reservoirs come additional benefits to the residents of the area. Plans for the development of the reservoirs as recreation and conservation areas are progressing in the Indiana Department of Conservation. The construction period will provide jobs for hundreds over the next several years. The ready supply of water will help alleviate desperate needs experienced by Marion, Huntington, and other area cities in recent years. The good of these projects is just beginning to unfold as construction starts.

The Federal judiciary of the State was increased with the addition by this Congress of one additional judge for each the northern and southern districts of Indiana and the addition of a judge to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. This increase in the staff of the courts will aid the cause of justice by relieving the backlog of cases in each court and speed judicial action.

Indiana's benefits from legislation which bolstered the general economy are measurable. More than 36,000 unemployed persons in the State took advantage of the extension of unemployment compensation immediately after it was effective. This alone pumped more than a million dollars a week into the Indiana economy. Rapid return of Federal income tax payments, payment of veterans' insurance annuities and the speedup of military spending aided Indiana in its recovery from the recession of 1960. Economic statistics in the State are encouraging and the general economic outlook for Indiana is favorable.

Indiana and Fifth District farmers have been enthusiastic in their reaction to the feed grains program. This program, initiated by the 87th Congress, has been largely responsible for the increase in total national farm income. It will, for the first time in years, cut the total grain surplus in storage. By doing so, it can cut the total cost of the farm program.

As a former prosecuting attorney, I know the need for the Attorney General's crime program. The benefits to be derived from the anti-crime legislation he was given by the Congress will accrue to all. It will be of assistance to every law-enforcement agency in the Nation and will go a long way toward final success in the fight against organized crime.

The social security amendments of this session of Congress have improved the program in light of today's needs. These new benefits include: optional retirement for men at 62 with proportionately reduced benefits; a raise in benefits to widows from 75 percent of that to which the primary insured was entitled to 82½ percent of those benefits; raised earnings ceiling for retired persons; and broadened insured status requirements.

The Housing Act of 1961 was the most comprehensive housing bill passed by Congress in years. The provisions of this bill will make it easier for families, especially moderate income families, to own their own home or to make improvements in their present dwellings. The program of urban renewal and development in this act is of great encouragement to towns and cities in our district which are planning needed local projects. The programs for housing for the elderly citizens, for farm families and for colleges will be of great use in our district.

Several communities in our district are planning airport improvements. The extension of airport programs by this Congress will enable these cities to provide more modern, safer airport facilities. Marion is completing work on a runway built under this program at the present time. Anderson, Huntington, and Wabash have contacted my office concerning their own airport development plans.

Many workers in the district have been affected by the change in the Federal wage and hour law. This Congress broadened the coverage of the law to include some 3.6 million more workers nationally and raised the minimum wage, in steps, to $1.25 per hour.

The national defense posture was a subject of much concern in this past session of Congress. Acting on the recommendations of the President, Congress quickly approved increased strength both in conventional and modern armaments, and in our fighting forces. At the same time a concerted drive by the Congress and the administration has resulted in giving the Nation more for its defense dollar. The badly mismanaged M–14 rifle procurement has been corrected and this improved weapon is being delivered on schedule to our fighting men around the world. The shocking labor problems at key missile bases which existed in past years has been corrected. The administration's efforts have reduced the time lost in labor disputes from an average of 21,500 man-days per quarter in 1960 to 768 man-days in the second quarter of 1961.

The Small Business Administration program was expanded by this Congress. Activities of this agency have increased rapidly this year. The SBA provides valuable assistance to small independent businessmen and to communities. Conferences are being arranged in the district to better acquaint businessmen with their activities.

My assignment on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has enabled me to observe the Nation's space efforts at first hand. The successes of our program this year, including the two successful suborbital manned launchings give preview to the developments of our space technology which are to come. With the impetus of increased emphasis for the moon program and other space efforts, our progress should be swift and the evidence of our progress increasingly more dramatic.

The committee activity is but one area in which I have taken special interest.

I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of an Indiana Dunes National Park. My plan would enable the park and the Indiana Deep Water Port to both be established. These two projects complement each other. The port is of great economic significance to the State and I am happy to see the leadership in this project being provided by Gov. Matt Welsh. The park is of great conservation and recreation value. We can and should have them both in Indiana. To this end I have directed my efforts.

The construction of the Mississinewa Reservoir will necessitate the removal of the grave of the historic Indian figure, Frances Slocum. The present Slocum Cemetery will be inundated by waters from the reservoir. Attempts to have her body reinterred in Pennsylvania have been thwarted, I believe, by the alert expression of intense local interest in this historic monument. Plans are being made to secure a suitable site for her grave near the present location and I have introduced legislation to have it recognized as a national historic memorial.

In this age of nuclear terror, civil defense is valuable insurance for every family and a strong deterrent force for the Nation. To encourage the needed local efforts in our area, I called a district civil defense conference. Response to the conference was enthusiastic. I hope the results of the ideas expressed by civil defense experts to some 350 community leaders from the district will soon be evident in projects in the various communities.

The Federal Government has a program of disposing of its surplus properties to certain governmental and civic groups. I introduced a bill which would allow youth services and welfare organizations, the YMCA, Boys' Clubs, and the like to take advantage of this program.

These are the activities and products of the 1st session of the 87th Congress which stand as highlights to me. It has been an active, productive session. I look forward to the second session next year to continue the work begun this year of constructive, responsible legislation which will benefit the Nation, our State of Indiana, and my district.

The British Arts Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the functioning arts councils which currently exist in the United Kingdom and in Canada have proved strikingly successful over the years in encouraging and stimulating the performing and visual arts. They provide a pattern on whose lines my proposal for a U.S. Arts Foundation is based. Some idea of the accomplishments of the British and Canadian councils during the year is available in the report which appeared in the Musical Courier for September 1961.

The direct and favorable effect on oversea countries by American artists who have gone abroad under our cultural exchange programs is clearly brought home by Actor Hal Holbrook in an interview which appeared in the current issue of Equity magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Noel Goodwin entitled "The Picture of Britain," the report entitled "Brief Look at Canada Council," in the Musical Courier, and the interview in Equity.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PICTURE IN BRITAIN

(By Noel Goodwin)

For the 12 months beginning last April the British Government has allotted £1,675,000 of national funds for the encouragement of the arts in Great Britain. The sum represents about 8 pence per head of population in the country and compares with about £30 per head for the cost of defense and the armed forces. Although it is the highest amount ever granted as a subsidy to the arts, it is still one of the lowest of its kind in Europe, even counting the relatively smaller countries of Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland.

A grant of twice this amount would enable national enterprises in music, opera, ballet, and the theater to operate on a basis of reasonable security. Without any grant at all there would now be no opera, no Royal Ballet, no Old Vic, and not more than two symphony orchestras in the country. Happily, the principle of Government patronage is now firmly, if still rather grudgingly, established as a part of national policy. Even so, it has never been properly planned as a whole but has just grown up from year to year since the war.

In the winter of 1939–40 the Pilgrim Trust gave £25,000 to set up what was then called the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA). Government support was confined originally to the loan of a secretary from the Ministry of Education. Soon afterward it was persuaded to vote £25,000 to match the Pilgrim grant, and 2 years later it adopted the infant CEMA entirely. Postwar reorganization changed CEMA in 1946 into a semiofficial but independent body called the Arts Council of Great Britain, with a Government grant of £350,000 for the year.

The arts council was charged with the duty of developing a greater knowledge, understanding, and practice of the fine arts exclusively, and in particular to increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public throughout the realm, as well as to improve standards of exécution. It remains today as the instrument by which Government funds for the arts are distributed, except for a few special direct grants to museums and art galleries. Otherwise the Government does not normally specify where and how the money shall be spent, such decisions being the council's responsibility.

A chairman and 15 Council members are appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, each serving for not more than 5 years. They are assisted by four advisory panels of experts representing music, drama, the visual arts, and poetry. All Council members and panel members are unpaid. The small paid staff is confined to a secretary general and his assistant, with separate directors for music, art, and drama, and regional directors for Scotland and Wales, plus the office staff. Total operating costs for the Council, including salaries, expenses, and local taxes, amount to just under £100,000 a year.

Allocation of government funds for the year is made after each enterprise claiming a grant has submitted estimates of income and expenditure for its planned projects. All enterprises must be "nonprofitmaking," and a sum is allotted in proportion to the costs and sphere of work as a grant-in-aid toward the expected operating deficit. They range from the £473,000 given to the Covent Garden Opera and Royal Ballet together in 1959–60 to £50 pocket money for some small local music society. In general music in its various forms receives rather more than three-quarters of the total annual government grant.

In addition to grants from the central government through the Arts Council some enterprises such as provincial orchestras and theaters are supported by grants from the local authorities (city, borough, and district councils) in the areas they serve. Under the Local Government Act, 1948, these Councils are empowered (but not compelled) to spend the product of up to sixpence in the pound of local taxes on the arts. I do not think any spend the full amount. Most still spend nothing at all in this way, and the total throughout the country amounts to only about £250,000 a year.

The chief merit of the British scheme for government assistance to the arts is that it exists at all. In spite of the rapid development of a genuine interest in the arts among all classes of people, such activity still is viewed with considerable suspicion. The British artistic conscience is the victim of a curious and long-standing hyprocrisy. It feels that art in itself is a doubtful diversion but becomes respectable when put to the service of worthy causes such as charity.

By making the Arts Council independent of political control, however, and charitable in the sense that those controlling it are unpaid, Britain has avoided the worst excesses of bureaucratic organization. Moreover, the enterprises assisted by the council are also required to be wholly self-governing in their affairs. They may accept other grants as well, as some now do from slowly developing industrial patronage and the conscience money of commercial television companies, but they must still maintain their independence and cultural purpose in artistic policy to qualify for public funds.

A scheme has lately been devised to assist Covent Garden in forward planning for opera by means of a guaranteed proportional subsidy for 3 years (actually 43 percent of its agreed annual expenditure). Other organizations still never know from one year to the next how much grant will be forthcoming, if any at all. The policy is apt to encourage budgeting for a higher-than-necessary deficit, in the hope that whatever lesser sum is received will be enough to see the project through.

In a way a premium is put on failure since the Arts Council may well choose to reduce grants to an organization which is just managing to get by in order to save some less successful claimant from final collapse. In addition once the council has made its decision, there is no means of calling it in question except by public outcry I know of only one occasion when public opinion was sufficiently stirred to compel the council to change its mind, and that was in the crisis affecting the future of the Sadler's Wells Opera 3 years ago.

Those concerned for the future development of the arts in Britain believe that the time is overdue for the government, having accepted the principle of public patronage, to resolve its compromise with policy. The margin between persistent anxiety and a reasonable basis for security is relatively small. It could be met by the national taxes collected from a single millionaire in the top income bracket, or more than covered if local authority grants were enforced at the rate of no more than 1 penny in the pound throughout the country.

BRIEF LOOK AT CANADA COUNCIL

The Canadian Government in March 1957, passed legislation providing for a Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. The council was created 1 month later.

At the same time the government handed to the newly formed council $100 million (the combined inheritance taxes collected

from the estates of two Canadian multimillionaires who had died the previous year).

The money was divided into two funds: One called the University Capital Grants Fund to provide money for universities planning to construct buildings for the arts, humanities, and social sciences; the other called the Endowment Fund, used to "foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in arts, humanities, and social sciences."

The latter, explains the council, is a perpetual fund, and from it only the annual income earned by the capital sum may be spent.

The council—composed of 21 members from private life—disburses an estimated $3 million per year from the income earned by the perpetual fund. Scholarships and fellowships are distributed with about half of the available funds. Much of the remainder goes into grants for orchestras, theaters, operas, ballets, choirs, musical festivals, and art galleries. Grants during 1959–60, for instance, went to the Halifax Symphony for a tour of Nefoundland, to the Canadian League of Composers for an international conference, to the Montreal, Stratford, and Vancouver Festivals, and to the Canadian Opera Co. for its season and two tours—these among a long list of others.

In its recent annual report the Canada Council stated: "The council is encouraged to believe that its program is of value to the Canadian people; furthermore, the relations which the council has had with the public would appear to suggest that faith in the concept of the council has been strengthened."

AN INTERVIEW WITH HAL HOLBROOK

(By Dick Moore)

When Hal Holbrook gives his celebrated solo performance of "Mark Twain Tonight" a note on the program precedes a list of 32 selections. The note reads: "While Mr. Twain's selections will come from the list below, we have been unable to pin him down as to which of them he will do. He claims this would cripple his inspiration. However, he has generously conceded to a printed program for the benefit of those who are in distress and wish to fan themselves." The program further speculates that of intermissions there will be "one or two, probably," and dismisses the dearth of music by explaining that "a trombone player was engaged, but is unreliable and should not be expected." Then, just in case the audience is under the impression that Mr. Holbrook is permitting himself to be pinned down after all, the pamphlet goes on to caution that it is not really official and that the program is subject to change.

One might assume from the foregoing that Hal Holbrook is loathe to commit himself. Not true. For this 36-year-old actor, monologist, writer, ambassador has, on an exhaustive tour of Europe under the auspices of the American State Department, committed himself deeply to the task of making Americans understood, and to an attempt at understanding people in other countries, too.

Hal Holbrook's living incarnation of Mark Twain was conceived in 1953 and, after a gestation period of 2 years, was delivered in 1955 without assistance in the Greenwich Village night club, Upstairs at the Duplex, where it remained and grew for 7 months. Off-Broadway, concert tours, record albums and a 22-week Broadway sellout followed. Among Mr. Holbrook's engagements was a guest appearance at an annual birthday party given for President Eisenhower by the White House Correspondents Association.

Prior to this impressive chain of events there had been 7 years of stock; a 2-person repertory company (organized with his wife) which gave 800 performances of Shakespeare for students, and a list of television credits (including a running part on a soap opera) which is respectable but not imposing.

Soon to be seen on Broadway in "Do You Know the Milky Way?" Hal Holbrook still regards his tour for the State Department as the most personally satisfying engagement of his career.

Question. It's been reported that you're abandoning your role as Mark Twain. Is that true?

Answer. I don't intend to give it up until I'm dead. What I would like to do is a play or two occasionally and then go back to Twain. I think the danger in doing a character like Twain is when you run it for a long time you begin to lose your spontaneity.

Question. Will you visit other parts of the world to represent the State Department?

Answer. Yes, I think so. I've been asked to represent them in several parts of the world and I've also received some very good offers to appear commercially all around the world. And what I would like to do in 2 years if I can be lucky enough to get what I want in the interim, is to go away for 10 months with my wife and two children and make a slow journey completely around the world, which is what Twain did, you see. I would like to recreate his trip, but add a lot more countries to it.

Question. On your recent tour for the State Department you were completely sold out in most cases. Had your European audiences heard of your success in the United States, and what kind of preparation was made for you?

Answer. I am a little unsure how to answer that. My impression is that they really hadn't heard of me in most cases. For instance, in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and even Oslo, they hadn't heard of me. But they knew Mark Twain extremely well and that's what I think drew them into the theater. However, what seemed remarkable to me was that just a little advance publicity in the form of newspaper releases, telling the public who I was and that I had been successful with this Mark Twain show, drew a whole houseful of people. They had to turn them away in many cases. That indicates two things, I think: a tremendous interest abroad in Mark Twain—they read him fully as much as we do—and that those people will go to see a live American actor on the stage the way children go to the zoo to see strange animals. An American actor, especially in a straight nonmusical play, is a strange freakish animal to most Europeans. They haven't seen many of us. In some of the European cities I visited I was the first American actor in a nonmusical production to be sent abroad by our country in 15 years. Even in a city like Vienna.

Question. You make a distinction between actors appearing in musical and nonmusical plays. Do you feel that a straight play represents our culture better? Does it offer better communication?

Answer. Well, the reason I mai e this distinction is that we have sent "Porgy and Bess" and "My Fair Lady" on a jaunt to Russia and we have sent many musicians over there. But until recently, we sent practically no straight theater. As for the matter of communication, I feel very strongly, especially after having taken this trip, that we underestimate the power which straight plays performed by good American casts can have in the matter of communication with those people abroad. It is not only our Government that overlooks this but our theater people, too.

Question. Not long ago you were quoted as saying that Twain's "satirical roasting of American foibles was taken in good spirits by the audiences." Is this "satirical roasting" used in Iron Curtain countries to discredit the American society, or can audiences accept it for what it is—legitimate self-criticism?

Answer. Do you know what I think? I think that people are far more similar than most of us realize. I had never been over there before, to Europe, except for one brief little jaunt. And, naturally, when I went behind the Iron Curtain I thought the first thing somebody would do would be to rush out onto the airfield, corral me, and try to make me into a Communist. Well, nobody tried to do that. As a matter of fact, they talked very little about politics. But when we criticize ourselves—not just to show what great fellows we are or how broadminded we are—but when we honestly criticize ourselves, especially with humor, I think it's the most disarming approach America can take with other people.

Question. You think this is understood on all levels?

Answer. Absolutely. Those people over there are just the same as we are. They're people, they grow up, they go to college, they go out and buy groceries, they have children, their families sit around and talk politics, theater, one thing or another. They are not dumb people and just because somebody tells them something it doesn't always mean they're always going to believe it. If they go to the theater to see an American production it means they're interested in seeing an American production. That's one step already. They have an inquisitiveness; they go there to find out something, and perhaps they go there to find out something they haven't quite been told yet. It's a very hard thing to explain to anybody, but people who go to the theater, they're not dumb. Twain did criticize himself, but on a universal plane. All the time that I was playing Twain, especially in the Iron Curtain countries, my whole motivation, the whole thought in my head was, "I wonder if you're gonna get the real point here. I'm not just talking about myself and my country. I'm talking about the human race of which you are a member." And I think people got that very, very much. Mark Twain is tremendously popular abroad. Well, why? He couldn't be popular abroad just because he wrote pretty stories about the Mississippi River. He's popular because he's a universal spokesman for the human race. And the human race is the same.

Question. Did most of the people who came to see you speak English?

Answer. Most of them, yes, but not all. It's so disheartening to try to convince people in this country—startlingly enough, people in the theater—that cultural exchange is worthwhile. They have the damnedest notions about it. They know they could do it better and that it isn't being done right. Really, they have the most narrowminded vision toward the theater's role in cultural exchange, just so narrowminded that it's very disheartening to talk to them.

Question. Could you be more specific?

Answer. Well, take the press when I got home. I could sense from the reporters a real skepticism. "They really understood you, huh?" This is the first question. Americans cannot quite conceive of the possibility that other nations learn another language and learn it well. Of course people over there speak English, that is, educated people, and these are the ones who would naturally go to the theater. I talked with people over there who spoke English beautifully—not so often behind the Iron Curtain, but in countries like Norway, Finland, Germany, and Austria and Holland, my gosh, they spoke wonderful English. And my show isn't just in English, it's in the American idiom. Sure, they missed some things, but you know I got the biggest response I've ever had in Oslo, Norway. Laughs.

Question. More so than in New York?

Answer. New York, hell. Biggest response I've ever had anywhere.

Question. Then they got some things the Americans didn't get?

Answer. Yes, they did. They got many things American audiences didn't get. I don't like to generalize and this was only one case, in Oslo. In Warsaw I got no response at all, but at the end of the performance they gave me an ovation which was the biggest ovation I ever had, so how do you figure it? They must have gotten something out of the show. I don't know what it was, it didn't seem to me like they were getting the jokes. But they got something. I thought they didn't understand a word; maybe they didn't.

Question. Were you able to talk with your audiences after the shows were over?

Answer. No, except those who came backstage or arranged parties. But I did do one thing which I think artists going abroad should do, and which the Government should make it possible for them to do when they are representing us in the cultural exchange program: I took my time. We have to make money in this country and since they pay about one-fourth as much abroad for a show as they would here, in order to even clear expenses over there it seems they have to schedule at least one show a day. Well, nobody can do a good job doing one show a day, traveling from one town to another. One of the benefits of the cultural exchange program is that there's a certain amount of financial support from the Government which enables you to take care of your obligations at home while you're away. But these tours should be constructed so that the artists involved can spend some time going to universities and talking to the students, or going to any kind of group to meet people, to talk. You don't know what a cow looks like till you see the cow, inspect his fur and everything. You have to know the details and, to me the most startling revelation of the whole trip was that those people are precisely the kind of people I know. They're me. I'm them.

Question. Did they ask you many questions?

Answer. Well, at first they asked a lot about Mark Twain, and I was anxious to get over that and talk about America. The one idea that seemed to come up more than any was that American youths are beatniks in leather jackets—knife-carrying kids. They think this is about the norm. Long live Hollywood. And they almost always refer to the "rich people" and the "poor people" in America. Even in places like Finland, which is a great friend of ours, the newspapers refer to our rich people and poor people as though there's a tremendous distinction. Well, this distinction has gone somewhat out of fashion in the past 60 years, let's face it, and they don't know it overseas.

Question. What fosters these misconceptions?

Answer. If you want to know that, then ask yourself, "What do I know about them? What do I think about them?" We are several thousand miles away from those people. What do we really know about them? We know a little bit about what we read in the newspapers, mostly the headlines on an article. But, what do we know about them as people? We have tremendous suspicion about them, suspicion which is heightened by the very sensitive international situation. But this suspicion is an outgrowth of ignorance. They are as ignorant of us as we are of them. The minute you learn something about a thing you're afraid of you're not as afraid of it again. You never will be. Well, it's the same between people. The kids at the universities with the marvelous faces, tremendously eager, bright, leaning forward with faces sticking out, you know, looking right at you. Interested, every one of them. Packed classrooms. Asking questions, wanting to know and, underneath it all, responding to a kind of underplayed humor more than anything else. I didn't give any speeches, I just kind of adlibbed, you know. There was this one incident at the University of Zagreb, when I was talking to the kids there.

They were great, their faces. I've talked to university kids in this country, too. Students are wonderful. Their minds are still open. You can still blow a little fresh air through the hole in their heads; they haven't corked it up yet, so there are possibilities, see? And these kids were asking questions. And there was this one kid—I found out afterward they were going to keep him out of the room because he was strongly communistic—he was standing along the wall and he finally interrupted me and he said: "Mr. Holbrook, what do the youths in America break windows with these days?" That kind of shocked everybody into silence. I said: "Bricks; what do you use?" And they all laughed. I said, "I've found bricks are as good as anything else to break windows with. I've done it with a baseball sometimes when I was aiming at the catcher and missed, but I found bricks are pretty good. Don't you find them pretty good, too?" Well, he looked sheepish and didn't say anything. The class was enjoying it. We were all enjoying it in good humor. I wasn't trying to make a speech. So then I went into a rather lengthy explanation about what it's like living in New York, what makes people break windows with bricks. I tried to make them conceive of New York City, conceive of a place where there are so many millions of people packed together in one small place, on top of each other where there's no room, no room for emotional outlets. Why do people break windows? No place to play; kids, you know, nothing to do. We rip down a lot of old homes, real crummy slums, to try to clean up the city. We're all the time cleaning up the city, we're building new houses, developments, etc., trying to make better conditions. And some kid whose family can't get into the new housing development—or maybe his crummy tenement building was torn down to make way for this new place and he's had to move around the block and make new friends and pull up his roots—he goes by this housing development and they've just put in those nice clean windows in the new building and, boy oh boy, he picks up a brick and, boy, he sees how many he can bust. That's what I told them.

Question. How did they take to that?

Answer. They took to that fine. Then this boy interrupted me again and he said, "Why don't they move to the suburbs"? And I thought, my God, he's been reading the "Man in the Gray Flannel Suit," and I laughed and I said, "We would love to get them to move to the suburbs. We would love it," I said. "But, you know, they won't go to the suburbs. People come to America in migratory waves. Every several decades we have a wave. Right now we have a wave of Puerto Ricans. A hundred years ago or a hundred and fifty we had a wave of Irish people, or German people. Right now we are in the path of a great wave of Puerto Rican people coming to live in our country. Where do they go? They go to New York City. We would love them to leave New York City and go outside. You know, we have across the Hudson River 3,000 miles of land that's practically unexplored. There's plenty of room for everybody." Some girl in the third or fourth row started to grin and nod her head. I said, "But you know of course it is very dangerous to go out there because you never want to get out in Wahoo, Nebr., or Seguin, Tex., or a place like that because you can't really call yourself safe. We still have Indian wars. There's a very vicious one going on out there now, but we don't tell about that sort of thing outside of our country because we don't want a bad name, but we're really fighting these wars very hard. And our beatniks, why, even in a civilized city like Wahoo, Nebr., why you can't walk down the street at 9:30 at night because you pass a bush and some fella or some young kid will rush out with a big knife and slit you from ear to ear." And then those students started to look at me. They didn't know whether to take this seriously or not. Some of them started to smile and others looked terribly serious and concerned. I said, "Oh, it's very dangerous. You don't want to cross the Hudson River." I said, "My kid is 5 years old. I've given him for Christmas what he wants, which is a switchblade knife with a pearl handle on it. He's been using a wooden handle one now ever since he was 3 years old and he's got six notches in it. I think that's pretty damn good for a kid his age, don't you?" Then they laughed. They just burst out laughing. They're not dumb. They're no dumber than we are.

Question. Why, in Yugoslavia, would they want to exclude a Communist student from your lecture?

Answer. Well, it's a very simple and hospitable thing to do, and those people are very thoughtful. The people in Europe, I think, are generally far more thoughtful than we are, although I do think we would do the same thing in this country in a situation like that. This particular boy who started to heckle me had caused a lot of trouble before because he heckled visitors a great deal and they asked the cultural attaché at our Embassy in Yugoslavia whether he thought they ought to keep him out. Our man said, "No, don't. Mr. Holbrook would want to have him there. He wants that. So, don't tell him anything about it." And it all worked out beautifully. I was very impressed with the university. The head of the American literature department there is a wonderful man; the whole staff of the literature department was there. Poor, poor, crummy, crummy building. Awful, falling down building. Unbelievable. But they were packed in there and they were learning. They were really boiling with interest and energy, and when you arrive—hospitable. Hell, they invite you in to have a little slivovic—this white gasoline they drink—and some of this coffee that would stand a cow up on his back feet, and they get you all in condition before they put you out in the room. They're very hospitable. They give you a lovely introduction. After it was over I stayed and talked. I have a nice picture you might want to use, incidentally, with the kids around me. Another point I wanted to make. Oh, yes. This kid, this young heckler, he said: "Mr. Holbrook, you are an authority on Mark Twain. What do you think Mark Twain was criticizing in the book of the Connecticut Yankee? England or America?" And I could see what was on the other side of his brain with that particular question. I thought a minute, and I said, "That's a wonderful question. I don't think Mark Twain was criticizing Great Britain any more than he was criticizing America or anywhere else, even over here, for instance. He was criticizing inhumanity to man, injustice, the subjugation of masses of people by a small group of people who took advantage of them, cruelty, meanness. He was satirizing all those things, and it seems to me that those aren't peculiar to England or America." I said, "You remember that scene where the king is out in disguise and he passes a long line of slaves all chained together going off to a kind of a work camp? Now that sort of thing has even happened over here in Europe. Hasn't it?" Nobody said anything so I said, "No, he was just satirizing what he always satirizes, which is the human race."

Question. Do our films have much influence over there and, if so, what kind?

Answer. God, we hear so much of this. I suppose the comments I'm going to make

now, and the ones other people make, are just water off a duck's back. They don't seem to do a damn bit of good because everybody is so damned anxious to take care of themselves and get another car and all that sort of thing, washing machines and all—but it's true. There has got to be some sacrifice if you want democracy. Because it requires it. And those movies that we send abroad are not doing a very decent job of work for us. Now, the question arises, are they supposed to do a job of work for us? Well, no, it's free enterprise. The movies are made to make money and entertain people. But American movies are shown widely in other countries, and they create an impression of America which is not fair. They are too special. They deal with people who wear lovely clothes, go to nice night clubs, have wonderful cars, live in a very pretty home. You know how it is. You look at a film about a guy who's supposed to be earning about $6,000 a year and he's living in a place that looks like his old man must be giving him an additional $20,000 a year to make expenses. It's a little unrealistic. Now, naturally, to people who don't have that, there's a certain amount of resentment. People in Europe looking at that—they envy, they envy, and once you envy you dislike, you have fear, you have suspicion. And then of course so many of our movies deal with another speciality, which is violence, mobs, people shooting each other all the time.

Question. In view of this situation, do you think that any kind of regulation by our Government in terms of what we do export in this especially critical time would be feasible or desirable?

Answer. Well, this is a very complicated question and it's not easy to say what I think, but I'll try. Basically, I am completely against regulation by the Government of the affairs of the individuals who are called citizens of the United States. But there's no simple answer. It seems to me that our Government, which is doing a good job under enormous circumstances, could do a better job in the area of culture and ideas. But in order to do that the Government has to have the urgency of the people's desire behind it, because the Government is us. And if people just don't give a damn, or if people don't inform themselves well enough about this historic war of ideas—which is and has been going on for several years now—if they don't, if we don't take this seriously enough, then we won't win it. The French people have great logic, you know, and one of their basic points of logic is that you have to give up something for everything you get.

Question. You recently testified before Congress on a number of arts bills and told of your experiences abroad. Do you have any feeling about the temper of the legislative body in terms of its willingness to recognize the importance of ideas?

Answer. Oh, yes. You know, it's amazing, life is such a revelation. Europe was a revelation to me. Going to Washington to testify before a subcommittee was a great revelation to me. I knew, of course, that all Senators didn't wear string ties and act like buffoons and all that sort of thing. I knew that all of them weren't ignorant of the finer things in life. But it came as a considerable surprise to me to discover real earnestness, real desire to know and great sympathy for the information they had asked me to give.

Question. Did you find this interest keenest among the representatives of our so-called culturally oriented regions?

Answer. No. The subcommittee before which I appeared is headed by a man named WAYNE HAYS from Ohio, from the poorest district of Ohio, the mining district. There was also Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, who is also from Ohio, from Cleveland, a more culturally minded place. There was also JOHN MONAGAN, a Congressman from western Connecticut in the farminug district, and there was also LEONARD FARBSTEIN, from below 20th Street in New York City. Those four people represented a certain geographic spread and they were all very interested in seeing this bill get a proper chance. But in order to give it a proper chance to pass they need some facts. Now those people don't know much about the theater. God, you could put in a thimble what they know about theater. It doesn't make them ignorant; theater is not their job. They don't know—like the fuss that was raised over Helen Hayes earning $2,500 a week overseas, which she wasn't. They don't have any idea, for instance, that an actor or actress pays an agent a commission; that a person of Miss Hayes' stature, for instance, obviously must have a secretary to handle a great deal of mail; that she loses a lot of money on a trip like that; that some actors like myself have offices, if they've gotten into a position where they've got a lot of heavy paperwork; they have press agents to pay; that a person who makes a good amount of money in the theater has got to hire a good accountant, and, they don't come cheap; and he's also got to have a smart lawyer; and by the time all these things are added up, plus other things that I haven't mentioned, it amounts to quite a financial obligation of which these people are unaware. Naturally, to them an actor is somebody that comes out and acts. He gets paid like a plumber, takes the money home and gives it to his wife, or spends it on sophisticated orgies. But, I'm very encouraged by Congress interest in our cultural exchange. It's the people in the theater that need to be a little more intelligent about what our theater has to offer and why we should offer it to other countries.

Question. What do we have to offer?

Answer. We have the most vital, energized theater in the world. It's slightly disorganized, but maybe that's one reason it's got so much flair. But when we send plays abroad, the purpose should be to show an honest picture of the American human being and to express the hope that he has and to show what's in his mind, how he thinks. And the beauty of this is that people abroad seeing a play in which these things are expressed are going to say "My God, they're just like me." Now this is not to underestimate the tremendous ideological differences which exist. But perhaps it's not necessary to go to war and destroy everybody just because you think differently. Perhaps there's room for differences of thought. If you like each other.

Question. Did you find that there is as much utilization of self-criticism in the plays of other countries as there is here?

Answer. I wasn't there long enough to find out. We saw classics, mainly, and in another language.

Question. What about TV abroad?

Answer. Well, I never saw any TV while I was abroad. I don't remember anybody asking me to see it, either.

Question. Were they interested in our television?

Answer. Interested, yes, but always in a kind of a critical way. I mean it came up in a lot of discussions.

Question. How?

A. "TV watchers," you know, "TV viewers, married to television." You see, they take the articles that we write about ourselves without the sense of humor that those articles sometimes have. This is one reason why we must send more plays over there. We must see those people face to face. We must show them there are various sides to our nature. I remember in Helsinki, at a big press conference we had there, this newsman was asking something about TV, bringing up the usual criticism of America, all a "bunch of TV watchers." He was asking me why I didn't want to do Mark Twain on television. That had apparently come out somewhere in the Finnish press. So I told him why: briefly, because I was afraid I couldn't do it the way I wanted to do it, and also that I didn't feel that television is theater, and that Mark Twain, as I do him, belongs to the theater. I have to have an audience. You can't call two or three people, one of whom has to go to the bathroom, an audience. So I told him these various things and blasphemed television a little bit just to show him there was at least one American who didn't love it.

Told him that I took it away from my children. And this newsman back at the rear said, "Mr. Holbrook, I wish my wife could hear you now." And I said, "Oh, my God, you've got one, too." And he shook his head and said "Yes." So you see, it's universal. The only difference is we've got the money to buy more of them, that's all. The best way to defeat the rest of the world, to kill their spirit, is for us to send free television sets abroad. Oh, we'd capture them then. It's a funny thing about us. We think we're too commercial, they think we're too commercial. One of the reasons they're so convinced we're so commercial is that we're constantly telling them so. And then we're proving it by everything we do. But if we think we're too commercial, why in the hell don't we do something about it? Now, not next week. Maybe the truth is, we don't think we're too commercial. Maybe we love it.

It was 5:30 and Mr. Holbrook had to leave. "Of course, as I walked down the street after our interview I thought of many things I should have said," he recalled a few days later. "One of them is this: I think every great star in our theater should take 1 year out of the peak of his career and go abroad in an American production. It would represent a large sacrifice to him financially, but it would reward him with perhaps the most satisfying experience of his life." This thought on the record, Mr. Holbrook left again—this time it was Vancouver for a tryout of his play. For Mr. Holbrook (who, like Mark Twain, has used the incisive tools of his own imagination to carve his opportunity) was preparing to return to Broadway where, for the first time, he would star with someone else.

Railroads' Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Journal-Gazette, Matoon, Ill., on September 21 and October 5, 1961, regarding the railroad's tax problems. They are as follows:

UNFAIR TAXATION?

There are growing numbers of news stories and special features in the press today on the poor financial condition of most of our Nation's railroads.

While the railroads may be the major subject of this discussion, the financial future of any form of transportation isn't bright when you look into the crystal ball.

The airlines and truckers are not pleased with their outlook.

One airline on the verge of bankruptcy was recently saved by merger with a larger carrier. Trucking companies are juggling their routes and changing their operations

constantly to try and stay in the black. Some railroads have proposed mergers with others to try and help their situation. They have not been very successful.

While each form of transportation has its own private problems, they all share one common problem.

Practically every State, village, and hamlet has either tried to, or is taxing transportation. Each levies taxes without regard to what its neighbors have done. It sometimes appears that there is almost competition between the States to see which can get the most in taxes out of transportation.

While all of this is going on the transportation companies are exposed more and more to financial difficulties.

The Federal Government offers no protection against local taxation and, of course, local governments can offer no protection from Federal taxation.

There is possible relief which transportation companies pray for when their backs are finally against the wall. That is Federal subsidy. Whether or not they can get it is always questionable.

It seems rather silly to have to ask the Federal Government for subsidy to offset, among other things, the payment of local tax bills. Federal money comes from the local people to start with and its intent originally was to nurse a new and promising form of transportation to life.

No one is trying to advocate that transportation be immune from taxes. There must be, however, a fair way to levy taxes on our various forms of transportation. With all of the experts in Washington such a study should be gotten underway.

Our railroad companies, trucklines, and airlines are a vital part of the security of our country. In time of emergency it is these companies who are called upon to do fantastic jobs.

They should all be made strong and kept strong, not only so that they can provide Mattoon and other cities with good and frequent service, but also for the day when they might well again be one of the most important contributing forces to our survival.

ARE THE RAILROADS UNFAIRLY TAXED?

Probably more so than any other form of transportation.

Part of the railroads' tax problems are created by the vast areas of land they use.

Due to the nature of their business they cannot share this land with other users and therefore cannot share their tax load in any way.

In 1960 the railroads were operating 220,000 miles of track. The maintenance of this right-of-way is paid for entirely by the railroad companies. This is as it should be. It would also seem perfectly fair for the railroads to pay taxes on their land just as any other corporation does, but this is not the case.

The railroads are required to pay double the taxes on their land that other corporations have to pay.

In the State of Illinois, railroad property in 1957 was valued for tax purposes at 100 percent of its value while other property throughout the State was valued at an average of less than 50 percent of its value.

In other words, most corporations owning a piece of property worth $1,000 would only have to pay taxes on 50 percent of that $1,000 valuation. Not so with the railroads. They must pay taxes on 100 percent of that valuation.

This is only a State tax and the State relies heavily on taxes received from the railroad companies. It totals over $18 million a year in Illinois alone.

And again, as always, the Federal Government steps in for its share.

For years the railroads have not been allowed to depreciate their property in a realistic manner. The Federal Government has its own ideas on the life expectancy of railroad equipment.

Actually, according to the Association of American Railroads, the railroads should be spending about $2 billion a year in modernization programs. This would come out of the railroads' reserves for depreciation.

The Internal Revenue Service has, on the other hand, been allowing only about one-third of that amount for depreciation. This causes abnormally high income tax payments for the railroads.

They cannot modernize their right-of-way and equipment and still carry this heavy tax load.

Something has to give—and what does?

The modernization program, as well as the quality and quantity of service offered.

It appears that the State and Federal Governments are treating the railroads rather unfairly.

Nuclear Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion in its national convention in Denver last month again gave serious consideration to the vital issues affecting our national welfare and security. I think we should all take special heed of their deliberations. The vital contributions of its members to the defense of our Nation and the continued responsible interest they have shown in the maintenance of our national security and freedom has earned the Legion the heartfelt respect and gratitude of the Nation.

The responsible vision of the Legion was strikingly displayed in the resolution adopted at the convention on Aeronautics and Space. The American Legion reaffirmed its support of the most rapid possible development of a nuclear powered aircraft and resolved to urge the President, the Congress, and the Department of Defense to reevaluate the nuclear aircraft program and assign to it the highest priorities as an item vital to our nationl defense. At the end of this statement I would like to include the complete resolution adopted by the American Legion on the nuclear aircraft.

I have fought hard for the development of the nuclear-powered aircraft. The limitless range and endurance of a nuclear aircraft, in addition to the obvious military advantages for conventional military aircraft operations, would undoubtedly open up complete new concepts of military operations. To see what can develop with a revolutionary propulsion system we need only look at what has happened in the case of nuclear submarines. Certainly thinking people saw the advantages of nuclear propulsion for submarines for the classical operations of torpedo warfare and of course these advantages were sufficient and necessary enough to justify the development. But who foresaw the completely new concepts of military operations which came along with nuclear submarines such as the Polaris ballistic missile system? These are the types of development which in the present gravity of world events have made it possible for us to maintain our freedom. The American Legion in its resolution on the nuclear aircraft has shown the vision we must have to assure the availability of the wherewithall we must have to maintain our freedom in the future.

It was encouraging to me to see the recognition given in the American Legion resolution to the status of the development work on the nuclear aircraft when it was stopped earlier this year. This is, in my opinion, an important issue and one which has caused me special concern when the nuclear aircraft development program was stopped. We have developed the technology. We were on the homestretch of actually having a nuclear aircraft. I am sure we will someday go back to the job and complete it, but I am afraid we have thrown away our lead and momentum and that we now will not be the first to have this revolutionary system of propulsion.

Following is the complete text of American Legion's resolution on the nuclear-powered aircraft:

RESOLUTION NO. 559

CONVENTIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT

Whereas the gravity of world events make it imperative that the United States accelerate research and development efforts to the maximum in the field of weaponry if we are to maintain the peace and safeguard our freedom; and

Whereas it is now technologically feasible to develop the nuclear-powered aircraft which is capable of sustained flight over long periods of time without refueling; and

Whereas such aircraft will provide means for a realistic airborne alert which could be employed either strategically or tactically; and

Whereas an atomic-powered aircraft provides an invaluable mobile launching platform for ballistic missiles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Denver, Colo., September 10–14, 1961, That it reaffirms the principles and objectives adopted by the American Legion at its 42d national convention in support of the most rapid possible development and production of a nuclear-powered aircraft and urges the President, the U.S. Congress, and the Department of Defense, to reevaluate this program and assign to it the highest priorities as further means of strengthening our national defense.

Resolution on Residual Oil Import Quotas Adopted by the New England Governors' Conference, Kennebago Lake, Maine, September 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we in New England feel very strongly that urgent attention should be given to the residual oil import study now

being undertaken. The New England Governors' Conference at Kennebago Lake, Maine, adopted the following resolution on September 11, 1961, and it shows the importance they attach to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas quotas imposed on residual fuel in 1959 have brought about a shortage and substantial price increase costing the New England states over $30 million a year in added fuel costs; and

Whereas these restrictions are hampering our regional industrial growth; and

Whereas restrictions on this vital industrial and heating fuel have penalized particularly hospitals, civic institutions and public agencies; and

Whereas these restrictions on residual oil imports have damaged our international trade relations, thus adversely affecting our national security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New England Governors' Conference records its unequivocal opposition to the continuation of these quotas, and applauds the efforts of the New England Senators' Conference and of the Members of the New England Delegation in the House of Representatives to have these quota restrictions removed; and that, furthermore, The New England Governors' Conference calls upon the President of the United States, who will receive shortly a recommendation from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to bring about an end to the discriminatory and unfair burden that has been placed on the citizens of the New England states.

Capitol Closeup, by Martha Rountree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive and objective reporters of the Washington scene, in my opinion, is Martha Rountree whose program, "Capitol Closeup," presents an illuminating commentary of the happenings here. Recently, she gave a particularly penetrating analysis of the current administration trade policies. I recommend it to the Members of the House:

CAPITOL CLOSEUP

(By Martha Rountree)

This is Martha Rountree in Washington. With Congress now adjourned until January, Washington is settling down to the real paperwork. But all will not be completely quiet on Capitol Hill—several investigations promise to be worthwhile.

Congress is gone, but by no means forgotten. Not all the lawmakers will be absent this fall, however. Two of the hottest congressional investigations in a long time are scheduled. The only thing that could happen to cause them not to live up to their billing would be an apathetic interest by the public. Both U.S. trade with Iron Curtain countries and the issue of the military indoctrination program, if pursued, may well answer a lot of urgent questions.

Though both of these investigations are vitally important to the security and well-being of the United States, the Red trade investigation will point up the manner in which we have been helping the Soviets and the Soviet bloc to strengthen themselves economically and militarily through trade with the West.

Congressman WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, said recently: "On several occasions during his campaign, John Kenedy promised to revise what he considered the sterile negative concepts that governed free world trade with the Communist bloc; and he has kept his word." Continued JUDD: "Within 6 months, Mr. Kennedy has drastically altered American policies on trade with the enemy, so quietly that few realize the magnitude of his actions. He has created an entirely new atmosphere." And here we might point out that certain people over at the State Department have contended that commerce between East and West is actively promoted to ease world tensions.

JUDD says: "The President has successfully pushed through the Senate several radical amendments to the Battle Act facilitating trade with the Soviet Union and its satellite empire; the Defense Department has been persuaded to overturn an earlier ruling that precision machine tools could not be exported to the U.S.S.R.; the Treasury Department has lifted its ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat; and a legal reinterpretation by Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges has opened the door for sale of below-cost surplus farm commodities to Iron Curtain nations."

JUDD pointed out that in 2 days this summer, the Commerce Department approved 41 licenses for the sale of goods to Red bloc nations; 13 granted permission for export to the Soviet Union; 11 to Czechoslovakia; 9 to Yugoslavia; 4 to Rumania; 2 to Hungary; and 1 each to Poland and Bulgaria. Ruled nonstrategic in nature, and therefore approved for export, were all ball bearings, machine tools, power transmission systems, aircraft and automotive spare parts, electrical machinery, geophysical instruments and other industrial products and chemicals.

American firms are now being urged to import from the Red bloc, a matter of some concern to several old allies. It is known, for instance, that the Russians wish to export to this country asbestos, furs, lumber, pulp and paper, ferrous metals and alloys. Worried Canadians pointed out that the list reads almost like a rundown of Canada's main exports to the United States.

And, wound up JUDD, "but to the bright young men who surround the President there are no two ways about trade with the Communist bloc. Commented one of them recently, 'What you can't realize is the effect these policies have on world tensions. It was time for us to take the initiative and we have. You can see the results yourself.' and so you can," concluded JUDD.

Khrushchev has already written U.S. farm products into his plans for the future. He has promised his people free bread by October and said their diet would include more horse meat and American corn. We are told that Hard Red wheat shipped to the Soviets will cost the American taxpayer 62 cents a bushel at the port of shipment.

We were most interested in the statement earlier this week made by William Hamilton, Canadian Postmaster General. He predicted a steadily increasing trade threat from the Soviet Union. To meet such subsidized competition, he said, the West must call on "the initiative, imagination, and sense of responsibility of freemen making free decisions." He also said that, "Our (Canada's) policy is simply to regain control of our national economic destiny."

It was less than a year ago—December 22, 1960, as a matter of fact—that Canada's press and politicians let it be known that the U.S. dissatisfaction with the Castro regime was no reason for them to disrupt their normal economic and diplomatic relations with Cuba. (And that's a quote.) In fact we were criticized in Canada for our trade embargo as "mistaken strategy." Ottawa gave a warm welcome to the 10-man Cuban trade delegation which called on them last fall. Canada has traded freely with the Iron Curtain countries; she has kept the Red Chinese on their feet with her steady shipments of wheat. England and our other allies, like Canada, have aided the enemy through trade. Cuba has been able to get a good deal of U.S. merchandise from Canada. As a result, Canadian banks were the only ones not discriminated against when Castro took over. Canada last year said she was doing so well she no longer had to rely, as she had in the past, on foreign investments for the development of her resources—and slapped heavy tax penalties on U.S. investors. Of course, all of this was last December when politics was the climate. And the opposition party (out power) was selling nationalization. So Prime Minister John Diefenbaker's team had to attack somewhere and unfortunately it was us. But, with Diefenbaker's new vote of confidence, and with the political debris swept away, the Canadians no doubt are getting a good clean look at things again.

Let's hope that their concern over the Soviet trade threat will brush off on our other allies. A trade embargo by all the allies could go a long way toward settling the Red threat in general. In fact, if we and our allies joined together in a complete trade embargo, we might just come up with the only weapon for negotiation on a nuclear test ban. To the Soviets and their puppets, trading is a primary means through which they are attempting to obtain the machines and know-how to round out their industries, which in numerous areas are far behind Western industries and industrial know-how. A major reason they continue to lag behind in many areas, of course, is because they have devoted a large amount of their resources to such areas as the space field and missilery in a brazen effort to score a propaganda victory over the West.

Commented Senator THOMAS DODD recently: "We should employ a retaliatory trade embargo against the Communist world. If we use a real trade embargo against them," said DODD, "it would help us and the free world no end."

It is something to think about.

Resolution Adopted by the American-Bulgarian League at its 18th Annual Convention in New York City on September 2–4, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to call your attention to a resolution adopted by the American-Bulgarian League at its 18th annual convention in New York City on September 2–4, 1961, as it concerns the Communist threat.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN-BULGARIAN LEAGUE AT ITS 18TH ANNUAL CONVENTION IN NEW YORK CITY ON SEPTEMBER 2–4, 1961

Whereas we, Americans and Canadians of Bulgarian descent, organized in the American-Bulgarian League for U.S.A. and Canada, have always stressed before our fellow-citizens and our Governments the dangers of Soviet imperialism and Communist subversion and the futility of attempting "peaceful coexistence" with this evil;

Whereas the events of recent weeks in Berlin and Germany and the sudden unilateral resumption of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union have awakened once more among us all the realization that the oppressive imperialist policy of the Soviets not only has not changed but instead has become even more menacing and provocative, so as to threaten our own survival;

Whereas these same events have also confirmed once more that the enslaved European nations, Bulgaria among them, are as freedom loving and as hostile to their Communist regimes as ever and must be considered the stanchest and most valuable allies of our free world; and

Whereas we are bound by our Constitution and bylaws, as well as by our heritage and our conscience, to call attention to the continued plight of the heroic Bulgarian people, who are still completely deprived of all freedom and other elementary human rights: We solemnly

Resolve,

1. That we continue, individually and through our organization, our unrelenting and determined efforts to expose the true nature and menace of Marxist ideology, Communist subversion and Soviet imperialism.

2. That we reaffirm our support of an honorable and firm stand by our Governments in the face of Soviet political aggression, military threats and nuclear blackmail and that we call for a decisively stronger effort to take the initiative in the ideological battle with communism.

3. That we stress our readiness to also support a policy of greatly increasing and material preparedness and particularly the conventional military strength of our countries and to bear all sacrifices required from us for the achievement of this aim.

4. That we express our regret and serious concern with the fact that our political leadership and our press still do not emphasize enough before world public opinion, in the United Nations and at the negotiation tables everywhere, the eminent and basic fact that as long as the Communist governments do not permit the free exchange of press, radio and private communications for their citizens with all other countries in the world and as long as they impose a system of secret and closed societies—the free world is right in refusing to trust the words and the actions of those Communist governments and consequently in demanding that the existence of such governments and regimes be recognized as the true and main danger to world peace and progress.

5. That we urge our governments in all future negotiations with the Soviet powers and in the United Nations, to consider the right of self-determination for all the peoples under communism—as expressed in free elections under international supervision—to be the foremost demand and main prerequisite for any agreement concluded by the free world, the more so as this right of self-determination is a basic ingredient of all international understandings regarding Germany and Berlin and of all peace treaties concluded with Bulgaria and the other Eastern European nations after World War II.

6. And that we finally and solemnly declare before all our fellow citizens that we are truly and deeply convinced that the present and the future freedom and well-being of our continent and of all mankind will only be secured if we live up to, defend and actively propagate our heritage of freedom and human rights for all men everywhere.

So help us God.

School Aid Advocates May Aim Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of September 21, 1961, which, in my opinion, contains a powerful message. I respectfully commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

SCHOOL AID ADVOCATES MAY AIM TOO HIGH

If nothing else, the 87th Congress has proven again that of all controversial subjects before the lawmakers, Federal aid for school construction is perhaps the most controversial. In the last decade, Congress has broken the barrier on civil rights. It has succeeded once in increasing postal rates. It has, each year, voted a foreign aid program. But legislators have not been able to handle the school issue.

In 1961, the Kennedy administration suffered perhaps its most severe legislative defeat when the House rejected its school bill. Then Congress turned around and extended two of the "retread" programs—Federal aid to impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act. Both are important. Both were extended for 2 years which, in the viewpoint of some, precludes the passage of a general school bill next year. This prediction does not impress us. It was a doubtful strategy to lump the education measures in one general bill.

At any rate, general school aid has been ruled out again by the legislators. We have believed that a reasonable and temporary program, designed to wipe out the classroom shortage that followed depression and two wars, was desirable. Both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower presented construction programs.

There are, we suppose, many reasons for failure. Through the years, politics, not the problems of education, has consistently ruled the day when school issues were debated. Some people have a sincere objection to any Federal program. Frankly, we have no desire to spread the functions of Washington, either. And we think that any school aid bill should be definitely limited and very carefully written to rule out Federal control.

But the big reason for the school failure may be this: Consistenly, advocates of such a program have asked for too much. They have made sweeping statements, offered numerous statistics, some of them doubtful, and have shown an unwillingness to compromise. This year, the issue was clouded by religion. It was also, we suggest, clouded by the generalities of all-out school aid proponents and by their usually uncompromising position.

So perhaps the most ardent advocates of a construction program must, themselves, carry part of the responsibility for failure. In 1962, a more reasonable approach might provide the needed classrooms, not just more politics.

Alert in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago my wife and I had the privilege of viewing a most extraordinary motion picture, entitled "Alert in the Sky." I comment on this picture primarily because it reemphasizes once again the value of motion pictures in relating the story of America and individual Americans as human beings to the peoples of the world.

"Alert in the Sky" is not only fine entertainment and most moving in an emotional way, but it is not contrived. It has the ring of truth. It portrays the basic American instinct of real humanitarianism and a universal feeling toward mankind.

I do not know what the plans are for the picture's distribution. One can only hope that it will be seen by many Americans as well as by international audiences. Once again, it emphasizes that those who represent us in official missions dedicated to defend our freedom with all the strength and resources of our country still are capable of remembering and loving a small boy, an individual human being.

My colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, viewed this film, and I am sure he is in agreement with me, as are others who have seen it and expressed the feeling that this is a film of merit, making a real contribution to a better and truer image than many have of our great country.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Report of U.S. Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen on the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the 87th Congress convened on January 3, 1961. The Senate was composed of 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans—100 in all, or 2 from each of the 50 States as provided by the Constitution.

The House of Representatives with a total of 437 authorized Members consisted of 260 Democrats, 172 Republicans, 1 undetermined, with 4 vacancies.

SECTION 1. THE REPUBLICAN REPORT: ISSUES, FACTS, AND ACTIONS, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

ADMINISTRATION MAJORITY OF 28 IN SENATE

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON resigned his Senate seat to become Vice President, thereby becoming the Presiding Officer of the Senate and leaving a vacancy from Texas which was filled by the appointment of William A. Blakley. This vacancy from Texas was subsequently filled by a general election as a result of which JOHN TOWER, age 36, a Republican, and a professor at Midwestern University at Wichita Falls, Tex., was elected by a decisive vote. This changed the party ratio in the Senate to 64 Democrats and 36 Republicans. I emphasize the fact for the purpose of showing that the administration party had a majority of 28 votes in the Senate.

EFFECTS OF 1960 CENSUS

The population shifts shown by the 1960 census mean that 25 States must redistrict their congressional seats. In 9 of these States the House delegations will be increased, and in 16 States they will be reduced. It is quite likely that the 88th Congress, which will be elected in November of 1962, will show substantial changes in the makeup of the State delegations.

EFFECT OF CLOSE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The spirited preconvention contests for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, and the close election in November of 1960, stimulated a sharp interest in a modification of present laws dealing with national elections. Resolutions were quickly introduced for the nomination of candidates for the Presidency by direct primary, for the abolition of the electoral college, for the selection of presidential electors on the basis of congressional districts, together with other proposals. All of these, however, can be consummated only by a constitutional amendment, and thus a change from the present system is not imminent inasmuch as the Congress took no action on any of these proposals during the session just closed.

NEW PROPOSAL FOR INAUGURATION DAY

Still another suggestion dealing with the election process was to reduce the 10 weeks' time between election day and the day on which the President under the Constitution takes the oath of office. It has been suggested, therefore, that a new President might well take the oath immediately after election day and that the inaugural ceremonies be held in the spring when the weather is balmy and stable.

There is, however, a time factor in all this. A new President must have time to select a Cabinet and other high officials and also plan his program. In addition, newly appointed officials must have time to prepare for their new responsibilities. Moreover, such a proposal could only be carried out by a constitutional amendment, and that usually takes a considerable period of time.

EXECUTIVE RELATIONS

The Republican minority relationship with the President and the executive branch has been agreeable, objective, and firm. The President, having served with so many Members of the House and Senate in the legislative branch, brought an understanding background to the consideration of national problems, whether on the domestic level or in the international field. The Republican minority has always contended that it was entitled to be consulted on matters of national import, that it should have an opportunity to comment and criticize where important policies were involved and thereafter abide the result so far as policies in the foreign field were concerned.

With respect to domestic legislation the Republican minority has not hesitated to approve if approval was deemed in the national interest, to amend if amendments were necessary, and to oppose if such measures were not conducive to our national well-being and to the preservation of our free system. We regard this as enlightened opposition and the record on domestic measures speaks for itself.

There is set out in the following pages of this report a brief summary of the most important legislative measures which were enacted into law. It is necessary to highlight the essential provisions of these measures in order to afford complete understanding of their content.

A FILIBUSTER AT BOTH ENDS OF THE SESSION

The 1st session of the 87th Congress was unusual in at least one respect. It began with a filibuster and almost ended with a filibuster. The first order of business in the Senate when Congress convened was an endeavor to secure a change in a standing rule of the Senate numbered 22. This rule deals with the procedure of closing off debate and the bone of contention for a good many years has been the number of Senators required to vote on cloture in order to bring it into effect.

Several attempts have been made over the years to liberalize this rule. The effort to do so this year was promptly met with long speeches, live quorum calls to which all Senators must respond, and other procedures to prevent action on a modification of this rule. The debate continued day after day and, in fact, within a few days before the inauguration of the President. This presented a real dilemma.

Unless an accord was reached on the matter, or the rule change withdrawn, the Senate could not confirm the President's Cabinet selections and the country might have been confronted with the spectacle of a President duly inaugurated but without a Cabinet.

BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT REACHED

In the face of this predicament a bipartisan leadership conference was held at which all groups who had an interest in the matter agreed to defer further consideration of the proposed rule change until the end of the session, at which time the Rules Committee would be asked to report a modified rule for further consideration by the Senate.

BIPARTISAN PROMISE KEPT

In late August the Rules Committee did report such a rule change in the form of an amendment to the existing rule XXII but without recommendation by the committee. Thus the matter was again in the hands of the Senate for further consideration.

CLOTURE PETITION DEFEATED

An amendment to rule XXII was finally offered providing that cloture could be effected by a vote of three-fifths of the Members present and voting. Along with this rule modification there was filed a petition under existing rules to close debate on this motion, which was signed by 22 Senators. The cloture petition required a two-thirds vote. It was, in fact, defeated and that ended any endeavor during this session to bring about a modification of rule XXII.

SAMENESS OF LEGISLATIVE PATTERN

There is always a certain sameness to the legislative pattern year after year and Congress after Congress. In this respect the 1st session of the 87th Congress did not differ materially from its predecessors. Early in the session came the committee assignments to standing, select, and special committees and the usual requests for funds to carry on various investigations.

COST OF INVESTIGATIONS

Each year it seems that the investigations grow in number and in length. In the 84th Congress the Senate spent $7 million on investigations; in the 85th it was $8.2 million; in the 86th it was $10.8 million. At the close of the first session of this Congress $4.1 million had already been authorized for Senate investigations.

NATIONAL ISSUES

DEPRESSED AREAS

The depressed areas bill which had languished before the House and Senate for many years was finally enacted into law. Such a measure could have become law several years ago if the Democratic Congress had been willing to modify certain provisions which President Eisenhower had objected to as excessive and extravagant.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Strangely enough there were no administration proposals in the civil rights field other than the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and this is the only item in this field on which the Congress took action.

MINIMUM WAGES

Modifications of the Fair Labor Standards Act, commonly referred to as the minimum wage law, were enacted. Here again one might properly point out that there could have been modifications in the Minimum Wage Act several years ago if Presidential recommendations had been at least in substantial part met by the Congress.

AID TO EDUCATION

Congress voted to continue for 2 years the program of aid to federally impacted areas—where children of Federal workers and military personnel have required the building of additional school facilities—and the National Defense Education Act to encourage studies in science, foreign languages, and mathematics. Although lengthy consideration was given to an overall Federal Aid to Education Act, it fell by the wayside.

AGRICULTURE

Seldom is there a session when farm legislation does not command great attention. In this session two administration bills—one referred to as the emergency feed grains program and the other as the omnibus farm bill—were enacted into law. However, the latter was very substantially changed by Congress before it went to the President for signature.

MEDICAL AID FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

No further action was taken in this Congress on medical aid to the aged. Therefore, the law enacted in the 86th Congress and signed by President Eisenhower is still in effect and many States through legislative action are now giving effect to this program.

LABOR

Principal items in the labor field on which Congress took action this session included temporary unemployment aid, social security changes, aid to dependent children of jobless parents, and extension of the Mexican migratory farmworker program. A limited job retraining program was part of the depressed areas bill approved by Congress. A large-scale job retraining program, approved by the Senate, was pending in the House at adjournment time.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The acute Berlin crisis and the new Communist offensives in Asia raised anew the threat of conventional, as well as of missile, warfare. Congress gave all that the administration requested, and more in the way of military appropriations.

A new interest in civilian defense became manifest as a result of these crises. Some $300 million was authorized and appropriated to make a nationwide survey as to what might be done to develop more effective civilian defense measures, including both mass and individual shelters.

Space exploration was continued and at the request of the administration expanded to a billion-dollar-a-year program.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

The administration requested that a new agency be established to study ways and means of disarmament. Congress insisted on the use of the term "arms control" as well, on the grounds that it would more accurately describe the purpose of such an agency.

HOUSING

The most expensive omnibus housing bill in history was enacted into law in this session. Among other things FHA mortgage insurance was extended to a new so-called middle-income housing program under which practically no downpayments are required and the mortgage repayment period may be extended up to 35 years, and in so-called hardship cases up to 40 years. In addition, subsidized public housing was provided for the first time for middle-income families.

NEW JUDGESHIPS

Because of crowded dockets there has long been a pressing need for an increase in the number of Federal judges at the district and circuit level. President Eisenhower had pointed out this need for over 3 years, but it was not until this session that Congress agreed to meet this need by providing for 73 new judgeships.

PUBLIC DEBT

Toward the end of the session the administration chose to claim as one of its "major" accomplishments the raising of the ceiling on the public debt—from its permanent limit of $285 billion to a temporary limit of $298 billion, effective until next June 30.

While the administration preferred to regard this as a major achievement, Congress recognized that, as required by the Constitution, it was done only to cover the debt increase due to enormously expanded domestic, military, and foreign spending programs.

OTHER LEGISLATION

Other enactments of general interest included the Highway Financing Act to continue the present interstate highway construction timetable, the water pollution control program, and tax extension.

APPROPRIATIONS

In addition, there were the usual appropriation bills which are always a "must," consisting of appropriations for the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Interior, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, State, Justice, Commerce, Treasury, and Post Office, and the District of Columbia, the independent offices and agencies, legislative, military construction, foreign aid, judiciary, plus the various supplemental appropriations.

The control over the appropriation of money is one of the most important of the constitutional powers of Congress. It was here that an intensive struggle between the administration and Congress was waged this session. The administration put constant pressure on Congress to agree to direct borrowing from the Treasury—so-called back-door financing—for many of its most expensive programs; that is, housing, depressed areas, and the loan program for underdeveloped countries in the foreign aid bill. If agreed to, Congress would have relinquished its traditional control over appropriations insofar as such programs were concerned. Because of the vast costs of these programs, the weakening effect of the loss of congressional control over spending could have been incalculable. It is gratifying to observe that as finally passed the foreign aid bill eliminated back-door financing. Moreover, in the supplemental appropriations bill, Congress struck out other back-door financing of depressed areas, housing, mass transit, and open spaces programs, and thereby went a long way toward reestablishing a proper equilibrium in power as between the executive and legislature.

LIGHTER MOMENTS IN NEW FRONTIER LAND

With becoming modesty the New Frontiersmen mentioned only 33 major accomplishments during the first session—more than Roosevelt and Eisenhower combined. We would give credit where credit is due, and call attention to other imperishable moments of greatness:

First. The request—which the House, good sport that it was, went along with—that tickets to the "entertainments" connected with the inauguration of President-elect Kennedy be exempt from Federal admission taxes. No previous administration had requested such exemption, which cost the Federal Government an estimated $60,000 in tax revenues. This might be termed the first sacrifice a la New Frontier.

Second. The removal of some Eisenhower plaques from new post office buildings, so they could be replaced by Kennedy plaques. Sacrifice No. 2. However, the Senate balked and took no action.

Third. The order that all White House cooks, maids, valets and other household help must sign statements that they would not write or speak publicly about their association with the Kennedys. Many potential literary careers were nipped in the bud, and this was sacrifice No. 3.

Fourth. Interior Secretary Udall's request that gas and oil lobbyists sacrifice by buying tickets for a presidential birthday dinner.

Fifth. The cloud of Madison Avenue-type "explanations" thrown about De-

fense Secretary McNamar.. after he let slip the fact that, contrary to Mr. Kennedy's presidential campaign propaganda, no "missile gap" existed as between the United States and Russia.

Sixth. Mr. Kennedy's economic report to Congress, which provided the President with a self-serving alibi, that is, if economic conditions improve he can say, "Fine, we Democrats did it," and if things get worse he can say, "That's what Eisenhower handed me."

Seventh. An order, apparently issued by the public relations section of the New Frontier, to the effect that executive agencies should glorify even their routine actions by dramatic press releases crediting these developments to the chief scout of the New Frontier, President Kennedy.

INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

There are always many matters in the international field which receive a thoroughgoing discussion in the Senate even though they do not come before the Congress for specific action. This session they included the Berlin crisis, the Cuban debacle, the problems in Laos and the Congo, proposals to admit Communist China and Outer Mongolia into the United Nations, and others.

There are, however, a good many items in the international field which do require congressional action. These include the foreign aid authorization bill and the appropriation measures to go with it, funds for various agencies operating abroad such as the Export-Import Bank, the Inter-American Bank, and necessary funds for the participation of this country in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Central Treaty Organization, the United Nations, the Congo venture, and other activities.

PEACE CORPS

A new agency in the international field, known as the Peace Corps, established earlier by Executive order, was made permanent. It was designed to send Americans to countries in need of additional trained manpower.

NUCLEAR TESTS

One item in the executive domain which received a great deal of discussion was the matter of banning nuclear and atomic tests. This was under the direction of the President. After nearly 350 fruitless sessions at Geneva, Switzerland, the Soviet Union broke up the test ban conference and saluted its action by a series of bomb tests in the atmosphere.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The urge to amend the Constitution never dies. Every session of the Congress sees the introduction of proposals to amend that organic document. In spite of this it has been amended only 23 times in 164 years, including the 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights adopted in 1791 and the 3 which were the direct result of the Civil War.

These proposals come in great variety and deal with such matters as presidential primary, abolition of the electoral college, providing a vote for 18-year-olds, poll tax repeal, giving the President power to veto single items in appropriation bills without vetoing the entire measure, presidential disability, repeal of the presidential two-term amendment, providing a 4-year term for Members of the House, filling House vacancies in the event of disaster, exclusion of the Federal Government from school control, and a good many others.

There were a total of 39 resolutions introduced to amend the Constitution but only 2 received as much as Senate subcommittee approval; none was passed.

THE "MONEYMOON" IS NEVER OVER

We hear much of honeymoons between the President and the Congress, but there are also moneymoons—that is, the continuing exercise of the spending function by the Congress.

I can state it no better than was stated in an editorial in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, August 25, 1961, and at this point I shall set out the editorial in its entirety. It needs no elaboration and speaks for itself. From all this it must be quite evident that the "moneymoon" has not stopped:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 25, 1961]

SEVEN MONTHS OF SPENDING

When President Kennedy took office a bare 7 months ago the fiscal outlook for the Federal Government was for a slight surplus for the year ending last June 30 and an appreciable surplus of $1.5 billion for the current fiscal year, ending next June 30.

By the time last June rolled around that slight surplus had been converted into a deficit of $3.9 billion. And now Mr. Kennedy's Budget Director has toted up the figures for the present fiscal year and foresees a deficit of at least $5.3 billion.

Now, then, a little arithmetic will show you that if, instead of a $1.5 billion surplus you have a $5.3 billion deficit, the total change for the worse in the Government's accounts is $6.8 billion for this present fiscal year. And when you add on the $3.9 billion deficit created in the last 6 months of the last fiscal year, you come up with the staggering total of $10.7 billion by which this administration has changed things for the worse.

It would be an error to suppose that this dramatic change from comfortable surplus to staggering deficit has been caused by a sharp drop in the Government's revenues or that it can all be laid at the door of the Berlin crisis.

The administration has, it is true, shifted its revenue estimates around quite a bit. Originally, the President thought Mr. Eisenhower's estimate for 1961–62 revenues was too high and he cut it back. But now the present administration thinks the previous administration was about right, or if anything slightly low. The current revenue estimate for this year is $82.4 billion, some $100 million more than Mr. Eisenhower hoped for.

The real change has been in spending. Of last June's $3.9 billion deficit, $2.6 billion represented greater expenditures from the Eisenhower budget. And the whole of the $6.8 billion change in outlook for this fiscal year is accounted for by an increase in planned spending from $80.9 billion to more than $87.7 billion in the revised Kennedy budget.

Moreover, this spending increase has by no means been due entirely to new spending on arms. The military accounted for less than $800 million of that $2.6 billion increase in spending from January to June; most of it came from accelerated spending by the administration for its antirecession program. As for the 1961–62 budget, only $3.7 billion of the total $6.8 billion increase is to go for new military spending.

Out of this maze of figures, one thing emerges. A total of $10.7 billion has been added to the fiscal burden of the Government in its first 7 months, of which not more than $4.5 billion, by the administration's estimate, can be attributed to defense costs—less than a billion in the 1961 fiscal year, $3.7 billion in the current fiscal year.

The remaining $6.2 billion of the increase is made up of sums added for welfare spending, education, housing, public works, the Peace Corps, the general administration of the Government, and all the rest. That $6.2 billion, it might be noted, would have turned the Eisenhower surplus into a Kennedy deficit if the Nation had never heard of Berlin.

But since the Nation has, that $6.2 billion is $6.2 billion of added weight which the country must carry in addition to all its present and future burdens for military defense. For those military burdens will increase. Budget Director Bell warns that it may even be necessary to take additional action this year and that certainly next January's budget will carry higher defense costs.

As for what that total budget will be—welfare, pump priming, and all the rest—we have no idea. But clearly you can put aside the thought, so often expressed in Washington, that all this new spending is just due to the urgent needs of defense.

And we don't think you need expect anything trivial in next January's budget from an administration that can achieve a $10.7 billion change from black to red ink in a bare 7 months' work.

NEW PEACETIME SPENDING RECORD

The 1st session of the 87th Congress voted a grand total of $95.8 billion for President Kennedy to spend—more than any other President has received in peacetime. The previous peacetime record was $83.8 billion voted last year.

Some of the new money that Congress authorized this year will be spent in future years. But spending is certain to set a peacetime record during the fiscal year that started July 1. Official administration estimates place the figure for this year at $88 billion, an outlay exceeded only in 2 war years.

THE CUBAN DEBACLE

The failure of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba last April 1961 caused dismay and consternation and ever since has been the subject of repeated discussions in the hope that the whole factual story might at long last be set forth.

This is a matter of vital importance to the Nation in view of the fact that a Communist infection festers only 90 miles from our shores. One could ventilate this subject at great length from many sources, but I have seen no account which sets forth the whole history of the matter in more compact fashion that the article which appeared in Time magazine on September 1, 1961, which was excerpted from a more detailed article in the September issue of Fortune magazine.

Certainly, the Cuban debacle will continue to be discussed, and it is not inappropriate, therefore, that this summation be included in this report for ready reference for any discussion which may arise:

[From Time magazine, Sept. 1, 1961]

HOW THE CUBAN INVASION FAILED

Last April's U.S.-backed invasion of Cuba's Bay of Pigs will be long remembered and

angrily debated. In the September issue of Fortune, the magazine's Washington correspondent, Charles J. V. Murphy, tells in behind-the-scenes detail the incredible story of how that invasion failed.

The idea for the invasion had taken root during the early summer of 1960. By then, thousands of defectors from Castro's Cuba were in the United States. Many of them were soldiers. The job of organizing and training them was given to the Central Intelligence Agency. It became the specific responsibility of one of the CIA's top deputies, Richard M. Bissell, a former economist who is also a highly practical executive.

During the summer and fall of 1960, President Eisenhower from time to time personally reviewed the scheme. In late November, the last time it came up for his comprehensive review, an operational plan had not yet crystallized. It was taken for granted that a landing in force could not possibly be brought off unless the expedition was shepherded to the beach by the U.S. Navy (either openly or in disguise) and covered by air power in whatever amount might be necessary. Eisenhower, the commander of Normandy, understood this well enough.

After his election, Kennedy had been briefed fairly frequently on the Cuban situation. He discussed Cuba at length in both his preinaugural talks with Eisenhower. On taking office, Kennedy decided that he had to have from the Joint Chiefs of Staff a technical opinion of the feasibility of the project.

HOW IT WAS PLANNED

The plan still assumed that U.S. military help would be on call during the landing. Castro's air force consisted of not quite two-score planes—a dozen or so obsolete B–26's, plus about the same number of obsolete British Sea Furies. But in addition there were seven or eight T–33 jet trainers, the remnants of an earlier U.S. transaction with the Batista government, so the force was not the pushover it appeared at first glance. Armed with rockets, these jets would be more than a match in a battle for the exiles' B–26's.

It stood to reason that, considering how small the landing party was, the success of the operation would hinge on the B–26's controlling the air over the beachhead. And the margins that the planners accepted were narrow to begin with. The B–26's were to operate from a staging base in a Central American country more than 500 miles from Cuba. The round trip would take better than 6 hours, and that would leave the planes with fuel for only 45 minutes of action over Cuba. In contrast, Castro's air force could be over the beachhead and the invaders' ships in a matter of minutes. Hence the absolute necessity of knocking out Castro's airpower, or at least reducing it to impotence, by the time the ground battle was joined.

This, in general terms, was the plan the Chiefs reviewed for Kennedy. They judged the tactical elements sound, and indeed they accorded the operation a high probability of success. But some of Kennedy's closest advisers were assailed by sinking second thoughts. What bothered them was the "immorality" of masked aggression. They recoiled from having the United States employ subterfuge in striking down even as dangerous an adversary as Castro, and they were unanimously opposed to having the United States do the job in the open.

THE CHANGES

The "immorality" of the intervention found its most eloquent voice before the President during a meeting in the State Department on April 4, only 13 days before the date set for the invasion. The occasion was Bissell's final review of the operation, and practically everybody connected with high strategy was on hand—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Lemnitzer, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, as well as McGeorge Bundy, Paul Nitze, then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas Mann, and three Kennedy specialists in Latin American matters—Adolf Berle, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin. There was also one outsider, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose support Kennedy wanted. After Bissell had completed his briefing and Dulles had summed up risks and prospects, Fulbright denounced the proposition out of hand: It was the wrong thing for the United States to get involved in.

Rusk said he was for it, in answer to the President's direct question, but, as would presently be manifest, he privately had no heart for it. Two other men among the President's senior foreign policy advisers, not present at the meeting, shared FULBRIGHT'S feelings: Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles and Adlai Stevenson. In deference to these views, Kennedy made two separate rulings which were to contribute to the fatal dismemberment of the whole plan. First, U.S. airpower would not be on call at any time. Second, the B–26's flown by "our" Cubans could be used in only two strikes before the invasion—first on D-minus-2-days and again on the morning of the landing.

Dawn of April 15, by the timetable, the B–26's, having flown undetected through the night from their Central American staging base, appeared over Cuba and bombed the three fields on which Castro's ready air was deployed. The attack was, on the whole, highly successful. Half of Castro's B–26's and Sea Furries and four of his T–33 jets were blown up or damaged.

REQUEST FOR "BOXER"

Sunday evening, only some 8 hours after Kennedy had given the final go-ahead, the expedition in the first dark was creeping toward the Cuban shore. In Bissell's office, there was a call on the White House line. It was Bundy, being even crisper than usual: The B–26's were to stand down, there was to be no air strike in the morning, this was a Presidential order. Rusk was now acting for the President in the situation. Bissell was stunned. He and CIA Deputy Director General Charles Cabell, an experienced airman, went together to the State Department to urge Rusk to reconsider. Cabell was greatly worried about the vulnerability to air attack of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. The ships, he suggested, could unload and retire to the open sea before daylight; as for the troops ashore being unduly inconvenienced by Castro's air, it had been his experience as a colonel in the Burma Theater that air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear: military considerations had overruled the political when the D-minus-2 strike had been laid on; now political considerations were taking over.

Past midnight Bissell and Cabell restudied the battle plan while signals of consternation welled up from their men far to the south. At 4 o'clock, less than an hour before first light on the Cuban shore, Cabell went back to Rusk with another proposal. It was manifestly impossible for the Cuban Brigade's small force of B–26's (only 16 were operational) to provide effective air cover for the ships from their distant base. Cabell now asked whether, if the ships were to pull back to international water, the U.S.S. *Boxer*, a carrier on station about 50 miles from the Bay of Pigs, could be instructed to provide cover. Rusk said "No." The President was awakened. Cabell registered his concern. The answer still was "No."

THE END

The invasion force had little chance. They were without the ranging firepower which the B–26's with their bombs and machineguns had been expected to apply against Castro's tanks and artillery. Castro's forces came up fast. He still had four jets left, and they were armed with powerful rockets. He used them well. Before the morning was done he had sunk two transports and driven off two others.

Now Kennedy and his strategists became alarmed. About noon on Monday, Bissell was told that the B–26's could attack Castro's airfields at will. But the orders came too late. Most of the pilots had been in the air for upward of 18 hours in an unavailing effort to keep Castro's planes off the troops and the remaining ship. That night a small force was scratched together. It was over Cuba at dawn, only to find the fields hidden by low, impenetrable fog.

Tuesday was the turning point. The men ashore had fought bravely and gained their planned objectives. They had even seized and bulldozed the airfield. But they were desperately short of ammunition and food, and under the pressure of Castro's superior firepower and number they were being forced back acoss the beach. There remained one last chance to make the thing go. *Bozer* was still on station. The release of a few of its jets simply for air cover should see two landing craft with ammunition and rations safely to the shore.

At a White House meeting that night, Bissell made it plain that unless U.S. airpower was brought forward, the men on the beach were doomed. He asked that *Boxer's* planes be brought into the battle. Rusk still would not have this. Several others were also opposed, including the President's personal staffers. Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke vouched for the worth of Bissell's proposition. The outcome of the meeting was a singular compromise. Jets from *Boxer* would provide cover next morning for exactly 1 hour, long enough for the ships to run into the shore and start unloading and for the remaining B–26's to get in a hard blow.

Next morning, through an incredible mischance, the B–26's were over Cuba half an hour ahead of schedule. *Boxer's* jets were still on the flight deck. But Castro's jets were ready. Two of the B–26's were shot down; others were hit and forced to abort. That was the melancholy end.

VITAL STATISTICS

I presume it can be properly said that there are certain vital statistics about every session which, while quite undramatic, nevertheless set forth in some detail the days when House and Senate were in session, the size of the RECORD which was compiled, the number of bills introduced and enacted, and items of a similar nature. It would be proper, therefore, to include at this point in this report a résumé of congressional activity for the entire session.

RÉSUMÉ OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY, 1ST SESSION OF 87TH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business trans-

acted by the House and Senate. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

Data on legislative activity, Jan. 3 through Sept. 26, 1961

	Senate	House	Total
Days in session	146	147	
Time in session:			
Hours	1,005	569	
Minutes	00	43	
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	12,755	7,489	20,244
Appendix			7,578
Public bills enacted into law	[1] 121	[1] 206	327
Private bills enacted into law	[1] 88	[1] 176	264
Bills in conference		7	
Bills through conference	14	41	
Measures passed, total	1,133	1,232	
Senate bills	459	245	
House bills	433	678	
Senate joint resolutions	25	11	
House joint resolutions	27	31	
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	19	
House concurrent resolutions	23	25	
Simple resolutions	143	223	366
Measures reported, total	[2] 1,239	[2] 1,159	
Senate bills	501	179	
House bills	433	772	
Senate joint resolutions	27	6	
House joint resolutions	26	24	
Senate concurrent resolutions	29	11	
House concurrent resolutions	23	19	
Simple resolutions	200	148	348
Special reports	35	54	
Conference reports		62	
Reported measures not acted on	[3] 36	[3] 60	
Measures introduced, total	3,071	10,955	14,026
Bills	2,644	9,480	12,124
Joint resolutions	145	593	738
Concurrent resolutions	55	401	456
Simple resolutions	227	481	708
Quorum calls	33	115	148
Yea-and-nay votes	207	116	323
Bills vetoed	[1] 1	[1] 5	
Vetoes overridden			

[1] Figures on laws and vetoes are complete through Sept. 26.

[2] These figures on measures reported included all placed on calendar or acted on by Senate even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 1,115 reports has been filed in the Senate; a total of 1,275 has been filed in the House.

[3] This figure does not agree with the total difference between bills reported and bills passed, because resolutions and bills placed on the House Calendar without having been formally reported were not included in figures of measures reported to the House: the difference in the case of Senate figures is due to uncounted bills "laid on the table" or indefinitely postponed."

Disposition of executive nominations, Jan. 3 through Sept. 26, 1961

Postmaster nominations, totaling 2,097, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	704
Withdrawn	1,243
Unconfirmed	150
Army nominations, totaling 10,563, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	10,540
Unconfirmed	23
Air Force nominations, totaling 12,637, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	12,635
Unconfirmed	2
Navy nominations, totaling 18,362 disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	18,361
Unconfirmed	1
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 3,541, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,262
Unconfirmed	279
Civilian nominations other than postmaster, totaling 3,570, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,460
Withdrawn	28
Unconfirmed	82

Disposition of executive nominations, Jan. 3 through Sept. 26, 1961—Continued

SUMMARY

Total nominations received	50,770
Total withdrawn	1,271
Total unconfirmed	537
Total confirmed	48,962

APPROPRIATIONS

When each session of the Congress closes it is customary to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a verified table of budget estimates and appropriations for the entire session, together with requests for and congressional actions on loan authorizations contained in appropriation bills, so that a complete fiscal picture of what was contrived during the session might be available. To make this report reasonably complete, therefore, there follows a résumé of actions in the appropriations field. This has been compiled by the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This is a highly competent staff and there is every reason to believe that the figures are accurate and correct in every detail.

Fiscal year 1962

[In millions]

	Original January 1961 submission	Revised as of Mar. 28, 1961	Revised as of May 25, 1961	Revised as of July 26, 1961	
EXPENDITURES ESTIMATED					
Major national security	$47,392	$48,172	$48,322	$50,922	
Other	33,473	36,087	36,661	36,801	
Total	80,865	84,259	84,983	87,723	
SURPLUS OR DEFICIT					
Receipts	82,333	[1] 81,433	[1] 81,433	[1] 81,433	[2] 82,433
Expenditures	80,865	84,259	84,983	87,723	87,723
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+1,468	−2,826	−3,550	−6,290	−5,290
NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY					
Major national security	46,278	48,062	48,584	51,831	
Other	34,589	37,964	41,005	41,212	
Total	80,867	[3] 86,026	[3] 89,589	[3] 93,043	

[1] Estimates prepared in March 1961.

[2] President estimated an additional $1,000,000,000 in revenue a few days after July 26, thus making the deficit $5,290,000,000.

[3] Includes $1,982 transferred from 1961 to 1962 by action on 3d supplemental appropriations bill.

NOTE.—No figures from trust fund accounts are included in above tables.

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed		Final action, amount as approved	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared to budget estimates
			House	Senate		
	1961 SUPPLEMENTALS					
H.R. 5188	3d supplemental	$5,275,213,127	$8 3,506,119	$4,637,419,970	$1,694,055,637	[1] −$3,581,157,490
H.R. 6518	Inter-American program	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000	
H.R. 7712	4th supplemental	88,024,000	47,214,000	47,214,000	47,214,000	−40,810,000
	Total, 1961 supplementals	5,963,237,127	1,450,720,119	5,284,633,970	2,341,269,637	−3,621,967,490
	1962 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.R. 5954	Treasury-Post Office	5,371,801,000	5,281,965,000	5,327,631,000	5,298,765,000	−73,036,000
H.R. 6345	Interior [2]	782,387,000	753,319,000	813,390,850	779,158,650	−3,228,350
H.R. 7035	Labor–HEW	5,004,281,081	4,327,457,000	5,161,380,000	4,915,965,000	−88,316,081
H.R. 7208	Legislative	136,082,802	104,353,335	135,432,065	135,432,065	−650,737
H.R. 7371	State, Justice, judiciary	795,891,202	751,000,050	762,038,550	756,422,550	−39,468,652
H.R. 7444	Agriculture	6,089,244,000	5,948,466,000	5,967,457,500	5,967,494,500	−121,749,500
	Loan authorizations	(612,000,000)	(629,900,000)	(725,500,000)	(725,500,000)	(+113,500,000)
H.R. 7445	Independent offices	9,174,561,000	8,404,098,000	9,098,769,500	8,966,285,000	−208,276,000
H.R. 7577	General Government-Commerce	666,278,000	629,958,000	650,438,200	641,135,800	−25,142,200
H.R. 7851	Defense	46,396,945,000	42,711,105,000	46,848,292,000	46,662,556,000	+265,611,000
H.R. 8072	District of Columbia	(292,827,398)	(268,122,400)	(270,438,360)	(270,067,897)	(−22,759,501)
	Loan authorizations	(24,600,000)	(29,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(29,000,000)	(+4,400,000)
	Federal payment	39,753,000	32,753,000	32,753,000	32,753,000	−7,000,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed		Final action, amount as approved	Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared to budget estimates
			House	Senate		
H.R. 8302	Military construction	$1,047,568,000	$983,369,000	$1,020,146,750	$951,690,750	−$95,877,250
H.R. 9033	Foreign assistance	4,993,991,000	3,835,245,000	4,416,091,000	4,123,345,000	−870,646,000
H.R. 9076	Public works	4,000,788,000	3,662,701,380	3,940,926,880	3,908,880,980	−91,907,020
H.R. 9169	Supplemental	1,134,639,841	573,040,923	1,068,503,903	1,125,333,341	−9,306,500
	Total, 1962 appropriations	85,634,210,926	77,896,020,688	85,243,260,198	84,265,217,636	−1,368,993,290
	Total, all appropriations	91,597,448,053	79,346,740,807	90,527,894,168	86,606,487,273	−4,990,960,780
	Total, loan authorizations	636,600,000	658,900,000	754,500,000	754,500,000	+117,900,000

[1] Major reductions include two items submitted directly to Senate (S. Doc. 19) (1) $2,969,525,000 to restore funds of Commodity Credit Corporation. Entire estimate: disallowed in conference: $1,951,915,000 resubmitted for 1962 in budget estimates for Agriculture (H. Doc. 155); (2) $490,000,000 for "Payment to the Federal extended compensation account." Reduction made by Senate. Resubmitted to Senate for 1962 in Labor-HEW bill (S. Doc. 30).

[2] Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, $15,000,000; House reported and passed, $10,000,000; Senate reported and passed, $10,000,000.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

EPILOG

The session is over. The appraisal now begins.

Generally, possession appraisals are on the quantitative side. How much has been done? How many bills have been introduced? How many laws have been enacted? What percentage of the administration's program has been approved? Truly this is important, but not nearly so important as the question of what kind of measures have been enacted and how they affect the national direction.

A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

First. From the qualitative standpoint, let it be said that when claims are made about the enactment of a Wage-Hour Act this could have been done more than a year ago under the Eisenhower administration at $1.15 per hour. But the Democrats at that time insisted on $1.25 and the inclusion of much intrastate business within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government by using the dollar sign and sales volume as the criterion of what constituted matters affecting interstate commerce.

This year, however, the Kennedy administration itself proposed $1.15 an hour with increases in the future and made substantial concessions on the invasion of intrastate commerce, but the precedent was set: The new law now extends Federal jurisdiction over enterprises which are and should be within the jurisdiction of the States.

Second. There could have been a distressed areas and area redevelopment program long before the new administration came into power but its leaders insisted upon criteria which were objectionable to the Eisenhower administration.

Third. In the farm field this year Congress successfully resisted administration efforts to persuade it to give up primary responsibility for the development and enactment of new farm programs. What the administration sought to do was reverse the traditional roles of the legislative and executive branches by, in effect, delegating to the Agriculture Department the power to proclaim new farm laws, leaving Congress with no alternative but to accept or reject such programs without modification. Congress, in its infinite wisdom, declined the honor.

Fourth. As the States continue to provide legislation and formulate their plans for health care for the aged under the medicare program enacted in the Eisenhower administration, certainly this administration could properly have done much to encourage that program rather than insist on supplanting it with an entirely new program calling for additional social security taxes. Any claim by the present administration to great achievement in the field of health care for the aged would be hollow indeed.

Fifth. Doubtless, full credit will be taken for the enactment of a foreign assistance program, but it should be remembered that enactment occurred only after the program was considerably modified and the back-door financing eliminated by the Congress. Curiously, the administration then did an about-face on its foreign aid financing proposal and announced the new program was wholly acceptable.

Sixth. Congress also prevailed against the demands of the administration by (1) approving extension of aid to federally impacted school areas and extension of the National Defense Education Act without enacting an omnibus Federal aid to education bill, and (2) rejecting proposals to generate and sell public power at the proposed atomic energy plant at Hanford, Wash.

These, then, were the major areas in which the administration was forced to bow to the will of Congress.

These were not instances where Congress sought to show its mastery of the administration solely for the satisfaction of victory. The stakes were much higher.

The will of Congress prevailed in these cases because any other course would have been detrimental to the interests of our citizens and this Nation's leadership in world affairs.

If, therefore, the New Frontier emphasizes quantity, we might well look at the quality and consider how the New Frontier proposals were radically modified by the Congress under the spur of Republican determination that extremism in new enactments must be avoided.

More important still is the question of our national direction.

We adjourned in the month of September when we observe the anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States.

Since its birth, the Republican Party has always shared the constitutional concept and devotion to the purpose and meaning of that document in order to give fixed direction to the National Government. It includes the dedication of Republicans to the concept of a central government with divided powers, a State-Federal system with proper regard for the rights of the States, the guarantees of freedom, limitations upon the authority and jurisdiction of the National Government, and a wholesome repect for the principle that the legitimate object of government is to do for people what needs to be done and which they cannot do at all or effectively in their separate and individual capacities.

It embraces also the basic principle of our whole free competitive market system, which permits economic decisions to be made in the marketplace with a minimum of governmental intrusion. It includes also the fundamental idea of growth through incentive and opportunity.

POLICIES OF NEW FRONTIER

All this, however, does not seem to be the dogma of the New Frontier. Its platform and policies clearly disclose that it follows a purported line of growth through spending, through the enhancement of Executive power, through more and more regulation, through deeper intrusion into the affairs of the States, through use of Federal funds to handcuff the States and local communities, and through the achievement of a kind of collectivism by small doses.

ASSESSING FLOUNDERING OF ADMINISTRATION

It is strange, indeed, as one assesses the floundering of the administration that it should claim kinship with Jefferson, who was so jealous of centralized government. It is a kind of outlandish heresy for the New Frontier to style itself as the "party of hope" when the smothering of freedom can only be the ultimate result of its program.

The New Frontier is still floundering. It seeks firmly to face up to the Communist menace abroad by toying with the collectivist view at home, but the choice will have to be made. We cannot have it both ways.

In this month of our constitutional anniversary—or in any month—we might well remember what Benjamin Franklin, wise counselor that he was, said to the wife of former Mayor Powell of Philadelphia in the afternoon of September 17, 1787, when she inquired, "Dr.

Franklin, what have we got, a monarchy or a republic?"

Quickly came Franklin's reply, "A republic if you can keep it."

Our Republic will be kept only as we reenergize our devotion to the meaning and purpose of the Constitution of the United States, for therein lies firm direction for the Nation both at home and in our relations abroad.

SECTION II. THE REPUBLICAN REPORT—SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION AND TREATIES, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

AGRICULTURE

Special feed grain program

(Public Law 87–5. Approved March 24, 1961)

The special program for feed grains (H.R. 4510) amended section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, by adding a new subsection which provided:

(1) The level of price support for the 1961 crop of corn shall be established by the Secretary at such level not less than 65 percent of the parity price as the Secretary may determine and be made available on crops not to exceed the normal production of the 1961 acreage based on its average yield per acre for the 1959 and 1960 crop acreage.

(2) Eligibility for price support on the 1961 crop of corn, grain sorghums, and any other feed grain, will require that the producer shall participate in the special agricultural conservation program for 1961 for corn and grain sorghums to the extent prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 2

(1) Producers who divert acreage from the production of corn and grain sorghums and increase their average acreage devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil conserving crops or practices by an equal amount will be paid. Any producer may elect in lieu of such payment to devote such diverted acreage to castor beans, safflower, sunflower, or sesame, but must take measures to keep such diverted acreage free of insects, weeds, and rodents. The acreage eligible for payments in cash or its equivalent in kind must equal 20 percent of the average acreage planted to corn and grain sorghums in the crop years 1959 and 1960 or up to 20 acres, whichever is greater, with payments in cash on in kind at the basic county support rate not in excess of 50 percent of the normal production of the acreage diverted from corn or grain sorghums. Payments in kind only may be made by the Secretary for the diversion of up to an additional 20 percent of such crops at the basic county support rate not in excess of 60 percent of the normal production of the acreage diverted and based on the 1959 and 1960 crop acreage. Adjustments in acreage and yields for the 1959 and 1960 crop years may be made as are necessary to correct abnormal factors and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The Secretary may not exceed 50 percent of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance.

(2) Appropriations were authorized in such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the program, and obligations may be incurred in advance of appropriations. The Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to advance from its capital funds such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses in connection with the program during fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and to pay such costs as may be included in carrying out section 3 of the act.

(3) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

Section 3

Payments in kind are to be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the CCC will redeem for feed grains, and the Secretary will assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates at such time and in such manner as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes of the 1961 feed grain program. In the case of any certificate not presented for redemption within 30 days after its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges for the period beginning 30 days after its issuance and ending with the date of its presentation for redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate.

Section 4

Not later than 90 days after the effective date of this act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a detailed report, including estimates where final figures are not available, setting forth, but not limited to the number and percent of cooperators under this act, the acreage retired from production by States, the cash payments made, the quantity and kind of feed grains made available under the payment-in-kind provisions and the value thereof, the overall cost of the program, the estimated savings compared with the program in effect before this act became effective, and other such information as will indicate the progress, cost, and reduction of surpluses under this act.

Farm-operating loan program adjustment

(Public Law 87–8. Approved March 29, 1961)

Under this law (H.R. 1822), which adjusted the amount of funds available for farm-operating loans made pursuant to section 21(b) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the Farm Home Administration was authorized to use up to 25 percent of the funds annually appropriated for operating loans to make loans to farmers whose credit needs exceed $10,000. Previously, only 10 perecnt of the funds could be used for this purpose. A limit of $20,000 was placed on the amount of this type of credit for which a borrower could be indebted at any one time. Repayment was to be made in accordance with the borrower's ability to repay, over periods up to 7 years, and at an interest rate of 5 percent.

Increase in funds for sale of surplus farm commodities

(Public Law 87–28. Approved May 4, 1961)

This law (S. 1027) amended title I of Public Law 480 by increasing from the present $1.5 billion to $2 billion for calendar year 1961 authorization to finance the sale of surplus farm commodities to certain countries against "soft currencies" which cannot be converted into dollars.

Temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments

(Public Law 87–33. Approved May 16, 1961)

This law (S. 1372) amended section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 by authorizing pooled acreage allotments to be transferred by the owner within a particular country where they are put in a pool and the land is taken by virtue of eminent domain instead of being available for use of the original owner only. This authorization was for a period not to exceed 3 years.

Agricultural Adjustment Act amendment relative to flooded cotton acreage

(Public Law 87–37. Approved May 20, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7030) amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act to permit farmers whose cotton acreage has been flooded to transfer their acreage allotment to another farm within the county or adjoining county where they can plant on higher ground without increasing the allotted acreage. The law applied to 1961 only.

Special milk fund extension and increase

(Public Law 87–67. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (S. 146) extended and increased the special milk program for children through June 30, 1962, and authorized the expenditure of up to $105 million in Commodity Credit Corporation funds for this purpose during that fiscal year.

Surplus foods to assist underdeveloped areas

(Public Law 87–92. Approved July 20, 1961)

This law (S. 1720) amended Public Law 480, as amended, to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy people and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world. It repealed section 601(a)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960. This law will terminate December 30, 1961, with the termination of title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Amendment of section 107(a)(3) of Soil Bank Act to provide additional relief for disaster areas

(Public Law 87–127. Approved August 7, 1961)

Emergency Feed for Livestock

This law (S. 2197) amended that section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, making feed owned or controlled by the act available at any price not less than 75 percent of the current support price for such feed (or comparable price if there is no current price support) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle (including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance. Such feed is to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock.

The law was made effective only until June 30, 1962.

Agricultural Act of 1961

(Public Law 87–128. Approved August 8, 1961)

This law (S. 1643) included the following provisions:

The 1962 Wheat Program

1. Limited foreign relief use of 1962 marketing excess wheat to friendly countries.

2. Excluded new wheat allotment farms from the 1962 wheat diversion program.

3. Provided for control of all insects on diverted wheat acreage.

4. Provided that acreage diverted from wheat may be planted to castor beans, guar, sunflower, safflower, or sesame, but no diversion payment would be made therefor.

5. Provided that the total acreage of cropland on the farm devoted to soil conservation uses, including idle land shall be increased in 1962 by the acreage diverted. The Secretary of Agriculture could, under his authority, include additional terms and conditions, prohibit noncropland from being put into crops.

6. Provided for payment rates of 45 percent for the first 10-percent reduction and 60 percent for any further reduction.

7. Required the Secretary, in fixing wheat diversion payments, to use actual 1959 and 1960 farm yields where they are proved; and made discretionary the use of adjusted county yields and farm productivity where actual yields are not proved.

8. Permitted any farmer to divert up to a total of 10 acres so long as the total wheat

acreage diversion does not exceed the larger of (1) its highest wheat acreage of 1959, 1960, or 1961, or (2) its 1962 allotment.

9. Limited the provision for increasing Durum wheat acreage allotments to 1962, 1963, and 1964; and provided that the demand for Durum wheat for export at subsidized prices not be considered in determining the need for and amount of any increase.

Feed Grain Program

1. Provided an additional limitation on the malting barley exemption from the feed grain diversion program, limiting it to malting barley producers who do not exceed 110 percent of their average 1959–60 barley acreage.

2. Provided that the average acreage of cropland on the farm devoted to soil-conserving uses, including idle land, shall be increased in 1962 by the acreage diverted. The Secretary could, under his authority, include additional terms and conditions, prohibit noncropland from being put into crops.

3. Provided for use of actual 1959–60 farm acreages and yields when proved and provided for adjustment of farm yields for the same factors as used for adjusting acreage, and included soil and water conservation measures among the factors for which adjustments may be made.

Marketing Orders

1. Added the following commodities to those for which marketing orders may be issued:

(a) Apples produced in Maryland, New Jersey, Indiana, California, Michigan, New York, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

(b) Apples for canning or freezing produced in all of the States named above and products of apples produced in those States, except canned or frozen products. Orders applicable to apples for canning or freezing would be subject to the same processor approval required for cherries or cranberries for canning or freezing.

(c) Peanuts, but no peanut products.

(d) Retained marketing authority for tobacco.

The law repealed the marketing order authority for soybeans and extended the marketing order authority to the following commodities (but not their products); cherries and cranberries for canning or freezing, turkeys, turkey hatching eggs, and all other agricultural commodities not specifically covered or excepted.

Commodities specifically excepted are honey, cotton, rice, wheat, corn, grain, sorghums, oats, barley, rye, sugarcane, sugarbeets, wool, mohair, livestock, soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, poultry (other than turkeys), eggs (other than turkey hatching eggs), fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing (other than those specifically covered), and apples (other than those specifically covered).

Section 8(e) of the law was amended relating to marketing orders to prohibit the importation of oranges, onions, walnuts, and dates (other than dates for processing) which do not meet the grade, size, quality, or maturity requirements of orders applicable to the domestic commodities.

Wool Act Extension

Extended the Wool Act for 4 years.

Public Law 480

1. Authorized the use of foreign currencies for dollar sales to American tourists.

2. Required 5 percent of the proceeds of title I sales in each year to be set aside in amounts and kinds of foreign currencies specified by the Secretary of Agriculture for agricultural market development and required such amount of sale and loan proceeds as the Secretary determines necessary, but not less than 2 percent, to be convertible into currencies of other foreign nations which are or may become dollar markets.

Agricultural Credit

1. Provided for a $60,000 indebtedness limit on Farmers Home Administration farm real estate loans.

2. Limited indebtedness of associations for soil and water conservation loans to $500,000 in the case of direct loans and $1 million in the case of insured loans.

3. Provided for a $35,000 indebtedness limit on operating loans.

4. Authorized loans to soil conservation districts for purchase of conservation equipment.

5. Made clear that claims referred to the Attorney General may be compromised.

6. Prohibited exercise of the Farmers Home Administration authority to borrow from the Treasury unless authorized "in appropriation acts."

General Provisions

1. Authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program with no limitations on amount, and to be paid for by direct appropriations.

2. Extended the Veterans' Administration and Armed Forces milk program 3 years, to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds.

Congress flatly rejected the Kennedy administration's revolutionary farm legislative proposals. Practically all of the administration's plan suffered defeat. These proposals, which would have stripped the elective representatives in Congress of considerable right to determine directly the needs of the agricultural industry, were as follows:

A proposal which would have permitted farmer advisory committees to dray up their own commodity support programs for submission to Congress if approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Congress could then have vetoed them or let them take effect in 60 days, without amendment. This would have stripped the Congress of its constitutional right to legislate.

An administration request for national marketing agreements and orders and the authority to set up production allotments under marketing orders if approved by producers.

Secretary Freeman expressed two views after passage of this act. Once he admitted the administration's failure when he remarked after the signing of the bill that he was "disappointed" that it did not include key administration requests to "enable farmers to adjust their production and marketing more effectively on a long-term basis." Later, he did a complete turnabout and tried to give the administration credit by claiming the act "as the most constructive and promising farm legislation in many years."

In fact, the administration's original farm plan was completely "gutted."

Amendment to farm credit laws

(Public Law 87–343. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (S. 1927) amended the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to improve the lending service and other operations of the cooperative system of associations and banks which are regulated by the Farm Credit Administration. The amendments, largely of a technical nature, concerned the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit association, and the banks for cooperatives.

Extension of Mexican farm labor program

(Public Law 87–345. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (H.R. 2010) extended for 2 years the program under which American farmers were permitted to hire Mexican nationals as temporary, seasonal workers when domestic help was not available. This law amended title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by further refining the regulations governing the Mexican farm labor program.

This legislation was the subject of extensive debate on the floor of the Senate, particularly with respect to the administration position that greater protection should be afforded migratory American farmworkers by the establishment of a minimum wage in this field. This position was not sustained by the Congress.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Amendments to Atomic Energy Act and Euratom Cooperation Act

(Public Law 87–206. Approved September 6, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8599) amended existing atomic energy legislation including the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958.

These amendments were either technical or updated the act. Included were amendments involving procedures with respect to inventions, patents and patent rights, access to and exchange of restricted data, annual congressional hearings, damages arising out of programs, and claims settlement.

Authorizing funds for the Atomic Energy Commission

(Public Law 87–315. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7576) authorized appropriations of $270,440,000 to the Atomic Energy Commission to provide for, among other things, construction of production and weapon facilities, research and development facilities, and power generation assistance projects. The law extended the date for approving proposals under the cooperative power reactor demonstration program for 1 year to June 30, 1962. As finally enacted, a controversial provision for production of electric energy at the Hanford, Wash., reactor was omitted.

The proposed conversion of the Hanford reactor to steam generating facilities, which had the unqualified support of the administration, would have added an additional $95 million to the authorization. Its inclusion would have been a first step in the creation of a gigantic nationalized power grid and would have placed the Atomic Energy Commission in direct competition with the public utilities. The provision passed the Senate and Senate conferees held out at length for its acceptance by the House. Members of the House, however, including many Representatives of the Pacific Northwest, were not persuaded to favor this uneconomical, low-efficiency project.

Those who advocated the Hanford project, including the administration, finally had to give up in defeat.

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

District of Columbia election law

(Public Law 87–389. Approved October 4, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8444) amended Public Law 376 of the 84th Congress and implemented the 23d amendment to the Constitution, which provided the vote for residents of the District of Columbia in electing the President and Vice President of the United States. It established the minimum voting

age at 21 and the minimum residency at 1 year.

CIVIL SERVICE

Making permanent certain increases in civil service annuities

(Public Law 87–114. Approved July 31, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5432) made permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219; Public Law 85–465).

Increasing Federal employees per diem rates for official traveling

(Public Law 87–139. Approved August 14, 1961)

This law (H.R. 3279) increased the maximum rates of per diem allowances for employees of the Federal Government traveling on official business from $12 to $16.

Other principal increases included:

1. Maximum allowance for official travel authorized on an actual expense basis from $25 to $30 per day.

2. Maximum allowance for use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes from 10 cents to 12 cents per mile.

3. Maximum allowance for use of privately owned motorcycles from 6 cents to 8 cents per mile.

4. Allowance of reimbursement on actual expense basis up to $10 in excess of normal per diem allowance established in a given country for employees traveling outside the continental United States or Alaska when authorized due to unusual circumstances.

5. Raising the authorized maximum per diem of certain State Department advisory committees to the same rate applicable to other Federal employees.

6. Addition of parking fees when incurred in official status as an item of expense for reimbursement.

7. Transferral of the President's authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget to establish per diem rates outside the continental United States.

8. Preservation of the status of Alaska and Hawaii that existed prior to their obtaining statehood in areas in which travel allowance would be fixed on the basis of cost.

Defense of suits against Federal employees

(Public Law 87–258. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 2883) amended title 28 ("Judiciary and Judicial Procedure"), United States Code, to provide a method for assumption by the Federal Government of responsibility for claims for damages against its employees arising from the operation by them of vehicles in the scope of their employment.

Salary protection for classified and postal field service employees

(Public Law 87–270. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7043) would extend to employees in the postal field service the same salary retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as was provided employees under the Classification Act of 1949 since 1956; would validate certain statutory salary increases made pursuant to Civil Service Commission regulations but ruled not proper by the General Accounting Office; and would make ineligible for salary retention protection certain employees whose reduction in grade resulted from a temporary promotion to a higher grade.

Forfeiture of Federal benefits in cases of offenses involving the national security

(Public Law 87–299. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6141) amended the act of September 1, 1954 (so-called Hiss Act), to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition against payment of annuities and retired pay. The Hiss Act had prohibited, also, payment of civilian annuities or military retired pay in cases of conviction of any of a long list of other criminal offenses.

EDUCATION

Federally impacted schools and NDEA extension

(Public Law 87–344. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (S. 2393) extended the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 (relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in federally impacted areas) for 2 years to June 30, 1963, and the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (otherwise expiring June 30, 1962) for 2 years to June 30, 1964.

When the President signed this law on October 3, he made the statement that he did so with "extreme reluctance." That statement was a dead giveaway of what the administration had tried to do with the extension of the Federal aid to impacted school areas legislation.

They had wanted this extension for only a 1-year period, for obvious reasons. If they had succeeded in getting only a 1-year extension, then another extension would have been necessary during the next session of Congress—an election year. At that time, they planned to use this legislation as "bait" or blackmail to force the enactment of the President's general Federal aid to education program—which did not even get off the ground during this session.

As it was, and as the President indicated by his "extreme reluctance" comment, the administration failed in this highhanded maneuver. The extension was made for 2 years, eliminating the chance to use federally impacted areas as a lever to bring about the socialization of education in this country.

Also, something else should be noted about this extension.

News stories about the passage of this legislation read as follows:

President Kennedy's Senate lieutenants moved * * * to salvage the bare bones of his education program and put off until next year his broader school-aid proposals.

The Democratic leader called for debate "on legislation to extend impacted areas aid to school districts crowded by children of Federal workers and military personnel."

This was actually a belated reversal of an entirely different position taken by the Democratic leadership. Republican Members of the Senate had attempted previously on three different occasions to extend aid to impacted school districts. It was President Kennedy's party in the Senate which succeeded in defeating these extensions.

The original recommendation by the President would have decreased the authorization for these laws by half.

It was the Republican Members, joined with some from across the aisle, who brought about the extension of these laws, and not, as news stories went, that the Democratic leadership was salvaging part of the President's program.

Notable also is the fact that the extension of 2 years instead of 1 year proposed by the administration came about through Republican support.

How odd to be told of the need for forward planning and future programing in the extension of financial aid abroad, only to have that necessity vigorously denied by the same administration spoksemen when it was a matter of extension of financial aid to our own children.

FINANCE AND TAXATION

Railroad loan guarantee authority extension

(Public Law 87–16. Approved April 1, 1961)

This law (H.R. 1163) amended section 510 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to extend for 15 months to June 30, 1963, the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission which expired on March 31, 1961.

Study on amendment of Public Law 86–272 relating to State taxation of interstate commerce

(Public Law 87–17. Approved April 7, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4363), to amend Public Law 86–272 relating to State taxation on interstate commerce, broadened the congressional study of State powers to tax concerns in interstate commerce by authorizing the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, separately or jointly, to make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States, territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Exemption from tax income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from obligations of the United States

(Public Law 87–29. Approved May 4, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5189) amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from obligations of the United States by not including such sums in gross income unless such obligations are held for or used in connection with the conduct of commercial banking functions or other commercial activities.

This could not be considered an accomplishment of the New Frontier. In fact, it could not even be considered an original idea of the New Frontier. Although the measure had been recommended by the Kennedy administration to ease the drain on U.S. gold reserves, they had obtained the idea from the Eisenhower administration, which had originally come forth with the recommendation.

Acceptance of gifts to be used to reduce public debt

(Public Law 87–58. Approved June 27, 1961)

This law (H.R. 311) specifically authorized the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to accept gifts of money or other property which are made to the Government on the sole condition that they are to be used for the reduction of the public debt.

Old series currency adjustment

(Public Law 87–65. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (S. 1619) adjusted the accounts of old series currency in the Treasury Department in order to permit the Treasury to make a bookkeeping entry of the fact that $410 million of old currency was unaccounted for and from evidence that at least $100 million had been destroyed. This action relieved the Government from paying interest and releasing the gold and silver redemption fund for this $100 million for which the Government was paying interest at the rate of 3 to 4 percent.

Extension of debt limit

(Public Law 87–69. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7677) increased the national debt ceiling from its permanent $285 billion level to $298 billion during fiscal year

1962. The ceiling was scheduled to drop to the permanent level July 1, 1961.

In spite of the oft-repeated intention to achieve a balanced budget, huge domestic expenditures made it necessary for the administration to request another temporary extension of the debt limit. It now stands at an alltime high. The new ceiling is $5 billion above the temporary extension which expired June 30, 1961.

There are grave fiscal implications involved in the compulsive and unrestrained spending practices of the Kennedy administration, practices which have changed surpluses to deficits and abandoned any semblance of concern for a balanced budget. The administration has vainly attempted to substitute bigger Government spending for effective leadership as it has temporized with crises at home and abroad. A record peacetime debt ceiling is the result after only 8 months, with more than 3 years yet to go.

Excise, corporate tax extension

(Public Law 87–72. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7446) extended for 1 year, until July 1, 1962, the present taxes on corporations, new cars, auto parts, liquor, cigarettes, telephone calls, and travel.

The corporate income tax remained at 52 percent. The law continued the following excise taxes imposed during the Korean war: Distilled spirits, $10.50 a proof gallon; beer, $9 a barrel; cigarettes, 8 cents a pack; passenger cars, 10 percent; auto parts and accessories, 8 percent; general telephone service, 10 percent; transportation of persons, 10 percent.

On April 20, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a message recommending changes in the Federal tax system, pending a long-range tax reform. The message was broken down into five major categories: First, tax incentive for modernization and expansion; second, tax treatment of foreign incomes; third, correction of other structural defects; fourth, improvements in tax administration machinery; and fifth, excise tax and corporate income tax rate extension. The latter was taken care of under the public law listed above, and was the only portion of the message that met with success during this session of Congress.

And it should be noted that this extension was another example of a recommendation which had been borrowed from the Eisenhower administration. Its enactment was merely carrying out what Eisenhower had asked for.

The House Ways and Means Committee handed the President a direct slap in the face on the rest of his tax proposals. After spending a major part of this session on consideration of the President's tax proposals, that committee postponed action on his recommendations until next session.

This decision stemmed from the fact that the initial Treasury recommendations were not thought out in sufficient detail and were not based on thorough study. During the hearings the Treasury repeatedly reversed itself and it was not hard to see that the Treasury had no informed policy which could stand up under committee examination.

In other words, the President's tax proposals were such a mess that, no matter how much time the Ways and Means Committee spent on trying to untangle them, its efforts were to little avail. The Treasury did not know what it was talking about, so how could the House committee come to any decision?

Even the President's calling the Democratic members of the committee to a secret meeting at the White House did not get the President's proposals reported out this session.

Perhaps the administration needs to do one of two things—either change its economic policies, or get a complete new set of tax advisers who know what they are doing in the Treasury.

Maybe they need to do both.

GOVERNMENT

Creation of joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the 1st inauguration of Abraham Lincoln

(Public Law 87–1. Approved March 1, 1961)

House Joint Resolution 155 created a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the 1st inauguration of Abraham Lincoln.

Authorization for distribution of copies of the Congressional Record to former Members of Congress

(Public Law 87–2. Approved March 21, 1961)

S. 451 authorized distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress.

Restoring the military rank of General of the Army to former President Eisenhower

(Public Law 87–3. Approved March 22, 1961)

S. 1173 restored the military rank of General of the Army to former President Eisenhower on the active list with his former date of rank in such grade without, however, entitling him to the pay or allowances of General of the Army. It authorized the Secretary of Defense to assign military assistants to General Eisenhower as General of the Army. It also authorized the Administrator of General Services under section (b) of the act of August 25, 1958 (Public Law 85–745) to reduce the sum to provide an office staff for a former President of the United States by the sum of pay and allowances of any such military assistants so assigned. Provision was made that nothing contained in the law will affect or limit the benefits provided the widow of any former President under the act of August 25, 1958 (Public Law 85–745).

Supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961

(Public Law 87–14. Approved March 31, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5188) provided $1.69 billion in supplemental appropriations for the following major departments and agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1961:

Department of Agriculture	$127,943,000
Department of Commerce	9,313,000
Department of Defense	286,900,000
Executive Office of the President and Development Loan Fund	51,732,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	133,156,500
Independent Offices	196,948,650
Department of the Interior	21,246,000
Department of Justice	15,880,000
Department of Labor	527,315,500
Department of the Treasury	36,097,000

Renewal of reorganization authority

(Public Law 87–18. Approved April 7, 1961)

This law (S. 153) further amended the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such an act would apply to reorganization plans transmitted by the President to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

President Kennedy met defeat this session on his plans to reorganize the Federal Communications Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The House killed the FCC reorganization plan by a lopsided vote of 323 to 77 on June 15. The Senate rejected the SEC reorganization by a vote of 52 to 38 on June 21.

The plans were defeated on the grounds that, in some instances, they provided for excessive delegation of powers to lower echelon officials and in other cases they concentrated too much authority in the hands of the agency chairman. Overall effect of the plans, opponents charged, would be to deny litigants many of their legal rights and to put independent Government agencies under White House domination and control.

Clarification of membership, functions, and responsibilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Council

(Public Law 87–26. Approved April 25, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6169) amended the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, replacing the President by the Vice President as Chairman of the Council. It also repealed the existing authority of the President to appoint a member from the Federal departments and agencies of the Government and three members from civilian life and, instead, in addition to the Vice President, the Council would be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It authorized any member, in the case of unavoidable absence, to designate another officer of his department or agency as his alternate provided the alternate holds an office in the Federal Government to which he was appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate or his service as an alternate is with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Appointment of additional circuit and district judges

(Public Law 87–36. Approved May 19, 1961)

This law (S. 912) provided for creating 73 new judgeships of which 10 were new circuit judgeships, 61 permanent district judgeships, and 2 temporary district judgeships.

Since 1954, the Democratic congressional leadership had refused, for political purposes, to permit a judgeship bill to be brought up for a vote. The Eisenhower administration time and again pressed for action in the Congress. The need for additional judges was becoming critical. During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, President Eisenhower offered to appoint new judges on a 50–50 basis—half Republicans, half Democrats. Still no action was taken in the Democratic-controlled Congress.

After the Democrats won control of the White House, however, things changed. The Kennedy administration's first request, made 3 weeks after the inauguration of President Kennedy, was for a judgeship bill. It was acted upon with great haste, and in less than 3 months this bill, creating new judgeships to alleviate the congestion in our Federal courts, became law.

As the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee said, the Democrats gambled and won. As a result they handed the President's brother, the At-

torney General, one of the biggest political plums to be doled out in this country.

Indian Claims Commission extension

(Public Law 87–48. Approved June 16, 1961)

This law (S. 751) extended the existence of the Indian Claims Commission for 5 years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with the Commission. Upon the dissolution of the Commission, the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States.

Fourth supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961

(Public Law 87–74. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7712) provided for $47,214,000 of additional funds for fiscal year 1961. Funds were provided for—

(1) Department of Defense (military), for retired pay, $14,500,000.

(2) Department of Justice, for support of U.S. prisoners, $405,000.

(3) Department of State, for contributions to international organizations, $32,204,000.

(4) Treasury Department, for salaries and expenses, $105,000.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization

(Public Law 87–98. Approved July 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6874) authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1962 for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and other purposes.

Legislative branch appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–130. Approved August 10, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7208) made appropriations in the amount of $135,432,065 for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1962.

The Senate total was $28,421,840; the House, $47,856,835.

Among other agencies included in this law were the Library of Congress and the Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

Independent offices appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–141. Approved August 17, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7445) made appropriations of $8,966,285,000 for the various independent executive offices for fiscal year 1962.

Among items included were:

Veterans' Administration: $4,889,270,500 (more than one-half the total.)

National Aeronautics and Space Administration: $1,671,750,000 (about one-fourth earmarked for moon exploration program).

General Services Administration: $568,904,500 (a large portion to be used for construction of new Federal buildings in various locations).

Federal Aviation Agency: $724,800,000.

Housing and Home Finance Agency: $427,843,000.

National Science Foundation: $263,250,000.

Authorizing funds to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation

(Public Law 87–155. Approved August 17, 1961)

This law (S. 763) repealed the requirement for annual appraisal of assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury. The law authorized payment on the basis of the financial statements of CCC, subject to audit by the General Accounting Office, for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year.

Treasury-Post Office Department appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–159. Approved August 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5954) made appropriations of $5,298,765,000 for the Department of the Treasury, the Post Office Department, and the Tax Court of the United States for fiscal year 1962.

The Treasury Department total was $928,515,000. Of that amount $452 million was for the Internal Revenue Service (1961 appropriation, $413.9 million).

The Post Office Department total was $4,368,500,000.

The Tax Court total was $1.75 million.

In connection with the Post Office Department, one defeat might be called by some a victory for the Kennedy administration. In his message to Congress March 24, on the budget and fiscal policy, the President stated with reference to an increase to postal rates:

The January budget submitted by my predecessor called for an additional $843 million in postal revenues to eliminate the deficit in that Department's operations. Such an increase must be effective July 1 to close the gap between postal expenditures and postal revenues * * *. I urge the Congress to close this gap * * *.

Subsequently, an open rule was granted by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives to consider postal rate increases—legislation having been submitted and hearings held in the House. This means that the House as a whole could amend the bill in any way it saw fit. Administration representatives intervened and requested a closed rule, which, in effect, would prevent any amendments to the bill. This gag rule was granted. The bill came to the floor the following day under the rule which prevented any Member of the House from offering any amendment. Representative BROWN, Republican, Ohio, and and Representative COLMER, Democrat, Mississippi, opposed the granting of a closed rule, citing the right of the House to amend the bill in any way it saw fit and, by a vote of 142 yeas to 222 nays, the gag rule was defeated. The administration refused to bring the postal rate bill to the floor of the House under an open rule for fear it would be amended to such a point that it would be unacceptable by reason of increase in rates for second and third class mail. Therefore, no postal rate increase bill received consideration by the Congress.

Continuing appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–182. Approved August 30, 1961)

This law (H.J. Res. 544) amended clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of June 30, 1961 (Public Law 87–65), by striking out "August 31, 1961," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1961." This enabled continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962.

Also the law amended subsection (b) of section 101 of Public Law 87–65 by increasing the following appropriations: (1) Administrative expenses for area redevelopment programs from $400,000 to $600,000; (2) mutual security programs from $485 million to $665 million; and (3) payment to the Federal extended compensation account from $45 million to $70 million.

Communications Act of 1934 amendments

(Public Law 87–192. Approved August 31, 1961)

This law (S. 2034) provided (in lieu of rejected Reorganization Plan No. 2 concerning FCC)

(1) Authority for the Commission to delegate certain of its functions to a panel of Commissioners, an individual Commissioner, an employee board, or an individual employee, provided that any such delegating authority shall not be rescinded without a vote of a majority of the members of the Commission then holding office;

(2) That any order, decision, report, or action made by such delegation shall be enforced in the same manner as any other action of the Commission;

(3) That every application of a person aggrieved by any such delegated decision shall be passed upon by the Commission;

(4) That the Commission may deny the application for review without saying why;

(5) That, if the Commission grants a review, it may set aside any past action or may order a rehearing; and

(6) That any employee to whom the Commission may delegate review functions in any case of adjudication shall be qualified by training, experience, and competence to perform such review duties.

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 amendment

(Public Law 87–196. Approved September 5, 1961)

This law (H.J. Res. 438) amended the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to authorize and direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities, exchanges, and national securities associations. The results of such a study shall be reported to the Congress on or before January 3, 1963. There was authorized to be appropriated the sum of $750,000 to carry out such a study and investigation.

Prohibiting transmission of bets by wire communications

(Public Law 87–216. Approved September 13, 1961)

This law (S. 1656) amended chapter 50 ("Gambling") of title 18, United States Code (with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information), to assist the States in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities, by prohibiting the use of wire communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of bets or wagers and gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce, subject to a penalty of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years or both.

Prohibiting interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia

(Public Law 87–218. Approved September 13, 1961)

This law (S. 1657) amended chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting, subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, the transportation in interstate and foreign commerce of wagering paraphernalia.

Prohibiting travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises

(Public Law 87–228. Approved September 13, 1961)

This law (S. 1653) amended chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit

travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises, subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

Interstate Commerce Commission authority to delegate to employee boards

(Public Law 87-247. Approved September 14, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8033) amended section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employee boards. Under previous law, every case in which a hearing had been held and exceptions to a recommended order had been filed, the matter had to go to the Commission, or to a division of the Commission, for a decision. This law would permit the Commission to delegate to employee boards the function of reviewing recommended orders entered in cases in which hearings had been held.

This legislation effects a form of procedural reorganization within the ICC by statute rather than by reorganization plan.

State-Justice Department appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87-264. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7371) made appropriations of $756,422,550 for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1962.

Of this total appropriation, the State Department total was $269,717,000, the Justice Department total was $294,489,900, the judiciary total was $54,777,650, the U.S. Information Agency total was $136,550,000, and the Commission on Civil Rights total was $888,000.

The Civil Rights Commission, due to expire 60 days after its final report was due September 9, 1961, was extended for 2 years to September 30, 1963.

Candidate Kennedy and the 1960 Democratic platform made glowing promises on just about every phase of the many-faceted subject of civil rights. The 2-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission, however, was the only fragment passed in this session of Congress. A great volume of legislation introduced was bottled up in the Democratic-controlled committees of the Congress. Vigorous Republican efforts to secure action were thwarted.

District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87-265. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8072) made appropriations of $32,753,000 for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1962.

Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961

(Public Law 87-274. Approved September 22, 1961)

This law (S. 279) established a grants-in-aid program involving demonstration and study projects, personnel training, and technical assistance to local, State, and private agencies in the field of juvenile delinquency. It authorized appropriations of $10 million annually for 3 years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

Labor Department and Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriations for fiscal year 1962

(Public Law 87-290. Approved September 22, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7035) made appropriations of $4,915,965,000 for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1962.

The Labor Department total was $629,350,000.

The total for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was $4,260,429,000, of which the National Institutes of Health total was $738,335,000.

Among the related agencies for which appropriations were included in this law were the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board.

Telecasting of professional sports contests

(Public Law 87-331. Approved September 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 9096) amended the antitrust laws to authorize pooling of sponsored telecasting by a professional football, baseball, basketball, or hockey league and to permit each league to sell pooled rights to a television network without violating the antitrust laws, provided such sale does not impair college football gate receipts through network telecasts of professional football contests at times when college games are normally played.

Supplemental Appropriation Act of fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87-332. Approved September 30, 1961)

The following allocation of funds for fiscal 1962 was provided under this law (H.R. 9169):

Department of Agriculture	$16,520,000
Department of Commerce	221,353,136
Department of Defense (civil functions)	5,000,000
Department of Defense (military)	40,150,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	253,579,000
Executive Office of the President	560,000
Funds appropriated to the President (disaster relief)	15,000,000
Independent offices	487,639,000
Department of the Interior	17,175,000
Department of Justice	985,000
Department of Labor	14,429,000
Department of State	10,482,150
Treasury Department	675,000
The Judiciary	3,115,000
Legislative branch	821,150
Claims and judgments	37,850,905
Total	1,124,983,341

The law contained House-sponsored amendments providing that no part of the funds included in the measure shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with loans to be financed with funds borrowed from the Treasury for the following programs: area redevelopment, mass transportation loans and grants, open space land grants, and low-income housing demonstration grants.

These amendments constituted a stunning defeat for the administration with respect to its sponsorship of back-door financing, particularly since in each of the four above-mentioned programs back-door financing had been authorized earlier in separate legislative enactments.

False bomb information

(Public Law 87-338. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6834) amended section 35 of title 18, United States Code, to increase penalties in certain cases for imparting false bomb information by (1) making it a misdemeanor knowingly (but without malice) to impart or convey such false information, subject to a penalty of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and by (2) making it a felony to convey such false information willfully and maliciously or with a reckless disregard for human life, subject to a penalty of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Amending Federal Firearms Act

(Public Law 87-342. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (S. 1750) strengthened the Federal Firearms Act, which prohibited the shipment of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by persons under indictment or convicted of certain specific crimes of violence, by striking out "crimes of violence" and inserting "crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year" (Federal standard of a felony). The penalty of not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, remained the same.

Amending Foreign Agents Registration Act to broaden coverage

(Public Law 87-366. Approved October 4, 1961)

This law (H.R. 470) amended the Foreign Agents Registration Act to broaden the definition of "foreign principal" under the act to include domestic organizations which are substantially "supervised, directed, controlled, or financed" by a foreign government or foreign political party. This law also further refined criteria for commercial exemptions under the act by providing that a foreign principal, in order for its agents to be eligible for exemption from registering under the act, must be engaged in activities which are either private and nonpolitical and financial, or private and nonpolitical and mercantile.

Extending the application of U.S. espionage laws outside the jurisdiction of the United States

(Public Law 87-369. Approved October 4, 1961)

This law (H.R. 2730) extended the application of chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship, to acts committed anywhere in the world by repealing section 791 of title 18. Under that section the provisions of chapter 37 had applied only within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, on the high seas, and within the United States.

HOUSING

Interim increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization

(Public Law 87-68. Approved May 25, 1961)

This law (S.J. Res. 89) granted to the Federal Housing Administration an additional $1 billion mortgage insurance authority by amending section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, and increasing this authority from $15 billion to $16 billion.

Housing amendments of 1961

(Public Law 87-70. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (S. 1922) authorized and expanded the housing program by providing for urban renewal, $2 billion; college housing loans, $1.2 billion; community facilities loans, $500 million; farm housing loans, $407 million ($200 million in new funds in addition to $207 million existing authorization); "open space" grants, $50 million; housing for the elderly direct loans, $75 million; urban renewal planning grants, $55 million.

The major provisions of the law were:

Title I—New Housing Programs

1. Limited-interest loans (5 to 6 percent), made to commercial developers, for construction or rehabilitation of both sales and rental housing for moderate-income families.

2. Forty-year, no-downpayment loans for the rental program.

3. Maximum term for new single-family sales housing was 35 years, except term may be extended to 40 years in hardship cases.

4. Maximum term for existing sales housing was 30 years.

5. Downpayment fixed at 3 percent, including closing costs, on a maximum mortgage of $15,000 in high-cost area.

6. A 3-percent downpayment and a 35-year term was provided for two-, three-, and four-family units to be sold to families displaced by urban renewal or other governmental action.

7. FHA authority to contract for new guarantees under this program was limited to July 1, 1963.

8. Forty-year, no-downpayment loans (at below-the-market-rate interest) were provided for nonprofit organizations and public agencies, for construction and rehabilitation of five-family or larger rental dwellings for moderate-income families with guarantees under this program limited to July 1, 1963.

9. Twenty-year, limited-interest (6 percent maximum) loans were provided for improvement of existing dwellings within urban-renewal areas or one- to four-family dwellings outside such areas. Loans may be as high as $10,000 per family unit.

10. Regular mortgage loans may be made on housing incorporating new and advanced designs and techniques.

11. Loans on apartments in a multifamily dwelling that are individually owned and have individual mortgages were permitted.

Title II—Elderly and Public Housing

1. Expanded to $125 million the 1959 authorization of a $50 million revolving loan fund to make direct loans to nonprofit groups at below market rate for construction of housing for the elderly.

2. Expanded eligible groups to include consumer cooperatives and public agencies.

3. Authorized the Public Housing Administration to contract for construction by local housing agencies of an additional 100,000 public housing units. (PHA has $336 million available for contracts through previous authorization.)

4. Authorized $5 million for demonstration programs by local housing authorities for experimentation with new methods of providing housing for low-income families.

5. Raised the limit on per room expenditures for public housing for the elderly from $2,500 to $3,000.

Title III—Urban Renewal and Planning

1. Authorized an additional $2 billion in Federal capital grants for urban renewal projects.

2. Authorized $25 million at 3½-percent disaster loans by the Small Business Administration to small businesse forced to vacate by urban renewal project or other governmental action.

3. Permitted local urban renewal agencies to sell land and property to cooperatives, nonprofit organizations, and public agencies who intend to build moderate income rental units on the land.

4. Raised the existing authorization from $20 to $75 million for grants to States and localities for planning various types of urban and small-city rehabilitation projects, and raised the Federal share from one-half to two-thirds of the cost of each planning project. Under this provision, mass-transport studies can be financed and, in addition, it gave States blanket authority in advance to conclude interstate compacts to undertake joint planning projects.

Title IV—College Housing

1. Raised from $1,675 million to $2,875 million (in four steps by July 1, 1964) the Federal revolving fund for low-interest, long-term loans to colleges, universities, and hospitals for construction of housing, and raised the limit on the portion of the fund that can be used for dining halls, student centers, and other nonhousing facilities on college and university campuses and on hospital housing for nurses and interns by $120 million each.

Title V—Community Facilities

1. Raised from $150 million to $650 million the communities facilities loan fund for local water, gas, and sewage plant improvements.

2. Provided $50 million of this increase for low-interest loans to metropolitan agencies for construction of mass-transportation systems, with authority limited to December 31, 1962.

Title VI—National Housing Act Changes

1. Authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow an additional $750 million from the Treasury for its special assistance program, with an additional $760 million of existing FNMA funds transferred to the program.

2. Expanded the existing home-improvement loan guarantee program for 4 years to October 31, 1965.

3. Increased the terms for regular FHA home mortgage insurance by raising the maximum mortgage maturity for new homes from 30 to 35 years and by lowering the required downpayment for one-family dwellings, but retained the 30-year maturity for resale housing. The new schedule required 3 percent on the first $15,000 valuation of a home, 10 percent on the next $5,000, and 25 percent on anything over $20,000. The maximum mortgage for a one-family home was increased from $22,000 to $25,000 and for two-family dwellings from $25,000 to $27,000.

4. Removed the dollar limit on the number of loans that can be insured by the FHA for all general mortgage insurance programs.

5. Made October 1, 1965, the cutoff date on the FHA's authority to insure new loans.

6. Permitted FHA to reduce its premium on any regular mortgage insurance from one-half to one-quarter of 1 percent.

7. Extended for 1 year, through October 1, 1962, the FHA authority to insure mortgages on housing for military personnel and civilian armed services employees in areas around defense installations (Capehart housing) and on similar housing around National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Atomic Energy Commission installations.

8. Raised from 25,000 to 28,000 the number of housing units that can be built under the Capehart program after June 30, 1959.

Title VII—Open Space Land

1. Authorized $50 million in Federal grants to States and localities to pay up to 30 percent of the cost of acquisition of land in and around urban centers to create open space areas for recreation, conservation, scenic, and historical purposes.

Title VIII—Farm Housing

1. Extended the farm housing program for 4 years, through June 30, 1965, and increased the existing $207 million authorization previously granted in 1956 by $200 million.

Title IX—Miscellaneous

1. Extended the voluntary home mortgage credit program for 4 years, through October 1, 1965.

This law has a unique legislative history in the Democratic-controlled Congress. It is an example of omnibus legislation at its worst. A number of sound, proved housing programs were made hostages to all sorts of unrelated and unsound proposals which could not have been enacted on their own merits. To get a continuation of the former, Congress had to accept the latter. As a result, a considerable number of Senators who had always supported housing bills in the past, voted against the conference report. They had just been lectured to by the President on unnecessary spending programs, and then found that they were expected to support a bill that exceeded by $1 billion the total authorizations requested by that same administration.

The housing bill this year was the great sop to far-out liberals. They were allowed to play with it and insert any and all expensive plans they had been toying with for a number of years. In a sense, it was a sort of psychiatric treatment—they could get rid of their frustrations and inhibitions in this bill. It may have saved them from a crackup, since the Kennedy administration deliberately refused to carry out any of its promises with reference to civil rights or immigration reform.

The result, however, will be an enormously expensive housing program, not only because of the swollen authorizations, but also because of new programs which will inevitably grow and grow in years to come. The genetics of this kind of legislation is such that old programs never die, they simply get bigger and bigger.

During the consideration of this bill in the Senate, the administration nearly suffered a first-class spanking. One of the heralded new features of the bill was a so-called moderate-income housing program, calling for 40-year, no-downpayment loans up to $15,000 for single-family housing. It would mean that almost 20 years would have to pass before the buyer built up a 6-percent equity. So unsound did this proposal appear that it was eliminated on the floor by a bipartisan vote. Enormous pressure was then brought to bear by administration leaders, and a slightly modified middle-income program was restored to the bill by a very narrow margin of victory.

The conference report on this bill adopted the worst features of Senate and House versions of the bill. It was successful because authorizations of the "pork barrel" variety were sharply increased and helped to break down resistance to other parts of the bill about which there was great doubt or suspicion. However, every success has its price, and the price here was the refusal of many Senators hitherto friendly to housing legislation to support such an extreme measure.

Amendment concerning Federal savings and loan insurance corporation

(Public Law 87-210. Approved September 8, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7108) amended the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act and was designed to strengthen the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which insures savings accounts in savings and loan associations and similar institutions up to a statutory limit of $10,000. Supplemental payments would be required by insured associations in order to build up the Corporation's reserve fund. The law would require insured institutions to pay a premium prepayment equal to 2 percent of the annual net increase of the accounts of their insured members in addition to the usual one-twelfth of 1 percent annual premium and would reduce the home loan bank stock purchase requirement to 1 percent of outstanding home mortgages and other similar obligations.

IMMIGRATION

Amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act

(Public Law 87-301. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (S. 2237) revived and made permanent the Alien Orphan Adoption Act by

amending the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide for the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain eligible orphans under the age of 14; provided for judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders; authorized acceleration of issuance of visas to aliens on the second and third preference waiting list; lifted the quota ceiling of 2,000 numbers from the Asia-Pacific triangle and provided 100 quota numbers for each country in that area; and made permanent a liberalization of tuberculosis exclusion provisions.

There is no question but that this legislation is a small step forward, and does provide relief in a number of hardship categories. It is, however, a piecemeal correction; that is, just the type of correction that was soundly denounced in the Democratic platform of 1960. That platform made sweeping criticisms of existing immigration laws, and said that sweeping revisions of these laws—as opposed to "piecemeal" changes—could be expected in the event of a Democratic victory.

In addition, the Democratic candidate, Mr. Kennedy, was and is an expert in this field. While a Senator, he had written a handsome booklet which was widely distributed free of charge wherein was set forth our immigrant heritage, and the need for liberalizing the immigration laws. During the 1960 campaign, Mr. Kennedy repeatedly said that he took the platform pledges on immigration reform very seriously, and, if elected, would throw the weight of his office into such an effort. Evidently he developed a sore arm, because nothing remotely resembling what was promised came from the administration during this session, despite the topheavy Democratic majority in both Houses. The President might have started with the Eisenhower proposals laid before Congress in 1953 and several times thereafter, or the reforms proposed by Republicans in both the House and the Senate in accordance with the Republican 1960 platform.

The absolute silence of the administration means that immigration reform will again be what it should not be, a campaign issue raised during election year, and dropped thereafter.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Sugar Act extension

(Public Law 87–15. Approved March 31, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5463) extended the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for 15 months. It also permitted the President to cut off the 800,000-ton share of the Cuban quota earmarked for the Dominican Republic and it provided that in setting quotas special consideration should be given Western Hemisphere countries buying U.S. farm commodities.

Inter-American social and economic program and Chilean reconstruction program appropriations

(Public Law 87–41. Approved May 27, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6518) made appropriations of $500 million for loans for programs of economic projects intended to improve living standards in Latin America. Of the $500 million, $394 million went into the International Development Bank, $100 million to the International Cooperation Administration, and $6 million to the Organization of American States.

The law also carried an additional $100 million for loans to aid Chile's recovery from earthquake damage.

The law contained a provision that none of the funds could be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan was made.

On interest rates on Latin American aid funds, the administration had to settle for less than a complete victory. Here is what happened:

Originally, the administration indicated that it wanted no restrictions on the interest that could be charged to Latin American borrowers of American aid funds—H.R. 6518. The Senate, however, approved the Williams of Delaware amendment providing an 8-percent ceiling. The House refused to accept this amendment. The State Department got hysterical and asked the Senate to back down. The Senate refused, whereupon the House finally agreed to require that money could not be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank, or at a rate above the legal limit in the country where the loan was made. The Senate finally agreed to this in lieu of the Williams of Delaware 8-percent ceiling. So the administration wound up with some limitations on the interest that could be charged, although originally it apparently sought no restrictions. The principal amount involved here was $500 million.

Office of Internal Travel

(Public Law 87–63. Approved June 29, 1961)

This law (S. 610) provided for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce for the purpose of encouraging foreign travel within the United States. The Department of Commerce was authorized to spend up to $4.7 million annually for this purpose except for the first year, beginning July 1, 1961, when a $3 million ceiling would apply.

Establishment of Caribbean Organization

(Public Law 87–73. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (H.J. Res. 384) dissolved the Caribbean Commission, composed of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and created the Caribbean Organization to be composed of the Caribbean territories of these four countries as a formalization of the growth of the self-governing powers of these dependent territories.

Oil Pollution Act of 1961

(Public Law 87–167. Approved August 30, 1961)

This law (S. 2187) implemented the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, by—

(1) Making unlawful the discharge by any person from any ship, which is a tanker, within any of the prohibited zones, of oil or any oily mixture which fouls the surface of the sea; and, the discharge by any person into the sea from a ship, other than a tanker, the same type of polluting substance.

(2) Excepting from prohibition the discharge of such substance for the purpose of securing the safety of the ship, preventing damage to the ship or cargo, or saving life at sea; or the unavoidable escape by leakage of such pollution; or the discharge of sediment which cannot be pumped out because it had become solid or which arises from the purification of oil fuel or lubricating oil, provided the discharge is made as far from land as practicable.

(3) Providing the following penalties for persons who violate the provisions of this act: (a) that such a person is guilty of a misdemeanor; and (b) that, upon conviction, punishment shall be a fine not exceeding $2,500 nor less than $500, or imprisonment for up to 1 year; or both.

(4) Providing that the administration and enforcement of this act shall be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

(5) Providing that the prohibited zones for all ships shall be all sea areas within 50 miles from land, with certain specific exceptions for tankers, and other specific exceptions for ships other than tankers.

International Finance Corporation charter amendment

(Public Law 87–185. Approved August 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6765) authorized acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation. Under this law, the U.S. Governor of the Corporation was authorized to agree to an amendment to the charter of the Corporation which authorizes the Corporation to make investments of its funds in capital stock and to limit the exercise of voting rights by the Corporation unless exercise of such rights is deemed necessary by the Corporation to protect its interests.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

(Public Law 87–195. Approved September 4, 1961)

This law (S. 1983) authorized a total of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal year 1962 for foreign aid. The total authorization was $11,963,500,000. In addition to fiscal 1962 authorizations, there was $1,700 million authorized for fiscal year 1963 and $6 billion authorized for fiscal years 1963 through 1966. The law's principal provisions included:

(1) Development Loan Fund: (a) The President was authorized to make loans from this Fund payable as to principal and interest in U.S. dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine. (b) For fiscal year 1962, $1,200 million was authorized to be appropriated, and for the next 4 years, $1,500 million was authorized to be appropriated each year on an annual basis.

The President was authorized to establish an interagency Development Loan Committee which shall, under his direction, establish standards and criteria for lending operations of these funds.

(2) Development grants and technical cooperation: (a) The President was authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine to promote the economic development of less-developed friendly countries and areas. (b) For fiscal year 1962, there was authorized to be appropriated to the President $380 million to be available until spent.

(3) Investment guaranties: (a) The President was authorized to issue guaranties of investments in connection with projects, etc., in any friendly country with which such an agreement has been reached. (b) This authority shall continue until June 30, 1964.

(4) Surveys of investment opportunities: (a) The President was authorized to participate in the financing of investment opportunity surveys undertaken by any person on such terms and conditions as he may determine. (b) There was authorized to be appropriated $5 million for fiscal year 1962 for this purpose.

(5) Development research: (a) The President was authorized to use funds made available to carry out programs of research into, and evaluation of, the process of economic development in less-developed friendly countries.

(6) International organizations and programs: (a) The President was authorized to make voluntary contributions on a grant basis to international organizations and to

their programs on his own terms and conditions. (b) There was authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1962 for this purpose $153,500,000.

(7) Supporting assistance: (a) The President was authorized to furnish assistance to friendly countries in order to support or promote economic or political stability on his own terms and conditions.

(8) Contingency fund: (a) There was authorized to be appropriated to the President for fiscal year 1962 $300 million for use by the President for assistance when he determines such use to be important to the national interest. (b) The President shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives currently informed of the use of these funds.

(9) Military assistance: (a) The President was authorized to furnish military assistance on his own terms and conditions to any friendly country or international organization, the assisting of which the President finds will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace. (b) There was authorized to be appropriated to the President $1,700 million for fiscal year 1962 and $1,700 million for fiscal year 1963 to be available until spent.

(10) Administrative provisions: (a) The President was authorized to exercise any functions conferred upon him by this act through such agency or officer of the U.S. Government as he shall direct. (b) There was authorized to be appropriated for administrative expenses to the President for fiscal year 1962 the amount of $50 million.

The administration claimed a major victory on this issue. However, in fighting for the 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund, to be financed through Treasury borrowing, representatives of the administration bitterly contended that retention of the process of annual appropriations would greatly hinder the new program and would be completely unacceptable. When the final version of the bill was passed, providing for annual appropriations and eliminating all provisions which would have permitted back-door financing, the tune changed and the administration chanted, "wholly satisfactory."

An amendment to the foreign-aid bill providing that no assistance be given an international organization of which Communist China is a member was deleted from the final version.

Another aspect of the foreign-aid program concerned the administration's attempts to liberalize the Battle Act to permit trade with Communist countries. This proposal was high priority on the President's 16-point program for this session. While it was passed by the Senate, no action was taken on the House floor.

(NOTE.—The Senate unanimously adopted a bipartisan resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) expressing the sense of the Congress against the seating of Communist China in the United Nations. The House vote likewise was unanimous. Nevertheless, the speculation in Washington is that, as soon as Congress adjourned and its presence no longer serves as a restraint on the administration, Communist China will be seated in the United Nations.)

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

(Public Law 87-256. Approved September 21, 1961)

The law (H.R. 8666) sought to provide for improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges, and was designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of these programs, administered and sponsored by the U.S. Government, especially by consolidating in one act various existing pieces of legislation authorizing such programs.

Among provisions in the law were—

Reaffirmation that all foreign currency utilized would be subject to the appropriations process;

Dollar appropriations would be available until spent;

Liberalization of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to families of exchange visitors; and

Liberalization of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to tax on incomes of students and exchange visitors.

Peace Corps Act

(Public Law 87-293. Approved September 22, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7500) provided for a Peace Corps to help peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. It made permanent a Peace Corps established earlier by Executive order of the President. It authorized appropriations to the President for fiscal 1962 not to exceed $40 million to carry out the purposes of the act.

Arms Control and Disarmament Act

(Public Law 87-297. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 9118) provided for establishment of a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problems of limitation, reduction, and control of armaments. It would be a fully staffed independent agency, but subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. The Director, who would serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the President on arms control and disarmament matters, would be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, and would receive a salary of $22,500. The law authorized appropriations of not to exceed $10 million, available until expended, to carry out its provisions.

Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1962

(Public Law 87-329. Approved September 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 9033) appropriated for fiscal 1962 funds in the amount of $4,123,345,000, a decrease from the $4,993,991,000 requested by the President.

The funds were allocated as follows:

Title I:	
1. Economic assistance:	
Development loans	$1,112,500,000
Development grants	296,600,000
Surveys of investment opportunities	1,500,000
International organizations and programs	153,500,000
Supporting assistance	425,000,000
Contingency fund	275,000,000
Administrative expenses	47,500,000
2. Military assistance	1,600,000,000
3. Department of State	3,000,000
Title II: Ryukyu Islands, Army	7,089,000
Title III: Export-Import Bank	[1,300,000,000]
Title IV: Treasury Department	171,656,000
Title V: Peace Corps	30,000,000

Exchange of military atomic energy information with France

(Public Law 87-363. Approved October 4, 1961)

This law (H.J. Res. 569) authorized the United States and France to immediately exchange classified information to permit French military forces to be trained in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons. It also provided for the transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapon systems, but not parts of atomic weapons, to French military forces assigned to NATO.

This law waived the 60-day waiting period (before such agreements take effect) during a congressional session.

LABOR

Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961

(Public Law 87-6. Approved March 24, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4806) provided for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation and a temporary increase in the rate of Federal unemployment tax.

To be eligible for this extended compensation, an individual must have exhausted, after June 30, 1960, all rights under the State law and have no rights to unemployment compensation under any Federal or State law.

Federal funds were made available to the States to extend benefits for up to 13 weeks, but for a total of not more than 39 weeks in a year.

The program will expire June 30, 1962, and is to be financed by a temporary increase in unemployment tax employers pay on a wage base of $3,000 and will increase this basic tax by a special 0.4 percent tax to 3.5 percent, which will be effective on wages paid between January 1, 1962, and December 31, 1963.

The law extended benefits to those who have used up their State unemployment compensation between June 30, 1960, and March 31, 1962.

The law contained a provision which reduced unemployment compensation for those who are receiving pensions from private organizations but excluded from this provision those receiving disability and social security benefits.

The Federal Government would not be reimbursed for the funds advanced until January 1963 and 1964.

The act established an unemployment trust fund which is to be maintained as a separate book account from which compensation payments and State reimbursements shall be made with a terminal date of December 31, 1964, for transfers to or from the fund.

Section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was amended to increase the taxes on wages paid during the calendar years 1962 and 1963 from 3.1 to 3.5 percent.

The amount authorized to be made available for the purposes of this act was increased to—

(1) Three hundred and eighty-five million dollars for fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(2) Four hundred and fifteen million dollars for fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

Unemployment was 6.6 percent when the New Frontier dawned last January. The jobless rate has been higher in every month since. In 1961 unemployment has averaged 6.8 percent of the work force—as against an average of 5.8 percent in the comparable months of Republican 1960.

Temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance benefits

(Public Law 87-7. Approved March 24, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5075) provided temporary extended railroad unemployment insurance

benefits for railroad workers similar to those provided workers in industry generally by providing additional unemployment benefits on a temporary basis to those unemployed railroad workers who have after June 30, 1960, and before April 1, 1962, exhausted all their rights to unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The act authorized the transfer of funds to the railroad unemployment insurance account from the general funds of the Treasury, such transfers to be without interest and to be repaid without interest.

A temporary increase in the tax rate payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act of one-quarter of 1 percent was made on compensation paid in 1962 and 1963. There were no changes in the existing law. The provisions for the payment by employers of a contribution rate of 3¾ percent paid after December 31, 1961, and before January 1, 1964, was suspended by a provision in this bill which would make the rate 4 percent with respect to such compensation.

Minimum wage amendments

(Public Law 87–30. Approved May 5, 1961)

This law (H.R. 3935) amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to provide minimum wage coverage for certain employees.

Major provisions of the law:

(1) Raised the $1-an-hour minimum wage to $1.25 by 1963 and brought under the Wages and Hours Act an additional 3.62 million workers, most of them in retail stores.

(2) Took effect 120 days after bill was signed into law.

(3) Provided a wage floor of $1.15 on the effective date of the law with the minimum of $1.25 to take effect 2 years later.

(4) Brought under the law 2.18 million employees of large retail stores and service establishments.

(5) Included employees of enterprises which do more than $1 million of annual business provided $250,000 of the goods sold move across State lines.

(6) Included employees of a unit of a chain which grosses $1 million in the year provided the unit did at least $250,000 business.

(7) Exempted from coverage under the retail provisions: hotels, motels, restaurants, auto dealers, farm implement dealers, motion picture theaters, hospitals, nursing homes, schools for handicapped or gifted children, amusement or recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis, and laundry workers.

(8) Gave newly covered workers $1 an hour for the first 3 years, $1.15 for the fourth year, and $1.25 the fifth year.

(9) Gave no overtime coverage to newly covered employees for the first 2 years but coverage after 44 hours the third year; after 42 hours the fourth year; and after 40 hours the fifth year.

Political expediency, necessary to gain Democratic support in the House, guided consideration of this legislation. There was real horse trading involved in this issue. Despite the President's campaign promises to achieve the widest possible coverage, a number of workers who were previously covered were excluded under the law. Administration supporters, in order to pick up support from southern Congressmen, and those from other farm areas, were willing to make these "minor" concessions.

Three large groups of workers did not receive coverage under the new extension: about 140,000 employees of laundries, about 305,000 employees of auto and farm equipment dealers, and about 17,000 employees of transit systems with less than $1 million annual sales.

Extension of the minimum wage was one item on the President's 16-point priority program. A bill was signed into law and the end result hailed as a great victory, with that ease of turnabout which has characterized this administration. In actuality, it is an ignoble monument to political expediency which sacrifices those workers in greatest need.

The record should be made clear, that because of the gyrations of the administration on the minimum wage issue, it can be shown that American workingmen are losing more than a billion and a quarter dollars in increased pay because President Kennedy failed to live up to the campaign pledge on minimum wages. The loss figures are from the Department of Labor. Here is the record:

In 1960 the Republican administration tried to get the Democratic-controlled Congress to raise the minimum wage to $1.15 as of January 1 of this year. Senator Kennedy helped scuttle this, flatly pledging he would raise it to $1.25 if elected President.

Last February, President Kennedy did not request $1.25, but $1.15 declaring it should not get to $1.25 for 2½ more years.

Since the $1.15 minimum wage law did not go into effect until September 5, 120 days after the law was signed, then it is clear that nearly 2 million workers lost a total of $224 million in increased pay that they could have had under the Republican administration's proposal, if adopted last year.

Thus, that is the sacrifice, or price, workers have paid for the 8 lost months on the New Frontier.

However, that is not all the story.

When the law goes to $1.25, 2½ years after President Kennedy pledged it would, then the workers covered—an estimated 3 million—can ask themselves how much they are out of pocket between the Democratic pledge and performance. The answer is a further loss of $1 billion in wage increases promised but not delivered. This is the additional price workers are now paying for the 2½ years which have disappeared in 8 months of the New Frontier.

When President Kennedy signed the law May 5, he said: "I want to express my satisfaction in signing the bill to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour."

Not a word was said about $1.15.

Not a word about the 2½-year wait ahead.

Here is the factual record:

August 3, 1960: Democratic-controlled Senate-House conferees failed to agree on President Eisenhower's proposed legislation for increasing the minimum wage to $1.15 effective January 1, 1961, the conference collapsing because Senator Kennedy insisted on $1.25.

August 30, 1960:

I intend to take this fight to the American people. I am sure that they will support me in November in my goal of a minimum living standard of $1.25 an hour * * *" (Senator Kennedy to the Minimum Wage Conference).

November 4, 1960:

We have a minimum wage—but to be of any help at today's prices it must be raised to $1.25 an hour (Senator Kennedy in a campaign speech).

February 6, 1961: President Kennedy asked Congress for a $1.15 law plus broader coverage with provision to go to $1.25, 28 months after the effective date.

May 5, 1961: President Kennedy signed the minimum wage bill into law thus making September 4, 1961, the effective date for $1.15, and September 4, 1963, the effective date for $1.25.

February 14, 1961: Secretary of Labor Goldberg told the House Education and Labor Committee that there were 1,906,000 covered workers who were making less than $1.15 and that the increase to $1.15 would mean an additional $336 million in their pay envelopes annually. Based on these figures the workers lost $224 million in their pay envelopes when Senator Kennedy scuttled President Eisenhowers' bill—eight-twelths of $336 million.

February 14, 1961: Secretary of Labor Goldberg also testified that there were 3,021,000 covered workers who made less than $1.25 and that the increase to $1.25 would result in $836 million more annually in their pockets. This means that the 2-year delay in President Kennedy's fulfillment of his promise to obtain a $1.25 minimum is costing the workers $500 million annually or a total of $1 billion for 2 years—$336 million subtracted from $836 million.

Increased benefits under Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

(Public Law 87–87. Approved July 14, 1961)

This law (H.R. 1283) increased the maximum level of weekly compensation benefits payable to workers or to the beneficiary of workers under the act who are injured or disabled within the course of their employment from $54 to $70; provided a comparable increase in death cases, adjusting the ceiling on average weekly wages from $81 to $105; and increased the statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000. These increases were based on the principle of the original act in 1927 which provided that compensation equal two-thirds of the difference between the average weekly wage prior to injury and the earning capacity of the worker after injury. Compensation under this act would not be paid by the Government and no appropriations would be necessary.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Missiles, planes, and ships authorization

(Public Law 87–53. Approved June 21, 1961)

This law (S. 1852) authorized $12,371 million for the purchase of missiles, planes, and ships for fiscal year 1962.

Included in the law was $596.2 million of authority for the procurement of heavy long-range jet bombers.

Military construction authorization

(Public Law 87–57. Approved June 27, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5000) authorized the sum of $893,947,750 for military construction for fiscal year 1962. Among other items in the authorization were 3,000 units of Capehart housing previously authorized and an additional $12 million in authorization for the Department of the Air Force to be used for the construction of test facilities for its large solid propellent booster in connection with the Nation's space effort.

Status of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates

(Public Law 87–100. Approved July 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4349) placed the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps (Regular) graduates in a status comparable to that of U.S. Naval Academy graduates, with respect

to the form of regular commission received by members of this corps. This law neither increased, decreased, nor otherwise affected the period of obligated service for these graduates.

The law also repealed existing provisions relating to the requirement for application to remain on active duty as a Regular officer. As a result of this law, these officers will have to make application in order to get out of the service at the expiration of their obligated tour.

The law would not apply to NROTC (contract) students who only agree to serve in the Reserve after graduation.

Providing uniformity for entitlement to reenlistment bonuses

(Public Law 87–103. Approved July 25, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4324) made the period within which reenlistments must be entered into under both section 207 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (reenlistment within 3 months) and section 208 which required reenlistment within 90 days uniform at 3 months. The law also provided relief to those persons who were erroneously paid higher reenlistment bonuses as a result of the technical difference between "90 days" and "3 months."

Authorization for President to order units and members of Ready Reserves to active duty

(Public Law 87–117. Approved August 1, 1961)

This law (S.J. Res. 120) authorized the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months or until July 1, 1962. The law restricted the number to not more than 250,000 members of the Ready Reserve who may be on active duty (other than for training) without their consent at any one time.

The law also provided that until July 1, 1962, the President may authorize the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, periods of active duty, periods of active duty for training, periods of obligated service, or other military status, in any component of an armed force, or in the National Guard, that expire before July 1, 1962, for not more than 12 months.

This legislation was part of the overall defense buildup asked for by the President in light of the international situation. It should definitely be noted that in all such instances, the administration received wholehearted backing from the Republicans in the Congress. Partisanship did not enter the picture, and the defense of the country was placed above all else.

Aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels authorization

(Public Law 87–118. Approved August 3, 1961)

This law (S. 2311) authorized additional appropriations in the amount of $958,570,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. It was an expansion and continuation of the previous authorization (H.R. 6151) which became Public Law 87–53.

Under this law the Army was allocated $36,700,000 for aircraft and $33,770,000 for missiles; the Navy and Marine Corps, $281,400,000 for aircraft, $262,200,000 for missiles, and $41,600,000 for naval vessels; the Air Force, $294,100,00 for aircraft, and $8,800,000 for missiles.

Permitting enlistment of certain aliens in Army and Air Force

(Public Law 87–143. Approved August 17, 1961)

This law (H.R. 181) permitted enlistment in the Army and Air Force by aliens lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–144. Approved August 17, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7851) made appropriations for the Defense Establishment of $46,662,556,000 for fiscal year 1962.

Of this total appropriation, the Army received $11,802,312,000; the Navy, $14,505,665,000; the Air Force, $18,836,534,000; and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, $1,310,445,000.

The above funds included about $3.5 billion which was requested as emergency funds for the Armed Forces buildup.

Nearly $1 billion was provided to continue development and production of long-range jet bombers. The Congress added $180 million over the administration request in an item of $400 million for development of B–70's.

The law also contained $207.6 million for civil defense projects, including fallout shelters to be constructed in Federal buildings.

This was one instance where, believe it or not, the administration did not want some additional money voted by the Congress. For instance, the Congress added $514,500,000 for the procurement by the Air Force of B–52 and B–58 long-range bombers, in addition to the $180 million over the administration request for development of the B–70's.

The Congress completely disregarded the administration's idea that there were already enough B–52's and B–58's provided for, and did not heed the administration's plea that this money not be added. The Congress felt that this country was in bad enough position relative to national defense and that it should not be allowed to get any worse. The use of missiles is new and relatively untried. Therefore, the manned bomber unmistakably would be our chief weapon of defense for the present and for several years to come. Also, the Congress had sense to realize that Russia was not relying on missiles alone, but was also building up her manned bomber force. So this additional money was added.

The Democratic-controlled Congress "charitably" gave as one of its reasons for the addition that they must appropriate enough money to make it possible for the administration to change its mind, implying that they were still hoping that the administration would open its eyes in this respect.

Military construction appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–302. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8302) made appropriations of $951,690,750 for military construction for the three service branches of the Department of Defense, including installations at home and overseas, for fiscal year 1962.

Naval vessels loan to friendly countries

(Public Law 87–387. Approved October 4, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7726) authorized the President to extend for an additional 5 years the loan of 2 naval vessels to Portugal and to Spain, respectively; to loan an additional 14 naval vessels to friendly foreign countries for 5 years (6 to NATO for Denmark and Greece, 2 to SEATO for Pakistan, 6 to the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China); and to place 2 vessels in the reserve pool to be loaned in case of loss by enemy action or act of God.

As originally proposed by the administration, extension of the ship loan beyond the original 5-year period would have been permitted at the discretion of the President without requiring congressional action. Congress deleted such discretionary authority.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Reducing duty-free allowances for returning resident travelers

(Public Law 87–132. Approved August 10, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6611) amended paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 by reducing temporarily from $500 to $100 the duty-free allowance permitted returning resident travelers from foreign lands with the exception of the Virgin Islands for which a duty-free allowance of $200 was permitted. The law would take effect 30 days after enactment and would be in effect for 2 years to July 1, 1963.

Small Business Act amendment

(Public Law 87–198. Approved September 5, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8922) amended the Small Business Act to increase by $20 million the amount available for regular business loans thereunder.

Increasing small business loan authority

(Public Law 87–305. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8762) amended the Small Business Act to increase the amount available for regular business loans. The law authorized new appropriations of $105 million and merged the revolving fund authorization for the business loan program and the prime contract program. Not to exceed $1,125 million would be in the revolving fund in the Treasury for use of the SBA in the performance of its duties and powers. The disaster loan fund was not pooled with that of the other two programs.

Export insurance and guarantees

(Public Law 87–311. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (S. 2325) amended the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss, and to authorize the Bank to establish a reserve of not less than 25 percent of its contractual liability in connection with such guarantees and insurance. The law placed a limit of $1 billion on the aggregate contractual liability of the Bank for such guarantees and insurance.

Amendment to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 relating to small business investment companies

(Public Law 87–341. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (S. 902) amended the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 by (1) raising the amount of capital the SBA may invest in a small business investment company (SBIC), on a matching basis, from $150,000 to $400,000; (2) by limiting to $4 million the amount of operating loan SBA may make to any one SBIC (in addition to the former limit of 50 percent of the SBIC's capital and surplus) and imposing as a limitation on loans and investments by SBIC without approval of SBA ceiling of $500,000 or 20 percent of the original capital and surplus of any one small business concern, whichever is the lesser; (3) by giving SBA authority to undertake administrative procedures to suspend an SBIC license or to issue a cease-and-desist order against violations of the act or regulations; and (4) by amending the provisions for loans to State and local development companies by raising the ceiling to $350,000 for each identifiable small business

concern and by raising the maximum maturity on such loans from 10 to 25 years.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS

Area Redevelopment Act

(Public Law 87-27. Approved May 1, 1961)

This law (S. 1) provided for designation of "redevelopment areas" based on amount and persistence of unemployment, with the Secretary of Labor providing basic data. It also provided—

(1) For designating areas not meeting standards of "redevelopment areas," taking into account the number of low-income families and amount of unemployment and underemployment.

(2) For industrial and commercial loans not exceeding $100 million for standard areas and $100 million for nonstandard areas. Loans were not to exceed 65 percent of the cost of the project with interest rate based on a formula that amounts to about 4⅜ percent. Maturities up to 25 years were permitted. An area must have an approved economic development program to receive financial assistance under this act.

(3) For public facility loans, the total of such loans not to exceed $100 million with interest rate at about 3½ percent and maturities up to 40 years.

(4) For grants for public facilities, the total of which was not to exceed $75 million.

(5) For establishing a revolving fund of $300 million for loans to be obtained by borrowing from the Treasury.

(6) For assistance to redevelopment areas and other areas in the form of information, advice, and research.

(7) For $4.5 million for technical assistance which may be provided by contract or directly.

(8) For administrative provisions.

(9) For authority to terminate designation as a "redevelopment area."

(10) For amending the Housing Act to increase flexibility in providing urban renewal assistance for nonresidential purposes.

(11) For amending the Housing Act to authorize urban renewal planning grants in redevelopment areas for not more than 75 percent of the cost of the project.

(12) For occupational retraining, $4.5 million a year to finance State and local retraining classes.

(13) For retraining subsistence payments, $4.5 million a year for States to pay weekly checks to unemployed while attending retraining classes.

The administration "worked both sides of the street" insofar as the financing for most of this program was concerned. In a bill sent to the House, the President proposed that the main feature—a $300 million loan fund—be provided for by the regular appropriations method. In the Senate, however, administration spokesmen noted that Mr. Kennedy—when a Senator—had favored so-called back-door financing of the program. Moreover, these spokesmen said the back-door method would be quite acceptable to Mr. Kennedy today. The back-door method was the one Congress eventually voted.

The program finally approved was nothing more than a blownup version of a more sensible, more logical, more economical approach which President Eisenhower had called for on a number of occasions. The only new jobs which the program guaranteed to create were those of the Washington bureaucrats hired to administer the effort.

By a few strokes of the pen, so to speak, the administration has created 647 new distressed areas—often to the astonishment and dismay of residents of the communities involved.

When the area redevelopment bill was under debate in Congress earlier this year, the Department of Labor listed 103 labor surplus areas in the United States. The term depended upon a variety of formulas. One required that a labor surplus area must have had an annual average unemployment rate of at least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

But when the area redevelopment bill became law, something new had been added. The Secretary of Commerce was empowered "to distribute (area redevelopment) projects widely among the several States so far as is feasible and proper, in order that actual experience with this program may be had in as many States and in as many different circumstances as possible."

This is the language which has brought on the rash of administration-designated "distressed areas"—a total of 750 such areas, or 647 more than under the old "labor surplus" definition. And there's nothing in the law which requires the Secretary of Commerce to consult local citizens before he tags their community as "distressed."

That's what happened this past summer in Tyler, Tex., which suddenly found itself a distressed area to the dismay of the inhabitants, at least one of whom found his credit shut off. Ironically, just a short while earlier, Tyler was feeling mighty good about business conditions thereabouts. The July issue of Progressive Tyler, a local publication, said building permits for the second straight month had topped the million-dollar mark, a tire company was getting set to open a big new plant, bank deposits were up. Tyler's newspaper, Morning Telegraph, reported Tyler was leading all east Texas in retail business activity and purchasing power.

Then on July 22, now termed "Black Saturday" by local residents, came word that the New Frontiersmen in Washington had decided that the area was "economically distressed." The first reaction of one Tyler newspaper was: "Where can we file suit for slander?"

Federal-aid-to-highways program

(Public Law 87-61. Approved June 29, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6713) made available an additional $11.7 billion for the interstate highway program.

Included in the financing of the program were $600 million a year from continuance of the present 4-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline until 1972; $150 million from other highway taxes; and $150 million made available by switching the 5-percent excise tax on trucks and buses from the General Treasury to the highway trust fund.

The law contained these tax increases:

1. Use tax on trucks and buses over 26,000 pounds increased from $1.50 per 1,000 pounds to $3 per 1,000 pounds.

2. Tax on highway tires increased from 8 to 10 cents per pound and on inner tubes, including tubes for bicycle tires, from 9 to 10 cents per pound through September 30, 1972.

3. Tax on tread rubber increased from 3 to 5 cents a pound through September 30, 1972.

4. Tax of 2 cents a pound on tires, 1 cent a pound on inner tubes, and 2 cents a pound on tread rubber on "floor stocks" on hand July 1, 1961.

The law also continued for 2 years the provision granting bonuses in allocations to States banning advertising billboards along the new roads.

The law provided that the manufacturers' tax on trucks, buses, and trailers already classified as a highway trust fund revenue source was to be transferred to the highway trust fund as of July 1, 1962.

A few interesting facts about this law.

The studies for such a program were begun by Congress as far back as 1946.

The program itself was begun under the Eisenhower administration.

There is a wide disparity between what the Kennedy administration proposed and what Congress agreed to, as indicated by the following examples:

First. The administration proposed that the diesel fuel tax be increased from 3 to 7 cents, but Congress set it at 4 cents.

Second. The administration proposed that none of the 10 percent manufacturers' tax on autos, trucks, buses, and trailers be diverted from the general to the highway trust fund, but Congress diverted the entire tax to the trust fund from July 1962 to October 1, 1972, on the grounds that nonhighway users would benefit from the program.

Third. The administration proposed that the tax on vehicles be raised from $1.50 to $5 per 1,000 pounds over 26,000 pounds when loaded, but Congress set the rate at $3.

Fourth. The administration proposed that the tread rubber tax was to be increased from 3 to 10 cents per pound, but Congress set this at 5 cents per pound.

Fifth. The administration proposed that the billboard control program be extended for 4 years, but Congress provided for a 2-year extension.

On this measure, most issues were bipartisan, and the voting did not in any sense of the word follow party lines.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

(Public Law 87-88. Approved July 20, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6441) provided that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall administer the act.

Other provisions were:

1. The Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, or other Federal agency concerned shall give consideration in the survey or planning of any reservoir to inclusion of storage for streamflow regulation for water control purposes, except that such storage and releases shall not be provided as a substitute for adequate treatment or other waste-controlling methods at the source.

2. The Water Supply Act of 1958 was amended to permit the Federal agency concerned to make its own determination of future water supply needs and, on the basis of such determination, to include capacity in a project without definite contractual commitments from State or local authorities.

3. An authorization of not to exceed $5 million per fiscal year with a total limitation of $25 million was provided for the development and demonstration by the Secretary of practical means of treating sewage and other wastes to remove the maximum amounts of pollutants in order to maintain the Nation's water at a quality suitable for repeated reuse; improve methods of identifying and measuring pollution; and methods for evaluating the effects of augmented streamflows to control pollution not otherwise susceptible to abatement.

4. Authorization for construction grants for sewage treatment plants provide for $80 million for fiscal year 1962; $90 million for fiscal year 1963; and $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964 through 1967 for a total of $570 million.

5. A conference can be called in the case of interstate pollution upon the request of the Governor, the State water pollution control agency, or with the concurrence of both and the governing body of any municipality. The Secretary may call a conference on his own initiative in the case of interstate pollution. In intrastate pollution, a conference may be called only when requested by the Governor of the State where the pollution is occurring. In cases involving intrastate pollution, the Secretary may refuse to exercise Federal jurisdiction if in his judgment the pollution is not of sufficient significance to warrant so doing.

6. If pollution is not abated within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may request the Attorney General to bring suit in the name of the United States only with the written consent of the Governor of the State.

The administration had wanted to give power exclusively to Federal officials to determine areas of pollution. The Congress clamped down on this attempt to further extend the control of the Federal Government and the executive branch, by providing that such determination be made with the cooperation and compliance of State officials.

Establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park

(Public Law 87–126. Approved August 7, 1961)

This law (S. 857) provided for the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park and authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the area described. The Secretary also was authorized to use donated funds and appropriated funds in making acquisitions under this law. Also established was a Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission which is to terminate 10 years after the date the seashore was established.

In a message to the Congress of February 23, President Kennedy called for the establishment of this national park, and also requested the establishment of two other parks by name, at Padre Island, Tex., and Point Reyes, Calif., S. 4, by Senator YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, to establish the Padre Island park, and S. 476, by Senators ENGLE, Democrat, of California, and KUCHEL, Republican, of California, to establish the Point Reyes park, hardly got off the ground. Why? Did their location have something to do with it?

According to a story in a Chicago newspaper of September 17, the Kennedy administration is listing this as one of the "major achievements" of its "magnificent" record during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It should be pointed out that this bill, S. 857, was sponsored by the two Senators from Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, and Senator SMITH, Democrat, former roommate of the President. That bill also received bipartisan support, and was not passed by Democrats alone.

Perhaps what makes this such a "major achievement" is the fact that it lies within Kennedy's home State of Massachusetts and deals with an area that has long been the playground of the Kennedy clan.

Amendments to Federal Airport Act

(Public Law 87–255. Approved September 20, 1961)

This law (H.R. 8102) amended the Federal Airport Act by authorizing Congress to appropriate up to $75 million a year for 3 years for grants for airport construction to be matched generally on a 50–50 basis by States and local communities.

This represented a major setback to the New Frontiersmen in their drive to commit Congress to appropriation by back-door financing. The Kennedy administration had requested a 5-year $375 million program based on the form of back-door spending called contract authorization. Firm opposition, primarily in the House of Representatives, eliminated the back-door financing and cut the length of the program to 3 years. The new law also adopted the program originally proposed by Republicans to limit airport aid only to measures which contribute to the safety of the traveling public.

Saline water conversion program expansion and extension

(Public Law 87–295. Approved September 22, 1961)

This law (H.R. 7916) provided for expansion and extension of the saline water conversion program, under the Interior Department, for developing practicable low-cost means for the large-scale production of water from saline water, with authorization for appropriations of not to exceed $75 million, to remain available until expended, through fiscal year 1967.

Among other things, the measure specifically provided for—

Saline water research, demonstration plants, financial assistance for construction of conversion plants, and grants and contracts to States and local bodies.

Delaware River Basin compact

(Public Law 87–328. Approved September 27, 1961)

This law (H.J. Res. 225) granted the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact for the conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related resources of the Delaware River Basin. It provided for participation in the compact by the United States and involved the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

Public works appropriations for fiscal 1962

(Public Law 87–330. Approved September 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 9076) appropriated $3,908,880,980 for civil functions of the Army and certain agencies of the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and several study commissions for fiscal year 1962.

The total included $724,021,880 for river and harbor and flood control construction by the Army's Corps of Engineers.

The Bureau of Reclamation received $152,405,500 for construction and rehabilitation of reclamation projects, power transmission facilities, and related activities. For plant acquisition and construction by the Atomic Energy Commission, $195,360,000 was appropriated.

This bill was one of the last to pass the 1st session of the 87th Congress—and for a very good reason. It had been purposely held up so that the projects in the legislation might be used by the administration to stimulate certain votes for other parts of its program contained in other bills.

Lead and zinc subsidies for small producers

(Public Law 87–347. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (H.R. 84) provided for subsidy payments for the mining of lead and zinc by small producers. The Secretary of the Interior was authorized to pay small producers 75 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the market price for lead, and 55 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the market price for zinc. A small producer was defined as one who has not produced or sold more than 3,000 tons of lead or zinc combined during any 12-month period between January 1, 1956, and the first day for which he seeks payment. Maximum individual production eligible for stabilization payments was set on a descending scale for 1962 through 1965. A total maximum authorization for payments each year was provided on a descending scale over the same period of time. Lead and zinc producers in about 20 States would be eligible for such subsidies.

A bill somewhat similar to this was pocket vetoed by President Eisenhower last year.

PERSONAL AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Food Additives Transitional Provisions Amendment of 1961

(Public Law 87–19. Approved April 7, 1961)

This law amended the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety" (Public Law 85–929), by extending from March 5, 1961, to June 30, 1964, the final effective dates of this law and Public Law 86–139, the Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant and Desiccant Amendment of 1959. This extension (H.R. 3890) authorized the continued use of certain additives and pesticide chemicals not covered by regulations issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the Secretary finds that such continued use would involve no undue risk to the public health, that such additives and pesticide chemicals were in commercial use prior to January 1, 1958, and that scientific investigations to determine safe levels of use were being pursued with due diligence.

Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961

(Public Law 87–22. Approved April 24, 1961)

This law (S. 278) extended for 4 years, to July 1, 1965, the program under which the Federal Government on a 50–50 matching basis aids the States to train practical nurses and made available $5 million yearly to carry out the program.

Aid to dependent children of unemployed

(Public Law 87–31. Approved May 8, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4884) amended title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. The program is a temporary one for a period of 14 months from May 1, 1961, through June 30, 1962, and is estimated to cost $200 million in Federal funds.

The law provided Federal participation in benefits for such children on the same basis as the existing Federal-State programs for children whose wage-earning parents have died, deserted them, or become disabled.

The new program was optional for the States.

Included in the law was a provision for some $10 million for an increase from $12 to $15 a month in Federal funds for medical care of persons on old-age assistance rolls.

Social Security Amendments of 1961

(Public Law 87–64. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6027) amended and broadened the social security program, effective 30 days after enactment, in the following manner:

1. Increased minimum benefits for retired workers from $33 to $40 per month.

2. Permitted men as well as women to start collecting benefits, on a permanently reduced basis, at the age of 62 years.

3. Increased widows' benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the husbands' benefits.

4. Changed eligibility requirements to permit payment of benefits to workers employed in a job covered by social security for one quarter out of every four calendar quarters since 1950, instead of one quarter out of every three quarters as now provided.

5. Raised from $1,201–$1,500 to $1,201–$1,700 the level of earnings of retired persons for which a dollar is deducted from benefits for every $2 earned. Deductions above $1,700 will be subject to dollar-for-dollar deductions.

6. Extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1962, the deadline for applications by disabled persons made eligible for benefits under the 1960 law.

7. Amended the Internal Revenue Code to increase scheduled social security payroll taxes by adding an additional one-eighth of 1 percent on employees and employers and an additional three-sixteenths of 1 percent tax on the self-employed. The new tax schedule, effective January 1, 1962, was (for employees and employers in 1962) 3⅛ percent; for 1963–65, 3⅝ percent; for 1966–67, 4⅛ percent; for 1968 and after, 4⅝ percent. For the self-employed the tax for 1962 was 4.7 percent; for 1963–65, 5.4 percent; for 1966–67, 6.2 percent; and for 1968 and after, 6.9 percent.

8. Increased for 9 months, $15.8 million in funds for matching Federal grants to the States for public assistance payments to the aged, blind, and disabled, and changed the formula to increase to $31 the amount for which the Federal Government will pay 80 percent, and upped the limit from $65 to $66 with the change effective from October 1, 1961, through June 30, 1962.

9. Authorized for 1 year, ending, June 30, 1962, funds for temporary aid to U.S. nationals returning home under distressed circumstances.

What noble words have been uttered about the needs of the older people for better medical care. What statesmanlike phrases, what unkept promises have been spoken on this subject. What deathless prose.

What dead prose.

The President has said:

This is a matter of national concern. I believe the need for such insurance is urgent.

He placed medical care for the aged under social security on his 16-point priority program for action this session of Congress. Nothing whatsoever has happened to implement his recommendation.

The President promised on November 1, 1960, that, if he were elected President he would submit "to Congress within 30 days" after he took office and immediately enact a plan for medical care for the aged under social security. Well, he kept part of that promise. He did submit the program.

That is as far as it went. The House Ways and Means Committee which would first have to take action on such a proposal, became so bogged down trying to untangle the mess of the President's tax-revision proposals, that it never got around to medical care for the aged under social security.

But, other plans, not under social security, were introduced into this session of Congress. But, alas, they, for the most part, were Republican plans—and of course nothing happened in regard to them.

After all, what Democratic committee chairman would dare take action on any medical care plan—particularly a Republican one—that was not under social security. The administration wants such a plan under the social security system, but apparently they can't get what they want.

So, nothing has been done.

The beautiful, heart-rending speeches about the needs of the older people were as hollow and shallow as many of the orators from whom they emanated.

The concern voiced was not—as the people were led to believe—with the urgent need for such legislation. The concern was actually with just how to further lead this country down the road to socialism—by placing the medical care under the social security system.

Aid for training teachers of the deaf

(Public Law 87–726. Approved September 22, 1961)

This law (S. 336) established a grants-in-aid program to assist in training teachers of the deaf. It authorized appropriations of $1.5 million annually for 2 years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961

(Public Law 87–395. Approved October 5, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4998) (1) expanded such facilities for the chronically ill and the aged; (2) provided for expanded research to more effectively develop and utilize hospitals and other medical care facilities; and (3) increased grants to assist in constructing health research facilities.

To accomplish these three purposes, the law did the following:

1. Increased authorization from $30 million to $50 million a year for the next 5 years for the chronically ill and the aged.

2. Set up a new 5-year program of $10 million annually for special project grants to public and nonprofit organizations for developing new or improved methods outside hospitals, also for the chronically ill and the aged.

3. Increased for a 3-year period from $10 million to $20 million authorization for grants-in-aid to States for constructing private and other nonprofit nursing homes.

4. Liberalized eligibility criteria for constructing rehabilitation centers under Hill-Burton program by requiring such centers to provide medical service and either psychological, social, or vocational services.

5. Extended Hill-Burton authorizations for construction loans for hospitals and other medical facilities until June 30, 1964.

6. Increased annual appropriations ceiling for hospital research grants from $1.2 million to $10 million, extended the program to facilities other than hospitals, and authorized grants for constructing and equipping experimental facilities.

7. Amended authority of the Surgeon General, PHS, to make nonmatching grants to construct health research facilities by restricting same to projects of regional or national significance.

8. Extended for an additional 3 years the matching grant program for constructing health research facilities, with an increase in authorized annual appropriations from $30 million to $50 million.

TRANSPORTATION

Extension of authority for dual-rate contract agreements by steamship conferences

(Public Law 87–75. Approved June 30, 1961)

This law (S. 2154) extended until September 15, 1961, the dual-rate contract agreements by steamship conferences which permits temporary exemption from the antitrust laws.

Federal Aviation Act of 1958 Amendment

(Public Law 87–197. Approved September 5, 1961)

This law (S. 2268), known as the antihijacking law, provided—

(1) That aircraft piracy, or attempted aircraft piracy, is punishable by death, if so recommended by the jury, or by not less than 20 years imprisonment, if the death penalty is not imposed;

(2) That interference with flight crew members or flight attendants on board an aircraft in flight in air commerce is punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both;

(3) That the carrying of weapons on aircraft by unauthorized persons is punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and

(4) That the imparting of false, willful, and malicious information concerning an alleged attempt to commit any act of aircraft piracy is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Subsidy to American-flag steamship lines

(Public Law 87–243. Approved September 14, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6309) amended title VI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide that, effective July 1, 1962, advance payments of vessel operating-differential subsidies could not exceed 90 percent of the estimated subsidy, except that an additional 5 percent might be paid after the contractor's audit was completed and the Secretary of Commerce had verified its correctness. Under previous law the foregoing percentages were 75 and 15 respectively.

The Department of Commerce in its report on the bill indicated opposition. Department opposition was cited when the bill was considered in the Senate. However, the House report stated the Department "subsequently withdrew its objections, after further study, because of the permissive nature of the legislation which leaves discretion to the Secretary of Commerce as to the percentage of subsidy payable before audit."

Licensing independent ocean freight forwarders

(Public Law 87–254. Approved September 19, 1961)

This law (S. 1368) amended the Shipping Act of 1916 to require licensing by the Federal Maritime Commission of all persons independently engaged in the business of forwarding shipments by oceangoing common carriers from the United States or its possessions, and to authorize payment by the carriers to forwarders as compensation for services performed in connection with the dispatch of such shipments.

GSA favored provisions requiring licensing of forwarders, opposed provisions to permit carriers to compensate forwarders for services furnished shippers. The Budget Bureau indicated no objection from standpoint of administration's program. GAO opposed provisions to permit carriers to compensate

forwarders for services furnished shippers.

Construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards

(Public Law 87-266. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6732) amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to exclude from the 50-percent minimum U.S.-flag participation under section 901(b) all vessels built, rebuilt, or documented abroad (after enactment) until such vessels have been documented under U.S. laws for 3 years. It was designed to discourage American operators from transferring vessels to foreign registry and then redocumenting them under the American flag at their convenience, and to provide an incentive to American-flag tramp operators to build new vessels in the United States.

Use of vessel reserve funds for research and new design (containerization)

(Public Law 87-271. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6974) amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to authorize operators of subsidized vessels to use their capital reserve funds to finance research, new design, and development programs; to permit borrowing from capital reserve funds to acquire cargo containers; and to provide safeguards against undue depletion of such reserve funds.

Extending preferred status to mortgages covering vessels, including tugboats, of 25 or more gross tons

(Public Law 87-303. Approved September 26, 1961)

This law (H.R. 2308) amended the Ship Mortgage Act to extend preferred status to mortgages covering towboats, barges, scows, lighters, car floats, canalboats, or tank vessels of 25 or more gross tons in order to meet the needs of the small operators and generate construction work for shipyards. The previous law conferred such preferred status only on vessels of 200 or more gross tons.

Dual-rate contracts for shipping

(Public Law 87-346. Approved October 3, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6775) amended the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, to provide permanent legalization of steamship conferences, notwithstanding our antitrust laws, and to authorize ocean common carriers and conferences thereof to enter into dual-rate contracts with shippers.

TREATIES

Columbia River Basin Treaty

(Ex. C, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified March 16, 1961)

Under the treaty, three large storage dams would be built in Canada, doubling former storage capacity for regulating the flow of the main part of the Columbia River. The increased storage capacity would be used for controlling floods and increasing the generation of electric power for the benefit of the United States and Canada. The treaty would be in force for 60 years, termination optional.

Convention on the Organization for Economic Development

(Ex. E, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified March 16, 1961)

OECD would replace OEEC and add to the 18-nation OEEC membership the United States and Canada. The convention provided for consultation and voluntary cooperation among member nations for the purposes of (1) promoting the economies of member countries, and (2) assisting the less developed countries and distributing the aid burden more equitably. The resolution of ratification included a declaration intended to protect the constitutional division of powers between the Executive and Congress.

Second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding certain matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds

(Ex. D, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified May 4, 1961)

The agreement would provide for validation of German dollar bonds whose owners obtained them from legitimate sources and not as a consequence of Soviet seizures of bonds in Berlin at the close of World War II. The procedures for validation would be the same as those provided in a 1953 treaty between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to bonds of issuers located in the Federal Republic and the western sectors of Berlin.

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954

(Ex. C, 86th Cong., 2d sess. Ratified May 16, 1961)

The convention was designed to alleviate pollution of the high seas by prohibiting discharge of oil and oily wastes by tankers and other ships in prescribed areas and thereby to control their harmful effect on coasts and coastal waters, birds and other wildlife, and fish and marine resources. In 1960, the President recommended acceptance, subject to an understanding, reservations, and recommendations, which were included in the resolution of ratification.

Proposals by the United Kingdom for modification of the International Loadline Convention

(Ex. I, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified May 16, 1961)

The convention prescribed the depths to which ships engaged in international commerce might be loaded and required such ships be marked with loadlines in accordance with the convention's terms. The proposal was designed to prevent retroactive application of the provisions of the convention involving ship structures.

Treaty of Extradition Between the United States and Brazil

(Ex. H, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified May 16, 1961)

The treaty followed the pattern of some 65 other extradition treaties then in force, including all the countries of South America except Brazil. Neither country would have to extradite if the death penalty might be imposed, primarily due to the fact that capital punishment is prohibited under Brazilian law. Crimes subject to extradition, conditions to be satisfied, procedures to be followed, and circumstances when extradition would not be granted were contained in the various articles of the treaty.

Treaty of Friendship and Navigation Between the United States and Belgium

(Ex. J, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified September 11, 1961)

The treaty contained provisions designed to provide protection for the property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium.

This treaty required that if any dispute regarding any provisions of these conventions arose between the parties, and if such dispute was not satisfactorily settled by other means, the dispute would be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

Treaty of amity and economic relations between the United States and Vietnam

(Ex. L, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified September 11, 1961)

The treaty contained provisions designed to provide protection for the property and interests of American citizens and companies in Vietnam.

This treaty required that if any dispute regarding any provisions of these conventions arose between the parties, and if such dispute was not satisfactorily settled by other means, the dispute would be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

Geneva Radio Convention

(Ex. I, 86th Cong., 2d sess. Ratified September 25, 1961)

The main purpose of this convention, dealing with the international regulation of radio communication, was to replace those which were adopted at Atlantic City in 1947 and approved by the Senate in 1948.

The new regulations included special provisions for research purposes, to support the space program; recognition of the unique spectrum requirements of radio astronomy, by designating a number of bands for radio astronomy observations; and special procedures to eliminate interference in the field of high-frequency broadcasting.

Geneva International Telecommunications Convention

(Ex. J, 86th Cong., 2d sess. Ratified September 25, 1961)

The main purpose of the treaty was to continue in effect the principal provisions of the convention signed in Buenos Aires in 1952 and approved by the Senate in 1955.

It contained provisions governing composition, functions, and structure of the International Telecommunication Union—ITU—a specialized agency of the United Nations with permanent headquarters in Geneva.

The ITU was generally recognized as an effective organization for carrying on negotiations among its members and for coordinating the use of all forms of international telecommunications.

VETERANS

Veterans' home loan extension

(Public Law 87-84. Approved July 6, 1961)

This law (H.R. 5723) extended both the VA guarantee and direct home loan programs for veterans. The program for veterans of World War II was extended to July 25, 1967. The program for veterans of the Korean war was extended to January 31, 1975.

The law also increased from $13,500 to $15,000 the maximum amount an eligible veteran may borrow from the Government as a direct loan in areas where private financing cannot be obtained. For this purpose $1.2 billion was provided for direct home loans over the next 6 years.

Under this law, a veteran will be eligible for a GI loan for 10 years from the date of his discharge from his last period of wartime service, plus an additional year for each 3 months of active wartime duty.

Board of Veterans' Appeals

(Public Law 87-97. Approved July 20, 1961)

This law (H.R. 866) amended section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals. It also required that these decisions of the Board shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. The amendment takes effect as of January 1, 1962.

Increasing special pension payments to certain persons awarded Medal of Honor

(Public Law 87-138. Approved August 14, 1961)

This law (H.R. 845) liberalized the requirements for entry on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Congressional Medal of Honor rolls by prescribing age 50 as an eligibility requirement. It increased the special pension from $10 to $100 for those recipients who specifically indicate a desire to receive such special pension. Recipients who are

now receiving the $10 special monthly pension would not have to indicate such a desire for the increase but would automatically be paid the new $100 rate from the effective date which began on the first day of the first month following enactment of this act.

Special dividends for certain national service life insurance policyholders

(Public Law 87–223. Approved September 13, 1961)

This law (H.R. 4359) amended section 723 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of dividends on insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 which had been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section.

The administrative expense to the Veterans' Administration involved in the payment of the special dividend would be borne by the revolving fund. The Bureau of the Budget believed that these expenses should be paid from retained earnings of the fund before distribution. The VA favored the legislation.

This legislation was nothing more than a hoped-for popularity by paying veterans in advance.

Increased dependency and indemnity compensation for certain veterans' widows

(Public Law 87–268. Approved September 21, 1961)

This law (H.R. 6969) amended section 417 of title 38, United States Code, to adjust dependency and compensation rates so that benefits for certain widows of veterans whose deaths are due to service connection will not be less generous than benefits payable to widows of veterans whose deaths are nonservice connected.

Leadership and Literacy in Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the dedication of the Van Alan Clark Science Center of the Loomis School, Windsor, Conn., Dr. T. Keith Glennan, former Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, addressed the faculty and students of the school. "Leadership and Literacy in Science and Technology" was the subject of his talk, and I believe his remarks deserve serious attention. I would like to include the text of his remarks in the RECORD:

LEADERSHIP AND LITERACY IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

(By T. Keith Glennan)

Headmaster Grubbs, Mr. Clark, members of the Loomis family whose forefather, Joseph Loomis, founded this school, trustees, faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the Loomis School, in the proceedings of this great day, when we are met this day to dedicate the Van Alan Clark Science Center, I am deeply honored to be a participant.

The dimension of Loomis as an institution engaged in the development of intellect and character is well known. The Loomis quality in teaching, learning, and leadership is exemplified by the careers of its graduates in the best colleges and universities and in the practical affairs of life itself. I have asked myself, "What has built the Loomis dimension and quality?" In looking for an answer, I have found the hallmarks of any effective institution of learning—an able faculty; an alert administration; a student body of high intellectual promise; wisdom, judgment, and support from a loyal constituency of trustees, alumni, and friends; devotion to country; and faith in God.

Yet what is the unique mark of Loomis? On this point, I have heard the basic insistences of your first headmaster, Nathaniel Horton Batchelder: honesty, independent thinking, fair play, and hard work. Behind these I find Mr. Batchelder's prior, and more general principle, the importance of the habit of doing the right thing.

This principle, it seems to me, summarizes the moral and intellectual virtues as habits of action and constitutes the evident foundation for the eminence now enjoyed by this institution.

I regard the Clark Science Center of the Loomis School as the latest evidence of its exemplary habit of doing the right thing.

Over the past 10 years, I have given some part of my time and energies to the administration of two very large governmental organizations working in the fields of science and technology. The most recent experience was in the field of space exploration for peaceful purposes. I shall not distract you with a detail of this great effort to coordinate governmental, industrial, and academic organizations and people for what may well be the most exciting adventure man has undertaken. I shall simply state two abiding concerns of us all. The first is whether we can get the scientists and engineers who can lead us to the successes we have come to expect from American science and engineering. The second is whether the Americans, as a people and as an electorate, will learn enough about science and its methods to support the effort with the intelligence and conviction we have a right to expect of a free people.

To point up the crucial character of these concerns, I shall ask and answer some questions I am sure are in your minds.

Is the Soviet Union a worthy competitor of the United States in science and technology? Yes.

Have Soviet scientists and engineers demonstrated clear technological superiority in some phases of space exploration? Yes.

Will they put a man on the moon and bring him back before we do? They may.

Can we beat them at this if we spend more money—say $20 billion more than called for under the last budget submitted by the Eisenhower administration? Perhaps, but the issue would still remain in doubt.

Has the American program nevertheless learned more about outer space than the Soviets? Yes.

Will this approach pay off in the end with supremacy in space exploration and provide significantly beneficial results for all mankind? Yes.

I say flatly to you that the understanding of these questions and my answers to them requires, first among other things, an understanding of the nature and methods of science and technology. Those having interests and abilities in the sciences should discover and develop them as the vocation of their lives. I know of nothing they could do better with their lives. Those whose interests and abilities lie in other fields should nevertheless acquire by active learning a sufficient understanding of the nature of science to guide and support intelligent public action to strengthen the American scientific and technological effort. I know of nothing that is more needed by the country.

It is to these activities—the early discovery and education of native scientific talent and the understanding of scientific attitudes, methods, accomplishments, and limitations by all—that the Clark Science Center is being dedicated this day.

To illustrate the sort of thing I am sure will go on in the center, and I hope one day in every secondary school of the country, let me tell a rather precise ancedote.

Galileo was curious about the motion of free-falling—that is to say, uniformly accelerating bodies. He had, quite literally, figured that the velocity was proportional to time. He devised an inclined plane to make a body fall more slowly in order to observe better what happened, and was not surprised to find in the course of the experiments that what he had figured was so.

Galileo was curious—curiosity is, of course, a universal human impulse.

It has surely led man to all his discoveries, most of his progress, and plenty of his troubles. An ordinary man is usually curious about specific things like the meaning of a girl's smile and this can certainly lead him to discovery, progress, and sometimes, to trouble. A scientist or philosopher, on the other hand, is curious about ideas and concepts of the nature of the universe. Disciplined curiosity, deliberately released from the particular and addressed to the general, gives the scientist leverage, makes his discoveries significant, and leads him to the progress and troubles that are my topics.

Galileo was curious about motion, yet this curiosity did not spring whole from the brain of Galileo alone. He had plenty of help.

Though he was an Italian and lived in the 16th and 17th centuries, he had help from Aristotle, a Greek who lived and wrote in the 3d century B.C. He had help, too, from men of other countries and times. The medieval schoolmen had broken down motion into uniform and nonuniform motion, and nonuniform motion into nonuniformly accelerated motion and uniformly accelerated motion. This last concept Galileo took as the object of his prime curiosity. A Dutchman named John of Holland had accurately described uniform motion as a body traveling the same distances in equal measures of time Nicole Oresme of Paris had shown geometically that, for a uniformly accelerated object, the mean velocity was half the sum of the initial velocity and the final velocity. These discoveries linked in specific mathematical relationships velocity with distance, and distance with time. With our 20–20 hindsight, the next step seems easy, almost obvious. Yet it sometimes takes a genius in the right circumstances to make it. It is also clear that had Galileo not taken it, somebody else would have. The time was ripening, and the next step, the eternal problem of science, has a certain inevitability. It is akin to capping a joke, or finding the last, right word for a poem.

Aristotle and his followers had held that the velocity of a uniformly accelerating body was proportional to the distance traveled. Galileo went him one better. True, the velocity was proportional to the distance, but the distance was proportional to the square of the time; therefore the velocity was proportional to the time. Galileo proved these propositions in a series of geometrical propositions and, in doing so, leaned heavily upon his predecessors.

Notice that the argument, both ways, is deductive. Deductive analysis still has an important place in science, but its conclusive weight, if any, was demolished by Galileo's experimental approach establishing the relevant facts of nature. I had better let Galileo himself say how he did this.

Here, then, is history's first laboratory report:

"A piece of wooden molding or scantling, about 12 cubits long, half a cubit wide, and

3 finger-breadths thick, was taken; on its edge was cut a channel a little more than one finger in breadth; having made this groove very straight, smooth, and polished, and having lined it with parchment, also as smooth and polished as possible, we rolled along it a hard, smooth, and very round bronze ball.

"Having placed this board in a sloping position, by lifting one end some 1 or 2 cubits above the other, we rolled the ball, as I was just saying, along the channel, noting, in a manner presently to be described, the time required to make the descent. We repeated this experiment more than once in order to measure the time with an accuracy such that the deviation between two observations never exceeded one-tenth of a pulsebeat. Having performed this operation and having assured ourselves of its reliability, we now rolled the ball only one-quarter of the length of the channel; and having measured the time of its descent, we found it precisely one-half of the former.

"Next we tried other distances, comparing the time for the whole length with that for the half, or with that for two-thirds, or three-fourths, or indeed for any fraction; in such experiments, repeated a full hundred times, we always found that the spaces traversed were to each other as the squares of the times, and this was true for all inclinations of the plane; that is, of the channel, along which we rolled the ball. We also observed that the times of descent, for various inclinations of the plane, bore to one another precisely that ratio which, as we shall see later, the author Galileo had predicted and demonstrated for them.

"For the measurement of time, we employed a large vessel of water placed in an elevated position; to the bottom of this vessel was soldered a pipe of small diameter giving a thin jet of water, which we collected in a small glass during the time of each descent, whether for the whole length of the channel or for a part of its length; the water thus collected was weighed, after each descent, on a very accurate balance; the differences and ratios of these weights gave us the differences and ratios of the times, and this with such accuracy that although the operation was repeated many, many times, there was no appreciable discrepancy in the results."

Notice the elements of control: The very straight, parchment-lined groove and the very round bronze ball to make the distances accurate and reduce friction to negligible effect—the adjustability of the plane to different inclinations to vary the speed from experiment to experiment—the divisibility of the plane into accurate fractional distances—the confirmations of results through repetition—the water clock measuring time by the weight of the water expended through controlled flow during each roll of the ball—and the checking of this device through repetitions showing no appreciable discrepancies.

Notice, too, the meticulous honesty of the account. We are permitted to infer that the groove was not perfectly straight, but only "very straight"; that the ball was not perfectly round, but only "very round"; and that there were discrepancies, but so small as to be not appreciable.

Note the invention and design of devices for precise observation and measurement in every case relevant to the problem except the common one—the vetrical drop. Experimental science, unlike deductive analysis, is not a matter of commonsense, but special sense. Galileo, lacking the observational means for the case of the free-falling body, approximated this condition by devising a method for accurate observation and timing at different but known distances and inclinations.

Hearing this experimental evidence, simplico, the Aristotelian of Galileo's day, then says: "I would like to have been present at these experiments; but feeling confidence in the care with which you have performed them, and in the fidelity with which you relate them, I am satisfied and accept them as true and valid."

In this we laymen are invariably and necessarily simplicos. We take the experimental findings of science on faith. Yet in so doing, we should know what we are doing. We should early in life be thrust into an environment like the Clark Science Center. Here, even though our main interests and abilities lie elsewhere, we follow deductive analysis, put the theorems to experimental test, and make experiments ourselves. We are then in position to accept the findings of science with something less than faith, let us say, with a reasoned and experienced confidence. The only proper object of faith, after all, is God.

Before leaving the greatness of Galileo as the founder of experimental science, let me mention his contribution to the defining of a scientific problem for investigation. This contribution was an exclusionary principle; namely, rule out all possible extraneous factors and keep things simple. We have seen that Galileo ruled out the case of the vertical drop because he could not observe or time it accurately. He ruled out physical friction by making it negligible. He ruled out air friction in these experiments because it, too, was negligible. Yet Galileo knew air resistance was not always negligible, particularly in his pioneer work in ballistics. He excluded it simply to cut loose from the difficulties and clarify the basic problems. The difficulties he left to the engineers.

I hardly know a better way of distinguishing between basic science and engineering than to say that the engineers, as designers of devices, structures, and systems for practical application, have to put scientific exclusions back into the problem—exclusions like frictions, vibrations, temperatures, pressures, and human beings. Some, it turns out, can still be excluded as negligible. Some have to be controlled. Others have to be neutralized.

At some point, I think, elementary engineering problems should have a place in the learning processes carried on in the Clark Science Center. A sense of their scope would yield an understanding of our leadtime requirements in getting from basic scientific concepts to practical applications.

Finally, I would emphasize that all of Galileo's theorems on the mechanics of motions were stated and demonstrated in mathematical terms. Galileo himself felt that the entire universe was ordered in accordance with mathematical principles. This idea, though very old—running back to Plato and the Pythagoreans—also found expression in Newton's laws, quantum mechanics, and relativity theory. Mathematics is a truly interdisciplinary language and tool of science and engineer. Its most important impact is high-powered generalization. The power of its deductive systems to analyze specific—even unknown and unsuspected—relationships is well demonstrated. Galileo himself used plane geometry to analyze specific relationships of time, distance, and acceleration with respect to uniformly accelerating bodies.

Today we can use, and have used, computers to help analyze these and many other factors with respect to artificial bodies traveling in space. I would hope for close relationships between mathematics instruction and science instruction in the Clark Science Center.

I now repeat my anecdote about Galileo. Galileo was curious about the motion of free falling—that is to say, uniformly accelerating—bodies. He had, quite literally, figured that the velocity was proportional to time. He devised an inclined plane having negligible friction to make a body fall more slowly in order to observe better what happened and was not surprised to find in the course of the experiments that what he had figured was so.

I have tried to explain the significances of this anecdote as I see them. I shall draw no tiresome lessons. I chose Galileo because he stood where youngsters with little or no scientific learning stand today, where too many Americans stand today, in a world of Aristotelian physics. Galileo considered the Aristotelian world with its flat earth where, if things moved, they had to be pushed or pulled. It was and still is a most plausible world to the uneducated observer. Galileo thought, however, that the world might be otherwise. He invented a method of finding new knowledge that places us today in a very small world, a part of the Newtonian solar system of a minor star on the outskirts of one of the lesser galaxies in an Einsteinian universe.

How all this learning came about is only the basic primer for those who would make science and technology their careers. The need for these professionals is pressing. It may even be desperate. Scientific and technological supremacy rests upon superior aggregations of talent in depth and over time. This race we are beginning to lose. Last year we graduated less than 35,000 engineers. The Soviets graduated more than 100,000—and those who contend they are inferior to ours are not sustained by the available evidence.

As for those whose interests and abilities lie elsewhere, I would have them understand Galileo's gift to us all. I think we must engage in a vast effort toward scientific literacy among the entire American people.

I would rid people's minds of cliches about scientists as mad geniuses and engineers as open-collared roughnecks in boots.

I would replace this nonsense with an understanding of the methods of science and engineering. I would abolish the absurd image of the disloyal scientist with an understanding of the absolutely necessary cooperation and essential internationalism of scientific advancement. I would destroy faith in sudden, miraculous breakthroughs with an understanding that behind every breakthrough lie hundreds, even thousands, of relevant investigations in prior literature. I would discard the easy assumption that scientific and technological supremacy depends upon some arbitrary number of budgetary billions of dollars. I would have the people know that supremacy depends upon superior aggregations of scientific and engineering talent in depth over time. I would have them understand what this talent can and cannot do. I would convince them that money for finding, educating, paying, and equipping this talent is well spent; that funds forcibly directing it to spectacular feats are worse than wasted. They waste talent and time and defy our whole experience in the encouragement of scientific and technological advancement.

In these matters of educating professionals and laymen, we of the colleges, universities, and technological institutes look to the better ordering of our own instruction. Beyond this we look to the primary schools where science and mathematics begin simply. We look to the secondary schools where abstraction, analysis, and experimental science can surely reach the complexities now thought appropriate to college instruction. We look with especial confidence to the independent, private, and preparatory schools, like Loomis, for the leadership that is the responsibility of their freedom.

Loomis has long had one of the best preparatory-school science programs in the country. I hail the Clark family for supporting this program with the well-conceived, modern installation and equipment that is the Clark Science Center. It is for the scientific instruction of boys who shall

one day be leaders of men and opinion. It is for their good and for the common good of the country. It is a right thing.

I thank you.

Be Sure You Live in One of the Big Five

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, electoral college reform remains one of the most urgent and significant challenges confronting this Republic. I continue to be hopeful that before the 2d session of the 87th Congress adjourns we may be able to approve and send to the States for ratification a workable, equitable congressional amendment to correct the inequities of our present electoral college system.

As one of the authors of Senate Joint Resolution 12—the so-called district plan for electing presidential electors—I believe this proposal incorporates the necessary reforms without injecting into our presidential elections any new elements of inequality or danger. Senate Joint Resolution 12 is an improved and modified version of the former so-called Mundt-Coudert amendment which developed nationwide support a year or two ago.

In connection with the need for electoral college reform, I hereby call attention to an interesting article appearing in the Omaha World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., published September 26, 1961.

It is entitled "Be Sure You Live in One of the Big Five," and is written by John Jarrell of the Omaha World-Herald Washington staff.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANT TO BE PRESIDENT?—BE SURE YOU LIVE IN ONE OF THE BIG FIVE

WASHINGTON.—Any native-born American boy or girl has a chance to grow up and become President, under the Constitution.

Right?

Right.

But listen to Mississippi's Democratic Senator JAMES EASTLAND:

"The dice are loaded against any child becoming President who was born in and wants to live in any State other than one of the five largest States in the United States."

Mr. EASTLAND had some research carried out, in connection with the Senate debate on rule 22 (cloture) to prove his point that the small States get the crumbs and the big ones the gravy.

By 10-year periods, he studied the five largest States, a list that varied through the years. At the time of the Constitution, for example, they were Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, and Maryland.

Today they are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio.

Of 30 Presidents elected on their own, said Mr. EASTLAND—passing those who succeeded and never faced the electorate for President—23 definitely came from the 5 largest States.

He dismisses five more for various reasons—Herbert Hoover is a Californian; California was not then one of the top five but soon entered the charmed circle, and besides Mr. Hoover was more a citizen of the whole country.

Similarly, he said, Benjamin Harrison was from Indiana (then sixth) but born in Ohio, in the fourth spot.

Texas-born, Kansas-raised Dwight Eisenhower lived in New York when elected, he said.

Mr. EASTLAND concedes that President Kennedy, from Massachusetts, is one elected from outside the big five. But he finds Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, the only President elected from a really small State (111 years ago).

Also, he said, major Cabinet jobs and Supreme Court appointments have largely gone to the populous five. Eight States (even before Hawaii and Alaska) have never had a Cabinet member. Twenty (not including the two new ones) have not had a Supreme Court justice.

"I challenge any one," said Mr. EASTLAND, "to consider these figures and to deny the inevitable conclusion that the small States and the people therein have been cut out and discriminated against in having a voice in the operation of the Federal Government."

The Senate, he contended, is the only bastion where they have such a voice.

Need for Immediate Nationwide Action on White House Conference Recommendations in Education for Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech I made recently at the New England Conference on Education for Aging at the University of Rhode Island, pointing up the need for immediate nationwide action on White House Conference recommendations in education for aging:

NEED FOR IMMEDIATE NATIONWIDE ACTION ON WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS IN EDUCATION FOR AGING

(By Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, New England Conference on Education for Aging, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., August 29–30, 1961)

WANTED: LESS TALK AND MORE ACTION IN AGING

Reverend Collins, Governor Notte, Mr. Bresnahan, Dean Browning, ladies and gentlemen, it was with sincere pleasure that I accepted the invitation to speak here today. I consider this New England Conference on Education for Aging to be one of the truly hopeful results of the White House Conference.

The Office of Education deserves a great deal of credit for its foresight in planning for the series of regional meetings to implement the recommendations of the Conference that are uniquely the responsibility of education and educators throughout the Nation.

I was glad to see the statement in the preliminary material for this meeting, sent out by your program chairman, that you are expected to develop "specific action recommendations" and not a "repeat of the recommendations which emerged from the White House Conference on Aging."

Those of you who have heard me speak before, on the subject of aging, know of my plea for action. I believe we have long since passed the stage where words can be substituted for tangible deeds. If we are sincere, we can start to build with the tools at hand and with the vast amount of information and knowledge we already possess.

I would not be honest with you, if I did not also share my disappointment in the lack of positive planning and action that has followed the national conference that was said by many to be "the beginning—not the end," "the launching pad," "a milestone for action," and other high-sounding promises. So far, these can be considered empty phrases, or professional oratory.

No conference is expected to perform miracles, but I do not think the American public was expecting too much, to believe that following all of the local and State meetings involving thousands of citizens, building toward a national conference that included the outstanding people in the field of aging, that there would be more reassuring activity than we have had to date.

Is it any wonder that meetings are being held to consider the political aspects of aging? The elderly are beginning to lose faith in those who speak in their behalf and are wondering whether the only recourse remaining is action through pressure. I hope this will never be necessary, but rather that we, together with the older persons may find answers to the complex situations that have resulted for this rapidly expanding segment of our population.

Your deliberations these 2 days can exert a very positive influence on the role that education will play in accepting and discharging its responsibility for the elderly who have earned the right to fair treatment and stand ready to share in the effort necessary to put words into action.

As I reviewed the background statements for the White House Conference and the policy statements developed at the meetings, I became aware of two recurring themes that seemed common to each: (1) The need to involve older persons in the research and planning for their age group, and (2) the need for further education at all levels and in every phase of the problem.

It would be presumptuous of me, in the presence of so many educators, to attempt to suggest the methods. Instead, I would like to suggest some of the areas where the need for additional information or education is apparent, if we are to face up to the Nation's second most challenging problem. Next to achieving peace, the problem of our aging is considered to be the most serious social problem of our time.

My list of areas requiring educational support and assistance is not complete, nor is it arranged in any way to suggest priorities. To some degree, they are interrelated.

1. The image of aging itself is old fashioned and inaccurate. We, of course, are vitally concerned with the problems of all older persons, but we have emphasized the indigent and senile aged and have neglected the elderly who are enjoying better health in their later years than at any time in our history. This group will continue to reap the benefits of the millions of dollars being devoted to research into every aspect of health that will benefit all age groups including senior adults.

I am aware that the theme of a recent conference was "Changing the Public Image of Aging." I am not aware, however, of any significant action that is being taken to accomplish it.

2. Ability still is not accepted as the basis for hiring and retiring—in spite of the studies that have proven older workers to be more of an asset than a liability. Who educates management to the point of removing age barriers to employment or replacing chronological age as the basis for separation?

3. Never before have we been so acutely aware of the housing needs of the elderly. New legislation offers greater hope for achieving the goal. But, who will convince local authorities to amend zoning restrictions and who will overcome the concept that homes for the aged are undesirable and breed future slum areas.

Perhaps even more discouraging to older persons are the age restrictions that exist in available housing. Even where they can afford to pay the rentals and apartments are vacant, individuals over 50 and 55 are being rejected as undesirable—too old.

4. Much has been said about the need to introduce an understanding of the problems of aging at the earliest reasonable period in our educational program. Who is preparing or revising the curriculums and textbooks? Who has trained the instructor to teach the material?

5. Everywhere I hear about the need for professionals in the field of aging. Where are such courses being given? Is there sufficient subject matter and research to establish a collegiate degree in the field of aging?

6. For the retired persons who may be bed- or home-bound and for others who depend on television for filling time—what kind of educational viewing is beamed toward them to challenge their minds, overcome illiteracy for some, and to train them for more responsible senior citizenship?

7. Where are the educational programs needed to supplement earlier training? It was recently said that doctors and others who have worked in the medical field for any length of time should attend graduate courses or seminars in geriatric psychology. For whom and by whom should such sessions be arranged?

8. With shortages in teacher supply or teacher assistants what efforts are underway to take advantage of the experience and talents of the thousands of retired teachers who are interested and willing to serve?

9. Preparation for the later years is recognized as the key to successful retirement. But at best, it is still being scheduled on a hit-and-miss basis. Who should sponsor such training, and by whom should it be given?

You can and will add other areas to my nine-point list in your deliberations, but it is unmistakably clear that there is a job to be done at every educational level and by every available educator.

I would hope that every first-rate college and university throughout the Nation would develop a program for its retired alumni that would make it financially feasible and possible for them to return to the campus to participate in programs that will keep them interested and alert throughout their later years.

Adult education leaders in every community should consider ways to bring the instruction to the retirement or nursing homes—either in person or by way of educational television.

Under the cooperative research program of the Office of Education, grants can be made for programs in aging. This law has been in effect for several years, but to my knowledge the University of Michigan has submitted the only acceptable application to be approved. Following this series of meetings across the Nation, there should be many dynamic projects initiated, under this research program, that will give real meaning to the authorizing legislation.

Before closing, I would comment on two recommendations that I made when I last spoek on the subject of aging in this region: (1) That a regional center on aging should be established on this campus, and (2) that I would introduce legislation establishing a Federal Commission on Aging.

Plans are well along for the regional center, meetings have been held on the campus and in Washington to identify distinguished leadership for the project and to establish guidelines for grants. It is appropriate that the University of Rhode Island serve as host for this regional meeting.

As you know, I introduced my bill H.R. 2238 to establish a Federal Commission on Aging immediately following my remarks at the opening session of the White House Conference on Aging. I expected an action program to be submitted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

During the hearings on the Department's appropriation, I severely criticized their representatives for failure to give leadership to a Federal program in aging. These remarks I also included in the report of the hearings. Because I believed action could not wait for the next session of Congress, I scheduled hearings on my bill for a Federal Commission on Aging.

Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare advised me of several organizational changes and expressed a sincere interest in initiating an immediate program of action. Rather than divert any staff from this goal, I had the hearings on my bill postponed.

Confirming my action to postpone the hearings, I wrote to Secretary Ribicoff and raised seven basic questions that I believed required answers, if the Department were to demonstrate its interest and support of a program that would measure up to the known needs and provide the leadership expected of the Department that expends two-thirds of the money spent by the Federal Government for services and benefits for older persons.

Briefly the questions covered: my concern for the failure of the Federal Council to carry out a dynamic interdepartmental program; the need for more direct and effective channels for initiating legislation and public relations activity; the assurance, that following the White House Conference, the relationship with national organizations, the vital place of the regional representative on aging, and the continuation of projects begun under the conference act would not terminate with the final report of the meeting.

I also expressed my deep conviction in maintaining a bipartisan approach to the entire field of aging and the desirability of a citizens advisory group.

It would have been far better for the expanded program to have been included in the regular budget proposals. However, I advised the Secretary of the possibility of a supplemental appropriation and the need for immediate action.

I have been assured the Department will submit a supplemental request for funds that will make it possible to expand staff, authorize grants for research, training, and demonstration projects in addition to those presently permitted under existing authority. Also, it is my understanding that a nonpartisan advisory committee will be named by the Secretary.

If all of this comes to pass, I believe we would all agree, that we are off to a good start. The success of the Department's program will not depend entirely on their efforts, but the combined efforts of Government at all levels, with interested volunteers and private organizations and most important of all—the energy, imagination, and support of citizens of all ages throughout the Nation.

Your efforts here will make a significant contribution toward the responsibilities of the Office of Education in the total departmental program. I must say the Adult Education Section of the Office of Education has a headstart with one regional conference completed, with this one well under way, and the planning for the seven others nearly completed.

We can all hope that statements like the following quotation may by eliminated if our efforts are successful. It reads, "Never have so many said or written so much about a class of people so old. Everywhere you look is an article, a speech, an interview, or theory expounded about retirement. People just retired, or about to retire, must be getting self-conscious. But there is one peculiarity about this flow of concern and counsel regarding senior citizens. It is full of paradoxes—exact opposites approaches."

I do not suggest that we shall all suddenly agree on a single answer to each of our problem areas. We are dealing with individuals, separately molded, with widely different backgrounds and experience gained during an earlier 40 or 50 years.

As the article states further, "It takes all kinds, and these days all kinds grow old." To which we may also add—that by whatever route an individual reaches later maturity, he never surrenders his right to independence or dignity—and he never loses his desire to be needed and appreciated.

For those of us who believe that education is a lifelong experience, the task before us, though broad and uncharted, will give a special measure of deep personal satisfaction.

At a time in world affairs when all available manpower and every existing talent needs to be alert, prepared, and strong, we dare not falter or delay in our efforts to recognize and reclaim the vast army of senior soldiers who have served and whose experience and wisdom are still very much needed. Time is of the essence—the deadline for action is now.

What Happens to Our Foreign Aid to Colombia, South America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on August 26 an arresting and significant news story appeared in our Nation's press—describing the curious fact that Lauchlin Currie is in the front ranks of planners in Colombia, South America, who will determine the use made of American taxpayers' dollars loaned or given to that country.

I think all Americans should read this news dispatch and then ponder the news commentary by Richard Starnes which deals with this almost unbelievable situation.

I ask unanimous consent that both the news dispatch and the news commentary be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUCHLIN CURRIE TO HELP SPEND U.S. LATIN AID

WASHINGTON.—Lauchlin Currie, who chose to stay out of this country rather than face inquiries on Communist Party associations, is in the front ranks of planners in Colombia whose task it will be to spend American money allocated under the newborn Alliance of Progress.

Mr. Currie, on the White House staff from 1939 to 1945 and a former World Bank employee, went to Colombia in 1950 as a private consultant to reorganize the Government's administrative setup for a $150,000.

A year later the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee began its mammoth investi-

gation of the Institute of Pacific Relations and related matters concerning the fall of China to the Communists, Elizabeth Bentley, confessed Red spy, testified that Mr. Currie had cooperated with an underground group of the Communist Party and had been one of her informants.

LINKED WITH IPR

Mr. Currie was also listed as a member of the board of trustees of IPR in 1946. Members of the organization were linked by the Senate committee to propaganda activities which aided the Communist takeover in the Far East.

In 1953 a report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation was made public which listed Mr. Currie as a supplier of documents to a Russian spy ring.

Rather than answer questions concerning the Bentley testimony, Mr. Currie chose to remain in Colombia. His U.S. citizenship was revoked late in 1955 because he had remained outside this country longer than the 5 years permitted for naturalized citizens.

Information received here from the Colombian-American Chamber of Commerce gives the details of Mr. Currie's plan, which he calls Operation Colombia. A Spanish language newspaper received here also outlines the plan in an interview with Mr. Currie.

The former Roosevelt assistant is identified in both as a consultant of various Colombian planning and economic boards. No official word has been received from the American Embassy in Bogotá on Mr. Currie's role, however.

The Currie plan presented to Colombian officials would combine land reform and industrialization. He recommended breaking up the land into small, highly mechanized farms operated by their owners. He suggested moving 1,500,000 people from rural areas into Colombia's four most populous cities to strengthen homebuilding, public works, and factory output.

NEW HAUNT TO J.F.K.

(By Richard Starnes)

NEW YORK, August 25.—A mysterious, half-forgotten figure who was branded a fellow in the consortium of Communist spies that operated in the New Deal days has returned to haunt President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

He is Lauchlin B. Currie, a former administrative assistant to F.D.R. Mr. Currie, now a citizen of Colombia, was frequently mentioned in congressional investigations as a tool of the Soviet spy apparatus in Washington. In 1953 the FBI named him as a procurer of Government secrets for Communist spies. Elizabeth Bentley, a former courier for a Communist espionage network, testified that Mr. Currie's job was to steal White House secrets for the spy ring.

The former White House aid hotly denied all the charges under oath. But in 1950 he left the country and settled in Colombia, where he became an occasional adviser to the Colombian Government. In 1955 his U.S. citizenship was revoked on the ground that Mr. Currie, a native of Nova Scotia who was naturalized here in the midthirties, had automatically forfeited his citizenship by remaining outside this country for 5 years.

I can find no record that Mr. Currie protested revocation of his U.S. citizenship. In 1954 he married a Colombian national, and so far as the record goes has not set foot in the United States since. The State Department, however, glumly asserted that it had "heard" Currie had been in New York recently.

I have been unable to check this tidbit of information at this writing. The State Department, of course, has ample reason for its uneasy interest in the doings of Mr. Currie, erstwhile accused cat's-paw of Soviet espionage and current adviser to the Government of Colombia.

Mr. Currie, for all his fragrant record in Washington, is the author of an economic development plan which is now under serious study by the Government of Colombia. If it is adopted it will become the blueprint for spending that nation's share of the multibillion-dollar alliance for progress fund.

Mr. Currie's plan, according to State Department sources, is a far-out scheme for "forced draft" industrialization of Colombia. It envisions, among other things, "effective" industrialization within 2 years—a goal which experts regard as wildly unrealistic. Another aspect of Mr. Currie's blueprint involves the mass removal of much rural population to proposed industrial areas.

Concerned as it is over the harebrained Currie plan, our State Department has carefully avoided making any suggestion that the Colombian Government reject it. Any representations now, the State Department is afraid, would be misunderstood as meddling with Colombian sovereignty.

But the fact is that our officials would be in an equally embarrassing dilemma if a Latin American government offered a crackpot blueprint in a bid for Alliance for Progress funds. If the Colombian Government, for example, adopted the Currie "forced draft" proposals, and this country then rejected them, it would be interpreted as a tremendous affront by Colombia.

Washington officials, who are frankly unhappy over the whole mess, are hoping such subtle hints as have been dropped in Bogotá will be enough to torpedo the Currie scheme without damaging our relations with Colombia.

The Captive Nations and House Resolution 211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was heartening to witness the call of the President for a full-scale discussion of colonialism in the United Nations Assembly. Millions of Americans who recognize the basic strategic value of all the captive nations in a cold or hot war are looking forward to this eventuality. We hope, though not without some misgivings about our present abilities, that the facts on Moscow's colonialism, both within and outside the Soviet Union, are fully and courageously disclosed.

In submitting House Resolution 211 last March to create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, it was one of my aims to prepare for such an occasion. The work of such a committee would be a continuing source of data, information, and ideas on Moscow's colonialism, useful not only to our executive agencies but also to the American public at large. In January we shall intensify our efforts to create this necessary committee.

The interest of our people in the captive nations is profound and widespread. I have shown this week after week in the letters and documents placed into this RECORD. Continuing this policy, I, under unanimous consent, include the July 18 editorial on "We are Guardians of the Flame" in the Dayton Daily News in the RECORD. I also include the editorial on "The Captive Nations" and the reproduced article on "The Myth of Soviet Unity," written by Dr. Lev. Dobriansky, of the Georgetown University, in the RECORD. Both pieces appeared in the April–June 1961 issue of Newsletter From Behind the Iron Curtain.

The articles follow:

WE ARE GUARDIANS OF THE FLAME

Captive Nations Week is something more to mourn than celebrate.

It irks Premier Khrushchev no end that America marks this week, calling the world's attention to Hungarians, Bulgarians, Czechs, Poles, Albanians, Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, East Germans, Tibetans, Chinese, the Russians themselves, and others who live without freedom.

The East Germans, now pouring into West Berlin at the rate of 1,000 a day for fear a separate treaty with the Soviet Union will close their escape hatch, are luckier than most. The Hungarian blood bath still recalls what happens when people under communism dare to assert their rights at home.

Khrushchev himself made history, as he fought his way to the top in the Kremlin inner circle, by denouncing the dead Stalin as a ruthless egomaniac. Yet while the old dictator lived, Khrushchev was a fawning slave, joining in hymns to Stalin. He became top dog too recently to forget what the underdogs are thinking and hoping.

The hope of the enslaved is with us who possess freedom. It is the hope that, if we can keep the spark of liberty alive, it will spread, eventually, to their own lands. Old weapons backfire and old diplomacy is ineffective in this grim epoch, but to forget the captive is to stand in danger of falling captive.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The captive nations are testimony to the fact that we cannot do business with Communists. Americans should remember that there is not a single nation or territory under communism which did not have relations with the Soviets. Moreover, the more high-sounding the treaties and agreements made with the Soviet Empire, the quicker and more absolute was the enslavement. By studying the captive nations for the lessons they can teach we learn that:

1. Red Russia cannot be contained by disarmament pacts, cultural exchanges, windy debates, give and take agreements, appeasement.

Rather, the seed of communism's destruction lies within itself. The conquered are longing and planning for their freedom. To shake hands with Khrushchev—or with the one who may soon replace him and start the cycle over again with friendly smiles and lofty proposals—is to snuff out the captive's spark of resistance, a weapon against our own enslavement. For our own sake, therefore, we should work to keep Americans aware of the present state of the captive nations and of the best natural hope for our victory, which comes from them.

2. The strongest advantages of the enemy are not military, but political and psychological.

It was not armed might that locked the galling chains about necks of the captive nations. Although Russia's greatest conquests occurred in times of war, the armies came second. First there came subversion in government; the puppets of appeasement assured the people that peace, friendship, and freedom were to be the gifts of cooperation with the Reds. In education, traditional moral standards and patriotism

were held up for examination as curiosities, and then suppressed. In communications, what the people should not know was not reported and what they could know was subtly distorted. The string about each nation's throat became a cord, and the cord became a rope, and the rope eventually became an iron chain. We must be totally prepared militarily; but no amount of armed might will protect us if we rot—from within.

If all we know is what is in the refrigerator, what is on TV, how much gas is in the car, and which cigarette pleases most; if all we have time for is luxury, then we should hoard well our comforts, for we have not long to enjoy them. We must have time, even in the name of selfishness, to learn and teach the lessons of the captive nations, to win this war of politics and psychology which the Soviets have declared.

3. To work for our own preservation, we must work toward liberation of the captive nations.

It is foolish to talk about keeping ourselves and the rest of the free world from Communist domination without planning the liberation of the enslaved 900 million freedom fighters. Waging ideological, political, phychological war is the way. The free world must become absorbed, in international dealings, with the subject of the captive nations. Every reliable report of Red suppression of the enslaved must become subject to investigation by the free world.

Young Hungarians, who as children joined the 1956 uprising, remain in prison today, some to be executed at the age of 18, others to bear the physical and mental tortures inflicted in an effort to convert them to communism. Hungarian parents see their preteen children marched off each summer to camp where they are thoroughly indoctrinated. If these parents believe that free peoples are resigned to appeasement, we cannot expect them to correct repeatedly the lies taught their children. Therefore, given enough Khrushchev visits, there will be no captive nations a generation hence, but only Communist nations.

Within Russia itself, as we think of it, there are entire nations of enslaved, suffering people. In 1937 Khrushchev was sent to the Ukraine. He systematically liquidated 400,000 men, women, and children. This purge of a national group was the bloodiest in history until 1943, when Krushchev returned to the Ukraine and repeated his terrible slaughter on a large scale.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond comprehension. Justice and charity demand we preface any evaluation of peaceful coexistence with consideration of the plight of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Caucasus, China, Cossackia, Croatia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, and White Ruthenia.

It is not practical to negotiate on other matters without insisting on freedom for the enslaved; for by doing so we write off the millions who look to us for help, we invite further Communist aggression, we become slowly reconciled to surrender via default.—The Patrick Henry League Special Edition, 1960.

THE MYTH OF SOVIET UNITY

Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky has written an excellent article entitled "The Myth of Soviet Unity," which expodes a number of generally accepted misconceptions. Dr. Dobriansky, associate professor of economics at Georgetown University and staff member of Georgetown's Institute of Ethnic Studies, is an authority on the Soviet Union and communism, whose views have been widely quoted in leading newspapers, governmental studies, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in many scholarly publications.

Representative EDWIN B. DOOLEY, of New York, has included the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 86th Coongress, May 4, 1960, with his remarks. We republish the article as follows:

"The U.S.S.R. is a giant with clay feet—a restless conglomeration of many unwilling nations held in bondage by masters of deceit in Moscow. Soviet strength depends largely on hiding this fact from the world.

"POPULATION FIGURES

"The U.S.S.R.

"Russians, 96 million; non-Russians, 114 million; Estonia, 1,200,000; Latvia, 2,100,000; Lithuania, 2,700,000; Byelorussia, 10,300,000; Ukraine, 42 million; Cossackia, 10 million; Idel-Ural, 15 million; Georgia, 4 million; Armenia, 1,800,000; Azerbaijan, 3,700,000; Uzbek, 8,100,000; Turkmen, 1,500,000; Tadzhik, 2 million; Kazakh, 9,300,000; and Kirghiz, 2 million.

"Figures based on U.S.S.R. census, 1959.

"Propaganda is the Russian Communists' most important weapon in the cold war. Out of a strange mixture of truths, half-truths, and bald lies, they have cunningly devised an amazing system of deception. Chief among their deceits is the myth of Soviet unity.

"This myth is kept alive only as long as we remain ignorant of the facts. It is high time we exploded the myth with knowledge of the truth.

"What Americans do not know about Russia came to light painfully last July when a joint resolution, unanimously passed by Congress, called for the observance of Captive Nations Week. Now Public Law 86-90, this congressional act is the first official recognition which our Government has made of the existence of non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

"The act of Congress mentions many captive nations without and within the U.S.S.R. borders. Deceived by Russian propaganda Americans had long thought of captive nations only in terms of the satellites in eastern and central Europe.

"When the resolution was made public, reporters, commentators, and the public inquired, 'Where is White Ruthenia? Where is Cossackia?' Many admitted that they had never heard of Idel-Ural or Azerbaijan or even Turkestan. Meanwhile a number of writers and analysts continued along their merry but blind way to apply this act of Congress solely to those minority captive nations in central Europe.

"Those who investigated the situation were astonished to discover that there are more captive nations within the U.S.S.R. than there are without. They were surprised to learn that the people of those captive nations within the Soviet borders outnumber all the Russians combined.

"When the joint resolution was passed few Americans appreciated this fact. But Khrushchev did. Knowing the implications of President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, he exploded.

"Khrushchev was aroused because he wants to hide from the free world the fact that Russia, although a political giant, is a giant with clay feet—a giant whose framework is made up of many different strands.

"We must understand some important distinctions between tribes, nations, states, voluntary federations, and tyrannically constructed empires.

"The state, it should be noted, is simply the political aspect of the nation. Sometimes you have several nations voluntarily existing in one state, as in Switzerland. Again, you may have a nation being ruled, in separate parts, by two governments, as in Ireland. Again, many nations, against their will, may be politically and tyrannically controlled by one superimposed government, as in the Soviet Union.

"After World War I, the present captive nations within the U.S.S.R., were newly independent states. In the collapsing Russian empire, after World War I, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and other non-Russian nations, declared their political independence. They were free of czarist control. Furthermore, they had no mind to submit to Communist control from Moscow. They established themselves as free democratic republics. Ukraine and Georgia were even recognized as separate states by Lenin's Soviet Russia.

"We remember well the tragic fate that overtook independent Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and others in the forties. But what most of us forget is that similar tragedies befell Georgia, the Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and others in the early twenties. Trotsky's Red Russian Army had picked them off one by one after softening them up by infiltration, subversion, propaganda, etc.

"By 1923, following the first wave of Red Russian imperialism, these non-Russian nations were forced into the spurious federation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Because of their large populations and their natural resources, these non-Russian nations formed the base for Moscow's further imperialist thrust into central Europe. Currently, they form the base for Russian colonial designs in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa.

"Yet—and here is a basic point which Americans must grasp—these non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. have not passively accepted the Soviet yoke. Each decade, since the twenties, has seen serious friction, resistance, even open rebellion, scald the hand of their Moscow masters.

"This struggle continues. Not a month goes by that Moscow does not launch a fresh attack against this nationalistic trend. Indeed this opposition to Moscow pressured Stalin to bid for the inclusion of Ukraine and Byelorussia as original members of the United Nations. From time to time, Moscow finds it expedient to pretend that the non-Russian republics are independent. Amendments to the U.S.S.R. Constitution provide for these republics to have their own war ministries and to enter into direct diplomatic relations with other states. Moscow clearly does not underestimate the reality of these restless nations.

"In December 1957, Khrushchev addressed the Supreme Soviet in Ukraine. He referred to Ukraine as 'a truly free and independent nation.'

"But Nikita Khrushchev is not fooling the Ukrainians—and he dreads their genuine nationalism. Even during the illusory 'spirit of Camp David' his agents in Munich assassinated the Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stefan Bandera, and, under the economic disguise of 'voluntary resettlements, Khrushchev is currently engineering the deportation of families from western Ukraine to central Asia and the Crimea.

"These non-Russian nations within the Soviet borders are ancient peoples with long histories and periods of national freedom. Ukraine has 42 million people, the biggest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. The three Baltic nations number 6 million; White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), 10.8 million; Georgia, 4 million; Armenia, 1.8 million, Azerbaijan, 3.7 million; and Turkestan, purposely divided by Moscow into five 'republics,' (Kazakh, Tadzhik, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Uzbek), 22.9 million. Add to these some 10 million ethnic and nationally conscious Cossacks located above the Caucasus, and about 15 million Moslems concentrated in the Idel-Ural (Volga-Ural) country, and you wind up with the sizable figure of about 114 million people. This figure covers only 11 compact ethnic and national non-Russian units. There are many small tribal units besides. The Russians number 96 million. Kremlin propaganda concerning the eco-

nomic progress of the U.S.S.R. would take on a different color if it were subjected to the searching light of reality.

"Moscow is supervising an uneasy conglomeration of many nations within the borders of the U.S.S.R. and a restless system of additional colonies outside its borders.

"An economy based on extensive captive resources can hardly be compared with a free national economy. Most of the resources within the U.S.S.R. are concentrated in non-Russian areas: agriculture in Ukraine, Turkestan, and Georgia; coal in Ukraine and Turkestan; oil in Azerbaijan and Idel-Ural; 90 percent of the manganese in Georgia and Ukraine; iron ore in the Caucasus and Ukraine. Turkestan, three times the combined size of Britain, France, and Germany, alone accounts for about half the copper, lead, zinc output, and is also rich in bauxite and silver.

"Soviet propaganda concerning the military might of the U.S.S.R. also acquires a different shade of meaning when confronted with facts. Forty-three percent of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian. Even apart from likely Russian defections, this is most significant. As for potential Ukrainian, Russian, and other defections, Hungary has furnished the most recent example of what may happen.

"Despite their inner weaknesses, the Russians have not only manufactured a myth of unity and invincible strength but they have managed to have the myth accepted by America. They myth has been swallowed not only by the public but by newsmen, commentators, columnists, and political leaders in high levels of government. A few examples:

"The New York Times, October 21, 1958: 'Cardinal Agagianian is Russian by birth, having been born near Tiflis.' This statement makes about as much sense as asserting that 'Cardinal D'Alton is English by birth, having been born in the British Empire.' Cardinal D'Alton is Irish and Cardinal Agagianian is Armenian.

"Returning from a visit to the U.S.S.R., Adlai Stevenson wrote: 'Russia is still a land of sharp and vivid contrasts.' He meant the U.S.S.R.

"Last July the Governors' report on the Soviet visit was issued. Referring to the United States and the U.S.S.R., the report stated: 'Ways must be devised for the people of these two major nations to understand each other.' Even Khrushchev, speaking to various peoples within his empire, would not go so far as to call the U.S.S.R. a nation.

"We would expect the U.S. Office of Education would be correctly informed. Yet, in its 'U.S. Mission's Report on Education in the Soviet Union,' we read: 'The one fact that most impressed us in the U.S.S.R. was the extent to which the nation is committed to education as a means of national advancement.' Actually, our Government still recognizes the free governments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

"I can almost hear my readers complaining that I am indulging in semantics. But this is not merely semantics. Senator John F. Kennedy would resent it very much if people kept calling him Richard M. Nixon and vice versa. Everyone likes to retain his own identity, his own background, character, and intentions. So do peoples and nations.

"The cold war today is being waged basically on the propaganda level. Hearts and minds of men are the primary targets. This has always been Russia's empire-building mode of attack. But Moscow's lies will eventually smash themselves against the hard reality of truth. Truth makes men free—and we can begin to triumph over imperialist Russian totalitarianism once we replace our misconceptions of Russia with knowledge of the truth. The captive nations resolution was a start. It is tragic that Moscow knows this better than we."

Will This Administration Stand Firm on Red China and Outer Mongolia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Congress concludes its 1st session of the 87th Congress, one of the great questions confronting the country is whether the J.F.K. administration will take the necessary steps at the United Nations to prevent the admission of Red China and Outer Mongolia—two Communist countries whose every effort in the U.N. would be to injure the cause of freedom and advance the cause of Russian communism.

I call attention to an editorial in the August 12 issue of the Saturday Evening Post on this subject and also to a radio editorial aired by Mutual Radio on the same subject. The radio editorial was presented on August 5 by Robert F. Hurleigh, president of MBS. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN DID OUTER MONGOLIA CAST OFF ITS RED SHACKLES?

For some reason the State Department appeared surprised because Chiang Kai-shek was said to be upset by reports that Washington was about to recognize Communist-satellite Outer Mongolia as an independent republic worthy of a seat in the United Nations. Ambassador Everett Drumright was called back to Washington from Formosa, presumably to be given instructions on how to explain to the generalissimo that our trafficking with Outer Mongolia was just a little shenanigan between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. which needn't mean anything to Formosa.

But what in the world is the point of giving non-Communist Asia even 5 minutes of the shakes to revive this often-exploded notion that Outer Mongolia is independent? If President Kennedy or Dean Rusk or whoever is responsible for this bizarre idea would brush off the published hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations—before Senator Patrick A. McCarran's subcommittee in 1952—the ancestry of this hoary heresy would expose its shabbiness. On page 4522 et seq. of the aforementioned hearings is the testimony of William C. Bullitt, our first Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Mr. Bullitt testified that Owen Lattimore, an expert on the Mongolian question, came to him in Moscow early in 1936 on the way from a visit to Outer Mongolia. Lattimore, according to Bullitt's testimony, urged Bullitt to recommend to President Roosevelt that Outer Mongolia be recognized as a "fully independent" republic.

"I asked him," said Mr. Bullitt, "if there was no Soviet control of the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia. And he replied there was no Soviet control whatsoever. I asked him if the GPU, which at that time was the title of the Soviet secret police, had no control there, and he said they did not, that the Mongolian People's Republic was independent and that his advice, which he urged me to telegraph at once to President Roosevelt, was that the American Government should immediately recognize the independence of the Mongolian People's Republic."

All this came as quite a shock to Mr. Bullitt because only a month earlier he had had a revealing conversation with an old acquaintance of his, an assistant commissar named Karakhan, who had been quite active in Outer Mongolia on behalf of the Soviet foreign office, Karakhan, according to his own statement, was sent to Outer Mongolia in 1934 to finish off any signs of restiveness under Soviet control. On his return to Moscow Karakhan called on Bullitt at the U.S. Embassy.

"I said to him that I had heard he had been out there to finish off the People's Republic of Outer Mongolia, or rather any signs of independence in it, and he said that indeed he had, but it was a very small affair." Explained Karakhan, "After all, in a country of nomads there are only 300 or 400 people that count, and all I did on a given night was to have about 400 people seized by the GPU agents in the army and police force, and I had them shot before dawn and installed the people that the Soviet Government wished to have installed."

It seemed incredible that a Soviet official would be so frank with a foreigner, but Mr. Bullitt assured the committee that he had known Karakhan since 1919 and that they were, as the phrase is, "just like that."

Mr. Bullitt also knew, before the arrival of Lattimore in Moscow, that the U.S.S.R. had signed a protocol of mutual assistance with Outer Mongolia and that the Chinese had made "the strongest kind of a protest" against the infringement of the sovereignty of China. "I was obliged to conclude," said Mr. Bullitt, "that either Mr. Lattimore knew nothing about the subject on which he was supposed to be the leading American expert or that he was deliberately attempting to assist in the spread of Communist authority through Asia. I left the matter * * * with a question mark in my mind."

Recently Mr. Lattimore visited Outer Mongolia again, and this time his pet project, which has been turned down repeatedly, seems about to be accepted. Why? If Outer Mongolia is any less a Soviet satellite than it was in 1936, evidence is lacking. Isn't this where we came in?

EDITORIAL BY MUTUAL RADIO

The issue of China and the United Nations, which has been under discussion in Washington all this week, is a serious one. In all probability, we will suffer a major defeat at the General Assembly meeting next month. We just do not have the votes any more to prevent Communist China from gaining admission to the world body. In the General Assembly the United States is just one vote among 99, a nation known as the Upper Volta, for example, has as much voice—the same vote—as we do.

For some reason, the so-called neutralist nations are perfectly willing to overlook the bloody track record of Communist China and vote for it. They do not seem to realize, or care, that what they are voting for is to condone gangsterism, murder, and tyranny.

The U.N. has had its share of reversals. But its blackest day will be the one on which it admits Red China.

Goals of the New Frontier: Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, thus far in 1961, the Kennedy administration has sparked more constructive action on the critical problems of boosting farm income and managing

our food abundance than had been recorded through all the previous 8 Republican years. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a résumé of the accomplishments of this administration and the 1st session of the 87th Congress in the field of farm legislation.

Executive and congressional actions since Inaugural Day have improved the position of farm families in terms of income, morale, and prestige.

We have, indeed, come a long way since the 20th day of January.

Here are just five of the steps:

First. Net farm income in 1961 will be about a billion dollars above the total for 1960—the last of the do-nothing Benson years.

Second. In cities and towns across the land there is a growing appreciation for farm families and their ability to produce abundance for what they really are—blessings. The last administration's concept of farmers and abundance as burdens, as a basis for frustration and admission of failure, is fading away under the impact of truth.

Third. The family farm is again recognized as a fundamental part of the free enterprise system and a major contributor to a rich and rewarding social, spiritual, and cultural life.

Fourth. The farmer has been returned to full citizenship status through a strengthened system of farmer-administration of agricultural programs, through expanded use of farmer-advisers in mapping policies at the Washington level, and through the administration's clearly expressed confidence in the ability and the willingness of farmers to utilize self-help opportunities in production and marketing management, and;

Fifth. Full recognition is being given to the need for coordinating farm and food policies, so consumers and producers may share equitably in the benefits of abundance.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way. Yet, as every farm family knows, we still have a long way to go—and President Kennedy, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Members of the Congress who share their philosophy and their goals know it, too.

The solution to the farm problem, President Kennedy said in his first farm message to the Congress, "lies not so much in severe restrictions upon our talent to produce as upon proper channeling of our abundance into more effective and expanded uses. American agricultural abundance can be forged into both a significant instrument of foreign policy and a weapon against domestic hardship and hunger."

And, in combination with those objectives, the President added this significant point:

> It is also our purpose to insure that the farm family that produced this wealth will have a parity in income and equality in opportunity with urban families—for the family farm should be protected and preserved as a basic American institution.

As he took over direction of the Department of Agriculture to administer programs aimed at achieving the administration's goals, Agriculture Secretary Freeman left no doubt about his will to put vitality and purpose into remedial action—and to do it with an all-out appreciation for the need to act right now.

"We can neither ask nor expect an indefinite continuation of programs and policies under which the U.S. Government pays ever-increasing amounts for stockpiles of commodities that threaten to become evermore unmanageable," he declared. "Nor," he added—and this is the guideline for the Secretary's efforts—"can we either ask or expect that the American farmer shall continue to invest his capital, his labor, his skill and his management ability for a reward that is not only shockingly below the national average but substantially below any accepted American standard for a minimum wage."

Words, of course, can carry purpose and promise, but they are meaningless unless they lead to deeds.

What has been done by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Members of the House and Senate who have a sincere concern for the welfare of farmers?

Mr. Speaker, the first big effort was in the field of bringing the supply of feed grains into balance with current and carryover needs, and out of this push came the emergency feed grains program of 1961. It was adopted by the Congress in the face of almost solid Republican opposition, and then adopted by farmers in the major feed grains areas with an enthusiasm that surprised supporters and shocked critics.

The widespread willingness to cooperate in this initial nationwide program of the new administration proves three things:

First. Farmers are willing to face up to the proposition that price stability must be accomplished by supply management;

Second. Farmers are convinced the administration has both sincerity and stamina in its approach to farm and food problems; and

Third. Farmers have a revived faith in their stability to work with one another, using the facilities of Government to do that which they cannot immediately do for themselves, in the interests of farm welfare and the general welfare.

You will hear increasing complaints that while the 1961 feed grains program has reduced acres devoted to corn and grain sorghums it has not reduced the tonnage of these feeds. It is true that in anticipating production there must be primary dependence upon averages—and in much of the Corn Belt this year perfect growing conditions have brought per-acre yields above average. But no farmer who has ever experienced drought or flood or heavy insect infestation—and no farmer has ever escaped them all—finds fault with nature when she provides sun and shower and temperature in perfect proportion. He accepts this good fortune gracefully, and so does his Department of Agriculture.

Yet the fact remains we are going to consume more feed grains in the year ahead than we produce in 1961—and this will be the first dent made in the carryover in a long, long time.

The feed grains bill was followed by the introduction in Congress, and the passage, of the Agricultural Act of 1961. When President Kennedy signed this bill he signed the most comprehensive piece of farm legislation our Nation has seen since the thirties.

It extends the feed grains program for another year, it provides facilities for adjusting the wheat supply that growers later approved in a referendum, it strengthens the role of food as an instrument of foreign policy, it makes credit a more useful tool in maintenance of the family farm system, it widens the opportunities for self-help programs through the avenue of marketing agreements and orders, and it continues the wool program and the programs for conserving our soil and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman has called the Agricultural Act of 1961 a license for hard work—by the Department of Agriculture, and by farmers who want to play a role in repairing the income leaks in their own industry while feeding our own Nation and helping meet the food needs of the free world.

I can assure you, on the basis of association and observation, the Secretary of Agriculture is using this license and will continue to ignore the limitations of both clock and calendar in agriculture's interests. But he can't go it alone. He and the President need an understanding Congress and cooperative farm families.

The Kennedy administration has not lost sight of the fact farm families must live while seeking to make a living, and that housing, electricity and telephone service figure prominently in living standards.

The pace of Rural Electrification Administration activities has been accelerated. Generation and transmission loans are being evaluated with the aim of protecting the security and effectiveness of REA financed systems—systems which, I remind you, are owned by the users of the electric and communication services they provide, not by the Government. The administration's housing bill, passed by the Congress in June, makes approximately $430 million available for home construction loans in rural areas.

The Department of Agriculture is active in the area redevelopment program, through which rural communities may receive assistance in their efforts to attract new industries that will provide more jobs.

We can know a better way of life on the farm and in rural communities—but I would again emphasize that its achievement demands from each of us a will for understanding, a faith in one another and in our ability to use wisely and well the facilities of our Government, a flexibility that enables us to measure the status quo against change unhampered by either passion or prejudice, and a rededication to the dream that kept our forefathers moving into new frontiers.

I assure you that our President is investing that will, that faith, that flexibility and that rededication in the future of all of us.

Speech by Mr. Sydney E. Byrnes, President of the Connecticut Broadcasters Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to a very enlightening speech made by Mr. Sydney E. Byrnes, president of radio station WADS, Ansonia, and president of the Connecticut Broadcasters Association, at the annual meeting of the association at the Waverly Inn, Cheshire, Conn.

I was highly gratified at Mr. Byrnes' explanation of the program undertaken by the Connecticut Broadcasters Association to cooperate with State and Federal officials in the development of an effective civil defense program and to lend their talents and their facilities to the success of this program. I think that the contribution of the Connecticut Broadcasters Association will be most effective.

Following is the text of Mr. Byrnes' speech:

REMARKS BY CONNECTICUT BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT SYDNEY E. BYRNES

Ladies and gentlemen, I wonder how many of you in this room today, realize how important you really are. Individually, each one of us carries a tremendous responsibility in serving the ever-increasing radio and television needs of the communities we serve. This, we know. We have been aware of this responsibility for many years and I believe we have met everyone of our responsibilities, not only to our citizens, but to our local, State and Federal Governments. The importance I refer to today, is the importance of the broadcasters to the very survival of the people, men, women, and children who live in Bridgeport, New Haven, Hartford, Bristol, Torrington, Waterbury, Ansonia, and all other communities in our State of Connecticut.

Today, as never before in our history, our cities, our States and our great Nation live under a cloud—a radioactive cloud. With world conditions as they are today, we never know when a Conelrad alert will be the real thing. When a switch to 640 or 1240 to hear the President will be the real thing. When clearing our main streets will be a matter of life and death, and not just an opportunity for CD volunteers to practice their lessons. American boys stand today, at this hour, on the West Berlin border with loaded guns—ready for any eventuality. Our President stated the seriousness of the world situation in his address to the Nation a few months ago and reiterated the seriousness of the situation in his now famous U.N. speech just a few short weeks ago. Negotiations going on now—today between East and West can well determine whether there will be a tomorrow for countless millions of people in our country and throughout the world.

Our Nation is working for peace but preparing for war. Our people are praying for peace, but preparing for war. No longer is civilian defense a joke, no longer is a person building a fallout shelter, some kind of an eccentric person. He is the smart one. And you, ladies and gentlemen, here today are the key to survival. For in every pamphlet and brochure published by civilian defense, there is the warning to be sure and have a battery operated radio. To know what has happened to the world, listen to your radio, to know whether you can drink the water, listen to your radio, to find out if you can go outside, listen to your radio. At your stations, if you survive an attack, you have the power to save thousands upon thousands of lives.

Radio informed during World War II and Korea, but we never really were subjected to the threat of annihilation of our cities as we are today. We have gone through floods and hurricanes in our State and have been of inestimable service to our citizens. But never before have we been cast in the lifesaving role we find ourselves in at this critical hour in our history.

I wish the questions concerning the feasibility of Conelrad were answered by now by the Department of Defense. I wish that the Federal Government would show radio and TV stations how they can finance underground facilities for emergency broadcasting in the event of an attack. I wish there was more clarification of just what the status is of station managers and personnel of radio and TV stations in the event of a real attack.

But, I guess these matters are all being worked on by those in authority in Washington. But, the important thing is for broadcasters to realize the important part they must play in this infamous game of world Russian roulette. Our broadcasters must recognize the dangers and be prepared to meet all emergencies. Preparation must start now.

The Connecticut Broadcasters Association has let it be known to our Governor that we will do everything possible to cooperate in State civilian defense. We have again pledged the full cooperation of you the brodcasters of this State. We know our responsibilities and we will live up to them in the future as we have in the past.

This is only one reason why a strong CBA is so important, why we need very station as a member, and the key man of every station as a tireless worker whenever he or she is called upon to serve.

We have done a lot of work in the last 6 months, but let me tell you that this is only the beginning. We will continue to ride herd on all legislation in the State and in our Nation's Capitol. We will continue to work on our right to know, and we will continue to oppose all forms of censorship that might be unfairly legislated against our industry. We will continue to work for the establishment of the NAB Research Center in our State and we will continue to work for closer liaison between our legislators and opinionmakers and our association. We will have a substitute for the now defunct "Voice of Democracy" contest and we will do everything possible to let all the citizens of our State know how doggone proud they can be of their broadcasting and telecasting stations and the personnel working for those stations. We will do these things and more and much more, but don't for a moment think that this doesn't take time, precious time from our own stations. Time from my 500-watter is just as important to me as your time taken from your 250- or 1,000-watter and your TV channel.

But a little time from all makes the job a lot easier and it gets done in much less time.

Let no one kid you, that almighty dollar is important. But it has its place. That dollar is no good if you lose your license, that dollar doesn't mean much if you're legislated to death and have to close your doors; that dollar doesn't look so good if there is an ICBM aimed at your tower. I say everything has its place. You and I run our stations to support ourselves and our families, and the families of the people who work for us. But there should also be plenty of time to serve our communities, both on and off the air, and there should be some time in every week to support the State association which was formed to look out for you and your stations. Be assured that if you say, "let the next guy do it," the next guy is sitting back and saying the same thing about you. And I'll bet commercial against public service time, that the job will never get done.

You're going to be called to work for CBA if you haven't already been called. We need your know how, your energy, and your dedication to this great industry which puts bread and butter on our tables at night.

I hope you found our meeting today stimulating. I hope you learned something that you can take back to your stations.

And, speaking for the board and all the committees, I hope you are satisfied with what we have been trying to do for all of you.

We cannot expect everyone to approve of everything we do, but I hope that we always please the majority.

You have given us the right to speak out on important issues facing our industry. As I said in our first edition of "The Voice," we appreciate your confidence in us. We will not use this authority unwisely. We will not use it without great deliberation. We, your board, have too much respect for you and your stations. And we want you to have that same respect for CBA. Tell us when we are wrong, encourage us when we are right. Help us to help you.

The broadcasting industry is a great industry. Be proud of it, promote it, defend it, criticize it, improve it, but remember, no station is an island unto itself. We stand together or we fall together. Thank you.

Is It To Be "Government" or "Givernment" for the U.S.A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in South Dakota, the editor of the Miner County Pioneer, Sid Davidson, of Howard, has come up with a comment on a typographical error which may prove to be more alarming than it is funny. I ask that his editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESCRIPTION GOOD

One of our good editor friends recently failed to catch a typographical error made in his back shop. Thereby, unwittingly he may have coined a new word to add to our American version of the English language.

His linotyper had slipped up on the word "government," a mistake in one little vowel. In error he set it, "Givernment," and it got by the proofreaders.

Naturally.

Now, we ask you what better word can describe our administration and Congress of today than this inadvertently newly coined word "Givernment"?

Uncle Sam, the great giver—the greatest the world has ever known—right now is in the throes of expanding his largess, both to his nephews and nieces at home, and his cousins abroad.

Already, due in large degree to his generosity, Uncle Sam is in debt for almost $290 billion—a sum larger than the debts of all the other nations of the world combined.

He's asking that the debt ceiling be raised another paltry (?) $5 billion to $295 billion, so that he can not only make larger gifts to those already on the receiving end of his bounty but add millions to his list of donees.

On second thought, being of a suspicious mind, could it be that the linotyper made an intentional boo-boo and deliberately set that word "government" as "givernment"? Could be.

Alaska Has Shared in New Frontier Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

At the beginning of this session of Congress, I listed certain objectives of major importance for the development of the State of Alaska on which I intended to concentrate attention during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. These are: (1) The development of low-cost sources of power for the 49th State; (2) the rehabilitation of Alaska's fisheries; and (3) the development of low-cost transportation and the improvement of existing transportation systems for the State.

At the close of this historic session of Congress, which was the first session during which President Kennedy was in the White House, I am happy to see that we have made significant progress in each of these areas. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that the Democratic administration in the White House has cooperated in working with me for a better Alaska.

In addition to the three major areas in which I concentrated efforts during this session, I am also pleased by significant progress in other areas of Federal administration which will be of great benefit to the 49th State.

The record of the 1st session of the 87th Congress has been one, generally and from the broad national point of view, one of extraordinary activity. More affirmative legislation of benefit to the Nation has been produced than in any other session, certainly, since the end of World War II.

Responsible for this record of achievement, in my view, where (1) the fact that the Government was under the leadership of the same party in both the executive and legislative branches; (2) the time was upon us for action to meet piled-up problems; and (3) the leadership of President Kennedy proved to be vigorous and informed.

President Kennedy's watchword has been action—action on behalf of the American economy and action on behalf of American security. His dynamic leadership has strengthened America's position, both domestically and internationally. Where the Eisenhower administration maintained the status quo, the Kennedy administration took the initiative. Where President Eisenhower used the veto, President Kennedy has offered constructive proposals to move America forward.

As his first official act, President Kennedy ordered the distribution of surplus food to those hardest hit by the recession. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—area redevelopment legislation which President Eisenhower had vetoed. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—the most comprehensive housing program in more than a decade. He urged Congress to enact—and Congress enacted—a wage and hour statute increasing the minimum wage and broadening coverage under this law for the first time in many years.

This Democratic Congress passed and a Democratic President signed legislation making 600,000 additional persons eligible for increased social security benefits and earlier retirement. This Democratic Congress, cooperating with a Democratic President, produced 33 major items of legislation for the American people.

The result of all this is a stronger America. Economically, we are looking forward to a year of record prosperity. Every major economic indicator points up. Four million more Americans were working in July than in January with experts predicting substantial declines in unemployment in the near future. We are moving rapidly toward full employment, a condition our economy has not enjoyed since early 1957.

In international financing, President Kennedy reversed the drain on our gold reserves, stabilizing the value of the dollar and reassuring the world of the soundness of the American economy.

President Kennedy let our potential enemies and the world know that henceforward we would operate from a position of strength, not weakness, and he backed his words with action. He, with the cooperation of Congress, doubled our Polaris submarine program insuring a full operational fleet 3 years sooner than originally scheduled. He increased long-range missile programs, expanded naval and ground forces, and stepped up troop carrier plane procurement, increasing the mobility of our forces. President Kennedy, with the cooperation of this Congress, has moved to give us alternatives other than capitulation or nuclear holocaust.

Where legislation was needed, the President requested it and the Congress responded with major legislative enactments in almost every legislative field.

I am happy to be able to report that Alaska shared in full measure in this welcome activity, which has moved the Nation forward. The following are specific accomplishments of the 1st session of the 87th Congress on which I wish to report.

HYDROPOWER

Rampart Dam

The importance of constructing Rampart Dam on the Yukon River is essential to planning for economic development in Alaska. The Alaska congressional delegation has consistently worked to bring this project and its importance to national attention and also to obtain action which will make it a reality.

This year the Kennedy administration recommended an increase of $200,000 over the $100,000 recommended by the outgoing Eisenhower administration in the budget estimate for continuing engineering and economic studies of Rampart. The fact that this magnificent dam has caught the imagination and attention of Congress as well as the administration, was demonstrated by the fact that the appropriation which was voted for this undertaking was even larger than the budget estimate. The Senate voted an appropriation of $400,000 for Rampart, an amount that was cut to $350,000 for the 1962 fiscal year in a conference between the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees.

Other progress on Rampart included the appointment of an eight-member economic advisory board to the Corps of Engineers on Rampart, of which five members are residents of Alaska. I was privileged to attend the first meeting of this important group which was held in Anchorage during the weekend of May 27 to 30, and which included a field trip to the site of the project.

Another promising development for Rampart was the selection of a widely known economic consultant organization—Development & Resources Corp.—to make the economic study which is so important to the authorization of Rampart. This is the firm which is headed by the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal.

I look forward to further progress on Rampart during the coming sessions of Congress.

Snettisham project

Early in the session, I introduced a bill, S. 594, which would authorize construction of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau. This prospective source of low-cost power is an important part of plans for economic development of southeastern Alaska. Plans for this hydropower facility have, in the past, been based on construtcion of the entire project at one time. As it is now unlikely that an industrial consumer of large quantities of this power can be obtained in the near future, consideration is being given by the Bureau of Reclamation to a three-stage development of Snettisham. This possibility, which is being explored, would provide a source of low-cost power for growing community requirements of the Juneau-Douglas area meeting actual estimated power shortages even without a potential industrial consumer.

FISHERIES REHABILITATION

Early in the past session of Congress I introduced, with 23 other Senators, a bill, S. 1230, which would authorize distribution to State fish and wildlife agencies of funds collected from tariffs on imported fishery products. The significance of this legislation is that funds for fisheries rehabilitation would be allocated directly to States having important fishery resources rather than being diverted to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. I am hopeful this legislation will receive early and favorable action by the Congress in the next session.

TRANSPORTATION

There were a number of highly significant developments in the field of air and surface transportation for Alaska during the 1st session of the 87th Congress which give promise of improving and lowering the cost of transportation to Alaska.

Airport aid

Of major importance was the enactment of an extension of Federal airport aid legislation which, for the first time, places Alaska on the same basis as the other States in the allocation of these funds. I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the State of Alaska has a greater need for adequate appropriations for airports than any other States in the Union in view of the necessity for reliance upon air transportation for the greatest portion of Alaska travel. As passed by Congress, the new airport aid bill authorizes an allocation to Alaska each fiscal year of nearly $4 million, as contrasted with the $1,350,000 annually to which Alaska was previously entitled.

Another significant aspect of the Federal airport aid legislation was the inclusion of a provision authorizing Federal agencies having inspection and clearance duties at international airports such as immigration, customs, plant quarantine, etc., to acquire space at airports necessary for the performance of these duties. Before enactment of this legislation such facilities had to be provided by the airports or carriers serving them.

Highways

With the hope of developing an improved system of highways for Alaska that I introduced legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 137, which would authorize an initial ex-

penditure by the Department of Commerce of $800,000 for the purpose of studying the importance to the Nation of developing highway communications to and within Alaska. This legislation, which at my urging was recommended for introduction by the Kennedy administration, is the first step in making possible the construction of highways in Alaska equivalent to those in all the other States. I look forward to early and favorable action on this bill in the next session of Congress.

Maritime agency reorganization

As I have pointed out to the Senate repeatedly, a major requirement for the development of the State of Alaska is the reduction of the exorbitantly high water freight rates which now retard growth in the 49th State. I have taken advantage of every suitable occasion during my service in the Senate to call attention to the existence of this serious transportation problem and to recommend congressional and executive action for its solution.

Early in this session, I testified before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee that there is a desperate need to reduce transportation costs affecting Alaska. This was in the course of hearings conducted by Senator BARTLETT on the general question of problems in offshore shipping. At that time I recommended a number of possible courses of action which could be taken to reduce water freight rates and improve this form of transportation to Alaska.

One of my recommendations was the reorganization of the Federal Maritime Board. I pointed out that this might be one means of establishing a regulatory agency for water transportation which would recognize the public interest—a recogntion which has not been noticeable with previous regulatory agencies. I was, therefore, gratified when the President sent to Congress a plan for reorganization of this agency into the Federal Maritime Commission.

The plan of the President, which I strongly supported, and which was adopted, provided for reconstitution of the Federal Maritime Board with five rather than three members, and further provided for separation of regulatory functions of the agency from promotional responsibilities—a correction of an anomalous situation which, I believe, was often the cause of decisions by the agency which were not in the public interest.

Although the President did not accept my recommendation that an Alaskan be appointed to the reconstituted communism, I am hopeful that when the next vacancy arises it will be possible to appoint a qualified Alaskan.

The operation of this important agency remains one of the most important factors in the establishment of equitable water freight rates to Alaska.

Dual-rate amendment

Another important achievement in the struggle to obtain a fair break for Alaska on water freight rates was the enactment of an amendment to the bill, H.R. 6775, which modifies the laws governing conference agreements of water carriers in foreign commerce. The amendment, which I introduced with Senator BARTLETT as cosponsor, and which was enacted will give special procedural advantages to Governors of States against which conference-imposed rates discriminate against consumers. My amendment provides that in cases where a Governor—for example, the Governor of Alaska—finds that a rate for water shipments imposed by a conference is discriminatory, the Maritime Commission will be required to make a prompt ruling on the Governor's protest. The amendment would require action by the Maritime Commission within 180 days in such cases.

The reason I felt this amendment was important arose from the discovery in the course of discussion of the dual-rate legislation that the Trans-Pacific Conference, which includes Japanese carriers serving Alaska, has been exacting an arbitrary surcharge of 30 percent on shipping rates between Japan and Alaska above the rate from Japan to other States. I am happy to point out that, as a result of attention focused on this discrimination by my amendment, this arbitrary surcharge was removed by the Trans-Pacific Conference prior to enactment of the new dual-rate bill.

Railroad transportation

Another source of transportation rate discrimination against Alaska has existed for many years with respect to charges for transportation of freight by transcontinental railroads. In 1957 the General Services Administration filed a formal complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission against the practice of transcontinental railroads of requiring payment of higher rates for shipment across the continent of freight by railroad if it is to be transshipped to Alaska than is applied to shipments destined for any other place in the Pacific Ocean area. The Interstate Commerce Commission, however, ruled against the GSA, and it is still the case that transportation rates on transcontinental railroad shipments are considerably higher on goods going to Alaska than on the same commodities moving exactly the same distances over the same railroads that are eventually destined for Samoa, Japan, Guam, Hawaii, and the west coast of South America.

To correct this discriminatory situation I introduced a bill, S. 1723, which would prohibit transcontinental railroads hauling shipments destined for Alaska from charging more for such shipments than for shipments bound for other parts of the Pacific Ocean area. I am hopeful we will obtain early and favorable action on this legislation during the next session of Congress.

Another proposal which would have the effect of lowering transportation costs to Alaska was discussed with the Alaska and Washington State congressional delegations by representatives of four transcontinental railroads—the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Union Pacific, and the Milwaukee Railroads. These four railroads have been making plans for what, in effect, would be the extension of transcontinental rail service to Alaska. This would be accomplished by utilizing sea trains to be operated by a New York firm, McAllister Bros., from Seattle and Tacoma to Seward. The proposal of the railroads was based on transportation of commodities in carload lots, rates to be set on the basis of an entirely new rate structure. The plan originated with the recognition that Alaska has grown sufficiently and the prospects for its future growth are such that the city of Anchorage should be used as the distribution center for the State rather than Seattle.

Joint rates

Again at this session of Congress, the bill, S. 1725, introduced by Senator BARTLETT, was passed. This would permit carriers to Alaska to establish through routes and joint rates.

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

The management of land in Alaska, which is still almost entirely under the control of the Department of the Interior, remains one of the most important factors in the economic growth of our State. The improvement of management, in a way that will release Alaskans from the bondage of bureaucracy they have suffered for so many years at the hands of the Bureau of Land Management, is one of my major objectives as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

While progress on this line proceeds exceedingly slowly, there is hope of recognition of the importance to Alaska and the other public land States of improved means of disposing of the land and transferring it into private ownership.

Public Lands Act

I was pleased by the submission to Congress, as one of the first acts of the new Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, of a bill (introduced in the Senate by Senator BIBLE and in the House by Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) which would completely revise existing legislation governing disposition of public lands. The enactment of this legislation would, I believe, make land transfer procedures of the Department of the Interior more efficient than has been the case in the past.

A 5,000-acre withdrawal limitation

As another means of controlling the use of the public domain in the interest of citizens of States in which it lies, I, together with 17 other Senators, again sponsored legislation which would limit land withdrawals by the Interior Department for any purpose to 5,000 acres in the absence of a specific act of Congress.

As I strongly believe the power of the Secretary of Interior to withdraw land from productive use has been abused in the past, thus hindering its effective use by the citizens who in the last analysis really own it, I am hopeful the next session of Congress will see the enactment of this legislation.

Military land withdrawal legislation for Alaska

It will be recalled that there has been in effect, since the 85th Congress, legislation which was introduced by Senator ENGLE of California to limit withdrawals of public land for military purposes to areas of less than 5,000 acres unless they are specifically withdrawn by act of Congress.

Pursuant to this legislation, five bills were passed at the first session of the 87th Congress which will authorize withdrawal of designated areas in Alaska needed for military purposes. In order to obtain firsthand knowledge of the feeling of Alaskans about this legislation, I conducted hearings at Anchorage and Fairbanks in May of this year at which all those interested in the matter had an opportunity to testify. Certain amendments were made in the legislation, as a result of these hearings, which are direct results of suggestions of Alaska residents. Among these are amendments which require the military to decontaminate areas they have used before the land is restored to its prior use. In another case, that of the bill to withdraw land on the Granite Creek area, an amendment reducing the amount of land withdrawn along the Richardson Highway was adopted after citizens of the area protested that the Army did not need for its purposes land which was valuable for settlement because of its accessibility.

The areas withdrawn by the five bills are as follows:

1. Two hundred and fifty-six thousand acres in the Elelson Air Force Base area for use of the Army for 10 to 15 years.

2. Lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks for use by the Army as a Nike Range.

3. Lands in the Big Delta area for continued use of the Army at Fort Greely.

4. Lands in the Granite Creek area for use by the Army at Fort Greely.

5. Lands in the Campbell Creek area for use of the Army at Fort Richardson.

The fact that the public, which is greatly concerned with the use of these lands, had an opportunity to express its views concerning these withdrawals seems to me to be an

excellent example of the reasons why legislation, such as the "5000 acre withdrawal bill" I have sponsored is needed to control withdrawals for other than military purposes.

Equalization of Alaska with other States in land transactions

Two public land management bills were passed during the first session of the 87th Congress, which, while not of overwhelming national significance, are of great importance to Alaskans as demonstrations of recognition of the fact of statehood and of the fact that Alaskans should have the same kind of treatment as residents of other States insofar as administration of the public domain is concerned.

These bills, both of which I sponsored, are:

1. Isolated tract sales: This bill, which is now Public Law 87–147, authorizes the sale, in Alaska, of isolated tracts of public domain having mineral deposits, with a reservation of minerals to the Federal Government. Prior to passage of this act it was the opinion of the Department of the Interior that, although such sales could be made under legislation applicable in the other States, the law did not permit such sales in Alaska.

2. Repeal of law affecting filing of adverse claims against mining patents:

Until passage of Public Law 87–260, adverse claims against mining patents could be filed in Alaska during a period 8 months longer than that allowed in the other States. The law that was repealed was enacted in 1910 in recognition of exceptional difficulties in communication and transportation in Alaska which provided a basis for extending the time within which adverse claimants could oppose mining patents far beyond that required in the other States.

Now, there is official recognition that this was a hindrance to development of Alaska resources and that there no longer exists a valid reason for slowing up mining claims in Alaska for period beyond that in effect in the other States.

The significance of these laws is their recognition that Alaska has a status which must be recognized as equal with that of her sister States, as well as their importance in removing obsolete statutory hobbles on Alaska development.

Homesteaders

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, it became possible to assess the benefits of Public Law 86–789, which I introduced in the 86th Congress to allow certain Alaska homesteaders to obtain mineral rights in their homesteads.

The rights of homesteaders to these deposits in cases where they were deprived of them by arbitrary action of the Department of the Interior remains of deep concern to me. It will be recalled that the legislation I introduced in the 86th Congress would have authorized the Interior Department to quitclaim mineral rights to all Alaska homesteaders who had initiated their compliance with homestead procedures before the Kenai Peninsula oil strike in July of 1957. Because then Secretary of the Interior Seaton demanded that the bill be drastically amended I agreed, reluctantly, to his amendments to avoid a certain veto of such legislation as could be enacted and in order to provide the benefits it would bring to the homesteaders who meet his stipulations. It will be recalled that the result was enactment of Public Law 86–789, which limited relief to homesteaders on the Kenai Peninsula who had completed homestead requirements by the date of the oil strike in July 1957.

While I was dissatisfied that I could not obtain enactment of more generous legislation, I am gratified that some of the Alaska homesteaders for whose benefit the law was passed have received official notification from the Department of the Interior that they may receive full title, including title to oil deposits in their homesteads.

The first cases adjudicated under Public Law 86–789 were decided in March 1961. A number of others are pending on appeal in the Office of the Secretary of Interior at this time. Until final adjudication by the Department it is impossible to determine how many Alaska homesteaders will receive rights to mineral deposits in their homesteads.

Wildlife ranges

One of the actions of Secretary Seaton which was most strongly protested, as an aggression against the rights of Alaskans to manage the land on which they live, was the establishment by the Secretary of the Arctic Wildlife Range. It was adding insult to injury, in my opinion, that, as one of the last acts of the Eisenhower Administration, and despite the opposition of the State of Alaska, the people of Alaska, the Governor, and the entire Congressional delegation, Secretary Seaton set aside the 9 million acre Arctic Wildlife Range in Northeastern Alaska. At the same time the Interior Department announced establishment of two other wildlife ranges—the Izembeck Range and the Kuskokwin Range.

As one means of effecting the wishes of Alaskans to prevent establishment of these ranges—especially their opposition to establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range—I, together with Senator BARTLETT, was able to defeat the appropriation of any funds for management of the Arctic Range and the Izembeck Range for the 1962 fiscal year.

I pointed out at the hearing of the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the Arctic Wildlife Range had been steadily and strongly opposed by Alaskans and that no purpose could be served by appropriation of funds to manage it. In the case of the Izembeck Range, Senator BARTLETT and I pointed out that there was very little justification for the expenditure of funds requested by the Department. Happily, the Appropriations Committee agreed with us, and this is one expenditure taxpayers will not be called upon to make in the 1962 fiscal year.

I am now hopeful, in accordance with a suggestion and a plan advanced by Governor Egan and in accordance with views of the Secretary of the Interior that recreation and wildlife areas should be managed by the States in which they are located, that the new Secretary of the Interior will soon see the way clear to return the Arctic Wildlife Range to Alaskans and allow it to be managed by the people who know best how to do it in the State department of fish and game.

Forestry research laboratory near Fairbanks

Of great potential importance to the development of Alaska's vast forest resources was the appropriation this year of $350,000 for a forestry research laboratory to be operated by the Department of Agriculture near Fairbanks. This laboratory was one of several which had been recommended earlier but for which funds were never requested by the Eisenhower administration or appropriated during that period.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress I made a strong appeal for these funds before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Although it was not in the administration budget and the House of Representatives had not voted the money, I was persuasive in obtaining an amendment to the budget recommendations of the Department of Agriculture when the appropriation measure came before the Senate which included the $350,000 required for the laboratory which will be located on the campus of the University of Alaska.

In view of the fact that these funds were not in the original budget submitted by the administration, and in view of the failure of the House to recognize the importanec of this appropriation, I believe it is quite significant that the Senate appropriated this money and that the appropriation was retained in conference with the House of Representatives.

The wilderness bill (S. 174)

The Senate passed on September 6 a piece of legislation having a potentially important effect on the management of the public domain. This is known as the wilderness bill. Alaskans, like residents of other States of the Union, are well aware of the great importance of conserving for posterity some of our natural resources of scenic grandeur which, if not protected, might be lost to future generations. To accomplish this, conservation groups have long been interested in enactment of legislation which would provide for permanent preservation of wilderness areas.

The State of Alaska is, of course, in a somewhat different position from other States with respect to establishment of wilderness areas. Our State has only begun to develop, unlike many other areas of the West where economic development has been proceeding rapidly for many generations.

To take account of Alaska's special position, I was able to obtain an amendment to the wilderness bill, as passed by the Senate, which will require that before wilderness areas are established in Alaska special consideration will be given by an advisory group, which must include a majority of representatives from the State of Alaska. I am hopeful that the requirement that potential reservations of wilderness areas in Alaska be reviewed by citizens of the State will insure that areas which are needed by Alaska for economic development will not be forever removed from exploration and the establishment of beneficial enterprises, as might be the case without this protection.

NATIVE BENEFIT LEGISLATION

William Beltz homestead bill

Early in this session of Congress, I introduced S. 1065 for the purpose of conveying to the widow and children of William Beltz, the late noted Eskimo legislator, a homestead which he had begun to establish prior to his tragic death. It seems to me entirely fitting that the widow and young children of Bill Beltz should have the benefit of ownership of this land. After an adverse report had been drafted for the Department of the Interior by the Bureau of Land Management, I am happy to report that as a result of my emphatic protests the essential principles of this bill have now been approved by the Department of the Interior, and I am hopeful this humane legislation will be enacted soon after Congress reconvenes.

"NORTH STAR" FUNDS RESTORED TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

Among services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to Alaska natives which are particularly beneficial is the operation of the Indian Affairs vessel, *North Star*, which provides necessary supplies for a large number of isolated communities in remote areas of the North Pacific, the Bering Sea, and the Arctic Ocean. The Department of the Interior had requested in its 1962 budget an appropriation of $375,000 to be used for refitting a vessel to perform this essential service. Although the funds were approved by the House of Representatives, the Senate Appropriations Committee, perhaps capitulating to pressure from shipping interests opposing this vital service, failed to include the funds required for the *North Star* in the appropriation measure reported by the committee.

I fought hard for the restoration of this money on the floor of the Senate, overcoming substantial opposition, to obtain the funds needed for the *North Star* by a rollcall vote of 48 to 43. As it is rarely possible to upset the action of the Appropriations Committee when an appropriation measure is reported to the Senate floor, my colleague, Senator

BARTLETT, and I were required to exert a major effort to persuade our fellow Members that deprivation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the $375,000 needed to refit the *North Star* would be a catastrophe to the native people of northwestern Alaska who are totally dependent upon it for the transportation of necessary supplies.

INDIAN REVOLVING LOAN FUND INCREASE

Among the most important actions of Congress affecting the native population of Alaska and Indian citizens everywhere, was the enactment of Public Law 87–250 to increase the authorization of funds for the Indian revolving loan fund. This fund was increased from $10 to $20 million. Although the Senate had voted an even larger increase in the fund, the House of Representatives failed to agree to the amendment of the Senate and, therefore, the law was passed as described above.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

One of the primary objectives of the Kennedy administration is the redevelopment and rehabilitation of areas of the United States that have suffered exceptionally from unemployment over the last few years. One of the first acts signed by President Kennedy was Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This act provides a program of loans and grants for industrial rehabilitation to stimulate employment and eradicate unemployment in the distressed areas where unemployment has been substantial and persistent over a long period of time.

In addition, the act provides assistance to certain Indian reservations and farm areas where per capita income is very low.

As a first step in obtaining assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act, an area must be classified for this purpose by the Area Redevelopment Administration. Incident to this is the classification of the area as one of substantial and persistent unemployment. On September 8, the Department of Labor classified every election district in Alaska except districts 4 and 5 as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. It thus appears likely that almost the entire State of Alaska will be eligible for area redevelopment assistance.

To acquaint civic leaders and municipal officials with requirements for obtaining area redevelopment assistance and procedures to be followed in establishing area redevelopment programs, a series of meetings was held in Alaska in August by Daniel L. Goldy, Deputy Director of the ARA. These meetings, which were well attended, were held at Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. In a number of areas of Alaska enthusiastic planning and programing are in progress for redevelopment programs which should contribute much to the greater prosperity of Alaska.

AID TO EDUCATION

As I firmly believe that a strong educational system is essential to the welfare of the United States, and as it has become increasingly clear over the years that local communities of the United States can no longer support the system we require in this age of peril, I have consistently supported Federal aid to education.

In the Senate an adequate bill, S. 1021, was passed on May 25 to provide Federal contributions to the States for construction of educational facilities and payment of teachers' salaries. I spoke on the floor of the Senate in support of this important measure which was, unfortunately, stalled in the House of Representatives and not finally enacted.

As introduced, S. 1021 contained a provision for allocation of funds to the States on the basis of per capita income which was manifestly unfair to Alaska. Immediately upon analysis of this provision it was clear that, under its terms, our State would receive far less of the funds provided than those it needs and those to which it is entitled. I immediately pointed out to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the allocation provision, which placed Alaska in the same category as wealthy States such as New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania, was totally unrealistic when consideration is given to the extraordinarily high costs of education in Alaska.

For the purpose of developing an amendment to the aid to education bill to take account of the special needs of Alaska I arranged with the University of Alaska, in cooperation with the Alaska State Board of Education, for the advisory services of Dr. George Rogers, professor of economics at the university, to assist in developing a formula for Alaska that would put our State in a position equivalent with that of the other States.

Dr. Rogers' research revealed that the costs of education in Alaska can be demonstrated, on the basis of wholly reliable data, to be so much greater than the same costs in other parts of the United States that a strong case can be made for specialized treatment of Alaska in the apportionment of school aid funds.

The presentation of the facts concerning Alaska's needs for educational assistance and the abnormally high costs of construction and other school expenses in Alaska brought recognition from the Senate that a special formula should be applied for Alaska. The amendment finally adopted was suggested by Senator BARTLETT, and authorizes a special allotment ratio in cases such as that of Alaska in which costs of education appreciably exceed costs in other States.

IMPACTED AREAS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Although a comprehensive program of Federal aid to education was one of the principal objectives of the administration of President Kennedy, obstruction of his efforts in the House of Representatives made it impossible to pass legislation to accomplish this. At the end of the session it was possible to enact only a 2-year extension of the impacted-areas program for Federal assistance for construction and operation of public schools in areas in which there are large numbers of Federal employees and a similar extension for 2 years of provisions of the National Defense Education Act under which the Federal Government provides loans and fellowships to graduate and undergraduate students in institutions of higher learning and makes other benefits, such as assistance in construction of facilities for science and language instruction available to public and private elementary and secondary schools.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Among the most important of the administration bills passed at the last session of Congress was President Kennedy's bill to improve and extend provisions of Federal housing legislation. Among provisions of the bill that will be very important to Alaska and the rest of the Nation are: (1) A new program to provide benefits of homeownership to families in the moderate income brackets by allowing them to obtain mortgage insurance of loans on long terms (40 years) at low cost, with a downpayment of only 3 percent of the acquisition cost of the property; (2) a new program of community facility loans for acquisition of mass transportation equipment for urban communities to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency; (3) a program of grants by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to States and local public bodies for the acquisition of open space land near housing developments and urban areas for the purpose of preventing urban blight and making communities more pleasant places in which to live; (4) liberalization of farmers' home loan programs to authorize farmhousing loans in rural areas not previously qualified as farms, and the authorization of funds to increase farmhousing research.

Maurice Gebhart, executive director of the Alaska State housing authority, called my attention, during consideration of the housing legislation, to the importance of including in the act an amendment to increase cost limitations on housing for elderly persons and on low-rent housing in Alaska in accordance with long standing precedent under which Alaska has had special consideration for costs of construction under mortgage insurance provisions of title II of the National Housing Act. Accordingly, I introduced an amendment, which was passed, which increases the normal room cost limitation on low-cost housing in Alaska from $2,500 to $3,000 and for housing for elderly persons from $2,500 to $3,500.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Public Law 87–64 was another early recommendation of the President. This law, amending the Social Security Act, increases benefit amounts for certain beneficiaries of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Another recommendation of the President which was enacted, to improve existing programs of assistance to dependent children, was Public Law 87–31, which will make it possible for the Federal Government to provide aid to dependent children whose need arises from the unemployment of their parents. Previously, aid to dependent children was not authorized in these cases.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

Public Law 87–88, Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, is another important legislative act that will benefit Alaska and the other States.

Of particular importance to Alaska is the authorization for establishment in Alaska of a water pollution control laboratory. Seven such laboratories for the research, experimentation, and study of water pollution control were authorized by the act, but only Alaska was singled out as a State in which one of them should be located.

The Water Pollution Control Act also extends this program of importance to the health of the Nation for an additional 5 years and increases amounts of money authorized for it.

At my suggestion a representative of the Surgeon General's Office visited Alaska this year for the purpose of inspecting needs of the State for increased Federal assistance, particularly in native villages, for the control and abatement of water pollution.

VETERANS BENEFITS

The men and women who serve the Nation as members of the Armed Forces are among those citizens to whom we should provide every benefit needed to make up to them such loss of time as they suffer from their education and careers because of military service.

I have always believed it is as important for us to recognize the contributions of those who serve in peacetime as those who serve in time of war. Accordingly, I have been a cosponsor and strong supporter of the bill, S. 349, introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH, to equalize veterans benefits of post-Korea GI's with those available to veterans of wartime service. This bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on August 10, and I hope it will receive favorable action at the next session of Congress.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In March the Congress passed and the President signed into law a bill to provide temporary unemployment benefits to States. The law authorizes Federal advances of money to the States to prolong duration of benefits by 50 percent for any jobless worker who exhausted his regular benefits under State unemployment insurance pro-

grams between June 30, 1960, and March 31, 1962. However, certain workers who started to receive the special benefits before March 31, 1962, and had not used them up by that date, will continue to receive them through June 30, 1962. The act limits the special benefits to 13 weeks and the total of all benefits in a year (regular plus special) to 39 weeks.

A Federal extended compensation account within the unemployment trust fund was created, and the act directs that funds from the account be used to repay the Federal Government for advances to the States under the act. To finance the account, the net Federal unemployment tax was raised from four-tenths of 1 percent to eight-tenths for calendar 1962–63 only.

POSTPONEMENT OF REDUCTION OF CREDITS AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT TAXES

Representative RALPH RIVERS introduced a measure in the House (H.R. 6145) that would allow a 1-year postponement of the reduced credit provisions relating to the Federal unemployment tax insofar as they are required by certain past advances to a State under 1954 amendments to title XII of the Social Security Act. The measure would have had the effect of preventing the reduced credit provisions from applying to wages paid by employers in Alaska for calendar year 1961. Representative RIVERS succeeded in getting the measure reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means—no easy task—even though the full House did not take action on it prior to adjournment.

MINIMUM WAGE

An achievement of the Kennedy administration this year was passage by Congress of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961—the so-called minimum wage bill—which was signed into law May 5. The new law, as finally enacted, did the following:

Raised the minimum wage for workers already covered by the minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (about 23.9 million persons) from $1 an hour to $1.15 an hour during the first 2 years after the amendments went into effect and to $1.25 an hour thereafter;

Made the overtime provisions of the act applicable (with certain exceptions) to newly covered workers on the following basis: no overtime pay required during the first 2 years amendments are in effect; overtime pay required for more than 44 hours work in a week during the third year; for more than 42 hours during the fourth year; for more than 40 hours thereafter;

Brought under the minimum-wage and overtime provisions of the act various new categories of workers (estimated at 3,624,000 persons) at the following minimum wage scales: $1 an hour during the first 3 years in effect, $1.15 an hour during the fourth year and $1.25 thereafter.

The bill also specified that supervisory personnel (retail assistant managers) remain exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act even if they spend up to 40 percent of their time in nonsupervisory work.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

The most generous river and harbor appropriations bill in many years, as far as Alaska is concerned, was passed late in the session. I was particularly gratified at inclusion of $25,000 to begin surveys for causeways across Knik Arm and Turnagain Arm in the vicinity of Anchorage. I used all the persuasion of which I am capable with my fellow Members to obtain this appropriation.

The bill also appropriates $785,000 for completion of navigation improvement at Wrangell Narrows, which will permit the dredging of an anchorage basin 500 yards long, 200 feet wide and 26 feet deep at mean lower low water on this important transportation artery in southeastern Alaska. The anchorage basin is particularly needed in connection with operation of the new State of Alaska ferry system which is scheduled to begin late next year.

The Senate also inserted and managed to retain in conference appropriations of $10,000 for a study of how the Seward small boat harbor can be expanded and $14,000 for a study looking toward dredging the harbor at Wrangell where heavy oversea shipping is handicapped through silting in from the Stikine River. The Senate also managed to insert $10,000 for a flood control study on the Tanana River at Nenana and increased from $15,000 to $25,000 the amount which will be available for a Knik River flood control study.

Another addition, inserted initially in the House, consisted of raising the appropriation for Bureau of Reclamation investigations in Alaska from $250,000, which was the maximum permitted by law, to $350,000.

All Alaska appropriations for the Corps of Engineers requested in President Kennedy's budget were voted by the Congress. These included $150,000 for advance engineering on an $11,100,000 Chena River flood control project near Fairbanks, $1 million for a start on construction of a $2,030,000 second small boat basin at Juneau, $11,000 for investigations for a project to deepen and enlarge the small boat harbor at Petersburg, $8,000 for similar investigations at Valdez, $15,000 for flood control investigations at Kodiak, $10,000 for Valdez flood control investigations, $43,800 for general navigation and flood control investigations in Alaska and the following sums for operation and maintenance: Cordova Harbor, $150,000; Juneau Harbor, $180,000; Nome Harbor, $53,000; Valdez Harbor, $125,000.

FREE ZONE FOR ANCHORAGE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Late in the session, in order to give the Senate Committee on Commerce an opportunity to hold hearings before the convening of the second session of the Congress in January, I introduced a bill which would provide for establishing and operating a foreign-trade zone, a Hall of States, and an international reception and information center at the Anchorage International Airport.

It occurred to me while at Shannon Airport recently, returning from a trip to Scandinavia for the Senate Public Works Committee during an informal recess of the Senate, that the situation there and at the Anchorage International Airport were almost identical. Foreign visitors to the Anchorage airport now number close to 150,000 annually.

Former Mayor George Byer, of Anchorage, had proposed and vigorously fought to establish an international reception center at the Anchorage airport. He felt that these many visitors, most of them catching whatever glimpse of the United States they will have while at the airport at Anchorage for a few brief hours, should be told in the most attractive manner possible about United States history, ideals and accomplishments. With that I wholeheartedly agreed.

But after seeing the free port at Shannon, it seemed to me that we could proceed a step further and establish a free port at Anchorage so that visitors there could purchase U.S.-made products, as well as those from other countries, without paying duty. I thought also that this might be coupled with a Hall of States where each State would be invited to exhibit some of its history and how it developed as well as some of the products for which it is famous.

I am pleased that the Senate Commerce Committee will shortly hold hearings on this measure and I hope it will be reported promptly and favorably to the Senate in January 1962, so that this very important center—important for Anchorage, for Alaska, and for the United States as well—can soon become a reality.

TRUCKING MAIL TO ALASKA

In September, the Post Office Department inaugurated the trucking of surface mail to Alaska, from Seattle to Fairbanks, on an experimental basis. Postmaster General J. Edward Day announced the plans during May, when he was in Alaska to dedicate new post offices at Anchorage and Kenai. Seattle departures are scheduled for 12:01 a.m. each Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

While mail is to be trucked only to Fairbanks and its outlying areas in the initial phases of the experiment, I have urged postal officials to extend this service to other communities, including Anchorage, at the earliest possible time.

The contract calls for mail to reach Fairbanks not more than 96 hours after leaving Seattle, reducing the transit time between Seattle and Fairbanks by a minimum of 3 days, as compared with previous boat and train service. Airmail will continue to be flown to Alaska and letter mail will be airlifted to the 49th State on a space-available basis from Seattle.

JUDGESHIP BILL

On the advice of State officials, members of the Alaska bar and others whose opinions I solicited, I introduced during the 86th Congress a bill to provide for an additional Federal judgeship for Alaska. In the 87th Congress my objective was achieved by the enactment of Public Law 87–36, the omnibus Federal judgeship bill, which included a provision for appointment of an additional judge for Alaska.

In support of this additional judicial position, I pointed out to my colleagues in the Senate that Alaska's lone Federal judge had to hold court in an area larger than falls to the lot of any other Federal judge. Alaska's area of 586,400 square miles is one-fifth of the area of the 48 older States. Hearings in Federal cases have to be held in communities hundreds of miles apart, in Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Nome, and perhaps elsewhere. The Judiciary Committees and Congress agreed that these distances are too great to subject a single district judge to such extensive journeyings, and the omnibus measure as enacted included the Alaska position.

Raymond E. Plummer of Anchorage was nominated for the second judicial post by the President and confirmed by the Senate as Alaska's second U.S. district court judge.

CRABMEAT BAN LIFTING

Early in March of this year, I strongly protested to the secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce a proposed move to lift the 10-year-old ban on importations of crabmeat from the Soviet Union, pointing out that Alaska king crab is the outstanding and only example of a new development in the Alaska fisheries which otherwise have been sadly depleted. The basis of the ban on the importation of Russian crabmeat was that it was produced by forced labor, namely, Japanese prisoners of war. After Japan publicly announced that all prisoners of war had been repatriated to their homeland, there was little justification for continuing the ban, particularly in view of the fact that the Russians were using the ban as a propaganda device against this country, in other matters. Moreover, it was indicated that the impact on king crab sales from Alaska might not be as great as first expected, because of the high tariff on imported crabmeat—15 percent on frozen crabmeat and 22.5 percent on prepared crabmeat—and also, because crabmeat is in short supply.

FOREIGN AID

A major enactment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress is Public Law 87–195, the Act for International Development of 1961. This law embodies the new program of the Kennedy administration for aid to underdeveloped countries and for mutual defense

assistance to allied nations. I am hopeful that its enactment and the establishment of a new agency, the Agency for International Development, will provide corrections for many of the mistakes in foreign aid of the past. It is the hope of the President, and my hope, that the new Democratic administration can make the foreign aid program a meaningful tool of American foreign policy.

However, there was a provision of this legislation which I felt should be amended. This was the chapter relating to the Development Loan Fund under which funds are loaned to other nations for the purpose of assisting in carrying out long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities. It has been my observation from long experience in countries of Latin America that one of the major inhibiting factors on economic development is the imposition by banks of exorbitantly high interest rates, which makes it extremely difficult to distribute the wealth of the country where it is most needed. It seemed to me that in establishing a new program of foreign aid, it was essential that the legislation be amended to limit interest rates on loans derived from funds loaned by the United States to recipient countries. Therefore, I introduced an amendment, which was adopted by the Senate on a rollcall vote of 74 to 16, providing that loans by the Development Loan Fund would be made only on the condition that interest charged by borrowers of funds derived from U.S. loans could not exceed the rate of interest charged by the U.S. Government by more than five percentage points. Although, as I noted, this amendment was adopted in the Senate by an overwhelming vote, the conferees of the House of Representatives on the foreign aid bill refused to accept the amendment and it was rejected in the law as finally passed. The foreign aid program as passed does, however, contain a related, but not as effective, limitation on interest rates. The provision enacted is that the funds shall not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest excessive or unreasonable for the borrower.

DUCKS, GEESE AND ESKIMOS

When news came of the arrests in Alaska of Eskimos for shooting ducks, along with my colleagues in Congress, Senator BARTLETT and Representative RIVERS, I protested to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

Secretary Udall, who apparently was taken as much by surprise at the unprecedented action of the agents of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska as were nearly all Alaskans, and was so to speak "on the spot," stated in his earlier reactions that he had no choice but to "enforce the law." That would mean that henceforth Eskimos taking waterfowl for food between March 10 and September 1 would be considered to be in violation of the migratory bird treaties with Canada and Mexico, and therefore subject to arrest, confiscation of their guns, and to prosecution if they were apprehended while taking waterfowl.

Various groups and individuals, concerned with the serious plight of the Eskimos in these circumstances, urged that steps be taken by the State Department to negotiate a modification of the treaties with Canada and Mexico.

On the other hand, I was convinced that such efforts were unnecessary and instead urged my view that the Eskimos had not violated the provisions of the treaties, and that they could properly be so interpreted. I presented this view in letters to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and to others.

I pointed out in an address to the Senate that no action had ever been taken during administrations prior to this to prosecute natives of Alaska for taking migratory fowl out of season and that this had not been the practice, either, of Canada or Mexico, the other signatories to the migratory bird treaty. It was my view that the treaty never contemplated a prohibition against taking of fowl for necessary food by Indians or Eskimo populations of the signatory nations. I hope and believe that my presentation of this solution to the problem which has arisen will be accepted as national policy and that further difficulties will not arise in Alaska.

INTERNAL REVENUE OFFICE OPENED IN ANCHORAGE

In accordance with my long-term ambition that all Federal Government services should be moved closer to the people of Alaska than they are in distant locations in the other States, I was happy to attend the ceremonies marking establishment of an Internal Revenue Service office in Alaska at Anchorage in January 1961. The transfer of this office from its former location at Tacoma is one more improvement in services to Alaska that are made possible by the fact of statehood and the representation of the people of the State by a congressional delegation at Washington.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY ON ANNETTE ISLAND

As a result of my efforts, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has agreed to construct eight-tenths of a mile of road on Annette Island, to provide access to the Metlahatla powerplant. Funds for this improvement will be programed soon.

NEW POST OFFICES

In addition to the Kenai and Anchorage International Airport postal facilities already mentioned, we have succeeded in having a major Federal building programed for Juneau, the capital. This is now being designed.

Post offices were established during the year at Dot Lake, Kotlik, Buckland, New Stuyahok, Eagle River, Russian Mission, Halibut Cove, and Napakiak. Work began on new post office buildings at Spenard, College, Valdez, and Eastchester. Weekly mail service by air to Port Walter, Washington Bay, Port Armstrong, and Port Alexander was established at my request. Additional star route service was put into effect in the north Kenai area.

MISCELLANEOUS

At the urging of the Alaska delegation, the Department of the Interior agreed to modify the terms of a contract by the city of Kodiak to repay indebtedness incurred in connection with an Alaska public works project.

The first Alaska cost-of-living studies being made on a regular basis by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a result of appropriations we obtained were issued this year for Anchorage and Fairbanks. Juneau and Ketchikan reports will follow.

At my urging, the Department of Agriculture assigned an assistant Farmers Home Administration supervisor to Alaska, to have headquarters at Fairbanks.

Higher per diem payments for Federal employees traveling on official business were put into effect this year by virtue of new legislation which I supported.

Mr. President, the list of accomplishments for Alaska and the Nation in this 1st session of the 87th Congress is a long one. I think we may take pride in what has been achieved.

At this turning point in history, the virility and the strength of the United States, the health of her economy, the versatility and might of her Armed Forces, and, above all, the determination of her people, are indispenable to our leadership in the free world and our capacity to insure the preservation of human dignity. The stakes are high; the problems difficult. What we do in the 2d session of the 87th Congress may be our supreme test. We will not fail our responsibilities.

Junk Mail Bonanza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the many unnecessary legislative enactments of the 1st session, 87th Congress, was the last minute extension of junk mail provisions for congressional franking privilege. This was extremely unwise in light of our precarious fiscal position, the deficit policies of the administration and Congress, the already overburdened postal system, and moreover, the waste it will encourage.

The majority party rammed this bill through as a part of the last hectic day's program. Those of us who wanted a rollcall on this issue were thwarted because of the majority party's insistence that there would be "no rollcall votes" on the last day. The American taxpayers should take a dim view of this flagrant abuse. By this new enactment, Congressmen can send nameless, addressless junk mail to cities.

I campaigned on the principle of overall program of economy in Government, with junk mail being one of the features in this program. I object not only to this legislation but the ramrod tactics which brought its enactment.

The Mount Vernon News, a fine daily newspaper in my district, had an excellent editorial on the subject recently:

MORE JUNK MAIL COMING

The last act of the 87th Congress was to approve a supplemental appropriations bill authorizing expenditure of more than a billion dollars.

Among its provisions was one which permits Congressmen to flood metropolitan areas of the country with political propaganda in the form of junk mail, delivered without charge to the Congressmen to the "occupant" of the many millions of residents in all the cities of the land, large and small.

Previously Congressmen had been given the privilege of sending such mail to residents in the rural areas on their plea that it was extremely difficult to obtain lists in such areas.

The action of Congress, therefore, extends this free mail privilege to the entire country without the Congressmen having to go to the trouble and expense of securing mailing lists.

It has been estimated that the cost of this service will run from $1,500 to $6,000 a year per Congressman, depending on how much of the junk the various Congressmen dump into the postal system.

Inasmuch as the Postal Department will not receive any revenue for the handling of this mail, it will increase the annual deficit at which the Department has been operating, a matter which has caused great concern to responsible public officials.

It goes without saying that all Members of Congress do not approve of practices of this nature, but there are enough to override opposition, as has been demonstrated in the junk mail privilege as well as in other matters designed solely to benefit Congressmen at the expense of the taxpayers.

These extraordinary privileges are many, but to name only a few they include a Federal pension if they are defeated for reelec-

tion after age 55 and have served 15 years on the Federal payroll, 5 of which can be in any Federal capacity, Capitol janitor, Army private or whatever; stationery allowances; clerical forces to which relatives are frequently appointed; junkets abroad that are written off as "official business" but which in the majority of cases are vacation trips at public expense; and medical service at Walter Reed and Bethesda hospitals.

All of these things, if exploited to the limit, could amount to thousands of dollars each Congressman is drawing annually out of the Public Treasury.

There are few if any employers who are as liberal with fringe benefits as Uncle Sam is with those who are selected to enact the country's laws. The legislators themselves have seen to that.

Reds in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the month of September I spoke repeatedly in the Senate, criticizing U.N. intervention in Katanga and the composition of the Adoula-Gizenga coalition government in Leopoldville, which has been fostered by the U.N.

At that time, I had the feeling of belonging to an ineffective minority. The general trend of editorial policy seemed to support the U.N., although with some misgivings.

Within the past 2 weeks that has been a significant shift in editorial opinion. And the last few days have brought highly encouraging news concerning the conclusion of a formal cease-fire agreement between the United Nations forces and the Government of Katanga.

Over a 2-week period, the following articles and editorials appeared in national newspapers and periodicals, and I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

First. Article in the Wall Street Journal describing how U.N. was forced to intervene to prevent the Leopoldville Government from using U.S. aid dollars to purchase Communist arms in guise of "machinery."

Second. Editorial in the New York Times stating that the U.N.'s attempt to end the Katanga secession by force has failed, and that a solution must be found by conciliation within a federated state structure. It warned that the U.N. troops must not be tricked into aiding Gizenga and his Communist-oriented army take over the Adoula government from the inside.

Third. A feature article by Mr. S. L. A. Marshall which appeared in the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune, presents the case for Katanga and President Tshombe.

Fourth. A lengthy letter to the editor of the New York Times written by Mr. George H. T. Kimble, former director of the American Geographical Society and head of the Geographic Department at Indiana University.

Fifth. An editorial in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Let's Keep an Eye on the Congo," which takes the stand that the real threat to Congolese independence comes not from the Belgians whom President Tshombe has used to help maintain order, public services and economic vitality; "it comes from the Soviets and their allies who have been sheltered and encouraged in their intrigues by Antoine Gizenga and his demagogic predecessor, Patrice Lumumba."

Sixth. Editorial entitled "Are We Helping Deliver the Congo to the Communists?" from the Saturday Evening Post.

Seventh. New York Times article dealing with cease-fire agreement in Katanga.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

REDS IN THE CONGO: THEY INTENSIFY POWER BID, HOLD KEY POSTS IN LEOPOLDVILLE REGIME—U.S. AID DOLLARS ALMOST BUY ARMS FOR PRO-COMMUNISTS IN GUISE OF "MACHINERY"—THE VOICE OF RADIO MOSCOW

(By John R. Gibson)

LEOPOLDVILLE.—Could the United States unwittingly help finance wily Communists attempting to take over the Congo?

As unbelievable as it seems, this is exactly what might have happened here except for last minute intervention the other day by United Nations representatives who suddenly spotted and became suspicious of a proposed Congolese trade agreement with East Germany.

Here is what happened, according to U.N. officials:

A high-ranking minister in the Congo's coalition central government, aided by a leftist Belgian adviser, secretly formulated an agreement to exchange 40 million francs ($800,000 at the official exchange rate), palm oil, and other products for East German "machinery." The only immediate outlay from the Congo's scanty foreign exchange would have been a 5-percent payment into a Swiss bank account. This 5 percent would have come out of $10 million in economic aid funneled into the Congo by Uncle Sam through the U.N. earlier this year.

"MACHINES" WERE ARMS

The proposed deal got almost completely through channels before it was discovered and blocked by the U.N. It took little investigation, U.N. sleuths report, to establish that the "machinery" actually was to consist of armaments, probably destined for Communist-sympathizing Congolese army troops based at Stanleyville.

As if this were not disturbing enough, it is believed the 5-percent payment eventually would have found its way back to the Congo, partly as a payoff to the minister and his Belgian adviser, and partly to finance propaganda activities against the present central government headed by Cyrille Adoula. Although this government, being a coalition, contains some pro-Communists, it is supported by the United States and generally is regarded as pro-Western.

The proposed deal with East Germany was just one of the many angles being tried here by the Communists and their allies, followers of the slain Patrice Lumumba. Their aim is simple: To take over the Congo. Their strategy, as deduced by westerners aware of what's going on: To twist the Adoula government to their purposes or, if that doesn't work, to turn the Congo once again into a brawling basin of tribal warfare—probably a fatal blow to U.N. prestige here.

REDS STAGE COMEBACK

Although the Communists and their sympathizers haven't had too much influence in Leopoldville since they were driven out by Congolese Gen. Joseph Mobutu a year ago, the near-success of the trade deal with East Germany points up their rapid comeback here.

As often is the case in new countries where everyone is bidding for personal power, it's difficult to tell which politician is a Communist, which a power seeker with no sincere political philosophy, and which is merely for sale to the highest bidder. In some ways, however, it makes little difference here in the Congo which of the three types a politician may be; if any of the three, he is probably getting his support from the Communists and would follow Moscow's direction.

Leading the list of pro-Communists here is Antoine Gizenga, a vice premier in the central government. Mr. Gizenga, a Lumumba follower, set up a rump government in Stanleyville last year after Lumumba's death and received counsel from known Communists. But many insiders believe Mr. Gizenga lost political power by hesitating for several weeks before deciding to enter the present Leopoldville government.

These authorities consider Chrystophe Gbenye, who was Mr. Gizenga's right-hand man at Stanleyville, as the most dangerous leftist leader in Leopoldville. As interior minister, he controls the police. He and his aides have been suggesting to some newspapers supporting the Adoula government that they may face censorship if they don't advocate tougher action against secessionist Katanga Province. Mineral-rich Katanga, headed by Moise Tshombe, so far has vigorously resisted Communist influence and reunion with the rest of the Congo.

OTHER LEFTISTS HOLD HIGH POSTS

Jason Sendwe, the other vice premier of the Leopoldville regime, also rates as a dangerous leftist, Westerners say. Mr. Sendwe lost out to Mr. Tshombe as Katanga's president. Other pro-Communists in the Adoula government: Remy Mwamba, minister of justice; Marel Bisukiro, foreign commerce minister; Joseph Lutula, who has the curious title of minister of the middle classes; and Egide Bochely-Davidson, whom pro-Reds pressured Mr. Adoula into naming chief administrator in Katanga, a job he still hasn't taken over.

With such men in powerful positions, it stands to reason that there will be a sharp increase in leftist activities, Westerners say.

Already, such a trend is noticeable. Although the old Lumumbist newspapers died out during the past year, a new one, Le Matin, has just made its bow. It shouts the leftist line that the Adoula government should squash Katanga fast with arms and without consulting the United Nations. Notices announce meetings of "young Lumumbist" groups.

These organizations have been hampered by a lack of leaders. After General Mobutu forced Russian and other Communist diplomats to flee Leopoldville, paid Red agents simply went underground or to Stanleyville. Now every plane from Stanleyville brings more of these leaders back.

From outside the Congo, Russia's Radio Moscow booms in over the short wave radios most Africans have access to. East Germans circulate a brochure declaring their policy to be "Africa for Africans."

Westerners expect Communist agitation here will increase after resumption of formal diplomatic relations between the Congo and Red lands. "The Communists are keeping quiet until they win recognition," asserts one Western envoy. "When they get that they'll open up. We're dealing with experts."

Moderate government leaders, notably Justin Bomboko, foreign minister, and Joseph Ileo, information minister, are trying to

stave off the Red advance. But the job isn't easy.

Leftist Gbenye's authority over the police means the government must find other means of enforcing a clampdown on Red propaganda. Some moderates favor turning the job over to General Mobutu's army but that would raise the danger of losing control over the trigger-happy soldiers. The U.N. has helped some by deporting during the past 2 weeks 30 local Belgians known to be Communists or some other breed of agitator.

If the present government here fails to control the left, as many pessimists believe will be the case, there is the possibility General Mobutu will return to action. He is rated strongly anti-Communist and hasn't said much during recent months. Observers question how much of the Congolese national army he controls but they concede it is enough to cause a new crisis. Another point: If General Mobutu should go into action, the U.N. might feel obliged to oppose him.

General Mobutu's lack of control over the important Stanleyville arm of the national army adds another advantage for the Reds. The Stanleyville force is controlled by Gen. Victor Lundula, Mr. Gizenga's chief of staff during the Stanleyville separatist regime. General Lundula has volunteered to march his army on Katanga, and Mr. Tshombe's government radio station periodically announces the Lundula army is on the move. U.N. representatives scoff at these charges but privately they fret that just this may happen.

What all this adds up to is a possible collapse of the central government here and an abrupt end to the United Nations and American influence. At worst, Westerners figure, this would lead to a Communist takeover; at best, it might result in a long period of unrest and neutralism.

[From the New York Times]

THE SMOLDERING CONGO

Among the many problems confronting the now leaderless United Nations is one that is surpassed in importance only by the Berlin crisis and the crisis over the Secretary Generalship. This problem is the Congo, where an uneasy truce threatens to explode into new violence that could again rock Africa, the United Nations, and the world.

The Congo presents three problems in one. The first is how to reunite the Congo, in particular how to reintegrate secession-minded Katanga, whose riches and revenues are essential to make the Congo a viable state. The United Nations' attempt to end Katanga's secession by force has failed. A solution must be found by conciliation, not new U.N. ultimatums, and within the long-projected federal structure that provides for substantial self-government for the federated states. This seems to be what President Tshombe really seeks. He is now half in, half out, of the Congo, but he has appealed to Premier Adoula for a "palaver," which is the African way of settling things. The Premier should not refuse.

The second problem is how to prevent Communist-oriented Deputy Premier Gizenga and his still independent army under General Lundula from taking over the Adoula government from the inside. Soviet agents, now returned to Leopoldville, are working toward that end. The U.N. troops, financed mainly by the United States, must not be tricked into aiding such a plot.

The third problem is how to maintain the United Nations troops in the Congo as a stabilizing force in the face of mounting deficits that threaten the United Nations with bankruptcy. Far too many states are following the Russian example in refusing to pay their assessments. It is up to the Assembly to take action against them. They are violating their charter obligation, the prescribed penalty for which is suspension of membership or expulsion.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE STRANGE CASE OF KATANGA

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

In the Congo story there is nothing more ironic than the course of events which makes Moise Tshombe of Katanga the villain, the main antagonist of the United Nations, while Antoine Gizenga, the skulker from Oriente province, emerges as cooperator of sorts and almost a hero.

That happens only because the U.N. has its own design for the Congo, however much that plan may be against nature, and irrespective of the sufficient proof over the past 15 months that it is an excessive expectation.

It happens also because Gizenga sees what he thinks is a first-class opening by which ultimately to subvert the U.N.'s undertakings by grabbing power himself, which would mean riddance to the U.N. and all its works in darkest Africa.

Also, it happens because Tshombe still holds out, preferring that the little something solid (meaning Katanga) in the Congo quicksand to union with a central government which merely drifts along without either gaining political control of the country or demonstrating a capacity to administer it if it did.

The U.N. had great dreams. All of the Congolese chieftains were to get together in one big happy political family and henceforth speak the language of brotherly love. Thereafter, with the U.N. leading them by the hand they would be tutored into that degree of wisdom requisite to reestablishing the Congo as a thriving and productive union of provinces populated mainly by savages. It was foolish from the start. The leading Congolese had no such potential.

But what was the fundamental job, really? Simply this, the return of law and order, so that men and women would return to work, trade and industry would resume, food would move where it was required and creature satisfactions would return to normal. There would then be something for government to govern. That possibility could not be furthered by rupturing whatever remained in the Congo that was still operative.

Katanga did not share in the general collapse. Villain or no, Tshombe kept his province solid, productive and reasonably tranquil, considering the obstacles strewn in his path. The mines continued their output. The people were fed. And though Katanga cargo took a different route to the sea, its communications for the most part remained in repair, in contrast to other provinces. To Tshombe's credit, he at least did a more effective job of administering a large area, and avoiding chaos, than any other single Congolese. Further, he did not initiate separatism in Katanga. It has always had semi-autonomous control of its own affairs because the Belgian mining companies were powerful enough politically to keep it that way.

Tshombe sinned in two ways. The first was his bid for independence which was offensive to U.N.'s controlling idea toward the Congo, though it has recklessly supported the principle of self-determination practically everywhere else on the globe. His collateral transgression was the withholding of revenues by the Congo's one prospering province. The central government is many millions worse than bankrupt and hurting worse every day in its pocketbook. So blame Tshombe.

But listen also to this comment on the Leopoldville government by the U.N.'s Dr. Carl Sture Linner: "Its lack of money is not as dire as its lack of knowledge about how to spend it." If that be true, Tshombe's crime was that he would not help finance profligacy and ineptitude in a ministry whose control over the Congo extends hardly beyond the near horizon.

Furthermore, it was not Tshombe through his separatism and withholding of taxes, who prostrated the Congo. His withdrawal was an exacerbating factor but not the main squeeze. The damage done by it could be remedied soon enough, unless the U.N. embroils the whole community in trying to discipline one man, since Tshombe at least kept Katanga reasonably whole.

When Gizenga, the heir of the late Patrice Lumumba, withdrew to Stanleyville with his military cohorts, making by his presence a fief-holding of Oriental province, that was what scuttled the Congo's main chance for a gradual recovery. It also settled famine and worklessness on millions of Congolese.

There ensued a political blockading of the Congo River over the 1,100-mile stretch of its navigable waters between Leopoldville and Stanleyville. It was pressed from both directions as the politicos at both ends each sought to starve the other out, irrespective of the costs to the multitude.

When nothing moves on that great waterway, the Congo is in fully desperate straits. The stream is the life artery of the whole central basin of Africa and the immediate surrounding highlands. Roads and rails tie into it to make a communications network possible. Except that the jungle is more fruitful, depriving the region of this waterway is like keeping the Nile from Egypt.

That was Gizenga's contribution. The U.N. and the Congo moderates have temporarily made peace with him becuse it seems politically expedient. They should know better. The whole territory abounds with other alligators.

[From the New York Times]

U.N. IN KATANGA—ACTION HELD CONTRARY TO AGENCY'S ROLE, PLEBISCITE ADVOCATED

(The writer of the following letter, former director of the American Geographical Society and head of the Geography Department at Indiana University, is the author of "Tropical Africa.")

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

There is something deeply disturbing about the recent activities of the U.N. in Katanga. For here is an agency dedicated to the finding of peaceful solutions to world problems, engaged in a war against people whose chief offense is that they happen to be richer than their provincial neighbors and object to the prospect of being either run or milked by them.

No matter how well meant this intervention may be, it can scarcely fail to disillusion those who hitherto have thought of the U.N. forces in the Congo as a kind of peace corps. This intervention is also calculated to confirm the suspicion of those who are beginning to wonder if the U.N. is not resorting to the very kind of coercion it has long condemned in the colonial powers.

Then, again, it is bound to produce anxiety in the minds of many yet-to-be-liberated peoples, for if the U.N. imposes its will on the inhabitants of Katanga, will it not later try to do the same on the Baganda, the Barotse, the Masai, and all the other African groups who equally have no taste for subjection to their stronger neighbors.

DETERMINING STATUS

Be this as it may, I take leave to wonder if the action of the U.N. is really in harmony with the spirit of its deliverances on the subject of self-determination. One of these, made in 1955 at a meeting of the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council, stated that "all peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination—namely, the right freely to determine their political, economic, social, and cultural status."

If this statement means anything, it means freedom for the inhabitants of Katanga to decide, without internal compulsion or external fixing, what kind of government they want and who shall govern them. True, they may not qualify as a nation in the Western sense of the word, but most of them have as much identity as the 18th century Americans and the 20th century Jews, and as much right to the appellation of peoples.

The fact that they find themselves living inside the same political boundaries as several dozen other peoples is, I submit, no reason for the United Nations insistence that they should go on doing so, for the boundaries were artificial (being unethnical) in the first place, and in the second place, the peoples have few, if any, common bonds, other than their former subjection to Belgian rule and opposition to it. Many of them, in fact, differ at least as much as the Swedes do from the Spaniards.

EQUATORIAL TERRITORIES

The United Nations did not insist that the peoples of the heavily mineralized Gabon should continue to live in political association with those of the other three territories of French Equatorial Africa when they received their independence in 1960. On the contrary, it welcomed all four of them immediately and unanimously into its growing membership.

If, as is commonly affirmed, the main reason for the United Nations insistence on the continued political adherence of Katanga to the rest of the former Belgian Congo is because this province is heavily mineralized, it is surely surprising that the U.N. did not likewise insist on the continued political association of Gabon with its erstwhile French neighbors for, insofar as they are known, the geographical endowments of the Central African Republic and the Republics of Chad and Congo (Brazzaville) are individually smaller than those of the six provinces of the former Belgian Congo.

Not, of course, that the Central African Republic and the Republics of Chad and Congo (Brazzaville) are alone in their slender means. At least 10 of the African countries welcomed into the membership of the United Nations during the past 6 years have smaller revenues than any of the 6 Belgian Congo provinces had on the eve of the country's independence in 1960. At least five have, it could be argued, a lower "viability rating" than any Congolese province.

Would it not be better perhaps for the United Nations to use its meager financial resources for supervising a plebiscite to decide what kind of political allegiances the peoples of the Congo desire to form, rather than enforce an alien, and palpably unwelcome, will on one of them? There is a precedent for such action. A plebiscite was recently taken in British Cameroons with quite satisfactory results. There is also a compelling reason for it, namely, the maintenance of world peace—and the United Nations own high standing as the chief instrument of such peace.

GEORGE H. T. KIMBLE.

SOLSBERRY, IND., *September 26, 1961.*

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

LET'S KEEP AN EYE ON THE CONGO

For years it was possible to say, "Let Dag do it," with the knowledge that a difficult situation would at least be in the hands of an immensely capable and incorruptible public servant. But now there is no Dag, and this makes a world of difference—quite notably in the Congo, where he so tragically and abruptly lost his life.

Though an uneasy truce still prevails in Katanga, the Congo is by no means out of danger.

As it always has, the real threat to Congolese independence comes not from the Belgians whom Moise Tshombe has used to help maintain order, economic vitality, and essential services in Katanga; it comes from the Soviets and their allies, who have been sheltered and encouraged in their intrigues by Antoine Gizenga and his demagogic predecessor, Patrice Lumumba.

With the world's attention diverted, Iron Curtain agents have been pouring into Leopoldville to work their mischief, or at least to try to the best of their considerable ability. Premier Adoula has apparently been trying to steer an independent middle course, but whether he can succeed is still an open question. Vice Premier Gizenga and his lieutenant, Christophe Gbenye, in the vital post of Interior Minister, are at least Communist sympathizers, and there has been little evidence that Gizenga has abandoned his ambition to rule the Congo.

The U.N. army was turned against the only consistently stable, Western-oriented regime the Congo has known, which threatened no one. And the central government's plan to make a Red-leaning Gizenga deputy boss of Katanga if the U.N. operation had succeeded should be ample indication that all is not yet well in Adoula land.

It should be a warning to the West that any further efforts to force unification had better be scrutinized with care before they are allowed to proceed.

Congolese unity is still a goal to be pursued—but not unity at any price. Not at the price of freedom; not at the price of forced submission to a regime in which Communist agents and/or sympathizers have been allowed to gain control.

They have not yet gained control of the Leopoldville government. But there is a real danger that they may, unless the West plays its cards with care and determination.

Premier Adoula still has to prove himself. The U.N., after its spectacular blunder in Katanga, has to reestablish its claim to confidence. This will be harder without Mr. Hammarskjold.

Meanwhile, the U.N.—which has been assembling an air force in the Congo—ought to be put on clear notice that any renewal of its military offensive would be intolerable. And the United States—which as chief support of the U.N. operation has a moral as well as practical stake—had best keep a close watch.

Right doesn't alone make might in this imperfect world. It has to be made to prevail.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

ARE WE HELPING DELIVER THE CONGO TO THE COMMUNISTS?

The New York Times put it conservatively when it stated recently that the United Nations, in invading the Katanga Province of the Congo, had set a precedent "at considerable risk to itself." Surely if the United Nations can invade the Congo to enforce its own theory of what this country's Government should be like—an action not hinted at in the United Nations Charter—other nations will want to know what goes on.

Leaving aside the pompous nonsense regarding the need to "bring peace to the Congo," the fact is that United Nations troops (financed for more than $40 million by the United States) brought war to the one part of the Congo where there was peace, prosperity, cooperation among the various races and an imposing "infrastructure" (to borrow a word from U.N. gobbledygook) of modern civilized living, President Tshombe of Katanga had agreed to go along with a federation of Congolese States, but the United Nations insisted that Katanga must submit to the total authority of a Communist-dominated central government.

Why representatives of the United States, which is a federal system, should crack down on the federal form of government for the Congo is beyond us. Even more mysterious is our support of the United Nations effort to force Katanga to weaken its economic and military posture by deporting white officers and officials. Mercenaries these are called, except when they are Communist Czechs, Poles, or Soviet citizens; then they become technicians. Following this imposition of racism, unwanted by the Katangans, came the demand, also backed by the United States, that Katanga knuckle under to the Communist-dominated central authorities.

As to the central authorities, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, produced a translation of an article in the Soviet publication New Times which stated that the followers of Lumumba had a clear majority in the Congolese parliament and that Premier Cyrille Adoula was committed to carry out all decisions made earlier by the Lumumba government. It was already known that Adoula had agreed to make one of the Red-trained Gizenga's men minister of the interior (in charge of the police), and that one Egide Bochely-Davidson, another Lumumba protege, was to be chief administrator of Katanga.

Had it not been for the tragic accident which ended his life, Secretary General Hammarskjold might have rescued the United Nations from the consequences of its blunders. That the mess may have been created by U.N. representatives on the spot, without sanction by the home office, is suggested by the willingness of President Tshombe of Katanga to deal with Hammarskjold despite his previous refusal to talk with Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien, the local U.N. "enforcer." The invasion of Katanga was obviously ordered without approval by the Security Council, as is made plain by the protests of the foreign offices of Great Britain and France. Lord Lansdowne, Britain's parliamentary undersecretary for foreign affairs, who talked with the late Secretary General before his death, is convinced that the U.N. forces had exceeded their instructions. We may be sure, in spite of the uneasy truce, that the Communists have not given up in the Congo.

Why do we go along with a course so freighted with disaster to the Congo and our commercial and strategic interests? For one thing, there is in the United States a heavily brainwashed but socially and financially prominent minority which has what the kids call a "thing" about the United Nations. These people pay little attention to what the United Nations actually does. All criticism is met by cries that "the United Nations is the hope of the world," or that it "stands between us and the horror of nuclear war." This sort of thing may represent the triumph of hope over experience, but it does constitute a considerable part of American public opinion to which any administration feels obliged to pay some heed. So the Communists get the strategic key to Africa—and the cobalt—and we get the consciousness of having acted nobly and disinterestedly.

We can hardly be expected to stand by the U.N., when the U.N. too often seems concerned with prompting Soviet objectives, especially in the Congo, whose people, insofar as they are articulate, want continued cooperation with the West.

[From the New York Times]

U.N. AND KATANGA AGREE ON TRADING CONGO PRISONERS—PROVISIONAL PACT ALSO CALLS FOR WORLD BODY'S TROOPS TO YIELD SOME POSTS

(By David Halberstam)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO.—A prisoner exchange agreement between United Nations and Katangan officials was announced here today by the United Nations command in the Congo.

The agreement is not final. It still requires approval by United Nations headquarters in New York.

The accord, which the United Nations describes as a protocol implementation of the cease fire that was agreed on last month, also calls for the withdrawal of United Nations troops from several positions they took during 8 days of fighting in Katanga.

The cease-fire went into effect September 21. It was agreed on in Ndola, northern Rhodesia, between United Nations officials and Moise Tshombe, President of secessionist Katanga Province.

The truce followed fighting that began September 13 when United Nations troops took over in Elizabethville, the provincial capital, in an attempt to restore the province to the control of the central Government in Leopoldville.

TSHOMBE AGREES TO TRADE

President Tshombe and Mahmoud Khiari of Tunisia, a United Nations official, reached the prisoner-exchange agreement in Elizabethville last night.

It calls for an exchange of prisoners without further delay. This is scheduled to take place Monday afternoon.

The Katangans have 191 United Nations prisoners—184 Irish, 5 Italians, 1 Swede, and 1 Norwegian. The United Nations has an estimated total of 220 Katangan prisoners.

The agreement also calls for the withdrawal of United Nations troops from Elizabethville's post office, radio station, the Lido Hotel, and an underpass on the fringe of town that had been a key point during the fighting.

The agreement creates three subcommissions, each composed of two Katangan officers and two United Nations officers, to carry out inspection at any time and at any place at the request of either party. A complaint by either side on a possible violation of the cease fire would be handled by the subcommissions.

CIVILIANS DISARMED

The Katangans, according to the agreement, would assure that no civilians carried weapons. Both sides would work to stop hostile propaganda. This has been a key point. The United Nations has charged that the radio station in Elisabethville had been used primarily to stir up anti-United Nations feeling.

The United Nations had expected to give up the post office as part of the agreement. But some of the other points of the agreement, such as the withdrawal from the tunnel, were last-minute concessions to the Katangese.

The agreement also will permit the Katangese to operate again at the airport, which has been a United Nations stronghold. Katangan troops will be allowed to return to the airport and the Katangans will be able to fly provisions out of the airport to their troops in the back country. Civilian air flights will be resumed.

In effect, the agreement puts the airport under joint control.

Katangan forces and United Nations forces will remain in the positions they occupied on September 12 at Albertville, Niemba, Nyunzu, and Jadotville.

The agreement also provides that the United Nations will not consider the cease fire to be violated if Katangan troops reply to fire from some external attack.

Nothing more is given on this point. But the central Congo Government has made it clear that this agreement does not apply to it.

The point is thus somewhat unclear, since the United Nations mandate here calls for it to take any action necessary to prevent civil war.

United Nations officials here declined to comment on the agreement. There was no doubt that the concessions to Mr. Tshombe caught some officials here by surprise. Mr. Khiari is withholding comment until he returns here and Dr. Sture C. Linner, head of the United Nations mission in the Congo, is also withholding comment.

Mr. Khiari told officials here that the afternoon session with Mr. Tshombe had been marked by several eruptions and then returns. Mr. Tshombe called the new agreement a victory for Katanga.

It was noted here that the document made no reference to the February 21 resolution expelling mercenaries from Katanga. Newsmen had been told there would be a reference to this in the agreement.

Statement of Senator Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 26, I had the honor of speaking before a meeting convened under the auspices of the Citizens Alert Committee of Corpus Christi, Tex.

To me this meeting was another impressive evidence of the remarkable grassroots anti-Communist movement that has sprung up in this country. This movement is, to a certain degree, amorphous and groping for leadership. What it signifies, however, is that our people are tired of defeats and retreats under Communist pressure, that they are looking for answers, that they are prepared to face up to the dangers.

In my statement before the Citizens Alert Committee, I tried to point out that the Communists have greatly accelerated their timetable of conquest and that the major battles which will decide the fate of mankind for centuries to come loom immediately on the political horizon.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my speech before the Citizens Alert Committee of Corpus Christi.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE THE CITIZENS ALERT COMMITTEE, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1961

FIVE MINUTES TO MIDNIGHT

"Five Minutes to Midnight" may sound like a melodramatic subject. But I assure you it is not melodramatic in the context of the present world situation. I have, in fact, chosen this subject with all deliberation because I believe that it truly and accurately reflects the gravity of our peril.

In a speech I made last year, I recounted all the defeats that the free world had suffered during the postwar period. I said that we stood with our backs to the wall, that we had no more room for retreat, no more margin for error. Another 15 years like the past 15 years, I said, and there would be no free world left to defend.

In the light of everything that has happened since last November, I now feel obliged to revise this estimate.

I am now convinced that the major battles which will decide the fate of mankind for centuries to come, loom immediately on the political horizon. I am convinced that, instead of 15 years, we now have to think in terms of a timetable of 2, 3, or 5 years at the most.

Berlin is not the only point of crisis. There are signs that the Communists are preparing for assaults at a score of different points—in Laos, in Vietnam, in Korea, in Iran, in the Congo, in Portuguese Angola, in Brazil and Venezuela and Mexico, and throughout Latin America.

During the entire postwar period, the free world has enjoyed military superiority over the Communist world. But it is the Communist world which has held the initiative and won the victories in the cold war.

They have held this initiative and they have won their victories for a very simple reason: the Communists have chosen always to attack, and we have chosen always to defend. They are trying to win the world for communism; we are always in the position of simply trying to hang on to what we have.

It is almost as though there were an understanding on a set of rules which call for the cold war to be fought only on the territory of the free world and never on the territory which has been incorporated by force into the Communist world.

If you took the best army in the world, with the best generals in the world, and the best equipment in the world, and compelled it to fight a war in which it could only defend but never attack, "the best army in the world" would soon lose this war. And we shall certainly lose the cold war and lose our own freedom in the process if we continue to fight under the arbitrary, senseless one-sided handicap that we have imposed on ourselves.

Every American has been brought up to believe in the power and invincibility of his country. It is almost impossible for us to conceive of America being defeated, of America becoming part of an international slave empire dominated by Moscow.

But no nation is invincible for all time, as mighty Rome learned at the time of the Barbarian invasions.

Let us have no illusions about it. America can be defeated. We can become slaves. If we place our comforts before survival, if we shrink from danger, if we indulge in pipe dreams rather than facing up to reality, then the future is black indeed.

If, on the other hand, we mobilize our resources, if we face up to facts with open eyes and face up to dangers without flinching, then I am certain that we will ultimately prevail.

The evidences are many that the world Communist movement is girding itself for massive assaults on what is left of the free world.

The conference of the Communist and Workers Parties which took place in Moscow last November issued a manifesto that should be read with care by everyone who wants to understand better what the future holds in store for us.

This manifesto was an unmistakable declaration of war against human freedom and free people everywhere. Above all, it was a declaration of war against the United States.

There was some exceedingly ominous language in this manifesto, the kind of language that a commander in chief would employ in preparing his lieutenants for an all-out assault. Let me read one of these passages from the manifesto to you:

"Indeed, the Socialist Parties and the Communist Parties must synchronize their watches. * * * It is necessary to check the time of the Communist movement so that our powerful army keeps in step and makes confident strides toward communism. Every party will adhere to these decisions in a strict and sacred manner throughout its activities."

The manifesto was full of phrases indicating the total confidence in the early victory of communism on a worldwide basis. It reeked of an almost drunken sense of power.

It said that the international Communist movement had become the most influential political force of our time. It claimed that victory would soon be theirs.

When Khrushchev visited our country in 1959 at the invitation of President Eisenhower, he took advantage of our hospitality to inform us that our grandchildren would live under communism.

The proposed timetable for Communist world conquest has been dramatically accelerated since this statement was made.

In the manifesto issued by the Moscow conference and in the 4-hour speech made by Khrushchev on January 6, 1961, it was apparent that the Communists were thinking of a timetable of some 10 or 15 years.

The developments of recent months, the crescendo of threats and ultimatums, the increasing arrogance of their manner, now suggest that the Communists have decided to further step up the tempo of their attack because they feel that they have the free world divided, in retreat, incapable of effective reaction.

On at least two occasions in the past 6 months, Khrushchev has indicated that he now hopes to see the worldwide triumph of communism in his own lifetime. Since he is heading toward 70, obese, and disposed to fits of rage, it is clear that Khrushchev is thinking of several years rather than 15 years. Khrushchev had never made such statements previously; I believe it would be a serious mistake not to attach significance to them.

The first aftermath of the Moscow conference was Soviet intervention in Laos. Indeed, the signatures on the manifesto were hardly dry when the first Soviet planes arrived in Laos bearing supplies for the pro-Communist faction.

At that time, they were still not as confident as their language suggested. They felt their way gingerly, because they were worried over the possibility of a vigorous free world reaction.

The first Soviet planes that landed in Laos in early December 1960 carried only benzene.

We did nothing.

The next round of Soviet planes brought in small arms munition. Still we did nothing.

The next group of planes brought in mortars and howitzers and the ammunition for these weapons. Still we did nothing.

Finally, when it was clear that we would take no action to interfere with the buildup of Communist strength of Laos, the Soviet planes started ferrying in Vietminh officers and technicians.

The complete inactivity which had characterized the closing days of the outgoing administration, carried into the opening days of the new administration. There had been some talk of invoking the SEATO Treaty if the Communists persisted in their invasion of Laos. We said that we would not stand idly by while the Communists moved from one position to another position.

But we did nothing.

By May of this year, the situation in Laos had deteriorated to the point where the Royal Government forces had no alternative but to seek an armistice. Now we find ourselves negotiating for the establishment of a coalition government in Laos, under conditions where the Communists hold all the trump cards.

Even before the free world's defeat in Laos had been consummated in a formal cease-fire, there came the Cuban fiasco. Here again we demonstrated a terrifying incapacity for decisive action.

There is no question but that the great majority of the Cuban people had by that time turned against the regime because of its destruction of human freedom, its persecution of the church and the labor movement and the universities and the middle classes. The Kremlin had already intervened heavily on the side of Castro by providing him with massive quantities of arms. But in the name of nonintervention, we did not lift a finger to assist the Cuban freedom fighters once we had put them ashore. And the hopes of the Cuban people for early liberation went crashing to the ground.

On August 21 we suffered another crushing defeat in Latin America when Cheddi Jagan and his People's Progressive Party triumphed in the British Guiana elections. He was a minority victor who won with only 42 percent of the votes. But he had a plurality of three seats. This tiny plurality, I fear, will be enough to enable him to establish another Castro regime, which will give Moscow its first beachhead on the South American mainland.

We did nothing to encourage or assist the parties opposing Jagan. On the contrary, to the extent that we did intervene in the British Guiana elections, we intervened on Jagan's side. We intervened when, only 6 weeks before the election, we approved a World Bank loan of $1¼ million to British Guiana, which was personally signed for by Cheddi Jagan as Minister of Commerce.

Our handling of the Berlin situation has also been characterized by a seeming incapacity for action. We have committed ourselves to defend Berlin, and I believe we will. But when Khrushchev, on August 13, closed the access roads from West Berlin to East Berlin and erected a barbed wire and concrete barricade across the breadth of the city, it took us 3 whole days in which to file a protest so flimsy that the West Berliners demonstrated in indignation against it.

Again no action was taken.

No one, of course, wants a war, if war can be avoided. But a war of miscalculation becomes far more likely every time Khrushchev puts us to the test and we confine our reactions to expressions of indignation. Khrushchev will stop at nothing if he believes that the West always talks big but that it backs away from action.

In the case of the Berlin crisis, there were many things we could have done and should have done that would in no way have increased the danger of war. The simplest, the most dramatic, the most effective, and at the same time the safest measure, would have involved the imposition of economic sanctions.

It is my belief that, in response to the sealing off of East Berlin, the West should have immediately suspended all shipments of machine tools and industrial and chemical processing equipment and that it should have warned the Kremlin that it would follow this measure with a total economic embargo if there were any further provocations.

I have advocated this measure repeatedly on the floor of the Senate. It is a measure which would hit the Soviet regime in its industrial solar plexus.

The Soviet regime, from its inception, has shopped the free world systematically for the best industrial equipment it could find. If the Soviet regime today has a powerful industrial plant, if it has a technology with which it can threaten the entire free world, it is largely because of the assistance it has received from the United States and other free countries.

But despite Soviet successes, they have still not developed a capacity for the production of high precision machine tools and other precision equipment. These items they still try to obtain from the free world. And, in far too many cases, the free world places profit above survival and above principle, and sells the Soviet Union the machinery in which it is interested. Let me give you an example of what I mean.

Early this year, we stopped the shipment are employed in our missile guidance systems and firing systems. We were able to of 37 machines used in the production of the ultra-high-precision ball bearings that demonstrate in the course of our investigation that the Soviet Government had been trying desperately for many years to make such machines but had not been able to do so. We were also able to demonstrate that these machines, produced by American engineering genius, were absolutely unique in the world. And it was on these grounds that we were able to get the license revoked.

But I am greatly afraid that things like this are going on all the time, not merely in our own country, but in France and England, and throughout the NATO alliance.

This is why I say that an embargo on the shipment of machine tools and other critical industrial equipment would hit the Soviet Union like a blow in the solar plexus.

Such an action would be worth 10,000 speeches in convincing the Soviets that we mean business.

But so far no such action has been taken.

The pattern of paralysis which I have just described to you is all the more frightening because it goes back so many years. In fact, we have taken no really heroic action since we intervened in Korea. And even this heroic action was vitiated later when the paralysis of which I speak set in, and caused us to throw away the victory which could have been ours.

Our failure to act at the time of the Hungarian Revolution was probably the gravest and most costly of all our recent political delinquencies.

The Hungarian revolution was without question the greatest opportunity the West has had to force the Kremlin back to its prewar frontiers and to reestablish a stable political balance in Europe. The satellite empire was seething with discontent. Poland and East Germany, in particular, stood on the very brink of explosion. The Red army units stationed in Hungary had, in the first phase of the fighting, given indications of massive disaffection. Thousands of them, in fact, had gone over to the side of the Hungarian freedom fighters with their weapons. The Kremlin itself, as Khrushchev has publicly admitted, was aware of the gravity of the crisis and was divided on the course to be followed.

But instead of taking action to support the heroic freedom fighters of Hungary, we limited ourselves to pious declarations of sympathy. We did not even take the simple and obvious action of insisting on the immediate dispatch to Hungary of a corps of U.N. observers. Nor did we move immediately to make it clear that we recognized the government of Imre Nagy.

It would have been bad enough if we had been completely inactive. But our guilt went further than this. In almost so many words, President Eisenhower assured the Kremlin that we looked upon Eastern Europe as its legitimate sphere of influence and that we had no intention of intervening.

The Kremlin was encouraged by these assurances. The Soviet troops, which had been withdrawn from Hungary after their first inglorious defeat by the Hungarian freedom fighters, were sent pouring back into Hungary in a surprise attack, supported by a force of 5,000 tanks.

I can think of no more dismal moment in our entire history. I believe that the man who said, "The blood of the Hungarian people is on our hands," spoke for a considerable part of the American public.

In the present Berlin crisis we are paying for our inaction in Hungary, our inaction when the Communists were overrunning North Vietnam, our inaction in Laos, our inaction in Cuba.

There may be some people who believe that by inaction we are preserving peace.

But I believe, on the contrary, that, when you are faced with a ruthless and implacable aggressor, with a Hitler or a Khrushchev, inaction and appeasement lead inevitably to war.

The only road to peace is the one of resoluteness and courage and principle.

The time has come to call an end to our retreats before the worldwide offensive of the international Communist movement.

The time has come for action instead of words.

The time has come to recognize that we are engaged in mortal combat with a merciless enemy, that there can be no coexistence between communism and freedom because communism does not tolerate coexistence.

The international Communist offensive has been gathering momentum at a terrifying pace.

The more momentum it gathers, the more we retreat and concede under its pressure, the more difficult it will be to stop this offensive.

To stop it, we must somehow go over to the counteroffensive.

Communism has openly proclaimed its goal to be the establishment of a worldwide Communist order.

Let us openly proclaim our goal to be the worldwide triumph of freedom over communism.

Communism appears to be invulnerable only because we have granted it invulnerability.

Actually, it is the most vulnerable of all systems precisely because it is the most despotic and most hated of all systems.

The resentment and the hatred and the national spirit which made the Hungarian Revolution and the Poznan rebellion and the East German uprising and the Tibetan Revolution are not dead.

They are alive today in Hungary and Poland and Tibet and in all the countries that have been subjected to Bolshevik tyranny.

This hatred and this national spirit are also alive in China and in the Soviet Union itself. Remember that 80 percent of the Chinese soldiers captured in Korea refused to return home despite the strong ties of family, while in Hungary thousands of Red army soldiers defected to the side of the revolution.

On the day that the United States commits itself in all earnestness to a policy of liberation, on the day that it announces that it seeks nothing less than the worldwide triumph of freedom over communism, the weaknesses of communism will be increased tenfold.

Let us seek out these weaknesses systematically.

Let us stop helping them build up their economic strength with shipments of machine tools and critical industrial machinery and surplus food.

Let us stop pouring billions of dollars of aid into Communist countries.

Let us do our utmost to tear down the Communist tyrants, not build them up. Let us add to their difficulties whenever we can.

If they mount guerrilla movements in South Vietnam, let us mount them in North Vietnam.

Let us take the counteroffensive, let us strike a blow for freedom, whenever the opportunity presents itself.

The opportunities will not be lacking.

We could begin and should begin by helping the people of Cuba to recover their freedom from the most tyrannical regime that has ever oppressed them.

Let us do these things with a sense of urgency, without stint, with all the dedication and energy we can muster.

It is 5 minutes to midnight. There is very little time in which to reverse the trend to disaster.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, when the 87th Congress convened in January, all of us were full of hope. On January 20, when a new President assumed the arduous duties of the White House, we were ready to march forward toward the New Frontiers, arm in arm with our great Chief Executive.

Now that we have completed our first session's legislative schedule, it is time to take stock; to review our accomplishments and see whether our hopes of January have become realities in September.

Despite some setbacks and some unfinished business, the answer must be affirmative. Looking at the record of the first session objectively, we in the Congress can be proud of our accomplishments.

President Kennedy, on February 21, 1961, gave Democratic congressional leaders a 16-point priority list of legislation, which he said he hoped could be passed at the earliest opportunity. Much of this legislation was part of the basic Democratic program that Congress had pushed for years. A Democratic Congress, with the leadership and guidance of the Kennedy administration, acted favorably on three-fourths of this priority list.

A .750 average over a full season is championship performance, to use a baseball metaphor.

Subsequently, in special messages, the President submitted many other requests for legislation, the majority of which were given favorable consideration by the Congress.

The 87th Congress has met its responsibilities and has done so in such a manner that we can all be proud as we return to visit with the constituency we represent. We have worked hard. We have been productive. We have led the way to vast gains in our economic and military structure.

As for my own part in the work of the Congress, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and as the senior subcommittee chairman, I have had an intimate relationship with important items on the President's priority list. The first bill our committee considered is the new Minimum Wage Act.

As the chairman of the general Subcommittee on Education, I listened to thousands and thousands of words of testimony relative to the educational needs of our Nation. More is in store for the forthcoming session, together with proposed consideration of a more liberal and fair school lunch program, as well as legislation to get a start on the special problems of the senior citizens.

I have also served as a member of the ad hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Exports and Imports on American Employment. This subcommittee is gathering a wealth of material which will be of inestimable value as background when the Congress reviews our foreign trade policies next year. We have already collected a vast amount of statistics relating to the coal, steel, aluminum, glassware, pottery, and toy industries. More will be gathered and sifted during the congressional recess.

Other major bills upon which our committee acted favorably, and which I supported, were the youth employment opportunities bill and the bill authorizing a program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining, to develop new skills.

Of special interest to the people I represent, I am most satisfied with the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act, of which I was a cosponsor; the enactment of a stronger water pollution control act, which will provide for a study of the effect of runoff water from abandoned coal mines; the reporting from the Committee on Education of a bill extending the protection of the Federal Coal Mine Safety program to employees in smaller mines; the extension of the National Defense Education Act which has meant so much to high schools in each of West Virginia's counties and has enabled more than 1,200 West Virginians to attend a college or a university; and the appropriation of funds to start construction on armories and reserve training centers, including facilities at Fairmont and New Martinsville.

From a nonlegislative standpoint, I am extremely gratified at the success of efforts to open the Army's oversea coal procurement to West Virginia mines, which will directly promote the economy of so many areas of my State.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that my voting record is such that I have both feet on the New Frontier. I have supported and fought for the President's measures to strengthen the domestic economy, to improve education, to combat organized crime, to control juvenile delinquency, to strengthen our ties with Latin America, to improve and extend our program of combating Communist aggression through foreign aid, and to strengthen national defense and internal security.

This then is a summary of the 1st session of the 87th Congress and my part therein. Any constituent, old or new, may obtain information as to any specific vote by addressing an inquiry to my office.

J.F.K. Should Realize We Aren't Spineless People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Ashland Times-Gazette, one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my district, published an excellent editorial on July 8, 1961, which seems equally appropriate for consideration now that the session

of Congress has concluded. I recommend its reading to the Members of the House:

J.F.K. SHOULD REALIZE WE AREN'T SPINELESS PEOPLE

President John F. Kennedy created a great storm in this Nation last year when, as a candidate for President of the United States, he charged that U.S. prestige in the world had fallen to a new low.

He pledged that if elected he would act in such a way as to halt the downward trend in American prestige and restore the United States to its rightful place as the unchallenged leader of the free world and a mighty and reliable friend of all foes of communism.

Later, in his inaugural address, Kennedy said:

"Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend or oppose any enemy, in order to assure the survival and success of liberty."

To date, President Kennedy has authorized a complete fiasco in Cuba, handed Laos to the Communists while our diplomats talked, and hidden from his own people the truth about his conference with Russian Premier Khrushchev in Vienna. He has proposed a form of censorship for the free press of the United States, has attempted to hide the true seriousness of his back ailment from the American people and has spent more time away from the White House in his first 6 months in office than his predecessor after he made repeated attacks during the campaign on former President Eisenhower's White House absences.

As a matter of fact, if President Kennedy was alarmed at the low state of U.S. prestige in the world last summer and fall, certainly there is total panic in the White House now. U.S. prestige never has been lower. Even some of our warmest friends and most resolute allies are reassessing their positions in view of our refusal to defend Laos, our failure in Cuba and our generally spineless posture in the face of trouble in other areas of the world.

Now there appear to be cracks in our determination to defend Berlin and in our steadfast refusal to recognize the Communist Chinese regime and to admit the China Reds into the United Nations.

Somehow we get the impression that President Kennedy is convinced, as was President Eisenhower in the fading months of his administration, that the people of the United States have no guts, will not support any firm or decisive action, and would almost surely impeach a President who took any risk other than appeasement.

Certainly this is not the general attitude in this part of the Nation. Perhaps the White House is too heavily populated (overrun would be a better term) with the longhair "thinkers" of the effete East from Harvard.

This is no time to be a sittin' an' a thinkin' while resting aching backs in a comfortable rocking chair. It is a time for action, a time for guts (or courage, if the Harvardites prefer the gentler term), a time for all of us to stand up and be counted.

We must make it clear to the Russians by our actions, not just high-sounding words (written by Harvard English professors), that we will not tolerate for one instance the loss of another square foot of territory by any means anywhere in the world.

If this requires that we fight, then fight we must. We are rapidly reaching the point where we must fight or perish. We had little use for the ruffian from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, during his years of White House occupancy, but sometimes we long for H.S.T.'s return so when a job comes along, that needs doing, it would get done, one way or another.

The people of the United States picked a mighty poor time to elect to the White House a man with a weak spine.

Congressman Samuel S. Stratton's Report to the People of the 32d Congressional District on the Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to report to the people of the 32d Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to represent, on the record of accomplishments of this 1st session of the 87th Congress, the first Kennedy Congress.

A PRODUCTIVE SESSION

This has been a long session, the longest in 10 years, but it has also been a most productive session, one of which we and the people we represent can, I believe, be justly proud.

Some idea of the extent of our accomplishments can be gained by noting that during this session, quietly and without great fanfare, we have enacted some 33 major pieces of legislation. Even if not all 33 were of equal importance, this record still measures up most favorably alongside the 11 pieces of legislation enacted by the first Congress under Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, or the 12 enacted under the first Eisenhower Congress.

COMBATING UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the biggest jobs that faced us this year was taking prompt action to end the recession, to get our economy moving again, and to bring new job opportunities into our distressed unemployment areas like Amsterdam, Gloversville, Johnstown, Schenectady, and Oneonta.

Our first big step was enactment of the distressed areas bill, or the Area Redevelopment Act, for which I have long been fighting as a cosponsor. In fact, for me the high point of the whole session came when President Kennedy invited me to the White House to see him sign the bill into law. And on my office wall in Schenectady today is proudly displayed the pen he used that morning.

As soon as the bill was signed I arranged for a special area redevelopment conference for upstate New York. This was held in Amsterdam on July 21. A later conference was held in Oneonta on August 22. Already steps are underway to bring help under this bill to the unemployment areas of our district.

STIMULATING JOBS AND BUSINESS

Also designed to stimulate jobs and business were the housing bill, the water pollution bill, and the Interstate Highway Finance Act of 1961. These measures made it possible for communities like Gloversville and Johnstown to continue to take advantage of urban renewal programs to revitalize their downtown areas. They enable communities like Canajoharie to move forward in building a new sewage treatment and incinerator plant. They pushed along construction on the northway and the thruway spur in Schenectady, with all the added construction jobs those projects entailed.

Also to combat the recession, Congress passed an extension of unemployment benefits, provided for voluntary social security retirement for men at age 62, extended aid to children of unemployed persons, increased the minimum wage in certain fields, and underwrote an extensive broadening of the surplus food distribution program.

STRENGTHENING THE NATION'S DEFENSES

Perhaps the most significant action which this Congress took was to authorize a sweeping increase in our armed forces to meet increased Soviet belligerence. The more than $2 billion we added to the defense budget went for greater protection—more of those polaris submarines I have been pushing for, more manned bombers, more ships and tanks, and more guns for our troops.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND ROAMA

A corollary result of our new defense buildup was the welcome decision, for which I have long been pressing, to retain the Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome at full strength, and without any cutback in the vital 6,200 civilian jobs located at the Rome Air Materiel Area—Roama. Besides that, defense contracts being channeled into unemployment areas of New York State rose by over 300 percent in the second quarter of 1961 and rose by 12 times in the Schenectady area, another substantial boost in putting people back to work.

BIG LEAP FORWARD IN SPACE

Still another program of vital importance to our overall national defense was the bill authorizing $2 billion more for an all-out crash program designed to overtake and surge ahead of the Soviet Union in space travel. This so-called man-on-the-moon program was not a gimmick. It was a very necessary effort to gain for our country the same kind of predominance in space that our Navy presently affords us on the high seas and that our Air Force provides for us in the air. It should be noted that this crash space program passed the House without a single dissenting vote, in spite of the added budget cost.

STANDING FIRM IN BERLIN

Another historic accomplishment of this session was the legislation calling up our Reserves as evidence of American determination to back up President Kennedy in his firm resistance to Communist pressures and threats in Berlin. By coming to Congress for this authorization, instead of acting entirely on his own as he could have done, the President made it possible for Congress to register unmistakably our complete national unity behind the freedom of the people of West Berlin.

LOCAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

The fight for adequate flood control protection for our district was successfully advanced in this session of Congress. Funds were appropriated to continue flood protection works on the South Chuctanunda Creek in South Amsterdam, and also to initiate, at my request, a new study of flood protection measures along the Mohawk at Schenec-

tady. Congress also appropriated funds to get underway the new overall survey for the north branch of the Susquehanna River in Otsego County. In fact, a public hearing in line with this new survey was held in Oneonta earlier this spring. The purpose of this survey is to develop a successful alternative to the old 1936 plan for constructing three big dry reservoir dams in the Otsego County area.

At my request, the U.S. Army Engineers also moved in promptly on July 29 when flash floodwaters hit the village of Unadilla, and they are currently studying the possibility of Federal help to Unadilla for rebuilding needed flood control works.

GLOVE AND CARPET IMPORT PROBLEMS

Several major strides forward were made in Congress in the fight against destructive low-cost foreign import competition, especially in the glove and carpet industries. This progress was largely the result of the actions of two congressional groups, of which I have been a charter member, formed to combat excessive imports. One of our groups, headed by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], paid several visits to the White House, conferring with the President and with some of his top advisers, seeking help and relief.

The biggest developments of the year along this line were the two favorable decisions handed down by the Tariff Commission, one in the baseball case, the other in the Wilton and Velvet carpets case. In both instances, the Commission reversed its earlier decision and recommended additional tariff protection. Although final approval of the Commission's recommendations has been delayed by the President to permit the submission of additional evidence, I am most hopeful that in the end he will approve them both, and thereby demonstrate his determination to make the escape clause of the Trade Act really work. And so, in comparison with events of the last few years these have been promising happenings indeed.

COOPERATION WITH THE PRESIDENT

One major reason for the substantial amount of constructive legislation adopted by Congress this year was the unusually high level of cooperation between Congress and the new President. Mr. Kennedy was never too busy to welcome a visit from a Congressman with a problem to discuss—or even, as I discovered, with just a baseball from the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown to be autographed.

In general, I supported the President's program in Congress this year. I did so for two reasons. First, because it was directed at what I regarded as the two absolutely vital goals of restoring jobs and business at home, and building an invulnerable deterrent to Communist aggression abroad; and second, because I believed most strongly that any President, especially a new one, deserves a fair and reasonable opportunity to get his program underway. In this same spirit I supported a good deal of Mr. Eisenhower's program, too, in the last Congress, and I refused to join in attacks on his conduct of foreign affairs over such things as the U–2 incident. In this Congress I similarly believed it was essential for us to back up President Kennedy's request for greater long-range leeway in the administration of our mutual security measures, and his proposal for a Peace Corps and a new Arms Control Agency. We live in perilous days today, and in the conduct of our foreign policy, we must, I believe, speak with one, clear, firm voice.

FARM POLICIES

As the representative of a major dairy and poultry farming area in upstate New York, I found myself this year one of the few Congressmen of my party in the whole northeastern section of our country whose district included major farming regions. In fact, not a single New York State Congressman was on the House Agriculture Committee this year.

A number of events have been helpful to the farm area of our district in this session, for example, the expanded school milk program, the increased use of farm surpluses abroad, the action of the Agriculture Department in boosting the price of class III manufacturing milk, and the public hearing on possible further boosts in this class III price.

I did not, however, support the feed grain bill or the omnibus farm bill, because of the effect which I believe these pieces of legislation would have on farm costs in New York State at a time when real relief for our own dairy farmers is still a long way off. It seems to me shortsighted for the Department to help grain farmers in the Middle West without making corresponding protection available to the equally important interests of dairy and poultry farmers in New York State.

DEFEAT FOR THE MILK SANITATION BILL

I am pleased to report success once again this year in my perennial fight to kill off the so-called milk sanitation bill. This measure would, under the guise of setting up health standards, actually make it possible for midwestern dairy farmers to flood New York State markets with their "tired midwestern milk," thereby depressing still further the income of New York State farmers. I can report that following my own testimony against the bill this year, it has been bottled up in committee for still another year.

ANTICRIME BILLS

As a former mayor who gained some experience in office fighting against organized crime and racketeering, I was especially pleased that Congress this year passed by an overwhelming vote three pieces of legislation I had joined in sponsoring and which had been requested by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to break up interstate criminal and racketeering organizations.

BUDGET, FISCAL MATTERS, AND THE GOLD OUTFLOW

While Treasury experts estimate that fiscal year 1961 will end up with a budget deficit, which usually happens in a recession year, there are a number of encouraging matters to be kept in mind.

First, about three-quarters of the expected $6 billion deficit stems from our expanded defense and space programs, which were, as I have mentioned, supported virtually unanimously by Members of the House and Senate of both major parties. Most of the balance went for antirecession measures, a top emergency item.

Second, the total deficit expected from the current recession, about $8 billion, compares very favorably with the overall deficit of $15 billion that was left over from the 1957–58 recession.

Third, while overall Government spending was up somewhat this past year, the percentage of our total national income spent for Federal Government purposes was actually smaller than in the preceding year, which means that the public sector of our economy has not expanded in relation to the private sector during this past session of Congress, but just the opposite.

Fourth, President Kennedy's fiscal policies have now completely stopped the dangerous outflow of American gold supplies that was underway at the end of last year. Now, by contrast, gold is moving back into our country, a most encouraging indication of fiscal stability.

CONCLUSION

While this session of Congress, this first Kennedy Congress, has been a genuinely productive one, much remains to be done, for example, in the field of health insurance and education. The whole reciprocal trade agreements program is also up for reconsideration in 1962. These problems lie ahead of us to be dealt with in the second session of the 87th Congress which opens on January 10.

In the meantime, I want to express my thanks and appreciation to all who have written me to express their views, to those whose cooperation made our annual questionnaire a success once again, and to those whose advice and assistance have made the job of being a Congressman more effective. It has been an honor once again to serve as your Representative in Washington.

In the weeks ahead I look forward to meeting and talking with all of you in the course of my regular open air office hours and my other visits around our district. My Schenectady office, FR 4–4000, is always open to serve you, and my Washington office, CA 4–3121, extension 5076, will also remain open daily during the recess. At both locations my staff and I stand ready to be of service to you at any time and in any way we can.

Project More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of Members of Congress to Project More, a new program of public service that is being undertaken by the American Academy of

General Practice, the Nation's second largest medical association and the official organization of family doctors. Through its membership of 27,000 physicians, the academy is launching a nationwide program to recruit talented young students to careers as physicians. As a first step, a pilot study will begin in November 1961, in Omaha, Nebr., and Binghamton, N.Y.

Through Project More, the American Academy of General Practice will provide the means and stimulus to enable the medical profession, and individual doctors at the local level, to compete on a positive basis with other sciences for the qualified students of the Nation. While indicators point more and more conclusively toward an overall physician shortage, the situation in the family doctor ranks is desperately critical right now, especially in less densely populated areas. This is true in the face of mounting public demand for the family doctor, who cares for the individual as a person and the family as a unit.

Project More is divided into two simultaneous phases. The first is direct doctor-to-student presentation of the medical career story to junior and senior high school students through a formal program in the schools, and, beyond the students, to their parents and community citizenry through civic and service club speeches, television and radio appearances, and other means. The second phase is a program of publicity and promotion designed to create public awareness on as wide a scale as possible.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the American Academy of General Practice for the splendid public service they are undertaking with Project More. I know that their efforts will help to bring better medical care and more medical care to our fellow citizens, now and in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a special report on Project More that appeared in the July 31, 1961, issue of the Headquarters Bulletin of the American Academy of General Practice.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT MORE, A CONTINUING PHYSICIAN RECRUITMENT PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF GENERAL PRACTICE

DESCRIPTION

Project More is a program of mechanics designed to assist chapters of the American Academy of General Practice to engage in the recruitment of medical students in the various communities of the United States where their members are located. In addition, it will be used as the tangible hook on which to base national and local publicity, which will, in turn, provide a stimulation to participants to continue and expand their efforts.

Project More will begin on a trial basis in November 1961, and continue 1 month. Activities of a concentrated nature, which will be microcosmic of the national program, will be conducted in two test cities. These test cities will be Binghamton, N.Y., and Omaha, Nebr. Following the studies, which will take place as nearly simultaneously as possible, experience data from each will be collated, analyzed, and included in a master plan which will be prepared at academy headquarters and made available to all State chapters of the American Academy of General Practice.

Project More is a doctors' program. It will be conducted by physicians because it is the academy's belief that doctors are the best recruiters of future doctors. Members of the academy, initially in the test cities and later in the national program, will form Project More task forces and conduct the program under the direction of a local coordinator. Material to be used in the program will be prepared by the academy headquarters staff. In addition, the headquarters staff will have overall responsibility for the national and local publicity programs, conducting the former directly and the latter through the local project coordinator.

Project More presently will be aimed at junior and senior high school students. Ultimately, it is expected that it will be expanded to include junior high school students and students in liberal arts colleges. An important part of the program at the local level will be a junior preceptorship segment in which students selected by school career-guidance authorities will spend a day in a depth association with individual members of the task force. These students later will prepare essays outlining their experiences and feelings toward a physician career which will be judged by a local panel of judges, the best selected, and then the two top ones from each test community judged by a national panel. The winner of this national selection will receive a prize consistent with the scope and intent of Project More.

Project More is an official program of the American Academy of General Practice. It was conceived as a first step toward forestalling the imminently threatening doctor shortage, particularly the critical shortage of American family physicians. As the Nation's second largest medical association and the official organization of family doctors, the academy recognizes its obligation to the citizens and families of the United States and will begin to discharge this obligation with Project More. The project was officially sanctioned by the congress of delegates of the academy at the annual scientific assembly in Miami Beach in April, 1961.

PLAN OF ACTION (TEST CITIES)

Project More will be conducted in the test cities within the framework of the following specific plan of action. This plan of action is a study plan and will be added to and/or subtracted from the national plan as the individual segments give evidence of usefulness in practice in the test cities. These test activities will be conducted with the full knowledge and assistance of the test-city school systems as well as with the sanction of the local governments and medical and other involved organizations in these cities. The groundwork for sanction by these groups is being laid at the present time.

The test plan

Proclamation of "M.D. Career Month": By act of the city council, this proclamation will be made to launch officially the month-long program in the test cities. This will constitute the official recognition by the cities of Binghampton and Omaha of the fact that Project More will be conducted in these communities during the month of November, 1961.

Inauguratory address to student audiences: Task force members will inaugurate Project More in the test-city high schools in addresses to assembled junior and senior classes, explaining the fact that the project is being launched on a test basis in the two cities and outlining the aspects of the month-long campaign and the purpose of the national project.

Formation of future physicians' groups: Interested and curious students in each high school will be enrolled, with assistance from counseling authorities, in future physician groups known as "Ars Medica" groups. These will form the hard core of the student audience with which the task force will work during the bulk of "M.D. Career Month." Membership will not necessarily be limited by academic qualifications, but rather by expressed interest or curiosity about a physician career.

It is contemplated that these "Ars Medica" groups will meet three times during the first 2 weeks for approximately 1 hour each time. The first session will consist of an introduction to medicine; the second, a discussion of medical education, and the third, an impromptu discussion of the pros and cons of medical practice, with a question and answer period. There will be one session during the third week which will be devoted to a tour of hospitals and other medical facilities. A single session the fourth week will consist of an entertainment period such as a picnic or coke party for the entire group, and will feature informal discussions with task force members.

Formation of "junior preceptorship" groups: These groups will be selected on the basis of interest and/or curiosity from among scholastically qualified students in the "Ars Medica" groups. School authorities, including career counselors and English instructors, will determine these selections. These students, who will be the most likely candidates, will be given the opportunity of spending a day in close association with individual members of the task force. These "preceptorship" activities will be the heart of the program and careful personal attention will be accorded them by members of the task force. This will not be a matter of having a student "sit in the waiting room waiting for the doctor" the whole day, but rather will be a matter of as close association as possible between the two participants as to patient conferences, attention to the medical library, hospital rounds, house calls, and even to the extent of spending an evening with the physician in his home. Each participant will be thoroughly briefed as to how the day's activities should be conducted, and it is hoped that the association will provide a platform from which a close personal friendship between physician and candidate may grow. Not only will the "preceptee" be alert to the physician's daily activities, with an eye to the production of an essay, but, also, the physician will be measuring the student against a yardstick for future doctors based on his own experience and a profile provided by the academy.

Essays prepared by "preceptees" will be judged by a panel of judges selected from among thought leaders in the community. A winner will be chosen from among preceptees in each test community and the two resultant winners then will be judged by a national panel, with the winner of this competition receiving an appropriate prize. Finale dinners honoring "junior preceptees" and their parents in each community will be held to mark conclusion of the month's activities and to announce the winners of the essay contest.

Promotion of Project More: Promotion of the project in the test cities will be launched with the proclamation by the city government and continued throughout the month-long program. It will be conducted in the test community simultaneously with the development of the program, and on the national level as nearly simultaneously as possible.

Promotional activities in test cities

News and feature stories in daily and weekly newspapers.

Appearances by task force members on television and radio programs.

References to the project by clergy in church activities.

Coverage in industrial house organs.

Addresses to service and civic groups by task force members.

Coverage in chamber of commerce and other organizational bulletins.

Tie-ins with local merchant advertising.

Poster promotion in drug and retail outlets.

Literature in physicians' waiting rooms.

Letters from task force members to patients, outlining Project More and requesting interested sons and daughters to make appointments for discussion.

National promotional activities

Coverage in medical journals published by the academy, and other national medical publications.

News and feature coverage by national wire services.

Feature coverage by national lay magazines.

News and feature coverage by network television and radio.

Arrangements have already been made for much of the national coverage. The local promotion will be developed during the summer and early fall and will be timed to begin breaking as soon as the program opens in November. It then will be carried on throughout the program on a coordinated basis.

Report to the Fifth District of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded a long and strenuous session—the longest since 1951 at the peak of the Korean conflict. As a new Member, I want to express my gratitude to the House leadership for its courtesy and helpfulness to me. I also want to thank the good people of the Fifth Massachusetts District who have helped me immeasurably in my work here in the Congress by sharing with me their suggestions and their criticisms, by letting me know of their apprehensions and their hopes. I am grateful to them for the sympathetic reception accorded my first 9 months of service.

Throughout this session I have kept in direct touch with the people I am privileged to represent through newsletters, radio talks, and frequent trips to my district. I have maintained an office in Lowell at 15 Kearney Square and another at 1705 Federal Building in Boston to better serve those constituents of the district who reside in the metropolitan area. Only by keeping close to the source of all government power—the voters themselves—can honest, reliable representation be possible.

This, then, is my first annual report to the Fifth District of Massachusetts, the area which gave birth to the liberties we cherish today.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Early in the session the House leadership assigned me to two committees: the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The former includes service on the Military Operations Subcommittee, one of the most powerful bodies in the Congress, which audits the expenditure of defense funds, seeking always to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the expenditure of more than one-half of our Federal budget outlay. Within the scope of this subcommittee's responsibility also falls our civil defense program. The Merchant Marine Committee assignment permits me to keep an active eye on many matters directly affecting our great port of Boston and our New England shipbuilding industry.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

From the very outset, the 1st session of the 87th Congress was darkened by the lengthening shadow of the Kremlin. The tragedy of Cuba, the erosion of free soil in Laos, the deteriorating Berlin situation, the chaos in Africa—all were telescoped within the first 9 months of 1961. Within constitutional limitations, the Congress worked to lift the Communist shadow.

We granted a special $500 million Latin American appropriation, and $100 million for Chilean disaster relief, as requested in 1960 by President Eisenhower and recommended again by President Kennedy this year. We passed a foreign-aid bill designed to meet the needs of people fighting communism on the one hand, and poverty and hunger on the other. While granting the President a generous contingency fund and the power to program development loans on a 5-year basis, Congress prudently retained its responsibility to review the program each year.

In an attempt to carry freedom's message to the people of newly merging nations, to work side by side with them in developing their full potential, we created a Peace Corps. We also supported the establishment of a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, to search for workable, effective approaches to the solution of the world's problems.

As we intensified our peaceful offensive against Communist ambitions, we steadfastly continued our efforts to maintain a strong deterrent force—a defensive strength so powerful that it will continue to hold any would-be aggressor at bay. When the President called for additional defense funds as the Berlin crisis took shape, Congress responded readily and unanimously. In all, we granted a record-breaking peacetime total of $47.6 billion for the Department of Defense.

Without a single dissenting vote, the House of Representatives made clear its opposition to the recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

While the Congress displayed a generally united front on foreign affairs, there was considerable division among Members of both parties on homefront legislation.

I supported the minimum wage increase with the hope that it would bring into closer competitive range those States which have lured away so much of our New England industry through low-wage inducements.

When the Congress considered the area redevelopment bill, I warned my colleagues that it could open the door to federally subsidized raids on existing industries. Fortunately, antipirating guarantees were written into the legislation, and I voted for the bill as it passed the House, although I preferred, and worked actively in support of, a substitute proposal which would not only have reduced the drain on the Federal Treasury, but would also have provided more meaningful assistance to those areas which most urgently need it. After the bill emerged from the Senate and came back to the House from conference, it contained what I regarded as dangerous and unnecessary back-door spending provisions. This factor, coupled with my earlier misgivings about the bill, prompted me to vote against the conference report.

Another major dispute arose when the Congress was called upon to choose between a $1.1 billion continuation of the housing program and a vastly expanded bill with an inflated price tag of $8.8 billion. I voted for the measure which would have continued all existing programs, and against the massive committee bill, following the clear mandate of President Kennedy only a few weeks earlier when he pleaded with the Congress not to expand his proposals and to "hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards."

We were successful in preventing an all-out abdication of power to the Secretary of Agriculture, but the farm legislation which was passed still was costly and entwined in redtape, a hangover from depression and war days when high supports and rigid controls were inaugurated. We were, however, able to block an administration proposal to sell U.S. farm products, subsidized by American taxpayers, to Russia.

The Federal aid to education bill ended in deadlock in the very Rules Committee I had voted to expand earlier in the session in the hope that the House would have an opportunity to work its will on every major issue to come before it. The House itself refused to be steamrollered into debate on a hastily contrived measure which was brought to the floor after but a few minutes' consideration by the Education Committee, and under rules which severely restricted adequate consideration of a highly complicated subject. Many wholehearted supporters of Federal school aid in both parties opposed the consideration of this makeshift bill. Even the National Education Association, which has worked so hard over the years for school aid legislation, labeled it a bad bill. I worked diligently for legislation to continue necessary and just aid to impacted school areas, and was pleased when the Congress enacted a bill practically identical to one I filed in February to achieve this purpose. In company with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues, I supported continuation of the vitally important National Defense Education Act.

I supported the water pollution control program; the extension of unemployment benefits to jobless workers and to their dependent children; the motion to eliminate the wartime excise tax on transportation; the bill to create the

Cape Cod National Seashore; the move to eliminate funds for the Hanford Reactor Plant, which I believe would have been an unwarranted intrusion in the field of private endeavor, and the proposal to continue the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years—although, like many other Members, I was deeply disappointed in the administration's apparent indifference to civil rights legislation.

MORSE LEGISLATION

During this first session I introduced a total of 33 public and private bills and resolutions. Some of these measures evidenced my support of identical bills introduced earlier, others were original with me. Among them were a bill to create a U.S. Agency for World Peace and Security, ultimately passed by the Congress under the title of the Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament; a proposal to provide credit toward retirement for periods of hospitalization for service-connected disabilities immediately following discharge from military service; legislation to provide a long overdue increase in veterans' compensation for disability incurred during active military service; a plan to expand oceanographic research activities of the Department of the Interior; a bill to grant to self-employed persons the same tax deferment privileges on money put aside for pension purposes as now enjoyed by employed persons—identical, by the way, to a bill which passed the House and now is pending in the Senate; legislation to authorize wider distribution of books and other instruction material for the blind; a resolution to create a House Select Committee on Urban Affairs; the Cape Cod National Seashore proposal; the bill, to which I previously referred, to extend for 2 years Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; a resolution calling on the United Nations to conduct free elections in the Baltic nations; and a resolution to name our Bedford Veterans' Administration Hospital in honor of the late beloved Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers.

Hearings before my Military Operations Subcommittee prompted me to draft H.R. 8404, which would allow a 50-percent tax writeoff on construction of home fallout shelters. The financial problems which may confront the 250,000 reservists who may be called to active duty inspired H.R. 8470, my bill to provide a moratorium on principal payments on federally insured or guaranteed mortgages for reservists and guardsmen called to active duty who are unable to make such payments while serving.

I was particularly pleased when, late in the session, my colleagues in the House joined in unanimous support of my resolution to place a bust of my distinguished colleague, the beloved former Speaker of the House, Joseph W. Martin, Jr., in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building.

HOMEWORK

There are many facets to the job of representing a district of 475,000 people. Fascinating and important as the legislative tasks are, I find that the efforts I am able to put forth to aid the Fifth District bring equal satisfaction.

Our district reflects the economic character of the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We are heavily dependent upon industry. In recent years we have seen our traditional sources of employment drift to low-drift States. We have come out second-best in the textile import situation. We must seek remedies for these problems. I have taken the floor of the House to call for a commonsense approach to trade matters, so that the essentiality of our domestic textile industry and the plight of our own textile workers will be ignored no longer. I am actively working with a group of colleagues to find affirmative answers to the questions involved in retraining workers to acquire new employment skills. I have been gratified that some $250 million new defense contracts have come to our district since January.

Working closely with civic, business, and labor leaders, I sponsored a conference here in Washington last summer to bring together private citizens and top Government figures, experts in the fields of defense procurement, housing, area redevelopment, small business, and trade. From the generous comments I received from those who participated, it was a smashing success. Plans are already underway for a second conference in 1962.

A splendid example of appropriate Federal, State, local cooperation occurred when the tragic fire struck the town of Ayer in June. When I learned of the catastrophe, I arranged an emergency conference in Washington between Ayer officials, Governor Volpe, our two Massachusetts Senators, and representatives of Federal agencies which possibly could provide assistance. Ayer is getting back on its feet, primarily through its own inspiring initiative, with the proper encouragement of other levels of government.

Last June, I urged the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish the Northeast Water Pollution Research Laboratory, authorized in the 1961 Water Pollution Act, in Lowell. We have the misfortune to have one of the Nation's most badly polluted rivers, the Merrimack, in our district. With our magnificent Lowell Technological Institute, and the facilities and resources of so many other outstanding universities and colleges within easy reach, Lowell provides an ideal and logical location for the facility. Senator Saltonstall has vigorously supported this effort since its inception and we were joined by Senator Ben Smith in a joint plea to Secretary Ribicoff in the closing days of the session. I have received word that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will call upon my office for assistance in arranging an inspection tour of the area.

Although the President's budget had called for a 1962 appropriation of but $500,000 for the Minuteman National Park in the heart of Middlesex County, it became apparent that an accelerated program of land acquisition would ultimately reduce overall costs because of the rapidly increasing land values in the area. With the vigorous support of Senator SALTONSTALL and Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK, we obtained congressional and Presidential approval of a 1962 budget for the park of $2.5 million. There is no doubt that this action will significantly hasten the completion of the park which will preserve for posterity the battlegrounds where our struggle for independence began.

One of the first tasks I undertook after taking office was a vigorous campaign to ease residual oil restrictions. Industrial expansion has been discouraged by the severe controls on residual imports; industrial fuel costs have soared. Residual oil costs skyrocketed by more than $118 million in 1 year alone because of Government-inflicted quotas. I have asked the Attorney General to determine if this quota system has not resulted in a Government-sponsored violation of antitrust laws. I have also urged the House Small Business Committee to consider the dilemma of New England residual oil users at the same time it investigates the problems facing domestic oil and coal producers.

One of the most enjoyable parts of my job is sitting down with the people I have the honor to represent in Washington. Nearly 2,000 folks from home stopped by my office in room 136 of the Old House Office Building during the session. It is always a pleasure to help arrange appointments if a constituent is in town on business with the Federal Government, or tours of our various historic shrines, if it is a pleasure trip.

In retrospect, the 1st session of the 87th Congress—in fact the entire year of 1961—was a critical period. Never before has there been such an urgent necessity for responsible Government. Convinced of the right of the people of my district to know firsthand of the issues that the Congress has considered and of the activities of the man they have chosen to represent them, I have prepared this report in recognition of my responsibility to them.

I earnestly hope that it will inspire an even greater interest in the business of government, for not without a lively, personal interest on the part of all our citizens in the conduct of public affairs, can we expect our freedom long to endure.

Prospects in Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, because the public power issue occupied so much time and attention on the part of both the House and Senate this year, it would seem appropriate that the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain at least a brief review of developments that have occurred since adjournment. One of the most persistent phases of this controversy involved the proposal to erect

steam-generating facilities at the Hanford plutonium reactor.

The House successfully resisted efforts to force American taxpayers to contribute $95 million for construction of an 800,000-kilowatt powerplant at Hanford; not satisfied with this definitive decision against the Federal Government's further intrusion into the electric power field, Hanford proponents came back with a watered-down version that would have cost the U.S. Treasury a mere $58 million for a 400,000-kilowatt station. The House responded with an overwhelming 251 to 155 vote in opposition to this idea.

Under the circumstances, the average citizen might assume that public power addicts would be satisfied to permit Hanford to lie dormant for the remainder of the 87th Congress, if not for all time. Certainly the House left no doubt as to its opinion of the project. According to a published report, however, in some quarters there is reluctance to accept our decision.

Why the House should be suspect of caprice in this matter is not immediately definable. Perhaps proponents feel we can be persuaded to revise our appraisal on the theory that the U.S. Government is going to be in a position to venture out more recklessly with the taxpayers' contributions in the years immediately ahead. If such is the case, the basis for these hopes is not generally clear.

At the present time we must suffer through the largest debt in all history, with no relief anticipated. Interest alone amounts to approximately $10 billion a year. In the face of this gloomy picture, the heavily burdened taxpayer would logically expect responsible Government officials to make every effort to keep nonessential spending to a minimum. If, somewhere in the administration, a method of reducing military expenditures without jeopardizing the defense structure has been devised, the plan will unquestionably receive a unanimously enthusiastic welcome throughout our land. In no event, however, should any ensuing savings be invested in bureaucratic enterprises of the Hanford variety.

Mr. Speaker, any substantial reduction of expenses for military purposes is as improbable as the sudden conversion of Khrushchev to Christianity. We hope and pray for such a miracle, but we are too practical to expect it. The free nations of the world are in for a long struggle unless the tension explodes and envelops the world in another holocaust. Recognizing the severity of this struggle against the totalitarian plan for destruction of all governments outside the Red orbit, Congress and the executive department have a moral obligation to conduct the Nation's affairs in the most efficient manner possible and to eliminate all extravagances, particularly wherein issues are clearly divorced from the national security.

It was disturbing to read that one of the Senate sponsors of Hanford was quoted as saying he will "never give up" in his efforts to prevail upon Congress to establish the project to which the House has repeatedly objected. Now it becomes obvious that we who have joined together in blocking this wasteful bureaucratic creation must resign ourselves to the fact that we are likely to be exposed again to the same pressure to which we were subjected when the public power enthusiasts went to work on us last year. Unfortunately, much of the propaganda in favor of Hanford originates within Government departments and is, therefore, being subsidized by the taxpayer. One of these days Congress may finally have had its fill of these methods and refuse to appropriate funds that are, in effect, being used in an attempt to unbalance the balance of power which was established to guarantee this Nation's welfare and integrity. Meanwhile let us be prepared for another bureaucratic onset in 1962.

Two editorials which have appeared in newspapers published in the State of Washington in the past several weeks are highly relevant to the Hanford controversy. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The one published by the Centralia, Wash., Chronicle on September 13, which is a reprint of a Long View, Wash., Daily News, needs to be studied carefully in the light of statements made in the House and Senate with respect to the availability of coal in the Northwest. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] on July 12 made this statement in the course of his remarks in favor of the Hanford powerplant:

> Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert a statement on the relation of the Hanford reactor electric generating facilities and the development of coal resources in the Northwest. You will note that the Northwest uses very little coal, and the Hanford installation itself is the biggest user. In the future, the use of coal cannot support the major power requirements of the area.

Figures provided by the U.S. Geological Survey show Washington alone has in excess of 30 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves, which in the overall are but a small part of the generous supplies with which the United States has been blessed. Only last week the Associated Press reported that the Geological Survey's latest estimates place recoverable coal at 830 billion tons for the Nation as a whole. In addition to the vast storehouse in Washington itself, there are more than 100 billion tons of recoverable reserves in Montana, 46 billion tons in Utah, 60 billion tons in Wyoming, and 40 billion tons in Colorado.

The United Mine Workers of America have opposed Hanford with good cause. The president of district 10, with headquarters in Renton, Wash., issued public protests against a subsized powerplant that would take away from miners, railroad men, truckers, and employees of numerous allied industries the opportunity to earn a livelihood for their families. The editorial to which I refer definitely confirms the UMWA hopes for a better tomorrow through expansion of Washington coal industries.

I remind my colleagues that the coal industry of the Northwest would not be the exclusive loser to a subsidized Hanford powerplant. One of the avowed objectives of the Department of the Interior's grandiose scheme in supporting Hanford is the long-range power grid to carry electricity through a series of exchanges from the Pacific coast to the Mississippi valley. Thus Hanford constitutes a direct threat to coal producers in the Midwest. Furthermore, through the proposed intertie grid system, even the electric powerplants in my district could eventually be deprived of market outlets because of the allegedly harmless but admittedly extravagant Hanford plan.

The other editorial which I include herewith, from the Boise, Idaho, Statesman, presents a brief but concise summary of the philosophy of public versus private power. As stated, private industry has met every obligation for industrial power and has paid enormous Federal taxes that have been misused, in part, to create Federal competition through such facilities as are now envisioned for Hanford. The Duquesne Light Co. in Pittsburgh illustrated its advertisement in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of October 3 with dramatic drawings of the extent to which America's investor-owned light and power companies have taken care of rising requirements and will handle whatever needs develop in the ensuing years. In 1930 there were 150,000 miles of transmission lines, a figure that rose to 364,000 miles in 1959 and will reach half a million miles by 1970. The electric companies will add more than $7 billion in transmission facilities in the present decade. This money will come from the voluntary investments of American citizens who believe in the free competitive economy that built this Nation to the greatest power on earth in less than 2 centuries. Bureaucratic intrusion is the surest way to throttle industry progress, destroy investor confidence, and dim America's outlook for the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself a sincere friend of the West. During the past several years I have received hundreds of letters from residents of communities from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean commending me for my efforts to preserve the natural beauty of western areas threatened by unnecessary and devastating Federal wrecking projects. I have had scores of callers in my office who are in enthusiastic sympathy with my philosophy but would not want to be publicly identified with opposition to bureaucratic plans because of the fear of reprisal.

My first obligation is to the 22d District of Pennsylvania, but I shall always support legislation designed to benefit the national welfare. The proposed powerplant at Hanford would be unfair because it would directly subsidize competition for hard-pressed regions elsewhere in the country where new industry is badly needed but where no similar federally provided advantage of low-cost power prevails.

There are many other factors weighing against Hanford, Mr. Speaker. They were reflected in the several House votes during the session just closed and need not be repeated here. But it appears obvious that this file of objections

must be kept at hand and resubmitted for public display if the Hanford proposal is resurrected as indicated.

The newspaper editorials follow:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Sept. 20, 1961]

PUBLIC POWER LIGHT DIMS

The refusal of the House of Representatives to approve a plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash., to produce electricity has started a new line of protest from the public power proponents that is amusing. The Portland Oregonian views the Hanford refusal as evidence that Congress is opposed to growth in the Northwest. The Oregonian reasons that there "is abject fear that it (the Northwest) will take industries away from their districts and States." Continuing, the Oregonian says:

"If this be true (and how else can this vote be interpreted?) the Northwest may expect similar opposition to new Federal multipurpose projects including electricity (which repays its own cost and helps irrigation). It may expect congressional pressure to increase the Bonneville Power rate to further restrict industrial expansion. It may expect raiding of our power resources from other areas.

"Those who thought the Federal Government never should have started development of the Columbia Basin's resources—for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and power—evidently have gained some recruits in the House. The drive is to keep the Northwest in colonial status, a vacation land, a semi-wilderness, a place to visit but not to settle, a region unable to find enough jobs for its children."

The Oregonian offers new and different reasoning than any we have read before. Apparently it has been concluded in the Columbia Basin area that the Government is obligated to forever spend more and more millions of money provided by the entire Nation for the public power subsidy that is provided the Northwest. This is an unusual philosophy as is evidenced by the expression of opinion that "other areas fear industries will be taken from them and transplanted to the Northwest." The Portland area got most of its new industry in this manner. Its aluminum industry, which processes bauxite with federally subsidized public power, was and is a highly questionable arrangement. No one ever saw any bauxite produced in Oregon. It comes from Texas.

All of which is an excellent illustration of Federal largesse of huge proportions. Naturally the Oregonian is unhappy that the Federal Government isn't continuing to subsidize its area forever.

The Oregonian, in its protest over the Hanford situation, renders important illustrative service. Take Idaho, for example, the source of part of the water resource that makes Northwest power. Idaho fought tooth and nail and won the fight against the high Hells Canyon Dam. The promoters of this project assured everyone in sight that it had many benefits and no dangers. Protective legislative clauses were offered in the way of amendments to the bill that sounded as though Idaho would be protected.

The Portland complaint over a change in congressional attitude (Congress voted the money for the string of dams along the Columbia) makes quite plain the danger that exists in Federal encroachment in any area for the simple reason that Congress—the supreme power—can, and does, change its mind. The protective amendments in the high Hells Canyon legislation could have been repealed just as the Oregonian points out that Congress presently is opposed to expansion of the Federal Columbia power system.

In plainer words, what the Government gives, it may take away. And any area that runs the risk of resource involvement with the Federal Government, if it is at all possible to avoid it, only asks for inevitable disappointment. The sure way is the Idaho way—keep the Government off the river and let private enterprise assume the responsibility under State commission control.

Private industry has met every obligation for industrial power and has paid enormous Federal taxes that have been used, in part, to build the Bonneville and the John Days and the McNary Dams. Never have these dams brought the Northwest a stable economy. And they never will for the simple reason that Congress, the representation of all the States, just can't keep on doling money out to support two isolated areas—the Northwest and the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is not the American system to make residents of roughly 45 of our States the underwriters of cheap power in the other 5. Oregon wouldn't want to help any other State in the same manner that she has received Federal assistance. And Oregon does not hesitate to see spooks under the public power table now that Congress has decided it can no longer provide larger bait through cheap power for the Northwest area.

Should the Hanford situation mark the end of one of the really raw giveaways by Federal Government, the Nation may breathe a sigh of relief. While the Oregonian calls the Hanford House vote "the most cold-blooded expression of this intention yet to be publicly displayed," we view it in another light. It is the signal of a welcome new day.

"What will the Northwest do about it," the Oregonian asks. A Federal corporation to absorb Bonneville with bonding powers to finance projects Congress refuses to vote?

That's not the answer.

Oregon, and the State of Washington as well, ought to quit smoking the public power opium and get back to the old days of sound business without dependence on the Federal Treasury. In addition to the stability the private enterprise tradition provides, there is the pride of self-accomplishment. Idaho, without Federal power aid or threats, sets a fine neighborly example.

[From the Centralia (Wash.) Chronicle, Sept. 13, 1961]

FUTURE OF COAL

Could it be that Washington State might some day become a major coal-producing region of the Nation? It is a possibility, as well as a distinct probability.

At the present time an estimated 64 trillion tons of bituminuous coal lies practically untouched in areas where it is impracticable to mine by orthodox methods. Much of it is buried in hard rock in hills from 5 to 95 percent off horizontal. The uncovered coal in Washington, according to estimates, amounts to 465,000 times more than in our neighboring State of Oregon.

The Bureau of Mines is now preparing to set up an experimental project at Roslyn, near Cle Elum, at mine No. 9 of the Northern Pacific Railroad, by an installation of special equipment to determine if these vast resources of coal can be tapped by hydraulic mining instead of the methods employed on the east coast. Water pressure at 4,500 pounds per square inch would cut away the coal from the solid mass. Hydraulic mining on the surface is not new, but this will be the first attempt to employ it in uncovering underground coal beds.

The Japanese are now buying large amounts of American coking coal, which comes out of the Eastern mines, involving not only expensive methods of extraction, but also a long, expensive haul. If the Roslyn experiment is successful we will not only have the opportunity of supplying this rapidly increasing demand, but we will have the added advantage of abundant water for hydraulic mining but close proximity of ports for shipping overseas. As the economy of the West expands there will be added markets on our own shores.

Presently Washington State's coal-mining industry is almost nonexistent, with the State ranking only 35th in all phases of mining.

Southwest Washington should keep an eye on this experiment. Many of the oldtimers of Cowlitz County remember that in the early 1920's substantial amounts of coal were used in home furnaces. Rock Springs coal, from Wyoming, competed with Chehalis coal mined only a few miles away.

While such a development of this kind might not be right around the corner, it could be before we realize it and give us something other than the major industries, involving forest products, to sustain our economy and push it ahead.

We have a huge ace in the deck here in Longview, too, in that we are ideally equipped to handle large exports of all kinds to every area of the Pacific.

Goal of the New Frontier: New Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the course of civil defense in the United States has taken a dramatic new turn within the past few months. Since May 1961 these events have occurred:

First. The President personally has addressed the Congress and the American people on the vital importance of civil defense as national "insurance."

Second. The Department of Defense has been made responsible for carrying out major civil defense functions, including shelter protection, vested in the President by law and policy.

Third. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is being reconstituted as the Office of Emergency Planning to assist and advise the President in exercising his civil defense and mobilization planning responsibilities.

Fourth. The Congress, responding to the President's call for a stepped-up civil defense program, has appropriated funds for shelter and other civil defense purposes four times as great as those appropriated in fiscal year 1960.

Fifth. Civil defense authorities in the Department of Defense have taken the first steps in a national program to identify, mark, improve, and equip existing structures in the United States for shelter against fallout hazards.

Sixth. Among the citizenry there has been a quick upsurge of interest in civil defense which appears to be more substantial and enduring than at any time in the past.

In sum, America is coming of age in the thermonuclear age.

We find it heartening and fortunate that the President recognizes the vital importance of an effective civil defense. His personal messages to the Congress and to the American people have banished, almost overnight, a great deal of

public apathy and indifference. We have always believed that if the President, as the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief, would speak out clearly on the subject and show that the Federal Government itself takes civil defense seriously, the people also would be convinced. They would be more willing to help themselves and support the national effort. Public apathy, in the final analysis, is merely a reflection of official apathy.

In what manner does the new civil defense shelter program announced by President Kennedy differ from that of the preceding administration There is no radical departure in civil defense doctrine or concept but a decided shift in coverage, agency jurisdiction, magnitude of funding, and degree of Federal participation.

The new program emphasizes the largest number of shelters to be obtained in the quickest time at the least cost. Consequently, it is directed to finding suitable fallout shelter space in existing structures, making improvements where appropriate, and stocking the shelters with emergency supplies. Federal funds will be spent for these purposes. In this sense it is a public shelter program, although privately owned as well as public buildings will be surveyed, marked, and equipped.

In summary, the major differences characterizing the new shelter program are reflected in the decisions, first, to assign fallout shelter functions to the Department of Defense; second, to embark upon a nationwide Federal program of identifying and marking available community shelter space in existing buildings throughout the United States; third, to stock these shelter spaces with federally procured emergency rations, water, and monitoring and other equipment; and fourth, to undertake some limited improvements, starting with existing Federal structures, to expand the occupancy potentials.

Thus the Federal Government is prepared to spend more money and do more things for civil defense preparation than has been done before.

In the 11 years, 1951 through 1961, actual Federal expenditures for civil defense aggregated $532 million. The appropriations for fiscal year 1962 include $206.7 million to the Department of Defense, $86.5 million to the Office of Emergency Planning, and $13 million to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for procurement of medical supplies associated with the emergency hospital program.

These funds, totaling $306 million for fiscal year 1962, represent 58 percent of the total outlay for the past 11 years. There is no doubt that the civil defense program has been stepped up.

The shelter survey and marking program is scheduled for completion by the end of December 1962. Stockage of shelter spaces will be completed the following year, although shelter spaces will be equipped as they are identified.

Under my direction, the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations prepared a comprehensive report on the new civil defense program. See House Report No. 1249, 87th Congress, 1st session. The report stresses the need for an optimum shelter program, and the national shelter survey should provide important data for the development of such a program. Construction of shelters in schools and other suitably located places will be necessary to supplement the fallout shelter spaces in existing buildings.

Our report includes a special note of warning to the American people:

Avoid fly-by-night operators with shelter-building schemes and would-be sellers of expensive or useless gadgets and devices under the label of civil defense.

Be wary of false advertising of merchandise or services, including insurance policies, which are offered as civil defense protection.

Do not sign a contract for construction of a home shelter until you have consulted civil defense officials in your city, or other government unit, and have received reliable information on requirements and cost estimates.

Be sure that what you buy for individual or family civil defense needs is really essential and meets the necessary standards of performance.

People's Capitalism—A World Lenin Never Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Nate White, which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I found it extremely interesting and worthwhile and consequently take pleasure in calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

TREND OF THE ECONOMY: PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM—A WORLD LENIN NEVER KNEW

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—Karl Marx could not recognize today's capitalism, and it would be difficult for Nikolai Lenin to understand the enormous changes which have taken place in capitalism since his passing in 1924.

It is doubtful if the Kremlin propagandists today understand modern capitalism. They continue to lash out at 19th-century types of capitalism, as though they were existent today. Today's capitalism is as different from that of the 19th century or the early 20th as are Marx's theories in the light of today's state capitalism of the Soviet Union.

Marx and the Kremlin propogandists are out of date, and the present Soviet discussion of capitalism reflects obsolescence in the economic considerations of the Soviet system.

Undiluted Marxism is nonexistent in the Soviet Union today. The U.S.S.R. of Nikita S. Khrushchev, with its incentives, its pay scales, its private privileges, its speed-up program, its unsanitary conditions, its bottlenecks, its sweatshops, its lack of safety devices for workers, more nearly resembles the capitalism of the late 19th century which Marx assailed, and of the early 20th, which Lenin attacked, than anything else.

Meanwhile, Western capitalism itself has become socialist in its trend.

Capitalism, whether it is the Soviet brand, or the Western brand, is still the utilization of capital for economic development and profit.

Today's capitalists in the West, however, are men and women who act as stewards in the administration and use of other people's moneys. Large corporations, owned by thousands of stockholders, are enormous publicly owned, semiprivately operated collectives under the managerial tutelage of carefully chosen stewards.

These corporations in the past 30 years, under community social pressures, under Government compulsion, and under union pressure have moved into a socialized form of capitalism which outperforms and outdoes the fondest dreams of Marx and Lenin.

These corporations today follow a comfort pattern in their labor contracts. They seem to be in competition to see which one can outdo the other in arranging new deals for their workers. More and more the workers express their will in the minutiae of plant operations.

American capitalism, as well as French, British, and German capitalism, is laboristic in tendencies and trends. A large mixture of State investment in research and operations, in State control, State regulation, State inspection, State policies on the labor force have so changed the fundamental capitalistic system of the days of Marx and Lenin that today they would probably like to take credit for the change, if they were here.

Private capitalism, in other words, has moved to such a degree toward semipublic ownership and control, with labor unions in many instances exercising major control through their own ownership of the shares of corporations, that it can today correctly be called a people's capitalism.

It is still capitalism. There must be money to invest. There must be profits. There must be good management. There must be initiative. There must be competition. And, of course, many small industries, stores, shops, and services exist which are more purely private than the largest corporations.

In addition to the semiprivate corporations, the socialized people's capital projects, there are, of course, outright examples of State capitalism in all of the so-called capitalist countries.

State capitalism in the United States is a fact of daily experience, even as it is in many countries of Western Europe. Government investment in rocketry, space research, and exploration is outright State capitalism. The enormous Government laboratory for space research to be built, at a cost of $60 million in Houston is a new case in point.

The Rand Corp. has long been a Government-operated and capitalized enterprise. Other instances, most of them stemming from national security needs, could be cited.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the one most often mentioned, but, of course, there are many others.

Even the special authorities—such as the New York Port Authority, the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority, the Triborough Bridge Authority, and so on, are semipublic corporations, operating in the tradition of private capitalism, although they are actually, in their ultimate analysis, examples of State capitalism.

Thus the Marxists and Leninists of the Kremlin, those who lash out with typical ignorance and Communist invective, are so naive and obsolescent in their knowledge and awareness of the massive changes in Western capitalism they stand exposed.

France, for instance, is deeply committed to state capitalism. Its Renault works, its oil industry, and many others find the state

the largest shareholder. Italy is committed to state capitalism in many instances.

The United States is not a socialist state in the pure sense. Yet it is progressively exhibiting large tendencies in this direction. Its big corporations, owned as they are by thousands of individuals, by shareholder labor unions, religious and fraternal organizations, can even be classified as semipublic enterprises.

These corporations' enormous commitment to the Federal, State, and local tax systems indicate a kind of evolving capitalism. It is genuinely more correctly described as stewardship capitalism, people's capitalism, or public capitalism.

The term "people's capitalism" came into currency first during the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was picked up after World War II by the Advertising Council, the New York Stock Exchange, and others to indicate the kind of capitalism which was developing in the United States.

If the people of the developing nations of the world could grasp what a people's capitalism actually is they would be for it, and no amount of Communist propaganda could turn them aside from their desire to develop it for themselves.

People's capitalism is the utilization of the resources of a nation, both publicly owned and privately owned, for the economic development of all the people.

In international economic development, the great financial institutions, operated in the world interest in the manner of private capitalism, although they are semipublic, are examples of stewardship capitalism or people's capitalism. There is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for instance, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Administration, the Bank for International Settlements, the Export-Import Bank, etc., to name only a few.

In his address at Vienna before the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund (another semipublic form of stewardship capitalism) Robert L. Garner, the distinguished IFC president, who retires from the post October 15, made the point that IFC could assist in spreading share ownership in the developing countries—in other words expand people's capitalism privately.

"The ability to draw capital from large numbers of people is a necessary element for sustained growth of modern business. It is the basis of people's capitalism," Mr. Garner commented.

Mr. Garner elaborated the points that state bureaucracies—such as those which operate in the Soviet Union—can stifle initiative and enterprise. In a sense he was warning the world to beware of an overdevelopment of state capitalism. If the initiative must be governments, because of the large demands for capital today, then let the development be in the manner of private capitalism, he reasoned. In this way the best of private capitalism—its initiative, its drive, its decisionmaking process, its concern for careful stewardship—is maintained.

In operating the IFC, Mr. Garner managed it as a private business. His "main consideration," he told the IMF, "was my interest in private business and my conviction that it can be the most dynamic force to bring widespread material progress to more people."

Mr. Garner warned the world that "the institution of private enterprise is under deadly attack, not only from avowed communism, but from advocates of all degrees of socialism and state control. Their propaganda is clever, organized, and persistent. • • • Unless (business) awakes to the present danger and determines to pay the price and make the fight to preserve and expand its system, its productive contribution may be lost to the world, and bring about total change in our society."

The Garner valedictory address is well worth the close study of business and government leaders in all countries. It is available from the IFC, 1818 H Street NW., Washington 25, D.C.

Mr. Garner fully recognized that "no nation can today walk alone; and that for the first time those countries which have achieved a more abundant life have accepted responsibility to assist their poorer neighbors to improve their lot."

But he called for an "honest facing of the facts," especially in the poorer countries.

It is not geography or a lack of natural resources which hold nations back, he said, nor is it a lack of capital. South America and Africa, for instance, are lands richer in natural resources than North America or continental Europe, yet they contain backward economies. They also contain hidden resources of capital, selfishly hoarded and concealed.

"I am forced to the conclusion," Mr. Garner observed, "that economic development or lack of it is primarily due to the differences in people—in their attitudes, customs, traditions, and the consequent differences in their political, social, and religious institutions.

"Therefore, if the countries which are lagging are to join in the procession of economic progress their people must change some of their thinking and some of their methods. This is the stubborn core of the problem, the most important factor regulating the pace of growth—how fast will people adapt. A bulldozer can move most things, but not ideas and habits."

Mr. Garner differed with the advocates of the "ultimate welfare state, who propose that government (which likewise they intend to control) take the maximum amount from all who work and who own property and spread it around as they deem most fitting."

In a recent thoughtful discussion of present-day capitalism, presented before the International Industrial Conference in San Francisco, P. F. S. Otten, president of the board of directors of Philips Industries, Eindhoven, the Netherlands, discussed "a new form of capitalism" which he termed "social capitalism."

"It is true," Mr. Otten noted, "that present-day capitalism is becoming more and more conscious of its responsibilities toward the interests of the community, not because of soft-heartedness or unrealistic ethics but on account of the realization that in the long run no member of any community can evade those responsibilities without placing himself outside that community.

"It is coming to be realized that the ruthless exploitation which—as we now acknowledge—was practiced in many cases by the earlier capitalism, and which was perhaps inherent in the industrial revolution and the subsequent industrial "sturm und drang" period, has proved—like all ruthless exploitation—to lead to suicide both from the aspect of business economics and from that of social economics. No longer is it the pursuit of maximum profit that governs our actions; it is the pursuit of continuity."

In another analysis of the changes going on in capitalism, Dr. Paolo N. Rogers, foreign relations director of the Olivetti Co. of Italy, told the San Francisco group that "the private sector has contributed to the economies of developing countries in a measure and to an extent much larger than is generally known." Citing a report of the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), Dr. Rogers compared the public and private contributions of the West to the developing countries as compared to the contributions of the Soviet bloc.

These figures are quite illuminating.

Year by year, the Western public contribution was: 1956, $3,200 million; 1957, $3,700 million; 1958, $4,300 million; 1959, $4,500 million, for a total in the 4 years of $15,900 million.

In addition to the public contribution from the West, was the enormous private contribution. In total—public and private—these were as follows: 1956, $6,200 million; 1957, $7,400 million; 1958, $7,300 million; and in 1959, $6,900 million, for a total Western 4-year contribution of almost $28 billion. Percentages for the Western (public and private) are: 1956, 48 percent; 1957, 50 percent; 1958, 40 percent; 1959, 35 percent.

The comparable Soviet bloc contribution was: 1956, $608 million; 1957, $227 million; 1958, $556 million; 1959, $894 million, for a 4-year total of $2,300 million.

Dr. Rogers then showed the breakdown of the contributions of the various sectors of the world in the economic development of the developing countries, the private capital sector, the public capital sector, and the Communist or Soviet bloc sector. These percentages are worth noting, especially in terms of Communist propaganda blasts against capitalism.

It can be seen that the new capitalism of the world is so far outshining and outperforming the Communist types that it is no wonder the Kremlin propagandists try to deceive the world.

Their blasts, fortunately, are so out of date and so obsolescent that both Marx and Lenin, and perhaps even Stalin, would be ashamed of their naivete. The developing nations of the world are progressively being made aware of the Communist falsification.

Here are the percentages as presented by Dr. Rogers:

	Percent
1956	
Western private sector	44
Western public sector	47
Soviet bloc	9
1957	
Western private sector	48
Western public sector	49
Soviet bloc	3
1958	
Western private sector	37
Western public sector	56
Soviet bloc	7
1959	
Western private sector	31
Western public sector	58
Soviet bloc	11

Modern capitalism, in other words, has nothing to be defensive about. It has nothing of which to be ashamed. It has nothing in other words, which the Communists can even pretend to equal, much less attack.

Stewardship capitalism, people's capitalism, social capitalism, by whatever name you wish to call it, is concerned today with developing people everywhere who love freedom.

This is a far cry from the capitalism of the Industrial Revolution which gave Marx the material for his writings. If Karl Marx were here today he would be a present-day social capitalist, chairman of the board, probably, and Nikolai Lenin would be his executive vice president.

Report on Accomplishments of 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this 1st session of the 87th Congress has been

the busiest that I can remember since World War II days. And it has also been one, I believe, of great accomplishment.

Strides have been made in almost every field, domestic as well as foreign. With a recession dogging us, more surplus food was made available to the needy and employment benefits were expanded. To get people working again, we put the Interstate Highway program back on schedule and started things moving in the airport construction and housing fields. And we began an area redevelopment program—a program that offers a lot of hope to idle people in both rural and urban areas of Tennessee.

We made the greatest improvement in the minimum wage law since its original passage under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Social security was liberalized. We enabled some 5,000 communities to begin ridding their lakes and streams of pollution.

We enacted legislation to step up the war against interstate crime, gambling, and racketeering—bills that were originally recommended by the Senate Crime Committee, of which I was chairman, back in the early 1950's, and that were pressed for this year by our Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy.

In defense and foreign affairs, this Congress has cooperated fully with the President. Our Military Establishment was greatly strengthened. We took steps to catch up in the space race. And perhaps most important, we enacted a more effective foreign-aid program and established a permanent Peace Corps—the most imaginative and potentially the greatest contribution to world peace in years.

My deepest regret is that the House did not join the Senate in passing a full Federal-aid-to-education program, and that no program of medical and hospital care for the elderly has yet been enacted. But I am hopeful that we shall provide funds for school construction and increased teachers' salaries, as well as enacting a sound program of medical care for our older people, after the Congress returns in January.

Mr. President, I have prepared a topical résumé of the major legislative action taken in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, based on a compilation by the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. Bills passed by both Houses and signed by the President are designated by their Public Law number; those which passed the Senate but have not yet cleared the full Congress are designated by their Senate bill number.

This résumé is as follows:

ECONOMIC AREA—AGRICULTURE

Omnibus farm bill: Enacted a major farm bill to reduce wheat and feed grain surpluses; authorized Secretary to consult with farmers, farm organizations, and other groups to develop new farm programs; extended the Agricultural Trade and Development Act to December 31, 1964; consolidated and modernized the Farmers Home Administration; extended the Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1965; extended Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971; authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program to be paid by direct appropriations; and extended the Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds—Public Law 87–128.

Feed grains: Authorized a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 crop of corn at $1.20 a bushel, with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, in an effort to raise the incomes of feed grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands—Public Law 87–5.

Drought relief: Enacted a temporary 1-year program authorizing the sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price-support levels and permitting grazing of livestock on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs or moving hay on these lands in or near drought areas—Public Law 87–127.

Farm loans: Increased proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with debt over $10,000 from 10 percent to 25 percent to help meet the rapid and increased cost of farming—Public Law 87–8.

Mexican farm labor: Extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to December 31, 1963; prohibited infringement upon the rights of domestic workers—Public Law 87–345.

Cotton farmers' relief: Authorized emergency relief to cotton farmers where floods have made it impossible to plant—Public Law 87–37.

Farm credit: Liberalized farm credit laws to: permit installment payments on Federal land bank loans to be scheduled more frequently than semiannually if desirable to the borrower; permit Federal land bank loans to be made to corporations set up by farming families—now restricted to persons—extend from 5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate term loans; require in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to the accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans—Public Law 87–343.

GENERAL ECONOMY

Federal unemployment compensation: Authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks in an effort to ease the unemployment problem throughout the country—Public Law 87–62.

Aid to dependent children: Authorized a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962, of aid to dependent children, permitting States to aid needy unemployed parents and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates; and increased by $3 the minimum amount to which the Federal Government will participate on a matching basis in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision for recipients of old age assistance—Public Law 87–31.

Railroad unemployment compensation: Approved benefits of a similar nature for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act—Public Law 87–7.

Railroad retirees: To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act permits men without 30 years service to receive reduced annuities upon reaching age 62; and reduced from 3 to 1 year the required time which must elapse after marriage before a wife or husband, otherwise qualified, may receive the annuity—Public Law 87–285.

Minimum wage: Increased minimum wage to $1.25 (from $1) and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers—Public Law 87–30.

Area redevelopment: Established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas—Public Law 87–27.

Social security: Increased minimum old age insurance benefits and benefits to widows under the Social Security Act; provided reduced benefits to men at 62; liberalized disability provisions; increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent; increased (for 1 year) the amount of public assistance payments for old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled—Public Law 87–64.

Manpower Training Act of 1961: Authorizes a 4-year, $655 million manpower training program to help alleviate the unemployment problems by enabling workers whose skills are obsolete to receive training which will qualify them to obtain and hold jobs, with priority to unemployed persons including those in farm families with a net income of less than $1,200 a year. (S. 1991.)

Housing Act of 1961: Enacted a housing program, authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds. The act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of low-interest rate, 35-year mortgage loans for middle-income housing (except in hardship cases the mortgages may be extended to 40 years); requires a 3-percent downpayment on low-income housing, with a permissive inclusion of settlement costs; authorizes $75 million for mass transportation systems, and $50 million for "open space" grants; and includes a reauthorization of approximately 100,000 public housing units—Public Law 87–70.

FHA: Increased by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA—Public Law 87–38.

Veterans' home loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home-loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967; and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967—Public Law 87–84.

Federal Aid Highway Act: Enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, revising the original estimated authorization for 41,000-mile, 13-year program of interstate highways by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 billion to $37 billion; extended for 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls—Public Law 87–61.

Federal Airport Act extension: Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964, and authorized a total appropriation of $225 million, or $75 million annually—Public Law 87–255.

Small business loans: Increased by $20 million the amount that the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular business loan program, which will enable SBA to continue its loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month—Public Law 87–198.

Small business amendments: Increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million which, in addition to the $20 million approved in Public Law 87–198, increases the total SBA revolving fund to $1,125 million—Public Law 87–305.

Small Business Investment Act: Increased limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latters' investments in individual enterprises—Public Law 87–341.

ICC loans: Extended for 27 months (to June 30, 1963) authority of Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to help ease the credit difficulties of railroads—Public Law 87–16

Small towns and rural counties: Established a 20-member bipartisan Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural

Counties to study and investigate Federal policies and programs relating to the economic needs and problems of these areas (S. 1869.)

Water pollution control: Authorized an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants to control water pollution, thus raising the annual limit on grants from $50 million yearly to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, $100 million for fiscal 1964, through and including 1967. In addition, this measure increased from $3 to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States to administer water pollution control programs and extended the program through June 30, 1968, and authorized $5 million a year for the Secretary to use to develop demonstration program to treat sewage, to measure pollutants, and to evaluate the effects of sewage treatment—Public Law 87–88.

Lead-zinc subsidy: Aided the domestic lead-zinc industry by authorizing a 4-year program of stabilization payments for small mineowners—75 percent for lead and 55 percent for zinc of the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price whenever the market falls below 14½ cents—Public Law 87–347.

TRADE AND COMMUNICATIONS ECONOMY

Broadcasting: Liberalized antitrust law to validate certain contracts for television broadcasting of professional sports games—Public Law 87–331.

Civil antitrust investigations: Authorized the Attorney General to compel the production of documents required as evidence in civil antitrust investigations—S. 167.

AEC sales: Accelerated property sales to stimulate the economic growth of atomic energy communities—Public Law 87–174.

Metal scrap: Extended to June 30, 1962, the existing suspension of import duties on metal scrap—Public Law 87–110.

Corporate excise extension: Extended for an additional year the existing 52 percent corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation, thus preventing a loss of revenue of some $2.5 billion—Public Law 87–72.

Clay and shale—tax treatment: Permits miners of clay and shale to include as a depletion allowance the process of manufacturing brick and tile—Public Law 87–312.

Income-tax returns: Curbed tax evasion by assigning identifying numbers to all taxpayers—Public Law 87–397.

Unemployment tax credits: Prevented double taxation in the case of Federal and State unemployment taxes arising as a result of a technical deficiency in the Federal tax law—Public Law 87–321.

Federal savings and loan: Strengthened the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the National Housing Act by increasing the reserves and cutting the overcapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation created as a reserve credit facility for savings and home mortgage credit institutions—Public Law 87–210.

VETERANS' AID

Disabled veterans' compensation increase: Provided increases in rates of service-connected disability compensation (to reflect cost-of-living increases since last compensation raise in 1957) ranging from 2.6 to 16.7 percent, depending upon degree of disability; restores for 2 years after January 1, 1962, the eligibility of veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, to apply for national service life insurance. (H.R. 879.)

Veterans' widows: Increased payments to veterans' widows. (Public Law 87–268.)

INTERNATIONAL AREA

Foreign assistance authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal 1962; a long-term (5-year) Development Loan Fund program authorizing an appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion for each fiscal year from 1963 to 1966; and established a new foreign aid agency. (Public Law 87–195.)

Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin-American aid program, which includes $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration—Public Law 87–41.

OECD: Ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consisting of 18 European member nations, the United States, and Canada, to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of the member states.

OECD—Permanent representation: Authorized the President to appoint, subject to Senate confirmation, a permanent representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and provided for the cost of U.S. participation in OECD including salaries of the American representative and his staff. U.S. share is 25 percent of the OECD budget which will run to about $5 million annually. (S. 2423.)

Battle Act revision: Strengthen U.S. policy abroad by authorizing the President to permit economic aid to Iron Curtain countries, except the Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East, when he considers it important to U.S. security. (S. 1215.)

Peace Corps: Carried out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples to help themselves. The Peace Corps is designed to provide the framework through which America's idealism, her humanitarianism, and her generosity can find a personal expression in the task of helping to build with our own hands a better world for our mankind—Public Law 87–293.

Disarmament: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament—Public Law 87–297.

Surplus as aid: Authorized disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 87–27.

Agricultural aid: Authorized the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less-developed countries through development programs under title II of Public Law 480, Agricultural Trade Development Act—Public Law 87–92.

Alien Orphan Adoption Act: Made permanent and expanded the Alien Orphan Adoption Act which permits orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens to enter the country on nonquota visas—Public Law 87–301.

Caribbean Organization: Authorized the President to accept on behalf of the United States the agreement establishing the Caribbean Organization; the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization; made available to the Organization the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act; and authorized the Secretary of State to appoint a U.S. observer to the Organization. Organization is to concern itself with social, cultural, and economic matters of common interest to the Caribbean area—Public Law 87–73.

Fulbright Act: Authorized legally classified American nationals to qualify and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act for advanced education abroad—Public Law 87–153.

U.S. food reserve: Expressed an interest in exploring with other nations the possibility of establishing an international food and raw materials reserve under the United Nations and related international organizations to acquire and store in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials exclusive of minerals.

Export-Import Bank: Authorized Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries—Public Law 87–311.

Red China: Expressed as the sense of the Congress that:

First. The United States should continue to support the Government of the Republic of China as the representative of China in the United Nations.

Second. The United States shall continue to oppose seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; and

Third. The American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

International Finance Corporation amendment: Amended the charter of the IFC to allow purchase of capital stock to encourage private investment in underdeveloped countries by creating a wider flexibility of financing to meet the varying needs of private enterprise—Public Law 87–185.

Mercy fleet: Supported the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships to assist in disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the public health field and other works of technical assistance.

NATO: Extended through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, a commission established to explore means of increasing cooperation and unity of purpose among NATO countries—Public Law 87–116.

United States-France: Provided immediate effectiveness for atomic cooperation for mutual defense purposes between the United States and France—Public Law 87–363.

Loans to friendly nations: Authorizes loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations—Public Law 87–387.

DEFENSE AND SPACE EXPLORATION AREAS

Ready Reserves: Granted authority, requested by the President, to call to active duty up to 250,000 ready reservists, authority to continue until July 1, 1962; and to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months, which would otherwise expire on July 1, 1962—Public Law 87–117.

Military procurement: Authorized $12.4 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962—Public Law 87–53.

Military: Clarified the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act—Public Law 87–391.

Additional military procurement authorizations: As requested by the President, authorized additional funds to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sea lift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorization for procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was $1,753 million; however, of this amount, additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000—Public Law 87–118.

Military construction: Authorizes $831 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and

abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases—Public Law 87–57.

Aeronautics and Space Council: Reactivated and strengthened the usefulness of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and provided that it be administered by the Vice President—Public Law 87–26.

NASA authorization: Authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency—Public Law 87–98.

War hazards: Increased monthly disability and death compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act—Public Law 87–380.

Marine Corps: Improved the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by providing for the expanded assignment of supply-duty-only officers to unrestricted duty—Public Law 87–123.

Emergency evacuation: Provided for advances in pay to Armed Forces personnel in cases of emergency evacuation of dependents from oversea areas—Public Law 87–188.

Coast Guard—Temporary appointments: Extended to January 1, 1964, the authority of the President to make temporary appointments in the Coast Guard, or until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number authorized by law—Public Law 87–257.

AEC authorization: Authorized $270,440,000 for a total of 40 new AEC projects including the Stanford linear electron accelerator and electric generating facilities—Public Law 87–315.

AEC omnibus amendments: Enacted numerous amendments to the AEC Act designed to provide a better framework and to help us keep pace with emerging developments in atomic energy. Amendments included the transfer of 3 kilograms of plutonium and 500 grams of uranium 233 to the International Atomic Energy Agency to aid in the prestige of the IAEA as a center for distribution of special nuclear materials, and the transfer of 8 additional kilograms of plutonium and 30 kilograms of uranium 233 to Euratom for research purposes and to help start an experimental plan for reprocessing fuel elements—Public Law 87–206.

Air Force promotions: Provide a temporary program through June 30, 1963, for promotion for all active duty Air Force officers below the grade of colonel—Public Law 87–194.

Reserves: Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive, and other changes include making ROTC graduate training program run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary—Public Law 87–378.

WELFARE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Aid to education: Enacted a $2,550 million 3-year Federal-aid-to-education program for school construction and increasing teachers' salaries. (S. 1021.)

Impacted areas—NDEA extensions: Enacted bill which extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose. Also, extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages—Public Law 87–344.

College housing: Increased the loan authorization by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964—Public Law 87–70.

Educational TV: Authorized Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, building, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel. (S. 205—H.R. 132.)

Educational opportunities for migratory farm families: Authorized a 5-year program to aid in educating children of migratory workers. The Federal Government is to pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. (S. 1124.)

Juvenile delinquency: Authorized a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $10 million a year for 3 years to aid in financing projects to combat juvenile delinquency—Public Law 87–274.

Nurses' scholarships: Extended for 4 years (to June 30, 1965) $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act—Public Law 87–22.

Vocational teacher training: Authorized two 1-year programs of Federal grants for training teachers of the deaf, and advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists—Public Law 87–276.

HEALTH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Migratory health services: Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. (S. 1130.)

National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Established a 15-member council to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal law, regulations, programs, policies, and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor to provide a better understanding of conditions, needs, and long-range solutions of this problem. (S. 1132.)

Community health services: Expanded and improved community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged, construction of nursing homes, and training of public health personnel—Public Law 87–395.

Mass transit: Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities; $25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment—Public Law 87–70.

RESOURCE BUILDUP

Saline water conversion program: Extended the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorized a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount—Public Law 87–295.

Air pollution: Extended air pollution control authorization to June 30, 1966, provided for public hearings, and authorized $5 million a year to finance the studies. (S. 455.)

Shoreline areas: Authorized the Department of Interior to study means and costs of acquiring and preserving 14 ocean, lake, and river shoreline areas appropriate for recreational parks. Authorized the Department of Agriculture to study appropriate shorelines within the Nation's 186 million acres of national forests. Each department is to report its findings and recommendations within 2 years. Authorized $400,000 for each survey and a grand total of $25 million of matching funds to assist the States in acquiring State shoreline areas. (S. 543.)

Wilderness bill: Established a national wilderness preservation system providing that any time within 10 years, the President may recommend to Congress the permanent inclusion within the wilderness system areas totaling approximately 54 million acres. (S. 174.)

National fuels study: Approved a resolution authorizing the Senate Interior Committee to make an investigation and study of the current and prospective Government policies, to determine changes for an effective national fuels policy. Report of the findings to be submitted by January 31, 1961. (S. Res. 105.)

Migratory waterfowl conservation: Authorized a 7-year migratory waterfowl conservation program permitting advances to States to purchase necessary lands—Public Law 87–383.

CRIMINAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

Circuit judges: Created 73 additional U.S. district and circuit court judgeships to help ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars—Public Law 87–36.

Jury commissioners: For the first time since 1884, increased the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts from the present $5 to $10 per diem for each day employed in the performance of duties. (S. 1899).

Agency investigations: Prohibits obstruction of any lawful inquiry or investigation by the Department of Justice or Treasury and strengthens prohibitions against injuries to persons furnishing information in connection with the inquiry. (S. 1665).

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce. (S. 1658).

Racketeering enterprises: Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities—business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, etc.—Public Law 87–228.

Transmission of bets: Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gambling. Exempts information carried for use of the press and wireless communication—Public Law 87–216.

Wagering paraphernalia: Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers games, or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual course of its business, but allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal—Public Law 87–218.

Felons: Extended Fugitive Felon Act to all felonies—Public Law 87–368.

Espionage: Extended laws against espionage and censorship to acts committed anywhere in the world—Public Law 87–369.

Tax stamps: Made it a Federal crime to transport fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate commerce—Public Law 87–371.

Plane hijacking: Made airplane hijacking a Federal crime subject to a possible death penalty—Public Law 87–197.

Aircraft claims: Authorized immediate payment of up to $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damage as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles—Public Law 87–212.

Supplemental air carriers: Provided a permanent place in the aviation industry for supplemental air carriers without adverse effect upon scheduled carriers. Provides that a carrier may request and be authorized to perform limited services supplemental to those furnished by the regular air carriers, and authorizes the Board to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental service containing limitations on the type and extent of service authorized (S. 1969.)

REORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT AIDS

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans

for the reorganization of the Government—Public Law 87–18.

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963—Public Law 87–264.

HEW: Authorized two additional Assistant Secretaries—one to handle international affairs, the second to handle medical and scientific matters. (S. 2073.)

Labor: Authorized an additional Assistant Secretary to perform functions relating primarily to the employment and effective utilization of women in our labor force—Public Law 87–137.

FTC reorganization: Provided for the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission to expedite the present workload—plan No. 4. Effective July 9.

CAB reorganization: Authorized the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide greater flexibility and a more expeditious handling of CAB cases—plan No. 3. Effective July 3.

Maritime reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Maritime Board—plan No. 7. Effective August 12.

ICC: Authorized reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission—Public Law 87–247.

FCC reorganization: Authorized FCC to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases to expedite and improve the administrative process—Public Law 87–192.

SEC reorganization: Authorized the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate certain of its functions by published order or rule to a division of the Commission, an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or an employee or employee board, and provides for appeals of such delegations. (S. 2135.)

SEC investigation: Authorized $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules, for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963—Public Law 87–196.

Internal Revenue employees: Appropriated funds for an additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees—Public Law 87–159.

Travel expenses: Increased the allowances of Government employees for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include from $10 to $16 per diem allowances and from 10 to 12 cents a mile by private automobile—Public Law 87–139.

Interstate commerce—Property destruction: Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose—Public Law 87–221.

Rural carriers: Increased equipment allowance for rural mail carriers to 12 cents a mile. (S. 189.)

Postal employees: Extended to employees in the postal field service the same salary-retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided under the Classification Act since 1956—Public Law 87–270.

NSLI special dividend: Authorized the payment of a special insurance dividend averaging from $100 to $150, for those veterans who have RS or W insurance. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance and the premium increases at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, with the increased rate at the end of each 5-year period—Public Law 87–223.

ELECTIONS AND THE WHITE HOUSE

Federal election laws: Passed a clean-elections bill to strengthen our electoral system, provide more realistic ceilings on campaign expenses, make available at the State level information on campaign financing, and provides for a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Federal office or to political committees acting for such candidates. (S. 2426.)

National conventions: The Senate adopted unanimously a resolution expressing as the sense of the Senate that the party conventions held every 4 years to nominate candidates for President and Vice President should not be commenced prior to the first Monday in September of the year in which the election is to be held. (S. Res. 141.)

District of Columbia elections: Implements the 23d amendment to the Constitution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; retains the voting age at 21 and provides for a 1-year residency requirement—Public Law 87–389.

White House: Established the White House as a national monument—Public Law 87–286.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every Representative has an obligation to report to his constituents.

This is my report to the people which deals with the work and the record of the 87th Congress. It summarizes my activities and states my position on important issues.

Citizens have a right to know the views, the record, and the performance of their Representative in Congress. For that reason, I make weekly radio broadcasts, send out occasional newsletters to those who request them, and mail a report at the end of each session to my constituents.

It is difficult for me to acquire all their names and addresses. Some have missed my reports. Others have received duplicate copies. A large number of letters are returned with incorrect addresses.

In an effort to provide better service and to eliminate extra work and difficulties, a new method of mail distribution was approved which will help in getting my report to all interested persons.

There have been efforts to deny Representatives the opportunity of mailing these reports by taking away their congressional franking privilege. Behind this effort are interests that would deny citizens the right to know about their Congress through their elected representatives.

This would keep important information from the people which often is difficult, if not impossible, for them to receive otherwise.

It has been charged that this service to the people is too costly. The facts are that the cost last year for franked mail for all Members of Congress was $3,800,000. The per capita cost to Berks County citizens for this service is less than 2 cents a year.

Since the cost of franked mail is paid by direct appropriation from the Treasury, it is not included in the postal deficit which last year was more than $800 million.

The loss in second-class mail service to newspapers and magazines accounts for much of the postal deficit. It costs American taxpayers more in 4 months for postal subsidies to one big publisher than it does to pay the cost for the franked mail of all Congressmen for a whole year. Subsidies to the six Luce publications which include Time, Life, and Fortune, amount to $1 million a month.

The subsidy to this big news monopoly for 1 year amounts to more than the combined annual salary of all the 437 Members of the House of Representatives. Yet syndicated columnists and political writers who attack the franking privilege maintain complete silence about the cost of subsidies to these giant publishers.

THE CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE

It is quite obvious that many persons do not realize how closely their welfare, their opportunities for jobs, for education, health services, old-age and disability pensions, and a decent livelihood are affected by action or inaction of the Congress.

Good government depends to a large extent upon the interest and the participation of our citizens in political and governmental affairs. In the complexities of our modern society it is often difficult for the average citizen to understand how government actually affects him.

It is my hope that this report will be helpful in giving my constituents a better understanding of controversial issues and of the conflicting interests and philosophies which divide the two political parties.

There will always be differences of opinion which are essential in a vibrant democracy, if differences are kept on a high plane and every opportunity is given to the people to learn the truth and the facts.

That is why I feel obligated to inform my constituents on the work of the 87th Congress and what their Congress means to them and to our country.

THE 87TH CONGRESS SETS RECORD

The 1st session of this 87th Congress has been one of the most productive in history. This record has been the result of the joint efforts of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration. It has been likened to the memorable first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration. In March 1933, it was closed banks and soup lines. In January 1961, it was sagging farm prices, rising unemployment, stifled credit, and an unfavorable balance of payments.

To fight unemployment and to reverse the recession trend, President Kennedy stepped up the release of already authorized funds for Federal procurement and for construction of highways and other projects. He asked local communities to initiate "boost the economy" programs.

He accelerated farm price-support payments, cut the interest rate on loans by the Small Business Administration to firms in areas of heavy unemployment,

lowered the maximum permissible interest rate of FHA home mortgages.

The President recommended to Congress and secured the enactment of:

Extended unemployment compensation.

A higher minimum wage with coverage for 3.6 million added workers.

Aid for dependent children of people who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits.

An area redevelopment program which will provide, over a 4-year period, $300 million in loans to areas of high unemployment or depressed income. The program also calls for grants for public facilities and funds for the retraining of workers, subsistence payments, and technical assistance to communities.

A liberalized Social Security Act.

A comprehensive Housing Act which will help meet the needs of more of our people, provide stimulus for the economy, and permit a stronger attack on slums, urban blight, and unemployment.

New highway legislation to assure the financial solvency of our Interstate program and to improve construction planning.

An expanded airport construction program.

Increased appropriations to combat the pollution of our rivers.

A 6-year program aimed at achieving economic conversions of salt water to fresh—with vast potential benefits to millions of people who do not have access to Minnesota's 10,000 lakes.

An emergency feed grain program, and an omnibus farm bill.

Legislation to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. There was substantial progress in other ways in civil rights for all citizens.

New laws to combat organized crime, and a 3-year program of demonstration projects for control of juvenile delinquency.

The first major addition to our National Park System in 14 years.

And a community health facilities program to help our 17 million senior citizens through nursing homes, diagnosis, and advisory centers, improved hospitals, and other community services.

People who say the Kennedy administration is really not so different from the Eisenhower administration should, as Al Smith used to say, "look at the record."

BATTLE OF WORDS

These are programs that the Republican leadership in Congress have opposed with such arguments as wasteful and unnecessary spending, States rights, welfare statism, big government, and Federal control. Throughout our history, however, liberal programs such as offered by President Kennedy have always been opposed by ultraconservative interests.

There is, of course, a sharp conflict between the Republican philosophy which Democrats refer to as trickle-down and the Democratic belief that progress and prosperity depend upon the purchasing power of the people and their opportunities for jobs and expanding public service.

Republican leaders contend that the Nation cannot afford to do the things which the administration proposes, while Democrats insist that our country cannot afford to ignore them.

Like my Democratic colleagues, I am alarmed at the terrible waste in human and natural resources which goes on in the name of economy.

The real wealth of our Nation lies in these human and natural resources, the intelligence, health and know-how of our people, and the productive power of men and machines. Unemployment is waste. Failure to use the services of partially handicapped persons and many men over age 50, who are willing and able to work, is wasteful. To deny our youth educational opportunities is a waste to our Nation which needs to develop the best of its talent.

The waste in lost productivity and wealth due to economic curtailment, unemployment and recession during the last several years is too staggering to estimate, running into untold billions of dollars. President Kennedy reversed this trend with his progressive program and strong leadership which won substantial congressional support including some help from the more liberal Republican Members.

PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRATIC WHIP

In this session of Congress I again served as whip and floor leader of the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation, and as an assistant to the majority whip, Congressman CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma. Mr. ALBERT is one of the seven top leaders of the Kennedy administration. His ancestors migrated from Berks County almost a century ago.

As a party whip, I had occasions to meet with House and Senate leaders, with the Vice President, and with President Kennedy himself. During the session I met with the President on four different occasions in the White House. I was pleased to have played a part in securing favorable consideration for his program in the Congress.

SPEAKER RAYBURN

During the session I enjoyed several opportunities of briefly serving as Speaker pro tempore, substituting for the immortal House Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Representatives of both parties are grieved by Speaker RAYBURN's illness. There is no doubt but that he will go down as one of the great men in American history. To know him as a close and dear friend is a real privilege.

SAM RAYBURN is well known to many Berks citizens. He graciously accepted my invitation to meet and talk to individuals and groups who visited the Capitol. It was an annual event for students and their teachers from Woodrow Wilson High School at West Lawn to meet Speaker RAYBURN in his private office or on the floor of Congress.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

My attendance record was again one of the highest in Congress. On 231 quorum calls and votes, I missed only 3, giving me an attendance record of 98.7 percent. It is extremely difficult to get a 100-percent record because of conflicting duties which Members frequently face.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I am a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This committee has jurisdiction over the following regulatory agencies: Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Power Commission, and Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Comerce Committee specializes in the fields of transportation, communication, finance, health, and safety. As a member of this committee, I voted for the reorganization of the Communications Commission, which regulates the broadcasting industry.

I supported the new Commissioner, Newton N. Minow, in his effort to promote educational features on television and to eliminate fraud and deception and those evils which contribute to juvenile delinquency and crime.

As a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I gave special attention to programs which seek to find the cause and cure of crippling and killing diseases. My bill to aid the graduate schools of public health in training doctors, nurses, technicians, and other specialists, was passed by the Congress as part of the overall community health facilities bill.

Our subcommittee also deals with problems on food additives and labeling, smog and air pollution, and travel safety.

I am also a member of the House Administration Committee which manages the House side of the Capitol. It has jurisdiction over House employees, committee appropriations, contested elections, and printing of Government documents. I also serve as member of the Printing Subcommittee and the Committee on Accounts.

BILLS INTRODUCED

In this session of the Congress I sponsored legislation to raise income tax exemptions to $800 a year; increase minimum social security benefits to $50 a month; allow benefits to men who retire at age 62; women at 60; establish a Federal Agency for the Handicapped; grant a deduction for income tax purposes to handicapped persons for transportation expenses to and from work; and provide an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting handicapped dependents unable to care for themselves.

Other bills I introduced were designed to provide a massive public works program to put jobless people back to work; provide a pension for World War I veterans; aid in the creation of a nationwide system of junior colleges; increase the Federal authorization to assist schools of public health in training specialists for public health service and institutional work; establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency; limit postal subsidies to giant publications; honor the Dean of March Music by naming one of the buildings of the Library of Congress the John Phillip Sousa Memorial Library.

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

As part of my congressional duties, I presented testimony before several House committees on pending legislation. They included such subjects as aid to the handicapped, pensions for veterans of World War I, postal subsidies, and public health legislation.

I have taken part in discussions on the floor of the House on such questions as foreign policy, mutual security, automation, social security, aid to education, disarmament, and the Berlin crisis.

ANTIRECESSION PROGRAM

When President Kennedy took office last January, the country was in the midst of its third serious recession in 6 years. Five and a half million Americans were out of jobs. Business failures were at the highest levels since the great depression. Our major industries were operating between 50 and 80 percent of capacity. Housing starts were at their lowest since 1949, farm incomes were critically low, and millions of our fellow citizens looked hopelessly for work in the many areas throughout the Nation.

Here is a brief report on the most important bills which were introduced to restore health and vitality to our economy, to increase our rate of economic growth and to meet urgent needs.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

To aid the unemployed, President Kennedy asked that Congress extend unemployment benefits for an additional 13 weeks. Within 63 days after taking office, the Congress passed President Kennedy's proposal. I gave full support to this effort.

To aid the hungry in areas of heavy unemployment, President Kennedy issued an Executive order increasing the quantity and quality of surplus food available to needy families throughout the Nation.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Twice vetoed by former President Eisenhower, the Area Redevelopment Act was passed in this Congress and signed by President Kennedy. It provides $394 million in Federal loans and grants to assist urban and rural areas suffering from excessively high rates of unemployment. I supported this bill which was important to Berks County and to the people of many other areas of Pennsylvania, particularly to distressed coal region areas like neighboring Schuylkill County.

HOUSING

To meet housing needs and to increase our rate of economic growth, Congress passed the most comprehensive housing program in congressional history.

This new law will help to give every American an opportunity to own his own home. To help our citizens in the lower income groups to buy their own homes, the law contained a low-interest, low-downpayment, 35-year loan program.

This bill also included an expansion of urban renewal, public housing, housing for the elderly, and college housing. In addition, a program was established to obtain open spaces in urban renewal areas for children to enjoy fresh air and recreation.

The housing program is extremely beneficial to Berks County. It makes it possible for thousands of our citizens to purchase decent homes through FHA-insured mortgages. It provides loans for our colleges. This year Albright College received $920,000 to build needed dormitory space.

The city of Reading was given a grant under the housing law to begin a study of its urban renewal program, to say nothing of the Federal grants the city has received for other parking lots, other redevelopment projects. Many of our boroughs in the county have benefited from this legislation.

Projects such as the Hensler Homes to provide decent shelter for our senior citizens also comes under this important program.

It was necessary for the President to muster substantial party support for the housing program which was strongly opposed by 84 percent of the Republican Members of the House. Because of my long experience and interest in housing, I gave my full support to President Kennedy on the housing issue.

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

As part of his antirecession program, President Kennedy proposed a liberalization of our social security program.

Minimum monthly benefits were raised from $33 to $40. Widows' benefits were increased. Men were given the option to retire at 62 years of age with slightly reduced benefits. The requirements for eligibility were liberalized to enable thousands of our senior citizens to come under the social security program. Yet, of all welfare programs, this is the one which Republican leaders most bitterly oppose. One of the leading objectives of the John Birch Society, a conservative front organization which includes many millionaires, is to repeal social security. The Birch Society has strong influence in the Congress. Its influence was felt at this year's national convention of Young Republicans in Minneapolis, which passed a resolution calling for the abolition of our compulsory social security program. The popularity of social security, however, causes many other conservative leaders to conceal their hostility toward this program.

With many liberal Democratic colleagues, I feel that much still remains to be done to improve social security. Benefits generally are too low and coverage should be expanded to those old folks who are not covered. However, the minor social security changes made this year will help an additional 4½ million people to enjoy improved living conditions in their retirement years.

COMMUNITY HEALTH FACILITIES BILL

The community health facilities bill which was recently enacted will provide community health services and facilities for our aged people and for the chronically ill. It calls for expanded research in seeking the cure of crippling and killing diseases. The bill provides matching funds for improved nursing home programs, home health care plans, and outpatient diagnostic services. Increased authorizations for the construction of public and nonprofit nursing homes are also provided.

The need for this legislation was pressing. With the lengthening of the lifespan in America, the problems of chronic illness have increased. More than half of the 17 million persons over 65 years of age, excluding those in institutions, have some kind of chronic health problem which interferes with their daily living. In addition to this, many middle aged, young adults, and even children are affected by chronic illnesses.

Included in this act was a proposal which I sponsored. I was pleased to play an active part in the drafting and final passage of this important bill.

AGRICULTURE

Efforts were made to improve farm incomes which for the past 8 years had declined sharply. The drop in buying and consuming power of American farmers helped to aggravate the recession and had an effect on the whole economy.

This year net farm income will be about a billion dollars above the total for 1960. Both executive and congressional actions since inauguration day have been directed toward improving the position of farm families.

Congress enacted the broad scale and long-range program called the Agricultural Act of 1961. This act extends the feed grains program for the 1962 crop, liberalizes farm credit programs, establishes wheat programs for 1961–62, encourages acreage reduction, extends and broadens the food-for-peace program, and extends such important instruments of national policy as the school milk program, and the conservation programs.

The objective of the President and his administration is to insure that the farmers who feed our people will have a parity in income and equality in opportunity with urban families.

As President Kennedy said in his first farm message to Congress:

> The solution to the farm problem lies not so much in severe restrictions upon our talent to produce as upon proper channeling of our abundance into more effective and expanded uses. American agricultural abundance can be forged into both a significant instrument of foreign policy and a weapon against domestic hardship and hunger.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUILDUP

On taking office, the President and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara set about on an immediate review of our defense posture which resulted in a revamping of our military strength. It was designed to protect and strengthen our strategic deterrent by improving such programs as Polaris missile production, our continental defense, and our bomber warning systems, and by strengthening our ability to deter and confine limited and guerrilla type wars.

Included in the new defense appropriations are some $300 million for a more effective civil defense program.

The recent Russian achievements in space were another factor in increasing our defense buildup. This year Congress increased its outer space authorizations by 75 percent to start us on the road to match and eventually surpass the Soviets in space technology and exploration. Success in the field of space exploration would also lead to better weather fore-

casting, improved land and sea navigation, untapped resources in solar power, and better communications throughout the world.

NEW STARTS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Military might alone is not sufficient for our Nation's security or for future peace. The skill of our diplomats and the molding of foreign policy are also of vital importance.

When President Kennedy took office, he faced the grimmest situation in foreign relations that has ever confronted a new Chief of State.

Communist guerrillas were advancing in Laos and threatening at every weak point in southeast Asia. Communist puppets and agents from Moscow were moving to consolidate their positions in Africa. A Communist beachhead had been established only 90 miles from our shore in Cuba, despite the best efforts of the previous administration to contain the influence of Moscow, and our alliances with old allies abroad were steadily deteriorating.

REBUILDING OLD TIES

The administration at once responded to these problems not only by increasing our military strength but by repairing our relations with our old allies in Europe. A strong free Europe is seen as our first line of defense against the Communist menace. Soon after his inauguration, President Kennedy was meeting with the leaders of the European powers in an attempt to strengthen and reactivate NATO. Today, when the Berlin crisis looms high, Europe and the United States are standing firm as a solid block against the irresponsible demands of the Communist world.

WAR ON THE BREEDING PLACES OF COMMUNISM

As an effective means in fighting communism, President Kennedy placed the emphasis on eliminating conditions that breed communism. In his address announcing the new alliance for progress, the President announced our Nation's commitment to cooperate with the underdeveloped nations in ending the poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and unemployment upon which communism thrives.

Along with our assistance, the underdeveloped nations would be expected to make necessary internal reforms such as land redistribution and tax revision in order to make their governments more stable and to make a greater contribution to their own national development. The President has pledged to rid our foreign aid programs of waste and corruption, and to insure that our aid would help all the people and not just the favored few.

Many in Congress feel that economic assistance is a vital part of our defense effort. It will do little good to forge strong military alliances in the chain to contain world communism if our economic links are weak. Many of us agree with President Kennedy who declared that military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurrection and chaos.

PEACE CORPS

Congress voted to establish a permanent Peace Corps as part of our overall effort to avoid war and chaos. It is hoped that this relatively inexpensive program will contribute toward curbing Communist aggression throughout the world. It also strikes at poverty, illiteracy, hunger, insecurity, and such evils on which communism breeds.

ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

Another new start in our foreign policy came when Congress passed an Arms Control Agency that would emphasize our Nation's peaceful intentions, concentrate the work of all Federal, State, and local disarmament groups, and work out practical and effective alternatives to nuclear war.

This legislation, which I helped to sponsor, enjoyed the wholehearted bipartisan support of former President Eisenhower and former Secretary of State Christian Herter, as well as all leading Members of both parties in the 87th Congress.

UNMET PUBLIC AND HUMAN NEEDS

Despite excellent progress made in this session, several major measures will face the Congress next January.

AID TO EDUCATION

It was unfortunate that the administration's aid to education proposals were killed by the conservative coalition in the House. The final move to consider even a modified general aid to education bill on the House floor was killed by almost solid Republican opposition with the help of conservative southern Democrats. One hundred and sixty of the one hundred and sixty-six Republicans voted to kill the school bill.

The President's proposals are essential to help meet the growing shortage of classrooms and teachers. On the national level, there is a shortage of 142,000 classrooms and 135,000 qualified schoolteachers.

The administration's proposals would have meant an extra $28 million for the State of Pennsylvania to spend on education, to say nothing about the 1,000 or more scholarships to needy high school seniors and other programs to be expanded under the National Defense Education Act.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The President's proposal for financing hospital and nursing home care through the social security system to meet the needs of our senior citizens is also awaiting action by the next session of Congress.

This program is essential to meet the health needs of the more than 17 million people who are now over age 65. At a time when the health needs of these people are greatest, their income is at the lowest levels in their lives.

PRESIDENT MOVES TO HALT INFLATION

At a recent press conference, President Kennedy expressed his fear that inflation would again rob our people if our major industries did not hold the line on unjustified price increases.

Acting upon the advice of his Council of Economic Advisers, the President pointed out the inflationary tendency of excessive concentration in some of our major industries. The President told the people that administered or rigged prices in some of our Nation's major defense industries have played a key role in the inflation of recent years and have robbed our people of millions of dollars in real income.

Inflation is a real problem which is too often associated with deceptive efforts to defeat programs which are in the public interest. In recent years, however, it has been revealed that unjustified hikes in the price of steel have been a leading factor in the inflationary trend. The prices in this key industry have been pushed up faster and further than the average of all other commodities.

President Kennedy is deeply concerned about increasing the Nation's rate of economic growth and in preventing inflation from robbing our people of their hard-won social gains. To prevent this, President Kennedy has called upon both labor and management to show moderation and self-restraint in price hikes and labor contract negotiations.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Every informed person knows that there needs to be a proper balance between Government spending and revenues. But there is a big difference between investments for public service, education, health, housing, and the big spending which benefits a favored and powerful few.

One road leads to a strong and prosperous economy. The other leads to unemployment and recession and the neglect of human needs and public service.

ABUNDANCE SHOULD BE USED WISELY

In these days of great confusion, it is important to look beyond scare words and deception, and seek the truth and the facts.

We are blessed in our country with abundance and with great human and natural resources. Yet there is unnecessary suffering and distress. There is no need to fear the future if we have faith, courage, and understanding, and if we dedicate ourselves to promoting the public welfare and the common interest we all share in a strong, united and prosperous America.

As a Member of Congress this has been my objective. This is why I have supported legislation for schools, jobs, old age security, and programs to meet the needs of our people and our country.

FEDERAL FUNDS AID BERKS

More than $24 million in Federal funds have entered Berks County during the first 8 months of this year. Nearly a million and a half dollars a month comes to local citizens every month as pension payments to our aged and disabled folks through social security. This purchasing power is also a stimulant to business.

Aid to Albright College was given in the form of a long-term, low-interest loan of $920,000 for needed dormitories. It supplements the funds received from local citizens who are making voluntary contributions toward the long-range development of the college.

An additional $143,000 went to both Albright and Kutztown State College in the form of student loan funds to enable needy youths in Berks County to achieve a college education.

READING GETS FEDERAL AID

Three and a half-million dollars in loans and grants went to the city of Reading to assist in building needed parking facilities and other urban renewal projects.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars has been advanced to help extend the city's sanitary sewer system to include the 18th and 19th wards. Another quarter of a million dollars went to several of our local boroughs and townships to assist them in building adequate sewage and water treatment systems.

Recently, a number of local businessmen and Reading city officials came to Washington to seek Federal funds under the community facilities program for assistance in the elimination of the Seventh Street grade crossing. Senator CLARK and I have introduced legislation which would make this aid possible.

Almost a million dollars went to the Reading Hospital to help provide 228 additional beds for that institution. One hundred and eighty thousand dollars in small business loans were cited for Berks. Federal funds also come into the county through other progressive programs.

Federal aid helps to pay for our highways and for many other programs like aid to the blind and public assistance. It has been a major factor in providing employment and in keeping the community prosperous and the Nation strong.

EDUCATIONAL AID FOR READING AND BERKS

The Reading School District this year received more than $100,000 in Federal aid to education. Some of the money, provided by the Defense Education Act, was used to develop new programs in mathematics, science, foreign languages, and guidance.

Federal funds helped elementary schools to acquire microprojectors to increase scientific knowledge of our youngsters. Visual-aid equipment and reference books to aid teachers and pupils in fields of vital importance to the Nation were also acquired with Federal aid.

Federal assistance helped to build the language laboratory at Reading High School and at Northwest Junior High School. To the credit of local school authorities, the Reading School District has taken full advantage of Federal aid to education.

Educational opportunities for local students have been enhanced and the burden of educational costs for Reading taxpayers has been alleviated by Federal funds. Educational aid funds for Reading schools are being used for everything from teachers' salaries and reference books to low-priced daily luncheon platters.

The Reading School District has received $34,000 in Federal aid funds for the practical nursing program. In addition, $15,286 under the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 helps to pay for teachers salaries in the field of vocational education.

As far back as 1861, Federal aid to education programs have been beneficial to school districts which took advantage of Federal assistance. These aid programs prove that the old scare slogans of "Federal Control" and "Wasteful Spending" do not stand up when all the facts are available for consideration.

The need for Federal aid is more urgent today than ever. If President Kennedy's school aid proposals are adopted it will provide many Federal scholarships for talented young people in Berks County who are now being denied the full opportunity to develop their talents and brain power.

To meet educational needs and to relieve local taxpayers of increasing school costs, the Kennedy school aid program is most essential.

Federal aid programs such as these which have helped Berks County, and other sections of the Nation, meet with strong opposition from opponents of the Kennedy administration. It is on these important domestic programs that the two parties sharply disagree.

POLITICAL SPENDING

A congressional committee has reported that millions of dollars are being spent each year in national political campaigns. Yet influencing election contests involves much more than the expenditures which are cited in such reports. To get a more realistic picture of political spending, one should also include the cost of political efforts of syndicated columnists and political writers and the value of free space given by the big news monopolies to influence political thinking and voting trends.

Nearly all of the big high-salaried national columnists hold conservative views or reflect the interest and philosophy of those who own and control the big news syndicates.

It is this fact that causes a one-sided presentation of news and information and makes it difficult for a clear public understanding of the controversial and crucial issues which confront the people of the Nation.

Political spending reports are not complete unless they include all the organized efforts to influence public opinion and election results.

COOPERATION WITH INDUSTRY

Our business community has made steady recovery from the recession. All the important statistics point to a rising level of business activity, which will mean both greater employment and profitable enterprise.

Whenever I could properly be of assistance to business and industry in Berks County, I have cooperated in every possible way. I fully appreciate the importance of a successful and prosperous industry to our community. A healthy climate for business means jobs for working men and women, and prosperity for our city and county.

Politics are never permitted to interfere with my responsibility to all of my constituents. I am sure that many Berks County business leaders will attest to this fact.

Pennsylvania's Democratic Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK is a good example. As former mayor of Philadelphia, he has gained nationwide attention for the big city's rebirth and progress under his leadership.

Senator CLARK has a business and professional background and comes from a well-to-do family. Yet Senator CLARK is one of the most progressive Members of the Senate. He is a man of impeachable integrity, great ability, and political courage.

In his years in the U.S. Senate, Senator CLARK has become known for his untiring efforts for social reform, civil rights, and progressive and humanitarian legislation. The more progressive leaders of industry understand that Senator CLARK's efforts for economic growth and social reform legislation are not only in the public interest but also essential to business and industry.

SPECIAL REPORTS AVAILABLE

Persons interested can get special reports on social security, the Maidencreek, and Blue Marsh water development proposals, the dividend withholding tax issue, television reform, political spending, and postal subsidies. Write to my Washington office for any of these special reports or for any other information in which you are interested.

NATIONAL CITATION

One of the most rewarding experiences during my service in the Congress was to receive a citation of merit for my efforts and work in the Congress on behalf of the handicapped citizens of our country.

The award was presented to me by the Indoor Sports Club of America at their national convention banquet in Washington last summer.

On a number of occasions I have discussed the problems of our handicapped people on the floor of Congress and have called attention to the legislation which I have introduced in their behalf. Much progress has been made in getting recognition and consideration by the Congress for an effective program to aid the handicapped.

CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

Because of population trends, Pennsylvania will lose 3 of its 30 seats in the next Congress. Unless the State legislature acts to eliminate 3 districts, a statewide election for 27 Representatives is necessary.

It is expected that Berks County will be joined with one of the neighboring counties to form a new district. Schuylkill County is the most probable because it will bring the total population of the district to 447,000 which is close to the new population average of 419,000.

Schuylkill County is one of the many depressed areas in Pennsylvania. It sorely needs Federal cooperation and help in meeting the needs of its people. If a Berks-Schuylkill district is formed, it will cement ties between the two counties that will be of mutual benefit to the citizens in both counties.

After his inauguration, President Kennedy said that the greatest danger which faces us is our unwillingness to do the things that need to be done. It is evident that our first task is to arouse greater public interest in politics and government and an understanding of fundamental issues. To assist in this effort, I will make myself available during the congressional recess to appear before any and all groups to speak or to answer questions on issues before the

Congress and the Nation. Those interested can contact me through my Reading office.

On Fighting Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, some people talk a good fight against communism. Others do something about communism. Some people talk against social injustice. Others act against social injustice. Some people deplore usurious interest rates. Others batter down the rates.

Mr. President, I know a man who does something about communism, acts against social injustice and fights high interest rates.

He does not fight communism with his mouth. He fights it with his energy; he fights it spiritually and materially.

The man I am talking about is a Denver born Maryknoll priest, Father Dan McLellan.

Colorado is proud of Father McLellan as a man who substitutes action for words in combating the international menace of godless communism.

The whole country should know about Father McLellan's methods of fighting an ideology that feeds on fear, hate, poverty, greed, and sickness.

That is why I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a testimonial to the tactics of this brilliant and courageous priest, an article in the Reader's Digest of April 1961, describing his work.

Father McLellan, as the article concludes has become a significant force in the cold war.

The doers against communism will salute this valiant son of Colorado as a man who knows the enemy and how to fight him effectively.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONEY MIRACLE OF FATHER DAN

(By Lester Velie)

Two and a half miles up in the Andes, on the cold windswept shores of Lake Titicaca, the ancient town of Puno, Peru, not long ago leaped out of its centuries-old poverty and stagnation into the 20th century. A homemade miracle did it.

Where earth-floored mud hovels stood before, hundreds of homes have sprouted, many with indoor plumbing and hot showers. Where 35,000 townsfolk had only their legs to get around on, buses and taxis now run. The town has an electric-oven bakery, a radio broadcasting station, and a refrigerated packing plant nearby. Stores sport bicycles, sewing machines and refrigerators. And onetime shoeless, illiterate Indians have blossomed out as founders of their own businesses.

The man who breathed this life into Puno is a lean, 44-year-old 6-footer who tells earthy stories in the Andean Indian languages of Aymara and Quechua. He is a bullfight aficionado and has done a bit of bullfighting himself. Called Father Dan, he is formally the Reverend Daniel McClellan, a Maryknoll Fathers missionary.

When Father Dan came to Puno his parishioners, few of whom saw more than $100 in a year, barely subsisted. There was little or nothing to spare for emergencies: a doctor's bill, a burial, even tiles for a new roof. Banks made no loans for personal needs. In fact, in all of the 85 miles between Puno and the Bolivian border, there was not one bank where 300,000 Indian farmers and villagers could save or borrow. In a money crisis they turned to usurers, and paid as much as 50 percent monthly interest. How could Father Dan tend to men's souls, when their minds were tormented by debt and their bodies were in want?

Puno, moreover, was the typical neglected stepchild of the Latin American system that drains the wealth of the interior into the national capital and centralizes all government there. Did a street need paving? The petition had to go 500 miles and over two mountain ranges to Lima—there to gather dust on some ministry desk. Did the schools need benches? Money trickled down so slowly from Lima that children used rocks for school seats. Even if the people wanted to do something for themselves or their town, there was no capital to do it with.

Father Dan created that capital as food was created in the miracle of the loaves and fishes—almost out of nothing. To his parish house he called seven townsmen: two laborers, a judge, an office clerk, two doctors and an officer of the National Police.

"What our Puno people need," said Father Dan, "is lending money, working money." The faces before him grew long. This was not news.

"And I know where to get it."

The faces brightened.

"Look, let me show you." Father Dan took a copper sole (4 cents) from his pocket.

"By itself, in my pocket, this sole can't do much. But suppose 100 of us each put 5 soles into a savings pool, and did this every week for a year. See? The handful of soles would have grown to 26,000 soles, about $1,040. They would be transformed from idle money into working money—that could be lent out. And as the loans came back in monthly installments, the money's lending power would be multiplied. We could lend up to three times as much as we put in—some $3,000 in all."

It turned out that the padre had been staying up nights studying how to set up a credit union. Through such unions in Western Europe, the United States and elsewhere, he pointed out, some 15 million men and women have banded together in their factories, their offices, churches, villages, to save money together and to make loans to one another.

"But that's in rich Europe and richer America," Father Dan's listeners protested. "Will our suspicious villagers trust anyone with their few soles? Will they repay what they borrow?"

Father Dan talked down these doubts. Twenty-three Puneños put up 603 soles, about $24, to form a credit union. Today, after 6 years, it is the biggest in South America. In this bootstrap bank some 4,000 Puneños have accumulated an average $90 each, and from it $1,200,000 in loans has already flowed.

In the credit union Father Dan has found a quick way to raise living standards in an underdeveloped country and to give people hope until land reforms and industrialization come to the rescue. He has hit on a form of self-help assistance that lets the proud individual keep his pride, and that develops the managers and risktakers for a free, modern society. And, above all, he has taught the people to tackle their problems on a community level—a rare procedure in Latin America.

The Reverend Daniel McClellan looks out at the world with intense eyes set deep in a worn face. As a Denver highschool student who boxed and was an all-State football center, he dreamed of life as a missionary with adventures in faraway lands. But the biggest adventure of all he found in people.

As a seminary student at Maryknoll, in a New York City suburb, young McClellan would spend his free days in New York gymnasiums talking boxing with the bruisers training there and occasionally sparring with one. Or he would wangle his way backstage to make friends with Broadway figures, or would talk airplanes with fliers at a Long Island airport, where he learned to solo. When he was ordained, there was quite an assortment of well-wishers on hand, his sister recalls.

In Peru, to build his "banks with a heart," Father Dan needed his talent for people. One of the first borrowers to present himself at the Puno credit union was a ragged figure whose care-lined face and drooping shoulders spoke of the beaten man. His story, told in the Quechua tongue of his Inca ancestors, was a familiar one. He had borrowed 300 soles from a moneylender to bury his father. At 30 percent monthly interest, he had already repaid three times the amount of the loan; yet he was no nearer repaying the principal than when he first borrowed the money a year before.

With Father Dan the young credit union's loan committee—a secretary, a government clerk and a laborer—sized up the applicant. He had been among the first to join the union, painfully accumulating 30 soles of savings. His neighbors respected him. The committee granted the man a loan to repay the usurer. Now, instead of paying 360 percent yearly, he would repay at what amounted to an annual rate of 6 percent.

Mariano Cruz Rojas, an 18-year-old sheepherder, walked 9 miles in sandals made from old automobile tires to apply for a loan. In his frayed poncho, mended homespun pants, and speaking only in Aymara, he seemed just another illiterate Indian. But his eyes glowed with intelligence, and he had an idea. If he could borrow $25, he could buy onion seed and sell it to the people of his village. He got his loan.

In a month young Mariano was back. He had sold his seed and could repay his loan. Now he wanted to borrow $40 to buy more. When he returned to repay this second loan, he wore shoes. With subsequent appearances and repayments be sported a suit, then a shirt and a tie. Within a year he was applying for his loans in Spanish. He learned to read and write, and soon was teaching others in his village. Today, on loans from the credit union, Mariano Cruz Rojas has built a farm-supply business that employs two salesmen. But for the union he would still be a sheepherder.

News of Father Dan's credit union reached faraway Madison, Wis., home of the world organization, the Credit Union National Association (CUNA). CUNA was interested in spreading credit unions throughout Latin America and sent a full-time field specialist to Peru.

Father Dan, released from parish duties to devote all his efforts to credit unions, went to Lima. There he found the familiar Latin American contradiction of great wealth side by side with cruel poverty. Proud banks, grown great on the agricultural and mining wealth sucked into the capital, studded the center of the city. Skyscrapers and luxury apartments and a residential section of fine mansions gave it a modern air. Yet ringing all this, like a sullen army set for a siege, were some 35,000 of Lima's workers and lower-middle-class people—cabdrivers, market porters, waiters—encamped in rusted tin

shacks, many of them roofless, without water, without light and full of disease.

In this seemingly hopeless human jungle, among illiterate factory workers, handymen and laborers, Father Dan found the human material for credit-union treasurers and directors. Some members could save only one sole a week. Yet the small pools of capital helped cabdrivers repair their ancient cars without falling into the hands of loan sharks. Families borrowed to buy books and shoes and clothing for children when school opened.

Working outward from the wilderness of the slums, Father Dan spread credit unions among bank clerks, naval officers, newspaper reporters, lawyers. Fifteen young Lima business executives formed their own credit union in order to learn how to organize them among wage earners. A textile manufacturer formed a credit union among his employees so that they could borrow and buy shares in his business.

Communists fought the credit unions. They argued that workers who solved their money problems through self-help reduced pressure on the boss. When this argument failed, they tried to take over the unions—unsuccessfully.

As the credit unions grew, a national federation of them was organized. With money contributed by businessmen and by bankers who themselves provided no banking service to the people, Father Dan set up a federation office staffed by five devoted young Peruvians. One turned down a job with an American concern to work at lower pay for Father Dan. Another rejected a career in the United Nations.

Father Dan borrowed $1,500 from the Maryknoll Fathers, bought a car and started traveling to the far reaches of Peru's Andean highlands, coastal desert, and jungles to form credit unions, audit them, nurse them. He raised dust on some 55,000 miles of primitive roads in 2 years. What the car couldn't reach, an Amazon River boat or an airplane would.

He created a credit union training center at San Marcos University, in Lima, to which future administrators flocked. He journeyed to La Paz in Bolivia to form six pilot credit unions there. Venezuela paid part of the expenses of an inter-American credit union workshop at which Father Dan's staff gave most of the lectures.

By the end of 1960 Father Dan could count more than 200 credit unions in Peru, serving 40,000 families. New credit unions were rising at the rate of three a week. He had created a pool of consumer credit and growth capital that now rivals the resources of some of the big banks, and he dreams of a larger goal. If 1 million Peruvians were to save only 1 sol a day, there could be as much as $45 million of working money yearly—where none was before. And this could be achieved in other Latin American countries, too.

Puno today is an example of what can be done. The town got its first X-ray equipment when the credit union lent a doctor $3,000. It got its first modern dental equipment with such funds, and its first bus. The number of trucks and cars in Puno's streets has doubled. Topping all this, 700 construction loans made by the credit union meant that many families now for the first time have floors and indoor tapwater.

Not long ago, when the townsfolk of Puno honored Father Dan with a luncheon, a prominent Peruvian Communist freshly returned from an expense-free junket to Red China, urged the townsmen to "break with their cultural past" and look to communism as "the true road to progress."

In Father Dan's absence, a fellow Maryknoll missionary answered. "The Communists give us promises," he said, "but Father Dan has acted."

"It's the little guys all over the world who hold our fate in their hands," says Father Dan. "They spell the difference between the liberty we love and the life of slavery others would force on us."

What began as a one-man assistance program in a remote, mountain-locked town, has blossomed into a significant force in the cold war.

Now I Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I visited Camp Greentop recently and was much impressed by the remarkable experiment conducted by the Board of Education of Frederick County. The work at Camp Greentop is so well described in an article "Now I Know" in the Maryland Teacher, by Dr. Warren R. Evans, supervisor of health and physical education of Frederick County schools, that I am appending the text of the article:

NOW I KNOW

(By Dr. Warren R. Evans, supervisor of health and physical education, Frederick County schools)

"I liked being in the out of doors where I could learn more about nature. I learned that some plants are good to taste and smell. And that snakes are not slimy."

"Being on my own at camp was fun. It teaches you how to get away from parents for a while."

"I learned so many new things about plants and animals because I could see the real plants and animals. It isn't like looking the plant up in a book and reading what it says in the paragraph."

"I learned so many new things about nature that I could never begin to name them. When we went to Owens Creek and looked for insects, I was surprised when the teacher found the caddis fly and his home, because I had never seen one and I have wondered what they looked like, but now I know."

Perhaps the looks of a caddis fly and his home seem pretty unimportant to you, but who can say what unimportant-seeming detail may ignite that precious spark of intellectual curiosity in the eager and questing mind of a child? Who can evaluate the importance to his future development of that first heady experience in independence, when, "away from parents for a while" he discovers for himself that "snakes are not slimy?"

The quotations are taken from questionnaires filled out by sixth-grade youngsters in Frederick County following a week's participation in an outdoor education program, sponsored by the Frederick County Board of Education. Through this unique program, upper elementary grade children and their classroom teachers spend one school week at Camp Greentop in the Catoctin Mountain Park, near Thurmont.

This program has developed as a result of the writer's attending a Virginia State Workshop in Outdoor Education with Herbert Steiner, State Supervisor of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in September 1956. This workshop was one of several conducted by the Outdoor Education Project of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, a department of the National Education Association.

Dr. James Sensenbaugh, superintendent of schools, and Mrs. Louise Thompson, elementary supervisor, indicated interest and lent support when the idea of a school camping program was suggested to them in October of 1956.

The first planning committee meeting was held in December of that year, and great enthusiasm for the project was shown. It was decided to select two sixth grade classes for a pilot program during May of 1957. Two action committees grew out of this meeting, one to work on program and one to work on such administrative problems as food service, transportation, leadership, and housing. All State conservation agencies and the National Park Service indicated great interest and offered help in the development of the program.

The administrative committee arranged transportation, lined up the food service personnel, ordered needed equipment, made arrangements to have a nurse available at all times, reserved the camp facility for the last 2 weeks in May, and took care of many other administrative details. It was agreed that the facility, equipment, transportation, and instructional leadership be provided by the parents. The fee per pupil was set at $8 with provisions made in each school to provide PTA scholarships for children unable to pay the fee. It was agreed that every possible effort should be made to make sure no child was omitted from the program for financial reasons.

The program committee established the following general objectives:

1. To recognize the value of our natural resources and to learn to use them wisely.

2. To increase our emphasis on science education and to give every student a chance to develop increased interest and knowledge in several areas of science.

3. To make classroom learnings more meaningful through application of knowledge to practical outdoor situations.

4. To learn to live democratically with other children and with adults through experiences in outdoor living.

5. To develop skills and interests in outdoor recreation which will carry over into later life.

The two sixth grades chosen were from East Frederick and North Frederick elementary schools. The principal criterion for selection was the enthusiasm and outdoor experience of the teachers.

The program for these pilot groups included such activities as crafts, collection making, a hike to the Foxville fire tower, a field trip to the coal hearth and iron furnace, a forestry project on tree planting, tree identification, watershed protection, erosion control, and fire prevention, a hike to Chimney Rock, a hike to Cunningham Falls with a luncheon cookout, fly-, bait-, and spin-casting demonstrations, fishing, and a hike to Owens Creek. The evening programs included square dancing, campfire programs planned by the children, and an illustrated lecture on birds and snakes of the area by the park naturalist.

From this pilot experience it was decided that an experimental program would be run for the school year 1957–58, to gain experience, try different sized groups, try several grade levels, look for the solution to the problem of leadership, and to explore as many program areas as possible. One of the principles agreed upon was that all participating teachers would be volunteers during this year, and that no teacher would be required to participate who might feel insecure in this type of situation.

During the summer of 1957, Janice Wickless, sixth grade teacher at North Frederick Elementary School, Thomas Fogle, a teacher of elementary physical education, and I, spent three weeks at the Gull Lake Biological Station of Michigan State University attending a workshop in outdoor education.

Leaders in outdoor education and school camping from 21 different States attended this workshop. This gave us a wonderful chance to discuss problems with experienced people and to visit several school camp facilities in Michigan. During and since this summer workshop, a "Guide for Teachers" has been developed for the use of teachers participating in the program.

During the fall of 1957 there were 8 classroom groups, including slightly more than 300 children, taking part in the program from September 23 to October 18. Jack Bubrick, a former teacher of physical education in Carroll County with a great deal of camp experience, was hired as camp director, and the three visiting teachers of elementary physical education were assigned to the outdoor school staff for the fall season. Frostburg State Teachers College cooperated in the development of a program by having their student teachers spend a week as cabin leaders at the camp as part of their student teaching requirement.

The program for the spring of 1958 calls for having 24 classroom groups attend the outdoor school between April 14 and June 6. In preparation for this camp session, in addition to the teachers guide, there is a detailed program supplement called the "Activity Program." This will include specific educational objectives in the areas of social living, health, work activities, outdoor recreation, nature interpretation and conservation, and related educational activities in such fields as math, science, social studies, language arts, music, art, dramatics, shop, and homemaking.

Also included will be detailed material on the camp program, a description of and suggestions for preparation for each activity and a section on evaluation. As part of the evaluation program, each class is scheduled for an evaluation session after supper each evening which is followed by a report to the entire camp group on the activities of the day.

Our long-range plans now call for all sixth grade groups in the county to participate in the program starting in the fall of 1958. This means that all sixth grade teachers in Frederick County will be expected to take part in the program next year. Because of the high percentage of teachers who are eager to participate in the project, this has not been nearly as great a problem as was anticipated.

Here are some principles which we felt to be especially important in relation to this program:

1. Emphasis is educational rather than recreational.

2. The program is a part of the regular school curriculum and the classroom teacher is the key to its effectiveness.

3. The camp activity program should not include things which can be done just as well in the classroom.

4. As much pupil-teacher planning as possible should be carried on.

5. Children learn best by doing.

6. Camping experience is highly motivating for children and this fact should be exploited.

Frederick County feels that this program has great educational potential, and that such things as conservation of natural resources, the natural sciences, democratic living, and the wholesome use of leisure can be taught most effectively in an outdoor setting such as that provided at the Frederick County Outdoor School. The great need to conserve natural resources, increased leisure, and the obvious need to increase emphasis on science education give educational implications of great significance to a project of this kind.

As for the children themselves, about whom all this activity revolves, how do they feel about it? They like it. One liked it because he "learned how to make my bed better and how to get along without my parents." Another "learned to eat foods I usually don't eat at home." Still another liked "having to wash when I want to," while the most encouraging comment came in answer to the question, "What did you like least about your camping experience?" The answer, "There was no least."

Needed: A National Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion lately concerning the will and the determination of this country to employ its military strength in defense of freedom. In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of Members of Congress a letter from President Kennedy to the president of the Air Force Association, which was read to the delegates at the AFA convention in Philadelphia on September 22, and the statement of policy adopted by the association at the convention.

I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A NATIONAL ALERT

(NOTE.—Following is the full text of the Air Force Association's 1961–62 statement of policy, as adopted by delegates to AFA's 15th annual convention, in Philadelphia, Pa., September 21, 1961.)

In this, our 15th anniversary year, with the Nation in grave peril, we respectfully acknowledge the heavy responsibility that weighs upon our new Commander in Chief—a burden that is his alone. And we are well aware that it is far easier to advise than to decide.

Nevertheless, we would be remiss in our duty as Americans were we not to state, particularly at this time, our deeply held beliefs, our aims, and our objectives. We offer them here, together with our pledge of personal effort and sacrifice to achieve them, in this 1961 statement of policy of the Air Force Association.

POWER EQUATION

If the record of 40 years of oppression, aggression, deceit, and duplicity had not already done so, events of the past several weeks have made it abundantly clear that the Soviet system—regardless of what form it may take at any given time in any given part of the world—is incompatible with the existence of freedom.

The cloak of coexistence no longer conceals Soviet aims. Communist intent and Communist power stand naked before the world. We must face the Soviet system with the only force it understands and respects—even stronger power, accompanied by the avowed determination to use this power if and when it is needed.

FREEDOM OR COMMUNISM

Mankind cannot exist indefinitely in a world that remains half slave and half free. Preservation of the status quo is not adequate as a national goal. Freedom must bury communism or be buried by communism.

Complete eradication of the Soviet system must be our national goal—our obligation to all free people—our promise of hope to all who are not free.

NATIONAL ALERT

To attain the level of national power needed in this crusade, the energies and talents of the American people must be mobilized on new terms. We therefore petition the President to declare a national alert—a new and higher level of national effort.

Such a declaration would establish a basis on which to build and maintain the power we need. It would make clear to the Soviets and to the world that we are determined to back our words with action, even at the risk of war—that we seek not merely to preserve our freedoms but to extend them.

A CREDIBLE DETERRENT

The overriding priority of the day must be the unquestioned credibility of our nuclear deterrent. This credibility has been undermined by Soviet confidence in its own rising strength and by Soviet belief that the United States is unwilling to engage in nuclear war in behalf of freedom.

MILITARY PROGRAMS

A credible deterrent will require accelerated military programs now and in the future. We consider the following to be basic:

Greater survivability for our striking forces.

Airborne alert for a substantial portion of the Strategic Air Command.

Expansion of our manned bomber programs, including rapid development and production of the B–70 as a high-priority weapon system.

Acceleration of our strategic missile programs in terms of numbers and effectiveness.

Improved intelligence and reconnaissance systems, both aeronautical and spaceborne, to obtain more information on Soviet capabilities and intentions, and to guard against suprise nuclear attack.

Greater reliability and survivability of the national command and control system, to reduce the chances of war by error, and to insure immediate, effective, and sustained employment of our forces.

Equipping of our aerospace defense system to counter the full spectrum of the Soviet aerospace threat as evidenced by Soviet progress in supersonic bombers, missiles, and manned spaceborne systems.

Increase of our ability to deter or promptly prevail in situations short of general war.

Accelerated research and development efforts to attain and maintain technological superiority in areas of our choice.

NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM

Currently, our national space program gives priority to nonmilitary applications. It fails to recognize the important contributions that space systems must make to the extension of our military capability. This faulty emphasis must be reversed to utilize U.S. space technology as a prime factor in the international power equation. All phases of the national space program must first be measured against the yardstick of national security needs.

NUCLEAR EMPLOYMENT

National policy must make it abundantly clear that the United States will not hesitate to employ its nuclear strength in response to Soviet aggression—whether that aggression takes the form of nuclear attack, nonnuclear attack, nuclear blackmail, aggression by Soviet satellite nations, infiltration, or subversion—should the military situation dictate that use of nuclear weapons is in the best interest of the United States.

National policy must prescribe that the choice between nuclear and nonnuclear weapons is neither moral nor political but is essentially a military consideration. If this principle is not recognized as national

policy and firmly enunciated to the world, we are seriously compromising the effectiveness of our nucelai arsenal and thus increasing the danger of general conflict.

SURVIVAL OF THE PEOPLE

The national alert program must also insure the survival of the majority of the American people and the survival of viable government machinery in the event of general war. Needed measures include protection of individuals, military, and civilian, against blast, heat, and radiation—including fallout. They must provide for reestablishment of the national social and economic fabric following a general war.

THE ONLY INSURANCE

The ability to fight, win, and purposefully survive a general nuclear war provides the best, indeed the only, insurance against such an eventuality. We must be willing and able to risk war, and make sure that both our willingness and ability are firmly implanted in the minds of the Soviet leaders. Only from such a position can we then apply economic, diplomatic, technological, and other pressures against the Soviets.

To those who say that today such a position cannot be sustained, that deterrent credibility cannot be achieved, that it deteriorates into a stalemate of bluff—to these arguments we reply: "Your stalemate philosophy is a philosophy of despair and defeat. Its acceptance by the United States would, in itself, break the stalemate in a psychological sense—and in favor of the Soviets. World leadership would automatically revert to the loudest rocket rattler. Initiative would pass to the aggressor."

The President has said, "We must never negotiate through fear. But we must never fear to negotiate." In turn, we must never fear to refuse to negotiate that which is not negotiable. We must never compromise basic principles. We must never appease.

TECHNOLOGICAL REALITIES

The stalemate philosophy ignores the realities of technological progress. The advent of nuclear weapons has changed the international power equation. But technology also can wipe out equations and write new ones. It has done so in the past.

There is no reason to believe that nuclear weapons, no matter how they may increase in numbers and ferocity, mark the end of the line in military systems development. New weapons, more selective in application and less destructive of life and property, may come into being. Their possession by one side and not the other could surely break a nuclear stalemate in a dramatic fashion. Thus, the search for new and advanced systems must have a high priority in our military research and development effort.

THE PEOPLE ARE READY

We believe that events in this fall of 1961 have convinced the American people, if any were unconvinced before, that Soviet aims are both evil and implacable. We believe the people are willing and eager to respond to whatever level of effort may be required of them, if the need is made truly clear. We are convinced that the people are ready to work toward, and fight for if necessary, the elimination of communism from the world scene.

Let the issue be joined.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE TO AFA

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1961.*

DEAR MR. STACK: While it will not be possible for me to be present, please convey my warm greetings to all attending the 15th annual convention of the Air Force Association, and assure them of my deep interest in the proceedings. The subjects under discussion are of major significance in helping to safeguard our ideals and way of life in this age of international tension and change.

I know that many members of the association, veterans of earlier service to our country, meet this year in the full knowledge that their services may be required again. I am confident that, if the need should arise, they will respond in the same spirit of devotion to national security and international justice that has moved the Air Force Association since its inception a decade and a half ago as a citizens' organization dedicated to adequate airpower as a necessary adjunct to world peace and national survival.

In the years that have passed since your founding, airpower has become aerospace power and both its capabilities and responsibilities have taken a quantum jump. Technology has shrunk the world while the ferocity of modern weapons have multiplied manifold. The forces of nature, unleashed by scientific progress, unfortunately know no ideology. They serve those who would enslave the world as well as those who would make it free.

Thus we face, in the short run and the long, a wide range of military and diplomatic challenges by a strong and determined adversary. We must be prepared to respond to these challenges across a wide spectrum of military capability, taking full advantage of the flexibility and effectiveness of modern weaponry to deter aggression, but also, if necessary, to fight and win against it. In this great effort our Air Force will, as it has in the past, play a vital role.

This is the basis of our military doctrine in a difficult decade and I welcome the continued support of the Air Force Association in the strengthening of the forces required to achieve it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Let's Back Fight for Freedom in Red Area, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, U.S. Army, retired, former U.S. Commander in Chief of Military Government in Berlin during the 1948–49 blockade, was one of the several remarkably able commanders who has represented the United States in Berlin. During his Berlin tour of duty, Brigadier General Howley spent some 1,600 hours with the Russians at the conference table. The record shows that he won from them some 1,300 agreements on matters ranging from dog licenses to the establishment of a central bank.

General Howley's formula for success in dealing with the Communists was stated in these words:

Recognize that Communists are liars and swindlers and cutthroats, and treat them as such.

Mr. President, because of his unique qualifications, I believe we should all pay attention when General Howley speaks about the problem of Berlin. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an article by Brigadier General Howley which is every whit as pertinent today as it was on its date of publication, August 18, 1961, in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN ON SPOT IN 1948 BERLIN CRISIS SAYS: "LET'S BACK FIGHT FOR FREEDOM IN RED AREA TOO"

(By Frank Howley, vice president, New York University; former head of American Military Government in Berlin)

Here we go again. This time it is Berlin—but this is only part of the same old operation which has been clobbering us from one end of the world to the other. If anyone has any doubt that our defensive policy against Soviet machinations has failed, this is another proof.

We simply cannot survive on a basis of defending ourselves against Soviet attacks in places of their choice and at times of their selection.

What is happening in Berlin now is a repetition of what happened in Berlin when I was there in 1947, leading up to the blockade of Berlin in 1948. The main difference is that the Soviets, having succeeded then in blockading Berlin, have had 12 years of continued success against us in other parts of the world. They are being swept along by their repeated victories over us.

In Berlin right now they have simply shifted from the diplomatic to the physical. Khrushchev found that at the United Nations he could not have his way even after his rude behavior. The United Nations continues with the same President. Khrushchev found that by negotiation, he was not succeeding in the disarmament conferences because we would not throw away our security. He found that the atomic testing discussions were not giving him what he wanted.

So, he shifts his emphasis from negotiation to physical efforts to gain control of Berlin. He fully expects to succeed as he has succeeded in the past.

REDS LOST, BUT WON

It must be remembered that the hunger blockade imposed upon the people of Berlin in 1948–1949 was, from the Soviet point of view, though not a total success, still a success.

We were the ones who lost 72 lives. We were the ones who spent a billion dollars, and ended up with the Soviets holding complete control of one-third of the city of Berlin, despite the international agreements which had specified that the city be administered as a whole by all four powers.

This third of the city, now controlled ruthlessly by the Soviets—now harasses the other two-thirds.

In Berlin now comes, as it has in other places, first, propaganda; then, step by step, the use of force against the people. The Communists will try not to give the Western powers sufficient basis for an all-out effort against them. That will only come from miscalculation, if it comes at all.

On the propaganda front it is Khrushchev who is screaming that Berlin is a bone in his throat. It is we who should have been screaming, during the past years, that the Soviet troops and the Soviet Communist stooges, imposed upon East Berlin and East Germany, constitute an outrageous violation of solemn agreements.

I anticipate that next harassment of Germans will come by way of shipping clearance papers. A few years ago we permitted the Soviets to compel the use of such papers. All trucking being shipped in and out of Berlin must receive these clearance papers from the nonrecognized East German government.

When this power to control German traffic in and out of the highways, railroads and canals was put into effect by the So-

viets, I reported to higher authority that this would be the means of the next blockade of Berlin—a subtle blockade.

THEY HOLD WEAPONS

It still can be done. The economic miracle of West Berlin can be brought down to a crawling economy of unemployment, if the East German Government adopts the simple policy of delaying the approval of these clearance papers. Without them no truck, barge, or train of the West Berliners can move in or out of the city.

I believe that the Communist stooge government of East Berlin and East Germany will not blockade the Western exit and entrance; or at least will not block the Western Powers from access to and from the city. Instead they will hurt the Berliners while giving us no excuse for major retaliation. They will continue, however, to nip away our rights until we have few or no rights left in the city. This is the pattern they have employed in Berlin in the past, and all over the world against us.

From our point of view there is no answer to the Berlin question short of the answer to the German question.

The Russians must be made to live up to their agreement to hold free elections in East Germany as well as West Germany. These elections must be under supervision and be based on a constitution for the entire country. Such elections must be free, otherwise they can be simply a means of turning over the entire country to Communist control. The U.S.S.R. agreed at Potsdam in 1945 to such elections. They have never lived up to their word.

There is a real danger that, in our desire to negotiate, we will forget basic principles and agree to some makeshift arrangement that will be entirely favorable to the future control of Germany by the Communists.

PERILOUS BARGAIN

The Soviets would probably be willing to consider a common government for all of Germany with Berlin as its capital, if we would permit them to run their own elections in Communist-controlled East Berlin and East Germany—elections which would be handled without any outside supervision.

This would mean 100-percent representation by Communists for East Germany. Despite the difference in population of 16 million in East Germany under Soviet control, and close to 50 million in the Western areas, the Soviets probably would demand equal representation in the common congress for all of Germany.

They might settle for one-third control of all of Germany—providing they could continue to control completely their Eastern Zone of Germany. This would give them a representation in the German Government; a representation greater than they had in Czechoslovakia when they successfully overthrew the legitimate Government by making use of their one-third control.

If we agree to this, the Soviets will use East Germany as a weapon to beat us out of the rest of Germany. We set the precedent for such an idea by going to Paris after the blockade of Berlin was lifted and agreeing to a status quo which meant that the Soviets would take out of common control one-third of the city of Berlin. At that time the Soviets tried to reestablish their share of control over the two-thirds of Berlin, occupied by Britain, France, and the United States. I blocked this move.

JUST STEP 1

The steps being taken now by the Communist East German Government in blocking the accesses to West Berlin are, at present, applied only to Germans of East Germany and of East Berlin. This is step 1. Before the blockade of 1948, step 1 was to interfere with the comparatively small traffic of the United States, Britain, and France from Berlin to the West. A month or so after we meekly allowed them to do this, they imposed on the 2.5 million Germans of West Berlin the total hunger blockade which is so well known to all of us.

In dealing with the Soviets it is not enough to carry a big stick and speak quietly. We must carry a big stick and roar. The Soviets understand no other language. The British habit of quiet understatement is a real danger in dealing with the Soviets. Soviets are loudmouths. They scream. They understand the same language in reply. A gentle answer misleads them as to our determination.

The great danger today in dealing with the Soviets is the danger that they will overestimate their power and their ability to get away with another crime. They have good reason to believe they can get away with crimes against us. They successfully got away with the Berlin blockade and even when defeated by our airlift, ended up with more control than they had before.

After we had gone with Mr. Jessup to Paris and agreed to the lifting of the blockade on the basis of "let bygones be bygones," I reported publicly that, the Soviets having successfully gotten away with this crime against humanity would try again to gain by force that which they were unable to gain politically.

The next try was Korea where the Soviets almost succeeded in gaining complete control of the entire country. As it was they ended up with control of half of the country.

WORLDWIDE PLAN

From Korea the Soviets moved to Indochina where they provoked a civil war and had their Chinese Communist allies support the destruction of our friends in Indochina. Finally they settled for half of the country, now known as North Vietnam, from which they are even now harassing South Vietnam and are causing trouble in the neighboring country of Laos, ably supported by supplies (including guns) dropped from Russian planes.

The Soviet plan in the former Belgian Congo went astray. The Soviets, even though their stooge Lumumba is dead, have now got a very good representative in Gizenga and have control of the Stanleyville area, plus a big representation in the present chaotic government at Leopoldville. So, the Communists are making progress.

Next on their agenda is Portuguese Angola, south of the Congo River.

I have just returned from Angola where I found the Portuguese doing more for the poor people of Angola than most of the countries which have voted at U.N. to criticize Portugal's colonial policy.

WE DON'T LEARN

It's pointless to go on with the pros and cons in the many things which have been discussed and tried. We never seem to learn. We learned nothing from Laos, Indochina, nor from past Berlin experience. Being goodhearted, we have become the international boobs of all time.

It's high time that our Government, whether Republican or Democrat, begins to think in terms of the interest of the American people and begins to think in terms of reality. Work that can be done better by missionaries should be done by missionaries, not attempted by hypocritical politicians. International work that can be done better by private enterprise should be done by private industry. The international gangster operations of the Soviets should be called that and should be recognized as such.

We should stop misleading our own youth by giving respect to the Soviets; respect which they derive from international bodies devoted to truth and peace. For the Soviets to participate in the United Nations or for us to even consider the entrance of Red China is to deny the very foundation upon which the United Nations is built.

WOULD BACK REVOLTS

It's high time we indicate a belief in freedom. We are the ones who should be supporting revolutions all over the world—revolutions against tyranny and slavery, and not against only our friends. The best place to start is in Berlin and Germany—right now. After that, can come Hungary, the Balkans, and the Baltic nations. Yet, when the freedom fighters of Hungary rose up and set up their own government we couldn't deny them fast enough; we couldn't assure the Soviets quickly enough that we had no hand in the revolution.

Let's, in the future, support these revolutions and encourage them publicly. Let us encourage them to fight for their freedom. There is no better place to start where people are willing to fight for their freedom, than in Berlin and in Germany—right now.

That the Soviets recognize this is indicated by their transfer of their Communist Marshal Konev to command the troops there.

This command shift is not to be against the West, though full propaganda is made of that idea. It is to put down an anticipated uprising of the German people against their slavery. If it does happen again, let's help these people to fight Soviet tanks and the Communist rulers with something other than stones which is what they had last time.

Let's, for a while, stop giving the smile technique to the enemy. Let's stop promising him that we won't hit him—we've paid a high price for our spirits of Camp David and for our spirits of Geneva. Thanks to our assuring the Soviets that under no circumstances will we fight, they have been able to concentrate not on building bases all over the world to defend themselves, but upon gaining great advantage by sending men into space. Meanwhile, we have had to defend ourselves at costs of billions of dollars against a possible attack from the Soviet Union. Let's let them be a little uncertain for a while as to our intention—let's have them spend some real money and effort on defense. We can outlast them if we run by the same rules.

President Kennedy has made a step in the right direction. At least he is speaking with a firmness which represents the American people. Let's pray that our actions continue to be as firm as our words.

What To Do About Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in This Week magazine of September 17, I wrote an article entitled "What to Do About Red China." It outlined the reasons why our policy as a nation should be one of opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations. And it went further and suggested that if the admission of Red China is ever voted by the United Nations the United States should suspend its political and financial support of the U.N. Since publication of the article, I am advised that This Week magazine has received over 100,000 communications from readers supporting my contention that Red China should be kept out of the world organization. I ask unanimous consent that the article

from This Week magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT TO DO ABOUT RED CHINA

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

(As the U.N. again weighs the admission of Red China, millions of words will fill the General Assembly. This Senator believes the best U.S. policy can be put into just two words—"Say No.")

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In the affairs of nations, the time inevitably comes to take strong action. Such a time is here. The Communists are moving on many fronts, among them the United Nations.

The Communist strategy is to undermine our position in the Far East by insinuating Red China into the United Nations. Supporters of that maneuver tell us they have the votes in the United Nations General Assembly to do it, that in the next week or two Red China will have been afforded a seat.

Now is the time for us to act, and my proposal is that the United States declare that if the United Nations votes to admit Red China, our Government will, from that moment until the action is revoked, suspend its political and financial support of the United Nations.

NO PEACE WITHOUT LIBERTY

Let us never forget that we support the United Nations not because it is an international organization—but because the United Nations was created to serve great human ends. Those ends are liberty and peace. We do not want peace if, to have it, we must forego our liberty. And our liberty is imperiled if we cannot have peace. If free China's base in the Far East were undermined, the United Nations would also be an instrument for undermining liberty. It would endanger world peace if the anti-Communist alliance were to be weakened, thus encouraging the Communists in their aggressiveness. In these events, the United Nations would not be supporting the aims it was conceived to support.

It follows that, in the interest of the very goals the United Ntaions was designed to serve, the United States must use every pressure at its disposal to redirect the United Nations back to the great aims stated in its charter. The procedures of the United Nations are no substitute for our own policy.

Our policy is to preserve our freedom. The United Nations helps or hinders that policy according to the decisions it makes. If it makes decisions that militate against its own original purpose, it is no longer useful.

It is objected: But what if every nation decided to boycott the United Nations every time the General Assembly took a move of which it disapproved? Wouldn't that mean the end of the United Nations? The answer is this, and let us not avoid stating it simply: The United States is not just every nation.

Providence has imposed upon us the task of leading the free world's fight to stay free. Ours are the principal decisions to make, and we must make them with reference to the enduring interests of the free world, even if they are not so recognized by all members of the free world. There would not tomorrow be a free country in the world if the United States were to lose its independence of action in this time of crisis.

Only by exercising that independence of action, even in so drastic a way as I now propose, do we continue to discharge our duty as leader and most powerful member of the free community of nations. By refusing to use the resources at our disposal, we forfeit our strength, and weaken our cause.

The Soviet Union often talks about boycotting the United Nations. In fact, it has not done so—but would freely do so exactly at that moment when withdrawal could be shown to advance the fortunes of the Soviet revolution. It is every nation's sovereign right to withdraw from an international body. But the point is to exercise that right, not as the Soviet Union might, but as a nation must if its vital interests are at stake.

THE USES OF POWER

The United States should never use its power cynically, or triflingly. We must never use the United Nations for any petty nationalistic enterprise. We do not seek to transform the United Nations into the servant of our frivolous national interest. We are willing to abide by majority votes on matters that do not involve the national security or the impoverishment of a vital ally But when the United Nations by a majority vote seriously weakens the international structure of our resistance, as would be done if the Republic of China's claim to the legitimate governorship of mainland China were undermined, we cannot afford to acquiesce simply out of a regard for the United Nations bylaws. This is the moment where policy must transcend mere parliamentary procedure.

Fortunately, it is inconceivable that the United Nations would admit Red China if the United States took an unrelenting policy of opposition. We have taken such a policy in the past and year after year, Red China lost her bid to batter her way in. Why is the situation different this year from last? What has changed?

Has Red China become more civilized? The evidence to the contrary is striking—reports from the mainland are of the worst misery from starvation and repression in the entire history of China.

Has Red China become so strong now that we cannot afford to exclude her? The columnist Joseph Alsop, a close student of Far Eastern developments, reports, and in this others concur, that the Government of Red China may be in a more difficult position now than at any time in its 12-year history. This is precisely because of the costly and tragic blunders of the lustful ideologists who have so wrecked the nation's economy and morale.

Is opposition to Red China weaker in the Far East now than last year? On the contrary it is stronger. The swarm of refugees from Red China have carried the word of misery under Communist totalitarianism to every corner of Asia. By contrast, Formosa's economy is thriving. Land redistribution has brought a wide ownership of property. The morale of its armed forces is at an all-time high.

Why, then, should we be worrying this year about the outcome of the forthcoming debate? In part it is because of the admission over the past year of a dozen or so African nations whose foreign policy is oriented toward Moscow's, owing to a residual bitterness against the colonialist policies of the West, and other factors. But if we are deeply convinced of the soundness of our Far Eastern policy, are we prepared to allow a dozen African states to change the course of foreign affairs?

If we were truly resolved to have our way on China, we could, of course, win the votes of the African states. We could approach them in terms they understand. And we could show them that the greatest colonialism ever effected, anywhere, is that of communism in China. If the President's team worked as hard to get the votes of the African members as it worked to get the votes of the Democratic delegates in Los Angeles, we could sit back secure in our conviction that the Communists will not prevail in the United Nations.

The important change of the past year, obviously, has been the weakness of the present administration in the field of foreign affairs—whether in Cuba, in Laos, in Outer Mongolia, or in the United Nations. Instead of showing resolution, what has our Government done? Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, said in January that it was perhaps "inevitable" that Red China should be recognized. Many of the men who surround the President have long been accused of policies of appeasement toward Red China.

A TRIAL BALLOON

In June the White House floated a trial balloon in the New York Times, suggesting that we were prepared to offer a seat to Red China—because we were confident she would refuse it unless we simultaneously ejected the government of Nationalist China. And this, clearly, we were not prepared to do. The effect of that maneuver was to go a long way in collapsing the entire edifice of arguments, strategic, and moral, by which over the years the Government had painstakingly constructed the absolute case against admitting Red China under any circumstances.

In July a second trial balloon was floated to the effect that by recognizing Outer Mongolia our Government hoped to appease the forces clamoring for recognition of Red China.

Such a policy of appeasement and militant indecisiveness has thrown despair into the ranks of our closest allies. Our friends no longer know just exactly what the intentions of the United State are. It is on such confusion and indecision that communism thrives.

But the situation is not irreparable, and there is evidence in the past few weeks that the back of the United States is stiffening. It is not too late. The answer to the forces of appeasement in the United Nations in the forthcoming debate is a simple one. It can be expressed in just two words of one syllable each: Say no. We cannot cooperate in a venture of self-destruction.

The United States has—right now—the power to prevent the United Nations from becoming an instrument of Soviet foreign policy. We are the guardians of the ideals which the United Nations was formed to serve. A loyalty to those ideals requires that we work to save the United Nations by refusing to cooperate with it for so long as it betrays those ideals.

The true friends of international peace and freedom everywhere, including millions upon millions of Asiatics, will look upon us with gratitude and confidence if we will just say no—and prove we mean it.

Problems of Small Retail Grocers in Mountain Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, during the last session the Senate passed S. 1037, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural products.

I had informed the Democratic policy committee that I had an interest in this bill and I hoped to be on the floor at the time it would be called up for action. Unfortunately, it was motioned up toward the end of the session and passed without debate. I had intended to make a few remarks on the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act at that time.

Happily, certain objectionable features of the original proposed legislation

were removed in the Agriculture Committee.

However, it seems that further study of the PACA is justified in view of certain unusual conditions affecting small independent retail grocers in the Rocky Mountain West.

Retail grocers who are isolated in small mountain towns in Colorado, far from their wholesale sources, are discriminated against under the regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture under the PACA. The regulations affect mountain-town grocers in a manner not affecting their bigger brothers in the large cities of the West where wholesale supplies are warehoused within a few miles.

I asked the Associated Grocers of Colorado to explain in a memorandum exactly how the PACA regulations discriminate against the smalltown retail grocer. I intend to present this memorandum to the House Agriculture Committee in hearings next year.

In the meantime, Mr. President, so that other western Senators may have an opportunity to become acquainted with this problem of the smalltown retail grocer, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, prepared by Mr. Richard Means, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY RICHARD MEANS, ASSOCIATED GROCERS OF COLORADO

The Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act supervised by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is a matter which has given us great and continued concern.

The law itself refers to different categories of business including commissioned merchants, wholesalers, etc., but the only classification which concerns the independent merchant is that of "dealer" as described in paragraph 6. The term "dealer" means any person engaged in the business of buying or selling in carloads, any perishable agricultural commodity in interstate or foreign commerce, except that (A) * * * (B) "no person buying any such commodity solely for sale at retail shall be considered as a 'dealer' in respect of any such commodity in any calendar year, unless his purchase of such commodity in carloads in such year are in excess of 20."

The title of the act, is important: "An act to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate commerce * * *."

The Secretary of Agriculture, through his service and regulatory announcement No. 121, has attempted to change the law by regulation No. 46–2(n):

"Wholesale or jobbing quantities" as used in section 1(6) of the act, means quantities of produce of not less than 1 ton in weight per day * * *."

The application blank forwarded to independent retail grocers on page 4 thereof entitled "Licensing Provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended":

"3. 'Dealer' is defined to include:

"(a) * * *.

"(b) 'Retailers' (selling to consumers only), when they purchase fresh or frozen fruits and/or vegetables in quantities aggregating a ton or more during any day, or single transactions totaling a ton or more in the course of interstate or foreign commerce, and have such transactions in excess of 20 times during a calendar year."

We have always contended that the Secretary of Agriculture did not have the right to adopt a regulation and thereby change a law passed by the Congress.

Our interpretation of paragraph (8) of the act convinces us that the purchase of a carload lot of produce by Associated Grocers and by it distributed to its member retail food merchants, with its own trucks, should and does thereby eliminate the retailer from being required to take a license under the act. The transits in interstate commerce are ended when such food products are bought and paid for by Associated Grocers.

Recently, the National Association of Retail Grocers, through its general counsel, Henry Bison, Jr., and National Food Brokers Association through its president, Watson Rogers, have suggested to the Senate Agriculture Committee that the PACA be amended to carry a provision exempting food retailers who buy 90 percent or more of their fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables from one or more wholesalers who are licensed under this law.

The PACA was passed by the Congress, not for the purpose of including retailers who sell to consumers but, for the express purpose of protecting shippers, sellers and, of course, buyers, who sell in carload lots in interstate commerce.

The independent grocer in Colorado does not buy and hold any carload lots because he is not equipped to handle produce in carloads such as a 60,000-pound (30 tons) refrigerated rail car. The ordinary retailer buys from a wholesaler, but there is no question but what the wholesaler must apply for and pay the fee for a PACA license.

Associated Grocers of Colorado, with a membership of retail grocers within the State numbering in excess of 500, supplies produce to those independent merchants. We pay a license fee because we buy in carload lots. We act as a wholesaler and have privity of contract with a shipper, producer, or seller.

The independent retail store has no privity of contract with the producer or shipper because he buys directly from us. If he found bad merchandise or had any other objection relative to the purchase of perishable commodities, his recourse would be to Associated Grocers because he could not claim against the producer, the shipper, or other business who might sell to Associated Grocers. Therefore, he has no benefit from the law and no need for it.

For these reasons, every retail food merchant within the State of Colorado who does not buy in carload lots or who would buy 90 percent or more of his requirements from a wholesaler who is licensed under the law, should be exempt from the provisions of the regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture and should not be required to pay a $25 annual fee.

Shooting From the Hip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on September 8 I made a speech on the floor of the Senate in rebuttal to an address delivered by Dr. Ralph K. White, Chief of the Soviet Bloc Division of USIA's Office of Research and Analysis.

On September 15 the Washington Post printed an editorial critical of my speech and on September 16, the Post printed my answer to the editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial and my reply be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1961]

SHOOTING FROM THE HIP

After a succession of fumbling and amateur efforts to impersonate the late Joe McCarthy, Senator THOMAS J. DODD has at last achieved success. Last Friday he called for a congressional investigation of the U.S. Information Agency and asked it to dismiss forthwith Ralph K. White, one of its Russian affairs specialists—all because Dr. White had expressed in a speech to the American Psychological Association some provocative ideas about the Soviet Union of which the Senator did not wholly approve.

Dr. White's principal thesis was that there exists a "mirror-image" relationship between Soviet thinking and American thinking—a relationship in which there are striking similarities except that, "what was black and white in the American image system is white and black in the Soviet image system, just as, in a mirror, what was left and right appears as right and left. He thinks that the misconceptions on either side constitute a danger and he urged his fellow psychologists to cultivate an attitude, "best characterized as tough-minded empathy, or empathic tough mindedness—not a sneaking sympathy for the Communist cause but a realistic, imaginative understanding of how the whole world looks from a Communist point of view, as a preliminary to a critical dissection of that point of view.

Now, one may agree or disagree with this diagnosis. But surely it reflects an opinion clearly within the range of Dr. White's professional competence, clearly consistent with the aims of the Agency in which he holds a responsible position and clearly reflective of devotion to the interests of the United States. Why, then, should Senator DODD denounce it in so unbridled a way and say that if USIA leaders share White's approach, "this entire agency must be either cleaned up or dismantled."

We suggest a possible explanation—that the Senator never saw the speech itself but shot from the hip on hearing or reading an account of it. We rather think that if the Senator were to read the speech in its entirety with some care, he would find very little fault with it. For, in sober truth, it is an honest attempt to provide a measure of that realism which, as Dr. White says, we desperately need "if we are to win either our ideological battle against communism or the joint battle that we and the Communists are waging against mutual suicide."

In his illuminating study of the relations between Russia and the West under Lenin and Stalin, George Kennan concludes that the misunderstandings and errors of judgment at the end of World War I resulted in large part from "the inadequacy of the information at the disposal of the allied governments." He offered an astringent observation:

"Sometimes I think it might be made a maxim of democratic statesmanship in difficult situations to seek its information, however distasteful this might be, from the study of its enemies rather than from the consultation of its friends."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1961]

SHOOTING FROM THE HIP

Your editorial of September 15 is a further example of the continued indulgence by the Washington Post in what it likes to call McCarthyism when practiced by others.

My Senate speech about the recent address of Dr. Ralph K. White, Chief of the Soviet Bloc Division of USIA's Office of Research and Analysis, referred to a dozen or more specific statements of Dr. White and made specific criticisms of those statements. The Washington Post ignores all this and picks out a rather routine and noncontroversial thesis of Dr. White's, pretending that this was the object of my critique.

Few will argue with Dr. White's contention that we must try to gain "a realistic, imaginative understanding of how the world looks from a Communist point of view." While this idea may seem novel and exciting to Dr. White and your paper, it is basic to anyone who concerns himself with the cold war. What I did object to in Dr. White's speech, I spelled out clearly; and since your editorial chose to ignore these specific criticisms, I shall restate them now.

Dr. White contends that Soviet aggression in Berlin and around the world originates partly in defensive fear and in a sincere desire to stabilize the cold war conflict; that we are too inclined to look upon Communist leaders as villains; that we overestimate their evil; that we should not dismiss the words of Soviet leaders as lies because most of the time "what they say is close to what they really think."

White leaves a clear implication that differences in the relative moral standing between Soviet Russia and the United States are only of degree and he lists our U–2 flights and our attempt to help Cuban freedom fighters as proofs that we are not unlike the Reds. And throughout his remarks, he indicates that the Russian people have the same basic outlook and attitude as their Communist leaders.

If these views were the speculations of some obscure academician talking to his fellows, they would still be subject to the give and take of criticism. But when they come from the man who is charged with advising the USIA on the best means of bringing the American message to the world with respect to the Soviet Union, then this is a matter which calls either for the dismissal of Dr. White or the announcement by our Government that it has rejected the basic premises upon which our postwar policy of resistance to Communist aggression has been based.

My criticisms of Dr. White's remarks, briefly stated, are as follows:

Communist aggression in Berlin and around the world is based not on their legitimate or even imagined fears of the free world but on their oft-expressed intention to bury the free world and subjugate it to communism.

We are not inclined to overestimate the evil of the Communists; we are inclined to underestimate it. How can you exaggerate the evil of men who have murdered 20 million of their own people, who have enslaved hundreds of millions of others, who have destroyed the independence and national life of a dozen nations, who have systematically committed every form of villainy known to man?

Soviet leaders are not saying what they really think. Their approach to their own people and to the rest of the world is one of calculated deceit. Thus, they have broken more than 1,000 treaties solemnly agreed to; they have deliberately lied about germ warfare in Korea, about alleged U.S. aggression all over the world, and about disarmament. They lie consciously and deliberately every day of every week of every month of every year.

We need not condemn our country for either the U–2 flights or for the assistance to the Cuban freedom fighters. The one was a necessary action to protect ourselves from surprise attack, the other was a fulfillment of a moral obligation to help a once-free people liberate themselves from a Communist dictatorship, sustained in power by Communist arms.

Finally, my belief, contrary to that of Dr. White, is that the Russian people and all peoples enslaved by communism do not share the same outlook and beliefs as their enslavers.

Thus, the incredible defection of several million Russian troops to the Nazis during World War II, the exodus from East Germany, the mass defection of Soviet troops to the side of freedom during the Hungarian uprising, the multi-billion-dollar jamming program by which the Communists prevent news from getting to their people, the most highly developed system of terror in history that would certainly not be necessary if, as Dr. White alleges, the Soviet people shared the attitudes of their masters.

This was the substance of my speech, all the particulars of which the Washington Post chose to omit in its critical editorial.

As for your assumption that I did not read the complete White text, I wish to assure you that I read it carefully, just as I am sure you read it carefully.

The essential difference between you and me is that you share these theories of Dr. White and I reject them. This is the real basis for your continuing attacks upon me. Since you decided to ridicule my views, it would have been more manful to debate them openly, point by point, rather than make a sneak, hit-and-run attack with a dose of innuendo and personal vilification, which ducked all the vital questions involved.

THOMAS J. DODD,
Senator from Connecticut.

REA Administrator Norman Clapp Reports on Recent Developments in Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding appointments of the Kennedy administration to date was the selection of Norman Clapp, of Wisconsin, as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

This able and dedicated administrator has been hard at work as head of REA since early this year and is currently reporting personally to the regional meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on the problems and progress of the program.

His excellent report is worthy of note by all who are interested in the REA program. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF NORMAN M. CLAPP, ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE 1961 REGIONAL MEETINGS OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

It is fitting and proper, I think, that we have the opportunity at this point to get together to discuss the problems that face the rural electrification program.

During the months since I became REA Administrator, it has been my privilege to meet with many of you. I have visited many of your systems, I have spoken at a number of your annual meetings, and I have addressed a number of your statewide and G. & T. meetings. Both in my office in Washington and in your home communities. I have had the chance to discuss in detail with many of you your individual problems.

I have been increasingly impressed with the sense of purpose and the high degree of unity which has characterized your work both locally and between systems on a broad basis. This unity is forcefully demonstrated through the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Through NRECA, you have built for yourselves an aggressive, well-managed national association that has proved to be not only a bulwark of strength against the attacks of those whoe philosophies and goals conflict with your objectives, but also a source of dynamic leadership in moving this program forward to fulfill its great purposes for rural America.

I want to pay personal tribute to your able president, R. A. Yarbrough, your board of directors, your distinguished general manager, Clyde Ellis, and your dedicated staff. I hope you realize the importance of the job NRECA, Clyde Ellis, and your staff have been doing. The fact that the rural electrification program weathered the political storms of the period from 1953 to 1961 without suffering more damage than it did, I am sure, can be attributed in great measure to the effectiveness of NRECA as a fighting spokesman for nearly 5 million rural consumers served by more than 900 cooperative systems.

I am here today to tell you frankly, perhaps bluntly, that the battles are not all over. I am here to talk with you about the "Crisis in Rural Electrification," and I can assure you we are facing a crisis in rural electrification which may very well determine the ultimate fate of the cooperative systems you have worked so hard to build.

Because it is a crisis, because we do face some showdown battles ahead, it is all the more fitting and proper that I come to talk to you, for you are the veterans who have been through the fire of conflict, know the opposition, and know the cause for which you are striving.

To properly understand the significance of present controversy over the REA program, it is necessary to go back to 1935 and review how this program developed. The REA approach to the urgent need of rural electrification was not completely worked out in advance either by the framers of the act, or in its earliest administration. The present form of the program was molded, like so many other great developments in this Nation's history, by the force of events.

In 1935, with only about 1 farm in 10 favored with central station electric service, the Congress recognized a need for a new approach to electrifying rural America. While those who framed and sponsored this legislation clearly provided an avenue through which rural people could do the job themselves, this was only one of several avenues of approach provided by the act.

There were many active leaders in the struggle for rural electrification who assumed and believed that the power companies themselves would do the job. After all, they were already in the business, they had the know-how, and they called themselves public service organizations. Give them long-term Government loan funds at low interest rates to serve the unserved rural areas, it was believed, and they would go to work.

Power companies were—and still are—eligible for REA loans. The entire first year of this program was a year during which the first Administrator, Morris Cooke, carried on fruitless negotiations with the electric industry. Administrator Cooke sought a basis upon which the industry would accept the challenge laid down by the Congress that

the power companies broaden their vision and get out and provide the area coverage service that people in rural areas were entitled to have.

But the power companies were not interested. Their spokesmen said they were already serving as much of the rural areas as they could afford to serve. The rest of the rural market would not pay out, they claimed. It was absurd to talk about systems that would serve only three consumers to the mile, they said. They were willing to skim the cream, but they were not interested in rural electrification on any basis approaching area coverage.

It was only after the REA Administrator was convinced that a new approach was the only hope for achieving a broad-based program of rural electrification, that he seriously looked to farmers and other rural people to take on the assignment. It was at this point that the co-ops actively stepped into the picture and shaped the present RSA pattern in meeting this problem.

This is history. What you have accomplished is also history. It is a rich history which demonstrates what rural people can do when they set their minds to it. With REA technical assistance and long-term capital, you successfully built hundreds of electric systems. You did it better and cheaper, and you did it in tougher, thinner areas, than the old hands of the power companies would admit could be possible.

The vital ingredients in your achievement were a high sense of public responsibility and an enthusiastic willingness by countless rural people to devote time and energy to this kind of public service. That sense of public responsibility has been a unique trademark in this program.

The cooperative electric systems in the REA program are private enterprise institutions. Each is "investor owned" just as much as any of these power companies now spending millions of dollars trying to convince the public that this tag somehow is their special proprietary virtue. Your electric cooperatives are owned by nearby 5 million investor owners. What is more, these investor owners are people who live on their systems, are served by them. They are local owners, not absentee coupon clippers. The investments come the hard way, a little at a time, from modest incomes, yet I dare say their investments are properly entitled to as much public concern and protection as that of any Wall Street investor.

REA-financed electric cooperatives are private enterprise in the highest sense of the word, but they are private enterprise with a distinctive responsiveness to public need.

Today there are 990 active rural electrification borrowers. In all there have been 1,090 borrowers in the program. Their combined investment, including loan funds, is about $4 billion. They serve nearly 5 million consumers. They have been instrumental in spreading electric service, directly or by competitive example, to about 97 percent of our farms. They themselves serve over half of these farms.

And as for the money they have borrowed from REA, they are paying that back—with interest—on schedule, even ahead of schedule. There is only one borrower delinquent, and that one is only $81,764 behind in principal and interest. This is a repayment record without parallel in the history of any loan program—public or private.

But this very success has created the present crisis in rural electrification. The rural territories which the power companies passed up in disdain have now become attractive to them. As a result the cooperative systems which developed the rural areas they now serve are threatened by mounting attacks from the outside. And on the inside they suffer from a growing complacency of many officers, directors, managers, and members who somehow seem to think all the battles have been won and the work is done. They seem to act as though all that needs doing now is routine maintenance, regular billing, and full enjoyment of each new financial statement.

This is the crisis. Here are the challenges. Upon our efforts—yours at home and through NRECA and ours in REA—depend the ultimate survival of cooperative rural electrification, control of the systems you have built, protection of the growing investment of rural people in them, and the role of electric power in the future development of rural America.

If you—and we in REA—are to continue to do the job with which we are changed, we must look now to the future security and effectiveness of these systems. We must look not only to the ability of these systems to survive, but also to their effectiveness in doing the job for which they were created—supplying the rapidly growing demand for electric service in rural areas on an area coverage basis at as low a cost as possible. We must move now to assure these systems a growing source of power, at the lowest possible cost and on terms consistent with their security and effectiveness. We must move now to protect the integrity of the service areas we have developed in good faith. We must constantly improve system management, alert the member-owners of our rural cooperative systems to the dangers which threaten them, and build public understanding and support for our program and its needs. And we must move now to strengthen the economic base and expand economic opportunities in the rural America we serve.

In the total picture, the problem of adequate power supply is our most immediate concern. If we are to meet the growing needs of rural areas for electric service our capacity to provide that power must grow apace. Power must be available on a dependable basis and at as low a cost as possible on terms that are fair and reasonable. Each system must have full opportunity to serve all loads in its area—the bigger and better loads as well as the smaller, more expensive ones, the denser as well as the thinner areas.

REA-financed borrowers currently buy about 38 percent of their power needs from commercial power companies in the wholesale power market. REA-financed generation facilities supply only about 16 percent of their needs. The balance is purchased from publicly owned generating sources such as TVA, Bureau of Reclamation, regional power authorities, and municipalities.

REA borrowers are major customers of the power companies, and we have no objection to that—provided the power supplied is adequate, economical, and available on fair terms, and provided the power companies do not use their control over the source of power to cripple our borrowers' systems.

We do object to the dual rate. We do object to the power supplier dictating what consumers our borrowers may or may not serve in their own service areas.

Last year 189 REA borrowers had to purchase their power under such contracts from 19 different power companies. The penalty rate is nothing more than a device by which these companies deprive a co-op of the load advantages of industrial and commercial power users in its area. The power company charges the co-op one wholesale rate for power needed to serve the smaller consumers on the cooperative's system, and a penalty rate for power needed to serve the larger consumers. This is an invasion of our borrowers' territory and a violation of their rights. It is moreover a limitation on the ability of the distribution system to serve its members efficiently and economically. And, I might add, it is injurious to the security of the Federal Government's loan.

So far as we are concerned at REA, we do not propose to approve any such power contracts. We are determined to get rid of the dual rate and similar restrictive clauses in the power contracts affecting our borrowers.

And we are serving notice upon power suppliers that we do not propose to leave our borrowers dependent for power upon companies that are demonstrating every day and in every way their basic hostility to our cooperative systems.

Let it be understood that we consider it bad business and a violation of plain, commonsense to depend upon any power company which invades a borrower's territory or pirates away customers. Neither do we think it wise to do business with a supplier which joins in the campaign of vicious misrepresentation designed to undermine the position and acceptance of our cooperative system in the eyes of the public. Electric power is the lifeblood of a distribution system. We cannot afford to depend upon a borrower's avowed enemies to supply it.

In view of this, we have broadened our criteria for measuring the desirability of REA-financed cooperative generation and transmission facilities. As before, we will grant loans where economically feasible for such G. & T. facilities if the other power sources available are either inadequate, undependable, or more costly than REA-financed generation. But in addition we will also approve feasible G. & T. loan applications if it is necessary to protect the future security and effectiveness of our borrower distribution systems. This is the so-called third criterion of REA's generation and transmission policy added under the new administration.

Let me make our position clear. REA proposes to make loans for generation and transmission as an alternative for borrowers that are unable to buy power on fair and reasonable terms or that find themselves forced to rely on a hostile source for their future power supply.

To do a better job of it we have reestablished a Power Supply Division in REA. To get the maximum efficiency from our power supply programs, to achieve the maximum economies for you and your member-consumers, to get the most "mileage" out of our loan dollars takes concentrated attention, smart engineering, and far-sighted planning. This is the function of our new Power Supply Division.

More recently a new threat has developed. As our Nation's population surges upward, people from the urban centers spread out into the countryside. Farmlands become housing developments. Then come the shopping centers, and the cities push their boundaries wider to keep up with the growth. In the 12 years from 1948 to 1960, the number of cities annexing rural territories more than tripled, and the number of square miles annexed increased almost four times. Last year 712 cities with populations of at least 5,000 annexed more than 1,082 square miles.

When rural areas developed in good faith by the co-ops are annexed and brought within the new city limits, the power companies are quick to take advantage of the fine print in their franchises.

And, just to show how it can work, there is a city in Oklahoma that reached out and annexed an area served by a rural electric cooperative. It kept its legal hand on the area while the city's enfranchised power company used the annexation as leverage to pirate cooperative consumers. This compelled the cooperative to negotiate sale of its facilities in the area. Then the city deannexed the area.

Pirating of the choice loads in rural territory long served by co-op systems is reaching serious proportions. Across the country from one coast to the other, there is a spreading pattern in seizure of thousands of co-op consumers by power companies hungry for the more profitable loads in the rural territories they once refused to serve.

Co-ops must fight to hold the territory they pioneered. Continued area coverage and low rates depend upon serving the richer portions along with the thinner areas of their territory. In some cases, sheer survival of the co-op is going to be threatened by the new inroads of the power companies. The geography of population growth is more vital to the existence of nonprofit, member-owned co-ops than it is to any other type of power system.

At REA we have been giving much attention to this growing menace. We stand ready to give—and are giving—legal assistance to our borrowers in a case-by-case defense of their territorial rights. But this alone is not going to win the struggle.

This growing encroachment on co-op service areas is not confined to isolated instances. It is a general pattern. It is vitally important that you realize this fact. You may think your particular co-op is safe now, but, mark my words, the days are numbered. Your turn will come, and you had better be sure that, when that time comes, there are some ground rules to protect you.

This threat cannot be successfully answered on a case-to-case basis. Nor can it be met by Federal legislation or action. The only effective answer must come through your State legislatures. State protective legislation is required guaranteeing the right of our cooperative rural electric systems to serve all consumers in the service territory they have developed and to continue to serve that territory even though it may at some later time be annexed to a municipality.

We hope to be able soon to propose a basic legislative approach in the form of a model bill which can be adapted to the particular law of each State, but which at the same time will serve as the rallying point of the entire cooperative rural electrification movement. With a unified approach and solid support we can build the momentum and public acceptance so important in putting such legislation across in each State where it is needed.

Success in winning both the battle of power supply and the battle of territorial integrity rests with the leadership of the rural electrification movement and upon the extent to which the 20 million people who benefit from cooperative electric service can be aroused to the dangers threatening local ownership and control. This is where you come in.

The need for members to understand their rights and responsibilities in a cooperative enterprise was never greater than it is today. The issue of whether a farm family could or could not get lights was easily understood 25 years ago. Today the lights are in, and the issues are now issues of comparative rates, better service, who is to control the systems, and who is entitled to the benefits which flow from electric service. These issues are more subtle, less obvious, but just as important as getting that first hookup 25 years ago.

Your members own a valuable property. Altogether across the Nation REA-financed cooperative members own properties worth many billions of dollars. More than just owning it, they are in a position to secure for themselves many more billions of dollars worth of future benefits if they maintain effective control of these properties and develop them to their full potential. Otherwise, those billions of consumer benefits which can be theirs will be converted to billions in profits for someone else.

And all this, too, is an important factor in determining whether low-cost electric power shall be available to expand economic opportunity in rural areas or whether the power bill will become the means of siphoning off the economic strength and retarding the growth of rural America. TVA and Bonneville have shown what low-cost power means in economic development and well-being in the Tennessee Valley and the Northwest. It can mean just as much for rural areas everywhere.

All this your members need to know and understand. It is vitally important to them and their future. They need to know it does make a difference who stands behind that light switch.

In this program of member education there is a need to give special consideration to a vast new group of members coming into our cooperatives as a result of suburban growth in the many rural areas. There are not farm folks. Even though some might have been brought up on the farm and know the REA story from childhood, they are essentially city people now. Yet their understanding of their stake in their cooperative electric service is just as vital to the success of the cooperative in surviving and achieving its purposes.

I might add also that your employees need to know all this too. I have been appalled at times by how little understanding co-op employees seem to have of the basic advantages of the cooperative systems and what they mean to people as contrasted to the service of profit-taking companies.

All this is most urgent. It is a big job. But that is not all. You cannot—we cannot—afford to stop there. Rural people alone, your members and your employees alone, cannot win the battles in Congress or in the State legislatures that must be won if this great program is to continue. We must have the sympathetic understanding of millions of fair-minded city people. And we can have it only if we can get our true story to them.

The opposition knows this. This is why the power companies are building up the tremendous propaganda effort we see in the newspapers, on the radio, over television, through direct mail, and countless organizational channels.

We are in a battle for people's understanding and support across the country.

NRECA's TNT program—"Tell the Nation the Truth"—is a great step forward in giving nonrural people the REA story. It is an essential countermeasure to the damage done by opposition propaganda. It is no idle frill or luxury, it is serious business. It is designed to help make sure that people who will be passing judgment on this program in so many ways get the basic facts straight. Every co-op has a part to play in the success of this campaign.

There is more, of course, to good public relations than a national advertising program, or even a good local program. Fundamental to good public relations is the kind of example your cooperative sets, the kind of community citizenship it displays to the public. Is your business soundly managed? Is your policy on financial reserves above criticism? Do you plan your growth to keep standards of service high? Are you active as a community builder? Do you treat your employees fairly and recognize their rights? This is not only good public relations, but good management as well.

I want to say a word about financial planning. Long-range financial planning is just as fundamental to good management as is long-range engineering planning.

Unfortunately, financial planning has in recent years become a bone of contention in public discussions of the REA loan program, especially in conjunction with the 2-percent interest rate controversy.

Now so far as this administration is concerned the debate over the 2-percent rate is over and done. President Kennedy has made that clear. Secretary Freeman and I are in complete accord on it. The 2-percent rate was agreed upon by Congress when it passed the Pace Act back in 1944 as a fair approximation, over the years, of what this loan money would cost the Government. At the time it was higher than the cost of borrowed money to the Government, but it was fully expected there would be periods when it would fall short of the Government's cost. Over the years it is expected to average out with no significant loss to the Federal Government. It is also a rate which recognizes the special dimculties and higher costs of providing area coverage in the rural areas and partially offsets them. A fixed rate also makes it easier for borrowers to plan ahead.

But to keep the interest rate controversy alive as a subsidy myth, and to turn the public against you and the REA program, the opposition has added a new twist. The co-ops, they say, borrow this money at 2 percent, then turn around and invest vast reserve fund accumulations at considerably higher rates of return. The implication is obvious, and there is no doubt that this falsehood makes many a hard-pressed taxpayer mad if he does not know the true story.

Actually, REA-financed borrowers as a group have not accumulated any vast reserves, reasonable or unreasonable in amount. The average net worth of the systems is only 20 percent of their total assets. Current and future expansion must still be done on borrowed money.

Every business needs reserves as a normal requirement of sound operation. They are needed for working capital, for renewal and replacement, and for contingencies of various kinds.

It is vital to public understanding of our problems and needs that we establish some reasonable, sound, and acceptable standards as to what constitutes legitimate reserve levels and how they should be managed.

NRECA and the Statewide Managers Association are carrying out a study of reserve policies to provide you with helpful information in determining a policy on reserves for your co-op. REA is cooperating. REA has appointed a committee to reexamine the questions of adequate reserves and prudent reserve management policies as a function of long-range financial planning. We expect to recommend general guidelines which we hope will be helpful to each borrower in evaluating its own position and at the same time put the entire controversy over reserves in a light that Congress and the public will clearly understand.

Good employee relations is another important aspect of good public relations. Every employee can and should be an ambassador of good will for cooperative rural electrification. We must, in turn, see to it that our systems are among the best places to work.

We must show constructive leadership in improving wage standards and conditions of employment. We must recognize the importance of better job training. We must do a better job in safety.

Let us not overlook the broader implications of good employee relations. In some circles, I suppose, it would be called labor policy. We would be shortsighted, indeed, if we did not recognize a broad basis for mutual support between farm people in the rural areas and working people in the cities. Agriculture represents a vast and essential market for the industrial products the city worker manufactures. The great mass of city workers are, in turn, the primary market for the farmers' crops.

Public opinion polls show that working people in the cities have consistently supported your efforts to provide your own rural electric service. We have had consistent support in the Congress and many State legislatures from representatives of predominantly labor districts.

This is a spirit of mutual understanding which is significant to the future of cooperative rural electrification. It is a kind of cooperation we should do all in our power to encourage. There is no better place to

start than in our own cooperative's employee relations.

And, finally, there is no greater opportunity for our cooperative electric systems to show their true colors in public service than in the present challenge of rural area development. Your leadership and active participation in expanding economic opportunity and growth in rural America is vital not only to your individual communities but also to the national welfare. As you help establish new homegrown industry in your respective communities, you will be providing new employment, stimulating business, and adding income in rural areas. Your contribution to rural areas development will make new friends for the co-ops, both on and off your service lines.

The job of rural electrification is not done. We have hooked up 97 percent of the Nation's farms with central station electric service in the last 26 years, it is true, but the bigger job of realizing the maximum benefits from that service is just beginning.

We now face a showdown battle which will, in all likelihood, determine whether cooperative rural electrification will be able to survive.

REA-financed rural cooperative systems represent a middle way between the commercial profit-taking power companies on one hand and public power systems on the other. They are private enterprise, but with a built-in public conscience. Not only must they retain a permanent place in the electric power industry of this country, but they must be allowed to move ahead and fulfill their destiny in the future development of rural America.

I am here today to assure you that President Kennedy believes not only in the great past performance of this program but also in its even greater future. And let me assure you, also, that it does make a difference—a very great difference—to this program when the President of the United States is on your side. It makes a difference who is the Secretary of Agriculture. And I hope it is your finding by this time that it makes a difference who is Administrator of REA.

So far as this administration is concerned, the course is clear. We believe in this program. We believe in the rural people who have built it. You have our support.

The question now is—will we have yours?

A Forward Step for Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the session, S. 1440 came over from the Senate. It provided for the establishment of a register of certain motor vehicles licenses. It was passed under the Consent Calendar. We had introduced an identical bill, H.R. 8388, which was tabled by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in order to permit the passage of S. 1440. Both bills were to improve the administration of the national drivers license register program. This register contains the names of persons whose permits to drive motor vehicles have been revoked for drunken driving, or having been convicted of a traffic violation resulting in loss of life.

The purpose of our own H.R. 8388 and S. 1440 is to clarify the present law for the reason that some States do not revoke, but suspend, driving permits. Other States both revoke and suspend. Our legislation would have authorized the Department of Commerce to list suspensions as well as revocations—or both—for the two offenses we have mentioned.

Organizations which proposed this legislation were, the American Association of Motor Administrators, American Bar Association, Traffic Institute of Northwestern University, and the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

This new bill will assist 13 States in taking advantage of this service. Already about 68,000 names have accumulated on the new National Register. Real benefit will accrue to all the States, providing greater protection in knowing of the past history of persons who apply for permits to drive but who conceal a history of past convictions for these two offenses.

Our interest in this legislation came about because a constituent had written us that her brother and he cousin had been killed by a drunken driver while on a trip, in another State. A fellow passenger was so mangled that she was a human wreck. The culprit driver was released on bond and yet from the day of the accident to this day, the man who was responsible and who was an admitted drunken driver, has never appeared in court to answer the charge, nor has he ever been found.

We were glad to have H.R. 8388 set aside for S. 1440, if doing so would expedite the passage of this most needed amendment. We cannot bring back the lives of the relatives of our constituents, nor the lives of thousands of others who have perished from accidents caused by those who were driving while intoxicated. But we will be able to know that these same culprits, in most cases, will not be permitted to drive so recklessly again, and that this legislation, in the future will bear fruit and pay greater dividends because of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include views about our bill from the Director of Driver Register, Mr. W. G. Eames, of the Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, set forth in a letter as follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RANDALL: We were pleased to learn last night that the House of Representatives passed the amendment you introduced to permit the National Driver Register Service to receive and disseminate records of suspensions as well as revocations for driving while intoxicated and involvement in a fatality. This will make our program much more workable. Many of the States will be able to participate and some of the States who are unable to cooperate under the enabling legislation will now be able to send us their records and thereby provide a more complete and effective register.

We feel that we are making good progress in our effort to service the States. We have over 70,000 driver license revocations and have sent out over 1,200 reports to the participating States. Forty-five of the jurisdictions, including Alaska, Hawaii, Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, are sending us information and several others tell us we can expect some from them soon.

Many talk about improving highway safety, but do not do much more than talk. It is very gratifying to me, and I hope it will be to your constituents to note the positive action you have taken in introducing and supporting this amendment.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL G. EAMES,
Director, Driver Register.

The Camillus Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, whenever the foreign relations of the United States are in a posture that suggests that war might be imminent, I am reminded of our first comparable situation. The time was 1794 in George Washington's second administration. The French Revolution was well underway and England and France were at war. Our own people, the people of the United States, were taking sides with these two foreign contenders. The Treaty of Paris which was supposed to have settled the American War of Independence had been violated by the British and by ourselves and another war seemed to be in the offing. At this juncture, President Washington nominated to the Senate the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay, as a special envoy to Great Britain to negotiate a settlement. Mr. Jay returned from London with a treaty which the Senate ultimately advised President Washington to ratify.

Among our own people, the proponents of France and antagonists of Great Britain opposed this treaty in every possible way. As soon as the treaty was published in this country, Alexander Hamilton began a series of public letters in defense of Mr. Jay's treaty, over the signature Camillus. These letters, 38 in number, were most effective in bringing about the Senate's consent to the President's ratification of the treaty. The first seven of these letters deal with what is always the modern question: "The difficult problem of how nations, whose interests it is to be friends, may adjust their differences without loss of dignity."

Many students of statecraft rank Hamilton's Camillus letters above anything else he ever wrote, even above the Federalist, a better known work which is regarded as the classic work on government in a free society.

The Camillus letters are as apropos today as when written in the summer of 1795. In the context of today's problems, I hope they will be read by every thoughtful citizen and every responsible officer of the United States. As these letters are out of print—imbedded in collected works, I ask unanimous con-

sent that these seven Camillus letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Argus]

CAMILLUS [1]

DEFENSE OF MR. JAY'S TREATY

No. I

JULY 22, 1795.

It was to have been foreseen, that the treaty which Mr. Jay was charged to negotiate with Great Britain, whenever it should appear, would have to contend with many perverse dispositions and some honest prejudices; that there was no measure in which the Government could engage, so little likely to be viewed according to its intrinsic merits—so very likely to encounter misconception, jealousy, and unreasonable dislike. For this, many reasons may be assigned.

It is only to know the vanity and vindictiveness of human nature, to be convinced, that while this generation lasts there will always exist among us men irreconcilable to our present national Constitution; embittered in their animosity in proportion to the success of its operations, and the disappointment of their inauspicious predictions. It is a material inference from this, that such men will watch, with lynx's eyes, for opportunities of discrediting the proceedings of the Government, and will display a hostile and malignant zeal upon every occasion, where they think there are any prepossessions of the community to favor their enterprises. A treaty with Great Britain was too fruitful an occasion not to call forth all their activity.

It is only to consult the history of nations, to perceive, that every country, at all times, is cursed by the existence of men who, actuated by an irregular ambition, scruple nothing which they imagine will contribute to their own advancement and importance; in monarchies, supple courtiers; in republics, fawning or turbulent demagoges, worshiping still the idol—power—wherever placed, whether in the hands of a prince or of the people, and trafficking in the weaknesses, vices, frailties, or prejudices of the one or the other. It was to have been expected that such men, counting more on the passions than on the reason of their fellow citizens, and anticipating that the treaty would have to struggle with prejudices, would be disposed to make an alliance with popular discontent, to nourish it, and to press it into the service of their particular views.

It was not to have been doubted, that there would be one or more foreign powers indisposed to a measure which accommodated our differences with Great Britain, and laid the foundation of future good understanding, merely because it had that effect.

Nations are never content to confine their rivalships and enmities to themselves. It is their usual policy to disseminate them as widely as they can, regardless how far it may interfere with the tranquility or happiness of the nations which they are able to influence. Whatever pretensions may be made, the world is yet remote from the spectacle of that just and generous policy, whether in the cabinets of republics or of kings, which would dispose one nation, in its intercourses with another—satisfied with a due proportion of privileges and benefits—to see that other pursue freely its true interest with regard to a third, though at the expense of no engagement, nor in violation of any rule of friendly or fair procedure. It was natural that the contrary spirit should produce efforts of foreign counteraction to the treaty; and it was certain that the partisans of the counteracting power would second its efforts by all the means which they thought calculated to answer the end.

It was known, that the resentment produced by our revolution war with Great Britain had never been entirely extinguished, and that recent injuries had rekindled the flame with additional violence. It was a natural consequence of this, that many should be disinclined to any amicable arrangement with Great Britain, and that many others should be prepared to acquiesce only in a treaty which should present advantages of so striking and preponderant a kind as it was not reasonable to expect could be obtained, unless the United States were in a condition to give the law to Great Britain, and as, if obtained under the coercion of such a situation, could only have been the short-lived prelude of a speedy rupture to get rid of them.

Unfortunately, too, the supposition of that situation has served to foster exaggerated expectations; and the absurd delusion to this moment prevails, notwithstanding the plain evidence to the contrary, which is deducible from the high and haughty ground still maintained by Great Britain against victorious France.

It was not to be mistaken, that an enthusiasm for France and her revolution, throughout all its wonderful vicissitudes, has continued to possess the minds of the great body of the people of this country; and it was to be inferred, that this sentiment would predispose to a jealousy of any agreement or treaty with her most persevering competitor, a jealousy so excessive as would give the fullest scope to insidious arts to perplex and mislead the public opinion. It was well understood that a numerous party among us, though disavowing the design, because the avowal would defeat it, have been steadily endeavoring to make the United States a party in the present European war, by advocating all those measures which would widen the breach between us and Great Britain, and by resisting all those which would tend to close it; and it was morally certain, that this party would eagerly improve every circumstance which would serve to render the treaty odious, and to frustrate it, as the most effectual road to their favorite goal.

It was also know beforehand that personal and party rivalships, of the most active kind, would assail whatever treaty might be made, to disgrace, if possible, its organ.

There are three persons prominent in the public eye, as the successor of the actual President of the United States, in the event of his retreat from the station—Mr. Adams, Mr. Jay, and Mr. Jefferson.

No one has forgotten the systematic pains which have been taken to impair the well-earned popularity of the first gentleman. Mr. Jay, too, has been repeatedly the object of attacks with the same view. His friends, as well as his enemies, anticipated that he could make no treaty which would not furnish weapons against him; and it were to have been ignorant of the indefatigable malice of his adversaries, to have doubted that they would be seized with eagerness and wielded with dexterity.

The peculiar circumstances which have attended the two last elections for Governor of this State,[2] have been of a nature to give the utmost keenness to party animosity. It was impossible that Mr. Jay should be forgiven for his double, and in the last instance triumphant, success; or that any promising opportunity of detaching from him the public confidence, should pass unimproved.

Trivial facts frequently throw light upon important designs. It is remarkable, that in the toasts given on the 4th of July, wherever there appears a direct or indirect censure of the treaty, it is pretty uniformly coupled with compliments to Mr. Jefferson, and to our late Governor, Mr. Clinton, with an evident design to place those gentlemen in contrast with Mr. Jay, and, decrying him, to elevate them. No one can be blind to the finger of party spirit, visible in these and similar transactions. It indicates to us clearly one powerful source of opposition to the treaty.

No man is without his personal enemies. Preeminence even in talents and virtue is a cause of envy and hatred of its possessor. Bad men are the natural enemies of virtuous men. Good men sometimes mistake and dislike each other.

Upon such an occasion as the treaty, how could it happen otherwise, than that personal enmity would be unusually busy, enterprising, and malignant?

From the combined operations of these different causes, it would have been a vain expectation that the treaty would be generally contemplated with candor and moderation, or that reason would regulate the first impressions concerning it. It was certain, on the contrary, that however unexceptionable its true character might be, it would have to fight its way through a mass of unreasonable opposition; and that time, examination, and reflection would be requisite to fix the public opinion on a true basis. It was certain that it would become the instrument of a systematic effort against the National Government and its administration; a decided engine of party to advance its own views at the hazard of the public peace and prosperity.

The events which have already taken place are a full comment on these positions. If the good sense of the people does not speedily discountenance the projects which are on foot, more melancholy proofs may succeed.

Before the treaty was known, attempts were made to prepossess the public mind against it. It was absurdly asserted, that it was not expected by the people that Mr. Jay was to make any treaty; as if he had been sent, not to accommodate differences by negotiation and agreement, but to dictate to Great Britain the terms of an unconditional submission.

---

[1] The agitation against the Jay treaty grew daily more dangerous, and the attacks on the administration became more virulent. Hamilton did all he could to stem the tide, but the popular feeling was such that he was actually stoned at a public meeting. Four days later he entered the field in a more formidable manner, by publishing the first of the "Camillus" essays, which were continued throughout the year. Gradually the opposition concentrated their whole fire upon Hamilton, who kept up his chief argument in "Camillus," and replied to his antagonists, driving one after another from the field, as "Philo-Camillus." These last papers of "Philo-Camillus" add nothing to the main body of argument, are in their nature ephemeral, and exhibit only the writer's power of retort. It does not seem necessary to reprint them.

The "Camillus" essays, however, deserve careful study. In a controversial sense they stand first among Hamilton's writings. They did more to check an apparently irresistible popular feeling and turn it the other way, than anything else. They show Hamilton's ability in argument, a masterly handling of the immediate issue, and a profound knowledge of the question in all its bearings. They also exhibit Hamilton's general theory of our foreign relations, and his wide knowledge of the whole field of international law.

The force and ability of these essays were not lost upon the opposition. It was in this connection that Jefferson wrote that "Hamilton was a Colossus to the anti-Republican Party," and he urged Madison to take the field against their great enemy. Madison, however, had no stomach for the fight, and prudently abstained. Nothing shows more strongly Hamilton's influence upon public opinion than the effects produced by this remarkable series of essays.

[2] New York.

Before it was published at large, a sketch, calculated to produce false impressions, was handed out to the public, through a medium noted for hostility to the administration of the Government. Emissaries flew through the country, spreading alarm and discontent; the leaders of clubs were everywhere active to seize the passions of the people, and preoccupy their judgments against the treaty.

At Boston it was published one day, and the next a town meeting was convened to condemn it; without ever being read, without any serious discussion, sentence was pronounced against it.

Will any man seriously believe, that in so short a time an instrument of this nature could have been tolerably unnerstood by the greater part of those who were thus induced to a condemnation of it? Can the result be considered as anything more than a sudden ebullition of popular passion, excited by the artifices of a party which had adroitly seized a favorable moment to furorize the public opinion? This spirit of precipitation and the intemperance which accompanied it, prevented the body of the merchants and the greater part of the most considerate citizens from attending the meeting, and left those who met, wholly under the guidance of a set of men who, with two or three exceptions, have been the uniform opposers of the Government.

The intelligence of this event had no sooner reached New York than the leaders of the clubs were seen haranguing in every corner of the city, to stir up our citizens into an imitation of the example of the meeting at Boston. An invitation to meet at the city hall quickly followed, not to consider or discuss the merits of the treaty, but to unite with the meeting at Boston to address the President against its ratification.

This was immediately succeeded by a handbill, full of invectives against the treaty, as absurd as they were inflammatory, and manifestly designed to induce the citizens to surrender their reason to the empire of their passions.

In vain did a respectable meeting of the merchants endeavor, by their advice, to moderate the violence of these views, and to promote a spirit favorable to a fair discussion of the treaty; in vain did a respectable majority of the citizens of every description attend for that purpose. The leaders of the clubs resisted all discussion, and their followers, by their clamors and vociferations, rendered it impracticable, notwithstanding the wish of a manifest majority of the citizens convened upon the occasion.

Can we believe that the leaders were really sincere in the objections they made to a discussion, or that the great and mixed mass of citizens then assembled had so thoroughly mastered the merits of the treaty as that they might not have been enlightened by such a discussion?

It cannot be doubted that the real motive to the opposition was the fear of a discussion; the desire of excluding light; the adherence to a plan of surprise and deception. Nor need we desire any fuller proof of the spirit of party which has stimulated the opposition to the treaty, than is to be found in the circumstances of that opposition.

To every man who is not an enemy to the National Government, who is not a prejudiced partisan, who is capable of comprehending the argument, and dispassionate enough to attend to it with impartiality, I flatter myself I shall be able to demonstrate satisfactorily in the course of some succeeding papers:

1. That the treaty adjusts, in a reasonable manner, the points in controversy between the United States and Great Britain, as well those depending on the inexecution of the treaty of peace, as those growing out of the present European war.

2. That it makes no improper concessions to Great Britain, no sacrifices on the part of the United States.

3. That it secures to the United States equivalents for what they grant.

4. That it lays upon them no restrictions which are incompatible with their honor or their interest.

5. That in the articles which respect war, it conforms to the laws of nations.

6. That it violates no treaty with, nor duty toward, any foreign power.

7. That, compared with our other commercial treaties, it is, upon the whole entitled to a preference.

8. That it contains concessions of advantages by Great Britain to the United States, which no other nation has obtained from the same power.

9. That it gives to her no superiority of advantages over other nations with whom we have treaties.

10. That the interests of primary importance to our general welfare are promoted by it.

11. That the too probable result of a refusal to ratify is war, or, what would be still worse, a disgraceful passiveness under violations of our rights, unredressed, and unadjusted; and consequently that it is the true interest of the United States that the treaty should go into effect.

It will be understood that I speak of the treaty as advised to be ratified by the Senate—for this is the true question before the public.

CAMILLUS.

No. II

1795.

Previous to a more particular discussion of the merits of the treaty, it may be useful to advert to a suggestion which has been thrown out, namely: that it was foreseen by many that the mission to Great Britain would produce no good result, and that the event has corresponded with the anticipation.

The reverse of this position is manifestly true.

All must remember the very critical posture of this country at the time that mission was resolved upon. A recent violation of our rights, too flagrant and too injurious to be submitted to, had filled every American breast with indignation, and every prudent man with alarm and disquietude. A few hoped, and the great body of the community feared, that war was inevitable.

In this crisis two sets of opinions prevailed: one looked to measures which were to have a compulsory effect upon Great Britain, the sequestration of British debts, and the cutting off intercourse wholly or partially between the two countries; the other to vigorous preparations for war, and one more effort of negotiation, under the solemnity of an extraordinary mission, to avert it.

That the latter was the best opinion, no truly sensible man can doubt; and it may be boldly affirmed that the event has entirely justified it.

If measures of coercion and reprisal had taken place, war, in all human probability, would have followed.

National pride is generally a very untractable thing. In the councils of no country does it act with greater force than in those of Great Britain. Whatever it might have been in her power to yield to negotiation, she could have yielded nothing to compulsion, without self-degradation, and without the sacrifice of that political consequence which, at all times very important to a nation, was peculiarly so to her at the juncture in question. It should be remembered, too, that from the relations in which the two countries have stood to each other, it must have cost more to the pride of Great Britain to have received the law from us than from any other power.

When one nation has cause of complaint against another, the course marked out by practice, the opinion of writers, and the principles of humanity, the object being to avoid war, is to precede reprisals of any kind by a demand of reparation. To begin with reprisals is to meet on the ground of war, and put the other party in a condition not to be able to recede without humiliation.

Had this course been pursued by us, it would not only have rendered war morally certain, but it would have united the British nation in a vigorous support of their government in the prosecution of it; while, on our part, we should have been quickly distracted and divided. The calamities of war would have brought the most ardent to their senses, and placed them among the first in reproaching the government with precipitation, rashness, and folly for not having taken every chance, by pacific means, to avoid so great an evil.

The example of Denmark and Sweden is cited in support of the coercive plan. Those powers, it is asserted, by arming and acting with vigor, brought Great Britain to terms.

But who is able to tell us the precise course of this transaction, or the terms gained by it? Has it appeared that either Denmark or Sweden has obtained as much as we have done—a stipulation of reparation for the violation of our property, contrary to the laws of war?

Besides, what did Denmark and Sweden do? They armed, and they negotiated. They did not begin by retaliations and reprisals. The United States also armed and negotiated, and, like Denmark and Sweden, prudently forbore reprisals. The conduct of the three countries agreed in principle, equally steering clear of a precipitate resort to reprisals, and contradicting the doctrines and advice of our war party.

The course pursued by our Government was, then, in coincidence with the example of Denmark and Sweden—and, it may be added, was in every view the wisest.

Few nations can have stronger inducements than the United States to cultivate peace. Their infant state in general, their want of a marine in particular, to protect their commerce, would render war, in an extreme degree, a calamity. It would not only arrest our present rapid progress to strength and prosperity, but would probably throw us back into a state of debility and impoverishment, from which it would require years to emerge.

Our trade, navigation, and mercantile capital would be essentially destroyed. Spain being an associate of Great Britain, a general Indian war might be expected to desolate the whole extent of our frontier; our exports obstructed, agriculture would of course languish; all other branches of industry would proportionately suffer; our public debt, instead of a gradual diminution, would sustain a great augmentation, and draw with it a large increase of taxes and burdens on the people.

But these evils, however great, were, perhaps, not the worst to be apprehended. It was to be feared that the war would be conducted in a spirit which would render it more than ordinarily calamitous. There are too many proofs that a considerable party among us is deeply infected with those horrid principles of Jacobinism which, proceeding from one excess to another, have made France a theater of blood, and which, notwithstanding the most vigorous efforts of the national representation to suppress it, keeps the destinies of France, to this moment, suspended by a thread. It was too probable, that the direction of the war, if commenced, would have fallen into the hands of men of this description. The consequences of this, even in imagination, are such as to make any virtuous man shudder.

It was, therefore, in a peculiar manner, the duty of the Government to take all possible chances for avoiding war. The plan adopted was the only one which could claim this advantage.

To precipitate nothing, to gain time by negotiations, was to leave the country in a situation to profit by any events which might

turn up, tending to restrain a spirit of hostility to Great Britain, and to dispose her to reasonable accommodation.

The successes of France, which opportunely occurred, allowing them to have had an influence upon the issue, so far from disparaging the merit of the plan that was pursued, serve to illustrate its wisdom. This was one of the chances which procrastination gave, and one which it was natural to take into the calculation.

Had the reverse been the case, the posture of negotiation was still preferable to that of retaliation and reprisal; for in this case, the triumphs of Great Britain, the gauntlet having been thrown by us, would have stimulated her to take it up without hesitation.

By taking the ground of negotiation in the attitude of preparation for war, we at the same time carried the appeal to the prudence of the British Cabinet, without wounding its pride, and to the justice and interest of the British nation, without exciting feelings of resentment.

This conduct was calculated to range the public opinion of that country on our side, to oppose it to the indulgence of hostile views in the Cabinet, and, in case of war, to lay the foundation of schism and dissatisfaction.

But one of the most important advantages to be expected from the course pursued, was the securing of unanimity among ourselves, if, after all the pain taken to avoid the war, it had been forced upon us.

As, on the one hand, it was certain that dissension and discontent would have embarrassed and enfeebled our exertions, in a war produced by any circumstances of intemperance in our public councils, or not endeavored to be prevented by all the milder expedients usual in similar cases; so, on the other, it was equally certain that our having effectually exhausted those expedients would cement us in a firm mass, keep us steady and persevering amidst whatever vicissitudes might happen, and nerve our efforts to the utmost extent of our resources.

This union among ourselves and disunion among our enemies were inestimable effects of the moderate plan, if it had promised no other advantage.

But to gain the time was of vast moment to us in other senses. Not a seaport of the United States was fortified, so as to be protected against the insults of a single frigate. Our magazines were, in every respect, too scantily supplied. It was highly desirable to obviate these deficiencies before matters came to extremity.

Moreover, the longer we kept out of war, if obliged to go into it at last, the shorter would be the duration of the calamities incident to it.

The circumstances of the injury of which we more immediately complain afforded an additional reason for preceding reprisals by negotiation. The order of the 6th of November directed neutral vessels to be brought in for adjudication. This was an equivocal phrase; and though there was too much cause to suspect that it was intended to operate as it did, yet there was a possibility of misconstruction; and that possibility was a reason, in the nature of the thing, for giving the English Government an opportunity of explaining before retaliations took place.

To all this it may be added, that one of the substitutes for the plan pursued, the sequestration of debts, was a measure no less dishonest than impolitic; as will be shown in the remarks which will be applied to the 10th article of the treaty.

But is it unimportant to the real friends of republican government, that the plan pursued was congenial to the public character which is ascribed to it? Would it have been more desirable that the government of our Nation, outstripping the war maxims of Europe, should, without a previous demand of reparation, have rushed into reprisals, and consequently into a war?

However this may be, it is a well-ascertained fact, that our country never appeared so august and respectable as in the position which it assumed upon this occasion. Europe was struck with the dignified moderation of our conduct; and the character of our Government and Nation acquired a new elevation.

It cannot escape an attentive observer, that the language which, in the first instance, condemned the mission of an Envoy Extraordinary to Great Britain, and which now condemns the treaty negotiated by him, seems to consider the United States as among the first-rate powers of the world in point of strength and resources, and proposes to them a conduct predicated upon that condition.

To underrate our just importance would be a degrading error. To overrate it may lead to dangerous mistakes.

A very powerful state may frequently hazard a high and haughty tone with good policy; but a weak state can scarcely ever do it without imprudence. The last is yet our character; though we are the embryo of a great empire. It is, therefore, better suited to our situation to measure each step with the utmost caution; to hazard as little as possible, in the cases in which we are injured; to blend moderation with firmness; and to brandish the weapons of hostility only when it is apparent that the use of them is unavoidable.

It is not to be inferred from this, that we are to crouch to any power on earth, or tamely to suffer our rights to be violated. A nation which is capable of this meanness will quickly have no rights to protect, or honor to defend.

But the true inference is, that we ought not lightly to seek or provoke a resort to arms; that, in the differences between us and other nations, we ought carefully to avoid measures which tend to widen the breach; and that we should scrupulously abstain from whatever may be construed into reprisals, till after the employment of all amicable means has reduced it to a certainty that there is no alternative.

If we can avoid a war for 10 or 12 years more, we shall then have acquired a maturity, which will make it no more than a common calamity, and will authorize us, in our national discussions, to take a higher and more imposing tone.

This is a consideration of the greatest weight to determine us to exert all our prudence and address to keep out of war as long as it shall be possible; to defer, to a state of manhood, a struggle to which infancy is ill adapted. This is the most effectual way to disappoint the enemies of our welfare; to pursue a contrary conduct may be to play into their hands, and to gratify their wishes. If there be a foreign power which sees with envy or ill will our growing prosperity, that power must discern that our infancy is the time for clipping our wings. We ought to be wise enough to see that this is not a time for trying our strength.

Should we be able to escape the storm which at this juncture agitates Europe, our disputes with Great Britain terminated, we may hope to postpone war to a distant period. This, at least, will greatly diminish the chances of it. For then there will remain only one power with whom we have any embarrassing discussions. I allude to Spain, and the question of the Mississippi; and there is reason to hope that this question, by the natural progress of things, and perseverance in an amicable course, will finally be arranged to our satisfaction without the necessity of the dernier ressort.

The allusion to this case suggests one or two important reflections. How unwise would it have been to invite or facilitate a quarrel with Great Britain at a moment when she and Spain were engaged in a common cause, both of them having, besides, controverted points with the United States. How wise will it be to adjust our differences with the most formidable of these two powers, and to have only to contest with one of them.

This policy is so obvious, that it requires an extraordinary degree of infatuation not to be sensible of it, and not to view with favor any measure which tends to so important a result.

This cursory view of the motives which may be supposed to have governed our public councils in the mission to Great Britain, serves not only to vindicate the measures then pursued, but warns us against a prejudiced judgment of the result, which may, in the end, defeat the salutary purposes of those measures.

I proceed now to observe summarily that the objects of the mission, contrary to what has been asserted, have been substantially obtained. What were these? They were principally:

1. To adjust the matters of controversy concerning the inexecution of the treaty of peace, and especially to obtain restitution of our Western posts.

2. To obtain reparation for the captures and spoliations of our property in the course of the existing war.

Both these objects have been provided for, and it will be shown, when we come to comment upon the articles which make the provisions in each case, that it is a reasonable one, as good a one as sought to have been expected; as good a one as there is any prospect of obtaining hereafter; one which it is consistent with our honor to accept, and which our interest bids us to close with.

The provisions with regard to commerce were incidental and auxiliary. The reasons which may be conceived to have led to the including of the subject in the mission will be discussed in some proper place.

CAMILLUS.

No. III

1795.

The opposers of the treaty seem to have put invention on the rack, to accumulate charges against it, in a great number of cases, without regard even to plausibility. If we suppose them sincere, we must often pity their ignorance; if insincere, we must abhor the spirit of deception which it betrays. Of the preposterous nature of some of their charges, specimens will be given in the course of these remarks; though, while nothing which is colorable will remain unattended to, it were endless to attempt a distinct refutation of all the wild and absurd things which are and will be said. It is vain to combat the vagaries of diseased imaginations. The monsters they engender are no sooner destroyed than new legions supply their places. Upon this, as upon all former occasions, the good sense of the people must be relied upon; and it must be taken for granted, that it will be sufficient for their conviction to give solid answers to all such objections as have the semblance of reason; that now, as heretofore, they will maintain their character abroad and at home for deliberation and reflection, and disappoint those who are in the habit of making experiments upon their credulity, who, treating them as children, fancy that sugarplums and toys will suffice to gain their confidence and attachment, and to lead them blindfold withersoever it is desired.

In considering the treaty, it presents itself under two principal heads: The permanent articles, which are the first 10, and which, with some supplementary provisions, adjust the controverted points between the 2 countries; and the temporary articles, which are all the remaining ones, and which establish the principles of mutual intercourse, as to general navigation and commerce. The

manner of the discussion will correspond with this natural division of the subject.

An objection meets the treaty at the threshold. It is said that our envoy abandoned the ground which our Government had uniformly held, and with it our rights and interests as a nation, by acceding, in the preamble of the treaty, to the idea of terminating the differences between the two countries, "in such a manner as, without reference to the merits of their respective complaints and pretensions, may be best calculated to produce mutual satisfaction and good understanding."

It is observed, in support of this, that our Government has constantly charged the first breaches of the treaty upon Great Britain, in the two particulars of carrying away the Negroes and detaining the posts; that while the evacuation of New York was going on, a demand of the surrender of the Negroes was made by Congress, through our commander in chief, which not being complied with, commissioners were sent to ascertain the number carried away, with a view to a claim of compensation; that early and repeated applications were also made for the surrender of the western posts, which not only was not done, but it is proved by the circumstances that orders were not given for it, according to the true intent of the treaty, and that there was, from the beginning, a design to infract, and a virtual infraction of the article with respect to this object. All this, it is alleged, has been the uniform language of our Government, and has been demonstrated by Mr. Jefferson to be true, in his letter to Mr. Hammond, of the 29th of May 1792; and it is asserted that the ground ought not to have been given up by Mr. Jay, because it was the standard of the mutual rights and duties of the parties, as to the points unexecuted of the treaty of peace.

A proper examination of these matters is therefore called for, not only by the specific objection which is made to the principle which is contained in the preamble, but by the influence which a right solution is calculated to have, in giving a favorable or unfavorable complexion to the whole plan of the adjustment.

It is true, as suggested, that our Government has constantly charged as breaches of the treaty by Great Britain, the two particulars which have been stated; but it is believed to be not true, that it has uniformly charged them as first breaches of the treaty. Individuals may have entertained this idea. The State of Virginia seems to have proceeded upon it in some public acts; but as far as is recollected, that ground was never formally or explicitly taken by the Government of the United State. until the above-mentioned letter from Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Hammond, when, for the first time, an attempt was made to vindicate or excuse the whole conduct of this country, in regard to the treaty of peace, contrary, I will venture to say, to the general sense of well-informed men.

The most solemn act of our Government on this head is an address of Congress to the different States, of the 13th of April 1787.

This address admits contraventions of the treaty on our part; and instead of deriving either justification or extenuation of them from prior infractions by Great Britain, urges the different States to a repeal of all contravening laws.

But if the fact, in this respect, were admitted to be, as stated by the adversaries of the treaty, it would not authorize their conclusion.

It would not follow, that, because the ground had been taken by the Government, it ought to have been pertinaciously kept, if, upon fair examination, it had appeared to be not solid, or if an adherence to it would have obstructed a reasonable adjustment of differences.

Nations, no more than individuals, ought to persist in error, especially at the sacrifice of their peace and prosperity; besides, nothing is more common, in disputes between nations, than each side to charge the other with being the aggressor or delinquent. This mutual crimination, either from the nature of circumstances, or from the illusions of the passions, is sometimes sincere; at other times it is dictated by pride or policy. But in all such cases, where one party is not powerful enough to dictate to the other, and where there is a mutual disposition to avoid war, the natural retreat for both is in compromise, which waives the question of first aggression or delinquency. This is the salvo for national pride; the escape for mutual error; the bridge by which nations, arrayed against each other, are enabled to retire with honor, and without bloodshed, from the field of contest. In cases of mutual delinquency, the question of the first default is frequently attended with real difficulty and doubt. One side has an equal right with the other to have and maintain its opinion. What is to be done when the pride of neither will yield to the arguments of the other? War, or a waiver of the point, is the alternative. What sensible man, what humane man, will deny that a compromise, which secures substantially the objects of interest, is almost always preferable to war on so punctilious and unmanageable a point?

Reject the principle of compromise, and the feuds of nations must become much more deadly than they have hitherto been. There would scarcely ever be room for the adjustment of differences without an appeal to the sword; and, when drawn, it would seldom be sheathed but with the destruction of one or the other party. The earth, now too often stained, would then continually stream with human gore.

From the situation of the thing, and of the parties, there never could be a rational doubt that the compromising plan was the only one on which the United States and Great Britain could ever terminate their differences without war; that the question, who was the first delinquent, would have been an eternal bar to accommodation, and consequently, that a dismission of that question was a prerequisite to agreement. Had our envoy permitted the negotiation to be arrested by obstinacy on this head, he would have shown himself to be the diplomatic pedant, rather than the able negotiator, and would have been justly chargeable with sacrificing to punctilio the peace of his country. It was enough for him, as he did, to ascertain, by a preliminary discussion, the impossibility of bringing the other party to concede the point.

An impartial survey of the real state of the question will satisfy candid and discerning men, that it was wise and politic to dismiss it. This shall be attempted.

It has been observed that two breaches of the treaty of peace are charged upon Great Britain: the carrying away of the Negroes, and the detention of the posts. It remains to investigate the reality of these breaches, and to fix the periods when they can be said to have happened.

As to the Negroes, the true sense of the article in the treaty of peace, which respects them, is disputed.

The words of the stipulation are (art. 7) that "His Britannic Majesty shall, with all convenient speed, and without causing any destruction or carrying away any Negroes or other property of the American inhabitants, withdraw all his armies, garrisons, and fleets from the United States."

These terms admit of two constructions: one, that no Negroes, or other articles which had been American property, should be carried away; the other, that the evacuations were to be made without depredation; consequently, that no new destruction was to be committed, and that Negroes, or other articles, which, at the time of the cessation of hostilities, continued to be the property of American inhabitants, unexchanged by the operations of war, should be forborne to be carried away.

The first was the construction which was adopted by this country; and the last is that insisted upon by Great Britain.

The arguments which support her construction are these:

1. The established laws of war give to an enemy the use and enjoyment, during the war, of all real property, of which he obtains possession, and the absolute ownership of all personal property which falls into his hands. The latter is called booty; and, except ships, becomes vested in the captors the moment they acquire a firm possession. With regard to ships, it seems to be a general rule of the marine law that condemnation is necessary to complete investment of the property in the captor.

2. Negroes, by the laws of the States in which slavery is allowed, are personal property. They, therefore, on the principle of those laws, like horses, cattle, and other movables, were liable to become booty, and belonged to the enemy as soon as they came into his hands. Belonging to him, he was free either to apply them to his own use, or set them at liberty. If he did the latter, the grant was irrevocable, restitution was impossible. Nothing in the laws of nations or in those of Great Britain will authorize the resumption of liberty, once granted to a human being.

3. The Negroes in question were either taken in the course of military operations, or they joined the British Army upon invitation by proclamation. However dishonorable to Great Britain the latter may have been, as an illiberal species of warfare, there is no ground to say that the strict rules of war did not warrant it; or that the effect was not, in the one case, as well as in the other, a change of property in the thing.

4. The stipulation relates to "Negroes or other property of the American inhabitants"; putting Negroes on the same footing with any other article. The characteristic of the subject of the stipulation being property of American inhabitants, whatever had lost that character could not be the object of the stipulation. But the Negroes in question, by the laws of war, had lost that character; they were therefore not within the stipulation.

Why did not the United States demand the surrender of captured vessels, and of all other movables, which had fallen into the hands of the enemy? The answer is, Because commonsense would have revolted against such a construction. No one could believe that an indefinite surrender of all the spoils or booty of a 7-years' war was ever intended to be stipulated; and yet the demand for a horse, or an ox, or a piece of furniture, would have been as completely within the terms "Negroes and other property" as a Negro; consequently, the reasoning which proves that one is not included excludes the other.

The silence of the United States as to every other article is therefore a virtual abandonment of that sense of the stipulation which requires the surrender of Negroes.

5. In the interpretation of treaties, things odious or immoral are not to be presumed. The abandonment of Negroes, who had been induced to quit their masters on the faith of official proclamation, promising them liberty, to fall again under the yoke of their masters, and into slavery, is as odious and immoral a thing as can be conceived. It is odious, not only as it imposes an act of perfidy on one of the contracting parties, but as it tends to bring back to servitude men once made free. The general interests of humanity conspire with the obligation which Great Britain had contracted towards the Negroes,

to repel this construction of the treaty, if another can be found.

6. But another and a less exceptionable construction is found in considering the clause as inserted, for greater caution, to secure evacuations without depredation. It may be answered that this was superfluous, because hostilities having ceased, the stipulation to surrender implied of itself that it was to be done without depredation. But to this the reply is, that a part of the clause manifestly contemplates the case of new depredations, and provides a guard against it, in the promise that the evacuations shall be made without causing any destruction. To cause destruction is to do some new act of violence. This reflection destroys the argument drawn from the superfluousness of the stipulation in the sense here given to it, and by showing that it must have such a sense in one part, authorizes the conclusion, that the remainder of the clause has a similar sense. The connection of the two things, in parts of one sentence, confirms this inference.

These arguments certainly have great weight, and do not admit of easy refutation. It is a fact, too, that the opinions of some of the ablest lawyers of our own country have, from the beginning, corresponded with the construction they enforce.

It is not enough for us to be persuaded, that some of the negotiators, who made the peace, intended the article in our sense. It is necessary that it should be found in the instrument itself, and, from the nature of it, ought to have been expressed with clearness and without ambiguity. If there be real ambiguity in such a case, the odiousness of the effect will incline the scale against us.

It does not remove the difficulty, to say, that compensation for the Negroes might have been a substitute for the thing. When one party promises a specific thing to another, nothing but the thing itself will satisfy the promise. The party to whom it is made cannot be required to accept in lieu of it an equivalent. It follows, that compensation for the Negroes would not have been a performance of the stipulation to forbear to carry them away; and therefore, if there be any thing odious in the specific thing itself, the objection to the interpretation which requires it is not done away by the idea of substituting compensation. For the article does not admit such substitution, and its sense cannot be defined by what it does admit.

Some color to our sense of the article results from these expressions in the same clause, "leaving in all fortifications the American artillery that may be therein." But this expression is not of equivalent force to that of property of American inhabitants. For example, suppose an American ship to have been captured and condemned, it might still be said of her, in a certain sense, this is an "American ship," alluding to the country of which she had been the ship; but it could not be said in any sense of her, this ship is American property, or the property of American inhabitants. The country of which a thing was, may often be used with aptness as a term of description of that thing, though it may have changed owners; but the term property, which is synonymous with ownership, can never be used in the present tense as descriptive of an ownership which has ceased. Moreover, if the expressions in the two cases had been (as they are not) of equivalent force, it would not follow that they were to have the same meaning in both cases, being applied to different matters. For an odious consequence in one instance, would be a reason for rejecting a particular sense of a word or phrase, which would be proper in another, to which no such consequence was attached.

Let me now ask this question of any candid man: Is our construction of the article respecting the Negroes so much better supported than that of Great Britain, as to justify our pronouncing with positiveness, that the carrying them away was a breach of the treaty?

To me it appears clear that this must be considered, speaking favorably for us, as a very doubtful point, and that we cannot, with confidence, predicate a breach of the treaty by Great Britain upon this event. If it was one, it happened in May 1783.

The affair of the Western posts is now to be examined. That the detention of them, after the proper point of time for delivering them up, was a breach of the treaty, will not bear a dispute. But what that proper time was, is a serious question between the two parties.

Our Government has contended, that the posts ought to have been surrendered with all convenient speed after the provisional treaty took effect; and Mr. Jefferson, who is much cited on the present occasion, has shown by an ingenious and elaborate deduction of circumstances, that this was not only not done but never intended.

But Mr. Jefferson has not even discussed the question, whether the provisional or the definitive treaty was the act from which the obligation to perform was to date. This is an important omission; for Great Britain affirms the definitive treaty to be the criterion.

As an original question much might be said on both sides. The natural relation of the terms provisional or preliminary and definitive, seems to exhibit the former as inchoate and imperfect, and to refer to the latter the conclusive obligatory force and legal perfection. There is room, therefore, to say, that all but the mere cessation of hostilities, or for the execution of which there is no precise point of time fixed in the preliminary articles, is referred to in the definitive treaty.

On the other hand, it may be argued, that a preliminary treaty is as much a national treaty as a definitive one, both being made by an equal and a competent authority; and that there is no good reason why those things which are sufficiently regulated by the preliminary, should not go into immediate and complete effect, equally as if regulated by the definitive treaty; or why the latter should be considered as anything more than an instrument for adjusting points which may have been left open by the preliminary articles, and for giving more perfect form. Accordingly, there are examples of preliminary treaties going into mutual and full execution, though never followed by definitive treaties.

But, however, this question may have stood on principle, the conduct of our Government in the particular case has settled it against us, and has completely sanctioned the doctrine of Great Britain.

If performance was to date from the provisional articles, this applies as well to us as to Great Britain. It was incumbent upon Congress to have notified the treaty, with the proper solemnities, to the different States and their citizens; to have made the recommendations stipulated by the fifth article; and to have enjoined the observance of all those things which we promised on our part. The nature of some of these stipulations rendered it particularly urgent that no time should be lost. But all was deferred till the ratification in this country of the definitive treaty. The 15th of January, 1784, is the date of the act which attempts to carry the treaty into effect on our part. This then is a practical settlement by ourselves of the principle, that performance was to date from the definitive treaty.

It is no objection to the position, that our seaports were previously evacuated. That was matter of mutual convenience; and though done, does not change the state of strict obligation between the parties. Even in the view of liberal and conciliating procedure, the prompt surrender of our seaports is, for obvious reasons, a very different thing.

But our dilemma is this, if the delay of orders for evacuating the Western posts, previous to the ratification of the definitive treaty, was, on the part of Great Britain, a breach of treaty, our delay to act upon the points stipulated by us, till after that ratification, must have been equally a breach of treaty; and it must have been at least contemporary with any breach that could have been committed by Great Britain.

We are compelled, then, by our own example to agree with Great Britain, that she was not obliged to surrender the Western posts till after the mutual ratification of the definitive treaty, and to abandon the superstructure, however soothing to our wishes, which has been reared upon a different foundation. If so, we must look to the period of the exchange of the ratification in Europe for the date of the orders for evacuating. I have not in my possession materials for fixing with accuracy that period; but considering the time of the ratification here, and the time of its probable arrival in England, we are carried to the latter end of April, or beginning of May, 1784; so that it is not till about May, 1784, that we can charge upon Great Britain a delinquency as to the surrender of the posts.

Having now examined the nature of the infractions of the treaty of peace charged upon Great Britain with reference to dates, I shall, in the next number of this defense, trace some instances of infraction on our part with a like reference. The conclusions to be drawn from this comparison, if I mistake not, will greatly disconcert some articles of the prevailing creed on this head, and go far toward confirming what was preliminarily offered to evince the prudence of our envoy in relinquishing the favorite ground.

CAMILLUS.

No. IV

1795.

An accurate enumeration of the breaches of the treaty of peace on our part, would require a tedious research. It will suffice to select and quote a few of the most prominent and early instances.

One of the earliest is to be found in an act of this State, for granting a more effectual relief in cases of certain trespasses, passed March 17, 1783. This act takes away from any person (subjects of Great Britain of every description included) who had, during the war, occupied, injured, destroyed, or received property, real or personal, of any inhabitant without the British lines, the benefit of the plea of a military order; consequently the justification which the laws and usages of war give, and the immunity resulting from the reciprocal amnesty which, expressly or virtually, is an essential part of every treaty of peace. To this it may be added that it was considered by Great Britain as a direct infraction of the sixth article of her treaty with us, which exempts all persons from prosecution "by reason of the part they might have taken in the war."

Mr. Jefferson, not controverting the point that the provisions of this act were contrary to the treaty, endeavors to get rid of the inference from it, by alleging three things: (1) That it passed antecedently to the treaty, and so could not be a violation of an act of subsequent date. (2) That the treaty was paramount to the laws of the particular States, and operated a repeal of them. (3) That the exceptionable principle of this act was never sanctioned by the courts of justice, and in one instance (the case of Rutgers and Waddington in the mayor's court) was overruled.

As to the first point, it is sufficient to answer, that the law continued to operate, in fact, from the time of the treaty till the

4th of April, 1787, when there was a repeal of the exceptionable clause, by an act of our legislature. During the period of 4 years, many suits were brought and many recoveries had; extending even to persons who had been in the military service of Great Britain.

To the second point, these observations may be opposed:

The articles of the Confederation did not, like our present Constitution, declare that treaties were supreme laws of the land. The United States, under that system, had no courts of their own, to expound and enforce their treaties as laws. All was to depend upon the comparative authority of laws and treaties, in the judgment of the State courts.

The question, whether treaties were paramount to, and a virtual repeal of, antecedent laws, was a question of theory, about which there was room for, and in this country did exist, much diversity of opinion. It is notorious, that it has been strenuously maintained that however a national treaty ought, in good faith, to be conclusive on a State, to induce a repeal of laws contrary to it, yet its actual laws could not be controverted by treaty, without an actual repeal by its own authority. This doctrine has been emphatically that of the party distinguished by its opposition to national principles.

And it is observable, that Congress, not relying entirely upon the force of the treaty to abrogate contravening laws, in their address already cited, urge the States to a repeal of those laws. It is likewise observable in respect to the very act under consideration, that the legislature of the State, in April 1787 thought a positive repeal of the exceptionable clause necessary.

The complaints of a power whose treaty with us was, in fact, violated by the operation of a State law, could never be satisfactorily answered by referring to a theoretic, abstract, disputed proposition. Such a power might reply with irresistible force: "It is not for us to concern ourselves about the structure and meaning of your political constitutions, or the force of legal maxims deductible from the forms and distributions of power which you have adopted for your government. It is the act in which alone we are interested; you have stipulated this and that to us—your stipulation in practice is contravened. It is your duty to see that there are no impediments from conflicting authorities within yourselves, to an exact fulfillment of your promises. If you suffer any such impediment to exist, you are answerable for the consequences."

As to the third point, it is to be observed, that though there may have been no express formal decision of our courts, enforcing the exceptionable principle of the trespass act, yet there never was a decision of a Supreme Court against it; and it may not be amiss to remark incidentally, that the decision of the mayor's court, from which Mr. Jefferson is glad to derive an exculpation of our conduct, was the subject of a severe animadversion at a popular meeting in this city, as a judiciary encroachment on the legislative authority of the State. The truth on this point is, that according to the opinion of our bar, a defense under a military order was desperate, and it was believed that a majority of our Supreme Court bench would overrule the plea. Hence, in numerous cases where it might have been used, it was waived; and the endeavor on behalf of the defendants was either to effect, on collateral grounds, a mitigation of damages, or to accomplish the best compromises that could be obtained; even the suit of Rutgers and Waddington, after a partial success in the mayor's court, was terminated by a compromise, according to the advice of the defendant's council, owing to the apprehension of an unfavorable issue in the Supreme Court; and this, notwithstanding the defendant was a British subject.

Under these circumstances, which are faithfully represented, is it possible to doubt, that the act in question operated a breach of our treaty with Great Britain—and this from the commencement of its existence? Can we reasonably expect that nations with whom we have treaties will allow us to substitute theoretic problems to performances of our engagements, and will be willing to accept them as apologies for actual violations?

It is pertinent to remark that the British commander in chief very early remonstrated against this act; but the remonstrance produced no effect.

Another act of the State of New York may be cited as a violation of the treaty on our part, which must have been nearly contemporary with that of the detention of the posts. Its date is the 12th of May 1784. This act confirms, in express terms, all confiscations before made, notwithstanding errors in the proceedings, and takes away the writ of error upon any judgment previously rendered.

This was, in substance, a new confiscation; judgments which from error were invalid, were nullities. To take away the writ of error, by which their nullity might be established, was to give them an efficacy which they did not before possess; and, as to the operation, cannot be distinguished from the rendering of new judgments. To make voidable acts of confiscation valid and conclusive, is equivalent to new acts of confiscation. A fair execution of the treaty required that everything in this respect should be left where it was, and forbade the remedying of defects in former proceedings, as much as the restitution of new judgments.

Another and an unequivocal breach of the treaty is found in an act of South Carolina, of March 26, 1784. This act suspends the recovery of British debts for 9 months, and then allows them to be recovered only in four yearly installments, contrary to the express stipulation of the fourth article, "that creditors on either side shall meet with no lawful impediments to the recovery of the full value in sterling money of all bona fide debts theretofore contracted."

It is idle to attempt to excuse infractions of this kind by the pleas of distress and inability. This is to make the convenience of one party the measure of its obligation to perform its promises to another. If there was really an impossibility of payment, as has been pretended, there was no need of legislative obstruction; the thing would have regulated itself; and the very interest of the creditor was a pledge that no general evil could have resulted from allowing a free course to the laws. If such impediments could be justified, what impediments might not be justified? What would become of the article, the only one in the treaty, to be performed by us, of real consequence to Great Britain?

This infraction by South Carolina was prior to that of the detention of the posts by Great Britain.

But the case of Virginia is still stronger than that of South Carolina. There is evidence which cannot be disputed, that her courts, in defiance of the treaty, have constantly remained shut to the recovery of British debts, in virtue of laws passed during the war.

An act of her General Assembly of the 22d June, 1784, after suggesting as breaches of the treaty by Great Britain the carrying off of the Negroes and the detention of the posts, after instructing her delegates in Congress to request a remonstrance to the British court complaining of these infractions and desiring reparation, and after declaring that the national honor and interest of the citizens of that Commonwealth obliged the Assembly to withhold their cooperation in the complete fulfilment of the said treaty, until the success of the aforementioned remonstrance is known, or Congress shall signify their sentiments touching the premises, concludes with the following resolution:

"That so soon as reparation is made for the foregoing infraction, or Congress shall judge it indisputably necessary, such acts and parts of acts passed during the late war, as inhibit the recovery of British debts, ought to be repealed, and payment thereof made in such time and manner as shall consist with the exhausted situation of the Commonwealth."

The plain language of this resolution is, that there were acts passed during the war, which then actually inhibited the recovery of British debts; and that for the removal of this inhibition, a repealing act by the authority of Virginia was necessary.

However unfounded this position might have been in theory, here is conclusive evidence that the fact in Virginia was conformable to it; that her courts had been, ever since the peace, then were, and until a repealing law was passed were likely to continue, to be shut against the recovery of British debts. When testimony of this kind was urged by the British minister, was it possible for our envoy to make any solid reply? Who could be supposed to know better than the Legislature of Virginia the real State of the fact? When that legislature declared it to be as has been stated, who or what could contradict it? With what truth has it been asserted, that "it was at all times perfectly understand" that treaties controlled the laws of the States?

Additional proof of the contrary is found in the subsequent conduct of Virginia. On the 12th of December 1787, the State passed an act repealing all such acts or parts of acts of the State as had prevented or might prevent the recovery of debts due to British subjects according to the true intent of the treaty; but with this proviso, that there should be a suspension of the repeal till the Governor, by advice of council, had, by proclamation, notified that Great Britain had delivered up the posts, and was taking measures for the further fulfillment of the treaty, by delivering up the Negroes, or by making compensation for them. This denotes clearly, that in the opinion of the Legislature of Virginia there were acts of that State which had prevented and might prevent the recovery of debts according to the treaty.

It is observable, too, that the resolutions of June 1784, do not even give the expectation of a complete repeal of the impeding laws, in the event of reparation of the breaches of treaty by Great Britain. They only promise such a modification of them as would permit the payment in such time and manner as should consist with the exhausted situation of the Commonwealth; that is, not according to the true intent of the treaty, but according of the opinion of the Legislature of Virginia of the abilities of the Commonwealth.

As the infraction which these proceedings of Virginia admit resulted from acts passed during the war, it was of course coeval with the first existence of the treaty of peace, and seems to preclude the possibility of any prior breach by Great Britain. It has been at least demonstrated, that the detention of the posts was not such prior breach, as there was no obligation to surrender till after the exchange of the ratifications of the definitive treaty in England.

I pass by the serious contraventions of the treaty in this important article of the debts, which are of later date, because they do not affect the question of the first breach, though they are of great weight to demonstrate the obligation of the United States to make compensation.

The argument, then, upon the whole, as to the question of the first breach, stands thus: It is a great doubt whether the carry-

ing away of the Negroes was at all a breach. If it was one, the Trespass Act of this State preceded it in date, and went into operation the very moment it was possible to issue process. The detention of the posts is subsequent to breaches of the article concerning their recovery of debts on our part. This, in the case of South Carolina, is determined by the date of her act (Mar. 26, 1784), which is before the exchange of the ratifications of the definitive treaty could have taken place. In that of Virginia, it results from her own testimony, that impediments to the recovery of British debts, created by acts passed during the war, continued from the first moment of the peace until after the year 1787. Or if, contrary to our own interpretation, we are disposed to adhere to the provisional treaty, as the act from which performance was to date, we are guilty of a breach in not acting ourselves upon that treaty; a breach which, being contemporary with the existence of the treaty, seems not to admit of any prior contravention. From all which it follows, that take what ground we will, we must be perplexed to fix the charge of the first breach of the treaty upon Great Britain.

Let the appeal be to the understandings and hearts of candid men—men who have force of mind sufficient to rescue themselves from the trammels of prejudice, and who dare to look even unpalatable truths in the face. Let such men pronounce, whether they are still satisfied that Great Britain is clearly chargeable with the first breaches of the treaty? Whether they are not, on the contrary, convinced that the question is one so mixed and doubtful, as to render a waiver of it, even on the score of intrinsic merit, expedient on our part? and specially whether they can entertain a particle of doubt, That it was wiser to waive it than to suffer it to prove a final obstacle to the adjustment of a controversy on which the peace of their country was suspended? This was undoubtedly the alternative to our envoy. In the choice he made, the ultimate opinion of our enlightened country cannot fail to applaud his prudence.

CAMILLUS.

No. V

1795.

The discussion in the last two numbers has shown, if I mistake not, that this country by no means stands upon such good ground, with regard to the inexecution of the treaty of peace, as some of our official proceedings have advanced, and as many among us have too lightly credited. The task of displaying this truth has been an unwelcome one. As long as a contrary doctrine was either a mere essay of polemical skill, or a convenient ingredient of negotiation, it was natural for those who thought differently of it, to prefer silence to contradiction; but when it is made the engine of great errors, of national conduct, of excessive pretentions, which forbid a reasonable accommodation of national difference, and endanger rupture and war, on grounds which reason disapproves and prudence condemns, it becomes an indispensable duty to expose its hollowness and fallacy. Reserve then would be a crime. The true patriot, who never fears to sacrifice popularity to what he believes to be the cause of public good, cannot hesitate to endeavor to unmask the error, though with the certainty of incurring the displeasure and censure of the prejudiced and unthinking.

The disposition to infract the treaty, which, in several particulars, discovered itself among us, almost as soon as it was known to have been made, was, from its first appearance, a source of humiliation, regret, and apprehension to those who could dispassionately estimate the consequences, and who felt a proper concern for the honor and character of the country. They perceived that besides loss of reputation, it must sooner or later lead to very serious embarrassments. They have been hitherto mistaken in no part of their anticipations; and if their faithful warning voice, now raised to check the progress of error, is as little listened to as when it was raised to prevent the commencement of it, there is too much cause to fear, that the experience of extensive evils may extort regrets which the foresight of an enlightened people ought to avert.

Citizens of United America as you value your present enviable lot, rally around your own good sense. Expel from your confidence, men who have never ceased to misadvise you. Discard intemperate and illiberal passions. Aspire to the glory of the greatest triumph which a people can gain, a triumph over prejudice. Be just, be prudent. Listen impartially to the unadulterated language of truth. And, above all, guard your peace with anxious vigilance against all the artful snares which are laid for it. Accompany me with minds open to conviction, in a discussion of unspeakable importance to your welfare.

Weigh well, as preliminary to further investigation this momentous proposition. "Peace, in the particular situation of this independent country, is an object of such great and primary magnitude, that it ought not to be relinquished, unless the relinquishment be clearly necessary to preserve our honor in some unequivocal point, or to avoid the sacrifice of some right or interest of material and permanent importance." This is the touchstone of every question which can come before us respecting our foreign concerns.

As a general proposition, scarcely any will dispute it; but in the application of the rule there is much confusion of ideas—much false feeling, and falser reasoning. The ravings of anger and pride are mistaken for the suggestions of honor. Thus are we told in a delirium of rage, by a gentleman of South Carolina, that our envoy should have demanded an unconditional relinquishment of the Western posts as a right; till which was granted, and until Lord Grenville had given orders to Lord Dorchester to that effect, open, to be sent to our President, to be by him forwarded, he should not have opened his lips about the treaty. It was prostrating the dearest rights of freemen, and laying them prostrate at the feet of royalty.

In a case of incontestible mutual infractions of a treaty, one of the parties is to demand, peremptorily of the other, an unconditional performance upon his part, by way of preliminary, and without negotiation. An envoy sent to avert war, carrying with him the clearest indications of a general solicitude of his country that peace might be preserved, was, at the very first step of his progress, to render hostility inevitable, by exacting, not only what could not have been complied with, but what must have been rejected with indignation. The Government of Great Britain must have been the most abject on earth, in a case so situated, to have listened for a moment to such a demand. And because our envoy did not pursue this frantic course—did not hold the language of an imperious bashaw to his trembling slave, he is absurdly stigmatized as having prostrated the rights of freemen at the foot of royalty. What are we to think of the state of mind which could produce so extravagant a sally? Would a prudent people have been willing to have entrusted a negotiation which involved their peace to the author of it? Will they be willing to take him as their guide in a critical emergency of their affairs? [3]

[3] No man in the habit of thinking well either of Mr. Rutledge's head or heart but must have felt, at reading the passages of his speech which have been published, pain, surprise, and mortification. I regret the occasion, and the necessity of animadversion.

True honor is a rational thing. It is as distinguishable from quixotism as true courage from the spirit of the bravo. It is possible for one nation to commit so undisguised and unqualified an outrage upon another as to render a negotiation of the question dishonorable. But this seldom, if ever, happens. In most cases, it is consistent with honor to precede rupture by negotiation, and whenever it is, reason and humanity demand it. Honor cannot be wounded by consulting moderation. As a general rule, it is not till after it has become manifest that reasonable reparation for a clear premeditated wrong cannot be obtained by an amicable adjustment, that honor demands a resort to arms. In all the questions between us and Great Britain, honor permitted the moderate course; in those which regard the inexecution of the treaty of peace, there had undoubtedly been mutual faults. It was, therefore, a case for negotiation and mutual reparation. True honor, which can never be separated from justice, even requires reparation from us to Great Britain, as well as from her to us. The injuries we complain of in the present war, were also of a negotiable kind. The first was bottomed on a controverted point in the laws of nations. The second left open the question, whether the principal injury was a designed act of the Government or a misconstruction of its courts? To have taken, therefore, the imperious ground which is recommended, in place of that which was taken, would have been not to follow the admonitions of honor, but to have submitted to the impulse of passion and frenzy.

So likewise, when it is asserted that war is preferable to the sacrifice of our rights and interests, this, to be true, to be rational, must be understood of such rights and interests as are certain, as are important, such as regard the honor, security, or prosperity of our country. It is not a right disputable, or of small consequence, it is not an interest temporary, partial, and inconsiderable, which will justify, in our situation, an appeal to arms.

Nations ought to calculate as well as individuals, to compare evils, and to prefer the lesser to the greater; to act otherwise, is to act unreasonably; those who counsel it are impostors or madmen.

These reflections are of a nature to lead to a right judgment of the conduct of our envoy in the plan of adjustment to which he has given his assent.

Three objects, as has appeared, were to be aimed at, on behalf of the United States: (1) Compensation for Negroes carried away. (2) Surrender of the Western posts. (3) Compensation for spoliation during the existing war.

Two of these objects, and these in every view the most important, have been provided for; how fully, will be examined hereafter. One of them has been given up—to wit: compensation for the Negroes.

It has been shown, as I trust, to the conviction of dispassionate men, that the claim of compensation for the Negroes is, in point of right, a very doubtful one; in point of interest, it certainly falls under the description of partial and inconsiderable; affecting in no respect the honor or security of the Nation, and incapable of having a sensible influence upon its prosperity. The pecuniary value of the object is, in a national scale, trifling.

Not having before me the proper documents, I can only speak from memory. But I do not fear to be materially mistaken in stating that the whole number carried away, so ascertained as to have afforded evidence for a claim for compensation, was short of 3,000 persons, of whom about 1,300 were of 16 years and upwards, men, women, and children. Computing these at an average of $150 per head, which is a competent price, the amount would be $450,000, and not two or three millions, as has been pretended.

It is a fact, which I assert on the best authority, that our envoy made every effort in his power to establish our construction of the article relating to this subject, and to obtain compensation; and that he did not relinquish it till he became convinced that to insist upon it would defeat the purpose of his mission, and leave the controversy between the two countries unsettled.

Finding, at the same time, that the two other points in dispute could be reasonably adjusted, is there any one who will be rash enough to affirm that he ought to have broken off the negotiation on account of the difficulty about the Negroes? Yes, there are men who are thus inconsiderate and intemperate. But will a sober, reflecting people ratify their sentence?

What would such a people have said to our envoy, had he returned with this absurd tale in his mouth: "Countrymen. I could have obtained the surrender of your posts, and an adequate provision for the reparation of your losses by unjust captures; I could have terminated your controversy with Great Britain, and secured the continuance of your peace, but for one obstacle—a refusal to compensate for the Negroes carried away; on this point the British Government maintained a construction of the treaty different from ours, and adhered to it with inflexibility. I confess that there appeared to be much doubt concerning the true construction; I confess, also, that the object was of inconsiderable value. Yet it made a part of our claims, and I though the hazards of war preferable to a renunciation of it."

What would his adversaries have replied to him on such an occasion? No ridicule would have been too strong, no reproach too bitter. Their triumph would have been complete; for he would have been deservedly left without advocate, without apologist.

It cannot admit of a serious doubt, that the affair of the Negroes was too questionable in point of right, too insignificant in point of interest, to have been suffered to be an impediment to the immense objects which were to be promoted by an accommodation of differences acceptable in other respects. There was no general principle of national right or policy to be renounced. No consideration of honor forbade the renunciation; every calculation of interest invited to it. The evils of war for 1 month would outweigh the advantage, if at the end of it there was a certainty of attainment.

But was war the alternative? Yes, war or disgrace?

The United States and Great Britain had been brought to issue. The recent spoliations on our commerce, superadded to the evils of a protracted Indian War, connected with the detention of the western posts, and accompanied with indications of a design to contract our boundaries, obstructing the course of our settlements and the enjoyment of private rights, and producing serious and growing discontent in our Western country, rendered it indispensable that there should be a settlement of old differences, and a reparation of new wrongs; or, that the sword should vindicate our rights.

This was certainly, and with reason, the general sense of our country when our envoy left it. There are many indications that it was the opinion of our Government; and it is to be inferred, that our envoy understood the alternative to be as has been stated.

Indeed, what else could be contemplated? After the depredations which had been committed upon our commerce, after the strong sensibility which had been discovered upon the occasion in and out of our public councils, after an envoy extraordinary had been sent to terminate differences and obtain reparation; if nothing had resulted, was there any choice but reprisals? Should we not have rendered ourselves ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of the whole world by forbearing them?

It is curious to observe the inconsistency of certain men. They reprobate the treaty as incompatible with our honor, and yet they affect to believe an abortion of the negotiations would not have led to war. If they are sincere, they must think that national honor consists in perpetually railing, complaining, blustering, and submitting. For my part, much as I deprecate war, I entertain no doubt that it would have been our duty to meet it with decision, had negotiation failed; that a due regard to our honor, our rights, and our interests would have enjoined it upon us. Nor would a pusillanimous passiveness have saved us from it. So unsettled a state of things would have led to fresh injuries and aggravations; and circumstances, too powerful to be resisted, would have dragged us into war. We should have lost our honor without preserving our peace. Nations in similar situations have no option but to accommodate differences, or to fight. Those which have strong motives to avoid war, should, by their moderation, facilitate the accommodation of differences. This is a rule of good sense, a maxim of sound policy.

But the misfortune is, that men will oppose imagination to fact. Though we see Great Britain predominant on the ocean; though we observe her pertinaciously resisting the idea of pacification with France, amid the greatest discouragements; though we have employed a man whose sagacity and integrity have been hitherto undisputed, and of a character far from flexible, to ascertain what was practicable; though circumstances favored his exertions; though much time and pains were bestowed upon the subject; though there is not only his testimony, but the testimony of other men who were immediately on the scene, and in whom there is every reason to confide, that all was attained which was attainable: yet we still permit ourselves to imagine, that more and better could have been done, and that by taking even now a high and menacing tone, Great Britain may be brought to our feet.

Even a style of politeness in our envoy has been construed to his disadvantage. Because he did not mistake strut for dignity, and rudeness for spirit; because he did not, by petulance and asperity, enlist the pride of the British court against the success of his mission, he is represented as having humiliated himelf and his nation. It is forgotten that mildness in the manner and firmness in the thing are most compatible with true dignity, and almost always go further than harshness and stateliness.

Suppositions that more could be done by displaying what is called greater spirit, are not warranted by facts. It would be extremely imprudent, on that basis, to trust ourselves to a further experiment—to the immense vicissitudes in the affairs of Europe, which from moment to moment may essentially vary the relative situations of the contending parties. If there ever was a state of things which demanded extraordinary circumspection, and forbade a spirit of adventure, it is that of the United States at the existing juncture, viewed in connection with the present very singular and incalculable posture of Europe.

But it is asked, to avoid Scylla, may we not run upon Charybdis? If the treaty should preserve our peace with Britain, may it not interrupt it with France? I answer, that to me there appears no room for apprehension. It will be shown in the course of the discussion, that the treaty interferes in no particular with our engagements to France, and will make no alteration whatever in the state of things between us and her, except as to the selling prizes in our ports, which, not being required by treaty, was originally permitted merely because there was no law to forbid it, and which being confined to France, was of very questionable propriety on the principles of neutrality, and has been a source of dissatisfaction to the other belligerent powers. This being the case, no cause of umbrage is given to France by the treaty, and it is as contrary to her interest as to inclination, wantonly to seek a quarrel with us. Prostrate indeed were our situation, if we could not, without offending France, make a treaty with another power, which merely tended to extinguish controversy, and to regulate the rules of commercial intercourse, and this not only without violating any duty to France, but without giving any preference to another. It is astonishing that those who affect so much nicety about national honor, do not feel the extreme humiliation of such an idea. As to the denomination of alliance with Great Britain which has been given to the treaty, it is an insult to the understandings of the people to call it by such a name. There is not a tittle of it which warrants the appellation.

CAMILLUS.

No. VI

1795.

There is one more objection to the treaty for what it does not do, which requires to be noticed. This is an omission to provide against the impressment of our seamen.

It is certain that our trade has suffered embarrassments in this respect, and that there have been abuses which have operated very oppressively upon our seamen; and all will join in the wish that they could have been guarded against in future by the treaty.

But it is easier to desire this, than to see how it could have been done. A general stipulation against the impressment of our seamen would have been nugatory, if not derogatory. Our right to an exemption is perfect by the laws of nations, and a contrary right is not even pretended by Great Britain. The difficulty has been, and is, to fix a rule of evidence, by which to discriminate our seamen from theirs, and by the discrimination to give ours protection, without covering theirs in our service. It happens that the two nations speak the same language, and in every exterior circumstance closely resemble each other; that many of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland are among our citizens, and that others, without being properly our citizens, are employed in our vessels.

Everybody knows that the safety of Great Britain depends upon her marine. This was never more emphatically the case, than in the war in which she is now engaged. Her very existence as an independent power, seems to rest on a maritime superiority.

In this situation, can we be surprised that there are difficulties in bringing her to consent to any arrangement which would enable us, by receiving her seamen into our employment, to detain them from her service? Unfortunately, there can be devised no method of protecting our seamen which does not involve that danger to her. Language and appearance, instead of being a guide, as between other nations, are, between us and Great Britain, sources of mistake and deception. The most familiar experience in the ordinary affairs of society proves, that the oaths of parties interested cannot be fully relied upon. Certificates of citizenship, by officers of one party, would be too open to the possibility of collusion and imposition, to expect that the other would admit them to be conclusive. If inconclusive, there must be a discretion to the other party which would destroy their efficacy.

In whatever light they may be viewed, there will be found an intrinsic difficulty in devising a rule of evidence safe for both parties, and consequently, in establishing one by treaty. No nation would readily admit a rule which would make it depend on the good faith of another, and the integrity of its agents, whether her seamen, in time of war, might be drawn from her service, and

transferred to that of a neutral power. Such a rule between Great Britain and us would be peculiarly dangerous, on account of circumstances, and would facilitate a transfer of seamen from one party to another. Great Britain has accordingly perseveringly declined any definite arrangement on the subject, notwithstanding earnest and reiterated efforts of our Government.

When we consider candidly the peculiar difficulties which various circumstances of similitude between the people of the two countries oppose to a satisfactory arrangement, and that to the belligerent party it is a question of national safety, to the neutral party a question of commercial convenience and individual security, we shall be the less disposed to think the want of such a provision as our wishes would dictate a blemish in the treaty.

The truth seems to be, that, from the nature of the thing, it is matter of necessity to leave it to occasional and temporary expedients—to the effects of special interpositions from time to time, to procure the correction of abuses; and if the abuse becomes intolerable, to the ultima ratio; the good faith of the parties, and the motives which they have to respect the rights of each other and to avoid causes of offence, and vigilance in noting and remonstrating against the irregularities which are committed, are probably the only peaceable sureties of which the case is susceptible.

Our Minister Plenipotentiary, Mr. Pinckney, it is well known, has long had this matter in charge, and has strenuously exerted himself to have it placed upon some acceptable footing; but his endeavors have been unsuccessful, further than to mitigate the evil by some additional checks, and by drawing the attention of the British Government to the observance of more caution. A more sensible effect of our representations has been lately experienced; and with attention and vigilance that effect may be continued, and perhaps increased. But there is reason to fear that it would constantly be found impracticable to establish an efficacious conventional guard.

I proceed now to the examination of the several articles in the treaty, in the order in which they stand.

The first contains merely a general declaration that there shall be peace and friendship between the contracting parties, the countries and people of each, without exceptions of persons or places.

One would have imagined that this article, at least, would have escaped a formal objection, however it might have been secretly viewed as the most sinful of all, by those who pant after war and enmity between the two countries. Nothing but the fact could have led to a surmise that it was possible for it to have been deemed exceptionable; and nothing can better display the rage for objection which actuates the adversaries of the treaty, than their having invented one against so innocent a provision.

But the committee appointed by a meeting at Charleston (S.C.) have sagaciously discovered, that this article permits "the unconditional return to our country of all persons who were proscribed during the late war."

With all but men determined to be dissatisfied, it would be a sufficient answer to such an objection to say that this article is a formula in almost every treaty on record, and that the consequence attributed to it was never before dreamt of, though other nations besides ourselves have had their proscriptions and their banishments.

But this is not all—our treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783 has an equivalent stipulation in these words (art. 6): "There shall be a firm and perpetual peace between his Britannic Majesty and the United States, and between the subjects of the one, and the citizens of the other." In calling this an equivalent stipulation, I speak with reference to the objection which is made. The argument to support that objection would be to this effect: "Exiles and criminals are regarded as within the peace of a country; but the people of each are, by this article, placed within the peace of the other; therefore proscribed persons are restored to the peace of the United States, and so lose the character of exiles and criminals." Hence the argument will turn upon the word "peace"—the word "friendship" will have no influence upon the question. In other respects there is no difference in substance between the two articles. For the terms "people," "subjects," "citizens," as used in the two treaties, are synonymous. If, therefore, the last treaty stipulates that there shall be peace between the governments, countries, and people of the two nations, the first stipulates what is equivalent, that there shall be peace between the two governments, and the subjects and citizens of each. The additional words, "without exception of persons and places," can make no difference, being merely surplusage. If A says to B: "I will give you all the money in this purse," the gift is as complete as if he had said: "I give you all the money in this purse, without exception of a single dollar."

But the object of the stipulation, and the subject of the objection, have no relation to each other. National stipulations are to be considered in the sense of the laws of nations. Peace, in the sense of those laws, defines a state which is opposite to war. Peace, in the sense of the municipal laws, defines a state which is opposite to that of criminality. They are, consequently, different things; and a subject of Great Britain, by committing a crime, may put himself out of the peace of our Government, in the sense of our municipal laws, while there might be a perfect peace with him, in the sense of the laws of nations; and vice versa, there might be war with him, in the sense of the laws of nations, and peace in that of the municipal laws.

The punishment of a subject of Great Britain as a felon would certainly not constitute a state of war between the parties, nor interfere with the peace which is stipulated by this article; though it is declared that it shall be inviolable, and might as well be affirmed to prevent the punishment of future as of former criminals.

But who, in the contemplation of the laws of the respective states, are the proscribed persons? They must have been understood to have been subjects or citizens of the states which proscribed them—consequently cannot be presumed to be comprehended in an article which stipulates peace between the nations and their respective citizens.

This is not a stipulation of peace between a nation and its own citizens; nor can the idea of expatriation be admitted to go so far as to destroy the relation of citizen, as regards amenability for a crime. To this purpose, at least, the offender must remain a citizen.

There can hardly have been a time when a treaty was formed between two nations, when one or the other had not exiled criminals or fugitives from justice, which it would have been unwilling to reinstate. Yet this was never deemed an obstacle to the article, nor has an immunity from punishment ever been claimed under it, nor is there the least ground to assert that it might be claimed under it.

It follows that the objection which has been taken to this article is wholly without foundation. It is humiliating to the human understanding, or disreputable to the human heart, that similar objections should come from sensible men; it is disgustful to have to refute them. The regard I feel for some of those who have brought it forward makes it a painful task. How great is the triumph of passion over the judgment on this occasion.

CAMILLUS.

No. VII

1795.

The second article of the treaty stipulates that His Britannic Majesty will withdraw all his troops and garrisons from all posts and places within the boundaries lines assigned by the treaty of peace to the United States; and that this evacuation shall take place on or before the 1st day of June 1796; the United States, in the meantime, at their discretion, extending their settlements to any part within the said boundary lines, except within the precincts or jurisdictions of any of the said posts; that all settlers and traders within the precincts or jurisdictions of the said posts, shall continue to enjoy, unmolested, all their property of every kind, and shall be protected therein; that they shall be at liberty to remain there, or to remove with all or any part of their effects; also to sell their lands, houses, or effects, or to retain the property thereof at their discretion; that such of them as shall continue to reside within the said boundary lines shall not be compelled to become citizens of the United States, but shall be at liberty to do so, if they think proper, making and declaring their election within a year after the evacuation; and that those who should continue after the expiration of a year, without having declared their intention of remaining subjects of His Britannic Majesty, shall be considered as having elected to become citizens of the United States.

This article, which accomplishes a primary object of our envoy's mission, and one of primary importance to the United States, has been as much clamored against as if it had made a formal cession of the posts to Great Britain. On this point an uncommon degree of art has been exerted, and with no small success. The value of the principal thing obtained has been put out of sight by a misrepresentation of incidental circumstances.

But the fact is, nevertheless, that an object has been accomplished, of vast consequence to our country. The most important desiderata in our concerns with foreign powers are the possession of the western posts and a participation in the navigation of the river Mississippi. More or fewer of commercial privileges are of vastly inferior moment. The force of circumstances will do all we can reasonably wish in this respect; and, in a short time, without any steps that may convulse our trade or endanger our tranquillity, will carry us to our goal.

The recovery of the western posts will have many important consequences. It will extinguish a source of controversy with Great Britain, which at a period not distant, must have inevitably involved the two countries in a war, and the thing was becoming every day more and more urgent. It will enable us effectively to control the hostilities of the northern and western Indians, and in so doing will have a material influence on the southern tribes. It will therefore tend to rescue the country from what is at present its greatest scourge, Indian wars. When we consider that these wars have, 4 years past, taken an extra million annually from our revenue, we cannot be insensible of the importance of terminating that source of expense. This million, turned to the redemption of our debt, would contribute to complete its extinguishment in about 20 years. (This is a rough calculation, but it cannot materially err.) The benefits of tranquillity to our frontier, exempting its inhabitants from the complicated horrors of savage warfare, speak too loudly to our humanity, as well as to our policy, to need a commentary.

The advantages of the recovery of the posts do not stop here; an extension of trade

is to be added to the catalog. This, however, need only be mentioned at this time, as it will come again into view in considering the third article.

But two consequences, not commonly adverted to, require particular notice in this place.

There is just ground of suspicion, corroborated by various concurring circumstances, that Great Britain has entertained the project of contracting our boundaries to the Ohio. This has appeared in Canada—at the British garrisons—at the Indian towns—at Philadelphia—and at London. The surrender of the posts forever cuts up by the roots this pernicious project. The whole of our western interests are immediately and deeply concerned in the question.

The harmonious and permanent connection of our weste.n with our Atlantic country, materially depends on our possession of the western posts. Already has great discontent been engendered in that country by their detention. That discontent was increasing and ranking daily. It was actually one of the aliments of the insurrection in the western parts of Pennsylvania. While the posts remained in the hands of Great Britain, dangerous tamperings with the inhabitants of that country were to be apprehended—a community of views between Great Britain and Spain might have taken place, and by force and sedition events formidable to our general union might have been hazarded. The disposition or prevention of that community of views is a point of the greatest moment in our system of national policy. It presses us to terminate differences and extinguish misunderstandings with Great Britain; it urges us to improve the favorable moment, and stamps with the charge of madness the efforts to let go the hold which the treaty, if mutually ratified, would give us.

Whoever will cast his eye upon the map of the United States, will survey the position of the western posts, their relations to our western waters, and their general bearings upon our western country, and is at the same time capable of making the reflections which an accurate view of the subject suggests, will discover multiplied confirmations of the position, that the possession of those posts by us has an intimate connection with the preservation of union between our western and Atlantic territories; and whoever can appreciate the immense mischiefs of a disunion will feel the prodigious value of the acquisition. To such a man the question may be confidently put: Is there any thing in the treaty conceded by us to Great Britain, to be placed in competition with this single acquisition? The answer could not fail to be in the negative.

But it is said by way of objection, that, admitting the posts will be surrendered at the time stipulated, it is no acquisition by this treaty; it is only the enjoyment of a right which was secured by the treaty of peace.

With as much good sense might it be said, that the stipulation of reparation for the spoliation of our property, or even immediate actual reparation, if it had been obtained, was nothing gained, because the laws of nations gave us a right to such reparation; and it might in this way be proved to have been impossible for our envoy to have effected anything useful or meritorious.

Let us see what is the real state of the case. Great Britain had engaged, by the treaty of peace, to surrender the western posts with all convenient speed, but without fixing a precise time. For the cause or on the pretext of our not having complied with the treaty on our part, especially in not removing the impediments which the antecedent laws of particular States opposed to the recovery of British debts, she delayed, and afterward refused, to make the surrender; and when our envoy left this country, there was too much appearance of an intention on her part to detain them indefinitely, and this after having actually kept them 10 years. The treaty of peace was consequently in this particular suspended, if not superseded. It was either to be reinstated by a new agreement, or enforced by arms. The first our envoy has effected; he has brought Great Britain to abandon the dispute, and to fix a precise, determinate time when, at furthest, the posts are to be delivered up. It is therefore to this new agreement that we shall owe the enjoyment of them, and it is, of course, entitled to the merit of having obtained them; it is a positive ingredient in its value, which cannot be taken from it; and it may be added, that this is the first time that the merit of procuring, by negotiation, restitution of a right withheld was ever denied to the instrument which procured it.

But the picture given of the situation of Great Britain, to warrant the inferences which are drawn, is exaggerated and false. It cannot be denied that she is triumphant on the ocean; that the acquisitions which she has made upon France are hitherto greater than those which France has made upon her. If, on the one hand, she owes an immense debt, on the other she possesses an immense credit, which there is no symptom of being impaired. British credit has become, in a British mind, an article of faith, and is no longer an article of reason. How long it may last, how far it may go, is incalculable. But it is evident that it still affords prodigious resources, and that it is likely, for some time to come, to continue to afford them. In addition to this, it is a well-ascertained fact, that her government possesses internally as much vigor, and has as much national support, as it perhaps ever had at any former period of her history. Alarmed by the unfortunate excesses in France, most men of property cling to the government, and carry with them the great bulk of the nation, almost the whole of the farming interest, and much the greatest proportion of other industrious classes. Her manufactures, though probably wounded by the war, are still in a comparatively flourishing condition. They suffice not only for her own supply, but for the full extent of foreign demand, and the markets for them have not been materially contracted by the war. Her foreign commerce continues to be immense; as a specimen of it, it may be mentioned, that the ships from India this year announced to have been seen upon or near the British coast amounted to 35 in number, computed to be worth between 4 and 5 millions sterling. It is no light circumstance in the estimate of her resources, that a vast preponderancy in that quarter of the globe continues to nourish her wealth and power.

If from a view of Great Britain, singly, we pass to a view of her in her foreign connections, we shall find no cause to consider her a prostrate nation. Among her allies are the two greatest powers of Europe (France excepted)—namely, Russia and Austria, or the emperor; Spain and Sardinia continue to make a common cause with her. There is no power of Europe which has displayed a more uniform character of perseverance than Austria; for which she has very strong motives on the present occasion. Russia, too, is remarkable for her steadiness to her purpose, whatever it may be. It is true, that heretofore she has not discovered much zeal in the coalition, but there are symptoms of her becoming more closely and cordially engaged. If she does, she is a great weight in the scale.

Against this will be set the astonishing victories, heroic exploits, and vast armies of France, her rapid conquests to the Rhine, the total reduction of Holland, the progress of her arms in Spain and Italy, the detaching of the King of Prussia from the coalition, and the prospect of detaching some others of the German princes; and it will be added, that the continental enemies of France appear exhausted, despairing, and unable to continue the war.

This, if offered only to show that there is no probability that the enemies of France can succeed in the original object of the war against her, or can divest her of her acquisitions on the Continent, has all the force that may be desired to be given to it; but when it is used to prove that the situation of Great Britain is so desperate and humbled as to oblige her to receive from France, or the United States, any conditions which either of them may think fit to impose, the argument is carried infinitely too far. It is one thing for a country to be in a posture not to receive the law from others, and a very different thing for her to be in a situation which obliges others to receive the law from her, and, what is still stronger, from all her friends. France evidently cannot annoy Russia; she cannot, without great difficulty, from their geographical position, make any further acquisitions upon the territories of Austria. Britain and her possessions are essentially safe while she maintains a decided maritime superiority. As long as this is the case, even supposing her abandoned by all her allies, she never can be in the situation which is pretended by the opposers of the treaty.

But in describing the situation of France, only one side of the medal is presented. There is another side far less flattering, and which, in order to come to a just conclusion, must be impartially viewed.

If the allies of Great Britain are fatigued and exhausted, France cannot be in a better condition. The efforts of the latter, in proportion to intrinsic resources, have, no doubt, been much greater than those of the former. It is a consequence from this, physically certain, that France must be still more fatigued and exhausted even than her adversaries. Her acquisitions cannot materially vary this conclusion: the Low Countries, long the theater of the war, must have been pretty well emptied before they fell into her hands. Holland is an artificial power; her life and strength were in her credit; this perished with her reduction. Accordingly the succors extracted from her, compared with the scale of the war, have been insignificant.

But it is conjectured, that as much has not been done as might have been done; that restitution of the posts has not been procured, but only a promise to restore them at a remote period, in exchange for a former promise which had been violated; that there is no good ground of reliance upon the fulfilment of this new promise, for the performance of which there ought to have been some surety or guaranty; that the restitution of the posts ought to have been accompanied with indemnification for the detention, and for the expenses of the Indian wars which have been occasioned by that detention and by the instigation of British intrigue; that it was better to go to war than to relinquish our claim to such indemnification, or if our present circumstances did not recommend this, it was better to wait till it was more convenient to us to enforce our claims than to give them up. These are the declamations by which this part of the treaty is arraigned. Let us see if they are the random effusions of enthusiasm, or the rational dictates of sound policy.

As to the suggestion that more might have been done than was done, it must of necessity be mere conjecture and imagination. If the picture given of the situation of Great Britain was better justified by facts than it is, it would not follow that the suggestions is true; for the thing would depend not on the real situation of the country, but on the opinion entertained of it by its own administration—on the personal character of

the prince and of his council—on the degree in which they were influenced by pride and passion, or by reason. The hypothesis, that the dispositions of a government are conformable with its situation, is as fallacious a one as can be entertained. It is to suppose, contrary to every day's experience, that Cabinets are always wise. It is, on the part of those who draw the inference, to suppose, that a Cabinet, the most violent, rash, and foolish of Europe, is at the same time moderate and prudent enough to act according to the true situation of the country. Who of our enthusiasts, reasoning from his view of the abased condition of Great Britain, has not long since imagined that she ought to be on her knees to France suing for mercy and forgiveness? Yet how different hitherto is the fact. If we carefully peruse the speeches of the leading members of the convention, we shall observe the menaces against Britain frequently interspersed with invitations to peace; while the British Government maintains a proud and distant reserve, repels every idea of peace, and inflexibly pursues the path of war. If the situation of Europe in general, and of Great Britain in particular, as is pretended, authorized us to expect whatever we chose, how happens it that France, with all her victories, has not yet been able to extort peace?

As to the true position of France, we are not left to mere inference. All the official reports, all the private accounts from thence acknowledge a state of extreme embarrassment and distress—an alarming derangement of the finances, and a scarcity not distant from famine. To this are to be added a continuance of violent and destructive conflicts of parties, and the unextinguishable embers of insurrection.

This fair comparison of the relative situation of the contending parties will, I know, be stigmatized as blazoning the strength and resources of Great Britain, and depreciating the advantages of France. But the cant phrases of party cannot alter the nature of truth; nor will they prevent the people of the United States from listening impartially to it, or from discerning that it is a mark of fidelity to their interests to counteract misrepresentation by placing facts fairly before them, and a duty which they owe to themselves, and which they cannot omit to perform without betraying their own interests, to receive them candidly, and weigh them maturely.

The conclusion is, that all those highly charged declamations which describe Great Britain to us as vanquished and humbled, as ready to pass under the yoke at command, and to submit to any conditions which we may think fit to prescribe, are either the chimeras of overheated imaginations, or the fabrications of impostors; and if listened to, can have no other effect than to inspire a delusive presumption and a dangerous temerity.

But to judge the better of the extravagance of these declamations, it will be useful to go back to the periods when the negotiation began and ended. Our envoy arrived in England, and entered upon the business of his mission, at the moment when there was a general elation on account of the naval victory gained by Lord Howe, and previous to those important successes which have terminated in the conquest of Holland; and the treaty was concluded by the 19th of November last, prior to the last-mentioned event, and the defection of the King of Prussia. The posture of things at the time it was in negotiation, and not at this time, is the standard by which to try its merits; and it may be observed, that it is probable the negotiation received its first impression, and even its general outline, anterior to the principal part of the disasters sustained by the coalesced powers in the course of the last campaign.

It may not be improper to add, that if we credit the representations of our envoy, Great Britain manifested similar dispositions with regard to the treaty at the commencement as at the close of the negotiation; whence it will follow that too much has been attributed in this country to the victories of France.

The subject of the second article will be resumed and concluded in the next number.

CAMILLUS.

Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

I am pleased to report to the Senate that of the 236 bills and resolutions referred to your Committee on Commerce, 72 were reported to, and 68 passed by the Senate. Of these, 44 were signed into law by the President, 22 are still pending in the House, and 2 were Senate resolutions.

Your committee received, reported favorably, and the Senate confirmed 1,081 routine nominations in the Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Of the 44 major nominations submitted to us, 6 were withdrawn by the President, 32 were reported to and confirmed by the Senate, and the remaining 6 were received too late in the session to be acted upon.

Your committee held 64 days of public hearings, and our subcommittees held 77, a total of 141.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Number referred to the committee	236
Number reported by the committee	72
Number passed by Senate	68
Number pending in House	22
Number pending on Senate Calendar	4
Number of Senate resolutions approved	2
Number signed by President	44

NOMINATIONS

Number of routine nominations in the Coast Guard and Coast and Geodetic Survey received, approved, and confirmed	1,081
Number of major nominations received	44
Number withdrawn by President	6
Number approved and confirmed	32
Number received too late to be acted upon	6

DAYS OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

By committee	64
By subcommittees	77
Total	141
Number of executive sessions	21

We have been busy during this 1st session of the 87th Congress. Here are a few of the highlights:

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Among the more important measures given approval by the committee and the Congress in this field after public hearing, were the following:

H.R. 6775 (Public Law 87-346) to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the operation of conferences;

H.R. 6100 (Public Law 87-45) to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises;

S. 576 (Public Law 87-93) to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy;

S. 1368 (Public Law 87-254) to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders;

H.R. 6309 (Public Law 87-243) to increase certain interim payments of estimated accrued operating-differential subsidy;

H.R. 6974 (Public Law 87-383) to authorize the expenditure from capital reserve funds of amounts for research, etc.; and

H.R. 2457 (Public Law 87-222) to clarify the construction subsidy provisions, with regard to reconversion, etc.

A public hearing was held on Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 7, to reorganize the Federal Maritime Board, which became effective when neither House disapproved.

Pending for action in the committee in the 2d session, 87th Congress, are a few maritime bills of particular importance, including:

S. 882, to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels.

S. 885, to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing of vessels;

S. 1183, to reimburse certain vessel owners for expenses caused by allocation of vessel construction contracts to shipyards on another coast; and

S. 1886, to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting collection of fees for services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Your committee had before it legislation to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance and coordination of these great natural resources.

Segments of our commercial fisheries continue to have problems and we had before us legislation to provide a program to enable this industry to regain a favorable economic status. Fish passage facilities over river dams, new fish hatcheries, shellfish laboratories, and fisheries research legislation have been under consideration.

An alien fishing fleet is operating in waters adjacent to Alaska. We need legislation to improve and modernize our fleet to meet this competition. Such legislation is before the committee to assist industry to meet this threat.

Sports fishing and hunting continue to grow in popularity and it is apparent that it will grow during the foreseeable future. Fifty million of the 130 million people in this Nation over 12 years of age went fishing or hunting in 1960. Millions of American families take advantage of these outdoor recreational sports. They spend millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of days and travel billions of miles to enjoy sport fishing and hunting. These sportsmen spent almost $4 billion for goods and services in 1960. Legislation for the betterment of hunting and fishing is a subject of major importance to our committee, as every year people have more time for recreation and pastime activities.

The wetlands bill, to expedite the purchase of lands for the use of waterfowl, and legislation to implement the International Convention To Prevent the Pollution of the Sea by Oil were also enacted and signed into law.

COMMUNICATIONS

Extensive hearings have been held on a number of bills and issues involving various phases of the communications industry ranging from the report of the operation of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 as it pertained to the presidential and vice presidential campaign of 1960, to the bill, S. 2034, which involved the reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission.

FCC REORGANIZATION

Hearings were held on Reorganization Plan No. 2 as it related to the Federal Communications Commission. This reorganization plan was rejected by the House of Representatives and following our hearings, at the request of Senator John O. Pastore, chairman of our Subcommittee on Communications, the Commission submitted a legislative proposal that would accomplish the desirable objectives of the plan. This became S. 2034. Further hearings were held, the bill was reported and passed by the Senate July 27, 1961, and the House on August 3, 1961. The differences between the two bills were resolved in conference and, on August 31, 1961, S. 2034 became Public Law 87–192.

This is the first major revision of the Communications Act in 10 years and brings into effect certain administrative procedures which we hope will serve as a guide for other administrative agencies.

POLITICAL BROADCASTING

Extensive hearings were held to receive the reports of the Federal Communications Commission, and the radio and television networks as to the manner in which S. J. Res. 207, 86th Congress, which suspended section 315 as it applied to the presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1960 campaign, actually functioned. All the reports, particularly the extensive analysis prepared by the Federal Communications Commission, indicated the huge success of the suspension during the 1960 campaign.

SPACE COMMUNICATIONS AND FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS

Hearings were commenced on the subject of space communications, and the important question of the manner in which the radio spectrum is allocated between government and nongovernment groups, so essential to an orderly development of a sound telecommunications system. S. J. Res. 32, which called for the creation of a special five-man group to study and report on the manner in which the radio spectrum is allocated with a view to determining how much frequencies may be utilized to the maximum degree possible was part of these hearings.

In view of the fact that the Commission had not made a final determination as to what system shall be used, who shall operate the system, etc., further hearings have been deferred until such determination is made. In addition, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Communications has been notified that the question of Government and non-Government use of frequencies and the manner in which they are allocated for such purposes, is presently being studied by the administration and that a policy is expected to be announced in the near future. Further hearings are being deferred until such determination is made.

BOOSTERS AND COMMUNITY ANTENNA

During the 86th Congress, your committee was responsible for the enactment of the so-called booster legislation which authorized the Federal Communications Commission to adopt regulations to regulate VHF boosters. The Commission has since done so, and hearings were held in Wyoming and Utah to ascertain the practicality and workability of the FCC's new procedures. As a result of these hearings certain cumbersome procedures were brought to the attention of the Commission and in most instances, were improved. Others are still being worked on.

EDUCATIONAL TV

For the third straight Congress your committee has reported out the chairman's educational television bill which would expedite the utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges and in our adult training program.

After extensive discussion on the floor of the Senate, the bill passed 67 to 13 and in August was reported favorably by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is an important piece of legislation that is designed to assist in putting on the air the more than 200 television channels that have been reserved for educational purposes. The bill is now before the House.

NETWORKS

The committee has held extensive hearings with regard to network practices in the past and, as a result of special funds appropriated to the FCC for a network study, the Commission has recommended specific legislation that would lead to the regulation of the networks.

This bill, S. 2400, was introduced by Senator PASTORE and will require extensive hearings.

CLEAR CHANNELS

S. 2290, to amend the Communications Act, as amended, is the so-called clear channel bill. Hearings will be held on this legislation in the next session. On September 14, the FCC issued its final decision in the so-called clear channel case in which it opened up 13 of the 25 clear channels heretofore used by one station at night so that now it will be a shared operation by an additional unlimited time station on the basis of one new station on each of the 13 channels. It reserved for future consideration possible changes with respect to the 12 clear channels. S. 2290 would maintain the status quo.

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

The investigation authorized under Senate Resolution 305 (86th Cong., 2d sess., June 14, 1960) was delegated to the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee, a subcommittee of the standing Communications Subcomittee.

Extensive public hearings, covering 50 representatives complaints which arose during the political campaigns of 1960, were held by the subcommittee; and witnesses from the Federal Communications Commission, radio and television licensees, interested organizations, and the public were heard.

The subcommittee report (S. Rept. 994, Sept. 13, 1961) has been presented in six parts as follows:

Part I, "The Speeches, Remarks, Press Conferences, and Statements of Senator John F. Kennedy, August 1 through November 9, 1960."

Part II, "The Speeches, Remarks, Press Conferences, and Study Papers of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, August 17 through November 7, 1960."

Part III, "The Joint Appearances of Senator John F. Kennedy and Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Other 1960 Campaign Presentations."

Part IV, "The 15-Minute Radio and Television Network Newscasts for the Period September 26 through November 7, 1960."

Part V, "Hearings Before the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee, March 27, 28, and 29, 1961."

Part VI, "Recommendations."

Parts I, II, and III constitute a unique record in American political history. For the first time, we have the complete press conferences, speeches, remarks, and statements of the two major candidates for the Presidency throughout the presidential campaign period. Here, then, is the presidential campaign of 1960.

Part I was submitted on September 13, 1961, and consent was granted by the Senate, authorizing the filing of parts II through VI with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment sine die of the 87th Congress, 1st session. The report was ordered printed with illustrations.

AVIATION

Of the many bills considered in this field, I believe the three most important that were approved by the Senate to be:

S. 1703, as originally introduced, would have extended the provisions of the Federal aid to airports program for a period of 5 years and increased the level of funds from $63 million to $75 million annually. The bill included a provision which would for the first time limit Federal participation to items directly related to air safety. The Senate considered the House bill, H.R. 8102, striking all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of S. 1703 and passed the amended House bill on September 1. A conference was called to resolve the differences between the bills. However, the conferees were unable to agree as to the method of funding, the Senate urging that the contract method of funding be employed and the House supporting the annual appropriation method. Because the differences could not be resolved, the conference was discharged. Subsequently, the House further amended H.R. 8102, as amended by the Senate, to provide for a 3-year $225 million program at the rate of $75 million annually and adopted the annual appropriation method of funding. Since it was apparent that the House would not recede in its position opposing contract authority and in view of the lateness of the session, the Senate on September 14 accepted the House bill to insure that the Federal aid to airports program would continue without interruption.

The Senate on August 28 passed S. 1969, a bill to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers. The bill made clear that a supplemental certificate was primarily one authorizing charter service but provided that the Board may, when the public convenience and necessity required, authorize individually ticketed service. The bill would provide for a statutory definition of charter service specifically authorizing all certificated carriers to engage in all-expenses-paid tours. The Federal Aviation Act would be amended so as to authorize the Board to impose civil penalties for violations of its economic regulations.

A bill, H.R. 7318, incorporating many features of the Senate bill was reported favorably by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and passed the House on September 18. Because of the many differences in the two bills, the required conference will not be called until 1962.

S. 2268, to make certain acts if committed aboard aircraft in air commerce Federal crimes, passed the Senate on August 10. Included would be such acts as assault, maiming, murder, manslaughter, malicious mischief, robbery; the act of hijacking was made the equivalent of piracy and subject in the discretion of the jury to the death penalty. The bill was approved by the President on September 5, 1961.

Our subcommittee conducted extensive hearings on the subject of air safety over a a period of 3 weeks. Examination of the following areas was emphasized:

1. The status of air transportation in 1961—commercial, business and private—in relation to air safety problems of today and tomorrow;

2. The responsibility of various Government agencies for the promotion and advancement of air safety and the practices and procedures used to discharge same;

3. The responsibility of the aviation community itself for self-imposed vigilance and discipline in achieving a maximum degree of

air safety and the manner and method of fulfilling it;

4. The areas of safety hazard disclosed by the 1960 accident record, considered in the light of the accident record of prior years—which include, among other things, aircraft design, terminal area facilities, weather, and air traffic control; and

5. The present planning being conducted by both Government and the aviation industry, including research and development projects, for overcoming any existing weaknesses in our system of air safety or anticipated hazards of the near future. The essential objective of the hearings was to provide a means for the free exchange of ideas to the end that all segments of the aviation community, including government agencies, could acquire a sympathetic understanding of the problems confronting one another and proceed to take such action as the record indicated, so as to promote the highest degree of safety in all aspects of air travel.

Aside from the three principal measures discussed above, S. 1931, a routine bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act relating to war risk insurance until June 13, 1966, was passed by the Congress and signed by the President July 20, 1961.

The subcommittee held 1 day of hearings on CAB Reorganization Plan No. 3. The full committee did not take an official position on the plan but at the direction of the chairman, its vote of 9–8 in support of the plan was reported to the Government Operations Committee.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation reports its activities during this session as follows:

S. 320 (S. Rept. 528), to amend provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State.

Passed Senate with floor amendments—July 17.

Reported out by House committee—August 31 (H. Rept. 1090).

H.R. 1163 (S. Rept. 126), extending the loan guaranty provisions of part V of the Interstate Commerce Act. (S. 1146.)

Public Law 87–16.

H.R. 8033 (S. Rept. 839), to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employee boards. (S. 1667.)

Public Law 87–247.

S. 1725 (S. Rept. 443), to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and to establish a joint board to review such rates.

Passed Senate June 27.

Pending in House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

S. 2491 (S. Rept. 838), to permit the application of the bulk commodity exemption when other commodities are concurrently transported in the same vessel.

Pending on Senate Calendar.

Senate Joint Resolution 21, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell 10 Liberty-type merchant vessels to citizens of the United States for conversion into barges.

Passed Senate September 1.

Pending in House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

In addition, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee held the following miscellaneous hearings:

Government competition with regulated carriers.

Domestic offshore trade with Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

Decline of the common-carrier industry.

Rail transportation of new automobiles.

Need for temporary technical amendment to the water carrier section of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The subcommittee advised your Committee that the following bills were likely to receive consideration during the second session of this Congress:

S. 1283 (companion bill H.R. 5596 has been reported by House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce), to amend sections 204(a) and 406(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such Act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders.

S. 1197, to amend section 15a(3) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the rule of ratemaking where competition between carriers of different modes of transportation is involved. This bill was put over to the second session by a vote of the full committee.

S. 1145, to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

S. 1284, to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes.

S. 2560, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

S. Res. 150, urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to act with extreme caution and full deliberation on applications for approval of railroad mergers in order to afford Congress time to review the problems arising from the railroad merger movement.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

Your committee handled many other very important pieces of legislation that do not fall into the fields of jurisdiction of our standing subcommittees, and I desire to comment on a few of them.

FOREIGN COMMERCE

S. 610, a bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of travel service in the Department of Commerce, and S. 1729, a bill to promote the foreign commerce of the United States, grew out of our study of such commerce during the 86th Congress. S. 610 was signed by the President on June 29, 1961, and S. 1729 is awaiting House action. This bill would implement and expand our export program.

OCEANOGRAPHY

Oceanographic research received much attention by your Committee on Commerce during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, just as it did during the 86th Congress.

S. 901, to advance the marine sciences and establish a comprehensive national 10-year program of research and surveys in the oceans and the Great Lakes, was introduced by the chairman on February 9, 1961; reported favorably, following hearings, by the committee on June 20, and passed the Senate on July 28 by a vote of 50 to 32.

The bill then was sent to the House of Representatives, where it was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At the close of the recent session, the House committee had taken no action on this proposed legislation.

The bill would authorize—

1. Expanded oceanographic research or surveys by 6 Departments, 3 independent Agencies, and 15 Bureaus, offices and services in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

2. Coordination of the national oceanographic effort by a Division of Marine Sciences in the National Science Foundation, the Division to be established under the proposed act.

3. Participation by educational and scientific institutions, State agencies, associations, organizations, industries, and qualified individuals who would, in the opinion of contracting or granting authorities of the Federal Government, contribute to the scientific knowledge of the oceans and Great Lakes.

4. Construction of 43 oceanographic research ships and 18 ships for ocean surveys. Twenty-three of the research ships would be for use by institutions, including universities, 14 for fisheries research and 6 for military oceanography.

5. Construction of shore facilities for institutions engaged in oceanographic research and for Federal agencies conducting coastal or deep ocean surveys under the program.

6. Development and acquisition of new and improved scientific devices, instruments, and tools for marine exploration and research.

7. Education and training of marine scientists, including biologists, geophysicists, chemists, geologists, meteorologists, bacteriologists, pharmacologists and taxonomists required to achieve the objectives of the 10-year program.

8. Formal and reciprocal cooperation with other nations in marine research and oceanographic surveys.

The scientific community, in general, supported the bill. Objectives of the proposed legislation were applauded by Departments to which the bill was sent for comments, but the Departments took the position that legislation was unnecessary.

The bill contained 21 sections. Section 1 constituted the title section, stating that "this act may be cited as the 'Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961.'"

Title 2 set forth a declaration of policy which asserted, in part that:

"The Congress further declares that sound policy requires that the United States not be excelled in the fields of oceanographic research, basic, military, or applied, by any nation which may presently or in the future threaten our general welfare, maritime commerce, security, access to and utilization of ocean fisheries, or contamination of adjacent seas by dumping therein radioactive wastes or other harmful agencies."

The subsequent 18 sections set forth duties and authorized funds for the National Science Foundation, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, and Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce; Office of Education and Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Atomic Energy Commission; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior; Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury; Office of Naval Research, Bureau of Ships and Hydrographic Office, Department of the Navy, and the Smithsonian Institution.

A number of general provisions were included in the concluding section. Among these:

1. Secretaries of Departments, and administrators of bureaus or offices participating in the national oceanographic program would be authorized and directed to include in their annual reports a report on major activities or programs undertaken pursuant to the act.

2. The Bureau of the Budget would be required to provide the Congress, in connection with the annual presentation of the budget, a horizontal budget showing the totality of the program for marine sciences, funding assigned to each agency, and estimated goals and financial requirements to complete the program.

3. Construction or modernization of any ships or subsurface craft would be required to be done in domestic commercial facilities.

4. Information, uses, products, processes, and patents developed as a result of contracts or grants made under provisions of the Act would, with such exceptions as may be determined to be necessary in the interest of national defense, be fully and freely available to the general public.

During hearings in the 86th Congress on proposed legislation to authorize a national oceanographic program it was developed that

the U.S. Coast Guard was precluded under its organic act from conducting oceanographic research except in connection with the ice patrol.

On October 25, 1960, the chairman addressed a letter to Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, Commandant of the Coast Guard, inquiring as to the capabilities of the Coast Guard fleet for ocean research in addition to existing duties and responsibilities provided statutory restrictions were removed.

A comprehensive report was prepared by the Coast Guard and submitted to the committee on November 14, 1960. This report showed that the Coast Guard has 347 vessels in operation, of which approximately 100 are large, sturdy, oceangoing vessels which, with proper instrumentation, could be used for marine research without interfering with the traditional agency activities. Limited oceanographic research also could be conducted from a considerable number of other ships of the Coast Guard Fleet, including lightships, and from offshore towers which are being constructed to replace lightships.

The Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences also was contacted by your committee and they warmly endorsed legislation to enable the Coast Guard to engage in oceanographic research, and to collect and analyze oceanographic data. The Committee on Oceanography recommendation also was sent to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

On March 2, 1961, I introduced S. 1189, following closely the recommendations of the Committee on Oceanography, and stated on the floor of the Senate: "The U.S. Coast Guard has the greatest potential of any agency of our Federal Government for obtaining certain types of valuable oceanographic data in the quickest possible time and at the lowest cost."

Hearings on the bill were held on May 2, 1961, and the bill was reported favorably by the committee on June 6. Meanwhile the House had passed a similar bill which, however, did not contain provisions for the collection and analysis of oceanographic data. On June 12, the Senate passed the House bill, substituting the language of the Senate bill as an amendment. The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and conferees were appointed.

House and Senate conferees met on September 14 and agreement was reached. Both House and Senate approved the conference report, and on October 5, 1961, the President signed the bill into law (Public Law 87-396).

I would be remiss if I did not express my heartfelt appreciation for the cooperation and untiring effort of all the members of the Committee on Commerce in carrying through to a successful conclusion our first session's program. I am deeply and sincerely appreciative. By their efforts they have made this a truly wonderful committee.

Our staff again has done a fine job, and I am confident I speak for the committee when I thank them for it.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

Goals of the New Frontier: Immigration Policy and Refugee Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in our endeavors to strengthen the economic and military defenses of the free world we should recognize immigration policy as one of the elements in achieving economic and political stability as well as social equilibrium. Immigration policy is an essential part of our diplomacy.

Nine years have elapsed since our present immigration law—the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952—has seen a revision. Several related laws have been passed in the meantime, however, they have been mostly temporary in nature and designed to meet an emergency need.

This session of Congress saw an important achievement in the first substantial revision and codification of the Immigration Act of 1952. The Alien Orphans Adoption Program, which previously was subejct to periodical temporary extensions, was made permanent. Under this program, since 1957, about 10,000 orphans have come into this country. The lives of thousands of helpless orphans and of many American couples who will make homes for these children will be brightened because of this legislation. Of tremendous importance is the provision which will expedite the entrance into this country of about 18,000 spouses, parents, and unmarried children of naturalized citizens and aliens who have already been admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Those close relatives whose visa petitions were approved by July 1, 1961, will now be issued nonquota immigration visas and will shortly be reunited with their families here in the United States. This will remove a terrible hardship and remedy many psychological, moral and economic problems caused by the separation of families for years. Also included in the omnibus revisions is the creation of a single, statutory form of judicial review of alien deportation and exclusion orders issued by the Justice Department. Other progressive revisions in our outdated immigration law eliminate the requirement that a visa applicant state his race and ethnic classification in his application. Korean war veterans are granted equal naturalization privileges as now accorded veterans of World War I and World War II. The 2,000 quota ceiling currently imposed on the Asian-Pacific triangle is removed so that newly independent nations will be eligible for a minimum annual quota of 100, without causing a reduction of quota numbers from other Asian and Pacific areas. Newly independent countries are assured a quota equal to the total quota currently set for each of the parts which comprised the new nation. Laws against "sham" marriages which are entered into for the purpose of evading immigration laws are tightened. Another revision which will preserve family unity permits the spouse and children of a retired naturalized U.S. citizen, over 60 years of age, to remain with their spouse or parent without losing their naturalized citizenship.

Closely related to immigration policy is our refugee program. In the face of world tensions and political oppression attention is focusing once again on the world refugee problem. President Kennedy has called for increased attention to the U.S. refugee resettlement programs and legislative action to strengthen our programs. Legislation that will centralize the authority to conduct and to appropriate funds to support U.S. refugee programs is in conference and in all likelihood will be enacted in the second session. Our refugee programs are of utmost importance in our present-day world. If a person risk flight from behind the Iron Curtain, but finds no haven in the free world, his escape from communism will end in complete disillusionment with democracy.

President Kennedy's pledge to revise the immigration law to make it more humanitarian and to reunite families has been carried out through enactment of Public Law 87-301. This is just the first step in an overall revision to be undertaken under the leadership of President Kennedy who while serving in Congress was one of the top authorities on immigration matters. Our immigration policy will be adjusted to the condition of the world of today and tomorrow and to our place and role in that world. Our hands need not be tied to national origin quotas based on legislation enacted over 35 years ago in circumstances which no longer exist. We are capable of admitting, absorbing, and assimilating more newcomers than is permitted under present legislation. The legislation enacted this session is proof that the Democratic administration is well on its way toward the thorough modernization of our immigration policy necessary if we are to accept our responsibility as leader in the world's struggle for peace and freedom. For, if we fail to modernize our immigration policy we will negate our own best interest in foreign affairs, as well as our own domestic, economic, and social well-being.

Report on the 1st Session, 87th Congress, by Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, normally I submit the report of my stewardship to my friends and neighbors of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey at the end of each Congress.

The productive efforts of the 1st session of the 87th Congress have been such, however, that I believe a separate report of this new completed session is due to my constituents. It is with considerable pleasure that I summarize the activities of this Congress, of which I am proud to be a Member.

In many respects, at the advent of this Congress and the new administration there was a similarity in our national posture to the first days of Franklin Roosevelt's administration. In March 1933, banks were failing, soup lines extending. In January 1961, unemployment was rising, farm prices falling. Credit was tight, balances of payments were unfavorable.

Intelligent action was needed, and quickly, to stimulate our national economy. Action came, and quickly, under the dynamic leadership of President Kennedy.

The President's first official act was to order the distribution of surplus food to the victims of the recession. Then, in partnership with our beloved, wise and tireless leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the President urged legislative remedies for our domestic ills.

As a result of this new and necessary close cooperation between the President and Congress, some of the most vital and far reaching legislation in our history came forth.

MINIMUM WAGE

Broadening the basic coverage for the first time in 23 years, the 1961 act goes far toward achieving the goal I have always sought: to assure that each of our citizens receives a decent living wage.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

My longstanding struggle to improve our unemployment compensation system was at least partially realized by passage of the Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, which benefited approximately 700,000 jobless workers and their families immediately and will benefit an additional 2.5 million workers over the next year.

A companion act benefited approximately 60,000 railroad workers. And a third act made families of unemployed workers with dependent children temporarily eligible for Federal public assistance payments. This will benefit another 1 million of our Nation's needy.

HOUSING

The most comprehensive Housing Act in our history was signed into law by the President on June 30. This legislation will be of particular benefit to people of the middle and lower income groups, enabling many to purchase homes who had not previously been able to do so. Other sections of the law will assist renovating old homes, and help communities to build parks and recreational areas.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Although not as desirable as my own bill to assist our senior citizens, the Social Security Act of 1961 does much to assure a better life for those who have so richly earned it.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The act to improve the plight of economically hard pressed areas finally became law. Although I had helped to pass this legislation in 1958 and again in 1960, each time previously it had been vetoed by the former President.

SMALL BUSINESS

The 1961 act improved the ability of our small business firms to participate in our national industrial effort.

AGRICULTURE

The most comprehensive farm bill in many years was passed by the 87th Congress, and signed by the President. The effect of this act is already being felt, as the index of prices farmers receive from their crops has begun to rise slowly in the past 2 months. In addition to this general farm legislation, the Feed Grain Act, signed into law on March 22, promises to successfully reduce our surplus wheat and feed grain, the holding of which is most costly to all Americans.

In addition to these and other acts designed to stimulate our domestic economy and provide assistance to our individual citizens, there were other laws enacted which were most significant for our Nation.

CIVIL RIGHTS

My continuing and vigorous efforts on behalf of civil rights had already resulted in the Civil Rights Act of 1960—the first real positive accomplishment in the civil rights field in 80 years. This year, though not made a permanent part of our Government as I had struggled to make it, the Civil Rights Commission was extended for another 2 years.

VETERANS

The home loan program for World War II and Korean veterans was extended, and insurance dividends were provided for certain Korean veterans.

ALIEN ORPHANS

Although not as broad as the bill I have introduced in this and previous sessions, the act made permanent the provision for admission of alien orphans.

EDUCATION

The differences in view were so wide, and the complexities of the legislation so involved that a comprehensive program for Federal aid to education was not possible this year. I am hopeful that such a program will come forth during the next session, for a strong educational system is one of the basic requirements for our continued national preeminence. Fortunately, the Impacted Areas and National Defense Education Act were extended for another 2 years. Another bill I was most happy to see enacted was one I had sponsored. The law—276 of the 87th Congress—will encourage and assist our young and dedicated people who wish to become teachers of the deaf.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of which I am the ranking member steered through the House three important bills to combat organized crime and racketeering. Signed into law by the President, the acts will prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises. This includes transmission of bets and transportation of gambling equipment.

Another much needed piece of legislation was put through by my subcommittee: The bill to provide 73 additional Federal judges, which will help to relieve the crowded calendars throughout our Federal courts.

As important as all the above legislation is to all our citizens, the most important concern of everyone from one end of our Nation to the other is our position in the world and our national security. For upon that security depends our very existence as a nation of freemen.

With the stirring words of his inaugural address still ringing in the minds of all peoples throughout the world, the President has continually demonstrated to the Russians that we shall negotiate only from a position of strength.

Congress has assured that we shall continue to maintain that position of strength. The largest peacetime military budget in history—$47 billion—was approved. With this budget we shall be able to prepare for all types of conflict. And by such preparations, we hope that conflict will be avoided. Our Polaris submarine program has been expanded. Our strategic bombers are on a more intense alert. Our antiguerrilla forces are being strengthened. Minuteman and Skybolt missile programs are being expanded. More funds have been provided for our military research and development effort. Production of B–52 and B–58 bombers was accelerated and funds were authorized for the immediate development of the B–70 supersonic bomber. The President requested and Congress granted authority to call up military Reserve and National Guard units.

An area of our defense effort that affects every citizen is civil defense. Over the past years, this entire program was without life. The President has changed this, I am happy to say. I have personally emphasized the necessity for a meaningful civil defense program, and we are at long last seeing that program shape up.

An extension of our national defense is our foreign aid program. With enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 we demonstrate to the world that we are willing to help those less fortunate than ourselves, particularly those nations whose people are ready to help themselves and preserve their freedom.

Perhaps the most significant act passed by this Congress and signed into law was establishment of the U.S. Disarmament Agency for world peace and security. This is the one single act of this session that may be remembered in the history books of future centuries. Passage of this act at the very time the Russians had resumed their nuclear tests has dramatized before the eyes of the world our sincere dedication to the cause of peace.

Such an act does not imply any weakness. Our military budget proves the contrary. But rearmament efforts and disarmament studies are not incompatible. We must continue to prepare for the worst. We must no less vigorously continue to seek what has up to now been impossible. As one of my constituents but it, "We must end the arms race before the arms race ends the human race."

As a sponsor of this legislation for the past 2 years, I was especially gratified by its enactment.

Of particular interest to my friends in the 10th District were the following measures:

MEADOWLANDS

As I have sought for many years, an appropriation of $50,000 was approved to make a study of the meadowlands redevelopment.

JET NOISES

A resolution adopted by the House as an outgrowth to my own resolution directs a study of the problems created by use of jet aircraft to be conducted by the House Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce. I do not want the people living in the vicinity of Newark Airport and the plane patterns about the airport to suffer as those on Long Island have suffered.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Public Law 364, signed recently is an outgrowth of a resolution I introduced in February, and is the first step to establishment of a permanent memorial to our distinguished and far-seeing President from New Jersey.

EAST-WEST TUNNEL

Although no legislative action was here necessary, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization at long last agreed to study the recommendation I have made and stressed for the past 2 years—use of the proposed First Mountain Tunnel for civil defense purposes.

In brief, these are some of the highlights of the work of the 87th Congress. There are other items I want to mention, both under the headings of finished and unfinished business. These I shall include in a revision of my remarks which I shall insert in the bound copy of the RECORD, and have printed and distributed—at my own expense—to the people I represent.

In Unions There Is Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled "In Unions There Is Strength," which was carried in the September 15 issue of Vital Speeches. This thoughtful and thought-provoking speech was delivered to the Chicago Rotary Club No. 1 by Mr. Maurice R. Franks, the president of the National Labor-Management Foundation.

Maury Franks is a fearless advocate of democratic trade unionism. He was literally reared in the American trade union movement, and over three decades served in some highly responsible positions in organized labor. Maury Franks is unwaveringly devoted to the trade union philosophies of men like Samuel Gompers and Warren Stone, and it has been his mission in life for the past 20 years to encourage a rebirth of true democratic spirit and practice in American organized labor. This speech is exemplary of his courageous work.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN UNIONS THERE IS STRENGTH—TOO MUCH STRENGTH, IN FACT, WHICH MUST BE CURBED

(By Maurice R. Franks, president of the National Labor-Management Foundation, Chicago, Ill., and editor of Partners magazine, delivered before Chicago Rotary Club No. 1, Chicago, Ill., August 8, 1961)

I am grateful for this opportunity to come before my fellow Rotarians today to discuss a subject of vital national importance and, I believe, of deep and mutual concern.

I am especially grateful to our chairman for making clear in his introduction that I am a product of the labor movement. For, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, I am just that. I spent better than a quarter of a century in the union labor movement. And what's more, I believe as much today as I always have believed, in unionism as a highly valuable economic institution. I believe that unions, where needed and when properly operated, have much to offer our progressive economic society.

Furthermore, speaking frankly, as my name suggests that I do, I am convinced that if it hadn't been for the stupidity, the avariciousne , and the plain shortsightedness of the businessman himself, particularly the businessman of yesterday who didn't give a damn about his workers' welfare, who cared not in the least whether his workers ate or slept, who provided abominable working conditions all around—that if it hadn't been for him, there would have been no need for workers to band themselves together in order to obtain economic justice. But those are the facts of labor history—and those would be the facts of tomorrow's development if we had no unions today.

UNIONS, GOOD OR BAD

So there is no longer a question in my mind—or in yours either, for that matter, of unions to be or not to be. The question today is, What kind of unions are we going to have? Good unions or bad unions?

Now, I have acquired my personal philosophy of unionism from the true fathers of the American labor movement—from such men as Samuel Gompers, Daniel Willard and Warren Stone—from men who did not believe in and did not practice the kind of unionism we see about us today. These men taught me that labor and management are not natural-born enemies, that they are indeed fellow human beings, who are natural-born friends and allies—partners, if you please—partners in a common cause—partners in production—partners in producing the most of the best for the least, for mutual benefit. The unions should be with us to emphasize this relationship and to help realize its social and economic advantages. Good unions do so.

But it is impossible to have good unions with bad leaders. And today, ladies and gentlemen, we have some pretty bad leaders—some of the worst type our minds can imagine. We have among us a hierarchy of union leaders whose sense of social and economic responsibility is seriously lacking, and whose tremendous power and exercise of power accomplish far more evil than good. Such is the extent of the evil power they wield that, if allowed to go unchecked, it will not only wreck the labor movement which the world has grown to respect, but it will wreck our Nation to boot.

THE DANGEROUS POWER OF LABOR LEADERS

When you stop to consider the power of some of our greatest labor leaders today, the effect is frightening—as menacing as any hostile power abroad in the world. When a man like David McDonald, who heads the United Steelworkers Union, snaps his finger, down goes the steel industry and the vital production thereof—down goes the employment of almost every steelworker—down goes the American economy—down goes the very safety of the Nation itself.

When a man like Walter Reuther winks his eye, down goes an auto industry and the employment of millions of workers, directly and indirectly affected. When Jim Carey pulls the switch, down goes a vast segment of the electrical industry—to which our entire economy is tied and upon which much of our Nation's overall defense development is dependent. When Joseph Curran calls the shot, shipping on our east coast comes to a halt. And when Harry Bridges waves his flag, all west coast shipping stagnates.

Ladies and gentlemen, this sort of thing exceeds all reasonable authority. But, even so, it does not match the authority acquired by the gentleman whose name I've saved for you. I refer to James Riddle Hoffa.

That middle name of his certainly is appropriate. For, as a labor leader, this Hoffa is indeed a riddle to all of us who believe in good unionism. If that man ever cracks his whip, down will go everything.

In unions there is strength—and should be. But it is men like Hoffa, and the other union leaders I have mentioned, whose conduct supports the second part of my thesis—too much strength—excess strength that must be curbed, if we as a nation are to survive and not be made ready for the burial job Nikita Khrushchev promised us. For unless the powers of such labor leaders are curbed, our free society will one day be struck dead and belong only to a bygone era.

S. 2134

Now, fellow Rotarians, this brings me to the precise reason for my coming here to talk to you today—to explain to you how this alarming excess of power wielded by the big bosses of the labor movement can be checked—and without sacrificing any of the principles of good unionism.

It was my privilege early this year to work closely with Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota in the drafting of proposed legislation which, if enacted, would markedly cut down the personal powers of the individual union autocrat and refer vital economic decisions to the ones who alone have a right to make them—the members of a negotiating union themselves. This legislation, drawn up in the form of Senate bill 2134, would render it impossible for any strike to be called at the snap of any union leader's fingers, or at the crack of any union leader's whip.

This bill—and let me repeat its listing, so that the number will sink into your minds—S. 2134—was introduced in the Senate by Senator MUNDT on June 22 with the cosponsorship of Democratic Senators JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and Republican Senators WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, and FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota. And incidentally, it has the complete backing of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. It is thus a bipartisan bill. And here is its preamble.

"S. 2134 is a bill to strengthen democratic processes within labor organizations respecting the calling of strikes, to protect union members against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of union members, to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce, and to promote the growth of the Nation's economy through reducing economic waste by providing for an impartial secret strike vote."

Such is the purpose of this proposed legislation—this Senate bill 2134. It is to curb the autocratic power of a union's leadership to singlehandedly shut down an industrial operation, large or small. It is to make a union leader and his negotiating committee the servants of a union membership, as they are intended to be, and not their finger-snapping masters, as our American free society never intended they should be. It is to support the highest offices of collective bargaining, the institution our early labor movement made every human sacrifice to achieve for the worker, and to sweep from the scene the disreputable spectacle of collective bludgeoning—bargaining, not in good faith, but with the cudgel of a phony strike threat lying handy on the union side of the table.

Senate bill 2134 would make good-faith bargaining bilateral and of obligation to both sides. It would enable the union to shape its final demands, and the employer to make his final offer, before any strike vote could be taken. And only when such a deadlock, if one occurs, has been reached, will the situation be referred to the employees to be affected for their decision by protected secret ballot.

To clarify these proposals further, let me read to you Senator MUNDT's own presentation, in the course of the speech he delivered on the floor of the Senate on June 22, the day he introduced S. 2134:

"Briefly (and I quote) our bill would operate in the following manner. Under existing law, the duty to bargain collectively requires that any party desiring to modify or terminate an existing contract must serve written notice on the other party to the contract of the proposed modification or termination 60 days prior to the expiration date of the existing agreement. Our bill provides that no strike ballot shall be taken during this 60-day period, but, that if a labor organization desires to obtain authorization for a strike, a strike ballot shall be taken on the 60th day or as soon thereafter as is practicable. This procedure will allow approximately 60 days of honest collective bargaining negotiations in an atmosphere entirely free of strike threats, since there will be no authorization on which to base the threat. Also, it is fairly certain that by the 60th day, the issues between the parties will be pretty clearly drawn, which means the employee will be able to make his decision on the basis of well-defined contentions and specific counterproposals."

Further quoting Senator MUNDT's remarks, "Any strike ballot taken on or after the 60th day will be supervised by a three-member election committee. One member will be selected by the union, one member will be selected by the employer, and the third member will be selected by the union and employer members. If they cannot agree on such third member, he will be selected by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. The bill requires the voting to be by secret ballot, and the committee is directed to count and process the ballots in such way that the identity of the voter will be unknown to the election committee and to all other persons.

"Where appropriate, the strike ballot will be stated in terms which will reflect a choice, by the employee, between a strike and an acceptance of the employer's final offer in settlement as stated by him."

Still quoting Senator MUNDT, "If in the balloting a majority of the affected employees vote in favor of a strike, then the union representative has full legal authority to call a strike. He is, however, under no legal obligation to call a strike immediately; and if he desires to negotiate further, the authorization granted by the balloting has a 60-day life.

"If a majority of the affected employees vote to accept the employer's final offer in settlement, the employer is then legally obliged by the requirements of 'good faith bargaining' to sign a contract incorporating the terms and conditions as stated by him in his final offer."

CONCLUSION

Now, fellow Rotarians, you will recall that I said in my opening remarks that I was extremely grateful for this opportunity to discuss this problem with you. Well, that was no casual statement. I meant what I said. And for a very good reason.

I believe that the Rotarians of this great city of Chicago—and, in fact, the Rotarians of the Nation as a whole—are in an ideal position to help promote the passage of the bill I have discussed from this platform. Most of Rotary's members are employers, well geared to lend responsible influence to their employees. If the Rotarians here today were to go forth from this meeting and as soon as possible explain the proposals contained in Senate bill 2134 to the people on their payrolls—as some businessmen throughout the Nation have already done and are doing—I believe that we would stand a very good chance of getting this bill enacted into law.

Many businessmen I have come in contact with—and, I may say, quite a few of them are fellow Rotarians—are victims of the little bug whose bite fills them with timidity. They will wholeheartedly approve a worthwhile project but only behind closed doors. In public they are hesitant to mention it, to give it the boost that it needs. Then there are others who will not take time out to study important issues such as S. 2134 and they are what may be termed "rather naive."

But the time has come, please believe me, when the businessman—whether he be a Rotarian or not—must shake off his chronic timidity—which, if I may say so, is used here mostly as a polite term for lethargy. The time has come when every businessman owes it to himself and to our free society to stand up and be counted, to stand up in front of his employees and tell them what, in his opinion, they can do in their own behalf.

Now your employees may not be able to stand up and be counted, if their particular position is such as to make them too conspicuous. But I'll tell you one thing you can help them do, in this instance. You can encourage them to sit down and be counted. You can encourage them to sit down and write their Congressmen and Senators, telling their representatives in the Nation's Capital that this is the kind of legislation they need and want. Because, unless a groundswell of popular opinion—and especially of worker opinion—is generated and made to reach all of our Federal lawmakers; the bill we have been discussing just doesn't have much of a chance of passage.

I thank you.

Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, among the most important recommendations it has made to the Congress in its barely 2 years of existence, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has proposed that Congress provide for mandatory review by its appropriate committees of all Federal grant-in-aid programs which may be enacted in the future at least once every 5 years.

The purpose of the recommendation is to provide a systematic means of insuring that outmoded grant programs are not unnecessarily perpetuated; that all such programs are regularly reviewed to determine whether they should be continued, expanded, repealed or redirected to serve a better purpose; and that, by so doing, the integrity and usefulness of the grant-in-aid device will be protected.

As a member of the Commission representing the House, and as a Member of Congress interested in encouraging greater efficiency in the operations of Government, I introduced legislation, in company with several of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle, to implement this Commission recommendation. I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that hearings have been held by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and prospects are excellent for favorable action early next year.

A major reason for the excellence of the bill's prospects, I believe, is the favorable attention the legislation has attracted in recent weeks from responsible individuals and organizations across the country. For example, one of the finest weekly newspapers in the East, the Westfield (N.J.) Leader, has published a series of two editorials on this subject this month. These editorials have made a valuable contribution to public awareness of this important but often neglected field. Because they point up in a particularly cogent way the issues which are involved, I include the two editorials from the September issues of the Westfield Leader as a part of my remarks.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the editorials follow:

FEDERAL AID TOTEM POLE

No matter how you figure it, New Jersey is low State on the Federal aid totem pole.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by Congress, reports that where Federal grants-in-aid provided nearly one-quarter to one-third of all State and local revenues in five States in 1959, Federal grants amounted to less than 6½ percent of payments to governments in New Jersey that year. This was the lowest percentage of Federal contribution to receipts of any State. Median State was North Carolina, which received 17 percent of its revenues from the Federal Government. Wyoming and Alaska each received nearly one-third (32.3 percent) of their revenues from Uncle Sam.

This comes as no surprise to New Jersey. Computations made annually by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association have shown that the taxpayers in this State pay premium tax dollars for each dollar of "aid" received from the Federal Government. Last year the price in New Jersey stood at $2.14 for each dollar in Federal aid received—highest in the Nation.

The Federal Commission's report traces the history of Federal aid to State and local governments and its tremendous growth. Such grants totaled less than a quarter billion dollars in 1932. They have multiplied more than 30 times, to a 1962 total Federal grant estimate of $7½ billion.

Consideration was given in the report to means of terminating or modifying and redirecting grants which have outlasted the purpose for which they were intended. As a first step the study group advocated legislation subsequently introduced by several Members, including Congresswoman FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey. This would provide an automatic 5-year termination of authorization on future grants-in-aid programs and subject them to congressional review to determine continued need. Taxpayer groups across the Nation have repeatedly called for such a review of all Federal aid programs.

FEDERAL AID—HOW IT GROWS

What makes government costs—and your taxes—grow and grow?

A classic example is cited by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations studying Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments.

In a report recommending periodic congressional reassessment of Federal aid programs, the Commission commented: "Once a Federal grant begins, it hardly ever ends." Substantiating this observation is the tremendous growth in Federal grants to State and local governments to initiate or expand programs in various fields. These expenditures have grown 30 times in three decades until they now total $7,450,479,000, the Commission's report indicated.

Special committee and even presidential recommendations to cease, taper off or otherwise modify a dozen or more major grant programs in the light of changing needs have met with little success in the past.

Among obstacles the Commission found that once programs are established, officials administering them and other supporters acquire a "sense of mission." Usually they see need for expansion, rather than contraction. Recipient States and local government are reluctant to take over full expense of continuing programs established with Federal aid.

Even efforts to redirect outmoded programs to more urgent needs usually result in new programs and appropriations piled on top of old, rather than their replacement. As an example, the Commission cited vocational aid programs, where, as urgent needs for skills changed over the years, new programs were added but the old ones often were continued.

Costs of the Federal grants are particularly felt in this State where latest findings by the New Jersey Taxpayers Association show that a dollar received in Federal aid costs taxpayers of New Jersey an average of $2.14.

Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to insert a statement which I have received from the Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs and which I desire to call to the personal attention particularly of those colleagues of mine in the U.S. House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am in full agreement with the statements contained in the following and it is my hope that the full congressional inquiry desired may be instituted:

PORTUGUESE-AMERICAN
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Boston, Mass., September 21, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A pamphlet was sent you with pictures illustrating incredible atrocities inflicted on Portuguese men, women, and children when terrorists from Congo invaded Angola, Portuguese West African province, in March 1961.

The invasion was spuriously represented as a nationalist uprising by native Angolans. There is evidence the invasion was planned, financed, and directed by Communists and Communist sympathizers. No less an authority than Lord Home, British Foreign Secretary, so indicated.

Holden Roberto, terrorist leader, in an interview in the Paris newspaper Le Monde, issue of July 19, 1961, admitted the terrorists committed atrocities pictured in the pamphlet as part of cold, deliberate plan of operation.

In view of this terrible statement and other alarming circumstances, I respectfully request full congressional inquiry into this matter, particularly the reasons for the sudden change of U.S. policy toward Portugal, which now has our Government participating at the United Nations in Soviet-Afro-Asian campaign against Portugal with regard to Angola. Our United Nations delegation actually voted to censure the Portuguese for defending themselves against the tortures and butchery portrayed in pamphlet.

At the United Nations, our Government is supporting Soviet Russia and other enemies of West against Portugal, member of NATO and longtime friend of United States and West.

Portuguese-Americans, and many others, are bewildered over the change in position of our Government and think an explanation is due them and the public.

MARTIN CAMACHO,
Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in a long drawn out and argumentative 1st session, the 87th Congress disposed of an impressive amount of business. The legislation enacted included 33 measures which are classed as major legislation, more of such legislation than has been enacted in the last half-dozen years combined. Much of it was highly controversial, requiring repeated adjustment and debate before it reached the final voting stage. Additional important proposals raised serious questions of constitutionality or of expediency, and after serious and protracted consideration were rejected for the time being. It was a hard session, and the final effects of its accomplishments are not immediately evident in domestic and foreign situations beset by unprecedented difficulties. The general public attitude seems to be a tendency to wait to see what happens. Criticism seems to be more or less perfunctory, and much of its sting is dulled both by rising industrial activity on the home scene and by preoccupation with increasing foreign danger. Clearly, the Congress did not move as far and as rapidly as some of the progressives had hoped. On the other hand it did not plunge headlong into action which might upset prevailing practice and tradition. The mood of the country is essentially conservative, disinclined to experiment with speculative social projects involving radical deparaures from the past. The Congress went along with that mood. We must await developments before we can pronounce judgment.

The least controversial subject before Congress was military preparedness. A record peacetime military budget of more than $47 billion received scarcely a dissenting whisper, either from the Congress or from the Nation as a whole. The President got all he asked for, and more, to build up every arm of the service. Foreign economic aid got a more critical scrutiny. There is a growing disposition to demand that such aid should at least be not prejudicial to national interests. Generous special aid for Latin America was voted, with needed precautions that such aid should be used to improve living conditions in the areas where it is to be applied. Two innovations in our dealings with foreign powers were put into law: the Peace Corps; a permanent disarmament agency. Both represent idealistic approaches to the problem of promoting peace and well-being among all men. Only time can reveal their efficacy.

On the home front, a vast array of domestic problems received careful consideration. One of the first acts of the new Congress was to pass a bill designed to aid depressed and underdeveloped areas. Understandably, the Congress cannot legislate new industries into being. They must be organized, furnished with capital, manned with a working force possessed of the necessary skills, and provided with a market in which their output can be absorbed. Again, time is required to determine the practical results of the measure passed by Congress.

A new farm bill designed to reduce agricultural surpluses without further detriment to the whole farming industry was passed. A regrettable consequence is an increase in the price of grain to those farmers who must buy feed for livestock. The problem of import quotas, particularly of residual oil and textiles, under the Reciprocal Trade Act received considerable argument, but no immediate solution. Veterans gained various additional benefits, and the minimum wage was increased. Social security laws were further improved, with widened coverage. More money was made available for hospitals, airports, and a variety of public works. The water pollution program was expanded. Unemployment benefits were provided for a longer period, and aid was offered to the children of the unemployed. All these are of direct interest to West Virginians.

In response to a long-felt need, 73 new Federal judgeships were authorized, which should speed up the work of the Federal courts.

In the matter of taxes, the only proposal to receive favorable consideration was an increase in highway taxes to complete the interstate roads program. Proposals to permit more rapid writeoffs of industrial development investments were turned down; likewise, a proposal to raise postal charges to those who already pay the major costs of postal service.

One leak through which American money flows to foreign countries was blocked by a substantial cut in duty-free allowance for returning tourists.

This is a random sampling of the many domestic problems which were considered, either favorably or unfavorably, by the 87th Congress. The second session of this Congress looms before us in a few short weeks. The interval should provide

perspective from which to assess accomplishments of the first session and suggest further action.

Meanwhile, there are personal problems whose solution may be aided by a voice from Washington. Every citizen has a right to expect from his Congressman a sympathetic and active interest in these problems, whether their respective views on national and general issues coincide or do not coincide. It is the purpose here to say with all the sincerity at my command that I shall be happy and honored to hear from you, be it a matter of promoting industrial and business activity, of employment, of veterans' concerns, of social security regulations, or of any other of the many problems involving Federal Government participation. Further, your thinking on recent and pending legislation will be invaluable in helping me to appraise public opinion. May we all work constructively for the common good of this great country. In the long run, the common good resides in the sum of all the many individual lives made better and freer and richer by the interaction of social forces. In the Western World, thank Heaven, the individual is important.

The supreme challenge to all of us is to seek wisdom. Earthly wisdom is not enough. Only a divine wisdom is sufficiently farseeing to guide us through the universal turmoil of this perilous age. If we can lay aside our petty prejudices and self-seeking, and fix our faith firmly on the goodness and rightness of the God of all the earth, we may finally find a way through our difficulties to peace and happiness. May the meditations of our hearts and the work of our hands be found acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our salvation.

Analysis of Proxmire Votes on Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all Members of the Senate are subject to criticism or approval on the basis of their position on spending and economy.

Often it is helpful to hear a public official express his attitude on economy in government. But there is no substitute for the actual record.

This year I am following my policy in the Senate of reporting to the people of Wisconsin my vote on every appropriation bill that came before the U.S. Senate in 1961.

My votes on Senate amendments and passage of appropriations bills amounted to a net reduction of over $2.1 billion in the administration's budget requests.

I voted to cut defense spending by $101 million—$525 million below the Senate figure.

I voted to cut foreign aid spending by $727.9 million.

I voted to cut domestic spending by $1.2 billion.

A summary of my votes on appropriations follows:

	President's budget request to the Senate	Proxmire vote	Remarks
DEFENSE			
Defense	$46,396,945,000	$46,323,292,000	The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $46,848,292,000. I sponsored an amendment to cut $525,000,000 for B–52 and B–58 manned bombers which the President had not requested and which the Secretary of Defense repeatedly said we do not need.
Military construction	1,047,568,000	1,020,146,750	
FOREIGN AID			
Mutual security	4,993,991,000	4,266,091,000	In addition to a $577,900,000 reduction voted by the Senate, I voted to reduce funds for military assistance by $150,000,000.
Inter-American program	600,000,000	600,000,000	I voted against the authorization for this program when it passed the Senate in 1960, and I voted against the conference report on the appropriation bill in 1961 to protest this unnecessary spending. I am not claiming any saving, however, since there was no opportunity to speak against this bill when it passed the Senate this year.
DOMESTIC			
Agriculture	6,089,244,000	5,967,457,500	
Commerce and general government	666,278,000	649,493,200	In addition to a $15,839,800 reduction voted by the Senate, I sponsored an amendment to cut funds for the U.S. Travel Office by almost $1,000,000.
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	39,753,000	32,753,000	
Independent offices	9,174,561,000	9,020,681,500	In addition to a $75,791,500 reduction voted by the Senate, I sponsored amendments to cut 7 items back to the administration's requests, which would have saved $59,488,000. I also voted for amendments to eliminate a $12,000,000 subsidy for a commercial supersonic airplane and a $6,900,000 subsidy for helicopter service in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.
Interior	782,387,000	823,024,850	
Labor-HEW	5,004,281,081	4,863,518,500	

The Senate bill was $157,098,919 over the President's request. On 29 items the Senate was $297,861,500 above the President. On other items they were $140,762,581 below the President. The Proxmire amendment would have reduced each of the 29 items to the level requested by President Kennedy, leaving the cuts made by the Senate on other administration requests intact. As a result my amendment would have reduced the Senate bill by $297,861,500 and the President's request by $140,762,581.

	President's budget request to the Senate	Proxmire vote	Remarks
Legislative	$136,082,802	$135,432,065	
Public works	4,000,788,000	3,940,926,880	
State-Justice-judiciary	795,891,202	762,038,550	
Treasury-Post Office	5,371,801,000	5,327,631,000	
Supplemental, 1962	1,134,639,841	1,068,503,903	
3d supplemental, 1961	5,275,213,127	4,637,419,970	
4th supplemental, 1961	88,024,000	47,214,000	

Proxmire reduction in Federal spending

Defense	−$101,074,250
Foreign aid	−727,900,000
Domestic	−1,282,849,135
Total	−2,111,823,385

Voting Record of Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my voting record for the 1st session of the 87th Congress:

Rollcall No. 1: Call by States, January 3, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 2: Election of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the 87th Congress. The nominees were Representatives SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, and CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana. An "R" on the chart represents a vote for RAYBURN, and an "H," a vote for HALLECK, (R) 258, (H) 170; January 3, 1961; MATHIAS, H.

Rollcall No. 3: House Resolution 1, a resolution barring George O. Chambers, Republican, the certified victor in Indiana's Fifth District, or his opponent, J. Edward Roush, Democrat, from taking the oath as Representative. The resolution was to refer the election results to the Committee on House Administration for investigation on motion to move the previous question "thus terminating debate," January 3, 1961; yea, 252; nay, 166. MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 4: Call of the House, January 31, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 5: House Resolution 127, a resolution providing that during the 87th Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of 15 members. On agreeing to resolution, January 31, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 3: Call of the House, March 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 7: H.R. 4806, Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, authorizing Federal grants to the States for the temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits from regular State unemployment programs. Passed 392–30, March 1, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 8: House Resolution 167, a resolution to authorize the expenditure of funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Adopted 412–6, March 1, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 9: H.R. 5188. Third supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1961. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, amendment to provide an additional $29,990,000 for payments to school districts in impacted areas (principally those with Federal installations). Agreed to 339–62, March 7, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 10: Call of the House, March 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 11: Call in committee, March 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 12: Call of the House, March 9, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 13: H.R. 4510, Emergency Feed-Grains Program for 1961. On motion to send bill back to the Committee on Agriculture for further consideration and to omit from the bil' the granting of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to sell Government-owned corn and grain sorghums on the market at 17 percent below the price support price. Recommittal motion rejected, 196–214, March 9, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 14: H.R. 4510, Emergency Feed-Grains Program for 1961. Passage of the bill. Passed 209–202, March 9, 1961; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 15: Call of the House, March 10, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 16: Call of the House, March 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 17: H.R. 4510, Emergency Feed-Grains Program for 1961. Adoption of the conference report. Agreed to 231–185, March 21, 1961; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 18: Call of the House, March 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 19: H.R. 5463, extend the Sugar Act of 1948 through December 31, 1962, and authorize the President to deny the Dominican Republic any quota bonus resulting from a cutback in the Cuban allotment. Passed under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required) 284–129; March 21, 1961 (276 yeas were necessary for passage); MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 20: H.R. 4806, Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, authorizing Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment insurance payments for up to 13 weeks beyond the regular payment period for workers who exhausted normal benefits during the recession. Adoption of the conference report. Agreed to 363–31, March 22, 1961; MATHIAS, announced for.

Rollcall No. 21: Call of the House, March 23, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 22: H.R. 5000, military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1962. Amendment to strike an authorization of $3,812,000 for an Army Quartermaster research project in Natick, Mass., and substitute a section authorizing $10,000 for a study of the feasibility of keeping the project in Chicago. Agreed to 269–145. March 23, 1961; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 23: H.R. 5000, authorize appropriations of $804,573,000 in fiscal 1962 for military construction. Passage of the bill. Passed 412–0, March 23, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 24: Call in Committee, March 23, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 25: Call in Committee, March 23, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 26: Call of the House, March 24, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 27: H.R. 3935, Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Committee version, raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers already covered from $1 an hour to $1.25 in two steps, and extending minimum wage and overtime coverage to 4,311,000 additional workers. AYERS, Republican, of Ohio; KITCHIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, amendment substituting a new text raising the minimum for the 23.9 million covered workers to $1.15 an hour, and extending minimum wage coverage (at $1 an hour) but not overtime coverage to 1,300,000 additional workers. Agreed to 216–203, March 24, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 28: H.R. 3935, HIESTAND, Republican, of California, motion to recommit the bill. Rejected 196–224, March 24, 1961; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 29: H.R. 3935, passage of the bill as amended by AYRES and KITCHIN. Amended 341–78, March 24, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 30: Call of the House, March 28, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 31: Call of the House, March 28, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 32: S. 1, an act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. On motion to recommit (WIDNALL substitute) (failed), March 29, 1961; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 33: S. 1, an act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. On passage, March 29, 1961; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 34: Call of the House, April 11, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 35: Call of the House, April 13, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 36: Call of the House, April 18, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 37: Call of the House, April 19, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 38: S. 912, an act to provide for the appointment of 10 new Federal circuit court judgeships and 60 new district court judgeships, April 19, 1961. Yea, 337; nay, 76. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 39: Call of the House, April 20, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 40: H.R. 6027, social security amendments of 1961, increasing minimum benefits for retired workers, permitting men as well as women to retire at age 62 with reduced benefits, liberalizing eligibility requirements and providing an increased payroll tax. April 20, 1961; yea, 400; nay, 14; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 41: Call of the House, April 25, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 42: H.R. 6518, a bill to appropriate $500 million for the Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program and $100 million for the Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. April 25, 1961; yea, 329; nay, 83. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 43: Call of the House, April 26, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 44: S. 1, Area Redevelopment Act, authorizing $394 million in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed industrial and rural areas. Adoption of the conference report. April 26, 1961. Yea, 224; nay, 193. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 45: Call of the House. May 3, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 46: H.R. 3935, fair labor standards amendment of 1961. Conference report, raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers already covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act to $1.25 an hour, reached in two steps over 2 years, and extending minimum wage coverage (at $1.25 an hour, reached after 4 years (and overtime coverage (with some exceptions) to about 3,624,000 additional workers, mainly in the retail trade. May 3, 1961. Yea, 230; nay, 196. MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 47: H.R. 6441, Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, increasing the annual authorization for Federal grants to help communities construct sewage treatment plants from $50 million ot $100 million and the overall limit from $500 million to $1 billion. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, motion to recommit the bill with instructions that the Public Works Committee reduce the amount of the annual authorization to $75 million and the overall limit to $750 million and require that after June 30, 1964, grants in any one fiscal year exceeding the original $50 million allotments be matched by the State. May 3, 1961; yea, 165; nay, 256; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 48: H.R. 6441, Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 Passage of the bill May 3, 1961; yea, 308; nay, 110; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 49: Call in Committee, May 4, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 50: Call in Committee, May 9, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 51: Call in the House, May 10, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 52: Call of the House, May 11, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 53: H.R. 2010, extend for 2 years, without change, the law permitting Mexicans to enter the United States for farmwork (Public Law 82–78). May 11, 1961; yea, 231; nay, 157. MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 54: H.R. 6094, raise the ceiling on appropriations for salaries of members and employees of the Council of Economic Advisers from the current $345,000 annually to $2 million. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, motion to recommit the bill to the Government Operations Committee with instructions to reduce the salary ceiling to $700,000. May 11, 1961; yea, 152; nay, 196; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 55: H.R. 6094, passage of the bill, May 11, 1961; yea, 209; nay, 137; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 56: Call of the House, May 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 57: Call of the House, May 16, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 58: House Resolution 284, a resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution, May 16, 1961; yea, 241; nay, 70; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 59: Call in Committee, May 16, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 60: Call of the House, May 17, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 61: House Concurrent Resolution 226, concurrent resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to re-evaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and passage, May 17, 1961; yea, 404; nay, 2; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 62: H.R. 4614, passage of the bill establishing an Office of International Travel and Tourism. The bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. May 17, 1961; yea, 305; nay, 104; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 63: Call of the House, May 24, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 64: S. 1852. Authorize appropriations for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval ships in fiscal 1962. May 24, 1961; yea, 402; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 65: H.R. 1986. A bill to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter. On motion to recommit with instructions. May 25, 1961; yea, 16; nay, 346; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 66: Call in committee, June 1, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 67: H.R. 7371. Appropriate $751,300,050 for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary and related agencies in fiscal 1962. June 1, 1961; yea, 256; nay, 71; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 68: Call of the House, June 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 69: Call in committee, June 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 70: H.R. 7444, Agriculture Department appropriations for the fiscal 1962. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, amendment to reduce the $250 million authorization for agricultural conservation program payments in calendar 1962 to $150 million, as proposed by the President. June 6, 1961; yea, 184; Nay, 196; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 71: H.R. 7444. Passage of the bill appropriating $5,948,466,000 for the Agriculture Department and Commodity Credit Corporation. June 6, 1961; yea, 320; nay, 65. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 72: Call of the House, June 7, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 73: Call of the House, June 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 74: Call of the House, June 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 75: H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On motion to recommit with instructions to remove extension of excise tax on transportation from the bill. June 8, 1961; yea, 189; nay, 196; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 76: H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On passage. June 8, 1961; yea, 295; nay, 88; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 77: Call of the House, June 12, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 78: H.R. 7053, a bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit, June 12, 1961; yea, 104; nay, 252; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 79: Call of the House, June 13, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 80: Call of the House, June 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 81: Call of the House, June 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 82: H. Res. 303. Resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan for the Federal Communications Commission. June 15, 1961; yea, 323; nay, 77; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 83: H. Res. 302. Resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan for the Securities and Exchange Commission. June 15, 1961; yea, 176; nay, 212; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 84: Call of the House, June 19, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 85: H.R. 6765, authorize U.S. acceptance of an amendment to the chapter of the International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the World Bank, to permit the IFC to extend its investments in private companies in underdeveloped countries by acquiring capital stock. June 10, 1961; yea, 329; nay, 18; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 86: H.R. 7712, fourth supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1961, providing $47,214,000 for the Departments of State, Justice, Treasury, and Defense, of which $32,204,000 in State Department funds was committed to pay the U.S. assessment for the U.N. action in the Congo. June 19, 1961; yea, 292; nay, 63; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 87: Call of the House, June 20, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 88: House Resolution 304. Resolution disapproving the Reorganization Plan for the Civil Aeronautics Board. June 20, 1961; yea, 178; nay, 213; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 89: House Resolution 305. Resolution disapproving the President's Reorganization Plan for the Federal Trade Commission. June 20, 1961; yea, 178; nay, 221; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 90: Call of the House, June 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 91: Call of the House, June 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 92: Call in committee, June 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 93: Call in committee, June 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 94: Call of the House, June 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 95: H.R. 6028, Housing Act of 1961. Motion to instruct Currency Committee to report out a substitute bill extending existing programs for 1 year, with a $1.1 billion authorization. June 22, 1961; yea, 197; nay, 215; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 96: H.R. 6028, passage of the bill, authorizing $4.9 billion in housing programs over 4 years. June 22, 1961; yea, 235; nay, 178; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 97: Call of the House, June 26, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 98: Call of the House, June 26, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 99: H.R. 7677, increase the national debt limit ceiling for 1 year from its permanent $285 billion level to $298 billion during fiscal 1962. June 26, 1961; yea, 231; nay, 148; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 100: Call of the House, June 27, 1961; MATHIAS, absent.

Rollcall No. 101: Call in Committee, June 27, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 102: Call in Committee, June 27, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 103: Call in Committee, June 28, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 104: H.R. 7851, defense appropriations for fiscal year 1962. Amendment to delete a provision, submitted in the President's defense budget, prohibiting price differentials in favor of economically depressed areas. June 28, 1961; yea, 173; nay, 239; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 105: H.R. 7851, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. June 28, 1961; yea, 412; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 106: S. 1922, Housing Act of 1961, authorizing $4.88 billion in housing programs over 4 years. Conference report agreed to by House. June 28, 1961; yea, 229; nay, 176; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 107: House Resolution 354, a resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives. June 29, 1961; yea, 108; nay, 270; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 108: House Joint Resolution 225, a joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin Compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes. June 29, 1961; yea, 92; nay, 257; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 109: H.R. 187, establish uniform procedures for Federal court review of alien deportation and exclusion orders issued by the Justice Department. Passed under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required). July 10, 1961; yea, 304; nay, 59; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 110: S. 857, a bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore. July 10, 1961; yea, 278; nay, 82; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 111: Call of the House, July 13, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 112: House Joint Resolution 435, a joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes. July 17, 1961; yea, 367; nay, 12; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 113: H.R. 2555, a bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in oversea areas, and for other purposes. July 17, 1961; yea, 285; nay, 87; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 114: Call of the House, July 19, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 115: Call in Committee, July 19, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 116: H.R. 6874, authorize fiscal 1962 appropriation of $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Adoption of the conference report. July 20, 1961; yea, 254; nay, 59; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 117: House Resolution 328, resolution disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the National Labor Relations Board. July 20, 1961; yea, 231; nay, 179; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 118: House Resolution 336, resolution disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, motion to discharge House Resolution 336 from the Government Operations Committee. July 20, 1961; yea, 231; nay, 179; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 119: H.R. 8302, a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On YATES' amendment. (Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass.) July 25, 1961; yea, 241; nay, 170; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 120: H.R. 8302, appropriate for fiscal 1962, $883,359,000 for construction at military installations in the United States and abroad. July 25, 1961; yea, 409; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 121: Call of the House, July 26, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 122: Call of the House, July 27, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 123: Call of the House, July 31, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 124: Senate Joint Resolution 120, give the President discretionary authority to call up to 250,000 members of the Ready Reserves and extend for 12 months the tours of duty of persons currently on active duty with the Armed Forces, for the purpose of meeting a possible crisis in Berlin or elsewhere. July 31, 1961; yea, 403; nay, 2; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 125: Call of the House, August 1, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 126: Call of the House. August 2, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 127: S. 2311, authorize $958,570,000 additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels to meet a possible crisis in Berlin or elsewhere. August 2, 1961; yea, 460; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 128: H.R. 30, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Re-

sources Compact. August 2, 1961; yea, 140; nay, 261; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 129: Call of the House, August 3, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 130: S. 1643, an act to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interest of consumers, and for other purposes. August 3, 1961; yea, 224; nay, 170; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 131: Call in Committee, August 3, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 132: H.R.7856. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for the purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Federal Communications Commission. August 3, 1961; yea, 198; nay, 151; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 182: H.R. 7856, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, or when in the best interests of the United States, and for other purposes. August 7, 1961; yea, 307; nay, 78; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 134: Call of the House, August 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 135: House Resolution 404, a resolution taking H.R. 7576 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to a conference. On motion that motion to instruct conferees to be laid on table. August 8, 1961; yea, 164; nay, 235; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 136: House Resolution 404, a resolution taking H.R. 7576 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to a conference. On Van Zandt motion instruct conferees on H.R. 7576 not to agree to Senate amendment. ($95 million, Hanford, Wash., electric energy generating facilities.) August 8, 1961; yea, 235; nay, 164; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 137: Call in Committee, August 8, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 135: H.R. 8033. Reorganize the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit delegation to employee boards of ICC review authority in adjudicative cases. August 8, 1961. Yea, 212; nay, 174; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 139: Call of the House. August 9, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 140: House Resolution 406. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6882, a bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor. On agreeing to resolution. August 9, 1961. Yea, 369; nay, 16. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 141: Call of the House. August 9, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 142: H.R. 6302. Transfer ownership and administration of Freedmen's Hospital, D.C., from the Federal Government to Howard University and authorize appropriations for construction of a teaching hospital to replace the old Freedmen's Hospital plant. August 9, 1961. Yea, 321; nay, 61. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 143: Call of the House. August 10, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 144: H.R. 7851, Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1962, appropriating $46,662,556,000 for the Armed Forces and civil defense. Adoption of the conference report. August 10, 1961; yea, 333; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 145: Call in Committee, August 10, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 146: Call of the House, August 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 147: Call of the House, August 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 148: Call of the House, August 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 149: Call in Committee, August 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 150: Call of the House, August 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 151: Call in Committee, August 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 152: Call in Committee, August 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 153: Call of the House, August 16, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 154: Call in Committee, August 16, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 155: Call of the House, August 17, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 156: Call of the House, August 18, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 157: H.R. 8400, a bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes. On passage August 18, 1961; yea, 287; nay, 140; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 158: Call of the House, August 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 159: Call of the House, August 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 160: H.R. 6384, amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to make airplane hijacking a Federal offense punishable by imprisonment or death and to provide penalties under Federal law for other crimes committed in commercial aircraft. August 21, 1961; yea, 374; nay, 5; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 161: Call of the House, August 21, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 162: Call of the House, August 22, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 163: Call of the House, August 22, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 164: H.R. 7763, a bill to provide for planning the participation of the United States in the New York World's Fair, to be held at New York City in 1964 and 1965, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. August 22, 1961; yea, 353; nay, 42; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 165: Call of the House, August 23, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 166: Call of the House, August 24, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 167: H.R. 84, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes. August 24, 1961; yea, 196; nay, 172; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 168: Call in committee, August 24, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 169: H.R. 8181, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and for oceanographic research. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill. August 28, 1961; yea, 223; nay, 120; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 170: H.R. 8181, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and for oceanographic research. August 28, 1961; yea, 208; nay, 135; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 171: H.R. 7176, a bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. August 28, 1961; yea, 337; nay, 3; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 172: Call of the House, August 29, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 173: H.R. 8773, a bill to amend section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1016), relating to lump sum readjustment payments for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, and for other purposes. August 29, 1961; yea, 394; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 174: Call of the House, August 29, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 175: H.R. 6242, a bill to amend section 508 of Title 28, United States Code, relating to attorneys' salaries. August 29, 1961; yea, 172; nay, 223; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 176: Call of the House, August 30, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 177: H.R. 8890, on question to consider under Calendar Wednesday procedure, a bill to amend Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, so as to extend their expired provisions for an additional year and to authorize payments under Public Law 815 for school construction in school districts with severe classroom shortages, to etxend for 1 year the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes. August 30, 1961; yea, 170; nay, 242; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 178: Call in Committee, August 30, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 179: H.R. 8028, authorize $10 million annually for 3 years for conducting pilot projects and training personnel for controlling juvenile delinquency. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan, amendment to limit all pilot demonstration projects to the District of Columbia. August 30, 1961; yea, 187; nay, 217; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 180: Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, resolution stating the sense of Congress as opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and to U.S. recognition of Communist China. August 31, 1961; yea, 395; nay, 0; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 181: S. 1983, Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, conference report, authorizing $4,253,500,000 in fiscal 1962 for foreign aid and $1.5 billion in each of the following 4 years for development loans. August 31, 1961; yea, 260; nay, 132; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 182: Call of the House, September 5, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 183: Call in committee, September 5, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 184: H.R. 9033, Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1961. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, amendment as amended by FORD, Republican, of Michigan, increasing the military aid appropriation from $1.3 billion to $1.6 billion in fiscal 1962. (The Passman amendment would have increased the military aid appropriation for fiscal 1962 from $1.3 billion to $1.475 billion.) September 5, 1961; yea, 243; nay, 151; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 185: H.R. 9033, Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1961. Passage of the bill. September 5, 1961; yea, 270; nay, 123; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 186: Call of the House, September 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 187: Call of the House, September 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 188: H.R. 9000, 2-year extension of Federal aid to schools in federally impacted areas and of the National Defense Education Act. Passed under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required). September 6, 1961; yea, 378; nay, 32; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 189: Call of the House, September 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 190: H.R. 8723, amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 to provide for its more effective enforcement. POWELL, Democrat, of New York, motion to pass the bill under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required). September 6, 1961; yea, 245; nay, 161; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 191: H.R. 8666. A bill to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges. September 6, 1961. Yea, 329; nay, 66; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 192: Call of the House, September 6, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 193: Call of the House, September 11, 1961; MATHIAS, absent.

Rollcall No. 194: Call of the House, September 12, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 195: Call in Committee, September 12, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 196: Call of the House, September 13, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 197: H.R. 8302, military construction appropriation bill. SHEPPARD, Democrat, of California, motion to disagree to a Senate amendment denying $3,812,000 for transferring the Army's Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass., September 13, 1961; yea, 212; nay, 185; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 198: H.R. 7371, appropriation bill for the State and Justice Departments, ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, motion to agree to a Senate amendment extending the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, September 13, 1961; yea, 300; nay, 106; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 199: H.R. 9076, public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1962. JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa, motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce by $4,225,000 the appropriation for construction of transmission lines in connection with the upper Colorado River Basin project and prohibit construction by the Federal Government of grid lines interconnecting the three major hydroelectric powerplants in the project. September 13, 1961; yea, 182; nay, 225; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 200: H.R. 9076, passage of the bill, September 13, 1961; yea, 378; nay, 31; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 201: Call of the House, September 13, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 202: H.R. 7576, authorize $328,440,000 for construction by the Atomic Energy Commission. Adoption of the conference report, which authorized $58 million to add electric generating facilities to a plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash., September 13, 1961; yea, 156; nay, 252; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 203: H.R. 8102, extend the Federal Airport Act. HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, motion to amend the Senate version of the bill by limiting extension of the act to 3 years, and authorized appropriations, without contract authority, to $225 million, September 13, 1961; yea, 398; nay, 4; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 204: Call of the House, September 14, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 205: H.R. 7500, a bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower, on passage, September 14, 1961; yea, 288; nay, 97; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 206: Call of the House, September 15, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 207: House Resolution 455, resolution to send H.R. 2010, extending the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to conference. September 15, 1961; yea, 243; nay, 135; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 208: House Resolution 464, rejection of closed rule prohibiting amendments from being offered to a bill raising postal rates (H.R. 7927) SISK, Democrat, of California, motion that, in effect, would assure consideration of the bill under the closed rule. September 15, 1961; yea, 142; Nay, 222; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 209: Call of the House, September 16, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 210: S. 2393. Two-year extension of Federal aid to schools in impacted areas and of the National Defense Education Act. Passed under suspension of the rules (two-thirds majority required). September 18, 1961; yea, 342; nay, 18; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 211: S. 1459. Increase the amounts of longevity step pay increases for postal workers and make the workers eligible after shorter service. September 18, 1961; yea, 362; nay, 4; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 212: H.R. 5751, publicize the dissemination of Communist propaganda through the mails, September 18, 1961; yea, 369; nay, 2; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 213: H.R. 8914, permit farmers in the summer fallow area (western Kansas and nearby areas) to plant a barley cover crop on land prepared for wheat before the acreage control program for 1962 took effect. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (two-thirds majority required). September 18, 1961; yea, 213; nay, 151; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 214: H.R. 7377, amend the Classification Act of 1949 to increase the number of "supergrade" positions under Civil Service. September 18, 1961; yea, 305; nay, 53; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 215: Call of the House, September 19, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 216: H.R. 9118, a bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. On passage, September 19, 1961; yea, 290; nay, 54; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 217: Call of the House, September 20, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 218: Call of the House, September 20, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 219: H.R. 7500, a bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. Conference report on adoption, September 21, 1961; yeas, 253; nays, 79; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 220: H.R. 5628, a bill to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden. On motion to suspend rules and passed, September 21, 1961; yea, 215; nay, 125; MATHIAS, nay.

Rollcall No. 221: H.R. 4172, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States. On motion to suspend rules and pass, (two-thirds majority required). September 21, 1961; yea, 166; nay, 173; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 222: Call of the House, September 22, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 223: H.R. 258, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption, September 22, 1961; yea, 142; nay, 159; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 224: Call of the House, September 23, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 225: H.R. 7377, a bill to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized; to fix the compensation of hearing examiners; and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. September 23, 1961; yea, 229; nay, 71; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 226: H.R. 9118, a bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. Conference report, on adoption. September 23, 1961; yea, 253; nay, 50; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 227: Call of the House, September 26, 1961; MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 228: Call of the House. September 26, 1961. MATHIAS, present.

Rollcall No. 229: H.R. 258, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. September 26, 1961; yea, 97; nay, 173. MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 230: H.R. 9033, a bill making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. September 26, 1961; yea, 192; nay, 81; MATHIAS, yea.

Rollcall No. 231: H.R. 9033, a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recede and concur in Senate Amendment No. 27 with an amendment. September 26, 1961; yea, 152; nay, 119; MATHIAS, nay.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of the conference committee report on House Resolution 62, passed by the 1961 Pennsylvania General Assembly:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 62

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, committee of conference on the part of the senate and house of representatives for the purpose of considering House Resolution 62, resolving (the senate concurring): That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment, respectfully submit the following bill as our report:

WILLIAM J. LANE,
PETER J. CAMIEL,
CLARENCE D. BELL,
Committee on the Part of the Senate.

MARION L. MUNLEY,
KATHRYN GRAHAM PASHLEY,
ELISABETH S. WYND,
Committee on the Part of the House of Representatives.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 24, 1961.

Whereas there has been introduced in the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961, the equal rights for women amendment, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas this amendment reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex": Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to adopt the equal rights for women amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

We certify that this bill has passed the house of representatives and the senate.

——— ———,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

——— ———,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

——— ———,
President pro tempore, Senate.

Approved the —— day of ———— A.D. 1961.

——— ———,
Governor.

Chairman Heller Predicts Booming Economy but No Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished and very able Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers delivered a highly significant speech before the American Life Convention in Chicago.

In the course of the speech Chairman Heller recognized our continuing unemployment dilemma, but pointed out that in spite of that "we have gained mightily since February and cut a $50 billion gap between actual and potential output by more than $10 billion."

Heller goes on to predict that another $20 billion or so of pickup in the economy and diminution of the gap can be expected in the next 6 to 9 months.

He feels that the economy may be growing fast enough to begin to solve some of the nagging unemployment problem that is unquestionably the most serious economic problem facing us.

Chairman Heller deals confidently with inflation—indicating that in the months ahead there will be little or no excessive demand pressure—or deficit pressured inflation—on prices.

He foresees some danger beginning in the last half of 1962 of a wage-cost-push inflation. He puts it this way:

> We will be approaching, but will not yet have reached, full potential operations. The American economy cannot grow at 10 percent per year forever. That pace will abate. The cyclical productivity gain will be exhausted and the slower long-run pace of productivity growth will take over. A slower rate of expansion may cause some margins to shrink. The euphoria of the recent past may cause some wages and other costs to rise. Prices may respond. The start of an inflationary creep will then be a real possibility. It is the job of all of us to avoid it.

On budget policy Heller's speech marks a sharp and extremely important departure. Heller shifts the discussion from the conventional budget which has concerned the Congress and 99 percent of the American people in previous considerations of Government policy to the income-and-product budget, that reflects all Government transactions. Heller contends that this latter-type budget will be in balance in late 1962. He is ominously silent on the balance of the conventional budget.

On this note he seems to slide off the hook on the obvious inconsistency involved in an unbalanced conventional budget in fiscal 1963 combined with an expansive—perhaps even a boom phase in the economy.

Mr. Heller does not answer the question raised by the President at his recent press conference when President Kennedy backed away from his previous budget strictly in balance position in the coming fiscal year.

The question is, When, if ever, will this administration plan to balance the conventional budget? Regardless of Mr. Heller's brilliant argument in favor of the income-and-product budget as a useful economic tool, it is the conventional budget that marks the increase in debt of our Federal Government and the basic soundness of the Government's financial position. Certainly it should be in balance during any coming boom period such as that forecast by Mr. Heller.

It is disturbing that the President's principal economic adviser adds his authoritative voice to the President's in what appears to be a program of discarding a balanced budget as a fiscal policy goal—ever.

Mr. President, in spite of, and I might say because of this policy disagreement on my part, I find the speech by Mr. Heller highly significant and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC FUTURE AND GOVERNMENT POLICY

(Remarks of Walter W. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, before the American Life Convention, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill.)

At the outset, let me translate the title of today's talk—which, as it stands, may seem both a bit portentous and a bit pretentious—into terms which relate more specifically to the interests of the life insurance industry.

In large part, of course, your economic fate hangs—in common with the fate of all of us—on the future course of production, income, and employment. My discussion will reflect that interest by reviewing quickly the overall outlook for the economy.

But beyond this, the life insurance industry—in its role as an outlet for savings, as a guarantor of personal economic security, and as a portfolio and direct investor on a vast scale—has an intensified interest in the course of prices. So I shall probe at some length the facts and forces that seem to govern our present position of price stability and the prospects for avoiding inflation in the face of continued recovery.

Finally, in the realm of policy, you have a direct and obvious stake in monetary and credit measures. My comments on the economic policies of the Kennedy Administration will respond to this special interest by reviewing only briefly our wage-price and budgetary policies but inspecting more closely the current role and course of monetary policy.

I. THE CURRENT ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

If I were giving this talk 8 months ago—and, believe me, sometimes it seems to me that I did—I would have described the economy and the administration as facing three difficult problems: (1) Reversing the recession, (2) avoiding another submerged peak and breaking through to reasonably full employment for the first time since early 1957, and (3) accelerating longrun economic growth.

Today the first of these problems—except for the nagging ache of a high unemployment rate—is behind us. Our young recovery has thus far been a solid one. The two-quarter increase in gross national product of about $26 billion compares favorably with other postwar revivals. We continue to see a GNP for the fourth quarter of this year in the neighborhood of $540 billion and a further healthy rise to the $565–570 billion range by the second quarter of 1962. Beyond that date—in the absence of necessary information that will be provided by the Federal budget for fiscal 1963, by plant and equipment and other surveys, and by actual developments the rest of this year—the future is much hazier. We have not yet tried, for example, to forecast when we will reach magic numbers like $600 billion or $800 billion or $1 trillion. Indeed, if we were to try, the numbers would be labeled projections, not forecasts.

The recovery of which I have spoken gives us a good running start toward the solution of our second problem, the restoration of full employment. But most of the race is yet to be run, and the homestretch is the hardest. As you know, we have only begun to shorten the shadow of unemployment.

Since December 1960, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate has hovered around 6.8 or 6.9 percent of the civilian labor force. But by mid-1962, if our forecast is correct, the unemployment rate will have come down substantially, though not as fast and not as far as we would like. Even then, there will be room for further reduction in unemployment and further expansion of demand and output. Evidence on available industrial capacity is necessarily rough and incomplete, but it is not to be ignored. And the evidence of still-unused capacity suggests strongly that the necessary industrial might is ready and waiting to match the supply of willing hands. I am not speaking of purely statistical improvements in this number or that. I am speaking of the unmatched capacity of our economy to produce the goods and services that people want, and the incomes to buy them.

In a growing, investing, improving economy, potential output never stands still. Yet, we have gained on it mightily since February, and cut a $50 billion gap between actual and potential output by more than $10 billion. In this and the following two quarters, one may reasonably expect it to shrink by another $20 billion or so. If it does, we will have reached by mid-1962 roughly the same stage in the business cycle we reached in 1959 before the steel strike interrupted our rise. The test then will be whether we can continue the surge of recovery toward the goal of full employment.

More hangs on our success than just the solution to our second problem. Full employment without rapid growth is conceivable, but rapid growth without full employment, without pressure on capacity, is probably inconceivable in a free enterprise economy. If we are to solve the third problem I mentioned earlier and make this "a decade of development" for ourselves as well as for younger economies, we need the basic stimulus to investment and innovation that comes from high levels of activity.

The curve of potential output for the American economy has been rising since 1955 at 3½ percent per year. Once we touch that curve again we can grow along it. Or we can raise our sights and aim to grow faster—say, at the 4½-percent rate which President Kennedy has characterized as well within our capability. But restoring the economy to the 3½-percent growth curve is an essential first step.

As the President has already indicated, this administration will come forward with further policies designed to promote full

employment and an increased rate of growth. But our freedom to do so will be endangered if we fail to meet yet another test—that of reasonable price stability and underlying strength in our balance of payments.

I need not remind this audience that inflation knows no equity. Inflation is a gamble in which the dice are loaded against those with no desire or no capacity to play. We need not erect price stability into the central goal of economic policy to know that inflation is more than inequitable, that it obstructs the achievement of our other economic goals.

A committee of eminent European and American economists which recently reported to the OEEC on the problem of rising prices stated at one point: "Price stability by itself will not assure adequate research and development, technical education, increasing business and labor efficiency, a skilled and adaptable labor force, a high level of investment, active competitive conditions, progressive and vigorous business leadership, and other real factors that are responsible for economic growth."

Indeed it will not. It will take vigorous action on the part of the business community, organized labor, and the Government to secure those things. But in the modern world, if prices and wages once again begin to creep upward at too fast a pace, our balance of payments will be an early casualty. To defend the dollar we may be forced into policies of monetary and fiscal restriction even before we have reached full employment and accelerated growth. But, as history and analysis show, these classical defenses against excessive demand are blunt and unsuitable weapons when applied, short of prosperity, against cost-generated inflation. They may not work at all, and if they do work, it will be at heavy cost in terms of national product that might have been.

In recent years we have lost ground to our international competitors primarily on the productivity front. Their productivity has grown more rapidly than ours. The way to reverse this trend is clear—we need to step up our efforts in investment, in research, in training, to improve our productivity more rapidly. Now productivity is the child of expansion, not restriction. Investment in modernization and technical advance flourishes and resistance to technical change weakens in an economy whose expansion opens up new opportunities daily. The urgency of holding the price line stems from this: if we succeed, the way is open for private and public policies of expansion; if we fail, then we may be prevented in the short run from pursuing the very policies that may solve our problems in the long run. Price stability, unlike virtue, is not its own reward. But the rewards are great.

II. PRICE STABILITY: THE RECORD AND THE PROSPECT

I want to turn now to a closer examination of the problem of price behavior. I propose to review the recent course of prices, to examine the various forces which are capable of causing a renewed upward movement in prices, to assess the present and prospective strength of these forces, and to offer an appraisal of the outlook for price stability. I propose to direct my attention to wholesale prices, and particularly to wholesale industrial prices, not because these are more important to human well-being than consumer prices, but because these are the prices which relate most closely to the competitive position of the United States in the world market.

The Korea inflation had run its course by 1951. But after a short reaction, wholesale industrial prices began to rise again, gradually but steadily. From 1953 to 1959, prices of industrial goods rose by 12 percent. Over the same 6-year period, the prices of our exports of manufactured goods rose by 16 percent. While our export prices of manufactures were thus going up by one-sixth, the comparable export prices of Belgium, France, Italy, and Japan were actually declining, and German export prices rose by a mere 2 percent.

Our balance of payments worsened during this period. Manufactures were a smaller proportion of our exports and a larger proportion of our imports in 1959 than in 1953. The U.S. share in the manufactured goods exports of 10 major industrial countries fell between 1953 and 1960.

Although it is certainly going too far to say that the United States priced itself out of the world market during this period—after all, our total merchandise exports were rising significantly—it would be equally wide of the mark to deny that our price performance was an important factor in the relative deterioration of our world market position in manufactures.

Since 1959, and more particularly in the last 6 months, the story changes dramatically. Wholesale industrial prices have been better than stable since early 1959—they have actually declined slightly More significantly, perhaps, wholesale industrial prices are actually lower today than they were at the very bottom of the recession in February of this year. In fact, this has been the only one of the four postwar recoveries in which wholesale industrial prices actually declined in the first half of recovery.

In passing, let me note also that in spite of the continual upcreep in the price of services, our Consumer Price Index rose less than 1 percent in the past year and less than one-half of 1 percent in the first 6 months of recovery.

Even more reassuring was the price reaction to President Kennedy's July 25 message to the Nation on the Berlin crisis. Many people, thinking back to the speculative orgy which followed U.S. intervention in Korea in June 1950, expected a wave of hoarding, scare buying, and profiteering which would launch another inflationary spiral. But in fact, the American people reacted with prudence and calm, and industrial prices have continued to decline since July.

Does this dramatic reversal of form signify that we have managed in some mysterious manner to solve the problem of peacetime inflation? However, much we would like to think so, the answer must be in the negative. We cannot overlook the fact that the American economy has paid a high price—too high a price—for the price stability of these last 3½ years. Throughout that period, our economy was operating at levels substantially below our reasonable potential, and the level of unemployment was disturbingly high. But now we face the much more difficult problem of moving up to reasonably full utilization of our human and material productive resources and stepping up our rate of growth without precipitating renewed inflation.

What are the forces which we must master if we are to maintain price-level stability? There are, in truth, several possible causes of inflation. Let me discuss briefly the three forms of the inflationary process most frequently discussed among economists—"demand-pull" inflation, "bottleneck" inflation, and "cost-push" inflation.

Demand-pull inflation is inflation in its classic form. It appears whenever the total demand for goods and services of all kinds outstrips the capacity of the economy to produce those goods and services. We had demand-pull inflation in the years 1946–48, and again in 1950–51. The pressure of excess demand which generates this kind of inflation may come from any sector of the economy. It can come from an increase in spending by consumers, by business firms for investment purposes, or by Government.

It is a simple fallacy, but unfortunately a very common one, to maintain that this kind of inflation can arise only from deficits in the Federal budget. This is demonstrably untrue. For example, in the years 1947 and 1948, prices soared despite the fact that there was a surplus in the Government budget.

Likewise, prices have been virtually stable in 1960–61, despite a deficit in the Federal budget, just as they were in the fiscal year 1959, in the face of a much larger deficit. The explanation is obvious enough: it is total demand which determines whether severe pressure exists on capacity to produce. If consumer and business demand are depressed, even an increase in Government demand reflected in a budget deficit may not press unduly upon the economy's capacity to produce. By the same token, if consumer and business demand are unusually high, even a large surplus in the Government budget may not be sufficient to reduce aggregate demand to a noninflationary level.

Bottleneck inflation, really a subspecies of demand-pull inflation, may occur in a recovery before the economy as a whole has reached capacity operation. It may happen that some lines of production reach capacity operation while in the rest of the economy there is still considerable slack. As demand continues to increase, there may be strong pressure on the prices of the goods produced by the bottleneck industries, and these price increases may be passed on through the economic system and initiate a wave of further increases.

The third type of inflation has come to be known as cost-push or market-power or seller's inflation. This kind of inflation can occur both in prosperity and in recession, though the climate of prosperity is more conducive to inflation of any kind. Cost-push inflation is generally associated with the entrenched market power of private economic groups. Negotiated wage increases have been known to push up prices. High prices and profits have been known to attract wage increases. We need not seek for a beginning to this process, we need only seek an end. Unions have sometimes talked as though any wage increase, however large, could readily be absorbed by management without a price increase. Management, on the other hand, has sometimes talked as though every wage increase, even an increase within the limits of advances in productivity, necessitates an equivalent increase in prices. Yet, this position would logically mean that the real income of the working man could never increase.

What are our chances in the months ahead for avoiding these three forms of inflation?

The prospects for demand-pull inflation seem remote. There is certainly no evidence of excess demand in the economy at present. On the contrary, as I noted earlier, the rate of unemployment remains disturbingly high after 7 months of recovery, and there is abundant evidence of unutilized productive capacity.

Nor is there visible evidence of the existence of bottlenecks. On the contrary, excess capacity appears to be spread widely throughout the economy at present.

Finally, there is ground for cautious optimism about the prospects for avoiding cost-push inflation. Average hourly wage rates in manufacturing have increased throughout the postwar period, but for at least the past 4½ years, the increases have been successively smaller. Between 1955 and 1956, the increase was 5.6 percent; in succeeding years the increases were 5.1 percent, 4.1 percent, 3.4 percent, 3.3 percent, and (between June 1960 and June 1961) 2.7 percent.

Accompanying this modest recent rise in manufacturing wage rates was a sharp cyclical upswing in productivity.

Between February and August of this year, output per man-hour of production workers rose by 4.8 percent. The modest wage increases during the past year have combined with these productivity increases to yield unusually sharp declines in labor costs per

unit during this stage of the recovery. This state of affairs is a favorable omen for continued price stability.

III. POLICIES FOR RECOVERY WITH STABILITY

A. Wageprice policy

I have documented my conviction that the stage is now set, as it has not often been, for healthy further expansion without inflation. I have expressed my hope that the administration will not be forced to meet a threat of inflation short of full employment by monetary and fiscal restriction. Such measures can control rising prices only at the cost of throttling the recovery. Is there no other escape from this cruel dilemma?

There are two possibilities we can dismiss at once. Direct wage and price controls we abhor—on economic grounds as well as political. Vague and generalized appeals are without effect.

The President's letters to the steel companies and the Steelworkers Union were of course neither vague nor generalized. These letters constituted a reasoned and persuasive appeal for specific actions which will serve the long-run interest of the steel companies, the steelworkers, and the Nation. I do not know what effect these letters have had, but it is reassuring that the steel industry has not raised prices thus far, and that the president of the Steelworkers Union has pledged that his union will remain fully conscious of its responsibilities to the public in its wage negotiations next year.

You may be sure that the administration will remain alert to the danger of a renewal of the wage-price spiral, wherever it may arise. Through the work of the President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee as well as through other channels, we hope that there will emerge both in management and labor a deeper appreciation of the stake which every one of us has in a stable price level. Every person who wants the United States to continue to discharge its world responsibilities, and every persons who favors full recovery and a faster rate of economic growth, is tied by the bonds of logic to the cause of price stability.

The critical period may come toward the second half of 1962. By then, if our forecasts prove right, we will have experienced a 10-percent gain in output in a year of recovery. We will be approaching, but will not yet have reached, full potential operations. The American economy can not grow at 10 percent per year forever. That pace will abate. The cyclical productivity gain will be exhausted and the slower longrun pace of productivity growth will take over. A slower rate of expansion may cause some margins to shrink. The euphoria of the recent past may cause some wages and other costs to rise. Prices may respond. The start of an inflationary creep will then be a real possibility. It is the job of all of us to avoid it.

B. Budget policy

Perhaps the major way in which the Government's policies strike their blow for good or evil in the economy is through the Federal budget, through taxes and expenditures. Over the years the budget—and particularly its surplus or deficit—has become more than an economic force; it has become a symbol. And as is often the case with symbols, the content has become oversimplified in the process. I need not tell a sophisticated audience that it is folly to identify, come what may, a budget surplus with fiscal responsibility and a budget deficit with fiscal irresponsibility. In relation to both price stability and other economic goals, there are constructive deficits as well as destructive deficits.

Government dollars bear no mysterious tag that renders them more explosively inflationary than private dollars. When the economy is slack and capacity redundant, we seek for expenditures to fill the gap. Whether the added expenditures should be private or governmental—State, local, or Federal—depends on the urgency of the needs to be met. If public needs—for education, for highways, for urban renewal—are most pressing, the resources are available to meet them through Government budgets. If private needs—for food, for housing, for services, for capital goods—are most urgent, fiscal policy may serve them by tax reduction, which places additional income at the disposal of families and private business. In neither case does policy seek spending for spending's sake. And in either case, if a budget deficit results, it is, economically, a constructive deficit in the sense that its force expresses itself in higher output and higher consumption rather than higher price levels.

In the opposite situation, when demands press against capacity, a deficit would be destructive. Prudence and good management require that expenditures be pruned. The choice is between the reduction of Government expenditures and the limitation of private spending through additional taxes. The result will be a constructive budget surplus, but the object is the avoidance of inflation.

Here I hope you will forgive me a technical aside, but one that is relevant to the making and understanding of good fiscal policy. Budgeting, as you know, is in large part a matter of convention. And the budget whose balance we all eye is a conventional document. Though it serves well as an instrument of management and control of Government operations, it is subject to substantial limitations as an indicator of the Government's fiscal impact on the economy. For example, it does not reflect the operations of the trust funds—involving some $23 billion of payments in fiscal 1961—which do represent genuine income-generating transactions. Also, net loans by the Government—for housing, export-import, and other purposes—appear in it as current expenditures and net repayments as current receipts—rather than as balance-sheet changes, as they do in private accounting. With minor exceptions, it is on a cash, instead of accrual basis; for example, it reflects corporate taxes not when the liabilities accrue, but when the Government receives the cash—on the average, with a lag of about 6 months.

Let me illustrate the effect of such factors on the size and timing of reported budget surpluses and deficits. In the third quarter of 1957, our economy entered the sharpest of its four postwar recessions. The trough came in the spring of 1958. During that period, prudence called for a constructive deficit. In fact, for fiscal year 1958 the conventional budget showed a small deficit of $2.8 billion. But the picture is quite different if we look at the Federal budget in terms of the receipts and expenditures as reflected in the national income accounts. In the second half of fiscal 1958, this deficit was at the substantial annual rate of $9.6 billion. This income-and-product-account version of the budget (a) includes only those transactions which do have an income-generating effect and (b) uses an accrual rather than a cash basis of reporting. On the upswing, the reverse effect occurs: the income-and-product deficit shrinks while the conventional deficit remains large. In the fiscal year 1959, in the course of recovery, the conventional budget showed a huge deficit of $12.4 billion. The economically more faithful income-and-product account budget showed the deficit in the first half of fiscal 1959 continuing at an annual rate of $9.4 billion, but toward the end of fiscal 1959, it turned a sharp corner to virtual balance.

We are at present in a similar situation. While we face a conventional budget deficit of something over $6 billion for the current fiscal year, our preliminary projections suggest strongly that the income-and-product budget will move into balance or even into surplus in the first half of 1962. For economic policy purposes, the conventional budget is, to be sure, a useful first approximation of Government's fiscal impact. But the income-and-product budget is a much more useful and reliable measure, one on which a major educational job is in order.

C. Monetary policy

Credit markets during the 1961 expansion show a striking contrast to the 1958 upswing. This year interest rates have moved within a very narrow range. Yields on Treasury bills continue to fluctuate between 2¼ and 2½ percent. Yields on long-term Treasury bonds have risen only three-tenths of 1 percent above their recession low.

The stability of interest rates this year is in large part the result of active Federal Reserve policy. Month after month the Fed has been keeping commercial banks well supplied with reserves. Free reserves have generally exceeded $500 million, and banks have expanded substantially their holdings of short-term U.S. Government securities. Their strong liquid position enables banks to finance business expansion either directly by loans or indirectly by taking over short-term securities previously held by business firms. Over the last year, total bank deposits and currency have risen about 6 percent, and in the last 3 months the rate of increase has been somewhat greater.

Meanwhile, Federal Reserve authorities continue to buy longer term U.S. Government securities. Since the abandonment of the "bills only" policy in February, well over $2 billion of securities of longer than 1-year maturity have been purchased on the open market. These purchases have increased bank reserves. They have also exerted direct downward pressure on long-term interest rates and have released funds to finance business investment and residential construction.

In other words, monetary conditions conducive to economy recovery and growth have been created and maintained.

At the same time, one may observe—though not in any spirit of complacency—that prices have been stable and the balance of payments has been improving. I have already discussed the outlook for price stability. As for our international position, we fully recognize that monetary techniques must be adapted to the new mobility of funds across the foreign exchanges. The importance of maintaining internationally competitive short-term rates has kept the discount rate at 3 percent and bill rates above 2¼ percent throughout the later stages of recession and recovery. This year the Fed has been, on balance, a net seller of short Treasury securities and has supplied bank reserves by acquiring longer securities. Allowing for the cost of forward exchange cover, the bill rate has remained competitive with short-term rates in other leading financial centers.

Thus, while Federal Reserve policy has helped to defend the dollar externally, it has been governed primarily by domestic economic goals. This seems to me the proper distribution of emphasis, and I have been interested to find the same view in the report of the Commission on money and credit.

Our rates of interest—especially long-term rates—cannot at all times adjust to foreign interest rates so as to prevent capital outflow altogether. Our interest rates cannot be out of line with the profitability of real investment here at home without jeopardizing our prospects for economic recovery and growth. In any case, high interest rates in the United States could not prevent large outflows of equity capital and direct investment if profit opportunities were markedly more favorable abroad.

We must face the fact that, given the development of the U.S. economy relative to the rest of the world, we probably will be,

and should be, a capital-exporting country for some time to come. We will have to be competitive enough in world markets to pay for capital exports by a surplus on current account. Our fundamental, long-term, balance of payments problem will have to be solved by means other than domestic monetary policy.

A close scanning of the economic horizon discloses no reason for expecting or for advocating a change in monetary policy and credit conditions in the near future. The statement we made in our testimony of March 6 still applies: "The economy needs the stimulus of low interest rates and greater credit availability, not merely for recovery of the ground lost in the recession but for the more difficult and important tasks of restoring full employment and promoting growth." By now we have regained the ground lost in recesison, but we are still far from full employment. The task of accelerating the longrun growth of productivity still lies ahead. Business spending to enlarge and modernize capacity is only in the early stages of expansion. It needs further stimulus and finance. Fortunately, the recovery itself is generating increased personal and corporate saving which can be, and must be, channeled into productive investment.

Interest rates are governed by secular forces as well as cyclical events. The upward trend in interest rates of the fifties—in large part the corrective consequence of the low pegged rates and the inflation of the forties—will not necessarily continue in the sixties. If—as many observers believe and all of us hope—inflationary psychology in the United States has been arrested, the premiums which expectations of longrun inflation added to interest rates in the fifties will be—indeed, will have to be—gradually shaken out of the rates.

Both the experience of the recovery to date and the outlook for the future suggest that it is wrong to expect interest rates and monetary policy to repeat past cyclical patterns. There is no immutable natural law that interest rates must rise sharply in recoveries. The course of interest rates depends upon specific economic circumstances and governmental policies. Fortunately so, for it means that we have some freedom to influence economic expansions through monetary policy.

Do not misunderstand me. We at the Council certainly do not regard monetary policy as a one-way street, to be used as an instrument of expansion but never as an instrument of restraint. On the contrary, monetary policy is too important a tool of countercyclical policy to be limited to one-way use. Few policy tools are as flexible and as speedily reversible as general monetary policy. These are characteristics we cannot afford to sacrifice. At some future date a shift to monetary restraint may well become necessary. We would wish monetary policy to be used as vigorously and actively against inflation, if and when inflation is the clear and present danger, as against recession and underproduction, when—as this year—they are the pressing problems.

D. Housing credit policy

Finally, we are particularly pleased with the decline in the cost of mortgage credit since the new administration took office in January. Of all interest rates, it is probably the interest rate on mortgages which most directly affects the largest number of families. A lower mortgage interest rate means that homeownership is now a possibility for some families previously unable to afford their own homes, and it also means that others can now buy better homes for the same monthly outlay.

The policies adopted by the new administration in the housing credit field have been among the forces which have produced this decline in the cost of mortgage money. Particular mention should be made of increased purchases of mortgages in the secondary market by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the reduction in the maximum allowable rate on FHA mortgages from 5¾ percent to 5¼ percent, and the measures taken by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to encourage rate reduction by saving and loan associations.

We are well aware that the May 29 reduction in the FHA ceiling rate from 5½ to 5¼ percent was not greeted with unanimous approval by mortgage lenders. The decision to reduce the FHA ceiling to 5¼ percent was taken only after a most careful appraisal of the outlook for the behavior of the general money market, as well as the outlook for the supply and demand of mortgage funds. While events since May 29 have not confirmed our expectations in every respect, they nevertheless offer more comfort than disappointment. Both FHA applications and FHA home starts were higher in August than they were when the new rate was instituted on May 29. Perhaps even more significant is the fact that FHA starts in August constituted more than 20 percent of estimated total nonfarm private starts for the first time since January, up from lows of 17 percent in June and July. All reports indicate continued ready availability of mortgage funds under the FHA program.

In short, the available evidence suggests that the present 5¼-percent-rate maximum is not inhibiting home construction and financing or preventing FHA programs from performing their important functions in the Nation's economic progress. Moreover, although the situation is under continuing review, our appraisal of trends to date in various sectors of the money market has yielded no findings which would seem to signal an early change in housing credit policy.

IV. CONCLUSION

This has been a long speech because these are big problems. There are no simple answers. Too often popular economics is one-dimensional economics: we are told how to solve the balance-of-payments problem, or how to achieve full employment, or how to avoid inflation. It is all very simple—what is forgotten is that an all-out solution on one front may spell an all-out disaster on another. Economic policy has multiple objectives, is bound by many constraints, and must comprehend complex relationships. I am suspicious of books entitled "Economics Made Easy," for, too often, economics made easy is economics made empty.

Press Accounts of the 26th Annual Convention of the Italian-American Veterans of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose two press accounts of activities accompanying the 26th Annual Convention of the Italian-American Veterans of the United States.

One article appeared in the Utica Daily Press for August 17, 1961, the other in the Utica Observer Dispatch for the same date.

The articles follow:

[From the Utica Daily-Press, Aug. 17, 1961]

GOVERNORS TO ATTEND CONVENTION IN UTICA

The Governors of New York and Massachusetts will attend the 26th Annual National Convention of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States here next week.

John F. Nave, Syracuse, general convention chairman, said last night that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and Gov. John A. Volpe would speak at the convention expected to attract approximately 1,000 delegates.

Other speakers will include Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of Schenectady, who has been mentioned in some circles as a possible Democratic candidate for governor in 1962.

Assemblymen from New York State, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania also will participate.

The convention will open Thursday and continue through Sunday.

August 25, has been designated National Commander's Night. Governor Rockefeller will be the speaker. Nave said Governor Volpe also will participate in the Friday night dinner-meeting.

The Massachusetts Governor will be the speaker Saturday evening sharing the spotlight with Representative STRATTON.

The toastmaster Saturday night will be Dr. Edward Re, chairman of the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Governor Volpe will be accompanied by his chief military aid, Gen. Joseph T. Regan.

Governor Rockefeller will be accompanied by Frank Volto, New York State Director of Veteran's Affairs.

Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of this congressional district, local State senators, and assemblymen and city officials also will speak during the convention.

Nave said the evening convention meetings to be addressed by prominent State and National officials will be open to the public. Reservations can be made by contacting Frank Corriale, deputy cochairman.

Volpe will be honorary parade marshal Sunday, August 27. Paul Carbone, Boston, national chaplain of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, will give the oration at Chancellor Park prior to a mass at St. Mary of Mount Carmel Church.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Positano, of East Vineland, N.J., national honorary chaplain, will celebrate the mass.

The parade will move at 9 Sunday and end at the St. Mary of Mount Carmel Church.

Vincent LoParco, a native Utican, and national commander of the Italian-American War Veterans, will preside at the convention. Angelina Tenuto, Chester, Pa., is the national president of the auxiliary.

Convention headquarters will be in Hotel Utica.

Convention officials said last night delegates will start arriving in Utica Wednesday.

[From the Utica Observer Dispatch, Aug. 27, 1961]

NO COMPROMISE IN BERLIN, VOLPE, STRATTON TELL VETS

(By David Beatty)

Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, last night singled out three important "if's" in his speech before the Italian-American War Veterans national convention here.

"If Berlin was worth fighting for a dozen years ago, it is worth fighting for today.

"If we back down on Berlin, we will be forced to back down all over the free world.

"If you want peace," he said, "prepare for war."

His viewpoint on Berlin was backed by Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Demo-

crat, of Schenectady, who also addressed the 600 veterans and their wives at a banquet in the main ballroom, Hotel Utica.

"In sealing off East Berlin, the Russians broke a solemn agreement without consulting us," the Congressman said. "Now they are going to try to do the same thing on the Berlin air corridors. But we aren't going to let them."

Both speakers stressed that no Berlin compromise can be made with the Russians.

Governor Volpe said, "We must do whatever is necessary with speed and dispatch to bolster our Armed Forces, increase our bomber production, rehabilitate and modernize our Navy's ships—80 percent of which were built during or before World War II.

"Though all the world fears war, Russia has a greater reason to fear it than anyone else. Between the Soivets and the West, lie 100 million captive Europeans. Their hatred of Red domination is so great that should Russia turn her guns and her face away from them to fight the West, they would set upon her from the rear and help destroy her," he said.

"At Yalta and Potsdam, Stalin promised that the East Germans could make their own self-determination in free elections. Khrushchev repeated this promise in Geneva in 1955. The Soviets should honor that promise today at a time when they say they want to get out of Berlin."

The West should abide by the results of a free election, the Governor said, and to insure its freedom, the election should be conducted under the United Nations supervision.

Representative STRATTON posed the Berlin problem in these words:

"The blunt truth is that from here out we Americans must be prepared either to fight to defend our rights or else surrender to Russian pressure and brand ourselves for all the world to see as a paper tiger."

Cyrus Eaton: A Very Powerful Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 19 of last year, I presented a brief exposé of the career of Cyrus Eaton, the Canadian-born industrial tycoon who has made himself an apologist for Khrushchev and the Soviet Union.

At the time, as I recall, there were a few critical comments by commentators who were unaware of all the facts. No one really defended Cyrus Eaton. But they argued that Cyrus Eaton was an eccentric old man, that he was harmless, or that he could never do as much harm as could be done by making Cyrus Eaton a big issue.

I believe the theory that Eaton is really a harmless eccentric old man or a "dupe" has been demolished for all time by a series of articles which the distinguished commentator, Henry J. Taylor, recently wrote for the United Feature Syndicate.

It is nonsense to talk of Eaton as a "dupe"—

Said Mr. Taylor—

and his friends in Cleveland and elsewhere should stop this in a hurry * * *. Eaton's operations are * * * continuous and relentless and bear on our battle to shield ourselves and the free world from the known menaces of the U.S.S.R. and Communist imperialism.

He [Eaton] can give such support to the Soviets while the flame of peril lick at our feet only because other citizens protect his liberty by providing a nation where heroes have died, and are willing to die again, to preserve it. Such performers could not survive 1 minute like this in the totalitarianism they compliment or under the tyrant they acclaim.

Some personal standards remain in this free land, however—

Mr. Taylor concluded—

including the liberty to resent the presence in our country of any man who flies all the way to Paris to congratulate Khrushchev when he slapped the face of the United States, and that I saw Eaton do. In his way, is this powerful man, Cyrus Eaton, aiding the Soviet any less than it was aided in a different way by Alger Hiss?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete text of the four articles on Cyrus Eaton, written by Henry J. Taylor for the United Features Syndicate.

There being no objection, the articles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, August 21, 1961]

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Cyrus S. Eaton, the very rich crony of the U.S.S.R., continues to play a thoroughly damaging part in the life of our country. Technically, we are not at war. But if he is not giving aid and comfort to Russia, by what conceivable grave definition can that grave phrase be used?

Our national peril is officially declared. We arm, draft our men, serve notice we will fight for survival. Yet Mr. Eaton finds occasion after occasion to show his support of the Kremlin and display to the world dramatic approval of Soviet activities and of Khrushchev personally.

This is the man I saw rush up to Khrushchev at Orly Field in Paris to wring his hand in congratulations after the Red leader had insulted our President, our Nation and all Americans so violently a few hours before. In fact, Mr. Eaton flew all the way from Cleveland, he said, to do it. May I ask what we would have done if any American had done all this for Hitler?

Khrushchev pounded on the world with his shoe at the United Nations in New York and threatened annihiliation of the free world by Red rockets. Mr. Eaton promptly gave him and his iron-fisted entourage a banquet, and a eulogy, at the Waldorf-Astoria. He described Khrushchev's completely phony disarmament plan as the "most statesmanlike utterance in my lifetime."

And now Mr. Eaton could hardly wait for Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin to reach Cuba on his propaganda tour before inviting him and other accompanying Russians to ply that trade up north; Alan Shepard and Virgil Grissom at the same time so properly declining Mr. Eaton's invitation to help the Cleveland tycoon give this Red charade an added push.

What goes on here?

This is the man the Kremlin gave perhaps the greatest badge of dishonor an American can receive—the insidious Lenin Peace Prize. It was after the Soviet butchery of Hungary. Yet Mr. Eaton announced in Moscow, "I am deeply appreciative of this high honor."

Others point to Henry Ford, Sr.'s lapse into the foolishness of his peace ship in World War I. But Mr. Ford's fantasy was whimsy as pure as driven snow and a single sad tour into dreamland. Mr. Eaton's operations are completely different in character and objective, are continuous and relentless and bear on our battle to shield ourselves and the free world from the known menaces of the U.S.S.R. and Communist imperialism.

Khrushchev has cited Mr. Eaton's realism in an official report to the Supreme Soviet Council. Mr. Eaton is repeatedly quoted in Pravda, Izvestia, Current Digest, the New Times (distributed throughout the Communist world in nine languages) Kommunist, the political organ of the Soviet Party, and Red radio outlets which bounce his words off the raw iron girders of the Soviet police state.

In an article Mr. Eaton wrote for the Moscow magazine, the Progressive, he asserts that tension between the United States and Soviet Russia and the threat of nuclear war are primarily America's fault.

He states that America is obsessed by war. "I am firmly convinced the Russians want peace," he says. He insists we have not met the U.S.S.R. half way. He writes of America's swollen pride, boasting, arrogance, truculence, and says "someone will take up the challenge." He disparages the forces indispensable to our security and the free world and heaps contempt on our global battle to check the totalitarian forces he champions. He lavishes praise on Sino-Soviet actions, global performances, programs and purposes. "Let's stop baiting Russia," he says.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 23, 1961]

A VERY POWERFUL MAN

(By Henry J. Taylor)

High Communist functionaries are welcome in Cyrus S. Eaton's Cleveland home and at his cooked-up Pugwash, Nova Scotia, summer conferences.

It was from this idyllic island retreat with Mr. Eaton and the Soviet Ambassador to Canada, A. A. Aroutunian, that Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin on August 7 sent a message to Maj. Gherman Titov in orbit aboard the Vostok II and then enplaned for Moscow to join his fellow spacemen, leaving some 14 other Russians still in Mr. Eaton's care.

In this way Mr. Eaton plays both sides of the border. Soviet Ambassador to the United States Mikhail A. Menshikov, in turn, made Mr. Eaton's Cleveland house his base of operations during 1958 forays around northern Ohio, to the bitter dismay of the 15,000 or so Lithuanian-Americans thereabouts who continually seek to expose Kremlin domination of their homeland through their American-Lithuanian Council.

This very rich crony of the U.S.S.R. was given in the Kremlin by Khrushchev himself the insidious Lenin Peace Prize, first known as the Stalin Peace Prize until Khrushchev changed its name. But Mr. Eaton is, and remains, no "dupe."

He is a very powerful man.

Born in Nova Scotia in 1883, he moved here in 1900 and became a naturalized citizen in 1913. He is a director of numerous large utilities, a giant steel company, many industrial enterprises, and a great railroad; he is head of an important Cleveland-New York investment firm; and has served as a trustee of Denison University, Case Institute of Technology, and the University of Chicago.

Nor does Mr. Eaton apparently forget his businesses when he visits the Kremlin. The Chicago Council of Soviet-American Friendship's bulletin, for whatever its influence reports on Eaton discussion with Khrushchev, in part:

"So far as I am concerned, the companies I am associated with are prepared to do

business with Russia and, as soon as we can do it without going to jail, with the People's Republic of China."

And Representative WILLIAM E. HESS of Ohio points out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 10, 1959, that one of the companies Mr. Eaton is associated with did sell $3 million worth of cold rolled steel to the Soviet Government.

It would be outrageous, however, for Mr. Eaton to speak as if all these great American enterprises in which he is associated were under his thumb and would do his bidding, for this is simply not true, although his bidding itself is mighty clear.

But Mr. Eaton goes on, as reported:

"The great mistake we make in the United States is believing the Soviet regime is something terrible • • • Mr. Khrushchev is popular in the United States. He has many characteristics the Americans like • • • Hitler in his prime and through the Gestapo had no such spying organizations as we have in the United States."

What steps have been taken about Cyrus S. Eaton? There is still so much more to say that it must go into another article soon.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 25, 1961]

IT ISN'T JUST CYRUS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Cleveland Tycoon Cyrus S. Eaton, the very rich and powerful crony of the U.S.S.R., who plays a thoroughly damaging part in the life of our country, violates no statute, although Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, raised the question in the Senate whether he is not afoul of the Logan Act.

The act prohibits unauthorized negotiations or intercourse with a foreign power, punishable by a fine or a prison sentence. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1960, pp. 9888–9889.)

He directed the attention of the Attorney General of the United States to what Mr. Eaton has done and is doing. Mr. Eaton was born in Canada, where he still maintains a residence, moved to this country in 1900 and later became a naturalized citizen. It was through the Canadian door that Senator DODD reached the Logan Act question, as follows:

"He has publicly urged Canada 'to completely disassociate itself from America's stubborn attitude in foreign affairs.' If Mr. Eaton said in his many private conversations with Canadian officials what he said in public, then he has violated the Logan Act and should be prosecuted."

Supplying some background as well, Senator DODD continued:

"Mr. Eaton claims 'American politicians in general are relentlessly driving us to war, that American officials do not represent the American people whereas in the Soviet Union the Government speaks for all the people.'

"He says Russia doesn't really mean to communize the world, that 'Dr. Zhivago' was suppressed (there) because Soviet youth cannot bear any criticisms of their beloved Government; that the Russian massacre of Hungarian patriots was no different from our sending troops to Lebanon, etc."

Prior to this, at his own request, Mr. Eaton appeared (June 1958) before a House subcommittee which investigates pro-Soviet apples in our barrel, Hollywood pro-Reds and some pitiable people as well whose disloyalty, long since abandoned, was an error in youth. The chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, afterward issued the following statement, in part:

"It is believed that no useful purpose can be served by permitting Mr. Eaton to repeat the groundless accusations that Iron Curtain countries have used for propaganda purposes."

Some of Mr. Eaton's Cleveland friends say, "Oh, all this is just Cyrus, you know." Well, I do know, and it is not "just Cyrus" at all. He can give such support to the Soviet while the flames of peril lick at our feet only because other citizens protect his liberty by providing a nation where heroes have died, and are willing to die again, to preserve it. Such performers could not survive 1 minute like this in the totalitarianism they compliment or under the tyrant they acclaim.

It can well be that communism at any time will put the feet of the world in marching boots. If this powerful man does not know that Soviet imperialism is based on a pattern of bloodshed, barbarism, suppression and slavery he knows nothing.

Some personal standards remain in this free land, including the liberty to resent the presence in our country of any man who flies all the way to Paris to congratulate Khrushchev when he slapped the face of the United States.

[From United Feature Syndicate, Inc.]

CYRUS S. EATON

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Cyrus S. Eaton, the rich and very powerful crony of the U.S.S.R., is at it again—but this time he sings the Soviet song as chairman of the board of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

Writing in that capacity he invaded the Letters-to-the-Editor column of the Washington Star and other newspapers around the country. His statement is gratuitous, for President Kennedy's nationally acclaimed United Nations speech with which it deals says not one word about railroads and is the proverbial million miles from the provinces of railroad management.

Mr. Eaton's statement declares the speech "provocative." It declares, in part, that the President "left no question that we would employ force, and even drop the dreaded bomb, if we failed to get our way completely in Laos and Berlin," and concludes that "the Soviets and Chinese must recognize the President's words as a challenge and a threat."

No one need be told that this outrageous reversal of who is threatening whom is exactly the Communist line and lie throughout the world, told by Khrushchev and here by Eaton alike. And anyone familiar with the powerful tycoon's constant declarations and actions supporting Kremlin objectives and condemning America's will recognize this current pitch as typical.

Khrushchev's diabolic stategy of world terrorism by H-bomb threats is clear, documented and famous. If Cyrus Eaton wants to twist this truth to blame America he should move himself and the money he made here to Moscow.

But by what authority can Eaton identify a giant, publicly owned American corporation with all this?

Business standards require the board of directors or the shareowners to treat with the long-overdue question of this man as such an enterprise's spokesman on public affairs. Khrushchev claims there is wide American industrialist support behind Eaton. Eaton furthered this impression by trotting out 150 businessmen to a spectacular lunch he gave (Biltmore Hotel, New York) honoring Khrushchev after his U.N. shoe-pounding tirade against America. In today's peril no public corporation has a right to let Eaton create the slightest misunderstanding as to where it stands.

This has nothing to do with freedom of speech; it has everything to do with corporate propriety. Eaton does not own the C. & O. He's merely employed by it. He's one of the hired help, like anybody else, and just as subject to be fired as anybody else. And if Khrushchev thinks Eaton's setup in the front office typifies big business, Eaton has him as conned as the man who bought the Brooklyn Bridge.

The corporation's latest proxy statement (March 21, 1961), filed with the Security and Exchange Commission, shows 8,204,274 common shares outstanding and total assets of more than a billion dollars ($1,065,922,911). Eaton owns about one-seventy-ninth of the business; about 1¼ percent. By latest count 92,482 individuals and institutions own the other 98¾ percent. Yet the board of directors consists of only 10 men, one of the smallest for any giant business in the country. And Eaton has on it himself, his son and his son-in-law, a Cleveland physician, as 3 of the 10. By this absolutely untypical formula a tiny but brainy minority can swing the only real authority that is swung, and back it up by a billion dollars of other people's assets in which their roots are really no deeper than a postage stamp on a haystack.

Top authority in large public corporations is necessarily more statutory than representative of the ownership as a whole. That's why the executiveship is a public trust. It is also why captialism gets such a terribly unfair black eye if a close-knit few ever make the corporate body their personal vehicle for anything. For they can run with the ball as if they owned the entire vast enterprise unless somebody blows the whistle.

If the directors fail in their public capacity, the stockholders owe it to themselves, the 24,500 employees, the users of this public utility and to our imperiled Nation as a whole to blow the whistle on Cyrus S. Eaton—and blow it loud enough for Khrushchev to hear. The Kremlin tyrant misunderstands far to much about America and capitalism already.

Duplicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Donald Rogers in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune exposes the duplicity of the Kennedy administration—another example of saying one thing and doing another:

SCHIZO-FRANTIC ROUTE

(By Donald I. Rogers)

If you can pause long enough in the task of building your fallout shelter, it may be worthwhile now to take the time to reappraise what's going on, where we're headed and what a businessman might expect of the administration.

The characteristics that emerge from the Washington murk could include: Timidity. Lack of confidence. Ambivalence. Absence of clear purpose.

Foreigners who would be our friends view with fear the spectacle of a people trying to stiffen the spine of a President who's supposed to lead them. If it is confusing to those who dwell abroad, it's perhaps more confusing to Americans who must do business abroad.

It shouldn't be, though, for those same qualities are the dominant ones on the domestic scene.

Quick, now. Can you answer within 5 seconds whether this is a free enterprise administration or a Socialist one?

Ah, yes, the President praises free enterprise. He says nice words. But there are others who work for him who also make utterances and advance programs, with no reproach from on high.

Let's see, now, there's Mr. Udall and Mr. Swidler, pushing hard for a totally unnecessary public-power network to stretch from coast to coast. These are Kennedy men. Are they advocating free enterprise?

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges tells everyone to sell hard, for it'll bring prosperity.

By golly, there's a free-enterpriser, right in the fold.

Sell, he says. That makes sense. Do you know the biggest selling force in America today? It's advertising, and—whoops, the Federal Trade Commission, Galbraith, Schlesinger & Associates have attacked the very concept of advertising.

Then, of course, on this same subject of selling Attorney General Robert Kennedy has come out and simply told people they'll have to do without so many things.

Oh, well, that's just a bit of confusion, perhaps, and maybe they'll straighten it out.

The administration says its No. 1 domestic objective is full employment. Fine, fine.

The administration admits, and the President has stated, that the tax system is a chief deterrent to expansion that would bring fuller (if not full) employment. Fine; good perception.

The administration, however, is talking of tax increases for next year. Huh? How's that again?

Yes, but there are other things. Morals, for instance, and ethics. The whole soiled business world must be cleaned up, this administration tells us. Bobby Kennedy has demanded codes of ethics for the conduct of the filthy game of turning a profit. Moreover, he has made allegations of almost universal price fixing, a dastardly practice, indeed.

The Justice Department's Antitrust Division has accused a company of having prices higher than its competitor's; another because its prices were lower than its competitor's; another because its prices were the same as its competitor's, and still another because the competitor complained its prices were so low it could not compete.

You'll never get this column to come out against high morals in business. It's best we don't say anything about the necessary support the administration got from those highly "moral" political machines in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and so forth. Aw, but there we go again.

The multibillion-dollar balance-of-payments problem that furrows the brows of many thoughtful economists has been tackled by the administration, and we now have specific rules about how much perfume a tourist can bring from Grasse.

The administration has also tackled inflation. A letter has been sent asking that the price of a single product—steel—be held in line. Meanwhile, food prices are being raised by Government action and inflation is being stimulated by more Government deficits.

Unemployment is bad, says the administration. But it raised the cost of employment by boosting the minimum wage, which tends to roll back employment. Know what that causes? Unemployment, that's what.

Sacrifice for defense, says the President. Betimes, don't you dare criticize the splurging on domestic programs. Pay for 'em whether you want them or not.

Enough of this. Taking stock and reappraising isn't much fun after all.

Time Magazine Recalls Noble Record and Spirit of Wisconsin's Red Arrow Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin's famed Red Arrow Division is once again among the first in the Nation to be called to active duty in a period of national crisis. To make clear the firmness of our national resolve to defend Berlin, and with that symbolic city the integrity of the Western Alliance, the President has turned to the 32d Infantry Division of the Wisconsin National Guard, whose record in a century of service to our Nation can hardly be surpassed.

In the lead article of a cover story on the military callup Time magazine documents our Nation's willingness to sacrifice and fight to resist Communist expansion and to preserve freedom, by reporting on the attitude of the Red Arrow Division.

Time recalls:

In World War II the Red Arrow Division fought its way from Buna to Saidor to Hollandia to Aitape to Luzon in 654 combat days—more than any other combat group in the Nation's history. Along the way its men won 11 Congressional Medals of Honor, 49 Legions of Merit, 153 Distinguished Service Crosses.

Time notes the serious hardships and personal inconvenience that the present callup is causing the Wisconsin division. More than 10,000 families in over 100 Wisconsin towns and cities will feel the pinch. But the resolution and spirit of the Red Arrow Division are summed up by the division chaplain, Rev. William B. Downey, who says:

There are values more important than peace. Freedom and justice for example. I'm prepared to sacrifice peace for them.

As Time concludes:

Those were words that freemen everywhere could stand by.

I ask unanimous consent that the Time article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE ARE VALUES

In Washington, President John Kennedy and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko discussed East-West tensions for 2 hours. They settled nothing, but top-level talks between the United States and the U.S.S.R. would continue, and the Berlin crisis seemed to be easing slightly.

In confronting the crisis, it is vital that the United States convince the Communist leaders that the Nation is willing to fight and its citizens are ready to sacrifice. Last week, across the United States, 82,000 reservists and National Guardsmen prepared to answer a call to active duty. Among them were 10,000 officers and enlisted men from 72 Wisconsin communities. They were members of the National Guard's famed 32d Division—and there could be no doubting their spirit.

RED ARROW TATTOO

The 32d is a crack outfit. It earned its shoulder patch, a red arrow piercing a battleline, in the Meuse-Argonne during World War I. Its first casualties were suffered when the troopship *Tuscania* was sunk by a German submarine. In World War II the Red Arrow Division fought its way from Buna to Saidor to Hollandia to Aitape to Luzon in 654 combat days—more than any other Army unit in the Nation's history. Along the way its men won 11 Congressional Medals of Honor, 49 Legions of Merit, 153 Distinguished Service Crosses. In these two wars, the 32d suffered 20,500 casualties.

When the 32d returned to Wisconsin after 4 years of World War II, the town of Marshfield (population, 14,153) had suffered so many casualties (20 dead out of an infantry company of 122 men) that it refused to have another National Guard unit located there. Recalls Mrs. Clare Ecke, whose husband fought with the Red Arrow Division: "I remember one blue Monday when the Marshfield News Herald had nine killed-in-action pictures spread across the front page. That's a lot for a town like this to take." But Marshfield changed its mind, and now its men are returning to duty. One is Harry Donald Steinmetz, 43, who retired as a master sergeant in 1959 after 20 years with the 32d. Says Steinmetz, who has rejoined the 32d: "I feel like I have the Red Arrow tattooed on my shoulder. I'd hate to see the boys leave without me."

The impact of the 32d's return to duty will be felt in every Wisconsin city and town. The far north town of Superior (population 33,563) is losing a high school principal, superintendent of student teaching, basketball coach and 55 students at Wisconsin State College. Medford (population 1,622) is sending its mayor, its city attorney, and three teachers. Rib Lake (population 794) is losing its only physician, Dr. Robert Pettera. Says Pettera: "I knew when I signed up that I had to be ready for something like this."

KIDS GET HUNGRY

Inevitably, the call-up worked personal hardships. In the town of Stettin (population 4,141), Capt. Raymond Ott canceled plans for expanding his milk franchise: "I'll just have to teach my wife Rosemary how to keep the business going until we get back. But this is what we signed up for—to take care of emergencies. It looks like we got an emergency."

Said Wausau Salesman Robert Melang: "The main thing my wife fears is loneliness, especially at night after she's put the children to bed. Except for her and the kids, I don't mind going. We've had good training—we've got a real good outfit." Says Antigo's Capt. Norman Martell, the father of eight: "Sure, it's rough on all of us, but that's what we're here for. I've been building myself up a little insurance business for the last 6 years. Now I'm having to make arrangements to have part of my accrued savings paid out to me while I'm in service. Eight kids can get kind of hungry."

In Tomahawk, Lt. Michael Redmond got his orders just 3 days after he was married. Says he: "That's just the way it is. It looks as if we're going to have to teach the Russians a lesson." Four of the five men at Dar's service station are leaving, including Owner Darwin Hilgendorf. Just last month, Norman Osero had opened Norm's Stereo and TV Shop. Last week he had a new sign out: "Clearance Sale."

VALUES MORE IMPORTANT

Thus, despite the hardships it work on them, the men of the Red Arrow Division return to duty with resolution and high spirit. That resolution and spirit were expressed by a division's chaplain, Rev. William B. Downey, as he put on his major's uniform: "There are values more important than peace. Freedom and justice, for example. I'm prepared to sacrifice peace for them." Those were words that free men everywhere could stand by.

Frondizi Administration Praised by Dr. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the synopsis of a lecture delivered before the faculty and student body of the Visitation Academy for Young Ladies, Frederick, Md. The speech was given by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Frederick County, Md. Dr. Thorning, who is also associate editor of World Affairs, Washington, D.C., and professor of Latin American history, Marymount College, Arlington, Va., has served our country in South and Central America. He is the only living U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. He has visited Argentina frequently and knows the people and officials of that great Republic. His praise for the administration of President Arturo Frondizi, of Argentina, is deeply encouraging to all who place their faith in human freedom, genuine social progress, and life's eternal values. The synopsis reads as follows:

FRONDIZI ADMINISTRATION PRAISED BY DR. THORNING

Delivering his first lecture in a series at Visitation Academy here, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, praised the administration of President Arturo Frondizi in Argentina for "trying to live within its income without grandiose schemes for government monopolies which simply attract hordes of hungry officeholders and bureaucrats."

The Maryland educator, author and diplomat added:

"In recent years, Argentina faced huge reconstruction problems because the national patrimony, to no small extent, wasted by Peronista politicians without any corresponding increase in national production. Today President Frondizi is showing a good example of economy in government and giving every possible encouragement to those citizens, Argentines or foreigners, who believe in the system of private property. Slowly and systematically, the nation is finding new markets for meat, grain, hides, and wool. At the same time, the annual deficit, due to heavy petroleum imports, is being reduced. This has been done by private enterprise. One result is that, by the end of this year, it may be that Argentina will come close to providing its own gasoline, lubricating oil, and natural gas.

"Success along these lines means that the Argentine people will enjoy the benefits of a stable currency. Citizens who live on pensions or on the income derived from insurance policies are being treated fairly. A definite check has been given to inflation. Workers are encouraged to put money in the banks. Thrift and economy have been restored to a position of honor in the community. This can be a cornerstone of social progress: better housing, improved health standards, and advances in education.

"It is important to note that La Prensa, one of the Western Hemisphere's best newspapers, is urging Argentina to uphold freedom and decency against the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raul. The great organ of public opinion in Buenos Aires declares that 'every American Republic should follow the lead of democratic Costa Rica and work for the liberation of the Cuban people.' While Oswaldo Dorticos, the Castro puppet-President is the guest of Mao Tse-tung, Soviet Gauleiter of China, all Americans can understand the vital importance of community action against aggressors." Rev. Mother Mary de Chantal and Sister Claire Joseph, directress of studies, presided at the meeting here.

The Credo That Inspired Dag Hammarskjold To Give His Life for Civilization Can Inspire Us To Carry On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the late Dag Hammarskjold lived by a faith that demanded selfless service and a deep concept of the brotherhood of man. He died, as we know, in execution of that faith.

The distinguished editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar and also a man of singularly strong faith, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, recently dug back in the files to find the credo of Dag Hammarskjold. Mr. Meeman thought so highly of it that he published it in the Press-Scimitar on September 20. I believe it should be read even more widely, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meeman's column containing the Hammarskjold credo appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CREDO THAT INSPIRED DAG HAMMARSKJOLD TO GIVE HIS LIFE FOR CIVILIZATION CAN INSPIRE US TO CARRY ON

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

Dag Hammarskjold died at the front.

He died at the front of mankind's advance. There may be questions as to the wisdom of his strategy of the moment.

There can be no question of the wisdom of his long-range purpose and the importance of what he was doing to carry it out.

It was to enforce peace, long a dream of humanity, now the requisite for survival.

The measure of his rightness and his greatness was the wrath and the intent of the enemy of mankind to destroy him, which his determined course brought down on his head.

He was winning a magnificent victory where many thought success impossible. He was saving the newly won independent Congo from being dominated by Communist imperialism.

What was the credo which animated this man, which led him to dedicate his life, his mind, his spirit, his emotions, his patience, and at last to take the risk that demanded his heart's blood?

Dag Hammarskjold told us when in 1953 he was asked by Edward R. Murrow to state his faith over CBS, "This," he said, "I believe:

"The world in which I grew up was dominated by principles and ideals of a time far from ours, and, as it may seem, far removed from the problems facing a man in the middle of the 20th century. However, my way has not meant a departure from those ideals. On the contrary, I have been led to an understanding of their validity also for our world of today. Thus, a never abandoned effort frankly and squarely to build up a personal belief in the light of experience and honest thinking has led me in a circle; I now recognize and endorse, unreservedly, those very beliefs which once were handed down to me.

"From generations of soldiers and government officials on my father's side, I inherited a belief that no life was more satisfactory than one of selfless service to your country—or humanity. This service required a sacrifice of all personal interests, but likewise the courage to stand up unflinchingly for your convictions.

"From scholars and clergymen on my mother's side, I inherited a belief that, in the very radical sense of the gospels, all men were equal as children of God, and should be met and treated by us as our masters in God.

"Faith is a state of mind and the soul. In this sense we can understand the words of the Spanish mystic, St. John of the Cross: 'Faith is the union of God with the soul.' The language of religion is a set of formulas which register a basic spiritual experience. It must not be regarded as describing in terms to be defined by philosophy, the reality of which is accessible to our senses and which we can analyze with the tools of logic. I was late in understanding what this meant. When I finally reached that point, the beliefs in which I was once brought up and which, in fact, had given my life direction even while my intellect still challenged their validity, were recognized by me as mine in their own right and by my free choice. I feel that I can endorse those convictions without any compromise with the demands of that intellectual honesty which is the very key to maturity of mind.

"The two ideals which dominated my childhood world met me fully harmonized and adjusted to the demands of our world of today in the ethics of Albert Schweitzer, where the ideal of service is supported by and supports the basic attitudes to man set forth in the Gospels. In his work I also found a key for modern man to the world of the Gospels.

"But the explanation of how man should live a life of active social service in full harmony with himself as a member of the community of the spirit, I found in the writings of those great medieval mystics for whom self-surrender had been the way to self-realization, and who in singleness of mind and inwardness had found strength to say yes to every demand, which the needs of their neighbors made them face, and to say yes also to every fate life had in store for them when they followed the call of duty, as they understood it. Love—that much misused and misinterpreted word—for them meant simply an overflowing of strength with which they felt themselves filled when living

in true self-oblivion. And this love found natural expression in an unhesitant fulfillment of duty and in an unreserved acceptance of life, whatever it brought them personally of toil, suffering—or happiness.

"I know that their discoveries about the laws of inner life and of action have not lost their significance."

To adopt his credo is the sincerest tribute any of us can give his memory.

Progress by Solid Accomplishment Without Headlines or Fanfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last November the people of our country elected a Democratic President and reaffirmed their faith in the Democratic Party by continuing that party's control of the Congress.

Let us reflect on this American decision for a moment now that the heat of political battle has cooled and the comfortable breezes of autumn approach the Capitol to sweep away, equally, the fiery oratory, the impassioned pleas, the acrimonious arguments, and the hot air.

The 1st session of the 87th Congress has ended and we near the end of the first year since the election of President John F. Kennedy. The time for reflection—the time for judgment—is here.

On February 21, 1961, 1 month after taking office, President Kennedy sent to the Democratic congressional leaders a 16-point priority list of legislation. The President did not pull these programs out of a hat. Many of them have been part and parcel of the Democratic Party's platform for years—all of them reflect that concern for the welfare of our people and country which has always characterized the Democratic Party.

A review of prior first sessions of Congress reveals these interesting facts:

In the 1st session of Congress under President Roosevelt 11 major bills were passed. They all dealt with the domestic scene.

In the 1st session of Congress under President Eisenhower, 12 major bills were passed. That included extensions of four existing programs, amendments to two others and three reorganizations of executive agencies.

In 1950, under President Truman, an alltime high, until this year, was accomplished by the passage of 14 major bills.

In this 1st session of the 87th Congress, under President Kennedy, we can boast of the passage of 33 major bills.

Numbers alone, however, are not too important. The content is of maximum concern. It will be much too burdensome to analyze in detail all of these items. I will try to be as concise as possible.

Of the 16 priority measures requested by the President, 12 were enacted into law during this 1st session of the 87th Congress. Of course, many more than 12 bills have been enacted—many of these others also came before the Congress at the request of the President. Including treaties submitted to, and ratified by the Senate, the Congress approved 138 separate matters submitted by the President. Few were disapproved or killed by the Congress. Three, of major importance, will be considered in the second session of this Congress which begins on January 10, 1962, they are, first, aid to education; second, medical care for the aged; and, third, tax revision.

Actually, both Houses of this Congress passed and sent the President a total of 693 bills and resolutions. All but eight were approved by the President.

On the domestic front Congress has enacted a series of major legislative proposals designed to stimulate our lagging economy, to promote sound economic growth and development of our human and natural resources, to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, and to promote the well-being of all Americans. They include a number of measures previously vetoed by former President Eisenhower or stymied as a result of "divided government" over the prior 6-year period.

In the area of national defense and foreign policy the Kennedy administration has worked vigorously to rebuild our military strength and to restore our international prestige. Congress has responded by providing necessary funds to improve our defense posture in the face of renewed aggressive activity by the Soviet Union in many parts of the world. It has cooperated in undertaking important new programs to aid the peoples of Latin America and to provide a more efficient and comprehensive type of mutual security program to strengthen our allies, newly emerging nations, and underdeveloped areas of the world.

The Rules Committee has been made more responsive to the Democratic leadership and to the majority will of the House. With the exception of comprehensive aid to education legislation, the new 15-member Rules Committee has provided a majority to assure floor action on all major legislation recommended by the administration so that the membership of the House could work its will in connection therewith.

On the other hand, the record of Republican conduct has been extremely irresponsible. For example, 97 percent of the Republicans voted in the House against consideration of the education bill, 86 percent against the conference report on the minimum wage bill, 84 percent against the conference report on the omnibus housing bill, 80 percent against the conference report on the area redevelopment bill and 50 percent against the conference report on the mutual security bill.

Apparently the Republicans plan to continue their do-nothing policy. The achievements of this session, however, cannot be hidden by Republican carping and negativism.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

In this vital area the Congress has authorized $12.5 billion in additional funds for fiscal 1962 for construction of aircraft, missiles and naval vessels, stepping up Polaris submarine production to 29 by 1964 instead of 1967. It has authorized $893.9 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases. $1.7 billion has been authorized for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1962. This includes increases for a manned moon-orbiting project and for research on solid and nuclear propellants.

There has been $131.4 million authorized for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects. In addition to this, the Congress has authorized the President to call up 250,000 reservists and National Guardsmen for active duty of not more than 1 year. It is believed that nothing less than this will suffice in the face of Khrushchev's continuing threats over Berlin.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In this area the President came very near getting what he wanted in a foreign aid bill. But the Congress held back on the blanket authorization for Treasury borrowing and insisted that—although long-term commitments could be made—the various committees on Capitol Hill be required to review these commitments each year.

Treasury borrowing is invidiously referred to by many as back-door financing. It is no such thing. Treasury borrowing merely means that the Congress in a single bill authorizes the lending and directs the Treasury to make the money available. The bill must pass both Houses of Congress and be approved by the President. Any time the Congress desires, it can pass a repealer of such law. It does in one step what usually requires two steps. In the case of most Government expenditures a law is first enacted authorizing them and then a second law is enacted directing the expenditure by appropriating the money. The two-step procedure is usually followed for spending. The one-step procedure has been traditionally followed for lending.

THE PEACE CORPS

One of the really valuable measures enacted into law during this session was the bill creating the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps will not revolutionize the world, but it is well worth trying. It is a tribute to the President's perception of the mood of America that the Corps has received such enthusiastic support from the American people. This group of dedicated young volunteers will bring great credit to our Nation and enhance American prestige throughout the world. This is one of the positive ways of combating communism.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AGENCY

Perhaps, aside from the foreign aid bill, the most important piece of legislation passed by the Congress in the area of international affairs was that establishing a permanent U.S. Arms Control Agency. This Agency may well make a major contribution to disarmament and the establishment of peace.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Six hundred million dollars was appropriated to effectuate a previously authorized aid program for Latin America. This important action provides $100 mil-

lion for disaster relief in Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants through the International Cooperation Administration.

Two measures important to the hungry of the world were also approved by the Congress. One extends indefinitely the President's authority to use surplus farm products to aid the peoples and economies of undeveloped nations and permits a broadened program. The second expresses the desire of the Senate that the President should explore with leaders of other nations the possible establishment under the United Nations of an international food and raw materials reserve.

A U.S. Travel Service to promote and encourage foreign tourist travel in the United States was established in the Department of Commerce.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Nine hundred and twenty-eight million dollars have been authorized to provide 13 weeks' additional unemployment compensation, up to June 30, 1962, for jobless people whose payments expire. This measure also increased the tax on employers by four-tenths of 1 percent for 2 years beginning January 1, 1962. Similar benefits were supplied for unemployed railroad workers in separate legislation.

Legislation for aid to dependent children provided temporary grants to States to finance their inclusion in the Federal-State unemployed assistance program. This will expire on June 1, 1962.

The minimum wage bill raised the minimum from $1 to $1.25 an hour and extended coverage to 3½ million additional workers by gradual wage step-ups.

Three hundred ninety-four million dollars in loans and grants for industrial plants and public facilities has been authorized for the new Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce.

An additional $11.5 billion has been authorized for completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972.

Construction aid under the Airport Act has been extended for 5 years to June 30, 1966; $375 million is authorized for grants for that period.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

An important amendment to the Social Security Act raises the minimum monthly old-age insurance payments from $33 to $40, increases the benefits to widows, provides that male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62, liberalizes the disability provisions, and increases the tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent each.

Although the comprehensive aid-to-education bill did not get out of the Rules Committee, the Congress did pass legislation extending for 2 years the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and for assistance for schools in federally impacted areas.

One of the most important programs enacted by this first session of the 87th Congress is the Housing Act of 1961. It authorizes a 4- to 5-year $4.9 billion housing program for low and moderate income families on liberalized terms, urban renewal, open space development in cities, college dormitory constructon loans, 100,000 new units of public housing, community facilities, an extended farm housing program, an increase in funds for housing for the aged, and a provision for loans to cities to acquire mass transportation facilities.

The Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961 expands and extends the programs of Federal grants to the States and communities for construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and studies to improve services for the aged outside of hospitals.

An interim increase of $1 billion has been provided in FHA mortgage insurance authority for dwellings.

Five million dollars a year for 4 years has been provided for the extension of a program of grants and scholarships for the training of practical nurses under the Vocational Education Act of 1946.

One hundred and five million dollars has been authorized for a 1-year extension of the special milk program for schools and child care agencies.

The Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961 provides a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $5 million a year for 4 years to help finance projects to combat juvenile delinquency. This marks the first effort in this field by the Federal Government.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Reorganization plans for the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Home Loan Bank Board, became effective during July and August as a result of congressional approval. A similar plan abolished the Federal Maritime Board and replaced it with a five-man Federal Maritime Commission.

Seventy-three new Federal judgeships were created with the enactment of Public Law 87-36 to relieve the tremendous backlog in almost all Federal courts.

Three important anticrime bills—the first such package since 1934—were enacted. Among other things, these bills prohibit transmitting gambling information. Such a proposal had been made 35 times in the last 52 years.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

An extension of direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean veterans to February 1, 1975, was enacted. This measure authorizes an additional $1.2 billion for the direct loan program through fiscal year 1967.

Veterans have been authorized to combine separate periods of service in different periods of war to permit them to qualify for a nonservice-connected pension under the 90-day service requirement.

Payment of $60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance was authorized by the Congress on September 1, 1961.

Other measures include a pension increase for holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor and a requirement that the Board of Veterans' Appeals make findings of fact and conclusions of law in each case.

MISCELLANEOUS

Natural resources: In the natural resources area an expansion of the water pollution control program increases the grants to State and interstate agencies from $3 million annually to $5 million for operations through 1968, and from $50 million to $100 million annually for construction of treatment works. A minor year-to-year saline water research program has been converted into a $75 million, 6-year program to achieve a major breakthrough.

Corporate and excise taxes: Pending a complete revision of our tax laws, the Congress extended for 1 year the present tax rates on corporations and excise levies on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, automobiles, parts and accessories, local telephone service, and transportation of persons.

Civil service retirement annuity increase: We made permanent the temporary increase in Civil Service Retirement annuities enacted in 1958.

Food for peace: We raised the authorization under title 1 of Public Law 480 by $2 billion for calendar year 1961 providing for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations for foreign currencies.

Postal workers: A new provision for three longevity steps which are assigned after 10, 13, and 16 years of service respectively will give each employee for each step an amount equal to one step increase for his position.

The Postmaster General, we hear, is urging the President to veto this bill, until such time as the Congress authorizes an increase in postal rates. I have joined many of my colleagues in asking the President to disregard such advice.

The two problems are separate and distinct and should not be confused. Equity and simple fairness dictate that these workers are entitled to this relief. It is long overdue.

Whenever the Postmaster General will recommend to the Congress that business mail be made self-supporting, I believe the Congress will pass a proper rate increase bill. But the longevity increase bill should not be made dependent on a postal rate increase.

This, then, is the record. It is an impressive one; a record that will surely be considered one of the best that any Congress has made. I am proud to have contributed to it.

The work, however, is not done. Many important programs must still be acted on. Prime targets in the second session which begins in January are comprehensive Federal aid to education and medical care for the aged through the social security system.

It has been a difficult and hard-working first session. The New Frontier has not yet been reached. We have, however, gone a long way toward a revitalization of our Nation.

On September 15, 1961, I attended, with Secretary of the Treasury Dillon,

the Vienna meetings of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association. These meetings were most valuable. They were attended by the official representatives of 74 countries. They help knit the free world into a harmonious organization of mutual help for building a peaceful economy.

From Vienna I went to Rome as a member of the President's commission to the centennial celebration of the unification of Italy. The good will engendered by this delegation was well worth the time and energy expended.

Although my attendance at the closing days of this session was excused because of the official business, to which I attended, it is well to note that there was not a single rollcall during my absence, the result of which would have been changed by my presence. In fact, that is true of the entire session. Excluding the calls on days on which my presence was officially excused, I missed only five rollcalls and five quorum calls out of a total of 231.

On a more personal level, I urge all of my constituents—regardless of their political sympathies—to write to me at my Washington office, Room 1305, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., and share their views with me. They are welcome to acquaint me with such problems, with which they believe I can assist them. It is only thus that democracy can work.

The Significance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the New Jersey State Bar Association's recent commemoration of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week, the Union County Bar Association conducted appropriate ceremonies on September 18, 1961, in the Union County Courthouse, Superior Court Judge Walter L. Hetfield III presiding.

The president of the Union County Bar Association, John T. Glennon, Esq., of Elizabeth, N.J., delivered an address on that occasion which merits the attention of our colleagues. Briefly and cogently, Mr. Glennon expressed the meaning of citizenship, related this meaning especially to the position of new citizens in a community, and stressed the responsibility of members of the bar to honor the principles of good citizenship.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Glennon's address:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CITIZENSHIP DAY AND CONSTITUTION WEEK

U.S. citizenship is a glorious possession representing the dreams and struggles of men for centuries. Our Constitution, which guarantees priceless freedoms to our citizens, sets forth a concept of liberty that has been an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere. It is, therefore, most fitting to stress the significance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week. It is the intention by the several proclamations that have been issued by our President and Governor that the observance will honor those youth of native birth, just arrived at voting age (of whom there are approximately 2½ million each year) and those from other countries recently naturalized as they accept the rights and privileges of citizenship and begin full participation in the civic and political life of their communities, States and Nation. This observance not only will honor especially these two groups of our citizenry, but will afford an opportunity for all citizens, native born and naturalized, to rededicate themselves to the ideals and principles upon which this Nation was founded and built.

As lawyers we should feel honored to play a part in the observance of this day and week. Judge Hetfield in his judicial wisdom being mindful of the importance of such a recognition of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week, has set aside a period of time so that a proper observance of this day and week be made by our Courts in Union County and the Members of the Bar. For this courtesy, I, as President of the Union County Bar Association, should like to extend my personal appreciation and thanks.

By such recognition, courts and lawyers lend a dignity to the status of new citizens. We can help to promote unity and increase the interest of every citizen in public affairs. The importance of citizenship is thus emphasized and the individual's feelings are stirred. Naturalized citizens come to feel themselves more closely identified with the great body of their fellow citizens in a community. By our actions as lawyers, young people of our country also gain a realization of the interest we manifest in their good and faithful performance of their duties as citizens.

By our interest we also demonstrate to all communities the great imperatives of citizenship, duty to God and country.

Wisconsin Attorney General John Reynolds' Brilliant Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable John Reynolds, delivered a highly impressive speech at the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention at Eau Claire, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent expression of the aspirations of a distinguished leader of the Wisconsin Democratic Party be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Democrats, we are still the minority party in Wisconsin, as the 1960 election proved. People do not vote Democratic in Wisconsin just out of habit. If we are to win and hold the respect of the voters of this State, we must do it by offering them something better than our opponents. Politics must be something more than a game for us, because if it should degenerate into that, we had better remember that the Republicans have been the home team in Wisconsin since the Civil War.

During the McCarthy era we liberals in Wisconsin distinguished ourselves because we stood on our convictions in the face of social ostracism, economic reprisals, and character assassinations. If we had not fought McCarthyism then there would then be no strong Democratic Party here today.

And today if we do not fight for human rights there will be no strong Democratic Party here tomorrow. Because the great issue that confronts America today, the issue that truly separates the liberals from the conservatives is the issue of Human Rights. The Democratic Party of Wisconsin has always stood for the equal opportunity of every man and for the equality of all men regardless of race or religion. We must not now abandon these principles in order to seek political advantage.

We are proud that Governor Nelson courageously led the fight for civil rights in housing. We know that Republican obstructionists killed that bill. But we also know that Democrats did not go forward with untarnished armor. I am sorry to say that a few of our own Democratic legislators—men who wrap themselves in the banner of our party at election time—voted with the bigots on this matter. Their conduct mocked that great principle of the equality of all men which is so basic to any liberal thought.

When I was in Europe last summer I was shocked and ashamed to pick up a European newspaper and see on the front page a picture of sit-in demonstrators, not in Little Rock or New Orleans, but in our own Capitol building in Madison, Wis. Their defeat disgraced the name of Wisconsin and the name of America around the world. And knowing that some Democrats had voted on the side of man's inhumanity to man made the news even more disheartening to me.

I am proud to be able to report that as your Attorney General, I have seen to it that our inadequate laws dealing with racial discrimination have been enforced to their limits. Every instance of discrimination that has come to my attention has been promptly investigated and violators prosecuted.

Let me say here that the Governor's Commission on Human Rights and the district attorneys of our State, both Democrat and Republican, have been most helpful and cooperative in all these human rights matters.

In 1962 we must go to the people on this issue of human rights. We must have confidence that the ordinary American places the rights of all men to liberty and happiness above the temptation to prejudice.

If the price of public office is to become racial bigots, then I say the price is too high. If Wisconsin is to be run by bigots, let it be run by Republican bigots.

We have worked to make the government of this State a more responsive and representative servant of the people. One of the greatest achievements of the Democratic Party is the antisecrecy law enacted in 1959. That people should know of the conduct of their government is essential to a democracy—and neither freedom nor democracy can survive and flourish if the business of the government is conducted behind closed doors. As your attorney general I am proud to tell you that my office has vigorously enforced this Antisecrecy Act. The intent of the Democratic sponsers of the antisecrecy bill has been given full effect by a narrow construction of the few exceptions to the open-meeting rule. The demands for open meetings by hundreds of citizens and by a large segment of the press have been followed

up by the attorney general's office. In every case within the contemplation of the law we have ordered government agencies to open their doors to the scrutiny of the public and of the press.

The fight for an open government has, however, just begun. Many Wisconsin educational agencies and their committees still meet in secrecy. And other government units conduct their affairs away from the scrutiny of the public. The crusade for open meetings must continue, not only by the attorney general's office, but by liberals in every county and every community all across Wisconsin.

Still another front on which the battle for liberal principles is being waged is in the area of economic opportunity. The small, independent businessman is being systematically and ruthlessly destroyed. Even today, as I speak in communities, large and small, in all corners of Wisconsin I find that the small, independent grocer and dry goods retailer have practically disappeared.

If the trend toward the concentration of great economic power and wealth in the hands of a few huge monopolies continues it will destroy the small businessman and it will destroy economic opportunity for all of us. In fact, these monopolies will destroy the free enterprise system as we know it. The purpose of the antitrust laws is to help the small businessman and the consumer and to preserve the free enterprise competition system.

As attorney general of Wisconsin, I have launched a twofold attack to protect small business and keep economic opportunity open to all. First we have conducted a vigorous antitrust campaign under the present laws. The attorney general's office has initiated more antitrust cases in the past 3 years than during any other 3-year period in Wisconsin history.

For example, we have prosecuted, or are prosecuting, such industrial giants for the violation of Wisconsin antitrust laws as Allied Chemical, Dow Chemical, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, E. I. du Pont Co., Brunswick Corp., Texaco Oil, Borden Dairies, Fairmont Corp., and Pet Milk to name just a few. Second, Governor Nelson and I have asked the legislature for stronger antitrust laws, for more antitrust attorneys (we have only one full-time man now) and a consumer counsel in the attorney general's office. We must work harder than ever to keep the people alert and aroused over the growth of monopoly and the undermining of economic opportunity that is occurring in Wisconsin and in the Nation.

As attorney general, I served on the constitutional revision commission. That commission recommended constitutional reorganization to make the government more responsible to the people by consolidating the vast government bureaucracy which is spread over 70 agencies and commissions and by eliminating those long terms for department heads which insulate them from popular control. We also recommended a 4-year term for the Governor to give him a better opportunity to develop, present and seek public support for his program.

Governor Nelson's program for Wisconsin and President Kennedy's program for the Nation provide us with a strong liberal record with which to go forward in 1962. It is for us to take our record to the people. And we must begin today. Our crusade will require much time and hard work. But we must not shrink from the task. Our belief in the democratic system and our adherence to liberal principles require that we carry this fight forward this year as we have carried it forward every year since we reorganized the Democratic Party in 1949.

To achieve a victory for progressive principles and the public interest we must not let incumbency make us over-confident. Nor must we allow the taste of victory to deter us from fighting for liberal principles. We will win only if we are true to our liberal beliefs—as we have remained true in bad times and good since 1949.

I ask you to join with me in rededicating ourselves this year to those liberal and humanitarian principles which are the heritage of the Democratic Party.

Goals of the New Frontier: Medical Care Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, high on the agenda of unfinished business which will face the Congress when we meet again next year is the problem of insurance against health care expenses for our retirees under social security. In a special message last February President Kennedy reaffirmed this as a major goal of the New Frontier in these words:

Twenty-six years ago this Nation adopted the principle that every member of the labor force and his family should be insured against the haunting fear of loss of income caused by retirement, death, or unemployment. To that we have added insurance against the economic loss caused by disability. But there remains a significant gap that denies to all but those with the highest incomes a full measure of security—the high cost of ill health in old age.

A few facts indicate the extent of the need to which the President referred. There are currently 16 million of our citizens who are over 65 years of age. They go to the hospital more often and stay longer than their younger neighbors. As a result, their annual medical bill is twice that of those in the rest of the population but their annual income is only about half as large. In addition, it must be remembered that among those who can least afford medical care, the tendency is to do without it, frequently until an emergency situation develops, so that these figures actually understate the increased need for medical care among older citizens.

To meet this pressing need—to fill the gap described by the President—legislation has been introduced which would utilize the social insurance approach, enabling people to pay during their working years toward meeting the health costs they will face in old age. The bill represents a sound and practical answer to a national problem. It does so without proposing to limit the patient's choice of doctor or hospital or to subject people to a means test which would deny them dignity and self-respect in their days of retirement.

It should be emphasized that the President's proposal centers around the problem of meeting hospital and nursing home costs. This has the advantage not only of eliminating any question whatever of disturbing the doctor-patient relationship, but also allows us to focus on the element of health care costs that have risen the most rapidly in recent years. Hospital rates have more than doubled since 1948 and they threaten a continuing rise. By providing a program to meet a large part of this high-cost element, we can bring more adequate health care on a broad basis within reach of our senior citizens.

In so doing, I am convinced that we will also expand the opportunities for private insurance plans to provide adequate coverage for other aspects of health care to our older citizens and for across-the-board protection to people who have not yet reached retirement age. This is true because the fact that our retired people have a much greater need for medical care also means that they represent a high-risk market to the private insurance firms who must either deny them coverage, reduce benefits, or else raise their rates to a level that puts coverage beyond the reach of many, both young and old. Handling this high-risk, high-cost aspect of the situation through social insurance will remove a major obstacle to the extention of private insurance to meet more fully the other aspects of our medical care cost problem.

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, held extensive hearings on the President's proposal. Our study deepened my conviction that we need this program and that it is a sound and moderate program. The record of the hearings includes a mass of facts and figures documenting both the need and the practicality of the recommended solution. But, as Secretary Ribicoff pointed out in his appearance before us, "statistics cannot measure the anxiety and suffering of elderly people who see their small savings, their homes, their security about to be swept away by the near certainty of expensive illness." The Congress can and should eliminate this source of fear and insecurity and favorable action on the President's recommendation is the logical and fair way to do so.

The House That Bilked Jack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate today to have the benefit of the writings of many young Americans published in the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom, the New Guard.

In a recent issue there appears a sum-up of the activities of the 1st session of the 87th Congress prepared by one of these outstanding young American writers. Robert E. Bauman, presently a resident of Washington and a student at Georgetown Law School, has had a unique opportunity to observe the Congress in action and I commend his article to you and all Americans.

Under unanimous consent I include herewith Mr. Bauman's article entitled "The House That Bilked Jack":

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS—A ROUNDUP: THE HOUSE THAT BILKED JACK

(By Robert E. Bauman)

"I want to be a President who is willing to take the responsibility for getting things done, and to take the blame if they are not done right * * * a President who will formulate and fight for his legislative policies * * * who will not back down under pressure. * * * I am not promising you action in the first 100 days alone * * * I am promising you 1,000 days of exacting Presidential leadership"—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, New York City, November 5, 1960.

As autumn crosses the land, and the nights are chill, the words echo as if muffled by distant time. Though less than a year since their utterance in that Harvard-Yankee twang, full throated and compelling, the phrases now are desolate; faded like the browning ink of letters from a dusty attic. Go back and listen.

At Los Angeles, September 9, 1960:

"I have asked Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman CELLER, of New York, to embody all the [civil rights] pledges of the Democratic platform in a bill, and that will be among the first orders of business when the new Congress meets in January."

At La Crosse, Wis., October 23, 1960:

"If I am elected I will give the farm problem top priority in the opening weeks of my administration."

Again, Los Angeles, November 1, 1960:

"I have pledged myself and my party to immediate enactment of a program for medical care for the aged through social security * * * that pledge will not be filed away with old unmeant campaign promises * * * it will be at the very top of the agenda for action."

And in Washington, January 15, 1961:

"Aid to education is the most important bill—Federal aid—so one of the first items on the Democratic agenda in 1961 is the passage of an adequate bill for school construction * * * [and] to raise teachers' salaries."

Realism is like rigor mortis. It not only stiffens, but is also a symptom of an acute personal problem, at least for the victim. And J.F.K. has plenty of problems, not the least being his record with the overwhelmingly Democratic 87th Congress. In the snowy Capital days of late winter past, one writer could exult:

"It was a heady, exciting time in Washington. The days had the tang of high adventure, and the men around him found the President's enthusiasm 'contagious.'" But now the heat of a Capitol Hill summer has changed the tang to a twinge.

One forecast in Kennedy's January state of the Union address has proven dismally correct: "The news will be worse before it is better." By May, the end of the first 100 days had come, preceded by reams of Presidential messages sent to Congress (they came to be known as One-a-Day Brand) containing over 150 requests for more Federal spending. The schemes ranged from the Peace Corps to aged widows.

With the topheavy Democrat majority in the Senate (65–35) that august body gave J.F.K. less trouble. The slings and arrows that punctured the New Frontier came from the House, a body notorious for its evil coalition of folks-back-home and Congressmen.

As the Senate quietly shoved the filibuster rule change under its thick carpet (for a later death in September), the House joined the issue with J.F.K. on expansion of the Rules Committee. By a Kennedy-Rayburn majority of 5 whole votes (out of 429 cast), the committee was packed with a Kennedy majority. Now we could move ahead. (Later the critter was to turn on its creator and bite him soundly on his Federal aid to education bill.)

The minimum wage was to be raised to $1.25 an hour; then came the first jolt—the House notched its gun and voted $1.15. The net compromise was $1.15 now, $1.25 later (2 years later, for those workers expecting this as agenda item No. 1).

Next came the farmer, whom you may recall was also agenda item No. 1. The feed grains bill squeaked through the House by 7 votes. J.F.K. was gratified. It would mean higher farm prices. Farm prices have slid down and down, while consumer food costs are at an alltime high.

The remainder of the J.F.K. do-it-yourself farm program was a victim of dumping by congressional committees. The idea was to let Secretary Freeman and the farmers work it out themselves, with Congress having a veto power. It never saw the light of day. Congress passed what amounted to extensions of previous Benson programs. (As Truman had said on the day after election "The farmers voted for Nixon and they can go to hell.") Strike agenda item No. 1(B).

When Congress really got down to work in early summer, victory followed victory; the House threw out the J.F.K. proposals for reorganization of the FCC and the NLRB, while the Senate, in a rare display of petulance, rejected similar plans for the SEC and came within five votes of killing the Kennedy $9 billion housing bill.

Aid to depressed areas sailed through both Houses, and, with no profile of courage to veto it this time, became law, further adding to the growing deficit.

Agenda item No. 1 (C) civil rights, somehow got lost in the shuffle. Said Senator CLARK at an NAACP rally: "Without Presidential support there will be no bill, and we do not have that support."

Agenda item No. 1 (D) was a tougher problem: Federal aid to education. The story is well known by now, with its cacophony of voices about church and state, need and desire, black and white, NEA and J.F.K., salaries and buildings, Adam and Clayton and Powell.

What finally came before the Congress, not in January but August, was a watered-down pitch for Federal aid for school construction leaving out teachers' salaries entirely. (He had said in January: "I am confident that a Democratic Congress will pass a bill to raise teachers' salaries * * *.") The vote in the House was crushing, 242 to 169. Chairman POWELL of the Education Committee pronounced the benediction: "It is dead."

In a last minute face-saving operation J.F.K. whispered that he would accept an education bill extending the aid to federally impacted areas program and the National Defense Education Act scholarship program, both Eisenhower measures. But, said Jack, with his eye on fighting again another day, we need extend it for only 1 year. And so, Congress passed a 2-year extension, and that was that.

And could anyone escape the sounds of battle on the Hill over long-term foreign aid? J.F.K. called for 5-year loan authority and back-door Treasury bond issues to finance the aid. He was told clearly by House Republican Leader HALLECK and others who knew the facts that he could get 5-year loan authority, but not the financing provision. The House would never stand for circumvention of its constitutional right to appropriate annual sums carefully scrutinized and examined. The foreign aid bill, in the form CHARLIE HALLECK had predicted, passed the House by a large majority, with the Kennedyites conceding defeat on the key provision on financing without even a rollcall.

Ike left us with a projected 1969 budget in balance, with an $80 million surplus. J.F.K. wound up the fiscal year in June with a deficit of $3.9 billion. Eisenhower had planned a 1962 budget that would have had a $1.5 billion surplus. Kennedy's advisers admit to a 1962 deficit of $5.3 billion, and congressional experts say it will be closer to $7 billion plus. Of course 44 percent of the Kennedy increase is for defense spending, but that means 56 percent is for the J.F.K.-liberal domestic programs, a large part of which is financed by back-door spending. And yet no new taxes have been requested. "Ask not what your country, etc., etc."

As J.F.K. has signed with a flourish each of his mutilated legislative "triumphs" he has crowed about his victories in Congress. His salivating press admirers have echoed the line. Outside the White House sanctum we stand in puzzlement, remembering another fall, other words.

P.S.—What ever happened to medical care for the aged (agenda item No. 1(E))?

United States Should Continue Friendly Relations With Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 23, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] was recognized under previous order of the House. His remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attack the President of Venezuela, Romulo Betancourt, with the same kind of false charges which the enemies of democracy in the Western Hemisphere often have used in unsuccessful efforts to discredit him.

Since competent observers of Latin America recognize instantly the incredible distortions contained in the statement, at first I thought the attack should not be dignified with a rebuttal. However, most of us do not have the opportunity to follow the intricacies of Latin American political developments. So the public will know only that a Member of Congress has indicted the President of Venezuela with grave charges. Generally it will not be known that the statement was entered in the RECORD in the waning hours of the session when urgent legislation was before us. If no voice is raised to counter them, the public perhaps will be inclined to give credence to the accusations. Therefore, I believe that the record must be set straight.

The present Goverment of Venezuela is one of the principal foundations for democracy in Latin America. Yet, there is an active lobby engaged in undermining the friendly relations between the United States and Venezuela.

I am compelled to ask: Is Mr. ROUSSELOT's statement unwittingly a part of an effort to establish a climate of sympathy for the ex-dictator of Venezuela who is currently in Miami fighting extradition to Venezuela?

Let us consider Mr. ROUSSELOT's charges and the evidence he submits to support them.

The gist of his argument is that President Betancourt is a Communist and

that, by giving aid and moral support to Betancourt's government, the United States is supporting a Communist takeover in Venezuela.

Mr. ROUSSELOT asserts:

The facts pinpoint Betancourt as a lifelong supporter of Communist objectives and ideology.

The principal "facts" related to support his view are: First, Betancourt was a Communist in the early 1930's; second, quotes from letters allegedly written by Betancourt in 1932; third, the relationship between Betancourt and Castro is that of "teacher and disciple"; fourth, Betancourt "welshed" on an alleged agreement with the United States at the OAS conference at San Jose to support a strong declaration against Castro in return for the U.S. vote for sanctions against the Dominican Republic; fifth, the Betancourt government's "wavering" support for the U.S. position on important issues in the United Nations; sixth, the Betancourt government's alleged interference with private property and foreign investments in Venezuela.

Mr. ROUSSELOT's conclusions are based on some strange distortions of history.

In point of fact, since 1935 Romulo Betancourt has been one of the outstanding anti-Communist, democratic leaders in Latin America.

Venezuela has had a tortured political history. Since achieving independence in 1830, Venezuela has been plagued by tyrannical rulers, political instability, and revolt. The exploitation of Venezuela's vast oil deposits since World War I brought great wealth to a handful of people, while the rest have lived in the same abject poverty as before the oil bonanza.

Three decades ago Romulo Betancourt and a group of other young university students began to seek a way to remedy conditions in a country where the vast majority of the people had no voice in governing their own society and in determining their own destiny.

The students' first attempt came in 1928 with the organization of a general strike to break the grip of the dictator, Juan Vincente Gomez, who had ruled Venezuela with an iron hand for 20 years. The strike failed, and most of the young men, including Romulo Betancourt, were deported.

During his exile in Costa Rica, Betancourt did indeed become a Communist. However, close contact with militant Communists convinced him of the evils of communism.

He broke with the party in 1935. Betancourt's subsequent history has been one of constant combat against the Communists whose ideology he had learned by firsthand experience to detest.

Upon the death of Dictator Gomez in 1935, his successor, General Lopez Contreras, permitted the exiles to return. Most of the opposition groups banded together into two political organizations. The Communists founded the PRP—Partido Republicano Progresista—as a front organization because Communist activities were outlawed. The group of democratic leaders, including Romulo Betancourt and most of his present associates, formed ORVE. In 1936 the dictator prohibited all political activity. ORVE and PRP went underground and joined forces under the name of the Partido Democratico Nacional in order to better combat the totalitarian government.

From the outset dissension arose between the Communist and non-Communist members of the Partido Democratico Nacional. The non-Communists, led by Betancourt, insisted that the Communists should break all ties with the international Communist movement. When the Communists refused, the two groups split—in 1937—with the Communists coming out openly as the Partido Comunista de Venezuela—Venezuelan Communist Party.

In 1941 Betancourt's party was legalized by the government and adopted its present name, Accion Democratica, or AD, which later became the majority party in Venezuela.

The constant conflict between Accion Democratica and the Communists is overwhelming evidence of their animosity. During World War II the fledging AD party took a strong stand for the Allies and against the Soviet-Nazi pact. The Communists, as they did the world over, at first denounced the conflict as "imperialist." Only when the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union did the Venezuelan Communists, as Communists again did the world over, become violent opponents of the Axis.

During World War II Communists maintained close relations with the regime of Gen. Medina Angarita. Medina's official party presented joint lists of candidates with the Communists which were contested by Accion Democratica candidates.

In 1945 a coup d'etat deposed Medina and brought Betancourt and Accion Democratica briefly to power. The Communists even took up arms to defend the Medina regime.

In 1948 the AD supported government of President Romulo Gallegos, the first democratically elected president in Venezuelan history, was deposed by a military coup led by Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez.

The Perez Jimenez decade helped the Communists in Venezuela. The military government immediately prohibited action by Accion Democratica, jailing and exiling its political leaders, as well as its union leaders. The Communist Party, on the contrary, was permitted to function and to publish its daily newspaper for almost 3 years. Thus, the Communists took advantage of the vacuum left by the persecuted AD union leaders.

To maintain his power, the dictator had to strangle the vigorous free trade unions which Betancourt and the AD had nurtured. The democratic leadership in the unions was destroyed, and the labor movement was taken over by the Communists.

Since the overthrow of Perez Jimenez in 1958, Accion Democratica and other democratic labor leaders have had a bitter fight to recapture the labor movement from Communist leadership. By the beginning of this year, democratic elements managed to win 122 out of 135 elections in the various labor unions which comprise the Venezuelan Confederation of Labor.

On the political side during the Perez Jimenez decade, the Communists also were active. In December 1951, the Communists published a letter, directed to the National Executive Committee of Accion Democratica, urging joint action. AD did not reply.

The following year the Communists issued another call for a united front proposing that they join with Accion Democratica in forming a provisional government. Again AD did not reply.

To a subsequent appeal in 1955 for a united front between the Communists and Accion Democratica, Venezuela Democratica, an AD publication in Mexico, answered:

Communist participation [in unified action against the regime] would mean an attempt to convert what should be an instrument of struggle against the Venezuelan dictatorship into an apparatus for struggle and propaganda against the United States in its controversy with the Soviet bloc.

After Perez Jimenez was finally ousted in January 1958, Betancourt's Accion Democratica still would have nothing to do with the Communists. As a matter of historical fact, in the free elections at the end of 1958, in which Betancourt was a candidate for President on AD's ticket, the Communists aggressively supported his opponent, Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, candidate of the URD Party. Larrazabal officially welcomed their support.

The final tabulation gave Betancourt 49.18 percent of the total vote, Larrazabal 34.61 percent, and Rafael Caldera—Social Christian—16.21 percent. There can be no doubt about for whom the Communists voted. In Caracas, the country's major urban and industrial center, where Communist efforts were concentrated, Larrazabal drew 69 percent of the vote to Betancourt's mere 11 percent.

Since President Betancourt assumed office in February 1959, the Communists have worked to create situations of instability for him, to weaken him, to overthrow him. If President Betancourt were a secret Communist agent, as Mr. Rousselot suggests, would it make any sense for the Communists to be undermining him?

As for President Betancourt himself, he has made his ideological position unequivocally clear. In public life for over three decades, he has written numerous books, made innumerable speeches and public statements, and governed the country twice. He vigorously has stated and defended his anti-Communist position.

For example, on his return to Venezuela from exile in 1941 Betancourt published some statements in the newspaper Ahora on May 20. These declarations are reproduced on page 99 of the book, "Romulo Betancourt, Semblanza de un Politico Popular," published in Caracas in 1948, and also beginning on page 68 of the book, "Romulo Betancourt, Interpretacion de Su Doctrina Popular y Demo-

cratica," published in Caracas in 1958. There he states:

I am not a Communist. The sector of Venezuelans who as Communists have organized such a political group, affiliated with the Third International, say in No. 3 of their clandestine publication, El Martillo (June 1938): "Romulo Betancourt is not a Communist, is not a member of the Communist Party and never has belonged to its ranks." I will not limit myself to reject a political label capriciously hung on me as upon almost all Venezuelan opposition political leaders. I add that I consider unnecessary a Communist Party in the country. Venezuela urgently needs a profound renovating transformation of its political, economic, and social organization, which, to have historical vigor and a guarantee of permanency, must be channeled by a great democratic party to which adhere, around a concrete program and subject to a single-party discipline, the most brilliant of all the creative, productive social classes, not just one class: the working class.

Moreover, I reject the Communist Party, with all the force of my intransigent Venezuelanism, because its dependence on Moscow converts it into a simple bureaucratic appendix to the Soviet state. And if we reject nazism, for acting globally in accord with the dictates of Hitler, for the same reason we reject communism, which acts globally in accord with the dictates of Stalin. There is nothing in common, therefore, between us and the European internationals, whether it be the Second Socialist International, the Second International of Moscow or the Fourth International which Leon Trotsky tried to create.

We are advocates of the democratic forces of our America, politically organized, taking up the ideal of continental unity foreseen by Bolivar and the great leaders of the first republic, but without renouncing for a moment the basic principle that each country is autonomous to resolve its own domestic problems.

From 1941 to 1945 Betancourt was the most outstanding leader of Accion Democratica and a daily columnist in the newspaper El Pais.

From that journalistic position he maintained an active campaign against communism.

In 1944 Betancourt opposed the Communist candidate for the Caracas City Council for the district of San Agustin, and won.

After the revolution of October 1945, when Betancourt became President of the revolutionary junta, the Communist Party bitterly opposed him. Betancourt's position at that time with regard to communism, and that of the revolutionary junta, is contained in some statements made to Ernie Hill of the Chicago Daily News in April 1947. These statements are reproduced on page 471 of the book "Trayectoria Democratica de una Revolucion," published in Caracas in 1948. Here Betancourt states:

I must say, in this respect, that the attitude of the government which I preside is absolutely different than that of the government of Gen. Medina Angarita, deposed on October 18, 1945. That government through its party maintained a close alliance with the Venezuelan Communist groups, and joint lists of candidates of the Communists and the official party were combated by us when we were in the opposition. From the government we have maintained an attitude of complete independence toward the Communist groups and there is not the remotest possibility that the organized political forces which back the present regime would present joint lists of candidates with the Communists.

After the military coup of 1948 Betancourt again lives in exile. In those 9 years of exile he wrote many articles, lectured and published two books, "Pensamiento y Accion" and "Venezuela, Politica y Petroleo." In the latter, on page 69, Bentancourt explains his decision to break away from the Communists:

None of those who later founded Accion Democratica became active in his first exile in political groups subordinate to the third international. Despite being quite young, because the majority had just passed the age of 20, we resisted the temptation to transfer our political will to Soviet directorship, then so attractive to educated youth. When we approached the Communists' tents, the roots of the group's Venezuelan and American sentiments were badly shaken. We collided with a foreign group, deaf and blind to the vital necessities of our peoples, a kind of bigotry genuflexing before the imperious orders of the Comintern bureaus. The small group of compatriots then organized into the embryo of what would later be the Communist Party of Venezuela took charge of deepening the open trench between our group and theirs, unleashed against us an offensive of insults in which they still persist with extraordinary tenacity 20 years later.

After the overthrow of Perez Jimenez in 1958 Betancourt's presidential candidacy was launched by Accion Democratica. From public platforms Betancourt attacked the Communist Party and declared that he would never accept Communist assistance or cooperation. In a speech at the close of the campaign on the night of December 5, 1958, in Caracas' Plaza de el Silencio, he stated:

I want to say explicitly that in the formation of this Government, if the people of Venezuela carry me to the Presidency of the Republic with their votes, that I will not seek the collaboration of Communist Party. The Communist Party, as any other group of Venezuelans who uphold a political ideology, have a perfect right to sustain their press and their propaganda; but the Communist Party cannot form part of the executive train of the democratic Venezuelan Government because its political philosophy is not in accord with the democratic structure of the State, and because its position in international policy is not only foreign, but also opposed to the interests of Venezuela.

In the almost 3 years President Betancourt has occupied the highest post in his country he has continued to repudiate the Communists and to exclude them from the councils of his coalition government.

On his inauguration as constitutional President of Venezuela, February 13, 1959, he declared:

My talks regarding the formation of the Government were limited to COPEI and URD. It was those two parties and Accion Democratica, the latter the one which nominated me for the Presidency, which signed the triparty pact of October 31, 1958. The Communist Party was excluded from that agreement by the considered decision of the signatory organizations. During my election campaign I made it perfectly clear that I would not consult the Communist Party on the formation of a government and, while respecting that party's right to operate as an organized group within the country, I would not invite any of its members to hold administrative posts from which they might exercise an influence on Venezuela's domestic or international policy. This position is well known among Venezuelans, and it was based by the three major parties on the fact that the Communist political philosophy is not consonant with the democratic structure of the nation and that the party's views on the course Venezuela should follow in international affairs are not in keeping with the best interests of the country.

In a thunderous speech on November 1, 1960, in which President Betancourt first denounced rightwing attempts to overthrow the constitutional government, he went on to state:

But some have sought to have a lenient and soft attitude adopted when leftwing elements, submissive to orders from abroad, carry out revolutionary attempts. But we, as has been said emphatically again and again by spokesmen for the labor and rural workers movement, we are Venezuelans, we will choose our course and follow our path. Because we were not born in Cuban Sagua La Grande nor in Havana; because we were not born in the Ural Mountains, in the Siberian steppes, nor in a Moscow neighborhood, because we were not born in Peiping, China. We were born in San Cristobal, in Achaguas, in Carupano, in Caracas, in any place in this immense Venezuelan land, and we were fed at the breast of a Venezuelan mother. And we have been nourished by the fruits of a land fertilized with the blood and bones of our grandfathers and our great-grandfathers, of the men who died in the War of Independence so that this country would be sovereign.

For that reason, and because the sovereign will of the nation was expressed in the elections of December 7, 1958, Venezuela is not disposed to tolerate any attempt to establish in the country either a dictatorship of a totalitarian Fascist type or a dictatorship of a totalitarian Communist type.

It seems impossible to me that anyone could read the above denunciation of the Communists by President Betancourt without sensing his violent opposition to the Communists who are trying to destroy democratic government in Venezuela.

Remember, Betancourt's denunciations of Communist activities in Venezuela are published in Venezuela, stated in the press in Venezuela, or addressed to the Venezuelan public over radio and TV in Venezuela. It is absurd to assert that a man who has spent practically his entire adult life building a democratic political party and defending it from Communist onslaughts is a secret Communist agent.

Betancourt's public and evident record of anticommunism cannot be ignored. Instead, his enemies try to cloud it and cast doubt upon it. Let us examine the process in Mr. ROUSSELOT's statement:

Betancourt's so-called breaks with Communist objectives—

According to ROUSSELOT—

have been hollow gestures. As far as I can determine, he never actually left communism even though for expedient reasons, he has often put on the mask of anticommunism.

Then later Mr. ROUSSELOT says:

The fact must be faced that he is a former functionary of the Communist International and is still working consistently for Communist ends.

What evidence does Mr. ROUSSELOT submit? We are treated to lengthy quotations from letters allegedly written in 1932 by Romulo Betancourt, supposedly captured by the then Dictator Lopez Contreras and published in a Red Book. In these letters Betancourt is supposed to outline his course for introducing communism into Venezuela by posing as a democrat.

I suggest that Mr. ROUSSELOT look again at the Red Book. He will find that it has no publishers imprint. Photostatic copies of the letters allegedly written by Betancourt are not reproduced in it.

The red book contains anonymous, unproved, and unverified allegations which were used against Betancourt by the dictator, Lopez Contreras, in the 1930's to discredit the leader of Venezuela's first major democratic movement. The fact that the same dictator republished the allegations in a book in 1955 does not establish their authenticity.

As for President Betancourt's relationship with Cuba's Castro, Mr. ROUSSELOT asserts that "the relationship between the two men has been that of teacher and disciple." As proof, Mr. ROUSSELOT avers:

As long ago as 1948 Betancourt intervened and saved Castro's life when the latter was in danger of death in Bogotá for his active participation in the bloody Communist riots. Betancourt certainly knew at the time that Castro was a Communist for both the Colombia police and the American FBI had documentary material in their files proving Castro's communism. Nevertheless, Betancourt threw the mantle of his protection around Castro and saved him to become the Communist midwife of Cuba.

If "documentary material" establishing Castro as a Communist existed in the FBI files, it was unknown to the Deputy CIA Director, Gen. C. P. Cabell, who testified on November 5, 1959, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as follows:

That question is related to the question, Is Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro a Communist?

Let me develop that thought for you, sir. Our information shows that the Cuban Communists do not consider him a Communist Party member, or even pro-Communist.

On the other hand, they are delighted with the nature of his government, which has allowed the Communists opportunity, free opportunity, to organize, to propagandize, and to infiltrate.

We know that the Communists consider Castro as a representative of the bourgeoisie, and were unable to gain public recognition or commitments from him during the course of the revolution.

We know that the Communists were concerned when, at the time of his trip to the United States, he showed evidence of a friendly attitude toward the United States.

We know also that it has been the assigned task of the Cuban Communist Party to prevent Castro's revolution from establishing friendly relations with the United States, or ending its tolerance of Communist activities.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that Fidel Castro is not a Communist; however, he certainly is not anti-Communist. His extreme policies, including confiscation of private property, lead him to take positions and make statements such as his violent anti-U.S. outbursts which are extremely useful to international communism and are being exploited by the Communists to the maximum extent.

How could Romulo Betancourt, a Venezuelan, "certainly" know that Castro was a Communist in 1948 because "the American FBI had documentary material in their files proving Castro's communism"? Indeed, the Deputy Director of the U.S. CIA, who has access to FBI files, seems to have overlooked the purported FBI documents.

I ask, moreover, with whom did Betancourt "intervene" in Bogotá "to save Castro's life"? The Conservative Party was in power in Colombia in 1948. The murder of Liberal Leader Jorge Eliecer Gaitan triggered the Bogotá riots that year. Romulo Betancourt's sympathies and political convictions lay with the Colombian liberals. What influence could Betancourt bring to bear upon anyone influential in the reigning Conservative Party?

The hostility between Betancourt and Castro is too well publicized to be ignored. Castro's puppet radios blast Betancourt daily as the "pseudo-president of Venezuela" who is "servile" to Washington. In Venezuela, the Fidelistas join their Communist mentors in violent attacks on the Betancourt government.

At the OAS conference in Punta del Este in August, Cuba's Che Guevara, in an attempt to undermine Venezuelan prestige and drive a wedge between the United States and Venezuela, read portions of a stolen United States Embassy document which relate some of the economic difficulties which Venezuela faces. Venezuela responded with a scathing statement:

The offensive launched by the Cuban delegate against the Government of Venezuela can only be explained by a desire to create diversions in order to obscure the submission of the Cuban Government to Chinese-Soviet interests to the discredit of American traditions and prevailing international agreements.

Mr. ROUSSELOT admits that "Castro followers fight Betancourt politically in Venezuela." Then he comes up with the following incredible reasoning:

Betancourt and Castro have parted company in respect to their rival programs to bring about communism in Latin America. [Betancourt] believes he can sneak communism into power by fooling the liberals into helping him. For that reason he puts on the masquerade of anticommunism. Castro, on the other hand, is seeking to bring communism through terrorism. Moscow sits back complacently and lets both of them try their techniques.

Shades of Alice in Wonderland. No one who knows the fierce Communist-Castro fight to overthrow Betancourt can take this seriously. Furthermore, no one who understands Communist strategy can believe that Moscow would welcome a death struggle between two of its adherents in Latin America, if indeed Venezuela were in the Communist camp.

In fact, Betancourt is opposed because he represents a powerful democratic barrier and a threat to Castro in Cuba.

Apropos of the stolen U.S. Embassy document, I will diverge for a moment to correct a serious distortion.

Mr. ROUSSELOT quotes a passage from the memorandum which points out the administrative difficulties in Venezuela. Mr. ROUSSELOT quotes the passage for the same reason Communist Che Guevara did—to discredit the Betancourt regime.

Those familiar with Venezuela's history know that its present administrative problems stem from the heritage of decades of maladministration. In fact, our Embassy wrote a sympathetic memorandum, listing the deficiencies and pointing out the importance of a sound technical assistance program to help Venezuela to overcome present problems. The Betancourt regime recognizes the urgent need for corrective measures and has exerted itself to reform conditions which have existed through decades of dictatorships.

Furthermore, Mr. ROUSSELOT attempts to leave the impression that an author of the Embassy document was castigated for criticizing the Venezuelan regime. I do not think I misread Mr. ROUSSELOT's intention. He said:

What has happened to one courageous man who worked on the preparation of this report, knowing full well that it would be unwelcome to his superiors?

Perhaps it is a coincidence, but it is interesting to know that John M. Gates [sic], Jr., was recalled to Washington subsequent to the issuance of this report and a new First Secretary appointed.

The staff memorandum in its entirety was a sympathetic examination of the problems faced by Venezuela's first democratically elected government. I do not know what powers of mind-reading Mr. ROUSSELOT may possess to infer that "the courageous man who worked on the preparation of this report" knew "full well that it would be unwelcome to his superiors." I am certain, Mr. ROUSSELOT did not discuss the matter with those involved.

Furthermore, Mr. John Cates, far from being recalled to Washington "subsequent to the issuance of this report"—the implication being that he had displeased his superiors in the Department of State—actually had completed his 4-year tour of duty in Caracas, was rotated back to Washington as a routine matter, placed in a key position on Latin American affairs and was on duty in Washington several weeks before Che Guevara publicized the matter in question.

Mr. ROUSSELOT's version of the Betancourt government's action on matters of foreign policy of interest to the United States required examination.

Mr. ROUSSELOT informs us:

Adlai Stevenson is a trusting admirer (of Betancourt) although the wavering vote of the Venezuelan Ambassador in the United Nations on issues important to the United States should put him on his guard.

First of all, Dr. Carlos Sosa Rodrigues, Venezuela's Ambassador to the United Nations, is not even a member of Betancourt's Accion Democratica. He is an independent, a member of one of the richest families in Venezuela, and conservative politically.

In the second place, what "wavering vote"? Let us examine the record.

During the 15th regular session of the General Assembly the U.S.S.R. introduced a resolution to consider the U–2 and RB–47 incidents. Venezuela voted with the United States against the resolution; the Dominican Republic under

Trujillo, whom Mr. ROUSSELOT seems to admire so much, abstained.

Again, on a recommendation to allocate the Cuban complaint against the United States to committee—to keep it off the the General Assembly floor where the Cubans wanted it in order to make propaganda against the United States—Venezuela supported the United States position, while the Dominican Republic—which Mr. ROUSSELOT claims "gave 100 percent support to the United States in all security situations"—abstained.

During that same session Venezuela voted with the United States on the question of Chinese representation, although other allies in the Western camp, such as Ireland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, voted with the Soviet Union's position to consider the Chinese question.

Venezuela under Betancourt also has voted with the United States on such disputed issues as the Hungarian question and the resolution reaffirming United Nations objectives in Korea and calling upon UNCURK to continue in accordance with past General Assembly resolutions.

It is true that Venezuela does not vote down the line with the United States on every issue. I do not think that we expect blind support from our friends as the Russians demand from their satellites. On matters concerning colonialism, nuclear testing, and underdeveloped nations, Venezuela takes an independent course, as do many other nations in the Western Alliance.

Venezuela has, for instance, voted against the United States position and for a resolution calling upon the administering authority to organize a plebiscite in western Samoa. True, the Soviet Union supported the plebiscite. But so did Guatemala, Ecuador, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

On a resolution requesting France to refrain from nuclear tests in the Sahara, which the United States opposed and the Soviet Union supported, Venezuela cast its vote against the position taken by the United States. But so did Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, Iceland, Ireland, and Canada, among others.

The fact is that on key issues affecting Soviet-Western relations Venezuela has supported the Western position.

In the present General Assembly, Dr. Marcos Falcon Briceno, Venezuelan Foreign Minister, backed a single Secretary General, condemned the Soviet Union for resumption of nuclear tests, and urged self-determination for Berlin.

I have dwelled at some length on the question of Venezuela in the United Nations because a seemingly casual remark like Mr. ROUSSELOT'S can have far-reaching and damaging effects upon our foreign policy.

One more assertion in the foreign policy field by Mr. ROUSSELOT cries out for clarification. According to Mr. ROUSSELOT:

> Betancourt had promised that if we met his wishes in the Dominican matter [OAS sanctions for the Trujillo-inspired attempt on President Betancourt's life], he would back the United States in a strong OAS declaration against Castro. But no sooner had we kept our part of the unsavory deal than Betancourt welshed on his pledge. He joined in a move to pass a weak, anti-Communist declaration which studiously refrained from citing Castro by name.

As a matter of record, the Dominican sanctions were voted unanimously by the 20 American Republics. There was never any doubt that the American nations would condemn the Dominican dictator for his attempt upon the life of a democratically elected president of a sister republic. President Betancourt had no need to make "a deal" for U.S. support on that issue.

As for the OAS declaration to condemn Castro's Cuba, the United States encountered firm resistance almost everywhere in the Western Hemisphere. The key big powers—Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico—opposed the move. Not that they, or Venezuela, or any of the smaller nations present, approved of Castro. But they believed that an OAS condemnation at that time would not have the desired effect of turning Castro away from the Soviet Union.

Moreover, democratically elected governments in Latin America must be responsive to public opinion to remain in office. Unfortunately, at the time of the San Jose conference, most of the Latin American governments were in a difficult position. Their people still regarded Fidel Castro as the Robin Hood of the Caribbean. In the judgment of most of the Latin American regimes—many of them quite conservative—direct condemnation of Fidel Castro would have opened a Pandora's box of domestic problems by handing their leftwing elements ammunition to attack the moderate governments.

As a matter of fact, Betancourt demonstrated great courage with regard to the anti-Communist resolution which the OAS conference did pass. The Venezuelan Foreign Minister was then Ignacio Luis Arcaya, a member of the leftist political party, URD, which had supported Betancourt's opponent, Larrazabal, for the Presidency. Arcaya was a member of Betancourt's cabinet in accord with the coalition agreement signed by the three major Venezuelan parties prior to the elections in an effort to assure political peace in Venezuela during the reorganization following 10 years of dictatorship. Arcaya refused President Betancourt's orders to sign the resolution on behalf of Venezuela. Betancourt substituted him on the spot and ordered his replacement to sign. This act took courage, for URD withdrew from the coalition government and moved into the opposition.

Mr. ROUSSELOT'S statement also distorts the Venezuelan economic picture. He states:

> Perez Jimenez literally rebuilt the country out of his national revenues in an extraordinary public works program and still was able to accumulate a surplus.

To quote Mr. ROUSSELOT further:

> At the end of 1957, on the eve of Perez Jimenez' departure, the Treasury of Venezuela had a surplus of Bs2,364 million. This was the nest egg which Larrazabal and Betancourt inherited when they came to power. Against this huge surplus, there was outstanding virtually no foreign debt and a domestic debt of only Bs1 billion.
>
> In 3 years Betancourt has succeeded in squandering all this inherited surplus and Bs5 billion more which his regime has raised through taxation.

The true situation is revealed in the Quarterly Review of the Bank of London and South America for January 1961. It says:

> With the overthrow of the dictatorship, hitherto unsuspected economic problems were revealed. Despite the large fiscal revenue from the petroleum industry—which had been swollen in 1956–57 by Bs1,200 million from the auctioning of new concessions, for the first time since 1943—maladministration and extravagance in the public works program had led to the accumulation of obligation estimated at Bs4,500 million. At the same time, external influences on the economy became unfavorable because of the rapid change in the international petroleum situation. As conditions returned to normal after the Suez crisis it became clear that the growth of productive capacity had substantially outstripped the rise in world consumption. The present Venezuelan Government, though dedicated to a program of reform, appears to be pursuing its aims with moderation. It has been extremely unfortunate in taking office at a period of unprecedented economic difficulties.

Let us examine Venezuela's economic situation from another objective source, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Of Perez Jimenez' vaunted "extraordinary public works programs," the IBRD mission headed by Henry R. Labouisse reports:

> Before the change of government in 1958, a large part of Government investment was concentrated on the development of the central, notably the Federal district. Furthermore, the Government's investment effort was accompanied by waste and lack of planning. As examples of large investments in projects either of low priority or constructed to extravagant standards or both, one may cite the appropriation of over Bs 300 million for 12 luxury hotels and 2 teleféricos, over Bs 100 million for military clubs and housing, and Bs 140 million for the Caracas racetrack.

While the racetrack and military club, which resembles the United Nations in New York, and the luxury hotels were going up, the IBRD has this to say about the state of education in Venezuela:

> Past governments have not paid sufficient attention to many of those functions which are important for economic development and which involve substantial current expenditures. For example, prior to 1958 expenditures for education and training were not accorded a high priority.
>
> In fact during the school year 1957–58, when the move toward constitutional government took place, only 57 percent of school-age children were actually attending school. Furthermore, retention rates had been so low that relatively few of those who had been in school in previous years had attended for more than a year or two. Thus in 1957–58 more than half of total enrollment was to be found in the first two grades while only some 6 percent were in the sixth grade.
>
> The present Government has done a remarkable job in rapidly enrolling the backlog of school-age children who were without previous education. By the school year 1959–60 it is estimated that some 400,000 of these backlog children had been enrolled while at the same time in each of the 2 years 1958–59 and 1959–60 more than 200,000 or some 75 percent of the children reaching 7 years of age, had also been enrolled in the first grade. Total primary school enrollment

for all grades went up from 751,561 in 1957–58 to 1,067,900.

On maladministration in the Perez Jimenez administration the IBRD reported:

In 1958, the new Venezuelan Government found that there was a great deal of disentangling to be done in the allocation of expenditures among the several parts of the petrochemical project before the exact value of the fixed assets could be established. This work was well under way during the mission's visit. Although it was not possible to state precise amounts by mid-1960, we estimate that, after taking into consideration a fair share of the expenditures on services and facilities used in common with the oil refinery, the investment in the chemical plants * * * will amount to about Bs600 million when completed. This amount is far above the expenditure that should be required—probably three or four times higher—to provide plants of their capacity in Venezuela.

The petrochemical industry is but one of the many lucrative "public works" whose expenditures were diverted. I recommend a reading of the IBRD missions report entitled, "The Economic Development of Venezuela" to anyone who is interested in a complete picture of Venezuela before 1958 and the difficulties facing Romulo Betancourt's government in bringing order out of chaos.

Mr. ROUSSELOT speaks of a "huge surplus" against which "there was outstanding virtually no foreign debt and a domestic debt of only Bs1 million."

On the contrary, as the Bank of London intimates, the unsound accounting systems and a system of short-term borrowing by the ministerial offices and autonomous bureaus resulted in the accumulation of tremendous credits in the hands of nationals and foreigners. In the careful language of the IBRD:

In both 1956 and 1957 petroleum company payments for concessions contributed to very large capital inflows which in fact were permitted to augment the Government's cash balances. At the same time, however, the Government and its autonomous agencies borrowed on short term and medium term to finance investment projects. Although no reliable estimates are available, it is conceivable that the Government's unrecorded indebtedness may have increased by Bs 2 billion in 1956 and 1957, with the largest borrowing concentrated in 1957. An undetermined amount of this debt was owed abroad.

"Where then has the money gone?" asks Mr. ROUSSELOT, referring to the nonexistent surplus in Perez Jimenez' treasury. The money—not the nonexistent surplus, but Venezuela's reserves—has gone to pay off the debts left by the dictator. The provisional Government paid off around Bs 1,900 million and the constitutional government has paid off Bs 100 million, which makes a total of Bs 2,000 million, an amount which has exhausted the fiscal reserves of the country. Betancourt honored the debts to protect the country's credit.

What about the charge that President Betancourt is opposed to private and foreign investment?

Mr. ROUSSELOT states in this regard:

Although he has not yet actually expropriated American property—remember he is still playing the role of an anti-Communist—he has made it so uncomfortable for private enterprise that there has been a flight abroad of over $1 billion of capital during Betancourt's 2½ years.

Capital flight did indeed occur after the overthrow of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship. Some of the money was "hot money." Some of the capital fled because of fear of loss of usurious profits or fear of the modern social reforms which the new democratic government promised. Some of the flight was caused by speculators who thought that Venezuela would establish exchange controls followed by devaluation and that it would be a profitable maneuver to purchase dollars at 3.35 bolívares in order to reimport them and sell them later at 5 or 6 bolívares per dollar.

Of the capital flight, the IBRD says:

Some part of the movement of private capital was a natural response to the ending of the petroleum boom, and this should cause no concern, particularly since exchange reserves had been accumulated with which to finance such outflows. Another segment of this outflow may have resulted from the political uncertainties associated with the transition to a democratic regime in 1958 and early 1959. The acceleration of capital flight which occurred in the latter part of 1959 was however the result of vague, and even exaggerated, fears of measures the government might take to control the economy.

I have attempted to deal with the principal points raised in Mr. ROUSSELOT's statement and to correct the major distortions. It is impossibl to untwist all of them.

I have concentrated upon he attack upon President Betancourt However, the statement did not ignore other sincere Venezuelans who have risked life and fortune for many years to bring democratic and responsible government to Venezuela. Dr. Raul Leoni, President of the Venezuelan Congress, has devoted himself to the establishment of constitutional government in Venezuela. Ambassador Jose Mayobre, who has shown himself to be a sincere friend of the United States, is glibly labeled a "Communist" without any credible evidence.

I cannot help but wonder what prompted Mr. ROUSSELOT's statement. As I suggested at the beginning of this reply, could Venezuela's deposed dictator, Marcos Perez Jimenez, be hovering in the background?

Mr. ROUSSELOT makes the extraordinary statement that "Perez Jimenez has been under constant harassment and legal persecution" in the United States. We have an extradition treaty with Venezuela under which proceedings were instituted to return Perez Jimenez for trial upon charges of embezzlement. The proceedings began in August 1959, and Perez Jimenez is free on $100,000 bail while the decision granting extradition is on appeal.

All during the pendency of the extradition proceeding Perez Jimenez was free to enjoy his $400,000 mansion and the charms of Miami night life. He went fishing on his luxurious cabin cruiser, traveled to New York whenever it suited his pleasure, and even took a vacation in the Hawaiian Islands. Only now, after the Court's determination that he would be extradited, has he been restricted and denied the use of this yacht.

This extradition is not, as Mr. ROUSSELOT suggests, a farce brought for political vengeance. Perez Jimenez himself provided the evidence upon which the proceedings was based. When in his unseemly but prudent haste to escape Venezuela on the night of January 23, 1958—when almost the entire Venezuelan population took to the streets in protest at this brutal rule—the dictator inadvertently left behind one of his suitcases.

The suitcase was crammed full with currency, negotiable bonds, title deeds to real estate in Venezuela, and a number of documents in his own handwriting showing how the funds of the Venezuelan Treasury were siphoned.

From that evidence the Venezuelan authorities were able to reconstruct the theft or embezzlement of approximately $13 million. This charge was buttressed by canceled checks, bank deposit slips, and statements, and papers in the handwriting of Perez Jimenez and of his principal lieutenants.

Extradition in the United States is a judicial proceeding which requires a finding of probable cause that the accused is guilty of the crimes with which he is charged.

The U.S. district court in Miami just a few months ago—after a proceeding that had gone on for nearly 2 years—held that there was probable cause to believe that the embezzlements had been committed.

Perez Jimenez immediately filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus which has been denied. I might add parenthetically that in doing so he was availing himself of a remedy which he himself abolished in Venezuela during his tenure in power and which the present democratic government of Romulo Betancourt has reinstituted.

I am sure Mr. ROUSSELOT does not mean to imply that the U.S. courts are lending themselves to an improper or vengeful proceeding. The extradition will be determined by the courts of the United States in accord with the law and on the basis of the evidence presented by the Venezuelan Government.

It appears that an attempt to confuse public opinion in the United States is being made for the purpose of saving Perez Jimenez. This endeavor to discredit the present Government of Venezuela can have a dangerous effect upon the conduct of our foreign policy in Venezuela and Latin America and should be thoroughly explored by the appropriate congressional committees when Congress reconvenes.

A Report to the People of Union County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, if the 1st session of the 87th Congress were to be

evaluated on the basis of what the people were led to expect from it—and this standard is, I believe, a fair one—it would have to be concluded that the record is inadequate and disappointing.

People's expectations were high, and for a number of reasons: The 1960 platforms of both political parties promised action on a wide variety of problems; for the first time since 1952, the President belonged to the party which controlled both House and Senate; the majorities in both Houses were substantial; the session was the longest since the wartime year of 1951; and the President submitted no less than 355 specific legislative requests to the Congress.

Although Congress passed a large volume of legislation, most of it was relatively unimportant. On the big issues—tax reform, education, foreign aid, civil rights, transportation, agriculture, labor, and others—Congress either failed to act at all or drastically revised Presidential proposals.

There are several explanations for Congress' poor record. Most important, perhaps, was the administration's failure to establish priorities and to concentrate on obtaining approval for its most important recommendations. Related to this was the impression created by the administration that it favored quantitative solutions to problems rather than qualitative solutions, that it believed that spending more money and starting new programs would automatically produce desirable results. As the session progressed and it became more apparent that a deficit was inevitable, Congressmen developed a healthy fear of the inflationary effects of an unbalanced budget. This, together with the mood of moderation shared by most Members this year, brought an increasingly negative response to administration requests.

The worsening international situation, and the huge increase in defense spending it required, took Congress' attention away from domestic matters and confirmed Members' reluctance to embark on new and expensive programs.

SOME WORK TO DO

However valid these reasons may be, Congress in 1961 has left an immense amount of work for its second session to do. Since 1962 will be a national election year, political pressures are not likely to make it any easier to obtain sound and constructive legislation.

The first and possibly most controversial issue of the first session was the question of enlarging the House Rules Committee to assure that the majority leadership could bring its legislative program to the floor for a vote, and decision, by all the Members. Together with 21 of my Republican colleagues, I voted for enlargement, and I am convinced our vote was a wise and proper one. It did not, as some feared, open the gates to a flood of big spending programs, but it did serve to place responsibility for the record of the Congress where it belongs—with the majority.

To a considerable extent, the accomplishments of the session just ended can be attributed to two emergency situations: The economic recession earlier in the year and the Berlin crisis which came to a head in the closing weeks of the session.

For instance, temporary extension of unemployment compensation and a temporary program of aid to the dependent children of unemployed workers—both very worthwhile—were the direct results of the effort to fight the recession. The area redevelopment or depressed areas program, which was also passed as an antirecession measure, was far less defensible and I opposed it in its final form because of its implicit threat to established industrial areas like our own and because of its failure to direct help to areas needing it most. Only two small projects, by the way, have been started in the more than 5 months the agency has been in existence.

Although somewhat less directly related to the recession, the minimum wage and the omnibus housing bills both benefited from the widespread desire to stimulate the economy by increasing purchasing power. The housing bill presented me with a particularly difficult decision. Having worked hard in our Banking and Currency Committee for several of the programs in the bill, including housing for the elderly, college housing, middle-income housing, and mass transportation, I was nevertheless strongly opposed to the rather bald-faced attempt to pass the bill by loading it with "sweeteners" in the form of benefits for almost everyone. One section of the bill, for example, provided 10 times the amount of funds requested by the President. Consequently, I supported amendments to trim the fat from the bill, but when these failed it seem clear that, on balance, the bill contained so much of importance that it ought to pass.

RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY

The major legislative accomplishments in the fields of national defense and foreign policy likewise depended largely on the existence of an emergency. In direct response to the President's address to the Nation in July on the Berlin crisis, Congress voted $46.7 billion in defense funds, $6.4 billion above last year's appropriation and the largest amount in a single year since the Korean war. Congress also quickly approved the President's request for authority to call to active duty 250,000 reservists for up to 12 months and to extend the service of those currently on active duty for the same length of time. A reorganization of the civil defense agency, which the President transferred to the Pentagon, was supported by Congress, as was the President's request for a huge increase in funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to make possible a speedup in the man-in-space and space satellites programs.

In foreign affairs, the creation of two new agencies—the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—attracted special attention as well as widespread bipartisan support in Congress. While both agencies are frankly experimental, each is a hopeful attempt to take the initiative in a key area of cold war politics. The Peace Corps, which is already helping to channel the talents and energies of young Americans into constructive service in several less fortunate countries which are striving for self-development, will also help prove to a skeptical world that our people are genuinely and unselfishly interested in helping others. The Arms Control Agency, on the other hand, will provide a new and deeper dimension to much of our foreign and defense policy by doing the planning and research and making the technical studies and tests necessary to make certain we know what we are doing in the complex business of disarmament negotiations. I supported both new agencies.

Congress also first, approved an expansion of our valuable cultural and educational exchange programs; second, ratified a convention joining the United States, Canada, and 18 European nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development which, among other objectives, is designed to help ease our balance-of-payments problem; third, appropriated funds to back up our Latin American economic cooperation program; fourth, extended the food-for-peace program under which we sell farm surpluses for local foreign currencies; and fifth, passed an immigration bill which made permanent the alien orphan adoption program and speeded up the process of reuniting relatives abroad with their families in the United States.

But the most important foreign policy program of all—foreign aid—was one of the year's notable failures and, together with the collapse of education legislation, accounts to a large extent for characterizing the first session as disappointing. The basic aims of the two measures—to put foreign aid on a long-term financing basis and thereby help to overcome much of the waste and inefficiency in the program, and to provide Federal help in building classrooms in areas where overcrowding is most serious—were supported by substantial majorities in both House and Senate. Yet, for reasons that apply to both bills, Congress decisively rejected them.

WHAT WENT WRONG

In both cases, administration proposals were much too ambitious. The foreign aid bill failed to provide an effective means of congressional control of the program, while the educational bill proposed a permanent program including subsidy of teachers' salaries. Moreover, administration supporters refused to compromise on terms that could have assured at least partial victories. A temporary program of Federal aid limited to classroom construction, for example, passed the House last year and could have become law this year. In neither case did administration spokesmen make a convincing demonstration that their objectives were clear and obtainable. Floor leadership of the bills, too, was inadequate and was marked by contradictions and inconsistencies as well as by a failure to cooperate with the minority in writing legislation that would meet national needs.

As a result, foreign aid was limited to a 1-year appropriation, and the only

education bill to pass was a 2-year extension of the existing National Defense Education Act and the program of aid to school districts burdened with nearby Federal establishments.

The list of administration proposals defeated or postponed by the 1st session of the 87th Congress is a long one. The President's comprehensive tax revision recommendations, a few of which I favor but a number of which I find unwarranted, including the plan to repeal the 4-percent dividend credit, were put off until next year. Other major bills met the same fate: oceanography research, medical care for the elderly under social security, a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs, establishment of a national wilderness preservation system, a program of building college classrooms and providing college scholarships, and improvement of educational television.

Congress also left unfinished the President's request for a retraining program for unemployed workers; it postponed action on the administration's export promotion program; and ignored entirely the President's proposals for major changes in the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. It postponed action on his proposed Youth Conservation Corps, rejected a bill for more effective enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and failed to complete action on five bills to aid U.S. migrant farmworkers. Congress refused to consider an administration request for increased postal rates, and took no final action on the President's proposal to make the conflict-of-interest laws more effective.

One of the most serious failure of the Congress this year, for which the administration must share the blame, was the refusal of both to seek action on civil rights legislation, legislation endorsed in the platforms of both political parties.

In addition to the more important measures passed under the impetus of the critical international situation and the recession, Congress completed action on a number of significant bills. The social security laws were liberalized to provide a small increase in the minimum benefits for retired workers, and to permit men as well as women to retire at age 62 on a reduced-benefit basis. The water pollution control program was expanded to help more communities construct sewerage treatment plants. The Community Health Services and Facilities Act provided increased assistance for public health services, nursing home construction, hospital facilities and outpatient services.

SEVERAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A new U.S. Travel Office was established to promote foreign travel in the United States. A program to develop ways of converting salt water into fresh water was approved. Residents of the District of Columbia were granted the right to vote in presidential elections. Four of the seven plans by which the President proposed to reorganize regulatory agencies were approved and three rejected. The Justice Department received new antiracketeeer weapons in the form of several bills barring the use of interstate transportation and communications facilities to further illegal purposes. A 3-year program to help control juvenile delinquency also became law. And, after ignoring the need for new Federal judgeships for several years, 73 new positions were quickly created—14 more than the President had requested.

Other, more routine and expected measures, were also approved, including a revised farm program which continues, I believe, to follow the wrong road—the road to high food prices and huge supplies of surplus commodities.

As in every Congress, most of the basic legislative work was done in the various committees. Both my own committees—Banking and Currency and Government Operations—have unusually broad jurisdictions, and our workloads reflected this fact.

In addition to the housing bill and the area redevelopment bill—which, as reported by our committee, was a much better bill than that finally passed by Congress—the Banking and Currency Committee greatly strengthened American small business: First, by increasing the Small Business Administration's business loan authority; second, by improving small business opportunities to obtain Government contracts; and, third, by expanding the supply of long-term loan and equity capital for small business concerns through privately owned small business investment companies. Moreover, we saved taxpayers $4 million annually in interest charges by authorizing the Treasury to adjust its accounts with respect to unredeemed currency issued before 1934. We permitted the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation to use surplus grains to feed wildlife in cases of drought or other emergencies. We approved two bills to strengthen the savings and loan association industry. And we helped place American exporters on an equal basis with foreign competitors by authorizing the Export-Import Bank to protect exporters against political and credit risks, a measure I hope will stimulate lagging American exports and improve our balance-of-payments position.

STUDYING THE GOVERNMENT

Much of our activity on the Government Operations Committee is continuing in nature, in keeping with our "watchdog" responsibilities which cover all aspects of the Federal Government.

This year, for instance, we maintained a close check on foreign aid and military operations, exposing weaknesses and recommending ways of improving programs. We continued to persuade Government agencies to liberalize their information policies and respect the people's right to know. Besides the several reorganization bills and the legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs, which I previously mentioned, two of our reports were of special importance—a detailed study of the new civil defense program, of immense significance to each one of us, and an investigation of the growing practice in the Federal Government of secretly recording telephone conversations, an unauthorized and potentially dangerous invasion of privacy. As a result of the former study, I introduced legislation to provide a tax deduction for the costs of building fallout shelters and to authorize FHA-insured loans for this purpose.

As ranking minority member, much of my time was devoted to the work of the committee's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. Among other things, we continued our long-range investigation of the Agriculture Department's administration of certain of its price-support programs. We held hearings which helped convince the Department to prohibit the watering of hams, a practice which, in effect, inflated the consumer price of ham by approximately one-third. We studied and recommended to the National Institutes of Health improvements in their administration of health research programs which they have already put into effect and which are estimated to save the Government at least $200,000 a year. And we are presently reviewing certain intergovernmental problems in metropolitan areas.

Recently, we began an intensive study of the consumer protection activities of the Federal Government. Our objectives are to increase the effectiveness of this protection and to improve the coordination of consumer protection activities between Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies. Already, some startling inadequacies have been found. The Food and Drug Administration, for example, reported that this year it was able to examine only one-fifth of 1 percent of the interstate shipments of food to determine whether hazardous levels of pesticide residues were present.

Our subcommittee also completed hearings on legislation which I co-sponsored which would require that all new Federal grant-in-aid programs be formally reviewed by Congress periodically to determine whether they should be repealed, continued, expanded or drastically revised. Because too many Federal grant programs are permitted to continue long after they have served an important purpose, I am convinced this legislation can both save the Government money and improve the Government's service.

However we may feel about individual grant programs, it is clear that Federal grants-in-aid are indispensable to the States. In fiscal year 1959, the last year for which figures are available, New Jersey received $172.7 million in Federal grants, more than half as much—51.4 percent—as our State raised in tax revenues, $336.3 million. Several States received more from the Federal Government than they raised themselves, and Alaska got almost twice as much.

UNION COUNTY IN CONGRESS

Union County, the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, is directly affected by what Congress did and did not do this year. The year's most significant success was unquestionably the beginning of a new program of aid to metropolitan areas like our own for the purpose of bolstering commuter mass transportation systems. Although Congress at the last moment reduced funds for this program to the point where it could

barely get started this year, I shall continue to press the administration to reallocate money previously appropriated for other, far less important projects and put it to work in this highly critical field.

Approval of the new program was particularly gratifying to me since I was a cosponsor of the legislation and because I have worked hard on this problem for more than 3 years. A major factor in winning congressional approval of the program, by the way, was the timely endorsement of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its comprehensive commuter transportation study, which it had undertaken at my request. Better transportation is the key to halting the deterioration of our cities and making metropolitan areas more pleasant, attractive, and efficient places in which to live and work. I hope, therefore, the new program will receive the imaginative and energetic administration it needs.

For the first time, the serious flood control situation on the Elizabeth River received concrete attention from Congress. At my request, Congress appropriated funds for a Corps of Engineers' survey of flood damage along the river which will, I hope, result in Federal participation in constructing flood protection facilities. The people of Elizabeth, Hillside, and Union in particular have suffered increasingly from the frequent flooding of the Elizabeth River and, unless effective protection is provided soon, will suffer even greater damage as urbanization of this heavily populated area continues.

This year, too, brought the results of several years of constant effort to improve post office facilities in Union County. After years of investigation, planning, and necessary preliminary work, new and remodeled post office buildings and substations were begun or completed in a number of our communities, including Elizabeth, Mountainside, Fanwood, Scotch Plain[illegible]l, Roselle Park, Springfield, [illegible].

Changes in the immi[illegible]w, I am happy to report, will ben[illegible]umerous Union County families. Congress authorized the wives and husbands of permanent residents and the immediate families of citizens to come to the United States without regard to existing quota limitations. This will eliminate the lengthy delays experienced by many in seeking to reunite their families. Acting immediately on the basis of the new law, I have already received dozens of reports from American consulates abroad informing me of their cooperation in speeding the issuance of immigration visas.

JET NOISE ARRIVES

At the beginning of this year, most of Union County was deeply concerned at reports that the Port of New York Authority intended to build a huge new jet airport in the Great Swamp of Morris County, adjacent to our own county, and planned to permit jet aircraft to operate out of Newark airport. Although we have been successful in blocking the Great Swamp jetport, jets have now arrived at Newark. Despite my own efforts, and those of many others, to convince the Governor of New Jersey that jets should not be permitted at Newark until methods of eliminating noise hazards had been perfected, the Governor allowed the port authority to initiate jet service on a limited basis. According to recent reports, however, many more jet flights will be scheduled from Newark in the near future. I shall continue to urge the Governor and the port authority to insist that every possible noise prevention technique be used to protect airport neighbors from the hazards of jet noise.

Among the several methods I have used to keep in close touch with the people I represent and the problems of our district—including my annual congressional questionnaire, my regular report to the people, office hours in the district, and so forth—a new one this year, an industrial survey, proved very worthwhile. At the height of the recession, I prepared a detailed questionnaire covering major aspects of the economic situation in the county, employment and production trends, labor relations, taxes and community services, and prospects for the future, and asked the principal manufacturers and union locals to reply. Their answers revealed that our area economy is strong, that it suffered somewhat from the recession, but that improvement was expected and long-range growth anticipated.

Union County has both economic assets and liabilities, and I found the survey results very helpful in determining how best I could contribute to the future well-being of our people.

As always, my staff and I, both in Elizabeth and in Washington, have obtained a great deal of satisfaction from the daily business of helping the people of Union County. While no statistics are available, we have welcomed literally thousands of constituents who wrote and visited us in Washington and who sought help with a multitude of business, labor, civic, and personal problems with the Federal Government. I have always considered this the most rewarding aspect of my work as your Representative in Congress, and I want to take this opportunity once again to remind you that, no matter what your request, I shall always try to be of service.

Two other assignments, related to my work in Congress, deserve mention in this summary report of the first session. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am one of three Members from the House of Representatives, undertook a number of studies aimed at increasing cooperation between Federal, State, county, and local governments in such fields as estate taxes, Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments, State, and local taxation of private property located on Federal areas, and intergovernmental cooperation in tax administration. As a sponsor of the legislation which created the Commission, I have been extremely pleased with the quiet but effective way in which this new and unique agency of government has gone about solving some of the thorniest, if least glamorous, intergovernmental problems.

STUDYING MASS TRANSPORTATION

Its best work this year, however, was done in two studies, which the Commission made at my request, in fields of special interest to Union County. One study dealt with ways of improving governmental cooperation in metropolitan areas and the other attacked the fundamental problem of intergovernmental responsibilities for mass transportation in metropolitan areas.

My position as a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College in Washington, which is the only institution of higher learning in the world for deaf students, continued to be a rewarding one. Great progress has been made in expanding the facilities of the college and, consequently, its service to young people throughout the country who have been deprived of their hearing. Congress also gave this cause a boost when it appropriated $3 million for training more teachers of the deaf.

In concluding this report, I want to express my thanks to the more than 500,000 residents of Union County whom it is a privilege to serve and who have continued to make it possible for me to represent them at the Nation's Capital. While I have tried to render a comprehensive report on the work of Congress in 1961, space limitations prevented me from providing adequate detail for those of you who are interested in particular issues. Any of you who desire additional information or wish to delve more deeply into any of the matters I have mentioned, please write to me either in Elizabeth or in Washington and I shall be delighted to furnish you with additional information.

A Salute to the Ladies of Hadassah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is again my privilege to bring to the attention of this House the commendable spirit and notable accomplishments of the dedicated ladies of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America.

Through the years I have marveled at the singular lack of selfishness and the magnificent spirit of devotion to a cause which characterizes this organization. I am sure my colleagues in this House join me in expressing a sense of honor to number among their constituents such public-spirited ladies.

In August, Hadassah held its 47th annual convention in Denver, Colo. This year was an especially notable one because of the impressive dedication, on June 6, 1961, of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center near Jerusalem.

Hadassah was founded a half century ago for the purposes of conducting health work in Israel—then Palestine—and of fostering Jewish ideals in the

American-Jewish community. With the opening of this magnificent medical center, another milestone has been reached in Hadassah's health-for-peace program, dedicated to the marshaling of every possible resource in a battle to defeat the scourges of mankind.

Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center is a vast complex of buildings, housing a 500-bed hospital, a medical school, a nurses' training school, clinical and preclinical laboratories, research laboratories, and a mother-and-child pavilion. Dedicated as it is to the principles of humanitarianism, it is a magnificent blending of the latest in modern technology and the oldest of philosophies—love of mankind.

I was privileged to visit the site of the center during my trip to Israel early in 1960. I was impressed then, and I am sure that the finished product is fabulous.

In addition to the tremendous scientific achievements which will be made under the aegis of this medical center, the ladies of Hadassah have also made possible one of the most significant contributions ever made to the development of modern art. The synagogue which has been built on the grounds of the center features 12 magnificent stained glass windows created by one of the geniuses of contemporary art—Marc Chagall. These windows represent the best in contemporary technique and reflect the inspiration of religious faith. It is not surprising that the ladies of Hadassah should have been responsible for such a flawless merger of art and science, for a vital part of their philosophy has always been that cultural contributions go hand in hand with scientific advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that these magnificent windows will be on display in New York City's Museum of Modern Art, beginning November 5 of this year. In January of 1962, they will be sent to Israel to take their place as the living monument to the indomitable spirit and devotion of the ladies of Hadassah.

It takes no small amount of determination—and capital—to create such an institution as Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center. With the exception of the $4 million medical school fund which was raised by the university, the members of Hadassah are solely responsible for almost $20 million which has gone into the construction of this center. This represents voluntary contributions on the part of the membership, and the ladies are to be commended for their generosity and sense of purpose, even though I am sure there was considerable sacrifice on their part.

But, again, it is axiomatic that any project of this organization should be carried out with devotion to the cause and little regard for the personal sacrifices which may have been involved. I am certain that the organization's determination to fulfill its purpose will remain just as strong and that the next project undertaken will be just as successfully and energetically completed.

The idealism which has inspired the ladies of Hadassah to exert every possible effort to bring to Israel the most modern medical care facilities, educational opportunities, and public health institutions, is equaled only by their interest and participation in community affairs throughout our own country. Hadassah members have made significant contributions to the enhancement of American spiritual and moral values, and their guiding principle has always been preservation of human rights and freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to congratulate their extremely able and personable president, Mrs. Seigfried Kramarsky, of New York, on her reelection. Her untiring efforts and inspiring leadership have helped to guide Hadassah to the heights of unselfish greatness.

I salute the wonderful ladies of Hadassah, Mr. Speaker, and I am confident that my colleagues join in heartfelt appreciation of their achievements and goals.

Goals of the New Frontier: The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These ringing words in President Kennedy's inaugural address caught the imagination of our country.

A direct, personal response to this challenge was offered by President Kennedy's proposal for a Peace Corps—a band of dedicated, trained Americans who have volunteered to go abroad to help the people of less fortunate nations in the interests of world peace.

It is a tribute to the President's perception of the mood of America that the Peace Corps has received such enthusiastic support. It is a tribute to the people of the United States that they have responded to the Peace Corps challenge in a way that demonstrates to the world that Americans are motivated by moral purpose, that they are generous and that they have not lost the pioneer spirit of neighborliness.

I am proud that the Democrats in Congress supported Peace Corps legislation solidly and forcefully, and that it is through their efforts that the Peace Corps has been established on a continuing basis.

Because the time in the affairs of the world was late, and because the previous administration had failed to rise to the challenge of the Peace Corps idea, President Kennedy established the Peace Corps by Executive order on March 1.

This has made a quick start possible, and it is now likely that as many as 1,000 Peace Corps volunteers will be in training or overseas by January 1. Already there are some at work abroad.

There are 62 in Colombia where they will work for the improvement of conditions in Colombian villages.

Sixteen men and women are on their way to the island of St. Lucia in the West Indies Federation, where they will help to improve agricultural methods, teach personal health and establish farm youth groups.

Fifty volunteers are in Ghana teaching mathematics, physics, English, biology, and chemistry in secondary schools.

By the end of this month 35 volunteers will be at a training camp on the slopes of Mt. Kilimanjaro in Tanganyika. They will survey farm-to-market roads for the Government of Tanganyika. Four geologists will map unknown Tanganyika areas and four civil engineers will design bridge, culvert and road construction.

Thirty-eight volunteers trained at Harvard University are now in Nigeria, where they will teach in secondary schools. By the end of October, 48 more will begin community development work in Chile. A month later, 130 will be helping to teach English and science in Philippine village schools.

Thirty-two volunteers are now in training at Putney, Vt., for service in east Pakistan. Twenty-nine are at Colorado State University training for west Pakistan, 35 at Michigan State University for Nigeria and another 50 at the University of California at Los Angeles for Nigeria. About 35 people will begin training October 2 at Ohio State University for agricultural extension work in India.

Volunteers are now being selected for service in Malaya, Thailand, and Sierra Leone. By June 30, 1962, the Peace Corps expects to have 2,700 volunteers in training or overseas.

Practicality has been the goal of planning for Peace Corps operations. Its volunteers have been selected with extreme care, and its training programs have been rigorous. Projects have been weighed carefully to make certain that they will really benefit the people of the host country and that the Peace Corps can furnish the skills requested by foreign governments.

But all of this caution and the emphasis upon being practical cannot disguise the fact that the energizing force behind the Peace Corps volunteers is idealism.

Some opponents of the Peace Corps have been unable to understand idealism. One was openly incredulous that any sane American would give up a good job to go overseas to live in humble circumstances at low pay just to help other people. Others sneered at the idea of unselfish service and called the whole plan a boondoggle.

The Peace Corps will not revolutionize the world, but it is worth trying.

We Democrats are determined to keep our defenses strong. We are determined to preserve freedom in the world and honor at home. But at the same time we believe in idealism. We have not given up hope. We shall always stand ready to extend the helping hand of friendship, symbolized in this session of Congress, and throughout the world, by the Peace Corps.

Résumé of Activities of the Committee on House Administration, 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on House Administration for the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

During this session 256 items of legislation were referred to the Committee on House Administration. Of these 99 were subsequently approved by the Committee and reported favorably to the House.

At the first meeting held in the current Congress the chairman appointed four standing subcommittees: Accounts, Elections, Printing, and Enrolled Bills—Library—Memorials. At the same time three special subcommittees were appointed to deal with, first, electrical and mechanical office equipment; second, parking; and third, audit of the contingent expenses of the House.

Under the chairmanship of Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL the Accounts Subcommittee conducted hearings on requests of 18 standing committees and 2 select committees for funds to finance authorized studies and investigations during the 87th Congress, as follows:

Committee	Authorizing resolution	Funds resolution	Funds approved	Amount requested	Amount approved	Period (years)	Foreign travel
Agriculture	H. Res. 86	H. Res. 94	Feb. 28, 1961	$50,000	$50,000	2	Yes.[1]
Armed Services	H. Res. 78	H. Res. 79	do	150,000	150,000	2	No.
Banking and Currency (Housing).	H. Res. 143	H. Res. 144	do	100,000	100,000	1	Yes.[2]
Banking and Currency	Rule XI(4)	H. Res. 200	Mar. 15, 1961	5,000	5,000	2	No.
District of Columbia	Rule XI(5)	H. Res. 189	do	10,000	10,000	2	No.
Education and Labor	H. Res. 141	H. Res. 149	Feb. 28, 1961	633,000	633,000	2	Yes.[2]
Foreign Affairs	H. Res. 60	H. Res. 61	do	150,000	150,000	2	Yes.
Foreign Affairs		H. Res. 348	June 29, 1961	5,000	5,000	2	No.
Government Operations	Rule XI(8)	H. Res. 70	Mar. 1, 1961	640,000	640,000	1	Yes.
House Administration	Rule XI(9)(k)	H. Res. 158	Feb. 28, 1961	20,000	20,000	2	No.
House Administration	Rule XI(9)(k)	H. Res. 357	June 29, 1961	10,000	10,000	2	No.
Interior and Insular Affairs	H. Res. 92	H. Res. 128	Feb. 28, 1961	60,000	60,000	2	Yes.[3]
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.	H. Res. 108	H. Res. 165	do	435,000	435,000	2	Yes.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.	H. Res. 420	H. Res. 439	Sept. 7, 1961	150,000	150,000	2	Yes.
Judiciary	H. Res. 56	H. Res. 68	Feb. 28, 1961	200,000	200,000	1	No.
Judiciary	Public Law 86-272.	H. Res. 204	Mar. 15, 1961	165,000	150,000	1	No.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries.	H. Res. 98	H. Res. 99	Feb. 28, 1961	75,000	75,000	2	Yes.
Post Office and Civil Service.	H. Res. 75	H. Res. 76	do	100,000	100,000	2	No.
Public Works	H. Res. 23	H. Res. 136	do	950,000	950,000	2	Yes.[4]
Do	do	H. Res. 433	Sept. 7, 1961	150,000	150,000	2	Yes.[4]
Science and Astronautics	H. Res. 55	H. Res. 85	Feb. 28, 1961	300,000	300,000	2	No.
Small Business	H. Res. 46	H. Res. 148	do	580,000	580,000	2	No.
Un-American Activities	Rule XI(18)	H. Res. 167	Mar. 1, 1961	331,000	331,000	1	Yes.
Veterans' Affairs	H. Res. 49	H. Res. 50	Feb. 28, 1961	50,000	50,000	2	Yes.[2]
Do	do	H. Res. 392	Aug. 10, 1961	100,000	100,000	2	No.
Ways and Means		H. Res. 291	June 13, 1961	25,000	25,000	2	No.
Select Committee To Investigate Export Control Act of 1949.	H. Res. 403	H. Res. 453	Sept. 19, 1961	60,000	40,000	2	Yes.
Total				5,354,000	5,319,000		

The House of Representatives has authorized travel outside the United States with the following limitations:
[1] By subcommittees of not to exceed 5 members.
[2] To any commonwealth (of the United States) or possession thereof.
[3] Territories and possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States.
[4] Canada; and 2 subcommittees not exceeding 6 members and not exceeding 2 staff members each, as authorized by the chairman of the committee to do so, are authorized to travel outside the United States in connection with highway conferences.

In this report no attempt will be made to list bills or resolutions considered by the committee other than those which affect the entire membership of the House or those which are of general public interest. As a matter of fact a large proportion of the legislation considered by the Committee on House Administration is primarily connected with the administrative functions of the House.

House Resolution 219, authorizing an increase in the basic clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives by an additional $3,000 per annum, and authorizing one clerk in addition to those to which each Member is entitled by law, was approved by the committee and passed by the House on March 15, 1961.

The Subcommittee on Accounts approved, and the full committee authorized a favorable report on House Joint Resolution 538, which would allow each Member to be reimbursed for transportation expenses incurred by him in traveling on official business between Washington and his congressional district, such reimbursements to be in addition to mileage to which a Member is otherwise provided by law. This legislation would also provide reimbursement of travel expenses between Washington and each Member's congressional district for two round trips for one staff member, or one round trip for each of two staff members in each fiscal year. The proposed legislation did not reach the stage of final consideration in the House before adjournment.

Many resolutions were referred to the committee which would authorize additional personnel for committees and offices of the House and would provide increases in compensation.

Hearings were held on many subjects on which action was postponed until the second session. One of more than routine interest was the proposal, on which hearings have been held in many recent Congresses, to provide a residence for pages of the House and Senate. Seven bills are pending on this subject.

The special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment, under the chairmanship of Hon. PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri, inspected and approved several new models of various types of office equipment for Members, and authorized the Clerk of the House to add these to the "approved list" of such equipment. In this connection the committee further recommended the enactment of House Joint Resolution 392—Public Law 87-107. This provided additional electric typewriters for Members of the House, and in certain cases, depending upon the population of a Member's district, provided an additional $500 allowance for such equipment.

Probably the most important and time-consuming legislation confronting the Committee on House Administration during the first session ofthe 87th Congress was the question referred to it of the right of J. EDWARD ROUSH or George O. Chambers to a seat in the 87th Congress. The Subcommittee on Elections, under the chairmanship of Hon. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, conducted a thorough investigation of the matter, including a recount of all the ballots cast for the respective candidates for Representative in Congress in the Fifth District of Indiana at the general election of November 8, 1960. After several months of intensive study and investigation, the committee reported to the House of Representatives on June 13, 1961—House Report 513—the result of its findings, namely, that J. EDWARD ROUSH was duly elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Indiana in the 87th Congress, and was entitled to a seat therein.

Further, the committee recommended—House Resolution 340—that payment be authorized both to Mr. ROUSH and Mr. Chambers covering compensation provided by law for Members of the House of Representatives for the period beginning January 3, 1961, and ending on the date of the adoption of the resolution—House Resolution 339—declaring that Mr. ROUSH was duly elected.

The Subcommittee on Printing, of which Hon. WAYNE L. HAYS is chairman, reported favorably to the House 68 resolutions authorizing the printing of various documents, manuscripts, and hearings, of which 14 were legislative proposals originating in the Senate. The majority of requests for such printing resulted from demands upon the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee for copies of documents relating

to communism and subversive tactics threatening the security of the United States.

The committee authorized a revision and reprinting of the document entitled "The Capitol: A Pictorial Story of the Capitol in General and the House of Representatives in Particular," which it is hoped to have available for Members early in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

A manuscript written by Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, was authorized to be printed as a House document, under the title "History of the House of Representatives."

Following is a list of the resolutions authorizing printing in the 1st session of the 87th Congress:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document 412, 85th Congress—"The Capitol."

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume II, the Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev" and to provide for the printing of additional copies.

H. Res. 91. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document certain material relating to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of a House document.

H. Res. 104. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2237, 86th Congress, 2d session.

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics."

H. Res. 201. Providing for additional copies of House Document No. 118, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, What It Is—What It Does."

H. Res. 250. Providing for the printing as a House document the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held March 13, 14, 1961, at Washington, D.C.

H. Res. 251. To provide for the printing of the Constitution of the United States, with an index and ancillaries, as a House document.

H. Res. 259. Authorizing the printing as a House document of a compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations; and providing for additional copies.

H. Con. Res. 307. Providing for additional copies of a publication entitled "Soviet Total War—Historic Mission of Violence and Deceit," 85th Congress, 1st session.

H. Con. Res. 308. Providing for additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of hearings entitled "Communist Training Operations—Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups."

H. Con. Res. 309. Providing for additional copies of hearings entitled "The Northern California District of the Communist Party—Structure—Objectives—Leadership."

H. Con. Res. 310. Providing for additional copies of a study entitled "Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities—Subsequent Action Taken by Congress of Executive Agencies—A Research Study by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress."

H. Con. Res. 311. Providing for additional copies of H. Document No. 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled, "Facts on Communism and volume I, The Communist Ideology."

H. Res. 292. Providing for additional copies of a consultation entitled, "Language as a Communist Weapon."

H. Res. 293. Providing for additional copies of testimony of Peter S. Deriabin, former officer of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' committee of state security (KGB) entitled, "The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations."

H. Res. 294. Providing for additional copies of staff consultations entitled "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism."

H. Res. 295. Resolution providing for additional copies of hearings entitled, "Communism in the New York Area—Entertainment." 85th Congress, 2d session.

H. Res. 296. Resolution providing for additional copies of a consultation with Edward Hunter, author and foreign correspondent, entitled, "Communist Psychological Warfare—Brainwashing," 85th Congress, 2d session.

H. Res. 297. Providing for additional copies of H. Doc. 119, 86th Cong., 1st sess., entitled, "Patterns of Communist Espionage."

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the inaugural addresses of the Presidents as a House document and providing for additional copies.

H. Con. Res. 327. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of H. Doc. 198 of the 84th Cong., entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

H. Res. 349. Authorizing the printing of "United States Defense Policies in 1960" as a House document.

H. Con. Res. 342. Authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes extended to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, and providing for additional copies.

H. Con. Res. 364. To print as a House document the publication "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology 1818–1957, volume 1," and to provide for the printing of additional copies.

H. Res. 397. Providing for additional copies of House Report No. 2228, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "The Communist-Led Riots Against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960."

H. Res. 398. Providing for additional copies of House Report No. 2237, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Annual Report for the Year 1960," prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities."

H. Res. 408. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report, House Report No. 851, on H.R. 8400.

H.J. Res. 558. Providing for printing copies of "Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives."

H. Con. Res. 384. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics."

H. Con. Res. 385. Authorizing the printing of a manuscript entitled "History of the House of Representatives."

H. Res. 473. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1249 entitled "New Civil Defense Program."

S. Con. Res. 7. To print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy.

S. 451. To authorize the distribution of copies of the Congressional Record to former Members of Congress requesting such copies.

S. Con. Res. 15. To print as a Senate document, with additional copies, "A Report on United States Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender.

S. Con. Res. 17. Authorizing the printing of the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol" as a Senate document and providing for additional copies.

S. 1748. To provide for the increased distribution of the Congressional Record to the Federal judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 23. To print additional copies of pt. I of hearing on migratory labor.

S. Con. Res. 24. Relating to printing of publications of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 27. Authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the proceedings of the National Water Research Symposium.

S. Con. Res. 39. To print 3,000 copies of a compilation of the hearings, reports, and committee prints of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

S. Con. Res. 40. Authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the 40th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf; and providing for additional copies.

S. Con. Res. 44. To print certain hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in Spanish, French, and Italian languages.

S. Con. Res. 47. To print additional copies of report entitled "Freedom of Communications."

As a result of intensive hearings conducted in previous Congresses, the committee recommended approval of H.R. 8141, a bill providing for the revision of the laws relating to depository libraries. The bill was passed by the House on August 22, 1961.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills—Library—Memorials is Hon. PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri. One of the more important items of legislation approved by the committee in this session was the approval of the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson. Seventeen Members of the House had introduced legislation on this subject, but in the closing days of the session the committee approved Senate Joint Resolution 51, which was passed by the Senate on September 7, 1961. After approval by the House the resolution was signed by the President and became Public Law 87–364.

Another bill of importance which was approved by the committee was H.R. 4659, which authorized the establishment of a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, and also authorized the expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States. This bill eventually became Public Law 87–186.

Many other items of proposed legislation are under consideration by the Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills—Library—Memorials, but action on many of them has been postponed until the second session of this Congress.

Under the rules of the House the Committee on House Administration is responsible for "examining all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House; and in cooperation with the Senate, of examining all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that they are correctly enrolled; and when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the House, to the President of the United States in person, and report the fact and date of such presentation to the House".

During the first session of the 87th Congress the Committee on House Administration reported to the House the enrollment of 422 House bills and 27 joint resolutions, which, in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, were delivered to the President for signature.

Speech of Philippine Ambassador Narciso Ramos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made at the dinner of the Lin-kou Noncommissioned Officers' Club, Taipei, Taiwan, by His Excellency Narciso Ramos, Ambassador of the Philippines to the Republic of China, on May 29, 1961.

Mr. Roy E. James, whom you will remember as a valuable associate on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was kind enough to send me the copy of the address. From a personal viewpoint, I am glad to ask that this speech be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I had the opportunity to know Ambassador Ramos in 1955–56 when he was serving as the Ambassador of his country in India. In my service there as Ambassador of the United States, I knew him as an outstanding representative of his country, as a man who held our country in respect, and I knew him also as a warm friend. I am sure that his speech is straightforward, as anyone who knows Ambassador Ramos would expect it to be. He speaks to us as a friend and we can learn much from studying his speech.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR NARCISO RAMOS, AS GUEST OF HONOR AND GUEST SPEAKER, AT THE DINNER OF THE LINKOU NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS CLUB, TAIPEI, MAY 29, 1961

I feel highly complimented to be asked to be your guest of honor and guest speaker on this occasion which, I understand, has been arranged to greet new members and to bid farewell to departing members of the Linkou Non-Commissioned Officers Club in Taipei.

Allow me to congratulate you all on having an association for social purposes like the Linkou NCO Club—a club designed to "foster esprit de corps and create a closer bond among members of the Linkou Air Station."

You Americans are noted for your social organizations. Away from your comfortable homes and customary surroundings in America, you fight ennui and boredom and a foreign assignment by joining service clubs which provide you with wholesome entertainment and relaxation, American style, during your off-duty hours.

This is all to the good, for as Americans manning battle stations all over the world to protect the freedom of others as well as your own way of life, you cannot afford to have less than the highest possible morale, whether you be in the jungles of Laos or in the tense but sophisticated atmosphere of West Berlin, and this you cannot attain if you are denied the amenities to which back home you have been accustomed.

But may I say in all friendliness that you must guard against a tendency that may do you more harm than good abroad and that is the tendency to isolate yourselves in little American pockets from the inhabitants of the foreign lands you have come to help and with whom, if need be, you will have to fight shoulder to shoulder in the defense of common ideals and common goals.

From a broadminded individual's standpoint, there is ample justification for you, Americans, to pass your hours of leisure in your own exclusive U.S. clubs. In a strange land, human beings, whether they are Americans, Filipinos, Chinese, or Thai, tend to gravitate in surroundings where they can mingle with persons of their own race or nationality. For what is more natural than for one to seek the company of people coming from the same country with identical origins, backgrounds, and interests?

But you, my American friends, have global responsibilities, and you cannot afford to alienate the sympathy of your foreign allies by standing apart and aloof from them. Asians, proud of their own ancient culture, are as sensitive as any other people of the world. They do not wish to thrust themselves into your exclusive circles, but whatever may be your problems in the United States regarding racial integration, I think it would be a grave mistake to give your Asian friends the impression that socially that they are not your equals.

That you have invited me to be your guest of honor tonight, me, a Filipino and an Asian, is yet another proof of your desire to mix, and get better acquainted, with your allies and sympathizers of other races and nationalities. I can assure you, as one from Asia, that such a desire has been, and will always be, reciprocated.

Here on Taiwan, as in my country, the Philippines, your present relations with the common people are on a warm and cordial basis. In both countries, "Hate the United States" slogans are nonexistent. You do not now find either in Manila or in Taipei posters saying, "Yankee Go Home."

But this cannot be said of your relations with the ordinary people of other areas. Only the other day, I read in the newspapers about the report of Sammy Davis, Jr., the Hollywood movie star, on the distressing anti-American sentiment in such Latin American countries as Brazil and Argentina. He had just returned to Hollywood from night club appearances in Rio and Buenos Aires, and he said he found there unbelievable signs of anti-American hostility. Your prestige must have come down considerably in Argentina in spite of the friendliness of the incumbent Argentine President, Mr. Arturo Frondizi, to the United States. I was Minister of the Philippines in Buenos Aires for 3 years—from 1949 to 1952 in the time of the Perons—but while the Perons were not friendly to the United States, the Argentines as a whole were not then openly antagonistic to the American people.

In Cuba, of course, there is no love for you, Norte Americanos. Need I say more?

From Buenos Aires, I was transferred to New Delhi where I served as chief of mission from 1952 to 1956, the year I came to Taipei. Although the United States has granted India enormous amounts of economic aid, the people of India have never really warmed up to their American benefactors until Communist violations of the Indian border in recent months gave them second thoughts about peaceful coexistence with the Peiping regime.

The United States has given immense sums in military and economic assistance to countless countries, yet you, my American friends, are not receiving in other parts of the world the kind of gratitude and appreciation which you deserve by reason of your matchless generosity. I believe no sensible person would question the honesty and sincerity of your intentions in trying to be helpful to weaker and less developed nations, but since you are not getting the desired results in terms of gratitude, it is high time, I believe, to reexamine not only your basic foreign aid policies, but also your system of approach, individual as well as collective, in dealing with the great variety of peoples throughout the world who need your help and support to survive in freedom.

We Filipinos are generally happy and proud of our friendship with the American people—a friendship that has stood the vicissitudes of time. I served in 1946–49 as Minister-Counselor at the Philippine Embassy in Washington, D.C., and I think I well understand the American way of life. But other Asian peoples, not having had the opportunities of historic association the Philippines has had with the United States do not understand and trust Americans as well as we do. In view of your grand and urgent mission in the world, permit me to say that you have to exert greater efforts to get closer to these other peoples so that you yourselves and your lofty aims may be better understood by them.

Despite your preoccupation with domestic affairs, you, the American people, have come to a most important conclusion—that no nation, not excepting the almost self-sufficient United States, can live alone and go its way without regard to what happens beyond its borders.

The recognition of interdependence is probably the most significant development in American public opinion in the last 150 years. The old cry of "no foreign entanglements" has been drowned out by the stern realities of world leadership. Not only the American Government, but you, the American people, have committed yourselves to international cooperation and have voluntarily accepted the heavy burden of high taxes to pay the bill.

I think there is no doubt that you Americans want to help the rest of the world to be on its feet economically and to defend itself against aggression. The motives are both humanitarian and enlightened self-interest. I am convinced that the idealism of the ordinary American is genuine. Because it is not a complicated idealism, political leaders in other countries have at various times underestimated its genuineness or overestimated American gullibility. I would say that most Americans are willing to share their abundance with less favored peoples, but I do not blame you if you are getting fed up with the notion that your abundance is limitless.

We, in Asia, could contribute a lot to a better understanding between ourselves and the American people if we showed a proper awareness that while American resources are tremendous in comparison with the resources of other nations, such resources have their limits. We would win the respect of Americans if we showed adequate concern that every American dollar allotted to us as aid is fully utilized for the purpose it has been intended. And you, my American friends, could be sure that every courteous and considerate act on your part toward the least of the common people of Asia would gain a deeper spot for the United States and the American people in our hearts.

I wish all the members of the Linkou NCO Club success. Thank you.

Goals of the New Frontier: Fair Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on virtually the same battleground on which previous minimum wage battles were carried on, the Democrats fought and this time won a substantial victory. Attempts have been regularly made to expand the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but it has taken 23 years to achieve that result.

We succeeded this year where we had failed before because of the vigorous action of President Kennedy, who in implementing the goals of the New Frontier is determined to see that all of our people share in our growing national prosperity. The bill that passed this year is very similar to the measure that was requested by the President. It was, in fact, very similar to the measure he had supported so vigorously in the last Congress as a Senator.

This year's amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act include an increase in the minimum wage for the 23.9 million workers previously covered from $1 to $1.25 an hour. The higher level is to be reached in two steps over a 2-year period. Protection of the minimum wage provisions and, with some exceptions, of the overtime provisions of the act was extended to 3,624,000 workers not previously covered. The newly covered will reach the level of $1.25 an hour and a 40-hour workweek in three steps over a 4-year period. The bulk of the newly covered employees are in the retail and construction industries.

As important as the increase in the minimum wage and the numbers of newly covered workers is the change of philosophy and policy implicit in other amendments of this year, where we succeeded in introducing the dollar-volume-of-business test as a criteria of coverage. In providing for "establishment coverage" we have eliminated the anomaly under which some workers in a given plant or firm were covered and others not.

In the course of debate on this measure the same tired old alibis and excuses were raised by the conservatives to starve off action in this field. The chief charge was that any raise in the wages and any extension of protection would be "inflationary."

The wages of a little over 3 million workers previously covered will be affected, adding approximately $836 million to the annual wage bill. Of the 3.6 million workers newly covered, the wages of approximately 1⅓ million will be raised, adding approximately $700 million to the annual wage costs. The employers' annual wage bill will thus be raised by approximately $1,536 million—less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the gross national product—$520 billion a year.

Not only is the increase proportionately small, but studies of the economic effects of the original act and the subsequent raising of the minimum wage demonstrate that the increase in wage costs was not necessarily reflected in consumer prices. As a matter of fact, during periods of relatively high unemployment such an increase in purchasing power can be expected to have a beneficial rather than a harmful effect on the economy.

Very little, if any, of the increase will be spent for items in short supply. Studies of low-income consumer expenditures show that over half of the increase will be spent for food and clothing. An increase in the wages of those at the bottom of the income scale can be expected to give a boost to those very sectors of the economy that need stimulus.

It will contribute, in a small way perhaps, to a reduction of farm surplus. Substantial amounts will be drained away in excise, income, and social security taxes.

I delight in the passage of this year's act, but I am not satisfied. As President Kennedy said as he signed the amendment last May:

> This does not finish the job. It is a very meaningful step forward, but we have need for further improvement in this most vital field.

Failure to extend the act will encourage the continuing growth of a depressed class, numbering in the millions, whose members cannot realistically hope to share in our prosperity or to share in what we think of as the American way of life.

As a nation we can ill afford the cost of such cheap labor. Poverty below the subsistence level quickly translates itself into slums, crime, delinquency and disease for which ultimately we must pay the price. The protection of the wage-hour law must be extended to all who need it. To fail to do so would be indefensible—socially, politically, and economically indefensible.

Permitting the Secretary of Labor on his own and without a request initiated by a worker to bring suit for back wages due under this act is an important and worthwhile improvement in its enforcement procedures. It does not, however, go far enough. Unscrupulous employers failing to comply with this act in years past have cheated workers of over $350 million a year. This must be stopped. After experience has been gained with this new provision, we should plan to move forward with still more effective procedures.

I would urge, in addition, extension of the Child Labor provisions of the original Fair Labor Standards Act to agriculture. Exploitation of children on the "factory farm" is not a bit less vicious, not a bit less cruel than exploitation of children in the mine, the mill, or the smelter. Elimination of this abuse is an imperative goal of the New Frontier.

District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Agency Revitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the revitalization of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Agency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

As one who has lived in Washington for many years while serving in the Senate, and who takes a keen personal interest in the welfare and future of our Capital City, I am deeply concerned over a part of the District of Columbia revenue bill just considered by the Senate and House of Representatives.

This measure was brought up during the closing days of Congress, and was reviewed in the heavy legislative logjam at the end of the session. Although passed by the Senate and discussed in one of two subsequent conferences, it was finally voted down for the second time by the House on September 26, and now remains to be considered next session.

Due to my desire to see Washington's fiscal needs relieved through passage of H.R. 258, and due to the minimum of time available for its enactment, I voted for the conference report in its present form. However, I must confess that one portion of the bill caused me concern, and my subsequent extended study has confirmed this feeling.

I refer to the so-called parking amendment which would permit money held by the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency to be spent for fringe lots, parking space underneath new freeways, and lots adjacent to Federal installations—but which would require legislative authorization for spending on all other parking purposes.

My own analysis indicates that this amendment, if permitted to stand in future years, will cripple Washington's parking program and deal a severe blow to all efforts to improve the city's physical development.

Right now, we see the paradox wherein millions of dollars are being spent on highways and freeways, to bring more automobiles into downtown Washington—but inadequate provision being made for parking these cars, once they are there.

Provision of adequate parking, adequately planned, is vital to every major program of improvement in Washington. It is essential to the success of downtown revitalization, Southwest redevelopment, and other projects in which private citizens have invested millions of dollars.

The body assigned to plan and build Washington's parking facilities is the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency. If effective solutions are to be found to Washington's parking difficulties, the Agency must be allowed to retain its full powers and financing. This it will not do under the new amendment. Although this amendment is somewhat more acceptable than the original House version, which would have completely stripped the Agency of all authority, it would still tend to destroy the city's parking program.

The Agency cannot function effectively if its authority to build facilities is restricted

to a few kinds of parking. It cannot carry out a coherent program if it must beg its authority to construct general parking facilities from Congress each year.

Continuation of this amendment would leave the general citizenry of Washington to the mercy of a few interests chiefly interested in personal gain—the same interest which set out to destroy the Agency in the first place.

We cannot permit this to happen. This great Capital should and must have adequate parking facilities.

Therefore, I want to go on record as urging that the so-called parking amendment be eliminated when the conferees next meet to consider H.R. 258. I further urge that Congress take every opportunity to strengthen and encourage the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency in its efforts to meet and solve the top-priority problem of providing adequate parking in Washington, D.C.

Congressman O'Hara Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress began in a period of economic recession and is ending at a time of international crisis.

When we convened in January, it was evident that strong measures were needed to stimulate our lagging economy and to promote the sound and orderly growth of our human and natural resources. Evident, too, was the need to rebuild our defenses and restore our prestige abroad.

The Congress and the administration, acting in cooperation, took steps to get our economy rolling again. Area redevelopment, minimum wage, omnibus housing, and major amendments to the farm program—these and other measures followed one after the other in quick succession as Congress moved to meet the challenge of the sixties.

President Kennedy's domestic program suffered somewhat from the changes in the international situation. Both he and the Congress had of course been prepared to expand our space program, to strengthen our military defense, and to improve the operation of the foreign aid program. Over the months, however, the worsening of the international tensions called for ever more attention to our defense and foreign policy.

The Congress responded by granting the President the authority and the funds to strengthen our Armed Forces and increase our military effort. Our space program has been substantially stepped up and important new tools have been forged to do the long-term job of strengthening our allies and assisting the newly emerging and underdeveloped nations of the world.

In keeping with my previous practice, I am reporting these events to the people of the Seventh District of Michigan. What follows is that report:

AGRICULTURE

The Emergency Feed Grain Act and the omnibus farm bill are designed to effect a substantial reduction in wheat and feed grain surpluses. These measures and administration action raising price support levels will mean an increase in farm income of a billion dollars in the next year. Federal storage costs will be down—some $500 million will be saved—consumer food prices stabilized, and greater protection afforded the family farm.

The school milk program was extended as were the veterans and armed services milk programs. The farm housing loan and credit programs were liberalized—loan ceilings were raised and the funds available were increased.

The Mexican farm labor program was extended for 2 years with modest revisions designed to protect the domestic farmworker. The disposal abroad of an additional $2 billion in surplus commodities was authorized. The Sugar Act was extended setting quotas for domestic and foreign producers and continuing the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar and reallocate Cuba's share of the sugar quota.

GENERAL ECONOMIC

The minimum wage was raised, in steps, to $1.25—from $1 per hour—and coverage was extended to an additional 3.6 million workers.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was established and authorized to make loans—$300 million—and grants—$90 million—for industrial and commercial projects and public facilities in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. The cities of Warren and Port Huron among others in our district are considering plans to participate in this program. An occupational training program with retraining subsistence payments to trainees was provided to help equip unemployed workers for new jobs.

The most comprehensive housing bill yet provides expanded Federal funds in the form of loans and grants to communities for urban renewal, public housing, housing for the elderly, community facilities, open-space development, and mass transportation systems. FHA interest rates were reduced and low down payment, long-term loans were made available to medium-income families buying new homes.

The 41,000-mile, 13-year Federal highway program was modified, increasing the Federal share of the cost and the users' share of the taxes. The incentive bonus to the States which enter into agreements for billboard controls was extended for 2 years.

The Federal Airport Act was extended.

Small business loans were made available in increased amounts.

Among the steps taken to reduce the flow of gold were the following: Reduction in the duty-free allowance—from $500 to $100—for Americans returning from abroad; establishment of the U.S. Travel Service in the Commerce Department to promote travel from abroad; an increase in Commerce Department services to U.S. exporters.

TAXES

The existing 52-percent corporate income tax and the excises on automobile, liquor, tobacco, local telephone calls, and passenger transportation were continued. A loss of $2.5 billion in revenue at this time seemed too much despite the dissatisfaction with these taxes.

A curb on tax evasion was promised by a new program of assigning identifying numbers to taxpayers. For most it will be their social security number. An additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees will soon be on the lookout for tax evaders.

GENERAL WELFARE

Minimum social security benefits and the benefits of certain widows were increased; benefits at a reduced level were made available to men as well as women on reaching age 62. A similar provision was enacted for railroad retirees.

Federal aids to communities and nonprofit organizations were made available to combat juvenile delinquency.

Impacted areas legislation under which schools in our district get some $300,000 a year in Federal assistance was extended for two years as was the National Defense Education Act designed to strengthen education in science, math, and languages. Grants and scholarships for the training of practical nurses will continue to be available.

Local communities will be helped to expand health services for the aged, to construct nursing homes and train public health personnel.

Federal loans to the States were authorized to permit the extension of unemployment benefits up to 13 weeks for workers who had exhausted their benefits. Railroad workers were separately provided for.

Federal aid to the States was made available for the needy children of the unemployed on the same basis as to the needy children of deceased or deserting fathers.

DEFENSE

The President was granted authority to call 250,000 ready reservists to duty. The Secretary of Defense now has authority to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months.

Procurement of aircraft, missile, and naval vessels has been stepped up. The Polaris submarine program, for example, was accelerated so that we will have a full fleet in commission 3 years sooner than previously planned.

Substantial improvement can also be expected in our Defense capabilities in nonnuclear areas. Congress has provided additional funds for the purchase of weapons, equipment, and ammunition, to provide increased air and sea lift, and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The training of special forces in guerrilla warfare has been increased.

Operations in space will be stepped up by the $1¾ billion made available to the NASA, a substantial increase over previous appropriations.

Civil defense was taken off its starvation diet. Congress encouraged by the President increased by a factor of four the annual appropriation for civil de-

fense. Money is not the whole answer, however, and the complete reorganization of the Civil Defense Administration is being undertaken by the Secretary of Defense. The lives of tens of millions of Americans may depend on the success of this effort.

A military construction bill this year provided for essential military building projects including a $5 million administration building at the arsenal in Warren. We now have an atomic cooperation program for mutual defense purposes with the French. The President has been authorized to loan naval vessels not essential to our own needs to certain friendly nations.

INTERNATIONAL

A distinctly Kennedy flavor was imparted to legislation in the international field.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created. It will have primary responsibility for coordinating research, managing negotiations, and directing U.S. participation in inspection systems.

The Peace Corps was made permanent. American youngsters will carry American skills, talents, and idealism abroad to help others help themselves. Our younger generation, which has so often been called upon to fight wars, will now be given an opportunity to work for peace.

The foreign aid program emphasized long-term planning and development loans instead of grants. President Kennedy has indicated that he will insist that recipient nations be willing to help themselves.

The establishment of the Inter-American Alliance for Progress and the appropriation of additional funds for the Inter-American Development Bank will be of substantial assistance to our often forgotten neighbors to the south.

Here, too, the President has called for new concepts of social reform and self-help on their part.

The food-for-peace program was expanded.

Orphans adopted by U.S. citizens were permitted to continue entering the United States without regard to immigration quotas.

Aid for resettlement was provided for refugees and escapees from the Iron Curtain and Cuba.

MISCELLANEOUS

The life of the Civil Rights Commission was extended for 2 years.

The cutoff date for veteran's home loans was moved forward and the funds available for them increased. Certain veterans' widows will get increased benefits. Congressional Medal of Honor winners can now receive a $100 a month pension at the age of 50 if they so desire.

Seventy-three additional U.S. district and circuit court judgeships were created to ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars.

Use of the mails, the telephone, the telegraph, and other means of interstate communication was prohibited to the operations of gamblers, bootleggers, and dope peddlers. Airplane hijacking was made a Federal crime.

The equipment allowance for rural carriers was increased. Salary retention protection was made available for the postal field service.

The water pollution control program was continued and additional funds made available to help construct sewage treatment facilities. The city of New Baltimore is receiving almost $220,000 toward the cost of their new plant under this program.

COMMENTS

This has been a hard-working Congress. This session lasted longer and produced more legislation than any in the last 10 years. If in spite of the volume of legislation enacted our efforts seem not to have been spectacular, it is perhaps because the efforts of this Congress were in many respects familiar. Much of the domestic legislation particularly had been previously proposed but not enacted. A great deal remains to be done of course, but many of the committee hearings and much of the work completed this year will bear fruit when we meet next year.

NEXT YEAR

Among the important measures to be considered next year will be:

Aid to education—classroom construction and teachers' salaries for elementary and secondary schools.

A Federal program in aid of higher education.

Overall revision of the Internal Revenue Code—to plug loopholes and encourage capital improvement and plant expansion,

Health care of the aged under social security.

Postal rate increases.

Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs.

An increase in veterans' service-connected disability benefits—to reflect the cost of living changes since the last raise.

A Federal program to encourage the development and use of educational television.

Migrant worker legislation—providing increased medical services and educational opportunities for the migrant farm families and greater protection from exploitation for the children.

Strengthening the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act.

Tightening of antitrust laws.

Tax-free retirement funds for the self-employed.

Permanent overhaul of the unemployment compensation setup and the establishment of Federal standards.

A program of retraining jobless workers displaced by automation.

A youth conservation corps and an occupational training program for jobless youngsters.

Aid for medical education—construction of facilities and scholarships for students.

Amendments to the Labor Acts, including jobsite picketing and emergency strike provisions.

Changes in the salary schedule of Federal employees.

YOUR REPRESENTATIVE

I am not only your legislative representative in a very real sense. I am your representative in all your relations with the Federal Government. If you are having any problem with any Federal agency and feel that I can be of assistance, please let me know. We won't always be able to get a favorable ruling; indeed, it is not my function to do so. I will assure you, however, that I will see that you receive prompt consideration and that you are given a fair opportunity to present your side of the case. I expect to be in Michigan for most of the remainder of this year, and within the limits of my schedule will make myself available to any person or group that wishes to meet with me.

Message of Mormonism Centers Around Life and Mission of Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the 131st Semiannual General Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormon—Elder Hugh B. Brown delivered an address which I commend to all those who seek the abundant life of the Master.

Full text of the address by President Hugh B. Brown, counselor in the first presidency, delivered at the Sunday morning session of the 131st semiannual general conference follows:

My brothers and sisters, and in that salutation I should like to include all who are listening regardless of their church affiliation, because we are convinced that we are brothers and sisters. We believe in the universal brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

We are speaking this morning not alone to church members. We are advised that perhaps more than 50 percent of those attending in person or through the use of modern media, are friends of the church who are visiting us. We appreciate your interest—we extend to you a hearty welcome. Your attendance seems to indicate that you have heard something about the Mormons and perhaps would like to know more. We should like to respond briefly to your implied inquiry about the church. We shall avoid dogmatism, for that ordinarily brings antagonism. We simply invite you, our friends, this morning to, as Isaiah said, "Come and let us reason together."

BABEL OF ORGANIZATIONS

We respect all men in their religious beliefs, but the divergent beliefs and multiplicity of creeds have, through the centuries, been the cause of much confusion and concern. The condition of the world religiously is stated in the Catholic Encyclopedia, from which I quote the following:

"A Babel of religious organizations all proclaim themselves to be the Church of Christ. Their doctrines are contradictory and precisely insofar as one of them regards the doctrine; which it teaches as vital it declares those of rival bodies to be misleading and pernicious."

Now, while we do not agree that the beliefs of others are necessarily pernicious, we do think it regrettable that the original Church of Jesus Christ, as outlined in the New Testament, has been broken up into so

many creeds. We believe the Lord's House should be a house of order, not divided against itself.

The question is often asked, what are some of the distinguishing characteristics of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints? What, if anything, has this church to offe. which is new? Would it be worthwhile to take a closer look at Mormanism?

Though there are many fundamental differences between this church and others, we must today be content to mention—and that only briefly—just one of them. We refer to our faith in continued revelation from God to men. It seems a bit paradoxical that this fundamental doctrine of the church should make it unique or distinguish it from others, inasmuch as in all dispensations of the Gospel current relevation has been the sustaining power, the vivifying spirit of the divine church.

In a concrete statement of beliefs known as the Articles of Faith, we declare our faith in all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that he will yet reveal many great and important things.

History proves that when the spirit or gift of revelation is withdrawn from the church, there is nothing but a dead form left and men are prone to worship God with their lips and honor Him with their mouths, but, because there is no communication and therefore no understanding, their hearts are far from Him.

A REVEALING SPIRIT

The things of God can only be understood by the spirit of God and the spirit of God is a revealing spirit. The Master promised before He left the earth, to send another comforter which should lead men into all truth. Divine revelation has always been a characteristic of the Living Church—it is absolutely essential to its continued existence in an organized state on the earth.

You remember the prophet Amos said, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets." (Amos 3: 7.)

And in the Proverbs we read, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." (Proverbs 29: 18.)

We have ample Scriptural authority for our declaration that a man must be called of God by prophecy and by the laying on of hands by men of authority to preach the Gospel and administer its ordinances. The Apostle Paul said, "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." (Hebrews 5: 4.) And Aaron was called by direct revelation through Moses. When revelation ceases, people dwindle in unbelief, and not only the people but the church apostatizes in the absence of inspired leadership.

That is exactly what happened in the Primitive Church and that situation was a harbinger of a universal apostasy, of which the Church of England speaks in its "Homily Against Peril of Idolatry," as follows: "So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom—a horrible and most dreadful thing to think—have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry; of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man; and that by the space of 800 years and more."

Without continued revelation there can be no authorized ministry on the earth and without authorized officers there can be no Church of Christ. If some say there is no revelation and will not be further revelation from God, we ask, "Why not? Has God lost the power to reveal His mind and will to men?" Of course, to so state is tantamount to blasphemy. Do we not need revelation or word from God? I ask you to consider the condition of the world and note the dire need of the world for some divine guidance and direction.

Well then, if God could reveal and we need revelation, is the fault with man? Have we lost the gift or the faith or the understanding that will enable us to receive revelation? Certainly it would be more modest of us to admit the fault in ourselves than to blame God for not speaking, if He does not speak. Or perhaps there may be some jamming of the messages by the enemy, as a result of which some have been led to believe that there is no power that can transmit. We ask, in radio or television language, "Has the broadcasting station gone out of business or broken down, or are there no receiving sets?"

So long as men believe there can be no revelation they will make no attempt to tune in. They will lose their faith and will no longer look up and listen. Some even deny there is need for revelation, but the daily press challenges that statement; in this imperiled, divided, and chaotic world the need for God's help was never more apparent and urgent.

An English divine recently said, "Oh, that some man would arise who could authoritatively say to the world, 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

Is it possible, our friends, that religion is the one department of human interest, investigation and research where progress is impossible? Would any professor say to his class in chemistry, astronomy, physics, or geology, that no further discovery or revelation of scientific truth is possible? Is religion the only human interest which is static and quiescent? Did Christ leave his church leaderless and intend it to continue so to be?

For ourselves, because of our faith in the universal and unchangeable love and justice of God, we cannot believe that his church in one dispensation would be blessed and led by what in television parlance might be termed "live" revelation and in another dispensation leave a distraught and imperiled world with only the recorded messages of ancient prophets, some of which messages were for specific purposes and under special circumstances. We believe that revelation both "live" and recorded is now and will continue to be available to men. Whenever the Lord has recognized his church he has given through his prophets messages of warning, instruction, and hope.

FAITH IN SCRIPTURES

When we say that we believe all that God has revealed, we declare our faith in the Scriptures. We believe the Bible to be a repository of divine truth and that that is authoritative, though not beyond the need for interpretation and proper translation and, therefore, we say, when we declare our faith in the Bible, "as far as it is translated correctly." And when we declare that we believe that God does now reveal, that He still speaks through his prophets, and that his word is scripture whenever and wherever given, when we make this statement we are simply following the Gospel of Jesus Christ and declaring as true the Judeo-Christian religion.

We sometimes meet with skepticism when we say that He still reveals, but let us paraphrase the words of Paul for a moment. Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should do what He has promised to do? And if time would permit we could take you through the scriptures from Genesis to Revelations and show the promises of God with respect to the latter days. Why should it be thought incredible not only that He would keep His promise but that He would continue to do what He has done through all the dispensations of the Gospel from the beginning?

The Church of Jesus Christ was established and is now directed by revelation, and that fact is largely responsible for the appeal which this new church makes, and when I say "new" I wish to emphasize that to us it is not new, but a restoration of that which was. The true Church of Christ is not a blind alley, it is an open thoroughfare, where men may confidently pursue truth in the light of revelation. That the church is progressive and responsive to revealed truth is evidenced by our further declaration that we believe that God will yet reveal many great and important things.

This church, our friends, is not committed to any formal or inflexible creed, but its members are taught to believe in and live by the revelations of the past and the present and thus prepare themselves for the revelations yet to come. Our concepts and even our faith must be held subject to new light. The present and urgent need for continued revelation in this age of communism, atheism, godlessness, the spirit of the anti-Christ, becomes more apparent when we realize that revelation gives us our most conclusive proof that there is a Divine Being and how the world needs to know something of Him.

In an age when hundreds of millions of people are being systematically indoctrinated with the abominable doctrines of communism, which are that there is no God, religion is an opiate, Christ is a myth; surely in the midst of such determined, persistent, and relentless attacks from the enemy we may expect from God our Father some direction and for that direction we humbly pray.

But our message is this, our friends, God has spoken from the heavens, communication between heaven and earth is still possible, the lines are open. That is the challenging message of Mormonism, that is the ensign to the nations, it is a message of hope in an imperiled world, and if we are to exercise saving faith and accompany it with works and, of course, faith without works is dead, we must know something of Him, of His existence, His personality, His laws, His purposes with respect to man, and realize that we are, in fact, His children, related to Him. He said, "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." (John 17: 3.)

We do not say that God is immaterial and incomprehensible and without a body. Rather we say He is approachable and He is our Father. Now, revelation may come through dreams or visions, the visitation of angels, or, on occasion such as with Moses, by face-to-face communication with the Lord. You remember the Lord spoke to Adam, and not only while he was in the Garden of Eden, but after he was cast out. He spoke to other patriarchs and prophets through the ages. He spoke to Enoch, who was called "the Seventh From Adam," and it is said that he was translated because he was especially favored with the presence of the Lord. The record reads, "And Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." (Genesis 5: 24.)

The Lord by revelation warned Noah of the coming flood. He talked with Abraham and told him to leave his country and go into a new land and gave him some promises with respect to his posterity.

MOSES COMMISSIONED

By revelation He commissioned Moses to go into Egypt and under God's personal direction released the children of Israel from the bondage of the Egyptians.

So we may trace the line of revelators, men who have stood, each in his time, as the medium through whom God speaks to His people, from Moses to Joshua, through the Judges, on to David and Solomon and down to Zachariah and Malachi. Christ, Himself, came to this world to reveal God to men and He, Himself, was led and directed by revelation from His Father while He dwelt on this earth.

The Lord, as you know, revealed to Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist,

what was to happen, and you remember what happened to Zacharias because of his lack of belief. The Lord revealed to Mary what was going to happen with respect to the birth of Christ. The apostles were led, directed, inspired by revelation from time to time in in the meridian of time. Christ Himself said this: "I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, he gave Me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak." (John 13: 49–50.)

The apostles in the meridian of time were in touch with the heavens by revelation. Note what Paul says:

"But God hath revealed them [divine truths] unto us by His spirit: for the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

"For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God." (I Corinthians 2: 10–11.)

You remember John on the Isle of Patmos wrote the Book of Revelations, and, incidentally, this is sometimes called the Apocalypse, and that means in Greek "revelation." This is what he says at the beginning of his book—it was not written of his own wisdom:

The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him (speaking of himself), to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant, John. (Revelation 1:1.)

The Scriptures, then, are not only replete with evidence, but conclusive, proving that God does and always has, whenever there has been a dispensation of the Gospel upon the earth, been in touch with his people.

Remember Paul said this, and he is speaking now of our time:

That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on the earth, even in him. (Ephesians 1:10.)

REVELATION—STANDARD PROCEDURE

From the scriptures cited and many others, it seems evident that revelation from God to man has been a vital characteristic, it has been standard procedure in all dispensations of the Gospel. All the prophets and leaders of ancient times were led, directed, chosen, inspired by God himself through revelation.

Eusebius records what happened after the apostles had been slain and were no authoritative answers could be given. He says, "When the sacred choir of apostles became extinct and the generation of those that had been privileged to hear their inspired wisdom had passed away, then also the combinations of impious error arose by the fraud and dilusions of false teachers. These, as there were none of the Apostles left, henceforth attempted without shame to preach their doctrine against the Gospel of truth."

And Mosheim reminds us that both Jews and heathens were accustomed to a vast variety of pompous and magnificent ceremonies in their religious service. All the records of the second century mention the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Christian church. "But," you ask, "were these the times that have been?" Some of you may say, "We can believe in the revelation in Adam's day and in the days of Moses, in the days of Christ, in the days of the Apostles, but not now."

Is there any indication that we might, with reason, expect some word from God? Hear John's testimony as he spoke of things that were to come in the latter days. He said:

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred and tongue, and people,

Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him: for the hour of his judgment is come." (Revelation 14:6–7.)

That, my dear friends, is a prophetic promise of revelation in our time. The church today is founded on the rock of revelation as securely as it was in the days of Peter when Christ said to him, after Peter had spoken of his knowledge of him,

"Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (Matthew 16:18.)

We think we are justified in anticipating future revelation and we believe that it will be surpassing in importance and glorious fullness anything that has yet been revealed. We believe that he will continue to reveal himself as long as man continues his probation here on earth.

MESSAGE OF MORMONISM

Now, you friends of ours probably ask, "What particular revelation is the one on which you found your church?" Time will not permit, of course, a complete answer to that, but humbly, and from the very center of my heart, I say to you, our friends, and to you members of the church, God has restored the Gospel of Jesus Christ and there was a great revelation, one of the greatest of all time, when the Father and the Son, anticipating our very day and the events of these times, appeared to a man, and they were personal beings, they were separate and distinct, they were in form like man, thus proving the first scripture in Genesis, "God created man in his own image." They spoke to him.

Other revelations followed. The whole message of Mormonism centers around the life and mission of Jesus, the Christ, and we proclaim to the world in contradiction to the hellish doctrine of communism, God does live. He still speaks to men. There are prophets on the earth.

If that statement is true, it is the greatest message that has come to this earth since Christ ascended into heaven because it is a measure of his coming, and if it is true, all of you should know it. That it is true we humbly testify.

We ask you to listen, to read, to pray—ask God for guidance—and we promise you, paraphrasing the prophet Moroni, that if you will ask of God in faith in the name of Jesus Christ, whether what we declare is true, he will reveal the truth of it unto you by the power of the Holy Ghost.

We believe this is the message for which the world has been waiting. We declare it is the very truth of God, and for my own self I bear witness to that effect and say to you in humility, but without any equivocation, by the same power and authority with which Peter spoke, I say, with him, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." I know this to be true and plead with men everywhere to harken for it is a message from the heavens, to which I testify in the name of Jesus Christ, amen.

Kefauver's Drug Fight—October 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Mr. Frank Carey, the Associated Press science writer, has written a provocative and informed summary regarding the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee's continuing study of drug pricing.

The following article, which appeared in the Nashiville Tennessean, sets forth this reporter's view of the subcommittee's work.

I ask that excerpts from this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEFAUVER'S DRUG FIGHT—OCTOBER 16

(By Frank Carey)

WASHINGTON.—A new round of a prolonged battle royal—perhaps the bitterest yet—is coming up on the issue of whether drug prices and profits are too high.

Starting October 16, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will open a fresh chapter of hearings on a hotly controversial bill to place the drug manufacturing industry under tighter Federal police control.

The measure, introduced by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, is an outgrowth of nearly 2 years of stormy and widely publicized investigations by the subcommittee.

The bill calls for changes in the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, the patent code, and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Backers say the intent is to lower drug prices to consumers and to improve the protection afforded under present law.

KEFAUVER, chairman of the subcommittee, said in introducing the bill:

"The need for action stems basically from the fact that, by any test and under any standard, prices and profits in the ethical (prescription) drug industry are excessive and unreasonable."

KEFAUVER'S announced goals are: (1) To slap down allegedly monopolistic practices by big companies which he contends have grossly inflated prescription drug prices; (2) force more competition among drugmakers and enable small manufacturers to compete on more equal terms with the large ones; (3) make sure that medicines are safe and efficacious and that doctors are told the whole story of the good and bad points of a given drug.

He also says the bill would provide the means and incentive for doctors to prescribe by generic or official names—rather than trade names—and thus enable consumers to shop around for the best buy.

The drug industry contends that existing law is good enough if Congress will only vote enough money to let the Food and Drug Administration do the policing and inspection job needed.

The hearings are expected to produce major fireworks for these reasons:

1. They will be concerned at the outset with the patent aspects of the bill. Both sides expect that such organizations as the American Bar Association will oppose the proposed changes on this score: Such legislation might establish a dangerous precedent that could immediately imperil the entire patent system.

2. The drug industry, in early December, will offer its first testimony in formal opposition to the bill. Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the trade organization representing the drug industry as a whole, told a reporter:

"We are prepared to bite back. Before, during the hearings preceding introduction

of the bill, we just licked our wounds—and we had some deep ones.

"We knew instinctively that we were right, but we couldn't always produce specific facts. We are better prepared now to speak to the proposals, rather than just answer criticism.

"Senator KEFAUVER has hit the public in its pocketbook with his allegations of excessive drug prices and profits. I propose that we hit the public in the pocketbook, too, and point out that, in terms of drugs that can save lives, shorten the length of various illnesses compared with years ago, and actually reduce public expenses in the case of mental hospitals. * * * The public is really getting a bargain."

* * * * *

KEFAUVER's drug patent proposal would reduce exclusive patent rights to a new drug from the present 17 years—for patents of any kind—to 3. After the 3 years, the exclusive patent holder would be compelled to license other qualified manufacturers to produce and sell the drug, but would be entitled to collect royalties for 14 years.

OPPOSITION SEEN

He expects opposition from patent lawyers who fear this would be an opening wedge against all patents. But he insists:

"Drugs and drugs alone (among patentable things) have a peculiar effect on the health of our citizens. And we feel that in the case of drugs where the purchaser is a captive, we have an unusual and peculiar situation which warrants making this exception to the patent laws without establishing any precedent."

The drug industry contends this phase of the bill would greatly reduce drug research.

Earlier drug hearings—beginning in December 1957, and running off and on throughout 1960—produced a typewritten record running to more than 10,000 pages.

* * * * *

When a report on the hearings was filed last June by the Democratic majority—picturing the big drug manufacturers as making extraordinary profits through alleged control of patents on prescription medicine—the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association labeled it an unjustified attack on the drug industry.

In addition, two Republican members of the subcommittee—Senators EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and HRUSKA, of Nebraska—filed a dissenting report. They charged that the Democrats' report was a 400-page monstrosity containing findings that were prejudiced and unfair.

Controversy raged anew early in July when hearings on the Kefauver-Celler measure were opened.

AMA OPPOSES

The American Medical Association opposed some key features of the bill—notably, the one under which the Food and Drug Administration, before approving drugs, would investigate whether they actually worked. At present, the FDA checks only to see if they are safe.

KEFAUVER suggested that AMA's evaluation of drugs is colored by revenues from advertising of drug manufacturers in AMA publications.

Dr. Leonard W. Larson, AMA president, termed KEFAUVER's statements an unwarranted slur on the AMA and urged that KEFAUVER retract his implied charge. KEFAUVER has refused.

During the July hearings, the stand of the AMA on the drug bill was that the medical profession, working with the drug manufacturers, could clean up any unsavory conditions in the drug business, and should judge for itself whether a new drug has merit.

But several individual doctors retorted in testimony that any hope of a cleanup without tough Government policing is dim.

These doctors charged that many physicians are confused, even deluded, by high-pressure, extravagant, or misleading advertising claims about the efficacy of new medicines pouring into the market at the rate of about 400 a year. Even medicine advertisements in the AMA's chief publication—the AMA Journal—sometimes mislead, some witnesses said.

AMA witnesses asserted that the AMA Journal's articles and editorials discuss at length the good and bad points of medicines and that doctors rely on these rather than ads for information about new drugs.

RIBICOFF HELPS

Proponents of the Kefauver bill were heartened by testimony given recently by Health and Welfare Secretary Abraham Ribicoff. Up to that time there had been NO indication of the Kennedy administration's stand on the measure. There had been unofficial reports that Ribicoff might introduce a rival bill.

Ribicoff came out strongly for a tightened drug-licensing law—notably on the issue of requiring drugmakers to prove the effectiveness, as well as the safety, of drugs before they can be marketed.

In that regard, he called up Congress "to give American men, women, and children the same protection we have been giving hogs, sheep, and cattle since 1913."

But he also spoke to the price-and-profits and other controversial issues:

He commended the advances made in producing revolutionary new drugs in the last two decades. He credited them with contributing enormously to combating ill health, increasing life expectancy, reducing deaths from infectious diseases, and comforting and relieving the chronically ill.

"But," he said, "there is a negative side as well: A pattern of high [drug] prices and incomplete safeguarding of the consuming public * * * your [subcommittee] evidence has shown that the price of many important drugs is too high. Information available from your subcommittee and from Government agencies shows profits in the drug industry generally higher than other industries, and the source of these profits is ultimately the American consumer * * *."

Just what are the specific arguments of both sides regarding drug prices and profits?

KEFAUVER and his backers offer figures like these—brought out in testimony during the original 1959–60 hearings—to support their contentions of excessive prices:

A tablet of predisolone—one of the cortisone family of drugs for treating ailments like arthritis—costs only 1.6 cents to produce, exclusive of selling and distribution costs. Yet the price to druggists is 17.9 cents, and the ultimate consumer pays about 29 cents a tablet.

In the field of antibiotic wonder drugs, the KEFAUVER group cites figures for tetracycline, the most commonly used of the broad spectrum, or widely versatile, antibiotics.

The figures they cite run this way, exclusive of royalty, selling and distribution costs: produtcion cost—2.9 cents a capsule; price to retail druggists—30.6 cents; and price to the consumer—51 cents.

REBUTTAL

The drug industry, maintaining that costs to consumers are not unduly high, contends that production cost is only one of many factors in computing prices, and that consideration must be given to such things as research and development costs, and the cost of new product marketing.

KEFAUVER and his supporters retort that the drug industry's major companies devote only 6.2 percent of the sales dollar to research but up to 25 percent on advertising. They contend that if less money were spent on advertising and promotion, prices to consumers could be sharply lowered.

There was testimony that for prednisone, another cortisonelike drug, the price the large companies charged to drugstores was $17.90 for a package containing a given number of tablets—whereas the price charged by some of the smaller firms ranged as low as $4 a package.

The drug industry contends, in rebuttal, that many of the small companies do not engage in research and are, therefore, free of substantial costs, allowing them to sell their drugs at a lower price.

Drug industry spokesmen say it's true that the long-term trend of prescription prices has been upward and that drugs cost more than formerly, but so does nearly everything. They say further that drug prices from 1949 through 1959 rose slightly less than the cost of living as a whole.

On the matter of profits made by the drug industry, KEFAUVER and his supporters say the drug industry in 1960 once again showed a higher profit on investment, after taxes and after all expenses including research, than any other industry.

Industry spokesmen contend that critics tend to cite the industry's best years on profits—and say nothing about leaner years. They contend there are signs of a downward trend and that the decline will continue unless someone comes along with a cure for cancer or heart disease.

OTHER FIGURES

Dr. Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, offers some other figures.

"If all the profits due to U.S. drug industry sales for 1 year—amounting to $171 million—were distributed evenly among the Nation's 180 million population, it would mean 95 cents a person as a gift.

"Put it another way: If all their profits were turned back in terms of lowering the price of prescriptions, it would mean a saving of only 24 cents on the average prescription. But it would also mean no expansion of plant facilities, no extension of research labs, no new research—in short, no more drug industry."

The drugmakers contend they didn't get a fair shake during the original drug price hearings.

They say, for one thing, that the majority staff of the subcommittee engineered presentation of testimony so that damaging charges against the industry were timed to coincide with newspaper deadlines, whereas friendly testimony was timed so it would be least likely to get public attention.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in order that my constituents may know exactly how I voted on matters coming before the House of Representatives during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my complete voting record:

Individual voting record—Subjects of rollcalls, 87th Cong., 1st sess., convened Jan. 3, 1961; adjourned Sept. 27 (legislative day Sept. 26), 1961

Rollcall No.		Vote
1	Call by States. Jan. 3, 1961	Present.
2	Election of Speaker. Jan. 3, 1961. Rayburn 258, Halleck 170, present 2	Halleck.
3	H. Res. 1. A resolution referring the election of a Member from the 5th Congressional District of Indiana to the Committee on House Administration. On ordering previous question. Jan. 3, 1961. Yeas 252, nays 166.	Nay.
4	Call of the House. Jan. 31, 1961	Present.
5	H. Res. 127. A resolution providing that during the 87th Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of 15 members. On agreeing to resolution. Jan. 31, 1961. Yeas 217, nays 212, present 1.	Nay.
6	Call of the House. Mar. 1, 1961	Present.
7	H.R. 4806. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes. On passage. Mar. 1, 1961. Yeas 392, nays 3.	Nay.
8	H. Res. 167. A resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On agreeing to resolution. Mar. 1, 1961. Yeas 412, nays 6.	Yea.
9	H.R. 5188. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. On Fogarty amendment. Mar. 7, 1961. (Payment for school districts—$29,950,000.) Yeas 339, nays 62.	Yea.
10	Call of the House. Mar. 8, 1961	Present.
11	Call in committee. Mar. 8, 1961	Present.
12	Call of the House. Mar. 9, 1961	Present.
13	H.R. 4510. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Strike out sec. 3.) Mar. 9, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 196, nays 214.	Yea.
14	H.R. 4510. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. On passage. Mar. 9, 1961. Yeas 209, nays 202	Nay.
15	Call of the House. Mar. 10, 1961	Present.
16	Call of the House. Mar. 15, 1961	Present.
17	H.R. 4510. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. Conference report. On adoption. Mar. 21, 1961. Yeas 231, nays 185.	Nay.
18	Call of the House. Mar. 21, 1961	Present.
19	H.R. 5463. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. On motion to suspend rules and passage. Mar. 21, 1961. Yeas 284, nays 129.	Yea.
20	H.R. 4806. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes. Conference report. On adoption. Mar. 22, 1961. Yeas 363, nays 31.	Nay.
21	Call of the House. Mar. 23, 1961	Present.
22	H.R. 5000. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. On Yates amendment (Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass.). Mar. 23, 1961. Yeas 269, Nays 145.	Nay.
23	H.R. 5000. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. On passage. Mar. 23, 1961. Yeas 412, nays 0.	Yea.
24	Call in committee. Mar. 23, 1961	Present.
25	Call in committee. Mar. 23, 1961	Present.
26	Call of the House. Mar. 24, 1961	Present.
27	H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes. On Ayres amendment. Mar. 24, 1961. Yeas 216, nays 203.	Yea.
28	H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. Mar. 24, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 196, nays 224.	Nay.
29	H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes. On passage. Mar. 24, 1961. Yeas 341, nays 78.	Yea.
30	Call of the House. Mar. 28, 1961	Present.
31	Call of the House. Mar. 29, 1961	Present.
32	S. 1. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. On motion to recommit. (Widnall substitute.) (Failed.) Mar. 29, 1961. Yeas 127, nays 291.	Yea.
33	S. 1. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. On passage. Mar. 29, 1961. Yeas 251, nays 167.	Nay.
34	Call of the House. Apr. 11, 1961	Present.
35	Call of the House. Apr. 13, 1961	Present.
36	Call of the House. Apr. 18, 1961	Present.
37	Call of the House. Apr. 19, 1961	Present.
38	S. 912. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. On passage. Apr. 19, 1961. Yeas 336, nays 76, present 1.	Yea.
39	Call of the House. Apr. 20, 1961	Absent.
40	H.R. 6027. A bill to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes. On passage. Apr. 20, 1961. Yeas 400, nays 14.	Nay.
41	Call of the House. Apr. 25, 1961	Present.
42	H.R. 6518. A bill making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. On passage. Apr. 25, 1961. Yeas 329, nays 83.	Yea.
43	Call of the House. Apr. 26, 1961	Present.
44	S. 1. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas. Conference report, on adoption. Apr. 26, 1961. Yeas 224, nays 193.	Nay.
45	Call of the House. May 3, 1961	Absent.
46	H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. May 3, 1961. Yeas 230, nays 196, present 1.	Nay.
47	H.R. 6441. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control. On motion to recommit with instructions. May 3, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 165, nays 256.	Yea.
48	H.R. 6441. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control. On passage. May 3, 1961. Yeas 308, nays 110.	Nay.
49	Call in committee. May 4, 1961	Present.
50	Call in committee. May 9, 1961	Present.
51	Call of the House. May 10, 1961	Present.
52	Call of the House. May 11, 1961	Present.
53	H.R. 2010. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. May 11, 1961. Yeas 231, nays 157.	Yea.
54	H.R. 6094. A bill to amend sec. 4 of the Employment Act of 1946. On motion to recommit with instructions. May 11, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 152, nays 196.	Yea.
55	H.R. 6094. A bill to amend sec. 4 of the Employment Act of 1946. On passage. May 11, 1961. Yeas 209, nays 137	Nay.
56	Call of the House. May 15, 1961	Absent.
57	Call of the House. May 16, 1961	Absent.
58	H. Res. 284. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. May 16, 1961. Yeas 241, nays 70.	Not voting (paired for).
59	Call in committee. May 16, 1961	Absent.
60	Call of the House. May 17, 1961	Present.
61	H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and passage. May 17, 1961. Yeas 404, nays 2.	Yea.
62	H.R. 4614. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. On passage. May 17, 1961. Yeas 305, nays 104.	Nay.
63	Call of the House. May 24, 1961	Present.
64	S.1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. On passage. May 24, 1961. Yeas 402, nays 0.	Yea.
65	H.R. 1986. A bill to repeal the provisions of sec. 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter. On motion to recommit with instructions. May 25, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 16, nays 346.	Nay.
66	Call in committee. June 1, 1961	Absent.

Individual voting record—Subjects of rollcalls, 87th Cong., 1st sess., convened Jan. 3, 1961; adjourned Sept. 27 (legislative day Sept. 26), 1961—Continued

Rollcall No.		Vote
67	H.R. 7371. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. June 1, 1961. Yeas 256, nays 71.	Nay.
68	Call of the House. June 6, 1961	Present.
69	Call in committee. June 6, 1961	Present.
70	H.R. 7444. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On Reuss amendment (agricultural conservation program) (strike out $250,000,000 and insert $150,000,000). June 6, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 184, nays 196.	Yea.
71	H.R. 7444. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. June 6, 1961. Yeas 320, nays 65.	Nay.
72	Call of the House. June 7, 1961	Present.
73	Call of the House. June 8, 1961	Present.
74	Call of the House. June 8, 1961	Present.
75	H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On motion to recommit with instructions (transportation tax repeal). June 8, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 189, nays 196.	Yea.
76	H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On passage. June 8, 1961. Yeas 295, nays 88.	Nay.
77	Call of the House. June 12, 1961	Present.
78	H.R. 7053. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. June 12, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 104, nays 252.	Nay.
79	Call of the House. June 13, 1961	Present.
80	Call of the House. June 14, 1961	Present.
81	Call of the House. June 15, 1961	Present.
82	H. Res. 303. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on Apr. 27, 1961. On agreeing to resolution. June 15, 1961. Yeas 323, nays 77.	Yea.
83	H. Res. 302. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on Apr. 27, 1961. On agreeing to resolution. June 15, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 176, nays 212.	Yea.
84	Call of the House. June 19, 1961	Absent.
85	H.R. 6765. A bill to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) June 19, 1961. Yeas 329, nays 18.	Not voting.
86	H.R. 7712. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. On passage. June 19, 1961. Yeas 292, nays 63.	Not voting (paired against).
87	Call of the House. June 20, 1961	Absent.
88	H. Res. 304. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3, 1961. On agreeing to resolution. June 20, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 178, nays 213.	Not voting (paired for).
89	H. Res. 305. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 9, 1961. On agreeing to resolution. June 20, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 178, nays 221.	Not voting (paired for).
90	Call of the House. June 21, 1961	Present.
91	Call of the House. June 21, 1961	Present.
92	Call in committee. June 21, 1961	Present.
93	Call in committee. June 21, 1961	Present.
94	Call of the House. June 22, 1961	Present.
95	H.R. 6028. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. June 22, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 197, nays 215, present 2.	Yea.
96	H.R. 6028. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes. On passage. June 22, 1961. Yeas 235, nays 178, present 2.	Nay.
97	Call of the House. June 26, 1961	Absent.
98	Call of the House. June 26, 1961	Present.
99	H.R. 7677. A bill to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On passage. June 26, 1961. Yeas 231, nays 148.	Nay.
100	Call of the House. June 27, 1961	Absent.
101	Call in committee. June 27, 1961	Present.
102	Call in committee. June 27, 1961	Present.
103	Call in committee. June 28, 1961	Present.
104	H.R. 7851. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On Saylor amendment. June 28, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 173, nays 239.	Nay.
105	H.R. 7851. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. June 28, 1961. Yeas 412, nays 0.	Yea.
106	S. 1922. An act to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. June 28, 1961. Yeas 229, nays 176.	Nay.
107	H. Res. 354. A resolution to provide for a flag for the Members of the House of Representatives. On agreeing to resolution. June 29, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 108, nays 270.	Nay.
108	H.J. Res. 225. A joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. June 29, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 92, nays 257, present 1.	Yea.
109	H.R. 187. A bill to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) July 10, 1961. Yeas 304, nays 59.	Yea.
110	H.R. 5786. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) July 10, 1961. Yeas 278, nays 82.	Nay.
111	Call of the House. July 13, 1961	Present.
112	H.J. Res. 435. A joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) July 17, 1961. Yeas 367, nays 12.	Yea.
113	H.R. 2555. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in oversea areas, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) July 17, 1961. Yeas 285, nays 87.	Nay.
114	Call of the House. July 19, 1961	Absent.
115	Call in committee. July 19, 1961	Present.
116	H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. July 20, 1961. Yeas 354, nays. 59.	Nay.
117	H. Res. 328. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961. On agreeing to resolution. July 20, 1961. Yeas 231, nays 179, present 2.	Yea.
118	H. Res. 336. A resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to Congress by the President on June 12, 1961. On motion to discharge Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of resolution. July 20, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 184, nays 218.	Yea.
119	H.R. 8302. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On Yates amendment. (Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass.) July 25, 1961. Yeas 241, nays 170.	Nay.
120	H.R. 8302. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. July 25, 1961. Yeas 409, nays 0.	Yea.
121	Call of the House. July 26, 1961	Present.
122	Call of the House. July 27, 1961	Present.
123	Call of the House. July 31, 1961	Present.
124	S.J. Res. 120. A joint resolution to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes. On agreeing to the joint resolution. July 31, 1961. Yeas 403, nays 2.	Yea.
125	Call of the House. Aug. 1, 1961	Present.
126	Call of the House. Aug. 2, 1961	Present.
127	S. 2311. An act to authorize additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. On passage. Aug. 2, 1961. Yeas 406, nays 0.	Yea.
128	H.R. 30. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact. On motion to recommit with instructions. Aug. 2, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 140, nays 261.	Yea.
129	Call of the House. Aug. 3, 1961	Present.
130	S. 1643. An act to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to increase farmer participation in the development of farm programs, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interest of consumers, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Aug. 3, 1961. Yeas 224, nays 170.	Nay.
131	Call in committee. Aug. 3, 1961	Present.

Individual voting record—Subjects of rollcalls, 87th Cong., 1st sess., convened Jan. 3, 1961; adjourned Sept. 27 (legislative day Sept. 26), 1961—Continued

Rollcall No.		Vote
132	H.R. 7856. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, for the purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Federal Communications Commission. On passage. Aug. 3, 1961. Yeas 198, nays 151.	Nay.
133	H.R. 7728. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, or when in the best interests of the United States, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Aug. 7, 1961. Yeas 307, nays 78.	Nay.
134	Call of the House. Aug. 8, 1961	Present.
135	H. Res. 404. A resolution taking H.R. 7576 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to a conference. On motion that motion to instruct conferees be laid on table. Aug. 8, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 164, nays 235.	Nay.
136	H. Res. 404. A resolution taking H.R. 7576 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to a conference. On Van Zandt motion instruct conferees on H.R. 7576 not to agree to Senate amendment. ($95,000,000, Hanford, Wash., electric energy generating facilities.) Aug. 8, 1961. Yeas 235, nays 164.	Yea.
137	Call in committee. Aug. 8, 1961	Present.
138	H.R. 8033. A bill to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the delegation of certain duties to employees boards. On passage. Aug. 8, 1961. Yeas 212, nays 174.	Nay.
139	Call of the House. Aug. 9, 1961	Present.
140	H. Res. 406. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6882, a bill to provide for 1 additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor. On agreeing to resolution. Aug. 9, 1961. Yeas 309, nays 16.	Yea.
141	Call of the House. Aug. 9, 1961	Present.
142	H.R. 6302. A bill to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes. On passage. Aug. 9, 1961. Yeas 321, nays 61.	Yea.
143	Call of the House. Aug. 10, 1961	Absent.
144	H.R. 7851. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Aug. 10, 1961. Yeas 383, nays 0.	Not voting.
145	Call in committee. Aug. 10, 1961	Absent.
146	Call of the House. Aug. 14, 1961	Absent.
147	Call of the House. Aug. 14, 1961	Absent.
148	Call of the House. Aug. 14, 1961	Absent.
149	Call in committee. Aug. 14, 1961	Absent.
150	Call of the House. Aug. 15, 1961	Absent.
151	Call in committee. Aug. 15, 1961	Absent.
152	Call in committee. Aug. 15, 1961	Absent.
153	Call of the House. Aug. 16, 1961	Present.
154	Call in committee. Aug. 16, 1961	Present.
155	Call of the House. Aug. 17, 1961	Absent.
156	Call of the House. Aug. 18, 1961	Present.
157	H.R. 8400. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes. On passage. Aug. 18, 1961. Yeas 287, nays 140.	Nay.
158	Call of the House. Aug. 21, 1961	Present.
159	Call of the House. Aug. 21, 1961	Present.
160	H.R. 8384. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occurring on board aircraft in air commerce. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Aug. 21, 1961. Yeas 374, nays 5.	Yea.
161	Call of the House. Aug. 21, 1961	Present.
162	Call of the House. Aug. 22, 1961	Present.
163	Call of the House. Aug. 22, 1961	Present.
164	H.R. 7763. A bill to provide for planning the participation of the United States in the New York World's Fair, to be held at New York City in 1964 and 1965, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Aug. 22, 1961. Yeas 353, nays 42.	Nay.
165	Call of the House. Aug. 23, 1961	Present.
166	Call of the House. Aug. 24, 1961	Present.
167	H.R. 84. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes. On passage. Aug. 24, 1961. Yeas 190, nays 172.	Nay.
168	Call in committee. Aug. 24, 1961	Present.
169	H.R. 8181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. The question is on engrossment and 3d reading of the bill. Aug. 28, 1961. Yeas 223, nays 120.	Nay.
170	H.R. 8181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. On passage. Aug. 28, 1961. Yeas 208, nays 135.	Nay.
171	H.R. 7176. A bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. On passage. Aug. 28, 1961. Yeas 337, nays 3	Yea.
172	Call of the House. Aug. 29, 1961	Present.
173	H.R. 8773. A bill to amend sec. 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1016), relating to lump-sum readjustment payments for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, and for other purposes. On passage. Aug. 29, 1961. Yeas 394, nays 0.	Yea.
174	Call of the House. Aug. 29, 1961	Present.
175	H.R. 6242. A bill to amend section 508 of title 28 United States Code, relating to attorneys' salaries. On passage. Aug. 29, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 172, nays 223.	Not voting (paired against).
176	Call of the House. Aug. 30, 1961	Present.
177	H.R. 8890. A bill to amend Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Cong., so as to extend their expired provisions for an additional year and to authorize payments under Public Law 815 for school construction in school districts with severe classroom shortages, to extend for 1 year the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes. On question of consideration. Aug. 30, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 170, nays 242.	Nay.
178	Call in committee. Aug. 30, 1961	Present.
179	H.R. 8028. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes. On Griffin amendment. Aug. 30, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 187, nays 217.	Yea.
180	S. Con. Res. 34. A concurrent resolution relative to the relationship of the United States with the Republic of China and Communistic China. On agreeing to resolution. Aug. 31, 1961. Yeas 395, nays 0, present 2.	Yea.
181	S. 1983. An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic development and internal and external security, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Aug. 31, 1961. Yeas 260, nays 132, present 1.	Nay.
182	Call of the House. Sept. 5, 1961	Absent.
183	Call in committee. Sept. 5, 1961	Present.
184	H.R. 9033. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On Ford amendment. (Strike out $1,300,000,000 and insert $1,600,000,000.) Sept. 5, 1961. Yeas 243, nays 151.	Nay.
185	H.R. 9033. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. Sept. 5, 1961. Yeas 270, nays 123.	Nay.
186	Call of the House. Sept. 6, 1961	Present
187	Call of the House. Sept. 6, 1961	Present.
188	H.R. 9000. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Cong., and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 6, 1961. Yeas 378, nays 32.	Yea.
189	Call of the House. Sept. 6, 1961	Present.
190	H.R. 8723. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes. On suspension of rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 6, 1961. Yeas 245, nays 161.	Nay.
191	H.R. 8666. A bill to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges. On suspension of rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 6, 1961. Yeas 329, nays 66.	Nay.
192	Call of the House. Sept. 6, 1961	Present.
193	Call of the House. Sept. 11, 1961	Absent.
194	Call of the House. Sept. 12, 1961	Present.
195	Call in committee. Sept. 12, 1961	Present.
196	Call of the House. Sept. 13, 1961	Present.
197	H.R. 8302. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fical year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On Sheppard motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment, with an amendment. (Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass.) Sept. 13, 1961. Yeas 212, nays 185.	Nay.
198	H.R. 7371. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 25, with an amendment. (Civil Rights Commission—extension.) Sept. 13, 1961. Yeas 300, nays 106.	Yea.

Individual voting record—Subjects of rollcalls, 87th Cong., 1st sess., convened Jan. 3, 1961; adjourned Sept. 27 (legislative day Sept. 26), 1961—Continued

Rollcall No.		Vote
199	H.R. 9076. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Transmission lines and facilities.) Sept. 13, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 182, nays 225.	Yea.
200	H.R. 9076. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain study commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. Sept. 13, 1961. Yeas 378, nays 31.	Nay.
201	Call of the House. Sept. 13, 1961	Present.
202	H.R. 7576. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with sec. 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Failed.) Yeas 157, nays 251.	Nay.
203	H.R. 8102. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes. On motion to recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment and agree to same with an amendment. Sept. 13, 1961. Yeas 398, nays 4.	Yea.
204	Call of the House. Sept. 14, 1961	Present.
205	H.R. 7500. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. On passage. Sept. 14, 1961. Yeas 288, nays 97, present 3.	Nay.
206	Call of the House. Sept. 15, 1961	Absent.
207	H. Res. 455. A resolution taking H.R. 2010 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to the conference. On agreeing to resolution. Sept. 15, 1961. Yeas 243, nays 135.	Not voting.
208	H. Res. 464. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7027, a bill to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes. On previous question. Sept. 15, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 142, nays 222, present 2.	Not voting.
209	Call of the House. Sept. 16, 1961	Absent.
210	S. 2393. An act to extend for 2 additional years the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Cong., and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 18, 1961. Yeas 342, nays 18.	Yea.
211	S. 1459. An act to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 18, 1961. Yeas 362, nays 4.	Yea.
212	H.R. 5751. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political progaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 18, 1961. Yeas 369, nays 2.	Yea.
213	H.R. 8914. A bill to amend subsec. (d) of sec. 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept. 18, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 213, nays 151.	Nay.
214	H.R. 7377. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) Sept, 18, 1961. Yeas 305, nays 53.	Nay.
215	Call of the House. Sept. 19, 1961	Present.
216	H.R. 9118. A bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. On passage. Sept. 19, 1961. Yeas 290, nays 54	Nay.
217	Call of the House. Sept. 20, 1961	Present.
218	Call of the House. Sept. 20, 1961	Present.
219	H.R. 7500. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 21, 1961. Yeas 253, nays 79.	Nay.
220	H.R. 5628. A bill to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Sept. 21, 1961. (⅔ required.) (Failed.) Yeas 215, nays 125.	Nay.
221	H.R. 4172. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Sept. 21, 1961. (⅔ required.) (Failed.) Yeas 166, nays 173.	Nay.
222	Call of the House. Sept. 22, 1961	Present.
223	H.R. 258. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 22, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 142, nays 159.	Nay.
224	Call of the House. Sept. 23, 1961	Present.
225	H.R. 7377. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized; to fix the compensation of hearing examiners; and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 23, 1961. Yeas 229, nays 71.	Nay.
226	H.R. 9118. A bill to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 23, 1961. Yeas 253, nays 50	Nay.
227	Call of the House. Sept. 26, 1961	Present.
228	Call of the House. Sept. 26, 1961	Present.
229	H.R. 258. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 26, 1961. (Failed.) Yeas 97, nays 173.	Nay.
230	H.R. 9033. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. Sept. 26, 1961. Yeas 192, nays 81, present 3.	Nay.
231	H.R. 9033. A bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 27 with an amendment. (General provisions—certification of certain data.) Sept. 26, 1961. Yeas 152, nays 119, present 1.	Nay.

Is the Area Redevelopment Program Needed in East Texas? What Are the Facts of Employment, Purchasing Power, New Industries, and Displaced Families?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, passage of the area redevelopment bill has set off a furor in Texas, particularly in east Texas.

No sooner had the legislation become law than some of the Texas newspapers, particularly the big metropolitan dailies, began condemning the legislation as unwanted and unneeded. Indeed, some of the newspapers, reporting that 41 counties in east Texas had been designated as "distressed areas" or "depressed areas," declared that the Federal Government had heaped "insults" on these communities, as a forerunner to unwanted Federal intervention in local affairs.

On August 23, the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, meeting at Tyler, Tex., adopted resolutions declaring that the Secretary of Commerce had "arbitrarily" designated 41 counties in the region served by this organization as "distressed areas" without any such designation being either sought or desired by the counties themselves, and demanding that this "odious designation" be withdrawn. These resolutions further suggested that no Federal assistance was needed or wanted in these counties. They made claims that Texas, and east Texas in particular, is leading the Nation in the number of new industrial plants and plant expansions and in the creation of new job opportunities. Figures were cited to show the number of new industrial plants and plant expansions in Texas and east Texas.

Specifically, this resolution states:

And keeping in mind that the State of Texas leads the Nation in the number of new industrial plants and plant expansions and in the creation of new job opportunities not only during the calendar year 1960, but for the first 6 months of the current year.

And in view of the fact that out of a total of 378 new industrial plants established in the State of Texas during 1960, 235 of them were located in east Texas, even though the East Texas Chamber of Commerce region comprises only 20 percent of the geographical area of the State; as against 143 new industrial plants located in the other 80 percent of the State.

And taking note of the fact that out of a total of 487 industrial plant expansions, during the same period, 299 were located in east Texas as against 188 for the rest of the State.

In contrast to this glowing description of economic conditions in the 71 counties of east Texas, some of the smalltown newspapers of the region have posed questions of this kind:

If job opportunities are so plentiful, why are so many people in our hometown unem-

ployed, and why are so many people moving away in search of jobs?

I have been doing some research into these questions, to try to find out what the facts are, and I think I now have the facts rather clearly.

Before citing them, however, let me point out why the figures on new industrial plants and plant expansions fail to answer the question whether or not there is a need—even great need—in east Texas for the Federal assistance available under the area redevelopment program.

NUMBER OF NEW INDUSTRIAL PLANTS DOES NOT REFLECT NEED FOR JOB OPPORTUNITIES

First, a simple count of new plant and plant expansions does not tell us anything about how many new jobs are created. A majority of these so-called plants are very small shops which will hire half a dozen people or so—many even less.

Second, a simple count of new plants and plant expansions does not tell us how many previously existing businesses have gone out of business in the same period the new business units were being created.

Third, a count of new plants and plant expansions refers only to industrial plants. It gives no information about the greater source of jobs in service establishments, or on farms, or in the professional services. Nor, of course, does the number of new and expanded industrial plants tell us anything about the total number of jobs that may be needed to provide employment for the people of the region.

Finally—and this proves to be most important—a simple count of the number of new industrial plants and plant expansions in the whole of the 71 counties tells us nothing about employment or other economic conditions in the individual counties. The area comprising the 71 counties of east Texas is larger than several whole States on the eastern seaboard, and these counties differ from one another in vast degree. A few contain large cities, such as Dallas, in Dallas County; Galveston and Texas City in Galveston County; Houston and Baytown in Harris County; Beaumont and Port Arthur in Jefferson County; Waco in McLendon County; and Austin in Travis County. But the majority of this vast area is made up of rural, smalltown, and small-city communities.

In order to obtain a clearer picture of what the employment trends have been in these counties, I have obtained from the Texas Employment Commission information on the number of business establishments, the number of employees, and the wages paid in each county over a series of years back to 1956. The Texas Employment Commission data cover not just industrial establishments, but all kinds of establishments—including retail establishments, and so on—where the establishment has four or more employees. In addition, I have compared the population changes as reported to the Bureau of the Census and the estimates of income, or what is called "Effective Buying Power," as reported by Sales Management magazine.

The facts, in a nutshell, are these: A few large cities—particularly Dallas and Houston—have indeed been growing very rapidly. New industrial plants, many new businesses of all kinds, have come in; employment has been growing rapidly and, indeed, the populations of the big cities are increasing enormously. People have been moving into the cities from the small town and rural areas. They have had to, in order to obtain jobs.

In contrast, however, the overwhelming percentage of the smaller towns and rural areas of east Texas are going downhill. In most of these counties employment in the first quarter of the present year was less than it was a year ago, 2 years ago, and even 5 years ago. Thus there have been fewer jobs, despite the fact that the population tends to increase at a rate of about 20 percent each decade, and the number of persons of employment age tends consistently to increase. What is happening, in fact, however, is that the populations of most of these counties are actually declining, because families are being forced to move away in search of employment opportunities.

In many of the 71 counties of east Texas, purchasing power has actually gone down within the past year.

DISPLACED POPULATION A NATIONAL PROBLEM

These basic facts as to these differences between the big cities and the small towns and rural areas have, I am afraid, been overlooked by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce and by many other well-meaning groups who are no less concerned about progress and expanding economic opportunities.

New businesses and new job opportunities in the big cities are no solutions to the problems of declining economic opportunities in the small cities, towns, and rural areas. Some people are adventurous, it is true—like to move to the city and can readily do so. But a great many families in the smalltown and rural areas cannot easily move, and will not move until extreme pressures force them to move. They have ties of many kinds holding them to the community, including, in many cases, a home and a home mortgage which they cannot readily leave. The fact is that we will have extremely serious unemployment and underemployment in these communities so long as nothing is done to expand economic opportunities on a decentralized basis.

On the other side of the coin, the huge migration to the cities is also causing great problems for the city governments and the State governments and for the people concerned. There is too little room, too little police protection and social services, and too little money in the city budgets to meet the great financial demands that this movement of population—frequently unemployed population—places upon them.

What we are dealing with here is not a trend peculiar to Texas, but one which is creating grave problems throughout the Nation. Almost everywhere the story is the same—people are being pushed out of the small towns and rural areas of America and are piling into the great cities, causing overcrowding and all of the other social and economic problems associated with the big cities. For at least 20 years now people have been moving away from the farms and into the cities at a rate of about a million people a year. Clearly the Nation is reaching a crisis. Something must be done to help create new kinds of economic activity and expanding job opportunities in the rural and smalltown communities.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION RECOGNIZED THAT 41 COUNTIES OF EAST TEXAS NEED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

I might add that the Department of Agriculture has long recognized this problem, though when it had the problem to itself, under the previous administration, it did not recognize it to the extent that it was willing to urge the kind of steps that are needed to cope with the problem.

Incidentally, the Secretary of Commerce has not designated any area in Texas as a "distressed area" or as a "depressed area." He has called them only "redevelopment areas," meaning areas of serious unemployment or underemployment—just as has the Department of Agriculture since 1955.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Commerce has not arbitrarily designated the 41 counties of east Texas as redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment bill these areas were automatically designated as eligible to participate in Federal assistance by virtue of the fact that they had been designated as "redevelopment areas"—under the Rural Areas Development program adopted by the Department of Agriculture in 1955 and operated throughout the Eisenhower administration. In other words, even the Eisenhower administration recognized these 41 Texas counties as areas of serious unemployment—as areas needing Federal assistance and efforts to create new economic opportunities—although, of course, the Federal assistance offered during the Eisenhower administration did not involve any financial assistance.

It should be made clear also that under the new area redevelopment program the Federal Government will not force any Federal assistance on any area. Under this program areas suffering from severe unemployment are recognized as eligible for Federal assistance, in certain kinds of projects, which the local communities must themselves propose and must help to finance.

CONTRASTS BETWEEN EXPANDING EMPLOYMENT IN BIG CITIES AND DECLINING OPPORTUNITY IN OTHER EAST TEXAS COMMUNITIES

Now let me point out more specifically just what has been happening in the rural and smalltown areas of east Texas, as compared to the few big cities.

In the decade 1950–60, the population of the two largest counties increased by 54 percent. These are the counties in which Dallas and Houston are centered. In contrast, the population of the other 69 counties increased by only 5 percent, while the population of the Nation as a whole was growing by 19 percent.

If we omit from our totals of east Texas the 4 largest counties—Harris, Dallas, Jefferson, and Travis—we find that the population in the other 67 counties increased in the decade by only 1 percent.

Between 1959 and 1960 the total effective buying income—that is, income after taxes—as estimated by Sales Management magazine, increased by 15 percent in the 2 largest counties, but by only 3 percent in the other 69 counties as a whole. Omitting all 6 of the big-city counties from our totals for east Texas, we find the total effective income actually declined in the other 65 counties, by almost 2 percent.

In the 11 counties of the First Congressional District of Texas—counties in which I am naturally especially interested—effective buying income dropped by 8 percent. This was in a period when effective buying income in the Nation as a whole increased by 7 percent. Whatever may have been done by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce to bring new industries into Dallas and Houston, and perhaps into three or four other cities, this obviously has not solved our problem in the First Congressional District, in view of an 8 percent total decline in income.

I might add that, according to the Texas Employment Commission, employment in these 11 counties actually decreased by 4 percent between the first quarter of 1960 and the first quarter of 1961. So, in the year when the East Texas Chamber of Commerce can boast of many new industrial plants in some parts of east Texas, employment in the 11 counties of my district actually declined by 4 percent. Furthermore, total wages paid in these 11 counties dropped by 3 percent.

The basic data from which I have drawn these remarks appear in the tables to follow.

The first table summarizes data for population, total and per capita income, business establishments, employment and wages for the 71 counties of east Texas, for the State of Texas, and for the United States as a whole. The 71 counties of east Texas are compared in several different ways:

First, the counties containing the 2 largest cities are compared with the totals of the other 69 counties; second, the 6 big-city counties are compared with the other 65 counties. In addition, separate totals are shown for the 11 counties of the First Congressional District of Texas.

The table is as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Population, estimated effective buying income, business establishments, employment and wages, selected counties in east Texas, the State of Texas, and the United States (dates as specified)*

	East Texas						Texas total	U.S. total
	71 east Texas counties	2 counties versus 69		6 counties versus 65		11 counties of 1st Congressional District		
		2 large city counties	69 other counties	6 large city counties	65 other counties			
Population:								
April 1950 [1]	3,713,547	1,421,500	2,292,047	2,020,823	1,692,724	276,945	7,711,194	150,697,361
April 1960	4,610,668	2,194,685	2,415,983	2,942,935	1,667,733	245,942	9,579,677	179,323,175
Estimated effective buying income (thousands of dollars):								
1955	$6,319,724	$3,443,870	$2,875,854	$4,504,256	$1,815,468	$254,882	$12,938,800	$265,601,325
1957	$6,945,371	$3,869,391	$3,075,980	$4,996,919	$1,948,452	$277,739	$14,287,425	$298,254,624
1959	$7,649,856	$4,126,016	$3,523,840	$5,368,097	$2,281,759	$319,895	$15,712,535	$333,381,285
1960	$8,354,844	$4,735,907	$3,618,937	$6,108,477	$2,246,367	$295,382	$16,888,189	$358,100,646
Estimated per capita, effective buying income: [2]								
1955	$1,498	$1,843	$1,224	$1,761	$1,094	$959	$1,449	$1,602
1957	$1,571	$1,903	$1,288	$1,829	$1,154	$1,041	$1,528	$1,734
1959	$1,646	$1,933	$1,402	$1,867	$1,287	$1,154	$1,601	$1,866
1960	$1,790	$2,108	$1,494	$2,033	$1,350	$1,214	$1,740	$1,974
Business establishments (number): [3]								
Mar. 31, 1956	33,262	17,023	16,239	22,299	10,963	1,609	62,031	1,867,768
Mar. 31, 1958	37,638	19,708	17,930	25,692	11,946	1,689	70,118	2,092,998
Mar. 31, 1960	39,798	21,122	18,676	27,404	12,394	1,765	74,705	2,281,876
Mar. 31, 1961	40,757	21,741	19,016	28,174	12,583	1,813	(4)	(4)
Average employment in 1st quarter of year (number): [3]								
1956	917,782	569,313	348,469	713,763	204,019	32,707	1,622,448	37,586,000
1958	966,629	609,477	357,152	765,467	201,162	31,596	1,812,868	40,039,000
1960	917,954	564,252	353,702	714,542	203,412	32,609	1,861,146	41,967,000
1961	983,522	628,933	354,589	780,914	202,608	31,265	(4)	(4)
Wages paid in 1st quarter of year (thousands of dollars): [3]								
Mar. 31, 1956	$911,874	$602,324	$309,550	$742,604	$169,270	$26,475	$1,542,462	$38,826,070
Mar. 31, 1958	$1,035,823	$693,889	$341,934	$855,933	$179,890	$27,573	$1,859,009	$43,985,803
Mar. 31, 1960	$1,111,953	$760,238	$351,715	$921,682	$190,271	$31,216	$2,005,022	$49,946,685
Mar. 31, 1961	$1,150,756	$783,463	$367,293	$953,993	$196,763	$30,338	(4)	(4)

[1] Bureau of the Census, census of population.
[2] Sales Management magazine.
[3] Texas Employment Commission (data are for business establishments with 4 or more employees).
[4] Not available.

The second table shows for each county employment and wages paid in the first quarter of each of several selected years, as reported by the Texas Employment Commission. The counties are arranged in alphabetical order, except that the 11 counties of the First Congressional District of Texas appear separately.

This table shows that employment in the 11 counties of the First Congressional District of Texas in the first quarter of this year was not only less than it was a year ago, it was even substantially less than employment 5 years ago in 1956.

TABLE 2.—*Employment and wages in establishments having 4 or more employees 1st quarter of the year, 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1961*

[Dollars in thousands]

	Average employment in 1st quarter				Wages in 1st quarter of year			
	1956	1958	1960	1961	1956	1958	1960	1961
71 counties, total	917,782	966,629	917,954	983,522	$911,874	$1,035,823	$1,111,953	$1,150,756
6 big-city counties, total	713,763	765,467	714,542	780,914	742,604	855,933	921,682	953,993
Dallas	269,406	285,741	265,352	298,870	275,494	318,190	351,223	362,822
Galveston	29,638	33,428	31,027	31,794	27,539	33,896	34,968	36,969
Harris	299,907	323,736	298,900	330,063	326,830	375,699	409,015	420,641
Jefferson	60,560	67,876	59,816	61,153	68,959	82,749	74,110	80,258
McLennan	25,372	24,641	25,912	26,056	21,798	21,449	24,504	24,986
Travis	28,880	30,045	33,535	32,978	21,984	23,950	27,862	28,317

TABLE 2.—*Employment and wages in establishments having 4 or more employees 1st quarter of the year, 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1961*—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

	Average employment in 1st quarter				Wages in 1st quarter of year			
	1956	1958	1960	1961	1956	1958	1960	1961
11 counties of 1st Congressional District, total	32,707	31,596	32,609	31,265	$26,475	$27,573	$31,216	$30,338
Bowie	9,134	7,353	7,283	7,386	6,853	5,837	5,818	6,349
Cass	1,383	1,320	1,261	1,338	959	964	937	1,010
Delta	186	153	194	258	107	81	113	197
Franklin	458	359	310	244	304	313	338	276
Harrison	7,281	7,466	8,360	8,233	6,235	7,312	9,130	9,609
Hopkins	1,629	1,684	1,804	1,794	1,129	1,225	1,351	1,316
Lamar	4,386	5,276	4,869	4,764	2,853	3,861	3,768	3,733
Marion	672	639	481	488	482	556	381	414
Morris	4,831	4,343	5,143	3,665	5,593	5,224	7,082	4,940
Red River	792	851	824	924	408	478	547	599
Titus	1,955	2,152	2,080	2,171	1,552	1,722	1,751	1,895
65 counties, total	204,019	201,162	203,412	202,608	169,270	179,890	190,271	196,763
11 counties of 1st Congressional District, total	32,707	31,596	32,609	31,265	26,475	27,573	31,216	30,338
54 other counties:								
Anderson	2,749	2,988	3,046	2,895	1,963	2,455	2,550	2,445
Angelina	9,231	7,964	8,021	7,667	8,032	7,415	7,822	7,274
Bell	8,933	8,271	8,699	8,869	6,550	6,190	6,961	7,113
Brazoria	13,929	15,640	13,930	16,179	16,908	20,898	19,673	24,435
Burleson	285	356	405	415	133	162	230	240
Camp	553	583	610	585	312	352	379	372
Chambers	1,192	1,691	1,389	1,286	1,250	2,251	1,861	1,691
Cherokee	3,979	3,836	3,571	3,516	2,532	2,767	2,724	2,715
Collin	3,292	3,506	3,886	4,147	2,246	2,794	3,031	3,528
Ellis	4,232	4,658	5,132	4,750	2,969	3,425	4,091	3,731
Falls	1,547	1,628	1,351	1,367	774	877	749	759
Fannin	2,064	2,089	2,336	2,194	1,240	1,433	1,839	1,817
Freestone	599	855	832	727	401	672	570	472
Grayson	11,119	11,796	11,590	11,148	8,738	9,962	10,163	9,919
Gregg	14,733	14,517	14,796	14,583	13,869	13,801	14,742	15,160
Grimes	762	807	846	794	470	552	621	646
Hardin	2,728	2,723	2,944	2,654	2,083	2,354	2,622	2,269
Henderson	2,118	2,274	2,089	2,496	1,559	1,824	1,646	2,129
Hill	1,835	1,752	1,589	1,738	1,118	1,129	1,082	1,237
Houston	3,686	1,214	1,278	1,411	3,354	875	905	949
Hunt	4,725	4,934	5,903	6,087	3,351	3,945	5,364	5,972
Jasper	2,600	2,712	2,752	2,693	2,246	2,470	2,550	2,607
Kaufman	2,194	1,884	1,858	1,742	1,394	1,325	1,299	1,360
Lee	316	302	446	464	155	159	302	252
Leon	266	321	330	337	130	153	165	177
Liberty	4,825	4,032	4,137	3,471	4,138	3,448	3,747	3,311
Limestone	2,012	1,871	1,788	1,710	1,382	1,346	1,284	1,282
Madison	341	547	562	499	206	351	389	394
Milam	3,296	2,843	2,517	2,462	3,509	3,008	2,835	2,984
Montgomery	3,246	2,846	2,697	2,508	2,540	2,387	2,211	2,244
Nacogdoches	3,537	3,305	3,362	3,474	2,467	2,478	2,568	2,649
Navarro	5,121	4,607	4,574	4,383	3,847	3,580	3,474	3,360
Newton	547	552	510	500	280	321	307	317
Orange	9,661	11,131	9,784	11,012	10,869	13,685	13,092	15,300
Panola	1,352	1,279	1,173	1,190	1,161	1,164	1,159	1,224
Polk	1,712	1,558	1,639	1,573	1,095	1,116	1,308	1,208
Rains	95	60	77	43	51	26	41	17
Robertson	1,007	982	963	1,014	759	744	679	816
Rockwall	442	356	552	391	374	419	609	423
Rusk	4,278	4,343	4,423	3,983	3,758	4,199	4,012	3,820
Sabine	676	1,058	927	905	445	790	643	628
San Augustine	423	595	514	440	244	354	362	298
San Jacinto	138	132	143	129	89	97	94	96
Shelby	2,243	1,923	1,987	1,916	1,461	1,234	1,301	1,284
Smith	14,781	14,205	15,682	15,740	12,484	13,024	15,220	15,657
Trinity	468	390	486	386	244	200	292	216
Tyler	1,014	906	876	1,032	571	547	579	678
Upshur	902	923	1,043	1,034	547	592	679	735
Van Zandt	1,449	1,447	1,563	1,482	1,169	1,279	1,385	1,224
Walker	1,227	1,415	1,416	1,472	719	991	935	1,050
Waller	747	726	709	794	655	684	713	813
Washington	1,753	1,848	2,077	2,107	997	1,158	1,413	1,412
Williamson	2,605	2,607	2,867	2,928	1,584	1,666	1,880	1,944
Wood	1,747	1,778	2,126	1,961	1,373	1,483	1,903	1,742

Finally, the third table shows for each county the population in 1950, and again in 1960, together with the total effective buying income, as estimated by Sales Management magazine, in 1959 and in 1960:

TABLE 3.—*Population, 1950 and 1960, and estimated effective buying income, 1959 and 1960, 71 counties of east Texas*

	Population		Effective buying income	
	1950	1960	1959	1960
			Thousands	*Thousands*
6-county total	2,020,823	2,942,935	$5,368,097	$6,108,477
2 largest counties:				
Dallas	614,799	951,527	1,812,907	2,141,158
Harris	806,701	1,243,158	2,313,109	2,594,749
Next 4 largest counties:				
Galveston	113,066	140,364	220,482	264,652
Jefferson	195,083	245,659	453,261	484,680
McLennan	130,194	150,091	223,324	239,972
Travis	160,980	212,136	345,014	383,266
11 counties of 1st Congressional District, total	276,945	245,942	$319,895	$295,382
Bowie	61,966	59,971	84,944	80,933
Cass	26,732	23,496	23,346	24,266
Delta	8,964	5,860	7,737	7,115
Franklin	6,257	5,101	5,849	5,156
Harrison	47,745	45,594	60,800	55,902
Hopkins	23,490	18,594	28,378	24,387
Lamar	43,033	34,234	47,857	41,315
Marion	10,172	8,049	8,889	8,255
Morris	9,433	12,576	11,747	13,629
Red River	21,851	15,682	18,329	15,242
Titus	17,302	16,785	22,019	20,072

TABLE 3.—*Population, 1950 and 1960, and estimated effective buying income, 1959 and 1960, 71 counties of east Texas*—Continued

	Population		Effective buying income	
	1950	1960	1959	1960
			Thousands	*Thousands*
54 other counties, total	1,415,779	1,421,791	$1,961,864	$1,950,985
Anderson	31,875	28,162	41,182	36,265
Angelina	36,032	39,814	54,540	54,573
Bell	73,824	94,097	175,949	174,774
Brazoria	46,549	76,204	114,281	132,086
Burleson	13,000	11,177	11,908	12,104
Camp	8,740	7,849	9,889	8,413
Chambers	7,871	10,379	12,641	16,621
Cherokee	38,694	33,120	41,142	37,664
Collin	41,692	41,247	56,217	53,040
Ellis	45,645	43,395	59,009	61,232
Falls	26,724	21,263	25,896	23,229
Fannin	31,253	23,880	28,606	26,801
Freestone	15,696	12,525	17,333	13,832
Grayson	70,467	73,043	119,779	113,037
Gregg	61,258	69,436	124,655	118,589
Grimes	15,135	12,709	14,977	13,728
Hardin	19,535	24,629	29,782	32,040
Henderson	23,405	21,786	27,994	25,088
Hill	31,282	23,650	37,788	33,178
Houston	22,825	19,376	21,422	20,588
Hunt	42,731	39,399	54,904	54,562
Jasper	20,049	22,100	22,771	24,552
Kaufman	31,170	29,931	31,208	34,424
Lee	10,144	8,949	10,041	9,437
Leon	12,024	9,951	12,548	10,337
Liberty	26,729	31,595	38,635	43,825
54 other countres—Continued				
Limestone	25,251	20,413	$23,730	$22,462
Madison	7,996	6,749	7,233	7,344
Milam	23,585	22,263	25,004	24,362
Montgomery	24,504	26,839	32,593	34,798
Nacogdoches	30,326	28,046	38,967	34,171
Navarro	39,916	34,423	47,664	45,424
Newton	10,832	10,372	9,363	9,960
Orange	40,567	60,357	94,188	99,436
Panola	19,250	16,870	22,166	21,168
Polk	16,194	13,861	17,662	16,592
Rains	4,266	2,993	3,330	3,028
Robertson	19,908	16,157	19,518	17,618
Rockwall	6,156	5,878	6,622	6,766
Rusk	42,348	36,421	57,114	50,427
Sabine	8,568	7,302	7,496	7,718
San Augustine	8,837	7,722	6,661	6,819
San Jacinto	7,172	6,153	6,427	5,865
Shelby	23,479	20,479	24,877	22,068
Smith	74,701	86,350	123,325	129,630
Trinity	10,040	7,539	8,504	7,903
Tyler	11,292	10,666	12,833	12,398
Upshur	20,822	19,793	19,819	22,209
Van Zandt	22,593	19,091	23,504	23,524
Walker	20,163	21,475	20,834	27,285
Waller	11,961	12,071	17,926	18,722
Washington	20,542	19,145	20,034	21,478
Williamson	38,853	35,044	47,356	44,853
Wood	21,308	17,653	22,017	22,938

Source: Population from Bureau of the Census; effective buying income from Sales Management magazine.

Ammunition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an excellent article on the question of U.S. trade with Iron Curtain countries in strategic materials. This article appeared in a new weekly newsletter entitled "Ammunition," published and edited by Mrs. George W. Malone, wife of the late Senator from Nevada, and Martha Rountree, the well-known news commentator.

This is an extremely interesting and alarming article which should give the American people some idea of the variety of critical materials we are shipping behind the Iron Curtain where we can be sure they are being used to build up the cold war machine of the Communists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD issue 3 of the newsletter "Ammunition."

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMMUNITION

In the interest of our national security, Ammunition believes the American people should know that the Department of Commerce is daily issuing export licenses to American firms for the shipment of strategic materials to the enemy. Many of these materials have military use and potential.

The State Department, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense are all a party to the issuance of these licenses. They have intervened directly in making decisions on such exports, and in using pressure to resist an investigation by Congress.

Recently the press reported that there had been an 800-percent increase in the number of export licenses issued for the shipment of goods to Iron Curtain countries. The report came just 3 weeks after the President's "Hard Line on Berlin" speech of July 25, 1961.

The Department of Commerce wasted no time in denying the report. Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges said that the increase was only 400 percent.

Whether the increase was 400 percent or 800 percent is not the issue. The issue seems to be: Why should we permit the shipment of warmaking materials to Iron Curtain countries? We still remember the scrap iron and steel we sold to Japan in 1939, which came back to us in the form of bullets and bombs.

Also we are shipping farm surpluses to Russia at the expense of the American taxpayer. When asked about it, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman replied: "We can't let them starve, can we?" The story is unbelievable, but true.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is currently holding hearings on this matter and the House of Representatives has established a select committee to investigate the situation. Congress now stands adjourned until next January. So, regardless of the findings of this committee, regardless of how shocking the investigation may be, nothing can be done about these shipments until Congress comes back in January. And, even then, it will mean that legislative proposals will have to be made to the proper committees, study will have to be given such proposals, and then, once out of committee, action will come only after a scheduling for floor action. In the meantime, months will have gone by. The enemy will have been profiting at our expense. The Soviet military buildup will be getting strategic war materials which they badly need.

Only the President of the United States can do anything about the matter right now. Although the President is responsible for foreign policy, a President must delegate. As it stands, the policy covering exports to Communist nations is not a top-level decision. Somewhere in the State Department and other departments there are those who support active trading with the very nations whose leaders are bent on our destruction under the guise of easing world tensions.

I. WHAT ARE WE SENDING OUR ENEMIES?

In the matter of a few months, our American policies on trading with the enemy have been drastically changed. They have been changed so quietly that few have been aware of the significance of what is going on.

The Defense Department has been persuaded to reverse an earlier edict that precision machine tools were not to be exported to the Soviet Union.

A new legal interpretation by the Secretary of Commerce has opened the door for the sale of below-cost farm commodities to Iron Curtain countries.

In 2 days recently the Department of Commerce approved 41 licenses for the sale of assorted goods to the Red bloc countries: 13 for the Soviet Union; 11 for Czechoslovakia, 9 for Yugoslavia, 4 for Rumania, 2 for Hungary, and 1 each for Poland and Bulgaria. On August 4, just 1 day, licenses with a dollar value of $848,126 were granted by the Department of Commerce.

The Commerce Secretary has ruled that the following goods are nonstrategic in nature (and, therefore, acceptable for export to Communist countries): ball bearings, machine tools, power-transmission systems, aircraft and automotive spare parts, electrical machinery, geophysical instruments, and other industrial products and chemicals.

As of this writing, the United States is sending to the Communist-alined nations the following nonstrategic equipment: railway equipment, synthetic rubber, industrial instruments, pipe valves, chemical products, precision grinding machines, aircraft gyroscopes, iron and steel scrap, electrolytic copper—to name but a few of the materials we are sending to Khrushchev and his comrades.

A group of House Members have been led to believe, by the Secretary of Commerce, that the policy is that we will allow shipment of any materials which the Soviet Union can acquire elsewhere in the world. For example, the Defense Department raised objections to the export of a machine to bore V–8 engine blocks. This machine would have greatly increased the Soviets' capacity to produce automotive engines for trucks so vital to military transportation.

Nine days after the Defense Department action, however, it reversed itself and a permit was issued on the basis that similar equipment could be obtained in another country.

Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican, of Washington, in pointing out to the Congress of the United States that we helped Poland build a new steel plant, said he asked the Secretary of State this summer whether or not the Soviet Union would get some of the products of this steelmill. The Secretary of State admitted that it would.

Poland is making a loan to Cuba and, among other things, the proceeds will be used to build a shipyard and battery repair facilities. Obviously, this is designed to provide a base for Russian submarines, yet the State Department goes on the naive basis that by helping Poland we are buying the good will of the Polish people. Actually, the Polish people probably don't even know of our help. What we are really doing is assisting the Communist leadership of Poland to hold these people under the lash of communism.

The reason given for granting more licenses is that the Commerce Department policy now demands a quick "Yes" or "No" answer to exporters requesting licenses for shipment to Iron Curtain countries, and the Secretary attributes the increase in shipments to the speedup in decision making.

In just 2 weeks, starting with Monday, August 14, up to and including Friday, August 25, the following listing of licenses issued, commodities involved and the point of destination will give you a good idea of our amazing new foreign policy.

Number issued	Country	Commodity description
21	Yugoslavia	Electron tubes, processing vessels, copper cable, construction machinery and parts, petroleum products, copper scrap, borates, electronic testing machines and parts, silicon, automotive parts, aircraft parts, synthetic resins, physical properties testing and inspecting machines, iron and steel scrap, semiconductors, steel pipe, and synthetic lubricants.
5	East Germany	Semiconductors, surgical and medical instruments, cigar leaf tobacco, technical data (patents filed), and, synthetic resins.
6	Hungary	Technical data, chemical specialties, industrial sewing machine parts, and medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations.
8	U.S.S.R.	Steel and iron staples, textile machinery and parts, bakery machinery and parts, glass products, manmade fiber and manufactures, asbestos gaskets, and saw blades.
8	Cuba	Spanish radio transcriptions; small red beans, dry, ripe; technical data; vertical record-filing cabinets; and malaria eradication commodities.
1	Bulgaria	Industrial chemicals.
2	Rumania	Resistors and synthetic resins.
15	Czechoslovakia	Industrial chemicals, medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations, industrial instrument and parts, safety apparel and equipment, geographical world globe, rubber manufactures, and synthetic resins.

II. WHAT ARE WE DOING?

The Soviets and their satellites must have an adequate supply of strategic raw materials from which can be manufactured the tools of war. They are not able to find the products at home so they try to buy them from the free countries. We have been supplying many of the commodities necessary to the very existence of international communism.

It is claimed, for example, that our agricultural surplus is not strategic. How many times have we heard the plea that we must feed the starving Russians, when we have such an over abundance of foodstuffs and agricultural products? There is no question that the agricultural surpluses which we have shipped behind the Iron Curtain help the Communist war efforts.

Napoleon once said, "An army travels on its stomach."

Needless to say, when people have failed to produce sufficient food to provide even basic sustenance, morale falls and with it falls their productivity. Our food, therefore, helps to fill enemy stomachs, and raise enemy industrial productivity.

Agricultural products can be strategic

The agricultural products themselves seem blandly innocent and free of possible strategic value. How untrue. Wheat, as an example, can be converted readily to alcohol, and alcohol is one of the prime ingredients in explosives. Our surplus wheat might become ammunition aimed at us.

Some of these supplies come from us—courtesy of our "friends." We send several million tons of surplus wheat, for example, to Canada. And then last year, Canada shipped 29 million tons of wheat to Red China. The Red Chinese, because of the failures of their communal farms, are forced, we hear, to subsist on diets of 600 calories per day (a pure Metrecal diet is 900 calories per day).

Now, to those who are calling the shots on trade and foreign policy, lumber, like wheat, is also marked "nonstrategic." However, we have the right to expect those charged with protecting the security of the United States to know better—it is their business to know. Lumber is vital to both the military and economic life of any country. Railroad ties, resin, and many chemical derivatives are made from this simple nonstrategic lumber. The most innocent-sounding commodities can be used against us in our death fight with international communism.

We are also sending air conditioners, which our enemies have not learned to mass-produce, to the Iron Curtain countries. Air conditioners are required equipment for submarines.

As Ammunition sees it, we are producing and sending to our enemy goods which can be used against us. We are, in addition, freeing Red manpower and production machines to make the tools of war.

Some claim that we are strengthening our economy at home through this trading with the enemy. In reality, we are strengthening communism abroad. We can strengthen nothing for ourselves while we support an enemy whose avowed aim is to bury us.

III. WHAT HAS THE CONGRESS DONE?

Very little. In 1951 the Congress enacted the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act which is known as the Battle Act. The declared purpose of the Battle Act is to place an embargo on any shipment of strategic goods to a nation which threatens the security of the United States. This applies specifically to the Soviet Union and all countries under its domination.

The Battle Act prohibits the sale of arms, ammunition, implements of war. atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation of materials of strategic value, and items used in the production of any of the above. It was further declared in the Battle Act that no military, economic, or financial assistance would be granted by the United States to any nation unless it also places such an embargo.

The intent of the Battle Act seems plain and simple enough. It says we will neither help our enemy nor will we help those who give assistance to our enemy. But unfortunately it has been demonstrated that ways to circumvent this act (such as having a material classified as "nonstrategic"; or as trading indirectly through a "middleman" as in the case of the United States-to-Canada-to-Red China wheat transactions; and in some cases we can debate the term "unfriendly") do exist.

The Battle Act is too flexible and open to wide interpretation. It needs prompt revision which will tie down its true intent. Do not trade with the enemy to his advantage.

IV. A BRIGHT LIGHT

Mr. A. E. Hillman, head of the Republic Electric & Development Co., (REDCO) of Seattle, Wash., refused to have any part in strengthening our enemy. He received a $150,000 order for control parts for a lumber mill from a Canadian firm. A few phone calls determined that the Canadian firm was planning to erect a lumber mill in the Soviet Union. This mill, with REDCO parts, would be the most modern, the most efficient, and the most productive in the world. Hillman checked with the Department of State, and got a green light for the sale.

Courageously, however, Hillman turned down the $150,000 order, an estimated 10 percent of REDCO's annual business, saying in a letter to the Canadian firm:

"We at REDCO are unanimously convinced of the following facts:

"The Russian Government has vowed innumerable times to achieve the ultimate destruction and elimination of democracy either by all-out warfare or by economic warfare. The result would be the same. Daily, throughout the world in a relentless, predictable program we see Russia slowly but surely achieving that goal. Hungary, China, Tibet, North Korea, Vietnam, and now Laos. Next comes Formosa, South Korea, Japan, India and their final victory by one means or another will be in North America.

"The one advantage we in North America have over the Communist bloc is our production know-how, and it was that single ability more than any one factor which brought about victory in World War I and World War II and, at the moment, still insures our victory in world war III. To knowingly give away the even tiniest portion of that production superiority represented by the excellence of the Magnestat control system would represent to us the admission of the inevitability of world domination by communism. To this we will never admit.

"On his recent visit to Moscow, your representative was told by the Russian purchasing committee that they could not train enough technical people in the next 20 years to achieve the building of this tremendous lumber mill and were therefore purchasing North American technical know-how to close the gap from 20 to 2 years. REDCO will have no part in handing this advantage to our sworn enemy."

Unfortunately, too many people do not share Mr. Hillman's patriotism or awareness of the danger in supplying the enemy. They are the people who are making money at the expense of the security of the United States by shipping such strategic material to the enemy as we have detailed herein. It is also unfortunate that we cannot list their names, but this information is classified as "Top Secret" over at the Department of Commerce.

V. WE HAVE REAL CAUSE FOR ALARM

On May 11, the Senate passed by a vote of 43 to 36 administration-sponsored legislation to modify the Battle Act even further to give President Kennedy more authority to extend aid to Iron Curtain countries when he considers it in the national interest.

The chief sponsor of the bill was Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Rela-

tions Committee. During the debate over the proposed changes in the Battle Act (which passed the Senate, but not the House), Senator FULBRIGHT said:

"Kennedy should not be denied the authority by Congress because I do not think a legislative body is competent to conduct our foreign relations."

It is hard for us to understand why the will of the American people does not prevail.

Our observation is that Americans who elect our President and our Congress do not want us, through trade, or any other means for that matter, to give comfort and strength to those who are dedicated to our destruction. We doubt if anyone running for office could win election today on such a platform.

Why are the names of the business organizations which are granted export licenses to deal with the Reds kept "top secret"? Is it possible that they may be ashamed of what they are doing? Or, is it possible that they may be afraid that public opinion is against what they are doing?

It has been stated many times that government export licenses are a privilege granted to a few by our Government. Why, then, should not the names of the privileged few be made public?

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat of California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Information, stated that Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges had written him on April 5, 1961:

"In the future, the public can find out the names of every firm granted export licenses, what is being shipped abroad, and the destination of the shipments."

But that was back in April, and has never become a policy.

Congressman Moss further informed Ammunition that some businesses are so afraid of having their names made public that they have threatened the President with dropping all foreign trade if their names are made available to the general public.

VI. THE FUTURE

It is the hope of Ammunition that our readers will make demands on our Government to stop the flow of goods helpful to our enemy by:

(a) Making public the names of those businessmen who trade with the enemy;

(b) demanding a realistic appraisal of what is "strategic";

(c) closing the many loopholes in the Battle Act so that there will be no room for errors of judgment.

The U.S. House of Representatives has established a select committee to investigate trade with the enemy. It is hoped that this will lead to a tough law that will protect us from the type of thinking that directs this misguided course of aiding the enemy.

Can there be any doubt that we must avoid all possible ways of helping the Soviet bloc to strengthen itself economically and militarily?

Do We Need Whole Fish Flour?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, an effort presently is being made to gain the acceptance of whole fish flour as an adulterated article under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Howard Hardy, Beach, N. Dak., presently administrative assistant of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., raises timely objections to the adoption of the proposed standard, which merit studied and careful consideration by the Food and Drug Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hardy's letter to me, dated October 10, 1961, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: The September 15 copy of the Federal Register discloses a matter that is of prime concern to all of us, a proposal that whole fish flour be recognized as a human food by the Food and Drug Administration.

The Food and Drug Administration informally expressed the opinion that this whole fish flour should be regarded as an adulterated article under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

It appears very evident that a real effort is being made to downgrade our food standards with very little consideration for the progressive steps and accomplishments of the FDA. The request would ask for permission to manufacture an adulterated food and have it recognized as a part of diet of the people in the United States. The very suggestion that whole fish of any species, from head to tail including the intestines with contents be accepted as a recognized food causes one to question the proponents' so-called desire to help the needy.

The adoption of the proposed standard will open the door for further proposals to approve other unwholesome products in our food supply. The proposal implies that 1 part fish heads, etc., to 11 parts of wheat flour might be used in bread as a cheap source of protein. This we would question, since the present cost of whole fish flour is more than 2½ times that of wheat flour. It may be that this is an attempt to give relief to the fisheries in marketing of the undesirable varieties as well as to clean up the disposal problem of heads, tails, entrails, etc., at the expense of the wheat and dairy farmers.

Plans to use this stuff for distribution in foreign countries where there is a protein shortage may be useful, however, there is no animal protein shortage in the United States. One might question the benefactor who would grind up a whole fish and "doctor" it up beyond recognition with the intent of sneaking it into one's daily diet. The proponents would make it appear that they do not intend to sell the product to the American consumer but to the undernourished in foreign lands. They are hopeful that if the standard is established in the United States the people in foreign lands will believe that we are in the habit of eating this thing. This attempt to degrade our food standards to further the interests of the few concerned is bordering on subterfuge.

Our food supply is as clean and safe as modern technology can make it and for more than 50 years the efforts and policy of the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture have been to improve our standards.

If the gates are let down for the introduction of this adulterated food, our farmers, warehousemen, grain and produce handlers, packers, and many others have wasted a great deal of time and money. When and if the FDA should approve the sale of fish flour, Viobin Corp., of Monticello, Ill., intends to construct a plant at New Bedford, Mass., to process whole fish and also has every intention of utilizing the waste materials (heads, scales, intestines, and bugs) of the fillet plants. If a garbage disposal problem does exist, it would seem that there must be better ways of alleviating it.

This is the product fish interests would have us believe is good for the American consumer and our friends in foreign lands and are requesting the Food and Drug Administration to recognize it as a human food.

We understand that legislation has also been introduced to further the attempt.

Sincerely,

HOWARD HARDY,
Administrative Assistant.

A Call for Austerity in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared entitled "A Call for Austerity in the Federal Government." This statement directs itself to a trend in the fiscal affairs of our Government which concerns me greatly and, indeed, should be of concern to all Americans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR AUSTERITY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

For 25 years I have been working and urging the executive branch of our Government to exercise economy and restraint in the vast spending programs which have been presented to the Congress. I believe the time has now come when the administration must sponsor a program of austerity in spending the tax dollar. If we are unable to economize, I predict we will do irreparable damage to the value of our money and to our economic well-being. I can forsee an economic depression that will not only curl your hair, it will singe your hide like an atomic blast.

I realize that my views run counter to the theories so popular with certain latter day economists and others who have abandoned the idea that the function of Government is to do only those things which the States or the people are unable to do for themselves. Their idea—briefly stated—is that a program, any program, should be financed by the Federal Government if it seems to be a good program. The extension of this theory was described by that great Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft, as "creeping socialism." If he were to comment on the spending antics of 1961, he would no doubt call it "galloping socialism."

The dollar perhaps is not a particularly accurate yardstick for measuring the cost of Federal Government. Even so, I think a table showing the funds appropriated by each session of each Congress since I came to the Senate in 1937 is of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have this table inserted in the body of my remarks at this point:

Appropriations made by the U.S. Congress from 1789 to 1961, by Congress and session

Congress	Years	Number of sessions, unless shown [1]	Amount of appropriation	Cumulative totals
1st	1789–91	3	$8,991,600.15	$8,991,600.15
2d	1792–93	2	18,523,469.97	27,515,070.12
3d	1794–95	2	23,288,547.94	50,803,618.06
4th	1796–97	2	7,813,952.45	58,617,570.51
5th	1798–99	3	33,244,745.68	91,862,316.19
6th	1800–1801	2	25,426,779.67	117,289,095.86
7th	1802–3	2	25,745,012.11	143,034,107.97
8th	1804–5	2	26,134,921.62	169,169,029.59
9th	1806–7	2	31,401,908.53	200,570,938.12
10th	1808–9	2	16,072,086.80	216,643,024.92
11th	1810–11	3	44,547,705.53	261,190,730.45
12th	1812–13	2	28,492,349.71	289,683,080.16
13th	1814–15	3	114,950,002.87	404,633,083.03
14th	1816–17	2	86,518,342.43	491,151,425.46
15th	1818–19	2	60,402,480.92	551,553,906.38
16th	1820–21	2	43,933,019.87	595,486,926.25
17th	1822–23	2	40,698,131.62	636,185,057.87
18th	1824–25	2	48,723,180.67	684,908,238.54
19th	1826–27	2	46,472,063.95	731,380,302.49
20th	1828–29	2	48,467,710.77	779,848,013.26
21st	1830–31	2	25,523,357.64	805,371,370.90
22d	1832–33	2	33,158,534.72	838,529,905.62
23d	1834–35	2	31,937,708.51	870,467,614.13
24th	1836–37	2	67,057,928.40	937,525,542.53
25th	1838–39	3	75,275,307.65	1,012,800,850.18
26th	1840–41	2	46,889,439.52	1,059,690,289.70
27th	1842–43	3	58,815,068.31	1,118,505,358.01
28th	1844–45	2	46,148,783.40	1,164,654,141.41
29th	1846–47	2	109,458,767.11	1,274,112,908.52
30th	1848–49	2	84,849,872.59	1,358,962,781.11
31st	1850–51	2	78,703,382.25	1,437,666,163.36
32d	1852–53	2	93,589,493.26	1,531,255,656.62
33d	1854–55	2	136,682,218.62	1,667,937,875.24
34th	1856–57	3	139,384,097.35	1,807,321,972.59
35th	1858–59	2	123,267,455.03	1,930,589,427.62
36th	1860–61	2	158,529,756.83	2,089,119,184.45
37th	1862–63	3	2,133,183,800.75	4,222,302,985.20
38th	1864–65	2	1,658,190,940.49	5,880,493,925.69
39th	1866–67	2	301,451,202.89	6,181,945,128.58
40th	1868–69	3	314,197,415.71	6,496,142,544.29
41st	1870–71	3	347,464,849.23	6,843,607,393.52
42d	1872–73	3	372,669,413.68	7,216,276,807.20
43d	1874–75	2	302,732,699.01	7,519,009,506.21
44th	1876–77	2	212,478,994.05	7,731,488,500.26
45th	1878–79	3	345,426,730.20	8,076,915,230.46
46th	1880–81	3	380,602,488.43	8,457,517,718.89
47th	1882–83	2	439,339,683.74	8,896,857,402.63
48th	1884–85	2	308,059,511.37	9,204,916,914.00
49th	1886–87	2	402,695,244.04	9,607,612,158.04
50th	1888–89	2	463,135,612.69	10,070,747,770.73
51st	1890–91	2	$611,505,568.32	$10,682,253,339.05
52d	1892–93	2	623,722,043.37	11,305,975,382.42
53d	1894–95	3	594,845,924.59	11,900,821,307.01
54th	1896–97	2	613,965,943.52	12,514,787,250.53
55th	1898–99	3	1,135,560,043.90	13,650,347,294.43
56th	1900–1901	2	936,517,800.53	14,586,865,094.96
57th	1902–3	2	915,286,077.25	15,502,151,172.21
58th	1904–5	3	956,401,394.33	16,458,552,566.54
59th	1906–7	2	1,105,173,690.33	17,563,726,256.87
60th	1908–9	2	1,275,767,923.09	18,839,494,179.96
61st	1910–11	3	1,298,275,356.24	20,137,769,536.20
62d	1912–13	3	1,429,665,118.72	21,567,374,654.92
63d	1914–15	3	1,605,939,097.86	23,173,313,752.78
64th	1916–17	2	19,848,162,534.66	43,021,476,287.44
65th	1918–19	3	32,721,505,312.88	75,742,981,600.32
66th	1920–21	3	7,465,218,995.40	83,208,200,595.72
67th	1922–23	4	7,171,247,259.15	90,379,447,854.87
68th	1924–25	2	6,619,879,000.00	96,999,326,854.87
69th	1926–27	2	7,022,691,000.00	104,022,017,854.87
70th	1928–29	2	7,679,715,000.00	111,701,732,854.87
71st	1930–31	3	8,565,355,000.00	120,267,087,854.87
72d	1932–33	2	11,956,392,000.00	132,223,479,854.87
73d	1934–35	2	15,702,722,442.00	147,926,202,296.87
74th	1936–37	2	8,935,846,274.00	156,862,048,570.87
75th	1938 [2]	1st sess.	[3] 9,183,701,740.92	166,045,750,311.79
75th	1939 [2]	2d and 3d sess.	[4] 10,333,996,189.84	176,379,746,501.63
76th	1940 [2]	1st sess.	[5] 11,447,634,076.84	187,827,380,578.47
76th	1941 [2]	2d and 3d sess.	[6] 16,878,865,241.77	204,706,245,820.24
77th	1942 [2]	1st sess.	[7] 57,792,715,367.26	262,498,961,187.50
77th	1943 [2]	2d sess.	[8] 147,071,208,961.89	409,570,170,149.39
78th	1944 [2]	1st sess.	[9] 114,564,008,594.62	524,134,178,744.01
78th	1945 [2]	2d sess.	[10] 67,614,266,774.74	591,748,445,518.75
79th	1946 [2]	1st sess.	[11] 69,780,137,109.60	661,528,582,628.35
79th	1947 [2]	2d sess.	[12] 35,734,209,164.94	697,262,791,793.29
80th	1948 [2]	1st sess.	[13] 35,982,887,708.01	733,245,679,501.30
80th	1949 [2]	2d sess.	[14] 41,675,480,957.05	774,921,160,458.35
81st	1950 [2]	1st sess.	[15] 46,497,456,897.86	821,418,617,356.21
81st	1951 [2]	2d sess.	[16] 81,045,040,441.00	902,463,657,797.21
82d	1952 [2]	1st sess.	[17] 101,117,786,897.00	1,003,581,444,694.21
82d	1953 [2]	2d sess.	[18] 85,999,646,411.00	1,089,581,091,105.21
83d	1954 [2]	1st sess.	[19] 65,155,156,254,797.00	1,154,737,345,902.21
83d	1955 [2]	2d sess.	[20] 58,160,445,563.00	1,212,897,791,465.21
84th	1956 [2]	1st sess.	[21] 63,947,281,321.00	1,276,845,072,786.21
84th	1957 [2]	2d sess.	[22] 73,041,364,417.00	1,349,886,437,203.21
85th	1958 [2]	1st sess.	[23] 73,064,958,328.00	1,422,951,395,531.21
85th	1959 [2]	2d sess.	[24] 81,119,818,276.00	1,504,071,213,807.21
86th	1960 [2]	1st sess.	[25] 81,572,357,732.00	1,585,643,571,539.21
86th	1961 [2]	2d sess.	[26] 83,790,241,957.00	1,669,442,813,496.21

[1] Number of sessions per Congress, until 1938, were varied and are not shown separately until that date.

[2] Fiscal year.

[3] Excludes $172,473,242 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[4] Excludes $1,022 819,464 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[5] Excludes $1,904,152,417 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[6] Excludes $2,193,125,902.29 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[7] Excludes $3,062,440,984.94 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[8] Excludes $3,861,678,074.46 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[9] Excludes $4,642,328,743.56 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[10] Excludes $6,749,006,537.59 payable from trust -fund receipts.

[11] Excludes $6,662,202,694.43 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[12] Excludes $4,653,376,294.93 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[13] Excludes $5,487,396,936 payable from trust-fund receipts; includes $914,286,500 contained in 3d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, approved Dec. 23, 1947.

NOTE.—Prior to the fiscal year 1938, 75th Cong., 1st sess., trust fund appropriations (payable from trust fund receipts) were not an important portion of the total appriations. Commencing with that fiscal year they have greatly increased due to the sums in the unemployment trust fund, the railroad retirement account, and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and other trust funds. Commencing with the fiscal year 1938 trust fund appropriations are not included in the total appropriations but are shown in the footnotes for each fiscal year.

[14] Excludes $5,480,063,813 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[15] Excludes $6,517,603,514 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[16] Excludes $6,632,999,495 payable from trust-fund receipts, and includes $19,841,-684,745 contained in public laws approved subsequent to November 27, 1950.

[17] Excludes $8,127,323,548 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[18] Excludes $8,532,644,348 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[19] Excludes $8,999,782,171 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[20] Excludes $9,891,179,453 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[21] Excludes $10,871,988,245 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[22] Excludes $11,679,248,757 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[23] Excludes $15,610,607,572 payable from trust-fund receipts.

[24] Excludes $16,382,991,651 payable from trust-fund receipts; $4,708,950,000 for refunding internal revenue collections; and $633,349,085 for cumulative sinking fund.

[25] Excludes $19,495,828,782 from trust-fund receipts; $5,402,200,000 for refunding internal revenue collections; and $633,349,085 for cumulative sinking fund.

[26] Excludes $22,329,891,975 payable from trust-fund receipts; $6,053,675,000 for refunding internal revenue collections; and $633,349,085 for cumulative sinking fund.

If you study this table, you will realize that this session of the Congress has approved the fourth highest spending budget in the history of the Republic. The $86 billion—excluding authority to spend money directly from the Treasury without benefit of congressional blessing—is exceeded only by the amount this Nation spent during 1943 and 1944—at the height of World War II and the amount spent during the Korean war in 1952.

The Kennedy administration will spend more during the 1952 fiscal year than all the administrations of all the Presidents spent during the first 133 years in which the United States of America existed, from 1789 to 1922.

This administration will spend four times more than the record spending year during World War I when the budget was $18.5 billion.

The 1962 spending of $86 billion compares with $4 billion spent in 1933, and $10.3 billion in 1937 when I came to the U.S. Senate.

I observe that the Congresses of which I have been a Member for the last 25 years have voted slightly over $1,600 billion in that period.

The United States is doing precisely what the Communists hope we will do—spend ourselves bankrupt.

Are we going to persist in this easy path so that the Communist hopes will come true—that the Communists will take over an economic ruin without firing a shot?

Or shall we harken to the advice of Thomas Jefferson of Virginia? I realize that Jefferson is not as popular with the Frontiersmen as he was with old-fashioned Democrats. Here is what he said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues—and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence—we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude."

What did Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, have to say on this question? I quote him: "From our past experience, it cannot be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred."

This is the advice this Nation had from the two men who are regarded as the patron saints of the Democratic Party. If Republicans advocate following this advice, why do Democrats ignore it?

Let me quote another man—a Democrat with a most distinguished record in the modern era. James F. Byrnes was a Congressman, a U.S. Senator, a Justice of the Supreme Court, the assistant to the President during the greatest war in our history, Secretary of State in our postwar Government and Governor of the great State of South Carolina. On February 18, 1952, he said, "We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs, seriously proposed, should be adopted, there is a danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pull-

ing an oar in the galley of the Ship of State."

Why does the administration ignore the wisdom of great Democrats and accept the advice of the power-grabbers?

Doesn't our new President remember what he said a year ago? On October 3, 1960—in a campaign speech—he said, "It is extremely important that the United States maintains, to the extent that it is possible, a balanced budget."

Has he now concluded a balanced budget is not possible? Or does he plan to attempt to balance the budget, as he hinted in his Berlin speech, by raising taxes?

The American people now pay about 31 percent of their incomes in taxes. Does he plan to pile on more taxes? That would be austerity for the people, but what about some austerity in Government? On my motion, the following language was inserted in the Senate report which accompanied the defense appropriation bill to the floor:

"ECONOMY AND AUSTERITY

"The committee desires to make a point of the fact that, where an approved capability can be attained at less cost than estimated, funds appropriated by the Congress need not be spent in their entirety and can be returned to the Treasury. The committee and the American people would be encouraged if there were more evidence of cost consciousness on the part of both civilians and uniformed personnel in the Defense Establishment and a more objective determined effort made at all levels of the Defense Establishment to effect savings in the use and expenditure of monetary, human, and materiel resources. Further, the committee recommends that high-ranking officials and officers of flag rank give particular attention to the practice of austerity in connection with their privileges in order to set an example and to popularize the idea of getting the most fight out of each tax dollar."

What do I mean by austerity? I checked the dictionary, and Funk and Wagnalls says the word means "severely simple, unadorned." Perhaps we understand the word better when we look at the antonyms—the words which have an opposite meaning: "affable, appeasing, bland, easy, genial, gentle, indulgent, mild, pliable, soft, sweet, tender, tractable, yielding."

We need some austerity—some self-discipline—on the part of the servants of the people—not alone on the part of the people.

The very able and distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, a great man in the tradition of a great State, has made a study of the self-indulgent programs proposed by this administration since it came to power last January. He has concluded that the tax increase required to support these programs would be in the neighboorhood of 20 percent. I believe his conclusion is conservative.

If Senator BYRD's estimate is correct, it would mean adding one-fifth more to each person's tax bill. This would raise the average tax to 37 percent of your average income.

Mr. President, even the most ardent social planners concede that taxes which take over one-third of an individual's income will kill the incentives which make our free enterprise system work. There has been a good deal of evidence in recent years that these incentives are blighted and dying.

Mr. President, even these ardent high taxers concede that excessive tax rates destroy capital and restrain incentives needed for economic progress and job creation. Before we were confronted with new increases in the monetary budget, even the present administration was committed to a tax program next year which would reduce the high tax rates. At that time, administration spokesmen were placing great emphasis on the need to improve the long-term growth rate of the economy. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon alluded such need in his statement of May 3 before the House Committee on Ways and Means:

"As we look back over the past century we see that our record of economic growth has been unmatched anywhere in the world. But of late we have fallen behind. * * * Clearly, we must improve our performance. Otherwise, we cannot maintain our national security, we cannot maintain our position of leadership in the eyes of the world and we cannot achieve our national aspirations. The pressing task before us, then, is to restore the vigor of our economy and to return to our traditionally high rate of economic expansion and growth."

Since the new monetary buildup was launched, however, the administration has taken a new tack. Now it has fallen back on the discredited theory that more Government spending will in and of itself provide the greater economic growth which the Nation needs. The point which the administration planners do not make, however, is that they are substituting a shot in the arm, with all its inflationary potential, for fundamental policies which will enable the economy to modernize and expand more rapidly and without inflation over the years ahead.

As we peer into the future, it is not too difficult to see where this new approach will take us. Through a new surge of deficit financing, the administration expects to touch off a boom which will carry through the 1962 election. If inflation results, they will blame everyone but themselves for this fact—while retaining full credit for what they contend is prosperity.

In the August issue of the Morgan Guarantee Survey, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, formerly economic adviser to President Eisenhower, says:

"The economy at large has been experiencing a revival since February. The recovery is widespread and is proceeding at a rather brisk rate. Total production already exceeds the prerecession peak, and total employment is not far behind. It appears, therefore, that the bulk of the new spending commitments by the Federal Government will come to fruition, not in a time of recession for which many of them were intended, but when recovery is well advanced and the economy is expanding of its own momentum—perhaps when it is already booming."

Mr. President, here we go again. We know that hot deficit money will stir up a semblance of prosperity. We equally know that this condition will be temporary unless extended by the pouring in of more hot money. Looking beyond 1962, and to 1964, the question is: Will we be in for another whirl of deficit financing in the intervening period?

I personally do not take too seriously the statements of the administration that it will ask for tax increases, if necessary, next year to balance the budget. Its testimony in the Ways and Means Committee hearings provides ample evidence of its recognition that the present tax structure retards expansion of the private sector of the economy including the provision of new jobs in new and old industries. It seems obvious to me that if it is not going to provide leadership to relax the tax brakes on the private economy then it will take new and repeated action to further expand spending in the public sector, including new and liberal doses of deficit financing as required to extend the boom and postpone the day of the bust.

Is this a calculated program to destroy free enterprise? Are the planners deliberately setting about to change our economic system?

Whether the effect is planned or mere accident, the results are the same and the problem is the same.

Unless we are completely irresponsible we must quickly and consciously make a decision as to how we will handle the cost of our Government. There are three possible choices:

1. We can keep on the way we are going. We can forget about the future and live in a dream world present. We can follow the advice of the Democratic national chairman who blandly asserts we can have both guns and butter. This is the easy way. This is the way Rome fell. They appeased the barbarians and held circuses for their own people. And the Dark Ages followed. I will not accept this choice.

2. The Government can require ever increasing austerity from the people by demanding higher taxes and giving them in return more and more Federal "services"—which is another way of saying more control and less individual freedom. I will not accept this choice.

3. The Government can practice austerity. This means no new programs unless they contribute to our ability to defend ourselves. This means a cutback in domestic programs. This means a reduction in the Federal payroll. This means some hard thinking to devise policies to serve America rather than programs which destroy our country. This means a renewed public interest in pulling down the tax barriers to our economic progress—a program which should have priority over all nonessential spending. This means an end to appeasing and coddling special groups in the United States and the beginning of appeals directed to our people because they are first and foremost Americans.

This is the path we should take; it is the path we must take if the United States is to survive. To my mind we don't have three choices—we have only one, a genuine, far-reaching and protracted period of austerity on the part of the Federal Government. This path will require courage in high places in this Government—the courage to say "No." Our new resident likes to talk about courage. I would like to see him exhibit courage and take the action which the times require of him.

If he fails this responsibility in the next few months, the people have only one recourse. In November of 1692 the people must elect to the Congress, regardless of political party, men who are zealously dedicated to a program of Federal austerity. If the executive branch fails in its clear duty—those of us in the legislative branch who have the courage to vote against the concept of both guns and butter must be reinforced. Give Congress the votes and it can do the job.

Acceptance and Inaugural Address of Randle Elliott as President of Hood College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the inauguration of Dr. Randle Elliott as the fourth president of Hood College recently. As a delegate from Haverford College, I had the privilege of participating in the ceremony and was impressed with Dr. Elliott's serious and constructive approach to his great responsibility. Because his address is so pertinent to the

problems of education which confront the Congress and the country, I am appending the text of his inaugural address:

ACCEPTANCE AND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF RANDLE ELLIOTT AS PRESIDENT OF HOOD COLLEGE

Mr. Smith, I accept this important charge from your hand with particular satisfaction, knowing that under your strong leadership a devoted board of trustees stands ever ready to face anew the changing needs of liberal education. The courage to do what must be done is seldom lacking when direction is clear. This fact is amply illustrated in a story that came back to mind several days ago, during the nationwide emphasis on Fire Prevention Week.

When the famous Iroquois Theater of Chicago was in flames in 1903, a young boy stopped at the edge of the crowd to watch the fire. Suddenly a frantic woman seized him by the arm.

"Come with me," she cried. "My children will burn. Save them."

He did save them, and went back again and again, until he had saved 15 others. Afterward, when people praised him, he waved them aside, saying, "What else could I do? The mother put it up to me."

This morning, Mr. Smith, you have clearly put a task up to me, and, in all my dealings with faculty, administrative staff, and students, I propose to be equally direct and specific. In accepting the high responsibilities of this office, I am well aware of my personal shortcomings; but I have absolute confidence that as part of a victorious team we at Hood College will press on to new victories. In fact, we dare do no less, in fulfillment of the trust laid upon us by the 1,300 parents who have placed their daughters in our care this year, and countless other parents who will do so in years to come. It may properly be said that they, too, have put it up to us.

A glance at the buildings around you—a deep breadth of the air of freedom and friendliness on this campus—an acquaintance with the young women who make up this student body, or with representative numbers of those who have gone on after graduation to make their mark in the world—provides eloquent testimony to the inspired leadership that you and the board of trustees have given to this college, and the devoted service of a faculty and administration who for years passed have been dedicated to this discovery and dissemination of truth.

Yet by its very nature a college cannot stand still and endure. The closed portals of dozens of other institutions, which in past generations met the educational needs of their times, can also testify to that. As long as society has problems, as long as humanity is disunited, as long a portion of mankind is subjected to tyranny, as long as men live and dream dreams, while there is still a star in the heavens unexplored, the work of the college and university is undone.

I would be less than candid if I seemed to minimize in any way my appreciation of the magnitude of the tasks ahead—both for American higher education as a whole, and for Hood College as an important contributor to the educational product of our country. It has been often and rightly observed that during no prior period has population grown so rapidly, and human knowledge expanded so explosively, as in recent years. Paraphrasing that great contemporary British statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, it is emphatically true that never before has there been so much to be taught to so many.

While Hood College has come a long way in providing a strong liberal educational program—despite the burden of its frankly limited endowment—there is much still to be done. As a relative newcomer to this ongoing effort, I find great encouragement in the normal state of self-dissatisfaction that prevails on this campus. Not complacent about what has been done well in classrooms, laboratories, chapel and extracurricular activities—but rather looking eagerly for ways of doing these and other things better—trustees, faculty, and administration last year cooperated in an exhaustive self-study of the college, no phase of fiscal practice, plant, program personnel, or student life was neglected. And, with the true scholar's objectivity, no effort has been made to gild the lily. During the past month the results of this year of factfinding were laid on my desk.

We now know in great detail—over 300 pages of statistics, descriptive text and other data—the present status of all departments of Hood College. And at faculty and board meetings this week, decisions were made to continue the self-study during the present academic year. Next month we begin to analyze realistically where we should go from here. We will assemble comparative data on programs and practices prevailing at other colleges. We do not profess to have a monopoly of ideas; so we shall call upon some of our friends at other institutions to help us evaluate Hood's situation and possibilities. The end result, we know, will further strengthen the offering of this College to future generations of Americans.

The role of the president in setting academic goals, and in implementing them decisively, is of course germane to our purpose in assembling here today. Little can be added now to the more than 700 significant books, monographs, and magazine articles that have been published during the past 60 years regarding the work of the college or university president. But the fact that more than half of these publications have appeared since 1940, and almost a third of them since 1950, suggests that the last word has not been said—and probably never will be said—on the ever-changing nature of this job.

Basically, the president's role is that of a catalyst. He must spark or accelerate necessary actions or reactions for which other people often provide the creative ideas or the administrative talent. (One can only hope that—as in physical chemistry—the catalytic agent may be preserved substantially unchanged at the end of the reaction.) The president, therefore, is an expediter, whose chief contribution to the future of his college calls for sound judgment, and initiative tempered with tact. There are various reasons why this must be so. Most important, however, is the fact that learning can flourish only in an atmosphere of liberty, and in a politic that practices as well as preaches democracy.

The reason for existence of a college is to teach; therefore no college can be better than its faculty. A good faculty is necessarily a community of scholars who have been professionally trained to think for themselves. Through years of preparation they have cultivated the self-discipline to withhold judgment until all the facts are in hand. Any administrator may at times become impatient to get the job done, but one who seriously seeks the right answers on matters of educational policy and practice would be foolish to short-cut a pool of available talent that thrives on its autonomy. An institution of higher education is therefore the last place in the world for a dictator.

The interrelationship of the basic disciplines in a liberal arts college, and the mutual dependence of educational policy and institutional goals on human and material resources, prevent the college presidency from being—as it was in days gone by—largely a one-man or one-woman show. An institutional effort is required to formulate proper value judgments of the complex facts, probabilities, and policies that must be acted upon. This calls for the organized and disciplined work of many highly trained minds. The president wants and needs their inspired best. In discharging his accountability to trustees, donors, former students, and other constituents, he must work closely with his faculty and top administrators much as a famous Secretary of State once described his relationship to his professional staff:

"He must be their protector and inspirer, their critic, the appreciator of excellence. He cannot be aloof. He must share and guide their thought, partake of their perplexities. He must give as well as receive. His mind must enter into their minds, and theirs into his."

In this way the product of their common work may best fulfill the classic goal of the charter under which Harvard College has thrived for more than 300 years: "to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity."

Dr. Distler has most ably stated the objectives toward which our whole educational effort at Hood College is directed. We believe so firmly in the vitality of Hood's liberal arts curriculum, and its importance in the development of useful citzenship to sustain a democratic society under test, that I can save 5 minutes of my remarks by saying enthusiastically, "Me, too, Sir."

As Dr. Distler spoke, I couldn't help recalling the trick which Chauncey Depew once played on Mark Twain when they were both invited to speak at a banquet. Twain spoke first for some 20 minutes and was received with open acclaim. When Depew's turn came, immediately afterward, he said: "Ladies and gentlemen, before this dinner Mark Twain and I made an agreement to trade speeches. He has just delivered mine, and I'm grateful for the reception you have accorded it. I regret that I have lost his speech and can't remember a thing he had to say." Depew then sat down amid much applause.

The presence of so many friends of Hood College here today, your familiarity with Hood's liberal arts objectives, your spontaneous enthusiasm for Dr. Distler's analysis of the current need to reemphasize liberal education and of Hood's important part in meeting that need, tempt me just a little with the example of Chauncey Depew.

Yet, there is, of course, more to be said—and by my reference to the humor of a past generation I would not want anyone to think that we here are unmindful of the gravity of the situation that confronts us. These are perilous times for the future of our democratic way of life. I speak not of any external threat from materialistic forces that are rife in the world; but rather of the prevalent reluctance of our own citizens to expend intellectual effort—the endless search for shortcuts or "easy ways out"—and the pitiful lack of a sense of purpose to motivate our younger generation. The enduring nature of truth is perhaps no better illustrated in contemporary writing than in the quotation of H. G. Wells, who 40 years ago wrote: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." Stated simply, our job is to help win that race.

We propose to win by challenging Hood students to their best efforts in every classroom, laboratory, and college-sponsored activity. Through selective admissions procedures, we know that the young women here are capable of superior attainments. They desire and will get no less than exacting standards enforced by scholarly teachers. The readiness of young Americans to work and accept purposeful sacrifice was graphically underscored this year in their clamor to serve without pay in the Peace Corps. Two years ago a report issued by the American Council on Education quoted one

college student as saying: "Where I found weakness, I took advantage of it; but where I found strength, I respected it. If I'm allowed to slip by, I'll do it every time. But if I'm really expected to perform, I'll come through or go down fighting."

We owe it to our students to expect them to perform, and to teach them the relevance of their studies to the lives they will live. The apparent purposefulness of study in the physical sciences explains why there are fewer poor students in the science courses of our colleges than in the humanities or social studies. Yet in an era when half of our adult population seeks to escape boredom through spoon-fed, mass-media entertainment, and when the viability of civilization depends on social control of the hydrogen bomb, the humanist and the social scientist certainly should be able to establish the relevance of their endeavors. When they do, student minds will erupt from the grooves of conventionality, substitute reasoning for memory, and discover the satisfactions of independent thought and scholarship.

It is obvious that not all teachers can inspire these reactions in young minds. A great president of Harvard once observed that there are two kinds of good teachers—those who are young, and those who never grow old. Central to our ideal of creative instruction is the scholarly teacher whose genuine concern for the students keeps him—or her—forever youthful, youthful in spirit, continuously attuned to the resultantly receptive ears of eager learners. For this type of person, teaching is fun.

For his students, this kind of teacher has something real to give. His mental outlook reflects a passion for his own field of learning, an insatiable desire for related knowledge from other fields, and a strong intellectual curiosity blended with tolerance. He is driven by an irresistible urge to keep moving ahead in his own field, so that the facts, opinions, and ideas he despenses are ever fresh, pertinent for the time and place, and destined to be honorable in the more mature minds that will reflect upon them in years to come.

In a small liberal arts college like Hood, the scholar-teacher's thinking and continuing study derive impetus from his proximity to unspecialized learners, and to friendly colleagues in other disciplines. These are two relationships, it has been observed, which are likely to add meaning to his research and more realistic social usefulness to his results. While the teacher and his teaching alike benefit from this kind of college, the college in turn also benefits from the aura of immortality that surrounds such teachers: It owes them not only adequate compensation to the full limit of available resources, but also tangible encouragement of their productive scholarship through subsidy of approved research, and the granting of professional leaves of absence when necessary to consummate it.

It should be apparent that we at Hood believe in the small college, and are therefore committed to it. We, of course, appreciate the indispensable contribution made by the larger colleges and universities through the numbers they educate, the variety of their curricular offerings, and the facilities they accord for highly technical research. In fact, one of the blessings of the diversity of American higher education is that we in the small colleges are free to depend upon the output of the larger institutions for many things—among them, for the kind of professionally trained faculty members I have just been describing. But we have seen and experienced the many real values of the small college, with its warm interpersonal relationships among faculty and student body, and the security it affords in a homelike atmosphere away from home. It offers every student the opportunity to develop leadership qualities and a sense of civic responsibility, through active participation in a wide choice of extracurricular activities. Again and again we have observed that many students best develop, in this milieu, their optimum intellectual, social, and moral consciousness. These are the students whom Hood strives to serve, and whose suitability for this program our admissions procedures are designed to identify.

If nothing I have said so far has made it clear, let me now emphasize that Hood also believes strongly in the need for and the values of higher education for women. The true importance of their position in American life is often overlooked, and consequently in many quarters insufficient attention is given to their special curricular and extracurricular needs. In the United States, 83 percent of the elementary school teachers are women, and 93 percent of our church school teachers are women. Who is it who takes most of the high school graduates to talk with college admissions officers? Why, the mothers, of course. It is they who shape the moral fiber of the next generation.

In our free democratic society, women volunteer workers spark a wide range of good causes upon which the social structure of America depends: PTA's, orphanages, church organizations, and dozens of similar agencies. Our best surveys of the issues in local elections—the grassroots of democratic government—are undertaken, and their results published for the guidance of us all, civic-minded women in the League of Women Voters, the AAUW, and other groups. In this country, there are 3½ million more women eligible to vote than men. The number of women in responsible government positions—both elective and appointive—has increased markedly since 1940, and during the same period the women doctors and lawyers in this country have more than doubled. Yet in the utilization of trained womanpower we lag far behind the Soviet Union, where three out of every four doctors are women. Our vast reservoir of female talent, waiting to be developed and used, is a tremendous national resource still virtually untapped.

The return on our educational investment in women, however, is perhaps quicker through the indirect, very real, and powerful influence they exert on men. This has been true since the day of Adam and Eve. Two hundred years ago Jean Jacques Rousseau observed:

"Men will always be what women want them to be. If, therefore, you would have great and virtuous men, what you must do is teach women what constitutes greatness and virtue."

We at Hood believe that greatness and virtue are best taught in the church-related college. We believe with King Solomon, one of the wisest men in recorded history, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." We seek, with St. Paul, to build our educational structure upon "whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report." We are mindful of the piercing words of the man who, almost 2,000 years ago, looked Pontius Pilate in the eye and said, "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

Pilate's question "What is truth?" had of course been answered previously in the upper room, when our Lord said "I am the way, the truth, and the life." But in giving primacy to that spiritual truth revealed in the Bible and incarnate in Christ, we do not hold as any less than God's truth those aspects of the truth which are discoverable in the realms of mathematics, chemistry, physics, and other disciplines. Our aim is to integrate all truth in the curriculum, and apply our Christian teachings in all kinds of student activities and all phases of administration.

Hood has always been a church-related college. And from its constructive ties with Christian leadership, in and through the church, has flowed an appreciation for the importance of religion as an integral part of the Hood College program. We try to take our religious goals as seriously as the college catalog claims. This entails not only formal study in courses on religion as part of the curriculum required for graduation, and not only prescribed attendance at regular chapel services. The community of student-faculty fellowship here must be conducive to the development of a personal concern for spiritual growth, and a sense of commitment and dedication.

We do not just educate youth; we educate them for a purpose. The true educator does not stoop to indoctrination. He holds forth the truth where and as he finds it; he strives to motivate his students to accept it and apply it for social good. Such men and women helped educate Harry Steenbock, the great scientist of the University of Wisconson. He dedicated his career to helping the hundreds of thousands of children whose bones were bent and bodies deformed by rickets.

For 16 arduous years, Dr. Steenbock worked in his laboratory, among thousands of healthy white rats with beady eyes and sick, doomed rats with rheumy eyes. After many discouragements, he finally suceeded in trapping the sun to overcome a disease that had plagued mankind for ages. A breakfast food company offered him $900,000 in royalties for the rights to his patented discovery. But he coolly turned down the offer, because he felt that profiteers might put a price on his product which would withhold it from many families who needed it most. He wanted to give strong bones to every baby in America.

Dr. Steenbock therefore helped establish, and turned his patented processes over to, the nonprofit Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation. Through it more than 400 manufacturers were licensed to give bone-building vitamin D to the public at cost in milk, cereals, flour, other foods, and pills. Since its start in 1925, the foundation's modest royalties have snowballed for the benefit of mankind. Under the inspiring guidance of Harry Steenbock, they have fostered many other discoveries, inventions, and free research, and have provided funds for the professional training of about a thousand promising young scientists.

This kind of motivation—this kind of dedication—was described in memorable words by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1884, "To carry anything * * * to an end worth reaching," he concluded, "you must believe something and want something with all your might. More than that, you must be willing to commit yourself to a course, perhaps a long and hard one, without being able to foresee exactly where you will come out. One may fall * * * but in no other way can he reach the rewards of victory."

This is a statement of faith for America in our time. And the liberalizing education which produces such faith, and such high social purposes, is our clarion call at Hood College. Let all respond to it who will.

Army Historian Revives 1951 Anti-MacArthur Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the publication of the Department of Army His-

tory, dealing with World War II and with the opening phase of the Sino-Korean war, has renewed the controversy concerning Gen. Douglas MacArthur's strategy and his conduct of operations in that war. The section pertaining to the Korean war is in part critical of General MacArthur and the newspaper reports on this publication dwelt upon this criticism.

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, writing in the Weekly Crusader, has written two articles in rebuttal to this Defense Department history. I ask unanimous consent that these articles by General Willoughby, appearing in the Weekly Crusader on July 15 and July 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY HISTORIAN REVIVES 1951 ANTI-MACARTHUR SMEAR—IT IS AN OLD STORY

On June 10, the newspapers carried wire-service dispatches reporting the upcoming release of a new volume of the Army historical war series, dealing with the Sino-Korean war, 1950–51. Five separate titles are in preparation. This volume 2 is entitled "South to the Naktong-North to the Yalu, June-November 1950." The volume comprises 813 pages. The dispatches, however, were strictly limited to the final chapter XXXIX, "The Big Question," pages 749–776, or approximately 3½ percent of the bulk of this opus. This is an odd statistical limitation. The wire services, of course, did not make this restricted selection; they only reported what was given to them by the author, Roy E. Appleman, a Reserve officer who was a division historian during the war. In the final chapter of his book, by accident or design, Appleman perpetuates an old hoax (long since refuted) i.e., the anti-MacArthur smear of faulty intelligence, alleged surprise in the Korean and Chinese entries into war and an inferential confirmation of all these gossipy vagaries in the Truman-MacArthur conversations during their Wake Island meeting, October 15, 1950. Naturally, the wire services and newspapers picked up the old theme song, though the headlines seem equally divided, viz:

"Army History Explains MacArthur's Bad Guess" (A.P. in Evening Star, June 10, 1961).

"Who Was To Blame for Korean War Mistakes" (U.S. News & World Report, June 19, 1961).

"History of Korean War Due: MacArthur Absolved" (Hearst papers, June 11, 1961).

"Book Says Truman Erred on Chinese" (U.P.I. southern papers, June 10, 1961).

We are reproducing the Washington column, as the substance is generally repeated in all other newspapers. A careful scrutiny of language reveals that the damaging aspects of these brief dispatches are inherent in direct quotes from the author, viz:

(U.S.N. & W.R.) "MacArthur told Truman there was very little chance that China would enter the war * * * (and) * * * MacArthur's opinion appeared most decisive * * * in determining the future course of U.N. military action."

(U.P.I.) "How was it possible for the U.N. Command to mistake so grossly the facts in the situation even after it had met a considerable part of these Chinese forces in combat.

"The author blames not only faulty intelligence but high level misjudgments for contributing to the military catastrophe suffered by the U.N. troops in the winter of 1950–51."

It is pertinent to note here that these are the author's opinions and conclusions. He calmly sits in judgment on General MacArthur and his entire staff. What are his military qualifications, his training? Appleman is a graduate of Ohio State University and obtained an M.A. in history at Columbia University. We will accept that he is a writer on historical topics, trained in historical methodology, though he repeatedly violates every principle of it. As to military and strategic appraisal (and that it is an inescapable element), he entered the Army as a private in 1942 and was commissioned a second lieutenant the following year after completing officer candidate school. In 1944, he was assigned as combat historian with the U.S. 10th Army. The officer candidate school was a highly abbreviated, wartime training course to develop junior combat officers. While giving full and unstinted credit to Appleman's military service—too many embusques and draftdodgers are in opinion-making jobs, alas.—I am not prepared to accept a second lieutenant's views on the strategy of high command in MacArthur's precarious situation in the Sino-Korean war. We will dispose of these items presently. The wire services requested my definition of the salient elements or critical factors in this controversy.

The critical factor in the Sino-Korean war was a bland assumption that four (4) partially trained, understrength divisions in occupation in Japan could handle the North Korean invasion of 1950, with 13 divisions, in a ratio of 4:1.

MacArthur received some reinforcements, notably the Marine division, and completely defeated the North Korean Communists. After Inchon, a brilliant maneuver against the enemy's flank and rear, the 8th U.S. Army took over 130,000 Red prisoners.

Four months later, this identical army with eight divisions and a miscellany of U.N. contributions (another division) was forced to fall back temporarily under the impact of fresh forces—the cream of the Chinese Red Army—initially with 33 divisions (in November 1950) to be increased rapidly to 72 divisions, in the spring of 1951.

Here we are confronted again with military ratios of 4:1 rising to 9:1, blandly expecting the American GI—no superman he—to take on these odds. It is to his everlasting credit that he did—and with unparalleled tenacity wore his enemy to a frazzle—and an armistice in the U.N.

Whenever the congenital idiocy of our foreign and military policy leads to a strategic impasse or the liberal (crypto-Communist) press is looking for scalps, the target is either a commander (unpopular in the Pentagon) like MacArthur or his intelligence services. This happened in Korea (1951) and is repeated by Appleman (1961). It was to happen in the abortive Franco-British-Israeli operations in the Suez Canal affair. It happened quite recently in blaming both the generals (the J.C.S.) and the Central Intelligence Agency for the abortive Cuban invasion.

In every instance the discrepancies in military strength at the point of crisis, the numerical ratios—indispensable yardstick for command decisions—are blandly ignored.

KOREA, 1951—ITALY, 1944; COMPARISONS

Eisenhower did not risk any such gamble in Europe. He did not attempt to expose his divisions in ratios of 1:4 or 1:8. That lethal point becomes crystal clear in a comparison of the Korean and Italian theaters: There are notable similarities in geography, viz:

Both are peninsulas jutting southward from large land masses. Both are in relatively the same latitudes and have similarities in climate. Both are dominated by mountain ranges. Passable, all-weather roads in both countries are few. Korea is a 525-mile-long S-shaped peninsula, varying in width from 125 miles to 200 miles. Italy's familiar boot-shaped peninsula is 800 miles long, 150 miles across at its widest point and 85 miles at its narrowest. Both Korea and Italy are predominantly rough, mountainous countries. The Tabek Range in Korea is comparable to the Apennines in Italy; their heights range from 8,500 to 9,560 feet.

From the standpoint of comparative troop strength, Allied forces in Italy were in a consistently more favorable situation than the U.N. forces in Korea. Ignoring the fact that German infantry was understrength and considering divisional units only, the tabulation below is self-explanatory, viz:

Korea: Relative divisional strengths 1950–51

Allied divisions	[1] 4–8
Red North Koreans	8–13
Red Chinese	33–75
Frontages (miles)	120

[1] 6–9 ROK divisions, in flux.

Italy: Relative divisional strengths, 1944–45

Allied divisions	22
German-Axis divisions	[1] 15
Frontages (miles)	100

[1] German infantry understrength: ½ Allied figures.

Troop densities per front-mile

Korean theater:	
September 1950 (miles, per divisions (8 divisions))	15
November 1950 (miles, per divisions (11 divisions))	36
May 1951 (miles, per divisions (19 divisions))	6
Italian theater:	
January 1944 (miles, per divisions (11 divisions))	5.5
April 1945 (miles, per divisions (22 divisions))	5.4

THE APPLEMAN MENAGE AT WORK

I raise the question if a "historian" of predominantly civil training can be considered qualified to appraise, approve or condemn command decisions and arrive at definitive strategic conclusions in the purely military field? We are not dealing here with a narrative of events but with command and staff on the highest level, with reputations of commanders and technicians who have spent a lifetime in their professions. I state categorically that an accelerated course in a wartime officer candidate school is not sufficient preparation to become a Clausewitz or von Schlieffen or a Camon. The author rather naively gives the show away in his "preface." His admissions are highly suggestive, viz:

"Official records are indispensable for fixing dates and time of major events and troop movements. But anyone familiar with the way the records of combat units during battle are made up will know that they seldom tell the essential facts of what happened and how and why. They are often the product of indifferent clerks transcribing, at places remote from the scene of action, a minimum of messages for something—anything—that will satisfy the official requirement for a report."

Comment: This is calculated nonsense. The staff sections are composed of experienced officers, graduates of service schools who piece together fragmentary information, front-line reports, radio-intercepts, etc., and reduce it to daily summaries and maps. Intimately associated with the situation, over a long period of time, their interpretations on the spot are obviously eyewitness observations, infinitely preferable to postmortem reflections after a lapse of years.

"When the author arrived in Korea in early July 1951 he talked with hundreds of soldiers, from privates to three-star generals, about particular actions and decisions, of which each had personal knowledge 'in some degree.' Many were in distant lands. To them went letters. Over the years, information came back from many corners of the globe."

Comment: My own postgraduate studies in history, at the feet of Frank Hudder, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., impressed on me the fallacy of "post mortem" recollections. Memory is notoriously faulty. A standard test in applied psychology (group reports on events) proves that elapsed time produces variable reports if the class is divided in segments and report at intervals. It is axiomatic that the witness must have authority in his field.

A soldier in the firing line can only report on the segment of terrain under his eyes; he cannot pass on battalion or regimental problems. Specifically, the author, while sharply assailing faulty intelligence, has never consulted me (though available in the same city) on intelligence facts and procedures. In this instance, he has failed to apply orthodox historical procedures. On the other hand, as in the Truman-MacArthur meeting (unrecorded and denied by MacArthur), the author is fond of relying on hearsay evidence and alleged statements attributed to me by others.

"The author turned over to Mr. Mossman a large number of sketch maps and overlays which he had prepared while writing the text. Mr. Mossman, a former infantry officer, has a wide knowledge of military matters. Mrs. Norma Heacock Sherris assisted in finding suitable illustrations."

"The writer is much indebted to Mrs. Joy B. Kaiser. Many a complicated troop movement she has 'reconstructed' on an overlay from coordinate readings in S–3 and G–3 journals and periodic reports. The author never tried to write up the story of an action until after it had been plotted on a terrain map. Thus Mrs. Kaiser, in a 2-year period, saved him much labor."

Comment: Why not use the official G–3 and G–2 maps, produced under the supervision of trained professionals? On what grounds were they ignored? Why was it necessary for the author to make sketch maps and overlays of his own? The net result, of course, is that the pictorial and map presentations are not those of the responsible FEC staff officers in their domain, viz, General Chamerlain (G–3) or General Willoughby (G–2), but essentially the personal impressions of Major Appleman and Messrs. Mossman and Dunay and Mrs. Kaiser, unquestionably devoted workers and estimable civil-servants—but not graduates of the Fort Leavenworth C.G.S. School.

"Mr. Stanley Falk prepared a useful digest of the Far East Command Daily Intelligence Summary, July through November 1950, relative to the Korean war. In an early stage of the work, Mrs. Gwendolyn Taylor gave valuable help."

Comment: This astounding procedure concerns me directly and it is at the heart of the calculated hoax that intelligence was faulty and the Chinese entry in the nature of a complete surprise. From December 7, 1941, onward, the G–2 section prepared a "Daily Intelligence Summary," containing a record of all information (Ground, Air, Navy) that came in, digested all action reports and plotted it on situation maps and overlays. The ebb and flow of military information, action, or events are best handled on a daily basis rather than a periodical review. They reflect the command more accurately; they enable a minute trace of collateral factors. Now, Colonel Appleman evidently failed to understand this (an index of ignorance on the technique of intelligence) and entrusted to Mr. Falk (whose military experience is not recorded) the digest, i.e., the arbitrary selection, of what was or was not important or significant in an official report, for which I had assumed responsibility and which I edited personally and minutely.

This is not, therefore, the intelligence appraisal of MacArthur's G–2, a general officer of long experience in his field, but the arbitrary selection of one Mr. Falk—probably a very estimable person but hardly qualified to pass on my own work or override my own conclusions.

"THE BIG QUESTION"—THE BIGGER HOAX

The wire services and newspapers were evidently guided by and reported largely on the contents of chapter XXXIX: "The Big Question." Appl an blows hot and cold.

(1) "The evaluation by General MacArthur and his intelligence officers of Chinese intervention and Chinese military capability in Korea in October and November 'seems' to have been the determining factor in shaping U.N. military action."

Comment: We accept that Washington received the daily intelligence summary from Tokyo (the DIS) and unless they had something better, they had to agree.

(2) "It must be inferred that either Washington was undecided or that its views coincided with that of the C in C."

Comment: Better than "interference." Appleman should know that there were also daily telegrams and frequent "telecon" conversations.

(3) "The Korean war had scarcely begun when the Far East Command began to consider the threat of Chinese intervention."

Comment: Does that sound like a "surprise," as charged?

(4) "Much of the information on Chinese troop movements came from Chinese sources on Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek received a steady stream of intelligence from his agents on the Chinese mainland."

Comment: Quite so. The CIA was kicked out of China and sought (and obtained) refuge and fraternal sustenance from G–2 in Tokyo. We had been in touch and supported Chiang Kai-shek's intelligence efforts as far back as Manila (1941); we even had one of Tai-Li's men on our staff; he was a graduate of West Point [sic].

(5) "On September 8, the Daily Intelligence Summary (D.I.S.) included a report that if the outcome of the (Korean) war seemed doubtful, elements of Lin Piao's 4th Field Army probably would be committed.

"The F.E.C. (MacArthur) learned in mid-September of an 'alleged' conference in Peiping where it was decided to support North Korea 'short of war.' "

Comment: This brings into sharp relief the function of brother Falk, as a "selective digest" of the D.I.S. He picked the wrong sequence or failed to understand the significance of what he omitted. The information was available in D.I.S. 2909, August 27, 1950. Note a "facsimile reprint of 'Intelligence Highlights,' a daily feature of the D.I.S. which I personally edited every day.

(6) "On the last day of September, the D.I.S. reported on an 'alleged' high-level conference in Peiping, August 14, at which it was decided to provide 210,000 Chinese troops for use in Korea."

Comment: Previously reported. A confirmation which can hardly be said to sustain Appleman's thesis of MacArthur being "surprised." Note the frequent use of the adjective "alleged" (like a police blotter?) for intelligence data.

(7) "A new note of more official character entered in the intelligence clamor on October 3. Chou En-lai summoned the Indian Ambassador, Sardar K. M. Panikkar, and told him if U.N. forces crossed the 38th parallel, China would send troops to defend North Korea."

Comment: So both Washington and MacArthur knew of Chinese "intentions." The surprise element is thus vanishing. This completely negates the Truman-MacArthur talks on Wake Island.

(8) "On October 5, FEC intelligence listed as a No. 1 priority in enemy capabilities 'reinforcement by Soviet satellite China.' But this estimate did not long remain in first priority. It dropped. On October 14, it again raised reinforcement of North Korea to first priority. There it remained during the Wake Island Conference * * *".

Comment: This is Mr. Falk's evaluation, the assistant who made digests for Appleman. This is his opinion on priorities. It cannot possibly erase the existence of our printed reports, personally edited by me every night, the responsible G–2 whom Appleman failed to interrogate or contact, at any time, in his postmortem historical investigation, though we both lived in the same city.

(9) "The D.I.S. for October 14 (day before MacArthur-Truman conversation) carried a lengthy analysis and 'presumably represented the official view of Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, the FEC G–2. This estimate accepted a total strength of 38 Chinese divisions in 9 armies (corps) in Manchuria. It expressed the view that Russia would find it convenient and economical to stay out of the conflict and let the Chinese provide the troops. It went on to say that the interest of all intelligence agencies was focused on the 'elusive Lin Piao' and the Yalu River."

"Declarations by Chinese leaders threatening to enter North Korea are probably in the category of diplomatic blackmail * * * beyond the purview of (field) intelligence: it is a decision for war on the highest level, i.e., the Kremlin and Peiping. However, the numerical and troop potential in Manchuria is a fait accompli. A total of 24 divisions are disposed along the Yalu River at crossing points * * * the grouping in the vicinity of Antung is the most immediately available force, astride a suitable road net for deployment southward."

Comment: Appleman supplied italic (for the blackmail item). Why did he not also supply italic (for emphasis) for the Chinese divisions, in position of readiness, along the Yalu—the fait accompli of 24 enemy divisions? Appleman then plays his "ace," the MacArthur-Truman conversation on Wake Island, October 15—though no amount of conversation could diminish the number of Red divisions crowded in the sanctuary of Manchuria or wipe away the fait accompli of river crossings held in overwhelming strength.

(10) "The conference between the President, General MacArthur, and selected advisers * * * most of the talk concerned plans for the rehabilitation of Korea. * * * In response to President Truman's question 'What are the chances for Chinese or Soviet interference?' notes of the conference indicate that MacArthur replied: 'Very little * * * the Chinese have 300,000 men in Manchuria * * * 10/200,000 are distributed along the Yalu River * * * we have bases for our Air Force in Korea. If the Chinese tried to get down to Pyongyang there would be greatest slaughter * * *.' "

Comment: Substance of statements, compiled by Gen. Omar N. Bradley from "notes kept by the conferees from Washington." This is the same Bradley, implacable foe of MacArthur, who probably cast the deciding vote in the J.C.S. for the subsequent dismissal of the general. The same Bradley who viewed the Korean war "as the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time." Does he think the front: Denmark-Berlin-Switzerland as the right front, the right place, the right time? We could have stopped the Chinese (and the Russians) in Korea. Siberia is harder for the Russians to support than East Germany and we will soon be confronted with it. Obviously, this is the place to ascertain MacArthur's real views on Wake Island and puncture Appleman's balloon, reflecting, of course, the Pentagon's hostility toward the general at the time. A la suite of the wire services reports on Army history, MacArthur issued the following statement:

"MACARTHUR'S STATEMENT ON THE WAKE ISLAND CONVERSATIONS

"General of the Army Douglas MacArthur released a statement to the United Press International on June 14, 1961, concerning the entrance of Communist China into the Korean war:

"(a) *There is no substitute for victory*

"'Probably through a misunderstanding of the text reported upon, or for other unknown reasons, there has recently been published an incorrect impression of the references made in the excellent work, "South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu," by Roy E. Appleman, to my reply, "Very little" to a query during the Wake Island conference concerning my views on the possibility of Soviet or Red Chinese national forces formally entering into a state of war against us on the Korean Peninsula. The author records in his text the assumptions upon which this reply was based. They were that any such act of war would cause us to react in our conventional, traditional, and historic manner by employing our full power to destroy the enemy's bases of supply and attack, thereby isolating his forces already on the peninsula where we had complete control of the air and adjacent seas in addition to possessing a practical monopoly of atomic power.'

"(b) *Treason in Embassy and U.N. channels*

"'Under such adverse conditions no enemy commander in his right senses would have committed major forces to such a peninsula campaign without prior assurance that we would accord him a privileged sanctuary within which safely to mount and supply his offensive against us. Such an assurance may well, indeed, have been communicated to the Red Chinese by the British traitors, Burgess and McLean, who defected to the Soviet during the Korean war with full top secret information on the war plans and intentions of the United States—plans and intentions which insofar as they related to our reaction to formal acts of war against us by Red China were not communicated to me as the commander in the field.

"'Our field intelligence kept us informed of the deployment of Red Chinese troops on the Manchurian-Korean border but this deployment was a natural defensive measure in view of the conflict raging to the south. Moreover, the decision of one nation to enter upon war against another involves a political decision quite beyond the reach of field intelligence.

"'The discussion concerning the accuracy of American estimates of Red China's intentions in reference to the Korean conflict is, however, largely academic. The results would have been the same.'"

"(c) *Our leaders lacked the will to fight*

"'We had publicly announced our national objectives as the clearing of North Korea and unification of the country, and such objectives could and should have been achieved quite regardless of any military intervention by others, especially as we then had the power to achieve them against any nation or combination of nations on earth. What we lacked was not measured in terms of military inteligence or of military power but in the courage of our leaders to keep faith with our fallen soldiers and to fight through to the victory for which they died.'"

DEPLOYMENT OF CHINESE ARMIES: FROM CANTON TO THE YALU

The northward displacement of Chinese Regular Army units beginning with August 1950, from South and Central China was reported as soon as information came in, through Chian Kai-shek's agents on the mainland and certain cryptographic and diplomatic fragmentary data became available. The source is irrelevant; the point is—was this information made of record in Washington, in Tokyo, and distributed to commanders in the corps and division level? It was—and the long-established (1941) medium was the "Daily Intelligence Summary" (D.I.S.), a paperbound daily publication, mimeo processed, which time-conscious Major Appleman preferred to have boiled down by one of his assistants. We have already furnished sample pages from the D.I.S. We also have on file maps showing mainland locations of the Chinese 3d and 4th Field Armies, the cream of the crop, which eventually fought in North Korea. Their progress toward Manchuria and the Yalu was reported by me in unbroken succession and with a sense of increasing urgency, viz:

D.I.S. 2849, June 28, 1950: "The possibility exists that North Korea may receive reinforcements from Chinese Communist Forces."

D.I.S. 2856, July 5, 1950: "Early contingents of Chinese Communists of Korean nationality have been integrated in the Red North Korea Army. Hereafter * * * these units will be employed intact and retain their identity."

D.I.S. 2859, July 8, 1950: "Intervention (in Korea) can be expected should Mao-Tse Tung believe the situation favorable for decisive action."

D.I.S. 2888, August 6, 1950: "South Chinese Party official announced that if North Korea is invaded (by the U.N.) the Chinese would offer North Korea whatever assistance is needed."

D.I.S. 2913, August 31, 1950: "Report on troop movements from Central China to Manchuria over a considerable period." See facsimile of D.I.S. 2909 August 27, att.

D.I.S. 2921, September 8, 1950: "If North Korea forces are unsuccessful in driving the U.N. from Korea, General Lin Piao's Fourth Field Army will be committed."

D.I.S. 2937, September 24, 1950: "Indications that Communist troops on the Korean border moving south into Korea."

D.I.S. 2948, October 4, 1950: "Buildup of Chinese forces along the Korea-Manchurian border. Massing at Antung and other Yalu crossings conclusive."

D.I.S. 2963, October 20, 1950: "Intervention is a decision for war on the highest level, i.e., the Kremlin and Peiping. However, the numerical and troop potential in Manchuria is a fait accompli. A total of 24 divisions are disposed along the Yalu river * * * the capacity for crossing at Antung or north (therefore) is not questionable."

D.I.S. 2974, October 31, 1950: "Indications that some of the units disposed along the Yalu had already crossed the border and were then in Korea."

After the first capture of Chinese troops, Tokyo removed the problem of Chinese intervention from the "realm of the academic" to a serious, proximate threat. Although "piecemeal commitment" for limited purposes was possible, Tokyo warned of not losing sight of the maximum potential of the Chinese Reds, i.e., a prompt commitment of 29 of the 44 divisions then identified along the Yalu. On November 3 the Communist order of battle in Manchuria was shown in great detail. See facsimile page of D.I.S. 2977, reproduced previously.

DEPLOYMENT OF CHINESE ARMIES: OPERATIONS IN NORTH KOREA

At this point, I quote from briefings to the press, in the critical period. Identifications based on actual captures and interrogation of Chinese soldiers merely confirmed what previous D.I.S. had currently forecast. I accept full historical responsibility for the wordings of these daily intelligence summaries; they were mimeo reproduced during the night, in order to be on General MacArthur's desk in the morning with airmail distribution to other command posts. Emphatically, this was not the product (as Appleman believed) of "indifferent clerks transcribing a minimum of messages * * *."

November 1: The initial entry began in October via Yalu River crossing points and continued slowly throughout November. Along the Yalu River, 11 Chinese armies, i.e., corps of 3 divisions each were stationed poised for action, in a position of readiness. This represents 33 divisions, approximately 10,000 men each, with an infantry component of 6/8,000.

November 25: Under the cover designation of "volunteer" forces, three Red corps had been identified and more were suspected. The U.S. 8th Army, with four ROK divisions and four American divisions were engaged in probing attacks along the Sinanju-Kunuri front. On that date 6 Chinese corps, or 18 divisions were in partial deployment west to east from Chongju to Tokchon. They took extraordinary care not to disclose their positions; reinforcements were coming in from the Yalu (never crossed by our planes) at a distance of only 50 miles.

This broad deployment lent itself to a wide envelopment. When the east (Korean) flank of the U.N. Forces broke, the 40th, 38th and 42d Chinese Corps were in a position to move south and west and pin the 8th Army against the seashore and destroy it piecemeal.

The probing attack on the 8th Army (a reconnaissance-in-force) in that period, disclosed the full extent of the Chinese commitments, in a superiority of 8 U.N. divisions to 18 Red divisions, without counting the rehabilitated I, II, and III, North Korean Corps with an additional 9 Red divisions to enter the picture later on.

December 12: The U.S. 8th Army promptly fell back successively, while the Xth U.S. Corps was fighting a similar action, with a view of evacuating its exposed position and rejoin the 8th Army at a later date.

December 27: The enemy followed slowly in the same deployment of six Chinese corps, always with the plan to again envelop the east flank. At no time was the U.S. 8th Army in a position to offer serious opposition until the junction with its X Corps; the addition of five divisions would give the combined 8th Army a chance to select a position, fight or resume the counter offensive. This was done in February. Even then, the discrepancies in total strength would continue in favor of the Chinese with the entry into action of the rehabilitated North Korean I, II, and III Corps.

December 27: The U.S. 8th Army deployed generally along the 38th Parallel, with the bulk of the American Divisions in the left sector. In the meantime, the brilliantly successful evacuation of the X Corps was terminated on December 24 and two ROK Divisions were landed on the east coast, in the area of the enemy III N.K Corps. The mass of the Chinese, however, began to concentrate on a narrow front, in column of divisions, with a view of penetrating in direction of Seoul and the potential of a double envelopment. The attack was anticipated several days in advance, as of January 1, when it was actually executed. As stated previously, at no time was the 8th Army in a position to stand and fight until a junction of the X Corps and the entry into action of its 5 additional divisions. Consequently, the army fell back again to an East-West line through Pyongtaek.

January 30: Coincidental with the entry into action of the X Corps, the 8th Army noted a slackening of enemy resistance in the west sector and evidence of a sideslipping to the east of the Chinese forces. As on the Anju-Kunuri line on November 24, the 8th Army resumed the offensive in a closely coordinated attack, with limited objectives—but with its East flank now strongly secured by the X Corps, which was not the case on November 28. This forward movement dislocated whatever project the enemy was in process of execution. His Western Corps including the I N.K. were driven

northward and across the Han River, involving 12 Divisions. When 6 more divisions, deploying to the east, collided with the IX and X U.S. Corps, they suffered a staggering defeat and by February 20 were in full retreat.

Six Chinese Corps or 18 Divisions have now been committed, as well as the rehabilitated V, II, and III N.K. Corps, an additional 10 divisions of lesser combat quality. This represents a ratio of 31 divisions against 12 combined U.N. divisions. The issue here is not necessarily between equipment or armament but between infantry; the infantry slice per Chinese Division is close to 7,000. There are local instances in which the discrepancies in infantry were staggering. On February 14 the 23d Infantry with a French Battalion attached stopped the onslaught of the entire 42d Chinese Corps, the 123d, 124th and 125th Divisions. In terms of infantry this represents 4 U.N. Battalions against 27 Communist Battalions and in terms of doughboys, about 4,000 against 23,000 a ratio of 1:6; at this stage of the game, the average U.N. division attempts to hold a frontage, as the crow flies of 12–15 miles.

THE YALU AND BERLIN: WHAT ARE THE RED INTENTIONS?

Berlin is a little closer than the Yalu. But already precautionary questions are being raised about the Kremlin's real intentions. The boys are getting ready "to cover up." Now the line of demarcation between "enemy intentions" and "enemy capabilities" is thin—but sharply drawn. Field intelligence can normally appraise "enemy capabilities," i.e., strength, direction, and disposition of his forces. At the Yalu, however, the decision of a nation (like Red China) will risk a major war (by attacking U.N. contingents) was obviously in the diplomatic field. It could hardly be ascertained by the infantry patrols of the 8th Army.

As to Red "capabilities," they were progressively clarified tracking the Red armies from Canton northward to the Yalu; the deployment of enemy divisions along the Yalu; spotting assembly areas at bridge crossings, etc. As to when they would cross (the calendar date) depended largely on daily aerial observation; unfortunately, that was forbidden by Washington. There remained only a "probing action," a reconnaissance in force—which is exactly what MacArthrur ordered—and found out. We have an identical situation today around Berlin and along the NATO front.

ARMY HISTORY EXPLAINS MACARTHUR "BAD GUESS"

A new official Army history says, in effect, that if Gen. Douglas MacArthur was wrong about the Red Chinese entering the Korean war, so were a lot of other people, including top Washington officials.

The new Korean war history says that when General MacArthur told President Truman in mid-October of 1950 that Chinese intervention was unlikely he was merely repeating a view held generally in Washington.

The Chinese did enter the war before the month was out. A prolonged debate arose about whether there was intelligence warning of the impending Chinese intervention.

In the following year, Mr. Truman removed General MacArthur from command, but the reason did not involve the old argument about intelligence. Mr. Truman was angered over General MacArthur's insistence that he be permitted to pursue the Chinese Reds into China and that his planes bomb munitions sources across the border.

PART OF A SERIES

The latest account of the intelligence controversy is contained in a new volume of the Army historical series.

Written by Roy E. Appleman, a Reserve officer who was a division historian during the war, the new book is scheduled for distribution later this month.

Of the conference between Mr. Truman and General MacArthur at Wake Island on October 15, 1950, the book says that Mr. Truman asked General MacArthur, "What are the chances for Chinese or Soviet interference?"

According to the history the substance of General MacArthur's answer was "Very little. Had they interfered in the first or second months, it would have been decisive.

"We are no longer fearful of their intervention. Wo no longer stand with hat in hand."

"PURELY SPECULATIVE"

The history says that "General MacArthur has challenged the accuracy of the notes of the conversations at the Wake Island conference." It says he claims that while he did say the chance of interference was very little he added that this opinion was purely speculative and represented the military view, whereas the question fundamentally was one requiring a political decision.

The book adds:

"It must be noted that General MacArthur's opinion of the subject was not questioned by the President or any of the others present, who must be assumed to have had knowledge of the highest level of intelligence. * * * It would seem General MacArthur in responding to the President's question merely voiced the consensus of the highest officials from the seat of Government."

Congressman Joseph E. Karth Reports on Activities During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this 1st session of the 87th Congress has been an eventful period for the Nation and for the people of Ramsey County.

Job and business opportunities in the St. Paul area are looking brighter than ever as the result of Federal projects. Work started on the $8,317,000 St. Paul-South St. Paul floodwall which will make possible a whole new industrial park in the Riverview area when the floodwall is completed. Soon construction will be begun, within weeks, on a $7,600,000 annex to the present post office and custom house. By far the most spectacular development was the rapid authorization for a completely new Federal office building and courthouse for St. Paul to cost $11,700,000 when completed. Already $1,553,000 has been appropriated for buying a site and making preliminary designs.

In addition, swift progress is being made to build a new Lake States Forest Experiment Station on the University of Minnesota St. Paul campus. Preliminary plans for this $1,250,000 building and facilities are well along.

Included in the public works appropriations for this fiscal year are $750,000 in funds to continue work on the Mississippi River floodwall and $15,000 for a survey of Pigs Eye Lake to determine its capabilities as a harbor. The lake is envisioned as the great barge terminal of the upper river which will exploit more fully St. Paul's advantage as the great gateway to the Northwest of the North American Continent.

I sought in all ways possible to attract defense, space, and commercial work to the Twin Cities area and Minnesota to help our economy.

NATIONAL SCENE

In Washington the erratic joint performance of Congress and the new administration during this last session reminds me of a couple of skittish farm horses working in a doubletree for the first time. There's much snorting, confusion, backing and hauling, kicking, rearing, jumping the traces, and getting tangled up in the harness before the hard work gets started.

But for all these early difficulties the "team" turned in a pretty impressive performance on legislation during the first session. True, not all the important domestic legislation proposed was given adequate consideration. What best characterized the new administration's attitude in this field was a basic concern for our country's human resources. At its request Congress passed an extension of temporary unemployment compensation benefits for long-term jobless workers in industry and on the railroads; benefits for the children of the unemployed on the same basis as fatherless children; improvements in social security benefits, involving increased minimums, allowing men to retire at 62 with reduced pensions, and raising widows' benefits—involving 4.4 million people; an authorization to distribute surplus food to the destitute; improvements in minimum wage protection to include 3.6 million more workers and to raise the wage to $1.25; a vast new housing and urban renewal program to help in the rebuilding of the country's deteriorating cities; and, an Area Redevelopment Act to encourage economic rebuilding of cities and farm areas which have lost substantial industry.

Other congressional action, of special interest to Federal workers, was the passage of bills to increase the allowances of those who are required to travel, and legal protection of Federal employees involved in auto accidents while on official duty.

I worked for the enactment of a longevity pay bill which would give postal workers benefits at least comparable to those in the Federal classified system. This is important unfinished business to be taken up in the second session and should be enacted into law.

In the field of civil rights the new administration has concentrated on using the vast and effective powers of the executive department in broadening employment opportunities for all workers wherever this Government has any influence. The results have been substantial. In advancing civil rights in housing, education, transportation, and vot-

ing, the administration's achievements have been truly impressive.

American agriculture has become a problem heretofore unknown in history—a farm economy which produces more than its intended market can possibly consume. Under the preceding national administration, policies encouraged farmers to grow ever-larger crops for storage. The present administration has attempted to reduce excess production of wheat and feed grains to ease the tremendously expensive problem of storage. It has sought, too, to save the farmer's level of income. The omnibus farm program which was passed by Congress developed new approaches which it is hoped will best accomplish these objectives.

To ease the worst effects of the recent drought in Minnesota and the region, I helped work for the enactment of laws to preserve the basic herds of livestock through Government assistance for feed and loans.

To encourage local communities to do a better job for the health of their people this Congress passed a water pollution control law to double the rate of building new sewage treatment plants and to encourage the construction of community health facilities, mainly for nonhospital health services including nursing homes for the chronically ill and the aged.

INTERNATIONAL SCENE

National defense and the response to Russian attempts at technological terror in atomic energy and space have preoccupied a substantial part of the attentions and the energies of the administration and the Congress.

Laos, Cuba, Congo, Berlin, and Vietnam are world trouble spots which recently highlighted the clash of interests between communism and democracy.

Our major task was rebuilding our country's armed strength which had been somewhat dismantled during the last 8 years behind the slogans of "more bang for a buck," "massive retaliation," and the like.

Billions of our treasure have had to be appropriated for ballistic missiles, bombers, Polaris submarines, armored vehicles, atomic cannon, and the vast amounts of fabulously expensive hardware that go into a modern defense establishment.

Khrushchev's missile-rattling and threats of military adventures raised our arms budget from an estimated $40.3 billion last January to an appropriation of $46.7 billion now.

In addition we have had hurriedly to develop an orderly scheduled U.S. space program to counter the Russian policy of technological terror which has had the effect of shaking the confidence of our allies and the so-called neutrals in our ability to maintain a superiority in science. From my knowledge I am sure we are well ahead in the overall scientific spectrum although we have suffered a propaganda setback as the result of Russia's "space spectaculars."

Congress approved $1,671,750,000 in funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for our country's civilian space program in the next year. Some of this money will be spent to speed up our program for a manned moon expedition which has now been given an urgent priority. While the physical act of landing a man on the moon is not in itself too important, the technological knowledge gained by acquiring this ability is of immeasureable value.

It is to our foreign relations that the administration and this Congress have given special attention.

Foreign economic and military assistance to help friendly nations to help strengthen themselves so they do not fall prey to Communist subversion and assault was of first importance. Congress approved $3.9 billion for this purpose in the final hours of the session. Included in this legislation was $30 million for a bold new idea, a Peace Corps of dedicated men and women who will live with and teach special skills to the peoples of underdeveloped areas in the world.

Communist attention to Latin American lands in turn stimulated the administration to propose a new alliance for progress program implemented by $500 million in funds. The shock of Cuba's line-up with the Communist world has forcefully called American attention to the threatening revolutionary situations in the Western Hemisphere.

As part of our worldwide offensive of new ideas the administration and Congress worked out a new U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to gather together the best available brains of our country to prepare research and data for the day when arms control becomes the subject of genuine negotiation among the world powers. I am proud to have been associated with the enactment of this idea because it deals with the crucial matter of human survival and also because it will explore the very fundamental relationships of an economy whose prosperity has become alarmingly dependent upon huge defense budgets. Economists and Government officials have long asked each other the worried question, "What will happen if peace really breaks out?" Through the Arms Control Agency we at last have an important means to make a serious, continuing study of gearing a highly productive economy to peace.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

While this session has been one of the most productive in many years, Congress has much to do when it reconvenes in January 1962. A few of the important matters it will surely have to consider are bills for:

Tax reform—plugging loopholes to raise money to alleviate a deficit caused by defense increases;

Manpower retraining—providing a program to train workers made permanently jobless through technological change and shifting industry;

Education—authorizing programs for Federal assistance, such as for medical students and elementary and secondary school-age children;

Aged—adequate medical and hospital care for the aged under the social security system;

Labor—setting minimum standards in the administration of the unemployment compensation system; and, clarifying provisions of labor relations laws; and

Federal postal and classified workers—revising employee legislation to improve and equalize salary schedules and to provide machinery for collective bargaining.

Other important bills will of course come up and may even precede those I have listed because events will dictate the action to be taken.

I am confident, though, that the Congress and this administration will continue to move ahead in mutual respect and harmony to meet successfully whatever challenges will arise and to assure as best we can the well-being of the American people and the peoples of the world.

Before Time Runs Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, about the 20th of September, it was our privilege to have a discussion with one of the officials of the Aerospace Medicine Division of the Office of the Surgeon General of the Department of the Air Force. The subject of our discussion was the effects of radiation from atomic tests upon tissues of the human body.

The conference was arranged at our request after a trip to the Nevada Testing Grounds back in April where we became extremely interested in the effect of radiation and came back to Washington with a determination to find out if any research was being done or performed which might lead to the discovery of a prophylaxis, or some means or methods whereby medical science could build up in advance, a degree of resistence or immunity to radiation comparable in a way to vaccination or immunization measures for virus or disease.

Since the publication of the book in 1958 entitled "On the Beach," we have been intensely interested and devoted to the idea that along with all other types of atomic research and development, there should also be funds appropriated for radiobiology research, that is, for those that remain alive and physically competent, some medical treatment might or could be researched and developed in the hope that it would reduce to a minimum the effects of radiation which would otherwise continue to deteriorate and degrade the remaining population.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert as extraneous matter, an excerpt from an article in the Washington Post of September 23, 1961, by Drew Pearson, entitled "Russian A-Tests Will Cause Cancer." And I quote part of that article as follows:

Experts estimate that the Russians have already spread enough strontium 90 during the month of September to cause 100,000 cases of bone cancer in the United States

alone. In most victims the cancer will develop slowly in the next two decades—far removed in time and space from the September in Siberia when the poison was turned loose.

Thus Premier Khrushchev's cute grandchildren whom I saw playing in the sand beside the Black Sea will not know for a long time whether they will suffer cancer from the bombs exploded by their grandfather; nor will my grandchildren and all the other children of the United States and Russia know for 10 or 20 years whether they will suffer.

Another thing: The United States may well receive a heavier dose of radioactive fallout than the Soviet gets from its own tests. This is because the winds move from west to east, and come next spring will drift south with the polar air masses bringing radioactive spring showers. It's the rain that deposits the greatest amount of fallout and we get far more rainfall than Russia.

Regardless of whether the United States or Russia suffers most, however, one thing is certain; Scandinavia and Canada are directly in the northern airstream; Africa, South America and southeast Asia, in contrast, will suffer least.

Thus the white races and the cultural centers of the world, where the population is least dense, are getting the heaviest dose of radioactive poison. The underdeveloped countries with their heavy population centers in India, Indonesia, and southeast Asia will suffer least.

Our tests caused far less contamination of the world's atmosphere than current Soviet shots which scatter almost all their radioactive residue into the jet streams. The contamination is 5 to 10 times more concentrated than around the equator.

In short, the Russian tests will deposit hotter fissionable material on the people of the world in greater quantity and in a shorter time. So far, we are keeping our tests underground.

Some further facts about fallout:

1. Any dose of radiation, no matter how small, produces a harmful biological effect.

2. The people of northern and central China will absorb more strontium 90 than the people of the West. For the orientals get their dietary calcium mostly from cereals, westerners mostly from milk. But the dose of strontium 90 in milk is expected to double in many U.S. areas as a result of the Soviet tests.

3. Russia's radioactive blasts will linger in the atmosphere for another year, hanging like an invisible pall over the northern hemisphere. And the most dangerous poisons—strontium 90 and cesium 137—will come down with either rain or snow. This is why the poison will fall unevenly depending on the snow or rainfall in certain areas. You are certain to see "hot snow" next winter and "radioactive rain" in the spring.

4. Some experts warn that radiation danger is increasing so rapidly that nations won't be able to test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. World outrage and the danger to their own people may become too great. These experts have suggested privately that Russia may have been in a hurry to get her atmospheric testing accomplished before the radiation level rises to the point that the world rises in anger against the tester.

Our conference with officials of the Department of Defense in the interest of intensified radiobiological research was very encouraging. The representatives of the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission agreed that while the mission of the Medical Department of the Department of Defense in support of radiobiology research program is to insure the capabilities of the combat personnel to accomplish their assigned mission in war, the responsibility goes much broader than this in the concept of national survival. National survival, of course, requires survival of the people, our most important single national resource. The importance of conserving this resource is the long lead-time required to replace it. National survival after a thermonuclear holocaust requires not only that the people remain alive, but that they retain their competence to rebuild that which has been destroyed, in order to arise again as a well-integrated nation.

This requires not only that they remain alive and physically competent at that time, but if at all possible to reduce to a minimum any late effects that radiation in the environment might have, thereby deteriorating and degrading the competence of the population of this country. To this end better knowledge of the effects of radiation upon the tissues of the human body is required. In order to do this appropriately, we must counteract the extremes of opinion which say at one end, "Radiation is no problem," and which say at the other end, "It is too devastating to comprehend." Somewhere between these two extremes lies the truth, and the elucidation of this truth on a scientific factual basis is the goal of radiobiological research.

Mr. Speaker, in our opinion, this field of radiobiology research is not just simply interesting and fascinating, it is of vital importance to every person in our land.

The United States spends sizable sums of money on general medical research each year, but here is a field of research which must be thoroughly—but hurriedly—explored while there may yet be time.

The clock is turning fast. The danger may be great from present tests, but if the tests should cease and thermonuclear war should commence, the very research so desperately needed might have to be suspended.

It is our sincere hope that with the coming of the new session, careful and earnest thought will be given to adequate appropriaticns leading to the discovery of a possible prophylaxis against the effects of radiation.

Let us hurry with this important goal of radiobiology research while there is yet time.

Fire From the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce for Thursday, September 14, 1961, entitled "Fire From the Hill."

This article deals with the vital question of how best to provide financing for our railroad industry, and it raises a question which warrants the careful scrutiny of all thoughtful persons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRE FROM THE HILL

It was inevitable that sooner or later the Interstate Commerce Commission would come under congressional fire for underwriting those private loans to the New Haven Railroad that the Government is now obliged to write off.

The amendment Congress tacked on to the Interstate Commerce Act's section V via the Transportation Act of 1958, was, of course, intended to help ailing railroads by authorizing ICC to guarantee private financing of new equipment purchases in circumstances where the carrier could not obtain such financing at reasonable terms without such a guarantee. The fact that several years ago an Eastern railroad was unable to market equipment trust obligations at the high rate of 7 percent helped convince Congress that some kind of aid of this type was urgently needed.

But the 1958 act did specify that the commission was only to underwrite such loans on behalf of the Government when convinced that there was a reasonable prospect that the loans would be repaid. It was with this in mind, apparently, that the House Appropriations Committee refused this week to recommend that the Government pay New York banks $14.7 million guaranteed by ICC to help the New Haven, which is now in reorganization. This does not mean that the Treasury will not honor the obligation. It merely means that the committee itself, for the time being, wants no part of the matter.

There is, perhaps, some point to this righteous legislative indignation, although we are not too sure what it is.

During the early months of this year, when ICC was still underwriting section V guarantees to the New Haven, there were grave doubts that the railroad could long survive. But by that time, the Commission was heavily committed as, indeed, were many other of the New Haven's creditors.

Last year, although the New Haven had been badly bruised by fate, prospects looked much better. If the winter had not been so bad, if the economic slump had not gone so deep the section V loans might just have tided the New Haven over its crisis. In that event neither the Commission nor section V would be getting dark scowls from the Appropriations Committee today. As matters turned out, ICC guessed wrong. The section V loans were not enough. And section V is under a cloud.

But before heaping too much censure on the Commission let us recall the purpose of the section V loans. It is not to provide Federal guarantees to prosperous railroads (and there are quite a few of these); it is to bolster those which are skirting so close to the edge of financial disaster that they are no longer able to finance their equipment needs in the marketplace.

In these circumstances, almost any guarantee ICC gives must necessarily be marginal. If there were no element of risk there would be no need for the guarantees.

And to put it quite bluntly, in the case of the New Haven the major fault lay not so much with ICC as with the State, municipal, and local governments which, dependent upon the New Haven's essential services, should have come promptly to the rescue; which did a great deal of talking about it but did not get around to acting on their alarms until too late. ICC did act, but until just about the time the hearse showed up at the door, it acted alone.

We are not so much concerned, however, with the pros and cons of ICC's handling of

the New Haven guarantees as with the effect of the current congressional criticism on the future of the guarantee program.

Let it be remembered that ICC's initial approaches to these loans were those of a barefoot man tiptoeing through a darkened room littered with broken glass. Many long months passed before it consented to approve any section V loans at all. Even today, 3 years after the act was passed, and near the end (we hope) of one of the worst periods in the history of American railroading, it has guaranteed a total of only $138 million in section V loans out of a total authorization of $500 million.

This does not strike us as the record of a profligate, free-spending agency dedicated to letting the chips fall where they may. On the contrary, the Commission is about as cautious an organization as is to be found in Washington, even if one includes the branch libraries. If one effect of the current spate of criticism of ICC's actions in support of the New Haven is to scare it into turning down any further section V guarantees under which repayment potentials are doubtful—the only railroads that will be able to qualify for this type of assistance in the future will be those that don't need it and don't want it.

Goals of the New Frontier: Housing Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Act of 1961 has been hailed as one of the greatest pieces of housing legislation ever to pass the Congress. In speaking of the act, President Kennedy said:

> For the communities of the Nation, large and small, it provides an opportunity for a giant step toward better cities and improved housing. And I think the beneficial effects of this legislation will be felt by every American.

Those who remember the bitter frustrations of recent years can fully appreciate the monumental accomplishment that this act represents. For years we were confronted by an administration which opposed any new housing legislation. We had to fight vetoes, threats of vetoes and obstructive parliamentary tactics to get even the most modest housing measures. The Housing Act of 1961 provided, for the first time, an FHA loan program which will benefit low income families, and added to the Housing Act such forward looking measures as loans and grants to communities to attack the problem of mass transportation, and assistance to them in preserving open spaces for recreation and conservation.

MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES

There are many families whose incomes were a little too high for low-rent public housing and yet not quite high enough to be able to afford decent private housing who have received little benefit from previous housing programs. The Housing Act provided that modest income families be eligible for loans with terms as long as 35 years, and even 40 if needed, and downpayments of as little as 3 percent of the sales price. In addition, under a new program of low interest loans for rental and cooperative housing the FHA can insure a mortgage on a project with an interest rate as low as 3⅛ percent. This will mean a saving of as much as $20 a month per family, compared to ordinary rental housing financing.

HOUSING CONSERVATION

The Housing Act also deals directly with the problem of maintaining and improving existing homes. It is far more economical to prevent the development of slums than it is to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in clearing away slums once they have been created. To aid persons in providing major repairs and alterations of existing housing the Housing Act permits FHA to insure 20-year rehabilitation loans up to $10,000 per dwelling unit.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Despite two vetoes specifically objecting to housing for the elderly, the Democratic Congress in 1959 forced through a new program of direct Federal 3⅜-percent interest loans to help build rental housing suited to the needs of the elderly and within their financial reach. The Housing Act of 1961 authorized an additional $75 million for this program, and extended the eligibility requirements to include cooperatives and certain public bodies.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

The Housing Act provided long overdue additional authority for the low-rent housing program—the program aimed directly at our most critical housing needs. The Housing Act of 1961 has revitalized the low-rent housing program by authorizing an additional 100,000 units—enough to meet at least our most pressing needs and permit local authorities to plan ahead.

The act also amends the low-rent housing program to meet the special needs of low-income elderly families where incomes are so low that they threaten the solvency of housing projects. To enable local authorities to take care of these families, the law now authorizes an additional payment of up to $120 a year where this extra help is necessary.

URBAN RENEWAL

Our most direct attack on slums and urban blight is provided by the program of slum clearance and urban renewal created by the Housing Act of 1949. When the new administration took office it found that the $2 billion authorized in previous years had been wholly committed. To replenish the program, the Housing Act authorized an additional $2 billion, an amount estimated to carry the program for the next 4 years.

The act also amended the urban renewal law to give more equitable treatment to small communities and depressed areas. Since these places suffer some disadvantage in meeting their share of urban renewal costs, the 1961 act increased the Federal share from two-thirds to three-fourths for towns and cities up to 50,000 population and depressed areas up to 150,000.

SMALL BUSINESS AND URBAN RENEWAL

The Housing Act also provided some well-justified benefits for small business firms in urban renewal areas who are often hard hit by the process of clearing and rebuilding blighted areas.

To alleviate these hardships the Housing Act provides for 20-year 3⅜-percent loans through the Small Business Administration, to help displaced business firms relocate elsewhere. In addition, displaced business firms will benefit by the elimination of the $3,000 ceiling on Federal payments for moving expenses.

URBAN RENEWAL FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

The new Housing Act also recognizes the fact that sound rebuilding of our cities requires the elimination of more than just residential blight. Business districts can become sore spots just as well. To meet this need, the Housing Act increased from 20 to 30 percent the proportion of urban renewal grant funds which can be used for nonresidential projects. These projects can be of special benefit to municipalities by increasing manifold the tax returns to the city.

COLLEGE HOUSING

One of our most successful programs in the field of housing is that of low interest, liberal loans to finance needed housing for institutions of higher learning. To help our universities, so vital to the educational and scientific advances on which our Nation's welfare and its very safety are dependent, the Housing Act authorized a total of $1.2 billion for these loans to carry the program for the next 4 years.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

One of our most pressing national needs, particularly in small communities, is the improvement and expansion of our investments in public facilities to serve all of our people. To provide for these needs the Housing Act of 1961 greatly expanded and liberalized the program of public facility loans. The interest rate on these loans was reduced to approximately 3½ percent. At the same time an additional $450 million was provided for these loans which can be made to any community up to 50,000 population and designated redevelopment areas up to 150,000.

MASS TRANSIT

One of the most serious problems facing our metropolitan centers is that of efficient transportation. City after city is finding that it is choked by traffic. The Housing Act takes a major step toward meeting the transit needs of our urban areas by a provision which authorized $50 million in low-interest loans which can be used by public bodies for the acquisition, construction and improvement of public and/or private transportation facilities and equipment. In addition, the act authorizes $25 million for demonstration grants covering up to two-thirds of project cost for projects designed to explore new and better ways of overcoming mass transit problems.

FHA HOME LOAN INSURANCE

To make the benefits of FHA loan insurance and home ownership available to additional families, the Housing Act liberalizes the terms by reducing minimum downpayment requirements, by increasing the maximum mortgage amount for a single family home from $22,500 to $25,000, and by increasing the maximum maturity for newly built houses from 30 years to 35 years.

OPEN SPACE LAND

There has been growing concern over the fact that the rapid population increase in our towns and cities has led to the virtual disappearance of open space suitable for parks and playgrounds. In order to help communities to preserve some open land, the bill authorizes $50 million for partial Federal grants to acquire open land to be held permanently as park land. These grants can cover up to 20 percent of the cost in the case of individual political subdivisions. However, if the land will serve all or a substantial part of the whole urban area, the Federal share can be increased to 30 percent.

FARM HOUSING

The act recognizes that housing problems in rural areas, while different from those in the cities, are just as serious. In particular, mortgage credit is generally very difficult to obtain. To meet this need, the existing program of direct Federal loans for farm housing is extended for 4 years and an additional $200 million is made available for these loans.

The Housing Act of 1961 represents a tremendous step toward the goal of providing decent housing and a suitable environment for every American.

Rockefeller Seeks to Aid New York Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, "Rocky's Rail Plan Would Help State," appeared on September 13, 1961, in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. I commend it to the attention of the entire House and request that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

ROCKY'S RAIL PLAN WOULD HELP STATE

Governor Rockefeller, who came to Rochester yesterday for a 2-day visit, may go into history as the Governor who did most to save this State's railroads from financial disaster. At stake in this effort are thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in this area alone.

Rockefeller on Monday urged in Washington that a broad Federal program of aid be instituted, starting with repeal of the 10-percent tax on passenger fares. This would be a boost of $200 million alone. More specifically pertinent to the Rochester area, the Governor sought to prevent the New York Central from being frozen out of a proposed merger with the Baltimore & Ohio and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads. His urging should be heeded.

As this newspaper has pointed out, the New York Central depends heavily on revenue from carrying trains routed over its rails by the other two lines. But if the two merge without including the New York Central, it will pay the merged lines to keep this traffic on their own rails, cutting heavily into Central revenues.

That could only mean curtailed service in such communities as Rochester to which the Central is vital. This railroad pours more than $8 million into payrolls here and pays taxes of almost a half million dollars a year to the city of Rochester. It is a large factor in support of much industry here and its transportation service is vital to much of the rest.

The Governor is not the first to give verbal recognition to the plight of this State's railroads, but he is the first to move decisively to help them. Through this action, they have been relieved of a growing tax squeeze and have been enabled to obtain rolling stock they could not otherwise get.

All this is in line with his campaign pledge to help provide better climate for industry and with his duty as Governor to help preserve jobs and revenue in the State. With such action, his moves to bolster higher education, reorganize the State government and keep it fiscally sound, Rocky has rolled up an excellent record in his first 3 years. He is a welcome visitor to our city.

Address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the Vienna Monetary Meetings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following address was given by the Honorable Douglas Dillon before the annual meetings of the Boards of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund in Vienna on September 20, 1961. I cannot stress too greatly the importance of these meetings to the economic well-being of our Nation and its economic relationship with the rest of the free world.

We have every right to be proud of our distinguished Secretary. His remarks indicate his extensive knowledge of the international situation and how to present the American viewpoint in such a way as to induce the utmost cooperation. His attendance at the formal meetings was only a small part of the tremendous load which he undertook and performed so well. Almost every minute of the day outside of the formal meetings was devoted to meeting with important representatives of the various particiapting countries.

The good will thus created is immeasurable.

The address follows:

First, let me say how delighted I am to be once again in the gracious and storied city of Vienna. Since my last visit a little more than a year ago, I have seen fresh evidences of growth and change—change that reflects the industry, the imagination, and the initiative of the Austrian people. The stability of the Austrian Government in postwar years—the extent of Austria's remarkable economic resurgence—the unswerving devotion of the Austrian people to democratic principles—all are features of modern Austria that command our respect. This small nation—this revered cradle of thought and culture—this courageous outpost on the frontiers of freedom—has aroused the admiration of freemen everywhere. On behalf of my Government—on behalf of the President of the United States, who recalls with pleasure the warm hospitality he received here last June—I wish to say that we consider Vienna to be a most auspicious setting for the important work upon which we are embarked.

During the past year the International Monetary Fund, under the distinguished leadership of Per Jacobsson, has again demonstrated its vital importance to world monetary stability and econommic growth.

The role of the Fund is being further enhanced at this meeting where we have the privilege of welcoming to our deliberations 10 new countries—the largest increase in a single year's operations since the Fund's inception. It is a particular pleasure for me to welcome to our midst our good friends from Cyprus, Laos, Liberia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Togo.

Since we met a year ago in Washington, $2.4 billion has been drawn from the Fund. A major part of that was the recent drawing by the United Kingdom, but 21 other member countries made drawings totaling more than $900 million. There are also 20 standby arrangements in effect, with unused drawing rights totaling $1.2 billion.

Fund assistance in the past year has both strengthened the structure of currency convertibility in the industrialized countries and helped many of the developing countries to adopt or maintain programs of financial and monetary stabilization. The Fund has come to occupy a central position in international monetary affairs—a role I am confident will be of ever-increasing importance to all our member countries in the years ahead.

A few years ago, almost all drawings from the Fund were in dollars. Since the advent of currency convertibility in Western Europe, however, the Fund has made great progress in using a larger number of the currencies it holds, thus increasing the percentage of drawings in currencies other than U.S. dollars. During the past year, 11 different currencies were drawn from the Fund, and two-thirds of the total drawings were in currencies other than the dollar. This is an encouraging development. It has made a reality of the original concept of the Fund as a reserve pool of many currencies for the use of members.

Last year the Fund's advisory activities continued on a broad scale. Wherever member countries have sought to deal effectively with financial instability—by strengthening their fiscal resources, by controlling money and credit, or by otherwise improving their financial institutions—they have been able to rely on the staff of the Fund for expert and objective advice.

The stabilization programs many members of the Fund have worked out and put into operation—usually with Fund advice—have at times been criticized on the ground that they have supposedly imposed a choice between stagnation and economic growth. I do not believe that this is a correct appraisal of the role played by financial stabilization in economic development. I agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Jacobsson in his brilliant opening statement: that the aim of a well-designed stabilization program is to eliminate inflation, not only as a source of balance of payments disequilib-

rium, but also as an obstacle to economic growth. Financial stability can thus assist economic growth which, together with social progress, must be the major objective of development policy.

Of course, financial stability cannot of itself cure all the problems of economic growth that beset the developing countries. Effective development planning, basic internal reforms, and adequate capital from both external and internal sources—all are necessary. This is well recognized by the Fund, which is, as it should be, the partner of economic development institutions, national and international, in coordinated efforts to increase the flow of external assistance and to help the developing countries make the best use of their own domestic resources.

I turn now to the economy of the United States and the status of our international balance of payments.

The recovery of the U.S. economy, following the mildest of our postwar recessions, is well underway and moving strongly. The low point in economic activity was reached in the first quarter of this year. In the second quarter, major economic indicators recorded new highs. Gross national product, personal income, and personal consumption expenditures all reached fresh peaks in the April–June period. Total industrial production recorded a new high in July and again in August. We estimate that gross national product—which jumped from an annual rate of just over $500 billion at the beginning of the year to $516 billion in the second quarter—will reach approximately $540 billion during the fourth quarter. The course of our economic recovery has been particularly encouraging since prices have remained stable. Hence, almost the entire rise in our gross national product has been real. Moreover, our increased economic activity has not been accompanied by speculative buying or abnormal buildup of inventories.

During the past year the monetary and fiscal policies of the United States have been directed at limiting the extent of the decline in economic activity and at strengthening the forces of recovery. Prompt recognition by our monetary authorities of the impending downturn brought a quick shift of policy from monetary restraint to ease. As early as June of last year, the Federal Reserve relaxed credit restrictions by reducing discount rates and lowering the reserve requirements of commercial banks. Federal Reserve purchases of Government securities provided additional bank reserves to combat recession and finance expansion. Reflecting this Federal Reserve policy, total loans and investments of commercial banks have expanded by 7 percent, or $14 billion, during the past 12 months. This large increase provided a major force which softened the strains of recession and stimulated recovery.

On the fiscal side, increased unemployment benefits and other Government outlays associated with the recession—in conjunction with reduced income tax collections—have operated as in previous recessions to provide an automatic supporting influence. Largely as a result of these built-in stabilizers the total value of all goods and services produced during the economic downturn never fell appreciably below the corresponding quarter of the previous year.

As I noted earlier, we are especially encouraged that our recovery and our attainment of record new levels of production have been accompanied by price stability. Our index of wholesale prices has remained for 3 years at virtually the same level. Retail commodity prices have been stable while the overall index of consumer prices has increased by less than 1 percent since last October.

The business outlook for the United States during the coming year is very promising. Excessive stocks have been liquidated. As a result of rising production and sales, inventories have once more begun to increase moderately but they are not high in relation to either present or prospective needs. Consumers have reduced their debt and built up their savings, thus strengthening the outlook for retail trade. Net financial savings of individuals rose by $7.7 billion in the first half of 1961 on top of a $10 billion rise in 1960. In contrast to 1958–59, interest rates have remained remarkably constant during the initial recovery period.

We anticipate further vigorous growth. The substantial room in our economy for further expansion should avert any inflationary pressures that might otherwise develop. For we have no shortage of productive resources, nearly all of our industries are operating well below capacity, and the labor supply is ample. Continued rises in output should materially assist us in solving the persisting problem of relatively high unemployment. Nevertheless, we are developing worker retraining programs designed to attack this problem directly.

Federal budget expenditures remain well within our capacity. In fact, the deficit for fiscal year 1961 and the projected deficit for 1962 are together much smaller than the deficits during the last comparable recession and recovery in 1958–59. After taking into account all presently scheduled expenditures, including the substantially increased outlays for defense requested by President Kennedy in July, our estimates point to a deficit this year (fiscal 1962) that will amount to about half the deficit for fiscal 1959. In addition, our gross national product will run some 17 percent higher than in fiscal year 1959, and our tax revenues will be about 21 percent greater. Hence, the economic impact of the current deficit will be considerably less than half that of the 1959 deficit.

The deficits in fiscal 1961 and 1962 are essentially a reflection of the short fall of revenues resulting from the recent recession. This is a characteristic of our tax system, because it is heavily dependent upon direct taxation of personal and business income. For the same reason we may expect sharp increases in revenues as business improves and the economy grows. The calendar year 1962 gives every promise of being a very good year for business, and since our revenues are based upon earnings of the previous year, we can confidently look forward to a substantial increase in our income during the fiscal year 1963, which begins next July 1. Fiscal 1963 will be closely comparable in the business cycle to fiscal 1960, when Federal revenues jumped $10 billion over the preceding year. Hence, unless a need arises for further increases in defense outlays, the balanced budget which President Kennedy is determined to submit next January can be achieved without any increase in taxes. However, should additional defense expenditures become necessary, the President has stated clearly and unequivocally that he is prepared to request additional taxes should they be required to balance the budget.

I would like to emphasize the firmness of our decision to balance our budget in fiscal 1963. Indeed, had it not been for the increase in international tensions over Berlin, which forced us to increase our defense expenditures substantially above the levels previously planned, we could have looked forward confidently to a substantial budgetary surplus in fiscal 1963. We are resolute in our determination to maintain both a sound and an expanding economy so that the United States may play its full part in the defense and the development of the free world and, at the same time, meet the requirements of an increasing population at home.

I am glad to be able to report that the U.S. balance of payments has developed in a much more satisfactory manner this year than in 1960. The marked improvement in our merchandise account during 1960 continued into 1961 and the large speculative outflows of short-term capital, which swelled the volume of our outpayments in the second half of 1960, have ceased. Our merchandise trade surplus in 1960 amounted to $4.7 billion, whereas in 1959 it had been less than $1 billion. In the first half of 1961 our trade surplus was running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $6 billion.

These developments are reflected both in our "basic" position (comprising all of our recorded transactions exclusive of U.S. private short-term capital outflow) and in our overall payments position. In 1960 the basic deficit amounted to $1.9 billion, compared with $4.3 billion in 1959 and $3.6 billion in 1958. In the first half of 1961, the basic position continued the substantial improvement shown in 1960 and, without counting special prepayments of $650 million on U.S. Government loans, was almost exactly in balance.

Our overall deficit, which is measured by decreases in U.S. holdings of gold and convertible currencies plus increases in foreign liquid holdings of U.S. dollars—which together amounted to about $4 billion in both 1959 and 1960—was running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate somewhat under $1.7 billion in the first half of 1961. The figure of $1.7 billion also does not count as a receipt the special debt prepayments of $650 million. While this indicates the continuation of substantial short-term capital outflows, these movements have represented, for the most part, a substantial enlargement of the financing of world trade by U.S. banking institutions and have not been speculative in character.

These are encouraging developments. But they do not mean that the United States can relax its efforts to achieve a satisfactory and durable equilibrium in its balance of payments. We must have a large and growing export surplus of goods and services to pay for military expenditures abroad which we incur for the defense of the free world. We must have it for both that portion of our foreign aid program that is not covered by procurement in the United States and for our continuing large outflow of long-term private development capital.

The improvement in our trade surplus so far this year cannot be expected to continue in the months ahead, since it was accomplished more through a decrease in imports than through an increase in exports. And now, as the U.S. economy moves toward reasonably full employment of resources, we must look to a corresponding expansion of our imports. Indeed, they have already started to grow. While this tends to sharpen our payments problem, it also leads to larger world trade and greater prosperity for our trading partners.

Accordingly, we must continue to make intensive efforts to expand our exports. This means for us, as it does for any nation, that we must constantly improve the productivity on which the ability of our producers to compete in world markets is based. It also requires that we prevent increases in money costs from canceling out improvements in productivity. At the same time, our producers must search out export opportunities with energy and imagination. The domestic market of the United States is a very large one and many of our producers have traditionally thought almost exclusively in terms of that market, rather than of opportunities overseas. We believe this orientation can and must be shifted, for there are surely thousands of our producers who can be more successful in the export field than they have been in the past. It is for this reason that our Government is devoting considerable effort to bringing market opportunities abroad to the attention of our business community.

We are well aware that the position of the dollar as a strong reserve currency depends upon our success in maintaining a reasonable equilibrium over the years in our balance of payments. This we are determined to do. As we succeed, the upward trend in the accumulation of gold and dollars by other countries taken together will necessarily be slowed. The elimination of current payments imbalances can, of course, be greatly facilitated by the cooperation of surplus countries in pursuing liberal trade policies, in increasing long-term development assistance, and in sharing expenditures for the common defense in accordance with their capabilities.

During the past year, as Mr. Jacobsson has reminded us, there has been active discussion and examination in governmental circles, among economists, and in the financial press, of the adequacy of existing international monetary arrangements. These discussions have been very helpful. Mr. Jacobsson has now proposed that each of the principal industrial countries commit itself to lend its currency to the Fund up to a stated amount. I strongly agree that an arrangement of this sort should be worked out to insure the Fund access to the additional amounts that would be needed should balance-of-payments pressures involving these countries ever impair or threaten to impair the smooth functioning of the world payments system.

At the same time, for its regular requirements, the Fund can, and should be expected to, borrow from one or another of the participating countries under article VII whenever its supply of any of these particular currencies becomes low. It would also appear reasonable to consider the possibility that such loans be credited against any commitment which the lending country may have undertaken as its part of the multilateral arrangement. These special bilateral borrowings would thus replenish the Fund's supply of particular currencies in strong demand and, in this way, would help to avoid undue drains on its gold reserve.

I have no fixed opinions on the details of the multilateral borrowing arrangement. I am confident—on the basis of the encouraging views I have heard expressed in the past few days—that practical means can be found to give effect to the agreement in principle which so evidently exists. There are four important aspects which I do wish to emphasize:

First, the aggregate amount the participating countries should look forward to committing to the project should be large enough to add decisively to the Fund's capacity to play its essential role.

Second, to be effective, the additional resources must be promptly available in case of need.

Third, safeguards will be required to insure that there will be effective consultation between the Fund and the lenders, and that the Fund will only actually borrow under the commitment arrangements after taking full account of the current reserve position of the lending country. In addition, each country which actually lends to the Fund should, in case the need develops, be able automatically to obtain repayment from the Fund.

Fourth, I concur in Mr. Jacobsson's judgment that there must be no weakening of the policies that have guided the Fund in the use of its resources; nor should the new arrangements change in any way the existing rights and duties of members of the Fund, both as drawers of currencies and as providers of currencies.

This is an important project. The Fund should push ahead promptly in its current consultations with the prospective lending countries in order that the Executive Board may carry the project to completion so that the participating countries may obtain the necessary legislative authority from their Parliaments early next year. With this done, the monetary system of the free world will be substantially strengthened. For the Fund will then clearly be in a position to meet the changing needs of the new world of convertible currencies.

Speaking for my country, I want to say that the United States regards the work in which we are engaged here in Vienna as having a direct and important bearing upon the future course of free world growth and progress. I have confidence in the ultimate outcome of our deliberations because I have confidence in the vitality of the free economies upon which the work of the Fund is founded. Our mutual goal is a world of expanding opportunities for every human being to pursue his legitimate aspirations in peace and freedom. The International Monetary Fund is playing an important role in helping us to achieve it.

Depressed Area Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when the New Frontier proposed the depressed areas bill earlier in the year, those of us who voted against it described it not only as a waste of taxpayers' money, but a cruel hoax to the depressed areas themselves. The following article in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor, verifies what the opponents of this agrarian reformer vehicle predicted would happen.

DEPRESSED AREAS' RELIEF DEPRESSED
(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—The highly touted depressed areas program has made a slow break from the starting gate.

President Kennedy put the aid program near the top of his campaign list of measures to "get the country moving again," but the Government won't make its first industrial assistance loan until next week.

Many reasons advanced for the program's disappointing lack of early foot but administration officials are inclined to blame a congressional requirement that no community can get an industrial loan until it prepares—and wins Federal approval of—an elaborate overall economic development program.

Mr. Kennedy signed the depressed areas program into law May 1. It's being run by the new Area Redevelopment Agency in the Commerce Department.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS ON TAP

The program is supposed to help hard-hit communities attract job-creating industries. Congress authorized $200 million of Federal loans for commercial and industrial facilities and $175 million of loans and grants for such public projects as sewers, that a community needs to service new industries.

The ARA has cleared two public projects.

Gassville, Ark., received a $160,000 loan and grant for a water system that it needs to attract a new firm. Cambridge, Md., obtained a $213,000 loan and grant for a sewage system that will bring in a new food processing plant and will make it possible for a publishing company to expand.

One of the early difficulties has been a widespread lack of understanding of the kind of help the ARA can supply. An Agency spokesman said that ARA probably has received one impracticable inquiry for every workable plan that has been laid before it.

The most outlandish proposal came from a community that wanted ARA money to build a jail. Others have requested funds for libraries, hospitals, and similar worthy but ineligible public facilities.

ONLY 31 PROMISING

The ARA has only 31 loan and grant applications that it considers promising.

If they are approved and are carried out, they will provide a meager 10,942 jobs.

Eighteen applicants want $6,500,000 of loans and grants—but chiefly grants—to build public facilities. Two proposals call for tourist and recreation facilities, while the remaining 16 are for water, sewer, and other utilities.

Thirteen communities are seeking industrial loans. They want $20 million from the ARA and are planning to put up $132 million of private, local, and State money.

The projects include an aluminum reduction mill on the Kentucky-West Virginia border, a steel mill, a furniture factory, a woodworking plant, two canneries, a papermill, a metal processing plant, a small metal parts factory, and a peat moss processor.

The depressed area program was expected to be particularly helpful to Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal towns, New England textile communities, and a scattering of steel and automobile towns in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois.

But no Pennsylvania town has asked for an industrial loan. The best guess of Washington officials is that they prefer borrowing from the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Administration. It lends money at 2 percent, while the ARA charges 4 percent.

The aluminum plant is one of five West Virginia industrial applications.

Goals of the New Frontier: Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems confronting this Nation of ours at the time of the 1960 presidential election was that of the so-called depressed or distressed areas. This is still a problem today. But what I would like to point out at this time is the fact that since the election there has been a great deal of progress made in the solving of many of the problems associated with the chronic and persistent unemployment which exists in these areas.

I think we all know the definition of a "depressed or distressed area." It is one where there has been serious unemployment which has existed for a considerable length of time. This unemployment has been caused by several factors, singly, or working in concert. These have included: technological changes; migration of industry; changes in demands for products; protracted seasonal unemployment, and depletion of resources. My hometown of Evansville, Ind., has been hard hit for several years by unemployment. The percentage of

unemployment there has been consistently over the 6-percent mark most of the time. In many other parts of the country similar conditions have existed. In February of this year the figure was 7.9 percent in the city of Evansville.

At the beginning of 1960, the figure was 8.5 percent. At the present time, the percentage of unemployed is now down to 6.5 percent. This is still far from what we would like to see. But it is some improvement. Under the area redevelopment program, passed by a Democratic Congress during this Democratic administration, we hope that we can get that figure much lower.

The unemployment situation in Evansville has been repeated time and time again all over the country. The Chrysler plant there was closed down, and the operations there, bodybuilding and assembly, were moved to St. Louis. Servel, Inc., makers of refrigerators, discontinued their operations in Evansville. Several other concerns in the community also closed up their operations there. To combat this, the people of the city and its outlying area raised $1 million to help attract new industries to the area; $300,000 was raised to help small business in the city. The people of this city did just about all that they were able to do to combat the unemployment. The assistance of the Federal Government was clearly necessary, if they were to ever really rise above the tremendous economic problems that continually pressed in about them. This same situation has been true in the eastern part of my district—the Greater Louisville area. In this area are the cities of Jeffersonville, in Clark County, and New Albany, in Floyd County.

For some years, I have been greatly concerned over this situation, not just as it applies to the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana, but to other areas of the country likewise. I am proud to say that I introduced one of the very first so-called depressed areas bills. During the 85th and 86th Congresses, we Democrats passed such legislation, only to have it fall under the veto of the Republican occupant of the White House. The story changed during this Congress as the Democrats with effective leadership from President Kennedy, passed the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. When the President signed the legislation on May 1 of this year, he commented:

> In this free society we want to make it possible for everyone to find a job who wants to work and support their families, and this bill is an important step in that direction.

Under the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, the Federal Government is able to go into these areas of chronic and persistent unemployment and assist State and local leaders to attract new industries; to help in the improvement of needed public facilities; and provide assistance to those workers displaced by the migration of industries from their areas through job retraining. This will enable them to be qualified for new jobs which may become available in their communities. All this will be a big boost to these distressed areas.

Under the act, $300 million is provided in revolving loan funds—$100 million for industrial and commercial loans in urban areas, $100 million for similar loans in rural areas, and $100 million for loans for public facilities. For fiscal 1962, Congress appropriated a total of $122,500,000 for these loans. In addition, Congress appropriated $40 million for the current fiscal year for public facility grants, $3,325,000 for technical assistance, and $4,875,000 for operating expenses. To date, the Area Redevelopment Administration has designated 663 areas—covering some 863 counties or parts of counties—as eligible for assistance under the terms of the act. They have been so designated because of high unemployment or underemployment or because of low farm income or family income. The Department of Labor has certified some 120 additional areas as surplus small labor markets, enabling them to be eligible for assistance under the program as soon as they are officially termed "redevelopment areas" by the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce. More areas are in the process of being designated as the Labor Department continues to make studies as to their economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been sufficient time since the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act to be able to predict just how much better off these economically distressed areas—both urban and rural—will be under the program. But I do know that we are making progress in the right direction. That direction is the helping of such areas to assist themselves to bring in new industries through a study of their economic capabilities, through improvement in their community facilities which will be used by such industries, by assistance in the retraining of the area's workers, and by the bringing to these communities and rural areas a sense of hope and direction which many of them have been lacking for years. Through this legislation, we can help dispell much of the fog of discouragement and frustration which has arisen out of the lack of economic growth.

The area redevelopment program involves a new partnership made up of the Federal Government's agencies which have a direct interest in these areas. These include the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration. The Congress directed all these agencies to coordinate their activities toward the effective carrying out of the mandate of the act. That mandate is the return of economic growth and prosperity, and along with it, a return of human dignity and hope to the people and the communities and farm areas suffering from the hardships of industrial relocation and economic recession. Under the previous administration, little if anything was done to assist these areas and their people. The Democratic Party has always been dedicated to the welfare and human dignity of the American people. The area redevelopment program, enacted by this Congress, is a significant example of that doctrine.

The first two projects under the act have been approved. One is the $160,000 loan and grant for a water system which was needed in order to help a new firm locate in the community of Gassville, Ark. This will provide 1,000 permanent new jobs initially for workers in a four-county redevelopment area. The other project is that of Cambridge, Md. Here, a $213,300 loan and grant for a sewerage system will result in bringing in one new industry and expansion of an already existing firm. The result here will be 875 permanent new jobs initially. There are other projects in the process of being approved now by the Redevelopment Administration. This is a sample of the assistance that will be afforded eligible areas. This is a sample of the type of human and community assistance which the Democratic Party believes in. Helping people to help themselves.

Much has been written and spoken on the subject of the depressed areas of the country. Heavy unemployment existed. Some still does. Hope dwindled as local and State resources were unable to cope with the problem. These areas have a right to share the economic growth that the rest of the country is experiencing. Their people have a right to hope and jobs. Their children have a right to the kind of education and opportunities which economic progress will help bring to these areas, just as they have to the guarantees spelled out in our Constitution. This program is a step in the right direction. It is still a relatively small step, but it will go a long way in restoring the confidence of these peoples in their communities, their local way of life, and in themselves.

The Responsibility of the Neutral Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished president of the Mutual Broadcasting System, Robert F. Hurleigh, has presented some exceptionally well reasoned views on the responsibilities of the neutral-bloc nations to the United Nations. His comments in a recent editorial broadcast by the Mutual Radio Network express the hope that the so-called nonalined nations will exercise discretion in world affairs in the days ahead.

No group has more at stake in the survival of the United Nations than the smaller, neutral nations. Alone they cannot stand against the tyranny of the Communists. Neutrality is the right to be unalined, but it is not the right to be irresponsible.

Mr. Hurleigh's remarks deserve wide attention, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD the editorial on the Mutual Radio Network for September 21, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Call them neutrals; call them nonalined; call them the Afro-Asian bloc; call them what you will. From India to Upper Volta they have cried for recognition. They have asked to have a voice in world affairs. But with a voice, they must realize, comes responsibility.

Far more than we, they need the United Nations. It is the forum that gives them the voice. Without it, most of the world's problems would end in bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is in the General Assembly, where the Upper Voltas have an equal voice with the Big Two, that these nations get their recognition.

If the United Nations is not to become a memory of the past, crushed under the same Red heel that stamped out hope in Hungary, then these nations—the Indias, the Voltas, the Indonesias, and the rest—must make those votes mean something and use them to see that a Secretary General is appointed.

The General Assembly, by a two-thirds vote, can select a temporary Secretary General. These nations have the votes to make it come to pass. If they use them wisely and well, they will show that they have a right to be heard in the council of nations.

Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our President has often told us of the need to sacrifice. The following two articles from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune point out how the White House is the lending example of doing without the frills. After all, $12,500 was used to paper a whole room. But the American people should not be surprised by this exhibition of a sense of values. Several months ago the White House had ordered fancy carpeting from France; when the story leaked out, Mr. Salinger denied the story and then suddenly the nonexistent order was canceled.

Those in the depressed areas of this country, for whom our President's heart bleeds so profusely, will be happy, I am sure, to read of another example of White House austerity.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times]

DESIGNER'S VIEWS IRK WHITE HOUSE

RICHMOND, VA.—The White House has expressed annoyance over an interior decorator's criticism of the $12,500 wallpaper project in its diplomatic reception room.

Mrs. John F. Kennedy's press secretary, Miss Pamela Turnure, telephoned the American Institute of Interior Designers in New York to "voice our displeasure" at the remarks of the institute's president, Milton Glaser of Richmond.

Mr. Glaser was quoted October 1 in the Richmond Times-Dispatch as saying "somebody got stuck" when $12,500 was paid for the antique wallpaper installed in the White House room.

The wallpaper was removed from the Maryland home by Peter Hill of Washington. He paid $50 for it.

The wallpaper is Zuber's "Scenic America." It was removed from the walls of an old home in Maryland for transfer to the White House. The $12,500 bill was accepted by the National Society of Interior Designers.

Miss Turnure complained to the institute over what she termed "the lack of dignity" of the newspaper article and the "undignified situation" it created for the White House.

RETRACTION IS ASKED

The Times-Dispatch said it was told last night that she had informed the institute that unless Mr. Glaser retracted his remarks, the White House would withdraw its publicity support from a downstairs library the institute is redecorating at the Presidential home.

Miss Turnure said today in Washington she would have "no comment" on the statement attributed to Mr. Glaser that the White House threatened to withdraw publicity from the institute project.

The White House previously had announced that the institute was redecorating the ground-floor library of the executive mansion as a gift. Their project includes, Miss Turnure said, generally redesigning and repainting the room, and installing a new carved wooden mantle that came from a house in Salem, Mass.

Mr. Glaser was quoted in the October 1 article as saying:

"Why on earth did they go to all the trouble of scraping it [the wallpaper] off those old walls when new paper is available from the same blocks?

"It doesn't make any sense to me. I don't know how faded the paper is. But some people like old broken things because they are old and broken down. Maybe Mrs. Kennedy is one of them."

Yesterday, after talking with the institute's public relations headquarters in New York, Mr. Glaser modified his attitude.

"Hours of painstaking care must be taken to remove antique paper from old plaster walls," the institute president said.

"Often the paper will begin to disintegrate, making it necessary to transplant fragments, piece by piece, onto a cloth backing.

"It is highly intricate and delicate business. Anyone willing to contribute this amount of time and expense is to be commended."

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

WHITE HOUSE WALLPAPER RAISES STICKY SITUATION

(By David Wise)

WASHINGTON.—Was the White House stuck for $12,500 in antique wallpaper installed in the diplomatic reception room last week?

"Somebody was stuck," snapped Milton Glaser, president of the American Institute of Interior Designers.

"Undignified," a spokesman for Mrs. John F. Kennedy said of Mr. Glaser's remark.

The only person, in fact, who was saying absolutely nothing at all was Peter Hill, a Washington resident who bought the wallpaper for $50 just before a wrecking crew could demolish the walls of an old house in nearby Thurmont, Md., scraped the wallpaper off with a putty knife and a razor blade, and sold it to the National Society of Interior Designers for $12,500, which presented it to the White House for nothing.

Mr. Hill, who made a $12,450 paper profit, so to speak, was staying out of the whole sticky situation.

What may become known as the Great White House Wallpaper Flap of 1961 began October 1 when Mr. Glaser, head of the American Institute of Interior Designers (hereinafter referred to as the AID and not to be confused with the NSID, which donated the wallpaper) was interviewed by the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

"Somebody got stuck," Mr. Glaser was quoted as saying. "Why on earth did they go to all the trouble of scraping it off those old walls when new paper is available from the same blocks? It doesn't make any sense to me. I don't know how faded the paper is. But some people like old broken things because they are old and broken down. Maybe Mrs. Kennedy is one of them."

The wallpaper in question, manufactured by Jean Zuber, of Rixheim, Alsace, France, about 1834, depicts scenes of early America, including a view of New York City from Weehawken, the parade grounds at West Point, Boston Harbor, the Natural Bridge of Virginia, and Niagara Falls. There are lots of Indians in the panel, titled "Scenic America."

Anyway, to get back to the story, Miss Pamela Turnure, Mrs. Kennedy's press secretary, was leafing through some newspaper clippings Thursday when she came across Mr. Glasser's comments. Miss Turnure, a lovely young lady who seldom gets angry, got very angry indeed.

She called the AID to "voice our displeasure" at Mr. Glasser's remarks. "I just called up to express our displeasure and disapproval," Miss Turnure said yesterday. "I said we were working with them on another project, and it was highly inappropriate for them to comment. It was very undignified."

REDECORATION IS GIFT

The AID, Miss Turnure explained, is redecorating the ground floor library of the White House as a gift. The work includes repainting the room, installing an antique carved wooden mantle, and some period furniture.

However, Miss Turnure flatly denied a report in the Richmond paper that she had told the AID the White House would refuse to publicize the library project unless Mr. Glasser retracted his remarks. "That is not correct," she said.

She said it is true that the Zuber firm is still manufacturing the wallpaper from the same wooden blocks, but she said that from an art historian's viewpoint, the age of the paper and its quality is related to its worth.

As for Mr. Hill, wisely staying out of the whole thing, he is said to have discovered the paper in the home of Mrs. William J. Stoner, a Thurmont widow. He purchased the paper from the wreckers for $50, and they gave him a week's time to get the stuff off the walls. The house has since been demolished.

Mr. Hill, a lay preacher, tucked away his putty knife, brought his wallpaper to the White House, and laid it out—in 32 strips—on the floor of the office of Mrs. John Pearce, White House curator. Mrs. Kennedy came down to see it. She liked it so much that she wrote to the NSID and asked if the society would like to donate the paper to the White House. The NSID bought the paper from Mr. Hill and papered the reception room with it.

That's all there is to it, except for the fact that Mr. Glasser, after consulting with the NSID's press agent in New York, did not stay glued to his original statement. He issued a new statement yesterday, in which he said:

"Hours of painstaking care must be taken to remove antique paper from old plaster walls * * *. It is a highly intricate and delicate business. Anyone willing to contribute this amount of time and expense is to be commended."

Radio and Television Licenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

In a speech in the Senate several days ago, the senior Senator from Wyoming raised a fundamental question of public policy: Should large corporations doing a considerable amount of business with the Government be licensed to operate radio and television stations?

The Senator from Wyoming raised another question of public policy related specifically to the radio and TV licenses held by two such corporations, General Electric and Westinghouse: Should these two companies be entitled to retain their licenses, having been the principal defendants convicted in the recent electrical conspiracy cases at Philadelphia?

As chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to examine at close hand some of the management failures that led to the involvement of GE and Westinghouse in these conspiracies. We discovered that these cases simply dramatized what had been a way of life in the electrical manufacturing industry for decades. The companies involved, notably GE and Westinghouse, had been flagrantly disregarding the antitrust laws for years and getting away with it.

It was therefore most distressing to me to read published reports that some members of the Federal Communications Commission are now prepared to vote for renewal of the radio and TV licenses of GE and Westinghouse without a careful hearing.

Accordingly, on September 20, 1961, I sent a telegram to the Chairman of the FCC, the Honorable Newton N. Minow, urging a full public review of this matter before the FCC votes on renewal. Mr. Minow replied by letter the following day that my telegram would be brought to the attention of the full Commission and that no decision on the question of renewing the GE and Westinghouse licenses had been made to that time.

I have since been advised that the FCC can be expected to act before the middle of November.

In my opinion, the FCC will be failing its public trust if it renews the GE and Westinghouse licenses without a public hearing. The public has a right to know whether the same corporate attitude which led Westinghouse and GE to flout the antitrust laws carries over into their operation of radio and television stations—channels of communications which are themselves a public trust.

Some reflection of this attitude was made plain in the comment on a recent "Meet the Press" program by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy:

"We have found in going through past cases that there have been antitrust violations by companies continuously. That there is a fine paid and the practice continues. For instance, in General Electric there must have been dozens of violations of the antitrust laws over a period of years. It didn't have any effect on them."

I can imagine the public outcry that would ensue if a radio or television license were renewed without a hearing for an individual who had been fined several thousand dollars and sentenced to jail for 30 days, as some of the executives of GE and Westinghouse were. Even if the individuals had been convicted only once there would doubtless be protests. But here we have the word of the Attorney General of the United States that GE has been involved in dozens of violations and that "It didn't have any effect on them."

And what of the objectivity in molding public opinion of a large corporation which depends heavily upon the Government for business? According to the official announcements of the Department of Defense for the 100 companies doing the most business with that Department from July 1950, through December 1957, Westinghouse ranked 19th with a total of $1,555,600,000. In 1960, Westinghouse bettered this by jumping to the rank of 16th among defense contractors with a total business in that year alone of $257,600,000.

In the public hearing that I urge the FCC to hold on the proposed renewals of GE and Westinghouse licenses, the FCC certainly should go into the question of whether these stations gave uninhibited coverage in their news programs to the involvement by GE and Westinghouse in the electrical conspiracy, to our subcommittee's investigation of this matter, and to other, related matters.

I do not know whether such full coverage was given; but in all fairness—not only to the public but to the stations themselves—this question should be fully and publicly explored.

While the FCC is about it, it might apply the same test to the coverage given over GE and Westinghouse stations of other public policy questions in which these companies—as electrical manufacturers—have been directly involved in the period covered by the Philadelphia indictments.

For example, how did the stations owned by these companies deal with an important controversy in 1959 in which GE and Westinghouse were involved with the Tennessee Valley Authority over the purchase by TVA of a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator for one of its steamplants in Alabama? The GE and Westinghouse bids were virtually identical and very high—around $17 million. A British firm, C. A. Parsons Co., Ltd., bid low—around $12 million. The TVA awarded the contract to the British company, and immediately GE and Westinghouse began a campaign to mold public opinion on their side and to pressure the Government into awarding one of them the contract.

Were GE and Westinghouse TV and radio stations used as outlets for this effort to mold opinion to one point of view?

And how are GE and Westinghouse radio and TV stations treating on their news programs today the news about the mass of damage suits brought against these companies as a result of the Philadelphia convictions? Indeed, what will these stations report about this very statement being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The RECORD is full of newsworthy matters in which GE and Westinghouse have been involved during the years; congressional committee hearings in which GE and Westinghouse, together with other basic suppliers, were accused of discriminating against rural electric cooperatives in the delivery of scarce equipment; and in which GE has been accused of shortening the life while increasing the prices of electric bulbs. Details of these and many more involvements are available and should be looked into by the FCC.

It is my understanding that, in support of their current applications for radio and television license renewals, GE and Westinghouse have submitted to the FCC general information about the news coverage their stations have given to controversial matters involving these two companies.

While this self-serving material is available to public inspection, the public looks to the FCC to scrutinize it as the FCC is equipped to do and to judge whether GE and Westinghouse stations are dealing objectively with unfriendly news.

This can be done satisfactorily only through public hearings. I urge the FCC to hold such hearings.

Taras Shevchenko: Ukrainian Poet-Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an address I delivered on March 19 at the Cleveland Public Auditorium at commemoration ceremonies upon the 100th anniversary of the death of the Ukrainian poet-hero, Taras Shevchenko:

Taras Shevchenko, national poet-hero for generations of Ukrainians, was born in serfdom, orphaned at a tender age, labored for heartless taskmasters, won literacy by hard sacrifice, sketched the spirit of his countrymen with pen and brush, offended the crude feelings of Czar Nicholas I, was exiled to military servitude for 10 years, was denied the right to spend his last years in his native land, died at the age of 47 years but his mortal remains were put to rest in the soil of his beloved Ukraine.

This, in brief, is the sketch of a man whose spirit has been a source of lasting inspiration to the people of a nation long submerged by Russian imperialism.

That spirit which so well characterizes the history of Ukraine will be memorialized here in the United States through the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko.

The passing of those years in a century has brought events which have earned due and proper recognition for this remarkable man.

In his time he won warm appreciation from his countrymen who saw in him and his works the courageous voice of their long-held national aspirations.

His enemies, the Russian autocrats, viewed his artistic expressions with contempt, but their fears of his influence in awakening and stimulating the national consciousness of the Ukrainian nation brought him years of political exile and banishment from the land of his birth.

But exile, banishment, cruel deprivation, and the tyrants whip cannot stamp out ideas and ideals which spring from the inspired spirit.

During the century since his death the cause of the Ukrainian nation has become known to those who love liberty and freedom in many distant lands.

The first half of the 20th century has been filled with great human pathos and far-reaching changes in the affairs of nations.

Wars and revolutions have toppled kings, monarchs, and czars, dismembered empires, and liberated long-suffering peoples and submerged nations.

In these circumstances the old chains which enslaved the people of Ukraine were

broken, the golden age of independence which filled the dreams of Shevchenko, was realized.

With the collapse of the empire of the Russian czars in 1917, an independent Ukraine emerged from the ashes of corruption and despotism.

The strivings of a people rich in heritage, and proven worthy in the test of sacrifice, had been fulfilled.

Joined by the people of other nations long submerged by the tyranny of the Muscovites, success for the long awaited era of national independence seemed assured.

Russian imperial power had been broken.

A spirit of national revival moved the people of Ukraine and the other non-Russian peoples from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas.

But this golden era of liberty, freedom and national independence was short lived.

A new despotism had seized control at the former seat of imperial Russian power.

Western in its origin, but Moscovitic in its applicaiton, this new tyranny soon put new chains of serfdom upon the Ukrainian nation, constraining her national development, thwarting her cultural revival and preventing her from taking a rightful place in the community of free nations.

This episode in history finds some parallel in the life and times of Shevchenko.

After 10 years of exile in military servitude where his health was broken, Shevchenko was allowed to return to Petrograd.

Expecting to return to his beloved Ukraine and there to carry on his work of national emancipation he soon learned that the personal decision of Czar Nicholas I, restricted his movements and forbade even short visits to the land of his birth.

Thus, Shevchenko with high spirits upon his release from the outposts of the empire, soon found that the same tyranny of spirit was exercised in many ways.

The hand of Moscow had not changed, it held him in spiritual bondage.

That is the case with the Ukrainian nation today.

Freed of the tyranny of the Czars a new tyranny of Red imperialism has been imposed upon it.

The same land of Moscow remains. It has not changed, only the faces and titles of the masters have changed.

The new imperialism of Moscow has however, been forced to recognize the existence of a Ukrainian nation and even claim it to be an independent nation.

This the czars refused to do, preferring to delude themselves and many innocents abroad that Ukrainians were some sort of little Russians.

How Shevchenko despised that reference of "Little Russians."

But Shevchenko would not be happy with the kind of recognition given to Ukraine today by the Russian commissars.

For it is meaningless.

It accords to Ukraine a national independence in form while imposing by force a substance called socialism, which in reality is nothing more than old fashioned Russian despotism.

The heart, the life, the soul of the Ukrainian nation is held in Russian bondage.

And today there are innocents abroad who continue to look upon the Ukrainians as "Little Russians" while others are deluded into believing that the Ukrainian nation is independent and its people are free.

The skill of massive deception practiced by the czars has been refined and perpetuated by the commissars.

Meanwhile, the yearnings and aspirations of the Ukrainian people so well expressed by Taras Shevchenko have been strengthened, they have become emboldened in this revolutionary era, they too are refined and perpetuated in this generation of Ukrainians on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

In his last years, while in exile, Shevchenko devoted his talents to the preparation of textbooks in his native language, so confident was he that Ukraine would be emancipated from the Moscals.

Knowing the need for these tools in the rebirth of national independence, he spent himself in these preparations.

We can learn much from this chapter in the life of the man we honor today.

Confident of victory he admonished preparation for the tasks which would quickly follow the day of national liberation.

That must be your spirit today. That lesson followed with dedication in our times will bring a rich harvest of blessings in the future.

We must not, we may not, wait another 100 years for the dismemberment of the unholy Russian empire.

Business Leaders Criticize Reader's Digest Article on U.S. Employment Statistics

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the September 1961. issue of Reader's Digest carried an article by Mr. James Daniel, a roving editor of the publication, criticizing the methods used to gather U.S. unemployment figures, and the manner in which the statistics are presented to the public by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In his article Mr. Daniel suggests that employment figures are based on misleading assumptions and suspect techniques, and concludes that they give a distorted picture of the actual national job situation.

Because of the importance of these charges I have invited Mr. Daniel to testify before the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, at hearings which are scheduled for December 18–20.

In the meanwhile several prominent users of U.S. employment figures have written to tell me that they do not share Mr. Daniel's critical opinions. One such letter comes from Mr. C. Ashley Wright of the Standard Oil Co., who writes that Mr. Daniel's charges are supported by "gross misstatements of facts and by a series of unjustifiable inferences." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wright's letter be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

The Business Research Advisory Council, an outstanding national group with membership drawn from nominees selected by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, recently adopted a formal resolution calling unwarranted criticism of the Bureau of Labor Statistics "unjustified and unfortunate." I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the chairman of this council, Mr. George C. Hagedorn, who is also director of research for the National Association of Manufacturers, containing the text of this resolution, also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Another letter comes from Mr. Myron S. Silbert, vice president of Federated Department Stores, Inc., and a member of the Business Research and Advisory Council to the Buerau of Labor Statistics. He encloses a letter addressed to the editor of the Reader's Digest commenting in detail on Mr. Daniel's contentions. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Silbert's letters to me and to the Reader's Digest also be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARD OIL CO.,
New York, N.Y., September 21, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Because of your well-known contributions to the work of the Joint Economic Committee, I am writing to offer a few comments on an article in the September Reader's Digest entitled "Let's Look at Those 'Alarming' Unemployment Figures" by Mr. James Daniel.

In effect, this article charges the officials of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with a conspiracy designed to exaggerate its statistics of unemployment and to mislead the Nation into believing that the unemployment problem is more serious than it really is. The charge is supported by gross misstatements of facts and by a series of unjustifiable inferences.

Having worked for several years with the Bureau of Labor Statistics as a member of its Business Research Advisory Council and its subcommittees, I have complete faith in the high integrity of its staff. I feel that the Digest article does the Nation a serious disservice insofar as it impugns that integrity and creates doubts concerning the honesty of the Bureau's figures.

Respectfully yours,

C. ASHLEY WRIGHT.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N.Y.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The Business Research Advisory Council to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been much concerned about certain published criticisms which reflect on the honesty and competence of the Bureau. I know that this is a matter of concern to you also as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Statistics. For that reason, I believe you will be interested in the following resolution which was adopted by the council at a recent meeting:

"The Business Research Advisory Council, organized 14 years ago and in continuous contact with the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics since then, consists of members drawn from the business community, selected from personnel nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce of the United States.

"The council concedes that there is room for honest differences of opinion in regard to the methods and concepts used by the Government in collecting statistics on employment and unemployment. On the whole, however, the council believes that the methods used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide a reasonable and useful procedure for presenting information on the levels of employment and unemployment.

"The council has complete confidence in the honesty, objectivity, and competence of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and its leadership. It regards public allegations that the Bureau has manipulated its methods and its results with an eye to their political impact as unjustified and unfortunate."

I hope you will feel free to quote this resolution whenever, or wherever, you may think appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE G. HAGEDORN.

FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC.,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I addressed to the editor of Reader's Digest objecting to inaccuracies in the article in the September issue of Reader's Digest concerning unemployment statistics.

Very truly yours,

MYRON S. SILBERT.

FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC.,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. DEWITT WALLACE,
Editor, the Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: May I, in this letter, discuss the article in the September Reader's Digest by James Daniel on employment and unemployment statistics.

For several years, I have been a member of the Business Research and Advisory Council to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Our council represents the business community and the leading business associations. There is another advisory group chosen by the labor group.

Our job is to study the various reports prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and to give them the best advice we can on how to improve them. The Bureau reviews its contemplated programs with our business council.

I have been chairman of the Committee on Manpower and Employment Statistics of this Council. Our committee is particularly interested in the subject of Mr. Daniel's article.

I have attempted to evaluate Mr. Daniel's article.

There is always a need to check Government statistics and review underlying definitions. Mr. Daniel had full right to dig into this subject, but I do not believe his digging is accurate, and it is below the standard of good research.

May I say why I think so.

1. The survey of 35,000 households is a reasonably good tool for an estimate of total employment and unemployment. It is probable that a complete person-to-person count of the unemployed would not give a more accurate answer and would be very expensive.

The household sample survey does give a very good approximation. A sample of this size is a sound scientific way to get these figures of employment and unemployment.

2. This survey is conducted by the Census Bureau. I have reviewed the detailed methods and believe them to be scientifically sound and honest.

3. Some years ago, a committee representing several different Government agencies reexamined the questions used on employment and unemployment and made some revisions. I have studied the reports of this special committee and believe them to be very sound and thoroughly honest. This special committee included many other parts of the Government besides the Bureau of Labor Statistics and was truly a Government-wide group of experts.

4. It is only recently that the staff of the Bureau of Labor Statistics received responsibility for the publication and presentation of the monthly figures on employment and unemployment, so it is not correct to say they have prepared news releases for this subject back over the years.

It is my opinion that in the period in which the Bureau of Labor staff has issued figures and analyzed trends of employment and unemployment they have been highly conscientious and have been motivated only by a desire to serve the country well and to do their job accurately.

5. They have not presented a slanted picture on unemployment.

6. They have presented all the figures on employment as well as unemployment. The story on both sides has been made available in the Government reports.

7. The Bureau staff has made special studies on "Who are the unemployed?" It has analyzed the unemployed according to age groups, color groups, and length of unemployment. These have helped to show that the most serious part of unemployment was not the entire number, but primarily the core of longer time unemployed above the age of the recent students. This has helped to give an accurate picture of unemployment.

Why do we take Mr. Daniel's article with such concern?

Because without accurate facts it tends to cast undesired doubt on a capable and honest group of Government workers who have done a very good job and not a bad job.

There is room for continuing searches on unemployment and employment statistics, but such challenges should be made with a high degree of accuracy.

Sincerely yours,

MYRON S. SILBERT.

Press Reports Pentagon Efforts To Trim Waste in Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, several articles in newspapers and magazines have appeared recently describing the Defense Department's new attack on waste and inefficiency. With a Defense budget now topping $47 billion, the importance of this effort cannot be emphasized enough. The present international situation, which has prompted a major military buildup including the call-up of National Guard and Reserve units, makes it all the more essential to achieve maximum military efficiency for the sums which are appropriated. The opportunities for waste in a period of military expansion are notorious. Therefore it is welcome news that the officials in charge of spending operations, led by Deputy Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric and Assistant Secretary Thomas D. Morris, are mounting a concerted campaign of costcutting.

One article describing certain aspects of this campaign appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Written by Louis Kraar, a Journal staff reporter, it outlined the kinds of procedures that the Pentagon seeks to adopt to achieve greater economies. I was impressed with the overall picture presented in this article, and desiring further clarification I wrote Assistant Secretary Morris to request a more detailed report on the new methods that are being adopted. I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article and my letter to Assistant Secretary Morris be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A major defense procurement reform that has already been adopted is the consolidation into a central supply agency of all the nonmilitary purchases of the Armed Forces. This reform has been advocated for some years by the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, led by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. As a member of this committee I have strongly supported this change and now hope that it will achieve the economies that are predicted. According to the Pentagon, this single step may save as much as $250 million per year once it is in full operation. It should put an end to the wasteful duplication in procurement and stockpiling that was documented over and over again in the hearings conducted by the Joint Economic Committee.

An article in Newsweek magazine describes the difficulties inherent in spending billions of dollars efficiently. It quotes Pentagon leaders and industry spokesmen on the kinds of new procedures which may be most helpful. As in the case of Mr. Kraar's Wall Street Journal piece, this article raises some questions about which more clarification would be desirable. I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

One of the most obvious causes of waste in all military spending operations has been the increasingly widespread use of cost-plus contracts. In the past decade the percent of budget-fattening cost-plus procurement has risen from 12.7 percent to over 42 percent. During the same period the volume of defense spending increased enormously, so the total amount of cost-plus procurement has risen an even greater amount. Commenting on the need for efficient defense production, the New York Times recently noted:

> The cost-plus method of guaranteeing profits for defense contractors is another breeder of waste. More than one-third of all defense contracts are let on a cost-plus basis—virtually all in fields that carry the highest priority or involve the most experimental work. The Defense Department is now looking for a system that will provide a greater spur to speed and quality.
>
> When billions of dollars are being spent on negotiated contracts, in the belief that these assure more dependable and economical performance than could be obtained through competitive bidding, the country is entitled to prompt notice that it is getting value received.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times entitled "Efficient Defense Production" also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable THOMAS MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Installations and Logistics,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MORRIS: The Wall Street Journal of October 5, 1961, carried an article by Louis Kraar describing Defense Department efforts to eliminate waste and reduce costs in military spending. The article quotes you several times. Mr. Kraar apparently discussed this subject with a number of other Pentagon officials, and he may also have drawn on the printed text of the hearings before our Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee.

I am impressed with the overall picture of your Department's efforts to reduce spending in defense procurement which is presented in this article. However, there are several points in the article about which I would like more information. They are as follows:

1. Specifically what steps are being taken to "expand competition among suppliers of military hardware?" Mr. Kraar suggests that the saving in the current fiscal year resulting from this more vigorous competition "may reach $100 million." Is this figure correct? Have you looked into the possibility of renegotiating existing contracts to inject a similar money-saving element of competition?

2. What exactly are the plans to revise buying regulations to provide stronger incentives for cutting costs? The Journal article suggests that you may use the "powerful incentive of the profit motive" to achieve this? Is this correct, and if so, how would this be accomplished?

3. The article states that cost-plus contracts "may be deemphasized." Specifically, what steps are being taken to accomplish this? What share of Defense procurement is now cost-plus? How much do you think this share can be reduced?

4. The article also quotes you as saying that savings of $50 million per year can be achieved in the purchase of airplane spare parts, and that the percentage of such parts bought competitively can be increased from 15 percent to 30 percent. What specific steps are being taken to achieve this revision? Are similar changes being adopted for all spare parts procurement?

5. I would also like to have more information on the proposed "sliding scale of 'award fees' tied to total performance" described in the final paragraph of the article.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

PENTAGON'S PURSE: MILITARY SEEKS TO CUT COSTS, PARTLY OFFSET BERLIN BUILDUP OUTLAY—OFFICIALS AIM TO BOOST USE OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING, CENTRALIZE MORE BUYING—MR. MCNAMARA'S BLACK BOOK

(By Louis Kraar)

WASHINGTON.—As the big bills for the Berlin buildup begin to pour in, Defense Chief McNamara and his Pentagon band are resolving to strive harder than ever to save military dollars.

Their best economy efforts, it's conceded, won't prevent the Nation's defense outlays from surging to a new post-World War II high of around $50 billion in the year starting next July 1. But, policymakers vow, they will help keep costs from climbing more than is necessary. By streamlining military purchasing, shutting down unneeded installations, and using less dramatic devices, officials expect to reap annual savings high in the millions.

"We must allot and use men and units as if we had to reach into our own pockets to meet the payroll," declares Army Secretary Stahr, whose service is bearing the brunt of the current expansion in troop strength.

Right up to Mr. McNamara himself, civilian leaders insist their aim is to avoid any Berlin-born letdown in economy and efficiency efforts. "We have no intention of using the present crisis as an excuse for easing up our drive" declares the tough-minded former Ford Motor Co. executive who bosses the Pentagon.

BEGINNING MOVES

Beyond mere rhetoric, defense policymakers are steaming ahead on various economy courses. The degree of final success, of course, depends on how far they'll really push—often against opposition from Congress and from military men inside the Pentagon. Nonetheless, these beginning moves are being made with some visible effect:

On orders from Secretary McNamara, the military services are expanding competition among suppliers of major hardware they buy. Thus, after first picking Borg-Warner Corp.'s Ingersoll-Kalamazoo division alone to develop a new aluminum amphibious vehicle called LARC, the Army awarded a production contract to LeTourneau-Westinghouse as well as to Ingersoll-Kalamazoo. "We reduced the price almost 50 percent, saving over $40,000 per unit, compared with what we would have paid if there had been no competition," estimates an Army purchasing agent. Such competition before long will be extended to aeronautical and other spare parts, among other things. Savings may reach $100 million in the fiscal year ending next June 30, officials reckon.

Pentagon procurement officials are laying plans for revising complex, often-rigid buying regulations to provide stronger incentives to contractors for cutting costs and improving performance of aircraft, missiles and other weapons. While such schemes have seen limited past action, the idea now is to make far greater use of what one top official terms the powerful incentive of the profit motive. One possibility under study: Giving contractors added fees for a particular efficient, economical job, but charging them a penalty for an especially poor showing. The cost-plus contract, under which a supplier gets a set fee plus reimbursement of expenses, may be deemphasized.

The new Defense Supply Agency, designed to centralize purchasing of items used by all the services, will gradually expand its scope. It's starting out with clothing, food, petroleum, medical, automotive, construction, and a few other things on its shopping list; soon it will take over certain services, including transportation management, and buying of electrical and electronic equipment. Chemical supplies and aviation parts may be added later on. Within 4 years, officials estimate, annual operating savings will run about $50 million.

SURPLUS INSTALLATIONS

The campaign to close down surplus military installations is becoming a Pentagon fixture. A special office is working full time to scrutinize some 6,700 sites in this country and abroad for possible closing or cutback. Besides the 73 installations now slated for shutdown or curtailment, more are expected to be disclosed before the year's end, and news of the same sort may come periodically thereafter. Prime targets include supply depots, which now burden the Pentagon with 41 million square feet of excess storage space.

"This current Berlin buildup," declares one high official, "will require more rapid, rather than slower, action in closing unneeded bases. We need the men and materials that can be reassigned to high-priority missions."

The McNamara Pentagon team pursues these and other economy efforts with a special style of management designed to bring quick results, that concentrates authority at the top. The Secretary, for instance, demands that aides keep a special scoresheet on every major weapons project for his personal scrutiny; in a thick black looseleaf notebook, Mr. McNamara gets a monthly review of the important events in each project, including possible delays, financing problems, and an indication of whether a decision is required on the program during the next month.

"This notebook gives the boss a panoramic view of all important programs," explains a McNamara aide. "It means he gives much tighter surveillance and closer personal attention to these programs than others did in the past."

" 'Managing by projects' has become a way-of-life in the Pentagon," adds the Assistant Defense Secretary for Installations and Logistics, Thomas D. Morris. "It means we concentrate our time and our staff talent on a few major, well-defined problems that can be pursued to a point of action, as opposed to dispersing our efforts."

This technique has brought swift action on such things as centralized procurement. Mr. McNamara raised the issue in a confidential memo to associates last March 23; they studied it, and by September 1 plans for the Defense Supply Agency were set. That 5-month feat is considered better than par for the course in the Pentagon's bureaucratic jungle.

But the McNamara methods have brought sharp complaints from military and civilian leaders of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who maintain too much authority is centered at the top and too little use is made of lower echelon expertise.

"Mr. McNamara tries to run everything himself. He's almost smart enough to do it, but he's only human and can't know all," snaps a veteran Pentagon civilian official. "Often, these people decide to do things without really understanding the facts."

The Air Force, for instance, contends that local purchasing of automotive parts proves more economical in the long run than centralized buying. The reason, service officials say, is less paperwork and delay. Now, however, these parts will be handled by the new central procurement agency.

Apart from any internal misfires, the economy drive is encountering formidable obstacles on the outside. Stanch local resistance to base closings and curtailments is being faced by the Pentagon leaders. Delegations from affected towns have streamed into the Capital to plead for their bases, and Congressmen have sought to reverse shutdown decisions. So far, however, the administration has reversed itself only occasionally. When the Pentagon decided to retain in operating forces six wings of B–47 medium bombers originally earmarked for retirement this year several bomber bases in this country won new leases on life. And now, in step with the Berlin buildup, the Air Force is postponing next year's scheduled closedown of four airbases in Britain.

STEPPED-UP TRAINING

In addition, stepped-up training for the Berlin crisis has caused the Army to reopen Fort Chaffee, Ark., though Mr. McNamara insists: "We don't have plans for any more reactivations."

Even if all the economy efforts were to succeed, defense outlays still would rise. "Notwithstanding all our efforts to effect economies in the execution of the defense program," warns Defense Comptroller Charles Hitch, "defense expenditures are likely to continue their upward trend in fiscal 1963." Spending then is expected to hit $50 billion, up from this year's post-World War II high of about $47 billion, thanks to a series of Kennedy-ordered step-ups in military strength.

But added efficiency is considered all the more vital now. Increased outlays alone

don't produce more defense capability, warns Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric. Without special efforts at squeezing more value from available money, he declares, the country could get shortchanged in military strength. And in the current crisis atmosphere top civilians say, they're getting good cooperation from below in tightening up on unnecessary spending.

The individual military services, it's reported, have diligently pursued the search for more competition in defense procurement. The Navy, for one, estimates that by having two producers rather than one for its Sidewinder air-to-air missile, the cost has been lowered by 30 percent to $2,300 per missile; Philco Corp. and General Electric Co. are the two major contractors for the Sidewinder.

BUYING SPARE PARTS

A new area for reducing prices through competition will be the purchase of various spare parts according to Assistant Secretary Morris. "Our studies of aeronautical parts have revealed that the percentage of such parts bought competitively can probably be increased from 15 to 30 percent and that price savings on the order of $50 million per year can be realized," he reports.

As things stand now, procurement from a single source still represents the bulk of all defense contracting—about 60 percent of the total. Service officials have tended to shun more competition for many reasons, including fear of buying from unproven sources, and lack of time and manpower to conduct competitions. Moreover, buying from a single source often is inherent in certain stages of defense work; a major missile or airplane whose details must be worked out bit by bit can usually be developed only by a single major contractor known to have the needed manpower and facilities for the job.

Where they are feasible, even relatively small increases in competitive procurement, defense officials say, can bring significant cost cuts. "It's believed that price savings of at least 100 million can be achieved this fiscal year," states a high official.

EXTRA FEES FOR CONTRACTORS

In another effort to achieve savings, the services will be urged to make greater use of contract arrangements that offer companies a substantial share of the fruits of any cost-cutting plans they can devise. Often if speed of delivery or special performance features—extra high altitude for a plane or extra long range for a missile—are urgently wanted, extra fees may be given for exceeding certain standards.

The most fundamental change in the works is simply modifying administrative procedures to allow the military services to pay higher profits, when warranted by contractors' good work. Present laws allow up to 15 percent profit for research and development work and 10 percent for production; but in practice contractors rarely get more than 10 percent for research and 7 percent for production.

To stimulate better, cheaper work, too, procurement chiefs plan to give more weight to past performance in selecting contractors for future jobs.

And as a special incentive for contractors, Assistant Secretary Morris, the Pentagon's top procurement man, proposes a sliding scale of award fees tied to total performance. While details have yet to be decided it would work primarily like this: The Government would select a board of professional experts not directly involved in a particular contract to determine how much profit a concern should get for a given job after it's completed. A particularly good job would mean a higher than normal profit in the form of an extra award fee; especially poor performance would mean a penalty instead.

WEAPONS: THE STRUGGLE TO BUILD MORE OF THEM BETTER AND FASTER WITHOUT UNDUE COSTS OR PROFITS

(The Nation's biggest business—and its biggest challenge—is defense. The record in meeting that challenge is good, but it may not be good enough. This week Senior Editor James M. Cannon and Associate Editor Lawrence S. Martz turn the spotlight on the problems of the defense industry, and what's being done about them.)

Ever since 1777, when Washington's ragged troops were freezing at Valley Forge and the Continental Congress was complaining about war contractors' "lust of avarice," the problem has remained: How can the country produce the best weapons, with the least delay, and at the lowest possible cost? As the weapons have evolved from muskets to missiles and the cost of defense has soared to $50 billion a year, the problem has become as complex as the 1.5 million parts of a Nike-Zeus antimissile battery. And in Washington today, the continuing search for solutinons has assumed a new urgency—and a new sense of purpose.

Top defense industry leaders, in New York 2 weeks ago for a meeting of the National Security Industrial Association, heard this blunt warning from Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense: "We cannot afford production delays. We cannot tolerate unsatisfactory material. Overall, your industry's performance has been good, but 'good' is not enough in these times. There have been far too many failures. We are by no means satisfied."

Reasons for dissatisfaction weren't hard to find. There was the supercarrier *Kitty Hawk*, now on extended sea trials some 22 months behind schedule; there was the M–14 rifle, only now free of the production bugs that have beset it for 2 years. There was the missile that malfunctioned because a workman let a drop of solder fall into a semiconductor; there was the new jet aircraft delayed for 6 months because a company official didn't tell his superiors that there were problems with the engine.

For all the horrid examples, Gilpatric made it clear that his warning was not an indictment of the defense industry. He also acknowledged what businessmen have been guardedly grumbling about for year—that the Government shares the blame for delays, rising costs, and uneven quality in defense contracts. His basic message: Fundamental changes are being made in defense procurement. They will hurt some firms—the inefficient, the incapable, the careless. But they will reward good performance, and they will benefit the country.

Cheers: The businessmen were enthusiastic. "We'll have accomplished a great deal if we can get rewards for good performances and penalties for bad work," said E. V. Huggins, NSIA president and chairman of Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s executive committee. "I've never seen a time when there was a better approach to cooperation [between industry and the Pentagon] than there is today."

What are the problems? Understandably, both defense and industry officials are reluctant to jeopardize their improving relations with quoted criticisms; the president of one space-age company dismissed the whole subject as "to touchy" for comment. Off the record, though, they list a bewildering variety of often contradictory complaints on the difficulties of defense business.

Government aides accuse the contractors of bidding low on competitive contracts, counting on raising the price later in renegotiating sessions; of, on the other hand, bidding high on negotiated cost-plus contracts, hoping to make a profit on the cost figure; of neglecting quality controls; of failing to coordinate parallel stages of projects and permiting delays in whole programs. The contractors, in turn, accuse the Government of forcing their profits down (from an average 7 percent to 3 percent in 8 years, one industry official says); of making unnecessary design changes on contracts in work; of erecting mountains of redtape and trying to supervise niggling details.

Shortcomings: "There has not been a widespread failure in defense procurement," Gilpatric told Newsweek last week, "but we've noticed on a number of occasions that contractors on whom we've relied for excellence * * * have not taken the kind of precautions, particularly in quality control, that we expected.

"The other day, we were suddenly told the engine for a new aircraft wouldn't be ready until 5 months after the scheduled date. Top management was not made aware by its own people that the problem had developed. So the flight test was thrown off by 6 months.

"Industry is often blameless (when failures occur). It is not always easy to identify contractor failures. We are moving into a new order of things. We are pressing all designs and engineering beyond pragmatic experience (and) men have to set constantly higher standards."

Experted to death: Most businessmen, for their part, admit they're not always blameless. But many of them echo the complaint of George M. Bunker, board chairman of the Martin Co.: "We are being overmanaged by the (Government), especially in research and development, and are being experted to death." Other contractors agree with the Boeing engineer who told Newsweek: "If an automobile manufacturer started out to build a racing car, then changed to a stock car, then to a passenger car, then went back to building a racing car, he'd have something of the same problem Boeing is having with the Dyna-Soar space glider, thanks to the Air Force and its constant changing of design goals.

"There's almost no such thing any more as a blanket cost-plus contract," the spokesman for another top contractor said. "If you do your damndest to be efficient, you just get renegotiated."

Despite the friction, Government and industry both recognize underlying problems they must learn to live with.

First and most basic, weapons are advancing so fast that they become obsolete before they've gone into production; thus a shrinking proportion of defense work is on production contracts, and a swelling amount on research and development. General Electric, for example, did 90 percent of its defense work on production during the Korean war, estimates now it's less than 40 percent.

At the same time, as weapons become more complex and expensive, the quality standards soar out of sight. This is most obvious in such fields as missile testing, where failure of a single widget can set back a whole program for months. And the high standards are requiring extensive advances in techniques. One contractor noted: "When you're building a missile silo you've got to pour concrete to tolerances of fractions of an inch. What concrete man has ever done that? It's building with calipers. You've got to develop a whole new breed of workers."

Complicating the question is the fluctuating world crisis, which makes speed essential. The Minuteman missile, its rocket motor and its underground silo are being developed simultaneously; a change in any stage can require extensive redesigning of the others—which inevitably adds to cost and time.

Politics: A final fact of life is the semipolitical nature of defense contract awards.

One disappointed contractor said: "You put up a highly qualified bid, and then because of some purely political consideration—unemployment in some other area, or because a Senator has the ear of the buying agency, or whatever—you get knocked out."

None of these factors is likely to change. But other problems can be solved—as illustrated by the cases of the Kitty Hawk and the M–14.

New York Shipbuilding Corp., a subsidiary of Merritt-Chapman & Scott, won the Kitty Hawk aircraft carrier contract 5 years ago with a bid of $119.8 million—reportedly below what the work-hungry yard figured would be final cost. There were a host of design changes; as costs mounted, the Navy says, the company cut corners wherever it could. About $1 million a year was saved in housekeeping costs—but metal shavings and other debris littered the decks and found their way into fuel, water, and chemical lines. Thus, considerable work had to be done twice to clear out the pipes, says the Navy.

No one will estimate the final cost of the *Kitty Hawk*, and the debate over who pays for how much of the added price continues. Navy Secretary John B. Connally, Jr., estimates the Navy's design changes were responsible for about 12 months of the delay, and New York shipbuilding's inefficiency for the remaining 10 months. In any case, published reports say the Navy found from 700 to 1,400 deficiencies in the ship.

Inevitable: As the first missile-firing supercarrier, the *Kitty Hawk* was in many ways a development contract, subject to the inevitable design changes that go with a new weapon. But such problems can extend to production work, too—as the M-14 rifle demonstrates.

"I think it is a disgrace the way the project was handled," Defense Secretary McNamara told the House Armed Services Committee in July. "I don't mean particularly by the Army, but by the Nation. This is a relatively simply job, to build a rifle • • • and yet this project languished for months—years, actually."

One explanation was offered by L. E. Kreig, vice president and general manager of Olin Mathieson's Winchester Western Division: "This is not a gun; this is a machine tool." Olin and Harrington & Richardson, Inc., which got the first contracts for the M-14 early in 1959, couldn't unsnarl the production problems until this summer. The rifle has 110 parts, many of which must be machined to close tolerances; in addition, major design changes became necessary.

"Design changes are a way of life," Kreig said. "Nobody can foresee everything. The problem is not the changes themselves, but the way they have to be made. Every piece of paper accounting for every action must be approved [by the Government] before the action is taken. This looks like economy, but it's probably one of the most expensive measures that could ever be taken."

Pledges: The problems are obvious; the solutions are not. But in the new atmosphere that followed the Kennedy administration into Washington, defense and industry leaders have agreed on a surprising number of changes. In a speech to the NSIA, Secretary McNamara last June promised the Government would try to simplify its specifications; reduce development times; hold down the number of design changes, and cut the amount of information required from contractors. Both industry and the Government are working to cut costs, with some impressive results. Samples: The Polaris fusing assembly, which formerly cost $50, can be made now for $5; Martin Co. found a way to make a $45 missile component for $7.

The Defense Department is trying to reverse the trend to cost-plus contracts, up from 12.7 percent of the budget in 1951 to 42.6 percent in fiscal 1960. And Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense, hopes to raise the number of contracts let by competitive bidding from the current 15 percent to 25 or 30 percent. Success, he says, will save tens of millions of dollars.

Businessmen welcome all these moves, though some are skeptical about the chances for fixed-price contracts and competitive bidding on today's complex contracts. The plan they like best is McNamara's emphasis on rewarding good performance and punishing failure.[1] He wants more contracts like the one just signed for a new missile: If it works on the first, second, or third shot, the producer gets a 15-percent bonus. If it works on the fourth or fifth shot, he gets no incentive payment. If it does not work by the sixth firing, he loses 5 percent, and the penalties go higher after that.

To keep the ball rolling, McNamara has set up an independent Logistics Management Institute, headed by Charles H. Kellstadt, board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co. The institute, under acting executive director Dr. Sterling Livingston, a Harvard Business School professor and defense-buying expert, will study the whole Government supply field and propose new ideas.

Livingston, who rewrote the Navy's procurement instructions in World War II and helped rebuild the military buying apparatus in the Korean war, thinks the new emphasis on the profit motive will make a big difference in raising quality, cutting delays and costs. "Now we pay a man to goof as well as perform," he says. "In the future, we will penalize a man who goofs, and pay him better to perform."

Will the changes make any real difference? Some veterans on both sides of the fence tend to doubt it; they see the problems as too complex, and too well established, to permit more than token improvement. But the consensus was summed up by Livingston, who expects no overnight production miracles but is convinced that great steps forward can be made. "These problems have been around a long time, and people have been working on them for a long time," he said. "But Secretary McNamara and his staff have an astonishing determination to get things done. The real difference is that the top level wants something to happen."

Efficient Defense Production

The Pentagon is dissatisfied with the way many large defense contractors are doing their job. Quality is poor on some weapons; delivery dates are not being met and costs are too high. The record has been disturbing enough to prompt Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric to tell the heads of defense industries: "We are by no means satisfied that the unique managerial talent with which this Nation is endowed has yet made itself fully effective in defense production."

This is a dismaying comment in a year when we are spending $25 billion on military procurement and the exigencies of the world situation compel us to be ready with a wide range of arms and the means to get them swiftly to any part of the globe. In a crisis we must never find ourselves obliged to use nuclear weapons because we do not have enough conventional arms to meet the requirements of a limited war. The anxiety being expressed by Air Force units in Europe over just this possibility indicates the need for top speed in fulfilling all our procurement goals.

Allocating the blame for waste in defense production is never an easy task. The military services themselves often are much at fault, as they were on the M–14 rifle and many aspects of the missile program. The hangover of the Pentagon's own "troika" system of divided procurement responsibility, delays in the approval of designs and the issuance of contracts, the kind of perfectionism that results in frequent changes after contracts go into production—all these have been factors in slowing deliveries and driving up costs.

The cost-plus method of guaranteeing profits for defense contractors is another breeder of waste. More than one-third of all defense contracts are let on a cost-plus basis—virtually all in fields that carry the highest priority or involve the most experimental work. The Defense Department is now looking for a system that will provide a greater spur to speed and quality.

When billions of dollars are being spent under negotiated contracts, in the belief that these assure more dependable and economical performance than could be obtained through competitive bidding, the country is entitled to prompt notice that it is getting value received.

[1] The idea isn't new. In 1907 the War Department hired the Wright brothers to build a plane, agreed on a 10-percent bonus for each mile of speed over 40 miles an hour and a 10-percent penalty for each mile under the target. The Wrights hit 42.25 miles per hour, got a $5,000 bonus.

Federal Participation in the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the Herald Statesman, Yonkers, N.Y., carried an editorial on September 23, 1961, concerning Federal participation in the New York World's Fair of 1964.

The article, of course, speaks for itself. However, for the record, I would like to inject my own view of the situation.

It is one thing for the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to state a direct opinion on whether or not the United States should invest in the promotion of the cause of peace and understanding among the people of the world. He is certainly entitled to his opinion. However, in this particular instance, he is apparently trying to use the entire New York congressional delegation as his scapegoat in delaying action on a bill which has the unanimous support of the Governors of the 50 United States, White House endorsement, and overwhelming congressional approval.

The position of the Empire State has been grossly misrepresented. It is unreasonable on the part of the Senator to presume that New York would not seek Federal participation in this worthwhile international endeavor. As I pointed out in the RECORD on August 22 when H.R. 7763 passed the House by a clear-cut majority, the latest Federal expenditure for participation in a world's fair was $13,500,000, in 1958.

Federal appropriations for fairs and exhibits since the Chicago World's Fair in 1893 have totaled $65,009,812.

I trust the Senator is not suggesting that the United States now set a precedent by discontinuing participation in international fairs and exhibits.

The article follows:

HE'D KEEP UNITED STATES OUT OF WORLD'S FAIR

If and when the 1964 World's Fair opens in New York, among the nations not represented by exhibits may be the United States.

The United States will not be represented, that is, if Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has his know-it-all way.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill looking toward a U.S. exhibit in the fair, and the Senate is said to be prepared also to pass that bill if Senator FULBRIGHT, the chesty chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, will permit it to do so.

Under Senate rules and custom, you see, the chairman of a committee has all but complete power to release or to pigeonhole, and thus kill, any legislative proposal—even though all other Members of both Houses and the President may be clamoring for its passage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT's contention is that, when the world's fair was first discussed in the Congress in 1959, the New York congressional delegation "pledged that no Federal funds would be sought." So he sees a proposal to appropriate $300,000 to study the nature and scope of possible U.S. participation in the fair as a violation of that pledge since it might lead to construction of an American pavilion at a cost of up to $30 million.

New York spokesmen, on the other hand, declare Mr. FULBRIGHT has misconstrued, deliberately or otherwise, the position of the Empire State. Our Senators JAVITS and KEATING have asserted that it truly never was and is not the intention of this State to ask a Federal subsidy to help establish or promote the fair—the World's Fair Corp. is prepared to do all that out of its own capital and income. New York does want, however, a U.S. exhibit in the fair—an exhibit at least comparable to those of foreign nations which have contracted or are reported ready to contract for space and buildings in the vast exposition.

The Arkansas Senator has demonstrated more than once in recent months that, having eaten too fulsomely of the oats of power, he suffers either from too much toga or too tight britches.

To an ill-timed and unwarranted if not hare brained, pronouncement on the Berlin situation, for example, he now adds his dictum on the World's Fair.

In the former he put his opinions above those of the White House, while in the latter he seeks to substitute his personal judgment for that of the whole Congress.

It's right, of course, that a U.S. Senator take his responsibilities seriously—but that is not to say any Senator should take himself too seriously.

Report to the People of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit herewith my report to the people of Oklahoma, covering legislation and other activities, as their senior Senator in the 87th Congress, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Oklahomans, early autumn fishing trips were out of the question this year for Members of Congress, so I missed my customary date with a hook and line in September. However, while remaining in Washington, we helped string up a "record catch" for Oklahoma in one of the longest sessions of Congress in my experience.

The fine results of the session can be attributed to the favorable administration, and to a hard-working delegation which had the help of thousands of dedicated Oklahomans who took an interest in legislation contributing to the well-being and progress of our State. Every project received the joint efforts of Oklahoma citizens and their Senators and Congressmen. These included bills to expand highway building, step up social security and old-age benefits, strengthen farm commodity and soil conservation programs, and meet the critical new needs for better educational opportunities.

One way to measure our accomplishments is to total up the amounts which will be returned to Oklahoma people through Federal investments in Oklahoma and Oklahoma-related programs and projects. This year the total was increased to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. The figure includes Federal aviation and military payrolls as well as benefits from legislation which covers both grants and loans for hospitals, rest homes, waterworks, sewage systems, and other community facilities or urban renewal projects. The number of such projects sponsored locally will determine the exact totals.

HIGHWAY BILL PASSED

A major project of the Senate Public Works Committee on which I serve as ranking Democrat was the new highway bill. This will greatly assist highway construction in Oklahoma by providing about $47 million more between fiscal years 1963 and 1966 than did the previous measure.

As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, I worked with the President to speed up the Nation's space program. This included the appointment of James E. Webb of Oklahoma City to head up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The program, including the goal of sending a manned vehicle to the moon and back, will require an investment of $30 billion or more in this decade—including, I hope, hundreds of millions in Oklahoma.

As ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I took a leading role in amending the unemployment compensation laws and the social security laws which provide increased payments to widows of retired workers, raise the minimum retirement payments, and provide the option for retirement at age 62 to men. Increased subsistence payments and medical care for the aged and higher benefits for dependent children were secured.

RIVER PROJECT SPEEDED UP

The most substantial gains from this session are for land, wood, and water. Appropriations for these increased from $80 to $130 million. Included are funds permitting a speedup in the Arkansas River navigation project which should make completion possible by 1970, 3 years sooner than previously expected.

Our hopes for the proposed central Oklahoma water supply and navigation project are much brighter than ever before. Survey funds were obtained for the Corps of Engineers to revise and expand previous studies. The new study will be on the basis of a broader evaluation of economic benefits to be derived from the project. This will be possible because of both legislative amendments and changes in administrative regulations secured by us. This reinforces our purpose to complete navigation into central Oklahoma simultaneously with northeastern Oklahoma.

Other good news in the water program: The Arbuckle and Waurika reservoir projects were economically justified. Both will come before Congress next session. Little River Reservoir at Norman was allocated $900,000, and its construction was started.

Soil conservation appropriations will provide $18,095,844 for Oklahoma projects.

SCHOOLS GET FUNDS

U.S. Government aid to schools in federally impacted areas gained a 2-year extension this session, providing $10,899,400 for 1962 to Oklahoma schools.

Congress also appropriated $15,229,000 for military construction at Armed Forces bases in Oklahoma, and the airport bill assures us of at least $2,389,065 for better aviation facilities over the next 3 years.

Other high points for the year include the statewide Community Development Clinic held August 26, in Oklahoma City, successful negotiations to purchase the Oklahoma Ordnance Works, Pryor, for a vast industrial development, First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space held in Tulsa, an important new Federal antipollution and water quality improvement laboratory and experiment project at Ada, and the final report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, which I headed.

Encouraged by a vigorous new administration, the 1st session of the 87th Congress was off to a fast start. One of my first duties was to give the final report on the 2-year study done by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

This report showed Oklahoma to be some 10 years ahead of most of the Nation in developing its natural resources and was called excellent and timely by President Kennedy.

NEW COMPLETION DATE FIXED

Early in the year Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., head of the southwestern division, Corps of Engineers, advised that several years could be cut off the expected completion date of 1973 for the Arkansas River navigation project. This project basically is a 500-mile barge navigation channel being constructed from the Mississippi up the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers to near Tulsa. But it has other great benefits including flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water, and recreation.

I arranged a meeting of the Oklahoma delegation to start action in Congress on the accelerated program. This involved the need of an additional $4,150,000 in the 1962 budget for planning an Arkansas River bank stabilization.

We were able to get the Bureau of the Budget to recommend this in the President's revised budget. Congress then appropriated the funds and for good reason. The speedup (1) provides badly needed employment, (2) saves money because of the rising cost of construction materials, and (3) will reduce transportation rates much sooner.

The river navigation appropriation for 1962 also includes $250,000 for planning on the Short Mountain project, the first of six locks and dams to be built in Oklahoma. This project near Sallisaw will consist of a lock, and a dam 6,700 feet long and 64 feet high. Estimated cost is $101 million.

RESERVOIR FUNDS LISTED

Construction on larger reservoirs will move along with Eufaula getting $28 million; Keystone, $27,500,000; and Oologah, $1,759,000 for its completion.

Two other major projects in eastern Oklahoma received funds. Pine Creek Reservoir in McCurtain County gets $175,000 for planning so it will be eligible for construction next year. Broken Bow receives $1,250,000 for construction.

Study funds voted by Congress include $16,000 for the Bird-Caney project on the Verdigris, $50,000 for the Central Oklahoma project, $500,000 for the Arkansas-Red River

pollution study, $37,000 for Boswell Reservoir, $3,500 for Crutcho Creek, and $25,000 for the Kaw Reservoir near Ponca City.

Also $15,000 for Oklahoma City floodway; $11,000 for Shidler Reservoir; $15,000 for extension of navigation from the Arkansas-to-Eufaula Dam; $15,000 for exploring navigation possibilities on the Poteau River; and $10,000 for start of surveys on the Cimarron in Oklahoma, Kansas, and New Mexico.

Bureau of Reclamation projects in Oklahoma add $2,906,000 to the water program. These funds mainly will go to start construction on Little River Reservoir near Norman and toward completing Fort Cobb and Foss reservoir projects on the Washita. The Waurika project reached the Senate Interior Committee just before adjournment and favorable hearings were held. I will be pushing for approval of both the Waurika and Arbuckle projects in the next session.

RECLAMATION STUDIES APPROVED

Congress also approved study funds for several Bureau of Reclamation projects including Mangum, $36,000; Mountain Park, $2,700; Chikaskia (at Blackwell), $10,000; and a general study of Oklahoma basins, $106,000.

Although not actually in our State, projects for which funds were appropriated in Kansas, Texas, and Arkansas also will greatly benefit Oklahoma.

This was another big year for soil conservation watershed projects, which do so much to hold water where it falls. Of the $18,095,844 appropriation, $10,620,250 goes to the Soil Conservation Service for upstream development and retardation structures, $7,290,000 to the Agricultural Conservation Program, and $185,594 to research at Chickasha.

The Public Works Committee on which I serve approved the Sallisaw Creek watershed project with $4,552,584 in Federal funds, helping to provide Stilwell and Sallisaw a water supply. Congress also acted favorably on upper Red Rock Creek (Garfield, Kay, Noble, and Grant Counties), $1,985,844; Haikey Creek (Tulsa County), $419,000; and Cane Creek (Muskogee and Okmulgee Counties), $1,529,365.

Another major victory this session was the passage of my antipollution bill. With it, Oklahoma communities can share $7,218,860 in matching Federal funds over the next 5 years for improving sewage treatment facilities. Other provisions include (1) authority to hold additional water in reservoirs to maintain streamflow during dry periods, and (2) charging up to 30 percent of a reservoir's cost to future municipal water needs without requiring cities to make immediate contracts in advance of such needs.

As the only Senator serving on both the Public Works and Finance Committees I had two opportunities to work on the highway bill. It gives Oklahoma $195,100,000 in matching funds for fiscal years 1963–66. Moreover, an amendment Senator MONRONEY and I sponsored requires the Defense Department to repair State highways damaged in the process of certain military construction. Legislation I earlier sponsored enables relocated roads around the new lakes to be built according to present needs, not as they were.

HOUSING ACT PASSED

Another measure passed by Congress this session was the Housing Act. It will aid both the young and the elderly in our State.

One provision makes $246,875,000 available for loans in constructing college dormitories in 1962 with a reduced interest rate of 3¾ percent. During this session loans totaling $5,873,000 were made to six Oklahoma educational institutions. Another provision of the act gives the same interest rate and makes more money available to private, nonprofit sponsors—such as church groups— for building housing for the elderly.

Planning funds amounting to $106,000 were allocated toward construction of two new State park lodges on the Eufaula Reservoir.

This session's farm program was worked out with the help of thousands of progressive farm leaders. Under the plan, Oklahoma's 1962 wheat allotment will be nearly 5 million acres. Based on an average yield, the new price support of $2 per bushel, is expected to give Oklahoma wheat farmers about 10 percent more income next year. The feed grains measure is expected to add to farmers' purchasing power by about 10 percent of this year's feed grain production value.

The reopening of Camp Chaffee at Fort Smith, Ark., near the end of the session brings needed jobs to eastern Oklahoma. But military bases within the State itself will add more than $250 million to Oklahoma's economy next year through civilian and military payrolls, according to the Department of Defense.

ORDNANCE WORKS OBTAINED

Earlier in the report I referred to the hard work, resourcefulness, and energy of Oklahoma citizens in the successful efforts of the session. The negotiations for the Oklahoma Ordnance Works at Pryor for a big, new industrial site is a good example. Cooperating with the Governor and other State and local officials, the delegation was able to get the General Services Administration to release the facility for $1,700,000. With 10,000 acres of land, a complete railroad network, and many other improvements, this will be a real magnet for much industrial growth.

The delegation teamed up to help Tulsans obtain a new mission for the federally owned aircraft plant operated by Douglas in Tulsa, and the delegation assisted the Cherokees in gaining payment of their $14,769,000 claim which had been pending for 10 years.

Teamwork by the delegation and citizens in the lead and zinc areas resulted in passage of the long-sought bill providing production payments for small mine operators.

The Oklahoma delegation also had unlimited backing on two other major projects—the statewide Community Development Clinic at Oklahoma City and the first National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space at Tulsa. The development clinic drew 1,500 Oklahomans interested in improving their communities. The space conference introduced hundreds of America's top scientists and industrialists to the advantages of our great State.

Of utmost importance to me, too, was the average of 1,000 letters a week delivered to my office during this session. Assisted by my staff, I have tried to give prompt attention to each letter. And, I want to remind everyone in Oklahoma that the purpose of my office is to serve you. Please do not hesitate to call on me if you think I can be of some assistance.

And, finally, I want to thank each individual citizen—civic leaders, State and local officials, the press, radio, and television—for your splendid cooperation and assistance during the 1st session, 87th Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. KERR.

Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of each session of Congress I have made it a practice to report to the people of my district on the accomplishments, as well as the shortcomings, of Congress. I believe that an informed public is an intelligent public.

This is my report for the 1961 session. I urge my constituents to read it carefully, to learn what has been achieved and what still remains to be done. Above all, I want them to know that I have always sought to represent the interests of all the people of my district, regardless of race, color, creed, or political affiliation.

THE 1961 SESSION OF CONGRESS

This year's session of Congress was not only one of the longest, lasting nine full months from early January to the end of September, but it was also one of the most hard-working and productive sessions in the last 10 years. Under the vigorous leadership of President Kennedy, we have enacted many important and far-reaching measures of the new administration's program, which is designed to meet the challenges of the 1960's. Congress passed most of the legislation promised in the Democratic platform of 1960 and requested later by President Kennedy. We proved that the Democratic Party is truly concerned with the interests of the people and is making a serious effort to deal with pressing social and economic problems which have been neglected during 8 years of Republican administration.

The major task faced by President Kennedy was to rebuild our military strength and to restore our international prestige. In this respect, Congress gave him full cooperation by providing the necessary funds to strengthen our national defense to meet the aggressive activity of Soviet Russia in various parts of the world. We undertook new programs to aid the Latin American nations, and we also adopted a more efficient foreign aid program to strengthen our allies and to help the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The Kennedy administration was also faced with many problems at home which required legislative action by Congress to stimulate our lagging economy. Again, Congress cooperated by adopting legislation to relieve the hardships of unemployment, to increase the minimum wage and extend coverage to more millions of workers, to help the chronically depressed areas, to develop our natural resources, and to combat the recession in other ways. Congress also enacted liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act providing more benefits, new programs for housing and slum clearance, aid to dependent children, control of polluted waters to protect our water supplies, combating crime and juvenile delinquency, and others. Some of these had been previously vetoed by former President Eisenhower, but I am glad that President Kennedy has signed them into law.

Needless to say that I have strongly supported the President and his program in Congress. I fought for progressive and liberal measures or amendments on every occasion. The administration and the Congress were faced with grave responsibilities at home and abroad to an extent greater than ever before, and I

did everything within my power to share in those responsibilities. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I was in the midst of it all, and we worked harder and longer than ever before.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 1961 SESSION

Among the more important achievements of the 1961 session, which I supported, may be listed the following measures:

Unemployment compensation: This act provided for an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits to those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. It helped alleviate the severe hardship of unemployed workers and their families.

Aid to dependent children: A sum of $200 million in aid over a 14-month period was approved to help nearly a million children of unemployed parents who were suffering great hardship.

Area redevelopment: This is a special assistance program to help urban and rural areas which have a high unemployment rate or a low income. It provides loans to these areas to build new industries and create jobs. Many of my constituents who are of Puerto Rican origin will be pleased to know that industrial areas in Puerto Rico will be aided under this program.

Minimum wage: This is one of the most important acts adopted by Congress this year which is providing wage increases to 27½ million workers in the country. Minimum hourly wage rates are increased from $1 to $1.15 this year, and to $1.25 in 1963. In addition, minimum wage coverage is extended to 3.6 million more workers—the first such expansion since the law was adopted in 1938. I was in favor of increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 this year and introduced a bill for the higher rate, but this was the best we could get.

Social security benefits: Liberalized benefits were enacted which have already increased social security payments for 3.7 million elderly people. The new law also provides retirement for men at the age of 62—women already have this privilege—it increased benefits for widows by 10 percent; it raised the earnings ceiling for retired people; it also provides other assistance for the needy aged, the blind, and the disabled.

Housing program: This is a comprehensive housing measure, the first of this kind to be passed by Congress in the last 12 years. It provides nearly $5 billion in loans and grants for urban renewal, public housing for 100,000 low-income families, housing for moderate-income families, for elderly people, college housing; also home improvement, liberalization of the FHA mortgage insurance program, urban mass transportation systems and other community facilities.

Milk program for children: The special milk program for children, which is of great benefit to many needy and undernourished children, has been extended for another year and a sum of $105 million was authorized. This is $10 million more than last year, so that more children will benefit from it.

Crime and delinquency: Three new major laws were enacted to combat gambling, rackets, and other organized crime; 3-year program was started to combat juvenile delinquency, the first such program undertaken by the Federal Government; also 73 new Federal judgeships were created which will reduce the huge backlog of court cases.

Water pollution control: A 5-year program was approved to help communities protect their water supplies, construct plants for waste treatment, and reduce pollution of rivers and harbors.

Other measures: There were many other measures adopted, among the more important being: a program to convert saltwater into fresh water to meet future water shortages; modernization of the Nation's airports; additional funds to complete construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System; training more nurses; extension of the home loan program for World War II and Korean veterans; a program to help construction of nursing homes for the aged, improving hospitals and other health services; extension of the National Defense Education Act and also extension of the school program to aid federally impacted areas.

The record of achievements in the field of international affairs and the security of the Nation during the 1961 session is equally impressive. We hope and trust it will bring the desired results in safeguarding our Nation and the free world and in raising our country's prestige to new heights. Among the more important steps taken by Congress in enacting defense and foreign policy legislation may be listed the following:

Foreign aid: Congress voted over $4 billion for military, economic, and technical aid to our allies and to underdeveloped countries of the free world. Included in the program is authority for the United States to extend long-term aid over a 5-year period for economic and development projects, but Congress will have to review and approve such appropriations annually. This should be of help to many countries in planning ahead, raising their standard of living, and resisting Communist expansion.

Peace Corps: This provides for direct participation by American volunteers in helping people in less-developed countries. Some 2,700 young Americans will serve under this program to help such nations develop their resources, education, and health services.

Defense funds: Congress voted an increase of $6 billion in defense budgets to strengthen the Nation's security, which includes increased missile programs, a stepped-up bomber alert, increased Armed Forces personnel, and other steps.

Civil defense: Congress voted a big expansion in civil defense to provide the people of America with the first serious shelter program in the event of emergency.

Space exploration: Funds to enable the United States to take the lead in space exploration and achievement were doubled, including the first steps toward putting a man on the moon.

Alliance for progress: A fund of $600 million to help Latin American countries and to improve U.S. relations with those countries was set up by Congress. This program is known as alliance for progress and was proposed by President Kennedy. It seeks to encourage social and economic reforms in Latin America and eliminate the threat of a Communist takeover such as occurred in Cuba.

Arms control: For the first time, the United States has set up a new arms control and disarmament agency, whose task it will be to seek ways to curb the arms race. It will be a planning and research organization.

Food for peace: Expansion of this program was urged by President Kennedy and approved by Congress. It provides for the sale of our surplus agricultural products at reduced prices to friendly nations, and also to use some of these commodities to help feed needy people in underdeveloped countries.

This is not the complete record of achievements. There are others too numerous to mention here; but it is a record of which the entire Nation should be proud.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

I do not want to appear partisan in stressing only the achievements. There have been some failures and shortcomings, too, which I trust the 2d session of the 87th Congress will correct in 1962. I prefer to call them unfinished business, and among the measures on our list of unfinished business which are of paramount importance are these:

Medical care for the aged: We must provide adequate medical care for the 17 million elderly and retired Americans, and this care should be set up under the social security system. President Kennedy has termed this legislation of "highest priority" and I look to its enactment in 1962.

Aid to education: Aid to our schools remains a major domestic problem, which also affects the welfare and security of the Nation. We need adequate schools, more classrooms, and better paid teachers, and such programs should include aid to public and nonpublic schools without discrimination. This is purely an educational matter and religious isues should not be brought into it.

Civil rights: The only civil rights action taken by Congress in 1961 was to extend the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years, but this is not sufficient. We need effective legislation to eliminate every vestige of discrimination, whether in education, in employment, in voting, in housing, or in other fields. We must assure all our citizens true equality and opportunity as guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Tax reform: A general tax revision is needed to close loopholes benefiting the rich, create new incentives for business, and lighten the tax burden for the poor.

Manpower retraining: This is a program for training or retraining jobless workers displaced by automation, so that they can obtain employment in other industries. This should be of great help in reducing unemployment.

There are a number of others, which I shall list briefly: public works projects in areas where unemployment remains

high; increasing medical school facilities and providing scholarships for medical students; changes urged by unions to liberalize labor laws; improvement of foreign trade policies; maximum development of our natural resources; protection for consumers against high prices in drugs, high interest on loans, and consumer products.

LEGISLATION WHICH I INTRODUCED OR COSPONSORED

The following are some of the more important bills which I introduced or cosponsored during the 1961 session:

Amend the immigration laws so as to base quotas on the 1950 census, make available unused quotas to countries whose quotas are oversubscribed, reunite families, and other reforms. An immigration law was enacted which permitted the approved second and third preference cases to be considered nonquota. Thus, families in these categories will be reunited.

Alleviate unemployment conditions in economically depressed areas. I was a cosponsor of this bill which was enacted and steps are now in process to help such areas.

Allow taxpayers a deduction up to $1,000 from gross income for educational expenses for themselves or dependents.

Designate March 9 of each year as "Amerigo Vespucci Day," in honor of the Italian explorer after whom "America" was named.

Establish a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to encourage tourism to the United States and foreign trade. I was a cosponsor of this bill, which was enacted and a bureau has been set up.

Make Federal grants to the States in order to provide facilities and services for the day care of children outside of their homes.

Provide assistance for projects to develop techniques for the control of juvenile delinquency. This bill, of which I was a cosponsor, was also enacted.

A resolution that the United States oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

Authorize the construction of more low-rent public housing units. By reason of the fact that New York City has availed itself of the provisions of the public housing program, the allowable units were completely used up. My proposal, which was adopted, will enable the city of New York to continue to build additional new low-rent public housing projects.

Provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or retirement benefits.

Provide hospitalization, nursing home and other health services to the aged under the Social Security System.

Establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. This bill, which I cosponsored, was adopted and such an agency is now being set up.

Require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit. This is known as "truth in lending" bill, and is aimed to protect consumers against high interest rates.

Establish hospital facilities and post-hospital care for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children.

CONCLUSION

Due to space limitations, it is impossible for me to discuss other legislation and issues of interest to the people of my district. Whenever called upon, my staff and I have always been ready to help them with their personal problems. These services will be continued to my constituents in 1962. I am very grateful for the many letters of appreciation for my efforts and the assurances of continued support.

In addition to my office in Washington, I also maintain offices in the district which are located at 1484 First Avenue and 208 East 116th Street. Constituents are welcome to come to either office and to discuss their problems. We shall do all in our power to help them. If they cannot come, they may write to me at my office in Washington, 1507 New House Office Building. My very able and devoted staff in Washington and New York consists of the following: Melba J. Coutsonikas, Max Feigin, John F. Aiello, and Modesto Munoz.

St. Louis Blue Cross-Blue Shield Continues Coverage for Retirees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago—on May 15—I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks based on a letter I had received dealing with the question of hospitalization and surgical insurance for retirees and their families. The woman who wrote to me had protested that when her husband went on retirement at age 65, the health insurance coverage he had carried while working was canceled. When the couple applied to Blue Cross-Blue Shield for nongroup coverage, the husband was accepted but the wife was turned down because of a prior health condition.

I pointed out in my remarks that the St. Louis Blue Cross-Blue Shield program was one of the first in the Nation to extend coverage to people over 65. But I called attention to the particular kind of problem raised by the case I cited.

Mr. Speaker, I am now happy to report that after investigating the facts in the specific case which prompted my remarks of May 15, Mr. T. R. O'Brien, executive secretary of the Missouri State Medical Association, to whom I gave the name of the family involved, has advised me that the couple never had coverage under Blue Cross-Blue Shield, but was covered by a commercial carrier while the husband was employed.

Mr. O'Brien advised me that anyone who has Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage under the St. Louis plan as an employee can continue coverage after retirement on an individual basis, with such memberships "normally subject to cancellation only for nonpayment of dues."

The case I referred to in May reflects the hardships of many retired workers and their dependents when health insurance coverage ends with retirement. But I am glad to have the assurance that this does not apply to anyone who, while employed, is covered by the St. Louis Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan.

Goals of the New Frontier: Amendments to the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign last year and since taking office this year, the Democratic Party and President Kennedy have made it clear that one of the basic goals of the New Frontier is to broaden and extend the social security program—to make it more adequate to the problems and the needs of the sixties. In this first year of the Kennedy administration, we have made real progress toward that goal, particularly in the area of improving existing provisions of the law.

The need for these changes was summarized by the President in his message of February 2 when he noted that the average retired worker's benefit was only $74 a month, and that a majority of these people have no other significant income. As the President said:

> We must not permit the benefits of retired workers and their families to lag behind rises in living costs; we cannot decently exclude our older population from the general advances in standards of living enjoyed by employed workers.

To meet these needs, the Kennedy administration recommended five changes in the present program to increase the minimum benefit level, expand coverage under the act, permit optional retirement at age 62 by men as well as women, increase the size of widow's benefits, and broaden protection under the disability program added to the act in 1960. The amendments enacted by the Congress, while not meeting fully the President's recommendations, are substantially in accord with them and, as I have indicated, represent real progress toward the goal of updating this basic social insurance program to fit changed and changing conditions. Let me review briefly the changes which we have made.

First, the minimum monthly benefit has been increased from $33 to $40. It is estimated that more than 2 million

people will benefit from this change during its first year of operation, and it should be emphasized that these are the people who most need help—the people who, in too many instances, have been subsisting below the minimum standards of health and comfort.

Second, we extended coverage of the social security program by liberalizing the requirements for achieving insured status. This change brings under the act an estimated 170,000 new workers in the first year and is of particular importance to those whose most productive periods were in occupations not covered by the program in its earlier years.

Third, we provided a 10-percent increase in the level of benefits going to widows. Again, this is a change which works to help those who have been most disadvantaged. A recent survey of the economic situation of our older citizens showed that widows have less retirement income than either single persons or retired couples. An estimated 1½ million women will benefit from this long overdue change in its initial 12 months of operation.

Fourth, increased flexibility has been added to the social security retirement program by the change we enacted giving men workers the option of retiring with somewhat reduced benefits at age 62. This change was in line with one provided earlier for women workers.

Fifth, the Congress this year modified the ceiling on outside earnings of retired persons. While recognizing that there is substantial sentiment in favor of greatly increasing the outside earnings allowance which the act utilizes as a test of retirement, it must be remembered that this type of change can be a costly one, which would require a further substantial increase in contributions to the trust fund. The modification worked out by the Congress raises from $1,500 to $1,700 the level of outside earnings which a retiree can have with only $1 of benefits deducted for each $2 earned beyond the basic $1,200 annual earnings limitation.

While the Congress did not act on President Kennedy's recommendation for a broadening of the disability program's coverage, we did extend until June 30, 1962, the deadline for establishing eligibility under this program. This assures more adequate time for workers disabled for many years to learn of the provisions of this relatively new program and to seek benefits under it.

Finally, it should be noted that continued actuarial soundness is assured for the trust fund by a raise in the payroll tax rates to cover the costs of these improvements. The cost is a modest one, amounting to only one-fourth of 1 percent of annual wages up to $4,800, evenly divided between employers and employees. The benefits provided are great and become even more meaningful when we think of them, not just in terms of dollars and cents, but in terms of people trying to live out their years of retirement in dignity and some measure of comfort.

Mr. Speaker, many of us would like to have seen the Congress enact amendments to the Social Security Act which would go even further toward our goal of meeting the increased needs of our retired persons. We have before us as unfinished business the President's separate recommendation for a program to help social security retirees meet the costs of hospital and nursing home care. As noted before, further improvements in the disability benefit program are also warranted. At the same time, the improvements which I have reviewed bring us measurably closer to a social security program which fully meets the challenge of the sixties. They are part of a record of achievement as well as reminders of still-unfinished business.

Highlights of Legislative Accomplishments During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I am proud of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. That an outstanding and enviable record was achieved is indisputable, if one is familiar with the real facts.

This Congress has gone a long way, in a few short months, in enacting beneficial legislation for all the people of our country. We have seen the tide of recession turned back with increased employment, and we have seen our gold reserves increase from a minus percentage to lofty heights in plus percentage.

I have embraced the responsibility and the privilege to work with our President on many of these programs—each designed to benefit our Nation. Understandably, my assignment has required long hours of hard work not only on problems of the national and international fronts, but also our own local topics, which also received the priority importance they all demanded.

At this point, in keeping with my planned intentions, I wish to set forth some of the highlights of legislative accomplishments in this session, with my brief analysis of each one.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Labor Day, 1961, brought pay raises totaling an estimated $536 million to more than 27½ million employees. An additional 3,624,000 workers coming under the new law will receive a minimum hourly wage of $1 to be increased to $1.14 in 1964 and $1.25 a year later. Those already covered by Federal wage laws will be raised to $1.15 this year and to $1.25 in 1963.

While the new law may not be all that some of us desired, it represents a compromise which was the best we could get and a real victory over those who fought to maintain the status quo. The new law does provide at least some assistance to our underpaid workers, which they desperately needed in order to exist in view of present alltime high living costs.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

More than 3.7 million Americans are now receiving bigger social security checks under the new Social Security Act Amendments of 1961. One out of every four persons drawing social security received the automatic increase under the liberalized benefits enacted by this session of Congress. The new law also reduced the optional retirement age for men to 62—with reduced benefits—increased widows' benefits by 10 percent; raised the earnings ceiling for retired persons; increased the Federal share of State programs for the needy, aged, blind, and disabled; and liberalized the law in other respects.

Again, this law does not provide all the needed benefits a great many of us would like to see furnished. It does, however, represent a step forward—a step we know will provide the impetus to work toward the next. It was my hope that the Social Security Amendments of 1961 would include the provisions of my bill, H.R. 4807, which provides that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after the child attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college. This is an important and much-needed provision, and I shall continue to work for its enactment.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

This is the most comprehensive housing measure passed by Congress in 12 years. It provides assistance, through Federal loans and grants to cities, towns, and rural areas for urban renewal, elderly housing, farm housing, college housing, urban mass-transportation systems, home improvements, community facilities, to list some of the benefits.

ADDITIONAL MAJOR DOMESTIC LEGISLATION, DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY LEGISLATION

The Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act provided for repayable Federal grants to States to provide 13 weeks' additional unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers exhausting their benefits. This helped alleviate the severe hardships of unemployed workers and their families during the recession period.

The bill providing aid to dependent children of needy unemployed parents was of great help to the children of our Nation who were suffering untold hardships and deprivations. Another law also extends the special milk program for children.

The veteran's home loan program was extended; other laws beneficial to our veterans were passed.

I also voted for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission; the bill providing for the Peace Corps; the bill to assist our youth and help control juvenile delinquency. I was happy to vote out of my committee and vote on the floor of the House for the longevity pay raise bill to assist our postal workers.

We also passed the National Aeronautics and Space Act amendments; a bill providing increased authorization for the food for peace program; funds for inter-

American social and economic cooperation program were provided. Numerous defense authorizations and appropriations measures, as recommended by President Kennedy, have also been enacted by the Congress.

While not of great interest nationally, possibly, but of primary interest to a great majority of my constitutents, we have taken a long step forward in our search for a solution to the noise problem of low-flying aircraft over residental areas. The passage of legislation, with which I associated myself as a co-author and strong advocate, authorized and directed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the problems involved in, and measures to minimize or eliminate, aircraft noise nuisances and hazards to persons and property on the ground. However small the progress may seem, it it a forward step and it has given those living in the vicinity of large airports reason to hope for a better tomorrow. American technology can conquer and solve any problem. In my opinion, this investigation will reveal that it is possible to minimize aircraft noise and we shall be able to set criteria. Once the criteria is set, industry will find the way to meet the criteria. It is difficult to reach a goal when the goal hasn't been specified. This investigation and study, I am confident, will succeed in setting forth the goal and engineering technology will do the rest. However, we must be ever alert to insure that appropriate steps are taken to protect the people should industry fail to do what is necessary on its own.

Each Congressman has his own projects which may not be far-reaching but are nevertheless important. It has been my pleasure in recent days to arrange for the famed Fanfaren Korps from Düsseldorf, Federal Republic of Germany, to perform on the steps of the Capitol at noon on Friday, September 29, 1961. I invite my colleagues to be present and welcome this group to our country. The Honorable Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency, will welcome them on behalf of President Kennedy. The impression this fine group of young people take back with them to their native land can be of great benefit in our relations with Germany. Quite often this type of thing gets to the individual citizen the impressions we desire when high-level diplomacy cannot.

DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

It is not possible here to discuss all the legislation and questions of importance to my constituents. I have represented them to the best of my ability in Congress; I have been anxious to help them whenever called upon, concerning their personal problems. It has been gratifying to receive letters expressing their confidence in me and assuring me of their continuing support. I shall continue my best efforts in their behalf.

I maintain a Queens congressional office at 93–11 101st Avenue, Ozone Park, telephone Virginia 9–6625, which is open daily. I invite my constituents to call there and discuss any problems or requests they may have. I am pleased to have them write to me at my Washington office, 1720 New House Office Building, and urge them to visit my office when they are in the Nation's Capital.

Goals of the New Frontier: Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress on education, President Kennedy stated that our goals in this area must be "a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it." More specifically he pointed out that "we must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms, both college academic facilities and dormitories, both scholarships and loans, both vocational and general education."

Had Congress accepted the legislative proposals made by the President, or, indeed, had it accepted any of the other more modest proposals that followed during the course of this session, great strides could have been made toward the realization of the goals stated by the President—goals which themselves could not conceivably be the subject of partisan or political dispute. But in a blazing display of political factionalism the House of Representatives not only rejected these proposals, it refused even to discuss the subject.

A number of Members who voted against debating the bill that was brought to the floor attempted to avoid their share of the responsibility for blocking Federal assistance to education by complaining of the procedure that was employed. The procedure, known as Calendar Wednesday, has existed in the rules of the House for over 50 years, and it was chosen, of course, because it was the only feasible means of allowing the entire membership to express their position on Federal school aid. It is significant to note that those who complained of the procedure were not so vocal when a bare majority of the Rules Committee precluded the use of more familiar procedures. Furthermore, had the House voted to consider the bill that was called up on Calendar Wednesday, there would have been ample time for discussion of the administration's proposal and opportunity for the introduction of amendments or substitutes. The only fair conclusion that can be drawn is that those who voted against debating the school bill are opposed to Federal aid to education.

This conclusion would seem absolutely fair but for one thing: only shortly after the House blocked consideration of the school bill it voted overwhelmingly to extend for 2 years the so-called impacted areas law and the National Defense Education Act—both of which are undeniably Federal aid to education. Federal aid to school districts that are "impacted—that is, overcrowded because of Federal activity in the locality—is really only a little less Federal aid than the administration proposed.

Only a relatively few of the Nation's school districts receive impacted area aid, and the needs of those districts that do not receive this aid are equally critical and immediate. More than 2 million children attend school in unsatisfactory facilities, and in the next 10 years some 600,000 new classrooms will be required, at an average cost of $40,000 each. The average salary of American teachers is about $4,800 annually, and we now have a shortage 250,000 public-school teachers. If the impacted areas program is to be continued, therefore, it should be continued as part of a comprehensive, nondiscriminatory Federal effort. As President Kennedy said in his education message, "one-sided aid is not enough."

The stated goals of the New Frontier in the field of education—attaining new standards of excellence and making this excellence available to those who are willing and able to pursue it—are not really the goals of a political party. They are the goals of an enlightened society that understands where the real sources of progress and strength lay. Reasonable men may differ over the means to attain these goals, but the time has arrived when these differences must be honestly debated and put to the test of public opinion. The goals involved are too important for anything less.

Address of the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at the Annual Meeting of the World Bank at Vienna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 22, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following address was given by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, before the annual meeting of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in Vienna, on September 19, 1961.

Mr. Ball is one of the most astute members of the new administration and his remarks are worthy of the attention of our colleagues.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BALL, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WORLD BANK AT VIENNA

No one can study the annual report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development nor observe its operations throughout the past few years without the conviction that it has outgrown its name. The International Bank today is no longer merely a remarkable financial institution but a major instrument of human advancement. Under the perceptive and imaginative leadership of its President and other officers, its Executive Directors and its staff, it has

provided not only material help but wise counsel to nations both new and old, that are caught up in the great ferment that is sweeping the world.

The nature of this ferment is still difficult to comprehend. Its elements are political, economic, social, cultural, and scientific. It affects more than half of the world's peoples. It involves the release of massive forces through a kind of seismic social convulsion—the crumbling of old systems and the creation, often in violence and blood, of new nations and institutions.

What we are experiencing today is distinct from the waves of political revolution we have known at earlier times. That half of the world's population embroiled in this ferment is asking for more than national independence. Most of the peoples involved in this surging movement have already secured the juridical right to rule themselves. But all too often this is only the beginning of the task of building the essential institutions of statehood.

The people in what we have come to call the less developed areas of the world are giving insistent voice to many and varied demands—demands which we should not, indeed which we cannot, ignore.

They are demanding access to the basic material requirements of life—food, clothing, and shelter—which previous generations have known so meagerly. They are demanding other material comforts and conveniences that are available to the peoples of the more developed societies. They are demanding personal freedom and dignity, better education for themselves and their children, and the opportunity for cultural and spiritual growth. Finally, they are demanding the right to live out their lives in peace and security.

Quite obviously, all these demands cannot be satisfied quickly even by the most far-reaching and successful programs of economic development. Yet economic development remains an indispensable element in their fulfillment. If the revolution which we are witnessing today is to succeed—and its frustration could mean only catastrophe—then the more developed nations must provide, through public assistance and private investment (and I do not underestimate the importance of private investment), that measure of resources needed to transform and modernize at least half the globe.

All of this has been said before and much better. But today I want to emphasize two considerations that are not always adequately stressed.

First is the element of time and urgency. Most of the older industrial societies achieved their present levels of economic and technical development over a period of centuries, but the less developed nations of today will not wait. Two billion people are no longer prepared to accept the miserable conditions of life which their ancestors patiently endured. They are persuaded that the vaulting technology of the modern world offers the physical means by which centuries of stagnation can be overcome.

The second element that complicates our task is our lack of reliable insight into what we are doing and where we are going. We know very little about the anatomy of economic and social growth. An abundance of preconception masquerades as principle; an abundance of theory substitutes for experience. Yet the lessons implicit in the history of industrialized societies are largely irrelevant. For we are dealing with disparate cultures, with violent emotional impulses, and with explosive political pressures. We find ourselves constantly moving into new terrain; we must experiment, appraise, and try to learn by doing, without losing our forward momentum.

It is here that the IBRD and its affiliated institutions are making a special contribution—the contribution of experience patiently acquired, thoughtfully appraised and incisively applied. In a real sense the Bank has been a pioneer, moving with firm purpose through the tangled forest of economic development.

It is because of its willingness to depart from precedent that the Bank has evolved from being merely a lender of money to an institution that is playing a part in shaping the world revolution of development. In this process the Bank, through its varied initiatives, has contributed to our understanding of the process of development, and the means of encouraging development, far more than most of us realize.

The Bank, for example, has not been bound by any doctinaire commitment to the principle that the marketplace must be the sole arbiter of investment. Many less developed countries possess neither the institutional structure nor a sufficient entrepreneurial tradition to make this possible. If resources are to be injected into the investment stream in such a manner as to contribute most efficiently to economic growth then they must be employed systematically to build those basic elements of production—transportation, roads, powerplants, and factories—that are indispensable to the growth process. And this obviously implies a considerable measure of planning at the national level in which the state must necessarily take the lead.

The recognition of this paradox—that intelligent planning for a less developed economy may be essential to the progressive achievement of economic freedom as the society moves toward a higher level—has been implicit in much that the Bank has done.

At the same time, the Bank has come to understand that national planning is itself an esoteric art which most less developed societies cannot practice effectively without help and guidance. As an international organization bringing together the skills of many nations, the Bank has equipped itself to provide that guidance in ways that take into account the sensitivities of the developing countries.

Perhaps the most refined form of the Bank's activities in this connection has been the organization of consortia. In providing the leadership for consortia, the Bank has had an extraordinary opportunity to encourage, review, and criticize national economic plans. I am sure that few of us are fully aware of the amount of painstaking effort that has been expended in the leadership of consortia or of the quantity or quality of useful advice which the Bank's technicians have provided to the developing countries.

But the perfection of the consortium is not the only contribution which the Bank has made to the art and practice of national planning. It has created an Economic Development Institute to train senior government officials, and the management of the Bank has recently proposed a Development Advisory Service which the Executive Directors have approved. Through this Development Advisory Service the Bank may provide expert help in development planning on a continuous basis, through career-type personnel. It may establish resident missions, where requested, to assist in the preparation and execution of broad development programs. It may furnish technical advice and assistance in the actual administration of particular programs of lesser scope. This, it seems to me, is a useful extension of the Bank's activities and one which deserves our full support.

One reason why the Bank has succeeded in its diverse tasks is that it has perceived the need to adapt its tools to the requirements of the responsibilities it has undertaken.

The establishment of the International Development Association is, I think, a manifestation of this perception. The IDA is now an effective member of the community of international lending institutions. But, as we can see from its first annual report, the demands on the International Developmet Association are increasing. We may well need to face an enlargement of IDA funds in the near future.

With the facilities of IDA serving as a complement to its own, the IBRD should be able to increase its effectiveness. Yet action through international mechanisms such as the Bank and its affiliated institutions is, of course, only one phase of the massive effort that is needed to meet the demands confronting us.

The United States has long recognized that the economically advanced countries cannot fulfill their responsibility solely through their participation in the work of the Bank. During the last few months, my Government has been engaged in a major renovation and strengthening of its own arrangements for bilateral assistance. President Kennedy's new program, which the Congress has just approved, rests on two major premises.

The first is the same premise which has animated much of the work of the Bank—that sustained economic and social progress under conditions of freedom can be achieved only by regarding the development process from the point of view of the recipient nation as a whole. Development programs can best succeed where there is a determination on the part of the peoples to mobilize their own resources for the purposes of working out overall country programs in which each project is related to all other projects. Human needs are too acute and capital resources too limited for money to be devoted to isolated projects which contribute little to the total national economy of an underdeveloped country.

The other major premise which played a part in the development of President Kennedy's new program has been the conviction that the task of raising the level of life in the less developed countries is one which the economically advanced nations must share. It is an undertaking far beyond the resources of any one nation.

It was with this in mind that my Government has welcomed the initiative taken by the IBRD in the sponsorship of consortia. It is with this in mind also that we have become an active participant in the Development Assistance Group, soon to become the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. This group will provide a means for systematic consultation to increase the total volume of resources for development and to improve their utilization.

We have great hopes for the new Development Assistance Committee. We are convinced that, as it gains experience, it can play an even more useful role. Yet, here also, we are moving in an area of empiricism and only time and experience will show exactly how the work of the committee will develop.

But I do want to make one point quite clear. The Development Assistance Committee is merely another tool for all of us to use in responding to the formidable demands imposed by the revolution of development. In helping to mobilize the resources of the industrialized countries through all appropriate mechanisms—including consortia under certain circumstances—it will be in no sense a competitor of the Bank. Its activities will be harmonized so as to supplement and complement the Bank's own most useful efforts.

The efforts of which I have spoken so far—bilateral, international and national—offer hope and encouragement for the future. Primarily they are concerned, however, with only a single aspect of the development process, the provision of technical services and the investment of external capital resources to insure economic growth.

Yet we all know that economic development cannot be an end in itself. It is merely one means—albeit an indispensable one—of satisfying human aspirations. Economic development is aimed ultimately at the achievement of broad humanitarian goals. But if those goals are actually to be realized we must face up to the uncomfortable fact that economic development will have to be accompanied by other political, social, cultural and economic processes—and this presents a major problem.

Economic development cannot serve its real purpose if its benefits are enjoyed exclusively by a wealthy elite, while the great masses remain in poverty. Nor can there be any assurance of lasting benefits from economic development in any nation where the government is the master of society and not its servant.

It is with respect to this point, I think, that the debate among the more advanced countries as to the most desirable system of economic and social organization is most often misunderstood, particularly in the less-developed nations. All too frequently the controversy is regarded as merely a dispute concerning the merits of governmental intervention in the economic processes of society.

Nothing could be further from the truth; the argument is far more fundamental than that. Every modern society—however advanced or primitive—takes for granted a measure of governmental control over the economy. The critical issue of our times is not "government control" but uncontrolled government. Where the people of any nation lack the power to choose their rulers, can criticize them only at personal peril and have no effective means of influencing their behavior, these people can easily be reduced to slavery, and there is no guarantee than any degree of economic development will actually benefit anyone except the rulers themselves.

A second major problem which we face stems from the fact that the successful achievement of our humanitarian objectives depends to a considerable extent upon the ability of economic growth to keep pace with demographic developments.

The "population explosion" has become a familiar term in recent years. Even so, its true dimensions are difficult to grasp. Some time this year, the three-billionth human being will be born. On the basis of a statistical average, 200 births occur every minute. It is also a stark fact of demography that the major portion of these births is taking place in the less-developed regions of the world.

The prevailing rate of population growth affects not only the net rate of economic advancement, but also the volume of resources and the nature of the national programs required to achieve rapid development. Even under the best of circumstances, the less-developed nations will fight a losing battle unless they can obtain, and use with maximum efficiency, a huge volume of capital and technical skills. In this context, the population explosion, if continued, will place an ever-increasing burden on the more advanced countries and on international lending institutions. It will place a burden as well on the developing countries, to achieve greater effectiveness in mobilizing internal resources for development.

The population problem must, of course, be taken into account in drafting national development programs. Areas with plentiful manpower may find it uesful to stress development activities of a labor-intensive nature. Nations with small populations relative to resources may more appropriately consider laborsaving activities. And the rate of population growth will, of course, require close attention to the proper balance between increasing the production of basic foodstuffs and quickening the pace toward industrialization.

Rapid population growth, therefore, conditions the prospects for achieving the true objectives of economic development. It is a problem intimately bound up with the social and cultural traditions—and inhibitions—of each particular country. It is a problem which, in all its aspects, calls increasingly for the exercise of the most mature wisdom. But while we cannot solve this problem here today we can at least define our goal. We want a world in which every birth is accompanied by a birthright.

There is a third major problem which is all too often neglected. In our preoccupation with the process of development at the national level we have given all too little thought, I fear, to the total economic impact of the development revolution on the world as a whole.

We can hardly expect the less developed nations to attain a level of self-sustaining growth if they are unable to earn a growing volume of convertible foreign exchange in world markets. Any program for economic development may become an absurdity unless it realistically takes account of world trading patterns and prospects.

There are several facets to this complex problem. First, the less developed nations must be able to find reasonably stable markets for the raw materials they produce. The foreign aid provided under even the most ambitious assistance program for a developing nation can be totally negated if that nation suffers an abrupt cyclical decline in the world market price for a major raw material it exports. This is particularly true of those countries which are dependent upon one or two basic commodities for the bulk of their foreign exchange earnings.

Quite apart from these cyclical fluctuations, we know also that certain primary commodities show a continuous tendency toward increasing output. As a result, the aggregate supply of these products may come to exceed any conceivable future demand at reasonable prices. Obviously, any development program aimed at increasing a country's capacity for producing commodities in world surplus will be self-defeating. In persistent surplus situations we must face the hard necessity of devising mechanisms, within a worldwide framework, to stabilize prices and production.

This is a problem which is greatly preoccupying the U.S. Government today. We are giving a great deal of thought and effort to its solution. But I must emphasize that it cannot be solved by the creation of special preferential systems between groups of primary producing countries and one or more industrialized countries. Such discriminatory solutions, in the long run, will only delay and complicate the working out of these problems on a worldwide basis.

Another aspect of this question which enters into the total equation of development planning is the impact of worldwide industrialization on world markets. As the less-developed countries progress toward economic advancement they will begin to move progressively into the edges of industrialization. Initially they may concentrate on the production of articles needed to meet the expanding demands of their own peoples. But if they are ever to be capable of continuing the development process through their own efforts—if they are to reach the beckoning goal of self-sustaining growth—then they must be able to sell their production on the world markets.

It goes without saying that in many of the developing nations the most valuable productive resource is low-cost labor. With a large reservoir of unskilled labor and a shortage of capital, it is only natural that such countries should tend to concentrate their production in labor-intensive industries. In an ideal world one might expect the industrial nations to move consciously toward more sophisticated production, leaving to the developing nations an expanding field for simpler manufactures. But this is not an ideal world and we all know well enough that the structural adjustments which this implies—even though marginal so far as most economies are concerned—cannot be easily or quickly accomplished.

I would expect, therefore, that we are only at the beginning of a process in which the governments of the industrialized nations must take the lead in providing an orderly opportunity for the expansion of markets for the production of the underdeveloped nations. In the absence of a great deal of will and effort and consultation among nations there is grave danger that the normal and necessary changes in trading patterns will be artificially distorted by restrictive reflexes on the part of major consuming nations. In that event the hope for a prosperous world in which resources are most effectively used would be cruelly delayed or frustrated.

In my remarks this morning I have recited a litany of problems. Economic development itself, the improvement of political and social organization, the population explosion, and the relationship of economic development to the world trading system—all of these are complex and difficult. Formidable troubles for an already greatly troubled world.

I would not suggest that the IBRD—nor any other national or international agency engaged in economic development—has the power to solve these problems. We cannot possibly assure a perfect adjustment between economic planning on the one hand and the relevant political, social, demographic, and commercial factors on the other. However, we must do our best to make certain that our plans and efforts in the field of economic development do not wholly ignore these vital problems—that we take account of them to the extent permitted by the dimensions of our knowledge and by the built-in limitations of the environment in which we work.

Development planning is complex, and those responsible for such planning may be forgiven a certain reluctance to accept the introduction of new complexities. But we shall do ourselves no service unless we make sure that those objectives are not frustrated by our indifference to forces and elements that are not included in the narrow definition of development planning. A great American philosopher once defined a fanatic as "A man who redoubles his efforts when he has forgotten his aim." The field of economic development demands men of talent and dedication but men for whom the overall humanitarian aim is always clearly visible.

It is with confidence this morning that we can commend the work of the Bank and its related institutions. Its past achievements are solid and enduring. Its future prospects are encouraging indeed, and I want to welcome all new and prospective members of the Bank and IDA represented here today.

I think we can say without qualification whatever that the Bank has become a vital instrument for preserving a peaceful and orderly world and for promoting the advancement of mankind toward higher plateaus of material and spiritual well-being.

Goals of the New Frontier: Natural Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this 1st session of the 87th Congress has been one of solid accomplishment for conservation of our natural resources. Significant new laws have gone on the books and wise and timely investment has been made in new resource programs. As the result of hearings completed this session and other work accomplished in the committees, the stage is now set for further progress during the second session to begin next January.

This is a field of legislation which even more than most requires looking forward and moving forward. Idling in neutral gear loses ground. As President Kennedy said to the Congress last February 23 in his precedent-setting special message on natural resources:

Wise investment in a resources program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever.

And, he pointed out that—

Problems of immediacy always have the advantage of attracting notice—those that lie in the future fare poorly in the competition for attention and money.

Since last January the Kennedy administration and a Democratic-led Congress have taken natural-resources conservation and development machinery that was blithely idling in neutral and put it into forward-moving gears. Where the existing machinery was inadequate to the job to be done we have built new machinery. We will build more next session.

Let me review some of the conservation highlights of this session's record:

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE

Until this year, 14 years had passed and our population had increased by 37 million since the last major unit was added to our national park system in the continental United States. It had been 24 years and 52 million people since a portion of our rapidly vanishing ocean shorelines had been set aside for the recreational use of our people.

President Kennedy had been in office little more than a month when he expressed to the Congress his strong recommendation for establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore. One hundred and sixty-five days later the Congress directed that the magnificent beaches of Cape Cod were to be set aside, forever, for all the American people. Later this year we provided a supplemental appropriation of $2,250,000 to permit the National Park Service to begin land acquisition.

WETLANDS CONSERVATION

This same session of Congress, working together with the new administration, enacted a measure that probably ranks as one of the five most significant pieces of wildlife conservation legislation in our history. It provides the means whereby the Fish and Wildlife Service can protect the vital "wetlands" required for conservation of ducks and geese before these opportunities are lost.

Public Law 87-383 (H.R. 7391)—known as the Dingell bill for its author, the gentleman from Michigan—authorizes appropriation of $105 million for acquisition of wetlands for waterfowl refuges over the next 7 years. These appropriations are to be repaid to the Treasury through the sale of duck stamps. In view of the increasing competition for land use and rising land prices, this "crash" program is our only reasonable chance of saving our great continental flights of migratory waterfowl. At the same time it will not be at the expense of the general taxpayer since the expenditures will be repaid by the hunters who buy duck stamps.

I believe this bill ranks with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929, the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934, and the amended Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 as one of the most significant authorities yet enacted for conservation of wildlife resources.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

This same session we enacted significant amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. These provide effective new tools for conservation of fish and wildlife resources, which depend upon clean water, as well as for public health. The 1961 amendments are described in detail elsewhere in this series of remarks by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], author of the bill—H.R. 6441, Public Law 87-88. In summary, the new amendments authorize additional water storage in Federal reservoirs for release during periods of low streamflow, extend Federal enforcement authority against polluters to all navigable waters, authorize regional laboratories for both enforcement and basic research, and increase the authorization for matching incentive grants to local governments for construction of State-approved treatment plants.

It is also significant that later in the session this major new conservation authorization was implemented by appropriation of $80 million—the new fiscal 1962 ceiling which it authorized—for the construction grant program.

OPEN-SPACE CONSERVATION

The Housing Act of 1961—Public Law 87-112; H.R. 7444—also broke new ground in the conservation field. It authorizes for the first time a program of Federal grants to assist local governments and States conserve permanent open-space land near urban areas for park, recreation, scenic, watershed, and other natural resource conservation uses while the open space is still available.

OTHER LEGISLATION ENACTED

Water pollution control in offshore waters was advanced when the Senate approved U.S. participation in the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil. This treaty sets penalties for discharge of waste oil at sea within 50 miles of shore, thereby helping to prevent damage to fish and sea and shore birds and fouling of beaches and harbors. Subsequently, legislation to implement the treaty was enacted as Public Law 87-167—H.R. 1290.

Public Law 87-112—H.R. 7444—the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill—for the first time makes wildlife conservation practices eligible for agricultural conservation program (ACP) Federal cost sharing.

Public Law 87-61—H.R. 6713—the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961—extends for 2 years the national program of billboard advertising control.

Public Law 87-27—S. 1—the Area Redevelopment Act—authorizes Federal assistance to help local governments build new public facilities, specifically including facilities with resource conservation values.

Public Law 87-152—S. 614—authorizes use of surplus grain for feeding of wildlife to tide them over in emergencies such as those caused by unusually severe weather.

Public Law 87-119—H.R. 1182—establishes the Wyandotte National Wildlife Refuge on two islands in the Detroit River, Mich., an important stopping and wintering area for waterfowl 10 miles south of Detroit.

Public Law 87-295—H.R. 7916—authorizes $75 million for accelerated research into problems of converting sea and chemically polluted waters for consumptive uses.

Public Law 87-328—House Joint Resolution 225—provides the consent of Congress to an interstate-Federal commission which will plan and operate comprehensive development of water resources of the Delaware River Basin.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Legislation to establish other national seashores progressed in both bodies. The Senate passed S. 476 and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs completed hearings on H.R. 2775, companion bills to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore, 30 miles north of San Francisco, Calif. S. 4, H.R. 5013, and H.R. 5049, to establish Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, have been the subjects of hearings. Action is pending on S. 1797 and similar bills to preserve the Indiana Dunes; and on S. 992 and the differing H.R. 6258, to preserve portions of the Oregon Dunes.

S. 543, to authorize coastal and inland shoreline area studies and grants to the States for acquisition of shoreline areas, has been passed by the Senate.

The Senate passed S. 77, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland. Action is pending in both bodies on S. 1760, to establish a Great Basin National Park in Nevada. Hearings have been conducted on H.R. 5712 and S. 1381, to establish the Ozark Rivers National Monument, and on H.R. 6289, to establish the Ozark Scenic Riverway.

The Senate-passed wilderness bill, S. 174, is pending in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Public Lands is holding field hearings this fall.

H.R. 8520, which would help control Federal financial and technical participation in drainage of natural wet lands in waterfowl-nesting areas in Minnesota and the Dakotas, was passed by the House. Enactment would help eliminate the contradiction of the Department of Agriculture helping to subsidize drainage of such lands while the Department of the Interior is attempting to preserve them to conserve waterfowl.

H.R. 8181, to establish a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, was passed by the House.

H.R. 7490, protecting sea otter, walrus, and polar bear on the high seas, was passed by the House.

Hearings were held on the Water Resources Planning Act, S. 2246, H.R. 8155 and others. The President's proposal would establish a framework for comprehensive river-basin planning.

H.R. 9084 and S. 2516, and others, introduced late in the session, would apply principles of multiple use to public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Also pending for consideration next year: H.R. 6793, to establish the King Range Conservation Area in California. The bill would provide additional authority to consolidate "checkerboarded" public lands and provide orderly procedures for reconciling conflicting uses.

S. 404 and H.R. 8354, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, were both reported favorably out of committee; floor action is pending.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved six cooperative Federal-State land and wildlife management areas in California which will result in improved habitat for fish and game of interest to sportsmen. The same committee established significant review procedures relating to withdrawal of public lands for military use.

The Congress this session granted the request of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission for an extension of time to submit its long-awaited report and recommendations to us next January—at the beginning of what promises to be another landmark session for conservation.

Broad National Support for Tax Rate Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated that tax legislation, based on the administration's 1961 proposals, "will be the first order of business in the next session of Congress." I concur in the view that we should proceed promptly in the direction of tax revision but the type of revision I urge is a thorough reform of the existing tax rate structure.

During the hearings conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means on the administration's proposals, Treasury Secretary Dillon speaking particularly of the proposed investment credit said that this new tax provision was needed "so that we can secure a higher rate of growth, create jobs and stabilize the dollar both at home and abroad. There is not a moment to lose."

Mr. Speaker, I agree that "there is not a moment to lose," but I cannot agree that the tax program advanced by Secretary Dillon is the solution to our basic tax problems. During the 86th Congress and again this year I have been the sponsor along with my distinguished committee colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], of legislation, H.R. 2031 and H.R. 2030, to reform Federal tax rates and methods. We also have been joined in sponsorship of this measure by other members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the House.

When this legislation was reintroduced in January of this year the gentleman from Florida and I told the membership of this House that "the slow and intermittent growth of recent years is proof that more Government programs and greater spending provides no offset for a capital-destroying tax structure." The Herlong-Baker legislation will remove the tax blocks to economic progress and mitigate some of the most destructive features of our tax laws.

Just a few weeks ago we emphasized that basic tax rate reform "would contribute to military preparedness. This is just as true in the present as in the past. A dynamic, growing economy provides the strongest base for our national security."

Mr. Speaker, during the committee hearings on the administration's proposals spokesmen for 35 organizations broadly representing all areas of the country and all walks of life were in agreement that there is an urgent need for basic reform of tax rates and methods. These 35 organizations, represented by 8 witnesses, urged immediate enactment of the Herlong-Baker legislation.

These witnesses testified in behalf of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce—which includes the commerce chambers of 28 States and localities—the National Small Business Men's Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers Association, Virginia Manufacturers Association, Manufacturers Association of Bridgeport, Conn., and the National Association of Manufacturers. A California college economist also endorsed the bills.

Excerpts from the testimony of these witnesses follow:

Morgan Doughton, president, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce:

Since 1959, this (House Ways and Means Committee has had before it the companion mills introduced by Representative HERLONG and Representative BAKER for comprehensive reform of tax rates and methods to enlarge incentives everywhere. The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce at its national convention in St. Louis in June 1960, concluded a careful study by passing a resolution which endorsed the principles of these bills as the proper solution to the Nation's tax and economic problems. In the intervening period, numerous Jaycee organizations throughout the country have inaugurated programs evidencing their continued support of these principles.

The action isn't unusual; the Junior Chamber of Commerce has consistently supported through its programs those fundamental objectives deemed basic to our survival and well-being. Through us, there are 200,000 young men in this country who are asking that they be given the opportunity to advance further the economic development of their country and themselves, through a more dynamic economy released to grow as a result of reformed tax rates and methods. It is our position that the Herlong-Baker legislation alone of all pending proposals cuts deeply enough into the problem to be legitimately called an answer.

Comprehensive tax rate reform is our best and only sure means of getting an increased rate of economic growth. As carefully calculated in the Herlong-Baker legislation, graduated rate reform over a span of years will have only a minor revenue effect: greater economic growth will produce a larger taxable base, sustaining Government revenues. If we are genuinely interested in securing greater economic growth, comprehensive tax rate reform is the means for achieving it.

The case for the proposals of Representatives HERLONG and BAKER is too strong to be denied * * * greater economic development is a challenge requiring the united efforts of 185 million people. The Herlong-Baker bills, leading to economic growth through the release of impediments to capital creation, would accomplish their objectives without disrupting the economic unity we so badly need * * * our belief in the Herlong-Baker approach is based on the recognition that it provides a start toward the realization of our ambitions in the strengthening of this Nation and in regard to our personal lives. * * * I would like to point out that the Herlong-Baker measure is a moderate program for reform of tax rates and methods.

The Herlong-Baker legislation would open up the maximum opportunity for these young men, some of whom may someday occupy the positions you gentlemen presently hold.

John L. Connolly on behalf of member State chambers of the council of State chambers of commerce including the State Chambers of Commerce of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin and the Empire State Chamber of Commerce—New York—Greater South Dakota Association, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, South Texas Chamber of Commerce, West Texas Chamber of Commerce, Lower Rio Grande Valley Chamber of Commerce—Texas—and the Salt Lake City, Utah, Chamber of Commerce:

I would not feel that I have done justice to the many State organizations which I represent before you if I left with you the impression that, in their view, depreciation reform alone will assure sound and sustained economic growth in this Nation. Much more must be done for adequate reform of our tax structure, and particularly with respect to the income tax rates.

By reform of the tax structure we do not mean a shifting of tax burdens from one group of taxpayers to another * * * we have in mind reform which would add to no one's tax burden and would benefit everyone.

We shall support all expenditures that are essential for defense but we think it is high time that some effective brake be applied to halt the rapid growth of nondefense spending * * * we recognize, of course, that your committee has relatively little control over the expenditure budget. But we believe it can gain a real measure of control through a major tax reform program. Such a program would involve far more temporary revenue loss than could be afforded in any one year, so it would have to be made effective gradually over a period of years. This forward scheduling of rate reductions is provided in the Herlong-Baker tax reform bills, the principles of which we strongly support.

By enact ent of this type of tax reform program, with rate reductions scheduled progressively over several years, a strong competitor would be set up against powerful spending interests. Then we might have a fair test of whether the Nation needs and wants more spending or less taxes.

Frank M. Cruger, president of National Small Business Men's Association:

All the small businessman wants—and this has application to all businesses regardless of size—is the same opportunity that was available to commercial enterprises before overburdening tax rates were imposed. Equally as evident is the proposition that the kind of tax action undertaken is as important as the need itself. This is no time for dubious innovations.

Moreover there is no real need for protracted study of the situation as the administration said it was undertaking because both the basic problem and the solution are strikingly plain even to the untrained economic eye. The problem is the tax rates, and the solution is reform of the rates.

The reform must be thoroughgoing. It must make a frontal assault on all the capital robbing elements of the present system of tax rates and methods. A legislative program that is truly remedial must offer a sound and realistic method for releasing the tax brakes on capital supply and economic progress, without curtailing national defense and other essential governmental expenditures or forcing deficit spending.

And, every American can take a great measure of reassurance from the fact that a program fully meeting these demanding requirements is in legislative form and is before this very committee for consideration.

I refer to the bipartisan companion bills sponsored by two members of this committee—Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., of Florida, and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee. This is a sound and well seasoned approach which will undoubtedly provide large amounts of fresh capital for businesses of all sizes—small, medium, and large—thus permitting widespread and fast moving expansion of businesses that would step up the rate of economic growth.

By the very nature of their small size, small business offers an untapped potential for economic progress; for getting the unemployed back to work, for providing the new jobs needed to accommodate the vast numbers of new entrants to the work force. After all, as the saying goes, small business has nowhere to go but up and it will, in a surprising degree, if given the economic elbow room that the Herlong-Baker bills would allow.

I would like to point out that our Government is utterly and completely dependent upon the business system of this country, and if that system is unable to prosper under its (tax) burdens, then the Government will be unable to prosper.

Leslie K. Pollard on behalf of Wisconsin Manufacturers Association:

Despite my criticisms of the (administration's) investment credit proposal, I hope it is clear that I am not opposed to tax changes as a means of helping us to attain greater economic growth. On the contrary, I would urge, just as strongly as the President, the need for action now. Such action should take the form of freeing income which would otherwise be absorbed by taxation for the manifold requirements of economic growth. Such income should be left free to find for itself the particular applications in which it can contribute to growth.

What we need is greater resources for venturesome investments in new companies, new products, and new processes, as well as in the modernization and expansion of the plant and equipment of existing firms. The aim should be not to stimulate or to guide the process of business expansion but to return to it more material to work with.

Another objective of tax legislation should be to mitigate the serious impairment of personal and business incentives resulting both from the level of income taxes and the steep progression of personal tax rates. The very rapid rise in personal rates over the middle brackets is a barrier to individual economic progress as well as to growth of the economy generally.

In my mind, the most practical and most effective way of attaining these objectives is through the legislation sponsored by Representatives HERLONG and BAKER now before your committee.

There is one provision of this legislation which has a special appeal to me and which, I believe, should be of great interest to small business, keeping in mind that some 85 percent of all business units are unincorporated. This is the linking of the top rate of individual tax, when the legislation has been finally effectuated, with the top rate of corporate tax. There certainly is no reason why an unincorporated business, or for that reason any other individual taxpayer, should be subjected to a higher tax rate than a corporation.

In supporting the Herlong-Baker legislation, the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association is not unaware that it presents what some believe is a hard choice for political leaders. In common with businessmen everywhere, we are often dismayed when we are confronted by statements of our Representatives and Senators to the effect that it is unrealistic to attempt to contest the ever-increasing spending trend. There is, I am afraid, a great deal of buckpassing in this area. The spending always seems to be the fault of some other political element, but when the votes are cast it seems that such spending elements have acquired a lot of support among those who profess to lament the trend. Neither political party has much to be proud of in regard to its record on spending. It is unfortunate that the top leadership of neither party has to date made the decision that it will stand for the paramount national interest in tax rate reform as against the accumulation of lesser interests for more spending.

Enactment of the Herlong-Baker legislation would free capital and incentives for economic expansion. It would lead to the creation of new enterprises, new processes, new products and services, and new jobs. There is a desperate need for legislation of this type.

Daniel C. Lewis, on behalf of Virginia Manufacturers Association:

The trend of increasing governmental expenditures will not be halted, or even slowed, unless a contest is set up for the use of growth revenue between spending and forward-scheduled, thorough-going reform of tax rates as suggested in bills sponsored by Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., and Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, which are before this committee.

The competition for the use of growth revenue gain is made possible in the Herlong-Baker proposal by a provision which allows postponement of scheduled reductions, in any of the 5 years needed for effectuation, when a budgetary imbalance appeared imminent * * * the Herlong-Baker bills will really enable the economy to achieve the greater, and sustained rate of growth that even the administration has conceded is essential to our well-being. * * * One of the strong features of the Herlong-Baker proposal is the provision for the use of revenue gain to offset the revenue effect of the legislation.

It is respectfully requested that this committee reject the administration's tax program * * * and instead, give urgent consideration to broad tax rate reform as set forth in the Herlong-Baker legislation.

Arthur Kemp, professor of economics, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.:

The ground for tax reform has been well cultivated by two distinguished members of your committee, Representatives HERLONG and BAKER, by their identical bills, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031. A consideration of this legislation, it seems to me, is an important first step in bold and imaginative political leadership.

It would be inappropriate, perhaps, for me to quote here the remarks which Mr. HERLONG made on the floor of the House on January 16, 1961, on behalf of Mr. BAKER and himself in connection with the reintroduction of their legislation. However, I do believe that these remarks should be incorporated in the record of these hearings.

The point which intrigues me * * * is the effect which the Herlong-Baker legislation would have in the rebuilding of what has become a most critical shortage in America—individual venture capital.

Too little attention has been paid to the decline in individual capital formation * * * the Herlong-Baker bills would accomplish much in that respect * * * promoting a substantial increase in individual capital formation.

I should like to conclude by complimenting this committee on the fact that there originated within its ranks a program so well fitted to the economic realities and needs of our times. You need little further advice from the administration, or from any other quarter on what to do. If you report out H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, you will find that there are more economists in America who will applaud your action than you might have supposed.

Charles R. Sligh, Jr., executive vice president, National Association of Manufacturers:

To release the potential for growth and good for people inherent in our free system, the purpose of tax action should be neither to stimulate nor to give, but to relieve. What this Nation needs is abandonment of the tax philosophy which places limits on growth, human well-being and national strength.

We cannot afford to whittle away tax reduction opportunities in actions which will create more problems than they cure.

The patient is ill today not because of the failure of the Government to engage in the process of transferring tax dollars from one pocket to another, but because the Government in the use of tax rates and methods has eroded his health and limited his capacity for vigorous activity. To apply a doubtful palliative at any other point would put in further jeopardy the health of the patient, and raise the question whether the cure which is already known will ever be applied in the critical decade of the 1960's.

In the second year of the 1960's, the Federal Government has not yet faced up to a problem which should have been resolved in

the mid-1950's. In the dynamics of progress, and in our position of relative strength and leadership in the world, we have slipped, seriously so. We are still way ahead of the rest of the world in accumulated strength, and in the average of citizen well-being. But it is dangerous to take comfort in what we have achieved, at the expense of facing the issue of what we must achieve from here on. Past records don't win future Olympics.

The administration's estimate that its combined (tax) program would mean an increase of 500,000 jobs must be rejected. As stated elsewhere, the likely result would be either no increase or perhaps reduction in the number of jobs which otherwise would be available.

However, if $1.7 billion in soundly conceived tax relief would result in the creation of 500,000 jobs—it becomes interesting to speculate on what thorough reform of tax rates and methods would mean for job creation.

Certainly, the result would be jobs in abundance; jobs for the unemployed, for workers who are released through modernization in particular industries, and jobs for young men and women who in rapidly increasing numbers are graduating from our high schools and colleges each year. The administration has acknowledged the role of capital formation in providing the growth and the jobs and the strength which this Nation must have. But its program as a whole does not provide one faltering step in the direction of accomplishing this objective.

No one should be allowed to get away with the thought that the issue of priority between spending and reform of tax rates and methods is simply a matter of timing. The issue is whether tax erosion of the Nation's economic strength shall be continued at full force, in order to pay further homage to social concepts of government responsibility which already has wrought too high a price in retarded progress.

The best time to act has already passed. The next best time is the present. Further delay will only make thorough reform of tax rates and methods more difficult to accomplish.

Businessmen have a self-interest in paying lower taxes but the businessman serves a larger interest when he urges moderate tax rates compatible with the character of a free economy.

More capital would mean the relatively greatest uplift to the weaker sectors of the economy—the people who need jobs, and then better jobs * * * the enterprises which don't get started and can't keep going or growing because of lack of adequate financing * * * the areas of the country in which incomes and living standards are on the lower side of the scale * * * the States which cannot hold their well-trained young men and women because of greater opportunity elsewhere.

There are five major tax blocks to progress and job creation:

Steeply graduate individual tax rates.

Excessive top rate of corporate tax.

Unrealistic length of lives and classification of depreciable property.

Taxing of gains on transfers from one investment to another.

Destructive rates of estate and gift taxes.

Reform of these rates and methods is the purpose of the legislation, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, sponsored by Representatives A. S. HERLONG, JR., and HOWARD H. BAKER, of this committee, and which has such widespread support throughout the Nation.

The world is capital minded as never before. Everywhere the demand is for more capital for faster economic progress and advance in living standards. Since World War II, American policy has been to recognize the need for more capital everywhere but at home.

H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031 would reinstate the United States as the most dynamic economy of the world, providing new opportunity to prove that capital in a free society is more productive of good for more people than under any other system.

In this dangerous age we cannot afford a lesser program.

We cannot afford further delay in enactment of this program.

Report by Congressman Laurence Curtis to the People of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, I think it is important to review the activities of the session.

THE COLD WAR

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs is the committee most closely concerned with the nonmilitary aspects of the cold war, the most dangerous issue now confronting the American people. I therefore report first on my work as a member of that Committee.

Although the Foreign Affairs Committee does not make or administer foreign policy—that being the constitutional function of the President and the State Department—it does authorize the spending of the funds to carry out foreign policy, and it proposes resolutions on vital foreign policy issues.

The Congress this year passed provisions against the admission of Red China to the United Nations, prohibiting assistance to the present government of Cuba, and prohibiting assistance to any other country if the President determines that it is dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

Berlin, Laos, and Cuba present critical problems. The Secretary of State and military leaders have kept the committee fully advised of the situations. Under the committee's procedure each member is given an opportunity to ask questions or to express his individual views. The communication is two sided and thorough. I have joined the Foreign Affairs Committee in giving the President's cold war policies strong bipartisan support. It urged firmness in the face of threats.

My votes have been cast in the realization that the present nonmilitary aggression against the United States is war; that we are in a period of great danger to our country; that Americans must have stout hearts and steady nerves and that it may be necessary to risk war in order to avoid certain war; that once a country gives in to threats, only eventual war, or surrender and enslavement, can follow.

A strong military posture is our first line of defense, and I have supported the President's policies, which have included added billions for defense, and more manpower for our military forces.

FOREIGN AID

This is the subject to which the Foreign Affairs Committee devotes its major attention.

There is growing opposition to these programs. Some of it is of the extremist variety. Much of it results from past mistakes and unsatisfactory performance of the program. But after the most detailed and lengthy hearings, a great majority of the committee, including myself, was convinced that the program must go on and past mistakes be avoided.

Foreign aid is one of America's most important tools in the cold war. The military aid now goes almost entirely to undergird the military potential of countries on the borders of Soviet bloc nations, such as Greece and Turkey. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other top military officials were unanimous in stating that money spent on this aid was just as important to the defense posture of the United States as money spent on our own Defense Establishment.

The most important function of economic aid is to show developing countries that they can raise their standards of living in freedom without having to choose the road to the Soviet type of tyranny. Developing peoples want freedom, but in many cases they want economic progress even more, and are prepared to turn to Communist methods, if necessary, not realizing that such a turn will lead to Communist slavery.

The Foreign Affairs Committee heard much evidence of the extent of similar programs being undertaken by Soviet bloc nations. This is persuasive evidence of the effectiveness of our own programs.

As a result of Cuba and the threatened increase of Soviet influence in South America, the need for development aid has become greater than ever.

The act governing foreign aid was redrawn this year. It sought to tighten up the administration of foreign-aid programs, emphasize economic development, and place reliance on countrywide programs of a long-term nature rather than on more piecemeal projects. The Agency handling economic foreign aid will now be called Agency for International Development.

After some controversy as to the financing of the program, the Congress made provision for long-range planning which was satisfactory to the President. Future commitments were authorized, backed up by annual appropriations. The House refused to sanction Treasury borrowing as a method of financing development loans. I urged and supported such refusal. Treasury borrowing is also referred to as back-door financing or financing from the public debt. There is mounting feeling in the House that it is an undesirable financial practice.

The Congress reduced the funds requested by the President for foreign aid. But this was in line with past practice, and if the cuts turn out to be too hampering, further amounts can be provided for by supplementary appropriations, which can be taken up next January. Aside from the Treasury borrowing issue discussed above, I supported the President's requests.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The new foreign aid legislation reiterated support of policies which have particular application to Arab-Israel nations: Freedom of navigation in international waterways, increased economic cooperation and trade between countries, disapproval of discrimination against American citizens based on race or religion. It directed that these principles be supported in the administration of foreign aid.

The statements of these principles have this year been somewhat watered down from the stronger form in which they appeared in last year's legislation. The House retained them in their stronger form. This was done through amendments made in the Foreign Affairs Committee, one of which I offered. The Senate, at the request of the administration, weakened them, and the House had to agree to a compromise. I serve on the Subcommittee for the Middle East and have visited that area and Israel on three occasions.

PEACE CORPS

A new approach to foreign aid was inaugurated this year through the Peace Corps. The bill establishing this program was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, which conducted hearings and reported it favorably.

The idea of using trained young Amercan men and women to work on cultural and development projects in many parts of the world had been discussed and studied. I took part in a study mission of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee which visited foreign projects in developing countries. It found that some of the programs looking to capital improvements had not been satisfactory.

The study mission was favorably impressed by development projects where young American college graduates were performing the type of work planned for the Peace Corps volunteers. In one project recent graduates of American agricultural colleges were working shoulder to shoulder with their Vietnamese counterparts on an experimental agricultural station, testing the adaptability to that area of produce and fibers not previously grown there. The study mission recommended projects of that type which would reach the grassroots.

I supported the Peace Corps, both as a result of this experience, and because I believe that we need more trained people working abroad to match the growing numbers of Russian and Chinese agents and "technicians." The House supported the Peace Corps by a vote of 287 in favor to 97 against. Its success will depend largely on careful selection of personnel, thorough training and wise management. The plans for its administration, training and operation appeared to be well conceived.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Foreign Affairs Committee also had jurisdiction over the legislation setting up the new Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It is an expansion of the work of an existing agency within the State Department. Its primary function is to prepare for disarmament negotiations. This involves technical studies covering wide fields. It is important to the national security that this work be done with great thoroughness and competence to avoid the risk of getting trapped into unwise negotiations.

The bill established a strong independent Agency, although it is under the supervision of the Secretary of State. The Agency will point the way to areas where negotiation will be possible and where agreements will be verifiable, but the bill does not move in the direction of appeasement. It is not antimilitary, and had the support of our top military people. The House passed the bill, 290 in favor to 54 against. I voted with the majority.

The disagreement in Congress as to the name of the Agency points up the divergent views held about the Agency. At one stage it was called Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. At another, Arms Control Agency. The final name, a compromise, was Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

As a delegate from the House, I attended the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris last November. It is a meeting of delegates from the legislative bodies of the NATO countries. The United States sent nine delegates from the Senate, and nine from the House. There were committees on military, economic, and political questions.

Discussions before the Economic Committee, of which I was a member, made it clear that the Communist bloc nations use trade not for peaceful commercial intercourse, but as a means of political and economic aggression. A dictatorship can move fast and wield unified economic power. By focusing that power on a given product or a given market the Communist bloc nations can cause total disruption. There was discussion of means by which the free world can protect itself from this type of aggression.

This Conference was a valuable experience.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

In my report of last year I said:

I have cast my votes in the direction which I believe would promote a free economy, sound money, and wise governmental economy * * * avoiding the extremes on either side.

The danger of overcentralization of governmental powers in Washington needs continual watching. Government should be kept close to the people, and local control of local matters is a cornerstone of American democracy. The fight for home rule and against unwarranted Federal interference must be a continuous one. Federal power has a tendency to feed on itself.

I still believe strongly in these principles. Many bills before the House this year aimed at desirable objectives, but went too far both as to spending and as to centralization of power in Washington. I found it necessary to vote for amendments reducing the excesses. My voting record, which will be found below, gives examples of this. In many cases a majority of the House shared that view, and amended or rejected the bills, or held them over for action next year.

As Congress completed this fall only the 1st session of the 87th Congress which lasts 2 years, legislative matters not disposed of remain active and can be taken up at the 2d session starting next January.

SPENDING

This has been a spending Congress. The world situation required increased military spending, but domestic spending was also increased, and would have been greater if the more moderate views by a majority of the House had not brought about some reductions.

The budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, had been submitted by the previous administration as a balanced budget. Due largely to increased expenditures since January, it ended up with a deficit of $3.9 billions.

A balanced budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, had been promised by the new administration, but increased expenditures have admittedly now thrown it out of balance, and a deficit of $6 or $7 billion is estimated.

The civil employment rolls have grown with a net increase of 100,000 persons since last January.

The American public must heed the warnings voiced by two great Americans, both Democrats. Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, and by no means regarded as an extreme conservative, warned the House on August 16, 1961. Referring to the current spending, he said:

Now, of course, we are not taking in money enough to pay this. * * * Ever since this session began we have been spending in the red at the rate of $1 million every hour, day and night. * * * I do not have to tell you what this is leading to. If we continue to spend at this rate, especially with these backdoor provisions, spending will accelerate at an even greater rate.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, told the Congress on September 13, 1961:

The big increases in Federal spending in the recent past, the present, and the future, have been and (short of war) will be in domestic-civilian programs; not defense or foreign aid. These programs are financed through both the regular budget and trust funds. * * * Indefinite deficit financing of vast increases in both nondefense and defense expenditures at the same time will create uncontrollable inflation and reopen the run on our gold. These are elements of weakness.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

That part of the President's program dealing with familiar issues previously before the Congress was the most successful. Much of it was enacted, although often in modified form: foreign aid, stepped-up defense, housing, minimum wage, pollution control, depressed areas, judgeships. New programs established the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Other parts of the President's program were less successful. The education bills were lost in a morass of cross currents, including religious and racial questions. Tax proposals went by the board, including increased postal rates to reduce the postal deficit. The farm program was refused in part, while part of it went through in modified form. The powerful

Ways and Means Committee decided to postpone consideration of medical care for the aged under social security.

The following issues deserve special comment. Other issues are discussed in connection with my voting record, reported on below.

MINIMUM WAGE

A partisan note was injected into the discussion of minimum wage legislation. It was pointed out that the President as a Senator had a year ago refused an increase to $1.15 an hour, while insisting on $1.25. But this year his bill provided for an immediate increase only to $1.15 and a postponed increase to $1.25 in 1963, and was passed in that form. It was argued that but for the President's insistence a year ago on an immediate increase to $1.25, the increase to $1.15 could have been had a year sooner.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The administration was criticized for lack of legislation on civil rights, despite platform and campaign promises. It decided to seek progress through executive action rather than through legislation. It seemed clear that the President did not desire the divisive effect on Democrats in the Congress at the start of his administration which would have followed a drive for civil rights legislation.

The executive action brought the Federal power to bear in the enforcement of existing laws protecting minority rights in voting, school segregation, interstate transportation, and jobs with the Government and its contractors.

The Congress extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. The Commission has recommended legislation to prevent the unfair use of educational requirements to block the registration of voters; to extend the rights of the Attorney General to intervene in cases involving deprivations of constitutional rights beyond the present law which limits such intervention to cases involving voting rights; to require every segregated school district in the South to produce within 6 months a plan of desegregation. Further legislation is needed and must be taken up next year. It will have my wholehearted support.

IMMIGRATION

An immigration bill was passed this year which will be helpful in many respects, but does not face up to the issue of discrimination resulting from the quota system. The new law makes permanent the provisions regarding the admission of orphans and adopted children, provides an appeal in deportation cases, and speeds the admission of certain applicants entitled to a preference. Bills seeking more extensive revision of the law have been filed and must be taken up next year. They will have my support.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security benefits were again increased, mostly for those in the lower ranges. Men as well as women were made eligible to retire at age 62 on benefits somewhat reduced from what they would receive if they retired at age 65. Payroll deduction and employers' contributions—both really taxes—were slightly increased to cover the cost of the above changes. These increases are in line with developments over many years of gradually increasing benefits. The average monthly old-age retirement benefit has increased as follows: 1950, $43; 1955, $61; 1960, $74.

The so-called retirement test governing the amount which a person may earn after retirement without forfeiting any part of his retirement benefits was again slightly increased. I have filed a bill and have strongly supported legislation to bring about a larger increase.

MASSACHUSETTS PROBLEMS

Massachusetts problems, of course, receive my special attention.

Bills beneficial to Massachusetts, which were enacted and which I worked for, were: to establish the Cape Cod National Park; an appropriation for the development of the Minuteman National Park in Concord and along the "battle road"; an appropriation to transfer the Quartermaster Container Institute from Chicago to the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center at Natick, Mass., where the Army felt it could function more efficiently.

I worked to see that Massachusetts got its fair share of appropriations for such programs as urban renewal, airport construction, military construction, flood control.

On the other hand it is necessary to oppose bills that are unfair to Massachusetts.

Some of the programs for Federal grants-in-aid to the States have a tendency to drain money unfairly from Massachusetts taxpayers for the benefit of other sections of the country whose industries are in competition with ours.

Massachusetts people are ready to do their fair share on problems of truly national importance, but when Federal aid is provided for the solution of local problems, Massachusetts—a high Federal taxpaying State—usually suffers. It is necessary to be constantly on the alert to see that Federal aid is not taken advantage of by other areas whose combined legislative power is great, to the disadvantage of Massachusetts.

Many problems affecting Massachusetts must be handled by the executive departments rather than by legislation. The Massachusetts congressional delegation acts as a unit in seeking action favorable to Massachusetts. I have joined in these efforts, and have personally taken up many of these problems with the departments concerned.

Such problems are: efforts to have some of the facilities for the proposed moon shot—Project Apollo—located in Massachusetts; relief for railroads; opportunities for small business, which is of particular importance to Massachusetts; removal of quotas on the imports of residual oil which hurt our area; fair protection of the textile industry; protection for the fishing industry; maintenance of the workload at the Boston Shipyard and Watertown Arsenal in order to preserve job opportunities.

VOTING RECORD

As the fairest and most impartial way of reporting on the highlights of my voting record at this session, I am listing the votes chosen annually by the New York Times as the key House rollcall votes of the year.

NEW YORK TIMES KEY ROLLCALL VOTES, 1961

(What follows is copied directly from the New York Times except for the addition under each item of how CURTIS voted and of his comment on the vote.)

1. Enlarge Rules Committee: January 31, 1961, RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, proposal to enlarge Rules Committee membership from 12 to 15 members, increasing Democratic membership by two and Republican membership by one. Passed: Yea, 217; nay, 212. Democrats: Yea, 195; nay, 64. Republicans: Yea 22; nay, 148. CURTIS voted nay.

It was argued that this enlargement was intended to reform the Rules Committee so that it would not hold back bills from House consideration as it had done in the past. I believed that it was really an effort to transfer the power of the Rules Committee from the hands of one group to another group. Subsequent events have justified that belief, as the enlarged Rules Committee has withheld as many bills from House consideration as did the previous committee before enlargement.

2. Minimum wage: March 24, 1961, KITCHIN, Democrat, of North Carolina; AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, substitute amendment to the administration's fair labor standards proposal. The amendment limited the President's proposal of a $1.25 an hour minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and reduced the number of persons affected. Passed: Yea, 216; nay, 203. Democrats: Yea, 74; nay, 177. Republicans: Yea, 142; nay, 26. The Senate bill, which prevailed, provided for a $1.25 minimum. CURTIS voted for the Kitchin-Ayres substitute.

The above description of the President's proposal is subject to criticism. The bill bringing forward the President's proposal when the Kitchin-Ayres substitute amendment was presented did not call for an immediate increase to $1.25 an hour. It called for an increase to $1.15, together with a postponed increase to $1.25 to be effective in 1963.

I voted for the immediate increase to $1.15 as provided for in the Kitchin-Ayres substitute, but felt that the postponed increase for 1963 should be passed on at a later date. I also felt that some of the increases in the number of persons affected in the President's bill violated the concept of interstate commerce, which was the ground for Federal jurisdiction over those persons. I therefore voted for the Kitchin-Ayres substitute as a more reasonable bill.

3. Depressed areas: April 26, 1961. Conference report compromising Senate-House differences and authorizing direct borrowing from the Treasury, in lieu of congressional appropriations, for Federal loans to areas of chronic economic distress. Passed: Yea, 224; nay, 193. Democrats: Yea, 193; nay, 56. Republicans: Yea, 31; nay, 137. CURTIS voted "nay."

I disapproved of Treasury borrowing, also known as back-door financing, as a means of providing funds for this program. I also believed that the bill was highly disadvantageous to Massachusetts. Many commentators felt that rural areas had been included in order to attract southern votes.

4. Housing: June 22, 1961. Administration's proposed Housing Act of 1961, author-

izing $4,900,000,000 in Federal grant and loans over a 4-year period. Passed: Yea, 235; nay, 178. Democrats: Yea, 210; nay, 38. Republicans: Yea, 25; nay, 140. CURTIS voted "yea."

I believed that this bill went too far in some respects, but nevertheless voted for it, feeling that the good outweighed the bad.

5. Omnibus farm bill: August 3, 1961. Acceptance of the conference report compromising Senate-House differences on the Agricultural Act of 1961, extending production and price controls but not including a controversial proposal authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish commodity control programs unless Congress objected within 60 days. Passed: Yea, 224; nay, 170. Democrats: Yea, 175, nay, 58. Republicans: Yea, 49; nay, 112. CURTIS voted "nay."

I believed that this bill represented a continuation of discredited farm policies, and would not bring surplus production under control as claimed. Subsequent events have justified that view.

6. Foreign aid: August 18, 1961. Final passage of the $4,368,500,000 authorization without the provision, requested by the President, for long-term borrowing authority. Passed: Yea, 287; nay, 140. Democrats: Yea, 195; nay, 63. Republicans: Yea, 92; nay, 77. CURTIS voted "yea."

The bill authorized long-range planning, but eliminated the borrowing authority as the result of a compromise satisfactory to the President. I have supported foreign aid.

7. School aid: August 30, 1961. Emergency Educational Act of 1961—a compromise offered after other permanent school legislation bogged down in the Rules Committee—providing $325 million for a 1-year public school classroom construction program. The bill also extended for 1 year student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act, and extended the existing program of aid to schools in federally impacted areas. Rejected: Yea, 170; nay, 242. Democrats: Yea, 164; nay, 82. Republicans: Yea, 6; nay, 160. CURTIS voted "nay."

The question before the House on this vote was not passage of the bill, but was whether to take up consideration of the bill under the unfamiliar Calendar Wednesday procedure. This was a hastily thrown together and ill-conceived bill. Although it brought forward some entirely new approaches to the problem, the procedure used to bring it before the House was unfair and gave insufficient time for consideration. The fact that the House refused even to consider the bill by a vote of 242 against to 170 in favor is eloquent testimony. Even the National Education Association opposed the bill.

Subsequently the House passed bills extending the impacted area and NDEA laws, and I voted for them.

CURTIS BILLS

It is the practice of some Congressmen to file a large number of bills, many of which are repetitions of other bills already before the Congress on subjects of popular interest. I have not followed that practice, but have limited my bills to matters of special interest to the 10th District or to matters which I felt were insufficiently covered.

Among the bills which I filed this year were the following:

H.R. 5975, to increase earnings limitations for persons retired under social security to $2,400.

H.R. 4730, to equalize overtime and holiday pay for substitute postal employees with those of regular employees.

H.R. 2884, to make veterans disability benefits the same whether the disability was incurred in peacetime or in wartime.

H.R. 3432, to extend to Government employees who are not veterans the same rights of appeal on civil service questions as are now given to Government employees who are veterans.

H.R. 2754, to rename the Veterans' Administration hospital on South Huntington Avenue in Boston as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

H.R. 5113, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to provide space for State veterans' agencies as they now do for certain national veterans' organizations, as desired by the Massachusetts Office of Veterans' Services.

These bills will be further taken up at the second session of the present Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS

I also filed nine private bills relating to individual problems regarding immigration. These usually seek an exception to some law or regulation which would create hardship if literally applied.

The objectives of two of these bills were accomplished by administrative action. The remainder will be considered at the next session beginning in January. As Congress completed this fall only the 1st session of the 87th Congress which lasts 2 years, pending legislation will be carried over until Congress reconvenes in January.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

I believe that one of my major duties is to see to it that constituents are fairly treated in all their dealings with the Federal Government. I maintain offices open throughout the year in both Boston and Washington for every possible service to constituents. I conduct periodic meetings with constituents in every section of the district.

My newsletters published in the local press seek to keep people in touch with matters of interest in Washington, and report on my activities. I both write these letters and do the necessary research myself.

In appearances at local gatherings I have pointed out the falseness of Soviet claims—especially those relating to peaceful coexistence, immediate and total disarmament, and Western colonialism. I have urged greater understanding and appreciation of the American heritage of freedom. I have urged increased efforts in the cold war, especially in the field of propaganda in which the Soviet-bloc nations have so outmatched us.

CONCLUSION

In closing this report, I express my appreciation to the people of the 10th District for the honor and privilege of representing them in the Congress of the United States.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).